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### TABLE OF PAPYRI

#### I. NEW LITERARY TEXTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyri</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3209.</td>
<td>Alcman, <em>Méloí</em>, vi</td>
<td>MWH, 2nd cent.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3210.</td>
<td>Commentary on Alcman?</td>
<td>MWH, 1st cent.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3211.</td>
<td>Lyric Verses</td>
<td>EL, 2nd cent.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3212.</td>
<td>Lyric Verses</td>
<td>EL, 2nd cent.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3213.</td>
<td>Lyric Verses in 'Doric'</td>
<td>EL, 2nd cent.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3214.</td>
<td>Anthology (Euripides)</td>
<td>MWH, 2nd cent.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3215.</td>
<td>Tragic Trimeters</td>
<td>EL, 2nd cent.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3216.</td>
<td>Tragedy</td>
<td>MWH, 2nd cent.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3217.</td>
<td>Menander, <em>Sicyonius</em></td>
<td>SS, 1st cent.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3218.</td>
<td>New Comedy</td>
<td>SS, 1st cent.</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3219.</td>
<td>Treatise on Plato?</td>
<td>MWH, 2nd cent.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. EXTANT CLASSICAL TEXTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyri</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3220.</td>
<td>Hesiod, <em>Erga</em> and <em>Aspis</em></td>
<td>MLW, 2nd cent.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3222.</td>
<td>Hesiod, <em>Erga</em>, 144–56</td>
<td>MLW, 3rd cent.</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3224.</td>
<td>Hesiod, <em>Erga</em>, 179–95</td>
<td>MLW, 2nd cent.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3225.</td>
<td>Hesiod, <em>Erga</em>, 265–79</td>
<td>MLW, 2nd cent.</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3230.</td>
<td>Hesiod, <em>Erga</em>, 293–301, 763–4, 78 (or 789), 1–13</td>
<td>MLW, 1st cent.</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3234.</td>
<td>Thucydides, Bk. I 73. 4–74. 3</td>
<td>MEW, 1st/2nd cent.</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### III. SUB-LITERARY TEXTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Papyri</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3235.</td>
<td>Rhetorical Declamation</td>
<td>MWH, 3rd cent.</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236.</td>
<td>Rhetorical Declamation</td>
<td>MWH, 3rd cent.</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All dates are A.D.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3238</td>
<td>Glossary to Homer, II. i–ii</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>3rd cent.</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3239</td>
<td>Alphabetic 'Glossary'</td>
<td>MEW</td>
<td>2nd cent.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IV. OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3240</td>
<td>Official Correspondence</td>
<td>MEW</td>
<td>c. 88/9</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3241</td>
<td>Notifications to Tax-farmers</td>
<td>MWH</td>
<td>11 Feb. 163</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3242</td>
<td>Declaration of Property</td>
<td>MAHEA</td>
<td>185–7</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3243</td>
<td>Report to a Prefect of Egypt</td>
<td>MWH</td>
<td>214/15</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3244</td>
<td>Oath of Office</td>
<td>AKB</td>
<td>3 Dec. 228</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>Report of a Public Physician</td>
<td>AKB</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3246</td>
<td>Fragment of a Petition</td>
<td>AKB</td>
<td>297/8 (?)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3247</td>
<td>Fragment of a Petition</td>
<td>AKB</td>
<td>16 Aug. 298</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3248</td>
<td>Fragment of an Official Diary</td>
<td>AKB</td>
<td>3rd cent.</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3249</td>
<td>Nomination to a Liturgy</td>
<td>AKB</td>
<td>Sept.–Dec. 326</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### V. PRIVATE DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3250</td>
<td>Freight Contract</td>
<td>MAHEA</td>
<td>c. 63</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3251</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of Indebtedness</td>
<td>MAHEA</td>
<td>2nd/3rd cent.</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3252</td>
<td>Deed of Surety</td>
<td>AKB</td>
<td>257/8</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3253</td>
<td>Letter of Zoilus to Horion</td>
<td>MEW</td>
<td>3rd/4th cent.</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VI. DOCUMENTS FROM THE ARCHIVE OF LEONIDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3254</td>
<td>Sale of Flax</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>312–15</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3255</td>
<td>Application for Lease</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>6 Nov. 315</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3256</td>
<td>Application for Lease</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>317/18</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3257</td>
<td>Application for Lease</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>10 Nov. 318</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3258</td>
<td>Application for Lease</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3259</td>
<td>Lease of Land</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3260</td>
<td>Sub-lease of Land</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3261</td>
<td>Contract concerning Recruits</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3262</td>
<td>Receipt?</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VII. MINOR TEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3263</td>
<td>Monthly Report of Village Scribe</td>
<td>JRR</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### VIII. TEXTS FIRST PUBLISHED ELSEWHERE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>Declaration about Bribery</td>
<td>AKB</td>
<td>80/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3265</td>
<td>Declaration by Glassworkers</td>
<td>AKB</td>
<td>June/July 326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3266</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of a Loan</td>
<td>AKB</td>
<td>13 Aug. 337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AKB = A. K. Bowman  EL = E. Lobel  MEW = M. E. Weinstein
MAHEA = M. A. H. El-Abbadi  JRR = J. R. Rea  MLW = M. L. West
MWH = M. W. Haslam  SS = S. Stephens
LIST OF PLATES

I. 3209 frr. 1–6
II. 3210
III. 3211, 3212, 3213, 3215
IV. 3214, 3216, 3217, 3218

V. 3229
VI. 3239, 3243 frr. 2–4
VII. 3243 fr. 1
VIII. 3250

NUMBERS AND PLATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Plates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3209 frr. 1–6</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3210</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3211</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3212</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3213</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3214</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3215</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3216</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3217</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3218</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3229</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3239</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3243 fr. 1</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3243 frr. 2–4</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3250</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND ABBREVIATIONS

The method of publication follows that adopted in Part XLIV. As there, the dots indicating letters unread and, within square brackets, the estimated number of letters lost are printed slightly below the line. The texts are printed in modern form, with accents and punctuation, the lectional signs occurring in the papyri being noted in the *apparatus criticus*, where also faults of orthography, etc., are corrected. Iota adscript is printed where written, otherwise iota subscript is used. Square brackets [ ] indicate a lacuna, round brackets ( ) the resolution of a symbol or abbreviation, angular brackets < > a mistaken omission in the original, braces {} a superfluous letter or letters, double square brackets [[ ] ] a deletion, the signs ′ ′ 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. Lastly, heavy Arabic numerals refer to Oxyrhynchus papyri printed in this and preceding volumes, ordinary numerals to lines, small Roman numerals to columns.

The abbreviations used are in the main identical with those in E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: an Introduction* (1968). It is hoped that any new ones will be self-explanatory.

NOTE ON INVENTORY NUMBERS

The inventory numbers in general follow a set pattern, of the form 20 3B.37/D (3)a. Here '20' is the number of the present cardboard box; '3B' refers to Grenfell and Hunt's third campaign at Oxyrhynchus; '37' is the series number given within that year to the metal packing box; 'D' indicates a layer of papyri inside that box. A few inventory numbers have the form A. B.3.2/A(6); these refer to a separate series of boxes.
NOTE ON THE TERMS
'RECTO' AND 'VERSIO', 'FRONT' AND 'BACK'
AND THE USE OF ARROWS (→, ↓)

The terms 'recto' and 'verso' are strictly applicable to papyrus only in those cases (which are in a minority) where a recognizable part of a roll is preserved. If there is doubt whether a roll can be recognized, the terms used here are 'front' and 'back', in conjunction with arrows placed beside the first line of the text to indicate the direction of the fibres in relation to the writing. A horizontal arrow (→) means that the fibres run in the same direction as the lines of writing; a vertical arrow (↓) means that the fibres run at right angles to the lines of writing.

To avoid confusion it must be stressed that an arrow of this sort refers always to the relationship of the writing to the surface on which it stands, that is, the vertical arrow is not used simply to indicate the back of papyrus which has on the front a text running parallel with the fibres. It means that the writing of the text on the side in question runs at right angles to the fibres. The addresses of letters and other endorsements are often written parallel with the fibres on the back, while the main text is written parallel with the fibres on the front. It will be readily understood that because of the method of manufacture of papyrus sheets this means that the endorsement runs at right angles to the text on the front. However, since an arrow refers only to a single surface, such an endorsement will be preceded by the note 'Back →'.

These signs can be applied to codices, since in them the writing is normally only horizontal across the page. The arrow in horizontal position → will therefore indicate a page of a codex in which the fibres run in the same direction as the writing, horizontally; an arrow in a vertical position will mean that the writing, if horizontal, crosses the fibres, which are by inference vertical. It is necessary to set this point out explicitly since the basis of use of the signs → ↓ is not that laid down in P. Antinoopolis III p. xii; and a theoretical defect of the new basis is that it cannot be used to describe a page of a codex which bears no writing.

When the terms 'recto' and 'verso' are applied to parchment codices, it is proposed to retain the time-honoured meanings 'recto' = a right-hand page, 'verso' = a left-hand page.
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO PAPYRI
PUBLISHED BY THE
EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY

I 32 (= Ch.L.A. IV 267) 28-30. Read and restore:

opto te felicitissimum (domine?) mult-
tis annis cum tuis (omnia)?


50 3. Expand proton(patiokov). See XLV 3241 8 n (p. 103).

61 1-3. Restore:

[A7γρηλος Σαραπιον ο και Ηπολλωνα]-
[i(δ' χηροि με]ρος [επι(τηγοκ)] Ηρει(νοιτου)]
νυν επι(τηγοκ) 'Ερμοσολίτου. See JEA 38 (1952) 88 n. 6.


103 2. For protonan(εντε) read protonan(εγνατι). See XLIV 3188 introd., para. 2.


A photograph shows that for φοβον we should read Φοβ' ου (= Φοβόυ). J. R. Rea.


II 276 (= CPJ II 422 = S. Daris, Documenti per la storia dell'esercito, No. 68) 12. For Δερμεθδων read Δερμεθδων. Z. Borkowski; confirmed from a photograph. Delete Δερμεθδων from L. Calderini, Dizionario dei nomi geografici, ii 2, p. 97, and Δερμεθδων κύμη from WB III p. 292.

289 2, 12, 15, etc. Expand the abbreviation λ# more probably to Λ(υκίων) Π(αρμεθδων) than to λ(υκίων) Π(ομεντής), cf. ibid. introd. See CPR V 1. 5 n.

304 (= SB X 10246) 12-13. For τα πήν prokèleîmenon κεφάλαιον read τα μεν π. κ. See XLIV 3198 14 ff. n.


310 (Description = SB X 10247) 2. Between διαν(εγραφήκεν) and γε(ρεικακολ) insert ιπ(ερ).

For (τους) a read α (τους).

4. Between μαθ(ηκτε) and διά insert a (τους).

See ZPE 19 (1973) 265-6.


III 413 162. For τῆ πλαγ(ε)ία δύο διά read τῆ πλαγ(ε)ία θύρα. See CPR V 17. 8 n.

IV 722 27. For ἧχ(αλέ) read and restore Ἥχ(αλελ). 30. For οδῷς ἐπιξά read and restore οδῷ μέλρους τράπων οὐδένι. See ZPE 20 (1976) 59.

VI 891 11. The suggestion θ' ρ' μας, made in a footnote to XXXI 2569 (pp. 117-18), is withdrawn. Closer inspection has shown that what was taken for the descender of ρθω is a riser from an extravagant flourish on the xi of ἄγγιστο in 10, which descends to touch 12 and rises again almost to touch 11. J. R. Rea.

VII 1016. The terminus post quem for this manuscript of Plato, Phaedrus, has been raised to A.D. 235 by the re-dating of the recto (VII 1044). See ZPE 21 (1976) 14.
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

1031. For ἡμιαράθῳ read ἡμιαράθῳ. This reference is given under μέτρων ἡμιαράθων in WB III p. 362 col. ii, but the correction is not in BL I–VI or in W. Chr. 343. Delete ἡμιαράθῳ from LSJ. J. R. Rea.


1104. For τὸν τῶν πολεμικῶν ἔπις – τρισθυμ ἔπις τὸν τῶν πολεμικῶν τραγῳδή (τη). For τ. (.) read τραγῳδή. See XLIV 3193 introd.

1116. For ὁμήρου read φιλόμε. See HSCP 79 (1975) 17 n. 50.

1127. For διὰ τὸν τε (over, probably, ἕ) τόπο καὶ τὸ περιτερέων. J. R. Rea.

IX 1204. For Ζηνογένειος read Ζηνογένε. See XLV 3246 introd.


X 1249. See J. Vaio, Babrius 110. 3–4, in Philologus 117 (1973) 140–1.

XII 1405. See under XLIII 3105 3–4.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

XXVI 2438. See I. Gallo, Una nuova biografia di Pindaro (P. Oxy. 2438), Salerno, 1968.
2450. See D. C. Kurtz, The Man-eating Horses of Diomedes in Poetry and Painting, in JHS 95 (1975) 171-2 and Pl. XVIII.

2460 fr. 5 recto. For Διόςκουρι|ά|ν read Διόςκουρι|α|ν. The name Διόςκουρι|α|ν is exceedingly rare; Διόςκουρ|ι|α|ν is much more likely. J. R. Rea.


XXXIV 2715. The first copy should have Τροκ[τό]ρφος restored after Ε[φ]ρο|ν. The second copy actually has Τροκ(τό)ρφος, cramped and very faded. Suggested by J. C. Shelton; confirmed from the originals.

XXXVIII 2843. For eιποκ(?) read ιποκ. See PfPE 20 (1976) 58-60.
2861 9-10 n. In the third sentence for ‘former’ read ‘converse’. J. D. Thomas.


XL Introd. p. 6. The wrong equation 5 modii = 1 artaba is based on bad arithmetic, see ZPE 13 (1974) 195-6. On the sizes of the various modii and artaba measures see now ZPE 21 (1976) 43-62.
2895 i 19-20. For Τ[...], κλ...κον read [κλ...]κον. R. A. Coles. A very small trace to the left of λ near the foot suits only a diagonal, e.g. of α. Most of the gap is occupied by the arms of κ and the main part of α.

XXXVIII 2843 25. For ιποκ(?) read μποκ. See ZPE 20 (1976) 58-60.
2861 9-10 n. In the third sentence for ‘former’ read ‘converse’. J. D. Thomas.

XXVIII 2803. See under XXXII 2619.
2820. See GRBS 16 (1973) 293-93 for a new assessment by N. Lewis, using the following new readings:
4. For [...], κον read [κον]. R. A. Coles. A very small trace to the left of λ near the foot suits only a diagonal, e.g. of α. Most of the gap is occupied by the arms of κ and the main part of α.

XLII 3006 10. For parallels see ZPE 16 (1975) 76.
3028 introd. para. 3. The practice of keeping grain on the threshing-floor till government commitments were met is now attested by P. Petaus 53 of A.D. 184/5, over 100 years earlier than X 1255. J. C. Shelton.
3030 3 n. (p. 94 para. 3). In the list of receipts after ‘131/2 P. Tebt. 361;’ add ‘143/4 BGU I 299;’. J. C. Shelton.
3036-45 introd. Add PUG I 19 to the table of receipts for ενθηκέφαλων πόλεως. See Rev. hist. de droit franç. et étr. 53 (1975) 511. (The plate (PUG Tav. XI) allows the possibility of reading the date in line 4 as θ" [καί] θ" = A.D. 314/15 instead of θ" [καί] θ"
ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

304/5. The Athenodorus who signed the receipt is presumably the systates of that name who appears in PSI V 462 of a.d. 314/15. J. R. Rea.

307 translation (p. 28). Before 'to undertake' insert 'immediately'. See AJP 97 (1976) 190.

308 n. add fin. For XX 2273 1 read XXVII 2473 1.


3117 n. Add a reference to 18 (1975) 308, where attention is drawn to another occurrence of the title o impavicTaroc rraic = nobilissimus puer, used this time of Flavius Honorius, consul a.d. 386 and future emperor. J. R. Rea.

3120 For to IV, role] x-rarroc read probably to β', ρ[εXX[ovciv] vnaToec. Dr. Dieter Flagedorn pointed out that none of the parallels, collected by him in JPE 10 (1973) 131–4, has the article. The traces are very badly damaged, but the lack of space confirms that role did not appear here either. J. R. Rea.

3123 The word opdoypdpoc occurs also in Archiv 2 (1902–3) p. 219 l. 26 in a Christian sub-literary text. G. H. Roberts.

3124 For το ιx[AAouct]v-rraroic read probably το β', μ[εXX[lovec] υπάτος. Dr. Dieter Hagedorn pointed out that none of the parallels, collected by him in ZPE 10 (1973) 131–4, has the article. The traces are very badly damaged, but the lack of space confirms that τοίς did not appear here either. J. R. Rea.

3130. The word ὀρθογράφος occurs also in Archiv 2 (1902–3) p. 219 l. 26 in a Christian sub-literary text. G. H. Roberts.

3131 For p. , (vac.) the suggestion na(pd), made in AJP 97 (1976) 190, does not appear to satisfy the traces. J. R. Rea.

3134. In the last line of the translation (p. 118) for 'Sarapion' read 'Serenus', see text line 12.

3150 n. Add a reference to Aurelia Tarilla daughter of Philadelphus in P. Merton III 124 of a.d. 520. She is clearly distinct from Tarilla d. of Praous in XVI 1995 of a.d. 542 and also not particularly likely to be identical with the Tarilla in 3150.

3169 60, 92. For Πενθερεότας read Πενθερέωτας, a woman's name. Correct translation and index accordingly. J. R. Rea.

P. Fay. 39. 1–2. For μεθυστή τέλον ξερω(Δ) Βουκάλ(ων) read μεθυστή τέλον ξεροπουκάλ(ων). See ZPE 16 (1975) 77–9.


392. 38. For Ἰσαάκις read Κανιμής. See ZPE 21 (1976) 16.

441 (Description). Text in ZPE 16 (1975) 55–8.


622 (Description). Text in ZPE 16 (1975) 54–5.
I. NEW LITERARY TEXTS

3209. Alcman, Μέλη vi

An end-title reveals these scraps to be remnants of a roll of bk. 6 of the μέλη of Alcman. The identification is due to Dr. Rea. An ambiguous notice in the Suda apart (see below), this is the first testimony of the sixth book of μέλη; on the basis of that notice, one supposes it to be the final such book. The papyrus gives us suggestive remains of the last few lines, most substantially of the last two, but their precise import is hidden.

The metre is of some interest. Five out of the last seven lines (fr. 1) have their first few syllables more or less intact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Syllables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>κλός φερ [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>εκάρποσ τ [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>δ' εὐθύς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>δ' ἀφ' ψήλω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(ult.) δύμον απ' ἀκρφ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We may synthesize as $x – o – x – [$.

The uniformity is remarkable. The following citations may be compared:

1. A restoration of PMG 2 (iv) (XXIV 2389 fr. 3(a)) 3–7 giving three and a half consecutive iambic tetrameters was suggested by Barrett (Gnomon 33 (1961) 685); the incorporated lemma is said by ps.-Herodian to have occurred ει τῇ δευτέρᾳ φονή (‘no doubt of Bk. 1’; Lobel: this is supported by the context of the citation). PMG 15 (bk. 1?) may be a single such verse. Cf. PMG 92(d), PMG 79.

2. PMG 59(a) consists of two consecutive iambic trimeters catalectic, $x – o – x |

3. PMG 14 has three otherwise unconnected lines of the form $x – o – o | – x – o – –$, analysed by Heliodorus as a catalectic iambic trimeter of a type admitting a spondee in the fourth foot. At least one of these lines occurred in company with

---

1 $\pi$ means presumed anceps element occupied in the given instance by a long syllable; similarly $o$, $x$ signifies that $o$ and $x$ are both attested.
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

dactylic cola; the fourth-foot alternation is attested ‘in primo’ (sc. libro, one presumes; Priscian III 428 Keil). Cf. the lemma of the beginning of a poem at PMG 5 (XXIV 2390) fr. 2 i 22–3 as supplemented by Page, cē Mā]c ἄλεσαμαι τ[αν]τῶν μάλτα.

(4) One of several lengths labelled ‘alcaenicum’ by Servius is the ‘iambic trimeter brachycatalectic’, \( \overbrace{\text{- - -} / \text{- - -}}^{\text{- - -}} \), PMG 161(ε); cf. PMG 174.

(5) PMG 20 consists of four and a half consecutive iambic dimeters, \( \overbrace{\text{- - -} / \text{- - -}}^{\text{- - -}} \) \( e'ν \tau\delta ι'ε', \) Athen. x 416d. PMG 110 and 121 are single such lines. PMG 59(b) has another, with different but allied cola fore and aft.

(6) The metrical structure of PMG 89 is uncertain, but it contains several cola which begin with iambic movement, as well as several which do not. Cf. PMG 41, PMG 16.

For the iambo-trochaic (rather than κατὰ μέτρον iambic) nature of some of these lengths, see A. M. Dale, CQ 13 (1963) 48–9 (= Collected Papers, 117–18).

There is no proof that cola of different movement were not used in this final strophe or poem, but the papyrus gives strong presumptive evidence. The uniformity points in fact to composition κατὰ στίχον. On the one hand we have the several sequences of identical iambic cola listed under (1), (2), and (5) above (PMG 2 (iv), 19, 59(α), 96, 20), on the other we have attestation of homogeneous composition in other metres, διὰ ἔξιον ἕνωκα (Heph. 12: PMG 46), διὰς στραφάς of catalectic dactylic tetrameters (Heph. 43: PMG 27), four consecutive dactylic hexameters (PMG 26), a pair of cretic hexameters (PMG 58), and the peculiar testimony of Heph. π. σημείων 4, p. 74 Consr. (PMG 161(α)), of fourteen-stanza poems, the first seven stanzas being in one metre, the second seven in another. I do not know whether Hesychius’ entry in κλεψάμβατι (Ἀριστοκένων: μέλη τυν παρ' Αλκμάνι) is also relevant. It is a reasonable supposition, though in the present state of the evidence it can be no more than a tentative one, that we have here a stichic iambic composition: whether in tetrameters, catalectic trimeters, or dimeters, I cannot say, but if the end-title is centred, it will be one of the shorter lengths.

The statement in the Suda runs ἔγραψε βιβλία σ' μέλη καὶ Κολυμβώκας. It is now clear that this is to be taken as attesting six books of μέλη, and this is a welcome piece of clarification. But are we now to read ἔγραψε βιβλία σ' μελ' ὁς', καὶ Κολυμβώκας, implying that the Κολυμβώκα are something apart from the six books of μέλη, or ἔγραψε βιβλία σ', μέλη καὶ κολυμβώκας, implying (despite the fact that the general title was simply μέλη, witness 3209 and XXIV 2392) that κολυμβώκα are a constituent of the six books? The Κολυμβώκας remain as enigmatic as ever, and now that we are no longer free to adopt Mr. Lobel’s hitherto phenomena-saving suggestion that there were five books of μέλη and one entitled Κολυμβώκας (P. Oxy. XXIV p. 8 n.), it is more likely than before that there is corruption (cf. J. A. Davison, Proc. IX Int. Congr. Pap. 35–8 = From Archilochus to Pindar, 179–83). 

1 Might not κολυμβώκας, by graphic error, be hiding μελαιμβάκα or μελαιμβ(κάς) φάς;? (But I will not conceal the principal objection to this, namely that the single certain attestation of the word
There is a bare possibility, raised by γαμ[ at fr. 4. 3 and certainly not contradicted by the main fragment, that the pieces under this number are from a marriage-song.\(^1\) (Leonidas of Tarentum calls Alcman τὸν ἵμηρον ὀμηναίῳ.) If so, it is of interest that Sappho’s final book appears to have been constituted mainly of epithalamia (see Lobel, Cάσφος Μέλη, xiii–xv, Page, Sappho and Alcaeus, 112–19, 126). It may be worth observing that all the Aacman quotations in catalectic trimeters (cited under (2) above) are compatible with their belonging to such a class of song.\(^2\)

The text is written in a round and upright hand of fairly common type (comparable with, for example, the rather stiffer XXVIII 2494), assigned a date within the first half of the second century. There is nothing remarkable about the lection signs. I find no trace of a second hand. The back is blank.

Fr. 1

...Μ

κλεοσφερ[ι

κ,κυροεικατ[ι

βδιυνυς.

Χωδαφυηλω[

 advocat[ι

πολυναπακρω[ι

[ι]λεκμανος[ι

μελιμβου, Diog. Laert. 6. 76, is applied not to melic iambics such as we seem to have in 3209 but to one of Cercidas’ dactylo-epitrite compositions. [Elsewhere the word is restored from μμιμβου; VIII 1082 fr. 4. 17, Cercidas’ end-title, may equally be μελιμβου or μμιμβου.]

In the next sentence, πρώτος δε εἰσήγαγε τὸ μῆτερτρος μελιδείς, I would delete μῆ (cf. ps.-Plut. de mus. 3, of Terpander’s proemia, τοις ἐπει . . . μήλῃ περιπλῆτα βίον).

1 In view of this possibility, it may be wondered whether Sappho fr. 117, ἱχαίρος ἀ νυμφά, χαρέτω δ’ ὁ γάμβρος, cited without attestation of authorship by Hephaestion Ench. iv 2 (p. 13 Consbr.), might find a better home in this poem or group of poems by Aacman: the metre is catalectic iambic trimeter. The only counter-indication that I see is that cod. U of Choeroboscus in Heph. iv (p. 220 Consbr.) transmits ἀνύμφη (with smooth breathing); but although this is the only relic of specifically aeolic prosody in the manuscripts at any of the three attestations, it is perhaps enough to uphold the traditional authorship.

2 ε’ may be as likely a correction as ε’ for the attribution at PMG 19, in view of its special liability to corruption.
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

The papyrus continues for a further 6.5 cm., blank.

Fr. 1 4., possibly a flat-topped sigma 5 ..., scattered specks, extending into left margin 6 [, trace just above letter-top level, close to ε, probably apostrophe or diastole, and medial speck to right on isolated fibre 7 Mostly stripped; some ink on the lower layer suggests original damage 8 ], oblique trace coming in to foot of χ: a rather than ε. After δ, if an apostrophe was written it will have been lost 11 ], tail of coromis? To the right of the name, a blot 14 ], indeterminate traces that I cannot account for.

Fr. 2

\[\nu\kappa\rho\beta\rho\omega[\]
\[\chi\nu\kappa\alpha\tau\rho[\]
\[\epsilon\nu\kappa\nu[\]
\[\tau\alpha...[\]

Fr. 3

\[\alpha\kappa\nu\nu[\]
\[\phi\omega\beta\omega[\]
\[\tau\epsilon\tau\rho[\]
\[\delta\eta\tau[\]

Fr. 3 1 The upper papyrus layer was deficient when the text was written. a: a corner of the papyrus is turned over and liable to become detached, but a is certain [, medial trace, apparently horizontal, perhaps ε 2, represented by tail and part of right-hand side 3, bottom half only 3 ], confused with offsets 4 ], two specks, positions suggesting a.

Fr. 2 1 [, low curve of e.g. c, or bottom left of δ 2 ]χγδ, tops only 3 ], perhaps 5 \[Apostrophe uncertain...[, traces anomalous: correction? 6 γ, τ, and final a very doubtful, represented by scattered specks 9 [, ε or τ, then rising curve, e.g. λ]
3209. ALCMAN, Μέλινοι

Fr. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 4 1 Indeterminate traces on lower papyrus layer 2 Second letter, if a single letter, represented by a low curve, perhaps θ or α. Longum not quite certain Above α, casual ink (rather than accent)? 6], perhaps ε.

Fr. 5 1 ], oblique coming in to base of β, suggesting a [ traces on isolated fibre 2 μ, or λ, less good.

Fr. 6 3 Perhaps line end 7 Or ]η, if; π is on a displaced bit of papyrus.

Remaining: (1) a scrap with indeterminate traces of perhaps three or four letters; (2) a piece (3-2 x 6-5 cm.) with horizontal fibres on both sides, probably therefore to be linked with fr. 2 and the lower half of fr. 1 (see at fr. 2): it has very slight traces of ink on either side; and (3) several small pieces, either blank or as near blank as makes no difference.

Fr. 1 3 Poets confer κλός on others, but it might be thought more likely that Alcman is concerned with his own κλός: does the Muse (or Muses) bring it?

κλός, not κλός, probably because of original intervocalic digamma: so Κλεομάκρα in the Louvre Parthenéion 72, and Κλέω regularly in the Laconian inscriptions. But πυλεών at XXIV 2387 fr. 3 ii 5 (= PMG 3, 65) without such justification. Cf. on εὐδοκέ, line 6 below.

4 κφίροςκα is acceptable. Such behaviour is surely too undignified for a Muse; perhaps a πορφίνος?

(I do not know if there is any relevance in the horse imagery at Alcm. 1. 50 ff. Anacreon has κεφαρτίν in an extended girl-foal metaphor, PMG 417. 15.)

6 δ' δ' εὐδοκέ rather than δ' δ' εὐδοκέ? Is the subject Alcman himself, or, if this is a wedding-song, the bridegroom? εὐδοκέ not εδ' εὐδοκέ, for c appears to be followed by a διαστολέ, clarifying the articulation (which otherwise might be ambiguous, εὐδοκέ or εὐδοκέ); for the high position of the sign see XLIV 3153 563 n. Less probably εὐδ' ε', the sign being an apostrophe (Alcman has ε' as well as ε' as attested for him by Apollonius Dyscolus, PMG 70). For the final letter, the location of the specch excludes only ν among vowels.

eυδοκέ(ε) would be the expected spelling. Lyric papyri often vary in the extent of dialectal thoroughness. Non-laconization again at line 8 below.

8 δ' χ' makes an acceptable reading, ξ' χ' and δ' χ' are excluded. δ' χ' nominative or accusative? δ' χ' υψηλάδ: singular or plural? δ' χ' (δ' χ') appears in wedding-song context at Sappho 44. 27 (δείγ' μελός δάριον ήκα πλεσθες νησίδα μελός), [Hes.] Sat. 279 (πέρι δέ σφακων δραπετον δάριον), cf. Eurip. IA 1009 (Υφέβαλος . . . εκέκαυσα θηρίον), Theoc. 18. 8 (οπω δ' δαχτύλ ημέρας' ψέματος), and for δ' χ' Bacchyl. 23. 3, Alc. G 2. 34. But the word is of course not restricted to such context. Frequently of the sound of musical instruments. An alternative articulation would be δ' χ' δ'.
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

The following fragments were referred to in the introduction to XXIV 2389, a commentary on Alcman, where they were described by Mr. Lobel as 'a few very much tattered and rubbed prose fragments, perhaps also a commentary, in variant A'. I have been unable to elicit any coherent sense from them, but it is clear that the work represented is a commentary, and the internal evidence goes some way towards justifying a presumption that these are further fragments of the same manuscript as frs. 1–34 of 2389. Sappho is twice mentioned (1. 9, 12), but a probable mention of Archidamus (2. 6) suggests that Alcman may be the poet under discussion.

Mr. Lobel, at 2389, identifies other manuscripts that apparently proceed from the hand of the same scribe and isolates their various distinguishing features. XXXIV 2694 was claimed in BICS 7 (1960) 46 for the same man (wrongly, in my view), and I should have judged that he was responsible for XXV 2430, a somewhat larger version of what Mr. Lobel designates variant A (the coronides of 2430 may be compared with that of 2389 fr. 4). Mr. Lobel assigns the hand to the second half of the first century.
3210. **COMMENTARY ON ALCMAN?**

Fr. i  
Col. i  
Col. ii  

(a)  

(b)  

(c)  

Fr. 1  

In many places the surface is so rubbed that the letters have almost completely or have completely disappeared. Where the damage is less severe and scattered traces survive I have reported those that represent a restricted choice of letters. Where no traces remain I have put square brackets, provided that there is reason for believing that letters once stood there. All supralinear additions and corrections are to be understood as being by the second hand unless otherwise stated.

Alignment of the verso and recto fibres establishes, I think, that the positions of (a) and (b) relative to each other and to (c) are as shown.

Col. i 3 ], upright, perhaps π , oblique, compatible with α 4 δ, a dot below is evidently accidental 3, mid-stroke prolonged 6 3, descender only 8 3, or o 1, upright 3, apex: λ 9 3, or η 10 3, compatible with ow 11 ], perhaps λs; the next three letters hardly ες, not δως; then ευ unverifiable ' ...', several traces, the last an upright 12 3, or ε, less good ... a high and a middle speck; traces of a possible upright; upright and top bar (γ, τ); high speck of another letter: εραπ, εικ, την, possible inter alia 13 ], apparent upright, followed by low trace: ν (εν) and κ (εικ) are possibilities 14 3, or λ, μ 1, perhaps κ 1 (ad fin.), anomalous: low trace suggesting upright followed by stroke sloping forwards and extending.
slightly below line: ερ, α? 15 . (ante ϵ), compatible with π . (ante ν), upright, rubbed clean to right 16 . (tert.), upright with hook or bar to right at top 17 . . (post ν), specks, an upright, a low curve, two specks one low one above line 18 . (quart.), γ, π, τ . . . . . , what remains appears to be a horizontal bar with an upward curl at right. At the end, some fainter traces that extend up to the previous line, possibly offsets 20 . , low horizontal, §?

Col. ii 3 . , either a lemma in ecthesis (perhaps α[ ]) or a marginal siglum (cf. e.g. 2389 fr. 9 ii).

Fr. 2

\[
\text{Tef (?)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{γ} & . \text{παι[ ]} \\
\ldots & \text{εκε[ ]} \\
\ldots & \text{ρ. . . idap[ ]} \\
\text{τα. . . Εκπ. . . . . . . [ ] }
\end{align*}
\]

5

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{αρχιδ[ ]} \\
\text{. . α[ . . [ ]} \\
\text{. . ηρ[ . . . . . . . . [ ]} \\
\text{τη. . . παρατηγα[ ]}
\end{align*}
\]

10

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ατετρ[ . . ραφεθαι[ ]} . \text{φ. . . ρεθμ[ ]} \\
\text{υπερεκτυγαμ[ ]} \\
\text{ιοφαμρ[ . . μοι[ . . [ ]} \\
\text{. . ος[ . ]}
\end{align*}
\]

15

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{φατοστ[ ]} \\
\text{αιει', . . η[ ]} \\
\text{. . αυτω[ ]}
\end{align*}
\]

20

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ανηγ[ ]} \\
\text{ειδες[ ]} \\
\text{υφι[ ]}
\end{align*}
\]

25

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ρεχεσεσεωσ[ ]} \\
\text{θο' [ . . οι[ . . ]} \\
\text{αρ' . ία[ . . η[ [ ]}
\end{align*}
\]

Foot (?)
3210. COMMENTARY ON ALCMAN?

Fr. 2 3 [, upright] After π, perhaps α or ω; then scattered specks before τ, of which the most considerable is apparently oblique, running upwards from left to right: χ neither excluded nor particularly suggested. μ less good, for the left hasta is quite vertical. After π, perhaps ε. Before α, two uprights. Before τ, perhaps δ. 10 , , first, upright curving to right at top, second, upright, third, speck at letter-top level. 11 , anomalous: extending below the line and sloping backwards; hardly ρ. After π, perhaps ε. 16 , , perhaps ρ. 20 , seemingly two uprights, perhaps π. 21 ε, or π. 22 τ, or η. 23 (ante θ); high trace, perhaps top of oblique. 14, low curve: probably ε, or ω. 24 , a mere speck, represented by two apparent uprights with suggestion of mid-stroke. 25 , a low curve: a, ε, o, ω. 26 ο, apparently by 1st hand: the surface is stripped above the line, so that there is room for up to three letters after α. 27 , bottom of upright. 28 , several traces, one perhaps an upright; a sublinear speck may be accidental. 29 , two strokes meeting at top to form an apex, the first more vertical than horizontal, the second more horizontal than vertical. 30 , first, upright with top bar to right (γ, ε, π?), second, upright with hook to right at top (ε, ε?)

Fr. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i</th>
<th>Col. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ρη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>ευκαρη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, θαυη</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ατονα[,].</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ανταμενη</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, πη[,].ο [, ο</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, ε</td>
<td>φηςς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, γοντος</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, μοχεξεθαι [</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[, β[</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 3 This fragment probably belongs above fr. 4, for in each fragment the script of the first column is rather small and cramped, whereas that of the second is larger than usual. They do not evidently join, however, and the distance between them cannot be determined.

a, b, in upper margin, in hand; apparently line beginnings.

Col. i 2 , high trace, compatible with τ. , probably a letter in suspension at the end of the line. 4 π, or τ, or τ. 5 , upright. 6 , four uprights, with mid- or high stroke between second and third. 8 , upright, probably τ or γ. Col. ii 1 , , or . , upright 3 ι, or δ. 4 ι, better than τ, μ, or π.
### NEW LITERARY TEXTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 4</th>
<th>Fr. 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col. i</td>
<td>Col. ii</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>
<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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col. i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Col. i</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 Col. i 5 ψ, or φ | Fr. 5 10 ρ, descender only |
| Fr. 5 1 (sec. et tert.), uprights | Fr. 6 6 9, or θ, [, low trace, perhaps of upright |
| Fr. 6 2 [, low trace of upright or oblique | Fr. 7 Col. i 3 ], τ, γ |
Fr. 1 10–13 Talk of vowels and consonants, but I cannot elicit the word or principle under discussion.

10–11 διὰ δύναινον[τῶν, 'with two vowels', εὐμφώνων λιθείς, 'ends in x? consonants'.

Hephaestion, discussing 'lengthening by position', divides the phenomenon into five categories and quotes a verse supposedly from Alcman to illustrate the first, that represented by words that terminate in two consonants (λίθεις εὐ τῶν εὐμφώνων); καὶ κῆρος εὐ καλλιεργεῖσας πολλαῖς ἴμενος μάκαρε ἄνήρ (Ench. 1 3, p. 2 Costbruch, = PMG 15). But I am far from sure that there is relevance in this; it leaves διὰ δύναινον[τῶν unaccounted for. [The same goes for other doctrine on such words. No. 16 of Theodosius' examples of masculine declensions lays down the rule that nouns ending in two consonants keep two <c>ov unaccounted for. [The same goes for other doctrine on such words. No. 18 of Theodosius' Hephaestion, discussing 'lengthening by position', divides the phenomenon into five categories and

12 λίθεις, λίθεοι are two of many possibilities. Presumably ψωμία[των should be too short, for the lines of XXVI 2389 whose lengths are guaranteed vary between 29 and 35 letters. Then εὐ εὐμφώνων is a possible reading.

15 All is doubtful here. Possibly something on the lines of περὶ[τῶν εὐκτικα πρότειν [ὁτι (kappa is unverifiable), but πρότειν is not a normal formula. The orthography of κινία was treated by Herodian in his καθολική προσεβεία. He stated (a) that it should be written with one sigma (κινία not κινία), and (b) that the iota is long (κινία, καὶ κινία or κινία). (a) on grounds of its derivation from the future of κινούμενον, (b) in accordance with the general rule regarding the quantity of the penultimate syllable of nouns and adjectives in -ca (Lentz i 266. 13–16, 445. 28 f., ii 536. 11 f.; i 533. 13–19, ii 12. 11–16; ii 455. 13–16). This whole line of inquiry is dubious in the extreme, and I see no way of controlling it. κινία is not attested for Alcman or Sappho, and I have not found any other suitable word that is.

16 There is little hope of reading what precedes περὶ; presumably this is the name of some authority. If περὶ is rightly read and the line ends here (faint traces hereabouts seem to be offsets), hardly the etymological formula παρὰ τό, 'derived from'.
and last words or phrases of a lemma. If it is the second such sequence that represents ἓως, I cannot suggest what the preceding word might be nor put forward plausible alternative readings. If it is the first, ἒκοσμησεὶς suggests itself as the next word (and φῶς ὑπὲρ could be supplied in 24, and cf. Ὅμηλοι in 23?), but then the lemma is neither Lesbian nor Alcmanic.

26 Perhaps ἀπαλω. If so, not in extant Sappho, Alcaeus, or Alcman.

27 It might be worth mentioning the possibility of βηρέων [τά]ξειν, 'grave accent'.

Fr. 3 Col. i 6 Perhaps λέοντος, but even so not necessarily introducing a lemma.

7 I see no connection with Alcm. 1. 63 (which is treated in 2389 6 ii), or for that matter with Sappho 60. 7L-P.

Col. i 3 Apparently a mention of Ascalaphus, whether as son of Ares and Astyoche (Homer) or as informer against Persephone in the underworld (Ovid, Apollodorus, late mythographers and commentators). A probability in favour of the former is established by the suspicion that Ascalaphus' name and place in the Persephone legend may not be prehellenistic and by the suggestion of a martial context in μάχεσθα at i 7. I would think that neither ἄκαθολον nor ἀκαλα 'unhoed' (Theoc. x 14) need be considered.

Fr. 4 Col. i 1, 2 ἔμειρεν, [ἐ]κεῖνοι: presumably in paraphrase or explication, cf. ἔμυκε at 2389 6 ii 31.

Fr. 5 7 κόλαθος: not a book reference, for they are not given according to the roll. I may say that I have attacked fr. 2. 12 with κόλαθος in mind, without succeeding in extracting anything coherent from that line.

3211. Lyric Verses

The two scraps published under this number were not found together and there is nothing to show that they came from the same roll. The larger obviously contains verse and may reasonably be supposed to represent a lyrical verse text, what little survives of the other can be interpreted compatibly with lyric verse. But there is at present nothing useful, that I see, to be made of the text of the fragments. Their interest lies in the striking script. There is no doubt that the same hand wrote both, but fr. 1 is stiffer with a sharp-pointed α and a straight-backed ε, fr. 2 relaxed and rounded. Common to the two are an exceptional treatment of the right-hand apex of μ and the inordinate elongation of the stalks of stalked letters ρ, τ, ν, φ. I suppose that a comparison with such manuscripts as 1233 and 2307 and a dating in the second half of the second century will not be far astray.
Fr. 1

\[ \text{εκ, . . .[} \] 
\[ \text{τεφαν, [} \] 
\[ \text{δεκωμ[,} \] 
\[ \text{α [} \] 

Fr. 2

\[ \text{ναλαςέλπιδ[} \] 
\[ \text{ρ . . χα, η[} \] 
\[ \text{γαμιαδα, έομ[} \] 
\[ \text{ζυγιοιωμακαρτ[} \] 

Fr. 1 If lyric verses are represented—the short line, l. 4, supports the hypothesis—some part or derivative of ετέφανος may be to be recognized in l. 2, some part or derivative of κόμως in l. 3. Cf. e.g. Pind. Pyth. viii 19 seq. ... ἐτέφαναμένων ... κόμως.

Fr. 2 3 seq. ...γαμιαδα δασκο[., ζυγιοιωμακαρτ[., the prima facie likely articulations.

5 χροσεαν ἄγκα, [. ἄναγκα, [. not worth considering as an alternative.

3212. LYRIC VERSES

Second century

The following remains may reasonably be described as representing a lyric composition. There appear to be no dialectal peculiarities except α for γ (and this is consistent with a source in dramatic lyrics), unless κλειδ[., l. 3, represents some form of κλειδίως or εκκλειδίως (Pind. Øl. i 110, Pyth. ix 91; Bacchyl. vi 16).

Written slowly in a spaced, upright, rounded capital of average size by a hand which may be compared to those of 211, 220, 1249 and assigned to the second century.
Rubbed; in some places the ink has completely disappeared. To judge by the margins to left of and below the text this was a copy of good quality.

1 The end of a stroke from left touching the stalk of τ about the middle; a possible ω opposite ends of the base; perhaps parts of separate letters ζι of ι only the top, but I think not ε χ would certainly be taken for λ; there is no sign of the right-hand branch between γ and ε the foot of an upright; τ likely only the left-hand side [, the foot of a stroke hooked to right 2 ], three disjointed traces of a partly circular or triangular letter 3 [, a low upright, followed by the upper left-hand part of a circle, ϵ rather than ο Before χ a short flat stroke level with the top of the letters After ζ, which is anomalous, a thick dot, level with the top of the letters, and a speck below and slightly to right on the line; ται not verifiable [, a triangular letter and, after a blank, another; prima facie λα [, an upright with a small loop to left of its foot; if a, anomalous 4 ], the right-hand end of a cross-stroke touching the top of ο Of υ only the tip of the left-hand branch and the foot 5 [, the top of a small circle or loop [, a dot above general level 6 ], the lower part of a stroke curving down from left; λ or α?, 7 γ and ζι represented only by the bottom of the loops ...[, on the line a small hook, open to right; the upper end of a stroke rising to right; the lower part of an upright 7], the right-hand side of a circle 8 θ could not be ruled out for ζ ζι, on the line the base of a circle

3213. Lyric Verses in 'Doric'

Second century

The piece, of which parts of eight verses are preserved in this scrap of a roll copied by the same hand as 1092 (Hdt. ii), was also copied by at least one other scribe, the writer of 2443, the same verses being represented by 3213 1 seq. and 2443 fr. i, 11 seq. 2443 was tentatively attributed to Pindar (fr. dub. 345 Sn), but the text as now constituted has formal features that prima facie rule out all but Alcman of the known lyric poets that come into consideration as author. So far as I can judge from what

1 Besides 1092 this copyist is recognized in PSI 1390 (Euphorion), PSI 1391 (commentary on lyric, now identifiable as 2622, Pindar?), and other manuscripts as yet unpublished, both extant authors (Hdt. iii, Plato, Phaedo) and new text (commentary on Odyssey xxii). To these must be added both the text and the marginalia of the Alcaeus in 2297, the text distinguished from all the rest by the employment of a shallow 'catena' -topped μ, instead of a deep v-centred μ, and of ω with a high central cusp, instead of ω with a nearly flat base.

A considerable number of small scraps, some susceptible to grouping, I have failed to identify either as from one of the identified rolls or from some other identifiable author.
survives I doubt whether I could have arrived at this conclusion on grounds of matter or style.

Of the additions (lection signs, and variants or corrections) that have been made, some it seems rather arbitrarily, to the text most look to me as if they might be due to one pen, and that the original hand's.

\[
\begin{align*}
\mu\alpha.. & \varepsilon\nu\kappa \omicron\beta\omicron\iota\iota[ ]\nu\tau\epsilon\mu\mu\nu[ ]
\\ & \varepsilon\kappa\tau\nu \varepsilon\alpha\nu\gamma\iota\omicron\omicron \mu\iota[ ]
\\ \omega & \delta\varepsilon\iota\delta\iota\acute{\alpha} \omega \cdot \gamma \nu \iota \kappa \acute{\iota} \acute{\iota} \acute{\iota} \iota.
\\ & \tau\alpha\acute{\iota} \delta \phi\delta \eta \tau \alpha\omicron \iota \omega \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota \iota
\\ & \delta \iota \acute{\iota} \acute{\iota}
\\ & \tau \alpha \acute{\iota} \delta \phi\delta \eta \tau \alpha\omicron \iota \omega \iota \iota \iota
\\ & \acute{\iota} \tau \epsilon \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \alpha \nu
\\ & \tau \alpha \acute{\iota} \delta \phi\delta \eta \tau \alpha\omicron \iota \omega \iota \iota \iota
\\ & \delta \iota \acute{\iota} \acute{\iota}
\\ & \tau \alpha \acute{\iota} \delta \phi\delta \eta \tau \alpha\omicron \iota \omega \iota \iota \iota
\\ & \acute{\iota} \tau \epsilon \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon \alpha \nu
\\ & \tau \alpha \acute{\iota} \delta \phi\delta \eta \tau \alpha\omicron \iota \omega \iota \iota \iota
\\ & \delta \iota \acute{\iota} \acute{\iota}

\end{align*}
\]

The top of the column. The upper part of the piece is split and wrinkled and has a darkened area in which ink is sometimes only uncertainly distinguishable. There is also a sprinkling of black marks sometimes not distinguishable from ink. 2443 fr. 1, 11 seq. resolves some doubts in vv. 1 seq. 1 seq. The contribution of 2443 fr. 1, 11 seq. between half-brackets. In l. 12 κατοικίας is written. 1 λ is not verifiable; between ω and ε there are only two or three dots level with the top of the letters. 2 See note 2. The upper part of the coronis scoured off, but clearly the middle of the coronis was not abreast of the paragraphus. Above 5 the lower part of an upright 4 At an interval from 50 the upper part of an upright 5 much distorted, but I see no likelier choice. 8 Of g only the upper part; θ may be a possible alternative.

1 μα, is preceded by a short line ending \(\omicron\circ\). 2443 fr. 1, 10. 3 Λευκόθεαν: though it might be possible to devise a construction for the accusative singular, the prima facie likelihood is Λευκόθεαν ... τέμενος. Λευκόθεαν by extension for Nereids is reported at Et. Mag. (Gen.) 561, 45. 4 Μυρίακος (Μυρίακος) δε ν υ μόνον την Λευκόθεαν Ιησούς φημι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς Νερήδας Λευκόθεαν ἀνομάζει, and Hesych. Λευκόθεαν πάσας αἱ φόνταις is presumed to mean something of the same sort.

Pausanias says that there were many τεμένης of the Nereids (ii 1, 8), and mentions a particular one at Cardamyle in Messenia (iii 26, 7). Since there is no metrical reason for the choice, Λευκόθεαν for Νερήδας might contain a clue.

Since -θ is represented by -ς in its only other occurrence, l. 6, -ςαι would have been consistent here. There can be no reasonable doubt that 2443 had nothing but -σαμ, but I am confident that ε in the present manuscript was converted (? by a different pen) from ω, and though I cannot affirm that θ was made from ε by closing the opening, it has an anomalous look and I am not sure whether it has been given its central stroke.

[νεράτοι, supplied by 2443, looks too much for the space by not less than an average letter. 2 έκ... διάφων: in phrases of this form (and the parallel, where the genitive precedes ἐξανών however articulated), which are found in all kinds of hexameter verse, but as far as I can discover in no lyric verse but here, the genitive is usually a place-name, or something more or less equivalent, or the scene of an activity. Thus, e.g., Ἑφόρης Od. i 159, Callim. ἦθ. iv 43, Τριοίς Od. x 332, Αθιδίνων.}
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

Od. v 282, πομηφ τόν ἔργαν δίκα, ἐν χρόνιον τοὺς ἅγιους Άργον. ἄρθρ. 

vii 568, πολυμοίῳ Ἡ. vi 280, περάς ων Άργον. ἄρθρ. ii 165, βεβαιότερον Θεοκ. 

xxxv 87, ἔργαν v 2817 (Σέλεκος ἄργων Ἐρώτης). ἄρθρ. ii 459, γάμος Ἡλιόλοκος in 562, ἀγάμος (corr.) ἴ. 

«ων, θεῖόν οὖν τοὐχ. ἄρης, ἄρα ἄργων Άργον. ἄρθρ. iii 69). 

πτω, εἶναι: the dotted letter must be read either as γ or as ε, either anomalously formed and neither offering a recognizable meaning.

3-διάς δὲ γλυκεῖς: the i of διή ‘pomegranate’ is long at Nicand. Θρ. 72; 870, Ἀλεξ. 489; 609, short in Emped. and in the derivatives διόν Aristoph. Ν. 881, σώσοντος Ἀλεξ. 276. Pomegranates might be mentioned as significant in respect of the marriage envisaged in the next verses; n. Allen and 

Hölliday’s note on ly. ἴ. iii 372.

-άς: the shortening of the vowel in the accusative plural of words of the first declension is character- 

ized as Doric in places where this scansion is requisite (e.g., Ἰ. viii 378 schol. Α δὲ Ζευς... προφανείας... εὐκλέους τὴν τελευτάιαν... ἐπὶ δὲ ἄρατων Δώρων, similarly scholl. B (Herodian) and T) and in places where it is an alternative not metrically determinable (e.g., Θεοκ. i 93 schol. 

Η δὲ τὸ μοῖρον. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἔτοιμόνον, εἰπάμει γενικέω, εἰ ἀποτύπων ἂντάς πληθυ- 

νικῶν Δωρίκως.

Since there is here no ambiguity as between genitive singular and accusative plural and the quantity of ας is not metrically determinable, the ‘shorts’ have no critical function, but are themselves 

inferred from the doctrine, as being in a Doric text. The same appears to be true of ἐάκους-ων, 2394 

fr. 2(ε) 5, the only other instance I have found.

(4-άς guaranteed by the metre is recognized in the Alcman quotation, fr. 17, 5; it seems to have been 

now dismissed from the Stesichorus quotation, fr. 7, 2. There appear to be no examples in the book- 

texts of Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus, or Simonides.)

δω-ο.: as far as I know δως is not more Doric than δω; indeed I find it only a couple of times, 

in compounds in Pindar (Nem. iv 28, ΟI. ii 50). And o would in any case be scanned as long before γλ. 

γλυκεῖς: I can verify neither -άς, in the line, nor η, if that was superscribed. Except for Pindar 

and Bacchylides, there is a nearly complete lack of evidence about the representation of this ending in 

the παράδοσε of the relevant lyric poets. 2387 fr. 3 ii 3 (PMG 3) just fails to provide an instance for 

Alcman; -ας may be elicited from the quotations Alcmin. 6 (2391 fr. 21(ε) 2, a commentary), Alcm. 14, 

but the authority of quotations is slight.

There is a reasonable likelihood that ἄδεις testifies to -εια in the παράδοσε of Simonides (2430 

fr. 44, 8, PMG 519). [The agreement of the quotations (Simon. 48, 1; 103 fr. 1, 297, PMG 553; 608) 

can obviously have no significance in the case of the common form.]

] κεια[ at 2443 fr. 1, 4 may be relevant or not.

4 seq. I can give no account of what stands between δος and δη, which I can read only as πε, nor 

understand the construction of ποταμω[ι]ς, if the cancellation of a converting dative to genitive is to be 

accepted. [στέπῃ, i.e. ταί δε δη δη, does not seem excluded as a deciphemer (Ε. G. T.)]

There is no prima facie difficulty, if the dative is retained, in construing ‘they… prayed to the 

. . . river’, but there are obscurities left that I cannot resolve.

Genitives in -ω are characteristic of the παράδοσε of Alcman. They are replaced by genitives in -οι 

texts of Stesichorus, Simonides, Pindar, and Bacchylides, where -οι also is admitted (and is pre- 

ponderant in Ibycus, 1790); but not ω except in ‘Pindar’ fr. 333, in which ω is reported at (a) 6; 7 

but -ωω at (d) 19; 17. 2394 has several examples of genitive or accusative in which ω has ωω written 

above.

4. ταί δε: ἕραςαμαν μονοίς (2443 fr. 1, 8) and ἄνω (2443 fr. 1, 12 and 3213 2) imply a single 

male speaker. On the prima facie natural assumption that ταί is nominative plural, the first interpreta- 

tion that would occur to me is: they (women previously mentioned) prayed that they might achieve 

γάμον τελεύν and comparable locutions are always used in reference to a man who obtains a wife, 

not a woman who obtains a husband, thus: Hes. Cat. 204 δή ἔπληγμαν παλεύοντα γάμον, 211 5 seq. δε... 

ἐπέλεγεν... γάμον (Peleus), Callim. ἴ. Ἀπολ. τελεύν μέλλους γάμος (τι παύει), ἄρ. Ἐρώτης. 

(fr. 1161 ὁ... γάμον μενεῖαν τελεύτα (Jason), ἴ. 4 τοῖς δὲ γάμον ἐξεπέλετο, ἴ. Ἰμ. xix 35 ἐκ δὲ ἐπέλεγεν ἄνων (Hermes), Sapph. 112 1 seq. γάμπερ, κοί μὲν δὴ γάμος... ἐκτελέσατα. If this is not 

an imaginary difficulty, an alternative hypothesis might be to make the subject of the infinitive different
from the subject of the principal verb, the construction as in hy. Hom. vi 16 seq. ἔστιν τὸ ἐκατός εἶναι κοινῶς ἀλῇ. But in view of the multiple ambiguities and uncertainties of l. 4 I refrain from offering further speculations.

καλλιρωπόφωτη: if this and the next three verses are, as I suppose, dactylic tetrameters, καλλιρωπόφωτη must be recognized here and ends of lines at δέδομεν and χήρ. They would be written in couplets, the last dactyl in each being replaced by a cretic. Examples of this substitution, theoretically justified διὰ τῆν ἑπί τελος διάφορον Heph. Esth. xx 8, are not easy to find. Besides Archil. fr. 115, quoted by Hephaestion, and Theocr. epig. xx 2 I have nothing but 'Ibycus' 1790 i 24 (PMG 282) ἐπὶ 'Ελικονίδης ἀμβατος λαγός, where a final long seems inescapable.

6 seq. '... experience those things that are... to women and men'.

πατερόμενον made into πατερόμενον: the representation in certain places of θ as c is peculiar to texts of Alcman and is not found in any of the other lyric poets. It should by itself suffice to determine attribution.

-εῶν is inconsistent with -ῆν, l. 7; it has been brought nearer by superscribing η as an alternative (or correction). In company with c for θ what might be expected on the strength of the analogies in texts of Alcman is -εῶν (i.e. -εῦ), which represents -εῶν at Alcm. 1 17 (γαμεῖν), 43 (ἐπαίνει), 6 fr. 4, 4 (βῖλαι). But this apparent consistency may be fortuitous; -εῶν is spelt both -εῶν (ψαίνει sc. ἐν) and -εῦ (ἀιώνιον) in the same manuscript, 1 43, 88. Even wider divergences in the spelling of -εῶν are seen in what are taken to be manuscript of Stesichorus, πολύμεθα[v], 2617 fr. 4 18, σεργοῖς with o written below η, fr. 7 1 2, γαμεῦ 2618 fr. 1 ii 9. The single available example from Simonides presents the spelling -εῦ (ἀδώρων 2430 fr. 79, 12), from 'Ibycus' -εῦ (μυ]νεῦ 1790 (a) 12). (There is apparently an instance of -εῦ for -εῖν in Pindar, ἄγανον Pyth. iv 56 not metrically protected; neither Pindar nor Bacchylides has any instances of -η.)

[α]μα: I suppose the general sense must be 'desirable'. χάμα [αμα] does not seem to me very attractive and I should say was too long, but I have nothing better to offer.

7 κοινῆς is the only vocalization of the first syllable found in any other place, except that in a fragment of a papyrus in Florence, published by Snell as Pind. fr. dub. 1544, at col. ii 10 a verse begins κοινῇ], which may be a second instance of the same word and spelling.

κοινῆς ἀλογον is the only other instance of the word in a lyric poet (Stesich. 183 4, a quotation).

-δίας τῆς εἴδες [το]ύχειν seems clear enough; cf. (i) λέοντας... κοινῶν II. xx 39 seq. Ar. Pox 844 (κ.λ.), Thesp. 1122 (εἰςνυ καὶ γαμμίλους λέοντας); (ii) κοινῶδες... εἰκόνες γάμαν Ανθ. Pal. vi 133 (Αρχιλο¬χειον) (Finn. Pyth. ix 41 (αιδεῖας τοιχεῖν... εἴδες). But the genitive singular κοινῆς has been marked by means of a superscribed-ω-, -ε, as possibly a 'Doric' accusative plural. The same suggestion has not been made in regard to εἴδες, and for that reason may be considered negligible. If in fact there was an ambiguity in a text presenting only -ας -ας, it seems to point to [κα]χερ, compatible with either case, and to rule out [το]ύχειν, as the required supplement.

2394 (PMG 162) also contains fragments of lyric verses attributed to Alcman, like 3213, on the strength of dialectal characteristics. Between 2394 and 2443 there appears to be a correspondence of structure too marked to be dismissed as fortuitous but not exact enough to certify identity.

In the two tracts of text, one from each manuscript, shown below,

(a) two consecutive lines exhibit πε[ε]α[ε]α in the same vertical relation.

(The evident value of this fact may be, but is not necessarily, impaired by the fact that eα is followed by κ in 2443, a different letter, prima facie τ, in 2394.)

(b) three consecutive lines exhibit α[ε]α[ε]α in the same vertical relation.

In this apparent agreement there is some degree of illusion. 2443 has a whole line more than 2394, ending in another æ further to right by the breadth of a letter, or more, than αε in the preceding line, and consequently having ææ in a different 'longitude' from 2394.

If there is anything in these observations, it must be supposed that the two manuscripts had different layouts or states of preservation.

2394 fr. 1 i (b) 4 is:


and there are neither above nor below ends of lines extending as far to r.

2443 fr. 1, 7 is:


and there are both above and below ends of lines extending as far as -ας[ε], or farther.
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

2443 fr. 1, 1-7

2394 fr. 13 has no relation to fr. 1 i (b) 4, but ll. 3 seqq. compare as shown with 2443 fr. 1, 2 seqq.

fr. i, 1-7

[\textit{\[\pi\varepsilon\theta\varepsilon\]
\[\varepsilon\alpha\kappa\varepsilon\]
\[\kappa\varepsilon\alpha\varepsilon\]
\[\lambda\alpha\delta\varepsilon\varepsilon\]
\[\varepsilon\theta\[\ldots\].\varepsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\c].\kappa\tau\lambda.\}]

3214. Anthology (Euripides)

45 5B.58/B(1-2)a 10 \times 15 cm. Second century

A fragment of papyrus from the lower part of a single column, broken at either side. The piece is unusual among papyrus anthologies in that it is a professionally executed manuscript. The text is written on the recto, in a largish round, upright, and ornamented book-hand, the type conventionally known as ‘roman uncial’. This example does not have the lateral compression to which the style, like others, is prone: the letters are broad (omicron, for instance, has greater width than height), and the spacing between them is comparatively generous; not that the effect of distension is very marked, but it is an untypical palaeographical feature. P. Ryl. III 514 and P. Oxy. VIII 1084 are otherwise fairly similar; compare also XX 2260, XXIII 2354, XXXII 2634. (On the style see G. Cavallo, Annali della scuola normale superiore di Pisa, serie II, xxxvi (1967), 209-20, E. G. Turner, Greek Manuscripts, ad no. 13.) The hand may be assigned with some confidence to the second century, and I would put it in the first half.

The calligraphic intent is reinforced by a curious feature of the layout. Each citation is headed by identification of its source: the script of this heading, which is centred, is reduced in size to almost half that adopted for the text of the quotations.

Five citations are represented. The first is unidentified, the remaining four are Euripidean: a pair of verses preserved in corrupt form by Stobaeus which now finds a home in either the Euripidean Antigone or the Antiope; a verse ascribed to the Antiope, also previously known from Stobaeus; what appears to be Medea 76, here attributed to the Phoenix; and a sequence of five verses from the Protesilaus, incorporating one quoted by Clement of Alexandria.

There are good grounds for thinking that the collection, or at least that section of it represented by the papyrus, was drawn exclusively from Euripides. The heading which identifies each extract takes the form of the title of the play in question, with \textit{\[\varepsilon\kappa\]}: e.g. \textit{\[\varepsilon\kappa\] \textit{\[\nu\tau\iota\phi\nu\varepsilon\]}\}. The papyrus is broken off to the left, but if the author as well as the play had been specified, the end of the dramatist’s name would in some cases probably be visible. The inference from this apparent omission is perhaps not quite certain, for Euripides will invariably have been prominent in collections such as this, and one could conceive of a convention whereby the author was named only when he was someone other than Euripides. But the presumption is a strong one. Cf. XLII 3005, an anthology which appears to be wholly Menandorean.
The selected passages (with the theoretical exception of the first) all have to do with marriage. Extracts on marriage were collected at least as early as the second century B.C.: witness P. Berol. 9772 and 9773 (BKT V 2. 123–8, 129–33). These latter two collections show a close affinity with Stobaeus iv 22, the chapter entitled peri γάμου; virtually all of their citations which are not new are found there. A similar affinity with Stobaeus, with the chapter peri δευτερόν καὶ δεύτερον (iv. 19), is to be seen in P. Schub. 28 (Pack² 1579), also of the second century b.c., and most strikingly in the third-century papyrus edited by H. Maehler in Mus. Helv. 24 (1967), 70–3. Cf. also the second- or third-century Florence papyrus reviewed by V. Bartoletti in Atti XI Congr. Pap. 1966, 1–14. Of the present papyrus's five citations, two recur in Stobaeus' π. γάμου chapter. The papyrus anthologies generally follow a less elaborated system of arrangement than Stobaeus, and 3214 is no exception. The two passages in common, the second and third in 3214, occur under Stobaeus' sections 5 and 4 respectively of the π. γάμου chapter. The bulk of Stobaeus' Euripidean extracts appears to have been taken from a compilation of Euripidean passages arranged in alphabetical order according to play title (see Stobaeus iii ed. Hense, Prolegomena, lv–lvii), but 3214, while it does appear to be confined to Euripides, does not follow an alphabetic order.

The back is blank.

For the fragments of Euripides, I have referred both to Nauck and to Mette, Lustrum 12 (1967) [frr. i–1181] and 13 (1968) [frr. 1182–1470].
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

traces —— foot of upright 8 —— traces on isolated fibre level with letter tops: α or ω not suggested, but neither excluded 10 —— room only for τ —— traces suggesting ζ, then perhaps left-hand side of cup of v 11 λ, remains of lower half, perhaps χ also possible —— base trace, of a serif or an oblique: of vowels, α, η, i 12 —— surface thoroughly abraded: room for letter of medium size y represented by right hand hasta and rubbed traces of possible oblique —— mid-line trace perhaps of upright 13 —— upright

1 Apparently not extant. Presumably ἦν 'ι', then either μ' ἐν (e.g. ἄδοραν ἦν μ' ἐν ἅψ[ράσιν τιθέντος] or μέν (e.g. ἄδοραν ἦν μ' ἐν ἅψ[ρειαν ἔχον]). The absence of an apostrophe (11, scriptio plena at 3) tells against the former, though in itself that is perhaps the likelier articulation.

2 Some high ink between i and o does not look accidental; the trace suggests the foot of an upright, and could be taken as part of a superlinear γ, added with the intention of converting Ἀντώνύς to Ἀντώνυς. π is now damaged. There seems no doubt that π was written, but it seems possible that it was altered to ψ: there is perhaps a trace of a downward oblique joining the foot of the second haste. I do not know whether one would be justified in justifying the fact that the next citation is headed ἦς Ἀντώνυς rather than, say, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δρόμου in supporting intended ascription to the Antigone.

The papyrus's attribution is not necessarily the true one. Von Arnim (Suppl. Eurip. p. 17) has suggested that four citations ascribed in Stobaeus to the Antiope (among them the next in the papyrus) belong in fact to the Antigone. Similarly it is not easy to find accommodation for the present quotation in the Antiope, whereas in the Antigone the lines could well be addressed to Creon by Haemon or by Antigone herself.


The lines have defined emendation. It is certain that the papyrus does not have the impossible αὐτοῖς, and the presumption is that it has the truth, lurking in the damaged two or three letters between α and καλῶς. Given the traces (which exclude παγκάλως), I can suggest only α τοι (so also E. G. Turner, J. R. Rea), 'I shall have a marriage which, let me tell you, it is right should be a good one—one in which I shall grow old' (sc. 'because I'll have married someone my own age'?—N.B. the Stobaean section which houses it). This is good as a reading and offers ready explanation of the Stobaean corruption, even if the particle does not seem to sit very comfortably. The Press reader suggests taking ατια as a generalizing masc. and construing it with καλῶς ἔχειν: '... which it is fair should be good for those I shall grow old with'. Given that λέκτρα can approximate to 'spouse', however, I prefer the interpretation I have offered.

6 Eurip. fr. 214N, 266 Mette: Stob. iv 22d. 43, with attribution, as here, to the Antiope. Tentatively ascribed to the Antigone by von Arnim (loc. cit.), together with frr. 212, 213, 215N. The papyrus does not prove him wrong: the postulated corruption could have taken place at practically any stage.

Cf. Aesch. PV 890, τὸ κρήσκεια καθ' ἕκατον ἰραστεῖ τοὺς μακρὸ. 8 Almost certainly Med. 76, παλαιά καὶ[ν]έλπισα κηθεί[ματων]. Either we have here a mis-attribution (due to omission of the Phoenix quotation: perhaps fr. 804N?) or else the verse had been used in both plays, or had got interpolated in the Phoenix (on repeated lines in Euripides see P. W. Harsh, Hermes 72 (1937) 435–49). I consider the former the more likely.

10–14 Line 13 is Eurip. fr. 653N, 871 Mette. The papyrus confirms Nauck’s emendation of ὁρα καὶ to χρήν (implicitly rejected by Mette). Cited in isolation by Clement of Alexandria, Strom. vi 2. 24. 5 f. (p. 441. 13 Früchtel), it now acquires a context—or would do, if the tenor of the surrounding verses were intelligible. The speaker can hardly be anyone other than Acastus, but it is still not clear to me who (if anyone) is being addressed, nor what desirable thing would happen to ἐὑρίκεια if monogamy were abandoned.

Obvious supplements for the beginnings of 10–11 are ἅτο τῶν ἔκειν] ἐν, 11 (almost certain) ὅτι] γνώματος. There are many things one might do for a woman's sake. If Acastus has anyone particular in mind, it must be Protelsiaus; but he may be generalizing. Of 12 E. G. Turner notes, 'must presumably be -μορός, fem. accusative present participle'. But we do expect a caesura. παλαιοῖς, dat. of παλαιοῖς, would be apt enough in a gibe about Laodameia's supposed behaviour (see below—rather this, in the immediate setting, than in reference to Hades), though an adjective or feminine would be easier.
Any attempted reconstruction of the plot of the Protesilaus is bound to be fanciful; and the previously known line is perhaps the most enigmatic of the far from transparent fragments. (F. Jouan, Euripide et les légendes des chants cypriens 1966, 323, makes it an exasperated reaction by Acastus to Laodameia's refusal to remarry, after Protesilaus' death at Troy. This is clearly desperate, and a per-versely literal reading of the line.) But the accession of something of its immediate context does I think make one thing clear: the passage must be considered in close relation to the four verses that constitute fr. 657N. There the man who damns all women without exception is said to be οὐκοίκος κοίτας. Some women admittedly are bad, but some—like Laodameia (οὕτως)—have a φύσις εὐγενεία. The verbal recurrences suggest strongly that that passage is in some sense a retort to the present one.1 This helps define the speaker's attitude: we want a φύσις γυναικῶν. Is Acastus speaking in moral indignation and disillusionment, occasioned by what he mistakenly thinks to be Laodameia's faithlessness to her newly wed newly dead husband? (Hyg. fab. 104. 2, quod cum famulus matutino tempore poma ei (sc. Laodamiae) attulisset ad sacrificium, per rimam aspexit viditque earn ab amplexu Protesilai simulacrum tenentem et osculantem; aestimans earn adulterum habere Acasto patri nuntiavit.) The point may then be sardonic, that if women are not to respect the institution of marriage, it would be better to abandon the futile attempt to maintain it: the resultant system being expressed in deliberately outrageous form. Cf. fr. 402N (Ino). There the merit claimed for polygamy as against monogamy is that a man could throw out the kκλκτ, and keep the ixωρκ. And here? What is the consequence for εὐγενεία. (εὐγενεία?) Possibly that one's reputation as εὐγενεία or διεγενεία would no longer depend upon birth (moral connotations of εὐγενεία played upon pασιμ in Euripides, N.B. λήμα εὐγενεία in fr. 657). We cannot be sure the quotation ends here: it may have continued in the next column.

1 Not perhaps an immediate or direct retort, for the tone is mild and considered. It would be appropriate towards the end of the play: whether in the mouth of the chorus, or as the final comment of a messenger announcing Laodameia's suicide (the reference back to Acastus' outburst then being a piece of unconscious irony), or as a revelation ex machina, or as a retraction by Acastus himself, after learning (too late to save her?) of the unworthiness of his suspicions. On the other hand, fr. 654N would make an admirably suitable comment by the chorus if the passages belong to either side of an agon (δυναν λεγόντων, ταθέρων, θημασιμένων, ἀρρενον τοῦτο λάγονε κοφείτερος).
marginal note to right of l. 2 is not, so far as I can judge from PSI XIII tav. 3, in the same hand as the two marginal notes to left of 1302 ll. 1 and 3, or in the same relative position as either of them. If the two columns are not contiguous, there is no particular case for thinking them connected.

This copyist has been identified in a number of manuscripts produced on the same handsome scale and containing sometimes Sophocles, sometimes Euripides: PSI 1302, Eur. Ais., and 3215 fr. 1, having 20 lines to the column; 2077, Soph. Scyrians, 2452, Soph.? (Eur.?) Theseus, having more than 20 lines to the col.; 3215 fr. 2, Eur. Hec. 223–8 from the top of a column of indeterminate height; a number of scraps not as yet published of which the source is not ascertained. I should likewise incline to attribute to him Antiphon Soph., π. ἀληθ., in 1364, Aeschin. Socr., Μητραδής, in 2889, though these have a different ν.

Fr. 1

\[ \text{\( \nu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon [\text{θ} \varepsilon \rho \omega \varepsilon ] \)} \]
\[ \text{\( \mu \alpha \tau \omega \nu \varepsilon \alpha \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \alpha \)} \]
\[ \text{\( \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon [\theta] \varepsilon \rho \omega \varepsilon ] \)} \]
\[ \text{\( \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \alpha \)} \]
\[ \text{\( \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon [\theta] \varepsilon \rho \omega \varepsilon ] \)} \]
\[ \text{\( \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \alpha \)} \]
\[ \text{\( \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon [\theta] \varepsilon \rho \omega \varepsilon ] \)} \]
\[ \text{\( \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \alpha \)} \]

1. traces near the line, possibly the bottom right-hand curve of \( \omega \)
2. marg. \( \mu \) [not verifiable]
3. \( \nu \) (represented by the lower end of the diagonal and the right-hand upright) sug-
gested]... the top of a heavy upright, followed by the top of a stroke slightly hooked to right, and this by the upper end of a light stroke rising to right; if the last represented θ, a narrow letter might follow before a]...[a slightly concave upright, perhaps the right-hand side of θ, followed by what now look like the right-hand side of a small loop and the upper end of a thick stroke descending to right, both level with the top of the letters]...[a flat stroke, as of γ, with traces, apparently compatible with ε, at the right-hand end 18 λ, ρ, between ν and ρ faint traces not suggesting η 19 ], a trace level with the top of the letters

I have found no identifiable quotation in these verses. PSI 1302 is identified as from Euripides Ἀλκιτίδας by the presence of fr. 86. The style of this speech is compatible with the same authorship.

7 i.e. τί ποτε προσδοκόντω...; and this is by far the commoner order in Euripides, and, I think, the other tragedians.

8 I suppose metaphorical, ‘set free’ a slave, but physical liberation is expressed by the same phrase, v. Eur. Ηέκ. 551 seqq.

14 κλεπ is a much more noticeable feature of the vocabulary of Sophocles than of Euripides (only in Μέδεα, twice).

15 The marginal entry looks like a variant not a comment. The supplement suggested might acceptably be accompanied by such a variant. But it should be said that in Euripides, at any rate, εὐ λέγειν much oftener means ‘speak well’ than ‘speak well of’ (e.g. Αἰλ. 1070), and that εὐλογεῖν is much oftener employed than εὐ λέγειν when a word for ‘praise’ is wanted.

16 The supplement assumes that what was said came to ‘more like a father than a master’, cf. e.g. Eur. Ορ. 1520 seqq. μὴ πέτρος γένη βασιλεύει...; μὴ μὲν οὖν κεφαλή, Σοφ. Αἴ. 662 seq.

Fr. 2

Hecuba ll. 223–8

\[\text{[\varepsilon ναυσιματοδεπιστα]}\]
\[\text{[πεστηθουδεπαυσαχιλλα]}\]

225 \[\text{[ον]}\][μεταποσπασθ θ][
\[\text{[α] :] ύπισταθ[}
\[\text{[η] :] τανταθ[...[}
\[\text{[η] :] ιππα[...[}

This scrap is in the same hand as PSI XIII 1302 and 3215 fr. 1, but contains verses from a surviving play, to the text of which it contributes nothing.

224 οπλαττα codd., Σ: οπλαττα Ναυκ 225 δράσων Μ, Π, (τά καλά τῶν ἀντυγράφων Σ), δρασεις Α, Λ, sscc. Μ 227 καὶ παροικεῖν cum codd. praeter Λ (καὶ κακῶν)
3216. Tragedy

A fragment apparently of a tragedy, written in a small, round and upright hand, similar to XXI 2294 except in so far as it is more freely serifed and in the case of ε and ι less rounded. XXI 2301 may also be compared. The hand may be assigned a date around the middle of the second century, or later rather than earlier. On the back there are illegible remains of one line, written across the fibres in a crude documentary hand.

Eistheses divide the remnant into three sections. The first two have their beginnings preserved and are evidently lyric; the latter of these is indented in relation to the former. Any restoration of the third section will project its beginnings further to the left than the first, so that there were two degrees of eisthesis. The doubly indented section is presumably an epode, and the unindented lines are likely to be trimeters, though trochaics are not excluded.

The evidence for authorship does not point in any one direction. διλαξτοιν (7) is found among the tragedians only in Euripides, being used twice in the extant plays and attested for him as the lexis of fr. 1123 Nauck². This hardly adequate ground for attribution to Euripides is made still less secure by τετ (19), which is characteristically (though not only) Sophoclean. Of the subject-matter little can be said other than that mention is made of Apollo and of oracles and that there may be some connection with the Trojan war.

The lection signs appear to be by the first hand. There are four stops in middle position. A correction at 4 has been added in a thin pen, perhaps by the copyist; another hand seems to be responsible for the insertion of an iota adscript in 6. A corruption in 18 is uncorrected.
3216. TRAGEDY

τον ἔρι.
προσφή

λέγειν.

φροντ[.] δή.

λυπήσεσον[.
εἰδ’ ἀλαστρὸν[.
αληθβουλὴ[.
χρεανήκε[.

ανάξπ[.
ποικεκ[.
σώματ[.
κάμαρ[.

_οιτουτ.[.

χρησμῷ[.
καφφρυγῳ[.
δόρυχημα[.

]νεόπουδουτῆ[.
]τακτικειάπ[.

]γαρουργημερ[ε[.
]. η[.
]. ηζε[.
]. η[.
]. μενοῦ[.

]γίζα[ευ[.
]δηπάκ[λυ[.
]. γνεμ[.

2 [, speck at line level 5 [, room only for narrow letter δ, base only, ζ perhaps not excluded ι, a possible, hardly ε or ω 7 ϊ, ink at foot of ι to left: offsets? letter overwritten? 9 [, trace at line level, perhaps of upright (e.g. ι) 14 ,, trace apparently of descender on isolated fibre [, low trace of apparent curve 14/15 What is transcribed as a paragraphus appears not to be on the top layer of papyrus, and is in a lighter ink. Two further traces can be discerned at some distance to the left 15 [, foot of upright 18 The first ο is open to the left, but no other reading is possible 21 [, speck at mid-line level 23 γφ, or ε 25 [, upper part of upright, with trace perhaps of horizontal leaving at top, e.g. γ
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

2 Ζήφον, ξυφρόν.
5 As a reading, φροντής has the edge on φροντής.
7 δίλακτος: in tragedy at Eurip. Hec. 85, Or. 1479 (δίλακτος Wilamowitz), fr. 1123N (a lexis in isolation, referred by Nauck to Hec. 85).
9/10, 17/18 Apparently the paragraphus is used to divide one choral section from the next, and the δίπλη ὀβελίσμην to mark the end of the lyrics. Dramatic papyri exemplify various systems of signs. Cf. Anecd. Paris., 'δίπλη ὀβελίσμην ἀπερατᾶς ἐν κομῳδίαις καὶ τραγῳδίαις περιόδοις', and the more comprehensive treatment of Hefaestion, π. εἰσείλον 5-11.
10 In view of Φοίβος at 14, probably II ὑδας or II ὑδας; εῦνος (12) suggests the vocative. II[adv] and II[δέειθον are other possibilities.
11 κεκ[.] part of κρίστειν?
14/15 The 'paragraphus' (see apparatus) is presumably without significance.
17 δηπ: the accent distinguishes δηπ from δηπει.
18-27 It seems reasonable to assume that these lines are iambics. I would suppose the first foot to be missing from 18, 19, and 20.
18 νεότος: the accent precludes correction to νεότος. The palaeographically closest word I can think of is νεότος (II for PT); which would scan in iambics.
19 ἵπται ἵπται. ταύτα: crisis is implied, τάκτει.
20 ἱπταμένος ὁ λέον τ' ἐπιτεί.
23 ἄλματα;? But other articulations are open.
25 τέλεϊς, ὁ λέεις, καλείς, αλ. In this line and the following, the stop probably coincides with the caesura. The collocation δῆ παί, however (26: but not necessarily δῇ), occupies the third foot at Soph. fr. 760N.

3217. MENANDER, Sicyonius

This scrap of dramatic dialogue is written in the same hand as X 1238 (now Kassel, Sicy. fr. 11), a rounded uncial dated by Grenfell and Hunt to the late first century A.D. Because of the marginal and interlinear addition of names of characters 1238 was identified as belonging to the Sicyonius of Menander (see Recherches de Papyrologie 3 (1964) 154), although its position in the play has never been established. An interlinear pi (line 3), presumably forming part of an abbreviation of the name Pyrrhias (but cf. Kassel ad Sicy. fr. 11), suggests strongly that this scrap belongs not only to the same play but to the same scene as 1238. Attempts to align the two fragments have been unsuccessful. The back is blank.
1 θ', top of the letter is broken off, but θ is more likely than ε.
2 Below and slightly to the right of π, traces of 2 letters: a cross-stroke ligatured to an upright, then a trace of ink at foot level.
3 broad, round-bottomed letter with trace of ink below, ϕ or ψ possible, if the trace is part of the letter; if it is stray ink, ε, θ, o, o may be considered.
4 ι, perhaps feet of λ or χ, then ε or θ followed by traces like the ρ in line 6.
5 ϕηπωε(α or sim.? Cf. Sym. 411 and fr. 11. 2 (1238 2). Only a dot of ink on a broken fibre remains of the initial letter.
6 [, low trace, sloping up to right, foot of δ, λ or χ. a has too rounded a base.

3218. New Comedy

Fr. 1 5×5 cm.
Fr. 2 2·5×3 cm.

Two small fragments written along the fibres of a buff-coloured papyrus, so well made that while the horizontal fibres are stripped in several places the vertical fibres present an almost undamaged surface. Fr. 1, from the top of a column, contains ends of 7 lines of iambic trimeters; fr. 2 has parts of 6 lines.

Similar patterns of vertical fibres on the backs suggest that fr. 2 belongs below fr. 1 with its front right-hand edge in the same vertical alignment as the corresponding edge of fr. 1. It is even possible that fr. 1. 7 and fr. 2. 1 are parts of the same line, but attempts to place the fragments in that relationship have not proved completely satisfactory and it seems more likely that they were somewhat further apart.

The scribe wrote an informal round hand in which elegantly formed letters with serifs occur alongside forms much more cursively written. Compare E. G. Turner, GMAW, Pls. 37-8, which are dated to the early and late first century respectively. This hand exhibits characteristics found in both of these plates. A second hand has made the marginal correction at fr. 1. 2. The only lectional sign is a dicolon at fr. 1. 6.

The speaker of μα τοιε θεοε (fr. 1. 4) is designated by Π, i.e. by an ordinal number standing for third actor. For dramatic texts with parts similarly designated see XXVII 2458 (Eur., Cresphontes) and PSI X 1176 (New Comedy). The significance of this notation is discussed by E. G. Turner in 2458 introd. and by E. G. Jory, ‘Algebraic Notation in Dramatic Texts’, BICS 10 (1963) 65-78.

There is little of situation or language, in spite of the name Moschion (fr. 1. 5, fr. 2. 3), which suggests an identity for the fragments.

The back is occupied by writing in a serific informal hand of the first or early second century; there is little to establish context beyond επηρεόθη (fr. 1. 4) and θεαε (fr. 2. 2), which might point to romance. A diplomatic transcript only is provided.
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

Fr. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ọι αὐτηρήδων</th>
<th>ọι ταύτην ἰδὼν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθρ[</td>
<td>Λυ[δ]ιαν ῥ ἔχων λίθο[ν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διανεύσων</td>
<td>μι' ἀδικεῖς. μαρτύρομαι[i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαδικευμαρτύρουμα[ι</td>
<td>νοη. Π. μᾶ τούς θεούς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νοτάματος θεους</td>
<td>κλαίων Μοσχίων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κλαίωμοσχιών</td>
<td>ξ[ ...]κείθη: [πευ][ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Fr. 2

| πορ[θ][ομα[ | π[πόθ]ομα[i |
| μοσχιών[ | Μοσχίων[ |
| ατεληπον[ | κατεληπον[ |
| ερεγενο βλ[ | επε γώ βλ[ |
| μελλε[ | μελλε[ |

Fr. 1 2 νεον corrected to λιθον by m2 5 κ, stroke curving up to right, definitely suggesting κ 7 [, a rounded letter, c or e rather than o
Fr. 2 1 [, a descender 6 μ, trace of upstroke and right descender

Fr. 1 2 The scribal error suggests that the copying was done by eye rather than dictation. E. W. Handley observes that in some writing styles the words νεον and λιθον might be easily confused.

Λυδα λίθος: the touchstone used to distinguish false gold from true and, by extension, apparently a commonplace allusion to detecting the truth or falsity of a situation. No doubt entirely appropriate to New Comedy. See Corp. Paroem. Gr. ii on Λυδα λίθος (Macar, v 75) and βάσανος λίθος (Greg. Cyp. i 64 and note). Compare Bacchylides, fr. 101: Λυδα μὲν γὰρ λίθος μανίζει, [χρυσό, Theocritus xii 37: Λυδή [ις]ν ἔχων πέτρα στάμα and Sophocles' Alexander: ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἄλας γὰρ βάσανος ἢ Λυδή λίθος in H. Hunger, 'Palimpsest-fragmente aus Herodians καθολική Προσφοβία', J. O.E. Byz. 16 (1957) 7.
4 νοη: most probably part of a verb, κατανοη or sim. It might also be from a proper name, i.e. Χρυσόν, Λευκόν, but I find no such name in New Comedy.

Γ: the appearance of the text suggests that the scribe found the notation Γ in his original for he has written it in continuously without separation or a break of any kind. It is unlikely that this text was ever used as a production copy, although it was probably copied from one.
6 πευ[ deleted: probably the next line begun in error.
Of the following scraps, the two most considerable and some at least of the others have to do with the dialogues of Plato. The work appears to be a monograph, and the remains would be consistent with a work ‘on Plato and the dialogue’, but I cannot say whether this adequately reflects its scope. Fr. 1 describes Plato’s indebtedness to Sophron as being ‘in respect of the dramatic’ (if the obvious emendation is correct), and, alleging \( \beta \alpha \kappa \kappa \alpha \nu \alpha \) against Plato on Aristotle’s part, repudiates the assertion made by Aristotle in the \( \text{De Poetis} \) (quoted by Athenaeus and alluded to by Diogenes Laertius) that Alexamenus of Teos (Tenos \( \text{apud} \) pap.) was the first to write dialogues—or dramatic dialogues, as the papyrus qualifies. Fr. 2 states that Plato uses the four characters Socrates, Timaeus, the Athenian Stranger, and the Eleatic Stranger as mouthpieces for his own doctrines, and asserts that the Strangers represent Plato and Parmenides. There is evidently a connection of some kind with Diogenes Laertius (DL) 3. 52, where a similar statement is made, except that there the identification of the Strangers with the two philosophers is expressly denied. Some scantier fragments seem to be concerned with the historical development of tragedy: conceivably in a comparison of the respective developments of philosophy and tragedy on a more elaborate scale than that found at DL 3. 56.

In \( BICS \) 19 (1972) 17–38, I have attempted to reach an understanding of the critical theory underlying the surviving text and have investigated, without positive result, the authorship of the work and its relationship with DL.

The hand is a rather small, rounded example of a not uncommon type, with a slight backward slant. Omicron, more variable than most letters, is usually small and often high, and the beginning of the ‘mixed’ style may be discerned in the broad kappa and delta. The hand may be assigned a date around the middle or the second half of the second century. \( XXI \ 2306 \) and \( XVIII \ 2159 \) are comparable in so far as most of the letters are made in the same movements, but the former is less well formed and
shows more freedom with ligatures, while the latter is a more formal hand with a clear tendency to make all the letters the same size.

High stops are used, and *paragraphi* apparently mark off sentences. Apart from the occasional enlargement of the first letter of a word, there are no other lectional aids. The back is blank.

I am glad to have been able to consult partial transcripts by Mr. Lobel and by Professor Turner and a full transcript and some notes by Mr. Parsons.

Fr. 1

9·6 × 5·8 cm.

2 ρ, or ς; v scarcely poss. φ, ρ, tails only ,[,] bottom of upright: ρ, τ, ? ,[,] ys, or ,[,] υ

10 ,[,] to slight for identification but compatible with 2nd transcript 11 ,[, minimal

12 ,[,] tops only: three upright or oblique strokes, high traces at end (poss. 'ο')

There are negligible traces of a second column
Fr. 2

(a) 11° x 6·5 cm., (b) 5·3 x 5·3 cm.

Col. ii

(b) ...]e\(b\)

di\(a\)π\(a\)ντω\(m\)

t\(w\)ν\(e\)τ\(i\)ν\(o\)

5 \( τ\)α·ποκ\(υ\)λ\(l\)λε\(υ\)ν\(d\)

d\(i\)α\(l\)ο\(g\)ου\(s\)τ\(η\)

\(π\)θ\(\i\)δ\(ε\)δ\(i\)α\(t\)ε\(m\)αι

ο\(υ\)τ\(i\)νο\(υ\)ξ\(e\)\(f\)ε\(ν\)υ\(h\)

\(\alpha\)υ\(t\)ο\(υ\).

10 \(\nu\) ....]

ε\(π\)

Col. i

8 lines

(a) ....]

c̄p\(r\)ω\(τ\)α\(γ\)ο\(r\)αc.[...]\(e\)...τ\(ω\)ν

\(χ\)ο\(m\)ε\(n\)ω\(σ\)παρα\(α\)ν\(t\)ω·τ\(a\)δ\(e\)

\(φ\)δ\(o\)κ\(o\)υ\(n\)τ\(a\)α\(p\)ο\(φ\)α\(ι\)ν\(e\)τ\(a\)δ\(i\)α

\(ρ\)ο\(c\)ω\(p\)ω\(ν\)c\(w\)o\(k\) ... α\(u\)σ\(τ\)ε\(μ\)αι

\(\nu\)ν\(a\)θ\(h\)ν\(a\)i\(o\)υ\(ς\) [...\]\(a\)\(υ\)\(λ\)ε\(λ\)α\(e\)

\(ρ\)ν\(c\)\(w\)o\(v\)c\(w\)o\(i\)ν\(v\) ... \(\alpha\)\(τ\)η\(c\)\(ζ\)\(e\)\(ν\)

\(ρ\)\(h\)\(n\)\(a\)\(i\)ο\(c\)\(ζ\)\(e\)\(ν\)o\(v\) [...\]\(τ\)\(n\)\(κ\)\(a\)i

\(e\)ν\(d\)\(h\)c\(a\)λ\(λ\)a\(d\)a\(γ\)r\(a\)m\(a\)t\(i\)

\(c\)\(p\)ο\(i\)ο\(μ\)\(ε\)ν\(c\)\(τ\)\(c\)\(τ\)\(o\)κ\(δ\)\(i\)a\(λ\)o\(γ\)\(o\)\(υ\)

\(ν\)\(a\)κ\(a\)i\(a\)\(n\)e\(i\)ω\(d\)\(w\)o\(l\)o

\(v\)\(γ\)·λ\(ο\)ι\(o\)v\(c\)\(o\)\(ν\)\(λ\)\(e\)g[\(c\)

\(\nu\)\(μ\)ρ\(n\)\(a\)\(θ\)\(h\)n\(i\)a

10 \(\mu\)\(ε\)t\(a\)δ[...][...][...

\(\mu\)\(e\)ν\(o\)c\(τ\)\(o\)r....]

The distance between (b) and (a) may be calculated by alignment of the verso fibres. The estimate of a gap of eight lines has a margin of error of no more than a single line either way.

Col. 2]... a or, better, o [c, \(o\), \(ω\), \(κ\) ... 3], or \(κ\); then seemingly anomalous letter, perhaps a or o; then low speck; perhaps another letter lost before \(τ\) ... \(τ\), or \(i\) or \(p\) ... 11]...[, slight traces on
loose fibre \(, (\text{ante } \nu)\), high trace suggesting \(\iota\), but \(\sigma, \omega, \alpha\) cannot be excluded \(13\) ct, or ct* ... tops only: abhy poss.

Col. ii (b) \(3\) \(\omicron, \rho\) less good
or \(\iota\)
(a) \(3\) \(\rho\), \(\epsilon\) less good
\(5\) \(\iota\), low speck \(6\) \(\iota, \eta\) less good? \(10\) \(\epsilon, \alpha\) less good
\(13\) ct, or ct*

Fr. 3

\[
\mu...[
\νίομυνομ[.
\πιευτοκρ[.
\κ[...].\sigmaε[.
5 \]να[.].
\]

Fr. 4

\[
\beta[.].\lambda[.
\ε[.].\αδετοτον [. 
\κ[.].\υτερονυτοκ[.
\[φόκληδ[.
\]

Fr. 5

\[
\omega...[
\nuτ[.
\ωδ[...].\ευ[.
\άραγωδια[.
5 \]απολλοκ[.
\[αλεγοντων \ προ[.
\πηγαγεν[.
\[πτ...].[.
\]

Fr. 6

\[
\delta[.].\rho[.
\]

Fr. 7

\[
\nuρ[.
\[λ[.
\[φερ[.
5 \].[.].\ ημα[.
\[επτον[.
\]

Apparently, on external and internal evidence alike, from the same vicinity as fr. 4. J. R. Rea suggests combining the fragments so as to make \(3, 3\) ff. the line-ends of \(4, 1\) ff.; this is possible but I cannot confirm it. The fibres on the back point, though not definitively, to another combination: \(\omega\) at \(3, 4\) in alignment above \(\nu 4, 2\).

1 Perhaps \(\mu φ,[\ 4]\), low curve:
\(\epsilon, \epsilon, \eta, \alpha\ ?\ 5\), high trace, possibly end of a final alpha

Fr. 5

\[
\omegaντρ[.
\nuτ[.
\ωδ[...].\ευ[.
\άραγωδια[.
5 \]απολλοκ[.
\[αλεγοντων \ προ[.
\πηγαγεν[.
\[πτ...].[.
\]

Fr. 7

\[
\nuρ[.
\[λ[.
\[φερ[.
5 \].[.].\ ημα[.
\[επτον[.
\]

\[
2\, ,\ anomalous \(\alpha\) ?\ [3, \theta, \tau?\ 5\, \alpha\ and \kappa\ enlarged \]\, \eta, \upsilon, \iota\ [.\, \nu, \alpha?\ 6\, \varphi', \omega, \alpha\]

2, \ anomalous \(\alpha\) ?\ [3, \theta, \tau?\ 5\, \alpha\ and \kappa\ enlarged \]\, \eta, \upsilon, \iota\ [.\, \nu, \alpha?\ 6\, \varphi', \omega, \alpha\]

4 \(\rho\), or \(\epsilon\ 6\, \iota\, \, \min (\text{Postscript:) \ The papyrus has suffered damage and the latter part of 5 now reads } \eta\mu[.)
Fr. 8
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Fr. 9

Fr. 10

Fr. 11

Fr. 12

Fr. 13

2 v enlarged  3 τi, τ less good

2 i or v best, μ just poss., not β

high trace: κ, τ, δ, p, al.

5 ἀ, or υ 6 τ

high speck

3 μ, perhaps μυ

7 τ, υ poss.

8 τ, υ, θ, α?

2 τ, η, i? 6 τ, or ε; θ less good

10 ... or [τ]: ε, possibly τ, υ suggested, perhaps λ

1 τ, υ
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

Fr. 14

[ ] omega.
[ ] eperton.
[ ] ...[ ] o

1 a enlarged

Fr. 15

[ ]
[ ] et
[ ] ...[ ] o

Fr. 16

[ ]
[ ] oretanopliou
[ ] onomik
[ ] kakoka.
5 [ ] etepoibe
[ ] eriptanatas
[ ] leit.
[ ] ohi
[ ] kioto.
10 [ ] tria.
[ ] iok

Fr. 17

[ ]
[ ] tona.
[ ] por.
[ ] leitik

Fr. 18

[ ] ynu.
[ ] ose.
[ ] metodouc
[ ] eouskaita.
5 [ ] ...[ ] V
[ ] eapode
[ ] e.

Fr. 19

[ ] ...[ ] o [ ] lek
[ ] eouskaiat
[ ] eoupsath
[ ] poto[ ] eti.
5 [ ] eteis.

1 o, tip of descender δi[alek] poss. 2 o, or c, less good 4 [ ] prob. v or y 5 ...] ...[ rubbed [ ] or [ ]}
Fr. 20

\[ \theta e \tau \ldots \tau a c a \]
\[ \xi e o u c e m e b h o d o u \]
\[ \lambda e k t i k \]
\[ \mu e n \tau \eta i \]
5
\[ \psi k e n e n e \]
\[ \tau a a y \]
\[ \iota k o e k \]
\[ \eta p l \]

6 \( \gamma \), or \( \pi \)
8 \( [, \theta \) or \( \epsilon \) suggested

Fr. 21

\[ \lambda a b e n \]
\[ \delta e i c \eta \]
\[ \gamma \eta k o u i \]
\[ \iota k o n k w o \]

3 \( \theta \) or \( \rho \)
4 \( \psi \), or \( \psi \phi \)

Fr. 23

Col. i

\[ \kappa a i t a c \]
\[ \beta i n a \]
5
\[ \nu e f a \]
\[ \nu \]
\[ \alpha v \]
6
\[ \delta e \]
\[ \kappa \eta \]

Col. ii

Fr. 24

Fr. 25

\[ \lambda a c k \]
\[ \pi \]
\[ \epsilon i n a k \]
\[ \iota c s t o \]
\[ \tau i k \]
Fr. 1: 'meanwhile(?) imitating Sophron the mimewriter too in respect of the dramatic element of the dialogues; for Aristotle is not to be believed when he says in his malice against Plato, in 'On Poetry' (vult 'On Poets') bk. 1, that dramatic dialogues had been written even before Plato by Alexamenus of Tenes.'

2 ποιεῖται, cf. ποιείται 2 ii 5.

3-5 Comparable statements are made by (1) DL 3. 18, δοκεῖ δὲ Πλάτων καὶ τὰ Σάφρονος τὸν μυθουργὸν βιβλία ἰμηλημένα πρῶτος εἰς Αθήνας διακομαίει καὶ ἴσθισθείσα πρὸς αὐτόν, (2) Ολυμπιοδόρου, Πίλα Πλάτωνι, 3, ἕξαρη δὲ πέντε καὶ Ἀριστοτέλει τῷ κομικῷ καὶ Σάφρονι, παρ’ δὲν καὶ τὴν μίμησιν τῶν προκόπων ἐν τοῖς διάλογοις ἀνθίσθη ἐκλήσθη· κτλ., (3) Απολ., Ρέαλεγονα in Platonis dialogos, 3, ἔξαρεν δὲ καὶ Σάφρονι τὰν γελοιογοςμίαν, τὴν μιμητικὴν ὠάστερ καταθέτατο βαουλόμενον δ᾽ ἵνα διάλογον γράφως μίμησιν προκόπων εὑρέθη, and (4) Τζέτζες, Chil. 10. 806–10, which is vaguer but important for the authority cited, ... ἄβ' ἀπόκριτο, (ἐ. τοῦ Σάφρονος βιβλίων) ἐμμέστατο γράφως τοὺς διαλόγους, ἀν ὑπὸ τοῦ Σίλλους βαῶν ἄρα τὸν Ἕμερον διαγράφως, cf. ibid. 11. 8–10, ἐν μίμησι δὲ τοῦ Σάφρονος μιμητὰ διαλόγους. ἀν Σάφρον ἂν γράφατο ἵνα ἐδίκη τῶν ἰμιμιματων, ἤ ἀντίδροτον, κεκτημένα.

Our author is unique among ancient writers in describing Plato's debt to Sophron expressly in terms of 'the dramatic'.

8 π. ποιητικῆς: in error for π. ποιητῶν, the less well known work, as in fr. 75, 76, 77 Rose. The passage in question is quoted by Athenaeus, 11. 505c, and alluded to by DL 3. 48, the matter under discussion being in either case the εὑρέσεις of the dialogue form: fr. 72 Rose, F17 E. Mensching, Favors I. Athen. 11. 505c: ἐγκόμα αὐτοῦ (τοῦ Μένωνος) διεξάγεται ο ν τοὺς ἄλλους ἀπαθητὸς κακολογηθηκας (Πλάτων), ἐν μὲν τῇ πολιτείᾳ Ἔμμονον ἐκβιβάζον καὶ τὴν μιμητικὴν ποιήσει, αὐτός δὲ τοὺς διάλογους μιμητικὸς γράφας, ἄν τῆς ἱδίας αὐτὸς αὐτὸ εὑρθείτε ἐκτ. πρὸ γὰρ αὐτῶν τοῦ δεῖ τὸ εἴδος τῶν λόγων ὁ Σάφρονος Ἀλέξεμενος, ὡς Νικέας ὁ Ποιήτης ἱστορικὸς καὶ Καστός. Ἀριστοτέλες δὲ τὸν περὶ ποιητῶν ἀνθέων γράφει ὀρθοῦ ἄνθεων δημότων τοὺς καλομένους Σάφρονος μίμησις μὴ διαφέροι εἴναι λόγων καὶ μιμητικῶν, η τοῦ Ἀλέξεμενοῦ τοῦ Σάφρονος τοὺς πρότυπα γραφῶν τῶν Συμφωνικῶν διαλόγων." ἄντωνος θέματος ὁ πολυμθέτατος Ἀριστοτέλης πρὸ Πλάτωνος διαλόγους γεγραφῶν τὰν Ἀλέξεμενος.

(The papyrus does not settle the vexed question of the soundness of Athenaeus' text of the quotation, for pro Πλ. ομοιο is an equally legitimate paraphrase whether Aristotle said that Alexamenus' dialogues were the first of the Socratic dialogues or—as the various emendations would have it—that he wrote dialogues before the Socrates.)

DL 3. 48 διαλόγους τοῦν πρῶτον ἐπῆκ οἱον πρῶτον γράφας Ζήνωνα τὸν Ἐλέατην Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ἐν πρώτῃ περὶ ποιητῶν Ἀλέξεμενον Στυρέα τῷ Σάφρῳ, ἀς καὶ Φαθαρίων ἐν Απωμηνεμένα (FHG iii 579), δοκεῖ δέ ποι τὸν Πλάτων ἀκριβώς τὸ εἴδος καὶ τὰ προτείμενα δικαίως ἐν ὀστὲρ τὸν κάλλους οὔτος καὶ τὴν εὐφρένους ἀποφέρωσι.

The only other mention of Alexamenus extant in ancient literature, the present passage excluded, is at Eustathius, in II. 21. 142 (cited for the accentuation), Ἀλέξεμενος, Σάφρος ἀνήρ, εὑρέσεις οὐ μιμητικῶς γράφας. This is manifestly dependent on Athenaeus.

It is remarkable that the papyrus specifies dramatic dialogues. I have elsewhere (BICS 19 (1972) 19–22) given reasons for thinking that 'dramatic' is not an arbitrary qualification but is tantamount to 'mimetic', and that what our author is concerned to repudiate is Aristotle's assertion that Alexamenus' logoi are to be accounted mimesis. Briefly, I take his position to be: Plato got the dramatic element of his dialogues not from Alexamenus but from Sophron.

10 Τήνων: Τήνων Aristotel ap. Athen. loc. cit.; Τήνων Athen. ibid. cit.; Στυρέα ἦ Τήνων DL loc. cit.; Τήνως Eustath. loc. cit. The chances are that of Τήνως and Τήνως, one is the corrupt version of the other.
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I find nothing to determine the choice other than the weight of authority in favour of Τήμος. The De Poetae quotation utilized by Athenaeus, and DL’s source, each had ‘Tean’, for the mutual agreement of these authors is enough to protect either of them from suspicion of subsequent corruption. More generally, the papyrus’ other mistakes or corruptions in this section (κατανομησικων και περὶ ποιητικής) do not encourage faith in it.

11 ἦς is virtually certain. I do not know how ἰδέαται (or ἐφ') would relate to what precedes. The only alternative is ἐφευκτά or compound, which does not look attractive.

12 Possibly τὸ ἄλλο (ἐ).
NEW LITERARY TEXTS

Frr. 3-5. These fragments have to do with tragedy, specifically, it seems, with the introduction and increase in number of actors. They add nothing to our historical knowledge. Fr. 3 evidently belongs closely before fr. 4, but I cannot exactly fix their physical relationship (see apparatus).

There is no necessity to assume that the discussion has any bearing on the Platonic dialogues, but it is possible to find the connection in a comparison of the stages of development through which tragedy and philosophy respectively passed, such as is made at DL 3. 56: ὥσπερ δὲ τὰ παλαιὰ ἐν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ πρῶτον μὲν μόνον ὁ χορὸς δεδομένης, ἄστερον δὲ Θέσπις ἕνα ὑποκρήτην ἤξερεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ διαμαπαίκεια τὸν χορὰν καὶ δεύτερον Αἰσχύλος, τὸν δὲ τρίτον Σοφοκλῆς καὶ ευσηπλήρωσεν τὴν τραγῳδίαν, οὕτως καὶ τῆς ἱλοσοφίας ὁ λόγος πρῶτον μὲν ἡ μονοείδες ὡς ὁ φαικιός, δεύτερον δὲ Λυκόπρος προεύρηκε τῶν ἥδικων, τρίτον δὲ Πλάτων τῶν διάλεκτικῶν καὶ ἐκτελεσθῆναι τῆς ἱλοσοφίας. Another possibility, given our author's view of Plato qua dramatist, is a comparison of some kind between the number of actors in tragedy and the number of participant characters introduced in dialogue.

Fr. 3 3 Θέαςπις ὑποκρίτην ἐδέχεν τὸν πρῶτον, ν. sim., seems secure.

4 τραγῳδίας ἐν ἐκείνης; ἐπὶδο[3在这方面，似乎应该考虑]<3[τρ]ἀγῳδίας. But there are other possibilities.

Fr. 4 1 δ[ι]ς κληρικός?
2 μὰς τοῖς τοῦτον (unless, as Dr. Rea cautions, τοῦτον): sc. Thespis, probably.
3 3 ὑποκρίτην ὑποκρίτην (τὴν, 4 Σοφοκλῆς. The introduction of the second actor is presumably attributed to Aeschylus, as in DL, for it seems clear enough that the papyrus does not credit Aeschylus with the introduction of the third.
4 3 3 δ[ε] τρίτον ν. sim.?

Fr. 5 1 τρ[αγῳδίας, τρ[αγ[ω[ν, al.
3 τραγ[ω[δίας] ἤτα? Perhaps I should not venture to proffer ἐπὶ τραγ[ωδίας] [τραγ[ωδίας] φ[λοσοφίας].

5 Articulation as Ηπ[όλ[λω] is practically enforced by the enlarged alpha, which rules out -α πολλ[ό] and discourages δ πολλ[ό]. If this fragment is part of a comparison of tragedy and philosophy, perhaps Apollo stands as the representative of philosophy, as Dionysus (3. 2) of tragedy.

6 προ: or προ (πρῶτος;) or τρι (Πραγματικ;).

Fr. 6 2 In view of δραμ[α], perhaps πρόασ[ε]ρ[α]ν.

Fr. 7 2 τ[ῆ]ς δ[ρ]αμ[ατικῆς? Iota adscript is not written in the other fragments (1. 3, 7, 8; 2 i 3, 4; 19. 3), but should probably be recognized at line 5 of this fragment.
5 Since δαὐδ[ε]υ[ν] seems out of the question, the articulation is presumably γη α[ς] (or γη Ας[)].
6 (-)δ[ι]ς[ι]ν[ιον or -δις[ι]ν[ιον. It is conceivable that the Symposium, or symposiac literature generally, is under discussion.

Fr. 8 The appearance of this fragment is consistent with its belonging to col. ii of fr. 2, but I cannot place it. The following restorations then suggest themselves:
2 Λη[νία[ν](al.[paleographically better than Ττ[μα[ν])]
5 περ[ε] τὸν τεσσ[ερ(ος (προ[σώπω]]])

Fr. 9 3 περι τ[ῶν] π[ροσώ[πων? 4 ο[πότε, α[π[φο[ν, al.

Fr. 10 4/5 Apparently a diple obelismene (to mark a new section?), but it may be an ordinary paragraphus.
5 Not ν]π[ο[κρετ[.]}

Fr. 11 3 Π[λα]τ[α][ν][σ(ω[ν]
4 Apparently διάλογο[φ]ίαν (e. g. τὰ πηρ[ῶνa.

5 Dialectic again in line 7. DL, in his analogy between tragedy and philosophy (3. 56: see on frrr. 3-5 above), says that Plato perfected philosophy by the introduction of dialectic, but I cannot offer any plausible reconstruction of the fragment using that passage as a model.
6 οὐ (κόμας) οὐδὲν (κομιάσατον οὐ κομιέει).

9 I do not know whether the subdivisions of the 'practical' and 'theoretical' sciences have any relevance for the fragment.

Fr. 12 4 μετετόν, al. The enlarged alpha enforces this articulation.
5 Possibly θεωρητικ.

Fr. 15 2 Conceivably μέθοδον, cf. 18. 3, 20. 2.

Fr. 16 2 ἐνανορθοῦν calls to mind the three forms of government distinguished by the commentators as ἐξ ἐνανορθάεσσεσ (Δαμιανος Albinus), ἐξ ὑποθέσεως, and ἀνωθότερος (Albinus didasc. xxxiv 118 Hermann vi, Anon. Proleg. xxvi sub fin., Proclus in temp. ii 8. 15-21 Kroll). Cf. ἀνωθότερος at 19. 4. But the use of the verb rather than the noun is against interpretation on these lines, and the rest of the fragment does not naturally fall in with it.

3 οἰκονομίας [- or] -[iκών δ] μικτός (or μικρός). Against the latter is the papyrus' regular spelling of ι as ει (the ratio is 7 or 8 to 1).
4 The only possible articulation seems to be to isolate θ as a numeral, but it is strange that it should have no special designation as such, contrast the elaborate καὶ at 2 ii(a) 9. ἐν τοιούτῳ καὶ θ is then the obvious restoration (in books 8 and 9), but neither the Republic, nor the Laws, nor the Letters, is an obviously suitable reference, nor do any Oeconomica bring light. In view of the twofold difficulty, καὶ(θ)δο καὶ might be considered.
5 βάλλεται (or βάλλειτον) or βάλλειται probable.

Fr. 17 4 ποιητικ[-].

Fr. 18 3–4 Cf. 20. 2, which perhaps makes 4 πρὸς]ξεως καὶ παὶ ἄγμαστος (or παὶ θου) a less likely suggestion than it would be otherwise.

Fr. 19 This fragment is likely to have some relationship with the ἀνωθότερος ἀγάθη discussion of Pl. Rep. vi 510 c–11 a and vii 533 b–d, but I cannot get at the sense of it. The relation of ἡ διαλεκτική (μέθοδος) to τὰ μαθήματα is treated by Albinus, didasc. vii ad fin. (162 Herm. vi), but there is no close affinity with the papyrus. Cf. also Proclus in temp. i 289 Kroll, in Aeleib. i 128 and 246.
1 Perhaps διαλεκτική]καὶ, as the subject of the following participles.
2 Καὶ ποιητικά is not credible, ἐξ ἀνθαίρεσι scarcely more so. I would emend to Καὶ ποιητικά. The trace above the first omicron, transcribed as if it were the tail of a phi, may in fact be a supralinear correction.
3 διάπεια ποιητική.
4–5 ηθωρητικ is less secure.

Fr. 20 1 ἀνωθότερος]θερητος τὰς ἀρχας (cf. 19. 4–5) is perhaps a rather far-fetched suggestion.
2 'Methods' in the vicinity of Στοιχεῖα also at 18. 3. The fragments are unlikely to belong close to each other, for the writing there is smaller.

Fr. 21 2–3 θεωρητικά?
Fr. 23 i 2 Probably λαμπρομένων.

Fr. 25 2 A heading?
II. EXTANT CLASSICAL TEXTS

3220. Hesiod, *Erga* and *Aspis*  

Second century

Π39. On these fragments see the introduction to 2495. Under that number were published others, apparently in the same hand, from at least two lost works of the Hesiodic corpus. The fragments of *Erga* and *Aspis* published here might have belonged to two different rolls, but it is equally possible that both poems were contained in one. In *Erga* the column-height was 38–9 verses, about 22 cm. The *Aspis* fragments are at least compatible with this format; a column may perhaps have ended at v. 194.

*ERGA*

15 ῥήμεντο[... ]

15 με[... ]

interlinear

260 ἀποτελεσμάτοι[... ]

260 πανο[... ]

308 ἐργα[... ]

309 τεργα[... ]

311 Π[... ]

*Erga* 17 μὲν had perhaps been accidentally omitted 309 II agrees with other sources in having τ’ before ἐργα- 311 The trace does not suit the letters of 310 (omitted in four other papyri and CD); probably Π[... ]
Top of column

360  γωνεψιλισθη
c
κροικαταθεο
μεγακατυγεν
αποταμε

365  ησθηρη

381  αιεν
γωκρ

440  γερσεαν  Ακικ
δεεργον  ναυθλι
εκαρακ  

445  θυμ
ντου
εσεροσαλ
εσετε  εκαθαι  εσπορη

452  φοαζε  υταγγερ

450  ροτ

3220. HESIOD, ERGA AND ASPIS

357 -μετα was a slip, but δολη is a variant known from Π8, Proclus, and the Φ manuscripts except Ε
358 not τέρπεθ τον as Φ 361 καταθει as Π5 Π11 codd., Plutarch, etc.; Philoponus and cod.
M of Stobaeus give the active (cf. Plato, Crat. 428 α) 365 Apparently θορμηπια as in G; contrast
ηθαι in 359 383 επιστελλα as codd. and many quotations: περιπελη Max. Tyr. 441 ηθη:
the accent appears to be in a different ink. Π48 and the medieval tradition give -ηθη. Cf. Kühner-Blass
1 545 n. 11; Chandler, Greek Accentuation, 2nd edn., para. 703 442 The interlinear sigma is crude
and heavy. Below it the top of τερπαντια 443 κ’ αθλακ: the κ’, omitted in most codd., was given
by Laur. 32. 16, Par. 2707, Vat. gr. 57, but suspected of being a Byzantine conjecture. It is also found
in Π8, below
\[\begin{align*}
455 & \eta \delta i o v[ \\
460 & \pi r \omega \mu a[ \\
465 & \alpha p[ \\
470 & \chi e[ \\
475 & \alpha \rho[ \\
480 & \chi \alpha a[ \\
485 & \pi o l l o[ \\
490 & \chi r h \xi o[ \\
495 & \chi l t \in[ \\
500 & \epsilon m \mu[ \\
505 & \epsilon i k[ \\
510 & \k a t[ \\
515 & \chi a[ \\
520 & \tau \mu[ \\
\end{align*}\]

459 \(\epsilon \phi o m \eta \theta \gamma\) codd. 460 \(\varepsilon \rho\) as Pollux. One cod. gives \(\delta \rho\), the rest \(\varepsilon \rho\). 465 sscr. perhaps \(\varepsilon \rho\). 496–7 omitted, as in \(\Omega\), schol. vct., Et. Gen., and Tzetzes. Plutarch and Proclus knew the lines, but not necessarily in just this place; Schoemann suggested that they belonged after 492. 538 If \(\gamma \mu \) was written, the margin was not straight
3220. HESIOD, ERGA AND ASPIS

575  ἑναμἐ[  
       ἡ, τοσσ[  
       αἱνεταμε[  
       ἀρτέργοιστ[  
       ὑπροφερεμ[  

580  ἡγεθανειετ[  
       πολλ[  

585  ὅσα[  ἄγες[  
       ἀσεγ[  ἀσαι[  
       ἀκεφὰ[  ἡρκ[  
       ἅτρ[  ὑποκ[  
       ἐκ[  κη[  

590  ἡγαλατ[  

End of column

Top of column

578 γάρ ἔτι as codd. (cf. 309) 588 The space available indicates ἀναλόεο δέ) (Hermann) rather than ἀναλόεο δέ τε (codd.), though the omission might be a mere accident 590 False iota adscript 689 ἐπιτα as codd.: παρστα Πκ below 690 omitted, as in Πκ; homoeoteleuton will be responsible 692 ἔπι διαξαν as Πκ, not ἔφι as part of the medieval tradition
END OF COLUMN

699 f. Prima facie, πατις is 699 παρθενική ... τις 700 τὸν δὲ μᾶλτα γαμεῖν ... and 701 πάντα μᾶλ' ἀμφίς ἵνα ... is missing; or 699 is missing and 700-1 are transposed. But the line one might expect to be absent is 700, which is omitted by two other papyri (Π4, Π46) and Stobaeus, ignored by Proclus, and marginal in Vat. gr. 57. It is not impossible that the τις was a π (700 = 701), though the horizontal would be abnormally prolonged to the left 705. Perhaps ὑποτελεῖ ἐνδοκέντρωσις. An ancient variant had θηδεν, see below on 758. 736 a ( = 758) is absent, as in Π5, Proclus, Moschopulus, Tridinius, and Vat. gr. 904. 738 Insertion and trema by a second hand 740 Aristarchus athetized the line. This scribe is very sparing with tremas and elision-marks, so their absence here does not necessarily imply the articulation κακότητι δὲ. Codd. are divided between this and κακότητι ἀδὲ; the schol. vet. mentions also readings κακότητι τῇ κακότητι etc. The omission of 741, if it is anything but an accident, would imply τῇ 742 ἐν as quotations and most codd.: ἐν Vat. gr. 57 and 904 746 ἀνεπιφῆλτον as codd., quotations, Proclus, schol. vet.: ἐν τῇ ἀνεπιφήλτων γράφουσα schol. (cf. 748) 747 κροίζη as Π44, C, etc. Other sources give κροίζη.
3220. HESIOD, ERGA AND ASPIS

Top of column

\[\tau, \upsilon \delta \varepsilon \lambda \nu \kappa \nu \rho \iota \tau \]...

775
\[\kappa r\rho o n o \mu \] \[\mu e g a m e i e n o \] \[\sigma t h \sigma o s - o r a x \] \[\sigma m \alpha t \] \[\sigma r o t \theta e e r g o n \]

780
\[\eta \] \[\ldots \] \[\phi \]

800
\[\mu \pi \] \[\iota t e k a i \] \[\pi \epsilon \] \[\phi \] \[k o \]

805
\[\nu l o t o m o r \] \[\kappa a d \] \[\sigma t e v u l a p o l l a t \] \[\xi o n t \] \[\sigma d a r \] \[\beta a i n \] \[\xi \xi \sigma \]

810
\[\eta \pi \delta \] \[\rho \] \[\pi \alpha \] \[\rho o \pi \] \[\epsilon \phi \] \[\epsilon n \]

807 \(\beta \alpha l l e i \eta \nu \) as \(\Pi \) codd., not \(\beta a l l e \mu e \eta \nu \) (Rzach)
809 \(\sigma r e t a c \) was written instead of \(\delta r a d e \), and corrected with an \(e \) (for \(a \)). The correction was made with a blunter pen.
Uncertain location (314–15?)

Fragment of uncertain location, a flat dot at letter-top height is closely followed by the upper left part of a round letter; then a pointed top before ρ. Compatible with κὐρίων (315), but if so, Π had του for το in 314. This has figured in several conjectures. I cannot find any alternative location for the scrap in Erga or Aspis. (Erga 382–3 and 443–4 are excluded by the presence of other fragments.)

**ASPIS**

85

90

95

190

**Asp.** 85 ϒ not ψ is correct 87 The i is a later addition 92 -τυμ- or -τυ- ἄχισται is a new reading; codd. have -τῦν- 94 ɛ̅πετειλ[α]τίς (as Vat. gr. 1825, s. xiv) or ɛ̅πετειλ[ε]ν as Tricl.). Most codd. have ἐπετειλλής (cf. Od. 11. 622) or ἐπετειλλής (cf. [Hes.] fr. 190. 12) 95 ̀ου[-κόντα as most codd.: εὐκόντα (cf. II. 5. 226) F 189 The space indicates καί} (ή, etc.) not οι] (B) εὐαιδής as BJ, Et. Gen./Magn.: εὐαίδης b schol.
193 δι ΒΠ: δή m (om. RLS) 197 δυλεία as BJ: ολοκ B, which led Peppmüller to conjecture ολοκ ημι 199 Apparently χρυσή as Vat. gr. 1825 and m: χαυσέων the rest. Preceding it, χειρι[ς] (BFS) rather than χειρί[ς] (BJ) 202 διοκαστήγευσιος as BS: ληποκ και δις υιός k] 200 εις ημερίαν Κατ’ ημερίαν Κατ’ ημερίαν

3221. HESIOD, Erga, 93?-108

93/Dec. 18/H3 3.0 x 8.4 cm. Second/third century

Π. Written on the back of a list containing words beginning χα, χε, χη, etc. Most of these words are covered up by a strip of papyrus stuck over them for strengthening. On ↓ the Hesiod text is copied in an ugly informal upright rounded capital, leaning slightly backwards, to be assigned to the latter part of the second or the early third century.
The traces of the first line are not sufficient to show whether it was 93 (unknown to Origen, Proclus, and part of the medieval tradition) or 92. There may have been an elision-mark as well as the smooth breathing. II disagrees with Sceclus, who read μυοίης for δύματης. 99 is present, as in all manuscripts; it is omitted in one quotation, while two others end with 98. 102 II supports quotations and most manuscripts against P's ἢδ' ἐπί. 104 was athetized, according to the scholia.

3222. Hesiod, Erga, 144–56

30 B.41/D(2–3)a  2.6×8.2 cm. Third century

Πα. A competent but ugly example of the mixed style, with a slight lean to the left, probably to be assigned to the third century.

145 μον ὡ[ν] [ε] μεν ὡδε[ν]

150 αλκευοδέτ[ε]

155 αυσηθὲλ[ε]

146 Above co, the right-hand end of a stroke resembling a grave accent (not expected here) followed by a small semicircle open to the lower right and a dot. A spot above the line, possibly the right-hand end of an acute accent, which would have been on the alpha. As this is the wrong accent for δύματης, it might conceivably point to a variant δυματης. Perhaps κρα]πεν was written for κραπεν (P. Berol. 21107 and codd.); the trace after ε can be taken as ρ, but there hardly seems room for ou. I cannot explain the superscript, which is in the same hand as the text. It might be read as ρ.

156 II agrees with P. Berol. and all codd. in unaugmented κάλυψεν.

3223. Hesiod, Erga, 172–215, 228–45

21 B.29/C(11–12)a  13.0×22.5 cm. Second century

Πα. Upright, small, quickly made hand of the type in which hypomnemata are written (cf. VI 853, XXXI 2536, and PSI XII 1285). Probably a working copy, to be assigned to the early second century. Written on the back of a register containing
18 lines mentioning names, aurotas, and small sums of money, in a regularly clerkly hand of the later first century.

Part of two columns; 2.5 cm. of the upper margin remains. The space between columns is about 4 cm., the column itself being about 9 cm. in width. The height of the first column was 56 verses, 25 cm., if no verses were missing, but in col. ii the writing is slightly bigger. The earlier part of Erga must have occupied the three preceding columns, but the number of verses present in this text cannot be calculated exactly.

*Top of column*

172 | πτος | βεα | ρπν | έ[...]
---|---|---|---
173 | βαλλωνταφ | ξειδωροσαρου | οργαλ | ..
175 | ηπτροκοθ | ηροπειταγενεθαι | ουδετ | ..
176 | ο. εστιο | ονομαπτημαρ | Τοις | ..
180 | αματουκα | χοσουδετινκτωρ | άκρη |...
185 | αθαλεπαδε | έοιδωσουσιμερμαν | .. | ..
190 | καινιοιμεμιζε | εταιεθλακακεπ | τοις | ..
195 | εικαιαυτόγενομερησμανβρωσωρ | θαλλο | ..

...
EXTANT CLASSICAL TEXTS

50

173 II does not give the additional lines after 173 attested by Π6 and Π58, and in part by the scholia

174 II agrees with Π6 against ὁφελοῦ given by many of the manuscripts and the scholia

177 καμάρων was at first written, as in Φ, but it was corrected before the next words were added, so being made into ων

179 II agrees with Π6 and all manuscripts in the spelling μεμετάται not μεμετάται 183 -δογα-, banalization of the Ionic -δόκαν. Similarly cod. Riccard. 71 The scribe began to write ετερος, but corrected himself before completing the second ε.

186 αρατόν: Marcus Aurelius 11. 32 gives ἀρατόν. II agrees with the direct tradition βάλοντες έπεκείν, C, Φ, Marcus: βάλοντες έπεκείν (c) or βάλοντι έπεκείν the majority of the other manuscripts

187 οὔδε is superior to the oúde of the medieval tradition, and it has been printed by editors since Aldus. For οὔδε μεν Brunck conjectured οὔδε κεν. The critical letter in II might have been κ, but it looks more like μ. At the end, the cod. have ο of νε, but Et. Gen. (cod. A) 5 v. γηράντεσσα gives αίδης, which points to the reading given by Π 188 Apparently not τοικενήν[ν] 190 οὔδε: so CD; a number of manuscripts have οὔδε 192 There is no room for ὅρος αἰτία (c) given by manuscripts and testimonia. ὅρος αἰτία had been restored from the close imitation in Kaibel, Epigr. Gr. 1110. 2. The inscription has καλομημένα; II agrees with the other sources 200 The marginal variant, νοεώς για τον μισθον, was known from Ps.-Ammonius Π. ὁμολογεῖ καὶ διαφόρων λέξεων and related works, and P. Berol. 21107 has it in the text 203 προεϊέτες by mistake for προεϊέτες 204 Apparently ενόθες for ενοθής

207 II agrees with most manuscripts in ὀρέων (ὁμελών Ambr. G 32 sup.) 210-11, athetized by Aristarchus, are present, as in the three other papyri which cover the passage (Π6, Π58, Π52)

215 Π6 has αὐτού, which is impossible 237 Or perhaps νείτες. Both spellings are found among medieval manuscripts (the second being commended by Moschopulus), besides νικ-, νείτ-, νικ- 241 II agrees with the manuscripts against δς κεν (Aeschines) 243 Manuscripts, Aeschines, and other quotations agree on λιμαυ δύσι καὶ λοιμάν (λἱμαυς'λομοιος Π6). II probably had καὶ λείμου καὶ λόμου, or unmetrically καὶ λείμων ὁμοῦ καὶ λόμων 244-5, omitted by Aeschines and either omitted or condemned by Plutarch in his commentary (Proclus ad loc.), are present here, as also in ΠΠΠ6, ΠΠ52
PI. Upright, informal capitals, not unlike the mixed style, and probably to be assigned to the later second century. $v$ has a long tail curving to the left.

The interest of these scraps lies almost entirely in the critical signs visible in the margin. They include the obelos, the diplos, the asteriskos, of which the cross has the form of a $\chi$, and perhaps a bare $\chi$ in 186, but it may have been a diplo or another asteriskos. It is known that Aristophanes and Aristarchus used critical signs at least in the Theogony; and for the Works and Days critical signs in an ancient edition are implied by schol. 276 $b$ to $\epsilon \mu \theta \varepsilon$ $\eta$ $o$ $\nu$ $\delta$ $o$ $N \nu$ $\delta$ $m$ $e$ $v$ $\nu$ $\delta$ $e$ $v$ $\nu$ $\delta$ $e$ $v$. The manuscripts of Aristides, who quotes the line, are divided $182-5$ The asteriskos, according to the Anecdota Romanum, p. 3 Osann, was used by Aristarchus in his edition of Homer as kalos eirinmen, tov epitw $v$ ai $\alpha$ $\varepsilon$ $\gamma$ $\theta$ to $\tau$ $\sigma$ $\pi$ $\rho$ $\omega$ $\nu$ $\delta$ $m$ $e$ $v$ $\nu$ $\delta$ $e$ $v$. It is the correlative of the asteriskos meto $d$ eirein, which signifies as $\delta$ $r$ $\nu$ $v$ $\tau$ $\mu$ $\eta$ $\tau$ $\kappa$ $y$ $u$, $\mu$ $\eta$ kalos $\delta$ $e$ keimev ev ai $\alpha$ $\varepsilon$ $\gamma$ $\theta$ $\sigma$ $\pi$ $\rho$ $\omega$ $\nu$ $\delta$ $m$ $e$ v $\nu$ $\delta$ $e$ $v$. (Cf. sch. Dion. Thr. p. 737; 15; sch. II. 6. 490-3.) In other words, the signs were used where a line or passage occurred more than once and was judged to be more appropriate in one context than in another. $\times$ is found in this sense in P. Tebt. 4 (second century B.C.) at II. 2. 141 and 164, and in PSI 8 (first century A.D.) at Od. 5. 110; $\times$ in P. Lit. Lond. 27 (first century A.D.) at II. 23. 657, in III 445 (second/third century A.D.) at II. 6. 490-2, and also in codd. Vat. gr. 30
EXTANT CLASSICAL TEXTS

(i. xiv) and Par. 1805 (s. xv) at II. 5. 891. The Hesiodic lines, however, are not known to have occurred anywhere else. I presume that a diploe preceding an asteriskos has its usual function of calling attention to something in the line worthy of remark, though I have not found other instances of the conjunction 185-6 are closer together than normal 186 The χ, a general-purpose symbol, is one of the commonest critical signs in papyri (cf. E. G. Turner, Greek Papyri, pp. 116 f.), though it seems not to be found in Homer papyri, and it is absent from the list in the Anecdota Romanum. The papyrus is not well enough preserved here to rule out the possibility that this was a diploe or another asteriskos

3225. Hesiod, Erga, 265–79

Second century

Π48. Written in well-formed, medium-sized rounded formal capitals, bilinear, some letters having serifs. Probably to be assigned to the middle of the second century. The back is blank.

265 27/C(1–2)c

267–73 were condemned by Plutarch, but there is no evidence that they were ever omitted by a manuscript 268 εθέλη as 1090 (Π10), against (ε)θέλη of the codd. 270 μυτη: the accent is anomalous. A minute trace below the circumflex may represent an acute 271 The space between the two fragments calculated from the other lines suggests επεκ[κακώμα] (δρα instead of δόρα) as in Π10 273 After λις prima facie ε, sc. εις written for metrical εις as in Archilochus, 2310 fr. 1 i 14, 2313 fr. 8(a) 14, (b) 3, 2319 fr. 4. 13; Anacreon, 2321 fr. 1. 4. But it might be a large serif at the foot of ε running into the corner of ν. Above, a dot (perhaps casual) followed by what may either be a circumflex (which would be anomalous with the spelling τέλεων; cf. δοκέει in Anacreon loc. cit.) or a superscript correction (ε ?) μητοδέστα as Π10. Proclus, ΨΦ, and some of the ψ manuscripts, against τερπηκάρων (D, Tzetzes, al.) 278 εσθήν Π10 to judge by the space, most quotations, and all codd.), not εσθεμέν (Clement) 279 απαράποις δε δέωκε as codd. and most quotations, not ανθρώποι δε δέωκε as Porphyry on Od. 9. 106 ff.
3226. *HESIOD, ERGA, 311-16, 345-53, 414-19, 421-2, 432-6, 441-3*

27 3B.39/E(t)a and 41/G(4-6)b Fr. 2 3.9 x 6.3 cm. Second/third century

**Π**46. Five fragments in fair-sized upright flowing capitals; many verticals have a right-pointing tail at their foot. Only roughly bilinear, β above, ρ below line, deep μ. Same general type but not same hand as VIII 1090 (*Erqa*), XVII 2090 (*Theogony*), and PSI 847 (New Comedy). Probably falls within the second century but could be second/third. There were 33 or 50 lines to the column. The back is blank.

---

Fr. 1

```
Top of column

→ 311  [εργο[ε]][δ]
[ειδεκ[ε]
[πλουτε]
[δαμιον]
315 [ευκεν][ ε]
...[εργον]
```

Fr. 3

```
Top of column

1ν[.]ορθοσελη[ 421 ]
[νμηνημενο.][ 422 ]
```

Fr. 4

```
345 γειτ[ι]
πήμα[ι]
εμο[ι]
ουδαν[ι]
εμεν[ι]
350 αυτωτ[ι]
ωκαν'χρ[ι]
μηκακ[ι]
τ[ε]φ[ι]
```

Fr. 5

```
441 [ντατήσα][ 441 ]
[τρατρυφον][ 441 ]
...[.][.][.][.][.][ ]
```
314–16 As codd. and four other papyri; Π19 had eight unidentifiable verses here before correction: the same slip in Vat. gr. 38
(corrections m2) 315 ετικ as Π6, codd., Et. Gen., not ετικ 353–5 were condemned by Plutarch 421–2 are added in a different hand. They were presumably omitted lower down as a result of homoearchon, 420 and 422 both beginning with προσ (but 420 προσ Athous Iviron 209 a.c. and Triel., προσ Par. 2774) 415 Or perhaps προσ or προσ 416 μεταθεται was apparently written instead of προσπεται. Above the first alpha is a small delta, followed at a much lower level by what looks like an epsilon perched on the delta 417 σειμος Π38, codd. 434 The codd. have έτι θιοη preceded by κ', γ', δ', or directly by έτερον. In II, έτοι is preceded by a trace of a vertical, so presumably έτερον. The correction introduces two separate changes, suggesting collation with a different copy rather than simple rectification of a slip 435 ακιώτατος as codd., Proclus, Hesychius. Et. Magn. attests a variant ακιώτατος 436 γνηθε as Ιβ D φ and grammatical citations, against γινηθε of Tzetzes and Φ 441 Above the second tau, traces of a superscript 443 The first trace is the top of a round letter

3227. HESIOD, Erga, 415, 421–35, 440–53

Π47. Two fragments of a roll written in a large-sized roughly made ‘Biblical majuscule’, reminiscent of but not the same as XXVIII 2486. Not so regular as XVII 2075 or XXII 2334. Bilinear, ν and ρ scarcely reaching below the line. There is a just perceptible contrast in thickness of stroke in some horizontals. Should probably be assigned to late second or early third century. On the back is part of two columns of a money account of the third century (⊥).

The column had 34 lines. Its height was about 17 cm., its width much the same. 2.5 cm. of the upper margin is preserved, and 4 cm. of the lower; the height of the roll must have been about 25 cm.
Top of column

415 ἔπωριονομῆρησαντος

421 ὀψιέληγεν

ημεοςωρίουνε[.]γον

νυπερωνιὸντριπτηχυν

νυποποιεμονοντων

425 ὁφρανκεταμοιο

ἐκαδωρωμαζη

ὑδεγῆνοιςκανενερης

οὐσικαταπουραν[]

χωρωτατοετοτε[]

430 ματιπηςας

ηρ[ε]ταῖςτοβοηη

ησεαμεοκκαταυκουν[]

πολυλωσονουτω[[]]

βουσβαλωρ[[]

435

[[][

End of column

415 μετ' ἐσωρίον by mistake for -σωρ. II agrees with Πα, codd., Et. Sym. in the accusative; Et. Gen. has the genitive. The marks above and below the last letter of the line may represent a bracket (περιγραφή). Dr. Rea suggests that 415 was repeated by mistake after 420 because of the similar beginnings of 414 and 420 (see the note on the passage in 3226 above)
anomalous, but perhaps serves to distinguish the sense ‘sprouting’ from the usual sense ‘a shoot’. Cf. ps.-Ammonius p. 12. 3 Nickau on ἀμφος and ἀμπής

422 ὅριον ἄρρεν as Πειρ. sch. vet., Proclus’ lemma, ΩΔΦ, Tzetzes, sch. Eur. Andr. 1164: ὅριον ἄρρεν Φι, editors 423 τρίπηξ as D and Laur. 32. 16: -w the rest. δὲπερὶν is elsewhere neuter

424 ὀπτο as most codd.; a few give ὀπτωκ

425 κε τάμων as Πειρ. and most codd., against τετάμων EN 429 ὄχυρωτος most codd.: -τερον

Vat. gr. 44 and 121, Ambr. C 222 inf. 431 The correction is mistaken 441 I cannot account for the suprascript 443 κ’: see above (p. 41) on Πειρ. 448 ψαιν as most codd.: -τεκ


3228. Hesiod, Erga, 511–29

3228. **HESIOD, ERGA, 511–29**

The suprascript is in a different hand. The corrector supposed a mistake to have been made because he misread καίλ as κατ. 516 Corrected by the first hand because he misread κατ as κατ. 518 Βορεβω confirms Rzachi's correction of codd. βορεβω 519 Above κατ perhaps κατ. 521 ερυθίνια as codd. 522 Corrected by the first hand 523 Some editors call for ερυθίνια. 524 Apparently μεχίη as Proclus and some Φ manuscripts, not μεχίη 525 It cannot be determined from the space whether of was preceded by ου γάρ (codd., Et. Gen.) or by ουδέ (Hermann) Above 530, interlinear ink; possibly ή relating to μολισθήτες (μολισθήτες some manuscripts; μολισθήτες Crates)

3229. **Hesiod, Erga, 670–4, 686–716, 743–56**

IIa·. Four fragments of a generously laid out manuscript. There were 18 verses to the column, which measures 14 cm.; 3·8 cm. of the upper margin is preserved, and 5·5 of the lower. The large formal round calligraphic letters (each 5–6 mm. high) are as large in size as in any papyrus manuscript. The type is that of the Hawara Homer, not of XVII 2075 (note the deep μ); but the scribe's work lacks the delicacy of the Hawara manuscript. Probably to be assigned to the middle or later second century. The back is blank except for a column of figures.
Fr. 2

Top of column

\[\text{μλοις[} \]
\[\text{αρ[} \]
\[\text{ημας[} \]
\[\text{αδεπατ[} \]
\[\text{φρειω[} \]
\[\text{ηυψυκατ[} \]
\[\text{κολη[} \]
\[\text{ποντουμε[} \]
\[\text{μασιπη[} \]
\[\text{κ'επαμας[} \]
\[\text{βιοναχ[} \]
\[\text{αικαιφοτ[} \]
\[\text{μαυρωθ[} \]
\[\text{εσθαικαιροςδεππακ[} \]
\[\text{να[} \]
\[\text{κατ'ενσπο[} \]
\[\text{κονα[} \]
\[\text{ουτωνετομ[} \]
\[\text{πολ[} \]
\[\text{εμαλπολλαγαμ[} \]
\[\text{το[} \]
\[\text{εστορηβοιμεμπ[} \]
\[\text{εγ[} \]
\[\text{ωδεγαιμενοςκ[} \]
\[\text{κ[} \]
\[\text{αμφισεωμηγε[} \]
\[\text{πτηγβακωκαιη[} \]
\[\text{τηςδαντεκακησο[} \]
\[\text{ηηρτανδ[} \]
\[\text{ε[} \]
\[\text{δισκαιω[} \]

End of column

Fr. 3

Top of column

\[\text{μλαγμ[} \]
\[\text{ταιροδ[} \]
\[\text{οψ[} \]
\[\text{εγ'a[} \]
\[\text{ερ[} \]
\[\text{εγ'a[} \]
\[\text{αρα[} \]
\[\text{ετ'a[} \]
\[\text{ωε[} \]
\[\text{ες[} \]
\[\text{κ[} \]
Fr. 4

| αμνη[ | ντιδεμ[ |
| γαρεπαυ[ | ι'[,],επ[ |
| .ηκρωξ[ |
| δδωναι[ |
| λοεθαιεπε[ |
| γηοικοια[ |
| κατηονοτα[ |
| καμηρονι[ |
| ειωλ[[,],υτρ[ |
| γη',αρεπι[ |
| νεπαι[ |
| αθεος[ |

689 παντα: απαντα codd., Π9, 690 omitted; see on Π9 above (p. 43) 693 ειν' διοξων: see on Π9 693 καί is the better-attested reading (sch. lemma, CDΦ, al.); some manuscripts give τα δι θη[; or perhaps θη[, θη[; anyway not θη[ι 695 πολιπ ι αs Π9, quotations, sch. lemma, and some ψ manuscripts: εινι CDΦ, al. 696 τρηκωνυων as Π9, quotations and most codd. Tzetzes 'corrected' to -κωνια, which influenced some copyists 696 τρηκωνυων as Π9, quotations (except Pollux 1. 58 v.l. and Et. Sym. s.v. τετορε), and most manuscripts, against ήςών Η. the first π of πεμέπτια is corrected from μ; the correction consists simply of a horizontal line resting on the apexes 699 ωε κι as Π9, Stobaeus, codd. (except for one or two giving ωετι'), against νια (ps.-Aristotle Οτοσν. and Aristides) 700 is omitted, as in some other sources. See on Π9 704 δειμαλοιχιος as Gregory of Nazianzus, Π9, Proclus, sch. lemma, codd., Et. Gen./Magn., Eustathius: -γου Stobaeus, ps.-Zonaras 705 Only Stobaeus has δαλοι. Other sources all give δαλος, whether followed by καί εν ωμ' γηραι θηκεν (Plut. Mor. 527 a, Stob., Π9 (καεω[ . . . . . . ],κεν)), καί ωμ' γηραι δωκεν (Plut. Mor. 100 c, Et. Gen., διφζ, Tzetzes, Eustathius), or καί ωμ' γηραι θηκεν (Φ) 709 εκ γι' as Π9, Proclus' lemma, Et. Gen., CDΦ, Tzetzes: e' δ γι' Βατ. gr. 57, αL: κεν Et. Ged., N2, Moschopulus, Triconiæ 711 κε γι' again, here only with D: κεν the other codd. with Proclus' lemma and Ετυμολογικα 713 αλλωρι' τ' α[λλον as CDΦ; the particle is absent in other codd. and Et. Gen. 747 κροξιγι(ι): see above on Π9

3230. Hesiod, Erga, 293–301, 763–4, 78 (or 789), 1–13

Π9. A tall strip of papyrus containing on the front excerpts from Erga in no obviously accountable order. The hand is a quickly written, upright, business one of medium size, in which letters are often linked to each other, and is probably to be assigned to the first part of the first century A.D. Cf. II 291 (P. Lond. 800), a document of A.D. 25/6, and P. Lond. 276B (Pal. Soc. II 182) of A.D. 15. XIX 2221, a commentary on
Nicander, is of the same type. The back has been used (ㅏ) for a private letter (l. 10). αδελ-
θονεπιστολη [] also to be assigned to the early first century after Christ. A slight space
separates each excerpt from the last, except that Op. 763–4 are followed without interval
by a line from another passage.

Top of column

? ... .οφι]

293 [μενηθ]
     [μενος]

295 [εδανακακεωρ]
     [κεβιγατοτοσει]
     [ωμβαλληταιδε]
     [γημετηρησω]
     [ευπεργιδιογη]

300 [ην φυληιδες]
     [βιοτον-δετη]

763 [ ... k[.], αμπαλαπ]
     [μικαωθε, ν[.]

78 or 789 [αθαμιμυλοτε]

1 [περερηβεναοιδημικλεωρ]
     [δεινεπετετετετετετοι]
     [βροτουαθερεομ]
     [ρητοτεθεδωμεγ]

5 [μαρβρ[, εαιρεαθεβ]
     [δαρκζηλομημομθε]
     [θυρεικολοκν
cαι]
     [βρεμετπαρασε]
     [κωνωαμωτεδικαδ]

10 [μωδεκεπερσετ]
     [εικενηπερικι]
     [εικενεπεπ]
     [η διαδαμ]

End of column

In the first line, the tip of a stroke rising to the right is closely followed by two curling up inwards
(I think an open-topped o), and these, again closely, by a stroke rising a little higher and looped over
to the left, resembling the top of the ξ in 764. But the letters οφ do not appear in the first half of the
verse anywhere in Eges 294 is omitted by many quoting authors, but present in all manu-
scripts, including four other papyri 295 καικεωφε: P. Berol. 21107, codd., and all quotations
give κακεωφ. Aristarchus commended κακεφκ in such cases in Homer (sch. H. 3. 402, al.), and Schaefer
conjectured it here 296 μφτ αντικ as Πι, Πιν D, Laur. 92. 2, and quotations, against μφτ αντικ
of Proclus (?) and most codd. 764 The spacing indicates that λαοί not πολλοί stood before φημίζωσι, and therefore πολλοί not λαοί at the end of 763. II thus agreed with Παλ, codd. and some quotations against Demosthenes, Aeschines, Aristotle, Favorinus, and Proclus φημίζωσι is given by C, Et. Gen. A, the manuscripts of Aristides and Favorinus, and some of those of Demosthenes, Aeschines, and Proclus; other sources give -Σωκ or -Σωκ or -Σωκ 2 δὲ, i.e. Δι’; some codd. and some quotations have δὲ 10 As iota is correctly written in long diphthongs elsewhere (300, 1, 9), the scribe may have understood Πέρεια as vocative.

3231. Hesiod, Erga, 225-45

Second/third century

Παλ. A well-made upright capital of the mixed style of the later second century (or just possibly early third century) A.D. π and τ both reach well below the line. The back is blank.


The verse in the upper margin appears to be 242 (omitted below) in the form in which it is quoted by Plut. Mor. 1040 c (from Chrysippus). εὐφάγες codd. 225 II agrees with codd. in διδώσω (διδώστες Φ); Paley conjectured the subjunctive. See on the next line 226 -Σωκ Π, Vat. gr. 904 (first hand) and 1825, Paley: -Σωκ the rest δικαϊων is a new variant, for -ων of codd. as Παλ, codd., and one of Aeschines' quotations: the other has μυστάρται 241 μυστάρται 242 See above 244-5 are present; see on Παλ above (p. 50)

P. Oxy. 8A/8 = C. 841 6·3 x 4·5 cm.  
First century

Π81. On the front (→) parts of four lines of an agricultural register in a regular round cursive of the first century A.D. On the back (↓) parts of six lines in a clear quickly made linear cursive also probably of the first century A.D.

325  
\[ \alpha[ ...] \nu[ ...] \phi[ ...] \]  
\[ \kappa[ ...] \theta[ ...] \phi[ ...] \]  
\[ \chi[ ...] \tau[ ...] \pi[ ...] \]  
\[ \nu[ ...] \zeta[ ...] \kappa[ ...] \]  
\[ \kappa[ ...] \xi[ ...] \varepsilon[ ...] \]  
\[ \lambda[ ...] \theta[ ...] \tau[ ...] \]  

325 α[γυμάλα], not -ος as J. The *ecthesi* marking a new paragraph is remarkable.

3233. Isocrates, *περὶ τῆς ἀντιδόκεισθι* 66–80

13 I. 132/A(1–2)a–b  
Fr. B 6·8 x 19·9 cm.  
First/second century

Four fragments from a handsome papyrus roll; the backs are blank. Fragments A, B, and C are from §§ 74–80 of Isocrates xv, *περὶ τῆς ἀντιδόκεισθι*. Fragment D comes from Isocrates viii, *περὶ τῆς εἰρηνῆς*, § 28. Either the roll originally contained several speeches, or we have part of two different rolls; or, more probably, fragment D belongs to the excerpt viii §§ 25–56 introduced at xv § 66, see below.

The scribe wrote a practised, upright, bilinear book-hand, similar to but less elegant than P. Lit. Lond. 132 (C. H. Roberts, *Greek Literary Hands*, pl. 13b). I should assign it to the late first or earlier second century. The only marks of punctuation are one elision (6) and one trema on iota (52; not written on hyphen 16, 21, 24, 25). Iota adscript is omitted (10, 39), and there are two itacisms (48, 49). Some obvious errors have been corrected in the text (38, 49) or above the line (34, 39, cf. 15 n.), perhaps by the first hand; a correction of word-order (27) looks like a second hand.

In general, apart from errors of omission, 3233 coincides with the text of the Urbinas (T); note 12, where it supports a right reading of T against all other manuscripts; and 41–2, where it ignores the unique reading of another papyrus, I 27 (Pack² 1281). But if fr. D is correctly placed in § 66, we may conclude that the scribe copied out the excerpt from Isocrates viii complete; and if so, 3233 shares the practice of the other manuscripts as against T, which gives only the opening and closing words (here as elsewhere, see Isocrates, ed. E. Drerup, 1906, pp. xciv f.). 3233 itself has two unique readings, one of them wrong (51), the other irrecoverable (15 n.).

Collated with the text of G. Mathieu (Budé, 1950).
Fr. D

5 ἐπιθυμεῖτε τόν συμφεροντος καὶ τοῦ πλεον εχειν των αλλῶν ουκ ἐμπεναί δὲ τὰς πρα-ξεις τὰς εἰπὶ τὰντα

§ 66 (De Pace § 28)

Fr. A

10 ἦμαν εὐμπηπτη τὰντομομεν

§ 74

Fr. B

15 χρωμα τοῖς λογοῖς δοειν δ[ικην ἦμαν αλ]ε ἐν τοι-ουτος οὐ[οις ὑπερ αλλος τῆς με]νιτής [πυχεων πτωρας

ei τν[ες ου]ν ὑμῶν
υπελαθον [τοτε λιαν αλαζοιν-κον ειναι] κα μεγα τονηθεν
ου]κ αν δικαιω[ε ει την γνω-μην ταυτη] εχοιεν ωιμαι

§ 75

§ 76

20 γν.ρ. αποδεικνει την υπογεχεσι και τοιουτος ει-ναι τους λογο[ν] τους ανα-γνωσθεντα[ε οιους περ εξ

αρχης υπεθε[μην] βρο[λο-

μαι δ ημιν δια βρα[χ]ην [α-
EXTANT CLASSICAL TEXTS

πολογησαθε[ι] περὶ[ ε]ξ[ας-
β
τον και ποιησαν ετι μαλάλαιγν
καταφανες ως αληθη[θ]η κα[ι] το-
τε προηιμον και ναν λε[γ]ει

30
περὶ αυτων κα[ί] π[ρω]τον
μεν ποιος γενοι αν λογος
οιως τοις δικαιωται[ε]ρικς το
τους π[ρογιον]ν εγκαλα[κ]α[ι]
ζονταρια[ι] α[ε]ριων της α[μ]ητης[ε]

35
της εκεινων και των ερ-
γων των πεταμενων αυτων
επειτα τις αυ της ἔν[ει]

§ 77

Fr. C

.......

συμφ[ερο]τ[ων] υψ [χρη δι τως

40
νοιν] εχον τας περι αμ-

§ 79–80


φιστηρ]α μεν ταυτα[ν] α σπουδα-
ζεω αντεις δι τοις των τοις
με] [ο]μεν και τη παλαιο
α[ε]ριων προτειμαν επειτα
κα[ρ]α[ν] ηπειρο[νον] γινομεν

50

νομον μεν θεωτα [μυριο
και των Ελληνων και των
barbarων] ι[κ]ανοι γεγονακα

.......

Fr. A 7–8 The text restored in 7 is about 10 letters too long for the normal line-length. Since no shorter variant is likely, something must have been omitted.

12 δικαίων ὑμῶν: so Γ1; δίκαιος ὑμῖν τὴν μεγίστην Γαμγ. Θ; δίκαιον τὴν μεγίστην ὑμῖν ΔΕ. The space here is too short for τὴν μεγίστην.

13 τοιούτως: τοιούτως codd., rightly. It is no longer possible to tell whether the omitted iota was added above the line, since the papyrus is torn away.

15 This line is unusually short (14 letters). It seems that the papyrus had something longer than the unanimous version of the manuscripts.

16 ὑπέλαβον μὲ Γαμγ. Θ, ὑπέλαβον cett. The line is long (23 letters) without μὲ, though the argument from space is not rigorous enough to exclude the possibility that it was written.

[The Press reader, noting the reversal of μάλλον ἐτι in 27, offers the guess that the copyist also reversed the word order of ἐνέχασεν τὸτε, so that τὸτε fell in 15. If so, lines 15 and 16 would each have contained 18–19 letters and have fallen within the normal limits, see above. Note, however, that the person who corrected 27 did not indicate any change of word order above ἐνέχασεν.]

27 ἐτι μάλλον corrected to μάλλον ἐτι (so manuscripts). For θ (the second now lost in lacuna) used to reverse the word-order, cf. I 16 i 26, P. Amh. I 25, 25.

31 ποῖος: so Γ1 cett.; ποῖος τις Γα E.
32 ἡ δικαιότερος ομ. Γ1, ins. Γ2 mg.
33 εὖ ψεύδοντος: so Γ1 cett.; ἑξεδείναι E.
38 ρο[λ][ξ]: the deleted letter may have been hypsilon.
41 Κ. καὶ τῶν: καὶ τῶν codd. καὶ τῶν ἀλλων κ. I 27, which the space here does not allow.

Fr. C. 51 τῶν ἐλληνῶν: τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων codd. Probably a simple slip; for the contrast of ἄλλως Ἑλληνες / τὶς ἀνέκ (Athens), cf. e.g. viii §§ 14, 136, xv § 85.

52 ι[ς το]: the first trace looks prima facie like the left-hand half of tau. I take it to be iota, joined at the top by the first half of a trema written as two dashes.
as expected, eclectic. Most of its differences from Hude's large edition (Leipzig, 1898–1902), with which a complete collation of the papyrus is given in the notes, are in the matter of ν-ἐφελκυστικῶν, which the papyrus avoids and Hude favours. In the only two cases (lines 2 and 11) where it might be possible to speak of differing traditions, the papyrus presents the better reading, although in one case this is found in CEGMf and in the other in CG.

Fr. 1

66

op]er ἐξεχε μὴ κατὰ πολεις α[ν-
ton επιπλεοπτα τὴν πελοπ[ον-
νηςοι πορθειν αδονάτων [οι 
οῦνον προς ναυς πολλας αλλ[η-
λοις επιβοσθεὲν τεκμηριωθ]
5
δὲ μεγατον αυτος εποιῆσε ν[[ε-
κηθεῖς γα[ρ τ[μιας ναυς· ἡς ὀσκ[ε 
αντοι γα[λιας ους της δυναμ[ε-
ως κατα ταχ[ης των πλεον το[ν
10
στατον ἀνεχ[ερης τουτον μ[εν-
tοι τουτον ἐγιμβαντος και σαφ[μω 
δηλωθειτο]ς σης ἐν ταις γα[η 
των ἐλληνων] τα πραγ[ματα εγε-
νετο τρια τα ωφελημ[ατα επε 

Fr. 2

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

τω το λ[φο[ρν νεμεσθαι επειδή ε-
45
deisai[τε υ[περ ὑμων και νο 
χ ημων] το π[λεον εβοηθθη-
cate ο[τε γον[ιν ημεν ετι εωιν ευ 
παρε[γνεν ε[θε ημεις δε απο τε 
της ο[μικ[αν ς[

1 of low horizontal trace  2 of left upright and part of cross stroke  4 of small high and low traces  5 of very small high trace  6 of traces of a low horizontal and oblique sloping down to right, then scattered traces  7 of low oblique sloping down to right (κ), cross stroke (η), traces of low curve, higher horizontal and scattered (θ), faint but visible under microscope  8 of right downward sloping oblique (α), traces of ω, traces then curve of ω, then vertical (ι)  9 of traces of tops of letters  10 of bottom of rounded letter, then, after a gap, a small trace of a foot  11 of high trace of curve  12 of traces of curve then long high horizontal
2 τὴν CEGM, τὴν τε ABF, τε del. f.
2-3 πελο[α]νης: so ABEFM, Πελοπόνησων CG; possibly only one υ or else δ in the papyrus.
3 [α] omitted by C; spacing indicates that it was in the papyrus in this form or as α.
6 ἐποίησε ABEFGc, ἐποίησεν CM Hude.
7 ραοε: vacev manuscripts. The high stop is very small, but even under a microscope no connection with ι is visible.
10 ἀνεξάρατες ACEFGM ἀνεξάρατον B Hude.
11 τοῖνος ξυμβάνος CG ξυμβάννος τοῖνος ABEFGM.
43-9 How the restored lines in this fragment should be divided cannot be determined.
44 το om. AB.
III. SUB-LITERARY TEXTS

3235-6. RHETORICAL DECLAMATIONS

Third century

The fragments collected under these numbers are of μελέται written in the persona of Demosthenes. (The technical term for the exercise would be Ἀγωνιζόμενος, cf. Philostratus, Vitae Sophist. 575.) Both 3235 and 3236 are written across the fibres in a severe style to be assigned probably to the third century; but two hands may be distinguished. 3235 is more widely spaced, not only between letters but between lines, and it displays a greater contrast between thick and thin strokes of the pen; and the columns are apparently shorter than those of 3236. What is more, there are constant differences in some of the letter formations. Beta in 3235 lacks the horizontal bar at the base that it has in 3236; xi has its top and bottom bars connected in 3235, whereas in 3236 the centre is distinct; sigma and epsilon are invariably tall and narrow in 3235, but often smaller and more rounded in 3236, and in the case of epsilon the mid-stroke which is generally kept short in 3236 is regularly extended in 3235; the stem of upsilon is a continuation of the right-hand side of the cup in 3235, of the left-hand side in 3236. Such differences take on special significance when they occur in such a standard type of script; and the inference that two manuscripts are represented is to some extent borne out by the writing on the front: in either case a register of amounts of land, but the fragments of 3236 have the declamation written the same way up as the document on the front, those of 3235 the other way up.

The alterations made in the texts, at any rate in 3236, give the impression of textual revision rather than correction of scribal error, so that the pieces are probably autographs of contemporary compositions. As Demosthenic μελέται they are not particularly impressive, though the Attic is on the whole good and the writers knew their author well, at least the Philippic orations and the De Corona. They plagiarize somewhat clumsily.

Demosthenes figures quite large in the meletic repertoire as represented on papyrus, as is only to be expected: VI 858, an attack on him which utilizes the De Corona; BKT 7. 4-13, a speech based on the in Leptinem and put into Leptines’ mouth; XV 1799, a vindication of Demosthenes’ anti-Macedonian policy; cf. III 444, which mentions Philip and the Macedonians, and II 216, directed against Philip but in Asianic style. But these are the first certain papyrus examples of declamations actually in his person.
3235 is an Olynthiac, given a firm dramatic date of 349–348 B.C. by the historical situation set out in fr. 2. Though the speaker is not positively identified as Demosthenes, the political stance is clearly his, and that the speech is in his persona is not open to doubt. The problemata of μελέται are generally fictional but historically based: the argument of 3235 does not emerge.

Fr. 1

Col. i

5 πανταεκτηψιμετερα
toutou[...][νομοftp][εχουμεν'touc
ορουστοξεισρουθετα
ευτοπυλανεατως
5 γυλαταιρ, ρυποσβο
5 αιρετες αινιθος
...λεθευσιεος,
...ειτορ, λην, σεπειν
...ποιειτ, ζωγη, ε
...ροικη, τοφ[...]]
...αιουθεμεξεταιαλ
...απαντ, ναπλασιε
ασατος, εφευβουλε
...κειθε, ουτο[τ][ου]\[καρθες
10 τοικλο, ικαμιχηεις
...τηρηςμητωνελη
...κε 6 [...][...μενον
...κε, ...}

3235. RHETORICAL DECLAMATION

69
Sub-literary Texts

Col. ii

[c. 5] εγερτ[....], εωτ[....], ἤτευθ[....], αθην[5]

..φ[....]πποε[....], οικ[....]σεκε[....]

ορκε[....]υποε[....]

μειεγαρτο[....]

γεν[....]πολεμ[....]

10

ε[....]στηνελλα[....]

τ[....]π[....]κα[....]

εκειβε[....]

λειμαθ[....]

χετα[....]

15

ανδρε[....]

ρικ[....]πτ[....]

τ[....]

φ[....]

Col. ii 5 .. κι suggested, perhaps νι

Fr. 2

Col. i

Col. ii

των(ν)

cτ[....]νδουςποι[....]

ν[....]

ολυθεονουστος

υ[....]

ωιςμελουντω

πτωσαμφι[....]λυσ[....]

τωποδ’ν’δαια[....]ου[....]

τωκυδινεεις[....]

νωπολυνθοστ[....]

γαριμετερασα[....]

τω[....]αε[....]

αε[....]

μαθιναπα[....]

πολε...., με[....]

υπουρρ[....]

στως(ν)

...οιςμελουντω

υμων

αιμελοιντω(ν)

Πυδανα απωλετο

οις

ιμφ[....]ομας, ου

των Ποτεδαια, ου

τω κυδυνεις κα

νον Ὡλυθος· τα(ε

γαρ υμετερας α[....]

., .α πυδανα απωλετο

., .α πυδανα απωλετο

λαμβανον απο Περ[....]

φις[....]πολεως ἀτρος [....]

λυθον προμπθυθε[....]
Col. i 1 τῶ 11 ἐγγυοτικηύνιαφ.[...]
15 τε ἐπὶ Ὀλυνθίους Φί-
λαπποσαγα[...]τωρ[...]
πολεὶ φυέ, φ[...]

Col. ii 9 [, a high and a low trace (the latter thick), nearly joining; direction not clear, but suggesting an inward-curving upright 10 [, the first trace high and thick, suggesting an upright joining another stroke of indeterminate direction; the second trace an upright or possibly the right-hand side of a curve 14 [, surface rubbed: clear only, immediately after a, a low thick trace apparently slightly oblique 16 τ, or γ 16, or μ, λ, less good 17 [, represented by two uprights γ, or ω (alterum), π, μ, ν

Fr. 3

Col. i 5 παραχω[...]ήτι[...]
10 λο[...]α'[...]υμω[ν] (ν)
15 τα, α[...]β[...]
[...]
[...]

Col. ii κη[...]
μ[...]
τε[...]ται[...]
μετετερα[...]

In upper margin above col. i and intercolumnium, in informal hand: [, μ[...]]. Perhaps δημο-
φρ[...]. or κη[...]. sc. μελέτης, or -κόν; in which case this fragment will in fact be the begin-
ning of the declamatio.

Col. i 11, 5, 12, 13: filler signs a zigzag shape 11 [, speck at line level 15 [, c poss. 17 τ, or ρ
Fr. 4

. . . . .

πη[ . . . . .
ατη[ . . . . .
πυ[ . . . . .
ηδ[ . . . . .

5

φελτη[ . . . . .
ανδη[ . . . . .

κενη[ . . . . .
μαχο[ . . . . .

eυ[ . . . . .

10

γαδη[ . . . . .
ποψη[ . . . . .
αλλα[ . . . . .

κτ[ . . . . .
μα[ . . . . .

15

δη[ . . . . .

. . . . .

Fr. 1 Col. i ʻ... are all yours, these are the boundaries we have. But as it is, we failed to guard for ourselves even our territory this side of Thermopylae; some supposititious bastard, or slave rather, if the truth must be told, is laying claim to our possessions, and does not even go shares, but wants simply to rob us of everything. If these words annoy you and there is no one . . . .'

1-3 Presumably 'Demosthenes' has been outlining the extent of the Athenian empire.

2 Perhaps [[ενωνωμα]], but the papyrus is too mutilated to allow it to be confirmed. The tau of the following τοες is contiguous with the omega, so that its top stroke comes partly across it. Instead of ἐξομεν, ε(ξ)ομεν (or ε(ξ)ομεν) could be read, but έστων favours the present tense. The change of person is unwelcome: perhaps emend to έντεσα.

3 τὸ δὲ νῦν, used in preference to the regular νῦν δὲ, displays acquaintance with adverbial τὸ νῦν.

3-5 Athens had in fact taken urgent action to prevent Philip passing through Thermopylae in 352 after his capture of Pegasae. Unless the composer is guilty of a bad anachronism, this phrase must be accounted to rhetorical licence. If the allusion is to Athenian failure to support the Phocians in their attempt to hold the pass in the summer of 346, it is a little late in the day to be warning of the danger to Olynthus (fr. 2). The crucial significance of the pass is clearly brought out at De Cor. 32, where Demostenes affirms that Philip's purpose in restraining the false embassy from returning to Athens at once after the administration of the oath had been to prevent the Athenians sailing to Thermopylae and closing the pass, ἀλλ' ἀμ' ἀκούσας ταῦτ' ἀπαγγέλλων ἡμῶν κακείως (ἐκ. Philip) έντοκ εἰς Πολάω καὶ μηδὲν ἔχοι άμιλος έμείς πονησαί. (Cf. the opening sentence of Libanius' invective against Aeschines, or. XVII: Οὐκ ἡμεῖς, ὡς οἱκεροί, ἀρκεῖον Ἀλεξάνδρος τοῦτον Πολάω άνοίξεις Φιλίπων κτλ.) It may be that our author derived both the fundamental idea and the specific phrase έντοκ Πολάω from this passage.

4 έντοκ for ήμιν αντίοσ could possibly be defended as Demosthenic, but the idiom belonged also to the κοινη.
5-8 Ineptly adapted from Phil. 3. 30-1: εἰ δὲ γε δῶλος ἡ ὑποβολμαίος τὰ μὴ προσέκουντ᾽ ἀπάλλω καὶ ἐξοίκηστο, Ἡμέτερος δὲ σωματικὸν καὶ ἀρχηγὸς ἀνέγερς πάντας ἃν ἐφέσω εἶναι. Demosthenes' point is that Athenian losses are all the more intolerable as being suffered at the hands of a man who is not even a true-born Hellene (ὑποβολμαίος τὸς Ἅρλακος), but our author seizes on the words δῶλος and ὑποβολμαίος and transfers them into a context of literal fact.

10-11 What remains at the end of 10 is prima facie the mid-stroke of epsilon characteristically prolonged at the line end, with a trace of the extremity of its upper curve above. If so, there is a minimal trace before the epsilon which the limited amount of space requires to be iota, and thus ἐφέσω ('he rushes onward') all but enforces itself. However, this is scarcely tolerable Greek (and certainly not Demosthenic), and it seems preferable to regard the traces as an excised letter.

11 οὐδὲ μετέχεται: οὐδὲν ἐφέσω could equally well be read, but would be inferior in sense and language alike.

Col. ii 1. [The traces are further to the left than would be expected for the first letter of the line. Unless the alignment was at a considerable slope, a marginal mark of some kind.

3 οὐκεῖθεν εὖ.
5 Ψιλὴ ποσ.
6-7 πολὺ ἑρκεῖ οὐ ἐπί ἑρκεῖ, then [π]ννυν[.]
10 εἰς τὸν Ἡλλάδα[δα.
12-13 πόλεως.

Fr. 2 Col. ii '. . bring the Olynthians into alliance(?). It was thus by your negligence that Pydna was lost, thus Amphipolis, thus Potidaea, thus even now stands Olynthus in danger. For Philip, anticipating your negligence on each occasion (?), has advanced from Amphipolis as far as Olynthus. Now at last rouse yourselves to action (?) Against the Olynthians Philip . . .'

This passage shows plainly that the declamation is an Olynthiac, with a dramatic date of 349-348 b.c. But the precise nature of the vироген remains unclear.

1-2 The Athenians are presumably being berated for failing to make alliance with Olynthus.
1 The Demosthenic compounds are ὑπο-, κτε-, and ἀπενδόν; perhaps ἀπεποῦδος here for all that. At the end probably either ποείθεν or ποεῖν.
3 The Athenians' ἀμέλεια is a recurrent target for criticism throughout the Philippic orations. I note particularly Ol. 1. 10-11 (τὸ μὲν γὰρ πόλλη ἀπολογείκεται κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τῆς ἤμετρας ἀμέλειας ἢ τις βελτ. δικαιος), Phil. 1. 5 f. (φύει δ' ὑπάρχει . . . τοῖς ἔθελοις ποικίλα, καὶ κυρίων εἰς τῶν ἀμελεωσεως), καὶ γὰρ τοιαύτη ἡρθοσίμους (ὑπ. Philip) τὴ γνώμης πάντα κατέστραπται καὶ ἤξει—cf. Phil. 4. 47, 49), Phil. 1. 11 (οὕτω γὰρ ὤντος (ὑπ. Philip) παρά τὴν αὐτοῦ ράμην τοσοῦτον ἐπηρεάζεται, δεν παρὰ τὴν ἤμετρον ἀμέλειαν), Phil. 3. 5.
4-6 Perhaps the composer was unaware that Amphipolis was taken before Pydna. Demosthenes gives the towns in the order of their capture (Ol. 1. 12, cf. 8-9 and 3).

9-10 The word spanning these lines is presumably a noun governed by προ-, περο-, or προσλαμβάνως: ἀρέχεις πρὸς πῷς ἡμιβάζομεν? Demosthenes does not use ἀμέλεια in the plural, but Plato and Aristotle do, and it is appropriate here: 'your negligence on each occasion'.

12 ἄριστος (Ὑ) λόγον. ἄριστος, it is generally agreed, is not Attic. That is not to say that the composer did not find ἄριστος in his Demosthenes.
14 ff. are difficult. The stops(?) in 15 and 17 are in a more watery ink, and should perhaps be ignored. Respecting the first stop, in 14-15 we could supply an imperative, e.g. ἀνάμειζέτες[5] ἦμετερον σεβάστε, but then the subsequent asyndeton seems uncomfortable. Alternatively something like ὅτι ἀργήσητε, 'if you do nothing', continuing 'Philip will attack the Olynthians', e.g. τὸν πόλεμον ἐπιλέξεις in 16-17 (this line of approach is due to Mr. Parsons); but then the opening ἅλαλά καὶ νῦν seems inappropriate, and the whole thing very feeble. Remaining quite intractable is ὁγα[. . .]ο in 16, for which I have nothing plausible to suggest.

Fr. 3 Col. ii 14-15 οὐ[.]Χ.
16 ἄριστος or ['Ε]λάδες.

Fr. 4 3, 4 Ποίδ[να, Πω]πο[να: cf. 2 ii 4-6.
Two fragments, each with remains of two columns. The speech, patently in the person of Demosthenes, is directed against Aeschines. It looks a competent enough piece of work, though hardly distinguished. Fr. 1 combines an attack on Aeschines with an implicit exhortation to the Athenians to uphold their tradition of honour and self-sacrifice; reference to the exploits of Miltiades and Themistocles serves both ends. Fr. 2, in an apparent allusion to the 'wooden wall' Salamis oracle, seems to develop the metaphor of the fleet as a wall.

Fr. 1

Col. i

patr̓iwou γάρ ἕστιν
toúto, Λίσχινη, τώδε
tò δήμω, εὐζέων τὴν Ἐλ-
láda kai πόλεως πά-
c̱ς προκυδίνευσιν,
tá autōn eisférò-
tac kai dapanoménoi,
edan {de} déj kai[1] autēs á-
φημιμένους της πα-
τρίδος, odhí tòn épî Θρά-
kēs kai Ἰστράτων, Λίσχι-
nη, Ἀμφιπόλεως καὶ
ei tî touostôn éstiv
ēn tois Θρακικοῖς εἰρόις

καὶ βαράβρος, ὡς ἔλεγε
c̱lai, allà tòv Peirai-
ēs, tῆς ακροπόλεως,
tῆς Ἑλευσέινος. τοῦτο[t]ο

tò pàtrion tòn Μη-


[Image content is a page of text with Greek script, including columnar arrangement and some transliteration or translation notes.]
καὶ π[...]ωναστ[]  
λουμεταβάσεπ[ ]  
βημακαμηδε[ ]  
ρημαδουματ[ ]  
ταρθηκω[ ]  
ματ[ ]ουδεδ[ ]  
apοτηξίμα[ ]  
πήδησατ[ ]  
cαιακαλη[ ]  
αλλαθεμε[ ]  
ομιουγεουγαρ[ ]  
vηδημαγαγομε[ ]  
tαδη[ ]ενουδετ[ ]  
cυμμαχουον[ ]  
μενουμονου[ ]  
αθηραιουκαρτε[ ]  
tεπροποκααιτ[ ]  
ερατ[ ]ο[ ]ωντημ[ ]  
cυλικευσιδετα[ ]  
δεμαχασκελεπ[ ]  
αξιοικασκασκεν[ ]  
mαχωνθεμεστοκ[ ]  
μεναντασιπερτη[ ]

cαι π[...]
λου μεταβάς ἐπὶ τὸ
βήμα καὶ

cίως, ἀλλὰ Μ[ιλτιάδης,
αλλὰ Θεμιστ[οκλῆς·
όμοιοι γε, οὐ γὰρ, [Αἰσχ-
νή; δημαγωγοί. Μ[ιλ-
τάδης [μ]ὲν οὐδὲ τ[οῦ]c
συμμάχους ἀν[α-
μένων μόνους τοὺς
Ἀθηραίους ἀντέ[τατ-
τε πρὸς πάσαν τὴν
ερατ[ ]ο[ ]ωντημ[ ]
ευκληρευσιδετα[ ]
dὲ μάχας ἐκλεπτ[εω
ἀξιοὶς τὰς τῶν συ[
μάχων. Θεμιστοκ[λῆς
μὲν αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ τῆς
c
6, [ ], minimal traces 7 , [ ], low trace, apparently oblique
Fr. 2

Col. i

Col. ii

\[ \tau \nu \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \chi \gamma [\tau ] \]
\[ \alpha \lambda \omicron \eta \varepsilon \iota \chi \xi [\gamma ] \]
\[ \kappa \tau \theta \nu \kappa [\iota ] \]
\[ \varepsilon \iota \nu \xi \varepsilon \nu \mu \alpha \nu \mu \varepsilon \nu \]
\[ \tau \alpha \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \beta \varepsilon \alpha [\iota ] \]
\[ \upsilon \mu \omega \nu \iota \pi \rho \gamma [\iota ] \]
\[ \tau \alpha \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \beta \varepsilon \alpha [\iota ] \]
\[ \tau \alpha \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \beta \varepsilon \alpha [\iota ] \]
\[ \tau \alpha \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \beta \varepsilon \alpha [\iota ] \]
\[ \tau \alpha \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \beta \varepsilon \alpha [\iota ] \]
\[ \tau \alpha \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \beta \varepsilon \alpha [\iota ] \]
\[ \tau \alpha \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon \nu \beta \varepsilon \alpha [\iota ] \]

Col. ii 8 . . . 9 , scattered traces on misplaced fibres; perhaps only one letter before \( \varepsilon \) in 8 . . . 9 . . . speck at letter-top level 18 . . , high horizontal: \( \tau \), \( \xi \), \( \varepsilon \), possible, not \( \nu \) ? \( \tau \), corrected from (rather than to) \( \omicron \) or \( \rho \)?

Fr. 1 ‘For it is a tradition of this people, Aeschines, to keep Greece safe and to bear the brunt of danger for every city, by contributing and spending out of their own pockets, even, should it be necessary, if deprived of their country itself—not of their possessions in Thrace, Aeschines, Amphipolis and whatever of that sort lies in the Thracian barns and pits, as you used to say, but of the Piraeus, of the acropolis, of Eleusis. This is the tradition of Athens—and rightly so: for the commander of the forces was not Aeschines, who only yesterday or the day before came up on to the speaker’s platform from the tholos(?). . . . no, he was Miltiades, he was Themistocles—leaders on a par with you, Aeschines, were they not? Miltiades, without even waiting for the allies, proceeded to draw up the Athenians unsupported against the entire Persian army; while you think fit to desert our allies’ battles when they are not even battles(?). Themistocles . . .’

Col. i 2 \( \tau \omicron \delta \epsilon \rangle \langle \tau \omicron \delta \epsilon \rangle \). The slip is surprising in view of the familiarity with Attic otherwise shown.
5 προκεπυνεύειν: the word of the Marathon oath, de Cor. 208. Ptolemy of Naucratis was given the nickname 'Marathon' προκεπυνεύειν τὸν Πτολεμαίον τῷ Μαραθῶνι προκεπυνευκάντων θαμά ἐμφανίζομενον (Philostrobus, Vit. Soph. 559).

6 τα [οι δι]. Apparently two stages of correction. First δὲ was substituted for τα, the latter being cancelled by a dot on either side; then δὲ was crossed through, thereby conferring a stet on τα.

8 {δέ}. Though δέ represents the emended version, I do not see that it can stand without the further (unnamed) alteration of ἀφαιρέσιον to ἀφαιρέσιον.

10-18 Clearly dependent on De Chrys. 44-5 (almost = Phil. 4. 15-16), which runs: οἷον γὰρ οὖν γε σύνθες δὲ ὁμολογήσαντες τὸν Φίλιππον τὸν μὲν ἐν Ὀρθέῃ κακῶν (τῇ γὰρ ἀνὰ τὸν ἔπος δραγγείων καὶ Καβαθῆνα καὶ Μακεδόνος καὶ ἄλλων ληλαθείς [καὶ κατακεκλεισθείσα]) τούτων μὲν ἐπιθυμεῖν καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ταῦτα λαβεῖν καὶ πάσον καὶ κείμενα καὶ τοὺς έξωτάς κυβόως ὑποτίμησεν, τάς τ᾽ Ἀθηναίων λιμένων καὶ νεωτών καὶ προφύλακτα καὶ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἁγιωτητῶν καὶ τοιούτων προκώδων οὐκ ἐπιθυμεῖν, ἄλλα τὰτα μὲν οὐκ ἰάκτης ἤξιον, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν μεμελυκόντων καὶ τῶν ὅλων τῶν ἐν ταῖς Θρασείας ευρισκὲν ἐν τῷ βαράθρῳ χειμάζον. οἷον ἄλλα πάλαι is apparently a fiction of the composer.

16-17 Πειραιώς: either a misspelling of Πειραιῶς or an unsuccessful shot at the Attic form (Παιραὶ).
Direct comparison is too common a technique of disparagement to be significant in itself, but a particular influence here may well be the comparison that Aeschines draws between Demosthenes and statesmen of past days at *In Clis. 181 ss*. Common points of detail are that the question at issue is their generality, and that the list of past statesmen is headed by Themistocles and Miltiades (but in that order in *Aeschines*): πόσιμον ἢμων ἀμέσως ἀντί δοκεῖ Θεμιστοκλῆς ὁ στρατηγὸς ὑπ' ἐν τῇ περὶ Σαλαμίνα ναυμαχίᾳ τῶν Περσῶν ἐνιαύτη, ἢ Δημοκρίτης, ὁ νοῦ τῶν τὰξών λιπῶν; Μιλτιάδης δὲ, ὁ τὸν ἐν Μαραθῶν μάχῃ νικήσας, ὢν αὐτός; Our author seems to have taken the opportunity of turning the comparison back on Aeschines himself—an opportunity that the Ur-Demosthenes rejected (De Cor. 314 ff.).

14 ἄν γὰρ leaves the line somewhat short but is hardly to be doubted. A filler sign may have been used.

18 βασιλεὺς is no doubt another conscious Atticism. Demosthenes habitually refers to the king of Persia as βασιλεὺς, and uses the adjective at *Pro Lib. Rhod. 5.*

19–20 The restoration τά[ε] [oι] [oώ] [δε] μᾶχας avoids a repetition of the slip at i 2 (i.e. τά[ε] [οί] [δέ] <τάς> μάχας). Though it gives a greater rhetorical point than would τά[ε] τῇ βασιλείᾳ μάχας, it is linguistically very bold.

24 Continue on the lines of: Θεμιστοκλῆς μὲν αὖ τὰς ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀπάνων τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίας ευνελεγμένας τραίρεσις . . ., το δὲ . . .

Fr. 2 The ultimate source of this fragment appears to be the famous Salamis oracle, the second of the Delphic oracles given to the Athenian envoys when Attica was threatened by Xerxes: Hdt. 7. 141. Whatever disputes as to its meaning were at the time, the interpretation that established itself was that the wooden wall stood for the ships. In rhetorical literature, the line τέχνας Τριτογενῆς ξύλων ἄδοιος εὐφύστα Σαλεύς is cited by Theon as an example of a trope (*Progym. 81* *Sp. ii*), and Philostratus quotes it in the introduction to the *Vita Sophistarum* (g81). Libanius alludes to the oracle in connection with the victory at Salamis: *s. XV 40* τὴν δὲ (σχ. ναυμαχίαν) ἢ προσόμοιον οὐδὲν, δὲ. ἢ ἡ Ἑλλάς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πολύθου θεῶ δεῖα προσεῖρησα, cf. *XV 37* ναυμαχία μετὰ χρησμῶν κατορθοίκευσαι. The oracle, and especially the τέχνας ξύλων, held an important place in *poli* of Themistocles: cf. *Plut. Them.* 10, *Corn. Nep. Them. 2. 6–8, Polyacen. Strat. I 50. 2. Unless this passage is to be interpreted simply by reference to the naval reforms successfully carried through by Demosthenes, the allusion here may be taken as implying that a similar course of action to that enjoined by the oracle is being recommended, i.e. that the hypothesis of a motion that the Athenians abandon the city and resort to the fleet. Cf. *Philost. Vit. Sophh. 543,* on a declaration by Polemo: (Ἀμβροσίδης) ξυμβουλεύοντες ἐπὶ τῶν τριήρων φθέγχει ἐπάνως μὲν Φῆλιππον, νόμων δὲ Λεγέαν χειρισμότας ἀποθήκηκε τῶν πολέμων μισεμενέστα. (For a problem under the original circumstances cf. *Arpines 332* *Sp. i* : ἢ Θεμιστοκλῆς τέχνας ἐκλέξας τῷ πόλιν γράφει αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡμῖρροΰτα τὸ ἄτρο, cf. also Syrian. *I 203* *SR* (non-fictitious), which quotes the τέχνας line.) If this is so, the occasion envisaged was to be one when the city was in imminent danger from Philip: the spring of 338 is evidently suitable. (The fictional basis, if not the death-penalty liability of Polemo's theme, could be that after Philip's capture of Elatea Thebes had rejected Athens' overtures and accepted alliance with Philip.)

Col. i 17 πρόγονοι.

Col. ii 1–6 e.g. τρίτης ἐκήρυξεν ἔχουσα τοῖς οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ τεχνές τοιούτω καὶ ἡμᾶς εἰσέποιει δυνάμενον· εἰς γὰρ ταῦτα ἐνέπλεξαν ὑμῶν οἱ πρόγονοι . . ., ‘that in the triremes what you have is a wall, uncapturable(?) and able to save you, for it was these triremes that your forefathers used to board . . .’. 1 Or ἐκήρυξαν τε. The tradition behind the metaphor makes it less Isocratean than it would otherwise have been.

2–3 οὖν ἔχειν, 'not gettable', i.e. 'uncapturable'? Not Demostenic; nor are the alternatives ἐκθύτης, διεκθύτης.

5–6 Cf. *De Cor. 204,* eis τὰς τρίτας ἐμβάτεις.

6–9 I cannot restore. In 8 Dr. Rea suggests, instead of the obvious Ἀθηναίων, Ἀθηναίοι ὄντες· τέχνας πόλεις may follow in 9, but a coherent sense remains difficult to achieve. μὲν γὰρ τοὺς κινδύνους εὐθύς Ἀθηναίοι ἄντεκαν· τέχνας πόλεις is surely not tolerable, either in itself or in the context.

9–11 e.g. τῇ γὰρ τέχνῃ μείωσεν ἐφεσα λέστερον ἀπάλλακος; 'For what safer wall have you' (or, with ἐφεσα λέστερον, 'could you have') 'than Apollo?', i.e. than Apollo’s, the wall mentioned by the oracle.
I suppose this is preferable to punctuating after ἄφαλέστερον and continuing Ἄπολλων Πόθες, which would invert the normal order of Πόθες Ἀπόλλων.

11–12 δ] Πόθες, μαρτύρ[ει μοι, or μαρτύρομαι ε. For the apostrophe of Apollo cf. E. G. Turner, Eos xviii (1956), fasc. 2 (Symbolae R. Taubenchlag dedicatae II), 143–6, on P. Hamb. 132.

13–14 οὕτως δ' ἡμιμό[δε] τὸν Ποθέα καὶ δ[αίρε]λαστέρον ἐστιν, 'this the Pythian's wall is actually un-capturable', rather than ἡμιμόδε τὸν Ποθέα, 'this wall is the Pythian's and un-capturable'?

15 If e.g. καὶ εἴθε παραδικέ[ὶ δὲ] ἐξετή... Then neither καταφρονη[ῖ]αυ nor καταφράσει[ῖ]αυ suits the traces at the beginning of 18, but an object would be expected with an active verb such as καταφρονη[ῖ]αυ ('your enemies') or καταφράσει[ῖ]αυ ('yourselves').

What follows is also difficult. The starting point for restoration seems to be 19–21, presumably ἔτυμλ[ε]κεθ' καὶ προσπεκτε[κα]λετε. ἔπεισκευάζειν is especially used of refitting ships; the προσ- compound is rare and late. What precedes? τῶν καταγά γὰρ suggests itself (despite its inappropriateness to προσπεκτε[κα]λετε), but 18 remains a puzzle. In 18, two letters have been tampered with. ι was simply crossed out. τ was altered and has a double dot above it: perhaps an attempt was first made to convert it to ο, then the unsatisfactory result cancelled by the dots and a new start made. This will give us ποτε οὐδ'. Perhaps take ποτε with what precedes, and go on with something like οὐδ' τῶν καταγά γὰρ ἔπισκευα[κεθ'] καὶ προσπεκτ[ε]λετε, though we should want this to be imperative, despite οὐδὲν not μηδ': 'take no thought for affairs on land and refit (the ships) anew.' Some of the declamations of ps.-Libanius are very lax in the matter of negatives (and cf. on Fr. 1 Col. ii 3–9). But I cannot claim to be happy about this.

21–2 Perhaps ἄναλαμ[βάνετε] τῇ γὰρ ἐν νοῦ, 'recall these things to mind', is the amended version.

23 Probably a warning, εἰ δὲ μη.

3237. Glossary to Homer, Iliad i. 302–23

27 3B.44/K(1-2)a

Fr. 1, 9 x 25.5 cm.

Early third century

One column, a few traces of a previous column, and one unplaced scrap remain of this third-century word list. The reverse is mostly blank with traces of ink in one corner. The hand is a medium-sized sloping style with the angular letter forms characteristic of the third century (cf. Roberts, GLH 19a–19c). The only lectional signs are a trema (line 27) and a marginal mark (line 7) probably used to alert the reader that ἐρωμεῖ has been glossed twice. A second hand, smaller and rather faded, has annotated line 13 and added καλλιπαρηγον at the foot of the column.

The text is a familiar type, generally thought to be a product of the schoolroom and known to be related to the Scholia Minora. For a discussion of such texts see A. Calderini, Aegyptus 2 (1921) 303 ff. and A. Henrichs, 'Scholia Minora zu Homer I', ΖPE 7 (1971) 97–119.

Lemmata and glosses coincide in the main with P. Strassburg inv. Gr. 33 (Packa 1163) re-edited by A. Henrichs (op. cit. 142–5), cited here as P. Strass. with col. and line number. Other abbreviations used in the commentary are those listed in XXIV 2405 introd.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. i</th>
<th>Col. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(302) περαθητί</td>
<td>περαθητί</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(302) γνωσιαίοι</td>
<td>γνωσιαίοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(303) τ'αχεως</td>
<td>τ'αχεως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(303) [κελαιμον]</td>
<td>μελαιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(303) ἐρωτησε</td>
<td>ὑποξ[ω]ρης[ε]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(304) τω</td>
<td>ουτοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(304) αυτοποιη</td>
<td>εξ' ευαντ[α]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(305) μαχεσθήσεται</td>
<td>μαχεσθήσεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(305) α'ενητηρ</td>
<td>ανεστη[α]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(305) λυσαι</td>
<td>διελυσαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(306) εισακ</td>
<td>ιασ (m²) τοιχο[ε]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(307) οις</td>
<td>τοις εαυτον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(308) προερυصε</td>
<td>προειλικ[ουε]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(309) εκρεινεν</td>
<td>διερχορη[ε]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(311) εικασ</td>
<td>εκαθαρς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(310) βησαν</td>
<td>ενεβασαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(311) πολυμητος</td>
<td>πολυμητος[ός]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(313) απολυμαεωθα[ε]</td>
<td>α[ποκαθα]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(313) παρεκελευνοτ</td>
<td>παρεκελευνοτ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(314) καθαρματα</td>
<td>καθαρματα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(315) επετελουν</td>
<td>επετελουν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(315) τελειας</td>
<td>τελειας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(316) ακαρπον</td>
<td>ακαρπον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(317) παρεγενετο</td>
<td>παρεγενετο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(318) ευρηγο εὐν</td>
<td>ευρηγο[υ]ν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(321) δραστικος</td>
<td>δραστικος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(321) θεραποντες</td>
<td>θεραποντες</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(322) παραγενεθη</td>
<td>παραγενεθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(323) λαβομενοι</td>
<td>λαβομενοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(323) αγειν</td>
<td>αγειν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 l. προερυσσει 18 l. βρις 30 l. θεραποντε
3237. GLOSSARY TO HOMER, ILIAD i. 302–23

Fr. 2 (unplaced)

1. [trace of rounded letter
2. ]
3. [trace of upright 4
4. >8.
5. [indefinite traces.

1. Col. i 4 D Pa ἐν ἑντιάκει.
4. ὀδε, separated from γονέων by two oblique strokes, appears to have been added later. ὀδου supplied from D Pa.
5. 6–7 The lemma is glossed twice; placed in the left margin against the second gloss there is a sign, a slightly arched horizontal with a downward and backward tick at the right-hand end.
6. ὑποχώρησει so Hsch. περιβάλλεται cf. D περιβάλλεται.
7. So D Pa.
8. D Pa ἑντιάκει.
17. So D Pa P. Strass. VIII 17.
22. D Pa ἑκέλευσεν.
27. So D.
29. So Pa.
30. Homer has the dual θέραποντε. P. Strass. IX 6 has θεραπόντας. However, both this text (line 29) and P. Strass. IX 2 enter the dual form of the modifying adjective δτηρῶν, probably uncorrupted because of its metrical position.
32. So D.
33. So D.
34–5 M2 has added καλλιπάρμων, apparently overlooked at line 310. The restoration following D on ll. i 143 and P. Strass. VIII 20 fits the traces that remain, but is far from secure.
3238. Glossary to Homer, Iliad i–ii

Fr. 1, 30 × 16.8 cm. Early third century

One considerable fragment and several smaller pieces of a darkish, brittle papyrus-roll remain, which contain a Homeric glossary written on the back of an account. The largest fragment holds four columns of a word list covering Il. i 405–538. Although the side and lower margins are broken off, the upper margin for columns 3 and 4 is preserved. A smaller fragment (2.6 × 8.0 cm.) contains the beginnings of words from Il. ii 385–93. The hand is the same throughout, a small, sloping ‘Severe Style’, comparable with VI 852 (Eur. Hypsipyle), though smaller, and with P. Ryl. III 529 (medical treatise), characteristically used for space-saving copies of bulky texts. The scribe usually writes iota adscript on verbs (e.g. lines 114 and 119) but not consistently on nouns. There are a number of errors, most of which are uncorrected.

The glosses are more extensive than usual (cf. XXIV 2405, gloss 1) but do not contain material other than that found in the Scholia Minora. This glossary coincides in part with P. Ant. II 70 (Pack 2 1167), P. Mil. Vogl. Ill 120 (Pack 2 1168), and P. Colon. inv. 2281 (edited by A. Henrichs, ΖPE 7 (1971) 229–52). All coincidence with these texts is indicated in the notes. Other abbreviations are as given for 3237.

Fr. 1

Col. i

(?) ]....
(418) ].... τωι διο
(418) μεγαρες[ι]
(419) τερπικεραυ[ω] έν τερση-

5 μετ[ωι τοι]ς κεραυνοις
εετι Δ[ις Ε]πιβετον
(420) αγανυφων αγανυφετωδη
χειμερηνον
(421) ὠκυποροις ταχειας
(422) μη[ις] οργιζου
(422) παμπαν παντελως
(423) αμμονας αγαθους
(424) δ[αι]τα ενωχιαν
(424) [ε]πονται ακολουθησουει

10 (426) [χ]άλκοβατες ισχυρωκ βεβηκος

7 1. αγαν υφετωδη 9 1. ὠκυποροις
3238. GLOSSARY TO HOMER, ILIAD i–ii

(426) δωμα σ[ι]κημα

(427) γουνακο[μαι] γονυπετησω

(429) καλοξωνου

(430) αφειλαντο

(432) [π]ολυβενη[ε]ρθε βαθειας

(434) [τ]η δεχομενη
ton ictou eπικληθεντα

(433) ἀρμενα

(434) προςεγγυσαι εποιησαν

(435) καρπαλμωκ ταχεως

(435) ερετιμος [κ]οπαις

(433) προσονυος ο] προσονυος ετε
[to σιγονιj] απο της του

(434) [ι]πηεντες [ε]πιξαλακαντες

(434) [ι]πηεντες [ε]πιξαλακαντες

(436) [ε]υπας τας α]γκυρας δια το ε-

(461) διπτο[χα [. ]

(461) ωμοθετησ[αν ............]

(461) επιη[............. με]...

(461) ρους [ο]ωμ[.............]

(461) επικα[.............]

(462) σχυζης [κ [ ]

(462) αθοπα [μελαια [ ]

20. βαθειας 41. ρους, dot of ink, not letter
(463) λεῖβε ἑπ[ἐτενδ]έ
(463) πεμπωβολαὶ τ[ριαν]η[είδεις]
obελικοὶ [ ἐκ μ[ι]ας
ἀρχὴς πε[ν][τε α]βελοὺς

50 ἐχοντες
(464) ἐπαραντὸν ἐγ[ενες][αρτ][ο]
(465) μεττυλλαν δ[ι][κό]πτον
(465) ὀβελοὶ ὀβελικοὶ
(466) περιφραδεὼς ἐμπ[ε]ρος

55 (466) ἐρυκαντο εὐλυκυαν
(468) δαὐνυτο ἐνω[χ[ο]]πντ[ο]
(468) ἐδεντο εἰδεης ἡν
(468) δαιτος εἰς της εἰς ἰκον
ἐκα' ετ[η]τ[ω]μ' μεμεριεμεθ[η]ς

60 μερίδος
(469) εξ [ἐρον ενεντο [ε]ξεπ[λη]π[η-
ρωσαν την επιθυμ[ιαν]
οπερ εστω επληρω[ν]

65 (470) ἐπεκτειναντο πληρεις εποι-
ησαν του ω[ν][κ]ν' ουν τους κρατη-
(471) ρας νωμηςαν διεδωκαν
(471) δεσπαεσσιν ποτηριος[ς]
(472) τανημεριος δι αλης ημερας

70 (472) μολη[πη] αϊδη[ς]
(473) καλον αειδουτες[ κ[α]λως]
αιδουτες [ ]
(473) [παγιωνα] πρ[ιαν]
[αϊδης] ἐφιδ[ος]

75 Col. iii
(480) ἱππας[αν] ητελωσαν
(481) [πρ]ηεσ[ν'] εφυησεν

52 1. μεττυλλον 58 1. δαιτος αεσκε 59 1. εκατω 61 1. εξ ἐρον εντο 76 1. εφυησεν
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(482) [εὐρ[η] η c]τε' ῥα εἰτὶ το εξεχον

80
dια το στέφειν ειναι

85
(482) ιαχε εφωνει
(483) εβεεν τετρεχε
(483) διαπηκκουσα διαπερισσα
(485) ηπειρου τ(ν)[ς] γη[ς]
(486) υψου εις υψος
(486) ψαμαθο'ις ψαμαθος καλε ται η παραθαλασσος αμ μος
(486) ταυνεαν παρετειναν
(487) εκ[κ]' διαντο [ε]κκεδαννυτο
(490) [κυθ][ακ[ε]ρας] εν ό η οι ανδρες [ευ][δοξ[ου]] ται
(491) φθωνις[ε]κε] φθωνει
(492) αυθι τοτε εις εκεινον τω τοπω

95
η εις εκ[εινον το]ν τοπον
(492) ποθε[ε]κε [εποθ]ει
(492) αυθι[ην] π[τ]ην μαχην
(495) εφετεμεων εντολων
(497) ηρηη ορθρυνη
(498) ευνυπα ητοι μεγαλο φθαλμον η μεγαλο φωνον δια τας βροντ(ας)

100
(501) [κ]ατηρι αριστεραι
(501) [α]νθερεωνος [υπο το γε-]

105
[κε]υν τοπον δε[α το ε-] [κει] πρωτον α[νθειν τας]
[τρ]υχαν

(505) [ωκυ]μορωσατρ[ς]
(507) [απου]ρας α[ ]
(508) [μητιε]τα [ ]

77 1. στεφα 86 1. ψαμαθος 91 1. εν η οι ανδρες 102 βρον
Col. iv

(518) [ε]χθοδομη[ε]ιαν εις εχθραν
(518) [ε]λβεν
(518) εφη[ε]ιαν αναπειεις
(519) ερεθη[β]ιον ερεθηζη

115 (519) ονειδειος ονειδιστικος[ε]
(520) αρτως μασανως
(521) νεικε κακολογει
(522) αποστηχε αποτρεπχε
(522) νοησι αιδηι

120 (525) εμεθην εμου
(526) τεκμωρ τελος η τε[κμη-]
ριον
(526) παλιναγρεπτον παλιλη-
πτον

125 (526) απατηλον απατητικον
(527) ατελευτητον ατελεστον
(528) κοανε[η]αν μελαιαιας
(529) αμβροσιαν θειαν
(529) χαιτι αιοια

130 (529) επερρωσιαντο επεσειςηαν
(532) αλτο ηλατο αιεγληστος
λαμπρου
(533) εον το εαυτου
(534) εδεων καθεδρουν

135 (534) εφου του [[εα]]εαυτον
(534) ετη [υ]πεμ[ε]ιες
(537) ειμφαρα[ε]ιατο [ειν]εσουλευειατο
(538) αργυροπεζα [[...]]...η

Fr. 2

[ωστ, καὶκ [πεζα]
[νος...ε...[...]...της]
[...] ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ......
Fr. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i</th>
<th>Iliad ii 385-93</th>
<th>Col. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>kπ[ινομέθα] (385)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>)καφ</td>
<td>πα[ικολή] (386)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. .</td>
<td>η[θοιοι] (386)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεν</td>
<td>τελ[λιμέν] (388)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ας[πίδος] (389)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>ας[θμπροτής] (389)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gap of 4 lines**

| . . | κα[μειταί] (389) |        |
| . . | ευ[αον] (390) |        |
| . . | τεπο[ιον] (390) |        |
| 11   | μμμ[αζειν] (392) |        |
| . . | αρκ[ιον] (393) |        |

Col. i Traces of the glosses are too broken to permit restoration.

Fr. 4 (unplaced)

| τ. |
| κα. |

Fr. 1 Col. i

Lines 1 and 98 already stand a line or more higher than 75 and 111, which are shown by the margin to be the first of their columns. It is therefore unlikely that many lines, if any, stood above 1 and 38.

1 The letters that remain suggest Κρόνιον glossed Κρόνον νήσο, Δι. Κρόνιον occurs at 397 and 405; since nothing in the intervening lines seems remotely to suggest this gloss, it is probably only out of order.

2 So D Pa. τοι διο seems to have been added to the right of another entry (cf. line 67).

3 D Pa gloss οίκοις: here οίκοις would fit space and trace.

4-5 Sim. D Pa. The supplements in 5-6 are dubious in that both lacunas give space for 8-10 letters. A longer supplement could be constructed for 6, but I do not see how to expand 5, given the parallels. Perhaps the papyrus surface was damaged before writing.

7-8 D τόν λαόν νιφάδειν κατά τά ὑπό τοῖς νέβεσι μέρη.

9 D ταξέως πλεούσως; Pa ταχυπλάως.
So D Pa.
11 So D Pa.
12 So Ap D Pa.
13 So D Pa.
14 End of the lemma is -ovrai, dubiously restored to ἐποντα, because (1) -ontai is clear (2) the space will permit only 2-3 letters before this and (3) a form of ἵκλοοθις is the usual gloss for ἐποντα. D ἴκλοοθις; Pa ἴκλοοθις.
15 So D.
16 Ap D δῶμα; Pa οἴκημα.
17 So D.
18 D καλός καὶ εὐτυχόν; Pa εὐτυλότερον. καλόςων is unattested but not an unlikely formation (καλλ- in Homer). Cf. LSJ for other καλ- compounds.
20 Cf. D Pa.
23 So D Pa.
24—5 D πελασθήσαι ἐποίησαν.
26 So D Pa.
27 So Pa.
28—31 Cf. Schol. BT τὰ ἀπὸ πρόμηχης εἰς πρώτην διήκουσα σχολία.
33 Too damaged to restore securely.
34—6 A variant of D παρὰ τὸ εἰσάξεων τὴν ναῦν . . . καὶ ποιεῖ λεπταμένα? Spacing seems to demand that ε- (line 34) and λεπταμένα (line 35) be part of the same word and the large space after the break in line 36 would seem to indicate that the gloss is complete. It is possible to restore, e.g. εἰσαξαμεθανει, but neither is appropriate with adrait, which should require a passive verb. τῆν ναῦν is the likeliest supplement for line 36.
37 Perhaps προμηχής ἢ [αἰ]πογῆς | σχολία (so D Pa).
38 Only an ink dot remains of the gloss. Ap δίω; D διπλάσαντες; Pa διπλάνω.
39—43 From the remaining letters, the gloss appears to be a variant of Ἰσχ.: τὸ ἀφ’ ἔκαστον μέρους τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου ἵρκεων ἀφ’ ἡμῶν ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐπιτίθεσαν ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν.
44 Only traces of sigma remain. D ἐπὶ σχολίῳ; Pa σχολάςω.
45 μέλαν restored with D Pa.
46 While the traces do not exclude επιδίκε (so Ap), the space requires a longer word. ἐπέπειδε restored with D Pa.
51 The traces fit ἐγέφακετο. So D Pa P. Ant. II 70. 2.
53 So D P. Ant. II 70. 5.
54 D Pa πάνω ἐμπείρων. P. Ant. II 70. 8 ἐμπείρων.
55 So D Pa.
56 So Pa.
57 So D Pa.
58—60 Sim. Hsch τῆς ἐκ Ἰου μεταχρονείς ἐνωχώτας.
61—4 οὐκότι by dittography. Pa ἐπιθρόωσαν τὴν ἐπιθύμιαν.
67 So D.
68 So D Pa.
69 So Ap D Pa.
70 So Pa.
71—2 So D Pa.
73-4 παλίν? Nothing of the lemma remains; the gloss begins with πι and beneath it ζιδι. The reconstruction is suggested by D παιν, φθόνος ἠθοκ.

Col. iii 75 So D.
76 So Ap D Pa.
77-80 Cf. Schol. on Odyssey ii 428 (στεφη): τῇ τρόπιτι διὰ τὸ στεφεῖν εἶναι καὶ διὰ τὸ στερεόθειν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ναῦ. Also D: τῇ τρόπιτι τῆς ναοῦ, ἐπεὶ στερεώτερα τῶν σανίδων υπάρχειν: ἐπὶ γὰρ τῇ ἔλω τούτῳ ἄσπερ ἐπὶ θεμαλίῳ ταῖς ἐπικομιδεῖται τὰ ἄλλα ἔλω τῆς ναοῦ. At the beginning of line 78 there are traces of 5 letters (possibly ἔλων) then a clear του. The rest of the gloss (κατὰ . . . έλων) is coherent without this, but it does not appear to be a later addition. τρόπεις restored in line 79, because it fits the traces and the more common genitive τρόπων does not. The sense as well as the parallels indicate that the word is appropriate.

81 D μεγάλως ἥκει.
82 So Ap D Pa.
83 So D Pa P. Ant. II 70. 19.
84 So D Pa P. Ant. II 70. 21.
85 D Pa P. Ant. II 70. 22 ἐφ᾽ ἄφους.
89 So εὐτέχειν.
90 So D.
91-2 D ἀναδόξοις ἀναρκεις ἔχονται. The scribe placed a dot above omicron to indicate that it was written in error.

93 D Pa διδόθερκον. Apparently ἱδοθερκον, not εὐθέθερκον.
96 D ἔπεσθείς; Pa ἐπεσεΐς. Only the -ει remains, but space available favours the shorter word.
97 So Ap Pa.
99 So D Pa.
100-2 Sim. D: ἦτοι μεγαλόβαλοιν, παρὰ τοῖς ῥίποις, ἡ μεγαλόφωονν, παρὰ τῷ ὅπα, ὃ ἐκτὶ τῷ φωνήν. διὰ τὰς βρουν(άς) read by M. E. Weinstein.
103 So Ap D Pa.
108 D ταχυθανάτου; Pa ταχυθανατάτατος.
109 Ap αφορίσας; D αφελόμενος; Pa αφελών.

Col. iv 111-12 ἔλθει;? Traces fit this better than the other possibilities, e.g. D ἔλθην καταστῆσαι.

113 Cf. D Pa.
114 D ἐρεθίζει.
115 So D Pa.
116 So D Pa.
117 So D.
118 Cf. D.
119 D Pa θέασθαι. The iota adscript of the gloss has a horizontal line placed over it. I have been unable to find any parallel or to suggest a plausible explanation for its being so marked. Possibly the line was intended as a trauma, though I can produce no closer example of misuse than αναιτ (dative), P. Bodm. I II. 5. 450.

120 So D Pa P. Mil. Vogl. III 120. 1.
121-2 So D. Ap P. Colon. inv. 2281 iii 17 τόδες only.
125 So D Pa.
126 So D Pa P. Colon. inv. 2281 iii 20.
127 So D Pa P. Colon. inv. 2281 iii 22.
128 So D P. Colon. inv. 2281 iii 23.
129 Ap αἱ κεκυμέναι κόμαι; D P. Colon. inv. 2281 iii 24 τρίχες.
This puzzling fragment, originally complete in three columns, comprises an alphabetical list of words with what, for lack of a better term, must be called definitions. The small number of lemmata, fifty-three, including line 27, combined with the arrangement, as well as the contents themselves present problems which thus far have failed of solution. 3239 is probably not a glossary to a particular poem, unless that poem were alphabetically arranged or exceedingly repetitive, because the arrangement would have been inconvenient and also because that explanation does not take into account the peculiar ‘place-holding’ μν in line 27. Nor does it seem based on an acrostic principle, as there is often more than one entry for each letter. It is far too short for a lexicon. Nor does it appear to have been a school exercise, both on the basis of the writing (see below) and also because of the lack of corrections in a second, i.e. teacher’s, hand, although the sometimes rather fanciful definitions might possibly be the work of an unprepared scholar.

Alphabetical lists of words do occur in school exercises in syllabification, cf. Pack² 2676 = O. Tait II 2193 or in lists of particular kinds of words, e.g. words in -ους, cf. Pack² 2718 = J. G. Milne JHS XXVIII (1908) p. 124 iv. Pack² 2654 = P. Tebt. II 278 has an alphabetical list of occupations followed by an acrostic story, both of which may have been used as a way of teaching the alphabet. In both Pack² 2718 and 2654 there is only one entry per letter of the alphabet. Alphabetical glossaries are also found in Pack² 2119-28. The definitions given in them are usually more common words synonymous with the lemmata, possibly with an explanation of the derivation and sometimes with examples of usage from various authors. Obviously the relation between 3239 and any of these is tenuous, first because of the shortness of the list, second and more important because of the strangeness of the ‘definitions’ given, for example mouse defined as ‘vainglorious’ (26), bathing attendant as ‘rotten fate’ (34). All the surviving lemmata, so far as can be seen, are substantives. Beyond that there seems to be no connection between them. The index to PMG yields no connection with magical texts, which goes
against the assumption that 3239 interprets religious or oracular symbols; nor is there any relation with the Hieroglyphica of Horapollo. Some entries might be taken as ‘kennings’ or riddles: Tryph. π. τρ. 4 (Spengel, Rh. Gr. iii 195) κατά δὲ γλωτταν (sc. γίνεται αἰνιγμα), ὁταν τὴν μὲν θάλασσαν εὐφραγίστωρα λέγη, τὴν δὲ Ἀθηναίαν μαρμαρώπιν, τὸν δὲ μὸν δολιχοῦρον (with the last cf. 3239 26). But I have found no real parallels in the list of W. Schultz, Rätsel aus dem hellenischen Kulturkreise ii (1912) 135-46; and some items are clearly unsuitable.

From the papyrus itself one must conclude that the main motivation of the author was, somehow, alphabetical, cf. the nu in line 27; and it seems very likely that the lemmata were written, in each column at least, before the definitions, cf. in col. i the mistaken placing and erasure of what appears to have been ἀρουρα after line 6, in col. ii the spacing of the blank second half of line 27 and possibly the mistake caused by the two-line entry at lines 31 and 32.

The papyrus is written on the backs of two documents, A having col. i and most of col. ii, B having the rest. A and B are pasted together upside down relative to each other and the edge of A overlaps the first three letters of B. Neither is dated, although the writing is of the first century. B appears to be an account involving grain, A is very scrappy and indistinct. There is a washed-out heading at the top of B and the spacing suggests that its full height is preserved. The consequence of this is that at several places in 3229 large vertical fibres and the pasting have interfered with the writing.

The left-hand half of col. i, and the right-hand two-thirds of col. iii, have been torn away. But the full original height seems to be preserved.

The clumsy upright hand begins with some attempt at literary style, but becomes smaller and more cursive as the text proceeds. Beta (open-topped) and eta (y-shaped) almost always have the cursive form. It is of the class in which hypomnemata are written and should perhaps be assigned to the later second century.
Col. i

↓

πικρονκακον
αιειονος
ιλαραγεωργια
ιελβτετροκλον
κυπηκωνηγημα
κυλιας ανθος
τονος
αροντ α
πολεμοντοει
λεεχη
ηδουνθεων
χαρι ημεθης
πεταμενονθεος
παραγων
φιμοσαναξ
μμμερια
εβεια
ηπιετις

Col. i 3 ↓, high and low ink, as if from vertical 4 ↓. high traces in paler ink, ιν possibility 6 Below are traces of washed out letters, αδουρα? 7 ↓ possibly pi but not gamma 11 ↓ very smudged, after ω traces probably because the scribe was thwarted by the large fibre and had to begin the nu again 16 for μη μη, φι, or χι can be read, the first two if written rather small 18 ↓, three small traces on two fibres consistent with an oblique sloping down to right followed immediately by an upright alpha or mu? 20 ↓, high trace of curve opening to right
3239. ALPHABETIC ‘GLOSSARY’

Col. i

] πικρόν κακόν
] αἰεὶ οἶνος
] ἱλαρὰ γεωργία
] . φιλεῖ Πάτροκλον
] κυνηγικόν ἄγημα
] κυλίας ἄνθος
] τοιοῦτον
] ἄρουρα
] πόλεμον ποιεῖ
] λέειζη
] ἑδονὴ θεῶν
] χάρμα μεθής
] πετάμενος θεός
] παράγων
] ὁ νὺς ἀναζ
] μημερια
] εβεία
] . ἡ πίεσις
] .
Col. ii

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ιςς} & \quad \text{ημεγαλη}[	ext{],λπς} \\
\text{κρων} & \quad \text{εταμο επει,ατ...} \\
\text{κα[λ]θος} & \quad \text{εκερμα} \\
\text{λυχνος} & \quad \text{τοδεξιονφεγγ’ο'} \\
\text{25} & \quad \text{μολιδος} \quad \text{μεγα βαρος} \\
\text{μυς} & \quad \text{περπ ερος} \\
\text{ν} & \quad \text{ευφατα} \quad \text{ελαδι ουπταις} \\
\text{οι[., ].,ε,ι} & \quad \text{ηδονη[.,]εμ} \\
\text{30} & \quad \text{οι[κο]βομος} \quad \text{παραβολ[.,]} \\
\text{οσαραπις} & \quad \text{αλεξανδρειαν} \\
\text{οιμ[ε]ς} & \quad \text{κοκμει} \\
\text{οιμ[ο]ς} & \quad \text{οξος} \\
\text{παρακατης} & \quad \text{σαβατυχη} \\
\text{35} & \quad \text{ρητωρ} \quad \text{ερ[κ]γομωρος} \\
\text{ραβδ ος} & \quad \text{οδηγη οσαγαθη} \\
\text{ρωμ η} & \quad \text{ζεω ηπ ολις} \\
\text{εμω[.,]ς} & \quad \text{εμι δαλις} \\
\text{εμαγορος} & \quad \text{περπε ροντομα} \\
\text{40} & \quad \text{εμι,ις} \quad \text{οκαλοσαπρ} \\
\text{ετεφανος} & \quad \text{εκας,ω} \\
\text{τυχη} & \quad \text{ονακελεπλουςι’ο'} \\
\text{υδρο [,.,ος} & \quad \text{δευρε εω πο,ει} \\
\text{υδρο [φορος} & \quad \text{διωκ} \\
\text{45} & \quad \text{υπηρ ετης} \quad \text{αντι κυριος}
\end{align*}\]

Col. ii 22 1. ιυ or ριο After τ an upright (blotted at middle height, corrected?) 26 we corrected from η 27 The gap between 26 and 28 is only slightly larger than between 25 and 26 or 28 and 29. 40. two tiny traces a mid-height on edge which is not very clear and may be another letter πο, ει: either πορευ or πομευ (there are no traces of the upper loop of rho, but the lower loop is like rho in οσαραπις line 34).
3239. ALPHABETIC 'GLOSSARY'

Col. ii

*Ἰες  ἡ μεγάλη [ἐ]λπίς
κύων  ἱσταμός πειρατής
κάλλιος  εἰς ἔρια
λίχcosity  τὸ δεξίων φέγγο(ε)

25  μόλιβδος  μέγα βάρος
μῦς  πέρπερος
n
ξύστρα  ἐλαδίου επάνες
οἱ [...], ἐ. ἕ ν

30  οἱ[...]δόμος  παραβολ[...]]
ὁ Σαράπις  Ἀλεξανδρείαν
κοκμεῖ

οἶνος  ὀξος

παραχύτης  επιρὰ τύχη

35  ρήτωρ  ἐργόμαρος
μάρμαρος  ὠδηγὸς ἀγαθή
Ῥόμη  ἕινη πόλεις
εὔμνις  εὐμῦδαλος
εὐνάγορος  πέρπερον ετύμα

40  εὖμ. ἐς  ὁ καλὸς ἀὴρ
ἐστέφανος  ἐκάστῳ
τύχη  ὅν ἄν θλῆ πλοῦσιον(ν)

45  ὑδρο[...], ὅς  δευερεῖο  ποιεῖ

ὑδροφόρος  δυσώ

ὑπηρέτης  ἀντικύρος
Col. iii

νε [ δέ ]

φ...<

φορμή

χα...[

χαρω[

χαρω[

χωμ [. [

ψή[

ωρος[

Col. iii 52 χ is very faint, possibly another letter between it and δ. 58 ψ very faint, possibly space for a small letter between it and δ. 54 ω corrected from o?

Col. i In 5 the 'definition' is certainly complete, for blank papyrus precedes; so probably in 11 and 12. Starting from this alignment, and allowing for limited irregularities of margin as in col. ii, we may assume that 1–4 also are complete, and that 6–10 may (but need not) lack one or two letters at the beginning.

1 δόφυκτο;?

2 If ἀείθ is right, it must be adjectival; the obvious lemma is then ἀμβοκια (as the wine of the gods, already in Sappho 141 L–P). But if the line began unusually far to the left, we could try κ'ιάι, etc.

3 Perhaps κ' διακέ, unless the first trace is stray ink.

4 Ἡχωλείς. Before φιλεῖ perhaps ἦς;

5 κυνηγεύκων has a clear meaning, though the word is rare (τόποι P. Grenf. II 71 i 15; χώρα? Evagr. HE 3. 32). ἱγυμα is quoted in the sense 'that which guides' from Inscr. Perg. p. 246. 27, in the sense 'thought, purpose' from LXX Ez. 17. 3 (hence in Photius, etc., see Stephanus s.v.). If the meaning here is 'that which leads in hunting', Ἱρτείμε (would be a suitable lemma.

6 An extremely puzzling definition. A spelling error must be assumed. Two possible readings are καπαλακ ἄφος poetic and unexampled, but perhaps suitable for αἰδών, or εἰνάλεις ἄφος with ἐδίκε.

7 If τόνος, perhaps ἄφωνα;?

9 Ἀρθρός?

10 Ἐξίκ is the only possible reading. Perhaps the lemma was βουλατήριον.

11 Ἰανύμφης;?

12 Διάνοσς;?

13 Ἐρως;?

15 Strangely expressed definition. Ζεύς fits the alphabetic scheme.

16 θερμημέρα would fit the traces, but occurs usually in the plural, cf. LSJ s.v. Possibly the lemma is θηλος vel sim.

17 -ἐβεία.

18 The traces might allow ἡ κ' 'οιδή πέτιν. Cf. 21.

21 This title does not occur in the magical papyri or the Isiac aretologies. The closest is PMG XXIV a i μεγάλη Ἰεσ ϊ κυρία.

22 For the connection of κύρω with ιταμός cf. Aeschylus fr. 282N. I print περιτόσ as a misspelling of περιτόσ; but it is possible that the scribe corrected τις to τις. περιτό τις might also be read, but suits ιταμός less well.

24 δεξίων: well-omened? favourable to lovers or travellers?
26 The connection is less clear than usual here; possibly a reference to the Batrachomyomachia (there are no braggart mice in Aesop). πέραπος and its compounds are well attested in the literary Greek of the Hellenistic and Roman epochs, see LSJ and especially Lampe, PGL s.v.

29 αϊ...εί: the lacuna may hold one or two letters; then traces of a descender followed by a high trace; then the beginning of epsilon. After epsilon: alpha, lambda or possibly gamma. Dr. Rea suggests ωνιεδεδ ὑδηε: this is very attractive, though ω is not the most obvious reading of the traces.

30 παραβολή: the space allows παραβολήν -ον or -κο. I see no obvious sense. It is tempting to write παραβολής and refer to the image of the man who built his house on a rock, NT Matt 7. 24. But we might not expect an allusion to a Christian parable so early.

31 ο Διοράμει: no other entry has the article. Possibly he intended 'Ὀσαράμες as a by-form of 'Οσιράμες and 'Οσαράμος.

34 καπα τίχνη: cf. PMG XIII 635 τις καπαντ εἰςμακάνην. In a literal sense, some parachytae had a degraded lot in life, see Cumont, L'Égypte des Astrologues, 141 f. But notice also that καπα τίχνη is an anagram of παραχώρη.

35 ἐστὶ γάμιμος: the scribe apparently wrote ἐρωτο and corrected it to ἐρωτο; there is also stray ink round the rho, but not enough to prove that it was corrected. The word intended must be ἐραφόμων, which is glossed adulator, ambitionus, anciliarius, assessor, fuso, stalarius (Goetz, CCL vii 527, with derivatives; cf. Hsch. E 5668 ἐραφόμων ἐπαλήων).

36 The walking-stick of the blind or old? (For ἐβάθος as the equivalent of βαστάρχον, see NT Matt. 10. 10, etc.)

37 Cf. ξένων πόλει of Alexandria in the Oracle of the Potter, ΖΦΕ 2 (1968) 206, line 30.

38 S. Stephens suggests εἰμι [κ] = seminis. But the connection is obscure, and the case (genitive or mistaken plural) is strange.

39 κοντάρος: the Doric form is the only one which fits the traces.

40 M. W. Haslam has suggested Καλάς δ καλός δ[ε]γρή (Ser. Sulpicius Similis, Prefect of Egypt 107-12). If this were correct, it would provide a lower limit for dating the text.

41 ἐκάγωμεν is an exceptionally odd definition. There might be doubts about the reading: sigma could be omicron; the descender of tau is very thick (corrected); omega is widely separated from tau (but the scribe may have left a space to avoid thick fibres, as at the same point in 36-9 though not in 40). It is just possible that a narrow letter originally stood before epsilon, if the single point of ink is significant. But I have found no other satisfactory reconstruction; ἐκατερά(ε) can be excluded, since kappa is virtually certain.

42-3 ποίει is written slightly higher than the preceding words. I assume therefore that it carries over from 42.

43 δόρος, [ς]: before ος, what looks at first sight like the loop and part of the descender of rho. But if so, the descender ends short with an uncharacteristic curl to the right. Other possibilities are no more attractive: theta (malformed), beta (but elsewhere the scribe uses an open-topped form). Perhaps the letter has been corrected. The word as written was one letter shorter than δοροφόρος in 44; and the 'definition' was apparently δεπρ ἐσσω.

44 ἀντιφέρομεν is new, but cf. ἀντιφαίοντος, etc. Better so than ἀντικέιομαι or ἀντί (τοῦ) κέιομαι (which would produce a 'definition' much more explicit than any of the others).

45 Χαῖρε is new, but cf. Χαίρεται, etc. Better so than Χαίρεται or ἑαυτί (τοῦ) κέιομαι (which would produce a 'definition' much more explicit than any of the others).

47 Perhaps φ...ς; φως not suggested.

48 φιμβετές, φωμετές, etc.

49 χα...[,] the first traces looks very like νυ or πι. No attested word or name begins χαπ. Even for χα... the possibilities are few: χάνασα? Χανάν (cf. on 30)?

50 Χάρω?

52 χίμαρα (cf. 46)? But perhaps χι...ς should be read.

54 ἤρος (cf. 21, 31)? ἤρως(κόπος)?

H
3240. Official Correspondence

A warped fragment of the bottom of a column containing copies of two or three letters, the last one of which at least is official. It is not clear if this fragment belongs to a roll or is a single sheet of copies of letters pertaining to one dispute, see 2 n. Parts of the left and bottom margins, 3-6 and 2-0 cm. respectively, survive, but the full width of the left margin is not preserved. The back is blank.

The subject of the lower portion of the column is a boundary dispute of some duration, the history of which goes back at least as far as the term of Flavius Heracleides, predecessor of Junius Hestiaeus as strategus, and conceivably continued for forty years after this letter, see 14–16 n. Junius Hestiaeus is a new strategus and the period available for Flavius Heracleides is narrowed by this papyrus. The prefects C. Septimius Vegetus and M. Mettius Rufus gave instructions in the case.

→
c. 17 [ἐτι.] c. 18

 rivalry...
3240. OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE

5 ff. '... through a determination of boundaries according to the title deeds. Year 8 of Imperator Caesar Domitianus Augustus Germanicus, Phamenoth 13(?).'

'(Copy) of another. Mettius Rufus to Junius Hestiaeus strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome, greetings. Dionysius son of Dionysius applied to me in a petition stating that Vegetus, vir egregius, wrote to Flavius Heracleides who was strategus before you concerning the auroras of his which were stolen by the neighbours in order that the boundaries might be determined for him according to the title deeds, but nothing has been done yet. I desire you, if nothing has been done about the matter, to go to the locality and restore to each his own land. Farewell. Year 8 of Imperator Caesar Domitianus Augustus Germanicus ...'

2 Phaniaov [i. Restore perhaps 'Hrakleidov again, cf. 10–11. Possibly this is the first line of the letter of Vegetus mentioned in 10. There is just room for Κεπτίμος Οὐδέτερος at the beginning of the line, but not for ἀλλὰς or ἀπίστωσαν. Alternatively there is room for ἀλλὰς. Μέττιος Ρουφός. In either case the letter would be extremely short. The traces of l. 1 are extremely small and faint, but could possibly be read as ἄραν, i.e. as part of the titulature closing a preceding letter.

3 The earliest definite date for Mettius Rufus is 3 August a.d. 89, though he may have taken office in the spring of a.d. 89, see BASP 4 (1967) 89 and ΖΠΕ 17 (1975) 277. The date in 7, if it really were Phamenoth 13 = 9 March a.d. 89, would not exclude the possibility that Mettius Rufus was the writer of the letter.

Junius Hestiaeus is a previously unknown strategus in office sometime in a.d. 88/9, see 16–17.

10 The earliest known date for Vegetus, prefect of Egypt, is 8 February a.d. 85, the latest 26 February a.d. 88, see BASP 4 (1967) 89 and ΖΠΕ 17 (1975) 277.

Flavius Heracleides is known from PSI XII 1235. 2 as strategus some time between a.d. 80 and 90, but not in 83. This document indicates that he must have been in office after 83 some time in the prefecture of Vegetus and before the date of this letter.

12 For encroachment by neighbours cf. BGU II 616, P. Petaus 24.


14–16 For the restorations cf. BGU II 616, 5 ff. ἄραν [καὶ] γὰρ [τὴν] ἀρχαιολογίαν [καὶ] τὴν οἰκείαν καὶ ἀναμνηστικὴν [τὴν] πάσαν (καὶ τὸ ἑορτασμένον) τὴν ἀναμνηστικὴν (καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν) καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν καὶ τὴν ἑορτασμένον. This is a request possibly similar to one Dionysius may have written to Vegetus. In it, in P. Petaus 24, and in P. Flor. 319 of c. a.d. 133–7, which may possibly be connected with our document as the petitioner is 'son of Dionysius', the writers assume that the village scribe is in charge of the examination. There is no sign of him in our document.

3241. NOTIFICATIONS TO TAX-FARMERS

5 tB.59/H(i) 14 x 14 cm. 11 February a.d. 163

Two adjacent documents from a τόμος εὐγκολλήσιμος, both addressed to a pair of contractors for the ἐγκύκλιον, the tax on transfers of property. The first is a statement of payment of the charges due on the manumission of a female slave, the second, written by the same man on the same day, appears to concern the same transaction and refers to a public registration at Alexandria.

In manumissions three payments are to be distinguished: the ransom price, or λύτρα, paid to the slave's owner; the tax due upon the transaction, the ἐγκύκλιον; and a separate charge of 10 dr. (The suggestion made at XXXVIII 2843, that the 10 dr. are the tax itself, is to be rejected.) The first of the present documents records the payment of the last two of these, and the 10 dr. charge now has a name, the προ-πραπτικόν. The purpose served by this first letter, virtually complete, is something of a puzzle. It is not an acknowledgement of payment by the recipients, but a statement
of payment by the payer, and since it incorporates acknowledgement of a receipt (9-10 δέν [καὶ ε]ὑμβολον ἔχων), it was clearly not intended to serve as a receipt itself (by being countersigned by the taxmen). A precise parallel for the form of the letter is found in I 61, a statement made by an Oxyrhynchite ex-strategus of the Arsinoite nome to public bankers at Oxyrhynchus of the payment of a fine he had incurred by his failure to produce official papers when required. That letter, however, does not provide an immediate solution to the problem. (The revised readings of E. G. Turner in JEA 38 (1952) 88 n. 6, do not affect the basic form. Expand to εὑμβολ(ον) in 10.) In 3241 a possible explanation is that the money had been paid directly into the state bank, instead of passing through the hands of the tax farmers (cf. I 96, where a tax official pays the ἐγκύκλων on the sale of a slave into the bank; cf. P. Fay. 64, P. Osl. III 116). It would be a reasonable, perhaps obligatory, course of action to notify the circumvented taxmen, the nominal payees. A comparable explanation is available for 61, if the fine had been paid into a bank in the Hermopolite, where the man was currently strategus.

The matter might be more intelligible if the second of the present letters had survived intact. As it is, the significance of the publication through the katalogeion at Alexandria is not at all clear. It may refer to the δημοσίων of the manumission at Alexandria. If the current view of the identity of the senders of I 48, 49 and II 349 is correct (see XXXVIII 2856 2 n.), it was the duty of the ἐγκύκλων farmers, at any rate at the end of the first century, to notify the local agoranomus of the details of the manumission and authorize him to proceed with the registration. There would be no need for this to be done if the deed had already been entered at Alexandria. (Cf. IX 1200, where a request is made to the archidicasts to inform the Oxyrhynchite record office of the registration of a deed of sale through the katalogeion.) In view of the identity of the addressees, it seems less likely that the registration in question is that of a deed certifying the legal title to the slave, and hence with the man’s right to dispose of her (cf. I 73, where an agreement registered through the katalogeion is mentioned in connection with a registration of a slave before agoranomoi).

Above the first column are some scribblings in two different hands, apparently unrelated to the main text. The most legible of them read: ἔκαστος καί | περιτομέων | Συντονος | τον. On the back, not transcribed here, is what appears to be a prose encomium on the aulos.

Col. i

Θεα... | Σαρπιάκωνος ἀπὸ Ὀξυρύχου [πόλεως] διὰ Σαρπιάκωνος Ἀπολλονίου φροντί εστιν Ἀὐρηλίῳ Ἀντιλάχῳ καὶ Ἡρακλείδῃ ἐγκύκλων ἐν κληρίδων χαίρειν. Διεγραφα ὑπὲρ Ἰρα." 5... | ης δοῦλης ἑλευθερωθείσης ὑπ’ ἐμόν το
NOTIFICATIONS TO TAX-FARMERS

3241. Θεα... Σαραπίων απὸ Ὁξυρύχχων πόλεως
dia Σαραπίων Ἀπολλωνίου φροντιστοῦ
Ἀυρήλιος Αντωνέινου καὶ Ἡρακλείδη ἐν,
κνυκλώναις χ' αἵρειν.

10 [..]. . . περή[ ]
δριθῆς Πρεμ[ ]
λιστῆς δημοσιω-
dia τοῦ ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρεία καταλογείου.
Σαραπίων Ἀπολλωνίου ὁ προγεγραμμέ-
νυς φροντιστῆς [αὐτὸς τὸ ὑπόμημα]
ἐπιθέως. Ἔτοι τοῦ Ἀὐτοκράτορος
Καίσαρος Μάρκου Ἀυρηλίου Αντωνέινου
Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Λουκίου Ἀυρηλίου ὁ Ὀδήρων Σεβαστοῦ,

15 Μεξείρ [ ].

Col. ii

Θεὰ... Σαραπίωνος ἀπὸ Ὁξυρύχχων πόλ(εως)
dιὰ Σαραπίων Ὀλλωνίου φροντιστοῦ
Ἀυρήλιος Ἀντωνέινου καὶ Ἡρακλείδη ἐν-
κνυκλώναις χ' αἵρειν.

20 [..]. . . περή[ ]
δριθῆς Πρεμ[ ]
λιστῆς δημοσιω-
dιὰ τοῦ ἐν Ἀλεξάνδρεία καταλογείου.
Σαραπίων Ἀπολλωνίου ὁ προγεγραμμέ-
νυς φροντιστῆς [αὐτὸς τὸ ὑπόμημα]
ἐπιθέως. Ἐτοὺς τοῦ Ἀὐτοκράτορος
Καίσαρος Μάρκου Ἀυρηλίου Ἀντωνέινου
Σεβαστοῦ καὶ Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Λουκίου Ἀυρηλίου ὁ Ὀδήρων Σεβαστοῦ,

30 Μεξείρ [ ].

Col. i 'Thea- son of Sarapion of Oxyrhynchus, through Sarapion son of Apollonius, manager, to
Aurelius Antiochus and Heraclides, contractors for the transfer tax, greeting. I have paid you, on behalf
of the slave . . . freed by me, the transfer tax for her manumission, the sum being fifty-two drachmas of
coined silver, 52 dr., and for warranty fee ten drachmas, 10 dr., that is in sum total sixty-two drachmas,
62 dr., for which I have had a receipt. I, Sarapion son of Apollonius the abovementioned manager,
have personally written the statement. Year 3 of Imperator Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus
and Imperator Caesar Lucius Aurelius Verus Augustus, Mecheir 16.'

1 Θεαγόνης is far and away the commonest name in Θεα-, but the traces do not commend it. Θεάων is an attested name that is perhaps acceptable, but too little remains to be certain.

3 Αυρήλιος Ἀντωνέινος: Aurelius occasionally appears as the nomen of romanized Greeks before the
Antonine Constitution. I know of no earlier occurrence without a praenomen than this.
The heirs of an Aurelius Antiochus are mentioned in III 512, a document of A.D. 173. The nomen at this date greatly increases the chances of identity.

3-4 ἐγκυκληδαῖοι (guaranteed by 18-19 ἐγκυκληδαῖοι), a new title, equivalent to τελῶναι ἐγκυκληδαῖοι (XVII 2111 18, P. Vindob. Worp 1. 5), ἐγκυκληδαῖοι (XX 2281 3, P. Mich. II 123 verso vii 16, BGU III 914. 5, P. Osl. III 118. 1) will probably have been officials.

4-5 I take it that the lines were spanned by the slave's name, whose manumission is apparently the subject of the second letter also, where the name is ἠπεμ. Attested female names in ἠπεμ- are Ἠπεμια, Ἠπεμυα, and Ἠπεμιδάλεα. Ἠπεμιαίγνυς and Ἠπεμιμελόμενοι are thus possibilities.

5-7 The rate of the manumission tax is unknown except in the case of Roman citizens, who were liable to the vicesima libertatis. The raising of the tax, in so far as it related to an alienation of property, evidently devolved upon the ἐγκυκληδαῖοι farmers, as is suggested also by the phrase διὰ τῶν ἐγκυκληδαῖον καὶ δῶ άλλων καθήκουν in some manumission documents (P. Strasb. 122. 11, SB III 6293. 6). The ἐγκυκληδαῖοι on sales was 10 per cent (A. C. Johnson, Economic Survey, 355 f., S. Wallace, Taxation, 228, 230, 448 n. 60, 449 n. 75), but the manumission tax was not necessarily the same (a 2 per cent rate, also raised by the farmers of the ἐγκυκληδαῖοι, was levied on mortgages, II 243). However, 52 dr. are paid on the sale of a slave at I 96 (A.D. 180) and again at P. Hamb. 79 (second century), so that though slave prices varied considerably, it seems quite possible that the manumission tax was also a 10 per cent rate.

Since it is the purchaser, and in the case of mortgages the mortgagee, who pays the ἐγκυκληδαῖοι in the Roman period, the presumption would be that the manumission tax was payable by the unman¬mitted slave (as it is at P. Hib. I 29. 7, Ptolemaic), out of his or her peculium. But payment by the owner on the slave's behalf may have been regular practice. (At P. Tebt. II 407. 25 (A.D. 199?) a man who declares to his wife that he wishes to free some slaves standing in her name has himself paid the taxes due: διαγράφας πάντα τὰ πάντα αὐτῶν τέλη τῆς ἱλικηρόκους.) Similarly the ransom price itself, the λύστα, was paid not by the slave but by a third party. The slave's legal incapacity will account for both the payments in question being made, at least nominally, by someone other than the beneficiary of the transaction.

6-7 ἐγκυκληδαῖον [] . . . ς ς ἐν δραχμαῖς. For ἐγκυκληδαῖος in description of the tax (rather than of the collector) cf. P. Mich. II 123 verso vii 19 δαπάνης ἐγκυκληδαῖος. The problem is, what to supply in ? The upsilon and sigma are good readings, not open to much doubt; they are preceded by lettermops difficult to interpret, perhaps most satisfactorily taken as λ. So τέχνη; But why the genitive? Hardly θρητρία λύστα, even if there were room. τέχνη λύστα, however desirable, arouses the mis¬givings to which the jettisoning of available evidence among deficient is properly liable. But I find no answer that saves the phenomena. Τέχνη λύστα (or any other fraction) cannot be read; nor does it seem to help if the following ov is taken not as ov but as the termination of our verbum petitum (it would be admissible in itself: for omission of the participle in this phrase, cf. I 56 8).

8 The standing charge of 10 dr. occurs in various other documents relating to manumissions, viz. I 48, 49, 50, XXXVIII 2843, P. Lugd. Bat. XIII 24, cf. IV 722. Usually without a name, it is here called the πρόπορπατικός. So far as I know the only other occurrence of this word is at P. Col. inv. 480 (P. Col. I = W. L. Westermann, Upon Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt; c. 190-197 B.C.) 14, where it is synonymous with προποτλεθηκός (ibid. 9-10), which itself is found elsewhere only in the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus (SB Belheli I) 55. 15. [προποτλεθηκός is unaccountably missing from all the standard lexic.] It is apparently not a brokerage fee but a charge for warranty against eviction: see, on προποτλεθηκός and related words, J. Parthus, Griechische Bürgerschaftrecht i, 240-58, esp. 439 f. and 354 n. 3, cf. P. M. Meyer, Jur. Papyri 53. 1. 11 f., and F. Pringsheim, Greek Law of Sale, 429-44, 441. In sales of the Roman period the warrantor is the vendor himself (Pringsheim 439 ff., Taurenschlag Lawb., 251 n. 4), but it now appears that in the case of manumissions it was the state that undertook the liability for any eviction of the freedman from his freedom. This interpretation is suitable for the Columbia papyrus, where the προποτλεθηκός/προποτλεθηκός is payable τῇ πάλαι, i.e. to Alexandria. The same explanation has been given of the charges paid as βεβαιωτικοί or ὦπερ βεβαιώθηκα (P. M. Meyer, Festschrift Otto Hirschfeld gewidmet, 151). Pestman, Marriage and Matrimonial Property in Ancient Egypt 41, investigating property conveyances from bridegroom to bride, shows that πρόπορπατικός is equivalent to the demotic sḥ (n) ḫḏ ḫḏ, the deed which declares that the purchase money has been paid in full and to the vendor's satisfaction and which precedes the vendor's relinquishing his title to the property (this
being effected by a further deed). If a comparable procedure is to be envisaged for manumissions, record of the payment of the τραπεζικόν (the charge upon the πρόπραξες?) will presumably have served to give the freedman security from eviction once the transaction was completed.

The expansion προπραξες is now available for 50 (A.D. 100), a banker’s chic recording payment on a manumission.

20 τιμίατοι would satisfy the exigous remains.
22 ἃποπτή: the reading is secure (not, e.g., ἀνεκπ[λ]ευ[ν]ων ἢ). A more precise identification than is given in the first letter? ἐπισκεκλημένης Καλλιάπτης? μητρός Καλλιάπτης?

3242. Declaration of Property

A general property return, complete except at the foot, blank on the back, addressed to both the strategus and the royal scribe by Dionysia, an Antinoite woman, acting through Sarapion son of Longinus of Oxyrhynchus. She registers, in response to a call issued by the prefect Pomponius Faustianus (185–7), the property that she owned at the village of Sko in the Oxyrhynchite nome.

In form it follows the usual pattern, see A. M. Harmon, TCS 4 (1934) 135 ff.; S. Avogadro, Aegyptus 15 (1935) 131 ff.; and Cl. Préaux, CE 75 (1963) 117 ff.; other parallel documents: P. Harris, 74 (A.D. 99); P. Merton I 13 (98–102); P. Mil. Vogl. III 191–2 (130–1); PSI (ed. Bartoletti, 1965) no. 9 (161–2); PSI XIII 1325 (176–80); BGU XI 2022 (202); 2023 (198–201); P. Strasb. 192 (207); SB VIII 9878 (259); P. Vindob. Boswinkel 3 (279).

The present document is the first return known to me in response to a general call issued by Pomponius Faustianus. A point of interest is that Dionysia reports that part of her property was registered in the public records by her ancestors in the periods after the third year of Vespasian (A.D. 70/1) and the first of Titus (A.D. 79). This means that the property was preserved in the same family for over a hundred years. This is perhaps the longest history of a property in the same family that has been reported in the papyri of the period (Harmon, op. cit. p. 141, considered thirty-five years the longest history of a family property he was able to trace).

→ Διοφάνει ἡττ(απηγώ) καὶ Αρσκοκρατίων βασίλ(ικῶν) γρ(αμματεῖ) παρά Διονυσίας Καραπάδους τῆς καὶ Θαμιωνίου Αντινοίδος διὰ Καραπάδων Διογηνίου ἀπ’ Ὀξυφόρχων πόλεως. ἀπογράφομαι κατὰ τὰ κελευθέντα ὑπὸ Πομπωνίου Φαυστιανοῦ τοῦ λαμπροστάτου ἤγεμονος τὸ ὑπάρχον μοι περὶ κάμιν Νηλὺ τῆς ἅγιο τοῦ(παρχῶν) εἰκὸν τοῦ Ἀπολλώνιου κλήρου ἀμπέλου ἀρχαίας ἐν ἤ φοινεκ(ες) καὶ ἀγρόδ(ρων) καὶ κολαμεῖ—

1 ἡττ, βασιλ. γρς 2—3 αντινοίδος 6 το 7 φοινεκ., ἀγρόδ. l. ἀγρόδ(ρων)
To Diophanes, strategus, and Harpocration, royal scribe, from Dionysia, daughter of Sarapias alias Thannounion, of Antinoopolis, by agency of Sarapion son of Longinus, from the city of the Oxyrhynchus. I register in accordance with the orders issued by Pomponius Faustianus, the most glorious prefect, the two-thirds share of an ancient vineyard, in which there are date palms and fruit trees, and of a reed bed, which I hold in the vicinity of the village of Sko in the upper toparchy from the clericus of Apollonius, amounting to 4½ + 3½ aruras, which are a fourth share from the full listed number of 18½ aruras, which are in the name of my forebears and reported in the public records in the periods from the 3rd year of Vespasian and from the 1st year of Titus; likewise a two-thirds share of garden-land on the south side of the same vineyard including infertile ground, amounting to 1½ aruras, reported in the public records to have resulted from agricultural improvements in the aforesaid period; a two-thirds share of building land and infertile land and a water-wheel and of a half share of water sources, amounting to 2½ aruras, which is the quarter share devolving upon me and my partner of the 1¼ aruras listed in the public records as building land. Boundaries of the aforesaid properties are—on the south and east, property belonging to me and my partner; on the north, a vineyard belonging to Sarapion son of Andronicus; on the west, a vineyard. And likewise I register the two-thirds share of garden-land, amounting to 16½ aruras, which I hold in the vicinity of the same (village of) Sko from the dentes of Posidippus. Boundaries on all sides are:—property belonging to me and my partner. And likewise I register in the vicinity of Monimu . . . .
1 It is perhaps improbable that this Diophanes was identical with a Diophanes who—ten years later—appears as strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome, c. 197–200. There are other strategi in the interval, see H. Henne, *Liste des stratèges*, 31, and G. Mussies, *P. Lugd. Bat. XIV*, p. 26, no. 275. Another strategus, Isidorus, was in office on 25 May a.d. 186 (II 237 vi 32–6). It is not clear whether this Diophanes was his predecessor or his successor.

Harpocration is already known as royal scribe and deputy strategus in a.d. 186, see II 237 vi 36, vii 10, SB I 5693. 4. XXIV 2414 22?

4 Pomponius Faustianus was prefect of Egypt at least from December/January a.d. 185/6 to September a.d. 187, see BASP 4 (1967) 102.

Here we have a general call for property registration later than the one issued by M. Sempronius Liberalis, see Omaggio all' XI Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia (PSI ed. Bartoletti) 9, 5 n.

10–11 ἑπιστρατηγός Ὀδοστόν καί αἱ ἑπιστρατηγοὶ. It is not clear what the two dates signify.

One possibility is that they are the dates of the two earliest general property returns in which the family of Dionysia laid claim to this land. They are not, however, among the known dates of the general returns listed in ῥὰς 4 (1934) 184.

The long history of this family property is another indication of the stable and prosperous conditions of the second century. Other cases of family property with a history of two or more generations from the papyri of the second century are those of the families of Heron son of Hermobion, BGU III 959 (149), P. Berl. Lehlg. 18 (163), of M. Valerius Turbo, BGU VII 1574, 1565 (169), 1662 (181–2), of Onesicrates son of Polemaeus, BGU III 919 (second century), of Sabina Apollonarion, PSI XIII 1325 (176–80).

22 (ἄνωροὸς) ἵ[...]. Ἐ. Before ἵ = (ὁφόδον) the trace looks like the upright of δ = (τεριπρό). If so, probably the whole figure ought to be read ἵδήδη = 16 + ½ + ½ + ½, even though the lacuna seems somewhat too wide. The oblique stroke after the (ὁμλεκ) sign may have been unusually long.

### 3243. Report to a Prefect of Egypt

14 1B.201/2/L(b) Fr. 1, 32×20 cm. A.D. 214/15

A reply to the prefect of Egypt, Septimius Heraclitus, from the strategus of the Themistes and Polemon districts of the Arsinoite nome, concerning corn supplies. It is written in an accomplished ‘chancery’ hand (which shows that proficiency in this impressive style was not confined to the prefect’s office), stylistically looser than the otherwise very similar XIX 2227, which is roughly contemporary. Alpha and omicron occasionally ‘float’ to the top of the line, as in P. Berol. 6925 (tav. 2 of the plates given by G. Cavallo in *Aeg. 45* (1965) 215–49). The calligraphic intent is underlined by the presence of two rough breathings. The letter extended to a second column, which is mostly lost, so that the date clause is missing, but it is the balance in hand from the harvest of Caracalla’s 22nd year (a.d. 213/14) that is in question, and the document is probably to be dated around the end of 214 (see further 2 n.). It may be that the prefect’s demand for the information sought had been prompted by the impending imperial visitation: cf. PSI VI 683, a survey undertaken on the orders of the epistrategus on the occasion of Septimius Severus’ visit to Egypt in 199. 3243 was presumably intended, when written, to be the copy actually sent to Alexandria, but it was probably rejected on account of the original omission of the imperial titles.

The papyrus reveals that the Mons Claudianus was still being quarried in this period. Hitherto the latest evidence of its exploitation has been Hadrianic.
On the back are three columns of private accounts (not transcribed) covering a period of just over a month. The most frequently recurring item is wine.

Fr. 1
Col. i

Fractions of col. ii?

Fragments of col. ii?

Fr. 2 6 Fr. 3

Fr. 2 6 The first letter is probably alpha or epsilon (not rho, nor iota). 7 looks likely.
To Aurelius Septimius Heraclitus, most illustrious prefect, from Calpurnius Isidorus also called Harpocration, strategus of the Themistes and Polemon departments of the Arsinoite, greeting.

On receipt of your letter, my lord prefect, instructing me and the strategus of the other division to distribute the (grain?) that is in balance in the granaries from the harvest of the 22nd year of our lord emperor Severus Antoninus Felix Pius Augustus up to the date we receive your letter and to report to you the total amount remaining, adding how much has already been given over for provisions for the animals of the troops in the Thebaid and for the requirements of the men serving in the Porphyrite and Claudian quarries, as well as for the customary local . . .

Col. i 1 The earliest attested date for the prefecture of Septimius Heraclitus is 16 March, A.D. 215 (Stein, Die Pröfekten, 115). The fact that the strategus here does not yet call himself Aurelius makes it likely that Heraclitus was in office at any rate a few months before then (see next note).

2 The strategus is new in this nome, i.e. not in G. Bastianini, Gli strateghi dell'Arsinoites in epoca romana, p. 57. In XXXVIII 2876 Calpurnius Isidorus also called Harpocration is strategus of the Memphite nome. The editors put forward reasons for dating that document 'early in the sole reign of Caracalla' (14-16 n.). They mention the document published under this number and also another, published in this volume as 3263: in 3263, written just after 29 August A.D. 215, our man is, as here, strategus in the Arsinoite, but he appears with the additional nomen Aurelius. Evidently he acquired the name in the course of his tenure of office in the Arsinoite, as a result of the Antonine Constitution. The Constitution had begun to affect nomenclature early in the 23rd year of Caracalla, A.D. 214/15 (JEA 48 (1962) 124-31), so that the absence of 'Aurelius' here establishes a rough terminus ante quem. But the reference to the \( \text{Xonraypafetv} \) of the 22nd year suggests that the end of that year is passed (otherwise, moreover, one might expect specifically 'of the current (\( \text{tov } \text{evecrberc} \) 22nd year'), i.e. that the prefect's letter to which the present document is the response was written later than 29 August 214. A date in the last few months of 214 is therefore probable.

Isidorus' immediate predecessor in the Arsinoite nome may have been the well-known Sarapion also called Appollonius (or Appolloniai) who was strategus there in 210, but this cannot be regarded as certain, for Sarapion is last attested in that office on 31 July of that year (P. Flor. III 317; it is unsafe to infer from XVIII 2184 that he was still in office in 214).

5 \( \text{depetpa } \gamma \text{pimov} \) is a deferential phrase, used elsewhere only in private petitions to the prefect. It may be that the strategus is asking for an extension of time or some other indulgence.

6 The prefect's letter will have been addressed simply \( \text{straporov } \text{Aepwoitco} \), cf. PSI VI 683. 5. \( \tau \omega \tau \varepsilon \text{tèru } \mu \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \text{c } \eta \text{tratrg} \) : the strategus of the Heraclides division at this time may or may not have been either Aurelius Aelius(? Isidorus, in office some time between January and May 216, or Aurelius Hierax also called Ammonius, attested for May-June 213 (Musies, P. Lugd. Bat. XIV p. 18; Henne, Liste des stratégés, p. 57; Bastianini, op. cit., pp. 47 f.).

Perhaps the noun has been inadvertently omitted: \( \text{vpe} \text{trac} \) (P. Tebt. II 336. 7), \( \kappa \varepsilon \delta \varphi \? \) \( \text{prg} \text{trg} \text{pumv} \text{ov} \) : \( \text{vpe} \text{trac} \) ? But its ellipse at so early a date would be surprising.

Perhaps the noun has been inadvertently omitted: \( \text{prg} \text{trac} \) (P. Tebt. II 336. 7), \( \kappa \varepsilon \delta \varphi \? \) \( \text{prg} \text{trg} \text{pumv} \text{ov} \) : \( \text{vpe} \text{trac} \) ? But its ellipse at so early a date would be surprising.

\( \text{prg} \text{trg} \text{pumv} \text{ov} \) : \( \text{vpe} \text{trac} \) ? But its ellipse at so early a date would be surprising.
v[...v: only slight traces of ε and μ remain, but the strong stylization of the hand makes for precision in identification. Of ε there remains only the top of the upper loop, but any reading other than ε would be forced. μ is represented by a trace on an isolated fibre level with the foot of the following ε, and lower and to the left of this by a rightward hook, characteristic of μ, but found now and again also with κappa, and incompatible I would say with any other letter unless anomalously formed. If the letter were κappa one would expect other parts of it to be visible, perhaps the top of its vertical and the extremity of its lower leg. But μ is not entirely free from objection either, for elsewhere it is invariably ligatured to the following letter, in the case of εpsilon to the top of the lower half (the top half being ligatured in turn to the next letter again); whereas here there is no stroke coming in to the middle of εpsilon. θ[...c will have taken up most of the lacuna; it could contain one more letter, perhaps two, hardly more.

Unless some such error as γρ[...v is postulated, v[...v is practically unavoidable. If it is right, one must assume that the corn was to be used for the use of the military (cf. J. Lesquier, L'Armée romaine, 330-68), and that the strategi had had previous instructions specifying the amounts and the recipients (cf. e.g. P. Anth. II 107). Whatever the verb, το[...c constructs not with it but with λοιμοργοθμ[...v, cf. BGU III 576, 24, 977-9.

v[...v, however, makes it difficult to extract a reasonable sense. If the strategi are to disburse the balance (i.e. the corn left over after the quota for Alexandria had been filled and the military requisitions met), the second instruction, to inform the prefect of the amount left in store, is nonsensical, for there will of course be none. There are various ways of circumventing this (λοιμοργοθμ[...v might not mean in balance but in arrears, so that the amount of the civil annona in arrears is to be diverted to local needs; or το[...c (κ[...v includes some kind of grain that does not come under λοιμοργοθμ[...v, or grain from previous years), but it remains true that if the communication is connected with the impending imperial visit, as seems very likely, the orders one might expect would be, as Mr. Parsons suggests, not to make any further distribution but on the contrary to hold all remaining stocks in store until the government should know what resources are available. Working then from sense to text: δι[...e (or εκείν, intrinsically preferable but palaeographically inferior) is a forced and scarcely tolerable reading, while εκείν (ι. εκείν) would involve a phonetic error not uncommon but in this document unexpected and unparalleled. δι[...v (virtually a technical term of book-keeping and stock-taking) has stronger claims to consideration, for β, though not a wholly satisfactory reading, is perhaps an acceptable one; however, I am not sure that the lacuna can accommodate so much.

The participle may have been in another case, but πορθεντικ[...v, the likeliest alternative, would be rather too long for the lacuna.

On the Mons Phryphories and Mons Claudianus, see D. M. Meredith, 'Roman Remains in the Eastern Desert of Egypt' JEA 98 (1952) 94-111, and refs. ibid. 98 n. 4, 101 n. 3. For the military supervision of the quarries see Lesquier, op. cit. 239-43, and A. C. Johnson, Economic Survey, 241 f. The papyrus demonstrates that the Mons Claudianus was still being exploited under Caracalla. The general assumption, from which Meredith however demurs (pp. 109 f.), has been that it was permanently abandoned after Hadrian (C. Préaux, CE 51 (1951) 359).

3244. Oath of Office

This is a piece of a tomos synkollementos containing two joined copies of the same document (cf. XXXVI 2764). The right-hand piece, of which the text is here presented, is complete at the top and at both margins. Of the left-hand piece not much survives—merely enough to show that the texts are identical and to supply the date

1 Described as P. Oxy. ined. 15 in A. K. Bowman, The Town Councils of Roman Egypt (American Studies in Papyrology XI, 1971), Appendix IV.
missing in line 32. In the same folder were seven other scraps, including a piece possibly from the same tomos of which the right-hand text preserves parts of sixteen lines of a similar document.

The text is an oath of office of the familiar type, see E. Seidl, Der Eid, 76–80, P. Leit. 12 and most recently XXXVI 2764 with citation of similar documents. In this case the office—that of supplying fish for the city—is probably not liturgical; more likely the man works as a misthotes under the supervision of the agoranomos or euthenarchs. For a similar oath applied to a non-liturgic office see I 83 where an egg-seller undertakes to sell his produce only in the market.

Aurelius Sarapion son of Achilleus addresses Aurelius Theon also called Maximus, a (previously unattested) prytanis of the boul of Oxyrhynchus, swearing to fulfil the duty of supplying fish and and offering as his surety Aurelius Theon son of Theon. The back of the papyrus contains two dockets one of which probably describes the contents of the whole tomos; the other, which I have not been able to read fully, probably refers only to this text.

An additional point of interest is the occurrence on this papyrus of an example of the damnatio memoriae of Severus Alexander (see 11 n.).

→ (m. 1) ᾿Αὐρήλιῳ Ὀδηνὶ τῷ καὶ
Μαξίμῳ γις ἀσιαρχὸν ἑνδρ[ω]
προςάνει τῆς Ὀξι(υγρυγχτῶν) πώλου(εως) διάτροφον
τι καὶ τὰ πολειτομα(κά) τῆς αὐ[τῆς] πώλου(εως)

5 ᾿Αὐρηλίῳ[ο]ί̣ Σαραπίῳ[ν] Ἀχιλλ[ε]ά
κ[ε]ις μετρὸς Διεότος
ἀπ' Ὀξι(υγρυγχτῶν) πώλους μεταβό-
λος τῆς αὐ[τῆς] πώλους.

Ὀμνίῳ τῷ Μάρκου

10 ᾿Αὐρηλίῳ Σεούηρου
[Ἀλεξανδρου] Καἰσαρος
τοῦ κυρίον τῆς χρ-
ρηγῆςειν τῇ πώλει
ἀνεδεικτ' ἀνετ[ῶ]

15 ἵ[θ]θον ἀπὸ ἴς τῷ ὑ[ρ]
ὄ[ν]τος μηνὸς Ἑοίκ ἔδρα
δέον νεὶ τοῦ Μονί[μου]

2 γυμνός ἑνδρ[ω] 3 ο[δ]ζ πολ[ω] 4 [πολειτός τῆς α] πολ[ω] 7 ο[πολειτομ] 12 Filler at end of line (also in 13, 15); final letter extended in 7, 9, 10, 17, 18, 19, 23 15 ἵ[θ]θον ι?
1-4 Aurelius Theon alias Maximus was previously unattested as prytanis, see A. K. Bowman, The Town Councils of Roman Egypt, 131. For the title διέκτων καὶ τὰ πολιτεία, ibid. 59.
7-8 For μεταβόλος of fish see WO II 647, 1449, PSI VII 737, WO I p. 136.

11 The name Alexander is obliterated here and in line 30, and also in the corresponding lines of the other copy. This is evidently an example of the damnatio memoriae of Severus Alexander which is known from Egyptian inscriptions (SB V 8478, 8482 = Lepsius, Denkmäler xii, Taf. 92, nos. 333 and 344, SB III 7018) and from elsewhere (cf. RE ii (1886), 2327). I have not been able to parallel this on papyrus. In P. Ryl. II 297 (descri.) where the editors report the obliteration of Augustus I find nothing corresponding to their description of the erasure.

12-13 χωρηγήτης. For the term χωρηγία applied to a non-liturgical office see XXXI 2569 15-16. Cf. also P. Lond. III 974 (p. 115), containing a declaration of surety for a καρπώνης who is to supply fruit in Hermopolis; the verb there used is ἐπιπηρτέω. The situation in P. Got. 3 is probably different—the man who was to provide fish for the visit of Caracalla in a.d. 215-16 was εἰσδοθείς (line 6), which indicates that the post was a liturgy.

16-17 ξένη θητός. The reading is not certain, but we must have a phrase which connects with the following words to describe the conditions of the service. At the end of 16 we have really only a ligature leading from epsilon and no trace of a vertical. Omicron and sigma at the beginning of 17 fit the traces comfortably; the word ends with a short vertical which suits the right-hand stroke of nu. The phrase makes reasonable sense and implies that the fishing was a seasonal activity. An alternative possibility is ἐν ψ... ἐφαρμόσα (I. ἐφαρμόσα), i.e. "until the fishermen...are working," implying that he is to replace them. But this suits the traces less well and the sense is more difficult because it makes the man directly responsible for getting the fish, whereas a μεταβόλος is more naturally understood as a middleman between the fishermen and the market. Unfortunately the other copy does not preserve this section.

18 On fishing in Egypt see San Nicolo, Vereinswesen i 94-7, Besta, Aegyptus 2 (1921), 67-74. Recently published documents connected with fishing are P. Leit. 14, P. Wis. 6 (cf. ΖΕΠ 12 (1973), 262), 37.

30 [Δελτίον]: see 11 n.

32 The date is supplied from the other copy where zeta is clearly to be seen.

33 ff. For the form of the endorsements see e.g. VI 972, XXXVI 2764. The last letter surviving in 35 is more like omega than the beginning of epsilon and it is not clear whether it is included here. The endorsement by the surety will have read: Ἀδρήνος Θεόν Θέωσον ὁμάς τὸν ἄρων ἐγκυώμα τὸν Καρπώνα ἄν πρόκειται (cf. XXXVI 2764 36-8), but the traces in the last two lines are too indeterminate to offer a reading.

39-40 This docket has escaped decipherment. Line 39 is somewhat smudged, but I do not think that ἐπιδήμως can be read. The second letter looks like nu, the fourth could be epsilon, but in the fifth there is no trace of the bottom stroke which delta would require. Line 40 is more frustrating because the first seven letters, at least, seem clear but make no sense in any plausible articulation. Κοικώς is the most plausible reading but there is no evidence for such a building in Oxyrhynchus, nor would its connection with the present document be easily explained. Κοικώς appears in XXXI 2598, but the editor reasonably suggests a connection with the Fayum. To read κοικώς χερίσχορον vel sim. would be to force the orthography with no gain in understanding.

41 For this docket compare P. Lips. 52 verso.
The document contains a report submitted by a public physician and although the fragment on the right is too small to yield any significant information the occurrence of \(\nu\eta\rho\) in line 24 and the docket on the back suggest that the subject was the same. One significant point emerges in the fact that the report was submitted to a prytanis of Oxyrhynchus named Aurelius Aelurion alias Hesychius (here first attested as prytanis, see 3 n.). Such reports were usually addressed to the strategus in the third century, later to the logistes. The present text dates to a time of change in the municipal administration of Egypt. The position of strategus was clearly on the wane, but the institution of the logistes did not occur until several years later.

Documents of this type are reasonably common in the second, third, and fourth centuries A.D. They are discussed in detail by K. Sudhoff, *Artzliches aus griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (1909), 240 ff. and in P. Osl. III, pp. 100–3 (to the examples there cited add XII 1556 and PSI V 455). Apart from the address the present text does not differ significantly from the other examples. Aurelius Thonius, the public physician, reports that, as a result of instructions from the prytanis engendered by a petition from two Oxyrhynchites, he has examined the person in question and adds the details of the physical damage observed.

Col. i

\(\rightarrow (m. 1)\) επὶ ἵπτανω τῶν κυρίων ἰμαῶν Αὐτοκράτορος Μαξιμιανοῦ

\(\zeta\epsilon\beta\alpha\varsigma\tau\omicron\) τό ε' καὶ Μαξιμιανοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου Καϊσαρος τό β'.

Αὐρηλίῳ Αὐλοφάνιν τῷ καὶ Ἡσυχίῳ γενομένῳ ὑπομ. (ἡματογράφῳ)

βουλευτῇ τῇ τῆς λαμ. (προτάτης) πόλεως τῶν Ἀλεξ(ανδρέων) γυμ. (νασαρχάς)

βουλ(ευτῇ) ἐνάρχω

5 προτάτη τῆς λαμ.(πράς) καὶ λαμ.(προτάτης) Ὀξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως

παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Θωνίου ἀπό τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως

δημοσίου λατροῦ. ἐπετράπην ὑπὸ Ἐρήμου διὰ Αὐρηλίου

Βιρραίον υπηρέτου τῆς τάξεως ἐκ βιβλίων ἐπὶ·

δορέων καὶ ἢπ Αὐρηλίου Διδύμου καὶ Πτολεμαίου

10 Διονυσίου τοῦ καὶ Χρησιμώφου ἀμφοτέρων ὑπὸ άπο·

τῆς λαμ.(πράς) καὶ λαμ.(προτάτης) Ὀξ(υρυγχιτῶν) πόλεως ὡστε ἐφεδείν τῶν ἐνέγγραμ·

μέιον τοῖς βιβλιοφαίρεις αὐτῶν Παταρε[ῦτα]

καὶ ἢν ἐκαταιβοῦ διάθεσιν ἐνεργάσεις ποιοφωνεῖς.

ἡθεν ἐφεδόν τούτων ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ πόλει ἐπὶ παρ[όντος]

15 τοῦ αὐτοῦ ὑπηρέτου ἐξούσια ἐπὶ τοῦ πῆχου τῆς δεξιᾶς

3 ὑπομ. 4 λαму, ἀλεξ. γυμ. βουλ. 5 ι. προτάτης, λαμ. καὶ λαμ. 7 ὑπο, αὐρηλ. 11 λαμ. καὶ λαμ. ἀν. 14 ι. ἐφεδόν (cf. Mayser-Schmoll, I i pp. 175–6) 15 ὑπηρέτου
χιρός πραγμα και ἐπὶ τῆς ἀριστεράς πλ[ῆμα,]
ἀπερ προσφωνῶ. (νας.)
(ἔτους) νῦν καὶ (ἔτους) ἢ βασιλεὺς κυρίων ἡμῶν [ν Διοκλετιανῶν]
καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς Ζεβεττῶν καὶ (ἔτους) εἰς τῶν κυρίων[ν ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίου]
καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων Καίσαρ[ῶν, .........]
[.............],[...........],[.....]

Col. ii

→ (m. 2) ἐπὶ ὑπάτων τῶν
Δυρηλκοίν[π....]

υπηρ[π....][

25 Back ↓ (m. 3) ἀντί(ὑγραφῶν) περὶ .......ος
θηγ(ἀρσκὸς) Διονυσίου

16 1. χειρὸς 18 Λ twice 19 Λ 25 ατ 26 θνη-

(1st hand) 'In the consulship of our lords Imperator Maximianus Augustus for the fifth time and
Maximianus the most illustrious Caesar for the second time. To Aurelius Aelurion also called Hesychius,
formerly hypomnematographus, councillor of the most glorious city of the Alexandrians, (ex-?)
gymnasiarch, councillor, prytanis-in-office of the glorious and most glorious city of the Oxyrhynchites
from Aurelius Thonius from the same city, public physician. I was instructed by you through Aurelius
Ireneaeus, assistant of your office, in consequence of a petition presented to you by the Aurelius Didymus
and Ptolemaeus, sons of Dionysius also called Artemidorus, both from the glorious and most glorious
city of the Oxyrhynchites, to examine the Patareus mentioned in their petition and to make a written
report on the condition in which I found him. Accordingly I examined this man in the same city
in the presence of the same assistant, having on the forearm of his right hand a wound and on his left
hand a blow. Which I accordingly report. Year 13 and year 5 of our lords Diocletian and Maximian
Augusti and year 5 of our lords Constantius and Maximianus the most illustrious Caesars . . . (3rd
hand) Copy concerning . . . . ος daughter of Dionysius.'

2 The letters after alpha of Τ[α]τρ[ός] are virtually obliterated, but the numeral ε is clear.
3 Aelurion is known from PSI V 461. 9–10 (A.D. 290) where the name Ἡ[τρικοίνω] may now be re-
stored; he is here first attested as prytanis, see introd. and The Town Councils of Roman Egypt, 133.
12 The name at the end of the line is difficult to read. Παταρεδεῖος seems to fit best the surviving
traces (it occurs in P. Mil. Vogl. II 110). Or is it the ethnic Παταρεδεῖο, 'the man from Patara'? Παταρεδεῖο
is also a possible reading.
16 πληγή. Lambda looks to be the best reading for the second letter. πληγή is far more common
than πλῆμα but the meaning of the latter is closer to what is required here; πληγή means the act of
striking rather than the results of the act (cf. τύμπανα πληγῶν, PSI V 455. 16–17). The remains do not
suit πληγαμα, nor is it plausible to emend the text to πελαμα.
20 The month and day are lost at the end of the line.
21 A subscription by the physician will have followed here, as for example in VI 896 37 ff.: ἐπιθέσιαα προσφωνῶν ὡς πρόκειται. An oath is unusual in this type of document (P. Osl. III, p. 102).
25 δ'ντι(ὑγραφῶν). The last two letters are written very cursively above the line and the first
letter of περι has been corrected. The usual term for a document of this kind is προσφωνης, but the
initial letter certainly looks like alpha. As for the name, the last three letters seem secure but the be-
ingning is very cramped and indistinct. In the absence of other suitable narrτη ητ'(ντ)άγος must be
regarded as a possibility.
A fragment of a petition of which virtually only the address survives. The only clue as to its content is the occurrence of the word χώμα in 10. Several features of the papyrus suggest that this fragment was originally part of a large document. The first two preserved lines, which contain the date, are in a different hand from the rest. A trace of ink above the iota of Διοκλητ[ιανό looks like the foot of a descender in a previous line. Lines 4 ff. are indented and we should therefore assume that the first three lines constitute the end of a document written above and that at line 4 a new document commences. The back of the papyrus is blank.

What is left of the document—an address to the strategus from five people including two women—contains a couple of points of interest. This strategus has only been attested once, in IX 1204 where his name was read as Ζηραγένει. In line 4 of the present text we have Ζηραγένη and Dr. R. A. Coles, who has seen IX 1204, kindly informs me that Ζηραγένει should be read there. The male petitioners carry a normal sequence of municipal titles, but the father of one of the women has the curious title νεροποιητής πόλεως ἄπατος, a qualification which is, so far as I know, unparalleled. It is therefore difficult to elucidate its meaning, though it is obviously connected with the crown of office. Perhaps it means that the man had filled the office but not worn the crown, or vice versa (cf. SB V 7996. 97).

Described as P. Oxy. ined. 11 in A. K. Bowman, *The Town Councils of Roman Egypt* (American Studies in Papyrology XI, 1971), Appendix IV. When that note was written 3247 (inv. no. the same) was thought to be another piece of the same document but subsequent examination shows this to be wrong, though the hands are quite similar.
3246. FRAGMENT OF A PETITION

(1st hand) 'Year 14 and 13 of our lords Diocletian and Maximian Augusti and 6 of Constantius and Maximian the most illustrious Caesars [month and day]. (2nd hand) To Aurelius Zenagenes, strategus of the Oxyrhynchite from the Aurelii Horion also called Sarapion, formerly hypomnemato-graphus and prytanis and Seuthes also called Horion, both gymnasiarchs, and Thonius also called Theogenes, exegetes, and Claudia Heliodora daughter of Canopion formerly crowned (?) hypomnemato-graphus and Tychosous also called Eudaemonis daughter of Didymus also called Eudaemon (ex-?) gymnasiarch, councillor, all of the glorious and most glorious city of the Oxyrhynchites, and their partners. Best of the strategi, there is a dyke [on our land . . .]

2 It is difficult to be sure that this constitutes another date for the office of Zenagenes (IX 1204 is dated to a.d. 299) for two reasons: first, the reading of the date is not beyond doubt, though years 14 and 13 seem most likely; even if correct, it is not certain that this would necessarily refer to Zenagenes since the indentation of the lines following suggests that this dating clause may well be the end of a document. In texts of this kind it is common to find documents ranging over more than one year so the date of the petition to Zenagenes could be different. All that being said, however, the evidence of 3247 17 (same inv. no.) makes it probable that Zenagenes was in fact strategus in 298. There is a Zenagenes also in XVIII 2187 30 (a.d. 304), but he has no title.

3 If this date clause is the end of a previous document the month and day will have concluded this line.

5 The presidency of Aurelius Horion also called Sarapion was not previously attested.

7-8 δι' ἐτοῦς τὴν οἰκονομίαν. ἔστιν τὸ ἔτος τῶν ἀριστῶν τῶν στρατηγῶν, χώμα ἐν τῇ κε- . . .

3247. Fragment of a Petition

On this papyrus are preserved the left-hand sides of 23 lines of a petition, written in a hand very similar to the second hand of 3246. To judge from what is missing of the date clause in line 22 the surviving portion represents little better than a third of the original piece. The back of the papyrus is blank.

Since so much is missing it is impossible to reconstruct the sense of the petition with any plausibility but the remains, which include three occurrences of the word διακότριν (10, 12, 13), suggest that the subject may have been the exaction of taxes. Perhaps the petitioner is complaining of having been subjected to exactions beyond the legal requirements. The addressee of the petition is probably the same as in 3246, the strategus Zenagenes.

1 See footnote to 3246.
Although there is only a very narrow bit of papyrus above this line there are no traces of ink and it seems probable that this was the first line of the document. The name of the strategus Zenagenes should certainly be restored here (cf. 3246). If he was in office in 298 (line 17) we may now extend his tenure of the post (cf. IX 1204, a.d. 299). The great width of the document will easily have accommodated the names of the addressee and the petitioner.

3 This must be a reference to the magister rei privatae, and, as such, will be the earliest occurrence of this office. The earliest known holder of the post was Pomponius Domnus who was in office in Thoth of 298 (P. Beatty Panop. 1. 120). Since the date of the present text is only a month earlier than that (cf. 17 n.) it is not unreasonable to suppose that his name will have occurred here. By a.d. 299 Pomponius Domnus appears to have become rationalis (IX 1204 12). The form of the reference will be something like: τῇ τῶν διακησματότων μαγνήτρων τῆς προωτοτής τοῦ κυρίου μου[ name ..... ] τάξις.

5 Ακοινον. The name is not in NB or Foraboschi, Onomasticon Papyrologicum Alterum.

14 I am indebted to Dr. Rea for the suggestion that this should be restored as ἀνοθυμαία (cf. ἀραγομος in P. Cair. Preis. 13; 13; 14. 13). Addendum lexicis, if correct.
3247. **FRAGMENT OF A PETITION**

16 There is no obvious explanation for the fact that this and the following lines are indented about 2 cm. But since it is clear that this line does not begin a sentence it can hardly be the start of a new document. κατάφθασιν could be interpreted as κατάθεσιν (l. κέδεως), in which case it might be followed by τοῦ διηγητόου, i.e. ‘according to the order of the most perfect . . .’. Either the name or the title of a high-ranking equestrian official would be suitable to complete the phrase.

17 The date is A.D. 297–8. Line 22 will also have contained a year date, preceding the month and day in line 23. When a papyrus contains more than one document the year dates need not necessarily be the same, but since there is no indication that this is the case here (see 16 n.) it seems probable that the date in 22 will have been the same as that in 17.

19 ναύλα: see O. M. Pearl, *TAPA* 83 (1952) 74–9.

22-3 See 17 n.

---

3248. **FRAGMENT OF AN OFFICIAL DIARY¹**

This small scrap of papyrus contains the beginnings of lines of what must have been an interesting document. Unfortunately only part of the text, at the left-hand margin, has survived intact. The text consists of entries, arranged by date, referring to events of a public nature. Calendars containing lists of public festivals are known in the papyri, the most extensive Egyptian examples being XXXI 2553 and P. Osl. III 77. The present text, however, differs from these in two significant respects. First, it records events which apparently have no religious significance, e.g. a meeting of the town council (line 10); second, the entries are arranged under consecutive days at the end of Thoth and the beginning of Phaophi with no omissions, a special notation being used to mark blank days (lines 8–9). This is not paralleled in the religious calendars.

It seems most likely, in fact, that this is a fragment of an ‘Amtstagebuch’, of which the best known example is W. Chr. 41, recording the activities of a strategus. Other examples are PSI XIV 1444 and XLII 3072–4. The present text, however, does not seem to be concerned with the strategus. Perhaps the best clue to its nature comes in line 12 where δ ἔξις [ηρής] is mentioned immediately after the date. Given the format of the document, this seems to support the idea that the official whose activities are recorded here was the exegetes, perhaps the president of the κοινών of exegetae, or one of the κοινών serving a term of duty on a rota. The entry in line 10 conforms with the theory that the town council met regularly on the last day of the month (cf. *The Town Councils of Roman Egypt*, 36).

The back of the papyrus contains the faded remains of three lines, mostly illegible, perhaps by two different hands, the first of which (↓) ἥρης ἀλλοιος ἐρείτι· is separated from the others by a space of about 5 cm.

---

The traces of the first letter suggest pi, but the second does not favour, for example, πομ[π]ής, which would fit the context.

2 For the Ἐπαρτείων at Oxyrhynchus see e.g. XXXI 2553 12. This entry is paralleled in XLII 3072 5: ἔθους ἐν τῷ Ἐπαρτείῳ.

3 Cf. BGU II 362 iv 11.

4 A reference to the Capitoline games, first celebrated at Oxyrhynchus in the reign of Aurelian (BGU IV 1074. 10, P. Osl. III 85, cf. XLII 3135) ? In which case this text will date to the last quarter of the third century.

5 Perhaps ἐβρ[φ]γραφοι should be restored here. For the duties of the exegetes see P. Jouguet, La Vie municipale dans l'Egypte romaine, 315-18. On θεωρία see P. Osl. III 77, 18 n.

6 Cf. XLII 3072 3: ἔθους ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ κάκει τῷ.

8-9 These entries presumably cover blank days. The phrase might be οὐδὲν ὑπάρχει or ὑπερμνήματική vel sim.

10 Cf. the Lex Palmyrenorum (Abbot and Johnson, Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire, no. 89, 6) which has the phrase νομίμου βουλής.

15 One is tempted to see a reference to the office of strategus here and the traces of the first few letters are consonant with a reading of στρατηγοῦ but the traces following cannot be made to fit gamma.

3249. Nomination to a Liturgy

This text was originally part of a tomos synkollesimos, but only a scrap of the document attached at the left has been preserved. This contains exiguous traces of the ends of three lines. The main text is complete at the top and the left margin, with only
a few letters missing at the right-hand side. The lost portion will have contained the name of the nominee, the date, and endorsement by the official. The back of the papyrus is blank.

The nomination is cast in the form usual for this period (cf. e.g. XXXIII 2675). It is sent to the logistes, Flavius Leucadius, by the systates, Aurelius Eustochius, and others. It names a man who will perform the duty of guarding the temple of Hadrian for a period of one year. Although liturgies are known in connection with other temples in Oxyrhynchus, this particular one probably differs slightly from the other examples because in the fourth century the temple of Hadrian is known to have been used as a prison (see 12 n.).

Of greater interest is the fact that this text supplies more evidence to disprove the theory of Mertens (Les Services de l’état civil, 41–3) that the systates could be reappointed every third year. The present systates, Aurelius Eustochius, is now known to have been in office in A.D. 317/18 (XXXIII 2675), 326/7 (this text) and 337/8 (I. 86 10–11 cf. VIII 1116 5 note). It is even doubtful whether a minimum of two clear years between appointments (cf. XXXIV 2715 intro.) is still possible, see XLIII 313 3–4 n. It must be admitted that our knowledge of the functioning of the liturgical system in the fourth century is still scanty and the evidence so far has not brought to light any significant regularities in this period (cf. A. K. Bowman, The Town Councils of Roman Egypt, Appendix II).

→ ὑπατεῖς τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Κωνσταντῖνον
Αὐγούστου τὸ ᾽ΙΣ’ καὶ Κωνσταντῖνην τῇ έτιφανεστάτου
(vac.) Καίσαρος τὸ α’<br>
Φλαουὸν Λευκάδιον λογιστήν Οξυρυγχίτου<br>5
παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Εὐστοχίου Κοσπῆρως ευετάτου
τῆς ἐναλ λιτουργοῦσης φυλῆς [...]
καὶ ἄλλων ἀμφότερων καὶ Παριώνος [...] [...]<br>
χωτοῦ Θεοδώρου καὶ Τίθιον[μ]αθέου Ἑξῆχογίου καὶ Θωρίου<br>Φιλάιου καὶ Πτολεμαίου Σιθηβανοῦ καὶ [...]<br>10
Θεοδώρου τῶν πάντων ἀπὸ τῆς λαμ(πρᾶς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης)<br>ὀξυρυγχιτῶν πόλεως. Διδομέν εἰς λειτουργίαν<br>πρὸς τύραννα δημοσίου Ἀδριανίου ἐπ’ ἐνοα[υτόν]<br>ἐνα ἐπὶ ἀπὸ νεομηνίας Θώθ [ἐκς Μεσορῆ]<br>ἐπαγομένων πέμπτης καὶ ὀ[φ]της πέμπτης<br>15
τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος ἐτους κα’ ἑα’ γ’ τῶν<br>ἐπεγεγραμμένων ὄντα ἐπιτίθεον πρὸς τὴν<br>χρείαν. (vac.) ἔστι δὲ Αὐρηλίου<br>
... ...

2 l. Ἀυγούστου κωνσταντι'ην 10 λαμ καὶ λαμ 12 l. ἐπ’ ἐνοα’υτόν 13 l. νεομηνίας
In the consulship of our lords Constantinus Augustus for the seventh time and Constantius the most illustrious Caesar for the first time. To Flavius Leucadius, curator of the Oxyrhynchite, from Aurelius Eustochius son of Copreus, systates of the tribe... and other quarters currently performing liturgies and Parion... son of Theodorus and Timotheus son of Eulogius and Thonius son of Philaeus and Ptolemaeus son of Silvanus and [Terentius] son of Theodorus, all from the glorious and most glorious city of the Oxyrhynchites. We present for liturgy at the doors of the public Hadrianeum for a period of one year now from the beginning of the month of Thoth until the fifth epagomenal day of Mesore and including that fifth day of the present year 21, 11, 3, the man herein named who is fit for service. And he is Aurelius...

2-3 The consulship of Constantine Augustus (VII) and Constantius Caesar (I) fell in A.D. 326. The regnal year in line 15 is A.D. 326-7 (cf. note).

4 This attestation extends the term of office of Flavius Leucadius from A.D. 325 (I 52) into the autumn of A.D. 326. His name can now be restored in 3265 (inv. 3 iB.77/B(3)b). Flavius Thennyras was in office in 326-8 (I 83).

5 The restoration of οὐστήρω is guaranteed by name and circumstances. Eustochius is known from XXXIII 2675 and I 86 10-11 (cf. VIII 1116 5 n.). See introduction.

6 The name of the tribe is lost, cf. XXXIV 2715 5-6.

7-10 I find no other example of a systates associating other people with him in a presentation for a liturgy, but the κοινών of systatae appears in XLIII 3137 (A.D. 295), cf. the κοινών of laographi in XXXVIII 2855.

9 The surviving letters at the end of the line are difficult to read. They look like τηρη and I propose Τερής[ιου as a variant on Τερήςιου.

12 Whilst it is true that guards are attested for temples of Thocris, Serapis, and Isis (I 43 verso iv 16, ii 7, 14, XIV 1627 12), the fact that the temple of Hadrian at Oxyrhynchus appears to have been used as a prison in the fourth century (XVII 2154 13-14) suggests that we are dealing with a warder. This is confirmed by P. Harr. 65. 8 (cf. BL. III, p. 77). We might compare the προσθηραίων λογιστηρίου 'Οξυρυχύνω[του in XLIII 3104 8-9 (cf. S.P.P. III 84. 1, 77, P. Iand. III 37. 4).

15 Since the consulship is that of A.D. 326 (see 2-3 n.) and the regnal year is A.D. 326-7 the date of the papyrus falls between Thoth and Tybi of 326. The nomination therefore appears to postdate the beginning of the office (cf. XXXIII 2675 n.).
The papyrus, blank on the back, is complete except at the foot though there is minor damage along the vertical lines resulting from the original folding. It contains a freight contract, examples of which are rare in the first century of the Roman period. In form it follows the usual pattern, cf. P. Lond. III 948, p. 219 (a.d. 236) = Meyer, *Juristische Papyri*, 43; the abstracts in P. Ross. Georg. II 18 (a.d. 140); II 276 (a.d. 77); P. Lond. II 256, p. 99 (a.d. 15) = W. Chr. 443.

The contract is drawn up at Oxyrhynchus between Anoubas, skipper of a ship (under the orders?) of M. Cornelius Torullus, centurion, and Polytimus, slave of C. Norbanus Ptolemaeus. The charter is for the return trip between Oxyrhynchus and Hermopolis, from which 500 artabas of aracus are to be transported to Oxyrhynchus. Anoubas undertakes to do this for a freight charge of 28 dr. per 100 art., the total being 140 dr., and to transport free of charge a further 12½ art. per 100 art., making an extra 62½ art. and a full load of 562½ art. For the legal background see C. H. Brecht, *Zur Haftung der Schiffer in antiken Recht*.

The main point of interest lies in the details. The stipulation of the entire responsibility of the skipper for the safety of the cargo has often been supposed to have come into use after the first century, see 20 n. Similarly the clauses regarding the rules of navigation specified in the contract are of interest (20–4). Some of these clauses were known to us from a later date (P. Ross. Georg. II 18, a.d. 140) and were thought to be peculiar to a period of civil disturbances (A. C. Johnson, *Roman Egypt*, 413). It is perhaps reasonable to suggest that there was an official code of navigation on the Nile, and that the contractors quoted the relevant clauses according to the circumstances. This is at least borne out for the early Ptolemaic period by the royal ordinances (P. Hibeh II 198. 111 seqq.), which prohibit navigation by night and in a storm. These two rulings are closely echoed in the present document (22–3).

The date is suggested by Rea on the probability that C. Norbanus Ptolemaeus is the person who was iuridicus and idiologus in a.d. 63, see P. Fouad 21. 5, BGU V § 50 134, XI 2059 ii 1.

→ ἐναύλωσεν Ἀνοβας Ἐρμίου τῶν ἀπὸ Ὀξυρύνχου τοῦ Ἐρμοπολείου
Πέρες τῆς ἐποχῆς κυβερνήτης τῆς Μάρκου Κορηλίου Το-
ρουλλοῦ ἐκατοντάρχου εκάθες ποταμίας ἀγωνίας ἀρταβῶν
πεντακοσίων Πολυτίμως Γαῖον Νορβανοῦ Πτολεμαίου

5 τὴν δηλουμένην εκάθεν εἰν τῇ ναυτείᾳ, εἰς ἄν καὶ ἐμβαλεῖ-
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tai ἂφ' διν ἐὰν αἴρῃται τοῦ Ἐρμοπολείτου νομοῦ ὀρμόν ἁρακος μέτρῳ Ἀθηναίον ἁρταβάς πεντακοσίας καὶ τῶν ἐκατὸν ἁρταβῶν ἀνωλὶ ἁρταβάς δέκα δύο ἡμεῖς, ὅστε ἀποκατατ-τῆσα εἰς Ἀκαδιόνα καὶ Λιλῆ τοῦ Ὠξυρυχείτου, ναύλων τοῦ διεσταμένου πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῶν ἐκατὸν ἁρταβῶν ἀργυρίου δραχμῶν εἴκοσι ὀκτά, ὅστε εἰναὶ δραχμᾶς ἐκατόν τετεράκοντα, ἂφ' διν ὄμολογεί ὁ Ἀνουβάς ἐσχηκέναι παρὰ τοῦ Πολυτύμου ἐπὶ τῶν τόπων δραχμὰς ἐξομήκοντα δύο. τὰς δὲ λιοπᾶς τοῦ ναύλου δραχμὰς ἐξήκοντα ὀκτὼ ἀποδόσι τοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐγγόλης τοῦ ἁρακος. παραστηκτὸν οὖν τὴν ἐκάσθην ἐτοίμην πρὸς τὸν ἀνάπλου τῇ μας καὶ εἰκά-δι τοῦ ἐνετέρτος μηνὸς Σεβαστοῦ, καὶ γενόμενος ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ Ἐρμοπολείτου ὀρμῶν καὶ ἀναλαβῶν καὶ πα- ραλαβῶν τὸν ἁρακα ἀποπλευκάτως ἀνυπερβήτως μετὰ πίστες ἀσφαλείας, ἑαυτῷ παρεχόμενον εν τῷ ἀνά- πλω καὶ κατάπλης τῆς ἐκάσθης χορηγίας πάσαν ἐντελῆ καὶ νάιται ἰκανοὺς, καὶ μὴ ἐξέστο αὐτῷ νυκτοπλοείν μηδὲ χειμώνων οὖντος. ἀνορμίτω καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσφαλεστάτων ὀρμῶν, τῶν διεραιμάτων τοῦ "Ἐρμοπολείτου ὄντων πρὸς τὸν Ἁνουβάι, τῶν δὲ τοῦ Ὠξυρυχείτου ὄντων πρὸς τὸν Πολυτύμου. τῶν δὲ ἀρακα παρα- δότω τῷ Πολυτύμῳ ἡ τοῖς παρ' αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ τῆς Λιλῆ καὶ Ἀγαθιὼν ὀρμοῦν' μέτρῳ ὦ εὰν παραλάβῃ, τοῦ ἐγγήσιομέ- νου ἐκ τῆς κοιλῆς οὖντος τοῦ Πολυτύμου ἡ ἀποσικάτων αὐτῷ τιμὴν ἐκάστης c. 25 c. 25 Αὐτῷ ἀρμὼν 8-9 l. ἀποκαταστῆσαι 11 l. ἐκβολῆς 15 l. νυκτο- πλοεῖν ἂν οὐκενίτω; (σε εἰς π.) 28 l. Ἀκαδιόνας, ἐκβολομένου

Ἀνουβᾶς son of Hermias, from Hyphanton in the Hermopolite nome, Persian of the epigone, skipper of the river boat of 500 artabas burden of Marcus Cornelius Torullus, centurion, has chartered to Polytimus, slave of Gaius Norbanus Ptolemaeus, the aforesaid boat with her equipment(?), on which he will load, from whichever harbours of the Hermopolite nome he may choose, 500 artabas of aracus according to the measure of the temple of Athena, and for every 100 artabas 12½ artabas free of freight charge, so as to deliver (the cargo) to Acanthus and Lile in the Oxyrhynchite nome, at the freight charge agreed upon between them of 28 dr. of silver per 100 art., so that the total is 140 dr.; of which Anoubas acknowledges that he has received from Polytimus on the spot 72 dr., but the remaining 68 dr. of the freight charge Polytimus is to pay to Anoubas on the unloading of the aracus.
Therefore Anoubas is to provide the boat ready for sailing up the river on the 21st of the present month of Sebastus, and having arrived at the harbours of the Hermopolite nome, and after having embarked and received the aracus, he is to sail away without delay, with all security, supplying for himself on the journeys up and down the river full and complete supplies for the ship and sufficient crew. He is not to be permitted to sail by night nor (to weigh anchor?) in foul weather (and?) he is to lay up daily at the safest harbours, the tenders at Hermopolis being at the expense of Anoubas, but those at Oxyrhynchus at the expense of Polytimus. Let Anoubas deliver the aracus to Polytimus or his representatives at the harbour of Lile and Acanthon, using whatever measure he receives by. Whatever shall emerge from the hold is to belong to Polytimus or Anoubas shall pay to him as the price of each (artaba) . . . .
3251. Acknowledgement of Indebtedness

An acknowledgement of indebtedness in duplicate on the same sheet by the same hand. Only endings of the lines survive in col. i. What is printed is the text of col. ii.

The acknowledged debt is incurred through arrears of farm rents. As in XXII 2350, the tenure has now expired, and what we have is in effect a deed of loan in kind and money. Only the name of the lessor—and now creditor—is known from ii 13. He is a certain Theon, who is addressed as a former high priest of the temple of Hadrian at Oxyrhynchus. As in 2350 (see introd.) the debt is free of interest, if paid within a specified term, but if overdue it incurs an interest which serves as a fine (17 n.).

In form it follows the general pattern, e.g. P. Merton III 110, P. Strasbourg 143, 2350, XXXI 2566, P. Merton I 36 (for future farming).

The handwriting is closest to R. Seider, *Paläographie*, no. 38 (A.D. 201–2) and M. Norsa, *Scrittura documentaria*, tav. 13 (c. A.D. 215). The eleventh year mentioned in ii 12 might be of the reign of Severus, A.D. 202/3. Other possible years are 11 Marcus (= a.d. 170/1), and 11 Severus Alexander (= a.d. 231/2). Even 11 Gallienus (= a.d. 263/4) is not ruled out. The back is blank.

\[\ldots\ldots\]

\[\ldots\ldots\]

\[\ldots\ldots\]

\[\ldots\ldots\]

At the end is a wedge-shaped filler sign, also to be seen twice in col. i.

\[\text{3 -}\text{col}[^{\tau}]\text{ confirmed by col. i}\]

13 l. παραλημμητικό
3251. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS

15 θεσμύς, ταξιμεθάς κοι τού ὑπερπεσό(ν)-
tos χρόνου διάφορον τῶν μὲν γενό(ν)
ἐκ τετάρτου, τοῦ δὲ ἀργυρίου δραχμαῖ-
ον τόκον, γεωμέτρης κοι τῆς πράξε-
ως ἐκ τῆς ἡμῶν ἀλληλεγγύων διν-
tων εἰς ἑκτεισμ ἡ ἐξ οὖ αἰών ἡμῶν
ἀίρῃ. κύρια τὰ γράμματα διεσμά γρα-
φήτα πανταχῇ ἐπιφερόμενα καὶ

15 ὑπερπεσό 16 γενό

15 (.. to Theon ...) of the city of the Oxyrhynchi, ex-high-priest of the most august temple of
Hadrian in the same city, greetings. We acknowledge that we owe you from the money rent and rent
in kind of your lands, which we used to farm, nine artabas of wheat, five artabas of lentils and 112
drachmas of silver, all of which we shall pay back to you by Mesore 30th of the current eleventh year.
The debt in kind (will be paid) according to the measure used for payments to you, Theon. But if we
fail to make restitution in the appointed time, we shall pay you for the time overdue a supplement in
kind of one quarter and on the money interest at the rate of 1 dr., per mina. You have the right of
execution either from us acting mutually as sureties for the payment or from any one of us whom
you may choose. This deed is valid, written in duplicate, wherever it may be produced and ...'.

2 Possible would be Ὁὼ(ν) Ὁωπ(ος).
5 Hadrian's temple in Oxyrhynchus is known from VIII 1113 5-6 (A.D. 203) and XVII 2154, of
the fourth century, when the building was apparently used as a prison. See also XXXI 2552, introd.
6 On ψόφος and ἐκφόβοι see J. Herrmann, Bodenpacht, 98 seqq.
16—17 The term διάφορον is usually used for interest on loans in kind, while τόκος refers to money.
The 25 per cent rate of interest is rare (XXXI 2566 ii 15). The usual interest on loans in kind was 50
per cent, see N. Lewis, TAPA 76 (1945) 126 seqq. The 25 per cent interest does not figure in his lists.

3252. Deed of Surety

This narrow piece of papyrus contains a deed of surety of no special significance. The
papyrus is broken off at the foot. The back is blank except for an ink-mark. The
content may be compared with M. Chr. 354-5 and P. Mich. IX 535, where further
references are given.

The deed is addressed to Aurelius Sarapion also called Didymus, a former or
current gymnasiarch of Oxyrhynchus, by Aurelius Hatres son of Petaporecates from
the Aphroditopolite nome. The latter agrees to provide surety for a slave named
Eudaemon who belongs to Sarapion.

1 Add 3249 12 above.
To Aurelius Sarapion also called Didymus (ex-?) gymnasiarch of the city of the Oxyrhynchites, Aurelius Hatres son of Petearpocrates whose mother is Tanneis, from the village of Tmounepse in the Aphroditopolite nome. I agree voluntarily and of my own free will to stand surety to you for your slave Eudaemon whom I will produce up to Hathyr of the coming 6th year, and otherwise I will pay to you for him one thousand seven hundred drachmas cash as was agreed. And in answer to
3252. DEED OF SURETY

the formal question put by you about this I gave my assent. Year 5 of Imperatores Caesares Publius Licinius Valerianus and Publius [Licinius Valerianus Gallienus . . .]

8-10  This village does not appear in the Wörterbuch or its Supplement or in the index to P. Lond. IV. On the status of the Aphroditopolite in this period see P. Beatty Panop. p. xxxiv.

28  The only example I have found of a papyrus of this year without a Caesar following Gallienus is P. Lond. III 1284 (descr.), so the name of a Caesar will almost certainly have followed here. The matter is more complex than this because there are two Caesars in this reign, Valerian the younger and Saloninus, whom P. Bureth, Les Titulatures Impériales, pp. 117–18 conflates. The latest certain dating by Valerian the younger is Choiak of year 5 (XIV 1649 3), the first certain one by Saloninus in Mesore year 5 (XXXI 2560 23). Since the month name here is missing we cannot tell which it will have been. (I am indebted to Mr. P. J. Parsons for the substance of this note.)

3253. LETTER OF ZOILUS TO HORION

A business letter from Zoilus to his agent Horion concerned with action on information received from ‘little’ Pagenes. It is written across the fibres in a large and fluent late third- or early fourth-century hand. It is tempting to connect this letter with XVII 2142 and 2143 (A.D. 293), two orders for payment from a Zoilus to a Horion, and also possibly XII 1573, a tax-list of the late third or early fourth century which has the entry at line 13 μερ(εμοί) Ζωίλου δ(α) 'Ωρίωνος.

On the back is the twenty-sixth column or sheet of accounts, of Phamenoth of an unspecified year. The edges were trimmed before the letter was written.

↓ Zoilou τῷ φιλ(τάτῳ) χαίρων. Παγένης ὁ μεικρός λογαριαίων μοι ἴμεγκεν τῆς περισυψ[ε] καταστήσεις ὀπερ εἰς ἐπεμψία. μετοξύ ὁ ὁπτὼν γενόμαι καὶ ὀπερ ἑαυτόν καταλάβης εὐφωμον ἀπὶ τοῦ λογαριαίων τοῦτο ἀπόλαβε καὶ ὀφεῖ παρὰ σεαυτῷ ἐκτὸς ἄν δοκιμάσωμεν τί ὀφίλει ὁ περί τοῦ μεικροῦ Παγένη δοθήναι καὶ τί εἰς λόγου τῶν ὀφείλουν ὧν ἀποτείχα. ἄλλα καὶ τὸν ὁπνὸν ὃν λαμβάνον ὁ ἀγροφόλοις εἰς καταλαβεῖν ὑπὸ αὐτῶν. ἔκτος ἄν τι κρίνωμεν. [και περί τοῦ τοῦτον η, στο ὁ μεικρός Π(α) γένης

1 l. χαίρει 2 l. μεικρός 3 υπερ' εκεί. 1. περισυψ[ε] 8 l. ὀφείλει 9 l. μεικρός

Παγένη 10 l. ὀφειλομένων 12 l. λαμβάνει 15 l. μεικρός
'Zollius to Horion his dear colleague (?) greetings. Little Pagenes brought me the account of the last year's sowing, which I sent you. Mediate between them and what, if anything, you find agreed from the account, take it and keep it with you until we decide what ought to be given little Pagenes himself and what to the account of his debts. Furthermore, the wine which the field guard receives, collect it and keep it with you until we decide something. Also about this little Pagenes . . . that some were going hungry, especially in the settlement of Lu...s. Find out and see to it that a little grain is given them for food by Besarion, showing him my letters.'

(2nd hand) 'I hope you are well.'

1 φιλ is written without any mark of abbreviation. The likely expansion is φιλ(τάγω), which is commonly used in letters between colleagues; φιλ(φω), also possible, would imply a social rather than a business relationship. In XVII 2142 and 2143 the opening is Ζωίλος Ἡριών χαίρειν.

2 Παγένης. The name is not very common, cf. NB and Foraboschi Onomasticon and none of those examples can be connected with this man. PSI VIII 890 mentions both a Pagenes who is an ἀμπελουργός and a Horion, but is probably too early.

12-13 Most mentions of agrophylakes are of Byzantine date. Then they were both public officials and private employees, see E. R. Hardy, The Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt (New York, 1931), 64. However, they are mentioned at earlier dates in P. Lugd. Bat. XIII 6. 2 (first century A.D.), XVII 2122 11 (second/third century A.D.) and P. Princ. III 174 iii 6 (A.D. 260).

15 η., γρα should mean said, told, reported, wrote.

16 πινόντων; l. πινόντων. I have found no evidence for a general famine at the end of the third or beginning of the fourth centuries but no doubt there were local shortages, as at Oxyrhynchus in the mid-third century (XLII 3048 intro.).

17 Λού[...], Λοῦο[πα] or Λοῦ[κύ] will fit. It seems better to translate 'some were going hungry, especially in the settlement of L,' than 'some were going hungry in the settlement, especially L.' For the place name see perhaps P. Warren 10. 9 ὑπάμων[οι ἄπο ἐποικ[ό]ν Λοῦκ[ιον], cf. 23, VI 922 25, 998. All three are of the late Byzantine period.

19 Βησαρίωνος. The name is not uncommon, but none can be connected with this document.
VI. DOCUMENTS FROM THE ARCHIVE OF LEONIDES

3254-3262

Pliny describes an important and lucrative flax industry in Egypt, yet papyri have furnished very little information about flax or its cultivation beyond an occasional lease or inclusion of στιπαίον (tow) or λυκοκαλήμη (flax) in accounts and bills of lading. One reason for this is that the most famous flax came from the area of the Delta, in which papyri have rarely survived. The following documents which give the first extensive evidence for flax production outside this area are the business transactions of one Leonides and his occasional partner Dioscorus whose activity near the villages of Anti-pera Pela and Ision Panga in the Oxyrhynchite nome spanned some twenty years (A.D. 315-334). The archive consists of nine new texts, six of which are leases, and three documents already published:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3254</td>
<td>Sale of flax crop</td>
<td>A.D. 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXXI</td>
<td>Lease of 2 1/2 arouras near Ision Panga</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3255</td>
<td>Lease of 6 3/8 arouras near Ision Panga</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 103</td>
<td>Lease of 1 aroura near Ision Panga</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3256</td>
<td>Lease of 13 arouras near Antipera Pela</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3257</td>
<td>Lease of 5 arouras near Ision Panga</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3258</td>
<td>Lease of 7 arouras near Antipera Pela</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3259</td>
<td>Lease of 7 arouras near Antipera Pela</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3260</td>
<td>Lease of 6 arouras near Antipera Pela</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3261</td>
<td>Letter to four meniarchs, including Leonides, about recruits</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3262</td>
<td>Receipt(?) written by Leonides as meniarch of a tow guild</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSI V</td>
<td>Lease of 14 arouras near Ision Panga</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the majority of the texts are leases, it does appear that business was not limited to the growing of flax. The purchase of an already harvested crop by Leonides (3262), various references to stages in the processing of flax, and the address of 103 which gives Leonides and Dioscorus the title στιπασμικτη (al) all indicate that the men were merchants engaged in the preparation and marketing of linen fibre, tow, and perhaps linseed. Leonides himself was meniarch of a tow guild in 324 and 328, and if guild officials were selected like other officials at this time on their ability to assume financial burdens, then Leonides may have been a man of some affluence.
Processing:

The processing technique to which there are a number of references in these documents is essentially that which Pliny describes (N.H. XIX 16–17). The flax is harvested and allowed to dry, after which the seeds are removed and it is submerged in water until the stalks are sufficiently macerated to permit the inner fibres (linen) to be separated from the outer (tow). This softening process, known as water-retting, is mentioned in three documents: in 103 18 the rent will be paid in water-retted tow (ρεταρχευμένης); so also in 3255 22 (κεκυμηροχισμένης); and in 3256 the lessees contract to pay all the expenses up to and including the water-retting (ευμήροχισμοῦ) of the flax. Finally, the rent in PSI 460. 19 is to be paid in tow.

The over-all economic picture of early Byzantine Egypt which these documents present is in substantial accord with what is already known about the period. For example, a comparison of the rent prices of these leases with a flax lease from 306 (I 102) shows a rapid and inflationary increase. Further, all of the leases are short-term and most of them are contracted on the basis of rent-in-kind, a device which provided at least some protection against sudden inflation.

On flax growing in Egypt, see I. Kalleris, Αἰτίτα Χαί, 177 ff. and M. Schnebel, Landwirtschaft, 203 ff.¹

3254. Sale of Flax

12 1B.143/K(31)a 9.8 x 24.6 cm. 312-15

Only the left-hand portion of this document remains, in two pieces which seem to join without loss of text in line 12. The lower part is much abraded, so that only the formulaic parts of the text can be recovered; the foot, with the subscription, is completely lost. The back is blank.

Aurelius Evangelus has sold the flax crop of one aroura to Leonides for a sum of 7 (or between 7 and 8) talents. The document is not the usual 'sale-in-advance', which acknowledges receipt of the price against a promise of future delivery, for example P. Hamb. 21 (see F. Pringsheim, Greek Law of Sale, 278). It states that the sale has been completed, and the price paid over. Comparable texts are P. Tebt. II 379 (A.D. 128: grass crop), P. Osl. II 45 (A.D. 135: acacia trees), VI 909 (A.D. 225: acacia trees), BGU II 456 (A.D. 348: palm trees); a similar transaction is implied in P. Osl. III 133 (second century: garlic). In at least three of these the purchaser is to harvest the crop himself (P. Tebt. 379. 8 f., 909 24 ff., P. Osl. 133. 14); similar conditions were made in 3254 16 ff., though the details are now lost. In this form, purchasing the produce is not very different from leasing the land: see Pringsheim 303 f. and 523 f. (note P).

¹ A list of published flax leases is given in Collectanea Papyrologica. Texts published in honor of H. C. Youtie, by A. E. Hanson. Part II (PTA 20) No. 68 introd.
3254. SALE OF FLAX

In the consulship of our masters Constantinus and Licinius Augusti for the . . . time.

Aurelius Evangelus . . . from the village of Teis in the 8th pagus of the Oxyrhynchite nome:

To Aurelius Leonides, son of Theon, from the glorious and most glorious city of the Oxyrhynchites, greetings.

I acknowledge that I have sold to you henceforth . . . the produce in flax . . . ninth and . . . year (?) . . . held in partnership by me and . . . at the price agreed on . . . of the coinage of the Emperors . . . which (I have received from you in full), as to which payment (when the formal question was put I made acknowledgement) . . . on condition that . . . (taking the crop) for your own use, paying . . . the public taxes, and requisitions, and assessments of the current year. . . . The sale is incontestable, written in . . . copies, and in answer to the formal question I have made acknowledgement.

(2nd hand) 'I, Aurelius Evangelus, have sold the produce of one aroura of flax and I have received . . . seven talents and . . .
DOCUMENTS FROM THE ARCHIVE OF LEONIDES

1–2 Licinius Augustus appears as junior consul, always with Constantinus, in 312, 313, and 315; the iteration figure must be supplemented accordingly as τό β', τό γ', or τό δ'.

4 ν' [πάγου]: for the location of Teis in the 8th pagus, see P. Giss. 115 introd.

7 Supplement, for example, ἐν τοῖς ἔτοις τῶν ἐκ μᾶς μιᾶς might be supplied from 23 f., so that a–to describe the land on which the flax is grown, owned, or leased in common by Evangelus and a partner (τοῦ ἐπιτήδευμος αὐτοῦ, e.g., SB IV 7474). If this is correct, there is no space for further numerals after ἐν τοῖς καὶ τῶν.

The numerals are likely to represent a regnal year. They may refer to the separate years of two or more emperors (there is room for a third numeral at the end of 8); or they might be combined as ἐν τοῖς καὶ τῆς = 310/11 (19 Galerius, omitting colleagues)

9 ἐν τοῖς καὶ τῶν = 312/13 (Maximinus and Constantine, omitting Licinius)

11 ἐν τοῖς καὶ τῶν = 314/15 (Constantine and Licinius)

12 ἐν τοῖς καὶ τῶν μέχρι τῶν = 316/17

Of these, (c) and (d) have to be eliminated, although they overlap conveniently the possible consular dates in 1–2. The scribe did not write ζ. Otherwise I judge that ζ' would be a good reading; a is possible, β (open-topped) conceivable. If we eliminate (e) on the ground that this sale of 315 or earlier is not likely to involve the crop of 316/17, (a) and (b) remain; if either is right, it must be taken as the date of Evangelus' purchase or lease.

14 e.g. τάλαμα αἱ ἄγρα ἐπὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἄγρα[τα]ν εἰς πλήρους διὰ χειρὸς, cf. BGU II 456. 16 f., XIV 1705 9 f.

15 e.g. ἐπέκαθεν ὑπὸ κόνδυλον τοῖς, cf. XIV 1705 10 f.

18–19 Supplement on the pattern of, for example, XIV 1704 13 f. καὶ ἀποφέρεθαι [πάντα τὰ ἀπ' αὐτῶν περιεχόμενα εἰς τὸ ἱδών, τελοῦσά τι πάντων εἰς τῷ ἔργῳ δημόσιω] καὶ ἐπικεφαλεμονὸς παντοίους.

21 παντοίων χρῆ: I have found no real parallel to this phrase. In the context, παντοίος would be expected to apply to one item in the list of charges to be paid, as at 1704 15. Perhaps something like παντοίων χρησιμῶν ἐπιμεληθήν (but this use of ε庑είλαδε does not appear before the fifth century).

25 Perhaps καὶ τῇ τῇ καὶ τῇ τῇ. Perhaps διῆκόρη.

3255. APPLICATION FOR LEASE

12 IB.143/K(26)a 16 2×25 cm. 6 November 315

An epidoche in which Dioscorus, an occasional partner of Leonides (see I 103 and 3256), undertakes to lease 6½ arouras to be sown with flax. The rent on half of the acreage was to be paid in cash, the rent on the other half in kind. There is an interesting reference to the technical process of `water-retting' in 22 εἰς χρησιμοτήτις (cf. I 103 18 τεταρτοστήτις).

This text was first published, with commentary, in Collectanea Papyrologica. Texts published in honor of H. C. Youtie, by A. E. Hanson. Part II (= PTA 20) No. 80.
ὑπατείας τῶν δεκτῶν [ἡμῶν Κωνσταντῖνου καὶ Δικυνίου]

(vac.) Cεβίνιεταῖν τὸ δ

Ἄφριλα Ἐυτροπίᾳ θυγατρὶ [Θ]εοδώρου τοῦ καὶ Χαρ[ή]μω-

νος γυμναρχήσαντος προ[τανεύκαντος] γενομ[ένου] βο[υλ][ευτοῦ]

τῆς [λ]αμ(πράς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης) Ὀξυρυγχυτ[ῶν]

5 πόλεως

(vac.)

παρὰ Ἀφρίλιαν Διοκτόρου Λιμινιῶν ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλ(εως).

ἐκουσω[σ] ἐπιδέχομαι μεθώσασθαι πρὸς μόν[ον] τὸ

ἐνετὸς ἦταν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων καὶ περὶ τὸ "Ι[ε]ν

Παγγά ἐν περικόματι Πέκτου ἐν τόπῳ Τέλκε καλομένῳ

ἀρουρίων δεκαέπτα κοινωνίας Πανίρως κατὰ τὸ τῇ ἐταρτον

ὁρόσων μέρος ὦ ἑστὶ ἀρουρία ἐξ ἑτάρτου ὑγίου ἕκ γεωμε-

τριάς εἰ[πορίαν (λ)ιμνοκαλάμης καὶ τελείων ὑπὲρ φόρου τῆς με[λ]ὴς ἡμους ἡμεῖς

ἐκάστης ἀρουρίας ἀνὰ ἀργυρίῳ τάλαντο τέσσαρα, καὶ ἀρ[τ]ῶ εἶ ὑφο-

ρου [τῆς λοιπῆς] ἡμ[ιεια]ς τις μέρος τῆς ἐκθησομένης

10 τῆς λιμ[νοκαλάμης], κἀκε δ[ἐ] τ[ὸ]ν μεμισθισμένον ἀνθρώποι

ἐπερμ[α]των καὶ ἡ πολυμαία γεωργίας [τοῦ λοιποῦ ἡμους] μέρος

καὶ ἐξ ὑ[λοκλήρου] τῆς λιμνοκαλάμης καὶ τῆς [κ]ινδυνάς πάντα παντὸς

τῶν τῆς γής μοιώσων ό[ντων] πρὸς εἰς τήν γεωργίαν κυριεῖω[νεων

νῆς δέ [μου τῆς] ἐπιστοιχή ἐπάναγγελλε ἀποδοσῶ τοῖς φόροις καὶ

τὰ [ἐκφορά] τ[ὸν μὲν ἀργυρικὸν φόρον τῷ Παύσι μερὶ τῷ δὲ

ἐκφορά] τ[ῆς λιμνοκαλάμης ἐπὶ τῆς λίμνου εὐσυμβρ[ο]χείς[οι] τα.......

ἐνετῶτο ἐτους ἀνυπερβέτως, γενομένης σοι

τῆς πράξεως παρὰ τε ἐμοὶ ὡς καθήκει. κυρία ἡ ἐπιστοχή

25 καὶ ἐπέγραψε[σ] ὁμολογίας.

ὑπατείας τῆς προκειμένης (m. 2) Ἀθήνα.

Ἄφριλα Ἐυτροπίῳ δὲ ἐμοῦ Πολι

ἐχον τοῦτον τὸ ἱερον.

3 ευτροπίας κορ. from ευτροπιαν 4 γυμνος προ γενομ βουλα, λαμ, λαμ 8-9 ιειον παγ γα

12 l. εἰς επορίαν, τελείων 13 l. τέσσαρα 14 l. ἡμεῖς 16 l. ἡμεῖς 20 l. ἀποδόσων

24 ὡς καθ- overwritten on something now illegible

'The 4th consulship of our lords Constantinus and Licinius, Augusti.

'To Aurelia Eutropian, daughter of Theodorus, also styled Chaeremon, ex-gymnasiarch, ex-

prytanis, former senator of the glorious and most glorious city of the Oxyrhynchites.

'From Aurelius Dioscorus, son of Ammonius, from the same city.
Of my own free will I undertake to lease for the current 10th and 8th year only, from your possessions around the village of Ision Panga in the embankment of Pekty in the topos called Telke, a three-eighths portion from the seventeen arouras held in partnership with Panares, which is six and three-eighths arouras by survey, for sowing flax, and to pay as rent on half (of the land) four talents of silver per aroura and instead of rent on the remaining half a half share of the crop that is produced: and I, the tenant, in exchange for the seed I provide and the work I do (take) the remaining half share and all the seed; the whole being guaranteed without risk, the taxes to devolve upon you the landowner who retain possession of the harvest until you receive your due. If the undertaking is confirmed to me, I shall necessarily pay the money rents and the rents-in-kind—the cash rent in the month Payni and the rent-in-kind from the flax that has been water-retted in the basin . . . of the current year, without delay. You have the right of execution on me as is proper. The undertaking is incontestable and in answer to the formal question, I have given assent.

The aforesaid consulship (2nd hand) 'Hathyr 10. I, Aurelia Eutropion, have received the duplicate of this through me, Ptol. . . .'

3256. Application for Lease

An epidoche written along the fibres of a medium-brown sheet of papyrus; a small portion of the upper and left margin is preserved, but the document breaks off after the terms of the agreement are set out. Leonides in partnership with Dioscorus (see I 103, 3255) wishes to lease 13 arouras from Aurelius Heron to sow flax. The rent is a half share of the resulting crop.

Διορηλίων Ἡρωνι[...] τῷ καὶ Σαρ'[...]πίων αὐτ[...], λο[...] γυμ[...]νας ἀργυρίαν τῇ τῆς λαμ[...]πρᾶς [καὶ λαμ[...]πρᾶς τῷ] Στεφαν[...]νίουν τὸν ἑκατόν ὁμοία μεθάσασθαι πρὸς μ[...] νὸν τὸ ἐνεκτὸς ἑρ[...] καὶ [ἔς καὶ βές] ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων σε καὶ ἀντιπέρα Πέλα ἐκ τοῦ Νικοβίου κλήρου ἀπὸ ἀργοὺς εἴκοσι ἐξ τὰς ἐν ἀνάπαυσι ὄλικας ἀρώμα πεκτρία εἰσποράν λινοκάλαμης, ἐφ’ ὁ ἀντὶ

Φῶρου σὲ τόν γεωνόχον ἔχειν ἐν] ἐξερέτερο λινοκάλαμης ἀρώμα μίαν τῶν ἐτέρων ἀργοὺ χιλιάδα ἐκεῖν ἑξε[...] σὲ τὸν [αὐτὸν] γεωνόχον ἡμέρας τῆς ἀπ’ αὐτῶν περιγενιμένης λινοκάλαμης, καὶ ἡμᾶς τοὺς μεμικομένους ἀνθ’ ἡς πουσιμέθα γεωργίας καὶ ἄν

παρέχομεν στερμάτων καὶ ἀναλομάτων πάνων
Applications for Lease

16 1. καιρὸς εὐβροχειμοῦ

‘To Aurelius Heron also called Sarapion, (former logistes?), ex-gymnasiarch, ex-prytanis of the glorious and most glorious city of the Oxyrhynchites:

‘From Aurelius Dioscorus, son of Ammonius, and Aurelius Leonides, son of Theon, both from the said city:

‘Of our own free will we undertake to lease for the current 12th, 10th, and 2nd year only, from your property around Antipera Pela, being part of the allotment of Nicobius, of twenty-six arouras the thirteen arouras which are lying fallow, to be sown with flax; on condition that, in lieu of money rent, you the landlord receive one aroura of flax as a special payment; of the other twelve arouras you the said landlord receive half of the resulting crop and we the tenants, in compensation for the work we do and the seed and all the other expenses we incur up to the time of the retting of the flax and during the retting itself, receive the remaining half-portion along with the resulting seed complete, the whole being guaranteed without risk...

1 ασ[., Ι]ο[ ]; in theory a patronymic might be read, e.g. Π[α]λ[α]χ[έ]νε. But there are more attractions in δι[ά] λογ[ε]ταίον. We might then identify Aurelius Heron-Sarapion with Valerius Heron-Sarapion, logistes in 308–9 (XXXIII 2666 1 n.). J. G. Keenan has plausibly suggested that holders of the logistetia in this period took the name Valerius as a tribute to the imperial house (ZPE 11 (1973) 44–6). If the identification is correct, we must assume that Heron’s new name was surrendered or forgotten when he left office.

7 Ἀντιπέρα Πέλα: XXVII 2473 16 n.
10 εἰςφέτα: J. Herrmann, Bodenpacht, 115.
16 μ’χρος suits the spacing better than δχρος; χωρέ suits neither traces nor sense. P. Cairo Isid. 74 6 [τὰ τῶν ἀρουρῶν] ἔργα πάντα μέχρι τῆς (τῆς) εὐκομίδης κτλ.
18 εὐβροχειμοῦ refers to the process of ‘water-retting’, see general introd. p. 130.
20 The small traces can be fitted to the normal formula: write, for example, δημοσίου [δοτ]φ[ν] πρὸς ἐλ τῶν γεωχοὺν.

3257. Application for Lease

12 1B.143/K(4)a 15.6 x 24.8 cm.

An epidoche written along the fibres of a medium-brown, rather coarse sheet of papyrus. The original vertical folds have occasioned considerable wear and twisting of the fibres. The back is blank.

Leonides together with Ammonius, the son of Copres, wishes to lease 5 arouras of land near Ision Panga. The rate of 3 talents, 1,000 drachmas per aroura is somewhat less than that stipulated in XXXI 2585 (A.D. 315).
In the consulship of our masters Licinius Augustus for the 5th time and Crispus the most noble Caesar for the 1st time.

To the heirs of . . . son of Valerius, through Matrinus the executor:

From Aurelius Leonides, son of Theon, and Aurelius Ammonius, son of Copres, both of the glorious and most glorious city of the Oxyrhynchites:

Of our own free will we undertake to lease for the current 13th, 11th, and 3rd year only from their holdings around Ision Panga in the embankment of Nesla five arouras by survey, which formerly belonged to Thoinius, called Young, for the sowing of flax; and to pay you as rent three talents and one thousand drachmas of silver per aroura; the whole being guaranteed without risk, the taxes and annonae to devolve upon you the landlords who retain possession of the produce until you shall receive your due. If the undertaking is confirmed to us, we shall of necessity pay over the money rent in the two months Epeiph and . . . of the same year without delay. You have the right of execution upon us who are a mutual surety against payment as is proper. The undertaking is incontestable and in answer to the formal question we have given assent.

14th day of Hathyr of the aforesaid consulate.' (2nd hand) I, Valerius Matrinus, have received the duplicate of this through me, Dionysius.'
11 [ἀνεὼγὼν; cf. P. Lond. III 979. 18 f. (p. 234)].
13 θ[ε][θαυμάς] can be read at the beginning, but there is a gap with space for 7–8 letters before ἃς. Either poor papyrus forced the scribe to leave a space, or he has (for example) written μουν twice. No other variation of the ἐβαίνοσι-clause will account for the letters which remain or the position of δὲ.

14 'Επιτηκ καὶ δὲ κ. [. . .]: the last word should be a month-name, but the writing is difficult and perhaps in part a correction. Payni and Ἐπειφή are normally specified, see D. Hennig, Untersuchungen z. Bodenpacht, 22–4. Here, however, Παῦλος is not an acceptable reading, nor indeed did the scribe have any reason to reverse the usual order. Within the one year of the lease only Mesore and Ἐπαγόμενοι remain. Of these, Μεσορόφι might perhaps be read (the initial μ is very plausible); but I should have expected to see more of the tail of ρό.  

15 f. γυνομένη ἡμῶν τῆς πράξεως παρά τῇ ἡμῶν: the formula is similarly shortened in XXXI 2585 18 f. (see the note) and 3255 24.
16 κυράλα: see Hänsler, Die Bedeutung d. Κυρία-Κλαύσελ, 28 ff. The clause ‘will der Urkunde absolute Beweiskraft verleihen’ (Wolff, ΣΣ (RA) 90 (1973) 373, who discusses possible English translations of κυράλα).

16 Αὐτή ὁ: 10 November 318.

3258. Application for Lease

The document is an ἐπιδοχή in which Leonides leases an unknown quantity of land from Aurelius Dius for the current year. The land is near Antipera Pela (see 3259, 3256). The back is blank.

→ ὑπατείας τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίνου Αὐτοκράτορ playing[27]ο[ς] τῷ εἰς καὶ Δικαιῶν τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου Καίσαρος τῷ [αὖ] 
Αὐρηλίῳ Δίῳ Ζωίλῳ ἀπὸ τῆς λαμ[πῇ] καὶ λαμ[πῇ] (προτάτης) Ἑξυρνγχ (τῶν) 
(perc) πόλεως (perc.)

[τῆς] ἰδίας ἰδίας ἰδίας ἵνα ὑπαρχούσα ἐστὶν πε[ρὶ] Ἄντ[περα] [Πέλα] 
→ τῆς ὑπατείας τῶν δεσποτῶν λαμ[πῇ] ὑπαρχούσα.

1 ὑπατείας 3 Ζωίλου, λαμ[πῇ], Ἑξυρνγχ.

In the consulship of our masters Constantinus Imperator for the 5th time and Licinius the most noble Caesar for the 1st time.

To Aurelius Dius, the son of Zoilus, from the glorious and most glorious city of the Oxyrhynchites, from Aurelius Leonides, son of Theon, from the same city: Of my own free will I undertake to lease for the current 14th, 12th, and 4th year only from your holdings around Antipera Pela . . .

7 [ἰδίας ἰδίας ἰδίας]: the space will permit three dates or two dates linked with καὶ; the former is more probable (see 3257 6). There is not room for ἑτέρον to be written out. I have restored the year as ἵνα πρὸς ἰδίας, since these leases are usually drawn up within the first four months of the Egyptian year, i.e. near to the end of the consular year.
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3259. Lease of Land

Lease of Land

12 1B.143/K(23)a

A.D. 319

The beginning of a misthosis written along the fibres of a papyrus that has been folded twice vertically and endorsed on the back. Aurelius Apollonius also styled Serenus agrees to lease land near Antipera Pela to Leonides. The terms are missing.

→ ὑπατείας τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίνου
Cεβαστοῦ τὸ ε′ [κ]αι [Lambda]μύρου τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου
Καίσαρ[ε]ς παῖ 

εῷθωκεν Αὐρήλιος Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ καὶ Σερήνος

υίος Μπολλώνιου αὐτὸτῆς λαμπρᾶς καὶ λαμπροτάτης ὁ Ὀξυρυχιτῶν̄ν πόλεως
Αὐρήλιῳ Λεωνίῳ ὁ πάπα καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως

πρῶς μόνον τὸ εν[εκτὸς iβ″ iβ‴] δέ (ἐτος) τάς ὑπαρχούσας

κοι περὶ [Ἀντίπερα Πέλα] ἐν [. . . . . .] ἡ Πρωτολεό, λεγομένου

α[. . . . . . ][. . . . . . ][. . . . . . ][. . . . . . ] [. . . . . . ]

Back → μὲσθώσεις

1 ὑπατείας
5 ὁδὸς
6 σος
8 νάρθος, ἐν τῆς ἐτῶς ἡμέρας

10 "..."

In the consulship of our masters Constantinus Augustus, for the fifth time, and Licinius the most noble Caesar, for the first time.

'Aurelius Apollonius alias Serenus son of Apollonius . . . from the glorious and most glorious city of the Oxyrhynchites leased to Aurelius Leonides son of Theon from the same city for the current 14th, 12th, and 4th year only the (so many aouras) which belong to you near Antipera Pela in . . .'

Back. 'Lease . . .'.

2 It would be palaeographically possible to read ε ( = A.D. 320) instead of ε ( = A.D. 319), but the traces later in the line, though doubtfully assigned to individual letters of the name of Licinius Caesar, cannot be made to conform with that of Constantine Caesar, the junior consul of A.D. 320, and the date in 8 denotes the Egyptian year A.D. 319/320, which makes it virtually certain that the date of this lease is some time in autumn A.D. 319.

5 αυτ. . . . . . . . . . . : either another name or a title. The initial letters are like αυτ. in the δωρ. which occurs later in this line: next a high curved stroke as if an abbreviation or possibly a tiny omicron ligatured to the preceding letter; then a pi-shaped letter (or letters) with the initial descender curving up sharply at the foot, followed by an abraded spot in which high traces and tail of rho or iota can be seen. The next letter appears to be lambda or delta, followed by -ος.

J. C. Shelton suggests reading the last seven letters as παρ[α]δοξω in error for παραδοξος (for the title see, e.g., P. Hamb. 21. 2–3), though παρα- seems rather too long for the space.

E. G. Turner suggests perhaps δωρ. παρ[α]δοξω(ν) on the analogy of δωρ. λογιστῶν, etc.

J. R. Rea tentatively suggests δωρ. έτος(οι) τρίτους Ὀξυρυχίτους; (τριτος); παπ?). The o of δωρ. if right, is curiously, but not incredibly, mishapen. The next group would naturally be taken as αυτ., but τα is sometimes written here with the known ductus which puts the first half of the crossbar and the upright first and adds the second half of the crossbar separately. To read τ assumes that the second half of the crossbar is here lost in the damage. After οι the impression of ι is chiefly produced by the hook on the foot of the i of Ἀπολλώνιος above in 4. The title of ex-strategus of Oxyrhynchus would
apply to the father rather than the son. The known candidates would be the strategi of a.d. 287 (XIV 1690), a.d. 292 (I 59), and a.d. 316 (XVII 2113, 2114).

8 το ἐκτὸς ἐσ' ὡσ': there is room to restore two regnal year numbers, cf. 3257 6.

9 col. 3260 displays the same carelessness in pronouns.

ἐν[,]...[,] Πραγολε... λεγομένων. After ἐν there is a trace somewhat below the base line; likeliest possibilities are α, γ, τ, κ, μ, ρ, τ, χ. After the gap there is a little round loop and some traces below to the right which may belong to the line below; ω, ρ, k, possible. The pattern may be ἐν τόσω... λεγομένου (l.-w), cf. 3255 9. The place name seems to be new. At the end of Πραγολε... (or -ε[,]...) the last trace is the end of a horizontal, κ best, υ possible. After ε there is a small rounded trace.

to α[π' ἀρουραῖ] εἰς[οci vel sim.]

3260. Sub-lease of Land

A fairly well-preserved contract written along the fibres of a thick, dirt-encrusted papyrus, in which Gaianus sub-leases 6 arouras to Leonides for a one-third share of the resulting crop. This lease, like 3259, also a misthosis, quickly and bewilderingly shifts into the subjective style of the epidoche. The back is blank.

tοι[ε] α[π'] ποιδευθεσμοίοις ὑπάτως το γ' ἐμεθωκεν Παιανὸς Ἀμμωνίου ἀπο ἐποκονίὸν Χούτης τοῦ Ὀξυφυχώτου νομοῦ Ἀιωνὴ Θὼνος ἀπὸ τῆς λαμ(πράς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης)

5 'Οξυφυχώτων πόλεως πρὸς μόνον το ἐνεστὸς υφ' ἵσ' ἵσ' ἵσ' ἴσον αὐτ' ἐν ἑχομεν ἐν μεθωκεῖ περὶ κύριον Αντιπέρα Πέλα ἄρουρας ἔξω (γίνονται) (ἀρουραί) το εἰς εποραν λινοκαλάμης ἐφι' το

10 ἀντὶ φόρου ἑκεῖν εἰς τοῦ μεμεθωκότα το τρίτον μέρος τῆς περιγυμναῖτης λινοκαλάμης καμένε δὲ τοῦ μεμεθωκότα το λοιπὸν μέρος ἑκεῖν, ἐμοὶ τῷ Λεωνίδῳ τοῦ τοι Πέλα ἄρουρας ἔξω (γίνονται) (ἀρουραί) το εἰς εποραν λινοκαλάμης ἐφι' το

15 τὰ επέρματα ἀκάδινα [παντὸς κινδύνου τῶν τῆς γῆς δι' ἡμοίων ὄντων πρὸς τοῦ μεμεθωκότα κυριεύοντα τῶν καρπῶν] ἐως τὸ τρίτον μέρος ἀπολάβησε [ἐβαζον-μένης δὲ τῆς μεμβάσιμος ἐπάναγ-κ' ἔοικ ἀποδώσω [τὸ τρίτον] μέρος ἐν τῷ κ'] αὐρῷ ἀνυπερβλέτως γινομένης κοι

1 υπάτως 2, 28 γαίανος 8 ὲ—ς
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τῆς πράξεως παρά τέ εμοῦ [ὡς καθήκει.
πανταδετα . . . . . . . .]

25 . . . [.] [.] . . . τος. κυρία [?
ή μίκθως και ἐπερωτηθ(εις) όμοι[όηρεν.
. . . τ. οὐτοσαϊ . . . .]

(m. 2) Γαίανος μεμί[θακα τήν
γῆν καὶ ἔχον τοῦ ίνων [τῆς μω-
θύκες. Ἔπιμαχχ[ε εὐρα-
φα ὅπερ αὐτών γράμματα
μή εἰδότος.

31 ὅπερ

'Under the consuls to be designated for the 3rd time.
'Gaianus, the son of Ammonius, from the hamlet of Choute in the 6th (?) district of the Oxy-
rhynchite nome, leased to Leonides, the son of Theon, from the glorious and most glorious city of the
Oxyrhynchites for the current 18th, 16th, and 8th year only from those which we hold on lease around
the village of Antipera Pela, six arouras, that is 6 ar., for the sowing of flax, on condition that, instead
of money rent, you the lessor receive the one-third portion of the resulting flax crop and I the lessee
receive the remaining portion—I, Leonides, [taking] the seed, being guaranteed against risk, the taxes
on the land devolving upon the lessor who retains possession of the crop until you take the one-third
portion. If the lease is confirmed, of necessity I will pay over the one-third portion at the appropriate
time without delay, you having the right of execution upon me as is proper . . . .

'The lease is incontestable and in response to the formal question he has given assent . . . .'

(2nd hand) I, Gaianus, have leased the land and have received a copy of the lease. I, Epimachus,
wrote on his behalf since he is illiterate.'

1 τῷ [ε ἐ]ποδήπτησικοινούς ὑπάτους τῷ γ': A.D. 323. Cf. e.g. XLIII 3122 introd.
2 ἑποκινὸν Λουτῆς καὶ ἄγων: Λουτῆς is unattested. The number of the district is broken, but stigma fits
the traces better than epsilon or gamma.
14 ἐμοὶ τῷ Λεονίδου: a participle, e.g. λαμβάνοντος or παρέχοντος, should be supplied. In these
part-share leases the lessees supply as well as retain the seed (see 3255 16–17, 3256 15–16).
24–5 τῶν δὲ τῶν κτλ: a further condition? Perhaps about the disposition of labour, since there is
no such clause in the earlier part of the document (cf. the other part-share leases, I 103 11–12, 3256 16,
3256 14), possibly on the lines of P. Cair. Isid. 103 15–17: τά δὲ τῶν ἀρουρῶν ἔργα πάντα ἡμᾶς (ήμεις) οἱ
μεθοδίουμενοι ποιήσωμεν. In any case, this does not appear to be part of the praxis-clause.
27 From its place in the document, this should be a date (compare 3255 26, 3257 18); it is possible
to read η μὲν ἐποκ (εἰμένης) but the traces before this do not really fit ὑπάτους τῆς, and after, the letters
do not suit a month. The line appears to have been squeezed in after the subscription was written.

3261. Contract concerning Recruits

Four meniarchs, among them Leonides, have provided recruits on behalf of the
signatories, who acknowledge liability for the expense by this contract. Most of
the subscription is missing but part of the right margin, nearly as broad as the document
itself, survives and bears at its top, apparently in the first hand, the acknowledgement
of one of the subscribers.

12 1B.143/K(12)a 258×228 cm. A.D. 324

Four meniarchs, among them Leonides, have provided recruits on behalf of the
signatories, who acknowledge liability for the expense by this contract. Most of
the subscription is missing but part of the right margin, nearly as broad as the document
itself, survives and bears at its top, apparently in the first hand, the acknowledgement
of one of the subscribers.
The document gives no details of the assessment, though it does indicate that the service is compulsory, but it is tempting to conjecture that the guild as a whole has assumed the liability for which certain members were responsible. Compare, for example, XXXI 2579, in which a meniarch of a tow-workers' guild is paying the ἐπικεφαλαίων πόλεως on behalf of two of its members.


Of the two government officials mentioned the praeses Sabinianus is well attested, but the dux Barba is not otherwise known.

The back is blank.

→ τοῖς ἔοις ὑπὸ[τους] τὸ δ.  
oῖ ἔξης ὑπογράφειν [μᾶλλον]τες  
Λεωνίδη καὶ Θείων καὶ Μ[,][,] καὶ  
Σαρμάτῳ μετανάρχας [, c. 5]  
5 των χαίρειν, ἐπειδὴ ἐπ[ε]-  
βλέψαντες παρασκευὴν τίρο[ν]νας  
νεολέκτους κατὰ κέλευσιν τὸ[δ] δια-  
ἐπιστότου ἡμῶν ἔρε[
μ]ονος  
Σαβινιανοῦ κατὰ πρόσταξιν [τ]ρὶ διαχειριστά[τον]  
10 δουκὸς Βάρβα καὶ [πα]ραχόντες  
ὁμεῖς αὐτοῖς ἑνεγνήκας[θα]ι διὰ  
χρογραφεῖσαν, κατὰ ταύτα [ὁμολο-]  
γοῦμεν τὰ πάντα ἀπαξαπαλ[ῶς]  
ἀναλύματα ὑποστῆ[ασ]ι, [ἐκα-]  
15 εἰσὶν κατὰ τὰ μέρη, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦτος  
εὐνευδοκεῖν ἡμᾶς πάσιν τοῖς  
διαφέρουσιν τοῖς αὐτοῖς τίρω[ε]  
διὰ τὸ εὐποιεῖσθαι καὶ εὐν-  
ευδοκεῖν ἐπὶ τοῦτος, κύρια τὰ  
20 γράμματα ἀπλά γραφήσατα ἐπὶ ὑπο-  
γραφῆ ἡμῶν καὶ ἐπερωτή-  
θέντες ὁμολογήσαμεν.  

. . . . .

11 ἑνεγνήκας 14 ὑποστῆσαι 18 εὐποιεῖσθαι 23 ὑπατεῖας

Right margin at top → Διόσκορος [,] ἱωνος εὐδοκῶ.
DOCUMENTS FROM THE ARCHIVE OF LEONIDES

'Under the consuls to be designated, for the fourth time.
'Those about to undersign to Leonides and Theon and Matrinus(?) and Sarmates, meniarchs of
the... greetings.
'Since we were enjoined to furnish newly chosen recruits according to the order of our most perfect
praeses Sabinius (issued) in accordance with the command of the most perfect dux Barba and you
furnished them and guaranteed them by deeds of surety, accordingly we agree to undertake all ex-
penses whatsoever, each proportionately, and on these conditions we consent to everything pertaining
to these same recruits, because we have agreed and consent on these conditions. The document, written
in one copy over our subscription, is valid and in answer to the formal question we gave our assent.
'In the consulship aforesaid, ... 12th.
'...I, Dioscorus son of... consent.'

1 The date is A.D. 324, cf. e.g. XLIII 3122 introd.
2 M.: Ἔντισσας πρῶτη; see 3257 3, 18. Compare also XXXIII 2673 (of A.D. 304), where the names
Sarmates and Matrinus occur together. However, other names, e.g. Μέδουσ, could also suit the traces.
4 μυστάρχοι. That all four men are meniarchs of the same guild is almost certain. Cf. VIII 1139
1–2 and O. Tait II 196, 2, both documents addressed to several meniarchs of a single guild. The guild
name is shorter than the word in 3262 1, certainly too short for (π)ποπογιείςτω, (π)ποπογμετατέων,
(π)ποπομηγμένων, or (π)ποπομετέρων. Perhaps αποτέλεσμα is possible, if αποτέλεσμα implies αποτέλεσμα in
XXXI 2579 9.
9 Καβανού. For collected references see PLRE I 789 s.v. Sabinius (2).
10 If there was only one dux acting at this time in Egypt, see P. Abinn. p. 14, Barba was the dux
Ἀγγυπτί et Θεβαίδας; if not, he may have been dux Αγγυπτί only. On Egypt’s military commands in the
fourth and fifth centuries see R. Remondon in CL 40 (1965) 180–97.

3262. RECEIPT?

This badly abraded document is included because Leonides has written it himself,
styling himself meniarch of a tow-linked guild. While the language suggests that the
text may be a receipt for repayment of a loan, the exact nature of the transaction is
obscure. The papyrus is of poor quality; the back is blank.

1 [κομων] ο[ν] Θονίον Λεωνίδης μ[η]νάρχης ειτπ,...
...[.]. παίρειν. ἀνδρὲν...[.]... ἀπὸ πρῶτου λόγου [...
...οὖ[ν] ημευο [.]... καὶ οὐδένα λόγον ἔχει[ς][.] πρὸς οὐδὲνδρεξ. [χρεία] ἔχεις μον χίρα(ν)
κβ καὶ ιβ καὶ δ’ [Ε]πρότερον καὶ νόν ἐκχηκα ταῦτ... γηδὲ
γείσωντες δὲ τὸν πρῶτον λόγον [...] γείσωντε mou μοδίους μ...’
(ἔτους) κβ’ καὶ ιβ’ καὶ δ’ ὁ αὐτὸς Λεωνίδης [ε]νεμώμαι.

[1 ων, l. Θονίον 3 l. ημευο 4 χείρα; l. χείρα 6 μ of μοδίου corr. from δ]

7 [ενεμώμαι]

'To Comon son of Thonius, Leonides meniarch of the tow... greetings. Of those which... from the former account... forty-two and one-half (modii?) and you (or he) have no claim of any
kind. You have my chirograph (of?) the 22nd and 12th and 4th year, the former (account?), and
now I (or you) have received ... My total for the previous account is forty... Year 22 and 12 and 4. I the same Leonides have signed.

1 *Kýmun[ τ] or Kýmun[ τ]. The latter is unattested.
2  *... : a guild obviously connected with tow. After the first four letters the traces appear to be oc or or possibly π, followed by a vertical descender like i, then a semilunate shape ligatured to the previous vertical. The final letter appears to be omega with a line above which may represent a nu in suspension. These traces cannot be reconciled with the title on the back of 3261 or the guild name from 3261 4–5. It is just possible that Leonides wrote *... for *... see XXXVI 2799 4, but the reading of omicron is very doubtful.
3  ...: at the end λω more likely than λου or μου. *... *... μου, *... μου, *... μου, are all possible readings.
4  *... : perhaps πλήρες or *... πλήρως.
5  *... *... : om and *...: a guild obviously connected with tow. After the first four letters the traces appear to be oc or ου possibly ι, followed by a vertical descender like ι, then a semilunate shape ligatured to the previous vertical. The final letter appears to be omega with a line above which may represent a nu in suspension. These traces cannot be reconciled with the title on the back of 1 103 or the guild name from 3261 4–5. It is just possible that Leonides wrote *... for *..., see XXXVI 2799 4, but the reading of omicron is very doubtful.
6  *...: at the end λω more likely than λου or μου. *... *... λου, *... μου, *... μου, are all possible readings.

1. *... : perhaps πλήρες or *... πλήρως.
2. *... : a guild obviously connected with tow. After the first four letters the traces appear to be oc or ου possibly ι, followed by a vertical descender like ι, then a semilunate shape ligatured to the previous vertical. The final letter appears to be omega with a line above which may represent a nu in suspension. These traces cannot be reconciled with the title on the back of 1 103 or the guild name from 3261 4–5. It is just possible that Leonides wrote *... for *..., see XXXVI 2799 4, but the reading of omicron is very doubtful.
3. *... : at the end λω more likely than λου or μου. *... *... λου, *... μου, *... μου, are all possible readings.
4. *... : perhaps πλήρες or *... πλήρως.
5. *... *... : om and *...: a guild obviously connected with tow. After the first four letters the traces appear to be oc or ου possibly ι, followed by a vertical descender like ι, then a semilunate shape ligatured to the previous vertical. The final letter appears to be omega with a line above which may represent a nu in suspension. These traces cannot be reconciled with the title on the back of 1 103 or the guild name from 3261 4–5. It is just possible that Leonides wrote *... for *..., see XXXVI 2799 4, but the reading of omicron is very doubtful.
6. *...: at the end λω more likely than λου or μου. *... *... λου, *... μου, *... μου, are all possible readings.

1. *... : perhaps πλήρες or *... πλήρως.
2. *... : a guild obviously connected with tow. After the first four letters the traces appear to be oc or ου possibly ι, followed by a vertical descender like ι, then a semilunate shape ligatured to the previous vertical. The final letter appears to be omega with a line above which may represent a nu in suspension. These traces cannot be reconciled with the title on the back of 1 103 or the guild name from 3261 4–5. It is just possible that Leonides wrote *... for *..., see XXXVI 2799 4, but the reading of omicron is very doubtful.
3. *... : at the end λω more likely than λου or μου. *... *... λου, *... μου, *... μου, are all possible readings.
4. *... : perhaps πλήρες or *... πλήρως.
5. *... *... : om and *...: a guild obviously connected with tow. After the first four letters the traces appear to be oc or ου possibly ι, followed by a vertical descender like ι, then a semilunate shape ligatured to the previous vertical. The final letter appears to be omega with a line above which may represent a nu in suspension. These traces cannot be reconciled with the title on the back of 1 103 or the guild name from 3261 4–5. It is just possible that Leonides wrote *... for *..., see XXXVI 2799 4, but the reading of omicron is very doubtful.
6. *...: at the end λω more likely than λου or μου. *... *... λου, *... μου, *... μου, are all possible readings.
VII. MINOR TEXT

3263. Monthly report of village scribe. 31 4B.16/C(1–3)c. 8 x 17 cm. A.D. 215.

Compare XLIII 3133 for this type of text and the parallels. This one has been referred to in XXXVIII 2876 14–16 n. and in XLV 3243 2 n. for the name of the strategus, who here as a result of the Constitutio Antoniniana bears the nomen Aurelius in addition to Calpurnius.

→ 1 Αὐρηλίῳ Καλπουρίῳ τῷ Ποικίλῳ ἔργῳ 2 τῷ καὶ Ἀρποκρατίωνι[σ] ετρ(ατηγώ) Ἀρτεμίσιοντι 3 Θεμί(ίστου) καὶ Πολ(ύμιονος) μερίδων 4 παρὰ Αὐρηλίῳ[ν] Ἑρμ[.]ο( ) 5 κωμογρ(αμματέως) Ἀπόλλωνος πόλεως 6 καὶ Ψευτεώ. (νας.) 7 δήλῳ μηδὲν ἔχων 8 ἀνέκομεν εἰμόνι 9 ταξὶ τοῦ ἱδίου λόγου καὶ 10 ἀρχιερέως ἐπιτροπαῖς 11 τοῦ Μεσορή μυρὸς τοῦ 12 διεληλυθότος κῠ (ἔτους). (νας.)

Back ↓ (m. 2?) 13 Ἀπολλόνιος, Ψευτέω, Μεσορή.

4 Obvious, but unconfirmed, possibilities are Ἑρμ[.]ο[ν]ο(ν), Ἑρμ[.]ο[υ]ο(ν), Ἑρμ[.]ο[δ]ο(ν).

5–6 For the village names see P. Tebt. II pp. 368, 412.

9–10 ταξὶ ... ἐπιτροπαῖς. This supports the view that the departments of the idiologus and the high priest were not united till a late date, if ever, see P. Swarney, The Ptolemaic and Roman Idios Logos, PP. 133–4.

11–12 The report is for Mesore of 23 Caracalla, otherwise 25 July–29 August a.d. 215. The date of writing must be after 29 August, the last day of this leap year, but should be within a few days of it.

After 12 there is blank papyrus for a depth of c. 5 cm., but the bottom margin is torn. Date clause and subscription are expected; they may possibly have been written further down.

13 The sense requires something like Ἀρτ(ή)ῳ [Ἀρτ(ή)ῳ πόλεως καὶ] Ψ.
3264. Declaration about Bribery. Published by A. K. Bowman in Collectanea Papyrologica. Texts published in honor of H. C. Youtie, by A. E. Hanson. Part I (= PTA 19) No. 21. 30 4B.35/L(1-2)a. 9-8 × 16-4 cm. a.d. 80-1


12 § 33 ἡμῶν 35 ὅλων

'To Hermophilus... from Orsonouphis, son of Dioscorus, and Paonnes, son of Psenmeinis, and Pennamis, son of Amenneus, the elders, amongst others, of the village of Peenno in the middle toparchy. Further to the petition handed in to Claudius Horacleius the strategus by us and our fellow elders against Diogenes the superintendent of the dykes about his taking from fifty-one men four drachmas each for their non-performance of the five-naubia duty on the public dykes and having covered up similarly for nine other men in respect of their failure to complete their work, in response to your demand for the names of the aforementioned, we presented the names of thirteen men from among them who reported in writing to the strategus that they had not given anything to Diogenes or to his agents or to anyone else to avoid work on the dykes; but in response to your demand for the names of the others we declare on oath by the fortune of Imperator Titus Caesar Vespasianus Augustus that we are unable to produce any of the names indicated in the aforementioned petition. May it be well for us if we swear truly, but the reverse if we swear falsely. Year 3 of Imperator Titus Caesar Vespasianus Augustus (month and day).’
3265. Declaration by Glassworkers. Published by A. K. Bowman in *Collectanea Papyrologica*. Texts published in honor of H. C. Youtie, by A. E. Hanson. Part II (= PTA 20) No. 81. 3 1B.77/B(3)b. 15.3 x 25.7 cm. June/July A.D. 326

Col. ii

→ (m. 1) 'Ὑπατείας τῶν δεσποτῶν ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίνου (Ἀυγούστου) τὸ ἦ΄ καὶ Κωνσταντίνου τοῦ ἐπιφανεστάτου Καίσαρος τὸ α΄. (voc.)

Φλοιωνίων Λευκαδίῳ λογιστῇ 'Οξυρυγχότου

5 παρὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ὑδατρύγων τῆς λαμ(πράς) καὶ λαμ(προτάτης) ὁ ὁμοῦ ἐµοῦ Αὐρήλιον Ζωίδου. . . .

Col. ii

10 (m. 2) Αὐρήλιος Ζωίδος ἐπίδεδωκα

20 ψε πρόφεξι (ταῖος)

(1st hand) 'In the consulship of our masters Constantinus Augustus for the seventh time and Constantius the most illustrious Caesar for the first time. To Flavius Leucadius logistes of the Oxyrhynchite nome from the guild of glass-workers of the glorious and most glorious city of the Oxyrhynchites through me, Aurelius Zoilus . . . In response to your demand for an account of all the matters affecting our profession relating to the service of fitting out the warm baths in the public bath of the city, I have perforce drawn it up and submit it in order that your grace may be able to know. It is:

for the work needed on the warm baths, x hundred pounds; for the work needed on the gymnasium, x hundred pounds; at a rate of 22 talents per hundred pounds. Total 6000 pounds, total 1320 talents.

Which we accordingly report. In the aforementioned consulship, Epeiph . . . (2nd hand) I, Aurelius Zoilus, have presented this as set out above.'

3266. Acknowledgement of a Loan. Published by A. K. Bowman in *Collectanea Papyrologica*. Texts published in honor of H. C. Youtie, by A. E. Hanson. Part II (= PTA 20) No. 82. 31 4B.10/E(1-2)a. 25.3 x 14.2 cm. 13 August A.D. 337. This contract is written in duplicate on a single sheet of papyrus. The texts are identical with
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF A LOAN

The minor exceptions noted in the apparatus and apart from the fact that the line divisions do not correspond.

Col. i

In the consulship of Flavius Felicianus and Fabius Titianus the most illustrious, Mesore 20. Aurelius Eulogius, son of Leonteus, whose mother is Eusebia, from the glorious and most glorious city of the Oxyrhynchites to Flavius Annianus, protector, through Aurelius Heracleus, agent, greetings.

I acknowledge that I have received from you from hand to hand out of your house to the account of my business a capital sum of five hundred talents in the coinage of the Augusti, talents 500, on condition that, instead of your proportionate share of the profit from this money, I shall pay to you each month from the next month Thoth of the coming year 32, 22, 14, 5, 3, a sum of ten talents and I shall perforce repay to you without delay in the month of Phamenoth of the same year the aforementioned capital sum free of all risk and not subject to any claims; otherwise, I shall pay to you in each month of the extra time a sum of sixteen talents and four thousand drachmas until the capital is repaid, with you having the right of execution upon me and all my property. The deed, of which two copies are written, is valid and in answer to the formal question I have given my consent..."
INDEXES

Figures in small raised type refer to fragments, small Roman figures to columns. References in square brackets are to words wholly supplied by conjecture or from other sources. References in round brackets are to words represented by a symbol. The asterisk indicates words not to be found in LSJ or its supplement. The article is not indexed, and kaî is indexed in the literary sections only.

I. NEW LITERARY TEXTS

(a) Alcman, etc. (3209-3213)

δύνασθαι 3210 2 19.
δό 3210 1 10 3213 3.

*Εξήρος 3209 2 1?
εῦναι 3210 2 11.
εἰς 3210 1 13?
εἰς 3210 2 16.
ἐκ 3209 2 10? 3213 2.
ἐκέλπει 3210 4 12.
ἐλπίς 3211 2 1.
ἐπὶ 3212 6.
ἐρατὸς 3213 [1], 5.
εἴθης (εἰθεῖα) 3210 2 23?
εἴθης (εἴθή;) 3209 4 6.
εὔνη 3213 7.
ἐχεῖν 3213 2.
ἐκεῖ 3210 2 25?
ἐκεῖσθαι 3210 2 25?

-ζύγος 3211 2 4.

ὡμηκός 3210 4 1.
ὡσαύ οὐ 3213 1.
καὶ 3209 2 7?, 3212 3?, 4 3213 6(bis).
καλλήγορος 3213 4.
καλὸς 3209 4 5?
κελᾶς [3212 8.
κλέος 3209 1 3.
κνῖ 3209 2 3?
κνῖτα 3210 2 15?
κουμάλις ὰτε κουμάλος
κρινθος, 3210 2 7.
κνώ, [3209 1 1.

βαρύς (βαρέται) 3210 2 27?

γάι 3212 6.
γαίας 3210 2 11.
γαίας 3209 4 3.
-γώμη (-ομ) 3211 2 3?
γάμος 3213 5.
γῆρας 3212 7?
γῆ η 3212 5.
γλυκός 3213 3.
γράφεσθαι 3210 2 10.
γυνή 3212 6.

δακοφόρος (δακοφόρα;) 3211 2 3.
δή 3209 1 8 3212 1?, 3? 3213 3.
δεικνχ (δείκνυσι) 3212 4.
δύ 3213 4?

δύ 3210 1 10, 12?
δύμος 3209 1 9.
INDEXES

| κώμος 3211 i 3? | Σαρπός 3210 i 9, 12. |
| κωρίδιός 3213 7. | εὐθύς 3213 9. |
| λέγει 3210 i 6? | εκάστευ 3209 i 4. |
| λευκόθα 3213 1. | επιτροπή 3209 10 10 3210 2 15? |
| λάρνακα 3210 i 11. | κύσενον 3210 i 11, 13. |
| μακάρι 3211 2 4. | σάν 3210 2 17. |
| μέλος (end-title) 3209 i 14. | εφάρμο- 3210 2 12? |
| μη (μήτε?) 3212 4? | τίάς 3210 2 27? |
| μόνος 3212 5? | τε 3213 7. |
| νεφέρος 3209 2 1? | τελείων 3213 5. |
| νέ (dem.) 3209 i 6? 3213 4, 6. | τέμενος 3213 1. |

---

(b) Euripides, etc. (3214–3216)

| ἀλαστρος 3216 7. | δέ 3215 5, 7, 9 3216 4, 6, 7. |
| (-ε)-αλλάσσει 3215 i 19. | δεσπότης 3215 i 16. |
| ἀλλός 3216 8? | δή 3216 26? |
| ἀλτούτος 3216 23? | δίδυμον 3215 1 17. |
| αὖ 3214 11. | δίκαιος [3214 4]. |
| ἀνές 3216 10. | δόμος 3215 4, 17. |
| ἀνὴρ 3214 i 2? (βίος) 3215 1 18? | δὸρον 3216 17. |
| λεγόμεν (βίος) 3214 2? | δοῦλος 3215 1 4, 11. |
| λεγόμεν (βίος) 3214 2?, 5. | δώμα 3215 1 6. |
| αὐτοὺς 3214 6. | ἕγω 3214 i 7, [3], 10 3215 1 17 3216 13? |
| βουλή 3216 8. | εἴ 3216 7. |
| γύρνεσθα 3215 i 12. | εἴει 3215 i 17. |
| γυνώκτειν 3215 i 18. | ἐκ 3214 5, 7, 9 3216 19? |
| γυναικεῖος 3214 13. | ἐκεῖνος [3214 10]. |
| γυνή 3214 11. | ἐλευθέρος 3215 i 1, 8, 11, 13, 20. |
| | ἐν 3214 i 1? 3215 i 4. |
I. NEW LITERARY TEXTS

客栈 3215 12.
μ [3215 1 15].
εὐθένα 3214 14.
εὐλογεῖν 3215 15 marg.
εὔμαρας 3215 1 13.
ἐχέων [3214 3] (bis) 3215 1 4.

εόφ 3216 2?
γ 3215 1 12.
γρηγρ[ 3216 27.
=$((3215 0 1)

ἐχέων 3216 19.
καὶ 3215 1 6 3216 13, 16.
καρκός 3214 8 note.
καρκός 3215 1 5.
καλὸς 3215 3.
κατά [3214 6].
κέαρ 3215 1 14.
κεῖνος 3215 1 3.
κήδεμα 3214 8 note.
κήδεμα [3214 6].
κοινὸς [3214 13].
κρατεῖν 3215 1 6.
καταπνεύω 3216 11?
κτάθαι 3214 6.

λέγω 3215 1 5 3216 4.
λείτειν 3214 8.
λέκτρων 3214 3.
λέγειν [3214 13].
λύειν 3216 6.

μεθέναι 3215 1 8.
μέν 3214 1? 3215 16.
μή 3215 1 8.

νεαίναι 3215 1 2.
τενόποις 3216 18.
νοθετεῖν 3215 9.

οἶκος 3215 1 10.
οἶδαι τ 3216 20.

δέμοι 3216 12.
δὲ 3214 9?, 4 3216 18?
δέπος [3214 11] 3216 18?
οὐ 3215 1 15 3216 20.
οὖν 3214 10? 3215 16.
οὖνκα 3214 11.
οὔτως 3214 14.

παλαιός [3214 8] note.
πανδοκεῖς ( = εἰ) 3214 12?
πάς 3216 26.
πατήρ 3215 1 16.
παύειν 3215 1 15.
πολέμος 3215 1 10.
πολλάκις 3215 1 9.
πώς 3215 1 3 3216 6?
ποτε 3215 1 7.
τοῦ 3216 11.
πρὸς 3216 9?
προσδοκεῖν 3215 1 7.
προσφέρει 3216 3?
Προτεσθείαν ( play ) 3214 9.
Πήδος [3216 10].

σκαῖος 3214 10.
εὖς 3216 12.
εὐφόρος 3214 6.
εὖ 3215 1 5 7 8.
εὐγγεράσκειν 3214 4.
εὖν 3215 1 3.

τός 3215 1 19.
τές 3215 1 7.
τοῖς 3214 3?

Φοίβος 3216 14.
Φοίνιξ ( play ) 3214 7.
φτερός 3216 5.
Φοῖξ 3216 16.

χρεία 3216 9.
χρεών [3214 6].
χρή 3216 17.
χρῆ [3215 1 2 marg.
χρῆ 3214 13.
χρησίμος 3216 15.

(c) Menander, etc. (3217–3218)

ἀδικεῖν 3218 1 3.
αὕτὸς 3217 2?

βελ [3218 2 5.

έως 3218 1 5 5.
εἶναι 3217 3?
εἰκόνα 3218 6.
ἐχέω 3218 1 2.
INDEXES

(4) Romance (?) (3218 back) and Treatise on Plato (?) (3219)

INDEXES

(d) Romance (?) (3218 back) and Treatise on Plato (?) (3219)
I. NEW LITERARY TEXTS

II. SUB-LITERARY TEXTS

(a) Declamations (3235-3236)
INDEXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3235</td>
<td>i 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3235</td>
<td>i 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3235</td>
<td>i 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3235</td>
<td>i 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3235</td>
<td>i 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3235</td>
<td>i 13, 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 8, 9, 11, 22, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 8, 14, 17, 15, 3, 19, 23, 18, 8, 22, 9, 3, 14, 15, 20, 18—19, 17—18, 13, 10, 13, 13, 11, 13, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 4, 13, 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 13, 18—19, 17, 12, 11, 4, 12, 11, 4, 12, 11, 5, 13, 22, 15—16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 2—2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 11, 15, 14, 17, 15, 3, 19, 23, 18, 8, 22, 9, 3, 14, 15, 20, 18—19, 17—18, 13, 10, 13, 13, 11, 13, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 4, 13, 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 13, 18—19, 17, 12, 11, 4, 12, 11, 5, 13, 22, 15—16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 2—2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 4, 13, 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 13, 18—19, 17, 12, 11, 4, 12, 11, 5, 13, 22, 15—16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3236</td>
<td>i 2—2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. SUB-LITERARY TEXTS

(b) Homeric Glossaries (3237-3238)

(i) Homeric forms glossed

άγάνίψων 3238 i 7.
άγέμεν 3237 i 33.
άδώντες 3238 i 71.
άγλήθτος 3238 i 131.
αιθόπα 3238 i 45.
αίρά 3237 i 4.
άλτο 3238 i 131.
άμπρωςα 3238 i 128.
άμλωνας 3238 i 12.
άμφιβότης 3238 i 6.
άνθεραώς 3238 i 104.
άματηρ 3237 i 11.
άντιβαος 3237 i 9.
άνωγες 3237 i 22.
άπαθιλων 3238 i 125.
απόφιμων 3238 i 19.

ὅμα 3236 i 4.
ερός 3236 i 14.
-σπονδές 3235 ii 1.
ετρατηγεὺς 3236 i 21.
ετρατίδιος 3236 i 18.
eό 3236 i 19.
eυγγειν 3235 i 7, 3.
eύμμαχος 3236 i 14, 21.
eφέ 3236 i 3.

tειχεμός 3236 ii 13.
tέγος 3236 ii 2, 10.
tες 3235 i 6, 3236 i 13.
tευσετός 3236 i 13.
tράχης 3236 ii 1.
tρόπαιος 3236 i 19?

νμι 3235 ii 12.
νεικ 3235 i 16, 4 i 3, 10, 17, ii 11? 3236 ii 6, 10, 16?
νικέτρος 3235 i 1, ii 9, 3 i 14, ii 15.
νσήρ 3236 ii 23.
νπό 3236 ii 15.
νποβαλμαίος 3235 i 5.

Φιλιστος 3235 i 5, 2 ii 10, 15, 3 i 7, 11.
φίλος 3235 i 5.
φιλάττεν 3235 i 5.

ος 3236 i 15.

(3) Homeric forms glossed

(α) Πολιτικαλά 3235 i 16.

(β) Ἐπαφη 3235 i 12.

(γ) Καπνός 3235 i 12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEXES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καρεταία 3238 i ii 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καρποδώματα 3238 i ii 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κελωνίαν [3237 i ii 5].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κέλυφος (γραφί) 3237 i ii 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κρανοιμέθα 3238 i ii 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κρανίαν 3238 i ii 1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κνατέραν 3238 i iv 127.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυδαίνειραν 3238 i ii 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λείψ 3238 i ii 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λύματα 3237 i ii 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λόσαυ 3237 i ii 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαξευσιμένον 3237 i ii 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μεγάροις 3238 i ii 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μήπες 3238 i ii 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μητέρας 3238 i iii 110.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μιμώνευσις 3238 i ii 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μίστολον 3238 i ii 52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μολότη 3238 i ii 70.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νεωκε 3238 i iv 117.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νοήμη 3238 i iv 119.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νώμησαν 3238 i ii 67.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οβέλοις εἰς 3238 i ii 53.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἶδε 3237 i ii 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οἰε 3237 i ii 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐνεδάλεις 3238 i iv 115.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὀφροσύνα 3237 i ii 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παίρνα [3238 i ii 73].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παλαιάργευν 3238 i iv 123.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάμπαν 3238 i ii 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πανθημέρας 3238 i ii 69.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πανικόβις 3238 i ii 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πείρασα 3237 i ii 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πέθαναν 3238 i ii 24.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πεμπτοβόλα 3238 i ii 47.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πέναντα 3237 i ii 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>περιφράδδος 3238 i ii 54.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πέτασαν 3238 i iii 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ποθέεκκε 3238 i ii 96.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πολυβενθέκος 3238 i i 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πολυμητής 3237 i ii 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πρήξεν 3238 i ii 76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προφέρουσα 3237 i ii 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προτόνως εἰς 3238 i i 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προμηθεία 3238 i i 37?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκαλαί 3238 i iii 103.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σκηνοποιεύεις 3237 i i 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>στέφρα 3238 i ii 77.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμφωνεσσα 3238 i iv 137.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. SUB-LITERARY TEXTS

(II) Glosses

dékeidh 3238 i 21.
δι' 3238 i 34, ii 69, iii 80, 102, 105.
δαμάδων 3238 ii 67.
διακόπτεις 3238 i 52.
διάλεια 3238 ii 12.
διαπεραί 3238 i 83.
διαχωρεῖ 3238 ii 16.
dó 3238 i 2.
dραστικός 3237 ii 29.
dόμα 3238 i 16.

έντολ 3237 ii 14 3238 i 133.
εγία 3238 iv 120.
εἴδος 3238 ii 74.
εἶνα 3238 ii 6, 28, ii 40, 57, 63, ii 77, 80.
εκ 3238 ii 68, iii 85, 95, iv 111.
εκεί 3238 ii 48.
ἐκ, ἐξ 3237 ii 9 [3238 ii 48].
ἐκαττο 3238 ii 59.
ἐκεῖ 3238 ii 105.
ἐκεῖνα 3238 ii 94, 95.
ἐκπληροῖ 3238 ii 61.
ἐλέει 3238 ii 55.
ἐμπιθάζει 3237 ii 18.
ἐν στείρας 3238 ii 54.
ἐν 3238 ii 43, iii 91, 94.
ἐνάστος 3237 ii 9.
ἐνδήσε 3238 ii 57.
ἐνεργεῖ 3237 ii 28.
ἐντολή 3238 ii 98.
ἐξάπτεται 3238 i 30.
ἐξέχει 3238 ii 77.
ἐπιθέτον 3238 i 6.
ἐπιθυμία 3238 ii 62.
ἐπικλίνειν 3238 i 22.

φύλακας 3238 i 32.
φοι 3238 i 85.

έγγυα 3238 i 32.

γι' 3238 ii 8.

γιγνώσκει 3237 ii 3.

γνωστεῖν 3238 i 17.

βαπτίζε 3238 i 20.
βαθύνε 3238 i 15.
βρυξή 3238 iii 102.

γένεω 3238 i 104.

γεύεω 3238 ii 51.
γη 3238 iii 84.

γυναῖκες 3237 ii 3.

γυναῖκας 3238 i 20.

βαθύς 3238 i 15.
βρυξή 3238 i 102.

εφανε 3238 i 135.

εφάνης 3238 ii 44.

τάνυσμα 3238 iii 89.

τέκμηρω 3238 iv 121.

τελεσίζω 3237 ii 4.

τερτιοπάγων 3238 i 4.

τιτανίων 3238 ii 14.

τό 3237 ii 8.

τώ 3238 i 2.

ίγρα (κέλευθα) 3237 ii 20.
INDEXES
II. SUB-LITERARY TEXTS

(c) Glossary (?) (3239)

άγαθος 3239 36.
άθρο 3239 40?
αδέλφος 3239 2.
Αλεξάνδρα 3239 31.
αύ 3239 42.
Αναξ 3239 15.
άσθρο 3239 40?
αθος 3239 6.
*άντικρίσις 3239 45?
άρουα 3239 8.
βάρος 3239 25.
γεωργία 3239 3.
δεξιός 3239 24.
δείπρο 3239 43?
δυσάν 3239 44.
εις 3239 23.
ἐκατοτος 3239 41.
ελάδιων 3239 28.
ἐλείς 3239 21.
ἐργάμακος 3239 35.
ἐριν 3239 23.
ἐσο 3239 43?
ἐγγείν 3239 5.
ἐδονή 3239 11, 29?
θέλειν 3239 42.

(υπό [3238 iii 104].
υπομείνειν 3238 iv 136.
υποψηφίον 3237 ii 30.
υποσχερεῖν 3237 ii 6.
ὑψος 3238 iii 85.

φθίνειν 3238 iii 93.
φυεῖν 3238 iii 76.
φωνεῖν 3238 iii 81.
χειμερινός 3238 i 8.
χιτών 3238 ii 140?

φαμαθός 3238 iii 86.
φθόν 3238 i 70, [74].

(δεσπέρ 3238 ii 139?)

θέος 3239 11, 13.
θερμήματα 3239 16?

Διαφές 3239 3.
*Ιες 3239 141.
ἐταιμὸς 3239 22.
κακὸν 3239 1.
κάλαθος 3239 23.
κόλας 3239 18?, 40.
κοῦλα 3239 67.
κοκμεῖν 3239 32.
kουριακὸς 3239 5.
kώνων 3239 22.

Λέχθη 3239 10.
λόγχος 3239 24.

μέγας 3239 21, 25.
μέθη 3239 12.
μελίχος 3239 25.
μός 3239 26.

η 3239 27.
ζείτος 3239 37.
ζέστρα 3239 28.

οδηγός 3239 36.
οικοδόμος 3239 30.
οὐναίων 3239 29?
III. EMPERORS AND REGNAL YEARS

VESPASTIAN

Odespaceainoc 3242 10 (Year 3—retrospective).

TITUS

Avtokrapcwp Titoc Kaicap Odespaceainoc Sebactoc 3264 28—30, 35—6 (Year 3).

Domitian

Avtokrapcwp Kaicap Domianoc Sebactoc Germanyoc 3240 6—7 (Year lost), 17 (Year 8).

Marcus Aurelius and Verus

Avtokrapcwp Kaicap Markoc Auvphlloc Antunoc Sebactoc kai Avtokrapcwp Kaicap Lousioc Auvphlloc Ovphoc Sebactoc 3241 12—15, 26—9 (Year 3).

CARACALLA

O kuvios hmuoc Avtokraptoc Sevphoc Antunoc Ovphlloc Euvpheloc, Euvpheloc, Sebactoc 3243 1 7—8 (Year 22).
III. EMPERORS AND REGNAL YEARS

SEVERUS ALEXANDER

Márkos Ádáphllos Séounhрос Αλέξανδρος Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος 3244 9–12.
Ἀυτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Μάρκος Αδριανός Καίσαρ ὁ Καίσαρ ὁ κύριος 3244 28–32
(Year 9).

VALERIAN, GALLIENUS, (AND VALERIAN OR SALONINUS CAESAR)

Ἀυτοκράτορες Καίσαρες Πούπλως Λικίνινος Ουάλεμανός καὶ Πούπλως Λικίνινος... 3252 25–8
(Year 5).

DIOCLETIAN AND MAXIMIAN, CONSTANTIUS, AND GALERIUS

οἱ κύριοι ἡμῶν Διοκλητιανὸς καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς Κεβαστοὶ καὶ οἱ κύριοι ἡμῶν Κωνστάντιος καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς οἱ ἐπιφανεστάτοι Καίσαρες 3245 18–20 (Year 13, 12, and 5).
οἱ κύριοι ἡμῶν Διοκλητιανὸς καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς Κεβαστοὶ καὶ Κωνστάντιος καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς οἱ ἐπιφανεστάτοι Καίσαρες 3246 2–3 (Year 14, 13, and 6).
Διοκλητιανὸς καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς (Σεβαστὸν... Καῖσαρων 3247 22–3 (Year lost).

IV. CONSULS

ἐπὶ ὑπάτους τῶν κυρίων ἡμῶν Αὐτοκράτορος
Μαξιμιανὸς Κεβαστὸς τὸ ε’ καὶ Μαξιμιανὸς ἐπίφανεστάτου Καίσαρος τὸ β’ (A.D. 297) 3245 1–2, [22?].
ὑπατεία τῶν δεκαπτῶν ἡμῶν Κωνστάντιος καὶ Λικίνιος Σεβαστῶν τὸ... (A.D. 312–15) 3254 1–2.
ὑπατεία τῶν δεκαπτῶν ἡμῶν Κωνστάντιος καὶ Λικίνιος) Σεβαστῶν τὸ β’ (A.D. 315) 3255 1–2.
ὑπατεία τῆς προκειμένης 3255 26.
ὑπατεία τῶν δεκαπτῶν ἡμῶν Λικίνιου Σεβαστοῦ τὸ ε’ καὶ Κρέστου τοῦ ἐπίφανεστάτου Καίσαρος τὸ α’ (A.D. 318) 3257 1–2.
ὑπατεία τῆς προκειμένης 3257 18.
ὑπατεία τῶν δεκαπτῶν ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίων Αὐτοκράτορος τὸ ε’ καὶ Λικίνιου τοῦ ἐπίφανεστάτου Καίσαρος τὸ α’ (A.D. 319) 3258 1–2.
ὑπατεία τῶν δεκαπτῶν ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίου Κεβαστοῦ τὸ ε’ καὶ Λικίνιου τοῦ ἐπίφανεστάτου Καίσαρος τὸ α’ (A.D. 319) 3259 1–3.
τοις ἀποδειγματοφέρονσι ὑπάτους τὸ γ’ (A.D. 323) 3260 1.
ὑπατεία τῆς προκειμένης 3261 23.
ὑπατεία τῶν δεκαπτῶν ἡμῶν Κωνσταντίου Δημοσίου τοῦ ε’ καὶ Κωνσταντίου τοῦ ἐπίφανεστάτου Καίσαρος τὸ α’ (A.D. 326) 3264 1–3.
ὑπατεία τῆς προκειμένης 3265 18.
ὑπατεία Φιλομένου Φοιλακανό καὶ Φαβίου Τιτιανοῦ τῶν λαμπροτάτων (A.D. 337) 3266 1–2.

V. MONTHS

Ἄπειρ 3252 17 3255 26 3257 18.
ἐπάγωμεν 3249 14.
Ἐπείρ 3257 14 3262 5 3265 18.
Θεία 3249 13 3266 11.

Μεθέρ 3241 15, 30.
Παινό 3255 21.
Σεβαστός 3250 17.
Φανερό [3240 7] 3266 15.
Φανερός 3248 12.
Χιλιά 3244 16, 32.
INDEXES

VI. PERSONAL NAMES

Ἀγαθοῦστος see Index IV (a.d. 326).

Ἀλκαμώλων, Αυρ., alias Hesychius, former hypomnematongraphus, councillor of Alexandria, (ex-?) gymnasiarch, councillor, prytanis in office of Oxyrhynchus 3245 3–5.

Ἀκύλλους 3247 5.

Ἀκρόβατος see Index III s.v. Severus Alexander.

Ἀμβελέως, f. of Pennamis 3264 5.

Ἀμμανᾶς 3247 7.

Ἀμμανᾶς, f. of Aur. Dioncorus 3255 6 3256 3.

Ἀµµανᾶς, f. of Gaianus 3260 2.

Ἀνδρόκλης, f. of Sarapion 3242 19.

Ἀνοµαξ, Flavius, protector 3266 4.

Ἀννουξά, s. of Hermias, Persian of the epigone, shipmaster 3250 1, 12, 25.

Ἀντάκχως, Αυρ., ἐγκυκλιώτης 3241 3 [16].

Ἀντώνιος see Index III s.v. Marcus Aurelius and Verus, Carnacala.

Ἀπολλώνιος, Αυρ., alias Serenus, s. of Apolloniou 3259 4–5.


Ἀπολλώνιος, f. of CaparrLcov, h. of Dieus 3244 19.

Ἀπολλώνιος see Index VII (e) s.v. Ἀπολλώνιος κλήρος.

Ἀρσενουρίους, (Αυρ.) Calpurnius Isidorus alias, strategus (Arsinoite; departments of Themistes and Polemon) 3243 12 3263 1–3.

Ἀρσενουρίους, royal scribe 3242 1.

Ἀρτεμιδώρας 3247 2.


Ἀτρῆς, Αυρ., s. of Peteharpocrates, m. Tanneis 3252 5–7.

Αὐθεντός see Index IV (a.d. 326).

Ἀβδιλλάδεια see Εὔρυπησία.

Ἀβδιλλάδος . . . 3245 23 3249 17.

Ἀβδιλλάδος Κεστύμος Ἡράκλειτος, ἱσταφ. Λεγ. Λεγ. 3243 1 1.

Ἀβδιλλάδος see Αὐθεντός, Ἀμμάνας, Ἀντάκχως, Ἀπολλώνιος, Ἀρσενουρίους, Ἀτρῆς, Διδυμός, Δίος, Διάκορος, Ἐλευθαρίας, Ἐρ., . . ., Ἐδάγγελος, Ἐνδέλαμψας, Σηναγίτης, Σωλῶς, Ἡράκλειτος, Ἡρων, Ἡσίος, Θεογένης, Θέων, Θείων, Ἐκθαρρός, Καλποίριος, Λαυκίδης, Μάξιμος, Πτολεμαῖος, Σαραπίας, Σεμιθυς, Ἡρων.

Ἀβδιλλάδος see also Index III s.vv. Marcus Aurelius and Verus, Severus Alexander.

Ἀχίλλεως, f. of Aur. Sarapion, h. of Dieus 3244 5, 34.

Βαρβατας, dux 3261 10.

Βεσάριους 3253 19.

Βελλόνας, s. of Ammonias 3260 2, 28.

Βήσας see Νομφάνος.

Δίῳμος alias Eudaemon, (ex-?) gymnasiarch, councillor, f. of Techosus alias Eudaemonis 3246 8.

Δίῳμος, Αυρ. 3245 9.

Δίῳμος, Αυρ. Sarapion alias, (ex-?) gymnasiarch 3232 1–4.

Διος, m. of Aur. Sarapion, w. of Achilles 3244 6.

Διογένης, γυμνασιαρχής 3246 10, 23.

Διογένης, m. of Aur. Theon, w. of Theon 3244 25.

Διοκλητιανός see Index III s.v. Diocletian and Maximian, Constantius, and Galerius.

Διονυδα, d. of Sarapias alias Thamunion, Antinoite 3242 2.

Διονύσιος 3257 19.


Διονύσιος, f. of Dionysius 3240 9.

Διονύσιος, f. of . . . ος 3245 26.

Διονύσιος, s. of Dionysius 3240 9.

Δίος, Αυρ., s. of Zelius 3258 3.

Δίδακτος, Αυρ., s. of Ammonius 3255 6 3256 3.

Δίδακτος, f. of Osrenphis 3264 9.

Δίδακτος, s. of . . . ος 3261 24.

Διαφάνης, strategus 3242 1.

Διομυτίανος see Index III s.v. Domitian.

Εἰθηναῖς, Αυρ., assistant to the prytanis 3245 7–8.

Ἐνίπαμος 3260 40.

Ἐρ., . . ., Αυρ., village scribe 3263 4.

Ἐρμιάς, f. of Anubas 3250 1.

Ἐρμύλως 3264 2.

Ἐκτιαῖος see Ἡσαίους Ἐ.

Ἐλαγγέλους, Αυρ. 3254 3, 23.

Εὐδαίμωνες, Techosus alias, d. of Didymus (ex-?) gymnasiarch, councillor 3246 8.

Εὐδαίμωνες, Didymus alias, (ex-?) gymnasiarch, councillor, f. of Techosus alias Eudaemonis 3246 9.

Εὐδαίμων, slave 3252 14.

Εὐδάμως, Αυρ., s. of Leonteus, m. Eusebia 3266 3.
VI. PERSONAL NAMES

Εὐδήλων, f. of Timotheus 3249 8.
Εὐσέβεια, m. of Aur. Eulogius, w. of Leontius 3266 3.
Εὐστάχιος, Flavius, s. of Copreus, sstatares 3249 5.
Εὐστροπία, Aurelia, d. of Theodorus alias Chae- remon, late gymnasiarah, prytanis, and coun- ciliar 3255 3, 27 (εὐστρώπιον).
Εὐστρώπιον see Εὐστροπία.

Ζηρύγγης, Aur., strategus 3246 4 3247 1.
Ζωλίκος 3253 1.
Ζωδός, Aur., 3265 6–7, 19.
Ζωδός, f. of Aur. Dios 3258 3.

Πλοῦδώρα, Claudia, d. of Canopion, former hypo- meneamatograph, and στρατηγός 3246 7.
Πρακλείδης, ἐγκυκλιάντης 3242 3, [18].
Πρακλείδης, Flavius, ex-strategus 3240 10.
Πράκλητος, Claudius, strategus 3246 7–8.
Πράκλητος see Αἰώνας Πατημίου Πράκλητος.
Πράκλης, Aur, πραγματστής 3256 5.
Πρύσα, Aur., alias Sarapion, ex-logistes, former gymnasiarah and prytanis 3256 1–2.

Θαμβώνος, Sarapias alias, m. of Dionysia, Anti- noite 3242 2.
Θανάτος see Index VII(a) s.v. θανάτος, vi- oλακόπτης, d. of Sarapion 3241 [1], 16.
Thetaλής, Aur., theon, Strategus 3244 1–3.
Θέδωρος, alias Chae- remon, late gymnasiarah, prytanis, and councillor, f. of Aurelian Eutropia 3255 3.
Θέδωρος, f. of . . . 3249 10.
Θέδωρος, f. of . . . chotes 3248 8.
Θέων 3251 13.
Θέων, Aur., alias Maximus, prytanis 3244 1–3.
Θέων, Aur., s. of Theon, m. Diogenis 3244 23–5, 38–9.
Θέων, f. of Aur. Theon, h. of Diogenis 3244 24.
Θέων, m. Θεόγινος 3261 3.
Θέωνος, Aur., alias Theogenes, exegetes 3246 6.
Θέωνος, f. of Comen 3262 1.
Θέωνος, s. of Philaeus 3249 8.
Θέωνος Νέος καλοδίνους 3257 8.

Ἰούλιος Ἐκταῖος, strategus 3240 8.
Ἰείδωρος, (Aur.) Calpurnius, alias Harpocratiostrategus (Arsinoite; departments of Themistes and Polemon) 3243 4 3263 1–3.
Καίσαρ see Index III, Index IV (A.D. 297); (A.D. 318); (A.D. 319); (A.D. 326).
Καλλιστή, m. (or alias) of Προφίλ, slave 3241 21–27.
Καλλιστήνος Ἰείδωρος ὁ καὶ Ηρόδορος, strategus (Arsinoite, departments of Themistes and Polemon) 3243 4 3263 1–3 (+ Aur.).
Κανισίους, f. of Claudia Heliodora, former hypo- meneamatograph, and στρατηγός 3246 7.
Κλεάδα 3247 6.
Κλωνίδα 'Πλοῦδώρα, d. of Canopion, former hypo- meneamatograph, and στρατηγός 3246 7.
Κλώδιος 'Ηράκλειος, strategus 3264 7–8.
Κόλος, s. of Thonius 3262 1.
Κοππιείς, f. of Aur. Eustochius, sstatares 3249 5.
Κορνήλιος; M. Cornelius Torullus, centurion 3250 2.
Κρίσταιος see Index IV (A.D. 318).
Κριστατίους see Index IV (A.D. 312–15); (A.D. 315); (A.D. 319); (A.D. 326).
Κριστατίους see Index III s.v. Diocletian and Maximian, Constantius, and Galerius; Index IV (A.D. 326).
Λευκάκιος, Flavius, logistes 3249 4 [3264 5].
Λευκάκιος, Aur., s. of Theon 3254 5 3256 3 3257 4 3258 5 3259 7 3260 4, 14 3261 3 3262 1 7.
Λικτάνος see Index IV (A.D. 312–15); (A.D. 315); (A.D. 319).
Λικτάνος see Index III s.v. Valerian, Gallienus, (and Valerian or Saloninus Caesar); Index IV (A.D. 318).
Λιγγακίος, f. of Sarapion 3242 3.
Λιούκιος see Index III s.v. Marcus Aurelius and Verus.
Λούθα, jw (gen.) 3253 17.
Μ . . . , μυράρης 3261 5.
Μαξιμιάνος see Index III s.v. Diocletian and Maxi- mian, Constantius, and Galerius; Index IV (A.D. 297).
Μάξιμος, Aur. Theon alias, prytanis 3244 1–3.
Μάρκος see Κορνήλιος; see also Index III s.v. Marcus Aurelius and Verus, Severus Alexander.
Ματίνος, Valerius 3257 3, 18.
Μέττος 'Πούφος ἐφεσ., Aeg. 3240 4.
Μόνιμος see Index VIII(b) s.v. Moisîos.
INDEXES

Necos, Θάνους καλούμενος 3257 8.
Νεούλας see Index VII(c) s.v. Νεκώμιον κλήρος.
Νορβάνος; C. Norbanus Ptolemaeus 3250 4.
'Ορεννούς, s. of Dioscorus 3264 3.
Οδηλερώνος see Index III s.v. Βαλεριανος, (and Valerian or Salaminus Caesar).
Οδηλόροσ, f. of . . . 3257 3.
Οδήλωμος Χαρίνιος 3257 18.
Οίκεστακός see Index III s.v. Vespasion, Titus.
Οίδηρο see Index III s.v. Marcus Aurelius and Verus.

Παιγνής 3253 2, 9, 15.
Πανάρρης 3255 10.
Παρών 3249 7.
Πασίων 3247 7.
Παταράς [3245 12 ?].
Πεννάφιος, s. of Ameninus 3264 4.
Πενειοκράτης, f. of Aur. Hatres, h. of Tanneis 3252 6.
Πολέμων see Index VII(a) s.v. Πολέμωνος μερίς.
Πολέμησιος, slave of C. Norbanus Ptolemaeus 3250 4, 13, 26, 27, 29.
Ποταμίον τος see Index VII(c) s.v. Ποταμίον κλήρος.
Ποταδάπτον τος see Index VII(c) s.v. Ποτακάτον κλήρος.
Ποτασίος see Index III s.v. Valerian, Gallienus, (and Valerian or Salaminus Caesar).
Πρεμής, slave, d. of Calliope or alias C.? 3241 4, 21. Πρεμής 3245 27.
ΠτΟΛΕΜΑΙΟΣ, Aur., s. of Dionysius alias Artemidorus 3245 9.
Πτολεμαῖος, s. of Silvanus 3249 9.
Πτολεμαῖος, G. Norbanus 3250 4.
Σαβθάνας, praes. of Heraclea 3261 9.
Σαραπίος, alias Thamunion, m. of Dionysia, Antinoiteit 3242 2.
Σαραπίππος, Aur., alias Didymus, (ex-?) gymnasiarch 3252 1–4.
Σαραπίππος, Aur. Heron alias, ex-logistex, former gymnasiarch and prytanis 3266 1–2.
Σαραπίππος, Aur. Heron alias, former hypomnematographus, ex-prytanis, gymnasiarch 3246 5.
Σαραπίππος, f. of Thedia . . . 3241 1, 16.
Σαραπίππος, s. of Andronicus 3242 19.
Σαραπίππος, s. of Apollonius, φυκωτήτης 3241 2, 10, 17, 24.
Σαραπίππος, s. of Longinus 3242 3.
Σαρμάτης, μυριάρχης 3261 4.
Σεβαστός see Index III s.v. Titus, Domitian, Marcus Aurelius and Verus, Caracalla, Severus Alexander, Diocletian and Maximian, Constantius, and Galerius; Index IV (a.d. 297); (a.d. 312–15); (a.d. 315); (a.d. 318); Index V; Index XI(b) s.v. νύμφεια.
Σεφίρος see Index III s.v. Caracalla, Severus Alexander.
Σεφίριος see Αδριάντος Ευδαμονίος 'Εράκλειτος.
Σερίφως, Aur. Apollonius alias, s. of Apollonius 3259 4–5.
Σέρικος, Aur., alias Horion, gymnasiarch 3246 6.
Σέρικος, f. of Ptolemaeus 3249 9.
Σέρινας, m. of Aur. Hatres, w. of Petcharchocrates 3252 7.
Σεσούκος, alias Eudaemonis, d. of Didymus alias Eudaemon (ex-?) gymnasiarch, councillor 3246 8.
Σεμέθος, s. of Eulogius 3249 8.
Σηταυάς, Fabius see Index IV (a.d. 337).
Σίτιος see Index III s.v. Titus.
Σογράφος, M. Cornelius, centurion 3250 2–3.
Σομάς, Παντοβιος, s. of Σομάς, gymnasiarch 3249 9.
Σοφίος, Flavius see Index IV (a.d. 337).
Σωτάριος 3240 2.
Σωθάριος Λυκανάρος, protector 3266 4.
Σωθάριος 'Εράκλειτος, ex-strategus 3240 10.
Σωθάριος Αυτωκράτορ, logistex 3249 4 [3265 4].
Σωθάριος Φλαμίνιος see Index IV (a.d. 337).
Σωθάριος Λυκανάρος see Index IV (a.d. 3255 3).
Σωθάριος Λυκανάρος, alias, late gymnasiarch, prytanis, and councillor, f. of Aurelia Eutropia 3255 3.
Σωθάριος Λυκανάρος see Index IV (a.d. 337).
Σωθάριος Λυκανάρος, s. of Psemenius 3264 3.
Δράματα 3253 1.
'Ορλος 3253 1.
'Ορλος, Aur., alias Sarapion, former hypomnematographus, ex-prytanis, gymnasiarch 3246 5.

..., d. of Dionysius 3245 25.
VII. GEOGRAPHICAL

(a) COUNTRIES, NOMES, TOPARCHIES, CITIES, ETC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3241</td>
<td>Ἀλεξάνδρεια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ἀλεξάνδρεια, ἣ λαμπροστάτη πόλει τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων 3245 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3242</td>
<td>Λιβυκά 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3242</td>
<td>ἀνός τοπαρχία 3242 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3243</td>
<td>Αρκουνίων ( nomine) 3243 1 3 3263 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3243</td>
<td>Αρχαίος τόπος 3243 1 3 3263 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3243</td>
<td>Εἰθάμας 3243 1 12, [17?] 3247 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>μέσος τοπαρχία 3264 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>Οὐραγχέτης ( nomine) 3240 8 3246 4 [3249 4].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>3250 9, 25 [3254 4].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>3250 5? 3260 3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>3254 6 3255 4 3256 2 3257 5 3258 3 3259 6 3260 5 3265 6 3266 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>Οὐραγχαίοις ( πόλεις) 3241 1, [16] 3242 3 3251 2 3 3254 4 17 3260 3 (ε').</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>Πέργες (τής επιγονής) 3250 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3245</td>
<td>Πολέμιος μηρίς 3243 1 3 3 3263 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) VILLAGES, ETC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3242</td>
<td>Αγαθόν 3245 9, 28 (Ἀγαθόνος).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3250</td>
<td>Αριστερά Πέλα 3256 7 3258 7 3259 9 3260 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3263</td>
<td>Απόλλωνος πόλεις (Ἀρσινόη) 3263 5 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>Καλέντα 3258 8 3257 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>Λαδή 3250 9, 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>Μέρικα 3247 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>Μονάδοι (ἐσότεροι) 3242 23 3244 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>Πεντάς 3264 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>Πώλα (Ἀρσινόη) 3263 6 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>Σαλωνίμοι (τῶν Ἀρσινώτων) 3263 5 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>Σάλων (ἐσότεροι) 3263 5 13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) MISCELLANEOUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3242</td>
<td>Ἀρπολώνος κλήρος 3242 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3243</td>
<td>Ἀρπολώνος κλήρος 3243 1 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3247</td>
<td>Νέλα (περίχωμα) 3257 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3247</td>
<td>Νικοδήμος κλήρος 3256 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3255</td>
<td>Πέταν (περίχωμα) 3253 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3254</td>
<td>Παναγία 3242 6, 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3254</td>
<td>Τής 3254 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3254</td>
<td>Τρικοκέφαλι (Ἀφροδιτοπολίτης) 3252 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3255</td>
<td>Υφαντάς 3250 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3255</td>
<td>Υψιά (ἐσότεροι) 3260 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3255</td>
<td>Ψυτεώ (Ἀρσινόη) 3263 6 13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VIII. RELIGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3248</td>
<td>Αἱρέσεως 3248 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3251</td>
<td>Αἱρέσεως 3251 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3249</td>
<td>Αἱθραίου see Index XI (a) s.v. μέτρων Ἀθραίου.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3258</td>
<td>Ἀριστεράεων 3251 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3258</td>
<td>Ἀργεῖος 3263 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>θεωρία 3248 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3264</td>
<td>Ἱερᾶς 3248 3, 13.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3248</td>
<td>Καππαδοκῶν [3248 4?].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3251</td>
<td>Καππαδοκῶν 3251 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3248</td>
<td>Καππαδοκῶν 3248 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3248</td>
<td>Καππαδοκῶν 3248 40?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3248</td>
<td>τύχη (genius) 3244 12 3264 30.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IX. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS AND TITLES

αμόδον 3249 7.
βασιλεῖς γραμματεῖς 3242 1.
βουλευτήριον 3248 11.
βουλευτής 3245 [4], [4] 3246 9 [3255 4].
βουλή 3248 10.
γυν(α)ερ(χος) 3244 2 3245 4 3246 9 3252 3.
γυνασσαρχεῖν (3255 4) 3256 2.
γυνασσάρχος 3256 6.
δείπνοι καὶ τὰ πολιτικά 3244 3–4.
δοῦλος 3261 10.
ἐγκυκλίωσιν 3241 3, 18–19.
ἐκατοντάεις (οὐ -ος) 3250 3.
ἐξηγησὶς 3246 7 3248 12.
ἐπαρχὸς 3247 21.
ἐπαρχία 3263 10.
ἐργαμὼν 3242 5 3243 1 2, 5 (all praefectus Aegypti)
3261 8 (proeses Heracleis).
ιάτρος, δημόσιος 1. 3245 7.
ἰδιος λόγος 3263 9.
καταλογικὸν [3241 23].
κράτεισις 3240 10.
κωμογραμματεῖς 3263 5.
λειτουργικὸς 3249 6.
λειτουργία 3249 11.

νεκλεκτός 3261 7.
ϕίλ(ικάλιος) ἐπάρχου 3247 21.
πρεσβύτερος 3264 5.
προαναρριφέτης 3247 3.
πρωταναρριφέτης 3243 3 3254 3.
πρωτάρχης 3266 5.
πτέρνα, ἀπὸ τετάραν 3246 7–8.
πτημασία 3243 1 12.
πτημασία 3240 11.
πτημασία (3240 8) (3242 1) 3243 1 3, 6 3246 4,
10 (3259 5?) (3263 2) 3264 8, 22.
πτημασία 3247 16.
πτημασία 3243 2 5.
συμπρεσβύτερος 3264 9.
ἐντάτης [3249 5].
τάξις 3245 8 3247 4.
τάξις 3261 6, 17.
ὑπηρέτης 3245 8, 15.
ὑπομεσατογράφος (3245 3) (3246 5, 7).
φολῆ 3249 6.
χωραστησία 3264 10.

X. PROFESSIONS, TRADES, AND OCCUPATIONS

ἀγροφάλαξ 3253 12.
ἀλευς 3244 13.
κυβερνήτης 3250 2.
μεταβόλος 3244 7.
μηναρχής 3261 4 3262 1.
καταλογικὸν 3241 11.

XI. MEASURES

(a) Weights and Measures

ἀρουμά 3240 11 3247 9 [3254 23–4] 3255 10, 11,
13] 3256 8, 9, 11, 11 3257 7, 9 3260 8.
(ἀρουμά) 3242 8, 9, 12, 15, 17, 22 3260 8.
ἀρτάθη 3250 3, 7, 8, 8, 10 3251 8, 8.
(καντιφάρμου) 3265 13, 14, 15, 16.

(β) Money

δραχμή 3241 7, 8, 9 3250 11, 11, 13, 14 3251 9
3252 90 3257 10 3266 18.
(δραχμή) 3241 7, 8, 9 3264 12.

νόμισμα, Κεθαστῶν n. 3254 13 3266 7–8.
τάλαντον 3254 25 3255 13 3257 9 3265 15, 16)
3266 8, (8), 12, 18.
XII. TAXES

άντωνα [3257 11].
δήμωσι 3255 18 3257 11 [3260 16].
ἀγκυλακτον 3241 6.
ἐπικλημένος 3254 20.
ἐπιμερισμός [3254 20].
πολιταρχία 3264 14.
προπηγαγός 3241 8.
τέλεμα, δήμος τελεματα 3254 19-20, 26.

XIII. GENERAL INDEX OF WORDS

ἀγαθός see ἄριστος.
ἀγρόδρυμον see ἀκρόδρυμον.
ἀγροφόλας see Index X.
ἀγωγὴ 3250 3.
ἀίρετοι 3250 6 3251 21 3266 9.
3266 13.
ἀκρόδρυμον 3242 7 (αγρ- par.).
ἄμεια see Index X.
ἀλλα 3247 8 3253 11.
ἀλληλέγγυος 3251 19 3257 16.
ἀλλήλων 3250 10 [3254 11].
ἀλὸς 3240 8 3249 7 3264 5, 16, 24.
ἀμπελος 3242 7, (12), 19, 20.
ἀμφιθβον see Index IX.
ἀμφίστρος 3245 10 3246 6 3247 7 3256 4 3257 4.
ἀν σε ἔστιν ἄρι.
ἀνά 3255 13 3257 9.
ἀνάγεις 3242 13.
ἀναγκαίως 3265 11.
ἀναγραφή 3242 17.
ἀναλαμβάνων 3250 18.
ἀνάλομα 3256 15 3261 14.
ἀνάπαυς 3258 8.
ἀνάπλοις 3250 16, 20.
ἀνάλυς, 3250 8.
ἀναφάρφων 3240 9 3264 9, 32.
ἀναφέρων 3244 14.
ἀνάρχων 3263 8 3265 8-9.
ἀνέρ 3264 11, 16, 20.
ἀνώνυμα see Index XII.
ἀνορθῶν (7) 3250 23.
ἀριθμον 3255 13, 15 3256 9, 14 3260 10 3266 9.
ἀρίστοτες (3245 25).
ἀριστεράθεις 3250 19 3255 23 3257 15 3260 22.
3266 16.
ἀριστόλογος 3266 13.
ἀρίστω see Index VII(a) s.v. ἀρίστω τοπαρχα.
ἀριστεῖν 3247 10, [12], 13.
ἀριστειλάος 3261 13.
ἀριστεράθεις 3264 17.
ἀριστεῖν 3254 24.

απηλώτης (3242 18).
ἀπολύοντα 3261 20.
ἀπὸ 3241 1, 16 3242 3, 8, 10 3243 16, 17 3244 7, 15 3245 6, [10] 3249 10, 13 3250 1, 6, 12 3251 2, 6 3252 8 3253 6 [3254 3, 5] 3255 6, 8 3256 1, 7, 4, 6, 8, 12 3257 5, 6 3258 3, 5 3259 5, 5 7 3260 4, 7 3262 2, 2 3264 19 3266 9, [11].
ἀπογοφέθεια 3242 3, 20, 23.
ἀποδεκατένα 3260 1 3264 31.
ἀποδιδόνα 3250 15 3251 10, 14 3255 20 3257 14 3260 21 3266 14.
ἀπόδοσις 3266 19.
ἀποκαθιστάναι [3240 16] 3247 4 3250 8.
ἀποκέκλιθα 3243 10.
ἀπολαμβάνων 3253 7 3255 19 3257 12 3260 19.
ἀποστελεῖ 3250 19.
ἀποστέω 3250 29.
ἀποστολὴ 3247 6.
ἀποφάσις 3264 27.
ἀρα 3250 6, 15, 19, 26.
ἀργυρικός 3255 21 3257 14.
ἀργύριον 3250 11 3251 9, 17 3252 19 3255 13 3257 9 3266 7, [12], 17.
ἀρίθμησις 3254 15.
ἀριστερός 3245 16.
ἀριστοκράτω see Index III; Index IV (A.D. 297, 319).
ἀριστόκρατος 3242 12.
ἀριστεῖν 3240 12.
Ἀρίστην see Index XI(a).
Ἀρίστης 3242 7.
Ἀρίστος see Index VI.
Ἀριστεράθεις see Index VIII.
Ἀριστεράθεις see Index VIII.
Ἀριστεράθεις 3250 6, 13 3250 20.
Ἄρης 3250 24.
αὐθαυτές 3252 12.
Ἀστυπάλατος see Index III; Index IV (A.D. 297, 319).
αὐτός 3240 11, 12 3241 6, 9, 11, [25] 3244 8 3245 6, 12, 14, 15 [3249 14] 3250 15, 22, 27,30 3251 4 3252 19 3253 5, 9, 11, [18], 21 3255 6 3256 4, 12, 12, 17 3257 7, 15 3258 5.
INDEXES

3259 7 3260 91 3261 11, 17 3262 7 3264 11, 13, 15, 23, 24 3266 15.
(αστός) 3242 11, 21 3244 4, 25.
άφενα 3253 7, 13.
άφορείς 3240 13.
άφορευς 3240 5.
άξω 3240 13 3266 19.
βάλανειν 3265 10.
βασιλικός see Index IX.
βέβαιον 3255 19 3257 13 [3260 19].
βιβλίων 3245 8, 12.
βορρά 3242 19.
βολέσθαι 3240 14.
βολευείν see Index IX.
γενών 3240 12 3242 17, 22.
γής 3251 12, 16.
γενώς 3255 18 3256 10, 12 3257 12.
γεωργίη 3251 7.
γῆ [3255 18] [3256 19] 3257 11 3260 16, 29.
γάλακτων 3240 15 3241 8 3243 15 3245 3 3246 5.
γάλα 3250 17 3251 18 3253 5 3255 23 3257 15.
γάλακτος 3260 22 3262 6, 6 3266 19.
γάλακτος 3241 7, 8, 9 [3255 3] 3260 8 3265 16, 16.
γάλακτων 3253 21 3260 31 3261 20.
γραμματεύει see Index IX s.v. βασιλικός γ.
γράφειν 3240 10 3241 12 3251 21 [3254 21–2]
[3254 30] 3261 20 3266 22.
γραμματέος see Index IX.
γραμματεύειν see Index IX.
γραμματεύειν see Index IX.
διάπανος 3243 5 6?
διάπανος 3243 4.
δέκα 3241 8 3250 8 3266 12.
δεκαεί 3266 16.
δεκαείνα 3255 10.
δεκαείλτε 3256 9 3264 20.
δεξίων [3245 15].
δέσποτης 3243 5 3249 1 3254 1 3255 1 3257 1 3258 1 3259 1 3265 1.
δεσπότης 3243 7.
δηλούν 3240 10, 12 3243 10 3250 5 3251 14 3263 7 3264 19, 32.
δημός 3242 10, 12, 16 3249 12 [3254 19] 3264 3 3265 10 see also Index IX s.v. λατρεύς;
Index XII s.v. δημόσιος.
δημοσίως [3241 22?].
δέκα 3240 5, 9 3241 [23] 23 3242 3, 10, 12, 16 3245 7 3255 27 3257 3, 19 3261 11, 18 3264 31 3265 6 3266 5, 7.
διαγράφειν 3241 4.
διάθεσις 3245 13.
διάγνωσις 3261 7, 9.
διακεκράτει 3264 15.
διατροφή 3253 19.
διαφέρειν 3261 17.
διάφορον 3251 16.
διάφως 3242 12, 14.
διδάσκαλος 3249 11 3233 9, 18 3264 22.
διδάσκει 3263 12.
διδέτω see Index IX s.v. διέτην.
δέχεται 3250 24.
δέκατάκτα 3250 10.
(διμήνω) 3242 8, 12, 15, 21, 23 3251 21 3266 22.
διμήνη 3253 8.
δοῦλη 3241 5, 21.
δοῦλος 3252 14.
δοῦξ see Index IX.
δραμή see Index IX.
δραμάτως see Index XI(δ).
δραματικός 3251 17.
δυνατά 3264 30.
δύο 3241 7, 9 3250 8, 14 3257 14 3262 3.
δύσκολα 3251 10 3256 11.
δύο 3245 13 3250 6, 28 3251 13, 20 3253 5
δαυτός 3250 20.
διδόμενον 3230 13.
διδώνει see ἐκβαίνων.
ἐκβολή see ἐκβολή.
ἐφιγάρτεσσα 3264 19.
ἐφιγάρτεσσα [3245 11–12] 3249 16.
ἐφιγάρτεσσα 3245 13.
ἐφιγάρνη 3252 13 3261 11.
ἐφιγάρνηθη 3244 23, 38.
ἐφιγάρνηθη 3244 41.
ἐγκυκλιακόν see Index XII.
ἐγκυκλιακόν see Index IX.
ἐγκυκλιακόν see Index IX.
ἐγκυκλιακόν see Index IX.
ἐγκυκλιακόν 3240 3 3241 5, 9 3242 5, 9, 16, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, [23] 3243 6, 8 3245 1, 18 [19] 3246 2 3247 3 3249 1 3251 19, 20 3253 2, 21 3254 [1], 10 3255 [1], 15, [20], 24, 27 3256 13 3257 1, 13, 16, 19 3258 1 3259 1 3260 12, 14, 23 3261 8, 16, 21 3262 4, 6 3264 8, 33 3265 1, 6 3266 9, 20, 21.
ἐτι 3240 14 3252 18 3266 16.
ἐκδώσα 3266 32 3265 12.
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EI沃 cells 3250 16.
EI沃 cells 3247 8, 11 3250 11 3256 8.
EPωστος 3243 7.
EI沃 cells 3241 7 3242 8, 9, 15 3244 16, 21 3246 10 3247 6 3248 3, 13, 14? 3249 16, 17 3250 11, 23, 26, 29 3251 19 3253 11, 18 3256 8 3257 8, 11 16 3260 17 3261 1 3264 34 3265 12 3266 13.
EI沃 cells 3249 13 3250 16 3254 24 3256 11 3264 12.
EI沃 cells 3252 17 3266 11, 15.
EI沃 cells 3242 6, 11, 21 3245 8 3248 5? 3250 29 3251 17, 19, 20 3255 [11], 17 3256 7, 18 3257 7 3264 12 3266 7, 20.
EI沃 cells 3240 15 3247 11 3250 23, 30 3255 13 3257 9 3261 14 3266 10, 17.
EI沃 cells 3243 2, 3.
EI沃 cells 3247 20 3250 7, 10, 11 3251 9.
EI沃 cells 3248 4 3249 16 3249 13, 17 3251 18 3256 5 3257 5 3258 6.
EI沃 cells 3241 20 3256 16.
EI沃 cells 3247 9.
EI沃 cells 3252 18 3266 16.
EI沃 cells 3251 6 3255 21, 22.
EI沃 cells 3241 5.
EI沃 cells 3244 22.
EI沃 cells 3250 5.
EI沃 cells 3241 6.
EI沃 cells 3242 24.
EI沃 cells 3241 7.
EI沃 cells 3259 3261 15 3266 9.
EI沃 cells 3248 12, 15 3261 5.
EI沃 cells 3241 7 3242 7, 9, 10, 13, 17 3243 9, 12, 2 6? 3244 19 3245 14 3246 10 3248 2 3250 20 3251 4 3253 16 3255 9, 9 3256 8, [10] 3257 7, 14 3259 9 3260 7, [21].
EI沃 cells 3264 34.
EI沃 cells 3244 2 3245 4.
EI沃 cells 3245 9.
EI沃 cells 3244 7.
EI沃 cells 3242 2.
EI沃 cells 3245 2.
EI沃 cells 3243 2.
EI沃 cells 3245 12.
EI沃 cells 3241 12.
EI沃 cells 3249 12.
EI沃 cells 3251 8 3264 16.
EI沃 cells 3240 21.
EI沃 cells 3265 11.
EI沃 cells 3250 21.
EI沃 cells 3254 7.
EI沃 cells 3240 16.
EI沃 cells 3241 12, 26 3243 7 3249 15 3251 12 3254 21 3255 8, 23 3257 15 3260 6 3266 15.
EI沃 cells 3240 6, 16 3242 10, 11 3243 11 15 3244 6.
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27 3245 18, 18, 19 3246 2 3247 17 3252 17, 25 3259 8 3262 7 3263 12 3264 35 3266 11.
εδ 3264 34.
εθδσκειν 3244 26 3261 24.
εισφορεῖν 3264 33.
Εὐστήρησιν see Index III s.vv. Caracalla, Severus Alexander.
Εὐτυχῆς see Index III s.vv. Caracalla, Severus Alexander.

εὐχεθα 3253 22.
εὐφραίνει 3245 11, 14.
ἐόν 3241 10 3245 15 3250 12 3255 28 3256 10, 11 3257 19 3260 7, 10, [13], 29 3262 4, 4, 5 3263 7 3265 12 3266 6.
ἐόν [3249 13] 3255 19 3257 12 [3260 18].

ἡ 3244 21 3250 27, 29 3251 20.
ἡγεμόνων see Index IX.
ἡδή [3243 1 11].
ἡμέρα 3243 9 3250 23.
ἡμέρας 3265 9.
ἡμεία [3255 12, 14].
ἡμείων (3242 8, 14, 17) 3250 8 3255 14, 16 3256 12, 17 3262 3.

θεάτρων 3248 6.
θεμιτεῖ 3265 10, 13.
θεωρία see Index VIII.

θησαυρός 3243 10.
θυγάτηρ 3245 26 3246 7, 8 3255 3.

θύρα 3249 12.

ιαστρός see Index IX.

ιδος [3240 16] 3254 19 see also Index IX s.v.

ιδος λόγος.

ἰερὸς see Index VIII.

ἰππάρχος 3250 22.

ἐν 3240 12 3247 15 3265 12.
ἐσσιά 3255 26 3257 19 3260 29.

ἐπιτύχων 3252 21.
ἐχθές 3244 15.

καθήσεως 3255 24 3257 16 [3260 23].

κατοίκος 3265 16 (κατεργασάμενς) 3260 22.

καλακεία 3242 7.

καλεῖν 3255 9 3257 8.

καρπός 3243 7 3254 8, [23] [3255 19] 3257 12 3260 18.
κατά 3240 5, [12] 3242 4 3247 6 3250 23 3255 10 3261 7, 9, 12, 15 3264 9 3266 10, 17.
κατακελεύειν 3247 16.
καταλαμβάνειν 3245 13 3253 5.
καταλογεύων see Index IX.
κατάπλωσς 3250 21.

καταστροφή 3253 3.
κατεστάληκεν 3247 14.
κολλεῖν 3242 4.
κολλεύσεις 3261 7.
κοντινάριον see Index XI(a).
κεραμίου 3247 11, 18, 20, 21.
κέρας see καρμάς.
κεφάλαιον 3266 8, 12, 19.
κεφάλαια 3257 3.
κληραρχήσι 3257 3.
κλίνος see Index VII(e) s.vv. Απολλωνίων κ. Νικιθών κ., Ποκάππαν κ.
κοίλη 3250 29.
κοινον [3265 5].
κοινωνία 3254 10 3255 10.
κοινωνίας 3242 16, 18, 23 3246 10.
κοιμήσεις 3243 1 9.
κράτιστος see Index IX.
κράτειν 3253 14.
κτήμα 3243 12 12.
κτήσιν. [3246 10].
κυβερνήτης see Index X.
κυκλοφορόσι δια 3242 14.
κορείδων 3255 18 3257 12 3260 18.
κόρος (lord) 3243 7 3244 12 3245 1, 18, 19 3246 2 3247 3.
κύρος (valid) 3251 21 3255 24 3257 16 3260 25 3261 19 3266 21.
κώμη 3242 6 3247 5 3252 8 3254 4 3260 7 3264 6.
κωμογραμματεύς see Index IX.

λαμβάνειν 3243 1 5 3247 14 3253 12 3264 11.
λαμπρός 3242 5 3243 1 (3245 4, 5, 11, 11) 3246 9, (9) 3249 10, 10 3254 5, 6 (3255 4, 4) 3256 2, [2] 3257 5, 7 3258 3, 3 3259 5, 6 3260 4, 4 3265 5, 6 3266 2, 4, 4.

λέγων 3240 9 3259 9.

λειτουργεῖν see Index IX.

λειτουργοί see Index IX.

λειτουργία see Index IX.

λίμνη 3255 22 (λίμνος).

λιονοκάλλητις 3254 8, 24 3255 12, 15, 22 3256 9, 10, 13, 16 3257 8 3260 9, 12.

λιονέτερον 3255 17.

λιονταργεῖν see Index IX s.v. λειτουργεῖν. λίφ 3242 20.

λογαριασμὸν 3253 2, 6.

λογικήτης see Index IX.

λόγος 3242 10, 13, 17 3253 10 3262 2, 4, 6 [3265 9] 3266 6 see also Index IX s.v. ἰδόν λόγος.

λοιπογραφεῖν 3243 1 8.
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λουτός 3250 14, 3255 [14], 16 3256 17 3260 13
3264 26.

λουτον 3265 13.

μάλετα 3253 17.
μεθάναιν 3253 17.
μετρός see μικρός.
μέλλων 3261 2.
μέριμνηθέν 3244 20.
μέν 3247 11, 3251 16 3255 12, 21 3264 33.
μετέχει 3243 6 see also Index VII(a) s.v. θεμέλιον
μ. Πολέμιον μ. Πολέμιον μ.
μέτοχι 3242 8, 8, 12, 14, 15, 16, 21 3243 3, 5, 3255 11, 14, [16] 3256 17 3260 11, [13], 19, 21 3261 13 3266 9.
μέσος see Index VII(a) s.v. μέση τοπορχία.
μεττά 3250 20 3256 18.
μεταβάλλος see Index X.
μέταλλον see Index VII(c) s.v. Πορφυρικά καὶ
Κλαυδίαν μετάλλα.
μεταφύ 3253 4 (μεταφύ).
μέτρον see Index XI(a).
μέχρι 3251 11 3252 16 3256 16 (μέχρι)
μή 3250 22 3251 14 3252 18 3260 32 3264 13, 17, 25 3266 16.
μηδέ 3250 22 3264 23, 24.
μηδέκα 3240 13, 14 3244 20 3247 15 3263 7 3264 23, 30.
μήν 3244 16 3250 17 3255 21 3257 14 3263 11
3266 10, 11, 15, 17.
μηνάρχης see Index X.
μήτη 3244 23.
μήτηρ 3244 6, 25 3252 7 3266 3.
μικρός 3253 2, 9, 15.
μικροθέν 3253 7, 15 3256 5, 13 3257 6 3258 6 3259 4 3260 2, 10, 12, 17, 28.
μέλος see 3259 11 3260 7, 20, 26, 29.
μέλος see Index XI(a).
μέλος 3255 7 3256 5 3257 6 3258 6 3259 8
3260 5.

ναάλος 3247 19 3250 9, 14.
ναάλων 3247 11 3250 11, 18.
ναάλων 3250 5.
ναάλης see Index X.
νάκει 3243 (?).
νάκειτος see Index IX.
ναταρία 3249 13.
ναόμος 3248 10.
νάμυσ see Index XI(b).
νάτος 3242 11, 18.
νυκτοπλοῖον see νυκτοπλοῖον.
νυκτοπλοῖον 3250 22.

νῦν 3247 13 3262 5.
νῦν 3249 6.

ξέτης see Index XI(a).
ξυτότας 3265 14.

δύδος 3255 11, 11.
δήν 3245 14.

δίκαιον 3242 14, 17.
δίκως 3266 7.

dίνος 3247 12, 18, 21 3253 12.
dικτύς 3250 11, 14.
dίκαιος 3253 20.
dιοίς 3242 9.

dιοίχως 3244 9.

dιοίκης [3244 34] 3264 28.

dιοικούς 3242 11, 20, 23 3264 16.

dιομολύκιν 3250 12 3251 5 3252 11, 24 [3254 6, 22] 3255 25 3257 17 3260 26 3261 12, 22 3266 6, 22.

διόμητα 3242 9 3264 18, 20, 27.

dροκός 3244 21, [35].

dροκος 3250 16, 18, 24, 28.

dε 3241 9, [20?] 3242 7 3243 9 3245 13 3246 10 3247 8 3250 5, 6, 12, 28 3251 7, 20 3252 15 3253 12 3254 15 3255 11, [15], 16 3256 9, 14, 14 3260 7, 9 3262 2 3264 21.

δεκα 3244 17.

dεκέφ 3242 15 3245 17 3251 10 3253 4, 5 3254 14 3265 17.

dεκτε 3254 16.

οδος 3248 8, 9 3262 4, 4.


οστος 3240 13 3245 14 3247 13, 19, 20 3252 22
3253 7 14 3255 28 3257 19 3261 12, 15, 19 3264 19 3266 9.

οδελεύς 3251 5 3253 8, 10 3255 19 3257 12.

οδ(καλος)? see Index IX.

πάγος see Index VII(a).

πανταγός 3251 22.

πανταδεν 3242 22.

παντοδεν 3250 21.

παράδειξις 3242 2 3245 6 3246 5 3249 5 3250 12, 27 3253 7, 13 3255 6, 24 3256 3 3257 4, 16 3258 5 3260 23 3263 4 3264 3, 11 3265 5 3266, 6, 20.

παράδεικτες 3242 11, (22).

παραδιάλογα 3243 11 3250 26.

παραδόος 3259 57.

παραλαμβάνειν 3250 18, 28.

παραλημπτικός see Index XI(a) s.v. μέτρον para-


none
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παραλημθεῦσε see Index XI(a) s.v. μέτρον παρα-
λημπτεῖν.
παρείνει 3244 7 3250 16 [3245 13].
παρέγειν 3244 22 3250 20 [3255 15] 3256 15
3261 6, 10.
παρεστάναι 3250 15 3252 15.
παρείνει 3243 10 3246 9 3249 10 3250 20, 21 3251
10 3255 17, 17 3256 15, 19, 19 3257 10, 10 3260
[15], 24? 3261 13, 16 3265 8 3266 13, 14, 21.
πεινάει 3253 16?
πέμπτει 3253 4.
πέμπτος 3249 14, [14].
πεντακόσιον 3250 4, 7 3266 8.
πενταυαξίων see Index XII.
πέντε 3251 9, 3257 8.
πεντάκες 3241 7 3264 12.
πετρής 3240 11, 14, 20? 3241 20? 3242 5, 21, 23 3245
25 3247, 4, 5 3252 22 3253 14 3254 15 3255 8
3256 7 3257 7 3258 7 3259 9 3260 7 3264 11, 15,
περγάνεεθαι 3256 12, 18 3260 11.
περαιται see περαιται.
περίχωμα 3255 9 (Πέτω) 3257 7 (Νέπσα). περιτοικίου 3253 3 (περιτοικίου).
πήρει 3245 15.
πίνει 3253 16?
πιπάλεινεν 3254 7, [23].
πλήγμα [3245 16].
πολύς [3241 1] 3242 3 3244 3, 4, 7, 8, 15, (25)
3245 4, 5, 6, 11, 14 3246 9 3249 11 3251 3,
4 3257 5 3258 4, 5 3259 6, 7 3260 5
3263 5 3265 6, 11 3266 4.
πολιτικός see Index IX s.v. διόνυσον καὶ τὰ πολιτικά.
πόκος 3243 11.
ποτάμιος 3250 3.
πράγμα 3240 14.
πραγματεία 3266 7.
πραγματευτὴς see Index X.
πράξει 3251 18 3253 24 3257 15 3260 23 3266 20.
πραξικότης see Index IX.
προανάθη 3261 11.
πρὸ 3240 11.
πρὸζει 3242 9.
προβλήμα 3251 14.
προκάθου 3242 13, 18 [3244 35] 3255 26 (3257
18) 3261 23 3264 21 (3256 18, 20) 3266 12.
προσπαθεῖν see Index XII.
πρὸς 3239 12, [16] 3250 10, 16, 25, 26 3254 11
3255 7, 18 3256 5 3257 6, 11 3258 6 3259 8
3260 5, 17 3262 4 3264 7.
πρόσεταιξεν 3261 9.
προστάσεων 3243 11.
προσεισθέν 3245 [13], 17 3264 21 3265 17.
πρότερον 3247 5 3257 8.
πρότερος 3262 2, 5, 6.
πρωτανεύειν see Index IX.
πρώταναι see Index IX.
πρωτήτητα see Index IX.
πρωτότοκον 3251 7.


cωτοῦ 3253 8, 13.
cεβάζειμος see Index VIII.
cεβασμένος 3263 8.
cεμεύων (3262 7).
cεοππ 3262 1.
cετάρου 3253 20.
cέκφερ 3250 3, 5, 16, 21.
cέγραμα 3255 16 3256 15, 18 3260 15.

cέσανος see Index IX.
cέστάνμα see Index IX.
cέστανμα see Index IX.
cενεργεύς see Index IX.
cενεργής see Index IX.
cενεργὺς see Index IX.
cενεργός see Index IX.
cενεργότης see Index IX.
cενεργοτυποῦ 3241 10.
cενεργοχέοντα 3256 16, 17.
cενεργοποιήθη 3261 18.
cενεργοποιεῖται see Index IX.
cενεργοποιεῖται see Index IX.
cενεργοφονεῖ 3254 11.
cενεργοφόνος 3253 6.
cεὐνοῦ 3242 12 3250 5 3264 5.
cεὐνόγονον 3253 13.
cεὐνοδοκεῖν 3261 16, 18.
cεὐνοθῆ 3243 15.
cεὐνοθήτης see Index IX.

cόλαντον see Index XI(b).
cόλα see Index IX.
cόλα 3251 15.

cέ 3242 16 3243 6, 12, 15 3249 2 3251 6, 19
3255 24 3257 16 3260 23 3264 8 3266 20.
cέλειν 3254 19 3255 12 3257 9 3266 10.
cέλεμα see Index XII.
cέκαρδοντα 3250 12 3262 8.
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τέκκαρες 3255 13.

tέταρτος (3242 8, 9, 15, [16]) 3251 17 3255 [10], 11.

tετρακεχίλιοι 3266 18.

tέχνη 3250 30 [3254 11].

tέρων see Index IX.

tείς 3243 3 3 3253 8, 10, 11.

tιόν 3246 10.

tόνος 3251 18.

tοπαρχία see Index VII(a) s.vv. ἄνω τ., μέση τ.

tόπος 3240 15 3243 15 3250 13 3255 9.

tραύμα 3245 16.

tρείς 3247 9 3257 10.

tρικάσα 3245 11.

tριτός 3241 12, [26] 3260 11, 19, [21].

tροφή 3243 12.

tύχη see Index VIII.

δόρεμα 3242 15.

dιελογύς see Index X.

dύσ 3259 5 3262 1.


ὑπατεία see Index IV (A.D. 312-15); (A.D. 315); (A.D. 318); (A.D. 319); (A.D. 324); (A.D. 326); (A.D. 337).

ὑπατος see Index IV (A.D. 297); (A.D. 323); (A.D. 324).

ὑπέρ 3241 4 3247 8 3252 19 3255 12 3257 9 3260 31 3264 24.

ὑπερπληθεῖς 3251 15 3266 16-17.

ὑπηρετικόν 3243 13.

ὑπηρετήτις see Index IX.

ὑπό 3240 12 3241 5 3242 4 3245 7, 9 3247 10 3252 24 3253 11, 19 3264 8.

ὑπογράφειν 3261 2.

ὑπογραφή 3261 20.

ὑπόλογος 3266 14.

ὑπάρχει 3242 25.

ὑπομετρητίς (3248 8?, 9?).

ὑπομετρητογράφος see Index IX. ὑπεκτάναι 3261 14.

φαίνε 3251 8.

φέρει 3253 3.

φίλος 3253 1.

φωνή 3242 7.

φύσις 3251 6 3255 12, 13, 20, 21 3256 10 3257 9, 14 3260 10.

φωτιά 3247 9.

φωτιστής see Index X.

φυλή see Index IX.


χημών 3250 23.

χέρ 3245 16 3262 4 3266 7.

χειρογραφία 3261 12.

χειρόγραφον (3244 41) 3266 21.

χίλιοι 3247 12 3252 20 3257 10.

χίλια see χίλια.

χιοργραφία see χειρογραφία.

χωρητίς 3244 12.

χωρία 3250 21.

χώρα 3254 21.

χώρα 3243 13 3249 17 3265 9, 13, 14.

χώρος 3242 11, 13 3251 16 3266 17.

χώμα 3246 10 3264 14, [25].

χωματεσποτηλής see Index IX.


ἀκτε 3245 11 3250 8, 11.