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NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The general method followed in this volume is the same as that in Parts I–X. Of the new classical texts, 1860–2 are printed in a dual form, a literal transcript being accompanied by a reconstruction in modern style. In the others, and in the fragments of extant authors, the originals are reproduced except for separation of words, capital initials in proper names, expansion of abbreviations, and supplements of lacunae. 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. The Graeco-Egyptian literary texts and 1857, which is a non-literary document, are given in modern form with accentuation and punctuation. Abbreviations and symbols are resolved; additions and corrections are incorporated in the text, their occurrence being recorded in the critical apparatus, where also faults of orthography, &c., are corrected if they seemed likely to give rise to any difficulty. Iota adscript has been printed when so written, otherwise iota subscript is employed. Square brackets [ ] indicate a lacuna, round brackets ( ) the resolution of a symbol or abbreviation, angular brackets ⟨ ⟩ a mistaken omission in the original, braces { } a superfluous letter or letters, double square brackets [ ] a deletion in the original. Dots placed within brackets represent the approximate number of letters lost or deleted; dots outside brackets indicate mutilated or otherwise illegible letters. Letters with dots underneath them are to be considered doubtful. Heavy Arabic numerals refer to the texts of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri in this volume and Parts I–X, ordinary numerals to lines, small Roman numerals to columns.

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

Archiv = Archiv für Papyrusforschung.
**LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

P. Cairo Maspero = Catalogue des Antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire, Papyrus grecs d'époque byzantine, by J. Maspero.
P. Hamburg = Griech. Papyrusurkunden der Hamburgischen Stadtbibliothek, by P. M. Meyer.
P. Leyden = Papyri Graeci Musei Antiquarii Publici Lugduni-Batavi, by C. Leemans.
P. Par. = Les Papyrus grecs du Musée du Louvre, Notices et Extraits, t. xviii. 2, by W. Brunet de Presle and E. Egger.
P. Reinach = Papyrus grecs et démotiques, by T. Reinach.
I. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

1351. Leviticus xxvii.

2.6 x 5.9 cm. Fourth century. Plate I (recto).

This small fragment comes from a vellum leaf which contained double columns and when complete must have been nearly square in shape. It is inscribed with upright uncialis of medium size and the regular Biblical type; though somewhat heavy, they are well formed and probably not later than the fourth century. A new paragraph is marked by a projection of a couple of letters into the margin, as well as by a paragraphus (l. 6; cf. e. g. 1169). At the ends of lines an unusual unevenness was permitted. The quality of the text is not apparent from so short a specimen; a minor agreement with a few cursive MSS. is noticeable in l. 15.

Recto. Plate I.

Col. i. Col. ii.

. . . . . .

5 μης καὶ εσται αυτῶ

[ο ιερεὺς ἀνὰ μέσον

. . . . . .

Verso.

Col. i. Col. ii.

10 ὁ αγιάσας

[ο αὐτὸν προσθησεῖ τὸ [ἐπιπεμπτὸν] τοῦ αρ

. . . . . .

φέσεως ἀποδόθησε 24
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[γυριου π]ρος την τει ΤΩI [μην α]υτου και έσται
15 [αυτω] εαν δε μη λυ [τρωσ]θει που

4-5. A omits της τιμης.
8. [γαμησι]: γαμαει FM.
15-16. λυτρωσιει: so the cursives 15, 53, 108, 118; λυτρωσιει is the usual reading.

1352. PSALMS lxxxi, lxxxi.

13.1 x 10.5 cm. Early fourth century.

A practically complete vellum leaf from a book of the Psalms. The stichometrical arrangement of lines, for which 1226 supplies an early instance, is not here adopted, but stichometrical divisions are marked, somewhat erratically, by means of double dots (cf. 657 and 1078). The letters, which are of a third to fourth century type, show some variation both of size and formation; as a rule they are upright, but in l. 21 the scribe has lapsed into a sloping style. At its best this hand is rather similar to that of 849, and is no doubt of approximately the same date. THEOS and κύριος are abbreviated as usual, but not ιος (ll. 8, 37). Vertical and horizontal lines were drawn with a hard point as boundaries of the column, but there are no apparent traces of horizontal ruling within the space so marked. Alterations here and there have been made by a corrector who used a small cursive script. The pagination is original. The text is of a markedly 'mixed' character. An agreement with R is noticeable in l. 42, and another with the Vetus Latina against all other authorities in l. 15. In l. 34 a reading of ART has been substituted, presumably by the diorthotes, for that of BN. Peculiar variants, apart from the spelling of proper names, occur in ll. 11, 15, 17, 21, 26.

Verso.

rhoθ κατα σου διαθηκην διεθυντο τα lxxii. 6, 7
σκηνοματα των Ιδουμαιων και οι
Ισραηλειται Μωαβ': και οι Αγγαρη
νοι Ταιβα και Αμμων και Αμαλκη' 8
5 και αλλοφυλοι: μετα των κατοι
κοιντων Τυρων: και γαρ και Ασσουρ 9
THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

συνταγμένοι μετ' αυτῶν: ἐγενομένοι εἰς αὐτὴν τοις νοσί
Δωτοι:

ον: διαψαλμα

ποιησάμεν [αὐτοῖς ὡς τῇ Μαθί] αμ' καὶ τῷ σώζοντα: ὡς ο Ἰαβειν
ἐν τῷ χειμαρρῷ Κείσων: ἐξολε
θρεβθησαν: ἐν Ἀρδώμ' εγενθηθε

σαν κοπρος τῇ γη: εθον τους αρ
χοντας αυτῶν ὡς τον Ὀρηδ' καὶ
Ζηβ' καὶ Ζεβεβ' καὶ Σαλαμαί: α
ποντας τους αρχοντας αυτῶν: οι

τινες εισαν κληρονομησωμε

εαυτοις το αγιαστηριον του δων:

ο δ' μου εθον αυτους ὡσ τροχων:

ως καλαμην κατα προσωπων:

Recto.

ανευμον: οςει πωρ ο διαφλεξει δρυ

μον: οςει φλωξ κατακαυσα ορη: ου

τους καταδωξεις αυτους εν τη κα

tαιγιδι σου: και εν τη οργη σου κατα

εις αυτους: πληρωσον τα προσω

πα αυτων ατειμιας: και ζητησου

συν το νομια [ου] ατειμιας: κσι

ζητησουσιν το νομια σου κε: οι αισχυ

θητωσαν και ταραξθητωσαν εις τον

αιωνα του αιωνος: και εντραπητω

σαν και απολεοθωσαν: και γνωτωσαν

οτι νομια σοι κσ: συ μονος [ε]υψιτος

επι πασαν την γην:

πγ εις το τελος υπερ των ληνω

lxxxiii.
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tois νοις Κορε ψαλμος
ως αγαπητα τα σκηνωματα σου κε:
των δυναμεων; επιποθει και εκ
40 λειπει η ψυχη μου εις τας αυλας του
κυ: η καρδια μου και η σαρξ μου η
γαλλιασατο επι του θυ του ζωντα:
και γαρ στρουθιων ευρεν αυτω

1. διεθνο: l. διεθνο.
4. Γαζια: Γαζια Νατα; Γαζαλ AT, Ναζαλ B.
5. και is omitted by Νατα'T and many cursives.
10. διαγαμμα: om. ART.
11. ταυσιν, the corrected reading, is that of the MSS.
ανωτα: ανων R. There is no other authority for the insertion of γη after η.
12. l. Σαμαρα (Σαμαρα ΒΗΑΤ). Possibly the superfluous letters were dotted by
the corrector (cf. ll. 29, 34), for dots, if they had been inserted, would be no longer visible in this place.
13. Κεισων: Κεισων ντ Λ.
εξιδεθνισθσενα: εξιδεθθρ. Λ, εξιδεθθρ. Βαθ.
14. Αρθωρ: cf. the cursive 276 Aρθωρ, 293 Αλδωρ; Αλδωρ ΒΗΑΤ. The δ has
a dot over it and may be meant to be cancelled; cf. ll. 29, 34.
15. κατορος: ως κατορος B, ωςι κ. ΝΑΤ.
η γη: της γης R.
16. Ωρα: Ωρα ΜΑΤ. Ωρα MSS.
17. Ζαζια: Ζαζια MSS.
Σαλμαν: Σαλμαν B, Σαλμαν ΝΑΤ* (Σαλμαν R*) T, Σαλμανα a number of cursives.
απαντας: παντας ΜΑΤ.
20. αγασητηρων: so ΝΑΤ; αγασητηρων BR.
21. έδω: cf. l. 15; έδω ΜΑΤ.
23. ανεμου: πνευ ΝNA. R omits ο after πν.
24. κατακαπου: κατακοπου R.
26. καταδες: καταδες ΒΗΑΤ, καταδες T, καταδες R.
28. ζτητωσων Τ.
29. ανωτα: προσωπον Λ.
29-30. A dittography of αυτων... ωμα has been inaccurately removed. In l. 29 the
repeated letters have had dots placed above them; in l. 30 this method of deletion was
abandoned and a round bracket inserted, but not in quite the right position. A corresponding
bracket no doubt preceded αυτων in the previous line.
34. η, as originally written, is found in ΒΗ; om. ART. The two letters have been
cancelled by dots added above the line. ο ναστας R*.
37. τοις: om. R.
39. επιποθει R.
41. κ(νιο)ν: β(νιο)ν ΝNA. ηγαλλιασατο, as originally written, occurs also in the cursives
114, 202, 204. The alteration was made by the first hand.
42. τον β(νιο)ν του ζωντα: so R; β(νιο)ν ζωντα ΒΗΑΤ.
1353. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

1353. First Epistle of Peter v.

13·5 x 10·1 cm. Fourth century.

A leaf of thin vellum, broken and worm-eaten, but showing approximately the original dimensions. No clear traces of ruling are discernible. To the small size of the page the round uncial writing is on a rather disproportionately large scale; the hand bears a general resemblance to that of the Codex Sinaiticus, though both the lines and the individual letters are there rather less widely spaced. There is no clear instance of punctuation. Of the common angular sign used to fill up short lines there is one doubtful example in l. 3. theós and Xριστός were contracted as usual. The pagination number entered by a different hand on one side of the leaf shows that the volume was of considerable compass.

The text appears to have stood in no close relationship to that of any of the main authorities. An agreement with B against most other testimony is noticeable in l. 13 (cf. l. 25), but there are divergences elsewhere, e.g. ll. 17, 27. A variant not otherwise attested occurs in l. 6, and there is certainly one reading, more probably two, which have hitherto rested on much later authority (ll. 11, 34); cf. in this respect 1075. introd., 1170.

Recto.

δωσιν χαρίν π[α]πεινω v. 5, 6

θην[τ]ε ουν ὑπο την κρ[α]

ta[a]v χειρα του ὑν ἵ

ναι χριας υψωση en

καιρω πασαν τ[η]ν με

ρημαν[τ] v[μων επιρη

ψατε επ αὑτον στι αν

tω μελει π[ερι] υμων

ςη[ψατε γρηγορησα]

ςο[ς] ι[μων α[δε]λφοτη

ςι ημας εις την αιω

νιον[α]ν αυτον δοξαν εν

τω ωλιγ]ων π[αι]θνησα

καιροι καθιαρτει στη

ςι[ρει θε]ιονοςει αυτω

κρατος εις τους αιωνας

ςι[ς αιωνων αμην]

ςι Σιλουανων υμν

ςι πιστου αδελφου

ςι λογιζομαι δι ολι

[ω]ρ]υ εγραφα παρακα

ςι και επιμαρτυρων

Verso.
3. χειρα: so BKL; χειραν NA. The complementary mark at the end of the line is uncertain.
4. A dark mark above the line after ψωφη is probably not to be regarded as a stop. A diaeresis over ν of ιμας is likely to have disappeared in a lacuna.
5. καιρο: A adds επισκοπης.
6. επιρψατε: επιρ(ρ)ψατε MSS.
9–10. It may be inferred from the space that οτι did not precede ο as in ΝοL.
11. [ο δε]θρος: the β, of which the vestige is hardly to be mistaken, is slightly to the right of ο of ωρινονος, and since ω is an exceptionally broad letter it is clear that δω does not fill the available space. The addition of the article appears to be peculiar to the tenth-century cursive 13; another agreement, however, with that MS., which Eichhorn described as the queen of the cursive, is found in l. 34 below.
13. καταστεινιν: so B (καταστεινιν), Westcott-Hort; τίνα καταστεινιν ΝΚΛ &c., τίνα καταστεινιν A &c. The common spelling καταστεινιν is found also in Ν* (καταστεινιν).
17. κοσμω: so ΑΚΛ &c.; τω κοσμω BN.
18. K transposes ιμαν αδελφοτης; L omits ιμαν.
19. επιτελεσθε is for -θαθει.
21. ιμας: so K; ιμας BNAL.
22. δοξα: βασιλειιν και δοξαν L.
23. There is no room for το which in B precedes Χριστω, nor for Ιησου which ΑΚΛ add after it.
24. καταστεινιν: καταστεινιν ΝΑΑ; καταστεινιν ιμας ΚL.
25. ΝΚΛ &c. add θεμελιωσαν after ιθεθωσαν; BA agree with 1353 in its omission.
26. ε of εις is slightly to the left of ν of αθυμοσετε and directly over the first ν of αιωνων. It therefore appears that the reading here was still shorter than that of BA, and perhaps το was omitted, or η δοξα may have replaced το κρατος as in cursive 45. ΝL have η δοξα και το κρατος, Κ η δοξα και το κρατος.
27. [των αιωνων]: so ΝΑΚΛ &c.; om. B.
32. There would be no room for και (Ν) at the end of the line.
34. θ(τον) ν: τον θεον all uncial MSS. But though the letters θθ here are damaged and indistinct, there can be no doubt from the space that τον was omitted, as in a few cursive, including 13. At the end of the line ετοικετε (ΚL) would obviously be much too long.

1354. EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS i.

23-2 x 10-3 cm. Sixth or seventh century.

This papyrus leaf containing the beginning of the Epistle to the Romans is in far from good condition. One side is broken away and other damage has been sustained, especially on the verso, where decipherment is in places difficult. When complete, if the margin at the bottom of the columns was similar to that
at the top, the leaf was about 28 cm. high, and its breadth may be estimated at about 18 cm. The upright script, large and very heavy, is in the later Byzantine style; similar hands are seen e.g. in the illustrated chronicle edited by Bauer and Strzygowski, Denkschr. Wiener Akad. li. 204, and the papyrus codex of Cyril Alex. De adoratione (New Palaeogr. Soc. Plate 203). The ink is of the reddish-brown colour common at that period. A high stop is used in l. 29 and a paragraphus occurs below l. 33, the initial letter of the following paragraph being also enlarged. The usual contractions are found, including that of υός, though this word is once written out (l. 6). Textually the fragment is of slight interest.

Recto.

\[\text{προς Προμαίνους}\]

\[\text{[Παυλος δουλος Ἡν Χυ κλητος απο}\]

\[\text{στολος αφωρισμενος εις εναγγελιῳ}\]

\[\text{δύο προεπηγγειλατο δια τω}\]

\[\text{[προφητων] αυτον εν γραφαις α}\]

\[\text{[γιαις περι των ύιων αυτων του γε}\]

\[\text{[νομενον εκ σ]περματος Δαδ κατα}\]

\[\text{[σαρκα του ορισθεντος υυ δυ εν}\]

\[\text{[δυναμει κατα] πνα αγιωσυνης εξ α}\]

\[\text{[ναστασεως νεκρων Ἡν Χυ του κυ}\]

\[\text{[ημων δι ου] ελαβομεν χαριν}\]

\[\text{[και αποστολην ε]φ[ε]υπακοιν πιστε}\]

\[\text{[ως εν πασιν τοις εθνειν υπερ τιον]}\]

\[\text{[ονοματος αυτων εν οις εστε και [ν]}\]

\[\text{[μεις κλητοι Ἡν Χυ πασιν τοις ουσι]}\]

\[\text{[εν Ρωμη αγα]πητους δυ κλητους}\]

\[\text{[αγιος χαρις] ουμην και ερημην α}\]

\[\text{[πο δυ προς ημων και κυ Ἡν Χυ}\]

\[\text{[. . . . . . . . . . τιω δυ μου δι[a] Ἡν Χυ}\]

\[\text{[περι παντων υ]μον οτι η πιστις}\]

\[\text{[υμων καταγγειλε]ε [εν εν ολω τω}\]

\[\text{[κοσμου μαρτυριας γαρ μι[λ]υ ε[οιν ο]}\]

\[\text{[δυς οω λατρευω] ειν πινι μου εν τω}\]
Verso.

ευαγγελιων του ὅπο αὐτον ὡς αδια
25 λῆπτων μνειαν ὑμὸν ποιουμαι παντοτῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν προσευχῶν μου δέομενοι εἰ τὸς ἡδῆτο ποτε εὐδοκῇ θησομαι εἰ τῷ θεληματι τοῦ θν ελθεῖ πρὸς ήμας· εἰποθήω γαρ ἰδεῖν ήμας
30 ὅτι μεταδόχα χαρίσμα πολύν πνευμό
εἰς το ζητηθήναι ήμας τοῦτο δὲ εστὶ συνπαρακληθήνεσ ἐν ὑμῖν διὰ τῆς ἐν αλληλοις πιστείως ὑμῶν τε καί εμων Ὡν ἔθει δέ ὑμας αγγείων ἀδελφοι ο
35 τι πολλακις προεθεμῇ ελθεὶν πιθοὶ [ὑμᾶς καὶ εκωλύθης αὐξὶ τοῦ δεν ῥο ὅταν τῇ[να καρ]]ποῦ [σχῳ καὶ εἰν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ εἰ] τοις λοιποῖς εὐθεῖαν Ελ ληνιν τε καί βαρβαροῖς σοφοῖς τε καί α
40 νυνθοῖς σφιλετής εἰμι υστὶ το κατ ε μὲ προθυμὸν καὶ υμῖν τοις εν Ρωμη εναγγε[λισ]ασθαὶ ον γαρ επαισχυνομαι το εὐ[αγγ][ελι]ν δυναμιν γαρ δὲν [.] . . . . . . . . [.

2. ἓξον Χ(μωτό)ν: so ΝΑΕΓΚΛ &c.; Χ(μωτό) Ἱουν B and 209 (early fourth cent.).
4. The supplement is a trifle short; perhaps a small blank space was left after θ(εω)ν. Line 11 is analogous.
18. 209 alone has Χ(μωτό)ν Ιη(σο)ν, as in verse 1. A blank space large enough for three or four letters was left at the end of this line.
19. How the initial lacuna here should be filled remains doubtful. The ω of τῷ stands slightly to the left of the κ of και in the line above and directly above μ of υμων in the line below, and there is evidently not room for πρωτων μεν ευχαριστω, the ordinary reading. There is some authority for the omission of μεν (so 40*, Chrys., and some versions), but this reduction would hardly suffice unless there was also a lipography of the syllable τω. Possibly πρωτων was written α.
22. μοι: so ΒΣΑΚΔΕΚΛ &c.; μοι D*G.
26. ὑπερ: l. etl with the MSS.
31. l. στηραθηναι[ι]. The supplement is of full length and the reading of A, τουτεστιν, would be quite suitable. The ε of δε may of course have been elided.
32. l. συνπαρακληθηναι; cf. l. 21.
34. Whether the papyrus had ου θελω ουκ οιμαι (D*G) cannot be determined.
41. G omits τοιε εις Ρωμη.
42. It seems likely enough on considerations of space that the terminal -αι was written as ε once or even twice in the lacuna.

1855. EPISODE TO THE ROMANS VIII.

Fr. 1 11.2 X 4.4 cm. Third century. Plate I (recto).

The following fragments of a leaf from a papyrus book are in an upright informal hand of much the same character as 1171, though smaller in size; it may be assigned with probability to the third century. A paragraphus below l. 53 is the only form of stop, and no other signs occur except the diaeresis. θεός and πνεύμα certainly were contracted, and that the other ordinary abbreviations were used may be inferred with security from the spacing. A correction by a second hand is found in l. 17.

Unfortunately the leaf is badly mutilated, the loss of more than half of every line depriving it of much of its value for critical purposes. The text appears to have been of good quality, showing, like 1171, a general agreement with the Codex Vaticanus, from which the two definite divergences are the avoidance of the vulgar spelling ἐφ' in l. 16, and an illegible reading in l. 17, where the unknown variant ελευθερωθησαί απο for ελευθερωθησαί απο has been inserted by the corrector.

Verso.

ον [της ο]αρκι viii. 12
[tou kata sarca ζην ei gar kata sarca ζη[ε] mel]
[λετε αποθησκειν ei de πνι τας πραξεις] tou so
[ματος βανατουτε ζησεθε οσοι γαρ πνι δυ αγον]

5 [ται οντοι υι δυ εισιν ου γαρ ελαβετε πνα] δουλειας
[παλιν εις φοβον αλλα ελαβετε πνα υιοθεσιας en]
[ω κραζομεν αββα o πηρ αυτο το πνα συγμαρτυ]
[ρει το πνι ημων στι εσεμν τεκνα θυ ει δε τεκνα]
[kai κληρονομοι κληρονομοι] μεν δυ συγκληρον

10 [μαι δε Χυ εισερ συνπασχομεν ινα και συνδοξα]
[σθαμεν λογίζομαι γαρ στι ουκ] αξια [τ]α παθηματα 18  
[του νυν καιροι προς την μελλουσαν διρξα'ιν αποκα] 19  
[λυφθημαι εισ ημας η γαρ αποκαραδ[ο]κια] της [κ]πτι  
[σεως την αποκαλυψιν των] ήιον του δι απεκ  
15 [εξεται τη γαρ ματαιωτη η] κτισις υπεταγη  
[ουχ εκουσα αλλα δια τον υποταξαντα [ε]πε ελπιδι  
οιται απει]  
[οτι και αυτη η κτισις ελευθερωθη[.] .]] της δου  
[λειας της φθορας εις την ελευθεριαν της δοξης]  
[των τεκνων του δι οιδαμεν] γαρ οτι[ε] πασα η κτι  
20 [σις συνστεναζει και συνωδιει αχρι] του νυν  
3 lines lost.  
[βλεπο]μενη  
24  
25 [ουκ εστιν ελπις ο γαρ βλεπει τις ελπιζει ει] δε ο ου  
[βλεπομεν ελπιζομεν δι υπομονης απ'εκδεξ'ο]  
[μεθα ωσαντος δε και το πνα συναντιλαμβανεται]  
[τη ασθενεια ημων το γαρ τι προσευξωμεθα κα]  
[θο δει ουκ οιδαμεν αλλα αυτο το πνα υπερεβη[τ]γγχα  
30 [νει στεναγμοι αλαλητοι ο δε εραυνων τας καρδιας] 

Recto. Plate I.

τις [εγκαλεσει κατα εκλεκτων θυ θε ο δικαιον τις  
ο κατ'ακρινων Χο μου] ο αποθανου μαλλον δε εγερθεις  
ος και εστιν εν δεξια του θυ ος και εντυχχαινει υπερ] 
ημων της ημας χωριει απο της αγαπης του Χου  
35 θλιψις η στενοχωρια η διωγμος η λειος η γυμνοτης  
η κινδυνος η μαχαιρα καθως γεγραπται οτι εισε]  
σου θαγατουμεθα ολη την ημεραν ελογισθης] 
ως προβατα σφαιρις αλλ εν τουτοις πασιν υπερικω]  
μεν δια του αγαμησαντος ημας πεπεισαμε γαρ στι  
38  
40 ουτε θανατος ουτε ζωη ουτε αγγελου ουτε αρχαι ου  
τε ενεστωτα ουτε μελλοντα ουτε δυναμεις ουτε  
ψωμα ουτε βαθος ουτε τις κτισις ετερα δυνησται  
39
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\[\eta\]μας χωρίσαι ἀπ' ὅ τις ἀγαπᾷ τοῦ δὲ τῆς εἰ δω ἔν δε ἱν
[τά\]ω καὶ ἡμῶν [ἀληθείαν λέγω εἰ δω ὁ νοεῖ χωρίσαι
συμπαραγοραὶς: μοι τῆς συνειδησεως μου εἰ δὲ πνεύμα
αγὼ στὶ λυπή μοι ἐστὶν μεγάλη καὶ αἰδαλεύτος ο反复
δυνὴ τῇ καρδίᾳ μου ἡμῶν γερα αναθεμα εἰναι αν
τού εὖ ēν οτι τοῦ δω ἐν εὐδελφων ὁμοί τῶν συγγε
νὼν μου κατά σιάρκα

3 lines lost.

αἰωνίας αμὴν ὁμοί δὲ στὶ εἰκεπτωτέων ο λόγος

toū ἔν δὲ γαρ παντες οι εἴ Ἰηλ οὐτοι Ἰηλ οὐδ στὶ

5, 6

ἐιναι σπέρμα Αβρααμ παντες τεκνα αλλ εἰν Ἰσαακ
κληθηνε[ται σοι σπέρμα του ἐστιν ου τα τεκνα τῆς
σαρκώς ταυτα τεκνα τοῦ δὲ αλλα τα τεκνα τῆς εὐαγγέ
λιας Λογιστεῖται εἰς σπέρμα επαγγελιας γαρ ο λόγος

7

ἐντος κατα τον καιρὸν τουτον ελεύσομαι καὶ

60 έσται

3. τον αὐθιματο: so B\&ACKL &c.; της σαρκος DEFG.

7. It is quite unlikely that \(ωτε\), which in DE precedes \(α\τρ\), stood in the papyrus.

14. τον: om. FG.

16. [e\[\]: so AB\&CD\&EKL &c.; \(\epsilon\) B\&NCD\&FG.

17. What was originally written in place of the ordinary reading \(ελευθερωθηται οπο\) is not clear; no variant is recorded. Perhaps the first hand wrote \(\nuλευθερωθη\); ex; the corrector substituted \(ελευθερωθη\ οπο\). At the beginning of the line it is improbable that \(δωτι\) \(ND\&FG\) was read, the supplement being already of ample length.

19. \(\gamma\rho\): de Α.

25. The lacuna is of approximately the same length as those of the three following lines, and it is therefore hardly possible, even with allowance for the large number of iotas, that \(\tau\) και followed \(τε\) as in \(Ν\&ACKL &c\). The most suitable reading is that of \(B\) (so Westcott-

Hort); B\&DFG have \(τε\ τι, \ N\& τε και\). On the same ground \(\epsilonλνη\) (\(B\&CD\&FGK\&L &c\).) is preferable to \(\nuπαμενε\) (\(N\&A\)).

30. There would clearly be no room for the addition of \(υπερ \eta\)μον (\(Ν\&ACKL &c\).) before \(στεναιμοί\).

32. It is practically certain that \(εκ νυκτῶν (\(N\&AC\)) did not follow \(ευρεθεῖς\). With regard to the omission of \(Ι(\eta\)σων\) (so B\&DEK) and the addition of \(κα\) before \(αποθανον\) (so DEFGKL), the space gives no evident indications.

33. \(και\): so B\&N\&DEFGKL; om. \(N\&AC\).

34. The supplement here is rather shorter than in the adjacent lines, and perhaps \(ον\) was read after \(τε\) with FG.

39. τον αὐθιματοτον: so B\&ACKL; του αὐθιματου DEFG.

40. In DE \(ουτε εξωναι\) precedes \(ουτε \alphaρχα\), in C \(ουτε εξωναι\) follows; the papyrus
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evidently had neither of these readings. It is equally certain that 

\[\text{ov} \tau\epsilon\ \delta\nu\gamma\alpha\με\ \text{followed} \ \mu\varepsilon\lambda\lambda\omicron\omicron\tau\alpha, \ \text{not} \ \alpha\varphi\chi\alpha \ \text{as in KL.} \]

42. \text{the may well have been omitted, as in DEFG.}

44. [T]\wedge \kappa(\upsilon\rho)\omega : \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\mu\alpha\omicron\nu \ ACFG. The papyrus possibly read \(1(\upsilon\rho\omicron)\omega \) after \(X(\mu\upsilon\tau)\omega \) with \(D^*\text{FG}. \)

47–8. \(\alpha\nu\alpha\theta\epsilon\mu\alpha\ \epsilon\nu\alpha\upsilon\ \alpha\nu\upsilon\alpha\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\omega : \ \upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\theta. \epsilon\nu. \ \kappa\lambda\iota. \)

48. \(\alpha\nu\upsilon : \ so \ \text{BSACFKL &c.; } \upsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon \ \text{DEG.} \ \mu\upsilon\omega, \ \text{which is omitted after } \alpha\varepsilon\lambda\varepsilon\phi\omega \ \text{by} \ D^*\text{FG}, \ \text{is required to fill the space.} \)

49. \(\tau\omicron\upsilon \ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha \ \text{DEFG.} \)

54. \(\text{ov} \upsilon\tau\epsilon \ \iota(\kappa\rho\alpha)\rho\lambda\tau\alpha\iota \ \text{with DEFG is not impossible.} \)

56. The space would admit of \(\alpha\tau\iota \ \upsilon \upsilon \ \left(\text{S}\right)\b\). \)

57. \(\tau\omicron\upsilon \ \text{may have been omitted before } \delta(\epsilon\omega)\upsilon, \ \text{as in FG.} \)

1856. PHILO.

Fol. 4 \ 16 \times 15.5 \ \text{cm.} \quad \text{Third century.}

The following fragments are from the papyrus codex of Philo of which the pieces identified as belonging to extant treatises were printed under 1173. Apparently the codex contained other treatises which have not come down to us; at any rate we have not succeeded in identifying several fragments, though it is likely enough that of the smaller pieces at least the place will be found among Philo's existing works.

A palaeographical description of the papyrus was given in the introduction to 1173; the numeration of the leaves below is adapted to that of the leaves previously published. Fol. 4, the most considerable of the new fragments, is the left-hand leaf of a sheet of which Fol. 5, from near the beginning of the \(\text{De Ebrietate}, \) is the right-hand portion. Between the latter and Fol. 4, as the pagination shows, 5 sheets, i.e. 20 pages, intervened. The leaf is damaged in places, and in the recto it is difficult to obtain connected sense. Apparently the main subject is punishment, which is also under discussion on the verso, where interpretation is easier. The story of Croesus is cited in illustration of the doctrine that penalties are paid sooner or later, either in this world or the next, where disguise will be stripped off and the soul will be seen as it really is. Of Fol. 8, which belongs to the same sheet as Fol. 7, containing some of the final sections of the \(\text{De Ebrietate}, \) only beginnings and ends of lines remain. Since the pagination numbers are lost, there is no external indication as to whether the leaf preceded or followed Fol. 7. It is written in the more formal though perhaps not really different hand of Fols. 2–3, which come from the middle part of the \(\text{Quod Deterius Potiori insidiatur.} \) But the fragment is not to be found in the
preceding portion of that treatise, nor apparently in the *De Ebrietate*. Fol. 10 is not connected with any of the fragments previously published. It is broken both at the side and the bottom, but the damage is less severe than in Fol. 8. There is an agricultural simile on the recto, ll. 6–10, and the verso is concerned with prayer. Of Fol. 11, another independent leaf, only a small corner from the top remains. Frs. 1 and 2 are in the hand of Fols. 1, 4–7, 10–11; Fr. 3 is in that of Fol. 9, from the *De Mercede Meretricis*, but belongs to some other treatise.

Fol. 4 recto.

\[9\]

\[10\]

\[15\]

\[20\]
Fol. 4 verso.

25 τοις οὖν δοκίμσειν Κρατων τὸν καθ’ εαυτὸν ἀπά
των γενομένων ευδαίμονεστατο εἰναι καθ’
φασιν εκ τοῦ Δελφικοῦ τριτοδος ευθυνών τὸν Λ[η]θ[η]ς επιθέσεσθε τελος οραν μακρο’
β[ι]ν τὸν γὰρ αὕτων ατειμωρητὸν οὐδεὶς προς

30 α[λ]θείᾳ αφειταί δικαιὸς δε τὰς ἀρμοττουσας
διδοσιν εἰ[ς] καὶ μὴ εὐθὺς ἀλλ’ οὐχ γαν οὐς οὐντα,
τινος οὐχ γαρ οὐδεν τῶν εν τῇ φυσε βραβευν
σι παντὶ περὶ εν καιρῳ διδωσι μεντοι καὶ εἰ μὴ ενταν
θα καὶ παρ’ ημεῖς ἀλλ’ εναυτο παρα δικα[σ]ταῖς

35 [κρ]ειτοσι λειμενοι τῶν σωμάτων δεσμῶν
[ο]ν ταθη καὶ τας κακιας εξωτυριαι και ενεβλε
[γ]εν εξ εαυτου ψυχας γαρ ψυχας δικαζοντες γυ
μνας ολας δι’ ολων κατανουσι ειλικρινως ου
[δ]ι αὐθ υπὸ τῶν περιπατων [. . .] κατειλήμπτο

40 [πρ]οτερων απ[. . .]μενοι [. . .] εν τινι συν λ’
[. . .]αρα [. . .] [. . .] [. . .] [. . .] [. . .] [. . .]
[25 letters] . . [. . .] [. . .] πω
[30 ”] [. . .] α[πο[κρι
[32 ”] [. . .] θα
[45 ”] [. . .] ηρι.]
[27 ”] [. . .] [. . .] τυρά
[24 ”] [. . .] μα γιμναζων

Fol. 8.

Verso. Recto.

ακουειν εγὼ η[ ]γοπ[ό]ιοι δ οὐδεν
το αντι δ[ . . .]η[ ]ήν
θρωπος [. . .]
μενα[θ]
5 ακρατα μ. [. . .]

αρ 25 εμαι ομοιον
εμπνευθε
[. . .] ι και
]. δε εξ αποστο
as επεν[ 30 ]τομεν
ρειτεφ[ η]μυν
παν[ τ]ον ολον
προ τοσ . [ τ]υτες δω
10 αλλα πρ . [ ] . . σα .
about 9 lines lost.
20 [ . . . ] . [ ] . . .
ατερους [ ] . . .
σ . [ ] . . .
. . [ ] . . .
about 8 lines lost.

Fol. 10 recto.

εμπειρο[ η]μυν
ευχεται τι[ πα]ρουργον
αναδιδαξθι[ .]
νος η πηδαλιουχων (?)
5 ιουσ δ ουδε π . [ ] . . .
erισωμενος [ ] . . .
τρον π . . [ ] . . .
μηδε γυρευσαι φυτον [ ] . . .
απο πηγης αποχετευσαι μ [ ] . . .
10 μα των αρδο [ ] . . .
η ταυτ[ ] . . .
ουχ Ελλην μονον αλλα κα[ ] . . .
και βαρβαρος [ ] . . .
μενα μαρτυς δε και α[ ] . . .
φων προς Καμβησην . [ ] . . .
> ειποντα [. . .] . . . [ ] . . .
15 [. . .]ον ο[ . . . . . . .]

Fol. 10 verso.

] λογισμου
]σθαι κατα
]α και αθροα
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20

παραστοσθαι τῇ
] ευχαίς αποτει
] οὐκ επισταμέ
] μὲν αρετής δὴ μελε
] τελούσι τας ευχὰς ἵστω
] πρεσὸν ευσεβεῖα κοσμοῦ οἱ

25

κοντες παρατηρητεον δὲ
λεστερων μὴ ὁσα δυνατοὶ
] εἰν εὐχεσθαί δεῖ γαρ τας ὑν
] διδοῖτος μᾶλλον ἡ ἀδεί
μετερείσθαι παρ ὁ καὶ δῆμο
] τον υπὲρ τῇ

30 [σι

. . . . . . .

Recto. Verso.

σωφρόσυνη[ 5 |ν εφεδρεῖ τη
κατασκευ[α εἰ ]γονσαί σὺ εἴχω
ρημὴν θε[ ]νο
τ[ ]γς μῆς μετο κiliate

. . . .

Recto. Fr. 1. Verso.

. . . . . . .
]
]. κλοπαῖς καὶ αρπαγ[αις
]. . . . . .

[υσαφρ . . . . aβ . . .

. . . . . .
]
].[ατ[ 5 |λ αλ[ ]πετο[ ]νυμ[ . .

. . . .

Recto. Fr. 2. Verso.


. . . . .
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Fr. 3.

Recto. Verso.

τοσο[ ] ε[ττ]ιν ἀλλ[ ]
δησαι[ ] [ν]
καθ'[ ] .[ ] .[ ]

[ ] .[ ] .[ ]

5 [ντα· δογ· ] [ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][ν][nu

FOL. 4. 1. The letter after περι may be π, but πλ is unsatisfactory and a substantive is rather expected. περιπεπανωφαίν is possible (cf. Hesych. τεγενεψαι γεγεψμέναι).

5. e of ως has been corrected; apparently the scribe began to write δι. Both ῥ and νι seem to be inadmissible after επομαίνει.

6. θεόν: for the absence of contraction cf. ll. 15 and 16. Elsewhere in this MS, the contracted form is used.

9. ἐπίθεως in the sense of punishment is common in Egyptian documents, but hardly to be found elsewhere except in Philo (Mangey, i, p. 283. 12, ii, p. 314. 1, p. 525. 24). At the end of the line πασφεί would suit the remains, but the construction is obscure.

10. ασφοι after ἀναγόμα looks like a corruption of ανασωμα. τε is perhaps displaced.

12. περιμαθίμα is presumably for περιμαθείμα, which occurs in Philo ap. Euseb. PRAEP. EVANG. pp. 387 c, 393 a (Mangey, ii, p. 636. 1, p. 641. 23); Philo also uses περιμαθείμα. The next word is possibly ὀς.

13. The vestiges are consistent with συμφιλα, though the ν is too far from the μ. εγερμαφαίν occurs repeatedly in Philo, with the infin., as here, in i, p. 387. 30; Philo also uses περιμαθήμα. With other constructions elsewhere.

14. τον δε τον is a possible reading, but the ποι would be unsatisfactory and the passage apparently devoid of construction. The διβρες would rather be expected to be brought into some relation with the γενη. γενηρίδον, if that is the word intended, is intelligible though
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a novel form. Below the interlinear o a correction has been made, but what was originally written (?) and the purport of the alteration are not clear. At the end of the line σνγ. [or συς] seems inevitable.

23. Apparently not εκκόμ. ·

24-38. 'Let not then the truthful seer be despised who, when Croesus was supposed to be the happiest of all the men of his time, so the story goes, warned him under inspiration from the Delphic tripod to regard the end of a long life. For in truth no unjust person is allowed to go unpunished; but he pays the fitting penalty, if not at once, then late at any rate, as some think, although nothing in nature is determined late, but everything in due season. However, he pays it, if not here and among us, then in Hades, with better judges, who are freed from the chains of the body which of itself kindled and inflamed passions and vice; for judging with their souls naked souls they see them distinctly through and through.'

24. Some ink marks in the margin above ονε are probably accidental.

25. τονει suits the space better than των, and δικήθεντι perhaps better than οιδήθεντι. Croesus is referred to by Philo also in ii, p. 60. 13 and p. 468. 116 Mangey.

26. ανδρων is inadmissible.

27-9. According to the well-known story in Hdt. i. 32 the warning τινος ὀράων was given to Croesus by Solon; cf. Diogen. viii. 51 τιλος ὀρα βιων (μακροβιων cod. Pant.; cf. μακροβιων βιων here) τούτο τὸ ἀποφθέγμα Σδίων εἶναι κροιόψ. In l. 27 φωσ is extremely doubtful.

31-2. ονε επτλ.: cf. e. g. Eurip. Fr. 224 Δίκα τοι δίκα χρόνος, ἀλλ' ὄμως ὑποποεοῦντ' ἠλθεν, ὅταν ἴππει τοὺς ἄσεθη βροτών, Fr. 969 Ἡ Δίει... σίγα καὶ βραδεί ποδὶ στείχουσα μάρστει τοὺς κακοῖς δέλ βρατῶν. ἰμβεθεναί has no definite subject and is perhaps an error for ἰμβεθεναι.

34. ενώστε: l. εν Λ(ι)δου γε. For other uncorrected corrections in this text cf. e. g. Fol. 7 recto. 21 and αυθων[θ] for χλιαθω. and Fol. 10. 8-10 below.

39. περισσεύει: cf. e. g. Philo i, p. 288. 6 Mangey ἀπομιμασάμενοι τὰ περίσσει γυμνὴν επιδείκνυσαν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν. [νφ ον] might well be restored in the following lacuna, but there then seems to be no subject for the verb unless κατελθάμπτο was regarded as plural.

40. στον: apparently not ονε.

Fol. 8. 9. The doubtful ο is possibly τ; the next letter has a vertical stroke and is not α nor ο.

24. Ἰνοπ[ο]ον: the first letter may be τ, and γ[ο]ον could be read in place of π[ο].

25. σειαι: or [τ]ειαι.

33. The vestige after σα may be a medial stop.

Fol. 10. 4. πθαλαυὼκος and πθαλαυκεϊκώς are Philonian words, e. g. i, p. 145. 33, p. 131.

43 Mangey.

8. γιρωσοι is a vox nihil; was φιτεσαι meant? The € has been corrected, perhaps from α.

9. ἀποχένεις is used by Philo (Mangey, i, p. 29), but apparently not the verb.

10. A blank space is left after ἀφε, the archetype being presumably illegible or defective. ἀρδοτε would be in keeping with the context.

13. πρὸ σκαμβῆς is unattractive here, and we prefer to suppose that καμβῆταν was written for καμβήσαν; both μαρτίνες in l. 12 and εἰσοποια in l. 14 are in favour of a proper name.

14. For the use of the diple in a prose papyrus cf. 1241. v. 5, 24, vi. 25, P. Hawara 15 in Archiv v, p. 378. A similar sign is employed in 405 to mark a quotation, and possibly this is the meaning of the sign here.

28. l. αξι.
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30. The reason for the comma-shaped mark after πυτυδισιν is not evident. Such marks are not infrequently inserted at this period between doubled consonants, but would not be expected between πυτυδισιν and τυποῦσιν, and there is no parallel elsewhere in 1173 or 1856.

Fol. 11. 6. The first letter may be either γ or ι, and ου εχω may be ους χω-.

Fr. 2. 1. The a has been rewritten.
7. υ is made with a very long diagonal stroke in order to fill up the line.

Fr. 3. 5. The supposed stop may be the top of an ι.
11. The spacing suggests that the division was ἡς ὁράι.

1857. CALENDAR OF CHURCH SERVICES AT OXYRHYNCHUS.

29·6 × 36·4 cm. A. D. 535–6. Plate I (Col. i).

This unique papyrus, one of the most interesting documents concerning the early Egyptian Church that has been discovered, contains a list of συμφοραῖς at various churches on Sundays, festivals, and (apparently) other days through a period of five months in a year which was the 14th of an indiction-series. συμφοραῖς (conventus or collecta), a term applied by Cyril Hierosol. and Chrysostom to Christian congregations in general, is used by Dionysius the Areopagite (fourth or fifth century?) with especial reference to the celebration of the Eucharist; and, though his explanation of the origin of the term (De eccl. hier. i. 3) is incorrect, Socrates, who discusses συμφοραῖς and states that at Alexandria on Wednesdays and Fridays the scriptures were read and expounded, πάντα τινὰ συμφοράν γίνεται διὰ τῆς τῶν μνημείων τελετῆς (Hist. v. 22), shows that in the fifth century συμφοραῖς was used for a service which generally included the celebration of the Eucharist. The word passed into Coptic, e.g. Hyvernat, Actes des Martyrs, i, p. 249 'un jour qu'ils faisaient la sainte συμφορά dans le τόπος des saints apôtres Pierre et Paul, au jour de leur commémoration qui est le cinquième d'Ept' (cf. p. 29), and continues in the calendar of the Greek Church with reference to services on certain important occasions, e.g. Ἡ συμφορά τῆς Θεοτόκου on Dec. 26. Nilles (Kalend. utriusque eccl. i, p. 53 and ii, pp. 61–4) notes, as others have done, the resemblance to the Latin stationes or processions on fixed days to particular churches at Rome, especially in Lent or on festivals, when from before the times of the Gregorian Sacramentary (eighth century according to Duchesne, Christian Worship, ed. 4, p. 124) the Pope participated in the service and addressed the people—a duty which since 1870 is performed by a cardinal as his deputy. The parallelism between this list of συμφοραῖς and the Roman stationes is indeed curiously close, as was observed by the Rev. F. E. Brightman, to whom and to Mr. W. E. Crum we are indebted for valuable assistance in the interpretation of this papyrus (II).
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The text is in two columns, containing 32 and 36 or 37 lines respectively, of which the first has lost six lines in the middle but is otherwise complete, while the second is broken vertically down the middle, so that the details concerning festivals are lost, and there are also gaps affecting the numbers of the days and names of churches. The lines are closer together towards the end of Col. ii, of which the margin at the bottom is broken but was in any case much narrower than in Col. i, as if the writer were cramped for space, and it is not likely that any columns are missing, though a fragment assigned to l. 56 might possibly come from a later column. The script is a rather large, somewhat irregular uncial, the size of λ, υ, and χ and letters at the end of a line being often exaggerated. It suggests a scribe who was familiar with drawing up liturgical documents, probably Coptic as well as Greek, but was not particularly well educated, as is also indicated by the character of the Greek, which is correctly spelled but employs some vulgar forms; cf. notes on ll. 1, 2, and 8.

Abbreviations are numerous, being indicated usually by a wavy line either above or after the last letter written; but the contraction of χριστοῦ is avoided. Diaereses and paragraphi are used occasionally; cf. l. 56, note. The palaeographical evidence points to a date not earlier than about A.D. 450 nor later than about 550; but internal evidence fortunately enables the year to be fixed more precisely. Since several Sundays are recorded, the days of the week are known wherever the days of the month are preserved, so that e.g. Phaophi 23 (l. 3) was a Sunday. This day in an ordinary year corresponded to Oct. 20, but comes, like all the dates in Π as far as l. 62, within the six months' period from Aug. 29 to the end of Feb. during which owing to the difference of intercalation the days on the Egyptian calendar may fall one day later than usual in the Julian calendar. Hence Phaophi 23 in a Julian year next before a leap-year corresponds to Oct. 21. There happens to be no occasion in the fourth and fifth centuries on which Phaophi 23 of the 14th indiction falls on a Sunday, and of the two years in the sixth century which fulfil the prescribed conditions, 535 and 580, we have for palaeographical reasons little hesitation in preferring the earlier, which is in fact the only thoroughly suitable date, being confirmed by two pieces of internal evidence. In the first place the Nativity is recorded on Choiak 28, not 29, as is natural if the year was bisextile; cf. p. 28. Secondly Easter in 536 in Egypt fell on March 23 (Ideler, Handb. d. Chronol. ii, p. 263), a date which is quite in accordance with the indications in Π concerning the beginning of Lent (cf. p. 30), and of which the arrival would form a not unnatural point for the conclusion of the document. In 581 Easter fell on April 6, so that Lent began on Mecheir 30 (Feb. 24), and the year was not bisextile.

Π is thus shown to be concerned with the year 535-6, less than a century
after the Council of Chalcedon (451), which caused a schism in the Alexandrine Church, and to fall near the end of the patriarchate of Timotheus IV and of the period of compromise with the monophysites inaugurated by the Henoticon of the Emperor Zeno. Timotheus died in 536 and was succeeded by Theodosius, who was exiled by Justinian three years later, when the monophysite patriarchs of Alexandria were finally disowned by Constantinople and a permanent succession of rival catholic patriarchs began. The circumstance that Π belongs to the period of compromise accords well with the large number of churches mentioned, which had been greatly multiplied since the preceding century (cf. p. 26), and at most, but probably not all, of which the clergy were no doubt monophysites, as is perhaps also indicated by the exceptional prominence assigned to the festival of St. Philoxenus (ll. 24–7, note).

On the general character of early church festivals and calendars see Duchesne, op. cit. ch. viii. The earliest extant calendar of any of the Eastern Churches is a Syriac one, written in 411 and first published by Wright, and now by Nau in *Patrol. Orient.* x, pp. 11–23, which gives a list of festivals observed in Syria. Of the Latin Church the earliest calendars are the short Philocalian tables (336) referring to popes and martyrs buried at Rome, and the Martyrology attributed to St. Jerome, which is largely based on the same source as the Syriac calendar and in its present form is of the fifth century, a calendar of Tours (461–90), and another of Carthage (soon after 505). The oldest Byzantine calendars, that of Morcelli (eighth century?), that at Naples (ninth century?), and the Menologium of Basil (tenth century), are several centuries later than Π, which, as would be expected, differs considerably from them but agrees with the early Syriac martyrology with regard to the date of the commemoration of SS. Peter and Paul (cf. p. 29). Of the Coptic Church the earliest calendars are those published from menologia by Nau in *op. cit.* x, pp. 187–210 (thirteenth–fourteenth century), by Tisserand from Abul-Barakât in *op. cit.* x, pp. 252–78 (thirteenth century), Wüstefeld's *Synaxarium* (fifteenth century; the second half of the year was never issued), and Basset's (from fourteenth and sixteenth century MSS.; *Patrol. Orient.* i, pp. 224 sqq. and iii, pp. 247 sqq., covering Thoth—Choiaik only). For the modern calendar of the Eastern Churches see Nilles, *op. cit.* and Malan, *Calendar of the Coptic Church.* Π's list is naturally shorter than the medieaval ones, and has many other points of difference.

The starting-point is not the beginning of the Egyptian civil year (Thoth 1 = Aug. 29) but Phaophi 23 (Oct. 21, not 20, in 535), this date being explained by the title (ll. 1–2), which states that the list refers to συνάξεις 'after the πάνας descended to Alexandria'. Πάνας was the ordinary title in Egypt of the Alexandrian patriarch, e.g. in P. Amh. 3 (a). iii. 5 (cf. Deissmann, *Licht von*
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Osten, p. 137), Brit. Mus. 113 (10). 12, but it is applied also to presbyters and even subordinate clergy, e.g. P. Brit. Mus. 417. 3 πάπας Ἄρμουστόλεως (a village in the Arsinoite nome; cf. Deissmann, op. cit. p. 150) and 1631. ix verso. 1. In P. Giessen 55. 2, as Mr. Crum remarks, π' ἂν means πρεσβύτερος, which is often thus abbreviated in Coptic papyri, not πάπας, as suggested by the editor. In 1857 the mention of Alexandria and the obvious importance of the πάπας in question make it much more likely that the patriarch is meant than a local bishop. Oxyrhynchus was the seat of a bishop, who in 534 was abba Petrus (P. S. L. 216. 4); but κατελθεῖν would be a more natural word to use in reference to the patriarch's return than to the departure of the bishop of Oxyrhynchus on a visit to Alexandria. Probably, therefore, Timotheus IV had come to Oxyrhynchus on his way back from a tour of inspection in Upper Egypt, and started homewards a day or two before Oct. 21. The calendar, which is too elaborately written to be a mere private memorandum and may have been publicly exhibited, must have been drawn up either on his departure, if it is a notice concerning forthcoming σωφάξεις, or about Easter or later, if it is a record of σωφάξεις actually held. It is not a complete list of days on which there were services, for few of the churches mentioned were visited more than two or three times in the five months, and just before the Epiphany a whole week (Dec. 31-Jan. 6) passes without a σωφάξεις in an interval between continuous σωφάξεις from Dec. 19-28 and Jan. 7-13. That is the only case where a Sunday is certainly omitted in Π; but a regular use of all the churches mentioned, with Eucharistic services on Sundays and probably on important festivals, is quite compatible with the apparent claim of the writer in 1. 1 to set forth a comprehensive list of σωφάξεις, if that term is interpreted (cf. p. 19) in the light of the Roman stationes as special assemblies on Sundays and holy days at appropriate churches (if possible, the church of the saint whose day it was; cf. ll. 8, 10-11, and 24), at which the bishop of Oxyrhynchus was very likely present. At Rome the stationes are now 87, on 83 different days in a year, distributed among 44 churches (Nilles, op. cit. ii. 63); at Oxyrhynchus the σωφάξεις in about five months from Oct. to March were 66, on about 62 different days, distributed among at least 26 different churches, so that in a year the whole number of σωφάξεις may have exceeded 130, and of churches 40. The days at Rome on which two or more stationes are held on the same day are Christmas Day and the Thursday following the Fourth Sunday in Lent; at Oxyrhynchus two σωφάξεις took place on Tubi 1 (the day of St. Peter and St. Paul), 14, 15 and very likely on a day early in Mecheir (l. 50), possibly others. The use of εἰς in e.g. εἰς τὴν ἄγιλαν Μαριάν (l. 30) to indicate her church is exactly parallel to the use of ad in the Roman liturgy in connexion with the stationes, e.g. ad S. Paulum extra muros; the name of a saint standing for his church is
already common in sixth-century documents, e.g. 141. 3 (p. 25) and P. Stud. Pal. x. 35 (p. 24). That the calendar was an official one, drawn up by some presbyter or deacon or other assistant of the bishop of Oxyrhynchus, for the use either of the clergy whose duty it was to attend συνάξεις or of the public, is the most probable explanation of the care expended on its production.

Oxyrhynchus is not actually mentioned, but apart from the provenance of the papyrus and the correspondence between the saints invoked in 1151. 40–50, a Christian amulet of the fifth(?) century, and the names of several churches mentioned in Π, the fact that Oxyrhynchus was the town in question is proved by the occurrence of at least four known names of Oxyrhynchite churches. Thus the νοτιά ἐκκλησία in ll. 37 and 61 is doubtless identical with the church of that name in a list of guards stationed at the chief buildings of the town about A.D. 300 (43 verso. iii. 20). The continued survival of this church through the period of persecution before Constantine is the more interesting because its existence in the reign of Diocletian had been questioned by Wilamowitz, who (Gött. gel. Anz. 1898, p. 676) wished to regard ἐκκλησία in 43 as a place of assembly. The βαφτιστής ἐκκλησία mentioned in 43 verso. i. 10 perhaps occurs in l. 50, which can be restored εἰς τὸ βαφτιστήριον. ἐκκλησία and μαρτυρίον are sometimes treated as synonymous at this period, as is indicated by e. g. 941. 3 οἰκονόμον τοῦ ἄγιου Ἰωάννου . . . ἀντὶ τοῦ μαρτυρίου and 1311 Ἀνιανός πρεσβύτερος τοῦ ἀναπτυσσόμενου τοῦ ἄγιου τοῦ μαρτυρίου, this μαρτυρίον being no doubt the same as the church of St. Justus in l. 10 of Π; cf. 1151. 50 and p. 27. The ἀμφόδον ἄγια Εὐφημίας at Oxyrhynchus known from 1038. 23 is moreover to be connected with the church of that saint (cf. l. 41, note), and the οἰκ(ονόμος) τοῦ ἄγιου Γαβριήλ in 993 with the church named in l. 54.

Except in the case of the ‘Southern church’ and possibly the ‘Northern martyrium’, ἐκκλησία and μαρτυρίον do not occur in Π, but ἐκκλησίαν has to be supplied with τήν before μαρτύριων (l. 5), Φασίδια (e. g. l. 3), Ἀνιανής (ll. 21 and 44), and ἀμα Ἡράκλειον (l. 40). On the church ‘of the Martyrs’ see l. 5, note. Phoebammon is presumably identical with the saint of that name (Amélineau, Les actes des martyrs, pp. 54–9), whose day in later times (but not in Π; cf. ll. 46–8) was Tubi 27, and who is well known from many Theban and other Coptic texts (cf. e. g. Crum, Coptic Ostraca, p. xii) and Christian inscriptions (e. g. that quoted in l. 20, note), besides B. G. U. 694 (Arsinoë, seventh–eighth century), P. Brit. Mus. 1430, &c. (church or monastery at Aphroditus, eighth century), P. Stud. Pal. x. 35 (sixth or seventh century). Of the last-mentioned papyrus, which is a list of ἡμια supplied to various churches and monasteries at an unnamed town, we append the text with some additional restorations:
The churches of SS. Phoebammon, Euphemia, and Philoxenus (ll. 5, 6, 11) correspond to the churches in ll. 3, 51, and 24 of Π; ἡ ἁγία ᾲμα Ἡραίς (so Crum in l. 7; Wessely reads Ἡμα.) may be identical with ᾲμα [. . . in l. 40 of Π; the archangel (l. 8) is doubtless Μιχαήλ or Γαβριήλ (cf. ll. 8 and 54 of Π), and the ἁγίος ἄββα [. . . (l. 9) may well be the saint in l. 49 of Π, while the monastery in l. 10 can be that mentioned in 146. 1 and 147. 1. Whether ἄββα Μαρκέλλου and Ἁβραμίου (ll. 14–15) are names of churches or monasteries or of private persons is not clear; they do not occur in Π, but in view of the marked coincidences in ll. 5–11 with churches at Oxyrhynchus that town is in any case quite as likely to be the one concerned as Heracleopolis, to which Wessely doubtfully refers it. The ρ of ᾲμα Ἡραίων is uncertain, and in l. 40 of Π Ἁμαίου could be read (cf. B.G.U. 682. 1 = P. Klein. Form. 783 ἐνοκλίου τοῦ ἁγίου Ἁμαίω, perhaps a mistake for Ἁμαία, a name occurring in e.g. P. Klein. Form. 655. 3), or e.g. Ἀμαράνθον, or Ἀμαύριον (a reputed martyr under Hadrian; cf. Ruinart, Acta martyrum sincera, p. 18). But ᾲμα Ἡραῖς is a well-known Coptic saint, whose day was Tubi 28 (Jan. 23); cf. Hyvernat, Actes i. 78 sqq. With regard to the two omissions of ἁγιος in Π, where P. Stud. Pal. x. 35. 5 and 7 insert it, scribes are often inconsistent in the employment of that term (cf. e.g. 146. 1 with 147. 1); but the uniform use in Π of the accusative, not the genitive with τῷ, in the names of ἁγιοι suggests that the absence of the term where Phoebammon, Anniiane, and ama Herais are mentioned was no mere accident, and in the cases of Epimachus and Ision also, whose days are recorded (cf. pp. 26–7), the omission may well have had a real significance. Probably none of these persons had yet been officially recognized as saints: that churches in Egypt were sometimes called after persons who were apparently not yet technically ἁγιοι was already attested, e.g. at Oxyrhynchus (1058. 23 ἐκκλησιά ἄββα Ἰσακίων, later a Coptic saint; cf. l. 46, note), Aphrodito (P. Brit. Mus. 1419. 524 ἐκκλησία Ἐρμείου), Arsinoë (ἐκκλησία
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'siáwvos, cf. p. 27), and Alexandria, where the church of St. Michael was generally known as Alexander's after its founder, the patriarch from 313 to 326, and the church of Theonas was also called after its founder (Cabrol, *Dict.de l'archéol. chrét.* i, pp. 1110 sqq.). Whether the churches of Phoebammon and the two others were so called because they too were the founders is very doubtful. Phoebammon is not known to have been connected with Oxyrhynchus, and though he and ama Heraïs must have been officially recognized as saints soon after the date of Π, they have not survived in the modern Coptic calendar. Anniane may be identical with the 'Anuiān̄' who gave her name to a Memphite village in P. Stud. Pal. x. 297 verso. i. 6; but we have failed to trace her elsewhere. Her name recalls that of Anianus (Anianus is probably less correct), the second patriarch of Alexandria, and possibly she was his sister; but there is a difference of several weeks between his day in the Coptic calendars (Hathur 20, which comes in the period covered by the lacuna in ll. 14–19) and the services at Anniane's church on Choiak 12 and Tubi 17. That St. Anne, the mother of the Virgin, is meant is unlikely; cf. l. 21, note. Phoebammon is a common name, and if he and ama [ ... were different from SS. Phoebammon and ama Heraïs, both they and Anniane might be explained as the founders or even owners of churches. Since monasteries seem to have been sometimes called after private owners, this may have happened in the case of churches too. But it is more likely that they were martyrs or other holy persons venerated at Oxyrhynchus, though on a lower level of sanctity than e.g. St. Menas and St. Victor. They were thus in the same rank as Epimachus and Ision, of whom the former is obviously identical with St. Epimachus in the Coptic calendars, while the latter had a church at Arsinoë in the seventh or eighth century (P. Klein. Form. 299 ἐκκλησία 'Ισίωνος, this Ision being apparently identical with the ἄπα ις[ων] whose monasteries are mentioned in *op. cit.* 603); cf. pp. 26–7.

Other churches mentioned in 1357 include nine which were called after the principal saints, St. Mary (l. 30), the archangels Michael (l. 8) and Gabriel (l. 54), SS. Peter (l. 33) and Paul (l. 34?), the prophets Jeremiah (l. 46) and Zachariah (l. 52, note; which Zachariah is meant is uncertain), 'the Baptist' (l. 47), and 'the Evangelist' (l. 23). The selection of one particular evangelist as distinct from the others is somewhat remarkable. At first sight St. Mark, the founder of the See of Alexandria, might seem to be indicated, but St. John is probably meant for several reasons: (1) he is the only evangelist mentioned in 1151, and all the other saints there named (the Virgin and archangels, SS. Serenus, Philoxenus, Victor, and Justus) had churches in Π's list; (2) 141. 3 θυρωφ ( φ) τοῦ άγίου 'Ιωάννου implies that St. John was the patron saint of a church or monastery at Oxyrhynchus; (3) there is apparently a contrast intended between (St. John) 'the Baptist' and
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' the Evangelist', which goes far to explain the omission of the name in both cases. The remaining churches were called after various lesser saints (chiefly Egyptian martyrs), of whom SS. Cosmas (l. 22), Euphemia (l. 51), Julianus or Julius (l. 48), Justus (l. 10), Menas (l. 11), apa Noup (l. 56), Theodorus (l. 65), Theodotus (l. 63?), and Victor (l. 20) are still commemorated by the Coptic Church, but not SS. Philoxenus (l. 24) and Serenus (l. 4). In ten instances the names are lost, but l. 49 may well refer to the known church of abba Hieracion (l. 46, note). The churches most frequently visited on the occasions of συνδεσις were those of Phoebammon (8 σω.), SS. Philoxenus (7 or 8, including 4 in connexion with his festival), Mary (4 or 5, including 3 at Christmas), and Serenus (4); at the Evangelist's, St. Michael's, and the Southern church 3 συνδεσις were held, at the others 2 or 1. According to Rufinus, who visited Oxyrhynchus early in the fifth century, the city contained 12 churches in quibus publicus agitur populi conventus (i.e. σωνας) exceptis monasteriis in quibus per singula orationum domus sunt (Hist. Mon. v), and he was informed by the bishop of Oxyrhynchus that there were as many as 10,000 monks and 20,000 nuns. These numbers are probably exaggerated, but Rufinus' glowing account of the town's piety is corroborated by the large increase in the number of the churches, which in A.D. 535 probably amounted to 40 or more (cf. p. 21). Oxyrhynchus must have been an important Christian centre, and the disappearance of its numerous churches and monasteries is much to be regretted. Relics of them may be seen in some pillars in the chief mosque of Behnesea, and a single Corinthian column which marks the modern Coptic cemetery in the desert to the south-west of the town ruins.

Besides the list of churches II provides some valuable information concerning the various festivals and other days on which συνδεσις took place. Phaophi 25 (Oct. 22) was a 'day of repentance', a novel expression. A μουπατήριν τῆς μεταροίας at Alexandria is known from P. Flor. 298. 54, and the word is used in the Greek and Coptic Churches for 'obeisance' (Nilles, op. cit. i, p. lxiv). The date is too far removed from Christmas to be connected with Advent, which, moreover, does not seem to have taken its place among Western Church seasons before the latter part of the sixth century, while in the East the κυριακὴ τῆς δευτέρας παρονείας is the Western Sexagesima, and the observance of the τεσσαρακοστὴ τοῦ ἀγίου Φιλιπποῦ from Nov. 14 (his day, which may have come in l. 14; cf. p. 28) to Dec. 24 cannot be traced back earlier than 806, when it was enjoined upon monks by Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople. Hathur 3 (Oct. 30) was the 'day of Epimachus', i.e. St. Epimachus, a martyr under Maximian, commemorated in the Menol. Basil. and by the Coptic Church of the thirteenth–fourteenth centuries on the same day (Nau, op. cit. p. 192, Tisserand, p. 258), but since the fifteenth
century (cf. Wiistenfeld, op. cit., Hathur 4) on the day following. The omission of ἀγίων before his name may well be explained, as in the case of Phoebammon and others (cf. p. 24), by supposing that he was not yet formally acknowledged as a saint; but it is not clear that ἀγίων was anywhere inserted in connexion with the days of particular persons, and the omission may be due merely to desire for brevity. Ision, however, whose day was Choiak 15 (Dec. 11), is not called ἀγίως in the two papyri referring to his church and monasteries at Arsinoē (cf. p. 25), from which alone he was known previously, so that with both him and Epimachus the omission is likely to be significant, especially since Ision, unlike Epimachus, is absent from the mediaeval and modern Coptic calendars. Neither of these two was commemorated in a church called after himself, and that such did not exist is clear from the contrast with the festivals of SS. Michael (ll. 8–9, Hathur 12–13 = Nov. 8–9), Justus (l. 10, Hathur 14 = Nov. 10), Menas (l. 11, Hathur 15–16 = Nov. 11–12), and Philoxenus (ll. 24–7, Choiak 22–5 = Dec. 18–21), which were celebrated by σώναξις in their own churches (cf. p. 19). The archangel Michael's and St. Menas' days (the first of the successive σώναξις) coincide with their dates in the mediaeval and modern Coptic and Greek calendars (a σώναξις of the archangel in the Greek; cf. p. 19); but St. Philoxenus' day, in Egypt at any rate, was not known previously; cf. ll. 24–7, note.

The date of St. Justus' day creates a difficulty. The mediaeval and modern Coptic calendars mention apparently five saints of that name, and Hathur 14 (Nov. 10) seems to correspond to a commemoration on Hathur 16 of Justus, a soldier martyred at Rome (fourth century?); in that case he is different from (1) St. Justus the patriarch now honoured on both Phamenoth 16 (March 12) and Pauni 12 (June 6), (2) the Justus whose Acts are extant (cf. Amelineau, Les actes des martyrs, p. 177), a martyr at Antinoē, honoured in the mediaeval calendars on Mecheir 9, (3) the companion martyr of St. Apollo (Mesore 1), and (4) the son of the Emperor Numerianus (Mecheir 11, but Mecheir 10 in the thirteenth century); but the Justus Martyr mentioned on July 14 in the Menol. Basil., and on Oct. 2 in Morcelli's calendar, is perhaps identical with the soldier Justus. He is not found, however, in the mediaeval Coptic calendars, and the μαρτυρίων ἁπα τοῦστου at Oxyrhynchus, as the church is apparently called elsewhere (cf. p. 23), would better suit the martyr of Antinoē. Hence we are disposed to think that the latter may be meant in l. 10, in spite of the divergence from the mediaeval date of his festival. For a service at his church three days later (l. 13) and one at St. Victor's on Choiak 7 (Dec. 3, l. 20), as well as for a service at St. Serenus' on Choiak 27 (Dec. 23, l. 29), no explanation is given, and the reason for the choice of these days is obscure. The σώναξις on Hathur 17 might be connected with the Alexandrine custom in the fifth century (cf. p. 19) of holding σώναξις on
Wednesday. But the other two days are Tuesday and Monday, and the συνάξεις in II certainly depend mainly on saints' days, until Lent at any rate, when Saturdays predominate to the apparent exclusion of other week-days (cf. p. 30). Wednesdays are indeed until l. 56 more frequent in II than any other week-day (7 συνάξεις, the next being Tuesday and Thursday with 5), but this seems to be accidental. The practice in II apart from Lent is hardly in accordance with Socrates' statements (Hist. v. 22) concerning the importance of Saturdays as a day for συνάξεις in Egypt outside Alexandria.

In the lacuna affecting ll. 14–19 references to the days of SS. Andrew the Apostle (Choiak 4 = Nov. 30), Philip the Apostle (Hathur 18 = Nov. 14), and Cosmas (Hathur 22 = Nov. 18) may be lost; cf. notes on ll. 14–19 and 22. The observance of the Nativity (l. 30) by συνάξεις on three days (Choiak 28–30 = Dec. 25–7, not 24–6, in 535) does not seem to coincide with the three days' festival from Dec. 24–6 in the modern Coptic calendar. The mention of the Nativity occurs on Choiak 28, not 29 which is ordinarily Christmas Day, a circumstance which is best explained in accordance with the mediaeval Coptic synaxarium for Choiak 29 (Basset, op. cit. iii, p. 537) 'en effet elle (la naissance) eut lieu à la fin du 28 de Kihak et le 29e jour, et aussi, parce que dans les années bissextiles la nativité tombe le 28 de Kihak et dans les années non bissextiles le 29, ils (les Pères de l'Église) ont voulu que les deux jours fussent consacrés par honneur à cette sainte fête.' An early observance of Christmas Eve is less likely, for vigils (παραμονή is the word in the Greek Church) are very rare in early church calendars, and if Choiak 28 was Christmas Eve the mention of the Nativity ought to have occurred in the next line. Christmas Day had about a century before the date of II (cf. Duchesne, op. cit. p. 259) been fixed on Dec. 25 in the Eastern Church, one branch of which, the Armenian, still combines it with the Epiphany on Jan. 6, and that the Egyptian Church in the sixth century observed the Byzantine (i.e. Roman) date of Christmas irrespective of the peculiarities of the Egyptian calendar is in the case of so important a festival not a surprising exception to the rule governing saints' days. In an ordinary year, in which Choiak 29 coincided with Dec. 25, there were probably only two συνάξεις connected with Christmas, since Tubi 1 was a day of other commemorations.

In Col. ii the notices of saints' days &c. are lost but can in several cases be restored. The festival of St. Stephen, which is older than the discovery of his tomb in 415 (Duchesne, op. cit. p. 267), would be expected to be mentioned, and either the first of the two συνάξεις in II. 33–4 on Tubi 1 (Dec. 27) might refer to the ἡμέρα (διανού?) Στρεφάνου, who is honoured by the mediaeval and modern Coptic and Greek churches on that day, or the second συνάξεις might be εἰς τὸν ἅγιον
A church of St. Stephen at Arsinoë occurs in e. g. P. Stud. Pal. x. 75. 7. But in the East in early times, as is shown by the Syriac calendar of 411, the martyrdom of St. Stephen was celebrated on Dec. 26, that of SS. James and John, Apostles, on Dec. 27, and that of SS. Peter and Paul on Dec. 28, the first date being still observed in the Armenian Church, which inverts the order of the other two commemorations. Hence, since the service in l. 33 was at St. Peter's, that in l. 34 was probably at St. Paul's, and the absence of a συνάξις at this point in honour of St. Stephen, if not due to Christmas, may be accounted for by supposing that it took place on Thoth 15 (Sept. 12), when there was another commemoration of him in the Coptic calendars, or on Aug. 2, when he is mentioned in the Menol. Basil. In the mediaeval and modern Coptic calendars the day of St. Peter and St. Paul is Epeiph 5 (June 29), as also in the passage from Hyvernat's Actes des martyrs quoted on p. 19.

Tubi 3 (Dec. 29) is Innocents' Day in the Coptic calendars, the Greek Church celebrating also St. Marcellus (ob. c. 470), who, if identical with the Ἀβραὰμ Μαρκέλλος in P. Stud. Pal. x. 35, was formerly venerated in Egypt, though now no longer, and he may have had a church at Oxyrhynchus (cf. p. 24), possibly that mentioned in l. 49. Since the service on Tubi 3 was at Phoebammon's church, ἡμέρα Μαρκέλλου is less likely in l. 35 than ἡμέρα Πηνώιον, but the fact that Tubi 3 was a Sunday is sufficient to account for the σύναξις. After that day there is a remarkable gap of a whole week without a σύναξις, but Tubi 11 (Jan. 6) is the date of the Epiphany in the Coptic as in other calendars, and no doubt ἐπιφάνεια, (τὰ) ἐπιφάνεια, θεοφάνεια or βαπτισμὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ (cf. l. 30) is to be supplied in l. 36. What saints, if any, were celebrated by the σύναξις on Tubi 12–15 (Jan. 7–10), some of which may be connected with the Epiphany, is doubtful (cf. ll. 37–42, notes); but the service on Tubi 16 (Jan. 11) in l. 43 very likely commemorates the Virgin Mary, a well-known saint at this period, and that at St. Mary's (l. 45) on Tubi 21 (Jan. 16) is clearly connected with the commemoration of her death in the mediaeval Coptic calendars and of the consecration of the first church of the Virgin in the modern calendar. Duchesne (op. cit. p. 269) compares that festival in Egypt with one observed in Gaul in the sixth century on Jan. 11 or 18 and in Spain in the seventh century on Dec. 18; cf. also the σύναξις of the Greek Church on Dec. 26 (p. 19). From this point up to l. 52 the numbers of the days are missing, but a festival of St. Julianus on Mecheir 1 (Jan. 26) is perhaps indicated by l. 48, and the festival of Ἐπαναφώρη may have been recorded on Mecheir 8 (Feb. 2); cf. l. 52, note. The two σύναξις on consecutive weekdays, Mecheir 11–12 (Feb. 5–6), at the church of St. Gabriel the archangel (ll. 54–5) may well be explained as implying that Mecheir 11 was his day, in accordance with the two services at St. Michael's on the occasion of his festival.
The mediaeval Coptic calendars, however, commemorate him on Choiak 22 (Dec. 18), the modern also on Phamenoth 30 (March 26), the Greek Church formerly only on Nov. 8, the σώναξι τῶν ἀρχαγγέλων, but now on March 26 and July 13, while Wüstenfeld’s calendar mentions another commemoration of the archangel Michael on Mecheir 12. The only archangel of whom a commemoration is known before the ninth century is Michael (Duchesne, op. cit. p. 276), but as Gabriel had a church, he probably had a day also.

Mecheir 13 or 14 (Feb. 8 or 9) seems to have been a day of special importance (l. 56, note) owing to the approach of Lent (ἡ ἁγία τεσσαρακοστή), which in Egypt began not earlier than Mecheir 14 nor later than Phamenoth 19 (cf. e.g. P. Grenf. ii. 112), and in the year 536 on Mecheir 16 (Feb. 11); cf. p. 20. There was a σώναξι on Sunday Mecheir 15, but none on the 16th or any week-day before Saturday the 21st (11. 58–9), when one of the two σωνάξεις perhaps refers to the day of St. Onesimus, St. Paul’s disciple. The absence of σωνάξεις from Monday to Friday in this week is the more remarkable because in ll. 60–2, which cover the remaining nine days of Mecheir, the dates though incompletely preserved (cf. the notes) indicate only one week-day, also a Saturday, between two Sundays. This sudden rise of Saturday into prominence after Mecheir 15 (cf. p. 28) is not likely to be an accident in view of the significant fact that in about 365 the Council of Laodicea (can. 49, Labbe i. 1505) ordered the oblation of bread and wine in the Eucharist as well as the celebration of the festivals of martyrs to be confined during Lent to Saturdays and Sundays, and it harmonizes very well with the date of Easter in II which has been fixed on other grounds; cf. p. 20. In the concluding month Phamenoth (Feb. 25–March 26, ll. 63–8) the days are lost throughout, and since Wüstenfeld’s Synaxarium ends at Mecheir 30, no comprehensive mediaeval list of the Coptic saints commemorated in the following month is available in a translation; so that how far Nilles’ list, representing the modern calendar, is in accordance with mediaeval tradition, is, when Nau’s and Tisserand’s mediaeval calendars omit the day, uncertain. Hence any scheme of reconstruction for ll. 63–8 is hazardous, particularly since in three of the six σωνάξεις even the name of the church is doubtful. We have, however, attempted a provisional reconstruction based on the assumption that the procedure noticed in ll. 59–62 was continued in conformity with the directions of the Council of Laodicea. The key to our restoration is the identification of SS. Theo[dotus] in l. 63 and St. The[odorus] in l. 65 (i.e. the bishop of Pentapolis) with the saints of those names who are now celebrated by the Coptic Church on Phamenoth 6 and 12 (March 2 and 8), but are not mentioned on those days in the mediaeval calendars. If that identification is correct, the days of these saints were no doubt recorded, the second probably falling a day later than
in the modern calendar; cf. ll. 63–6, note. The day of St. Colluthus also, a well-known saint at this period, may well have been recorded in l. 66, and in l. 68, if Maplav is rightly restored, there may have been a reference to Easter Eve rather than to Good Friday or Easter Sunday. Whether the Sundays in Lent had special names remains uncertain.

Since the calendar clearly includes all the more important festivals during Phaophi—Phamenoth, the absence of certain days and commemorations is noticeable. All Saints' day is celebrated by the Coptic Church on Phaophi 23 (Oct. 20), which is recorded as a Sunday in Π. Since in l. 10 ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ supersedes κυριακή, there is a presumption against regarding Phaophi 23 in Π as All Saints' day, though cf. note on l. 20. The mediaeval Coptic calendars also omit this festival, but the Syriac calendar of 411 commemorates All Martyrs on the Friday after Easter, while the Greek Church celebrates All Saints on the Sunday after Pentecost, this date having been chosen as early as the time of Chrysostom (ob. 407) for a festival of All Martyrs. Hence Oxyrhynchus in 536 may well have observed that festival at the Martyrs' church either on that day or the Friday after Easter, both of which fall outside the range of Π. Of a commemoration of All Souls' day, Nov. 2 in the Greek as in the Latin Church, but not observed in the Coptic, there is naturally no trace. The Greek Church, distinguishing St. James the ἀδελφόθεος from St. James son of Alphaeus, celebrates the former since the tenth century on Oct. 23, the Coptic similarly on Phaophi 26 (the same day) and on Epeiph 18 or Choiak 30. No σώναξις is recorded in Π on Phaophi 26 and St. James is not mentioned on Choiak 30, so that if a festival of St. James was observed at this period Epeiph 18 is a more likely date. St. James son of Alphaeus, who is honoured by the Greeks on Oct. 2 or 9, by the Copts on Mecheir 10 (Feb. 4), when no σώναξις is recorded in Π, but in the mediaeval Coptic calendars on Mecheir 11 (Feb. 5) and Phaophi 5 (Oct. 2), is in the same position. Neither St. Demetrius Μυρόβλατος (ob. about 306), an important saint commemorated on Phaophi 29 (Oct. 26) by both Copts and Greeks, nor St. Barnabas the Apostle, whose day was Pauni 17 (June 11) in the mediaeval calendars, but is Choiak 21 (Dec. 17) in the modern, is mentioned. The absence of a σώναξις in honour of St. Stephen on Choiak 30 or Tubi 1, if ll. 33–4 are rightly restored, has already been discussed; cf. pp. 28–9. St. John the Evangelist's day in the Coptic calendars is primarily Tubi 4 (Dec. 30), when there was no σώναξις in Π, and since his festival would naturally be celebrated at the church of 'the Evangelist' (cf. p. 25), the only place where ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ can come in connexion with that church is in l. 42 (Tubi 15 = Jan. 10), for ll. 7 and 23 refer to Sundays. It is, however, more probable that St. John's day fell outside the period covered by Π, perhaps on Thoth 29 or 30 (Sept. 26 or 27) or Pachon 13 or 16 (May 8 or 11)
when he is also commemorated on days corresponding to the two commemorations of him in the Greek Church on Sept. 26 and May 8. The Circumcision (Tubi 6 = Jan. 1 in the Coptic calendars) is not marked by a σύναξις, an omission which is not surprising in view of the absence of that festival from the old Syriac, Roman, and Carthaginian calendars, although it is found in Gallican use in the sixth century, and in the early Byzantine calendars. Tubi 27 (Jan. 22) is the day of St. Phoebammon in the Coptic synaxary consulted by Amélineau (l.c.), but though l. 47 might refer to this day the σύναξις was not at his church, and is therefore clearly unconnected with his festival. The Finding of the Cross by the Empress Helena in 326 is celebrated in the mediaeval and modern Coptic calendars on Phamenoth 10 (March 6) in addition to the Exaltation on Thoth 17 (Sept. 14), which alone is now celebrated in the Greek Church, though the Menol. Basil. also records the Apparition of the Cross on May 7. There was probably no σύναξις on Phamenoth 10, which falls on a Thursday in Lent (cf. p. 30), and whether even apart from that circumstance there would have been a festival in connexion with the Cross is doubtful.

In the Julian equivalents of Egyptian days appended to the text the numbers in brackets give the dates in an ordinary year which was not bissextile; cf. p. 20.

Col. i.

+ Γνώσις συνάξεως μετὰ τὸ κατελθὲ (ἐίν)

Ινδικτίων) ιδ εἰς Ἀλεξανδρείας τῶν πάπα, οὖτος:

Φαώφι κυ εἰς τὴν Φοιβάμμωνος κυριακή(ή),
κε εἰς τὸν ἄγιον Σερήνου ἡμέρα(α) μετανοίας,
5 λ εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν κυριακή,
Ἄθυρ γ εἰς τὴν Φοιβάμμωνος ἡμέρα(α) 'Επιμάχου,
ζ εἰς τὸν εὐαγγελισμὸν κυριακή,
1β εἰς τὸν ἄγιον Μιχαηλά ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ,
γ ιετ αἰτίων,
10 ιδ εἰς τὸν ἄγιον Ἰωάντον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ,
ιε εἰς τὸν ἄγιον Μηναν ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ,
ιτ εἰς τὸν αἰτίων,
15 ιζ εἰς τὸν ἄγιον Ἰωάνδου,
[Χοίακ] 6 lines lost.

20 ζ εἰς τὸν ἄγιον Βίκτορα,
[ιβ] εἰς τὴν Ἀννιανής κυριακή,
1857. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

| IE | els τὸν ἄγιον Κοσμᾶ ἡμέρα Ἰσόνων, | 12 (11) Wed. |
| ID | els τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν [η] κυριακῆς, | 16 (15) Sun. |
| KB | els τὸν ἄγιον Φιλόζενον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ, | 19 (18) Wed. |
| 25 KY | els τῶν αὐτῶν, | 20 (19) Thur. |
| KD | els τῶν αὐτῶν, | 21 (20) Fri. |
| KE | ὁμοίως els τῶν αὐτῶν, | 22 (21) Sat. |
| KT | els τῶν ἄγιον Σέλεφινον κυριακῆς, | 23 (22) Sun. |
| KP | els τῶν αὐτῶν, | 24 (23) Mon. |
| 30 KΠ | els τὴν ἄγιον Μαρίαν γέννης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, | 25 (24) Tues. |
| KB | els τὴν αὐτῆν, | 26 (25) Wed. |
| λ | els τὴν αὐτῆν ὁμοίως, | 27 (26) Thur. |

Col. ii.

| Τῆλι: | a | els τὸν ἄγιον Πέτρον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ, | Dec. 28 (27) Fri. |
| DP(ως) | καὶ | els τὸν ἄγιον [Παῦλον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ, | |
| 35 γ | els τὴν Φοιβάρμιων κυριακῆς, | 30 (29) Sun. |
| IA | els τὴν Φοιβάρμιων ἐπιφάνεια τοῦ Χριστοῦ, A.D. 536. | Jan. 7 (6) Mon. |
| 1β | els τὴν νυτίνην ἐκκλησίαν, | 8 (7) Tues. |
| NY | els τὴν ἄγιον Φιλόξενον, | 9 (8) Wed. |
| 1θ | els τὸν ἄγιον M[ε]η[νά ἡμέρα . . . . , | 10 (9) Thur. |
| | els τὴν ἀμα ['Ἡραίδου ἡμέρα αὐτῆς (?)], | |
| | els τὴν ἄγιαν Εὐφημιάν ἡμέρα . . . . , | 11 (10) Fri. |
| | els τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν, | |
| 1ψ | els τὴν Λυκανήσης κυριακῆς, | 12 (11) Sat. |
| 1ς | els τὴν Λυκανήσης κυριακῆς, | 13 (12) Sun. |
| 45 κα | els τὴν ἄγιαν Μαξιάν ἡμέρα αὐτῆς (?) | 17 (16) Thur. |
| [Κ] | els τὸν Βασιλεισίθην, | |
| [Μεχειρ] | α (?) | els τὸν ἄγιον Ιουλίαν ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ (?) | 27 (26) Sun. |
| | els τὸν ἄγιον αὐτοῦ | |
| | ὁμολογοῦσαι καὶ els τὸ β' ὁμορρινὸν μαρτύριον (?) | |
| [.] | els τὸν ἄγιον Εὐφημίαν, | |
| [ή] | els τὸν ἄγιον Ζαχαρίαν κυριακῆς (?) | Feb. 3 (2) Sun. |
| θ | els τὸν ἄγιον Σερξίνον, | 4 (3) Mon. |
| ια | els τὸν ἄγιον Γαβριήλ ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ (?) | 6 (5) Wed. |

D
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

55 [β] eis tôn αὐτῶν,
[θ?] eis tôn ἀγι(ov) ἀπα Νουπ ἡμέρ[α] . . . .
[ε] eis τὴν Φοιβάδ(μωνος κυριακή,
κα eis τὸν ἀγι(ov) Φιλάδ(ευνον ἡμέρα . . . .,
ὁμ(ως) καὶ eis τὸν ἀγι(ov) . . . .,
60 κ[β] eis τὸν αὐτῶν [κυριακή,
κ[η] eis τὴν νοτι(η)ν ἐξικλησιαν ἡμέρα . . . .,
κ[θ] eis τὴν αὐτήν [κυριακή,
Φαμενῳ [?] eis τὸν ἀγι(ov) Θεόδ(ετον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ (?),
[β?] eis τὸν ἀγι(ov) Φιλόδ(ευνον ἡμέρα . . . .,
65 [τ?] eis τὸν ἀγι(ov) Θεόδ(ουρον ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ,
[θ?] eis τὴν Φοιβ(άμωνος ἡμέρα Κολλοῦθου (?),
[κ?] eis τὴν αὐτήν κυριακή (?),
[κς?] eis τὴν ἀγι(αν) Μαρίαν ἡμέρα . . . . (?)
Perhaps 1 line lost.

2. ὧν/ II. 10. ἱουστον II. 13. ἱούστον II. 22. ἱστιονος II. 46. ἱ[ ] II.
48. ἱου[ ] II.

'List of services after the patriarch descended to Alexandria, as follows: 14th indiction, Phaophi 23rd at Phoebammon's, Sunday; 25th at St. Serenus', day of Repentance; 30th at the Martyrs', Sunday.

Hathur 3rd at Phoebammon's, day of Epimachus; 7th at the Evangelist's, Sunday; 12th at St. Michael's, his day; 13th at the same; 14th at St. Justus', his day; 15th at St. Menas', his day; 16th at the same; 17th at St. Justus'; . . . .

Choiak . . . ; 7th at St. Victor's; 12th at Anniane's, Sunday; 15th at St. Cosmas', day of Ison; 19th at the Evangelist's, Sunday; 22nd at St. Philoxenus', his day; 23rd at the same; 24th at the same; 25th likewise at the same; 26th at St. Serenus', Sunday; 27th at the same; 28th at St. Mary's, Nativity of Christ; 29th at the same; 30th at the same likewise.

Tubi 1st at St. Peter's, his day; likewise also at St. Paul's, his day; 3rd at Phoebammon's, Sunday; 11th at Phoebammon's, Epiphany of Christ; 12th at the Southern church; 13th at St. Philoxenus'; 14th at St. Michael's, day of . . . ; at ama Herais', her day; 15th at St. Euphemia's, day of . . . ; at the Evangelist's; 16th at Phoebammon's, day of Philotheus; 17th at Anniane's, Sunday; 21st at St. Mary's, her day; 24th at St. Jeremiah's, Sunday; 28th at the Baptist's.

Mecheir 1st at St. Julianus', his day; . . . at St. abba . . . , his day; likewise at the Northern Martyr's shrine; . . . at St. Euphemia's; 8th at St. Zacharias', Sunday; 9th at St. Serenus'; 11th at St. Gabriel's, his day; 12th at the same; 14th at St. apa Noup's, day of . . . ; 15th at Phoebammon's, Sunday; 21st at St. Philoxenus', day of . . . ; likewise also at St. . . . ; 22nd at the same, Sunday; 28th at the Southern church, day of . . . ; 29th at the same, Sunday.
Phamenoth 6th at St. Theodotus', his day; 12th at St. Philoxenus', day of . . . ; 13th at St. Theodorus', his day; 19th at Phoebammon's, day of Colluthus; 20th at the same, Sunday; 26th at St. Mary's, day of . . .

1. Cf. pp. 21–2. *et* instead of *el* is common; cf. e. g. 144. 11 καταγαγεῖν *et* 'Αλεξανδρεία and, for an early instance, P. Par. 10. 2 ἀνακεχάρηκεν *et* 'Αλεξ.

2. *et*: the *et* is partly effaced, but ἐδήλου(πιονος) δ cannot be read, even apart from the difficulty that would arise concerning the date, since Phoebammon 23 did not fall on a Sunday of the 4th induction between 390 and 675, both of which years are unsuitable; cf. p. 20.

πάντα: the writer is fond of using this genitival form for the accusative; cf. l. 8 Μιχαηλά and l. 22 Κατφά. For the name of the patriarch see pp. 21 and 43.

3. Φίλιππους: cf. pp. 23–5. This day was probably not All Saints' (cf. p. 31), and St. Dionysius of Corinth, martyr under Diocletian, and the prophet Joel, formerly honoured on Phoebammon 23 (Nau and Tisserand, l. c.), are ignored.

κωπία(ς): this word and ἠμέρα, wherever they come in Π, might be in the dative, but γενών in l. 30 is in the nominative.


5. μαρτυριφ(ω): there was a well-known Coptic monastery of this name at Esna (Lato- polis), and a church τριάν μαρτυριφ at Arsinóë is mentioned in e. g. P. Brit. Mus. 113 (8). 11, and one τοῦ ἄγιου μαρτυριφ(ω) at a village near Antinoë in Crum, P. Brit. Mus. Coptic, p. 450. The Coptic calendars on Phoebammon 30 (Oct. 27) commemorate SS. Abraham, a Syrian anchorite (fourth century?), Valens, Anatolius (date uncertain), and a Julius and others, martyrs under Decius; the Greek church St. Capitolina, martyr under Diocletian, and St. Nestor (48. 306), and two days earlier (Oct. 25) SS. Marcianus and Martyrius (fourth century), whom Wustenfeld's and the modern Coptic calendars assign to Oct. 28, calling Martyrius Mercurius. Μαρτυρίσων could be read, and in that case he would stand in the same position as Phoebammon, who became a regular saint; cf. pp. 23–5. Μαρτυρίσων, referring to a saint now honoured by the Copts on Pachon 21, is also possible; but since there is a doubt whether there ever was a Coptic saint Martyrius, and Martyrius' day is far removed from Phoebammon 30, we prefer μαρτυριφ(ω) in view of the parallels and the rarity of abbreviations of proper names in Π. Moreover if Phoebammon 30 had been the day of Martyri(σ)us, ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ would be expected in spite of its being Sunday; cf. l. 10.

6. ἡμέρα Ἐσσάμου: cf. pp. 24 and 26–7. Wustenfeld's calendar commemorates on this day SS. Cyriacus (fourth century), and Athanasius and Irene, martyrs under Diocletian; Morcelli's calendar Cyriacus; the Menol. Basil. Epimachus and Eutropia.

7. τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν(ς): cf. pp. 25–6, and, on the date of the festival of St. John, p. 31. A church at Arsinoë was called τοῦ ἄγιου ἀποστόλου simply; cf. P. Stud. Pal. x. 75. 6. St. George of Alexandria (fourth century?, not the soldier), who is celebrated on this day in the Coptic calendars, is ignored.

8–11. Cf. p. 27. Μιχαήλα is not a correct form; cf. l. 2, note. The other saints now honoured on Hathor 12–15 are unimportant. From P. S. I. 63. 25 sqq. it appears that the whole festival of St. Michael lasted eight days or more, since an agreement was made to repay a loan at Oxyrhynchus on the 8th day τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ ἀρχαγγέλου Μιχαήλ τοῦ.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

'Αθηναίοις. There was a church of St. Michael at Arsinoë (e. g. P. Klein, Form. 845), as well as at Alexandria (p. 25). For other mentions of St. Justus' church see p. 23.

12. The lines after ἀνάρων (cf. ll. 25, 29, 31) are merely intended to fill up space, not to indicate a repetition of ἡμέρα ἀνάρων.

13. In the Greek and Coptic Churches Nov. 13 (Hathur 17) is the obit of St. John Chrysostom, the translation of his relics being celebrated on Jan. 27 by the Greeks, but on Nov. 13 by the Copts, who also commemorate his death on Fashon 12 (May 7). For ἱο[θ]ρων cf. l. 10; we are unable to reconcile the three doubtful letters with ἱο[θ]ρων or the name of any other Greek or Coptic saint, but this second σῶμαθαν at St. Justus', for which no special reason is assigned, is remarkable. A similar difficulty arises in ll. 20 and 29, where it can be explained by the supposed omission of ἡμέρα ἀνάρων; but that is inadmissible here, if ἱο[θ]ρων is right, since his day has already occurred in l. 10.

14–19. Three of these lines probably recorded services on the Sundays Hathur 21, 28, and Choiak 5 (cf. p. 22), and the remaining three some of the festivals of SS. Cosmas (l. 22, note), Philip the Apostle (Hathur 18 = Nov. 14 in both the Greek and Coptic churches), Matthew the Apostle (Hathur 20 = Nov. 16 in a thirteenth century Coptic calendar; cf. Nau, l. c.), Anianus, second patriarch of Alexandria (the same day in the Coptic calendars), Andrew the Apostle (Choiak 4 = Nov. 30 in both the Coptic and Greek churches), who probably had a monastery at Oxyrhynchus (146. 1, 147. 1), and Peter of Alexandria, martyr under Diocletian (Hathur 29 = Nov. 25 in the Coptic calendars; cf. Hyvernat, Actes des martyrs, i, p. 263).

20. Βιερόπα: cf. 1161. 49 and two inscriptions from Bawit in Hall, Coptic and Greek Texts, pp. 143–4, where SS. Victor, Phoebammon (cf. pp. 23–5), Menas (cf. l. 11), and George come at the head of lists of saints. ἐστήρα of St. Victor are known at Lycopolis (P. Cairo Maspero i. 67006. 56) and Syene (P. Munich 9. 37); a church at Aphrodito (P. Brit. Mus. 1572, &c.); a λαώρα at Arsinoë was called after him (i.e. his church; P. Klein, Form. 675. 2, &c.), and he is often mentioned in Coptic texts, but which of the five (?) different saints of this name occurring in the modern Coptic calendar was meant in l. 20 is not clear. Abul-Barakât's list (Tisserand, l. c.) mentions only one (Epeiph 20 = July 14), Nau's menologia the same one and two more (Hathur 5 = Nov. 1 and Mesore 24 = Aug. 17), but none of these dates corresponds with any of the eight dates in the modern calendar (Hathur 1, 10, 21, 27, Choiak 6, Mecheir 14, Pharmouthi 4, 27) on which a Victor is mentioned. Choiak 7 in l. 20 suggests a connexion with the bishop Victor coupled with the presbyter Anatolius (date ?) on Choiak 6; but if this Victor had been mentioned in l. 19, εἰς τὸν ἀνάρων would be expected in l. 20 on the analogy of e. g. ll. 8–9, while, if the date of the commemoration has merely altered by a day (cf. the case of Epimachus, pp. 26–7), ἡμέρα ἀνάρων is wanted in l. 20. It is possible that the omission is accidental here and in l. 28, a hypothesis which would remove the similar difficulty in l. 29, where the second σῶμαθαν at St. Serenus' (on a Monday) is hard to account for if the preceding Sunday was not his day. But in view of the inapplicability of this explanation to l. 13 (cf. note), we hesitate to postulate an inconsistency between ll. 10 and 28 with regard to the choice of κυριακή and ἡμέρα ἀνάρων, so that it remains doubtful whether Choiak 7 has anything to do with a festival in honour of St. Victor. Hence he is probably identical with the so-called son of Romanus, martyr under Diocletian, whose day is Pharmouthi 27 and who was the most important Victor; cf. Amélineau, Les actes des martyrs, pp. 177 sqq. On Choiak 7 the mediaeval Coptic calendars celebrate several unimportant saints, the modern calendar Heraclas 8th patriarch of Alexandria, the Menol. Basil. St. Theodore of Egypt, Theodulus of Cyprus, and the prophet Zephaniah.

21. 'Αμελανή: cf. l. 44 and p. 25. The name 'Αμελανή occurs in Lefebvre, Inscription chrét. no. 65. St. Anne, mother of the Virgin, who is commemorated in Wüstenfeld's and
the modern Coptic calendar on Hathur 11 (Nov. 7), in Natì's and the modern on Choiak 13 (Dec. 9, the Conception), and in all Coptic calendars together with the Greek Menal. Basil. on Mesore 1 (July 25), and by the Menal. Basil. also on Sept. 9, is hardly likely to be meant, though Choiak 12 comes near to the feast of the Conception; for apart from the doubt about the early date of that festival, which cannot be traced back further than the seventh or eighth century (Nilles, op. cit. p. 349), the two συνάξεις at Anniæus's church were both on a Sunday and so need imply no special festival. Procopius (De aedif. i. 3) states that Justinian erected a church in honour of St. Anne, but though the Latin Church did not celebrate her till much later, the insertion of δύνας would be expected, if she were meant. July 25 is most likely to have been her day at Oxyrhynchus, if she was commemorated.

22. Κοιμᾶ ἡμερὰ Ἁγίων: cf. l. 2, note, and p. 27. The dedication of a church to St. Cosmas without St. Damian is noticeable. The Greek Church since the tenth century distinguishes three pairs of these saints (1) July 1, Romans martyred under Carinus, (2) Oct. 17, Arabs martyred under Diocletian, (3) Nov. 1, Asians, sons of Theodote, apparently later. The Coptic church since the thirteenth century celebrates the Arabs on Hathur 22 (Nov. 18) and the Romans on Pauni 22 (June 16); a third commemoration in the modern Coptic calendar on Choiak 1 (Nov. 27) seems to refer to the Asians. Hathur 22 and Choiak 1 come in the period covered by the lacuna in l. 14-19, where εἰς τὸν ἑορτα τοῦ Κοιμᾶ ἡμερὰ αὐτῶι may well have occurred on the first of these two dates. The saints honoured by the Coptic Church on Choiak 15 are not important.

23. Cf. l. 7, note. On Choiak 19 (Dec. 15) the Coptic calendars mention St. John, ἤγονεμος (i.e. John, archimandrite of Sitt about 400), and Theophania.

24-7. St. Philexenus, who is also mentioned in 1150. 2 (sixth century), 1151. 48 (fifth century?) and P. Stud. Pal. x. 35. 11 (cf. p. 24), is either an otherwise unknown Egyptian saint or identical with the monophysite bishop of Hierapolis (ab. about 523), who is honoured in the mediaeval Syrian Jacobite menologia on Feb. 18 (Nau, op. cit., p. 72) and other days. The four συνάξεις in his honour (one more than at Christmas) indicate his great popularity, which would harmonize with the shortness of the interval between his death and the date of Π, if the bishop of Hierapolis is meant; but 1151 must in that case be later than 523. The day of St. Gabriel the archangel, Choiak 22 in the Coptic calendars, may have been Mecheir 11; cf. pp. 29-30. The other saints honoured by the Copts or Greeks on Choiak 22-5 are not important.

28-9. For St. Serenus cf. l. 4, note, and, for the two consecutive συνάξεις at his church, l. 20, note. Choiak 26 (Dec. 22) in the Coptic and Greek calendars is the day of St. Anastasia, martyr under Diocletian, and in Basset's mediaeval Coptic synaxarium of abba Hieracon, who had a church at Oxyrhynchus (cf. l. 46, note, and p. 24), but is here ignored. Choiak 27 in the Coptic calendars is the day of Psote and Callinicus, bishops of the Thebaid and martyrs under Diocletian.

30-1. For Christmas Day cf. pp. 20 and 28, and, for γέννα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, P. Grenf. ii. 112 (a), Χριστοῦ Γέννα καὶ Χριστοῦ X(ριστοῦ) γέννα καὶ Χ(ριστοῦ) Γέννα, which seems to be connected with the much disputed formula χριστοῦ. γέννα there, as here, is probably a substantive, Γέννα being a mistake for Γρηγορία. Χριστός of the church of St. Mary is mentioned in 147. 1.

32. On Choiak 30 (Dec. 26) the Coptic calendars commemorate David and St. James, bishop of Jerusalem (cf. p. 31), as well as the second day of the Nativity, while the Greek Church commemorates the Virgin (Flight to Egypt; cf. p. 19 and l. 45) and others.

33-4. For the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, or less probably St. Stephen, see pp. 28-9. In the mediaeval Coptic and Greek calendars the day of SS. Peter and Paul is Epeiph 5 (June 29) and St. Peter now has his own days on Mesore 7 (July 31) and Jan. 16. Numerous other saints called Peter are celebrated by the Copts, but not on any
day close to Tubi 1. A church of St. Peter at Arsinoē occurs in P. Stud. Pal. x. 75. 3. Other saints commemorated on Tubi 1 by the Copts include, besides St. Stephen, St. Leon-tius the Syrian, martyr under Maximian, after whom was named a hospital at Hermopolis (P. Klein. Form. 314. 1, unless the reference there is to St. Leon-tius the Arab), Paul bishop of Ephesus, and Ischyron and Aesculapius, who with 8,140 companions were martyred at Panopolis.

35. Cf. p. 29.

36. For the Epiphany cf. p. 29. In the mediaeval and modern Coptic Church this festival is preceded by a vigil (cf. p. 28) and continues for three days, but since the συνέχεις on the six following days here at different churches, the presumption is rather against their being connected with the Epiphany.

37. συνέχεις εκκεντρική: cf. l. 61, p. 23, and l. 47, note. There was a church of this name at Aphrodito; cf. e.g. P. Brit. Mus. 1419. 526, where the editor has overlooked the parallel from 43 verso. St. Theodorus Orientalis, martyr under Diocletian, whose Acts are extant, is celebrated by the Copts on Tubi 12, and ἡμέρα θεοδόρου may have occurred here, since the church of St. Theodorus (cf. l. 63–6, note) probably refers to a different saint of that name.

38. Φιλόδενος: cf. ll. 24–7, note. Φιλόδενος (cf. l. 43, note) is unsuitable. On Tubi 13 (Jan. 8) the Coptic calendars commemorate the first miracle at Cana and sometimes St. Theophilus, whom the Menol. Basil. also mentions on this day, and St. Menas (cf. l. 11).

39. Μ[παλά]: cf. l. 8. Tubi 14 (Jan. 9) is in the Coptic calendars the day of Maximus, who is apparently identical with the monk of St. Macarius honoured with Domitius three days later, and sometimes the day of Archelides and Irene (date uncertain), while the early Greek calendars commemorate St. Polyeuctus (ob. in Armenia about 259).

40. ήμερα Αρσινώς: cf. p. 24. Her day was subsequently a fortnight later.

41. Εὐερτία: cf. l. 51 and pp. 23–4. She was an important saint whose day in the mediaeval Coptic and Greek calendars is Epiph 18 (July 12) and in the modern Coptic one Epiph 17 (July 11) and Pauni 8 (June 2) as well, so that ἡμέρα αὐτῆς is unlikely either here or in l. 51. On Tubi 15 Wüstenfeld’s calendar mentions the prophet Obadias and a fourth-century St. Gregory (not of Nyssa); the modern calendar Cyriacus and Julitta, martyrs under Diocletian; the Monol. Basil. SS. Gregory of Nyssa (ob. about 395), Domitianus (ob. about 600), and Marcianus.

42. Cf. l. 7 and pp. 25–6.

43. On Tubi 16 (Jan. 11) the Coptic calendars all commemorate St. Philotheus, martyr under Diocletian, and since a church called after him is several times mentioned in the Aphroditos papyri (e.g. P. Brit. Mus. 1572. 9), and, as Mr. Crum informs us, in unpublished Coptic texts from Thebes, his day is likely to have been mentioned here.

44. Ἀντλίας: cf. l. 21, note, and p. 25. On Tubi 17 the Coptic calendars mention St. Maximus (cf. l. 39, note), the companion of St. Domitius, the Menol. Basil. SS. Tatiana, martyr under Severus Alexander, Meorteus, martyr under Diocletian, and Athanasius. But ἡμέρα αὐτῆς would be more likely than a mention of any of these, and κυριακή is still more probable.

45. κα: cf. p. 29. The Coptic calendars commemorate, besides the Virgin, Hilaria, daughter of the Emperor Zeno, St. Gregory of Nyssa (cf. l. 41, note), and St. Agnes (third century).

46. Ἱεροπηγια: i.e. the prophet Jeremiah, whose day in the Coptic calendars is Thoth 8 (Sept. 5) or Pachon 5 (April 30), in the Greek Church May 1, so that ἡμέρα αὐτῶν is unlikely. A monastery dedicated to him near Memphis (P. Stud. Pal. x. 295–8) has been recently excavated by Quibell, and another, in the Thinite pagarchy, is known from P. Brit. Mus. 1460. 12. Ἱεροπροφητεύς, whom the Copts honour on Phamenoth 15 (March 11) or Thoth 20
(Sept. 17), and ἵεροσακ, an Egyptian martyr mentioned in the Syriac calendar of 411 on June 15, who is different from a Nitrian monk contemporary with Chrysostom and formerly celebrated by the Greek Church (Nilles, op. cit. iii, p. 43). are less likely; but ἵειρακίων (who might be identical with the Syriac Hierax) ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ is possible; cf. p. 24. His church, however, may be the one meant in l. 49, where δηνικεῖ δὲ ἰερόσακιων can be restored, but the occurrence of δηνικεῖ, which is absent in 1058, is a slight objection to introducing him in either passage. This saint's day, moreover, was Choisak 26 (Dec. 22) in the fourteenth century according to Basset's synaxarium (Patrol. Orient. iii, p. 525). He lived in the reign of Diocletian and escaped from captivity at Oxyrhynchus (Amélineau, op. cit. p. 83). The number of the day in l. 46 is doubtful, καθως being restored because a Sunday is wanted in l. 46 or 47 before the Sunday which is apparently accounted for in l. 48. St. Antony the Great is honoured by both Copts and Greeks on Tubi 22 (Jan. 17), and if l. 46 refers to that day, he may well have been mentioned. Line 47 would then probably refer to Tubi 24. On that day (Jan. 19) the mediaeval Coptic calendars mention SS. Mary, a nun, Apa Pseote, and Demetrius, the modern one commemorates St. Mercurius of Alexandria, while the Menol. Basil, mentions amongst others St. Macarius, a famous Egyptian saint (cb. 391; cf. l. 47, note).

47. τὸν βαπτῖστήν: cf. pp. 25-6. His execution is commemorated by the Copts on Thoth 2 (Aug. 30), by the Greek Church on Aug. 29; his conception by both on Thoth 26 (Sept. 23); his nativity by both on Pauni 30 (June 24); the finding of his head by both on Mecheir 30 (Feb. 24), and that of his bones by the Copts on Thoth 16 (Sept. 13) or Pauni 2 (May 27), by the Greeks on May 25; the deposition of his head on Phaophi 29 (Oct. 26) by the Copts; his incarceration on ἵειρακίων 1 (Aug. 24) by the Copts, the general σώματος in his honour being on Jan. 7 (Tubi 12) in the Greek Church. The last is the only date at all near that in l. 47, which cannot be earlier than Tubi 23 or later than Mecheir 4 and was probably a week-day between the two Sundays Tubi 24 and Mecheir 1; cf. the next note. The σώματος on Tubi 12 (l. 37), which was at the Southern church, is not likely to be connected with a festival of the Baptist, and, Mecheir 30 not being available, since there was no σώματος on that day, the only place in Π which is at all suitable for a festival in his honour is l. 47; but his day is more likely to have been Thoth 2 or Pauni 30, outside the range of Π. The Coptic Church does not celebrate any very important saints from Tubi 23 to 30, St. Macarius (cf. l. 46, note) being honoured on Tubi 8 or Phamenoth 27 or later.

48. τοῦλακανόν: a Sunday service on Mecheir 1 is expected between l. 47 and 51, and since τοῦλακανόν, i.e. the Apostle, who is honoured on that day in the mediaeval Coptic calendars, cannot be read, the choice lies between τοῦλακανόν and τοῦλακον. A church of St. Julius at Arsinoe is known from P. Klein, Form. 743. If τοῦλακον be read, St. Julius of Akgâhs, the historian and martyr under Diocletian, whose Acts are known (Amélineau, op. cit. pp. 123 sqq.) and whose day is Thoth 22 (Sept. 19), is more likely to be meant than St. Julius bishop of Rome in 336-52 (now Mecheir 3, but not in the mediaeval calendars), or a third Julius, martyr under Decius (Phaophi 25, 27, or 30). Hence ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ would be unlikely, unless l. 48 be referred to Mecheir 3, the festival of the Roman St. Julius. In that case l. 47 might refer to Mecheir 1, and the week-days between the two Sundays in ll. 46-7 would be passed over, which is not a very satisfactory hypothesis, since Lent had not yet begun (cf. p. 39). On Mecheir 1, however, the Coptic Church commemorates St. Julianus, martyr with 5,000 companions, and although he is not mentioned in the mediaeval calendars, we on the whole prefer τοῦλακανόν to τοῦλακον, since the choice of the church would be accounted for, if it was his day.

49. Probably either ἰερόσακιων (cf. l. 46, note), or ἰερόσακιος Παύλου ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ, referring to the chief of the eremites (cb. 341), who is celebrated in the mediaeval and
modern Coptic calendars on Mecheir 2 (Jan. 27), the approximate date of this line, or ḏēḇrāḥ Mārēḵēlōn (cf. P. Stud. Pal. x. 35 and p. 24), who is perhaps the Marcellus mentioned on Epeiph 22 of Nau’s calendar but has disappeared from the modern one.

50. For [eis τῷ ἀγιῶν] Tōbīan, i. e. Tōbī lan, there is barely room, and cf. p. 23. ṭō bērōφων μαρτυρίων is more likely than e. g. ṭō bērōφων or ṭō ᾄραφων, a bishop of Edessa commemorated on Mecheir 9 in the mediaeval Coptic calendars; but ṭōbī can be part of a proper name in the genitive, like Φωιδάμμωνος (cf. p. 23), preceded by eis τῶν. In that case Ἀρσατόφικοδιοῦ, one of the seventy-two disciples, now honoured by the Copts on Phamenoth 19 but absent from the mediaeval Coptic calendars, might be meant. σ, however, rather than τ, would then be expected to come over the ε of ἀγιῶν in l. 51, and on Phamenoth 19 there seems to have been a σώματις at Phoebammon’s church (l. 66).

51. Cf. l. 41, note. The saints commemorated by the Copts and Greeks from Mecheir 4 to 7 are not particularly important.

52. [σ]: this is restored because the 9th (l. 53) was a Monday, so that a Sunday is wanted here. The day of St. Zachariah father of the Baptist is Thoth 8 (Sept. 5) in the mediaeval Coptic and Greek calendars; Z. the prophet is commemorated on Hathur 4 (Oct. 31) and Mecheir 14 (Feb. 8; so also the Menol. Basil.), a martyr Z. on Choisak 4 (Nov. 30), Z. of Antioch on Pachon 20 (May 15) and Z. an eremite on Pachon 26 (May 21) or Phaophi 13 (Oct. 10). Of these the festival of the prophet Zachariah on Mecheir 14 is much the nearest to Mecheir 8, and ἡμέρα αὐτῶν is possible; but the latter day (Feb. 2) coincides with the festival known in Eastern churches as ἑπαρπαστή, i.e. Presentation of Christ in the Temple, and in Western as the Purification of the Virgin. In the East this festival can be traced back to 350-400 (Duchesne, op. cit. p. 272), and the universal observance of it in the Eastern Empire was ordained by Justinian in 542 (Niceph. Hist. Eccl. xvii. 28), only six years after Π was written, so that there may have been a reference to it here instead of κυριακή (cf. l. 10). Since in the East this festival has always been one of Christ rather than the Virgin, the mention of another church than St. Mary’s would be intelligible, especially if St. Zachariah is the father of the Baptist. St. Simeon ὁ ἔθεσσαγος and St. Anne (cf. l. 21, note) are also honoured by the Copts on Mecheir 8, and by the Greeks on the next day (Feb. 3), but a mention of one of them is less likely here than κυριακή or ἑπαρπαστή.

53. ἕρχεται: cf. l. 4, note. Σεραπίων or Σέργιου also are possible. A similar difficulty arises in P. Klein. Form. 627. 1 ἀγιῶν Ἐρήπ (Arsinoite nome). The day of St. Sergius of Athribis, martyr under Diocletian, is Mecheir 13, only four days later than the date in l. 53, so that ἡμέρα αὐτῶν might be supplied with Σεργίου also. St. Sergius, companion of St. Bacchus, a Syrian martyr under Maximian, is honoured by both the Greek and Coptic churches on Phaophi 10 (Oct. 7). The Coptic calendars celebrate a Serapion, bishop of Nicui (fourth century), on Hathur 27 or 28 (which falls in the period of the lacuna in ll. 14-19); another, a martyr under Diocletian, whose Acts are extant (Script. Copt. iii. 1. iv), on Tubi 27 (twelve days before Mecheir 9), and a third Serapion on ἑσπαγμ. 1 (Aug. 24). But St. Serenus is much more likely to have been mentioned than any of these. On Mecheir 9 the Copts commemorate Paul, a Syrian martyr (fourth century); cf. l. 52, note.

54-5. Cf. pp. 23 and 29-30 and ll. 24-7, note. A πρ(σβίκτερος) τοῦ ἀρχιερέγχου Γαβριήλ in the Arsinoite nome is known from P. Stud. Pal. x. 177. 6. The various Coptic calendars on Mecheir 11 mention SS. James son of Alphæus (cf. p. 31), Basilides, Justus son of the Emperor Numerianus (cf. p. 27), and Palatianus, bishop of Rome (third century), and on the 12th the Archangel Michael (cf. l. 8) and SS. Fabianus, bishop of Rome (ob. 250), and Gelasius (ob. 496).

56. ἀπα Νοῦτ ἡμέρα ...: part of the ν of Νοῦν and the rest of the line were on a separate fragment, which is suitably though not certainly placed here. The day is
probably Mecheir 13 or 14, for it cannot be earlier, and if it is later, it must be read for in l. 57, to which there are objections. The various saints honoured in Mecheir by the Coptic and Greek churches do not include any name with N or ἄναρ, but the martyrdom of Anub under Diocletian is commemorated by the Copts on Pauni 19 (June 13) and formerly by the Greeks (Nilles, op. cit. ii. p. 42) on June 5, while an abba Nub or Anub, presbyter and martyr under Diocletian, whose Acts are extant (Script. Copt. iii. i. ix), is celebrated by the Copts on Pauni 23 and sometimes on Epeiph 24 (July 11) also. If the position assigned to the fragment is correct, abba Nub is doubtless meant and ἡμέρα ἄντρον is unlikely; but if it goes elsewhere, i.e. in l. 54-59 or in a later column (cf. p. 20), either Ἀνου or ἄναρ Νοῦρ can be read, and ἡμέρα ἄντρον might be right. ἄναρ Νοῦρ would, however, still be the best restoration in l. 56. Ἀνου is a very common Byzantine name, so that ἄναρ Νοῦρ should perhaps be read, possibly referring to the colleague of Apollo at Bawit; but cf. Crum, P. Rylands Copt. 461. 28-9, where apa Noub occurs.

The paragraph above and below l. 56, elsewhere employed only at the end of a month in l. 5, draw special attention to this day as for some reason of exceptional importance. Since the σύναξις was not at St. Mary's, a festival of the Virgin (cf. p. 29) is unlikely, and of the Coptic saints honoured on Mecheir 13-14 (Feb. 8-9) Severus, patriarch of Antioch, or the prophet Zachariah (cf. l. 52, note) are the most likely to have been mentioned. In the Greek calendar Feb. 8 is the day of St. Theodorus the Great, στρατηγός, whom the Copts commemorate on Epeiph 20 (July 14) and who is probably not the St. Theodorus of l. 65; St. Cyril is honoured by the Latins on Feb. 9 as well as Jan. 28, while in the Coptic Church his days are Thoth 12 (Sept. 9) and Epeiph 3 (June 27) and in the Greek Jan. 18 and June 9. But none of these seem important enough to account for the paragraph, which may well be connected with the circumstance that Lent began in 536 on Mecheir 16 (cf. p. 30). Mecheir 14 would be the last week-day before Lent, and this may have given a special importance to the σύναξις, whether the day was that of a saint, or of Repentance' as in l. 4, or had a title of its own.

57. [cf.]: the vestiges suit i rather better than θ, which is the only alternative (cf. l. 56, note), and the 15th being a Sunday is wanted either here or in l. 56. If it came in l. 56, the suggested explanation of the paragraph would still apply, perhaps even better; but a σύναξις on Mecheir 19 would be on a Thursday, whereas in l. 59-68 the evidence, so far as it goes, points to σύναξις on Saturdays and Sundays only. Mecheir 15 is in the mediaeval and modern Coptic calendars the day of St. Papnuthius, a well-known saint who had a church or monastery at Aphroditus (P. Brit. Mus. 1420. 204), so that ἡμέρα Παπνοῦθιος may have superseded ἐυφυία; cf. l. 16. Other saints venerated by the Copts on this day, St. Primus, patriarch of Alexandria (ob. about 120), the prophet Zachariah, and the forty martyrs of Sebastia, are less likely to have been mentioned.

58-9. On the omission of the week-days from Monday to Friday see p. 30. Mecheir 21 in the Coptic calendars is the day of SS. Basil, Peter, bishop of Damascus, Peter, patriarch of Alexandria (ob. 311), ambas Gabriel, bishop of Alexandria, amber Zacharias, bishop, and Onesium, disciple of St. Paul. The last may have been mentioned in l. 58 (ἡμέρα οἰκείων), or ἡμέρα ὁλην' οἰκείων is possible in l. 59.

60. [cf.]: a Sunday is wanted here and ἐκ τοῦ ἀντροῦ implies that the day is the next after Saturday, Mecheir 21; cf. l. 8-9, 11-12, and 24-32 with 35-6, where there is an interval of a week and the name of the church is repeated. On Mecheir 22 the mediaeval Coptic calendars mention SS. Pamphilus and Porphyrius, and bishop Marutha, martyr under Diocletian, the modern one St. Isidorus, martyr under Decius, and bishop Maronius (fourth century).

61-2. On the first of these two days, which are consecutive (cf. l. 60, note), a saint's
day was probably recorded; cf. e. g. ll. 11-12. The second is almost certainly Mecheir 29, for that Sunday is wanted in ll. 61-2, and though the doubtful χ in l. 62 might be λ there is a vestige of another letter, which suits the cross-bar of θ. Line 61 therefore probably refers to Mecheir 28 (Feb. 22), a Saturday; cf. p. 30. The Coptic calendars mention St. Theodorus son of Romanus, martyr under Diocletian, a well-known saint, on that day, and ἤμερα Θεοδόρου is possible in spite of the fact that the service was at the Southern church, for the St. Theodorus whose church is mentioned in l. 65 and possibly in l. 63 seems to be different. The Menol. Basil. mentions on Febr. 22 St. Athanasius, whom the Copts commemorate on Pachon 7 and sometimes on Thoth 30, and on Mecheir 29 (Feb. 23) both Greek and Coptic churches, as well as the Syrian calendar of 411, commemorate St. Polycarp, who may have been mentioned in l. 62 (ἡμέρα Πολυκάρπου instead of κυριακή).

63-6. On the restoration of the days in Phamenoth see pp. 30-1. St. Theodotus of Ancyra (l. 63, Phamenoth 6) was martyred in 304, and St. Theodorus of Pentapolis (l. 65, Phamenoth 13) about the same time. The latter is commemorated by the Copts on Epeiph 10 (so also Nau's calendar), as well as Phamenoth 12. The mediaeval Coptic calendars mention the Emperor Theodosius on Phamenoth 7, but that day is a Monday. The Greek Church on Phamenoth 6 (March 2) celebrates another Theodotus, bishop of Cyrena in Cyprus (cf. about 324), Theodotus of Ancyra on June 7; and on March 9 (Phamenoth 15) both churches honour the forty martyrs of Sebastia in Armenia (fourth century?). There is no special difficulty in l. 63, which, if it is Phamenoth 6, can be restored either Θεόδωρος ἤμερα αὐτοῦ or Θεοδόρων κυριακή or, if it is not the 6th, is probably the 5th (a Saturday), in which case Θεοδόρων ἤμερα ... is likely, and l. 64 would then most probably refer to the 6th instead of the 12th. But a difficulty in any case arises in connexion with St. Theodorus in l. 65. A church of St. Theodorus at Arsinoē is known from e. g. P. Klein, Form. 164, and another at Antinoē from P. Cairo Maspero i. 67022. 18, but which of the numerous saints of that name is meant is not clear. Nau's and Tisserand's lists each mention about thirteen commemorations of St. Theodore, occurring in both on Thoth 11, Hathur 5, Tubi 12, Mecheir 28, Pachon 2 and 9, Pauni 6, and Epeiph 20, and in Nau's list on Hathur 20, Mecheir 7 and 13, Pauni 18, and Epeiph 9, in Tisserand's on Hathur 4, Choiak 25, Mecheir 27, Phamenoth 21, Pharmouthi 5 and 7. The modern Coptic calendar according to Nilles celebrates, besides the bishop of Pentapolis, eight others, an obscure Th. with others on Thoth 9, Th. Orientalis on Tubi 12, the son of Romanus on Mecheir 28 (cf. ll. 61-2, note), the martyr with Timotheus on Phamenoth 21, the disciple of St. Pachomius on Pachon 2, the Alexandrian monk on Pauni 6, the bishop of Corinth on Epeiph 10, and the σοραμπάνεις on Epeiph 20. Without ἤμερα αὐτοῦ in l. 65 it would be quite uncertain which was meant, except that Th. Orientalis and Th. son of Romanus, whose days come within the period covered by ll, are unsuitable because their churches were not then visited. Since, however, two saints of this name have their days in Phamenoth, probably at least one of the two entries concerning Θεόδωρος and ἤμερα refers to the celebration of the day of a St. Theodorus at his church. That ll. 63 and 65 refer to the two festivals of different saints called Theodorus on the 12th and 21st is improbable, because the 21st is not likely to have been reached so early as l. 65, and the bishop of Pentapolis is the only Theodorus whose festival need be considered. The objection to reading ᾧ in l. 65 in accordance with the modern calendar is that, if l. 65 refers to a Saturday, l. 66 would naturally refer to the following Sunday, in which case l. 67, which is a day later than l. 66 (cf. l. 66, note), would be a Monday. Hence we prefer to avoid a violation of the directions of the Council of Laodicea, and to suppose that the festival of St. Theodorus was on the 13th (Sunday) instead of the 12th; cf. the similar variation in the case of the commemoration of Ἐπιμαχύς (pp. 26-7). Lines 66-7 then refer to the following Saturday and Sunday without difficulty, and l. 68 can refer to Easter Eve; cf. p. 31.
1357. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

With regard to the two supposed Saturdays, Phamenoth 12 and 19 (ll. 64 and 66), the Coptic calendars commemorate on the first Joseph son of the patriarch Jacob, as well as St. Theodorus, and in the thirteenth–fourteenth century mention Demetrius, patriarch of Alexandria (ob. 232), and Malachias, martyr, and on the second Aristobulus (cf. l. 50, note; he is not in the mediaeval lists, which mention the power given to the disciples to bind and loose). The saints in the Greek calendar are unsuitable. For the 19th Αρσενοβούλων is less likely than Κολούνθον, a well-known saint at this period (cf. e. g. P. Brit. Mus. 1460, 117), who in the Syriac calendar of 411 was celebrated on that day, though he is not in the modern calendar.

67. On Phamenoth 20 the Copts celebrate various martyrs of the period of Diocletian besides St. Athom.

68. The Virgin and St. Euphemia are the only two female saints mentioned in II, but this entry may of course refer to a third; cf., however, p. 31. Possibly this service is to be connected with an ancient commemoration of the Virgin on Phamenoth 21 (Nau, op. cit. p. 200), but a σώματι on a Monday in Lent would be contrary to the orders of the Council of Laodicea. The mediaeval Coptic calendars commemorate SS. Porphyrius, Apraxia, and Anatolius on Phamenoth 26, the modern one St. Sabinus of Hermopolis, Sadoch and 128 companions martyred under Sapor (341), and the prophet Hosea.

Additional note on l. 2.

With regard to the name of the νάσας, whom we have identified with Timotheus IV, the patriarch of Alexandria in 535 (p. 21), Mr. Crum suggests that Severus of Antioch may be meant. He was dethroned in 519 and appears to have spent the rest of his life in Egypt, his death taking place according to various authorities in 538, 539, or 542. For the monophysites, in Egypt at any rate, he was 'the patriarch' par excellence, and is so referred to occasionally without his name. The descent of the Alexandrian patriarch to his residence seems a somewhat inadequate point from which to date such a calendar as this, whereas no honour would be too much for Copts to pay to an incident connected with Severus, who has three distinct festivals in the Synaxarium. But whether Egyptians would refer to him as well as to the Alexandrian patriarch by the title νάσας is doubtful.
II. NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS

1358. HESIOD, Catalogue, Book iii.

Fr. 1 22.2 x 10.1 cm., Fr. 2 23.6 x 13 cm. Third century, Plate II (Fr. 2).

Some notable additions have been lately made by the papyri of Egypt to the surviving remains of the Κατάλογος Γυναικῶν, for which Ἡοῖαi seems to have been but another name (cf. Rzach in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyc. viii. 1201 sq.), ascribed in antiquity to Hesiod. Extensive fragments concerning the suitors of Helen have been published in Berl. Klassiker texte, V. i. ii. 2–3, with smaller pieces relating to Meleager and Bellerophon (ibid. i. 4), the latter of which is probably to be combined with 1421 (cf. H. G. Evelyn-White in Class. Quar. vii, p. 217); a Strassburg papyrus deals with Peleus and Thetis (ed. Reitzenstein, Hermes, xxxv, pp. 79 sqq.), and texts at Florence with Atalanta and Alcmena (P. S. I. 130, 131); the former of these heroines is also the subject of a scrap in the Petrie papyri (I. iii. 3). Further evidence of the popularity which this portion of the Hesiodic corpus evidently enjoyed is now provided by the following considerable fragments from the third book of the Catalogue (cf. Fr. 2. 9, note) and by 1358, in which the heroines Auge and Electra figure.

1388 consists of two good-sized pieces, apparently having no direct connexion with each other. Their recto is inscribed with third-century official accounts, each fragment containing parts of two columns of which only the ends and beginnings of lines are preserved. In Fr. 2 Col. i the entry διὰ πρα(κτόρων) ε (ἐτους) λημ(μάτων) ε (ἐτος) (δραχμαί) Ἀριν occurs, and in Col. ii the Oxyrhynchite villages of Λονίμων and Μερμέρδα are mentioned in separate paragraphs. The literary text on the verso may be referred with probability to the latter part of the same century. It is written in a slightly sloping uncial hand of rather large size and handsome appearance. Some corrections have been introduced in another, though not very dissimilar, writing, and this second hand may well be the source of the stops, accents, and other signs (except the diaeresis), but there is practically no difference in the colour of the ink. The acute accents are inclined at an unusually sharp angle to the line of writing and are sometimes even horizontal. Stops occur in all three positions, but do not appear to have been used with any real discrimination of values. From photographs kindly supplied by Prof. Vitelli it is clear that this hand is not the same as that of either P. S. I. 130 or 131, which were also obtained from Oxyrhynchus.
The subject of the two fragments is quite different, and their order is uncertain. Fr. 1 contains the ends of thirty-two lines from the upper part of a column, with slight remains of the column succeeding. The first fourteen lines of Col. i give the story of Europa, which was known to have been treated by Hesiod from the scholia on Homer, M 292 (Hesiod, Fr. 30), and will readily admit of an approximate restoration. In the lower portion of the column the allusions leave little room for doubt that the adventures were described of one of the sons of Zeus and Europa, Sarpedon, and that the writer identified him with the Sarpedon of the Iliad. This identification was already implied by the Homeric scholia cited above, e.g. Schol. T, l. i. Ηνίοθος δὲ Εὐρώπης καὶ Δίως αὐτῶν (sc. Σαρπ.) φήσι (cf. Schol. Eurip. Rhes. 29), and Immisch has noted that traces of it may be seen in Homer (Roscher, Lexicon, iv. 493), in spite of Z 198–9 and the remark of Aristonicus thereon (Schol. A, ad loc.) καθ’ "Ομηρον Σαρπηνδόν νῦν Εὐρώπης οὐκ ἐστὶν οὖν δὲ αὔτῆς Μίνωος, ὃς οἱ νεώτεροι': καὶ γὰρ οἱ χρόνοι εὐθεῖοι. A like tradition was followed by Aeschylus (Nauck, Trag. Fr. 99), and the author of the Rhesus (l. 29), probably also by Bacchylides (Schol. A, Homer, M 292); cf. Hygin, Fab. 106, where the Sarpedon slain by Patroclus is called Ioavis et Europae filium. Chronological difficulties were evaded by a legend that the hero's life was supernaturally prolonged: καὶ αὐτῷ δυνατίς Ζεὺς ἐπὶ τρεῖς γενέσθαι ζῆν says Apollodorus iii. 1. 2. Others distinguished two Sarpedons, the son of Europa, and the Sarpedon of the Iliad who according to Z 198–9 (cf. Apollod. iii. 1. 1. 3) was the son of Zeus and Laodamia, while another account made his parents Euandrus son of the first Sarpedon and Deidamia (Diodor. v. 79. 3). Since the agreement of the poet of the Catalogue with the Homeric account of Sarpedon seems to have been in other respects rather close (cf. notes on ll. 23, 25–8), his divergence on the point of genealogy is the more remarkable. It should perhaps be noted in this connexion that according to the statement of Schol. A on Z 119 (Aristonicus) the position in the Iliad of the Glaucus episode, in which alone the mother of Sarpedon is named, was regarded as insecure.

In the second fragment there are again remains of two columns, though those of the second are so slight as to be practically negligible. Of Col. i, as opposed to the main column of the preceding fragment, the top is lost while the end is preserved, but it is hardly likely that more than a few verses are entirely missing. The gap at the beginnings of the lines is fortunately slighter than in Fr. 1, but restoration is nevertheless a matter of considerable difficulty. To some extent obscurity may be due to a faulty text. Some errors have been corrected, and in one place a whole line which had been originally omitted has been inserted; but in l. 31, at least, no construction seems obtainable as the text stands. The key to the subject of the whole passage seems to be given in
ll. 28 sqq., which describe an extended flight and pursuit of certain females apparently through the air. Following a suggestion of Mr. T. W. Allen, to whom we owe a number of contributions to the reconstruction of 1358 and 1359, we suppose the pursuit to be that of the Harpies by the Boreadae. There is good reason to believe that this subject was treated in the third book (cf. Hesiod, Frs. 52-9); and that that book is the source of the present fragments is clear from the references to the Κατουδαίοι and Πνευμαῖοι in ll. 9 and 18; cf. the note on l. 9. In Hesiod, Fr. 54, the story of Phineus and the Harpies is said to have occurred ἐν τῇ καλουμένῃ γῆς περιοδῷ, but this is probably the appropriate name of that section of the book containing the account of the voyage of the Argonauts, in which the story of Phineus was an episode (cf. Rzach in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encycl. viii. 1205-6). From the similarity in phraseology between l. 20 and l. 28 it may be inferred that in l. 20 also the Boreadae are the subject; and this being granted, the construction of l. 15 (= Hesiod, Fr. 55) is hardly to be explained unless that line is one of a series specifying the various peoples and places passed by the Harpies and their pursuers; cf. ll. 25-6. We are thus carried back to l. 9 in which the Κατουδαίοι and Πνευμαῖοι are mentioned and to which l. 18 must be a retrospective reference. Hence it would appear that the whole of this column was a description of the flight, the chief points on the route being given with parenthetical explanations and amplifications.

Fr. 1.

Col. i. Col. ii.
[..........................] εἵπερησε δ' ἀλμυρὸν ὕδωρ .
[..........................] Δίὸς διμηθείσα δολοίσι
[τὴν ρα λαθὼν ηρπαξέ] πατηρ καὶ δωρὸν ἐδοκεν
[ορμον οι χρυσειον ου Η]φαιστος κλυτοτεχνης
5 [ποιησεν ποτ αγαλμα ἰδι][ησιν πραπίδεσσι[[ν]]]
[kαι κτεῖνον πορε πατρι] φερον· ο δ' εδεξατο δορζ[ν]
[αυτος δ' αρ δοκεκν κουρη·] Φοινικ[ο]ις αγανου.

10 [αυταρ επει ουτω τη]ηλε τανισφέρωι Ευρωπ[η]η [μιχθη ρ εν φιλοτητι] πατηρ ανδρων τε θεον τε
[αυτς επει απεθη νυμφης παρα καλλικβιοιο [η δ' αρα παιδας ετικ]τει] υπερμενει Κρονιων
[κυδαλιμων ευπθε]νων ηγητορας ανδρων
[Mιω τε κρειοντα] δικαιον τε Ραδαμανθυν
[καὶ Σαρπηδόνα διὸν] αμμόνα τε κρατερ[ον τε]

15 [τοις εας τιμας διεβάςσατο μητιέτα Ζ[ευς
[ητοι ο μεν Δικης ευρείμης ιδί ανασσε
[.............................. πόλεις ευ ναιεταωσας [
[.............................. πολυλή δ ἐχει ἐσπετο τιμηι
[.............................. μεγαλή]τερι ποιμεν λαων.

20 [. . . . . . . . . . ] μεροπων ανθρωπων
[..............................]λατο μητετα Ζευς.
[..............................]πολυν δ εκρινατο λαων.
[..............................]Τρ'ωεσσ' επικουρους'
[..............................]πολεμου δαήμων.'

25 [. . . . . . . . . . ] ἐπ αριστερα σήματα φαινον
[..............................]Ζευς] αφθίτα μηδεα ειδως.
[..............................]λατο εμφιαλούσαις
[..............................]Διοθεν τερας ἡν.
[..............................]Εκτρόμος ανδροφονοιο

30 [. . . . . . . . . . ] δε κηδε εθηκε.
[..............................]25 letters]ς Αργε[ο]σι'
[..............................]31 "']κα[']

Fr. 2. Plate II.

Col. i. Col. i

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

[..............................]π['
[..............................]κ['
[..............................]ώντ['
[..............................]π['] χ['

5 [. . . . . . . . . . ] αοδ['
[..............................]εσπε[.]ηνοο['
[..............................]ετα[.] κερ['
[..............................]ἐπι εργας και η['
[..............................]Κατουδ'αιοι και Πυγμαιοι'

10 [. . . . . . . . . . ] απε[πρεσιων μελάνοι['
[..............................]τ]εκε Ταια πελώρη
Fr. 1. i. 3–16. 'Her then father Zeus carried off by stealth, and gave her as a gift the golden necklace which Hephaestus, famed for his art, once made for a delight with cunning mind, and brought and gave in possession to father Zeus; and he received the gift with gladness: this gave he to the daughter of proud Phoenix. But when the father of gods and men had thus been mated in love afar off with Europa of slender ankles, he went away again from the fair-tressed maiden. And she bore to the almighty son of Cronus glorious sons, princes of wealthy men, lord Minos and just Rhadamanthus and godlike Sarpedon, blameless and powerful, to whom Zeus in his wisdom apportioned their honour. Sarpedon ruled in might over broad Lycia . . .'

4–5. Cf. Apollod. iii. 4. 2 τὸν ἥφαιστοτέκτον ὄρμον, ὃν ὑπὸ Ἡφαίστον λέγοντι τίνες ἐγερεῖ τοῖς Κάδμῳ, Θερεκύδη δὲ ὑπὸ Εὐρώπης ὅν παρὰ Δίῳ αὐτήν λαβεῖν. For ἐδείχσιν cf. e. g.
Homer, Υ 12 Ἰφιάστος ποιήσαν ἵδε ἡμῖν προσώδεσον. What has been taken as remains of an acute accent may be part of a diaeresis. The rest of the supplement in l. 5 is prompted by Suidas, s.v. ἄγαλμα... As an alternative βαίμα ἰδεῖν ποιήσα may be suggested, and this would perhaps be somewhat better adapted to the lacuna, which is of the same size as in the two preceding and following lines.

7. κοινοὶ Φωικοὶ κόρης: so Homer, Ζ 321. Φωικός κόρης. 8. θηλείς is quite doubtful; the λ may be α, δ, or μ, and this is preceded by remains of apparently, a vertical stroke. καθένα would suit the context, but a ν is unsatisfactory. ἐφώνεια is regarded as a late form (cf. Lobeck, Paral. p. 321), but is now shown to be of the same age as Ἐφώνη (first in Theog. 357). That the inserted κ is due to the corrector is not certain. For ταυσεῖρος instead of ταυσήφος, cf. Bacchyl. iii. 60, v. 59.

12. ευθύθειων, for which cf. Homer, Ω 81, was suggested by Allen. ερμήθειων or μεγαλοθείων would also be suitable.

15–16. The supplement suggested in l. 15 is based on Theog. 885 ὅ ὅταν ἔδει (Rzach with Ahrens, εἶ MSS., εἶ Heinsius) διελάσατο τιμᾶς. After ναος in l. 16 there is before the break a blank space (in which a stop is possibly to be recognized), so that ναος depending on e.g. μοῖρων διασάτο or διελάσατο (cf. Theog. 520 τοις γὰρ οἱ μοῖραι διασάτου μητέρα Ζεὺς) is excluded. Αὐτὴς ἐφώνει occurs in Homer, Ζ 173, 188, Π 455, &c.

18. l. δε, and this was perhaps intended, the accentuator being rather careless about the position of his marks; cf. note on l. 21.

21. A horizontal stroke above the first τ of μητέρα is probably to be interpreted as an acute accent intended for the next letter.


25–8. The remains of these lines look very like a description of the portent which in the Πιάδ precedes the death of Sarpedon, Π 459–60 ἀιματοσεῖας ὁ ψίλας κατέχειν ἤτα πάδα φίλον ομών; cf. Hesiod, Σετιλ. 384–5 καὶ δὲ ἄρ’ ἀν’ οὐρανόθεν ψίλας βάλει αἰματοσεῖας σήμα τείνει πολέμῳ ἐν μεγαβαρεί παθί. It does not, however, seem possible to read αἰματοσεῖας in l. 27, though the κ is not certain and γ or perhaps τ could be substituted. The final τ of αἰμήθαλουνα also is very faint, and the slight vestiges might be taken for a stop, but the accent would then be wrong. Ζεὺς δῆθεν μῆθεν εἰδῶσ occurs in Theog. 545, 550, &c.

ii. 1. It is not clear whether the small cross in the upper margin here is the initial letter (χ) of an adscript or a critical symbol as e.g. 1231. Φρ. 32. ii; cf. 1381. Φρ. 5. ii. There may also have been some insertion immediately above or below l. 1; the vestiges are hardly to be accounted for by any single letter.

29. εἰς θῇ; or perhaps εἰς τῇ. The first letter is really more like σ or τ.

Fr. 2. i. 9. Cf. l. 18 and Philod. Περὶ Ἐοτῆβ. 10 οὐδ’ Ἰσίδρος μὴ τὶς εἰς την ἑλληνική δὲ γραμμὴν ἁρπαγομένην, Harpocratio i. 296. 7 (so Suidas and Photius) s. v. ἐπί γῆν οἰκονομῆς, λέγον ἄν. καὶ τοῦ ἄν’ Ἰσίδρος ἐν γὰρ Καταλόγου Καταλόγου ὄνομαζομένου (Hesiod, Fr. 60), Strabo i, p. 43 (cf. vii, p. 299) Ἰσίδρον δὲ οἴκ ἄν τις αἰτίασάτο ἄργους ἤπικενα λέγοντος καὶ Μακροκέφαλος καὶ Πυγμαῖος, Harpocratio i. 197. 10 s. v. Μακροκέφαλος, θέου ἄντι πολύτιμον οὐδ’ καὶ Ἰσίδρος μέμνησα ἐν γὰρ γνωσίσθι Καταλόγο (Hesiod, Fr. 62). The line might be completed with δεμένων, as in l. 18.

10–14. The reference in this obscure passage, as Murray suggests, is perhaps to the δῆμος οἰνώρων (Homer, Ω 12, οἶκον οἰνώρων Hesiod, Theog. 212). They are placed by Homer, l.c., in the neighbourhood of the Ἑλληνοῖ πόλεις beyond the Ὁκεανὸς ῥόας and Λαύκη πτέρυς, and so could well be named after the Πυγμαῖος, who, according to Homer, Γ 5–6, lived near the Ὁκεανὸς ῥόας; the Aethiopians and Libyaans (l. 15) might indeed be expected to precede
rather than follow, but since these are coupled with the Scythians it is clear that the topography is somewhat vague. In Hesiod, I. c., the mother of the πολύπον ὀνείρων is Ὀδησ, but Euripides calls them sons of Earth in I. T. 1263 and Νεκ., 70 πότινα χθάν, μελανοπτέρυγον μάτε άνείρων: with the epithet μελανοπτέρυγον cf. μελάνο in l. 10. Lines 13–14 may be explained as alluding to the substitution of the articulate prophecy of Apollo for prognostication, as described in Eurip. I. T. 1259 sqq. On these lines the passage may be tentatively restored:—


If the accent on μελάνο is right, only one syllable is wanting; otherwise μελανόπτερον δχλων would be suitable.

11. Ἡμέρα πελάρμν occurs several times in the Theogony, e.g. 159, 173. But perhaps πελάρμν, which is found as a fem. form in Θεογ. 179, was here used.

12. πασομβατος is an epithet of Zeus in Homer, Θ 250.

13. A dark mark on the edge of the papyrus before φοσ does not look like an accent. ἀφαερθοῦω, if right, is remarkable, the verb being used elsewhere in the present tense only.

14. This line = Hesiod, Fr. 55, from Strabo vii, p. 300 'Ηνιόδος μάρτυρ εν τοις ἐπ' Ἑρατοσθενέων παραστάθηκέν ἔπειρας Λιθώνας κηλ. The MSS. of Strabo have τε λεγοντι δὲ, which has been variously emended: λήγων τε ἢ Ἡνιόδος, λῃστα τ' ἤδε Ηνιόδος, τε λήγω τ' ἤδε Βερνάρδη, τε λήγω τε ἢ Ἦρακ, Λιθώνας τ' ἤδε Κλερίκους, τε Λίθων τ' ἤδε Οσάννα, none of these quite coinciding with the reading of the papyrus, which may be accepted as correct. A mark like a very short grave accent above the ε of the first τέ seems to be meaningless.

15. 16–19. These lines apparently trace the origin of the Λιθώνας and others who had just been mentioned (l. 9, 15) from Zeus, who rather than Poseidon is presumably meant, as usual, by Κρονίων; cf. l. 19 Ἐπεκτέποι, which though an epithet of Poseidon in Θεογ. 441, 456, 930 would more naturally refer to Zeus when used independently. The fact that Poseidon is twice named below (l. 27, 31) is hardly a reason for supposing that he was intended here. Line 16 may be restored, with Murray, [ ἁντι ἕναν; or possibly there was a mention of Epaphus, as Mr. Lobel suggests; he is described as the father of Libya in Aesch. Suppl. 315–16, Apolloid. ii. 1. 4, &c. Line 17 might then be completed [τοιο Λιθών], Murray proposes [κλακα γαρ]; they were μέλανεροι according to Hdt. ii. 194. In the absence of corroborative evidence it seems hardly likely that μέλανες is to be taken as a proper name here, though the position of τε would suit this. For the superfluous iota adscript in l. 19 cf. l. 31.

20. The poet here returns to the Boreaeadae and Harpikes, who are apparently the subject of ἔθνη; cf. l. 28. θενίν is a form peculiar to Hesiod.

21. Mr. Allen suggests that the name Φικες stood here, but it seems very difficult to obtain a satisfactory completion of the line on that hypothesis. For the Hyperboreans cf. Hdt. iv. 32 ἥλι᾽ Ἡσιόδος μὴν ἐστι περὶ 'Υπερβορείων εἰρημένα (Hesiod, Fr. 209), Steph. Byz. S. v. τ' Ἡμίκαινες, τὸνο εὖ πόρρω Μασαγατῶν καὶ τοὺς Υπερβορείους ... καὶ Ἡσιόδος (Fr. 62). They were perhaps mentioned here as the starting-point of the chase.

22. We regard this and the two following verses as a parenthetical amplification of 'Υπερβορείων analogous to the genealogy of the Λιθώνας, &c., in ll. 16 sqq. For τεκε Γη cf. l. 11 above, and for the collocation πολύφων. πολυφ., Homer, I 154 πολύφωμεν πολυμοβάτων, K 315 πολύφωμοι πολυμοβείς. πολυφωβοῦς, which may be a mistake for πολυφωβοῦς, is an epithet of Demeter in Θεογ. 912 and of γαία in Homer, Ι 568, &c.
23-4. The restoration of Ἡράκλεας here (Allen) is commended by ἔλεκτρωμι in the following line. The Eridanian is mentioned in Theog. 338, and that the myth of the Heliades occurred in Hesiod was known from Fr. 199. The view that in its earliest form that story was connected with the Hyperboreans had already been taken by Preller, Grie ch. Myth. i, p. 358; cf. Hdt. iii. 115 Ἡράκλεας τω .. . ποταμοὶ ἔκδοσιμα ἐς βάλασσαν τὴν πρὸς βορέιν ἄνωμ, Ap. Rhod. Arg. iv. 611-14 Κελται δ' ἐπὶ βάσιν ἠθένα, ὡς ἂ' ᾿Απόλλωνος τάδε δικρών Ἑτοιμασίᾳ συμβέρεστα δίναις (sc. Ἡράκλεας), ἂ τε μυρία χεῖς πάροιιδεν, ὡς 'Ὑπερβορέων ἱερῶν γένος εἰσαφικεῖν. Whether the interlinear addition in l. 24 is due to the corrector or to the original scribe is not very clear.

25-6. Νεπτώρως was suggested by Lobel. The construction is awkward, though apparently not more so than at l. 15. For Ἀττικὴν and Ὀρτυγοναν cf. Strabo i, p. 23 (Hes. Fr. 65) Ἐρατοσθήνης δὲ Ὀρτυγος μὲν εἰκάζει .. . παπεύσασθα τὴ δέξῃ μὴ μόνον τῶν ἵπτομένων μεμνημένα, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀττικὴν καὶ Ὀρτυγοναν τοῦ πρὸς Σύρακουσας νησίον καὶ Τυρρηνῶν. In l. 26 νησίον is an obvious supplement, but is scarcely long enough for the lacuna; possibly [γησον επ Ὀρτς was written. Murray proposes στυφλόν.

27. οἷος: i.e. probably Laistrygon, who is called the son of Poseidon in Eustath. p. 1649. 10; cf. Gellius, N. A. 15. 21 Νεπτυνόι filios dixerunt .. . Laistrygonas. Polyphemus could hardly have been referred to in such vague terms. In place of ἐνθα perhaps οἷος might be restored, sc. Λαστρυγών, supplied from Λαστρυγόνος

θ of γεινθεδ was converted from a τ.

28. πολευς means 'to plough' in Ὀπ. 462, but must here mean 'range over' if, as is the natural assumption, the Boreadac are the subject. It might also be e.g. τρις with επι or αρα or μεν preceding.

29. Cf. Scul. 231 ἵμενοι μασέειν, of the Gorgons, and 304 ἵμενοι μασέειν, of θι άμενοι ὄπλοδιν, of hunters and hares.

30. Κεφαλληνῶν well suits the geography, the Στροφίδες or Πολύαι, where the pursuit ended, being placed to the south of Zacynthus; cf. l. 32 and Schol. Laur. Apoll. Rhod. Arg. i. 297 ὅποι δὲ ἥκιστοι οἱ περὶ Ζήτην τῷ Διὶ στραφθέντες λέγει καὶ Ἡσίοδος Ἑυθός οὐκ εὐφέρειν ἄνωφρ ψυμένων τοίς Φρ. 57) ἡτοί γὰρ ἄνωθεν δρος τῆς Κεφαλληνίας, ὅπου Ἀργοιοί Διὸς ἱερῶν ἔστων.

31. It seems impossible to obtain any connexion for this verse, since only a trochee is missing and a verb is demanded by the nominative καλύπτειν κτλ. An apopiosis analogous to Theocr. i. 105 οὗ λέγεται τῶν Κύμων δ᾽ θυσιάσω; is unsuited to the Hesiodic style; and the stop after νυμφή invalidates a transference of the verb to the beginning of the next line. Probably, then, either something has dropped out, as at l. 33 (e.g., as Mr. Lobel suggests, δήμοι Ὀδυσσεῶς ταλασσίφοροι, ὧν μετέπειτα εἰργε Ποσ. κτλ.), or the verse is out of its place, which is perhaps the more likely alternative, if ὑθονεῖς in the margin implies that a participle preceded γεινθεδ in l. 32.

32. γύαιοι Ἀργαίδας: i.e. presumably Delichium; cf. Homer, ι. 395-6 Νιτων βαϊδιμος νόδος, 'Ἀργαίδας ἀνάκτος, δὲ ἢ ἐκ δοῦλην κτλ. A reference to the Thessalian Cycnus, who is called 'Ἄργαίδας in Scul. 57 (cf. Apollod. ii. 7. 7), does not suit this context.

33. Possibly the supposed τι belongs to the interlinear insertion. κατ(ω) at the end of the line calls attention to the verse which has fallen out and been subsequently supplied at the bottom of the column; cf. e.g. 700. 27, 852. Fr. 1. ii. 8, Fr. 64. 57, 1232. ii. 3.

35. This verse, which was originally omitted, follows l. 33; see the preceding note. For μετάχορονας, which was restored by Allen, cf. Theog. 269.

ii. 1. The marginal sign (cf. e.g. 16) is presumably due to the corrector.
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1359. Hesiod, Catalogue.

Fr. 1  15 × 7.7 cm. Early third century. Plate III (Frs. 2 and 4).

The authorship of the following fragments is not established like that of 1358 by coincidences with extant Hesiodea, but will nevertheless hardly be questioned. Their subject is clearly well-known heroines of Greek mythology, whose stories with those of their descendants are narrated just in the manner of the Hesiodic Ἐραχθονίων. Fr. 1, the only substantial piece, is occupied with the adventures of Auge and her son Telephus. Fr. 2, from l. 5, where the transition to a new subject is marked by a paragraphus, relates to Electra, daughter of Atlas, and her descendants. If Ἐραχθονίων is to be restored in Fr. 4, 3, that fragment would be expected to be concerned with the same family as Fr. 2; ll. 5–8, however, apparently relate to Diomede and Hyacinthus, who were not connected with the Dardanidae.

The MS. is neatly written in a small, slightly sloping book-hand of a common type, and may be roughly dated about the year A.D. 200. Accents and other diacritical signs, probably also the punctuation, are secondary, as is evident from the colour of the ink, and may be credited to the corrector who has made occasional small alterations in the text.

Fr. 1.

[...]

[18 letters] [...]

[...]

[eι δη ρ ημι[λλεν τε και eι δη μιλθων] ακουσαι

5 [ἀβανά]των δι οι το[τ][9] ευαργες αντέφανησαν
[κευν]ψ δ’ [ε]υ μεγαρουσιν ευ τρεφε ςδ’ ατιταλλε
[θε]κεμ[ν] Αρκασιδημ Μυσων βασιλη[α]
[μιχθε]σ εν φιλοτητι βη Ηρακηνηι

10 [οι ρα μεθ ιτπους στειγεν αγανου Αθομεδωντος]
[οι δη ποισιν αριστοι εν Ασ[ι]διετραφεν α’ς]
[εκ δ ο γ Αμαζων]δων μεγαθυμων φυλον εναιρε
1359. NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS

[μαρναμενος κ]εινης δε τε γης εξηλασε πάσης [  
[αυταρ ο Τηλεφως] έτραπ' Αχαιων χαλκοκιτων[ων
15 [ασπίστας και εβη[η]ε μελαινάων επι νήων  
[αυταρ εσει πολλος] πελασεν χθονι βω[τιανερη]
[αυτου δη δεδμητο] βιη τ' ανδροκτασιη τ[ε
[.................]η κατοπισθεν ε[ι
[.................]ως δ' ικοντο θ'[ι
20 [.................]πεφοβημεν[ι]
[.................]ετο κλυτος αρ[ι]
[.................]ε δια κλε[ι].[ ] [  
[.................] [ ] [  
[.................]κλυ[ι]
25 [.................]μα[ι

Fr. 2. Plate III.

ε. [  
ε[ι
κα[ι μ[ι
5 Ηλεκτρή
γειναθ' [υποδμηθεια κελαινεφει Κρονιων 
Δαρδανων
Ηετιώνα τε
ος ποτε Δ[ημητρος μεγ ερασσατο καλλικομοι
10 και τον μ[εν φλογερο δαμασεν πληχθεντα κεραυνω
Ηετιωθα [χολωσαμενος νεφεληγερετα Ζευς 
ουνεκα Δ[ημητρ υμκομω επι χειρας εβαλλεν
αυταρ Δα[ρδανος ηλθεν επ ακτην ηπειρου 
εκ του Ερ[ιχθωνιος και Τρως μετεπιτα γενοντο 
15 Ιλος [τ Ασσαρακος τε και αντιθεως Γιαμιηδης 
νη[ι [πολυκληθει λιπων ιερην Σαμωρακερν
Fr. 3.

νοστοι
α
άιθο...

Fr. 4. Plate III.

κλεο[...
δαο θύγατρη
χθονίοιο
]. καλλος ε[...]
ευπλοκαμον Δ[ιομ]ηνην
η δ Τακιθην θεινατ αμι[νουά] τε κρατερον τε
]. τον ρα ποι' αυτος
Φοίβος
κτανε νηλε[ι] δισκω
]

Fr. 5. Fr. 6. Fr. 7.

\[...
]
[ν γερας αρ[θιτον
][ν ικανεν
][αμον τε[...
[λησ
][γρυνήων ηδ]
\[...]
[δια χρυσή[ν
Αφροδ[την
]. οιο
]. κατ' αρ. [...]

Fr. 1. 3. Perhaps αδαναρος (cf. l. 5), but the preceding remains do not combine well with this.

4-17. "... if he delayed or feared to hear the word of the immortal gods who then appeared plainly to him. And he received and bred her up and tended her well in his halls, making her equal in honour with his daughters. And she was the mother of Telephus, of the stock of Acras, king of the Mysians, after being mated in love with mighty Heracles, who went after the horses of proud Laomedon, the swiftest of foot bred in the land of Asia, and destroyed the race of the high souled Amazons in battle and drove them from all that land. Now Telephus put to flight the warriors of the brazen-coated Achaean and made them
embark on their black ships. But when he had laid many low on mother earth, his death-dealing might was stricken...'

4–5. The reception of Auge by the Mysian king Teuthras seems here to have been attributed to a divine interposition. η [ιι] λαβὼν is quite conjectural; the doubtful μι may be η, and there is barely room for the two lambdas. In l. 5 the supposed rough breathing on α is very uncertain, and a smooth one would be at least as consistent with the vestiges.

6. κερυφ': sc. Auge; the subject is Teuthras.

7. Cf. Hyg. Fab. 99 cum esset orbis liberis, hanc pro filia habuit, and Fab. 100, where the story of the proposed marriage of Auge to Telephus is given. Another version represented Auge as having become the wife of Teuthras; cf. Pausan. viii. 4. 9, Apollod. ii. 7. 4.

8. Ἀρκασίδην: cf. Callim. H. Dial. 216, where the name is applied to Iasius, who like Telephus was of the fifth generation from Arcas.


15. ἐφηγ': cf. e.g. Homer, Π 810 φῶτας δικοὶ βαδεὶς ἀφ᾽ ἵππων.


17. δεδομένα is extremely uncertain; the slight remains of the final vowel would be consistent with ζ. Above the line at this point is an ink-mark which suggests a stop, but that can hardly have been intended here.

18. Possibly ζηθη, but the lacunae now become too large for satisfactory restoration.

19. The last word may well have been διασάζων, as both Murray and Allen suggest; the remains after the lacuna are consistent with διασάζων.

21. Perhaps Αργεφορθε, as in Hesiod, Οφ. 84 πέμπε πατήρ κλετῶν Ἀργ..., but πέπετο, as in Homer, Ω 345 π. κρατῶν 'Ἀργ..., would be unsatisfactory, the vestige of the letter after the lacuna apparently not fitting.

22. Perhaps κληρον, the last vestige before the lacuna being part of the circumflex.

24. Cf. l. 21 and note.

Fr. 2. 5 sqq. Cf. Homer, Υ 215 sqq., Apollod. i.ii. 12. 1–2.

6. For the supplement cf. Hesiod, Στατ. 53.


That other name for Eetion was stated in Schol. Apollon. Rhod. i. 916 ἐγένετο δὲ τρίς πάθος. Δάρδανον τοῦ ἐς Τραίαν κατακύθαντα, ὡν καὶ Πολυάρχη φασὶ λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν ἐγχώρων, καὶ Ἡσίων ἐν Αἰαέων ὑμιλάζουσι· καὶ φασὶ κεραυνώθησαν αὐτῶν ὑβριστὰ ἀγάλμα τῆς Δήμητρος. The scholiast’s authority here is supposed to have been Hellanicus, who is cited in the context. The identity of Iasion with Eetion is also stated by Schol. Eurip. Πόιην. 1129.

13–16. Cf. Apollod. iii. 12. 1 Δάρδανος δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ διηνότῳ τοῦ ἄδελφου λυποτομένου Σαμοθρακὸν ἀποκείτω εἰς τὴν ἀντιπέρα ἡπείρον ἑλθε. νηθιν l. 16 looks like a reference to the voyage of Dardanus (in spite of Conon 21 ποιῶν χρήσι συνέκτω ἤν), and if so it seems probable that ll. 14–15 are parenthetical. Tros was the son of Erichonius and father of Ilus, Assaracus, and Ganymede. For l. 15 cf. Homer, Υ 232.

Fr. 3 containing beginnings of lines may well belong to the same column as Fr. 2, but their relative position is unknown.

Fr. 4. 1–4. The subject of these verses is not clear. It is natural to restore Ἐριχονίου-νομοι in l. 3 and to suppose that the fragment is more or less closely connected with Fr. 2,
and ll. 1–2 and 4 readily lend themselves to that view; ἱλε[...] in l. 1 may be ἱλε[πατρα daughter of Tros, and καλλος in l. 4 might be taken to refer to her brother Ganymede. On the other hand ll. 5–8 are apparently concerned with the quite different subject of Diomed and Hyacinthus. Perhaps a new section began at l. 5.

5–8. Cf. Apollod. iii. 10. 3 Ἀμικλα δὲ καὶ Διομήδης ... Ὑάκινθος. τούτων εἰσὶ τοῦ 'Ἀπόλλωνος ἔρωμαν λέγουσιν, ὥς διάκρινι βιαζὼν ἰκων ἀπίκτειν. ]α in l. 7 might perhaps be Ἀμικλα[α.

Fr. 5. 2. οφθητον: cf. Homer, I 413 κλέος οφθητον, H. Cer. 261 οφθ. ... τιμήν. γέρας οφθ. occurs in Alcaeus, Fr. 83.

1360. Alcaeus.

Late second century.

Since the publication of Part X some additional fragments of 1234 have fortunately come to light. One or two small pieces have fitted on to Fr. 1, lines 1–12 now reading as follows:—

5 το[...].]αιδαίσχυντοςτ[ι

That a new poem begins at l. 7 is established by the coronis. συμφάραι is another substantial gain, and ἀμίμη, which we hesitated to restore, is confirmed. The first word of l. 6 was of course μύσος, but the preceding verses remain obscure. It is disappointing that the gap at the beginning of them has not been more completely filled, but perhaps the missing fragment may yet make its appearance.

The remainder of the new pieces are printed below. Frs. 1–3 certainly, and probably Fr. 5 also, are from the bottoms of columns, but their position relatively to each other and to the columns of 1234 is unknown, and the assumption that
the latter were consecutive becomes rather more hazardous. In colour and condition, however, these additional fragments approximate to 1234. Fr. 1, and may well have preceded it. They cannot be brought into close connexion with 1234. Frs. 3–6.

As in 1234, political references are frequent, and the poems seem to belong mainly to the class of Σταυρωτίδ. Lines 1–8 of Fr. 1 are from the conclusion of a poem, of which, however, there is not enough to show clearly either the subject or metre; l. 8 may be scanned as an Adonius, but the absence of a paragraphus below l. 4 is against Sapphics. ἀ πόλις in l. 8 points to a political theme. The next piece opens with an apostrophe to some person who is apparently reproached as a half-hearted adherent of the party of Alcaeus. It is written in stanzas of uncertain length. If, as is possible, a paragraphus has disappeared below l. 11 (see the note there) they would be three-line stanzas, as in one of the Berlin fragments of Sappho (Berl. Klassikertexte, v. 2, p. 12), consisting of a second Glyconic, a greater Asclepiad, and a lesser Asclepiad. This, however, is quite doubtful, though a stanza of more than four verses is unexpected. Fr. 2, in Alcaics, is shown by the accompanying scholia to be similarly concerned with politics. The citizens are rebuked for their timidity and urged to suppress the coming tyranny, which is compared to smouldering wood that will soon be bursting into flame. In Fr. 3 hardly anything is left of the main text; a note on the lower margin explains a topographical allusion which occurred in it, and also mentions Bycchis, who figures in 1234. Fr. 3. 10 as well as in Alc. 35. 3. There is little distinctive in the other fragments with the exception of Fr. 5, where the 2,000 staters in l. 7 must mean the Lydian subvention already referred to in Fr. 1 of 1234 (reprinted above). Since Fr. 5 is evidently in Sapphics, it may even be part of the same poem as 1234. Fr. 1.
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Fr. 1.

οσπάρα[.
αλλαπ[. [.
τῶπο .. [.
πολλα[.][.
ωσεθέ[.
[.]στιτω[. [.
[.]απολιοσάμμα[.
[.]σωπαντ' ἤσαπ[.
ου'd'ασυνων[.]σταμοιο[.
βάμωλατο[. ]στοῦτ' ἐφυλαξ[.
μητιστων[,]κοπατρίδαν σεν[.
εἰσεταφάνεραι[.]σιναπαρχα . [.

Fr. 2.

η'ν[.
οδεπλάτν[.
κεφάλας,μάτει [.
[.]μειωδεσιγαγατεωπερνερκοργημοθυτα[.
[.]δενδυμανουαντιστηνατινωτιγαν[.
ντεσ'[.
οξίλον[.
[.]προιειμονον[.
κατασβεσκακαταπαυσταταχεωσμηλα[.
τεροντοφωσγενηται[.

Fr. 3.

σι[.
[.]ακ[.
αμο[. [.
Fr. 1.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ός} & \text{ πάρα} \\
\text{άλλα} & \text{ π[.]}. & [ \\
\text{τῶ} & \text{ πο} & \ldots & [ \\
5 \text{πόλις} & \text{άμμα} & [ \\
\text{Οὐ} & \text{ πάντι ἦς ἀπόρος (?)} & \\
10 & \text{οὐδ' ἀσύννετο[ο]ς ἀμ(μ)οισι δ[ὲ} & \\
& \text{βόμῳ Δατα[ίδ]α τοῦτ' ἐφυλάξα[ο} & \\
& \text{μή τις τῶν κ[α]κοπατρίδαν ὅπως } & [ \\
& \text{εἰσεῖται, φάνεραι τ[οί]σιν ἀπαρχαί [} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Fr. 2.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἔμεις δὲ σιγάτε ὅσπερ νεκρῶν ἑρωί μόσται, ο[ὐ] & \\
& \text{δῖν δυνάμενοι ἀντιστήμαι τῇ τυράννῳ.} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Fr. 3.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἄλλ', ὥς πολίται, νῦν, ἐτι τ[ῦ] δύ[λον} & \\
& \text{ἀς ἄμμι τῶν κάπνον] προέει μόνον} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Fr. 4.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἄλλ', ὥς Μυτιληναῖοι, ἔως ἐτι καπνὸν μόνον} & \\
& \text{ἀφύστι τὸ δύ[λον, τοῦτ' ἐστ[ιν] ἔως οὐδέπω τυρανν[εῖν,} & \\
& \text{kατωσβ[ε]τὲ και καταπαύσωσθε τα[χεὸς, μή λαμπρό-} & \\
& \text{τερον τὸ φῶς γένητα}. & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Fr. 5.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{σιν[} & \\
\text{ακρον} & [ \\
\end{align*}
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 4.</th>
<th>Fr. 5.</th>
<th>Fr. 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col. i.</td>
<td>Col. ii.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>μα[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>οννα[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>και[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>δαιμ[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>γαυτα[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>[σοστο[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>κα[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ξ[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 7.</th>
<th>Fr. 8.</th>
<th>Fr. 9.</th>
<th>Fr. 10.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Πη[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>να[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τηφ[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>κα[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ουρβ[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ξοτα [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Col. i. Col. ii.

\[ \varepsilon \lambda [ \ldots ] \delta [ \]

\[ \omega \varepsilon i \lambda ' \Lambda i \delta a [ \]

\[ \varepsilon \theta \nu n \eta ] \]

\[ \iota \lambda \eta \mu e \tau \varepsilon \dot{\eta} \xi \nu \pi \alpha [ \]

\[ \nu \phi \varepsilon \rho \nu \tau i \dot{\iota} \varepsilon \pi [ \]

\[ \phi \eta \sigma i \tau \varepsilon \dot{\beta} \omega \kappa i \delta i \]

\[ \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \varphi \alpha \nu . \]

Fr. 4.

Fr. 5.

Fr. 6.

Fr. 7.

Fr. 8.

Fr. 9.

Fr. 10.

\[ \lambda n \]

\[ \iota n \]

\[ \kappa a i \tau i \]

\[ \lambda o s \]

\[ \lambda o v \]

\[ \delta a i \mu i \]

\[ \kappa a l \]

\[ \iota n . \kappa \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 11</th>
<th>Fr. 12</th>
<th>Fr. 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col. i</td>
<td>Col. ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!σσονατ</td>
<td>άι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!μ</td>
<td>!μ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!ντα[</td>
<td>!ντα[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!στ[</td>
<td>!στ[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 14</th>
<th>Fr. 15</th>
<th>Fr. 16</th>
<th>Fr. 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!φ[</td>
<td>!σ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!ης [</td>
<td>!νοπτ[</td>
<td>!τολα[</td>
<td>!ημ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!σ [</td>
<td>!ντο[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!σμ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 18</th>
<th>Fr. 19</th>
<th>Fr. 20</th>
<th>Fr. 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!λω[</td>
<td>!βολλ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!ηκε[</td>
<td>!αμεγ[</td>
<td>!των[</td>
<td>!τ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!αστο[</td>
<td>!τιοδ[</td>
<td>!αψ[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!σμ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 22</th>
<th>Fr. 23</th>
<th>Fr. 24</th>
<th>Fr. 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!αινετ[</td>
<td>!δα[</td>
<td>!τερ[</td>
<td>!κα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!νκ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 26</th>
<th>Fr. 27</th>
<th>Fr. 28</th>
<th>Fr. 29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!αι[</td>
<td>!δεξα[</td>
<td>!κων[</td>
<td>!κων[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!λετ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Fr. 1. 8. The first mark of quantity is very doubtful, being abnormally low, but this might be accounted for by supposing the accent to have been written first. ἀρμα may be divided ἄρμα, either accusative or dative; for the latter cf. 1234. Fr. 1. 9 ἄρμα. ἐδωκαν.

9. A new poem is marked by the coronis. The letter before the lacuna is probably either γ or π; β, however, is not impossible. An adjective to balance ἄρμα of the next line is wanted.

10. For the doubled ν in ἄρμαν cf. Fr. 4. ii. 3, 1234. Fr. 2. ii. 8 ὄνωραι, and Alc. 18. i where the spelling ἄρμαντιμι is commended by these analogies. The rest of the line is difficult. οι seems practically certain, and the next letter can only be σ or ε. Before οι it could well be read, but this, though the preceding a may perhaps be λ, gives no word. That the letter next after the lacuna is the final s of ἄρμαν is not certain, for below the curved top there is a tiny speck which is consistent with ε or σ; but to read σωρε or σωρε does not suit the space so well, and leads to no other good result; αλμωζαί cannot be regarded as likely here. We have thus been led to αμωζαί, which would give a sense if some such verb as συνοδηγόν followed, but is unsatisfactory since the dialect requires a second μ. γφρ too would seem more natural than δε.

11. Under the β of βεωμα there is a narrow crack in the upper fibres of the papyrus, in which a paragraphus may possibly have disappeared, though it seems more likely that, if a paragraphus had stood here, some vestiges of it would have still been visible. There is certainly no paragraphus below either l. 12 or l. 13. The accidental omission of a paragraphus is of course not impossible, though an unsatisfactory supposition in consideration of their regularity in 1234.

12–13. For the construction μέ... εὐστατε cf. e.g. Aristoph. Eccles. 486–8 περικο-πομένη... μν ἠμαθεία γενήσαται, Aesch. Pers. 116 σφ. φθον ἄμωσεντε φόβο... μν πόλει πύθηται... και τὸ Κλασσιον πολισμ' ἀντίδοταν ἐσ' ἐμοί (ἠστατε). Χερ. Συρηφ. iv. 1. 18 άρα μν πολλάς ἑκάστη ἤμιν ψευδών δίησσα. The irregularity apparently gave rise to the marginal note. κοκοσπάρις is parallel in form to εὔπαρβης. In 1234. Fr. 6. 12 as well as in Alc. 37 the form κοκοσπάρις was used. For the paroxytone accent with gen. plur. of the 1st declension cf. 1231. Fr. 14. 8, note.

Fr. 2. 3. μάτει: cf. Sapph. 54. 3 μάτεσαι. The preceding dot is a low stop, of which there was no example in 1234.

4. The marginal note paraphrased the text. νεκρῶν μόστα is an unexpected combination, and the latter part of this line is very doubtfully deciphered. σωρ, σνε, ενε, might well be read instead of μν. ε of δε has been corrected.

6–7. An approximate restoration is made possible by the marginal paraphrase. That the metre is Alcaic is sufficiently clear from the rhythms of ll. 2–3 and 6–7 in conjunction with the shorter verse in l. 4 and the final trochee in l. 5. Line 7 is followed by a blank space equivalent to three lines, and was therefore probably the last, or (allowing for one shorter line) the last but one of the column.

Fr. 4. i. 3. ονο[]: cf. 1234. Fr. 2. ii. 8 ὄνωραι and note on Fr. 1. 10, above.

Fr. 6. 3–4. The accent points to ἤλπιδέργων rather than λ to ἔργων. Line 4, as compared with ll. 3 and 5, is too long for the last verse of a Sapphic stanza.

5. φιλον τοκησ occurs in 1231. Fr. 1. i. 22.

7. There is only a short space after α, but the slight flourish with which it was finished is suggestive of a final letter.

Fr. 7. The metre may well be Sapphic.
1360. *NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS*

**Fr. 12. i.** The curved stroke below the line shows that the letters belong to a single word; cf. e.g. 1233. Fr. 2. 20. It is the opposite of the *diastole*, of which there was an example in 1234. Fr. 2. i. 6.

**Fr. 15** possibly joins on above Fr. 16.

**Fr. 17. i.** The doubtful ϕ may be v.

**Fr. 18. i.** κε[ō]: or κε[α].

**Fr. 21** is rather doubtfully included here.

**Fr. 28.** The ξ is less carefully formed than is usual in this hand, and the fragment perhaps does not belong to this text. The attribution of Fr. 29, where in l. 1 only the bottoms of the letters remain, is also uncertain.

1361. BACCHYLIDES, *Scolia*.

**Fr. i** 18.1 x 13.1 cm. First century. Plate III (Fr. r, 4).

Bacchylides has already figured among the Oxyrhynchus papyri in 1091, a column from Ode xvi (dithyramb). The fragments now published are from a different manuscript, and belong to a class not represented in the British Museum papyrus; but their authorship is at once demonstrated by a coincidence with a passage cited by Athenaeus (Bacch. Fr. 20).

The rather large and ornate handwriting has a decidedly early appearance, and is likely to fall well within the first century. Characteristic letters are ε and θ, of which the cross-bar commonly consists of a mere dot separated from the curved strokes. ξ is similarly treated, and ζ, in which the connecting stroke is vertical and joins the horizontal strokes at their centre, is also in the archaic style. The apices or finials frequently added to straight strokes are another noticeable feature. Hands somewhat similar in these respects may be seen in 659 and P. Rylands 20, though probably those both belong to a rather earlier period than 1361; cf. also 1298. Stops in two positions, high and medial, are employed, and accents, breathings, marks of quantity and elision, &c., have been inserted fairly frequently. Possibly some of these additions may be original, but the text has been corrected and annotated, apparently by more hands than one, and to them the diacritical signs are more probably due. It is noticeable that strophes are not marked off, as usual, by paragraphi.

Like other papyri from the same find (1906), the roll has suffered severely; only three of the forty-eight fragments recovered are of any size, these having themselves been largely built up of smaller pieces. Fr. i, which at l. 6 sqq. coincides with Bacch. Fr. 20 and fortunately preserves the beginning of the poem from which those
attractive verses were taken, is addressed to Alexander, i.e. no doubt Alexander son of Amyntas, king of Macedon, to whom an ode was also dedicated by Pindar (Fr. 120). This Fr. 20 is commonly regarded as derived from a Παροίνων, or convivial piece, although no distinct class of Παροίνων or Σκόλια is ascribed to Bacchylides by ancient authorities. That such was in fact the nature of the fragment is now quite evident from l. 5, in which the poet describes his composition as συμποσίωσιν ἄγαλμα. For the dedication of such poems to royal personages cf. e.g. Pindar, Fr. 125, cited from τὸ πρὸς Ἰέρωνα σκόλιον. The piece is written in dactylo-epitritic stanzas of four verses, the first four stanzas forming a prelude, after which Alexander is directly addressed.

The beginning of another poem, which is no doubt of the same class, is preserved in Fr. 4. This, as the marginal title states and would in any case be clear from internal evidence, was addressed to Hiero of Syracuse. In ll. 8–10 the poet alludes to his previous compositions in honour of the victories of Hiero’s famous horse Pherenicus; and the coupling of ‘chestnut steeds’ with the name of Hiero in ll. 3–4 might at first sight suggest that the present piece also was designed to celebrate some success in the games. But if this were a regular epinician ode, its omission from the Hiero group in the British Museum papyrus would be very strange, and the occasion of the victory would be expected in the marginal title. Moreover, on the positive side there is not only the analogy of Fr. 1, but the direct reference in l. 6 to συμπόσιαι ἄνδρες. These reasons combine to determine the classification of the poem as a convivial σκόλιον. Its date was subsequent to the year 476 B.C., as the mention of Aetna in l. 7 proves; and Bacchylides was not at the time in Sicily (ll. 6–7). The metre, as in Fr. 1, is dactylo-epitritic, the strophes consisting of six verses each, in the following scheme:

\[
\begin{align*}
&- \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \equiv [-] \\
&- \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \equiv [-] \circ \equiv \equiv \equiv \\
&- \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \equiv [\circ] \equiv \equiv \equiv \\
&- \circ \equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv \\
&- \circ \circ \equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv \\
&- \circ \circ \equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv \\
\end{align*}
\]

The only other piece of any size is Fr. 5, consisting of remains of two columns, those of the first being quite considerable, though there seems to be a good deal missing at the beginnings of the lines. This column contains a lengthy mythological narrative, the key to which is not yet found. Line 6 ἐν [_xpath=φάλαξ] ῥοξεῖ, with the interlinear adscript . . . ὑπὸ πάτρος ἐν . . . , suggests a reference to the story of Pterelaus or Nisus, or some analogous myth; there is, however, no evident connexion between this and what follows, which relates to
a rape (ll. 13–14; cf. ll. 19–20). If Ἰδουτ in l. 14 (cf. l. 18) is the termination of a name (?μεδουτ?), this should provide the clue, but it has so far proved elusive. Notwithstanding this obscurity, the poem to which this column belonged may be presumed to be of the same class as the two discussed above. Its metre is of a different kind, and followed a more elaborate system, since no strophic correspondence is apparent.
Fr. 1. Plate III.

ωβαρβιτε·μηκετιπασσαλονφυλασ[...
επατονολιγρανκαππαγεάρνι.
δεύρεσεμασχερασ·ορμαινωτιπαιμ[...
χρυσεομουσαναλεξανδρωιττερο[...
5 καινυμπο[...
σιναγαλμ[...
ευτενέωνα[...
σενομενάνκ[...
κυπριδοστελπ[...
δμειγνυμέρ[...
σα[

10 ανδρασινυψο[...
μερμ[...
αντικ[...
μενπ[...
ν[
πασ[...
χρ[...

15 νάεσαγο[...
πλούτονώσ[...
μεγ[...
ονπ[...
λάχ[...

20 σθθυμ[...
φρονο[...
επερ[...

Fr. 2.

Πίγαρανθ[...

ωιχαρι[...

...
Fr. 1. Plate III.

"Ω βάρβιτε, μηκέτι πάσαν πολυάσεσιν
πάταιρον λυγμάν κάππαν γάρ
αυτήν.\n
δειπνησάς εσ εμάς χερασί δρμάινω τι πέποιπτεν
χρύσιμον Μουσάν Αλεξάνδροφ πτερόν

5 καὶ συμποσ[οις]ιν ἀγάμα'· ἐν] εἰκάδεσθαιν,
εὗτε νέον [νιγαθών γλυκεί' ἀγάκα]
σεμομενάν κυμάκων θάλασσαι θυμά'ν
Κιπρίδος τ' ἐλπίς (δ)αιμόσοι (?) φρένας,

ἀ κειγενυμεν[α Διονυσίοι]σα δόροις

10 ἀνθράξιν υψα[τάτῳ πέποιτε]ι μερίμ[ασ]
αστικ[α] μὲν πολλῶν κράδε]μαν λάθει,
πάσι δ' ἀνθρώποις μοναρξ[ή]σειν δοκεί,
χρυσ[δ]ε [δ' ἐλεφαντί] τε μαρμ[α]ρίσθουσιν οἴκοι,
πυροβο[λο]ρο[ί] δε κατ' αἰγλάεντια πόλιν

15 να[ες] ἄγω[μι]ν ἀν' Ἀλγύπτου μέγιστον

ὁ π[α]τερί μεγαλοσ[θενέος]?

[... ]ουπην[...

20 [―]μ[α]χ[[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[――[―"}
Fr. 3.

\[ \text{πόλις} \text{κοσμοῦ} \]
\[ \text{ανθρωπονομίας} \]
\[ \text{μεσασμένα} \]

Fr. 4. Plate III.

[\[ \text{μη} \text{παλιγγια} \]
\[ \text{βαρβιτωμέλλα} \]
\[ \text{ανθεύουομενις} \]
\[ \text{επίθεσινποιός} \]
\[ \text{ερωτεύεσθαι} \]
\[ \text{ενυποταισανδρεσιπι} \]
\[ \text{γνασευκτιτωνεϊκ} \]
\[ \text{οσθευμησαστοφ} \]
\[ \text{σηλαςφρονοφ} \]
\[ \text{καν} \text{φηφ} \]
\[ \text{πομενοσ} \]
\[ \text{εφεσφαποκουραφ} \]
\[ \text{σαδιδισαμχραφ} \]
\[ \text{μοσγθεσαμφ} \]
\[ \text{μακφ} \]
\[ \text{μαπ} \]
\[ \text{σηφ} \]
Fr. 3.

Myth. Lapiaz, Πεύκη, τὰ ἐκ τῶν Χρονοτριβων Ἀνδρας τῆς Θέας. Πεύκη, τὰ ἐκ τῶν Χρονοτριβων Ἀνδρας τῆς Θέας.

Fr. 4. Plate III.

NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Fr. 5. Col. i.

\(\text{τευείδεκαμ[}\)
\(\text{ονίαστάλα[}\)
\(\text{περόννυντελ[}\)
\(\text{ασκακικάταρατ[...}]\)

\(5\)
\(\text{νευδονεχ[...]}\)
\(\text{ιδεν[...εφαλ[...]} \text{μεχεσ[...]}\)
\(\text{νσολοφουσα[...]}\)
\(\text{χαλκεουμιτραν[...]}\)

\(10\)
\(\text{βρασύχειρακαμιαι[...]}\)
\(\text{ησκαλυκόπιδορ[...]}\)
\(\text{πατέρεμευν'αλλά[...]} \text{ρονοο[...]}\)
\(\text{ει[...κρατεράτεκ' πτο καρτ[...]}\)

\(15\)
\(\text{δονταναγην...}\)
\(\text{ελιου...}\)
\(\text{ενποσειδαονίασ}\)
\(\text{ισελεαν}\)
\(\text{μτοσολβιοντεκος}\)
\(\text{εκορηηρ[...]}\)
\(\text{βανδρωσ[...]}\)
\(\text{του}\)
\(\text{αλλικρήδεμνουθεασ}\)

\(20\)
\(\text{κυσαγγελοσ[...]} \text{αλεπψια[...]}\)
\(\text{ανευντεμολεν[...]}\)

Fr. 6.

\(\text{ησ[...]}\)
\(\text{οθον[...]}\)
\(\text{μασσο[...]}\)
\(\text{νθ[...]}\)

Col. ii.

\(\text{σ[...]}\)
\(\text{έ[...]}\)
\(\text{π[...]}\)
\(\text{λ[...]}\)

\(5\)
\(\text{αι[...]}\)
\(\text{μα[...]}\)
\(\text{σ[...]}\)
\(\text{δο[...]}\)
\(\text{ετ[...]}\)
\(\text{σε[...]}\)

\(10\)
\(\text{μο[...]}\)

\(15\)
\(\text{βρα[...]}\)
1361. NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS

Fr. 5. Col. i.

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{ν ἐνδον ἔχοι.} \\
&\text{\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots } \\
&\nu 5'\, εν\, [κ'] \text{φαλφ.} \\
&\text{Χριστόλοφος πα.} \\
&\text{\ldots \ldots } \\
&\text{χαλκεομίτραν} \\
&\text{\ldots \ldots } \\
&\visible{\text{ιοι κόρης}} \\
\end{align*}\]

Fr. 6.

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{\ldots } \\
&\text{\ldots } \\
&\text{\ldots } \\
&\text{\ldots } \\
&\text{\ldots } \\
&\text{\ldots } \\
&\text{\ldots } \\
&\text{\ldots } \\
&\text{\ldots } \\
&\text{\ldots } \\
\end{align*}\]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Fr. 7.

[ ... ]

Fr. 8.

[ ... ]

Fr. 9.

[ ... ]

Fr. 10.

[ ... ]

Fr. 11.

[ ... ]

Fr. 12.

[ ... ]

Fr. 13.

[ ... ]

Fr. 14.

[ ... ]

Fr. 15.

[ ... ]

Fr. 16.

[ ... ]

Fr. 17.

[ ... ]

Fr. 18.

[ ... ]
FR. 7.  ν ταλ[ X|αρ|ιτω|ν (?) ] ου[ν] 
FR. 8.  λο[ μο[ ] σται π[ ήν] 
FR. 9.  φι[ νι- ] θεως[ ] πόσιν 

FR. 11.  φι[ ] 

FR. 12. 

FR. 13.  μο[ν] 

FR. 14.  οσσα[ ] 

FR. 15.  

FR. 16.  να[ ] 

FR. 17.  

FR. 18.  κατ[ ] 

FR. 19.  αι[ ] 

FR. 20.  αι[ ] 

FR. 21.  αι[ ]
1861. NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS

Fr. 19.

[...]  

Fr. 20.

[...]

Fr. 21.

[...]

Fr. 22.

[...]

Fr. 23.

[...]  

Fr. 24.

[...]

Fr. 25.

[...]

Fr. 26.

[...]  

Fr. 27.

[...]  

Fr. 28.

[...]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 29</th>
<th>Fr. 30</th>
<th>Fr. 31</th>
<th>Fr. 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δ[</td>
<td>νκ[</td>
<td>έκο[</td>
<td>ῥα[i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χ[</td>
<td>ου[</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>ν[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ο[</td>
<td>ου[</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ[</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 μ[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 33</td>
<td>Fr. 34</td>
<td>Fr. 35</td>
<td>Fr. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>τέ[</td>
<td>θε [</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α[</td>
<td>οφ[</td>
<td>μπα[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε[</td>
<td>τ[</td>
<td>αιμ[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 37</td>
<td>Fr. 38</td>
<td>Fr. 39</td>
<td>Fr. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>δ[</td>
<td>κα[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νουσα[</td>
<td>θ[</td>
<td>τερ[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τδ[</td>
<td>θε[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 41</td>
<td>Fr. 42</td>
<td>Fr. 43</td>
<td>Fr. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[κ[</td>
<td>ο[</td>
<td>ιοε[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καιντη[</td>
<td>άνχαρ[</td>
<td>ο[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr. 45</td>
<td>Fr. 46</td>
<td>Fr. 47</td>
<td>Fr. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[</td>
<td>ε[</td>
<td>σ[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λευ[</td>
<td>ρ[</td>
<td>μσ[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Fr. 29. Fr. 30. Fr. 31. Fr. 32.

\[ \delta \] . \nu \kappa . [ ] \epsilon \kappa [ ] \tau \iota \\
\chi [ ] \chi [ ] [ ] \\
\delta [ ] \rho [ ] [ ] \\
5 \mu [ ] [ ] [ ] \\

Fr. 33. Fr. 34. Fr. 35. Fr. 36.

. [ ] \pi [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
\alpha [ ] \varepsilon [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
\epsilon [ ] \tau . [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] \\

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

. [ ] . [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
\rho [ ] \varepsilon [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
\nu o [ ] \theta [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
\tau [ ] \theta [ ] [ ] [ ] \\

Fr. 41. Fr. 42. Fr. 43. Fr. 44.

. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
\kappa [ ] \lambda [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
[ ] [ ] \chi [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
[ ] [ ] \chi [ ] [ ] [ ] \\

Fr. 45. Fr. 46. Fr. 47. Fr. 48.

. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
\varepsilon [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] \\
[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] \\

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Fr. 1. 1-16. 'For Alexander son of Amyntas.

'My lyre, no longer hung upon the peg restrain the clear voice of thy seven strings. Hither to my hands! It is my wish to send to Alexander a golden feather from the wings of the Muses, to grace his banquet on the festal days, when, as the cups go swiftly round, a sweet force warms the heart of noble youths and a presage of the Cyprian goddess thrills the mind. Mingling with the gifts of Dionysus it sends a man's thoughts up to the clouds; straightway he is overthrowing the battlemotes of cities, he fancies himself monarch of the world, his halls gleam with gold and ivory, and the corn-laden ships bring vast wealth from Egypt over the radiant sea; such are the dreams wherewith the winuruc stirs the soul.'

1. φιλάδε[ων : or φιλάδε[ων' ; in the Anacreontea both the masc. and fem. are found, but in earlier writers the gender is not determined. θάβρος recurs in Fr. 4, 2, but is not elsewhere found in Bacchylides or Pindar. For πάυσαλος cf. Pindar, Ol. i. 18 ἀπὸ φόρμυγγα πασσάλων λάμβαντ', Homer, ὧ 67 καὶ ὧ ἐκ πασσάλων κρέμασκε φόρμυγγα.

2-3. The marginal note has been restored on the supposition that it contained the title, although in Fr. 4 this is placed rather higher up opposite the first line of the poem. The hand also seems to differ; it is more formal, like the note in Fr. 21. 5, and less distinct from the hand of the text.

4. Μουσά.. πτερόν : cf. e.g. Pindar, Isth. i. 64 πτερόγνυον ἀπεθάνον ἀγλαίας Πιερίδων.

5. εἴκαδος[ν] : cf. e.g. Plutarch, Non posses suaviter vivi 4 (1089 c) ἐκ ἐφερείων ᾠαλάγεσθαι, πω ἕκκατον ἕτοιμον ἡ πολαι εἰκάδοι ἐβείνησαν πολυτελόστατα, and the will of Epicurus in Diog. Laert. x. 18 τὴν γενομένον σύνοδον ἐκάτω τοῖς εἰκάτοι τῶν συμφιλοσοφοῦσιν ἡμῶν.

6. ΐτ ἱλικίς' begins the citation in Athenaeus ii, p. 39 e (= Bacch. Fr. 20).

7. ηνομένων was Blass's correction of the MSS. reading ηνομένα or γενομένα. The first of θάλασσαι has apparently been deleted by a dot placed above it. θάλασσαι also MSS. Jebb reads θαλάσσαι with Weir Smyth.

8. τ' ἐλπὶς (ὅ)καθισθεὶς : Εἴπει δ' αἰθίσει (ὁ ἐν, E) MSS., δ' ἐλπὶς διαθίσει Erfurd, δ' ἐλπὶς διαθίσει Blass. The τ' of the papyrus implies a subjunctive, but there is not room for διαθίσει in the lacuna. Possibly διαθίσει was written (the loss of δ would be easy before α), though this too makes a rather long supplement even when the three iotaς and the ρ are allowed for.

9-10. ἀ μεγαλομεν[α ... ἄνθρας : άναμμενον ... άνθρας δ' MSS., ἀμεγαλομένα editors. The reading of the papyrus is probably correct.

11. αὐτίκα μὲν: Kaibel's conjecture for the MSS. reading αὐτὴ μὲν or αὐτὰς μὲν is confirmed; αὐτί, α' μὲν Bergk, εὐκτείνων Blass.

12. κράδε[να λέει : the MSS. have the unmetrical κράδεμων, which has been corrected by editors. Blass alters λέει to λέεσαι on the ground that the lengthening of the ν would not accord with the practice of Bacchylides or Pindar, but the traditional reading is defended by Jebb.

13-14. μαρμ[αρον ... αἰγλαίστα] πολύτον : the letters μαρ[ and ]α πο[ are on a detached fragment which is placed here with hesitation, since the appearance of the verso is somewhat dissimilar from the adjacent portion of Fr. 1. The combination is the more precarious because πάνω is a conjecture (Erfurd), though a very probable one; αἰγλάστα ρητ MSS., a spondee being lost. Bergk inserted καρπον after αἰγλάστα, and this was adopted by Blass, who, however, placed it after ρητ, mistakenly, as the papyrus now shows.

17. The accent and breathing above the supposed μ are doubtful.

18. This line should begin with a dactyl, for which the space before υρεσ seems barely sufficient. Possibly there was a wrong division of ll. 17-18, or some other dislocation.
23. The tops of the letters only remain; the first, third, and fourth were round, but are not to be clearly identified.

Frs. 2–3. The strong similarity of the verso of these two fragments to that of Fr. i makes it probable that they belong to the same column. In Fr. 3, moreover, there is at the right-hand edge some suggestion of a selis, and if this roughly corresponded with the selis in the middle of Fr. i, the remains of Fr. 3 would fit in with the metrical scheme, on the supposition that l. 4 (the last of the column) was the first verse of the stanza. But Fr. 3. 2 does not lend itself to combination with Fr. i. 23.

Fr. 3. 2–3. There is much resemblance here to Bacch. Fr. 34 ὁργάζ μὲν ἀνθρώπων διακεκριμένα μυρίαν, but though ὁργάζ is quite possible in l. 2, and the doubtful σ at the end of l. 3 may be ε, the preceding letter was apparently not κ. Of course if Bacch. Fr. 34 were to be identified here, Fr. 3 would belong, if not to a different column from Fr. i, at any rate to a different poem. A small dot over the final ν of ἀνθρώπων is probably accidental.

Fr. 4. i–10. 'For Hiero of Syracuse.

'Let me not yet lay aside the clear-sounding lyre; I am now about to fashion a fair flower of the gold-robed Muses for Hiero, renowned for his chestnut steeds, with those who share his banquet, and to send it to well-built Aetna. If in former time I have sung of Pherenicus, famed among steeds for his swiftness of foot, and of his victory by the Alpheus...'

2. Line 14 shows that this verse was a trimeter, but whether the last μετρόν was - or - is not clear.

3. For κλυτό cf. e.g. Pindar, Pyth. i. 37 στεφάνωσιν ἅν θητοὺς τε κλυτών.

8–10. If [Ἀλφέα] (Murray) is right, the reference is to Ode ν, which celebrated Hiero's victory with Pherenicus at Olympia in 476 B.C. For the supplement suggested for the end of l. 8 cf. l. 1182–4 of that poem ἑτ' ὁ κλείνος ποσαί νικάσας δρόμων [ἥλθ']ν Φερείνακα.

11–12. Murray suggests [τη] unwittingly, but ἁπτός does not suit the remains in l. 12. τομείτως may of course be τό μένως. In l. 11 a vestige of ink at one letter's distance from ρ may be either the top of a φ or ψ, or of some interlinear mark, e.g. a breathing.

13 sqq. It seems clear that these verses do not form an epode but follow the metre of the strophe. What remains of ll. 13–15 fits readily into the previous scheme, and the shortness of the next two lines also accords with it.

15. ὀνα: or possibly ὑπερ[.]

Fr. 5. i. καπ[: or καυ[.]

2. Perhaps Ποαεδαβωνιας; cf. l. 16.

4. The first letter, of which the lower half only remains, may be γ, ρ, or η.

7. γ, μ, ρ, τ, v would be possible after πα. Perhaps παρρ'δ should be restored; cf. l. 6.

8. The vestige following σ in the second line of the marginal note may either belong to a letter, e.g. τ, or be a stop; cf. e.g. Fr. 21. 5.

12–13. ἀλλὰ after the stop is doubtless the conjunction, and the second accent shows that an enclitic followed; τὰ or τὰ[ιν, e.g.,] would be suitable. In l. 13 the deleted ν points to the termination of a verb, preceded by something like δς or δντ. κρατερᾶ is presumably to be constructed with ἀναγκαι in spite of the absence of the iota adscript. In the marginal variant the infinitive ἐκτείνω (?) was apparently made to depend on the phrase χρόνος ἐμολε, or
whatever the verb was. The grammarian to whom this reading is ascribed may well be Ptolemaeus of Ascalon or Ptolemaeus Pindarion, more probably the latter, if his second name may be taken to indicate an interest in the lyric poets. It may be doubted whether the son of Aristonicus flourished early enough to be quoted here.

24. θ[α]λοσφην is presumably a variant for some similar epithet, e.g. τανίσφυρον, which occurred in the lacuna. The word is normally of two terminations.

ii. 2. For the marginal cross here and below cf. e.g. 841 passim. In 1174 this symbol, which is used much like our N.B., is sometimes surmounted by a small iota.

Fr. 6. There is a close resemblance in appearance between this fragment and the upper part of Fr. 5 i; but we have not succeeded in finding a suitable combination.

Fr. 7. 3. Either μ[ε]ρδ[η] or -μ[ε]ρδ[η].

Fr. 8. This fragment, though in some ways similar to Fr. 7, is apparently not to be joined on at the bottom of it. There is a junction of two selides on the right-hand side.

Fr. 9. 3. θεοτο[μ]τ: cf. Bacch. xvi. 132. The fragment is rather like Frs. 7-8, but a combination of this line with Fr. 7 6 θεοτο[μ]τ has little probability.

Fr. 10. 3. πόσων: the first letter may be read as η or μ, but these are more difficult.

Fr. 11. A junction of two selides passes through the ν of μαυδις.

Fr. 12. 4. Cf. Eurip. Alc. 570 εὐλύπασ 'Απόλλων. A dot in the o of φοι gives that letter rather the appearance of θ, but the mark, if ink, is with little doubt an accident.

Fr. 13. 2. The vestige after δελων might be regarded as a low stop.

Fr. 14. There is a junction of two selides at the right-hand edge of this fragment; possibly, therefore, it belonged to the same column as Fr. 8. It is similarly rather worn, but of a lighter colour.

Fr. 18. i. There is an ink-spot below the doubtful a.

3. That the mark above the partially preserved o represents a rough breathing is uncertain.

Fr. 19. 7. An ink-spot over the a does not look like part of a circumflex or mark of quantity, and was probably accidental.

Fr. 21. A junction of selides occurs to the right of this piece, which, however, differs in appearance from Frs. 8 and 14.

Fr. 22. 5. The mark of elision is doubtfully identified.

Fr. 24. 3. ν and ι being both narrow letters, λ[ε]ριρο does not overcrowd the lacuna.

Fr. 25. 5. Whether two thick ink-marks, which occur in the margin at the point of fracture just below this line, had any meaning is uncertain.

Fr. 26. 3. ουω[ is in keeping with the class of poems represented in these fragments; cf. introd.

Fr. 27. 1. Ερε[ν]. But the accent is uncertain.
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Fr. 29. Two selides meet just in front of this column, which must therefore be different from Fr. 5, ii, Fr. 25, and Fr. 33.

Fr. 33. 2. There is a mark of ink on the edge of the papyrus in front of this line.

Fr. 39. A reddish stain on this fragment makes it look rather similar to the top of Fr. 4, but it does not seem to belong there, although μ might be read in l. 1.

Fr. 42. 2. That this line was the last of a column seems probable, but is not certain.

Fr. 44. 1. The shape of the o indicates which way up the fragment is to be turned.

Fr. 45. 1. A dot above the supposed e of l. 2 may be the vestige of a long letter, φ or ψ, preceding e.

Fr. 48. It is hardly certain that this fragment belongs to 1361.

1362. CALLIMACHUS, Aetia.

Fr. 1 24·4 x 18·5 cm. First century. Plate IV (Fr. 1. Col. I).

Callimachus, who for a long time was poorly represented in the papyri, has during the last few years been obtaining the position which he might reasonably be expected to occupy. The publication of the important Oxyrhynchos fragments of the Aetia and Iambi (1011) was followed by that of pieces of various poems from a papyrus book of which remains were identified both at Berlin (Wilamowitz, Sitzungsber. Preuss. Akad., phil.-hist. Kl., 1912, pp. 524 sqq., 1914, pp. 222 sqq.) and Florence (P. S. I. 133), and of a scrap from the first book of the Aetia in P. Rylands 13 (cf. Wilamowitz, Hermes, xlvi. 3). To these are now to be added the further fragments of the Aetia and Iambi contained in 1362 and 1363. The former consists of remains of two columns, the first of which is nearly complete, with some minor pieces which are with one exception likely to belong to the mutilated second column. They are written in a round, rather ornate uncial hand of medium size, attributable to the first century. Though no doubt of earlier date, this script has much in common with e.g. 1375 and the Bodleian Homer from Hawara; among the differentiating features are the shapes of ε, θ, μ and the 'Ptolemaic' ξ, for which cf. e.g. 1361. Stops (in two positions, high and medial), some accents, breathings, &c., have been supplied subsequently, as is clear from the different shade of the ink; they may perhaps be due to the corrector who has made slight alterations here and there in the text.

The authorship of the piece, which in any case would not have been difficult to guess, is at once established by several coincidences with extant fragments of Callimachus. Its subject is a conversation with a man named Theogenes from the island of Icus, who is questioned by the poet concerning the
association of Peleus with Icus and the ceremonies with which it was celebrated. This conversation took place at a banquet given, as we are told by Athenaeus (xi. 477 c; cf. note on l. 8), by Pollis, an Athenian. Critics have objected to the statement of Athenaeus that Pollis is not an Athenian name, and Meineke proposed to emend Ἀθηναίως to Ὄθησαίως, and to infer that Thebes was among the Greek cities visited by Callimachus (op. Schneider, Callim. ii, p. 378). But it is now clear that the scene was Egypt, not Greece (l. 6); and the Athenian

Fr. 1. Col. i. Plate IV.

ηπωσουδεπιθουγ[]ισελανθανουνθεζευλουση
ημαροστειοιλευκοναγονικος·
εικαιριουκαιπαιδοσαγωνετειοιναγιστον
ατθιαυωντιστησουφασηρυγονη
εισηθατηνεκαλεσσομενθεασενδεινουσι
ειευνοοσα[,]γυπτωικαινσανεσταφετο
μεμβλωκωιδιοικαταχρεοι·ηνδεγενεθην
ικιοσθευνηνειχονεγκλισην
ουκεπτιταξαλλαινοσομηρικος·αιενομοιον·
οιοτεθεουσουνευνθεσεςτονομοιοναγει
καιγαρσορηκικημενεπεσυγεχαριδονμυστην
ουνποτειν·ολγωιδιδετοκουσβου
τωιμενεγαγδελεξαιπεριτεχεινοσαλευσων
τοτρινετεδανουνομακαιγενην·
ημαλεποστιδαλθεσσοτομουνοιδατοσαισαιν
αλλετικαιλεσχησουνσειευθελει
τηνημειστοκενη[.][φωρυτηρησεσφορεται
ουδεμενεισητ[.][.][.][.]οφρασσουχων
αιεσεισορω[.][.][.][.]τελευσεσατρεμειοσαινει·
βαλλομενχαλεπωιφαρμακονειποματι
θευγενεσα[.]εμειοσ[.]θεκηπαραθυμοσκουσαι
[]ειςκεινειταδεμοι[.]ξοι[.]εις[.][.]οι
μεμιουνουνασηνιτ[.]εις[.][.]μεμιεβεσθαι
πηλεα·κωσ[ειςκολευ[.]εις[.][.]κα·
origin of Pollis is no less evident from ll. 1-4, the point of which is that, though living in a foreign country, he took care to observe the Athenian festivals.

The obvious actiological drift of ll. 21 sqq. leaves no doubt that the poem is the Aetia, though the precise book is uncertain. Schneider supposed that Fr. 372, containing the reference to Peleus, occurred in Book i, and if that book treated of various festivals, it would be an appropriate source for a discussion of the peculiar ritual of Icus. But this attribution seems for the present quite conjectural; and the question in any case is of no great importance.

In the decipherment of this text material assistance has been rendered by Mr. E. Lobel.

Fr. i. Col. i. Plate IV.

hedos oude piθoygias elαmvanev ouδ' oste dουlois
"μαρ 'Oρεστειον λευκον αγους χους,
'Ικαρίου και παιδος αγων επετειον αγιστυν,
'Ατθιων οικτιστη, σον φαος, 'Ηριγυνης,
5 ει δαιτην εκαλεσεν ρμηθεας, εν δε ντ τοις
ξειων δι Α[ι]γυπτω καινος ανεστρεφετο
μεμβλωκως εδιον τι κατα χρεος, ην δε γενεθλην
"Ικιος, ι δ ευνην εξον εγω κλιειν
ουκ επιταξι, αλλ' αινος 'Ομηρικος, αιεν αμοιν
10 ως θεος, ου ψευδης, εσ τον αμοιν αγει.
και γαρ δ Θρηκιην μεν απεστυνε χαινον αμουσιν
οινοποτειν, δλευφ δ' ήδετο κιστυβιω.
tω μεν εγω ταδ ελεξα περιστειχουτοι αλεισιον
tο τριτον, ευτ' εδαν ουνομα και γενεθν.
15 "Η μαλ εποσ ταδ' αληθεις ότ' ου μονον εδατος αλιαν
tαλ' ετι και λασχης οινος εχειν εθελει
την ημεις, ουκ εν γαληρ αρυστηρεσι φορειται
ουδε μιν εις ατ[ι...]. δρωσιν οινοχων
αιτησεις όρωιν φ' ελευθεροι ατμενα σαινει,
20 βαλλομεν χαλεπωφ φαιμακον εν ποματι,
Θευγνες, ουσα[α] δ' εμειο σεθεν παρα θυμος ακοουαι
ιχαινει, ταδε μοι λεξουν [ανειρομενω]ω:
Μυρμιδονων ισοηνα τι πατριον ομμι σεβεσθαι
Πηλεα, κος "Ικω ευν[. . . . . . ]κα,
25 τευδενεκενγήτεινοντι...οτονεχουσα

Col. ii.

ηρωσκα[.].δουμα[ eιδοτεσσενεποι[ κεινησεριση[ ουδετερηνεγνωκατ[ 30 ουαταμυθεισθαισο[ τ[...].εμεθενιλεξαντο[ τ[...].μωκαρηπαυρωνο[ [...].λησεινηινε[ [...].θυμησιμο[ 

Fr. 2.

. . .
.  eius[ ην[ ραγε[ μη[ 5 . γεσο[ ιπα[ .στροφ[ [. .]

Fr. 3.

. . .
[ ηρακαειθ[ η[ . . .

Fr. 4.

. .
[ και[ πληγ[ δειδο[ 5 καμινανο[ αλιονοδη[ 

Fr. 5.

[ τεγεχισαν[ ηρωγο[ λωσκακ[ κεληθ[ . . .
25 τεῦ δ’ ἐνεκὼν γῆτειον ἴδι[.]υ[. . . ἐντον ἔχουσα

Col. ii.

ἥρως καθ’όδου πα[ἰς
eιδότες ὃς ἐνέπου[σι
κε[ῦν ἦ περὶ σῆν [
οὔθ’ ἔτερην ἐγνωκα[. τ[;
30 ο[δα[τα μιθε[ῶ[θαι βο[. [
t[α[ῦ][τ’] ἐμέθεν λέ[ξαντο[[s

Fr. 2.

... ...
]... ]
[... ]
]η[ [ ]
]μηρ[... [ [ ]
]μη[ [ ]
]νες[... [ [ ]
]π[ [ ]
]π[ [ ]
]ρ[ [ ]
]ρ[ [ ]

Fr. 3.

... ...
]... ]
[... ]
]ακ[ [ ]
]κ[ [ ]
]ν[ [ ]

Fr. 4.

... ...
]... ]
[... ]
]κ[ [ ]
]π[ [ ]
]δ[ [ ]
]δ[ [ ]
]ε[ [ ]

Fr. 5.

... ...
]... ]
[... ]
]τ[ [ ]
]λ[ [ ]
]κ[ [ ]
]κ[ [ ]
]κε[ [ ]
]λ[ [ ]

5 καὶ μὲν ἀπο[ ε[ ὠ[ [ ]
Fr. 1. 1-26. ‘... Nor did the morning of the opening of the wine-casks escape him, nor that when the jar-feast of Orestes brings the lucky day for slaves; and celebrating the yearly rite of the daughter of Icarius—thry day, Erigone, who to Athenian women broughtest such woe—he bade kindred spirits to a banquet, and among them a stranger who was a recent dweller in Egypt, having come on some private business. He was by birth an Ician, and I shared his couch, not by design, but the Homeric proverb says truly that the god ever brings like to like; for he was loath to drain off Thracian bumpers of wine, but took pleasure in a modest cup. To him, as the goblet was going round for the third time, when I had learnt his name and race, I said, “It is in sooth a true saying that wine wants to be mixed not with water alone, but also with converse. This is not carried round in ladles, nor will you ask for it regarding the proud looks of the cup-bearers, when the freeman fawns upon the servant; so let us put it ourselves as a salve into the unsoftened draught, Theogenes, and tell me when I ask you all that my heart is eager to learn from you, why is it your country’s custom to revere Peleus king of the Myrmidons, how does... Icus, and why does a girl with a leek and a... loaf (commemorate) the hero’s coming?”

1-2. The object of ἔλαβανεν is Pollis; cf. Athen. x1, p. 477 c quoted in the note on l. 8. πεδούγις apparently occurs only here. The epithet ὄρθριειος alludes to the well-known legend which connected the institution of the Χόδες with the reception of Orestes at Athens by Pandion; cf. e.g. Suidas, s. v. Χόδες. Though this day like the other days of the Anthesteraia was apparently a dies nefastus (cf. Photius, s. v. μαρα ἡμέρα), for slaves it was ἡμαρ λευκών since it was their privilege to participate in the celebrations; cf. Schol. Hesiod, Ὀφ. 368 ἑορτῇ Πιθανία, καθ’ ἑν οὐκέτων οὖν μισθών εἴρηκεν τῇ ἀνθαίασε τοῦ οἴου θεμιτόν ἥν, ἀλλὰ θύσαις πάντι μεταβιβάζοι τὸ δῶρον τοῦ Διονύσου.

3-4. The ἐπτάτιος ἄγατος (the substantive only here; cf. P. Rylands 13. 12 πλαγιτῶν) in honour of Erigone, daughter of Icarius, was the Λόφα, at which a song called διήγης was sung. This propitiatory festival is said (Hyg. Astr. ii. 4) to have been instituted as a means of averting an epidemic of suicide among the women of Athens (cf. Ἀρθείων οἰκίστη), which followed the death of Erigone. It was an offshoot of the cult of Dionysus, but is not known to have been connected with the Anthesteraia, nor need any such connexion be implied by the present passage.

8. Ἰκίος here and Ἰκίον in l. 24 were recognized by Wilamowitz, whose restoration of Ἰκίον for Κόφ in Schol. Pindar, Pyth. iii. 167 ὀ Πηλεὼς ἐν Κόφ τῇ νόσῳ... ἀπτάται, ὡς Καλλίμαχος ἰστομεί (Hermes, xlv. p. 475) receives a further confirmation; cf. Schol. Eurip. ΤΤ. 1128 and προσκυλεί (sc. τοῦ Πηλέα) διὰ γείμων τῇ (Ἔ)κοι τῇ νόσῳ καὶ ξυνανθένα ὑπὸ δόξαν τοῦ Ἀβάνου ἐκεῖ καταλύσαν τὸ βίον. The correct reading had been preserved by the metre in the epigram of Antipater, Ἀνθ. Παλ. viii. 2 κείθει καὶ Ὠθέτος γαμέτην ὑπὸ βραχύβιολος Ἰκίον, where the shortening of the initial vowel, notwithstanding the scansion of Callimachus, is remarkable. There remains one more passage in which we would suggest that the name of Icus in this connexion has been corrupted, namely Athen. xi, p. 477 c, where ll. 11-14 are cited (= Callim. Fr. 109): Καλλίμαχος... λέγων ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκίου ἔνων τοῦ παρὰ τῷ Ἀθηναίῳ Πόλιταν συνετασθέντος αὐτῷ. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ὀμρυκός κτλ. οἰκίου here seems meaningless, and Meineke, ap. Schneider, Callim. ii, p. 378 had already proposed Κελόν. In view of the proximity of ἔνων and Ἰκίον in ll. 6 and 8, it can hardly be doubted that Ἰκίον ἔνων is the true reading.

9-10. ἐπιτάξ has here the meaning assigned to it by Helladius, Chrest. (Phot. Bibli. p. 533. 36 Α, Bekker) τὸ ἐπιτάξ παρὰ Καλλιμάχω καὶ Ἀράστω κείμενον... ἐκ τοῦ ἐπίταγμα καὶ κόιλων πρώτητα. Perhaps this is the sense also in 1011. 239, if ἐπιτάξ there is rightly supplied. The ὀίον Ὀμρυκῶθε is from ρ. 218 ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν ὤμοιον ἅγει θεὸς ὑπὸ τὸν ὄμοιον. Callimachus’ text apparently had the usual ὡς αἰεὶ (αἰεὶ τοῦ Πλάτω, Λυσίτ. 214 Α, Aristot. 1260 b 10), but ἔκ τοῦ ὄμοιο, a variant found in many MSS.
Why the second hand rewrote the \( o \) of \( o\nu \) is not evident. A slight trace of ink (?) in the centre suggests that the original letter had some appearance of a \( \theta \); possibly \( \theta \) or \( e \) had been actually written and then amended not quite successfully.

11-14. καὶ γὰρ . . . τὸ τρίσιμον = Callim. Fr. 109 from Athen. xi, p. 477 c, ll. 11-12 being also found in x, p. 442 f. The reading in the second of these passages coincides with that of the papyrus, whereas in the former \( ἀπήγαρο \) (l. \( ἀπήγαρο \)) and \( ξυρωποστὶ \) are found in place of \( ἀπόστιμοι \) and \( οἰνωποστὶ \), and so too in Macrobr. Sat. v. 21. Schneider, following Bentley, preferred \( ἀπόστιμοι \) but not \( οἰνωποστὶ \); the early testimony of the papyrus should now turn the scale in favour of the latter reading.

15-16. These two verses are quoted anonymously by Athen. i, p. 32 b along with one of Simonides, and the three lines appear together as Simonides Fr. 88 in Bergk’s Poet. Lyr. The MSS. of Athenaeus have \( γάρ \) for \( μᾶλ \), \( διὰ \) \( τι \) for \( διὰ \) \( τι \), and, except L, \( λείψης \) for \( λείχης \). Kabel adopted Porson’s conjecture \( ūp' \) \( ἑρ \) for \( ūp' \) \( ἑρ \) and Bergk’s \( χλεύης \) for \( λείχης \), neither of which is confirmed. \( λείχης \) was rightly restored by H. Stephanus (Anthol. p. 513) and read by Casaubon and Schweighäuser.

18-19. The restoration and sense of these two verses remains in doubt. In l. 18 \( ἀφρῆς \) seems inevitable, and the accented \( ε \) commends \( αὐτὸν \) \( μιᾶ \), which, though the doubtful \( ε \) might be \( ο \), is more likely than \( αὐτὸν \) \( ημων \). The following vowel may be either \( ε \) or \( ο \); if \( ε \) is right, \( ιτ \) should be an epithet of either \( ἀφρῆς \) or \( οἰνωποστὶ \), preferably the former, since the exiguous traces of the letter after the lacuna suit \( ιτ \) better than \( ν \). \( άτεκτίς, \) \( άτρεμίς \), \( άτρέμος \), \( άτρέπτον \), \( άτρέπτος \) might serve. \( άτρέμα σαι \) is more in accord with the tenor of the passage than \( άτρέμα αὐτί \), and the clause \( δη \) . . . \( σαι \) is apparently a general description of the attitude of the guest on such occasions. It is hardly likely that an allusion is to be recognized to the license permitted to slaves at the Anthesteria (cf. note on ll. 1-2), with which, so far as is known, the \( λιόρα \), as remarked above, had nothing to do. The double accentuation of \( άτρέμνα \) may have arisen from confusion with \( άπτερω \).

22. \( ἵχαν \) apparently = \( ἵχαν \), a form found in Babrius 77. 2, Herondas 7. 25, Hesych., &c. \( ἵχαν \) \( ε\) \( νε\) \( ν\) is not otherwise attested, but is credible enough. For \( αὐτομορφ\) cf. the Berlin fragment in Sitzungsber. Berl. Akad. 1914, p. 224, \( δος \) \( \\delta \) αὐτομορφο \( φης \) \( σ\), \( τα\) \( ἐξερεω \).

23. \( Μυρμηδάνου \) \( ἔσσον \) = Callim. Fr. 508. The rough breathing apparently given to \( ἔσσον \) in the papyrus may reflect a supposed connexion with \( σοφός \); cf. Ἐτυμ. Magn. 383. 30 \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \) . . . \( ἕσσον \). derivations from \( έσσον \) and \( ησσον \) are also there suggested.

24. \( Πηλέα \) . . . \( Ηλε \); cf. Callim. Fr. 372 and note on l. 8 above. At the end of the verse \( ίκα \) may be either an acc. sing. of some noun in -ξ or a neut. plur. \( ήξτα \) \( τά \) θεσσαλοι, which Lobel suggests, would give a suitable sense. For \( κόσ \) cf. 1011. 4, 18 σετε.

25-6. A leek and a loaf were apparently the accompaniments of some ritual act performed by a girl. For the former cf. e.g. the use of \( πράσια \) at the archaic feast of the Dioscuri at Athens (Athen. iv, p. 137 e) and of \( γρηγορίδες \) at the Theaxenia at Delphi (id. ix, p. 372 a). [. . .] is presumably an epithet of \( γρασον \); there must have been at least two letters between \( ιτ \) and \( ν \), so that \( ειτ \) . . . is excluded unless the \( ε \) of \( ιτ \) was unelided, which is not at all likely. \( πα \) in l. 26 suggests \( παίς \) or \( παρθένος \).

32. \( ιο \) is followed by remains of a perpendicular stroke.

32-4 = Callim. Fr. 111. 2-4, which are now proved to have no connexion with the verse \( θε \) \( αὐτόμαν \) μεγάλαν κόμα διαλόγισμα associated with them by editors against the indications in Stobaeus. Schneider’s conjectural reconstruction of the context, as might be expected, also turns out to be wrong. On the other hand the first words of l. 33, which are given in the MSS. as \( υπαρχομένῳ ἦν \), had been successfully emended, Bentley’s \( νήν \) and Nauck’s \( εί \) (cf. Bentley) being now confirmed.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Frs. 2-4. These may be assigned with probability to the second column of Fr. 1, Fr. 4 being from the bottom of it. Fr. 5, which is of a lighter colour than the rest, is from the top of a different column.

Fr. 4. 4. δείλοι: this line possibly = Callim. Fr. 190 δείλοις ἀλίξουσι, ἀγοροὶ δὲ χείρας ἀν’ ἔργου.
5. ἀποι: or ἀποφ.
6. ἀνδρον is probably the substantive, as the paroxytone accent will then be intelligible, though abnormal.

1363. CALLIMACHUS, Iambi.

10.3 x 2.6 cm. Second or early third century. Plate VI.

The identification of this fragment is assured by the occurrence in ll. 5-7 of Callimachus Fr. 86, where an acute emendation of Bentley receives confirmation. Unfortunately both beginnings and ends of lines are missing throughout, and the loss is too serious for a satisfactory restoration. It seems fairly clear, however, that Schneider's suggestion that the persons addressed in Fr. 86 were θεοι in general (Callim. i, p. 252) was wide of the mark, for the context here deals with poetry and literary matters. The poet is apparently apostrophizing various classes of writers. There is a close similarity between this piece and Fol. 6 of 1011, and they may well be parts of the same poem.

This text is on the verso of a narrow strip which on the recto has the beginnings of a dozen lines of, apparently, some official list drawn up towards the end of the second century. The writing on the verso is a small informal uncial which does not seem to be appreciably later in date; it may fall within the second century or belong to the beginning of the third. Stops, which are in the high position, accents, and breathings are with little doubt due to a second hand, and the mark of elision in l. 3 should perhaps be classed with these; the diaeresis in l. 5, on the contrary, is most probably original.

5-7 = Callim. Fr. 86. In l. 5 ιερων is the MSS. reading, which had been corrected by Meineke. The rough breathing on ἀλέες is doubtfully identified; a smooth one would be equally possible. In l. 6 Παγγαϊῶν (so normally accented) was Bentley's correction of the traditional χαλέαυν. The remains of the first letter of l. 7 are inconsistent with ν, and άλαζων was apparently written, though the grave accent on the ν implies άλαζων, the ordinary reading, which there is no reason to doubt. Since a new sentence begins at l. 8, a finite verb seems to be required after βιβλια, and ψίχων which Schneider adopts from Sextus Empiricus is unlikely to be right. Other sources give ψίχει or ψίχε, of which the former was defended by Reiske; ψίχε Bentley, ψίχε Dübner, &c. Toup.

10. ἤτα: or ἵτα, ἵτα, &c.

11. ια: or ν.

13. It is rather tempting to identify this line with Callim. Fr. 98 c, which is given in Schol. Saibant. on Hephaest. p. 36, Gaisf. ii in the form ἔτις τραγῳδεῖ μοῦσα ληθεβίζουσα. Unfortunately the letter after μοῦσα is uncertain. A vestige of the top of it suggests a τ,
and λ, though perhaps not impossible, is unsatisfactory, since some of the lower part should be visible. It would therefore be rash, in spite of the similarity to Fr. 98 c, to assume that the first part of the line as given by Schol. Saibant. is corrupt.

19. τά περὶ τῶν καταστροφῶν is likely on the analogy of 1011. 313, 366.
25. κτ., κατ., or κατ. are also possible before σ.
29. The supposed mark of length may be a rough breathing.

1364. **Antiphon Sophistes, Περὶ Ἀλήθειας i.**

Fr. i 22.3 × 3.8 cm. Early third century. Plate V (Fr. i. Cols. v-vii).

The following fragments are written in a good-sized, sloping hand strongly resembling that of 7 (Sappho; Part I, Plate ii), and dating probably from the opening decades of the third century. As in 463, an analogous though perhaps rather earlier specimen of the same type, the columns are narrow and somewhat short, the written surface measuring approximately 17 by 4½–5 cm.; in 463 they were about 16 × 5 cm. It is noticeable that the Ἕ is formed by three distinct strokes, the comma-shaped middle stroke as a rule not touching either of the two horizontal ones. At the ends of lines the size of the letters was sometimes considerably diminished, but the scribe was nevertheless not very successful in maintaining a uniform length; the common angular sign is used as a supplement here and there. Some alterations have been introduced into the text by a corrector to whom are likely to be due the occasional accents, breathings, and marks of elision and quantity (e.g. l. 113). Perhaps he was also responsible for the punctuation, for which high and medial dots were usually employed; of the low dot only one instance occurs (l. 289). In any case, however, these additions may be regarded as practically contemporary.

The authorship of the fragment is fortunately established by the coincidence, pointed out to us by Wilamowitz, of ll. 18–20 with a citation in Harpocratization from the treatise of Antiphon 'On Truth' (Diels, Vorskratiker, ii, p. 298, Fr. 44). This is the sophist Antiphon, to be distinguished from his more famous contemporary, the orator Antiphon of Rhamnus. There was much confusion between the two, and their identity and the attribution of their writings early gave rise to discussion; cf. Hermog., De ideis, ii. 11. 7. Concerning the sophist few facts are known (see H. Sauppe in Ausgew. Schriften, 508 sqq., Blass, Att. Bereds. i. 108 sqq., Zeller, Gr. Phil. i. 1070, Gomperz, Gr. Denker, i, pp. 434 sqq., Engl. ed.). Suidas describes him as Ἀλήθεια τερατοσκόπος καὶ ἀποτομός καὶ σοφιστής ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Λαγομάγειρος, and attributes to him a work Περὶ κρίσεως ὀνείρων. Arguments between him and Socrates are reported by Xenophon, Mem. i. 6, and Αὐτοφῶν ὁ τερατοσκόπος is mentioned as one of Socrates' opponents
by Aristotle (φ. Diog. Laert. ii. 46). Besides the treatises 'On Truth' and 'On the Interpretation of Dreams', Antiphon is commonly credited with a work Περὶ ὁμοιοιας, which is praised by Philostratus (Vit. Sophist. i. 15) and quoted at some length by Stobaeus, and more doubtfully with another called Πολιτικός, of which a few words and phrases are preserved. The Περὶ ἀληθείας was in two books, and the surviving remains go to show that the first of them dealt with metaphysics, the second with physics. Blass, however (De Antiphanete Sophista Iamblichii auctore, p. 12), had already argued from certain fragments cited from Book i (e.g. 2, 14, 17) that, besides metaphysical problems, questions of human conduct were discussed in it. This judgement finds its justification in the present papyrus, which proves that the ethical and political speculations of Antiphon were not limited to the Περὶ ὁμοιοιας and the Πολιτικός, but had some expression also in the Περὶ ἀληθείας. That 1364 is from the first book of that treatise is not certain, though eminently probable in view of the analogous fragments to which attention was called by Blass; it may be noted too that φύσει and νόμοι, so prominent in 1364, are opposed in a fragment from Book i (Ant. Fr. 15), though the contrast there is of a different kind. Since the 400th στίχος is marked in l. 188, the section here recovered occurred in the earlier part of the book.

The papyrus consists of two main fragments with some small pieces, the place of which we have not been able to find. In Fr. 1, which contains six consecutive columns nearly complete and the beginnings of lines of a seventh, the subject throughout is the antithesis between law and nature. After defining justice as the observance of law, the writer proceeds to maintain that it is advantageous to disregard the law and follow nature when this can be done without detection. The laws of man may be broken with impunity, but not the laws of nature, and they are often in antagonism. Laws are a restraint on nature, and in so far are irksome and painful, i.e. harmful. Obedience to specific laws may also involve a positive loss of pleasure or increase of pain. Nor do the laws sufficiently counterbalance these defects by the advantages attaching to obedience. The position of Fr. 2 relatively to Fr. 1 is unknown, but at least one column intervened between them if Fr. 2 followed Fr. 1, and apparently a gap must also be postulated if the order is reversed. This fragment contains the ends of some lines of one column and the greater part of a second. The subject is still φύσει, but in a rather different aspect. Antiphon is here maintaining the unnaturalness of distinctions of class and race. Men are all alike in their physical functions and requirements; the barbarian is not differentiated by nature from the Hellene.

This opposition between φύσει and νόμοι, fundamental in the later sophistic
ethics, was, of course, not new. The antithesis is said to have been formulated by Archelaus, the pupil of Anaxagoras and teacher of Socrates (Diog. Laert. ii. 4 ἔλεγε... καὶ τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ αἰσχρὸν ὁδόφοσε ἄλλα νόμον). Hippias in Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 14 emphasizes the diversity of laws in different localities, and Plato puts into his mouth language analogous to that of Antiphon in ll. 59–63 below (Prot. 337 c ὃ δὲ νόμοις, τόπων όν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πολλὰ παρὰ τὴν φύσιν βιάζοντα). Similarly Protagoras in the Theaetetus (167 c) is made to remark on the conventionality and instability of right. Plato's views as to the ill effects of the doctrine may be read in Laws 889 d–e. But no such elaborate exposition of it as that here recovered has survived from the age of the older sophists. Remarkable too are the practical applications which Antiphon was apparently prepared to make of his theory. Gomperz has observed in connexion with this very philosopher that 'it was a sheer impossibility for the sophists... to promulgate anti-social doctrines' (Gr. Denker, i, p. 436, Engl. ed.). Teaching which explicitly justified furtive breaches of the law (ll. 12–23, 36–43), and treated obedience as merely a question of personal expediency (ll. 56 sqq.), cannot, to say the least, be regarded as pro-social. In his insistence on the artificiality of distinctions of birth Antiphon appears in a more favourable light. Here too the papyrus is likely to provide a locus classicus. Similar ideas are expressed e.g. by Euripides (Fr. 168 ὄνοματι μέμπτων τὸ νόμον, ἡ φύσις δ' ἵσση, Fr. 336 ὃ μὲν γάρ ἐσθάλει εἰγενῆς, Ion 854–6), but it would not be easy to find a more striking anticipation of the cosmopolitan ideal of the Cynics than that contained in Fr. 2. The judgement of E. Jacoby, De Ant. Soph. Peri όμοιαις, 1908, p. 29, that Antiphon a Cynicorum grege rerum naturae veritatem imitantium vehementer abhorrret turns out to be singularly wide of the mark.

By its revelation of the views professed by Antiphon on the subject of nature and law 1364 gives the coup de grâce to Blass's theory (De Antiphonte Sophista Iamblichii auctore) that certain passages in the Protrepticus of Iamblichus, which he acutely recognized as taken from an old Attic writer, were derived from our sophist. This attribution was contested on stylistic grounds by K. Töpfer (xxi. Jahresh. d. Gymn. in Ainau, 1902) and E. Jacoby (op. cit.), and rejected by Wilamowitz (Aristot. u. Athen, i, 174), but accepted without reserve by Gomperz (op. cit. i, pp. 435 sqq., 585). Unfortunately one of the arguments used by Blass was the absence in the remains of Antiphon of this very doctrine about law and nature of which he is now seen to have been so thorough-going an exponent. The author of the passages in the Protrepticus held very different opinions. It is clear that such sentences as οὖν ἐπὶ πλεονεξίαν ὁμάν δὲν οὖν τὸ κράτος... ἡγεῖται ἀρετὴν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ τῶν νόμων ὑπακούειν δειλιάν... φῶσει γὰρ ἴσχυρα ἐρωτεύσει ταῦτα (sc. τῶν τε νόμων καὶ τὸ δίκαιον) and ἥ μὲν εἶνομι...
The estimate of the literary qualities of the Περὶ Ἀληθείας found in Hermogenes, De ideis, ii. 11. 17 is on the whole borne out by the new fragments; cf. the careful analysis of Antiphon's style by Jacoby, op. cit. pp. 48 sqq., based largely on the remnants of the Περὶ ὁμοιώσεως. After remarking that Thucydides was πολλῷ κεχορισμένον (from Antiphon the orator) καὶ κεκουμηκότα τῷ εἴδει τῶν τῆς Ἀληθείας λόγων Hermogenes continues (c. 9) ὁ δ’ ἔτερος Ἀντιφών, οὗτος οὗ τῆς Ἀληθείας εἰσὶ λεγόμενοι λόγοι, πολιτικὸς μὲν ἡκοιτά ἐστι, σεμών δὲ καὶ ὑπέροχος τοῖς τε ἄλλοις καὶ τῷ δὲ ἀποφάσεως περαίνειν τό πάντα, ὥς τῇ τοῦ ἄξιοματικοῦ τε λόγῳ ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς μέγεθος δρώστος, ὑγήλιον δὲ τῇ λέξει καὶ τραχύς, ὡστε μὴ πάρῳ σκληρότητος εἶναι. καὶ περιβάλλει δὲ χωρὶς εὐκρινείας, διὸ καὶ συγχεῖ τών λόγων καὶ ἐστιν ἀσαφής τά πολλά, καὶ ἐπιμελής δὲ κατά τὴν συνθήκην καὶ ταῖς παρασώσεσι χαῖρον, οὐ μὴν ἥδους γε τί οὕτως ἀληθεὺς τόπων μέτετο τῷ ἄνδρι, φαίνει δ’ ἂν ὅσον δεσμότοτος πλήν τῆς φαινομένης μὲν, οὐ μὴν ὄψις γε ὡς ἀληθῶς. One obvious detail in common with Thucydidases is the spelling εὐνω, which is consistently written in the papyrus. On the other hand τῇ is found in ll. 151, 164; the previously extant fragments show τῇ three times (Fr. 54 ἔλασσον, Fr. 61 ἐκπλήσσωσι, Fr. 76 ἡσομομένου), τῇ in other places. An instance of an Ionicism occurs in l. 116 ἡσουτα. The writer’s tendency to poetical language may be seen in the metaphorical use of δεσμός in l. 104, and his tendency to poetical rhythm in the iambic trimeter in ll. 20–3; cf. note ad loc. A fondness for synonyms remarked in the extant fragments is further exemplified by ll. 266–7, 270–1. Parallelism and antithesis are prominent, and Hermogenes was clearly right in saying that Antiphon was ἐπιμελησ κατὰ τὴν συνθήκην καὶ ταῖς παρασώσεσι χαῖρον. The characteristic τῷ δὲ ἀποφάσεως περαίνειν is also much in evidence. Emphasis is sometimes gained by adding negative to affirmative clauses, as in ll. 161–2; and the not infrequent omission of the verb εἶναι helps to give a sententious effect. Hermogenes’ imputations of obscurity and superficiality were probably not altogether ill-founded. The argument in ll. 84 sqq. seems rather lacking in lucidity. Still, for the most part the writer puts his points clearly and forcibly enough, and the ornate style is effective and not unpleasing. These fragments are a notable addition to the relics of early Attic prose, and are of real interest for the history of Greek literature as well as for that of Greek philosophy.

Col. i. Fr. i. Col. ii.
[. . . . . . . ]η>
[... ... ... ... ... ...]
[... ... ... ... ... ...]
5 [... ...] με
 [... ...] νευ
[... ...] δικαίον[νη]νη
[παίντα της το]
[λεως νομιμα]
[εν] γι αν πολι
10 [τευ]γηται τις μη
[παραβαινειν]
Χρῶτ' αν ουν
ανθρώπος μα
λιστα [θ] εαυτω
15 ξυμφ[ε]ρουτως
δικαίοτητης ει
μετα μεν μαρ
τυρων τι[νος νο
μουσ μεγαλοπος
20 αγοι. μονομα
νος δε μαρτυ
ρων τα της φυ
σεως τα μεν γαρ
των νομων
25 [επιθ]ετα· τα δε
[της] φυσεως α·
[ανακαια και τα]
[μεν] των νο·
[μων] ομολογη
30 [θεν]τα υο φυν
[τ εστιν]· τα δε·
[της φυσεως φυν []
[τα αυχ] ομολογη []
[[τα]] τα ουν νομι

[=] μα παραβαινων

[λ] η αν αθη τους
ομολογησαντας
40 και αισχυνης
και ζημιας α·
πηλλακται μη
λαθων δ' δυ· των ·
de τη φυσει ξυμ.
45 φυτων εαν τε
παρα το δυνατων
βιαζηται· εαν
τε παντας αν
θρωπους θ[η]η.
50 ουδεν ελαττων
το κακον· εαν τε
παντες ειδων
ουδεν μειςον
ου γαρ δια δοξαν
t
55 βλαστει· αλλα
[δε] αληθειαν· εστι
tι
δε των[δε] ενε·
κα των η σκε
ψις· οι τα πολλα
60 των κατα νο
μου δικαιων
πολεμιως τη
φυσει κειται· νε

νο[μοσ] [ηται
65 γαρ [ε]τε τοις ο
φι[θ]αλμ[θ]οις α δει
Col. iii.

αὐτο[ὶ]ς ὁρᾶν καὶ ἀ οὐ [ἐ] Ἡ [ο] καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑσίν ἄ δεῖ αὐ
70 τα ἀκούειν καὶ ἀ οὐ δεῖ· καὶ ἐπὶ την γλῶσσην ἀ τη
δεὶ αὐτὴν λέγειν καὶ ἀ οὐ δεῖ· καὶ ἐ
75 πι ταῖς χερεῖν α τε δεῖ αὐτὰς ἔφαγαν καὶ ἀ οὐ δεῖ· καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ποσίν ἐ ἀ τε δεῖ αὐτοὺς
80 ἤνει καὶ ἐφ ἀ οὐ δεῖ· καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ νῦν ἐ ἀ ον τε δι αὐτὸν ἐπιθυμεῖν καὶ ἐνω ἦν [ἐστίν] ὄννν
95 μεν [Ἐ] πον αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν α[πὸ τῶν []

Col. iv.

100 φεροντῶν· τα δὲ ἡμεροντά· τα μεν ἀπὸ τῶν νομῶν κε[ῖ]
μενα δειμ[ᾶ]
105 τῆς φύσεως ἥ ἕστι τα δ ὑπὸ τῆς φυ σεως ελευθερα· ὦν [ ]
κοῦν τα ἀλγυ· τε νοιντα ὀρθῶν λ[α]
110 γου οὐνήσι τη[ν] φυςι μάλλων ἡ τα εὐφραίνων τα· ὕκον ἀν ὀν δὲ ἡμερον
115 τ' ἐγ τα λυπο[ῦντα] μάλλον ἡ τ[α] η δοντ[α] τα γαρ τω: [ ]
[—] ἀλλ' ή αὐθή
ρ[ο]ντα το βλα []
120 π[ε]ρεὶ ὑπὶ· ἀλλ' ὡς [ἐ] λειν· τα τοῦν τῆς φυςει ξυμ []
φεροντα τ[ο]ντ[ι].
2 lines lost.
126 [. . . . ]τπ[ι]ς[ι] [ .
 [. . . . ]ἀνο[ς][ .
 [. . . . ]καὶ οι[ .
130 [. . . . ]τα· κα[ι[
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ξυμφεροντο[ν] το δε αποθανειν
απο των μη ξυμ

Col. v. Plate V.

[θων] τες αμυνον
[ται και μη αυτοι]
[αρχ]ωσι του δραν.
135 [και ο]τινες] αν
[τους] γεινάμε
[νου]ς και κακους
οίτας εις αυτους
υ ευ ποιώσι· και οι
140 κατομνυσθαι
διδοντες ετε;
ροις· αυτοι δε μη
cατομμυμε
[νοι] και τουτων
145 των έρημωνον
πολλ αι τις ευ
ροι πολεμία την
υ φυσει· ένι τε αν
λ
tois [ε] αγνυνοσθαι
150 τε μαλλον εξων
ηττω-[η] και ελατ
των· ηδεσθαι· εξων
πλειω και κακως
πασχειν· εξων
μη πασχειν;
ει μεν ουν τις
155 [τ]οις τοιαυτα προ
[i]μενοις επικου
[p]ηςις εγγυνα

[ο]τινε]ς αν πα [ ]

Col. vi. Plate V.

ουκ αρισχόφεις αν
[ιν]η τοιον ένων
μοις πείθεσθαι νυν
165 δε φανεραι τοις
προσειμενοις
tα τοιαυτα το εξκ
νομον δικαιον
ουχ’ ικανον επι
cουρειν· ο γε πρω
170 τον μεν επιτρε
πει τοι πασχον
τι παθειν και τωι
dρωντι δρασαι
cαι ουτε ενταυ
θα διεκωλυν τον
175 πασχοντα μη
παθειν· ουδε τον
dρωντα δρασαι
eις τε την τιμω
180 μεν αναφερον
ιδιωτερον επι
185 την α [ποστοτι
δ] τω δεδρακο
190 [τ]ε περαι γαρ σι.
160 [το] παρά των νο
[μ]ων. τοις δέ μη
[π]ροίμενοις αλ
[λ]ε ν[. ..]αντίομαι
[κ]οις ελαττωσιν.

κυρ [. . .]υ. τὰν 195
ta de καὶ ταλει
πεται καὶ τοι δρα
σαι ι α]ρνε[ιθαι

Col. vii. Plate V.

4 lines lost.

202 [. . .] . . [. . .] ε
stiν μαλ[. . .
οστιπερ τ[οι . . κα

205 η[ν]ηροποτί η τ[ης
cατηγοριας . .
πειθω α [. . .
τοι τε πε[πονθο
τι καὶ τοι δε[δρα

210 κοτι γιγύνεται
gαρ ν[. . .
μα[ι κ[. . .
kai η[. . .
dυ[α

215 δεσαι[
ου[. .

Col. i.
[του
[ .
[ο]

235 ανθ[ι]φοτ[ου]
[ματα]
[η της
[η]λου[. .

Col. ii.

ρο[υν ε]π[αιδο]με
θα τε και σεβομεθα
τους δε [ε]κ φαν
λοι ο[ίκου οντας

270 ουτε ε]π[αιδο]με
θα. ουτε σεβομ[εθα
ει το[υτων] γαρ
προς αληθος

240 ]ω[σε]νε

H 2
275 ὁ τετεθηκεν φιλότητα πάντα πάντες ὁμοίως πεφυκα [πύρικα] μὲν καὶ βαρβάρα [πόιοι καὶ Ἑλληνίδες]

280 εἰναι σκοπεῖν [διε νοτον] παρερχεῖ τὰ τῶν φυσιῶν ἀναγκαῖον ἐπιστρέφον τοσί. ουτὲ β[αρβά]

290 ὅσοι αφορίσται

295 ἐρ[α] ἀπαντάσις

Fr. 3. Fr. 4. Fr. 5.
6-189. . . justice consists in not transgressing any of the ordinances of the state of which one is a citizen. A man would therefore exercise justice with most advantage to himself if in the presence of witnesses he held in esteem the laws, but in the absence of witnesses, the precepts of nature. For the precepts of the laws are adventitious, whereas those of nature are necessary, and the precepts of the laws are the product of agreement, not of growth, while those of nature are the product of growth, not of agreement. Thus in transgressing legal ordinances, whenever he is unobserved by the parties to the agreement, he is free both from shame and punishment, but not if he is observed. On the other hand, if he strain any of the innate principles of nature more than it can bear, the evil is no less, if he is unobserved by every one, nor any greater, if every one sees. For the injury does not depend on opinion but on fact. All this is the object of our inquiry; because most of what is just according to law stands in opposition to nature. The law has laid down for the eyes what they ought to see and what they ought not, for the ears what they ought to hear and what they ought not, for the tongue what it ought to say and what it ought not, for the hands what they ought to do and what they ought not, for the feet whither they ought to go and whither they ought not, and for the mind what it ought to desire and what not. Now the things from which the laws deter men are not at all more agreeable or akin to nature than those to which the laws encourage them. Life and death are both natural; and their life results from things that are beneficial, death from those that are not beneficial. And with regard to things beneficial, those that are ordained by the laws are restraints on nature,
while those that are ordained by nature are free. What causes gladness then on a right view is of advantage to nature rather than what causes grief; and so what is pleasurable would be beneficial rather than what is painful. For the truly beneficial ought not to be injurious but advantageous. What is beneficial, therefore, to nature . . . those who . . . and who repel attack but do not themselves begin the aggression, and who are kind to their parents even when these behave badly to them, and who permit others to affirm on oath but do not do so themselves. Much of what has been mentioned would be found to be in opposition to nature; there is involved in it greater pain when less is possible, or less pleasure when more is possible, or injury when injury might be avoided. Now if those who adopted such courses as these had any protection from the laws, whereas those who did not adopt them but opposed them incurred loss, obedience to the laws would not be without advantage; but as it is, legal justice is found inadequate to protect those who adopt them. First of all it allows the injury of the injured and the aggression of the aggressor, and besides not originally preventing the injured from being injured, nor the aggressor from making aggression, on being held over until punishment is inflicted, it is no more favourable to the injured than to the aggressor.'


7. Apparently τὰ has dropped out after τὰ ἄρτα.

18-20 = Antiphon, Fr. 44. Diels, from Harpocration, s. v. ἄγει, 'Ἀστείφων ἤ ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ἀλεπείας φησὶ Τοὺς νόμους μεγάλους ἄγει, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡγοίτο.

20-2. μενομένως . . . φυσικός is an iambic trimeter. Iambic rhythms occur also in ll. 113-15, 181-4, 272-4; cf. Jacoby, op. cit. p. 66.

34-6. Small curved brackets have been placed before and after the deleted letters, which have also been crossed through. The deleted paragraphs is only bracketed.

45. τὲ: l. τ. The mistake was probably caused by the following ἔως τὲ.

49. The deleted η has a dot placed above it, and is crossed through with a light diagonal stroke. A similar method has been followed in ll. 66, 68, 149, 151, 166, 291; etc in l. 57 has only the overwritten dots; cf. l. 245.

68. Apparently the scribe inadvertently wrote ωθεῖς.

87 sqq. Since the author's contention is that legal justice is contrary to nature (ll. 59 sqq.), he might here be expected to say that what is encouraged by the law is not more in accordance with nature than what is prohibited, instead of vice versa. But apparently he is here regarding law as predominantly negative, and is thus concerned to show that prohibitions and restraints involve pain, and so are more akin to death than life.

89. The syllables θρωποῦσι seem to have been originally omitted.

102-6. ἀπὸ . . . νπο: the variation of prepositions appears to correspond to no real distinction of sense, and ἀπὸ may be regarded as a clerical error.

108. l. ἀλκυνῆται: the final α was converted from ω.

109. τ of τε is clear, but ωτ is required.

116. τι[α η]δοτα: cf. Ps.-Plat. Ἀξ. 366 a τὰ μὲν ἡδοτα ἀμφικαία, and Pollux iii. 98 τὸ γὰρ ἦδον Ἰονικῶν καὶ τὸ ἦδει σπάνων μὲν πάρ' ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἅκρων δ' αὐτὸ εἰρρήτην (Fr. 148). Some instances of the active occur in later writers.

126-30. The length of the lacunae at the beginnings and ends of the lines are calculated from l. 131, where the supplement is practically assured by l. 135. There will be two lines entirely lost above l. 126, if l. 131 was on a level with l. 99. In l. 128 the rough breathing is probable, but might possibly be an interlinear τ. In l. 129 the letter after α may be γ, η, μ, υ, π, but not τ.
131-4. The antithesis of δαπαί and πάσχειν, which is repeated in Cols. vi–vii, occurs in Antiphon, Fr. 58. ρ of δαπαί was apparently inserted after the α was written, perhaps by the second hand.

148. τε: γε seems to have been originally written and subsequently altered, mistakenly. If the interlinear γ is rightly read, the inserter wished to read τε εν instead of τε. The first stroke of the ν is not clear, and the remainder of it is so much curved as to suggest a mark of short quantity above α of αν (cf. l. 113), but this would be unintelligible.

157. προσ[μένοι]: l. προσ[νεμοι]; cf. l. 169. The same mistake occurs in l. 162.

165-6. The deletion of the ν at the beginning of l. 166 (cf. l. 231) is doubtless due to the corrector, who objected to the original division of the letters. Probably the word in question was αν, which is sometimes divided ανν; cf. Crönert, Mem. Herc. p. 13. That the final ν of an adjective should have been carried over into the next line is much less likely.

167. ναρ makes the supplement a little long, but this is preferable to the supposition of a lost line containing e.g. the words τῇ ἄρεσον.

188. The marginal τ is a stichometrical figure standing for 400. Stichometry, which is frequent in papyri of poetical works, is seldom met with in prose; cf. e.g. F. Grenf. ii. 11. ii. 4 and 852. Fr. 25, note.

189-94. This passage ought to be restored. In l. 189 παια, if rightly read, may be an illustration of Antiphon’s tendency to poetic words; but perhaps the adverb is meant, as the scribe sometimes wrote iota adscript wrongly, e.g. ll. 151, 205. The ρ, however, is not altogether satisfactory, since a trace of the tail, if of average length, would be expected to be visible. The vestige of the top of the letter is consistent with π, but there would barely be room for έτεραι in the lacuna. The α at the end of the line may be δ. In l. 190 the doubtful ω may be ι; [το[υ] τι[μ[α]]]ουτοτας suggests itself, but partial supplements are useless. In l. 193 αν[ and α[ are equally possible. The letter before δι looks at first sight like γα, but this is probably due to a discoloured crack in the papyrus; ἐγὼκατ does not occur. δι might be read as αλ, but αλκνυ is less likely in this context.

203-7. As Murray suggests, the sense seems to be that the severity of τιμωρία will depend on the persuasiveness of the accuser; but the connexion with the next three lines is not clear.

211. ν has apparently been converted from π.

219. A small smudge below ω is probably not a paragraphus.

225-7. These lines have been bracketed and crossed through in the same way as ll. 34–6.

231. The lower part of a diagonal stroke is visible below this ν (or μ), which was probably crossed out and transferred to the end of the previous line, as at l. 166.

245. Dots are placed above the letters to be cancelled, as in l. 57; that over ρ is uncertain.

264. A horizontal stroke stands above περ, to the right of which there is a curved mark like those used elsewhere in this papyrus for purposes of deletion; for interlinear strokes instead of dots cf. e.g. 843. The marginal note no doubt refers to the alteration in the text. ακ was perhaps intended, though the suspension of the κ would be unusual.

266-98. ‘We revere and venerate [the great], but the lowly-born we do not revere or venerate; for in this our conduct to each other is barbarized, since we are all by nature alike fully adapted to be either barbarians or Hellenes. We may see this from the needs which all men naturally have; in... no one is marked off as barbarian or Hellene. We all breathe the air with mouth and nostrils...’
266. Perhaps πολύς.

279. A short diagonal apex often attached by the scribe to the top of a vertical stroke appears in κ of και in an exaggerated form.

285. ι: or γι.

286. κατα was perhaps originally written by a lipography for κατα τα.

299. This was probably the last line of the column, which is already longer than Cols. i–vi of Fr. 1.

Fr. 3. The rather dirty condition of this fragment and the next would suit a position in the first column of Fr. 2.

2. The remains suggest a rough breathing rather than a diaeresis on ι; a breathing is of course consistent with a compound, e.g. ἄμεισι or σύμεισις.

5. The broken letter before the lacuna seems to be by the second hand, in which case ἄιου– probably ended the line.

Fr. 4. 1–2. Possibly what has been taken for vestiges of letters here is the effect of dirt, and l. 3 was the first of a column.

5. ἄι perhaps ended the line; cf. the preceding note.

6. The margin after the final a is slight, but most probably this was the last letter of the line.

Fr. 9. The comparatively small size of the letters indicates that this fragment, if it belongs to 1364, is from near the ends of lines.

1365. History of Sicyon.

29:4 × 10:8 cm. Third century. Plate VI.

This interesting historical fragment consists of two nearly complete columns of 35 lines, written in a fine upright uncial hand approximating towards the biblical type (cf. 1392, which was found at the same time). Most of the letters are broad, but o is small and ε and σ narrow. ο is generally placed rather high in the line of writing. At the end of a line the letters are sometimes small. 847 (Part VI, Plate vi) is a specimen of this style on vellum (fourth century), but is somewhat later than 1365, which is likely to be nearly contemporary with 1234 (Part X, Plate iv) and P. Grenf. ii. 12 (Plate iii). These two papyri are in similar hands and have third-century cursive scholia, and we should assign 1365 to the earlier half of that century. An accompanying document was dated in the year 287. Paragraphi and two kinds of scholia, the high and middle points, are employed, but the distinction between them is not accurately observed. A breathing in l. 15 and accents in ll. 31 and 60 with an interlinear insertion in l. 56 seem to be due to a corrector, but the diaeresis in l. 20 is by the original scribe. The lines are rather short, ranging from 13 to 18 letters and rarely exceeding 15, and the loss of the ends throughout Col. ii is not serious.
The subject of the fragment is the origin and rise of Orthagoras, tyrant of Sicyon during part of the first half of the seventh century B.C., and founder of a dynasty which brought that town into prominence in Greek history and maintained itself in power for about 100 years. Concerning this family, which belonged to the original Ionic inhabitants, not to the Dorian conquerors, very little is known, except with regard to the last ruler, Clisthenes, whose only daughter married Megacles the Alcmaeonid and became the mother of the Athenian reformer Clisthenes, a circumstance which gave Herodotus the opportunity for an excursus on the government of the Sicyonian (v. 67-8), besides the well-known story of the wooing of Agariste (vi. 126-31). Orthagoras with the other predecessors of Clisthenes has been hitherto little more than a name, and concerning even that there were doubts, since Herodotus ignores him, giving the genealogy of Clisthenes (vi. 126) as son of Aristonymus son of Myron son of Andreas. Aristotle, to whom Pollux (ix. 77) attributes a treatise called Συμφωνίων Πολιτεία, briefly discusses the government of the Sicyonian tyrants (Pol. p. 1315 b, Bekker) πλείστον γὰρ ἐγένετο χρόνον ἣ περὶ Σικυώνα τυραννίσα, ἣ τῶν Ὀρθαγόρου παῖδων καὶ αὐτοῦ Ὀρθαγόρου ἐτῆς ἤ αὐτή διέμεινεν ἕκατόν. τούτον οὖν αἰτίων ὅτι τοῖς ἀρχομένοις ἔχρωντο μετρίως καὶ πολλὰ τοῖς νόμοις ἔδοξεν, καὶ διὰ τὸ πολιμκὸς γενέσθαι Κλεισθένης οὐκ ἦν εὐκαταφρύνητος, καὶ τὰ πολλὰ ταῖς ἐπιμελείαις ἐδημαγώγουν, and elsewhere (p. 1316 a) treats Myron as the immediate predecessor of Clisthenes, μεταβάλλει καὶ εἰς τυραννίδα τυραννίσα, ὅπερ ἡ Σικυώνος ἐκ τῆς Μύρωνος εἰς τὴν Κλεισθένειον. Pausanias, however (ii. 8. 1; cf. vi. 19. 2), agrees with Herodotus in the order Myron, Aristonymus, Clisthenes, and concerning the first gives the valuable piece of chronological information that he won a chariot-race in the 33rd Olympiad (648 B.C.). Nicolaus Damascenus (Fr. 61), describing Clisthenes' accession, makes Myron, Isodemus, and Clisthenes brothers, assigning to them respectively 7, 1, and 31 years' rule, and speaks of Myron as ἀπό Ὀρθαγόρου κατάγων τὸ γένος, implying that he was not his son. Plutarch (De ser. num. vind. 7) connects the tyranny of Orthagoras with an oracle, Συμφωνίως δὲ καὶ διαρρήσθη ὁ θεός προεύχε μαστιγοφόμοις δείσθαι τὴν πόλιν ὅτι Τελητίαν παῖδα στεφανόφιμον ἐν Πυθίω ἀρισταρφόμενοι διέσπασαν. ἀλλὰ Σικυώνιος μὲν Ὀρθαγόρας γενόμενος τύραννος καὶ μετ' ἐκείνου ὦν περὶ Μύρωνα καὶ Κλεισθένη τὴν ἀκολούθην ἐπαναστα. Libanius (Or. contra Severum, iii, p. 251, Reiske) calls Orthagoras a μάγευρος, i.e. 'butcher', while Diodorus (Exc. Vat. viii. 24) applies that term to Andreas (cf. Herodotus), and gives another version of Plutarch's story about the oracle. By a curious chance this fragment of Diodorus connects closely with our papyrus, supplying the details which must have been given in the column immediately before Col. 1; ὅτι Σικυώνιος ἔχρησεν ἡ Πυθία ἐκατον ἐτῆς μαστιγοφομηθεῖσαι αὐτοῦ. ἐπερωτησάντων δὲ αὐτῶν τίς οὖν ταῦτα ποιήσων πάλιν
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Andri [or Ari] was a despising Spartan race of Nicolaius' forefathers, and had a son named Aristonymus. But his fame was not apparent till the Pythian games at 582 B.C. (Pausanias x. 7. 7), and at Olympia probably not later than 568 [he suggested Diodorus, Hist, i. 140-1], since his daughter Agariste, who was betrothed to Megacles after the victory, apparently had a daughter of marriageable age about 550 (Hdt. i. 60 and vi. 126). Clisthenes probably died about 565, for Nicolaius (l.c.) assigns to him 31 years, and his anti-Dorian institutions continued in force for sixty years after his death (Hdt. v. 68), Sicyon being found in the Spartan league by 495 (Hdt. vi. 92). Hence the 100 years' period mentioned by Aristotle and Diodorus has generally been considered to point to about 665 as the date of the foundation of the tyranny (so Duncker and Busolt), though Plass, who (op. cit. i. 138) thought that revolutions might have occurred at intervals, preferred about 700, and Grote (iii. 37) 680-70.

The new fragment, continuing, as has been said, the story of the oracle in Diodorus, settles the question concerning his Andreas at any rate, who proves to be the father of Orthagoras. According to our author the Sicyonians, despising Andreas' low rank (he is called in 1. 20 'μάγευς, as in Diodorus, and as Libanius calls Orthagoras), paid no attention to the prophecy that his son would be the future scourge of Sicyon, and Orthagoras was brought up in humble circumstances (il. 1-22). On reaching military age he became a patrol (περίπολος), and distinguished himself in a war with the neighbouring city of Pellene, being promoted to the post of περίπολαρχός, in which he won fresh successes and fame (il. 22-52). After an interval, during which he seems to have become a democratic leader, he was elected polemarch, and carried on a victorious war (il. 52-68). This resulted in the city taking some step (cf. 1. 70,
note) which probably led directly to his seizure of supreme power, but at this point the papyrus breaks off. The story of Orthagoras is thus somewhat similar to that told by Nicolaus (Fr. 58) concerning the rise of Cypselus, who utilized his office of polemarch at Corinth to make himself tyrant, although Aristotle (Pol. p. 1310 b) states that Cypselus became tyrant not \( \epsilon k \; \tau o w \; \tau i m o w \) but \( \epsilon k \; \tau h s \; \delta h m a g y a l a s \). In the case of Orthagoras it appears that both causes contributed to his success, and probably the same is true of Cypselus. The distinctly favourable estimate of Orthagoras by our author harmonizes well with the praise awarded to the tyrants of Sicyon by Aristotle (cf. p. 105) and Strabo, p. 382.

The plain and straightforward but somewhat monotonous narrative of the fragment does not suggest an author who possessed very high literary merits. Hiatus is uniformly avoided. The writer is inclined to verbosity, especially in the long sentence in ll. 22 sqq., e.g. καταδραμόντων καὶ συμβαλόντων, πολὺ πάντων ἡποκλίμασε μέλιστα \( t w w \; \pi e r i s \; \vartheta l o w, \; \varphi κειστό \; k / a i \; \pi r o s \; \vartheta y g e t o, \) and displays a fondness for the genitive absolute (ll. 28, 34–6, 52, 61–8) and the repetition of the article with an adjective or other dependent words placed after a substantive (ll. 9, 57, 64, 69). For one expression, παρηλλαζέν ἡλικίαν (l. 24), there seems to be no precise parallel before the Roman period, but the general style of the fragment points to an earlier writer, and in view of the close connexion with Diodorus, Ephorus has the first claim to be considered. The extant quotations of Ephorus' own words are hardly sufficient to form a clear conception of his peculiarities, but he seems to have been rather verbose (cf. Walker, Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, pp. 42–3), and Dion's criticism of his style as \( \Upsilon t i o w \) καὶ \( \delta e i m e n o w \) would apply to 1365. The tendency to repeat the article is not traceable in the fragments which are certainly attributed to him, and is much more noticeable in the Hell. Oxy. (842) and Theopompus than in the 'Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία, which has very few instances of it. There are one or two other points of resemblance in diction between 1365 and 842 (cf. notes on ll. 24 and 33), and the hypothesis of a common authorship is attractive on stylistic grounds. Ephorus presumably described the Sicyonian tyrants in Books vii–viii, of which extant fragments refer to the First Messenian War and death of Croesus, while Theopompus is hardly likely to have discussed early Sicyonian history, so that, if 842 and 1365 belong to the same work, the identification would favour Walker's view that Ephorus was the author of 842. That our fragment comes from the lost treatise of Aristotle on the Constitution of Sicyon is also possible, but on the whole less likely in view of the popularity of Ephorus and the marked agreement with Diodorus. Our author shows an interest in political history, but his reference to the internal politics of Sicyon (ll. 58–61) is rather vague, and he does not happen to mention the Dorian aristocracy who controlled three out of the four tribes. There are several points
of agreement with the language of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία (cf. ll. 21, 24, 26, 28, 40, 46–7, and 51, notes), though some of these consist in common expressions, and the praise bestowed upon Orthagoras in 1365 is quite consistent with the opinion expressed in the Politics (cf. p. 105); but the early history of the Sicyonian tyrant is more detailed than the corresponding account of the rise of Pisistratus, and the references to the Sicyonians by name in ll. 29, 43, and 69 rather suggest a work in which the affairs of Sicyon formed an episode than one which was wholly concerned with that city. Aristotle in the Ἀθ. Πολ. usually speaks of the Athenians as δὸ δῆμος simply or uses the plural without specification. Diodorus is not likely to be author of the fragment, still less Nicolaus or any other writer of the early Roman age, and what historians in the Alexandrian period described Sicyonian affairs is unknown. That 1365 is either a fragment of Ephorus or, at any rate, of a writer who was deriving his information from Ephorus, whether Aristotle or another, remains the most satisfactory hypothesis. We have now to examine the value of his account in connexion with the previously known evidence.

The circumstance that at length both Andreas and Orthagoras are mentioned by the same writer, and the Diodorus fragment is now shown to refer to Orthagoras' father, goes far to undermine the current opinion that there was a widespread confusion of the names of these two persons. Since Andreas was not himself tyrant, his omission by Aristotle and Plutarch is explained, and Libanius' transference of the term μάγειρος from him to Orthagoras is perfectly intelligible in the light of ll. 15–22. But the difficulty in Herodotus' genealogy of Clisthenes still remains. If Orthagoras was the son of Andreas, and Myron, the grandfather of Clisthenes, was really the son of Andreas, either Myron was the brother of Orthagoras, which is inconsistent with Aristotle's statement (cf. p. 105) concerning the παῖδες Ὀρθαγόρου (the term Orthagoridae is a modern expression), or else there were two persons called Andreas, the father and the son of Orthagoras, and Herodotus was referring to the second. In the case of Myron there is reason to suppose that there were two rulers of that name (cf. p. 106), and since Herodotus' Myron is clearly identical with Pausanias' Myron who won the chariot-race in 648 B.C., to insert a generation between him and Orthagoras would result in pushing back Orthagoras' accession nearly to 700 B.C., a date proposed by Plass on other grounds (cf. p. 106) which are not convincing. Cypselus became tyrant at Corinth in the middle of the seventh century (652 according to Busolt, 655 Grote), and Theagenes at Megara apparently about the same time, so that the Sicyonian tyranny seems to have been the earliest of the three despotisms of the Isthmus; but since Myron was contemporary with Cypselus, it is not at all satisfactory to suppose two generations
of tyrants at Sicyon before him, and if the 100 years' period (cf. p. 105) is at all correct, four generations of rulers are more suitable than five. The introduction of a second Andreas as well as a second Myron is therefore open to objection. On the other hand, the omission of the second Myron involves the rejection of the statements not only of Nicolaus but, what is more serious, of Aristotle, whose allusion (cf. p. 105) to the change from Myron to Clisthenes is quite compatible with Nicolaus' account of the murder of Myron by his brother Isodemus which resulted in the speedy accession of Clisthenes, the third brother. If Herodotus' Andreas, the father of Myron, is to be distinguished from the Andreas of Diodorus and 1365, we should prefer to abandon the supposed 100 years' period of the Sicyonian despotism. The evidence for it is not free from suspicion, being clearly connected, so far as Diodorus, i.e. Ephorus, goes, with the reputed oracle, while Aristotle's reference to it may well be derived from Ephorus. Plutarch moreover, who mentions the oracle but not the 100 years (cf. p. 105), seems to be guilty of an anachronism, for his story implies that the gymnic contests at the Pythian games had been instituted before Orthagoras' time, whereas they are generally considered to have been added during the Sacred War (i.e. after 590 or 586; cf. Duncker, op. cit. ii. 149). Recent historians regard the oracle as a later invention arising from the length of the rule of the Orthagoridae, but the number 100 is likely to have been due to the oracle, and its correctness is not confirmed by any evidence that is clearly independent. Herodotus, however, ought to have mentioned Orthagoras when giving a genealogy of the Sicyonian tyrants, and on the whole it seems more likely that his Andreas was identical with the father of Orthagoras in 1365, and that he has confused Orthagoras with Myron or with Andreas, than that τοῦ Ὄρθαγορᾶος had dropped out of the text in vi. 126 before τοῦ Ἄνδρεω. As Walker observes, his genealogy of the kings of Salamis in Cyprus (v. 104) contains a somewhat analogous inaccuracy, there being one generation too many.

Col. i.

[ō][τ]α δημοτην κ[αι]
φα[υ]λον τον ανθρω
πον· παρημελησε
του ματειου. και τας
5 μεν αλλας θυσιας τας
[ε][πι]ταξθιειασ εκ των
[α][ε]λφων απεδωκε
τοις θεοις· της δε τυ

Col. ii.

και συμβα[λοτων εξ αι
φιδιου βο[ηθησα]
απεκτεινειν των πω
λεμων τηγας και
40 πολυ παντ[ων ηνο]
κιμησε μα[λιστα
των περιπολον
ανθ ὁν οι Σεκυωνι
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... the people of Sicyon, knowing] the man to be one of the common folk and of no account, neglected the oracle, and while rendering to the gods the sacrifices enjoined by Delphi took no heed of the coming tyranny. Andreas brought up the child born to him, giving him the name of Orthagoras, and until he reached maturity he continued to receive the nurture and education natural for the son of a butcher and an ordinary citizen. After passing the age of boyhood, however, he became one of the patrols who guarded the country, and on the outbreak of war between Sicyon and Pellene he was active and agreeable on all occasions. When an incursion was made by the people of Pellene and a fight begun, he brought up reinforcements suddenly and killed several of the enemy...
and distinguished himself far above all the patrols. In return for this the Sicyonians appointed him chief of the patrols, and no sooner had he received this honour than he gained a still more brilliant victory over the enemy, thus winning over and attaching to himself many of the citizens. After a while they chose him as polemach, chiefly on account of his courage and success in war, partly also by reason of the goodwill of the mass of the citizens towards him. During his office he fought bravely and kept close guard over his country, and inflicted much injury upon the enemy; whereupon the people of Sicyon again...

1. [ο]τ[ά]: something like γροῖν (or ωςδομενος) δε ο δήμος ο των Σικυωνίων (cf. l. 69) probably preceded.

11. Αυτός: ν is practically certain, and the vestiges of the following letters suit δης very well. Cf. Diod. viii. 24 and introd. pp. 105–6.

16. διατηρήσεται: this verb occurs four times in 'Aθ. Pol. with a participle.


21. του τυχόντων: cf. 'Aθ. Pol. 27. 4 μάλλον τῶν τυχόντων ἕτερον 


26. περισσοτέρων των [φ]υσιοστιων 

28. πολέμους νυν: cf. 'Aθ. Pol. 42. 4 περισσότερος τίν χάριν.

33. χαρίς: cf. 842. i. 9 ὅσον γυνώριμαι καὶ χαρίς έσται.


44. περισσοτέρου: cf. Thuc. viii. 92 ἐκ τοῦ περισσότερου 


66. παλέται καὶ τοὺς πολέμους παιδοροτόι: cf. 842. xv. 31 τοσούτα καὶ παιδοροτήτας τῶν Φοικήσ, xviii. 36 ὀδυνό ταύτα ἐποίει τοὺς εὐνοούμενα.

70. αὐτής: this must refer to something mentioned not long previously, and θεωρούν (cf. Diod. l. c.) εἰς Δέκφοιν επεφές οτοί πολέμαρχοι αυτὸν εἶλε τό (cf. l. 53) may have followed. 

Σικυωνίων δήμος (according to Pausanias vi. 19. 3) occurred in the dedicatory inscription upon the treasury built by Myron at Olympia after his victory in 648 B.C. (cf. p. 105); and that δήμος here refers to the democratic party as opposed to the aristocrats is unlikely.

1866. FRAGMENT OF AN ATTIC ORATOR.

32·7 x 12 cm. Late third century.

The recto of this papyrus contains a report by a decaprotus concerning payments of corn in A.D. 248–9, which will be published in Part XII. On the verso are the beginnings of lines of the ὑπόθεσις and first column of a speech by an Attic orator, preceded by the conclusion of a title ἱστομεν. The script is a large cursive, except the title, which is in uncials, and is probably not more than a generation later than the report. A paragraphus
after the ἰπόθεσις and a diaeresis occur, but no stops. The length of the lines is uncertain, but need not exceed an average of seventeen letters; cf. l. 6. A certain Antisthenes, who is not identifiable with any of the bearers of that name in the Prosop. Att., is mentioned at the outset of the ἰπόθεσις, and from the words φαρμακός (l. 3), θάνατος (ll. 4 and 18), and συγκοφαντ[ (ll. 7 and 13) it appears that the orator was defending, rather than prosecuting, some one on a charge of poisoning, but whether Antisthenes was the victim or the accused is not clear. There is no trace in the fragment of a reference to Τογένος, and the title may well belong to a preceding oration, since no Attic orator of such a name is known, and ἦγενος in any case probably refers to a speech (either ἵπέρ or κατά being supplied) rather than an author. The extant titles of orations concerning persons called ἦγενος are two by Hyperides, κατὰ Ἀθηναῖος, of which the first is partly preserved in a Paris papyrus, four by Lysias, (1) περὶ τοῦ Διογένους κλήτων, (2) πρὸς Διογένην οἰκίας, (3) πρὸς Διογένην ὑπὲρ μισθώσεως οἰκίας, (4) πρὸς Γλαύκωνα περὶ τοῦ Δικαιογένους κλήτων, and one by Isaeus, περὶ τοῦ Δικαιογένους κλήτων, which is preserved entire. If the title in 1866 refers to the following speech, none of those orations is suitable; but if, as is more likely, it is distinct from the speech concerning Antisthenes, it might belong to one of them, preferably one of the two speeches by Hyperides or the second of the four by Lysias. The apparent use of ὁ ἄνδρες Ἄθηναιος (l. 6) rather suggests Demosthenes; other orators, so far as can be judged, show a preference for ὁ ἄνδρες or ὁ Ἀθηναῖος or ὁ ἄνδρες δικασταί, and were less commonly read than Demosthenes in the third century in Egypt. But the number of his speeches is given by a grammarian in Schol. Aesch. De fals. leg. § 18 as seventy-one, and since besides the sixty-one which are extant there are fragments of about twelve others attributed to him, none of which is suitable, it is very doubtful whether two more could be added.

Col. i.

κατὰ (?) ἦγενος

Col. ii.

Ἀντισθενῆ[ὸς φαρμακό[ καὶ εαυτο[] 5 νατον κρί[ Καίνον μέν ο ἄνδρες Ἀθηνάιος

δίκην [ α[ tiς δαματον [ ti πισθ[ 20 μενος [ [.]ματο[ν [.]κω δε[}
ναιω φίλ[  
φαντ[  
λο τι κα[  
10  
eγών ου[  
και κατ . [  
μενού[  
και συκαφαντ  
με ηδὴ [  
15  
και γειν[  
tοι ταυτη[ν

υμνοι ό]
αλ]
μελει τ[  
25 νους π[  
νης τις[  
tους μ[  
δρες γ[  
καμή[  
30 φίλος [  
tοι το[ι

2. Αντισθενεύ: Αντισθενείς is possible, but not Αντισθενέος.
22. δή: or ὃδε.
28. The letter following δρες might be γ, η, μ, or ν, but not Δ[θηραώ.

1367. HERACLIDES LEMBUS, Epitome of Hermippus Περὶ νομοθετῶν.

Fr. 1 29.5 x 12.4 cm. Late second century.

Papyrus rolls which had become worn through use were not infrequently strengthened with patches gummed on the verso, but such patches, even when inscribed, seldom have any value of their own. An exception is provided by the fragments here published, which were stuck on the back of 1248, part of a copy of Plato’s Politicus. One of them (Fr. 2) shows that the work so utilized was the epitome by Heraclides son of Sarapion, commonly called Heraclides Lembus, of the treatises of Hermippus Περὶ νομοθετῶν, Περὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν, and Περὶ Πυθαγόρου, another (Fr. 1) contains one nearly complete column and part of a second from the end of Book i and the beginning of Book ii of the Περὶ νομοθετῶν. Hermippus, who is called by Athenaeus ὁ Καλλιμάχειος (i. 58b, v. 213f) and wrote after the death of Chrysippus (208–205 B.C.: Diog. Laert. vii. 184), was a voluminous biographical author, and the treatises above referred to are well known from citations; cf. F. H. G. iii. 36–42. Though divided into several books (the Περὶ νομοθ. had six, the Περὶ τῶν ἑ. σοφ. four, and the Περὶ Πυθ. two) and evidently self-contained, they are supposed to have been constituent parts of a larger whole called Βλου. The new fact which emerges from the title in Fr. 2 is that these treatises were epitomized by Heraclides Lembus. This circumstance has a not insignificant bearing upon the disputed question concerning the character of Heraclides’ compilation of the works of two other eminent
biographers, the Bion of Satyrus and the Διάδοχοι of Sotion. Heraclides was one of the authorities of Diogenes Laertius, who cites Ἦρακλ. ἐν τῇ Ἱδίᾳ Σατύρου Βίον ἐπιτομῇ (viii. 40), Ἦρακλ. ἐν τῇ Σατύρου ἔπιτω. (ix. 26), Ἦρακλ. ἐν τῇ ἔπιτο. (following a reference to the Βίοι of Satyrus, viii. 53), Ἦρακλ. ἐν τῇ ἔπιτω. τῶν Σωτίωνος Διαδοχῶν (v. 79), Ἦρακλ. ἐν τῇ Σωτίωνος ἔπιτω. (viii. 7, x. 1). The natural inference from such a method of citation is that Heraclides’ epitomes of the Bion of Satyrus and the Διάδοχοι of Sotion were two independent and self-contained works, and they were so treated e.g. by Müller in F. H. G. iii. 169–71. Diels, however (Doxogr. Gr. p. 149), following a suggestion of Hecker (Philologus, v. 433), has argued that the treatises of Satyrus and Sotion were digested by Heraclides into a single epitome, a theory accepted by Wilamowitz (Antig. v. Kariyst. pp. 87–9) and Susemihl (Alex. Litt. i. 503), but rejected by Unger (Rhein. Mus. xxxviii. 494). Diels’s objection to the common view, however, that Satyrus and Sotion had to some extent covered the same ground, and that it was useless to epitomize independently the same lives as given by the two authors, is conclusively met by the proof from the papyrus that Heraclides did not shrink from such repetition. Pythagoras was treated by Satyrus and Sotion, and Diogenes in dealing with his life expressly quotes Heraclides’ epitome of them both (viii. 7, 40). Yet, as we now learn, Heraclides made an independent epitome of Hermippus Περὶ Πυθαγόρου. If Diogenes on the subject of Pythagoras had also referred to Heraclides ἐν τῇ Ἐρμίππου ἐπιτομῇ, would not Diels and his supporters have said that the same great compilation which comprised Satyrus and Sotion was meant? There would have been just as much or as little basis for this identification as for the other. Some at least of the seven sages, too, figured in the pages of Satyrus and no doubt of Sotion; and Satyrus must have included a number of νομοθέται. Since Heraclides epitomized these parallel treatises of Hermippus as such, it is reasonable to suppose that his procedure was the same in regard to Satyrus and Sotion, especially as that is the obvious deduction from the citations of Diogenes Laertius.

That this new information concerning the epitomizing of Hermippus by Heraclides together with a specimen of his compendium should have now come from Oxyrhynchus is appropriate and natural in view of the fact that Suidas calls him Οὐρωποὶ Χάριτην. This testimony conflicts with that of Demetrius Magnes Ἀρ. Diog. Laert. v. 94, which describes Heraclides as Καλλαναῖος (Callatis in Pontus) ἡ Ἀλέξανδρεῖς. The discrepancy has been met in various ways. Diels and apparently Wilamowitz (I. c.) accept Suidas and regard Demetrius as mistaken. C. Müller, Unger, and Susemihl effect a reconciliation by supposing that Heraclides was a native of Callatis, but lived at Alexandria at the court of Ptolemy Philometor, and also for some time as an official at Oxyrhynchus.
Cröner (Colotes u. Menedemos, p. 136) holds that Suidas and Demetrius have confused two persons, (1) Heraclides Lembos of Oxyrhynchus, statesman and historian, and (2) Heraclides son of Sarapion, of Callatis, epitomizer. The discovery of 1887 does not of course prove the correctness of Suidas; but it is a little unfortunate for Cröner's hypothesis that fragments of one of Heraclides' epitomes, instead of the Ἱστορίαι or the Λεµβεντικὸς λόγος, should have come to light at Oxyrhynchus.

The legislators discussed in the fragments are Demonax, Cecrops, Buzygæs, Archimachus, and a personage at present unidentified whose fall is described in some detail in Fr. I. 1-19. This last belonged to the Hellenistic age, as is clear from the reference in I. 6 to 'Ptolemy'. He was accused of peculation, fled to Corinth and was condemned in absence. The association with Egypt might suggest Demetrius of Phalerum, but he is excluded by the fact that Hermippus himself is the main authority for the statement that he died of snake-bite in that country (Diog. Laert. v. 78). It is, however, quite unnecessary to assume that the πόλις mentioned in I. 7 was an Egyptian city. The short account of Demonax (II. 19-39) is unfortunately much mutilated; Hermippus disagreed with Herodotus, who is cited in I. 36, and later authorities in describing Demonax as king of Mantinea. At this point Book i ended, and with Book ii the writer turned to Athens. In the seven lines which remain concerning Cecrops a citation of Philochorus is noticeable in I. 47. Of Buzygæs, the mythical ancestor of the Athenian Buzygæ, we only learn that he was referred to in the poems of Lasus (II. 54-5). By Archimachus (II. 56 sqq.) the son of Heracles, whose name is usually spelled Archemachus, is probably meant. He was apparently brought into some connexion with a senate of 400 (II. 65-6), but here again the papyrus is disfigured by lacunae which make the sense difficult to follow.

The text is written in a rather small hand, somewhat similar to that of 843 (Part V, Plate vi) but firmer and more regular. It is probably of much the same date as 1248, in the mending of which 1887 was used, and may be assigned like that papyrus to the latter part of the second century. The title in Fr. 2 is in larger letters with horizontal dashes between the lines. For punctuation both paragraphi and dots in the high position are employed; some at least of the paragraphi are apparently later additions, and the dots also are likely to have come from a second pen. The few corrections that occur are so slight or so imperfectly preserved that it is impossible to say with security whether they are due to the original scribe or to a diorthotēs, and we have therefore as usual given the former the benefit of the doubt.
Col. i.

α
[....] ε [. . . σ]υντ [. . . . . .]
[.] ε [. . . μοη δη[.] και τινες
δ[.]ε[.]η[.]ιν επηνεγκαν αυ
[π.]ω εκατον και ενενη

5 κο[.]ντα ταλαντων ας πα
πα [Ππο]λεμαίου λαβοντος
εις [τη]ν πολιν ταυτην
δα[.]πο]φυγοντος αλλην
επη[.]νεγκαν ταλαντων

10 [εκατον] πεντηκοντα>
[k]α[.]ι νειν εις Κορινθουν
οι[.]ε[.]το[.] καταδικασθεις
νει[.]πο]λειτο . προς
την κ[.]α]ταδικην μετα

15 των υ[.]παρχοντον ουδε
νος δε [τ.]ων πολιτων

ωνομ[.]ε]ινων ου τε αγροι
διεφθαρησαν και η οι
κ[.]ια συνεπεσεν Ανιμω

20 ναξ ο βασ[.]λε]υν Μαντι
νεων λεγε[.]ται Κυρηναι
[οις] νομ[.]θε]γασαι και
ε[.]ε[.] δελφους [π]αραγενο
[κυ[.]ε[.]νος . . ] δε[.][.]δο]ναι τα>

25 [. . . . . . .] . [. . .] ε γρα
[. . . . . .] κε[.] συμμα
[.] . Μαντιω[.]εων [βα]τα]σιλευς
[ο Δημων]φος φ[.] . . . [. . .]
[προ]συμμας Βαρκαιο]σ

30 [. . .] . α [. . .] ιτε [. . .] [. . .]
[. . .] ειν Μαντ[.]ιν [. . .]

50 ος[.]
1367. NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS

[...]. α καθ ἐν α[...].κοῦν
[...]. ὁν ἔστων[...].
[...]. Διβυνη γ[...]. με

35 [μ]υνται καὶ τοῦ Δ[η]νο
[να]κτος καὶ Ἡροδ[τ]ος
[ως ὑπὸ Μαν[η]με[ων]>

40 ] β
[Ἀθηναίους Κεκρότα τον
[διφω][γ] καὶ γηγενή βα
[σι]ε[υ]ντα προτον
[νομοθετσαὶ] φασὶν τον

45 [νομίζων δ] αυτοῦ τους [...]
[...]. δόν εὐδοκήσῃ [ ]
[σαι Φιλοχορος δ]ε τα τω[ν]

κο[...]....]κ[...].
κα[...]. ανικήσῃ...
Βου[...]ο[...]οθ[...].

55 καὶ Δασος ο ποιη[...]ς
Ἀρχιμαχοῦ δε φι[...]ς θεο
θα τινας νομοῦς καὶ
[δι]ρρ[...]σαι χρη[...]τους δε
[τους] υπ αυτον τεθ[...]εν

60 τας [...] ν δε παρα[...].

ηπ[...]. ν χραμει[...].

65 [...]κην βουλευτα[...]
...
tερακοσιους ...[.]

Fr. 2.

Ἡρ[ακλείδου τον
Σαραπιων] ἐπιγονη
των Ἑρμίππου περι

70 νομοθετῶν καὶ
[P[π]τα σοφον και
Πυθαγορου

Fr. 3. Fr. 4. Fr. 5. Fr. 6. Fr. 7.

... ... ... ... ...
[σε]υ ... ρ[...]
[φη] ... σ[...]
[θη] ... μ[...]
[λα προς ... ...

2 sqq. ‘Certain persons therefore brought an action against him for a hundred and ninety talents on the ground that he had received this sum from Ptolemy for the city.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

When he was acquitted of this they brought another for a hundred and fifty talents; whereupon he withdrew to Corinth. He was condemned and he and his property were put up for sale to meet the judgement, but as none of the citizens offered to buy them his lands became waste and his house went to ruin.

Demonax king of Mantinea is said to have given laws to the people of Cyrene, and going to Delphi... Demonax is also mentioned by Herodotus, who says that he was given as a legislator to the Cyrenaeans by the Mantineans in consequence of an oracle.

Book ii.

At Athens the double-formed earthborn Cecrops when he was king, it is said, was the first lawgiver, and of his laws the... were highly esteemed; but according to Philochorus... Buzygges (is said) to have given laws; the poet Lasus also mentions him. It is said that Archemachus promulgated some laws and amended others, and that the laws made by him were good...

(Title) Epitome by Heraclides son of Sarapion of Hermippus on lawgivers and the seven sages and Pythagoras.'

1. It is not clear whether the superscribed α refers to l. 1 or is a displaced fragment.

6. l. λαξαριν.

13. There seems to be an error here. επ[α]λετό is followed by a vertical stroke after which there is a small break in the papyrus, and beyond this a vestige of the π is visible before ρ. To interpret the vertical stroke as the forpre part of the π is not at all satisfactory, owing to the height of the stroke and the width of the space beyond it. We prefer to suppose that a superfluous letter, or part of one, was written before πρως. To read η (οικαι) πρως would involve an alteration of καταδίκασθαι, and επ[α]λετο to (') is not a very likely alternative.

17. Whether the overwritten i was inserted by the original scribe or a corrector is doubtful; the υ has not been deleted.

19 sqq. Cf. Athen. iv. 154 d 'Εμπιττος δ' ἐν α' περὶ νομοθετῶν (F. H. G. iii. 36) τῶν μουμουχαστῶν εὑρέται αποσαίνει Μαντίνεσ Ἑλμανκαστός ἔνας τῶν πολιτῶν συμβουλέσαντος, καὶ ξυλαγμένοι τοῦτον γενέσθαι Κυρρηναίους. Herodotus, who is cited below (l. 36), relates how, on the accession at Cyrene of the lame Battus, that state was bidden by the Daphic oracle to apply to Mantinea for a καταριστήρι, and the Mantineans accordingly sent Demonax ὕδρα τῶν ἀδικών δικασμών who triumphed οὕτω καὶ τῷ βασιλείᾳ Βάττω τιμήσαυσε εὔχακα καὶ ἐρωτώνας, τὰ ἄλλα πάντα τὰ πρότερον εἶχον οἱ βασιλεῖς ἐς μέσον τῷ δήμῳ ἤθηκε (iv. 161); similarly Diodorus viii. 30 ὅτι τῷ τῶν Κυρρηναίων στάτας διατήρησε ἐγκέραντο δημοκράτεις Μαντίνεως, συνετεί καὶ δικαιοσύνης δοκῶν διαβάρειν. According to all these passages Demonax was a private citizen, and it is strange that he should here be given the title of king.

23-4. παραγεγεγομένω (sc. οἱ Κυρρηναίοι) would be expected from the narrative of Herodotus, but the following infinit. indicates that Demonax is still the subject. δῆμοι rather than δ[έμοι]ω is wanted, but is apparently not to be read; the doubtful initial δ may be a.

26. ἐκ: or possibly ἐκα.

32. Apparently not διορκεσσών. χ may be read instead of κ.

33. εὲ εὖ is also possible.

34 sqq. Cf. note on l. 19. There are dots above καί in both l. 35 and l. 36, but it is doubtful whether they were intended as marks of deletion, though the first καί might probably be spared; for the second cf. l. 55. A small fragment containing part of the δ and the second ο of Ἡρωδοτος and a vestige of δ in the line above is not certainly placed here.

39. As in l. 17 the responsibility for the correction remains in doubt.

42. [δηφώ]: cf. Suidas s.v., Aristoph. Wasps 438, &c.
1367. **NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS**

46. The letters before $\nu$ are indistinct, and there may have been some alteration; perhaps $\lambda$. $\varepsilon \ldots \psi$ should be read. The paragraphus below this line is of unusual length; it should, moreover, have been placed on a line lower down.

53. Boujeus was the mythical ancestor of the Athenian priestly family of Boue$\zeta$ma and was regarded as the inventor of ploughing and the originator of various moral observances; cf. e.g. Schol. Aesch. ii. 78 Bouc. $\ldots$ 'άθροισι των πάλαι, δότις πρώτος ζεύς ζευζεν, Hesych. Bouc. ἦρως Άττικης, δ ι πρώτος βούς ὑπὸ διοκάρου ζεύζεσι, Etym. Magn. 206. 47, Append. Prov. i. δι' ἀρα Boujeus Βους. $\ldots$ ἅλλα τε πολλὰ ἀράται καὶ τοῖς μη κοινωνοῦσι $\ldots$ ἔδατος ἢ υπόρος ἢ μή ὑπόσφαινον δῶον πλανωμένοις, Diphil. Fr. 62 Kock, Schol. Soph. Ant. 255 λόγος δὲ οτι Bouc. Ἀθηναίοι κατηράσατο τοῖς περιφρώσιν ἄναφον σῶμα.

54-5. This passage must be added to the scanty fragments of Lasus (four in Bergk's *Poet. Lyr.*).

56. 'Ἀρχίμαχος occurs as an Athenian name in Ps.-Demosth. Πρὸς Μακάριατον 45, but no lawgiver 'Ἀρχίμαχος is known. Presumably the reference is to 'Ἀρχίμαχος, the son of Heracles by one of the daughters of Thespius (Apollod. ii. 7. 8), though apparently he is not elsewhere credited with νομοθεσία.

62-4. The letters $\varepsilon \omega \iota \alpha$, $\alpha \tau \epsilon$, and $\rho \omega \tau$ are on a small fragment which is stuck on in the position given in the text, but is perhaps not in its right place. It is noticeable that the initial letters of ll. 63-4 are rather more to the left of the $\epsilon$ in I. 62 than is warranted by the ordinary slope of the column. The doubtful $\sigma$ following the $\epsilon$ may be $\gamma$ or $\pi$.

Fr. 3. 1. If $\lambda \varepsilon$w is right this fragment might well belong to the passage concerning Buzygæs; cf. note on I. 53. The $\zeta$, however, is not altogether satisfactory.

Fr. 7. If this fragment belongs to 1367, it must have come from near the end of a line, on account of the compression of the letters.

1368. **ROMANCE.**

19.2 $\times$ 9.6 cm. Third century.

The recto of this papyrus contains the ends of eleven lines from an official register of persons, drawn up, to judge from the handwriting, towards the close of the second century. A census and ἐπικεφάλαια are mentioned, and the document no doubt had reference to taxation. On the verso is the upper part of a column, with some letters from the ends of lines of the column preceding, from an apparently unknown romance. This is written in a medium-sized irregular hand, employing for the most part uncial forms but with a tendency to cursive; it is not likely to be later than about the middle of the third century. A paragraphus is once written, but no other kind of stop; $\nu$ at the end of a line sometimes takes the form of a stroke above the preceding vowel. Corrections in ll. 45-6 seem to be due to the original scribe. The fragment relates the adventures of a certain Glaucetes. During a ride he sees a vision of a youth who says that he and a maiden have been murdered and lie buried in a particular spot. Glaucetes then proceeds with his journey and arrives at a village where he prepares to pass the night. The piece is another illustration of the popularity
of such compositions, of which evidence has already come from Oxyrhynchus in fragments both of extant and non-extant authors; cf. 416–17, 1019, 1250.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[nu]</td>
<td>νιοις τὴν αὐτὴν θαυμασίαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[enē]</td>
<td>μεικρὸν απὸ τὴς ὁδὸς εἰκτρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[tēn ὦι]</td>
<td>30 πεις κείμαι δὴ ὑπὸ τῆ πλατα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[μίος]</td>
<td>τανιστὸ εκεῖνη καὶ μὲτ ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[di ekēi]</td>
<td>μον κορή καλὴ αμφοτέρην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ην]</td>
<td>μενοὶ οἱ Γλαυκητὴς εκ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[τὴν]</td>
<td>πλαγεῖς ὁσπερ εἰκὸς εὑρέτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[σι]</td>
<td>35 ἔκατο μὲν οὐδέν πρὸς ταύ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ποὺς]</td>
<td>τὰ ἑπενευκέν ὑπὸ μονὸν καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[παι]</td>
<td>[αμμ] ἡλαμβανὲν οἱ νεανὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 lines lost.</td>
<td>[σκόσ] ἡφανισθῇ ἐπινευσάν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[α]</td>
<td>[το]ς οἱ Γλαυκῆς κατὰ κρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[αχυ]</td>
<td>40 τοὺς ἡλαμβανὲν καὶ αμὰ ἑπέ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[δω]</td>
<td>στριφτὸ εἰ ποὺ αὐθῆς ἕδοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[φο]</td>
<td>ἐκεῖνον ἀλλ᾽ οὐκετὶ εὐθέτε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[α]</td>
<td>αὑρκένειτα ὑπὸ νυκτὸς εἰ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ε[]]</td>
<td>[ι]ς τὴν κωμὴν καὶ τὸν πα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>45 ὅ αὐτὴ πολλὰμος τοῦτον δὺ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[κα]</td>
<td>τὸν αἰβὸς ορὰ [παρ αὐτὴν] ἅποτα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[α]</td>
<td>σῖν ανεῳγμένη καὶ εἰν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[κα]</td>
<td>αὐτὴ στιβᾶδα εὐτέλη καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[δε]</td>
<td>φαιλὴν καταδρῆσαν οὐν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>50 πρὸς τῇ φατνῇ τοῦ ἀπὸν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ν]</td>
<td>βαλὼν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς στιβᾶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[.]</td>
<td>δὸς εἰπεχερεῖ καθευδεῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[.]</td>
<td>καὶ τοῦτο κατεισὶ γῆνη δὺ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[.]</td>
<td>a κλειμάκος η ἡν εἷς νυπέρω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 [οὺς α]γούσα κατὸ εἰς τὴν ὑπ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ποστασιν . . .</td>
<td>. . . . . . . . .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Col. ii. "... to bury her, turning aside a little from the path. There I lie beneath that plane-tree and with me a fair maiden, both of us slain." Glauceses filled with natural astonishment said nothing in reply to this, but merely nodding his head rode on; and when he nodded the young man disappeared. Glauceses hurried on, turning round at the same time on the chance that he might see him again; but he beheld him no more. While it was yet night he arrived at the village, which was on the bank of a river. Crossing this he saw an open stable with a poor and mean litter inside; so having tied up his horse at the manger he threw himself down on the litter and tried to sleep. Meanwhile a woman descended by a ladder which led down from an upper room to the stable... 

28. The letter before the lacuna is probably a or e. θαψε[ν] would fill the line better than θαψε[η], which is rather short.

46. The deleted letters, which are a ditto-gaph from ll. 44-5, have dots placed above and below them.

51. βαλὼν: cf. Arrian, Epict. ii. 20. 10 βαλὼν καθεδέχεται. This intransitive use of βαλλεῖν (cf. βάλτειν) is also found in poetry, and in the colloquial βαλλ' ἵνα κορακι, &c.

III. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

1369. SOFOCLES, Oedipus Tyrannus.

Fr. 7 4'4 × 8'1 cm. Fifth century. Plate VII (Frs. 1–2 recto).

These seven small pieces of three leaves from a papyrus book containing the Oedipus Tyrannus and no doubt other plays of Sophocles were part of a find of Byzantine literary fragments, which comprised 1369–74 and 1385, 1391, 1394, 1396–7 and 1401–3, besides a few very small unpublished fragments. Parts of fifty-six lines from the middle and later portions of the drama are preserved, nearly half being lyric, but too incomplete to be of much value. The script is a somewhat irregular sloping uncial of the oval type and probably belongs to the fifth century or the beginning of the sixth, being thus little later than 22, the only other extant papyrus fragment of this play. There were about forty-three lines on a page. A few corrections have been inserted in a different but probably nearly contemporary hand (ll. 780, 822, 1310) together with a breathing in l. 827 and the speaker's name in the margin of l. 689. The other occasional corrections and breathings, with the stops (high and low points), paragrapg, accents, diaereses, and marks of elision and quantity, seem all to be due to the first hand. Iota adscript is generally omitted. The scribe was rather careless, l. 778 being
omitted owing to homoioteleuton, and where the Laurentian codex (L) breaks down, as happens not infrequently in the choric passages, the papyrus (II) rarely helps, so that the only novelties are ἑμβατεῦται for ἑμβατεύων in l. 825, a doubtful variant in l. 752, and an uncertain confirmation of an emendation in the corrupt line 1310. It is interesting, however, that in at least three instances (ll. 827, 1306, 1307) and probably a fourth (l. 1355) the text agrees with the later MSS. against L, thus providing a fresh argument on the side of those who do not regard L as the ultimate source of the other MSS. of Sophocles.

Frs. 1–4. Verso.

688 τουμον παριει και καταμβλύνων κεαρ [xορ(ως)] ωναξ ειπον μεν οὐν
690 Χ' α'[παξ] μονων ισθι δ[ί]ξ
[-]
παραψ[ρουμον απορογι]
ἐπι φρον[μα] πεφα[θαι]
μ' αν [ει σε] νοσφι[ρ]αι
[ος τ εμαν γα]ψ φιλαι
695 [εν πονοις αλυψ]
[σαν κατ ορθον] ούροιςας
[τανων τ ευποματος ει δυναι γενον]
io lines lost.

708 [εμου πακουσον και] μαθ ουφεκ εστι σοι
[βροτειον ουδεν μαυτικης [εχον τεχνης]
710 [φανω δε σοι σημεια τονδε σιντομα]

Recto. Plate VII (Frs. 1–2).

731 [πυθ]ατο γαρ ταυτ' ουδε πω ληξαντ εχει
[και π]ου σθ' ο χωρος [ουτος ου τοδ' ην παθος
[Φωκις] μεν η γη κληκεαι σχιστη δ οδος
[ει ταυτο] Δελφων [καπο δαιλιας αγει]
735 [και τις χρ]ονος τιοισδ εστιν ουξ|εληλυθων·
[σχεδου τι προσθενη η συ τησ] διχων χθονος
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[ἀρχὴν εφάπαυν τοὺς ἐκηρυκτὸν πολεῖ
[ο Ζεὺς τι μοῦ] δρασαί βεβαιολυσάμει περὶ
[τι δ' εστὶ σου τ' οἴδέτοις ἐνθυμον
740 [μὴπο μ ερῴσα τον δ' Δαίων φωνὴν
10 lines lost.
751 [ανδρας λοχίτας οι αγνηρ αἰχηγητῆς
[πεντ ησαν οἱ ξυμπάντες· εἶν δ' αυτοίς ἡν
[κηρυκὴς απηνή δ' ηγέ] Δαίων μέτα

Frs. 5 and 6.

. . . . . . . .
775 [μητη]ρ δ' δὲ Μερ[οπῆ] Δωρίδης ἡγομεν δ' ἀνηρ
[αστ]ὼν μέγιστος των εκεί πρὶν μοι τυχῆ [)
777 [τοια]δ' επεστή θαυμασαί μεν] ἀξία[ί]:
779 [ανηρ] γὰρ εν δείπνοισ μ' υπερπλησθεῖσ μέθη
780 [καλε]ί ἐαρ' οινω πλα[στός ως]᾽ ὑήν πα[τρί
[καγω βαρυνθεῖσ] την μ]ὲν ουσαν ημὲραν
[μολις κατεσχον βασι]ραί δ' ίδων πέλας
[μητρος πατρος τ] ηλεγ' χο[ν] οι δε δυσφόρωσ
[τουνείδοις ηγον τω μεθέριτι τον λόγον
. . . . . . . .

Verso.

. . . . . . . .
819 [ωθειν δ' απ' οικων και ταδ' ουτος αλ]λάς ην
820 [η γω π εμ]αυτο τασδ] [αρας ο προστ]ίθεισ.
[λεχη δ] του θαυμαντος εν χερον] εμαίν.

. .
[αρ ουχι] πας [αι] αγανος] ει με χρη φανειν
825 [μηστ εμ]βατεναι πατεριδος η γαμοι με δει
[μητρος ε]γυναι και] [πατερα κατακτανειν
[Πολυβον] δι εξεθρεψε καζεφυσε µε

. . . . . . . .
Fr. 7.

Verso.

1304 [δε]πομας ε [θελων πολλα ανερεσθαι]
1305 πολλα πυθεσθαι πολλα δ αδρησαι
tων φρικην παρεχεις μου
αιαι αιαι
φευ φευ διδστανος εγω ποι γας
1310 [δε]πομας ε[θε]λων πα μου φθυγα

Recto.

1351 [ποιας ελαβεν μ απο τε] φ[ον]ον
[ερμυ κανεσσεν ουθεν ες χαριν]
[πρασσων τοτε]
[ναρ αν θανων]
1355 [ουκ ην φιλοσιν ουθ ε]μοι τοσουτον αχισ
[θελονι καμοι τουτ αυ]ν ην
[ουκουν πατρος]
[γ αν φονευς ηλθον ου]δε μυθυσο

688. καταμβηκων: so MSS., Jebb. Hartung and Wecklein proposed καταμβηλινεις.
689. χορο(ος), or possibly χορο(ου), is written as an ordinary abbreviation with a stroke through the ρ, not as in 1370. 1249 with ρ above and ρ under the χ. Lines 689-97 are divided somewhat differently in L, which begins l. 690 with -παξ and l. 696 with καρ' ὁρθον.
693. σι νοσφιζομαι: so MSS. Jebb adopts Hermann's σ' ἐνοσφιζόμαι.
695-6. Eleven letters would be expected in the lacuna in l. 695 and το in l. 696; the restoration of the reading of the MSS. gives 12 and 11, but with several narrow letters. πῶνες in l. 695 was corrected by Bergk to πόσονων in order to correspond to φθισουσα in l. 666 of the strophe, where Dindorf conjectured φθινᾶς, but the arrangement [ἐν πονοσαν αλ]υσαν κατ' ὁρθον] requires 13 letters before οὖρας in l. 696, which is unlikely. In ll. 666-7 the reading of the MSS. τριχες ψυχάν, καὶ τάδ' εἰ κακώς κακά again fails to correspond to αὐλόουσαν κατ' ὁρθόν, οὖρας in the antistrophe, and καί is generally omitted with Hermann. The papyrus supports the view that the error lies in the strophe, not in l. 696.
697. δυναι χεινυον or δυναον [γενον]? can be read; the first hand of L had the former reading, the first corrector (with the other MSS.) the latter, something (two accents?) being
erased above α. Neither reading corresponds to l. 668 τὰ πρὸς σφών. Hermann and Campbell read δόματα, omitting γενοῦ, which word (or έσθο) would have to be understood.

740. έφοτα των: or possibly έφοτα [τ]ου; cf. l. 777.

752. έψυχ’ άντες was wrongly accentuated, unless a new variant, e. g. οίνου π’ άντες, be read for οι έψυχ’ άντες: cf. l. 780, note.

777. The deletion of the wrong ι after αέα and the insertion of the mark of quantity seem to be due to the first hand. After this verse l. 778 ανυνθής γε μείτα τής εμής ούκ άδια has been omitted owing to homoioteleuton.

780. There are traces of ink between the two accents on ει and έν which apparently represent γ, i. e. γ(ε), or a smooth breathing. The scribe clearly either did not read πλαστός ος ενυ παρπί, which is indeed rather unexpected after καλεί μ’, or else misunderstood it. The accent of έν must be wrong: cf. l. 752, note.

782. δ’ was corrected from ι by the first hand. The supposed grave accent on ιάω resembles a mark of elision.

821. The ν of εμαίν is written very large.

822. The reading of the first hand πνευμα was a mere error.

823. δε[γνωσ]: there is room for two more letters in the lacuna, which is hardly smaller than the space occupied by αλετ αρ εφ in l. 822, and there may well have been another deletion. The first was apparently due to the original scribe.

824. φευγοντι: l. φευγοντι with Α (the Parisinus). L originally had φυν. τόντι, which was converted into φευγότι by the erasure of half the cross-bar of the τ as well as all the preceding letter.


825. μπορ εμπάτειών: μπορ εμπάτειών LA, μπορ’ having been corrected in L by an early hand from μπορ οι μ’ μ’; μπορ’ οι μ’ ζε’ εμ’ other MSS, μπορ εμπατειων Dindorf, Jebb. The aorist fits in better than the present with φυγειν and έδειν in the preceding lines, but whether the papyrus had μπορ’ (cf. l. 824), μπορ’, or μπορ’ is uncertain. Seven letters would be expected in the lacuna on the analogy of ll. 823–6, six according to l. 827, so that [μπορ’ εμ] or [μπορ’ εμ] is rather short.

826. There was possibly a low stop after τογγον.

827. έεθέψει καζεντει LA, Jebb; but cf. Od. xii. 134 δεινατα τεκνικά τε, and introd.

1304. δε[λων α] ε[θαλω: the reading is very doubtful, but the first letter visible seems to be ι or ο, the next to be ν rather than δ, and four feet are found in ll. 1305, 1306, 1308, and 1309.

The arrangement of ll. 1304–10 is the same as that in L.

1306. τοια: so edd. with L marg. and some of the late MSS.; τοιαν L, τοιαν with π suprastr A, &c.

1307. ααι ααι: so some of the late MSS.; αλ αλ’ LA, αλ αλ’ other late MSS., Jebb; cf. l. 827, note.

1308. The accent on διψατος is not certain.

1310. The reading [διψατος]i corr. from δελως[ε]τας is unfortunately very uncertain. LA have διαψετας φοράδων, the only variants for διας. in the later MSS. being the corrupt διψεται and διαπτεται. The letter above the line is not α or ε, but might be α. διαπωτας, an epic form used also by Findar, is adopted by Jebb from Musgrave and Seidler to preserve the anaepastic metre.

1351. LA also have φωνατ at the end of this line, but επιστολας at the end of the line preceding. That the scribe of Π had no hesitation in dividing words between two lines is clear from ll. 689 and 695. The restorations in ll. 1351–2 are from L, but the text and metre of these lines are doubtful.
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1355. ἰχλα: so A and edd.; ἰχλας, the unmetrical reading of L, &c., is possible, but in view of the other disagreements with L less probable.
1357. ὀδκοῦν παρός . . . παρός forms one line in L.

1370. EURIPIDES, Medea and Orestes.

Fr. i 8-i x 18-1 cm. Fifth century. Plate VII (Frs. 3 recto, 9 verso).

These nine fragments of seven different leaves from a papyrus codex of Euripides were found with 1369 and 1371–4. One belongs to the Medea, the rest to the Orestes, but the order of the plays is uncertain. The script is a good-sized uncial of the sloping oval type with thirty-seven or thirty-eight lines to a column, and resembles 1371. Fr. i (Medea) contains parts of fourteen iambic lines near the beginning of the drama (ll. 20–6, 57–63). Iota adscript is twice written by the first hand, twice omitted, but inserted by a corrector who used darker ink and to whom are due the breathing in l. 23 and frequent accents, stops (high, middle, and low points) except that at the end of l. 59, and marks of elision; diaereses and paragraphe are by the original scribe. The Orestes scraps, in the same hand, contain parts of nearly 100 lines scattered over the play, one-third being lyric (ll. 445–9, 469–74, 482–5, 508–12, 685–90, 723–9, 811–17, 850–4, 896–8, 907–10, 934–6, 945–8, 1247–63, 1297–1305, 1334–45, 1370–1). An insertion of iota adscript in l. 909 and a correction of l. 897 are made in a small uncial hand, which employed brown ink like that of the main text and seems to be different from that of the corrector of Fr. i, while the accents, breathings, stops (high point), and elision-marks are less frequent than in Fr. i and are probably due, like the diaeresis (l. 470) and most of the paragraphe, to the first hand. Corrections in ll. 1334 and 1342 and perhaps 511 are in a different hand, which may be identical with that of the person who inserted the speaker’s name against ll. 470 and 1249 in good-sized uncials and paragraphe below ll. 1250, 1257, and 1260, but was apparently not the writer of the text. Two glosses in late fifth or sixth-century cursive, explaining rare words, occur in the margin of ll. 1370 and 1371. The writer of these notes may also have been responsible for the speaker’s name against l. 1260, but the speaker’s name added in uncials against l. 1246, if not due to the original scribe, was probably inserted by a fourth corrector. The cursive notes are somewhat later than the scholia in 1371, but the main text probably belongs, like the other literary fragments of this find, to the fifth century rather than to the sixth.

Like the two extant papyri of the Medea (ll. 5–12 in P. Didot, ed. H. Weil, Monuments grecs, 1879, 18–22, and ll. 710–15 in 460) the present fragment is too small to be of any practical use for textual purposes; but the pieces of
the Orestes are more valuable, being longer than the previously known papyrus fragments of that play (ll. 339-43 with musical notes in P. Rainer, *Mittheil.* v. 365; 1062-90 in J. Nicole, *Rev. de Philol.* xix. 105; 1313-50, 1356-60 in 1178), and in spite of their unsatisfactory condition offer some readings of interest. The Orestes is one of the best attested of Euripides' plays, the Marcian (M), Vatican (V), and two Paris codices (A and B) being available as well as the Laurentian (L) and the Laurentian part of the Palatine (P). Of these M, the oldest (twelfth century), is acknowledged to be the best, A and V coming next; P stands nearer to MABV than to L. A noteworthy agreement with M against the other MSS. occurs in l. 946, and with A in l. 1335, and probably in ll. 816 and 1370; on the whole the corrected text is fairly accurate, though a slip in l. 508 has passed unobserved. Weil's emendation ἄγ' for ἄλλ' in l. 1340 is confirmed, which is the more remarkable since 1178, though five centuries older than 1370, agrees with the MSS. A new reading which may be right occurs in l. 508.

1401, which was found with 1370, is also perhaps Euripides, but is written in a different hand and seems to belong to a distinct MS.

Medea.

Fr. 1.

Verso.

20 Ἔθεια δ' ἡ δυστῆνος ἡμιασμένη.

Βοϊά μεν ὥρκους ἀνακαλεῖ δὲ δὲξιάς
πίστιν μεγιστήν· καὶ θεοὺς μὲν ἄρτυρεται.

διὰς ἀμοιβῆς [ἐξ Ιασονοῦ κυρεί]
κεῖται δ' απὸ τῶν σωμ ὑφεις ἀλγηδοσι

25 τον πάντα [συντηκουσα δικροις χρονον
ἐπει [π]ρος ἀνδρὸς ἑσθέντη δικημενη

Recto.

57 ωςθ' ἵμερος μ' ὑπῆλθε γῆ τε κοιμανθι

λέξαι μολοῦςην δ' ἐγερο Μηθειας τυχας,

του πασ' γαρ ἤ τα[λαινα] παντετα γῆνιν

60 ηθλο τε αρχη πημα κοψιδεο μεσον

ω μωρος ει χρη δεσποται ειπειν τοδε

[ως ουθεν οιδε των νεωτερων κα]κων·

[τι δ' εστιν ω γεραιε μη φθονει] φράσαι.
25. π of πωτα has been corrected.
58. μολούση: so ABPV, edd.; μολοῦσαν V (later hand) L.
Μηδεία: so V (with ἣ δεσπόζης suprascr.) LP (cf. Ennius, Med. Fr. 3); δεσπόζης AB and Schol. Phoen. 1, Wecklein, Murray.

Orestes.
Frs. 2 and 3. Recto. Plate VII (Fr. 3 recto).

445 [ἰδιὰ π]ρος [ἐχθρ]οιν ἡ πρὸς Ἀργείας χέρος
[παῖ]ν τῶν προῖς αστῶν οὐθανω βραχὺς λογος
[ὦ μέ]λεος ἦκεις συμφορας εἰς τουχατον
[ἐς σ ἐ]λπις ἡμὴ καταφυγας εχει κακων
[α]λλ ᾳθ]λιος πρασσουσιν ευτυχης μολων
19 lines lost.

469 [θωμαι γερον]τ[οις ομμ]ατιων φευγων κορας
Τυδ[αρες] ποιοι ποιηματορ της εμης [διδω ποσιν

471 Μ[ενελαιον] επει γαρ τοι Κληταιμηντρας ταφω
[Χ]οας χευμενος. εκλυον ὡς ἐσ [Ναυπλιαν
[ἡκοι συν αλοχαι πολυτης σ]εσωμενος
ἀγετε με προσ γαρ δεξιαν αυτου θελω

Verso.

482 [τι γαρ] φιλου μοι πατρος εστιν εγκ]ροφα
[κεινου γαρ οδε πεφυκε τοιωτοις γεγω
[πεφυκεν ει δε δυστυχει τιμητεω

485 [βεβαρβαρωσαι χρονιος ων εν βαρ]βαροις
[Ε]λληνικον τοι τον ομοθεν τιμαν αει]
21 lines lost.

508 [ει τοιδ αποκτε]μενε σύλλεκτρος γυνη]
[χω τουδε παις αι μ]ητερ' αυταποκτεν[ει

510 [καπειθ ο κεινον] γενομενος φοιν φοιν [ν]
[ποι
[λυσει περας δε κα]κων [ποι] προβηστεαι
[καλως εθεντο ταυτα πατερεσ οι παλαι]
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Frs. 4 and 5. Verso.

685 [συνεκκομίζειν δυναμίν ἕν δ[δ]ῶ θεός
[θηρακοντα καὶ κτεινοντα τ]οὺς [εναρτιον
[to δ αὐ τυνασθαί πρὸς θεῶν] χρ[ης]ω τυχ[ε]ῖν
[ἤκω γαρ αὐ[τοῖον συμμαχῶν κεν]δὸν δόξου
[εἰχών πονοσί πυρίοις αλώμενος]
690 [σμικρά συν ἀλκῆ τῶν λέιεμεν]ῶν φίλων

Recto.

723 [οτιν τραπομενος] θαρ[ατον Ἀργεῖων φυγῳ
[οὐτος γα]ρ [ην μοι κ]αταφ[υγῃ σωτηρίας
[Πυλα]δὴν δ[ρομῳ στειχοντα Φωκεων απο
[ηδὲ]ι[α]ν ὄψιν πιστος εν κακως ανηρ
[κρεις]τον γα[ληνης ναυτίλου]ιν εἰσοραν
[θασσον] η [με χρην προβαινων ικομην δι αστεως

Fr. 6. Verso.

811 [πα]λιάς παλ[λαιας απο σμφοράς δομον
[οπο]τε χρη[σεας ερις αρνος
[ηλ]ῦθε Ταυταλίδαις
[οικ]προτατα [θοιναματα
815 [και σφάγια γ]ενναῖων τεκεων
[φον]ο]ι φύκιος εξαμει
[βων δι] α[ιματον ου προλει

K
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Recto.

850 [Πυλαδῆς εοικε δ' ου μακραν οδ' αγγελος]
[λεξειν τα κειθεν σου κασιγνητον περι·
[ω τλημον ω δυστην του στρατη]λατου
[Αγαμεμνονος παι ποτιν Ηλεκτρα λόγονς
[ακουσον ους σοι δυστυχεις η]κω φλερον

Frs. 7 and 8. Recto.

896 [πηδος αει κηρυκης οδε δ' αυτους] φιλο[ς]
[ος αν δυνηται πολεος εν τ' αρξην]
[επι τωθε δ' ηγορευε Διομηδης αλαξ]
8 lines lost.

907 [οταν γαρ ην]ς τ[οις λογοις φρονων κακως]
[πειθη το] πληθο[ς τη πολει κακων μεγα]
[οσοι δε συν νω' χρηστα [βουλευονς αει]
910 [και μη παρατικ αυτ]ς ειςι χρησιμοι

Verso.

934 [υμιν αμυνων] σωδη[ν ηπον η πατρι]
935 [εκτεινα μ]ητερ [ει γαρ αρσενων φονος]
[εσται γυν]ιος[ν οσιος ου φθανοιτ ετ αν]
8 lines lost.

945 [ος ηγορευε συγγονον σε τε κτι]ανει[ν]
[μολις δ' επεισε μη πε]ρι[ουμενος θανειν]
[τλημων Ορεστης αυτοι]ε[ραι δε σφα[γη]
[υπεεχει τε τηδ ημεραι]ι [λειψειν β]ριον

Fr. 9. Fol. 1 verso.

Plate VII.

Ὑ(κτρο) Μυκην[ίδες ω φιλαι]
1248 τα πρωτα [κατα Πελαγων εδος Αργειων
χορ(ος) τινα [θροεις αυθαν ποτνια
Fragments of Extant Classical Authors

1250 π[α]μενει γαρ ετι σοι τοδ εν Δαναίδων πολει
στηθ [αι μεν υμον τονδ αμαξηρη τριβον
αι δ [ει]θαδ αλλον ουμον ες φρουραν δομον
τι λε με τοδε χρεος απνεις
εινεπε μοι φιλα

1255 φοβος[ε] εχει με μη τις επι δωμασι
σταθεις επι φονιων αιμα
πηματα πημασιν εξευρη
[κατειτε επειγομεσθ εγω μεν ουν τριβον

1259 τονδ εκφυλαξω τον προς ηλιου βολας
αι διηχωρ ημιο(ορον) και μην εγω τονδ οι προς εσπεραν φερει

1261 διοχια νων κορας διαφερ ομματων
εκείθεν ευθωδ ειτα παλινσκοπιαν
εχομεν ως θροεις

Fol. 1 recto.

1297 ηκουσαθ ανδρες χειρ εχουσιν εν φοινω
[Ελενης το κωκυμ εστιν ος απεικαζαι:
[ω Διος ω Διος αεναον κρατος ]

1300 ελθ επικουρος εμοισι φιλοισι παντος
[Μενελαε δυνησκο συ δε παρων μ ουκ αφελεις
[φουευτε καινετε ]
[ολλυτε διστυχα διστομα φασγανα]
[εκ χρος ιεμενοι ]

1305 λιποπατορα λιπογαμον α πλειστουσ

Fol. 2 recto.

1335 εσπ αξιωσι τ θρ [ανευρημει δομος
περι του γαρ αληθοι μαλλον αν φθεγκαιτο τις
[αλλ ειλθε κοι μετασχες ικειας φιλοις
[ση μπτερι] προσπεπονσα τη μεγ ολια

K 2
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Mενελα[ον] ημας µη θανοντας εισιδειν
1340 αγ' ω τραφείσα μητρος εν χεροιν εµης
οικτείρον η'μας καπικούφισσον κακων
ω' εις αγανα δευρ εγα δ ηγησοµαι
σωτηριας γαρ τεµη εχεις ηµιν µονη
τιδοι διακο τον εµον εσ δοµους ποδα
1345 σιωθη οσον γε τουτ εµ ω κατα στεγασ

Fol. 2 verso. Plate VII.

1370 [πεφευγα βαρβαροις εµµα][ρισιν]
[κεδρωντα παισταδων υπερ] τερεμνα

448. ηµην: so ABLPV, edd.; η γη (γ in rasura) M. The breathing is very doubtful.
472. χειµερον: so ABLPV, edd.; χειµερον M.
485. εν βαρβαροις: so ABLMPV, edd.; γραφεται δφ' 'Ελλάδος Μν and Apollon. Ty.

Eurip. 34.

508. αποκτει[σει]νεν συλλεκτρος: I. αποκτεινει συλ. The MSS. have αποκτεινειν συλλεκτρος, but συλλεκτρος is a good Euripidean word; cf. Her. Fbr. i, 1268. Possibly συλλεκτρος is a reminiscence of l. 476, where it has a somewhat different sense.

511. The initial lacuna ought to contain 13-14 letters, and ποι was no doubt omitted in its proper place by the first hand; the deletion of ποι after κακων is likely to be due to the corrector of ll. 1334 and 1342. δι ποι is read by all MSS. except L (δι πη) and a corrector of B (δι πη), and there is no reason to suppose an agreement with L here. δι ποι Wecklein, Murray.

686. This verse is bracketed by Wecklein following Hermann.
687. το (ABMV) or του (LP) can equally be read.
813. [πε]θανε ταυτελθαι: so MSS. except L, which has θανε ταυτελθαιων. The metre of this verse does not correspond to l. 825 of the antistrophe διαντου δη µη φθασε, and Hermann proposed έπερ δεν for θανε in l. 813, Murray µην φθασε θανατου µηρ in l. 825.
814. ακρογοτα: so MSS., Wecklein, Murray; ακτιγοτα εις Weil. The vestiges of the last letter suit a better than ε.

816-17. The reconstruction is very uncertain. The MSS. have δεν φαίνον φαινον εξαέμειβαν δε αµατος εν προδει (om. δεν Α), but l. 816 does not correspond to l. 828 of the antistrophe κεινων σιω πατριν µη πατριν (κεινων with δη supraesct. Α). Triclinius proposed έδεν for δεν in l. 816, Hartung deleted δαν in l. 828, but neither emendation yields an exact correspondence. Neither δεν nor τε [κεινων] suits the vestiges of ink before φαιν so well as ω with : added above the line, apparently by the first hand. Probably δεν was omitted with A, but [, ]αν φαινον φαινον can be read, and the vestige of a letter in the next line would suit o or σ better than α, so that εξαεμειβαν δη αµατηθαι is possible.

850. There is no trace of ink above πενυα. In ll. 852-4 23-4 letters are lost in the lacuna, but in 850 30, and in 851 29; these two lines spoken by the chorus therefore projected, although iambic. The δρινος begins at l. 852.

897. At the end of the line the first hand wrote αρξαιων ηη, which was corrected to αρξαιων ηη, the last word being altered to ηη, apparently by the same corrector. αρχαιου η. MSS.
There may have been another variant earlier in the line, for the reading of the MSS. gives only 22 letters in the space which in ll. 896 and 898 is occupied by 25. πλιστων was conjectured by F. W. Schmidt for πλεσω (v. i. πλεσω).

907. τοις, the reading of the MSS., was corrected to τες by Musgrave. Lines 907–13 have generally been bracketed by editors following Kirchhoff, and ll. 916, 933, and 938–42 have been suspected, but they all either certainly or probably stood in the papyrus.

910. παρατικα: or παρατικι. For αυτης (i.e. αδησ: so MSS.) cf. 1174. ix. 20 and note.

There is a lacuna above the τ.

945. The papyrus is more likely to have had γιγορεω with ABM (Wecklein) than γιγορεων with LP (Murray), since there are already 23 letters lost in the space which is filled in ll. 946–8 by 21.

946. πετρουπινων: so M, Wecklein; πετρουμινων ABLPV, Murray.

1247 sqq. Paragraphs were not employed by the first hand, but Electra’s lines project beyond those of the chorus; the arrangement is right as far as l. 1259, but not from 1260–3. The subsequent insertion of paragraphi and of ἀλὼν ἡμιχρόμου against l. 1260 brings the papyrus into harmony with the MSS., which apparently assign ll. 1258–9 and 1260 to different μικροφα, 1261–2 to Electra (L gives 1261 to the chorus), 1263 to the chorus (so Wecklein); Wilamowitz, followed by Murray, assigns 1262 to the chorus. Paragraphi may be lost below ll. 1259, 1262, and 1263, but hardly below 1261.

1250. παρατικαν γιαρ: the MSS. apparently begin this line with γαρ, but the traces of the first letter suit π better than γ.

1305. The restoration, which follows the ordinary reading of the MSS., gives 27 letters in the lacuna, the corresponding space in l. 1297 being filled by 28, in 1298 and 1300–1 by 27. Since all the indications point to the lines in this column having begun evenly, unlike those in ll. 1247–63, it is improbable that before λαπταστορα the papyrus read ταυ which is inserted by l and adopted by edd., or εις which is inserted by B2; but there would be room for θ' before α, as desiderated by Hermann.

1334. τλημων: so MSS. There has certainly been a correction, affecting perhaps the first three letters. The τ above the line is large, and probably due to the corrector of l. 1342 and perhaps 511, who is different from the corrector of 897; cf. introd.

1335. αλλοσι τε αρι: so A (τε δρ'); αδισιον δρ' L, αδισιν αρ' B2, αδισισ τε αρ' P, αδισισιν γαρ ΜB, αδισιν τε αρ' Wecklein, αδισινι ταρ' Murray.

1337. και: so ABMP, edd.; om. L.

1340. αυ: Weil’s emendation is confirmed; αλλ MSS. and 1178, Wecklein, Murray.

1342. θ' (so MSS.) was corrected from ωθ apparently.

1346 sqq. Since this column presumably had 37 or 38 lines like the rest, and the next column begins at ll. 1369–73, the papyrus no doubt included 1366–8, which are generally rejected on the authority of the scholium stating that they were interpolated by the actors.

1370. If, as is probable, ll. 1370–1 began evenly, most or all the letters of πεφωγα, which is usually assigned to 1369, must have come in 1370. βαρβάρος ευμιρις is the reading of Α, followed by Wecklein; βαρβαρος κακι ευμιρις BLP (so Murray), βαρβαροιν εν ευμιριν Μ. The Etym. Magn. also read εις, but there is barely room for it in the papyrus unless πεφωγα may be read.

The scholium ειδος πυτοδιατος refers to ευμιριων. A longer note beginning ευμιρις ετθον πυτοδιατος σανδαλιδου, occurs in schol. BM.

1371. τερμα: so ALP; τερμα BMV, Wecklein, Murray. With the scholion on πασταδων cf. Hesych. παστας- ακος γεγραμμον. Schol. BM have πασταδων δι των κατακτων.

After an interval of three lines there are below the α of τερμα what may be traces of ink, possibly the termination of l. 1376 αιδηρ α[υ] or αιδηρ[α] αυ.
1371. Aristophanes, Clouds with Scholia.

10.6 x 12 cm. Fifth century. Plate VII (recto).

This fragment and the other pieces of Aristophanes in the present volume (1372-4 and 1402-3?) were discovered with 1369-70. Egypt has done little hitherto for the text of that poet, for none of the extant papyrus or vellum pieces is earlier than the late fourth century and nearly all are of slight value, the most interesting being the Hermopolis fragments of the Acharnians, Frogs, and Birds (Berliner Klassikertexte, v. 2, no. 18), which confirm six emendations but do not present a very correct text. 1371-4 together are somewhat more extensive than the Berlin fragments, with which they are probably contemporary, and exhibit much the same characteristics. That they belong to four different MSS. is not certain, the hands being very similar though not identical. The number of the page, which is preserved in the case of the Wasps (1374), indicates that that play stood probably seventh, and the four plays (Clouds, Frogs, Peace, Knights) represented in the other fragments may well have been among those which preceded the Wasps, as they do in the Codex Venetus (V) together with the Plutus and Birds. But since the text of 1374 differs from the rest in its marked support of V and the absence of corrections, and the number of lines in a column, so far as can be judged, varies considerably (37 in 1371, 39?-41 in 1372, 44 in 1373, 45-9 in 1374), while 1371 is distinguished by the presence of scholia, it is safer to regard the different hands as representing separate MSS. If any two of the four are to be combined, these would be 1373 and 1374, in both of which double dots are employed to mark a change of speaker.

1371 is the upper part of the first leaf of the Clouds, containing on the verso a few letters from the ends of ll. 1-11 and on the recto parts of ll. 38-48 in a good-sized, sloping uncial of the oval type. In the broad upper and right-hand margins of the verso are scholia on ll. 2-5 in a small uncial hand which is perhaps identical with that of the main text, and lower down is a gloss somewhat more cursorily written than the scholia, but possibly by the same scribe. In any case these notes, which are in brown ink like the main text, are probably contemporary with it. Whether the longer notes occurred in the later columns except at rare intervals, if at all, is doubtful. Since l. 1 coincides with the top of a column (cf. 1373 in which a new play begins near the bottom of a column), it is quite possible that the Clouds was the first play in this MS.; in the Ravennas (R) and V the Plutus stands first, the Clouds second; but, while this is the fourth fragment of the Clouds obtained from Egypt (cf. Reitzenstein, Hermes, xxxv. 604 sqq. and
Berl. Klassikert. v. 2, no. 18, 2–3), no fragment of the Plutus has yet been found in that country. On the recto there are glosses in the left-hand margin, but in black ink instead of brown and in a certainly different semi-uncial hand; the upper margin has some brief notes on l. 52 in somewhat lighter ink by a similar but apparently not identical hand, while the speaker's name added also in light black ink before l. 38 is due to yet a third annotator of this column. A correction of the order of words in l. 47 was made, probably later than the glosses in the left-hand margin, by the writer of the notes at the top or by the writer of the speaker's name, and the same person may well have been responsible for the accents and breathings as far as l. 38, those in ll. 39–48 being apparently due to the original scribe, who also inserted the elision-marks, paragraphi, and occasional stops (high and middle). The notes in the various semi-uncial hands can be assigned with confidence to the fifth century, to which the body of the text is also likely to belong. The scholia in 1402 are certainly in a different hand.

The fragment (Π) is too short to show the quality of the text. A variation in the order of words in l. 47 which has been rightly corrected does not inspire confidence in a more legitimate variation of a similar character in l. 43. The original scholia on ll. 3–5, unlike the third-century commentary on the Acharnians (866), closely resemble the extant scholia, of which the older portions are derived from Didymus and other Alexandrian grammarians. In the fragmentary scholia on the Knights (late fourth or fifth century) published by us in Mélanges Nicole, p. 214, the agreement with the extant scholia is less marked than here. In some places the readings of Π are superior, but in general schol. R and V are fuller. The later notes have little or no connexion with the extant scholia.

Verso.

(1. 5) οἵ δ οἰκεται ρεγκουσιν οὔτως οἱ Αττικοὶ διὰ τοῦ] ζὸν οἵκεται] [πάντας τοὺς Συκιῶν ἐκ τῆς [νομοθετίας] μεν οὐν οἱ] αλλ' αὐτοὶ δὲ αὐτοὺς μετὰ τοῦτο ἑπτάκεν [οικεται] [τοῖς] δεῖξιν πασί τοὐτοῖς εἰς φροτοῖς διὸν γιὰ τῶν μηδὲν φροτ[ι]χοτον το βαθεῖος καθεύδειν

[iou iou ]

[ω Ζεὺς βασιλεὺς τὸ χρημα τῶν νυκτῶν διὸν]

[απεραντον υδεπόθ ημέρα γενησται]

[καὶ μὴν παλαι γ ἀλεκτρυνοῖς] ήκουσ' εγώ

[οἵ δ οἰκεται ρεγκουσιν αλλ' οὐκ αὐν πρό] τοῦ

[ἀπολοίο δὴ τὸν πολεμεί πολλὴν οὐνεκα]
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[ot oude kolais exestai mou tous oiketas]
[all ouv o xepastos ooutosi neanias]
[eugeiretas tis nuktos alla perdeita]
10 [en pente siturais egkekordulmenos]
[all ei dokei regymen egkeikalymenoi]

Διαγραμματικά

Plate VII.

(l. 52) / λαφι(γημο) ηε(ηε) τρυφες η κενεσες χρηματον: Κωλ(ιαδος) ναος εοικος καλοις!

2. The marginal note (ll. 1–8) on Zev batulei agrees nearly verbally with schol. RVα Ald., which have in l. 1 ρφγει for απλεω, l. 5 καταλωσι (rightly) for καταλυσαι, l. 8 τατης ἐχεσα for εχεσα τατης. V also has in l. 1 νειμιζῃν τοιτο for τ. νομ., Ald. in l. 2 των ηυμην εφεκατον for ἀρ. τ. πτ., omitting to ο νει Zev batulei in l. 3 and και σεβεων in l. 6, Θ Ald. Πεδοχριστον for Πεδοχριστον 4. R omits μεν in l. 5, and RV at the end have an additional sentence with a quotation from Homer.

3. With the marginal note (ll. 9–11) on ουδεποθ' ἡμερα γενησται cf. schol. V τουτο και ουραμονον δυνατα λεγεν, where ουραμονον is shown by Π to be an error for ορυγζομονον.

5. The note in the upper margin upon οi δ' οικται ρεγκουνιν corresponds closely to the extant scholia, Ald. having οιται Απτικε δια του κ (οιται . . . κ om. RVε), οικται de των (των οικται RVε) oδ των δεραποντα μονον (om. V) λεγει αλλα παιτα τους κατα την οκιαν καθεδουν των παιτα (καθεδουν ναι, φρονη ιε, καθεδουν ιε) των άλλων μεν (om. RV) ιμεραςτας αυτον δε φρονιστοντα αυτον δε φρονιστον (om. RV) των γαρ βασιλεω καθεδουντων μοι τωι ιτο (om. R) το μεγεν (των de μηδεν φρονιστον το βασιλειο καθεδειν add. V and, with κανοιον for καθεδειν, R). Π may have lost another line at the top, in which case the
beginning was different; but if the size of the lacuna in ll. 2–4 is correctly estimated, the opening sentence of schol. Ald. just fits the gap in l. 1. If l. 4 is to harmonize with schol. RV, about 30 letters must be added on to each line, for which there is hardly room, and which are not required in l. 2. π seems to have omitted the first half of this sentence, just as schol. Ald. has omitted the second half. In ll. 2–3 π seems to be somewhat shorter than the extant scholia, which in both R and V are corrupt. The use of ἐπήγαγεν in Ald. for εἶπεν in RV affords another point of contact with π.

10. κατακεκαλυμμένος in the margin is a gloss on ἐγκεκαλυμμένοι. Schol. V has a long note which is partly found in R, explaining the word as ἐγκεκαλυμμένοι καὶ συνεστραμμένοι.

38. Above the paragraphus over ἄσων something was written by the first hand which looks more like a cross than a stroke through it, or ψ. If it is more than a false start, it may be a critical mark. That it is a number referring to the page or quire is improbable.

39. δ' ὀν: so RVAG, &c., edd.; μεν ὀν or ὀν other MSS.

40. ε': so R, edd.; εις V.

41. καθ' εαυτόν λέγει refers to φιεύ; cf. schol. V ἑιε τὸ φιεύ and Ald. τὸ δὲ φιεύ ἱδιῶς. The ε of εἰδ' has been corrected by the first hand, probably from δ. ὀδήλ' is misspelled ὀδήλ' by R. η that had an accent as well as a breathing is not certain.

43. θύσιος αγροκος: αγροκος βδιος MSS., edd.; Naber conjectured ἀγρ. ήσυχας.

The order in π does not appear to have been corrected (cf. l. 47) and may be right; but under the accent over η is in similar ink a short horizontal stroke which is difficult to account for, being unlike a breathing or letter. Perhaps another circumflex (cf. the preceding η) was partly written by mistake.

44. The marginal μνερατος probably refers to ευρωτίων rather than to αἰκηρητος. The scholia in a fuller note explain ευρωτίων by εἰκή κείμενος, ἀκόρητος by ἀκολούθωτος.

45. π[.ν]θων refers to βριων: cf. schol. R (not in V) αδξων και τεθλωσ. Suidas s. v. ακόρητος adds και πληξίνων, schol. θ has θιλιων.

47. την θυγατρα του αδελφου refers to αδελφιδων. Schol. θ has του αδελφου αυτου θυγατρα. The MSS. all have αδελφιδων αγροκος δω, agreeing with the corrector, and the reading of the first hand, which separates αδελφιδου from Μεγακλεως του Μ. and gives no caesura, is a mere error; cf. l. 43, note. Above the α of α[δ]ελφιδων is what may be a grave accent, but these are not employed elsewhere in the papyrus, and the stroke, which is very short, may be accidental.

48. The marginal note no doubt referred to σεμνων or εγκεκαλυμμουνη, which are both commented upon in RV.

52. The note in the upper margin refers to this line δαπανης, λαφυμοα, κολλαδος, Γενετελιος. It is corrected by a critical mark which may have been repeated in the main text. τ of τη(η) has a stroke through it like that through the φ of λαφ(υμοα) and λ of Γενετελ(ιος). The form κεινης for κεινως is not known (κεινως occurs in Pindar), and is probably a mere misspelling like Γενετελ(ιος) in the next line, which, moreover, may well have contained the word γενεκος. With the explanation of λαφυμοα as τη(η) τρυπης και κεινως χρηματων cf. schol. V αδηφαγιας και πολυτελειας τουτεστε εκδηδημησης πολυτελει τροπης λαφυμοα γαρ λεγει το απληστος εαθεκν, schol. Ald. της περι τα έθεσμα πολυτελειας τουτεστε ανοιαξα, λαφυμοα γαρ κτλ., adding quotations from Eupolis and Homer, schol. R αδηφαγιας και της προς τα έθεσμα πολυτελειας. In view of the scholium in π, τροπη in schol. V is probably corrupt for τρυπη: cf. τρυπη και πολυτελεια in Xen. Memor. ι. 6. 10 and schol. Brunck s. v. καταγλυκωματων (l. 51) εικοτος δε ταυτα καταλεγει δεικνυς δι' αι γεγενεις γυναικεις υπο της λιαν τρυπης ταυτα πραττοντοι. Π, unlike schol. R Ald., explains λαφυμοα as waste of money, not glutony, and the first part of the note in schol. V may have meant the same, for αδηφαγια, like λαφυμοα, is used in both senses.
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Kωλ(ιδος) ναός ευκως κωλως: cf. schol. V Κωλοι ναός τῆς Λυκροδιτής οὔτω καλομένους, απὸ τοῦ συμβεβηκότος τὴν προσφυγομάν λαβὼν' ναινάς γὰρ ... Κωλιας δὲ ἐκλήθη ὅτι θύσιος τοῦ ιερῶς ιερείων κωλῆς ιερᾶς ἥμπασεν καὶ ἐπέκειτα (I. εἰ ἑκέιῳ φαβ. Suidas) τῷ τόπῳ ἐπικαθίσθη. Schol. R is nearly identical, but in place of the last sentence adds Κωλιάδα δὲ προσηφόρειν τὸν κύκλων ἀπὸ τῶν κώλων ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς κατηπονίτο. Schol. Ald. has οἱ μὲν Κωλιάδα τὴν θεῶν καλούσιν νεανίου Ἀττικοῦ ἀνδράντος ... οἱ δὲ τόπον οὐκοίτη κώλως ἀνδρός, ἐνθα ἡ θεῶς τιμάτα. Whether Π had ευκως κωλος after ναος (or τοπος) is uncertain, but in any case the interpretation given by οἱ δὲ in Schol. Ald. seems to be meant.


1372. ARISTOPHANES, Frogs.

Fr. 3 10-8 x 9-4 cm. Fifth century.

These four fragments of two leaves from a codex of the Frogs were found with 1371 and 1373-4, with which they are probably contemporary though certainly in a different hand and probably from a different MS.; cf. 1371. introd. The script, like that of 1373, is more compact than that of 1371 and 1374, and is also distinguished by its form of λ which is often large and almost cursive. Parts of fifty-five lines are preserved from the early and middle portions of the play. Iota adscript is sometimes written. A correction in l. 855 is by a different hand which used black ink, and to the same person are probably due the occasional accents (in Fr. I only) and stops. All three kinds of points are employed, but not very accurately, since the middle point is used instead of the high at the end of l. 44 where there is a change of speaker. Marks of elision and diaereses are due to the first hand.

The text, like that of the Berlin fragments of this play (cf. 1371. introd.), is of slight interest, but tends on the whole to support the most ancient MS., R (tenth century). Agreements with R against V, &c., are found in ll. 847 (?), 852, 853, and 893, and with RV and the Ambrosianus (M) against the Urbinas (U) in ll. 857 and 891, while V, &c., are supported against R in ll. 890 and 894. Mistakes occur in ll. 887 and 890, and very probably in ll. 879, 891, and 892, as well as in ll. 888 and 897, where the MSS. too are corrupt and the error is now traced back to the fifth century.

Fr. I.

... Recto.

44 [ὡ δαιμονε προσελθε δεομαι γαρ τι] σου.
45 [αλλ ουχ οιος τ ειμ αποσοβηναι τον γελων]
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[ὅρον λειτύρν ἐπὶ κροκωτῶι κειμένην
τίς ὁ νους τί κοθόρνος καὶ ρώπαλον ἤμυνθετήν
[ποι γης ἀπεδήμεις ἐπέβατεν Κλεισίθενει
[καναμαχήσας καὶ κατεδυσαμεὶς γε [ναυς
50 [τὼν πολεμίων η δωδεκ' ἡ [τριτσκάθεκα

Verso.

85 [ποι γης] ἡ τριτη[ων ε]ς μακαρων εὐωχιαν
[ὅ δε Ἐξομοσίες [ἐξολοιτο νη Δια
[Πυθαγ]γελος δὲ τερι εμου δ ουδεις λογος
[ἐπιτρ]βομενον [τον] ὁμον ουτωσι σφοδρα
[ουκ]ομιν ετερ εστ εν[ταυθα μειρακυλλα
90 [τραγ]οδιας ποιούντα πλευ η μουρια
[Ἐυριπὶ]δου [π]λευ η [σταδιω λαλιστερα

Frs. 2-4.

Verso.

840 [ἀληθες ο παι της αρουραιας θεου]
[οι δη με ταυτ ο στρωμυλισσυλλεκτα]δη
[και πτωχοποιε και ρακιοσυρραπτα]δη
[αλλ ου τι χαιρον αυτ ερεις παι Διοιχυλε
[και μη προς οργην σπλαγχνα θερμηνης κοτω
845 [οι δητα πριν γ αν τουτον αποφηνω σαφως]
[τον χωλοποιον οιος ον θρασυνεται]
[αρν αρη μελανα] παιδες ε[ξενεγκατη]
[Τυφως γαρ εκβαινειν παιρασκεναζεται]
[ω Κρητικας μεν συνλεγον μυοδιας
850 [γαμους δ ανοσιους] εισφερον εις την τεχνην
[επισχεσ ουτος ο πολυτιμητ] Αι[σχυλε]
[απο των χαλαζων δ] ο πονηρ Ευριπιδη
αναγιε σεαιτον εκποδιου ει σωφρονεις
ινα μη κεφαλαιω την κροταφον σου ρηματι
855 θενοὺς υπ' ὁργὴς εκχεῖ τῷ Ἡλεφ[[ο]]ν·
[σύ δὲ μὴ πρὸς ὁργὴν Δισχυλ αλλὰ πρασονω
[ἐλεγχ ἐλεγχοῦ λοιδορεῖσθαι [ὁ οὐ πρε]πει
[ἀνδράς ποιήσας] ὡσπερ ἀρτοπομίδας·
[σὺ δὲ εὐθὺς ὡσπερ πρέπουσ εἰ[π]ρη[σ]θεὶς θο[αι]
860 [ετοιμὸς εἰμι εὐγογε κοικ αναδυομαι]
[δακνεῖν δακνεῖσθαι προτερος εἰ τοῦτοι δοκεῖ.

Recto.

879 εἴλθετ επη[. . . . . .] δυναμῖν
880 δεινοτατε[ν]ν στοματων πορισασθαι
ρηματα καλὶ παραπρισματ επων

ννν γ[αρ] ἀγων σοφιας οδε μεγας
[χορει προς εργον ηδη]
885 [ευχεσθε δη] και [σφω τι πριν ταπη λεγειν]
[Ἀνῆρητερ η θρ[εψασα] τὴν εμην φρενα]
[ειναι με των [σων αξιον] μαρτη[ς]ων]
[επ[θε]ς και συ δη λιβαν[ωτων] λαβ[ων]
[ετεροι] γαρ εισιν οις ευχομαι[ι] θεοις
890 [ειδοι τι]νες οι κομμα [κα]ινον και μαλα
[ειδι δη προσευξου τι.] τησιν [διωταις θεοις]
895 [.] [.] ἁθηρ [κα]ινον βοσκημα και γλωσθης στροφιγης
cαι ἔννεπος και μυκτηρες οσφραντηριον
ορθως μ ελεγχειν ον ον απτ[(ω]μαι λογουν
900 και μην η[με]ις επιθυμουμεν
παρα σοφιον ανδρον ακουσαι τινα λογουν
γλωσθα μεν γαρ ηγισται[
νημα δ ουκ ατολμον αμφιον ουδ ακινητοι φρενες
προσ[δοκαν] ουν ε[ι]κος ἔστι
του [δ] ανασπωντ αυτοπρεμονος
87. The doubtful τ of σ[σ]μ might be a low stop by the first hand.
846. A high stop may have been lost at the end of the line.
847. Before the final ε of [ενογκατ]ε everything is very uncertain, but considerations of space make it probable that Π had μελων with VUAM, &c.
848. παρασχευματίου or -τιον can be read; -τιον MSS., edd.; but cf. l. 892.
851. Ἀ[σ]χολε, or, possibly, Ἀ[σ]χολε; if the upper dot is not part of the ε; but there is no change of speaker.
852. δι: so R, edd.; τ’ Μ, om. VUA. That Π did not omit a conjunction is practically certain, for even with δ or τ there are only 15 letters in the space occupied by 18 in l. 851 and by 16 in l. 853.
853. αναφέρει: so R and most edd.; ἀπαγε VUAM, &c.
855. θενω: so RVUM and most MSS. (θενω) and edd. (θενώ); but θε[σ]ω[ν] (Α and a few other MSS.) is possible.
857. πρέπει: so RVAM, H-G; θέμις U, &c., Velsen.
861. τοῦτω: or, less probably, τοῦτοι.
879. εἰπ. . . . . . . : εἰπο[φ]ομεναι (so MSS. except R είπ’ δ’[φ]ομεναι) cannot be read, nor apparently εἰπο[φ]ομεναι or εἰπ.ī. The arrangement of ll. 879-902 corresponds to that in RV, from which UAM differ.
881. ἔμμαι (so MSS., Blaydes, H-G) has been altered by many editors (πρέμινα τε Velsen following Kock).
882. οɗ (restored from the MSS.) is generally altered to δ by editors, following Hermann.
887. μαρτηριῶν (i.e. μαρτηριῶν) is a mistake for μοντηριῶν.
888. και συ δι λαβαρ[ωτον] λαβων: so Suidas (ομ. λαβων); και δι συ λαβων και συ λαβων. RVAM, &c., H-G; a few MSS. have και συ λαβων και συ λαβων και συ λαβων. Π’s order lends some support to Fritzsche’s λαβων και συ δι λαβων, which is adopted by Velsen.
890. τινες οι: οι is a mistake for ου, the reading of VUA, edd.; τινες σου R, τινες σοι και Μ.
891. δη: so RVM, Velsen, H-G; νῦν UA Ald. After προσεχον Π has three letters which are absent in the MSS. Possibly the scribe wrote τρ[φ]οσκεν [δι]ος (διος occurred in l. 890) for τινας διωτας. Only one dot is visible above the supposed ι.
892. αισφρ έμων is the reading of the MSS., but besides αισφρ originally for έμων the scribe wrote four (perhaps only three) superfluous letters at the beginning of the line. Of these all that is left is the bottom of a vertical stroke which would suit γ, η, ι, κ, λ, π, or τ, and may have been the initial letter. It is not certain that there was any writing at all between the doubtful ι and θρ.
893. έφεκτι: so R, edd.; έφεκτον VUAM.
894. αν σπ[ν]ωμαι: so VUAM, edd.; σπομαι R.
897. εμ[τ]ε[ν]αι επαι: εμφέλειαν ἐπιτε RVUA, Velsen, H-G, εμ. επι τε Μ, Bekker. In the corresponding passage of the antistrope (l. 994) the MSS. omit the word or words answering either to εμφέλειαν or to εκπτε δαι, and Dindorf wished to omit εμφέλειαν here. ἐπιτε δαιαν ὀδον is not very satisfactory and was not the reading of the first hand of Π, who wrote επαι before δαι[ α] [ ] ; but only the bottoms of the letters α[α] remain, and there may have been a correction.
902. The ο of τον seems to have been corrected.
1873. ARISTOPHANES, Peace and Knights.

Fr. i 8·5 x 17·3 cm. Fifth century.

The larger of these two fragments found with 1869–72 and 1874 (cf. 1871, introd.) is the upper portion of a leaf containing on the verso ten lines from the concluding scene of the Peace, and on the recto ten lines from the opening scene of the Knights, the text of which began five lines before the end of the column on the verso. The order of the plays was thus different from both that in R, where the Knights and Peace stand fifth and sixth, and that in V, where the Knights, Birds, and Peace occupy the fourth, fifth, and sixth places. Illegible traces of what may have been the number of the page occur on the verso. The smaller fragment, which belongs to a much later scene of the Knights, is not quite certainly in the same hand as the other, for the letters are more spaced out, as in 1871 and 1874, while in the larger fragment the writing tends to be compact. The hand of 1874 is, however, distinctly larger, and on the whole it is probable that both fragments of the Knights belong to the same MS. The only stops found are double dots indicating a change of speaker. These are generally by the first hand where the change takes place in the middle of a line. Where double dots occur at the ends of lines (Peace 1328 and 1331), these are due to a corrector, who used darker ink and was also responsible in the Peace for the insertion of the missing syllable at the end of l. 1326 in a large cursive hand, the paragraphus after l. 1328, and the deletion of the repetition of l. 1329. The corrections in ll. 6, 7, and 9 of the Knights together with the paragraphi are also due to a corrector, but not certainly the same. A solitary (wrong) accent in l. 1334 of the Peace and a few other corrections are probably by the first hand, as are certainly the marks of elision and diaereses.

Of the Knights the only other papyrus fragment is one from Hermopolis containing parts of ll. 37–46 and 86–95 with scholia (late fourth or fifth century), edited by us in Mélanges Nicole, pp. 212–17, while the Peace has not hitherto been represented on papyrus; but 1873 (II) is too short to be of much value. The text is carelessly written and the corrector not very observant, as is shown by e.g. l. 11 of the Knights; but some errors of R are avoided. R is supported against V three times (Knights 7, 14, and 1058), V against R twice (Knights 8, 15). A small correction of the MSS. by Blaydes in Knights 1017 is confirmed, and perhaps another by Brunck in 1058.
Peace.

Fr. 1.

Verso.

1326 καὶ τὰ γαθὰ παντα οὐσα απολέσασμεν
συλλε[εια]βαι παλιν εξ αρχῆς
ληψαί τ [αιθονα σιδηρον :

1329 δευρο ω [γ]υναι εις αγρον
[[δευρο ω γυναι εις αγρον]]

1330 χοπος μετ εμον καλη
καλως κ'ατακει[σ]ει :

1332 η[ημην] υπερασι ω

1334 [ω τρησμακάρω δικαι

1335 [ως ταγαθα] μνυ [εχ]εις

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

1326. παντα ουσα απολέσαμεν : πάνθ' ὀπ' απολέσαμεν MSS. Above ουσα a there seem to be some traces of ink along the edge of the papyrus, i.e. a page number.

1327. At the end of the line there is a smudge made by the corrector.

1328. τ: so RV, &c. (B' C Ald.); but there is no sign of a cross-bar and the letter is rather close to the preceding ι, so that perhaps γ was written by mistake. The paraphrased inserted below this line by the corrector and the double dots here and in l. 1331 make Π correspond up to that point with RV, which assign l. 1316-28 to the chorus, 1329-31 to Trygaeus, 1332 to a ήμιχρον, and 1334 to another ήμιχ., omitting l. 1333 which was a repetition of l. 1332. Editors arrange and emend l. 1329 sqq. in a variety of ways. The division of ll. 1332-5 in Π agrees with that in R, V combining 1334 with 1332 and 1336 with 1335.

1329. The repetition of this line, which is found only once in the MSS., was deleted by the corrector. Two instances of a similar repetition occur in ll. 1339-42 (τι δράομεν αὕτην and τρυγήσαμεν αὕτην), which are divided by V between two ήμιχρον, like the repetitions of ἦμιχρ ἦμιναι ὑδ. in ll. 1336, 1346, 1351, and 1361. Dawes rejected ll. 1339-42, concerning which schol. V remarks ἐν τοις οὐ δέχεται. But although the repetition of l. 1329 is no doubt wrong, it supports the view that ll. 1339-42 were found in Π, as well as the three concluding lines which stand in RV but are absent in many MSS. After the 10 extant lines of the Peace there is just room for 25 more lines (ll. 1336-end) arranged as in R (V combines them into 14), besides the first 5 lines of the Knights (cf. Fr. 1 recto); for since the normal column probably contained about 44 lines (cf. Fr. 2), there would still be a space equal to 4 lines available for the title.

1330. ὑπέρασι ω: for the absence of elision cf. l. 1326, but the papyrus is much damaged at the end of this line, and ὑπέρασι ω (so RV) or υπέρασι is possible.

1334-5. δικαίωσι: l. ως δικ. with MSS. ω is due to the two preceding instances of ω.
Knights.

Fr. 1.

Recto.

6 κακιστα δηθ' ουτος γε πρωτος Παφλο[γον]ον
   αυταις διαβολαις : ω κακοδαιμον ποις εξεις
   κακος καθαπερ συ : δευρο νυν προσε[λ]θ' ινα
   ξυναυλιαν κλαυσωμεν Ουλυμπον ν[ο][μο][3]
10 μμη μμη μμη μμη μμη μμη 
   τι κρυφομεθ' αλλως νκ εχρην δητευν τι[ν]α
   σοτηριαν νων αλλα μη κλαιν ετι
   τι [ο]μη γενοι' αν λεγε συ : συ μεν ουν μιου λεγε
   ινα μη μαχωμαι : μα τον Απολλω γαρ [μεν ου

Verso.

1057 [αλλ ουκ αν μαχεσα]με [χεσατο γαρ ει μαχεσαι]
   [αλλα τοιε φρασα]γαι προ[πο] Πυλον Πυλον ην σοι εφραζεν
   [εστι Πυλοο προ]ο Πυλοο : [τι τουτο λεγει προ Πυλοο
1060 [τας πνευμον φ]ο[λ]ημιν καταπησεο]θ εν βαλανεω
   [ εγω] δ' αλ[λα]ουτος τημερον γενησομαι
   [ ουτος γα]ρ ημιων τας πνευμον αφηρπασεν

6. The ο of Παφλο[γον]ον seems to have been altered by the corrector from o of the first hand. -ων MSS.
7. *autar: so RP Ald., edd.; αὐτάριον VARE. The first hand wrote διαζεύλοισι by mistake, a reminiscence of *autar* βαυλίσιν in l. 3; the corrector altered the final ε into two dots marking a change of speaker. The ε of *tēs* seems to have been rewritten by the first hand in order to make it larger, in harmony with the other enlarged letters at the ends of lines.

8. *νυ: so V (νυν), A, &c. (νυν); δή R Vat.†, Zacher, H-G.

9. The MSS. have *νομαρ* with the corrector (so edd.), but Eustathius read *νόμαρ* It is not quite certain that the first hand wrote *ν[α]*μωρ, but the final letter is not ν, ω, or ι.

10. *κρινομεθ: l. κρινομεθ with ΑΓΘ; κρινομεθ* RP, κρινομεθ* V. The ε of *νυ* (l. 15) is badly written, being almost like η. *τιρνη, if that was the reading, must have been rather cramped.

12. *νων: so ῬΠΜΑ; νων VA, νων R Vat.

13. *τι [ο]νυ: τίς ονι RV with the other MSS. according to Blaydes and Zacher. Bekker has put τι ονι, apparently by a misprint. The traces do not suit τι[ο]νυ, and there is not room for τι[ο]νυ, but τι may well be a repetition from l. 11. It agrees with RV, &c., in having no change of speaker after γένοι. Most editors make a change and rearrange ll. 13-16.


15. *[αλλ]: so VA, &c., edd.; om. R. Editors, following Sauppe, generally invert the order of ll. 15-16; cf. l. 13, note.

1017. *ἐκέλευ: ἐκέλευ* RV, &c., edd., ἐκέλευσεν ΑΘ. Blaydes had conjectured ἐκέλευ', comparing the imperfect ἐφραζέν in ll. 1042, 1048, and 1058. The ν is not absolutely certain, but ἐκέλευ' or ἐκέλευσεν cannot be read. In l. 1049 the MSS. vary between ἐκέλευ and ἐκέλευσε.

1058. *φρασάει: so most edd., following Brunck; φράσαε RΠΜ, φράξεν VΑΘ, &c.

The σ is somewhat smaller than would be expected, and there may have been a correction. The letter comes above the π of πυλω, but the other σ may have been omitted, at any rate originally.

1060. *φρασίον: σοι MSS., φράσι εdd. The letter before ησιν was certainly not φ, but seems to have been deleted by the first hand, so that φράσι was probably meant.

1061. The deletion of the superfluous λ is apparently due to the first hand.

1062. This verse was rejected by Zacher.

1874. ARISTOPHANES, *Wasps*.

Fr. 1 17-7 X 12-8 cm. Fifth century.

Of the various fragments of Aristophanes found with 1369-70 (cf. 1371. introd.) those of the *Wasps* are much the longest, portions of four leaves with more than 150 lines from the middle of the play being preserved. The script resembles that of 1371 and 1373. Fr. 2, but is larger and more irregular. There are no corrections except one in l. 609 made by the scribe himself, and, save for occasional double dots to indicate a change of speaker, no stops; but apostrophes to mark elision, &c., besides diaereses and paragrapli, occur. The page-numbers 19[5] and 196 are found on Fr. 1. No column is completely preserved, but Col. i had forty-five lines if ll. 475-6 were arranged, as is probable, like L
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II. 486-7, and Col. ii may have had the same number, while inCols. iii–iv the number increases to forty-seven or forty-eight. The next leaf is lost, and since Col. vii is for the most part lyric there is some uncertainty concerning the division of lines, which seem to have exceeded forty-six. In the last three columns a slight increase is discernible, Col. ix at any rate having apparently forty-nine lines. The leaf containing Cols. ix and x (pp. 203–4) was turned so that the recto came first, whereas the verso would be expected to occupy this position and correspond to the verso in Col. vii. Since approximately 9,200 lines have to be accounted for before Col. i, the _Wasps_ is likely to have been the seventh play in this MS., as in V; cf. 1373. introd. In R it stood ninth, between the _Acharnians_ and _Thesmophoriazusae_.

The text contains, as is usual in Byzantine literary fragments, a number of scribe's errors, but has several points of interest. The _Wasps_, like the _Knights_, is one of the plays in which _V_ tends to disagree most with _R_, and the papyrus (II), unlike 1372, strongly supports the former (cf. II. 449, 456, 506-7, 511, 568, 570, 573, 613, 621, 749, 790, and 8c67), except where _V_ has made an obvious mistake (II. 571, 6c8, 756, 796, 825-6, 865, and 875), and in I. 612? As compared with _R_, _V_ in this play seems to be distinctly superior. A slight correction of the MSS. in I. 576 by Brunck on metrical grounds and probably another in I. 790 by Bergk are verified, but in II. 452, 487, 749, 795, 802, 808, and 816 traditional readings which have been suspected are confirmed. New readings also occur in II. 499 and 795.

The small fragment 1403 seems to be in the same hand as 1374, and its colour suggests that it belongs to Fr. i, but we have not succeeded in identifying it.

Fr. i verso. Col. i.

443 [πρ]ρος βιαν χειρονευ [ουδεν των παλαι μεμιμημενοι δε[ι]φθερω[ν καιωμιδων ας ουτος αυτοις ημπολα
445 και κηνας και τους ποδας χειμωνος οντος ωφελει ωστε μη ριγων γ εκαστοτ αλλα τουτοις γ ουκ ενι ουδ' εν [οφθαλμοσιν αιδως των παλαιαν εμβαδων
ουκ αφησεις ουδε νυν μω κακιστον θηριον ουδ' ανημυσθεις οδ ευρων τους βοτρυς κλεπτοντα σε
450 [πρ]οσαγα[γων προς την ελασαν εξεδειρ εν κανδρικος [ωστε σε ση]ηλωτον ειναι συ δυ αχαριστος ηνθ αρα
αλλ' ανεις με και συ και συ πριν των ιουν εκδραμειν
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αλλα τουτο[ν] μεν [ταχ ημιν δωσετον καλην δικην
ουκετ' εις μακραν [ιν ειδήθ οίος εστ ανθρων τροπος
455 οξυθυμων και δικαιων και βλεποντων καρδαμα
πατε πατ' ὁ Σανθια τινος σφηκας απο της σκιασ
αλλα δρω[ν] τουτ' αλ[α και συ τυφε πολλω το κατινω
ουχι σονυ[θ] ουκ εις [κορακας ουκ απιτε πατε τω δυλω
και συ [προσθε]ις Δισχιυς ευτυφε τον Σελλαρτιου
460 αρ' εμε[β]λομεν [ποθ υμας αποσοβησειν τω χρονω
αλλα μα Δη' ου ρα[δι]ωσ ουτως αν αυτους διεφυγες
462 ειτερ εστυχον η[ων] μελεων των Φιλοκλεους

βεβηρωκοτες
463 ἀρα [ὅτι ουκ αυτα δήλα
tους [πενησιν η τυραννις
465 ως λαθρα γ ηλανθαν υπιουσα με]
ει συ γ ο πονω πονηρε και κομηταμινια
η[ων] νομων ημας απειργεις ων εθηκεν η πολις

Fr. 1 recto.  Col. ii.

ρψι
486 [ ομυδε ποτε γ' ουχ εως [     ]
[ αν] τι μον λοιπον ηι
487 [ οστις ημων] επι τυρ[αννι]ς εσταλης
[ως απανθ υμιν τυραννις εστι κ'αι ξυνωμοται
[ην τε μειζων ην τ ελαττων πραγμα τις κατηγορη
490 [ης εγο ουκ ηκουσα τωνιμι ουδε πενηκουν] ετων
[ινν] δε πολλων του ταριχους εστιν] αξιωτερα
[οστε και δη τουνω αυτης εφ] αγοραι κυλινδεται
[ην μεν ουται τις ορφος μεμ]βραδας δε μη θελη
[ευθεως ειρην ω το πολων τη]ς τως μεμβραδας
495 [ουτος ουφωνειν εοιχ ανθρωπος] επι τυραννιδη
[ην δε γητειον προσατη τας α]βινυ ηνυμα τι
[η λαχανοπωλεις φησιν] παραβλεψεσα βατερω
[ειπε μοι γητειοιν αιτε]ις ποτερον επι τυραννιδη
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500 [καμε γη πορνη χθεψ εισελθούντα της μεσημβρίας
[οτι κελητσαι κελευνοι] εξαντι[θ]ημ[η]εσα μου
[ηρετ ει την Ιππιου καθιστήματι] τυραννίδα;
[ταυτα γαρ τουτοις ακούειν ηδε ει] και νυν εγω
[του τατερ στη βουλομαι] τουτων] απαλλακθεντα των

505 [ορθοφοίτοσυνοφαντοδικό]ταλαμωρον τροπων
[ξην βιον γενναίων ωσπερ Μορυξος] αιτιαν εχω
[ταυτα δραν ξυνωμοτησ] αν και φρονιον τυραννικα
[νη Δι εν δικιη γεγον αρ γεριν ο[νθ]ων γ]αλα
[αντι του βιου λαβομεν αν αυ] με νυν αποστηρησ

510 [ουδε χαιρο βατισιν ουδ εγκελεσιν αλλη] διησπαν
[δικιδιον σιμερον φαγοιμ αν εν λαπαδι] πεπιγιμενον
[νη Δι ειδισθης γαρ ηδεσαι τοιοτοις πραγμασιν]
[αλλα ειν σιγων ανασχη και μαθης αγω λεγη]ω [...

Fr. 2 recto. Col. iii.

558 ας εμ [ουδ ειν ζωντ ηδειν ει μη δια την προτεραν αποφυξιν
τουτι περι των αντιβολουντων εστω το μημοσυνον μου

560 ει γ' εισελθον αντιβοληθεις και την οργην απομορθεις

565 κακο προς τοις ουσιν εος αμυων αν ισωσι τοισιν εμοιασιν
οι δε λεγουτι μυθους ημιν οι δ Αι[σωτου τι γελοιον
οι δε σκω]πτουσι ιν εγω γελασω και [τον θυμον καταθωμαι
καν μη το]υνοι αναπεθυμομεθα τα παιδαι ευθω ανελκει
τας θηλα[εις και τους ζησεις της] χειρος εγω δ ακροομαι

570 τα δε στιγμηθειν αποβληται κατειχο πατηρ υπερ αυτων
ωσπερ θεον αντιβολει με τρε]μους της ευθυνη ιν απολυσιαι
ει μεν χα[λ]ρι]ς αμι]νος φωνη [παιδεις φωνην ελευςαι
Fr. 2 verso.

607 [ασπαζόνται δια ταργυρίων καὶ πρωτα] μεν η [θυγατηρ] μεν
[απονήσι καὶ τω ποδ αλείφη καὶ προσκνύσασα φιλήση]

[καὶ παππίζοντο αμα τη γλώσση το] τριώμολον κκαλαματα

610 [καὶ το γυναιον μ υποθωπνευαν] φυστην μαζαν πρ[ό]σενεγκη
[κατειτα καθεζόμενη] παρ εμιο προσαναγκαζη φαγε τουτε
[εντραγε τουτε τοισιν εγω γα[ν]μα[ι καὶ μη με δησησ]
[ες σε βλεψαι και τον ταμιαν οποτ' αριστον παραθήσει]
[καταρασαμενος καὶ τονθορυσας αλλ' ην μη μοι ταχυ μαζη]

615 [ταδε κεκτημαι προβλημα κακων σκευην βελ]εων αλεωρην
[καν οινον μοι μη γχ]ης συ πιευ τον ονον το[νδ'] εσκεκομισμαι
[οινου μεστων κατ εγχ]κομαι κλινας ουτοις δ]ε κεχηρως
[βρομησαμενος του σοι]ν δινου μεγα διοι στρα[τιου]ν καταπαρδεν

619-20 [αρ ου μεγαλην αρχην αρ]χω και τη[ου] Διους φυβ]δεν ελαστ[ω

621 [οοοτις ακουο τονθ'] απερ ο [Ζε]υς
[ην γι]ουν ημεις θο]ρουβηςωμεν
[οιον βρονται το] δεικαστηριον

625 [ω Ζε]υς βασι[λε]υν
[κα]π ρα[τρα]ψομ ποππιζουσιν

Fr. 3 recto.

746 [α σου κελευντοις ουκ επ]ειδητο
747 [νυν δ ισως τοισι] φοις
[λογοι πειθέται]

[καὶ σωφρονεῖ μὲντοι μεθί]
[στασ εῖ τὸ λόγουν τῇ τροπον]
[πειθόμενος τῆς σοι]

[ιὸ μου μοι]

ουτος τι βοας

[μη μοι]

tοτουν μηδεν υπισχ(νου]

κεινων εραμαι κειδι γενομαι

ίν ο κηρυξ φησις τις απηψιμ

στος ανυστασθω [καπισταιην ετι τοις κηροις]

755

ψηφισκε[θνων ο τελευταίος]

σπευδ' ο [ψυχη του μοι ψυχη]

παρε [ω σκιερα μα τον Ηρακλεα]

μη νυν ετ εγω ν τουι δικασταις]

κλεπτοντα Κλεωνα λαβομι

760

[iθ ο π]ατπερ προς των θεων εμοι πιθου

. . . . . . . . . .

Fr. 3 verso. Col. viii.

790 [καπειτ] ερεθ[ηκε τρεις λοπιδας μοι καστρων]

[καγ]ον νεκαψ ὀβ[ολους γαρ ωομην λαβειν]

[κατα βδελυχθεις σφρομενος εξεπτυσα]

[καθ] ειλκον αυτον ο δε τι προς ταυτ ειφ ο τι]

[αλεκτρονων] μ [εφαισε] και οιλιαν εχειν

795 [ταχ]υ γον καθεψεις γ' αργυριον η δ ος λεγων]

[ορας ος]ν και τουτο δητα [κεφανεις]

[ον παυν] 

τι μικρον αλλ' στερ μελλεις ποιει]

[αναμενε ν]ν ον εγω δε ταυτ' ηξω φε[φω]ν]

[ορα το χρημα τα] 

λογι' ωσ περαινεται

800 [ηκηκοειν γαρ ως Δ]ηναιοι ποτε]

[δικασοιν ετι ταις οι]κειαις τας δικας [καν τοις προθυροις ενοικοδομησει πιας ανηρ]

[αυτω δικαστηριδιον μ]εκρον πανυ
[ōsper Ἐκαταίον πανταχοῦ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν [ 
805 [ἰδὼν τί ετερεῖς ὡς απαντῇ εγώ φέρω 
[οὐσπερ εφανείν κατὰ πολλῷ πλείωνα 
[αμιμ μὲν ἡν οὐρηγαίας αὐτῇ 
[παρὰ σοι κρεμὴστε εγγὺς εἰς τὸν πατταλοῦ

Frs. 4 and 5 recto. 

Col. ix.

814 [αὐτὸν μεθύου [γαρ τὴν φακήν ροφήσομαι 
815 [ατομ τί τι]ν ὀρίσων ὡς εἰμι ἐξηγεύκατε 
[ινα γ η]ν καθένοδος ἀπολογούμενον τινος 
[αδὼν αificei]ν ἐξηγείρη σε οὐτοσι 
[εν ετί πο]θω τα δ']βλλ αρεσκεὶ μοι τὸ τι 
[θηρων] εἰ πως εἰκομισάς το τοῦ Δυκοὺ 
5 lines lost.

825 ἠκαλων καλεῖ νυν ὡς καθήν εγὼ παλαι 
ἀφερ νυν τιν αὐτο πρωτον εισαγαγὼ δικῆν 
τί τις κακὸν δέδρακε τῶν εἰν τῶκα 
[η] [ὢματα προσκαυσασα πρωὴν τὴν χυταν 
ἐπισίχες οὐτος ὡς ὀλιγοῦ μ απώλεσα 
830 αἳνευ δροφάκτου τὴν δικῆν μελλεῖς καλεῖν 

Frs. 4 and 5 verso. 

Col. x.

853 [καὶ μὴν ἡμεὶς εἰπὲ ταῖς [στουνδαίς 
[καὶ ταῖς εὐχαῖς ]
865 [φήμην αγαθὴν λεξόμεν νῆθ[ην 
[στὶ γενναίως ἐκ τοῦ π]ολεμοὶ 
[καὶ τοῦ νείκους ἐυ]μεβητοὺ 
[εὐφημία μὲν πρῶτα νῦν] ὕπαρξ[ετω 
[ὁ Φοίβ Απολλὸν Πυθὶ ἐπ αὐ]γαθῆ τ[νχῃ 
5 lines lost.

875 [ὁ δεσπότος αναξ γειτόν αγνεὺν τομου προσβήσοιν προσπυλα 
[δεξαὶ τελετὴν καὶζὴν ὦναξ ἦν τῶ πατρὶ καὶ]ντομομο[μεν}
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[pauσων τ αυτον τουτο το λιαν στρυφον και] τρυνων [ηθος
[αντι σιραιον μελιτος μικρων το θυμιδω παραμεζας

444. δείχθειν, or perhaps δαφθερων, is for δειχθειν. 449. αυθ', so V, &c., edd. ουβ" R. 452. &c.; so MSS., Η(all)–G(eddaret); δείχθει Cobet. 453. τούς: so MSS. and most edd. The v.l. τούτω is implied by the scholia. 454. ει: έτη RV, edd. 455. πατε: so V, &c., edd. ταϊς R. 459. The MSS. assign this line not to the speaker of l. 458 (Sosias), but to a different person (οἰκείς R, Xanthias V), and generally give l. 460 to him also (so most edd.). R, however, supports Π in marking a new speaker after l. 459. Π probably assigned l. 458–9 to Bdelycleon, 460 to Xanthias or Sosias; Bergk gave l. 456 to Sosias, 457–9 to Bdelycleon, 460 to Xanthias. 462. βεθρωκετε which belongs to this verse was put in a line by itself, perhaps for want of space. 465. This line, which would be expected to correspond to the two preceding, is corrupt in the MSS. 466–7. Π agrees with RV in its division of these lines. There is no room before ησταιμε for οδ' which is commonly inserted on metrical grounds (cf. l. 429) by following Hermann. 489. ταις: it is uncertain whether Π had ταυς (so MSS., Starkie, H–G) or ταυς (Bruncn on metrical grounds), especially as προσατη may have had an iota adscript. 497. φησιν: παραβλέψας: παραβλέψασα φησι MSS., rightly. 499. τρίφειν: τρίφειν MSS. The remark of schol. V φησιν δει δια στσ φύσειν αι Αθήναι δοσματα would apply to τρίφειν even better than to τρίφειν, which connotes the idea of paying besides that of bearing. 505. The restoration gives 22 letters in the lacuna where the lines above and below have 18 or 19, so that Π probably did not have the correct spelling of the scholia ὀρθω: ὀρθω: R, &c., ὀρθω: V. Possibly δικο was omitted. 506. ει: so V, &c., edd. εικων R. 507. τυπαμακα: so V Suidas and most edd. τυπαμακα R, &c. There are no double dots at the end of this line or of l. 511. 508. οδ' εν: οδ' ἐν MSS., rightly. The repetition of ἐν seems to have caused a difficulty, as in l. 510. 509. αποστειρες: l. αποστειρεις with the MSS. 510. ηδων is an error for ἡδων αν: cf. note on l. 508. 511. πεπηγμενον: so V, &c., edd. πεπηγμενοι R. 515. ος: έτε V, &c., edd. έτε R. 520. ει γ': εῖr MSS., rightly; cf. l. 795, note. Paragraphi are omitted before this line and l. 576. 564. αποκλισαν: l. αποκλισαν, [α] [α] can be read; ἀποκλισαντι RV, ἀποκλισαντι BC, edd. 565. This verse is corrupt in the MSS., which have κάκα (κακά γε B Ald.) πρὸς τοῖς (τοῖς B Ald.) δέως δέων λόγως (δέων ἀνάλογως V) τοῖς ἐμοίοις. Π is corrupt in having κακά for κακα and may have omitted αναλογικα like RBC. Meineke proposed κακά πρὸς τοῖς οὐδὲς κακά on the basis of τοῖς τοῖς τοῖς (κακάς) δέως ἄν ἐν τοῖς ἐμοί, Starkie κα. π. τ. οὐδὲν ἄν (δέ τις) λόγως τ. ἐμ. 566. λέγων: so VBC; l. λέγων with R. 567. αναειδωμεθα: so VBC and most edd. αναειδωμεθα R.
570. σὺ γήγερα γενέα
571. ἰες: so RBC, edd.; θέος V.
573. χορευόμενος: so VBC, edd.; χορεύει R.
576. γραφόμενοι: so Brunk; γράφομεν MSS. against the metre (V has the line in the margin).

577. Either αυξ[εις (BC, edd.) or αυξ[με (RV) may be restored. This line and l. 626 may be the last of the columns.

578. ές: It was written with a long middle stroke as if it were originally the last letter of the line, and ν seems to have been added by the first hand later. με MSS., rightly.

606. προ[ερχομα: so RBC, edd.; προσκύνασα V. Richter’s emendation φιλήμη με for φιλήμη, accepted by Van Leeuwen, is not confirmed.

609. εκκαλαμάτα: l. τα; the MSS.

610. το[σίρ: so RB Ald.; τούς C, τούτουςν V, edd. It is not quite certain that Π had the unmetrical reading here, but 17 or 18 letters would be expected in the lacuna and το[σίρ would require 20.

και μή με δεσπόζη: καί μή με δεσπόζη (οτ δεσπόζη) MSS., κε μή με δεσπόζει Elmsley, Blaydes, κειν \\

613. παραθιεί: so VBC, edd.; παραθησα with ει̇ suprascr. R.

614. αλλαγ: so ι (αλλάγ: ἦν) edd.; ἄλλαν RVBC. Meineke thought that there was a lacuna after this line, rejecting l. 615-18.

619-20. Π agrees with RVΓ in combining these two lines into one, which is uniform with those preceding, and in omitting τη before τον. BC Ald., reading τη τον Δωδ, make two lines corresponding to those following. For Δωδ l. Δωμ.

621. απερ: so VB Ald., edd.; δουπερ R, δουπερ C.

623. φησι: so R, correctly; φησι VBC.

624. το δεσποτησαμενο: so RVC, edd.; τα δεσποτηρια B.

746. The α of ουκ is above the α of σις in the next line, and it is not certain whether Π read α with RBC and edd. (om. V), but there is no room for παρακελεύοντος (B Ald.). The metre of this antistrophe is not at all clear. ά σις does not correspond to είςναι in l. 732, and cf. note on l. 749. Editors divide ll. 743-9 in several ways; Π’s arrangement agrees with that of RV.

749. πεδομένοι: so MSS.; πεδομένοι most edd., following Brunk, who wished to make this verse correspond to l. 736 αυ τε παρών δέχομαι. πεδομένος is too short for the lacuna, and the emendation of this chorus on metrical grounds is insecure; cf. l. 746, note.

τι βοης: so Β and most edd.; τι μοι βοης RBC.

752. φησι: φησί MSS., rightly, except R which has the unmetrical φησιν.

756. σημα: so RBC, edd.; σημα V.

790. κατεπείτες ενεδρίκε: κατεπείτες ενεδρίκε RBC Ald., Starkie; κατεπείτεν έθηκεν V, κατεπείτε ενεδρίκε Bergk, whose emendation may well have been confirmed, H-G.

795. κατεπείτεσ: so H-G with the MSS.; κατεπείτεσ Suudas, καταπείτεσ Hirschig, καταπέπεσ Van Leeuwen.

γ' αργυροι: τάργυρον MSS, Starkie, H-G, αργυρον Brunk. The article is unnecessary, but defensible as generic, and with γοίν in the same line γ’ is also superfluous; cf. ει γ’ for ει in l. 560.

796. ος δειν... δειται: so RBC, edd.; ος διν... om. δειται V.

798. There is a blank space after ν’ου, but apparently no stop. Reiske wished to alter τοια to πάντως.
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801. αἱκειασί: 1. αἱκειασί.

802. Either αὐοἱ κοδομητερεῖ (VBC) or αὐοῇ κοδομητερεῖ (R, &c.) can be restored. Editors alter to αὐοκοδομητερεῖ, following Dobree.

806. [οὐαπερ: so VT, Ἰ—Γ; οὐαπερ γʹ (RBC)] is less likely, for there are already 21 letters in the space which is filled by 20 in the line above and by 21 in the line below.

808. ἐπὶ: so MSS. Some editors wish to read ὕπ or δηδ, but cf. Starkie's note.

816. [ἐνα γῇ: so MSS., Starkie, Ἰ—Γ; ἓν γῇ (Cobet) is too short.

825-6. V omits these two verses owing to homoioteleuton.

865. The size of the lacuna suits λέξεμεν (RBC, edd.) better than εξομεν (V).

1375. HERODOTUS vii.

15.5 x 12.3 cm. Early second century.

The upper parts of two columns, written in carefully formed round uncial letters of medium size. Although smaller in scale there is a close resemblance between this hand and that of the well-known Bodleian Homer (cf. Kenyon, Palaeogr. Plate 20); it is also similar in style to 1382, though probably of a somewhat later date and more appropriately assigned to the second century than the first. A correction in Col. ii. 5 seems to be due to the original scribe, who may also be responsible for the punctuation by means of high dots in combination with paragraphi. A deep margin (7.5 cm.) was left at the top of the columns.

In the text of the papyrus the chief point of interest is its failure to confirm suggested editorial excisions. Two unsupported variants (i. 6-8, 10) are of no importance. This is the sixth Herodotus fragment from Oxyrhynchus; cf. H. G. Viljoen, Herodoti fragmenta in papyris servata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μιλκαν Καρχη</td>
<td>§ 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δόνου εοπτα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσ πατρος μη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τροθεν δε Συρη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 κοοιν βασιλευ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σαντα τε Καρχη</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[δρονιων κατ αν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δραγ[αί]θιν ως η</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοις Ελιλησι εν</td>
<td>§ 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τη Ση[ι]κελ[ι]η[μ] εμα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χοντο εξ ησις αρ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ξαμενοι μεχρι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 δει[τ]ης ωπης ε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πι τοσοντο γαρ λε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γει[α]μ ελκυσαι [την</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1376. THUCYDIDES VII.

Height 31-8 cm. Late second or early third century. Plate III (Col. iv, ll. 155-165).

These considerable portions of the last third of a roll containing the seventh book of Thucydides belong to the large find of classical texts which produced 841-4, 852-3, 1012, 1016-17, &c. The papyrus (II) when discovered consisted of about 200 fragments, of which more than three-quarters have been identified. Excluding the small unplaced scraps, twenty columns, nearly all much damaged, are preserved, divided into three sections separated by gaps. The first, Cols. i–xiii, contains cc. 54-68.2, after which there are six columns lost; the second section, Cols. xx–i, follows, containing 72. 1–73.3; then comes another gap of six columns and finally the third section, Cols. xxviii–xxx, containing 78. 5–82.3, five or six columns more being required to finish the book. The hand is an elegant medium-sized uncial, resembling 1012 (Part VII, Plate iv) which was written between A.D. 205 and 250, and probably belongs to the early part of the third century or even the end of the second. The columns are tall, vii–viii having 53 lines, i, v, x, xi, xii, xiii 52, ii–iv, vi, ix 51, xxviii–xxx 50, xxxii at least 49, xxxi 48, xx 47. The lines are not very even and range from 15 to
23 letters, with an average of a little over 19. Their beginnings tend to slope away to the left as the columns proceed, giving the latter a considerable slant to the right. The common angular sign for filling up short lines is sparingly used, and final ν is occasionally represented by a horizontal stroke, at any rate in the later columns. Punctuation is indicated by high stops, marginal paragraphi, and sometimes by short blank spaces, but there are no breathings or accents, and diaereses are scarce. Iota adscript is rarely omitted in the first section, but frequently in the second and third. A few alterations have been made by the scribe himself (ll. 157 and 338), and corrections or alternative readings have been inserted here and there in two different hands, which are probably but little later than that of the main text (Π² ll. 356, 491, 551, 931, 956, 968; Π³ 407, 705). Uncorrected slips occur in l. 234 and perhaps in l. 638.

Π is in several respects the most important papyrus of Thucydides that has yet been found. While not possessing either the antiquity of the first-century fragments of Book iv (16 + 696) or the intrinsic merits of that unusually elaborate and careful copy, it is not only much the longest Thucydides papyrus extant but presents a good text, above the level of the average literary papyri of the same period, and moreover comes from a book in which the textual problems are exceptionally numerous and interesting. The seven chief MSS. form two groups, headed respectively by C, the tenth-century Laurentianus, and B, the eleventh-century Vaticanus. C is supported by G, the Monacensis (thirteenth century), which is sometimes defective, and B by A, the Cisalpinus (eleventh or twelfth century), E, the Palatinus, F, the Augustanus, and M, the Britannicus (all eleventh century), the last usually approximating to a middle position, although in the chapters covered by Π M exhibits more affinity to AEF than to CG. From vi. 92 to the end a disturbing element is introduced by the fact that B (supported up to vii. 50 by the fifteenth-century Parisinus 1734) branches off from the rest to such an extent that it is now generally supposed to represent a different recension, due to a sagacious but arbitrary grammarian, and Wilamowitz has proposed to identify this with an edition of Thucydides in thirteen books mentioned by Marcellinus. The ABEFM group was considered superior to CG by the older editors, who were imperfectly acquainted with C, but since the publication of Hude's text, which is based primarily on CG, the position has been reversed and the reputation of B has declined. As the divergences between B and C, particularly in vi. 92–viii, constitute the chief problem in the textual criticism of Thucydides, we preface a detailed classification of Π's readings with a summary of the evidence of extant papyri, showing the number of their agreements with C against B and vice versa and of their new readings, but disregarding
minor points such as ν ἐφελκυστικῶν, in the neglect of which Π resembles C. P. Giessen 12 is published by F. Fischer in *Thucyd. reliquiae in papyris et membranis Aeg. servatae*, Leipzig, 1913, pp. 27 sqq.; P. Wess. by C. Wessely in *Wiener Stud.* vii; the others are all from Oxyrhynchus, the small pieces 17, 451–3, and P. Geneva 257 being omitted.

1245  i. 139–41  4th cent.  with C 3  with B o  new 5
853  extracts from ii. 1–45  late 2nd  ,, 3  ,, 7  ,, 12
878 1 ii. 22–5  late 1st  ,, 1  ,, 1  ,, 2
P. Giessen 12  ii. 59–60  4th or 5th  ,, 1  ,, 2  ,, 0
225  ii. 90–1  1st  ,, 3  ,, 0  ,, 1
879 1 iii. 58–9  3rd  ,, 1  ,, 1  ,, 0
16 + 696  iv. 28–41  1st  ,, 4  ,, 1  ,, 29
880 1 v. 32–4, 40, 96–8, 103–5, 111  late 2nd  ,, 2  ,, 0  ,, 10
1180  v. 60–3  3rd  ,, 0  ,, 0  ,, 5
1246  viii. 38  early 2nd  ,, 0  ,, 1  ,, 0
1247  viii. 8–11  2nd  ,, 2  ,, 4  ,, 4
P. Wess.  viii. 92  7th  ,, 5  ,, 3  ,, 8

The best text is given by 853, 225, 16 + 696, and 1247, several of the others having been carelessly written, while P. Giessen 12, 225, and 1246 are too short to show much of their real character. Of the four best the two first-century specimens tend to uphold C, the two second-century ones B, which in the parts covered by 853 is supported by AEFM, but not in those covered by 1247. The balance is on the whole slightly in favour of C before vi. 92, and in favour of B after that point. That the MSS. of Thucydides are in the main sound, but have deteriorated since the third century in a number of small points is indicated by some of the new readings, especially in 16 + 696.

The instances in which Π’s readings affect differences between the seven principal MSS. are classified as follows, so as to bring into prominence its relations to C and B, whether alone or in combination with AEFM, which in this book are nearer to C than to B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With C</th>
<th>against ABFEGM</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>ll. 23, 45, right.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>,, C</td>
<td>,, ABFEM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66, wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, CG</td>
<td>,, ABFEM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58, right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, CE</td>
<td>,, ABFGM 1 (2?)</td>
<td>616?, 712, doubtful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, ACF</td>
<td>,, BEGM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>625, doubtful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,, CGM</td>
<td>,, ABF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>705, wrong, but corrected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 878. 47 τῷ τείχει agrees with ABFEGM against C (τῷ τε τείχει), 879. 33 δε with ACEFGM against B (om.), and 880. 82 σφοιρα with ACEFGM against B (om.).
With CEF against ABM 1 444, right.

ACEFG  BM 1 144, doubtful.
ACEFM  B 1 157, right.
ACEFM  B 1 725, doubtful.
ACEFGM  B 21 (22?) 9, 49, 64, 99, 125, 195, 447, 495, 552, 570, 683, 723, 734, 739, 852, 881, 943, 951, right; 122, 432?, 792, wrong; 186, doubtful.

ACEFGM 20 (21?) 22, 133, 175, 190, 277, 430, 602, 611, 702, 909, 941, right; 14, 732–3, 948, wrong; 85, 150, 197, 562, 691, 911?, 956, doubtful.

ACEFGM 20 (21?) 22, 133, 175, 190, 277, 430, 602–4, 611, 702, 909, 961, right; 14, 732–3, 948, wrong; 85, 150, 197, 562, 691, 911?, 956, doubtful.

From this table several conclusions follow. In the first place Π occupies a position almost exactly midway between B and C. Out of 69 passages in which these two MSS. are at variance Π agrees with C 32 (34?) times, with B 34 (35?) times in spite of the fact that in no less than 45 of these passages B stands alone, while C stands by itself only 12 times, being twice supported by G alone, and 55 times by one or more of AEFM. Where B is unsupported, Π agrees with it 20 (21?) times against 23 (24?) disagreements; where C is alone, it agrees with Π 3 times out of 12, and CG are supported by Π in 1 out of 2 instances. The text of B is therefore no longer isolated; it is practically as close to Π as is that
of C, its chief opponent, and closer to Π than are A or M. Out of the whole 94 passages in which the seven chief MSS. differ, Π agrees with E 58 (60?) times, B 57 (59?), F 57 (58?), C 56 (58?), and M 49 (50?), and with G 52 (53?) times out of 86 passages, so that the nearest MS. to Π is not a leader of either of the two families but E, and F is on the same level as B. E and F have very few distinctive readings: out of 6 cases in which E and 6 in which F differs from BC Π supports E twice (once with B suprascr.) and F once. Neither G nor A nor M obtains any assistance for their peculiar readings from Π, which agrees with BC against them 4, 6, and 11 times respectively.

From the point of view of quantity of agreements Π thus does not consistently support one MS. against the rest. C or CG when unsupported by some or all of AEFM are confirmed in less than a third of the instances. But nearly half of B's numerous peculiar readings in the chapters covered by Π are now shown to have been in existence in the second or third century, and the tendency of papyri, which was already traceable in 1246–7 and to a less extent in P. Wess. (cf. p. 157), to support B in vi. 92–viii was clearly no exceptional phenomenon. Since C and B are equidistant from Π, and there is no question of the text of C ever having been specially edited, it becomes doubtful whether that hypothesis is necessary in the case of B. An examination of the quality of the distinctive readings of B in relation to Π seems to us to favour the view that the special excellences and defects of B in the later books are due to its being derived, like C, from a text which is not far removed from that of Π, but into which a number of variations, chiefly errors, have been introduced in the intervening eight or nine centuries. Of the 19 (21?) readings in which B alone is supported by Π there are two clear cases of omission in AEFGM owing to homoioioteleuton (ll. 190 and 602–4); in ll. 22, 133, 175, 430, and 611 AEFGM are clearly corrupt, while B's readings, which have been suspected of being due to an editor, are satisfactory, and in view of Π's confirmation can be accepted without demur; in l. 909 certainly and probably in l. 961 AEFGM have made mistakes owing to dittography; in ll. 277 and 702 trifling additions are found in B, the omission of which may well be explained as slips. In all these 11 cases ΠB are certainly or probably right against the other MSS. The instances in which ΠB's reading is probably wrong confine themselves to two apparent examples of the confusion of ἡθή with δή (ll. 14 and 948; cf. l. 19, where Π is right and all the MSS. wrong on this point), and πεπαυμένους for ἀναπεπαυμένους in ll. 732–3. The remaining 7 cases, about which there is some doubt whether, as in the editions of Hude and Stuart Jones, they should be rejected or, as we should in the light of the new evidence prefer, be accepted, are small omissions or insertions (l. 85 om. δή, 150 ἐπέφερον for ἐφέρον, 691 om. εἰσι, 911 add. τής?) or
slight changes in the order of words (l.l. 197 and 562), and σωτήριον as a v. l. for σωτηρίων (I. 956). In any case they postulate only a trifling error on the part of either Π or, as is, we think, more likely, of ACEFGM. That the latter group combines to make some very serious mistakes is quite clear from their omissions owing to homoioteleuton, where B is proved by Π to have preserved the right text. C, when alone, contributes hardly anything of value in the chapters covered by Π; for in l. 45 κωλύσωσι for κωλύσωσι after δης; though probably right, is trivial, the omissions of υπό in l. 66, καί in 122 and 350, and ἢσυχαζόντως in 236, the insertions of oi in 164 and 234, the substitution of καταργόμενοι for κατεργάζομενοι in 162, εσόμεναι for ἐσούναι in 633, ἀταξία for ἀταξίαν in 652, and ἀναγκάζωνται for ἀναγκάζονται in 959 are, for the most part at least, obvious slips. Lines 22–3 afford a good illustration of the nature of corruptions which have arisen in Thucydides' MSS. between the third and tenth century. C has there νανοί καὶ ἵπποι καὶ μεγάθῃ ἠχούσαις, B ναθά καὶ ἵπποι καὶ μεγάθει ἠχούσαις, AEFM νανοί καὶ ἵπποι καὶ μεγάθει ἠχούσαις. The emendation of Duker ἵπποι οὐχούσαις for ἠχούσαις would account for the datives, but Π, which apparently had ναθά καὶ ἵπποι καὶ μεγάθη ἠχούσαις, is probably correct in spite of the simplicity of this reading, and the datives are to be regarded as errors which are less advanced in B and C than in the other MSS.

On the other hand, while the frequent and judicious support lent to B is one of the chief features of Π and cannot fail to increase the respect due to that MS. in vi. 92–viii, the superiority of Π’s text to that of B, as to that of any other MS. of Thucydides, is shown by its slightly more frequent and not less judicious agreements with ACEFGM against B. Out of 23 (24?) of these (G is defective in a few cases) there are only two cases (122 Τήνοι for Τήνοι and 792 ἐκάτερος for ἐκάτεροι), and possibly a third (432 ὑπέρ ὑ for ὑπέρ), in which there are strong reasons for considering B superior to PACEFGM. In 725 (διαλαβόντας for προφθάσαντας) Π’s support of the ordinary reading is confirmed by the removal of the repetition of προφθάνειν in 751 (φθάσωσι Π). The omission of γάρ, which is inserted by B in 186, is quite defensible, and the changes in the order effected by B in 83–4, 125, and 552 have nothing special to recommend them. The following readings of B, 49 om. τά, 99 ἐκάστοι for ἐκάστοι, 195 λειπομένους for ἀεὶ πολεμίους, 683 ἐβούλοντο for ἐβουλεύοντο, 723 τά for τάς, 739 τετάφθαι for τεταφθαί, 852 τρεφόμεναι for τρεφόμενοι, 881 om. μέρος, 943 τε for τότε, are merely due to slips of a copyist and are naturally absent from Π, while the rest of B’s peculiar readings, 9 om. καί, 157 δὲ (rejected by Π) for τε, 447 ἐσομένης for ὀυσίας, 495 om. καί, 570 ἐπεταί δὲ for ἐπεται, 734 Ἡράκλεια for αὖνοι Ἡρακλεῖ, 951 ἐκάστον καί for καί, though requiring consideration as probably ancient variants, have not found favour with recent editors, whose judgement in selecting from B’s variants
is generally confirmed by Π’s evidence, as also in the less numerous cases where AEFGM are divided between B and C. Of these instances ΠCG are undoubtedly right against ABEFM in l. 58 (φόβου against φόβων, a copyist’s error), and ΠCEFG against ABM in 444 (φαίνεται against φαίνηται which is due to a confusion of ἔδω with ἔδω). That Π is also right in supporting ACEFG against BM in l. 144 (κατὰ ἔξθος, omitting ῥῷ), CE against ABFGM in 616 (om. θάλ) and 712 (ἀποκρηφίσασα against ἀποκρηφίσασα) is more questionable, but still, as we think, probable; in an apparent but not quite certain agreement with ACF against BEGM in 625 either reading may be correct. On the other hand Π naturally supports B (suprascr.) E in 94 ἐξυδιασώσουτες (ἐξυδιασώσατες ABEFM by a slip), BEM in 699 αὐτῶν (αὐτῶν ACFG, also a slip), ABEF in 705 ἀποκρηφίσουσι (ἀποκρηφίσατες CGM, a dittography from the following ἔμπματες, also found in Π but corrected by Π2), and ABEFM in 963 αὐτῷ πρώτῳ (om. πρώτῳ CG). The agreement with BFM against CE in 508 as to the form πλενομένως against πλενομένων is trivial, and Π has made the same mistake as BG in 406-7 παρεσκεύασθεν for παρεσκεύασθε, the origin of the error (παρεσκευαζομαι wrongly corrected to -θε) being established. The 24 cases (cf. p. 158) where BC combine against one or more of the other MSS. need not be discussed in detail, since Π uniformly supports BC save in the unimportant matter of the spelling of στρατεία (l. 184), for which ΠEF have στρατιά (cf. l. 17 referred to below, where Π alone is correct on this point). With a few exceptions (e.g. the reading of M in 720) the variations of the other MSS. from BC are mainly mere mistakes, and even where they are defensible the authority of Π coincides with the verdict already expressed by recent editors against them.

Another interesting feature of Π is its occasional agreement with the later MSS. against the seven leading codices selected by Hude, who almost entirely disregards the later ones except Parisinus 1734 in vi. 92–vii. 50. The phenomenon of agreements between papyri and the ‘deteriores’ is not new; it has been decidedly marked e.g. in the case of Xenophon, as is shown by 463 and 497, but in that of Thucydides the only instances hitherto have been 16. ii. 36 διέδοσαν with Belkér’s KN for διεδίδοσαν and 853. v. 21 ἐκφυγέων with Paris. 1735 for ἐκφεύγεων. Π, however, exhibits at least 7 (8?) coincidences with the late MSS. One of these, 747 οὐκ for οὐκέτι with apparently KN and Paris. 1734 and 1791, is almost certainly right (Hude brackets ἐτη with Krüger), and the insertion of ω in before Συνακόσιοι in 999 with N, though perhaps due to a misplacement (cf. note ad loc.), is in accordance with custom. In ll. 486–7, where the chief MSS. are corrupt and Π is unfortunately incomplete, it apparently agrees with Paris. 1637, 1638, and 1736 in omitting an ἄν which can hardly be right, though whether that omission alone is sufficient to restore the passage is somewhat doubtful. In
544 Bekker's KLNQPO and Paris. 1637, 1638, 1733, 1734, and 1736 are stated to read ἐπιβολή (with Π) instead of ἐπιβολή before τῶν σύμφων χειρῶν, and this reading of the later MSS. deserves consideration although rejected by recent editors. Against the conclusiveness of the parallel χειρῶν σύμφων ἐπιβολαί in l. 434 may be urged first the possibility that ἐπιβολή in the second passage is a reminiscence of the first, and secondly the employment of the singular not the plural. In any case ἐπίβολη is to be regarded not as an error of the late MSS. but an ancient reading. In 713 Π agrees with Paris. 1637 in having τὸν for τοι in καθεσομένη τοι τῆς Σικελίας, a variant which is defensible. The omission, however, of Βοιωτοί before Βοιωτοῖς in 142, which also occurs in Paris. 1636, is probably a mistake; cf. the insertion of Δωρεᾶς in 152. Nor is there anything to be said in favour of ἀντιλαβέων, which was erroneously read by Π1 with Bekker's H in 551, but for which Π2 rightly wished to substitute the ordinary reading ἀντιλαβήν. ἐνεκκλείστο for the usual ἐνεκκλείστο in 946, which is partly supported by ἐνεκκλείστο in Paris. 317, lacks parallels earlier than the Roman period, while the simple verb is common in Thucydides and occurs again as near as l. 969; but for this very reason the compound may after all be right; cf. ll. 63 and 150. The agreements between Π and the late MSS., though not very striking and in a few instances, e.g. 551, probably due to accident, show that something may yet be gleaned from further collations of the MSS. of Thucydides.

The new readings peculiar to Π, apart from a few mere mistakes which have been corrected, number twenty-six. They are thus less frequent than those in the much shorter first-century fragments of Book iv, which would cover about 250 lines of Π, and in the extracts from Book ii in 853, which was found with Π and is contemporary with it; cf. p. 157. The following eight seem to be improvements, four of them confirming conjectures: 17 στρατείας for στρατίας (so Aem. Portus); 19 δῆ for ἃδη (so Gertz); 80 (?) om. τέ (so Hude); 549 (?) om. ἄν (so Herwerden); 660—6 ἱκαλωσ ἵσοι for ἤκαλωσ ἵσοι; 691 om. ἑτεί; 751 πλάσατοι for προφθάσατοι; 999 add οἱ before Σφρακτίον. On the other hand the following seven are of more doubtful value: 4 τῶι πεζωτι for τῶν πεζῶν, 10 om. μέν, 19 ὄμοστοις for ὄμοστοις, 63 ἀνεγκέκενα for ἀνεγκέκει, 67 add ἐπί, 152 Δωρεᾶς Δωρεάνις for Δωρεάνις, 732 τε ναυμαχίας for ναυμαχίας τε. In 86, 133, 352, 634, and 680 words certainly or probably occurred in Π which are not in the MSS., but owing to lacunae the nature of the additions is uncertain. In 638 there was some variant for πεπόθαται, which however seems to have been the word intended. The insertion of καὶ δρ in 363 and the omission of τε in 931 and of οἱ in 999 appear to be mistaken, and δὲ πολεμῶν for δ' ἐναρτίον in 695 and the insertion of ἀ in 729 are probably errors of repetition. The new readings are thus not very numerous, nor, except in 661, do they make very much difference, and passages in the
MSS. which have been widely suspected are generally confirmed; cf. notes on II. 22–3, 81, 94–5, 110, 139, 175, 483, 664, and 992. The larger proportion of new readings in 853 and much larger one in 16 + 896 may well be due to the different character of B in Book vii and in the earlier books, where it usually combines with AEFSM. If B had maintained its normal relation to the other members of its family, Π would have presented far more novelties. The fact that nearly half of B’s peculiar readings, including almost all those which are probably right, occur in Π proves their antiquity and value, and from vi. 92–viii B’s authority is now entitled to rank at least as high as that of C. With regard to the earlier books of Thucydides the evidence of papyri has hitherto been conflicting, but on the whole tends to support CG against ABESFM (cf. p. 157); 853, however, in a majority of cases favours the other side, the commentator in one case remarking of a variant found in CEG ἐν ἐνίοις δὲ γράφεται. Π’s support of B in the later books hardly affects the question, since the change which comes over B at vi. 92, however it is to be explained, clearly indicates another source for its text of the later books. That B in them represents an edition by a grammarian seems to us, as has been said, unlikely. In view of the notable agreements between B and Π the date of such a revision would have to be placed not later than the second century; for after deducting from the total of B’s peculiar readings (45) the instances (20 or 21) in which it simply supports Π, and those in which its reading can be readily explained by the ordinary processes of manuscript corruption, the remainder is small (about 12; cf. p. 158). This residue seems more likely to be due partly to the varied and independent character of its ancestor, which often agreed with Π but had many points of divergence, partly to the normal entrance of variations between the third and eleventh century, than to conjectures, whether good or bad, of a grammarian. It is indeed possible, and even probable, that if the text of Books ii and iv corresponding to B’s version of vi. 92–viii could be recovered, it would prove to contain many of the new readings of 853 and 16 + 896, and 853 happens to represent the text used by a grammarian who flourished at some period between 10 B.C. and A.D. 130 and may have played a part in determining the future text of Thucydides. But to the view that in vi. 92–viii CG or ACEFEGM represent the main tradition current in the second century, and ΠB stand apart as being due to a separate edition, several objections may be urged. The papyrus texts of Plato, Xenophon, Isocrates, and Demosthenes have, as a rule, been distinctly eclectic in their relations to the mediaeval MSS., and the eclectic character of Π’s text, which stands about midway between B and C, is a strong argument for its normality. Π neither exhibits a large number of arbitrary variants nor manifests any desire to eliminate
difficulties of construction, being on the whole decidedly conservative and combining the good points of both B and C, while 1246–7, so far as they go, display the same tendency to agree with many of B’s peculiar readings. Probably, therefore, B in vi. 92–viii represents a line of manuscript tradition which is different from that of ACEFGM, but to an equal extent conforms to the papyrus texts. B’s variations from C in both the earlier books, as is indicated by 883, and in the later, as is shown by Π, are to a large extent as old as at least the first or second century. Beyond the first century the history of the text of Thucydides is as yet veiled in obscurity.

Col. i.

| oβεν καὶ τοὺς iππονεξιλα 54 | καταθαλασσα[ν] καλον [ 56. 2 |
| βην Αθηναιοι δε ης [τε | [σφλ[σι] εξ τους Ελληνας] το [|
| οι Τυρρηνοι ιρβοπης ειποι | 55 οιγον[ομα φανερος] οις τους |
| ησαμετα των πεζων εις την | τε [ης] σεα Α[λλοις] Ελληνας ευ |
| 5 λαμ[η]δη και[ε] ης αυτοι τω | θυ[σ] τους μεν ελευθερουθαι |
| αλλοι οπταντον πασαδων γε | τους δε φοβ[οι] απο[λλεον]θαι |
| γενημενης δε της νυ [ | ου γαρ ετι δυ[σ][την ευσικοι [|
| κης τοις Σμυρακισοιοι] [ | 60 την υπολοιπον Αθηναι |
| λαμ[απρας] ηθη και του νυν | αων δυναμιν τον υπυπερον [ε |
| 10 τεκνου προτερον γαρ εθυ | [πανεκθυσον] ενον πολε |
| θουντο τας μετα του Δη [ ] | μην αμενεγκειν [και αν |
| μοσθενοι] ναυς επελαθου | του δοξαντες αυτων αιτι |
| [σας οη [μεν] Αθηναιοι ευ [ ] | 65 ομ ειναι υπο τε των αλλων |
| ταπαντει διη αθιμασι ηθαν | ανθρωπων και ι των επε |
| 15 και ο παραλογοι αυτοις με | τα επι πολυν θαυμασθησε |
| γενη νή [πολυ διε με]ξτιον ετι | σθαι και ην [δε] αξιοι ο αγω |
| της στρατειας ο μεταμε | κατα τε ταυτα και στι |
| λος πολεσι[α γε]ρα [ταυ]ρεις μο | 2 70 [ουξι] Α[θηναιων μονον |
| ναυς δη ομισθετεστε [ετε ] [ | [περι]εγινεντον [αλλα και |
| 20 θοντ]εις δημ[οκρατουμε | τιων αλλων πολλων δυμμα |
| ναυς] τε οσπερ και [αυ]τοι και | χιων και δεν ουτοι αυ μο |
| ναυς και] ειπ[ηνους και] [με]γε | νοι αλλα και μετα των ευ |
| δη εξήθεσας ου δυναμε | 75 μεθοθησαντων σφισιν |
| νοι επενεγκειν [ουτ εκ πο | ημερους τε γενομενοι με |
| 25 λιπεαξ τι μεταβολης το | τα Κορινθιων και Λακε |
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[diαφορον αυτον οις οις και προση
15 lines lost.

42 [του αυτου σωθηναι μονον] 56. 2 [τες προκινου[ν]θυνε[νσαι και
[ετι την επιμελειαν] ε
[ποιουτο αλλα και οπως]
[εκεινους κωλυσομενοι μοι]
[μενοντες ο]περ ην απο
[τε των παροντων των πε
[λιν σφωκ καθηπερτερα]
[τα πραγματα ε]μεικα[ν] και

45 [αι δυναμι[κα]της A]
[θηναιον τε και των ε]μ

50 [μαχων και κατα γην κα[ι]

dαιμο[ν]ων και την σφε
τεραν [ποιων εμπαρασχον

42 [του αυτου σωθηναι μονον]
[ετι την επιμελειαν] ε
[ποιουτο αλλα και οπως]

165 [τες προκινου[ν]θυνε[νσαι και
[του ναυτικου μ]εγα μερος
[προ]κοηντατες ε[θυνη γαρ
[πλειστα]α δη επι μιαν πο
[λιν ταυτην ευνηλθε

50 [αι δυναμι[κα]της A]
[θηναιον τε και των ε]μ

57. 1 [τεροι επι Σικελιαν] τε και
[περι Σικελια]σοι τοις μεν
[ενυγκηθησε]σαι την
[χοραιν ε]θοντες τοις δε
[ενυπερσασι]σαι εσι επι Σιρα

55 [κοσμεις ε]πιθελειμησαν
[ον κατα δικηνι τι μαλλων
[ουδε] κατα ε]μεικενε[ν]
[μετ] αλληλω[ν] σοι τοις της
[αλλα ως εκαστοις της ευν

[ρων] η] απαγγη εσχεν Αθη
[ναιο]ι] μεν αυτοι Ιωνες
[επι Δοφρεια]ς Συρακουσιοι

Col. iii.

57. 2 [εκ]οντες ηλθον κα[ι α]πουτος

105 [τη] αυτη φωνη [και νομι
[μοις ε]πι χρω]μενοι Δημηνοι
[και Ιμβροιοι και α]ιτινη[ται
[επι Εστια]νησοι οι εν Ευβοι

Col. iv. Plate III.

57. 6 [Συρακουσιου]ν στρατευου[ν]με
[νοις η]ραγκαζοντο πολε

7 [με]ν] των [δ][ε] περι Πελο
[πυνη]σον νησιωτων
[Κεφαλη]ναι] μεν και
110 [ai] Ἐστία|ιαν οἰκον[ν]τείς a
[παίκοι οντες εὐφη|στο]ρα
[τεσσαρ των] δι' α[λλων ο]ι
[μεν ὑπηκοοι οι δ] α[π]οι ἔξυμη
[μαχιας αυτονομ]ο[ι] εἰοι
6 lines lost.

Μ[η]νησ[οι] και [Σ]αμιοι και Χι
οι τ[ου]ν Χιοι οι[ν] υποτε
125 λεις οντες φο[ρου] ναις δε
παρεχοντες α[υτονομοι]
ευνεσπι[ντο και το πλει
[σ)]του Ίωνες φιντε οντοι
[πα]ρτε|ει και α[π] Αθηναιων
130 [πλην] Καρυστησιον ου[τ]ο[ι]
[δ ε]χ[σι]ν Αρνοπεη[ς] υπηκο
[δ ο]μπετος και αν[αγκη] ομως
[.......] γε επι Δωριεα[ς]
[ηκολουθουν προς δ αυτ[ος]
5 135 [Αιολης] Μηθυμναιοι με[ν]
[κα][υσι και ου φο[ρ]ω υπηκο
οι] [Τ]ε[νεδιοι και και Δινοι ι [υ
ποτελεις ουτοι] δε Αιολη[ς]
Διολευνοι τους κτησα[ι]
140 τους μετα Συρακοσιων [κ]ατα[α]
anαγκην εμα[χον] [τ]ο[ι]
Πλαταια [δε] και [α]ντικρυ
Βωιτος μονοι ει[κ]οτος
κατα εχθροι Ροδ[ο]ιος δε και]
6 145 [Κυθηρας] δωρι[ων] αμφοτε
ροι οι μεν Καλεδαιμονι
ων απ[ο]κο[ποι] [Κυθηριοι επι]
[μα] Τυλισπ[α]ιωι με[ε]ρ Αθηναι
160 [Σακωνθιοι] αυτονομοι-
[μεν κατα δε] το νησιω
[τικον μαλλον] κατεργα[-
[μενοι οι θαλα]σσης ε[
[κρατουν οι Αθη]ναιοι ζιν]
165 (ειποντο Κερκυραιοι δε)
7 lines lost.

173 [θοσ το Καριβαθιον ουχ ης
[σον ειποντο και οι Μεητος[η]
175 [μειο νυν] και[λ]ομεροι [εκ
[Nαυπακτον και εκ Πηλουν το]
τε υπ Αθηναιοι] εχομε [η
ης ες τον πολεμον παρε]
ποθη[θης][α]ς [και ετι] Μ[εγα]
180 [ρειφυ φυγαδες ου] πολλοι
[Μεγαρ]ε[ιοι] [Σ[ελινοι]|ετε[ιος]
κουρ[ο]ιος μαλλον η[ σ]τρα [η]
185 [τια εγι]νετο [η]δη] 41ρ
[γε]οι [μεν ου] της [κ][μ]αχ[η]
[α]ν ενεκα μαλλον η] της [ε]
[Λακεδαιμον Ιους [.] [.] τε [ε]
[εχθρας και παρατε]
190 [κα] εκαστοι [ι]διας ωφελι [ν]
[Ας] Δωρις επι] Δωριας [με]
[η]κολοθουν Μαθυνης]
[δε και αλλοι] Αρκαδιον
195 [μισθη]ε[ροι επι] τους αει
[πολε]μων[σ] σφιον] αποδει
[ναι και τοτε] τους μετα [η]
[Κ]αριβαθιον ελθοντας Αρ
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150 ον επεφερον Ροδί,
οι δὲ Αργειοι γενος [Σύρα
κοσιοι μεν Δωρίς Δωρί
[ευς Σικελίας δε και [εποι
[κοις εαυτων ουσι μεγα
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Col. v.

17 lines lost.

223 [ταναιοι βαρβαροι δι Εγε [57. i
[σταιοι οιτερ επηγα]γον [1
225 [το και Σικελων το πλευρ
[και των έξω Σικελιας Τιν
[φησι σε τιν]ς κατα [di
[αφοραν Συρακοσιοι]ν και I
[απυγει μισθοφοροι]ν τοσα [1
230 [δε μεν μετα Αθηναιοι
[εθνη εστησαν]ν Συρα 58. i
[κοσιοι δε αντε]βοηθη
[σαβ Καρα]οι]ναι]οι μεν ομο
[γαρ]η]ιν]ων ηνυξα][ζωντων
[εν τω]ν [επ] [κε]κει]α ιδρυμε
[νοι Σε]λερού]ντοι και οιδο
[με]ν η]ς [Σικελιας το
18 lines lost.

Col. vi.

9 lines lost.

267 [αποσταλε]ς [και Σικυ 53. 3
[ονιοι ανα]γκαστοι στρα
[τε]υντες και] τινων εξω Πε
7 lines lost.

277 [ες και ιπποι] και ο [αλλος 4

κερδο]οι γη]οι]μενοι πολε
[με]νοις· Κρητες δε και Αι
3 lines lost.

Col. vii.

310 οι]ν]τοι και] οι[γον ουδεν
εις ουδε]ν επερ]ους τως δε
60. i
311 [Αθηναιοι]ς τη]ν [τε αποκλη
σι]ν οροφι] Και τη]ν αληπε
8 lines lost.

323 [εκπλε]βομενοι απειτον 2
[λειν]ατο τα μεν τειχη τα a]
[νο] εκλιπ[ε]ν προς δ' αυταις
[ταις] ναυσι]ν α]πολαβοντες
[λαχι]στον τοις τε σκευει]
[και τοις ασθενεις ικανοι]
[γενεθαι του]ν]ο μεν φρον
[ρει]ν απο δε του αλ]λω]ν ιεν
335 [τας ναυς π]ασοι]ς ορ[αι ησαν
5 lines lost.

[αντι])γι]σενας] και ο]ν μεν
3
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[ομιλος α]φθονοις έμνελε
[γη και προς [α]παρης αν
29 lines lost.

350 [σαι και τας ναυς επιλη]ρω
[σαι πασας αναγκασαν]τες
[. . .]ας ε[σ]βαυνειν [οσ]τις

355 [δειδε ει]ραι και ξυνεπλη
[κα μαλιστα και εκαστο[ν] [το] φοτ]α]ν τον
4 [υ] [π] [α] [κ] [ακ] [ν] [υ] [ε] [θ] [α] [κ] [α] [ν] [υ]

360 [τε Ακαρπα]ν] ρ και των α
[άλων ξενων εσεβιβασον]

Col. viii.

και τα αλλα ο]ις οιν τ η]ν 60. 4
και ως εξ αναγκα]ιον τε και
τοι[αυτης] διαν[οιας επο
21 (?) lines lost.

387 [σαι που οκειαν π]ο]λ]ιν επι 61. 1
[δειν αθ]υμειν δει] δι[ν θηρ [ο
[δε πασχειν οπερ] ι[ι οπερ]

390 [τα]τοι των αν\[θρω]πων οι τοις
[προτοις αγωσι σφ]α]λ]εν
[tως επειτα δια] πα]ντος [την
[απιδα του φο]βου οφιοιαν
[ταις ξυμφοραις εχο]σοιν [α

[εμπειροι οντες και οοι]
[tων ξυμμαχων ξυ]ιστρα
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400 [τε των εν τοις πολεμοις παρα [ 
[λογων και το της τυχης και [ 
[μεθ ημων ελπισοντες [στηναι και αφ’ αραμαχου 
[μενοι αλλωσ του]δε του πλη 

405 [θωσ οοσ] [αυτοι] υπων αυ 
[των εφορατε παρασκευα 
[ει] ε[τε [εν]να δε 
[εσθαι] τις. αραγ]α αιμεν 62. 1 
[επι] τη τη [του λιμενου σ]τε 
[νοτι]πι] προς τον μελλονυ 

410 [τα οι]ξου]ν των νεων εσε 
[σθαι [και προς την εκε 
[νο]ν] επι των καταστρω 
[ματ]θων παρασκευην οι 
[προτερον εβλαπτομεθα] 

435 [αι σχησουσι] την παλιν α 
[νακρωσι] της προφητευον [ 
[σης] [νεο]ς τη απο το[ν]γοις 
[οι επιβαται] υποργωσι ες 
[τυμνο γαρ δη] ημαγκασι] 

440 [θα [ωσε] [πεζομα]χειν απο 
[των νεων κ]αι το μυτε 
[αυτους] ανακρονισθαι μητ ε 
[κεινους] εαυτοι φωελιμον 
[φαινεσα]ι αλλωσ τη και τη 

445 [γης πα]ς που]ν [οσον αν ο] 
[πεζοι]ς [ημ]ορ απε] η 
[ουσης ] ων ξιρη] με 
[μυ]μενους διαμαχε 
[σθαι αοου αυ δι]νσθ 

450 [και μη] εξωθεισθαι ες αυτην 
[αλλα] ενεπε] [οςις νη] 
[νεος μη προ[τεροιν] αξ 

12 lines lost

Col. x.
8 lines lost.

471 [μη] [οντες υμων της τε 63. 3 

475 φα]υρ]ης τη επιστημη 
[και των τροπων τη] μι 
[μησ]ι ε] εβαλμαισθε 
[k]ατα [την Ελλαδα και της αρ 
[ξις της ημερερας ουκ ε 

480 λαος]σων κατα το οφελει 
[σθαι εσ] [τε το φθερον τοις 
[υπηρετοις και το ανδ] 
[σθαι [πολυ πλεον μετειχ 
[τε ωσε] [κοινωνι] μονοι 

485 ελευ]θερων ημων της αρ 

Col. xi.
5 lines lost.

452 [νυμων νυν εσομενοι] και πε 64. 2 
[ζοι τοις Αθηναιοις] εισι και 

525 [μης και υπολοιπος] πολει [ 
10 lines lost.

536 σαμενος ευθυς εκελευ 

551 πα]ρουν τας ναυς τοι 
[δε [Γυλιππων και τοις Συρα 
[kοσιοις παρην µεν αισθα 

540 νεσθαι] ορωνι και αυτην 
[την παρασκευην οτι ναυ 
[μαχησασθαιν οι Αθηναιοι 
[προ]ηγαγε]λθη δ αυτοι και
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

χὺς οὐ[τες] δικαίως αὐν
tn υν ἀ[η] καταπρο[δί]
[k]ο[τε]α]φρονησατ'τες
δὲ Κορινθίων τε ους] πολ
490 [λακ[ε]ε νεκ[η]κατε κ']αι] [Σικε
\[ιοτ]ου [ουδ αντιστή[να]ι
[ονδεις] εος ηκμαζε το] ν[α]ν
[τικον ημιν] η[δι]σφαε α
[μυναθε αυτου και δειεια]
495 [τε οι και μετ ασθενιεια]
[και ξυμφορων η ματειρα]
[επιστήμη κρεισσων] [εστι]
[ε]ρεας ενυχωνησ] [ρομις]
[τιους τε] Α[θηναι]χης [υμων] 64.1
500 [παλι]ν [αυ και ταθε υπομι]
[μι]σουκω η[θι] ου]ν κα]'ης εν
[τοις] μεσοζο[ικοις] αλλας ο
[μοι]ζα] ταζ[ι]σθε] [ουΕ οπλιων]
[ηλικ]ι]νυ υπελιπτετε ει τε
505 [ε]μπιθησ[ε]ται τι αλλο η το
[κρατειν] η[μιν τους τε ευθα]
[δε πολεμου]ιους ευθες επ εκει
[να πλει'εσομε]νους και τους
9 lines lost.

η επιβου[λ]η των ιδηρων
545 χει[ρ]ων [και προς τε τα αλ]
[λα ε[ξ]ηρτυανται ως εκοστα]
κα[ι προς τουτο τε γαρ πρω 2
ρας [και της νεως ανω επι]
pολυν κατεβυρσωσαν οπως
550 απολισθανοι και μη εχοι
η]
αντιλαβει[π] [η χειρ επιβαλ]
λομενη και[ι] επιδη παν 3
ta etoi]naη [ην [παρεκελευ]
σαιντο εκει]ις οι τε
555 στρατηγοι και [Γελιππος]
και ελε]ξα]ν τοιαδ[ε οτι μεν 66.1
[κ]αλα [τα] περιεργασηνε ακαι
[του ο] γ]ων εσται ο γυρα
560 κοσιοι και ξυμμαχοι οι
tε πολλοι δοκεθη αμιν
[ειδε]ρι]οι ου]δε γαρ αν αν
[του οι]μο προθυμιων αν
565 [τε] λαβεισθε και[ι ει τις μη ε]
[τι ους] δει[ι] η]σθηται σημα
[νουμεν] Αθη[να]ειους γαρ 2
[ευς τ]ην χωραν τηνδε ειλ]
[θοτας προσων μεν επι]
[της Σικελι]χεις καταδουλω

Col. xiii.
[αν] και της[ Πε]λ[οπονησου]
[την] των τε πριν] υ Ε[λληνων
\[ευρη]σουσι πως ου σφαλουσι 67. 2
[π]ε] τας [ναυς και εν σφισι]
[αυ]τοις πατ]υ[ει εν τω]
625 [αυ]τοιν τροπω [κινουμε]
[νοι] ταραξ]ονται επει και
[τωι] πληθει των νων
[νον] [υ] [προστοι α[νθ]ρωπων v
[ποστ]αγίες των ναυτικώ
[wπε]ρ πα[ντα κατεχον
[tas μ]εν [νευκηκατε ναυ
18 lines lost.

598 η[σεως προσγεγενημε 67. 1
η[ς αυτοι το κρατιστος
600 ειναι ει των κρατιστων ενι
κη[σαι]νει διαπλασια] εκα[στου
η [ελπις τα δε πο]λλα προς
[τας επιχειρησ]εις η με
[γιστη ελπις μεγιστην
605 [και την προθυμα[ιν] πα[ρε
[χεται τα τε της α[ν]τιμ[ε
[με[σεως α]ντων [της πα
[ρασκενυ]σ η[μων τωι
[μεν ημε]τερωι τροποι
610 [ξυνηθη τε] εστι καλι ουκ ανα
[ρμοστοι προσ εκα[σ]τουν [n[αυν εωρεθα οι δε επε[ε
[δεν πολλοι μεν οπλιται]
[επι τωι] καταστροματων
615 [παρα το] καθεστηκος ωσι
[πολλοι δε] ακοψταται
[κερασιοι] ως ειπε[ειν A
[καρνανες] τε και α[λλοι e
[πι ναυς αναβα]ρτεις οι
620 [ουδι σω] παθερομενους
[κρη το βελος αφειναι]
[ο[υκ] ωφελ[ησονται ει tis
] κ[αι] τοδε [υ]μ[ων οτι ουκ ισαις
] 630 [ν]ο[μαι τα σειρα] περιβαται
[ειν ολιγω] γαρ [πολλαι αργοτε
[ραι μεν εσ το δραν τι οω βου
[λονται εσονται δε ες
] το βλαπτ[εσθαι αφ ον . . . . 
] 635 [η[μι ε]παρεσκευασται το
[δε αληθεστατον γνωτε]
[εξ ου η[μεις οιομεθα σα
[φους θετιν . σο]αι υπερβαλ
[λοντων γ]αρ αυτωι των
640 [κακων κατι βιο[μενοι]
[υπο της παρουσιας αποριας]
[εις απονοιαν καθεσθηκα]
[συν ου παρασκευης πιστει]
[μαλλον η τ]η[ς αποκιν]
645 [δυνασκε] ουσιοι οισο
[δυναστα] ι[ν η [βιοσιμη]
[νοι εκπελε]νσω[η η κατα]
[γνη μετα τουτο την απο]
[χορησια] ποιονται οις
650 [των γε πα]ροντων [ουκ αν]
[πραζου][ης χειρον προς
] 68. 1
[ου]ν [α]τιμιαν τε [τοιουτην]
[και τυχιη ανδ]ρων εαυτην
[παραδεδωκα]ν πολεμι
655 [οτα]των ωρη προσμει
[εξαι] μεν και νομισμεν
[αμι μεν] νομιμωτατων
[ει]ραι προς τους ευνυτους
οι αν ας ετε τιμωρια του
660 προσπισοντος δικαιως
ιωσι [ποστηρι της γην]
[μη το θυμουμενον αμα]
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7 lines lost.

675 [αιελοντο και αποπλευ] 72. 1
[σαντες προς την πολιν τρο [παιον εστησαν οι δ' Αθη. 2
[ναιοι υπο μεγεθους] των [παροντων κακων νε[κρο] δ
735 Ηρακλει ταυτην την ημε [ραν θυσια ουσα ου δοκειν α] [ραδιως εθελησαι υπακου [σα] υπο γαρ του περιχαρους [της νυκης προς ποσιν τε [τη εορθη και παντ ο] [4

Col. xx.
1 line lost.

Col. xx.
[α]λλ έχθρ]οντας η[δη παν 73. 1
735 Ηρακλει ταυτην την ημε [ραν θυσια ουσα ου δοκειν α] [ραδιως εθελησαι υπακου [σα] υπο γαρ του περιχαρους [της νυκης προς ποσιν τε [τη εορθη και παντ ο] [4

705 ανα[χ]ωρη[α][ι]ν την χρισμην ειχον’ Ερμοκρατης δε ο 73.1
Συρακοσ[ος]ος υποκοπασα αυ των την [δι]ανοιαν και νο


720 ταμητα α και [αι]μω εδοκει αυτως ο Ερμοκρατης αυτος [επι] τουτοι ταδε μ[η]χαρη

750 ζαι δεδως μη οι Αθηναι [οι] καθ ηπαχιαν φθασωσι εν [τη]ι νυκτη διελθοντες τα [χα]λεοσωτα των χωριων πεμπει των εταιρων τι

755 νας τι[ον ε]αυτου μετα ετ πεωρ [προς] το των Αθη

760 λε α[κουσεσθαι] και ανακα λαεσμενιν [τι]ναις οις ον 
tες των Αθηναιων επι [τ]η[θ]ειτι ησαν γαρ [τ]ινες τω Νι 
κι[α] διαγγειοι των ενθο

765 βεν εκελενον φραζευν [Νικια η]η απαγει της [ν]υ 
κτος το στρατευμα ως Συ 
rακοσιων τας οδους φυλασ [κ]
[και ε]σηκοντιζ'ουν [τε και
παριππενων και χρο
νεχ[ωρεις]αν παλ[λ]ν ε σ
[το αυτ' ι]στρατοπεδοι[ν]
[και τα ε]πιτη[δεια ουκετι
800 [ομωσ]ει ειχευν ου γαρ ετι
18 lines lost.

Col. xxx.
10 lines lost.
879 [αυτη ουκ επι Κα]τανυσ 80. 2 826 [νες εκελευν ον] τοις 81. 1
880 [τοις στρατευματι] αλλα
[κατ]α [το ετε]ρον μερος της
[Σικελίας το π]ρος Κα]μαρι
[να και] [Γεί]λας και] ταις ταυ
[τη πολεις] και Ελληνιδας
885 [και βαρ]βαροις κα[ησαν
[τες ουν πυρα πολλα] εχο[ρουν
[εν τη νυκτι κι]ς α[υτας]
[οιν φιλει και πα]τρι[ες]
[τοπεοις μαλιστα] δ]ε [τοις
13 lines lost.
903 [χωρ]ει αρια δε τηι εω αφι
κνουνται οιμος προς την
905 [θαλα]σσαν [και εσβαντε][
[ες] την οδον την Ελαιρη
[νη]ν [κα]λουμενην επο
[ρευν]ντο [οπως επειδη γε
[ νουτο] επι τω ποταμω τω
910 [Κα]κπατραι επαρα τον πο
[τη]ς[μο]ν και εν ανω δια της
με[σο]γειας ηντις γαρ
[Κ]ατ τους [Σικελους ταυτη

Col. xxxi.
7 lines lost.
930 [Αθηναιους απεληλυθο]

850 [και μαλιστα] τοις [υστα
[τοις] προσπι[πτ]οι[τες
[ν]οι παγ το στρατευμα φο
[β]η[σεια]ν και επι πολυ μεν 6
855 [τοιουτω τ]ροπ[ω] αντε []
[χον οι Αθηναιοι ετε]ρα
[12 lines lost.
926 [δ οι] Συρακουσιοι [και] οι ε[υμ]
[μ]αχοι ως τη [η]μερα [ε]
γενετο και εγνωσαν τους
935 κουτες η ου χαλεπως η
σαβανοντο κεχωρικτας
κατα[λαμβανουσι] περι αρισ
tου οραβ]ι και οισπερ προσεμι 2
ξαν τοις μετα του Δημοσθε
940 νους υστερους τ ουσι και σχο
[λατερου και ατακτοτερου]
[χ]ρωμουν ως της νυκτος
[τοτε ευνεταρακθησαν
[ε]υθυς προσπε[οντες εμα
945 [Χ]εροντο και οι [π]ε[ις] των
[Σι]ρακουσιων εν εκκλιουν
[to] τε ραιον αυ]τους διέχα
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ous [με]τεπερψαν απαν

915 τησεο[θ][ι]ς ε[η][ειδή δε] ε[γ]ε 6
νοτο επ[ι] τωι [ποταμωι]

Col. xxxii.
15 lines lost.

984 μ[αλλον]ν ετι η προς των 81. 5
985 Α[θηναιων και αμα] φειδω
τε τις εγγυετο επ ευπρα
χιαι ενε σοφε μη προ
α]νιλαθηνται τωι και ε
[μομο]ν και ως ταυτη τη

997 ι[i]θεα καταδαμασαμενοι
λη[φεσται αυτος επειδη 82. 1
γον]ν δι ημερας βαλλοντες
πα[ταχθεν τους Αθηναι
ους και ε]νμαχους ειρων

995 η[θ] [τεταλαισφερμενους
τους θε τραυμασι και την
αλληλε] κακοσαι κηρυγμα
ποιουνται Γυλιππος και
οι Συρα[κωσιοι και ξυμμα

1000 χοι π[ρωτον μεν των νη]
σιωτοι ει τις βουλεται ε
π ελευ[θεριαι ως σφας απι[
[εν]αι και απεχωρησαν τι
7 lines lost.

1011 τε βιαιως μητε δεσμοις μητε 2
τ[η]ς [αναγκαιοτατης εν
δειαί] διαιτης και παρεδο
σαι [οι παντες σφας αυτους

1015 εξακι[σχι]λιοι και το αργυν
ρινον [ο εἰχον απαν κατε
θεσαυρεῖτε ος αισθάνοντες εἰς αυτον

Fr. 1. Fr. 2. Fr. 3. Fr. 4.
\( \theta e \tau \rho \varphi [\) \( \kappa [\)
\( \nu \chi \delta [\) \( \lambda \gamma \tau [\)
\( \iota \tau [\) \( \nu \varphi [\)
\( \cdot \delta \cdot [\) \( \cdot \pi [\)
\( \cdot \omicron \cdot [\) \( \cdot \tau [\)
\( \cdot \omicron \cdot [\) \( \cdot \ubar{\omicron} [\)

Fr. 5. Fr. 6. Fr. 7. Fr. 8.
\( \alpha \cdot [\) \( \kappa \cdot [\)
\( \cdot \sigma \gamma i [\) \( \cdot \lambda \alpha [\)
\( \lambda \alpha i [\) \( \cdot \omicron \cdot [\)
\( \lambda \mu i [\) \( \cdot \kappa [\)

Fr. 9. Fr. 10. Fr. 11. Fr. 12.
\( \cdot \cdot [\) \( \cdot \cdot [\)
\( \cdot \tau \tau [\) \( \cdot \theta [\)

Fr. 13. Fr. 14. Fr. 15. Fr. 16.
\( \cdot \cdot \cdot [\) \( \cdot \cdot \cdot [\)
\( \cdot \cdot \cdot [\) \( \cdot \cdot \cdot [\)
\( \cdot \cdot \cdot [\) \( \cdot \cdot \cdot [\)

Fr. 17. Fr. 18. Fr. 19. Fr. 20.
\( \cdot \cdot \cdot [\) \( \cdot \cdot \cdot [\)
\( \cdot \cdot \cdot [\) \( \cdot \cdot \cdot [\)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 21.</th>
<th>Fr. 22.</th>
<th>Fr. 23.</th>
<th>Fr. 24.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α[</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>]η[</td>
<td>]ατη[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η[</td>
<td>λ[</td>
<td>]τ[</td>
<td>]σγε[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε[</td>
<td>η[</td>
<td>]η[</td>
<td>][</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 25.</th>
<th>Fr. 26.</th>
<th>Fr. 27.</th>
<th>Fr. 28.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>]ηον[</td>
<td>]ηολ[</td>
<td>]α[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υ[</td>
<td>ρνο[</td>
<td>]ε νε[</td>
<td>]υ εργα· τη .. [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η[</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 29.</th>
<th>Fr. 30.</th>
<th>Fr. 31.</th>
<th>Fr. 32.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α[</td>
<td>]α[</td>
<td>]α[</td>
<td>][</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εα[</td>
<td>]ρ[</td>
<td>][</td>
<td>][</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 33.</th>
<th>Fr. 34.</th>
<th>Fr. 35.</th>
<th>Fr. 36.</th>
<th>Fr. 37.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ε[</td>
<td>]η[</td>
<td>]ξ[</td>
<td>][</td>
<td>]μθονα[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε[</td>
<td>]η[</td>
<td>]ξ[</td>
<td>][</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 38.</th>
<th>Fr. 39.</th>
<th>Fr. 40.</th>
<th>Fr. 41.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]ορεσ[</td>
<td>]ε[</td>
<td>]ορα·</td>
<td>]κηρ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 42.</th>
<th>Fr. 43.</th>
<th>Fr. 44.</th>
<th>Fr. 45.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]μ[</td>
<td>]α[</td>
<td>]σ[</td>
<td>][</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Τυρηπνη: Τυρηπνη MSS., edd.
4. των πεσα: των πεσα MSS. The dative (instrumental) is meant to balance της διαφ οπατοπέδω (ll. 5–6); but τροπην ποιειθαι with the gen. occurs in ii. 19. 2, and the dative may well be a mere slip; cf. ειγανεια for εν ευςεια in l. 931.
9. και: so ACEFGM, edd.; om. B.
10. γαρ: μεν γαρ MSS. μεν is superfluous, as is remarked by the scholiast, there being no answering δε but another μεν in l. 13.
14. παρα[ τη] ηγη: so, with the remark δη γράφεται, B; παρα δη ACEFGM, edd. ηγη has already occurred in l. 9, and its repetition so soon after must be wrong, but the size of the lacuna distinctly favours the supposed agreement with B. The same question between ηγη and δη arises in l. 19, where Π, though imperfect, favours δη against ηγη of the MSS., and again in l. 948.
17. στρατεσ: so edd., following the correction of Aem. Portus; στρατεσ MSS. Cf., however, l. 184, where Π has στρατεσ and most MSS. στρατεσ. No regularity was observed by scribes in the use of these words.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

19. δ]: ηθ] (MSS.) is too long and Gertz had already conjectured δι here. ηθ, which occurred recently in l. 9 and by an error in l. 14 (cf. note ζ ad loc.), is less appropriate.

...the surface of the papyrus is much damaged and the supposed ισ very uncertain, but οισ[ι]ου[σι] and οισ[ι]ου[σι] are unsuitable. ισ occurs once elsewhere in Thuc. (iii. 10. i), but not διστρατος. Herodotus, however, speaks of ισδα διστρατα (viii. 144).

22–3. υαυ και [π]υαυ και [α].γεγθη ειχον[σαι]: υαυ και [π]υαυ και μεγαθε ης ης MSS., except B (υαυ και [π]υαυ) C (μεγαθε) Μ (μεγαθε suprascr.) Γ2 (μεγαθε) and α2 (υαυ και [π]υαυ και μεγαθε αης MSS.). Duker’s emendation ισδα διστρατος is accepted by Hude and Stuart Jones; it supports the simpler ισδα διστρατος with the accusatives, as preferred by the older editors. The chief objection to it is that the plural of μεγαθε is not found elsewhere in Thuc.; but cf. Stahl’s note and p. 160.

42. μονοτρυ: or, less probably, σωσημα], omitting ει in the next line with F.

45. καλιστροη: so C, followed by Hude and Stuart Jones; καλιστροη ΑΒΕΓΜ. Cf. Duker’s note and p. 160.

23. which agrees with C in reading λησωσι, not λησωσι, after ὁσω.

49. [τα: so ΑΕΙΜ, εδδ.: om. B. τα is necessary to fill the lacuna.

58. φοβαιοι: so CG, εδδ.: φοβαιοι ΑΒΕΓΜ.

63. ανεφεκτων: ησρεκτων MSS. except M, which has ἐνεφεκτων owing to the preceding ἐνεφεκταμενον. For ἀναφέρειν in the sense of ‘sustain’ in Thuc. cf. iii. 38. 3 αὐτή δη τοις κινδύνοις ἀναφέρει.

64–5. αυτοι αυτων (αυτων suprascr.) B, Classen.

66. There is no room at the end of the line for ιν ιν των επει, the reading of ΑΒΕΓΜ and edd. ινο is also omitted by C and some of the later MSS.

67. επι πα[λ]: πολυ MSS.

68. The supposed traces of χε αξιος are very slight, and the supplement at the end of the line somewhat long, for the ε comes under μ οι δομεταθαρχη; but no variant here is known, and neither η τοις αξιος nor η η αξιος suits the vestiges. For final η represented by a stroke cf. ii. 679 and 687.

1. The words των αλλων . . . αλλα και are omitted in Μ owing to homoioteleuton.

2. τολαιω: so ΑΒΕΓΜ, εδδ.: τολαιω Ε.

7. μετα Καρβαθρων: so ΑΒΕΓΜ, εδδ.: μετα των Καρ. G.

8a. επι ται[ρ]ενεπαι: προκαθωμενεια τε MSS.; but τε spoils the construction and is bracketed by Hude, following Krüger. Since the ν of δων comes under the final ν of ἀνών in l. 74 and above the final ν of μαντικων in l. 81, it is probable, though by no means certain, that τε was omitted. The supposed δ of δων is very doubtful, the vestiges suit τ better.

81. μεγα μερος: so MSS., Stuart Jones; Hude brackets μερος with Krüger and Stahl, but Π must have had it.

83–4. πολην τοι[ρ]εν: so ΑΒΕΓΜ, εδδ.: Π has τοι[ρ]εν πολην with β and a superscribed.

85. [πλην γε το]ν: so B; ΑΒΕΓΜ, εδδ. insert δι after γε, but neither [πλην γε δι το]ν nor [πλην γε δι το]ν suits the size of the lacuna, since ξ of ξ[ι]ς[παντος is under the ξ of ξ[ι]ς[νηλθε] in l. 84.

86. After γμπαντος the MSS. have λογον τοι which is not at all satisfactory. Heilmann conjectured ξυλον τοι, Krüger οχλον τοι, which is accepted by Hude but not by Stuart Jones. οχλον or οχλον is rather short for the lacuna, which has room for six letters before τοι εν, but ξ[ι]ς[παντος ξυλον is unlikely and} [λογον τοι εν τοδε] τοι[π] not inadmissible, although it is not quite certain that τοι belongs τοιδε rather than τοι.

90. Σκελειαν: so MSS., Stuart Jones; Hude adopts Krüger’s conjecture Σκελεια. The τ of τε comes under φ of γω in l. 89, and the reading of the MSS. yields 16 letters where l. 89 has 14½, so that Σκελεια even without iota adscript would be long enough; but in the
absence of very strong reasons for the dative (cf. Stahl’s note) Σικελίαν is more probable; cf. ll. 94–5, note.

91. τοις: so ABCEGM, eadd.; των F.

93. ἐκβολέοις: so ABCEFM, eadd.; om. G.

94. [ἔνω]ν [ἀ]γώνιστοι εἰς: so B (suprascr.) E (-σων-), eadd.; ἐνώπιον ὑπολειμμάτες ABCFM.

94–5. Συρακοσίους: so MSS., Stuart Jones; Bauer’s emendation Συρακοσίους is accepted by Stahl and Hude; cf. the former’s note. The vestige before ξ suits a distinctly better than ι. The objection to ἐπί Σικελίας is that since ἐπολέμησαν applies to both sides ἐπὶ Σ. ἐπόλ. must mean not ‘made war against S.’ but ‘came to S. for the war’, which is awkward if ἐπί Σικελίας is retained in l. 90, where Π’s reading is unfortunately doubtful.

99. κεκέστι: so AB (suprascr.) CEFGM, Hude, Stuart Jones; κεκεστότα B and Paris. 1638, which reading if retained would require εὐθεία in l. 101, as in several of the late MSS.

103. Δομήσει: so MSS. and cf. ll. 133 and 191; Δορίς Hude, Stuart Jones. This line seems to have been unusually long owing to a desire not to divide Συρακοσίους between two columns. There happens to be no quite certain instance in Π of such a division, butCols. vii, xii, and xxii probably began in the middle of a word. The division Συρακοσίους does not suit ll. 104–14.

110. Εὐσπημές: so ACEF, eadd.; Ἐσπημεῖς BGd.

116. Ἐγείρατην αἰτήσεις: so MSS.; these words are bracketed by Hude, following Krüger. That the fragment containing the doubtful ερ and αι in the next line is rightly placed is not certain.

121–2. The fragment containing α of α线条 and δ of δ[ ]mas is not certainly to be placed here. M omits και before Αρ[ ]μοι and C before Τη[ ]οι. Τη[ ]οι: so ACFEGM; Τῆν B, eadd.; cf. p. 160. The traces of a stroke after η suit a better than υ, and the line is already rather long.

125. αὐτος φοβον: so ACFEGM, eadd.; B places φόβου before οὐκ ἐποτελεῖς.

127. θυσιαστόν: so ACFEGM, Stuart Jones; θυσιαστον Hude with three of the late MSS.

130. The supposed stop after Καρνοτ[ ]πολ is doubtful.

133. [ . . . . ]ες γε: ἵναν γε B, eadd.; ἵναν τε ACFGM. γε is right, but ἵναν could be dispensed with, being a repetition of what has been stated in l. 128; cf. notes on ll. 142 and 152. Moreover if the letter preceding ες was υ, and not a, δ, or λ, the last stroke ought to be visible in a vacant space before ες. The surface of the papyrus is, however, damaged, and part of the υ may have been rubbed off. ιωθες γε is satisfactory enough by itself, but it is difficult to fill up the lacuna. ως, i.e. ὃς, due to the preceding ὃς, is hardly long enough.

139. κτίσισι: so CEFMB corr. γς, eadd.; κτίσεις ABd.

Βο[ ]τῶις: so MSS.; Βοιωτώι (τῶι) Lindau, followed by Hude and Stuart Jones. Βο[ ]τῶις: τοις is 100 long.

142. κατα[ ]τικροὶ Βοιωτῶι: so Paris. 1636; κατατικροὶ Βοιωτῶι Βοιωτῶι ACFEGM, Stuart Jones, καὶ ἄπειροι Βοιωτῶι Βοιωτῶι Hude, adopting a conjecture of Böhme. The meaning of κατατικροὶ here has been much disputed. It’s reading apparently connects it with Βοιωτῶι, i.e. ‘opposite to’ or ‘against’, not ‘outright’ or ‘on the other hand’. But the omission of Βοιωτῶι is probably a mere error; cf. l. 152, note, and p. 162.

144. κατα: so AE; κατ’ CG, κατὰ τό BM and some of the late MSS., Hude, Stuart Jones. The angular sign at the end of the line is not certain, but cf. l. 141.

146–7. E omits οι . . . Κυθηρων owing to homoioteleuton.

149. μέ[ ]τα: so ABCEFM (μετά), eadd.; μετα τῶν G.

150. ἐπεφέρον: so B; ἐφέρον ACFEGM, eadd. The supposed stop is uncertain.

152. Δωρίς Δωρί[ ]ευτ: om. Δωρίς MSS. Since Δωρίς has already been applied to the
Rhodians in l. 145 it is unnecessary here, but Δωρίς ετι Δωρίδας occurs in l. 191, and there are several similar antitheses in this chapter; cf. notes on l. 142, where the divergence between II and the MSS. is just the contrary to that found here, and 133, where ἡμεῖς is repeated in the same sentence by the MSS. (and perhaps II), much as Δωρίς here.

157. τε (corr. from δε by πιγιο): τε ACEFGM, edd., δε B.

162. καταγρψομαι: so ABEFM, edd.; καταγρψομαι C, corr. c.

164. κ Αθηναίων: so ABEFGM, Stuart Jones; om. ol C, Hude. That Π had ol is not quite certain, but if it was omitted there were only 11 letters where l. 163 has 12 and 165 13.

175-6. εκ Ναυπάκτου: so B, Stuart Jones; εν Ναυπάκτῳ ΑCEFGM, εν Ναυπάκτῳ Εκ Ναυπάκτου Hude following Classen.

184. στρατα: so EF; στρατεία ABCGM, edd.; cf. l. 117, note.

185. μεν ου: so ACEFG, Hude; μεν γαρ ου B, Stuart Jones, μεν ουν M. There is no room γαρ in the lacuna if the following της is rightly read, and μεν γαρ ου [της ε] [μαχης] does not suit the vestiges so well, besides yielding a line of 23 letters.

188. [ Lexera]mounai [. . . . ] τε: before τε is what looks like either ω or ο with a line above it, or else τ or γ with a stroke through it, and probably there was a correction. The MSS. read Λεξεραμονιον τε.

190. ὀφθείας: so B (ὀφθείας) a3 marg., edd.; om. ACEFGM owing to homoioteleuton; cf. ll. 602-4, note.

191. Δωρίδας: so MSS.; cf. note on l. 103.

193. The paragraphus below this line is uncertain.

195-6. αει [τοις μισθοις: so ACEFGM, edd. (αι); λειτομένους B.

197-8. εις θάλασσας ον: so B, avoiding a hiatus, followed by Bekker; ἦναι εἰσθάσεις ACEFGM, Hude, Stuart Jones. One of the dots over ο is visible.

223-4. Εγε [σταίναι τε B, Hude, Stuart Jones. The exact position of this fragment is uncertain and Εγε [σταίναι τε or Εγε [σταίναι τε can also be read, with στηναγαντζο | και Σκέλαυν in ll. 224-5. Σκέλαυν is the reading of B, preferred by Hude and Stuart Jones, Σκέλαυν τῶν of ACEFGM. Whichever arrangement be adopted, Π seems to have agreed once with B against the rest, once with the rest against B, rather than with or against B in both cases where this MS. differs from the others.

226. Τ[τοπ]τονων: cf. l. 3.

234. κα: l. και.

235. μετ του: so BCEGM3, edd.; μετα τον ΑF.

236. σους 

267-79. The division of lines in both fragments of Col. vi is quite uncertain.

277. ο αλλασ: so B, Stuart Jones; αλλας ACEFGM, Hude.

310-14. It is not certain that the fragment containing the beginnings of lines is correctly placed here, so that the division of lines is doubtful.

323-39. The division of lines is uncertain. With the ordinary reading of the MSS. ll. 327-35 are rather long, and perhaps there were some omissions. That Π agreed with C in reading των for τα in l. 327, or with B in having ἄθενενων and ἀπάσως for ἄθενεις(ε) and πᾶσας in ll. 332 and 335 is unlikely. The supposed λ of αξιον in l. 334 is very doubtful; it may be the π of πεζον.

337. [σβιζ]αγοντες: so BCF, edd.; but [σβιζ]αγοντες (AEFM) is equally possible. It is fairly clear that the scribe first omitted πληρωσατε και διανικαμισατε (so MSS.) owing to homoioteleuton, and then corrected his mistake, partly at any rate, by expunging τε μην. The missing πληρωσατε may have been inserted in the margin.

350. κα: so ABEFM, edd.; om. C.
352. [...]s: om. MSS. Perhaps [ταύτας or [ες αυτ]ας or [ταυτας, though none of these is any improvement.  
356. αποσαί], the reading of Π', does not occur elsewhere as a variant for αι πάσαι (MSS., Π').  
358. τε επ': so ACEFGM, edd.; τ' επ B, τ' ες Krüger.  
362-3. τα ἀλλα ὧν παρασκευάζομεν τε καί: τάλαλα ὧν αἴ διν τ' ἤν εἴ ἅν. τ. κ. MSS., except Β which has ὧν above δια. It is not certain that Π had ὧν rather than δια, and l. 363 is long enough without τε. δια αἴ διν τ' ἤν καί ὧν can hardly be right, and if ὧν αἴ διν τ' ἤν be retained, καί ὧν becomes superfluous, being perhaps due to a misunderstanding of τ'. ἢ διαγραφαί τε καί τοιαύτα διανοίας is a somewhat difficult expression, in which it is not clear whether διαγραφαί is feminine or neuter.  
386-96. The division of lines is uncertain.  
399. αεί: so MSS.; αεί Hude, Stuart Jones; cf. l. 195.  
395. αυτῷ: so BCEFGM, edd.; om. A.  
406-7. παρασκευάζομεν[εις] (corr. by Π from -θιο); so BG; παρασκευάζομεν ex. corr. c', παρασκευάζομεν ACEFGM, edd. After this the MSS. have α δι αὐτῷ ἐνίσχυμεν, which seems to have been seriously corrupted in Π, α δι becoming τιοι (?), and ἐνίσχυμεν becoming αι μν: the reading of the MSS. is superscribed by Π'.  
410-11. εο[τε][σθα]: the division ε[στιν] leaves l. 410 too short, although [σθα] is hardly enough for the lacuna at the beginning of l. 411, where three letters would be expected.  
425. τη[ι]: so ABCEFMg, edd.; om. G.  
426. ηγαγκασμεν[εις] or ηγαγκασμεν[ες] can be read.  
429. εὑρίσκα: so MSS.; εὑρίσκα edd.  
430. χρη αντετραποτηγήσαται: so Ba, edd.; μὴ ἀντιτραποτηγήσαται (which makes no sense) ACEFGM. B adds ἀντιτραποτηγήσαται γράφεται.  
432. απερ: so ACEFGM; ἁπερ δι Β, edd. Possibly δι is lost, the surface of the papyrus being damaged; but this addition would make the line read longer.  
442. ανα[ρκομεν][εις]: so BCEGM edd.; ἀνακρομενεις ΛΕΦ.  
444. φαινεται[ι]: so CEFG, edd.; φαινεται ABM, ABF having ειν for ειν in l. 443.  
447. [ονται]: so ACEFGM, edd.; εσομεν (B, with ονται suprascr.) is too long, since there was probably a space before εν.  
450-2. The letters α of [τηθι], αουν της προφητείας[εις], and ερο and part of the τ of προφητεία[ν] were on a separate fragment which is not certain to be placed here, στρ being very doubtful.  
452-3. αυξουν ... ηα: so B (with γράφεται ἦν) f, edd.; but the reading of ACEFGM αυξαν ... ηα would occupy the same space.  
479-86. ουκ ελαιοεις: cf. l. 483, note.  
480-1. φυλετεοῦμεν εἰ τε τὸ is repeated by mistake in E.  
482-3. τὸ θυσιασθαι: so ACEFGM, Hude; τὸ μὴ ἅθ. Ba, edd., Stuart Jones, τὸ διακεκαιροῦν some late MSS. The line is long enough without μη, but its omission is not certain.  
483. [πολὺ πλεον]: so MSS. (πλεον Β, πλεον CG, corr. 32, πλεον ΛΕFM). Hude follows Krüger and Stahl in deleting the words as inconsistent with and a gloss upon εἰκὸν θαλασσαν in l. 479, where Classen wished to delete εἰκὸν θαλασσαν, retaining πολὺ πλεον here. Stuart Jones keeps both phrases, and κατὰ τὸ ὕφελεσθαι is then contrasted with ἔν τε τὸ φυλετεοῦν τὸν ὁπικοῦν καὶ τὸ μὴ ὑπεκείασθαι, though this is not very satisfactory. Π, however, clearly had πολὺ πλεον[ου]: the stop after ὕφελεσθαι should have had ὑπερ for τε, as desiderated by Reiske, in l. 481.  
486-8. διὰτας αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ πάντων καταπραγματεύομεν τοῖσι τοῖσι τοῖσι: the best MSS. are corrupt here, inserting ἐν after διὰτας, which is impossible with the imperative (μὴ om. AF, add ατοι, καταπραγματευομεν E, -διατε ς, -διατε ς some late MSS.). The simplest course, followed by Stuart Jones, is to omit ἐν with Bekker, who in so doing claims the support of Paris. 1637, 1638, and 1736;
but this makes δεκίως very difficult, since ἀδίκως would rather be expected. Hude obelizes the passage. Π is unfortunately very imperfect: it is not certain that τῷ was omitted, and the supposed traces of δικίως are very doubtful; but reckoning from τῇ there are 12 letters in the corresponding space in the lines above and below, and 12 letters are necessary for l. 486 apart from τῷ. No support for Madvig's emendation τῇ . . . καταπρόδιδοτε is forthcoming, the imperative with μη being confirmed. The μ of μη is fairly certain, for the vestiges do not suit κ.


495. καὶ μετ' αὐθεντεῖας: so ACEFGM, edd.; B omits καὶ, but the size of the lacuna here is in favour of it.

496. υπερτομα: so ABCEFG, edd.; om. M.

499. [μη]τῷ: so edd. from Β's μη τῷ; but [μη]τῷ (ACEFGM) may of course be read.


523-5. The division of lines in this fragment is uncertain, but there is a short blank space after τοῖς in 525. In that line before νπολοιον Π may have had η, which is read by edd. with some late MSS., but omitted by ABCEFGM.

544. επιστολα: so several late MSS.; επιστολὴ ABCEFGM, &c., edd.; cf. χειρῶν στεφάνων ἐπιστολάκ in 434 and p. 162.

545-6. τὰ αὖθα: τάλα MSS., except C and a few of the later ones which have πολλα. Cf. l. 362.

549-50. οὐκος[απολίσ]θεν[νοι: οὐκος (καὶ ὁ Μ) ἂν ἂν. MSS. This use of ἂν with the optative after ὡς is rare, and Herwerden wished to delete ἂν here. The line is certainly long enough without it.

551. αὐτολάβη (αὐτολάβη Π²): αὐτολάβη MSS., except the Cassellanus (—βειν). The β was perhaps retouched.

552-3. πω[ϊς] ο[ι]μα: so ACEFGM, edd.; ομοια πάντα B.


565. δε: so BACEFGM, edd.; δή A with δεi suprascr. a².

569-70. The letters ητ in l. 570, και in 571, and και in 572 are a separate fragment which is not certainly to be placed here, and up to 579 the division of lines in Col. xii is doubtful. The supposed ε of εφις in 570 is rather large, and might well be the beginning of the line, but if so 569 must have been shorter than the MSS. reading (? δουλωτει for καταδουλωτει), or else καταδουλωτει | projected considerably in order to avoid dividing it between two columns; cf. l. 103, note.

εφῆ|[ε]τε νοι: ζείτε εἰ ACEFGM, edd.; ζέκτεν δὲ εἰ B.

571-2. Πε[ν]οστονησιου | τε: so B; om. τε ACEFGM, edd. Πε[ν]οστονησιου, omitting τε, is somewhat less probable.

576-7. υποστρεπτη: so MSS. The two letters following α have been corrected, perhaps from λε, i.e. υποσταλετη.

598-602. The beginnings of these lines with the two paraphrases are on a separate fragment, which is doubtfully assigned to this position. Line 600 is rather long (24 letters; om. τοι;!), and a paraphrasis is hardly expected after l. 597. The doubtful κ in l. 601 might be β. το in l. 599 is the reading of the MSS., retained by Stuart Jones; Hude reads τον with Krüger.

602-4. τα δὲ πολλα . . . ελε[κ]ς: so B² edd.; om. (owing to homoiooteleuton) ACEFGM; cf. l. 190, note, and p. 150.

611. εκσυνον: so B, Stuart Jones; τιν εκστηντην ACEFGM, τιν (τιχτρη) εκστησην Hude.

616. ακοφισται: so CE; καὶ δὲ, ABFGM, edd. πολλας δὲ καὶ ηκ. is less probable.

622-44. The division of lines is nearly certain up to l. 635, especially as there is
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a short blank space before ev in l. 631. The fragment containing ll. 637–44 might go a little further to the left.

625. [αῦτων]: so (αὐτῶν) ACF, Hude; ἀυτῶν (which does not suit the size of the lacuna) B, Stuart Jones, aὐτῶν(1) EGM, corr. g. But [αῦτων may of course be αὐτῶν.

τροπω: ἐνώσι is on a separate clause which is not certainly placed here.

633. εὐπρεπεῖ: so ABEFGM, edd.; εὐπρεπεῖ C.

634–5. [αφ ων] . . . | ημ[ι]ν: αφ' άν ημιν MSS. The attraction of the nominative of the relative clause is unusual, but seems unavoidable. [αφ ων ηδι is possible, but the missing word may have preceded αφ ων.

637–8. σαφῶς περιν. . . σαρία: σαφῶς πεπύθαι MSS., G having σφίζει γράφεραί above σαφῶς. The traces of the letter following περι suggest η, ν, or π; the next letter has almost entirely vanished. πεπυθεῖα is not suitable, and would create a difficulty in filling up the preceding lacuna; it is more likely that the scribe misspelled πεπύθαι, and possibly it was corrected.

644. αποκεκλειονεστι] or αποκεκλειονεστι] Duker's generally accepted emendation of the reading of the MSS., can be read.

649. πεπρεπεῖ: so ABGεηφ, edd.; but πεπρεπεῖ (CEFOM) is possible.

652. [αφ' άνειαν: so ABEFGM, edd.; αφ' άνεια C, corr. ε.'

654. [παραβαδδικαιών]: so ABEFGMCε, Stuart Jones; παραβδακχιον C, Hude.

660–1. δικαιοῦσι: δικαιοῦσιν C, δικαιονοσιν ABEFGMε, edd. In this awkwardly constructed sentence δικαίωσιν is generally considered to govern ἄποστιλήσαι, and οι αν., δικαιοσωσιν ἀποστίλησαι τ. γ. τό δυν. has to serve as the subject of νομίμωσιν εἰναι; cf. ii. 44. 1 to δ' εὐτυχοῖς, οι αν . . . λάγωσι . . . καὶ οι . . . ξυμετρηθεῖν. With δικαίωσι οιον, however, ἄποστιλήσαι is to be connected with νομίμωσιν εἰναι and balances ἀμίσασθαι better. The other difficulties, the fact that ἐναντίον is not the antecedent of αι, the change from the infinitive to the participle after νομίμωσιν, and the superfluous καί before τέλεσθαι, are not apparently affected by Π's readings.

663–6. The division of lines in this fragment is not quite certain.

664. [ημιν καί: so MSS. except Paris. 1638, which omits καί. καί had been deleted by Reiske and is rejected by Classen and Hude but retained by Stuart Jones; it is indispensable in Π, if ημιν is right. τε ημιν καί, omitting τα, might be read.

680–2. των πεπρεπεν | αφ | πεπρεπεν αὑτον καί αὑτον]: om. των MSS. There was some variant in Π unless l. 680 had only 14 letters, and though in l. 681 [εναυτον might be read with some late MSS., the following letter is like ε, not α, and not more than 10 letters would be expected in l. 680 after εναυτον, whereas πεπρεπεν αὑτον ουδε | gives 13. αὑτον αὑτον is unnecessary, but ων | [εναυτον | . . . . . . . . . | is less likely than a slight change in l. 680, such as the insertion of ταν.

683. [εβολοῦσα]: so ABEFGM, Hude, Stuart Jones; εβολοῦστα B.

691. [οι λοιπα: οι | οι λοιπα | οι λοιπα | οι | οι λοιπα | οι | οι λοιπα: so ABEFGM, edd. Π must have omitted οι or αι, probably the former, as well as ειον. οι has recently occurred in l. 687, where Classen wished to omit it as an intrusion from the present passage, in which he suggested the omission of αι. More probably Π is right in omitting οι here.

695. δε πολεμοῖο: δε' εναντίον ABCEFG, edd., δε' εναντίον Μ. πολεμοῖο is probably repeated from l. 692.

699. [αὐτῶν: so BEMηθέα edd.; αὐτῶν ACFG, αὐτῶν some late MSS.

702. [τε]: so B, Stuart Jones; om. ABEFGM, Hude.

705. [αὐτοκράταρι]: (corr. to -στεῖες by Π'): ἀναχωρήσατε ABEFGε, edd., -στεῖες CGM.

712. [αὐτοκράταρισα: so CE, Hude; ἀναχωρήσαττ ABFGM, Stuart Jones.

713. περιον: so Paris. 1637; περιον ABCEFGM, edd., περι three other late MSS.

716. [επιγείεια: so ABCEFGM, edd.; επιγείεια C and some late MSS.
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720. a και: so BCG, edd.; καὶ δ' ΕΜ, καὶ δ' καὶ AFg suprascr.
ēδικεί: so ABCEFG, edd.; ἔδικει ἑδαι M.
723. τα: so ACEFGM, edd.; τά B.
724-5. στεφανόρα: so BCEFM, edd.; στενότερα AB γράφεται.
των χωρών: so ACFEGM, edd.; τοι τε χωρίων B γράφεται.
725-6. προφθάσαντας: so ACEFMB γράφεται, Hude; διαλαβότας B, Classen, προδια-

labότας Stuart Jones. Cf. l. 751, note.
727. ένι[ε]γγυνσκον: so ACFM, edd.; ένυγγυνσκον BE.
728. πρόκο: so CEFGM, edd.; ἴπτω AB.
729. α: om. MSS. The insertion of α may have been intended to ease the construction of the infinitive δοκεῖν ἄν in 736 (which depends loosely on ένυγγυνσκον, καὶ ἔδοκεν πωτητα being parenthetic), but is probably due to a reminiscence of α καὶ αὐτῷ ἔδοκεν in l. 720. The ink of α is rather faint and it may have been intentionally obliterated. C has πωτητοῖς for ποτηταί (corr. c).
732-3. πεπαθμένοι: so B. ἀναπαθμένοι (ACEFGM, edd.) is too long.
734-5. αὐτοῦ ἠρεκλη: so ACEFGM, edd.; ἠρεκλή (ἡρεκλή γράφεται) B. Hude's conjecture ταύτη τέ ἡμέρα is not confirmed.
736. δοκεῖν αὐ: so MSS., but Π may have omitted ἄν.
739. τετραβιά: so ACEF, edd.; τετράβιοι B.
747. «ον: so apparently some late MSS. and Krüger, followed by Hude; oικεῖτι
751. φιλεσθω: προφθάσασθε C; προφθάσασθα ABEGF, edd., προφθάσαντας recently
occurred in l. 725 and προφθασθα is not found with a participle elsewhere in Thuc., so that
the simple verb may well be right here.
754. ετάρων: so BCEFGM, edd.; έτέρων A, corr. a².
755. εταύν: so ABEGF, edd.; ταύ C, corr. c⁴.
758. ἔνεσκότασαί: so C; ἐνεσκότασεν ABFGGc⁷, edd.; ἐνεσκότασεν M.
767. The initial σ of Συμμαχίων has been corrected or rewritten.
768. The σ of φιλασ[ποτή]ν seems to have been inserted later by Π.
780-5. The division of lines is uncertain.
782. προσθε: προσέθε ABCEFG, edd., πρόπροσθε M. Cf. l. 950, note.
840-4. The division of lines in this fragment is not quite certain. Line 844 may
be shortened by restoring προφθασθαλων with GM.
852. τπεγυάν[ε]να: so ACEFGM, edd.; τπεγυάνα B, (B) is not well suited to the size
of the lacuna.
879-89. The arrangement of these lines is fairly secure. To make κελας in l. 882
begin a line does not suit 883, and the division προσ | Καρυνας does not suit 879.
881. μηρος: so B, edd., om. B.
885. δαρι is on a separate fragment, which is not quite certainly placed here.
900. επί: so B, edd.; περά ACEF, obviously from l. 910.
911-12. διὰ τῆς μηρος γεγεναι: so B; ομ. τῆς ACEF, edd. It is not clear that Π
inserted it, but if it is omitted the line had only 16 letters, for to read ππηρα [μήρον is less
satisfactory, besides reducing l. 910 to 16 letters.
914. [μ]νεμψαν: so ACEFGB suprascr., Hude; but [μ]νεμψαντα (B, Stuart
Jones) is possible.
915-16. τπε [είδη ἔν] τπε [είδος ἔντο ἔν] τπε [είδη ἔντο ἔν] τπε [είδη ἔντο] can be read. ἐπεί δ' 'έγ, CG, ἐπείδη δ' ἐγ, AEFM, edd., ἐπείδη δ' ἐγ, B. The paraphrasus below this line was probably added by Π.
917. [ε]ρον (ABCFGM) is more likely than [η]ρον (E, edd.); cf. l. 429.
931. ευνηρ[ης] (corr. by Που to ευ αυρ[ης]): ευ αυρη τε MSS. ευνηρα is a mere error, but τε, which occurred in l. 928, is unnecessary. The surface of the papyrus is damaged after αυρ[η], but if the corrector had added τε, part of it ought to have been visible.
932. κε of ευνηρα is apparently corrected, perhaps from αρ.
938-9. ωστερ προσεμεξαν: so ACEFGM (προσεμεξαν), Hude, Stuart Jones (συμει-); ὅσ προσεμεξαν B. Π may have had either ὣ or ωστερ.
943. τοτε: so ACEFGM, edd.; τε after an erasure B.
945. εικεικλαιων[το]: έκεικλαιοντο Paris. 317, έκεικλαιοντο ABCFGM, edd. έκεικλαιον does not occur in Thuc., who uses κεικλαιον (the passive occurred in the lost l. 969), but έκεικλαιονθαι is common in writers of the Roman period. Cf. p. 162.
948. [ηδη οντω] so B with δη suprascr.; δη δετος ACEFGM, edd. The size of the lacuna strongly favours ηδη; cf. the confusion of δη and ηδη in ll. 14 and 19.
950. προςθε: so C, προσθεν ABFG, edd.; ξημπροεθεn M; cf. l. 782, note.
951. κυ: so ACEFGM, edd.; ίκων και B with some late MSS.
959. ωστα έναγκαζονται: so ABEGFM, Stuart Jones; ουα έναγκαζονται CK, ουα' έν αναγκαζονται Dobree, Hude.
960. τε: so MSS., except the two latter ones, Stuart Jones; Dobree, followed by Hude, wished to omit it, but cf. the next note.
961. πονω: so B with the Cassellanus and Paris. 1733, Stuart Jones; τονο τε ACEFGM, Hude; cf. the preceding note. Π is likely to have been right.
963. προςεθε: so ABEMFG4, edd.; om. CG.
967. έπεσεναστο: so ABF, edd.; έπεσεναστε ΚG, η έπεσεναστε Μ.
968. Before ενδιατρεισθαι there is a correction, the reading of the MSS. being apparently added by Π9 above the line. The first (and possibly the second) letter of ενδιατρεισθαν is crossed through, but probably by mistake, unless εν occurred in the preceding word (μεν ?). ενδιατρεισθαν MSS., edd.
992. γετυ: so MSS. Hude and Stuart Jones adopt Dobree’s correction δ’ οην.
999–1000. αι Συφλακσοι: so the Clarendonianus; om. of ABCFGM, edd. Cf. p. 161. έγμοναι: οι έγμοναι MSS.; cf. the preceding note. It is not certain that αι was omitted, but the lacuna is of the same length as that in l. 998.
1017. It is not certain that any lines are lost at the bottom of this column, which contains 49 lines so far, while Col. xxxi has 50.

Frs. 1–45. These small pieces are not to be regarded as coming from tops or bottoms of columns unless so described in the text.

Fr. 1. 2. ιωαι. [.] or ιωιδ. [.].

Fr. 3. ἢβ[ can be read in l. 3 and possibly θ in l. 6, but this fragment is not from ll. 110–15.

Fr. 15. The light colour of this fragment resembles that of Cols. xx–i and xxx–ii.

Fr. 28. 2. The supposed stop after ερα may be a letter.

Fr. 37. 2. Possibly Ενθαυβαι, but not l. 109. The colour of this fragment does not suit Col. iii, so that Στρε[τε ... Ενθαυβαι (ll. 119–20) is also inadmissible, as is ] (εω Πελακουςηη) Βουατοι in ll. 269–70.
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1377. Demosthenes, De Corona.

29.1 x 12.4 cm. Late first century B.C.

This nearly complete column from a roll of the speech De Corona is written in upright uncial letters whose informal character is exaggerated by the largeness of their scale. That the hand is of early date is clear from its style, which recalls that of 216, and a further proof is supplied by the verso, which contains accounts in cursive of the first century. The text on the recto may be ascribed with probability to the latter half of the first century B.C., or at any rate to the reign of Augustus, and thus seems to be the oldest fragment of any speech of Demosthenes hitherto recovered. Pauses in the sense are represented by short blank spaces, in which a high or medial dot is sometimes inserted (by a later hand?); such blank spaces, however, occasionally occur when there is no pause. Paragraphi were also employed (l. 11). A horizontal dash is once used for the purpose of filling up a short line. Remains of a cursive adscript, referring to the previous column, occur in the left margin opposite l. 12.

The text shows a tendency to omission, and was evidently not distinguished by great accuracy, but is not without small points of interest. A coincidence with a reading of Tiberius which was adopted by Blass is noticeable in l. 25.

ετερων επακολουθειν
γνωμαις ἑσθην καὶ μαλ
λον υμας επανω κατὰ
πολλακαὶ καὶ μαλιστα δ ἐπὶ
5 τοι θεουλευεσθαι τουτων
ασφαλεστερον και τα——
προς ημας εχειν εν εν
νοιαε στερ ον μικραν
ναιειν οις ελπιζω ρο
10 πην εαν περ επι ταυτης
μενητε της προσθεσεως

ου ουτως διαθεις Φιλιππος
τας πολεις προς ἀληθα
[δ]αι τουτων και τουτων
15 [ε]παρθεις τοις ψηφισμα
[σι]ν ηκεν εχον την δν
[ν]αμιν και την Ελατειαν

§ 167

§ 168
1378. DEMOSTHENES, Contra Midiam.

16 x 13.5 cm.

The upper part of a column, with the ends of a few lines from the column preceding, written in a medium-sized calligraphic hand of the biblical type. This style of script is now known to go back at least to the beginning of the third century (cf. 681, P. Rylands 16), and the present specimen appears to represent a comparatively early stage in its development. A high stop occurs in l. 11. A diaeresis in l. 10 takes the form of a short horizontal stroke.

Though so carefully written the text is not distinguished by great accuracy, and errors in ll. 11 and 19 remain uncorrected. There is no variant of importance.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

διαν ἀπαντῶν τοιν ἐ

τῇ πολὺς λαμπροτα

§ 153
The vestiges are doubtfully identified: εξαιτησθαι edd., εξαιτησθαι S and some others.

5. οσα: Blass wished to read δοσον, with έλαττων for έλάττω.
6. II. ος' και ος: l. ος διεκιώσ with MSS
7. έλαττ[ω]: so S, edd.; έλάττω other MSS. But έλαττ[ο] is also a possible reading.
8. I. ημεν. The scribe made the slightly lengthened stroke of ι, but then seems to have inadvertently treated it as the first stroke of the v.

1379. Livy, I.

14.3 x 10 cm. Late third century. Plate VI.

Livy so far has been represented in the papyri only by a portion of an epitome (668); now we have a fragment—unfortunately but a small one—from Book i of the historian himself. The present MS. resembles the epitome both in being in the form of a roll, and in the character of the script, which is of the mixed uncial style apparently prevalent in the provinces. A few differences are
to be recognized. Minuscule forms are more sparingly employed in 1379 than in 668; there are the usual $b$ and $d$, but $m$ is of the pure uncial shape, while $r$ is in a state of transition between uncial and minuscule. The general resemblance, however, between the hands of the two papyri is so close that they must be of approximately the same date, and since 668 can be assigned with probability to about the end of the third century, 1379 may be referred with little hesitation to the same early period. Punctuation, which in 668 was not employed except with abbreviations, is here rather elaborate, medial and low dots being used for short pauses, and an angular mark in the high position for a more considerable interval (l. 6).

The fragment (cc. v. 6–vi. 1), so far as it goes, shows a correct text, but is too slight to give an insight into its quality or affinities.

\[
\text{[gi]am venire pastoribus} \quad \text{v. 6}\\
\text{[ad regem] impetum facit [}\\
\text{[et a do]mo Numitoris alia [}\\
\text{[com]para]ta manu: adiuva}t\\
\text{[Rem]us: ita regem optrun [}\\
\text{[cat] N[u]mitor int[er] pri [}\\
\text{[mun] K[u]multum hostes [}\\
\text{[invasi]se u[r]bem a]que [}\\
\text{[adortos reg]iam dicti}tans \quad \text{vi i}\\
\text{[cum pube]m Albanam [in}\\
\text{[arcem pra]sidio armis[que [}\\
\text{[opti]nendum avocasset [}\\
\text{[postquam] [u]nes per[petra [}\\
\text{[ta caed]e pergere ad se g[vra [}\\
\text{tulantis uidit. extemplo [}\\
\text{[advoca]ty [on]c[ilo. sce[le [}\\
\text{[ra in se] fr[atr]is- originem [}\\
\text{[nepotum] ut geniti [}
\]

5. \textit{optrun[cat]}: the size of the lacuna is in favour of the singular, which is read by most of the best MSS.

13. The supplement at the end of the line is rather long in comparison with the others, but it would be rash to infer that the papyrus had some shorter word, e.g. \textit{peracta}, instead of \textit{perpetra}.

16. \textit{sce[le]}ra, not \textit{scel[hus} (M), is indicated by the spacing.

18. Above the vestiges of the supposed $u$ there is a mark suggesting the top of an $o$ or some other round letter. It does not look like an accident, but remains unexplained.
IV. GRAECO-EGYPTIAN LITERARY PAPYRI

1380. Invocation of Isis.

21·8 × 112·5 cm. Early second century.

The recto of this long and interesting papyrus contains an invocation (ἐπίκλησις) of the goddess Isis, the verso a somewhat analogous composition in praise of Imhotep-Asclepius (1381). As often happens with a roll that has been re-used, the surface of the recto has suffered considerably, and the ink is in many places very faint, rendering decipherment difficult, particularly in the later part where lacunae are more frequent. The twelve consecutive columns, each containing 22–8 lines, are written in a small semiuncial hand with a tendency to cursive forms in certain letters, especially α and ε. η is remarkable for its tall first stroke. Stops, usually in the high position and all having the same value, are common, and after one of these an initial letter is often enlarged. Diaereses are occasionally found, but no breathings or accents. Some corrections, chiefly due to misspellings of ει for ι or vice versa, have been inserted in an apparently different but probably contemporary hand, though not regularly nor always intelligently (cf. l. 120), besides a few insertions by the scribe himself, who was not very accurate. The handwriting of both recto and verso indicates a date not later than the second century, the recto probably having been written in the reign of Trajan or Hadrian, the verso under the Antonines.

The invocation falls into two sections, the first being concerned with the goddess in her well-known capacity of πολυψώφως (cf. ll. 97 and 101) and giving an elaborate list of her titles in towns or nomes of Egypt (ll. 1–76), and then in towns, districts, or countries in other parts of the world (ll. 76–119). The second section begins with a continuation of similar complimentary titles (ll. 119–42) still governed by ἐπικαλώματι σε, which no doubt occurred at the lost beginning of the first section, and proceeds in ll. 142–298 to a long and somewhat disconnected prose hymn of praise addressed to the goddess, dealing with the various aspects of her divinity and power. Similar but much briefer invocations of Isis occur in Apuleius, Metam. xi, 5, P. Leyden U ii, and P. Brit. Mus. 121. 492–504, and the magical papyri contain numerous invocations of Hermes, who was sometimes regarded as the father of Isis, sometimes as her son (l. 39, note) or other kindred deities. 1380, however, is both earlier and on a higher level than the magical papyri, which mostly belong to the third or fourth centuries and
are of a more composite character, being largely concerned with spells. Since the papyrus itself dates from near the beginning of the second century, the composition of the invocation can hardly be placed later than in the first—a date supported by the evidence of some of the place-names, which suggest the period between Strabo and Ptolemy, contemporary with Pliny; cf. notes on ll. 21, 40, 70, 74, and 94. It is obviously based mainly on Egyptian documents such as those from which Brugsch (Religion d. alt. Aeg. 646–7; cf. Budge, Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection, ii. 276–8) collected the Egyptian titles of Isis, and resembles the hymns to Osiris in the Book of the Dead. A demotic papyrus at Cairo (Spiegelberg, Catal. no. 31169) contains a short list of the titles of Isis with those of other gods, preceded by a list of Delta towns. But though the Egyptian elements are strongly marked both in the general arrangement and many of the individual expressions, the invocation was no doubt composed in Greek, as is shown by the identification of Isis with e.g. Hellas (l. 95), ἕλληνις (l. 44), and many Greek or non-Egyptian deities, the introduction of the Hellenic scheme of the universe with Olympus (l. 139), Lethe (l. 127), and the Dioscuri (l. 235), and the numerous parallels to Greek inscriptions and other evidence for Isis-worship in the eastern Mediterranean. As an important document written by an initiate, it ranks with the well-known inscriptions of Ios and Andros (C. I. G. xii. v, nos. 14 and 739; cf. Diod. i. 27), in which Isis speaks in the first person. When complete it must have been of considerable length, for the writing on the verso proceeds in the opposite direction to that on the recto, and while not much need be lost at the end of 1380, since 1381. i, though not the actual beginning, is certainly not far from it, there is reason to think that many columns preceded 1380. i, for most of 1381 is the prelude to a narrative which only begins in l. 222 shortly before the papyrus breaks off. The list of Egyptian places which occupies 1380. 1–76 only covers the Delta, but the towns of Upper Egypt on the same scale would not have taken up more than the three or four preceding columns, and what preceded these is unknown. Isis-worship appealed to the Greeks and Romans much more than any other branch of the Egyptian religion and, in addition to the account of Isis in Diod. i. 11–27, Plutarch’s treatise De Iside et Osiride, Apuleius, Metam. xi, and other literary testimony, the archaeological evidence from statues, inscriptions, gems, coins, &c., is extensive; cf. Drexler in Roscher, Lex. d. griech. u. röm. Mythol. ii. 373–548, Lafaye, Hist. du culte des divinités d’Alexandrie hors de l’Égypte.

The various aspects under which Isis is regarded in 1380 may be classified under the following heads. First as to her name, "Isis" occurs in l. 23 and often; more mysterious names ending in -ευ and resembling those found in magical papyri apparently occur in ll. 282, 286, and 296. Of her appellations derived
from the Egyptian Ἐσερέφμεφ (l. 46) is known from the recently discovered Theadelphia inscription, while ᾠνώτης in l. 68, Μοῦχις (?) in l. 45, Ὀνεί in l. 1, Ἰαθροίξεις in l. 14, Ταχυήντις in l. 75, and ῥυμεύνως in l. 3 are new and may be compared to the titles Ἴσίς Νεφρέμμεφ and Νεφωράςς at Socnopaiæ Nessus. In places outside Egypt the titles Θεα[π]βοις in l. 105 (among the Magi), Σαρκοκούνας in l. 119 (at Susa on the ‘Red Sea’), ΤΝ Ῥησία and Πελετρά (??) in ll. 114–15 (Troad and Dindyma) are also probably foreign appellations like the Egyptian rather than names of distinct divinities. The remarkable titles Δανώα in l. 104 (Persia), and Ἑλλάς in l. 95 (Stratonos Pyrgos) testify to the strong hold which Isis-worship had taken upon the Graeco-Roman world. The syncretistic tendency of the age is well shown by the identification of Isis with various Graeco-Egyptian and foreign divinities, Aphrodite (i.e. Hathor) in l. 9 and often, Artemis in l. 84, Astarte in l. 116, Atargatis, a Syrian deity, in l. 100, Athena (i.e. Neith) in ll. 30 and 72, Bubastis in l. 4, Core in ll. 72 and 105, Dictynnis, a Cretan deity, in l. 82, Hecate in l. 113 (cf. ll. 84 τριφωνις, 91 τριοδώτις, and the references to the underworld in ll. 127 and perhaps 164), Helen in l. 112, Hera in l. 26 and often, Hestia in ll. 23 and 73, Io Sothis in ll. 143–4 (cf. l. 64, where she is also connected with Io in an obscure passage), Leto in l. 79, Maia in ll. 39, 42, 103, and 116, Nanai, an old Babylonian goddess, in l. 106, Praxidice in l. 59, and Themis in l. 83. Several of these identifications were known, but those with Artemis, Helen, Hestia, Leto, Maia, and the last two appear to be new.

Isis as πολύμορφος (ll. 9 and 70) was worshipped as a kind of combination of the divine, human, and animal elements. She is called θεῶσ in ll. 77 and 107, θεά in l. 130, βία in ll. 26, 86, and 111, ἱερά in ll. 18, 41, 110, ἀγία in ll. 34, 36, 89, ἀγνή in l. 86, ἀμιάντος in l. 109, ἀβίβαστος in l. 115, τελεία in l. 32. The forms under which she often appears in art, as a cow, serpent, or with a vulture head-dress and wings, the symbol of motherhood, are illustrated by the titles in ll. 126–7 θεών πάντων τὸ καλὸν κύριον, l. 107 ταυρώτις, l. 58 ἀπόστη, l. 66 γυμνόμορφος; cf. the mention of her wings in ll. 219–20 and the institution of animal-worship ascribed to her in ll. 139–42, and ll. 159–63. The ordinary representations of her as a beautiful and youthful woman are indicated by the terms νέα in l. 85, νῦμφη in l. 30, ὀραία in l. 90, καλλίμορφος in l. 54, καλλίστη in l. 100, χαριτόμορφος in l. 59. With regard to her power she is called παντοκράτειρα in l. 20, πάντων δεσπότις in l. 231, δεσποτίς in l. 108, κρατίστη in l. 96, μεγάλητη θεῶν in l. 142, μεγάλητη in ll. 21, 92, and perhaps 66, μεγάλη in l. 77. As queen and ruler she appears as ἀνασα τῆς οἰκουμένης in l. 121, ἀνασα σῶλον in l. 57, and often as ἀνασα simply, βασίλισσα in ll. 36 and 218, δυνάστης in ll. 34, 41, 57, and 97, κυρία πάντης χώρας in l. 24. As a warrior-goddess she is called στρατιά in ll. 71, 83, 102, ἱγεμονίς in l. 52 (cf. l. 193).
στολαρχίς in l. 8, μικήτρια in ll. 30 and 48, ταχυνικής in l. 69; cf. ll. 239-42, where she is said to overthrow tyrants, and l. 80 ἐλευθερία.

Of Isis as law-giver fifteen ἑσσοῖ are alluded to in ll. 119-20 and two προστάγματα in ll. 155-7. Her foundation of νόμμα is described in ll. 203-5 and of δρήσιμα in ll. 244-5. As saviour or benefactress she is called σωτείρα in ll. 91 and 283, ἀνάστασείρα in l. 55, σώζουσα in l. 76, δοτείρα in ll. 13 and 68, χαρακτόστείρα in l. 10, ἀφροτητί in l. 99, ἄγαθή in ll. 51, 59, ἕπια in ll. 11 and 86 (cf. l. 153), πράσια in l. 43; cf. ll. 155-7 and 246-7. ὑβρισμα in ll. 39 and 98 probably refers to help in childbirth. Her son Horus is εὐφρένης καὶ ἄγαθος (ll. 246-7). Her identification with Abundance and Fortune is referred to in ll. 51 τρχη, 88 πανάφθονος, 99 εὐπλέα, 134-5 τῶν τάς καλάς ἀγώντων ἡμέρας εὐθνεία. Increase and decay were regulated by her (ll. 174-7, 194-6). In particular she was the goddess of seas and rivers and protectress of sailors and travellers, as is shown by ll. 61 πελάγους κυρία, 69 κυβερνήτις, 15 and 74 ὑμετρία; cf. the more detailed description in ll. 121-3. The Nile was her special charge (ll. 125-6), with which river are coupled in ll. 222-6 the Eleutherus and Ganges. As champion and model of the female sex she is said in ll. 214-16 to have given women power equal to that of men, and in ll. 129-32 to be ἐν Ὀλύμπω θέα εὐπρεπής, κόσμος θηλειῶν καὶ φιλόστοργος (cf. l. 12), providing sweetness in assemblies. She was the goddess of truth (l. 63 ἀλθεία) and love (ll. 109 ἄγαπὴ θεῶ, 28 ἄγαπῆ, 94 φιλία, 137 μουσεχθής). The sorrows of Isis are well known, but in 1880 she is rather the goddess of joy, as is shown by her titles εὐφροσύνη in ll. 19 and 31, ἐν Λήθῃ λαρά δῆμος in ll. 127-8, and by the gladness which she affords to the gods and her votaries (ll. 131-5, 157-9, 161-3, and 178-9). The invention, jointly with Hermes, of demotic writing, which is claimed by Isis in the Ios Inscr. 6-8, is alluded to in the title γραμματική in ll. 48 and 123, and λογιστική in ll. 27 and 124 perhaps refers to the discovery of arithmetic. She is also credited with the invention of weaving (ll. 145-6) and wine (ll. 179-83); cf. the more general phrases ἐπίνοια in ll. 34 and 60, φρονήσει in l. 44, φρονύμη in ll. 117 and 124, κεδυν in l. 79, εὐφρένια in l. 81, and the account of Isis as εὐφρενία πάντων in ll. 183-6. She is identified with the moon (l. 104), and the sun (ἡλίου δόρμα in l. 112); cf. ll. 157-9, where she is said to bring the sun, and 221-2 and 232-4, two mutilated passages referring to Horus in connexion with the sun. With the stars she is connected in ll. 159-61 and in l. 235, where the Dioscures are mentioned; cf. Io Sothis in ll. 143-4. The institution of the year of 365 days seems to be ascribed to her (ll. 153-5 and 204-5). As goddess of the sky (ll. 144-5) and light (ll. 248-9, 295), she regulated winds, lightning, snow, rain, and especially dew (ll. 172-4, 227-30, 237-9). A curious phrase πιστολαστής ἀνέμον καὶ ἔφης διάδημα (ll. 138-9; cf. ll. 193-4) is perhaps derived from the Egyptian, like ἐν ταῖς πανηγυρεῖς βιότροχος in l. 133 and τῶν
the aπεροκράτις in ll. 135–6. She was especially the goddess of immortality (l. 13), which she conferred upon her husband and brother Osiris (ll. 242–3) and her son Horus (ll. 246–7). Her recovery and burial of the former are mentioned in ll. 186–9, and her appointment of Horus as successor of Osiris in ll. 209–14, 250–2, and 263–8. As the goddess of mysteries she is called μύστις (l. 111) and χρησμοφόδος (l. 43), and is seen by her votaries (ll. 152–3). Temples of Isis were appointed by her in all cities (ll. 202–3), as is illustrated not only by ll. 1–119, but by special references to shrines or ceremonies at Busiris (ll. 269–71), Ὄσεριδος Ἀδυνό (ll. 161–3), Memphis (249), Heracleopolis (150–2), Abydos (l. 278), and an unknown town Ηλ [. ]κτος (ll. 148–9). In the processions (เอροδίαι) of the gods she took the chief part (ll. 136–7), being leader of the muses (ll. 62 and 128). She was all-seeing (παντόπιρις) in l. 93, κατόπτις in l. 87, πολυφθαλός in l. 129. Other noteworthy titles, most of which are new as applied to Isis, are τὸ ἄνω in ll. 38 and 42, ἀπάτειρα in l. 19, ἄφεσις ἐφύδων in l. 80, λατοφόρος in l. 40, μα in l. 6, πράσον ὄνομα in l. 143, and στέιχουσα in l. 87. Uncertain titles occur in ll. 7, 17, 25–9, 31, and 47, and much of the last four columns is obscure, Col. xii having only the beginnings of lines.

The detailed list of places in which Isis was worshipped naturally adds much to the extant evidence on the subject (cf. Wiedemann, Herodots zweites Buch, 190, Lanzone, Diz. di mitol. egiz. 813), and incidentally provides some valuable geographical information concerning the Delta, since the grouping of the places is more or less systematic. The section dealing with Upper Egypt is almost entirely lost, the first place mentioned being Aphroditopolis (l. 1) or some other town in the vicinity of Memphis, which in l. 2 is called by its old Egyptian name 'the House of Hephaestus' (Πηθ). Proceeding northward along the main western branch of the Nile past Letopolis (l. 6) and the Prosopite nome (l. 8) to Naucratis (l. 19) and the Gynaecopolite nome (l. 21), the list turns eastward to Buto (l. 27), the Salte nome (l. 30–2), and the northern part of the central Delta (ll. 33–7), then southwards to Bubastus (l. 37), Heliopolis (l. 38), and Athribis (l. 39). Again proceeding northward through the Phtheosphithe nome (l. 40) to Xois (l. 42), the list then shifts across to places in the Libyan nome far west of Alexandria (ll. 43–5), then back to Phagrioropolis in the eastern Delta (l. 46) and other places in that quarter up to Tanis (l. 59). The coast east and west of Alexandria occupies ll. 60–73, Pelusium and the extreme north-east ll. 73–6, after which the list turns to places outside Egypt. Besides a few nomes, about sixty-seven Delta towns are mentioned, including most of those found in Strabo or Ptolemy and several which were only known by Stephanus Byzantinus or the Geographus Ravennas and can now be located more definitely (ll. 15 Psochemis, 16 Mylon, 41 Teouchis, 69 Peucestis), and several that were previously
unknown (Il. 11 Calamis and Carene, 13 Hierasus, 17 Ce. culemis (?), 22 Pephremis (= Papremis ?), 31 Caene, 40 Hiera, 47 Chaintine, 54 Isidium, 64 Meniouis, 70 Melas, 71 Menoush; cf. Il. 4, 25, 31, and 66 where the names are new but uncertain). Alexandria is not mentioned, though a great Isis-temple there is known from 35 recto. 13. Perhaps the metropolis is accounted for by the mention of ‘the Island’, if that of Pharos is meant (l. 68, note), or it occurred without regard to its geographical position at the beginning of the list, which may, however, well have begun with Philae, or possibly the list was based on an ancient Egyptian one made before Alexandria was founded.

The fifty-five places outside Egypt are naturally for the most part familiar, and are arranged with less regard to geography. Beginning in l. 77 with Arabia, Asia Minor (Il. 78-81), Cyrene, Crete, Chalcedon, and Rome (Il. 81-3), Aegean islands (Il. 84-5), Cyprus (Il. 86-9) and some other places which for various reasons cannot be located with certainty (Il. 89-92; Hypsele in l. 92 is unknown), the list goes back to the frontier of Egypt and Palestine and mentions several towns on or near the Syrian coast (Il. 93-9; Sinope in l. 96 is out of place here). Then come Delphi (l. 99) and a rather mixed series of towns and countries including the Amazons (l. 102), India (l. 103), Persia (l. 104-6), and Italy (l. 109), the Hellespont and coast of the Aegean (Il. 110-13), Syria again (Il. 116-17), and finally an unknown Susa on the ‘Red Sea’ (Il. 118-19).

Altogether the papyrus, in spite of its imperfect condition, supplies a fairly comprehensive and vivid picture of Isis-worship in the first century when that Graeco-Egyptian cult had become a world-force. It is an intentionally archaic kind of composition, as is clear on comparison with 1381, which, though also a composition in praise of a Graeco-Egyptian deity and professing to be concerned primarily with the translation of a hieroglyphic roll, is much more Greek than Egyptian in character and style, illustrating the rapid decline of ancient Egyptian influences, even in matters of religion, under the Romans. The author of 1380 was no doubt a priest of Isis, possibly at Oxyrhynchus, where Isis had a separate temple (43 verso, ii. 16), but more probably at Memphis, which not only is dignified by an unusual name in l. 2 (cf. p. 203), and singled out in l. 249, but affords a connecting link with the text on the verso; cf. 1381, introd.

In the text the high stops represent those in the original, the commas are inserted by us. For assistance in connexion with the ancient Egyptian evidence concerning Isis and Imhotep-Asclepius we are indebted to Mr. F. Ll. Griffith and with regard to Alexandrian coins to Mr. J. G. Milne.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Col. i.

[1] 196
[2] THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
[3] Col. i.
[4] [t]hν ἐν Ἀφροδίτης; τὸλει Ἄντ].
[5] [175] Ἑβαίστου οἶκῳ
[6] [14 letters] ἡμείνων. τὸν
[7] [ἐν 12 letters] ὕπει Βοῦβασ-
[8] [5] τιν.;]...καλούμενη τὸν
[9] [ἐν Δητούς πλείστη] τῇ μεγάλῃ μίαν,
[10] [.....] τὸν ἐν Ἀφροδίτης πά-
[11] [λεὶ τοῦ Προπασσί][[σ]τοι θυλαρχεῖ-
[12] [δα] πολλομορφον, Ἀφροδίτην τὸν

10 [Ε]πὶ τοῦ Δήλτα χαριτοδότειραν
[13] [ἐν Καλαμίας ἥτιναν ἐν τῇ Καρπ-
[14] [ν] λιφίδιστοργον ἐν τῇ Νεκίου
[15] [ἀθανάτοιον ὅπως ἐν τῷ Ἰεράσφ
[16] [.....] ἀθροίζων ἐν Μομέμ-

15 [φ]λανσαυν ἐν Ψωχῆμε [δημο-
[17] [τριαν] ὡν Μῦκων ἀνασιαύν τὴν
[18] [ἐν Κε.. κυλήμε [. .] ἡμῶν τὴν ἐν
[19] ['Ερ]μοὶ πόλει καλλιμορφὸν, ἱερὰν
[20] [τὴν ἐν Ναυκράτει ἀπάτειραν, εὐφρα-

20 [σὸ]νην, σῶτειραν, παντοκράτειραν,
[21] [μεγίστην] ἐν Νηκίου τοῦ Τιμαῖ-
[22] [πολειτοῦ Ἀφροδιτίτην ἐν Περίθ-
[23] [μο] ὦ Ἰσιν, ἀνασιαυ, Ἑστίαν, [ἀνασασαν]
[24] [κυριεῖαν πάσης χόρας [τὴν ἐν Χυνο]

3. μ of ἱματων above the line. 30. τ of ἐτης above a deleted. 1. χαριτοδότειραν.
11. First, 1 of καλαμίου above a deleted. 13. τ of δοσειραν corr. from ρ. 15. of σπρασιων above a deleted. 21. δ of σπρασιων above the line. 23. ἐν Νηκίου above a deleted. 34-5. of αγαν above a (deleted?).
39. δι of αδειωθι above the line, and αι of μαυρ above ε (deleted?).

Col. ii.

25 τὴν ἐν Εσ[. . . . . . . . . . .] [. . . . . . .].
[26] Ἐπὶ Ἡραν, διαμ[. . . . . . . . . . .].
[27] [βούτῳ λαογιστικήν, .. . .. ἐν
[28] Θᾶνοι ἀγαπη[. . . . . . . . . . .].] χρό-
[29] νοι καὶ ἀγαφ[. . . . . . . . . . .].] ἐν
[30] τῷ Σατύρῳ κ[ι]κ[τ][ι][α][ν], Ἀθηναῖν, νυόμην]
[31] ἐν Νηθεῖοι[. . . . . . . . . . .].] [. . . . ἐν Καύς ἐν-
[32] φροσυτήν[. . . . . . . . . . .].] ἐν Σαμί Ἡραν, ἀνασ(σ)αν, τε-
[33] λείαν[. . . . . . . . . . .].] ἐν Ἱσῆω Ἰσι[. . . . . . . . . . .].] ἐν Σεβεννο-
[34] τῷ ἐπισφοιν, δυνατίν[. . . . . . . . . . .].] Ἡραν, ἀ-

35 γιάν[. . . . . . . . . . .].] ἐν 'Ερ[μο]πο ο[λ]ει Ἀφρ[ο]θείτην, 
[37] λει τῇ μεικ[ρ]άν ἀνασ(σ)αν ἐν Βουθά-
[38] στῷ τὸ ἄνω ἐν Ἡλίων π[δ]λει Ἀφρ[ο]
[39] δίτην ἐν Ἀ[θ][ρ][δ]ίτην Μαχαῖν, ὅρθωσαν ἐν

40 Ἱερᾶ Θεομ[ήθεν] ψέβοι τοῦ θεοφόρον ἐν 
[41] Τεοῖκι ἠράν[. . . . . . . . . . .].] δυνατεῖν ἐν τοῖς 
[42] Βουκολείοι Μᾶ[ι]αν ἐν Χαί ί[δ]ίω ἄνω, 
[43] χρησμοφό[δ][ν].] ἐν Καταβαθμῷ πρ[θ]-
[44] νοιάν ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀταμο φρονητικ[λ]

45 ἐπὶ Δινᾶς Ἀ'κτ[ῆ] Ἀφροδιτίτην, Μοῦ-
[45] ξίν, Ἐσερέμ[ι] ἐν Φραγιφρόν πό-
[46] λει [. . . . . . . . . . .].] ψι[ν].] ἐν Χοατέλη

Col. iii.

νεικηθ[ιδαν] ἐν . . . . . . . γραμ-

Col. iv.

70 βερνήτων ἐν Μελαθία πολύμορ-
[51] φον ἐν Μ[ε]λαθία στραγγίας ἐν 
[52] Μετηλείτη Κ[όρ]λον ἐπὶ Χάρακος Ἀ-
54-5. σεβροῦτον Π. 58. Π. Δευτεροπολεί αυτοκτόνων above ei deleted. 68. Π. δόθημαν. 69-70. ei or Π. eφ[θ]θε anrewritten. 80. Π. εφ[θ]θε anrewritten. 73. Π. εφ[θ]θε anrewritten. 76. Π. τοποπολείς. 78. Π. 1. εφ[θ]θε anrewritten. 85-6. Π. νέαν... κη... δια, ἥπιαιν.

καλὸν ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐν Δ[η]θη λα- 
ρᾶν ὅτι τὴν μουσαγωγὸν·

130 Ὀλύμπω θεῶν ἐνυφαί[επήρ:] κόσμω

θηλείων καὶ φιλοσ[ορ]γο[ν:] τὴν ἐν
ταῖς συνόδοις ἡδίας εὐφροινῶν·

τὴν ἐν ταῖς πανηγύρεσι βῆσσερι- 
χων· τῶν τὰς κάλας ἀγώνων

135 ἡμ[έ]ρας εὐθυνεῖαν· τὴν τῶν θεῶν
Ἀρτοκράτιν· τὴν ἐν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν
ἐξοδίαις πάνταρχον, µαισχηθήνι·

πιστοφορίαν ἀνέκου καὶ ζω- 

140 τὰ δὲ πάντων τῶν θεῶν ζε[ν].

102. l. Ἀµαζωῖ. 103. Ἰωβας Π. as of µαῖαν above e deleted. 104. Above e of περας a (?). deleted. 105. l. Μάγους. θ of θαν[ε]χων corr. from τ (?). deleted. 106. i of παῖες above e deleted. 107. θεος. Π. l. θεῶν... ταυρούν. 108. l. δεσπότων. 109. i of αµιαντος. above e deleted; l. -τον. 110. v of µυσαυ θορ. 113. l. Εκατήν. 116. l. Μαιαν. 120. i of -πατι above e deleted. l. διάκονες. eves of ermuqeves above the line. 124. First i of θυγατρικης above e deleted. 129. l. την for τον. 130. l. Ὀλυμψω. 137. i of µαισχηθήνι above e (?).
155 ρων τε εητεια σοι και ευδίαλ-
λακτος σ χαρίς τῶν δύο προσ-
tαγμάτων[?] ἕλιον ἀπ' ανατολῆς
μέχρι δύσεως σὺ ἐπιφέρει[ς] καὶ[ι] δλον
eυφραννοῖς[ι] ὁ θεὸς ἀστρη[ῶν] ἁ-
160 νατολαίς σὲ ἀκάμμου προσκυνοῦν
οἰ ἐπιχώριοι καὶ τὰ ἀλλα ἱερὰ ἄδω-
α ἐν τῷ Ὀσίριδος ἀδύτῳ, ὑλαροι γεί-
νονται ὅταν σὺ[ν] ὁμομάςωσιν.
οί [. .] δ'ά[λ]ιμονει ὑπόκουο σοι [γ]η-

142. μ. of μ[ε]γνητην above an (?) deleted.
143. ἐν Π. 144. l. μετάφοραν.
145. Second ε of ε[πικαρεις] above the line.
146-7. κα. of γ[υ]μακας corr.
152. ρ of ωρια above ε deleted and ε above the line.
153. δ (or δ[,]) above the line.
161. ἑρα Π. 162-3. ι. εύκατ (?) .
182-3. ν. of ν[υ]μ[ο]ν above the line.

Col. ix.

190 κ[. ]
σι[. . . . . . . . ] ν. ρ[. . .]
κ[. . . . . . . ] πόλει κα[ι. .]
κ[. . . . . . . . . ] η[π]ηδησας. ἢ[γ]ε-
μ[ο][ι]ς διαδηματουν φυ[ξ][η][ς][ε]

ως κυρία σῦ τὸν πα . Ι. ] τα-
φῆς κ[α. . ] μαγ[. . . ] Ἱ[α][ε] ν. [. . .]
ἀρτω . . . . 'Οσιγ[. .] π . . [ ] .
κα[ι . . . . . . η. . . .] έστ[ιν] έ[. . .]

200 σας(?) σῦ τὰ πάντα . . . μ . [ . . .]
καὶ τὰ πάντα πρὸς δια . . . [ . . . ]
σας: Ἡσία πάσας[ις] πέλασεν εἰς τὸν ἀπα-
ντε χρόνοιν κατέστησας[ι] καὶ π[ά]σαι[ν]
τὰ νόμμα καὶ ἐμφασίων τέλειον π[ε]-
205 ρέδωκας[ι] κ[α][ι . . . ] ἐσφώνα πάσι ο[. .]
σε[ι. .ει[. .] . η κ[α][α]τά ἰσαματά τόποι[. .] ἐν
πάντει τὸ π[. . . ] ἐδίκας πρὸς τὸ ἓ-

Col. x.

η[σ]ας: κα[ι . . . ] ἀ[δύτῳ] η[. . . . ] υνη-
σας ἢ[θη] [ . . ] ιτ[υμ]ν
ἀν[. . ] . ι. βασιλίσσα ηρ [. . . ] . . .]
κυρ[ια]
π[ρ][ο]ελθοῦσα πᾶσαν χῶραν [. . . . ]
κυρ[ιά]
α[. . ] . πλ[η]μ[υρ]ας ποταμών
τ[. . . . . . ] . [ . . . ] . γάνεις καὶ τοῦ ἐν Αἰ-
γυπτ[ρο] Ν[ε[λ]ο]υ[ν δ[ε] Τριτόλι Ελευθέ-
ρου, ἐν δ[ε] τ[ῆ] Ἰν[δική] Γάγγου καὶ [το]
δ[ε] ἦν τὸ πάν κα[ι τ]ὸ ἐγκερ . . . έστ[ι]
πάν-
τος ὀμβρου καὶ πάσας[ις] πηγῆς καὶ πά-
σι[ς] δρόσου κα[ί] χει[ῶνος καὶ πά-
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265 \(\epsilon\) \(\lambda\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\theta\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\epsilon\) \(\tau\) \(\gamma\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\rho\) \(\mu\) \(\nu\) \(\theta\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) 

266 \(\kappa\) \(\alpha\) \(\gamma\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) 

267 \(\kappa\) \(\alpha\) \(\iota\) \(\iota\) \(\epsilon\) \(\theta\) \(\iota\) \(\nu\) 

270 \(\beta\) \(\ldots\) \(\ldots\) \(\ldots\) 

290 \(\theta\) \(\epsilon\) \(\omega\) \(\theta\) \(\iota\) \(\gamma\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) 

295 \(\kappa\) \(\omega\) \(\kappa\) \(\iota\) \(\tau\) 

299 \(\iota\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) 

296 \(\epsilon\) \(\delta\) \(\rho\) \(\omega\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\epsilon\) \(\iota\) \(\tau\) \(\theta\) \(\iota\) \(\lambda\) \(\nu\) \(\iota\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) 

299–1 \(\tau\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) 

265–1 \(\tau\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) 

269 \(\epsilon\) \(\delta\) \(\rho\) \(\omega\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\epsilon\) \(\iota\) \(\tau\) \(\theta\) \(\iota\) \(\lambda\) \(\nu\) \(\iota\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) 

299–1 \(\tau\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) 

265 \(\beta\) \(\omega\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) 

270 \(\beta\) \(\ldots\) \(\ldots\) \(\ldots\) 

295–1 \(\tau\) \(\alpha\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\) \(\omega\) \(\nu\) \(\tau\)
Artemis; at Patmos young; . . .; at Paphos hallowed, divine, gentle; in Chios marching; at Salamis observer; in Cyprus all-bounteous; in Chalcedice holy; in Pieria youthful; in Asia worshipped at the three ways; at Petra saviour; at Hypsele most great; at Rhinocolura all-seeing; at Dora friendship; at Stratonos Pyrgos Hellas, good; at Ascalon mightiest; at Sinope many-named; at Raphia mistress; at Tripolis supporter; at Gaza abundant; at Delphi best, fairest; at Bambuye Atargatis; among the Thracians and in Delos many-named; among the Amazons warlike; among the Indians Maia; among the Thessalians moon; among the Persians Latina; among the Magi Core, Thapseus; at Susa Nania; in Syrophoenicia goddess; in Samothrace bull-faced; at Pergamum mistress; in Pontus immaculate; in Italy love of the gods; in Samos sacred; at the Hellespont mystic; at Myndus divine; in Bithynia Helen; in Tenedos name of the sun; in Caria Hecate; in the Troad and at Dindyma . . ., Palentra (?), unapproachable, Isis; at Berythus Maia; at Sidon Astarte; at Ptolemais understanding; at Susa in the district by the Red Sea Sarkounis; thou who also interpretest first of all in the fifteen commandments, ruler of the world; guardian and guide, lady of the mouths of seas and rivers; skilled in writing and calculation, understanding; who also bringest back the Nile over every country; the beautiful animal of all the gods; the glad face in Lethe; the leader of the muses; the many-eyed; the comely goddess in Olympus; ornament of the female sex and affectionate; providing sweetness in assemblies; the lock of hair (?) in festivals; the prosperity of observers of lucky days; Harpocrates of the gods; all-ruling in the processions of the gods, enmitting; true jewel of the wind and diadem of life; by whose command images and animals of all the gods, having . . . of thy name, are worshipped; O lady Isis, greatest of the gods, first of names, Io Sothis; thou rulest over the mid-air and the immeasurable; thou devisest the weaving of . . .; it is also thy will that women in health come to anchor with men; all the elders at E . . . cius sacrifice; all the maidens who . . . at Heracleopolis turn (?) to thee and dedicated the country to thee; thou art seen by those who invoke thee faithfully; from whom . . . in virtue of the 365 combined days; gentle and placable is the favour of thy two ordinances; thou bringest the sun from rising unto setting, and all the gods are glad; at the risings of the stars the people of the country worship thee unceasingly and the other sacred animals in the sanctuary of Osiris, they become joyful when they name thee; the . . . spirits become thy subjects; . . . (174-89) and thou bringest decay on what thou wilt and to the destroyed bringest increase, and thou purifiest all things; every day thou didst appoint for joy; thou . . . having discovered all the . . . of wine providedst it first in the festivals of the gods . . .; thou becamest the discoverer of all things wet and dry and cold (and hot) of which all things are composed; thou broughtest back alone thy brother, piloting him safely and burying him fittingly; . . . (193-6) leader of diadems; lady of increase and decay and of . . . (202-17) thou didst establish shrines of Isis in all cities for all time; and didst deliver to all men observances and a perfect year; and to all men . . . in every place; thou didst show . . . in order that all men might know that thou . . .; thou didst establish thy son Horus Apollo everywhere the youthful lord of the whole world and . . . for all time; thou didst make the power of women equal to that of men; and in the sanctuary thou didst . . . nations . . . (222-31) thou, lady of the land, bringest the flood of rivers . . ., and in Egypt: the Nile, in Tripolis the Eleutherus, in India the Ganges; owing to whom the whole and the . . . exists through all rain, every spring, all dew and snow, and all . . . and land and sea; thou art also the mistress of all things for ever; . . . (235-52) thou madest the . . . of the Dioscuri; . . . thou hast dominion over winds and thunders and lightnings and snows; thou, the lady of war and rule, easily destroyest tyrants by trusty counsels; thou madest great Osiris immortal, and deliveredst to every country . . . religious observances; likewise thou madest immortal Horus who showed himself a benefactor . . . and good; thou art the lady of light and flames; thou . . . a sanctuary at Memphis; Horus having judged before-
hand that thou hadst appointed him successor (of his father) . . . enthroning him, . . . (265-70) thou didst establish him lord of the throne and oracular king over his father's house for all time; in thy honour out of three temples that at Busiris called . . .

1-3. The 'House of Hephaestus' in l. 2, which was clearly in the neighbourhood of the southern apex of the Delta (cf. ll. 7 sqq.), no doubt refers to the Hephaestaeum at Memphis (Strabo, p. 807), being apparently used as a name of the city, like the Egyptian Har-kā-pilāh, 'the temple of the divine personality of Pah' (Wiedemann, Herodot's zweites Buch, p. 47). The worship of Isis at Memphis is again mentioned in l. 249, where she is said to have a special ἄθνον there; cf. Hdt. ii. 176. According to Diod. i. 22 and Euseb. Prasp. Evang. ii. 1 her tomb was at Memphis, according to Lucian, Adv. ind. 14, her hair, and she appears on the coins of the city and nome. That the author of 1880 was himself a priest of Isis at Memphis is not unlikely; cf. p. 195. ἡμένων in l. 3 is an Egyptian appellation like e. g. Ταχυψην in l. 75 (? Ταχυμένων), and one or two other titles are lost in the lacuna. Since the list of towns proceeds in a northerly direction, ἡμένων in l. 1 would be expected to be not far south of Memphis, and Ἀφροδίτης πόλις, the capital of the Aphroditopolite nome (Alsīh) is more likely than Νέδων πόλις, which is placed by Ptolemy in the Heracleopolite nome a little north of the capital, or Ἡρακλείων πόλις (Ἑθανία). Another Ἀφροδίτης πόλις (l. 7, note) is distinguished by the mention of its nome. If, however, as is possible (cf. ll. 18, 70, 73, 87, 96, 116, notes), the geographical order is not being strictly adhered to in ll. 1-2, a town in the Heliopolite nome, which adjoined the Memphite on the north-east, might be meant. Heliopolis itself occurs in l. 38, and Heroōpolis (Tell el Maskhūla; Naville, Pithom, p. 6) is too far away to be suitable, but the Ἀφροδίτης πόλις which is coupled with Heliopolis in P. Tebt. 313. 2, if it was in the Heliopolite nome and different from the town of that name in the Prospote nome (l. 7), may be referred to, or, possibly, Letopolis, if that town does not occur in l. 6, where it is expected, 'ονει- in l. 1 is probably the beginning of another Egyptian title like ἡμένων, &c., the first syllable perhaps representing άνωθεν = άν-νεφερ, 'good being'. A proper name 'όνεις with gen. 'ονείους occurs e. g. in P. Par. 5, xl. 4-5. With 'ονείου πόλις (Tell el Yahudia) or 'Ονει, the Egyptian name of Heliopolis, there is not likely to be any connexion.

4. ὄφεις: the doubtful one might be ο, but not μ, so that Μέλιμφε is inadmissible, even apart from the probability that the 'House of Hephaestus' means the town as well as the temple; cf. the preceding note. ὄφεις was presumably in the Memphite or Letopolite nome. The Coptic town Shetnoufī (Skhatamīf), about ten miles north of Letopolis, seems to be different.

4-5. Βοῦςβαστὸν: in Hdt. ii. 156 Βοῦςβαστὸς is equated to Ἀρτέμις and made the daughter of Isis. The identification of Isis with the cat-headed goddess Bastōs occurs also in P. Brit. Mus. 121, 496, and cf. l. 37, note. Βοῦςβαστὸν is unlikely owing to the absence of the article (cf. ll. 8 and 21, though later, in ll. 40 and 71, the article is omitted with nomes), and because Bagastus comes in l. 37. καλομείενν is not used elsewhere after titles in 1880.

6. [ἐν Ῥηβοῦσ] ψήφος [πρὸς Παλ] [τέρ] μεγάλη; the name is uncertain and [ἐν . . .] μεγάλη; [πρὸς Παλ] μ. can be read, but a mention of Letopolis (Αυςίμ) is expected between the Memphite and Prospote nomes, and in this neighbourhood no other town likely to have been called 'the great' is known, though that title is not elsewhere applied to Letopolis.

μίαν: cf. the common phrase εἰς Ζεὺς Σάραπι, e. g. 1382, 20; Isis is called 'the only one' in her Egyptian titles (Budge, op. cit. 277). Μ(ο)να, however, is possible; cf. e. g. l. 103 and Μενα in l. 116.

7-8. Aphroditopolis in the Prospote nome is known from Strabo, p. 802 συνάπτει δὲ . . . καὶ τῇ Ἀσιανοτῆτι νόμου, ἐν τῇ Ἀφροδίτης πόλις, and Pliny, N. H. v. 10 Βουσίρι, Συναπολίς, Αφροδίτες, Σαῖς. The identification with Nicii, which according to Ptolemy was the
capital of the Prospote nome, was rejected by Wiedemann (op. cit. p. 195), rightly, as l. 12 shows. There is more to be said in favour of identifying it with the Άπάρμβης of Hdt. ii. 41, which was in the Προσπότης χώρος and had a temple of Aphrodite, but that view is also rejected by Wiedemann. Άπάρμβης occurs elsewhere only in Steph. Byz., who omits this Άφροδίτης χώρος. The Prospote nome apparently included a triangular island between the main Canopic (western) branch and the Φαραονικός χώρος, which issued at the Sebennytic mouth, the northern limit of the nome being perhaps the ancient canal called Bahr el Fard‘unia ("Pharaonic river") which runs from east to west through Menfis; cf. Butler, Arab conquest of Egypt, p. 161. But it also extended to the west bank, since Φαραονική (Τερρανία) was included in it; cf. B. G. U. 453.2. There are ruins of a large town at Zawyet Razin on the Rosetta branch south-east of Menfis, which might belong to Άφροδίτης χώρος. Mrs. Butcher (Story of the Church in Egypt) would identify it with Nicu (cf. l. 12), but Butler (l.c.) follows Quatremère in placing that town, of which the Coptic name was Pschati, at Shabschir, where the canal joins the Rosetta branch, about six miles south of Ibsdät, which is identified with Nicu in a Graeco-Coptic-Arabic list of equivalents (Amelineau, Géogr. p. 283). Petrie (Naukratis, i, p. 93) puts Nicu at El Daharà, twelve or thirteen miles from Naucratis. The title 'mistress of the fleet' given to Isis at Άφροδίτης χώρος shows that it had a harbour of some importance. The form άποφρονίς seems to be new.

9. Άφροδίτης: i.e. in Egypt usually Hathor, with whom Isis was often identified (cf. Drexler, op. cit. 494-9), Horus being identified with Eros.

10. [ἐ]πὶ τοῦ Δάλτα: the writer tends to use ἐπὶ in place of ἐν when he is speaking of a town named after some natural object, e.g. in ll. 44 of Άπσασ, 45 Λευκής Άπτες, 60 Σχέδια, 61 τοῦ Ἱρμαλίου, 74 τοῦ Κασίου, 75 τοῦ Εκάργματος, 91 τῆς Πιτρας, but he is not consistent; cf. ll. 43 ἐν Καλαθαζῷμ, 54 ἐν τῷ Ἰατίῳ. With districts he uses ἐν, e.g. in ll. 29 ἐν τῷ Σατήν and 71 [ἐν] Μεριλείπη and frequently in ll. 76 sqq. Probably therefore τοῦ Δάλτα is a town rather than a district and identical with the κόψη rather than the χώρος at the junction of the Canopic and Sebennytic branches described by Strabo, p. 788. τοῦ Δάλτα in P. Rev. Laws xxxi. 6 is a district, but whether it corresponded to Strabo's χώρος or was further north, as suggested by Hogarth (Journ. of Hell. Stud. xxiv. 2°), or meant the Heliopolite nome, is not clear. On the whole it is probable that in xxxi. 6 κοπελαίδαι καὶ Δάλτα together form the Νεκρώσεις τῆς Ιατίου 20; cf. l. 21, note. Ptolemy's μέγα Δάλτα, μεγάλων Δ., and τρίτων Δ. are all east of the Prospote nome. The stop after καρποθέτημα is not quite certain, as it might be a continuation of the cross-bar of the ν; but though l. 11 presents difficulties it does not seem possible to combine the first part of it into one long adjective.

11-12. For ἡπίαν cf. l. 155.ἡ μιᾶς (cf. l. 6) might be read, but the letter preceding η is more like ι than μ. No place καλάμιος is known from Greek writers, but both it and Καρπηίη apparently belong to the ἄλλα πόλισε συχνά in the Prosopitis referred to by Hdt. ii. 41, and Colomos, which Geogr. Raven. 24 mentions next to Νίκιτα (i.e. Νεκιού: cf. l. 12) is perhaps identical with καλάμιος, to which Kalith, near the Barrage, bears some resemblance. Καμμοί could be read, but the division Κάμμις 21 π., or, treating the last word as an Egyptian title like Παντιφλίων, is unlikely owing to the correction of the τ of τοιμα from τι, for though irregular in his use of τ and ει in dative and altering αι to ι, the scribe does not elsewhere alter a correct ει. Καρπηίη is only known as a town in Mysia. With φιλοστοργηον cf. l. 131 and the Ios Inscr. 24-5 ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τέκνων γιονίς φιλοστοργηείσθαι ἐνομαθητα. 12. τῆς Νεκιού: cf. ll. 7-8, note.

13. Either 1) δένασαν δότως or 2) δένασαν(το)ν δότ., or ἀδάνας(σί)αν δότ. (as one or two words) can be read. The incorrect form ἀδάνασανδότερα would be similar to ἀνδροστάτωμα in l. 55 and would refer to the immortality conferred upon Osiris and Horus by Isis through her discovery of τοῦ τῆς ἀνάντιορος φάραων (Diod. i. 25; cf. ll. 242-3, 246-7); but δότωμα occurs by itself in ll. 13 and 68 and is probably a separate word here. There are some traces of ink
above the second αν, but they seem to be accidental. ἑβατόνου δίτεμα occurs in Hesiod, Op. 354. [Lambda]ναυ for 'Αλβάνη, which occurs e. g. in l. 30, is unlikely.

τῷ Ἱεράσω: this town, situated probably north of Niciu and not far from Momemphis (l. 14), is unknown. Ἱέρασω at Cyrene is mentioned by Steph. Byz. and Ἱέρασος ποταμός in Dacia by Ptolemy.

14. Ἀθροίχων: perhaps 'Αθροίχων, for there is a blank space before α: but the surface of the papyrus is damaged, and e. g. Ταθροίχων (cf. Ταχύσιν l. 75) is possible.

Μωμεβήτας: cf. Hdt. ii. 163 and Strabo, p. 803, who in describing the voyage from Schedia (cf. l. 60) to Memphis along the Canopic branch mentions the following places on his right, i. e. on the west bank, (1) Χαβρίων κάμη, i. e. probably the Χαβρίων of Byzantine geographers, (2) ἐρμοῦ πόλις (Damanhûr, cf. l. 18), (3) Γυνακών πόλις και Γυνακοπολίτης νομός (cf. l. 21), (4) ἐφεβής δὲ Μώμεμβήτα και Μωμεβήτας νομός μεταξὺ δὲ δωρίσου πλείους εἰς τὴν Μαρεντίαν, (5) ὑπὸ δὲ Μωμεμβήτου δύο νύμφαί... καὶ νομὸς Νεριώτης, (6) πόλις Μενελαος (cf. l. 21 and 70, notes). Champollion's identification of Momemphis with Menâf is accepted by Wiedemann (ap. cit. 572) and Daressy (Rev. arch. 3250 sér. xxv. 208), but not by Amélineau (Ginger. 250–1). This view would bring it within the Protopite nome (cf. ll. 7–8, note). Strabo's statement that there was a Momemphite nome is at variance with the evidence of P. Rev. Laws and the coin of the nomes, and probably the Μωμεβήτας was really a toparchy. From its position in 1380 Momemphis would be expected to be somewhat north-west of Niciu, and the name Menâf suggests Menophos (l. 17, note) rather than Momemphis, though the identification of Menophos with that Menâf also presents difficulties.

15. διανῶρας: Aphrodite was the chief deity of Momemphis according to Strabo, l. c.; but though ἕν can be read, there is not room for 'Αφροδίτης. For Isis as queen cf. p. 192 and l. 82, note.

Φαχύμειος: this place is no doubt identical with Steph. Byz. Ψχέραμις πολίς Αλγύπτου. Ἀρτεμιδώρος ἐν ὁδόν γεωγραφομένων καὶ Περίκερμος ἐν δεξίῳ μηρὸν καὶ Θειαβασίδη καὶ Ψχός. Probably it and the two places mentioned in ll. 16–17 were in the Gynaecopolite or Nitrion nome. The towns of the Satte nome apparently come in ll. 30–2, except Naucratis (l. 19, note). For [ὁμιστραυ], which seems to be new, cf. l. 74 ἐν Πλονωσίθρῳ. Psocheimi apparently had a harbour of some importance, and may have been situated at the separation of the two branches leading to the Canopic and Bolbitic (Rosetta) mouths, i. e. at or near Kafr el Zayâd.

16. Μίλωνας: this town is known only from Steph. Byz. Μίλωνα πόλις Αλγύπτου. 'Εκατάτιος.

17. Κο...κυνῆμα: this town, which is likely to have been near Hermopolis Parva (l. 18?) or Naucratis (l. 19), is unknown; cf. l. 15, note.

18. ἑρμοῦ ὁ πύλαις: the restoration is very uncertain, for Hermopolis ἕθερκα (Damanhûr) would be expected to be mentioned as such in order to distinguish it from Herm. ἔθερκα in the Heptanomia, Herm. τοῦ Μενεθσίου (l. 52), and Herm. near Buto (l. 35 ?). Moreover Hermopolis Parva was north of Naucratis (l. 19) and probably of Nithine (l. 21, note), being in the Ἀλεξάνδρεων χώρα according to Ptolemy, though this is not a very serious objection, for it was on the west bank of the Canopic branch (l. 14, note) and only twenty-four Roman miles from Nithine, and a change of direction from north-south to east-west in any case takes place before l. 27. But there would be room for another letter in the lacuna after μο (or μ), and perhaps an unknown town [...μ...πόλις] was mentioned here, which, if it was south of Naucratis (l. 19) like Niciu (l. 12) and Momemphis (l. 14), would not disturb the geographical order. Hermopolis Parva, however, if not mentioned here, was omitted altogether, unless it came in l. 26.

19. Ναυρίτες: Nekrâsh, discovered by Petrie on the west side of the main branch, as correctly stated by Ptolemy but not by Strabo. In P. Rev. Laws lx. 18 it is coupled with
the Saite nome, as in Ptolemy, but it issued coins distinct from those of the Saite nome, the bulk of which was certainly on the east of the Canopic branch; cf. ll. 30-2 and l. 18, note.

ἀνάτειρας: the reading is practically certain, for though the vestiges of the first letter are very slight the second can only be π or η. The form is new. ἀνάτειρα occurs as an epithet of e.g. Hephaestus, but the point of its application to Isis is not clear. Elsewhere she is said to be the daughter of Cronos (i.e. Keb) and Rhea (Nut); cf. Plut. De Is. et Os. 12, Diod. i. 13, and the Ios Inscr. 11-12, while other legends made her the daughter of Hermes (Plut. l. c.) or of Zeus (i.e. Ammon) and Hera (Diod. l. c.). In 1880 Isis is often identified with Hera and Maia, the mother of Hermes.

εὐθυρακής: cf. p. 193 and 'lady of joy and gladness' in her Egyptian titles (Budge op. cit. p. 277).

21. Νιθήν τοῦ Γυνακοπολείτου is no doubt Nithine of the Itin. Anton. between Hermopolis (cf. l. 18, note) and Andro, stated to be twenty-four and twelve miles respectively distant from them in the itinerary from Pelusium to Alexandria, while a few lines later in the itinerary from Alexandria to Memphis Hermopolis is stated to be twenty-one miles from Andro, so that there would seem to be an error in the figures. Andro, i.e. ἀνδρῶν πόλις, is generally considered to be identical with Γυνακοπολείς and appears to have been at Kharbat near Neglta where the desert bends away to the west and canals lead to Lake Mareotis (cf. Strabo, p. 803 quoted in l. 14, note, and Amélineau, Géogr. 221). Kun el Hsim and Kun Afriq, mounds south of Naucratis, may be identical with two of the places mentioned in ll. 15-17 and 21-3. 1880 agrees with the earlier authorities Strabo, Pliny (N. H. v. 9, 9), and the coins (on which Isis or Hator is represented) in mentioning the Gynaeopolite nome and ignoring the Andropolite, which is not mentioned before Ptolemy and P. Flor. 278 (third century), but is commonly found in later writers on Egypt except Steph. Byz. Neither name occurs in P. Rev. Laws ix-lixii, and that ἀπολείτη in xxxi. 4 is Γυνακοπολείς is very doubtful. Ἑλωπολήσις suits the size of the lacuna better, and would have the advantage of reducing the differences in the two lists of nomes to the correspondence between Ἑλωπολής and Ἁλής in xxxi. 5-6 and Νερόπολής in lxi. 20; cf. ll. 10 and 70, notes. Pithin, which is found in Geogr. Raven. 12 among unknown places in the north-west Delta, is probably identical with Nithine, and Pithin could be read here, in which case the Itin. Anton., not the Geogr. Raven., would be corrupt. Pathanon was the Coptic name of the modern Batenin, between Tanta and Mentīf, but this is too far south for Nithine, which suggests a connexion with the goddess Neith and may well be the correct form. The mention of the nome implies that there was another Nithine in Egypt; cf. ll. 7-8, 40, 52, and 54, notes.

22. Περρημμύ: this is very likely identical with the Πάρρημος of Hdt. ii. 63 and iii. 12, which Wiedemann (op. cit. p. 264) places in the eastern rather than the western Delta, being the site of a battle between Inaros and the Persians. The position, however, assigned to the Papremite nome in the list Βουσιρίτης, Σαῦτης, Χεμίτης, Παπρ., νήσος ἡ Προσωπίτες Καλομένη, Ναδό (Hdt. ii. 165) indicates that it lay near the middle of the Delta, but rather toward the west, i.e. between Tanta and Lake Borollos, and such a situation for Papremis would harmonize with the position occupied by Pephremis between the Gynaeopolite nome (l. 21) and Buto (l. 27).

23. 'Εστία like Isis, was considered to be the daughter of Cronos and Rhea (Diod. i. 13). In late times she was identified with Demeter and Persephone, but not apparently elsewhere with Isis.

24. [κύρειον πάσης χύρας: cf. ll. 125-6, note, and the Ios Inscr. 3-4 ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ τύραννα τοῦ πάσης χύρας. The deleted ξύνοι seems to be the beginning of an unknown town named after the god Ξυνός (Chnum). Ξυνός in Thebaid is placed by Ptolemy opposite Latopolis (Esnau).}
25. Es[...:] no suitable name for this town, which is likely to have been near Buto (l. 27), is known. Eschelita occurs in a Coptic list of bishoprics next to Naukratis, but this may refer to Ἐσχελίτα: cf. Amelineau, Géogr. p. 172. The doubtful σ might be o or ω, but not λ or ρ, so that Ἐσχελίτα and Ἐρφρύνον πολει (cf. l. 18, note) are excluded.

26. For Ἡραω cf. e. g. l. 32, and for διαφήμις l. 86 and 111. The a of Ἡραω has apparently been prolonged above the ν, perhaps by an afterthought. On the identification of Isis with Juno cf. Diod. i. 25 and Drexler, op. cit. 513-15. With what Egyptian goddess Hera was generally identified is not clear. A catacharct inscription (C. I. G. 4893) identifies her with Satis. Ἀδίκθος Ἡραω (εν (e above the line) διαφήμις is a less satisfactory reading, and Ἐρφρύνον Ἡραω is inadmissible, but εν Θυμοιεις, which in Roman times superseded Mendes, may have followed διαφήμις.

27. The supposed β of Βουράω is very doubtful, but that town is expected about this point. Its site has not yet been located with certainty, but Hogarth (op. cit. p. 4) accepts Petrie's proposal (Naukratis, i. p. 91) to identify it with Tell Fara'ū. The name seems to have survived in the village of Eibūn. Hermopolis, which according to Strabo, p. 802, was near Buto, apparently comes later; cf. l. 35, note. According to Hdt. ii. 156 Leto, i.e. Uat, a winged-sERPent goddess, protectress of Lower Egypt (Wiedemann, op. cit. p. 263), was the chief deity worshipped there, but Λητώ does not suit the vestiges of the second letter, which seems to be round, and for λαχανική cf. l. 124. Λητώ, however, may have followed; cf. l. 79.

28. Θεόν: the reading is fairly certain. Strabo (p. 809) places it on the strip of coast between Pharos and the Canopic mount Τῆς τῆς πολιν καὶ θεόν της πόλιν ἐντατάθη φασιν, ἓπόσιμον τῶν βασιλευόν τοῦ βασιλεύον μετήπλευν τε καὶ ἐλήφαν θενία: cf. Steph. Byz. κατὰ δὲ κατὰ τὸ στήμα τὸ Κανοπῖκα, and Hdt. ii. 113. Parthey (Erbdkunde d. alten Aegypt.) puts it east of the Canopic mouth on the site of Tāna.

ἀγάπου: cf. l. 109 ἀγάπου θεόν, which can be restored here, but ἀγάπου may be a title by itself like φαίλον in l. 94.

28-9. If χρῶν is right, the preceding ο might be ὁν ὁν: cf. τῶ ἡμοι in ll. 38 and 42. The words seem to belong to a title, not a place-name; but the ν is very doubtful, and possibly ἐν... ὁχρό... ω καὶ Ἀγα δο should be read. For the coupling of two names cf. l. 101.

30. τῷ Σατείρῳ: for a nome instead of a town cf. l. 71 ὑπονομέω, and for a district apart from individual towns in it, ll. 86-8. For νυγχαρία cf. l. 48 and Drexler, op. cit. 521. The chief deity at Saës was Neith-Athena (Hdt. ii. 59), so that this identification of Isis with Athena was very natural; cf. Plut. De Is. et Os. 9 τῷ ἐν Σατείρῳ Διόνυσος ἤν καὶ ἱερὰ καὶ ἱεράς καὶ ἱερὰς ἔστησεν καὶ ἐστησέναι καλοῦσιν. For Isis as νυγχάρι cf. the evidence for her relation to nymphs discussed by Drexler, op. cit. 539-90, especially a Myconus inscr. Ἀργοῖα καὶ δύναμιν καὶ δήσεις Νύμφαι.

31. Νύμφαι suggests a possible connexion with the modern Néléira, close to Naukratis, which was in the Saite nome (l. 19, note), but ἐν τῇ Βεά (or Βει) can be read, though after l. 13 the article is rarely used with place-names. The title may be Ἄργος; cf. e. g. l. 76.

Καυνή: the only known Egyptian towns of this name are (1) Καύνη (Κανή) in the Thebaid, (2) Κενη which the Itin. Anton. places between Taccona (in the κόστω των τοπιών of the Oxyryynchite nome; cf. 1285. 130) and Ἡσυῖ, i. e. probably in the Heracleopolite nome, and (3) a village in the Arisinoite nome (e. g. P. Tebt. 345). Chenopolis occurs in Geogr. Raven. 111 in the list Χοί (Ζώα: cf. l. 42), Τέλη, Χενοπόλις, Μέθυνον; and Caenopolis id. 125 in the list Τίνος (Ἀντινώ), Caenop., Seleirá, Chora (Χαράς; cf. l. 72, note). Nichis (Νίκη), Nastrim, Babilon. The arrangement is not clear in either case, but Chenopolis seems to refer either to Καυνή = Κανή or to Chenoboscium, while Caenopolis might be our Καυνή, which was probably in the Saite nome.

32. Σάλει: cf. l. 30, note.
33. ἤσειω: this is the natural point for mentioning Iseum (Steph. Byz., Geogr. Raven.; Isidis oppidum, Pliny), which had one of the most important temples of Isis in the Delta. The ruins of the town are at Behbût el Hagar, about eight miles north of Sebennytus (Samanian; cf. the next entry), and it no doubt belonged to the Sebennyte nome. For ιοςν cf. e.g. l. 23; at the ιοςν τοῦ Σεβηντοῦ (l. 54) she was called ἄνδρ(ο)σάτηρα.

34. For έτιμου cf. l. 60, and for δύναστι e.g. l. 41.

35. ἐρ[ν] ἔρ[μ]ου πόλει: there is some doubt about this name, which may be read ἔν ἔρμον πόλει. If ἐρ[ν] ἔρ[μ]ος is right, this town seems to be the Hermopolis περί τὴν Βουτόν on an island (Strabo, p. 802), since Herm. in the Mendesian nome comes in l. 52 and for Herm. Parva l. 18 is a much more suitable place than l. 35. The site of this Herm. is unknown; from its position here between Sebennytus (Samanian) and Diospolis, which seems to have been in the lower Sebennyte nome (l. 36, note), it would be expected also to lie in one of the two divisions of that nome, and such a situation is not inconsistent with Strabo's statement that Herm. was near Buto, which was mentioned in l. 27. The latter town was the capital of the Θεόνητος νομὸς according to Ptolemy, and if rightly placed at Tell Fera'în (cf. l. 27, note), it was close to the Bahr Nasharti, which Hogarth (l.c.) identifies with the Θεομακαδὸς ποσαμός of Ptolemy and makes the boundary between the Θεονῆτος νομὸς and its eastern neighbour, the Σεβηντοῦς κάτω. On the east side of this canal, in the district between Tell Fera'în and Kām Khansiri, which Hogarth has identified on good evidence with Παγωσίων, the capital of the Σεβηντοῦς κάτω according to Ptolemy, are the ruins of a large town at Hauwilid, which Hogarth regards as the site of Phragonis (not mentioned in 1380), and mounds of several smaller towns, e.g. Haddadi (cf. Hogarth's map), one of which may well have been Hermopolis.

36. βοσικλεισαν, ἄγεῖαν: for Isis as queen, her true name according to Apul. Metam. xi. 5 (cf. l. 82, note), cf. Drexler, op. cit. 512–13. The a of ἄγεῖαν may have been corrected, as in the previous line, where a is not certainly deleted; cf. l. 250, critical note.

Διόσπολις περί δύναστι τῆς μεγίστης: Diospolis Parva elsewhere refers to Ἡδι in Upper Egypt, but this Diospolis is clearly that mentioned by Strabo, p. 802 πληρών δὲ Μίδησι καὶ Δασσοταῖς καὶ οἱ περὶ αὐτὴν λίμνα καὶ Λοντάπολις: εν' ἄντωρα ἡ Βαύςαμα ἐν τῷ Βουριττῷ νομῷ καὶ Κυνάφοισι, Hermippus Fr. 50 διαστατεία (sc. Demetrius Phalerus) ἐν τῷ Βουριττῷ πληρῶν Δισσαπάλα, Hierocles, Synes. Nic. 60, Πολύν, Φραγώνια (i.e. Φραγωνία), Παγωσίωνέρχοντο, Δισσαπάλας, Σεβηντοῦς καθος, and the coins inscribed Δισσαπάλα, or Δισσαπαλίτων, οίκου. Its site is uncertain. Hogarth (op. cit. p. 12) places it at Tell el Balamūn, a little north-east of Sherûbîn on the west bank of the Damietta branch, about half-way between Sebennytus and the mouth, and Daressy (Rev. arch. 3me sér., p. 208) at Belkhâd about seven miles west of Sherûbîn, but such a position creates a considerable difficulty with regard to the statement of Hermippus that Diospolis was in the Busirite nome, since that nome was south of the Sebennyte and cannot have extended in the direction of Damietta; cf. l. 49–50, note. Against Hermippus, however, is to be set the fact that in 1380 the Busirite nome comes later, and the position of Diospolis in l. 36 rather suggests that it lay somewhere between Sebennytus and Busiris. Tell Mokdam near Mit Ghamr would be suitable, but that site has been sometimes considered to be Leontopolis (l. 58), and the mention of the lakes near Diospolis suggests that it lay not far from the coast. The issue of separate coinage indicates that it was in Hadrian's time the capital of a nome called Δισσαπαλίτης κάτω, but this is ignored by P. Rev. Laws, Strabo, and Ptolemy, and probably Diospolis belonged earlier to the Sebennyte nome. The Mendes papyri of the second century do not mention it, but it occurs with other nomes in a third-century ostracoon (Milne, Theb. Ostraca, p. 151).

37–8. ἐν Βουβδαστῷ τὸ ἄνα: Busubastus (the form έρι is not applied to the town in papyri) is Tell Basta, near Zagazig. τὸ ἄνα (cf. l. 42) is a curious expression, and it is not clear whether the reference is to space (cf. l. 144–5) or time. If to the latter (cf. l. 82, note),
there may be a connexion with l. 28 ἄνω χρώμα. Bubastus was said to have been founded in honour of Isis; cf. Diod. i. 27 and the Inscri. of Ios 16.

38. Ἰλλον ὑδέλαιον: about seven miles north-east of Cairo; cf. ll. 1-3, note.

39. Ἀθηναίοι: Tell Atrib, near Benha.

Maiás: cf. p. 192. As the mother of Hermes, she was a natural deity to identify with Isis, whose some legends made the daughter of Hermes (cf. l. 19, note). Mr. Griffith well compares the Greek name of Domantur, Hermopolis Parva, where Hermes = Horus, probably a very old identification made before Egypt was familiar to the Greeks; cf. p. 224. ἄρωμαι: cf. l. 98. This term is a common title of Artemis. The explanation of Schol. Pind. Ol. 3. 54 ὅτι ἀρωμᾶς ἑνὶ σωματικῶ ἡ ἀρωμάς τοῦ γεννώμενου is preferred by Höfer (Roscher, Lex. d. griech. u. röm. Mythol. iii. 1213). Applied to Zeus the term = stator.

40. Ἰτρά θειφρῶς: Ίτρά occurs as a village-name in Egypt in the Arsinoeite nome (P. Tebt. ii. p. 380), but this town was unknown. The Phthomphutide nome, which is ignored by P. Rev. Laws and Strabo and of which the capital was Ταυώ (Ptolemy) or Ταυνάτων πόλεις (P. Brit. Mus. 921. 6), adjoined the Atribride nome (l. 39) on the west, being north of the Prosopite nome (l. 8); cf. Itin. Anton, which places Ταυώ twelve miles from Ανδρέα (l. 21, note) and thirty from Κύντι (l. 49-50, note). The spelling varies, Θειμβόω ( ) and Θειφρων( ) being found on coins, Θειμφων in the best MSS. of Ptolemy, Θειφρων( ) in P. Brit. Mus. 921. Θειφρων in P. Ryl. 78. 5, Phthomphutide in Pliny, N. H. v. 49. It is not certain that a letter is lost after φι. For the omission of ροι cf. l. 71 and l. 4-5, note.

λα[π]φρῶν: the lotus-flower was a symbol of immortality in late times (Wiedemann, op. cit. p. 375) and the epithet is appropriate here to Isis, who on the coins of the Phthomphutide nome is represented with a lotus (Dattari, Numi Augg. Alex. 6350). The first o of λα[π]φρῶν is more like ο, but ϕωφρῶν cannot be read and ϕο[μ]φρῶν (cf. ll. 119-20) is also unsuitable.

41. Τεοχία: this is probably identical with Steph. Βyz. Τεώχιας πόλεις Αἰγύπτως. ισαί καὶ λίμνη ἀπωρομένα, but is otherwise unknown. It may have been in the northern part of the Phthomphutide nome (cf. l. 40) or in the Χώτε (cf. l. 42), or even further north (cf. the next note), if the Χώτε nome did not extend to the coast. The name suggests a possible derivation for Lake Edká, the Greek name of which is unknown: the village Edká is between Αμβύκη and Ροσέτα.

41-2. τοῦ Βουκολέων: the Βουκόλοι, as they are elsewhere called, were primitive inhabitants of the marshes along the north-west coast, and revoluted in A. D. 172. How far east they extended is not clear. The Βουκολοκόν στόμα of Hdt. ii. 17 is supposed by Wiedemann (op. cit. p. 66) and others to be the Phatnitic mouth, which was between the Sebennytic and Mendesian, but Sethe (Pauly-Wissowa, Realencycl. s. v. Βουκόλοι), followed by Wilcken, Christ. 21, introd., rejects this view, though Herodotus distinguishes the Bucolic from the Bollitine and Canopic mouths, which were on the west. Strabo mentions the Βουκόλοι once (p. 792) in connexion with Alexandria, once (p. 802) in connexion with the district between the Sebennytic and Phatnitic mouths. τῆ Βουκόλων in B. G. U. 625 (cf. P. Hamburg 39) is regarded by Wilcken (l. c.) as a district, but may mean the town Bucolia in Geogr. Raven. 9, Naufragit being no. 6 and Pithyn (cf. l. 21, note) no. 12.

42. Ξάνθι: the Ξάνθι is very doubtful and Ξάνθι possibly occurred in l. 32. If it did, ἐν Ξάνθι[γ] ἄνω, 'the upper division of the Ξάνθι nome' might be read here; but for τῆς ἄνω cf. l. 38. Strabo describes its position (p. 802) εν τῇ μεσογείῳ τῆ ἐπίτου τῶν Σεβεννητικῶν καὶ Φατνητικῶν στόματος Ξάνθι ἄντι καὶ νήσου καὶ πόλει ἐν τῷ Σεβεννητικῷ ρέμα, ἄντι δὲ καὶ Ἀρμοῦτικα (cf. l. 52, note) καὶ Λυκομάκων καὶ Νέαβης. An ancient list of Greek, Coptic, and Arabic equivalents (Amélineau, Geogr. p. 410) identifies Ξάνθι with Σακκά, about half-way between Hermopolis Parva and Thmuis. Pliny, N. H. v. 9. 9, the coins of the nomes, and Ptolemy show that there was a separate Ξάνθι nome in the first and second centuries, but Strabo's statement that
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Xoi is was in the Sebennyte nome (cf. l. 33) earlier is confirmed by the absence of the Xoite nome from the nome-lists in P. Rev. Laws.

43. Karoβαθμι: this can refer either to κ. μέγας (Akaba el Kebir) on the boundary between Egypt and the Marmarica according to Strabo, p. 678, and in the παράβαθμος of the Libyan nome according to Ptol., or, more probably, to κ. μικρός (Akaba el Saghir), placed by Ptol. some distance inland behind Λευκή Λεπη (l. 45) and nearer to Apis (l. 44) than is K. μέγας.

πρόνοιαν: Isis appears as πρόνοια on Alexandrian coins (Poole, Catal. p. 176); cf. Plutarch, De Is. et Os. 3 ἐπὶ πολλὰ μὲν ἔρμοι, πολλὰ δὲ καταγόμενοι ἠτέφανοι δὲ τὸν μὲν ἐστρων σοφίας καὶ προνοίας, ἔρμην δὲ γραμματικής καὶ μανίκης εὐφημίας νομίζομεν. διὸ καὶ τῶν εἰς ἑρμοφυλακοῦν Μουσῶν τὴν προτέραν ἵσταν ἁμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην καλοῦσα, σοφὴν ὀνόμα, διδυμὴ φόρμα, καὶ δικεντόνας τὰ θεία τῶν ἀληθῶς καὶ δικαιῶς ιεράφων καὶ λευστάκιον προσαγορεύοντος. Cf. also Apul. Metam. xi. 18 dea providens and Drexler, op. cit. 540.

44. ὡτι τοῦ Ἄσπεως φρονέων: ὡτι cf. l. 10, note, and for Apis Hdt. ii. 18 61 . . . ἐκ Μαρίπες τε πόλεως καὶ Ἀσπεως, Pliny, v. 39 Ἀπίς . . . nobilis religione Aegypti locus, Strabo, p. 779, and Ptol. iv. 5, who both place it a little west of Paraconitum, an important town in Roman times but ignored by 1380. Fourteau (Bull. de l'Inst. égyp. 178e scr. viii. 99) suggests that it was near Ṛds τῶν Ῥωχόμαν. Apis was probably the ancient capital of the Libyan nome, corresponding to Νουν Ἡτῆ τῆς τοῦ Ἄσπη' in Egyptian texts. For Isis as φρόνεως cf. l. 124 and Plut. De Is. et Os. 60.

45. Λευκῆς λεπη: cf. Strabo, p. 799, Ptol. iv. 5. It was on the coast east of Paraconitinm and north of καταβάθμος μικρός (l. 43), and is generally identified with Ῥδὰς ὡς Καναίας.

Μούχως: the first three letters are very doubtful. Μούχως is the name of villages in the Arsinoite (P. Tebt. 609), Heracleopolite (P. Hib. 68), and Oxyrhynchite (1842) nomes. There is no likelihood of any connexion with Μοχύς, the title of Isis at Acoros (C. I. G. 4703 c), which refers to the Μοχύς τόνος of the Hermopolite nome (P. Reinach. 15. 12, &c.).

46. Ἐσπερέμφοι: cf. the Theadelphia inscr. published by Brcicca in Bull. de la Soc. archéol. d'Alex. 1914, where a temple of Ἱστι' Ἐσπερέμφος is mentioned in l. 17. Spiegelberg (l. c.) translates the term 'making a good name'.

Φαγγώρων πόλει: i.e. the Φαγγώρωνος of Strabo, p. 805; which Steph. Byz. calls Φαγγώρων, the Geogr. Raven. Phagorior. Strabo mentions it as the capital of the Phagrioropolite nome (which is ignored by other authorities) along with Ἰρρώνιοντος (Tell el Maskhulta) and Φακωσσα (Fakdes or, as Naville thinks, Σφητ ὡς Ηνήα), and it probably lay in the Wadi Tumidli or on the east bank of the Pehsianac branch in the Arabian nome. Babastus, Pharaebuthus, and Tanis, capitals of nomes on the west bank of that branch, occur at some little distance (ll. 37, 53, and 59).

47-8. Ξαρίνη seems to have been in the south-east of the Delta, but whether the lacuna in l. 48 contained another place-name or a second title of Isis is uncertain. If εὖ is right Φακούσιου or Προνοῶν πόλει may be supplied; cf. the preceding note. For γραμματε[ί]κη' in l. 123 and p. 193.

49-50. Κυνοί πόλεις τοῦ Βου[σ]τ[η]ῳ: re [θ]ω [ο]υ: or, less probably, Δέκων] πόλεις τοῦ Β. ; cf. Rosetta Insr. 22. This three letters is mentioned in conjunction with Busiris (cf. l. 51) by Strabo, p. 802, Pliny, N. H. v. 64, Hierocles, and Meletus, Brev. p. 188, while the Itin. Anton. places it thirty miles east of Taba (in the Phthmphuthite nome; cf. l. 40, note) and twenty-five west of Θμίους (Tmei el Amidil) in about the centre of the Delta, which position accords very well with Herodotus' statement (ii. 59) that Busiris was ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ Δῆλτα. That town is identified in a list of Graeco-Coptic-Arabic equivalents with Αβουστρ, three miles south of Σαμαντά (Sebennytus; cf. l. 33), which is confirmed by the equation of Εβωζίς to Αβουστρ in the case of the Letopolite town (C. I. G. 4609. 1) and the Heracleopolite (B. G. U. 1061. 8, &c.), while Κουναί κάτω is identified with the Coptic Ρεκοι and Arabic Βεμε, a few
kilometres south of Abusir. Ptolemy also places Busiris a little south of Sebennytus, but puts both towns much too far south, his whole arrangement of the eastern Delta being vitiated by the wrong position assigned to the Τραυάνος Ποταμός (Wadi Tumidēl). P. Rev. Laws in xxxi. 7 mentions the Busiritic nome between the Sebennyte and Mendesian, and in lxiii. 6 between the Mendesian and Athribite.

50. Πραξιδίκη: cf. Türk and Höfer in Roscher, op. cit. iii. 2912–30. Originally perhaps connected with the Lycian goddess Panayasia, Praxidice (or three Praxidicae) was a deity akin to the Erinyes and Persephone, who is called Πραξιδίκη in Orph. Hymn. 29. 5. For the identification of Isis with Persephone cf. l. 72, note.


52. Ἐρμοῦ προμ. τοῦ Μενδεύτου: cf. P. Tcbt. 340. 5, which shows that it gave its name to a toparchy, P. Ryl. 217. 15–34, Strabo, p. 802, quoted in l. 42, note, and Steph. Byz., who states that it was κατὰ Θηβαίων. Since the Mendesian nome extended to the coast on the north-east, being probably bounded on the west by the Damietta Nile, it probably did not extend far south of Mendes-Thmuis. Bakhit, which is generally identified with Hermopolis, is about three miles west of Τμεί Ἐλ Αμιλίδ. Φερωψίδα (l. 57) was also in this nome. Thmuis, the capital at this period (cf. Ptolemy and P. Ryl), does not occur in 1880 except possibly in l. 26.

53. Φαρμαθαύ: Horbēl, the capital of a nome which lay between the Bubastite and Tanite.

54. τῷ Ἰσιδῷ τοῦ Σεβεννυτοῦ: this place, named after a temple of Isis, was previously unknown; cf. τῷ θείῳ in l. 33. The Sethroite nome was in the extreme north-east of the Delta; cf. l. 56, note.

55. ἄνδραστατερῶν seems to be an incorrectly formed compound (cf. l. 13, note) rather than two words, though for a confusion of sex cf. l. 135–6, note.

56. Ἡρακλείους πόλει τοῦ Σεβεννυτοῦ: the nome is added to distinguish it from Hermopolis in the Heptanomia. Ptolemy makes Ἡρακλεῖον μηκὰ πόλις (v. l. Σεβεννυτοῦ) the capital of the nome, and places it to the south-south-east of Pelusium; the Itin. Anton. places it twenty-two miles from Pelusium and the same distance from Tanis. It would be expected to be on the Pelusiac arm, not far from Daphnae. C. Müller (Ptol. iv. 5. 24) identifies it with Tell el Serig (= Tell Battīkh).

57. Φερωψίδα: this town was in the Mendesian nome, giving its name to a toparchy; cf. P. Ryl. 216. 274 and 217. 57, 59.

58. Λεόντοπολεία: this place, the capital of a nome, is sometimes identified with Tell Mokdām near Mīt Ghamr, between Sebennytus (l. 33) and Athribis (l. 39); cf. Strabo, p. 802, quoted in l. 36, note. Jomard, however, placed it east of Thmuis near Lake Menaīla. Ptolemy makes it south of Thmuis and west of Pharabaeus, but north of Sebennytus and Busiris, which is inconsistent with such a relation to Thmuis and Pharabeus. P. Rev. Laws xxxi. 8 mentions the Leontopolite nome between the Mendesian and Sethroite nomes, which rather favours Jomard’s view, but in lxvii. 8 between the Tanite and Pharabaithe nomes, which favours the identification with Tell Mokdām.

59. Ἀσίδια: Isis is often represented as a snake; cf. Drexler, op. cit. 533–9. — In P. Amh. 128. 56 προφητής τοῦ Ἰσιδοῦ ὁ Οφεων it is not clear whether ὁ Οφεων is a title of Isis or a proper name, as it is apparently in l. 116 of the same papyrus. Ἀσίδια is a less suitable reading than Ἀσόδια.

60. Σκηνία: cf. Strabo, p. 800 διότι δὲ τετράχων τῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἡ Σκηνία, κατοικία πόλεως ἐν ᾳ τοῦ νόστισθαι τῶν ἔθιματος πλούτων κτλ.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI


62. Κανοβάρι: near Abukir, but its precise situation is not certain.


64.:add.: cf. the Ios Insr. 32 ἐν τῷ ἀλέθεις καλῶν ἐνομοθέτησα νομίζειθαυ, and P. Brit. Mus. 46. 148 ἐνε (sc. Abraasax) εἴμι ἡ ἀλέθεια.

65. Mev[εiti]α: it is not certain that any letter is lost between π and ο, and only a narrow one is admissible; Μενοΐθα (cf. l. 63) or Μενοεθ[ει] cannot be read, although the following word might be τοῦ. Στραβο... is, however, a very unlikely name, the only one at all resembling it being Στραβοκτήτης in C. I. G. 4839. 11 Στραβο τῇ Σενο, referring to the modern Σεκκελ in the Mons Bereniceis. The other places in ll. 60–76 are on or near the coast, so far as they can be identified, and τῇ εὐερείᾳ is confirmed by l. 151 ἑτεραν τοι ὁρῶν (cf. also l. 280), while for Ἱος cf. l. 143–4 Ἱος Ἅληθ. Ἱο was often identified with Isis in Alexandrian times; cf. Drexler, op. cit. 439–46. π[ερ][ο] is possible in l. 64, but [ἡ]μερείος does not seem appropriate in l. 65, and for περίος Ἐ[ι]μ[ε]ρεία there is no room, so that the construction of Ἱος remains obscure.

65–6. τοῦ Ἱο...[εβι]στόν: the first letter is nearly certain, but the rest are very doubtful, especially εβ, which might be read as ε. Μενοεθ[ει]α is inadmissible. μερούισι is probably a mistake for μεροῦν: cf. l. 21. γνωσομορφος is a natural epithet of Isis, who is often represented with a vulture's wings; cf. l. 220 and Drexler, op. cit. 473–4.

67. Ταποσιρί: two towns of this name in the north-west of Egypt are known: (1) Ταπ. (ἡ μερή) east of Lake Mareotsis, mentioned by Strabo, p. 799, but by other writers called Ταφοθώρις, the modern Αβυσσί, with a temple and a reputed tomb of Osiris, (2) Ταπ. ἡ μερή between Alexandria and Canopus (Strabo, pp. 799–800). The towns mentioned in ll. 60–3 and the Μενολήνη of l. 72 suggest the second, but Παλαθία in l. 73 is placed by Ptolemy close to the first, and the sites of other places found in ll. 60–73 being doubtful, it is not clear which of the two is meant. A dedication to Isis with other gods from Ταπ. Parva was published by Néroufs, Rev. arch. 1887, p. 214, and Domina Isis Taposiris occurs in the dedication of a statue found at Faœulae (C. I. L. xi. 1544); a papyrus to be published in Part XII mentions τεφα (γα) Ισοδιος Ταποσερείδας in the Oxyrhynchite nome.

68–9. τῆς Ἰσιδος: this is more probably Πάρος ηγίας off Alexandria (Ptol. iv. 5; cf. p. 195) than the desert island off the Canopic mouth (Sclayx, Peripl. 84) or Νῆσος, a place in the Mareotis (Anon. Stat. mar. mag. 22–3). Νεσί, which the Geogr. Raven. mentions next after Λαυρίτης ('Λαυρίων πόλις in the Heracleopolite nome?) and Ζυγοπολίς (apparently in the Heptanomia), is probably different, as is Σωδίων ηγίας (Strabo, p. 799), between Δενεκ' Ἀστι (l. 45) and Taposiris Magna (l. 67, note). For τανκηθα[ν]ον cf. l. 84, note.

69. Πευκεστίδα: this was only known from Geogr. Raven. 73 Peucestim among several unrecognized towns, Naucratis being no. 61 and Buto no. 78. The title κυβερνήτης suggests that it was on the coast (cf. l. 74 ἐν Πευκεστίδα όρμηστραν), probably not far from Alexandria.

70. Μενοθγία: this town or district is unknown, and perhaps Μενεθγία should be read; cf. P. Rev. Laws xxxi. 6. Μενεθγία there, however, if correct, seems to mean the district round the πόλις Μενοθγία mentioned by Strabo, p. 803 (cf. l. 14, note), as being in the south-west of the Delta (Μενεθγία corresponds, partly at any rate, to the Nitriote nome; cf. l. 21,
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note), whereas in the light of the preceding entries Me(τη)nαίδη here would more appropriately refer to the Me(nai)δής νομός, of which Canopus (l. 62) was the capital according to Ptolemy, but which is ignored by P. Revenue Laws. The term Me(nai)δή, however, does not occur elsewhere, and with Me(τη)nαίδη it would be best to suppose that the list has made a sudden divergence to the south of the Delta in spite of ll. 60-8 and 72-5, which are concerned with the north coast; cf. the next note and that on l. 18.

71. Me(τη)nαίδη: this place is unknown; and Me(τη)nαίδη or Me(τη)nαίδη might be read. The name strongly suggests the Arabic Menāṣef (cf. l. 14, note), but of the two towns of that name one lies between Tanta and Cairo, i.e. too far south to be appropriate unless Me(τη)nαίδη be read in l. 70, and the other (Michael Menāṣef), about five miles north of Tanta, is identified with Ṭanūfes (the capital of a nome) in a Graeco-Coptic-Arabic list of equivalents; cf. Daressy, *Rev. arch.* 3me sér. xxv, p. 208.

στρήγιαν: cf. ll. 83 and 102. στράτης is a well-known epithet of Zeus and Athena (cf. ll. 30 and 75).

71-2. [Ep] Menēlēs: there is no room for τῷ in the lacuna. The writer becomes more sparing in the use of the article as he proceeds; cf. ll. 4-5, note. The Meletite nome is placed by Ptolemy between the Mēgōs ποιμός (i.e. the main western branch) and the Tālo ποιμός, which issued at the Bolbitine (Rosetta) mouth, i.e. in the district now mainly occupied by Lake Edku (cf. l. 41, note). It is ignored by P. Rev. Laws and Strabo, but found on the coins of the nomes (on which Isis or Hathor is represented), so that it seems to have been created or revived in the first century.

72. Κάλαθον: cf. l. 105 and l. 50, note. She was worshipped at Oxyrhynchus, as is shown by a papyrus to be published in Part XII.

Χάρακος: cf. Strabo, p. 760, who after describing the Κάσιων δρός (cf. l. 75) proceeds εἴδ᾽ ἐπὶ Πελούσιον (cf. l. 74) δδόσ, ἐν τῇ Γέρρα καὶ ὁ τοῦ Χαβρίου λεγόμενος χάρας καὶ τὰ πρὸς τῷ Πελούσιῳ βάθρα. *Chara* in *Geogr. Raven.* 127 (cf. l. 31, note) is perhaps identical.

Πλούτης: this town in the Μερετής νομός on the coast west of Alexandria not far from Taposiris Magna gave its name to the Μερετής κόσμος: cf. Hdt. ii. 6, Strabo, p. 799, Scylax, *Peripl.* 105, Ptol. iv. 5. This entry is somewhat out of place; cf. ll. 67-72, notes.

74. Πελούσιον: *Tell Farama*, about twenty-five miles south-east of Port Said. Ptolemy refers to it by itself apart from the Sethroite nome, of which Heracleopolis was the capital (cf. l. 56, note), and it issued separate coins, on which Isis occurs. Here it is also separated from the Sethroite nome, and is followed by the Κάσιων δρός (Rōs el Kūrāt; cf. Hdt. ii. 6 and Wiedemann’s note) and the Ἐκρητική (sc. Σερβιωνίδου Χάμης), which Ptolemy assigns together with *Πυροκόπτωρ (El Arîsh)* to a distinct region, the Κασιώτης. *Πυροκόπτωρ, however, occurs in l. 93 along with towns in Palestine, and was clearly regarded by the author of 1380 as beyond the Egyptian frontier, as in Pliny, *N. H.* v. 68, and Strabo, who extends *Φωική* up to Pelusium (p. 756).

75. For τοῦ Κάσιου cf. the preceding note, and for Ταχυτήρων p. 192.

77. 'Αραβία probably means the Sinai peninsula or Arabia Felix rather than the νομός Χριστία. Petra, perhaps the capital of Arabia Felix, comes in l. 91. For δεῖν cf. l. 107 and the *Ios Inscr.* 15-16 ἐγὼ ἐλεύ ἐπὶ παρὰ γανατίδει δεῖν καλομήνην.

77-8. ἦ τῇ [Νίκη]: cf. l. 68. At the end of the line τ is very doubtful, and perhaps ἦς ἐπὶ Νίκης οὔτε οὔτε Νίκης: should be read; that any letters are lost is not certain. If ἦ τῇ [Νίκης] is right, the reference may well be to an island on the west coast of Arabia called *Ἰταίδες ἦρα* (Agatharchides in *Geogr. Gr.* min. l. 186, Diod. iii. 44), thought to be the modern Barakdā; cf. Drexler, *op. cit.* p. 376.

78. The verb *τερονοκοτολεῖν* is apparently new. For Isis-worship in Lycia cf. l. 79 and Drexler, *Num. Zeit.** xx. 184 sqq.*

80–1. ἐλευθ[βρ]άν: ἐλευθ[βρ]άν could be read, but Isis Eleutheria occurs on Alexandrian coins of Galba (Poole, Coins of Alex. p. 23).

ἀφεσιν ἐφ[βρ]ῶν, εἰπ[τρι]α: ἀφεσιος is an epithet of Zeus in Pausan. i. 44. 9. ἐφοδιος in papyri usually means ‘attack’, and ἐφ[βρ]ῶν seems to depend on ἀφεσιν rather than εἰπ[τρι]α, in connexion with which it would have to mean ‘communications’. For Isis-worship at Cnidus cf. Drexler, Num. Zeitschr. xxi. 124–5, and for Isis-worship at Cyrene cf. Hdt. iv. 186, who says that out of respect for her the women of Cyrene and Barca ate no cow’s flesh.

82. Δικτυων: cf. Apul. Metam. xi. 5 me primigenii Phyrgyes Pessinuntiam nominantem dam matrem; hinc Autochthones Attici Cereriam Minervam (cf. e.g. l. 70, 32); illic fluctuantes Cyprii (cf. ll. 86–8) Paphiam Venerem (cf. e.g. l. 9); Cretes sagittiferi Dictyannam Dionan (cf. l. 84); Sicii trilingues Stygiadem Proserpinam (cf. l. 72, note); Eleusinii velutam (cf. ll. 37–8, note) dam Cererem; Ionumem (cf. l. 26, note) allii, Bellonam (cf. l. 83, note) allii, Hecatom (cf. l. 113) isti, Rhannusiam illi; et qui nascentis des Solis inchoantis illustrantur radiis Aethiopes Ariique, priscaque doctrina pollentes Aegypti ... appellant vero nomine reginam (cf. e.g. l. 36) Isidem. Dictynnas was another name of Britomartis; cf. Diod. v. 76, and Rapp in Roscher, op. cit. i. 821–8. The usual form was Δικτυων.


στρατιαν: the title is appropriate enough at Rome (cf. ll. 71, 102, 239–42, and 82, note), but the reading is not certain, for the first letter is more like θ than σ and the cross-bar of τ is very low, while the vertical stroke comes down farther than usual, unless what looks like the bottom of it belongs to the γ of τραφι in the next line. "Ἀτρομια (a variant of Ἀτροσιά) or Ἀ[γρ]αγιά (a form quoted by Suidas, s. v. μαραγογή) is possible; cf. for the latter l. 238. On Isis-worship at Rome, which was firmly established in the time of Sulla, see Drexler in Roscher, op. cit. 400–9, Lafaye, op. cit.

84. τραφι is new as an epithet of Isis, and what it refers to is not clear. Perhaps it means much the same as τριμορφος, which was an epithet of Hecate (l. 113; cf. l. 91 τριμορθια). Mr. Milne suggests a connexion with the three-faced goddess figured on the leaden tokens of Memphis (Ancient Egypt. 1915. 108). For τραφιι cf. l. 130 επιρ[σ]ην.

85. Πλῆθος: an island is expected, and [.]. έωσ, which can be read, does not provide a suitable name, so that Patmos seems to be meant. The spelling may be due to the likeness to the Παθμιτικόν στίμα (Ptol. iv. 5) which others call Πατμιτικόν.

νία μ.[.][αμ]...[κ]: the writer changes in ll. 85–6 from the accusative to the nominative, as again in ll. 107–9. ν of νία is very uncertain, but the space suits νία (cf. ὁμα in l. 90) better than θα. The second noun is not μο[ν]αρφι[α] or [γραμμι[α]]ρι[α] (cf. l. 123), but the doubtful ι might be ν, and the θ possibly ε.

86. For evidence of Isis-worship in Cyprus (cf. ll. 87–9) see Apul. Metam. xi. 5 quoted in l. 82, note, and Drexler, op. cit. 379–80. For δια cf. ll. 26 and 111, and for ιτια l. 111 διαν cannot be read, but καινιν with δ above the first ν (i.e. κανιν; cf. l. 79) is possible instead of ινια.

87. Chios is inserted between two places in Cyprus. For evidence of Isis-worship there see Drexler, op. cit. 381–2. στυχουνα as the title of a deity seems to be new.

κατατην: cf. P. Brit. Mus. 46. 280–1 ταν επερωστων με και κατ' δην μοι ερθομενον.

88. πανάθθανοι is a new compound; cf. εσπειλαν in l. 99.

89–90. The preceding mention of Cyprus and the occurrence of south Syrian towns in ll. 93 sqq. make it probable that both Chalcidice and Pieria refer to the districts in north Syria (Pieria on the coast, Chalcidice inland near Belus), rather than the homonymous districts in Macedonia, which would more naturally have occurred in proximity to the places mentioned in ll. 109–14. Petra, however, might be in the Macedonian Pieria; cf. note on l. 91. [ο]ριαν might be read for [ο]ριαν, but cf. e.g. l. 34. Συρια is inadmissible in l. 90.

90. Αλσια, if right (Ἰουσία is unsuitable), probably means Asia Minor rather than the Roman
province of Asia or Asia in general. On Isis-worship in Asia Minor cf. Drexler, Num.
Zeitschr. xxi. 1 sqq.

91. τριδιάτων: usually an epithet of Hecate; cf. l. 113 Ἐκατέρτη and l. 84 τριφύλιν.

Πύτρας: about fifteen towns of this name are known. That in the Macedonian
Pieria (Livy, xxxix. 26) might be meant (cf. ll. 89–90, note); but the Arabian Petra (Wadi
Músá) was the most important and, as ll. 93 sqq. are concerned with Syria, was probably
intended, although Arabia occurred in l. 77.

92. Ἄγαλη: the capital of an Upper Egyptian nome (Ptol. iv. 5) is unsuitable, but the
Ἄγαλη described by Steph. Byz. as κοινοκρίνα θρέφων may be connected with this Ἄγαλη.
An unknown place in Arabia or Syria, however, may well be meant; cf. ll. 93 sqq.

93. Τιμωκρόπουλος: El Arish; cf. l. 74, note. There is much spelling of this
name, which occurs elsewhere as Τιμωκρόπουλα or Τιμωκρόπαι. 1380 is certainly
incorrect on this point.

παυσίπτεων: cf. l. 87 κατόπτευ, but παυσίπταιρον can be read. The second π has perhaps
been corrected from ι or ρ.

94. Dora (Tantara) was between Ptolemais (l. 117) and Στράτωνος Πύργος in Palestine.
The latter town was the earlier name of Caesarea (Joseph. Arch. xv. 8, 5), and is found in
Strabo, p. 758, while Ptolemy calls it Κασαρία Στράτωνος. It was situated between Dora
and Ascalon (l. 96) and is still called Κασαρία.

95. Ἐλλάδα: for the personification of Hellas in art cf. Drexler in Roscher, op. cit. i.
2027–8. She has no special attributes. That Isis should be regarded not far from
Egypt as a specifically Greek deity is noticeable; cf. her title Λασίνα among the Persians
(l. 104 and p. 192).

96. Ascalon (Askalan) was north of Gaza (l. 99) and south of Στράτωνος Πύργος (l. 94).
Sinope (Sinód), which was on the north coast of Paphlagonia, is out of place among these
Syrian towns. The statue of Sarapis was said to have been brought to Egypt from Sinope;
cf. Plut. De Is. et Os. 28.


Ῥίσα: is between Rhinocolura (l. 93) and Gaza (l. 99).

98. Ἀριτάδεις: ὀρθωτίαν: cf. l. 225, where the name of the river Eleutherus shows that
Ταραῖτας on the Syrian coast north of Berytus (l. 116), not Tripolis in the Cyrenaica,
is meant. A town called Orthosia between Τριῶν and the Eleutherus is mentioned by Strabo,

99. Ἄγα: Gaza, a little south of Ascalon (l. 96).

ἐποίκια: ἐπόκλεια occurs in Hom. ρ 467, but ἐπόκλεια nowhere else. θ might be read for the
first ε and i for ν, and the fourth letter may be lost altogether; but cf. ll. 88 πανάθρησκον,
135 ἐποίκια. That ἐποίκια is a corruption of ἐπόκλεια (cf. l. 74 ὑπομητρίας) is hardly likely.
Δελφός: no Isis-temple at Delphi itself is known, but Tithora in Phocis had one; cf.
Pausan. x. 32. 9 and Drexler, op. cit. 387–8.

100. Βάμβουκα (Bambák) was an ancient town east of Antioch and twenty-four miles from
the Ephractes. For the worship there of Atargatis (a form of Astarte; cf. l. 116) cf. Pliny,
N. H. v. 81 Bambucen quae alio nomine Hierapolis vocatur, Syris vero Mabo (ivi prodigiosa
Atargatis, Graecis autem Dereco dicta collitur). For other identifications of Isis with
Atargatis see Drexler, op. cit. 500. The usual forms are Ατάρφαρις or Αταρφάρις, and -τασ here
is probably a mistake for -τασ (cf. l. 106, note), i.e. the nominative; cf. l. 107, note.
At Oxyrhynchus the cult of this goddess occurs in a papyrus to be published in Part XII.


102. Ἀμάρις: i.e. Ἀμάρις. Ἀμάρις (i.e. Ἀμάριδος) might be read, but στρατιάς (cf.
l. 83) suits the Amazons, who were regarded as historical even in late times.
103. India and the Ganges are mentioned in l. 226. That Isis-worship penetrated there was not known previously. For Isis in Thessaly cf. Drexler, op. cit. 387.

104. ἔλεγον: for the common identification of Isis with the moon, which some Egyptologists consider to be a non-Egyptian idea, cf. Diod. i. 25 and Drexler, op. cit. 437–8. Λατεινόν: this title, which suggests that the Persians learnt Isis-worship from the Romans, not the Egyptians, is curious; cf. τῇ Ἑλλάδα in l. 95.

105. For Κόρην cf. l. 72, note. θάυμαίον or θεία (cf. the critical note; the missing letter is quite uncertain) seems to be the equivalent of a Persian appellation; cf. p. 192. Traces of Isis-worship among the Parthians are known; cf. Drexler, op. cit. 379.

106. For Ναναία or Ναναίαν (cf. the critical note) cf. Ἰσίδωρος Ναναία at Nablus in the Arsinöe nome (P. Brit. Mus. 345.3) and the Ναναίοι at Alexandria (e. g. 84. ii. 6). Nanai was an old Babylonian goddess of fertility, identified with Artemis (cf. l. 84), and had a celebrated temple near Susa; cf. 2 Macc. i. 13 and Wagner in Roscher, op. cit. iii. 4–5. Φοίνικη Συρίας: Φοίνικη would be expected (cf. e. g. Ἡροδ. v. 14. 3), but Φοίνικα occurs as a place-name, and the form was perhaps intentional, though incorrect; cf. l. 100, note.

107. θεία: cf. l. 77, note, and for the case, which continues up to l. 109, ll. 85–6. Σαμοθρήξ: this island was the chief centre of the mysteries of the Cabiri, with which Isis may have been connected in Roman times.


109. ἀγάπης ὅδε: cf. l. 28 ἀγάπης [...]. The first letter might be λ, but λαγάπη does not suit the space. On the extensive evidence for Isis-worship in Italy as well as Rome (l. 83) see Lafaye, op. cit., Drexler in Roscher, op. cit. 397-412. She had a temple at Pompeii.

110. Σάμος: for evidence of Isis-worship there from coins and inscriptions see Drexler, op. cit. 381.

111. μυστερία: cf. the Ios inscr. 27 ἐγώ μυστίκας ἀγάρφους ἀνέθετο. Μύθος: on the Carian coast, ten miles north-west of Halicarnassus. The head-dress of Isis appears on coins of Myndus; cf. Drexler, Num. Zeitschr. xxii. 130.


113. ἰδίου δομά: cf. e. g. ‘eye of the sun’ in the Egyptian titles of Isis (Brugsch, Religion, 645), and ll. 157–9. ὁδός is inadmissible.

114. For Isis-worship in Caria cf. Drexler, op. cit. 119.

114–15. ἄνδρας implies that the writer considered ἄνδρας to be a feminine singular instead of neuter plural. ὢντες[...]γνωστὸν could be read in l. 114, but the Latin form is not suitable here (cf. l. 91) and ἔν τῷ γνωστῷ is unsatisfactory, so that probably the word is a foreign name, like the next. The e of εὗρον in l. 115 is not enlarged, as is generally the case with εὗρον in a new clause, and there is no trace of a stop before it; but ἐν τῷ γνωστῷ γνωστῷ (the absence of which town is remarkable), or ἐν τῷ γνωστῷ γνωστῷ could be read, making -νωστόν the termination of the preceding name. If not ρ, the letter following τ can only be ο: the next might be α, ο, or λ. For Isis-worship in the Troad cf. Drexler, Num. Zeitschr. xxii. 59. ἀβιβαστὸν = ἀβιβαστον occurs elsewhere only in an ancient gloss; cf. Stephanus, Thesaurus.

116–17. Berytus (Beirut), Sidon (Saida), and Ptolemaïs (Akka) were between Tripolis (l. 98) and Ascalon (l. 96). For Isis-Astarte in Syria cf. Drexler in Roscher, op. cit. 500 and l. 100, note. For φανέρων cf. l. 124.

118. This Susa (cf. l. 105) is apparently unknown, like the title Σαμαβίνε. The ἔμπροσθεν βυθῶνσα perhaps means the Persian Gulf (cf. Hdt. i. 180) rather than the Red Sea.

119–20. For Isis θεοφόρος cf. the Ios Inscr. 8–11 ἐγώ νόμου ἀγάρφους ἀδέμεν καί
What the... ayet? cf. cf.: fpyatvpa. bunch should means and 1. This is Horus. for in :
If 123. cf. cf. 24 in 141 is cf. (cf. 151). i. e. Egypt, would be more suitable.
126—7. το καδέν ζώω: i. e. as a cow; cf. l. 107 τουρήσεις and ll. 161—2, note.
129. παλ[ε]νυφθαλμ[α]ρ: the name Osiris was considered by some to mean πολυφθαλμος according to Plut. De Is. et Os. 32, and 'Whose husband is the inundation of the Nile', 'Who maketh the Nile to swell in due season' in Isis' Egyptian titles (Budge, op. cit. 278). For πάσαν χώραν cf. l. 24 and note. Here, however, πάσαν (τῆς) χώραν (cf. l. 151). i. e. Egypt, would be more suitable.
130—7. To καθόλου ζώω: l. e. as a cow; cf. l. 107 τουρήσεις and ll. 161—2, note.
131. For ἄριστον ήθεν cf. p. 193, and for μεσαναγωγών l. 62, note.
132—3. For the model wife and mother cf. p. 193, the lex Inscri. 29 sqq. εὐώ στέργεσθαι γενεᾶς ἐν ἀνδρόν ἡμῖνον... εὐώ συγγραφείς γυμνήτω, ἐθεν, and Drexler, op. cit. 491. ἡδία (οὐ γνώσα) seems to be otherwise unattested.
133. βόσκων: the metaphorical use of this word is new and probably represents an ancient Egyptian expression; a lock of hair characterizes many representations of Harpocrates (cf. ll. 135—6, note). But possibly the meaning of βόσκων here is 'bunch of grapes', alluding to Isis' discovery of wine (ll. 179—83).
135—6. τῷ τῶν θεῶν Ἀρεωκράτινα: cf. 'the female Ra', 'the female Horus' in Isis' Egyptian titles (Budge, op. cit. 277). The phrase seems to mean 'the darling of the gods' and to be an adaptation from the Egyptian rather than a direct equivalent, since 'Harpocrates' means 'Horus the (male) child', and the feminine would be something like 'Harthshēris'.
137. The stop after μεσακθήν] is uncertain, and there might be one after πάστωροι. μεσακθήν is not found elsewhere.
138—9. παστωάπαν is a curious compound. τεις τὸ ἱπποι[(οί)] might be read, but, though a letter may have been lost at the end of the previous line, ἰἀγγελ[ς] or ἰαγγελ[ς] is inadmissible. For τ instead of γ cf., however, l. 105 Μάρας. διάκαιμα rather supports παστωάπαν ἀνήμων in preference to παστωάς(ς) ἀστιν ἀνήμων, στιν ἀστικίσιν ἐμοί, which could also be read. The writer is fond of the adjective παστός, but it does not occur elsewhere in 1380 as a title. There are no other instances of this person, though this is naturally found in similar invocations. ἱπποι is a known form of the accusative, but not ἱπποί, and ἱπποί is correctly written in l. 58. For διάκαιμα cf. l. 194. 'Isis of lapis-lazuli' occurs among her titles in the demotic papyri mentioned on p. 191.
139—41. at kūnes might be read for ἵκωνες, in which case a dittography of at must be supposed. A reference to the dogstar occurs in l. 144, but the lex Inscri. 27—8 ἐυάγγελμα τεινέαν ἑλήθρα confrims ἵκωνες: cf. Diod. i. 15. If πρ in l. 141 is right, προβοαγαρμαί ἐخων is possible, but -i πρι (or τυρ) may be read for πα πρι. χάριτας or χάριτα is just possible, but the first letter is more like λ than α, μ, or χ.
142. ἔνω ἐν ἱσι [μεγίστη: ἐνω] is very doubtful, the space being barely sufficient. The first letter of ἵσι perhaps had a diacresis, as in l. 23. The letter above the line (cf. the critical note) is very uncertain: perhaps ἢ μεγίστη should be read.
143—4. ἵσι Σαθή: for ἵσι = Isis cf. l. 64, note. The reading seems clear. Sothis, the Egyptian name of Sirius, was identified with Isis; cf. e. g. 'Ισιώθις as one word (nom. or voc.) among a number of magical names with which Isis is invoked in P. Brit. Mus. 121. 495, and Plut. De Is. et Os. 61, quoted in ll. 221—2, note.
145—6. There is a blank space before προ[νείς, of which the initial letter is enlarged, but apparently no stop. [at to in l. 144 would make that line unusually long, and ἰπποκατήν]
suits κρατεῖν better than εἴπῃ τοίχοις, for which cf. l. 173. The τ of ὅταν in l. 146 is very uncertain, but καὶ πολὺς κείπονα, which can be read, is hardly satisfactory. With Isis as the inventor of weaving cf. ‘weaver and fuller’ in her Egyptian titles (Budge, op. cit. 278).

146–7. The second letter of σῷδε might be μ and the first and third are very doubtful. συναρμοθείημα is probably to be taken metaphorically (cf. the Ios Inscr. 21-2 ἐγὼ γυναῖκα καὶ ἀνδρα συνάγαγα. ἐγὼ γυναῖκει δικαίων βρέφος ἑνταξεὶ), though there seem to be no parallels for this use and ἀρμίστραμ occurs in l. 15.

148–9. This sentence apparently balances the one following. σῷδε has perhaps been omitted before ι. π[...[ can be read for ι] at the end of l. 148. There is not room for θῶναι, but which letter was omitted between θ and ι is uncertain.

149. ἀπαντᾷ is very doubtful, but cf. l. 148 ἀπαντᾷ. Possibly the second letter was μ with π written above it. ἀμαθεί (cf. Hdt. ii. 163) does not suit the traces of the fourth letter. Heracleopolis Magna is probably meant, not the Heracleopolis of l. 76.

152. ἄρωσι makes good sense, referring to visions of Isis in dreams (cf. Drexler, op. cit. 522-5); but the supposed traces of letters above the line and the deletion of π are very uncertain. Perhaps ἐπιότος should be read, the verb being then omitted.

153–5. Probably the corrected word beginning with ε was an aorist, and τει with ἑρμοῦ, such an order being common at this period. The mention of the 365 days (cf. l. 294 ἑπικανόν τείλε[ω] may be connected with the circumstance that at Sai the 5th intercalary day, the last of the year, was the birthday festival of Isis; cf. P. Hibeh 27. 205.

155. For ἤπαινα cf. ll. 11 and 86: possibly the ε was deleted. For εὐδιάλληκτος cf. P. Brit. Mus. 122. 28 εὐδιάλληκτος γενοῦ.

156. δ[...] προσταγμάτων: cf. the fifteenth θεσμοί in l. 120. The traces suit δ[...] better than σ[...] which would moreover be superfluous after σοῦ in l. 155.

157–8. Cf. the Ios Inscr. 18–19 ἐγὼ ὕλου καὶ σελήνης πορείαν συνέταξα. 161–2. τὰ ἄλλα ἰερὰ κοίνα is apparently accusative, not nominative. The ἰερὰ κοίνα may have included a sacred cow representing Isis, as the sacred bull at Memphis represented Apis. τῷ Ὀσίριδος ἅδατῳ (cf. l. 216) probably refers to τὸ τοῦ Ὀσίριδος ἄσιλον ἐν ὧ κεῖσθαι τὸν Ὀσιρίδος φασί, situated a little above Sai (Strabo, p. 803). A stop is expected before ἐν τῷ or ἰερῷ.

166. ], οὐτα: or ]...ιτα.

167. The last word of the line is not βασιλ[...]α.

170. τὴν γῆν στρώματι: Isis was especially the goddess of the fields and crops; cf. e. g. the stele quoted by Diod. i. 14 εὐρύστερα τῆς κρηθῆς καρπῶν.

171. -σα[,] is probably a verb -σα[...] with ἀπαντᾷ beginning a new sentence; but -σα[...[,] cannot be read.

173. [...]πυροβίωσε τὴν δρόσους: cf. l. 229 and P. Leyden V. vii. 23 Ἰσις ἡ καλογεύμενη δρόσους, which Brugsch (Religion, 137) connects with the supposed origin of Isis as the morning-glow.

174. There are short blank spaces after -σον and πάντα.

175–7. Cf. ll. 194–6, and Isis as τὰχη (l. 51) and νέμεις (Drexler, op. cit. 544–5).


179–83. The punctuation is uncertain; there may have been stops after παρέχει or πρῶτον and after πανηγύρισμα. In l. 180 παντός can be read and ἰερ[...] or ἵππα[...] before παρέχει. It is not certain that the two letters at the end of the line were deleted. πρῶτον in l. 181 is very dubious; and ἰερ[...] is possible. In l. 182 ἐπιστροφα, i.e. ἐπιστροφα (a late form) may have been first written (cf. κατάτας in l. 87), but the object of the correction (cf. the critical note) is then obscure. εἰκόνας (the two last letters are very doubtful) seems to be a mistake for ἑκόνα or ἑωχίας, but ἐπικλήθησα[...] cannot be read. Isis is not elsewhere
credited with the discovery of wine, Isis-worship according to Plut. De Is. et Os. 6 rather enjoining abstinence from wine.

183-6. After ψύχραν there seems to be an omission of καὶ θηρίων. That a stop is lost after ἀναστύχους is not certain, although there is a blank space; if εἰ ἔνω starts a fresh sentence connected only with what follows, there is a further omission in l. 184 of something corresponding to εἰρήματα ἑνεκὴς, but that can be avoided by connecting εἰ ἔνω with what precedes, though πίεσων in l. 186 is then redundant.

187. σοφί έπαφήγγες: μέγαν ὄσον (cf. l. 242) ἓγεγές hardly fills up the space, but "όσον (οποῖον;) ἔγεγες possible. For ἓς ἐπαφήγγες cf. l. 126 ἐπαφήγγεωσαν.

189. ὧγιαθοῦ δαίμων might refer to the serpent regarded as the good genius of each nome (Renouf, Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch. 1890, p. 11; cf. ἄσπις in l. 58), or possibly to the main western branch of the Nile (Ptol. iv. 5).

193-4. Either ἰδέως (cf. l. 237) or ἐπιφές. (cf. l. 297) or κατάφως. (cf. l. 257) can be read. ἓγεγες ἔξω is very insecure; καί [...] s is not unlikely. For διάφωτον cf. l. 139.

194-6. Cf. ll. 175-7. [ἐπιφές ἐξω] is possible in l. 195 (cf. Plut. De Is. et Os. 62), but the word contrasted with it is not στάσις.

196-7. After πα (or πά) there seems to be a correction, but it is not clear whether the letters between πα and ν were deleted. A phrase referring to Osiris is expected (cf. ll. 188-9 and 198), but τοῦ πλέοντος is not satisfactory. θηρία is inadmissible in l. 197.

199-200. Perhaps έπίθες; cf. l. 263. A stop would be expected after it.

202-3. ίση[ίδια can be read; but ἵση is the commoner form at this period. For εἰς τὸν [σπαν] χρόνον κατάθησα cf. ll. 213-14.

203-5. For τὰ νόμιμα cf. ll. 244-5, and for έπιμαντῶν τέλος (τὸν) cf. ll. 153-5, note.

205-6. It is not certain that there were stops after παρέδοκας and τόπον. The intervening words are more likely to be governed by παρέδοκας than by ἔδεα in l. 207.

206-7. Perhaps εἴ παντα τόσο κατάθησας (cf. l. 178), the object being ὅτι εὖ κτλ.

209. πίνακας can be read at the beginning of the line, but not πίνακας. [cf. l. 223] ἅπαντι is also unsuitable. For Ηωρα-Ἀπόλλων cf. ll. 246-7, note. The general sense of ll. 209-14 is parallel to that of ll. 262-8.

212. κ[...]j: perhaps κατὰ [...].

213. The stop after [πα]να seems to be superfluous.

214-16. Cf. Diod. i. 27, who connects the high position of women in Egypt with Isis, and e. the alternative names of one of the names Γυναικοπολίτης and Αἰδροσολίτης (l. 21, note).

216. For ἀδύνατος cf. ll. 162 and 249. The following letter can be η, κ, or π.

217. ὁραν suggests φόραν (cf. ll. 175 and 195), but ὁραν can be read.

218. Possibly βασιλιωσα Ἡρα: cf. e. g. l. 34. At the end of the line κυρι is all that is visible, and as there is no special trace of the surface being damaged, perhaps κυρί(α) should be read. There is however no other instance in 1880 of a participle beginning a fresh sentence.


220. πτέρυξιν cf: cf. ll. 65-6, note.

221-2. The supposed vestige of κ after το can be a diaeresis over 1 or ν. For Ηωρα in connexion with the sun cf. l. 233 and Plut. De Is. et Os. 61 εἶν ἐς τοὺς ἔρμων λεγομένων βῆθοι λιτορίους γεγραφθαί ... ὅτι τῷ τεν ἐπί τῆς τοῦ ἱλίου περιβολῆς τεταγμένων δύναμιν Ἡραν, "Ελλήνης δ' Ἀπόλλωνα καλοῦν ἑαυτόν ἐτὶ τοῦ πνεύματος οἱ μὲν ὁσμὴν οἱ δὲ Σωμῆ καὶ διατείς (cf. l. 144) Αἰγυπτίωτά.

222-6. Cf. ll. 121-3 and 125-6. ἐπαφήγες (cf. ἐπαφήγγεωσαν in l. 126) is inadmissible in
l. 224. The Eleutherus (cf. l. 98, note) was quite a small river, and that it should be placed on the same level of sanctity as the Nile and Ganges is remarkable.

227. *kí: the doubtful ρ may be i. ev may be εν. There is a short blank space after *ενιν, but apparently no stop. χρησιῶν cannot be read.

230. Whether γρή καὶ βθλάσης depend on λ[,]σ[ς] or are coupled with it is not clear;

λ[υ]ς[ω]ν in the sense of ‘breaking’ is not satisfactory.

232. ἄς is probably the termination of a verb, but πνευματικος (cf. l. 193) is unsuitable. There perhaps ought to have been a stop at the end of the line.

233-4. Cf. ll. 221-2. In l. 234 apè might be read at the beginning of the line, and πλέόνα ὅραν (or: παῖν ὅρον (not πρός) further on.

235. The Dioscuri, though frequently associated with Sarapis on Alexandrian coins, are not known to have been specially connected with Isis; but they like her were protectors of travellers by sea, and Isis was a goddess of the stars; cf. l. 159, and Drexler, op. cit. 435-9. Cf. ll. 138 and 227-30.

239-42. For the insertion of τυράννος proposed in the critical note cf. the Ios Inscr.

29 ἐγὼ τυράννος ἄρχει κατέλησα.

242-3. For Isis making Osiris immortal cf. ll. 13 and 246-7, notes.

244-5. Cf. ll. 203-4.

246-7. ἀβαντον ἔποιησας is to be supplied from l. 243. On the immortality conferred by Isis on Horus cf. Diod. l. 25. τητρός is possible in l. 246, but the doubtful o may be ω. Diodorus (l. c.) says τον δε Ὀμον μεθερμηνευομένων ἐφαιν' Ἀπόλλωνα (cf. l. 210) ὑπάρχαν καὶ την τε ιστοκην καὶ την μαντικην ὑπὸ της μυτρός Ἰσίδου διδαχθέντα διὰ τῶν χρησιμῶν (cf. l. 252, note) καὶ τῶν θηρασείων εὐφρενεῖν τῷ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος.


249. Μεθικ' : cf. ll. 1-3, note.

250-2. αὐτὰ is probably a corruption of αὐτῶν τοῦ πατρός, for Osiris does not seem to have been mentioned since l. 242 and cf. l. 263 sqq. διάδοχον αὐτὸμν ἐποίησα[ς]... ἐπὶ τοῦ πατρίου οἶκου.

252. χρησίων[,]δ[φ.]... can refer to either Isis (cf. l. 43) or Horus (cf. l. 266).


257. Perhaps εὐβασλῶν, contrasted with [δ]βουλίας in l. 258.


264-6. Ὀμον cannot be read in l. 264, nor does θυ in l. 265 seem to refer to Ἄθροος (cf. l. 279).

With θρόνος cf. l. 251 ἑρωνίσης.

269-71. Cf. l. 51, note.

276. τι τη: or τυρη.

278. Ἀδον: one of the chief reputed tombs of Osiris was there; cf. Plut. De Is. et Os. 20.

280-1. Cf. l. 284. ἀφώναντον seems to be for ἀφώνησον: cf. the next note.

282. κε. εὐβ: cf. l. 286 ῥασθεύθην and l. 296 ὁμωσανεί. All three seem to be mystical names of Isis in the vocative; cf. P. Brit. Mus. 121. 493-7 and 531-7.

285. 'εν τη: or [α]τη.

286. Cf. l. 282, note.

291. For εἰς τῶν αἰῶνων: cf. e.g. l. 268. τῶν Ὀμον, followed by an adjective or substantive, is not unlikely; cf. ll. 209-14.

296. Cf. l. 282, note. ἄλ may well be some part of ἀδρός: cf. ll. 127 and 162.
1881. **GRAECO-EGYPTIAN LITERARY PAPYRI**

1881. **PRAISE OF IMOUTHES-ASCLEPIUS.**

21.8 X 112.5 cm. Second century.

The verso of 1880, which is in much better condition than the recto, contains an analogous text in honour of a deity whose worship in Roman times to some extent connects through Hermes with that of Isis, namely Imouthes, the Egyptian Imhotep, identified by the Greeks with Asclepius the god of medicine. This deity stands on a somewhat different level from that occupied by most other gods of Egypt, being a historical person who came to be deified, like Amenhotep son of Hapu, a sage whose sayings were still honoured in the Graeco-Roman period, as is shown by a Theban ostraca containing a selection of them (Wilcken, *Festschr. für G. Ebers*, pp. 142 sqq.). In the λόγος τέλειος of Hermes (Pseudo-Apoll. 37) Asclepius is coupled with Isis and Hermes as *dii terreni et mundani*. Egyptian writings on his temples and figures made Imhotep the son of Ptah, but attributed to him a human mother and wife. He seems to have been a celebrated sage, physician, and architect, who lived in the time of King Zoser of the 3rd dynasty, as was stated by Manetho, if Sethe's convincing emendation (*Imhotep*, p. 19) of that writer's entry concerning King Zoser, as found in Africanus and Eusebius, be accepted, Τάσαρθος ἐνε γο’ (ἐφ’ ὅ ἐμπρήνῃ) ὁ Ασκληπιός παρα Αἰγυπτιίς κατὰ τὴν ἱστορικὴν νεόμοραν, καὶ τὴν διὰ ἔσχατον λίθων οἰκοδομίαν εὑρατο, ἀλλὰ καὶ γραφῆς ἐπεμελήθη. His principal temple, which was on the desert-edge near Memphis, is mentioned in the Serapeum papyri, e.g. P. Leyden i, p. 77 τοῦ προς Μέμφιν μεγάλον 'Ασκληπιείον, and his tomb was supposed to be there (Sethe, *op. cit.* p. 7), not far from the great step-pyramid which he built for Zoser; other temples to him at Thebes and Philae are known. The hieroglyphic evidence concerning Imhotep-worship comes mainly from inscriptions which are of the Ptolemaic age, though perhaps based in some cases on older material, and Sethe considers that his deification did not take place before the 26th dynasty. A. H. Gardiner (*Zeitschr. f. Aeg. Spr. xl. 146*) has pointed out that scribes were accustomed at least as early as the 18th dynasty to pour out the last drop of the water with which they mixed their ink as a libation to Imhotep. An ancient hymn, dating probably from the 11th dynasty, which couples Imhotep with Hardedef, a wise and pious prince of the 4th dynasty (cf. l. 7, note), is thought by Sethe to show that he was then regarded only as a sage. The author of 1881, however, asserts that the respect paid to Imhotep in late times was the revival of a worship encouraged or instituted by the celebrated king Mencheres.
of the 4th dynasty, but such attributions of great antiquity to religious foundations have commonly little historical value; cf. pp. 223–4.

Eleven columns, each of twenty-two or twenty-three lines, are for the most part well preserved, and few of the lacunae present serious difficulties. The author of the composition was primarily concerned with giving a paraphrase, rather than a literal translation, of an ancient Egyptian papyrus-roll concerning the worship of Imhotep, who in ll. 201–2 is called Imouthes son of Ptah, elsewhere, e.g. in ll. 228–9, Asclepius son of Hephaestus; but the extant portion, which from internal evidence clearly comes from a point near the beginning of the work, is mainly of a prefatory character, and the actual paraphrase is not reached until Col. x. Lines 1–32 describe the circumstances attending the discovery of the roll, apparently at the temple of Imhotep at Memphis (cf. l. 4, note), in the time of Nectanebo, the last of the Pharaohs and the subject of a number of legends in the popular literature of the Graeco-Roman period, e.g. the widely spread story of his being the father of Alexander, and the tale of his dream preserved in P. Leyden U (Wilcken, Milanges Nicole, 579–96). Owing to the loss of, probably, one or two columns at the outset, it is not known whether the writer stated the authority for his story about Nectanebo, which is likely in any case to have been derived from the priests of the Ἀσκληπιεῖον. The worship of Imhotep had, it appears, decayed in the troublous times preceding that monarch, and the temple was largely deserted when the king, with a view to restoring the worship on its former basis, caused an examination of an ancient roll found there to be made through his 'archidicastes', with the result that the descendants of a number of priests had posts of emolument revived for them, and the king made a large present of land to the temple. In l. 32 the author enters upon a rather long personal explanation of the reasons which had led him first to undertake and then to postpone the publication of this ancient document in the Greek language (ll. 33–64), and after three years interval to resume his work at the direct instigation of the god, who is represented as having miraculously appeared to him and his mother and cured him of a fever (ll. 64–167). After further explanations addressed to Asclepius concerning the nature of this composition in his honour (ll. 168–202), and an invocation of pious worshippers (ll. 203–18), the writer proceeds to paraphrase the contents of the roll, but at l. 247 the text breaks off soon after it had reached the really interesting point.

The principal facts which emerge from the fragmentary account of the ancient Egyptian document are that it traced Imhotep-worship back to Mencheses, i.e. Menkaura, the Mycerinus of Herodotus (l. 222; cf. ll. 28–32), and that the tomb of Imhotep is classed with those of 'Horus son of Hermes and also Caleoibis son of Apollo' as having been the object of special honours from that king
(ll. 228–34). Menkaura, the builder of the third pyramid of Giza, was worshipped, like his more famous predecessors Cheops (Khufu) and Chephren (Khafra), in Saite times, when scarabs with his name are common, and his piety, which was described apparently in some detail in the document with which our author is concerned, is often alluded to in Egyptian religious tales. Herodotus (ii. 129), followed by Diodorus (i. 64), contrasts his virtues with the vices of Khufu and Khafra for reasons which as regards the two latter are not clear (cf. Wiedemann, Herodots zweites Buch, 479); but the statements of the ancient Egyptian roll that no wars occurred in the time of Menkaura, and that the country was extremely prosperous, are in accordance with popular tradition, and whether the worship of Imhotep really dated from early times or not (cf. p. 221) that monarch is a most natural person to be associated with its institution or encouragement. The Old Empire kings were sometimes credited with composing books themselves, and from the manner in which Menkaura is connected with the βιβλια in both places in which he is mentioned it is quite possible that he was nominally the author of the roll. This was of considerable antiquity since it apparently required to be repaired by Nectanebo (ll. 24–5, note), though owing to the loss of the first column or two of 1381, in which the age of the book may well have been described, and the uncertainty attaching to the precise restoration of ll. 226–7, it is safer to suppose that the roll was, in reality at any rate, the composition of a priest. The fact that it professed to have been written under the Old Empire is, however, compatible with a date not earlier than the Saite period, when the archaizing tendency of the age probably led to the production of much religious literature concerning the ancient kings. But so far as it goes, the evidence of 1381 favours the view that the worship of Imhotep began in the early days of Egyptian history.

The interesting mention of the tombs of Asclepius, Horus, and Caleoibis honoured by Menkaura presents several problems. The name Kaλεοιβις is not found elsewhere, though Kaλιβις occurs in P. Grenf. ii. 32. 7, and no known ancient Egyptian deity bears a name which suggests an identification. His father, Apollo, would naturally be the god Horus, with whom Apollo was regularly identified in Graeco-Roman times (e.g. Hdt. ii. 156, Diod. i. 25, Plut. De Is. et Os. 12), but the four known sons of Horus were called Hapi, Mestha, Qebhsenuf, and Duamutef. Another difficulty arises from the mention of Horus son of Hermes (i.e. Thoth), who is distinguished from Apollo. Horus in late times (and probably in early times as well) was uniformly regarded as the son of Osiris, and it is remarkable, if Horus here is the ordinary deity of that name, that no legends about his tomb appear to be known, although Isis was sometimes supposed to have been buried at Memphis (cf. 1380. 1–3, note), and many towns
claimed to possess the tomb of Osiris. Unless Apollo here means some other god than Horus, which is unlikely, there would seem to be only two suitable explanations of the distinction between Horus son of Hermes and Apollo. Either Horus son of Hermes was a deified man on the same level as Imhotep, being earlier than the 4th dynasty and the reputed son of a god, in which case he and Horus = Apollo have nothing to do with each other; or else of the various local legends out of which the Horus-gods grew (cf. Budge, op. cit. i. 466 sqq.), two different myths are here associated, one making him a deified man (Horus son of Thoth), who had a tomb, the other placing him on a level with Ptah and Thoth and assigning to him a son Caleoibis, who in any case is likely to have been a deified man like Imhotep rather than an ordinary god. In support of the second view may be urged the somewhat similar conflict of testimony about Thoth, who under the title 'Ερμής ὁ Θησαυρός was coupled by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. i. 21) with Ἀσκληπιός ὁ Μεμφής as an example of a deified man. Sethe (op. cit. 9) connects 'Ερμής ὁ Θησαυρός with the Theban temple of 'Thoth-Teos, the ίβίς', who, he thinks, was a deified high-priest of Memphis; but this explanation is somewhat doubtful, particularly with regard to Clement’s Hermes; cf. Reitzenstein, Poimandres, 118 sqq. In view of the many forms taken by Horus-worship and the antiquity claimed for this Egyptian roll in 1381 we prefer to interpret ‘Horus son of Hermes’ as the ordinary Horus, and regard the reference to the tombs of Asclepius, Horus, and an unknown Caleoibis, all in connexion with a 4th dynasty king, as another proof of the early character of the source whence this tradition was derived.

That part of the preface which deals with the writer’s personal affairs and occupies the bulk of 1381 incidentally throws a few sidelights on Imhotep-worship. The expression ταύτης (sc. γραφής) εἰρέτης applied to him in ll. 187–8 is in keeping with the statements of Manetho (cf. p. 221) and an author quoted by Stobaeus, Ecl. phys. i. 41, who says that Asclepius invented ποιητική as well as ἱατρική. The invocation to pious worshippers (ll. 203–15) represents him not only in his usual character of healer of diseases, protector of physicians, and general benefactor, but also as specially concerned with the pursuit of virtue, and as the protector of seafarers, a function generally performed by Isis or the Dioscuri. With regard to the writer himself it is clear from ll. 145–51 that he was not a priest, and in none of his references to the healing art is there any indication that he was a physician. Where he lived is not stated; probably his home was at Memphis near the Ἀσκληπιεῖον (cf. ll. 70–3, 145–51, and p. 221). From his assertion in ll. 170–4 that he had previously composed a ‘physical’ treatise on the creation of the world, and the passage in which he addresses Asclepius as διδάσκαλος in connexion with his composition (ll. 181–98), he seems to have been
by profession a literary man, with a knowledge of ancient Egyptian (ll. 32–5) and
interested in mythology, being probably familiar with the works of the later
Greek sophists and early writers of romances, as is indicated by his florid style
and fondness for semi-poetical expressions and rare compounds, such as ἀκεστὸ-
δῶνος and ἀλλαττῶλογος. The date of the MS. shows that the composition of the
work took place not later than the early part of the second century, and it may
belong, like that of 1380, to the first; but it was probably at least two centuries
later than Pap. V of Leyden (second century B.C.) and not far removed from
the age of Aristides, whose oration ἔλει Ἀεπιλήπιον covers different ground from
that of 1381, and Apuleius, who, like Aristides, flourished under the Antonines.
Apuleius composed a treatise De mundo which is extant, an address in
honour of Aesculapius which is lost, and a dialogue and hymn in honour
of the same god, partly in Greek partly in Latin, of which an extract from
the preface is preserved in his Flor. 18, and an extant Latin translation of
the Greek dialogue between Hermes Trismegistus and Asclepius was attributed
to him. If any of his Greek treatises had survived, the style would very likely
have shown several of the same characteristics as that of 1381, though the
rhetorical description of the appearance of Asclepius in ll. 91–140 was perhaps
more on a level with the compositions of persons who had been cured at
the Serapeum of Canopus, to which Strabo alludes in p. 801 ἕνγγράφοντι δὲ τινες καὶ τὰς
θεραπείας, ἄλλοι δὲ ἀρέτας τῶν ἐνταθθά λόγων (cf. 1382), than with
the highly elaborated description of the appearance of Isis to Lucius in Metam. xi
or Aristides’ account of his visions of Asclepius in the ἱερὸς λόγος.

The text of 1381 is not very accurate and bears no trace of a systematic
revision. The only interlinear addition concerns the spelling of Μενχρόφους, ε
being written above η in a hand which may be different from that of the main
text but is more likely to be the same. A number of small omissions occur and
the construction of several sentences breaks down, though it is not always certain
that this was the scribe’s fault; cf. ll. 24–5, 59, 97, 129–30, 136, 222, and 226–8,
notes. Pauses in the sense are sometimes indicated by blank spaces, which also
sometimes appear, owing to roughness of the surface, in other positions. A single
(medial) stop is found in l. 167, but no other diacritical marks except diaeresis.
The papyrus is referred to in the notes as Π.

Col. i.

Col. ii.

σαν ἕκάστῳ προφήτειαν. οὐ

μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ [. . προφήσας τὴν

25 βῆθιν ἀνανεώσεως αὐτῷ

Ἄσκαλήπτου [ἐπιλούσισεν ἀλ-
5 ὰξεὶ ἀναγραφῆς τὸ πλῆθος αὐτῶν ἐπικρείναι βάθτην, παρεκελεύτω Νεκατί [τῇ δεί-
ποντί τῆν ἀρχὴν ἑκάστης τῆς βιβλίου μηνί] 10 εἰς μάλιστα ποιήσασθαι. ὃ δὲ ἐκτενέστερον αὐτὴν ἀναγρα-
πῆς ἐκόμισε τῷ βασιλείι, ὡς [ἀντὶ] τράκοντα ἡμερῶν μὲν ἀναλώσας εἰς τὴν
45 καὶ ἐκόλυσε [με τῇ] καταίστατα...] διὰ ἀγανακτήσαντός [καὶ ἀθα-

50 ἦν εὐθαμον, ἢ δὲ [ ] φήμη

55 δηκυνίς τῆς ἱερακί[ ] ἐπὶ πρὸς
tὰς κατεχούσας αὐτῶν[ ] νῦνοι

λα[ι]ς πυροφόροι ἀντονύματα τρι-
κοστάις τριάκοντα, καὶ μᾶλ[ι] 30 τῶν θεῶν ὑπὸ Μενχριοῦν
[εἰς] μέγεθος ἡσυχιεύον ἰς-
[β] προκείμενος Ἐλληνίδι γλώσσῃ
35 [ἐμ]παθοῦν ὁν ἄλοιν κηρεῖαν, καὶ ἐν μέσῳ ἑώρων τῇ γραφῇ ἐπεσχέθη τὴν προθὐμιάν

30. Second e of μενχριοῦν

above η. 24-5. l. τῆς βιβλίου ἐναν[τ]ων? 35. l. ἔν ὑπὸ ὦν. 38. ἵστορια II, a being corrected.

Col. iii.

45 καὶ ἐκόλυσε [με τῇ] καταίστατα...] διὰ ἀγανακτήσαντός [καὶ ἀθα-

50 μὲν εὐθαμον, ἢ δὲ [ ] φήμη

55 δηκυνίς τῆς ἱερακί[ ] ἐπὶ πρὸς
tὰς κατεχούσας αὐτῶν[ ] νῦνοι

λα[ι]ς πυροφόροι ἀντονύματα τρι-
κοστάις τριάκοντα, καὶ μᾶλ[ι] 30 τῶν θεῶν ὑπὸ Μενχριοῦν
[εἰς] μέγεθος ἡσυχιεύον ἰς-
[β] προκείμενος Ἐλληνίδι γλώσσῃ
35 [ἐμ]παθοῦν ὁν ἄλοιν κηρεῖαν, καὶ ἐν μέσῳ ἑώρων τῇ γραφῇ ἐπεσχέθη τὴν προθὐμιάν

30. Second e of μενχριοῦν

above η. 24-5. l. τῆς βιβλίου ἐναν[τ]ων? 35. l. ἔν ὑπὸ ὦν. 38. ἵστορια II, a being corrected.

Col. iv.

σκῆψασα ἀδίενος τεταρταῖα ἢ

70 μῶις νοῆσαντες ἱκέτα[α] πα-

75 φανεῖς εὐτελέσις αὐτήν

ἀπήλλαξαν βοηθήμασιν,

ημεὶς δὲ [[μη]] τὰς έσκύφας
[δ[ι]]α θυσίων τῷ σώσαντι
ἀπεδίδομεν χέριτας, ἐτεί

ἐπη
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скоеев. 6бев фугнв [то βεψογκι
дунон [ει] кαιροн ετι [ηρουν
тн τον (γ)ήρονυς, ἀρε[β][α]λαμμ[η][ν (δε)
60 την ἐπόσχεσιν. τότε γάρ[ρ] μα-
λιατα περισον την ἡλικιαν
φρουειν πέρφικε, θα[α] χαρὴ δὴ
νυφης καὶ φις[ρ]υμή φι[λάνει
ὀργουσα την προδομ[ι] αν. ἔτει
65 δὲ τηρεθες παρ[ραχθησ]χο[ν] χρόνος
μο[ν]ιν ἐπι[μο] καμιν[οντος,
τρε[τής διε . . .] την μητ[η]ρι ἐπι-
90 τὰς αὐτῶν φρικτὰς δυ-

49. ὁ ψηλόμαιντι. 54-55. ἀπηδήνυχαι της ἱστρίχος Π. 59. ἐτεται Π. 77. μη
Π. α οι τας κορρ. ην. 86. ν οι υπακούνοις κορρ. 87. ιδιαν Π.

. Col. v.

ν[άμε][η]ς ἀπαγγέλλειν. νῦξ
ἡν ὅτε παὼν [ἑκεκορηθε]
ξφον πλην τῶν ἀλγ[ο]ν-
των, τὸ δὲ θεῖον ἐνεργε-
95 στερον ἐφαίνετο, καὶ με
σφοδρὸς ἐφλεγε πυρηνεῖς, ἀσθμα-
τί τε καὶ βηκή τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ
πλευρ[ο]ῦ ἀναγομε[η]ς ὀδύ-
νης ἑσπανδίκτων καρπβα-
100 ρηθεὶς [δ]ὲ τοῖς πόνοις {δ} ἦν-
θαργος [ε]ς ύπνων ἐφερό-
μην. [ἡ] δὲ μιτὴρ ὡς ἐπὶ
παιδί, κα[ι] φοί[σ]ει φιλόστοργος
γάρ ἐστιν, ταῖς ἔμαις ὑπερ-
105 αλγο[ῦ]ςα βασιάνους ἐκαθὲ-
ζετο μη[δ]ε καθ’ ὀλγον ύπνων
μετ[α]λαμβάνουσα. εἰτ[ε] ἐγα[τ]-
νης ἐώφα—οὗτ’ ὀναρ ὀοθ’ ύ-
πνος, ωθαλμοὶ γὰρ ἦσαν

. Col. vi.

d[ο]ψ εἰσηγεῖ φαντασίανKaren],
καὶ ἀκαπ[τ]ος κατα[π]τεύειν
115 κωλυοῦσα εἶτε αὐτῶν τὸν
θεόν εἶτε αὐτὸς θεράπων-
tος. πλὴν ἦν τις ὑπερμη-
κῆς μὲν ἡ κατ’ ἀνθρω-
πον λαμπ[ρ]αῖς ἡμφιεσμέ-
120 νος ὀθοναι τῇ ἐνώνυ-
μον χειρὶ δέρουν βίβλον,
δὲ μοῖν ἄν κεφαλ[η]ς
ἐως ποθῶν δίς καὶ τρ[θ]ς
ἐπισκοποῖσα μὲ ἀφανῆς
125 ἔγνυτο. ἥ δὲ ἀνανήψασα
ἐτε τρομώδῃς ἐγείρειν με
ἐπειράτο. εὐροθῆνα δὲ μὲ
τοῦ μὲν [π]υρετοῦ ἀπη[λ]α-
γμένον ἵ[δ]ρωτα δὲ μοι πολ-
130 λοῦ ἐπαπο[λ]ισθάνοντος
τὴν μὲ[ν] τοῦ θε[ο]ῦ προσε-
Accrēπoνοι, ἐκλεπτότες μὲν οὐκ ἄρει·
βῶς, θ[ρ]εῖα γὰρ αὐτὴν μετὰ

κόννηστι ἐπιφάνειαν, ἐ-
μὲ δὲ ἀπὸμανάκουσα ν[η]φα-
λιώτε[ρο]ν ἐποίησεν. καὶ

135 διαλα[λή]σαντί μοι τὴν τοῦ

Col. vii.

θεοῦ προοελμοῦσιν μνεύειν ἄρε-
τὴν προαθῆσθαι ἐγὼ πάντα α-
πῆγγελον αὐτῇ δόσα [γ]ὰρ δ[ι]ά τὴν
ὑπερείς εἰθεν ταῦτα ἐγ[ड] δι' ἂν

140 νεφάτων ἐφαντασώθην.

καὶ τόνδε τὴς πλευρᾶς λαφη-
σάντων μοι ἀληθῶν, ἔτι
μοι μι[ᾶ]ν δοντός τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκε-
σάδουν ἑστρεῖαν, ἐκήρυσσον

145 αὐτοῦ [τ]ὰς ἐνεργείας. πάλιν ὃ' ἡ-
μῶν ταῖς κατὰ δύναμιν αὐτῶν
ἐξευμνεσαμένοις θυμα[ζ]αις
αὐτὸς ἀπήτευσε διὰ [τ]ῶν ἐν ἀνελαίας
αὐτῷ προσπολύνεν[ῳ] ἐρέως

150 τὴν πάλαι κατηγγελμένην αὐτῷ
ὑπόσχεσθαι. ἢμεῖς δὲ μηδὲ θυ-
σίων μὴτε ἀναθήματος [χρε-
ώσας] αὐτῶν εἰδότες ὡμος
τούτοις αὐτῶν πάλιν ἰκετεύ·

155 ὀμ[ε]ν. ὅς [ὁ] οὖ τοῦτος πο[λ]λάκις
ἐπε[ῖ]ν ἱδεσθαι ἄλλα τῷ προ-
καθωμαλ[ῶ]γημένῳ διπό-

Col. viii.

ρ[ο][υ]ν, καὶ[ι] μόλις ταπεινοῦ-
τι μοι τοῦτο τὸ δείξ[ε] ἡ[ς]

160 φῆς ὑπήρει με χρέος. ἐπεῖ
δ' ἀπάξ ἐπεγυνόκει[ε] με [ἄ]με[λ]-

165 λεῖν, δεύτεροτη, τῆς θε[ῖα][ς] βί-
βλου, τὴν σὴν ἑπικαλεσάμε-
νος πρόνοιαν καὶ [ ]πλη[ρ]·

170 ὑπε[ῖ] τὸν τῆς ἱστορίας[ς] ἀρμη-

175 θα[ῆ]λατον ἄθλον. καὶ


σὴν προφητεύων ἐπίνου-

185 αν' καὶ γὰρ [τὸν] τῆς κοσμο-

190 ποιας πιθ[ά]νο[λ]γηθεν-

195 τα μᾶθων ἐν ἑτέραν [β]λοφ-

200 φυσικῷ πρὸς[ς] ἀλήθειαν ἀνή-

205 πλωσα λόγῳ. καὶ ἐν τῇ ὅλῃ

210 γραφῇ [τ]ῶν μὲν ὑστερον προσ-

πεληρώσα, τὸ δὲ περὶ[ς] σει-

215 ον ἀφελον, διήγημα δὲ

πον μακρολογου[μ]ένῳ[ς]

συντόμως ἐλάλησα.
Col. ix.

180 καὶ ἀλλαττὸλογὸν μυθόνον ἀπαξ ἑφρασα, ὒθεν, [δεῖπνοτα, κατὰ τὴν σήν εὐρ[ένειαν ἀλλ’ οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν φρ]ονησιν τετελεσιούρ[γ]ήσ[θ]αι


195 ταὶ δὲ τῶν μέλλοντα, γραφὴ δὲ ἀθάνατος χάρις καὶ τὰ καρδιῶν ἄνησθασκ[ό]σαι τὴ[ν] μνήμην. Ἐλλην[ις] δὲ π[ᾶ]σα γλώσσα τὴν σήν λα-


Col. x.

σύν[τε] δε[ῖπ]ρο, [δὸ ἄνθ[ρω]πος εὐφ[ειν]ος καὶ ἀγαθοίς, ἀπι-

205 τε, βάσκαινοι καὶ ἀρεβείς. σύν[τε], δῶ [ς]..[..]ς. [.], δοὺς θη-

210 τεβ[σ]αντ[ε]ς τὴν [θ]εῶν νό-

σον[ν] ἀπηλλάγητε, [δὸ]σοι τὴν ἱερακήν μεταχειρί-

215 ξεσθε ἐπιστήμην, δού[ν]ι πορνήστε γιλαται ἁρε-

τῆς, δο[ὺς] πολλῷ πλῆθει ἐπιφύ[θ]ῃ[θ]ητε ἁγαθῶν,

220 σωτηρίος. μέλῳ γάρ αὐτῶ τερατώδεις ἀπαγγέλλειν

225 ἐπὶ[π]ανειας δούναις τε μεγεθή εὐθ[ρ]ημά-

των (τε) δορήματα. ἔχει δὲ ὄν-

230 τως [ὁ] βασιλεὺς Μενε-

χήρης τριῶν θεῶν κη-

235 δε[λ]γαν εὐ[ρ]εβήσας αἰωνίαν

Col. xi.

εἰληφέ δόξαν, [καὶ διὰ τῆς ἕβιβλου τὴν φίλημ [ν] εὐτυχεν ἅχος. τὴν τίον ἀσκῆ-

πιόν παιδὸς Ἡφα[στίου τα-

230 φήν καὶ τὴν τίον "Ω" ο[ν] Ἐρμο-

ῖδο ἐτε δὲ Καλεοβίας

τε νικυπτός διὰ τοῦτο καὶ
cαρποὶς ἀφ[θ]όνοις εὐθυν-

εῖτο. τῇ γαρ τοῦ προερ-

240 τῶν εὐσεβείας ὑποτε-

γιμέναι εὐπορόσιω χω-

[ρ]αί, καὶ τοῦτοντι[λ]ον ἐφ'] ο[ίς
'Nectenibis on hearing this, being extremely vexed with the deserters from the temple and wishing to ascertain their number speedily by a list, ordered Nechahtis, who then performed the duties of archidicasts, to investigate the book within a month, if possible. Nechahtis conducted his researches with much strenuousness, and brought the list to the king after spending only two days instead of thirty upon the inquiry. On reading the book the king was quite amazed at the divine power in the story, and finding that there were twenty-six priests who conducted the god from Heliopolis to Memphis, he assigned to each of their descendants the due post of prophet. Not content with this, after completing the renewal of the book (?) he enriched Asclepius himself with three hundred and thirty arurae more of corn-land, especially because he had heard through the book that the god had been worshippd with marks of great reverence by Mencheres. Having often begun the translation of the said book in the Greek tongue, I learnt at length how to proclaim it, but while I was in the full tide of composition my ardour was restrained by the greatness of the story, because I was about to make it public; for to gods alone, not to mortals, is it permitted to describe the mighty deeds of the gods. For if I failed, not only was I ashamed before men, but also hindered by the reproaches (?) that I should incur if the god were vexed, and by the poverty of my description, in course of completion, of his undying virtue (?). But if I did the god a service, both my life would be happy and my fame undying; for the god is disposed to confer benefits, since even those whose pious ardour is only for the moment are repeatedly preserved by him after the healing art has failed against diseases which have overtaken them. Therefore avoiding rashness I was waiting for the favourable occasion afforded by old age, and putting off the fulfilment of my promise; for then especially is youth wont to aim too high, since immaturity and enterprise too quickly extend our zeal. But when a period of three years had elapsed, in which I was no longer working, and for three years my mother was distracted by an ungodly quartan ague which had seized her, at length having with difficulty comprehended we came as suppliants before the god, entreating him to grant my mother recovery from the disease. He, having shown himself favourable, as he is to all, in dreams, cured her by simple remedies; and we rendered due thanks to our preserver by sacrifices. When I too afterwards was suddenly seized with a pain in my right side, I quickly hastened to the helper of the human race, and he, being again disposed to pity, listened to me, and displayed still more effectively his peculiar clemency, which, as I am intending to recount his terrible powers, I will substantiate. It was night, when every living creature was asleep except those in pain, but divinity showed itself the more effectively; a violent fever burned me, and I was convulsed with loss of breath and coughing, owing to the pain proceeding from my side. Heavy in the head with my troubles I was lapsing half-conscious into sleep, and my mother, as a mother would for her child (and she is by nature affectionate), being extremely grieved at my agonies was sitting without enjoying even a short period of slumber, when suddenly she perceived—it was no dream or sleep, for her eyes were open immovably, though not seeing clearly, for a divine and terrifying vision came to her, easily preventing her from observing the god himself
or his servants, whichever it was. In any case there was some one whose height was more than human, clothed in shining raiment and carrying in his left hand a book, who after merely regarding me two or three times from head to foot disappeared. When she had recovered herself, she tried, still trembling, to wake me, and finding that the fever had left me and that much sweat was pouring off me, did reverence to the manifestation of the god, and then wiped me and made me more collected. When I spoke with her, she wished to declare the virtue of the god, but I anticipating her told her all myself; for everything that she saw in the vision appeared to me in dreams. After these pains in my side had ceased and the god had given me yet another assuaging cure, I proclaimed his benefits. But when we had again besought his favours by sacrifices to the best of our ability, he demanded through the priest who serves him in the ceremonies the fulfilment of the promise long ago announced to him, and we, although knowing ourselves to be debtors in neither sacrifices nor votive offering, nevertheless supplicated him again with them. But when he said repeatedly that he cared not for these but for what had been previously promised, I was at a loss, and with difficulty, since I disparaged it, felt the divine obligation of the composition. But since thou hadst once noticed, master, that I was neglecting the divine book, invoking thy providence and filled with thy divinity I hastened to the inspired task of the history. And I hope to extend by my proclamation the fame of thy inventiveness; for I unfolded truly by a physical treatise in another book the convincing account of the creation of the world. Throughout the composition I have filled up defects and struck out superfluities, and in telling a rather long tale I have spoken briefly and narrated once for all a complicated story. Hence, master, I conjecture that the book has been completed in accordance with thy favour, not with my aim; for such a record in writing suits thy divinity. And as the discoverer of this art, Asclepius, greatest of gods and my teacher, thou art distinguished by the thanks of all men. For every gift of a votive offering or sacrifice lasts only for the immediate moment, and presently perishes, while a written record is an undying meed of gratitude, from time to time renewing its youth in the memory. Every Greek tongue will tell thy story, and every Greek man will worship the son of Ptah, Imouthes. Assemble hither, ye kindly and good men; avaunt ye malignant and impious! Assemble, all ye . . ., who by serving the god have been cured of diseases, ye who practise the healing art, ye who will labour as zealous followers of virtue, ye who have been blessed by great abundance of benefits, ye who have been saved from the dangers of the sea! For every place has been penetrated by the saving power of the god.

I now purpose to recount his miraculous manifestations, the greatness of his power, the gifts of his benefits. The history is this. King Mencheres by displaying his piety in the obsequies of three gods, and being successful in winning fame through the book, has won eternal glory. He presented to the tombs of Asclepius son of Hephaestus, Horus son of Hermes, and also Caleoibis son of Apollo money in abundance, and received as recompense his fill of prosperity. For Egypt was then free from war for this reason, and flourished with abundant crops, since subject countries prosper by the piety of their ruler, and on the other hand owing to his impiety they are consumed by evils. The manner in which the god Asclepius bade Mencheres busy himself with his tomb . . .

i. τα' τετε.'α: the supposed τ has an unusually short cross-bar on the left, and perhaps παλλα'ί should be read. The preceding word might be [ . . .]. From the references to τοῦ ἱεροῦ (l. 4), τῆς βιβλίου (l. 9), and τῶν θεῶν (l. 20), as if they had been mentioned previously, it is clear that Col. i is not the actual beginning of the papyrus, which on the recto breaks off in the middle of a column at this point.

Neతετε.簸: for the form of. Neతεత簸 in Theopomp. Fr. 101 (G-H); Neతεత簸, -τετ簸, -τεթ簸, &c., are found elsewhere.
4. τοῦ ἱεροῦ: sc. the 'Aσκληπιεῖον at Memphis (cf. ll. 21, 26, and introd.) rather than at Heliopolis (l. 19), where no temple of Asclepius is known.

7. Neither Νεκαν isize nor Νεχαού seems to be known, but Νεχαοῦ occurs, and Νεκαοῦ and Νεχαοῦ as variants of Νεχαοῦ. 

5 would imply that Nechoatis or Nearchus was a deputy; but it is doubtful whether the word is here used in its technical sense, or as equivalent to διηγηταῖ in Ptolemaic documents, which does not imply that the person in question was a deputy; cf. P. Tebt. i, p. 84. The reference to an archidicasts in Pharaonic times is interesting. That official is known to have existed under the Ptolemites as well as under the Romans, and he may well have been the counterpart of a Pharaonic official. Mr. A. H. Gardiner compares the 'chief lector' Hardedef, who found writings in a temple (Erman, Die München d. Pap. Westcar, i. 18; cf. p. 221). The superintendence of documents of various kinds was part of the duties of the archidicasts in Roman times; cf. e. g. 34.

9. μήνζε: cf. l. 13 ἀντὶ τρίκοκτα ἑμερῶν. Of the second letter only the tip of a flourish similar to that of the final η of l. 11 is preserved. 

24-5. These two lines are obscure and probably corrupt. ἀναφέρουσα (cf. l. 15) cannot be read. If ἀναφέρουσα is right (ἀναφέρουσα seems to be the only alternative), the 'book of renewal' would have to be explained as a title derived from ancient Egyptian; but this comes in very abruptly and λαμπροσ suggests nothing but πράσμα or a compound, and we are disposed to think τῶν βιβλίων ἀναφέρεσας a mistake for τῶν βιβλίων ἀναφέρων (cf. the wrong cases in ll. 129-30), and to suppose a blank space, as often in 1881, before πράσμα, though [ἐκ][φαινόμεν] is possible. The last letter of αἰτων is reduced to a mere speck of ink, and αἰτον can equally be read, but not αιτο το, though 'Aσκληπιεῖοι might easily be a mistake for 'Aσκληπιεῖοι; αιτο (το) is also unsatisfactory.

30. Μεινώνιος: the ε above the line is apparently in the 1st hand and may represent an alternative spelling rather than a correction. -νοισ is in late Ptolemaic times a common form of the genitive of names ending in -νος. In l. 223 the nominative is spelled Μεινέχερης, in Africanus ap. Syncellus Μεινέχης.

36. Μεινών: this form of the present corresponding to the future μεινῶ does not seem to be attested elsewhere.

45-9. Near the ends of ll. 48-67, and probably in ll. 45-7 also, a vertical strip of papyrus had scaled off the surface of the verso before it was written upon. Usually the scribe on reaching the single thickness, which had room for about two letters, left it blank, but in some cases he wrote across part or all of it, e. g. in ll. 48 and 56. This single layer has for the most part perished, but without affecting the reconstruction except in l. 57, where if a blank space was left to must be omitted, and in ll. 45-8, where the ends of lines are missing and the size of the lacunae ranges from 5-7 letters according to the amount of notice taken of the presumably missing strip. The general sense of ll. 45-9 is that the writer was afraid of vexing the god by the inadequacy of his tribute to him, but the construction is not clear. The supposed ήν of ἐκάλως is rather cramped, but ἐκάλως cannot be read, and for the aorist cf. l. 37 ἐπεχύθημι. For τὴν κατῶντα it is possible to substitute ἰχανοῖ ο. . . , but that is not a suitable epithet for Asclepius, and δαί seems to be the plural of a neuter word meaning 'reproaches', perhaps a misspelling of δοθ(ε)τηρίου; cf. Hdt. vii. 160 ὀμίλησα κατῶντα ἀνθρώπῳ. For ἀδὰμάτου cf. ll. 51 and 196, and for γραφῆς cf. ll. 159, 175, 187, and 195. [και in l. 46 makes the order of the following words rather awkward, and in ll. 47-8 τῆς γραφῆς . . . συμπληρομένης ο. . . (but not -μίας . . . ) could be read, if a blank space was left (see above). For τῆς συμπληρομένης cf. l. 158 τακτούντως μοι τούτο, τακτούντως is coupled with συμπληρομένη τῆς λέξεως by Plut. Mor. p. 7 a. τῆς γραφῆς συμπληρομένης may be genitive absolute, and ἀρέτη would then be dependent on the word ending in -νωμα, which would perhaps be an easier construction.
49. For the spelling οφθαλματιν for l. 72, where ομενοι apparently represents ἄλοματοι.

53. αὐτ(ε)ξα μόνοι for l. 193 τοῦ παραστέσματι μαθηματικῶν τῆς γνώσις. The only alternative seems to be αὐτό的质量, which yields a less satisfactory sense, and the traces suit a much better than ω.

59. (ἡ)τρίσχων is not a known form and the ητρ is not quite certain, for ἦ might be read for η and ε or φ for ρ; but the omission of γ between vowels is easily explained and γνώσις suits the context; cf. l. 63 εὐτρής. Possibly the omissions in this line (a connecting particle is wanted) and so producing two nominatives. If τεταρταία η τρίσχων is corrected to τεταρταία (or Ἰ-τρίσχων, which was certainly not written, τεταρταί... ἀπώλεσα agreement with δ) the θεος is very unsatisfactory, for both words ought to agree with τρίσχων, so that further emendation becomes necessary, and the confusion of the construction would be far worse than in l. 158-60. If θεος is not δ)θεος, [δ(τρίσχων)] ἀπώλεσα is the simplest change; but a reference to the god is not wanted in l. 68, especially as he is mentioned in l. 71. ἀπώλεσα could be read in place of ἀπώλεσα, but suggests no suitable verb, whereas ἀπώλεσα is often used of νόσος.

72. ομενοι apparently represents δευμενοι rather than εικεμενοι: for ό in place of ο cf. l. 49 οφθαλματιν. That δε occurred in the lacuna at the end of the preceding line is unlikely, for ω is written rather large and may well be the last letter, and final ε generally has a long flourish, which should be visible.


97-8. ἄρθρατος τε καὶ θρησκία: τε is perhaps a mistake for δέ; cf. l. 59, note. θρησκία for θρησκία is probably not a mere misspelling, θρησκία and θρησκία being attested.

99. For σφοδάζων in place of the usual σφοδάζων see Herodian, Περὶ μον., λέξ. 23. The passive of καιρομαρίαν is very rare.

100. [α]λθέαρης: αλθέαρης in the sense of 'active' is known (Hesych. ἀληστῶν ἀλθεαριτῶν), but αλθέαρης, in which the σ- owing to the context cannot have a privative force, is unattested and seems to be an error for ληθέαρης.

108. ἵππος has no object, the writer altering the construction; cf. l. 136 and 158-60.

111. μὲν has no corresponding δέ, but is answered by πλην ἦν καλ. in l. 117; cf. the preceding note.

136. προελαμμένη: the dative can be connected with αἰτή in l. 138, but the sentence is somewhat involved, and προελαμμένη would be an improvement, or possibly προελαμμένη was a nominative absolute; cf. l. 110 and 158-60, notes. The traces of the first two letters are very slight, but exclude βελαμμένη.

138. ἀπηγγελω is perhaps a new form of the aorist rather than a misspelling of ἀπηγγέλλων.

148. ἵππος: or ἵππος.

156-8. διαποροῦσα could be read for διαποροῦσα καὶ, but the correction of εἰσεῖν to εἰσεῖν seems necessary.

158-60. ταπεινώτατοι μοι is inconsistent with ὑπνεῖ με: cf. l. 108 and 136, notes, τούτο can refer to τοῦ προκαθαρωματος ὑπόμενον or to τὸ δεῖν τῆς γραμμῆς χρίτος, which follows.

164. There is not room for ἐκπληροθείνει, and probably the space after the corrected καὶ (cf. critical note) was blank.

168-74. For κατὰ πλάσειν, i.e. καθα πλάσειν, cf. l. 173 ἀνθρώπως. It is not certain that more than one letter is lost, but κατο[θ]άσειν yields no sense. καθαπελεύσων is much rarer than
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ἀναπλοῦς, for which cf. Hermes Trismeg. Poemand. l. 16 ὁτιά γώροι ἀνάπλωσις τῶν πρῶτων λόγων. The force of κατα ἀναπλοῦς here seems to be ‘widely’ unfold (cf. ll. 198–202), as contrasted with the beginning of the process (ἀναπλοῦς). καταπλοῦσεις would be correct as the Ionic form of καταπλοῦσειν, but there is no parallel for the metaphorical use of this verb in the sense of ‘come to an end’, and the alteration of ἀναπλοῦς to ἀνάπλωσις in l. 173 would leave μεθά to be governed by προφητεύων supplied from l. 169 or by some omitted participle, which is very unsatisfactory.

180. ἀναπετάλωσις is a new compound. For μεθάν cf. l. 172.

181. For ἀνάπλωσις cf. l. 162 with αὐν in the next line, as here. The α is very uncertain and ἁτε or ἁτα could be read.

187. ταυτῆς: sc. ἀναφήμα. The invention of demotic writing is usually credited to Thoth and Isis (cf. p. 193), but cf. p. 224.

197. ἀνεβάσκεις οἴσαν τὸ[ε] μη[

199. ἀνεβάσκεις οἴσαν τὸ[ε] μη[

200. ἀνεβάσκεις οἴσαν τὸ[ε] μη[

201. φάδα: cf. Rosetta Inscr. 4. The Greek equivalent Ἡφαίστου is used in l. 229; cf. p. 222.

211. παράσσετε φιλώστε (or possibly -σεσεθε) or παράσσετε could be read, but not φί

222. δωρήματα: for the omission of a connecting particle cf. ll. 59, 97, and 226–8, notes. δ is fairly certain, but the next two letters are very doubtful and the termination might be ήμων.

223. δί: it is not certain that any letter is lost.

226–8. For δά τῆς διβάλων cf. l. 29. The punctuation is uncertain. If τῆς φιλήμων εὐρύχρηστος (cf. l. 50) is right, that participle is to be connected with what precedes rather than with what follows, and is an explanation of ιῶνοι εὐφήμες δίβαν (cf. ll. 195–8), but there is an asyndeton in l. 228. With δά δά τῆς there still seems to be no connecting particle between χήρας and δωρημένος in l. 233, and l. 227 must be restored differently. The διβάλω is presumably the ancient Egyptian roll, as usual, but it appears here to be directly connected with Menkaura, not merely mentioned as evidence for his action (δος εκ τῆς διβάλω is unsatisfactory); possibly he wrote it nominally himself; cf. p. 223.

228–32. Cf. pp. 223–4. In l. 229 Ἡφαίστου the vestiges suit η very well and are consistent with φ. In l. 230 τῇ, τέρατον (or ὁρῶν or ὁρῶ) might be read, but the article, though omitted in l. 231, is confirmed by l. 228, and τῇ Πώρου is much the most probable restoration. The φ is written through what seems to be a blot of ink due to a correction, but there is no reason to think that the ρ was deleted.

234. ἄντιδοσων: the form seems to be unattested, but ἄντισως (neut. plur.) in the MSS. of the tragic poets is often misspelled ἄντισως.

247. πειρατείας (cf. l. 229) is probable.

**1882. TALE OF SARAPIS AND SYRION.**

15 × 25.3 cm. Second century.

The recto of this papyrus contains portions of an official account of taxation on land, written in the second century and mentioning the 18th year of an emperor (Hadrian or Antoninus?), and will be published in Part XII. On the
verso, in a large uncultivated cursive hand of the same century, is the conclusion and title of a story concerning the ἄρετή of Zeus-Helios-Sarapis (cf. 1149, 1, note) in connexion with a pilot called Syrion. The papyrus had been reduced to about half its height before the verso was used, but was doubtless a long roll originally, and many columns may have been lost before Col. i, of which only the ends of lines survive. The tale ends with Syrion’s disposal of some water, which probably had healing or otherwise miraculous qualities, to the inhabitants of Pharos. The story, which seems to have been based upon a manuscript preserved at Alexandria (l. 19, note), appears to have been Greek rather than Egyptian in origin, and is perhaps to be classed with the compositions of persons who had been cured of diseases at the Serapeum of Canopus, mentioned by Strabo (cf. p. 225). On Hellenistic ‘aretology’ in general see Reitzenstein, Hellenistische Wundererzählungen, 10 sqq., and cf. 1381.

Col. ii.

|
| 15 εἶπεν· διὰ σὲ χαρίσομαι τὸ ὕδωρ Φαρίταις. |
| καὶ ἀσπάσαμεν καὶ ἀνέπλευσεν, |
| καὶ ἀ(πὸ)δίδωσι τὸ ὕδωρ Φαρίταις καὶ λαμβάνει |
| παρ’ αὐτῶν εἰς τιμὴν ἄργυρίου (δραχμᾶς) ρ. καὶ |
| καταχωρίζεται ἡ ἁρετή ἐν ταῖς Μερκουρίου |
| 20 βιβλιοθήκαις. ὁι παρόντες εἰπατε ἐἰς Ζεὺς |
| Σάραπις. |
| Διὸς Ἡλίου μεγάλου Σαράπις |
| πειδος ἁρετή ἡ περὶ Συν- |
| ρώνα τῶν κυβερνή- |
| την. |
| 10 | 25 |
| 1. π above τ deleted. 16. καὶ corr. from δι. 17. ὕδωρ Pap. 22. νυσφα written over some expunged letters. 24. ν of κυβερνήτην corr. from ε. |

‘... he said “For your sake I will bestow the water upon the people of Pharos.” And having saluted him he sailed forth, and gave the water to the people of Pharos, receiving from them as its value 100 drachmae of silver. This act of grace is registered in the libraries of Mercurium. Let all present say “There is one Zeus Sarapis.” (Title) The act of grace of Zeus-Helios, great Sarapis, regarding Syrion the pilot.’

17. ἀ(πὸ)δίδωσι or ἀ δίδωσι can be read.
19. τοῖς Μερκούριοις βιβλιοθέκαις: cf. 886. 2–5 ἀντίγραφον ἱερός βιβλίον τῆς εἰρήτης ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ ταμίων, which is the heading of a magical formula for obtaining an omen, and another heading of a magical formula in Catal. codd. Astr. Graec. vii, p. 62 βιβλίος εἰρήτης ἐν Ἑλλοτροπίᾳ τῆς Αιγύπτου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἐν ὀδοὺς ἑγγεγραμμένῃ ἐν ἱερίς γράμμασι. Μερκούριοι may be merely equivalent to Ἑρμοῖ, but since the story is concerned with Pharos the Mercury quarter of Alexandria (Hirschfeld, Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten, 564–5) is likely to be meant. Whether it was called Μερκούριοι or Μερεώριοι is doubtful, the nominative not being found, but the neuter form is the more probable.

20. εἷς Ζεὺς Ζάραντις is a common formula on gems; cf. 1380. 6, note.

1383. Sailor's Song.

5.4 × 12 cm. Late third century.

This interesting little poem, a prayer to the Rhodian winds for a calm voyage, apparently complete, is closely parallel to 425, a brief invitation to sailors to compare the sea and the Nile, written in the second or third century in the metre ὑποκύπτω – ὑποκύπτω – ὑποκύπτω, and to P. Amh. 2, an early fourth-century acrostic Christian hymn in practically the same metre; cf. Wilamowitz, Gött. gel. Anz. 1904, 670, P. Maas, Philol. 1909, 445–6, Powell, Class. Quarterly, v. 177. The 10 στίχοι are sometimes marked off by strokes, like the double dots indicating the στίχοι in the alphabetically arranged P. Amh. 2, but as in 425 the writing is continuous. The script is third-century cursive, probably dating from about 250–280; it is thus somewhat later than 425, as is also indicated by the greater irregularity of the metre. In 425 the metrical value of syllables still depends on quantity, not accent, except in one instance where Νεῖλον is scanned as a trochee, whereas in 1383, as in P. Amh. 2, accent is often more important than quantity, e.g. v. 4 ὁτε μένειν, v. 7 ἄλ' ὑποτάξας ναύσιβάταις. Dactyls occur in place of anapaests or spondees in the first part of the verse more often than in P. Amh. 2, and the rule observed carefully in 425, and almost without exception in P. Amh. 2, that a verse should end with a paroxytone iambus, which results in the form ὕδατις being employed in 425 for ὕδατα, is violated in e.g. v. 3 ἑω, v. 8 ἔπτυγεται. Verses 6 and 10 are highly irregular and probably corrupt.

In the right-hand margin is the title; on the left hand are the ends of two lines which are likely to have belonged to another poem of the same character, though not certainly in the same hand. There is a margin above and below Col. ii which seems to be, like 425, complete, though a word is wanted at the end, and the poem may possibly have been continued in another column; cf. l. 10, note.
Graeco-Egyptian Literary Papyri

6. I. tois for sois. 9. ὑποσάγατε Pap. of ναοσβάτησε above the line. ν of ἀνέμουs corr.(?):

1. ἀπόλειες.

'I commanded the Rhodian winds and the seaward parts when I wished to sail; when I wished to remain there, I said to the seaward parts that the sea should not be smitten. Make the ocean obedient to seafarers! Suddenly a whole tempest arises. Shut off the winds, and, night, grant that the waters be smooth. (Title) To the Rhodian winds.'

6. μέρεις, unless corrected to μέρεσι(ν), is scanned as a dactyl; cf. introd. In v. 5 the word is abbreviated, and the same difficulty arises, but though two dactyls occur in place of two anapaests in vv. 7, 8, ἔλεγον in v. 5 is in favour of μέρεσι(ευ) there.

σοῖς: the top of the first person is lost, but the bottom of the surviving stroke turns to the right, whereas the bottom of a τ should be straight or turn to the left. The second person singular is found in l. 10, where νῦς is addressed, but is out of place with μέρεσι πελάγιος, which recurs in l. 8 without σοῖς, and τοῖς was no doubt meant.

7. ὅτε πλέουν: the form πλέουν is often found in MSS., but is usually corrected to πλένω. Here it corresponds metrically to μένων in the next verse, the first syllable being apparently lengthened in both words owing to the accent, unless the first syllable of ὅτε is lengthened; cf. introd. To read πλές(χ)οι is unnecessary.

8. ἔτει seems to mean Rhodes. For μέρε(ευ) cf. l. 6, note. An adjective making a tribarach or trochee seems to have been omitted after μῆ; cf. l. 10, note. For τυπη cf. Hom. δ 580 ἄλα τύπτον ἐρεμοῖς. Possibly, however, μῆ (ἀρχεῖ) τύπτει(τε) or μῆ τύπτει(τε -) should be restored before τα πελάγη.

9. ναοσβάτης for ναοβάτης occurs in Manetho i. 123. For the shortened first syllable cf. the next note and introd.

10. καὶ is treated as short; cf. introd. Verse 10 will not scan unless δός ð [iō]μ’ εὐβάτη (κε -) be read. There is not room for [ευμ’]ατα, and after εὐβάτα any further letters would run into the μ of ἀνείμους belonging to the title, of which the termination may have been obliterated, although the papyrus is preserved. Perhaps, however, ἀνείμους should be read there; the traces of the e are very slight and the letter may be raised above the line. This would leave room for 3 or 4 letters between εὐβάτα and the edge of the papyrus. The missing syllables may have come in the next column, if Col. ii was one of a series; cf. introd. But δός, the manner of writing the title, and the general appearance of the papyrus all suggest the conclusion of the poem, and an omission is likely enough; cf. l. 8, note.
1884. Medical Recipes, Theological Extracts.

30.2 x 15.4 cm.  
Fifth century.

The beginning and end of this remarkable papyrus consist of medical recipes, the first for a purge, the others for curing strangury and wounds, while the middle portion is taken up with two theological extracts, which have evidently been inserted on account of their medical interest, perhaps as a kind of charm. The rather large, irregular semiuncial hand and numerous mistakes of spelling indicate an uncultivated writer of, probably, the fifth rather than the sixth century. A few corrections are all by the scribe himself, who employed the brown ink common at this period. The lower part of the papyrus is practically complete, but in the upper part nearly all the right-hand half is missing, entailing the loss of only some of the figures in the first recipe, but the ends of all the lines except one in the first extract, of which the reconstruction presents difficulties, although the general sense is clear.

Lines 15-22 are apparently derived from an uncanonical gospel. Jesus meets some persons, who ask Him how the sick can be relieved. The answer is that He has provided olive-oil and myrrh for those who believe in the name (or power) 'of the Father, the Holy Spirit, and the Son', a notable inversion of the usual order of the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity. The scene is laid εν τῇ ἑρήμῳ, and possibly the background was suggested by Matt. viii. 2-4, Mark i. 40-5, Luke v. 12-16, where the healing of a leper is stated by Mark and Luke to have led directly to the departure of Jesus ἐπ' ἑρήμου τῶν or ἐν ταῖς ἑρημίσεις; or if the persons who met Jesus were lepers (cf. ll. 15 and 17, notes) there might be a connexion with Luke xvii. 11-14; or, as Dr. J. V. Bartlet proposes (cf. l. 15, note), the background may have been provided by Matt. xiv. 13-14, which has ἑρήμων τῶν and ἀπεκαθαρίζετο (cf. θαραπεῖα in l. 17). If ἡμῖν in l. 15 is rightly restored, the gospel to which the extract belongs must have been professedly written by one of the disciples. The first person singular or plural occurred in the narrative of (1) the Gospel of Peter, (2) the Gospel of the Ebionites, which is probably identical with that of the Twelve Apostles (Harnack, Gesch. d. altchr. Liter. i. 625 sqq.), (3) the Gospel of Philip, (4) 1224, if με in Fr. 2 recto. ii. 1 belongs to the narrative, and possibly also in (5) the Gospel of Thomas, (6) the Traditions of Matthias, and (7) the Payûm Gospel-fragment, of which three the extant remains are too slight to show the character of the narrative; but in 655, 840, and 1081 the disciples are referred to in the third person, as presumably in the Gospels according to the Hebrews and Egyptians.

The second extract (ll. 23-9) is quite different from the first, being concerned with the 'angels of the Lord' who are represented as having gone up to heaven
to seek a remedy for their eyes from Jehovah Sabaoth, to whose power they appeal. The story seems to be incomplete, and this suggests that the first extract too perhaps broke off prematurely, though it ends at a more intelligible point than the second. The link connecting the excerpts with the medical prescriptions is probably not so much the mention of the olive-oil and myrrh as relieving sickness, and the sponge as relieving the eyes, but in the implied virtue of an appeal by name in the one case to the Trinity, in the other to Jehovah Sabaoth, who is often invoked in Gnostic prayers, e.g. 1080. The second extract is clearly not taken from any gospel like that of Peter and (apparently) that of the Twelve Apostles, which covered the same ground as the Synoptists, but the Gospel of Philip, of which the only extant fragment begins ἀπεκάλυψέ μου ὁ κύριος τί τῷ ψυχήν δεῖ λέγειν ἐν τῷ ἀνάναια εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (cf. l. 23-4) καὶ πῶς ἐκάστη τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων ἀποκρίνεσθαι, was a document of a different class, and seems a possible source for both excerpts. It is, however, safer to regard them as independent of each other, and in that case the second extract may well be from a Jewish, rather than Christian, work of an apocalyptic character similar to e.g. the Apocalypse of Baruch (cf. 403) or the Ascension of Isaiah (P. Amh. i).

The first excerpt, considered by itself, can hardly be assigned with any confidence to a particular gospel, especially as it is uncertain what term was used in the narrative in speaking of Jesus (cf. l. 16, note). The unorthodox order of the Persons of the Trinity seems to point in the direction of that early conception which found expression in a curious fragment of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, ἀρπαὶ ἐλαβέ μὲ ἡ μάτηρ μου τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα ἐν μητὶ τῶν τριών πατέρων καὶ ἀπέγεικέ με εἰς τὸ ὅριον τὸ μέγα Θαυμάτωρ, and since that gospel is not itself a suitable source for l. 15-22, there is something to be said in favour of assigning the passage to the Jewish-Christian Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, which Epiphanius and Jerome for obscure reasons wrongly identified with the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The Ebionite Gospel was probably a century later than the other, and unlike it was a secondary document of a pronounced Gnostic character, while the Gospel of Peter, which is partly based on the canonical Gospels but was used by Justin along with them, occupies a middle position, Harnack assigning its composition to A.D. 110-30. The Akhmim fragment shows that the Gospel of Peter, to which 1224 possibly belongs, was still being studied in Upper Egypt in the fifth century, but the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, as a Jewish-Christian work, is perhaps more likely to have been associated with the source of the second extract.

Φοῦσκας καβαρσίου
κυμίου (δραχμαί) δ,
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μαράθου (δρ.) β, 
σελινού (δρ.) δ, 
κόστου (δρ.) δ, 
μαστίχης (δρ.) δ, 
κορίλου (δρ.) ζ, 
δαφνόκκοκα κα, 
καραλού (δρ.) [, 
πέρνης (δρ.) [, 
γλήχωνος (δρ.) [, 
φολλου (δρ.) [, 
ἄλατος [, 
δόξους [, 

5 ἦμην... ἄνδρες 
ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ ἔπαιν τῷ κυρίῳ, 35 ἵσσον, τίς ἐν ἑαυτίᾳ ἀρραβώντος; 
καὶ λέγω αὐτοῖς, ἔλεον ἀπέδωκα ἑ- 
λήσι καὶ σβήνου [ἐξ] ἐξέκυσα τοῖς 

10 πεποιθότι τῷ ἀνώματι τοῦ 
πατρὸς καὶ ἀγίῳ [πν] ὑμματο) καὶ τοῦ 

νιὸν. 

3. μ of μαράθου corr. 7. 1. κορίλου. 12. 1 of φολλου above 
the line; 1. φύλλου. 17. ἵσσον Π 1. ἵσσον ... τοι ἑραπέλα. 18. 1. ἐλαίου ... ἡμάτια. 19. 1. σβήνου [έ] 22. ἱσσον Π 23. ἰδείδων 25. σφόνγον Π 1. σφόνγον 26. τοις 
of avtores above the line. 1. κύριος ... ἀφηλάτω τοῖς 27. 1 of ἵσσον corr. from οι, and 1 from 
υἰοῦ Π. 28. Second a of αὐχεθίομεν corr. from οι, ἵσσον Π. 28-9. 1. 1 of ἱσσον Π 29. ἰδείδων. 1 of ἱσσον above the line. 30. 1. ἑραπελάτων ἵσσον Π 1. ἱσσον 31. 1. λαθών 
32. ἵσσον Π 34. 1. ἑραπελάτων οἰλῶν. 35. 1. λαθών. 36. 1 of κλεξιον 
above the line; 1. κλέξιον. 

‘Ingredients of a purging draught: cummin 4 drachmas, fennel 2 dr., parsley 4 dr., 
costus 4 dr., mastich 4 dr., coriander 7 dr., 21 laurel-berries, nut 1 dr., ham (?). dr., penn-
royal dr., silphium (?) 1 dr., salt 4 dr., vinegar ... 
... men met us in the desert and said to the Lord “Jesus, what cure is possible for 
the sick?” And He saith to them “I gave olive-oil and poured forth myrrh to them that 
believe in the name of the Father, the Holy Spirit, and the Son.” 
The angels of the Lord went up to mid-heaven, suffering in their eyes and 
holding a sponge. The Lord saith to them “Why came ye up, ye holy and all-pure?” (They 
say) “We came up to receive a remedy, Jehovah Sabaoth, for thou art mighty and strong.” 
For strangury, to heal the sufferer. Take the dry seed of basil-thyme, crumble it with 
wine of Ascalon, then drink it hot. 
For treating wounds. Take the fruit of a cyress, boil it and apply.’
10. Whether in this context πέρια has its ordinary meaning of 'ham' is doubtful; a herb would be expected.

12. φύλλον in medical writers is used sometimes with special reference to μολάβασθαρον (betel-nut), which was exported from India, and στομαθα, which was exported from Cyrene. The latter is more likely to be meant.

15. The position assigned to the isolated fragment ἀνδρεῖς is not certain, but no other place seems at all suitable. θε, δω, εω, or ου, but not οι, may be read for οι, only the tops of the letters being preserved; but no combination with II. 17–19 or 23 results, and in II. 16 and 20-1 the restorations, which are fairly certain, are inconsistent with this fragment. Bartlet prefers ημ[7]ν οι Φαρασσίωι, comparing 1224. Fr. 2 verso. ii. 1, but ἀνδρεῖς at this point seems satisfactory. The preceding word may well have been a number (e.g. τρεῖς), but since the exact length of the lacuna is uncertain there are several possibilities. ημ[7]ν λεπτοί ἀνδρεῖς might also be read on the analogy of Luke xvii. 11 δέκα λεπτοί ἄνδρες (cf. the other story of the healing of a leper mentioned in the introd.), but, as Bartlet observes, the context suggests that the questioners were persons who wanted to know how Jesus did his cures, rather than subjects of such cures.

16. αὐτῷ or τῷ σ(οτ)ῃμ(ν) (cf. 840) may be restored instead of τῷ κ(τ[ι])ῳ, which is the term used in the Gospels of Peter and Philip, or 'iēsoi might be dative instead of vocative; cf. 1224.

17. For the spelling θαρσία cf. l. 34 and the Arsinote ἄμφαθον Θαρσίας (e. g. P. Tebt. 329. 3). After this come very faint traces of the bottoms of four letters, of which the first seems to have begun rather high up and may well be ά, while the third has a vertical stroke suggesting γ, ι, μ, or ι. For ἀρράστους (Bartlet) cf. Mark vi. 13 ἦλειος οἰκ[7]ορ πολλούν ἀρράστους, but if the second and third letters were ῥρ there was a blank space between them. ἦλιον . . . is less satisfactory, but the sentence may have ended at θαρσία and the next word to be a verb. ἰπτεραί (cf. e. g. Matt. viii. 3 ἰπταμον αὐτοῖς) might be read, but hardly ἰπταμον, and there would be room after it for δε, but not αὐτῶν. This reading would require λεπτοί ἀνδρεῖς in l. 15; cf. note ad loc.

18–19. The fourth letter of απελί, if not δ, can only be λ, but δ is more suitable. Neither απελίων nor απελίς(ε)α makes a very good contrast with ἐξίσουσα, of which only the tops of the letters survive, and one verb would be sufficient; but though ε is quite well be read for ε (ε is really preferable to ε), and ν is possible in place of χ (or κ), ἐξίσουσα is inadmissible, not only on account of the third letter, which, if not ε, must be ι, but because after the fourth the top of a high letter like σ ought to have been visible. ἐξίσουσα and ἐξίσουσα are open to the same objection.


25. σφόνγγων might be for σφόνγγαν (cf. l. 31 λαβον) and the plural would be an advantage, but ερνέων in the sense of 'holding in the hand', which occurs in Plutarth, Athenaeus, and other late writers, but not in the N. T., would be expected to govern the accusative.

27. λέγοντας seems to have dropped out between ἄροι πανκάθαροι and Ἰεσοῦν λαβόν, or else αἱ δὲ εἰσαγ seems to be omitted.

30. στραγγουρία (i. e. -ρία) is an unknown equivalent of στραγγουρία, and of doubtful validity.

31. ἑρών is an Ionic form, but more prob. a misspelling of ἑρων; cf. l. 17 'iēsoī.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

V. HOMER FRAGMENTS

(The collations are with the text of Ludwich.)

1385. Fr. 2 7·3 × 5·7 cm. Two fragments, found with 1369-74, &c., of a leaf from a papyrus codex, containing on the recto the beginnings of B 444-6 and 456-67 (the writing on the verso being obliterated), with occasional breathings and accents. 460 η χηνψυ. Fifth century; in a sloping uncial hand; brown ink.

1386. 19·9 × 7·8 cm. Found with 1365 and 1392. On the recto parts of 2 lines in cursive. On the verso the upper part of a column containing portions of Δ 257-71, with some accents and marks of elision and quantity. A low stop occurs in l. 262. 260 κρητηρας κερωντ αι 262 πινωσι. ουν. Third century; in an upright informal hand.

1387. 9·9 × 4·2 cm. Middle parts of E 206-24 with occasional high stops and accents (208 βαλὼν). Second century; in well-formed round upright uncials of medium size.

1388. Fr. 1 7·6 × 8·6 cm. Four fragments, the first containing parts of Z 133-7 from the end of a column, and the others parts of Z 138-50 and 156-60 from the next column, of which I. 160 was the last line. Stops occur in the form of an acute accent high above the line, probably by a second hand. The papyrus has ο1 not μν in l. 159. First century B.C. (found with a contract dated in the 19th year of Ptolemy Auletes, to be published in Part XII); in good-sized uncials of similar type to those of 659 and 686.

1389. 6 × 17·7 cm. Fragment of a double leaf from a vellum codex containing on p. 1 beginnings of H 182-94, on p. 2 ends of 218-30, on p. 3 a few letters from the beginnings of 250-5, and on p. 4 a few letters from the ends of 285-9, with frequent accents, breathings, and marks of elision; stops in the middle position occur twice. Late fourth century; in a sloping uncial hand similar to that of the Freer Gospels; brown ink.

1390. 6·2 × 5 cm. Fragment of leaf from a papyrus codex containing on the verso parts of I 287-96 and on the recto parts of 325-31, with frequent accents. 328 δή. Fifth century; in slightly sloping rather heavy uncials; brown ink.

1391. Fr. 1 3·9 × 3·7 cm. Four fragments (one very small one unidentified), found with 1369-74, &c., from the middle of two leaves of a papyrus codex of Δ, written in brown ink in a large heavy sloping uncial of the fifth century.
The text, which varies considerably from the vulgate and seems to be remarkably corrupt, is:

Fr. 1.

Recto.

526 [\(\sigma\)]
527 θαυριον αλκης
528 μοειμοιν

Verso.

566 θαυριον αλκης
567 μοειμοιν
568 θαυριον αλκης

Fr. 2 and 3.

Recto.

597 
598 
599 
600 
601 
602 

Verso.

634 
635 
636 
637 πλειον εον 
638 [25 letters]
639 [31 letters]
640 [31 letters]
641 [31 letters]

526. Αλλο δὲ MSS. 528. κειν᾽ ἵππους MSS. For the doubled σ cf. l. 635, but the second is very doubtful, being more like γ. 598. l. Μακχανα. 643. δαμί (or -φι) ἐκάστων MSS. 635. An omission of about 3 letters apparently occurred in the earlier part of this line. 637. ἀφεσυ ἄρεα MSS. 638-40. The MSS. have ἐν τῷ μᾶ σφι κύκος γυνὴ εὐεξία βεβαίῳ ὅφει Πραγματο, ἐπὶ δ' ἀγείον κυῆ τυρών κυῆται χαλέπι, ἐπὶ δ' ἄ deltaXε λευκὰ πάλιν. Mr. T. W. Allen suggests that after ll. 636 or 637 some new lines were added referring to Hecamede and proposes με\(\sigma\)οδε\(\nu\)ον εὐσάκα or ἤκα φοροῦσα with either χειταν or εἰμαι. π[σακ][σακ] [cf. § 521] does not seem possible in the previous line. The vestiges of the supposed l. 641 are very uncertain, but ll. 637 and 640 may have been meant, though very corrupt.

1392. 14·2 x 9·1 cm. Found with 1385 and 1386. On the recto first halves of O 303-25. 307 βιβων. 308 ωμοιν. 311 τη. 324 κλονεουσι[ν]. Third R 2
century; in upright calligraphic uncials of biblical type, resembling 25, 661, 867, P. Rylands 16. On the verso, which is partly covered by strips gummed on in order to strengthen the roll, is some third-century cursive writing.

1393. 7 x 9.8 cm. Fragment of a vellum leaf containing on one side beginnings of Π 157-70, on the other ends of 191-203, with frequent accents and marks of elision. Oxytone words received a grave accent on the final syllable, e.g. 165 ἀγαθὸς. 166 ὢ inserted above the line by a second hand. Fifth century; in upright rather heavy uncials resembling those of 848. The leaf was ruled on the verso (?) with a fine point; brown ink.

1394. Fr. 1 4.3 x 1.6 cm. Six fragments (two unidentified), found with 1369-74, &c., from a papyrus book, containing on the recto parts of a 266-76 and on the verso parts of 296-307, with frequent accents, &c., added in darker ink. Oxytone words have a grave accent, as in 1393. Stops in the middle position in ll. 269 and 296 are apparently original. 271 νησ with δη interlined in darker ink. Fifth century; in a medium-sized sloping hand somewhat resembling that of 1372; brown ink.

1395. 6.5 x 8.9 cm. Fragment of a vellum leaf containing on one side the first halves of ζ 264-75 and on the other 294-305, with frequent accents and marks of elision added in lighter ink. Stops in the high position occur. 269 ἱππειν, the final s rewritten and repeated in lighter ink above the line. 273 ϕ of ϕημιν corrected; a paragraphus was inserted by a later hand below this line. 274 ι adscript of μωμενιν added together with a high stop by a later hand. εἰσίν. 297 ελθηνις corrected to ελθηνι by a later hand. 303 κενθωντι. Fourth century; in a fine upright script rather similar to that of the Codex Sinaiticus.

1396. Fr. 1 2.7 x 3.7 cm. Two fragments, found with 1369-74, &c., from a papyrus book, containing on the verso parts of ι 358-61, 364 and on the recto parts of 405-8, 410-12, with accents, &c., and three small unidentified scraps apparently from the same MS. 406 هة apparently corr. 411 νοὴσων τρίτη. Fifth century; in a sloping hand rather smaller and more compressed than that of 1394; brown ink.

1397. 3 x 2.8 cm. Fragment found with 1369-74, &c., containing on the verso marginal scholia on σ 67 and 70 in a small cursive hand. The text is [περε]ξώσα[το τα μηθα πιος ρακεστίων, and after a space ησθησεν, an explanation of ηδαν. On the recto traces of a few obliterated letters, probably also a scholium. Fifth century.

1398. 10 x 7.3 cm. Beginnings of φ 356-67, from the bottom of a column, with frequent accents, breathings, &c., added by a later hand, which has also corrected the text and inserted paragraphi and critical signs. Below 361
paragraphus. 362 diplē in margin. ἐν. 363 λ of πλαγκτή and χ of τοι added above the line by the corrector. 364 ἀπ’τοιον. 365 ημῶν ἱλήκητος, the λ added above the line by the corrector; paragraphus below. Third century; in calligraphic upright uncial of biblical type, resembling 1392, 661, &c.

VI. MINOR CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1399. 7·1 x 7·3 cm. Plate II (verso). On the recto parts of 8 lines of, probably, a petition to an official who is addressed as κύριε; a ἰπομηνματισμός of a βασιλικὸς (γραμματεύς) is mentioned. Late second or third century. On the verso the title

\[ \chiοιρίλου \, ποιηματά \]

\[ θαραβαρικα \, μηδί \, περσικα \]

is written in upright uncial which may belong to the middle or latter part of the third century. The papyrus is hardly the right shape for a σιάλνβος (cf. e.g. 301, 1091), and is more likely to have come from the end of a roll. With regard to l. 2, it is improbable that the three adjectives θαραβαρικά Μηδίκα δικα refer to three distinct poems; they rather designate in common the famous epos of Choeirilus which is called by Suidas ἦ Αθηναίων νίκη κατὰ Ξέρξου, by Stobaeus Περσῆς (Flor. xxvii. 1), and by Herodian Περσικά (Π. μον. λεξ. p. 13, ii. 919 Lentz). This was divided into more than one book (Herodian, l.c.), and may well have been of a rather wider compass than Suidas’ title would suggest, though there are no indications of this in the few surviving fragments (Kinkel, Ep. Gr. Fr. pp. 265 sqq.). Suidas credits Choeirilus with another work called Λαμικά and ἄλλα τινὰ ποίηματα, of which nothing is known; Naucke in his monograph on Choeirilus suggested (p. 101) that Λαμικά should be emended to Σαμικά or else assigned to Choeirilus of Iasus.

1400. 6 x 5·3 cm. On the recto part of a second-century taxing-list, which will be described in Part XII. On the verso ends of 10 and beginnings of 8 lines from the tops of two columns of a comedy, written in a small uncial hand of the second or early third century. The text is:

Col. i.  
[ἀδε]  
[αλην γαμει]  
[πιδω]  

Col. ii.  
[απο]  
[αυτη]  
[μητρ]
Fr. 1 recto. Fr. 2 recto. Fr. 3 verso. Fr. 4 recto.

| as                      | χορ(ος)   | ... |   |
| γνώμην ana...          | βθ[       | ... |   |
| εντα...[.]             | θρον σοφόν | τας[ | verso. |
| ... [.]                |           | θηλ[ |   |
| θιςεις                  |           | ητι[ |   |
| αιω...                 |           | α[   |   |

Traces of 2 more lines and 2 of a scholiwm.

Fr. 1 verso.

| αρχον              |   |
| κηφε                   | α[   |
| κου εκ          |   |
| ναον                      | κακ[ |
| νοεο( )                 |   |

1401. Fr. 1 8.5 x 6.6 cm. Four fragments, found with 1369–74, &c., from a papyrus codex of a tragedy, written in a hand similar to that of 1370 but not identical, though possibly from the same MS. of Euripides. Fifth century; brown ink. Frs. 1 and 2 are from the tops of columns. The text is:

[Greek text]

1402. Fr. 1 3.6 x 4.2 cm. Three fragments, found with 1369–74, &c., of a codex of Aristophanes (?) with semi-uncial scholia. The main text is in a different hand from those of 1371–4, and it is not quite certain that Fr. 3 belongs to this MS. Fifth century; brown ink. The text is:

[Greek text]
Fr. 2 recto.

Fr. 3 recto.

Fr. 3 verso.

Fr. 1 verso. 1–3 seem to be a note on σκόροδος or σκοροδίτως: cf. Schol. Ach. 165 τοῖς (sc. ἀλεκτροστῷ) γώρ ὅτε μᾶλλον μᾶχεσθαι σκόροδα δίδοται ἔσθεν, Knights 494 ὅταν γὰρ εἰς μάχην συμβάλλωσιν αὐτοῖς σκόροδα δίδοσιν αὐτοῖς, but the recto does not suit any point 30–50 lines distant from either of those two passages. Fr. 2 recto. 1 δρέπανα suggests Frogs 576 δρέπανον λαβώσω and κολικήν or κολικόν in l. 605. σκόροδα occurs in l. 555 of the same play, but Fr. 1 recto does not seem to fit that part of the Frogs.

1403. 2 x 3.2 cm. Fragment, found with 1869–74, &c., of the middle of a leaf from a papyrus codex, apparently in the hand of 1374, but not from the Wasps, though presumably Aristophanes. Fifth century. The text is:

Recto.

Verso.

1404. 5.9 x 16.9 cm. On the recto, written across the fibres, part of a Latin paraphrase of the fable of the dog carrying a piece of flesh over a stream and deceived by his own image in the water; cf. Aesop 339, Babrius 79. Phaedrus i. 4. The text is: Canis carneā inu(c)nit et flu-men tr(ans)iebat, deinde cum in aq(ua)num vidisset umbram car-nis existima(v)it alter(a)n. There is a blank space of 2.5 cm. after l. 4 and no trace of writing below, which would be expected to be visible if other lines followed immediately. The story thus seems to have been left incomplete. Third century; in a rather large cursive hand. ε is commonly of the v shape, made without lifting the pen, but twice has the form of e. On the verso, at right angles, are the ends of four lines of Greek, perhaps an account.
APPENDIX

List of Oxyrhynchus and Hibeh Papyri distributed.

The following is a list of published papyri which have been presented to museums and libraries at home and abroad since the publication of the last list in Part V, pp. 315 sqq. It includes the texts in Parts V-IX, with a small portion of Part X, of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, and the remainder of those in Part I of the Hibeh Papyri. The reference numbers given to the papyri in the institutions to which they now belong have been added where ascertained. The following abbreviations are employed:

B. M. = British Museum. The numbers are those of the Catalogue of Greek Papyri.
Bodl. = Bodleian Library, Oxford. The references are to the hand-list of MSS.
Bolton = Chadwick Museum, Bolton, Lancs.
Brussels = Musées Royaux, Brussels, Belgium.
Cambridge = University Library, Cambridge. The numbers refer to the Additions.
Chicago = Haskell Oriental Museum, University of Chicago, U.S.A.
Cleveland = Library of Cleveland University, Ohio, U.S.A.
Dublin = Library of Trinity College, Dublin.
Edinburgh = University Library, Edinburgh.
Glasgow = University Library, Glasgow.
Graz = University Library, Graz, Austria.
Harvard = University Museum, Harvard, Mass., U.S.A.
Illinois = University Classical Museum, Illinois, U.S.A.
Leipzig = University Library, Leipzig, Germany.
Leland Stanford = Library of Leland Stanford University, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.
Liverpool = University Library, Liverpool.
Morgan = Pierpont Morgan Collection, New York, U.S.A.
Muhlenberg = Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.
Newton = Newton Theological Institute, Newton Centre, Mass., U.S.A.
Pennsylvania = Museum of Science and Art, University of Pennsylvania, U.S.A.
Princeton = University Library, Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A.
Princeton T. S. = Library of Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, U.S.A.
Rylands = The John Rylands Library, Manchester. The numbers are those of the Catalogue of Greek Papyri.
Toledo = Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio, U.S.A.
Yale = Library of Yale University, U.S.A.

The following Oxyrhynchus and Hibeh Papyri had been passed on from Brussels to the University Library, Louvain, and have presumably been destroyed. They were numbered in the classical inventory of the University Museum 204–19.

Hibeh Papyri Nos. 39, 45.
Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

III. 412. B.M. 2040.
V. 840. Bodl. MS. Gr. th. g. 11.
841. B. M. 1842.
842. B. M. 1843.
843. Cairo 41082.
844. Harvard.
VI. 845. Cairo 41083.
847. Morgan.
848. Chicago.
849. B. M. 2041.
851. Muhlenberg.
852. Bodl.
853. Cairo.
854. Toledo.
855. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. e. 99 (P).
856. Princeton CC. 0174. 6. 871.
857. Muhlenberg.
858. Liverpool Class. Gr. Libr. 418.
859. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. f. 88 (P).
861. Cairo.
862. Cairo.
863. Cairo.
864. Illinoiis G.P. 864.
865. Newton.
866. Muhlenberg.
867. Illinoiis G.P. 867.
868. Muhlenberg.
869. Toledo.
870. Muhlenberg.
872. Muhlenberg.
873. Yale.
874. Rylands 449.
875. Cleveland.
876. Princeton.
877. Pennsyl. E. 3075.
878. Brusselse.
879. Cairo 41084.
880. Graz MS. II. 1948.
881. Cambridge Add. 5884.
882. Yale.
883. Morgan.
884. Bodl. MS. Lat. class. e. 20 (P).
885. Cambridge.
886. Cairo.
887. Cairo.
888. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. d. 98 (P).
889. Cairo.
890. Illinoiis G.P. 890.
891. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. f. 89 (P).
892. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. d. 105 (P).
893. Glasgow.
894. B. M. 2042.
895. Glasgow.
897. Illinoiis G.P. 897.
899. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. e. 65 (P).
901. Cambridge Add. 5885.
902. B. M. 2043.
904. B. M. 2044.
907. B. M. 2040.
908. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. e. 64 (P).
909. Illinoiis G.P. 909.
912. Cairo.
913. B. M. 2045.
914. B. M. 2046.
915. Yale.
916. Illinoiis G.P. 916.
917. Yale.
918. B. M. 1843.
919. Cairo.
920. Cairo.
921. Cambridge Add. 5886.
925. Princeton T. S. Pap. 2.
927. Illinoiis G.P. 927.
928. Illinoiis G.P. 928.
929. Cairo.
930. Glasgow.
931. Chicago.
932. Illinoiis G.P. 932.
933. Toledo.
934. Muhlenberg.
936. Toledo.
937. Cairo.
938. Chicago.
939. Cambridge Add. 5887.
941. Illinoiis G.P. 941.
942. Chicago.
943. Toledo.
944. Harvard.
945. Cairo 41085.
946. Morgan.
948. Pennsyl. E. 3076.
950. Morgan.
951. Princeton.
953. Louvain 218.
954. Leland Stanf. 1952.
955. Yale.
956. Cleveland.
957. Brussels.
958. Illinoiis G.P. 958.
959. Cairo 41379.
961. Cairo 41379.
962. Illinoiis G.P. 962.
963. Toledo.
964. Cairo 41086.
965. Morgan.
966. Cairo.
968. St. Deiniol's, Hawarden, A. N.
39496.
969. Cairo 41087.
970. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. g. 58 (P).
971. Illinoiis G.P. 971.
972. Cairo.
973. Louvain 219.
974. Yale.
976. Princeton CC. 0174. 6. 976.
977. Liverpool Class. Gr. Libr. 421.
981. Peabody Museum, Yale.
982. Princeton.
983. Dublin.
984. B. M. 1842.
986. Cairo.
988. Cambridge Add. 5888.
989. Cairo.
990. Illinoiis G.P. 990.
994. Brussels.
995. Cairo.
996. Graz MS. II.
1942.
997. Cambridge
Add. 5889.
998. Brussels.
999. Graz MS. III.
1941.
1000. Graz MS. I.
1951.
1001. Chicago.
1002. Morgan.
1003. Cleveland.
1004. Cairo 41088.
1005. Cairo 41089.
1006. Cairo 41090.
VII. 1007. B. M.
2047.
1008. Cairo.
1009. Cairo.
1010. Bodl. MS. Gr.
bib. g. 3 (P).
1012. Toledo.
1013. Cairo.
1015. Cairo.
1016. Toledo.
1017. B. M. 2048.
1018. Rylands 450.
1019. Dublin.
1020. Cairo.
1021. Dublin.
1022. B. M. 2049.
1023. Illinois G. P.
1023.
1024. Illinois G. P.
1024.
1025. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. d. 99 (P).
1026. Cairo.
1027. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1027.
1028. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1028.
1029. Cairo.
1030. Illinois G. P.
1930.
1031. Cairo.
1032. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. b. 7 (P).
1034. Dublin.
1035. Illinois G. P.
1035.
1036. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1036.
1037. B. M. 2050.
1038. Muhlenberg.
1039. Newton.
1040. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1040.
1042. Illinois G. P.
1042.
1043. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1043.
1044. Toledo.
1045. Toledo.
1046. Muhlenberg.
1047. Toledo.
1049. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. b. 7 (P).
1050. Cambridge
Add. 5890.
1051. Illinois G. P.
1051.
1052. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. d. 100 (P).
1053. Cambridge
5891.
1054. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1054.
1056. Newton.
1057. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. d. 100 (P).
1058. Princeton T. S.
Add. 3.
1060. Rylands 452.
1061. B. M. 2051.
1063. Toledo.
1064. Muhlenberg.
1065. Princeton T. S.
Add. 4.
1066. Toledo.
1067. Toledo.
1068. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1068.
1069. Cairo.
1070. Cambridge
Add. 5892.
1071. Cairo.
1072. Newton.
VIII. 1073. B. M.
2052.
1074. Illinois G. P.
1074.
1075. B. M. 2053.
1076. Rylands 448.
1077. Muhlenberg.
1078. Cambridge
Add. 5893.
1079. B. M. 2053.
1080. Princeton T. S.
Pap. 5.
1081. Cambridge
Add. 5894.
1082. B. M. 2054.
1083. Cambridge
Add. 5895.
1084. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1084.
1086. B. M. 2055.
1087. Cairo.
1088. B. M. 2055.
1089. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. d. 101 (P).
1090. Liverpool
Gr. Libr. 420.
1091. B. M. 2056.
1092. Bodl.
1093. Cairo.
1094. Muhlenberg.
1095. Muhlenberg.
1096. Princeton T. S.
Pap. 6.
1097. B. M. 2057.
1098. Cairo.
1099. Cambridge
Add. 5896.
1100. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. c. 100 (P).
1101. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. c. 66 (P).
1102. B. M. 2058.
1103. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. d. 102 (P).
1104. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. d. 102 (P).
1105. B. M.
Case 8.
1107. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1097.
1108. Muhlenberg.
1109. Toledo.
1110. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. c. 100 (P).
1111. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. f. 90 (P).
1112. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. c. 101 (P).
1113. Muhlenberg.
1114. B. M. 2059.
1116. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. d. 103 (P).
1117. Cairo.
1118. Toledo.
1119. Bodl. MS. Gr.
class. b. 5 (P).
1120. Illinois G. P.
1120.
1121. Cairo.
1122. B. M. 2060.
1124. Cambridge
Add. 5897.
1125. Newton.
1127. Cairo.
1128. Toledo.
1129. B. M. 2061.
1130. B. M. 2062.
1131. Muhlenberg.
1132. Princeton CC.
0174. 6. 1132.
1133. Cambridge
Add. 5898.
1134. B. M. 2063.
1135. Cairo.
1136. B. M. 2064.
1137. Toledo.
1138. Princeton T. S.
Add. 7.
1139. Toledo.
1140. Liverpool
Gr. Libr. 421.
1141. Muhlenberg.
1142. Cairo.
1143. B. M. 2065.
1145. Cairo.
1146. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. c. 102 (P).
1148. Cairo.
1150. Rylands 453.
1151. Glasgow.
1154. Muhlenberg.
1155. Newton.
1156. Toledo.
1157. Cairo.
1159. Toledo.
1160. Muhlenberg.
1161. Newton.
1163. Dublin.
1164. Liverpool Class. Gr. Libr. 422.
1165. Cairo.
1166. B.M. 2066.
1169. Princeton T.S. Pap. 11.
1172. B.M. 2067.
1178. Cairo.
1179. Newton.
1181. Muhlenberg.
1182. Cairo.
1185. Rylands 454.
1186. Cairo.
1187. Cairo.
1188. B.M. 2071.
1190. Dublin.
1191. Cairo.
1192. Toledo.
1194. Rylands 455.
1197. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. d. 104 (P).
1198. Newton.
1200. Cairo.
1201. Cambridge Add. 5899.
1203. Toledo.
1204. Cairo.
1205. B.M. 2072.
1206. B.M. 2073.
1208. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. 6. 6 (P).
1209. Rylands 456.
1212. Muhlenberg.
1213. Cambridge Add. 5900.
1215. Muhlenberg.
1217. Muhlenberg.
1218. Toledo.
1219. Muhlenberg.
1220. Cairo.
1221. Muhlenberg.
1222. Toledo.
1223. Cairo.
1227. Muhlenberg.
1228. Glasgow.
1230. Newton.
1231. Muhlenberg.
1235. Cairo.
1236. Muhlenberg.
1237. Cairo.
1238. Newton.
1239. Cairo.
1240. Newton.
1241. Cambridge Add. 5903.
1245. Muhlenberg.
1246. Muhlenberg.
1247. Toledo.
1249. Cambridge Add. 5901.
1250. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. d. 97 (P).
1251. B.M. 2057.
1252. Muhlenberg.
1253. Muhlenberg.
1257. Illinois G. P. 1307.
1258. Muhlenberg.
1259. Muhlenberg.
1263. Princeton CC.
1264. Liverpool
1265. Liverpool
1266. Harvard.

Hibeh Papyri.

1. B.M. 1821.
2. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. f. 78 (P).
3. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. e. 89 (P).
4. B.M. 1822.
5. B.M. 1823.
6. B.M. 1824.
7. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. d. 728 (P).
10. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. f. 79 (P).
11. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. g. 54 (P).
12. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. g. 55 (P).
15. B. M. 1825.
16. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. d. 79 (P).
17. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. f. 80 (P).
18. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. f. 80 (P).
20. B. M. 1826.
22. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. d. 82 (P).
23. Morgan.
25. Yale.
26. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. d. 80 (P).
27. Dublin.
29. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. d. 82 (P).
30. B. M. 1828.
31. Cairo 41073.
32. Chicago.
33. Cairo 41074.
34. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. c. 60 (P).
38. Graz MS. III.
39. Graz MS. III.
40. Graz MS. III.
41. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. c. 61 (P).
42. Cambridge Add.
43. Cambridge Add.
44. Cambridge Add.
45. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. d. 83 (P).
46. Cambridge Add.
47. Cairo 41075.
48. Morgan.
49. Cleveland.
50. Cairo 41076.
51. Yale.
52. Leland Stanford.
53. Cambridge Add.
54. Cambridge Add.
55. Leipzig Inv. No. 617.
56. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. f. 81 (P).
57. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. d. 84 (P).
58. Cairo 41077.
59. Leipzig Inv. No. 615.
60. Cairo 41078.
61. Cambridge Add.
64. Graz MS. I. 1949.
65. Leipzig Inv. No. 616.
66. Cairo 41079.
67. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. c. 62 (P).
68. B. M. 1831.
69. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. c. 63 (P).
70. B. M. 1832.
71. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. c. 64 (P).
72. B. M. 1834.
73. Peabody Museum, Yale.
74. Morgan.
75. Morgan.
76. Morgan.
77. Morgan.
78. Morgan.
79. Morgan.
80. Morgan.
81. Morgan.
82. Morgan.
83. Morgan.
84. Morgan.
85. Morgan.
86. Morgan.
87. Morgan.
88. Morgan.
89. Morgan.
90. Morgan.
91. Morgan.
92. Morgan.
93. Morgan.
94. Morgan.
95. Morgan.
96. Morgan.
97. Morgan.
98. Morgan.
100. Morgan.
101. Morgan.
102. Morgan.
103. Morgan.
104. Morgan.
105. Morgan.
106. Morgan.
107. Morgan.
108. Morgan.
109. Cleveland.
111. Morgan.
112. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. c. 63 (P).
113. Graz MS. I. 1946.
114. Brussels.
115. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. c. 63 (P).
116. Bodl. MS. Gr. class. c. 69 (P).
118. Harvard.
120. Cairo 41081.
121. Yale.
122. St. Deiniol's.
123. Harvard.
124. Cambridge Add. 4461.
125. Harvard.
126. Harvard.
127. Harvard.
129. Harvard.
130. Harvard.
131. Harvard.
133. Harvard.
134. Harvard.
135. Harvard.
137. Harvard.
139. Harvard.
140. Harvard.
141. Harvard.
142. Harvard.
143. Harvard.
144. Harvard.
145. Harvard.
146. Harvard.
147. Harvard.
149. Harvard.
150. Harvard.
151. Harvard.
152. Harvard.
156. Harvard.
158. Harvard.
159. Harvard.
162. Harvard.
163. Harvard.
164. Harvard.
165. Harvard.
166. Harvard.
171. Harvard.
INDICES

I. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS (including 1356).

(Figures in thick type refer to papyri, those in Italic type to fragments, Roman figures to columns; schol. = scholium.)
INDICES

1358. 2. 4 schol.
1359. 1. 2.
1856. Fol. 4. 2.
1856. Fol. 8. 2;
1856. 1. 20; 1361. 1. 12;
3. 3. 24. 2. 5 (?); 1364.
13. 48. 89. 236. 284;
1365. 2.
1356. 3. 14.
1368. 47.
1356. (apofr. Pap.) 1356.
Fol. 4. 10.
1356. Fol. 8. 2; 1360.
13. 2 schol.; 1365. 43.
1356. 3.
1359. 1. 5.
1356. Fol. 4. 1 (?);
1358. 2. 35.
1364. 165.
1356. Fol. 10. 28.
1364. 41.
1360. 1. 13.
1356. Fol. 4. 25; 1364.
295; 1365. 31.
1356. 9. 10;
1361. 1. 15; 1364. 87. 96. 99,
102; 1368. 29.
1365. 45.
1365. 7.
1364. 93. 98.
1356. Fol. 4. 43.
1368. 38.
1368. 1. 9.
1365. Fol. 8. 28.
1362. 1. 11.
1365. Fol. 10. 20.
1368. 88.
1367. 27.
1367. 8.
1367. 28.
1364. Fol. 10. 9.
1356. 1. 1. 33.
1356. 1. 31.
1356. Fol. 10. 10.
1356. 4. 4.
1356. Fol. 10. 22.
1356. 2. 32.
1358. 1. 25.
1359. 1. 11.
1359. 1. 8.
1356. Fol. 4. 11. 30.
1364. 197.
1356. 1. 2.
1361. 5. 19.
1362. 1. 25.
1362. 1. 17.
1364. 134.
1365. 63.
1356. 76.
1359. 1. 11.
1360. 1. 10.
1358. 2. 13 (?).
1360. 1. 4.
1359. 1. 6.
1362. 1. 19.
1362. 2. 34.
1365. 70;
1368. 41.
1362. 6.
1368. 97. 70 schol.
1362. 2. 13.
1365. Fol. 4. 39.
1361. 1. 11.
1364. 4. 7;
1360. 4. ii. 7; 1364. 67. 69. 73,
76. 79. 82. 95. 133. 138,
142. 148; 1365. 13. 44,
54. 60; 1367. 3. 45. 54,
59; 1368. 45. 48. 51;
1400. i. 5. ii. 2. d aυτός
1364. 194; 1368. 28.
1356. 2. 26; 1359.
1. 1.
1356. Fol. 4. 30;
1360. 2. 6 schol.
1368. 43.
1364. 290.
1365. 5. 4;
1371. 52 schol.
1364. Fol. 4. 8.
1359. 1. 14.
1361. 24. 3.
1358. 2. 23.
1362. 1. 20; 1368.
51.
1362. verso 2.
1366. 20; 1368.
51.
1364. 278. 289.
1364. 274.
1361. 1. 1. 4. 2.
1367. 29.
1359. 42.
1359. 1. 8; 1367.
20. 27.
1367. 62.
1364. 47.
1363. 7.
1359. 1. 9. 17.
1365. 4. 29; 1362.
1. 33.
1364. 55. 119.
1368. 42.
1361. 5. 25; 1362.
1. 7.
1365. 37.
1367. 53.
1402. 1. verso schol.
1367. 65.
1356. Fol. 4. 32.
1360. 9. 3 schol.
1360. 1. 11; 363. 10.
1359. 1. 16.
1404. 1.
caro 1404. 1. 3.
cum 1404. 2.
1358. 2. 32. Σαβίλη 1358.
2. 11.
1400. 1. 2.
1356. Fol. 4. 11. 16. 29,
32. 37; Fol. 10. 27; 1360.
3 schol.; 1361. 2. 1. 4. 2,
26. 4; 1362. 1. 11; 17,
1363. 8; 1364. 23. 54,
65. 91. 117. 189. 211,
272. 294.
1361. 1. 2.
1364. 173.
1364. 136.
1362. 1. 14.
1358. 2. 19. 26;
1362. 1. 7.
1359. 5. 1.
1363. 7.
1359. 1. 13; 1363. 23.
1367. 42.
1362. 1. 25.
I. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1361. 1. 6, 12. 3. 1362. 1. 33. 1364. 4. 8 (?). 1361. 4. 10. 1355. 47. 1361. 5. 3. 3. 1368. 8. 36. 1364. 63; 1367. 22, 44, 53. 1367. 39, 70. 1356. Fol. 4. 24; 1364. 18, 24, 28, 60, 88, 103, 160, 166, 171; 1367. 45, 57. 1358. 2. 14. Cf. vois. 1359. 3. 1. 1364. 81. 1362. 1. 5. 1358. 10, 2. 31. 1363. 2. 1364. 167. 1368. 43. 1360. 1. 4, 7, 8; al. 1358. 2. 29, 33; 1359. 2. 10; 1362. 1. 5, 11, 13; 1363. 3. 1359. 2. 14, 4. 7; 1360. 1. 13; 1362. 1. 17. 1358. 39. 1362. 1. 13, 15, 22. 1358. 29. 1361. 1362. 4. 6. 1364. Fol. 4. 31. 1365. 65. 1364. 1365. 51. 1367. 18. 1364. 269; 1370. 1371 schol. 1362. 1. 4. 1362. 1. 12. 1361. 26. 3; 1362. 1. 16. 1362. 1. 18. 1367. 12. 1363. 12. 1367. 15. 18; 1362. 1. 32. 1362. 1. 12. 1356. Fol. 4. 38, Fol. 8. 31.

1362. 1. 5. 1362. 1. 9. 1362. 1. 9, 10. 1362. 277. 1364. 29, 33, 39. 1361. 12. 3. 1364. 110. 1364. 14. 1360. 1. 12 schol. 1365. 7, 28; 1362. 1. 19; 1364. 52, 67; 1368. 41, 46. 1361. 3. 3. 1362. 1. 2. 1365. 15. 1364. 109. 1361. 3. 1365. 2. 30. 1365. 2. 26. 1365. Fol. 4. 5, 35, Fol. 10. 29, Fol. 11. 6 (?); 1365. 1. 5, 2. 9; 1361. 1. 9; 1362. 1. 6, 8, 1363. 15. 1364. 38, 66, 90, 173; 1365. 45, 44; 1365. 54. 1358. Fol. 10. 26. 1358. 204. 1358. 1. 14; 1362. 1. 21. 1363. 17, 20; 1364. 131, 135. 1361. 26. 2. 1362. 1. 19; 1402. 1. verso schol. 1356. Fol. 4. 7; 1362. 1. 15; 1364. 59. 1360. 1. 7. 1356. Fol. 4. 7, 24, Fol. 10. 11, 21; 1360. 1. 9. 1362. 1. 10, 15. 1362. 1. 9, 17; 1364. 145, 264. marg. 1364. 33, 172. 1360. 18; 1359. 1. 5. 1366. Fol. 4. 38, Fol. 10. 5; 1360. 1. 10; 1362. 1. 18, 1364. 86, 113. 1365. Fol. 4. 29, 32, Fol. 8. 24; 1360. 2. 4 schol.; 1364. 50, 53, 85; 185, 216 (i); 291; 1367. 15; 1368. 35. 1356. Fol. 4. 25; 1364. 12, 36, 84, 156 (mēn ovn); 1368. 43, 49. 1360. 2. 6 schol. 1368. 42. 1364. 107, 113. 1359. 2. 12. 1361. 1. 14. 1362. 1. 30 (óbeta); 1364. 69. 1362. 2. 9; 1364. 178, 270, 271, 289, 292. 1360. Fol. 10. 3. 1360. 1. 11, 2. 6 schol.; 1361. 7. 4; 1362. 1. 31; 1364. 58, 123, 144, 144, 1365. 36; 1366. 16; 1367. 7, 64; 1368. 35, 45, 53. 1365. 19. 1364. 65. 1358. 2. 13. 1362. 1. 18. 1356. Fol. 4. 31, 32.

Παγγαίος (Πάγγαιον Pap.) 1363. 6. 1363. 1. 14. 1365. 4. 7. 1365. 4. 36. 1365. 18. 1365. 18. 1365. 2. 25. 1361. 1. 17; 1362. 1. 26; 1365. 23. 1366. 6. 1358. 2. 12. 1358. 2. 12. 1364. 10, 1368. 37. 1364. 23. 23. 1364. 8. 1366. 3, 24. 1365. 3. 1356. 6. 1365. 6. 25.
II. PERSONAL NAMES.
II. PERSONAL NAMES

[Παῦλος] 1380. 34.  
Pέτρος 1357. 33.  
Πραξίδεις 1380. 50.

Σαβάωθ 1384. 28.  
Σάραπις 1382. 20, 22.  
Σαρκάνδης 1380. 119.  
Σερίφων 1387. 4, 28, 53.  
Συρίως 1382. 23.  
Σωθή 1380. 144.

Τακευάς 1380. 75.  
Τ[....]β[....]τος 1380. 114.

Φάδα 1381. 201.  
[Φιλάδεβος] 1357. 43.  
Φιλάδεβος 1357. 24, 38, 58, 64.  
Φιλάδεβος 1357. 3, 6, 35, 36, 43, 57.

Χριστός 1357. 30, 36 (?).  

Ορος 1380. 210, 222, 233, 234, 246, 250; 1381. 230.

[λε. εθνός] 1380. 282.  
[οικείοις] 1380. 296.  
[οικείας] 1380. 286.  
[φίλος] 1380. 47.  
[χριστός] 1380. 3.

III. GEOGRAPHICAL.

(Where no number of the papyrus is given the reference is to 1380.)

(a) Egyptian.

"Λάβιδος 278.  
"Αθρίδης 39.  
Αύγουστος 224; 1381. 237.  
"Αλεξάνδρεια 1357. 2.  
"Απίς 44.  
["Αραμώνιος] πώλει 1.  
["Αραμώνιος] πώλει τον Προσωπίτου 7.

Βασίλαντος 37.  
Βασιλέως 42.  
Βασίλειας 51, 269.  
Βασιλείας (νομός) 50.  
Βασίλιος 27.

Γυνακοπολίτης (νομός) 21.

Δέλτα 10.  
Δύσες πώλει η μικρά 36.

"Εφερμά 75.  
"Ερμοῦ πώλει (a) 18 (?); (b) 35.  
"Ερμοῦ πώλει τον Μενόσινού 52.  
Εοί 25.

"Ηλίου πώλει 38; 1381. 19.  
"Ηρακλέων 61.  
"Ηρακλέων πώλει 150.  
"Ηρακλέων πώλει τον Σερίφωντο 56.

"Ηφαίστου νεκρός 2.  
"Ηθίδος 148.  
Θάνους 28.  

"Ηρώδειον νεκρός 49.  
"Ηρώδειον 13.  
"Ησιδίων τού Σερίφωντο 54.

Κανυτή 31.  
Καλώμοια 11.  
Κάνάδος 62.  
Καρχηνία 11.  
Κάστορ 75.  
Καταβαθός 43.  
Κε... κύλημας 17.  
[Κυνός] πώλει τον Βουσιρίτου 49.

Λεώτος (v) πώλει 58.  
Λεωνίτις Λεωνίτις 45.  

Μελαίς 70.  
Μέργυς 249; 1381. 21.  
Μενόσινού τον (νομό) 52.  
Μενόσινοι 64.  
Μένουσις 63.  
Μένουσις 71.  
Μερκόφωνος 1382. 19.

Μερκόφωνος 1380. 210, 222, 233, 234, 246, 250; 1381. 230.

Νακράτις 19.  
Νέλλος 125, 225.  
Νέκδος 31.  
Νέθος 68.  
Νέων 21.

Νότις 42.  
Οσιράς οδούν 162.

Πευκεστής 69.  
Πεφράμα 22.  
Πλούσιον 74.  
Πλούσιον 73.  
Προσωπίτης (νομός) 8.

Σάντι 32.  
Σάντι (νομός) 30.  
Σεβασμίτης 33.  
Σεβασμίτης (νομός) 54, 56.  
Σχεδία 60.

Στάν 59.
INDICES

(b) Non-Egyptian.

IV. RELIGION.

(a) Graeco-Egyptian.

(1) Titles of Isis (all from 1880).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Παρθένος 1382, 15, 17.</td>
<td>Χοζ 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φέρωνος 57.</td>
<td>Χοζιμή 47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φθειαθόης (νομός) 40.</td>
<td>Ψάχνημα 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χάραξ 72.</td>
<td>Λοβίς 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ινδή 226.</td>
<td>Ραφέα 97.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ινδωί 103.</td>
<td>Ρμοκόλονκα (-ρούλα Παρ.) 93.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ιταλία 109.</td>
<td>Ρόδιοι άνκοι 1383. 6, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Καρία 113.</td>
<td>Ρόμη 83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κυνός 80.</td>
<td>Σαλαμίς 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κρήτη 82.</td>
<td>Σαμαθράκης 107.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κυκλάδες νήσοι 84.</td>
<td>Σάμος 110.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κύπρος 88.</td>
<td>Σάββαν 116.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κυρήνη 81.</td>
<td>Συνάπτη 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λατύνος 104.</td>
<td>Σούτσα 105.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λυκία 78, 79.</td>
<td>Σούτσα τῆς κατὰ τὴν Ἕρμηραν βίαλασσαν 118.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μέγας (Ματοι Παρ.) 105.</td>
<td>Στράτωνος Πύργος 94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μύκος 111.</td>
<td>Τένεδες 112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μύθη 79.</td>
<td>Τράπος 98, 225.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μύθη 81.</td>
<td>Τράψι 114.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νίκος 77.</td>
<td>Τ'Ψήφη 92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάτμος (Παθμος Παρ.) 85.</td>
<td>Φοινίκες (Φοινίκες Παρ.) Συρίας 106.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάφος 86.</td>
<td>Χαλκηδών 82.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πέργαμος 108.</td>
<td>Χαλκική 89.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πέτρα 91.</td>
<td>Χλάσ 87.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πειρία 90.</td>
<td>Πολεμαίος 117.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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265

| Page 26, 32, 34, 60, 68. |
| Θεαρίας 68. |
| ᾿Αρσικός 105. |
| θεία, ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ θ. εὑρητής 130. |
| Οἴμως 83. |
| θεῖος 77, 107. μεγάλης θείων 142. |
| ιερά 18, 41, 110. |
| ἑρωοκτόνουσα 78. |
| ἱλαρά ὄψις, ἐν Δήθῃ θ. 5. 127. |
| Ἰσίας 23, 33 (?), 76, 81, 115. |
| Ἴος, ιοῦ . . . προκαθήμενη 64. |
| Τὸ Σῶλος 143. |
| καλλιμορφός 18, 53. |
| καλλιστῆς 100. |
| κατάστης 87. |
| κεδνή 79. |
| κόρη 72, 105. |
| κόσμος θηλείων 131. |
| κράτισση 96. |
| κυθερήδης 69. |
| Λατώμ 104. |
| λαπτώ 79. |
| λογιστικὴ 27, 124. |
| λατρεύσαν 40. |
| Μαῦρα 39, 42, 103, 116. |
| μεγάλη 77. |
| μεγίστη 21, 66 (?), 92. μεγ. θεῶν 142. |
| μία 6. |
| μισθός 137. |
| μοισαναγωγός 62, 128. |
| Μοῦξας (') 45. |
| μοῦστα 111. |
| μ. [(])δε. [κ]ή 85. |
| Ναυαία (Ναύα Παρ.) 106. |
| νέα 85. |
| κερκώρα 30, 48. |
| κύμβος 30. |
| ἀδήμος 122. |
| Ὀμήρια 39, 98. |
| ὀνομά θύλου 112. πρώτων 8. |
| οἱριάτρια 15, 74. |
| Παλάβρα (') 115. |
| παισθύνοντος 88. |
| πάντωρχοι, ἐν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν εὐδοίαις π. 137. |
| παισκότριες 20. |
| παντικήσις 93. |
| πιστολαίποις ἀνέμους 138. |
| πολυμορφος 9, 70. |
| πολυφάδομος 129. |
| πολύφωνος 97, 101. |
| Πραξίδηκα 50. |
| προκαθήμενη, ιοῦ . . . πρ. 64. |
| πρόσωποι 43. |
| πρῶτον δυναμα 143. |
| χοροτομορφός 59. |

βασιλεία 36. |
βασίλευσεν, ἐν ταῖς παιγύρεσι 8, 133. |
Βούδαστις 4. |

γραμματική 48, 123. |
γνώμονας 66. |

δεισιτίς 108. δεισπ. πάντων 23. θεαρίας 26, 86, 111. |
διάδημα ζηζήτησε 139. |
Δικτυσσίτης 82. |
δότεται 13, 68. |
δύνασθε 34, 41, 57, 97. |

'Εκάτη 108. |
'Ελεύθερη 112. |
'Ελευθερία 80. |
'Ελλάς 95. |
ἐπανήγαγον τὸν Νείλον 126. |
ἐπίνους 34, 60. |
ἐπίτρωπος 121. |
'Εσπερίμεγς 46. |

'Εστια 23, 73. |
ἐδώρια, τῶν τὰς καλὰς ἀγάπης ἡμέρας εἰν. 135. |
ἐνεπέλα 99. |
ἐνπρτῶς 132. |
ἐνρείμα 81. εὐρ. πάντων 185. |
ἐνφρονίμη 19, 31. |

ζροῖς, θεῶν πάντων τὸ καλὸν ζ. 127. |

ἱγμονικὸς 52. ἵγ. διαθηρῶν 193. |
ἵλιον δύσμα 112. |
ἵππα 11, 86. |
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(2) Other Gods.

\'(Aπόλλων 1380. 210; 1381. 233.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
\'Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.

(3) Miscellaneous.

\'Aγάθος 1380. 189.
\'Aγάθος 1380. 189.
\'Aγάθος 1380. 189.

(5) Christian.

(1) Churches of Oxyrhynchus (all from 1357).

\'Aσκήνης 21, 44.
Bασιλικά 47.
Bπτισμένο 20.
\'Aπόλλων 1380. 210; 1381. 233.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
Aσκήνης 1381. 26, 189.
IV. RELIGION

(2) Festivals and other Days (all from 1357).

(3) Miscellaneous.
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ἀπαγγέλτων 1381. 91, 137, 219.
ἀπατῶν 1381. 148.
ἀπαλασσοῦν 1381. 76, 128, 206.
ἀπαντῶν 1384. 15.
ἀπατεῖ 1381. 161, 181.
ἄπαι 1380. 148, 171, 177, 185, 202, 206, 213, 268; 1381. 190.
ἀπώτερα 1380. 19.
ἀπωδᾶν 1381. 54.
ἀπείρα 1381. 204.
ἀπό 1380. 157; 1381. 19, 97, 122.
ἀποδεκανιά 1380. 168; 1381. 88.
ἀποδόναι 1381. 79; 1382. 17 (?); 1384. 18.
ἀποκλείει 1383. 9.
ἀπολήγετος 1381. 236.
ἀπομαστεῖ 1381. 133.
ἀπομένων 1381. 21.
ἀποστατεῖ 1381. 3.
ἀποσυγχάνει 1381. 43.
ἀρά 1383. 9.
ἀργύρων 1382. 18.
ἀρέτη 1380. 153; 1381. 47, 136, 211; 1382. 19, 23.
ἀρμόζει, 1381. 187.
ἀρωσα 1381. 27.
ἀρρωτός 1384. 17 (?).
ἀρχισθαί 1381. 34.
ἀρχιδικαστεῖ 1381. 8.
ἀσφάλεια 1380. 298; 1381. 205.
ἀσθένεια 1381. 96.
ἀσκεῖ 1381. 31.
ἀσπίζεται 1382. 16.
ἀςτία 1380. 58.
ἀστραφή 1380. 238.
ἀστροφόρος 1380. 159.
ἀσφάλεις 1380. 183 (?), 237.
ἀσβεστίς 1380. 176, 194.
ἀτικα 1381. 53.
ἀτόκα 1357. 8 et sacc. ; 1380. 256, 263; 1381. 5 et sacc. ; 1382. 16, 18; 1384. 18, 26. ἐ ἄνω. 1357. 9 et sacc. ; 1381. 32.
ἀτικοῦ 1381. 247.
ἀθανάτων 1381. 177.
ἀθάνατος 1381. 121.
ἀθηναῖος 1380. 80.
ἀθηναίος 1381. 232, 238.
ἀθέως (ἀθεωσιν) 1399. recto.
ἀθέως 1380. 36, 218.
ἀθάνατος 1381. 205.
ἀθέως 1381. 97.
ἀθυμίας 1382. 20.
ἀθύμισι 1381. 9, 25, 29, 33, 121, 162, 172, 185, 227.
ἀθών 1380. 171; 1381. 49; 1382. 5.
ἀθέτευν 1381. 111.
ἀθέτευμα 1381. 76.
ἀθόδοφος 1381. 83.
ἀθόρμητος 1381. 50.
ἀθώτρεχος 1380. 133.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 4.
ἀθώτρεχει 1380. 241.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 216.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 189.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 175-6; 1381. 143; 1383. 10.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 7.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 42.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 177.
ἀθώτρεχει 1380. 26, 86, 111.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 39.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 123.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 226.
ἀθώτρεχει 1380. 13, 68.
ἀθώτρεχει 1382. 44; 1382. 18; 1384. 2-12.
ἀθώτρεχει 1380. 173, 229.
ἀθώτρεχει 1380. 215; 1381. 42, 90, 146, 217, 220.
ἀθώτρεχει 1384. 29.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 13. ἄτομον ἤσειμα 1380. 156.
ἀθώτρεχει 1380. 158.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 243.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 192.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 233.
ἀθώτρεχει 1381. 222.
ἐγγονος 1381. 22.
ἐγγονος 1381. 226.
ἐγκερ . . ν 1380. 227.
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μυθέ 1381. 106, 151.
μυθείς 1381. 66.
μυθός 1384. 35.
μύρ (subst.) 1381. 9.
μύρ, ου μύρ ἔλλα 1381. 24.
μυρίους 1381. 176.
μύτη 1381. 152.
μύτηρ 1381. 67, 71, 102.
μυκρός. See Διός πώλις.
μυστήριοι 1380. 137.

ναινίδιτης 1383. 9.
νέον 1380. 85, 211 (?).
νείτης 1381. 63.
νηφαλικότερος 1381. 133.
νεκτήρας 1380. 30, 48.
νέων 1380. 70.
νύμφων 1380. 204.
νύστος 1381. 56, 73, 207.
nυτικά 1357. 37, 61.
νύμφη 1380. 30.
νύς 1381. 91; 1383. 10.

ξηρὸς 1380. 184; 1384. 31.

όδε 1381. 141.
όδυγος 1380. 122.
όδοι 1381. 98.
όδον 1381. 57, 181.
όδόν 1381. 120.
όξα 1381. 73.
όξεων 1381. 168.
όξος 1380. 2, 268.
οξικομένη 1381. 121.
οξίνως 1380. 106.
οξίνως 1380. 158; 1384. 32.
ολίγος 1381. 106.
ολεο 1380. 158; 1381. 174; 1383. 9.
*Ολυμπός 1380. 130.
όμβρος 1380. 228.
όμοιος 1357. 27, 32, 34, 50, 59; 1380. 246.

όμος 1381. 153.
ομοί 1381. 108.
ομέρος 1381. 74, 139.
ομοῦρα 1380. 113, 141, 143; 1394. 20 (?).
ομοφύσεως 1380. 163.
ομοί 1384. 14.
ομιάν 1380. 152; 1381. 108, 139.
ομίχλης 1381. 64.
ομίθσως 1380. 39, 98.
ομίσχον 1381. 84, 106.
ομιστρα 1380. 15, 74.
ομί 1380. 64, 119, 139, 175, 184, 221, 227, 260; 1381. 89, 122, 224, 245.
ομοσ 1381. 138, 206, 208, 210, 212, 214.
ομαν 1380. 163.
ομή 1381. 92; 1383. 7.
ομή 1380. 208, 250; 1384. 28.
ομη 1381. 40, 42, 155, 183.
ομην 1381. 111. ου μύρ ἔλλα 1381. 23.
ομή 1384. 34.
ομεν 1381. 108.
ομέν 1381. 64.
ομέν 1380. 1, 80, 139, 154, 155, 187, 237, 244. ομεν 1357. 2; 1381. 222.
ομβελψιμος 1381. 109; 1384. 24.
ομφέ 1381. 69.
ομφα 1380. 128; 1381. 139.

παγκάδαρος 1384. 27.
πάν 1381. 103, 229, 232.
πάλω 1381. 150.
πάλιν 1381. 85, 145, 154.
πανάφθονος 1380. 88.
πανυψαίρεις 1380. 137.
πάσταρχος 1380. 137.
πανταχεὶς 1380. 172.
παντεκφάτερα 1380. 20.
παντοτίτης 1380. 93.
πάνω 1381. 16.
πάπας 1387. 2.
παρά 1382. 18.
παραδίδουσι 1380. 204, 244.

παρακλητής 1381. 6.
παρακαταβαίνεται 1381. 6.
παριστά α 1381. 193.
παρίσι 1381. 70; 1382. 20.
παρίστανε 1380. 180.
παραγίγνονται 1381. 65.
παραφένει 1381. 2.
πάν 1380. 125 et seq.; 1381. 73, 92, 137, 191, 199, 200, 215.
πάτηρ 1384. 21.
πάτρων 1380. 267.
παίθεν 1384. 20.
παίρνεισθαι 1381. 127.
παλαιογος 1383. 6, 8.
παλαιογος 1383. 8.
παρίστα 1384. 10.
περί 1381. 247; 1382. 23.
περσονες 1381. 176.
περσαδος 1381. 61.
περσαδομεν 1381. 215.
πηγή 1380. 228.
πεθανογολογεῖ 1381. 171.
πεθανεῖ 1384. 33.
πιστούστις 1380. 138.
πιστός 1380. 152, 241.
πλεῖ, πλεῖς 1383. 7.
πλεῖν 1380. 234.
πλευρὰ 1381. 141.
πλευρῶν 1381. 82, 98.
πληθ 1380. 5, 212, 235.
πλήμμα 1380. 223.
πλῆρ 1381. 93, 117.
πληροφορία 1381. 164.
πλευτίζων 1381. 26.
πλευτίζων 1381. 10; 1384. 21.
πλους 1380. 215, 235, 243; 250, 263, 291; 1381. 134.
πλωτίζων 1381. 10.

Πολλάκια 1381. 32, 54, 155.
πόλος 1380. 232.
πολυμορφος 1380. 9, 70.
πολυφθαλμος 1380. 129.
πολυτίκων 1381. 129, 212. πλεῖων 1380. 234.
πολυφύσεως 1380. 97, 101.
πονεῖ 1381. 211; 1384. 25, 30.
πόνος 1381. 100.
VI. SUBJECTS DISCUSSED IN THE INTRODUCTIONS AND NOTES.

(The numbers refer to pages.)

accent in relation to metre 236-7.
Aegaes, στασιωτικα 57.
Alexander son of Amyntas 66.
All Saints’ Day 31.
Amazons 215.
Andreas of Sicyon 105-6, 108-9.
Andronopolis 206.
Anne, St. 36-7.
Annianae 23-5.
Antherasia 88-9.
Antiphon Sophistes, works 92-3; style 95.
Antisthenes 112.
Aphroditopolis (two towns) 203-4.
Apis (town) 210.
Apollo 223-4.
Apostle. See Evangelist.
Apostles, gospel of the XII 239.
Apuleius 190, 214, 225.
Arabia 213.
arabicastas 232.
Archimachus (Archem?) 115, 119.
arotology 225, 235.
Aristides, rhetor 225, 233.
Aristophanes, order of plays 134, 142, 146; papyri in
relation to MSS. 134, 138; scholia 135, 136-8, 244.
Aristotle on Sicyon 105-7; on Sicyonian Constitution
105, 107-8.
Asclepius. See Imhotep.
Asia 214-15.
Artarbechis 204.
Artargatis 215.
Athenaeus on Pollis 84, 88.
Auge 52, 55.
Bacchylides, fragments identified 65, 81.
Bambyce 215.
Boreadae 40.
Bubastis 203.
Bucoli, Bucolia, Bucolic
mouth 209.
Busiris 210-11.
Buto 207-8.
Buzyges 115, 119.
Caenea 207.
Caesarea in Palestine 215.

Calamisis (town) 204.
calendar, early Christian 21.
Julian and Egyptian 20.
Caleoibis (deity) 223-4.
Callimachus papyri 83; fragments identified 83, 88-91.
Catabathmus 210.
Cecrops 115.
Charax (town) 213.
Chorølius, works 245.
Christmas 20, 28.
churches at Oxyrhynchus
23-6.
Clisthenes of Sicyon 105-6.
codex. See book-form.
Coptic calendar in relation
to Greek 35-43.
Cosmas, St. 37.
Crosus 12, 18.
Cross, festivals of the 32.
marginal cross 82.
Cypselus 107-8.

Delphi 215.
Delta 204.
Demonax 115.
Demosthenes, number of his
speeches 112; oldest fragment of D. 186.
INDEXES

Oxyrhynchus

relation

Alexandria

metre,

Latina

law

Egypt

Metelite 236.

Nauck in festival

Musgrave Bentley

Bentley

Eseremphis

Erigone,

Epiphany

Epimachus,

Ephorus dreams,

Dioscuri
diple

Diodorus diadem

frontier

festival

Evangelist,

Europa

Euripides
euphemia,

Eridanus
deleter

Eleutherus,

Ebionites,

Easter,

Greek calendar in relation to

Coptic

Gynaecopolite nome 206.

Harpies 46.

Hebrews, gospel according to the 239.

Hecamede 243.

Helen 216.

Heliopolite nome 203.

Hellas (title of Isis) 215.

Hellenica Oxyrhynchia, style and authorship 107.

Hera 207.

Heraclopolis 211.

Heracleum 212.

Heracles Lembus 113-15.

Hera's, ama 23-5.

Hermes 209, 221, 223-4.

Hermippus 113.

Hermopolis, (1) 205; (2) 208; (3) 211.

Herodotus on Sicyon 105-6.

Hesiod papyri 44; fragments identified 49, 50.

Hestia 206.

Hiera (town) 209.

Hieracion, St. 39.

Hierasus 205.

Hieron 66.

Homer on δόμος ἄνειρων 49-50; on Sarpedon 45, 49.

Horus 209, 219-20, 223-4.

Hypapante 29, 49.

Hyperides, possible author of 1366, 112.

Hypsele (town) 215.

Iamblichus in relation to Antiphon 94-5.

Icus 83, 88.

Imhotep, worship of 221-3; tomb of 221, 223-4.

India 216.

Innocents' Day 29.

Io 212.

Iseum (town) 208.

Isidium (town) 211.

Istion 25, 27.

Isis, titles 191-4, 203-20; worship in Egypt 194-5,

203-13, 218, 220; worship elsewhere 195, 213-16.

Island (place-name) (1) 212; (2) 213.

Italy 216.

James, festival of St. 31.

Jehovah Sabaoth 239.

Jeremiah, St. 38-9.

Jewish apocalyptic work 239.

John, St. J. the Baptist 25-6, 39.

John, St. J. the Evangelist, church of 25-6; festival of 31-2.

Julianus, St. 29, 39.

Justus, St. 24, 27-8, 36.

Laodicea, Council of 39, 43.

Lasus, fragment of 119.

Latina (title of Isis) 215.

law and nature contrasted 93-4.

Lent 30, 41.

Leontopolis 211.

Leuce Acte 210.

Libanius on Sicyon 105-6, 108.

lotus 209.

Lysias, possible author of 1366, 112.

Manetho on Imhotep 221.

Mantinea 115, 118.

Martyrs, church of the 35.

Mary, the Virgin 29, 31-43.

Melais 212-13.

Memphis 195, 203.

Menas, St. 27.

Menelaüs 212-13.

Menkaura (Mencheres) 221-3.

Menophis 213.

Menouthis 212.

Mercurium at Alexandria 236.

Metelite nome 213.

metre, accent and quantity in 236; three-line stanzas in Alcaeus 57.
Michael, Archangel 27, 30, 35-6.
Momemphis 205.
moon 216.
Mouchis 210.
Myron of Sicyon 105-6, 108-9.
Nanai, Babylonian goddess 216.
Nativity 20, 28.
nature and law contrasted 93-4.
Naucratis 205-6.
Nebeoj (town) 207.
Nechautes, archidicastes 232.
Nectanebo 222-3.
New Testament cursive MSS. 1, 5, 6.
Niciu 203-4.
Nicolaits Damascenus on Sicyon 105-7, 109.
Nile 209, 217.
Nithine 206.
Northern μαρτύριον 23.
Noup, St. apa 40-1.
oracle in relation to chronology 105, 109.
Orthogoras 105-6.
Osis 217-18, 220.

Papnuthius, St. 41.
Papremis 206.
papyrus roll discovered in a temple 222-3.
patriarch of Alexandria 21-2.
Paul, St. 29, 37-8.
Pausanias on Sicyon 105, 108.

Peleus, festival of 84-5.
Pelusium 213.
Peucetis (town) 212.
Phagoripolise 210.

Pherenicus, horse of Hiero 66.
Phernophis (town) 211.
Philip, gospel of 238-9.
Philochorus, fragment of 115.
Philoeus, St. 38.
Philoxenus, St. 27, 37.
Phoebammon, St. 23-5, 32.
Phthemphuthite name 209.
Plithine 213.
Plutarch on Sicyon 105, 109.
Pollis 84-5, 88.
Fraxidice 211.
Pronoia 210.
Prospite nome 204.
Pschomis (town) 205.
Ptolemaeus Pindarion 82.
Pythagoras 114.
Red Sea 216.
repentance, day of 26.
Rhinocolura 213, 215.
Rome 214.
Rufinus on Oxyrhynchus 26.
saints with churches at Oxyrhynchus 24-7; saints' days 26-30.
Samothrace 216.
Sarpedon 45, 49.
Saturday services 28, 30.
Saturus 114.
Scholia on Euripides, Or. 133; on Aristoph. Clouds 135-8.
Severus 43.
Sicyon, tyrants of 105-9.
Sinope 215.
Snake, Isis as 211, 219.
Socrates on synaxes 19, 28.
Sophocles MSS. in relation to papyri 122.
Sothis 217.
Sotion 114.
Southern church 23, 38.

stationes 19, 22.
Stephen, St. 28-9.
stichometry 2; stichometrical numbering in prose works 103.
Sunday services 20, 22, 30, 31.
Susa on the Red Sea 216.
synaxis 19, 22, 26, 28.

Tapasiris 212.
Telephus 52-5.
Teouchis (town) 209.
Thapseusis (title of Isis) 216.
Theodorus, St. 30, 42.
Theodotus, St. 30, 42.
Theogenes of Icusa 83.
Thonis 207.
Thoth. See Hermes.
Thucydides MSS. in relation to papyri 156-64.
Timoteus IV, patriarch 21.
titles of papyri 115, 235, 245.
Trinity, order of Persons in the 238.
triple-faced goddess 214.
Tripolis 215.
Tyre 216.

uncanonical gospel 238-9.
vellum fragments 1, 2, 5, 242, 244.
verso, use of for literary texts 44, 190, 221, 245; patches for strengthening v. 113.
Victor, St. 36.

week-day services 28.
wine 217-19.
women, position of 217, 219.
writing, discovery of 193, 224.

Xois, Xoite nome 209-10.
Zachariah, St. 40.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aeschylus Fr. 99 (Nauck)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesop 339</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agatharchides (Geogr. Gr. min. i. 180)</td>
<td>213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthologia Palat. viii. 2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiphon Soph. Fr. 44 (Diels)</td>
<td>92-102</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollodorus iii. 4. 2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. 3</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. 1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apuleius, Metam. xi. 5</td>
<td>190, 208, 210, 214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristotle, Ἀθ. πολ. 12. 5, 14. 1, 20. 1,</td>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. 3, 27. 4, 42. 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Πολ. p. 1310 b</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1315 b</td>
<td>105-6, 108-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1316 a</td>
<td>105-6, 108-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athenaeus i. 32 b</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. 39 e</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 137 e</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iv. 154 d</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ix. 372 a</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babrius 79</td>
<td>247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacchylides v</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. 20</td>
<td>65-6, 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fr. 34</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callimachus Fr. 86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98 c</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>84, 88-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
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