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PREFACE

Of the five texts comprised in this volume, the four long classical papyri (nos. 841-4) formed part of a large find of literary fragments from about twenty MSS., which was made on Jan. 13, 1906 in circumstances described in the Times of May 24, 1906 and the Archaeological Report of the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1905-6, p. 10. Of the other literary papyri which were discovered at the same time, the portions of the Hypsipyle of Euripides and of a new commentary upon Thucydides Book II will be published in Part VI, which we hope to issue in the summer of 1908. The vellum fragment of a lost gospel (no. 840) was unearthed in a different mound in December, 1905.

In editing the two most important classical texts, the Pindar (841) and the new historian (842) we have enjoyed for the last time the very great privilege of collaborating with Professor F. Blass, whose tragically sudden death occurred shortly after he had completed the revision of the earlier proofs of those two texts, to the reconstruction of which he had so largely contributed. It is impossible for us adequately to acknowledge the debt which our publications of classical texts during the last eleven years owe to the generous and unstinted assistance of that illustrious scholar, whose brilliance of imagination and depth of learning were never more admirably displayed than in the congenial occupation of restoring, elucidating, and identifying literary papyri. His loss is indeed to us irreparable, and will be felt most keenly when we come to deal with the immense number of fragments from the Greek lyric poets found during the last two seasons, since in that department no less than in that of the Attic orators his pre-eminence was conspicuous.

In the reconstruction and interpretation of the new historian we also owe much to the most valuable help of Professors E. Meyer
and U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, while Professor J. B. Bury has contributed a number of suggestions and criticisms upon both that papyrus and the Pindar. The assistance which we have received from other scholars, particularly Professors E. Schürer and H. Schöne and Mr. E. M. Walker, is acknowledged in connexion with the individual papyri.

In the Appendices we give a list of addenda and corrigenda to Parts III and IV of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, and a list of published papyri recently distributed among various museums and libraries, in continuation of the list in Part IV, pp. 265-71.

The excavations at Oxyrhynchus were at length concluded last winter, the sixth which has been devoted to the exploration of that marvellously productive site; the publication of the vast store of Greek papyri from it will be the work of many years to come. Owing to lack of funds the Graeco-Roman Branch is unable to conduct excavations during the coming season, but we hope to resume our work in Egypt in the winter of 1908-9, when we look forward to breaking fresh ground.

BERNARD P. GRENFELL.
ARTHUR S. HUNT.

Queen's College, Oxford,
October, 1907.
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NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION

The same general method is followed in this volume as in its predecessors. The three new literary texts are printed in dual form, a reconstruction in modern style in the case of 840 following, in that of 841 and 842 facing, a literal transcript. In the two texts of extant authors, 843 and 844, the originals are reproduced except for division of words, addition of capital initials to proper names, and supplements of lacunae. Additions or corrections by the same hand as the body of the text are in small thin type, those by a different hand in thick type. Square brackets [ ] indicate a lacuna, round brackets ( ) the resolution of an abbreviation or contraction, angular brackets ⟨⟩ a mistaken omission in the original or a correction made by us; double square brackets [ ][ ] mean that the letters within them have been deleted in the original, braces { } that the letters so enclosed, though actually written, should be omitted. Dots placed within brackets represent the approximate number of letters lost or deleted; dots outside brackets indicate mutilated or otherwise illegible letters. Letters with dots under them are to be considered doubtful. Heavy Arabic numerals refer to the texts of the Oxyrhynchus papyri published in this volume and in Parts I–IV; ordinary numerals to lines; small Roman numerals to columns.
I. THEOLOGICAL

840. FRAGMENT OF AN UNCANONICAL GOSPEL.

8·8 x 7·4 cm. Plate I (verso).

This fragment consists of a single vellum leaf, practically complete except at one of the lower corners, and here most of the lacunae admit of a satisfactory restoration. The book to which the leaf belonged was of remarkably modest dimensions, but though the written surface only slightly exceeds two inches square the scribe has succeeded in compressing forty-five lines into the two pages. He used a small and not very regular uncial hand, round and upright, of a type pointing, we think, to a fourth rather than a fifth century date. A later date than the fifth century, to which most of the papyri found with 840 belonged, is out of the question. A peculiarity is the employment of red ink to outline and bring into greater prominence the dots of punctuation (in the middle position), initial letters of sentences, strokes of abbreviation, and even accents, of which two examples occur (ll. 23 and 36). Longer pauses are marked not only by dots but also by short blank spaces, and the following letter, besides being sometimes ornamented with red, is rather enlarged. Of the abbreviations usual in theological MSS. ἀνέσ (ἀνθρωπός), ἄν (Ἄνωθεν), and ἰώ (ἰω) are found. ι at the end of a line, in order to save space, is sometimes written as a horizontal stroke above the preceding vowel; and there is one apparent instance (l. 9) of the use of the common angular sign to complete a line shorter than its neighbours. In three cases words originally omitted have been supplied, all these interlineations most probably being by the original hand. The scribe apparently was particularly liable to omission, and in one or two other places supplements seem to be required; cf. l. 1 and notes on ll. 3–7 and 40.

The bulk of the fragment is concerned with a conversation between Jesus and a chief priest, which takes place in the Temple at Jerusalem, the episode,
which is of a dramatic character, being preserved almost complete. It is preceded by the conclusion of a speech of Jesus to His disciples, exhorting them to avoid the example of certain wrong-doers and warning them of the penalties which await the latter both in this world and the next (ll. 1–7). What particular class is referred to by the word ἀντοῦς in l. 3 is not clear. Jesus, who throughout the fragment is called simply ὁ σωτὴρ, then takes His disciples with Him inside the Temple to the ἀγνευτήριον, by which term the author of the gospel perhaps meant the 'court of the men of Israel', though how far this use of it is legitimate is doubtful (ll. 7–9; cf. l. 8, note). They are there met by a chief priest who is also a Pharisee, but whose name is quite uncertain (l. 10, note). The chief priest reproaches them for having neglected to perform the necessary ceremonies of ablation and change of garments before entering the holy place and looking upon the sacred vessels (ll. 12–21). A short dialogue ensues in which Jesus asks the chief priest if he is pure, and the latter answers recounting the different purificatory rites which he had himself observed (ll. 21–30). To this Jesus delivers an eloquent and crushing reply contrasting outward with inward purity, the external bathing prescribed by Jewish ritual with the inward cleansing which He and His followers had received in the waters of eternal life (ll. 30–45). Before the conclusion of the speech is reached the fragment breaks off.

In its general outline the episode described resembles Matt. xv. 1–20, Mark vii. 1–23, though the scene is there not Jerusalem but near Gennesaret, and the other details are of course different. The contrast between outward religious observance and inward purity was one of the most salient points in Christ's teaching, and is illustrated not only by the canonical gospels but by other uncanonical utterances ascribed to our Lord, e.g. the two series of Sayings of Jesus (1. 5–11 ἔδω μὴ νηστεύσητε κ.τ.λ., 654. 32 sqq. [ἐγείρεσσε τὰς κατὰ αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ.]). Even more clearly than 655, 840 belongs to a narrative covering the same ground as the canonical gospels. That this was composed with a view to advocating the tenets of a particular sect is not indicated by anything in our fragment; for though ll. 41–4 when separated from their context might conceivably be adduced as an argument for denying the necessity of the use of water at baptism, βαπτίζων is not there used in its technical Christian sense (cf. l. 15, note), and in other respects the fragment is quite orthodox. A possible point of connexion with the Gnostics may be found in the noticeable fact that our Lord is called not Ἰησοῦς or ὁ κύριος but ὁ σωτὴρ, a title which Irenaeus (I. 3) reproaches the Valentinian Ptolemaeus for using to the exclusion of κύριος; cf. Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, i. p. 124. But the use of σωτὴρ or salvator simply to designate Jesus is of course common in other early Christian writers, and though its employment indicates that this gospel belongs to a later stage of development than the canonical gospels,
in which it only occurs in Luke ii. 11 ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σωτήρ, ὅς ἦστιν Χριστὸς κύριος and John iv. 42 ὅθεν ὃτι οὗτος ἦστιν ὁ σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου, this is not sufficient to establish a Gnostic origin for the fragment. It is, however, enough to exclude the likelihood that 840 comes from either the gospel according to the Hebrews or that according to the Egyptians. For though σωτήρ is used in introducing quotations from those gospels by Origen (In Ioan., ii. 6 τὸ καθ' ἔξωθεν εὐαγγέλιον ἐνθα αὐτῶς ὁ σωτήρ φησιν' ἀρτι ἔλαβε μὲ κ.τ.λ.) and Epiphanius (Haer. 62. 2) ἐν αὐτῷ (sc. the gospel according to the Egyptians) γὰρ πολλὰ τοιάτα ὡς ἐν παραβάσεις μυστηριῶδες ἐκ προσώπων τοῦ σωτήρος ἀναφέρεται ὡς αὐτῶν ὄντων τοῖς μάθηταις κ.τ.λ., the evidence of the extant quotations themselves indicates that κύριος was the title commonly employed, as in the Gospel of Peter. In the absence of any definite resemblances between 840 and the scanty remains of the various uncanonical gospels composed in the second or third century, the fragment is best classed as belonging to a gospel distinct from any of them. The chief point of interest in it lies in the references to Jewish ceremonies of purification in connexion with the Temple-worship, about which the author at first sight shows an intimate knowledge. On some points the statements in the fragment find support in the extant authorities for the Temple-ritual at the time of Christ. Thus Josephus states that no Jew who was unclean had the right to be admitted to the inner court of the Temple, i.e. that known as the 'court of the men of Israel' (cf. l. 8, note), and the statement put into the mouth of the chief priest concerning the necessity of ceremonial washing and putting on white garments is in accordance with the regulations for priests described in the Mishnah (cf. ll. 25 and 27, notes). But that an ordinary Jew before visiting the inner court of the Temple had to wash and change his clothes as stated in ll. 18-20 is not confirmed by any other evidence; and neither the term ἁρυντήριον in l. 8 nor the λίμνη τοῦ Δανείδ in l. 25 are mentioned elsewhere, while considerable difficulty arises in connexion with the 'sacred vessels' which are stated to have been visible from the court to which Jesus and His disciples had penetrated; cf. ll. 12-21, note. Moreover the two stairways leading down to the 'pool of David' and still more the statement that dogs and swine were cast into it (ll. 33-4) seem to be details invented for the sake of rhetorical effect, for that a high priest washed himself in a pool of the character described in the fragment is incredible. So great indeed are the divergences between this account and the extant and no doubt well informed authorities with regard to the topography and ritual of the Temple that it is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that much of the local colour is due to the imagination of the author, who was aiming chiefly at dramatic effect, and was not really well acquainted with the Temple. But if the inaccuracy of the fragment in this important respect is admitted, the historical
character of the whole episode breaks down, and it is probably to be regarded as an apocryphal elaboration of Matt. xv. 1-20 and Mark vii. 1-23. In these circumstances the gospel to which the fragment belongs can hardly have been composed before the middle of the second century. The use of the term σωτήρ and the fact that the manuscript itself was written in the fourth or possibly even the fifth century may be represented as arguments for a third century date, but that seems to us improbable. After the four canonical gospels had come to be exclusively used in most churches, a process which was complete by the end of the second century (Harnack, Gesch. d. altchr. Lit. ii. p. 699), no new gospel covering the same ground could look for more than a very limited acceptance, and after about A.D. 180 authors of apocryphal gospels generally avoided competition with the canonical gospels by placing their supposed revelations in the period of the Childhood or after the Resurrection. Moreover, if the author of 840 wrote in the third century, we should expect him to betray a definitely heretical point of view, which, as we have said, is not discernible in the fragment. That it is Egyptian in origin is very likely, but it stands much nearer to the gospel according to the Egyptians which was composed in the second century, probably before the middle of it, than e.g. to the Pistis Sophia which was written in the third. The literary quality also of the fragment does not favour a very late date; the style is more ambitious than that of the canonical gospels, and the rhetorical tendency of the composer, who uses a number of words not found in the New Testament, is somewhat pronounced, but he is more successful in catching something of the genuine ring than many of the authors of apocryphal gospels. Hence we prefer to regard the work to which 840 belongs as composed before A.D. 200. While the story of the dialogue between Christ and the chief priest has no claim to be accepted as authentic, and is probably a secondary or even tertiary production, the fragment is an interesting and valuable addition to the scanty remnant of the numerous uncannonal traditions concerning Christ's teaching which were current in many Christian communities, especially in Egypt, during the third and fourth centuries.

We are indebted to Prof. E. Schürer for several suggestions in the interpretation of this fragment.

Verso.

προτερονπροοδικησαιπαντασοφι
ζεταιαλλαπροεκελειποσκαι
υμεσαμοιααυτουπαθεουγαρ
εντοιςοισιοισισαπολμβαχνου
3 σινοκακουργοιτωναίτων-αλλαζ[.]αι
cολασινύπομενουσινκαιπολ[.]ην
βασανον· Καιπαραλαβοντουσ
εισηγαγενειαυτουσαγνευτηριομας
περιπατειντωιρο-καιπροσε[.]δ)
10 θωφαρασαιοισαρχιερευσ[. . ]
tοονομασυνετυχεύναιτουσκαι[. . ] [
tωσωρί-τισεπερεψευνοισαι[. . . .
tουτοναγνευτηριονκαιδειμ[. . . .

tε
tαταγιασκευήμηλουσα[.]εμ[ .]μ[ .]
μην
15 τετωμαθητωνσωστου[. . . .
πτισθευτων-αλλαμεμολυ[. . . .
επατησαστυκτοίρεουτ[. . . .
tακαθαρον·ονομεισαι[. . . .
λουσαμενοσκαιαλλα[. . . .
20 ματαπατει·ουδεσ[. . . . .
ταταγιασκευή·καισ[. . . .
. [. .]οισμαθηται[

Recto.

συμμενταυθαώνεντοερο-καθα
eκκυνο
ρενεισ-λεγειαυτωκαθαρευο-ελουσα
25 μηναρευτηλημνουτοδί-καιδιετε
ρασκλειμακοσκατελθωνδιετερασ
α[.]ηλθον·καιλευκαευνυματαινε
δυσαμη-καικαθαρακατουτηλθο
καιπροσεβλεψατουτοισισαγιοισ
30 σκευεσιν· Ο-σωφροσαυτουναπο
[. . .]θειονεπεν·οναυτυφλοιμηρω
τ[.]συνελουσουτουτουσχεομενοισ
η[.]σινενοσκυνεσκαιχοιροιβεβλην
[. . .]υντοσκαιμερασ·καινψαμε
πρότερον πρὸ (τοῦ) ἀδικήσαι πάντα σοφί·
ζεταί. ἀλλὰ προσέχετε μὴ ποις καὶ
ὑμεῖς τὰ ὅμως αὐτοῖς πάθητε· οὐ γὰρ
ἐν τοῖς ὄνωσ μόνως ἀπολαμβάνου-
5 σιν οἱ κακοῦργου τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ [κ]αὶ
κόλασιν ὑπομένουσιν καὶ πολ[λ]ήν
βάσανον. καὶ παραλαβών αὐτοὺς
εἰσήγαγεν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγνευτήριον καὶ
περιπάτησεν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ. καὶ προσ[λ].
10 θῶν Φαρισαίῳς τις ἁρχιερεὺς Λευ[είς ?]
tὸ ὅνομα συνέτυχεν αὐτοῖς καὶ ι.[ἰπεν] tὸ σωτηρίας, τίς ἐπέτρεψεν σοι πατ[εόν
tοῦτο τὸ ἀγνευτὴριον καὶ ἴδειν [ταύ-
tα τὰ ἀγαία σκέψῃ μήτε λουσα[μ]ένον[φ] μὴ-
15 τε μὴν τῶν μαθητῶν σου τοὺς π[όδας βα-
πτισθέντων; ἀλλὰ μεμολύμμενος
ἐπάτησεν τούτο τὸ ἱερὸν τ[όπον ὄν-
tα καθαρών, ὃν ὦδεις ἀ[λλος εἰ μὴ
λοισάμενος καὶ ἀλλάξας τὰ ἐνδο-
20 ματα πατεῖ, οὐδὲ ὄραν τολμᾶ ταύτα
tὰ ἀγαία σκέψη. καὶ σύνες εὐθεῖα ὁ σω[τῆς)
ς[ῶν τ]οῖς μαθηταῖς ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ,
... before he does wrong makes all manner of subtle excuse. But give heed lest ye also suffer the same things as they; for the evil-doers among men receive their reward not among the living only, but also await punishment and much torment. And he took them and brought them into the very place of purification, and was walking in the temple. And a certain Pharisee, a chief priest, whose name was Levi, met them and said to the Saviour, Who gave thee leave to walk in this place of purification and to see these holy vessels, when thou hast not washed nor yet have thy disciples bathed their feet? But defiled thou hast walked in this temple, which is a pure place, wherein no other man walks except he has washed himself and changed his garments, neither does he venture to see these holy vessels. And the Saviour straightway stood still with his disciples and answered him, Art thou then, being here in the temple, clean? He saith unto him, I am clean; for I washed in the pool of David, and having descended by one staircase I ascended by another, and I put on white and clean garments, and then I came and looked upon these holy vessels. The Saviour answered and said unto him, Woe ye blind, who see not. Thou hast washed in these running waters wherein dogs
and swine have been cast night and day, and hast cleansed and wiped the outside skin which also the harlots and flute-girls anoint and wash and wipe and beautify for the lust of men; but within they are full of scorpions and all wickedness. But I and my disciples, who thou sayest have not bathed, have been dipped in the waters of eternal life which come from . . . But woe unto the . . .

3–7. This sentence is very obscurely worded, and perhaps corrupt. The contrast is, we think, between punishment in this life and in the world to come; hence we prefer ζώοι ‘living’ to ζώος ‘animals’. The use of ζώος, a poetical word employed also by Xenophon, is curious, but ἐν τοῖς ζώοις seems to yield no sense. The absence of an object for ἀπολαμβάνωσιν (e.g. τῶν μισθῶν) is awkward, even if one could be supplied from the sentence preceding i. 1; and after ἀλλὰ καί a phrase to balance ἐν τοῖς ζώοις would be expected. Possibly some words have dropped out; the scribe seems to have been rather prone to omission. For κόλασις in reference to the next world cf. Matt. xxv. 46 ἀπελεύσσοντι οὖν εἰς κόλασιν αἰῶνον: βάπτισμος is not so used in the N.T., though cf. Matt. xviii. 34. ὑπομνοῦσιν may be future, but the present tense makes a better contrast to ἀπολαμβάνωσιν.

8. ἀγνευτήρων: this term is not found elsewhere in connexion with the Temple, and what the author of this gospel exactly meant by it is not clear. The context shows that it was within the inner enclosure, and ll. 12–3, where παρ[κόσ] τοῦτο τὸ ἀγνευτήρων corresponds to περαπατεῖ ἐν ἱρᾳ, suggest that it was a large open court rather than a particular room, especially as the term ἀγνευτήρων is not a suitable description for any of the known rooms in Herod’s Temple. The ‘Chamber of Washers’ (Middoth v. 4) was employed for cleansing the inwards of the offerings, not for ceremonial ablutions. If ἀγνευτήρων implies a place where rites of purification were performed, the only part of the Temple to which the name would be at all appropriate is the space round the brazen laver, which stood between the Temple-porch and the altar, having succeeded to the ‘molten sea’ of Solomon’s Temple (cf. l. 25, note). But this is not likely to be the meaning of ἀγνευτήρων, for the brazen laver was in the court of the priests, which could not be entered by lay Israelites except for purposes of sacrifice (Kelim, i. 8 quoted in Schürer, Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes, ii. p. 273), and other indications in the papyri (cf. ll. 12–21, note) besides the general probabilities of the case suggest that Jesus and His disciples had not penetrated further than the ‘court of the men of Israel’, which was outside the priests’ court. If ἀγνευτήρων is legitimately used of the ‘court of the men of Israel’, the term seems to be applied to it not because it was a place where purification was performed but because it could only be entered by Israelites who were perfectly pure; cf. Josephus, Bell. Jud. v. 5 ἀνδρῶν δ’ οἱ μὴ καθάπαν ἁγνευτήρας εἴροντο τὴν ἐνδον ἀλής καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν πάλιν οἱ μὴ καθαρίσσετες εἴροντο, and Contra Apion. ii. 8 in terris (sc. porticis) masculi Judaorum mundi existentes alque purificati (sc. ingredientur). But it may be doubted whether the author of this gospel had any clear conception of the topography of the Temple, and the employment of the term ἀγνευτήρων may be a mere error; cf. introd.

10. Φαραώδης τις ἀρχιερεῖς: by ἀρχιερεῖς in the N.T. and Josephus are meant primarily the high priest actually in office and his predecessors, but also secondly members of the families from which the high priests were drawn; cf. Schürer, op. cit. ii. pp. 221–4. There is therefore no necessity for this person to have been the high priest in office at the moment. Most of the high priests were Sadducees, and hence are often in the N.T. contrasted with the Pharisees, but instances of high priests who were Pharisees occur; cf. Schürer, op. cit. ii. p 201. The combination Φαραώδης τις ἀρχιερεῖς is therefore quite legitimate, and such a person is particularly appropriate as the champion of external purity; cf. ll. 24–30.

Λα[τιν]: the reading is extremely doubtful, but neither ἀντ ὡς nor Καὶ ἀφίμα is admissible. The first two letters, if not λα, seem to be κα, and the third, if not ν, to be υ or κ.
12-21. From this speech of the Pharisee it appears firstly that entrance to that part of the Temple to which Jesus and His disciples had penetrated was permitted only to those who had either bathed (l. 19 λουσόμενος; cf. l. 24) or at any rate had washed their feet, and had put on fresh clothes, secondly that from this part of the Temple the holy vessels were visible. The principal holy vessels, e.g. the table of shewbread and the seven-branched candlestick, stood in the ἱερόν or larger room of the sanctuary; but this was only entered by the officiating priests, and the writer of this gospel is not likely to have been so ignorant of the facts concerning the Temple-service as to suppose that Jesus and His disciples could have wished to enter the sanctuary, much less that they could have succeeded in doing so without opposition from the Temple guards and with no stronger remonstrance from the high priest than that related here. Other sacred vessels were kept in the small chambers (38 in number), which surrounded the sanctuary on all sides except that of the porch; cf. Middoth iv. These chambers were apparently entered from the inside of the building, so that in order to reach them it would be necessary to pass through the Temple-porch, and their contents can hardly have been visible from the priests’ court which immediately surrounded the Temple-building, much less from the court of the men of Israel which was outside the court of the priests. Since the court of the priests was only accessible to lay Israelites for the purpose of sacrificing at the great altar, it is almost as difficult to suppose that Jesus and His disciples penetrated to these chambers as that they entered the sanctuary. The nature of the remonstrance addressed to them by the chief priest, who reproaches them not with being laymen but with being unclean, suggests that the scene of the conversation is the court of the men of Israel, which, as Josephus says, could only be entered by the mundi aūtē purificati or καθάπαν ἑρευνάτες (cf. l. 8, note). Hence if ἀμα σκέπη implies more than the bronze laver, and the rings, tables, and other accessories of the sacrifices, all of which objects, being outside the Temple-building, would be visible from the court of the men of Israel, the author of this gospel has fallen into a somewhat serious error. Moreover, the statement in l. 18-20 that bathing and changing of clothes were required from ordinary Israelites when visiting the Temple is not confirmed by anything in the authorities, which record the observance of these formalities only in the case of the officiating priests; cf. ll. 25 and 27, notes. Josephus’ reference to καθάπαν ἑρευνάτες probably means merely persons who were Levitically pure, and does not imply the performance of special rites of purification. Schürer, therefore, seems to be right in supposing that the author of the gospel has by mistake referred to laymen the regulations applicable only to priests.

15. βαπτισθέντων: βαπτίζειν is used here and in l. 42 not in the ordinary technical sense of baptizing, but with reference to ceremonial ablation, as in Luke xi. 38 ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης ἱδὼν ἐθάμασεν ὅτι οὐ πρότειν ἔπαισθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου, and perhaps in Mark vii. 4 ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωσαι οὐκ εἴδοσιν, where the reading is doubtful; cf. also Sir. xxxi. 25 βαπτίζειμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ.

20. ὀ πάν: α may be read in place of α.

25. τῇ λίμνῃ τοῦ Δ(αιν)δ: ‘the pool of David’ is not mentioned elsewhere, and it is not clear what the author of the gospel meant by it, or where it was situated. Schürer thinks that it refers to the ‘brazen’ or ‘molten sea’ set up by Solomon between the porch and the altar (1 Kings vii. 23, 2 Chron. iv. 2). This was a large laver supported by 12 brazen oxen, and containing according to 1 Kings 2000, according to 2 Chron. 3000, baths of water. It was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxv. 13, 16, Jer. lii. 17, 20), and though if Sir. l. 3 may be trusted the second Temple also had its brazen sea, Herod’s Temple did not possess one. In its place there was firstly a bronze laver between the porch and altar (Middoth iii. 6, &c.; cf. Schürer, op. cit. ii. p. 283) in which the officiating priests had to wash their hands and feet, and secondly a room fitted up with baths for daily use by
the officiating priests before entering on their duties; cf. Testam. XII Patriarch., Levi 9 καὶ πρὸ τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸ ἕγα λοίχον, and the authorities from the Mishnah cited by Schürer, l. c. This room, which is called in Middoth i. 9 ‘the house of baptism’, was reached by a passage from the Temple-building, and was clearly outside the Temple-enclosure. That the author of the gospel had in his mind the ‘brazen sea’ seems to us improbable, since the λίμνη is called after David, not Solomon, and while the brazen sea stood close to the Temple-building itself, the λίμνη which had two χλώμακες leading down to it (l. 25-6) and into which dogs and swine are cast (l. 33) is evidently conceived of as being outside the Temple (presumably in the valley below), and thus fulfilling the functions ascribed in the Mishnah to the ‘house of baptism’. Whether a pool called after David really existed is however very doubtful, for the details concerning it are more picturesque than convincing. The subtle distinction of the different stairways for the use of the clean and unclean, though plausible in itself, is, in the absence of corroboration, more likely to be due to the imagination of the author of the gospel than to have a historical basis, and the casting of dogs and swine into the pool looks like a rhetorical exaggeration; cf. note ad loc.

27. λευκὰ ἐνόματα: on this detail, that the officiating priests put on special garments, white in colour, the author of the gospel is correct (cf. Schürer, op. cit. pp. 281-2), as he is with regard to the necessity for their taking a daily bath before entering on their religious duties; cf. l. 25, note, and introd.

31. οὖν, τυφλοὶ: the dative is more common after οὖν, as in l. 45; but cf. Luke vi, 25 οὖν, οἱ γελῶσετε νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε, where there is an ellipse of ὑμῖν, and Rev. xviii. 16 οὖν οὗτος ἡ πίλη ή μεγάλη.

33. χώρας: that swine were not uncommon in Palestine at the time of Christ is proved by Matt. vii. 61, viii. 30, and Luke xv. 15. The reference to the dogs and swine is introduced to heighten the effect of the contrast with the waters of life in l. 43-4. The author of the gospel may well have had in his mind the stagnant pools which are a common feature of Egyptian villages, but the description is incredible when applied to a pool in which a chief priest bathed, and as a piece of rhetoric somewhat overshoots the mark; for the real point of the contrast between the two kinds of purification is not that the water was in the one case unclean, but that it only cleansed the outward skin, whereas the other form of purification was spiritual.

36. οἱ πόριμοι καὶ ἀἰτήτριβοι: cf. for this collocation τρεῖς γὰρ δοῦλοι περιέχει τὸν μὲν καταφαγόντα τὸν ὑποβάζοντα πορίμων καὶ αὐλητρίδων in the Ἑβραϊκὸς χαρακτήρας εὐαγγέλιον quoted by Eusebius in his Histories (Resch, Agaphra, p. 388).


40. πεπλῆφται: it would be possible to retain πεπλῆφται by reading ἐκῶν in place of ἐκείνων, but such a use of the neuter plural is unlikely.

42. βεβαίωσαν τισθενα: or βεβαίον τισθενα; but cf. ll. 15-6 βα πτισθενων.

43. βεβαίος μεθα: α, δ, or λ could be read in place of the doubtful μ, but not σ or ν, so that λαούμεθα and βεβαίωσαν μεθα (which is also too long) are excluded, and βεβαίος μεθα is practically certain. Βις τεινων is a less technical word than βαπτίζων, but there is, we think, no real distinction intended between the two terms here, since βαπτίζων is not employed in its technical sense; cf. l. 15, note.

43-4. ὑστέρος: or ἐκ ὑστέρος, with another word in place of ᾨών. The letter before εἰσελθεῖν may be τ or ν instead of σ, so that καὶ ἐκθείον is possible. ὑστέρος ὑστέρον occurs in John iv. 10, 11, vii. 38, ὑστέρος ὑστέρος in Rev. vii. 17, xxii. 6, xxii. 1 and 17. ἀπάθη, if correct, was no doubt followed by some words like τῶν οἰκραῶν οἳ τοῦ πατρὸς.
II. NEW CLASSICAL TEXTS

841. Pindar, Paeans.

Height 18 cm. Plates I–III (A Cols. iv, v, xxi, Frs. 82 and 128).

It is a somewhat remarkable circumstance that though several Pindaric fragments have been found at Oxyrhynchus (408, 426 (?), and 659 besides 841), none of them has contained any part of the Epinician poems. Eustathius tells us (Opusc. p. 60. 22) that that section of the poet’s works was the most popular as being fuller of human interest, less concerned with myth and less obscure in expression,—οι καὶ περιάγοντα μᾶλστα διὰ τὸ ἀνθρωποκότερον εἶναι καὶ ὁλιγόμεθον, καὶ μηδὲ πάντων ἔχειν ἀσαφῶς κατὰ γε τὰ ἄλλα: but this, so far as the evidence goes, hardly seems to have been the general verdict in Egypt during the Roman period. Recent discoveries moreover happily enable us to form our own opinion as to the character of some of the other categories. 659 provided for the first time a specimen of the Παρθένεια; and now the following much longer and more valuable text presents the material for an adequate estimate of the important class of Παιάνες.

The paean, which is a very ancient form of poetry, was a hymn originally sung in honour of Apollo or Artemis, whether in thanksgiving to, or propitiation of, the deity. Both of these motives appear in Homer; the Achaeans are to return to their ships singing a paean of victory (X 391), and try to divert the wrath of Apollo with a paean at a sacrificial feast (A 472-3). In later times paecans were dedicated to other gods than Apollo; Xenophon, for instance, speaks of a paean to Poseidon (Hell. iv. 7. 4); cf. Proclus, Chrest. ap. Photius, Bibli. 239 ὅ ὀ ἅριν ἔστιν ἄδος ἄδος εἰς πάσας τῶν γραφόμενων θεοῦς, τὸ ὄ ὀ παλαιῶν οἶνος ἀπενέμησε τῷ ’Απόλλωνι καὶ τῇ ’Αρτέμιδι, ἐπὶ καταστάσει λοιμῶν καὶ τόσων ἄκομοι· κατα-χρηστικῶς ὃ καὶ τὰ προσόδια τινὲς παίνας λέγουσιν. The sound of ἵππ was especially characteristic of the paean; Athenaeus, xv. pp. 696 e, f (cf. 701 b, c), calls ἵππαδόν the παίανων ἐπίρρημα or ἐπίφθεγμα, a description which the papyrus well illustrates; cf. also 660.

The Paeans were comprised in one of the seventeen books attributed to Pindar by the Cod. Ambrosianus and Suidas. To that book, apart from single
words, only two small fragments (52 and 61) could hitherto be certainly referred; a few others, now seen to belong to it, had been wrongly assigned to other categories. Of the Paeans of Simonides there are but a line and a half; of those of Bacchylides, previously represented by a couple of fragments, two specimens have lately reappeared in the British Museum papyrus. By a similar stroke of good fortune the lost book of the Paeans of Pindar is now partially recovered through the present MS., which, next to that of Bacchylides, is the largest extant papyrus of a lyric poet. The identification admits of not the smallest doubt. That the bulk at any rate of the poems are to be classed as paeans is obvious; and not only do they bear unmistakably the Pindaric stamp, but their authorship is conclusively established by several coincidences with already known citations as well as by references to Pindar in the scholia which accompany the main text.

The remains of this admirable manuscript, in elaborateness rivalling the Paris Alcman papyrus, were unearthed in deplorable condition; they consisted of some 380 fragments, none of which contained two complete consecutive columns, while the great majority were quite small. The process of fitting together has largely reduced the total, but many scraps remain unplaced in spite of repeated efforts; some of them no doubt will eventually be assigned by future revisions to their proper position, though it does not seem probable that there is much to be done in this direction. The task of combination has been greatly assisted by the fact that the literary text was written upon the verso of a cursive document; frequently a connexion, which otherwise would have remained a matter of conjecture, has been definitely established or excluded by the evidence on the other side of the papyrus. As now reconstructed the MS. falls into four principal sections. In A, which constitutes the bulk of what survives, as many as thirty-five consecutive columns containing parts of seven odes can be accounted for, though with large gaps and imperfections. The recto contains an elaborate list of persons, written probably in the latter part of the first century, with details as to parentage, age, and other personal characteristics. As often, the papyrus was cut horizontally before being re-used; it has also sometimes been divided vertically and rejoined, and strengthening strips have been glued on in places. Under B, where the hands on either side are the same as in A, are included several fragments which are distinguished by their dirty and decayed condition. There are remains of three columns which may be consecutive, but whether they belong to a single poem or form part of the last ode (VII) of A is doubtful; cf. the commentary ad loc. It is even uncertain whether B precedes or follows A. In C the cursive recto is the same as in A and B, but the text of the Pindar is in a new hand, which continues through D; the two groups, each including one practically complete column, are marked off from each other by
the presence of a different document, part of a land-survey list, on the recto of D, while the recto of C is the same as in A and B. Two isolated fragments: 26-7, where the text on the verso was written by the scribe of A-B, also have a different cursive, perhaps the same as in D, on the recto. The changes of hand in the verso and recto respectively make the order A-B, C, D the natural one; but it is not impossible that D preceded C or that C-D preceded A-B, for the case of Frs. 26-7 indicates that the recto of the roll as made up to receive the literary text on the verso was of a somewhat heterogeneous character. There is some internal as well as external evidence for distinguishing C-D from A-B, since it is doubtful whether the poems represented in C-D are also to be regarded as paeans; this question will be considered later (p. 23).

The text of the Pindar is written in short columns of fifteen or sixteen lines which occupy about 11.5 cm. in depth, a wide margin being left between the columns for the reception of scholia, and the lines placed rather wide apart, perhaps with a view to interlinear additions; the distance from the commencement of one column to that of the next is from 14 to 15 cm. The occurrence of the figure 900 opposite II. 25 proves that some 866 lines or fifty-seven columns had preceded the ten verses which survive of Paean I. On the assumption that a literary roll did not ordinarily exceed thirty feet in length, this MS. of Pindar’s Paeans would have consisted of more rolls than one. As already stated the text is the work of two scribes; in A-B the hand is a good-sized uncial, round and upright, but irregular and rather heavy. There is a noticeable variation in the size of the writing at different points; and cursive forms have occasionally intruded themselves at the end of a verse. On its own evidence this hand might be assigned with probability to the earlier decades of the second century, a date strongly indicated (1) by the document on the recto, which was written after the end of the reign of Titus (who is called ðeōs) but perhaps before the close of the first century, and (2) by the cursive scholia, which we think are not later than the middle of the second century and are likely to be for the most part practically contemporary with the main text. The scribe of C-D was the master of a much more practised and ornamental handwriting. This also is of the round upright type, but the letters are smaller and lighter, though firm and carefully finished (cf. Plate III). A noticeable feature, found also in some other well-written literary papyri, is the apices or little hooks with which the extremities of strokes are in many cases provided. A cursive ε occurs at the end of a line in Paean IX. 38.

Breathings, accents, marks of quantity and elision, and diaereses have been pretty freely supplied throughout, but accents are rather more common in C-D. Breathings are of the square shape. The system of accentuation shows a general
resemblance to that found e.g. in the Bacchylides papyrus and 223. In diphthongs, as usual, an acute accent falls on the first of the two vowels, while a circumflex generally covers both; a grave accent is placed by the scribe of A–B on the second vowel (III. 12, VI. 130), by the scribe of C–D in two instances on the second (Fr. 82. 25 τελείς, IX. 39 ανατιθεῖς), in one (IX. 39 μισσαίνως) on the first. Unaccented syllables often bear a grave accent, usually one or more of those preceding the accented syllable (e.g. I. 8 φιληστέφανων, V. 38 φερεμύλους), but a following syllable is similarly treated in Fr. 82. 21 ολοκληρ, IX. 42 ἐτέκε. The article ὁ is written ο in I. 5. Oxytone disyllables as a rule only have a grave accent on the first syllable (IV. 51 νόμον, VI. 14 τρώφων, &c.; an exception is θαμᾶ Fr. 20. 27), and a similar method is sometimes followed in polysyllabic words, e.g. VI. 16 θαμών, IV. 12 ογκύλεα for ϊγκύλεα. Syllables preceding enclitics are accented (IV. 27 ἀντιτός εμν, &c.) even in the case of paroxytones, e.g. V. 44 ἐνιά με, VI. 87 ὄνα ἀτ. Instances of mistaken accentuation are II. 98 θωμᾶ for θωμᾶ or θώμα, IV. 28 Μελάμπος for Μέλαμπος, IV. 36 ὅ for ὁς, 37 ἐκατόν for ἐκατόν (or ἐκατών), similarly IX. 39 ανατιθεῖς for ανατιθεῖς, and Fr. 82. 25 τελείς for τελεῖς. Punctuation is commonly effected by means of a high dot, which is freely supplied. At the ends of lines it is placed some little distance away at a level varying between the middle and top of the letters. The exact height is apparently immaterial, and therefore has been disregarded in our transcript; e.g. in IV. 34 the stop after καταβαλὼν is opposite the middle of ν, in 70 after προπάροιθεν it is at the top, the length of the pause being exactly the same in the two cases. Stops occurring in the course of lines are placed, as in the Bacchylides papyrus, well above the letters; but there is one genuine case of a dot in the middle position, where the pause is represented by the modern comma (VI. 15; cf. 182), and one instance of a dot just below the line (IV. 48), at the end of an interrogative sentence. A paragraphus is only used in the text to separate the metrical sections which are, apparently, always distinguished. Plain parargraphs are employed at the end of strophes and antistrophes, but at the commencement of new strophes they are accompanied by a conspicuous coronis, as in 658. Paean V, which consists only of strophes, accordingly has this coronis at the end of each one. The commencement of a fresh poem is denoted by a separate sign (VI. 1). In the scholia by the first hand of C–D paragraphi are frequently inserted to mark off the notes, and in A–B they appear sporadically for a similar purpose. In some other respects an apparent difference of practice in the two main divisions of the manuscript is to be noted. In C–D a curved line has in several cases been placed below letters or syllables, with no very clear object (cf. note on Fr. 82. 23); this does not occur in what remains of A–B. In the latter on the other hand there occur before lines certain critical signs, consisting of the ordinary διπλό;
which was used for a variety of purposes, or a small cross, which is also found in the Paris Alcman and _Berl. Klassikertexte_ V. (2) xvi (Corinna). This was not one of the recognized Aristarchean symbols and its precise signification is not certain; it may, as Wilamowitz says (_op. cit._, p. 64), be no more than a _nota bene_. Another example of a _dipte_ in a Pindar papyrus occurs in 659. 17. In C–D there is in four columns no instance of the use of such marginal symbols, which though not quite conclusive at any rate establishes a presumption against their employment elsewhere in that part of the papyrus.

How far hands other than the first have contributed towards these many lectional aids it is difficult precisely to determine. Unless there are considerable differences in the colour of the ink, which is here not the case, responsibility for such marks cannot be assigned. To a large extent at least, they appear in the present case to be original, and none of them is likely to be much later in date than the body of the manuscript. The numeration of the lines by hundreds (II. 25, &c.) is undoubtedly by the first hand: the title at VI. 1 appears to be a subsequent insertion.

The path of the reader has been still further smoothed by the frequent notes which accompany the text and which embody both apparatus criticus and commentary. A number of variants are recorded between the lines or in the margin, sometimes with a statement of the authority to whom they were due. Several readings are attributed to Ζ or Ζη (cf. note on IV. 58), who no doubt is Zenodotus of Ephesus. Others are coupled with the abbreviations _Ap, Apσ, Av_ and _Apv_, which are less easily identified, since it is uncertain how many names they represent. Perhaps Aristarchus for the first pair and Aristophanes for the second is the most likely interpretation; cf. note on II. 61. Chrysippus the pupil of Zenodotus and instructor of Aristarchus is probably referred to in Fr. 84. 13, and Theon, a later grammarian, may be named at II. 37. Other lections have the common adjunct γρ(_άφεται_), or more often stand by themselves, usually enclosed between two dots. The explanatory notes, which are especially full in II and in C–D, deal with names or allusions, grammatical points, and the like, or elucidate the sense—not always very successfully.

These additions are in several hands which are not always readily distinguished. The textual notes in A–B are mostly in uncial or semi-uncial script, and sometimes are certainly due to the first scribe, e.g. the variants at V. 38, VI. 55, &c. This scribe was moreover a careful if not an elegant writer, and made few slips which he did not himself correct; an instance occurs at VII. 1. To a distinct class belong certain other entries in a more sloping hand (H 2), including II. 1 _θωρᾶκος, 37 καί, 40 δύοις, IV. 4 σατο, V. 21 εριπναίς, VI. 1 title (?)_A, 10 _αέων, 14 κλυτον αλός, 52 interlinear ε_ and _πιθεύ_ (?), the note opposite II. 108–9, VII. 2
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επεσω(?) Fr. 16. 5 κελαδησαθ υμνος Fr. 21. 7 εσσεται. A third more rapid and lighter hand (H 3) is responsible for II. 2 πατριου, 27 ελ(?) V. 45 πανδωρου κ.τ.λ., and perhaps IV. 62 νο(s) κ.τ.λ.; while a few more variants, namely II. 52 interlinear and αει, 75 εν δε, IV. 58 ζη(νοδοτος) κ.τ.λ., VI. 180 στεφανουσι νυ . . . , are in the cursive (S 1) of the explanatory scholia. Here again a distinction has to be drawn. Two groups of these cursive notes are traceable throughout the papyrus, (a) = S 1, in a small and as a rule clear writing, and (b) = S 2, in a more rapid and negligent and generally rather larger cursive, the ink of which also is of a lighter shade; e. g. in the scholium opposite II. 43 το νοημα . . . ελπιδας belongs to S 1, the rest of the note to S 2. Evidently these two groups were written on different occasions, and at first sight would be put down to different persons; but they are of a similar character and at times approximate closely in style, and we hesitate to say that they could not proceed from a single hand. It is a question too how far the various readings classed under H 2 and H 3 may not be the work of the scholiast or scholiasts; H 2 and S 1, at any rate, are not unlikely to be identical. In C-D such variants as occur and many of the scholia proper are in the hand of the text, but S 1 and S 2 are responsible for a number of additions.

To turn now to the individual poems. Of the first there remain only the last ten verses, in which however the allusion to Thebes and the Theban δαφνηφορα (cf. I. 8 note and Frs. 129–31) clearly shows that the paean was written for the poet’s native city on the occasion of that festival. The metre, which is logaoedic, is as follows:—

```
2. 5 43
   10 10
```

II. The title of the second paean has disappeared with the margin at the commencement, but this loss is made good by the first few lines, which practically form a title, and with other internal evidence render it abundantly clear that the poem was composed for the people of the Thracian Abdera, and dedicated to Apollo. It is unfortunately mutilated, two of the seven and
a half columns comprising it being wholly lost and another badly damaged; the
remainder however, amounting to three-fifths of the whole, which consisted of
108 verses, is in good condition. Abderus, the mythical comrade of Heracles,
who is said to have founded the city to perpetuate his memory, is addressed
in the opening line; and the subsequent fortunes of the place, the failure of
a settlement from Clazomenae (ll. 55–6, 63–4), its successful colonization from
Teos (ll. 3, 65 sqq.), and its later prosperity (ll. 25–7), are appropriately
commemorated. There are some rather obscure allusions (ll. 39–40, 104–7) to
a war in which the Abderites were taking part. The date is subsequent to the
battle of Salamis, since the occupation of Athens by the Persians is referred to in
ll. 28 sqq. Perhaps the poem was written about the time of the formation of the
confederacy of Delos, when hostilities directed against the Persians were still
going on in the region of Abdera; or a struggle with some Thracian neighbour
may have been in progress. The whole ode is characterized by a distinctly
warlike note. It consists of three systems, the strophe having eleven and the
epode fourteen logaoedic cola, and each epode ending with the refrain ἵπτε
παίνω, ἵπτε παίνω δι' ἀνθρώπων λείπων. Similar refrains are found in IV and V.

In the following schemes a comma at the end of a verse indicates synphasia
as shown by the division of a word between two cola, and a vertical line marks
hiatus. Syllabae ancipites at the ends of verses will be apparent without special
note.

Strophe

10

Epode

10

(c)
III. The third paean is hopelessly mutilated. From the stichometry of the papyrus it may be inferred to have consisted of 102 lines (cf. note on l. 17) out of which seventy-five have disappeared altogether, while only one short passage of six verses in which Apollo is addressed is intelligible. The occasion of the ode and the patrons for whom it was written are not determinable; the Graces are named at the commencement.

IV. A peculiar interest attaches to the fourth paean, which is without doubt the ode spoken of at the commencement of the first Isthmian. Pindar there apologizes for having postponed the completion of a paean to the Delian Apollo to be sung at Ceos in order that he might first celebrate a victory won by his compatriot Herodotus at the Isthmian Games. Cf. ll. 6 sqq.

\[\text{εἰςον, \δω \'πολλωνιάς (sc. Delos)}\; \text{ἀμφοτερῶν τοι \ χαρῶν \ σὺν \ θεοῖς \ ζεῦξω τέλος, καὶ τὸν \ ἀκειρεκόμαν \ Φαίβον \ χαρεύων} \]
\[\text{ἐν Κέφω \ ἀμφιφύτῃ \ σὺν \ ποιτίων} \]
\[\text{ἀνθράσων, καὶ \ τὰν \ ἄλερκέα \ 'Ισθμοῦ \ υἱερόν,} \]

and the scholia upon the occasion of the poem:—οἱ Κεῖοι Δήλιακον παϊῶνα ήξίουν τὸν ποιητὴν γράφατο... μέλλοντος γάρ Κεῖοις γράφειν προσωδιακόν παϊῶνα... εἰς αὐθυπέραστον τὸ εἰς Δήλον ποίημα συντάττει τῷ Ἡρόδοτῷ τὸν ἐπίκοιν. It is now clear that the well-known fragments 87–8 χαὶ, δ' θεοματα κ.τ.λ. which have been referred to this Cean paean (Schneider, Pind. Fragm. p. 29; so Schroeder) have no connexion with it. On the other hand the conjecture of Dissen and Fennell that the poem was sung at the temple of Apollo at Carthaea is corroborated by the allusion in l. 13. The central idea is the virtue of contentment with a simple life like that of the Cears in their rocky island, which was nevertheless celebrated as the home of athletes and poets. This lesson finds further illustration in the stories of Melampus (ll. 28 sqq.) and of the local hero Euxantius (ll. 35 sqq.), in
the narrative of which some novel points emerge (see commentary). An interesting coincidence occurs with a quotation found in a corrupt form in Plutarch (ll. 50 sqq.).

The poem consisted of sixty-two verses divided into two systems, the strophe containing ten, and the epode, which as in II ends with a refrain, eleven lines. Two consecutive columns out of five are well preserved, but the remaining three are too severely damaged for continuous restoration. The metre is logaoedic.

Strophe

\[ \text{Strophe} \]
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
- & - & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & | \\
- & - & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
\circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - & \circ & - \\
5 & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - & \circ & - \\
- & - & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
- & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - , \\
- & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - , \\
10 & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
\end{array}
\]

Epode

\[ \text{Epode} \]
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccccc}
\circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
- & - & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
- & - & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
- & - & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
5 & - & - & \circ & (\text{syll. anceps ?}) \\
\circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
\circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
\circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
\circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
10 & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & \circ & - \\
\end{array}
\]

V. To Delos is also dedicated the next paean, the shortest and simplest in structure in the collection. Like Ol. xiv, Pyth. vi, xii, &c. it consists of strophes only; there were eight short stanzas in dactylo-epitritic metre, each commencing with the invocation \( \text{ἡ Ἀργεία Αἴαλος} \). The first six of these have almost entirely disappeared, and no sense can be gleaned until the thirty-sixth line is reached, from which point to the end there is no lacuna. The topic here
is the spread of the Ionian folk over Euboea, the Sporades, and Delos; and very likely the Ionians were the principal subject throughout. Perhaps the ode was written for the Athenians.

Strophe
\[\text{[Strophe notation]}\]

VI. Paean VI is inscribed 'For the Delphians, to Pytho,' and was composed for performance at the Theoxenia (ll. 61–2), one of the three principal festivals in the Delphic calendar. Like its predecessors this long ode has sustained considerable damage; three columns have disappeared entirely, two more are hopelessly mutilated, and another is very imperfect. Still even with these deductions about half of the 183 lines are complete or easily restored. The first eighteen, after which there is a gap, belong to an extremely graceful exordium, the commencement of which was already familiar in a citation by Aristides, though its classification was a matter of doubt; Schroeder puts it in the Prosodia. The body of the paean (ll. 74–120) is occupied with a sketch of the fate of Troy and the subsequent fortunes of Neoptolemus, including the passage, already partly known from a quotation, which offended the susceptibilities of the Aeginetans (cf. notes on ll. 117–9 and 123), and to which reference is made in the seventh Nemean. Pindar there repeats, in language very similar to that used in this paean, his version of the story of Neoptolemus' death (cf. ll. 104–20 with *Nem.* vii. 35–42), and protests that he had no intention of disparaging the Acaicd hero (*Nem.* vii. 64 sqq., 102 sqq.). The date of our paean is therefore prior to B.C. 461, the year of the victory which *Nem.* vii celebrates. From Neoptolemus the poet turns with characteristic suddenness to the praises of Aegina and the myth of the bride of Zeus whose name the island bore; and here the thread is lost.

The poem contains three systems, of which the strophe consists of twenty-one and the epode of nineteen verses with logaoedic rhythm.

Strophe
\[\text{[Strophe notation]}\]

Epode
\[\text{[Epode notation]}\]
VII. Of the seventh paean the commencement is preserved in a mutilated condition, but after the eighteenth line the connexion is broken, and it is doubtful, as we have said, whether the fragments grouped under B belong to VII or to another poem or poems. In Fr. 16, where there are some complete lines at the bottom of a column, Pindar speaks of his art and describes himself as inspired to walk in the way of his predecessors, among whom he perhaps refers especially to Homer. Fr. 19, which may have followed close after, also has some well-preserved lines in the lower part of the second column, where the myth of Asteria, the sister of Leto is related. The rest of A–B consists of small scattered fragments.

VIII. At Fr. 82, the first of C, we again arrive at a connected passage of sixteen more or less complete consecutive verses which, whatever the relation of C–D to A–B, a question to be considered immediately, no doubt belonged to a poem different from any that have preceded. The first column of this fragment appears from the remains of the scholia to have contained a reference to the story of Erginus, who in revenge for the murder of his father exacted a tribute from Thebes and was eventually slain by Heracles. Before the beginning of the next column, however, a widely different subject has been reached. Troy is now the scene, where Cassandra, on the departure of Paris in quest of Helen, prophesies
the impending doom presaged by the well-known dream of Hecuba. The scheme of the lines is appended:—

\[ i=f \]

Most of the other fragments of C may well belong to the same poem. 'Αλέξανδρος (?) is mentioned in Fr. 96; but the only other piece which has any complete lines is Fr. 84, which gives the beginning of a speech of a person whose identity is unknown.

IX. D is more valuable, for in one small piece there is a coincidence with the well-known Pindaric fragment on the occasion of an eclipse of the sun—'Ακτίς ἄλλων κ.τ.λ.—and a practically complete column gives most of a subsequent strophe and antistrophe from the same ode, thus establishing the metre and therewith the text of the extant fragment. In the later section the poet passes to the subject of the Theban seer Tenerus, son of Apollo and the nymph Melia; the poem was evidently written for Thebes. The strophe consists of ten logaoedic verses; of the epode there is no clear trace beyond the one line already known.

Strophe

\[ i=f \]
Some of the minor fragments of D are no doubt also to be assigned to IX; but the only pieces of any size, Frs. 129-31, containing parts of two consecutive columns, are proved by the metre to belong to a different ode.

It remains to be considered whether the poems represented in C-D are to be ranked, as those in A (with which B is naturally connected) undoubtedly are, as paeans. External evidence is inconclusive, for though there is a change of scribe at C the continuity of the sections is in a measure preserved, as has been explained above, by the recto and part of the scholia, as well as by the similar height of the papyrus and the columns of writing. The contents of the fragments must therefore be the main guide; and here it must be admitted that in certain respects C-D appear to be peculiar. There is no sign in these sections of ἵ or παιάν; and though the importance of this argument a silentio might easily be exaggerated, the fragments are sufficiently extensive to make the absence of those characteristic words remarkable. Secondly, it is curious to what an extent C-D are concerned with seers and soothsaying; see Fr. 82 throughout. Fr. 84. 10 sqq., Fr. 128 (Tenerus), Fr. 131. 20-2, and Fr. 139. There is a reference to an oracle in II. 73; but here such subjects almost monopolize the field. If however these poems are not paeans, what are they? Boeckh assigned the fragment on the eclipse of the sun to the Ῥπορχήματα on the strength of the passage prefacing the quotation in Dionys. Hal. de Demosth. dict. c. 7 τάστα (sc. certain passages from Plato's Phaedrus) . . . εἰ λάβοι μέλη καὶ μνημόνις ὁπέρ οἱ διθύραμβοι καὶ τὰ ῦπορχήματα, τοῖς Πυθάρου πνεύμαις ἐοικέναι δόξειν ἀν τοῖς εἰς τῶν ἔργων εἰρήμενοι. Hence Boeckh infers that the fragment must either come from a dithyramb or a hyporcheme, and that, since there is nothing Dionysiac in it, the latter must be the right category—a conclusion accepted by Schroeder. In favour of this classification may now be set the consideration that the paeans and hyporchemes were closely connected; cf. Menander Rhet. de Encom. p. 27 τοὺς μὲν γὰρ (τῶν ὑμων) εἰς Ῥπορχήματα παιώνια καὶ ῦπορχήματα νομίζομεν, τοὺς δὲ εἰς Διόνυσον διθύραμβος κ.τ.λ. On the other hand Boeckh's argument that the men-
tion by Dionysius of διθυράμβου and ὑπορχήματα limits the choice to one or other of those classes is unconvincing. Since the fragment cannot be included in both it need not necessarily belong to either; if Dionysius meant to imply that it came from a hyporcheme why did he go out of his way to mention dithyrambs? Boeckh further considers that the metre is well adapted to dancing, and therefore favours a hyporcheme; but this argument is counterbalanced by the apparent unsuitability of the predominant themes of C–D to an orchestic accompaniment. There is moreover another class of Pindar's works to which the paean stood in close relation, and whose claims should be considered, namely the προσόδια,—witness the passage already cited (p. 11) from Proclus: καταχρηστικὸς δὲ καὶ τὰ προσόδια τινὶς παιώνας λέγοντιν. It is noticeable that the word προσόδιον is not improbably to be restored in a mutilated scholium in Fr. 108, though this of course no more justifies the inference that the odes were προσόδια than the occurrence of δαφνη‐φορικῶν in Fr. 107 authorizes us to hold that they were δαφνη‐φορικά. That references to the Theban δαφνηφορία should be found in both C and D (Frs. 107 and 129–31, notes) is not surprising if VIII as well as IX had a Theban setting; there is an allusion to the same festival in I, which is doubtless a paean. The δαφνηφορίκα, like the παρθένεια of which they were a subdivision, were designed for a female chorus (cf. 659), of which there is no trace in these fragments, while the masculine participle in the gloss on IX. 36 points in a contrary direction.

On the whole, though it remains questionable whether a distinction should not be drawn between the contents of A–B and C–D, the evidence hardly seems

A. Col. i (Fr. 1).
sufficient to justify their definite attribution to different classes, still less for determining how the second class should be named.

Regret for the loss of so much of Pindar’s work is undoubtedly intensified by the discovery of this papyrus. In spite of their mutilated condition the new poems display merit of a very high order, though they may not rank among the best efforts of the poet’s genius. The long ode to Delphi (VI), in particular, is remarkably fine. Its extremely graceful exordium approaches the easier manner of the Oxyrhynchus Partheneion (859); but in general the style is more akin to that of the Epinicia, though, as V shows, the metrical structure of the Paeans was sometimes not less simple than that of the Partheneia. Mythical themes are frequent, as they no doubt were in all Pindar’s poetry, and they would of course be prominent in compositions of this class; but the other points in Eustathius’ criticism quoted above (p. 11), that in comparison with the Epinician poems the rest of the poet’s work was inferior in common interest and in clearness, are not justified by what is now known of the Partheneia and the Paeans.

In the reconstruction and elucidation of this papyrus we owe much to Prof. Blass, whose knowledge and ingenuity were perhaps never more conspicuous than in dealing with fragments of lyric poetry. The commentary unfortunately could not have the benefit of his revision, but the proof-sheets have been submitted to Prof. J. B. Bury, to whom we are indebted for a number of valuable criticisms and suggestions.

1. [ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ].

5 [ι]ή ἤ, νῦν ὁ παντελῆς ἐνιαυτός

10 [σῶ]φρονος ἀνθεσίν εὐνομίας.
[...]

Col. ii (Fr. 2, Col. i).

Opposite ll. 26–7,

[...]

Col. iii (Fr. 2, Col. ii).

[13 letters]...[...]

25 [...]<θ [...]ἀίκιαν [...].[...]αναμπελ [...] σαντεκαιευκαρπον μημοιμεγασερπων[...]

30 πολεμωπυριπλάγει [...] σανειδετισαρκεωνφιλοσ[...]

35 [...].[...]ιῃσπαιαινιηιε [...].[...]
II. [ἈΒΔΗΠΙΤΑΙΣ].

στρ. α’ 1 [Ναίδ]ὸς Ῥονίας Ἀβδηρὲ χαλκοθώραξ
2 [Ποσ]ειδάνος τε παί,
3 [σέθ]έν Ἰάον τόνδε λαῷ
4 [παι]άνα [δί]άξω
5 [Δή]ρηνον Ἀπ[δ]άλλωνα πάρ τ’ Ἀφρο[δί]ταν οὐ· τόπος ἐν Ἀβδηρίοις οὕτω καλοῦ-

Lines 6–20 lost = str. 6–11, antistr. 1–9.

Fr. 2, Col. i, opposite ll. 26–7.

10 — — — — — — — — — — θαρροῦσαν ὁ...
11 — — — — — — — — — — [.....] v.[.....]
2 2 ο ατίνα [ταίδε] ναίω
25 3 [Θρ]αίκιαν χαίεν ἀμπελό[ες]σάν τε καὶ
4 εὐκαρπον μὴ μοι μέγας ἔρπων
5 κάμοι ἐξοπίσω χρόνος ἔμπεδος.
6 νεώπολις εἰμί: ματρὸς
7 δὲ μάτερ’ ἔμας ἐπὶδον ἔμπαν
30 8 πολεμίῳ πυρὶ πλαγεῖ—
9 σαν. εἰ δὲ τις ἀρκέων φίλοις
10 ἔχθροισι τραχὺς ὑπανταῖζει
11 μάχθος ἑλυχιάν φέρει
12 καρπῷ καταβαίνων.
35 13 ἦθε παιάν, ἦθε: παιάν.
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Col. iv (Fr. 3, Col. i).

Plate II.

[12 letters] oi


40 [12] σ' 


τονοματ[...]ουσεοισαγαρθαφερειν 

dοκουσιοναιειπαιθακαταπολεμοναυ 

τακπονειναγαθασπολθετανικη

ελπιςα θηηποποιειεπεριστ' τ' αν


τιπαλωσαντοδαπηςφοδονοιναντε

[ ] 


φθονε 

[ ] 

μανστον 

eυμπρουειουτουντηπολε 

στασιαοντασδεκαπολιτε[.]οντα 

πολλωαλλουςπεπλυδασσει

50 [16] ουτοδεινβου 

γανοειω 

Col. v (Fr. 3, Col. ii).

Plate II.

λιαντεκαις[.]ου 

εγκειμενο[.]ειδθαλλειμαλα 

καὶσ[.]δια[.]κατομενιδιωτ 

θεοσ[.]]εχθ[.]ανορασ 

55 ηδφθονουσιχεται οιονουκετί[...]ορθονεισθο 

τωνπαλαιροβιαντων τ'γονευνη[...]θαναοντγαλλου 

δεκιανδρ[.]]ασθαγγαγ 

χρηδανθροκεινιαφερειν δε[.] [...]δια[.]εανθρειεσεγκηθα 

βαθύδοναισαν[...] [...]πρ[.]]οτουμελ 

τουσπολομεοκτησαμ[...] 

60 χθονοπολυλωρονολ[ ] 

γαρ[.] 

eυκατθηκαπερα[ ] 

παιονωναχατί[.] [...]σ 

[ ] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...] [...]...
18 [δὲ μήποτε λείποιοι.  
19 [δὺ]ναται ἢ τ᾽ ὄν] [ ἀν[ήρ]ων ὁφέλεια ἢ δ᾽ αὐχώσιν ἢ τὸ λήμμα
στρ. β’ 1 [- - - - - - ] ἀλκά] δὲ τείχος ἀνδρῶν] (Ἀλ.) καὶ Θεών, ν᾽: δομοὺν τῷ 'πότε-
2 [ὑψιστὸν ἵσταται] 
3 [- - - - - Ράρ] μάρναμαι μᾶν
40 [ - - - - δάιοις] 
40 [ - - Πο]ειδάνιοις γά]ένους [ἵππων οὐ]
5 τῶν γὰρ ἀντιμένων
7 [- - - - - - ] φέρεσθαι 
[ - - - - - - ] σέλας
45 [ - - - - πο]τικάρσῃ 
10 [ - - - - ο]ι μανεῖ φθονεῖ.
11 [ - - - - - - ] 
ἀντ. β’ 1 [- - - - - - - - - - - ο]ὶ λαὸν ἀστῶν 
2 [ - - - - - - - - - - ] 
50 [ - - - - - - - - - - ο]ι τὸ δ’ εὐβου-

λίπα τε καὶ α[δ]οῖ
5 ἐγκείμενοι[ν] αἰεὶ θάλλει μαλακαὶ ε[ὕ]διαί[ς]
6 καὶ τὸ μὲν διδότω
7 θεός: [ὁ δ’] ἐχθρὰ νοήσαι
8 ή[δ]ὴ φθόνος οἰχεῖται
9 τῶν πάλαι προθανόντων
c
10 χρῆ δ’ ἀνδρά τοκεύον[υ] φέρειν
c
11 βαθύδοξον αἰῶν.

ἐπ. β’ 1 τοῖς σὺν πολέμῳ κτησάμενοι
60 [χθόνα πολύδορον, ὅ[λ]βον
γ Ἀρ’(σταρχὰς).
3 εὐκατέθηκαν πέραν ἀγρίων] Παϊόνων
4 αἰχματάν [τε Στρυμνιαῖς γά]ΐς
5 σαθέας τρόφου: ἄλλα [δ’ ἀγοισά τοι (ʔ)] 
8 ἐπέπεσε μοίρα: πλάντί[ῶν]
65 τ’ ἐπέστη θεοὶ συνετέλεσαν[ν, ...],
ο[πομενάντων
ο[ί θεoi τελαύσιν.]}
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Col. vi (Fr. 3, Col. iii).

οδεκαλοντιπην[.]αισ
eυαγοριασ[[ν]]φλεγει;  
κευσιςδιπερταυνηλθεφγγοσ  
ανταδ[.]ημενεωμελαι

70  φυλλουπροπαροθεν'  
ημεπαιανηιωνπαιαν

deμηποτελειπον'

[.]Αλαμνποταμωσουξεδουμολυνταφυρσει  
βαιοισουνεντεσιν  
πρωτοτυλπάσασα

dομασαφυρσειαποκτενει

75  ποτιπολυσστατωνένδεμνοσ  
προελεγεντ'μελα[  
tοισιαμετεροι[  
υοξηλελεγενεσθα]

80  [.μνδανγ[.]μκμαχανων

Col. vii lost.

Col. viii (Fr. 4, Col. i).

[... ]εκαλεοντιμολπαί  
[... ]γανενοδμοναμφιτεπαρ  
[... ]αισπ[.]ηαισυψηλαισθαμαδ[. ]ων  
[... ]κόπ[. ]ηυσταμεγαιχορον  

100  [. ]ποδατ[.]θενοιχ[  
[... ]κελα[.]ηειγικωνανδαι  
[... ]ονεμο[. ]επ[. ]τ'ωδην  
[... ]υκλεα[. ]χα[. ]ιν  
[... ]ηρεκαιστ[. ]ηπποχαρμαν

105  [. ]δαιπολε[.]φιτελευ[ ]  
[... ]ουτοσκαιο[  
[... ]αυπροβια[.]αζοιο-  
[iωσωτημι[  
[... ]ημε'παιαν  
[... ]ποι'
841. **PINDAR, PAEANS**

8 δὲ καλὼν τι ποιήσαις
eὐαγορίασιν φλέγειν.
10 κεῖσοι δ’ ὑπερτατον ἡλθε φέγγος
11 ἀντα δυσμενῶν Μελαμ-
12 φόλλων προπαροιθεν. τόπος αὐ(τος) ἐν Ἀβδήρους
13 ἵτει παιάν, ἵτει: παιάν Μελάμφυλλον.
14 δὲ μήποτε λείποι.

στρ. γ’ [ἄλλα μν ποταμὸι σχεδὸν μολύντα φύρειν] π. [ ]
2 βαιοῖς σὺν ἐντεσίν 'Αρίστοφάνων(η;;) δύναται φύρειν ἀποκτενεῖ [ ]
75 : ποτὲ πολὺν στρατὸν. ἐν δὲ μνῆς ὑμεῖς ἐν δι.
4 πρῶτον τύχεω ἁμαρτ.
5 ἀγγελλε δὲ φοινικόπεδα λόγου παρθένοι προϊόγειν την; μὴλουναν μάχην;
6 εὐμενὴς Ἅκατα τοῖς ἴμετροις.
7 τὸν ἐκδελντα γενέσθαι: ἀν(τι τοῦ) ἐν ἢθελιν γενέσθαι.
80 [σ]ὸν δ’ αὐ γιάκυκμαχάνων

Lines 81–95 lost = str. 9–11, antistr. 1–11, ep. 1.

ἐπ. γ’ [ὡ] καλέοντι μολπαί
3 [Πίδο]ν ἀν’ εὐδομον ἄμφι τε Παρίνασσαίας
4 πε[ρί]ας υψηλαῖς θαμά Δ[ελφ]ῶν
5 [έλει]κώπ[δε]ς ἱστάμεναι χορὸν
100 6 [ταχ’]ποδά π[αρ]θένοι χαλ-
7 [κέ]ρα κελαβεψείτι γυλκῶν αὐθά
8 [νῦ]μον ἐμοὶ δὲ ἐκδι[ν] ἐσ-
9 [Ἀβδ]ὴν ἀρχει, καὶ στρατὸν ἱπποχάρμαν ἐτιν; ὑμὲν.
105 11 [.—]κα πολε[μο] τελεύ-
13 ἵτει παιάν, ἵτει: παιάν
14 [δὲ] μήποτε λεῖ[ποι].
[. . . . . . . . . . ] ναγλαο
[. . . . . . . . . . ] ναίχαριτε[.]

Fragment of Col. vii (?).
Fr. 5.  .  .  .
]  
]  
]  
]  
]  
]  
]  
]  
]  
]  
]  

Col. ix (Fr. 4, Col. ii).

. [  
ιει  .  .  .ος[  
5 αγλαϊντ[  
ματέρ[  
ναον[  
καίθυο[  
βωμω[  
10 × οκτω[  
υψοθεν[  
αιδαιζενευπλε[  
γαρύτ[.νδεχρυσο[  
ωριοντοιχρονον[  
θ  
15 θεασ[[τε]]ελικαμπυκ[  
ελαιν[.σαναμβροτ[  
φαεννοσαίθηρ[  
5 columns lost.

Col. xv (Fr. 6).

[νθενοσιεράν  
.  
]έοπ′αιλονομφαν  
95 [ξλομοριανπεργαναετωπη[  
λαμπεμεξντααθααηή[  
θυνντω[  ημαλδοςιτουκαπνου
841. PINDAR, PAEANS

Fr. 5: 

|[ολε ὦ
]τα ἀν
]
]οῦν
5 Ἱ' Ἀθηνᾶ

III.

[. . . . . . . . . . .] ν ἀγλαο-
[. . . . . . . . . . .] ναι Χάριτε[s]

. [\
ιει [. . .]ρξ\
5 ἀγλαιάν τι[\
ματέρι[\
ναύν ο[\
καὶ θυδέντα
βωμῶν [\
10 ὁκτῶ Κ[\
ὑψόθεν [\
ἀοίδαις ἐν εὐπλέκεσθι φωνῆ μελι-
γάρνῃ, τ][ν δὲ χρυσο[\
ἀριν ποτὶ χρόνον [\
15 θεάς θ' ἔλικάμπτυκος Σελάνας, ἀνίκα (?)\
ἐλαύν[ε]ην ἄν' ἀμφρο[ῦν κέλευθον, ἄμφι δὲ λάμπει (?)\
φαευνὸς αἰθήρ.

Lines 18–92 lost.

]ν σθένος ἱερὰν
Χαλκ[ε]οπ' αὐλῶν ὀμφάν
95 |]λοι μόρια ὑπεργανάει τῷ πυρί . . .
] λάμπει εὖ οὖ τὰ ἀγάθα σημ[αίνειν].
] θυόντων ἦ ἀνάδοσις τοῦ καπνοῦ.

D
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100

\[ \alpha \tau \rho \varepsilon \mu \nu \ \nu \sigma \omicron \mu \alpha i \]

\[ \alpha i \kappa o \nu i \varepsilon \delta \nu \sigma \varepsilon \tau a i \quad \sigma a t o \ \alpha \upsilon \nu \eta \theta \eta \]

5

\[ \delta \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \omega \nu \nu \alpha \tau \omega \tau e r o n \]

Col. xvi (Fr. 7, Col. i).

\[ \alpha \kappa a t a \pi a \sigma a n o \delta o n \]

\[ \sigma \nu \chi i a n k e i \]

\[ \alpha l l e t a i \]

\[ \chi r i a s i \kappa \acute{a} \rho \theta a i \]

\[ \chi \nu \nu o t o n o s t e n o n \chi \theta o n o s \]

Col. xvii (Fr. 7, Col. ii).

\[ \eta t o i k a i e g w o s \]

\[ \gamma i n o s k o m a i m e n a r e t a i s a \acute{e} \theta l o w \]

\[ \epsilon l l a n i s i n - \gamma i n w o s \]

\[ \eta o s [ \ldots ] \delta e k a i \]
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IV. [KEIOIS EIS AHTON].

στρ. α' 1. [ο - - - ο - - ο - ο] Ἀρτέμις
2. [ο - - - - ο] ὑσόμαι
3. [ο - - - - ο] αυδάν
4. [ο - - - - ο] γυναικών ἑδυόσεται. -σατο. ἄν, τι τοῦ ὑμνηθήσεται.
5. [ο - - - - -] 8' ἐπέων δυνατότερον.

6. [ο - - - ο] ἀ κατὰ πάσαν ὄδῶν
7. [ο - - ο - η] συνχιὰν Κέφ
8. [ο - - - - -]
9. [ο - - - - - -]

10. [ο - - - - - ο - ο] βιδίλλεται.

αντ. α' 1. [ο - - - - - -] ν χρόνον ὑρνεῖ
2. [ο - - - -] Αἵλων ἀγακλέα
3. [ο - - ο - ον] Χάρισι. Κάρθαι - πόλις αὐτῆς μία τῆς πενταπόλεως τῆς [Κήω].
4. [α μὲν ἀλαθέος ἑλα]χίσωσον στέρνον χθονός,

15. [δύμως γε μὰν οὕτω] νῦν Βαβυλώνος ἀμείφομαι.

6. [ο - - - ο - - ο] ἕχειν πεδίων [ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . άν κειστοθεῖ]
7. [ο - - - - - - ο] θεών [ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . θεών οίπερ τῶν νῆσον]
8. [ο - - - - - -]
9. [ο - - - - - - ο] η.

20. 10. [ο - - - - - - ο - ο] χθύσιν.

ἐπ. α' 1. ἦ τοι καὶ ἐγὼ σ[κόπ]ελον ναιὼν δια-
2. γιγνώσκομαι μὲν ἄρεταῖς ἀέθλων
3. 'Ελλανίσιν: γιγνώσκ[ο]μα[ι] δὲ καὶ
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μοισαγμαρχο[.]αλιο

25 [\textquotedblright]εκατίδιοι[.]νοαρ[.]αφερει
βιοδορομαχανιασακοσ\textsuperscript{διωρηματωβιο}
άνιπτοσεμικαβουνομασαδαεστερος\textsuperscript{Fr. 8, Col. i.}

\times \text{αλλ}γεμελάμποσουνοκθελεν\textsuperscript{[\ldots]}\textsuperscript{[11 letters]}\textsuperscript{[\ldots]}\textsuperscript{[\ldots]}\textsuperscript{[\ldots]}\textsuperscript{[26 letters]}\textsuperscript{[\ldots]}
\text{λιπουπάτρ[.]βαμ[.]ρχ[.]αργει}\textsuperscript{[\ldots]}\textsuperscript{[\ldots]}

30 \text{θεμενοσο[.]νοσολογιερασ}
\text{iηνηωεσα[.\.\.][.\.\.][.\.\.][.\.\.]

\text{ποδευκοθει[.]ςτυκα}
\text{καισυνγένειανδριφ[.]
\text{στερξαιμαη[.]ονδε[.]

35 > \text{εκασεονεσ-λογο[,]κροσευαν[.]
\text{επαινεσο[,]νομαιομεονθοςαν[.]

Col. xviii (Fr. 8, Col. ii).

\text{αυταρχεινπολιωνδεκατουπολεχα[.]
\text{μεροσεβδομαπασιφ[,]σανικαιωσι}
\text{παιο[,]σιερασδεωει[.\.\.]}\textsuperscript{[\ldots]}

40 \text{πενσφιντρεωτοπολεμον}
\text{διοσεννοσιδαντεβαρ[,]κτυπον[.]
\text{χθονατόποτεκαστρατον}
\text{τεμπακερανεωτροδοντιτε}
\text{εσταθαβεπαρατορνομαμα[.\.\.]

45 \text{τεραλποντεσκαυλονοικονενερκεα[.]
\text{επεταπλούσιντειρωνμακαροπιχωριου}
\text{τεθμον[,]μπανερμοναπωσαμενος}
\text{μεγαναλλοθεκαρονεχωλαν[.\.\.]

50 \text{ηκερεασφηνω[.]
\text{πορισοαγισανται[.]
\text{σονεαθερονομπερίδαιον[.}

Col. xix (Fr. 9, Col. i).

52 \text{βοταγω[.\.\.][.\.\.][.\.\.][.\.\.]
\text{λαχο[.}
ποίσαν παρέχουν ἡλιασ.
25 ἢ καὶ τι Δίω νῦν ἄρομα φέρει
8 βιόδωρον ἀραχανίας ἄκος. ἑώρημα τῷ βίῳ.
7 ἀνιππός εἰμι καὶ βουνομας ἀδαεστρος.
8 ἀλλ' ὦ γε Μέλαμπος ὦκ ἡθελεν [....]ν...[11 letters].τ[...].[,]...
30 θέμενος οἶκονόπολον γέρας.
11 ἢ ἢ ὅι ἐπατά[{ιαν}].

στρ. β' 1 τὸ δὲ οἴκοθεν[ν] ἄστυ καὶ ἄλικες
2 καὶ συγγένει' ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ ὡστε καὶ
3 στέρθαι μαται[ίῳ]ν δὲ [μάκαρ ἀνδρόν
35 ἔκας ἑόντων λόγον ἄν' ικτος Εὐξαντίου
6 ἐπαίνεσ', ἀ[λίκ]ιον μαιομένων δὲ ἀνα[ίνετο

6 αὐταρχεῖν, πολίων δ' ἐκατὸν πεδέχει[ν]
7 μέρος ἐβδομον Πασιφ[ά]ς [ο[ὲ]- κανωφ[....]...[.]φ[.]...
8 σι[ν]· τέρας δ' ἐδω εἰ-
40 9 πέν σφι τρέω τοι πόλεμον
10 Δίως 'Εννοοίδαι τε βαρ[ῦ]κτυπον.

ἀντ. β' 1 χθόνα τοί ποτε καὶ στρατῶν ἄβρον
2 πέμψαν κεραυνῷ τριόδωντι τε
3 ἐς τὸν βαθὸν Τάρταρον, ἐμὰν μα-
45 4 τέρα λιπόντες καὶ ὄλον οἶκον εὐερκεά·
5 ἐπείτα πλοῦτου πειρῶν μακάρων τ' ἐπιχώριον
6 τεβρὴν π[ά]μπαν ἐρήμου ἀπωσάμενος
7 μέγαν ἀλάθθι κλάρον ἕχω· λῖαν
8 μοι [πω]δ' ἐμπεδον εἰ-
50 9 η κεν; ἐὰν φρῆν κυπάρισ-
10 σω, ἐὰν δὲ νομὸν περιδαίον.

ἐπ. β' 1 [ἐμοὶ δ' ὀλίγον δέδοται, θάμνος δρυός.
53 [οὐ πενθέων δ' ἐλαχον, οὐ στασίων. ἐδ[ βοται] θάρ[jν]ν]

] λάχον
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4 lines lost.

58

5 lines

60

Fr. 10. ... [.]ηιη[ ιηιεδ[ The rest blank.

Col. xx (Fr. 9, Col. ii).

Col. xxi (Fr. 11, Col. i).

]σ[ ... επίναις

11 lines lost.

]αι

]αποθηκαιων

35
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Lines 54–7 lost = ep. 3–6.

V. [ΕΙΣ ΔΗΛΟΝ].

στρ. α' 1 ιηε Α[άλ]ι 'Απολλον'.

3 lines lost.

5 [– ο – ο – ο – ο –]
6 σ[– ο – ο – ο – ο –]

στρ. β' 1 ιηε Α[άλ]ι 'Απολλον'
2 [– ο – ο – ο – ο –]
3 σ[– ο – ο – ο – ο –]
10 4 κ[– ο – ο – ο –]
15 5 [– ο – ο – ο –]
6 λ[– ο – ο – ο –]

στρ. γ' 1 ιηε Α[άλ]ι 'Απολλον'
2 τ[– ο – ο – ο –]
15 3 [– ο – ο – ο –]
4 [– ο – ο – ο –]
5 Δ[άλ]ι [– ο – ο –]
6 συν [– ο – ο –]

στρ. δ' 1 ιηε Α[άλ]ι 'Απολλον'
20 2 [– ο – ο – ο – ο –]


Lines 22–32 = str. δ' 4–6, str. ε' 1–6, str. ε' 1–2.

στρ. ε' 3 [– ο – ο – ο – ο – ο –]ς
4 [– ο – ο – ο – ο –]
35 6 [– ο – ο – ο – Εὐ-] ἀπὸ Ἀθηναίων.
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Col. xxii (Fr. ii, Col. ii).

40 ἑορνεσπεισφυνηπολλαν ὠκτισανασους ερμυδεατ εσχον
dαλονεσπεισφυνηπολλαν ὃκενοχρυσοκομας
αστεριασθεμασικεν ὡτηρειασφυνηπολλαν
λατοοσθενάμεπαιδεσ
ευμενεδεδαθενοισεβατα
μετερονκελαδενναι
συμμέλλειάρηται
ἄνοσαγακλεοσμοφαι
προσολμπιουδίσσεχαρα
κλυμαντιπνηθο
λισσομαιχαρίτεσ

Col. xxiii (Fr. iii, Col. iii).

σιτκαισισυναφρδηται
eὐσαθεωμεδεξαίρετων

Plate I.
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6 Βοιαν ἔλον καὶ ἐνασσαν.
στρ. ζ’ 1 ἦτε Δάλι’ Ἀπολλών.
2 καὶ σποράδας φερεμήλους πολυμάλους (μήλους).
3 ἔκτωπαν νάσους ἐρικυδέα τ’ ἐσχον
40 4 Δᾶλον, ἔσει σφιν Ἀπόλλων
5 δόκεσν ὁ χρυσοκόμας Ἀστερίας δέμασ οἰκεῖν.
στρ. ἦ’ 1 ἦτε Δάλι’ Ἀπολλών.
2 Λατός ἐνθά με παιδέ
45 3 εἴμενε δέξασθε νόμο θεράποντα Πανδώρος Ἐρεχθεός αἰκλον.
4 ἡμέτερον κελαδεννά ἑν μελιγάρνι παι-
5 ἄνος ἀγακλέος ὀμφά... [. . .] [. . .]στροφ.

VI. ΔΕΛΦΟΙΣ ΕΙΣ ΠΤΘΩ.

στρ. α’ 1 Πρὸς Ὀλυμπίον Δίος σε, χρυ[σέ]α
2 κλυτόμαντι Πυθοῖ,
3 λίσσομαι Χαρίτεσ-
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θαμπανδαλφωνκοραίχονοσομφαλον
παρασκευεμελέτα[.]μενα[ ]
ποδικροτε[. . . . . . .].[ ]

Col. xxiv lost.
(Line 30 had a cross in the left margin.)

Col. xxv (Fr. 12, Col. i).


]τασθεασ [
] ειρθαν [ ] Ρωνω [ ] ἅχον [ ]
]σθεαστις[ ] Ἰγγ [ ]

Col. xxvi (Fr. 12, Col. ii).

50 καιποθεναθαν[. . . . . . .].βεθατ[ ]
Χ ταυταθεοσι[.].εν[ ]
Ε πιθευσοφοι[.]δυνατοι[.].
βροτοισιδαμαχανο[. . . . . .].ρεμεν
αλλαπαρθενογαρισού[.]μο[.]σα [ ]
55 παντακε[. . . . . .].[.].βεθεεσιν [.]ηλα[ ]
πατριμναμοσ[.]μιτε [ ]
τοκτονεσχετ[. . . . . .].μον [ ]
κλιτενιν[.].αρα[. . . . . .].βεμο[.] [ ]
> γλωσσαμελισσωσαπογλυκυν[ ] άαμών [ ]
60 αγωναλοξιακακαβαβν' ευρμν[ ]
eνθεωρειςι[ ]

65 μου[ ]
ευδ[ ]
φιλε[ ]
kρον[ ]

Col. xxvii (Fr. 12, Col. iii, with Fr. 13).
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16 θαμινὰ Δελφῶν κόραι χθονὸς ὁμφαλὸν
17 παρὰ σκιώντα μελπῆδος] μεναί
18 ποδὶ κρατῶντι γὰν θῶν


Scholia on Col. xxv.

50 ἐπ. α 8 καὶ πόθεν άθανατ — ω ω ἄρξατο.
9 ταῦτα θεοί [μ]εν
10 πιθεῖν σοφοῦ[ς] δυνατόν, τι[θεῖν].
11 βροτοῖσιν' δ' ἀμάχαν[ν] εὑ]ρέμεν'
12 ἀλλὰ παρθένοι γὰρ ἵσον ἃς νε[ή][μο[ι]σαι
14 πατρὶ Μναμοσ[ίν]α τε
15 τουτον [ἔ]σχετε[ε] τεβ]μόν,
17 γλώσσα μέλιτος ἀωτον γλυκῶν [προχέειν εἰς] ἀν(τι του) ἀώτου.
60 18 ἀγώνα Δοξία[i] καταβάντ' εὐρίν
19 ἐν θεών ἕνεια.

στρ. β' 1 θύεται γὰρ ἀγλαάς ὑπὲρ Πανελ-
2 λάδος ἀντε Δελφῶν
3 εὖ[ν]οι εὖξατο λι-

65 4 μοῦ σ[ω — ω — ω —
5 εὐδ[ω — ω — ω —
6 ϕιλε[ω — ω — ω — ω —
7 Κρόν[ει ω — ω — ω — ω —
πρυτά[  
70  τοιπα[  
χρησ[.]γ[  
θωνο[β[ 
καίποτε[  
πανθο[φ[  
ω  
75  δεστρωια[  
nεγκε[  
δεαπαιο[  
oνεμβα[  
παρ[.]οσι[ 

Col. xxviii (Fr. 13, Col. ii).

80  σιωδεμαίθεος·  
.ον.  
ilωδεθηκεναφαρ  
oφιτεραναλωσιμ  
κυανοπλόκωπαιδαποντιασκαι,]οκομοι.  
θετίδοσβιαταν  
85  πιστονερκοσαχαι  
ωθρασείφωναπεδασις·  
×  δασάτ'εριξελευκολενωι  
φορσοτοστεριξω  
ακναμπτονηραιμενοσάπν[.]ερείδων·  
oσατεπολιαδεπροπονωι  
φύάσα  
90  δέκεμεγαλονδαρδανιν  
επραθενειμηφιλασσεναπο[.]λ[.]ν·  
nεφεσιδεχροσεωσόλυμποι  
oκαικορυφα[ . ]νιζον  
mόρσμήνα[,]σενευσοθεωσοκοποσουτολ  

Col. xxix (Fr. 13, Col. iii).

95  μα·περιδυψικόμω[, . άλεναι  
χρημάραπεργαμονευρ[.]ι  
ιστώσαισελασαίθομενοσ  
πυρος·επειδαλκιμονεκυν[,]υμὰ[  

Fr. 13, Col. i.
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8 πρύτανι ο — — — — — —
70 τοι παν — — — — — — — — — —
71 χρηστήρης ρι — — — — — — — —
72 [Ποι]ως νόθον [εν — — — —
73 καί ποτέ [ο — — — — — — — — — —
74 Πάνθοδες — Δαναῶν ὁτε παί — —
75 δες Τροῖα[ο] — — — — — —
76 ἤνεγκε[ι — — Διομή-
77 δεα παίς [Ζηνός — — — — — —
78 ὃν ἐμβαλὸν ἴδν ἐσχε μάχας
79 Πάρ[ιος] ἕκαβόλος βροτή-

80 σῶ δέμαϊ θεός:
81 Ἡλίων δε θηκεν ἄφαρ
82 ὑψιτέραν ἀλωσίν,
άντ. β’ κυνοπλόκοιο παιδα ποντίας κιαρ[υ]κόροισ.
83 Θέτιος βιστᾶν
85 πιστὸν ἔρκος Ἀχαι—
86 δὸν θρασεῖ φόνῳ πεδάσαις—
87 ὅσα τ’ ἐριξέ λευκολέινῳ ἀδριστος το(υ) ἐρίξω.
88 ἀκναμπτον “Ηρα μένος ἀν[τ]ερεῖδων
89 ὅσα τε Πολιάδ’ πρὸ πόνων ἢμ(ποτα)κ(ητ) ὅσα.
90 δε κε μεγάλων Δαρβανίαν
91 ἐπραθ(ο)ν, ει μὴ φύλασσεν Ἀπόλλ[ω]ν’
92 νέφεσ(ο)ι δε χρυσέοις Ὁλύμποι—
93 ο καὶ κορυφαία[ί]ν ζων
94 μόρσιμ’ ἀναλύον Ζεύς ὁ θεῶν σκοπὸς οὐ τόλ—

95 μα’ περὶ δ’ υψικόμοι [Ε]λένα
96 χρήν ἄρα Πέργαμον εὑρ’ [δ]—
97 (α')στώσαι σέλας αἰθωμένοι(ν)
98 πυρὸς· ἐπει δ’ ἄλκιμον νέκυν [ἐ]ν τό[φ]φο
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πολυστονωθεντοπηλείδα ...

100 αλοσεπικουμβαντεσ[.]λ
θοναγγελο[.]σισω
σκυροθεν[.]στοτολήφ[]
eυφυμιαναγοντεσ·
οσδιερεξευλιουπολ[]

105 αλλάονεματηρεπειτα[.]δήνα[...]
eιδενύντεσταρω[.]σεναροί[...]
ιππονυμμιδονιν

ψχαλκοκορ[.]μιλογεγ[...]
χσεδον[...].μαρομομολοσίδαγ[...]αν

110 εξίκετ·ουδ[.]νεμοσθε[...].εν

Col. xiii (Fr. 13, Col. iv).

ουδετο[.]μυρφαρέτρανεκαβολον'
ο[...].σε[...].εοσ·
γε[...].πριαμον

π[...]σερκείωνηναρέβαμονε

115 [...]θοροντα·μημινένφρονεσοι[...]ον
[...]ητεπιγηρασιζέ
μενβιον[...]μφισολοιαδε

120 [...]νεφιδεωγάσσαρομφαλονευρων·

τωνχρησιμοναδιαφαλο[...]
εισεδιακαντουπατροσανηρεθή

125 νασασ[.]βισελερονδισελ[...]ηνιοβ[...].καθ[.]ηνησιονυναλβοντες[]
eυξι[...]τοπεριποιυχομου

Col. xxxi (Fr. 13, Col. v, with Fr. 14).

λανιουφαεννουστρον·
oynkevnwυπεπαιηνων
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17 πολυστόνον θέντο Πηλείδα,
18 ἀλὸς ἐπὶ κυμα βάντες [ἡ]λ—
19 θον ἄγγελο[ί] ὁπίσω
20 Σκυρόθεν Ν[ε]οπτόλεμο[ν]
21 εὐριβιάν ἄγοντες,
ἐπ. β' 1 δς διέπερσεν Ἡλίου πόλ[ε]ν.
21 2 ἀλλ' οὔτε ματέρ' ἔπειτα [κ]εδνάν
3 εἶδεν, οὔτε πατρώ[ο]ίς ἐν ἀρο[ύ]ραῖς
4 ἵππους Μυρμιδόνων
6 σε[θ]δόν ἔτι Το[μ]άρου Μολοσσίδα γα[ί]αν
110 1 ἐξίκετ', οἱ[δ]' ἀνέμους ἐ[λαθ]εν

8 οὐδὲ τὸν [ε[λ]ρυφαρέτραν ἐκαβόλον.
10 γε[ραι]δ[ν] [δς] Πρίαμον
115 12 [πε[ν]θοράντα, μή μιν ἐθάρρον' ἐς ὀ[ι]μ[ο]ν
13 [μ]ήθ' ἐπὶ γῆρας ἱέξε—
14 μεν βίου. [ά]μφιπόλοις δὲ
17 [κ]ε[ν] ρ[άφε]τα \(\kappa\τ[α]σ ζ' \kappa[τ]ο ν\) [κα]ὶ ἀνθρήται ἢ
120 17 [(ἐν) τερέμεινε φίλῳ γάς παρ’ ὀμφαλὸν εὐρίν.

στρ. υ' 1 [δ]ύομακλύτα γ' ἐνεσσι Δωριεῖ
125 3 νάσου, [ὁ] Δίος Ἐλ—

4 λανίου φασινόν ἀστρων.
5 οὐνεκεν οὐ σε παίδωνον
οδοποιεύωμεν' ἀλλασσάν
dóthiádechoménakateresio

πόθενελαβεσανάργετον ητη

δαιμονακαίτανθεμίζενοναρετ'

σπάντάτωιτακαίτατευχών

σονεγγυαλίζενολβον

eυρό[...]κρονουπαίος'υδατίδι[...]πα[...] 11 letters

ποῆ[...]ποπροθυρονβαθυκόλ[...] 11 letters

> αιγύμαν-ποτεχρύσεια

> εροσεκρυψατανκόμ[...]ἐπιχωρίον[]

κατάσκιονωτονυμετερον

> ἱναλεχέωνσεμπροτων

Col. xxxii (Fr. 14, Col. ii).

col. xxxiii lost.

Col. xxxiv (Fr. 15, Col. i).

[...][...]χφ[...]ἐνοσ' πονά

[...][...]
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130 πόδεν ἐλαβεῖς ναυπρύτανιν
9 δαίμων καὶ τὰν θεμίζενον ἄρετάν.
10 ὁ πάντα τοι τὰ τε καὶ τὰ τεύχων
11 σὺν ἔγγυάλιζεν ὀλβον
12 εὐρύ[πα] Κρόνου παῖς, ὕδατ(εσσ') δ' [ἐ]π' ᾿Ασ[ω-
135 ποῦ π[οτ' ἀ]πὸ προθύρων βαβύκολ-
14 πον ᾿α[ν]ρέψατο παρθένον
15 ᾿Αἰγιναν' τότε χρύσεαν ᾿α-
16 ἐρος ἐκρύψα[ς{τα}ν κόμ[α]ὶ ἐπιχώριον
17 κατάσκιον νῦτον ὑμέτερον,
140 ἵνα λεχέων ἐπ' ἀμβρότων

πονὸν ἴστην προθύρωνβαβύκολ -


ἐπ. γ' 8 [ - - - - - - ]χῦ[ - ]ἐνος
9 [ - - - - - - ]
10 [ - - - - - - ]
175 [. . . . . . . . . .] υγεδέ
[. . . . . . . . . .] εἱρόνασαρετασ
[. . . . . . . . . .] προστατικωμ
[. . . . . . . . . .] τρωίανφι
[. . . . . . . . . .] αλάον
180 [. . . . . . . . . .] νοισιπαν οστενοισιν [. . .]
[. . . . . . . . . .] σκιαζέτε μωσάν ἀρόξη
[. . . . . . . . . .] όφ]
[. . . . . . . . . .] πολλακι-παίανβέ
[. . . . . . . . . .] άν τωναπτότων[,]. κων εἰρελιομον
[. . . . . . . . . .] κσ
[. . . . . . . . . .] υτεθεσπιωνδότ[.
[. . . . . . . . . .] επεο[.]
[. . . . . . . . . .] ην. Μαάντεσαυλαν [ 9 letters ]φσωναγ. ιφ. [.

Col. xxxv (Fr. 15, Col. ii).

Χ. [.
2 lines lost.
[. . . . ] ειφιλο[.
[. . . . . μδε . [. ]
[. . . . . . μπα[.]
10 [. . . ] γχιθ[.
[. . . ] παινναιθερ[.
[. . . ] ε' ανκορυφαμ[.
[. . . ] νερουλεγομεν[.
[. . . ] αταυρωνες[.
15 [. . . . . ] υπροβωμ[.
[. . . . . . . . ] οιτ[.]. τ. μο[. . . . ] ταρο[.
[. . . . . . . . ] δησαναυδαν[.
[. . . . . . . . ] αιτέσιχρηστηριον

Β. Fr. 16.
[. . . . . . . . . .] αι
[. . . . . . . . . .] Ἰσσ
[. . . . . . . . . .] οαν
175 11 [ο — ο — ο — ο — — ν γε δέ]
12 [ο — ο — ο — — άπ]ερωνας ἀρεταί
13 [ο — ο — ο — — ο] προστακτικῶς.
14 [ο — ο] τρωάν — φι-
15 Λ — ω — ω λαδν
180 16 [ο — ο — στεφάνοισι πάν — στεφάνοισι ν]ν [. . .]
17 [ο — ο — ο — ο — — σκιάζετε] Μοισάν Άρ(ιστοφᾶ)ν(η;) κ[]
18 [ο — ο — ο] πολλάκι: παιάν δέ
19 [ο — ο — ο ά]ν. τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν κ. [, . .] κ.ω.ν. 
2η(νόδοτος) εἴλιομαν.

VII.

 [. . . . . . .] ν τε θεσπεσίων δύ[ε]ιραί (?)
 [, . . . . .] επει[. . .]
 [ . . . . . . . .] ον [άγ]λαάν τ' εσ αὐλάν [ 9 letters ]ως τὸν αν . . . [. .]

. [ ]

2 lines lost.
[. . .]ει φιλα[ ]
[. . .]ν δέ . . [ ]
[. . .]μπα[ ]
10 [. . .] αγχιθ[ε]
[. . ]ταυλόν αἴθερ[ ]
[. . .]ε' ἀν κορυφάν [
[φα]νερόν λέγομεν[
[. . .] α ταύρον ε][
15 [. . . . ι] ν πρὸ βωμ[οῦ (?]
[, . . .]οι[. .] τ. μο[. . ]παροι[
[, . . . . .] κελα[θ]ησαν αὐθάν·[
[ε]ν]αντέσι χρηστήριον

Fr. 16.

[. . . . . . . . . . . . . .]αι
[, . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]ον
[, . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]ραν

E. 2
52

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

[...]

5 [.............] ουσ κελαδηραθμουσ
[.............] πτον [.] αμαζινων
[.............] σφαισανιπποι[.]
[.............] πανοναρμα
[.............] ον

10 [.............] δουρανοντευντεπλωβηγατρι
μναμ[.]οι[.]αικοη[.]οιτευ
μαχαιρανδιδομεν
[.]υφλα[.][.]πανδρωφρενεσ
[.]στισανευθελικωνιαιδων

15 βαθειανελθ[.][.]τονερεθ[.][.]φοιαισοδον

εμοιιετουτ[.][.]εθω

[.....] αθανατ[.]υπορον

Two fragments from Fr. 16 (?).

Fr. 17. ... Fr. 18. ...
ομηρον[ ] οισ[ ]
ιόντεσα[ ] ...
επηδο[ ]
[ ]

Fr. 19, Col. i.

[ ]
[ δέλτον]
[ ]
[ μη ο]

5

[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
[ ]

[...] αυτ[.]αυτό

10 [..] εσθα[.]

λεχοσεπτημλοχειαν
841. PINDAR, PAEANS

5 έμπρος κελάδησας έμνους.

[...]

10 δ' Οὐρανοῦ τ' εἰπέπλω θυγατρὶ
Μναμ[ο]σ[η]να κόρα[ι]σι τ' εὐ-
μαχανίαν διδόμεν.

[π]υλα[ὶ] γὰ[ρ] ἄνδρῶν φρένες
[ὅ]στις ἄνενθ' Ἐλικωνιάδων

15 βαθειαν ἐλθ[ο]ντων ἐρευνήσα σ'[οφίας ὅδ]ῶν.

Fr. 17. . . . .

'Ομήρου []

ιόντες α[]

ἐπεὶ δα[]

. . .

Fr. 19.

]]

] διλτοῦ.

]

] εἰς ὁ.

5 ]]

]]

]

]

], , ατ[

10 π . . ἐσθα[ι] λίχῳ ἐπὶ τὴν λοχίαν.
]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

15

Fr. 19, Col. ii, with Fr. 20.

20 [.]υνάστιπεισομα[ηίδιοσουκεθδηέ]
κοιοινθυατηρηπ[απιστάμ.].δεδη[κακά .
ν' .
δεμινενπελ[ε]γε[ν'.

25 ρυθδείσανεναγεαπετρανφαινεν[ .]γαγγ'ι
καλ[.].οντιμινορτυγιανναυταιταλαν: 
πεφορητοθπ'αγαίονθαμα'.
τάσοκρατιστος .κεραστος.
ερασσατομιχθεις
30 τοξοφόροντελεσαγιονον'

Fr. 21. . . . . . . . . . . . . .

5 [.] ων'

10 [.] . ντελο{[.].
[.] νυχαίος[.]. νον
[.]περαίνοισ
[.]ναποκαίπατροσ'υμ
841. PINDAR, PAEANS

α
]ωτον ἐκαίρ-
γ
]

15
]

ἡ Δίος οὐκ ἐθέλοισα . . .
Κολον θυγάτηρ πι]
ἀπιστά μ[o] δέδοις κα . . .
δέ μιν ἐν πελάγει . . .

25 ρυθμεῖσαν εὔανγέλα πέτραν φανῆαι. [!]ν[αιγε]]
καλ[έ]οντι μιν 'Ορτυγίαν ναῦται πάλαι.
πεφόρητο δ' ἐπ' Αἰγαῖον θαμά·
tὰς δ' κράτιστος κόριστος
ἐράσσατο μιχθεῖς

30 τοξοφόρον τελέσαι γόνον.

Fr. 21. . . . . . . . . . . . .

5 . ν τέλος [έσ]ται 
] . ν τέλος [έσ]ται 
] ωτον

10 . ν ἀπὸ καὶ πατρός: ἦμα . . .
Fr. 22. . . . Fr. 23. . . . Fr. 24. . . . Fr. 25. . . .
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]

Miscellaneous unplaced fragments.

Fr. 26. . . . Fr. 27 (to Fr. 26?). . . .
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]

5 Χε... ε[.][ν[.].] ειθ[.][ή[.][ρ[.][μ[.]
κρο[.][ιονδω[.][ιγλα[.
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]
[...]

10 [. . . . ] [. .][μ[.][η[.][δ[.][ε[.
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]

Beginnings of lines.

Fr. 28. . . . Fr. 29. . . . Fr. 30. . .
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]

Fr. 31. . . . Fr. 32. . .
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . .]
Fr. 22. ... 

]... 

\nu

]s iσὴ ἔπι[ 

]

...

Fr. 26. ... ... ... ... Fr. 27. ... ... ...

[... ...]μ[... [ 

[... ...] ντενε[ 

[ε]πιος εἰχ' ἄμφι ... [ 

τι παρθένῳ σὺν πολ[ 

5 \chi ... ε[...] νηλεῖ θήρ μ[ 

Κρο[...] ν δῶμ' ἀγλα[ 

[... ...] τ Ἐπ' Ἠσυνία[i] 

[... ]ολ[...] ε[...]τρ[ 

[... ...] μαντις αὐ ... [ 

10 [... ...] ν μηδε[ 

[... ...] μ[...]με[ 

[... ...] άν]μφορ[ 

Fr. 28. ... ... ... 

... ... 

[...]σ[ 

ω ταῦτα[...] (?) 

ιή[...] παί μ[ 

dαμον 'Αθα[...] 

... ...
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Ends of lines.

Fr. 33.

Fr. 34.

Fr. 35.

Fr. 36.

Fr. 37.

Fr. 38.

Fr. 39.

Fr. 40.

Fr. 41.

Fr. 42.

Fr. 43.

Fr. 44.

Fr. 45.

Fragments having blank margin above.

Fragments having blank margin below.
Fr. 33. 

]α. [. . ]
]
]ασσ' ἀμφ[ιβέ]βακεν [ 
] πολιόν
]σο[. .] . ιας νέμε Λατοῖδας (?)
5 ] ἀλμά
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
] eiδεα τ[ 
]
] μ'* 
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
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]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
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Fr. 46.

Fr. 47.

Fr. 48.

Fr. 49.

Fr. 50.

Fr. 51.

Fr. 52.

Fr. 53.

Fr. 54.

Fr. 55.

Fr. 56.

Fr. 57.

Fr. 58.

Fr. 59.

Fr. 60.

Fr. 61.

Fr. 62.

Fr. 63.

Fr. 64.
Fr. 46. 

\[\pi i[\]
\[\alpha \mu \beta \rho \sigma \iota [\]
\[\alpha i [\]
\[\alpha i \nu \beta \epsilon \mu \omega [\]
\[\beta a [\]
\[\gamma [\]
\[\omega [\]
\[\kappa \epsilon \lambda [\]
\[\iota [\]
\[\nu [\]
\[\varphi [\]

Fr. 47. 

\[\nu [\]
\[\Delta \alpha l [\]
\[\nu [\]

Fr. 48. 

\[\cdot [\]
\[\cdot [\]
\[\cdot [\]
\[? \nu [\]
\[? \nu [\]

Fr. 49. 

\[s \phi r a [\]
\[s [\]
\[\delta [\]
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Scholia.

Fr. 65. . . . Fr. 66. . . . Fr. 67. . . . Fr. 68. . . .

Fr. 69. . . . Fr. 70. . . . Fr. 71. . . . Fr. 72. . . .

Fr. 73. . . . Fr. 74. . . . Fr. 75. . . . Fr. 76. . . .

Fr. 77. . . . Fr. 78. . . . Fr. 79. . . .

Fr. 80. . . . Fr. 81. . . .
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 65</th>
<th>Fr. 66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀλεί[</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μαντεία[</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νε[.ι[</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οὔ τῶν[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προς[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ομε[.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 70</th>
<th>Fr. 71</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀπολογε[.</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐ καὶ θ[.</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκλεισ[</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λειψ[</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ή[.</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 73</th>
<th>Fr. 74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] ]</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ηπαῖς ήσαν[</td>
<td>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fr. 82, Col. i.

ηπειγμαντευομενω
ηθληθηγ[.].,νειν[,.
ηγοθευνηλαρ:[.].]
πυρωθευνηλα[.].
μενοντοντοτεξελευ
μοι
]
πηθειαναιρε
][]παντροσπλαν
][]καιοχρη
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
]
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VIII. [ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ ?].

Fr. 82, Col. i.

έχρησεν μαντευμόνων
εἴκληθε γ[ε]νέν [ο].

λέγει δι' έκρησε ταύτα ἄντιος ὁ θεός ἤνικά . . .

μενόν τὸν ποτὲ ἐλευ-
σόμενον (?) μοι [ ]

ἀπε[π]τει ἀναίρε-

θέντος [ ] [ο]ν πατρὸς Κλα-
μένου ὑπὸ Περσήρους (?) . . . . καὶ ὁ χρη-

συμίς προύντιψε στρατεύ-
εσθαί ἐπὶ Θῆβας

[ ]

[ ] πας

[ ] εσ]

[ου έκρηθε

ἐκάτερος

]. . . τὸ ε[to(].χε( ).

Fr. 82, Col. ii.

[τὸ πάθος τὸ[υ]το πλῆρες [. . . . . . . . .
[ἔσοπε]τελέοισι εἴδως, τοῖς δὲ Τραώι τὸ Ἐκάθης
ἐνυπνιοὺς (α)ῦ τελεό(ς) ἐπιτελεῖσθαι.

20 σπευδοῦντ', ἐκλαγξὲ θ' ἱερότατον
dαιμόνιον κέαρ ὀλοεί-
sι στοναχαίς ἀφαρ,
καὶ τοιαδε κορυφὰ σά-
μαινεν λόγων: ὁ πανάπε[ερον εὐ-

25 ρέοντα Κρονίων, τελείς σ[ῦ νῦν τὰν πάλαι
π[ε]πρωμέναι πάθαν ἀ-
νίκα Δαρδανίδαις 'Εκάβα[α] φράσεν ὄψιν (?)
[ἄν] ποτ' εἰδον ὑπὸ σπλάγχνοις
φέροισα τόνδ' ἀνέρ', ἐδοξ[ε] δὲ

30 τεκεὶν πυρφόρον Ἑρμ[υν]ν.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
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ekatōnχerav'oxklhrai[
lioniasticànnewpist]
katerēpsaisēipte [ [ . . . ]aiterapanva[ əntwof]
35 [ . . . ]lepromahēia

Frs. 83 and 84.

]κνοφ[ ]με [ . ]
. . .
. δ[
ομ[ 5 τιτ[ ]κ[
δ[
λοιπ[ 13 letters ]μλ[ . ] [ σ[ ] 10 μεγ[ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ]ανδεπος ənt'pasof]
[.]γωμεν
υπερχωνος μυθοθηκομε[ κεκανοθιμβοσπεικα[ 15 [ . ]πέρτ'ωκεα[. ]ν παντασκατειρηκτου[ ]

Fr. 85. . . Fr. 86. Fr. 87. . . . . . . .
]σκρ[ ]νδροσθ[ ]ωσ[ ]τρηικα[ ]ανοιξαμ[ . ]ν [ . . ]

66
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ékatōγχειρα, σκληρά [δὲ βία
'Ἰλιον πᾶσάν νιν ἐπὶ πέδων
κατερείψαι ἕσσε δὲ . [ [. . . ]α τέρας ὑπνα[λέον
οὕτως α[]
33 [. . . ]λε προμάθεια

Frs. 83 and 84.

[να[| με [ [. . . .
. . δ[| ομ[| 5 τετ[| κ[| δ[| λοιπ[| σο[| 13 letters ]υλ[| 10 μεγ[. . . . . . . . π[ὰν δ’ ἔπος αντ’(τοῦ) πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν (!) κλιθεί[ς] ἐκο[νάσατο] σφίσιν,
μάλα πράξιον [δι]καίως.
κυνοὶ μάντει[ες] Ἄπολλωνος, ἵγῳ Χρόν(ιπτος ?).

Fr. 86.

άμ[δρος ὅτ[ε [ι]ωσ[| [τρχ κα[|
[ος οὺ λυτ[ός (?) [π]άντων ἐργαν ἱερ[ατον (?) [τα[. ]ἐντες[|
5 [. . . . .] [. . . . .] [. . . . .]

Fr. 87.

. . . .
Fr. 88. . . . Fr. 89. . . . Fr. 90. . . . . . .
\[\pi\epsilon\mu\[ \quad \beta\nu\[\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]

Fr. 91. . . . Fr. 92. . . . Fr. 93. . . . Fr. 94. . . .
\[\alpha\nu\[\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]
\[\ell\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]

Fr. 95. . . . Fr. 96. . . . Fr. 97. . . . Fr. 98. . . .
\[\lambda\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\]
\[\theta\rho\alpha\sigma\nu\[\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]

Fr. 99. . . . Fr. 100. . . . Fr. 101. . . . Fr. 102. . .
\[\nu\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\[\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]

Fr. 103 . . . Fr. 104 . . . . Fr. 105 . . . . Fr. 106 . . .
\[\omega\omicron\nu\theta\phi\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]
\[\cdot\cdot\cdot\]

Fr. 88. \( \pi \epsilon \rho [\pi] \)
\([.]\delta \omicron\]
\([.]\cdot \theta \omicron[\)

Fr. 90. \( \nu \cdot [\)
\(i \sigma \omicron \rho \omicron \mu \omicron \omicron \omicron \epsilon \phi \alpha \iota [\nu \epsilon \tau \omicron (?) \)
\(\chi [\alpha \lambda \kappa \epsilon[\), \(\mu \epsilon \nu \tau \delta[\)
\(\nu \pi \delta \kappa \iota \omicron[\)

Fr. 92. \]
\(\cdot \dot{\alpha} \nu [\rho (?)\)
\(\sigma \pi \alpha [\)
\(\alpha \Delta i\omicron \omicron \cdot \cdot[\)

Fr. 93. \]
\(\cdot [\)
\(\tau [\]
\(\epsilon \alpha \iota [\omicron [\)
\(\dot{o} \pi \lambda \omicron \omicron [\tau \epsilon [\)

Fr. 94. \]
\(\nu [\)
\(\nu [\)
\(\nu [\)
\(\nu [\)
\(\nu [\)
\(\nu [\)

Fr. 95. \]
\(\lambda o \mu \epsilon \nu [\)
\(\cdot [\)
\(\dot{\iota} [\)
\(\dot{\iota} [\)
\(\dot{\iota} [\)
\(\dot{\iota} [\)

Fr. 96. \]
\(\theta \rho \alpha \omicron \omicron [\)
\(\nu [\)
\(\nu [\)

Fr. 99. \]
\(\nu \tau [\epsilon [\)
\(\alpha [\cdot \pi \omega \lambda \lambda [\)

Fr. 103. \]
\(\tau [\nu [\alpha \theta \omicron \rho [\)
\(\iota \eta [\cdot [\)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 107</th>
<th>Fr. 108</th>
<th>Fr. 109</th>
<th>Fr. 110</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 111</th>
<th>Fr. 112</th>
<th>Fr. 113</th>
<th>Fr. 114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 115</th>
<th>Fr. 116</th>
<th>Fr. 117</th>
<th>Fr. 118</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δᾶ[</td>
<td>]   μ</td>
<td>μιτ[</td>
<td>]   μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐνπ[</td>
<td>]   ρᾶ[</td>
<td>]   ασχ[</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαρ[</td>
<td>]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 119</th>
<th>Fr. 120</th>
<th>Fr. 121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[υσ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>χ[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fr. 122</th>
<th>Fr. 123</th>
<th>Fr. 124</th>
<th>Fr. 125</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[Ν]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[σαρ[σ[</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>]σθε[</td>
<td>]σνυ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| [ ]    | [ ]    | [ ]    | [ ]    |
Fr. 107.

πρῶτος ἄπ[ό] δάφνης δαφὺς[φορκίν](!)

Fr. 108.

προσδι[ο]ν(?)

Fr. 112.

οὖν Χαρίτ[εσι;]

Fr. 116.

ρ

τὸ κύρ[ίον]

γάρ []

Fr. 124.

ο[κεν] [παρο]

ὁρ[τ] Ν[ ]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

D

Col. i (Fr. 126, Col. i).
Opposite lines 16-17.

\[ \cdot \cdot \cdot . \]
\[ \sigmarip \]

Col. ii (Fr. 127 and Fr. 126, Col. ii).

Fr. 127.

\[ \deltai \]
\[ \deltai \]
\[ \rhoi \]

Fr. 126, Col. ii.

\[ [.\varepsilon\nuo\varepsilon] \]
\[ \eta[.\arpi\upsilon\phi] \]
\[ \nu[.\iota\rho\phi\tau\omicron\upsilon] \]
\[ \eta\pi\omicron\upsilon{\tau}\]
\[ \eta\pi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\omicron\upomicron\chi] \]
\[ \upsilon\theta\alpha\gamma\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon\]
\[ \eta\nu\tau\omicron\omega\theta\epsilon\nu] \]
\[ \eta\mu\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\tau\omicron\omega\upsilon] \]
\[ \eta\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\omega\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\]

Col. iii (Fr. 128, Col. i).

Opposite l. 37.

\[ \sigma \]

Opposite l. 44.

\[ \varepsilon\sigma\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\upsilon \]
\[ \sigma\alpha\nu\nu\alpha\]

Plate III.

Opposite l. 40-41.

\[ \varepsilon\mu\nu\nu \]
\[ \tau\alpha\nu\upsilon \]
\[ \tau\tau\alpha\tau\lambda\lambda\mu\eta\nu\alpha \]

Between ll. 47 and 48.

\[ \varepsilon\mu\mu\upsilon\upsilon. \]
\[ \cdot \]
IX. [ΘΗΒΑΙΟΙΣ].

στρ. α’
1 [Ἄκτις ἀελίου, τί πολύσκοπε μήσεαι,]
2 [ὅ ματερ ὀμμάτων; ἄστρον ὑπέρτατον]
3 [ἐν ἁμέρᾳ κλεπτόμενον (ὡ) ἐθηκας ἁμάχανον]

4 [ἰσχύν τ’ ἀνδράσιν καὶ σοφίας ὀδὸν,]
5 [ἐπίσκοτον ἀτραπὸν ἑσομένα]
6 [ἐλαύνειν τι νεώτερον ἦ πάρος;]
7 [ἀλλὰ σε πρὸς Δίος, ἰπποσόα θοᾶς,]
8 [ικετεῖοι, ἀπήμονα]
9 [εἰς] ὁλ[βον τινὰ τράποιο Θήβαις,]
10 [ὅ πιὸ[ν]ιοια, πάγκουνον τέρασ.

ἀντ. α’
1 [—]ρᾶ[- ὁ ὁ ἀ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ
2 [—] [ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ
3 [ὡ]δο[νός]— πολέμοιο δὲ σάμα φέρεις τινός,
4 [ἡ] [κ]αρποῦ φ[θίσιν, ἦ νιφετοῦ σθένος]
5 [ὁ]π[ήρφατον, [ἡ] ἁτάσιν οὐλομέναν
6 [ἡ] πόντ[α]ν κενέωσιν (ὡ) ἀμ πέδουν,
7 [ἡ] παγετόν Χ[θοῦν, ἦ νότιον θέρος]
8 [ὑδατι] ζακότ[ῷ] βέον
  ἦ νότιον θ[έρος] ἐν [ὡ νῦτος πνεύ (?)]
  ἦ μεγαλοκύρῳ [ὑδατι . . .
  ἦ παρὰ τὸ νοτ[ιὸν.

9 [ἡ] γαίαν κατακλύσασα θήσεις]
20 [ἀνδρῶν νέον ἕξ ἀρχάς γένος]

ἐπ. α’
1 [ὁλοφύρομαι οὐδὲν ὅτι πάντων μέτα πείσομαι]

Lines 22–33 lost = ep. 2–10, str. 1–3.

Opposite ll. 40–41.

[τροπος
[τατου
[ἐπὶ]τελλόμενα
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Col. iv (Fr. 128, Col. ii).

Plate III.

γενειακὸς
εκραδυνυποδιομοιοιτινα
ταυτ[...][μεριαλεγεί]

35 λεχειπελασαμβροσιωμελίας ανεγγ[
μι[...][ταυλουτρικάδρυπε][...][δύονε ευτοπ][

αγανοκαλαμωσυμαγενθρόν μη[
tουποιμασι [τη]

μηδεσίτεφρενοσμμ[τερανχαρίν]
λιτανευσκα[τα][βολε]

μισαίασαν[τι[διειστεχα[τ]

40 χρηστηριον[...].[λοιπ[...].ε το[θ[.

ενωτήμερονευρβανθεμε[ι]

εξαρτονπροφάταντεκ[]
κοραμ[...][γείσωκεανουμελιασθεόπθη[]
[...][κάδομοστροτονκαξέαθουπο]

45 ακερσκομαπάτερανορέασ
επετρεψασεκατασφρονος-

καταροποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

Frs. 129–31, Col. i.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.

κατ[...].[νεωντοποιωσοροφ[...].[ρίανάν]
περίαλλαβροτωντίεν
ευρίποτετσυντεινεχώρων μεταπο[.

[κα[...].[κα[...].[κα[...]].σχυ[.
6 λέξει πέλας ἀμβροσίῳ Μελίας ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐγγὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ (?) με[ε]ν' οὐλοῦ τὴν φόβην ἀν[纽带]δούσ. ἐν τούτῳ []
7 ἀγανὸν καλάμῳ συνάγεν θρόνον με[]
toῖς ποιήμασι. τῷ[]
7 μήδεσι σὲ ί τε φρενὸς ἥμ[πι]τεραν χάριν.
8 λιτανεύω, ἐκαβδήλε.
9 Μοισαίαι αἱ [ἅ]πτιθεῖς τέχνα[ία].
10 Χρηστήμιον — λοντ[.]τ, τὸ ἐν Θῆβαις ίσμηνιοι.

άντ. β' 1 ἐν οὗ Τύνερον εὐρυβίαν θεμίτων ποτὲ
2 ἐξαιρετον προφάταν ἄτεκ[εν λέξει]
3 κόρα ὦ[γ]ειο 'Ὀκεανοῦ Μελία σοὶ Πόθισε[έ]
4 τῷ[?] Κάδμου στρατὸν καὶ Ζεάθου πόλιν,
5 ἀκροεκόμα πάτερ, αἴορεάς
6 ἐπέτρεψας ἐκατι σαθρονος.
7 καὶ γὰρ οἱ πόντιοι 'Ορο[σ]τίαινα νῦν
8 περιάλλα βροτῶν τίνιν,
9 Ἐὐρίπου τε συνέτειν χώρον μεταπορμεθήναι λέγεται (?)

Frs. 129–31, Col. I.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Two fragments perhaps from this column.

Fr. 132.

| εἰδω| |]αντα[ |
| } | |
| μεν| |
| } |

Fr. 133.

| . . . |

Fr. 131, Col. ii.

| . [ηλλ[ |
| εφ[ ]δο[ |
| τημι[ |
| λεγεται[ |
| γναμπτ[ |
| ψαντεσα[ |
| παθηδε[ |
10 | καθρουσο[ |
| ἀγησεται[ |
| πολιάοχ[ |
| αστουστε[ |
| ἓνοκαδ[ |

15 | τακ[ |
| εστα[ |
| εμοι[ |
| τιμε[ . . ]ρμιν[ |
| ἐμυπετα[ ]κεινο[ |
20 | ζευκθείσαπ[ ]οβωμ[ |
| νιονετιτε[ ]τονα[ ] |
| κλυτομάντιεστωδ[ |

Fr. 134. . . . . . . . Fr. 135. . . . . . .

| ] | ]μοι[ |
| ]σταλιονφ[ |
| ]στινδαπόλλα[ |
| ]ικδι[ |
| ]τινανδρανεκδ[ |
| Ευκδεκρητησο[ ] | ]τον[ |
| ]οτι[ | |
Col. ii.

...[.]αλλά
εἰ[.]δο[.
τῆς μῆ[.
Λέγετο[.
γναμπτ[.
ψαντες αἱ[
πατῆρ δεῖ[.

καὶ χρυσὸ[.
ἀγήσεται τί[.
σολιάχ[.
ἀστοίσι τε[.
ξενοκαδ[.

... τακ[.

ἀντ. ; εστα[.
ἐμὴν [.
τίν μὲν πά[.]ρ μὴν ἰμὴρ (?)
ἐμὴν δὲ πά[.]ρ κείνο[.]ς . . .

... ξευχθείσα π[.]βο[.]ωμ[.]ιος . . .
νίδων ἔτι τέξ[.]ε[.]ς τόν α[.] [.
κλυτομάντεις τῷ δ[.

Fr. 134. . . . . . . .

... Κραστάλιον φ[.
ἐστὶν δ' Ἀπόλλων[.
ἰκάδ[.]ο (!)}
καὶ ἄνδρῶν ἐκ[.[
]τ( ) ἐκ δὲ Κρήτης σ[.[}
Fr. 136. ... Fr. 137. ... Fr. 138. ...

] ] δ[ ] μον[ ἀσφ[ ]
][εἰσ[ ][ ὕψ[ ]
][...[ ]

[σκ[...

Fr. 139. ... ...

] πό[...]
] και[.] ἁπτήτωσασπ[ ]
] ἁπτήτωσασπ[ ]

Fragments which may belong to either C or D.

Fr. 140. ... Fr. 141. ... Fr. 142. ... Fr. 143. ...

] εμ[ ] ἄστων[ ] ε[ ]
]εἰρ[ ] ὕψ[ ]
]κε[ ] τω[ ] ἅικ[ ]
][ρη[ ]
][τ[...

Fr. 144. ... Fr. 145. ... Fr. 146. ... Fr. 147. ...

] κιαν[ ] κτον[ ] ἁσο[ ]
] θε[ ]
] λε[ ]

... ... ... ... ...
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Fr. 137...

5 ο] Δελφοί δὲν καὶ κ[
  ]ν ὁμώνυμο[  
  ]ς ὑπθαίον προω[  
  ]οι. εἰκάδος Ἀρίσταρχος ! [  
10 ]  
  ]ν

Fr. 138...

ποτ' ὅμων [ ν }] Ἰωμήν ( ! )  
  ]  
  
Fr. 139...

]. πο[ . . . . . . ]  
[ο( ) καὶ [εἰ]ς τὴν τῆς Αθηναίων πόλιμων ( ! )  
τοῖς] τὴν Αθήνην κατωκοῦσιν μαντεῖοι[θαί ( ! )

Fr. 144...

]κιάς[  
]τε ὑπομείν[α].  
]λεσά [ ]μυ [ 
  ]

... ... ...
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Fr. 148. . . . Fr. 149. . . . Fr. 150. . . . Fr. 151. . . .
] δεω[  ] αν[  ] δεο[  
] [  ] [  ] [  
. . .  ] [  ] [  
. . .  ] [  ] [  
. . .  ]

Fr. 152. . . . Fr. 153. . . . Fr. 154. . . . Fr. 155. . . .
ου[  Α[  ] ου[  ] σι[  ]
. . .  . . .  . . .  . . .

Fr. 156. . . . Fr. 157. . . . Fr. 158. . . .
]αι[  ]ανεμ[  ] αι[  
. . .  . . .  . . .  . . .
. . .  . . .

Fr. 159. . . . Fr. 160. . . . Fr. 161. . . .
]αξιοποι[  ] τε[  ] τοψι[  
]  ]  ]
. . .  . . .  . . .

Fr. 162. . . . .
] νταλιαν  [  
] εναιπάροια[  
] θυτ' κο[  
. . .  . . .

I. For the Thebans.

1-10. 'Ere the pains of old age draw nigh let a man clothe his mind with cheerfulness and be content in due measure, seeing the power that is set in his house. Oh joy! Now the consummating year and the Hours, children of Themis, have come to the horse-
loving city of Thebes, bringing Apollo's garlanded feast. May he long crown the
generations of the citizens with the flowers of sobriety and good government.'

1. The letter before the lacuna may also be o. For πριν . . . πριν cf. Pyth. ii. 91–2
προσέθε . . . πριν.
3. ἅδων κ.t.l. seems to be epexegetical of ἐπὶ μέτρα, i.e. the more a man has the greater should be his thankfulness. οἰκόδετος is a new compound.

6. Θρύμγων: cf. Pind. Fr. 30 Θύμῳ... ἄλογον Δίω... ἄ δὶ τὰς χρυσόμπυκας ἀγλακάρπους τίτκες ἀλαβίας Ὀρας.

8. δαίον φιληστέφανον: i.e. the festival of the Daphnephoria, which was celebrated at Thebes in honour of Apollo Ismenius every ninth year; cf. Frs. 107 and 129-31.

9. τὰυ δὲ: or τὰυδὲ, which Prof. Bury would prefer. For ἐρπτον cf. Pyth. iv. 240 στεφάνωι τί νι ποιῶ ἐρπτον.

II. FOR THE ABDERITES.

1-5. 'Aberus with breastplate of brass, son of the Naiad Thronia and Poseidon, beginning from thee I will pursue this paean for the Ionian folk, hard by the shrine of Apollo of Derenus and Aphrodite...'

1-2. This statement of the parentage of Aberus differs from the common version, according to which he was a son of Hermes (Steph. Byz. s. v. "Ἀβδηρα, Apollodor. Bībd. ii. 5. 8). [Naiδοι is due to Bury; it would be natural to make the paramour of Poseidon a Naiad. Some such epithet as τέλλιος would also be suitable, but that word is too long for the space. Aberus is said to have been beloved by Heracles, who founded in his honour the city of Abdera after he had been killed by the horses of the Thracian king Diomedes. It is noteworthy that, while Apollodorus l.c. calls Aberus Λοκρὸς ἠξ Ὀποιντός, according to the Tabula Farnesiana (C. I. G. 5984, c. 12 sqq.) he was a Θρυμγός, i.e. a native of the Opuntian Thronium. That city was supposed to have been named after the nymph Thronia (Schol. II. B 533), and the statement of the Tab. Farn. evidently reflects the same version of the legend as that here followed by Pindar.

ἀδρακός was no doubt followed by other words, though there is a short blank space after it; πατρίου was written by a different hand.

3. [σέθεν] is used as in Ἰεμ. i. 4 Δαίκου καταγνήτα, σέθεν ἀδρακός ὄμος ὄρματι βέμεν ἄινον, the termination -θεν having its proper ablative meaning, ἀπὸ σοῦ τὴν ἄρχην λαβὼν as the scholiast rightly remarks. ἄποικος γὰρ κ.τ.λ. explains ἰδιων. For the colonization of Abdera by the Teians in the middle of the sixth century B.C. cf. Hdt. i. 168, Strabo xiv. p. 644.

4. [διαγω]: cf. Simonides Fr. 29 καπτόλων μελῶς διώκων, and Ἰεθμ. iii. 21 (iv. 3) ἀρτές ὧμωρ διώκειν. μὲ could be read in place of the doubtful ω, but πατρίου ἀπαυγαίω, though it might be supported by an appeal e.g. to Ἰεθμ. vi. 2 δεύτερον κράτημα Μοσσαίων μελῶν κάρναμεν, is less suitable to [σέθεν].

5. [ἀ]πορον: cf. Pindar Fr. 63 (schol. ad Lycochron Alex. 440 ἄδρανων κόντι) ἄδρανος' τότες οὕτω καλούμενοι ἐν Ἀδήρασ, ἐνθε Ἁμώνου Ἀπολλωνος ἱερὸν ἐκείν, οἱ μημονείη καὶ Πιδάρος ἐν Παύσων. The majority of the MSS. of Lycochron show the spelling ἁδρανοὺς, one, Par. A, having Δαρ. A supplement of three letters would suit the papyrus better than one of only two, but there is hardly any difference in the space occupied by η and ε. There was perhaps a reference to the temple after [ά]πολο, as in the scholium on Lycochron l. c.

The papyrus consistently makes this verse end with two short syllables in synapheia with the verse following; the division adopted in the text at the fourth syllable of l. 6 has the advantage of placing the syllaba anceps at the end of the verse. An apparently mistaken division occurs also in the fourth line of the epode; cf. note on l. 25.

24-36. '... I dwell in this vine-bearing fruitful land of Thrace; may mighty time in future days ne'er weary of a stable course for me. Young is my city, yet I have seen my mother's mother stricken with foemen's fire. But if a man in succour of his friends
fiercely withstands the enemy, his efforts coming to the conflict in season bring peace. O Paean, to whom we cry, we cry! may Paean never leave us.'

24. νοίον: the speaker is the personified Abdera.

25. The marginal i marks the 900th line; cf. introd. and 659. 67. We transcribe
-ναί τε καὶ to this verse in order to avoid the internal hiatus καὶ ευκαρπον.

26-7. Cf. Ol. viii. 28-9 ὃ δ’ ἐπιστέλλων χρώνος τούτο πρᾶσσειν μὴ κάιοι, and for ἐμπέδος,
Nem. vii. 57 Μάραι τελεός ἐμπέδον ἄρετε.

28-9. ματρὸς ματέρ’ ἐμάσ: i. e. Athens, which took a prominent part in the colonization
of Teos (Strabo xiv. p. 633, Pausan. viii. 3. 6) which in turn was the parent-city of Abdera
(cf. schol. on l. 3 above). The meaningless ετέκον of the papyrus requires some such
emendation as that adopted in the text. The mark of length enclosed between two dots
over the second syllable of ἐμπαν was intended to replace or to be an alternative to the
quantity mark first written. The a is long in ἐμπον, short in ἐμπα. Either a long or short
syllable would be admissible at this point; cf. l. 65. For ελ[ Bury suggests ἕλιμνός as
a gloss on κάιοι.

31. ἀρετῶν is to be scanned as a disyllable. The marginal note ἕαν ἐν καίρῳ is a
paraphrase of the text and may be restored in various ways.

32. Cf. Pyth. viii. 10-1 τραχεία διαμερίσσων ἐπιστάθησα κράτει. The interlinear ἐξ,
signifying a variant ἐπιστάθησθη, is not certainly by the first hand; the present tense
is probably sound. In the marginal note opposite this line (and also in that on l. 34) it
is not clear whether δύναται is used impersonally = 'The sense of the passage is,' as
apparently in the scholium on l. 36, or whether δ μόχθος is the subject, for which cf. l. 73
δύναται φόρειε ἀποκτενεί.

34. For καταβαίνων here cf. Pyth. viii. 78 μετρῶ καταβαίνειν, though whether the verb
in these two passages means 'to descend into the arena' or has a wider sense 'to
proceed' (with seasonableness or moderation), is uncertain. The former meaning is very
appropriate in the present context.

37-8. The scholium δύσβαται ... λήμμα apparently refers to ἄλκα, though it does
not seem very apposite. Perhaps ἦ should be read for ἦ; of the following letter only the
barest vestige remains, but this, so far as it goes, suits the base of a τ. In the second
scholium we suppose that καί, which is in a different hand from that of Θεων(ν) ... ἀπάταις,
indicates a variant ἄλκα for the ἄλκαι of the text; cf. l. 40 δείκσις, IV. 4 σατ. It is true that
there is only a very slight remnant of the supposed mark of short quantity above ἄλκα, but there is certainly a trace of ink which it is not easy to interpret otherwise.

The remainder of the note cites in comparison another passage of Pindar (Fr. 213,1), to which
may be added Isthm. v. 44-5 τετείχετα δὲ πάλαι πύργος ἤψιτον ἄρταῖς ἀναβαίνειν. Why
the citation is introduced by the word θεω(ν) is not clear. Possibly θεω(ν) occurred
in the lacuna before διακ. To connect θεω(ν) with καί and suppose a crisis of καί αἰθόων
is unsatisfactory on account of (1) the difference in the hands, (2) the absence of diaeresis
over ε, (3) the difficulty of completing the sentence | καὶ ἐκθέοι. A better hypothesis,
we think, is to regard θεω(ν) as a critic who read ἄλκα; cf. the references to Zenodotus
and others in ll. 61, IV. 58, &c. The grammarian Theon, who flourished about the time
of Augustus, wrote commentaries on poets, and it has been argued from an allusion in
Schol. Ol. v. 42 that these included a work on Pindar; cf. Susemihl, Gesch. der Griech.
Litt. ii. pp. 215-7. This view is now corroborated by the papyrus. ὕψιτον in the citation
is inferior to the ordinary reading ὕψιον and is probably due to the occurrence of ὕψιστον
in l. 38, where the superlative is appropriate. At the end of that line αὐ is most
probably the termination of a verb, and ἵσταρ αὐ (Bury) has the advantage of being possible
with either ἄλκαι or ἄλκα. Other possibilities are γίνεται or perhaps ἔσσεται αὐ, though a future
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is not so natural; verbs like ἔμετα or βάλλεται would necessarily involve ἅλκ. The supposed αι may, however, be ν, though that is a less suitable reading.

39-44. Bury proposes to restore these lines as follows: μέροι μᾶς [ἐντλάμμαδι δόχος: ἔρκῳ δὲ μισοῦν ἡμᾶς] ἑκατόν μέν ἐπίπτων μένας τῶν γὰρ ἀυτομέλων πολέμων ἅμα φέρεσθαι κρατεῖν, παρόν ὅς σέλας. For ἀυτομέλων πολέμων cf. Ἕλε. 1. 67-8 ὅταν θεό... μάχαι ἀντίασον, and for ἀυτομέλων... ἅμα, Ἐκλ. viii. 28 λαγὸν ἅμα φέρων (ἢ) ἐναντίω στρατῷ. This ingenious restoration is attractive, but it is not very close to what the scholiast gives as τὸ νόημα. In l. 44 the vestige before σέλας would suit σ, but a supplement of 14 letters is rather long; κρατεῖν would be slightly shorter and perhaps clearer. In l. 41 on the other hand μέγα is hardly sufficient.

40. The marginal δαίμοις with mark of length above αι drew attention to the disyllabic scansion of the word in this passage, as also in Ἕλε. viii. 28. There is no necessity to assume that the λ was wrongly marked with a diaeresis in the text.

41. Cf. Οἰ. v. 21 Ἰσοτιμοῖον ἐπίπτων ἑπιτηδέμοις, and the reference to ἡ ἐπόποι in the scholiol opposite l. 43 sqq. At the beginning of the verse Blass suggested τυμώ δέ. For the metrical arrangement of the lines here cf. l. 5, note. 46. φθορεῖ suggests that γ μάνει not γμανεί is the right division. μανείν is not found elsewhere in Findar, but μάνεις occurs in Ἀρ. iv. 159.

48. The scholiol here is difficult and apparently corrupt (cf. ll. 57-8, note), and owing to the mutilation of the passage to which it refers emendation is hazardous. The termination of the participles in the second line is probably -τος rather than -τε; either ὄβρισαι or ὄβρισει may be read, and ἐπιτηδέμιν is just possible in place of ἐπιτιθε(θε)ιαν ἣν, but the letters μεν would be run together in an abnormal manner. None of these readings, however, produces a straightforward sentence, though the general sense is evident, that internal sedition gives external enemies their opportunity. στασιάζοντας καὶ πολιτεύοντας might be interpreted in the sense of the revolutionaries and the Government, but it is not improbable that some word like διαφάρωσ (Blass) has dropped out after πολιτεύοντας. To the emendation ἐπιτιθε(θε)ιαν ἄν (ἐξ) ἢ there is the objection that the object of ἐπιτιθειάν should be in the dative, not the accusative, and that either στασιάζων δὲ καὶ πολιτεύοντων (διαφάρωσ) or στασιάζοντας δὲ καὶ πολιτεύοντας (διαφάρωσ) would be expected. Another remedy would be to alter δὲ to τε and make τοὺς... στασιάζοντας (τέ) καὶ πολιτεύοντας the subject of ὄβρισαι, inserting ὡς... (Bury) before πολλὸς. μάλλον... ἢ δέξας would then mean 'with more energy, or quickly.' This also, however, is hardly convincing; perhaps the corruption goes deeper, and something like ἢ ὄβρισα (ἄριστοι τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει στατ. ὑπὲρ) καὶ (διαφάρωσ) πολλοί, πολλῷ μᾶλλον τοῖς ἐπ. ἐπιτιθ. ἢ ἔναν ὄβρισας was really intended. For the omission of ἄν with εἴῃ ὄβρισα cf. e. g. Schol. ad Soph. Ὄ. Τ. 175 ἔλεος εἴῃ ἀλφό ἔδωκα. A dot over the ν of ὄβρισαι possibly represents a diaeresis. The first α in στασιάζοντας was altered from an i.

Whichever view of the scholiol be preferred, it seems likely that ὄβρισα or ὄβρισει occurred in the text; cf. the antithesis of τὸ δὲ εὐθυλία κ.τ.λ. in ll. 44-2 with the opposition in Οἰ. xiii. 6-10 of ὑβρις to ἐλπομα [εὐθυλία]. Bury considers that ὀξέας in some form may also be restored, and suggests [μὴ ποῦ ὄβρις ἐπίθετα τόνδε λαμν ἀστῶν δύνης ὀξέας] πολέμων ἐπάγοι. This may well be the sense, and it is highly probable that ὁι in l. 50 is an optative termination; but the disparity in the length of the supplements proposed for ll. 48 and 50 is too great.

50-72. 'But the heart devoted to prudence and modesty ever enjoys gentle peace. Such may heaven bestow; the hostile envy of those who are long since dead has now passed away; and it is right that a man should take to his forbears a lot rich in glory. They gained by war a bountiful land and stored up wealth beyond the borders of Strymon,
the hallowed nurse of wild Paeanian warriors; but an adverse fate fell on them. Yet they endured, and the gods at last joined in accomplishing their desire. He who has wrought a good deed is made illustrious with praise; and to them came surpassing glory against the foe before Melamphyllum. O Paean, to whom we cry, we cry! may Paean never leave us.'

50. The letters ρι in ευβολειαν are corrected.
52. For ἐγκειμένων cf. 659. 48 (Pindar, Parthenieion) ὃν θίλεσων ἐγκειμαί, and for θίλεις Pyth. xi. 53 μακρύτερος ἀλβῷ τεθιλησα. aieί is the correct Pindaric form when the first syllable is long.
54–5. The φθόνος is that of the gods, traceable in the early vicissitudes of the colony; cf. ll. 63–5 and Pyth. x. 20 φθονράις ἐκ θῶν μεταρροπίαας. The schol. takes τώ... as equivalent to ἐπί τοῖς... , but the genitive is more naturally explained as simply objective. The reading of the third line of the note is far from secure. The second α of προθωνίων in l. 56 of the text is corrected from ε.
57–8. The meaning is that the descendant of ancestors who had shown such a good example should himself carry to them the tribute of a noble spent life. Cf. Νεμ. vi. 46 ἐπὶ θηρίῳ (sc. the bards) Δικαία ἔπορον ἔχον αὐτῶν ἀρετὰς ἀποδεικνύοντας μεγαλίας, which the scholiast explains ἐπείδη αὐτοῖς ὑπήκοον παράκολουσαν ἐπάυσαν οἱ Δικαία. The scholium on the present passage δεί[τοίς ἐκθ(ος)] κ.τ.λ. gives a practical interpretation which diverges rather widely from the general precept of the text, though it is not out of harmony with the spirit of the passage. It seems necessary to suppose an omission of the final σ of τούς and μακρον ντας; for other mistakes in the marginalia cf. l. 64 and note on l. 48.
61. ἐνκατέβηκος: cf. Theognis 276 χρήματα δ' ἐγκαταβῆς. The interlinear insertion apparently indicates the not very important fact that a critic whose name began with Ἀρ wrote ἐγκατέβηκος. Which of the commentators on Pindar is meant is however not clear; the name is nowhere written out in full, and several other abbreviations occur, which may or may not refer to the same person. In the present passage there is αρ with an angular mark above ρ, in Fr. 134. 9 (cf. Frs. 82, 94. 3, and 129–31. 1) αρσ; elsewhere we find αρ or αγρ followed by a ν having a vertical stroke drawn through the middle: for the former cf. II. 75, VI. 89, for the latter VI. 181. αρ in VIII. 35 may also well be one or other of these forms. If they all represent a single name, then that of Aristophanes of Byzantium is the most probable. But since Aristarchus, Aristodemus, and Aristionicus were also Pindaric critics who are quoted in the extant scholia, and four different compendia occur in the papyrus, it is not impossible that there may be references to all four scholars. At any rate it seems preferable to differentiate the group having a ν, and here there is the choice between Aristophanes and Aristionicus, a grammarian who flourished under Augustus and therefore not too late to be mentioned in this manuscript; cf. the possible allusion in II. 37 to his contemporary Theon. On the whole we are inclined in view of the greater importance of Aristarchus and Aristophanes to suppose that αρ and αρσ stand for the former, αρ� and αρσι for the latter. Some support for the expansion of αρσι as Aristophanes is to be found in the Paris Alcamen papyrus, where in ii. 3 the analogous compendium αρσι no doubt stands for ἠρσταρχος, αρσις in l. 32 probably representing Ἑραμπόρινη.
63. For τροφοῦ cf. Pyth. ii. 1–2 Στράκονσι... ἀνδρῶν ἐπών τε συνεργοχορήμαν διαμόνηι τροφοῦ and VI. 14 below. The scholium on ὀλλα κ.τ.λ. apparently refers to the failure of a previous attempt by Timaeus of Clazomenae to establish a colony at Abdera, recorded in Hdt. i. 168 Ἠμήναος κτίσας οὐκ ἀπόνυκτο ὀλλ' ἐπο Θηρίκον εξελθεῖν... ; cf. ll. 54–6, note.
65. τελοῦσιν: or τελοὺς ἐπίθηκαν?
67. The final ν of εὐσαρχεῖσιν has been deleted (by the first hand?) by a cross-stroke
and a dot placed above, but is necessary for the metre. ὕλευθος intr. has a similar sense in Ἀ ντ. vi. 38 πορὰ Κασταλίαν τε καθίτων ἐπιέμοι ὀμήρῳ ὕλευθος.

69. Μελάμφυλλον is not otherwise known. According to Pliny, H. N. iv. 11. 18, Melampyllus was the name of a Thracian mountain, and possibly this is here meant.

73-80. "But they shall put him to confusion when he has come near the river, matched with a small array against a great host." It fell out on the first day of the month; and the rosy-footed maiden, kindly Hecate, brought tidings of the word which was about to come to pass. And with her..."

73-5. The future indicative in φύροτε seems unintelligible except on the view that these three lines give the substance of an ancient oracle, which Blass suggested may have run in some such form as ἀλλ' ὡπότεν συμάνχῃ σχέδιον ἔλθῃ δι' τότε φύροτε ἐτέσι πὺν βυαίοι πολέν στρατών... The author or occasion of the prognostication was probably named in the lost marginal note opposite l. 73. The second o of μολοπτα ἔρρυβον was corrected from a and the final a has also been altered. "ἴν is a Doric form for ἱν: cf. e.g. C. I. G. 5774.117, &c. ἐντις, Alcam. Ἀρ. Eustath. Od. p. 1787. 43 παρέιτον. If our reading is correct, the form in the present passage had the sanction of Aristophanes (?), there being also a variant ἵν, of which the meaning is not easy to see. The supposed ἵ in however doubtful, the remains being an oblique stroke which might be taken for a grave accent. But a grave accent here would be mistaken, and the papyrus is distinctly rubbed, while the analogy of VI. 89 is strongly in favour of the reading in the text.

Bury suggests that the word beginning with o in the scholium here and at l. 105 may be the name of the people with whom Abdera was at war, and proposes to make them the Thracian Odomantii; but the vestige of the letter after o does not well suit ฿.

77. φοινικόπετα is applied to Demeter in Ol. vi. 94, where the epithet has been supposed by Boeckh and other critics to refer to the red colours of harvest; but no such allusion can be claimed in the case of Hecate, and no doubt in both passages the adjective is used like ὕδατης of personal charms simply.

In the first line of the scholium the letters taken for ελλ are blotted and apparently corrected; perhaps μᾶκνια was the word intended.

79. ἑλθότα = μελόπτα, a use which, though not actually found in Pindar, has good classical support, e.g. Hdt. i. 109 ἐλθέωι αὐξάουσα δὴ τεραυνίς. The scholiast gives an erroneous interpretation. ἰνὶ τῷ (cf. VI. 59, Paris Alcam. iii. 11) is written αρ in Fr. 84. 10 and IX. 35.

81. The object of καλέωτε is probably Apollo, and ἔκατα-βῶλε, as Bury suggests, is a likely supplement.

96-108. "... the songs invoke (Apollo) on fragrant Pindus, and by the lofty rocks of Parnassus the glancing-eyed maidens of Delphi set the fleet-footed dance and sing a sweet strain with resonant voice. And for me, O Abderus, accomplishing gracious glory of noble deeds, may you prosper the horse-loving host with a final war. O Paeon, to whom we cry, we cry! may Pacan never leave us.'

97-102. Cf. VI. 15-8. ἀμφί in l. 97 does not imply more than vicinity, the scene of the choruses being of course Delphi.

98. ἐν in ἔφαλαι was altered from an a.

99. ἐλείκωπτείς (cf. Pyth. vi. 1 ἐλείκωπτε ο σ' Ἀφροδίτας) is a very doubtful restoration.
The accent and the π are on the main fragment, the κω being on a smaller detached strip which extends from this point as far as l. 106 οι προβι. ; and though metre and sense make the place of this strip in Col. viii sufficiently secure, its exact position at l. 99 is not certain. The recto being blank gives no assistance. The objection to the reading κωπ is that the accent would be expected to fall more to the right than it actually does; of course before the supposed ω only a tip remains, and κωπ would be palaeographically rather more satisfactory. The letter after π is represented by the merest speck. It must also be noticed that the supplement [κλι] scarcely fills the lacuna, and [καλι]υπότεις (Bury; cf. Homer, II. Dem. 8, &c.) would in this respect be more suitable, though on the other hand in ll. 102 and 104 also somewhat short supplements in a similar position seem to be justified by the context.

106. χαλατία] can hardly be avoided, for χαλατί, which might be read, gives no possible word. Though at first sight a not very appropriate epithet to apply to the song of maidens, a good parallel to χαλατία here occurs in Anth. Pal. ix. 505. τείχεος χαλατίας ἑπιστρέφοντο αὐτοὶ Μελαμένη, while the use of χαλατος of the human voice is as old as Homer, e.g. Ἡ 785 Στέφανοι . . . χαλασφὼν, Σ 222 ὡπα χαλατον Λακιδαο. Cf. the name χαλατος, and III. 94, where χαλασφων apparently occurs.

101. κελαθεντι: or κελάθεντι; but the papyrus gives κροτεντι in VI. 18, and cf. Bacchyl. viii. 43 κροτεντι. κ οί γλεκον is over an erasure.

102-3. The right restoration of this passage is not obvious. If the emendation προβι[βι]οι were adopted in l. 106 (cf. note ad loc.) a satisfactory sense would be obtained by reading γαν ε'κελεν ταν στριν χαρέων ; cf. the conjunction of χαρέων and στριν in IV. 42, and ιμεθάν παίρν χαρέως in III. 37. But the word at the end of l. 102, where a bacchus is required after δι', would remain a problem. Before the lacuna any round letter may stand, ε, θ, ο, σ, φ, or ω, and the letter preceding, if not ε, must be σ, next to which is part of a vertical stroke suggesting ρ or ρ; further to the left the top of an acute accent is recognizable. The meaning of χαρεων moreover is quite uncertain, and the word may well be taken with ε'κελεα, when it might mean 'gladdness,' as in Pindar Fr. 75. 2 ἐντ' ἐν χρόνον (cf. l. 99 above), ὁλιμίποι, ἐπε τε κλητάν πέμπτες χάριν, θεοι, 'or 'glory,' as in Isthm. ii. 19 κλέων . . . χαρίσσειν, or even 'song,' as in Ol. x. 78-9 επομέναις χάριν . . . κελαθέσσαβε βροτάν, &c.; for εκελεα in connexion with the last sense cf. e.g. Νεμ. vii. 16 κελαθα ταύτα ἄνωθεν. Possibly, indeed, the marginal ζ(ν) φθάν really alludes to χάριν, though being on a level with l. 102 this gloss is more naturally referred to ψάμων. The reconstruction adopted in the text was suggested by Bury; it is close to the data of the papyrus and appropriate in itself, though κει in l. 104 seems rather otiose. έμοι of course is Abdera.

104. The second π in ιππόχαρμον seems to have been corrected.

105. Perhaps ουρ[η]ς, as Blass suggested, though this produces a mixture of metaphors, and barely fills the lacuna (cf., however, note on l. 99); Bury would prefer [ηρ]ης. On the allusion in πολέμων τελειωτριφω cf. introd. p. 17.

106. Blass wished to omit the final ε of προβι[βι]οι and so make Apollo the subject instead of Abderus. This may be right, but the mutilation of ll. 102-5 renders the correction hazardous. Our restoration assumes that the text is sound.

Fr. 5. The fifth line shows that this fragment belongs to the foregoing paean, and it may come either from Col. ii or Col. vii. L. 5, however, cannot be brought into direct connexion with Fr. 2. i. 1 by reading Ἀβδης ροις.

III.

4. οτ] there has perhaps been some correction, but o is clear.
8-9. θυάτηρα . . . διαιμόν: cf. Pindar Fr. 75. 3 θυάτηρα ὄμφαλον θυάτηρα.
12. There is a small mark rather high above the σ of αλας, but it may be
meaningless.
13. τιν: Apollo is addressed, χρυσός being an epithet like χρυσότρυσις or χρυσοκόμα
or χρυσοχαίτα. There would not be room for a broader letter than τ between τ and υ.
15. Σχόλω: a mention of the moon-goddess seems appropriate in this context. The
epithet ἀλκήμυς is applied to Semele in the only other passage where it occurs in Pindar
(Γρ. 75, 20).
17. This line is the 100th from II. 25, which is marked in the papyrus as the 900th
line in the roll, and therefore κ (= 1000) would be expected to appear in the margin here.
Presumably it was inserted at the top of following (lost) column. The extent of the gap
after l. 17 is accurately determined by the occurrence of μ (= 1200) in the margin opposite
l. 7 of VI. Of the intervening 200 lines, 125 are accounted for in the papyrus; there are
therefore (assuming that the μ is correctly placed with relation to the κ at II. 25) 75 lines
missing, i.e. 5 columns of 15 lines each. Since the strophe of ΠII contains at least
18 lines, it is improbable that the 102 lines which separate II and IV were divided
among two poems, and it may be safely concluded that the first 10 lines of Col. xv
belong to ΠΙ.
94. χαλκήσε: cf. note on II. 100. The superscribed variant αλλας is more probably
right than αλήσ.
95. Schol. The letter between the supposed ι and ι seems to have been altered, but
is probably intended for ια; there is no room for [κτ.ί.ου]. δ might replace λ, and perhaps
ιδοι should be read.
99. [ολαρ... ] may well be -αρ ι ι λαρ[iόν], but a combination with Fr. 28 ὁ βαθύς[φά[νοι]
λαρ[iόν] | ἄνεμοι (cf. Pindar Fr. 89 βαθύς[φά[νοι] τε λαρ[iόν]) is shown by the recto to be inad-
missible. Fr. 47 βαθύς[φά[νοι]οι) is also unsuitable.
101. [δόετέα: or ]δόετέαι?
IV. FOR THE CEANS TO DELOS.
1-2. Blass suggests the very attractive restoration [Τῶν ἀκιρεχώμαν τε καί] Ἀρτεμίς,
[ίδι δέλε, Λατό τε χορή]σιμα, comparing Ισθ. i. 7-8 καί τῶν ἀκιρεχώμαν Φοίβου χορέων ἐν Κέφ
δμφαρετα σῶν ποιήσεων ἀνθράκω, which is most probably a reference to the present paean.
The future χορεύομαι occurs in Aesch. Αγ. 31.
3. λος is probably the termination of a participle -όμενος.
4. The adscript σατο indicates a variant ηθύσατο. It is in a different hand from the
rest of the note; cf. p. 15.
12. The accent on σατο is somewhat doubtful.
13. The sense of the scholiast is plain, though its right restoration is a matter of
uncertainty. The slight vestiges before ια suit μ better than ι, and μία is therefore pre-
ferable to Καρβία.
14. Ιαία[φόρανος: or βρα[φο[ρανος (oracle σφ. Strabo vi. 262), when some other supple-
ment than ἄλας, which is somewhat long for the supposed size of the lacuna, will become
necessary.
15. It is noticeable that the letters ανσα are occur in the same position of the cor-
responding verse of the second strophe, l. 36.
16. Perhaps πεδίχειν: cf. l. 37 where πεδίχειν stands in a corresponding verse, and
note on l. 15.
20. Ιχθύσει is an allusion to the fishing industry of the Ceans; cf. the passage from
Ισθ. i quoted in note on II. 1-2.
21–53. 'Verily though I live on a rock I am known for prowess in Hellenic contests, and known for some display of the Muses’ art; verily too my acres bear a measure of Bacchus’ life-giving cure in extremity. I have not horses nor share in the pasturage of kine; but neither would Melampus leave his fatherland to lord it in Argos, nor lay aside his gift of divination. Hail, hail, O Paeon! The city and comrades of a man’s home and his kinsmen are dear, and bring contentment. In happiness remote from foolish men I praise the words of lord Euxantius, who when his fellows were eager refused to rule or to take the seventh share of a hundred cities along with the sons of Pasiphae; and he spake to them his prophecy: “I fear war with Zeus, I fear the crashing Shaker of Earth. With thunderbolt and trident sent they once the land and its whole host to the depths of Tartarus, but left my mother and all her well-fenced house. Then shall I, in pursuit of wealth and thrusting aside into utter neglect the decree of the blessed ones for our country, have elsewhere a great possession? How would this be quite secure for me? Dwell not, my heart, on the cypress-grove, dwell not on the pastures of Ida! To me little is given, a mere shrub of oak, but I have no lot in trouble or strife.”

22–3. For the hypallage of ἔλλαμιςν which in sense belongs to ἄελθων cf. e.g. Pyth. vi. 5 Πιθύμωκος ἕμοιν ὰθανάτου. The athletic prowess of the Ceans is emphasized in Bacchyl. ii. 6 sqq. ὁδ’ ἐν κλείστῳ αἰχίνι ἱσθμοῦ ..., ἐπεδείξατο ἐξδομηκοστα σὺν στεφάνωσιν, vi. 5–7 Κέων ἀδιαν ποι’ Ὀλυμπία παρ’ αὐτ και σταύον κρατεύσατ’ ου]; their service to the Muses was witnessed by the illustrious names of Simonides and Bacchylides.

24. The scribe at this point changed or mended his pen; the writing in the first three lines of the column is markedly larger and coarser than those which follow.

25. Only a tip of the letter before καὶ remains, but η is not enough to fill the space, and η was probably written by mistake, although the smooth breathing shows that there was no confusion with γ. The breathing, however, is imperfectly preserved, and might be taken for the second half of a superscripted η, in which case something other than η must be supposed to have stood before καὶ.

Διογένης: we owe this reading to Mr. Nairn, who suggested Διογένης, comparing Bacchyl. vi. 5 ἀμφιεκήρφιν Κέων. After δι any round letter would suit the remains, but only o or w will give any likely word. Νάθεν προμ is a possible but less attractive alternative. Διοδότις would be an unlikely epithet of ἀρχαίοις, and Διόδοτος, besides being unattested, would not fill the lacuna.

26. βιοδώρων: cf. Soph. Phil. 1162 βιοδώρως οὐ. The scholiast’s explanation ‘given to life’ is not happy.

28–30. This is not the ordinary form of the myth concerning Melampus as given e.g. in Hdt. ix. 34, Apollod. i. 9, 12, 8, which represents him as sharing with his brother Bias in the sovereignty of Argos. It is, however, noticeable that the later kings of Argos traced descent from Bias through Adrastus, not from Melampus. Besides Pyth. iv. 126 there is a reference to Melampus in 426. 12 ἔε’ Ἀργεὺς Μελαμπὸς, which may be Pindaric. Μελάμπος is accentuated in the papyrus as if it were Μελάμπως.


30–39. There is a break in the papyrus after ἀργεῖ, but sufficient margin remains after the ε to indicate pretty clearly that the line is complete. It is therefore inadmissible to read ἀπαθίμενος; but though τίνισθαι in the sense of ἀπαθίσθαι is not found elsewhere in Pindar, such a use does not seem impossible; cf. the phrase θίασα τὰ ἄπλα meaning to lay down one’s arms, and Aristoph. Λυγίτη. 312 θάμωσα δὲ τὸ φορτίον. Or, as Bury observes, θέμενος may be taken outside the negative and mean ‘having made his own, adopted’; cf. παιδα βίοδως, &c.

34. The letter after δ is either ε or ο.
35. ἀνίκος: cf. e.g. Ἡμι, iii. 33 Πηλεύς ἀνακρίνει, *Pyth.* iv. 89 ἑψάλμεις ὅναξ. But the reading is very doubtful, and we adopt it without much confidence. The surface of the papyrus is damaged, and if κ is right, it must be supposed that the lower diagonal stroke has entirely disappeared, giving the letter more the appearance of υ. The a also is not very satisfactory, for rather more than the speck which actually survives would be expected to be visible. We had also thought of [επ' ινεις, but that is a weak alternative.

Ейθων: some fresh light is thrown in the following passage upon the legend of Euxantius, which was treated at length in the unfortunately mutilated first ode of Bacchylides. An outline of the story is given in some scholia on the *Ibis* of Ovid, where it is said that Macello (Macedo, Macelo) and the other daughters of Damon had showed hospitality to Jupiter, and were therefore spared by him when he destroyed the Telchines, of whom Damon was the chief. Subsequently Minos arrived, and became the father of Euxantius by Dexithea (Dexione, Dexithone), one of Macello's sisters. The poem of Bacchylides (written for a Ceas victor) begins to give a connected sense at the point when Minos arrives in Ceos and weds Dexithea; his treatment of the earlier part of the story can be only vaguely conjectured from a few scattered fragments. But there is one other reference to this legend which has an important bearing upon the present passage of Pindar. It occurs in Nonnus, *Dionys.* xviii. ll. 35–8, which in the MSS. run as follows:—

Ζήρα καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα μηδὲ ἐξεύρηκεν Μακεδόν
καὶ Φλεγόνα ὅτε πάντως ἀνερρίζωσε θραύσεσθαι ἡμὸς ὅλην τρισάδεκα διαρρήκτες Ἑρωκλέων ἀμφοτέρας ἐφελάξε καὶ ναὸν προίηξε τραίνη.

There is a lacuna between ll. 35 and 36, which contained a substantive agreeing with μῆ, and the only necessary alteration in the traditional text is the simple correction of Μακεδόν to Μακεδόν. The emendations adopted in A. Köchly's Teubner edition (1857), τραίνη for Μακεδόν and ἀμφοτέροις for ἀμφοτέρας, are put out of court, as Jebb remarks (*Bacchylides*, p. 444), by the *Ibis* scholia. But what are the Phlegyae doing in this context? Jebb suggests (l. c.) that Nonnus here alluded to two distinct legends: (α) the destruction of the Telchines by Zeus, (β) that of the Phlegyae by Poseidon (Euphor. Fr. 154 ap. Servius Aen. vi. 618 iratus Ἁπειεως περισσεῖ τρίδεκα ετσε ταχέος ἐν ἱερῷ ἐνεκειμένη, τεκμεν᾽ ἀοιδοῖν). But the striking similarity of language in the lines of Nonnus and the present passage of Pindar (cf. νῆσος ὅλην ἐφελάξε with ll. 41–5 below) strongly suggests that if Nonnus was not copying Pindar, he was at any rate following the same tradition. The νῆσος can hardly be other than Ceos, and unless the appearance of the Phlegyae is to be ascribed to a confusion on the part of Nonnus, which would be a rash assumption, it must be concluded that one form of the legend brought the Phlegyae and Telchines together at Ceos, and represented their destruction by Zeus and Poseidon as simultaneous.

The introduction of Euxantius into this paean shows that the obscurity of the myth is somewhat exaggerated by Jebb (*Bacchylides*, p. 449). Bacchylides' reference to Ceos as Ἐξεύρηκεν νήσον (ii. 8) might of itself be taken to imply a rather wider currency than Jebb admits. Euxantius' refusal to leave Ceos for a share in the kingdom of Minos, as narrated here by Pindar, is an entirely novel feature.

36. ἐπίνειος: the corresponding word in the antistrophe (l. 46) also begins with the syllable ἐν-; cf. note on l. 15.


38. μήπος ἐξόδων: Pasiphaë is credited with four sons, one of whom, Androgeos, predeceased his father Minos (Apollod. iii. 15. 5–7). If Pasiphaë's sons had a double
portion, a seventh share would remain for Euxantius. But Minos had more children by another marriage.

The transposition of the second syllable of \( \omega \sigma \tau \mu \) is required for the correspondence with l. 48. Blass thought that it would be an improvement to place the final syllable \(-\sigma \mu \) also in this line, and transfer \( \mu \omega \) in l. 49 to the previous verse. At the end of the second line of the scholium \( \pi a \sigma i f a \eta \) is a possible reading, but the letters are much mutilated.

49. \( \tau i p a s \) may be explained as referring to divine interposition described in ll. 42-5, and there is no need to emend to \( \gamma i p a s \).

42-4. Cf. note on l. 35.

44. \( \pi a t i p a : \) i.e. Dexithea; cf. note on l. 35, Bacchyl. i. c. 8, Apollod. iii. i. 2.

46. \( \pi o i o t o v \pi e r a o v \); cf. \( N e m. \) v. 30-1 \( \nu o i o t a i v \) \( \iota \pi e r a \) . . . \( \iota \nu o i o t a i v \).

48. A point has been inserted immediately below the line between \( \omega \) and \( \lambda \), this being the only instance in the papyrus of the use of a low stop. If \( \pi o \) (Bury) is rightly restored in l. 49 the neuter \( \iota \mu \tau e o v \) must be taken as referring vaguely to the preceding sentence. Blass proposed to read \( \sigma o \) (cf. Pindar Fr. 221) and insert \( \omega \) before \( \lambda i a v \), \( \iota \mu \tau e o v \) being adverbial as in \( P y l h. \) x. 34 \( \nu o \) \( \theta a l i a i v \) \( \iota \mu \tau e o v \) . . . \( \Lambda p o l l a v o n \chi a i r e i \). The abnormal accentuation of \( \chi \omega \) might be explained as a survival of the lost negative; but the punctuation would make the synizesis of \( \iota \chi a v \); \( \langle o i \rangle \) particularly awkward, and the sentence \( \langle o i \rangle \) . . . \( \k e n \) would be weak. To read \( \sigma o w \) without \( \langle o i \rangle \) and regard the words as ironical is also unsatisfactory.

The quantity of \( i \) in \( \lambda i a v \) may vary, but it is short in the only other Pindaric instance (\( P y l h. \) i. 90), and is more likely to be the same here. There is a similar ambiguity in the corresponding syllable of the strophe l. 38 \( \nu o i o t a i v \) (for the short quantity cf. e.g. \( N e m. \) vi. 25 \( \nu o i o t a i v \)).

49. \( \pi o \) : the corresponding syllable in l. 39 is short, but there is no great objection to a \( \lambda e i l a v \) \( a n c e p s \) here, and the difficulty would be still slighter if \( \mu o i \) were transposed to the end of the preceding verse; cf. note on l. 38.

50-3 = Pindar Fr. 154, quoted by Plutarch, \( D e \) \( c e x i l . \) 9. p. 602, where the MS. tradition is now shown to be very corrupt. The lines there appear in the following form: \( \delta a \phi r a v \) \( k u p a r i a v o n \) \( f i l a t e i v \) \( \epsilon a v \) \( \delta e \) \( \nu o i o t a i v \) \( K r i f a s \) \( \pi e r a i o n a v \) \( \epsilon a i \) \( \delta \) \( \delta a l i o v \) \( \mu e n \) \( \gamma a s \) \( \delta e i o a i \), \( \delta e n \) \( \delta a l i o v \), \( \pi e r a i o n a v \) \( \delta \) \( \iota \) \( \chi a v o n \) \( \nu o i o t a i v \). Hermann altered \( \pi e r a i o n a v \) to \( \pi e r a i o n a v \), but that rather obvious correction is the only one proposed by modern editors which is confirmed by the papyrus, and the passage affords a good illustration of the precariousness of the attempt to emend lyrics where the metre is uncertain. The genesis of some of the corruptions is now apparent: \( f i l a t e i v \) was added to explain \( \epsilon a \), and the proximity of this infinitive led to \( \epsilon a v \) \( \delta e \) for \( \epsilon a \) \( \delta e \). The construction being thus obscured \( \epsilon a \) \( \phi r a v \) (\( \phi r a v \)) would easily become \( \delta a \phi r a v \), which fits in with the general sense of the passage (\( s i m p l i c i s \) \( l i b e r a l i u m \) \( h o m i n i u m \) \( d e l i c i u m \), says Schroeder); and \( K r i f a s \) no doubt came in from the margin; cf. the scholium of the papyrus. With regard to the latter part of Plutarch's citation the new evidence is somewhat ambiguous, but fortunately just sufficient is preserved to enable, with the help of the metre, a satisfactory restoration to be made. At first sight, what remains of the two topmost lines of Col. xix appears to belong to the main text, the writing being of the normal size; but to this view there are grave objections. \( \beta o r a i \) must represent Plutarch's \( \delta e i o a i \), which is required by the metre in the middle of the verse, as also is \( \chi a v o n \) in the second line. But in the first place the break down the left side of the papyrus follows a practically straight line, and therefore something of lines 54 and 56, containing 10 and 12 syllables respectively, would be expected to remain; the papyrus, however, is blank until l. 58 is reached, where before \( \pi e r a i \) as many as 13 syllables have to be supplied. This disproportion is too great to be accounted for by collocations of vowels or variations in the size of the writing (cf. note on l. 24). Secondly, there is not sufficient
room in the lacunae to the right of Il. 52–3 for the completion of the verses. We therefore prefer to suppose that the remnants of Il. 52–3 are marginal variants added by the first hand, in favour of which, moreover, there is the positive consideration that before λάχων in l. 53 is a blank space large enough for 1½ letters. The size of the writing is no doubt something of a difficulty; but analogous cases occur at V. 38, VI. 83, 172, Fr. 20. 28, where marginalia have been written by the original scribe in letters not appreciably smaller than those of the accompanying text.

To turn to the reconstruction of these two lines, modern criticism has rightly been suspicious of ὀδην ἀδρν, which produced no tolerable sense, and is now shown not to scan; but attempts at emendation have been wide of the mark. After δὲ ἄταυ the papyrus has a clear θ followed by a curved stroke, which pretty certainly represents either α or ω, and given the metrical conditions (— — ζ) Blass's βιμνὸς δρνός seems convincing; this involves the ejection of the superfluous μὲν γὰς, which was no doubt added as an explanation of ὀδηγόν. To alter ὀδηγόν to ὀδηγός is unnecessary, and the suitability of the epithet might be called in question. A certain species of oak is still the characteristic tree of Creos, and the acorns are the chief commercial product of the island. The metre of the last verse may be restored by means of a few simple alterations. What stood in the original text in place of δὲ ἄταυ βιμνὸς remains a riddle which is not likely to be solved. The θ above χ of λάχων is also difficult. There is a dot to the left of it (to the right is a lacuna) indicating an alternative reading; for a similar variant on a variant cf. V. 38. (Π)λαθν would not give a sense. As for λάχων, the writer may merely have wished to emphasize the possibility of the division δὲ λάχων as against δ’ ἔλαχω, and it is therefore unnecessary to suppose that a different verb figured in the text.

In connexion with κυπάρισσαν and the remark of the scholiast it may be noted that, as Bury reminds us, the Cretan μέλαθρον at Delphi mentioned in Pyth. v. 39 sqq. is described as κυπάρισσαν.

58. Ζηνιδίτης: cf. VI. 55, &c., and note on II. 61. The reading of the variant here attributed to Zenodotus is unfortunately doubtful. The δ may be a, and the diagonal stroke of the supposed ν has disappeared, what actually remains suggesting rather ρι. It is noteworthy that κερα. [apparently occurs three lines below, where a proper name is expected. But no name Κέραμος or Κέριος is known, and Κέριον ἡρω] would not scan in l. 59. There is a further difficulty about the ω of ἡρω, the left-hand half of the letter having vanished, while the surface of the papyrus is apparently intact. If not ω, the mark in question must be simply a mis-shapen point, and κεβνυν ἴρ could be read; but this is an unsatisfactory alternative.

60. We can find no other trace of this statement concerning the sons of Euxantius. A Κέω in Salamis is mentioned by Hdt. viii. 76 of δμῆλ τὴν Κέων τε καὶ τὴν Κυνίσσων τεταγμένα, another in Boeotia by Lysimachus in Schol. Soph. O. C. 91, but both were quite obscure. Κέων for Κέω cannot be read.

61. κερα. [and υδίς κ.τ.λ. below are in a different hand from that of τυείς . . . κατάφυκης, κεφα. [may be a personal name, but the writing is indistinct, and there is possibly a correction. The letter after ρ may be i; cf. note on l. 58. 'Ομηρης was a son of Heracles and Deianira, but he does not seem to fit in with the context. For δρ(τί τοῦ) cf. e. g. I. 4; an alternative restoration is 'Αρ(ιστοφαί)τ(ης), but in the other probable instances of that name the ν is not written above the line; cf. note on II. 61.
V. To Delos.


15. A verse has dropped out here. Possibly the marginal insertion opposite l. 45, Πανδώρου Ἐρέχθους δαίκλος, is misplaced and really gives part of it, for those words have no bearing on the context there, and they happen to coincide metrically with the conclusion of the missing line. δαίκλος is obscure; δαίκλος according to Hesychius meant αἴ γωνία ταὐ βῆλους, δαίκλος was a Lacedaemonian word for δέιπνον. Pandorus was a son of Erechtheus; cf. Apollod. iii. 15. 1.

35-48. '... they took Euboea and dwelt there. O Apollo of Delos, to whom we cry! They made homes in the scattered isles where the sheep abound, and laid hands on far-famed Delos, for Apollo of the golden locks gave them the body of Asteria to inhabit. O Apollo of Delos, to whom we cry! There may the children of Leto graciously receive me your servant, to the honeyed sounding strains of a glorious paean.'

36. ἐλον: the subject is οἱ ἄπο Λήδηδων ἰωνες, as indicated by the context and the remains of the scholiion opposite l. 35.

38. There is little to choose between the alternatives φερεμόλος and πολυμόλος, though in favour of the latter must be set the fact that this compound occurs twice elsewhere in Pindar (Ol. i. 12, Pyth. ix. 6) whereas φερεμόλος is not otherwise recorded. The MSS. show the same variation in the spelling of -μολος at Ol. i. 12, but the form with η is preferable.

39. The scribe began to write a round letter after εικονεα and then corrected it to τ.

40. οὖν ἐν απολλώνις σοφ.

42. Ἀστερίας δέμος = Δήλος. Asteria, sister of Leto, was turned into the island of Delos, which is sometimes called simply Asteria, e.g. Callim. Del. 300; cf. Fr. 19. ll. 21 sqq. below, and Nonnus 42. 41ο 'Ἀστερίας ὤδοις καὶ ἐπλέω νήσος ἔρημη.

44. εἰς ὑμῖ: trochaic (and sometimes also spondaic) words followed by enclitics received two accents according to the grammarians, and instances of such accentuation are found in MSS.: cf. Kühner-Blass I. p. 341. Other examples in this papyrus occur at VI. 87 and 132, Fr. 93. 4; cf. the Berlin Corinna papyrus, Berl. Klassiker texte V. (2) xiv. 1. 16 ταῖηα νω, 2. 89 δάκρυ τε.


48. The papyrus is so rubbed that no part of the addition in the margin, which is in a good-sized hand, is clear. It is doubtful whether there were really letters at the two places marked by dots outside the brackets, the traces of ink at those points being very slight.

VI. 'For the Delphians to Pytho.'

1-19. 'By Zeus of Olympus I pray thee, golden Pytho famed for prophecy, and ye Graces and Aphrodite, to receive me at the sacred season, the spokesman of the tuneful Pierides. For I hear that there are wanting men to dance to the music of the Castalian fount by the brazen-gated stream, and am therefore come relieving thy townsmen's need, and furthering mine own honour. I have obeyed my heart as a child his kind mother, and gone down to Apollo's grove, the home of garlands and festivity, where oft by the shady pivot of earth the maidens of Delphi beat the ground with nimble foot as they sing of the son of Leto.'
1–6 = Pindar Fr. 90, quoted by Aelius Aristides ii. 160 (ed. Keil). Hartung was right in attributing the lines to a pæan, but wrong in connecting them with Pindar Fr. 148. A marginal asterisk similar to that here occurs at the end of a poem in the Bacchylides papyrus vii. 54 (Facsimile Col. xiv).

3. Ἀτταμαῖος Χαρίτσεσίτου: ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλείας τοῦ Χαρίττου Αιγίου τῆς Μ. Μ. MSS., emended by W. Canter.

5. χόρδας, the traditional reading (χόρδας U, Bocckh) accepted by Keil and Schroeder, is confirmed by the papyrus; ἄρρητα Schneidewin, Ty. Mommsen, Christ, χορός Bergk, Hartung. ζήδεος χόρδας here means, as Keil points out, the season of the Pythian festival (ἱεραμψία ἀν Πηθύνα, C. I. G. 1688. 44, &c.); cf. Ném. iii. 2 ἔν ἱεραμψίᾳ Νεμέως, and the Delphic pæan to Dionysus, B. C. H. xix. 393 sqq., ll. 3–4 ἵππος ἵππος ταῦτα ἱερά ἐν ἱεράν. The syllable -ταρ occurs in the same position of a corresponding verse at l. 87, and -ανω- at l. 127. Other similar correspondences in this pæan are ll. 6 and 128 -αν, 10 and 132 -αν, 12 and 134 ποί, 15 and 137 τοῦτο τέσσε, 16 and 138 κόρα κόμα, 17 and 139 παρά σκόνην καθάςαν, 88 and 128 δεκαμπτον ἄδορπον, 98 and 138 ἰδον; cf. ll. 51 and 112 θεῶι [θεῶ].

6. Either ἀδίκιμον (so Aristid. MSS.) or ἀδίκιμοι may be genuine. The interlinear ω is not certainly by the first hand. Περίθοι for Περίθων MSS., emended by Canter. For προφάταν cf. Bacchyl. viii. 3 Μούσων . . . προφάτας.

7. The marginal μ marks the 200th line; cf. ll. 25, and note on III. 17. The brazen lions' heads mentioned by the scholiast do not appear to be otherwise known; that he calls the stream the Cepheus, which was on the northern side of Parnassus, is also strange.

8–9. A meaning somewhat different from that given in our translation would be obtained by connecting Κατάλακι with ἐδάφῳ and ψάφῳ with χορέεις: 'I hear a sound of dancing in which men are unrepresented,' i.e. the maidens dance alone (cf. ll. 15 sqq.). This construction is preferred by Bury.

10. Of the variants ἄληξεν, the reading first written, seems the best (cf. e. g. Ol. xiii. 9 ἄληξεν Ἴφιδας; ἄργυρος is used in the same way by Aeschylus and Euripides (e. g. Med. 1275 ἄργυρος φάνον ... τέκνοις), but not by Pindar. ἄληξεν would not give the requisite sense. κατὰ κομψόν in the marginal note below refers to the zeugmatic use in this passage of ἄληξεν, which with the acc. means 'ward off' and with the dat. 'assist.' The rough breathing on the ε of ἐτος in the papyrus is unusual.

14. τροφὶ is far preferable to the marginal κλετῶν. Cf. ll. 63 and Pyth. i. 1–2. The correction of κρατεὶς τοι to κρατεῖς is necessary metri grata. With πολί . . . [θῷ] cf. ll. 299 χόρον [παθοῦ] πολίδα; [ταχέᾳ] here would be less suitable to the size of the lacuna.

50. Perhaps ἄπαντας έπες (Bury), with a reference to ll. 87–9, or ἐπις for ἔπες if the shortened final syllable of εὐφροφάτραν in l. 111 is regarded as illegitimate; cf. note ad loc.

51–65. 'The gods are able to persuade the wise of these things, but for mortals it is impossible to find the way. But since ye have received this as your ordained right, O maidens sharing alike in all things with your father whom the dark clouds hide and Mnemosyne, hear me now: my tongue is fain to pay its best and sweetest honey-tribute when I have gone down to the broad lists of Loxias at the festival of the gods. For sacrifice is made for All-Hellas the glorious, which the Delphic folk prayed (to be saved from?) famine . . . ?'

51. θεῶι is a disyllable, if l. 112 is rightly restored. It is noticeable that the scansion of [θέώ] in that line is similar.

52. παθεῖ is metrically preferable to πείθειν if the restoration of l. 113 is correct.

54. The end of this line is a crux. μήδεν is inevitable, since μοι, though imperfect, is practically certain, and o and α are so close together that there is room for only a very
narrow letter between them. Since the Muses are evidently addressed it seems obvious at first sight to write μοίτας; but then the difficulty is to find a plausible restitution of the preceding dactyl and a construction for πάντα in l. 55. It is simpler to suppose that μοίτας is the termination of a feminine participle in agreement with παρθένον and governing πάντα. Yet even on this hypothesis some alteration of the text appears necessary. The letter after α, if not ο must be another σ, which gives no word. At a short distance from this is a vertical stroke which we suppose is the second upright of an ν; it might also be γ, τ, ι, υ, or the first half of ν or τ. With any of these letters, however, with the doubtful exception of τ, there will be a short preceding lacuna to be filled (e.g. ιον,1), and the metre will be wrong. To the reading adopted there is the objection that part of the diagonal stroke of a ν would be expected to be visible; but the surface of the papyrus is damaged, and the diagonal stroke may have been drawn somewhat higher than usual. If εὐφρόν in l. 115 be scanned as a disyllable, as written in the papyrus, the alternatives remain of regarding ηον... proposed as a compound verb, in which case the termination is incorrect (ιον,νοιανειαν; cf. e.g. Isthm. viii. 35 ἀδελφοιανειαν, and Bacchyl. i. 34, where the papyrus has βολαί for βολαία: or of supposing ιον... to conceal ιον and reading ιον(α)νιωτικιανειαν, the sense of νεωτν being the same as e.g. in Ol. ii. 12 ἀ Κρύνε παί Ρεία, ἐδοκιμότου νεωτν. But the ι of ιον is short elsewhere in Pindar, though it is lengthened in the compound ἤσοισενον, Nem. iv. 84; and hence we have adopted with some hesitation Bury's proposal to write εὐφρόν in l. 115 and insert γν after ιον. The errors in the papyrus are commonly due to omission of letters; and diaeresis is neglected e.g. in l. 77.

55. Only the top of the supposed η of ζηρ(νόσον) survives. A variant κελαμεφει appears to be indicated, but κελαμεφει produces the right correspondence with l. 116. κελαμεφει is a Homeric epithet of Zeus not elsewhere so used by Pindar. The Muses were the daughters of Zeus and Mnemosyne; cf. Fr. 16. 11 below.

57. τεθυμεν: sc. the inspiration of poets, το πιθεν ιανοφος (l. 52).

58. A comparison with l. 119 shows that the mark of short quantity above νυν is erroneous.

59. προξεν ει is only one of several possible restorations; κελαθεςι e.g. would also be suitable, ει being unnecessary with καταθιστα (cf. Pyth. iv. 55 Πιθον νυον καταθιστα). A difficulty, however, is raised by the note άντι του ἡσοτου, which would seem to imply that its author did not construct υσοτον with an infinitive coming after χλευκν. The reading of Zenodotus is unfortunately beyond recovery; it ends with a sloping dash which might mark an abbreviation or belong to an hastily written ν. For the language of l. 59 cf. Isthm. i. 51 γλωσσος ιασοτον, and Ol. v. 1 ιασοτον γλαυκειν.

60. ει ειν shows that άγώνα has a local Signification as e.g. in Ol. x. 24 άγώνα... Δια, έν άρχαιo σάματι πιρ Πέλοπος... ιντιοσατο. The analogy of this and other passages is in favour of the correction Λοξα.

61. θεων ειζα = Θεοκενιζος. In the following lines the institution of this festival is referred to the occasion of a famine,—a fact explained in the mutilated scholium but apparently not otherwise recorded. The local cults of Apollo were frequently brought into connexion with deliverance from such visitations, e.g. Pausan. i. 3. 4, where a statue to Apollo αδελθικας is said to commemorate the plague in the Peloponnesian war, and viii. 41. 8, where Apollo εικονύμος at Bassae is explained as εικονύματι εν νασω λοιμωκε; cf. also schol. on l. 125 below.

68-9. Fr. 48 would in some ways be suitable here,—Κροτετο οοοο παι μακαρων πριται (cf. Aesch. Prom. 169 μακαρων πριταιν), but the difference in the colour of the papyrus and the disparity in the size of the writing are decisive against this combination.

72. [Π]ωθωνος: cf. Pyth. v. 105. The transposition of the first syllable from the
preceding verse is required by the metre; l. 93, the corresponding verse in the anastrophe, as originally written was also a syllable short.

74. Πάρθονος was a priest of Apollo at Delphi and subsequently at Troy; cf. Verg. Aen. ii. 319 sqq. For Δαμων κ.τ.λ. cf. Isthm. iii. 54 (iv. 36) παίδεσσιν Ἐλλάνων, ὅσις Τροών· ἀπαίνων.

75. For the shortened first syllable in τρώια cf. e.g. Nem. iv. 25, where the MSS. have τρῳάν as an anapaest. But several editors substitute τρώιαν, and the interlineation in the papyrus shows that the question between ω and ε in such cases is an ancient one. A shortened ω (with no variant) occurs in l. 178 πατρῴαν or Τρωϊάν.

77. πᾶς Ἰπίδες: i.e. Athene; cf. Ol. xiii. 77 Ἰπίδες ἐγγεκριθέντον πᾶς and, for the allusion to Diomedes, Iliad e 115 sqq. The occurrence of πᾶς as a disyllable here is of interest in connexion with the corrupt passage in Ol. ii. 76, where πᾶς has been conjectured, and 659. 70 (Pindar, Parthenioud), where the probability of the vocative πᾶτ is now increased.

78-123. ' (Diomedes), whom the far-darting god in the mortal form of Paris smote with an arrow and estopped from battle. And straightway he put off the capture of Ilion, quelling by a bold deed of blood the doughty son of dark-tressed Thetis of the sea, the trusty defence of the Achaeans. What was his strife with white-armed Hera, as he matched against her his invincible power, what with Polias! In return for their great pains they would have razed the city of Dardanus, had not Apollo been on guard. But Zeus, the ruler of the gods, seated on the golden clouds and peaks of Olympus, dared not relax the decrees of fate: for high-coifed Helen's sake must the flaming fire's ray blot out wide Pergamon. And when they had placed in the sore-lamented tomb the mighty corse of the son of Peleus, went messengers over the sea-waves and came again bringing from Scyros Neoptolemus, great in strength, who sacked the city of Ilion. Yet saw he not thereafter his kind mother, nor roused he forth in the fields of his fathers the horses of the Myrmidons, a brass-accoutred host. He reached the Molossian land hard by Tomarus; but he escaped not the winds nor the far-darter with the broad quiver. For the god swore that he who killed aged Priam when he had sprung upon the altar in the court should come to no comfortable path in life nor reach old age; and he slew him, as he strove with the attendants about their allotted rights, in his beloved enclosure by the broad pivot of the earth. Oh hail, hail! Now for the pacan in full measure! Oh hail, ye youths!'

78-80. Cf. Iliad Α 369 sqq. Homer, however, does not ascribe the wounding of Diomedes by Paris to any special intervention of Apollo. The a of δεμω is corrected. For ἄκασθων cf. l. 111 below; the rough breathing is probable, but not certain.

81. Either ἀκιδω or ἀκιον may stand. The genitive is more natural, but it would therefore be less liable to alteration.

83. The metre shows καναπλοκότως to be the right reading. Both καναπλοκός and καναπλόκαμος are ἄραξ εἰρημένα. καναπλόκαμος is a favourite word of Bacchylides.

84. A dot has been placed above and below the δ in ἄριστος indicating that it should be omitted. ἄριστος is the Pindaric form; cf. Ol. ix. 76, Isthm. viii. 52.

87-9. For δοσα ... δοσα cf. Ol. xiii. 107 Ἀργεί τ' ὅσα καὶ ἐν Θῆβαις, ὅσα τ' ... μαρτυρήσει. In the Iliad Apollo appears consistently on the side of the Trojans, Athene on that of the Greeks.

87. ἐρίες: the Doric aorist is sufficiently common in Pindar, and hardly deserved a note; cf. e.g. l. 133 ἐγγούλιζεν.

88. Both a grave and an acute accent are placed above the a of αὔτων, the former being enclosed between two dots like the letters of variants (e.g. ll. 81 and 83). The
purpose was to indicate a choice between the alternative readings Δι[σ]ειδων (grave accent) and Δι[σειδων] (acute). Editors write Δισειδις in Pyth. iv. 37. A similar double accent is found in IX. 17.

89. ὀσσα: the variant ὀσσα attributed to Aristophanes implies a syllaba anceps at the beginning of the verse, but the syllable is short in the other surviving instances, ll. 7, 68, and 129.

πρῶς = αντί, a sense found in a line of Philemon δοῦλος πρὸ δοῦλον, δεσπότης πρὸ δεσπότου according to Bekker, Anecd. p. 112; cf. προφύγων. Ol. x. 23 ἑργῶν πρὸ πάντων βιωτοφίος is perhaps a parallel; ἀντί πάνω occurs in Isid. v. 25.

91. ἐπιμέθνης: ἐπιμέθνει Pap., but there seems to be no reason, as Bury observes, for dissociating Hera and Athene here, and the singular may easily have come in from the adjacent verbs.

92–3. The final o of ἀλειπποῦω was added at the beginning of l. 93 after κ was written. The omission may have been simply an oversight; but the papyrus is damaged at the end of l. 92, and it is possible that the final o was at first placed there, and then deleted; cf. note on l. 72. There is no sign of ἀλειπποῦω having been the original reading.

94. ἀνάμλης: for the Doric infin. cf. IX. 36 αναγενέ, Ol. l. 3 γαρένε, Pyth. iv. 115 τράβεν. σκοτός is used as in Nem. v. 27 Μαντήων σκοτόν (Acastus), &c.

95 sqq. Cf. Pyth. xi. 33 ἄρχει Ἑλλην πυροβίντων Ῥήματων.

ἐπισκώπω: cf. Pyth. iv. 172 ἐπισκώπα, an epithet which according to Boeckh vǐgorem et robur indicat, according to Fennell, who compares Thucydides i. 6. 3, refers to an eastern fashion of wearing the hair. The latter explanation would suit the present passage. The accent on the o is not quite certain.

96. A small difficulty occurs at the end of this line. The supposed i is doubtful, but to read εἰνεν διστάσει is unsatisfactory not only on account of the hiatus but because a space between ν and a would remain unaccounted for. Περγυμος (Ol. viii. 42) meaning Troy is always feminine wherever the gender is determinable, and therefore εἰνεν is inadmissible unless it be here declined as an adjective of two terminations on the analogy of δῆλος and ἡδος. On the whole we prefer διστάσιμοι (Soph. Trach. 881), and it is possible that an a was actually written after δ, for though there is no trace of ink on the surface of the papyrus is worn, a is long in διστών in the only other Findaric instance, Pyth. iii. 37.

97. αἰθομενος was a slip, perhaps due to πυρος. The s is practically certain.

99. There was certainly one letter, probably either i (or better) ν, immediately after -δα, and some traces of ink beyond may belong to a second. Περγυμος would be intelligible whether νεκον was taken adjectively or in apposition with the proper name; but the genitive is more likely to be correct.

So far as the general appearance of the papyrus and the recto is concerned, Fr. 66 might be placed near the end of this line in the gap between Cols. xxix and xxx; but there is nothing in the scholium which suggests any connexion with the text.

107. The marginal numeral is placed midway between this and the following line; l. 107 is the 100th from the preceding μ (l. 7).

108. As the text stands χαλκ. [δ]μολυν is in apposition with ἐπισκοπεῖ. There is not room in the lacuna for [θ] δμολυν: perhaps χαλκοκορα[ντ]υν (θ)δμ. should be read, but the particle is not necessary.

109–10. Cf. Nem. vii. 37–7 Προμύον ποιεordinates Νεοπτάλεμος ἐπιτρήμεν . . . ἀ τρόπαλιον Σκύρον μεν ἄμαρτε, πλαγιότισσα δ εἰς ἑφύρην ὕπατον. Μοιασσα δ ἑμπρακτεῖν ὕλην χάρον. At the end of l. 110 the choice of supplements seems to lie between ἐμπάθει (cf. Nem. vii. 17–8 σφοι δὲ μέλλουτα τριτον ἀνέμου ἐμπάθω , and ἐλαβ'ει, the former being more suitable to ἀγέμονος, the latter to ἐκυμβολα) ἐλαβέει has the advantage of explaining the mark of short
quantity which is visible above the lost vowel, and might naturally have been added to obviate confusion with ἔρθεν, whereas with ἔρμην no mistake could arise. Cf. moreover Philh. iii. 27 ὀδῷ ἔρθεν σκοπόν (sc. Apollo), Ném. i. 37 οὖ λάθων χρυσοθραυντὸν ἕταν. The first three lines of the scholiast perhaps contained some reference to Aegina or the Aeginetans. It was the following passage concerning the death of Neoptolemus which gave offence in Aegina; cf. note on l. 117-9 and introd. p. 20. The three lower lines, which are in a different hand, are so nearly effaced that the obliteration seems intentional.

111. The scribe has marked the final syllable of εἰρφουῖρτεν as short, which, if correct, implies the existence of a form in -ας side by side with that in -ας (Philh. ix. 26), as in the case of ἐπισότις and ἐπίστας; cf. ὀφρουρίαι in Philh. ii. 12.

114. Cf. Pausan. iv. 17. 3 Νεοπτολέμῳ γὰρ τῷ Ἀχιλλέως ἀποκείμενον Πρίαμον ἐπὶ τῇ ἔσχαρᾳ τοῦ Ἑρμίου συνίστασαι καὶ αὐτῶν ἐν Δελφοῖς πρὸς τῷ βωμῷ τοῦ ’Απόλλωνος ἀποσφαγήματι, and Vergil, Laet. ii. 499-553.

115. μῦ, v. l. v.: cf. Fr. 19. 24. Fluctuation between the two forms is common in the MSS. of Pindar. Mommsen and Bergk practically eliminate μῦ in spite of a consensus of tradition in several passages. μῦ stands alone in II. 73, Fr. 19. 26 and Fr. 131. 18, 19 in IV. 15, Fr. 82. 32 and IX. 47.

117-9 = Pindar Fr. 52, preserved in the scholia on Ném. vii. 94 καθὸ ποὺ ἀπολογέονται βούλεται περὶ τοῦ Νεοπτολήμος δαίδον πρὸς τοῦ Ἀχίλλης· ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ἐτίμων τοῦ Πίνδαρου ὅτι γράφων Δελφοῖς τὸν παίκτη ἐφή ἀμφισβάλωσα μαρμάροιν μύραν περὶ τίμων ἀπολογοῦμαι; cf. ιδί. 150 μυρίδες ὑπὸ λιγνίτων ἐπὶ τῷ δοκεῖν ἐν παιάνιν ἐπίτιν τῶν Νεοπτολήμον ἐπὶ ἑρωειδία ἐκλιθεῖται εἰς Δελφοῖς, νῦν ἀπεραύομαι ἐπίτιν ὅτι αὐτῶν ἰσοπολύλων ἐπελεῖταιν ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ κρεόν φιλοτιμίῳ ἀνηρήθη. The papyrus proves the antiquity of the mis-spelling μυρίαν which Boeckh, comparing the following words of the schol. on Ném. vii. 94 οὔκ ἐφησε . . . ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν νομιζόμενων τιμῶν τῶν Δελφοῖς, was the first to correct to μυρίαν. The letter after ν is not indeed certain, but the remains suit ρ better than any other letter and are not consistent with θ. μυρίαν cannot be defended; and the choice rests between Boeckh’s emendation and the reading attributed in the margin of the papyrus to Zenodotus, Πυθαῖον. The latter gives an excellent sense and may well be right, but it appears on the whole more probable that Πυθαῖον was an attempt to emend μυρίαν than that μυρίαν was a corruption of an original Πυθαῖον. The interchange of ν and α is too common to require illustration. μαρμάροιν, if not to be explained by the supposition that the citation was made from memory, must be a gloss on ἐμποτεῦμον. ἐμποτεῦμον is not attested, ἐμπότευμα (ἐμποτευκ, Ol. xiii. 44) being the regular form; but we can suggest no more satisfactory restoration: ἀντίσωμα is not used in the middle voice.

For κρέσοις in the note opposite these lines cf. Ném. vii. 42 κρέσοι νῦν ὑπὸ μάχας ἐλασεν ἀντίσωμον ἀνέπαυσα, and Schol. on l. 150 quoted above, which also illustrates ἥ τῶν χρημάτων κ.τ.λ.

119-20. The size of the lacuna shows that a syllable is missing at the beginning of l. 120. The reading κτανεῖμεν attributed in the marginal note to Zenodotus would be metrical; but a finite verb would be much more natural, and it is probable that the oblique construction has been wrongly carried on from l. 115-7. At any rate a future not an aorist infinitive would be expected to balance ἔγειμεν. κτανεῖμεν is therefore very likely a graphical error for κτάνειν ἐν, due to the influence of κτανεῖν in the text; the homoioteleuton would of course make the loss of ἐν particularly easy. μ in κτανεῖμεν is hardly certain, but is more suitable than ν.

121-2. The metre requires ἑ in l. 121, ἑ only in l. 122.

123-40. ‘An island of glorious name thou reignest amid the Dorian sea, bright
star of Hellenic Zeus! Therefore will we not lay thee to rest without a feast of paeans, but thou shalt receive our surging songs, and declare whence came to thee the god who guides thy helm and thy care for the right of the stranger. He who brings all things to pass in their diversity, the far-seeing son of Cronos, placed in thy hand thy happiness: by the waters of Asopus he once carried off from the threshold the deep-breasted maiden Aegina; then the golden tresses of the mists hid the shaded ridges of your land, that upon the immortal couch...

123 sqq. The abrupt transition to Aegina, which is addressed in the following passage, is in the Pindaric manner. The point of connexion is to be found in the Aeacid ancestry of Neoptolemus, Aegina being the mythical home of the line, as narrated below in the legend of the birth of its founder. This pointed juxtaposition of Neoptolemus and Aegina helps to explain the soreness of the Aeginetans at what appeared to them an unfortunate description of the manner of Neoptolemus' death; cf. note on ll. 117-9 and introd. p. 20. But they certainly had no cause to complain of the tone of ll. 123-32.

ονομαζότα is quoted from Pindar by Schol. T. on Ἰλιαδ X 51 (= Bergk Fr. 301) perhaps from the present passage; the feminine termination is also found in καυστέρα, another Pindaric epithet of Aegina (Nem. v. 9). For Δωρεή cf. Nem. iii. 3 Δωρίδα νάσον Λίγνασ, and Pindar Fr. i. 3.

124. φθερται in the marginal note probably means 'is found in', of a reading; the word is so used in an unpublished Oxyrhynchus fragment of Apollonius Rhodius with scholia.

125. Δώος Ἑλλανίου: cf. Nem. v. 10 πώροι βρεφών πατέρος Ἑλλάνιος, and for the marginal note cf. the schol. ad loc. φαίη γὰρ αἴχμων ποτε πιέζοντο τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἐνοι δὲ κατακλυσμοῖς, συνελθότας τοῖς Ἑλληνας καθηκότισσά τιν πλῆκτο ὑπόλοιπον τῶν τότε συστάτων κακῶν τὴν ἱστον, τούτον δὲ ἐξάλλον ἀποθέρμανε τὰ δεινὰ καὶ οὐτῳ διὰ τὴν τῆς Ἑλλάδος σωστρίαν Ἑλληνίου παρὰ τοῖς Λίγνησις τετμημέναι Δία.

128. ἄδοροι: cf. Pindar Fr. 124 οἱ ἄρατοι ἄξιοι (ἀξίες) ἀδόροοι (ὁ Βοεχκή) ὀσοῦ παύει (τοῖς) τέμπω μεταδόθησαν.

129. ρόδα: cf. Aristophanes, Εφ. 546 ἀριστῆ αἰτῶ πολοῦ τὸ ρόδον. The word is especially appropriate, like ναυςτάταν in l. 130, in the case of wave-washed Aegina.

130—1. καυστέραν and θεμίτιον are both ἀπαξ εἰρημένα. On the latter cf. Ol. viii. 20-3 Λίγναν... ἕνα Σώτηρα Δώος ξενίον πάροδος ἁγείνεται Θέμος ἐξα' ἀνδράσιον, Nem. iv. 11-12 Λικαίδων ἄστρου γῆς, ἰδία νεονερὲ καλών φεγγός, Nem. v. 8 φίλων ξενίων ἄρμαριν, and Fr. i. 3-4 νέμοντα (sc. the Aeginetans) οὐ δέμον αὐτῷ δίκαιον ἐπιφθαίνουσαν.

In ἄρατοι two short syllable appear in place of a long one (l. 9 ἄδοροι, l. 91 ἀπολλάξων); the same variation occurs in the case of the same word in the epode at l. 176. Bury notes that this resolution supports the traditional reading in Nem. iii. 14, where ἄγορα in a similar position in correspondence with a spondee has been commonly rejected.


133. The variant ἐγκαλίζοντο would presumably imply παί for παῖς, producing a hiatus. The indicative is no doubt correct.

134. The correction of ὡς to ὡδοτος is necessary for the metre. Asopus was the father of Aegina; cf. Isthm. viii. 17 sqq. διδύμα ψευάτο τὸ τρίατον Ἀποστίδων ὁπλότατο, Ζηρί τε ἄδω βασιλεί, ὃς τῶν μεν... σι' β' (sc. Λίγναν) ἐν νάσον Οἰλοστικόν ἑγκώμων κοιμάτο. Μοντάρας, for perhaps ποθ' ὑπό τοι. Βαυγκόλοπος is an epithet of the Muses in Pyth. l. 12. Cf. Βαυγκόλοπος.

135. ἀναρέστατο: this verb is usually written ἀνερεπάστικον (ἀνερεπάστικον II. Y 243, &c.), but the form ἀνερεπάστικον is found in Bekk. Anecd. p. 401, and ἀνέρεσθοι akin to ἀνέρασω and ἀρεστος would seem to be etymologically correct.
138. The meaningless and unmetrical εκρυφσαν of the papyrus perhaps arose from a ditography of ψα.

172. πωναί is an alternative reading. The mark of short quantity rather suggests πωναί as a variant on πωναῦ, but a final ι was certainly not written.

175. In the absence of the context there are no means of deciding between γε and the v. l. τε.

176. In ἀριστάς ω – = = – ; cf. note on ll. 130–1.

178. παρδοῦαν; or ] τρωίαν; in either case the ω is shortened; cf. l. 75.

178. νν is apparently a variant for παν. There is a short blank space between the final ν and the very slight vestige of the following letter, which was perhaps the initial of the name of the critic who supported the reading.

182–3. πωναί: πωνάω Pap. According to Ahrens, De dial. Dor. p. 26, πωνάω, τάν, &c., was the Doric accent; but different systems may have obtained among grammarians. If δί = ‘and’ the acute accent shows an enclitic (τοι?) followed.

The Zenodotean reading recorded in the margin is obscure. The letters are for the most part clear.

VII.

1. If δότερας (Pindar Fr. 109. 5 πενίας δότερας) is right, the Muses or Graces are addressed.


4. In front of the cross at the beginning of this line are some ink marks which might represent ω, but are more likely to be accidental.

12. ὅν = ἀνί.

15. πρὸ ὄρθωτοι (μετο?); or πρὸ ὄρθωτοι; cf. Frs. 129–31. 20 below.

16. παραῖσι is written slightly smaller and less regularly than the adjoining letters, and is possibly part of a marginal entry.

17. κελάδοσαν αὐδαῖς: cf. Fr. 16. 5 κελαδόσαθ᾽ ὑμνοὺς.

18. εναντίας is not found elsewhere except in Apoll. Rhod. iv. 148 εναντία δοῦναι ἐφορμή.

B. Frs. 16–25. On the general characteristics of this group of fragments cf. introd. p. 12. Whether any of them belong to Paean VII, or, if so, which, is doubtful. There are some resemblances in rhythm, but no correspondence can be established.

Frs. 16. 5. κελαδόσαθ is probably a variant for some other verb. The conjunction of the words κελαδόσαθ ὑμνοὺς here is noteworthy in connexion with Nεμ. iv. 16, where Bergk’s emendation of the traditional ὑμνον κελαδόσες καλλίκυκον to νίν κ. κ. has been accepted by Bury and Schroeder. Cf. VII. 17 κελά δοσαν αὐδαῖς.

6. Possibly κατ᾽ ὁμαζίτον, as in Pyth. iv. 247: only the scantiest traces remain of the word between ἵππου and ἄμαχ.

7. Συνίος: the first letter seems to be σ rather than ς or θυρίως would be an easier epithet. Cf. Aesch. Pers. 84 Συνίος θ’ ἄρμα διώκων, and for ἤν ἵππος cf. e.g. Ol. i. 41 χρυσόν τε ἵππος. The doubtful ν may be τ.

8. πτανόν: cf. Plato, Phaedr. 246. E. ζεῦς ἱππόν πτηνὸν ἄρμα. The supposed τ is represented only by the top of the crossbar, which might belong equally well to e.g. γ or σ.

10–7. ‘(I pray) to the fair-robed child of Uranus, Mnemosyne, and to her daughters to grant fullness of resource. For blind are the minds of men, whoever without the maids
of Helicon seeks the steep path of them who walked it by their wisdom. To me they have handed on this immortal work...'

10. Some word like ἑπίσκομην is apparently to be supplied in the lacuna. For εἰσπέλω ... κόµαρίου σέ cf. VI. 54-6 and Isthm. vi. 74-5 κόµαρ χρυσοπέλων Μιλοςτώνων.

11. εἰσπαραγών: cf. Isthm. iv. 2, where the word means rather abundance of opportunity than resourcefulness on the part of the poet. The latter sense is more appropriate in the present passage.

13-4. ἀνθρώπων... ὀρτις: so Ol. iii. 10-1 νῖσοντά εἰ' ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπων ὀρτις ὑμι... 

15. If ἀδήλωντων is right the sense seems to be ὀστις ἐρεννά τήν μαθηίαν ὁδών τῶν ἀδήλων ἀετῶν ταῖς ἀετῶν σφαίρασι: 'whoever emulates the masters of poetry must be guided by the Muses.' The allusion is perhaps to Homer; cf. Fr. 17. Bury would prefer to connect ἀδήλωντων with ὀρτις and σφαίρασι with ἐρεννά, which gives a less involved sentence, but makes ἀδήλωντων awkwardly placed. ἀδήλωντων, however, is insecure; the doubtful τ may be ε or ο, and γ may replace τ. To write σφαίρας ὁδῶν (cf. VIII. 4) would be a slight simplification, but that is hardly warrantable. For μαθηία cf. Pyth. v. 88 ἀδός μαθηίαν κἐλευθὸν ἀνώγων.

16. The paragraphus marks the commencement of a new metrical section. If Fr. 16 belongs to Paean VII this section will be an epode, since the metre of l. 16 differs from that of VII. 1.

17. πώνον seems to be the right reading; πάρον would keep up the metaphor of ὁδῶν in l. 15 (cf. Isthm. viii. 15 βίον πάρον) but combines less easily with διεδωκαν ἀδάντο[ο].

Fr. 17. The appearance of this fragment suggests that it is closely connected with Fr. 19, though whether it should be placed somewhere in ll. 1-9 or belongs to the succeeding column is doubtful; the recto is consistent with either position. A suitable collocation could be produced by making Fr. 17. l. 1 the next verse to Fr. 16. l. 17 and connecting πώνον with ὄμηρον; the papyrus being broken immediately above the latter word, there is no means of determining whether that line was the first of a column.

Fr. 18. The beginning of l. 10 in Fr. 16 seems to be a rather likely place for this small fragment.

Fr. 19. The first column of this fragment may follow immediately on Fr. 16. Such a position would suit the recto, which on the other hand indicates that Fr. 16 is not to be placed next to Fr. 19, Col. ii.

2. δήλων: cf. Kaibel, Ἐρίγε. 185. 10 ὄμηρον δήλων and 471. 1-2 ὄμηρος ύμποι εϊν δήλων. The occurrence of δήλων here may be a mere coincidence, but perhaps affords a slight additional argument for making Fr. 16 and Fr. 19, Col. i successive columns, and placing Fr. 17 at the top of the latter.

10. The scholiast indicates a reference to Leto; cf. l. 12 and ll. 20 sqq.

12. Either ἐκείργην or ἐκείργην, as shown by the accent. Cf. Pyth. ix. 28 ἐκείργην ᾱπολλων.

16-8. Whether Fr. 20 should be assigned to this column is very doubtful; ἐρώτασι is not very suitable to the context in ll. 20 sqq. The fragment is unlikely, owing to its difference in colour, to belong to Fr. 19, Col. i, but it may be the top of the column represented by Fr. 21. In the first line of the scholiast it is tempting to read τήν Δήλ[逻]ον λέγει Ἄρτ[φ]ήριαν (cf. V. 42, note), but though the supposed τ is quite uncertain and could well be τ (or γ or ο), there does not seem to be room for στε between the α and ι.

18. Only a short horizontal stroke, which we take for an elongated base of a δ, is visible before the lacuna; it is too near to the line above to be a paragraphus.
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20. πείσωμαι [i.e. v. l. πείσωμαι, indicating that πείσωμαι is from πέλεξαμ not πέςαμ]. The speaker is Asteria, as the next lines show.

21 sqq. Cf. Callimachus, Del. 36 sqq. άλλ' ὄφετος πέλεξεσαν ἐπέπλεξε, άνυμα ή ἡν του Ἀστερίη τὸ παλατίνα, ἐπεί μαθέν ἠθαν τάφρων οὐράνιθεν φεύγουσα Δωὸς γύμων ἀστέρι ἵση. Something corresponding to γύμων has to be supplied in l. 21 after ἐθλιλία σα, and ή perhaps = ἐφη; but this use does not occur elsewhere in Pindar, and Bury would interpret ή here on the analogy of Πυθ. iv. 57 ή μὴ Μηθέας ἐπέων στίχες, where however the reading has been called in question and ή is taken by some critics as equivalent to ἐφη.

22. Κοίνον θυγάτηρ: i.e. Asteria, not Λετο.

23. Of the last five letters the bases only remain; δεδεικνύσα seems to be right, but π or ν might be read in place of the following k. Some infinitive such as λέγειν or άδέσσει seems to be required to complete the sentence, though this profession of scepticism on the part of the poet is curious; contrast Πυθ. x. 49-50 θεών τελεσίτων οὐδὲν πατερίαν ἐμεν ἀπιστόν.

24. For the variant νω cf. VI. 115, note. In the incomplete state of the text it is difficult to decide between the claims of εν and ἄν. The a is probably by the original scribe; whether the overwten ν in this line and ν in the next are also due to him is much more doubtful.

25. εισαγία, ν. l. εισαγία: the dot to the right of the interlinear ν is lost. The present passage is one of the few authorities for the spelling εισαγία, which Hemsterhuis wished to restore in all passages where the word means 'clear' or ' conspicuous.' In Arist. De Mundo 5, p. 397, 16 one MS, has εισαγείτατοσ, and εισαγία is found as a variant on εισαγία in Iambil. Protrep. p. 152. 23. It does not seem possible to read the first letter of the scholiast as ε, and if μαναγεί is right, the stem must be μαναγεύ, which would presumably be another ν. l., although the entry is in the small cursive hand in which explanations, not variants, are commonly given, and μαναγεύ in any form would produce a difference of metre. The supposed γε could equally well be ν.

26. For the name Ὀρτυγία cf. e.g. Apoll. Rhod. i. 537 ή πού εν Ὀρτυγίῃ (ἐν τῇ Δῆλῳ Σχολ.) and Schol. LycoPhron 401 ή Λητοὺς ἀδελφή Ἀστερία φεύγουσα τὴν τοῦ Δῶν μίξιν μετέβαλεν ἑαυτὴν εἰς ὁρτυγία καὶ ἡλικίον εἰς τὴν βήλασσιν καὶ ἐγένετο νήσος, ὅτε ἐκ ταύτης Ὀρτυγία καὶ Ἀστερία ἐκκλείετο. τι is clear before μω; Blass preferred καλεῖν τε. In παλαι there is a hole between α and ε, which are farther apart than usual, but there would not be room for παλαιος, the o was abnormally small.


28-30. If τάς is right toσφόρον θελέσαμ γάλαν will be expegetic of ἐράσασο, i.e. Ζευς desired the island as the place for the birth of Απόλλων. A more natural interpretation would be to connect τάς with γάλαν, but this is inadmissible since τάς must refer to Αστερία, who was not the mother of Απόλλων. Perhaps τάς should be δτ = ἑως (Ol. x. 51), when θελέσαμ would be directly dependent on ἐράσασο as in Νεμ. i. 31 οὐκ ἔραμι . . . έχειν. The metre being uncertain we cannot decide between κράτιστος and κάριστος; the confusion of spelling is not unfrequent in Pindar, e.g. Πυθ. xi. 18, where there is authority for both κράτεραν and καρτεράν. For δ κράτισσος of Ζευς cf. Ol. xiv. 12 θεών κράτιστον παῖδες, and for θελέσαμ Πυθ. iii. 9 τῶν μὲν εύτεκτον Φλεγία θυγάτηρ πρὶν τελέσαμ ματροπόλῳ σὺν Ἑλευθ. γ ο γανον has apparently been corrected from α.

The present context, as suggested by Blass, would be appropriate to Fr. 90, reading in ι. 3-4 χ' ἀλικε[α] μὲν τάτε ... ἔνοι καίσε; cf. Pindar Fr. 88 άλλ' ά Κασεγιαν ἀπατ' ἄδεσσεθθυμάτῳ ἀγχοτάζει επέλακαν άν νο (sc. Δήλων), δε τότε τέσσαρες ἄρθαι πρέμων ἀπορροστών χθωνίας, ἀν δ' ἐπικράνασα σχέδουν πέτρων ἀδαμπτόπεπλόκα κιόνες. Moreover, the metre in Fr. 90 can be brought into correspondence with that in ι. 24-6: ο - ο - ισόμεθος εφαίνοντο . . . χ' ἀλεξα
\( \mu \varepsilon \nu \tau \psi \ldots \varnothing \psi - \varnothing \rangle \kappa \iota \omega \varepsilon, \) and the two passages might therefore stand in the relation of strophe and antistrophe. The difference of hand creates no real difficulty, for if C and D belong to the same MS. as A and B, which there is good ground for supposing (cf. introd. p. 23), a change of scribe necessarily occurred at some point, and there is no reason why the point should not be at the end of Col. ii of Fr. 19. The appearance of the papyrus, however, is very dissimilar in the two fragments; and the metrical argument is not strong, for the line of fracture on the left side of Fr. 90 is practically straight, and it is hardly likely that both \( \varnothing \psi - \varnothing \rangle \) in l. 24 and \( \varnothing \psi - \varnothing \rangle \) in l. 26 would have occupied the same space as \( - \chi \) in l. 25. We have therefore refrained from bringing Fr. 90 into immediate relation with Fr. 19, though the combination is undoubtedly attractive.

Fr. 21. The position of this fragment in relation to Frs. 16 and 17 is altogether uncertain; it may precede Fr. 16 or follow Fr. 17. The recto is practically illegible.

7. \( \varepsilon \sigma \varepsilon \tau \tau \varepsilon, \) which is probably a variant for \( \varepsilon \sigma \tau \tau \varepsilon, \) seems to be independent of \( \alpha \mu \omega \], being not quite in the same straight line, and apparently by a different hand.

Fr. 22. 3. Neither the circumflex accent nor the rough breathing is clear. \( i \sigma \eta \) (subj. of \( \iota \sigma \alpha \mu \iota \)) is conjectured by Bury in \( \Lambda \varepsilon \tau \mu \nu \) iv. 91.

Fr. 26. This fragment and Fr. 27 are distinguished by the fact that the recto is in a different hand from that of the rest of A and B, and may be the same as that of D, where the text on the verso is by a second scribe. Fr. 27 is of a darker colour than Fr. 26, and does not apparently join directly on to it.

5. \( \nu \rho \lambda \varepsilon \iota \dot{\theta} \rho \mu [\ldots \varnothing ] \), or possibly \( \nu \rho \lambda \varepsilon \iota \dot{\theta} \rho \mu [\varnothing \rho \ldots \varnothing ] \), but the letter before \( \mu \) is rather more like \( \rho \) than \( \iota \), and there is a mark above the preceding letter, which has to be ignored if this be read as \( \nu \) but can well be an accent on an \( \eta \).

6. \( \kappa \rho [\ldots \omega ] : \) the supposed \( \iota \) is rather tall and may be \( \phi \).

7. Cf. \( \Lambda \varepsilon \tau \mu \nu \) ix. 22 \( i \sigma \mu \gamma \nu \alpha \delta \varepsilon \iota \varepsilon \delta \chi \theta \alpha \sigma \iota \). A small dot at the base of \( \iota \) might be the vestige of an \( a \), but \( \delta \chi \theta \alpha \sigma \iota \varepsilon \) alone would not fill the lacuna.

Fr. 28. 2. \( \beta \alpha \nu \dot{\omega} \iota \zeta \ldots : \) cf. II. 58, &c. \( \beta \alpha \nu \dot{\omega} \iota \zeta \omega \ldots \) may also be read, but a combination with III. 99 is not possible; cf. note ad loc.

4. \( \lambda \theta \iota \varepsilon \nu \ldots : \) or \( \delta \varepsilon [\nu \tau \eta \ldots \? \]

Fr. 33. 2. Perhaps \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \gamma \sigma \sigma \) or \( \gamma \sigma \sigma \) : but the first \( \sigma \) is possibly a rubbed \( o \), and \( \gamma \sigma \sigma \) or \( \mu \omega \) c. e. g. might be read.

3. Possibly \( \Lambda \mu \rho \alpha \lambda \lambda \nu \); but the relative length of the next four lines renders it unlikely that this line is the first verse of a strophe from V.

4. The first \( \epsilon \) of \( \nu \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \) is extremely doubtful, but \( \epsilon \) or \( o \) are equally unsatisfactory; \( \lambda \varepsilon \) or \( \lambda \omega \) may be read for \( \alpha \sigma \).

Fr. 44. It is not certain which way up this fragment should be placed.

Fr. 46. 2. The mark of length above the \( a \) is not quite certain.

3. An alternative reading \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \varepsilon \mu \varphi \nu \) for \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \varepsilon \mu \varphi \beta \sigma \) is apparently indicated by the interlinear insertion.

4. \( \dot{o} \kappa e \) : or \( \lambda \kappa \kappa \). If \( \kappa \lambda \eta \varepsilon \) is right the next word may be \( \iota \dot{d} \nu \omega \varepsilon \) : \( \iota \omega \varepsilon \) cannot be read.

Fr. 47. 2. \( \dot{\beta} \alpha \lambda \omega \) : so probably rather than \( \delta \alpha \lambda \omega \). In any case this line cannot be the first of one of the strophes of V (\( \iota \mu \iota \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \iota \chi \sigma \alpha \lambda \lambda \nu \)), since \( \iota \zeta \omega \) \( \beta \sigma \alpha \lambda \sigma \iota \) in the line below does not suit the metre of the following verse \( - \varnothing \psi - \varnothing \rangle \).

Fr. 48. This fragment cannot be placed at VI. 68-9; cf. note ad loc.
Frs. 49, 50. These two fragments are of the same light colour, but do not join.

Frs. 54, 2. The letter after † must be either a or 8. The insertion above the line is in lighter ink and somewhat blurred.

Frs. 55, 1. The insertion (which is not certainly by the first hand) is at the distance of an ordinary verse from I. 2; the note is therefore a marginal one, and †[oro] came near the end of a line.

Frs. 59-60. The appearance of these two small fragments suggests a connexion with Col. viii of A owing to the fact that the recto there has a broad strip of papyrus gammed on to it, the writing on which runs in the reverse direction to the cursive of the recto, and the recto of Frs. 59 and 60 is covered in the same way with pieces from the same document. The strip down Col. viii, however, is practically complete except at ll. 102-4, and since neither of the fragments can be fitted on there, they may come from quite another part of the manuscript. The recto of Fr. 68 is similar.

Frs. 65-81. Of these seventeen fragments of scholia the recto of five, namely Frs. 71, 75, 76, 78, and 81 is blank, and they may therefore come from either A-B, C or D; in the case of Frs. 77 and 81 the remains on the recto are insufficient to identify the hand. The remainder, as is shown by the recto, belong either to A-B or C, the majority more probably to the former. Fr. 81, which is in small sloping uncial, should perhaps rather be referred to C or D.

Frs. 66. This fragment is composed of two pieces, the combination of which, though probable, is not quite free from doubt. The line of junction is at the lacunae after γεν[ and ρα].

Frs. 71, 4. Perhaps δε πίπερα[ς λέγει [ as in Fr. 82, 3.

C. The hand of the text changes at this point; cf. introd. p. 12.

VIII.

Frs. 82, 1 sqq. This scholium not improbably refers, like II. 7-11, to Clymenus and Erginus (cf. note ad loc.), but its subject is obscured by mutilation.

2. If ε[θ]ελθεις γεν[ is right the oracle was quoted verbatim.

4. The word after ἤρικα is perhaps καί; the vestiges are too slight for certain identification.

7-11. Cf. Apollod. ii, 4. 11 Κλίμακεν τῶν Μινώων βασιλέα λίθο βαλὸν Μενοκέως ἴλοχος, ὡς καὶ Περάρης, ἐν Ὀγχυστῷ Ποσειδῶν οἱ θέμες τετράκοι, ὁ δὲ κοιμᾶθι εἰς Ὀρχωμον τὴν ἱμηθήτας ἐπισκέπτεται τελευτῶν Ἱεργόνω τῷ παθί ἐκδοκίσα (cf. Fr. 65, 5) τῶν βάσανων αὐτοῦ, στρατευόμενος δὲ Ἱεργόνω εἰς θέσιας, κτείνας αὐτά ἀλλ' ἀνδρομάζων πέμπων αὐτῷ Θηβαίων δασιμῶν ἐπὶ ἐκόσιν ἐν κατὰ ἐκόσιν βῶδας. ἐπὶ τούτων τῶν δασιμῶν τοῖς κήρυκας εἰς Θῆβας ἀπέβας παντὸς ἄσσων ἵππος ἐλαθήσατο . . . ἐφ' αἰς ἀγωνικῶν ἐστράτευσεν εἰς Θῆβας. Ἡρακλῆς δὲ . . . Ἱεργόνω μὲν ἔτεινεν τοῖς δὲ Μινώως ἔτρεψατο. A similar account is given by Pausanias ix. 37, 2; cf. Schol. O. L. xiv. 2.

8. Perhaps ἱ Γου, but hardly Ἱεργ[ι Γου], since Ἱεργόνος is presumably the subject of ἄ]πητε. τοῦ, which would be expected, does not seem admissible; the υ is extremely doubtful, and palaeographically v would be more satisfactory.

17-9. A paraphrase of ll. 25 sqq. δεσπείρω in l. 19 is corrupt. τελέω is probably meant, and δό may represent αθ', 'further'; (ο')ν τελέως ἐπὶ τελέθημεν is less likely.

20-33. (Seeing Paris) hasting forth, straightway her godliest inspired heart cried out
with grievous moan and made utterance with such purport of speech:—O infinite far-seeing son of Cronos, now wilt thou accomplish the calamity fated of old what time Hecabe declared to the sons of Dardanus the vision which she once saw when she carried this man in her womb; she thought she bore a fiery hundred-handed Fury, who with cruel violence hurled down to the ground all Illium. And she said...''

20. σπεύδων' refers to Paris, hastening to set out for Sparta. The removal of the final ν of κλαγεῖν is indicated by a dot placed above and below the letter, as in l. 25 below; cf. II. 67.

21. κέαρ: i.e. that of Cassandra, κέαρ being used paraphrastically for the person as in Νεμ. vii. 102 τὸ δ' ἐμὸν οὐ ποτε φάσει κέαρ. For ἀδιάφορον στομαχαῖς cf. Πιδάδ Ψ 10 ἀδίκοιο ... γόνοι.

22. The accent and mark of quantity on στομαχαῖς show that the scribe carelessly mistook the dative for the nominative.

23. κορφᾶ: cf. Οἰ. vii. 68-9 τελείτατιν δὲ λόγων κορφᾶι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ πετοίκου and Πυθ. iii. 80 λόγων συνήμεν κορφᾶι. The analogy of these passages makes λόγων in l. 24 preferable to the v. l. λόγων. With what object the curved marks were placed beneath the syllables α and φαι is not clear; cf. IX. 35 and 41, where the syllables θη of λέξις and Την in the name Τήνερων are similarly underlined. Such signs are used e.g. in the Bacchylides papyrus to connect the constituent parts of compound words (iii. 23 διαμισίππον, v. 19 εἰρνάνακτος, &c.), but though the stroke would serve to warn the reader that Την in Τήνερων was not the article, and that τοιαῦτη was one word, not two, no similar explanation will apply to κορφᾶι οὐ λέξις. In the former word next to the circumflex accent is a mark which we can only explain as a sign of short quantity indicating κορφᾶι, though this is contradicted by the accent and κορφᾶι would not construe.

σάμαινε: the interlinear ν is in a lighter ink, and was perhaps added by a later hand.

24. λόγων: cf. note on l. 23. The adjective παναπτείρων is found only in Orph. Π. 58. 10 νόμον ὁγισάμεν παναπτείρων εὐφωμὸν ἀρχήν. παναπτείρων (Oppian C. ii. 517) in the same sense or παναπτίμω (Hesiod, Οἰ. 811, Anth. Pal. ix. 525. 17; cf. Pindar, Πυθ. x. 21-2 θέος εἰς ἀπίθανον κέαρ) are other possibilities.

25. The reading τελεύς was altered to τελεῖ (imperative), a dot having been placed above and below the final σ (cf. l. 20), and the accent of τελεῖ added. The indicative τελεῖ is preferable, since Cassandra did not wish for the accomplishment of the ruin of Troy, but only foresaw it.

29. τοῦδ' ἄνερ' means of course Paris.

30 sqq. On this well-known story of Hecuba’s dream cf. e.g. Apollod. iii. 12. 5 δευτέρου δὲ γεννᾶσθαι μέλλοντος βρέφους ἔδοξεν Ἐκάβη καθ’ ύπαρ δικῶν τεκείν διάτυρον (so Eurip. Τριόταιδες 921-2 βρέφος, διαίν τικόν μίμην, Schol. Eurip. Ανδρ. 294 λαυπάδα, Vergil, Αειν. vii. 320 ἲπει ταῖστιν Ciesseis πραενίς, &c.), τοῦτω δὲ πάσαν ἐπινίμεσθαι τὴν πάλιν καὶ καίρω.

32. ἐπὶ πίθον: cf. Aesch. Fr. 169 πρὸς πίθον βίλης, &c.

33 sqq. These mutilated lines probably refer to the interpretation of the dream, of which different accounts are preserved. According to Apollod. l. c. the interpreter was Priam’s son Aesacus, at whose recommendation the child was exposed, but ineffectually (cf. l. 35 (?) ἐσφαλῆ προμάθεια).

34. For ὑπαλλέων cf. Anth. Pal. v. 242. 5 ἐν ὑπαλλείων ὑπάρχον. Either ι or η might be read in place of α, but not ο.

35. Perhaps οὐτός 'Αριμαίος(τορροσ) or 'Αρί(μαίος(τορροσ)); cf. note on II. 61.

Frs. 83-4. That Fr. 83 should be placed at the top of this column is made almost
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certain by the combination of three considerations: (1) the similar appearance of the verso of Frs. 83 and 84, (2) the fact that a strengthening strip from a cursive document has been gummed on the recto of both of them, (3) the coincidence that when the fragment is so placed a column of exactly the right length results. On grounds analogous to (1) and (2) Fr. 85 is also to be placed in the upper part of the column, probably close to Fr. 84.

1–2. *e

8. The vestiges at the end of this line may belong to a scholiwm.

11. *καθείσ is occurs also in *Ol. i. 92 Ἀλφεῖνο πᾶσιν κλ. and *Νευ. i. 15 βία μὲ τάδε μέλει κλ. νίων (?) κεφάδιε. *καθείσ in the present passage will mean simply 'reclining.'

12. *πράξαν is apparently the neuter participle future agreeing with ἐνος, though the expression is somewhat strange.

13. If the marginal *Χρησ( ) gives the name of the speaker, possibly the Trojan Chryses, who was a priest of Apollo, or the Cretan Chrysothemis, who is said to have been the first winner in the contest of singing a hymn to Apollo at Delphi (Pausan. x. 2), may be meant. But on the analogy of the other abbreviated names of Pindaric commentators which occur in this papyrus it is more probable that *Χρησ( ) stands for the critic Χρύσησσος, who is frequently referred to in the extant scholia.

15. From the conjunction in the scholium of ὁλευον and θέμμοδε it may be inferred that the latter word followed in the text. The reading is practically certain, and τ cannot be substituted for θ, though it should perhaps be restored in accordance with the usual Pindaric declension.

Frs. 86. i. This line was probably, but not certainly, the first of a column. The fragment cannot be combined with Fr. 88 θ ἐπιτάτη, &c.

Frs. 87. 3. There is a remarkable coincidence between the remains of this line and Fr. 82. 20; the word ἱερώτατα probably occurs in both verses, and the same ambiguity of metre in the preceding word is also found in both cases. But the hypothesis that the two verses are in strophic correspondence is open to the objection that Fr. 87. 4 ζητεῖ does not agree with Fr. 82. 21 διαλαίη; this difficulty, however, could easily be overcome by writing διαλαίη.

Frs. 90. On the grounds for and against bringing this fragment into connexion with Fr. 19 sec note on ll. 28–30 ad loc.

Frs. 91. This fragment may contain the beginnings of lines.

Frs. 93. For the double accent on ὅλος cf. note on V. 44. The rough breathing is not clear.

Frs. 95. 5. Perhaps a critical note, if εν τιαὶ = 'in some copies.'

Frs. 96. i. ῥηπαῶν seems to be a variant for ταχῦν. If 'Ἀλέξων[ ]'ρ below is a reference to Paris, the fragment may come from the column following Fr. 82. ii; cf. Frs. 129–31. i.

Frs. 103–4. These two fragments are very similar in appearance, and probably go close together.

Frs. 107. ἀπ[ ]]δάψης διαφηρομακρά: the poems described as διαφηρομακρά were so called from the branches of laurel which the singers carried, and according to Proclus, Chrest. στρ., Phot. Bibl. 239, they were classed with the Παρθένεια.—Παρθ. οἰς καὶ τὰ Δαφνηφορικὰ ὑπὸ ἐις γίνος πτετεί. The δαφνηφορία was specially associated with the Ismenion at Thebes. Cf. introd. p. 24.

Frs. 108. προσάδι[ ]'ων seems a likely restoration; on its possible significance cf. introd. p. 24.

Frs. 109. The occurrence of an elision mark between ε and ο leads us to regard this line as belonging to the text in spite of the rather small size of the letters.
Fr. 111. Probably from the top of a column. The first line may be part of a scholium. 
Fr. 116. The vestiges below the third line seem to represent lectional signs rather than letters. 
Fr. 117. 2. The supposed high stop may be the end of an acute accent. 
Fr. 124. The writing in this fragment is slightly more cursive than usual in the notes by the first hand. 

D. Frs. 126–39 are distinguished from those under C by the presence of a different hand on the recto.

IX. For the THEBANS.

1–21 = Pindar Fr. 107, preserved in Dionys. Hal. De Demosth. dict. c. 7 ταίτα καὶ τὰ ὀμοία τούτοις, ἀ πᾶλα ἐστίν, εἰ λάβοι μένῃ καὶ βεβημόν ὄσπερ οἱ διδύμαιμοι καὶ τὰ ἱπποχήματα, τοῖς Πυθαίρου ποιήμασιν ἵκνεια δόξειν ἥν, ἡ δὲ τοῦ ἱπποχήματος ὄσμοι φαίνεται Ἀκτίτις, κτ.λ. The general accuracy of Dionysius' quotation is confirmed by the metre as determined by ll. 34 sqq., though some small improvements can now be effected. On the class of composition to which the ode belongs cf. introd. p. 23.

1–2. τί (Dionys.) suits the metre and makes good sense.

µήσει, δ' µάτερ: ἐώς θεόν µ' ἄτερ Dionys., of which Blass's emendation µήσεαι (or ἐμήσεαι Bergk) δ' µάτερ is confirmed by the metre.

3. An additional short syllable is required before ἐθνεῖς to produce a correspondence with l. 43, which there is no reason to suspect. Perhaps νυ, which might easily have dropped out after κλεπτόμενων, of τί ὑ' should be inserted. ἐθνεῖς is likely to be sound; cf. e.g. l. 19 below and Ol. ii. 16–7 δύσιπτους...θείμεν ἐργὶν τέλος.

4. ἵσχιν τ' ἅνδρας(ν) Blass, now confirmed by ll. 14, 34, and 44; ἵσχιν πτατών ἅνθρ. Dionys. (πτατῶν ἄρασιν Paris. 1745). Though the syllable may be long or short (short in ll. 14 and 34, long in l. 44), it is better to write -σων than -σι since -σων recurs in the same position in l. 14. Other similar correspondences in this poem are ll. 5 and 15 -τοι...-µεν, ll. 8 and 38 -τωι.

7. ἵππος διάδοσις Dionys., ἰπποσία δοῦς Blass.

9–11. Our identification of Fr. 127 is of course uncertain, but the accents on ἦδ[ and ἦν[ both happen to suit, and, moreover, the recto is blank as it should be if the fragment belongs to Col. ii of Fr. 126.

9. [τίς]: ἦς Dionys., but the syllable is long in ll. 19 and 49.

13. The remains of the first letter are consistent with either ο or ω, but the conditions seem less difficult if the two initial feet are taken to be οφωδος— rather than οφωδος. Above the ω or ο is a dot which is more probably the tip of a lectional sign, e.g. a grave or circumflex accent, than of an over-written letter. The doubtful σ might be ε, ο or ω, but hardly θ.

πολέμου δὲ σάµα: πολέμου δι' ἵμα Dionys. Scaliger's σάµα has been generally accepted, and πολέμου δὲ can now be confidently restored with the aid of the metre in l. 43.

16. (ο) ἡμ' πέδων: ἀλλὰ πέδω Dionys., of which Hermann's ἦ' is a natural emendation, but then a short syllable is wanting before ἦ'. (ηρ') (Blass) would serve.

17. For the alternative accents on πάγετον cf. VI. 88. The word is commonly made oxytone; cf. Arcad. 81. 14 πάγετος, ὄσπερ δὲ λέγει ἢ συνήθεια, Eranius Philo, p. 172 πάγετος μὲν τὸ χρύς, παγετός δὲ ὁ χειμών.
18. μίν Schroeder for Dionys. ἵππον. The scholiast below this line confirms ἦ νότιον
θηρος, but does not seem to have been illuminating.
22—33. It appears probable that a single column is the extent of the loss between
ll. 18 and 34. This column would have contained fifteen or sixteen lines, giving an epode
of the very suitable number either of ten verses, which is also the length of the strophe,
or of eleven, for which there is an exact parallel in IV.

ll. 34—49. 'I have been perfected by some divine influence hard by the immortal
couch of Melia to compose a noble strain with flute and cunning of the mind, for your
sake. I supplicate thee, Far-darter, consecrating to the Muses' arts this shrine . . .
wherein Oceanus' daughter Melia once shared thy couch, O god of Pytho, and bore mighty
Tenerus, the chosen interpreter of heaven's decrees. To his care didst thou, father with
unshorn locks, commit the host of Cadmus and the city of Zeathus, on account of his wise
fortitude. For the sea-dwelling wielder of the trident honoured him above other mortals,
and he hastened (to?) the region of the Euripus . . .'

34. The use of ἑρμαθήνυ is somewhat strange; the idea appears to be the need of
divine help if the poet is to attain perfection in his art. ἐπιτελείσθαι, which is given as an
equivalent, occurs in a different sense in Fr. 82. 20.
35. According to the explanation of the scholiast, the 'couch of Melia' means the
Theban Ismenion, or temple of Apollo Ismenius. Melia, the daughter of Oceanus, was
the mother of the seer Tenerus by Apollo, and like her son was revered at Thebes, where
there was a spring which bore her name, close to the Ismenion; cf. ll. 41—3 below,
Pyth. xi. 4—6 and Schol. ad. loc., Pausan. ix. 10. 5. &c.
36. For the Doric infinitive συνάγει cf. VI. 94, note, and for θρόνον, Nem. vii. 81 πολύφατον
θρόνον ὤμων ἄνει. In the fragmentary scholium in the margin μή may well be part of
the name Με[λιά] and τῆς of Τῆς μερος, e.g. εἶνε τοῦτῳ [τῷ ίερῷ τῆς] Μελιάν
tεκέκιναί τοῖς] Τῆς θεον Ἀρδάλωνι.
Cf. the preceding note.
38. The letters τη in ἐκαταβοιο are crossed through, and also have dots above them;
that ἐκαταβοιε is here the correct form is proved by the metre.
39. ἀνάβασθαι; cf. Pyth. viii. 29—31 ἀνάβασθαι πᾶσαν μακραγορίαν λύρα τε καὶ φθίγματι
μᾶλθακο, where, however, the verb has an abstract object.
40. The latter half of this line presents difficulties. λ and ο are clear, and if τ, which
is nearly certain, is right, the intervening letter must be ν. It is doubtful whether the
traces before λν represent two letters or only one; if there are two a τ would be best
for the first, though η, ζ, ξ, or perhaps κ might also be read; of the second there is only
a small speck, which would suit any letter beginning with a more or less upright stroke.
If on the other hand there is only one letter, it can hardly be other than ο, and some narrow
letter should stand between it and the λ. — λν τ' [δ' τ' Α]. As suggested by Blass, would
be attractive if a suitable word ending in λν could be found, though εἶν ο in l. 41 would
better accord with a single antecedent substantive. It is rather tempting to read τ' δ' Α
τ' [δ' τ' Α]; the supposed acute accent, of which only a tiny top remains, over the first syllable
well be a mark of elision or crisis, and the ο, though not very satisfactory, is
possible. The difficulty lies in reading anything but ο for the final letter, η and the
second upright of ν are indistinguishable in form, but some part of the diagonal stroke of
a ν would be expected to be visible. The papyrus, however, is damaged, and it is perhaps
too much to say that a ν is to be excluded, though a restoration requiring it cannot be
regarded as convincing, Bury suggests τ' δ' Α, which might be accepted if no better
solution is forthcoming.
41. On the myth of Tenerus cf. note on l. 35.
θεμίστων: cf. Pindar Fr. 192 ἄρσος θεμίστων {ὑμπότω} μάττεις Ἀπόλλωνιδα.
44. Kάθισεν στρατάν καὶ Ζεύδων πῦλων: i.e. Thebes and the Thebans. Ζεύδως is apparently an otherwise unattested form of Ζήδως, who with his twin brother Amphion took and fortified Thebes and was buried there.

47. There is not too much space for the στ "Oiράστριαια, which is the regular Pindaric form (Ol. viii. 48, Pyth. ii. 12, Nem. iv. 86), and perhaps "Oiραστρ. was written; cf. ὄφρικτως and ὄφρικτης. "Oiραστριαια (όφριαι) would have a different shade of meaning from that of "Oiραστριαια (όφρας).

48. Cf. Pyth. xi. 4.5 πάρ Μελιαν χρυσών εἰ ἄντων τριπώδων θρησκών, ὑπεραλλ' ἐπίμαθε λαξίας.

49. Without the complete context the meaning of ἄνυτειν cannot be clearly defined, but it appears to be equivalent to contendit, 'hastened,' a sense found in late writers; cf. Bekker, Anecd. p. 64 συντεινων, to τρέχειν συντεινων, Plutarch, Ap. 30 δρώμω συντεινα εἰς τό ἄστυ.

The subject of Fr. 139, where some one is said to have gone to Aulis and made prophecies there, is very probably Tenerus, but that note cannot be the continuation of μεταπομνήηαι λέγεται (¿), for such an arrangement would make the distance between Col. iv and the next too great, and it is pretty clear from the width of its lower margin that Fr. 139 ran underneath a column (cf. Fr. 126 ii and Fr. 129), whereas μεταπομνήηαι does not. It is, however, likely enough that Fr. 139 comes from the bottom of the column following Col. iv and referred to a passage standing in close relation to Εἰρήνου τε συντεινεις χώρον.

Fr. 129. The metre shows that these two fragmentary columns do not belong to IX; the strophe or epode contained at least fourteen verses (ll. 2-15).

3. ἐναρχεὶ with what seems to be the top of a mark of long quantity above the letter after the τ is presumably ἐναρχεὶ or ἐναρχαι, and the references to an ἐναρχεῖσι in the margin opposite and below the column are to be connected with this. This Theban δαβήφορα was held δι' ἐναρχηρίδος according to Proclus, Chrest. ap. Photius, Bibl. 239.

1-5. Scholium. Cf. Homer, Il. ἱ 751 sqq. οτε τ' ὄμη' ἵππων Τιταρήνων ἔργα εὔνεια, ὡς ᾧ ἢς Περεών προὶ εἰς καλλίρρηαν ὑδαρ. . . ὦρκον γὰρ δεινοῦ Στιγμὸς ὑδατὸς ἐστίν ἀπορρέω, the last line being partially quoted at the beginning of the note. The sentence is probably complete at Περεών, and the word τῶν seems to have occurred in the text. The space between ὄρκον κ.τ.λ. and καπνῆτ' κ.τ.λ. indicates that the two lines belong to distinct notes.

6. Schol. below line. The number of letters lost in the gap between the two halves of this note is uncertain, but may be estimated at about sixteen. It is not possible to read διὰ θ' ἐναρχεὶ, as would be expected (cf. note on l. 3); but perhaps ε is a graphical error for θ, or there may have been some question whether the δαβήφορα occurred at intervals of five or of nine years. Pausanias (ix. 10. 4) says that a boy called δαβήφωρ was made ἱερὰ ἐναρχή.

Fr. 132-3. If these two fragments are to be assigned to the foregoing column, they should be placed so that λωρί in Fr. 132 comes approximately over λουρί (l. 5 schol.), and Fr. 132 above and in the same straight line with Fr. 133, the edges of the papyrus in neither case directly joining. We are led to this arrangement by the coincidence that the fragments, like Fr. 130, have a strengthening strip gummed on to the recto, and also show a selis. But since the recto is in both cases nearly blank, it is not absolutely certain (though probable) that these fragments belong to D rather than to C.

Fr. 131. ii. 12 πολίσσον: cf. Ol. v. 10 ὕ πολισσότι Παλλάοι.

14. ξενοκαθῆς is a ἄπαξ λεγόμενον.

15. The paraphrases below this line marks the conclusion of a strophic section.
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18. μ[ : or perhaps τυ[ ; the tops of the letters are lost.
19. κείνων is also a possibility, but not κέινων on account of the accent.

Fr. 134. 3. The interlinear ικαδις seems to be the same word as that which occurs in the reading attributed to Aristophanes in l. 9 εκαδιος, which, if sound, must be an adjective derived from εκᾶς, otherwise attested only as a proper name. According to the E'tym. Mag. s. v. there was a festival of Apollo on the 20th of the month.
4. [π( )] : or [π( )] (Kp)ντ( Π).
9. Cf. note on l. 3.

Fr. 137. 2. The paraphrasis below the line shows that ἵππες[σια] is the beginning of a sentence.
Fr. 139. Cf. note on IX. 49. ι[ ] in l. 2 is possibly ἐχπηρ[ ].
Frs. 140–62. The recto of these small fragments is blank or practically so, and there is consequently no safe criterion for determining whether they belong to C or D. The texture and colour of the papyrus, however, suggests that Frs. 140, 146, and 161 come from D, and most of the others from C. Fr. 151 perhaps does not belong to this papyrus.
Fr. 145. 2. The letters are only slightly smaller than those above, and since the two lines are the ordinary distance apart, ι[σων] may be part of the text, not of a scholiwm.
Fr. 154. ι[ ] followed by a dot is an interlinear variant. The circumflex accent is doubtful.
Fr. 156. 1. The supposed mark of length over a may be a mark of short quantity or a grave accent.
Fr. 161. Cf. IX. Col. iv and Fr. 138.
Fr. 162. 1. This line is in a different hand from that of the rest of the text, and seems to be over an erasure. The hand of ll. 2–3, however, indicates that the fragment, which probably is from the bottom of a column, belongs to C–D.

842. THEOPOMPU5 (OR CRATIPPU5), Hellenica.

Height 21.2 cm. Plates IV and V (Cols. v–vi and xi–xii.).

Since the discovery of the Αθηναίων Πολιτεία in 1890 Egypt has not produced any historical papyrus at all comparable in importance to these portions of a lost Greek historian, obviously of the first rank, dealing in minute detail with the events of the Greek world in the years 396 and 395 B.C. The papyrus, which with the exception of the manuscript of Plato’s Symposium (843) is the largest literary text that has been found at Oxyrhynchus, originally consisted of about 230 fragments of varying sizes. These have been so far pieced together that only about fifty-five, none of which is large, remain unplaced, and it is improbable that further efforts at combination will yield results of much importance. Like the manuscript of Pindar’s Paëans (841) the historical work, though written in uncials, is on the verso of an official document. This is a land-survey register giving a long list of cultivators, and the entries in most
cases follow the same scheme, which gives (1) the geographical relation of the plot of land in question to its predecessor, (2) the name of the owner or lessee, (3) the rent and area, (4) the adjacent plots, (5) the changes introduced with regard to rent. The village of Ibion Argaei, which was in the south-west of the Arsinöite nome, is mentioned as being in the vicinity of one of the plots of land, and the land-survey was no doubt drawn up at some village near Ibion, but whether the historical work was also written in that district or at Oxyrhynchus is uncertain. Various years, ranging from the 4th to the 12th, of an unnamed emperor are mentioned, and the handwriting shows that he belonged to the second century. Since the survey was probably written soon after the 12th year, the reign of Commodus, which in Egypt was reckoned from his father's accession and therefore begins with his 20th year, is out of the question; the reign of Hadrian or Antoninus is as likely to be meant as that of Marcus Aurelius. The land-survey has of course been of the utmost service in determining the place of detached fragments of the historian, and is in itself of no slight interest: the text of portions of it will be given in Part VI. The writing in some places is concealed by strips of papyrus which were gummed on in order to strengthen the roll when the verso came to be used.

Of the historical work at least twenty-one columns are to be distinguished, written in two hands. Postponing for the moment the question of the right order of these columns, and assuming the correctness of the numbers assigned to them by us, the first hand is responsible for Cols. i–iv, vi. 27–xxi, and all the loose fragments except Frs. 3 and perhaps 16. The scribe employs a small neat uncial of the sloping oval type, representing a transitional stage between the earlier specimens of this style, e.g. the Oxyrhynchus papyrus of Demosthenes' Προόλουμα δημογορικά (26) of the late first or early second century, and the ordinary third century type illustrated e.g. by 23 and 232. N at the end of a line is generally indicated by a horizontal stroke above the final letter, a practice already found in the second century, and a few of the conventional abbreviations occur at the ends of lines, κ' for καὶ in ix. 25, xiv. 13, xx. 20 and 25, μ' for μὲν in xvii. 24 and 35, these being similar to the abbreviations found in e.g. the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία. A peculiar characteristic of this scribe is his tendency (especially at the ends of lines) to combine the letters M and H or Η and N so that the last vertical stroke of the first letter serves also as the first of the second, e.g. Ιωβίους in xiii. 10, μηνῶν in xvi. 2, τῆς in xix. 36. The beginning of a new section is marked by a coronis or paragraphus, a small blank space being left where the transition occurs in the middle of a line; but there are no stops, and only two accents (xx. 36, Fr. 45. 3), and a couple of breathings (xi. 2, xx. 32). Diaereses are sometimes placed over α and ο. In a few cases omitted words or letters have
been inserted above the line by the scribe himself (xii. 25, xvi. 2, xxii. 18 and 33, Fr. 33. 8), but not nearly so often as was desirable, the number of words omitted being considerable; cf. i. 5, note. Some serious corruptions occur, e.g. προς Παρθηνοπολιν for παρ Ταμπολιν in xv. 26, Πήγης (sic) for Περής in xx. 36, ουτωσ for υπο in xvi. 31 (cf. also i. 27, vi. 12, xii. 27, 39, xiv. 15, xx. 31, and xxii. 32), and the spelling of proper names is frequently inconsistent, cf. e.g. xii. 34–5, note. The second hand, which is responsible for v. 1–vi. 27 with Frs. 3 and perhaps 16, is smaller and rougher than the first. N at the end of a line is often written as a horizontal stroke; and a diaeresis occurs in v. 44. Stops (high points) are freely employed, a slight space being also left to mark the pause, and sometimes the space occurs where the stop is omitted; cf. v. 1, note. A paragraphus is found in vi. 10 marking a transition which the first hand would have ignored. In the margin against v. 45 occurs δ, perhaps denoting the 400th line of the MS.; cf. note ad loc. Unlike the first scribe, the second hand writes adscript. A slip occurs in vi. 18. With regard to the date of the MS., the survey on the recto was, as we have said, written about the middle of the second century, and we should ascribe the text on the verso to the end of that century or the early part of the third. A late third-century date is out of the question. The first hand is not very uniform either in the size or spacing of his letters; at the end of a line they are sometimes very small and cramped, and the beginnings of lines tend gradually to move further to the left as the column proceeds. Hence, though the columns measure about 16.7 x 9 cm. with tolerable regularity, there is much variation in the number of lines in a column and the number of letters in a line. Col. i has only 37 lines, but Col. ii has 40, Col. iii 43, and Col. iv. 42 (?). In Col. vii the number is as high as 45, the scribe being influenced by the more compact writing employed by the second hand, who in Col. v, the only extant column entirely due to him, reaches the exceptionally large number of 60 lines; even Col. vi, which is divided between the two scribes, has 53. After Col. vii the numbers tend to diminish again. Col. viii has 42 lines, Cols. xi–xii, xv, xvii–xxi 39, Cols. xiii, xiv and xvii 40, Col. xvi 38. Few lines by the first hand exceed 45 or fall below 35 letters, the average being about 40. In vi. 5–27, the only complete or nearly complete lines by the second hand, the average is also about 40. Cols. i–ii, vi, and xi–xxi, representing about two-thirds of a total of approximately 800 lines, are well preserved, and in all but a few passages admit of a satisfactory restoration of the lacunae. Of Col. iii only about half of each line is extant, and in Cols. v, vii, and viii still less, but the sense can occasionally be caught; Cols. iv, ix, and x, however, are hopeless.

These twenty-one columns are not continuous, but are divided into four
distinct sections, separated from each other by gaps of uncertain length in which several columns are or may be missing. We have called these sections A, B, C, and D. A consists of Cols. i–iv, including Frs. 1 and 2, only i–ii and iii–iv being continuous, but that Col. iii with Fr. 1 follows immediately after Col. ii is certain both from internal evidence and from the recto; cf. iii. 1–5, note. Whether the small Fr. 2 belongs to iii. 40–43, as we suppose, is more doubtful. B consists of Cols. v–viii with Frs. 3–7, and contains Cols. v, vi and the beginnings of lines of vii on the same piece of papyrus. The place of Frs. 3, 4, and 7, though separated from the main body of B, is definitely fixed (cf. notes on v. 41, vii. 1–2, and viii. 3); hence it is certain that Col. viii immediately follows vii. That Frs. 5 and 6 belong to Col. vii is practically secure, and we have assigned them to ii. 16–24 and 35–41 respectively, but their exact position is doubtful; cf. notes ad loc. C contains only the two quite fragmentary Cols. ix and x with Frs. 8–15, which seem to belong to this section. D, by far the largest section, has Cols. xi–xxi, which are continuous.

The first problem that arises is the order of these four sections, which unfortunately is in some respects not clear, in spite of the fact that our author (whom in order not to prejudice the question of his identity with any known historian we henceforth call P) seems to have arranged his work on chronological principles almost as strictly as Thucydides and much more carefully than Xenophon. That D comes after A and B is certain from internal evidence, for it contains (xviii. 33 sqq.) the account of the campaign of Agesilaus in the late summer and autumn of 395, whereas B narrates (v. 6–vii. 4) his campaign in the spring and early summer of the same year, and the general description of the anti-Spartan feeling in Greece in A (i. 33 sqq.) must obviously have preceded the much more detailed account in D of the Theban intrigues which led first to the war with Phociis and then to an open breach with Sparta (xi. 34 sqq.). That D comes last of the four sections is also indicated by the land-survey on the recto, the writing of which runs in the opposite direction to that of the verso, and which accordingly begins on the other side of Col. xxi. For Col. i of the land-survey is in a different hand from the rest, and follows a different formula, being apparently a register of land καθ’ ὑδατος, and concluding γίνονται καθ’ ὑδατος (ἀρουραί) ψηλλας, δαυτ ἡ πνευμꜰ, referring apparently to the following detailed survey-list, though only in a few cases is it stated that individual plots were under water. Hence the presumption is that the land-survey on the recto of A, B, and C comes later than that of D, i.e. that the writing on the verso of A, B, and C precedes D. With regard to the position of C (Cols. ix–x), owing to its hopelessly mutilated condition there is no internal evidence to guide us, so that beyond the presumption just indicated that it precedes D its relation to the
other sections is wholly uncertain, and it may be placed before A, between A and B, or between B and D. Our choice of the last alternative is quite arbitrary, and the question is of secondary importance. The main problem with regard to the order of the sections concerns A and B—which of these two is to be placed first? The external evidence is conflicting. On the one hand, before Col. i of A is a blank margin 4\(\frac{1}{2}\) cm. in width, whereas the ordinary width of the margin between two columns of this papyrus is only 1\(\frac{1}{2}\) cm. Since Col. i, i is obviously the beginning of a new chapter it is clear that the broad margin before it is no mere accident, and that Col. i is either the absolute beginning of the roll, or was intentionally separated widely from preceding columns in order to mark the commencement of a new division (probably a new book) of the author's work. That the roll originally extended beyond the present starting-point of A is known from the land-survey on the recto of the margin of Col. i, which breaks off in the middles of lines; but since no regard would be paid to the writing on the recto when the verso came to be used, it is quite possible that the vertical fracture down the left edge of the margin of A is the result not of injury when the MS. was thrown away, but of design when the verso was prepared for use. On the other hand A is written by the second of the two scribes who appear in B, so that if A follows B it is necessary to assume only one change of hands, whereas if A precedes B it must be supposed that the first scribe gave way to the second at some point in the gap between Cols. iv and v and then resumed at vi. 27. The hypothesis that B comes first has therefore the advantage of greater simplicity, and is supported by the analogy of the land-survey, in which we justifiably used the identity of the hand on the recto of A, B, and C with the second hand on the recto of D as an argument for placing the recto of A–C after D. In fact, the priority of B to A has so much prima facie probability that at first and for a long time we adopted that sequence; it was only when we came to examine in detail the historical problems connected with A that we decided to place it before B. The relative order of these two sections makes a considerable difference to the interpretation of A, for since B is known from other sources to refer to the spring and early summer of 395, the \(\theta\varepsilon\rho\sigma\) in A iii. 9, on which the whole chronology of A depends, must, if A comes after B, refer to 395, whereas, if A precedes B, the summer of 396 is meant, an earlier year being for various reasons out of the question. A unfortunately mentions no event of which the precise date is fixed by independent evidence, for though the arrival of Conon's reinforcements from Phoenicia (iii. 23–7) is also recorded by Diodorus, that historian's account of the naval war is too brief and his chronology too uncertain to help in choosing between the rival dates for the events recorded in A. The two principal difficulties which
arise from the attribution of A to 395 instead of 396, and which have therefore induced us to place A before B, are discussed in detail in the notes on iii. 9, 21, and 23-6. To summarize the results there reached, the view that the θέρος in iii. 9 refers to 395 inevitably leads to the conclusion that the year which P took as a kind of fresh starting-point after the close of the Peloponnesian war corresponds to the archonship of Micon 402-1, in which no incident of particular note took place, whereas the view that the θέρος is that of 396 will make P's starting-point after the war 403-2, approximately the archonship of Euclides, which is a most natural and reasonable year to select for the commencement of a fresh epoch. Secondly, the hypothesis that A concerns 395 leads to great confusion with regard to the Spartan ναός of, of whom two seem to arrive in the same summer, an inference which can only be avoided by encountering worse obstacles, whereas if A refers to 396 all difficulty is removed. Thirdly, the view that A concerns 396 has the advantage of allowing more time for the change of policy on the part of the moderate democrats at Athens with regard to a war with Sparta; cf. i. 16, note. We therefore prefer the arrangement adopted in the text, according to which A precedes B and relates to 396; and seeing that A in any case begins a new division or book, we are disposed to regard it as the actual commencement of the whole roll. A parallel for the changes of hands, whereby the portion written by a second scribe comes between two portions written by the first, is to be found in the MS. of the Αθηναίων Πολιτεία. There the third hand, which begins in Col. xx and continues up to the end of the second roll at Col. xxiv, is also responsible for the fourth roll containing Cols. xxxi-vii, the intervening roll containing Cols. xxv-xxx being written by the fourth hand.

We proceed to a short analysis of the contents of the papyrus, which for the convenience of future reference we have divided into chapters and sections, though in the present edition we generally refer to columns and lines only. A commences with an account of the sailing from Athens of a trireme commanded by a certain Demaenetus without official sanction to assist Conon, and the unsuccessful efforts of the Spartan harmost at Aegina to intercept it (i. 1-iii. 7). This incident, to which a passing allusion occurs in Aeschines (cf. i. 3, note), is of slight importance; but the commotion at Athens caused by it enables P to give a very interesting description of the attitude towards Sparta of the various Athenian parties at the time (i. 9-ii. 1), from which he diverges into an important excursus upon the origin of the anti-Spartan feeling in Greece (ii. 1-35). The adjectives used by P in describing the contending parties at Athens and his severe judgement upon the extreme democrats, whom he not only charges with accepting Persian bribes but with desiring a war with Sparta for purely selfish reasons (i. 33, note), betray his aristocratic proclivities;
but on the other hand he controverts strongly the theory, no doubt put forward by the Spartans, that the mission of Timocrates was instrumental in bringing about the anti-Spartan league, and exhibits a considerable historical insight into the political situation, of which he takes on the whole a very just view. The first of a long series of conflicts with Xenophon occurs in connexion with the date of the sending of Timocrates, whom Xenophon (supported by Pausanias and Plutarch) represents as dispatched by Tithraustes in the summer of 395, while P connects him with Pharmabazus (therein agreeing with Polyaeus), and implies that the mission took place much earlier, i.e. in 397 or early in 396. P and Xenophon also come into conflict on the question of the acceptance of Timocrates' bribes by the Athenians, and the part played by those bribes in bringing about the anti-Spartan confederacy, on both of which points P's version is again, in our opinion, superior (i. 33, note). An allusion to Pharax as διπότερον ναύαρχος goes far to solve the much disputed problem of the date of that admiral's year of office (i. 30, note). The mention of Timolaus in connexion with the opposition to Sparta at Corinth gives rise to a digression on some former exploits of his in the Decelean war. These are not mentioned by Thucydides, and the fact that the second one, which probably occurred just after the latest events recorded by that historian, had already been noticed by P probably in its proper chronological position, is an important indication of the scope of our author's work (ii. 17, note).

In iii. 7 begins a new chapter (IV), which starts by recording the commencement of a new year (the 8th) from the event chosen by P as a fresh point of departure after the conclusion of the Peloponnesian war. Unfortunately the lacunae, which prevent any continuous restoration of Col. iii after l. 5, render the interpretation of this crucial passage doubtful in several respects, and it is not clear whether the θερέαν with which the new year begins is the spring or mid-summer, or what event was taken as the commencement of the epoch. Unless, however, A is placed after B (cf. p. 114), the archonship of Euclides (403-2) seems to be the first year on the new reckoning, and the θερέαν is that of 396, not 395 (iii. 9, note). The rest of Col. iii (11-43) is concerned with the naval war, to which P gives great prominence (cf. xi. 1-34, xv. 32-38viii. 33), and of which he shows the most detailed knowledge, especially with regard to Conon. He thus presents a marked contrast to Xenophon, who after mentioning the stir caused at Sparta in the winter of 397-6 by the news of the Persian naval preparations (Hell. iii. 4. 1-2) entirely ignores Conon's proceedings until the battle of Cnidus in 394 (which itself is only introduced incidentally in iv. 3. 10-14 in connexion with the news of it reaching Agesilaus), in order that the stage may be left free for the Spartan king. That Xenophon was himself conscious of his deficiency is shown by his excuses in iv. 8. 1, where he justifies his silence concerning the naval war
on the ground that he was only describing τῶν πράξεων τὰς ὀξυμανημονεύτων. The narrative in Chapter IV is for the most part too incomplete to be intelligible, but the arrival of a new Spartan ναύαρχος, probably Pollis, is chronicled (cf. iii. 21 note), and at the same time (apparently the summer of 396) Conon, whose headquarters were at Caunus in Caria, receives reinforcements from Phoenicia. This event is also referred to by Diodorus in words so similar that they must be derived directly or indirectly from P, though probably with an error as to the chronology, for Diodorus puts the arrival of the Phoenician ships after the revolt of Rhodes, whereas P seems to place the revolt after the arrival of the reinforcements, which is much more likely to be correct (iii. 23-6, note, where the vexed question of the chronology of the naval war is discussed in full). Whether the scanty remains of Col. iv, with which A concludes, are also concerned with the naval war or deal with a fresh subject is uncertain. The gap between A and B need not be very extensive, for apart from Agesilaus' doings in Asia no events of much importance took place in 396, unless indeed P took account of Sicilian history, which is not probable, and the dispatch of Agesilaus to Asia and the early part of the campaign are likely to have been described before Col. i in the preceding book or division of P's work.

B, where it becomes intelligible, begins with an account of Agesilaus' campaign in the spring and early summer of 395, which occupies v. 6-vii. 4, v. 1-5 being perhaps concerned with his preparations during the winter, but possibly with quite a different subject. The narrative is not only more detailed than Xenophon's two accounts of this campaign in the Hellenica and Agesilaus, but differs widely from them, particularly as to the disposition of Tissaphernes' forces, of which the infantry were according to Xenophon sent by mistake to Caria, and the nature of the chief engagement which resulted according to both authorities in the capture of the Persian camp. On the other hand P agrees closely with the somewhat less detailed account of Diodorus, especially with regard to Agesilaus' route (v. 8, note), the part taken in the campaign by the Persian infantry, on which point Pausanias supports Diodorus (v. 13-6, note), the formation of the Greek troops in column (v. 9, note), the description of the ambush by which the Greeks secured the victory (v. 59, note), and Agesilaus' withdrawal from the interior owing to unfavourable auspices (vi. 30, note). There are some discrepancies between P and Diodorus concerning firstly the number of the Persian forces (v. 13-6, note) and of the slain (vi. 21, note), and secondly the manoeuvres connected with the ambush; apart, however, from these inconsiderable differences there is, except some conventional details added to Diodorus' account of the ambush (e.g. the fact that the Greeks raised a paean, as is usual in Diodorus' battles), really nothing in his account of this campaign that is not
found in P. In fact Diodorus' narrative looks like an abridgement of P with some variations of the language, which rarely coincides verbally with that of P. Whether P's or Xenophon's account is superior in credibility is open to dispute, but P's version has considerable claims to acceptance in spite of the fact that Xenophon is apparently describing the campaign from first-hand knowledge (v. 59, note). The rest of B, vii. 4–viii. 42 (Chapter VIII), deals in most elaborate detail with the superseding of Tissaphernes by Tithraustes and the assassination of the former, events which are briefly recorded by Xenophon in a few words. This chapter is badly mutilated, and no continuous restoration is possible; but enough remains to trace the close agreement between P and firstly Diodorus, who again seems to be giving an abridgement of P, and secondly Polyænus, who is fuller than Diodorus but somewhat less detailed than P (vii. 4, 21–5, 36–41, viii. 18, 21, 26, 27–30, notes). The story told by Nepos that Tissaphernes' replacement by Tithraustes was brought about by Conon finds no confirmation, and the date for Conon's visit to the Persian court indicated by Nepos and supported by Pausanias (the winter of 396–5), which has generally been preferred to the date implied by Diodorus (the winter of 395–4), is clearly inconsistent with P, who probably agreed with Diodorus on this point (vii. 4, note; cf. xv. 37, note). Persian affairs are still under discussion when B breaks off. A later reference to the negotiations between Tithraustes and Agesilaus (xviii. 37, note) shows that the account of these occurred in the gap between B and D, probably in the column following viii. This gap also comprised the earlier portion of the account of the revolution at Rhodes, of which the conclusion is extant in Col. xi, but whether C, containing the two fragmentary columns ix and x, is rightly placed between B and D is wholly uncertain; cf. pp. 113–4. Nothing can be made out of these two columns except that in Col. x P seems to be giving an appreciative character-sketch of some general or politician whose identity is uncertain (ix. 16, note).

When D, by far the longest and best preserved section of the papyrus, begins, P has reverted to the naval war, xi. 1–34 describing a revolution at Rhodes whereby the democrats with the connivance of Conon overthrew the existing oligarchic government, which was in the hands of the Diagoreans, one of the leading Rhodian families. Xenophon ignores this revolution, to which there is a brief allusion in a quotation from Androtion in Pausanias. It has hitherto been connected closely with the revolt of Rhodes from Sparta, which is mentioned by Diodorus, but P now shows that the two events were by no means contemporaneous, the revolution taking place in the summer of 395, the revolt from Sparta in the preceding winter or earlier (iii. 23–6, xi. 1, notes). The mention of the Diagoreans throws an interesting light on the treatment of an illustrious member of that family, Dorieus, by the Spartans (xi. 10, note), and
the reference to Conon's two chief lieutenants, Hieronymus and Nicophemus, supplies another point of contact with Diodorus (xi. 10–1, note). The cautious policy of Conon and the moderation displayed by the victorious democrats receive due recognition from P, who here shows no trace of an aristocratic bias. In xi. 34 the subject changes to the war between Boeotia and Phocis in the summer of 395, but this is not actually reached until xiv. 16 sqq., since P enters upon a series of digressions. A mention of the state of faction existing at Thebes (xi. 35–8) leads to what is the most valuable portion of the whole papyrus, a description of the constitution of Boeotia in 395 (xi. 38–xii. 31), which settles a number of important and highly disputed questions, and provides much new information. The nature of the four boulai referred to by Thucydides is explained, and while Köhler is shown to be right in connecting them with the four boulai which the oligarchs at Athens wished to set up in 411, the surprising fact is now ascertained that these boulai belonged to the individual cities of the league, not to the federation as a whole, which had a single boule of 660 members not invested with the supreme powers of the local boulai. The vexed question of the number of the Boeotarchs at the time of the Peloponnesian war is fixed at eleven, corresponding to a division of the Boeotians into eleven units, and what is still more important, we now have for the first time a complete list of the states forming the league and their distribution among the several units, according to which they shared the rights and duties of membership of the confederation (xi. 38, note). Of special interest are the details concerning the Boeotarchs appointed by Thebes (xii. 12–3, note), Orchomenus (xii. 16, note), and Tanagra (xii. 17, note). In xii. 31 P reverts to parties at Thebes, about which he shows himself very well informed. The description of the anti-Spartan faction is on the whole very impartial, and the analysis of their motives shows considerable historical acumen (xiii. 10, note; cf. xiv. 6 sqq.). A reference to the change in the Theban policy caused by the control of public affairs passing from the pro-Spartan to the anti-Spartan party leads to another interesting digression (xiii. 15 sqq.) upon the causes of the increase of Boeotian prosperity in the forty years preceding 395, and this excursus leads on to yet another (xiii. 36–xiv. 5) upon the lavish adornment of Attica in the same period. P then, after describing the political schemes of the anti-Spartan party (xiv. 6–21), at length reaches the origin of the Boeotian war. His account of the intrigues from which it arose (xiv. 21–xv. 15) is not only more detailed than Xenophon's, but differs in several important particulars—e.g. on the questions whether the Locrians concerned in the border dispute were the Opuntian (so Xen.) or the Hesperian (so P and Pausanias), whether the first act of aggression came from the side of the Locrians (so Xen. and Paus.) or from the Phocians
(so P), and what methods were employed by the Theban instigators of the war. The unsuccessful attempt of the Spartans to settle the dispute peaceably (xv. 7-11), which is recorded by no other historian, puts the policy of Sparta with regard to Boeotia in a new light, and this does not harmonize very well with the subsequent state of feeling at Sparta as described by Xenophon, whose account of the origin of this war is perhaps preferable in some respects to that of P (xiv. 21, note). The details of the invasion of Phocis (xv. 15-32) are all new but of no special interest. Incidentally P’s treatment of the whole dispute between the Phocians and the Locrians provides some important indications that he wrote his account before the conclusion, at any rate, of the Sacred War; cf. p. 134.

In xv. 32-xviii. 33 P once more returns to the naval war, and begins by recording the arrival (in the late summer) of a hitherto unknown Spartan ναίαρχος Cheiricrates, thereby producing a conflict with Xenophon, who represents Pisander as having been appointed ναίαρχος by Agesilaus at about this period (xv. 33, note). An otherwise unrelated visit of Conon to Sardis in order to obtain money (xv. 37, note) leads to a digression on the financial difficulties experienced by Greeks in the pay of Persia (xvi. 3-15). A passage which implies that the Persian empire was still standing shows that this history was composed before the conquest of Persia by Alexander (xiv. 3, note). After narrating the results of Conon’s mission and the departure of Tithraustes for the Persian court (xvi. 16-29), P proceeds to describe minutely a mutiny at Caunus of Conon’s forces upon the return of their commander. This event, which nearly led to the dispersion of Conon’s fleet, has been passed over by all historians except Justin, whose reference to it, though brief, seems to be derived indirectly from P (xvi. 29, note). The revolt was ultimately quelled by the efforts of Conon, whose προτιθύμωσι receives special praise from our author (xviii. 32). In xvi. 33 P reverts to Agesilaus, and describes his campaign in the late summer and autumn of 395 up to his arrival at Dascylium, where he passed the winter, at which point the papyrus breaks off. Diodorus omits this campaign altogether, and, as in the account of the war in the earlier half of the year (v. 6-vii. 4), P differs widely from Xenophon, who, omitting the not very exciting incidents of Agesilaus’ march, concentrates his descriptive powers upon one or two episodes which were capable of picturesque treatment, e.g. the negotiations of Agesilaus with the king of Paphlagonia and later with Pharnabazus. P, on the other hand, gives a plain, straightforward account of the military operations, showing considerable acquaintance with the geography of Asia Minor and the details of the campaign (xviii. 39, note). When he reaches the Paphlagonian incident he devotes only a few lines to it, but manages nevertheless to conflict
with Xenophon both about the name of the Paphlagonian king (on this point being also in disagreement with Theopompus and Nepos), and the method by which the negotiations were conducted (xx. 37, note). A description of an ambush (xix. 22-39) resembles with slight variations that in v. 59 sqq. Concerning Spithradates, a Persian noble who deserted to Agesilaus, somewhat less information is given than by Xenophon; but with regard to Spithradates's son Megabates P speaks openly of Agesilaus' attachment to him, which is only hinted at in the Hellenica, though amply illustrated by the Agesilaus (xx. 9, note). The papyrus concludes in the middle of a description of an abortive scheme for invading Cappadocia, concerning which country erroneous geographical ideas prevailed even down to Roman times (xxi. 35-9, note). The unplaced fragments (16-72) are too small to give any historical information.

To summarize the chief characteristics of our author, we have in this papyrus a very elaborate and detailed work of a historian of obviously great importance, who shows himself equally well informed whether dealing with events in Greece, the campaigns of Agesilaus in Asia, or the naval war. In the arrangement of his material he has adopted an annalistic method, evidently imitated from Thucydides, whereby events are narrated in chronological order and divided into years beginning in the 'summer' (whether spring or midsummer is not clear), and he has not grouped together according to subject events separated by any considerable distance of time. Hence there are abrupt transitions to and from different parts of the world, e.g. the account of the origin of the Boeotian war is inserted between two chapters dealing with the naval war. Whether P adhered strictly to this chronological arrangement there is not sufficient evidence to show; but so far as the extant portions of his work go, he seems to keep closely to it. On the other hand he is extremely fond of digressions, whether excursions into earlier history, e.g. the exploits of Timolaus and the rise of Theban prosperity, or general descriptions which serve to illustrate the background of the events which he is recording, e.g. the sketch of the constitution of Boeotia. These digressions, though adding greatly to the interest and variety of P's work, are seldom very relevant, and cause serious interruptions to the narrative. How easily he was led on from one excursus to another is well illustrated, firstly by i. 20 sqq., where, starting from the privateering expedition of Demaenetus, he reaches the achievements of the Corinthian Timolaus in the Decelean war through the intermediate stages of the origin of the anti-Spartan feeling first at Athens, then in Greece in general, and at Corinth in particular,—secondly by xii. 31 sqq., where, from the war between Boeotia and Phocis, he proceeds through the description of parties at Thebes, the causes of the previous preponderance of the aristocrats and the growing prosperity of Thebes, to a sketch of the flourishing
condition of Attica prior to the fortification of Decelea. With regard to the scope of his work, it is clear that it included, besides the events of 396 and 395, the history of the seven years between 396 and the close of the Peloponnesian war, the year 403-2, corresponding approximately to the archonship of Euclides, being taken by P as marking a kind of epoch. That his history, however, did not begin with 403-2, but comprised that portion of the Peloponnesian war which Thucydides did not live to narrate, is rendered probable by the reference to a former description of an incident of B.C. 411 in ii. 27. Since events prior to 411 are several times mentioned, but in no case with a reference to a former description of them, there is a strong presumption that P's history began where Thucydides' left off, and was intended to be a continuation of it. To what point beyond 395 the narrative was carried there is no internal evidence to show, except that which indicates the period of the composition of the work itself. The description of the constitution of Boeotia, which is contrasted with the conditions existing in the writer's own day, was certainly written after 387, when at the peace of Antalcidas the Boeotian league underwent considerable changes. On the other hand the fact that the Persian empire is spoken of in terms implying that it was still standing (cf. p. 120), proves that P's history was not written later than 330, and the use of the present tense in regard to the border disputes between Phocis and Locris, coupled with the absence of any reference to the Sacred War which resulted in the destruction of the Phocians, indicates that P's work was composed before the conclusion of that war in 346, to say nothing of the general probability that an author so well informed (cf. e.g. the extremely minute description of the mutiny in xvi. 29 sqq., which is likely to have been obtained from an eyewitness) was not writing more than a couple of generations later than the events which he narrates. It is therefore possible that the history reached a point some twenty or thirty years later than 395, but considering its elaborate scale this is not at all likely, and there is nothing to suggest that it went further than the battle of Cnidus in 394, with which Theopompus' Hellenica concluded.

That P's sympathies were aristocratic not democratic, and therefore on the whole with Sparta, is shown by his description of the parties at Athens, particularly his opinion of the motives influencing the extreme section of the democrats. In his account also of the intrigues which led to the Boeotian war he seems to acquiesce in the Spartan claims to the hegemony of Greece at this period. But so far from laying himself open to the charge of exaggerated partisanship, P compares favourably with Xenophon by his impartiality. While admitting (probably rightly) the fact of the acceptance of Persian gold by the Athenians in common with the Thebans, Argives, and Corinthians, he expressly defends those states from the accusation of Medizing, by controverting the pro-Spartan view
and minimizing the extent to which the mission of Timocrates was responsible for creating the anti-Spartan league. The moderation of the section of the Athenian democratic party headed by Thrasybulus and Anytus and of the victorious democrats at Rhodes is plainly recognized, and it is noteworthy that the leaders of the anti-Spartan faction at Thebes are classed among the βασιλεύον την καὶ γνωριμώσαντοι no less than their opponents. Of an anti-Theban bias, which is so marked in Xenophon, there is no trace; and it is clear that P wished to do full justice to the chief enemy and destined conqueror of Sparta. A still more remarkable example of his fairness towards Sparta's enemies is the prominence assigned by him to Conon, who figures no less conspicuously than Agesilaus, while there is a noticeable contrast between the dry and unenthusiastic catalogue of Agesilaus' achievements, which evoke hardly a word of praise, and the more lively narrative of the incidents of the naval war with its outspoken expression of admiration for Conon's skill in overcoming difficulties (xviii. 32). Nothing illustrates P's merits as a historian and his superiority to Xenophon better than the correct perspective in which he draws the two chief actors on his stage, refusing to allow the brilliant and showy but ultimately fruitless triumphs of Agesilaus in the East to obscure the slow but in the end successful steps by which Conon destroyed the Spartan sea power and restored Athens to a position among the leading Greek states.

A characteristic of P, which separates him from most Greek historians, is his dislike of rhetoric and apparent avoidance of speeches, of which there is only one consisting of but nine words (xi. 22–3), so that he almost seems to have taken the eighth book of Thucydides as his model. Allowance must, however, be made not only for the fact that the events recorded in the extant fragments do not offer any very favourable opportunities for inserting speeches (even Thucydides in Books i–vii and Xenophon have long sections without them), but also for the possibility that speeches occurred in the lost portions of P's history. His seeming divergence from the common method of employing speeches to indicate motives and illustrate situations is compensated by a frequent analysis of causes, which shows much historical insight into the politics of the early fourth century, e.g. the discussions of the growth of anti-Spartan feeling in Greece, and of the policy of the anti-Spartan party at Thebes. That our author was sparing in comments, whether of approval or of the reverse, upon the actions of his characters is clear; it is unfortunate that the only passage in which he seems to have entered on a general criticism of some one's character is hopelessly mutilated (Col. x).

While P's excellences as a narrator of facts, his wealth of information, his impartiality, his acuteness of judgement, and his seriousness, entitle him to very
high place among Greek historians, it is impossible to award much praise to his style. This, though correct and easy, is somewhat frigid, colourless, and verbose, rather like that of Polybius, and its monotonous flow is but seldom stirred to a little life, as in the descriptions of the democratic rising at Rhodes, the mutiny of Conon’s troops, and the adornment of Attica. So far from displaying any richness of vocabulary, he is decidedly careless about repeating words at very short intervals, and shows a marked fondness for certain expressions, e.g. βαδίζειν, παραζύνειν, and τυχάνειν with a participle in place of the simple verb. μὲν . . . δὲ are wont to recur with dull regularity, and the tendency to overload sentences with participles and parentheses, e.g. xiv. 8–16, sometimes produces a heavy effect. Some words and phrases recall Polybius, e.g. (ταῖς πόλεσι) ταῖς προερημέναις (ii. 32), πληγὴ (xiv. 20, xix. 25), καταζεύγαι (xix. 18). With χαρέστεσ in i. 9 cf. Ar. Pol. Z. 5, 1320 b 7. The nearest parallel to the curious expression βοήσατος ἐκεῖνος τῆς βοήθειας in xi. 23 is βοῶν ἄφρατον in Menander Fr. 510 (Kock). The hypothesis that he wrote his work later than 346 is excluded by internal evidence (cf. p. 122), and the style does not suggest a much earlier date. Hiatus is as a rule avoided, even at the cost of producing an unnatural order of words, e.g. ii. 34 ἐπηρεαίων μοιὲν ἦσαν τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους, and xi. 22 ἱμήν ὅ ἄνδρες, ἐφη, πολίται, ἐπὶ τοὺς πυράννους. Eight instances, however (cf. i. 4, note), of hiatus occur, and though most of these can be got rid of without difficulty by slight alterations of the text, we have preferred to allow them to stand. The avoidance of hiatus proves little as regards the date of composition, for it is common to the Isocrateans, Polybius, and even Plutarch.

Turning to P’s relation to other historians, everything in the papyrus leads to the conclusion that he was quite independent of Xenophon, and it is not even certain that Xenophon’s Hellenica was published before P wrote his work, for the Hellenica is now generally supposed to have been issued between 360 and 350, and the limits within which P composed his history are 387 and 346; cf. p. 122. If the Hellenica was published first, P shows a complete disregard for it, not only describing much that Xenophon had omitted, but frequently conflicting with him where the two writers cover the same ground. P may even have intended his work to be a contrast to Xenophon’s onesided and unsatisfactory account. With Diodorus P exhibits a remarkably close connexion; Diod. xiv. 80, which describes Agesilaus’ campaign in the early part of 395 and the suppression of Tissaphernes, is practically an abridgement of v–viii, and with regard to the naval war also Diodorus (xiv. 79. 4–8) has obtained his scanty details from P, though in the process apparently disturbing the sequence of events. The question whether the use of P by Diodorus was direct or indirect we postpone until we reach the question of P’s identity (cf. pp. 135–7), but we may remark that
with the discovery of P the criticism of Diod. xiii and xiv in any case enters on a new phase. Another late writer with whom P exhibits some noteworthy cases of agreement, though to a less extent than with Diodorus, is Polyæenus, whose account of the removal of Tissaphernes (Strat. vii. 16) seems to be an abridgment of vii–viii, and who alone of ancient writers agrees with P in associating the mission of Timocrates with Pharnabazus instead of with Tithraustes, though it is possible that this may be due to an accident (i. 33, note). Pausanias, too, presents some points of connexion with P, but generally mingled with points of difference. Thus he agrees with P that Epicrates and Cephalus took Persian gold (i. 33, note), and like P associates Amphitheus (whom he calls Amphithemis) with Ismenias and Androclidas (xii. 34–5, note); but on the date of Pisander's appointment as ναβαρχος (xv. 33, note) and that of Timocrates' mission and its effects he agrees with Xenophon against P, the view which Pausanias accepted being expressly controverted in ii. 1 sqq. Again with regard to the origin of the Boeotian war Pausanias agrees with P against Xenophon that the Locrians concerned were the Hesperian, not the Opuntian; but the embassy of the Athenians mentioned by Pausanias is not at all likely to have occurred in P's narrative, and Pausanias, like Xenophon, makes the Locrians the aggressors. On the question whether Tissaphernes' infantry took part in the campaign round Sardis Pausanias agrees with P against Xenophon, but his allusion to it is very brief, and that he himself used P in composing iii. 9 is most unlikely, though P may have to some extent influenced Pausanias' sources. The only ancient historian who mentions the mutiny of Conon's troops described in xvi. 29 sqq. is Justin, whose reference though brief seems to be derived ultimately from P. In the other late writers we have been unable to detect any trace of P's influence. With Nepos P comes into conflict both concerning the nature of the campaign of 395 and the date of the visit of Conon to the Persian court and his responsibility for the dismissal of Tissaphernes, and also in regard to the name of the Paphlagonian king, while Plutarch in his Agesilaus closely follows Xenophon's account of the campaign of 395, ignoring P altogether, and neither his Lysander nor his Artaxerxes betray any use of our author.

Such being in brief the evidence concerning the character of P's history, the way is now clear for the discussion of the most interesting problem of all—can he be identified with any of the known historians of the fourth century? For the authorship of so important a historical work the first names that naturally suggest themselves are those of the two famous pupils of Isocrates, Ephorus of Cyme and Theopompus of Chios. The close agreement between P and Diodorus at once suggests an identification with Ephorus, whose history is known to have been used by Diodorus in Book xiv; cf. 98. 2 Ἀμαθοὺς δὲ καὶ Σωλιο
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cal Kiteis autékonte to poilew with Ephorus Fr. 134 'Amadousoi de kal Sóloi kal 'Aiteis autékonte ev to poilew. Moreover, Hieronymus, one of Conon's lieutenants, who is stated by Harpocration to have been mentioned in Books xviii and xix of Ephorus (cf. Diod. xiv. 81. 4), occurs in xi. 10, and the spelling 'Akraifion instead of 'Akraifion in xii. 20 is in accordance with Ephorus' use (Fr. 67) of the adjectives 'Akraifworos and 'Akraifwntos. Neither of these coincidences, however, is really very striking, for any historian of this period who (unlike Xenophon) described the naval war in detail would be bound to mention Hieronymus, and Harpocration expressly says that other (unspecified) historians did so, while the insertion of the y in 'Akraifion and its derivatives occurred in Theopompos also and was probably a common practice outside Boeotia. Some characteristics of P would suit Ephorus very well, e.g. his intimate knowledge of Asia Minor, with which country Ephorus, whose home was at Cyme and who was a good geographer, must have been well acquainted, his proneness to digressions, of which Ephorus was fond (cf. Polyb. xii. 28 deuostatou estin ev tois parékbasen), and his full information concerning Theban affairs, which is thought to have characterized Ephorus also (Busolt, Gr. Gesch. iii. p. 710). P's divergence from Xenophon and points of agreement with other later writers besides Diodorus, e.g. Pausanias, Justin, and Polyadenus, would be in accordance with the views of modern critics concerning the relation of these authors to Ephorus; cf. e.g. E. Schwartz in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encycl. s.v. Ephoros, pp. 11-2, Melber, Jahrb. d. Class. Philol. Supplementbd. xiv. pp. 419 sqq., Busolt, op. cit., iii. pp. 245 sqq., though the explanation of divergences in late writers from Thucydides and Xenophon by reference to Ephorus has in our opinion often been carried too far. For forming an opinion upon Ephorus' style the extant fragments which very rarely quote his actual words afford but slight material; the awkward repetition of the words Δερκαλιδαν επεμυφαν after a brief interval (Fr. 130 from Book xviii) recalls P's carelessness in that respect (cf. p. 124), and there is at any rate no marked discrepancy of style between the extant fragments of Ephorus and P. The judgements of ancient critics who regarded Ephorus' style as smooth but tame are by no means inappropriate to P; cf. Cicero Hortens. Fr. 12 quid . . . Ephoro mitius inventi potest, Brut. 204 lenissimum Ephori ingenium; Dion. Chrys. xvii. p. 283 'Ephoros de polles mèn istorian paradóswin to ò' epitow kal áneimewn sou tis ápaggelias óuk epitídeon. The contrast between him and Theopompos is frequently drawn, e.g. in the well-known saying of Isocrates that the latter required the bit, the former the spur, and if it were necessary to identify P with one of these two the argument from style would be all in favour of Ephorus. On the other hand some of the characteristics ascribed by ancient critics to Ephorus are not illustrated by P, e.g. his
fondness for moral reflections (cf. Polyb. i. c. ταῖσ ἀφ' αὐτοῦ γνωμολογήται) and his use of speeches (cf. Plutarch, Mor. 803 b, quoted on p. 132); and if modern criticism (cf. e.g. Busolt, Gr. Gesch. iii. p. 707) is right in supposing that Ephorus was a pronounced partisan of Athens and opponent of Sparta, and that he abandoned altogether the annalistic arrangement adopted by Thucydides, grouping events according to subject without sharp chronological distinctions, in both these features he differed from P, whose work moreover attains a higher degree of historical value than critics have generally been disposed to allow to Ephorus. It is difficult for instance to believe that P could have written anything so unreasonable as Ephorus' account of the causes of the Peloponnesian war. But the really fatal objection to the identification of P with Ephorus, and one which caused Blass, who was at first disposed to favour that view, to reject it decisively, is that Ephorus wrote a universal history, which, although it became more detailed as he approached his own times, can hardly have described with very great minuteness the period covered by P, whereas not only is P's narrative extremely elaborate (compared with the parallel portions of Xenophon P is much longer), but there are distinct indications in the work itself that it began at the point where Thucydides broke off and not earlier (cf. p. 116). Hence in spite of the remarkable agreement between P and Diodorus, we have no hesitation in rejecting the view that Ephorus is the author of the papyrus, and the same objection to the identification of P with Ephorus is equally fatal to his identification with Anaximenes or any other fourth-century writer of a universal history. The primary condition which must be satisfied with regard to the authorship of P's work is that the historian whose claims are put forward wrote a continuation of Thucydides on a very elaborate scale.

That condition is fulfilled by Theopompus, whose Hellenica in twelve books began where Thucydides left off, and ended with the battle of Cnidus in 394, as is known from Diod. xiii. 42, xiv. 84, and Theopompus is in fact regarded by both E. Meyer and Wilamowitz-Möllendorff as the author of the papyrus, though that hypothesis was unhesitatingly rejected by Blass. Of Theopompus' Hellenica, which was certainly written before the same historian's more famous and longer work, the Philippica, only about twenty fragments survive, of which only four (nos. 7, 15, 15 a, and 23) consist of more than a few words. The events from 411 up to the close of the war seem to have been related comparatively briefly, for already in Book ii there occurs a reference to a Lacedaemonian harem which has generally been thought to have been appointed by Lysander, though that inference is not certain. After this, however, the history became much more detailed: Book viii, from which the names of certain places in Bitbnyia are quoted by Stephanus Byz., no doubt contained the accounts of the campaign of
Dercyllidas in 398–7. The solitary extant quotation from Book ix cannot be dated precisely, but Book x included a character-sketch of Lysander emphasizing his moderation (Athen. xii. p. 543), a passage which is also referred to by Plutarch (Lysand. 30), who introduces it in connexion with Lysander's death. Hence it is probable, as Meyer remarks, that in Theopompus also the sketch occurred at the point where he described Lysander's death at the battle of Haliartus. Since this event took place in the autumn of 395 and the concluding chapters of P narrate Agesilaus' campaign in the same autumn, while the battle of Haliartus has yet to be related, it is clear that Cols. xi–xxi, assuming that Athenaeus has quoted the number of the book correctly, cannot come from a later book than x. That they would, if Theopompus were the author, belong to Book x not to Book ix is made probable by the statement of Porphyry (ap. Euseb. Praep. Evang. p. 465) that Theopompus' account of the negotiations between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus corresponding to Xen. Hell. iv. i. 29–40 (cf. p. 120) occurred in Book xi; for these negotiations took place in the winter of 395–4 soon after the events recorded in Col. xxi, and it is unlikely that the narrative of events in Greece in the autumn of 395 occupied a whole book. Cols. i–x might still come from Book ix, but since there is some reason to believe that Col. i commences a new book (cf. p. 115), it is more satisfactory to refer Cols. xi–xxi to the same book. In that case Book x of Theopompus' Hellenica would comprise an account of events from the expedition of Demaenetus in the first half of 396 (cf. p. 115) down to the end of the year 395, the battle of Haliartus falling near the conclusion of this book, and the negotiations of Agesilaus with Pharnabazus near the beginning of the next. This would lead to the difficulty that Books xi and xii together would cover only the period from about January 394 to August (the approximate date of the battle of Cnidus is fixed by an eclipse), and even allowing for considerable digressions and the possible recital of events in other parts of the world such an arrangement seems disproportionate. The difficulty could be avoided by assigning Cols. xi–xxi to Book xi and assuming either that the sketch of Lysander referred to by Athenaeus occurred in Book x not in connexion with the battle of Haliartus or else that Athenaeus has erred in referring the passage in question to Book x instead of to Book xi. But Fr. 23 of Theopompus from Book xi seems to relate to the homeward march of Agesilaus from the Hellespont, which is likely to have been narrated in the book following that to which Cols. xi–xxi would belong, so that it is preferable to suppose that these columns would be part of Book x. Book xii is in any case something of a mystery. No quotations from it are extant, and possibly Suidas was right in stating that the Hellenica contained only eleven books.

The hypothesis that P's important work, which continued Thucydides'
history and has clearly had a large influence upon later historians, is to be identified with a known continuation of Thucydidês written by a historian of the first rank, who was undoubtedly much used by his successors in the same field, possesses obvious advantages and, especially when it comes to be advocated by Meyer in his own words, is sure to find wide acceptance. The positive arguments by which he in agreement with Wilamowitz-Möllendorff supports it against the rival theory of Blass, to be discussed later, are in the main as follows. Firstly, Theopompus, who as a child was exiled with his father from Chios on account of the latter's philo-Laconian views, is known to have been an aristocrat and on the whole in favour of Sparta as against Athens (cf. e.g. Fr. 17), though as would be expected from so great a historian, his personal feelings did not lead him into violent partisanship—witness his censure of the Spartans in the abstract of Philippica xii preserved by Photius ὡς Ἀθηναῖως ἐπειρατὸ ἐμμένειν, Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ ὑπέρογκα φρονοῦσες παρέξαυνον τὰς συνθήκας (cf. Blass' defence of Theopompus from the charge of extreme partiality in Att. Bereds. ii. pp. 415 sqq., and for a much less favourable view of Theopompus E. Schwartz, Hermes xxxv. pp. 109–10). This combination of aristocratic leanings with a sincere desire for truth corresponds, as Meyer thinks, to the attitude adopted by P, especially in his account of parties at Athens. Secondly, there is no reason to suppose that the characteristic vigour and eloquence of Theopompus were displayed in ordinary narrative such as that which occupies so large a part of the papyrius, and in fact the extant fragments of the Hellenica are not dissimilar in style from P. Of these the four largest are: (1) Fr. 7 ἀνήχθησαν εἰς Χαλκιδίαν καὶ Βεζάρτιον μετὰ τοῦ λοιποῦ στρατεύματος βουλόμενοι Χρυσόπολιν κατασχεῖν (for ἀνήχεσθαι cf. i. 7; στράτευμα occurs frequently in P); (2) Fr. 15 αὐτοκοινοῦσαι τῶν Ὀρωπίων Τηλέφορο καὶ τῶν μετ' ἐκείνων βουλομένων καὶ τῶν Ὀρωπίων ὑπάρχειν αὐτοῖς (for μετὰ in preference to σὺν cf. vi. 17, &c., and for the historic present xvi. 20, xvii. 17, &c.); (3) Fr. 15 τὸ δὲ τῶν εἰλατῶν ἔθνος παντάπασιν ὁμός διάκειται καὶ πικρῶς. εἰσὶ γὰρ οὗτοι κατεδοξολομένοι πολὺν ἀνάκαριν ὑπὸ τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν, οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν ἐκ Μεσσηνίας δύτες οἱ δ' ἔλεγαται κατοικοῦντες πρότερον τὸ καλολύμενον "Ἐλος τῆς Λακωνικῆς (cf. e.g. xiv. 25 sqq.; ἔθνος, διακεῖσθαι, and τὸ καλολύμενον are words of frequent occurrence in P; with the inversion ὁμός διάκειται καὶ πικρῶς to avoid hiatus with the following εἰσὶ cf. ii. 34 and xi. 22); (4) Fr. 23 (from Hell. xi and Philip. xiii according to Athen. xiv. p. 657) καὶ οἱ Θάσιοι ἐπεμφάνη Ἀγγείλῶν προσκόποι πρόσβατα καὶ βοῦς ἐν τεθραμμένοισι πρὸς τούτοις δὲ καὶ πέμνατα καὶ τραγημάτωι ἔδοξο παινοῦσαι. δ' ἂν Ἀγγείλασος τὰ μὲν πρόσβατα καὶ τὰς βότις ἔλαβεν, τὰ δὲ πέμνατα καὶ τὰ τραγημάτα πρῶτον μὲν οὕτ' ἐγνώ, κατεκεκάλυπτο γὰρ ὃς δὲ κατεῖδω ἀποφέρεις αὐτοὺς ἐκέλευσεν, εἰπὼν οὐ νόμμου εἶναι Λακεδαιμονίως.
χρησιμοποιεί τοιούτως τοὺς ἔθεσιν. Λεπτομερέστερα δὲ τῶν Ἡθοπ. τῶν Ἰσμ. τῶν Ἐπ. φαρ. κ.φ. τῶν Ἐπ. προστίμων ἐκείνων, διέταξεν αὐτοῖς τῶν ἐίσωσων, εἰπών ὅτι τούτους διόι διαφθείραν. τρώγοντας αὐτὰ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ αὐτὸν καὶ τῶν παρόντας Λακεδαιμονίων (the structure of the sentence ὅς ὁ Ἀγασίλαος κ.φ. ἡμ. is particularly like the style of Ὁ. P. This argument for the general similarity of the style of the Hellenica with that of Ὁ. can, we may remark, be supplemented by the occurrence of certain linguistic agreements between Ὁ. and Theopompus, including two possible references to extant portions of Ὁ. in quotations from Theopompus (p. 131). Thirdly, enough is known about the contents of the Philippica, particularly from the abstract of Book xii preserved by Photius, to show that Theopompus was extremely prone to digressions on all kinds of subjects, many of them very remotely connected with his main narrative, a feature which is notably prominent in Ὁ. also (cf. p. 121). Fourthly, several points in the probably just criticism of Theopompus as a historian by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Ep. ad Cr. Pomp. pp. 782–7) apply very well to Ὁ. Thus Dionysius speaks of both Hellenica and Philippica as being εὐπαρακενθητοῖ καὶ σαφεῖς, and praises the careful and diligent preparations which Theopompus had made in collecting materials and obtaining information, and the wide range of subjects treated (τὸ πολὺμορφὸν τῆς γραφῆς), which included descriptions of states, laws, constitutions (πολιτείων σχήματα; cf. Ὁ.’s excursus on the constitution of Boeotia), important individuals, &c. Dionysius specially singles out as Theopompus’ most remarkable characteristic, which distinguished him from both older and younger historians, his deep insight into causes and power of psychological analysis, τὸ καθ’ ἐκάστην πράξιν μὴ μόνον τὰ φανερὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ὄραν καὶ λέγειν, ἀλλὰ ἐξετάζειν καὶ τὰς ἀφανεῖς αἰτίας τῶν πράξεων καὶ τῶν πραξάντων αὐτὰς καὶ τὰ πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς ἢ μὴ δύοια τοῖς πολλοῖς εἰδέναι, καὶ πάντα ἐκκαλύπτει τὰ μυστήρια τῆς τε δοκούσης ἄρετῆς καὶ τῆς ἀγνοουμένης κακίας . . . διὸ καὶ βάσκαρος ἔδοξεν εἶναι, with which description may be compared the penetrating analysis of the motives of the various anti-Spartan parties in i. 33 sqq. and of the policy of Ismenias’ party at Thebes in xii. 37–xiv. 21. Fifthly, that Theopompus’ works were serious histories like that of Ὁ., and very far from being over-rhetorical, is shown by the unfavourable verdict passed upon him by one of his successors, Duris of Samos, a writer who sacrificed historical accuracy to mere effect, Ἐφοροὶ δὲ καὶ Θεόπαπτος τῶν γενομένων πλείστων ἀπελεύθησαν, οὕτε γὰρ μικρότεροι μετέλαβον οὐδὲνας οὕτε ἑδονήν ἐν τῷ φράσας, αὐτοῦ δὲ τῶν γράφειν μόνον ἐπεμελήθησαν. Sixthly, the blame passed on Theopompus in common with Ephorus and Timaeus by Polybius (xii. 25 f. 6) for his want of knowledge in describing battles would accord with the suspiciously conventional character of the account of the two ambuscades in v. 59 sqq. and xix. 22 sqq.

The combined weight of Meyer’s arguments, of which the first three seem
to us the strongest, is undoubtedly considerable, and we can reinforce them by several linguistic coincidences of which the last two are particularly striking, and perhaps provide direct evidence of P’s identity with Theopompus. Of P’s favourite expressions (cf. p. 124) τυχάνειν with a participle in place of the simple verb occurs in Theop. Fr. 149, παμοζύτεω in Fr. 100, while χωρίον ... κατεσκευασμένον καλώς is found both in xx. 30 (κακῶς Pap. by an error) and Theop. Fr. 33. The agreement of P with Theopompus as to the insertion of ν in the name Ἀκραίφυν (cf. Ἀκραίφυνον xii. 20, note) proves little, for Ephorus used the forms Ἀκραίφυνος and Ἀκραίφυνώτης (cf. p. 126) and the insertion of ν was probably common; moreover, Stephanus Byz. ascribes the form Ἀκραίφυνον to Pausanias, and (τὰ) Ἀκραίφυνα to Theopompus. Similarly the circumstance that Theopompus’ description of Mesogis and Celaenae (Fr. 290) is in accordance with vi. 45–vii. 2 (cf. note ad loc.), that of Parapotami (Fr. 264) with xv. 17–8, is of slight account. But the occurrence in xviii. 39 (cf. viii. 22) of the verb κατάραι in the rather rare sense of ἔλθειν, a use which is attributed to Theopompus (Fr. 327) by a grammarian in Bekk. Anecd. p. 104. 15, is significant in any case, and it is possible that this passage in P was the grammarian’s authority, while a still more noteworthy coincidence between P and Theopompus is found in connexion with the form Καρπασέως (xvi. 37, xvi. 16), meaning a man of Carpasus (in Cyprus). Steph. Byz. s. v. Καρπασία remarks ὁ πολίτης Καρπασέως ... καὶ τὸ κτητικὸν Καρπασεωτικὸς καὶ Καρπασεωτικὴ ἀκρα. Θεούπομπος ἐν δεκάτῳ Καρπασεῖς αὐτοῦ φήσων. ἵςως ἀπὸ τοῦ Κάρπασος ὡς 'Αιτίωχος 'Αιτιωχεύς, ἅφ' οὖ Καρπασέως. It has been generally assumed that the 10th Book in question belonged to the more commonly quoted Philippica rather than to the Hellenica, and C. Müller explains it (Fr. Hist. Gr. Theop. Fr. 93) by the supposition that the Carpasians were mentioned in connexion with Cimon’s expedition to Sicily, Cimon being mentioned in another fragment (94) of Phil. Book x. But both the assumption and the suggested explanation are mere guesses, and if the 10th Book belongs to the Hellenica the agreement with P is very remarkable, for, as we have shown (p. 128), Cols. xi–xxi, if not the whole of the papyrus, would belong to that Book. This coincidence may indeed seem to clinch the argument for the identification of P with Theopompus, but before deciding in favour of that view it is necessary to examine the objections to it.

In the first place P and Theopompus seem to disagree as to the name of the Paphlagonian king, who is called Γοὺς in xxi. 11 but Θοὺς by Theopompus according to Athenaeus, while Nepos, who is no doubt following Theopompus, calls him Θυγυς (xx. 37, note). Meyer evades the difficulty by supposing a corruption in the papyrus, which is admittedly not very trustworthy, especially as to proper names. But Γοὺς is not in itself an unlikely form for an Asiatic name which, as
the variations of it in Xenophon (Κόρος and Ὄρος) show, could not be represented satisfactorily in Greek, and the apparent disagreement between P and Theopompus is prima facie evidence against the identity of the two. Secondly, according to Porphyry ap. Eusebius, Praep. Evang. p. 465 b–c Theopompus in his Hellenica plagiarized from Xenophon (πολλὰ τοῦ Ξενοφώντος αὐτὸν μετατιθέντα κατελήφα) and in the 11th Book μεταβείς ἁργά τε καὶ ἄκυκτα πεποίηκε καὶ ἀπρόκτα the account of the negotiations between Agesilaus and Pharnabazus which Xenophon (Hell. iv. 1. 29–40) had described πᾶν χαριέντως καὶ πρεπόντως ἄμφων. It is very unfortunate that the papyrus breaks off shortly before that episode was reached, but the total disregard of Xenophon exhibited in the extant portions of P renders it improbable that he borrowed from that author, and though, as Meyer remarks, Xenophon is likely to have been the only historian who could describe those negotiations from first-hand knowledge, the divergence between P and Xenophon in regard to the treatment of the earlier negotiations between Agesilaus and the king of Paphlagonia (xx. 37, note), for the details of which Xenophon was equally in all probability the sole first-hand authority, renders it in our opinion very difficult to believe that P used Xenophon’s account when describing the negotiations with Pharnabazus. Hence if P is Theopompus, the general charge of plagiarism from Xenophon brought against him by Porphyry must certainly be dismissed, and it would, we think, be preferable to explain the specific instance alleged as also due to a misunderstanding. Whether Porphyry carries very much weight on a question of literary criticism may be doubted, but his evidence, so far as it goes, distinctly tells against the identification of P with Theopompus. Thirdly, the absence of speeches in P offers a point of contrast with Theopompus, who certainly employed them, as is shown not only by the censure passed upon him in common with Ephorus and Anaximenes by Plutarch Mor. 803 b ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν Ἐφ. καὶ Θεοπ. καὶ Ἀνδ. ῥητορεῖν καὶ περιόδων ἀς περαιώνον ἐξοπλίσαντες τὰ αγραυτήματα καὶ παρατάσαντες ἐστὶν εἰπένων ὀδύσει σιδήρων ταύτα μωραίης πέλας, but by two recently discovered fragments of the Φιλαπτικά (Didymus, De Demosth. Comm., ed. Diels and Schubart, pp. 19 and 35). It is possible however that the absence of speeches in P is due to accident; cf. p. 123. Fourthly, P’s account of Agesilaus does not accord at all well with what is known of the treatment of him in Theopompus. That the latter had a very high admiration for Agesilaus is clear from the fact that Plutarch quotes his praise (καὶ μέγιστος μὲν ἦν ὁμολογομένως καὶ τῶν τότε ἔφεσιν ἐπιφανέστατος, ὡς εἰρήκε ποιν καὶ Θεόπομπος), and the rather trivial anecdote preserved in Fr. 23 from Hell. xi, and probably in a slightly different form in Phil. xiii (cf. p. 129) recalls the stories about Agesilaus which Xenophon tells of his hero. P on the other hand shows no tendency to illustrate the personal character
of Agesilaus nor any enthusiasm over his achievements (though cf. v. 17-9, note). It is moreover very noticeable that Plutarch, who is generally considered to have derived much information from Theopompus (cf. e.g. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* iii. pp. 727 sqq.), and who in his *Ages.* mentions him four times, besides clearly referring in ch. 36 to the version in Theopompus' *Philippica* of the story about the gifts offered to the king, nevertheless ignores the divergences between P and Xenophon with regard to Agesilaus' campaigns in 395 and shows practically no trace of connexion with P anywhere. That P's account of the war in 395, which has influenced Diodorus and other writers of the Roman period and must have been still extant in Plutarch's time, was so completely neglected by him is somewhat remarkable in any case; but the identification of P with Theopompus makes this neglect much more difficult of explanation, and the view, which has been widely held, that Plutarch had first-hand knowledge of Theopompus, becomes almost untenable, with regard to the *Hellenica* at any rate, if P was the author of that work. Fifthly, while the agreements between P and Pausanias, Justin, and Polyaeus present no obstacles to Meyer's view, the acceptance of it leads to considerable complications when we try to account for the agreement between P and Diodorus, and to reconcile the dates at which P's work and Theopompus' *Hellenica* were probably composed. Meyer, from the standpoint of most modern criticism of Diodorus, which believes that 'die starke Abhängigkeit Diodors von Ephoros von dem neunten Buche der Bibliothek ab (i.e. to Book xv) eines der sichersten Ergebnisse der Quellenforschung ist' (Bauer, *Die Forschungen zur Gr. Gesch.* 1888-98, p. 265), explains the clear dependence of Diodorus upon P by the hypothesis that Diodorus' source, Ephoros, was using Theopompus. This leads, however, to a chronological difficulty. Theopompus was probably born about 376, since according to Photius he was 45 years of age, when through Alexander's intervention he returned to Chios from exile apparently in 332 (cf. Blass, *op. cit.* p. 400; Rohde, *Rhein. Mus.* xlix. p. 623). The statement of Suidas that Theopompus, like Ephoros, was *γεγονός*. . . . in the 93rd Olympiad (B.C. 408) is now universally regarded as containing an error in the figures, *γεγονός* meaning not 'born' but 'lived' (cf. Blass, *l.c.*). He survived the death of Alexander, for Photius relates that he took refuge in Egypt with Ptolemy, but when and where he died is uncertain. Concerning Ephoros' life even less is known. Probably he was born about the same time as Theopompus and died some time before him, for the latest event recorded about him is his refusal to accept an invitation to Alexander's court (Plut. *De stoic. repugn.* c. 20), and whereas part of Theopompus' *Philippica* must have been written after the death of Philip in 336, the 29th Book of Ephoros' history only reached 356, the 30th Book which reaches 340 being edited after the
historian's death by his son (Diod. xvi. 14). Meyer thinks that Theopompus wrote the *Hellenica* not much later than 350, and that the 18th and 19th Books of Ephorus, which covered the same ground, were not composed until after 330, for it is of course very difficult to reconcile the supposed dependence of Ephorus upon Theopompus without assuming an interval of some 15 or 20 years between the composition of the *Hellenica* and the parallel portions of Ephorus' history. But to this view there are two serious objections. That P wrote his history not much, if at all, later than 350 is probable enough; for, as Mr. E. M. Walker was the first to point out and as Meyer now admits, the account of the border dispute between Phocis and Locris in xiv. 25 sqq., where P speaks of the δμφυρβητήςμοι χώρα as still existing (ἐστι, in l. 25; cf. ἐπώνυμον and διαράδξουν in ll. 27 and 29) and contrasts in ll. 30–37 the former peaceful methods of settling the quarrel with the war which was kindled on that occasion, cannot have been written after the end of the Sacred War, which began in 356 with a struggle between the Phocians and the very same Locrians, and ended in 346 with the complete ruin of Phocis, whose place on the Amphictyonic Council was transferred to Macedonia. Hence 346 may be regarded as the terminus ad quem for the date at which P composed his history. Mr. Walker is even prepared to place it before 356, on the ground that a reference to the Sacred War would be expected in xiv. 25 sqq. if it had actually begun; but we do not wish to press this point, for the use of the present tense is quite compatible with the war being already in progress. If P wrote before 356, it is of course impossible to identify him with Theopompus without abandoning the current view concerning the date of Theopompus' birth, and even if he was writing between 350 and 346, which we regard as on the whole the most likely date for the composition of P's work, it is not at all easy to reconcile this with the evidence that Theopompus was born in about 376. A work so detailed and elaborate as that of P implies a large amount of research on the part of its author, especially since he disregarded Xenophon. Theopompus may have begun writing his *Hellenica* at the age of 23 or 24, but that he composed the 10th Book before the age of 30 seems to us distinctly improbable, so that taking 376 as the correct date of Theopompus' birth, the terminus a quo for the date of the composition of Book x is 347–6. Since the terminus ad quem for P's work is, as we have said, 346, the margin of time available for the supposed composition of it by Theopompus is reduced to the narrowest possible limits, if it does not disappear altogether. The margin may be extended for a year or two by supposing that when Photius gave Theopompus' age at his return from exile as 45 years, that figure was approximate, and he should have strictly said 46 or 47. But if the date of Theopompus' birth is pushed back before about 378 it becomes
necessary to alter the number of the year in Photius' account, and to this there are two objections: firstly, that Photius seems to be drawing his details concerning Theopompus' life from a trustworthy source, and that the mistake, if there be one, must be attributed not to him but to his copyists; secondly, that, in view of the fact that Theopompus was living in Egypt under Ptolemy Soter and may even have survived the year 300, 376 is a sufficiently early date for his birth, and a date before 380 is not at all probable.

The theory of the identity of P with Theopompus thus leads to a grave chronological difficulty with regard to the date of the 10th Book of the Hellenica, the composition of which would on general grounds of probability be assigned to a year later than 346, whereas in order to satisfy the exigencies of the theory the date has to be prior to 346, and it is open to the further objection that P's most prominent features as a historian (cf. pp. 122–3) do not in the least suggest the work of a very young man, but on the contrary are rather characteristic of maturity or even old age; cf. also p. 139. With regard to Ephorus on the other hand, Meyer's supposition that he wrote the last twelve out of 29 Books of his history after 330 seems rather hazardous in view of the fact that he is not known to have outlived that year. The interval, therefore, between the publication of the Hellenica and the composition of Books xviii and xix of Ephorus is likely to have been rather brief, and then the question arises whether it is probable that Ephorus would have neglected Xenophon and been content to reproduce in a shortened form the recently published work of his contemporary Theopompus as (granting that Diodorus in Book xiv is closely following Ephorus) he would seem to have done for the events of 396-5. Ephorus may have been a writer without much originality (cf. Wilamowitz, Arist. u. Athen ii. p. 16), but that he should have selected Theopompus as his principal or sole authority for the period covered by the Hellenica is strange. If P is identified with Theopompus, can the difficulty of admitting that Theopompus was Ephorus' source in Books xviii and xix be evaded by supposing a direct use of Theopompus by Diodorus for the period from 411–394?

The question whether Diodorus borrowed from Theopompus has long been disputed, but since Volquardsen in 1869 propounded the view that Books xi–xv of Diodorus were mainly derived from Ephorus and Theopompus was not used, nearly all modern critics have ranged themselves on his side. Neither the scepticism of Holm (Gr. Gesch. iii. p. 19) nor the attempt of W. Stern (Commentationes in hon. G. Studemund, 1889, pp. 245 sqq.) to prove on stylistic grounds that Diodorus had extensively used Theopompus in Books i–xx have won support, and the only concession sometimes made to the advocates of a use of Theopompus by Diodorus is in connexion with Book xvi, which deals with the period from
360–336, and of which Volquardsen left the source in doubt. Here F. Reuss' conclusion (Jahrh. f. class. Philol. cliii. pp. 317 sqq.) that parts of this Book are based on Theopompus is accepted by Bauer (op. cit. p. 266), but not by E. Schwartz (Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encycl. v. p. 682), though cf. Reuss, Bursians Jahresber. cxxvii. p. 37, where he suggests that Diod. xvi. 34. 5 is derived from Theopompus on the evidence of the new fragment in Diels-Schubart, Didymus Comm. de Demosth. xii. 43–9. The conditions of the problem are now entirely altered by the discovery of our papyrus. Volquardsen (Unters. über die Quellen Diod. pp. 67 sqq.) found five arguments against the use of Theopompus by Diodorus: (1) Theopompus is never cited by Diodorus; the mentions of his history in xiii. 42 and xiv. 84 do not count, because they belong to the extracts from a chronological epitome incorporated in Diodorus' history. (2) There is no correspondence between the fragments of Theopompus and Diodorus. (3) There is no trace in Diodorus of Theopompus' aristocratic bias. (4) The style of Diodorus does not resemble that of Theopompus. (5) For the period from 394–360 Diodorus could only have utilized Theopompus if he had searched up and down through the Philippica, and it is unlikely that he would have used a work arranged on so unsystematic a plan. If, however, P is Theopompus, these arguments break down completely, with regard to the Hellenica at any rate. As for (2), there would be a close agreement between Diodorus xiv and Theopompus; as for (3), since Theopompus' aristocratic bias would be very slight, and on the whole he would have to be regarded as a decidedly impartial historian, there would be no reason to expect an aristocratic bias to be traceable in Diodorus. With regard to (4) the identification of P with Theopompus necessitates a radical alteration in the ordinary conception of Theopompus' style (cf. pp. 137–9), and so far from the style of Diodorus being different from that of Theopompus' Hellenica, it would present considerable resemblance to it. Volquardsen's fifth reason does not apply to the period covered by the Hellenica, which moreover, being arranged on a chronological system, would be more convenient as a basis for a history arranged on Diodorus' plan than a less strictly chronological work, such as Ephorus is supposed to have written. There remains, therefore, only the first argument, which, seeing that Diodorus is not in the habit of quoting his sources (e.g. Hieronymus of Cardia is generally thought to have been largely used in Books xviii–xx), is hardly serious, and it is clear that if P is Theopompus the whole question of the relation of Diodorus to Theopompus will have to be reconsidered. Into that problem we do not propose to enter in detail; what we wish chiefly to insist upon is that the identification of P with Theopompus tends to disturb the prevailing view of the relation of Ephorus to Diodorus more seriously than an identification...
with e.g. Cratippus, who may well have been used by Ephorus (cf. p. 141), and, secondly, the hypothesis which Meyer adopts so readily that Ephorus used Theopompus’ *Hellenica*, is based not only on a somewhat hazardous assumption concerning the dates at which these historians wrote, but on conclusions concerning the relation of Diodorus to Ephorus and Theopompus which the identification of P with Theopompus goes some way to undermine. That Diodorus used P directly does not seem to us probable: for though the general agreement between them is very close, the verbal coincidences are not on the whole very striking (cf. p. 216); and, as Mr. Walker remarks, the fact that Diodorus, though adopting an annalistic arrangement like that of P, nevertheless commits the egregious blunder of first omitting the events of Greek history altogether during the two years preceding that in which he places the dispatch of Agesilaus, and then combining into one year his account of the two campaigns of Agesilaus which really belong to different years, is almost incredible if he was excerpting an author whose chronology was as clear as that of P. Such an error, however, is readily explicable on the assumption that Diodorus was using an author like Ephorus, who (as is generally supposed) grouped events together without strict regard to chronology. That Diodorus’ close connexion with P is due to his use of Ephorus who was based on P is much the most satisfactory hypothesis, but the acceptance of it, so far from providing an argument for the identification of P with Theopompus, creates somewhat formidable difficulties. It is not Diodorus but Plutarch who, if P is Theopompus, ought to exhibit traces of his influence; but these, as we have said (p. 133), are not forthcoming.

To these objections which we have brought against the identification of P with Theopompus may be added the great obstacle, which from the outset LCD Blass (and Dittenberger also) to reject that view, namely the absence in P of several of Theopompus’ most prominent characteristics, especially in regard to style. Thus Theopompus was noted for his comments either of praise or blame (principally the latter), a feature which is abundantly illustrated by the extant fragments of the *Philippica*, whereas P, except apparently in the fragmentary Col. x, shows no disposition to moralize upon his characters, preferring to let their actions speak for themselves. Even so important a personage as Ismenias is introduced (xii. 34) without remark, and Agesilaus’ relations to Megabates are stated, but neither excused nor censured. We hear, indeed, of Conon’s *προθυμία*, an expression which is also used of Cyrus (xvi. 9) and an obscure Persian general (xx. 35), but for Agesilaus the extant portions of P have, except perhaps in v. 17–9 (cf. note *ad loc.*), no word of praise. The notorious bitterness of Theopompus, which Cicero singles out when summing him up in a single epithet (*Hortens.*
Fr. 12 quid . . . Theopompo acris), and which is exemplified in his diatribes against Athens (Frs. 117, 238, and 297), however well deserved these may be, goes far beyond the censure, implied rather than openly expressed, upon the extreme democrats in ii. 10–14; and in the plain unrethorical composition of P we look in vain for any traces of the fire and passion which Theopompus put into his vivid and powerful description of the friends of Philip (Fr. 249), or Fr. 125 beginning ποιά γὰρ πόλις ἡ πούν ἔθνος τῶν κατὰ τὴν 'Ασίαν οὐκ ἐπρεσβεύετο πρὸς βασιλεῖα; τί δὲ τῶν ἐκ τῆς γῆς γεννωμένων ἡ τῶν κατὰ τέχνην ἐπιτελομένων καλῶν ἡ τιμών οὐκ ἐκμοίρασθη δόρων ὡς αὐτῶν; οὐ πολλαὶ μὲν καὶ πολυτελεῖς στρωμαί καὶ χλαύθεις, τὰ μὲν ἄλασθη τὰ δὲ ποικιλτά τὰ δὲ λευκά, πολλαὶ δὲ σκιναὶ χρυσά κατεσκευασμένοι πάσι τοῖς χρησίμωσι, πολλαὶ δὲ καὶ ξυστίδες καὶ κλίραν πολυτελεῖς; κ.τ.λ., or Fr. 135 Νικόστρατον δὲ τὸν 'Αργείου πῶς οὐ χρὴ φαύλου νομίζει; ὃς προστάτης γενόμενος τῆς 'Αργείου πόλεως καὶ παραλαβὼν καὶ γένος καὶ κρήματα καὶ πολλὴν οὐδίκαν παρὰ τῶν προγόνων ἀπαντᾷ ἐπιρρέουσα τῇ κολακείᾳ καὶ ταῖς θεραπείαις οὐ μόνον τούτοις τότε στρατείας μετασχάσθης ἄλλα καὶ τοὺς ἐμπροσθὲν γενόμενους. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οὕτως ἠγάπησε τὴν παρὰ τοῦ βαρβάρου τιμὴν ὡστε βουλόμενοι ἀρέσκειν καὶ πιστεύεσθαι μάλλον ἀνέκομψη πρὸς βασιλεῖα τῶν νόμων· τὸ τῶν ἄλλων οὐδεὶς πῶστε φάνησαται πονύσας· ἐπείτη καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ὅποτε μέλλοι δευτερέως ὑπάρχει χρῷς ἀναμύεται τῷ βασιλεῖον, ἐμπληθαίς σῖτον καὶ ἄλλων ἐπιθηδείων, ἀκόνων μὲν τούτο ποιεῖ καὶ τῶν Περσῶν τοὺς περὶ τὰς θύρας διατρίβοντας, αἴμομενος δὲ ὅταν τὴς θεραπείας ταύτης χρησιμεύσαθαι μάλλον παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως. ἦν γὰρ αἰσχροκερής καὶ χρημάτων ὡς οὐκ οἶδ' εἰ τις ἐτεροὶ ἢττοι. That the historian whose superiority to Thucydides and Philistus on account of the elatio atque altitude orationis sive was compared by Cicero (Brut. 66) to the superiority of Demosthenes to Lysias, and whose lexis Dionysius (Ep. ad Cn. Pomp. p. 786) compares to that of Isocrates, καθαρὰ γὰρ . . . καὶ κοινὴ καὶ σοφῆς, υψηλὴ τε καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆς καὶ τὸ πομπικὸν ἔχουσα πολὺ, συγκεκριμένη κατὰ τὴν μέσην ἀρμονίαν, ἤδεως καὶ μαλακῶς ἰδιοῦσα, could have attained so high a reputation as a stylist is incredible, if his other work resembled these fragments. It is also noticeable that out of three points which are censured by Dionysius (p. 787) in Theopompus, his over-anxiety to avoid hiatus, his continual rhythmical periods, and his wearisome epideictic figures (tēs της συμπλοκῆς τῶν φωνητῶν γραμμάτων καὶ τῆς κυκλικῆς ἐφυρμαί τῶν περιδῶν καὶ τῆς ὁμοιειδείας τῶν σχηματισμῶν), P exhibits only avoidance of hiatus (a rule which is subject to exceptions both in P and the extant fragments of Theopompus). Elaborate rhythmical periods and rhetorical antitheses, parasia, and paroemia (e.g. τι γὰρ τῶν αἰσχρῶν ἡ δεινῶς αὐτῶς οὐ προσὴν ἢ τί τῶν καλῶν καὶ σπουδαίων οὐκ ἄπην; in Theop. Fr. 249) are foreign to P's sober, unadorned style. In order to identify P with Theopompus it is practically necessary, as Meyer and Wilamowitz admit, to suppose that the Hellenica was written in a manner much
less ornate than that of the *Philippica*. In support of such a view of the development of Theopompus' style can be cited the difference in Xenophon's treatment of the period before and after the end of the Peloponnesian war, and the circumstance that Theopompus seems to have begun his historical researches tamely enough by writing an epitome of Herodotus, and when composing the *Hellenica* may have been to some extent under the influence of Thucydides. But on the other hand the ancient critics draw no distinction between the characteristics of the *Hell.* and *Phil.*, and in the case of a writer with so vigorous an individuality and such marked features of style as Theopompus it is certainly surprising, even apart from the story about the bit and the spur (cf. p. 126), that he should have been able as a young man (cf. p. 135) to curb his tendency to rhetoric so successfully as he has done, if he be indeed the author of the papyrus. That he was composing ἐπιθέτικος λόγος at the same time as the *Hellenica* appears from Fr. 26, which probably is derived from the preface to the *Philippica*, and the conception of history in the Isocratean school was in the words of the master himself (Isocr. iv. 9) αἱ μὲν γὰρ πρᾶξεις αἱ προγεγενημέναι κοιναὶ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν κατελεύθησαν, τὸ δὲ ἐν καρφῷ ταῦτας καταχρῆσαι καὶ τὰ προστίχουνα περὶ ἐκάστης ἐνθυμηθῃ καὶ τοὺς ὑπόμασιν εὑ διαθέσαι τῶν εὗ φρονοῦσιν ἰδιῶν ἑστώ.

Our comparison, therefore, of P's work with the *Hellenica* of Theopompus, though it has not presented any single insuperable obstacle to the identification of one with the other, if that hypothesis can be made probable on other grounds, and though even as regards style there are some points of agreement between the two (cf. p. 129), undoubtedly has shown the existence of a number of weighty objections to the identification of P with Theopompus. Can these be avoided by identifying P with another historian? To reject Theopompus and take refuge in complete agnosticism is most unsatisfactory, for admittedly P was a historian of much importance who has largely influenced later tradition, and since his work survived far into the second century his name at any rate must be known.

This being granted, there is besides Theopompus only one known historian, Cratippus, who seems to fulfil the primary condition required for identification with P, that he should have written a continuation of Thucydides, and it is Cratippus whom Blass wished to regard as the author of the papyrus. Concerning this writer our information is scanty, and his date has been much disputed. Dionysius Halic. (*De Thucyd.* 16) says ὡτικεν (sc. Thucydides) ἀπελή τὴν ἱστορίαν καταλιπέων ὡς καὶ Κράτιππος ὁ συνακαίνας αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ παραλειφθέντα ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ συναγαγὼν γέγραφεν' οὗ μᾶκαν ταῖς πράξεων αὐτῶς (sc. Thucydides' speeches) ἐμπνωθεὶς γεγενήσθαι λέγων ἄλλα καὶ τοῖς ἀκούσοντι ἀγλημάς εἶναι. τούτῳ γὲ τοις συνεντα αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς τελευταίοις τῆς ἱστορίας φησὶ μηδεμίαν τάξια ῥητορείαν πολλῶν μὲν κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν
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gennomenou pollon δ' ἐν ταῖς 'Αθηναῖς ὅσα διὰ λόγου καὶ δημηγορίων ἐπράξη (perhaps a quotation from Cratippus’ προσφοί). From this it is clear that Dionysius regarded Cratippus as a contemporary of Thucydides, and that Cratippus strongly objected to the speeches. More definite information about the period which his history covered is supplied by Plutarch (De glor. Ath. p. 345 C–E ἃν γὰρ ἀνέλης τοῖς πράττονται ὃιχ ἔξεις τοὺς γράφοντας. ἀνέλε τὴν Περικλέους πολιτείαν καὶ τὰ ναύσαμα πρὸς 'Ριῳ Φοιμίωνος τρόπαια ... καὶ Θουκυδίδης σοι διαγγέγραται. ἀνέλε τὰ περὶ Ἑλληνιστὸν Ἀλκιβιάδου μετανάστα μα καὶ τὰ πρὸς Λέσβον Ὀρασίου καὶ τὴν ὑπὸ Ὀρασίονος τῆς ὁλιγαρχίας κατάλυσιν καὶ Ὀρασίβουλον καὶ Ἀρχίτον (MSS. Ἀρχιππον) καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ Φυλής ἐξδομήκοντα κατὰ τὴς Σπαρτατίων ἡγεμονίας ἄνωταμένους καὶ Κόμων πάλιν ὑμβιβάζοντα τὰς 'Αθηναῖς εἰς τὴν ἄλλαυν, καὶ Κράτιππος ἀνήρτητα. This shows that Cratippus’ work, like Theopompos’ Hellenica and probably the history of P, included the period from 411 to the battle of Cnidus in 394. Apparently he went over again part of the ground covered by the last Book of Thucydides, for the expulsion of the oligarchs by Theramenes is narrated in viii. 89 sqq., and Thrasyllos’ proceedings at Lesbos are recorded (very briefly) in viii. 100. That Plutarch should have here placed Cratippus on the same level as Thucydides indicates that he must have been a very important historian, and it is remarkable that there are only two other extant references to him: (1) Ps.-Plut. Vit. Orat. p. 834, where he is quoted in reference to the Hermocopiadea, a subject which he may have treated in connexion with the return of Alcibiades; (2) Marcellinus, Vit. Thuc. 33 ἀλλὰ δὴ λόγον ὧτι κάθοδος ἐπὶ τῆς φεύγονσιν, ὡς καὶ Φιλόχροος λέγει καὶ Δημήτριος ἐν τοῖς Ἀρχίσιοι. ἐγὼ δὲ Ζάπυρον ληθείν νομίζω λέγοντα τοῦτον ἐν Θρᾶκι τετελευτηκέναι καὶ λάθευσιν νομίζων Κράτιππος αὐτῶν. τοῦ δ' ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ Τίμαιον αὐτῶν καὶ ἄλλους λέγειν κτισθαι μὴ καὶ σφόδρα καταγέλαστον ἦ. It appears from this that Cratippus was not older than Zopyrus, and Susemihl, identifying this Zopyrus with the friend of Timon of Phlius (Gesch. d. Gr. Lit. in d. Alexandrinerzeit, ii. p. 468), thinks that Cratippus lived in the third or second century B.C. (op. cit. i. p. 646). But it is quite uncertain which Zopyrus is meant: he may, for instance, have been the contemporary of Socrates (Herbst, Philol. xlix. p. 174). That Cratippus lived even later still has been maintained by Stahl,

1 ἐγὼ δὲ κ.τ.λ. has hitherto been treated as a remark of Marcellinus, ἐν Ὀρίσσῃ (which does not suit the sense) being generally altered to ἐν Ἀττικῇ; but, as Blass suggested, the passage in question is perhaps in iambic trimeters, though his proposal to regard it as a quotation from the Chronicae of Apollodorus is unhesitatingly rejected by Wilamowitz. The lines can be restored thus:

ἐγὼ δὲ Ζάπυρον

λέγοντα τοῦτον (οὐ χαὶ τετελευτηκέναι) (οὐ ἐν Ἀττικῇ τετυγιόναι)
ληθεῖν νομίζω, καὶ λάθευσιν δοεῖ

Κράτιππος αὐτῶν . . .

τὸ δ' ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ Τίμαιον αὐτῶν χαῖτέρους

κτισθαι λέγειν μὴ καὶ σφόδρα καταγέλαστον ἦ.
who boldly emends avrō (i.e. Thucydides) after συνακμάσας in the Dionysius passage into σοι avrō (i.e. Q. Aelius Tubero, whom Dionysius was addressing), and would identify Cratippus with the friend of Pompey. This violent emendation of Dionysius has however been universally abandoned, and most recent critics either defend the date assigned to Cratippus by Dionysius or leave the question undecided; cf. Meyer, Gesch. d. Alt. iii. p. 276; Busolt, Gr. Gesch. iii. pp. 631–2, where the literature of the subject is surveyed.

That Cratippus was an Athenian is a tolerably certain inference from the context of the Plutarch passage, which relates to Athenian historians, and Meyer adduces as an objection to the identification of P with Cratippus the circumstance that the Athenians do not occupy in P the prominent position which they have in Thucydides, and that his sympathies are rather with Sparta. But since Plutarch next after Cratippus proceeds to mention Xenophon, this objection does not carry much weight, for P is certainly not more pro-Spartan than Xenophon, and his just recognition of Conon's merits stands in marked contrast to Xenophon's biased attempt to belittle that commander's achievements.

To sum up the scanty evidence with regard to Cratippus, what is known about the scope of his history and his avoidance of speeches fits in very well with Blass' view concerning the authorship of the papyrus. That he was younger than Thucydides is practically certain in any case, and if συνακμάσας in Dionysius be regarded as a loose expression, and the publication of Cratippus', i.e. P's, work be assigned to the period between 375 and 350, it may well have been used by Ephorus, a hypothesis which would account for the agreements between P and Diodorus more easily than the rival view that P is Theopompos; cf. pp. 133–7. The style of P hardly suggests so early a date as 375–350, but since in any case he wrote his history before 346 (cf. p. 134) that difficulty is not very serious, and his independence of Xenophon can be explained by supposing that his work was published before Xenophon's Hellenica just as well as by the theory that P intentionally disregarded it. Moreover, the identification of P with Cratippus in preference to Theopompos would provide a possible solution for the mysterious paucity of references to him by name, for if his work was used not only by Ephorus but, as is possible, by Theopompos, it is to some extent intelligible that an author with so colourless a style was soon superseded by those writers and the more elegant Xenophon, although P's great merits as a narrator of facts would still be expected to have rescued him from the almost complete neglect into which Cratippus unquestionably fell.

In the absence of any other historian whose claims to be regarded as the author of the papyrus seem to be worthy of consideration, the choice lies between
Theopompus and Cratippus, and having stated the case for and against both as impartially as we could, we leave the decision to our readers. The positive arguments in favour of identifying P with so shadowy a person as Cratippus are inevitably not very convincing; the strength of his case rests largely on the objections to regarding Theopompus as the author of the papyrus, objections which have led both Prof. Bury and Mr. Walker to endorse the opinion of Blass. For ourselves we should prefer on many grounds to identify P with Theopompus, especially as that view can be supported by some direct evidence—the coincidences with regard to Кαρπασίας and κατάραι; cf. p. 131. The first of these can of course be reconciled with the identification of P with Cratippus by the supposition that Theopompus in the 10th Book of the Hellenica also mentioned the Carpasian leader of the mutiny or that the quotation comes after all from the 10th Book of the Philippica; and the second coincidence by itself would not be very remarkable. Nevertheless they appeal to us on the whole more powerfully than the other arguments for Theopompus, and seem to us to turn the scale slightly in his favour, so that in the heading of 842 we have placed Theopompus' name before that of Cratippus. On the other hand we feel more strongly than Meyer the difficulties (particularly those discussed on pp. 133-7) involved in his attractive hypothesis, which results in proving Theopompus to have been in his youth a greater historian and a worse stylist than has been generally supposed.

Call him by what name we will, our author's work entitles him to be classed among the select band of Greek historians of the first rank, below Thucydides indeed but above Xenophon, and the portions of his history which have been preserved constitute a notable addition to the extant evidence. Not only has it supplied new facts of importance regarding the events of 396-5 and the constitution of Boeotia, and thrown a new and unexpected light upon the sources other than Xenophon available to the later historians, but the agreement between P and Diodorus is bound to have far-reaching consequences. For quite apart from

Col. i (= A Col. i).

υποδετον [. . . . . . .]υσαζεπλευστερηση
 αδηνηθει[. . . . . . .]δημουγνωμης[. . .
 δεδουμαι [. .]οσοκ . .ιοσαυτησκουωσαμενο[
 απορισωτι [. .]ουληφοδεηγεταιπεριπουραγ[. .
 5 επειδη [. .]ξησαναυτω [. .]πολειτωνουθ[
 καταβασειοσπειραιακαικαθ[. . . . .]νιαινεκτ[. .]ν
 νεωσοικωναναγομε[. . . . . . .]δικορ[. .]αθο
the questions of his identity with Theopompus and the relation of Diodorus to that author and Ephorus, the discrepancies between Diodorus and Xenophon with regard to the events of 396–5 are now known to be due to the fact that Diodorus ultimately drew his account of those years from so well informed an authority as P.; and henceforth it will be necessary to take into consideration the probability that throughout the rest of the period from 411–394 the differences between Diodorus and Xenophon, e.g. with regard to the campaign of Thibron and the return of the Ten Thousand, are largely due to the same cause.

The credit of reconstructing the much damaged text of the papyrus is in a considerable measure due to Prof. F. Blass, who at first worked upon a rough copy. In November, 1906 the Greek was put into print, and the proof-sheets of it were revised by him shortly before his death. Proofs were also sent to Profs. E. Meyer and U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, and to the latter we are indebted for a number of valuable suggestions for the restorations of lacunae, &c., which are acknowledged in the notes, while E. Meyer has most generously placed at our disposal the very elaborate historical commentary upon the papyrus which he wrote in the winter of 1906–7, and which will be published shortly. This important contribution of the leading historian of Germany has of course been of inestimable service to us in composing our introduction and notes, though the conditions of some of the problems have been greatly altered by placing Cols. i–iv before v–viii instead of after them, as in the first proofs. Some suggestions on the text are also due to the late Prof. W. Dittenberger and to Prof. B. Nice, who were consulted by Prof. Blass. More recently the proofs of the whole edition were read by Profs. Meyer and Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, who have made some additional suggestions, and by Prof. J. B. Bury and Mr. E. M. Walker. To Prof. Bury we owe several excellent restorations in the text, while Mr. Walker’s criticisms have materially assisted in the elucidation of some of the historical problems connected with the papyrus.

Col. i.

υπὸ δὲ τοῦ[ς αὐτοῦς χρόνο]ν ἐξέπλευσε τριήρης
Ἀθήνηθεν [οὔ μετὰ τῆς τοῦ] δῆμου γυνώμης. ἦδίσ.
δὲ Δημαίν[ετ]’ος ὁ κ. . . ἱος αὐτῆς κοινωσάμενος ἐν
ἀπορ(ρ)ήτῳ τῇ \\ 3

β. c. 396

5 ἐπειδὴ [σφαν]έον τῆσαν αὐτῷ [τιν]’; τῷ ἠμ[εὶ]ν πολιτῶν συγ-
καταβάς εἰς Πειραιᾶ καὶ καθ[ελκύσας] ναῦν ἐκ τῷ ν
νεωσόικων ἀναγόμενον ἐπει[ει πρὸ]ς Κόν[ων]: Θο-
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\[\text{προβοδεμεταταυταγ[...]}\]
\[\text{ναιωναγανάκτοντω[...]}\]
10 \[\text{μοι}[...]\]
\[\text{ναύχαμ[...]}\]
\[\text{πολιναρχοντεσπόλε[...]}\]
\[\text{δαίμον[...]}\]
\[\text{ουσκατάπλαγεντεσοβ[...]}\]
\[\text{θορυβούμ[...]}\]
\[\text{ηγαγοντονήμονοθενπροσ[...]}\]
\[\text{οιουμενομε}\]
\[\text{τεσσχηκεναιτοπραγματοσυνελήνυθος[...]}\]
15 \[\text{τουπληθουσαισταμενοιτωναθηναιω[...]}\]
\[\text{περιθρασυβουλοκαίασιμονκαίαντονείδα[...]}\]
\[\text{σκοναυτουσοτιμεγαναροντακινδυνο[...]}\]
\[\text{μητησοπολιναπολισονιθησαιπαισωνδεάθ[...]}\]
\[\text{ναυνομενεπεικεισκατασονιεσεχοντε}\]
20 \[\text{στεργονταπαροταιδεπολλοκαιδημοτικο[...]}\]
\[\text{τοτεμενφοβηθεντεσεπεισθησαντοισουνβουλευ[...]}\]
\[\text{ουσικαιπεμψαντεσπροσμπωλαναρμοστην[...]}\]
\[\text{τοναιγεινιςείσο[...]}\]
\[\text{αταιτιμωρεισθαι[...]}\]
\[\text{τονδημα[...]}\]
\[\text{τατησοπολεωσται[...]}\]
25 \[\text{πεποιηκοτα[...]}\]
\[\text{προσθ[...]}\]
\[\text{χειδοναπαντατον[...]}\]
\[\text{χρονονεταρ[...]}\]
\[\text{ματακαιπολλατ[...]}\]
\[\text{λακεδαιμο[...]}\]
\[\text{σα[...]}\]
\[\text{πτεναπεπεμ[...]}\]
\[\text{μεγαροπ[...]}\]
\[\text{ρεσιαςεπιτασανασθα[...]}\]
\[\text{μετατουκ[...]}\]
\[\text{φθησανδεπρεσβ[...]}\]
30 \[\text{ωφασαλειπ[...]}\]
\[\text{πι[...]}\]
\[\text{κρατητεκαιγιν[...]}\]
\[\text{ανκαιτελε[...]}\]
\[\text{μορονυσκαισυλλαβωνφαραξ[...]}\]
\[\text{προτεροννααρχοσαπεστελεπροςτουσλ[...]}\]
\[\text{κε[...]}\]
\[\text{δαμκονουσοιαπεκτειαναντονισθαι[...]}\]
\[\text{ουντοδεανταπαροξυνοντονωνετιτο[...]}\]
35 \[\text{επικρατητακεφαλονυχουγαρετεχωνεπι[...]}\]
\[\text{μουντεσμαλιστατηπολυνικαταυτυνεσχο[...]}\]
\[\text{οικεπειδητειμοκρατειδελεχθησανκαι[...]}\]

Col. ii (= A Col. ii).

\[\text{χρυσιον[...]}\]
\[\text{προτερονκατοιτ[...]}\]
\[\text{μελεγ[...]}\]
\[\text{αιταπαρεκεινουχρη[...]}\]
\[\text{ματατ[...]}\]
\[\text{τουσενβωτουσ[...]}\]
842. THEOPOMPUS (OR CRATIPPUS), HELLENICA 145

ρόβου δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα γενομένου,] καὶ τ[ὁν] Ἄθη-
ναίων ἀγανακτοῦντων ὅσοι γνώριμοι κ' αἰ χα-
10 ρίστετες ἦσαν καὶ λεγόντων ὅτι δια[βα][λοῦ]σι τὴν
πόλιν ἄρχοντες πολέμου πρὸς Λακεδαιμονί-
ους, καταπλαγέντες οἱ βουλευταὶ τὸν θόρυβον συν-
ήγαγον τὸν δῆμον οὐδὲν προσ+[π]οιούμενοι με-
tεσχηκέναι τοῦ πράγματος. συνεληλυθότος δὲ
15 τοῦ πλῆθους ἀνιστάμενοι τῶν Ἄθηναίων οἱ τε
περὶ Θρασύβουλον καὶ Λίσιμον καὶ Ἀντωνὸν ἐδίδα-
σκόν αὐτοὺς ὅτι μέγαν αἱροῦνται κύδωνον εἰ
μὴ τὴν πόλιν ἀπολύσωσι τῆς αἰτίας. τῶν δὲ Ἄθη-
nαίων οἱ μὲν ἐπ[ι]εικεῖς καὶ τὰς οὐσίας ἔχοντες ἔ-
20 στεργόντα τὰ παρόντα, οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ καὶ δημοτικοὶ
tότε μὲν φοβηθέντες ἐπείσθησαν τοὺς συμβουλεύ-
ουσι, καὶ πέμψαντες πρὸς Μίλωνα τὸν ἀρμοστὴν
tῶν Ἀγίνης εἰπὸν  ὃπως δὕν]ματα τιμωρεῖσθαι
tὸν Δημαῖνεῖτον, ὡς οὐ μετὰ τῆς πόλεως ταῦτα
25 πεποιηκότα. [ἐμ]προσθ[εν δὲ σ]χεδὸν ἂπαντα τὸν
χρόνον ἑτάρ[ας τὰ] παράγματα καὶ πολλὰ τ[ῶν]
μὲν γὰρ ὅπλα τε καὶ ὑπηρεσίας ἐπὶ τὰς ναὸς τὰς
μετὰ τοῦ Κύωνος, ἐπέπροφθησαν δὲ πρέσβεις
30 ὡς βασιλέα π[. . . . . ο]ι περὶ [.π]ράγματι τε καὶ Ἀγνί-
αν καὶ Τελεσ[ήγ]ορον, οὕς καὶ συλλαβῶν Φάραξ ὁ
πρότερον ναῦσαρχος ἀπέστειλε πρὸς τοὺς Λα[κ]ε-
δαιμονίους οἱ ἀπέκτειναν αὐτοῦς. ἤματι-
οῦντο δὲ ταῦτα παροξυνόντων τῶν περὶ τὸν
35 Ἐπικράτη καὶ Κέφαλον οὕτω γὰρ ἔτυχον ἐπιθυμ-
ζόντας μάλιστα τὴν πόλιν (ἐκπολεμώσας), καὶ ταῦτην (τὴν γνώμην) ἐσχον
οὐκ ἐπειδή Τιμοκράτει διελέξθησαν καὶ [τῇ]

Col. ii.

χρυσίων [ἐλαβόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺ] πρότερον. καῖτοι τι-
vὲς λέγοντον αἰτία γινόσθαι τὰ παρ᾿ ἑκείνου χρῆ-
ματα τοῦ σ][][στήναι τούτους καὶ] τοὺς ἐν Βοωτοῖς

I.
κατουσι[...].,·αίσπροερημεναι[...]
5 ουκειδοτεσσατριττ[...].γεβεβηκείπαλαι
dισμενοσχείν[...].·νακαίακοπει—
οπωσεκτολεμω[...].τ[...].σεμεισωνυγαροι
μεναργειοικαβοη[...].γωσταίτουμαλκε
δαμνοινουστοισενει[...].στωνπολειτων
10 αυτοισεχροντοφιλιοισ[...].δι[...].νταεισαθηναισεπι
θυμουντεαπαλλαξατι[...].σαθηρα[...].ουσθησι[...]
συχιασκαιτησειρηνησκαι[...].οαγαγεινεπιτοπο
λεμεινκαι[...].σπρ[...].μονεινίαντοισεκτων[...]
κοινωνηχρηματιζεσ[...].αιτωνδεκορύθιονι[...]
15 οιμεταστησαιταπρα[...].αταζητουντεσοιμε—
αλλοιτοισαργειοισκατοισισβωισιστυχονυμ[...].
νωοδιακειμενοιπροστουσλακεδαιμονιουστ[...].
λασδεμονουσαυοίσδιαφορούγενσοιδ[...].ωνεγ[...]
κληματωνενεκαπροτεροναρίσταδιακειμεν[...].
20 καιμαλισταλακωνίωνωσεξεστικατακαμαθει[...]
eκτονκατατουπολεμονσι[...].βαλτωτουνβεκ[...].
λεικνωνεκυσγαροτεμεμπενταναίανεχων
επορθησετωνησοντισσετοεπαθηναι[...].σο
ουσωνοτεδεμεταδυν[...].ηρωνεισαμφιπολι—
25 καταπλευνασκαιαπαρ[...].νωνετεραστετ[...].ρασ
συνπληρουσαμ[...].σεσειχιοναυμ[...].ω—
tοντρατηγον[...].ιονωσπερειρηκ[...].ον
καιπροτερον[...].ιστασπολεμ[...].ας[...].βε—
ουσαπεντεκ[...].εμψατρια[...].α
30 μεταθεταντα[...].εξωντρηρη[...].κατα
πλευσασεισθας[...].ναπεστηςεταυτην[...].γαθη
ναιωνομενεννενταισπολεσηαισπροει
ρημεναισθιαταπολυμαλλουδιαφαρμα
βαζονκαιτοχρυσιονεπηρμενομεισεινη[...].α—
35 τουσλακεδαιμονιουσδεμιυλωνσσηαγι[...]
νησαμμοστη[...].ωσηκουσταπαρατωναθην[...]
ωσυνσιπληρωσαμενοστρηηδιαταχεω[...].
καὶ τοὺς ἔν τῷ θὰ ἀλλαίς πόλεσί τις προειρήμενας,
5 οὐκ εἴδοτες ὅτι πάντως αὐτοῖς υἱὲβεβήκει πάλαι
 δυσμενῶς ἔχειν [πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ σκοτεῖν
 ὅπως ἐκπολεμῶσοι] ταῖς πόλεισι· ἐμίσουν γὰρ οἱ
 μὲν Ἀργεῖοι καὶ Βοιωτοὶ . . . γασαί τοὺς Λακε-
 δαιμονίους ὅτι τοῖς ἐναὐτοῖς τῶν πολιτῶν
10 αὐτοῖς ἔχοντο φίλοις, [ο]ἱ δ' ἔν ταῖς Ἀθηναῖς ἐπι-
 ϑυμοῦντες ἀπαλλάξαι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους τῆς ἡ-
 συχίας καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ [προ]αγαγεῖν ἐπὶ τὸ πο-
 λεμεῖν καὶ πολυπραγμονεῖν, ἵν' αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν
 κοινῶν ἑρμηνεῖς φοι. τῶν δὲ Κορινθίων
15 οἱ μεταστήσατε τὰ πρᾶγματα βήσοντες οἱ μὲν
 ἄλλοι (παραπλησίως;) τοῖς Ἀργεῖοι καὶ τοῖς Βοιωτοῖς ἐτυχον δυσμε-
 νῶς διακειόμενοι πρὸς τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους, Τ[μέ-
 λαος δὲ μόνοι αὐτοῖς διάφορος γεγονὼς ἔδηȳων ἐγ-
 κλημάτων ἕνεκα, πρότερον ἄριστα διακειόμενος
20 καὶ μάλιστα Λακωνίζων, ὅσ' ἔγειστι καταμαθεῖν
 ἐκ τῶν κατὰ τῶν πόλεμον συμβάντων τὸν Δεκα-
 λεικόν. ἔκεινος γὰρ ὅτε μὲν πεντε)ναίαν ἔχων
 ἐπόρθησε τῶν νήσοις τινὰς τῶν ἐπὶ Ἀθηναίους οὐσῶν,
 ὅτε δὲ μετὰ δυὸ τρίηρων εἰς Ἀμφίπολιν
25 καταπλεύσας καὶ παρ' ἐκείγων ἔτέρας τέταρας
 συμπληρωσάμενος ἐνίκησε Σίχιον ναυμαχίαν τόν
 στρατηγὸν τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ὡσπερ εἰρηκαὶ πο
 καὶ πρότερον, καὶ τριήρεις τὰς πολεμικὰς ἔθαν
 οὕσα πέντε καὶ πλοία ἄν ἐπημύσαν τριάδικον.
30 μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα . . . ἔχων τριήρεις] κατα-
 πλεύσας εἰς Θάσον ἀπέστησε ταῦτα τῇ πο
 Ἀθηναίων. οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι ταῖς προει-
 ρημέναις διὰ ταῦτα πολὺ μάλλον ἦ διὰ Φαρνα-
 βαζὸν καὶ τὸ χρυσὸν ἐπηρμένου μισεὶν ἦς τοῖς
35 τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίους. ὁ δὲ Μίλων ὁ τῆς Ἁλικαρνας (ἡμᾶς ἄρμοστὴς;) ὁς ἦκουσε τὰ παρὰ τῶν Ἀθηναίων,
 συμπληρωσάμενος τριήρη διὰ ταχέων
L 2
Col. iii (=A Col. iii with Frs. 1 and 2).

(Fr. 1)

[i] [i] [e] περιεχομένων περιβολής της σηματικής.
[i] [i] [i] [e] ευκρατής ἔχων δουλείαν ἐνωσάτων.
[i] [i] [i] [e] γενοτικές ἀφοσιωματίζει.
[i] [i] [i] [e] τῆς ἑκατέρας ἀσαντωσαντοῦν.

5 [i] [i] [i] [e] περιεχομένων [i] [i] [e] παραδοξοτατων [i] [i] [e] τοις νεαρεστατον [i] [i] [e] ονεισαγεινανε [i] [i] [e] ονειναδοροτατων [i] [i] [ε] τον ρημα βαντων [i] [i] [e] ετοι [i] [i] [e] έρο ουσια 

10 [i] [i] [i] [e] εις αγαθονεστηκε [i] [i] [ε] αροσταστριηριαστα [i] [i] [i] [ε] κειδεκαταπλευσάστασ [i] [i] [ε] ένενυχαγαραειτω [i] [i] [ε] κενακωσηναπορα [i] [i] [ε] σποπουσσεπτεπτων [i] [i] [ε] άναθεφεραπαβαζονα [i] [i] [ε] παραγενεσαθαιβουλο [i] [i] [ε] αφακεσοναπαλα [i] [i] [ε] προσεμουναυτου διε [i] [i] [ε] έθαλομοιοικατω [i] [i] [ε] ναρχαρχοθεακλαν [i] [i] [ε] ναρχελαιδακατα [i] [i] [ε] ην χρωνονομονεικω [i] [i] [ε] ανησαεσκανων [i] [i] [ε] κιασαλειτουσσαι [i] [i] [ε] ασακτωνοσιδωνιοσ [i] [i] [ε] ιλειτουσταντησι [i] [i] [ε] μητη ναρχελαινφαρ
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εδίωκε τῶν Δημαίνετον ὁ δὲ κατὰ τούτον τίνων
χρόνον ἔτυχε μένων περὶ Θορικόν τῆς Ἀτ-
τικῆς. ἐπειδῆ δὲ προσπλέωσα ἐκεῖνος πρὸς

Col. iii.

[Θορικόν] ἐπεχείρησεν ἐμβαλλεῖν, ὁρμησεν ἐπὶ πολὺ
[προσπλέιν] κρατήσας δὲ ... νυεῶς αὐτῶν τὴν μὲν ὑ-
[φ' αὐτῷ] ναῦν, ὡς χειρον ἤν τὸ σκάφος, αὐτοῦ κατέλιπεν,
[ἐς δὲ] τὴν ἑκεῖνον μεταβιβάζας τοὺς αὐτοῦ ναῦ-
Κόνωνος .......... ὁ δὲ Μἴλων εἰς Ἀγῖναν με-
[τὰ] ............... τὰ μὲν ὄν ἀδρότατα τῶν
[περὶ] τοῦτο συμβάντων
[οί]τως ἔγενετο ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ] τοῦ θερίου τῇ μὲν

IV. 1

B.C. 396

10 ] ἐτὸς ὅγδου ἐνειστήκει.
] αρος τὰς τριήρεις ἀπα-
] ἐκεὶ δὲ καταπλέωσας τὰς
] ἐν, ἔτυχεν γὰρ ἄει τοῦ
] κατεστερευκακῶς ἡν νεώρια

15 ]ς ὅπου συνεπιτίπτεν
] τὸν δὲ Φαρνάβαζον α-
] παραγενόθαι βουλᾶ-
] [μενος]
] [βεῖν]
] [α]ρος μὲν ὅν αὐτοῦ διέ-

20 [τριβεν, ἐπὶ δὲ τὰς ναῦς τῶν Ῥακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν
[συμμάχων ἀφικνεῖται Πόλλοις] νααρχος ἐκ Ῥακε-
[δαιμονίων ............... τῆ]ν Ἀρχελαίδα κατα-
[............. κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐ]τὸν χρόνον Φοινίκων
[............. ἤ]κον ἐνευκοτία νῆς εἰς Καῦνον ὅν

25 [δέκα μὲν ἐπέλευσαν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας α] δὲ λείπουσαι
[ἀπὸ ......................... ζ]ς Ἀκτων ὁ Σιδώνιος
[................. βασι]λεῖ τοῖς ταύτης τῆς
[................. περὶ τῆ]ν νααρχίαν Φαρ-
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30 ]υτωναγοντωνα[παρα
]αιρονταπεριτηναρχη-[πεδουκ[ναυδεπροσ
]θομενοσαναλαβω-[πληρωσαςταστριηρεισ
]σταποται[,υτονκαν
35 ]υνηκ[,μνιανεισεπλευ
]υφαρναβαζουκαιτουκο
]ρη觞[ανηρπερησηπα
]τωναργαματωνος
]ουλετολαβειν[,ατα

40 ] νδεπρ[, [, [,]με[, ]υφιλ[, ]αυ
] οσαπεπεμψεικ[],βασιλε[αφ[,[ ]α
]ηνακηνηραγουλ[, ..., ] ηλθ[,[ ] ν
] παγγειασσεται[, ..., ] εασφ[, [ ]

Col. iv (⇒ A Col. iv).
25 lines lost

26 . [ ]
30 α . [ ]
35 αρχ[ντ[ ]
κουσ[σ[ ]
αντασφ[ ]
40 νανουδ[ ]
εχοντεσ[ ]
ειχονγα[ ]
[νάβαζος ........ παροξυνόμενοι αὐτῶν τῶν παρα-
30 [............. ὁ μὲν οὖν .... ] αρος τὰ περὶ τῆν ἄρχην
[............. τὸ στρατὸν πεδῶν. Κ[ὁ]νων δὲ προσ-
[............. αἰσθάνομεν ἀναλαβῶν
[............. συμπληρώσας τὰς τρίηρεις
[............. στα ποταμῷ τὸν Καί-
35 [νιον καλούμενον εἰς Λύμνην τὴν Κ[α]ννίαιν εἰσέπλευ-
[σε ................. τὸ γ Φαρμβάζου καὶ τοῦ Κό-
[νωνος ................. ]ρη[ς] ἀνήρ Πέρσης πα-
[............. ] τῶν πραγμάτων ὃς
[............. ] ηβ'ούλευ το λαβεῖν [κ'ατα-
40 [............. ] ν δὲ πρ[ ], [ ........ ]με[ ], [ν] φιλ[ ]αυ
[............. ] ὡς ἀπέπεμψαν ὃ[ς] βασιλέα σ'...α-
[............. ] ἡν σκηνήν αὐτοῦ Λ[ ... ]ηλθ'ε ... ]ν
[............. ] παγγείλας δὲ τὰ π[ ... ]εσσα[ ], ]ν

Col. iv.

25 lines lost
26 . [ 
. [ 
α[ 
φε[ 
30 α . [ 
π[ 
β . [ 
τα[ ], ]τα[ 
ποντα[ 
35 ἄρχ[ο]ντ[ 
κους ἱστ[ 
σιν τὰς μ[ 
.ωσιν πρ[ 
.τεκελ[ 
40 νων οὐδ[ 
ἐχοντες [ 
ἐξειν γάρ 
Some columns lost.
2nd hand
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Col. v (= B Col. i with Fr. 3).

Plate IV.

εἰς ὑπέκμακα . . .

μππεων . . .

ενιοὰπτη . . .

στιον ἢμε . . .

τοιαντικ . . .[.]

σ η σιλα . . .[.]

στρατον[.]

κα[.]

πρυ

ταορηταγάμε

ους τανηπαλι

ηστοιαντινηθβας

στοστρατοπεδον

ειν τισσαφερ[.]

λουθειουσελλη[.]

κισχιλιοσκα[.]

μελλαπτονο

σαμενοσχαλε

μυσκαρατα

περεκοινστος

λωσκακρα

στρατηγιας

σαφεταμαχεσθαι

ψυστρατεμα

σας ολεβαρβας

εσκαινωντετα

εκοινταστοσου

μυατοσσφορμας

τειδοντουσελλη

υτεντχορειαν

καταφρονειν

ε

ντασαντους

τουστρατεν

προσβαλου
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Col. v. Plate IV.

}, εἰσὶν δὲ καὶ… VI. 1
τῶν ἱππέων […] B.C. 395
], ἐνοικὶ δὲ πρὶ…
[τιοι, ἢ μὲν [οὖν
] τοιαύτῃ κ[. .].]
[μ. 'Αγησιλαῖος] δὲ 2
tὸ στρατόπεδον
tὸ) Κα[ῖσα]τρι-
[ον πεδίον] τὰ ὅρη ταξάμε-
10 [νος] οι, ταύτη πάλιν
[σας] ἦς τοιαύτῃ φθά-
[σ] τὸ στρατόπεδον
[ε] ειν. Τισσαφέρ' ἡς 3
[δὲ] ἐπηκολούθει τοῖς "Ελλη[σ]ιν
15 [ἐξών] ἵππεας μὲν … α[κισχιλίους κα[.]] μυ-
[ρίους, πεζοὺς δὲ … … … μυρίων ο[.]]<ν ἐλάττους.
[Ἀγησιλαος δὲ] ἤγη[σάμενος χαλε-
[πόν προσβάλλοντας τῶν πολεμίοις ἢ παρατά-
[δωος ἀμύνεσθαι πολὺ τῶν 'Ελληνοι ο[.]]<περέχοντας,
20 [ἐτάξεν ἐν πλινθίῳ τὸ στράτευμα …]λως καὶ κρα-
[τ] στρατηγίας
] σαντα μάχεσθαι
] ον στράτευμα
] σας, οἱ δὲ βάρβα-
25 [ροι] εις καὶ συντετα-
[γμέν] ἔχοντες τοσοῦ-
[τ] δ' ὑματὸς ἀφορμαίν
κα[.]τείδου τοὺς "Ελλη-
[νας] ὡτε τὴν πορείαν
30 [ματος] καταφρονεῖν
[ν] τες αὐτοῖς
] τοῦ στρατεύ-
[ματος] προσβαλοῦ-
(Fr. 3)
λο[ ]
ποτ[ ]
ηγ[ ]

(Ξρ. 3)
δ[ ]
ε[ ]
τε[ ]
λα[ ]

[ ]
[ ]
[ ]
κα[ ]

. α
π[ ]
oi[ ]
e[ ]
φ[ ]

. i[ ]

[ ]
[ ]
[ ]

[ ]
[ ]
[ ]

Col. vi (=B Col. ii).

Plate IV

τακοσιουσδ[ ]·είλουσ· καίτο· ........................................................
ξενοκλεα[ ]·παρτιατητ[ ] ..............................................................
βαδίζουτε[ ]·καταυτουσ[ ] ..............................................................
eισμαχηντ[ ]··ςθαί[ ] .................................................................]

5 αναστησασα[ ]··ςρα··ς[ ]·ρα[ ]·ς[ ] ..................................................]ανη
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35 [θίου] "νον προσέτατ-
[σε] τοὺς δὲ Πελοπό-
[νήσισς καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους] κι προσήγην πο-
[ν] ὁρὰ τοὺς Ἡλλη-
[νέον αἰ., ἔως ἀεὶ]

40 ὁμοίως εἰ. . 'διε-
[ν] ἑγγυτέρῳ μᾶλ-

λοῦν

ποτ[ ] γὰρ ἀμφοτέρῳ .
[τι] προϊντι .

ηγ[ ]

δ[ ] ὄργ., ἑ. . . . . . .
[στρατευμ[ ]]

tε[ ] ἀν[ . . . ] Ἀγνό-
[σι].

λα[ος] δὲ

τ[ ] ἐπονόμ. . . .

π[ ] ἀρασκευαί . .
νοὺς ἱνα τὴ ν · [ . .

κα'τα [ν] ἑμοῦσι [ . . .

t[ ] ὄμην πολλ[ ].

π[ ]

ο[ ] [ ]

e[ ] [ ]

ο[ ] τῶν τῆς νυκτ[ ]

60 . ο[ ]

μὲν ὁπλίτας [ . . . ]

Col. vi. Plate IV.

τακωσῖον δέ νυμοῖς, καὶ το[ῦτοις ἕπεστίσεν ἄρχοντα
ἴσονεκλέα [Σ]παρθίατην παγγείλας ὅταν γένονται
βαδιζοντε[s] κατ' αὐτοὺς . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
εἰς μάχην τάσσεθα. [εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπιοῦσαν . . . ]

5 ἀναστήσας ὁμα ἡμίρης [τ]ὸ [στ]ρᾳ[τε]ν μα πάλιν ἀνή-
γενειστοπ[.....]δεβαρβαροισνω[.....]αντεσ
ωσειωθεσα[.....]ναγτωνπροσεβαλλ[.....]τουσελη
σινοιδεπ[.....]νοναντουσοιδε[.....]τατοπε
διονατακτ[.....]ηκολουθουνοιδε[.....]νοκλησ
10 επειδηκαιρ[.....]ελαβενεναινοτοσπολεμίουσεπι
χειρεινανα[.....]σαεκτησενεδραστουσπελοσ-
νησιουσεωθ[.....]ομωτωνδεβαρβαρωνωσεδουνε
cαστοιπρόσθε[.....]γαστουσεληνασοεφευγουκαθα
tοπεδινουαγ[.....]αοηδεκατιδωνεπεφοβημενουσαν
15 τουσεπεμπεποποτουστρατευματοστουστεκουφουσ
[.]ονοστρατιωτωνκατουσιππεσονδιαδρουσκεινους-
οιδεμετατωνεκτησενεδρασσασταντςενεκειντο
τωνδεβαρβαρων[.]επακολουθησωμεταδεκτοιαπολεμ[.]οσ
ουλιανπολ[.]χρονουουγαρ[.....]ναντοκαταλαμβα
20 νευεαντουσατετ[.]μπολλων[.]εωνοντωνκαιν
μησωνκαταβαλλουσιμεν[.]τουπερειξακοσι
ουσεαποσταντεσεδεχασδω[.....]σεβ[.]δε[.]ονεπαν
τουστρατοσεδουτωνβα[.....]βοι[.....]παλαβον
τεσδεφυλακηνουσπιουδαι[.....]αθε[.]σανταχε
25 ωσαιρουσικαι[.]λαμβανουσιμωτω[.....]λημενα
γορανουχο[.....]δεανθρωπο[.]σι[.]πολλ[.]σκευηκαι
χρηματαμεν[.]ναλλωνταδισεσαφε[.....]αυτου(1st hand)γε
νομενησαετ[.]μαχηησταιμη[.]σοιμε[.]βαροικα
ταπλαγεντες[.....]εληνασαπεχωρησε[.....]σατισ
30 σαφερειπροστασσαρσειαγησιλασσεδεηρ[.....]νασαν
τουτερευμερασεναιστουσκυουσποπι[.]δουσαη
δωκεντισωπ[.]λεμιοισκατροπαιονεστη[.]καιη-
γηναπασαν[.....]σενεπρογενετσηρ[.]μαειο
φυγιανπαλιν[.]μεγαληνποιειοτδε[.]μπορειαο
35 ουκετιενντεγμενοσεχωνεντωπο[.]νθειωτουσ
στρατιωτασαλλεγναυτουσσουενηβουλοντοτησχω
ρασπεπεικακακωσαιο[.....]πολεμ[.]ουσισαφερ
νησδενυθομενουστουσ[.....]αδιξειειστοπροσθε
αναλαβωνανδιστουςβ[.....]πη[.....]θειοπισθεν
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γεν εἰς τὸ πρὸςθέν. οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι συνακολουθήσαντες ώς εἰώθεσαν οἱ μὲν αὐτῶν προσέβαλλον τοῖς Ἕλληνσιν, οἱ δὲ ἔπει. ἤπειροι, οἱ δὲ κα' ἄτα τὸ πεδίον ἀπάκτως ἐπηκολουθοῦν. ὁ δὲ Ξ[ε]νοκλῆς,

10 ἐπειδὴ καὶρ[ο]ν ὑπέλαβεν εἰναί τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐπι-

χειρεῖν, ἀνα' στήθας ἐκ τῆς ἐνέδρας τοὺς Πελοπο-

νησίωσιν ἐν τοῖς ὑπότεθθησαν ἐκείνους. οἱ δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἐνέδρας ἀναστάτων ἐνεκέιντο τοῖς βαρβάροις. ἐπακολουθήσαντες δὲ τοῖς πολεμίοις οὐ λιαν πολύν χρόνον, οὐ γὰρ [ὑ]δύφαντο καταλαμβά-

15 τοῖς ἐπεμπειν ἀπὸ τοῦ στρατεύματος τοὺς τε κούφους τοὺς ὑπερτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἰππέας διώκοντας ἐκεῖνους. οἱ δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἐνέδρας ἀναστάτων ἐνεκέиντο τοῖς βαρβάροις. ἐπακολουθήσαντες δὲ τοῖς πολεμίοις οὐ λιαν πολύν χρόνον, οὐ γὰρ [ὑ]δύφαντο καταλαμβά-

20 νείν {ε} αὐτοῦς ἀτε τῷ πολλῷ [ἵππεων ὄντων καὶ γυ-

μνήτων, καταβάλλουσιν μὲν [αὐ]τῶν περὶ ἑξακο-

δοις, ἀποστάντες δὲ τῆς διώξεως ἐβάζεις ὕπα ἀυ-

tὸ τὸ στρατόπεδο τὸν βαρβάρον. [κα']' ταλαβόν-

25 τε δὲ φυλακήν οὐ σφουδαζός κἀθεστῶσαν ταχέ-

ος αἰρόντων, καὶ ίλαμβάνουσιν [αὐ]τῶν [πολλῆς] μὲν ἀ-

γορᾶν συχνοῦσι δὲ ἀνθρώποις, πολλὰ δὲ σκευή καὶ 

χρήματα (τὰ) μὲν [τῶν ἄλλων τὰ δ') Τισσαφεῖροις, αὐτοῦ. γε- VII.1 

νομένης δὲ τῆς μάχης τοιαί[τ]ῆς οἱ μὲν βαρβάροι κα-

tαπαλγέντες τούς Ἐλληνας ἀπεχώρησαν [ο]υ τῷ Τισ-

30 σαφέρει πρὸς τὸς Σάρδεις Ἀγησίλαος δὲ περιμεῖνας αὐ-

tοῦ τρείς ἡμέρας, ἐν αἰσ τοὺς νεκροὺς ὑποσπάζουσιν ἀπε-

δώκεν τοῖς πολεμίοις καὶ τρόπαιον ἐστη[σε] καὶ τῆν 

gῆν ἀπασαν ἐπάθησαν, προῆγεν τὸ στρατόμαχος εἰς 

Φυγών πάλιν [τὴν] μεγάλην. ἐποιεῖτο δὲ [τῆ]ν πορείαν 

35 οὐκέτι συντεταγμένοις ἔχον ἐν τῷ πλανιθῶ τοὺς 

στρατιώτας, ἀλλ' ἔδω αὐτοῦς ὡς ἦμελεντο τῆς χώ-

ρας ἐπιέναι καὶ κακῶς ποιεῖν τοὺς] πολεμίοις. Τισσαφέρ-

ης δὲ πυθόμενος τοῦς Ἐ[λ]ληνας βαρβάρους ἐς τὸ πρόσθεν 

ἀναλαβόν αὐτοῖς τοὺς β[αρβάρους ἐπησκόλοθει ὁπισθὲν
Col. vii (= B Col. iii with Frs. 4–6 and Fr. 7 Col. i).

(Fr. 4)

[...]

λαοσμενον[

δρουκαλομενο[

κ[...

[...] εριτουτου[

τ[...

[...] ατηγομα[

δ[...] τιωσαφερη[

ετ[...

[...] υσεληνα[

οι[...

νονκαμα[

10 λο[...

με[...

ε[...

συ[...

αφ[...

ση[...

[...] ερ[...

15 δια[...

[...] απαρ[ (Fr. 5)

λο[...

κ[...] οιτ[...

σ[...

οργ[...

αυτωκαθη[...] οἱ[...] αδ[...]
40 αὐτῶν πολλοὺς σταδίων διέχων. Ἀγγείλαος μὲν οὖν....
3 τὸ πεδίον τὸ τῶν Λυδῶν [ἡγε τὴν στρατιάν [........] διὰ τῶν ὄρων τῶν διὰ μέσον κε[μένων ...] τῆς Λυδίας] καὶ τῆς Φυγιᾶς· ἐπειδὴ δὲ διεστρεφθησαν ταῦτα κατεβασάση
tούς Ἄλληνας εἰς τὴν Φυγιάν ἐσοὶ ἀφίκοντο πρὸς τὸν
45 Μαῖανδρον ποταμόν, διὸ.... ἰδίου ἀπὸ Κελαι-
νῶν, ἢ τῶν ἐν Φυγιᾷ μεγίστῃ [πόλις ἠστίν, ἐκδιώκουν
eis θάλατταν παρὰ Πριήνην κ[αί].... καταστρα-
tοπεδεύσας δὲ τούς Πελοποννησίους καὶ τοὺς
[σ᾽]υμμάχους ἐθύσε πότερα χ[ρή] δὲ[βαί]νειν τὸν ποτα-
50 μὸν ἢ μῆ, καὶ βαδίζειν ἐπὶ Κελαινᾶς ἢ πάλιν τοὺς
στρατιώτας ἀπάγειν. ὡς δὲ συνέβαινεν αὐτῷ μῆ
gίγνεσθαι καλὰ τὰ ἱερὰ, περιμε[ναὶ ἐκεῖ τὴν τ᾽] ἡμέ-
ραν ἦν παρεγένετο καὶ τὴν ἐπιοίζοντα ἀπῆγεν τὸν

Col. vii.

[στρατὸν] ....... Ἀγγείλαος μὲν οὖν ....
3 [........] τὸ πεδίον τὸ Μαῖανδρον καλούμενον
νεμονται Λυδιοί
κ[........] ....... δὲ βασιλεὺς

5 [........] ποτὲ τοὺς τίς [........] στρατηγὸν ἀμα
dὲ [........] Τισσαφέρνη
ετ[........] ....... τοὺς Ἐλλήνας
οὶ [........] ....... νὸν καὶ μᾶλ-
10 λο[........] ....... δίχα κεί-
με[ν] ε[ς[...

σὺ[........] Τισσαφ[έρνη
οὴ[........] Ἀρταξ[έρξ][........]

15 δια[........] ....... ἀπαρ[........]
λο[........] .......] κα[........] ριτε[........] σα[........]
οργ[........] .......] αὐτῷ κατηγ[........] α[........] εἰ[........]
σα[...].τεβασιλευσαμολογουν[τ].μαλιστ[δ][...].σαφερνυκασφε[...].εκεινου[20] παντωνκαθατιθρα[...].υτονκα[...].
οσεπειδηκαταφ[...].γιανκαλυβδ[το[...].ειμενεμψ[...].ολασασεφεφ[ρα[...].προσαρ[...].σαφ[...].νη[επ[...].οπροσμε[...].αιν[...].ςα[...].]
25 στ[...].[αβεινεκε[...].αιδ[εν[...].υτουγε[...].ται[πε[...].νουτο[...].ου[λω[...].ρε[...].ελλενηχ[σι[...].θραυσ[ (Fr. 7 Col. i.)
30 τα[...].[τ][...].δε[ροκρε[...].[ρ][...].
ριζεσθ[οποτε[ (Fr. 6)
35 φερνη[...].πεστειλεντ[αρ[...].[νατοτισσαφερη[...].]κ[β[ελτισσοιτωστρ[...].γω[...].]ανετε[δω[...].ερονεζειν[...].ατατη[...].ραπα[ουκ[...].ημενουπερ[...].]γμαγυ[...].]ανεμ[των[...].κατωνυπε[...].ωπρο[ε[...].]κειμενου[λτ[...].ςαλεηπο[ρ[.]σφ[βοιλομενος[...].π[...].]
40 στρατευματ[.]

Col. viii (= Fr. 7 Col. ii).
842. THEOPOMPUS (OR CRATIPPUS), HELLENICA 161

σαὶ...τε βασιλεῖς ὄραθομονυν[... ] μάλιστα...

di[...] Τισσαφέρνην καὶ σαί[...]ων ἐκεῖνον [...]

20 πάντων καθ' ἂ Τιβρα[...]τής α' ύτων κα[... ] ...

δὲ ἐπειδὴ καταφ[...] Φρύγιαν καὶ Λυβίαν [...]

to[... ]en ἀνέπεμψε[...]πῶλας ἂς ἐφερε'...

ρα[...]πρὸς ᾿Αρ[...]ον Τιςαφ[...]ρη[...]

ἐπ[...]ο πρὸς Με[... ]ιον ὡς α'[... ]

25 στ[... ]λαβεῖν ἐκεῖ[...]αιδ[... ]

e[...]πον γε[...]παί[... ]

πε[...]οντο[...]ον[... ]

λο[...]ν ἔμελλεν η[... ]

σιν[... ]Τ[...]βα[...]τ[... ]

30 τα[...]π[... ]

do[...]τῆς

ἀποκρε[...]μ[... ]

ριε[...]ο[... ]

ὁπότε α'[... ] Τισσα-

35 φέρνη[... ]ἀπέστειλεν τ[... ]ο αρ[...]ο

῾Αρ[...]ο[...]ο εἰς Σάρδης το[... ]ονον[... ] δυ-

νατός Τισσαφέρνη[... ] μι[... ]

βελτιστοὶ τῶν στρατη[...]ον[... ] ιαν ἐτε[...] ἀκιν-

dυμ[...]ερον ἔφειν τ[...]κ[...]τ[...]ον ο[... ] σα[...]παλα[...] ᾿Αγησιλά-

40 ου κα[...]ημένον περὶ [τ]γ[...]ν Μαγνή[...]ον[... ] ἐμ[... ]


ἀλ[...]ο[... ] ἀλλ[...] πο[...] ο[... ] αν[... ]

βουλόμενος δι[...]π[...] [... ]

45 στράτευμα τ[... ] [... ]

Col. viii.

2 lines lost

[... ]

[... ]
5 παρταξ[]
   ταμερα[]
   αυτονα[]
   γιασεπια[]
   τονιθρ[]
10 φερνησ[]
   πραξινα[]
   κοδομε[]
   πολεωσ . [
   υποτων[]
15 εβαδ[]
   τωνιθρα[]
   σ[.]αιπα[]
   επιστολα[]
   προπτηνα[]
20 τισκακτα . [
   εμειλη[]
   ψασκαία . [
   τηρειειο[]
   αριαμον[]
25 ταδεταν[]
   διατρειβω[]
   ματιαγ[]
   νονσυναρ[]
   καμεταπ[]
30 [.].λοι . νιπ[]
   σνεξ[]
   μεν . [
   τησθ[]
   ελεγ[]
35 [.].βα[. .].εω[]
   τα[.]σεπιστολ[]
   [.].ετοβυβλ[]
   [.].ττενβασι[]
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5 π' Ἀρταξέρξης
τα ἡμέρας
αὐτὸν ἁ:
γίας ἐπια[]
tὸν Τιθραύστην
Φρυ-

10 φέρνης []
πράξων α[]
κοδομεί[ί]ν
πόλεως . []
υπὸ τῶν []
oi-

15 ἐ βαδί[
τῷ Τιθραύστην
σ[.]ς]αὶ παρα[
ἐπιστολ[δ]ς
πρὸς τὴν α[]

20 τιας κατα . []
. ἐ Μιλη[σ]ι
ψας καὶ τα . []
τὴρεν εἰς []
'Αριαῖον ε[
κα-

25 τὰ δὲ ταῦτα
diatrīβῶν
ἰμάτια τ[]
νον συναρ[πα]
καὶ μεταπ[]
κα-

30 [. .]λοι . ν ἐπ[π]
συνεχ[]
μεν . []
τῆς δ[]
ἐλεγ[ε
με-

35 τὸ πρὸ βα[σ]ίλ[ε]ως []
tα[.]ς ἐπιστολ[α]ς
[. .]ε τὸ βυβλί[ο]ν
[. .]τεν βασιλ[ε]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

[. . . .]πυραμωνι[
40 [. . . .] εινεκ [.
[. . . .]ληναναγ[
[. . . .]μπαρβαρω[

Col. ix (= C Col. i with Frs. 8 and 9).

15 lines lost

16 [. . . .]

20 [. . . .]

(Fr. 8)

[. . . .]

(Fr. 9)

25 [. . . .]

Col. x (= C Col. ii with Fr. 10).

νοτη[. . . .]

αμαμε[...]

απθο[. . . .]

μαδε[. . . .]

5 [. . . .]ματ[

ηρημενονπαρζ[. . . .]

dιεκει[. . . .]

[. . . .]

[. . . .]

10 καιβιαζ[. . . .]

χρονομη[. . . .]

πολλησομα[. . . .]

ομο[. . . .]

κω[. . . .]

15 μαστηνηζ[. . . .]

. τερουσε[. . . .]

ητοι[. . . .]

νοσδετη[. . . .]

κεχρημε[. . . .]

20 ναστενοντω[. . . .]

γασκιδη[. . . .]

μεταπεμ[. . . .]

κενατιδ[. . . .]

τωνπλειο[. . . .]

25 [. . . .]

(Fr. 10) [. . . .]ωφ[. . . .]
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[... ] αὐτὸν ἀναγεννησαίναι

40 [... ] ἐν ἐκ [...] [ἀ]ληθεῦν ἀναγεννησαίναι
[τῷ]ν βαρβάρων

Some columns lost.

Col. ix. Col. x.

15 lines lost

IX να[,]
καγα- ἄμα μὲν [...]ον [...]ον [...]ον [...]
### THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

| Theodore | 80\[Ke\]| 7\(\tau\)(ra)\[\tau|y\]| Fragments probably belonging to Col. x. |
|----------|---------|----------------|----------------|
| **Fr. 11.** | ![Fragment 11](image1) | **Fr. 12.** | ![Fragment 12](image2) |
| ![Fragment 13](image3) | ![Fragment 14](image4) | ![Fragment 15](image5) |
Fragments probably belonging to Col. x.

Fr. 11.

\[ \eta \lambda \omega \sigma e v [ \]
\[ d o \varsigma a i [ \]
\[ k e d a i m o n \]
\[ 3o t o v \]
\[ p a s a \]
\[ t o v \]

Fr. 12.

\[ \ldots [ \]
\[ \ldots [ \]
\[ \ldots [ \]
\[ \ldots [ \]
\[ \ldots [ \]

\[ \alpha t e d [ \]
\[ 5 \]
\[ t o v p a r \prime \epsilon k e i v [ \]
\[ \ldots [ \]
\[ \ldots [ \]
\[ \lambda a \theta e [ \]

Fr. 13.

\[ \ldots [ \]
\[ \ldots [ \]
\[ \ldots [ \]
\[ \theta [ \]

Fr. 14.

\[ \omega [ \]
\[ \mu [ \]

Fr. 15.

\[ \sigma e i [ \]
\[ o [ \]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Col. xi (= D Col. i).

[...]σβο[...]
[...]ημε[...]ανεγητ[...]
[...]εντωλιμεν[...]
[...]μντεσχειρουσ[...]

5 [...]υοσδεπαρασκε[...]
[...]δωσινετοσ[...]
[...]τεργουσεπεχειρ[...]
[...]οραντονεγετα[...]
[...]τρηνονεχεπλευ[...]

10 [...]αρειναιτηδιαφθο[...]
[...]αινεικοφμωπροσ[...]
[...]γματωνουσιναυτοπ[...]
[...]εριμεινα[...]
[...]εκεινηητημεραπι[...]
[...]πονεγετα

15 [...]τουσμεναυτωπαρηγα[...]
[...]ανοπλοισει[...]
[...]λυμενα[...]φαδμεικρον[...]
[...]σαγοραστω[...]
[...]ροδιωνουσινειδοτηςενηπ[...]
[...]συπελαβω[...]
[...]αιρονεχειρειναιαυτοσεργ[...]
[...]νελεγοντο
[...]ψευχειριδιοσειστηναγορανκαιδοριμαχο[...]

20 [...]εναυτωναβασεπιτολιθονοπερειωθεικη[...]
[...]ττεινοκηρονανακραγωνοσηδυναμεγιστο[...]
[...]φμενωοδρεσεφηπολειταιεπιτουστυραννουσ[...]
[...]ταχιστηνοιδελουσιβοσαντοσεκενουτη[...]
[...]θειανειοπηθηςαντεσεμετευχειριδωειστασευ[...]

25 [...]βριατωναρχωναποκτεινουσινουστεδιαγο[...]
[...]ουσκαιτωκαλλωπολιτωνινδεκαδιαπραξα[...]
[...]ενοδεταυταυσυνυνουτπληθοστωτοροδων[...]
[...]σεκκλησιαναρτιδεσυνελεγμενωναυτωνκορω[...]
[...]ηκεπαλινεκκανουμενατωντρηρωνοιδετη[...]
Some columns lost.

Col. xi.

\[\ldots\] β\(\ldots\). \[\ldots\] .

[στην] ἡμέραν ἡξῆ[α]τε τοὺς στρατιώτας] συν τοῖς ἀ-
[πλοῖσι] ἐν τῷ λιμένι, προφασιζόμενος μὲν ἵνα μὴ βρα-
[θομοῖν] τε χείρους [γείωνται πρὸς τὸν] πολέμων, βου-
5 [λόμε]νος δὲ παρασκεύασας ἡσύχειος τοὺς Ῥοδίους
[όταν ἐ]δώσαν ἐν τοῖς ὁ[πλοῖσι] αὐτοῦς παρὼν] τα τηνκαί-
[τα τοῖς] ἔργοις ἐπιχειρεῖ[ν. ἔπει δὲ συνήθη] πᾶσιν ἐποί-
[ησεν] ὁρὰν τὸν ἐξετασμόν, αὐτὸς μὲν εἰκόσι λαβὼν
[τοὺς] τρήρας ἐξέπλευσήσεν εἰς Καῖνον, βουλόμενος
10 [μὴ] παρείναι τῇ διαφθο[ρᾷ τῶν Διαγορείων], Ἰεραπύρω
[δὲ καὶ] Νικοφήμω προσε[ταξεν ἐπιμεληθήναι τῶν
[πραγμάτων] οὐσιν αὐτοῦ πα[ρέδρους. οἱ π]εριμείναν-
[τες] ἔκεινην τὴν ἡμέραν, πα[ρόντων ἐπὶ] τὸν ἐξετα-
[σμὸν] τῇ υστεραίᾳ τῶν στρατι[ωτῶν καθά]περ εἰσόθε-
[σαν,] τοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν παρήγα[γον σὺν τοῖς ὁπλοῖς εἰς
[τὸν] λιμένα, τ[ο]ῦς δὲ μικρὸν [ἀπὸ τής] ἁγορᾶς. τῶν
[δὲ] Ῥοδίων οἱ συνειδότες τὴν π[ράξειν, ὦ]ς ὑπέλαβον
[καὶ] αρὸν ἐγχειρεῖν εἶναι τοῖς ἐργ[οῖς, συνελέγοντο
[σὺν] ἑγχειριδίοις εἰς τὴν ἁγοράν, καὶ Δαρμάχος
20 [μέν] τις αὐτῶν ἀναβᾶς ἐπὶ τῶν λιθῶν οὕτε εἰσήκει κη-
[ροῦ]στειν ὁ κῆρυξ, ἀνακραγὼν ὡς ἡδύνατο μέγιστον,
[ἰ]ς μεν, ὃς ἀνδρείας ἐφή, πολιτικήν, ἐπὶ τοὺς τυράννους
[τῇ] ταχύστην. οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ βοήσαντο ἐκεῖνον τὴν
[βοήθειαν εἰσποθήσαντες μετ' ἑγχειριδίων εἰς τὰ συν-
25 [ἐ]δρια τῶν ἀρχῶν τῶν ἀποκτείνουσι τοὺς τὰς Διαγο-
[ρείας καὶ τῶν ἁλλῶν πολιτῶν ἐνδέκα, διαπραξῆ-
[μένου δὲ ταῦτα συνήγων τὸ πλῆθος τὸ τῶν Ῥοδίων
[εἰς] ἐκκλησίαν. ἀρτι δὲ συνειδημένων αὐτῶν Κόνων
[ἡ]κε πάλιν ἐκ Καῖνον μετὰ τῶν τρήρων· οἱ δὲ τὴν
30 σφαγηνεξεργασαμενοικαταλυσαντεστηνπαρουσα
πολειτειανκατεστησανδημοκρατιανκατωνπο
λειτουντινασωλιγουσφυγαδασεποιησανμενου
επαναστασισηπεριτημπροδευτουστοτελουσελα
βεν βοιωτοιδεκαφωκειστουνουθερουεισ

35 πολεμοικατεστησανεγενοντοδετησεκθρασαντω
[].τιομαλιστατωνεντασθηβαιστινεσσωγαρπολλοι
[].τεσυνπροτετυχωνεσσαστασιασμονοιβωτοι
προελθουντεσειχελεταπραγματατοικα[]..τη·
βοιωτιανουτωσησανκατεστησκουιαβουλιατ[]]

Col. xii (= D Col. ii).

5 τετετσα[.....]καστητωνπολεωνων[I.....]
τοιςπολε[.....]μετεχεινα[.....]τοισκεκ[.....]
πληθοστ[.....]τωντουτωνδειωβουλω[.....]
μεροσεκασ[.....]θημενηκαιροθουλε[.....]

5 δεδοξεν[.]απασιστουτουκυριονεγυινεκ[.....]
ιδιαδιετελουντοδιοικουμενοιοδετα[.....]
οτωντουτοντοντροπονσυντεταγμενοι[.....]
δεκαμερηδιηντοπαινεσοιτηνχοραντικουν[.....]

10 καιτουτωνεκστονεναπαρειχετοβουκταρχιου[.....]
θηβαιομενεντεταρασυνεβαλλοντονομινεπε[.....]
πολεωνοδυναευπερπλαταιεονοισκωλουκαερ[.]θροθι.
κασκαφωνκαιτωναλλωνχωρωντουνπροτερον
μεμεκενοιςσυνπολειτουμενωντετεδενυτε[.....]

15 λωντωνειστασθηναδυονεπαρειχοντοβουκαρχιας
ορχομενοικαισικαινοιδυναθεσπιειςσυνεντρησην
καυτασβαιενεδεθεναγραοικαπελεντερωναλιαρ
τιοκαιλεβαδειακαιρωνεσεσυνεπεμπεκαταμε
ροσεκακτητωνπολεωντουνουθετεροννε

20 βαδιζεξενεκασκαιμουκακουκαιχαιρωνειας
οντωμενονεφεσερεμερητουσαρχιακυπαρειχε
τοδεκαβουλευτασκηκοντακατατοντονβουκταρχον
30 σφαγήν ἐξεργασάμενοι καταλύσαντες τὴν παρούσαν πολιτείαν κατέστησαν δημοκρατίαν, καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν τινὰς ὄλγους φυγάδας ἐποίησαν. ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐπανάστασις ἦ περὶ τὴν Ῥώδου τούτο τὸ τέλος ἐλαβεῖν. Βοιωτοὶ δὲ καὶ Φωκεῖς τούτῳ τοῖς θέρους εἰς πόλεμον κατέστησαν. ἐγένοντο δὲ τῆς ἐχθρᾶς αὐτῶς [αἵτινες μάλιστα τῶν ἐν ταῖς Θηβαίς τινές: οὐ γὰρ πολλοῖς [ἐπισεον πρότερον ἐτυχον εἰς στασιασμὸν οἱ Βοιωτοὶ προελθόντες. εἰσὶ δὲ τὰ πράγματα τότε καὶ τὰ] τὴν Βοιωτίαν οὕτως ἦσαν καθεστηκυία βουλαὶ τό—

Col. xii.  
Plate V.

τε τέταρτες παρ’ ἐκάστῃ τῶν πόλεων, ὡν ὅλη ἀπασι τοῖς πολιτείαις ἐξῆν μετέχειεν ἀλλὰ τοῖς κεκτημένοις πλῆθος τὶ χρημάζουν, τούτων δὲ τῶν βουλῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐκάστη προκαθημένη καὶ προβουλεύσασα

5 περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων εἰσεθέρεν εἰς τὰς τρεῖς, δ’ τι δ’ ἐδοξέων ἐν ἀπάσι τούτῳ κύριον ἐγίγνετο. καὶ τα μὲν ἰδίᾳ διετέλουσαν οὕτω διοικούμενοι, τὸ δὲ τῶν Βοιωτῶν τούτον ἦν τὸν τρόπον συντεταγμένον. [καθ’ ἑνέκεια μέρη διήρηντο πάντες οἱ τὴν χώραν οἰκουντες,

10 καὶ τούτων ἐκαστὸν ἕνα παρείχετο Βοιωτάρχην [ὅδε: Θήβαιοι μὲν τέταρτας (σ)υνεβάλλοντο, δύο μὲν ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως, δύο δὲ ὑπὲρ Πλαταιέων καὶ Σκόλου καὶ Ἐρ[ν]θρῶν καὶ Σκαφῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων χωρίων τῶν πρότερον μὲν ἐκείνους συμπολιτευόμενον τότε δὲ συντε-]

15 λώτων εἰς τὰς Θῆβας. δύο δὲ παρείχοντο Βοιωτάρχας Ὀρχομένιοι καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι, δύο δὲ Θεσπιεῖς σὺν Εὐτρήσει καὶ Θάρβας, ἕνα δὲ Ταναγραῖοι, καὶ πάλιν ἔτερον Ἀλιάρτιοι καὶ Λεβαδεῖς καὶ Κορωνεῖς, ὃν ἐπεμπε κατὰ μέρος ἐκάστη τῶν πόλεων, τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον ἐ-

20 βάδιζεν εἰς Ἀκραιφῆνα καὶ Κοπῶν καὶ Χαιρωνείας. οὕτω μὲν οὖν ἐφερε τὰ μέρη τούς ἀρχοντας: παρεῖχετο δὲ καὶ βουλεύτας ἐξήκοντα κατὰ τὸν Βοιωτάρχην,
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

κατωτοισαντιτακαθημερανανηλισκονεπτετα
κτοδεκαστρατιαεκαστωμερειπεριχιλιονσμεν

λ 25 οπλειταιππεαδεκακατοσοσηλωσαικατα
tοναρχοντακαιτωνκοιωναπελανουκαιτασε[...]
φο
ρασετοιονικαδικασεπεμπονκαιμετεχοναπαι
tωνομοωνκατωνκακωνκαιτοναγαθωντομεν
σουεθοσολονοσοσεπολειτουτοικατασυνεδρια

κατακοινατωνβωτωνενηκαθμειασυνεκα
θειενενδηαθηθυλετυχονοιβελτιστοκαιγω
ριμοτατοιοπολειτωνοσεπερκαιπροτερνειρη
cατασιαζουσεποσαλληλουσηγουστουτομε
ρουστουμενισμηναισκ[...].αντιθεοσκαιανδροληγ

35 τουδελεντιαδηνασιασκακορρανταδασεφρο
νουνδετωπολειτουμουνουμενεπεριτοπεουντε
αδηναλακεδαιμονον[...].ιδεπετονισμηναν
ατιανμενειχονατικεινεινεωθυμνοποθυμιοπροσ
τουδηνογενουτωσεφυγουμουνησφρον

Col. xiii (= D Col. iii).

[... . . .]τε[. . .].θηναιοναλλει[...]
[. . . .]. π[. . . .]. ερχονεπειοτ[...]
[. . . .] . τρ[. . .]. Ρουντομαλλ[...]
[. . . .]. ξκακωστοιενετοιμουσα[...]

5 [. . .].σεινδιακ[. . .].μεκουνδεωνε
d[. . .].αισιεταιριασεκα[. . .].σαί[...]
[. . .].σαθονπολλοικαιτωνενταισι[...]
[. . .]. λυβωτιανκ[. . .].με[. . .].χονεκ[...]
[. . .]. ουκεκινουσεδυναμισε[...]

10 [. . .]. ρωπτοτερονοιε[. . .].μεν[...]
[. . .]. ροκλεδη[. . .].καιπαραυοιοτ[. . .].αι
[. . .]. ηηβο[. . .]. ητονθιοντευετρ[...]
[. . .]. νοι[. . .]. κοτωνοστιανκαιλοντ[...]
[. . .]. υονυχονατηανπολινιαπ[. . .]. χον

15 [. . .]. ξαρπολομουντεσοιλακεδαιμ[. . .]. ά
καὶ τούτως αὐτοὶ τὰ καθ' ἡμέραν ἀνήλικοι. ἐπετέτακτο δὲ καὶ στρατιὰ έκάστῳ μέρει περὶ χιλίων μὲν
25 ὀπλίταις ἱππεῖς δὲ ἐκατόν ἀπλῶς δὲ δηλώσας κατὰ τῶν ἀρχοντῶν καὶ τῶν κοινῶν ἀπέλαυνον καὶ τὰς εἰςφορὰς ἐποιοῦντο καὶ δικαστὰς ἐπεμποῦν καὶ μετείχον ἀπάντων ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν κακῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν. τὸ μὲν οὖν ἔθνος δὴν οὕτως ἐπολιτεύτω, καὶ τὰ συνέδρια
30 {καὶ} τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Βοιωτῶν ἐν τῇ Καδμεία συνεκάθιζεν. ἐν δὲ ταῖς Θῆβαις ἦταν οἱ βέλτιστοι καὶ γνωριμώτατοι τῶν πολιτῶν, ὅσπερ καὶ πρότερον εἰρηκα, στασίάζουσε πρὸς ἀλλήλους. ἡγούμενο δὲ τοῦ μέρους τοῦ μὲν Ἰσμηνίας κα[ι] Ἀντίθεος καὶ Ἀνδροκλίδιας τοῦ δὲ Διονυσίδης καὶ Δίος καὶ Κορραντάδας, ἐφρόνον δὲ τῶν πολιτευμένων οἱ μὲν περὶ τῶν Δεωνίδην τὰ Δακεδαιμονίων, [ο] δὲ περὶ τῶν Ἰσμηνίαν αἰτίας μὲν εἴχον Ἀττικίζειν εξ δὲ πρόθυμοι πρὸς τὸν δῆμον ἐγένοτο ὡς ἐφυγὸς οὐ μὴν ἐφρόνητο.

Col. xiii.

[tis] τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἀλλ' εἰχ[ον] . . . . . . . .
[. . . . ] π[. . . . ]ε[σχόν ἐπεὶ τοὺς . . . . . . .
[. . . . ] ε[ς] κακῶς ποιεῖν ἐτοίμους α [. . . . ] Ἀττι-
5 [κε]ξειν. διακε[ι]μένων δὲ τῶν ἐν [Θῆβαις οὕτως
[κ]αὶ τῆς ἑταιρείας ἐκατ[έρ]πας ἅχονος, ἐπείτα
[πρ]ο[ή]θυνον πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς [πόλεσι κατ]ὰ
[τὴ]ν Βουκολίκα κα[ι] μετέ[σ]χον ἐκ[ατέρου τῶν]
[μερ]ῶν ἑκείνους. ἐδύναντο δὲ τ[άτε μὲν καὶ]
10 [μικρ]ῷ πρόπερον οἱ πε[ρὶ] τῶν Ἰσμηνίαν καὶ τὸν
[Ἀνδροκλείδαν καὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς τοῖς Θηβαίοις κ]αὶ
[παρὰ τῇ βοιλή] τῶν Βοιωτῶν, ἐμπρόσθεν δὲ] προ-
[εἰ]χον οἱ π[ερὶ] τῶν Ἀσ{τ}ίαν καὶ Δεωνίδην χρόνων
[tιμά] συχνὸν καὶ τὴν πόλιν διὰ π[. . . . ] χον.
15 [δὴ] γὰρ πολεμοῦντες οἱ Δακεδαιμ[ό]νιοι τοίς Ἀ-
[...]αιώσενθεκελειαδιετρείβουκαίος [...]. [...]. [...] τωνυσμμαχωπολυνυνιχωνουτοιμ[...] λοινεύναστευντωνετεροναμαμεντοπ[...]. στι ονειναύουσλακέ[...]αμον[...]ουσαμαδετσωπολλά [...].

20 πολινευργετε[...]σαδιαυτωσ[...]. [...] θη βαιοιπολυμποσευναμονιαρολκ[...]. [...] νθεωσοσοπολεμοστοσιασθηναιος[...]. [...] τοισλακεδαιμονιοσαρξαμενωνγαραπ[...]. [...] ειν τοιναθηναιωτηθεωσουσαισωπισθησαι[...]. [...] σαν

25 τασοιτεξερνυσωγκαισφωκαισεκολουκα[...]. [...] δοσκαισχοινουκαποτωνικαπολλωνετρώτοι ουτωνχαρωνατειχουσονεκασταιδιπλασιασεποι ηςεταςθηβασαουηναλλαπολυγεβελειονετηθη— πολινπραξαισωπεσενωσηνεδεκελειανεπετει

30 χισαυντοσιασθηναιοσμετατουλακεδαιμ[...]. [...] τατεγαρανδραποσακαλοταπαιαρ[...]. [...] νπολεμοναλισκομεραμκρουτιν[...]. [...] μπαρ ελαμβανονκαιτηρικησσατικη[...]. [...] κευθ— ατεπροχορονκατοκουντεσαπασαματεκομι

35 σανωσαυντοσαγιοσωνυξυλωκατουκεραμοντού τωνοικιωναρξαμενουστετετωναθηναιονη χωραπολυτελεστατησελλαδοσκατεσκευαστο επετονθευγραμειρακακωσεντασεμβολαια ταιωμροσενουτωνυλακεδαιμονιωποδειο—

40 αθηναωνυντωσεξησικητοκαδιειπεννητοκασ

Col. xiv (= D Col. iv).

[...]. [...]ρησολην [...]. [...] δεπαραντουησα[...]. [...] [...] κεησε[...]. [...] κοδομημεναση[...]. [...] [...] σαλλασ[...]. [...] [...] κολλητ[...]. [...] [...] ελρμβανονειστο[...].

5 [...] σαγαρουσα[...]. [...] μπραγματακατ[...]. [...] [...] σαθηβασκατ[...]. [...] [...] ουσωσιδετερτονα[...]. [...] δροκλειδακ[...]. [...] σουδαζωνεκπολε
[θην]αιοις ἐν Δεκέλεια διέτριβον καὶ σ...[.]. [.]. τ[ω]ν
α[υ]ῶν συμμάχων πολὺ συνείχον, οὗτοι μ[α]θέ- λον ἑυνάστευν τῶν ἑτέρων ἀμα μὲν τῷ πλ[η]σί-
ων εἶναι τοὺς Δακε[δα]ίμον[ῆς], ἀμα δὲ τῷ πολλά 'τ]'ην
20 πόλιν ἐνεργετε[i]σθαί δὲ αὐτῶν. ἐπ[έ]δοσαν δὲ οἱ Ἐπι-
βαῖοι πολὺ πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν ὀλῇκ[η]ρον ε[ἰ]-
θέως ὡς ὁ πόλεμος τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις [ἐνέστη καὶ]
toῖς Δακεδαιμονίοις· ἀρβαμένων γὰρ ἀπ[ε]ιλ[ε]ῖν
tῶν Ἀθηναίων τῇ Βοιωτίᾳ συνψεοθήσαν [εἰ]ς αὐ-
25 τὰς οἰ τ' ἐξ 'Ερυθρῶν καὶ Σκαφῶν καὶ Σκώλου καὶ Ἀδ/λί-
δος καὶ Σχαῦνο καὶ Ποτινῶν καὶ πολλῶν ἑτέρων τοι-
ούτων χωρίων ἃ τείχοι οὐκ ἔχοντα διπλασίας ἐποί-
ησει τὰς Ὕβασι. οὐ μὴν ἄλλα πολὺ γε βέλτιον ἐτι τῆν
πόλιν πράξαι συνέπεσον ὡς τὴν Δεκέλειαν ἐπετεί-
30 χισαν τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις μετὰ τῶν Δακεδαιμ[ονών]
tὰ τε γὰρ ἀνδρόποδα καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα [ τὰ] κατὰ τὴν
πόλεμον ἀλησκόμενα μικροῦ τι[ς ἀργυρίῳ] παρ-
ελάμβανον, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς Ἀττικῆς κ[α]τα[σ]κε[υ]ήν
ἂν πρόσχωροι κατοικοῦντες ἀπάσαν μετεκόμι-
35 σαν ὡς αὐτούς, ἀπὸ τῶν ἔνδικων καὶ τοῦ κεράμου τοῦ
tῶν οἰκίων ἀράμενοι. τότε δὲ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἡ
χώρα πολυτελέστατα τῆς Ἐλλάδος κατεσκεύαστο·
ἐπετώθη ἡμὰρ μικρὰ κακῶς ἐν ταῖς ἐμβολαῖς
tαῖς ἐμπροσθεν ὑπὸ τῶν Δακεδαιμονῶν, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν
40 Ἀθηναίων ὑπότοις ἐξήσκητο καὶ διεπετόνητο κα-

Col. xiv.

[θ' ὑπε]ρβολὴν . [. . . . . . . .] δέν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐπα[. . .] [. . .] ὁικήσε[ις] . [. . . . . . . . .] ϕικοδομημέναι ἡ πα-
[ρὰ τὸ]ς Ἑλλοις [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .] γὰρ αὐτῶν ἀπα-
[. . .] ὡς Ἑλλη[. . . . . . . . . .] εἰς τοῦ]ς
5 [. . . . . .] ἀγροὺς α[. . . . . . . .] τὰ μὲν οὖν πράγματα τὰ κατ[ὰ]
[τὰ]ς Ὕβασι καὶ τῆν Βοιωτίαν εἶχεν] ὑπὸς. οἱ δὲ περὶ τῶν Α[ν]. XIII. 1

δροκλείδαν κα[ὶ τῶν Ἰσμηνίαν ἐ]ςπούδαζον ἐκπολε-
μωσαιτεθνος[...]μονιονβολομενοι
μενκαταλυσαίτ[...]πιναμηδιαφθαρωσιν
10 ὑπεκεινωνδια[...]γουτασοιομενοιδε
ραδιωστουτοπη[...]μβανοντεσβασιλ[.]α
χρηματαπ[.]ρεβ[...]παρατοβαρβαρουπ[.]μ.
φθειωτηγγελλετο[...]σκαίνουσαργειον[.]κ'
τουσα[.]βαιονυμεθε[.]τολεμουτουσαγαρ
15 εκθρουντοισαλκεδαιμ[.]ντασαυτουσυνπαρε
[.]ενασετουσπολειταρ[.]ανοθενετεδεταντα
περιτοπραγματωνεμονομονοπομενοπουφα
νερουχαλεπωσεινεπιτιθειαυτουσινσωποτε
γαρουτεθημβανουσουτουςαλλουμβειντουσεισθη
20 σεσαιπολεμεινλακεδαιμονισαρχουσιτηησελα
δοσειπροωντεσ[.]εδιαταυτηςησαπατησπροηγειν
ειστοπολεμουσαντεσαπεισανανδραστινασφω
κεωνεμβαλεινειτηνλοκρουτωνεπεριωνα
λουμενωνουσεγενετοσησεκθρασιαταυτη
25 εστινευθεσιντουσισιμψιβητηημουσχωραπε
μιτοπαρανασοντες[.]εσκαιπροτεροντοτεπεπολε
μκεαυνηνπολλακισεπινεμουσινεκατερωτωντε
φωκεωνκαιτονλοκρονοποτεροιδαιτυωσωαισθη
σειστοτετερωνουσουπλεγειεσεπολλοιδαρταζουσ
30 ταπροβαταπροτεροντενοπολοντουτοναφε
κατατρωγεινομενοναειμεταδικησαταπολλακιο
γωνιδιενανταποσαλληνουστυτετευνο
λοκρονονθαινοσεβαλοντροβατωννυθυπουφωκε[.]σαροβουντουνουσεκεινωνυτων
35 ανδρων[...]περιτονανδροκλειδαικατοιονμη
νιαπαρεσκενασανειστηνλοκριδαμετατων
πλωνεβαλοννονελοκριδημενηστηνχωρας
πεμψαντεσπροβεσισβοιωτουσκατηγοριανε
πτω[.]μυτουσοφ[.]κεωνκαιβοσεινεκεινουσανωτουσ
40 [...]μυδικειν[.]αιδεπροαυτουσαειπτοτεφιλωσ
μόσαι τὸ ἐθνὸς [πρὸς τοὺς Λακεδαίμονιοὺς, βουλόμενοι μὲν καταλύσαι τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτῶν ἵνα μὴ διαφθερῶσιν


ἐξήρουσι τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ὄρντας αὐτοῖς συμπαρά-
[σκ]ευάσει(ν) τοὺς πολέμας. [δια]νοηθέντες δὲ ταῦτα περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐνόμιζον ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ φα-

νεροῦ χαλεπῶς ἐχεῖν ἐπιτίθεσθαι τούτους, οὐδέποτε γὰρ οὕτως Ἡθαίοιοι οὕτε τοὺς ἄλλους Βοιωτοὺς πεισθῆ-

σεβαίται πολεμεῖν Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀρχοντὶ τῆς Ἑλλα-

δος. ἐπιχειροῦτες δὲ διὰ ταύτης τῆς ἀπάτης προάγειν εἰς τὸν πολέμον αὐτοῖς, ἀνέπεισαν ἀνδρας τινὰς Φω-

κέων ἐμθαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Λοκρὸν τῶν Ἑσπερίων κα-

λουμεὼν, οὗ ἐγένετο τῆς ἐχθρᾶς αἰτία τοιαύτη;

ἐστι τοῖς ἐθνοῖς τούτοις ἀμφισβητήσιμος χώρα πε-

ρὶ τῶν Παρνασσῶν, περὶ[1] ἤς καὶ πρότερον ποτὲ πεπολε-

μήκαισιν, ἢν πολλάκις ἐπινέμουσιν ἑκάτεροι τῶν τε]

Φωκέων καὶ τῶν Λοκρῶν, ὅποτέροι δ’ ἀν τῦχοσιν αἰσθό-

μενοί ποτὲ τούς ἐπέρουσι συλλεγέντες πολλοὶ διαρπάζουσι

τὰ πρόβατα. πρότερον μὲν οὖν πολλῶν τοιαύτων ἀρ’ ἐ-

κατέρων γιγνομένων αἰεὶ μετὰ δίκης τὰ πολλά καὶ λο-

γων διελύνοντο πρὸς ἄλλους, τότε δὲ τῶν Λοκρῶν ἀνθραπασάντων ἀνθ’ ἐν ἀπέβαλον προβάτων εὐ-

θοῦσ οἱ Φωκε[1]̣ς, παροβολοῦσινταυτοὺς ἐκεῖνως τῶν

ἀνδρῶν ὅ[δε οἱ] περὶ τῶν Ἀνδροκλείδων καὶ τῶν Ἰσμη-

νίαν παρεσκεύασαν, εἰς τὴν Λοκρίδα μετὰ τῶν ὀ-

πλων ἐνέβαλον. οἱ δὲ Λοκροὶ δημομένης τῆς χώρας περίστημες πρέσβεις εἰς Βοιωτοὺς κατηγορίαν ἐ-

πο[ι]̣ντα τῶν Φ[ω]κεῶν, καὶ βοήθειν ἐκεῖνος αὐτοῖς
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Col. xv (= D Col. v).

[..]ασαντευδετονκαιροναςμ[....
[..]μηνιανκαιτονανδροκλε[....
[..]φωνουσθευτοισλοκροισφώ[....
[..]φωναυστωνεκτωνθηβωντ[....
5 [.]αλινανεχωρησανπροβεσθόδ[....
τεσπροσλακεδαιμονιονυσιουνυκ[....
πεινβοιωτοισειστηναυτονβαδι[....
λεγειναυτουνομισαντεςαπιστα[....
ουκε[.]φωνοσαυτουσπολεμονεκ[....
10 φωκεσαλλειτιδιεισθαινυμιζουσ[....
βανεινπαραυτωνενισισυμμαχοισ[....
ροξυννουνταυτουστωνκαιτηναπ[....
γυματαταισαυστησαντωντουσμεν[....
tωπιακεδαιμονιονπρακτουσαπεστ[....
15 τασπαλαβοντεσεβαδ[.]κονετινουσφωκε[....
λοντεσθεδιαταχεωνειστηνυφωκιδακ[....]η
σαντεσθηνετεονπαραποταμωνχωρακαδα[....
lιωνκαιφανοτεωενσαρησανταιαπολεσιπροςβαλ[....
λεικαδαιλιαμενπροσελθουνεσαπεχωρησαναυθ[....
20 ουδενποισαντεςαλλακαπληγασολιγασαλαβοντες
φανταευδετοσπροστιακατακρατοσειλονδια[....]
πραξεμενοιδεταμπροσθολθονειστηνυφωκιδακα[....]
tαθραμονντεονσιμεροστιτουπεδιουπερινελα[....
teιακακουσπεδειασκαιτουσταντηκατοικουν[....]
25 τασαπησαντοιουμενωνδετηναποχωρησιν
αυτωπροσπαρυνμπολυνεδεξεναυτοισαποπειρα
σθαιτησπολεωσεσπειστεοχωριονπεικωσιχωρυνπροσ[....]
βαλντεσεσεισεικαπροσβυμιασουδενελι
ποντεσαλλομενουδενεπραξαναποβαλντεσδ[....]
30 τωντρατωτωνουσουγοδηκουταπαλινανεχωρη
σανβοιωτοιμενο[.]υφοσαντακακαποιηςαντες[.]ουσ
Col. xv.

[ἀρπ]άσαντες δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἂσμ[ενέστατα οἱ περὶ
τὸν Ἰσ]μηνίαν καὶ τὸν Ἀνδροκλέ[ίδαν ἔπεισαν τοὺς
Βοι[ωτοὺς βοηθεῖν τοῖς Δοκρίδοις. Φω[κεῖς δὲ, ἀγγελθέν-
[τὰς αὐτοὶς τῶν Ἐτηβῶν τό[τε μὲν ἐκ τῆς Δοκρίδος
5 παύλιν ἀνεχόρησαν, πρέσβεις δὲ[..... πεμψαν-
tες πρὸς Δακεδαμίων ἡ[ξίον ἐκείνους ἀπει-
πεῖν Βοιωτοῖς εἰς τὴν αὐτῶν βαδίζειν. οἱ δὲ καῖπερ
λέγειν αὐτοὺς νομίζαντες ἀπιστὰ [ὑμῶν πέμψαντες
οὐκ εἰών τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς πόλεμον ἔκφερεν ἐπὶ τοὺς
10 Φωκέας, ἀλλ' εἰ τί ἀδικεῖσθαι νομίζων[ι βίκην λαμ-
βάνειν παρ' αὐτῶν ἔν τοῖς συμμάχοις ἐκέλευον. οἱ δὲ, πα-
ροξυνόντων αὐτοὺς τῶν καὶ τὴν ἀπ' ἄτην καὶ τὰ πρά-
γματα ταῦτα συντησάντων, τοὺς μὲν [πρέσβεις τοὺς
τῶν Δακεδαμίων ἀπράκτους ἀπεστέιλαν, αὐτοὶ δὲ
15 τὰ ὅπλα λαβόντες ἐβάδε[ξι]ν ἐπὶ τοὺς Φωκέας. ἐμβα-
λόντες δὲ διὰ ταχέων εἰς τὴν Φωκίδα καὶ [πορθή-
σαντες τὴν τε τῶν Παραποταμίων χώραν καὶ Δαυ-
λίων καὶ Φανοτέων ἐπεχείρησαν ταῖς πόλεισι προσβάλ-
λειν καὶ Δαυλία μὲν προσελθόντες ἀπεχώρησαν αὐθις
20 οὖδὲν ποιήσαντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ πληγάς διέγας λαβόντες,
Φανοτέων δὲ τὸ προάστιον κατὰ κράτος εἶλον. δια-
πραξάμενοι δὲ ταῦτα προήλθον εἰς τὴν Φωκίδα, κα-
tαδραμόντες δὲ μέρος τοῦ πεδίου περὶ τὴν Ἑλά-
tειαν καὶ τοὺς Πεδίεας καὶ τοὺς ταῦτα κατοικοῦν-
25 τὰς ἀπήχεσαν. ποιομένων δὲ τὴν ἀποχώρησιν
αὐτῶν {προς} παρ' Τ(άμμ)πολιν ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς ἀποπειρά-
σθαι τῆς πόλεως; ἔστι δὲ τὸ χωρίον ἐπ(ι)εικὸς ἱσχυρὸν. προσ-
βαλόντες δὲ τοὺς τείχεσι καὶ προθυμίας οὐδὲν ἐλλι-
pώντες ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν ἔπραξαν, ἀποβαλόντες δὲ
30 τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὡς ὀγδοῆκοντα πάλιν ἀνεχώρη-
sαν. Βοιωτοὶ μὲν ο[ὐ]ν τοσαῦτα κακὰ ποιήσαντες [τ]ῶν
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ὃς ἐπιστάτης ἔστιν τῶν ὑποδείκνυσιν καὶ τῶν ἀριθμῶν τῶν ὁλιγογράφων πapyρίων.


doxostwopollidiosunπληρωσαεικοσιωντρηρων
αναγομενοεκτηροδουκατελευσενειςκαινων
βουλουμενουδεσυμμεξαιτωφαρναβαζοκα.[.]τω
τιβραντηκαιχριματαλβενεβαινενεκτησ
καινουνπροσαυτουσετυγχανεδειοστρατιου

Col. xvi (= D Col. vi).

τασκατατουντονχρονονπροσοφειλομε

νοσμιοθεσπολλωμηνωμισθοδοτ[.]γντογαρν
πιτωνυτρητηιμωκακωποιεινθ[.]εστινα
ειςτουπολεµουσίωπερβασιλεωσεπ[...]τατον

δεκελεικονπολεµονοποτεσυμ[...]λακεδαι
μυονιθασενκοιδηβανωσκαγιων[.]σπαρει
Χυροχιρηµατακαιπολλακισµακα[.]λυθησαν
αιτωνσιµαχωντρ[.]ηρεισεµθητητηκυρου
προβυµαντουτωνδεβασιλευσιτεστος

επειδαινενητηηαιστοπολεµονκατατεµψασ
καταρχασολιγαχρηµατατουσαρχουσινουιωρει
tουεπιλοιτουχρονοιδετουπραγµατε
φεστωτεσουκεντεσυναλυσεινεκτωνιµδει


[...]εισαιταταινουνουσωσυµβαινειν

ειςθετιθραυστηθεµεσαραγενεοµενουνυκ

νοσωσταυτουκαιεγκοσοστικωνδυνευσεισθ

τριβήναιατααρµαταδιαχρηµατωνεδειει


15 [...]εισαιταταινουνουσωσυµβαινειν

ειςθετιθραυστηθεµεσαραγενεοµενουνυκ

νοσωσταυτουκαιεγκοσοστικωνδυνευσεισθ

τριβήναιατααρµαταδιαχρηµατωνεδειει


20 γνωσχειναπαγορευ[.]µαποστελλειναστωµε

θαυτουβαριµαροµιαθωνδωσιτωιστρατιω

tαιιερυσευσαρυριουταλαταδιακοσικαιει

κοσιελθεθδεητουαργυριονεκτησουσιαστησ

tισαφερνουσιθραυστηθεµενουνητερεµει
Φωκάς ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὴν ἐαυτῶν. Κόνων δὲ, παρειληφότος Ἡθος Χειμικράτους τὰς ναῦς τὰς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων, ὃς ἀφίκετο ναύαρχος διά-δοχος τῷ Πόλλιδι, συμπληρώσας εἰκοσι τῶν τριήρων ἀναγόμενος ἐκ τῆς 'Ρόδου κατέπλευσεν εἰς Καίνου·

35 βουλόμενος δὲ συμμεείζαι τῷ Φαρναβάζῳ καὶ τῷ Τιθράυστῃ καὶ χρήματα λαβεῖν ἀνέβαινεν ἐκ τῆς Καίνου πρὸς αὐτούς. ἔτυγχαν δὲ τοῖς στρατιῶ-
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25 νασολιγγόνχρονονενταίσαρδεσινανεβαίνειν

ωσβασιλεακαταστήσαστρατηγουσπειτωνπρα

γματωναριονκαπασιφερνηκαιπαραδουσαυτους

ειστονπολεμιστοκαταλειφθεβεαργυριονκαίχρυ

σιονοφασίφανηαπεριστακοσιαταλαντατων

30 δεκτριωνομετατουκονσιςκαταπλεναιν

τεσσειστηρικανναναπεισθενεσσουτωτινω—

διαβαλλοντωνσουτοισμουνεμέλλουσιναπο

διδουατουμισσουνουφειλομενουπαρακα

αζωταδειδιαυις[.]φωνοντα[.]συνπρεσιασ

35 κατωσεπιβαιαναχαλεποσεφερνακαισυνελθο—

τεσσεισεκλησιανειλοντοπρα[.]γγοναιν

αιδρακαρπασεατουγενοσκαιω[.]οφιλακην

εδοσαντουσωματοσινοσ[.]ωτασαφεκαστην

Col. xvii (＝D Col. vii).

[....................]σι[....................]ν

[....................]κιν[...[...]τωρ[....................]

[....................]τονκονωνα[....................]

[....................]ωστετυχανε[...[...]νο[............]

5 [....................]καραεικατελ[...[...]ψωνος[...[...]

[....................]ετοεπερτα[...[...]ωνονωδες[...[...]

[....................]υποντ[...[...]υσουκειαπιστευειτ

[....................]εκλ[...]σι[...[...]ελληνωναλ[...]απαν

[....................]σκομεισθαιανυν

10 [....................]ζφαυκενβουλειθαι[...[...]

[.]α[...[...]ουοεστρατηγοσσω—

[.]ντ[...[...]σθε[...[...]προστοπληθοστον

στρατω[...[...].κολ[...[...]ευ[...[...]υδεσσυφρομησαν

τ[...]στ[...[...]ευνομε[...[...]τατασπυλασηανυμε

15 κονω[...[...]ετυχενη[...[...]μεσοσεξεληλυθειπροτε

ροσεκτ[...[...]τειχουσιονθε[...[...]ροσπιτοεκριταεισωσ

ηνεξ[...[...]κατασταπυλασεπιμαβανονταιανυμεσ

σημια[...]τινεστωνκοννυπαρκολουθεινεω
25 νας ὀλόγων χρόνων ἐν ταῖς Σάρδεσιν ἀνέβαινεν
ὦς βασιλέα, καταστήσας στρατηγοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν πρα-
γμάτων Ἀριαῖον καὶ Πασιφέρνη, καὶ παραδόθη αὐτοῖς
εἰς τῶν πόλεμον τὸ καταλείφθην ἀργύριον καὶ χρυ-
σίον ὃ φασί φανήναι περὶ ἐπτακόσια τάλαντα. τῶν
30 δὲ Κύπρίων οἱ μετὰ τοῦ Κόνωνος καταπλεύσαν-
tes eis tην Καύνον, ἀναπεισθέντες {ο} ὕπ(ό) τινων
diaβαλλόντων ὡς αὐτοῖς μὲν οὐ μέλλουσιν ἀπο-
diδόναι τὸν μισθὸν τῶν ὀφειλόμενον, παρασκευ-
άζονται δὲ διαλύσεις μύνον ταῖς ὑπηρεσίαις
35 καὶ τοῖς ἑπιβάταις, χαλέπως ἑφέρον, καὶ συνελθόν-
tes eis ἐκκλησίαν εἰλοντο στρατηγοῦν αὐτῶν
ἀνδρα Καρπασέα τὸ γένος, καὶ το[ύ]φ φυλακῆν
ἐδοσαν τοῦ σώματος δύο σπρατιώτας ἀφ' ἐκάστης

Col. xvii.

[νεῶς ..................]νπ[...............]ν
[........................]κνα[............]
[........................]τὸν Κόνωνα [.............]
[........................] ὡς ἐπύγχανε [,............]
5 [........................]εραιει κατελ[,...] Κόνωνος [..]
[........................]γετε περὶ τὸ[ν] .. ον. Κόνων ὃς ἐς [....]
[....... ἀκόουσα α]ὐτῶν τ[οὺς λόγο]ους οὐκ εἰς πιστεεῖν
[........................]ἐκλ[.]ο[... τ[](ε)ρί]ν Ἑλλήνων, ἀλ[]ὰ τᾶ
- tas[........................]ς κομιείσθαι, ταύτῃ
10 [δὲ τὴν ἀπόκρισιν ποιήσαμεν] ἐφασκεν βούλεθαθι
[δ]μα[δήλωσα καὶ τοῖς ἀλλα[]οις, ὁ δὲ στρατηγὸς ὁ τῶν
[Kυπρίων ὁ Καρπά]σει[ς αὐτῷ] πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος το τῶν
στρατιῶ[τῶν ἡ]κολο[ύθει. ἐκείνο]ν δὲ συνεξορμη[σαν-
-]τοις, ἐπε[ἰδὴ] πορευόμενοι κα]τὰ τὰς πύλας ἦςαν, ὃ μὲν
15 Κόνων [ὅπερ] ἐτυχεν ἡγ[ού]μενος ἐξεληλύθει πρότε-
ρος ἐκ τ[οῦ] τείχους, τοῦ δὲ ἀ[νφ]ρωπο Τοῦ Καρπασέως, ὡς
ἦν ἐξ[.]ο]ν κατὰ τὰς πύλας, ἐπιλαμβάνωται τῶν Μεσ-
σηνίων] τινὲς τῶν Κόνων παρακολοθεῖν εἰω-
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θοτων[, ]μετατησεκειγουγ[, ]μησεπιθυμοντεσ-
20 τηπολε[, ]καταχεισαντονοη[, ]ανωνεξημαρτεν
dωδικ[, ]φοιδεσσυνακολουθο[, ]εστωνκυπριωναν
tελαμ[, ]αν[, ]νυτ[, ]φοσκαιδιεκολυνουσο
μεση[, ]αγει[, ]φοσκαιδιεκολυνουσο
τωνεξ[, ]λων[, ]εβοηθειτωστρατηγουο[, ]ε
dησαο[, ]μοω[, ]ιστηρυδαλινοηδεκυ
πριοι[, ]σαψ[, ]μενουστουκα[, ]
πασεω[, ]λλ[, ]μοσαναυτοειδηςειςμ[, ]
νοιανται[, ]
30 σκευασθαιπερ[, ]διαδοσινε[, ]βα[, ]
νοεω[, ]ιαστρη[, ]ειςηη[, ]αισθαξεισινογε
τυετελεγον[, ]ελλον[, ]πησρδονυπαραλα
βοη[, ]σεισκυπροντιλ[, ]ευσανεταδετσα
λαι[, ]μνειουκαιπαρακ[, ]πεστουσοδουλομε
35 [, ]πρωνβαδ[, ]προστηρναρπο
[, ]μαρχην[, ]καταλυνουσεια
[, ]νουταπ[, ]δυκακωνοι
[, ]οιης[, ]μαντουεις
[, ]εσις[, ]τωνλογων
40 [, ]Ην

Col. xviii (= D Col. viii).

πολυτη[, ]
τεσαποτης[, ]μενοι
χρησανθαυτοισαυτη[, ]τηρημονκο
νωνδεκατηγμε[, ]ελθωνυροσ
5 λεωνυμοντων[, ]σηνωνο
τιμωνοδυναται[, ]σηνωνο
γαραινωβουλειαδ[, ]νυστουσον
ληνασιτηνκαινο[, ]τωνκαρων
ωσπειστουσαυσουει[, ]
10 ραχηνκελευσαντοσοδ[, ]ουλαμβανει—
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θότων [οὗ] μετά τής ἐκείνου γι[ά]μης, ἐπιθυμοῦντες εἶν
20 τῇ πόλει[ι] κατασχέειν αὐτῶν ὅπ[οις] ἀν ὄν ἔξημαρτεν
dῶ δικ[η]ν. οἱ δὲ συνακολουθοῦντες τῶν Κυπρίων ἀν-
tελαρ[βά]νοντο τ[οῦ Καρπασέ]ιος καὶ διεκόλουν τοὺς
Μεσοπ[νίους] ἁγεί[ν] αὐτῶν, αἱ[σθανόμενον δὲ καὶ τὸ
tῶν ἐξ[ακο]σ[ῶν (σύνταγμα ?)] ἔβο[θέ]ει τῷ στρατηγῷ. ὦ [δὲ]
25 Κύνων [ὡς...]πε[...] τοῦ[ς] ἀνθρώπους εἰσπη-
δήσας [.....]μεν [εἰ]ς τήν πόλιν οἱ δὲ Κύ-
πριοι τοὺς Μεσοπ[νίους] τοὺς ἀψαμένους τοῦ Καρ-
πασέως βάλλοντες ἀπεκρούσαν, αὐτοὶ δὲ πεπεισ[έ]
νοι πάντα π[...] τῷ Κόμνωνα παρε-
30 σκευάσθαι περὶ τήν τοῦ μισθοῦ] διάδοσαν εἰσέβαι-
νον ε[...]ς τός τρι[ήρε]ις ἐπὶ ταύτας τ[α]ῖς πράξεσιν, ὡς γε
tίνες ἔλεγον, [μ]έλλοντες τοὺς ἐκ τῆς 'Ρόδου παραλα-
βαν[τές] εἰς Κύπρων πλέον. ἀποπλεύσαντες δὲ τῆς Ἀ-
λαν[...]μοιον καὶ παρακομίσαντες τοὺς βουλομέ-
35 [νος τῶν Κυπρίων, βαδίζουσιν] πρὸς τήν ἀκρόπο-
[λιν ἐν τῇ]ν ἄρχῃν τ[οῦ Κόμνο]νος καταλύσασιν ὡς
[αἰτίου γενομέ]νον πάντων αὐτοῖς τῶν κακῶν, ὁμοί-
[ως δὲ ...]ποι[σ] [... ... ... ... ... ... ... ]ν αὐτοῖς εἰς
[ ... ... ... υπηρεσία[ ... ... ... ... ] τῶν λόγων
40 [...] τῆν

Col. xviii.

πόλιν τῇ[... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... ... α]ποπλεύσαν-
tες ἀπὸ τῆς [ ... ... ... ... ... ... ] βουλομενοι
χρήσασθαι τοῖς αὐτ[ῷ δ] ... τῶν] τρίηρων. Κό-
νον δὲ κατηγρε[μών τῶν Κυπρίων] ἔλθων πρὸς
5 Δεώνυμον τὸν τ[ ... ... ... ... ... ... ]π[...]ν αὐτῷ δι-
ti μόνος δύναται τ[ [...] πράγματα σώσαι] τ[ [...] βα]ιλέως, εἰ
gάρ αὐτῷ βούλεται δ[ι]δόναι τοὺς φρο[νοῦν] τοὺς ['Ελ]-
ληναί οἱ τῆν Καύνον [φυλάττουσι καὶ] τῶν Καρῶν
ὡς πλείστους, παύσει[ν τήν ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ τα-
10 ραχήν. κελεύσαντος δ[ὲ τοῦ Δεωνύμου] λαμβάνειν
οποσουβουλεταστατ[. . . . . . .]ημευερην
ημεραπαρηκεκαιγαρη[. . . . . .]δηπεριδωσα
εισ&ηνεπισιωσαυτρηνη[. . . . . .]ενεσθαυλαθων
παρατουλεονυμουτωντε[. . . . . .]συχνουσκατουσ

15 ελληνασαπαντασεξηγηγανε[. . . . . .]νσεκτησουλεωσ
επειτατουσμε[. . . . . .]αθεναιουνουστρατοποδουσ[.]
μειστησεντους[. . . . . .] [. . . . . .]νπροσεταισανανκα[.]
τοκαγιαλον[. . . . . . . . . .]νταδεποησασκακακελευ
σακηρυξατ[. . . . . . . . . .]νεινεκαστουνστρα

20 τισονεπτη[. . . . . . . . . .]νελαβετωνυπρων
τοντεκαρπασε[. . . . . . . . . .]λωτεξκουτακαινουσ
μειστακετε[. . . . . . . . . .]τηγονανεσταυρωσε—
ακουσαντειδ[. . . . . . . . . .]καταλεψθεντεσενη
ροδωγανακτ[. . . . . . . . . .]φωσενεγκουστουσμ’

25 αρχοντατουσ[. . . . . . . . . .]νοσκατασταντασβαλ
λωτεσεξηλασ[. . . . . . . . . .]σταταπεδουνυδελιμε
νακαταλιπον[. . . . . . . . . .]θορυβουκαταραχηνπαρ
[. . . . . . . . . .]μοντουσοδ[. . . . . . . . . .]νωναφικομονοςκητησ
[. . . . . . . . . .]μαντουστ[. . . . . . . . . .]ἀσαντωνυλαβωναπεκτεί

30 νεκατοισαλλ[. . . . . . . . . .]φιδεδωκετομενουνυβασι
λικονστρατο[. . . . . . . . . .]οσεισμεγανκινδυν
προελθουνιακονου[. . . . . . . . . .]πηρεκεινουπροθεμιαν
επαναστατησταραχη[. . . . . . . . . .]γησιλοσθεπαρα[. .]ορεν

>—

ομ’. [. .]οιειστονελληστ[. . . . . . . .]ντοναρατωστρατ[. . . .

35 τι[. . . . . . . .]ακεδαμιονικρ[. . . . . . . . . .]τωνονυλαμχωνονμ’
χι[. . . . . . . . . .]νεβαδειζεδιατ[. . . . . . . . . .]λυδιασ[. . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . .]μενοικουντασβ[. . . . . . . . . .]ομενοσεμεμ[. . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . .]μεντασσον[. . . . . . . . . .]αιστοσθαινα[. . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . .]ηγενομ[. . . . . . . . . .]επειδηθεκα
[. . . . . . . . . .]πρενειστην[. . . . . . . . . .]τηνφαρη[. . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . .]ουπροηγετο
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στρατ[. . . . . . . .]μαλεψωτωακαπορθωντη[. . . . . . . . . .]
δεπαραλλαξα[. . . . . . . . . .]οιεκθειςπεδιονκαι[. . . . . . . . . .]
καλουμενον[. . . . . . . . . .]εβαλεστηςπημυςια[. . . . . . . . . .]
οπόσον βούλεται στρατιώτας, ταύτην μὲν τὴν ἡμέραν παρῆκεν, καὶ γὰρ ἦλθος ἦν ἡδὴ περὶ δυσμᾶς, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπιούσαν πρὶν ἡμέραν γενέσθαι λαβῶν παρὰ τοῦ Δεωνύμου τῶν τε [Καρών] συνήνοις καὶ τοὺς

15 Ἐλληνας ἀπαντᾷ ἐξήγαγεν [αὐτὸ]τὸ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἑπείτα τοὺς μὲν [ἐξ]ωθέν αὐτοῦ τοῦ στρατοπέδου περιέστησεν, τοὺς [δὲ ...] [. . . . .]ν πρὸς τέ τας ναῦς καὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν [ . . . . . . . . . . . . . τα[ύ]τα δὲ ποίησας καὶ κελεύσας κηρύξαι τῇ . . . . . βαίνειν ἐκαστὸν τῶν στρατ.

20 τιωτῶν ἐπὶ τῇ ν . . . . . . , συνέλαβε τῶν Κυψείων τῶν τε Καρπαση[α καὶ τῶν ἀλ]λων ἐξῆκοντα, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀπέκτεινε, τὸν δὲ στρατηγόν ἀνεστάρωσεν. ἀκούσαντες δὲ τὰ γενόμενα οἱ καταλειφθέντες ἐν τῇ Ῥώδῃ ἡγανάκτησον, καὶ βαρέως ἐνεγκότωσε τοὺς μὲν
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στράτευμα λεγειτῶν καὶ πορθῶν τῆ[ν γῆν]. εἶτα δὲ παραλλάξας τῷ τῆς Θήβης πεδίον καὶ τῶν Ἀπίας καλῶμενον εἰς ἑβάλεν εἰς τὴν Μυσίαν, καὶ ἐνέκει-
τοτοῦμυσο[.]σκελετονονσυντρ[.]
5 ταυτωνειστιγαροπολ[.]οιςομυσωναι[.]
βασιλεωσουχυπακονον[.]εσσοσουμενουν[.]
σωμετεχεινηρωντοστοστρατειασ[.]
ποιεικακαναυτοναυτονθελοιπωνεδην[.]
ρανεπειδηδηπροϊνενεγεντοκαταμεσος[.]
10 στατ[.]νολυμπονυμνισικοταλομει[.]
χαλ[.]πηγαιαστεινουναντηνειδου[.]
λοι[. . .]ασφα[. . .]σπορευθηναιδιαντησεμ[. . .]
tινα[. . .]στι[. . .]νυσουκαιαπεισαιμενοςπροσσ[. . .]
tονοη[. . .]νι[. . .]ευμαδιατησεχωρασπαρεντ[.]τη
15 δεπ[.]ποι[. . .]πονηνυσιωνκαιτωσμην[.]τα
χι[. . .]ουσπελευταιοιαυτωνκαταβαλ
λη[. . .]ωστρατιωνονακτωνδιατασ
στι[. . .]ωναγησιασοδεκαταζευξασ
πη[. . .]υτηνηνεμερανησυχιαν
20 η[. . .]μη[. . .]ομενατουσιασθανουσιδιε
φθαρη[. . .]δεπεριπεινηκουτανυστρατων
εισδε[. . .]επινοσμακαδισασειςενεδραντολουσ
τωμ[. . .]ορωντωνδερκιλιδειωνκαλουμενο
αιστι[. . .]οιγετοστρατευμαπαλιντωνδεμυςο
25 ουθ[. . .]καστοιδιατηπνπληγηνημητηπρο
tερα[. . .]μενηναπενατοναγησιαονεξελ
θυν[. . .]φωσμονεδικωποσπειδησουμενο
τουιτ[. . .]οιοιστοναυτοντροπονιδετωνελη
νωνερ[. . .]οιντεσωσονικανατουνσεκπηδη
30 σαντεσε[. . .]ηςενεδρασειςειρασησεαντοισπολε
μιοιστωνδεμυσονιμενηγουμενοικαιρω
τοιδωκο[.]τεσαεισηστουσελλησισυμιειζαν
τεσαπο[.]σκουσιοιδεπολλοκατιδοντεστουσρω
τουσα[.]νευπληγαιοσυνεσεφευγουπροστασκω
35 μασα[. . .]ασισεπεροσαγγελδηντοναυτοτωτω
μετα[. . .]νοσαπηγετοστρατευμασαλινη
αυτην[. . .]ωσισυνεμειξετοισεντα[.]σενεδρασ
το τοῖς Μυσο[τ]ς κελεύ[ον αὐτοὺς συντρ[ατείεσ με-
5 τ' αὐτῶν. εἰσὶ γὰρ οἱ πολ[λ]οι [τ]ῶν Μυσῶν αὐτ[ό]νομο
βασιλέως οὐχ ὑπακούον[τ]ες. ὅσοι μὲν οὖν [τῶν Μυ-
σῶν μετέχειν ἦροῦντο τῆς στρατείας [ο]ὐδὲν ἐ-
ποιεῖτε κακὸν αὐτοὺς, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἐθῆ[τ]ου τὴν χώ-
ραν. ἐπειδὴ δὲ προϊόν ἐγένετο κατὰ μέσον μάλι-
το στὰ τ[ό]ν "Ολυμπον τὸν Μύσιον καλούμενον, ὁρά
χαλ[ε]πῆς καὶ στενῆς οὖσαν τὴν δίδον [καὶ βου-
λόμ[ενος] ἀσφα[λῶς] πορευθῆναι δὲ αὐτῆς, πέμ[ψας
τινᾶ [πρός τ]οῦς Μυσοῦς καὶ σπεισάμενος πρὸς [αὐ-
τοὺς ἥ[γε τὸ] στράτευμα διὰ τῆς χώρας. παρέντ[ε]ς
15 δὲ πο[λλοῖς τῶν Π[ε]λοποννησίων καὶ τῶν συμ[μ]ᾶ-
χ[ῶν], ἐπιθέμενοι τ[ο]ῖς τελευταίοις αὐτῶν καταβάλ-
[λ][οντι τινας τ]ῶν στρατιωτῶν ἀτάκτων δια τάς
στροφορίας ὄντων. Ἀγησίλαος δὲ καταζεύγας
tὸ στράτευμα τα'ύτην τὴν ἡμέραν ἑσυχίαν
20 ἥ[γε ποιῶν τὰ νο[μ]ίματα τοῖς ἀποθανόντις διε-
θαρὰ[σαν] δὲ περὶ πεντήκοντα τῶν στρατιωτῶν·
eἰς δὲ τ[ὴν] ἐπιοῦναν καθίσας εἰς ἐνέδραν πολλοὺς
tῶν μ[εθοδό]βρον τῶν Δερκυλιδείων καλουμένων
ἀνασ[t]άς προῆγε τὸ στράτευμα πάλιν. τῶν δὲ Μυσῶν
25 οἰηθέντες ἐξ'καστοι διὰ τὴν πληγήν τὴν τῇ προ-
τέρα [γεγενν]μένην ἀπίειν τὸν Ἀγησίλαον ἐξελ-
θόντ[ες] ἑκ]τ]ῶν κωμῶν ἐδίωκον, ὡς ἐπιθήμενοι
tοῖς τ[ε]λευταίοις τῶν αὐτῶν τρόπον. οἱ δὲ τῶν Ἐλλη-
νῶν ἐ[ε]δρεύοντες, ὡς ἦσαν κατ' αὐτοὺς, ἐκπηδή-
30 σαντες ἐκ τ[ῆς ἐνέδρας εἰς χεῖρας ἔσαν τώς πολε-
μίοιοι. τῶν δὲ Μυσῶν οἱ μὲν ἤγοιμενοι καὶ πρώ-
tοι δι' χώκο]ντες ἐξαίφως τοῖς Ἑλληνι δισμείζαν-
tες ἀποθήκας δικοσκοροποῦν, οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ κατιδόντες τοὺς πρώ-
tους αὐτῶν ἐν πληγαῖς δόντες ἐφευγον πρὸς τὰς κό-
35 μας. Ἀγ[ησίλαος δὲ προσαγγελθέντων αὐτῶ τοιτοιν
μετα[βαλόμενος ἀπήγα τὸ στράτευμα πάλιν τὴν
αὐτὴν ὑδαῖν ἔλαβε συνεμείχε τοῖς ἐν τα[ῖς ἐνέδραις,
κακά[. . .]. ἕως ἑσπερινοῦ στρατεύματος ἀπεδομηκαίτη
προτερα[. . .]. θεσπροσπεδευσαμενεταντατοῖ—
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μεγαλεσθεὶσαν[. . .].
ρουκαπεργαντεσα[. . .].
τοτονοννεκρονν[. . .].
ητριακοντακαι[. . .].

5 κομωντινασκαθ[. . .].
ημεραστουστρ[. . .]. ἑποροσθεν[. . .].
στρατεύμακαικα[. . .]. βίβασα[. . .].
γαρ[. . .]. ανθρατωνφ[. . .].
γαλονουκεσ[. . .].
ντονπροτερου[. . .].
ουσενεβαλεναλ[. . .]. κατατηρεο[. . .].

10 κακάκοςκαθη[. . .]. ιουνιονοδεσπιθά
δα[. . .]. ἑσθομεγνηπηπερ[. . .]. απειβολ[. . .].
τοφαρμαβαζοκαιθερεπενουν[. . .].
νέπε[. . .]. ηκ[. . .].

15 εισκυκούστεροντυ[. . .].
κακακενο[. . .].
κακακο[. . .].

20 γ[. . .].

25 προς[. . .].

30 μινεπιχωρατοσκοδομη[. . .]. καικατε
καὶ κα[τεσκή]νονεν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον ἦ καὶ τῇ προτέρᾳ [κ]ατεστρατοπέδευσαν. μετὰ δὲ ταύτα τῶν
15 εἰς Κύζικον, ὕστερον δ[ὲ] ὡς Ἀγι[σ]θ[α]ο[ν ἤ][κεν ἄ]γων [Μεγαβάτην υἱὸν νεόν οὕτα καὶ καλόν. Ἀγησίλαος δὲ τούτων γενομένων ἀνέλαβεν αὐτοὺς μάλιστα μὲν ἕνα τοῦ μειράκιον, λέγεται γὰρ ἐπίθυμητι-κῶς αὐτοῦ σφόδρα ἤχειν, ἐπειτα δὲ καὶ διὰ Σπιθραδά-
20 τὴν ἡγεμόνα τε τῆς στρατιᾶς ἤγομένον αὐτοῖς ἑσεθαί καὶ [πρὸς] ἄλλα χρήσιμον. ἐκεῖνοι μὲν οὖν τὸ[ν]-
25 πρὸς χωρί̣ον δ καλείται Λεύκων Κεφαλαί. καὶ ποιησάμενος πρὸς αὐτὸ προσβολάς, ὡς οὐδὲν ἐπέραυν, ἀναστήσας τὸ στράτευμα προῆγεν εἰς τὸ πρόσθεν(ν) πορθῶν καὶ λεηλατῶν τῆς χώρας τῆς ἀκέραιον. ἀφικόμενος δὲ πάλιν πρὸς Γόρδιον, χω-
30 ρίον ἐπὶ χώρατος φοκοδομημένον καὶ κατε-
κενασμενονκακωσκακακαταςευξαστοστιαευμα
περιεμενενέξημερασπρισμενουσιονεμενονονυστρατωται
προσβολασμουσιονονυστρατωται

ουγκηνουλατοδιατηραθανουπροθυμανοσ
πηρχεναυτυπήγησωνυγενοσαναστησαν
ανουστρατισκελευσονυστουσπιθρι
δατουεισπαλαγουιανπονεοθαμεταδην

ταπροαγωνονοπολονυσιουσκανουσυμμα
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χουστ[. . . . . . . . . . . .]γιασκακησπαλαγον[
ασεκ[. . . . . . . . . . . .]πρατοπεδευετευδεσπι.
θριδατη[. . . . . . . . . . . .]νοδεπορευειςκαιπε.
σασεκ[. . . . . . . . . . . .]αγωνηνησιλαοςδεποιη.

σαμει[. . . . . . . . . . . .]νπαλαγονουπαγογ[
διαταχ[. . . . . . . . . . . .]αλαττανφοβουμενομπ.
χειμη[. . . . . . . . . . . .]ωσιεπουετετευπορε.
ανουκε[. . . . . . . . . . . .]περηπελεαλετερανγοπ.
μενονδια[. . . . . . . . . . . .]διεξε[. . . . . . . . . . . .]ποτερος[.

σεθαιτοισῃ[. . . . . . . . . . . .]τειλε[. . . . . . . . . . . .]τε[. . . . . . . . . . . .].

αυτωγηνπτο[. . . . . . . . . . . .]ντ ντ[. . . . . . . . . . . .]τοι[. . . . . . . . . . . .].

ιππεση[. . . . . . . . . . . .]ουσπεοουδεπελειων[. . . . . .].

ουκαταγ[. . . . . . . . . . . .]αιευμακακατινησυμπασ[.
.

ποιε[. . . . . . . . . . . .]νανθουνεπεβουλευσαναυτουπ[.

ριτονολυμπ[. . . . . . . . . . . .]περουδεπρογητουεληνασδιατη[.

φρυγιαστησιρ[. . . . . . . . . . . .]αττιδουκαπροσβαλωνπροσ[.

ως

ριοντοκαλουμ[. . . . . . . . . . . .]οιμειλημενετεχουσονκηδυνατ[.

λαβειαληνηγε[. . . . . .]ποστρατιωτασποιμονοδετην[.

πορειανπαρατονρυδακονονταμονατ[. . . . . .]κενεια[.

παστημδασκυλεινιλεμηνυφηκειατ[. . . . . .]δακυλειο[.

χωριονχυρονφοδρακακεσκευασμ[. . . . . .]ρονυπο[.

βασιλεωσκατονφαρναβαζουλεγονα[. . . . . .]γυρον[.
σκευασμένον καὶ(λ)ῶς, καὶ καταζεύξασ τὸ στράτευμα 
περέμεμεν ἐξ ἡμέρας, πρὸς μὲν τοὺς πολέμιους 
προσβαλάς ποιούμενος, τοὺς δὲ στρατιώτας ἐπὶ πολέμιον ἀγαθὸς συνέχων. ἐπειδὴ δὲ βιάσασθαι τὸ χωρίον ὦν ἦδυνατο διὰ τὴν Ῥαθάνου προθμίαν, ὡς ἐπηρέξειν αὐτοῦ Π(έρσα)γα ὁ ὕνον, ἀναστήσας ἦγεν ἄνω τοὺς στρατιῶτας, κελεύοντος τοῦ Σπιθραδάτου εἰς Παφλαγόνιαν πορεύσοντα. μετά δὲ ταῦτα προάγων τοὺς Πελοπονησίους καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους.
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χους πρὸς τὰ ὄρια τῆς Φρυγίας καὶ τῆς Παφλαγονίας ἐκεῖ τὸ στράτευμα κατέστρατοπέδευσε, τὸν δὲ Σπιθραδάτην αὐτὸν προσέφυσεν· ὁ δὲ πορευθεὶς καὶ περιήγησας ἐκείνους ἦκε πρόβεσθείς ἄγων. Ἀγησίλαος δὲ ποιησάμενος ὕπαρξε τῶν Παφλαγῶν ἀπήγαγε διὰ ταχέως τὸ στράτευμα ἐπὶ θάλασσαν, φοβοῦμενος μὴ χειρῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς προφήτας ἔνδειον. ἐποίησε δὲ τὴν πορείαν ὑπὲρ ἀυτῆς ὑπὸ περ ἠλθὲν ἄλλον έτέραν, ἡγοῦμεν διὰ τῆς Βιθυνίας διέξειον ἀκολοῦθον ἀρχιπεριπετέως·

10 σεσθαί τοῖς στρατιώταις. ἀπέστειλε δὲ τοῖς τετελεσμένοις, πειράζουσι περὶ πλείον ἡ συνεχεία θητείας, καταγαγὼν δὲ τὸ στράτευμα κατὰ Κίον τῆς Μυσίας, [πρώτον μὲν περιμείνας ἡμέρας αὐτὸν δέκα κακῶς ἑπετεῖαν] τοὺς Μυσίαν πάλιν ἄν οἶδαν ἐπεβουλευθείς αὐτῶ πρὸς τὸν Ὀλυμπον, ὡς]περ ξον χρήσει τὸ γράφει τοὺς Ἑλλήνας διὰ τῆς Φρυγίας τῆς παράθεσις. καὶ προσβαλόν πρὸς ἥρων τὸ καλόν ἔρων Μιλήτου Τείχους, ὡς ὦν ἦδυνατο λαβεῖν, ἀπήγαγε τοὺς στρατιώτας. ποιούμενος δὲ τὴν

15 πορείαν παρὰ τῶν Ρώσδακον ποταμῶν ἄφεξείται πρὸς τὴν Δασκυλίτην λίμνην ὕψ' ἵ' κεῖται τὸ[δ] Δα(σ)κ(υλίτης) ποταμὸς δ' ἀράμα διὰ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ποταμοῦ. καὶ κατεσκευάσθη [ἐν] ὕπ' Βασιλέως, οὗ καὶ τοῦ Φαρνάβαζον ἔλεγον ἄρα γύριον ὁ[ς]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

ηναυτωκαϊχρυσωναποτθεοθαικατεστρατον
dευκωδετουσστρατιωσασκειδειμετεπεμπετοπο
καλονοσεπιβατηστωναναρχωχειρικατειπεπολευκ
επεμελειτοτουελλησποντουεντετρηνεσεων

..., των

.. 

κελευσεναγησιλαοσενθεμενονοσατων

.. 

γενοιτουσστρατιωσασαποτησφια
φωτασασκοσικενειστοεραρπο

.. 

υκελικικασφωσικεκατομηκοσ
αιτοουτατοπευσκασαβαδι

Unplaced Fragments.

Fr. 16 (to Cols. i or ili?).

Fr. 17 (to Col. iv?).

Fr. 18 (to Col. iv?).

Fr. 19 (to Col. iv?).

Fr. 20 (to Col. iv?).

Fr. 21 (to Col. vii?).
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ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ χρυσίνον ἀποτίθεσθαι. κατεστρατοπ外籍
25 δευκάς δὲ τοῦ στρατιώτατος ἐκείθι μετεπέμπτο Παύγ-
καλον, ὡς ἐπιβάτης τῷ ναυάρχῳ Χειρικράτει πεπλευκῶς
ἐπεμελείτο τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου πέντε τριήρεις ἕχων.
[παραγ]ενομένου δὲ τοῦ Παγκάλου διὰ ταχέων καὶ
[ταῖς τρὶς] ὑρ[εσιν εἰσπλευσάντος εἰς τὴν Λίμνην, ἐκεῖ-
30 [νον μὲν] ἐκέλευσεν ὁ Ἀγγέλλαος ἐνθέμενον ὅσα τῶν
[. . . . .] μέν ἦν ὑ[πὸ] πλείονος ἄξια διαγαγεῖν εἰς τ[Ion].
[. . .] περὶ Κί[ξικον, ὡπως {αν} ἀπ’ αὐτῶν μισθὸς τῷ [σ]τρα-
[τιῶτα] ἔγειεντο. τοὺς δὲ στρατιώτας τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς Μ[υ]σίας ἀ-
[πέλυσε προστάγας αὐτοῖς ἴκειν εἰς τὸ ἔαρ, παρο[σκευαι-
35] [τὸν τ]οὺς ἐπίστατα ἤμισι βαδίζειν εἰς Καππα-
[δοκίαν, ἀκοῦ[ν]ν ταύτην τὴν χώραν διατείνειν ὡς-
[περ ταινίαν] στενὴν ἀρξαμένην ἀπὸ τῆς Ποντίκης
[θαλάττης] μὴρ Κιλικίας κ[αί] Φωινίκης, καὶ τ[δ] μῆκος
[αὐτῆς εἰς·αὶ τοσοῦτοι ὁπ]τε τοὺς ἐκ Σινώπης βαδίζουσις)

Unplaced Fragments.

Fr. 17 (to Col. iv?).

Τ[σ]σαφ[ερν
[αμο]
Τισσα]φερν
. . . . .

Fr. 18 (to Col. iv?).

]μιωσ[ι]
] γάρ πρ[ι]
|δων κ]
β]αξοι[
5 ]ετ[ι]
. . . . .

Fr. 19 (to Col. iv?).

:] τυρα[νν
[απασ[ι]
[αυτα[π]
]. μον[]
5 ὀμερω[]
[μετεν]

Fr. 20 (to Col. iv?).

:]τον δ[
]. αν ετ . [
]το τασ π[
]. ων ἀλ[
5 ]υρον[
]λυσαι[
Ο 2

Fr. 21 (to Col. vii?).

. . . . .
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Fr. 23 (to Col. x?).

] ἐστὶν [ ]  ὀμ. [ . . .

Fr. 29. Fr. 30. Fr. 31.

] ν τὴν [ ] . α[ ] . τῆς σιν[ . . .
]υτακ[ ]αυτο[ ] κατεσχ[ ]
]άφικν[ ]ο ἐντα [ ]εως απ[ ]
]μ[ ] . . . . 5] τοὺς στ[ . . .

Fr. 33. Fr. 36.

] ασ[ ]α μὲν π[ ]]
] κα[ ]οὐ[ ]λαβεῖν η[ ]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Fr. 37.} & \text{Fr. 38.} & \text{Fr. 39.} & \text{Fr. 40.} & \text{Fr. 41.} \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Fr. 42.} & \text{Fr. 43.} & \text{Fr. 44.} & \text{Fr. 45.} & \text{Fr. 46.} \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Fr. 47.} & \text{Fr. 48.} & \text{Fr. 49.} & \text{Fr. 50.} & \text{Fr. 51.} \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Fr. 52.} & \text{Fr. 53.} & \text{Fr. 54.} & \text{Fr. 55.} & \text{Fr. 56.} \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\end{array}
\]
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αρεικο

διεξιόντων

νην ὑστερ

σαφο

ρμων

στρατο

χρωμην

. . . .

. . . .
\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Fr. 57. & Fr. 58. & Fr. 59. & Fr. 60. & Fr. 61. \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\hline
Fr. 62. & Fr. 63. & Fr. 64. & Fr. 65. & Fr. 66. \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\hline
Fr. 67. & Fr. 69. & Fr. 71. & Fr. 72. \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\hline
Fr. 68. & Fr. 69. & Fr. 70. & Fr. 72. \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\hline
\text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} & \text{\ldots} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

Cols. i. 1–iii. 7 = chs. I–III.

_Expediti\ of Demaenetus. Anti-Spartan feeling in Greece._

'About the same time a trireme sailed out from Athens without the consent of the people. Demaenetus, the . . . of it, had privately imparted his plan in secret to the boule, as it is said, and some of the citizens having conspired with him, he went down with them to the Piraeus, and having launched a ship at the docks set sail to join Conon. Thereupon an uproar was raised, and the notables and cultivated class among the Athenians were indignant, declaring that it would give the city a bad name if they began a war with the Lacedaemonians. The bouleutai, frightened by the clamour, held a meeting of the people, pretending to have had no share in the enterprise. The populace having assembled,
the party at Athens of Thrasybulus, Aesimus, and Anytus came forward and pointed out that the Athenians were incurring great risks unless they relieved the state from the responsibility. The moderate and wealthy class at Athens was content with the present policy, while the populace and democratic party on that occasion, through fear, yielded to their advisers, and sent to Milon, the harmost of Aegina, to inform him that he could punish Damaenetus since the latter had acted without the leave of the state. But previously for nearly the whole time their policy was aggressive, and in frequent opposition to the Lacedaemonians. Not only were they in the habit of dispatching both arms and sailors for Conon’s fleet, but on a former occasion ... crates, Hagnias, and Telesegorus with their companions were dispatched on an embassy to the king, the ambassadors being captured
by Pharax, the former admiral, and sent as prisoners to the Lacedaemonians, who put them to death. This opposition was stimulated by the party of Epicrates and Cephalus; for it was they who were most anxious to involve Athens in war, holding that view not merely since they had dealings with Timocrates and received the gold, but long before. It is nevertheless asserted by some that Timocrates’ bribes were responsible for the formation of the war party at Athens and among the Boeotians and in the other states which I have mentioned, owing to ignorance of the circumstance that all of them had long adopted a hostile attitude towards the Lacedaemonians, and been on the watch for an opportunity to involve the states in war. For the Lacedaemonians were hated by the Argive and Boeotian factions for being on friendly terms with the opposing party of the citizens, and by the faction at Athens because it desired to put an end to the existing tranquillity and peace, and to lead the Athenians on to a policy of war and interference, in order that it might be enabled to make a profit from the state funds. At Corinth, of the partisans of a change of policy the majority were hostile to the Lacedaemonians for reasons similar to those of the Argives and Boeotians, while Timolaus alone had become opposed to them on account of private grounds of complaint, although he was formerly on the best of terms with them and a strong philo-Laconian, as can be ascertained from the events of the Decelean war. On one occasion, with a squadron of five ships, he plundered several of the islands tributary to the Athenians, and on another, having sailed to Amphipolis with two triremes, and manned four more supplied from there, he defeated Sichius (?), the Athenian general, in a sea-fight, as I have previously related, and captured the enemy’s triremes, which were five in number, together with a convoy of 30 (?) boats; subsequently with three triremes he sailed to Thasos and caused the island to revolt from the Athenians.

Parties, therefore, in the aforesaid states had been induced to hate the Lacedaemonians far more by these reasons than by Pharnabazus and the gold. When Milon, the harmost of Aegina, heard the news brought by the Athenians, he quickly manned a trireme and pursued Damaenetus. The latter at this time happened to be waiting off Thurcus in Attica, but when Milon arrived at Thoricus and tried to attack him he hastened to sail far in advance. Having gained possession of a ship belonging to them he left his own ship behind because the hull was inferior, and transferring his sailors to the other ship continued his voyage to Conon’s fleet, while Milon . . . with the trireme returned to Aegina.

1. A new book apparently begins here (cf. p. 115); and it is quite uncertain with what events our author synchronizes the expedition of Damaenetus, which took place in the first half of 306 ifCols. i–iv are correctly placed (cf. iii. 9, note), or in the early summer of 305 ifCols. i–iv followCols. v–viii, as is much less probable.

2. For ὰν μετά cf.l. 24. ἡ ν or ἡ οὐδείς may be substituted for ἡ διό, which was suggested by Wilamowitz. The construction in ll. 2–7 is not clear; cf. note on l. 5.

3. Δημαίνεται: he is identical, as was perceived by Wilamowitz, with Δημαίνεται ὁ Βοῦζγης in Aeschines ii. 78 θείοις δὲ ἡμέτεροι Κλέοσκολος ὁ Πλαύκου τοῦ Ἀχαρνίων νόος μετὰ Δημαίνετας τὸν Βοῦζγην συγκαταναλάξας Χείλωνα τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων πολέμοις, Χείλων being obviously identical with the harmost of Aegina called Μιλών in i. 22 and ii. 35. Aeschines has exaggerated the importance of the naval engagement, which as P shows was a trivial affair. The Damaenetus who is mentioned as strategus in 388–7 in Aegina (Xen. Hell. v. 1. 10) and in the autumn of 387 on the Hellespont (Hell. v. 1. 26) is no doubt the same person as Damaenetus ὁ Βοῦζγης; cf. Kirchner, Att. Prosopogr. i. pp. 216: but that on the present occasion he held the office of strategus is neither stated by P nor in itself likely. Mayer well compares the private expedition of Macartatus to Crete in (probably) 386–379 with a trireme which he had bought (Isaetz xi. 48). The word following Δημαίνεται
seems to be a title, if αὐτής is right. ἐπίστος could be read, but this would imply that the trireme was Damaenetus' own property, whereas it was clearly a warship belonging to the State. The doubtful κ might be α; the following letter can equally well be γ, i, μ, ν, π, τ, or υ; for (μ;?) a single letter (ν;?) may be substituted, and in place of υη (or ση) γη should perhaps be read. A single word as a family name or a title would be more suitable than κ...ιας αὐτής, but Μοικέγες is inadmissible, though it is possible that the word in the papyrus is a corruption of this.

4. βουλή ὄσω: for other instances of hiatus cf. vi. 39, vii. 7, xi. 22, xii. 24, xvi. 6, xviii. 5 and 24.

πράγματοι: the end of this line must have projected some distance beyond that of l. 1 and ll. 3 sqq.

5. ἐπαύθη: the vestiges of the letter following δι suit η somewhat better than ε. σίν [οις instead of σν] would have the advantage of preventing this line from being exceptionally short, but the construction of ll. 2-7 is then somewhat awkward. Between στω and πολεμῶν the scribe seems to have omitted either τινες or των, more probably the former; cf. the omissions of words in i. 36, ii. 16, xi. 20, xiv. 13, 29, xvi. 23, and xx. 20. Or possibly συν αὐτῷ, i.e. συ(χ)εώς should be read, as Wilamowitz suggests.

6. ναῦς: τὴν ναῦς would be expected, especially if αὐτής in l. 3 is right.

9. γνώνου[οι]: cf. xii. 31.

16. Thrasybulus and Anytus are well known as leaders of the moderate democratic party at this period. On Λισίμαχος, who is less frequently mentioned, cf. Kirchner, All. Prosopogr. i. p. 22. Our author ignores Archinus, who was also prominent at this time (cf. p. 140). It is interesting to note the cautious policy pursued by this section of the Athenian democrats, who side with the aristocrats in objecting to an open breach with Sparta, and for the moment succeed in curbing the warlike spirit of the majority of the democratic party headed by Epikrates and Cephalus (l. 25). The course of events was, however, too strong for the advocates of peace, and Thrasybulus himself in the late summer of 395 proposed the alliance with Boeotia, which was agreed to without opposition (Xen. Hell. iii. 5, 16). If the events recorded in i. 1-iii. 7 belonged to the spring or early summer of 395, the change of policy must have taken place within a very few months, and seems very sudden. It is therefore much more satisfactory to refer chapters I-III to 396, and to suppose more than a year's interval between the expedition of Damaenetus and the alliance of Athens with Boeotia; cf. iii. 3, note.

22. Μιλιουσ: he is called Χελων by Aeschines ii. 78; cf. note on l. 3. Which is the correct form is uncertain.

27. ἀντεπαίρετον (l. ἀντεπάρατον): it is possible that the scribe has himself corrected the ε to o.

27-8. For the secret assistance rendered to Conon by the Athenians cf. Isocr. Paneg. 142 ἐν δὲ τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ περὶ 'Ρόδων... χρώμενος δὲ ταῖς ὑπημείσιις ταῖς παρ' ἡμῶν, στατηροίντω δ' αὐτῷ Κόμως.

30. The letter after βασιλεία, if not π, can only be γ. πάντερπον is somewhat too long and is not very appropriate, since it occurs immediately afterwards in l. 32. Bury suggests πάντοτον, i.e. the first embassy to the Persians since the Peace, 'Επ[ε]κτείνετο is possible, but in that case we should expect our author to have distinguished this Epikrates from the democratic leader of that name mentioned in l. 35. το can be read in place of π[ε], and 'Επ[ε]κτένεισι or Αποσθαλείσι is more likely; 'Ἀμιξ[]περίστης seems to be too long. One of the three ambassadors, Hagnias, is known from Isocr. xi. 8 Ἀργεῖον οὖν ὦτε ἐπειδὴ παρεκκείσθαι προσβεβοῦν ἐπὶ ταύτα τὰ πράξεις, and from Harpocrates 2. v. 'Αργεῖος, τούτοις καὶ τοῖς συμπερασμεῖσις αὐτῶν φησὶν Ἀνδριαισίν ἐν πέμπτῳ τῆς Αρτέμιδος καὶ Φιλόχορος ὡς ἀλλων τε καὶ ἀπέθανον. Telesegorus is possibly the father of Λεωμήδης Τελεσηγόρου Κολυτείδες who
occurs in an inscription of the middle of the fourth century B.C. (Kirchner, op. cit. ii. p. 304). The date of the embassy, which was previously uncertain, is now fixed within narrow limits by the mention of φίλαρξ ὑπερτον ναυάρχος, for he is known from Xen. Hell. iii. 2. 12. 14 to have co-operated with Dercylidas in the spring and summer of 397. Apart from the uncertainty as to the period of the year in which the Spartan ναυάρχος entered on their command, it has been disputed whether Pharam' term of office belongs to 397-7 or 397-6. Since his ναυάρχος is here spoken of as past, the present passage, if i. 1-iii. 7 are rightly assigned to the first half of 396, is strongly in favour of the date 398-7; cf. iii. 9 and 23-6, notes.

i. 33 sqq. P here diverges into a highly interesting account of the causes of the formation of the anti-Spartan league, and in connexion with the mission of Timocrates the Rhodian supplies some new information of importance. Xenophon (Hell. iii. 5. 1-2) attributes to Tithraustes the mission of the Persian envoy with 50 talents, and specifies as the recipients at Thebes Androclidas, Ismenias, and Galaxidorus, at Corinth Timolaus and Polyantas, at Argos Cylon and οἱ μετ' αὐτῶν, but says of the Athenians καὶ ἀπὸ μεταλαβόντες τούτων τὸ τρίτον ἄργον πρόθυρον ἔσων εἰς τὸν πλέον νομίζοντες τε αὐτῶν ἀρχηγόν. He then proceeds to describe the outbreak of the Boeotian war, which he regards as the direct outcome of Timocrates' bribes. Pausanias (iii. 9. 8) also connects Timocrates with Tithraustes, and gives a list of the recipients of the money (Cylon and Sodamas at Argos, Androclides, Ismenias, and Amphithemis at Thebes, Cephalus and Epicrates at Athens, Polyantas and Timolaus at Argos), and like Xenophon treats the Boeotian war, in describing which he mentions οὗτοι ἀκόμα, as an effect of the mission. Phutarch too (Artax. 20; cf. Lysand. 27, Ages. 15) agrees with Xenophon's date for Timocrates. Only Polybaenus (i. 48) connects the episode not with Tithraustes but with Pharmabuzus, Κώνων Φαρμάβαος συμμαχῶν 'Αγρείοις τῷ Αρτάιῳ πορεύσαντα ἔπειτα τὸν Πέρσην χρυσὸν πέτυχαν τοῖς ἀδημογαθοῖς, κτλ., though it is possible that his statement is due to mere carelessness. Diodorus, Nepos, and Justin are silent on the subject. Our author, as appears both from i. 37 and ii. 4 and 32 Πάλης ταῦτα προσημαζόντα, had already described the sending of Timocrates, no doubt in its chronological position, in his main narrative, but ii. 33 shows that, like Polybaenus, he connected it with Pharmabuzus, and i. 37-ii. 1 indicates that, like Pausanias, he was in opposition to Xenophon believed in the guilt of the Athenians Epicrates and Cephalus. In ii. 1 sqq., however, he controverts the view that the anti-Spartan league was brought about by Timocrates, attributing the hostility of the states to Sparta to other and older reasons. It has been generally recognized that Xenophon's account of the origin of the confederacy is chronologically untenable, for if Timocrates was sent by Tithraustes, who cannot have reached Sardis before June 395, he must have arrived in Greece after the beginning of the Boeotian war (of which Pausanias' date is now confirmed by xi. 34 τοῦτον τοῦ βέρος), and therefore cannot have been the cause of it; and historians have usually accepted Xenophon's date for Timocrates' mission, and abandoned the connexion between it and the outbreak of the war; cf. Beloch, Gr. Gesch. ii. p. 193; Meyer, Gesch. d. All. v. pp. 231-2. Now, however, in the light of the new evidence another solution of the chronological difficulty in Xenophon's account is preferable. The error lies not in making Timocrates' mission precede the beginning of the war, but in supposing that he was sent by Tithraustes. On the view that he was inspired by Pharmabuzus the difficulty vanishes, for it is clear from the order of the narrative in P, who does not reach the Boeotian war until xi. 34 sqq., that there was a considerable interval of time (more than a year) between the mission and the opening of hostilities in the summer of 395. The reference in προσημαζόντα πάλης (ii. 4 and 32) seems to be to a not very distant passage, and it is possible that the description of Timocrates' mission in the main narrative occurred shortly before Col. i. If so, since the expedition of Demeaenetus took place in the first half of 396, the journey of Timocrates
must have occurred not later than the spring of that year. An earlier date for it would produce a conflict with Polyaeus, since he synchronizes the mission with the campaigns of Agesilaus in Asia, which began in the spring of 396. Polyaeus' statement is not lightly to be disregarded, especially as a close relation between him and P has been detected in another passage; cf. vii. 4, note. On the other hand the argument in i. 33–ii. 1 is more logical if the dispatch of Timocrates preceded in point of time the embassy mentioned in i. 29–33, which took place in 397 (cf. l. 30, note), and the year 397, in which Pharnabazus and Conon set to work to construct a fleet, is in itself a very suitable date. Hence the interval between the mission and the outbreak of the Boeotian war may be as much as two years. Even if Cols. i–iv are placed after v–viii and belong to the year 395 (cf. iii. 9, note), P's date for the mission cannot be brought down later than the spring of 395, so that there would still remain an interval of some months between it and the Boeotian war. The chronological mistake made by Xenophon and others may well be due, as Meyer suggests, to the circumstance that the fruits of the Persian bribes were not apparent till the summer of 395.

On the question of the date of Timocrates' mission and the Persian who inspired it, P is certainly right as against Xenophon. Which account is to be followed in regard to the action of the Athenian democrats? Here, too, we think P's version is more probable than Xenophon's, and that Epiphrates and Cephalus, as Pausanias also states, took the Persian gold. There was clearly a widespread belief in the fourth century that they did so, as is shown not only by our author's own view, but by that of the unnamed τινί, which he controverts in ii. 1–7, without however disputing the fact of the bribes having been received. Moreover, P's explanation of the origin of the anti-Spartan feeling as due not to bribery, but to anterior and deeper lying causes, is eminently just, and exhibits his acute insight into the politics of the fourth century, in which many of the leading statesmen thought it no shame to be in the pay of a foreign power, so long as the policy of which they really approved was pursued. And if P is right, as is practically certain, in minimizing the effects of Timocrates' bribes, he is probably correct also in his admission with regard to Epiphrates and Cephalus. Xenophon must have known of the charges against them, but, exaggerating the part played by Persian gold in bringing about the league, and, like our author, being aware of the strong war feeling at Athens (the corrupt words νομίζωντες τε αὐτῶν ἀρχεῖαν probably refer, as Meyer remarks, to the Athenian desire to recover their empire; cf. Hell. iii. 5. 10 καὶ μὴν ὠτα βαριλασθ ἢν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἡ πρῶτον ἔκτρησθε ἀνελκάκιν πάντες ἐπισταμένα), seems to have excepted the Athenians, mainly in order that he might emphasize the accusations of Medizing which he brings against the other allies, in particular the Thebans. Only in one respect does P compare unfavourably with Xenophon, the desire for personal profit imputed as a motive to the Athenian war party (ii. 10–14). Here he seems to be influenced by an anti-democratic bias, which is quite in keeping with that of Theopompus (cf. p. 129), and to misrepresent the natural patriotic aspirations of the Athenians to which Xenophon alludes, thereby coming nearer to the truth.

36. For the omissions cf. i. 5, note.

37. Τιμοκράτης: so also Xenophon and Pausanias. Plato (Μενο 90 Α) calls him Πολυκράτης, but the fault may be due to his MSS. Plutarch in Arilax. 20 has the form Ἐμοκράτης and Ἐμοκράτων, but in the second case apparently with a variant Τιμοκράτων, so that the mistake is presumably due to the MSS.

ii. 1. τινὶς λόγοισιν: the view which our author here controverts, and which originated no doubt in Sparta, coloured the sources from which Pausanias drew his information, and Xenophon shared it to a large extent; cf. note on i. 33. That P included Xenophon among the τινὶς is not likely, seeing that P's work was written little, if at all, later than Xenophon's Hellenica (cf. p. 124); the reference may be to historical works which have perished or merely to current tradition.
ii. 8. \(\text{Βωσω\ldots\gammaωται}\) : if not \(\gamma\), the letter after the lacuna must be \(\tau\). \(\gammaωται\ or\ \tauωται\) is very intractable; and if a correction is necessary the simplest course is to read \(\sigmaται\γωται\), i.e. \(\sigmaται\γωται\), the superfluous \(\gamma\) being an example of the practice of inserting a \(\gamma\) between two vowels, which is not uncommon in Ptolemaic papyri. A difficulty, however, then arises about the termination of \(\text{Βωσω}\), for the lacuna ought to contain only six or seven letters. \(\text{Βωσω\ οι\ στασι\γωται}\) is too long, and for \(\text{Βωσω\ οι\ στασι\γωται}\) there is barely room. That the scribe wrote \(\text{Βωσω\οι}\) is in any case probable (cf. l. 16), but \(\text{Βωσω\οι}\) is not used as an adjective at this period, so that with \(\text{Βωσω\ οι\ στασι\γωται}\) two corrections are necessary, which is not a very satisfactory hypothesis. If \(\sigmaται\γωται\) is the word intended, it must apply to the Argives as well as to the Bocotians, for the two states are treated as exactly parallel in l. 16, and the clause \(\epsilonι\ το\ αυ\ ειμ\ έτι\ αι\ κ.\ τ.\ ά\) refers to both, which implies that there was a philo-Laconian party at Argos as well as at Thebes. Theban politics at this period are discussed in greater detail in xii. 31 sqq.

13-4. This sarcastic and somewhat unfair criticism of the motives of the Athenian war party favours the view that our author is Theopompus; cf. note on i. 33 and p. 129.

17. \(\tau[\xi\omega]\\lambda\omega\sigma\) : both Xenophon and Pausanias state that he took Timocrates' bribes (cf. i. 33, note), and P no doubt admitted the fact, as he does definitely in the case of Epicrates and Cephalus; but he regarded Timolaus' private quarrel with the Spartans as the chief reason for his present anti-Spartan attitude. In Xen. Hell. iv. 2. 11 Timolaus appears as leader of the Corinthian contingent at the battle of Nemea.

21-32. Of Timolaus' exploits in the Decelean war (which is again referred to in xiii. 16 and 30) the expedition to Thasos must, as Meyer remarks, have occurred towards the end of 411. Thucydides (viii. 64) records in that year the fall of the Thasian democracy, the fortification of the city, and the expectation of speedy assistance from the Spartans, with whom the exiled Thasian oligarchs had taken refuge. In 410 Thasos has a Spartan harmost (Xen. Hell. i. 1. 32), so that the arrival of Timolaus with the Peloponnesian fleet falls in the intervening period. The incidents related in ll. 24-32 therefore occurred just after the point at which Thucydides' history breaks off, and the reference in ll. 27-8 to a former mention of them (probably in the main narrative) is important as an indication that the present work was a continuation of Thucydides; cf. p. 122. The earlier exploit, the plundering of certain islands (ll. 22-4), probably took place in 412 or early in 411, and is passed over by Thucydides.

26. \(\sigma\chi\omega\) must be corrupt, and more probably conceals the name of the Athenian stratagems than a reference to Chios. The only name among the known Athenian strateges at that period which remotely resembles \(\Sigma\chi\omega\) is \(\Sigmaτρομβ\chi\delta\ι\delta\) (Thuc. viii. 15-79), but he is not likely to be meant.

27. \(\omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\ \epsilon\iota\rho\nu\kappa\alpha\ \pi\nu\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\ \pi\rho\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\) : cf. xii. 32 \(\omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\ \pi\rho\omega\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\ \epsilon\iota\rho\kappa\alpha\), and ii. 21-32, note.

29. \(\epsilon\iota\pi\rho\mu\nu\\alpha\) : \(\pi\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\mu\\nu\\alpha\) would be expected (cf. Dem. viii. 25 \(\pi\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\mu\\nu\\alpha\ \tau\alpha\ \pi\lambda\iota\ \tau\alpha\ \alpha\\iota\tau\alpha\)), but \(\iota\alpha\ \pi\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\\nu\mu\\nu\\alpha\ \tau\iota\alpha\ \pi\lambda\iota\\iota\) is not satisfactory.

30. Wilamowitz suggests \(\tau\iota\alpha\ \epsilon\iota\\delta\\kappa\alpha\) in the lacuna.

33. \(\phi\alpha\rho\omega\delta\iota\zeta\\alpha\) : cf. i. 33, note.

34. The curious order of the words \(\epsilon\iota\pi\rho\mu\nu\\alpha\ \mu\\iota\\iota\ \gamma\sigma\nu\) is due to the desire to avoid hiatus; cf. xi. 22, note.

iii. 1-5. That Fr. 1 belongs to the top of this column is practically certain, (1) from internal evidence of its suitability to this context; (2) from the colour of the papyrus, which resembles that of Cols. i–ii in being much lighter than the rest; (3) from the recto, which has the beginnings of two lines that suit the first two lines of the column of the land-survey on the recto of Col. ii. The remainder of Col. iii (which on the recto has the ends of lines of a column of the land-survey) is on a separate fragment, but the correctness of its
position admits of no doubt; cf. ὅ δὲ Μίλους εἰς Αἴγιναν in l. 6. Since the width of the gap separating Fr. i from the bulk of Col. iii cannot be determined with absolute precision, and the beginnings of lines are lost throughout this column, the size of the lacuna on each side of Fr. i may be slightly larger or smaller than we have supposed in our restoration, which proceeds on the assumption that 5 or 6 letters are missing at the beginning and 8 or 9 in the middle of ll. 1-5.

It is not clear whose ship Demaenetus took possession of. Aeschines ii. 78 (cf. i. 3, note) states that he συγκαταναλώσας Χέλωνα (i.e. Milon), and Wilamowitz, reading τῆς νῆσος in vii. 2, thinks that Demaenetus captured Milon's ship. To this there are the objections: (1) that it is not easy to see how Demaenetus obtained possession of Milon's ship without capturing Milon himself, who, as appears from l. 6, returned safely to Aegina; (2) that the plural αἰτῶν in l. 2 suits the inhabitants of a place just mentioned (cf. vi. 24-5 εἰς Ἀμβρακίαν καταπλέωσα καὶ παρ' εἰκόνων) better than the Spartans; (3) the remains of l. 7 suggest that Demaenetus took flight on Milon's approach rather than that he gave action. Hence we prefer to regard αἰτῶν as the inhabitants either of Thoricus or, reading εἰκόνας, of that place, though we are unable to suggest a suitable place-name. μὴν νῆσος is, however, not satisfactory, and τῆς would suit the word better. For τῶν there is no room, but τοῦ (Burry) is possible.

6-7. Something like μετὰ τῆς τριήμερας ἀπέπλευσα is required.

Cols. iii. 7-iv. 42 = chs. IV-V. *The Naval War.*

iii. 9. The mutilation of this passage, which if complete would have explained the chronological system adopted by our author, is much to be deplored. If Cols. i-iv are correctly placed before v-viii, which describe Agesilaus' campaign in the spring and early summer of 395, the θέρος in iii. 9 must be that of 396, and the '8th year', of which the beginning is noted in l. 10, is 396-5. An earlier date is excluded by the description of Pharax in i. 31-2 as ὁ πρῶτος νιώτικος; for he is known to have held that office in the spring and summer of 397 (cf. i. 30, note), and since the expedition of Demaenetus, in connexion with which he is mentioned, falls within the seventh year of P's reckoning and Pharax' term of office was then already over, it is impossible to make the 8th year begin in 397. Granted that the θέρος in iii. 9 refers to 396 and is the beginning of the 8th year (the possibility of its referring to 395 will be discussed later), it remains doubtful what month P precisely regarded as the starting-point. Thucydides, who divides each year of the war into two equal parts, θέρος and χειμών, makes the former begin in the spring (cf. e.g. iv. 117 ἄμα ἦτο τῶν ἐπιγεννημένων θέρων), and Xenophon in *Hell.* i-ii. 3, where he is influenced by the annalistic method of Thucydides, similarly reckons in years beginning with the spring. Since P's work is probably, like Xenophon's, a continuation of Thucydides' history (cf. p. 122) and seems to be constructed on chronological principles, which if not as strict as those of Thucydides are more careful than Xenophon's, there is a certain presumption that he too reckoned in years which began in the spring; and iii. 11 may even have commenced with some phrase like ἐπος ἀρχομένου. On the other hand θέρος in iii. 9 might very well refer to midsummer, the starting-point of the Olympiads and year of the Attic archons. The later columns are compatible with either hypothesis: v-viii cover the period from about March—June 395, xi-xxi that from about July—November of the same year, and the transition from the 8th to the 9th year would, if it was noted and took place in the spring, naturally occur in the gap between Cols. iv and v, while if it was at midsummer, it would occur in the gap before Col. xi. In xi. 34 τοῦτον τοῦ θέρων referring to the war between Boeotia and Phocis probably means July, and the fact that the Theban intrigues and the dispute between Phocis and Locris, which are narrated in xiv. 21 sqq., began before midsummer (cf. xiv. 21, note) provides no argument against the view that the 9th year began in
midsummer, for there is no reason to think that P's arrangement of facts was so strictly
annalistic as to prevent his grouping together an intimately connected series of incidents
belonging to the conclusion of the 8th and the beginning of the 9th year. The later
columns being thus indecisive, the question what is meant by θίπος in iii. 9 has to be decided
by the evidence of Cols. i–iv. Assuming—as is most probable but by no means absolutely
certain—that the incidents in i. 1–iii. 7 refer to the conclusion of the 7th year and those
in iii. 11 sqq. to the beginning of the 8th, it is on the whole more satisfactory to regard the
θίπος in which the 8th year began as midsummer, not spring. The narrative of the
expedition of Damaenetus does not help, for the only definite mark of date connected
with it is the mention of Pharax as the former ναύαρχος, and if Pharax' term of office
ended, as is likely, in the autumn of 397 (cf. iii. 23–6, note) the expedition may have taken
place during the winter of 397–6 just as well as in the spring or early summer of 396. But
the account of the naval war in iii. 11 sqq. favours the view that the 8th year began in the
summer. It would be surprising in the first place that the narrative of the 8th year, if this
began in the spring, should commence with the comparatively unimportant naval war
in place of the expedition of Agesilas to Asia. Secondly, the arrival of the reinforcements
from Phoenicia (iii. 23–6, cf. note) is more likely to have occurred towards the end than
at the beginning of 396, for though Diodorus seems to have placed that event too late,
the view that these reinforcements were available to Conon throughout the campaign of 396
does not well accord with the statements of Isocrates about the blockade of Caunus.
Thirdly, the arrival of the new Spartan ναύαρχος (perhaps Pollis), which happened soon
after the beginning of the 8th year (iii. 21, note), suits the late summer better than the
spring, not merely because the summer or autumn was the normal time in which a new
ναύαρχος entered on his duties, but because the arrival of Cheiricrates, the successor of Pollis,
is definitely fixed by xv. 33 for the late summer (about July or August) of 395. If, therefore,
the new ναύαρχος of iii. 21 came out in the spring, either he remained in office considerably
more than a year, or he was not Pollis but some unknown individual, and Pollis' arrival
occurred later, the notice of it in P being lost. Of these two alternatives the second would
be preferable to the first, for great as are the irregularities connected with the Spartan
ναύαρχος (cf. iii. 21, note), there is no precedent for a ναύαρχος who took over the command
in the spring remaining in that position until the summer of the year following, and the
mention of Pollis in iii. 21 is of course conjectural. No one of the arguments in
favour of treating the θίπος in iii. 9 as midsummer is very strong, but together they seem
to counterbalance the presumption in favour of the other explanation created by the
example of Thucydides and Xenophon, and for the present we leave the question open.
In any case P does not use the Attic archons for dating purposes, but like Thucydides and
Xenophon reckons back to a fixed point. What this was is owing to the lacuna in l. 10 not
definitely ascertainable. It is not the end of the Peloponnesian war as foreshadowed by
Thucydides v. 26, where he states his intention of carrying his history up to the surrender
of Athens; for the capture of the city by Lysander took place on Munychion 16 = April 24,
404 according to Plutarch Lysand. 15, and the 8th year on P's system being 396–5, his
epoch-year is 403–2, not 404–3. Xenophon, however (or rather, as is generally supposed,
his interpolator), in Hell. ii. 3. 9 treats the capitulation of Samos in the autumn of 404
as the end of the war, and in any case it would seem that P connected the events of 404,
including the capture of Samos and the despotism of the Thirty, with the war, and made
a fresh start in the spring or summer of 403, i.e. approximately from the archonship of
Euclides, a well-known landmark in Greek history. The restoration of the Athenian
democracy and the general amnesty occurred on Boedromion 12 (= Oct. 4) 403 (Plut. de
glor. Ath. 7). On this view iii. 9–10 should perhaps be restored τὴν μὲν ἐπὶ ἐπὶ τὴν πρὸς
Ἄθηναίων.
Our discussion has so far proceeded on the fundamental assumption that Cols. i–iv are rightly placed before v–viii, and we have hitherto left out of account the hypothesis that the \( \theta' \) or in iii. 9 may refer not to 396 but to 395. It is not worth while reviewing in detail the consequences that would ensue from the combination of the present arrangement of Cols. i–viii with the view that the \( \theta' \) or belongs to 395, for that hypothesis would remove none of the difficulties which have led us to place Cols. i–iv before v–viii, and would not be supported by the chief argument for transposing v–viii before i–iv, the fact that Cols. i–iv are in the same hand as that of vi. 27–xxi (cf. p. 114). If the \( \theta' \) or in iii. 9 refers to 395, there is not the least doubt that Cols. v–viii should precede i–iv, not follow them. What are the results of this arrangement?

In the first place the \( \theta' \) or of iii. 9 would necessarily mean midsummer not spring, for the account of Agesilaus’ campaign in the spring and early summer of 395 would have preceded; accordingly Dmaenctus’ expedition would have occurred in the spring or early summer of 395. There is no insuperable objection to this, although the change of policy on the part of Thrasybulus and the moderate democrats with regard to a war with Sparta would become very sudden, and it is more satisfactory to suppose at least a year’s interval between the events described in i. 7–25 and the unanimously voted alliance of Athens with Boeotia in the late summer of 395; cf. i. 16, note. With regard to Pharax, the mention of him as \( \delta \pi \rho \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota \nu \chi \varepsilon \nu \) would merely cease to bear strongly on the vexed question of the date of his \( \nu \alpha \iota \iota \chi \iota \), since whether he was \( \nu \alpha \iota \iota \chi \iota \) in 398–7 or 397–6, he would equally be \( \delta \pi \rho \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \nu \alpha \iota \nu \chi \varepsilon \nu \) in the spring of 395. The really serious difficulties begin when we try to imagine what could have stood in the lacuna in iii. 10, and what reasons P had for taking as his epoch the remarkably uneventful year 402–1, corresponding to the archonship of Micon. That P should have grouped the events of the year of \( \alpha \nu \iota \chi \varepsilon \eta \) with the Peloponnesian war is perfectly intelligible, but that he should have also included in it the whole of the archonship of Eucleides, and made a fresh start with the Attic new year following the amnesty is very extraordinary. At the time when v–viii were placed before i–iv, Meyer suggested for iii. 10 τη μιν [την \( \Lambda \kappa \varepsilon \delta \alpha \mu \epsilon \mu \alpha \iota \omega \nu \) \( \alpha \chi \iota \) or \( \gamma \varepsilon \mu \alpha \iota \gamma \), i.e. the definitive organization of the Spartan hegemony, but we should certainly expect some particular event of well-known importance to be mentioned there, not a vague phrase. And, since no important historical incident occurred in the archonship of Micon at all, the choice of 402–1 as a starting-point would remain a complete enigma. Problems of still greater difficulty would, however, arise in connexion with the appearance of the new \( \nu \alpha \iota \iota \chi \iota \); for that he was Pollis, the predecessor of Cheirisrates, would be practically certain, and it would become necessary to suppose either that he disappeared almost immediately after his arrival, or that in iii. 11 sqq. P has abandoned altogether the chronological sequence of events and reverted to incidents which took place long before the beginning of the 8th year. Neither of the two explanations is at all satisfactory; cf. iii. 21, note, and iii. 23–6, note, where the whole question of the chronology of this period is discussed more in detail. The overwhelming difficulties which ensue concerning the starting-point of P’s system of years and the \( \nu \alpha \iota \iota \chi \iota \) of Pollis, if the \( \theta' \) or in iii. 9 refers to 395, seem to us much to outweigh the advantages which result from placing Cols. v–viii before i–iv: for apart from the argument based on the change of hands which is far from conclusive (cf. p. 115), especially as the margin before Col. i suggests that it is the commencement of a new book or section, the only gain afforded by making Cols. v–viii precede i–iv is that it would then be easy to bring P into harmony with Diodorus as to the date of the arrival of the reinforcements from Phoenicia recorded in iii. 23–6. It is, however, not absolutely certain that P and Diodorus differ on this point even if the \( \theta' \) or belongs to 396, and in any case the apparent order of events in P possesses such manifest advantages over their sequence in Diodorus that we are prepared to admit an error on the part of the latter; cf. p. 213.
iii. 11 sqq. P now turns to the naval war, the fragmentary account of which bristles with difficulties. The first is the identity of the person -_apos (-_ep_ _por_ _os cannot be read) who occurs in l. 11 and again apparently in ll. 19 and 30. The context (especially the mentions of Pharmabazus in ll. 16 and 36) indicates that he was on the side of the Persians, not of the Spartans; and if ll. 11–20 all refer to him it seems he has been in command of the fleet and to have had negotiations with Pharmabazus concerning the pay (cf. xv. 37, sqq.), while ll. 28–31 perhaps refer to his departure as the result of some new arrangement about the command introduced by Pharmabazus, his place being apparently taken by Conon (l. 31). Against this interpretation may be urged the fact that in the account of Diodorus, who owing to the silence of Xenophon is practically the sole authority for the naval operations between the building of the Persian fleet and the battle of Cnidus, Conon is throughout in command of the Persian fleet; cf. xiv. 39. 2 τε δὲ Κώνων πειρὰ τῆς ναυαρχίας διοικεῖσθαι ἐπόστατον (sc. Pharmabazus) αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῷ θειάστῳ ἡγεμόνι, and 51, 4 Κώνων ὃ τῶν Πειρατῶν ναύαρχος. At the battle of Cnidus, however, Xenophon (Hell. iv. 3. 11) speaks of Pharmabazus as ναύαρχος, and it seems possible that at the period with which Col. iii is concerned Conon, though really directing the operations, was nominally subject to a Persian commander other than Pharmabazus. That -_apos was one of Conon's lieutenants is not likely, for both P (xi. 10–1) and Diodorus mention Hieronymus and Nicophemus as acting in this capacity (cf. note ad loc.); that he was a Spartan ναύαρχος is still less probable; for even if ll. 16–8 refer to Conon's negotiations with Pharmabazus, not to -_apos, the Spartan fleet seems to be mentioned for the first time in l. 20, and the ἀρχή of -_apos in l. 30 most probably refers to the ναύαρχία in l. 28, which in view of the context is almost certainly the Persian, not the Spartan.

12. ἔµεικ; probably Caunus, the head quarters of the Persian fleet in the Aegean (cf. ll. 24 sqq.). That Rhodes, which became the head quarters later, had already revolted from Sparta is on the whole unlikely; cf. iii. 23–6, note.


21. Ἑλλάς; cf. xv. 32–5, where the arrival of Cheirisocrates as successor to Pollis is mentioned as having taken place before Conon's visit to Tithoestes and the mutiny. Both ναύαρχοι were previously unknown. Since Cheirisocrates' arrival is there mentioned in terms which seem to imply that this had not been previously referred to, it is not at all satisfactory to restore ἀπὸ τόῦ Ἑλληνικῶς here, and Ἑλλάς may be regarded as practically certain. That the ναύαρχία at Sparta was an annual office is generally agreed, but whether it normally was entered upon in midsummer or in the autumn is much disputed. Meyer, who formerly (Gesch. d. Alt. iv. p. 619) agreed with Beloch (Philol. xxiii. p. 261) in accepting midsummer, now agrees with Lohse (Quaest. chronol. ad Xenoph. Hell. pertinentes, pp. 43 sqq.) and with Beloch's former view (Rhein. Mus. xxxiv. p. 119) in regarding the autumn, i.e. the beginning of the official Spartan year, as the normal commencement of the term of office of the ναύαρχοι. But whatever may have been the rule, there is no doubt that there were great irregularities in practice. Lysander, for instance, was in command not from autumn to autumn or even summer to summer, but from spring to spring; cf. Lohse, l.c. But since the episode in connexion with which Cheirisocrates is mentioned is related by P after the Boeotian war, which took place in the summer (xi. 34), and before the campaign of Agesilaus in the late summer and autumn, Cheirisocrates' arrival must have occurred soon after midsummer, 395. He is mentioned again in connexion with the autumn campaign (xii. 26), and was no doubt succeeded in the course of the winter by Pisander, who fell at the battle of Cnidus in August 394; cf. xv. 33, note. Cheirisocrates' predecessor, Pollis, would therefore be expected to have come out in the summer or autumn of 396, and the great probability of this date for Pollis' arrival is one of the chief reasons for putting Cols. i–iv before v–viii in spite of the difficulty caused by the change of hands; cf. iii. 9,
note. For if Cols. i-iv are placed after v-viii and the 8th year in iii. 9 is 395-4, not 396-5, the advent of Pollis seems to coincide almost with his replacement by Cheiricrates. This conflict of evidence can only be explained in one of two ways. It is possible that Pollis entered office in the summer of 395, but only held it for a very short time before being succeeded by Cheiricrates. It is, however, not satisfactory to suppose that he was recalled so soon, still less that he died, for he is likely to be identical with the Pollis who was ἔπαυσεν in 393-2 (Xen. Hell. iv. 8, 11), and perhaps with the ναύρος of that name in 376 (Xen. Hell. v. 4, 61). Or secondly, Pollis may have entered office in the summer of 396, and on the hypothesis that Cols. i-iv follow v-viii the mention of his arrival is out of its proper chronological position. It must then be supposed that in relating the naval war P has departed from the fairly strict chronological arrangement followed by him in narrating the campaigns of Agesilaus and events in Greece, and has grouped together in Col. iii sqq. a series of events beginning with some which ought to have been mentioned long before. This explanation, however, is also very unsatisfactory, for in the subsequent sections dealing with the naval war (xi. 1-34, xv. 32-xviii. 33) the chronological arrangement is adhered to at the price of dividing the narrative of Conon's operations into two parts separated from each other by the account of the Boeotian war; and since iii. 9-10 seem to record the conclusion of one year and the beginning of another, it is singularly difficult to regard the events next related as really belonging to the beginning of the year just concluded.

22. Ἄρχελαία: this seems to be the name of a ship rather than of a place; cf. Frs. 19, 8 and 20, 11, where it is perhaps mentioned again. Possibly there is some connexion with Archelaus king of Macedon, a country which is mentioned in ix. 29.

23-6. Cf. Diod. xiv. 79. 8 παρεγενήθησαν δὲ τῷ Κοινῷ τριήρεις ἐνεχύκωσα, δίκα μὲν ἀπὸ Κλείσιας, ὑδατοῦσαν δ' ἀπὸ Φαοίκης, δω δ' Σιδανίων δυνάστης εἰς τὴν ἀγεμονίαν, a passage which is no doubt derived directly or indirectly from P (cf. p. 137), though whether Diodorus and P agreed exactly with regard to the numbers of the ships is by no means certain in view of the differences between them as to numbers elsewhere; cf. v. 13-6, 60, and vi. 21, notes. There is also the difficulty in Diodorus' account that these 90 ships added to the 80 which Conon possessed previously (xiv. 79. 6) make 170 triremes, but in his description of the battle of Cnidus (83. 4) the Persian fleet consists of only τριήρεις . . . πλείους τῶν ἐνεχύκωσα, against 85 on the side of the Spartans. Xenophon, however, (Hell. iv. 3, 12) states that the Spartan fleet was greatly inferior in numbers, so that πλείους τῶν ἐνεχύκωσα seems to imply too low an estimate.

Diodorus' statement concerning the arrival of the 90 ships comes at the end of a section dealing with the naval war (79. 4-8), in which he previously recounts the assistance offered by the king of Egypt to the Spartans, the blockade of Conon with 40 ships at Caunus by Pharax, the Spartan ναύρος, with 120 ships, the relief of Conon by Pharnabazus and Artaphernes, the revolt of Rhodes from the Spartans, and the capture by Conon of the Egyptian corn-ships which sailed to Rhodes in ignorance of the revolt. These incidents of the naval war he synchronizes with the dispatch of Agesilaus to Asia and his first campaign (79. 4 τούτων δὲ πραττομένων, referring to 79. 1-3); the second campaign of Agesilaus, which corresponds to Cols. v-viii, follows immediately afterwards (80. 1 μετὰ δὲ ταύτα), being succeeded by the Boeotian war and the battle of Haliardus (81. 1 τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τούτων τῶν τριῶν διψημένων), and Conon's visit to Babylon (81. 4-6). The events of all three chapters 79-81 are assigned by Diodorus to the year 396-5, but his narrative of the two preceding years 398-7 and 397-6 deals only with Sicilian history, and it is clear that in those three chapters the events of two or more years have been compressed into one. Isocrates (Paneg. 142) speaks of the Persian fleet being blockaded (πολυρρομένων) for three years ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τῷ περὶ Ρώδου: but πολυρρομένων is clearly a rhetorical exaggeration,
and it is not certain whether he is referring to the years 397–5 or 396–4. Beloch (Gr. Gesch. ii. p. 146), supported by Lohse, op. cit. pp. 24 sqq., takes the former view, placing the arrival of Conon at Caunus and the siege and relief of that place in 397, principally on account of the mention of Pharax, who is known from Xen. Hell. iii. 2. 12 to have accompanied Dercylidas in his campaign of 397, which began in the spring. The revolt of Rhodes is referred by Beloch to the summer of 395, by Lohse to the summer of 396. Meyer, on the other hand (op. cit. v. pp. 208–9), connecting Paneg. 142 with Evag. 64, where it is stated that the king ἀκαδαιμιώτων ἐντὸς τριῶν ἐτῶν ἀφελέτω τῇ ἄρχῃ, i.e. in the three years 396–4 up to the battle of Cnidus in August 394 (cf. Paneg. 154 and Evag. 56 through Conon’s fleet ἀκαδαιμιῶν μὲν κατανυμαχήθησαν καὶ τῆς ἄρχης ἀπεστερήθησαν, οἱ δ’ Ἑλληνες ἔλευθερώθησαν), postposes the arrival of Conon at Caunus and the siege of that town by Pharax to the spring of 396, placing the revolt of Rhodes at about the beginning of 395. That the naval war did not begin in the summer of 397 is, he thinks, implied by Xenophon, Hell. iii. 4. 1, where the commotion at Sparta caused by the news of the Persian preparations of a large fleet brings about the expedition of Agesilaus, which left Greece in the spring of 396. The chief objections to this view are (1) that it implies a very long term of office as ναύαρχος for Pharax, who is known to have been already acting in that capacity in the spring and early summer of 397, and (2) that if his operations in Asia against Conon took place in 396 it is difficult to account for his presence at Syracuse about midsummer of that year; cf. Diod. xiv. 63. 4 and 70. 2, where Φαρακίδας is no doubt identical with Φήρας, though Diodorus is almost certainly wrong in still calling him ναύαρχος. Moreover, as Lohse remarks (op. cit. pp. 26–7), the fear aroused at Sparta in 396 by the scale of the Persian preparations is not inconsistent with the supposition that the Persians had already a fleet of 40 ships in 397, and the three years of Isocr. Evag. in which the king ἀφελέτω τῇ ἄρχῃ are likely to be different from the three years of the Paneg. in which the Persian fleet was blockaded, and may be 395–3. Lohse’s discussion of this point requires some modification in the light of the evidence from P that the visit of Conon to the Persian court happened not in the summer of 395 but in the following winter, but on the main questions of the date of Pharax’ ναυαρχία and the distinction between the three years of the Paneg. from those of the Evag., we agree with him against Meyer.

The account of the democratic rising (ἐπανάλατας) at Rhodes in xi. 1–34 presupposes that the expulsion of the Spartans and the admission of Conon’s fleet had taken place some time previously, the government of the island being in the interval in the hands of the ἄνδρείς. Since the revolution is clearly assigned by P to the summer of 395 (cf. xi. 34 τοῦτον τοῦ βέρους), the expulsion of the Spartans can hardly have occurred later than the winter of 396–5. That P’s account of this immediately preceded that of the ἐπανάλατας is unlikely, for there is no reference in xi. 1–34 to the Spartans, and the rising of the democrats and the expulsion of the Spartans belong to different years according to P’s reckoning. The question then arises whether the expulsion of the Spartans took place before or after the events recorded in Col. iii. If these belong to 395 it would be necessary to suppose that the revolt of Rhodes from the Spartans preceded them, for there would be only a very brief interval of time (one or two months at most) between the arrival of Pollis and the democratic revolution. P would then confirm Diodorus’ statement that the reinforcements from Phoenicia arrived after the revolt of Rhodes. But it is in any case more probable that Pollis’ arrival took place in the summer of 396 (cf. iii. 9 and 21, notes); and if so there is an interval of practically a year between Cols. iii. and xi, which gives ample time for the expulsion of the Spartans during this period. Unfortunately the remains of Col. iii are insufficient by themselves to show definitely whether the expulsion of the Spartans from Rhodes had taken place or not. On the one hand Caunus not Rhodes seems to be the head quarters of the Persian fleet; and if Αργαφεύων[ ] be read in iii. 37 the situation may,
as Meyer suggests, correspond to that in Diod. xiv. 79. 5, when Pharnabazus and Artaphernes came to the rescue of Conon at Cannus, Rhodes being still held by the Spartans. On the other hand xi. 9 and xv. 36 show that even after Rhodes had become the head quarters of the Persian fleet Conon was in the habit of visiting Cannus, and it is possible that a mention of Rhodes in connexion with the Persian fleet occurred in iii. 11-2. Moreover, if the expulsion of the Spartans occurred after the events recorded in Col. iii, there is a discrepancy between P and Diodorus as to the date of the arrival of the reinforcements, since Diodorus places that event after the defection of Rhodes. In itself there is nothing at all improbable in the view that these reinforcements played a part in causing Rhodes to revolt from the Spartans, but we have some hesitation, in consideration of the agreements between P and Diodorus elsewhere, in accepting so serious a divergence between them as to the order of the events described in Diod. xiv. 79. 4-8, especially as the placing of Cols i-iv after v-viii would bring P into harmony with Diodorus on this point. On the whole, however, in view of the advantages gained by the hypothesis that the arrival of the reinforcements preceded the revolt, and the inextricable difficulties caused by maintaining that the events in iii. 11 sqq. belong to 395, we prefer to suppose that the order of events in Diodorus is erroneous, and that the arrival of the reinforcements occurred in the late summer or autumn of 396, the revolt of Rhodes in the same autumn or the following winter, the account of the latter event being probably lost between Cols. iii and v.

The accuracy of Diodorus' narrative of the naval war in xiv. 79. 4-8 having been denied in one important particular, it becomes somewhat doubtful how far the rest of it is to be trusted. If the siege of Cannus was conducted by Pharax, this must certainly be referred to 397, not to 396. For apart from other objections to the supposition that his ναυαρχία extended to 396 (cf. p. 212), since Pharax is called δ' πρόερχεται ναυαρχός (i. 31) in the year preceding the 8th year mentioned in iii. 9 and the arrival of Pollis apparently belongs to the 8th year (or at any rate to 396), it is very unlikely that he was the immediate predecessor of Pollis. And if another ναυαρχός intervened Pharax' term of office cannot have extended into 396. The probable chronology of the ναυαρχία is in our opinion 398-7 (autumn) Pharax; 397 (autumn) to 396 (autumn) unknown; 396 (autumn) to 395 (summer) Pollis; 395 (summer-winter) Cheiricrates; 394 Pisander (cf. xv. 33, note). Hence P on the whole seems to support Beloch's chronology of the naval war against that of Meyer. To make P consistent with Meyer's view that the naval war began in 396, it is necessary to suppose that Pharax in Diodorus xiv. 79. 5 is a mistake for Pollis or his unknown predecessor. There is, however, as Meyer remarks, a good deal to be said for treating Φάραξ there as an error, for if the siege of Cannus began in 397, when Pharax was with Dercylidas in Caria, Diodorus ought to have mentioned it in his account of Dercylidas' campaign in xiv. 39, and the indecisive character of the operations on land, which ended in a tame avoidance of battle and a truce for further negotiations, ill accords with the hypothesis that the Spartans had in 397 so large a fleet as 120 ships in the Aegean, and were taking active measures against Conon. It is possible, therefore, to limit Pharax' period of office to 397, and yet to regard the naval war as commencing in the spring of 396, for apart from the mention of Pharax in Diod. xiv. 79. 4 there is no clear evidence that Conon came to Cannus before 396. The substitution of another name for Pharax in that passage would however still be compatible with Conon's arrival there in 397, for Diodorus' expression with regard to Conon (διαρρήκτωτα δ' εν Κανίον μετά νεόν τυχανόποιησα) is quite vague. And since the rhetorical exaggeration in Isoc. Pang. 142 (cf. p. 211) is more excusable if the three years of the siege refer to 397-5 instead of 396-4, it does not seem worth while to reject Diodorus' statement that Pharax besieged Conon, though the number of the Lacedaemonian ships (120) may well be too large. The connexion suggested by Meyer between iii. 37 and the relief of Conon by Pharnabazus and Artaphernes (cf. p. 212) is therefore not very probable.
iii. 26. ἄπο Φωνίκης (cf. Diod. l. c.) is unlikely, as Φωνίκης occurs in l. 23, applying to the whole fleet. Perhaps ἄπο Σιδώνων καί... but the division of ἄλτων is very uncertain. The name ἄλτων is not known, and ἀνακτῶν may be all part of the name of the Sidonian.

30. ἀρος: the vestige of a letter before a would suit γ or τ best, but is also compatible with κ, σ, υ, or ξ. It is of course quite uncertain how many letters intervene between... ἀρος and μεν οὖν.

34. Perhaps καὶ διαβάς ὡς τάχιστα ποτάμων, as proposed by Bury, who suggested καλωμένων in l. 35.

35. εἰς λίμνην τὴν Κ[/κ]αύναν: there was a large lake a little north of Caunus, which was connected with it by a river, i.e. the ποταμὸν τῶν Καύνων of l. 34, or Κάλβης, as it is called by Strabo xiv. 651 εἰς Καύνον καὶ ποταμὸν πλησίον Κάλβης βαθὺς ἐξων εἰςαγωγήν.

36. Καίγωνος: the supposed κ has been corrected.

37. ὥρας[ὁ]: perhaps Πασσάφεϊον[ὁ], who is mentioned in xvi. 27 as having been proposed by Tithraustes to command the Persian forces along with Ariaeus, or 'Ἀρταφέϊον[ὁ], who, according to Diod. xiv. 79. 5, came with Pharnabazus to the help of Conon at Caunus (cf. iii. 23–6, note), unless indeed 'Ἀρταφέϊον[ὁ] there is a mistake for Πασσάφεϊον[ὁ], a name not known apart from xvi. 27.

40–3. Fr. 2, containing the letters [κων], [ισ], [αθ], and 'εασ[τ], is placed here chiefly on the evidence of colour; the recto is blank at this point, and the proposed arrangement is by no means certain.

Col. v. 1–vii. 4 = chs. VI–VII. Agesilaus in Asia.

v. 1. The supposed stops at the beginning of this line and l. 3 may represent the tip of a letter. The second scribe sometimes fails to insert stops when he leaves a space, e.g. in l. 6.

4. η μὲν [οὖ]: a new section probably begins here. Whether the preceding lines concerned Agesilaus' preparations at Ephesus (cf. Xen. Hell. iii. 4. 16–9) or events in another part of the world is quite uncertain.

7. τοῦ στρατοπεδοῦς is corrected, and the vestiges after στρατοπεδοῦς indicate something more than a. Perhaps the scribe began to write στρατευμα.

8. For Καύνον τρίον πεδίων cf. Diodorus xiv. 80. 1 μετὰ δὲ τοῦτα Ἀγρισίδας μὲν ἐξαγαγὼν τὴν δύναμιν εἰς τὸ Καύνον πεδίον καὶ τὴν περί Σιπύλον χώραν εὐθώς τὸς τῶν ἐγχώριον κτίσεως. The ὕμη in l. 9 probably refer to Sipylos. Xenophon does not state Agesilaus' route to Sardis.

9–10. Possibly ταξιμήνων εἰς πλωθὼν; cf. l. 34 and Diod. l. c. Ἀγρισίδας δὲ εἰς πλωθών συντάξας τοῦ στρατοπεδοῦς. But though the πλωθὼν must have been mentioned before l. 34, it would be more naturally introduced after the mention of Tissaphernes in ll. 14–6, i.e. in ll. 17 sqq., where the manoeuvres of the march are described. Moreover the ξ of ταξιμήνως is very doubtful, and the correct division may be τὰ δὴ τὰ... γορ... 

13–6. Cf. Diod. l. c. Τισσαφέρους δὲ μερίους μὲν ἵππεις πεντακασμιρίους δὲ πεζοῖς ἀθράσσες ἐπηκολυθεὶς τοῖς Δακεαμούσιοι. Wilamowitz proposes πεζοῖς μὲν πεντακασμιρίους καὶ... μερίους ἔχον, ἵππεις δὲ μερίους ᾗς ἐλάττων, and would bring the figures in Diodorus into agreement with P by emending πεντακασμιρίους into πεντακασμιρίους καὶ... μερίους. But P and Diodorus differ elsewhere in regard to figures (cf. notes on v. 60 and vi. 21.), and the ἵππεις may well have been mentioned before the πεζοῖ, as in Diod. l. c. and in xxi. 12 (though not in vii. 41). The restoration suggested in our text produces a conflict with Diodorus as to the number of the ἵππεις, but not necessarily in that of the πεζοῖ, since πεντακασμιρίους would suit the space. That figure is very high; but cf. Pausan. iii. 9. 6 γενομένης δὲ πρὸς
17-9. The restorations are due to Bury, who further suggests κατὰδῶν αὐτοῦς in l. 17 and continues in ll. 20-2 δὲ λέγοντες καὶ κρατῶν τὴν τάξιν, ἐποιεῖτο δὲ τῆς στρατηγίας ἀπόδοξαν αὐτοῦ, a passing compliment to Agesilaus' tactical skill; cf. p. 123. That the πλειθωρὶς was mentioned here is probable in any case; cf. ll. 9 and 34, notes.

22. The first α of μαχεσθαι is corrected.

24. σας: or σας without a stop; cf. note on l. 1.

34. πλω[θίον]: cf. vi. 35 and the passage from Diodorus quoted in l. 9, note. Diodorus proceeds to describe Agesilaus' arrival before Sardis and the plundering of the environs, including the παράδεισος of Tissaphernes; but the scanty remains of ll. 30-58 do not offer any points of connexion with his narrative, and it is not clear precisely where the battle described in v. 59-vi. 27 took place. Xenophon, whose account in Hell. iv. 22-4 = Ages. i. 30-33 is widely different (cf. v. 59, note), describes it as occurring on the bank of the Pactolus before Agesilaus reached Sardis, the environs of which were, according to Ages. i. 33, plundered after the engagement. Diodorus, whose description of the ambush in xiv. 80. 2-3 closely resembles that of P, represents Agesilaus as turning back (ἐπιτρέψας) after reaching Sardis, and places the scene of the battle ἀνὰ μέσον . . . τῶν τε Σάρδεων καὶ οὐβίρων, the site of which town is unknown. Pausanias in the passage quoted in note on ll. 13-6 vaguely says that the fight occurred in the "Ἐρμοὺ πεδίῳ, which is also mentioned in Ephorus Fr. 131, possibly in reference to this battle. From vi. 29, where it is stated that Tissaphernes after his defeat retreated with his troops (ἀπεκφύσσας) to Sardis, it is probable that in P's account Agesilaus had passed Sardis before the battle, and ἐπιτρέψας in Diodorus is, as Meyer remarks, likely to be due to a misunderstanding, since he uses the same expression (ἀπεκφύσσε) as P with regard to Tissaphernes.

40. A stop may be lost after μαχεσθαι.

41. μαλκοῦν: the position of Fr. 3 containing the supposed beginnings of ll. 42-9 and 54-60 is not absolutely certain, and it might belong to an earlier column. The recto gives no help. The combinations μαλκοῦν and Λ'γησιλαὸς and the fact that [i is the last line of a column are the grounds for placing it as we have indicated. If μαλκοῦν is correct, the iota adscript of εὐγνυτομις is perhaps erroneous.

45. δ in the margin opposite this line seems to indicate that this is the 400th line of the MS. Similar indications of the successive hundreds are common in poetical texts, e.g. 223 and 841; but the only parallel that we can adduce from a prose MS. of this period occurs in the Pherecydes papyrus (P. Grenf. II. 11), where σ in the margin opposite ii. 3 is more likely to mean the 600th line than the 6th section.

56. Perhaps τοίτον τῶν ἐναλτῶν.

58. There is a spot of ink in the margin before , which might represent ὥ, but may be merely an accident. That it is connected with δ in the margin against l. 45 is unlikely.

v. 59-vi. 53.

(Agesilaus sent) . . . hoplites and ὅ, light-armed troops, and appointed as their leader Xenocles, a Spartiate, with instructions to form in order of battle when (the main
body of the army) marched past them. Agesilaus on the next day at dawn roused his army, and continued his advance. The barbarians accompanied them as usual, some assaulting the Greeks, others... them, others in loose order following them over the plain. When Xenocrates considered that it was the moment to attack the enemy, he started up with the Peloponnesians from the ambush, and charged at a run. The barbarians at the sight of the advancing Greeks fled over the whole plain, whereupon Agesilaus perceiving the panic dispatched from his army the light troops and the cavalry in pursuit, and they in combination with the force which had issued from the ambush pressed hard upon the barbarians. They followed the enemy for no very long time, as they were unable to overtake them because the majority were horsemen or without armour, and after killing about six hundred of them they desisted from the pursuit, and attacked the barbarians' camp. Finding the guard not strongly posted they soon took it, and captured from the enemy large supplies, many prisoners, and much baggage and money, including that of Tissaphernes himself. Such being the result of the battle, the barbarians in terror of the Greeks retired with Tissaphernes to Sardis, while Agesilaus after remaining there three days, in which he restored to the enemy their dead under a truce and erected a trophy and ravaged the whole country, led his army forward again into Phrygia Magna. He no longer kept his soldiers formed in column on the march, but allowed them to range over as much of the country as they liked, and to plunder the enemy. Tissaphernes on learning that the Greeks were continuing their advance, gathered the barbarians together once more, and followed in the rear of his adversaries, at a distance of many stades. After crossing the Lydian plain Agesilaus conducted his forces through the mountains which lie between Lydia and Phrygia, and after traversing these brought them down to Phrygia until they reached the river Maeander, which rises at Celaenae, the largest city in Phrygia, and flows into the sea near Priene and (Myus?). There he encamped the Peloponnesians and their allies, and consulted the auspices whether he ought to cross the river or not, and whether he should march against Celaenae or retreat. Since the sacrifices proved unpropitious for him, after waiting there during the day of his arrival and the next, he retired with his army...

v. 59 sqq. With the account of the ambush cf. Diodorus xiv. 80. 2–3, which is somewhat less detailed, ἀπεστείλε Ἑυμηκὸν τῷ Σπαρταῖτι μετὰ χιλίων καὶ τετρακόσιων στρατιωτῶν νυκτὸς εἰς τὴν δασιν τὸν ὄπως ἐνεδρύεται τοὺς βαρβάρους. αὐτὸς οὖ άλλ᾽ ἵμαρα παρασύραμεν μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως ἐπειδὴ τὸν μὲν ἐνέδραν παραλάβατε, οἱ de βάρβαροι προσπήπτοντο ἀπίκακοι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκογένειας ἐξίπτωσιν, παραδόξως ἐξώψης ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ τοῦ Πέρσας. γινομένης de καρπῆς μάχης καὶ τοῦ συναχήματος τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἐνέδραν ἀριθμοῖς ἐκάκων μὲν παινόισαντες ἐπισφέροντο τοῖς πολέμισις, οἱ de Πέρσαι δεδωροῦσιν αὐτοῖς ἀπολαμβανόμενοι εἰς μέσον κατεπλάγησιν καὶ παραχωρήσα αἴθειν. οἱ de περὶ τῶν Ἀγγείων μὲν καὶ τῶν ἐπιδέδωσεν ἁμαρτάνοι μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐξωκατωλοιου ἀθραλώοι δὲ πλήθος ἢδρασαν, τὴν de παρεμβολὴν διήρησαν γέμισαν πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀπὸ de τῆς μάχης Τισσαφήρων μὲν εἰς Σάρδεις ἀσκώρως καταστελλόμενοι τὰς τόλμας τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων. The general resemblance between Diodorus and P is very close, though except in the last sentence of the extract (cf. vi. 27–30) the verbal coincidences (which are indicated by the underlined words) are not striking, and besides minor differences there is a discrepancy as regards Agesilaus' tactics, since Diodorus represents him as bringing on a general engagement before giving the signal to Xenocrates, while in P Xenocrates chooses his own time for the attack, and is then reinforced by a portion of the main army. Diodorus' account has been generally supposed to be derived from Ephorus; and if so Ephorus must have been based on P; cf. pp. 135–7.
Xenophon on the other hand (Hellen. iii. 4. 22-4 = Ages. i. 30-33) gives quite a different colour to the engagement. The Persian infantry having been sent to Caria (cf. note on v. 13-6), only the cavalry, under an unnamed ἤγμων, were engaged, at first with the Greek cavalry and subsequently with the infantry, while Tissaphernes himself is stated to have been at the time in Sardis and not present during the fighting. That Xenophon is referring to the same battle as Diodorus, though that has been doubted, is practically certain, for in both accounts the fight results in the capture of the Persian camp with much booty, and it is difficult to believe that if there had been two important victories, Xenophon would have omitted one of them; cf. Meyer, Gesch. d. Allt. ii. p. 207. Xenophon’s account is followed in the main by Plutarch, Ages. 10, but with some variation in details (e.g. according to Plutarch Tissaphernes was present in the engagement, and Agesilaus’ attack is described somewhat differently), which are explained by Sachse (Die Quellen Plutarchs in der Lebensbeschreibung des Königs Agesilaos, pp. 8-9) on the hypothesis that Plutarch was using Ephorus, who was based on Xenophon. If this view were accepted, it would follow that Diodorus’ account was not derived from Ephorus; but Sachse seems to us to overestimate the extent to which Plutarch in his Ages. has used Ephorus; cf. xx. 37, note, and p. 126. Nepos (Ages. 3) also follows Xenophon, but Pausaniai (cf. note on v. 13-6) supports Diodorus as to the presence of the Persian infantry. While Diodorus’ story stood alone, and might be explained as a comparatively late invention, historians have naturally preferred to believe Xenophon; but the case is now much altered, and the alternative version of Agesilaus’ victory found in P and Diodorus, which is clearly based on good evidence, has considerable claims to acceptance. The fact that Xenophon represents Tissaphernes as repeating in 395 the error which he had made with regard to Agesilaus’ plans in 396, and again sending his infantry to Caria where they were useless, is decidedly suspicious.

60. The traces of the first letter of the line do not suit e. εἷς τῶν διασώ τόπον (cf. Diod.) is therefore inadmissible. Diodorus gives the number of the στρατιώται as 1400 in all. Since it is quite uncertain whether [περ], [δέκ] or [περ] occurred in the lacuna at the end of the line, we abstain from inserting a number before δηλιθας, especially as P and Diodorus differ elsewhere in respect of numbers; cf. iii. 23-6, note.

vi. 2. Ξενοβλέπια: cf. Diod. l. c. and Xen. Hellen. iii. 4. 20, where it is stated that he was one of 30 Spartiates who came out with Herippidas in succession to οἱ περὶ Νίοσανθόρων in the winter of 396-5, and was appointed one of the two leaders of Agesilaus’ cavalry.

3. In the lacuna the βαδίζοντες are no doubt specified: probably they were Agesilaus’ troops, e.g. οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐραγίας (cf. Diodorus), rather than the πολέμων; cf. ἐπί τοῦ τῶν μὲν εὐδηρῶν παρταλλαγὼν in Diodorus. Βαδίζοντες also suits Agesilaus’ troops better than the enemy, although in the very similar account of the ambush against the Mysians in xix. 28 sqq. οἱ δὲ τῶν Ελλήνων ἐκ ἑρποποιητῶν, ἢ τῶν κατ’ αὐτοὺς, ἑκατορθίατος κ.λ., the subject of ἡμεῖς is the enemy. There is, however, this difference between the arrangements for the attack in the two cases, that in xix. 28 the troops employed for the ambush were left behind when the main army continued its forward march, whereas in the present instance, as appears not only from P’s account but more clearly from that of Diodorus, the ambush was laid on the line of march of the main army, which would thus have to pass it.

4. [εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπιστολήν (cf. xix. 22)] is due to Bury.

5. δῆμα ἡμῷ [μία]: cf. Diod. and τῆς μυστάτος in v. 59 corresponding to μυστάτος in Diod. It would be possible to read δῆμα τῶν στρατευτην] μιάς, but the other reading is preferable, though τῷ] εἰς τὰ] μια is very doubtful.

8. εἰς[. . . ]ον: εἰς εὐκλεῖον (Dittenberger) is not long enough; εἰς[. . . ]ον necessitates the alteration of αὐτοὶς to αὐτοῖς, but cf. the error of case in l. 18. εἰς[. . . ]ον αὐτοῖς is possible, but not very satisfactory.
vi. 9. ἀπάκτως: cf. Diod. i. c. προσπέπτοντες ἄπακτως.
21. Εξακοσιοῦνος: Diodorus gives the number of the slain as 6000, which is no doubt an error, probably due to a corruption in the MSS. Cf. v. 13-6 and 60, notes.
30 sqq. Diodorus (xiv. 80. 5) says only 'Ἀγαμέλοις δ᾽ ἐπεχείρησε μὲν εἰς τὰς ἀνὸς σατραπεῖας, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ιεραίοις δὲ δυσμένοι καλλιέργεις (cf. vi. 51-2) πᾶλιν ἀπόγαγε τὴν δύσαμαν ἐπὶ βάλλανταν, and omits altogether the autumn campaign of Agesilau. Cf. viii. 33 sqq. Xenophon (Hill. iii. 4. 25) says nothing of the advance to the upper Maeander, but proceeds direct to the death of Tissaphernes and the negotiations with Tithraustes which led to Agesilau's departure into the satrapy of Pharnabazus. The details provided by P are therefore new.
34. Φρυγίαν πᾶλιν [τὴν] μεγάλην: possibly P means to imply that this was the second invasion of Phrygia; cf. xx. 7 τὴν χώραν τῶν Ψρουγῶν δικοὶ εἰς ἤπιον τοῦ προτέρου (θέρ)νυς ἐξαδέλφευν (i.e. in 396), Xen. Hell. iii. 4. 12-5 and Diodorus xiv. 79. 3, where the first campaign of Agesilau in Phrygia is described. The campaign of 396, however, took place not in Phrygia Magna (i.e. the interior) which was in the satrapy of Tissaphernes, but in Phrygia παραβαλαντίδου (cf. xxi. 17) in the satrapy of Pharnabazus; and though the order of the words εἰς Φρυγίαν πᾶλιν [τὴν] μεγάλην may be intended to express that πᾶλιν qualifies Φρυγίαν, but not τὴν μεγάλην, a comparison yet. Diodorus xiv. 39. 29 ἀφεκμένου δὲ πᾶλιν πρὸς Γόρδιον, where πᾶλιν seems to be used loosely for 'further' and certainly does not imply a previous visit to Gordium, suggests that πᾶλιν in vi. 34 merely qualifies προφέρειν, not Φρυγίαν.
35. συστημαγείνους . . . εν τῷ πλ[ηθέ]: cf. v. 9, note. and Xen. Ages. 6. 7 ὁπότε γε μὴ πορεύοντα εἴδετε ὅτι ἐξείτο τοῖς πολεμίοις μάχεσθαι εἰ διόλουτο συστημαγένους μὲν οὖτος ἦγε τὸ στράτευμα κ.τ.λ.
39. ἐπικολούθησε δὲ νότοι: a hiatus which can easily be avoided by placing ἐπικολούθησε after αὐτῶν. For other instances of hiatus cf. i. 4, note.
41. The lacuna after στρατεύσιον may be filled up by ἄμαχει (Wilamowitz) or ἦμινγως.
42. κε μένων: by itself does not fill the lacuna; καί may be inserted after it, but is superfluous, and τὴν τε [Λεβάν, though possible, is equally unsatisfactory. In the last five lines of this column, however, a blank space about three letters in width has been left in the middle of the lines owing to a roughness in the papyrus, and if this blank space extended as far as l. 42 κε μένων] would be sufficient. But since it tends to diminish in size in ll. 49-50, it is very unlikely that it reached as far as l. 42, though it seems to affect l. 48, where the restoration, which is certain, gives only 16 letters in the lacuna in place of .
44-7. Agesilaus no doubt followed the road taken by Cyrus; cf. Xen. Anab. i. 2. 5-7 Κύρος θε . . . ἀρμάτῳ ἀπὸ Σαρπεδον' καὶ ἑξαλώθη διὰ τῆς Λεβάντις σταυμόν τρεῖς παρασάγγος εἴκοσι καὶ δύο ἐπὶ τῶν Μαίανδρον παταμῶν . . . τούτων διαβόλεσαν διὰ Φρυγίας . . . εἰς Κολοσσαίς . . . ἐντείνον ἱππαλών σταυμόν τρεῖς παρασάγγος εἴκοσι εἰς Καλαμίας, τῆς Φρυγίας πάλιν αὐξημένως, μεγάλην καὶ εὐδαίμονα. ἑνσταῦθα Κύρων βασιλεύα ἦν . . . αἱ δὲ πηγαί αὕτη (sc. the Maeander) εἶσαν εἰ καὶ τῶν βασιλείων. οὗ ἱππακόμο πρὸς in l. 44 was suggested by Wilamowitz, who proposes καὶ followed by a second adjective (e.g. καλλιστή) πᾶλιν ἐστίν in l. 46, with ἐκσταθεῖται in l. 47. This verb is however much less suitable than ἐκκλίσωσιν, and the lacuna in l. 45 may be filled up by αἱ ἔρισα negó by the name of another town (Wilamowitz suggests Μυσυτῆ). The coast at the mouth of the Maeander has greatly altered since ancient times, and Priene is now far inland and some distance from the river. The papyrus confirms the reconstruction of the ancient course of the Maeander in Wiegand and Schrader, Priene, pp. 8 sqq. Cf. also note on vii. 1-2.
Lydia and Caria; cf. the mention in l. 3 of the Lydians in the plain of the Maeander with Strabo xiii. p. 629 ὅ ὁ δὲ Μεσοφόρος εἶναι τὸ ἀντίκειμενόν μέρος διατείνει μέχρι τὴν καλύπτην ἀπὸ κλαυσών ὑπόκειται (cf. vi. 45), ὃς ἠφαίει Θεόμορφος, ὡστε τὰ μὲν αὐτοῦ φύγεσι κατέχουσι τὰ πρὸς ταύτα Κλαυσώ καὶ τὴν Ἀπαριστία, τὰ δὲ Μυσικοὶ καὶ Λυδοὶ, τὰ δὲ Κάρης καὶ Ιοನες. αὐτῶ δὲ καὶ οἱ πατεροὶ καὶ μιλεῖται ὁ Μαγεύσας, τὰ μὲν διατίθενται τῶν εὐθύνων κ.τ.λ. Wilamowitz proposes ἡ ἔνδυσαν, Κάρης τε καὶ Ιονες in l. 4, and would regard vi. 44—vii. 4 as the passage in Theopompus mentioned by Strabo. This restoration and identification however seem to us very doubtful, even if P is Theopompus; for ἀπὸ κλαυσῶν in vi. 45 apparently refers to the Maeander not to the Mesogis, about which Theopompus was speaking, and there is no room for anything corresponding to ὡστε τὰ μὲν αὐτοῦ φύγεσι ... Ἀπαριστία. Hence we attach little weight to the general resemblance between vi. 44—vii. 4 and Strabo's allusion to Theopompus as an argument for the identification of the latter author with P; cf. p. 131.

If our restoration of vii. 39—40 is correct, Agesilaus spent a period of inactivity at Magnesia. The extant fragments of P do not mention him again until xviii. 33, when he goes from Lydia northwards to the Hellespont; but xviii. 37—8 show that our author had described his negotiations with Tithraustes, no doubt in the gap between Cols. viii and xi. The correctness of the position assigned to Fr. 4 is guaranteed (1) by internal evidence, since it clearly contains the transition from Agesilaeus' campaign to the arrangements for the removal of Tissaphernes, (2) by the suitable combination μᾶλλον in ii. 9—10, (3) by the evidence of the recto, which has ends of lines at the right point, (4) by the colour and texture of the papyrus, which agree with those of Fr. 7, containing Col. viii. Frs. 21 and 22 also probably belong to Cols. vii or viii.

Cols. vii. 4—viii. 42 = ch. VIII. Death of Tissaphernes.

vii. 4 sqq. P now turns, like Xenophon and Diodorus, to the supersession of Tissaphernes by Tithraustes and the assassination of the former. Xenophon (Hell. iii. 4. 25; cf. Ages. i. 35) says merely γνωσὶ δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Πέρσης βασιλεῖς Τισσαφέρρην αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ κακῶς φέρεσθαι τὰ αὐτοῦ Τιθραύστην καταπέμψας ἀπετέλεσθαι αὐτοῦ τὴν κεφαλήν. Diodorus (xiv. 80. 6—8) is somewhat more detailed: Ἀρταξέρξης δὲ ὁ τῆς Ασίας βασιλεὺς τὰ τε εὐπρεπήτατα πολὺς καὶ καταρριποῦσι τῶν πρὸς ταύτα 'Ελλήνας πόλεις δὲ ὄργῆς ἐγείρει τὸν Τισσαφέρρην ... καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς μητρὸς δὲ Παρασάθος ἡν ἡξιομένου τιμωρησάσθαι τὸν Τισσαφέρρην ... καταστήσας δὲν Τιθραύστην ἡμέραν τούτην μὲν παρῆγγειλε συναναγιώνην Τισσαφέρρην, πρὸς τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰς σατράπες ἔπεμψεν ἐπιστολὰς ὅσως πάντες τούτα ποιῶσι τὸ προστατεύον. ὁ δὲ Τιθράυστης παραγενόμενος εἰς Κολοσσάς τῆς εἰρήνας συνάλαβε τὸν Τισσαφέρρην διὰ τούτων Ἀριάους σατράπιον λοιμώμον καὶ τὴν κεφαλήν ἀποκάψας ἀπεσταλεῖ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα. A fuller account of the methods employed by Tithraustes and Ariaeus to accomplish their object is found in Polyænus, Strat. vii. 16. The account in P, which is unfinished at the end of Col. viii, was much longer still; and although in the scanty remains of Cols. vii and viii only the general outline of the story can be perceived, the agreement with Diodorus and Polyænus is clear, and the accounts of both those writers are no doubt derived directly or indirectly from P.

vii. 4—20 probably describe the complaints against Tissaphernes and the king’s resolve to get rid of him. In vii. 21 sqq. we have the departure of Tithraustes and appointment of Ariaeus, in vii. 35 sqq. the message sent by Ariaeus to Tissaphernes at Sardis to induce him to come to Colossae, in vii. 20 sqq. the arrival of Tissaphernes with a bodyguard at Colossae, and his arrest while bathing at Ariaeus’ house. It is clear that P directly connects Tissaphernes’ fall with his want of success in the campaign round Sardis, as also in our opinion does Xenophon, in spite of Beloch’s objection (Gr. Gesch. ii. p. 148); and it is noticeable that in vii. 4 sqq. there is nothing to suggest that Conon was concerned. According to Nepos, Conon 3, the supersession of Tissaphernes was the consequence of the representations
of Conon, who was sent by Pharnabazus to the king to accuse Tissaphernes, and both Meyer (Gesch. d. Alt. ii. 209) and Beloch (l. c.) accept Nepos' story and adopt the date for Conon's visit implied by him and Pausanias iii. 9. 2 (the winter of 396–5) in preference to that of Diodorus, who (xiv. 81. 4) places this event between the revolt of Rhodes and the battle of Cnidus, i.e. in the winter of 395–4, after Tissaphernes' death. But that P supported Diodorus' date admits of little doubt, for it is very improbable that Conon had an interview with the king himself before his visit to Tithraustes narrated in xv. 32 sqq., and in Justin vi. 11–2 Conon's visit to the king is mentioned after the mutiny, which is now known from xvi. 29 sqq. to have taken place in the late summer or autumn of 395. Diodorus' date for Conon's mission is therefore preferable, as Meyer now admits; the motive was not the removal of Tissaphernes, but, as Diodorus says, the need of money for the fleet and the appointment of Pharnabazus as commander-in-chief.

vii. 15. ἡπολείπεν: there is possibly a reference to Artaxerxes' mother Parysatis; cf. Diod. l. c.

16. That Fr. 5 containing (as we suppose) parts of ll. 16–24 belongs to Col. vii is practically certain, not only from internal evidence (e.g. the mentions of ἐπιστολής and Τιθραύστης· ἡμίκοντα), but on account of the recto, which contains ends of lines like Fr. 4 (cf. note on vii. 1–2) and resembles the recto of both the other portions of Col. vii and Fr. 7, containing Col. viii, in having some white stains on the surface. The supposed junction in l. 18 is, however, not very satisfactory: for the vestiges at the beginning of the third line of Fr. 5 which, if our arrangement is correct, represent the second half of the ν of ὁμολογοῦν, would suit ω better, and in l. 22 we should expect τὰ ἐπιστολῶν, for which there is no room. Perhaps therefore Fr. 5 should be placed further to the right and nearer to the ends of ll. 16–24 or even lower down in the same column.

17. If Fr. 5 is rightly placed, κατηγοροῦσα is inadmissible, for the tail of the ρ ought to be visible, and the vestiges before α do not suit ρ.


21–5. Cf. Diod. l. c. and Polyæn. vii. 16. 1 Ἀρταξέρξης ἐπὶ τὴν Τισσαφέρους σύλληψιν κατέπνιψε Τιθραύστην δύο ἐπιστολάς κομίζοντα τὴν μὲν πρὸς αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρῶτος τοὺς Ἠλλήνας ἐπιτηρούν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα, τὴν δὲ πρὸς Ἀραίον ὅπως αὐτῶν συνάλλαξέν μετὰ Τιθραύστου. δὲ in l. 21 refers to Tithraustes. For ἐπιστολῶν cf. viii. 18 and 36. ρα in l. 23 is very likely παρὰ, but though the supposed i (or η) after the lacuna might conceivably be ο, there is not room for [βασιλεῖας]. Me. [.]ιαον in l. 24 is probably a proper name, perhaps that of another general; cf. πρὸς δὲ τῶν πολισι καὶ τῶν συστάσεων in Diod. The second letter, if not ε, may be α or ο; with α, the third letter must be τ. The word preceding may be ἐπὶ [μισθῷ]. συνάλλαξέν [ἐκ]καλον (cf. Polyæn.) suggests itself in l. 25, but the doubtful letter after οικειουσία in Diod. of. 39. somewhat better than i.

30–2. The ends of these lines, which are on Fr. 7, may be shifted one line higher up, but cf. the next note.

35. At the end of the line it is not certain whether the supposed α, which is on Fr. 7, belongs to ll. 34 or 35. But the last letter of l. 34 must be α, which does not suit the vestiges of this letter.

36–41. Tissaphernes was at Sardis according to Polyænus, l. c. τὸ μὲν στρατόπεδον κατέλαβεν ἐν Σάρδεσιν: hence the army at Magnesia (l. 40) was probably that of Agesilaus, who would pass that place on his way down the Maeander to the coast (cf. ll. 1–2, note), and ll. 36–41 seem to refer to Ariaeus' message to Tissaphernes, corresponding to Polyæn. καλεῖ τισσαφέρον ὁς ὁμοίου βούλευσασθαι δεῖ τὰ τέλη καὶ περὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων. That Fr. 6 belongs to this column is practically certain on account of the recto, which like that of Fr. 5, has ends of lines and white stains on the surface; cf. notes on ll. 1–2 and 16. We have assigned it to ll. 35–41 on account of the suitable combination τῷ[ν] στρατόπεδῳ in l. 39.
The resulting combination Μαυ[ν]θ[σ]αύ in l. 40 is, however, not very satisfactory. The vestige of the supposed α would suit γ, π, or τ better, and the traces of the supposed φω are compatible with many alternatives. Hence Fr. 6 may well belong to some other part of Col. vii.

37. ] . ρα . [: possibly ] 'Αρια[α], but the vestiges before ρ do not suit a very well.

viii. 3. That Fr. 7, which contains this column, is correctly placed admits of no doubt; for although the ends of a few lines of the preceding column preserved in it do not provide any certain combination with the rest of Col. vii, the mentions of Ariaeus, Tithraustes, and Tissaphernes and of the ἐπιστολαῖ establish its near connexion with Col. vii, and the texture and colour of Fr. 7 closely resemble those of Fr. 4, while the white stains found on the recto of both Frs. 5 and 6 and the rest of Col. vii are also present on the recto of Fr. 7.

The writing on the recto is here too much effaced to allow a combination between the middles of lines on the recto of Fr. 7 and the scanty remains of ends of lines on Frs. 4-6.

6. τα is no doubt the termination of a numeral, e. g. ἵπτα or τριάκωντα.

18. ἐπιστολαῖς: cf. l. 36, Diod. l. c., and the extract from Polyæn. quoted in vii. 21-5, note.


23. For καὶ τήρειν εἰς cf. xxviii. 38, note.


27-30. Cf. Polyæn. l. c. ἵδη δὲ περὶ λοιπῶν ἔχουν τῶν ἀκκάσης ἀπόθετο 'Αριαῖον μετὰ τῶν θυσιασμένων συμμαχίας αὐτῶν καθιέρως εἰς ἀφρώδες κατερραμμένην ἄγνιν Τιθραυστῇ παρέδοκεν. Νον in l. 28 is very likely the termination of λούδευνον (cf. Diod.) or γυμνῶν.

Cols. ix-x = ch. IX.

ix. 16 sqq. Whether Cols. ix-x precede or follow ν—viii is quite uncertain ; cf. p. 113.

Frs. 8 and 9 are assigned to Col. ix owing to the similarity of the script, which is here somewhat smaller than usual, and the colour of the ink, which is exceptionally black; but there is nothing to show whether they should be placed above or below ll. 16-20. Fr. 33 also may belong to this column. The reference to Macedonia in l. 29 is remarkable; cf. Fr. 19. 8, note. In Col. x the ink is fainter and the writing much less compact. The subject there seems to be a favourable character-sketch of some important general or politician, but the fragments are unfortunately not sufficiently intelligible to allow of his identity being determined.

x. 5. ἐπιστρέψαι[ι] cannot be read.

16. The first letter of the line may be α, ω, or ω, but hardly ε; ἰτέραυς Ελ[λ]α[κε]ς is therefore unsuitable.


18. [δ][γ][ς][α][β][γ]αι[ν] or [δ][γ][ς][α][β]αί[ν] (but not [ν][α][π][π]αί[ν]) may be read. If not σ or τ, the second letter must be γ or π. The line may have ended ο[ν]ες πρύγαμι φαίνοιται, as Wilamowitz suggests.


21. δ[η][μ][ο][τ][ικ][ abuses] τ. . . or δ[η][μ][ο][τ][ικ][α]ς στ[ι] or δημοτικώτατος τ[ι] is possible.

Col. xi. 1-34 = ch. X. Revolution at Rhodes.

'... every day Conon used to review the soldiers under arms in the harbour, on the pretext of preventing idleness from causing them to deteriorate in war, but really wishing first to render the Rhodians tranquil at the spectacle of his soldiers present under
arms and then to take action. When he had accustomed them all to the sight of the review he himself with 20 triremes sailed away to Caunus, as he did not wish to be present at the destruction of the Diagoreans, and Hieronymus and Nicophemus, his lieutenants, were ordered to take charge. These two waited during that day, and when on the next day the soldiers presented themselves for review as usual, marched some of them under arms to the harbour, and stationed others a little distance from the market-place. When the Rhodians who were privy to the plot considered the moment for action had come, they collected in the market-place wearing daggers, and one of their number, Dorimachus, mounting the stone from which the herald used to make proclamations, cried out as loudly as he could “Down with the tyrants at once, fellow-citizens”. The rest when he called for help (?) rushed with their daggers into the council of the magistrates, and killed both the Diagoreans and eleven of the other citizens. Having accomplished this, they collected the Rhodian populace in an assembly, and when they had just met Conon returned from Caunus with the triremes. The authors of the massacre put down the existing constitution and set up a democracy, sending a few citizens into banishment. Such was the result of the insurrection at Rhodes.’

xi. 1. The revolt of Rhodes from the Spartans is ignored by Xenophon, but mentioned by Diodorus xiv. 79. 6 (cf. iii. 23-6, note) and Androilon, cf. Paus. vi. 7. 6 ‘Ροδίων τε τών ἡμῶν πείσθεντα ὑπό τοῦ Κόνωνος ἡπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων μεταβιβάσαι σφᾶς ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας καὶ Ἀθηναίων συμμαχίαν. That the revolt was connected with a change of constitution was clear (cf. Xen. Hell. iv. 8. 20, where the exiled Rhodian oligarchs appeal to Sparta in 391), but it now for the first time appears that the two events were not contemporaneous. In the interval the government was in the hands of one of the leading families (cf. l. 25, note), and Conon’s fleet had already been admitted to the harbour before the democratic rising took place. Conon, though supporting the conspirators, took no active part in their proceedings, preferring to be absent at the critical moment. The date of the insurrection is fixed by xi. 34 as the summer of 395; the expulsion of the Spartans must have occurred in the winter of 396-5, if not earlier still; cf. iii. 23-6, note.

3-8. προφασιζόμενος μεν, παρασκε[νάσει ἡσύχους in l. 5, ἦταν in l. 6, ἐπειδὴ συνήθη ἐποίησεν] in l. 7 and αὐτὸς μὲν in l. 8 were suggested by Wilamowitz. We prefer ἐπείδη ἥτα to ἐπειδῆ, since a connecting particle is required between the two main verbs ἐβιόθοισα in l. 2 and ἐξεπέλευσαν in l. 9, and ἤταν in l. 5 only balances the preceding μεν. A somewhat different sense, which seems less appropriate, is given to the passage if, abandoning προφασιζόμενος μεν and placing a full-stop after πόλεμοι in l. 4, we restore παρασκε[νάσει προφασίζων] τοῦ Ῥοδίουσ [ἐν ἀντίθεσι συναρπάζειν ἔτη πάντα] ἑαυτῷ ἐξεπέλευσεν ἐπειδή παραπόταμος ἐπέπεπται ἐκ Κορωνίας. The lacunae at the beginnings of ll. 6-7 ought not to contain more than four letters, and perhaps ἤταν should be substituted for ἦταν, while in l. 7 τα may have been omitted by mistake.

9. For ἐς Καύνον cf. l. 29 ἐς Καύνον. Conon, having been admitted to Rhodes by the ruling oligarchs, was probably unwilling to be compromised by the action of the conspirators, and wished that the revolution should appear to be spontaneous.

10. τῶν Διαγορείων: cf. l. 25. The Diagoreans (cf. Aeschin. Ἐπ. 4. 4) or Diagoridae were an illustrious Rhodian family descended from Damagetus, king of Ialyssus, and renowned for their athletic prowess; cf. Paus. iv. 24. 5 and vi. 7. 1-7. Diogoras himself won the boxing contest at Olympia in 464, the victory being celebrated by Pindar in Ὠλ. vii, and his sons Acusilaus, Dorieus, and Damagetus, and grandsons, Eucles and Pisirhodus, were all famous athletes, especially Dorieus, who became the leader of the anti-Athenian party at Rhodes. Condemned to death with his kindred by the Athenians, he escaped to Thurii, and after fighting for some years on the Spartan side was taken
prisoner in 407, but released (Xen. Hell. i. 5. 19). According to Androtion, Ap. Paus. vi. 7. 6, when the revolt of Rhodes from Sparta with which we are concerned took place, Dorius was near the Peloponnese, and was arrested and put to death by the Spartans, whose conduct is now much more intelligible in view of the fact that the Diagoridæ had clearly taken the lead in expelling the Spartan harmosts.

10-1. The Athenians Hieronymus and Nicophemus are known as Conon's chief lieutenants from Diod. xiv. 81. 4, where they are left in charge of the fleet when Conon goes to visit the Persian king. *Νικόφθμος is there called *Νικιδήμος, but Xenophon (Hell. iv. 8. 8) and Lysias (xix. 7) agree with Ρ as to the form of the name. Concerning Hieronymus, Harpocratin (x. v.) says ἄλλα τε μημανέων καί "Εφορος ἐν τῇ ὑδάθα καί δικαία καί ἐν τῇ ἐνίτη καί δεκαία, but as he must have been mentioned in any detailed history of the naval war, this statement provides no argument for identifying Ρ with Ephorus; cf. p. 126.

12. πολιτέας was suggested by Dittenberger.

20. αὐτῶν has no construction and something has dropped out, probably τις or a word meaning 'leader'.

22. [Τωμῆ, ὥς ἄνδρες, ἐφε, πολίται, κ.τ.λ. This is the only speech in the papyrus; cf. p. 123. The position of ἐφε between ἄνδρες and πολίται instead of after τωμῆ is due to the desire to avoid hiatus; cf. ii. 34, note.

23-4. For such an accusative as τὴν βοήθειαν after βοήσαντος there is no near parallel, but βοήθειαν seems inevitable, and the phrase is so easily intelligible that we prefer to regard the expression as one peculiar to our author rather than to treat it as corrupt; cf. p. 124.

26. ἒνδικα: the moderation of the victorious democrats is noticeable (cf. τῶν ἄλιγμος in l. 32), and was clearly appreciated by our author, who here shows no trace of the aristocratic bias sometimes discernible; cf. i. 33, note, and pp. 122-3.

Cols. xi. 34-xii. 31 = ch. XI. Constitution of Boeotia.

1 In this summer the Boeotians and Phocians went to war. Their enmity was chiefly caused by a party at Thebes; for not many years previously the Boeotians had entered into a state of discord. The condition of Boeotia at that time was as follows. There were then appointed in each of the cities four boulaï, of which not all the citizens were allowed to become members, but only those who possessed a certain amount of money; of these boulaï each one in turn held a preliminary sitting and deliberation about matters of policy, and made proposals to the other three, and a resolution adopted by all became valid. Their individual affairs they continued to manage in that fashion, while the arrangement of the Boeotian league was this. The whole population of the country was divided into eleven units, and each of these provided one Boeotarch, as follows. The Thebans contributed four, two for the city and two for Plataea, Scolus, Erythrae, Scaphae, and the other towns which formerly were members of one state with the Plataeans, but at that time were subject to Thebes. Two Boeotarchs were provided by the inhabitants of Orchomenus and Hysiae, and two by the inhabitants of Theophras with Eutresis and Thisiæ, one by the inhabitants of Tanagra, and another by the inhabitants of Haliartus, Lebadea, and Coronea, each of these cities sending him in turn; in the same way one came from Acraephium, Copae, and Chaeronea. Such was the proportion in which the chief magistrates were appointed by the different units, which also provided sixty bouleutæ for every Boeotarch, and themselves defrayed their daily expenses. Each unit was, moreover, under the obligation to supply a corps of approximately a thousand hoplites and a hundred horsemen. To speak generally, it was in proportion to the distribution of their
magistrates that they enjoyed the privileges of the league, made their contributions, sent judges, and took part in everything whether good or bad. The nation then as a whole had this form of polity, and the general assemblies of the Boeotians used to meet in the Cadmea.'

x. 38 sqq. This digression on the constitution of Boeotia in 395, which is somewhat irrelevant to the account of the factions at Thebes, and still more so to the war between Boeotia and Phocis, is the most valuable section of the papyrus, and deserves of several long debated problems. First, as to the four \textit{boulai}; these were only known from Thuc. v. 38. 2 of \textit{Bouwlarxai} \textit{eiswtraon} \\vspace{1pt}\\textit{tis tispaXspui} \textit{boulai} tois Bouwlorw \\vspace{1pt}\textit{tov} \textit{kupw} \textit{tkouvi} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{kai} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{parbouwv} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{geKivwv} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{mpouwv} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{tovs} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{poulevwn} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{ouai} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{boulwvta} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{et} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{ofwvlev} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{efw} \\vspace{1pt}\textit{eivwv} \textit{eivwvmpwv}, and their relation to each other was uncertain, it being often supposed that the four \textit{boulai} corresponded to four different districts. The present passage shows that Köhler (\textit{Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad.} 1895, pp. 455-6) was fully justified in connecting them with the four \textit{boulai} which the Athenian oligarchs in 411 proposed to institute \textit{ei} tois \textit{mfdwvta} \textit{krwv}. (Arist. \textit{Alth. Pol.} 30), and each of which was to consist of 100 persons and to hold office for a year in turn; and his conjecture that in the case of important matters, such as treaties, the four Boeotian \textit{boulai} sat together is now completely established. The present passage, however, brings out a new fact of considerable value, that the four \textit{boulai} were not councils of the Boeotian league as a whole, but existed in each of the separate states which formed the federation. Thucydides' expression \textit{tis tispaXspui} \textit{boulai} tois Bouwlorw is therefore somewhat misleading, since the natural supposition is that he meant \textit{boulai} of the league. There was indeed, in addition to the four \textit{boulai} in the individual states, one federal \textit{boulai} for Boeotia (cf. xii. 12), which met in the Cadmea and consisted of 660 members, contributed by the several states in the proportion of sixty \textit{boulaurw} for each Boeotarch, but it is clear that Thucydides is not referring to this; and that the state \textit{boulai}, not the federal \textit{boulai}, possessed the supreme authority is indicated by the greater prominence given in P’s account to the former, as well as by Thucydides' words \textit{aipwv} \textit{et} \textit{tov} \textit{kupw} \textit{tkouvi}, and the circumstance that the treaty in question provisionally made by the Boeotarchs depended for validity on the consent of each individual state, not on a resolution of the federal council. For membership of the state boulai there was a property qualification, so that the numbers of the ruling oligarchies must have varied in the different states, of which there were at least ten (\textit{v. inf.}).

Secondly, as to the number of the Boeotarchs, Thuc. iv. 91 mentions eleven in b.c. 424 \textit{tovs \textit{m}llov Bouwlorwv} \textit{wai} \textit{pavwv} \textit{mpwv} \textit{ou \textit{tvwvev}to\textit{mpwv}} \textit{mwphtwv} \textit{... Pwfwvou \textit{b}nolov Bouwlorwv} \textit{e} \textit{Thbwv} \textit{met} \textit{\'A\textit{trwv}etwv} \textit{tovs \textit{L}w}yw\textit{m}zwv \textit{k.t.l.}; but it was formerly disputed whether or not the figure eleven included the two Theban Boeotarchs. A strong reason for supposing eleven to be the whole number of the Boeotarchs was supplied by Poppo (i. 2, p. 292), namely that if \textit{wai} \textit{pavwv} \textit{mpwv} referred to \textit{tovs \textit{m}llov Bouwlorwv} exclusive of the Thebans \textit{h}vai \textit{p}o\textit{twv} \textit{et} \textit{w}v should have been written. The number eleven has also been disputed by Wilamowitz (\textit{Hermes}, viii. p. 440), who wished to alter it to seven, corresponding to the seven Boeotian states mentioned in Thuc. iv. 93, a change which has been supported on other grounds and widely accepted e.g. by Cauer, Pauly-Wissowa, \textit{Real-Encyel.} iii. p. 647. Eleven is however the total number of the Boeotarchs in P (xii. 11-20), so that the correctness of the figure in Thuc. iv. 91 is vindicated beyond dispute. It is also noteworthy that P uses \textit{et} \textit{fwv} merely as a synonym for Boeotarch, and says nothing about an archon of the whole league; this officer therefore, who first appears in third century b.c. inscriptions, is not to be identified with one of the Theban Boeotarchs, as was suggested by Wilamowitz, \textit{l. c.}, still less to be regarded with Freeman (\textit{Hist. of Federal Gov.} i. p. 128) as the most ancient official of the league.

Thirdly, with regard to the members of the league, in 424 seven of them, Thebes, Haliartus, Coronea, Copae, Thespiae, Tanagra, and Orchomenus were known from
Thucydides’ account (iv. 93) of the battle of Delium. P now gives the complete list, adding the names of, firstly, Acraephium and Lebadea, which Thucydides there referred to in the expression καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι οἱ περί τῆς λίμνης, and secondly Chaeronea, which in 424 was not yet independent (cf. xii. 14, note), and also provides some information about towns which were subordinate to the sovereign members of the league. What is still more important, we now for the first time learn the proportion in which the eleven Boeotarchs were distributed among the various states. Formerly all that was known was that Thebes at the time of the Peloponnesian war had at least two Boeotarchs and probably no more (Thuc. ii. 2, iv. 91). It now appears that Boeotia as a whole was divided into eleven μεῖοι or units, each of which provided one Boeotarch and sixty members of the federal βουλή, 1000 hoplites and 100 cavalry, and that these μεῖοι were distributed among the sovereign states not evenly, but in widely varying proportions according to their relative importance. Thus four μεῖοι were assigned to the Thebans, though only two of them belonged strictly to the city (cf. xii. 12–3, note), two to Orchomenus, two to Theopompus, oce to Tanagra, one to Halistus, Lebadea, and Corona, who appointed the Boeotarch in turn, and similarly one jointly to Acraephium, Copae, and Chaeronea. These units also provided a basis for calculating both the contributions paid by the states for the federal taxes, the number of judges sent to the federal courts, and for defining in general the rights and duties of the individual states where common action was required (xii. 25–8).

The constitution of Boeotia in 395, which P directly contrasts with the conditions existing in his own day by τότε in xi. 38–9 and the use of the past tense throughout, lasted until 387, when at the peace of Antalcidas the Thebans were unwillingly compelled to reconstitute the league, and even quite small Boeotian towns received complete autonomy; cf. Xen. Hell. v. 1. 32–6, whose statements are confirmed by the evidence of the coins. Besides the ten sovereign states mentioned by P, except Acraephium (unless the coin from Acraephium ascribed by Head, Coins of Central Greece, p. 44, to 456–447 really belongs to 387–374, in which case the exception disappears), Plataea, Pharae, Mycaleus, and perhaps some other towns of which the names are uncertain are thought to have had coinages of their own from 387–374 (Head, op. cit. p. xlii). On the other hand the beginning of the period to which this constitution in the main applies may be placed at 447–6, when the Athenians were driven out of Boeotia and the league reconstituted under the hegemony of Thebes, which appears to have been the only Boeotian city to issue coinage between 446 and 387 (Head, op. cit. pp. xxxix–xl). Some changes, however, must have taken place between that year and 395 with regard to the states belonging to the league. Chaeronea was in 424 still subject to Orchomenus (Thuc. iv. 76. 3, cf. Hellicanic Fr. 49): it was no doubt made independent soon afterwards by the Thebans in order to weaken their ancient and most formidable rival. Plataea, which during the period of alliance with Athens had stood outside the league, did not rejoin it until 427, and that before that year two additional Boeotarchs were appointed by the Thebans besides the two who represented Thebes itself is not likely; cf. xii. 12–3, note. Before 447 the league had probably been in abeyance during the ten years in which Athenian influence was predominant, and even from 480 to the battle of Oenophya Thebes did not occupy the commanding position in Boeotia which she had held previously. From 480–456 the coins of only Thebes, Tanagra, and Orchomenus are known (Head, op. cit. p. xxxvii), and from 550–480 the members of the league were somewhat different from those in 395. The numismatic evidence of that period (Head, op. cit. p. xxxvii) indicates seven cities issuing coins with the league-symbol, Acraephium, Corona, Hallistus, Mycaleus (cf. no coin of Mycaleus is ascribed to this period on p. 51), Pharae, Tanagra, and Thebes, besides Orchomenus which apparently did not adopt that symbol on its coinage before 387, a circumstance of which the importance has, we think, been over-estimated; cf. xii. 16, note.
39. The space between τ and o of τοτε was, we suppose, left blank owing to a roughness in the papyrus.

xii. 1–3. Cf. Thuc. iii. 62. 3, where in 428 the Theban orator contrasts the δυναστεία διήρην ἀνθρωπῶν which existed at the time of the Persian war with the ἀληγαρχία ἵσσων ὑσών of Thebes in his own day.

4. προκαθηδρική, if correct, is employed in an unusual sense, referring to a preliminary sitting. Generally the word means ‘presiding over’. ιδία κ’ αθημενί is too long and would cause a hiatus.

10. Βοιωταρχών: so in l. 22, but in l. 15 Βοιωταρχαί.

12–3. Scolus, Erythrae, and Scaphae were towns in the Parasopia east of Plataea and Hysiae, between the Asopus and Mount Cithaeron. Scaphae is called Σκάφη by Strabo (ix. 2. 24), who states that its earlier name was Ἠτεωκή, and confirms the connexion of these three places with Plataea, τοὺς Παρασπάνους . . . ἀπαντάς ά' ἐπὶ Ὀθηβίαν ἄνωτα (ἐπετοι ά' ἐν τῇ Πλαταιαίᾳ φασὶ τῶν τε Σκάλου καὶ τῶν Ἑτεωκῶν καὶ τῶν Ἐρυθραίων). Pausanias also speaks of Erythrae (ix: 2. 1) and Scolus (ix. 4. 4) as belonging to Ἡ Πlatαια, remarking in connexion with the latter ἀποκρόμει δὲ καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς Ὀθηβίας τὴν Πλαταιαία δ’ ἄνωτος. It is thus clear that in much later times the boundary between the land of Plataea and Thebes was the same as it had been in the period which P calls vaguely πρότερον, contrasting it with τότε, i.e. 397. The question when these three towns became tributary to Thebes raises a difficult problem. The most natural interpretation of this passage taken by itself would be that Scolus, Erythrae, and Scaphae were traditionally united to Plataea, and only became subject to Thebes when that city rejoined the Boeotian confederacy on its capture in 427. A necessary corollary of this view would be that the right to appoint two extra Boeotarchs was only obtained by the Thebans after the fall of Plataea; before 427 the number of the Boeotarchs would be nine, not eleven. To this inference there is no particular objection, for eleven as the number of the Boeotarchs is not attested before the battle of Delium in 424, and in the scanty evidence hitherto available concerning the boundaries of the Πλαταιαί in the fifth century, there is nothing definite to show that Scolus, Erythrae, and Scaphae had ceased to be united with Plataea in the fifty years before 427. In 519 the Athenians made the Asopus the boundary between Thebes on the one hand and Plataea and Hysiae on the other (Hdt. vi. 108), and in 507, when Hysiae and Οενοέ were captured by the Boeotians, both places are called by Herodotus (v. 74) δήμου τοῦ ἐγχώσεως τῆς 'Αττικῆς, though whether Hysiae really belonged to Attica rather than to Plataea is doubtful. In 479 Scolus is indeed mentioned in Hdt. ix. 15 as being ἐν γῇ τῆς Ὀθηβίας, and Erythrae and Hysiae, which occur later on in the same chapter, also seem to be Theban and outside the Πλαταιαί. But, even if Herodotus is correct on this point, which is by no means certain, after the battle of Plataea the territory of the Plataeans may have been increased at the expense of Thebes, and at any rate during the period of the Athenian predominance in Boeotia, it is unlikely that Thebes possessed any territory south of the Asopus. After the battle of Coronea according to Thuc. i. 113 τῆς Βοιωτίας ἔξοδων Ἀθηναίων πᾶσαν, but whether the Plataeans suffered a diminution of their land is not known. Οενοέ in 431 was on the frontier of Attica and Boeotia (Thuc. ii. 18) and Erythrae and Hysiae, mentioned by Thuc. iii. 24 in connexion with the flight of the Plataeans to Athens, are called by the scholiast ad loc. δήμοι Βοιωτίας and have generally been regarded as not belonging to the Πλαταιαί; but since Plataea even when allied to Athens continued to be included in Boeotia, this evidence is not irreconcilable with the view that the Plataeans retained the south bank of the Asopus after 447 until the Peloponnesian war. An important fresh piece of evidence is provided by xiii. 23–8, where Erythrae, Scaphae, and Scolus occur in a list of Boeotian towns from which the inhabitants, owing to fear of an Athenian invasion, moved to Thebes. The date and circumstances of the removal
are not very clear (cf. note ad loc.), but it took place probably about 431; and Erythrae, Scaphae and Scolus, although coupled with three undoubtedly Theban towns, Aulis, Schoenus and Potniae, were, we think, dependent upon Plataea when the transference of the population occurred. For if Erythrae, Scaphae and Scolus were already in 431 separated from Plataea and joined to Thebes, it is very difficult to see what period is meant by πρότερων in l. 13.

In any case, whatever may have been the relations of those three towns to Plataea and Thebes in the fifth century, three such unimportant places as Erythrae, Scolus and Scaphae cannot have returned two Boeotarchs by themselves apart from Plataea, so that the Thebans are not likely to have appointed more than two Boeotarchs until the fall of Plataea in 427; and on the other hand it is clear from the agreement between P and Thuc. iv. 91 as to the total number of the Boeotarchs (eleven), that from 427 onwards they appointed four. Hence the manifest indication in Thuc. iv. 91 (cf. p. 224), that only two out of the eleven were ἐκ Θησείων in 424 is to be regarded as implying not an increase in the representation of Thebes between 424 and 395, but a difference in status and mode of election between the two representatives of Thebes itself and the other two, who were, as Thucydides shows, not ἐκ Θησείων, and may well, as Dittenberger suggested, have been citizens of Plataea and the three dependent towns.

14. συντελεύτων: this is the technical term for indicating the dependence of the lesser Boeotian towns on the sovereign states; cf. Thuc. iv. 76. 3 Χαριμώνων ἦ ἐκ Ὀρχομένων... συντελεύται and Paus. ix. 3. 6 τῶν ἐν πολεμαῖσιν ὑπάσαν εὐτίκειαν ἐξαιρέσεως λόγου συντελεύτας αὐτῶν.

16. Ὀρχομένων: Orchenomenus, the ancient and most serious rival of Thebes, issued its own coinage without the league-symbol in the sixth century and in the first half of the fifth. No coins of the city are ascribed to the period 456—387, and the league-symbol does not make its appearance on the coins of Orchenomenus till 387—74, though many of the types of that period are without it and have the traditional corn-grain of the city. On the strength of the numismatic evidence, and in particular the absence of the league-symbol, it has been supposed that prior to 447 Orchenomenus was not a member of the federation, or at any rate was not closely connected with it (Head, op. cit. p. xxvii; cf. Cauer, ap. Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encl. iii. p. 645); but that Orchenomenus should have remained outside the league for so long is not very likely, and the importance attached to the absence of the league-symbol from its coinage prior to 387 seems to us exaggerated, especially as the symbol is not always found on the coins of Orchenomenus from 387—74.

Ἰναῖος: this, as Wilamowitz remarked, cannot refer to Hysiae near Plataea, but must mean the inhabitants of Ὑππότος on Lake Copais, east of Orchenomenus. It is, however, we think, not necessary to alter the text to Ὑππότων, as he proposes. Ἰναῖος here probably indicates a real variation in the form of the name; cf. the ancient identification of Hysiae with Hyria mentioned by Strabo ix. 2. 12. Of Hyettus and its neighbour Olmones Pausanias (ix. 24. 3) says κόμμα ἕν τε οἰκία καὶ τεῖχος ἐν θέρμης μούρας ἐβραίων διὰ (ἐμάδεικτον) τῆς Ὀρχομένιος εἰς...; but the first statement is inexact, for Hyettus appears as an independent πόλις in inscriptions of the third century B.C. In 395, however, it was probably, as Meyer suggests, dependent upon Orchenomenus in the same way as Thische and Eutresis were subordinate to Thespiae.

Θεσπις αὐτῷ Εὐτρείναι καὶ Θίσσαι: that Thespias had two Boeotarchs is not surprising in view of its extensive territory at this period; cf. Thuc. iv. 76. 3, where Σφήν on the Corinthian Gulf belongs to it. For Eutresis cf. Strabo ix. 2. 28 Ἔπτρησι, καὶ τοῖς Ὀσίβοις. Thische as well as Corsiae, a town further west, became independent in the third century B.C., as is shown by inscriptions.

17. ἐνα ἐν ταυρογάραιω: in later times the territory of Tanagra was very extensive, including Eleon, Harma, Mycalessus, and Pharae (Strabo ix. 2. 14, Pausan. ix. 19. 4), Aulis (Strabo ix. 2. 8, Pausan. ix. 19. 8), and Hyria (Strabo ix. 2. 12); but, as Meyer observes,
the fact that Tanagra in 395 had only one Boeotarch indicates that it was then much less important, and probably most or even all of those six places at that time belonged to Thebes. Head (Coins of Central Greece, p. xxxviii) thinks that in 480-456 Tanagra aspired to the hegemony of the league, because it was the only town which struck coins in the name of the Boeotians as a whole; but this seems to us a very doubtful inference (Cauer l. c. wrongly states that Tanagra issued coins of its own in this period, and hence erroneously regards Tanagra as standing outside the league). That Aulis was Theban in B.C. 431 is made probable by xiii. 25, where it is mentioned together with Schoenus and Potniae, which were undoubtedly Theban; and of Hyria Strabo (l. c.) expressly says that it was formerly in the Thebais, while Phrae and Mycalessus, which were independent both before 480 and after 387, are much more likely to have belonged to Thebes than to Tanagra in the intervening period. Delium therefore seems to have been the only place of much importance belonging to Tanagra in 395; cf. Thuc. iv. 76, Strabo ix. 2. 7, Pausan. ix. 20. 1.

xii. 17-20. On the six minor states divided into two groups with one Boeotarch to each group cf. pp. 224-5.

20. Ἀκραίφιον: the spelling of this name is subject to many variations. P's form Ἀκραίφιον has hitherto been found only in Pausan. ix. 23. 5. 24. 1. Inscriptions and the older literature have only forms without the ν, Ἰ Ἀκραίφια, τὸ Ἀκραίφιον, τὰ Ἀκραίφια, but Steph. Byz. states that Theopompos employed the form τὰ Ἀκραίφια (cf. p. 126) and that Ephorus used Ἀκραίφιος and Ἀκραίφιατης for the ἐθνικός. Outside Boeotia the word seems to have been derived from ἀκραίφις.

21-3. That the federal boule, consisting of 660 members, was divided like the state bouλαί into four parts, each of which held office in turn, is neither stated by P, nor is at all likely. Lines 29-31 apparently refer to general meetings of the federal boule in the Cadmea, and another mention of it occurs in xiii. 12, but the ultimate decision in matters of supreme importance rested less with it than with the boulai of the individual states; cf. p. 224.

23. ἀπτόλ: sc. the Boeotians.

24. The hiatus στραταὶ ἐκάστῳ can be avoided by placing ἐκάστῳ μέρες after δί; cf. i. 4, note.

Cols. xii. 31-xiv. 5 = ch. XII. Parties at Thebes.

'At Thebes the best and most notable of the citizens were, as I have already stated, divided against each other, one faction being led by Ismenias, Antitheus, and Androcildas, the other by Leontiades, Asias, and Coranntadas. The political party of Leontiades sided with the Lacedaemonians, while that of Ismenias was accused of Atticizing, because it favoured the Athenian democracy when the latter was exiled. Ismenias' party, however, was not concerned for the Athenians but.... Such being the condition of affairs at Thebes, and each of the two factions being powerful, many people from the cities throughout Boeotia then came forward and joined one or the other of them. At that time, and for a short period previously, the party of Ismenias and Androcildas was the stronger both at Thebes itself and in the boule of the Boeotians; but formerly that of Asias and Leontiades was in the ascendant for a considerable period and (had complete control of?) the city. For when the Lacedaemonians in the war with the Athenians were occupying Decelea and collected a large concourse of their allies, this party prevailed over their opponents both by reason of the proximity of the Lacedaemonians and because the latter were instrumental in conferring great benefits upon the city. The Thebans made a great advance in the direction of complete prosperity as soon as war between the Athenians and Lacedaemonians began; for when the Athenians commenced to threaten(?)}
Boeotia, the inhabitants of Erythrae, Scaphae, Scolus, Aulis, Schoenus, and Potniae, and many other similar places which had no walls, congregated at Thebes, thus doubling the size of the city. But it nevertheless came to prosper in a much higher degree when the Thebans in conjunction with the Lacedaemonians fortified Decebalium against the Athenians; for they took over the prisoners and all the other spoils of the war at a small price, and, as they inhabited the neighbouring country, carried off to their homes all the furnishing material in Attica, beginning with the wood and tiles of the houses. The country of the Athenians at that time had been the most lavishly furnished in Greece, for it had suffered but slight injury from the Lacedaemonians in the former invasions, and had been adorned and elaborated with so much extravagance that . . . Such was the condition of Thebes and Boeotia.'

xii. 32. ὄπιςερ καὶ πρῶτερον: i.e. in xi. 36–8.

34-5. Ismenias and Androcidas are well known as the leaders of the anti-Spartan party at Thebes at this period and instigators of the war with Sparta, for the furtherance of which they took bribes from Persia; cf. i. 33, note. The form άνδροκλής which occurs here is a slip; άνδροκλέος, the correct Boeotian form uniformly employed by Xenophon, is found in xiv. 6 and 35, and the Attic variant άνθροκλής in xiii. 11. 'Αστις is not mentioned by Xenophon, who (Hell. iii. 5. 1) in his place associates with Ismenias and Androcidas an otherwise unknown Ἀστισιός. Pausanias, however (iii. 9. 8), couples Androcidas and Ismenias with άμφιθεμεν, who is obviously identical with our άστις, while Plutarch (Lysand. 27) calls him άμφιθεσ. Of the leaders of the pro-Spartan party Αστιάς (Λεωνίδης Plut.) is familiar, but άστις (or άστις as he is called in xiii. 13) seems to be otherwise unknown, for the άρχις who is associated with Leontiades in 379 (Xen. Hell. v. 4. 2, 6, Plut. Pelop. 5 sqq., Cornelius Nepos, Pelop. 3. 2) is not likely to be the same as άστις. With regard to the form of that name, 'Αστις does not occur elsewhere, but άστις is found in a Boeotian inscription. Κορμαίδας (cf. Κορμαίδας in Boeotian inscriptions) may, as Meyer suggests, be identical with the Boeotian general Κορμαίδας mentioned in Xen. Hell. i. 3. 15-22 and Ἀναβ. vii. 1. 33 sqq.

39. Though a plural subject for έφυγέν can be supplied out of τῶν δήμων, the sentence is made much clearer by altering έφυγέν to έφυγεν, as proposed by Wilamowitz. The reference is of course to the restoration of the Athenian democracy in 403.

xiii. 1-5. The general sense of this passage appears to be that Ismenias and his party favoured Athens not from any regard for Athenian interests but from selfish motives, in order that they might use Athenian support in the contest with the pro-Spartan party at Thebes; cf. xiv. 6–16.

10. [μυκτῷ πρώτερον: i.e. ever since the conclusion of the Peloponnesian war when the ascendency of Ismenias' party caused a complete change in Theban policy, and Thebes which had been the bitterest foe of Athens suddenly became leader of the opposition to Sparta; cf. Meyer, Gesch. d. Alt. v. pp. 213-4. P's description in xii-xiv of the attitude of Thebes and the origin of the anti-Spartan league is much fuller than the short accounts in Xenophon, Hell. iii. 5. 1–3, Pausan. iii. 9. 9, Plut. Lysand. 27 and Dion. xiv. 81; and in particular his analysis of the motives of Ismenias' party (xii. 37 sqq., xiv. 6 sqq.) is acute and just (cf. i. 36 sqq., where he rightly treats the Persian bribes as a factor of secondary importance); but he tends to lay too much stress on the mere rivalry of the contending factions, and to obscure the underlying cause which brought Ismenias' party to the front, the dissatisfaction of Thebes with the Spartan domination in central Greece, which hindered Theban ambitions. Here, as in the case of the war party at Athens (cf. i. 33, note), P's sympathy with Sparta causes him to under-estimate the legitimate patriotic aspirations of Sparta's chief opponents, but it is noticeable that he does not attempt to cast aspersions
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on Ismenias and Androcles, who equally with the leaders of the pro-Spartan party at Thebes are among the ἔλεγοντει καὶ γεφυρώνται (xii. 31), and the contest of Theban factions is described in quite different terms from the opposition between the γυμνοὺς καὶ χαμένης and οἱ πόλεις καὶ δημοκρατία in i. 9 sqq.

xiii. 13. For the spelling ἀστίαν cf. xii. 34-5, note.

14. [τι]α: there is room for three or even four letters before ν, but χρονοῦ[π]ια is preferable to χρο[ν]ου τια which seems the only alternative. The beginnings of lines tend to be irregular throughout the papyrus. The doubtful π before the lacuna can be γ, ι, κ, μ or ν. ν]ων may well be ει[χων, but διὰ χειρόν is inadmissible.

16. The vestiges after καὶ σ do not suit τρ'αρε[ι]ς[μ]ς very well, and τρατεματο seems too long for the space between σ and the final ν. σιν'τα[ε]ς[μ]ς (Bury) is also unsatisfactory.

22. ὁ πόλεμος: from the context, especially the mentions of Deceleia in ll. 16 and 29, this would naturally be interpreted as the Peloponnesian war. For some time we agreed with Meyer who suggested a connexion between xiii. 23-8 and the statement of Diodorus (xi. 81. 3) that the Spartans in the period preceding the battle of Tanagra τῆς μὲν τῶν Ῥηθῶν πόλεως μείζονα τῶν περὶδολον κυκεσίσαν, τὰς δὲ ἐν Βοιωτίᾳ πόλεις ἱμακαςαν ὑποτίττεσθαι τοῖς Θηβαίοις, and consequently referred ὁ πόλεμος to the war of Athens against the Spartans and Boeotians in 457. But while both writers allude to the increase in the size of Thebes, the explanation of it is quite different in the two cases, and Mr. Walker has convinced us that the natural interpretation is right, and that P ascribed the transference of population to Thebes to B.C. 431. Whether he was correct in his statement, particularly in the alleged reason for the transference, the fear of Athenian invasion, is not clear. The Boeotians may have expected reprisals for the treacherous attack on Plataea, and that Athens cherished hopes of recovering Boeotia is shown by the expedition of Nicias against Tanagra in 426 (Thuc. iii. 91) and the invasion two years later which resulted in the battle of Delium; but there was of course no attack upon Boeotia in 431, Attica being itself invaded, so that the impression conveyed by P's statement is not very accurate. It is noteworthy that in his account of the prosperity of Attica (xiii. 36-xiv. 3) P unduly minimizes the extent of the injuries inflicted by the Lacedaemonian invasions in the Archidamian war, which, as Thucydides shows clearly, caused widespread devastation. If fear of Athenian attack was the real reason of the συνοικίσμα, it would be more satisfactory to place that event in the period after the battle of Tanagra and the withdrawal of the Spartans from Boeotia when the Athenians, according to Diod. xi. 83. 1, gained possession of all the Boeotian cities except Thebes, which would naturally have become a centre of migration from other parts of the country.

Of the six places mentioned in connexion with the συνοικίσμα, Erythrae, Scaphae and Scolus were in the Parasopia near the Athenian boundary and in 431 belonged to Plataea (cf. xii. 12-3, note), while Schoenus and Potniae were Theban and respectively 50 and 10 stades north of Thebes (Pausan. ix. 8. 1, Strabo ix. 2. 22, 24, 32). A slight difficulty arises in connexion with Aulis, which was on the coast and much further away from Thebes, especially as in later times it was dependent not on Thebes but Tanagra. There is however not much doubt about the reading λιῷς, and there are other reasons for supposing that the territory of Tanagra was less extensive in 431-395 than later; cf. note on xii. 17.

23. ἀπ' εἰκόνα, though it gives a suitable sense, is very doubtful, for there seems to be no parallel for the metaphorical use of this word in prose, and γ, μ or ν can be read in place of π.

38. μικρά: this is an exaggeration; cf. l. 22, note.

xiv. 1-2. ἔνευ must be μυ[π]ιν or οὐιν, and δοτε probably preceded, perhaps immediately after ἵππολήν, while the word after ὧν εσεῖ is must be a comparative adverb. Bury suggests
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Phocians, thought, provide support from among their citizens. Having this policy in view, they considered that it was difficult to attack the enemy openly, since neither the Thebans nor the other Boeotians would consent to a war with the Lacedaemonians while supreme in Greece; but they attempted to incite them to make war by the device of persuading certain Phocians to invade the territory of the so-called Hesperian Locrians. The enmity between these two states originated as follows. There is a disputed area near Parnassus, about which they have gone to war in former times also; this is often encroached upon for grazing by both the Phocians and the Locrians, and whichever party procures the other in occupation collects in considerable numbers and plunders the sheep. Many such quarrels had been provoked by either side, which formerly they were always in the habit of settling for the most part by legal proceedings or discussion; but on this occasion when the Locrians retaliated by seizing an equivalent of the sheep which they had lost, the Phocians at the instigation of the men procured by Androclidas and Ismenias immediately took up arms and invaded Locris. Therupon the Locrians when their country was ravaged sent ambassadors to the Boeotians accusing the Phocians and asking for assistance, these states having always been on friendly terms with each other. Gladly seizing the opportunity, the party of Ismenias and Androclidas persuaded the Boeotians to help the Locrians, whereat the Phocians on receiving news of the action of Thebes withdrew from Locris and sent ambassadors to the Lacedaemonians asking them to forbid the Boeotians to enter their country. The Lacedaemonians, although they considered the story unworthy of belief, nevertheless sent a message ordering the Boeotians not to make war on the Phocians, but if they considered themselves aggrieved on any point to take satisfaction at a meeting of the confederaacy. The Boeotians, however, at the instigation of the men who had arranged the plot and its consequences, dismissed the Lacedaemonian envoys with an unfavourable answer, and taking up arms marched against the Phocians. They immediately invaded the country, and after ravaging the land of the Parapotamii, the Daulii and Phanoteis, they attempted an assault upon these cities. They attacked Daulia, but retreated without having effected anything, and even suffered some slight losses; of the Phanoteis, however, they took by storm the suburb of the town. After this success they advanced further into Phocis, where they overran part of the plain near Elatea and Pedieis and the people of that neighbourhood, and then turned homewards. As they were passing Hyampolis in the course of the retreat, they decided to make an attempt upon it. The place is remarkably strong, and though they attacked the walls and displayed no lack of energy they achieved no success, but had to retire with the
loss of about eighty soldiers. Having inflicted this amount of injury upon the Phocians the Boeotians returned to their own country.

xiv. 12–3. καὶ ἀδικοὶ and the insertion of δὲ were suggested by Wilamowitz; Blass had proposed ἐπειδὴ in l. 12 and made μεθίζεσθαι dependent on ἐπηγγέλθη, which is less satisfactory. The effects of the bribes of Timocrates and the anti-Spartan feeling at Corinth, Argos and Athens have already been described by P in ii. 1 sqq. Though the hopes of assistance from Athens were justified by the event, the expectation of help from Corinth and Argos proved somewhat premature, for these two states remained passive until the defeat of the Lacedaemonians at Haliartus had relieved Boeotia from danger.

14. The somewhat otiose sentence τῶινος...πολιτάς is corrupt as it stands, and the simplest course is to read συμμετέχοντες for συμμετέχοις; but this does not yield a very satisfactory sense, and possibly some words have dropped out.

21 sqq. With regard to the origin of the Boeotian war, P's account, which is much more detailed than those of the extant authorities, agrees with Xenophon's (Hell. iii. 5. 3) and Pausanias' (iii. 9. 9) in attributing the ultimate responsibility for the outbreak to the parties of Ismenias and Androcles (cf. also Plut. Ly. 27), and the occasion of it to a border dispute between Phoci and Locris. Diodorus, who (xiv. 81. 1) says merely Ψοκεῖς πρὸς Βοιωτοῖς ἐκ τινος ἐγκλήματα εἰς πάλαι καταστάσεις ἐπεικας τῶις Ἀθηναίοις συμμαχεὶς κατὰ τῶν Βοιωτῶν, not only gives no details but produces the false impression that Sparta rather than Thebes was the aggressor, a view which is defended in vain by Grote, for though Plutarch (Ly. 27) says that some regarded Lysander as the cause of the war rather than the Thebans, there can no longer be any doubt that the latter were the prime movers. But while P so far supports Xenophon and Pausanias, his account differs widely from theirs in point of detail. In the first place Xenophon states that the Locrrians in question were the Opuntian Locrians, whereas according to P they were the Hesperian Locrians and the disputed area was περὶ τῶν Παρασσῶν. Pausanias speaks of οἱ ἐκ Ἀμφίατος Δοκεί, thus agreeing with P, who is likely to be right on this point. In 394 both sets of Locrrians were allied to Thebes and Athens; cf. Xen. Hell. iv. 2, 17, 3. 15. Secondly, while Xenophon and Pausanias represent the Locrrians as beginning the dispute by encroaching upon the disputed area at the suggestion of their allies the Thebans, according to P it was the Phocians who originally made a raid upon the flocks of the Locrrians in the debatable ground, and the Locrrians only assumed the offensive as a means of retaliation. The subsequent invasion of Locris by the Phocians is also attributed by P to the instigation of a band of Phocians in the pay of the Thebans. There is further a minor discrepancy with respect to the precise action of the Locrrians in the disputed area. According to Xenophon they were persuaded χρήματα τελέσαι (which is translated 'levy money' though τελέσαι does not seem to be the right word in the context), and the Phocians retaliated by taking πολλαπλαθεὶς χρήματα. P's account on the other hand, according to which the dispute was concerned with the grazing of flocks, agrees closely with that of Pausanias, who says that the Locrrians τὸν τε αἰτῶν ἅκναξοντα ἔτημον καὶ ἦπαραν λεῖον ἄγωντες. Whether it was really the Locrrians or, as P asserts, certain Phocians who allowed themselves to be made the tools of Thebes cannot be decided with certainty. The intrigue becomes more involved in P's version, which brings out the remarkable ingenuity of Ismenias and Androcles in making the Locrrians appear the injured party, and displays an apparently very detailed knowledge of the circumstances. Meyer is disposed to prefer Xenophon's account on the ground that the Locrrians, not the Phocians, were allied to Thebes, and that the Phocians fell too readily into the trap prepared for them. On the other hand, if the facts were as P states, an abbreviated account of them would easily give rise to the version in which the Locrrians took the first step.
The appeal of the Locrians for Theban support (xiv. 37—xv. 3) is also related by both Xenophon and Pausanias, but neither of these writers mentions the embassy of the Phocians to Sparta and the unsuccessful mission of the Spartans to Boeotia (xv. 3—14) prior to the actual invasion of Phocis. According to them the request for Spartan assistance was made by the Phocians after the invasion had begun, and then the pretext for a war with Boeotia was eagerly seized. Pausanias adds the statement that the Athenians tried to prevent a conflict, ὅπερ μὲν σφάς (the Spartans) δεόμενοι μὴ κινῆσαι δίεις δὲ ἐπηρὰν ἄν ἐγκαλοῦν διακρίνονταi, an improbable story which looks like a perversion of the proposals of the Spartans in xv. 9—11. P must have described the successful appeal of the Phocians for Spartan intervention in a later chapter after the campaign of Agesilaus, in the middle of which the papyrus breaks off; but the narrative in xv. 7—11 represents the Spartans as pursuing a pacific policy and showing no great anxiety to accept the opportunity for declaring war on Boeotia. This does not harmonize very well with Xenophon's eminently just remarks (Hell. iii. 5. 5) upon the reasons which the Spartans had for welcoming a war with Boeotia at this juncture, and, as Meyer suggests, P may be exaggerating the Spartan moderation. On the other hand Xenophon himself in Hell. iii. 5. 3 says—what is probably true—that the Thebans had to take the initiative because they knew ὅτι ὅπερ τὰς πολίς ἕξετε τοῖς ἐξελθόντος τῶν Ἀκαδαμίων λίτων τὰς σταυρᾶς πρὸς τοῖς αὐτοῖς, and P's statement that the Spartans, while in doubt about the truth of the impending invasion of Phocis, gave the Boeotians the chance of settling the quarrel peaceably, is not inconsistent with their ready intervention when the invasion was an accomplished fact. The arrogant tone of the Spartan message, in which the Boeotians were treated as if they were subordinate members of the Peloponnesian confederacy is quite in keeping with their claim ἄρρεν ἡ Ἑλλάδος (xiv. 20).

25. ἵστα: on the use of the present tense here and in ll. 27 and 40, which has an important bearing upon the date of the composition of P's work, cf. xvi. 3, note, and p. 134.

xv. 3—4. ἀγγελθείην ὧν and τῇ ἵστε μὲν were suggested by Wilamowitz.

5. The vestiges after δὴ do not suit μεῖτα τῶν ταῦτα.

15 sqq. These details concerning the invasion of Phocis are all new, but of no special interest. With regard to the chronology of the war between Boeotia and Phocis, P's remark (xi. 34) that it began in the summer agrees with Pausanias' statement that the Locrians cut down τῶν σινών ἁκμάσσατα. Apparently the dispute between Phocis and Locris took place about May or June, the invasion of Phocis about July and August, and the battle of Haltauris about September or October.

19. ἦναλία: for the form cf. Strabo ix. 423 ὁμορος μὲν οἷς ἦναλία ὑπενε, οἱ δ' ὕστερον ἦναλιν.

24. Πελών: this town is mentioned by Hdt. viii. 33, but Πελών here may mean the people of Pedieis; cf. the similar ambiguity in the case of Παπασοτίμου.

26. The corruption of παπ Νομπολων into πρὸς Παπορν Ρόλιν was detected by both Blass and Wilamowitz.

xv. 32—xvii. 29 = ch. XIV. The naval war.
when he begins a war, dispatches a small sum at the outset and neglects the army subsequently, while those in charge of the campaign being unable to defray the expenses privately sometimes suffer their forces to disband. This is what usually takes place, but on the arrival of Conon and his declaration that the Persian cause would run the risk of ruin through want of money, of which it was unreasonable for the king's soldiers to be in need, Tithraustes sent some of the barbarians in his following with two hundred and twenty talents for the pay of the soldiers; this sum was obtained from the property of Tissaphernes. After remaining a short time longer at Sardis he then went up to the court of the king, having appointed Arienus and Pasiphernes to take command, and delivered to them for the purposes of the war the silver and gold that was left behind, which proved, as it is said, to be about seven hundred talents.

xv. 33. On Cheiricrates, who succeeded Pollis as ναύαρχος in the late summer of 395, cf. iii. 21 and 23–6, notes. Neither ναύαρχος was known previously. Cheiricrates seems to have taken no active steps against Conon; probably the bulk of the Spartan fleet was at Cnidus; but Pancalus was stationed with 5 ships at the Hellespont, where he co-operated with Agesilaus; cf. xxi. 25–7. In the course of the winter of 395-4 Cheiricrates was superseded by Agesilaus' brother-in-law, Pisander, who was killed at the battle of Cnidus in the following July or August. Xenophon, who (Hil. iii. 4. 27–9, supported by Plut. Ages. 10, Pausan. iii. 9. 6) represents Pisander as appointed ναύαρχος by Agesilaus when the latter was in the πεδίον ὑπὸ Κύμης on his way to invade Phrygia, i.e. in the late summer of 395 (cf. Hell. iv. 1. 1 and xviii. 38 sqq. and xix. 2, note), has clearly placed the beginning of Pisander's ναυαρχία too early.

37 sqq. This visit of Conon to Pharnabazus and Tithraustes to obtain money is not recorded elsewhere. Diodorus (xix. 81. 4–6) relates that Conon went to the king himself at Babylon for the same purpose, synchronizing this event with the Boeotian war. His date for Conon's journey to Persia conflicts with that of Nepos (Conon 3) and Pausanias (iii. 9. 2), who imply that it took place in the winter of 396-5; but the correctness of Diodorus' date is now amply vindicated (cf. note on vii. 4), and Conon's journey to Babylon is to be assigned to the late autumn of 395 or winter of 395–4. That he should have found it necessary to go to the king to obtain money is not at all surprising, for the 220 talents which he received from Tithraustes cannot have been sufficient to make up the arrears of many months' pay upon a fleet of over 100 triremes and numerous Greek mercenaries on land, and the serious mutiny described in xvi. 29 sqq. shows the dangers to which he was exposed so long as he was ill provided with funds.

xvi. 2–4. This sentence seems to be the origin of Justin's remark (vi. 2. 11) with regard to Conon's soldiers, quos praefecti regis fraudare stipendio soliti erant; cf. xvi. 29, note.

3. ἐστιν: the use of the present tense here and in ll. 9–16 is important as an indication that this history was composed before the fall of the Persian empire; cf. xiv. 25, 27, 49, xix. 5 and p. 132.

5. Λακηδαιμώνιος ήσαν: the hiatus can be avoided by reading Λακηδαιμώνιος(ς), as Wilamowitz proposes. Cf. i. 4, note.

7. Cf. Isocr. Panegyr. 142 τὸ μὲν ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ (sc. the king) πολλάκις ἄν διελύθησαν (sc. of στρατιώτα). 14. ν of εννευε is corrected from κ.

17. αὐ of αὐτον is corrected. At the end of the line the ν of σνν is written above the ν. 24–6. Tithraustes, having fulfilled the objects of his mission, the removal of Tissaphernes and the necessary arrangements for the continuance of the war, had no justification for remaining in Lydia; cf. Meyer, op. cit. v. p. 249. While Pharnabazus
was at Conon's request made commander-in-chief of the Persian forces (Diod. xiv. 81. 6; cf. vii. 4, note) and acted as such in 394-3, the successor of Tissaphernes as satrap was Tiribazus, who is first heard of in the winter of 393-2 (Xen. Hell. iv. 8. 12).

27. For Ariaeus cf. vii. 36 and vii. 4, note. From Xen. Hell. iv. 1. 27, it appears that he revolted from Persia in the course of the winter of 395-4. Pasiphernes was perhaps referred to in iii. 37, but is not mentioned by the other authorities, unless he is identical with the general whom Diodorus calls Artaphernes; cf. iii. 37, note.

Cols. xvi. 29-xviii. 33 = ch. XV. Mutiny of Conon's forces.

`The Cypriots who had sailed with Conon to Caunus, persuaded by certain persons who falsely asserted that there was no intention to give them the arrears of their pay, but that preparations were only being made for discharging the debts of the crews and marines, were filled with indignation, and having met in assembly elected as their leader a man of Carpasian stock, and gave him a body-guard of two soldiers from each ship . . . Conon after hearing their story urged them not to believe that (one section would be favoured), assuring them that they would all alike obtain their pay. Having given this answer, he said that he wished to make it known to the other soldiers also, whereupon the leader of the Cypriots, the Carpasian, followed him towards the main body of the troops. They started out in company, and when they were passing the gates Conon, being in front, came outside the wall first, but the Carpasian while he was going out at the gates was seized without Conon's consent by some of the Messenians in Conon's following, who wished to detain him in the city in order that he might be punished for his offences. The Cypriots who were accompanying him laid hold of the Carpasian and prevented the Messenians from arresting him, and the contingent of the 600, perceiving the fight, also came to the help of their leader. Conon . . . (went back) to the city, while the Cypriots attacked and drove off the Messenians who had seized the Carpasian, and being persuaded that Conon's plans with regard to the distribution of the pay were altogether (unjust), thereupon embarked on the triremes with the object, as some said, of taking up the Cypriots at Rhodes and sailing to Cyprus. Leaving . . ., and conveying with them the Cypriots who consented to come, they marched against the acropolis in order to destroy the power of Conon, whom they regarded as the cause of all their troubles . . . When the Cypriots landed at Caunus, Conon came to Leonymus the . . . and declared that he alone could save the king's cause, for if Leonymus would consent to give him the Greek guards protecting Caunus and as many Carians as possible, he would put an end to the mutiny in the camp. Leonymus having bidden him make as many soldiers as he wished, he remained inactive for that day, since it was already near sunset; but on the next before dawn he took a large number of the Carians and all the Greeks, led them out of the city, and proceeded to post some of them round the outside of the camp, others . . . by the ships and seashore. Having done this and given orders to proclaim that each soldier should go . . . he captured the Carpasian and sixty of the other Cypriots, whom he put to death, while the leader was crucified. The Cypriots who were left at Rhodes were enraged on hearing of this, and in their indignation first attacked and drove out the officers whom Conon had appointed, and then leaving the harbour caused a great tumult and riot among the Rhodians. Conon, however, arrived from Caunus, and having arrested their leaders put them to death, distributing pay among the remainder. Thus the king's camp, after it had reached a condition of extreme peril, was restored to peace by Conon and his energetic measures.'

xvi. 29 sqq. These Cypriot mercenaries were a land force, as appears from the contrast between them and the ἐπιμελέια and ἐπιβάται in ll. 34-5. Τhe ἐκατονταετῶν [σώτευμα]
in xvii. 24 seems to be part of them, but that restoration is far from certain. The mutiny is only mentioned elsewhere by Justin (vi. 2. 11) Sed Cononem seditionem militium invadit, quos praefecti regis fraudare stipendio soliti erant: eo instantibus debita pascentibus quo graviterum sub magno duce militiam praesumebant. The sentence quos praefecti . . . erant closely resembles xvi. 2-4, and P is probably the ultimate source of Justin's reference to the mutiny.

xvi. 31. The correction of οὐτος, which makes an extremely awkward construction, to υπὸ is due to Wilamowitz.

37. Καρπασέα: it is rather curious that Π does not mention his name, for the narrative of the mutiny is conspicuous for its wealth of detail, which is likely to have been obtained from an eyewitness. The omission may however, as Meyer remarks, be intentional, implying contempt; cf. xvii. 16 τοι δὲ διεργάσων τοι Καρπασέας. With regard to the form of the adjective, the agreement between the papyrus and Theopompus (Fr. 93) provides a strong argument for identifying him with our author; cf. p. 131.

xvii. 1. That the separate fragment containing the middle of ll. 1-8 belongs to the upper part of this column is made certain by its colour and the mention of Conon in l. 3. The exact position is then fixed by the recto, which has the beginning of a new section δὲ μακρὰν (vii. 15) ἐξαίδευσα (μακρὸν) εὔξηθαι (ἀλώνιος) partly on this fragment, partly on the piece containing the rest of Col. xvii.

5. πραιτέρῳ: a can be read in place of the first ε. άει is perhaps a separate word (= διετή); cf. άει in ill. 1.3.

6. πιεῖ τὸν μαιστρὸν cannot be read. At the end of the line α is possible instead of σ., but there is not room for οὐδέκαω σοι, and the division α[καίωσα] would make the line too short. Bury suggests σι' ω[πι.]

8-9. The general sense of Conon's answer is clearly that in the distribution of the money no one section of the troops would be favoured, but all would receive their share. In l. 8 the doubtful λ may be κ or ν or possibly τ; with the last reading [οῖδέναι πλεον]κτῆτε ἤγερεν is possible. Line 9 requires something like πάντας ἔλεγεν τοὺς μαθαῖν ἀπὸ τῆς ισημερίας. The letter before κομισθάναι, if not σ, can only be γ.

10-1. παισάμενος is due to Bury. Wilamowitz suggested ταῦτα [δὲ τὴν ἀπόκρημων καὶ τοῖς Ἀλλοις] ἔφασεν βουλεύοντα [διαφημίσας στρατιώτας], which no doubt expresses the sense correctly, and most of which we have adopted. The letter before ις in l. 11 cannot be α.

12. δὲ Καρπασέους αὐτῷ is due to Wilamowitz.

24. εἰκός[μ] ἔφασεν is very doubtful, especially as ἔφασε is rather short for the first lacuna, which has room for 5 letters, and this supposed corpus is not mentioned elsewhere. Perhaps εἴκ followed by a place-name should be read.

25. Something like [ὡς εἴδε] περιμετάνθαι would suit the sense.


28. ἀπείροθεν: the ν is extremely doubtful, but a and ε are inadmissible.

29. Perhaps περιμετάνθαι is more probably middle, but may be passive.

31. εἰς χαίρειν τοὺς τοῖς was suggested by Wilamowitz. ὡς γάρ τινες ἔλεγον seems to refer to the statements of the Cypriots, and is not, we think, to be interpreted as a reservation on the part of the author, for which τινες λέγωμεν would be expected; cf. ii. 1-2.

33 sqq. The narrative becomes very obscure at this point. τῷ Ἀλαμ. . . νόμου seems to be corrupt; there is not much doubt about the reading νομος; the only possible alternatives to οί are οὺ or ω, but these are less suitable. τῷ Σαλαμ. εἴτε could be read, but yields no sense, and that the mutineers reached Cyprus is unlikely, since it is clear from xviii. 1-22 that they soon returned to Caunus, and ὡς γάρ τινες ἔλεγον indicates that they did not carry out their original plans in full. Assuming that Ἀλαμ. . . νόμου is the name of an unknown
place, this was perhaps situated in Rhodes, for παρακαθέομαι τεις, if correct, seems to refer back to τοῖς eκ τῆς Ῥόδου παρακαθέομαι τεις, and if τοῖς Κόσων με (Wilamowitz) is right in l. 36 the acropolis might be that of Rhodes. On the other hand if Άλαν... was in Rhodes we should expect the statement that the mutineers sailed thither, whereas ἀποκρύπτουσαν or κατάφεεραν can hardly be avoided in the light of the following genitive, even though the omission of ἄρο before τῆς is not in accordance with our author's usage; cf. xviii. 1-2 ἀποκρύπτουσαν ἀπό τῆς... Moreover, the account in xviii. 23-8 of the proceedings of the Cypriots who were left at Rhodes does not harmonize at all well with the view that the acropolis of the city of Rhodes had been attacked previously. It is therefore very doubtful whether the mutineers sailed as far as Rhodes, and possibly the acropolis and the supposed place Άλαν... were in the vicinity of Caunus.

37. αὐτοῖς was suggested by Wilamowitz.

xviii. 2. The letter after τῆς might be α, and it is conceivable that the name Άλαν... τεις (xvii. 33) recurred here; but several other letters, e.g. δ, ε, or σ, are equally admissible. The verb lost probably had the sense of 'returned', sc. to Caunus.

3. If τοῖς is not an error for τοῖς, some part of the gear of the triremes is probably referred to, perhaps ἴστις; cf. Conon's capture of the μεγάλα τῶν Δοριάνων νείων ἰστία after Aegospotami (Xen. Hell. ii. 1. 29).

4. κατηγορεῖν τῶν Κυπρίων: κατηγορεῖν is unlikely, for there is no indication that Conon had left Caunus, and Leonymus was clearly posted in the immediate neighbourhood of the city.

5. Perhaps τῶν τῆς περὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ, as Wilamowitz suggests.

αὐτῷ ἵστη: for the hiatus cf. i. 4, note. αὐτῷ can be omitted without difficulty.

18. Some word like προηγόμεθα is probable in the lacuna.

19. Wilamowitz suggests τῆς κύριου βαίνειν, but a compound of βαίνειν would rather be expected.

20. Wilamowitz proposes τῆς ἑαυτοῦ, Bury τῆς σκηνῆν.

24. ῥάδῳ ἴγανακήθην: another hiatus; cf. l. 5.

30-3. With this favourable criticism of Conon cf. xvi. 8 διὰ τῆς Κύριου προθυμίαν, xx. 35 διὰ τῆς ῥαθάνου προθυμίαν, and p. 123.

Cols. xviii. 33-xxi. 39 = chs. XVI-XVII. Agesilaus in Asia.

While Agesilaus was marching towards the Hellespont with the army of the Lacedaemonians and their allies, as long as he was passing through Lydia he did no injury to the inhabitants, wishing to abide by the truce made with Tithraustes. But when he reached the country of Pharmaborus, he plundered and ravaged the land as he advanced. Then crossing the plain of Thebe and the so-called plain of Apia he invaded Mysia, and gave urgent orders to the Mysians to take up arms on his side; for most of the Mysians are autonomous and not subjects of the king. Those Mysians who elected to join the expedition suffered no injury from him, but he laid waste the land of the rest. When in the course of his advance he came to about the middle of the so-called Mysian Olympus, seeing that the pass was difficult and narrow, and being anxious to cross it in safety, he sent an envoy to the Mysians, and having made a truce with them began to lead his forces through the country. The Mysians however, after allowing many of the Peloponnesians and their allies to go through, attacked the rear-guard and struck down some of the soldiers, who were not in regular order owing to the confined space. Agesilaus encamped his army and remained inactive for the rest of that day while he was performing the due rites for the dead (about fifty of the soldiers had perished), and on the day following, having posted a large number of the so-called Dercylidean mercenaries in an ambush, again started on the march with his army. The Mysians all thought that Agesilaus was departing in
consequence of the loss received on the previous day, and coming out of their villages began to pursue the army with the intention of attacking the rear-guard as before; whereupon the Greeks in the ambush, when the enemy came up to them, charged out and attacked them at close quarters. The Mysian leaders and those in the forefront of the pursuit perished in the sudden onslaught of the Greeks, while the main body perceiving the losses of their comrades in front fled home to their villages. On receipt of the news Agesilaus wheeled round, and led his army back by the same road until he joined the force which had been in ambush, and pitched his camp on the spot where they had encamped on the previous day. Afterwards the Mysians, to whom the dead severally belonged, sent heralds and... took away the bodies under a truce, more than a hundred and thirty being killed. Agesilaus after obtaining guides from the villages and giving his soldiers a rest of [days led his army forward, and having brought them down into the country of the Phrygians (not that part which he had invaded in the previous summer but another which was un plundered), proceeded to lay it waste under the guidance of Spithradates and his son. Spithradates was by race a Persian, who for some time lived with Pharnabazus and was in his service, but having subsequently quarrelled with him, and being afraid that he would be seized and come to harm, took refuge for the moment at Cyzicus, and afterwards presented himself to Agesilaus with his son Negabates, who was young and handsome. When this happened, Agesilaus received them favourably, chiefly for the sake of the youth to whom he is said to have been much attached, but partly also on account of Spithradates, whom he hoped would act as guide of the expedition and be useful in other ways. For these reasons they obtained a warm welcome. Continuing the onward march of his army and plundering the country of Pharnabazus, Agesilaus reached the town called Leonton Cephalae; and after making several assaults, but without success, moved his forces and led them forward, plundering and laying waste the unravaged part of the country. Arriving subsequently at Gordium, a town built upon a mound and strongly fortified, he encamped his forces and remained there six days, making assaults upon the enemy and keeping his soldiers from dispersing by affording them numerous comforts. When he failed to overpower the place owing to the energy of Rhathanes, a Persian by race, who was in command of it, he put his soldiers in motion and led them on, being urged by Spithradates to enter Paphlagonia. He next led the Peloponnesians and their allies forward to the borders of Phrygia and Paphlagonia, and encamped his army there, sending Spithradates himself in advance. The latter having gone on and come to terms with the Paphlagonians returned with ambassadors from them. Agesilaus made an alliance with the Paphlagonians and then retired with all speed in the direction of the sea, being afraid that there would be a lack of supplies in the winter. He did not march by the same road as that by which he had come, but by another, as he thought that it would be easier for his soldiers to cross (Bithynia). Gyes... sent him... horsemen and more than two thousand footsoldiers. Having conducted the army to Cius in Mysia, he first remained there ten days, and again harried the Mysians in revenge for their treachery at Olympus, and then led the Greeks forward through Phrygia on the seacoast, where he attacked a place called Miletou Teichos, but being unable to capture it withdrew his forces. As he was marching along the river Rhynacius he arrived at Lake Dascylitis, near which lies Dascylum, an extremely strong place and fortified by the king, where Pharnabazus was said to store all his silver and gold. Having encamped his army there, he summoned Pancalus, who had sailed with the admiral Cheiricrates and was watching the Hellespont with five triremes. Pancalus arrived with all speed and entered the lake with his triremes, and was then ordered by Agesilaus to put on board all the more valuable part of the (booty) and transport it to... at Cyzicus, that it might produce pay for the army. The soldiers from Mysia he dismissed with orders to return in the spring, as he was preparing during the coming winter to invade Cappadocia, having heard that
that country stretched in the shape of a narrow strip from the Pontic sea to Cilicia and Phoenicia, and that the length of it was such that persons journeying on foot from Sinope . . .

XVIII. 37. ταῖς σπονδικαῖς: P’s account of the negotiations between Agesilaus and Tithraustes is lost in the gap betweenCols. viii and xi. They are described in some detail by Xenophon (Hell. iii. 4. 25-6). Diodorus (xiv. 80. 8) states briefly that a six months’ truce was arranged, while Isocrates (iv. 153) calls it eight months.

38. κατὰτίμιαν: καταίρων is often used by Thucydides for arriving by sea (e.g. viii. 31 and 39), but is rare in the sense of coming by land. It was employed by Theopomppus as equivalent to λαθῶν according to Stephanus Byz., who was perhaps referring to the present passage or viii. 22; cf. p. 131.

39. εἰε τῷ βασίλει: εἰε τῷ βασίλει: so Xenophon, Hell. iii. 4. 26 ἵππη ἐπὶ τῷ βασιλείῳ, followed by Plutarch, Ages. 11. Since the whole of the autumn campaign of Agesilaus in 395 is ignored by Diodorus, Xenophon has been hitherto practically the sole authority for it. The discrepancies between his account in Hell. iii. 4. 25-9 and iv. 1. 1-16 and that of P are no less marked here than in the campaign of the earlier part of the year (v. 6-vii. 4). The two historians are indeed writing from different points of view; with Xenophon the glorification of Agesilaus is the central motive, and in order to illustrate his hero’s personal character certain more or less dramatic episodes, e.g. the negotiations with the king of Paphlagonia and with Pharnabazus, are treated in great detail, so as to produce the impression that the author himself took part in the scenes which he describes: but the military operations, with the exception of the fighting round Dascylium which led to the desertion of Sphtradates, are only sketched in outline. In the Agesilas, Xenophon makes no attempt to give a connected story of the autumn campaign, but some anecdotes in the later chapters supplement the Hellenica on a few points, especially as to Agesilaus’ relations with Megabates. P on the other hand, gives a plain, matter-of-fact account of Agesilaus’ march, the course of which is now clear, and he shows no disposition to enlarge upon the picturesque incidents which enliven Xenophon’s narrative. Hence while Xenophon (Hell. iv. 1. 1) briefly summarizes the earlier part of the campaign corresponding to xviii. 38-xx. 38 in the words ὃς ἦν Ἀγγελιαος ἐπὶ ὄφρα καὶ ἐπὶ ὄραμα ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλείου ἤλεγχον τῷ βασιλείῳ ἐπὶ ὄφρα καὶ ἐπὶ ὄραμα, πῶς ἦν τῷ βασιλείῳ ἐπὶ τῷ βασιλείῳ, the negotiations with the Paphlagonians briefly described by P in xx. 31-xxi. 5, occupy Hell. iv. 1. 2-15.

XIX. 2. The plain of Thebe was by Adramyttium, and according to Xen. Hell. iv. 1. 41 Agesilaus returned thither in the following spring when forced to leave Dascylium. From Thebe he turned eastward; the plain of Apia (Ἄπια is due to Wilamowitz) was north of Mount Temnus on the upper Macestus; cf. Strabo xiii. 1. 70 and Polyb. v. 77. 9. In Hell. iii. 4. 27 Xenophon mentions the πεδίων τῷ ὕπερ Κύμης as the place where Agesilaus heard the news of his appointment to the command of the fleet as well as the army (cf. xv. 33, note), but in view of the long distance from Cyme to Adramyttium, it is, we think, probable that the ‘plain beyond Cyme’ refers to that at the mouth of the Caicus, not to that of Thebe.

5. That the Mystics had made themselves independent of Persia at this period was known from Xen. Anab. i. 6. 7. 9. 14, Hell. iii. 1. 13. &c. The use of the present tense εἰσὶ . . . βασίλειος ὄν ἐπακοόντος is another indication that P’s work was written before the fall of the Persian empire; cf. xvi. 3, note and p. 122.

15. Wilamowitz would insert τοῦς after ἰερˀ. 22 sqq. Cf. the ambush described in v. 59 sqq., where the tactics are similar but not precisely identical, and p. 130.
23. This band of mercenaries, formed by Dercylidas and handed on to Agesilaus, is not mentioned elsewhere. They were no doubt veterans who had served under Cyrus.

xx. 7–8. In the previous summer (i.e. 396) Agesilaus had invaded Hellespontine Phrygia (Φρυγία ἡ παραβαλαντίδος as it is called in xxi. 17) as far as Dascylium; cf. Xen. Hell. iii. 4. 12 sqq., Diod. xiv. 79. 3. On the present occasion after descending from the Mysian Olympus he turned eastward along the valley of the Sangarius.

9 sqq. Σπιθράδατος: P has Σπιθράδατης here twice, but Σπιθράδατης in xx. 19. 37 and xxi. 3 in common with the MSS. of Xenophon and Plutarch. The form Σπιθράδατης, which occurs in Ctesias Fr. 52, is more correct; cf. the variation with regard to Ραδύνης (xx. 35). Spithradates is mentioned in Xen. Anab. vi. 5. 7 as one of Pharnabazus’ lieutenants. The circumstances attending his desertion to Agesilaus are described more precisely in Hell. iii. 4. 10; it there appears that he was won over by Lysander and joined Agesilaus before the campaign of 396, whereas the present passage is vague as to the date of his arrival and in the absence of other evidence would produce the impression that it took place in 395. Concerning the origin of his quarrel with Pharnabazus (xx. 12) Xenophon in Hell. l. c. says only that he was έλληνιστής τί ἐπί Φορμαβάζου, but in Ages. 3. 3 he assigns as the reason the fact that the satrap wished to take Spithradates’ daughter ἄνευ γύμων. The detail that he first fled to Cyzicus (xx. 15) is in accord with Xenophon (Hell. l. c.). With regard to Megabates (xx. 16) in the Hell. (iv. 1. 6 and 28) Xenophon merely hints at Agesilaus’ attachment to him, but P’s blunt statement in xx. 19–20 is amply confirmed by the stories in Ages. 5. 4–5, copied by Plutarch, Ages. 11. The daughter of Spithradates, who plays an important part in Xenophon’s story of the negotiations with the Paphlagonian king (Hell. iv. 1. 4–15), is ignored by P; cf. xx. 37, note.

16. Wilamowitz would insert τῶν before νῦν.

25. Λέωντων Κεφαλῆς: Plutarch (Them. 30) calls it Λεωντοκέφαλος, and indicates that it was on the main road from Susa to Sardis. Appian, who (Milhr. 19) employs the form Λέωντων Κεφαλῆς, says that it was τῆς Φρυγίας ὁχυρώστατον χωρίον. The site of it is uncertain; Ramsay (Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, p. 229) would place it near Ayaz-Inn. Since Agesilaus proceeded next to Gordium (l. 29) Λέωντων Κεφαλῆς seems to be in the parts of Phrygia watered by the Sangarius or its tributary the Tymbiris.

29. πᾶλιν πρὸς Γάρδων: on the site of Gordium, which was on the Sangarius, see A. Körte, Gordion (Ergänzungsheft v d. Jahrb. d. arch. Inst. 1904). Agesilaus had not been there previously, and πᾶλιν is really otiose; cf. vi. 34, note.

30. κατασκευασμένος καλάξιος: cf. Theopompus Fr. 33 and p. 131.

35. 'Ραδύνης: he is clearly identical with the 'Ραδύνης who appears as one of Pharnabazus’ lieutenants in Xen. Anab. vi. 5. 7, Cyrop. 8. 3. 32, and Hell. iii. 4. 13. It seems necessary therefore to emend Πηγής to Πυρήνης, though it is noticeable that the scribe specially draws attention to the reading Πηγής by a paroxytone accent to distinguish the word from πηγῆς.

37 sqq. P’s account of Agesilaus’ relations to the Paphlagonians is not only much briefer than Xenophon’s (Hell. iv. 1. 2–15), but differs in several important respects. That the scheme of making an alliance with them was due to Spithradates is stated by both writers, but while Xenophon says that Agesilaus entered Paphlagonia and negotiated with the king in person, persuading him to marry the daughter of Spithradates, P represents Agesilaus as remaining on the border and using Spithradates as intermediary. Plutarch (Ages. 11) abridges Xenophon with slight variations, which do not warrant Sachse’s suggestion (op. cit. p. 9) that Ephorus is here Plutarch’s authority; cf. v. 59, note. The name of the Paphlagonian king is given as Ορός in Xen. Hell. iv. 1. 3–14, Κόρος in Xen. Ages. 3 and Plutarch, Ages. 11 (as Meyer remarks, this seems to be an ancient emendation of Ορός); and the king of Paphlagonia, whom Theopompus in the 35th book of the
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Agesilaus' invasion of Bithynia by Dercylidas is described. Theopompus probably treated of that campaign in the 8th book of the Hellenica, for several Bithynian names are quoted from it by Stephanus Byz. Since Agesilaus was anxious to return by a different, i.e. more northerly route, and Cius in Mysia on the sea-coast is the next place mentioned on his march (l. 13), he would naturally pass through Bithynia. ákópáqoipéros was suggested by Wilamowitz. ákópáqoipéros is also possible. The comparative adverb in -oí is attested in neither case.

10-2. Cf. Xen. Hell. iv. 1. 3 κατάλαθε τῷ 'Αγησιλάῳ ὄντες χάλκιον μὲν ἑσπέας διασχίζων δὲ πελταστῶς. περὶ χάλκιον is possible in l. 12, but a number ending in κατά, e. g. ἐννακασιστάς, is more likely, especially as P and Xenophon do not agree precisely with regard to the number of the πελτάτ. It appears.

15. πάλιν, unless merely redundant (cf. xx. 19, note), refers to the former plundering of Mysia in xix. 8.

18. Μιλύτων Τεχθός is clearly identical with the town near the confluence of the Macestus and Rhynacous (cf. l. 20), known in later times as Μιλύτων πόλις or Μιλυτώπολις; cf. Strabo xii. 8, 10. xiv. 5. 29.

21. Δα(σ)κύλων: Agesilaus' arrival at Dascylium is also recorded by Xenophon (Hell. iv. 1. 15), who describes the richness of the district surrounding the βασιλεία of Pharmazalus (cf. ll. 22-4), but without mentioning the dispatch of Pancalus with the booty to Cyzicus (ll. 25-33). His statement that Agesilaus passed the winter there is in accordance with P's description of Agesilaus' plans in ll. 33 sqq.

25-6. Pancalus is only known from the present passage; ἑπίθηκε is somewhat curious and is possibly an error for ἑπίσταθεν. The fact that Cheiricrates is still spoken of as ναίαργος produces a conflict with Xenophon; cf. xv. 33, note.

31. Some participle like διαρροσιμήνων (Bury) is required.

33. τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς Μυσίας: by these are apparently meant the Mysians who had joined Agesilaus according to xix. 6-7, and whose homes were therefore not far from Dascylium. That Agesilaus should have disbanded all the soldiers who had served under him in Mysia (as the words might mean) is incredible, for his position at Dascylium was far from secure. Xenophon (Hell. iv. 1. 17) states that owing to the lack of precautions he was attacked by Pharmazalus.

35-9. τῷ ἐπίστας χειμῶνα is to be connected closely with παρακεντόξιμον, not with βαδίζων, a winter campaign being of course out of the question. Agesilaus' intention of invading Cappadocia is not recorded by Xenophon, but he credits him even when obliged to retire to Thebe with ambitious dreams of conquest (Hell. iv. 1. 41 παρεκκλησίατο γύρω πορευώμενου ἧς δύναται ἀνάωνται, νομίζων ὡσα ὑπάρχειν χιλιόεντα ἐθνόν πάντα ἀποστορήσεως βασιλέως: cf. the more rhetorical description in Ages. i. 36 ἐπιτευματικὰ καὶ ἐπίβαζον καταλύοντες τὴν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα στρατεύσασαν πρὸτερον ἀρχῆν). Hence there is no reason to doubt P's statement that
Agesilaus entertained the plan of invading Cappadocia, although not only did unexpected obstacles, first the desertion of Spithyrates and then his own recall to Europe, prevent any attempt to put the scheme into execution, but the plan itself was based on a complete misunderstanding of the geography. The description of Cappadocia as ‘a narrow strip reaching from the Pontic sea to Cilicia and Phoenicia’ (i.e. the gulf of Issus) is of course inaccurate, and the distance from Sinope to the southern coast (ll. 37-8) was no doubt much underestimated. In this respect however Agesilaus only shared the general misconception of the ancient Greek world with regard to the shape of Asia Minor, which even later than the fourth century B.C. was conceived of as a kind of triangle, of which the apex was formed by a comparatively narrow isthmus joining Sinope to the Gulf of Issus; cf. Strabo’s discussion (xiv 5, 21) of the views of Apollodorus and Artemidorus. The latter writer had estimated the width of the isthmus at 1500 stades, which, as Strabo rightly remarks, are just half the correct number, and Pliny is no nearer the mark when he reckons the distance as only 200 Roman miles. That the journey from Sinope to ἡ ὄρμη Κηλίκια could be accomplished in five days was the opinion of Herodotus (i. 72, ii. 34), who in the former passage uses the word ἄνδρια to describe the position of Cappadocia, and five days is also the duration of the journey from Sinope to Soli on the Cilician coast according to Scylax Io2. Scymnus (who is probably following Ephorus), criticizing Herodotus’ view, estimates it at seven days. Herodotus’ statement has been explained (Wiedemann, Herodots zweites Buch, p. 145) as a misunderstanding of the time occupied by the relays of Persian postal messengers, and is certainly wide of the truth. But that Agesilaus was better informed is unlikely, and the incomplete sentence in ll. 38-9 may well have continued εἰτος πόντε ἡμερῶν, followed by εἰς Ἑλλάδα πορεύεσθαι or the like.

Fr. 16. The compactness of the writing makes it almost certain that this fragment belongs to Cols. v or vi. It is more probably in the second than in the first hand.

Fr. 17. The apparent mention of Tissaphernes renders it probable that this fragment belongs to Col. iv. Like Frs. 18, 23, and 38, it comes from the top of a column.

Fr. 19. 8. Ἀρχελαί? : cf. Fr. 20. 11 and iii. 22, note. Possibly the reference is to king Archelaus of Macedonia (cf. ix. 29), not to the ship (?) Archelas. Fr. 20 is probably to be placed in a line above or below Fr. 19, but apart from the supposed connexion with Col. iii the position of these two fragments, together with 18 which seems to belong to the top of the same column as Frs. 19 and 20 on account of its colour and general appearance, is quite uncertain. There is a possible mention of Lysander in Fr. 20. 6.

Frs. 21 and 22. That these two fragments belong to Cols. vii or viii is almost certain on account of the colour of the recto.

Fr. 29. This fragment does not suit iii. 10-22 or vi. 42-5.

Fr. 33. The exceptional blackness of the ink in this fragment suggests that it comes from Col. ix. But it is not certain that it belongs to 842 at all. The recto is blank.

Fr. 44. This fragment is from the bottom of a column, like Fr. 61.

Fr. 65. That this fragment and 68 belong to 842 is not certain.

Frs. 71-2. It is very doubtful whether these fragments come from 842. Fr. 71 is written in a larger hand and on thicker papyrus than elsewhere, and some traces of writing on the recto seem to be in a different hand from the two hands of the land-survey, while on the recto of Fr. 72 is some writing proceeding in the opposite direction to that of the land-survey and in a different hand.
III. EXTANT CLASSICAL TEXTS

843. PLATO, SYMPOSIUM

Height 31.1 cm. Plate VI (Cols. xxxi–ii).

This, the largest literary papyrus found at Oxyrhynchus, consists of the latter half of a roll containing the *Symposium* of Plato. The part covered is from 200 B to the end, comprised in thirty-one columns of which four (xix–xxii) are missing entirely, while two others (i and xviii) are represented by small fragments; but the remainder is in a very fair state of preservation. The space occupied by a column with the adjacent margin is about 10 cm. in breadth, and the total length of the roll may thus be estimated at some 23 or 24 feet. The small and well-formed but somewhat heavy writing exemplifies a common type of book hand, and probably dates from about the year 200 A.D. N at the end of a line of full length is written as a stroke above the preceding vowel; and the common angular mark is freely added at the end of short lines. Double dots are as usual employed to mark the alternations of the dialogue, but sometimes appear in other positions than at the end of a speech, e.g. in l. 955 and 1221. A single high point is used, more especially in the latter part of the papyrus, to mark a pause; the marginal paragraphus commonly accompanies both forms of punctuation, or stands by itself without them. Other lectional signs, apart from the diaeresis, are rare and for the most part due to a second hand which has corrected the decidedly careless work of the original scribe. The corrector’s ink, however, does not differ markedly in colour from that of the text, and in the case of minor insertions the two hands are at times difficult to distinguish. But as they are certainly not separated by any wide interval of time the question has no great practical importance. The clearest instance of a rough breathing by the first scribe occurs in l. 352. In cases of doubt we have as a rule credited alterations to the corrector, to whom is also due an isolated and seemingly futile scholium at l. 391.

The text, as so often with papyri, is of an eclectic character, showing a decided affinity with no single MS. Compared with the three principal witnesses for the *Symposium* it agrees now with B against TW, now with the two latter as against the former, rarely with T against BW (ll. 112, 180, 297, 350, 435, 660) or with W against BT (ll. 183, 674, 776, 966, 1007, 1015). Similarly in a passage cited by Stobaeus some agreements with his readings against the consensus of BTW
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are counterbalanced by a number of variations from Stobaeus' text (cf. notes on ll. 141-79). A few coincidences occur with variants peculiar to the inferior MSS., the more noticeable being those with Vindob. 21 alone or in combination with Venet. 184 (ll. 59, 898, 986, 999, 1194) and Parisin. 1642 alone or with Vat. 229 (ll. 349, 462, 1196). Of the readings for which there is no other authority, including several variations in the order of words, the majority, if unobjectionable, are unconvincing. The more valuable contributions, some of which are plainly superior to anything found in other MSS., are: l. 92 επι, l. 112 the omission of καί (so Stallbaum), l. 239 αν ειή, where BTW have a meaningless άν, l. 368 καλῶ as conjectured by Badham for τῷ κ., l. 471 μετεχεὶ as restored by Stephanus (μετέχεω MSS.), l. 517 τεκεῖω confirming a conjecture of Hug (κνεῖω MSS.), l. 529 επιθημι as conjectured by Stephanus (επιθημεῖ MSS.), l. 577 καί συ omitted by MSS., l. 699 θεοφιλεῖ (-ή BTW), l. 770 κατιδέει (? ) (κατιδίζεω MSS.), l. 898 μοι (probably) with Vind. 21 (μου BTW), l. 1142 διαβαλεῖ as conjectured by Hirschig (διαβάλη BTW). On the other hand in many cases the papyrus once more proves the antiquity of readings which modern criticism rejects or suspects.

In the accompanying apparatus, which is based on Burnet's Oxford edition, we usually confine ourselves to the readings of BTW. With regard to the last named MS., Prof. H. Schöne of Basel has very kindly placed at our disposal his new collation which often supplements and sometimes corrects the report of Burnet. Occasional references to the readings of other MSS. are derived from the edition of Bekker, and that of Schanz has also been consulted. We neglect minor orthographical variations such as αεί and αεί, the interchange of ι and ει, σ and ξ, εῦν and δύ, occurrence of elision, crasis, and ν εφελκυστικοῦ, and attraction of consonants.

Col. i.

5 lines lost.

[το ῶχυρός εἰναι φαναί τον Σωκρᾶ] 200 B
[τοι ιςχυρος ειναι φαναι τον Σωκρα] 40 lines lost.

Col. ii.

[τοντων ων] αν ενδεια παρην αντω] 200 E
[ναι φαναι ειπ[ε]] δη τουτωις αναμυη] 201 A

50 [σ ἡητι τινων εφησθα εν τω λογω ειναι τον ερατα ει δε [β]ουλει εγω σε αναμυη σοι οιμαι γαρ σε ουτωσει πως ειπειν]
οτι τοις θεοις κατεσκευασθη τα πραγ
ματα δι [ε]ρωτα[σ] καλων αισχρων γαρ

53 [ο]νικ ειη ερως ουχ ουτωσει πως ελεγες
[ε]ιπον γαρ φαναι τον Αγαθωνα και
[ε]πιεικως γε λεγε[ι]σ ο εταιρε φαναι
τον Σωκρατη και ει τουτο ουτως

η εχει αλλο τι ο ερως καλλους αν ειη [ο]

60 ερως αισχρός δε ου ωμολογει: ουκοι
[ομο]λογηται ου ενθης εστι και μη
[τιου
[αρ ε]ιστη και ουκ εχει ο ερως καλλος
[αν]γ]η φαναι: τι δε το ενθης καλ

65 [λους] και μηδ[α] μη κεκτημενον καλ
[λος αρ]σ [λει[ε]ς συ καλον ειναι: ου δητα:
[ετι οιν] ωμολογεις ερωτα καλον ειναι
[ει ταυττα ουτως εχει: και τον Αγαθω]
[να ειπειν] ο Σωκρατες κινδυνεωσ

70 [ουδεν ειδεναι ου τοτε ειπον: και]
[μη]ν καλως γε ειπας φαναι ο Αγαθω
[αλλα σμικρον] ετι ειπε τα αγαθα ου
[και καλα δοκε]ι σοι ειναι: εμοιγε: ει α
[πα ο ερως τω]ν καλων ενθης εστιν

75 [τα δ]' ε αγαθ[α] καλα καν των αγαθω
[ενθης] ειη: εγω φαναι ω Σωκρατες
[σοι οιν] ον δυναμην αντιλεγειν
αλλα ουτως εχετω ος συ λεγεις: ου
μεν ουν τη αληθεια φαναι ο φιλε

80 [Αγαθων δυσαντιλεγειν επει
Σωκρατει γε ουδεν χαλεπου και σε]

[μεν γε ηθη εσαω τον δε λογον τον
περι του ερωτους ου ποτε ηκουσα]

γυμα[ικ]ος Μαντινικης Διοτ[ι]ς
85 [σ]η ταύτα τε σοφὴ ἤν[[α]] καὶ ἀλλαὶ
πολλα[α] καὶ Ἀθηναῖοι ποτὲ θυσαμὲ
νοὶ πρὸ τοῦ λοιμοῦ δεκα ἐτη ἀνα
τὴ
βολὴν [ε]ποίησατο νοσοῦ ἡ δὴ καὶ
ἐμε τὰ ερωτικὰ εἰδίδαξεν ὅν οὐν
90 λογον εκείνη ελεγεν πειρασομαι
ὑμεῖν διελθεῖν εκ τῶν ὁμολογη
μενών εμοι καὶ Ἀγαθωνι αυτος ε}
π εμαυτον ὅπως αν δυνο[μ]ι δει
δὴ ὁ Ἀγαθων ωσπερ συ διηγησιω

Col. iii.

95 διελθεῖν αυτὸν πρωτον τις εστιν
ο ερως καὶ ὁποιος τις επειτα τα ερ
γα αυτον δοκει ουν μοι ραστον ε
[−]
ναι ουτω διελθε'ειν ως ποτε με η ξε
νη ανακρεινουσα διηε σχεδον δε
100 τι και εγω προς αυτην ετερα τοι
αυτα ελεγον οιαπερ νυν προς εμε Ἀγαθων
ως ειη ο ερως μεγας θεος ειη δε των καλων
ηλεγχε δη με τουτοι τοις λογοις οισπερ
εγω τουτον ως ουτε καλος ειη κατα τον
105 εμον λογον ουτε αγαθος καιγω πως εφη

λεγεις ὃ Διοτιμα αισχρο[[ν]] αρα ο ερως εστι
και κακος: και ἡ ουκ ευφημησεις εφη ἡ
οιει οτι εαν μη καλον η αναγκαιον αν
το ειναι αισχρον: μαλιστα γε: η και αν
110 μη σοφον αμαβες η ουκ ἤσθησαι οτι ε}
στιν τι μεταξι σοφιας και αμαβιας:
τι τοτο: το ὁρθα δοξαζειν ανευ του
εχειν λογον δουναι ουκ οισθα εφη οτι
ουτε επιστασθαι εστιν αλογον γαρ πραγ
115 μα πως αν ειη επιστημη ουτε αμα"
θια το γαρ του ουτος τυγχανον πως
αν ειη αμαθια εστι δε δηπου τοιουτο
η ορθη δοξα μεταξι φρονησεως και"
αμαθιας αληθη ην δ εγω λεγεις: μη"
120 τοινυν αναγκαζε [ο] μη καλον εστιν"
αισχρον ειναι μηδ ο μη αγαθον κακο
ουτο δε και των ερωτα [επειδη αυτος
ομολογεις μη ειναι αγαθον μη"
δε καλο
μηδεν τι μαλλον οιον δειν αντιν αισ"
125 χρων και κακων ειναι αλλα τι: μετα"
δυ τουτων εφη και μην ην δ εγω ο"
ομολογειτα[i] γε παρα παντων μεγας"
θεος ειναι των μη ειδοτων εφη παν"
tων λεγεις η και των ειδοτων: δυμπα"
130 των μεν ουν και η γελασασα και πως"
αν εφη ο Σωκρατες ομολογησε μεγας"
θεος ειναι παρα τουτων οι φασιν αυτο"
ουδε θεον ειναι τινες ουτοι ην δ εγω"
135 ποις τουτω λεγεις: και η ραδιος εφη λε"
γε γαρ [μοι ου παντας θεοςφη[σ] ευδαιμο"
ναι ειναι και καλους η τολμησαι αν"
τινα μη φαναι καλον τε και ευδαιμο"
ναι θεον ειναι με δι ουν εγων εφην"
140 ευδαιμονας δε δη [λαγεις ουν] τους τα"
γαθα και τα καλα κεκθημενους:

Col. iv.

ou τους ταγαθα και τα καλα κεκθημενους:
νους: πανυ γε αλλα μην ερωτα [γε] ο"
ομολογηκας δι ειδειαν των αγαθων"
145 και καλων επιθυμειν αυτων τουν τουν
των ουν ειδεις εστιν: ομολογη}
κα γαρ πως ἂν οὖν θεὸς εἰη ὁ γε τῶν
καλὼν καὶ ἀγάθων ἀμοιρὸς: οὐδα

μοι ὡς γε εἰκεν: ὀρας οὖν εφὴ στι

καὶ εὐθύς ἵνα νομίζεις: τι [οὐ

ἀν εφὴν εἰη ὁ ερῶς θυντός: ἱκιστὶα

γε: ἀλλα τι μην: ὡσπερ τα προτε

ῥα εφὴ μεταξί ϑυντο και αὐθαγα

tου τι οὐν ο Διονύσια δαιμόνι με

γας ο Σωκρατές καὶ γαρ παν το δαι

μονιον μεταξι εστὶ θεον τε και

θυντόν: τινα ην δ εγω δυναμε

ἐχον: ἐρμηνευον και δι-twitterμευ

ον θεος τα παρ αὐθρωπον και αν

θρωποι τα παρα θεον των μεν τας

δεησει και θυσιας των δε τας επε

tαξις τε και αμοιβας των θυσιων

εμ μεσω δε ον αμφοτερων συμπλη

ροι ωσε το παν αυτο αυτω ξυνδε

δεσθαι δια τουτο και η μαντικη

πασα χορει και η των ίερων τεχνη

tων τε περι τας θυσιας και τας [τε]

[λε]τας και τας επωδας και την [μα]

[τε]ιαν πασαν και γοητιαν θεος δε

αιθρωπο ου μειγνυται ἀλλα δια

τ[ο]υτο πασα εστιν η ομιλια και η

δ[ι]αλεκτος θεος προσ αἰθρωπου

και] εὐληγοροσ[σ]ι και καθεδονι και

[ο με]ν περι τα τοιαυτα οφος δα[ι]μον

αιρη τεχνας τη περι χειρουργιας τε[ι]

νοις] βαναυσους ουτοι δη οι δαιμονες

πολλοι τε και παντοδαποι εστιν εις

dε τουτον εστι] κα] ο ερως: πατρος

δε ην δ εγω και μη[ρ]σι τινος εστιν:
843. PLATO, SYMPOSIUM

makroteron men eph diagnosthain
omous de soi erω stai gar egenetai he A
phroditei istiownto oi theoi oi te [alloi]
kaio o tov Menioudios uios Poroos ep[ei]do
185 de edeuphinaion prosaitousa o[io]v
dei evowias owsis aferKent he P[ei]ni
a kai h[pi]eri tas thuras o ouv P[ei]po
mevusheis ton [ek]paros oinos [gar

Col. v.

oupo h[pi] eis ton ton Dios kηpon e[ei]a
190 theon behar lambanov enthe he ouv Peneia
ep[ou]levousa dia t[pi]n aut[pi]s apo
riav paiqion poihsasthai ek ton PIO
roo kattakleivetai ta par auto kai
ekhsse ton eron a dio de kai tis A

195 f[rodei]th[pi]s kalh[pi]s ouhsia sate ouv P[ei]
[roo ak]olouthis kai therapwv geyowne
o erωs genh[ei]s ev tois ekhein ge
vethlois kai ame fwshe erasthis ow
peri to kalon kai tis Aphroditeis

200 kalh[pi]s ouhsia sate ouv Poroos kai P[ei]
vias vious wv o erωs ev toiauth [tv]
chi k αe[ei]sthen proton mev pe
v[pi]s aei estin kai pollovoi dei atoplos
te kai kalos oinoi o pollovoi oionvai

205 alla skλhros kai avxmepos kai an
upodhtos kai aoikos xamaiptth
aiei oon kai asprows ep[pi]thuras kai
en odois upaidrios koymomenos t[pi]
thes μηtros fwsin evon aei evdei

210 su[ei]os kata de an ton patera ep[pi]
boulos esti [kalois] kai agathos andre
os oon kai et[pi]s kai svntvous θη[rei]n
215 ΤΗΣ ΔΕΙΝΟΣ ΑΕΙ ΤΙΝΑΣ ΠΛΕΚΩΝ ΜΗΧΑ ΒΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΦΡΟΝΗΣΕΩΣ ΕΠΙΘΥΜΗΤΗΣ ΚΑΙ
στης και ουτε ος άθανατος περικεν ουτε ος θνητος άλλα τοτε μεν της
ημερας θαλλει και ζη ηταν ευπορη

220 ση τοτε δε αποθυησκει παλιν δε α
ναβιοσκε[Σ] ται δια την του πατρος,
ψιν το δε ποριζομενον αει οπεκρει
ωστε ουτε απορει ερως ποτε ουτε πλου
τει σοφιας και αμαθειας εν μεσω εστι

225 εχει γαρ οδε θεων ουδεις φιλοσοφει ου
δε επιθυμει σοφος γενεσαι εστι γαρ ου
δε ει τις αλλοσ σοφος ου φιλοσοφει ου
δε αν οι αμαθεις φιλοσοφουσιν ουδ επι
θυμουσι σοφοις γενεσαι αυτο γαρ του

230 το εστιν χαλεπη αμαθια το μη οντα
καλον καγαθον μηδε φρονιμον δο
κεν αυτω ειναι ικανον ουκον επι
θυμει[Σ] ο μη οιομενος ενδεις ειναι
ου αν μη οιηται επιδεισται τινες ου

235 [ε]φην εγω θ Διοτιμα οι φιλοσοφουν

Col. vi.

tes ει μητε οι σοφοι μητε οι αμαθεις:

[δ]ηλον δη εφη τουτο γε ηδη και παι
[δι] οτι οι μεταξυ [του]των αμφοτε
[p]ων αν αν ειη και [ο ερ]ως εστιν γαρ δη

240 των καλλιστων η σοφια ερως δ εστιν
ερως περι το καλον οστε αναγκαιον ε
ροτα φιλοσοφον ειναι φιλοσοφον δε
οντα μετοξφι ειναι σοφου και αμαθους
αιτια δε [ουτω και τοινων η γενεσις]
245 πατρος μ[εν γ]αρ σοφου εστιν και εντο
ρου μητ[ρος δε] ου σοφης και απορου η
μεν ουν φιλης του διαιμονος οφ φιλη
Σωκρατες αυτη οι [δ]ε ου αφης ερωτα
eιναι θαυμαστου ουθεν επαθες ων]
250 θης δε ος εμοι δοκει τεκμαρομενη]
eξ ον συ ελεγες το ερωμενον ειναι ερω
tα ου το ερων δια ταυτα σοι οιομαι]
πανκαλος εφαινετο ο ερως και γαρ εστι
tο εραστον το τω οντι καλον καλον κα]
255 βου και τελειον και μακαριστον το
de γε ερων αλλην ιδεαν τοιαυτην
εχον οιαν εγω δηλθουν και εγω ειπο
ειεν δη ο δενη καλως γαρ λεγεις τοι]
oυτοσ αν ο ερωσ τινα χρειαν εχει τοις
260 ανθρωποις τουτο δη μετα ταυτα
eφη οΣωκρατες πειρασομαι σε διδα
και ουτω
ξαι εστι μεν γαρ δη τοιουτος γε]
γονως ο ερως εστι δε των καλων ως]
sυ φης ει δε της ημας εροιτο τι των]
265 καλων εστιν ο ερως ο σωκρατες τε και
Διοτιμα οιδε δε σαφεστερον ερα ο ερω
tων καλων τε ερωτα: και εγω ειπον στι
γενεσθαι αυτω[τω]] αλλ ετι ποθει εφη]
η αποκρισις ερωτησιν τοιανδει· τι
270 εσται οεκυνω ου εαν γενηται τα κα
λα ου πανυ εφην ετι εχειν εγω προς
tαυτην την ερωτησιν προχει]
204 C
204 D
204 E
204 F
275 τω αγαθω χρωμενος πυνθανοιτο}
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280 γω εξω αποκρεινασθαί οτι ευδαιμων

εσται: κτησε[ε] γαρ εφη αγαθων οι ευδαιμονες

ευδαιμονες και οικετι προσδει ερε

Col. vii.

[σθαι ἵνα τι δὲ β]ουλ[εται ευδαιμων ει]
[ναι ο βουλομενοις αλ[λα τε]λοις δοκ[ει ε]

285 [χειν η αποκρισις αληθη λ]εγεις ει]
[τον εγω ταυτην δ]ε την βουλησιν
[και τον ερωτα τ]ουτον ποτερα κοι]
[νοι οιει ειναι π]αντων ανθρωπων
[kαι παντας τ]αγαθα βουλεσθαι αυτοις

290 [ειναι] αει [η] π[οις λεγεις αυτως ην δ εγ[ω]
[koι]νοι ειναι παντων: τι δη ουν εφη
ω Σωκρατες ου παντας ερα[ν φαι]ων
ειπ[ε]ρ γε παντες των αυ]των ερωσι]
και αει αλ[]τινας [φαμεν εραν τους

295 δ ου: θαυμα[ξω] ην [δ εγω κ]αι αυτος]

αλλα μη θαυμαζε εφη αφιξοντε[ς]

γαρ αρα του [ερω]τος τι ιδος ονομα]
ζομεν το τοι[ν ολων επιτιθετεις ο]]
νομα ερωτα τ[α δε] αλλα αλλοις κα]

300 ταχρομεθα σιρομεθαι: ωσπερ τι ην

δ εγω ωσπερ η[οδε οι]σθ οτι ποιησις ε

στιν τι πολυ η γαρ τω εκ του μη ου]

η γαρ δος τος εις το ον η[ον]τι στοιχων αυτια]

πασα εστι ποιησις ωστε και αι υπο]

305 πασαις ταις τεχναις εργασιαι ποι

ησεις εισι και οι τουτων δημιουργοι
παντες ποιηται: αληθη λεγεις αλγ
λομως η δ η ουσια στι ου καλουνται
ποιηται αλλα αλλα εχουσιν ονομα
310 τα απο δε πιθηρης της ποιησεως εν
μοριουν αφορισθεν το περι την μου
σικην και τα μετρα τω του ολου ονο
ματι προσαγορευνεται ποιησις γαρ
ταυτα μονον καλειται και οι εχον
315 τες τουτο το μοριον της ποιησει
ως ποιηται: αληθη εφηνυλ λεγεις
ουτω τοινυν και περι των [ερωτα]
to μεν κεφαλαιον εστιν πιαση η
tων αγαθων επιθυμια και του εφ
320 δαιμονειν ο μεγιστος τε και δολε
ροσ ερως παντι αλλ οι μεν αλλη τρε
πομενοι πολλαχη επ αυτουν η κατα
ν χρηματισμον η κατα φιλογυμνατι
αν η κατα φιλοσοφιαν ουτ εραν κα
325 [λουμται ουτ ερασται οι δε κατα εν τι ει
dos οντες τε και εσπουδακτες το
tου ολου ονομα εσχον ερωτα τε και ε}

τα ης εφην εγω λεγει[ν]: και λεγεται με

Col. viii.

[η σοι δοκουσι μα Δι ουκ εμοι για την [δ εγιε [αρ ωυν] η δ η [ου]
[τως απλουν εφηνυλ λεγειν στι οι ανθρωποι του αγαθου
330 [γι ης εφη λογοσ ως οι α[ν] πτο ημη[ε]οσιν ε]
[α[ν][υν] ε[πος]ν ουτοι ο[ρωσι ο δ εμοι λο]
γος ουτε ημε[ισιος φης]ν ειναι του ερω
τα ειναι [ου]τε [ολου εα]μη τυγχανη]
γι ης ποι ο[ν]τε[ρα αγαθου ον] επιε αυτω
335 γι και πο[δας] και χειρας εθελουσιν απο
τε[μνεσθαί οι ανθρώποι εαν α'υτοις δο
[κη τα εαυτων πονηρα ειναι] ου γαρ το
[εαυτων ομαι εκαστοι ασπα][ς]νται
ε[ι μη ει] [τις το μεν αγαθ]ον [οι]κειον κα

340 [λει κ]αι εαυτ[ου το δε κακ]ον αλλοτριο
ως ουδεν [γε αλλο εστι]ν ου ερωσιν αν
θρ[ωποι] η [πι]ν αγαθου ερωσιν ναι εφη
τι δ[ε] ου προσθετειν ε]φη οτι και ειναι
tο αγαθον [αυτοις ερωσι] προσθετ[α]ν

345 [α]ρ ουν εφη κα[ι ου μονον] ειναι αλλα
εστιν αρα κα[λης]θην [ε]φη ο ερως του
το αγαθον αυτω ειναι αιει: αληθεστα
τα εφην εγω λεγεις: οτε δε τουτο ο ε

350 ρως εστιν αει η δ η των τινα τροπο
διωκ[ον]των αυτο και εν τ[ι]νι πρα
η
ξει σπουδη και η συντασιες ερως αν
καλ[ο]το τι πουτο πουχανει ου το
ergon εχεις ει[π][ειν:] ου μενταν σε ε

355 φην εγω ο [Διοτιμα εθαυμαζον επι
σοφια και εφοιτων παρα σε αυτα ταυ
τα:] μαθησομενοι αλλ εγω σοι εφη ερω
εστι γαρ τουτο τοκος εν καλω και]
κατα το σωμα και κατα την ψυχην

360 μαντειες ην δ εγω δειται οτι ποτε
gleis και ου μανθανο:] αλλ εγω δη
σαφεστερον ερω κυνωσιν γαρ εφη] ο
ω Σωκρατες παντες ανθρωποι και
κατα το σωμα και κατα την ψυχην

365 και επειδαν εν τινι ηλικια γενον
ται τικτειν επιθυμει[ν] ημων η φυ
σις τικτειν δε εν μεν αισχρω ου δυ
ναται εν δε καλω η γαρ ανδρος και
γυναικος συνουσια τοκος εστιν
370 esti de touto theion [[tontos]] to prag
ma kai touto ev thn th ou ti to

tos abataton evestin th kph
sis kai th genhsis ta 8 ev to anar
mosto advatan genesthai anaromo)
375 ston 8 estin to aisoxyron apantti to)
theo to de kalon armoston moira ou
kai elutthia 'h kalonh estin th ge)

Col. ix.


380 kai ephranomenon [th]aixeitai [k]ai ti)
ktei te kai genna: [o]tau de aisoxy[rho]v skn


385 pws ferei [ob]en dh t[o]v kouwthi [te kai]
hs h sparagwnti polh th ptohm[is]s ye
ynve peri to kalon [th]ia to megall[hs] w

denos apoluy[ei]v ton exonta estin


390 rous ws [s]v[ei]: allia ti mnh: tis gev


395 aphanasiai de anagkaion epibhmein
meta agadou ek tov omoilogymenov


400 eina: tauta te ouv pantat edida)
ske me opote peri tov erwtkwn lo
γ(ό)υς ποιοίτοι· καὶ ποτὲ ηρέτο· τι οίει·
ω Σωκρατες αιτίων εἶναι τούτου τοῦ
erωτοῦ καὶ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας η ὁυκ αἰσθά 
405 νεὶ ως δεῖνως διατίθεται παντὰ τὰ
[θ]ηρία ἐπείδαν ἐπείδαν γεννᾶν ε·
πιθυμησθε καὶ τὰ πέ̄σα καὶ τὰ πτη·
nα νοσοῦντα τε πάντα καὶ ερωτὴ·
καὶ διατίθεμεν πρῶτον μὲν πε
410 ρι τὸ ἑνμμιγναι ἀλλῆλοις επείτα
περὶ τὴν τροφὴν τοῦ γενομένου
καὶ ετοιμα ἐστὶν ὑπὲρ τούτων καὶ
dιαμαχεῖσθαι τὰ ασθενεστάτα τοῖς
ὑσχυροτατοῖς καὶ ὑπεραποθησκεῖ
415 καὶ αὐτὸ τῷ λειμῷ παρατινομένα
ὡστε εἰκείνα ἐκτρεφείν καὶ ἀλλο·
πάν ποιοῦντα τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρῶ
πους εφῆ οἰοῖς ἀν τις εκ λογισμοῦ
ταῦτα ποιεῖν τα ἰε θηρία τις αἰ
420 τὰ αὐτῶς ερωτικῶς διατίθεσθαι
ἐχεῖς λέγειν· καὶ εγὼ ελέγον στὶ·
οὔκ εἰδείν: ἡ δ εἰπεῖν διανοεὶ
οὐν δεινοῖς ποτὲ γενησθεῖτα τα ε
ρωτικα εὰ[ν] ταῦτα μὴ ἐννοης [[η]]
425 ἀλλὰ δία [ταῦτα τοῖ] ὁ Διοτιμα

Col. x.

ὁ[περ] ἑυνῇ εἰπὼν παρὰ σε [ηκ]ω γρώ[ν]ς
ο[τι] διδασκαλῶν δειμαί [ἀλ]λα μ[οι] λε
γε καὶ τούτων τὴν αἰτίαν κ[αὶ] τὰ[ν]
ἀλλον των περὶ τα [ἐρωτικα] εἰ τοι
430 νῦν εφὴ πιστευεῖς εκείνου εἰ[α]ς
φῶσει τὸν ερωτᾶ δῦ πολλὰς ωμο
[λογησαμεν μὴ δαυμαξε ευταύθα]
[γ]αρ τὸν αὐτὸν εκείνῳ λο[γο]ν η θυν
843. PLATO, SYMPOSIUM

435 τῇ φυσὶς ἤτει κατὰ δύνατον αἰει
tε εἰναι καὶ αὐθανατος δύναται δὲ
tαυτὴ μονὸν τῇ γενεσεὶ ὑπὶ αἰει
[κ]αταλειπεὶ ετερον νεον αὐτὶ τον
παλαιον ἐπεὶ καὶ εν ὃ εν εκαστὸν
tον ᾧ ὁν ᾧ καλειταὶ καὶ εἰ
440 ναι το αυτο οἰον εκ παιδαρίουν
ο αυτὸς λεγεται εως ἀν πρεσβυτης
γεννηται ουτος μεντοι οὐδεπο
τε ταυτα εχων εν αυτω ὀμος ὁ
αυτος καλειται αλλα νεος αἰει γι
445 γινομενος τα δε απολλυς και κατα τας
τριχας και σαρκα κα[ι] οστα και αιμα και
σομα μπαν το σωμα και μη στι κατα το
σωμα αλλα [κ]αι κατα την ψυχην οι
τροποι τα [η]θη δοξαι επιθυμαι ηδο
450 ναι λυπαι φοβοι τουτων εκαστα ουδε
ποτε ταυτα παρεστιν εκαστοι αλλα
tα μεν γιγνεται τα δ απολυται πο
[λυ] δε τουτων αποφωτερον ετι στι και
αι επιστημαι μη στι αι μεν γιγνονται
455 αι δε απολυνται ημιν και ουδεπο
τε οι αυτοι εσμεν ουδε κατα τας επι
στημαι αλλα και μια εκαστη των
επιστημων ταυτων πασχει ο γαρ κα
λειται μελεταν ως εξιουσης εστι της
460 επιστημης ληθη γαρ επιστημης ε
ξοδος μελετη δε παλιν καινην εν
ποιουσα αντι της απιουσης μηνη σω
ζει την επιστημην ωστε την αν
την δοκειν ειναι τουτω γαρ τω τρο
465 πω παν το θυητον σοζεται ου τω
πανταπασιν το αυτον αει ειναι
ωσπερ το θειον αλλα τω το απιον
καὶ παλαιομενον ετερον νεον ἐν
ἐνταλισεν οιον αυτο  την ταυ
470 τη τη μηχανη ὁ Σωκρατεσ εφη
θητον αθανασιας μετεχει και
σομα και ταλλα παντα αθανα

Col. xi.

[το]ν δε α[λη] μη ονεν θαυμαζε ει] το αυ
[του] αποβ[λαστημα φυσει παν] τειμα
475 αθανασιας γαρ χαριν παντι αυτη η
σπ[ο]δη και ο έρως επεται καιγρο α]
[kουσας τον λογον ηθαμασα] τε και]
[ειπο]ν ε[ιεν ην δ εγω ω σοφωτατη Διο]
[τιμα ταυτα οω [αληθως ο]ντως εχει]
480 [κα]μ η ωσπερ οι τελεοι σοφ[ισται ευ]ισθι
[εφ]η ο Σωκρατες [επει και των ανθρω
[πον ει εθελει ε[ισ την] φιλοτιμιαν
βλεψαι θαυμα[ζες] αυ της αλογιας
περι α εγω ειρηκε[α ει] μη εννοει ευθυ
485 μηθεις οω δειν[ως δη]ακεινται εροτη
tον ονομαστ[οι γενεσθαι και κλεος
εις τον αει χρονον αθανατον κα
ταθεσθαι και υπερ τουτον κινδυ
νους τε κινδυνευειν ετοιμοι εισι
490 παντας ετι μαλλο[ν] η] υπερ των
παιδων και χρηματι] αναλισκειν
και ποιον ποιειν [ο]υστινασον
και υπερποθησκειν επει οιει
208 C

208 D

συ εφη Αλκηστιν υπερ Αδημητου
495 απαθαινειν αυ τη Ακηλλα Πατρο
κλω επαπθαινειν η προαποθα
νειν των υμετερον Κοδρον υπερ
της βαλειας των παιδων μη οιο
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μενοὺς αθανατον μνημην αρε
500 της περι εαυτων εσεσθαι ην νυν
ημεις εξομεν πολλον γε δει εφη
αλλ οιμαι ύπερ αρετης αθανατου
και τοιαυτης δοξης ευκλεους
παντες παντα ποιουσιν οσω αν α
505 μενον ωσι τουσουτω μαλλον του
γαρ αθανατον ερωσι οι μεν ουν εν
κυμονες εφη κατα τα σωματα ου
τες προς τας γυναικας μαλλον τρε
πονται και ταυτη ερωτικοι εισι
510 δια παιδογοιας αθανασιαν και
μνημην και ευθαιμοιαν ως οι
ονται αυτος εις τον επιτα χρο
νον παντα πορις[ο]μενοι οι δε
κατα την ψυχην εισι γαρ ουν εφη
515 οι εν ταις ψυχαις κνουσιν ετι μαλλο
η εν τοις σωμασιν α ψυχη προσηθηκι
και κυνσα τα[α]λ και τεκειν τι ουν προσ
ηκει φρονησιν τε καλ την αλλη
αρετην ον δη ειςι και οι ποιηται
520 πα[η]τες γεννη[τορε]ς και των διη

Col. xii.

μουργων οσοι λεγονται ευρ[ε]τη
λιστη της φρονησεως η περι τας τω
πολεων τε και οικησεων [δ]αικοσμη
525 σις η δη ονομα εστιν σωφροσυνη τη
tε και δικαιοσυνη τουτων άν οταν τις
ek νεου εκκυμων η την ψυχην θειος
ων και ηκουσης της ηλικιας τικτει
tε και γενναν ηδη επιθυμη ζητει
209 Β
530 δὴ οἴμαι καὶ οὐτὸς περὶ ὧν τὸ καλὸ

ἐν ω ἀν γεννησεῖν ἐν [τω γ]αρ σαρώ

οὐδὲποτε γεννησεῖ τα τ[a] οὐν σῶμα

ta τα καλα μαλλον η τ[a] aiz[ρ]a aste

ζεται ἀτε κνῶν καὶ αν ενυχη ψυ

535 χὴ καλὴ καὶ γενναῖα [και] εὔφεια πα

νυ δὴ ασπαζέται[ι] τὸ ξυνανφοτερὸ

καὶ προ[ς] τον τον ανθρωπὸν εν


περι οἱ[ν] χρῆ] εἰναι τον ανδρα τον

540 αγαθὸν καὶ [α επιτη]θειν [και και έπι]

χειρὲ παιδεύ[ειν] ἀποτελε[ν]ος γαρ

οἴμαι τον καλὸν καὶ ομείλων α[υτ]ω

α παλαι έκει τ[ε]κτε καὶ γενή[α] καὶ

παρ[ου]ν καὶ απον μεμημεν[ος]

545 καὶ το γεννηθὲν συνεκτρεφει κοι

νη μετ εκεινο ώστε πολύ μείζων

κοινωνιαν της των παιδων προς

αλλήλους οι τοιούτοι ἵσχυοτι και

φιλιαν βεβαιοτεραν ατε καλλειο

550 νων καὶ αθανατωτερων παι[δ]ων

κεκοινωνηκοτες καὶ πας ἄν δεξαὶ

to εαυτῳ τοιοντος παιδας μαλλὸ

γεγονεναι η του ανθρωπίνους και

εις Ομηρον αποβλεψας καὶ εις Ἡσιодο

555 καὶ τοὺς αλλους ποιητας τους ἀγα

θους ζηλων οια εγγονα [ε]αυτων κα

tαλειπουσιν α εκεινοι[ς] αθανατὸ

κλεος καὶ μνημην πα[ρ]εχεται αν

τα τοιαυτα οντα· ει δε βουλει εφη

560 οιους Λυκουργος παιδας κατελιπε

το εν Λακεδαιμον[ν]ι σωτηρας της

Λακεδαιμονος καὶ ος ετος ειπ[εί]
tης Ελλαδος τιμιου δε πα[ρ] ημιν [και
εργα καὶ γεννησαντες παντοιαν α> 
ρετην ουν και ἵερα πολλα ἡδη γεγονε> 
δια τους τοιοντους παιδας εια δε τους 
anθρωπινους ουδενος πω ταυτα με 
ουν τα ερωτικα ιτωσ ο Σωκρατες και> 
εκ μυθεις τα δε τελεα και εποπτικα 
ων ενεκα και ταυτα εστι εαν τις ορ> 
θως μετη ουκ ειδ ει οιος τ αν ειη> 
es εν ουν εφην εγω και προβυμιας ου 
δεν απολειψω πειρου δε και συ επεσθαι 
εαν οιος τε ης ρι γαρ εφη τον ορθως 
η[ο]ντα επι τουτο το πραγμα αρχεσθα[ι] 
μεν νεον οντα ίεναι επι τα καλα σω> 
ματα και πρωτων μεν εαν ορθως η> 
γηται ο ηγειμενος ενοις αυτον σωμα 
tος εραν και εισαυθα γενναν λογους 
καλους επειτα δε αυτον κατονη> 
σαι οτι το καλλος το επι οσουν σωμα 
ti τω επι ετερω σωματε αδελφων εστι 
και ει δει διωκειν το επ ειδει καλου> 
pολλη ανοια μη ουχ εν τε και ταυτω 
ηγεισθαι το επι[ι] πασι τοις σωμασι καλ 
λος τουτο δ εννοησαντα καταστη 
οι παντων των καλων σωματω 
ερασθην ενοις δε το σφοδρα τουτο χα 
λασαι καταφροησαντα και σμικρο 
ηγησαμενον μετα δε ταυτα το εν 
tais ψυχαις καλλος τιμωτερον η>
γησασθαι του εν τω σωματι ωστε και
ean επιεικης αν την ψυχην τις και
εαν σμικρον ανθος εχη εξαρκειν
αυτω[ν] και εραν και κηδεσθαι και τι
600 κτειν λογους τοιοτους και ζητειν
οιτινες ποιησοντι βελτιων τους

νεους ινα αναγκαθη αν θεασασθαι
to εν τοις επιτηδευμαι και τοις
νομοις καλον και τουτο ιδειν οτι
605 παν αυτο αυτω ξυγγενες εστιν

ινα το πιερι το σωμα καλον σμικρον
ti ηγησηται εναι εναι μετα δε τα επι

τηθευματα επι τας επιστημας

αγαγειν ινα ειδη αν επιστημον
610 καλλος και βλεπων προς [πο]λυν ηδη

tο καλον μηκετι το παρ ενι ωστερ

οικετης αγαπων παιδαριου καλλος
[η] ανθρωπου τινος η επιτηδευμα
[το]ς [πο]λος δουλευων φαυλος η και

615 [σμι]κρολογος αλλ επι το [πο]λυν πελα}

Col. xiv.

γος τετραμενων του καλον] κα[ι] θεωρ[ω

πολιους και καλους λογους και μεγαλο

πρε[πεις τις τει και διανοι]ματα εν φιλο

σοφια αφθονο εως αν επι]αυθα ρωσθεις

620 και αυξηθεις κατιδη τινα επιστημην

μιαν: [τοιαυτην η εστί]ν καλον τοιουδε

πειρω δε μοι εφη τον νουν προσεχειν
ωσ οιον τε με[αλιστ]α ος γαρ αν μεχρι εν

tαυθα προ[σ] τα ερωτικα παιδαγωγη

625 η[θ] [θεωμε[νος] εφεξης] τε και ορθος

τα καλα προς τελος η[θη] ιον των ερω
843. PLATO, SYMPOSIUM

630 τις[ων] εξουσίας κατε[ψε]ται τι θαν[]ν
635 τις εμπροσθεν παντεϊς ποιοι ησαϊν')
πρωτον μεν αει ου και ουτε γιγνο
μενον ουτε απολλυμενον ουτε απο
ξανομενον ουτε φθινον επειτα ευ
τι μεν κο[λα]ν τη [δ] αισχρον ουδε το
ουδε.

640 σωπουν τι ουδε χειρες ουδε αλλ[ο] ου
δε εν σωμα μετεχει ουδε τις λογοις
ουδε τις επιστημη ουδε π[ον] ου εν ε
ο
τερ[οι] τινι οιον [εν] ζωω η ην ιγη η ην
ουρανω η έν τω [αλλω] αλλαι αυτο κα

645 ο αυτο μετ αυτου μονοειδες αει ου
τα δε αλλα παντα καλα εκεινον με
τεχοντα τροπον τινα τοιοις οι
ον γιγνομενον τε των αλλων [και]
apospayenon μηδεν εκεινο [μη]

650 τε πλεον μητε ελαττον γενηες
θαι μηθε πασχειν μηθεν οταν [δη]
tis apo toin οι ορθος παιδε
ραστειν επαινων εκεινο τι[ο]
καλοι
αρχηται καθοραν σχεδιον αν τι α

655 πτοιοτο του τελους τουτο [γα]ρ ειη ε
οτι το ορθω επι τα εροτικα ειειαι
η ιπ αλλου αγεσθαι αρχομενον α
το τοιν οι καλοι εκεινον ενε
κα του καλου αει επαινειαιωσπερ
660 ἐπαναβάσσως χρωμεν' ον ἀπο ἐνοσ ἐπὶ δύο καὶ ἀπο δύο ἐπὶ παν τα τα καλα σωματα και [ἀπο των

Col. xv.

[κα]λ[ω]ν σωματων ἐπι τα καλα επιτη δευματα και ἀπο των επιτηδευμα


670 ο εστιν καλου ει[ται]αθα του βιου ω’ φιλε Σωκρατεσ εφη η Μαντινικη’ ξευη ειπερ που αλλοθι βιωτον αν θρ[ω]πω θεωμενω αυτο το καλου ο ε’ αν ποτε ἵδης ου κατα χρυσων τ[ε]


690 [σε β]λεποντος ανθρωπου και εκεινο ω
[δει θεω]μενου και ἧνο[ν]τως α[ντω η]
[ουκ εινθ]μει εφη οτι ε]πταυθα [αυτω
[μοναχο]ν γινησται ορωντι ω[ρατον]
to kalon tiktew ouk eidos]α αρετης

693 [ατε ουκ ειδωλου εφαπτομενω α]ινυ a
[ληθη ατε του] αληθους εφαπ]τομενω
[αλλ αληθη α]ιτε τοιν αληθους εφαπτιν
[μενω τεκοντε] δε αρετην αληθη και
[θερεψαι]μενω υπαρχει θεοφιλει γενεσ

700 [θ]α: [κ]αι ειπερ τω αλλω ανθρωπων a
[θαυματο κ]ακεινω ταυτα δη Φα[δρε]
[τη κ]αι [οι] αλλοι εφη μεν Διοτιμα πε
[πεισ]μαι δ εγω πεπεισμενος δε πειρω
[μα]ι και τους αλλους πειθειν οτι του

705 [τ]ου του κτηματος τη] ανθρωποπεια
[φυσει] ει]υψηργον αμεινω ερωτοις
[ουκ] [αν] τις ραδιως λαβοι διο δη εγω
[γε φημ]ι χρηναι π[α]ντ' ανδρα του
[ερωτα τιμαν και αυτως τιμω τα

710 [ερωτικα] και διαφεροντως ασκω]

Col. xvi.

και [τους αλλα]οις παρακελευναι και
νυν τε και α]ιει εγκωμιαζω τον ερω
τα την διναμιν και ανδρειαν του
erωτος καθ ουν] οιος τ ειμι τουτον

715 ουν του [λογον ο] Philai[δρε ε]ι μεν ει με
βουλει ο]σ] εικωμι)ν εις ερωτα νο
μιον ειρησθαι] ει δε οι οικ] α]ι
ρεισ εορμαζων τουτο οι]ομαζε: ει
ποντος δε ταυτα] του Σωκρατουν
tους μεν επαινειν τον δε Αριστο
φανη επιχειρει[ε]ιν λεγειν τι oτι ε]
μνησθῆ αυτοῦ λεγῶν ὁ Σωκράτης
περὶ τοῦ λόγου καὶ εξαιφνῆς την...
αὐλεῖον θυραν κρυμμένην πολὺ
725 Ψοφοῦν παρασχεῖν ὦς κωμαστῶ
καὶ αὐλητρίδος φωνῆν ακούειν
tὸν αὐν Ἀγαθο[θ]όνα παῖδες φαναί
οὐ κεφεσθὲ καὶ ἂν μὲν τις τῶν εἰ
πιτηδεῖον ἡ καλ[ε]στε εἰ δὲ μη λε
730 γετε ὑπὶ οὖν πείνομεν ἀλλὰ πανὸ
[μεθὰ δὴ καὶ οὖν πολὺ ὑπερον Ἀλ
κ[λιαδ]’]ν τὴν φωνὴν ακούειν εν
[μεγά] Β[ρων]τος ερωτώντος ὁποῦ
735 Ἀγ[αθ]όνα καὶ κελευντ[ο]ς αγείν

παρὰ Ἀγαθωνα’ αγεί οὖν αυτοῦ πα
ῥα σφός [τῇ]ν τε αὐλητρίδα ὑπὸν
ἀλβοῦσαν καὶ ἀλλοὺς τινας τῶν
ακολου[θ]’]ν [κ]αὶ επιστημα εἰπὲ
740 τ[α]ς θυρὰς εἰστεφανωμένον αὐτῷ
κιτ[τ]οῦν τε ν’ εἰστεφανωμένον αὐ
[τόν κι]πτοῦ τε τινὶ εἰστεφανο

[μεν]’]ν δασὶ καὶ ἱδὼν καὶ ταινίας
[ἐχοντ]εν εἰπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς πανὺ
745 [πολλὰς καὶ εἰπεῖν] αὐδρ[ε]ς χαιρὲ
[τε με]θοντα αὐρα παν[ι]ν’ σφόδρα
[α]υ]δησαντες μονὸν Ἀγαθωνα εφ ὁ
π[ε]ρ ηλθομεν εγὼ γαρ τοι φαναὶ εἰ
750 χθεὶς μὲν οὐχ ο[ῖος] τ εγενομὴν ἀφὶ
κ[ε[σθ]θ]’]ν] νῦν δὲ ἦκο εἰπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ
[ἐ]χων [τὰς ταινίας ἵνα ἀπὸ τῇ]ς εἰ
μῆς κεφαλῆς τ[ῆς] τοῦ σφρατ[ο]ῦν
καὶ κα[λ]λιστεν [κε]φαλῆ[ν] εαν εἰπὼ
755 οὔτωσι ανάδεικτον ἀρ[α] καταγελασε
σθε μου ὧς μεθυνούσος ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ
ὑμεῖς γελατε ὁμοίως εἰς οἶδ εἰς ἀλή

Col. xvii.

θὴ λεγὼ ἀλλὰ [μοι λεγετε αὐτοθεν επι]
ῥητοὶς εἰςω η μη [συμπλεσθε η ου παν]
760 τας ουν αναδορύθησαι καὶ κελευνει εἰσ
ειναι καὶ κ[α]τακλε[ινεθαί καὶ τον Αγα
θώνα καλεῖν αὐτό]ν καὶ τον ιεναι αγο
μενον ὑπὸ των αὐθροποι καὶ πε
ριαιρουμενον αμα [τας τανιας ὁς]
765 αναδησοντα εὐπρέποσθε των ὀφθαλ
μων εχοντα ου κατιδειν τον Σωκρα
tη ἀλλα καθεσθαι παρα τον Αγα
θώνα εν μεσω Σωκρα[τους τε και εκει
νον παραχωρησαι [γαρ τον Σωκρατη
770 ος εκεινον κατιδειν παρακαθεσθο]
μενον δε αυτον αἰ[σπαθεσθαι] τε τον
Αγαθωνα και αἱ[αδειν ειπειν ουν]
tον Αγαθωνα ι[πολυνετε παιδεις Αλ]
kβιαδην ι[να εκ τρητων κατακη]
775 τα: πανυ γ ειπειν τοι]ν Αλκιβιαδην
αλλα τις ημεις οδε τριτος ξυμποτης
και αμα μεταστρεφομενον αυτ[ον]
orαν τον Σωκρατη ἱδοντα δε ανια
πηθησαι και ειπειν: ο Ηρακλεις του
780 τι τι ην: Σωκρατης ουτος ελλοχων
αν με ενταυθα [κατεκεισο] ὁσπερ ει
οθεις εξαιρυ[ης αναφαινεθαι]
κατεκεισο ὁσπερ [ει]ωθεις εξαιρυ[ης]
αναφαινεθαι οποιν εγω [ωμην ηκι
785 στα σε εσε]θαι και ἤνι τι η[ξεις και]
ti αν ενταυθα κατεκ[λινης] ὃς ου
παρα [Ἀριστ]οφανείς οὐ[δ] εἰ τίς ἄλλος
790 λιστῶ τ[ῶν] εὐθέων κατακεισθη καὶ
[τ]ο[ῦ]ν Σωκρατῆ[ν] Ἀγαθων φαναί ορᾶ εἰ μοι
α[νβρο]ω[ν] ό[ὐ]ν φαύλου πραγμα γεγο
795 φ' ον τοῦτον ἡρασθήνυν οὐκετι εἰ[ὲ]
στι μοι ουτε προσβλ[ε]ψαι ουτε δια
λεχθ[η]ναι καλω ουδ[ε]νι η[ν] ουτοι
ζηλοτυπ[ω]ν με καὶ ψ[θνων]θαν
μαστ[α] εργαζόταί και λοιδορείται
800 τε κ[α]ι το ἅ[ι]ρε μ' όγις α[πεχεταί ορα
]νων μη τι καὶ νυν] [εργασθαί αλλα
dιαλλάξ[ετι] η[μα]ς η εαν επιχεερη
β[εί] α[ζέθαι] επα[ίμανε] ος εγὼ την
]τοῦτον μαν[ια]ν τε καὶ φιλεραστη
805 αν πανυ ο[μ]ρωδιο ἀλλ ονκ εστι

Col. xviii.
[φαναί] τον Ἀλκ[ι]β[αθὴν ε]μοὶ καὶ σοι
[διαλλα]γή· ἄλλα τοῦτ[ων] μεν εἰς αὐθις
[σε τειμω]ρησομαί νων δὲ [μοι Ἀγαθων]
[φαναί] μεταδος των ταιρ[ων] ἑνα
810 [ἀναδήσω] καὶ την τούτου ταυτην
[την θαυμ]ασθην κε[ϕαλήν και μη]
[μοι μεμφη]ται [ο]τι [σε μεν ανέδησα

Col. xxiii.
[mαι Σωκρατε]σ εξελεγ[χε] συνεγινο]
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[πάλιν ἐραστής] παλινδικοὶς εὗν ερμημα διάλε
[χθεὶς καὶ εἰχαίρον τούτων δὴ μαλὰ εἰ]
[γιγνέτο οὐδὲν ἀλλ ὡσιπροειδε διαλέ
[χθεὶς αὖ μοι καὶ σὺν] ἡμῖν ἀρένσας ὀχέτο]

820 [απιών μετὰ ταύτα σὺνυγμαζώσα]
[προνακολουμμὴν] αὐτόν καὶ συνεγκύμνα
[δομὴν ὡς] τι ἐνταῦθα περαγὼν σὺν]
[πολλακις οὐδὲνος π]αροίντος κ]αὶ [τι δει]

825 [λεγειν οὐδὲν γαρ μοι πλεοίν κ]ν ἐπει]

[η] [ὡς δ' ὡς] διαμὴ ταῦτ ηνυ[τον ε]ἰ]δο[ε]
[μοι επιθετο]ν εἰναι τω ανδρὶ κατα]
[το καρπορ]ο']] καὶ οὐκ ανετ[α]']] εν επεί]

ρη [ὁπερ εν] ἐκείνηθ' αλλα εἰ[κειν]']] στέον

830 [η] [ὡς τι] ἕστι το πραγμα' προκαλοῦ]
[μα δ']] αὐτὸν προς τ[ο σ']υνδείπνει]
[ατεχν'ω]σ ῥαπ]εραστής παιδίκος

[ἐπιβουλ]ευων' καὶ μοι οὐδὲ τοῦτο[ν]']]

ν [ταχύντοι[ν]ηκοσεν' ὅρμως δ']] οὐ χρο[νῶ]

835 [επεισόδη ε]']πειδὴ δὲ αφικέτο το προτό]
[δειπνη]ςας απεινατε εβουλετο' κα']]
[τοτε μεν] αἰσχυνομενος αἰ[φηκα]
[αυτὸν α]']]θας δ']] επ[βο]νδε[ν]ςας επεὶ]
[ἡ] ἐδεδείπνη[η]']']'] διελεγμένη πορ

840 [το]']] τῶν νυ]κτῶν καὶ επειδὴ γη εβού]
[λέγο το]']] αι σκ[η]']πομενος στι οὐσα]

[εἰ]'] προσ[η]ναγκα]']]α αὐτὸν μεν
[ανεπανε]το οὐν [ε]']] τη εχομενη ε]

[μοι κλεί]']']] εν [ἡ περ ε]δειπνει αι ου

845 [δεις ε]']] τοι οικῆ]']]τε ἀλλος καθη]
[το]']] το οικο λογο κα][λος αν ε]']] κ]']] προς ον
οικ εθελειν λεγειν οιον ἡν πλην τοις δὲ δηγμενοις οὐς μοιχοις γνωσμενοις καὶ ξυγι
860 γνωσμενοις εἰ παν [ετολμα δραν τε και λεγειν ὑπὸ της οδύνης εγω] ουν διέδηγ
μενος τε ὑπὸ αλγινοτερον και το αλγι νοσατον ον αν τις δηχθειν· την [καρ διαν γαρ ἡ ψυχην η οτι δει αυτο όνο]
865 μασαι πληγεις τε και δηχθεις ὑπο τω [ἐν φιλοσοφια λογων οι εχονται εχι] [διην] 
αγριωτερον νεον ψυχης μην α [φινους οταν λαβωνται και ποιονισι δρα 
τε και λεγειν οτι]ουν [κα]ι [ω]ν αν Φαι
870 δρους [Ἀγ]αθωνας Ἐρ[υμ]αιξους Π[αν] [σανιας Αριστοδήμους τε και Α[ριστο] 
φι[ανας Σωκρατης] ἡ [δ]ε αυτον τι δ[ει]ε λε 
γειν κρ]οι οσιοι αλλοι· παντες γα[ρ κεκοι
νωνηκατε της φιλοσοφου [ϕ]ανιας
875 τε και βακχιας· διο παντες α[κου 
σεβ]ει συγγνωσεθε γαρ τοις τε τοτε [πραχ]θεισι και τοις νυν λεγομενοις 
οι δ ο[ικ]εται και ει τις αλλος εστιν βε
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885 [μοι ε]θοκει καὶ ειπ[ο]ν καὶ κεινῆςας

αὐτὸν Σωκρατες κα[θευδεις: ον δὴ

τ[α] η δ οι οιθα οιν α μοι δεδοκται]

τι μα[λιστα εφη συ εμο]ι δοκεις ἦν]

δ εγω [εμο]ι εραιστης α]ς εις γεγον[ε]ναι

890 μονο[ς κα]ι μοι φα[ιν]ει οκνειν μην]

σθη[ι]αι πρ]ος με εγω δε ουτωσι [εχιων]

παυν [ανο]ητ[ο]ν ηγουμαι ειναι σοι μη

ου καὶ [του]το χα[ις]ισσαθαι καὶ ει τι αλ

λο η τη[ς] ουσιας τη[ς] εμης θειο η τω


δ[εν εστι] πρεασβυτερ[ο]ν τ]οιον ὦσ στι]

[β]ελτιστ[ο]ν εμε γεν[εσθαι]: τουτο[ν]

δε οιμαι μοι συλληπτ[ο]ρα οιδεινα

κυριωτερον ει[ι]ναι σοιν εγω δη τοι

900 ουτω ανδρι πολυ μα[λ]λον α[ν] μη

χαριζομενος αἰσχύνοιμην] τους

φρονιμος η χαρι[ζο]μενος τ]ους

Col. xxv.

τε [πολλους κα]ι αφρονας κα[ι σουτος α]

κουςας μαλα ειραφικος καὶ σφ]οδρα

φιλ

905 [εαυ]τον [τε και εισοθ]ως ελεξε: ὡ Αλ


φαιλος ει[ναι ε]τ[ε]ρ [α]ληθη τυγχανει

ου[τα] α λεγεις περι εμοι και τις εστ’ ε

ν [εμοι δ]υναμις δ ης αν [σ]υ γενοιο α
910 μεινων α[μη]χανον [τ]οι καλλος ορω
ης αν ε[ν ε]μοι και της παρα σοι ευμορ
[ρων αυτο] κ[ου]φασθαι τε μοι επι
[χ]'ρεις και αλ[λ]αζασθαι καλλος αντι
915 καλλος ουκ ολιγω μου πλεονεκτειν
dιαινει αλλ αντι [δ]'οξης αληθειαν
ω
καλ[λ]ον κτασθαι επιχειρεις και τω
οντι χρυσια χαλκειων [δ]ιαμειβεσθαι
νοεις: αλλ ω μακαρι αμεινον [σκο
920 πει μη σε λανθανω [ουδε]ν ώς η τοι
tης διανοιας ωψις αρχη;[ου] βλε
πεν οταν ή των ομματων της
ακμης ληγειν επιχειρη συ [δε] του
των ετι [π]ορρω και εγω ακουσας;
925 τα μεν παρ εμοι εφην [τα]υτα εσ[τι]
ων ουδ[ε]ν αλλως ειρηται η [ω]ς [δια]
[ου σοι τε] στι αρ[ιστον και εμ]οι ηγε[ι:]Projected 219 A
αλλ [εφη το]υτο γ ευ λεγεις ε[υ] γαρ τω
930 επιοντι [χ]ρονο βουλευομαι πρα
ξομε[ν ο αν] φαινητα[ι νων περι
τε τουτων και περι [των αλλων
αριστον [:] [γ]ω] μεν δη ταυτα ακο
5
σα[ν] τε και ειτ[ον κα][ι] αφεις ωσπερ
935 βελει τετ[ρω]ςθαι αυτον ωμ[ην και
αναστα[ς γε] ουδ επιτρεψας τουτο
ειπειν ουδ[ε]ν ετι] αμφι[ε][σ] το με
τον το εμαυτον τουτον και [γαρ
ην χειμων υπ][ο τον τριβωνα κα[]
940 τακλινεις τον τουτων περιβαλω
τω χειρε το[ντο τω δαι]μονω ωσ
ηληθω και[ι θαυμαστω κατεκει]Projected 219 C
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μη[ν την νυκτα ολην και ουδε]
τατ' αν ο Σωκρατες ε'ρεις [ο'] [ψε]ν
945 δομαι ποιησαντος δε δη ταυτα
εμον [ουτος τοσουτον περιεγε]νε
to τη' [και κατεφρονησεν και κ]ατε

Col. xxvi.

γελασεν της εμην ωρας και υβρισεν [και
περι εκεινο γε ομην τι ειναι ο αν[δρες]]

950 δικασταί δικασται γαρ ετε της Σωκρα
[τους] υπερηφανιας ειν γαρ εστι με θεους
[μα θεας ο] [δειν] περιττοτερον και θαδε
δα'ρκης ανειςτημεν με[γε Σωκρατοις]
η ει μετα πατρος καθην η αδελφου

219 D

955 πρεσβυτερον: [το διη με τουτο τιμα]
οιευθε με διανοιαν εχει[υ] ηγουμενο
μεν ητιμαθαι α'γαμενον δει την του
tου φυσιν τε και σωφρονην και αν
dρειαν εντεινυχηκοτα ανθρωπω

219 E

960 ποιοντω ουω [ο'νκ αν ομην πιστε] εντυχει ειν φρονη[οιν και εις εγ

219 F

κρατειαν ωστ[ε ο] [σθε]ν οπως[ε]ν οργη[οι]
μην ειχον ει και α'ποστερηθειν)
[της ποιου] [ου] [θεο] [σια] [ου] ουτε οπη

965 προσαγαγοιμην αυτον ευπορον
[ειν γαρ ηθειν οτι χρηματι γε πολυ]
μαλλον ατρωτος ην πανταχι η
σιδηρο ο Αιας ο τε ομην αυτον μο

219 G

νω αλωσεθαι διεπεβενυμει με ηπο]
970 ροου δη κατα[δ]'ευβουλωμενος τε ι
πο του ανθρωπου ως ουδεις ειπ [ου
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

δευς αλλον περιν[ε]ια ταυτα τε γραμπρονυγευνε και με

η τα ταυτα στρατια ημειν (εις Πο)

975 [τε[ε]]δαιαν εγενετο κοινη και συν εσειτουμεν εκειν πρωτον μεν ουν
tois πονοις ου μονον εμου πε[ρ]η] (α[λ]λα και των αλλων απαντα)ν

(οποιον αναγκασθειμεν·απο)

980 [λειψθεντες που οα δη επι στρατει
[ας ασει]τειν ουδεν ησαι οι αλλοι προσ
tων] καιρ]τερειν εν των τας ευφαειας

α

μονος απολλυειν οιον την τα ταλα και πινειν ουκ εθελων οποτε αι)

985 μιαγκασθει παντας εκρατειν και

[ο] παντων θυμασιωτατων Σωκρα
tη] μεθυνοντα ουδεις ποιτει εω]

μ'εν α[ν]θρωπων τοιτου μεν ουν

μ'εν δοκει και αυτικα ο ελεγχος ει

990 [σεοθαι προς δε αν τας του χειμω

ει

νος καρ]σε[ις]ς δε[ινοι] γαρ αυτω
[θε χειμωνισ]ς θαυμαρ]solveria ειργαζε

[το τα τε αλ]λα [και] ποτε οντος [ου] πα
gου οιον δε[ινοις]τατων και παντων

Col. xxvii.

995 η ουκ εξιοντων [ενδοθεν η] ει (τα]ς ει

ξειοι ημφιεσμενων [δι] τε θαυμαστα δη

οσα και υποδεξεμενων και ει[ει]λιγ

μενων τους [ποδας ε]ς πειλου[ς] και

αρνακιδας ουτος [ειν τουτω]ς εξη[ει]

εκοι εχων ιματιων μ[εν] τοιοιτων [οιοι]ν
περ καὶ προτερον εἰσεθεὶ φορε[ν] ἀν
υποδη[τ]οσ δὲ διὰ τοῦ κρυστα[λ]λον
ρα[δ]ον επορευτο η οἱ αλλοι ὑποδέ
1005 π[ον] αὐ[τὸν ὡς καταφρονο[ύν]τ' α[ς σ']
φ[ωτ] καὶ ταυτα μεν δη ταυτα οιον
δ[α] τοδ ερ[ε]ξκ [κ]αι ετήν καρτερος
αν[η]ρ εκει ποι̊τε επι στρατιας αξιον
ακομα[θ]αι συννο̊ησας γιαρ αυτοθι
1010 [εωθεν τι ε]ισθήκει σκοπων καὶ επι
δη ευ πρου[χωρε]ι αυτω ουκ ανειη
α[λλα] εισθη[κε] ζητων καὶ ἱδη ἦ
μεσθηβρα [κα] αυθρωποι ησ[θ]ανό
το κ[αί] βαυμ[α]ζοντες αλλος αλλω
1015 ελεγεν οτι Σωκρατης ος εξ εωθ[ε]]
ν[ο]ν φροντιζων τι εστηκε τελευ
κ[αι γ]αρ θερο[ς τοτης γε ην χ]αιμενια
220 C
1020 εξ[ε]γεγκαμενοι αμα μεν εν τω ψυχει
κ[αθην]υδον α'μα δ εφυλαττον αυτον
[ει και την νυκτα] εστηκοι ο δε ειστη
κει [μεχρι εως εγενετο και ηλιο[ς] ανε]
σχεν επειτα ωχετι απιων προσευκα
αυτω [αποδουναι οτε γα]ρ η μαχη ἦ
εξ ης εμοι [και τια αριστη] εις εδοσαν οι
στρατη[γοι ουδεις α]λλος εμε εσωσεν
1030 αι[θ]ρωποι [η ουτος] τετρομενοι
ν[οκ εθ]ελων α'τολιπει[ν] αλλα συνοι
σ[οσε και] τα οπλα [και αυτον εμε και εγω]
μεν ο Σωκρατες κ'αι τοτε εκελευν
σοι δειοναι τα αριστεια τους στρατη}
220 D

220 E

T 2
1040 [εγενου των στρα·πηγων εμε λαβειν·] [η σαυτων ετι ταιγινων] α[νδ]ρωνε[ς αξιωματ]ος

Col. xxviii.

[νεωρασθαι Σωκρατην οτε απο Δηλιον] 

[φυγη ανεχωρει το στρατοπεδον· ετυχο]

γαρ παρ]αγενομενον ιππον εξ[ων] ουτος

1045 δε [οπλα·] ανεχωρει ουν εσκεθασμει[νων] η[δη] των ανθρωπων ουτος τε αμα και[α]]

[Δ]αγα[ης και εγω περινυχανων· και τινι] ευθυς παρακελευμαι τε αυτων θαρ

ριν και ελεγον οτι ουκ απολειψω αυτω

1050 ευναισθηθαι δη και καλλειον εθεασμη[ν]

[Σωκρατη η [εν] Ποτειδα]· αυτος γαρ)

ηπτον εν φι[ιω] η διαι το εφ ιππον ειναι


1055 ριστοφανες το σιν δη τουτο και εκει]

διαπορευθαισθαι οσπερ και ευθαδε βρεν

θυμωμενοι τε και [τω) αφαλμω [πα]ραβαλ

λων ηρεμα παρασκεπων και[α] τους φι

λουσ και τους πολεμους δη[λοις ων]

1060 παντι και πανυ πορρωθε[ν] οτι ει τις

αψαιτο [ιουτου των ανδρως μαλα]

eρωμενως αμυνειαι· διο και ασφα

λων απηι και αυτως και ο ετερος σκε]

δοιν] γαρ τι των [ο]υτως διακειμενω]

1065 εν τω πολεμω ουδε] αποτυκται α[λλα]
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[τὸ]νσ προτροπαδὴν φεύγωντας διὰ

ωκουσιν' πολλὰ μὲν οὖν ᾧν 

τὶς καὶ

αλ[λ]α εὑρὶ Σωκράτην ἐπισημανεῖ καὶ

θαυμασία ο[λ]λα τῶν αλ[λ]ῶν [εἰ]πιτηδέν

1070 ματῶν τὰχ αν τ[ίς] καὶ[ι] περὶ α[λ]λον τοΐς

αὐτὰ εἰποὺ τὸ δὲ δὴ μηδὲν[ι] αὐθανὼν

οροιον εὐ[αι] μὴτε τῶν[ν] παλ[αι]ων μὴ

te τῶν [ὑν] ν[ν] τῶν τοῦτο αξ[ι]ον παν

tos ὑθαμβατὸς οἰος γαρ [Ἀχιλ]λεύς ογενε

1075 τὸ απεικ[ασεί]ὲν αν τ[ίς καὶ] Βρασίδα[ν]

καὶ αλλὸν κ[αὶ] ο[ἰ]α α[ὐν] Περικλῆς καὶ Νε


αλλόν κτα ταῦτα αν τ[ίς] καὶ[ι] τοὺς αλλοὶς α[ὐ]

πεικαζοὶ οἰος δ[ε] ο[ὕτο]σι γεγονεν τ[η]ν

1080 αποτιν ναθροπος καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ λ[ο]

γοι αὐτὸν οὐδ ἐγγυς αἰ οὐροὶ τίς ᾧ

τῶν νῦν ὠντω τῶν παλαιῶν εἰ

μὴ ἀρα οἰς εἰς [λεγ]ὼ απεικαζοὶ τίς αν

tον αὐθρο[π]ων μεν μηδέν τοὺς [δ]ε


τοὺς λογοὺς καὶ γαρ οὐν κ[αὶ] τοὺς[το] εἰν

τοὺς [πρῶτοις παρελιπον ὁ]τι κα[ὶ] ρι λο

Col. xxix.

gοι αὐτὸν ομ[ὸς]τατοι εἰσὶ το[ὺς σε]ιληνοι

tοὺς διογομ[ένοις εἰ] γαρ εθέλ[οι τί]ς τῶ


ὄνοματα κα[ὶ] ρήματα εξῶθεν περὶ

παμ[φ]ι]χοντας σατυρου τινα ὑβριστον

dο[ρα]ς ονος γαρ κανηλίνους λεγε

1095 καὶ [χ]άλκεας τινας καὶ σκυτοτομους

καὶ βυρσὸ[ε]ς καὶ αἰε διὰ τῶν αὐτὸ
ταυτά φαίνεται λέγειν σωτε απειρος
cαι ανοιχτός ανδρώπος[[ν]] πας αν τον

λόγουν καταγέλασειν διογορέμονος

110 ο δε ίδον αν τις και εντοις αυτοις γιγνο
μενος πρωτόν μεν νόμων εχοντας εν

δον μονος ευρήσει των λόγων επει
tα θειοτάτους και πλειστα [α]γάλμα
tα αρετης εν αυτοις εχοντας και ε)

1105 πι πλειστον τινοντας μαλλον δε επι
pαν οσον προσηκεισκοπιει τω μελ

λοντι καλω καγαδω εσεσθαι ταυτα
tαυτα εστιν οι άνδρες α εγω Σωκρα
tη επανω και αι a μεμοιμαι συμ

1110 μειδας ημεις εποιεα με ειπρισεν

και μεντοι αυκ εμε μονον ται
tαιριν ω ανδρες α εγω Σωκρα

η τη επανω και αι a μεμοιμαι συμ

1115 τοις εξαπατον οις εραστης παιδικα

μαλλον αυτος καθισταται αντ ερα

ω

στον ο δε και σοι λεγω Αγαθων μη ε)

εξαπατασθαι υπο τοισον αλλ [[ν]]πο τω

ημετερων παθηματων γνωντα

1120 ευλαβθηναι και μη κατα την πα

ρομιαν ωσπερ νηπιον παθοντα

τη παρησια αυτου οτι εδοκει τις ε

1125 ρωτικος εχειν του Σωκρατους

του ουν Σωκρατης νηφευν μοι

δοκεισ [[ε]]φων οι Αλκιβιαδη [ο]υ γαρ
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αν ποτε ουτω κομψως κυκλω
περιβαλλομεν[ο]ς αφαιρειται ειν' ε
1130 Χειρεισ ουνεκα ταντα πα[ν]τα
[ειρηκας] και ως [ε]ν [παρεργοι δη[λε]]
[λεγον επι τελευτης αυτο ερηκας]

Col. xxx.

ως ου παντα τοντον ενεκα ερηκως)
tου εμε και [Α]γαθωνα διαβάλλειν οι
1135 [ομηνος δειν εμε μεν σου εραν και μη]
[κενος αλλοι [Α]γαθωνα δε οποιο σου εραοθαι
και μη δφ [κενος αλλοι αλλου ουκ ελαθες]
αλλα το σατυρικον σου δραμα τουτο
και σειλημικον καταδηλον εγενε

1140 τοι αλλ οφιε Αγαθον μηδεν πλεον
αυτω γενηται αλλα παρασκευαζον
οποι εμε και σε μηδεις διαβαλει του
[οιν] Αγαθωνα ειπεν και μην ομ Σω
κρατει κινδυνεις αληθη λεγενεν

1145 τεκμαρομαι δε και ος κατεκληνη
ev μεσο εμου τε και σου ινα χωρις
ημας διαλαβην ουδεν ουιν πλεον

ασε
αυτω εσται αλλ εγω παρ ελθενεν κατα
κλινησμαη: πανυ γε φαναι τον

1150 Σωκρατη δευρο υποκατο εμου κα
τακλεινου: ω Ζευ ειπεν τον Αλκη
βιαθην οια αυ πασχω υπο του ανθρω
που οιεται μου δειν πανταχη περι

αιναι: αλλ ει μη τι ω θανμασι εν [με]
1155 με[σος ε]μου εα Αγαθωνα κατα[κει]
[σθαι] αλλ αδυνατον φαναι τον
Σωκρατη σε μεν γαρ εμε επινεσας

dei δε εμε αυ του επι δεζη επανει
eαν οὐν ὑπὸ σοι κατακλῆθη Ἀγαθῶ

1160 οὖν δὴπον ἐμὲ παλιν επανεστα πρὶ
ὑπ εμον μαλλιν επανεβημαι

σῆς το μειρακίων ὑπ εμον επανεβη

1165 εγκωμιασαι ίουν ίου φαναι τον Ἀγα
θωνα Αλκιβιάδη ουκ εσθ ὁποις αν

evβαδε μεναιμι αλλα παντος[[α]] μαλ


1175 του μεν ου[ν] Ἀγαθωνα ως κατ[α]κει
[ση]αι εξαιρηθες δε κωμαστας ηκειν

Col. xxxi.

παμπολλους επι τας θυρας και επι
tυχοντας αν[[α]]ωγμεναι εξιον

1180 τος τινος εισω αντικρου πορευεθαι

1185 μεν ουν Ερυξιμαχου και τον Φαι

Plate VI.

223 A

223 B

223 C
διαθειν αν\[\varepsilon\] πολιν α\[\gamma\]ιν [μ]\[\alpha\]κρων των

1190 νυκτων ουσων εξεγερσαι δε προς
ημεραν η\[\delta\]η αλεκτρυ\[\sigma\]ων αισιουν
tων εξεγερμενο\[\varsigma\] δ\[\epsilon\] ιδειν τους

μεν αλλως καθε\[\delta\]ορτας και οιχος
μενους Αγαθωνα δε και Σωκρατη

1195 και Αριστοφανη ετι μονους εγρηγο
ρεναι και πινειν εγ μεγαλης φιλα

λης επι δεξια τον ουν Σωκρατη
αυτους διαλεγεσαι κατα τα μεν αλ
λα ο Αριστοδημος ουκ εφη μεμη

1200 σθαι τον λογων ουτε γαιρ ε\[\epsilon\] αρχης
παραγενεσαι ιππονυσταξειν τε

tοις

tο μεν κεφαλαιον εφη προσαναγ
καζειν τον Σωκρατη ομολογειν
αυτους τουν αυτων ανδρος ειναι

1205 κομωδιαν και τραγωδιαν επιστα
σθαι ποιειν και τον τεχνη τραγω
δοποιον ουτα κομωδοποιοι ειναι
tαυτα δη αναγκαζομενοι αυτοι\[\varsigma\]
και ου σφοδρα επομενους νυσταξει
d

1210 και προτερον μεν κατα\[\theta\] αρθειν το

Αριστοφανη\[\tau\] ε\[\delta\]η δε ημερας γι
γνωμενης τον Αγαθωνα τουν ουν
Σωκρατη κατακομμισαντα εκει
νους απιευναι και ωσπερ εισεθε επε

1215 σθαι και ελθοντα εις Λυκιον απο
η\[\epsilon\]ι\[\gamma\]ιμενον ωσπερ αλλοτε την
αλλην ημεραν δ\[\epsilon\]ι\[\alpha\]τριβειν και
κ\[\alpha\]ιν ουτω διατ\[\rho\]ι\[\psi\]αντα εις εσπε

ραν οικοι α\[\upsilon\]απανεσθαι;
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223 D

J.

T
Unidentified Fragments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δο</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω[</td>
<td>ρω[</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>το[</td>
<td>γ[</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ακα[</td>
<td>πα[</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>οφ[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>(j)</td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α[</td>
<td>αιν[</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(o)</td>
<td>(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ: Κ[</td>
<td>ω[</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q)</td>
<td>(r)</td>
<td>(s)</td>
<td>(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρε[</td>
<td>ν[</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plate VI.
48. παρη: l. παρη.
54. ἐπωτα has been corrected (by the first hand?) from ἐπωτος.
59. ἀλλο τι: so BT, Burn(ēt); the corrector’s reading ἀλλο τι η is found in Ven. 184, Vind. 21. The letter at the end of the line has been so effectually deleted that its identity is doubtful; the repetition of the article would be a natural blunder.
62. ῥαυ was omitted owing to ὑματιείτων.
66. The final ε of λέγεις has entirely disappeared, although the surface of the papyrus does not show signs of damage.
69. ὡ Σωκρατες κινδυνευο: κινδ. ὡ Σώκ. MSS.
71. έπας: so Vat. 227; είπες other MSS.
79. φιλε: φιλούμενο MSS.
84. The original scribe blundered over the name Διστιμας, writing a ν (or perhaps π) for μ and separating the final ε. W has μακτικης for Μαντινικης and similarly μακτικη at l. 671.
85. η of ην is altered from ει, i.e. ειναι was first written; the correction may be by the first hand.
88. ἐπισωταστο: ἐπισωπε MSS., which agree with the corrector’s της.
89. The addition of the rough breathing on ον is due to the second hand.
90. λογον εκειν ελέγευ: εκ. Ἑλ. λογ. MSS.
92. τι: so Burn, who attributes this reading to W, but wrongly, W having ἀπ’ like BT. ἐπ’ is found as a correction in the Cod. Coisl. and Paris. 1642.
93. δε δι: so TW; διδι Β.
94. διθηγησω: so MSS.; δι ηγησω Burn, with Schanz.
96. οποιος: ποιος MSS. The second ε in ἐπειρα was inserted after the ε had been written.
98-9. The word ἐφην was originally wrongly divided. The scribe also began to write some other letter in place of the first α of ἀνακριβουσα.
99. δε: γαρ MSS. There is an apparently accidental diagonal mark below the line after διη.
105. εφην λεγεις: λέγεις ἐφην MSS.
107. εφην was originally written for εφη η: the correction is probably by the second hand, which at the same time accented οιι.
112. το ορθα δοσαζειν: so T, Burn. τα ορθά W, το ὀρθοδοξαζειν B. &c.
ανευ: και ανευ MSS. Schanz omits και with Stallbaum.
117. τοιαυτο: τοιαυτω MSS.
125. The double dots and paragraphus marking a change of speaker are misplaced; they should have come at the next line.
126. τοιαυτω εφη: εφη τοιαυτω MSS.
131. The first of οι ομολογοσ has been corrected from ο, perhaps by the second hand. The papyrus omits εφην, which the MSS. read before λεγεις.
141. τα καλα: so B; om. τα Burn. with TW, Stobaeus. W inserts ογαθος και after τους.
142-3. The dittography is marked by a line drawn above the superfluous letters.
Cf. ll. 195. 333. 695-6. 712, &c.
147. πος αν: so B, Stobaeus; πας ὡ τω TW, Burn.
γε των: so Burn. with TW, Stobaeus; γε ὡν B.
148. α of ομοροσ seems to have been converted from an α.
153. εφη: so TW; εφην B, Stobaeus, Burn.
156. τη: so BT, Burn.; om. W, Stobaeus.
158. διαπροσθενευον: the common Egyptian spelling at this period.
163. το αν of αν corrected from α.
167. τας [της] λεγεις: so B, Stobaeus; om. τας TW, Burn.
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168. [μ]ωτ’εύνοι: so MSS.; μωτ’ευν Badham, Burn.
173. ιγηγηρησα: the interchange of λ and ρ is common. The deletion of the superfluous σ was probably by the second hand.
175. Stobaeus omits αν.
176-7. περὶ χειρογραφα: so Stobaeus; om. περὶ BTW, Burn.
τινας: the reading is not certain. α has been corrected (by the second hand?) apparently from ο, and above the spot where β of βαναυσος would be is the top of a rounded letter, which is probably β or σ. Perhaps τινας was first written, and the correction of ο obscured the σ which was rewritten above the line; but the remains suit a β rather better.
βαναυσος is a mistake for βαναυσος.
178. παλλοι τε: so Stobaeus; om. τε BTW, Burn.
179. There is a dot between ν and ε, and the two letters are rather farther apart than usual; but no pause here is possible. Stobaeus omits ευν.
180. και μητρος τυνε ευτω: so originally (ευτω) T; in BW τυνε ευτω precedes και μ.
183. υστερωτο: so Wbt (ευτω); ἡστερωτο Burn. with T, ἡστ. B.
189. εφ’εχθων: εφεσθων MSS.
190. κεκαθε: so some MSS.; κεκαθε Burn. with BTW.
194. και: so BT, Burn.; om. W.
195. καθι... Περον came in here from l. 200, the error being caused by the repetition of Ἀφροδητης.
202. πεινη: so TW; πενης B.
203. The second α in απαλος has been corrected from ο.
207. και: but και in ll. 203 and 209.
208. νταδος: so Burn. with BW, Origen; -ος T.
211. και αναθος και αγαθος: τοις και τοις ἡμ. MSS.
213. αμοιδας was apparently originally written, νος having been converted from μοι; μηλαιος MSS.
215. πορμος is a correction from φρονιμος, perhaps due to the original hand. ποροσμος (B) and φοροσμοω are also found.
216. φαρμακης: l. και φ. with MSS.
218-9. της ημερας: την αυτης τη. MSS.; the omission is to be accounted for by the ὁμοστελευτων.
219. και: so B; τε και TW, Origen, Burn.
220. The corrector took the first παλι with αποθημενει, but there is little to be said for his reading, which has no other support.
224. αυ και: τε αυ και T, Burn., δυ αυ και Origen, τε και B.
229. σαφοι: l. σαφοι. ε was apparently written originally in place of the first σ.
230. χαλεπη: χαλεπων MSS.
232. αυτω: so T (αυτ.), Wb (αυτ.); αντι B.
237. δη: so TW, Burn.; δη B.
239. αυ εις: αυν BTW, omitting εις. αυ Burn., who wrongly attributes this reading to W; it is found in Ven. 184, Vind. 21. The papyrus is probably right.
243. μετοξον is a common spelling.
248. ωθης: l. ωρης.
251. ελεγε: λεγει MSS.
εμαι ερωτα: ερωτα εμαι MSS.
252. αυμας: so some late MSS.; αυμα Burn. The ω of το is corrected from ο.
254. αβρον is a correction by the second hand from αγαθον.
253. τελειον: τέλειον MSS.
254. τι: so B, Burn.; om. TW. The letters -τοι Σω are corrected.
255. ρα: so Biom and other MSS. (ερα), ροδ b; ροδ is necessary. Cf. l. 276.
256. The accent on τι is dubious. There are two short dashes visible above the line, meeting like α ν.
257. The termination of αυτω and άλ in αλλ have been altered, but it is doubtful what was first written. Perhaps αυτω άλλ should be read.
258. ταθει: so TW, Burn.; ταπαθει B.
259. ταμεθει seems to be for ταμεθι, though this form is not Platonic. ταωιθε MSS.
The τ has been corrected from a δ. It is unlikely that οιαν δει was intended.
260. χ of προχενσθαι seems to have been altered, and the final ι was perhaps not originally written.
261. τα: so BTW as in l. 266; om. Ven. 184 and Schanz; ερω Burn. with the Aldine edition.
262. The second hand has made good the omission of the repeated ευλαμουνές. δ in l. 281 is over >.
263. α ρ blotted.
264. δι: so B; δι ΤW, Burn.
265. αρα: so T, Burn.; om. BW. The supposed base of an ε above ιδοι may be the left-hand dot of a diaeresis on ι.
266. τω: τι BTW, τοι Vind. 21, Burn. τω may be right, but the marginal ο is unintelligible.
267. αν is mistakenly omitted by W.
268. εχουντω: so ΤW; εχουσι B, Burn.
269. μοροι: so BT, Burn.; μορο W with μοριον as a variant.
270. τουτα: l. τουτο with MSS.
271. χρηματισμ α was first written: the correction is likely to be by the second hand.
272. εχουν: εχουσι (BTW) or εχουσι MSS.
273. ε in the termination of κινδυνεις has no doubt been converted from a σ, κινδυνουσι having been originally written.
274. ειναι, which was repeated by mistake, is cancelled by the line drawn over it; cf. l. 142, note.
275. ανθρωπι: so BT; αν άνθρωποι Bekerker, Burn.
276. The recurrence of των γαθον led to the omission of η σοι δοκουσι ... γαθον, which has been supplied by the second hand in the upper margin. των γαθον there is in agreement with BW; τιγαθου Τ.
277. πρασδηταν was written originally both here and in l. 346.
278. αν ν: so BT, Burn.; om. W.
279. αυτω: so ΤW; αυτο B.
280. δε: so Paris. 1642; δι BTW, Burn.
281. τουτο: so MSS.; τουτο Bast, Burn.
282. των: so Τb, Burn.; των Τb, των with π. l. των W.
283. α of αυτο has been corrected from ο αυτον Τ.
284. συντασις: so B, Burn.; συντασις TW.
285. The two dots marking the end of the speech are misplaced as at l. 125. The α of μαθησεμενος has been corrected.
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361. δη: ήδη MSS., as regularly; η δ' η Bekker, Burn.
363. καπ: so TW, Burn.; om. B.
364. τυπ: so BW, Burn.; om. T.
368. και: so Badham; τοι και MSS. Burn. brackets η γαρ ... τοκος εστω
with Ast.
370. τουτο is crossed through, probably by the corrector.
372. εκείνω: so B, Burn.; εστιν TW. θ in ἄβανατον is corrected from ν.
373. τα: so B, Burn.; ταύτα TW. The second ν of γενεσις is blotted.
376. δεο; so B; δειφ τ (v.l. δεφ) W.
382. εινασπιράται: ωσπειράται T and (with v.l. -εται) W, Burn.; σωσπειράται B.
383. αναλεσται: there is not room for αναελεσται (BW, Burn.); ανειλεσται T.
386. πετοσιε: so TW, Burn.; ποίησις B.
388. απολιηζη: so TW, Burn.; ἀπολαίησθαι.
391. The marginal note is obscure. It seems to begin ὠν (πι τοι) ὀν (τως) εἰς, and possibly refers to εις, though that word hardly required explanation. The letter after ρω may be γ and the following doubtful s may be ε or perhaps o. For ὠν (πι τοι) cf. e.g. 841. II. 79.
393. γενεσις: γεννησε ΜSS. αει γενεσις: l. αειγενεσ with MSS.
402. τ ο τι corr.
404. αεισαμεν: αεισιμεγ Burn.; cf. l. 422 διανεμει, l. 692 ενθεµει.
406. επαινημησθαι has been corrected from -μωσι, probably by the second hand.
412. τοιτων και: so BT, Burn.; om. και W.
415. ανω: αντα MSS. The final α of παρατευμεναι has been corrected from ω.
421. ελεγον: αν ελεγον B, Burn.; ανελεγον B, αν ελεγον TW.
425. Διασιμα is perhaps intended, but Διασ. was first written.
431. α of ὄφηδοςφασεν is corrected from ο. The high dot between θ and a of δαναφε, but it is presumably accidental.
435. τε: the papyrus is rubbed, but the vestiges suggest τε (so T, Burn.) rather than το (W.). B has το είναι ἄβανατος, omitting και.
436. τη γενεσι is bracketed by Burn., following Vermehren. α of αει corr.
438. The letters ει after και have dots over them, which may mean that ει was to be cancelled; but ει cannot be spared, and they are apparently unintentional.
443. τωτα = τωτα; το αντα MSS., Burn.; similarly in l. 451.
449. τροποι: τόποι B.
452. The second γ of γενεσια seems to have been altered from ν, and λν in απωλεσται also shows signs of cancellation.
453. ειτ: so B, Burn.; εστω TW.
462. μνημη: so Paris. 1462, Vat. 229, Sauppe; μνήμη ΜSS., bracketed by Burn. with Bäuerl. Either μνήμη ... μνήμη οτ μελετη ... μνήμη would give a sense.
465. The lectionary marks added to ου τω warn the reader against the reading οτω which is actually found in B.
466. ανων: so B (Bekker) and some other MSS.; l. αυτο.
469. ενκαταληπτων, the reading of the first hand, occurs in some inferior MSS.; εγκατα-
λειτων BTW, Burn.
471. μετεχεις: the papyrus is the only authority for this reading, which was restored by Stephanus; μετεχει MSS.
472. αδηματων: so MSS.; δδονατον Burn. with Creuzer.
481. [εφ]το: so BT, Burn.; om. W. The size of the lacuna indicates that the papyrus read εφει simply (B), not εφει γε (TW, Burn.).
487. ει: so TW; ει B, Burn.
490. ἑαυτῶς: so BT, Burn. πάντες W. T. omits μᾶλλον.
493–6. W omits αν . . . προαποθανεῖν owing to the διευτελεύτων.
498. l. βασιλέας.
507. κατὰ τα: so Paris, 1812, &c.; om. τα BT, Burn.
517. κυριεται was first written, αι and ε interchanging as commonly. Cf. l. 747, &c.

om. τα MSS.

τεκεῖν confirms a conjecture of Hug (τίκτειν Jahn); κυνίν MSS., Burn.
523. τα: so MSS.; τά Burn, following Sommer.
526. αυ: so B; δ’ αύ TW, Burn.
527. εκκυμων: l. εγκυμων.
θεῖον: so MSS. ἦδος Burn. with Parmentier.
529. ἐπιδήμη agrees with a conjecture of Stephanus, punctuating after αυ. ἐπιθεμεί MSS.
530. δή: so BT, Burn.; δ’ W. B has περὶ δύν for περίδον.
539. περί: so MSS. Burn. brackets with Stephanus.
544. παραῳ και απω is the order of BW, Burn. απ. καὶ π. T. The deletion of αυτ is probably by the second hand.
551. The accent distinguishes πᾶς αὕ from πᾶσαν, and the mark of short quantity shows that αὐ is not equivalent to αὐν. ε in the termination of κεκουσμηκτεῖν is a correction
554. eἰς Πισιδιαν: om. eἰς MSS.
560. κατελείπτει: so b, Burn.; κατελείπεν . . . τῶ B, κατελείπετο TW.
563. The papyrus probably had ημιν, as B; ἐμίν TW, Burn.
564. o Σαλων: om. o MSS.
566. ἐλησι: ἐν Ἑλλά, MSS.
567. αλλα: l. καλα with MSS.
568. καί: om. MSS.
571. The ν of ἀφθαρσων has been corrected from some other letter, perhaps ι.
576. εφη: l. εφη.
577. και αυ: om. MSS.; the addition adds emphasis and may be right.
578. εαυ: αὐ MSS., Burn. The double dots after η Bü follow from the mistaken reading εφη in l. 576.
582. αυτων: so TW; αἰτῶν B, Burn.
584. κα in καλους is corrected, perhaps from πολ.
585. το επι: so rightly BT; τῷ ἐπι W.
586. τα: so TW rightly; τῶ B. T omits επι.
590. τοιτο: so BW, Burn.; τούτῳ T.
592. There are small oblique dashes, which are presumably accidental, over the σ of χάλασαι and after εαυ in l. 597.
597–8. και εαυ: so BT, καὶ αὐ W; καὶ Hermann, Burn.
600. καί: so MSS.; Burn. brackets with Badham.
601. W. has ει τινες.
609. ειδῆ is probably meant for ἔδη (TW; ἕνειδη B).
611. το παρ: so MSS.; τῷ παρ Burn. with Schleiermacher.
614. εινος is a correction from τινος, perhaps by the first hand.
618. τικτεί is the reading of the great majority of the MSS., but the papyrus may of course have had the right reading τικτη.
619. ροσθείς: ροτείς W.
631. The final ν of γεγυμομενον is corrected from σ, and the same alteration was perhaps made in the case of αυξανομένον in the line below.
635. τοδὲ: l. τοτε. The omission of ουδε was probably caused by the preceding ου.
637-8. or ... oυξρος is bracketed by Burn. with Voegelin.
639. aυτο : so BT, Burn.; αυτό W.
640-1. αυτέ εν : l. αυτέν oμ with MSS. or αυτέ εν oμ.
645. μετ : so apparently the papyrus; l. μεθ.
647. τρεπθαν τινα : so B, Burn.; τινα τρ. TW.
649. εκείνο : so B, Burn.; εκείνω TW.
651. It is most unlikely, on account of the space, that the papyrus had δε δη as TW; δη simply B, Burn.
652. There is an oblique mark like an accent above the o of απο, but it may be unintentional; cf. note on l. 592.
665. και : so MSS.; ους Burn., with Schanz.
669. αυτο : the ω is almost certain; l. αυτο.
670. There is a dot above the ν of στυν, which may mean that the letter was to be cancelled; but the practice of the writer as to the use of ν εφελκωτικον is quite inconsistent.
674. ιδη : so W, Burn.; ειδής BT.
675. There is an (apparently accidental) curved mark above the π of παιδες.
679. μα of autou added later.
681. µονον θεασασθαι: θ, µόνον B; θεασθαι µόνον TW, Burn.
684. θ of καθορον has been altered from a τ. l. αναπλεων.
689. εφι : so BW, Burn.; om. T. The λ of φαιδον is rewritten; a high dot before the φ is probably meaningless.
695-6. The dittoegraphy was caused by the recurrence of εφαπτομενω.
699. θεοφιλει : so l, Burn.; θεοφιλη BTW.
701. Φαιδρε : δ Φαιδρε MSS.
708. The final α of ανθρα is corrected from i.
712. τον ερωτα was written in careless anticipation of the sense.
718. The coronis, which is similar to those in the Pindar papyrus (841), marks the close of the section. Others occur at l. 1122 and at the end of the dialogue.
721. επικεφαλειν τε λεγει τι : λεγει τι επτ. MSS.
724. αυλειον; so l, Burn.; αυλον BT (? W). The testimony of the papyrus on such a point is, however, of little value.
728. l. σκεψατε. The scribe perhaps took the words for ανε (οιχ) εφεστε.
730. πανομεθα : anapavomeba MSS.
741-3. The scribe blundered badly here. The fact that he wrote n (the termination of των) στεφανωμενον in 1. 741 is an indication that he also wrote στεφανωμενον in ll. 742-3, though the corrector may have deleted the superfluous μενον. The line drawn above the letters should have extended to τε either in l. 741 or 742.
747. δεξασθε (B, Burn.) is corrected from δεξασθαι. δεξασθε TW.
748. απα [ερ] : so TW; φερε B, Burn.
749. ηδομεν : so TW, Burn.; ηδομεν B.
753. The words are bracketed by Burn. with F. A. Wolf.
755. W has καταγελασαθαι.
763. A low dot between -τοι and ιτο is probably meaningless.
770. ὧς ἐκεῖνον καθίσειν BTV, &c., which is unsatisfactory, and is bracketed by Burn. with Badham. The papyrus has quite clearly κατίθε, which may be a mistake for καθίσειν, caused by κατίθε in l. 766. But it may also be interpreted as κατ(α)δείν, which would give a good sense: Socrates made room as soon as he saw Alcibiades.

776. δε τρίτος: so W, Burn.; δέ τρ. B, τρ. δέ Τ.

778. oriv: B has ὤρι.

779-80. τοῦτο τί ὑπ': so TW, B, τοῦτ' εἰσείν B and as a variant W.

783. ο of κατεκυσο is corrected from τ. The dittography has been eliminated in the usual way.

786. ως: we print the reading of the MSS.; καὶ Hermann, νῶς Hug.

789. The first letter of the line was almost certainly τ, i.e. the papyrus had τι εμπαθησω: διεμπαισω MSS. There is an oblique stroke, no doubt accidental, immediately below the μ.

797. It is unlikely that anything stood in the papyrus after ουτοσι. ουτοσι ... Τ, ούτοσι πῶς Coisl.

798. διωμεστα: so B, Burn.; διωμάσια TW. The τ though rubbed is practically certain.

828. ανταίρω was originally written; the alteration may be by the first hand.

829. The reading of the first hand, whatever it was, does not appear to have made sense. There was probably some alteration also at the beginning of l. 830. The accent on ε was added by the corrector.

830. εδειπτεν η' κει: so MSS.; εδειπτόκειεσεν Burn., δειπτόκειεσεν Bekk., Anecd. i. 346. 23. δειπτόκειεσεν: so MSS.; δειπτ. δει Burn. with Bekker, Anecd. i. c.

840. επεδιγ' γε: om. γε MSS.

841. νος is for οφε: cf. l. 828, note, &c.

842. μενες: μονον was originally written.

846. The papyrus probably agreed with B and T marg. in reading δη, the omission of which would make the line unnaturally short; om. TW.

847. The supplement in the middle of the line is somewhat long, but not impossible. εχ' εω cannot be read; perhaps αω was omitted.

852. l. αφανεσι: there is no trace of the final i.

859. γνωσομενοιν: γν. τε MSS., but the supplement is already somewhat long.

862. τε: so B'T, Burn.; τε καὶ W.

863. οὐ is a correction from ος. B has δειγ' η for δηγησι.

864. γαρ η γυνη: so TW; γυνη γαρ B. Burn., following Usener, brackets γυνη as not read by Schol. B.

867. μη: so BW; καὶ μη Τ, Burn. ν of νου seems to have been corrected from μ.

876. τε τοτε: so TW, Burn.; but τοτε (B) is just as likely to have been written.

(According to Schanz, B has τε and T omits it.)

877. The letters νυν λ are converted from συλγ.

878. τε: τι B.

880. The termination of επιθ εατε is corrected from ήατ.

883. καὶ is superfluous: om. MSS.

891. εχω: so B, Burn.; ἦχω TW.

893. χαρίσθαι: χαρίζθαι MSS.
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... so B, Burn.; τε TW.
896. ὠν στὶ: so TW, Burn.; ὁν τε B.
898. μοί: the vestige of the letter before σ is too small for certainty, but suits considerably better than ν, μοι Vind. 21, Burn.; μοι BTW.
905. ὁ φιλε Ἀλκ. is the ordinary reading.
910. [τ]οι: so BTW, Burn.; τι other MSS., Bekker.
913. τε.: so BT, Burn.; om. W.
924. There may have been two dots after ϕ, the lower one of which is effaced.
925. εὐν: so TW, Burn.; ἐμοί B.
928. σοι τε] στι: στι σοι τε MSS. The o is quite doubtful, but the letter after τ is plainly ε, not ε.
935. βελτι: so TW; βέλη B, Burn.
940. The size of the lacuna suits τούτου (TW, Burn.) better than τούτου (B).
944. B has av, but τοῦτο without av (TW) is equally possible here.
948—9. [και] περι ἕκτον: καίτερ ἕκτον TW, καίτερ κέινο B, καίτου κέινο Burn. περι, which gives no sense, is doubtless a slip for -περι.
954. η ει: so B, Burn.; om. ει TW.
955. ε of με is converted from η; to which hand the correction is due is doubtful.
960. The Attic form ὕμνη (so MSS.) required no alteration.
961. εὑρίσκεται: κατερείαν MSS.
962. οὐθ, which was first written, is the reading of BTW; οὐθ' Paris. 1810, 1642, Vat. 229. ὁργείμην has been altered from ὁρικομην.
963. ει κα: om. ει MSS. rightly.
964. [συν]οντας: συνδεόμενα was originally written.
966. ηδεν: so W; ἡδη B, Burn.
χε: so TW; τε B, Burn.
969. The scribe first wrote αὐθεστα.
970. δη: so BT, Burn.; τε W.
979. [οπο]ταν: so BT; ὧδητ W, Burn.
απολειφθεῖτε is the reading of the MSS.; ἀπαληφθεῖ Cornarius, Burn.
983. The erroneous λ has not been struck out.
986. [ὁ] παραγω: so TW rightly; ὁππαγ B.
θαυμαζομαιτων: so Vind. 21; θαυμαστῶτατον BTW, Burn.
987. The slight vestiges suit εώραι κε εν (TW, Burn.) not εώρακεν (B).
992. ε in the termination of χειμωνίς is a correction from ο.
993. παγον: so B, Burn.; τοῦ π. TW.
995. η οὐκ: so B, Burn.; om. η TW.
996. δη: so TW, Burn.; η B. The η of ημεθερμενων was corrected from ε, and τεθ from ηο, i. e. the scribe at first omitted τε δαυμαστα.
999. ουτος: so Vind. 21; οὐτος δ' BTW, Burn.
1000. [ο]ποιτερ: so B, Burn.; ολοι TW.
1003. οι αλλα is corrected from ου.
1005. The scribe misunderstood οφων, connecting the σ with καταφρονοῦσα; cf. l. 1015. note.
1007. [αυ] τοι: so W, Burn.; αὕτι BT, B having also ἐρεῖτε.
1008. Probably no significance is to be attached to the fact that whereas in l. 974 an ε has been added above the i of στρατια, here there is no such insertion. Burn. reads στρατια with Cobet; στρατείας MSS.
1011. ανει: l. ανει. B has προχώρησι for προνχ.
1014. ε of δαμαία κωστε is corrected from ο.
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1015. *ως: om. MSS. The first scribe unintelligently divided the word *εωθωράων as *εωθω *ράων.
1016. W adds καί before τελευτατέρει.
1017. *ιωκον is the traditional reading, in place of which various conjectures have been proposed.
1025. καί: om. MSS.
1030-1. *τετραμεθυνον *ουκ εξελόων: so BW, Burn.; *οίκ εξ. τετρ. T. The second λ of *αλλα is corrected, apparently from σ.
1032. *Σωκράτης: cf. l. 1051, though Σωκράτης is rightly written in l. 1051.
1034. *ο of παρακαλεόμεια is altered from ω and α of δαρμέων from ε.
1038. *φιλοι: so some MSS., Stephanus; φιλοί BTW, Burn.
1061. *αφαίτο: ἄφεται MSS.
1062. B has ἀρίστησιν.
1063. *αὐτός: αὑτός MSS.
1069. There is not room in the lacuna for *μεν (so MSS.) after των.
1071. *δή: om. MSS. ανθρωπον is a slip for ανθρώπων.
1072. *εἰναι μέσα: so TW, Burn.; εἰναι με B.
1077-8. The transposition of καί . . . *αλλας κατα . . . τίς was necessary. W has τοῖς for ταύτα (ταύτ᾽).
1080. το of *αποσκευα is converted from a, and the first upright of π was originally curved, i.e. the scribe began to write ανθρωπός.
1083. *οι: so TW; *ει δέ B, Burn. B has λέγων for λέγω (TW, Burn.).
1089-90. των . . . λογοίν: so TW, Burn.; τῶν . . . λόγον B.
1090. *παράνυ: so TW, Burn.; om. B.
1091. τμα: so B; τν των TW, δή τμα Burn. with Baiter.
1094. *κανθάλων: κανθάλων MSS.
1099. B has διαγραφόμενοι.
1100. *αυ: so MSS.; *αδ Beker, Burn.
1124. *εἶσκε τι ε or τε seems to have been first written; it is uncertain to which hand the correction is due. l. παρρησία.
1129. *φανα is a correction from *εφη.
1130. *ονεκά: l. αν ενεκά (TW, Burn.). The ν is corrected from a δ, and it is curious that B has ὀνδὲ instead of ὀδ.
1142. *διάδανα: so Burn. following Hirschig. διαδάνη BTW.
1148. The first ε of κατακλησάμεια is corrected from η.
1153. l. περιεινή.
1157. *εμε: so B, Burn.; με TW.
1159. *κατακλῆθι: κατακλή MSS.
1160. *π of δηπον is corrected from μ, and ε was twice written for αι in επαινεται.
1167. *παντων: MSS. παντώ, which is unexceptionable, though παντως would also give a good sense. The δ of εινθεί was converted from σ.
1173. εὐποροῦ: l. εὐποροῦς.
1179. αναλογικάς was first written.
1180. εἰν: εἰς τὸ MSS.
1186. τούτων: om. MSS. rightly.
1187. εἰπον δὲ: ἦ θέ ΒΒ, ἧ θά τις Τ.
1189. The first scribe wrote ἀντὶ πολὺ.
1191. Below the ὁ of αὐθοτοῖοι are some accidental marks.
1194–5. Σοκρατῆς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης: this is also the order in Ven. 184 and Vind. 21. Ἀρ. καὶ Σωκ. BTW, Burn.
1196. μεγάλης φύ(λο) αλη: so Paris. 1642, Vat. 229; φ. μεγ. BTW, Burn.
1207. κομοδόπωσον: so BTW; καὶ κωμ. Vind. 21, Burn.
1210. προεροῦν: so TW; πρώτον B, Burn.
1211. 1. Αριστοφάνης.
1213. κατακομματα: so BW, Burn.; κατακομμάτα T.
1214. καὶ ωσπερ: so MSS.; Burn. inserts (f) before ὡσπερ with Hermann.
1218. καὶ was apparently repeated by mistake, and overlooked by the corrector.
1220–1. The title is placed opposite the middle of the preceding column.
Fr. (b). The letters after ὠς have been altered or deleted. But it is possible that the fragment should be turned the other way up, when the reading would be }\left[\omega\right]_\alpha\varepsilon\iotaν.
Fr. (r). This small fragment from the top of a column clearly comes from this papyrus, but cannot be certainly placed in any of the columns remaining. It might belong to Col. 1, where δοκεῖ probably stood in the first line, but there would be no ο in underneath the δ unless there was a variation as to the position in the sentence of βουλοῦτ' ἄν.
Fr. (u) is from the bottom of a column.

844. ISOCRATES, Panegyricus.

Height 31.1 cm. Plate VII (Cols. ix–x).

These considerable remains of a roll containing the Panegyricus of Isocrates extend from § 19 to § 116, though with some serious lacunae. Forty-seven columns were occupied by the ninety-six sections, and the total number would have been about eighty-six, for which it may be estimated that some 24 feet of papyrus would have been required. The manuscript was a handsome one written in a rather large calligraphic uncial hand very similar to that of the Rossal Demosthenes, of which a facsimile is given in Kenyon's Palaeography, Pl. 16; cf. also the Hawara Homer (ibid., Pl. 20) and 20. Kenyon attributes the Demosthenes to the end of the first century, but it is perhaps more likely to belong to the earlier decades of the second, to which we should assign this Isocrates papyrus. There is often a marked decrease in the size of the letters at the ends of lines, and in order to save space T is lengthened so that the crossbar
comes above the tops of the letters adjoining. Short lines are filled up by the usual angular sign. A paragraphus is used to mark a pause, and is sometimes accompanied by a short blank space at the end of the sentence; the three varieties of stop, high, middle, and low, are also freely added, though in a good many cases probably by the second hand, to which a number of corrections and alterations are due. No other lectional marks occur beyond a rare sign of elision or breathing inserted by the corrector. Iota adscript was originally not usually written, but has mostly been supplied later.

Like the British Museum papyrus of the De Pace, the present text of the Panegyricus is unfortunately of a distinctly poor quality, and does little beyond establishing still more clearly the superiority of the codex Urbanas (Γ). It is characterized by a number of additions, some of which are evident interpolations and none is convincing; the most flagrant example is at ll. 344-50, where a sentence founded on a subsequent passage is inserted without apparent reason; cf. ll. 17, 42, 77, 164-5, 258, 302, 355, 356, 421, 558, 561. On the other hand the papyrus occasionally exhibits a shorter text, either on its own authority (ll. 449, 562) or in agreement with Γ against the vulgate (ll. 202, 264, 395, 480, 497, 608, 609, 669). Though on the whole the coincidences with Γ predominate, agreements with MSS. representing an inferior tradition are frequent. Sometimes the corrector has changed a reading of Γ into that of the vulgate or vice versa. Certain variants also appear which are otherwise only found in MSS. of the Περὶ Αἰτιῶν, where a large section of the Panegyricus is repeated; cf. notes on ll. 230-1, 400, 449, 558, 613-5. In view of the general character of the papyrus its variations in the order of words carry little weight; and it may be doubted whether there are more than a couple of readings for which an independent value can be claimed, i. 290 ελαττω γε as conjectured by Cobet, and l. 659 συμπεινθησαντις, a variant recorded by Victorius but actually found in no MS. The archetype from which this text was derived appears to have been defective in places; cf. ll. 33-5, 291, and 605.

In the collation given below we have made use of the Teubner edition of Blass, the apparatus of which is unfortunately very limited. Proofs of the text of the papyrus were sent to Prof. E. Drerup in order to be utilized for his forthcoming critical edition of Isocrates, and to him we owe some references to individual MSS. of the vulgate. Differences with regard to elision, insertion or absence of ν ἐφελκυστικόν, interchange of ει and ι, &c., are not separately noticed.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Col. i.

\[\text{von} \ \eta \text{mas e} \text{dida} \breve{a} \text{san} \ e \ \eta \text{mas di} \ \$ 19\]
\[\mu \text{oi di oun am} \phi \text{oteren} \ \text{e} \text{vka pro} \text{s} \text{ekei per} \text{i} \]
\[\text{tauta po} \text{ignsas} \text{thai te} \text{n} \]
\[\pi \text{leist} \text{en} \ \delta (i) \text{a} \text{tri} \breve{b} \text{n} \]
\[\mu \text{ali} \text{sta meen ina prouv} \]
\[\text{gou ti ge} \text{ntai' kai pao} \]
\[\text{samo} \text{ni} \text{te} \text{s} \text{pros} \ \eta \]
\[\text{e} \]
\[\text{ma} \text{s auto} \text{us filou} \text{ni} \text{k} \]
\[\text{to as ko} \text{n} \text{en tois barba} > \]
\[\text{pois pole} \text{mer} \text{s} \text{ow} \text{men} \]
\[\text{ei de tout eost'[ai] ada} \text{na} \ \$ 20\]
\[\text{ton, ina de} \text{lo} \text{sw} \text{tous} \]
\[\text{em} \text{p} \text{odw} \text{on o} \text{n} \text{tas te} \text{n} \]
\[\text{15 [ta} \text{on} \text{Ell} \text{hnw} \text{on en} \text{dai} \]
\[\text{moi} \text{ai' kai pas} \text{i ge} \text{n} \text{ntai} \]
\[\text{[p} \text{a} \text{ner} \text{on} \text{. oti kai to pro} \]
\[\text{[te} \text{ron} \text{eta} \text{on} \text{[p} \text{o} \text{li} \text{es} \]
\[\text{[di} \text{ka} \text{i} \text{o} \text{sw te} \text{s ba'layt} \text{t} \text{es} \]
\[\text{20 } \text{[e} \text{pe} \text{v} \text{e' kai nyn o} \text{[v} \text{ke' adi} \]
\[\text{[k} \text{wos amphi} \text{s} \text{ بت} \text{[e' }\text{[p} \text{e} \text{r} \text{i} \]
\[\text{[te} \text{ns y} \text{e} \text{m} \text{onias [to} \text{u} \]
\[\text{[to me} \text{nu [g} \text{a} \text{p} \text{e' }\text{ei de} \text{]y} \text{v} \text{on} \text{da' sa} \text{n} \]

Col. ii.

\[\text{avtei parame} \text{nei a} \]
\[\text{25 [i]ou} \text{ai de te} \text{n y} \text{e} \text{moni} \]
\[\text{a[v} \text{e} \text{e' in ovst} \text{per al} \text{lo ti} \]
\[\text{g} \text{e} \text{e' ras } \text{te} \text{s pr} \text{w} \text{tous tu} \]
\[\text{chi' tas} \]

Col. v.

\[\text{ta} \text{as } \text{[a} \text{vtei} \]
\[\text{30 [e} \text{r} \text{e} \text{g} \text{e} \text{ias kai } \text{ta} \text{as xr} \text{e} \text{i} \]
\[\text{[a} \text{vtei kai } \text{ta} \text{as [w} \text{fel' e' } \text{ias } \text{tas} \]
\[\text{[a} \text{p} \text{avtei g} \text{i} \text{no} \text{m} \text{e' } \text{nas} \]

\[\text{\ldots} \]

\[\text{\ldots} \]

\[\text{\ldots} \]
Col. vii.

γοῦμενος καὶ πρῶτον τε

[νεόμφις] καὶ πρὸς τας

35 [[γενομένων]] τεχνῶς εὐ

φιεστ[α]τοῦς οὐτας καὶ

[πρὸς [τὰ τῶν θεῶν εὐ]

σ[e]βεσ]τατα διακείμε

ν'ους] καὶ μὴν οὐσιν

40 [πρὸς]ήκει τίμης [τὴν]χα

[νεὶ]ν τοὺς θηλικο[ντῶν]

[αγα]θων αἰτιοὺς γ'ε'γερ >

[νη]μενως περιεργῶν


[σα]μῦντι τ'ο μέγεθος εὐ

[ρεί]ν ητ[ε]ς ἵση τοῖς πε

[πρα]γμενο[ίς] εστίν' πε

[πι] μ[ε]ν οὖν τοῦ μεγί >

50 [στ']οι τῶν εὐεργετήμα

[τὼν] καὶ προτον γενομέ

[νο]ν καὶ πα]σι κοινοτά

[τοῦ ταυτ ε]χομεν εἰπείν

[περί δὲ τοὺς] αὐτο[ύς] χρο

55 [νο]υς ὀρώσα] τῶν μ.εν

[βαρβαρους] τὴν π'λεί

[στὴν τὴς χωράς κατε]

[χοντας τ]ους δ [Ε]λλῆ

[νας εἰς μ]ικρὸν τοπον

60 [κατακεκλ]ιμενο[ν]['ς]

[καὶ διὰ σ]πανιστήτα

[τῆς γῆς ε]πιβουλευο

[τα]ς τε σφιχ]σιν αὐτοίς;

[καὶ στρατ]ίας επάλλη

Col. viii.

§ 33 [βοντε]ς τοὺς μαλ[ε]στα

75 [βιο]ν δεόμενους. καὶ >

[στρατ]ημο[ν]ι χαταστάντες

[αὐτο]ν· καὶ πολεμο[ν] κρα

[τη]σιν τοὺς βαρβά

[ροὺς] πολλὰς μεν εφ' ἐ

80 κατερας τῆς ηπειρο[ν] πο

λε[ι]ς εκτίσαν· ἀπασα

δε τας νησίους κατοκί

σαν· αμφοτέρους δὲ >

καὶ τους [ακο]λοθήσαν

85 [τα]ς καὶ τους ν['π][ο]μεν

[ναντας εσω]σιν τοις

[μεν γαρ ἵκανιν την]

[οικο] χωρ'αν κατελιπον·

[τοις δὲ πλείο]ς τῆς ὑπαρ

§ 34 90 Χουσις επορίσαν α

παίντα γαρ περιέλαβον

το τ[ούς τοπον ου ν]μ'ν τυ

χαν'ομεν κατεχοντες. ὡς

[τε καὶ τοις ναστε]ρον βου

95 [ληθεί]σιν απο]καταί τι

[ν]'ας καὶ μ.μη'σασθαι

[τη]ν πολιν την ἡμετε

ραν. πολλῆν [παί]στοι

νην εποίησαν· ὠν γαρ

100 [αυτο]ις δει κτί]ωμενος

[χωρα]ν διαικινδυνε

[ειν α]λλα εἰς τη]ν υφ η >


[εις τα]ξιν ο[ι]κεων ιον

105 τα'ς καί]τοι τι[ς] αν ταν

65 Λούς ποιοῦμενος·
καὶ τοὺς μὲν διευθετήσατο·
καὶ τὸν καθ’ ημέραν·
[τὸν δὲ διὰ τὸν πολέμον]
ημεραὶ προανοίγοντες·

70 ταῦθ’ οὕτως εὐχοτα
περιείδειν·

Col. ix. Plate VII.

[β]άρους αναστατουσ ποιοῦνες εὐσεβείς τοὺς Ὀλυμπίους
τοῖς τοσάκτων ἐυποροῖς
προσαγαγόντως·

120 [παρὰ]πρὸς τοὺς δεομένους
νοὶ εὐρίσκουσιν ἑποκράτα
ταὐτὰ·

125 [καὶ]πρὸς τοὺς δεομένους
νοὶ εὐρίσκουσιν ἑποκράτα
ταὐτὰ·

130 ἔπειδή τα μεγαλύτερα
συνδετέραξε τοὺς αὐτοὺς
καὶ τοὺς

135 πως οὕτως τῶν παραβότων
tοῖς ἀνθρώποις

Col. x. Plate VII.

155 ραδειγμά ποιηματἰσιν πρὸ
tοῦ γαρ καὶ νομοὺς ἑθεὶ·

160 περὶ τῶν φιλικῶν

165 λήλους εὐθυμεῖν εἰκονίδιον·

170 χριστὸν τοῖς προσερχομένον
tοῖς ἑτεροθείας

175 δὲ [δ]ικαίωσασα·
αλληλούς ἡμιν γεγο

140 νερ. μηδέν μεν ανευ
tης πολείως τῆς ἡμε
tερας εἶναι· τα δὲ πλεί
στα δια ταύτην γεγενή
cθαί· παραλαβοῦσα γὰρ § 39

tοὺς Ἑλληνας ανομοὺς
ζωντας· καὶ σποράδην
καὶ
οἰκουντας· τοὺς μεν ὑ
πο δυναστειῶν ὑβρίδο
μενοῦς· τοὺς δὲ διὰ αναρ

150 χιαν απολλυμένους. και
tοὺς των κακῶν
αυτῶν ἀπηλλαξαν
τῶν μεν κυρίας[ὲ] γενο
μενη· τοῖς δὲ αὐτὴν πα

[λ]· [π]οῖς παρ[ὲ]δώκε· τὴν
τοινυν αλλὴν διοικῆ
σιν οὔτως φιλοξένως

180 κατεσκευασατο καὶ
πρὸς ἀπαντᾶς οὐκε
ωσ. ὦστε καὶ τοῖς Χρῆ
ματων δεομενοί· καὶ
tοῖς ἀπολαύσαι τῶν

185 νπαρχοντων ἐπιθυμοῦ
σιν ἀμφοτεροίς ἀρμοτ
τείν· καὶ μῆτε τοῖς εὐ
δαιμονοῦσι· μήτε τοῖς
δυστυχοῦσιν εἰ ταῖς ε

190 αὐτῶν ἁρχηστός ἔχειν
ἀλλ' ἑκατεροίς αὐτῶν
εἶναι παρ ἡμῖν τοῖς μεν
ηδιστας διατριβὰς τοῖς
dε αὐσφαλεστάτην κατὰ

Col. xix.

μικρον εποιησαν αλλὰ
tοσούτων τας τυχας
ek[α]τερ'ων μετηλλα

200 ἔξαν. ὁμ[θ]ο μεν ἑκετεν
ei ἡμας αξιωσας βια
ton e[x]θρων απαθὸ το
σον ε[θ]η διαπραξα
μενος απήλθεν Ἑυρυσ

205 [θ]εους δε β[ι]ασαθαι προς
[δοκησας αυτος αἰχμα]
[λῶτος γενομένος κι[ε
[τῆς ἡμαγκασθ]]η κατα
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Col. xx.

[ετ]η[λευτησεν πολλων] § 61
[δ υ]παρ[χουσον ημιν]
ευ[γρησιων εις την πο
215 [λιν την] Λακεδαί[μονι]
[ον] περι ται[της μι]ωνης
[μο]ι συμβεβη]κεν ε’πειν
[αφ]ορ[η}ν γαρ] λαβον[τε]
[την δι [ημων] αυτοι]ς υε
220 [ν]ομε[υν σοιτηριαν]
[οι] προγ]ονοι μεν τω]ν
[ν]υν εν [Λα]κεδαιμ[ον]
[β]ασιλευντων εγγο[νοι]
[δ Ηρ]ακλεους κατηλ[θων]
[λακεδαιμ]οι[α] και Μεσ[σ]η
[ην οικ]ισται δε Σπα]ρ
[της εγενο]νυς και τω]ν

Col. xxii.

ωστε περ]ι μεν της εν
tois Ελλησι δυνασιεις.
ουκ οιδ οποι]ς αν της σα
fεστον επιδειξαι δυ
250 νηθειρ] δοκει δε μοι
και περι των προτερον
προς τους βαρβαρους τη
πολει πεπραγμενων >

210 [στηναι και τω] μεν ν
§ 60
[περενεγκ]οντι την
[ανθρωπιν]ην φυσιν.

Col. xxiii.

230 [παροντων] αγαθων [α]
[παντων αυτιοις αρι]η
[γοι κατεστη]σαν· ωιν ε
§ 62
[χρην εκεινοις με]μ
[νημενους μηδε]πο
235 [τ εις την] χωραν ταιτην
[εισβαλειν εξ] ης ορμη
[θευτε εις τοσανην]
[ευδαιμο]νιαν κατεστη
[σαν μηδ ε]ις] κινδυνους
240 [καθιστανα]ι την πολιν
[την υπερ των παιδων]
[tων] Ηρακλεους πρ[ο]
[κινδυνουσα]ν μη
[δε τοις] μεν απ εκεινου
245 [γενομενωις διδοναι]

§ 65 285 δουλωσα[θ]αι τους Ελλη
υν εφ ημας πρωτη]ς
§ 66 68 μεν ουν των πολεμων
[ο Περσικος γεονου]ν
290 μην ελαττω γε τεκμη
ο πολ
ρια τι[ο]μα των εργων εστι[ν]
προσηκεν ειπειν' αλ

255 λως τ'[[ε]] επειδὴ καὶ τον

ης

λογον κατεσταμην πε

ρι της η[γ'][ε]μονιας της ε

π εκεινους εσομεν[[ου]]ς·

απαιτας μεν ουν εξα

260 μηδουν τους κινδυν >

λι

νους αι αν μακρολογιοι

ην· περι δε των μεγι

στων τον αυτων τροπων

ι

οντερ ολιγον προτερον

265 πειρασομαι και περι του

των διελθειν' εστι γαιρ

§ 67

[α]ρχαοιστατα μεν των

[ε]θνων και η[α']ς μεγιστας

[δ']υναστειας εχοντα >

270 [Σ]κυθαι και Θηρακες και

[Πε]ρατινυ τυγχανουσι δ ου

[τω]ι μεν απαντες ημιν

[σα]

[επ']βουλευ[[ο]]ντες η δ[[ε]]μετρα

[πο]λις προς απαντας

275 [του]ς διακινουσθαι[ν]

[σα]ς' και τι λοιπων

[εο]ται τις αντιλεγοντας

[ηρ']ν επιδεικθαι των

[μ]ην Ελληνων οι μη

280 [δω]ναμεν' οι τυγχα

[νειν των δεικα[ι]ων η]

[μ]οις ικετευειν αξιων

[τες]' τ[η]ων δε βαρβαρων

[οι βουλομενοι κατα

tois peri tov patrion

αμφισβητουσιν· eti gαρ

tapeinhs ouhsis της Ελ

295 λαδοι ηλθουν εις την χω

ραν ημων Θρακες μεν

μετ Ευμολπου του Πο

σιδωνος. Σκυθαι δε με

τ Αμαζωνων των Αρη

300 ως θυγατερον· ου κα

[τα των] αυτων χρονου·

[αλλα] κα[θ] ο'ν καιρου ε

[κατερικι της Ευρωπης]

[επηρξον μισουτες >

305 [μεν α]ηταν το των Ελλη

[νων γ]ενων' ιδι[α'] δε προς

[ημας εγ'ελημ'ατα] πι[ο]ν;

ησαμενοι· νομι[ζον

tes ek [τ]ροτου του τρο

310 [πο]υ πι[ρος] μιαν μεν [πο

λιν κινδυνε'νσειν· απα

σων δε αρ[α] κρατησειν·

ου μην κατορθωσαν·

αλλα προς μονους τους

315 προγονους τους ημε

tερους συμβαλουτες.

ομους διεβαρθησαν. 

ω[σ]περ αν ει προς απαν

tas ανθρωπους επο

320 λειπαν· δηλον δε το

μεγεθος των κακων

tων γενομενων εκει

αν

νοις· ου γαρ· ποθ οι λογω
Col. xxiv.

περὶ αὐτῶν τοσοῦτον χρόνον γὰρ

325 νῦν διεμειναν. εἰ καὶ
[[μη]] τὰ πραξθέντα πολὺ
tῶν ἀλλῶν δι' ἤμνεγκεν,
λεγεται δ' ὅν περὶ μεν  § 70
Διαζουν ὁς τῶν μεν

330 ἐλθοῦσαν. οὐδὲμα πα
λιν ἀπηλθεν· [α]ύ δὲ ὑπολει
φθείρα· δι' αὐτὴν συνάδε
συμφορ'αν εἰκ] της [[ἐξ]] ἀρ
χῆς εξεβλ[ήθη]ν περὶ

335 δὲ Θρακων ὁτι τὸν ἀλλὸν
χρόνον ὁμοῖοι οἱ προσ
οικουτες ἡμῖν. διὰ την
tοτε γενομενὴν στρα
τειαν τοσοῦτον διελ

340 πον. ωστε εἰ τῷ μετα
ἐν τῇ χρωσα εὕνη πολ
λα. και γενὴ παντοδαπα-
και πολε[ῖς] μεγάλας κα
τοικισθηναι[ν] τοντων

345 δὲ οὐστο[ς] εχοντω[ν] οὐ
κ' οκνητ[ε]ον εἰς[ε] περὶ
tῶν υπόλοιπω[ν] εἰσπει
α δὴ συμφερε τοῖς πρα
γμασι μνησθηναι >

350 περὶ αὐτῶν καλὰ μὲν οὖν κα
ταντα καὶ πρεπο[ν]τα
τοις περὶ τῆς ἡγεμον[ν]ν
ας αμφισβητουσα[ν] α
δελφα δὲ τῶν εἰρη[μὲ]

355 νων καὶ τα τοιαι[θ] οια

Col. xxv.

κινδυνω[ν] εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν
χρόνον σὺ μπεσουντων

365 καὶ τῶν μὲν πολεμι
ων ανυπόστατον οἰο
μενων εϊναι διὰ το
πλῆθος. τῶν δὲ συμμα
χῶν ανυπ[ερβλητον

370 ἡ[γ]ομενοιν εχειν την
αρετην. αμ'φοτερων
κρατησαντες ας εκα
τερων προσθηκεν και
προσ απαντας τους

375 κινδυνο[μ] διενεγ
κοντε. εὕθως μεν
tων αριστε[ιων] ἡ[γ]
ωθησαν οὖν πολλα

δ' υπερον την αρχην

380 της βαλατ[ης] ελαβον
δον[τ]ων μ[ε]ν των αλ
[λων] Ἠλληνων οὐ
[κ] αμ'φισβητουντων
[δε] τωμ νυν [ημας α

385 [φαιρε]σθα[ῖ] ζητον
[τω]ν και μ'ηδεις οι
εσθω με αγ[νοειν] ο
τι κα[ε] Δικε[θαιμοι
οι περὶ το[ν]τοις τους

390 καιρους πι[ολουν
[αγα]θων αιτ[ιοι τοις
[Ἑλλ]ησι κατ'εστησαν
υπο
[αλλ]α δι' α τον [και
[μα]λλον επαφ[ι]ειν
ISOCRATES, PANEGYRICUS

περ εἰκὸς τοὺς ἐκ [τῶν
tοιουτών γεγονότας
]|ς"
οὶ πρὸς Δαρείουν [κα]
Ξερήν πολέμησα[ντες
360 ἐπεράζαν· μεγιστοῦ γάρ
ἐκεῖνον πολέμου συν
στάντος. καὶ πλείστων

Col. xxviii.
[ἐσκόπουν ὁπὸς ἀκρὶ
[βῶς καὶ καλὸς] ἔσχον >
405 [σιν ὦν ὄντω τοὺς] πε
[ρὶ τῶν ἵδιων σὺ]μβο
[λαίων ὦς τοὺς πε]ρὶ τῶν
[καδ ἐκαστὴν τῇν ημὲ
[παν ἐπιτηθεματὶν]

410 ἐ
tολ(ων) ἐ[
γραμμ(α
]ατα τῶν α' ()
]

395 [ἐξ]ῶ τὴν πολὺ[ν ωτι
[τοι]ούτων αντ[αγω
[ν]ιστῶν τυχοῦσα το
σουτων αυτῶν [διὴ
νεγκὲν· βουλὸμαι

400 δὲ μικρῶν μακροτε
ρὰ περὶ τῶν πολ[εων εἰ
πεῖν [καὶ μὴ α]γαν [ταχὺ

Col. xxix.

ἐσθαι καὶ σωτηρεῖς αλ

415 λὰ μὴ λυμ[ε]όνες [ἀπο
καλεὶ[σθαι τω] ποιε[ιν εν
προσα[γορε]π[δ]ένοι τας
ов
πολεις αλλ[α] μη] βια [κα]
tαστρεφομενοι πιο[το

420 τεροὶς μεν τοῖς λογοίς η
[καὶ μὲν τοῖς ὀρκοῖς χρῶ
[με]νοι· ταῖς δὲ συνήθη
[καὶ]ς ωσπερ ἀναγκαῖς

425 οὐχ [οὐτως επι] ταίσ
dυναστεῖας

11 lines lost.

[αυταῖς] διανοίας χρῶ
[μενο]ι καὶ τοὺς νέοις τε

440 [ρούς ε]ν τοιουτοῖς ηδὲ
[σι παῖδε]νων τες ὁ]τως
[ανθράς] αγα[θοὺς α]πεδει
[ξαν το]ὺς πολὲ[μὴ]ςαν
[τας πρὸς τοὺς εκ τῆς

445 [Ἀσίας ὦ]στε μὴ[θ]εν
[πωπο]τε δυνηθηναι
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

[περὶ αὐτῶν μητὲ τῶν
[ποιητῶν μητ[ε] τῶν
[τὰ]υν
[σοφίστων] ἀξίωσεν τούς
450 πραγματῶν [εἰσε]πε[ί]

Col. xxx.

ποίες γαρ αὖ γενομένων συμφέροντι τοιούτους αὖν
dρασίν οἱ τοσοῦτον μεν
tῶν επὶ Τροιαν στρατα
455 τευσαμενων διήνευ
cαλν

Col. xxxi.

[λε]πτησαίεν ἄλλα τῶν
[αὐτῶν τὸ]ις εκ τῶν θεῶν
[γεγο]ρουσίν καὶ καλὸν
460 [με]νοίς ημίδεοις ἄξιοι
[ὁ]θείων· καὶ γαρ εκεῖ
[νοι]τα μεν σωμάτα
[τα]ίας τῆς φύσεως ἀναγεννήθη
cοιησε ἀπεδοσάν της δ ἀ
465 [πε]τησ ἀθανατον την
[μυθήμην εποϊησάν·
[αι] εἰμι μεν οὐν οἱ θ [ημ]ε
[τέροι] προγονοι καὶ Δα
[κεδα]ίμοιοι φιλοτι
470 [μοι]ς πρόσ ἀλλήλους
[εἰχὼν ὦν μὴν α[λλα
col. xxxii.

495 πρὸς τοὺς εἷς ἀπασχολήσαι τῆς Ἑλλάδος κατὰ
φρονής υπάρχεις ἀπηντ[ῶν]
495 [ποιε]μόν ιδίον ποιήσα
cες
500 πρὸς τοὺς ἀποκαθαρίσαι τῆς
tῆς Ἑλλάδος κατα
505 φρονησάντος τῆς οἱ
c[ε]ιαν δυνα[μ]ιν ε]χον
510 ω[σ]περ έν ἀλληρίαν
515 ψυχαῖς μελλόντες
κιν[δ]υνευόντες οἱ δ ου
κ [ε]θασαν πυθομένου
510 τῶν περὶ τῆς Ἀττικῆν
515 πολέμου καὶ παντων
520 τῶν ἀλλῶν αμελήσαν
[περὶ κα]λλιστα[ν]ν εν ε[ν]
[κεινοις] τοις χ[ρονοις ε]
[φιλοτεχνησαν ουκ εξ]
475 [θρο]νους. ο[λ]λ ανταγωνισ
[tas] σφας [αυ]τους ειναι
[νομιζοντες] ουδε ε[πι δου]
[λεια τ]ης των Ε[λληνων]
tον βαρβαρον θε[ραπευ]
480 [ο]ντες. αλλ[α] π[ερι μεν]
[τ]ησ κοινης σωτηριας
[ομοιου]ντες οποτε
[ρου δε] ταυτης αείτωι γε
[νασονται. περι τουτου]
485 [ποιοι] μενοι την α
[μιλλαν] επεδειξαντο
[δε τας] αυτων ευσυν
[χια]σ πρωτων μεν εν
[τοις υπο Δαρειου περ]
490 [φθείρσι]ν αποβαντων
[γαρ αυτων εις την Ατ]
[τικην οι] μεν ου περι
[εμειναν] τ]οις συμμεται
[χους αλλα] τ[οις κοινον]
[tεσ ηκον ημιν αμιν]
[νουντες τοσ]αλλην
[ποιησαμενοι] σπολυ
[δην οσν] περον της
515 [αυτων χορ]αις πορ]θουν
[μενης σημειον δε]
[του ταχυ]ν και της α
[μιλησ] τους μεν γα]ρ
[ημετερους προγονους]
520 [φιλο]σι] της αυτης ημε
[ρας πυ]θεσαι τε την>
[α]ποβασιν την των βαρ
[βαρων] και βοηθησε[ν] τα]
[ες επι] τους ορους της
525 χω[πας] μ[αχη]
[τοις τροπαιo]ν στη]ςαι
[των πολεμιων τους δ εν]
[τρισι] διακο
[τα]ς[αν
530 σια και Χιλ]ια σταθηνα δι]
[ε]θειν σ]τρατοπεδου πο
[ρεουμενος] ου]τω]
[σφο]δρ]α] ηπειρ[θησαν]
[οι με]ν [μ]ετασχειν των

Col. xxxiii.

535 κινδυ[ν]ων. οι δε φθηναι
[συμ]βαλοντες πριν ελ
[θει]ν τους βοηθησον>
[tas με]τα δε ταυτα γε
[νομενης] της υποτερου
540 [στρατειαις η]ν αυτος Η]ερ
[ξης ηγαγευ ε]κλιπων>

Col. xxxiv.

νον. απ[ημων διελομε
νοι τον [κινδυ]νουν Δακε
575 δαιμονιοι μεν εις Θερ
μοπιλας προσ το πε]ον
[χιλι]ους αυτως επιλε
[ξαντες. και των συμ
μαχων ο]λιγους παρα
545 [εκ της Ἀσιας οὐ]ν γαγεί
[ρας περὶ οὐν τις οὐ]ν χιν
[περβόλας προθυμη]ὴ
[θεὶς εἰπεῖν . . . . . . .]
§ 5 lines lost
καταλίπτειν ο μη της
ανθρωπίνης φυσιαν ις
ε[ργ]ον εστὶν οὺν προτε
ρ[ο]ν επαναστα πρὶν ε
560 ξευρέν καὶ συνυγαγκα
σεν ο παντε[ς] ανθρωποι
θρυλοῦσιν. ο[ς]ε[τε] στρα
τοπεδω’ πλε[ιοναι μεν
dia της ηπειρο[ν] πεφεν
565 σα[ς] δε διὰ της δαλάτης
tον μεν Ελλησπόντον
ζευγασ. τον δε Αθω δι
[ορφ]ις. προσ δη τον ου
tω] μεγα φρονήσασαν
570 και τηλικαντα διαπρα
Ξαμενον και τοσον >
tων δεσποτην γενομε

Col. xxxv.

610 κ[χδε καταπλευσαν
τ[ες ουτως εβουλευ
σαύτοι περι των λοιπων
ωσιτε πολλων αυτως
καὶ καλῶν προείριγα

615 συμενῶν . . . . .

ἐν [τοῖς τελευταῖοις

toῖν κινδυνῶν ετὶ πλεον

dιηνεγκαν αὖμως

γαρ απαντῶν τῶν συμ

620 μᾶχων διακειμένων

καὶ [Πελοποννησίων

μεν [διατείχοντων

toῖν Ἰσθμον

Col. xliv.

. . . . . § 109

[τιαν ἐχοντων] γ καίτωι

625 [Βουλομένων πλεον]

[κτειν οὐκ αυ]ν δὴ ποιν>

[τῆς μεν Σ]κιωναῖων

[γῆς επεθυ]μησαμεν

[ην Πλαταιῶν] τοῖς ὦς

630 [ημᾶς καταφυγου]ν] φαι

[νομεθα παραδο[ν]τες

[τοσαυτὴν δὲ χωρα]ν

[παρελιπομεν] πι[αν]

[tas αν ημας ευπόρῳ]

635 [τερως εποιησε]ν τοι

[ουτων τοιν]ν]ν ημ.]ων

[γεγενημενων κα]ί

. . . . . . .

Col. xlvii.

6 lines lost

[tous συμπε]νθησουνται

Col. xlvii.

κρίνειν φυγας δὲ καὶ στ[α] § 114

σεις καὶ νομῶν συμ
660 ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς τῶν ἄρποιν ἄρ
[χῆς διὰ το π]ληθ[ος τῶν
[οικείων κα]κ[ων ἐπ]αν
[σαμεθ ἀλ]ηλούς ε]λε
[ουστὶ οὐ]θεν ἕ[ἀρ τ]ὸ
665 σαύτην σχόλην [παρ]ε
[λιπον] ο[σθ] έτε[ρω]
[συναχθεσ]θηναι τινος
[γαρ οὐκ εφί]κοντα ἡ
τις ουτῳ πορρῳ των

670 πολιτικ[ῶν ἡν ε]ε
[στήκωσ πρ]αγμα[τ]ῶν
[οστὶ ο]κ [ἐ]γγυς η[ν]αγ
[κ]αθὴ γενεσθαι τῶν
[σ]υμφορὰν εἰς αι τοι
675 άντι τα]ν φυσεις η[μας
[κ]ατεστησαν εἰς οὐκ αι
[σ]χυρονται τας εαυτον
[π]όλεις ουτωσ ανομως
δια[τ]ιθείται καὶ τῆς
680 ημετερας [ουτως] αδι
κως κατηγορουντες·
αλλα προς τοις αλλοις
[κ]αι περὶ των δικων·
[κ]αι των γραφῶν των
685 [πο]τε παρ ἡμιν γενο
μ[ε]φων λεγειν τολ >
μωσιν αυτω πλείους
[η] εν τρισ[ν] μησιν α
κριτος αποκτειναν
690 τες ὁν η πολις επι
tης αρχησ απασης ἐ

\[x\] \([\phi]\)οσεις και π[ο]λιτ[είως
695 μεταβολας ετι δε[ε] παι
δων υβρεις και γ[νώ]ι
κον αισ[χ]υντας [κ]α[ι] χον
ματων [δ] [αρπαγ]ας [tis
αν δυναι[το] διεξελθειν
700 πλην τοσοτον εισεπέ
[ε]χομεν αν κατα παν
των οτι τα μεν [ν]φ η
μων δεινα ραδι[ον] αν
τοις ενι ψηφισματι δι
705 ελυσεν τας δε σφαγας
και τας ανομιας τας
επι τουτων γενομε
νας ουθεις αν ιασασθαι
δυναιτο· και μην ου

710 δε την παρουσαν ειρη
νην ουδε την αυτο
νομιαν την ε[ν ταις
πολιτεοις μεν [ουκ εν
[ν]οςαν εν δε ταις [συν
715 θηκαις αναγεγραμ[με]
νην αξιον ελεοθαι
μαλλον η την αρ[χην
την ημετεραν] τ[ις
γαρ αν τοιαυτης κα[τα
720 σ[κευη]]ειπιθυμησειν
ἐν ἡ καταποντισται
μεν την θαλατην
cατεχουσα[ν] πε[λτα
σται δε τας πολεισ κα
725 ταλαμμανουσιν αυ του προς ετερον περι της, χωρας πολες μεν εντος τεχνους οι πολιται προς αλλη

730 λους μαχοντας πιεις

Unidentified Fragments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. . δ[</td>
<td>. ε</td>
<td>. εμυ</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>επ[</td>
<td>. σ</td>
<td>. λους</td>
<td>. αστον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε[</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>. αυ</td>
<td>. π</td>
<td>. το[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]αυ</td>
<td>. οι</td>
<td>. ειν[</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]υ</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. ονο</td>
<td>. τω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. ελ</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i)</td>
<td>(j)</td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>(l)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>. σ</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]σ</td>
<td>. α</td>
<td>. ιο</td>
<td>. νο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]σ</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. το</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(m)</td>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>(o)</td>
<td>(p)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>. νο</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>. ειν[</td>
<td>. ον</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>. ε[</td>
<td>. τ</td>
<td>. .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>. .</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X 2
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1. ἐδίδαξαν: so Ε; the marginal variant δίδαξαι is parallel to the vulg. ἀπαλλάξαι.
9. φιλονικεῖος is also the spelling of Ε, and is preferred by Drerp; but in a question between ι and ει the testimony of a papyrus of this period is of course valueless.
12. The original εστη, altered by the second hand, is condemned by the hiatus;

17. το: om. MSS.
18. ημων η [πολις]: η πόλις ημῶν MSS.
21. πορι: so vulg.; the dots signifying deletion were superscribed by the second hand.

Om. πρίγι Γ.

23. The supplement at the beginning of the line is somewhat short for the lacuna.
29–31. τῶς ἐφεργεῖας καὶ τῶς χρείας is the vulg. reading. τε after ταῖς is very doubtful, and τῶς [ε] ἐφεργεῖας is a quite likely alternative. τῶς χρείας καὶ τῶς ἐργασίας Γ; τῶς τα χρείας κ.τ.λ. Ε, Β.
33–5. ομολογομένως: so MSS., with γενομένων after πρώτως. A blank space was left by the scribe at the beginning of 1. 34, and in this the corrector has inserted something, the slight vestiges of which suit γενομένως, at the same time deleting γενομένως in 1. 35 which reflected the omitted γενομένως after πρώτως. The result is an intelligible sentence in itself not inferior to that obtained by emending ὁμολογομένως to ὁμολογομένοι (B. with H. Wolf and others) though not making a serious claim for consideration. προς τε is the reading of the MSS.
42. γ[ε]νομένως: om. MSS. περιμεγν is the reading of Γ; πάρεργον vulg.
45. δορ[κ]αι τῶ[σ]α συνηθην: so Γ; δοριάς τοσαίης vulg.
53. εἰς[ε]μεν εἰς[ε]: so vulg.; εἰς[ε]μεν Γ.
60. κατακλαμε[ν]-[ει][ν]: so Γ (κλεμ.), κατακλεισμ. E vulg., κατακλη[μ]. M.
75. και: om. MSS.
so 6pp. Tocr. SO KaTarrjaav
1. SO perhaps om.
(x6. SO ra/r/nju om. Trar/jKur., (Kintpa. SO evtpy. fKyovoi tS)u TouTWi'. SO SO SO SiaXvaaadai SO SO SO aWuv SO Tbov SO

79. ἐφοστερα: so Ρ, Β.; ἐκτερα, which originally stood in the papyrus, is the vulg. reading.

81. απασας: so Ρ; πάσας vulg.

100. δε; l. edn.

106–7. ηνεμορκοτ ἑπαναλγος cannot be correct, since with this there is nothing for ταυτης to refer to except ταυτην in l. 104. The reading inserted by the corrector at the column of the agreement with the traditional text. πατρικωτεραν was perhaps influenced by ηγεμονικωτεραν: πατριωτ., as in the margin, MSS.

109. τα: so Ρ; om. vulg.

118. [ειε: so Ρ; επι vulg.

131. επομεναι ταυτην: ταυτην επ. MSS.

132. αλκων καλως; so vulg., Β.; ἄλλων καλως γΕ. 

138. τθον; so Ρ; των θεων E and vulg.

157. The alternative reading πολτερον is that of the MSS.

164–5. διαλυνθαι τα προς ἄλληλους εχθρας: διαλυνθαι τα προς ἄλληλους MSS.

168. αυτων: so Ρ; τοιτων vulg.

176. ἄλλως, the reading of FE, has been substituted by the corrector for ανθρωπος.

λοιποις vulg., and so Β. on account of the following ἄλλης.

196. παραλιπων: so Ρ: vulg. παραλιπότετε, with τίνες instead of τίς.

202. [εχθρων απαθοθ: so Ρ; εχθι. κατεστησατο efforts. vulg.

207. γενομενου; (γ) is better suited to the space than γεγονως (vulg.).

213. ημην ευζηραισων: so Ρ; ευεργης, ημην vulg.

215. τιρ; so Ρ; των Ε1 vulg.

223. εγγογνοι: so Θ; εγγογνοι Ρ, &c.

230–1. αγαθων [απασθον αυτου: so vulg. in the Antidosis; αγ. αυτ. απ. ΡΕ, Β., αυτ. αγ. απ. vulg. in the present passage.

234. The supplement at the beginning of the line hardly fills the lacuna, which would be expected to contain eight or nine letters; perhaps there was some correction.

236. [εισβαλει: so ΡΕ and Antid. vulg.; there would not be room for the vulg. εμ-βαλλειν.

οριζοντες: so ΡΕ Antid.; ὁμ. αὐτῶν οἱ πρόγανοι vulg.


245. [γενομενους: so Α and vulg.; γεγονωνωσι ΡΕ Antid. vulg.

251. προτερον: so Ε; the omission of προτερον indicated by the line drawn over the letters (by the second hand) is in accord with Γ and Antid. vulg.

255. The correction is by the second hand.

258. εσομεν: om. MSS.

261. αγαν was apparently first written in place of λιαν αν.

262. περι: so Θ; επι Γ, &c. The papyrus omits στας, which is found after μεγιστων in E2 Α3.

264. προτερον; so Ρ; πρ. διαλθην Ε vulg.

267. [αρχαιοτα: so in Antid. Θ, αρχαικώτατα Α; l. αρχικωτα with MSS.

268. εθνων: so vulg.; γεγονων ΓΕΘ. τας, the elimination of which is indicated by the superscribed dots (probably by the corrector), is omitted in the MSS.

273. η δε [ποιης, the original reading, is that of Ρ; the addition of ημετερα is in accordance with the vulg.

290. ελαστω γε: so Cobet; om. γε Ρ; α. τοιτων E1 vulg.

291. After τεκμηρια the first hand wrote των, and left a blank space between this and εστιν.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

302. καρπων: om., MSS.
312. E has ἑκατεράτσαιν.
323. The dot in the middle of the line apparently marks the place of the omitted αν.
336. α, which is superfluous, is slightly smudged, and was perhaps intended to be deleted.
337–8. δια ... στρατευσ: om. ρ and Antid.; δια τὴν τότε στρ. E1, B., γεγενεμένην for γεγενεμένην vulg.
344–50. This passage, which has no other authority, is evidently based on the latter part of § 74. Its insertion here seems pointless. The λ of καλα in l. 350 is converted from τ, after which there was originally a blank space.
355. τα: om. MSS.; cf. l. 356.
356. τοι: three or four letters are required to fill the line, and τα in l. 355 points the way; om. MSS.
357–8. The first hand probably made the wrong division γεγονοτα σοι.
361. εκείνων πολεμον ανεστάτος: so vulg.; πολ. ανεστ. έκ. Γ.
366. Om. oμομεμαν E1, om. εναν Ε2.
376. A low stop after τ seems to have here been substituted for a high one.
379–80. So Γ; της δια την ἀφι. vulg.
393. [άλλα] α: so vulg., Β.; ἄλλα καὶ Ε2, καὶ Γ, δια ταῦτα is the reading of the MSS.; the corrector’s δι αυτο ταῦτα is no improvement.
Kai after ταῦτα is omitted by Ε2.
395. πολυν: so Γ; πολυν την ἡμετήριαν Ε1 vulg.
400. μικρω: so Θλ in the Antid.; διέγρ. MSS. here.
401. τοις πολς τους: τοιν πολδον Γ, Β.; τοιν π. τοῦτων and τοῖς π. ταύτων other MSS.
402. αγν [ταχι: ταχι λαι MSS. For αγαν cf. l. 261; the reading here is not certain; but λαι at any rate is impossible. αγαν produces a hiatus.
408. τηρ: so Γ; om. vulg.
410 sqq. The marginal adscript indicates that this fragment comes from § 78, but its position is not clearly marked, and there was evidently a divergence from the ordinary text. [ε in l. 410 may be δε ἐφετε, and the word after γραμματικων is very likely αλ(ια); but something certainly intervened between πολλων and γραμματικων. The penultimate letter in l. 412 is either τ or γ.
417. προσισχωρεινεινον: so Θ in Antid., the mistake being occasioned by the preceding προσισχωρεινεινον; but the υ in the papyrus is very uncertain. προσισχωρεινον MSS.
421. [και]: om. MSS.
425. E1 adds αυτων after ταυ.
440. τουτοκα: so vulg., with and without έκ. τοις τουτως Γ.
449. The MSS. add εκείνως after ταυ, which was here originally omitted. εκείνως is also omitted by Θλ.
450. The column contained one or two more lines.
453. It is not certain that the papyrus read μεν with ΓΕΘ2; om. vulg.
461. The space points to εκείνως (Ε1 vulg.) rather than to εκείνως (Γ), but not very decidedly.
466. επανασα: so ΓΕΘ2; κατάλειπον Ε marg., vulg.
471. και (vulg.) was possibly written after αλλα, though the line is not too short without it.
480. π[ερ μεν: so Γ; δια μεν περι vulg.
487. φυσικας: so vulg. in the Antid., B.; εφικτιας Θ2, ἀρετας ΕΕ.
497. ιδιον: so ΓΕ, Β.; Ιδίον καιθεν vulg.
498 sqq. τοις απασις: so MSS. The corrector has inserted εξ before απασις here and
at the top of the column (ll. 495–6), where the passage is rewritten. The intruded ε is there accompanied by the variant κατασφυγομαςτες for -τας, a reading also found in Α in the Antid., οπτητον on the other hand being placed in its traditional position instead of after ενοτες as in l. 501. As the original scribe gives the ordinary text in l. 497 it is likely that he wrote correctly κατασφυγομαςτες in l. 500.

517. αυταλη: ηυ. αντων in the Antid.

523. Σομηνοτες, the original reading, is also found in ΘΛ in the Antid.

525. μι αγη: so ΓΕ; the reading is uncertain, but there does not seem to be room for και μαχη.

528-3. The corrections are by the second hand.
535. φθορα: so ΓΕ and Antid.; φθηβήν vulg.; the termination άι is written over an angular complementary mark.

536. The letter after τ looks like ο, but this is probably owing to the disappearance of some fibres of the papyrus.

548. After ειπεν the ordinary text has ηλατω των υπαρχοντων ειρηκεν, which cannot be reconciled with the remains in the papyrus; perhaps ειρηκεν | ελαττω.

555. ται ονται: so Α here and in the Antid.; τωιοτον other MSS.

558. There is no word in the traditional text here between φωτες and ιστιν, but ΘΛ in the Antid. have ηνγον, which no doubt stood in the papyrus. The final ν is fairly certain, and the first letter must be either ε or θ.

561. ανθρωποι: om. MSS.
562. θυμηλοςιν: so Γ; θυμηλοιν vulg.

569. μεγα is omitted by Ε.

567-8. αυτοι: τοι ισον καταστησαί: so vulg.; the marginal adscript gives the reading of Γ and B.

568. The second hand, besides rightly emending δε to δις, proceeded to alter the division of εφες, but changed his mind.

602. προγόνων: so Ε and vulg., om. Γ; πατέρες Antid. vulg. οι δε ημ. πατέρες had occurred in the previous section, οι δ' ημ. πρόγονοι in § 85.

605. A blank space was left by the first hand before δοξαν; cf. l. 34.

607. προτερον: so vulg.; το προτ. Γ.
608. τυχη: so Γ; τυχ τυχ. vulg.

609. δε: so vulg. and Antid.; om. Γ.

610-1. In the MSS. of the Antidosis the words και κατασκευαιστες τα περι την πολιν intervene between κατασκευαιστες and ουτως, and the papyrus would admit of their restoration (κατασκευαστες τα περι την πολιν ουτως κ.λ.) but this would make Col. xxxv a rather long one, whereas l. 623 stands higher than l. 669, and it seems more likely that there was no disagreement here with other MSS. of the Panegyricus. και . . . πολιν is bracketed by Β.

613-5. αυτοι | και καλων: so ΘΛ in the Antid. To read και | καλων αυτοι produces too great a disproportion in length between ll. 613 and 614. As to what followed προεργαζομενων there is no clue.

630. The papyrus most probably had κατασφυγομαι; φυγομαι Γ originally.

638. The slight vestige points to a round letter at the beginning of the line, above and slightly to the left of which there is a τ by the second hand. Perhaps the original scribe wrote αυр instead of των.

645. ει: so Γ, Β.; ενος (vulg.) would be too long for the lacuna. The deletion of ν at the beginning of the line is probably by the second hand.
647. παρ[δα]ς was originally written for πατρ[δα]ς; the correction is probably due to the second hand.

650. συμπεθήσοντας: so Victorius, B.; συμπεθήσοντας 8, συμπαθ. E and vulg. The ν is broken, but α cannot be read.

664. οὐβεν: οἴδειν edd.; cf. l. 445, where the corrector has substituted δ for θ.

669. αὐτῶ: so Γ; οὕτω τοποθετον vulg.

670. εἰστηκών: om. MSS. Cf. § 171 τῶν τῶν πολιτικῶν εἰστηκόμεν.

677. τοι: so Γ; τάς μέν vulg.

679. καὶ τῆς: so Γ; τῆς δ' E, vulg. The deletions in this line and the next are probably due to the corrector.

688. The appearance of the papyrus suggests that the scribe partially erased the superfluous letter, which is most probably an η, at the beginning of the line.

693. The corrector omitted to alter the μ of συμ.

698. It is unlikely that διαρπαγμα was originally written.

701. [ε]χομεν αν: εξω MSS.

κατά παντῶν: so vulg.; καθ ἀπάντων Γ.

708. οὐδεῖς: cf. l. 664, note.

713. εννοουσαν was originally wrongly divided εννοουσαν.

719. The corrector's κατάστασανς is the reading of the MSS.

729. οἱ πολίται προς ἀληθοὺς: so Γ; πρὸς ἄλλ. οἱ πολ. vulg.

Fr. (d). This fragment might be placed above l. 29, θατων being restored as εκατων and an intervening line being lost.

Fr. (z), which is from the top of a column, may be the end of l. 363.
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Addenda and Corrigenda to 'Oxyrhynchus Papyri', Parts III and IV.

For the literature connected with these volumes see the various bibliographies of papyri by U. Wilcken and F. Blass in Archiv für Papyrforschung iii, S. De Ricci in Rev. des études grecques 1905, and P. Viereck in Burniat's Jahrbücher. 1907. After comparing with the originals the suggestions which have been made, we give a list of most of those which, whether right or wrong, affect our transcriptions. Supplements of lacunae and readings already indicated in our notes are generally ignored. Where the source of the correction is not indicated, it is our own.

III. 404. 4. μηνῶν τιν (Deissmann), cannot be read.

408. 57. αὐθεν (Schroeder) is possible, as is his suggestion αὐθωνεξι in l. 61. The following suggestions by him or Fraccaroli are unsuitable: 25. αμφί [βωτρασ, 33. παυσάςνων Ἀρμιτρωνιαδας, 62. λιπουσα, 64. καρτεμιδ. Whether Fr. (d) belongs to 408 is very doubtful; the verso is in a different hand.

409. 6. τὸ παθαμον (Leo) is possible. 35. παρεπρεπρασα (Leo) is possible. 41. αδεικτος εστι (Leo) is unsuitable. 45. αδεικτον (Kretschmar) is possible. 65. παλιν (Leo) does not suit the vestiges very well. 58. δει α' τοτον (Leo) can be read. 63. ουτος δι εσων (Leo) is possible. 80. μεθηκας (Leo) is possible, but not βλαψεις in l. 81. 100. το λοιπων ou is inadmissible.

410. 84. δην θεωμενος (Fuhr) can be read.

411. 36. τις στρατες (Fuhr) is possible.

412. 6. ινοπενων ουτον for ἴνοπενθον ουτον (Hefermehl, Berl. Phil. Wochenschr., March 31, 1906). 9. l. παρα (sic) for para. 33. [λατ] τ Ωμεν (Ludwich, Berl. Phil. Wochenschr., Nov. 14, 1903) is possible, and in l. 35 ελος can be read. 55. For επεθηπτης there is not room.

413. 6. δηβαυτον (Sudhaus) is possible. 28. ἂργαγμας (Crusius, Herondas, Mimiambi, 1905, pp. 101 sqq.) does not suit the vestige of the letter before μ which seems to be ϊ or ϊ. 53. οι περιδοκτες (Crus.) is unsuitable. 57. Crusius' proposed reading τ δ διστων [προσ αληθειας] is possible but very doubtful. 91. παραλληλις (Crus.) may be right. 112. μυτησις (thet) ποιησις (sieu) (Sudh.) is possible, but the first letter after the lacuna is more like δ. Ι. [δις μοι] for μ. 113. δας του (Sudh.) is unsuitable. 116. δει τας ἀδατισας (Sudh.) is unsuitable. 118 marg. l. σκληρατοσις for σκληρωτο (Sudh.). 130. και έκ[εις]οι (Crus.) is possible, but the next word is not ἀφοεις (Sudh.) or ἀφοαι (Crus.). 130. καθανελαιος οις (Crus., Sudh.) is possible. 132. διεφθην γων (Crus., Sudh.) cannot be read.

133. ἐπαρασθης(θια) (Crus.) is possible. 134. Neither Crusius' επιπροσιον δι τα νουθεμαν nor Sudhaus' επιπροσιον ουτογ ονιν φαινομενα suits the vestiges. 139. [ἡ δὴ] ηρ αρα (Crus.) is possible, but not έκπειν αρα (Sudh.). 147. μι τις for μ ερις (Sudh.) is probably right. 148. Neither ογαμα οι καταβαςμαι (Crus.) nor κωβαστα (Sudh.) is suitable. 151. ποτε (Sudh.) or έρως τε (Crus.) can be read. 152. έκξελλων (Sudh.) is unsuitable. 178. ίαυ(α) which we printed in the margin against l. 213 probably refers to this line (Crus., Sudh.). 181. λεξω (Sudh.) is possible. 186. λογος (Sudh.) is unsuitable. 186. πετρι (Sudh.) is possible, but not πετροψ (Crus.).
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428. 1. η'έρ(ην) (Fuhr) is possible, but there is not room for ποτε in the lacuna before it.


452. 10. l. πρωτοί for πρωτον.

464. 3. στηρετει (Kroll) is inadmissible. 5. σχορ[η]ς (Ludwich) is possible. 6. εξ[π]νδ[ου]ν (Kroll, Ludw.) is possible. 12. μηλλ[ων] (Ludw.) is possible. 13. καιρο[ν]ων (Ludw.) can be read. 14. κρατε]ουν (Kroll) is unsuitable. 15. φανδ[ου]ν (Kroll) is possible. 16. θεμ[α]ν (Kroll) can be read. 18. σχον (Kroll) is inadmissible. 19. π[ρ][δ][ω][ρ][ων] (Ludw.) is inadmissible, but η ῥησιον (Kroll) is possible, while δηλωσατε κακου παιν (Ludw.) is inadmissible. 20. και άλλο (Ludw.) can be read, but not δωμα. 21. έσιν (for εισιν) Ludw., but ομον (Ludw.) is inadmissible, as is ομωριτους (Kroll). 22. Δηλωσατε (Kroll) and κοινοφασσατο (Ludw.) are not long enough. 28. Παρα (Kroll) is inadmissible. 35. άλλα γης (Ludw.) is possible. 37. καιρος (Ludw.) or φαινου (Kroll) can be read. 38. και δουνο (Kroll, Ludw.) is possible. 39. χαλε παι (Kroll, Ludw.) can be read. 40. πολλωνοκεστους (Ludw.) is inadmissible, 43. l. αμπιθος (Kroll, Ludw.). 45. μαρτυρει η γη (Ludw.) is inadmissible. 54. l. εκ σκοτειν (Kroll). 55. αυτωρ (Ludw.) is possible. 58. φα[ι]νον (Ludw.) is possible. 61. ρ ιες (Ludw.) is possible.

471. The Maximus against whom this speech is directed seems to be the prefect in 103–7, Vibius Maximus. De Ricci suggests that the erasure of his name on the Coptos tariff and the Abu Tufa milestone may be due to these proceedings. 6. l. δι' i.e. ηπ' ον for δι' ον (Wilcken). 18. δουργ (i.e. στιοδιρ) can be read for δουλη (De Ricci). 20. θιδομενον (Cröner) is possible. 24. ο[π]ατα (Cröner) is unsuitable, but his suggestion παντος is possible. 28. γαρ (Cröner) is unsuitable. 62. δολείων (Wilck.) can be read. 75. ον can be read for συ, as suggested by T. Nicklin and Cröner, but the letters seem to have been deleted. 108. δολερον (Cröner) is unsuitable. 131. l. Μα[η]ς (Wilck.). 142–3. l. ο[υ][λ]λο[ς] (Wilck.). 145. l. Την εκει (Wilck.). 146. l. αρ' χηρ εις δεκα (Wilck.). 147. Wilcken restores παιδεια τε και επι. 151–3. Wilcken conjectures το[πην] [πην] τον ταιον[ας]ν εξθραδισθαιν. 154. Wilcken's suggestion δ' ο[ε] does not suit; και can be read.

472. 24. καταγγοριαστων (Cröner) is possible. 25. παιρ[ο]ντος[ο]ν (Cröner) cannot be read. τοιουτοις δ' ον [και (Cröner)] is possible. 37. The mutilated word is not αοινον (Cröner). 48. διαστηματος (Cröner) is unsuitable.

481. 1. πρω τως (for πρω τω; cf. P. Tebt. II. p. 132.

483. 3. l. εκ for παρα). ένωπιον cannot be read in l. 36. 488. 22. l. θεν; cf. P. Tebt. II. 327. 28 and 487. 18. 491. 5. Cröner suggests καθ' ανθρωποιν τραπων (Cröner) is unsuitable, and the passage is hopelessly illegible.

19. l. κοβαρέων (Cröner).

492. 9. The word before έκτειναι is not και (Cröner).

494. 44. Probably παρερθηθε; cf. 713. Ια παρερθη(η).

495. 9–10. παν δευτερων ως ην αυτη δοκη (Cröner) is possible.

496. 16. εκαν ποτα συμβατη (Cröner) is unsuitable, as also is his suggestion αρρητα in l. 15. 497. 15. l. χριτε γαρ (χριτε).

500. 11–2. l. η' ιουναν and ε[ο]ν (Cröner) is unsuitable (cf. B. G. U. 868, 12) (Cröner).

504. 16. δοστε (Cröner) is unsuitable. 20. περι τοιουτο (Cröner) is possible. 44. του δια[λ]ον (Cröner) is not very suitable.

506. 28. [δι]στησας (Cröner) can be read, but the following του renders a proper name more likely. 38. παραγραφής (Cröner) is possible.
525. 8. λγ[αο]ν (Crön.) for λυ[ν]νγν is possible.
530. 8. δον for ετι (Crön.) is unsuitable.
533. 13. τελιον (Crön.) is unsuitable. The letter after γφι might be almost anything.

APPENDIX II

List of Papyri distributed.

We give here a list of published Oxyrhynchus and Hibe papyri which have been presented to different museums and libraries in Europe and America in addition to those of which a list was given in Part IV, pp. 265-71, and also some further details about those Oxyrhynchus and Fayûm papyri which in the former list were assigned to America without a more precise indication. We have added the present reference numbers (where ascertained) of the several institutions to which the papyri now belong. The papyri which do not
appear in either list are still at Queen's College, Oxford. The following abbreviations are employed:

B. M. = British Museum. The numbers refer to the Catalogue of Greek Papyri.
Bodl. = Bodleian Library, Oxford. The references are to the hand-list of MSS.
Bolton = Chadwick Museum, Bolton, Lancashire.
Bristol = Bristol Museum.
Brussels = Musées Royaux, Brussels, Belgium.
Cairo = Museum of Antiquities, Cairo, Egypt. These papyri remain temporarily with us at Oxford.
Cambridge = Cambridge University Library. The numbers refer to the 'Additions'.
Carnegie = Carnegie Institute, Pittsburg, U.S.A.
Charterhouse = Library of Charterhouse School, Godalming, Surrey.
Chicago = Haskell Oriental Museum, University of Chicago, U.S.A.
Columbia = Library of Columbia University, New York, U.S.A.
Cornell = Library of Cornell University, U.S.A. The papyri are numbered MSS. A 101.
Dublin = Library of Trinity College, Dublin.
Edinburgh = Library of Edinburgh University.
Graz = Library of Graz University, Austria.
Harvard = Semitic Museum of Harvard University, Mass., U.S.A.
Holyoke = Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. U.S.A.
Johns Hop. = Library of Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, U.S.A.
Manchester = Museum of Manchester University.
McCormick = Library of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, U.S.A.
Michigan = University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.
Morgan = Pierpoint Morgan Collection, New York, U.S.A.
Pennsyl. = Museum of Science and Art, University of Pennsylvania, U.S.A.
Princeton = Library of Princeton College, New Jersey, U.S.A.
Smithsonian = Smithsonian Institution, Washington, U.S.A.
Toronto = Museum of Victoria University, Toronto, Canada.
Union Theol. = Union Theological Seminary, New York, U.S.A.
Vassar = Library of Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, New York, U.S.A.
Wellesley = Wellesley College, Mass., U.S.A.
Western Res. = Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A.
Yale = Library of Yale University, U.S.A.

**Oxyrhynchus Papyri.**

| | 287. Columbia. | | d. 75 (P). |
| | 293. Columbia. | | |
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411. B. M. 1523.
413. Bodl. Gr. class. b. 4 (P).
414. Columbia.
415. Graz I. 1930.
417. Smithsonian.
418. Harvard.
419. Brussels.
420. B. M. 1524.
424. Graz I. 1926.
426. Toronto.
427. B. M. 1525.
428. Harvard.
429. Manchester.
430-1. Harvard.
432. Graz I. 1929.
433. CambridgeAdd.
444-4.
434. Harvard.
435-6. Yale.
438. Yale.
439. Bolton.
440. Manchester.
441. Brussels.
443. Graz I. 1927.
444. Yale.
448. Cornell.
459. Columbia.
464. Bodl. Gr. class. d. 75 (P).
465. B. M. 1526.
466. Columbia.
467. Bodl. Gr. class. f. 73 (P).
468. Edinburgh.
469. Chicago.
471. Bodl. Gr. class. a. 10 (P).
472. Morgan.
473. B. M. 1527.
474. Manchester.
475. Charterhouse.
476. Chicago.
477. Columbia.
478. Brussels.
479-80. Chicago.
482. Chicago.
483. Pennyl. 2822.
485. Bodl. Gr. class. c. 56 (P).
486. Columbia.
487. Chicago.
489. B. M. 1528.
491. Morgan.
493. Toronto.
494. B. M. 1529.
495. Brussels.
496. Bodl. Gr. class. a. 9 (P).
497. Yale.
498. Toronto.
500. Graz III. 1918.
504. Bodl. Gr. class. c. 57 (P).
505. Cornell.
506. Harvard.
507. Brussels.
508. Cornell.
509. Brussels.
510. Chicago.
511. Graz I. 1931.
512. Chicago.
513. Toronto.
514. Vassar.
515. Smithsonian.
519. Brussels.
520-1. Columbia.
522. Yale.
523. Cornell.
524-5. Vassar.
529. Pennyl. 2804.
530. B. M. 1530.
533. Harvard.
541. Cornell.
551. Princeton.
559. Harvard.
561-72. Johns Hop.
574. Bodl. Gr. class. f. 74 (P).
575. Chicago.
577-8. Chicago.
580. Johns Hop.
582. Johns Hop.
590-8. Holyoke.
605-7. Yale.
609-10. Chicago.
611. Carnegie.
612. Pennyl.
613. Princeton.
615. Princeton.
616-7. Yale.
618-20. Princeton.
621-7. Yale.
633. Union Theol.
638. Yale.
639-43. Union Theol.
645. Yale.
646. Manchester.
652. Pennyl. 2796.
653. Bodl. Gr. class. c. 58 (P).
IV.
654. B. M. 1531.
655. Harvard.
656. Bodl. Gr. bibl. d. 5 (P).
657. B. M. 1532.
658. Yale.
659. B. M. 1533.
660. Graz I. 1923.
661. Cairo.
662. B. M. 1533.
663. CambridgeAdd. 4415.
664. Cairo.
665. Toronto.
666. Bodl. Gr. class. d. 76 (P).
668. B. M. 1532.
669. Cairo.
673. Brussels.
675. Graz I. 1922.
676-8. Wellesley.
680. Manchester.
681. Johns Hop.
682. Edinburgh.
683. Manchester.
684. Johns Hop.
685. Bodl. Gr. class. f. 75 (P).
686. B. M. 1534.
687. B. M. 1535.
688. B. M. 1536.
689. Wellesley.
690. Brussels.
691-2. Wellesley.
693-5. Princeton.
696. Pennyl. 2814.
698. Wellesley.
703. Bodl. Gr. class. g. 51 (P).
704. Pennyl. 2820.
705. CambridgeAdd. 4416.
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 4418. 748. Western Res. 784. B. M. 1542.
731. Manchester. 771. Manchester. 88470. 2.

Fayum Papyri.

63. Pennsyl. 2781. 117. Pennsyl. 2785. 239. Princeton.
65. Pennsyl. 2779. 120. Pennsyl. 2784. 243. Cornell.

807. McCormickBH
88470. 3.
808. Cairo.
809. Carnegie.
810. Cairo.
811-2. Vassar.
813. Brussels.
815-7. Cairo.
818. B. M. 1543.
819. Vassar.
820. Cairo.
821. Vassar.
822. Wellesley.
823. Brussels.
824. Wellesley.
825. Cairo.
826. Wellesley.
827. Cairo.
829. Wellesley.
832. B. M. 1544.
833. CambridgeAdd. 4420.
834. CambridgeAdd. 4421.
836. Brussels.
837-8. Cairo.
839. Bodl. Gr. class. c. 59 (P).
250. Chicago.
251. Cornell.
253. Pennsyl. 2777.
261. Pennsyl. 2778.
263. Columbia.
265. Yale.
267. Yale.
268. Holyoke.
271. Princeton.
274-7. Chicago.
296. Johns Hop.
### Hibeh Papyri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35–6</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>314–7</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>320–1</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>Johns Hop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Graz I, 1924</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>Johns Hop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>Yale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Yale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–6</td>
<td>Yale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>McCormick BH</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>McCormick BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88442.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Pennsy 1, 2824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Pennsy 1, 2825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Carnegie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Smithsonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>Smithsonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Western Res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125–7</td>
<td>Gen. Theol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>McCormick BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88442.3</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td>McCormick BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88442.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Graz I, 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>McCormick BH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88442.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141–4</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>152–3</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Vassar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Smithsonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>157–8</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>159–62</td>
<td>Yale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>Graz I, 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Smithsonian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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αγος 14, 21, 29.
ἀγρευτήμον 8, 13.
ἀδυκέν 1.
ἀλλὰ 2, 5, 16, 45.
ἀλλάσσειν 19.
ἀλλος 18.
ἀνέρχεσθαι 27.
ἀνθρώπος 5, 39.
ἀπό 44.
ἀποκρίνεσθαι 30.
ἀπολαμβάνειν 4.
ἀρχέρεσις 10.
ἀδηστίας 36.
ἀτός 3, 7, 8, 11, 24, 30.

βάλλειν 33.
βάπτειν 43.
βαπτιζέιν 15, 42.
βάσανος 7.

γάρ 3, 15.

Δαίδ 25.
δέρμα 35.
δία 25.

ἔγω 41, 42.
εἰ 18.
ἐίσαι 17, 23.
ἐίς 8.
ἐσάγειν 8.
ἐκάνον 24, 39.
ἐκτός 35.
ἐν 4, 9, 23, 25, 33, 43.
ἐννοῦν 39.
ἐνδέχεσθαι 27.
ἐνδυμα 19, 27.
ἐντάξαθα 23.
ἐπιθύμία 38.
ἐπιτρέπειν 12.
ἐρχεσθαί 28, 44.
ἐτέρος 25, 26.

ἐσῆ 44 (?).
ἐσός 4.

ἡμέρα 34.

ἱρόν 9, 17, 23.
ἱστάναι 21.

καθαρεύειν 23, 24.
καθαρός 18, 28.
κακία 41.
κακοῦργος 5.
καλλωπίσειν 38.
κατέρχεσθαι 26.
κλάμαξ 26.
κλάσις 6.
κόινω 33.

λέγειν 11, 24, 31, 42.
λεείν 10 (?).

λευκός 27.
λίμνη 25.
λοιπῆς 14, 19, 24, 32, 37.

μαθητής 15, 22, 42.
μή 2, 18, 31, 42.

μήτε 14.
μολύνθην 16.
μόνος 4.

μυρίζειν 36.

νέπτυσθαι 34.
νέφ 34.

ομαίος 3.
ομοία 11.

όμον 13, 20, 31.
ός 18, 33, 42.

ὀστήρ 35.

οὐ 3.

οὐδεὶς 31, 45.

οὐδέ 20.

οὐδεὶς 18.

οὖν 23.

οὔτους 13, 17, 32.

παραλλαγβάνειν 7.
πᾶς 1.
πᾶχειν 3.
πατέν 17, 20.

περιπατεῖν 9.
πληρωθ 40.
πολίς 6.
πόρνη 36.
ποῦς 15.

πρό 1.
πρὸς 30, 38.
προσβλέπειν 29.
προσέχεσθαι 9.
προσέχειν 2.
πρότερον 1.

πως 2.

σκεῖος 14, 21, 30.
σκορπίος 35.

σμήχειν 35, 37.
σοφίζεσθαι 1.

σύ 12, 15, 23, 32.

σῶν 22.
συντυχάνειν 11.
σωτήρ 12, 30.

τίς 12.

τίς 10.
τόπος 17.
τότε 28.

τυφλός 31.

ἐδώρ 33, 43.

ἐρείπω 3.

ὑπομονεῖν 6.

Φαρμακίας 10.

χεῖν 32.

χοίρος 33.
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Large Roman numerals refer to poems: sch. = scholium.

אברטיאμας IX. 45.
אקαμπτος VI. 88.
אκολούθως Fr. 95. 4 sch.
אκος IV. 26.
אקודוס L. 3.
אודה IX. 1.
אלאξανδρος Fr. 96. 2 sch.; Frs. 129–31. 1 sch.
אלהי VI. 10 (v. l. ארך and אצטיא).
אלא IX. 36.
אלא IV. 24.
אלאטיריאς Frs. 129–31. 1 sch.
אלאה II. 37 and sch.
אלאם VI. 98.
אלאה II. 55 sch., 73; IV. 28; VI. 54, 105, 128; IX. 7.
אלאתו IV. 48.
אלאה II. 63; VI. 118 sch.
אלא μ Fr. 33. 5.
אלא VI. 100.
אלאוס VI. 14.
אלאוס VI. 82.
אמע IX. 16.
אמעFr. 21. 7 sch.
אמעורטוס Fr. 16. 6.
אמע II. 76.
אמעאוצי IV. 26; VI. 10.
אמעאוצי IV. 53; IX. 3.
אמעאוצי Fr. 46. 2.
אמעאוצי IX. 35.
אמעאוצי III. 16; VI. 140.
אמעאוצי IV. 15.
אמעאוצי IX. 3.
אמעאוצי II. 25.
אמעאוצי II. 63 sch.
אמעאוצי IX. 97.
אמעאוצי Fr. 26. 3.
אמעאוצי Fr. 33. 2.
אמעאוצי VI. 117.
אץ II. 48 sch. = אץ VII. 12.
אץ II. 97; III. 16. אץ IX. 16. אץ VII. 12.
אץ אדוס III. 96 sch.
INDEXES

"Aργος IV. 29 and sch.
άρμα IV. 22; VI. 131, 176.
άρματη Fr. 124 sch.
άρματες v. l. VI. 10.
Άρισταρχος (?) II. 61 sch.; Fr. 82. 35 sch. (?); Fr. 94. 3 sch.; Frs. 129-31. 6 sch.; Fr. 134. 9 sch.
Άριστοφάνης (?) II. 75 sch.; VI. 89 sch., 181 sch.
άρκειν II. 31.
άρμα Fr. 16. 8.
άρμαρα IV. 25; VI. 106.
*Άρτεμις IV. 1.
άρτεραθή VI. 50.
άρτη IX. 20.
άρτη Π. 3 sch.
*Άστερια V. 42.
άστος II. 48; Frs. 129-31. 13.
άστρον VI. 126; IX. 2.
άστυ I. 7; IV. 32.
*Άστρον VI. 134.
άτραπατος IX. 5.
αι Π. 80; Fr. 82. 19 sch.
αιδά II. 101; IV. 3; VII. 17.
αιδά Β. 3.
Αδάς Fr. 139. 2 sch., 3 sch.
αιδάς III. 94; VII. 11 (?); IX. 36 sch.
αιταρχήν IV. 37.
αιτός II. 43 sch.; VI. 7 sch.; Fr. 82. 4 sch.
αιχεῖν II. 37 sch.
αιχήμας VI. 125 sch.
άιμα VI. 81; Fr. 82. 22.
*Αιφρόδιτα Ι. 5; VI. 4.
Αίχαι Ι. 85.
άιωνος VI. 59 and sch.
Βαβυλών IV. 15.
βαβύδωνος Π. 58; Fr. 28. 2 (?).
βαβύδωνος Fr. 47. 3 (?).
βαβύκηλατος VI. 135.
βαθής IV. 44; Fr. 16. 15.
βαίνειν VI. 100.
βαίνος II. 74.
βαίλειν IV. 10.
βαρύκτυπος IV. 41.
βατικός VI. 84.
βαδισμός IV. 26.
βίος IV. 26 sch.; VI. 117.
βίοςτειν I. 1; II. 73.
βουνομία IV. 27.
INDICES

IV. 27, 35, 49, 52; VI. 11 sch.; Fr. 21, 7; Fr. 73 sch.; Frs. 129–31, 1 sch., 3 sch.; Fr. 134, 2 sch.

cis II. 75 sch.; IV. 13 sch.
cis II. 33 sch.; VI. 1 sch., 7 sch., Col. xxv sch., 118 sch.; Fr. 19. 4; IX. 9; Fr. 139. 2 sch.

eis III. 95 sch.; Fr. 84. 14 sch.; Fr. 134. 4 sch. "φράσιν IX. 20.

"Εκάστα Fr. 82. 27.

"έκαθος VI. 79, 111; IX. 38.

"έκλειψις Fr. 19. 12.

"έκω IV. 35.

"εκαστος VI. 62 sch.

"Εκών IV. 78.

"έκταρος Fr. 82. 15 sch.

"έκταρα IX. 46.

"έκτεχνος Fr. 82. 31.

"έκτατον IV. 37.

"έκτάκτων VI. 63 sch.

"έκτυπον Ι. 118 sch. "έκδεξ... Fr. 134. 3 sch.

"έκθει IV. 50 sch.

"έκτηνος Ι. 43 sch.

"έκων Ι. 102.

... Ι. 27 sch.

"έλκωνος III. 16; IX. 6.

"έλκωνος IV. 14.

"Ελεύθ Ι. 65.

"έλκωνος III. 15.

"έλκωνος Fr. 16. 14.

"έλκωνος Ι. 99.

"Ελλανός VI. 125.

"Ελλήνιος VI. 123 sch.

"Ελλανίς IV. 23.

"Ελλώς VI. 62 sch.

"έλκων Ι. 43 sch.

"έλκωνος VI. 78.

"έλκωνος Ι. 57 sch.

"έλος ΙI. 29; IV. 44; VI. 11 and sch.; Frs. 129–31. 17.

"εμπαιον II. 29.

"εμπεδών II. 27. "εμπεδών IV. 49.

... ΙI. 31 sch., 43 sch., 48 sch., 69 sch.; ΙΙI. 12; VI. 5, 61, 98, 106, 119 sch., 120, 124 sch., 125 sch.; Fr. 19. 24; Fr. 95. 5 sch.; ΙX. 3, 17 sch., 36 sch., 40 sch., 41; Fr. 162. 2 sch.

"έμπαιος VI. 114.

"έμπαιος Frs. 129–31. 3.

"έμπαιος VI. 123.

"έμπαιος V. 44.

"έμπαιος Ι. 5.

"έμπαιος Frs. 129–31. 1 sch., 6 sch.

"Εμπαιον ΙV. 41.

"έμπαιος ΙI. 63 sch.

"έμπαιος ΙI. 74.

"έμπαιος VI. 11 sch.

"έμπαιος Fr. 82. 19 sch.

"έμπαιος IX. 43.

"έμπαιος Fr. 82. 2 sch.

"έμπαιος VI. 110.

"έμπαιος ΙI. 27.

"έμπαιος IV. 39.

"έμπαιος IV. 36.

... ΙI. 49 sch.; V. 40; VI. 7 sch., 98.

... Fr. 17. 3; Fr. 84. 15 sch.

"έμπαιος ΙI. 65; IV. 46; VI. 105.

"έμπαιος ΙV. 114.

"έμπαιος ΙI. 7; ΙI. 63 sch.

"έμπαιος ΙI. 22, 3 (?).

"έμπαιος ΙI. 48 sch.

... ΙI. 3; IV. 16 sch.; VI. 7 and sch., 100, 116, 134 and sch., 140; Fr. 19. 10 sch., 27; Fr. 26. 7; Fr. 82. 11 sch.

"έμπαιος ΙI. 64.

"έμπαιος IX. 5.

"έμπαιος Fr. 82. 18 sch., 19 sch.; IX. 34 sch.

"έμπαιος IX. 28–9 sch.

"έμπαιος ΙI. 48 sch.

"έμπαιος IX. 46.

"έμπαιος IV. 46; VI. 138.

... ΙI. 5; VI. Col. xxv sch.; VII. 2 sch.;

... Fr. 84, 10.

"έμπαιος VI. 58; Fr. 19, 29.

"έμπαιος Fr. 87. 3.

"έμπαιος I. 9.

"έμπαιος Fr. 16. 15.

"έμπαιος V. 45 sch.

"έμπαιος IV. 47.

"έμπαιος VI. 87 and sch.

"έμπαιος V. 39.

"έμπαιος Fr. 82. 30.

"έμπαιος V. 21 sch.

"έμπαιος VI. 114.

"έμπαιος ΙI. 26.

"έμπαιος ΙI. 33 sch.

"έμπαιος II. 68; VI. 9, 100; Fr. 16. 15;

... Fr. 82. 5 sch.; Fr. 137. 2 sch.

... ΙI. 44; VI. 115; VII. 3.
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σηλός II. 102.
τον VI. 10.
τα FRS. 129-31. 21.
τον VI. 62 sch.; FRS. 129-31. 6 sch.
ενωγις v. l. Fr. 19. 25.
ενωγια II. 67.
ευτυχίς VII. 18.
ενωγις Fr. 19. 25, v. l. ενωγις and νανα-
γις (?)
Ελθεια V. 35.
ευμαλία II. 50.
ειδία II. 52.
εισέρχει IV. 45.
εκτησία VI. 62 sch.
εκέβη τυηv Fr. 82. 18 sch.
ευμαλία I. 2.
εκαρπος II. 26.
εκελεθής II. 103.
ευμαχίαν Fr. 16. 11.
ευμαχία II. 78; V. 45.
εύνο Fr. 19. 20.
ευνί̃ζειν VI. 128.
ευμολη Ι. 10.
Εξάντατος IV. 35, 60 sch.
Ευδομος ΙΙ. 97.
ευπεπλος Fr. 16. 10.
ευπλεκής III. 12.
Ευήρατος IX. 49.
ευφήλεων VI. 53.
ευφίλας VI. 103; IX. 41.
εύφιλας Ι. 134; Fr. 82. 24.
εύφιλας VI. 60, 96, 120.
ευφιλαρέτη VI. 11.
εύφιλων VI. 115.
ευχαρίστα VI. 64, 125 sch.
ευθος II. 43 sch.
ευθομος II. 29.
έχειν IV. 48; V. 39; VI. Col. xxv sch., 57;
Fr. 26. 3; Frs. 129-31. 4 sch.
έχθρος II. 32, 54.
ζάδες ΙΙ. 63; VI. 5.
ζάκοσς ΙΙ. 18.
Ζέαδος IX. 44.
ζυγόνα FRS. 129-31. 20.
ζεύς IV. 41; VI. 1, 94, 125 and sch.; Fr.
19. 21; Fr. 92. 3; IX. 7.
ζυγόστατος IV. 58 sch.; VI. 55 sch., 59 sch.,
118 sch., 119 sch., 183 sch.

§ II. 37 sch., 43 sch., 48 sch.; VI. 118 sch.;
IX. 6, 14-7, 17 sch., 19.
§ IV. 21, 25. = ἐφή (?) Fr. 19. 21.
ηδή II. 55.
ημεις II. 55 sch.
ημέτερος II. 73 sch., 77 sch.
ημικα II. 29 sch.; Fr. 82. 4 sch.
"Ηρα VI. 88.
ηως IV. 58 sch. (?).
ησυχία II. 33; IV. 7.
ητο VIC. 118 sch., 130 sch. (?)
ητορ VI. 12.

δαλία VI. 14.
διδάξειν II. 52.
θυμα II. 98; Fr. 19. 27.
θυμαν VI. 16.
θύματος IV. 52.
θυρεών II. 23 sch.
θέα III. 15; VI. Col. xxv sch.
θερίγωνος I. 6.
θεμίζωνος VI. 131.
θέμις Fr. 84. 15 sch.; IX. 41.
θερίστων V. 45.
θέρσος IX. 17 and sch.
θεσπέσιος VII. 1.
θέτις VI. 84.
θέως II. 54, 65 and sch.; IV. 17; VI. 51, 61,
80, 94, 112; Fr. 82. 4 sch.; Fr. 95. 3 sch.

θέων II. 37 sch.
θῆμα I. 7.
θημίζω Fr. 82. 11 sch.; IX. 9, 40 sch.
θημίδαιον Fr. 134. 7 sch.
θηρ Fr. 26. 5.
θηράκτης II. 55 sch.
θοιος IX. 7.
θοὺς VI. 18.
θράσυς VI. 86; v. l. Fr. 96. 1.
θραίκια II. 25.
θροία II. 1.
θρόης IX. 36.
θυγατήρ Fr. 16. 10; Fr. 19. 22.
θίων III. 96 sch.; VI. 62.
θύεις III. 8.
θωράξ II. 1 sch.

'Ιαων II. 3.
'ιέναι Fr. 17. 2.
'ιππαυρον IV. 31, 62.
индексы

ф. 134, 3 sch.
ф. 139, 3 sch.
ф. 50; ф. 90.
ф. 21.
ф. 12, 105.
ф. 129-31, 19.
ф. 11, 17; v. l. ф. 16, 5.
ф. 139.
ф. 53.
ф. 3 sch.; ф. 130.
λόμης ΙΙΙ. 95 sch.
λαπθήνειν VI. 110.
λός I. 9; II. 3, 48; VI. 179.
λαστίδια VI. 15; Fr. 33, 4 (?)!
λατόν VI. 44.
λέγειν IV. 39; VI. 11 sch.; VII. 13; Fr.
19, 16 sch.; Fr. 71, 4 sch.; Fr. 82. 33;
IX. 35 sch.; Frs. 129–31. 4 sch., 7 sch.
λεπτέων II. 39, 72, 108; IV. 29, 45.
λευκώλειος VI. 87.
λέχος VI. 140; Fr. 19. 10 sch.; IX. 35, 42.
λέων VI. 7 sch.
λήμα VI. 37 sch.
λίκαν IV. 48; Fr. 162. 1.
λίμος VI. 64.
λίσασθαι VI. 3.
λιπανεύειν VI. 38.
λόγος II. 77; IV. 35; Fr. 82. 24; Fr. 84.
4 sch.
λοπτή II. 33 sch.; Fr. 84. 8.
λοξίων VI. 60.
λοχία Fr. 19. 10 sch.
λυπός Fr. 86, 3 (?)
μαιεύειν Ια. 36.
μάρακ IV. 46; Fr. 48. 2.
μάλα Fr. 84. 12.
μάλακος II. 52.
μάλλον II. 48 sch.
μάχι II. 39.
μαναίειν II. 46.
μαντεία Fr. 65. 2 sch.
μαντεύεσθαι Fr. 82. 1 sch.; Fr. 129. 3 sch.
μαντεί Fr. 26. 9; Fr. 84, 13; Fr. 95. 6 sch.(?)
μάρινανια ΙΙ. 39.
μάριον III. 34.
μάρτη II. 28, 29; III. 6; IV. 44; VI. 12, 105; IX. 2.
μάτρω F. 27. 2.
μεγαλόκτος IX. 17 sch.
μέγας ΙΙ. 26; IV. 48; VI. 90; Fr. 84. 10.
μεθέω ΙΙΙ. 124.
Μέλασμος IV. 28.
Μελιάμφολλος II. 69 and sch.
μέλι VI. 59.
Μελία IX. 35, 43.
μελίγνυμας III. 11; V. 47.
μελές ΙΙ. 57 sch., 77 sch.
μελπερεύονει VI. 17.
μέν II. 53; IV. 22; VI. 51; Fr. 84. 14;
Fr. 90. 3; Frs. 129–31. 18.
μένος VI. 88.
μέντοι VI. 11 sch.
μέρος IV. 38.
μετά II. 43 sch.; Fr. 95. 5 sch. (?); IX. 21, 36 sch.; Frs. 129–31. 4 sch.
μεταπορεύεσθαι IX. 49 sch.
μετρίως I. 3 sch.
μέτρον I. 3; VI. 121.
μέχρι VI. 62 sch.
μή II. 26; IV. 16 sch.; VI. 91, 115.
μήδεσθαι IX. 1.
μήδος IX. 37.
μήν II. 75.
μήποτε II. 36, 72, 108; Fr. 84. 14 sch.
μήτη VI. 116.
μηχνάει Fr. 19. 29; IX. 43.
μύ ΙI. 73; VI. 115 (v. 1. νυ); Fr. 19. 24
(v. l. νυ), 26; Frs. 129–31. 18.
Μημονίνα VI. 56; Fr. 16. 11.
μούρα ΙI. 64.
μούρος (μουρός Pop., v. l. Πύθως) VI. 118.
Μοίρα ΙI. 44; VI. 181.
Μοισαίος IX. 39.
Μολονός VI. 109.
μολία II. 96.
μοναρχεῖν IV. 29.
μόριον ΙΙΙ. 93 sch.
μόρισμος VI. 94.
Μούσα Fr. 95. 3 sch.
μόχθος II. 33 and sch.
Μυρμιδώνες VI. 107.
ναιν II. 24; IV. 21; V. 36.
Ναίς ΙI. 1.
νάος III. 7.
νάσος V. 39; VI. 124.
ναυγής (?) v. l. Fr. 19. 25.
ναυπίεταις VI. 130.
ναϊται Fr. 19. 26.
νέειν VI. 98.
νέμειν VI. 54; Fr. 33. 4.
νέόπολις II. 28.
Νεοπτόλεμος VI. 102.
νέος VI. 122; IX. 20. νεώτερος IX. 6.
νέφος VI. 92.
νήλης Fr. 26. 5.
νήσος IV. 16 sch.
νικαί II. 63 sch.
νικαφθορία Fr. 48. 3.
νίκη II. 43 sch., 106 sch.
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νυ IV. 15; v. l. VI. 115; VI. 180; v. l. Fr. 19. 24; Fr. 82. 32; IX. 47.
νεφέτος IX. 14.
νοειν II. 54.
νόμμα I. 3; II. 43 sch.
νόμος II. 102.
νομίς IV. 51.
νόσος V. 45.
νοτέρος IX. 17 sch.
νότος IX. 17 and sch.
νῦν I. 5; VI. 121.
νῦν VI. 58.
νῦτον VI. 139.

ἑπένοια VI. 61.

ὁ δεμοστῆν, τῶν Fr. 19. 28. τῷ IX. 44.
τοῦ II. 59; IV. 42. τὰ καὶ τὰ VI. 132.
ὁδε II. 3; Fr. 82. 29.
ὁόδος IV. 6; Fr. 16. 15; IX. 4.
ὁόδημια I. 1.
ὁὁδυν Fr. 134. 5 sch.
ὁοεύν V. 42.
ὁοκόβον IV. 32.
ὁοκότετος I. 4.
ὁοεύν IV. 45.
ὁομος VI. 115.
ὁον II. 3 sch., 43 sch., 55 sch.
ὁοχέρεθα II. 55; IV. 61 sch.
ὁοιοντόδολος IV. 30.
ὁοτῶν III. 10.
ὁοδοβος II. 60; VI. 133; IX. 9.
ὁογίως IV. 52.
ὁολος Fr. 82. 21.
ὁοιος IV. 45.
ὁοφύρεσθα IX. 21.
ὁολύμπιος VI. 1.
ὁολύμπια VI. 92.
ὁομορος Fr. 17. 1; Frs. 129–31. 4 sch.
ὁομυλος VI. 108.
ὁομύμα IV. 2.
ὁομύναι VI. 112.
ὁομος II. 37 sch.
ὁομφα III. 94; V. 48.
ὁομφαλος VI. 16, 120.
ὁομφάνωμος Fr. 134. 6.
ὁονερητήριος IV. 61 sch. (?).
ὁοξίων II. 48 sch.

ὁομυκλοτός VI. 123.
ὁοπτώο VI. 101.
ὁοπλος Fr. 93. 4.
ὁοπος II. 5 sch.; VI. 125 sch.
ὁορα T. 3; VI. 106.
ὁορκος Frs. 129–31. 4 sch.
ὁοροην IX. 11.
ὁοροητήριος IX. 47.
ὁοροηφὴ Fr. 19. 26.
ὁοροηφιλός VI. 9.
ὁος II. 79 sch.; III. 95 sch.; IV. 36; VI. 62 sch.; 77, 104, 113, 118 sch.; Fr. 82, 27; IX. 41.
ὁοσος, ὁοσος VI. 87, 89 and sch.
ὁοτε VI. 63.
ὁοτος Fr. 16. 14.
ὁοτος Fr. 86. 1.
ὁοτι IX. 21.
ὁοτινος IV. 28, 53; VI. 94, 127; Fr. 19. 21;
Fr. 86. 3.
ὁοτινος II. 55 sch.; VI. 110, 111.
ὁοτινος IX. 21.
ὁοτιρετος II. 55 sch.
ὁολόμενος IX. 15.
ὁοφέκτον VI. 127.
ὁοφαντός Fr. 16. 10.
ὁοφτε VI. 105, 106.
ὁοφτος II. 43 sch., 69 sch., 105 sch.; VI. 51, 57; Fr. 16. 16; Fr. 82. 17 sch.; IX. 36 sch.; Frs. 129–31. 1 sch., 4 sch.; Fr. 162. 3 sch. ὁοφτος Fr. 69. 1 sch.; Fr. 82. 35 sch.
ὁοφίτερος VI. 82.

παγαντός IX. 17.
παγκονος IX. 10.
παθα Fr. 82. 26.
πάθος Fr. 82. 17 sch.
παυεν II. 4, 35, 71, 107; V. 47; VI. 182.
παυαν VI. 121, 127.
Παιωνις II. 61.
παξ II. 2; IV. 60 sch.; V. 44; VI. 12, 74, 77 (παξ), 83, 134; Fr. 28. 3.
πάλαι II. 56; Fr. 19. 26.
πάληται IV. 47.
παναπατήρων Fr. 82. 24.
Πανδομος V. 45 sch.
Παντελλάν VI. 62.
Πανθεος VI. 74.
παντελής I. 5.
παντοδιπος II. 43 sch.
πάρ, παρά VI. 17, 120; IX. 17 sch.; Frs. 129-31, 18, 19.
παραγωγής II. 43 sch.
παρέκκλησιν IV. 24.
παρθένιος II. 77, 100; VI. 54, 136; Fr. 26. 4.
Πάρμος VI. 79.
Παράμάσιος II. 97.
πάρον IX. 6.
πάρε IV. 6; VI. 55, 132; Fr. 82, 32; Fr. 84, 10 and sch., 15 sch.; Fr. 87, 3; IX. 21.
Παραφάς IV. 38.
πάτρεια IX. 21.
πατρῷ VI. 56, 118 sch.; Fr. 21, 10; Fr. 82, 8 sch.; IX. 45; Frs. 129-31. 9.
πάτρων II. 2 sch.
πατρίς IV. 29.
πατρίων VI. 106, 168 (?).
πεδαν VI. 86.
πεδεχεῖν IV. 16 (?), 37.
πεδίον IV. 16 and sch.
πεδίον Fr. 82, 32; IX. 16.
πεζίειν II. 43 sch.
πεζὼν VI. 13, 52; Fr. 19, 20.
πειρὰν IV. 46.
πέλαγος Fr. 19, 24.
πελάς IX. 35.
πέμπτεν IX. 43; Fr. 88, 1.
πενθος IV. 53.
πεντάλας IV. 13 sch.
πενταμίνιος Fr. 82, 26.
περαμίνων Fr. 21, 9.
πέραν II. 61.
Πέργαμος VI. 96.
πέρδειν IX. 91.
περί IV. 58; VI. 62 sch., 95, 118, 125 sch.
περιέλλα IX. 48.
περιόδος IV. 51.
Πέρσας II. 29 sch.
πέτρα II. 98; Fr. 19, 25.
Περλείδας VI. 99.
Περνάω Frs. 120-31. 4 sch.
Περίδες VI. 6.
Πύθαρχος Fr. 82, 3 sch.; IX. 1 sch.
Πύθος II. 97.
πυτῶν VI. 85.
πλάσιον II. 30.
πλήρες Fr. 82, 17 sch.
πλούτος IV. 46.
πνίν Fr. 96, 2.
πνῦν VI. 50, 130.
ποίημα IX. 37 sch.
ποιμά VI. 172.
πόλεμος II. 43 sch., 57 sch., 59, 105; IV. 40; IX. 13.
πολέμιος II. 30, 31 sch.
πολιούχος Frs. 129-31. 12.
Πολιαί VI. 89.
πολιαῖ Fr. 33; 3.
πόλες II. 3 sch., 29 sch., 48 sch.; IV. 13 sch., 37; VI. 104; Fr. 99, 2; IX. 44.
πολιτείας II. 48 sch.
πολική VI. 182.
πολιδωρός II. 66.
πολύμπος V. 38 (v. l. περέμπος).
πολύς II. 48 sch., 75; IV. 50 sch.
πολυτακτός IX. 1.
πολύτοπος VI. 99.
πονεῖν II. 66.
πόνος VI. 89; Fr. 16, 17.
πόντιος VI. 83; IX. 47.
πόντος VI. 124; IX. 16.
πορθόμας Fr. 139, 2 sch. (?).
πόρος Fr. 162, 2 sch.
Ποσειδάνιος II. 2.
Ποσειδιάνιος II. 41.
ποσίμως II. 73; Fr. 138, 1 sch.
ποτέ IV. 42; VI. 73, 135; Fr. 82, 5 sch., 28; IX. 41.
ποτή II. 75; III. 14.
ποτικοριώ II. 45.
πότινα IX. 10.
πούς VI. 18.
πράσσειν Fr. 84, 12.
Πράσιμος VI. 113.
πρᾶς I. 1, 2.
πρὸ VI. 89; VII. 15.
προβαθέως Π. 106.
προβαθμός Frs. 129-31. 20.
προβιθήσειν II. 56 and sch.
πρόδυνον VI. 134 sch., 135.
προδέγαων II. 77 sch.
προμαθεία Fr. 82, 35.
προπάραθεν II. 70.
πρὸς II. 43 sch., 57 sch.; VI. 1, 114; IX. 7.
προσδόκω Fr. 108 sch. (?).
προστακτικῶς VI. 177 sch.
προφέρεταιν Fr. 82, 10 sch.
προφάταις VI. 6; IX. 42.
προκάτας VI. 69.
πρῶτος II. 76; Fr. 107 sch.
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πτανός Fr. 16. 8.
Πέθος v. l. VI. 118; IX. 43.
Πνεῦ VI. 1 sch., 2.
Πνουθέθεν VI. 72.
πύρ II. 30; III. 95 sch.; VI. 98.
pos IV. 49.

μῦν VI. 7 sch.; IX. 18.
μπτεν Fr. 19. 25.
μοθός VI. 129.

σάμα IX. 13.
σαμαίνειν Fr. 82. 23.
σαμάρων IX. 46. σαμάρων I. 10.
σαλι I. 44; VI. 97.
σενέθαι IX. 5.
σημαίνειν III. 95 sch.
σέθος III. 93; IX. 14.
σκάϊζω I. 2; VI. 180.
σκόιδος VI. 17.
σκληρός Fr. 82. 31.
σκότελος IV. 21.
σκοπίς VI. 94.
Σκυράδεν VI. 102.
σός VI. 133.
σόφια Fr. 16. 15; IX. 4.
σοφίς VI. 52.
στείδειν Fr. 82. 20.
στελάγχων Fr. 82. 28.
στερήσα I. 129–31. 4 and sch.
στερέα ΙI. 48 sch.
στέας IV. 53; IX. 15.
στέρεως IV. 34.
στέρνων I. 14.
στέφανος VI. 13. 180 and sch.
στονάξη Fr. 82. 22.
στρατεύομαι Fr. 82. 10 sch.
στρατά I. 73 sch., 75, 104; IV. 42; IX. 44.
Στρέξ Frs. 129–31. 4 and sch.
στό II. 3 (στέβν) and sch.; III. 13 (τίν); VI. 1, 127; Fr. 82. 25; IX. 7, 43; Frs. 129–31. 18 (τίν).

συγγένεια IV. 33.
συμφέρων II. 57 sch.
συμφόρος Fr. 26. 12.
σύν II. 59, 74. 82; V. 18, 47; VI. 4. 55; Fr. 26. 4; Fr. 94. 3 sch.; Fr. II. 12. 1.
συνήγω IX. 36 (inf. συνήγω).
συνήθεια Frs. 129–31. 4 sch.
συνήρεθαι VI. 125 sch.

συνήθως VI. 118 sch.
συντείνειν IX. 49.
συντελεῖν II. 65.
Σύριος Fr. 16. 7.
σφέις, σφί (υ) IV. 40; V. 40. σφίων Fr. 84. 11.
σχείν I. 1; II. 73; VI. 109.
σώφρον I. 10. σώφρων IX. 46.

Τάρταρος IV. 44.
ταύρος VII. 14.
τάφος VI. 98.
τάχυστος II. 100.
ταχύς Fr. 96. 1 (v. l. βρασίς).
tειμός IV. 47; VI. 57.
tείχος II. 37.
tελεύθαιος II. 105.
tέλος Fr. 21. 7.
tέμενος VI. 120.
tεσ VI. 11.
tέρας IV. 39; Fr. 82. 34; IX. 10.
tείχον IX. 132.
tέχνα IX. 39.
tέως II. 3 sch., 29 sch.
tήμα II. 3 sch.
tήλ ... IV. 61 sch.
tήνερος IX. 41.
tεύς IX. 48.
tευθέα I. 30; VI. 81, 99; IX. 3, 19.
tευκτείν II. 29 sch.; Fr. 82. 30; IX. 42; Frs. 129–31. 21.
tιμά VI. 11 and sch., 118.
tίε Fr. 19. 20; IX. 1.
tίς I. 2; II. 31, 66; IV. 25, 60 sch.; VI. 130 sch.; Fr. 26. 4 (?); Fr. 95. 2 sch. (?).
t 5 sch.; IX. 6, 9, 13, 34; Frs. 129–31. 4 sch.

Συναρπάσω Frs. 129–31. 4 sch.
τλάν II. 64.
tόθ VI. 15.
tοι IV. 21, 40; VI. 70 (?), 132.
tοιάδε Fr. 82. 23.
tοιοίος II. 43 sch.
tοικείς II. 57.
tολμάν VI. 94.
Τόμαρος VI. 109.
tαξιοφόρος Fr. 19. 30.
tότος II. 5 sch., 69 sch.
tότε VI. 137.
τραχός II. 32.
τριχ IV. 40.
τριτέριος II. 43 sch.; IX. 9.
τρισάλος IV. 43.
τρισάλος II. 63; VI. 14.
τρισάλος VI. 75.
τυγχάνων II. 76.
τυφλός Fr. 16, 13.
τέχνα Fr. 21, 8.

φρυγίς II. 48 sch.
φθορ VI. 7 and sch., 134; IX. 18 and sch.;
Frs. 129–31. 4 sch.
νίσο IV. 38, 61 sch.; Frs. 129–31. 21; Fr.
152. 2.
νάττορος V. 46; VI. 139; IX. 37.
νῦν . . . Fr. 21, 10.
νυμφία IV. 4 sch.; Fr. 94. 1 sch.
νύμφα Fr. 16. 5.
υπατάξεις II. 32.
υπέρ II. 63 sch.; VI. 62; Fr. 84. 14, 15.
υπεργανάθος III. 95 sch.
υπέρατος II. 68; Fr. 86. 4; IX. 2.
υπέρφατος IX. 15.
υπάλλος Fr. 82. 34.
ύπα Fr. 82. 28; Fr. 90. 4; IX. 34.
υπομένων II. 65 sch.; Fr. 144. 2 sch.
υποτίθυνας II. 43 sch.
υφηλίς II. 98.
υψίκομος VI. 95.
υψιστός II. 38.
υψόθεν III. 11.

φανερός III. 17; VI. 126.
φαίνειν Fr. 19, 25; Fr. 90. 2.
φανερός VII. 13. φανερός Fr. 74. 2 sch.
φέγγος II. 68.
φέρειν II. 33, 43, 57; IV. 25; VI. 76, 124.
sch.; Fr. 82. 29; IX. 13.
φερόμενος ν. l. V. 38.
φθορις IX. 14.
φθανείν II. 46 sch., 55 sch.
φθάνον II. 55.
φάλ . . . VI. 178.
φάλα . . . VII. 7.
φιλέων VI. 67 (?).
φιλήσωττέρας I. 8.
φιλίστως I. 7.

φιλος II. 31; IV. 33; VI. 12, 120.
φλέγων II. 67.
φοινικόπετα II. 77.
φόνος VI. 86.
φορέων Fr. 19. 27.
φραξείν Fr. 49. 1.
φρήν IV. 50; Fr. 16. 13; IX. 37.
φυλάσσεις VI. 91.
φύρων II. 73 and sch.

χάλκεος II. 100; VI. 7 sch.; Fr. 90. 3.
χαλκείς III. 94.
χαλκεωθάραξ II. 1.
χαλκοκορυστάς VI. 108.
χαλκόπτολος VI. 7 and sch.
χάραμα II. 103; IX. 37.
χάριτες III. 2; IV. 13; VI. 3; Fr. 112. 1.
χασμάτων VI. 7 sch.
χάθως II. 60; IV. 14, 42; VI. 16; Fr. 84.
14; IX. 17.
χαρείν IV. 2 (?).
χαρεύεις VI. 9.
χάρης II. 99; III. 101.
χράν Fr. 82. 1 sch. χρή II. 57. χρήν VI. 96.
χρίζειν Fr. 82. 14 sch.
χρήμα VI. 118 sch.
χρησμός Fr. 82. 9 sch.
χρηστήρα χρή VI. 71; VII. 18; IX. 40.
χρόνιον II. 27; III. 14; IV. 11; VI. 5.
χρόνες Ι. 1, 92, 137; Frs. 129–31. 1 sch.
χρόνιττος Fr. 84. 14 sch. (?).
χρυσό . . . Frs. 129–31. 10. χρυσό . . . III.
13.
χρυσόκόμος V. 41.
χώρος IX. 49.

ψόφος VI. 8 and sch.

ἄ VI. 125; Fr. 28. 2; Fr. 82. 24; IX. 2, 10.
ἄ IV. 31, 62.
ἀδόν II. 102 sch., IX. 36 sch.
ἀδελφός Fr. 84. 15 and sch.; IX. 43.
ομοί Ι. 6.
ἄριστος III. 14.
όν ΙΙ. 129–31. 4 sch., 6 sch.
ἀνάβελεια II. 37 sch.
INDEX III. 842.

Numerals in thick type refer to columns.

ἀγαθών 12. 28; 20. 34.
ἀγανακτεῖν 1. 9; 18. 24.
ἀγγέλλων 15. 3.
ἀγέν 17. 23; 19. 14, 20; 20. 15, 36; 21. 4; Fr. 71. 5.
Ἀγγείλας 5. 6, 47; 6. 14, 30, 40; 7. 1, 39; 18. 33; 19. 18, 26, 35; 20. 4, 15; 21. 4.
 advisers 30.
Ἄγρις 1. 30.
ἅγιοι 6. 25; 11. 16, 19.
ἁγιός 14. 5.
ἅλκειν 15. 10.
ἅδρομάτος 3. 7.
αἴει 5. 39; 14. 31, 40; 16. 3; 20. 23.
αἰ 3. 13.
Ἄδημα 2. 10.
Ἄδημηνει 1. 2.
ἀγάλλικα 18. 16.
Ἄγνα 1. 23; 2. 35; 3. 6.
ἀλέει 1. 17; 6. 25; 10. 6 (?); Fr. 13. 4 (?);
15. 21; 16. 36; 19. 7.
αἰσθάνεσθαι 3. 32; 14. 28; 17. 23.
Ἄσμα 1. 16.
αἰτόω 11. 39; 16. 9.
ἀκέμασο 20. 29.
ἀκόνωντες 7. 38 (?).
ἀκοῦον 17. 13.
ἀκοπτέων 21. 9.
ἀκοίειν 2. 36; 18. 23; 21. 36.
Ἀκραίφωνος 12. 20.
ἀκόρον μῆλα 17. 35.
Ἀλατί, ἡ ποίος ἢ (gem.) 17. 33.
Ἀλάτρος 12. 17.
Ἀλλακεσθαί 18. 32.
Ἀκτόν (ἡ) 3. 26.
ἀλλά 6. 36; Fr. 11. 10; 12. 2; 13. 1, 28; 15. 10, 20; 17. 8; 20. 8; 21. 8. ἄλλα ὣ θ ἤ 
5. 42.
ἀλλάζων 12. 33; 14. 32.
ἀλλάζει 2. 16; 6. 27; 7. 42, 43; 8. 41; Fr. 11. 9; 11. 26; 12. 13; 14. 3. 19;
15. 29; 17. 11; 18. 21, 30; 20. 21. ἄλλας 5. 20 (?).
ἅμα 8. 5; 7. 6; 10. 2, 3; 13. 18, 19; 18. 34.
ἅμαρτηθέσιμος 14. 25.
Ἀμφίφυλος 2. 24.
ἀμφάτερος 5. 43.
ἀν ὁ 14. 28; 16. 7; 17. 20.
ἀναβαίνων 11. 20; 15. 38; 16. 25.
ἀνάγειν 1. 7; 6. 5; 15. 36.
ἀναφέρειν 20. 2.
ἀνακράζειν 11. 21.
ἀναλαμβάνων 3. 32; 6. 39; 20. 17.
ἀναπτείν 14. 22; 16. 31.
ἀναπέμπειν 7. 22.
ἀνασταυρόν 18. 22.
ἀναφορέων 15. 5. 30.
ἀνελάβοδον 13. 31.
Ἀνθρωπείδεσις 14. 6, 35; 15. 2; (ἡρ) 13. 11.
(Ἀνθρωπέλη) 12. 34.
ἀνήρ 3. 37; 11. 22; 14. 22, 35; 16. 37.
ἀναθραψάζων 14. 33.
ἀνθρώπους 6. 26; 17. 16, 25.
ἀναστάτων 1. 15; 6. 5, 11, 17; 19. 24; 20. 27; 36.
ἀντι Fr. 11. 13; 14. 33; 21. 15.
Ἀντίθεος 12. 34.
ἀντιλαμβάνειν 17. 21.
ἀντιπάτρες 1. 27.
Ἀντως 1. 16.
ἀνω 20. 37.
ἀνω 21. 31.
ἀνωθεν 14. 40; 15. 6.
ἀπαγγέλλων 3. 43.
ἀπαγορεύειν 16. 20.
ἀπαλλάττων 2. 11.
ἀπάνα 1. 25; 6. 13, 33; 12. 6, 27; 13. 34; 18. 15.
ἀπάτη 12. 21; 15. 12.
ἀπελευχά 13. 23 (?).
ἀπεικόνες 15. 6.
ἀπερχεσθαί 15. 32.
Ἀπίας πεθεῖν 19. 2. 
ἀπόστα 15. 8. 
ἀπλάσε 12. 25. 
ἀπό 6. 15; 13. 35; 14. 17, 30; 16. 38; 18. 2; 21. 32, 33, 37. 
ἀποδαλέαν 14. 33; 15. 29. 
ἀποδαλόνα 6. 31; 16. 32. 
ἀποδέηκεν 19. 20, 33. 
ἀποκοίμησεν 17. 28 (?). 
ἀποκείμεναι 3. 23; 11. 25; 18. 22, 29. 
ἀποθάνατοι 3. 18. 
ἀπολέειν 1. 18. 
ἀποσπασθάναι 15. 26. 
ἀποσπάμενοι 1. 27; 3. 4. 
ἀποσταλεῖν 17. 33 (7); 18. 1. 
ἀπορέθυνοι 20. 9. 
ἀπορρίθητοι 1. 4. 
ἀποστέλλειν 1. 32; 7. 35; 15. 14; 16. 20; 21. 10. 
ἀποστείλαντο 21. 34. 
ἀποσφιώτες 6. 29, 15. 19. 
ἀποσφυρόμενοι 15. 25. 
ἀπρακτός 15. 14. 
ἀπτέναι 17. 27. 
'Αργύλων 2. 8, 16; 14. 13. 
'Αρχαίος 7. 23, 36, 37 (7); 8. 24; 16. 27. 
ἀρκτικὴ 3. 19; 10. 18. 
-αράσι 3. 11, 19, 30. 
-αρατμήσει 1. 22; 2. 36. 
ἀρματζέει 15. 1. 
'Αρταφερής 7. 14; 8. 5. 
'Αρταφερήσεις 3. 37 (?). 
ἀρτι 11. 28 
ἀρχεῖν 1. 11; 4. 35; 13. 23, 36; 14. 20; 21. 37. 
ἀρχον 11. 25; 12. 21, 26; 16. 11; 18. 25, 29. 
'Αρχελάοι 3. 22; Frs. 19. 8 (?), 20. 11 (?). 
ἀρχη 3. 30; 16. 11; 17. 36. 
'Ασίας 12. 35; (Λατίας) 13. 13. 
ἀμμενώνσιάτα 15. 1. 
ἀνδραλώς 19. 12. 
ἀντε 6. 29; 13. 34. 
ἀπάκτων 19. 7. ἀπάκτων 6. 9. 
Ἀττική 2. 39; 13. 33. 
Ἀττικικός 12. 38; 13. 4 (?). 
ἀδείς 6. 39; 15. 19. 

Λαλίς 13. 25. 
ἀυτόθι 18. 3. 
ἀυτόσπομοι 19. 5. 
αὐτός 1. 3, 5, 17, 33; 2. 10, 13, 18; 3. 2, 29, 42; 5. 31; 6. 3, 7, 8 (?); 14. 20, 21, 22, 25, 27, 36, 40; 7. 17, 20; 8. 7, 39; 11. 15, 20, 28, 35; 12. 23; 13. 11, 20, 24; 14. 1, 3, 9, 15. 22, 34, 40; 15. 4, 8, 11, 12, 26, 39; 16. 17, 27, 32; 17. 7, 20, 28, 38; 18. 5, 15, 16, 29; 19. 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, 16, 29, 35; 20. 9, 12, 13, 17, 19, 20, 26; 21. 11, 15, 24, 32, 34. 
αὐτὸς 3. 4; 6. 8 (?); 11. 12; 13. 17, 35; 14. 39; 15. 7, 32; 16. 14, 21, 36; 18. 7; 19. 33. 
ἀφθάνων 10. 3. 
ἀφίκοντα πᾶσι 15. 34; 18. 28; 20. 24, 29; 21. 20; Fr. 29. 3. 
ἀφυστάναι 2. 31; 6. 22. 
ἀφορμῶν 5. 27. 

Βαλείτης 18. 19 (?). 
Βαλλέας 17. 28 (?); 18. 25. 
Βαρύθυρας 5. 24; 6. 6, 12, 18, 23, 28, 39; 8. 42; Fr. 11. 9; 14. 12; 16. 21. 
Βαρυῖος 18. 24. 
Βασίλης 1. 30; 3. 27, 41; 7. 4, 18; 8. 35, 38; 14. 11; 16. 4, 9, 19, 26; 18. 6; 19. 6; 21. 23; Fr. 33. 4. 
Βασιλείκος 18. 30. 
Βέλτιστος 7. 38; 12. 31. 
Βελτίως 13. 28. 
Βέκεσταίος 10. 10; 20. 34; Fr. 18. 4. 
Βεκέσταίος 21. 9 (?). 
Βιος Fr. 11. 11. 
Βιός 11. 23. 
Βιοθέα 11. 24. 
Βιοθέας 14. 39; 15. 3; 17. 24. 
Βουσιάρχης 12. 15; (χος) 12. 10, 22. 
Βουσιοί 2. 3, 8, 16; 11. 34, 37, 12. 7, 30; 13. 12; 14. 19, 38; 15. 3, 7, 9, 31. 
Βουλήσταντα 3. 17, 39; 6. 30; 7. 44; 11. 4, 9; 14. 8; 15. 37; 17. 10, 34; 18. 2, 7; 11, 37; 19. 11. 
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