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PREFACE

This volume is the fifteenth in this series to have appeared with Mr. E. Lobel's name on the title-page; it is the ninth in which that name has appeared alone. This achievement is one which scholars everywhere will wish to salute, and to which a younger generation of papyrologists will be eager to pay a tribute of thanks.

The contents include lyric verses, dramatic verses, hexameters and elegiacs, and commentaries on verses, and are rounded off by two specimens of the same dialogue by Aeschines the Socratic, and the beginning of Philostratus' book about the art of making love.

The editors are grateful to the Jowett Copyright Trustees for undertaking financial responsibility for the publication, and to Dr. M. W. Haslam for making the index. Special care has been lavished on the illustrations by the Costwold Press and the photographic experts of the Oxford University Press.
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### Table of Papyri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyrus</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Centuries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2878</td>
<td>Lyric verses in the Aeolic dialect?</td>
<td>Late 1st or early 2nd cent.¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2879</td>
<td>Lyric verse</td>
<td>Late 1st or early 2nd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2880</td>
<td>Lyric verses</td>
<td>1st cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2881</td>
<td>Play</td>
<td>Mid 2nd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2882</td>
<td>Ionic verse</td>
<td>Later 2nd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2883</td>
<td>Rhianus, Μελέτιακα?</td>
<td>Not later than mid 3rd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2884</td>
<td>Elegiacs</td>
<td>2nd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2885</td>
<td>Elegiacs: Epode</td>
<td>2nd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2886</td>
<td>Commentary on a poem</td>
<td>2nd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2887</td>
<td>Commentary on a hymn?</td>
<td>Late 1st or early 2nd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2888</td>
<td>Commentary on the Odyssey</td>
<td>2nd and half 2nd cent.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2889</td>
<td>Archion Socrates, Milliades</td>
<td>Early 3rd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2890</td>
<td>Archion Socrates, Milliades</td>
<td>2nd/3rd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2891</td>
<td>Philostratus, π. Ἀδραποκλινος</td>
<td>Early 2nd cent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All dates are A.D.

### List of Plates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2878</td>
<td>2880; 2881/2; 2882; 2891 fr. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2879</td>
<td>2884; 2886; 2890 Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2883</td>
<td>2883 fr. 1; 2885 fr. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2884</td>
<td>2885 IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2885</td>
<td>IV: 2885; 2890 Front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2886</td>
<td>2887; 2889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2887</td>
<td>2883 fr. 2; 2887; 2889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2888</td>
<td>V: 2888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Numbers and Plates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Plate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2878</td>
<td>2886 II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2879</td>
<td>2887 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2880</td>
<td>2888 VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2881</td>
<td>2889 V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2882</td>
<td>2890 Back II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2883 fr. 1</td>
<td>2890 Front IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2884 fr. 2</td>
<td>2891 fr. 1 III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2884 II</td>
<td>2891 fr. 1 III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2885 IV</td>
<td>2891 fr. 3 I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND ABBREVIATIONS

The method of publication follows that adopted in Part XXXVII. As there, the dots indicating letters unread and, within square brackets, the estimated number of lost letters are printed slightly below the line. Corrections and annotations which appear to be in a different hand from that of the original scribe are printed in thick type. Square brackets \( [ \) indicate a lacuna, round brackets \( ( \) the resolution of a symbol or abbreviation, angular brackets \( \langle \) a mistaken omission in the original, braces \( \{ \) a superfluous letter or letters, double square brackets \( \{\{ \) a deletion, the sign \( ^{\dagger} \) an insertion above the line. Dots within brackets represent the estimated number of letters lost or deleted, dots outside brackets mutilated or otherwise illegible letters. Dots under letters indicate that the reading is doubtful. Letters not read or marked as doubtful in the literal transcript may be read or appear without the dot marking doubt in the reconstruction if the context justifies this. Lastly, heavy Arabic numerals refer to Oxyrhynchus papyri printed in this and preceding volumes, ordinary numerals to lines, small Roman numerals to columns.

NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

2878. Lyric Verses in the Aeolic Dialect?

The wretched scraps found under this number were assembled in the belief that they represented lyric verses in the Aeolic dialect and might contribute something to the text of Sappho or Alcaeus. In the event I have not succeeded in recovering from them a single verse or enough of one to recognize a single metre, or more than half a dozen words, of which only one, ἐποίησεν (fr. 2, 9), is specifically, and that one not uniquely, Aeolic. Frs. 4, 5 and fr. 6, 11 contain sequences that recur in verses of Alcaeus (and might have been sequenced on as clues to identification, if they had occurred as single lines without context); fr. 12 exhibits a peculiar relationship to the manuscript D of Alcaeus (fr. 23, 6 seqq. PLF B1). There is nothing, that I see, unequivocally Aeolic except ἐποίησεν (as one may say, since Doric is plainly ruled out), and I do not know how ἐποίησεν (fr. 2, 2) or ἐποίησε (fr. 1, 1, if that was written) is to be reconciled with the hypothesis of an Aeolic text.

The text is written in a medium-sized upright round book-hand to be ascribed, I suppose, to the end of the first or early part of the second century. Hooks or scintae are occasionally but quite irregularly used by way of embellishment. There are no lection-signs.

Fr. 1

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[\text{ἔρως, ἐρωτάς, ἀφερετήν, ἐμομυσία, ἐμοῦ, ἐμαύς, ἐμπόθω, ἐμπάλας, ἐμαθὴς, ἐμαχθεῖς, ἐμαθήσας, ἐμαχθεῖς, ἐμαθήσας, ἐμαχθείς, ἐμαθής, ἐμαλαξίος, ἐμασίος}]
\end{array}
\]

Fr. 1 Top of column? 1 Between a and a slightly convex headless upright, \( ^{\dagger} \)? 3, \( ^{\dagger} \), the upper part of a stroke descending to right; \( ^{\dagger} \) perhaps likewise 9, \( ^{\dagger} \), the upper part of an upright; \( ^{\dagger} \), the line of an upright with a stroke rising to left from its base 6, \( ^{\dagger} \), the right-hand end of a nearly horizontal stroke level with the top of the letters; \( ^{\dagger} \) a possibility 7, \( ^{\dagger} \), the upper right-hand arc of a circle
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Fr. 2

[extensive damage]

Fr. 3

[extensive damage]

Fr. 4

[extensive damage]

Fr. 5

[extensive damage]

Fr. 6

[extensive damage]

2878. LYRIC VERSES IN THE AEOLIC DIALECT

Fr. 5 1), an upright with foot turning to right; or perhaps μ 4 Of κ only the right-hand stroke

Fr. 5 2) Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides, alongside of αἰσθά (and derivatives), have only

various. In Alcaeus μανασ would be expected to appear as μανας.

Fr. 6 1) [extensive damage] stripped

Fr. 6 2) [extensive damage]

Fr. 6 3) a base upright

Fr. 6 4) a base upright

Fr. 6 5) [extensive damage]

Fr. 6 6) [extensive damage]

Fr. 6 7) a base upright

Fr. 6 8) [extensive damage]

Fr. 6 9) an upright

Fr. 6 10) [extensive damage]

Fr. 6 11) [extensive damage]

Fr. 6 12) [extensive damage]

Fr. 6 13) [extensive damage]

Fr. 6 14) [extensive damage]

Fr. 6 15) [extensive damage]

Fr. 6 16) [extensive damage]

Fr. 6 17) [extensive damage]
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Fr. 7

Fr. 8 Vacant

Fr. 9

Fr. 10

8 Fr. 9 Prima facie top of column 3 it, an upright, turned over to left at the top and set off to left at the foot 4 it, perhaps the right-hand end of the cross-stroke of 5; r not so probable 5 , the top of an upright turned over to left, followed by the upper part of a triangular letter 6, the bottom and top of the left-hand side of a triangular letter

Fr. 9 a Non Alloc. 283 (16 e) "attype".
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Fr. 15

\[\text{\ldots} \]

\[\text{\ldots} \]

Fr. 15 i [s, the start of a stroke rising to the right. \(\text{\ldots}\) A trace level with the top of the letters, followed by a strongly right-hand-hooked stroke, perhaps \(\beta\) or \(\varepsilon?\)

Fr. 14

\[\ldots\]

\[\text{\ldots} \]

Fr. 16

\[\text{\ldots} \]

\[\text{\ldots} \]

Fr. 16 i The top right-hand arc of a circle.

Fr. 17

\[\text{\ldots} \]

\[\text{\ldots} \]

Fr. 17 i The lower end of a stroke curving down from left, followed by the lower left-hand part of a circle: \(\varepsilon\), the left-hand side of a circle; \(\varepsilon\), a speck near the line; \(\varepsilon\), a high, slanting, slightly concave stroke; \(\varepsilon\), The top of \(\varepsilon\) or \(\beta\) suggested.

Fr. 18

\[\text{\ldots} \]

\[\text{\ldots} \]

Fr. 18 i Beginnings of lines? \(\text{\ldots}\) i, the left-hand end of a stroke just off the line.

Fr. 19

\[\text{\ldots} \]

\[\text{\ldots} \]

Fr. 19 i The upper end of a stroke descending to right, below it on the line the left-hand end of a cross-stroke.

Fr. 20

\[\text{\ldots} \]

\[\text{\ldots} \]

Fr. 20 i, perhaps the right-hand end of the cross-stroke and a trace of the base of \(\varepsilon\); \(\text{\ldots}\) a dot on the line; \(\text{\ldots}\) After \(\varepsilon\) (above which the end of a stroke from left) faint traces of a triangular letter? \(\varepsilon\), the left-hand side of a circle.

Fr. 21

\[\text{\ldots} \]

\[\text{\ldots} \]

Fr. 21 i The base of a circle, or two letters represented.
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Fr. 22

Fr. 23

Fr. 24

Fr. 25

Fr. 26

Fr. 27

Fr. 23 §, as an upright, with the left-hand arc of a small circle to right of its foot; a speck on the line.

Fr. 24 §, a cross-stroke as of \( \gamma \) but hooked back at its right-hand end; on the line a loop open to right.

2870. LYRIC VERSE

Although not much is missing in the upper part of col. i of this remnant, I can follow no continuous thread of meaning, nor can I make a guess at the likely date of the writer. The metre appears, more plainly in col. ii, to be for the most part mixed dactyls and anapaests, but I see no other reason for thinking of Stesichorus (though he is well represented among Oxyrhynchus finds), and my own impression is that this is a rather late composition.

The writing, which displays a good deal of irregularity in the formation of letters, is a book-hand of a type attributed to the late first or early second century. 226 and P. Berol. 9968 (Schubart, P. gr. Bör. 30b) are better-executed examples. There is a sign like a large rough breathing in the margin of col. ii between il. 10 and 11. There is an accent at col. ii 3, and three or four marks of quantity, one, I think, like the two variants, by another hand.
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σαμαίνει; elsewhere σαμαίνει (e.g. Arch. Est. 671, i.e. σαν σαμαίνει γάρειν ὧν 57a). Cf. Minn. 12, 1 ‘Μωρέον... διὰ τὸν χαίρειν σαμαίνει.

1 I cannot account for την here and in l. 14 contrasted with οὐ in ‘μικρός τ. l. 2, μικρός τ. l. 4, μικρός l. 6, μικρός l. 7.


3 την: it is difficult to manage anything but την την, but it is very instructive as a decipherment, being quite dissimilar to any other, inconsistently used though they are, and σαμαίνει is a very strange associate of καθαρότερες, a way of speaking to which I can offer no parallel in Greek. And I am not sure that there is room for σαν in the gap.


6 seq. A natural guess would be καθαρότερές σαμαίνει (καθαρότερες... καθαρότερα Πλτ. Ἐλ. s. 29. s. 61. 105)., but though καθαρότερές would be acceptable, a representation by part of the καθαρότερα to left at its feet, there is a dot between καθαρότερα and the presumed καθαρότερα that would have to be accounted for by an immediate extension of the καθαρότερα.

Drip such and such a shower from the high (high) (water) would have been a reasonable view of the construction; καθαρότερες like four grids (Plut. Of. vii 50), καθαρότερες (Stop. Frpos. 649), and with καθαρότερα. Καθαρότερα καθαρότερα καθαρότερα καθαρότερα.

καθαρότερες (katharoteres) is not the only possible word (only at Nicand. Thes. iii of the makes μικρότερον.

It looks as if καθαρότερα would not reach the left-hand margin defined by the supplements of l. 2 and 4 seq., but a prefixed καθαρότερα might extend too far. καθαρότερον is suitable enough applied to a river, as καθαρότερα is (e.g. by Herod. ii 93). But I do not know how it is to be understood as applied to a body of water described as a καθαρότερον.

10 ἔτσι seems to be required by the sense, but by itself it is insufficient for the space.

10 Among other possibilities καθαρότερες as at Plut. Nat. ii 47.

2880. LYRIC VERSES

I have failed to find more of this easily recognizable manuscript and to identify the author of the verses of which the beginnings are preserved. I suppose they are, more likely than not, choral lyric. There are some ambiguities of articulation, and more, if account of syntheses is to be taken, but I think it is safe to say that no part of them at present exists among the fragments of Simonides, Pindar, or Bacchylides.

The text is written in an informal hand which has a number of cursive characteristics including a free use of ligatures. The split r is regular throughout. The rough breathing and accent at l. 6, the only lection-agon, appear to be original. There appears to be no reason to suppose that the manuscript might not have been written within the first century.

δικασμένος

μακρύος... μικρότερός

5 μικρότερός

στιγμένος...

10 γράφεις...

End of a column and of a piece or poem. On a line is written what could be taken for small vs., though I doubt whether that was intended. i. prima facie i., but perhaps y followed by a comma upright. γιὰς σαν a dat, though the sentence is incomplete. I doubt whether y could have been written ι. converging strokes with curved traces below, perhaps y, but anomalous followed by the apex of α or ι. 6 seq., In left-hand margin the upper part of the same. 7 seq., The top of two circles or loops, the first having a dot close to left, the second having a projection to right, followed by what looks like the top left-hand part of a badly joined α and the upper part of an inscrutably connected. 11 After ρ a dot on the line above and to right of which a short stroke descending from left; above the first upright of ρ a slightly uplifted semicircular stroke. Of ρ only the right-hand apex.

2881. PLAY

The contents of the following scraps may be taken till disproved to be the ends of iambic trimeters from a drama. The vocabulary appears, in fact, to be that of the Attic tragedians. I have found nothing by which to identify the play or the author. The upper piece obviously enough is a report of a vision or dream along, I suppose, with some general reflections arising out of it. I can follow no consecutive thread in the
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

lower piece, which I hoped might in II. 6 and 7 throw light on problems in Aeschylus and Sophocles respectively.

The text is written in a small slightly sloping hand with some characteristics verging on cursive, for instance, the ligatured as regularly used, and there is a good deal of variety in the forms of certain letters. All elisions are indicated. There are a few 'acutes', I do not see why on the particular syllables chosen, and double provision, a 'grave' and a hyphen, to ensure recognition of oépsepdépépe. In the lower scrap high dots for punctuation appear. I suppose a date about the middle of the second century is not unlikely.

(a) [\ldots]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]

\[\ldots\]
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Chalepoi (I. Bux.), where there seems to be a fairly general agreement that it is used adjectivally and means "dry and prosperous" (LIS) or the like. I doubt whether that rendering is likely, but as the

chorion is no business of mine and throws no light on and receives none from the second occurrence of the word, I have no more to say.

5 "kephalai: : of the letter after a there remains only a small loop or circle about level with the top of the letters, compatible with ε, though that would not have been my first guess. There is no dot to denote cancellation above it, a stroke through it would have been lost. Whatever was written, it is hardly to be doubted that the genuine "kephale" (diphthongs euphonic Attic, P. V. 256, ἀκολοῦθος ... τὴν κοιλεῖν, Thes. 192) "kephale" represents the truth. But how this is to be interpreted I do not know. Its strange resemblance to the fragment of Sophocles referred to above (σ. 1, 4) is no help, since the effective element in ἱπτανεῖν is Ἰπτεῖν, and thus has no obvious application.

6 "kephale"; this case is not of present interest in the three tragedies (though a genuine "kephale" is quoted from Sophocles Euryblock, fr. 46F 1, κεφαλή τε τος, nor is the declination, though an example of either has been introduced by conjecture into Aeschylus).

8 κατάθηκος οἵς ἡμείς, τρίτον ἐδοξοῦμεν, κατὰ τὰς ἑξήκοντα, of the front feet of a wolfhound.

The presence of some animal or quadruped seems to be implied, so that a literal "horn" might not be out of place, but "ear" is left unexplained.

2882. Ionic Verse

I have not succeeded in identifying the following ends of verses, which I suppose to represent lamnic tritomists or trochaic tetranomi, though these are not the only possibilities, and characterize as Ionic solely on the strength of dissyllabic "kephale".

The writing is a slightly sloping, informal-hand, to be dated, I suppose, in the later second century. As far as I can tell the accents and stops are by the same hand as the text.

3 5 Perhaps the overhand of ε. 4 4, an upright or first possibility 8 8, a dot near the line 6, perhaps part of the left-hand end of the cross-stroke and the foot of the mark of ε; in the interlinear space above it the left-hand end of a cross-stroke 10, a dot on the line, followed by the upper part of an upright; 9, acceptable 11, perhaps the upper part of the right-hand stroke of a 14, a dot on the line 15, faint traces near the line 16, the letter before a appears most likely to be ι, but it is preceded by what resembles a reversed comma something in left-hand angle and this by a dot level with the top of the letters, which I cannot combine 14, a speck level with the top of the letters 16, the top of an upright 13 MSS. of Ionian poets are not consistent in their rendering of the present infinitives of contract verbs, see note on 2322 fr. 1, 11. Examples of the second sort isinfinite are not uncommon, but the same inconsistency seems to be attested by their here contracted with eπίκεισθαι 2313 fr. 3 (5) P. Pcm. 14 (6) 11.

14 A patronymic ending -ονοῦ of 2310 fr. 5, 6, eπίκεισθαι (7omoukēthai) at 2310 fr. 5, 14 cannot represent a patronymic unless the name is mistakenly written.

2883. Rhianus, Meconeidou?

The evidence on the strength of which the two fragments under this number are assigned to the Meconeidou of Rhianus is rather more persuasive than the general considerations in favour of identifying the same poems in the verses preserved in the complementary manuscripts 2522 α and η.

Fighting about a town between two parties of one which, 'the enemy', is identified as 'Spartans', and defeated at that, answers very well to what is found in Book iv of Pausanias' guide-book to Greece about the second Macedonian war, an account had, he says, almost entirely on Rhianus (iv 6, 3 seqq.). What is preserved in 2883 and 2522 respectively is parts of speeches made, one in victory (a second is implied, fr. 2, 1), the other in defeat, by a person who stands in either case in the same relation to a similar audience. I am not sure whether it is licent to recognize a worder and more inconsequent style of speaking in 2883 than in 2522.

The language has a vaguely Homeric tincture without being in detail particularly imitative.

The writing, though firm and practised, is not a regular book-hand, but has some curious features. A τέρματα ανε μεν might be provided by the two marginal entries in fr. 1, which are in a book-hand, if they were better preserved. I suppose it is not likely to be later than the middle of the third century.

There are three or four accents, all prima facie written by the original hand, as are the two or three apostrophes. There are also a number of stops.
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Fr. 2

178, 179
176, 177
174, 175
172, 173
1.2 = 1.3 = παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων...
παραθύρων...

1.2 = 1.3 = παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων...
παραθύρων...

The style of the little that is left of these verses is consistent with their ascription to a Hellenistic or later author. Unless they are complemented in some way nothing useful can be said about them. I am uncertain whether or not the large fragment contains parts of more than one piece.

The text is written on the back of a roll (of which the front is blank except for a couple of letters in fr. 3), in a commonplace small upright second-century hand. There are no lection signs. There is a variant at fr. 4, 7, corrections at fr. 2, 5 and 8, a marginal addition at fr. 2, 17, in another hand or hands.

Fr. 1

1.2 = 1.3 = παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων...
παραθύρων...

1.2 = 1.3 = παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων... παραθύρων...
παραθύρων...
παραθύρων...

The text is written on the back of a roll (of which the front is blank except for a couple of letters in fr. 3), in a commonplace small upright second-century hand. There are no lection signs. There is a variant at fr. 4, 7, corrections at fr. 2, 5 and 8, a marginal addition at fr. 2, 17, in another hand or hands.
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Fr. 2

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 3

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 4

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 5

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 6

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 7

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 8

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 9

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 10

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 11

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 12

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 13

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 14

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 15

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 16

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 17

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 18

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 19

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 20

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 21

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 22

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 23

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 24

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 25

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 26

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 27

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 28

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 29

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 30

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 31

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 32

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 33

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 34

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 35

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 36

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 37

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 38

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 39

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 40

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 41

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 42

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 43

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 44

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 45

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]

Fr. 46

\[
\frac{\text{Fr. 2}}{\text{Fr. 3}}
\]
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

2885. ELEGIES. EPISTLE

Scraps containing elegiacs and epodes, in one hand and from one manuscript, raise hope of additions to the Archilochus already found in some quantity at Oxyrhynchus. But as soon as larger pieces are formed it becomes plain that something much later than Archilochus is represented. Apart from the one epode, about the date of which it might be possible to hesitate, the elegiac poems can hardly be supposed earlier than the end of the fourth century B.C. and might be much later. I have come on no clue to the author—I assume in the absence of a statement at fr. 1, 21 or fr. 11, 11, that the several pieces are by the same person, though at fr. 11, 10 I refer to what might be an indication of a diversity of sources—and except at fr. 1, 11 seqq. have not been able to elicit any continuous sense from what has survived. Those verses are the conclusion of a piece in which a speaker warns a female character of the danger of allowing herself to be too greatly influenced by love, citing examples from old stories of women who for love had committed crimes against fathers and brothers. Even in these lines a great deal remains uncertain.

The text is written on the back of a roll in a small, round, second-century hand, slightly firmer in fr. 4 than in the rest. But this fragment and the upper part of fr. 1 have on the front remains of lines of a fair-sized, upright, business-hand, which, with the similarity of the surface, goes to show that they were not very far apart. The front of the other fragments is blank and they are assigned to this manuscript on the strength of the hand. The horizontal surfaces of frs. 8 and 11 are likewise so similar (and to a less degree those of frs. 7, 9, and 10), that it may be inferred that these also came from one sheet.

There are no lection signs except a couple of apostrophes in fr. 4. Besides one or two self-corrections there are some additions and corrections made with a thicker pen.
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

28

Fr. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[9]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 1: This has the appearance of a title.
the lefthand side of a small circle
perhaps the right-hand ends of the overlapping and cross-
stroke of ε;
the upper end of a stroke descending to right
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Fr. 4

[...]

Fr. 5

[...]

Fr. 10

[...]

Fr. 15

[...]

Fr. 20

[...]

2885. EPODE

[...] on the line the lower part of a stroke rising to right? [14 [...], a median dot [...]. I cannot rule out [...], perhaps the right-hand stroke of a, [...]. The left-hand side of a small loop off the line. [20 [...], the foot of an upright [...], a slightly concave upright [...], the right-hand end of a cross-stroke [...].

Fr. 4. 5 1. Are nothing else as likely as synechēs, though I look as if it would have been crushed, unless what I have taken for the foot of the first upright is the foot of [...]. Synechēs is one of the names of a township in Crete, of which others are Tyraeum and Tyraeos (Pliny, N.H. 8, 133; in Tyrannus; Scyl. 84, 47. Tyrannos on its drachmhas implies nunc or nunc).

Since wōle Hekateon cannot be supposed to be a definition of Tyraeum, a reasonable guess seems to be 'fearing Hekate he came to Aristaeus' town', or (but not nunc or nunc) 'Tyraeum [...] nunc o Aristaei [...].

Aristaeus was one of the sons of Zeus, and since Ilion may not have been yet built in his time (and Diodorus iv 25, 3 says he was king of Dardanians), his 'town' may refer to Dardania. His 'town' may refer to Dardania. His 'town' may refer to Dardania. His 'town' may refer to Dardania.

7-97. A comparison with similar contexts makes eth 'the', look unavoidable as the beginning of 1, 8.

E.g. These. 191 with Gom's note, 192, 193, 194, 195. Met. 4, 3, 4. And. c. 219, 219. But I don't see the purpose of the marginal addition.

[...]

11. Apparently ὅποιος ἦν ἄρα, though it looks a tight fit. ad mundus ad mundus ἀρπάζει seems a reasonable guess, but I do not think it would reach the main alignment as open, if that was written at the beginning of 1, 8.

[...]

13. If eth 'is to be taken as and eth, I call attention to a peculiarity of the epodiēs for which I cannot account. In manuscripts of early Ionic authors the crisis of eth is represented by eth, what 2389 (Achilles) fr. 1, 2, 2, above 2244 (Hipparchus) fr. 11, 16. But in the ' Ionic' pieces of Callimachus it is much more often than not represented by eth, e.g. fr. 114, 114, 115, 115, 116, and this monosyllabism of 'Doric' extends even to 'Attic' fr. 6, e.g. Theocritus xiii 37 (έρωμεν, for ἔρωμεν).
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

Fr. 5

[\[ \[ \]
\] \[\]
blank for \( \tilde{\imath} \)

Fr. 5 1 At the upper right-hand side of \( \tilde{\imath} \) confused ink, forward-sloping upright

Fr. 6

\[\[ \]
\[\[\]
\[\]
\[\]

Fr. 6 1 The lower part of \( \phi \) or \( \phi \) suggested

Fr. 7

\[\]
\[\]
\[\]
\[\]
\[\]

Fr. 7 1, 2 the lower part of an upright ruled out

Fr. 8

\[\]
\[\]
\[\]
\[\]

2885. ELEGACS

Fr. 8

\[\]
\[\]
\[\]

Fr. 8 15 If \( \phi \) could be read, \( \xi \) \( \xi \) would be a reasonable guess.
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

19 Although παραπομπή occurs once found in the Odyssey, the word otherwise only appears in much later writing.

Fr. 9

...[illegible]...

Fr. 10

[illegible]...

Fr. 11

...[illegible]...

2885. ELEGIES

of the letters, then a stroke descending to right and the base of a circle with ink above 7 8. A stroke rising to right 9 9. anew looks must like 8, but I think illusory 10 Of 9, only the loop 11 If the lower part of a stroke descending from left 12, 13., an upright; e, not suggested 14., a dot level with the top of the letters 15. a median dot 16., perhaps the right-hand base angle of 8 17., two dots resembling the underside of a damaged loop, followed by the top of a stroke bending over to right

Fr. 11

...[illegible]...

Fr. 10 a dot level with the top of the letters...[illegible]...[illegible]...[illegible]...

...[illegible]...
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

leap of 4 or the left-hand base angle of 4, followed by an upright 1 crossing the end of a stroke from left against its left-hand side above the foot of an upright 1, the lower part of an upright 1, the upper left-hand arc of a circle 1, the left-hand side of a or o if suggested 19 Befor 1 displaced loops followed by a sharp loop suggesting a 28 the lower part of a stroke rising to right 29 Rubbed and the ink consequently displaced. Printa finds the last three letters are as given, but the text had a cross-stroke at the top 1, e or o

Fig. 11 5 τερενικάνθρωπος (only at Od. 4) can hardly be avoided. I do not know what can have preceded but w. Though w is not a very satisfactory interpretation of the ink, w is not possible. 5 τερενικάνθρωπος (only at Od. 4) is perhaps likely to imply a βίβλος in L, 5 in spite of what I say in the app. crit. 5 τερενικάνθρωπος (only at Od. 4) may have preceded, but it would have an unnatural look and s is inordinately far from w. I do not think βίβλος an alternative.

2886. COMMENTARY ON A POEM

A commentary on a composition of which the only line that can be approximately reconstructed with reasonable probability is a hemistich. There is nothing that I see unfavorable to the hypothesis that the whole consisted of hemistichs. The subject of the part preserved by the commentator seems to be the apparel of a male person, about (6) i & g.7, garment (7-11), ornaments? (12-17)

Commentaries are often written in wide columns. The only guess I can make at the original width of (6) i, based on the supplement proposed for L. 10, is that one third or rather more than one third of the column is lost. But what with the uncertainty about the exact form of the supplement and the irregularity of the copyist's writing, spacing, and use of contraction, not much reliance can be placed on this estimate.

As appears from (6) ii, lemma (preceded by δεξιά δεξιάμενος) projected by one letter into the left-hand margin. It was presumably intended to articulate the text by stops and blanks (eg. (6) i x), but any such intention seems to have been carried out in a rather casual way. There is a number of blanks in places where they have no purpose and stops omitted where they might be expected.

It can hardly be supposed that the writing is that of a professional copyist. There is great variation in the shape of many of the letters—a appears in at least seven distinct forms, L. 2, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 16—and in some places, where the ink is clear, a correct decipherment would be impossible apart from the sense (eg. ev. II. 6, 9, ian. I. 10)

The decipherment is made precarious in many places, particularly on the stained left-hand side, in spite of the fact that truly cursive forms and ligatures are by no means freely employed. I should guess that the hand was to be dated in the second century. For what it is worth I note that σ αδρεά everywhere in its place, after o as well as after w.
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

The text is written in a practised but informal round hand of medium size to be assigned to the early second century or even the end of the first. It has no section signs and is not articulated in any way so far as I can tell, though in the absence of a good proportion of the left-hand margin the evidence about projection and indentation has gone.

Fr. 1. There is a 'joint' at the right-hand side, almost coincident with the edge. From L 11 on, the lines appear to be slightly shorter. y Of the only the extreme right-hand curve y Of the only the left-hand curve 5 Of the only the edge of the top, the lower part of a stroke rising to right (but to which letter is being missed), followed by a short cut of the upper right-hand side of a circle, having a projection to right at about its middle and a dot to right of this, level with the top of the letters; possibly the central part of the top of \( \varphi \), a trace on the line, followed by a loop, open to right, on the under-layer; if separate letters, the second perhaps \( \upsilon = \gamma \) Of \( \epsilon \) only the top and hooked foot of the right-hand stroke 6 Of \( \epsilon \) only the lower end below the line 7 On the line the end of a stroke from left 8; rather than \( \epsilon \) 10 \( \epsilon \) normally 10, apparently the upper end of a stroke descending to right 11, the right-hand end of a cross-stroke touching \( \gamma \) level with its cross-stroke 12, a heavy dot level with the top of the letters \( \rho \), perhaps 13, represented by the left-hand apex and the tip of the right-hand upright, followed by a dot to its right. But for 14 I cannot rule out 15, \( \gamma \) level with the top of the letters \( \varphi \), perhaps \( \epsilon \), the upper right-hand angle of \( \epsilon \), or less probably \( \gamma \). For case 16, a trace about mid letter. After \( \alpha \) is an upright descending below the line with a stroke according to right from its bottom to about three-quarters of the way up. No prima facie stroke out 17 looks as if it had a low cross-stroke, but I believe \( \varepsilon \) is illusory 18, traces on the line. It is completely unattestable \( \epsilon \) only the base 19, the lower part of a flourishing stroke, followed by the top of a parallel stroke 20 \( \epsilon \) on the line a line, on both sides of which the author is almost completely destroyed \( \gamma \) quite unattestable 24 After an upright having to right two traces, one above the other; \( \varepsilon \) or \( \varepsilon \) seems to be the only choice. Before the top of a loop or blunt apex followed by the slightly concave upper part of an upright 26, the top of a slightly convex stroke followed by the upper end of a stroke descending to right, not prima facie able to be combined in \( \varepsilon \), but, if separate letters, leaving too little room for 26 unattestable

Fr. 1. I think, probably project further to left in line 1 than in line 2. As well as I can judge, the first matches the alignment inferred from L 13, 19 seqqu., the second falls short of it. 2 It I can offer any account of \( \alpha \) is. Can \( \varepsilon \) be intended? 3 Apparently the end of a feminine adjective. \( \delta \) is nowhere feminine. 4 seqqu. \( \varepsilon \) looks like, but I am uncertain how it should be articulated. \( \psi \) looks short for 5, rather long for L 4; \( \varepsilon \) is probably short for L 4. 6 Since the long divine must be supposed to come from verse, and specifically from the composition being commented upon, it may be remarked that no such evidence as there is L 1, 2, 14 seqqu. was, it is believed, in the hands of Heracleides when he put the end and the beginning of hexameter verse 7 seqqu. \( \varepsilon \) too short in L 1, 5; too short in \( \varepsilon \); perhaps too to be prefixed \( \epsilon \); \( \varepsilon \) looks best in \( \gamma \); \( \psi \) being too short \( \varepsilon \); this not ruled out on the score of verse in L 1 8, 13 seqqu. \( \varepsilon \) if they are to be taken together, appear to say: from these (statements) one may infer that (the poet) indicates the season (of the year), that of the year, by the reasonable, 13, offering he brings to the addresses. But this construction leaves L 13, seqqu., ' of the poet's age', unaccounted for. 9 I can add no parallel to the infinitive, \( \delta \) without, instead of \( \psi \) \( \psi \) without. 10 From: Thuc. ii. 70, vii. 70, Dem. 1. 25, 31, and 12 common forms: 

\( \delta \) \( \delta \) \( \delta \) \( \delta \)

Pind. 1. in. 10, 13 seqqu. \( \psi \) looks hardly available, and \( \varepsilon \) is not as \( \psi \) \( \psi \) without in a tolerable genus. 14 seqqu. \( \psi \) \( \psi \) \( \psi \) \( \psi \) suggests a preceding \( \psi \) \( \psi \) \( \psi \) \( \psi \) and \( \psi \) could be reconstructed, represented by the left-hand apex of \( \psi \) and, after indenture traces, the feet of \( \psi \) the base of \( \psi \) the foot of the left-hand and the whole of the right-hand stroke of \( \psi \). Before some there are faint traces reconducible with the bottom left-hand are of \( \psi \) and the hook to right of the foot of \( \psi \), but \( \psi \) was not written nor would there be any room here for \( \psi \). (\( \psi \) the papyrus is damaged and broken, but I see no other interpretation of the ink as likely.) 12 Except in a late Latin inscription (Inscr. Copt. 4. 263, iii 124.), the original statement in L 8, that it is a feminine in Akkadian, he says, as a conclusion between Arabic and Akkadian words, P.O. 1234 ii. 2: 14, is withdrawn by implication in the supplement.
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

17 8εν ου τοι Σιδηρος. 8ον εις ου τοι Σιδηρος. Ως εις ου τοι Σιδηρος. Of 8e in 8, perhaps not too long. But I. 18 perhaps implies that no figure was actually mentioned.

21 αετος. not in the MSS. Or, perhaps, in the MSS. 21 seq. (or alternatively αετος, τοι, εις, τοι, ρασα, if that is to be elicited from II. 21 seq.). But though the surface is darkened and disturbed, I do not think of it as a possible deracinement.

22 οντος τοι το διαβαλλει, 8χταλ. Fnd. 8. ii 116. 116.


24 seqq. 8εν τοι Σιδηρος. For ουτος simply 'a body of persons,' cf. e.g., ἴδεται in Soph. Tr. 1179 seqq. (on which L. S. 337 seqq. 'judge a mistake!'), and this meaning would be required, if the same verbs were used as in respect of Φαэтων, 'to make over to, place at the disposal of.' But the verbs regularly accompanying γινομαι is the unqualified διαφθείρει, e.g., Αριστ. Ναυ. 277 γινομαι διαφθειρείν τινα Περσας of Bollnow's collection there), to which the corresponding noun is διαφθείρεις, Anth. Agam. 29, Aristoph. Thesm. 596, and though I cannot advance an example of διαφθείρεις ἐν ουτως or διαφθείρεις γινομαι, I remain in doubt whether έναθειρεμαι (cf. I. 21 seqq. or μεταφερειακος, I. 28) is to be preferred to, or γινομαι and ∊αθειριες.

25 seqq. Of the words from 8εν τοι Σιδηρος I can give no account. They might be expected to correspond at least in part to ουτος ἀκροθεμνεται. But that the verb would be a recognized way of referring to the make-up of a chorus; cf. schol. Aristoph. Thesm. 312 τοι γινομαι διαφθειρειας έναθειρεμαι τως Λέοντας. Cretan women dancing round an altar, mon. ap. Hyp. Isth. xi 2 and 3. Apparently a promise of a μαραθιαι. οὐκ εικόνις ουτος Hdt. iv 76.


Fr. 2 Fr. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 2</th>
<th>Fr. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 2 and 3 look as if they might come from the same neighbourhood as fr. 1.

Fr. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 4 consists of two scraps of which the relative levels are fixed by cross-hires, but there is no external evidence about their interval.

2888. COMMENTARY ON THE ODYSSEY

2888. COMMENTARY ON THE ODYSSEY

The commonly found kind of commentary proceeds more or less systematically through the text commented on. The distance between the first and second of the passages discussed in the following piece argues that its scope was different. It may be suggested that the selection made of points for discussion and the discussion itself are what might be expected to characterize a product of the school of Krates. In col. i an apparent ἀκροθεμνεται is resolved by reference to motive, in col. ii a problem of Homeric astronomy, in col. iii a problem of Homeric geography is dealt with. But I am bound to remark that, though in col. iii Krates’ view about the scene of Odysseus’ wanderings in general is accepted and his explanation of a particular point appears to be defended against criticism, in col. ii this commentator rejects by implication—whether expressly or not I cannot be sure—an alteration of the Homeric text which Krates wished to make.

Apart from this possibility that it is a representative of Pergamene rather than Alexandrian scholarship, 2888 is of no great interest and I could have wished that a collection of fragments which fitted together almost without residue had contained a text of more value.

The text, written without lection signs of any sort in lines of about 20 letters, is articulated by cross-heads (i 26, loc.), paragrapheus (i 12), and diplayers om paragrapha (ii 39). The hand must, I suppose, be considered to be related to the common angular type, but it is an uncommon variant of it. I should compare it with 232, which the editors give reason for dating before the middle of the 3rd century and think may be assigned to the second half of the 2nd.

* P. Amb. 13, Aristarchos, Commentary on Hdt. I, has no notes on ch. 103-124. I do not know the explanation of this respect and must in papyrus MSS. we are always dealing with detached fragments we cannot be certain that similar instances did not occur elsewhere. Nevertheless the method adopted in the papyrus preserves the particular character of the text commented on.
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advice was intended to bring Odysseus as quickly as possible into civilised regions, this might be the
commentator's reply to a critic that the poetical course was not his direct way home. But there are
too many uncertainties about v. 4 seq. for one to say that I can verify this inference.

5 In (Odysseus viii. 5.
6 ἔρμα, ἡ ἀγών, 7 ἡ βοῦς. I do not wish to pursue a point made by a critic of 5th cent.
7 μὲν αὐτὸ τῆς Καράκας ἐντευκτικός, καὶ ἀρνητικός. Have I not considered the possibility of a variant here (though none is recorded); but, apart from the ἀρνητικός, ἀντίκερος is incompatible with the trace towards the end of the line, which might be the last part of an or a διήκοντος. But not ut... 11. seq. This looks to me very much like an allusion that Odysseus 'would never have reached the Mediterranean' that is, would not, if he had started from a point as located and followed a course as described in the preceding. If this inference is correct, it would be natural to draw the further conclusion that two voices are represented in ll. 4 seq. (of which one would appear to be that of Kratos), namely, a view that Kratos' island was to be located in such and such a place and the view of an objector that a person sailing from that place and keeping the Bear on his left would not come to the

Mediterranean.

14 ὑπεξείς ὁ δ' Κράτωρ looks likely, but I can come to no settled opinion about the two or three letters required between it and ἁριακόν.

15 ἦν ὁ μεταφης. ἦτο, it seems about the right length.

16 seq., ἀπάντω, ἀναφέρω, ἀπαντῶ, ἀναφέρω. I should guess that Sthenus the astronomer (of Babylon or Seleucia) was meant and that ἄρα was ἀπαντῶ, ἀναφέρω. St. 1. 1015 W. 2. paraenêthēseis de kai ἀπαντῶ, ἀναφέρω. But I do not know enough to exclude Sthenus the Hesiodic scholar (of Ithaca) and ἀπαντῶ, ἀναφέρω. If the second Sthenus was mentioned the date of composition of this commentary could not be earlier than about the middle of the first century b.c. Otherwise it might be as early as the second. 20 Perhaps ὡς ἄρθος 606. 'κακονομοῦντας ἔρχομαι ἔρχομαι ἀναφέρω. Sthenus, it seems, to refer to a critic of Kratos, of which the point would be that Kratos recommends not the shortest route but the one that soonest brings Odysseus into regions where he would be forwarded. Perhaps ὡς, 501. ἤβατολος. i.e. from north-west to south-east, has some reference to ἀναφέρω, ἀπαντῶ ἐν τῷ δικαίῳ ἡμών ἴσοις εἰς ἑαυτούς. 15 seq. directly went to want.

21 It appears to be common ground to the commentator and the person he quotes that the roadway took place in the manner, a view known from elsewhere (A. Gell, xiv. 5) to have been championed by Kratos, not in the waters round Italy and Sicily.

Curriculum

Another scrap has been fitted into col. ii which gives ll. 10-14 the following appearance:

ταρταράς,[...], [...], [...]

κόφρας, [οὐκ] ἐπὶ τὸν ἔγλειον

κέφαλας, [...], [...]

μηντίδες, [...]

πεταλοῦσας [...], [...], [...]

κοίμεσθαι [...], [...], [...], [...]

κολλήσας [...], [...], [...], [...]

κυβρίας [...], [...], [...].

2889. Aeschines Sociotatus, Miletus

Even without the confirmation supplied by the quotation of ll. 4 seq. it would have been a likely conjecture that the following scrap preserved the beginning of the Socratic dialogue attributed to Aeschines entitled Miletus. From it we learn the
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occasion, the place, and the persons of the discussion, of whom two, Miliades and Euripides,—or three, if ἔννοι meaning Socrates is counted—appear in 289a and, I should say, identify that piece.

The hand is a good-sized example of the angular type, comparable with 1364, similarly written in narrow columns, and to be dated early in the third century. There are a few high stops but no other addition to the bare letters.

εὔχριστον[...
εὐτυχριστον]
μελετάμεθα[
μελεταμεθα]οιοντὸς[t τὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλή
τὴν ἔδωκαν ὑμῖν]

To the left of the column there are about two inches of papyrus blank except for a thick stroke opposite II. 7 seq., which may be intended as an embellishment of a title. However, that may be, it is obviously the beginning of a work, and it looks as if it missed the length better than ever. I am not sure that (i) should not be written; (ii) is the foot of an upright turning slightly to right, e.g. O [i.e. only the long stroke, perhaps a dot]. (iii) is the start of a stroke rising to right (10.), a cross-stroke as of (v). (iv) is upright perhaps preceded by traces of a diagonal.

2890. AESCHINES SOCRACEUS, Miltiades

The piece of papyrus, on both sides of which the following text is written, is presumably one leaf of a conjunctive pair from a codex. I think it probable that the edge from which its missing fellow must be supposed to have broken off is the right-hand edge of the 'front'. If so, the 'back' was the recto and the 'front' the verso in the book. There is nothing to show whether the page contained more than one column.

The characters taking part in the dialogue appear, though not quite unambiguously, to be Socrates, Euripides, and Milctades (288a 3 seq.), three of the four participants in 2889, which may reasonably be thought to be the beginning of Aeschines' Miltiades. It is natural to infer that 2890 is subsequent passages of the same.

The hand is a poorish example of the common angular type dated from about the middle of the second to the end of the third century, though this seems early for a codex. There are a few high stops and a single sign of elision, the blank spaces appear to have no significance.

Back

Back
NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

and in view of the necessity to find about five more letters for 1, 3 and about ten for 1, 4 this alternative must be contemplated here.

1 seqq. Perhaps, 'is surprising, that I find such details ... of which we must suppose we have the beginning in the first of the fragments printed below. From these it is possible to infer that the book was a systematic exposition of arts amatoria, starting with methods of approach, fr. 1 ii, and proceeding by way of a section on flattery, of which the opening is lost, followed by a section on kisses, of which nothing but the heading remains, fr. 3 ii. The treatment appears to have been summary and matter of fact. Lucian (Periand. 24) implies that her vocabulary was marked by rare or invented words. ἑσπερον, fr. 1 ii 3, cannot be considered one of these, though it seems to be used in a sense not found elsewhere, but ὁμιλέω, fr. 3 ii 6, may be one.

The writing is a fairly-sized book-hand of a common type, comparable with 220, and, I suppose, to be placed early in the second century. There are no lection signs. There is a cancellation indicated by superscribed dots in fr. 3 ii 4 and another, apparently misplaced, in fr. 3 ii 6.
2801. PHILAEUS, π. ἱδρυεσκόλο

παίδες συνήγοροι Φιλαέως
tics 'Oπομένοις Σύμπαν
νοειδωρίαν μετάφασα
και ετάντων, άπειρος
καὶ νημάτοις κ. ο. μ. [κ. ο. μ.]
5 ξαίρε κεφαλή paraφρ.-
γνωρίζοντας

2 a seq. The sopher should neglect his appearance so that his intentions are concealed from the reader.

The sense of ἀξία is required at the end of 1, 2, but I cannot accommodate the link 3 to any part of that word.

I can find no parallel to the use of ἄπωρος apparently as 'engaged in a performance', 'on the job'.

Fr. 2 These two scraps were originally one. I do not much doubt that they contain the second part of the text of Fr. 1, but seq. But I cannot match them together again nor attach them to their places in fr. 1.
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(a) Verse (2678-85)

[Fragment list]

For the names of limes, see Hesych. Prot. 12, 2614.