THE

OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

PART IV

GRENFELL AND HUNT
EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND
GRAECO-ROMAN BRANCH

THE
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI
PART IV

EDITED WITH TRANSLATIONS AND NOTES

BY
BERNARD P. GRENFELL, D.Litt., M.A.
HON. LITT. D. DUBLIN; HON. PH. D. KOENIGSBERG; FELLOW OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD

AND

ARTHUR S. HUNT, D.Litt., M.A.
HON. PH. D. KOENIGSBERG; FELLOW OF LINCOLN COLLEGE, OXFORD

WITH EIGHT PLATES

LONDON

SOLD AT
The Offices of the EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND, 37 Great Russell St., W.C.
and 8 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCII, TRÜBNER & CO., PATERNOSTER HOUSE, CHARING CROSS ROAD, W.C.
BERNARD QUARITCH, 15 PICCADILLY, W. ; ASHER & CO., 13 BEDFORD ST., COVENT GARDEN, W.C.
AND HENRY FROWDE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

1904
PREFACE

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

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

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

BERNARD P. GRENFELL.
ARTHUR S. HUNT.

OXFORD,
APRIL, 1904.
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NOTE ON THE METHOD OF PUBLICATION AND LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The same general method is followed in the following pages as in preceding volumes. As before, a few of the new literary texts are printed in a dual form, a reconstruction in modern style accompanying a literal transcript. In other cases, and in the fragments of extant authors, the originals are reproduced except for division of words, addition of capital initials to proper names, expansion of abbreviations, and supplements, so far as possible, of lacunae. In 668, however, which is on a rather different level from the other literary pieces, accentuation and punctuation have been introduced as well as in 658, which strictly does not belong to the literary section at all. Additions or corrections by the same hand as the body of the text are in small thin type, those by a different hand in thick type. Non-literary documents are given in modern style only. Abbreviations and symbols are resolved; additions and corrections are usually incorporated in the text and their occurrence is recorded in the critical notes, where also faults of orthography, &c., are corrected wherever any difficulty could arise. Iota adscript is printed when so written, otherwise iota subscript is used. Square brackets [] indicate a lacuna, round brackets () the resolution of a symbol or abbreviation, angular brackets () a mistaken omission in the original; double square brackets [ ] mean that the letters within them have been deleted in the original, braces { } that the letters so enclosed, though actually written, should be omitted. Dots placed within brackets represent the approximate number of letters lost or deleted; dots outside brackets indicate mutilated or otherwise illegible letters. Letters with dots underneath them are to be considered doubtful. Heavy Arabic numerals refer to the texts of the Oxyrhynchus papyri published in this volume and in Parts I-III; ordinary numerals to lines; small Roman numerals to columns.
The abbreviations used in referring to papyrological publications are practically the same as those adopted by Wilcken in *Archiv* I. i. pp. 25-28, viz.:—

*Archiv* = Archiv für Papyrusforschung.


P. Cairo = Greek Papyri in the Cairo Museum, Catalogue by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.
P. Catt. = Papyrus Cattaoui (*Archiv* iii. 55 sqq.).


I. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

654. NEW SAYINGS OF JESUS.

24.4 x 7.8 cm. Plate I.

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

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

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

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

{oí} τοῖοι οἱ λόγοι οἱ [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . oûς ἐλά-
λησεν Ἰη[σοῦς] ὅ ζῶν κύριος? [. . . . . . . . . . . . . .
καὶ Θωμᾶ καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτοῖς] πᾶς ὅστις
ἀν τῶν λόγων τούτων ἀκούσῃ θανάτου

5 οὐ μὴ γευσηται.

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

The general sense of the introduction is clear, and most of the restorations are fairly certain. In l. 1 an adjective such as θαυμάσιοι is necessary after oî [. . . . . . . . . . . . . . oûς ἐλά-
λησεν Ἰη[σοῦς] ὅ ζῶν κύριος? [. . . . . . . . . . . . . .
καὶ Θωμᾶ καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτοῖς] πᾶς ὅστις
ἀν τῶν λόγων τούτων ἀκούσῃ θανάτου

5 οὐ μὴ γευσηται.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

St. John, the phrase has the deeper and metaphorical meaning that those who obey Christ's words and attain to the kingdom, reach a state unaffected by the death of the body. The beginning of l. 1 requires some correction, oi τῶι οἰ λόγοι οἴ being extremely ugly. The corruption of oi τωι into oi τωι is not very likely, though cf. Luke xxiv. 44 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοῦ, οὐσα ωι λόγοι οἱ εἰς εὐλαβεῖ πρὸς ἵματι ἔτι δών σῖν ἵματι. But since τοιοῦ is found in late prose writers for τοιάδε, the simplest course is to omit the initial oi. The τοιοῦ being in a crack is not clear in the photograph, but is quite certain. The restoration of l. 2 presents the chief difficulty. κύριος is very doubtful; κόι followed by e.g. ἰποδανῶν is equally likely, and several of the possible supplements at the end of the line require a longer word than κύριος to precede. A dative before καὶ Θωμᾶς is necessary, and three alternatives suggest themselves:—(1) a proper name, in which case Φιλίππῳ or Μαρθά (or Μαρθᾶς) are most likely in the light of the following words καὶ Θωμᾶς. Apocryphal Gospels assigned to Thomas, Philip, and Matthias are known, and in Pistis Sophia 70–1 Philip, Thomas, and Matthias (so Zahn with much probability in place of Matthew found in the text) are associated as the recipients of a special revelation; cf. Harnack, Allchrist. Littler. I. p. 14; (2) a phrase such as τοῖς τε ἄλλωσι τοῖς (i) μαθηταῖς (so Bartlet, cf. l. 32 and John xx. 26 καὶ . . . ὄντων ἐστι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Θωμᾶς μετ' αὐτῶν); (3) 'Ἰσαάκ τῷ καὶ Θωμᾶς, suggested by Prof. Lake, who compares the frequent occurrence of the double name Ἰσαάκ ὁ καὶ Θωμᾶς in the Acts of Thomas. The uncertainty attaching to the restoration is the more unfortunate, since much depends on it. If we adopt the first hypothesis, Thomas has only a secondary place; but on either of the other two he occupies the chief position, and this fact would obviously be of great importance in deciding the origin of the Sayings; cf. pp. 18 sqq. On the question whether the introduction implies a post-resurrectional point of view see pp. 13–4.

There is a considerable resemblance between the scheme of ll. 1–3, oi λόγοι. . . οὗ εὐλαβῆσθαι Ἰησοῦς . . . καὶ εἰπέν, and the formulae employed in introducing several of the earliest citations of our Lord's Sayings, especially I Clem. 13 μάκαρ μεταμιμέων τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ όν εὐλαβῆσθαι διδάσκων . . . οὕτως γὰρ εἰπέν, Acts xx. 35 μηνονοίαν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ότι αὐτοῦ εἰπέν. Rendel Harris had already (Contemp. Rev. 1897, pp. 346–8) suggested that those formulae were derived from the introduction of a primitive collection of Sayings known to St. Paul, Clement of Rome, and Polycarp, and this theory gains some support from the parallel afforded by the introduction in 65a.

First Saying. ll. 5–9.

5 [ λέγει Ἰησοῦς]

μὴ παυσάσθω ὦ ᾽Ιησοῦν . . . . . . . ἐως ἄν

ἐγρη καὶ ὅταν εὐρη [θαμβηθήσεται καὶ θαμβηθεῖσι βασιλεύσει καὶ ἰ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαύσεται.

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

The conclusion of this Saying is quoted from the Gospel according to the Hebrews by Clement of Alexandria (Ström. ii. 9. 45) ὃ καὶ τῷ καθ 'Εβραίους εὐγγέλιῳ ὁ θεομάχος
First Saying. II. 9-21.

λέγει Ἱησοῦν . . . . . . τίνες

10 οἱ ἔλκοντες ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰ

ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐρανοῦ ἐστίν; . . . . . .

τὰ πεπείνα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῶν θηρίων θ.

Since this volume was put into type, Harnack has expressed his views of this "Agrapha" in Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Abh. 1904, pp. 175-9. He there shows in opposition to Zahn that astonishment is to be interpreted here as a sign of joy, not of fear, and strongly repels the unfavourable criticisms of Resch upon the Saying, of which Harnack in fact maintains the substantial genuineness. Incidentally, as he also remarks, the close parallelism between the language of the papyrus and Clement is important, for from whatever source this Saying found its way into the present collection, it cannot have come through Clement. There is, therefore, good reason to think that the Gospel according to the Hebrews (or at least a part of it) was known in Egypt in a Greek version at an early period, a view which has been disputed by Zahn.
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15 τι ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστὶν ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ
οἱ ἱερεῖς τῆς θαλάσσης οὗτοι οἱ ἔλκουσ-

20 γνώσοσθε ἐαυτοὺς ἐν]. . . . . . . . .
καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ηπτο.] . . .

'Jesus saith, (Ye ask? who are those) that draw us (to the kingdom, if) the kingdom is in Heaven? . . . , the fowls of the air, and all beasts that are under the earth or upon the earth, and the fishes of the sea, (these are which draw) you, and the kingdom of Heaven is within you; and whoever shall know himself shall find it. (Strive therefore?) to know yourselves, and ye shall be aware that ye are the sons of the . . . Father; (and?) ye shall know yourselves . . . and ye are . . . '

The reconstruction of this, the longest and most important of the Sayings, is extremely difficult. Beyond the supplements in l. 15 which are based on the parallel in Luke xvii. 21 with the substitution of τῶν ὀνόματός, St. Matthew's phrase, for St. Luke's τοῦ θεοῦ which is too short for the lacuna, and those in ll. 12–3, 16, and 18, the general accuracy of which is guaranteed by the context, it is impossible to proceed without venturing into the region of pure conjecture. There seems to be no direct parallel to or trace of this Saying among the other non-canonical Sayings ascribed to our Lord, and the materials provided by ll. 10–12—οἱ ἔλκουστες, the kingdom of Heaven and the fowls of the air—are at first sight so disparate that the recovery of the connexion between them may seem a hopeless task. But though no restoration of ll. 9–14 can hope to be very convincing, and by adopting different supplements from those which we have suggested, quite another meaning can no doubt be obtained (see below), we think that a fairly good case can be made out in favour of our general interpretation. The basis of it is the close parallelism which we have supposed to exist between l. 15 τῶν ὀνόματος, and, on the other hand, l. 10 οἱ ἔλκουστες ἡμᾶς followed in l. 11 by ἡ βασιλεία ἐν ὀφράγµατι, whereby we restore οἱ ἔλκουστες [at the end of l. 14. If this be granted ll. 9–16 divide themselves naturally into two parallel halves at the lacuna in l. 11, ll. 9–10 corresponding to ll. 12–5, and l. 11 to ll. 15–6. How is this correspondence to be explained? The simplest solution is to suppose that ll. 9–11 are a question to which ll. 12–6 form the answer; hence we supply τίς in l. 9; cf. the 6th Saying, which is an answer to a question. A difficulty then arises that we have ἔλκουστες ἡμᾶς in l. 10 but ἔλκουστες ἡμᾶς in ll. 14–5. This may be a mere accident due to the common confusion of ἡμᾶς and ἡμεῖς in papyri of this period, and perhaps ἡμᾶς should be read in both cases. But ἡμᾶς in l. 10 can be defended in two ways, by supposing either that Jesus here lays stress rather on His human than on His divine nature, and associates Himself with the disciples, or that the question is put into the mouth of the disciples, i.e. the word before τίς was ἔρωτάς or the like. There remains, however, the greatest crux of all, the meaning of ἔλκουστες. In the two passages in which this word
occurs in the New Testament it has an unfavourable sense; but here a favourable meaning is much more likely, as with ἀλεύω in John vi. 44 ἦν μὴ ὁ πάγη ... ἠλεύων αὐτῶν, and xii. 32 πάντως ἐλκύσα πρὸς ἔμαυτόν: Mr. Badham compares Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 6 τοις μείν γάρ (i.e. wild beasts of sinners) προτρέπει τῷ Κύριῳ τούς δὲ ἤδη ἐγχειρησάσαι καὶ χείρα ὄργει καὶ ἀνέλει, and ibid. v. 12 ἡ ἁγίω τοῦ Λάγων ... πάντα τῶν καταδεδυμένων καὶ ἐντός ἐκατό πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἔλθει. A phrase such as εἰς τὸν βασιλείαν is required to explain ἔλκοτες, though even with this addition the use of that word in such a context must be admitted to be difficult. The idea in ll. 12-6 seems to be that the divine element in the world begins in the lower stages of animal creation, and rises to a higher stage in man, who has within him the kingdom of Heaven; cf. Clement’s discussion (Strom. v. 13) of Xenocrates’ view that even ἄγαν ζωὰ possibly had some τῶν θεῶν τῶν, and the curious sanctity of certain animals in the various Apocryphal Acts, e.g. Thecla’s baptized lioness, Thomas’s ass, Philip’s leopard and kid buried at the door of the church. It is possible that there is some connexion between this Saying and the use of Luke xvii. 21 by the Naassenes; cf. p. 18. The transition from the inward character of the kingdom to the necessity for self-knowledge (ll. 16-21) is natural. Since the kingdom is not an external manifestation but an inward principle, men must know themselves in order to attain to its realization. The old Greek proverb γνῶθι σεαυτόν is thus given a fresh significance. Mr. Badham well compares Clem. Paedag. iii. 1 ἣν ἂραι δὲ οὐκο πάντως μέγιστον μαθημάτων τὰ γνῶσαι αὐτῶν ἐαυτὸν γάρ τις ἐνί γνώρι θεῶν. For the restoration of l. 16, cf. l. 18. ταύτην in l. 17 is the βασιλεία. This line may have ended with something like ὅπως οὖν, if we are right in correcting γνώσασθαι to γνῶσθε (cf. the similar confusion in l. 23). For οὖν, which is required by the context in l. 18, cf. e.g. Luke xx. 36. τί in l. 19 (τί is equally possible) is perhaps the beginning of an adjective, but τοιχίων χώρων, e.g., might also be read. Ηοο γνῶσθε in l. 20 is to be emended is uncertain; we suggest γνῶσο(κε)θει, but the corruption may go deeper. «η is perhaps εἰς τό τὸ τῆς βασιλείας. ηπτοι in l. 21 is very obscure; the letter following τ may be ε, ο or ω; but neither if η is the article, nor if ηπτοι is one word, does any suitable restoration suggest itself. ηπτοι can hardly be a participle, for if λέγει ηπτοις occurred, as would be expected, at the end of the line, there is room for only about four more letters in the lacuna. It is tempting to read η πρὶς άλις, with εν τῇ πάλης τοῦ θεοῦ in l. 20, as Blass suggests, comparing for the omission of αὐτῶν Mark vi. 20 ἀλλὰ αὐτῶν ἀνάμως δίκαιον. Another and quite different restoration of the early part of this Saying is suggested by Dr. Bartlet, who would read λέγει ηπτοις μῆ γραφθέων: οἱ ἔλκοτες ἦσαν ἔν τῇ τῆς γῆς, ἵμαν γάρ τῆς βασιλείας ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ψηλῆ ἦσαν ἐκατον τα πεντεισι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πᾶν ζώον δὲ τί τοῦ τῆς γῆς ἐστιν τα τε ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ οἱ ἱδεῖν τῆς θαλάσσας ... , comparing the idea in Epistle of Barnabas, v. 12 and 18 τός οὖν αὐτός κυρίων ποτα ὄργει δημιου ἡ ἱδών ἡ πειναὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; αἰώνιοις ἠγάπην ἄνθρωποι ὅτι το οἰκείος ἑξοφυσίως ἐστίν, ἵνα τις ἐπίταξες κυρίων. ἐάν οὖν ὡς ἦν τοῦτο νῦν, ἥματι ἐξῆκαν πάντες ὅταν καὶ αὐτῶν τελειώθηκεν, κληρονόμοι τῆς διαθήκης κυρίων γενεάς, and II Clem. v. 4 έτεν ἐν τῆς Περιπο μὴ φοβείσθωσαν τὰ ἁρία τοῦτο λέγει ... καὶ γινώσκετε, ἀδελφε, ὅτι ἡ ἐπιθυμία ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ τῆς σαρκος τούτης οὐρανος εἰς το θεοῦ καὶ ὀλιγοχρόνοσ, ἐν δὲ ἐναγγείλα τοῦ Χριστοῦ κ.τ.λ. (a passage resembling the 1st Saying; cf. note, ad loc.). The parallels from Barnabas and Clement perhaps give this restoration some advantage over ours, but ἔλκοτες alone without an explanatory phrase is not a satisfactory word for ‘persevere,’ and the transition from the promise of the kingdom of Heaven to the fowls of the air is very abrupt and almost inconsequent, while it is difficult to find the connexion between the fowls of the air and the second mention of the kingdom of Heaven. This, the chief problem in the 2nd Saying, seems more easily explained by the hypothesis of a repetition of ἔλκοτες and the resulting parallelism between the two halves of ll. 9-16 which we have suggested.
Third Saying. ll. 21-7.

λέγει Ἰη(σοῦς).

οὐκ ἀποκρύψεις ἀνθρώπος . . . . . .
ρων ἐπερωτήσαι πα[. . . . . . . .
ρων περὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆς . . . . . .
25 σετε ὅτι πολλοὶ ἔσονται πίρωτοι ἐσχατοὶ καὶ
οἱ ἐσχατοὶ πρῶτοι καὶ [. . . . . . . .

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

Line 24 may well have continued τῆς βασιλείας followed by a word meaning 'know' (?εἰδόθησέτε, or γνώσετε or ἀκούσετε, for γνώσεται or ἀκούσεται), but the double -ρων in ll. 23 and 24 is very puzzling, and in the absence of a clear parallel we forbear to restore the earlier part of the Saying. Dr. Bartlet suggests a connexion with the Apocalypse of Peter, e.g. § 4 κἀγάλ ἐφήν αὐτῷ καὶ ποῦ εἰσί πάντες οἱ δίκαιοι η ποία ἐστιν ὁ αἰών ἐν ὑπείρασιν τάσπερ ἐχοντες τὸν δόξαν, § 5 οὔτοι ἐστιν ὁ τόπος τῶν ἀρχέων (l. ἀρχαίων, Bartlet) ἑών τῶν δικαίων ἀνθρώπων, taking ἀρχαίων to be equivalent to πρεσβυτέρων; cf. Matt. v. 21, 33 ἐφήθη ταῖς ἁγίοις and Luke ix. 8, 19. But the problem was an old one. Lines 25-6 πολλοὶ . . . πρῶτοι follow Mark x. 31 (=Matt. xix. 30) πολλοὶ δὲ ἐσωτερικά πρῶτοι ἐσχαταί καὶ οἱ ἐσχατοὶ πρῶτα. In the insertion of οἱ before ἐσχατοί the papyrus agrees with BC and many MSS. in Mark x. 31; ND and other MSS. omit οἱ there, and in Matt. xix. 30 οἱ is generally omitted, though found in C and some others. Luke xiii. 30 is rather longer, καὶ ἵδιος ἐστιν ἐσχατοί οἱ ἐσονται πρῶτοι καὶ ἐστίν πρῶτοι οἱ ἐστονται ἐσχατοί. συν in l. 27 is no doubt the termination of a verb: ζωή (πάνω) κλειρονομηθαίσῃ (Matt. xix. 29) and μετ' ἑμῶν βασιλείας(ν) are too long, but ζωή πάνως ἐξωθήσεν (cf. John iii. 16, 36, v. 24, &c.) is possible.

Fourth Saying. ll. 27-31.

λέγει Ἰη(σοῦς). [πάν τὸ μή ἐμπροσ-
θεν τῆς ὀψεως σου καὶ τὸ κεκρυμμένον
ἀπὸ σοῦ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται σου. οὐ γάρ ἐσ-
30 τιν κρυπτὸν δ οὐ ψανέρων γενήσεται
καὶ τεθαμμένον δ ὁ ὕπερ ἑγερθήσεται.

'Jesus saith, Everything that is not before thy face and that which is hidden from thee shall be revealed to thee. For there is nothing hidden which shall not be made manifest, nor buried which shall not be raised.'

The sense of this Saying is clear, and the supplements are fairly certain. Lines 29-30
are parallel to Matt. x. 26 οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐστίν κεκαλυμμένον ὁ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτὸν ὁ οὐ γνωσθήσεται, Luke xii. 2 οὐδεὶς δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένων ἐστίν ὁ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτὸν ὁ οὐ γνωσθήσεται: cf. Mark iv. 22 οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν ἐὰν μὴ ἴνα φανερωθῇ οὐδεὶς ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον ἀλλὰ ἴνα ἐλθῃ ἐστὶν φανερὸν. In general arrangement the papyrus agrees with Matthew and Luke perhaps more than with Mark; but the language of the first half of the sentence is much closer to that of Mark (whose expression ἐὰν μὴ ἴνα φανερωθῇ instead of the more pointed δὲ αὐτὸς φανερώθησεν suggests the hand of an editor), while that of the second half diverges from all three. τεθημένων makes a more forcible contrast to κρυπτῶν than the corresponding word in the Synoptists, which is merely a synonym. Instead of ἐγένετο a more general word such as γνωσθήσεται can be supplied; but this detracts from the picturesqueness of what is in any case a striking variation of a well-known Saying.

Fifth Saying. 11. 32-42.

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

Though this Saying is broken beyond hope of recovery, its general drift may be caught. It clearly differed from the other Sayings, both in this papyrus and the first series of Logia, in having a preliminary paragraph giving the occasion, which seems to be a question put by the disciples; cf. p. 15. For ἐξετάζων in reference to them cf. John xxi. 12 οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐπὶ ὄλωμα τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξετάζων αὐτῶν ὁ τίς εἰ; εἴδοτες ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἐστιν. αὐτῶς in l. 1 is not very satisfactory, but something more than μαθηταὶ is required, and cf. 655. 17-8. Φαρισαῖος is not likely in the light of what follows. The question clearly consisted of a number of short sentences, each beginning with πῶς or τί, and so far as can be judged, they were concerned with the outward forms of religion, fasting, prayer (προσευχό· μεθά?), and almsgiving. How far, it is probably asked, are existing Jewish ordinances to be kept? The answer of Jesus appears to have been a series of short commandments insisting on the inner side of religion as the pursuit of virtue and truth, and very likely concluding in l. 40 with the promise 'Blessed is he who doeth these things.' If this explanation is on the right lines, there is a general parallelism between this Saying and
Matt. ix. 16–22 and Luke xviii. 18–22, but the occurrence of ἀληθεία and ἀπεκρυμένον (?) suggests that the language was more Johannine in character. Line 39, as Prof. Lake remarks, could be restored on the basis of Rev. ii. 17 τὸ μὴν ἐμάκρονται. The reference to fasting in l. 33 suggests a connexion with the 2nd Logion (‘Except ye fast to the world’), which may well have been an answer to a similar question by the disciples.

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

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

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

We proceed to a closer examination of the two series. In 1 the 7th Logion ('A city built on a hill') is connected with St. Matthew's Gospel alone; the 6th ('A prophet is not acceptable') has a noticeable point of contact with St. Luke in the use of the word δικαιος, and the 1st also agrees with St. Luke. The 5th ('Wherever there are') starts with a parallel to St. Matthew, but extends into a region far beyond. Nowhere in 1 can the influence of St. Mark be traced, nor was there any direct parallel with St. John's Gospel; but the new Sayings, both in thought and expression, tended to have a mystical and Johannine character. In 654 we have one Saying (the 2nd) of which the central idea is parallel to a passage found in St. Luke alone, but of which the developments are new; the conclusion of the 3rd Saying connects with St. Matthew and St. Mark rather than with St. Luke, while the 4th is a different version of a Saying found in all three Synoptists, and is on the whole nearer to St. Mark than to the other two Evangelists. The 1st Saying and, so far as we can judge, the 5th have little, if any, point of contact with the Canonical Gospels. As in 1, so in 654 the new elements tend to have a Johannine colouring, especially in the 2nd Saying; but some caution must be observed in tracing connexions with St. John's theology. The 1st Saying, if the papyrus had been the sole authority for it, might well have seemed nearer in style to St. John than to the Synoptists; yet as a matter of fact it occurred in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, a very early work which is generally admitted to have been originally written in Hebrew and to have been independent of the Canonical Gospels, most of all St. John's. On the other hand, while the Sayings in 654 contain nothing so markedly Johannine in style as e.g. 'I stood in the midst of the world...,' in 1. 11 sqq., the introduction contains a clear parallel to John viii. 52. This at first sight may perhaps seem to imply a knowledge of St. John's Gospel on the part of the author of the introduction, but it must be remembered (r) that St. John may well not have been the sole authority for the attribution of that Saying to our Lord, and if so, that the author of the introduction may have obtained it from another source, (2) that a knowledge of St. John's Gospel on the part of the author of the introduction does not necessarily imply a corresponding debt to that Gospel in the following Sayings, which, as we have said, stand on a somewhat different footing from the introduction.

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

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

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

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

'These are the . . . Words which Jesus the living . . . spake to . . . and Thomas, and he said unto them "Every one that hearkens to these words shall never taste of death."' Such is the remarkable opening prefixed to the collection of Sayings in 654 by its unknown editor. The first point to be noticed is that the name given to the collection is, as was acutely divined by Dr. Lock (Two Lectures on the Sayings of Jesus, p. 16), λόγοι not λόγω, and all questions concerning the meaning of the latter term may therefore be left out of account in dealing with the present series of Sayings. The converse of this, however, in our opinion by no means holds good, and as we have pointed out (p. 4), the analogy of the present document has a considerable bearing upon the problems concerning an early collection of λόγωι. Secondly, the collection is represented as being spoken either to St. Thomas alone or to St. Thomas and another disciple or, less probably, other disciples. Does the compiler mean that the Sayings were the subject of a special revelation to St. Thomas and perhaps another disciple, from which the rest were excluded? In other words is this introduction parallel to that passage in the Pistis Sophia 70-1 in which mention is made of a special revelation to SS. Philip, Thomas, and Matthias (or Matthew; cf. p. 4)? The case in favour of an affirmative answer to this query would be greatly strengthened if the introduction provided any indication that the editor assigned his collection of Sayings to the period after the Resurrection. But no such evidence is forthcoming. We do not wish to lay stress on α ζων in l. 2 owing to the uncertainty attaching to the word that follows; but the phrase α ζων certainly does not point to the post-resurrection period. In the Canonical Gospels St. Thomas is made prominent only in connexion with that period (John xx. 24 sqq.), but this circumstance, which is probably the strongest argument in favour of a post-resurrectional point of view, is discounted by the fact that the Gospel of Thomas, so far as can be judged, was not of the nature of a post-resurrectional Gospel but rather a Gospel of the childhood (cf. pp. 18-9), and, secondly, seems to be outweighed by the indications in the Sayings themselves (cf. p. 12) that some of them at any rate were assigned to Jesus' lifetime. The force of the second argument can indeed be turned by supposing, as Dr. Bartlet suggests, that the standpoint of the collection, both in 1 and 654, is that of a post-resurrection interview in which the old teaching of Christ's lifetime is declared again in relation to the larger needs of Christian experience. But such a view necessarily implies that II. 1-3 define a particular occasion (e.g. that contemplated in John xx. 26) on which the Sayings were spoken in their present order, and to this hypothesis there are grave objections. The use of the aorists ἀναφηκεν and ἐγέρθη in 654. 2-3 does not prove that one occasion only was meant. The repetition of λέγει Ἰησοῦς before each of the Sayings seems very unnecessary if they are part of a continuous discourse. The difficulty of tracing a connexion of ideas throughout 654, and still more throughout 1, and the frequent changes in the persons addressed provide fresh obstacles to such an interpretation; and the inappropriateness of the word ἐγέρθης in connexion with the risen Christ has already been alluded to (p. 12). To suppose that 654. 3-31 is a speech in itself, that II. 32-6 revert to the original narrative broken off at l. 3 and that 1 is part of a later discourse appears to us a very strained interpretation.

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

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

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

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

The chief dividing line in the controversy lies between those who agreed with our suggestion that 1 belonged to a collection of Sayings as such, and those who considered 1 to be a series of extracts from one or more of the numerous extra-canonical gospels which are known to have circulated in Egypt in the second century. Does 654 help to decide the question in either direction? One argument which has been widely used in support of the view that 1 was really a series of extracts, viz, that the Sayings had no contexts, is somewhat damaged by the appearance of a Saying which has a context. But we are not disposed to lay stress on this contradictory instance, which is clearly exceptional, though we may be pardoned for depreciating beforehand the use of the converse argument that the occurrence of a context proves the Sayings to be extracts. This argument may seem to gain some support from the use of αὕτω (and probably αὑτοῦ) in 654.32; and it will very likely be pointed out that such a passage as 655.17–23 would be by the insertion of ἤπειροι after λέγει make a context and Saying in form exactly resembling 654.32 sqq. But the use of αὕτω causes no ambiguity where it is found in one of a series of Sayings each beginning λέγει ήπειροι, a formula which itself recurs later on in the same context; and the argument from the analogy of 655.17–23 is open to the obvious retort that such a passage may equally well have been transferred from a collection of Sayings with occasional contexts, like 654. The fact is that the formal presence or absence of contexts in a series of Sayings can be employed with equal plausibility to prove or disprove the view that the series consisted of extracts, and would therefore seem a very unsound argument to introduce into the discussion. The matter of the context of the 5th Saying, however, has perhaps a more important bearing than the form upon the question of extracts. The phrase λέγει ήπειροι there follows two historic presents, ἢξαρξαν and λέγουσιν, and is therefore presumably itself a historic present; and if λέγει ήπειροι is a historic present in one case, it should be so throughout 654 and 1. This context therefore confirms the explanation of λέγει ήπειροι in 1 suggested by Zahn. Are we to follow him in his next inference that the formula λέγει ήπειροι has been taken over without alteration by the editor from his source, which was therefore presumably a Gospel narrative? To this we should answer by a decided negative. As Dr. Lock remarks (Πάντα Lectures, p. 18), 'it is not likely that λέγει should have occurred uniformly in a narrative,' a criticism which is strengthened by the recurrence in 654 of at least three more instances of λέγει ήπειροι (I. 9, 27, and 36), and by the comparison of 654.32 sqq. and 655.17–23, which suggests that if the former had been taken directly from a Gospel like that to which the latter belonged, ήπειροι would have been omitted. It is, we think, much more probable that the formula λέγει ήπειροι is due to the editor of the collection than to his sources, whatever they were. And though there is now no longer any particular reason for interpreting the tense of λέγει as more than a historic present, a secondary meaning is not excluded, and may be present in l. 36 just as much as in the other instances where there is no context. We should be inclined to paraphrase λέγει ήπειροι as 'This is one of those λόγοι of Jesus to which I referred in the introduction,' and to explain the uniform repetition of it as marking off the several λόγοι from each other, and giving greater impressiveness to the whole. The fact that the editor used the aorist and not the historic present in his introduction suggests that by his employment of the present tense λέγει throughout the Sayings he intended to produce a slightly different effect from that which would have been caused by λέγειν or εἶπεν. But
this new light shed upon the formula λέγει Ἰησοῦς does not bring with it any new reason for regarding the Sayings as extracts from a narrative Gospel.

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

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

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

The views which we have discussed so far have, whether satisfactory or not on other grounds, all been confronted by the initial difficulty of the introduction. Let us now examine those Gospels ascribed to disciples whose names either occur or may with reasonable probability be supposed to have occurred in II. 2–3. It is obvious that the introduction would suit a series of extracts from e.g. the Gospel of Thomas much better than one from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The Gospel of Thomas is known to have existed in more than one form, namely as an account of Jesus' childhood which is extant in several late recensions of varying length, and as an earlier Gospel condemned by Hippolytus in the following passage (Ref. v. 7) οὐ μῶνον δ' αὐτών ἐπιμαρτυριών φασιν (sc. the Naassenes) τῷ λόγῳ τὰ Ἀστυρίων μνημέρα ἀλλὰ καὶ θρηνών περὶ τῶν γεγονότων καὶ γεγομένων καὶ εὐθυμών ἐτι μακραίρια κρυβομένῳ ὄμω καὶ φανερώμενῳ φύσιν ήπειρον φασιν τὴν ἑνώς ἀνθρώπου βασιλείαν εὕρων ζητούμενη, περὶ ἡς διαπρῆθην εν τῷ καθ' Θωμᾶν ἐπιγραφομένω εὐαγγελίῳ παραδόθησι λέγοντες αὐτῶν: εἰμίς ὅμων εὑρίσκει εν παιδίου ἀτού εὐτά ἕκα γὰρ εν τῷ πεσαρακαδεκάτῳ πάνω κρυβόμενω φανερώμα. Here we have two remarkable points of contact with 654, the mention of Thomas coupled with the ἑνώς ἀνθρώπου βασιλεία (cf. the 2nd Saying).

The parallels between 1 and one of the later forms of the Thomas Gospel have been worked out with great ingenuity and elaboration by Dr. Taylor on pp. 95–8 of The Oxyrhynchus Logia and the Apocryphal Gospels. There is much to be said for his view that the extant Gospel of Thomas contains some traces of 1, and the probability would be increased if 1, which Dr. Taylor was inclined to regard as extracts from the Gospel according to the Egyptians, be supposed to be derived from the earlier Gospel of Thomas. 654 does not seem to contain any clear points of connexion with the later Gospel of Thomas, but this is compensated for by the remarkable parallel from Hippolytus quoted above. It is moreover noteworthy, as Mr. Badham remarks, that the Acts of Thomas, which may well have been partly built upon the Gospel, exhibit a knowledge of that Saying which occurs both in the Gospel according to the Hebrews and in 654, and that, as Prof. Lake informs us, an Athos MS. (Studia Biblica, v. 2, p. 173) asserts that the περιμοιή of Christ and the woman taken in adultery (which has found its way from the Gospel according to the Hebrews into St. John's Gospel) occurred in the Gospel of Thomas. But there are serious objections to regarding 1 and 654 as extracts from that Gospel. In the first place though it is possible that Thomas is the only disciple mentioned in the introduction, it is equally possible that he stood second, and in that case the Gospel from which the Sayings may have been extracted is more likely to have been one which went under the name of the person who stood first; though indeed, if there were two disciples mentioned in the introduction, it is not very satisfactory to derive the Sayings from any Gospel which went under the name of only one. A much greater difficulty arises from the divergence of the Sayings from what little is known about the earlier Gospel of Thomas. The saying quoted by Hippolytus is widely removed in character from those in 1 and 654, and it is significant that, though the doctrine of aeons seems to be known to the author of the Gospel of Thomas, 654 employs in 1. 24 the neutral word τόσοι in a passage in which αὐτως, as is shown by the parallel from the Apocryphal of Peter, would have been highly appropriate, if the composer of the Sayings had known of or been influenced by that doctrine. The Gospel of Thomas, which Harnack thinks was known to Irenaeus, is indeed placed before A.D. 180, but from
the quotation in Hippolytus, coupled with the form of the Gospel in later times and the scanty evidence from other sources, it has been considered to have been mainly at any rate a Gospel of the childhood and of an advanced Gnostic character. If the Sayings are to be derived from it, the current view of the Gospel of Thomas must be entirely changed; and it is very doubtful whether this can be done except by postulating the existence of an original Thomas Gospel behind that condemned by Hippolytus. This would lead us into a region of pure conjecture into which we are unwilling to enter, at any rate until other less hazardous roads to a solution are closed. That there is a connexion between the earlier Gospel of Thomas and the Sayings is extremely likely, but this can be better explained by supposing that the Sayings influenced the Gospel than by the hypothesis that the Gospel is the source of the Sayings.

The Gospel of Philip, which is assigned by Zahn to the beginning of the second century, by Harnack to the second century or first half of the third, would, even if it were certain that ὕλείπτωρ occurred in 654. 2, be an unsuitable source for the Sayings. The extract quoted from it by Epiphanius shows much more highly developed ascetic and Gnostic tendencies than can be found in 1 and 654.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

655. Fragment of a Lost Gospel.

Fr. (b) 8·2 x 8·3 cm.

Plate II.

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

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

Col. i.  
(a) [. . .]ΠΩΝ ΠΡΩΩΙ ΕΙ . . .  
[. . .]ΕΙ ΔΕ ΕΕΙΠΙ . . . 
[. . .]ΡΩΙ ΜΗΤΕ [. . .]  
[. . .]ΜΩΝ ΤΙ ΦΑ[ 
5 [. . . . . . ] ΤΗ ΚΤ[. 
[. . . . . . ] ΤΙ ΕΝΑΥ[.  
(b) [. . .]ΚΩΕΙ [. . .]ΚΡΕΙ[. 
[. . .]ΚΕΙ [. . .]ΤΩΝ [. 
ΝΩΝ ΑΤΗ[ [. . .]ΥΕΛ [. 
10 ΝΕΙ ΟΥΑΕ ΝΗ[ [. . .]ΕΙ [. 
ΕΝ ΕΞΟΝΤ[ [. . .]ΝΑ[. 
ΜΑ ΤΙ ΕΝ [. . .] ΚΑΙ 
ΥΜΕΙΣ ΤΙΣ ΑΝ ΠΡΟΣΟΒΗ 
ΕΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΕΙΛΙΚΡΙΝ  
15 ΥΜΩΝ ΑΥΤΟ[ [. . .]ΩΣΕΙ 
ΥΜΕΙΝ ΤΟ ΕΝΔΥΜΑ Υ 
ΜΟΝ ΛΕΓΟΥΣΙΝ ΛΥ 
ΤΩ ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ 
ΠΟΤΕ ΗΜΕΙΝ ΕΜΗΑ  
20 ΝΗΣ ΕΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΤΕ 
ΣΕ ΟΥΟΜΕΘΑ ΛΕΓΕΙ

Col. ii.  
(c) Θ  
30 ΑΕ[  
0[  
35 Ν [. 
ΚΑ[  
40 [. 
(δ) ΕΝ[  
ΤΗ [ 
ΚΡΥΨ[  
45 ΕΙΣΕΡΠ[ 
ΚΑΝ[  
ΔΕ ΡΕΗ[ 
ΜΟΙΩ[ 
ΚΕΡΑΙ[
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OTAN ΕΚΔΥΣΧΘΕ ΚΑΙ MH ΑΙΧΥΝΘΗΤΕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ὧν τῷ πρωὶ ἐναρεῖ ὑψὲ ὡς ὑπὲρ τῆς ἡλικίας ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15   | ὤμων; αὐτοὶ δὲ ὄσει ὑμῖν τὸ ἐνδυμα ὄ-
| 20   | ὅς ἐσεὶ καὶ ρήτε σε ὀψόμεθα; λέγειν: καὶ ὅταν ἐκδύσησθε καὶ ὑπὲρ αἰσχυνθῆτε, |
| 41   | ἔλεγεν τῷ κλείδῃ τῆς γυνῷσεως ἔ-
| 45   | εἰσερχόμενος οὐ-


1–23. 'Take no thought' from morning until even nor from evening until morning, either for your food what ye shall eat or for your raiment what ye shall put on. Ye are far better than the lilies which grow but spin not. Having one garment, what do ye (luck?) . . . Who could add to your stature? He himself will give you your garment. His disciples say unto him, When wilt thou be manifest to us, and when shall we see thee? He saith, When ye shall be stripped and not be ashamed . . .'

41–6. ' . . . He said, The key of knowledge ye hid; ye entered not in yourselves and to them that were entering in and opened not.'

1–7. Cf. Matt. vi. 25 μὴ μεριμναίετε τῇ ψυχῇ ἵματι τῇ φύσει μηδὲ τῷ σῶματι ἵματι τῇ ἐνθύσει. οὐχὶ τῇ ψυχῇ πλεῖον ἐστὶ τῇ τροφῇ καὶ τῷ σώματι τῷ ἐνθύματι; Luke xii. 22–3 μὴ μεριμναίετε τῇ ψυχῇ τῇ φύσει μηδὲ τῷ σῶματι τῇ ἐνθύσει. ἤ γὰρ ψυχῇ πλεῖον ἐστὶν τῷ τροφῇ καὶ τῷ σώματι τῷ ἐνθύματι. The papyrus probably had μὴ μεριμναίετε at the beginning of the sentence but differs (1) by the addition of ἀπὸ πρωὶ . . . ἕως πρωὶ, (2) by the use of a different word for σῶμα and probably for ψυχῇ, though it is possible that τῷ σῶματι or τῇ ψυχῇ preceded ἀπὸ πρωὶ in l. 1, (3) by the omission of the second half of the Saying as recorded in the Gospels. In ll. 1–2 there is not room for εἶπεν μου μητρέ. στόλη in ll. 5–6 is not quite the word that would be expected, being used in the New Testament for grand 'robes' rather than a plain garment, but if the division τῷ στόλῳ is correct στόλη cannot be avoided, and with the reading τῆς it would be difficult to find any suitable word; cf. also e.g. 839 ἦδεν μοι γεμώνοι . . . ἡγομένα αὐτῷ στόλην.

7–13. Cf. Matt. vi. 28 καὶ περὶ ἐνθύματος μὴ μεριμναίετε; καταμιθεῦτε τὰ κρίμα τοῦ ἀγροῦ πῶς αὐξάνωσιν; οὐκ ἔχετε σοιδ' ἐνδοθεν πρόλογον λέγω δὲ ἐμῶν ὅτι οὐδὲ ἡμοί ἐν πίστει τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ περιεβῆλετο ὥς ἐν τοῖς, Luke xii. 27 κατασχήσατε τὰ κρίμα πῶς αὐξάνωσι· οὐκ ἔχετε σοιδ' πρόλογον λέγω δὲ ἐμῶν οὐδὲ κ.τ.λ. and Matt. vi. 26 οὐχ ἐμεὶς μᾶλλον διαβέβητε αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν πετενῶν); Luke xii. 24 πᾶσα μᾶλλον ἐμεὶς διαβέβηκε τῶν πετενῶν. The corresponding passage in the papyrus is not only much shorter, but varies considerably, though to what extent is not quite clear owing to the uncertainty attaching to the restoration of ll. 10–2. Our reasons for placing Fr. (a) in the particular relation to Fr. (b) indicated on Plate II are the facts (1) that Fr. (a) is from the top of a column which is presumably, judging by the general appearance and lacunae in Fr. (a), Col. i of Fr. (b); (2) that though there is nothing in the external appearance of Fr. (a) to show that it contains any actual ends of lines, the connexion of ll. 8–9 and 9–10 which results from our proposed combination of the two fragments, τῶν [κρισιων καὶ] ἄμμελεν, is so suitable to the context that it is unlikely to be fortuitous. The connexion of ll. 10–1 and 11–2 is, however, more difficult. With the readings and punctuation which we have adopted εν in l. 12 suggests nothing but ειδ[ε]ντες, which does not suit τι, and there are many points of uncertainty. At the end of l. 10 the letter before I is more like Γ, C, or T than Ε, so that οὐδὲ ν'δ'με (cf. Luke xii. 27) is not very satisfactory. ΜΑΤΙΩΝ can be read in l. 12, and would in the context be expected to be the termination of a word meaning 'garment'; but with the reading ιμάτων it is hard to explain the vestiges of the two letters on l. 11 of Fr. (a), which suit respectively a straight letter such as Η, Ι, Λ or Ν and Δ or, less probably, Α or Λ. ἐνθύμιατον, a rare word not found in the N. T., but not inappropriate here, is possible; but ἐν εύο[ν]ει εὐδοκ[ίων] is surely unlikely. It is also possible to connect καὶ ἐμείς with τις instead of with the preceding words, but this does not help towards making the restoration of ll. 10–2 easier. These difficulties could be avoided by supposing that Fr. (a) is to be placed much higher up in relation to Fr. (b), but this involves the sacrifice of any direct connexion between Frs. (a) and (b), and ll. 8–9 and 9–10 afford very strong grounds for our proposed combination of the two fragments.
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and Luke xii. 25. Thus δι' εὐαγγελίων μεριμνῶν δύναται ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ προσθείναι πῆχυν; The papyrus version is somewhat shorter, omitting μεριμνῶν and πῆχυν. The position in which this Saying is found in the papyrus is also slightly different from that in the Gospels, where it immediately precedes instead of following the verse about the κρίσις. In l. 13 προσθη(ε)ίν could be read in place of προσθῆ(ε)ίν; there does not seem to be room for προσθῆ(ε)ίν.

15–6. Cf. Matt. vi. 31–3 μὴ ὄνημι μεριμνήσας ἵνα φάγωμεν ἢ τί πίωμεν ἢ τί πέρασθαι. The papyrus version is nearly identical and proceeds μὴ φαντάζο τὸ μεριμνάνων ἵνα εἴδηκεν ὁ πατὴρ ἔμας δόθην ἵματι τῆς βασιλείας. The papyrus has the corresponding idea but expressed with extreme conciseness. αὐτοῦ δὲ δὲσε, unless δὲσε is an error for δὼσε, raises a difficulty, for we should expect ὁ πατήρ οὐ ἢ θεός. Apparently αὐτὸς refers back to πατήρ οὐ θεός in the column preceding, or the author of the Gospel may have here incorporated from some source a Saying without its context which would have explained αὐτός (cf. 654. 32).

17–23. For the question cf. John xiv. 19 sqq. ἢ μὴ μερίζω καὶ ὁ κόσμος μηδὲμερίζομαι ὡς ἔμεινε δὲθεωρητε με ὡς ἐγὼ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐζήσετε ... πέμποντες. ἐνδέξατε τοὺς ἄνθρωπους τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀλήθειας ἡμῶν. This answer ascribed in the papyrus to Jesus bears a striking resemblance to the answer made to a similar question in a passage of the Gospel according to the Egyptians which is referred to several times by Clement of Alexandria, and which is reconstructed by Harnack (Chronol. i. p. 13) thus:—τὴν ἰδιότητα πυθαγορικήν μέχρι πάντως θαυμάσω οὕτως ἐπεχύρισεν τῷ κύριῳ μέχρις ἵνα αὐτοὶ γνῶσιν τῆς ἡμέρας. The answer ascribed in the papyrus to the Egyptians is somewhat somewhat more literary and elaborated phrase τῷ τοῦτον ἐνδύμα μεταφέρσετε, (3) the absence in the papyrus of the Encratite tendency found in the earlier part of the quotation from the Gospel according to the Egyptians. On the relation between the two see p. 27.

Whether the papyrus continued after αἰσχυνθητείς with something like καὶ ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο τοῦ, k.t.l., is of course uncertain, but Fr. (d), which probably belongs to the bottom of this column, is concerned with something different.

25. φωτιζομένος: the corrector’s spelling φωτεινὸς is commoner than φωτιζομενὸς. Perhaps this passage was parallel to Matt. vi. 22–3 (Sermon on the Mount) ἐν ὕ τὸ ὄφθαλμον σου ἀπλάκες, δόξα τοῦ σώματος φωτεινοῦ ἔσται, κ.τ.λ.; cf. Luke xi. 34–6. But the papyrus must in any case have differed largely in its language, κ' ἀφιμω (?) in l. 26 suggests a Johannine colouring.

30. The Αʹ of ΑΕξ projects somewhat, but since the whole column tends to the left, probably no importance is to be attached to the circumstance; cf. the initial δ in l. 47. 42–6. With the remains of these lines Bartlet well compares Luke xi. 52 αἰσθανόμενον ἄνθρωπον ἔνδυται ἐκ τῆς ἀλήθειας, διὰ τὸ τὸ ἐνδυματος ἐνδύματος, ἑπεκτείνω μέχρι τῆς ἀλήθειας, διὰ τὸ τὸ ἐνδυματος ἐνδύματος, ἕνα τὸ δύο τοῦ, κ.τ.λ.; cf. Luke xi. 34–6. But the papyrus must in any case have differed largely in its language, κ' ἀφιμω (?) in l. 26 suggests a Johannine colouring.
655. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

655 seems to belong to a Gospel which was closely similar in point of form to the Synoptists. The narrator speaks in the third person, not in the first, and the portion preserved consists mainly of discourses which are to a large extent parallel to passages in Matthew and Luke, especially the latter Gospel, which alone seems to be connected with II. 41 sqq. The papyrus version is, as a rule, shorter than the corresponding passages in the Gospels; where it is longer (II. 1–3) the expansion does not alter the meaning in any way. The chief interest lies in the question of the disciples and its answer, both of which so closely correspond to a passage in the Gospel according to the Egyptians and the uncanonical Gospel or collection of Sayings used by the author of the Second Epistle of Clement, that the Gospel of which 655 is a fragment clearly belongs to the same sphere of thought. Does it actually belong to either of those works, which, though Harnack regards them as one and the same, are, we think, more probably to be considered distinct? In the Gospel according to the Egyptians Salome was the questioner who occasioned the remarkable Saying beginning ὅταν τῷ τῆς αἰοχώνος ἐνδομα πανηγυρεῖ, and it is much more likely that 655 presents a different version of the same incident in another Gospel, than a repetition of the Salome question in a slightly different form in another part of the Gospel according to the Egyptians. Nor is 655 likely to be the actual Gospel which the author of II Clem. was quoting. It is unfortunate that owing to the papyrus breaking off at αἰοχώνοτε there is no security that ὅταν γίνηται τὰ δύο ἐπὶ, or at any rate something very similar, did not follow, and the omission in the Clement passage of a phrase corresponding to II. 22–3 may be a mere accident. But the fact that the question in II Clem. is worded somewhat differently (πότε ἢ ἡ βασιλεία), and is put into the mouth of τῷ instead of the disciples, as in 655, is a good reason for rejecting the hypothesis that the two works were identical.

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

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

656. GENESIS.

Height 24.4 cm. Plate II (e verso).

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

The evidence of so early a text is of particular value for the book of Genesis, where the uncial MSS. are most weakly represented. The only first-class MS. available for comparison practically throughout the parts covered by the papyrus, namely, xiv. 21-3, xv. 5-9, xix. 32-xx. 11, xxiv. 28-47, xxvii. 32-3, 40-1, is the Codex Alexandrinus (A). The Vatican and Ambrosian codices do not begin till later in the book, the Sinaiticus (S) is defective except for occasional verses in the twenty-fourth chapter, the readings of D, the Cottonian MS., which for the most part survives only in a collation (= D), are unascertainable in xx. 4-11 and xxiv. 28-39, and the Bodleian Genesis (E) fails us in xxiv. The result of a collation, where possible, with these MSS., is to show that the papyrus, while seldom supporting E, does not side continuously with either S, A, or D, though, of course, too little of S remains for a satisfactory comparison. As a general rule the readings favoured by the new witness are the shorter ones; cf. e.g. notes on ll. 16, 27, 47-8, 53, 62, 67, 74, 129, 138-9, 154, 183, 185, 188, as against ll. 42, 81, 144, 163. Not infrequently variants occur otherwise attested only by cursive MSS., though here too no consistent agreement can be traced, and the mixed character of the cursive texts is further emphasized. The papyrus is certainly pre-Lucanian, but it has two readings characteristic of Lagarde's Lucanian group (= Holmes 19, 108, 118), \( \gamma e \nu o u s \) for \( \tau o \, \gamma e \nu o u s \) in xix. 38 and the omission of \( \epsilon k e \theta e \nu \) (with the Hebrew) in xxiv. 38. Readings common to this group and other cursive are \( \epsilon k e \nu \gamma \) for \( \tau o \gamma \nu \) in xix. 33, and \( \alpha i \nu \rho e s \) for \( \alpha i \nu \theta o \rho o u \) in xx. 8. On the other hand, the papyrus opposes the Lucanian group in the addition of \( \tau \nu \nu \kappa a \, \epsilon k e \nu \gamma \) in xix. 35, and the omission of \( \epsilon f o \beta \theta i \gamma \) . . . \( \alpha i \nu \gamma \) in xx. 2, in the one case against in the other, with the Hebrew. The number of
variants which are altogether new, considering the scope of the fragments, is considerable; see ll. 48, 55, 56, 81, 114, 154, 155, 156, 160, 163, 181. A peculiar feature is the tendency to omit the word κύριος when applied to the Deity; this occurs in no fewer than four passages (ll. 17, 122, 155, 166), in three of which (ll. 17, 122, 166) the omission has been made good by the second hand. A blank space was originally left where the word occurred in l. 17. In the version of Aquila the Tetragrammaton was written in Hebrew letters, and this peculiarity reappears in a few Hexaplaric MSS. of the Septuagint. The papyrus offers the first example of a similar tendency to avoid the sacred name in a text otherwise independent of the Aquila tradition.

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

(a) Verso xiv. 21–3.

[Δραμ δο] μοι τους ανδρας
[την δε υπον λαβε σεαυτω
[ειπεν δε Δραμ προς βασιλεα
[Σωδομων εκ[ε]]μω την χεις
5 [η μον προς τον θεον τον θ
[ψιστον ος εκ]πισηυν του ουρα
[νον και την γην ει άπο σπαρ
[του εως σφαιροτορος θ
[ποδηματος] ληψομαι

(b) Verso xix. 32–xx. 2.

[με] αυτον και εξαναστησο
[μεν εκ του] [πατρος ημων σπερ
[μαι εποτισα]ν δε τον πατερα
25 αυτων ουν ον εν τη νυκτι εκει
[νη και] εισελθουσα η [πρεπειτε

Recto xv. 5–9.

10 [σπ]ερα σ[ο]ν [και επιστευσεν
[Δραμ τω [θ]ω [και ελογιαθη
αυτω εις δικαιοσ[υ]νη επεν
[δε προς αυτον] εγιω ο θεος ο εξα
[γαγων σε εκ χωριος Χαλδαιων ωσ
15 τε δουναι σοι την γην ταυτην
[κ]ληρονομησαι [ειπεν δε δεσπο
tα κυριε κατα τι γινομαι οτι
[κ]ληρονομησομεν α[υ]την επεν
[δε α]μην λαβε μοι δαμαλιν τριε
20 [τι]ζουσαν και αιγα [τριετιζουσαν

Recto xx. 2–11.

[δε Αμειβελεξ β]ασιλεας Τερα
65 [ρον και ελαβεν την Σαρρα και
[εισηλθεν ο θεος] προς Αμβη
[λαξ εν υπνω την] νυκτα και ει
[πειν ιδον αν απροδυνακεις πε
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[Σα]ρρας της γενο[ίκος] αυτου
[αδε]λφη μου ε[τίν]α[πε]στειλεν

[ε]ποιησας τουτο ειπεν δε Αβρααμ
[ει]πα γαρ [α]ρα ουκ εστιν θεοσ εβεια
[ε]ν τω τουτω τουτω εμε τε απο

28-37.

(ε) Recto xxiv. 28–37.

δραμουσα η παις απηγγειλεν
εις τον οικου την μητρος αυτης
κατα ρηματα ταυτα τη δε Πεθεκ
κα [α]δελα[φα]ς ην η ουομα Λαβαν
και εδραμεν Λαβαν προς τον αν
θροπον εξω επι της ηνης και
eγεντ[ο] νηικαι ειδεν τα ενωτια
tα ηθελια περι τας χειρας της
110 αδελφης αυτου και του[τε] ηκου
σεν τα ρηματα Πεθεκ[α]κας της
αδελ[φης] την λεγουσης ου
tως λεια[λη]κεν μοι ο ανθρωποις
cαι ηθελη[π]ροσ τον ανθρωπον ε

115 στηκοτος αυτον επι των καμη
λων επι της ηνης και εηπεν αν
τω δευρο εισελθη ευλογητος κυνω
ινα τι εσηκας εξω εγω δε ητ[οι]
μακα την οικιαν και τοπου ταις
120 καρ[ηλιοι κατηλθεν δε αν[θρω]
ποις εις τη[ν]ν οικιαν και απεσαζε
[η σα κα]μηλους κ[αι] εδωκεν αχυρα
και χορτασματα ταις καμηλοις
[και υδωρ τοις ποσιν αυτου και τοις
125 [ποσι] των ανθρωπων των με[τ]η
που και παρεθηκεν
3 lines lost

Verso xxiv. 38–47.

150 [πο]ρευσαι και εις την φυ[λη]ν μου
κ[α]μη μη υπηρετησαι τον ους
και ειπεν μοι ο θεος ο ευρεστη
σα εναντιον αυτου απο
στελει τον αγγελον αυτου µε
155 ται σου και [ε]ιναι σου την
dεν ου νοικαι [και] η[μη]ν ευναι
και ηθελη την ημην
160 μου εκ της φυλης μου η εκ του
οικου του πατρος μου τοτε αθω
ος εσθη απο της αρας μου νηικα
γαρ ειναι εισχεις εις την ημην
φυ[λή]ν και μη σοι δωσιν και εσθη αθω
165 σ απο του ορκου μου και ελ θων
[ση]μερου επι την πηγην ε[ε]ιον κα
[με ε]ι ο θεος του κυριου μου Αβρ[α]μου
ιναι [εις δοιος την ουν μου η[μη]ν]
εγω [πο]ρευσαί[ε]ιν εις την [αι]
170 [στη]κασι επι της [πηγης] του [υδατος]
αι δε θυγατερες των ανθρωπων
[της] πολεως εξελευσανται αι ανθη
σαι υδωρ και εσται παρθενοι η
175 [ει]ναι εις του ποτινον με εικοναν
[μοι πις ευ και τας καμηλοις σου η]
135 [παίς Αβρααμ] εγώ εἴμι . . . . .
[. . . . . τον] κυρίον [μου σφοδρα
καὶ ψυχή [και] εξωκεν αυτώ
προβατα καὶ μοσχοὺς καὶ
κ αργυριον καὶ π[αιδίσκας καὶ
140 [κ]αμη[λοῦς καὶ οὐ[ους καὶ ετεκέ
Σαρέα [η γυνη του κυριου μου υιον
[εν τοι κυριο μου μπετα [τα] το [γνηρα
[σαι αυτον και εδωκ’]εν αυτω παν
[τα οσα ην αυτω και ωρκισειν με ο
145 [κυριος μου λεγων ου] λημψη [γυ
[ναίκα τω υιω μου απο τον] θυγατε
[ρων των Χαναναιων ον] οἱς [ε
2 lines lost

(d) Recto xxvii. 32–3.

. . . . .
ν[ι]ο[ς
εξεστη [δε
195 μεγάλη[υ] σφ[οδρα
θηρ]ευσι[ας
eισενεγκας [μοι
. . . . .

Verso xxvii. 40–1.

. . . . .
] εκλυ[σεις
τρα]ξιλ[αν
200 το] ύλακ[ωβ
ει[ν ιογη[σεν
αυτω ι] ειπεν
. . . . .

1. [Αβρααμ δεν] is somewhat short for the lacuna, but to add προς would make the supplement rather long.
4. The deletion of ε may be due to either the first or second hand; εκτενω ΑΔ.
13. προς αυτω: so most cursives; αυτω ΑΔ. The ε of ει[ν ω seems to have been altered from some other letter.
16. [κ]ληρογυμπας: so Α; κλ. αντιρ ΑΔ.
17. A blank space, sufficient for four letters, was left by the original scribe between τα κατα, and in this κυριος was inserted by the second hand; cf. ll. 122, 155, and 166.
25. εκεινη: so a number of cursives, including the 'Lucianic' group; ταυτη ADE.
27. αυτης which is read after πατρως by ADE seems to have been omitted by the
papyrus, the line being quite long enough without it. On the other hand την νυκτα εκεινη
is omitted in D.
28. εϊδη: the same spelling for ηδει recurs in l. 43; εγνω D in both places.
32. τη νεωτερα: so the Codex Caesareus and several cursives; προσ την νεωτεραν ADE.
εχθες has been added at the end of the line by the second hand.
36. μ of μετ has been altered from α.
37-8. εκ ... [σ']ερα: so AD; στρ. εκ του π. ημων E.
39-43. The position of the small fragment at the ends of these lines is made
practically certain by the recto (cf. note on l. 81); but the scanty vestiges in l. 42 do
not suit particularly well and the reading adopted is very problematical. Moreover above
the line between the supposed α and η is a curved mark which does not suggest any
likely letter and remains unexplained. One cursive (108) has και η νεωτερα, but there
is no ground for attributing this to the papyrus.
42. την νυκτα εκεινη: om. ADE. The papyrus reading is found in the cursive
56 (margin), 74, 106, 130, 134, 135.
43. εϊδη: cf. l. 28, note.
47. There would be room for two or three more letters in this line.
47-8. εκαλεσεν νομα: εκαλεσεν το νομα ADE. There is not sufficient room in the
lacuna for the usual ν εφεκτυσσεν, still less for το.
48. λεγονσα which is read after Μαθαθιαν by ADE was certainly omitted by the papyrus
(so Jerome), the passage being thus quite parallel with the name Λυμμαν
in the following verse.
53. νυν γενοντο: so the 'Lucianic' cursive; ο νυν του γενον Α, νυν του γ. D, νυν του
γ. E.
55. τη νυκτα τουτη: της στηρεως νυκτας ADE. The rest of the line was left blank,
a new chapter commencing at l. 56.
56. εκαλεσεν δε: και εκαλεσεν ADE.
57. προς λιβα: so AD; εις λιβα E.
62. A has ον before αδελφη, but οτι is omitted, as in the papyrus, by D and E. After
εστιν the papyrus omits the second half of the verse εφιδεθη γαρ επειν (οτι) γνων μοι εστιν
μν ποτε αποκερωσαν αυτον οι μοι δια της πολεως δι αυτην (ADE), as do the cursive15 (first
hand), 82, 106, 107, 135.
64. Αμασελεχ ισο Αμασελεχ is the regular spelling of the name in this text. Αμασελεχ
ADE.
67. There is evidently not room in the lacuna for A's reading ειπεν αυτω ηδον συ
αποδημητες, and the omission of αυτω is more probable (so DE and many cursive) than that
of ην (om. E).
74. E inserts οτι before αδελφη here and αδελφος in l. 75.
79. καθαρα καθιστα: so A; καθιστα καθαρα E.
80. εφισαμην: εφισαμην A, εφισαμην E.
81. εγω (εγω AE) may have been merely repeated here from l. 79, but, as Mr. McLean
points out, it is supported by the Hebrew and may well be a genuine reading. The other
letters on this fragment (ll. 80-5) suit so exactly that there can be no reasonable
doubt that it is rightly placed here, although there is also a slight difficulty with regard to the
verso.
αμαρτεων, the reading of the first hand, is that of AE.
86. διοντα: so A; ζησει E.
93. αρχες: so a number of cursive; ανθρωποι AE.
104. τε: so A; δε E.
105. The reading of the interlinear insertion is very uncertain, but the alteration apparently concerns the termination of the verb, and it seems more probable that ἀπόκτενοντι was corrected to ἀπόκτενοσαν than vice versa. ἀπόκτενοσαν ΛΕ; ἀπόκτενοσαν occurs in the cursive 72; cf. l. 105, note.

109. The reading of Α here is exactly parallel to that of the papyrus, το after κατα having been originally omitted and supplied by an early corrector. ΝΔΕ are deficient.

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

113. εἰδεν: εἰδεν Α.

114. περι: επι Α, ἐν ταῖς χερεῖ a number of the cursive.

112. κύριος has been added at the end of the line by the second hand: ἐὰν ΝΔ.

123. ημίμακα: so ΝΔ; ημίμακα Α.

126. ἀπεσάζεν: so ΝΔ; ἀπεσάζεν Α.

129. The papyrus agrees with Α in omitting κύριαθα which ΝΔ add after ωδαρ.

135-6. The reading of the papyrus here cannot be determined; ΝΔ have κύριος δὲ εὐλογησεν, Δ [ἐ]δειδοςον, κύριος δὲ εὐλογησεν or εὐλογησεν τοι; makes the end of l. 135 a little long, but a blank space may have been originally left for κύριος as in ll. 122 and 126 or δε may have been omitted.

138-9. The papyrus here omits several words and its exact reading is not quite clear. Α has προδατα καὶ μοσχόν καὶ ἀργυρίων καὶ χρυσόν παιδάς καὶ παιδάκις καμήλους καὶ οὐκ, D leaves out the καὶ after μοσχόν, transposes ἀργυρίων and χρυσόν and inserts καὶ before παιδας. It is just possible that the papyrus agreed with D in reading μοσχόν χρυσόν καὶ, but παιδας καὶ παιδάκις καὶ can evidently not be got into l. 139, and more probably both χρυσόν and καὶ παιδας were omitted and καὶ was written with each substantive. The words originally missing were probably supplied by the second hand at the bottom of the page, for opposite l. 139 is the semicircular sign commonly used to mark an omission; cf. e.g. 16. iii. 3.

141-2. It is quite possible that the lines were divided υ|ου and that ενο was omitted, as in D.

143. αὐτον: οὐ αὐτὴν (D).

144. The length of the lacuna indicates that the text agreed with D and the second corrector of Ν in adding παντα before the simple αὐτα of ΝΔ.

152. After μεν ΝΔ add εκείδειν. The papyrus here supports the 'Lucianic' cursive's 19 and 108.

154. παρευθησατα: so a number of cursive; παρευθη Α, παρευθεσα ΝΔ.

155. α θεος: κύριος ο θεος Α, om. ο θεος ΝΔ.

156. ενυπη: so ΛΔ and the second corrector of Ν; ενυπη Ν. ἀποστελει: so ΝΔ; ἀποστειλε Α.

160. η: καί MSS.

162. απο: so ΝΔ; εκ Α.

163. εκειδειν: εκδης ΛΔ.

164. τὴν ειμι φιλην χνυ: so D; την φιλην μου Α.

164. συ δοσιν: this is the order in many of the cursive: δοσιν σου ΛΔ. καὶ before εσθ is omitted by D.

165. ἀρκιμον: so the cursive 72 (cf. note on l. 105); ἀρκιμον ΝΔ.

166. κυριοι (so ΝΔ) is again due to the second hand; cf. l. 17, note.

168. ημερη: there is not room in the lacuna for more than two letters, so ημ [νν] (ΝΔ) is inadmissible. η is found also in the cursive 75 and 106.
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169. εφεσσηκα: εστηκα ΝΑΔ; there is an erasure before εστηκα in Α, and apparently εφεσσηκα (which also occurs in several cursives) was the original reading.

170. της της γης: so ΝΑΔ; την τηνν Α.

171. [αι δε]: so D; και αι ΝΑ.

172. εξελαιωντι
να: so ΛΔ; εκτορεωντοι Ν. The papyrus seems to have had ἀντλησαι, which is found in some of the cursives; υδρευσαθα, the better supported reading, is too long.

174. [επφο]: the papyrus follows the vulgar spelling. ἐγὼ was originally omitted, and was added by the second hand.

μεικτον is also the spelling of Ν.

175-6. The reading printed is that of Α, which on the whole seems to suit the space best; but μοι may have been written at the end of l. 175, and the variant of Ν πιε και σεν or of D και σεν is quite possible.

178. δησπασιν αυτοι (Ν) seems more likely than εδαινον δησπασι (ΛΔ), for though the supposed δ may equally well be ε the line is already rather long, and the lacuna in l. 179 is sufficiently filled with [τοιαυ και].

181. εν τω: προ του ΝΑ, προν η Δ.

183. διανω: so Ν; διανοια μον ΛΔ.

ου δει: so ΝΑ: και άδειον Δ.

185. Though the κ of και is not quite certain and still less the a of και θεσθη, the papyrus clearly agreed with ΛΔ in omitting αυτη which is read after ομοιον by Ν.

188. A here has την ουδειν επι των βραχων αυτης αφ ευτης και ειπεν, while ΝΑΔ omit επι των βραχων. The papyrus reading was still shorter, since not more than about 15 letters should stand in the lacuna, and there can be little doubt that αυτης was left out, as in some of the cursives.

189. πιε: l. πιε.

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

657. Epistle to the Hebrews.

Height 26.3 cm.

This considerable fragment of the Epistle to the Hebrews is written on the back of the papyrus containing the new epitome of Livy (668). The text is in broad columns, of which eleven are represented, corresponding to Ch. ii. 14-v. 5, x. 8-xi. 13, and xi. 28-xii. 17, or about one-third of the whole. The columns are numbered at the top, those preserved being according to this numeration 47-50, 63-5, 67-9; it is thus evident that the Epistle to the Hebrews was preceded in this MS. by something else, probably some other part of the New Testament. The hand is a sloping uncial of the oval type, but somewhat coarse and irregular, and apparently in the transitional stage between the Roman and Byzantine variety. It is very similar in appearance to the hand of 404, a fragment of the Shepherd of Hermes, of which a facsimile is given in
P. Oxy. III, Plate iv; and we should attribute it to the first half of the fourth century, while it may well go back to the first quarter. As stated in the introd. to 688, the papyri with which this was found were predominantly of the third century, and it is not likely to have been separated from them by any wide interval. The fact that the strips of cursive documents which were used to patch and strengthen the papyrus before the verso was used are of the third and not the fourth century points to the same conclusion. There is no sign anywhere of a second hand, and such corrections as occur are due to the original scribe, who is responsible for occasional lection signs and the punctuation by means of a double point inserted somewhat freely and not always accurately (cf. e.g. l. 19); a single point is occasionally substituted. This system of punctuation is remarkable, for it seems to correspond to an earlier division into στιχοι longer than those in extant MSS. and frequently coinciding with the arrangement in the edition of Blass (Halle, 1903). The contractions usual in theological MSS. are found, IC being written for Ἰησοῦς. Orthography is not a strong point, instances of the confusion common at this period between ι and υ, ε and α, ν and ο, being especially frequent; but apart from minor inaccuracies the text is a good and interesting one. Its chief characteristic is a tendency in Chs. ii–v to agree with B, the Codex Vaticanus, in the omission of unessential words or phrases; cf. notes on ll. 15, 24, and 60. This gives the papyrus a peculiar value in the later chapters, where B is deficient; for here too similar omissions are not infrequent (cf. notes on ll. 118, 125, 151, 152, 161, 224), and it is highly probable that they were also found in B, particularly when, as is sometimes the case, D (the Claromontanus, of the sixth century) is on the same side. Of the other MSS. the papyrus is nearest to D (cf. notes on ll. 60, 125, 145, 152, 154, 178, 222, 224–6), but the two sometimes part company (cf. notes on ll. 139, 163, 180); only in one doubtful case (note on l. 168) does it support N against the consensus of the other MSS. Variants peculiar to the papyrus, apart from the omissions already referred to, are noted at ll. 32, 37, 106, 115, 156, 162, 227, 229. We give a collation with the Textus Receptus and the text of Westcott and Hort, adding particulars concerning the readings of the principal authorities.

Col. i.

\[\text{καταργηση του} \text{ το κρατος εχοντα του θανατου} \]
\[\text{τουτεστι το} \nu \text{ διαβολον} : \text{και απαλλαξη του} \]
\[\text{τους οσοι φοβοι θανατου δια παν} \{\text{του}\} \text{του ευν} \]
\[\text{ου όνοχοι ησαν δουλειας} : \text{ου γαρ δηπον αγγελον} \]

ii. 14
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[ἐπιλαμβανεται] ἀλλα σπερματος Ἀβρααμ επι
[καμβανεται οθ]ἐν ϕιλεν κατα παυτα τους α
[δελφοις ομοιωθ]ηναι : ἵνα ελεημον γενηται
[και πιστος αρχη]ρευς τα προς τον δυν εις το ειλαο
10 [κατα] τοις αμαρτιαις του λαου : ἐν ω γαρ πεπον
[θεν αυτος πιρασ]θεις : δυναται τοις πιραζομε
[νος βοηθησαι οθ]θειν αδελφοι αγιοι κλησως ε
[ποωρανου ρετοχ]ιν : κατανοησατε τον αποστολο
[κα] και αρχηγεα της ομοιωματος ημων Τι πιστον οντα
15 [τω ποιησαντι] αυτον : ως κε Μωυσης εν τω οικω
[αυτοι πιλιν]νος γαρ δοξης ουτος παρα Μωυσην
[ηξιωται καθ]ος τον πλεον τιμην εχει τον [ο]ικου : ο
[κατασκευα]ρεα αυτον : πας γαρ οικος κατασκευε
[ας]ται υπο τινος : ο δε παντα καταςκευασας : θες
20 [και] Μωυσης μεν πιστος εν ολο τω οικω αυτου
[ος θεραπω]ν εις μαρτυριον : των λαληθομε
[νον Χ]ς χε] ος υιος επι τον οικον αυτοι ου οικος
[εσμεν ημε]ις : εαυ την παρρησιαν και το καυχη
[μα της ελπιδος κατασχωμεν : διο καθως λεγει
25 [το πινα] το αγιον σημερον εαυ της φωνης αυτου
[ακουσητε] μη σκληρωνητε τας καρδιας υμων
[ος εν τω πα]πατικρασμω κατα την ημεραν του
[πιρασμου] εν τη ερημω ου επιραγισαν οι πατερες υμω

Col. ii.

μη

30 εν δο[κι]μασια και ειδον τα εργα μου τεσσερακοντα
etη [δι]ο προσωκθεισα τη γενεα ταυτη και ειπ[ον
αει [πλανο]ται εν τη καρδια αυτων διο ουκ εγνω[σαν
τα]ς οδους μοιν ως ωμοσα εν τη οργη μου ει εισ[ε
λει[σκον]αι εις] την καταπαυσιν μου : βλεπεται αδελ
35 φο(ι μη) ποτε εστε εν τιν υμων καρδια ποιηρ[α
[απι][στια]ς : εν τω αποστηναι απο δυ[ν]ωτοσ : αλ [
[λα] πα[ρα]καλεσατε εαυτους καθ εκαστην ημ[ε}
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39

40 χοι] γα[ρ του Χ]ρι[ου] γεγοναμεν : εαντερ την α[ρχην
της] υποστασεως μεχρι τελους βεβαιαν [κατα
σ]χωμεν εν τω λεγεσθαι σημερον εαν της φι[ω
νης αυτου ακουσητε : μη σκηληρυστε τας κι[ρ]
δειας υμων ας εν τω παραπικρασμω : τι[νες
45 γαρ ακουσαντες παρεπικραναν αλλ ου πα[ντες
οι εξελθοντες εξ] Διονυσου δια Μωΐσεως τεσ[τιν
δε προσωχθεισεν] τασσερακοντα ετη ουχι τη[σ]
αμαρτησασιν αν τα κολα επεσεν εν τη ε[ρη
μω : τισι]ν δε αναμενετε μη εισελυεσθαι τι[σ
50 της]ν καταπασιν αυτου ει μη τοις απιθησασε[ιν
κα]λα βλεπομεν στι [οικ] ηθυνασθησαν εισελ[λα
θειν δι α[πια]τειαν] : φοβηθομεν ουν μη πι[ο]
τε καταληπομενης επαγγελιας εισελθειν
[εις την καταπασιν αυτου δοκη τις εξ ιμ[ων
55 υστερη]η]κεναι : και γαρ εσμεν ευγγελισμεν[οι

Col. iii.

μθ
[καθαπερ κ]ακεινοι αλλ ουκ αφελησεν ο λογος
[της ακοης] εκεινως μη συνεκερασμενος
[τη πιστι τοις ακουσασιν : εισερχομεθα γαρ εις
60 καταπα]υσαις οι πιστευσαντες : καθως ειρηκεν
[ωσ] ωμοσα εν τη οργη μου ει ελευσοντε εις την κα
[ταπαν]υσαις μου : και των εργων απο καταβ
[λης κοσμυ]υν γενηθεντων ειρηκεν που περι της
[εβδομα]δεωσιν αυτως : και κα[τε]παυσες ο θς εν τη ημε
65 [ρα τη εβ]δομη απο παντ[ιον] των εργων αυτου : και
[εν τοι]ων πα[λ]λων εισελυ]νται εις την καταπα
[μον επι ουν απολιπετε τινας εισελθειν εις αυτη
[και οι προτερου ευαγγελισ]θεντες ουκ ειση[λθ]α
[δι απιθα]ν οπλιν των οριζει ημεραν σημερο

Col. iv.
ν
περ πασαν μακα[ρη]ν διστομον και δικνουμε
νος αχρει μερισμουν ψυχης και πυς αρμων τη
85 και μυελων και κριτικος ευθυμησεων και εν
υνων καρδιας : και ουκ εστιν κτισις αφανης
ενωπιον αυτου : [παντα δε γυμνα και τετραχη
λισμενα τοις οφθαλμοις αυτου προς ον ημων
ο λογος : εχουτες ουν αρχερεα μεγας διε
90 ληθυθοσ τους ουρανους Ιν τον ιουν του θυ
κρατομεν της [ομολογιας ου γαρ εχομεν αρχε
ρεα μη δυναμενον συνπαθησαι ταις ασθε
νεια]ις ημων [πεπιρασμενον δε κατα παντα
καθ ομοιωτητα] χωρις αμαρτιας προσερχωμε
95 θα ουν μετα [παρρησιας το θρονω της] χαριτος
[iν]α λαβωμεν ελεος και χαριν ευρωμεν εις
[καιρον βοηθειαν πας γαρ αρχερεα εξ ανθρω
[πων] λαμβανουμεν υπερ ανθρωπων κα
θεσταται τα προς του θυ ινα προσφερη δορα
100 [και θυσιας υπερ αμαρτιων μετριοπαθειν δυ
ναμενος τοις α]γυνουσι και πλανωμενοι εστι
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καὶ αὐτὸς περίκειται ἀσθενεῖαν καὶ δὲ αὐτὴν
οφιλεῖ καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ οὐτῶς καὶ περὶ εαυ
tοῦ προσφέρειν περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν καὶ οὐχ ἐν
105 αὐτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμὴν ἀλλὰ καλοῦμε
νος ὑπὸ τοῦ ὅ τι οὐτῶς καὶ ο Χριστὸς οὐχ εαυτὸν εἶν
ξασεν γενὴθηναι αρχιερεὰ ἀλλ' ο λαλήσας

12 columns lost.

Col. v.

καὶ αὐτὸς περίκειται ασθενείαν καὶ δὲ αὐτὴν
οφιλεῖ καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ οὐτῶς καὶ περὶ εαυ
tοῦ προσφέρειν περὶ ἀμαρτιῶν καὶ οὐχ ἐν

x. 8

[προσφέρονται τὸ τέτειρην κεν ἑν δοὺ η' τ' τοῦ ποιήσαι το

[θελημα σου] : αναίρει τὸ [πρωτὸν ἱνα [το δεύτερον στὴ

[στη εν ον θέληματι ηγιασμένοις ο] [εἰσὶν διὰ τῆς προσ

[φορὰς τοῦ σωμάτος Ίην Χ[ν] ἐφάπαξ : [καὶ πας μεν ἐν

[εἰς

[προσφέρονται τὸ τέτειρην κεν δοὺ η' τ' τοῦ ποιήσαι το

110 [θελημα σου] : αναίρει τὸ [πρωτὸν ἱνα [το δεύτερον στὴ

[στη εν ον θέληματι ηγιασμένοις ο] [εἰσὶν διὰ τῆς προσ

[φορὰς τοῦ σωμάτος Ίην Χ[ν] ἐφάπαξ : [καὶ πας μεν ἐν

[εἰς

[προσφέρονται τὸ τέτειρην κεν δοὺ η' τ' τοῦ ποιήσαι το

[θελημα σου] : αναίρει τὸ [πρωτὸν ἱνα [το δεύτερον στὴ

[στη εν ον θέληματι ηγιασμένοις ο] [εἰσὶν διὰ τῆς προσ

[φορὰς τοῦ σωμάτος Ίην Χ[ν] ἐφάπαξ : [καὶ πας μεν ἐν

[εἰς

[προσφέρονται τὸ τέτειρην κεν δοὺ η' τ' τοῦ ποιήσαι το

115 [θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

[εἰς τις καθ' ἡμέραν λιτοῦργον καὶ τάς αὐτάς
[πολλακίς] προσφέρων θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

[εἰς τις καθ' ἡμέραν λιτοῦργον καὶ τάς αὐτάς
[πολλακίς] προσφέρων θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

120 [θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

[εἰς τις καθ' ἡμέραν λιτοῦργον καὶ τάς αὐτάς
[πολλακίς] προσφέρων θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

[εἰς τις καθ' ἡμέραν λιτοῦργον καὶ τάς αὐτάς
[πολλακίς] προσφέρων θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

125 [θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

[εἰς τις καθ' ἡμέραν λιτοῦργον καὶ τάς αὐτάς
[πολλακίς] προσφέρων θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

[εἰς τις καθ' ἡμέραν λιτοῦργον καὶ τάς αὐτάς
[πολλακίς] προσφέρων θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

130 [θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

[εἰς τις καθ' ἡμέραν λιτοῦργον καὶ τάς αὐτάς
[πολλακίς] προσφέρων θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

[εἰς τις καθ' ἡμέραν λιτοῦργον καὶ τάς αὐτάς
[πολλακίς] προσφέρων θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε

[εἰς τις καθ' ἡμέραν λιτοῦργον καὶ τάς αὐτάς
[πολλακίς] προσφέρων θυσίας αἰτίας οὐδεποτε
π.σω δοκεῖτε χειρονος ἀξιωθησεῖται τιμωρίας ο τὸν ὑ[ιον] τοῦ [θυ καταπατήσασα καὶ το αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης 135 κοινὸν η[γησαμένος εν ὠ γηγασθῇ καὶ το πᾶ τῆς χαρίτος ενθίβρισε οίδαμεν γαρ τὸν εἰποντα ερωι εκ δικήσεις εγ[ὼ ανταποδώσω καὶ παλιν κρυεί κς τὸν λοιπον αυτόν φοβερον το εμπεσειν εἰς χειρας θυ ζωτος [αναμμυνησκεσθε δε τας προτερον ημε 140 ρος εν α[ις φωτισθεντες πολλην αθλησιν υπερευνατε παθηματων τουτο μεν ονειδισμοι τε και θλιψειν

Col. vii.

ξδ
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παρά Καίειν προσήνε'κεν δι' ης εμαρτυρηθή ειναι δ'ει
[κ']αιος μαρτυρουντος επί τοις δώροις αυτω του θεω και δι' αυ
tης αποθανων ετη λαλει' πιστει Εως' μετετθη[η] του μη
ιδειν θανατον και ους ευρισκετο διοτι μετεθηκεν αυτον
165 ο θεον' προ γαρ της μεταθεσεως μεμαρτυρηται ευρι受灾ηκε

Col. viii.

[ζε]

ναι τω θεω Χωρις δε πιστεως αδυνατον ευαρεστησαι
πιστευαι γαρ δει τον προσερχομενον θεω σιε εστιν
και τοις ζητουσιν αυτων μισαποδοτης γινεται πιστει
170 χρηταμεθεθες Νοε περι των μηδεσω βλεπομενων
ευλαβηθησεις κατεσκευασει κιβωτων εις σωτηριαν του
οικου αυτου δι' ης κατεκρινειν του κοσμου και της κατα
πιετην δικαιοσυνης εγενετο κληρονομος πιστει καλου
μενος Αβρααμη μητηκουσεν εξελθειν εις τοπον ου ημει
175 λεν λαμβανειν εις κληρονομιαν και εξηλθειν μη επι
σταμενος πιετου ερχεται πιστει παρωκησαι εις γην της
επαγγελιας οις αλλοτριαν εν σκηναις κατοικησας μετα
Ισακ' και Ιακωβ των συνκληρονομων της επαγγελιας της
αυτης εξεδεχετο γαρ την τους θεμελιους εχοσαν πο
180 λιν της τεχνης και δημιουργος ο θεον πιστει και αυτης
αρρα δυναμιν εις καταβολην σπερματος ελαβεν και πα
ρα καιρον ηλικιας επει πιστον ηγησατο τον επαγγελιαμε
νον διο και [αφ ενος εγεννηθησαν και ταυτα γενεκρο
μενου καΐως τα αστρα του ουρανου τω πληθει και
185 οι ης αμμοι η παρα το χειλος της θαλασσης η αναριθμητος
κατα πιστιν αυτοι πιντες μη κομμαμενοι τας
[ε]παγγελειας αλλα πορρωθεν αυτας ιδοντες και ας
[π]ασαμενοι και ομολογησαντες οτι ξενοι και παρεπιθμοι
[ε]σαι επι της [γης

1 column lost.
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Col. ix.

190  ἐξ

[πρωτοτοκα διήγη αρτων : πιστεί διεβήσαν την Εμυδραν  
[θαλάσσαν ὡσ διὰ ξηρας γης : η[ς] περαν λαβοντες οἱ Αἰγιν 
[πτοιοι κατεποθησαν] πιστεί τα τιχα Ιεριχω επέσαν κυκλω 
[θεντι ετι επτα ημερας : πιστει Ρααβ η πορη ου συναπω 

195 [λητο τοις απιθησασιν] δεξαμενη τους κατασκοπους μετ' 
[εἰρηνης και τι ετι λεγω επηλυψει γαρ με διηγουμενον ο τρο 
[νος περι Γεθεων Βαρ]ακ' Σαμψω Ιεβθαε Δανειω τε και Σαμουηλ 
[και των προφητων] οι δια πιστεως κατηγουσαντο βασιλειας 
[ηργασαντο δικαιους] : επετυχον επαγγελιον [shake] εφρα 

200 [ξαν στοματα λευτ']των : εσθεσαν δυναμιν πυρος [shake] εφ 
[γον στοματα μαχαιρις : ευνυμαιησαν απο ασθενει 
[ασ εγενηθησαν] : χυροι εμ πολεμω παρεμβολας εκλει 
[ναι αλλοριοιν ελαβον γυνεκα;.] [shake] εξ αναστασεως τους 
[νεκρους αυτον αμλοι δε ετοιμαμοθησαν ου προσδεξα 

205 [μενοι την απολυτρωσιν] ινα κρειττοιοι αναστασεως 
[tυχωσι ετεροι δε] εμπεγμων και μαστειγων πειραν 
[ελαβον ετι δε δεσμων και φυλακις : ελιθασθησαν 
[επρισθησαν] επι[ραβθησαν : εν φοιω μαχαιρα α 
[πεδανον περιη[λ]θον ευ μηλωται ευ εγοις δερμα 

210 [συν υπερουμενοι] θλειβομενοι : κακουχουμενοι 
[ον ουκ ην αξιος] ο [κα]σμος επι εργηεις πλανωμε 
[νοι και ορεσι και σπ]ηλειως και ταις οπαις ην γης : και 
[οντι παντες μαρτυρηθευτες δια της πιστεως ουκ εκομ 
[σατο την επιγεια]ειαν του δυ περι της κριτον 

215 [τι προβλεψαμενον] ινα μη χωρις ημων τελειωθωσι[τ] 
[τοιγαρον και] ημεις τοσοντον εχοντες περικιμενον 

Col. x.

[την εντεριστατον αμαρτειαν δι υπομονης τρεχομεν το
220 π[ροκειμεν]ενον ἡμεὶς ἀγωνα ἀφορώντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πιστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰν οὐς αὐτῷ τῆς προκειμενῆς αὐτῷ χα ρας ὑπεμεινεν τὸν σταυρὸν αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας εν δεξιὰ τε τὴν θρονον τοῦ Ἰου κεκαθίζεν : ἀναλογισάσθαι γαρ τοιαῦτην ὑπομεμενηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν αμαρτωλῶν. εἰς αὐ
225 τοὺς αντιλογιαν ἵνα μὴ καμήτε ταῖς ψυχαῖς εκλελυμε νοί : ὑπὸ μερίμνι αἵματος αντικατεστητε πρὸς τὴν α μάρτιαν αγωνιζομένοι καὶ εκλελυμένης τῆς παρακλήσεως ἡτος ὑμεῖς ὡς ὑίοι διαλεγεται ὡς μου μὴ ὀλγωρεί παιδεὶ ας καὶ μὴ ἐγκυον ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ἐλεγχομένου : οὐ γαρ α
240 παρον ου δοκει χαρας ειναι αλλα λυπης υστερον δε καρ πον ειρηνικον τοις δι αυτης γεγυμνασμενοις αποδιω[σ]ι

Col. xi.

[εθ]

δικαιοσύνης διο τας παρεξεινας χειρας και τα παραλευμε να [γονατα ανορθωσατε και προχιας ορθας ποιετε τοις
245 ποσιν υμων ινα μη το χωλον εκταπθη αθη δε μαλλον ειρηνην διωκετε μετα παντον και τον αγιασμον ου χωρις ου[θ]εις ου[σ]εται τον και επισκοπουντες μη της υστερων απo της χαριτος του θυ μη της ρεια πικριας ανω φιουσα ενοχλη κατι δι αυτης μιανθαιν οι πολλοι μη της πορνος η βεβηλος
250 ως [Ησαυ ος αντι βρωσεως μιας απεδοτο τα πρωτοτοκια αυτου ἐσ
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τε [γαρ οτι και μετεπειτα θελων κληρονομησαι την ευλογι
αν [ 

14. l(γου)ν; so ΝΑBCD, &c., W-H.; Χριστου ισαων EKL, &c., T-R.
15. εν τω ουκ; so B; εν αλω τω ουκ ΝΑCDΕ, &c., T-R., W-H. εισω may have come in from verse 5.
16. δοξης ουτως: so KLM, &c., T-R.; ουτως δοξης ΝΑBCDE, &c., W-H.
19. παστα: so ΝΑBCDKM, &c., W-H.; τα π. EL, &c., T-R.
23. εαν: so ΝΒDE, &c., W-H.; εανερ ΛC, &c., T-R. κ of καυχημα has been altered apparently from χ.
24. ἀποδος κατασχομεν: so B; ελπ. μεχρι τελους βεβαιων κατασχ. ΝΑCDΕ, &c., T-R., W-H. The phrase μεχρι τελους βεβαιων κατασχομεν recurs in verse 14 and may have come in here from that passage.
31. πρωσωπηθασαι: l. πρωσωπηθα; the δ has been altered from τ.
32. εν τη καρδια αυτων διο: τη καρδια αυτον δι MSS.
36-40. The position of the narrow strip placed near the beginning of these lines is uncertain, but it suits very well here. The recto being blank does not help to decide the question.
37. παρακαλεςτε is another otherwise unattested reading: παρακαλεστε MSS.
38. α(δη)τε: so M; αχρες other MSS., T-R., W-H.
42. A double point may be lost after αγομεν.
51. οδυνακατησασαι: οδυνη γησασαι MSS. The form οδυνακατησασαι occurs e.g. in Matt. xvii. 16 (B), Mark vii. 24 (NB).
The first ε of εσελαβεων is written over a double point.
58. συνκεκριμενος: so ΑΒCD, &c., W-H. in text; συνκεκριμενος Ν, W-H. mg., συνκεκριμενος T-R.
59. γαρ: so ΒΔΕ, &c.; ενω ΝΑC.
60. πην was certainly omitted before καταπουσω as in BD; πην is found in other MSS. and is read by W-H. and T-R.
63. πων: γαρ πων T-R., W-H. with all MSS. except ιοηνατ. which agrees with the papyrus in omitting γαρ.
64. κατερπαισε is a mistake for κατερπαισεν.
66. εισελεσαρθη: so D and some cursives; ει εισελεσαρθη other MSS., T-R., W-H.
70-1. The vestiges of καθως are very slight, but are a sufficient indication that the papyrus read προερημη with ΝΑCDΕ, &c., W-H.; rather than ειρημη (correctors of DE, KL, T-R.), since the division καθως does not account for the traces of ink at the end of l. 70.
80. σ of σεοη was converted from τ.
81. ειρηγης: so ΝΑCDΕ, &c., T-R., W-H.; ειρηγης Β.
85. ευμνων is for ευρων.
96. It is almost certain that the papyrus read ευρωνευ, since without this word the line would be unaccountably short; B stands alone in omitting it.
99. The line is sufficiently long without τε after δωρα (om. B and an early corrector of D), and in view of the tendency of the papyrus the omission is probable.
106. ουτως, κ.τ.λ.: the MSS. here have καθασπερ (ΝΑBD) or καθασπερ και (ομ. και CD) Δαρων ουτως, κ.τ.λ., but there is evidently not room for all this in the papyrus. The only
other authority for any omission here is K, which leaves out αὐτος καὶ ο Χριστος; but even without these words the line would remain rather too long. To omit καθωσπερ καὶ Αὐρων suits the space better and does not damage the sense.

112. The papyrus may of course have read αἵματος (DE) for σῶματος and ἀρχιερεὺς (AC) for ἑρευς (ΝΔΕΚΛ).

115. ἀμαρτίαν: ἀμαρτίας MSS.

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

118. εἴθρα: εἴθρα αυτοῦ MSS. The superfluous ε in ποδιον ν was a slip due to the preceding ναποδιον.

124. τὸς μὲν: so D and some cursive; ἀμαρτίων αὐτῶν T-R., W-II, with other MSS.

125-6. μὴ μημεθήσομαι: I, μὴ μημεθήσομαι.

127. ἀμαρτίας: ἀμαρτίας MSS. The second ε of ἐκοιτες has been altered from α.

139. τὰς προτερὰς ἡμερὰς: so T-R., W-II, with most MSS.; τὰς πρ. ἀμαρτίας Ν, τὰς προτερὰς ἡμερὰς D.

144. δὲν μὲν: so AD, W-II.; δένοσ μοι ΝΕΗΚΛ, &c., T-R. We cannot of course be sure that the papyrus did not have δέησας, but the absence of μοι is the important thing and is much in favour of δέησας.

147. εὔνων: so ΝΑ, W-II.; εὔνων DE, &c., εν εὐνόοις T-R. with a few minuscules.

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

153. πιστῶς: πιστῶς μοι D.

154. μοι η ψυχή: so DE; η ψ., μοι T-R., W-II, with other MSS.

156. πραγματον: αὐτοται σαι] (I. ἐπάστασαι) is the reverse order to that of all the MSS.; πράγματων is usually connected with βλέπομενοι.

157. αὐτῷ τὸ μνῆμα: so ΝΑΕ, W-II.; τὸ μνῆμα ΚΛ, &c., T-R.

161. προσηνεκία: προσηνεκία το θεοῦ MSS.

162. αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ: αὐτῷ was originally written but was altered to αὐτῷ. αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ ΝΑΦ, αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ΕΚΛ, &c., T-R., W-II.

163. λαλεῖ: so ΝΑ, W-II., T-R.; λαλεῖται DE, &c.

164. εὐφαγείτο: so ΚΛ, &c., T-R.; εὐφαγέτε ΝΑΕ, W-II.

165. εὐφηστικεύμαι: so ΝΕ, ευφ. ΑΚΛ, W-II., T-R. If εὐφηστικεύμαι was correctly written this line was somewhat longer than those preceding.

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

169. καθωσπερ καὶ Αὐρων: so P only; καθωσπερ other MSS., T-R., W-II.

175. λαμβανεῖν εἰς κλ.: the usual reading; κλ. λαμβανεῖν Ν.

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

180. αὐτός ἀρμον is for αὐτῆς Σαμά. The papyrus agreed with ΝΑΕ, &c., in omitting στέφανα or στέφανα υπάσα which is found after Σαμα (or after δύναμιν or ἐλαφίν) in D and other MSS.
182. It is practically certain that the papyrus did not read ἐτεκεν after ηλικιας with EKL and other MSS. (so T-R.). It is omitted in ΝΑΔ, W-H.

185. ὦ τη: so all the best MSS.; ὦτει T-R. with a few minuscules.

186. Considerations of space make κομισσάμενοι (Ν, &c., W-H.) preferable to λοβοντες (DE, &c., T-R.).

187. The papyrus evidently omitted και πεισθέντες which is found in some minuscules and read in the T-R.

188. This line is rather long, and the papyrus may have had παροικω for παρεπιδήμων, as P.

192. ἔπρεμ γη: so ΝΑΔΕ, W-H.; om. γῆς ΚΛ, &c., T-R.

193. εἴπασαν: so ΝΑΔ, W-H.; εἴπασε EKL, T-R.

194. πορνή: επιθυμεῖν πορνή Ν.

196. γαρ με: so ΕΚΛ, &c., T-R.; με γαρ ΝΑΔ, W-H.

197. The papyrus agrees with ΝΑ (so W-H.) in the omission of conjunctions between the names as far as Δαυιδ. B. τε καὶ Σ. καὶ 'I. T-R. with other MSS. The spelling Σαμψω is attested as a variant by D. The ε of Δαυιδ was originally omitted; Δαυιδ ΝΔ, W-H., Δαυδ, Δαδ, and Δαβι (T-R.) other MSS.

201. μαχαράς: so ΝΑΔ, W-H.; μαχαράς other MSS., T-R. But the papyrus is inconsistent and has μαχαρας in l. 208.

εὐνομωθήσαν: ΝΑΔ, W-H.; εὐνομωθήσαν EKL, &c., T-R.

203. The size of the lacuna is inconclusive as to whether the papyrus read γυνεκὼς] (ΝΑΔ) or γυναίκας (ΕΚΛ, &c., T-R., W-H.).

208. [ἐπαιθήσαν εἰπεραγαγιθήσαν: this is also the order of ΑΔ, &c., and T-R.; εἰπερ. επρ. ΝΔ, &c., W-H.

μαχαράς: cf. l. 201, note.

211. εἰ: so ΝΑ, W-H.; εν DE, &c., T-R.

216. τοιοῦτον: Ν τηλειοῦτον.

222. τὸν σταυρόν: so Δ; om. τον other MSS., T-R., W-H.

223. καθά(ec): so the uncial, W-H.; καθάσαν T-R. with some minuscules.

224. The papyrus agrees with D in omitting τον which is read before τοιοῦτον in other MSS. and by T-R., W-H.

αὐτῶς: so a corrector of Ν; αὐτῶς ΝΔΕ, W-H., αὐτῶν A, αὐτῶν ΚΛ, T-R.

225. εὐδαμογειν: so Δ; εὐδαμογεῖν οἱ minuscules.

226. μέχρι: so Δ; μέχρι other MSS., T-R., W-H.

227. αγωγιθέντες: αἰταγωγιθέντες MSS.

229. καὶ μῆ: μῆθ MSS.

231. εἰ: so most MSS., W-H.; εἰ T-R. with a few minuscules.

232. τὴν γαρ: so ΝΑ, W-H.; τὴν γαρ est in DE &c., T-R.

233. καὶ σύ νῦν est is also the order of ΝΑΔ, W-H.; καὶ σύ κ. o. τῷ ΚΛ, &c., T-R.

235. πολὺ δὲ: δὲ is also attested as a variant by D and was added by the third corrector of Ν; πολὺ ΝΔ, W-H., πολὺ Δ, &c., T-R.; πολὺ μὲν Ν, &c., W-H.

239. αὐτοτητις is a graphical error for αὐτοτης. πασα δὲ is the reading of ΑΚΛ, &c., T-R.; πασα μὲν Ν, &c., W-H.

241. The ε of εἰρήκεν has apparently been corrected and the η of αὐτης was altered from ο or αι, which perhaps reflects the variant δὲ αὐτως recorded in D; but it may well have been a mere slip.
658. *THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS*


15·5 x 7 cm.

An interesting survival of the Decian persecution of the Christians in A.D. 250 is preserved in this papyrus, which is an example of the *libelli* or declarations which suspects were compelled to make that they had sacrificed to the pagan gods. Two only of these *libelli* have hitherto been published, one at Berlin (B. G. U. 287; Krebs, *Sitzungsbl. Berl. Akad.* 1893; Harnack, *Theol. Literatur.* 1894, p. 38), the other at Vienna (Wessely, *Sitzungsbl. Wien. Akad.* 1894; Harnack, *Theol. Literatur.* 1894, p. 162). Both of those documents were from the Fayûm; the present specimen, though from another nome, has the same characteristic phrases, which were evidently a stereotyped formula, and confirms in all respects the emendations and deductions proposed by Harnack in connexion with the Berlin papyrus. Like them also it is addressed to a commission which was specially appointed to conduct the inquisition against the Christians.

To the superintendents of offerings and sacrifices at the city from Aurelius ... thion son of Theodorus and Pantomynis, of the said city. It has ever been my custom to make sacrifices and libations to the gods, and now also I have in your presence in accordance with the command poured libations and sacrificed and tasted the offerings together with my son Aurelius Dionysius and my daughter Aurelia Lais. I therefore

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tois } & \text{ epi tov } \text{ ierow [kai} \\
\text{thnaiwn } & \text{ poleios} \\
\text{par' } & \text{ Avpilov } \Delta; . . . . \\
\text{theios } & \text{ Theodorou } \mu[\tau]ros \\
5 \text{ Panto} & \text{nuemidos } \alpha[t]\gamma\varsigma\varsigma \\
\text{ai} & \text{ thwv } \\
5 \text{ tois } & \text{ kai } \\
\text{theois } & [\delta]\epsilon\tau\epsilon\lambda[v]sa \text{ epi } \delta\epsilon \\
\text{kai } & \text{ vnu } \\
10 \text{kata } & \text{ tate } \\
\text{kaleusis } & [\xi]\beta\alpha\sigma[\tau]\nu [\text{Pa}\nu]\nu \kappa. \\
\text{epeia} & \text{ kai } \\
\text{i} & \text{ethusa kai} \\
\text{tov } & \text{i} \text{erwv } \\
\end{align*}
\]
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request you to certify my statement. The 1st year of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Pauni 20."

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

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

13-4. τῇ θυγατρί: women were clearly included in the Decian Edict; cf. the Vienna libellus, which is from two men with their wives, and the 5th Edict of Maximin (Euseb. de Mart. Pol. ix. 2), quoted by Harnack, πανδημία πάντας ἄνδρας ἡμα γυναιξὶ καὶ ὀάετας καὶ αὐτοῖς ἰσομείας παιί δόκιμω καὶ σπένδινω, κ.τ.λ.

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

II. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

659. Pindar, Παρθένειαν and Ode.

Fragments of a roll containing parts of at least five columns of lyric poetry in Pindaric dialect, written in good-sized round uncialis, which we assign to the latter half of the first century B.C. Occasional accents, breathings, and stops (high and middle point) have been added by the original scribe, who has also made a few corrections of his work; the text, however, was not left in a very perfect condition, and several alterations are necessary on metrical and other grounds. The first three columns, but for the loss of a few lines at the beginning of each, are in good condition; the fourth becomes more fragmentary, while Col. v, which probably succeeded immediately and to which the majority of the small unplaced pieces appear to belong, is hopelessly broken. The position of these is to some extent fixed by the fact that the verso of Cols. i–iii was utilized for a collection of epigrams (862); for since the verso of most of the scraps is blank, they must be placed later than the upper half of the third column.

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

The metre of the Παρθένεια is distinguished, like its language, by an ease
and simplicity which fully bear out the reputation of this class of Pindar’s
odes; cf. Dionys. Halicarn. Demosth. 39, where after citing the poetry of
Aeschylus and Pindar as an example of want of connexion, abruptness, and
unexpected changes of construction, the critic proceeds χωρίς ὁτι μὴ τὰ Παρθένια καὶ εἰ τινα τούτους ὤμοιας ἀπαίτει κατασκευᾶς διαφαίνεται δὲ τις ὤμοια καὶ τοῦτος εὐγένεια καὶ σεμνότης ἄρμονιας τὸν ἄρχαίων φιλάττουσα πίνον. Strophes and epodes consist alike of five verses having a prevailing choriambic element. The scheme is as follows:—

**Strophes.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lines 1 and 3 in the strophe, 1, (2) and 4 in the epode stand in synapia with the lines succeeding; and a single long syllable before or after a choriambus} & \text{ is probably to be regarded as lengthened by 'syncope' to the extent of an additional short syllable, e.g. } \ldots \ldots \ldots = \text{L-ooo-J, or } \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots . \\
\text{The commencement of each new strophe is marked in the original by an elaborate coronis, and the antistrophes and epodes are commonly denoted in the same way by paragraphi, which are, however, sometimes omitted.} & \\
\text{The metrical scheme shows that the number of lines missing at the tops of Cols.} & \\
\text{iii and iv must be either 8 or 23—a larger figure is out of the question.} & \\
\text{A loss of 8 lines would give a roll of the likely enough height of about} & \\
\text{20 cm., and is a satisfactory supposition in other respects. Each column} & \\
\text{would accordingly consist of from 28–29 lines, and a lacuna of about 8 or 9} & \\
\text{lines may therefore be postulated at the beginning of the first two columns.} & \\
\text{On this view the remains of the second poem extend to the second verse of} & \\
\text{the eighth strophe, or the 107th line from the commencement; the numeration} & \\
\text{given in the text below refers only to the lines actually preserved in the papyrus.} & \\
\text{The length of the strophe of the first poem (Col. i and the lost portion} & \\
\text{of Col. ii) is also five verses; the epode was longer, how much longer depends} & \\
\text{upon the number of lines lost at the top of Col. ii.} & \\
\text{If it be assumed that no space was left between the end of this ode and the commencement of the next,} & \\
\text{as the analogy of the Bacchylides papyrus and 408 would indicate, the epode} & \\
\text{extended to the rather unexpected length of 14 verses; if on the other hand} & \\
\text{the division was marked by a blank space, this number would be lowered by} & \\
\text{two or three lines. A different figure would of course result from the adoption} & \\
\text{of the hypothesis that the loss in Cols. iii–iv amounts to 23 verses, which would} & \\
\text{bring down the epode of the previous poem to a maximum of 9 lines.} & 
\end{align*}
\]
We append the scheme of the metre:

**Strophes.**

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Strophes.} & \quad \text{Epodes.} \\
\text{Strophes.} & \quad \text{Epodes.}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\ldots & \ldots \\
\ldots & \ldots \\
\ldots & \ldots \\
\ldots & \ldots \\
\ldots & \ldots \\
\ldots & \ldots \\
\ldots & \ldots \\
\ldots & \ldots \\
\ldots & \ldots (= \text{l. } 5)
\end{align*} \]

Lines 4-5 in the strophe and 1-3 and 4-5 in the epode are connected by synaphia.

Col. i.

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Col. i.} & \quad \text{Col. i.}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Col. i.} & \quad \text{Col. i.}
\end{align*} \]

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Col. i.} & \quad \text{Col. i.}
\end{align*} \]
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Col. ii.

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

Col. iii.

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

[...]

54
KEIMAIAXHRHM[.]ΔΘΕΙΑΝΟΙΔΑΝΠΡΟΣΦΟΡΟΝ.

50 ΠΙΣΤΑΔΑΓΑΙΚΗΛΕ ΑΡΤΥΧΑΛΘΟΝΕΧΟΡΟΝ
ΕΚΛΟΙΚΕΤΕΟΝΥΚΙΝ
ΛΑΜΠΡΟΞΕΝΙΑΙΚΙΤΙΜΑΣΕΝΤΑΣ
ΤΑΠΑΛΑΙΤΑΝΥΝ

55 ΤΑΜΦΙΚΤΙΟΝΕΣΙΝ
ΠΠΩΝΤΩΚΠΟΔΩΝΤΟ[. ]
ΓΝΩΣΙΟΙΣΕΩΝΙΚΑΙΣ.

59 ΤΑΙΕΝΙΟΝΕΝΙΩΝΟΓΧΗ[. . . . . . ] ΑΣ
ΤΑΙΔΕΝΑΙΤΙΩΝΙΑΣ[. . . . . . ]
ΧΑΙΤΝΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΙΣΕΚΟΣ
ΜΗΘΕΝ' ΕΝΤΕΠΙΣΙΝΕΠΙΠ[ ]

κειμαί χρή μ[ε] λαθεῖν ἀοίδαν πρόσφορον.

50 πισταὶ δ' Ἀγασικλής
μάρτυς ἢλυθον ἐς χορᾶν
ἐσλοίς θε γοναίς
ἀμφὶ προξενίαις τι-
μαξεῖσιν τὰ πάλαι τὰ νῦν

55 τ' ἀμφικτίονεσσων
ἐπ'ποιν τ' ἀκμαλόδων πο[λυ-]
γνῶτοι ἐπὶ νίκαις,
αἰτ ἐν αἰῶνεσσαι Ὀγχη[στοῦ κλ.]ταῖς
στρ. δ' ταῖς δὲ ναῦν Ἰτανιὰς ἀ[μφ]ε εὐκλεία[ῦ]

60 χαίται στεφανίοις ἐκκό-
μηθέν, ἐν τε Πίσα περι-

Col. iv.

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

ῬΙΖΑΙΤΕ[ ][: ]ΜΩΝΟΝ[ ][: ]

unftepαi0i 0.: [ ][: ]

65 ΕἲΝΗΚΕΝΚΑΙΕΠΕΙ[. . . . . . ] ΑΟΣ
ΤΩΝΔΑΝΔΡΩΝΕΝΕΞ[.]ΝΜΕΡΙΜΝΑΣ
ΓΟΠΗΝΟΧΕΡΑΝΟΕΠΙΝΟΥΠΑΙΓ
ΓΛΩΣΣΟΝΑΛΛΑΔΙΚΑΣ[,]ΔΟΥC
Π[. ] ΑΣΦΙΑΛΗ[. ]Ν·

60 ΔΑΜΑΙΝΑΤΑ[. . . . . . ] ΚΩΙΝΥΝΜΟΙΟΠΙΩΔΙ
ΣΤΕΙΧΩΝΑΓΕΟ[. ]ΝΓΑΡΕ[. ]ΦΡΩΝΕΥΕΤΑΙ
ΠΡΩΤΑΘΥΓΑΤΗΡ[,]ΔΟΥ
ΔΑΦΝΑΣΕΥΠΕΤΑΛΟΥΧΕΔ[,]Ν
ΒΑΙΝΟΙΚΑΠΕΙΔΙΟΙ[']

75 ἈΝΑΔΙΚΤΕΡΟΤΑΝΝΕΠΑ[ ]
ΣΚΗΣΕΜΙΔΕΣ[. ] ΛΑ[. ]
ΑΔΕΡ[. ]ΑCA[. . . . . . . . ]
ΜΥΡΙΩΝΕ[. . . . . . . . ]' IC

βίζα τε ὁ — —
[σε]μικὸν ἀν ὁ ὁ ὁ — — — — ἐπταπτήλουσιν.

65 ἐνήκεν καὶ ἑπείτα[α δυσμενῆς χό]λος
τῶν' ἀνδρῶν ἐν[ε]κεῖν μερίμνας σώφρονος
ἐχθρῶν ἐρεῖν οὐ παλιγ-
γλωσσὸν ἀλλὰ δίκας [δ]ιδοὺς
π[ιστὰς (?) ἐφιάλ[ις].]

πρῶτα θυγατὴρ [ὁ]δοῦ
δάφνας εὐπετεῖόν σχε[δ]' ὅ
βασινὸς πεδίλων

75 ὁν Δαισιστρότα, ὁν ἐπά-
σκησε μηδεσ[ι] — — —
ἀ δ' ἐρ — ἀσά — — — —
μυρίων ἐ ὁ ὁ ὁ ὁ
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Col. v.

85

80 Ἐν νή καὶ ψεύδοντας ἡμᾶς

80 μὴ νῦν νέκταρ ἰδὼν ἀπὸ κρᾶνος ἐμᾶς
dιψῶντ' ἂς ὅο—ὁ—παρ' ἀλμυρῶν
οἶχεσθον' εἶ—ὁ—

Fragments.

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

95 Ἰερ[ ] Ο[ ] Ἀ[ ] Ξ[ ]]

90 ἸΩ[ ] Ε[ ] Η[ ]]

100 Ε[ ] Σ[ ] Θ[ ]]

105 Ν[ ] Ρ[ ]]

110 Ἰ[ ] Δ[ ] Ι[ ]]

115 Ν[ ] Μ[ ]]

120 Ἰ[ ] Η[ ]]

125 Ο[ ]]

130 Σ[ ] Π[ ]]

135 Θ[ ]]

140 Φ[ ]]

145 Χ[ ]]

150 Θ[ ]]

155 Λ[ ]]

160 Ν[ ]]

165 Φ[ ]]

170 Θ[ ]]

175 Ι[ ]]

180 Λ[ ]]

185 Ν[ ]]

190 Φ[ ]]

200 Θ[ ]]

205 Ι[ ]]

210 Λ[ ]]

215 Ν[ ]]

220 Φ[ ]]

225 Θ[ ]]

230 Ι[ ]]

235 Λ[ ]]

240 Ν[ ]]

245 Φ[ ]]

250 Θ[ ]]

255 Ι[ ]]

260 Λ[ ]]

265 Ν[ ]]

270 Φ[ ]]

275 Θ[ ]]

280 Ι[ ]]

285 Λ[ ]]

290 Ν[ ]]

295 Φ[ ]]

300 Θ[ ]]

305 Ι[ ]]

310 Λ[ ]]

315 Ν[ ]]

320 Φ[ ]]

325 Θ[ ]]

330 Ι[ ]]

335 Λ[ ]]

340 Ν[ ]]

345 Φ[ ]]

350 Θ[ ]]

355 Ι[ ]]

360 Λ[ ]]

365 Ν[ ]]

370 Φ[ ]]

375 Θ[ ]]

380 Ι[ ]]

385 Λ[ ]]

390 Ν[ ]]

395 Φ[ ]]

400 Θ[ ]]

405 Ι[ ]]

410 Λ[ ]]

415 Ν[ ]]

420 Φ[ ]]

425 Θ[ ]]

430 Ι[ ]]

435 Λ[ ]]

440 Ν[ ]]

445 Φ[ ]]

450 Θ[ ]]

455 Ι[ ]]

460 Λ[ ]]

465 Ν[ ]]

470 Φ[ ]]

475 Θ[ ]]

480 Ι[ ]]
659. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS 57

\[(k)\] \\
\[l)\] \\
\[(m)\] \\
\[(n)\] \\
\[(o)\]

1. 1. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS 57

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

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

7. κεκρυμένον: cf. Nεμ. vi. 3 διέψυχε δὲ πᾶσα κεκρυμένα δύναμις.

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

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

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

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

21-4. A fresh ode begins at l. 21, the change being marked in the margin by a symbol of which vestiges appear opposite this line and the next. The name of the person to whom the poem was dedicated and its occasion may have been added, as in the Bacchylides papyrus. The small fragment placed at the top of this column and containing parts of ll. 22-4 is suitable both with regard to the recto and the verso (cf. 062. 39-40, note), but its position can hardly be accepted as certain. None of the remaining fragments can be inserted here, their verso being blank. For \[\pi\sigma\r [\phi \mathrm{φων}]\], a favourite word of Pindar, cf. e. g. Pyth. v. 117 θεός δι οί τό νῦν τι πρώτων τελεί διάμαν.

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

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

33. σειρήμα δὲ κάμπον ... δε Ζεφόρου, κ.τ.λ.; cf. Schol. on Homer, Od. μ. 168-9 (γαλήνη ἔπλευση νημιά κάμπον δε κύματα δαιμών) ἀντίδεθε Ἡσίοδος καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρους ἀληγεν αὐτῶς (sc. τάς Σειρήνας) ἔρη.

34. ΛΑΙΣΚΩΝ is apparently a mistake for αἰλίσκων; cf. Ol. iv. 2 ἥρκεν ἕπο τοικλοφόρων γαῖας ἀμαντήσατε. The initial Λ could equally well be Δ but hardly Ν, nor does ναίσκων give so good a sense.

37. Μ of ΧΕΙΜΩΝΟΣ has been altered from Ν.

38-9. φρίσσων Βορέας; cf. Pyth. iv. 81 φρισσότων δήμφρων which a scholar explains φρίσσων ποιότητας. ΕΠΙΣΠΕΡΧΗΣ is a mistake for ΕΠΙΣΠΕΡΧΗΣ; cf. for the word Od. ε. 304 ἐτάραξε δὲ πότον, ἐπεισέχομαι δ’ ἐλλασσόμεθα. We transcribe ὀκναλός and πότον on account of the metre though this change does not affect an absolute correspondence, ———ο——ο—— taking the place of ———ο——ο——. ὀκναλός μη ἀντειπέρα in Opp. Ἱαλ. 2. 535.

40. ΚAI belongs to the next line.

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

44. Cf. Pindar, Ἕλν. xi. 18 μελεγδούσαι δασιδάντα μελιζέμεν ἀωδάε. The Λ of ΤΑ was altered apparently from O.

46–7. μέν... τε: cf. e.g. Ol. vi. 88-9 πρότων μὲν... γνώσαι τ' ἵππειν.

49. ἀωδίν πρόσφορον: the phrase recurs in Ἕλν. ix. 7.

50. The alteration of ἈΓΑΣΙΚΑΣΕΙ to ἈΓΑΣΙΚΛΕΙ is necessary for the metre. Who this Agasicles was is obscure; perhaps he was the παῖς ᾳρθυδής who ἀρξει τῆς δασίνης according to the account of Proclus άρ. Photius Βιβλ. 239, or he may merely have been some member of the family of Acoladas. The rather abrupt way in which his name is introduced and the context in which it occurs might suggest that a third poem commenced in Col. iii, a supposition which would be strengthened if the loss at the tops of the columns were extended by another fifteen lines (cf. introd.). But the hypothesis of two consecutive odes in the same metre would require to be justified by stronger evidence than that supplied by the passage before us. For πεισά μάρτυς cf. Πυθ. i. 88, and xii. 27 πιστοί χορευνάν μάρτυρες.

53. τιμαθίασαν: ΤΙΜΑΘΕΝΤΑ the papyrus, and the accusative may possibly have been justified by the sequel, but as the passage stands τιμαθίασα τὰ πάλαι οὐ τιμαθεύσασι πάλαι seems an improvement, though the accumulation of datives is not elegant. In any case the division of the lines is wrong, as in ll. 40–1 and 66–7. For the language cf. Ισθ. iii. 25-6 τιμώντες ἀρχαῖν λέγουσα πράξεις τ' ἄρματοι. It is noticeable that the papyrus has the spelling ἄρματοι which was restored to the text of Pindar by Boeckh in place of the MSS. reading ἄρματοι.

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

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

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

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

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

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

66. The transference of σῴφρωνος to this line is necessary metri gratia. For μέρμην in
the sense of ambition for distinction in the games cf. e.g. Ol. i. 109–11 θεὸς ἐπίτροπος ἐὼν ταῦτα μήδενα ... 'Πέρον μερίσμασιν.

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

The reading ἐξεθημὲν ἠμὲν is fairly satisfactory, though NE hardly fills the space between the Α and P.

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

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

73. ΩΣΔΗΝ: the facsimile is again deceptive, transforming the Χ into Ε and Ε into Τ. There might be room for two narrow letters between Δ and Ν, but σχεδημύ is hardly to be avoided, though σχέσιμον εὐμέταλον σχεδημύ βαύμασι is not very satisfactory.

75. Δαιστρῶτα is another name for which no authority can be cited, but it is quite a possible form, στρωτός being the Bocotian for στρωτός. Whether the reference is to a goddess or a woman is doubtful. A second name must have followed in l. 76; cf. ll. 80–2, note. For the anaphora of the relative cf. the reading of some MSS. in Findar, Fr. 75. 10 ἐν (τ. Ι. τῶν) Βριάμων ἐν (τ. Ι. τῶν) ᾨμίθδαν τε ἄγοντα καλέοντο. The Ν of the second AN is more like Λ. ἐπικτικός is a Findaric word; cf. Nεμ. ix. 10 ἐπικτικόν ἐκτικός ἄγοντα τιμίος, and Fr. 194. 4.

80–2. Do not when in sight of the nectar from my spring go thirsty away to a salt stream. νίκτεροβ seems right, though the T is not very satisfactory, the length of the vertical stroke rather suggesting P; T, however, is an irregular letter. Cf. for the metaphor Ol. vii. 7–9 καὶ ἔκλη νεκταρ χυτοί, Μασών δόλων, ἀθελοφόρας αδέρφασιν πέμπων, γλυκὸν καρπῶν φρέσκο, ἀδάσκουμεν. The persons addressed are presumably the two named in ll. 75–6, the masculine form of the dual being used of a feminine subject as e.g. in Soph. O. C. 1113, 1676. In l. 81 the original reading διψώτερον seems preferable to the correction or variant διψωτέρον since there is no certain instance in Findar of the latter elision; but of course the question cannot be decided without the following words: διψώτερον ἅδε, e.g., would give a good sense. It is noticeable that in the next line, though the substitution of Θ for the second Κ is necessary, the Χ has not been crossed out.

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

Fr. (n) 128. ΧΗΡΑ is very intractable, leading only to ξήρ or σήραγγε in some form; but the first letter is plainly Κ and not Θ.

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

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

Fr. (a) 13.1 x 9 cm.

Fr. (a)

[. . ] [. . ]χεοδ[. ]ψ απείρατ[ ]ον εσσεσθαί Fr. (b)

ξες' ἰεπαίηον αναρασιων τ[ ]ἀμμορον [ ]μον ϕα[ ]ομενοι[ ]μεμε[ ]

οιστων δούρω τε αϊδάροι] [κα πολλακις Πυθο τι[ ]ἀ μεν ταυτ' αϊοισα γναμψ[ ]

θεσπεσιας δ ἀπο κυισας μ[ ][ ]]

κ[ . . . ] πολλακις Πυθο φι[ ]

μεν ταυτ' αϊοισα γναμψ[ ]

ενου δ' νεου ου μελλε . [ ]

5 ἣ πολεμονδε κορυσσομε[ν ]

θεσπεσιας δ ἀπο κυισας μ[ ]

κ[ . . . ] πολλακις Πυθο φι[ ]

μεν ταυτ' αϊοισα γναμψ[ ]

ενου δ' νεου ου μελλε . [ ]

10 [ε]παιασ[ε] νυν αλιοι τριτα[ ]

[ε]παιασ[ο][ν] α . χεν . . ουλα . [ ]

[. . ]ος' αυτικα δε σκοπιασ οι [ ]

[. . ]ητο μεταχροναι . [ ]

[. . ]νοιτί . γαν εραταν [ ]

15 [ε]παιαν δ αρα νυκτα κ[ ]

[μα]ρτυραμεναι δ.][κ[ ]

[. . ]ος' ἰεπα[ιον] ν. [ ]

[. . ]φ πρω[. . ]δ κ[ ]
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

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

7. Πυθών μή: ορ πεδίων σοι?

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

11. Possibly αυχενα, ου or αυχενα, ου.

13. μεταχρονον: cf. Hesiod, Θεог. 269 μεταχρόνοι γὰρ ἰαλλον (of the Harpies), where μεταχρόνοι is explained as equivalent to μεταχρώ.

661. Epodes.

14·1 x 16·4 cm. Plate V.

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

Palaeographically this fragment is of considerable interest. It is written in handsome round uncials, of a type not infrequent in papyri (cf. 25, 224, 678, 886, 701), and also exemplified in the great Biblical codices. On the verso of the papyrus are parts of two columns in a cursive hand which is not later than the beginning of the third century, and is quite as likely to fall within the second. The text on the recto then can be assigned with little chance of error to the latter half of the second century. Accents, &c., have been added by two different hands, some being very small and neat, others larger and in lighter ink. To the smaller hand may be attributed also the occasional corrections and the punctuation, but whether this hand can be identified with that of the body of the text is doubtful. The document in cursive seems to be a series of medical prescriptions or directions; it is too fragmentary to give any connected sense, but the occurrence of the words τρείβανον, συκάμενος and apparently χιραλέος may be noted.

Col. i.

\[\text{\ldots}\]

\[\gamma\ \alpha\iota\ ν\]\[\rho\omega \ άριω \ μένος.\] 5 \[\nu \ καταρροον \]
\[κά\iota \ με \ δικτύοις \]
\[\omicron\nu \ ω \ Παλαιμονες \]
10 \[\tau\o \ θηριον\]
\[\omicron\nu \ ω \ Παλαμόμωρες \]
15 \[\alpha\pi\omega\ε \ τον \ ϕόρον \]

Col. ii.

\[\pi\omicron\tau\a\iota \ με\ς \ βαλ\chi\]
και \[\tau\iota \ χ\ αμπυρι\s\]
\[\ell\eta\gamma\iota\ ο \ μυ\rho\omicron\ µα\iota\]
πυρδά\omicron\ πυ\leap\]
20 κη\γ\iota \ ϓ ι \ εκ\e\iota\ναν \]
\[\tau\a\iota\s \ έμαι\ς \ επ\omega\δ\a\iota\ς \]
οι \[\delta \ ε\iota\π\a\iota \ [.\].\]
10 \[\mu\iota \ τ\u \ γ\iota \ α\u\iota\t\iota\ ε\iota[\Lambda]θ\iota\nu\iota\]
\[\eta\s \ κα\iota \ με \pi[i][\iota]\iota[\nu]\iota\rho\iota\]
25 
\[\hat{\omicron}\nu\theta[i]\chi\iota\epsilon \ σα\u\iota\nu\iota\alpha\iota\sigma\iota\sigma\iota\]
\[\epsilon\omicron\phi\u\iota\a\iota\iota \ \delta \ \epsilon\iota\ \alpha\iota\sigma\iota\]
\[\pi[i]\iota[\kappa]\alpha\iota\ \κα\u\iota\gamma\iota\rho[i]
\[\epsilon[i]\iota \ \tau\a\iota \ \theta\α\iota\σ\a\iota\sigma\a\iota \ \tau[i]\]
3. The corrector apparently wished to alter ἀριὸς μενὸς to ἀγριὸς μενὸς, but the ω is not crossed through. Blass suggests θηρὸς ἀγριὸς μενὸς, and notes that in Anth. Pal. xii. 162, 1 ὀπσω τοξιθαρωὸν αὐτὸ ἀριὸς the same corruption or the same word occurs.


16. πολλὸς is for πολλός, i.e. πολί τάς.

17. ἁμπιρίδις, but the vestiges of the letter following ξ do not suggest ο, though that letter cannot be said to be impossible. πυχαὶ πυρξί . . gives no sense.

19. πυλεῖ is a πού μήθης: the letters are all quite clear.

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

26. Above the ε of αἰθή is a small circular mark which seems to be accidental. A high point might be recognized after επισθω.

27. κατάγρι may be κατάγρις = καθήμεν, but then the preceding word should be a noun, and it is difficult to find anything suitable. The θ above the deleted τ is almost certain, and the vestiges of the first letter of the line strongly suggest π, which leaves us with πιὰρβαλον or πιᾶρβαλον.

662. Epigrams.

12·8 x 49 cm.

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

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

Col. i.

[Δεωνιδου]
[tis tivos euσa γυναί Παριην υπο κ’έιονα κ[ι]σαι
[Πρηγό Καλλιτελέναι και ποδίαπη Σαμη
[tis de se και κτερείη Θεοκριτος ω με γεγονες
5 [εξεδοσαν θησκεις δ εκ τινω] εκ τ[ο]κετον
[ευσα ποσον ετεων δυο κεικον] νη ρα γ ατεκνος
[ουκ αλλα τρετη Καλλιτελην ελιπον
[Σωι σου κεινος γε και εις βαθυ] γηρας ικοιτο
[και σου ξεινε ποροι παντα Τυχη] τα καλα
10 [Αντιπατρον]
[φραζε γυναι γενεην ονομα χόνα : Καλλιτελης μεν
[ο σπειρας Πραξο δ ουνομα γη δε Σαμος
[σαμα δε τις τοδ εχωσε Θεοκριτος ο πριν αδικτα
[αμετρας λυσας αμματα παρβενιαι
15 [πως δε θανες λοξιοιν εν] αλγεσιν ειπε δε ποιαν
[ηλθες ες ηλικιην διασακις ενδεκετις

[η και απαις σου ξεινε λειριπα γαζ εν νεσατι
[Καλλιτελη . . . . . . . . . . . .] τιε νη[πιαχον]
[ελεις ες ολβιστην πολην] τριξ[α και σου οδιτα
20 [ουριου ιθυνοι παντα Τυχη βιοτον]

Col. ii.

Αμυντου
αυχιαλεας νος[.] ον υπ οφυνοι ανθεσι δακρυ
ν[.]λων ενβα[.]σεις ψ[.] ρο[.]απης σπιλαδι
φραζε γυναι τις εουσα κ’αξ εκ τινοσ ειπε τε πατρην

25 νη[.]οιας εθανες νοουσου υπ αργαλεη
ονομα κεν Πραξω Σαμη ξεινε εκ δε γονην
Kalleteles yevon αλλ' εθανον τοκετω·
tis de ταφον σταλωσε Θεοκριτος ἡ με συνενων
ἀυτὴ δοσαν ποιην δ ἡλθες εσ ἡλικιν
30 επταεις τρις ενος γενομαν ετι ἡ ρα γ ατεκνος
ου Καλλιτελῆς τριετῆ παιδα δομω λειτομαν
Ἀμυντον
τας πεσαρος ατρεστον Δακεδαμωνα τας κερα μουνας
πολλακις αν πολεσι δηηρμιν εφριξεν Δρης
35 νυν υπ αινκατω Φιλοποιμει δουρι τ ἀχ[α]μων
πρηνης εκ τρισαν ρηπε μυριαδαν
ασκεπος οιωνι δε περεξυνκηρον ιδοντες
μυρονται πεδιον δουν . δ[ι...]φεσιτος
[κ]αινον δ εκθρωσι[κοντα ]ἐρη[ν]. . . . [.]ο λοστρους
40 [. . .]δας δερκομεναι . . . . α[κροπο[λ . . .]

Col. iii.

Λεωνδουν

Ἀκρωριται Πανι και ευπατρις . . . .] νυμφαις
[Γ]λημις ο συνγειτων δομα κ'υνηγεσις
τανταν τε προτομαν και δ[ι . . . . . . .]]ης . [.]
45 βυρσαν και ροθιους τους δ ανεθηκε] τοϑας
Παν ω και νυμοι τονδ[ι . . . . . αγρευστηρα
Γλημιν αεξησαιδ αιεδ[ι . . . . .].

Ἀντιπατρων

σιλαιων αλοχοις αντρησαιν ηδε κερασται
50 τασδ Ακρωριται Πανι και γγεμοι
και προτομαν ακμητα και αυτο νεον τοδε καπρον
δερμα το μηδ αυτω ρηγυμενον χαλυνοι
Γλημις ανηρτησε καλας χαρτισιον αγρας
δεικνυις εφθιου κουρος Ομαφαες . . .
55 Α[εω]ψ[ι].[δ]ου
δρυμονομου
Fragments.

(α)  
(β)  

4. γεγωνες (or τεγωνες) is for γωνης.

12. Πραξω: so l. 26; Πραξω MSS. But the spelling of the papyrus is too inconsistent to merit much attention. Thus we have in a single epigram αυχαλες and αργαλες (ll. 22, 25), πωςα and πωρ (ll. 25, 29); η however tends to predominate after a vowel or ρ in the epigrams of Amyntas, a elsewhere.

14. παρθενων: l. παρθενιας or -ης.

17. The e above the line is clear enough, and the letter below is apparently i and not ρ. γιο is of course the right reading.

18–20. The question of the position of the two fragments (α) and (β) at the bottom of this column has already had to be considered in connexion with the text on the recto; cf. note on 650. 1–4. They might well be put here so far as the appearance of the papyrus and of the writing is concerned; but the letters will certainly not coincide with any known version of ll. 18–20. The scribe is far from being reliable no doubt, and something has evidently gone wrong in l. 18, which should be Καλλετη τριτη παιδι τινι φηναινον. Before νηπιαχων however there is a clear e; perhaps ετε ε or ετε for ετι was written. τριμα and οδιμα being in their right places it is scarcely admissible to postulate a divergence from the ordinary reading in the intervening words. Combining the two fragments, και συ γ' δ ζημα [οθριον θηναις — ω ι — βιστρων] would give an intelligible variant; but apart from the difficulty of reading συ and ϊπνω this also uspsets τηπιαχων, with which the first line of Fr. (β) is inconsistent, and does not account for the space between τρξ(α) and και; moreover on turning to the recto the resulting readings ναι[ν] ου[ν] αθεδουμαν[, [.]ων] εναι(ν) (cf. 659 Frs. (α), (β)) are, to say the least, unattractive. We therefore prefer to suppose that these fragments came earlier in the papyrus; they do not seem to belong to the lost half of this column.

21–3. These two very puzzling lines do not combine at all easily with what follows and may be displaced; perhaps, as Blass suggests, they belong to the next epigram, which is apparently defective at the beginning; cf. note on ll. 33–4. The construction would indeed be improved by a verb for τουσα in l. 24 to depend upon (as in the first line of Leonidas’ epigram της τινος εισα . . . , εισα), but the word φορης is the natural commencement (cf. l. 11 and Anth. Pal. vii. 165, 1 ειπε, γιναυ, της εφες), and the participle is not unintelligible. With regard to the reading, in l. 22 the letter after νω may be γ, and there are traces of ink above φ which may indicate a correction; before νω is the end of a high cross stroke which would suit γ, φ or τ. νος(τω)ν is just possible though not satisfactory, and would of course leave the line a syllable short. In l. 23 ενισθη could be read for ενισθη and the following word is perhaps some form of ψυχρας; but there is hardly space for a letter between the (very doubtful) φ and the σ (which may be another o). The ψ might be φ. Blass suggests λειδων εμπληκεται . . . , and this may well be right, but was certainly not written.

24–31. “Say, lady, who you are and who your father, and tell your country and of what grievous sickness you died.” “My name, sir, is Praxo of Samos, and I was the
daughter of Calliteles, but I died in childbirth." "Who set up the tomb?" "My husband, Theocritus, to whom they gave me to wife." "And what age did you reach?" "Thrice seven and one year old was I." "And were you childless?" "I left in my home a boy of three years, Calliteles." "

24. ο of εκ was converted from ι and the letters ωο have also been corrected.
25. 1. καὶ ποίας ἑδαμες. ἡπαισε seems to have been originally written, the π being subsequently converted into α and another π added above the line. Whether the initial ν, of which only a slight vestige remains, was at the same time altered is doubtful owing to a hole in the papyrus.
26. κεν is a mistake for μεν.
28. The superfluous ο at the beginning of the line is due to the analogy of the two previous epigrams: cf. ll. 7 and 17. 1. κολλετέλνυ.

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

33–4. 1. τῶν πάρον... τῶν χήρα... πολλακές ἐν πολέσιν. The last word is however very doubtful; πο may be χω and σ may be ς, while of the supposed ε only a slight vestige of the base is left. Blass would retain ἐν and read πόλεων ὑπὲ πολίων. A corrupt has fallen out either before or after ll. 33–4, since there is nothing to govern ἀκάδαιμων. Perhaps, as suggested above, ll. 33–4 should come in here, though they do not seem particularly appropriate.
35. θ should perhaps be inserted after ννν.
36. 1. μηρίδων.
37. ξ of περιμάζοσ (περιμαςψατον) has been corrected.
38. The letters in the latter part of the line are much damaged; the φ could equally well be ψ, εισ may be εις or ., ε, and for the supposed μι, which is not satisfactory, .ι should perhaps be substituted.
39–40. The letters χρευ and κροσο are on a detached fragment, the appearance of which decidedly points to the position here assigned to it. The contents of the recto create no difficulty (cf. 659. 21–4 note) and κρόσοσι in some form fits the context in l. 40 very well; moreover above ρ of χρευ is the end of a long stroke descending from the line above, which just suits the ψ or χ after the lacuna in l. 38. The cumulative effect of these considerations is undeniably strong.

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

42. Λειψας was the name of a mountain peak in Sicetion, and 'Αριστοπλημός is given by Steph. Byz. as a local epithet of Dionysus. The mutilated word before νυμφας was probably some adjective ending in -ασι (cf. l. 49), but the space is very short for ςμις...ος as required by the metre, and a corruption may be suspected.
43. 1. Νηρίσ as in ll. 47 and 53. For Κυνηγεσις cf. Anth. Pal. vi. 183. 2; σκυνησης (vi. 34. 4) could also be read.
44. The first a of τονια was been corrected, and to make the result clearer another π was added above the line.
45. Cf. Anth. Pal. vi. 34. 2 καὶ κάπρου τούδε καθάψε πόδας. καθάψε might of course be read for αἰσθήκη here, but the meaning would not be affected.

46. λ. νύμφαι. θέρετρα must be θερετήρα or θερετήρα; perhaps τόποι (ἀλκυμόν ἀγροτήρα.

47. λ. αἰξήσαι followed by something like αἰείν ἄγραυσι καλοῖς; but the remains of the letter after αἰ suggest η, ζ, or η. Cf. Anth. Pal. vi. 158. 3-4 αὐξεῖν δ' αἰεὶ Πάν ἄγελθν Νύμφαι πίθακα, and vi. 34. 5-6 ἄλλα δ' Πάν σκοπεύτα καὶ εἰς ὑπόσω Πολλαῖον εὔαγρον πέμποις υἱᾶ σμύλεω.

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

49. λ. Σιληνῶν.

50. λ. ταῖτ' for τασθ.

51. αἰμήτα may be interpreted in the sense of 'uninjured' or 'permanent' on the analogy of πυλαι ἀκμῆται in Anth. Pal. ix. 526 or may be regarded as an epithet which strictly applies only to the living animal (cf. Soph. Αἰγ. 353 ἀφρόν τ' ἀκμήτα ταύρον).

52. χάλοι is for χάλοιται; cf. νύμφαι for νύμφαι in l. 46. The top of the ο is missing, but β seems excluded.

54. λ. Ὀνα(σ)θέρετρῷ ὃς?

56. λ. δρυμονόμου ὡς δρυμῶν ὀμοί. The rest of the epigram was never added.

663. ARGUMENT OF CRATINUS' ΔΙΟΝΥΣΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ.

19.8 x 12.3 cm.

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

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

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

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

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

8. τῶν ποιη( ) is corrupt. Blass suggests υπερ τῶν ποιη(τῶν), which makes good sense but is a rather drastic change; cf. however the next note. Körte prefers πρὶ(τοι) τῶν ποιη(τῶν), which is nearer to the text of the papyrus.

12. παραγιγμένων seems to be a mistake for some word like προτειγμένων. Körte suggests παραγγέλλεσθαι.

30. Perhaps ωσπερ τυπον or ταρίχ(ας); cf. Al. Rap. 558–60 τὰ πολὺ τάριχα οὐκ εἰρηκά πω. μὰ Δ', αὐτὲ τῶν τυμῶν γε τὸν χλωρίῳ, τάλαι, ἐν οἷς αὐτὸς τὰς τάλαρας κατήθεικ. χαρόν is also possible; cf. Crat. Fr. iuc. 280 ἀ τάλαρος ἐμέ διάπλεως ἔσται χάρον. Körte prefers ὤρον or χαμα, τάλαρον being the technical word in Athenaeus p. 122 for a bird-basket.

664. Philosophical Dialogue.

Height 29 cm.

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

But who was the author of this dialogue? It is written in remarkably good Attic (except εἰς οἶκον for εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν in l. 49), and so far as the style is concerned it may be a product of the Aristotelian age. Blass, indeed, suggests that it might actually be attributed to Aristotle, with whom Pisistratus was a favourite figure. In support of such a view appeal could be made to certain resemblances in language between this fragment and the Αθηναίων Πολιτεία—assuming the authenticity of that work:—compare e.g. ll. 3–6 (Σύλων) προλέγειν Αθηναίως ὅτι Πεισίστρατος ἐπιβουλεύει τυραννίδος πείθειν αὐτούς οὐκ ἢν δυνατός with Ath. Pol. 14. 2 ὃς μὲν γὰρ ἀγιοφόρος Πεισίστρατος ἐπιτιθήμενος τυραννίδιον... ἐπει δὲ λέγων [οὐκ ἐπειδὴν, ll. 8–9 ἀποδημίαιν ἐνετεύχεν ποιησάμενον, with Ath. Pol. 11. 1, 13. 1 ἀποδημίαιν
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ἐπούσατο, ll. 23-4 διὰ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων κατάστασιν with Ath. Pol. 42. 1 ἡ ἐν κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας, ll. 25-6 οὐδὲν ἐπεδίδοκεν πρὸς μεγαλοψυχέαν with Ath. Pol. 37. 2 τοῦν πρὸς ὁμόγνητα (cf. l. 112) καὶ ποιηρίαν ἑπιθέσουσαν; cf. also l. 115 τίνι ταύτῃ ἐφη] and Arist. Fr. 44 τι τοῦτ' ἐφη. But such coincidences are not very conclusive; and on the other hand these fragments do not conform to the normal type of Aristotelian dialogue, in which, as we know both from the allusions of Cicero (ad Att. iv. 16, xiii. 19) and his imitations, the leading part was taken by the philosopher himself. It will be safer then to leave the writer anonymous, though he may well be as early as the third or even fourth century B.C.

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

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

(a) Col. i. Col. ii.

προτερον η Πισιστρατον λαβειν [θεωι
την αρχην απεδημησεν επει]
664. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

δὴ προλεγον Ἀθηναῖοις συν
Πισιστράτου επιβουλευει τι
5 ραννίδι πιθεῖν αυτοὺς οὐκ ἦν
δυνατὸς· εγὼ δὲ καταμείνας

ηδὴ Πισιστράτου τυραννὼν
τὸς αποδήμιον ενεπεθέν
ποιησαμενος εν Ἰώνιαι μετὰ

10 Σολωνος διετρίβον· χρονωι

de των φιλων σπουδαζουν
tων ηκει με· και μαλιστα
Πισιστρατου δια την οικειο
τητα· Σολωνος κελευντος

15 επανηλθον Ἀθηναζε κατε

λιπον μεν ουν ενταυθα παι
da Θρασιβουλον τον Φιλο
μιλου. κατεηλθειν δε μει
ρακιουν ηδη μαλα καλον καγα

20 θον και την οψιν και τον τρο
pον πολυ διαφεροντα των
ηλεικιωτων ταπατειωμε

νων γαρ των αλλων δια την
των πραγματων καταστασιν·

25 ουδες επεδεδωκει προσ με

gαλοφυαν· παντας δε υπερε
βαλεν ιπποτροφιαις και κυ
νηγαιας και ταις αλλαις δαπα
ναις] διεβεβλητο δ εν τη το

30 λει της νεοτερας των του
του Πισιστρατου θυγατερων
eran ίδων αρρηφορουσαν·

Αγνοθεος ουν ο παππος αυ
tου παρ αι και τρεφομενος

λ[ ]
ϕρ[ ]
50 σφ[ ]
τ[ ]
λοι[ ]
55 ου[ ]
του πατ[ ]ρος
παρη[ ]
γυ[ ]
tου[ ]

60 θης[ ]
δι[ ]
αυτο[ ]
μετα[ ]
tολμ[ ]
65 της· [ ]
tου α[ ]
ξεικ[ ]
φη ζ[ ]
δρειαν[ ]
70 χρον[ ]
νειχετ[ ]
tαγει[ ]
ερ[ ]
μη[ ]
75 ραν[ ]
κεματ[ ]
κακεινη[ ]
pαινει[ ]
nησμ[ ]
80 ποδημ[ ]
35 etwγχανεν ο Θεασιβουλος·
dia to tou patros kai tηs
μητρος ορφανον καταλει
φθηναι· τραχυνθες ti moι
δοκε[ι] pros auton kalei μ'
40 eis oikon· συγγενει τε αυτωι
οντα kai καταλελειμμενον
eπιτροπον υπο tou Φιλομη
λου· καγω μαλα προθυμως
eβαδιζου και γαρ ην εν ηδο
45 η μοι το συνδιατριβειν Αγνο

(b) Col. iii.
μεν ουτως πιθανω εοικεν
ei touvνν εφην αληθη ταυτ [ε
στιν ουτ αν Περιανδρου λυ
σιτελοιη μαλλον αρχειν η υ
95 φ ετερον αρχεσθαι· ουτ' αλλω
ουθεν τω[n] φαυλος αρχοντων·
dokο γαρ αι[υτ]ον εφην εν τοις
φιλτατοις [κομι]εισθαι τας αμαρ
tias· τι γαρ [φιλ]τερον ανδρι
100 vouν εχοντι] πατριδος· και
κατα ψυσιν [οι]κειων ανδρω
πων : υπο[λαβον σων ο Αρι
[φ]ρων αληθη nη Αi εφη λε
[γ]εις· και βουλ[λ]ομεθα σοι μαρ
105 τυρησαι εγω και Αδειμαντος
ουτοσι παραγενομενοι νυν
[Πε]ριανδροι δια την αμοτη
τλα μεγαλη πανυ συμφοραι
[πε]ριπεσοντι : και ο Πιοιστρα
110 τοις τινι ταυτη εφη :] εγω ει

Col. iv.
υπολαβων
νηδι
γαρ η
ρον []
85 μη γι
ταισα
γουν [
[[οτ]ι]
οσω]
90 αυτο[}
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[π]εν φρασω προ τ[ου γαρ] Κυ
[ψε]λαν τον Περιανδρ[ε]ου π’[ατε]
[ρα] λαβειν την αρχη[ν εκ]ρα
[το]υ της πολεως ο[ι καλο]μ

115 [με]νου Βακχυ[αδα]ι συ[γγενεια]
[με]γαλη λαβ[ον]τος [δε αυ]
[το]υ την αρχην το[ιτων το]
[μεν] πληθος εφυγε τ[ι [. . . . . ]
[. . . .] μν ολιγο[ι] δε και[. . . . . . ]

120 [. . . .] επομ. ουν υιεις [. . . . . ]
[. . . .] ενει [. . .] εσ. [ει [. . . . . . ]
[. . . .] ροχον [. . . .] μεραι [. . . . . ]
[. . . .] ενηθ [θ [. . . .] ητες εσ [. . . . . ]
[. . . .] ωι οι επι [. . . ] ως δεθ [. . . . . ]

125 [. . . .] προς το[ιν Π]εριανδρον [. . .]
[. . . .] σι μοι [πληςαξε]ιν [. . . .]
[. . . .] ποποι [. .] υπερ το[ιν Πε]
[μια]υδρον κ[αι] της ειςα [. . . . . ]
[. . .] κελευσα [. . .] στιν [. . . . . ]

130 [. . . .] νειν ω [. . .] λεται [. . . . . ]
[. . . .] η εγει [. . . .] προποι [. . . . . ]
[. . . .] λομαι κ [. . .] βουλ [. . . . . ]
[. . . .] ὡσαπερ [. . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . .] ειουτ [. . . . . . . . . . .]

135 [. . . .] ευτο [. . . . . . . . . . .]

(c) 150 [. . ισ [. .]
[. . ουτ [. .]
[. . εινα [. .]
[. . οη [. .]
[. . ανελ [. .]

155 [. . μοσ [. .]
[. . ρδεβ [. .]

160 [. . ο[ς ε[α [. .]
[. . νοι [. .]
[. . ευρον [. .]
[. . σασ [. .]
1-10. This statement that just before the establishment of the tyranny of Pisistratus Solon left Athens and went to Ionia is not only new but conflicts with the account of Plutarch (Sol. 30-1), who represents Solon as refusing to fly and as living on at Athens in friendly relations with the usurer. The 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία (14. 2) does not suggest that Solon retired from Athens, though on the other hand there is nothing there inconsistent with such a view; it is simply stated that Solon's warnings and opposition proved fruitless. Diogenes Laertius indeed asserts (l. 51, 62) that Solon died in Cyprus, and this statement may now have to be treated with more respect than heretofore. A new light is thus turned upon the much discussed question of the meeting between Solon and Croesus as king of Lydia. The usurpation of Pisistratus and the accession of Croesus to sole sovereignty are placed in the same year, B.C. 560, and there will be no chronological objection to the interview described by Herodotus, if it is transferred to this period. With regard to the date of Solon's death, χρόνοι in l. 10 here is too vague to build any argument upon; according to Heraclides Ponticus he survived the overthrow of the constitution συνχών χρόνων, according to Phanias of Ephesus less than two years (both ap. Plutarch, Sol. 33).

5. 1. πείθειν. 11. This construction of συνεδρίζων with the infinitive is common in Aristotle, e.g. Ath. Pol. 38. 4 οὔς αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁλίγαν διδάσκων. 15. κατελείπον is probably for κατέλειπον.
26. 1. ἵππηβαλλόντες. 29-32. This is the first mention of a second daughter of Pisistratus. With ορθοφοροῦσαν cf. Polyaeus, Stratigem. 5. 14 Θρασυβρότης Φιλομήλου τῆς Πεισιστράτου Θυγατέρος ἐρραθίς πομπεύοντος αὐτὴν προσόρρωμα ἐφιλήσεως. Apparently the author of our dialogue either did not know of or did not accept this more romantic version, for ορθοφοροῦσαν and πομπεύονσαν can hardly refer to different occasions. For διαβιβάλλονται with the infin. cf. Hdn. 2. 6. 10 ἀλλ' ἵππηβαλλόντες μισοφοροῦσας εἶναι, but the construction is unusual.
37. ορθανόν: l. ὀρθανόν. 82. All that remains of the supposed ρ over the line is a rather coarse horizontal stroke, immediately above a break in the papyrus.
88. The letters οστ have each had a short horizontal stroke drawn through them, probably by the first hand; the doubtful υ was perhaps also deleted.
91-114. "This accordingly seems probable. If then," said I, "this be true, it would be of no more advantage to Periander to rule than be ruled by another nor to any other bad ruler. For I suppose," I said, "that he will reap the reward of his misdeeds among those dearest to him. For what is dearer to a sensible man than his country and his blood-relations?" "Yes, by Zeus," struck in Aриphron, "you speak truly, and I and Adimantus here wish to bear you out, having just been with Periander when his cruelty plunged him into a terrible disaster." "What disaster?" said Pisistratus. "I will tell you," he said. "Before Cypselus, the father of Periander, obtained the supremacy, the great clan of the Bacchiadæ, as they are called, ruled the city. When he became supreme the majority of them fled ... a few however remained...."

98. κομμείσθαι τὰς αμαρτίας in the sense of κομμείσθαι τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν is a curious expression, though cf. Arist. Eth. Nic. ix. 7 κομμητεύον τὰς τίχρας.

106-9. Unless the present conversation is to be supposed to have occurred while Pisistratus was still a private person, which is eminently improbable, this passage plainly implies that Periander of Corinth was not yet dead when the tyranny of Pisistratus was established at Athens. The ordinary chronology places the accession of Periander in B.C. 625 and his death in 585, thus leaving a very considerable interval before the first tyranny of Pisistratus, which no one desires to put earlier than B.C. 560. According to one passage of Herodotus, however, Periander and Pisistratus were contemporaries; for he makes the former arbiter in a war between Athens and Mytilene which followed upon the capture of Sigeum by Pisistratus (v. 94-5). The usual method of avoiding this difficulty is to suppose that there were two wars with Mytilene, and that the arbitration of Periander occurred in the first. But for this there is no kind of evidence, and, as Beloch has pointed out (Rechitaciues Museum, vol. xliv. p. 466 sqq.), the difficulties involved in this explanation are hardly less than those which it attempts to solve. He himself suggests that the mistake of Herodotus consists in referring an arbitration by Periander in a dispute between Tenedos and Sigeum (Arist. Rhel. i. 15. 13) to the period of the war against Mytilene; at the same time Beloch considers that the chronology of Periander is quite insecure, and that he might with advantage be put several decades later. But other references in Herodotus clearly point to the earlier date, for the tyranny of Periander at Corinth synchronized with that of Thrasybulus at Miletus (Hdt. i. 26, v. 92), which was established at the beginning of the reign of Alyattes king of Lydia (i. 18-22); while the eclipse of the sun which ended the war between Alyattes and Cyaxares of Media (i. 74) provides a securely fixed point of departure (approximately B.C. 585). Herodotus' chronology is probably past mending.

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

115. Cf. Hdt. v. 92 ὡς ἀλλαχρή, καὶ οὕτως Βακχυδα βαλεθέρντα τὴν πόλιν ἐνδοσαν διὰ καὶ ἔγκειτο ἐκ ἀλήλων. It is doubtful whether the mistake of the original hand in the spelling of the name was anything more than ν for ζ; but there is barely room in the lacuna for [οδιει].

119. καὶ: the third letter is quite uncertain; perhaps καὶ ἐμεθιν | από | ἀγ εἶναι. The question of the reading here is complicated by the doubt concerning the position of the fragment containing the first part of l. 120 sqq. Lines 125-6 and 127-8 will suit the arrangement adopted in the text, which moreover brings out a column of exactly the required length. In l. 120 this fragment contains the doubtful α and part of the τ; the rest of the τ (which apart from the fragment could be read as τ) is on the upper piece. Another break occurs between l. 133-4, but here the junction is almost certain. The latter parts of
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ll. 128-132 ἔτει [128] ἔτει ἐν [129] ἐνω[130] ἔτει [131] θεων[132] are also on a detached fragment the position of which, though probable from the appearance of the papyrus, is by no means secure.

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

665. History of Sicily.

Fr. (a) 10.5 x 4.6, Fr. (b) 10.3 x 4.6 cm. Plate I.

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

The period to which the fragments refer seems to be that immediately following the general overthrow of the tyrannies in the Sicilian cities which took place about the year 465 B.C. (Diod. xi. 68.5). This period is indicated by the frequent mentions of conflicts with the ξίλων, by whom are meant the mercenaries settled in the cities by the tyrants as a support of their rule. Diodorus, who is the sole authority for the history of this time, narrates the course of the hostilities at Syracuse between these new comers and the older citizens (xi. 72, 76); and implies that Syracuse was not peculiar in this respect:—'Almost all the cities,' he says (76.5), '... with one consent came to terms with the strangers (ξίλων) settled there.' The papyrus fills in some of the intermediate details passed over by the historian. We hear of an expedition of ξίλων from Enna and Cacyrum against Gela, which received aid from Syracuse. This was apparently followed by overtures from the ξίλων to the Syracusans (cf. note on 1. 5), which, however, proved ineffectual, for the next event is a battle between them. Shortly afterwards the mercenaries settled at Minoa were defeated
by the combined forces of Syracuse and Agrigentum. The activity displayed by Syracuse warrants the inference that she had herself already got the upper hand of her own ξένοι, who, as Diodorus relates, were finally defeated in a pitched battle. The campaign of the Syracusans against Catana mentioned at this time by Diodorus (76. 3) is part of the same anti-foreign movement. But hostilities seem to have extended beyond the opposing sections of the various city states. The fragments also supply information of an expedition of Agrigentum against Crastus, and an engagement subsequently occurred at the latter place between the Agrigentines and forces from Himera and Gela, which may be supposed to have come to the assistance of Crastus. These new facts may not be very weighty, but they convey a more adequate idea than was before possible of the period of unrest, the στάσεις and ταραχαί, which intervened between the overthrow of the tyrannies and the establishment of general peace.

[τω]ν εν Ομφα[λοι καὶ
Κακυρων ἡξεν[ων επὶ
[Γ]έλαν στρα[τεία
βο[ηθ]εῖα Συρακο[σίων
5 Τε[λων]οίς καὶ π ἐπὶ
των ἡξεν[ων προς Συρα
κοσιοῖς
μαχ[η Συρακο[σίων καὶ
των ἡξευ[ον ἐπὶ
10 Πλακικων πε[τεῖ]
[. . . . . . . .]ρ[π] . .
. . . . .
Ακρα[γαντ]ιων επὶ

Κραστον στρα[τεία
η γενομενη περί
15 Κραστον Ἰμερα[ίων
καὶ Γελωνων προς Α[κρα
γαντιων μαχ[η
ως οι την Μινωαν
των ἡξεων οικ[η
20 ξοτες ὑπ[ν Ακρα
γαντιων καὶ Συρα
κοσιων ηρ[η][σαν

2. Κακυρων: the site of this town, which is mentioned by Ptolemy, has been placed at the modern village of Cassaro, near Palazzolo; the present passage seems to indicate that it should be looked for further west, and the position given in Kiepert's Tōpogr. Hist. Atlas is probably not far from the truth.
3. All that remains of the letter at the end of the line is a straight stroke which
suggests ε, η, or η. ρ is not impossible, but there is no trace of the tail, and we therefore hesitate to introduce πριάσμα, which is otherwise attractive, into the text.

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

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

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

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

23. A fresh entry probably commences at this line, and in that case there would be one or even two letters before ἀκρηγαντιών. e.g. η or τὸ ἀκρηγαντιών.

666. ARISTOTLE, Προτρπητικός.

27·2 x 9·8 cm.

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
<th>Col. iii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>]χη</td>
<td>τε πραττειν των</td>
<td>115 δια της ψυχής αγα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ρει</td>
<td>δεούτων τι προ</td>
<td>θων πλεονεκασα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]τε</td>
<td>διο ρομουμενος</td>
<td>ει αυτων ειναι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ψδου</td>
<td>κωλυμη διο δει</td>
<td>τα κτιματα παν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>την τουτων</td>
<td>των αισχιστων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ατη[.]</td>
<td>θεωρουσαν ατυ</td>
<td>120 ωσπερ γαρ ει τις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]φιαν</td>
<td>χιαν φευγειν</td>
<td>των οικετων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]των</td>
<td>65 και νομιζειν</td>
<td>των αυτων χει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]λας</td>
<td>την ευδαιμονιαν</td>
<td>ρων ειν καταγε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]πλε</td>
<td>ουκ εν τωι πολ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]αν</td>
<td>λα κεκτησθαι γι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ων</td>
<td>νεθαι μαλλον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]μισ</td>
<td>70 η εν τωι πως</td>
<td>125 των αυτων τροπων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]δεν</td>
<td>την ψυχην δια</td>
<td>οις πλεονοις αξιαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>την ψυχην δια</td>
<td>την κτησιν ειναι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]τιθεσ</td>
<td>και γαρ</td>
<td>ιδιας φυσεως αβλι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]αν</td>
<td>σωμα ου το λαμ</td>
<td>130 ους τοιους ειναι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]κου</td>
<td>πραι εσθητι κε</td>
<td>δει νομιζειν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ει</td>
<td>75 κοσμιμενον</td>
<td>και τουτο κατ α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 lines lost.</td>
<td>φαει τις αν ει</td>
<td>[λ]ηθειαν ουτως</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>ναι μακαριον</td>
<td>[ε]χει τικτη ταρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]φισ</td>
<td>αλ[α] το την υγει</td>
<td>135 οις φησιν η παρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>αν εχον και σπου</td>
<td>οιμια κορος μειν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>80 δαιως διακε[μ]ε</td>
<td>υβριν απαιδε[ν]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>]ηφι</td>
<td>νον καν μηδεν</td>
<td>σια δε μετ εςου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>] δειν</td>
<td>G 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ai|σχυνο
] . нι παρ
50 ]αυτον
]η γαρ
] . κνων
фа|τυη
]υ οταν 
]τος

μη]

των προείρημε
νων αυτω παρη
tον αυτον δ[η] τρο
85 πον και ψυχην
eαν η πεπαιδευ
μενη την τοιαυ
tην και τον τοιον
tον ανθρωπον
90 ευδαιμονα προσ
tagορευτευν εστιν
ουκ αν τοις εκτος
ηι λαμπρως κε
χορηγημενος
95 αυτος μηδενος
αξιος ουν ουδε γαρ
[i]πον εαν υσια
χρυσα και σκευ
ην εχη πολυτε
100 λη φαυλος ον
τον τοιοτον
αξιον τινοι νομι
ζωμεν [τινοι νο
μιζωμεν] ειναι
195 αλλ εαν διακειμε
νος (ηι) σπουδαιωσ
tοντον μαλλον
επανουμεν

χωρις δε των ει
110 ρημενων συμ
βαινει τοις μηδε
νος αξιοις ουσιν
οταν τυχωσι χο
[ρηγιας και τον

σιας ανοιαν τοις
140 γαρ διακειμενοις
τα περι την ψη
χην κακως ου
τε πλουτος ουτ ι
σχυσ ουτε καλλος
145 τον αγαθον εστιν
αλλ οουι περ αν α|υ
ται μαλλον αι δια
θεσεις καθ υπερ
βολην υπαρξ|ωσι
150 τοσουτω μειζω
και πλειο τον
κεκτημενον
βλαπτοσι (εαν) αρ|εν
φρονησεως [πα
155 ραγευνωται ι το
γαρ μη παιδι μα
χαιραν τουτ [εστιν
το μη τοις φαι
λοις την εξουσι
160 αν εγχειριζε|ειν

την δε φρονησιν
απαντες αν ομολο
γησειν εις το [μαν
θανειν γιγησθαι (και)
165 ζητειν ον τας [δυ
ναμεις φιλοσοφια
περιειληφεν ο|σ

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

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

65. The extracts of Stobaeus and Maximus Mon. begin after κα. νομίζει δὲ Μ, νόμιζεν δὲ A, νομίζει Τ,. νομίζον τék Max., νομίζειν τék Laur. 68. γινοσθήν: so Max., Laur.; γίνεσθαι ΜΑ, Tr. 69. μᾶλλον η: μᾶλλον δ (?) ΜΑ, Max., Laur., ἀλλ' εὖ τék. 70-2. ποι την ψυχήν: τήν ψ. εὖ ΜΑ', τῇ ψυχῇ εὖ Α', τék Max., Laur. Above the ω of ποι there are in the papyrus some faint vestiges, which if not accidental might perhaps represent a cursively written εὖ; but we have considered this too doubtful for insertion in the text. In any case τοῖς has not been cancelled, and if the intention was to indicate a reading εὖ τοῖς the εὖ should have been written further to the left. 73. σωμαν ὑπὸ τῷ: so ΜΑ, Max., Laur.; σῶμα αὐτῷ τék Τ,. 76. τις αὖ: so ΜΑ', Max., Laur.; τε εὖ Α', τék Τ,. 78. Considerations of space made it more probable that νομίζειν or νομίζειν (Α, Tr., Max., Laur.) was written than νομίζειν (M). 82. προερχόμενον: so MSS. except Max., where παροκείμενον is found. 85. ψυχήν: so Μ, Tr., Max., Laur.; ψυχή Α. 86. έν ς πεπ: so Μ, Tr., Max., Laur.; ενεστών ἐδείκνυ τék. 88. καὶ: Laur. substitutes εἰς τοῦτον is omitted in Max. 92. τοῖς: so ΜΑ, Max., Laur.; τοῖς τοῦτον τék.
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93. λαμπρος: so MA¹, Max., Laur.; λαμπρος Λ¹, Tr.
κεκοσμημενος: κεκοσμημενος MSS. (κεκοσμημενος Laur., putting λαμπρος after κεκοσμ.)
95. αυτος: Max. and Laur. add δι.
96. ουδε: so Λ² (and conjecturally Meineke); ουδε Λ¹ and the other MSS.
97. εναι θελια: εναι θελια MA, Max., Laur.; καν ψελια Tr.
100. The papyrus does not support Meineke's insertion of α ενια before φοιλος which is adopted by Rose.
105. εναι: δι αν MSS. except Laur., which has δι αν and adds δ before σπουδαιος.
106. The insertion of ηι (so MSS.) is necessary.
109–19. The excerpts of Stobaeus and Maximus omit this passage, and unfortunately its meaning and construction are obscured by a corruption. Apparently πλειονως conceals something like πλειον αξια, and we may either add συμβη (cf. II. 125–7) and place a comma after κηματα, when the sense will be as in the translation above, or connecting ται δι της ψυχης αγαθων with τυχων insert δ or διπερ (so Diels) before παντως αυσχυτων. 'It sometimes happens that worthless persons have both external and mental gifts, and value the former above the latter, which is the most disgraceful thing of all.' Corruptio opitomi pessima. The latter remedy produces an easier construction and a more pointed sentence.
122. ται is omitted in the MSS.
126. πλειονος: πλειονος MSS.
128. συμβηθηκεν; συμβηθηκε MSS.
130. τοιοτω ειναι: so MSS. except A, which transposes the words.
131. The excerpt of Maximus ends here.
150–5. Stobaeus here has χαρις φρονησεως παραγενομενα, which is the conclusion of his quotation. In l. 153 we have supposed that the repetition of αν led to the loss of εαν. To read (ε)αν χαρις would make the line too long.
164. There would hardly be room for the necessary και after γνωσθαι, but the homoioiolepton may easily have caused its omission; cf. note on 153–5.
169. φιλοσοφιτων was the key-note of the Protrepistikos, as of the similarly named work of Iambichus: cf. Bywater, ibid., pp. 68–9.

687. ARISTOXENUS?

18 x 8 cm.

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

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

The fundamental unit which was the basis of the Greek scale in all its later developments was the tetrachord, typically consisting of two dieses, i.e. semitones or smaller intervals, and a complement, or the interval remaining when the dieses were subtracted from the concord of the fourth. The magnitude of the three intervals determined the genus of the tetrachord as enharmonic or chromatic, the enharmonic variety containing two quarter-tones and a ditone, and the chromatic other divisions, e.g. two semitones and a tone and a half. The more familiar diatonic tetrachord, composed of a semitone and two tones, was distinguished by having only one diesis. Larger scales were effected by the arrangement or combination (ἀρμονία) of such tetrachords in two ways, (a) by conjunction (συναφή), when the last note of one tetrachord coincided with the first note of the next; or (b) by disjunction (διάφυσις), when the tetrachords were separated from each other by a tone. The combination of a pair of tetrachords in these two methods produced respectively the heptachord and octachord scales of the seven-stringed and eight-stringed lyres. Further additions resulted in what was known as the perfect scale, which took the following form (t = tone, d = diesis, and c = complement):—

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
\text{νητών (συμμικτών)} & \text{υπατών} & \text{μεσάνων} & \text{διπολιάτων} \\
\hline
\hline
\text{t} & \text{d} & \text{d} & \text{c} \\
\text{t} & \text{d} & \text{d} & \text{c} \\
\text{t} & \text{d} & \text{d} & \text{c} \\
\text{t} & \text{d} & \text{d} & \text{c}
\end{array}
\]
It will be observed that this system diverges at a certain point into a conjunct and a disjunct scheme, the heptachord scale being the basis of the one (the 'lesser complete system') and the octachord that of the other (the 'greater complete system'). The additional note at the bottom was technically known as the προσλαμβανόμενος.

To come now to the passage before us. The writer is examining and locating different scales, and has proposed for consideration a heptachord scale of the form \[ \text{\textdoublespace} \frac{d}{\text{\textdoublespace}} \frac{d}{\text{\textdoublespace}} \frac{c}{\text{\textdoublespace}} \frac{d}{\text{\textdoublespace}} \text{\textdoublespace} \text{\textdoublespace} \text{\textdoublespace}} \]. A scale of this type would be enharmonic or chromatic (ll. 1–2) and also a conjunctive arrangement (ll. 2 sqq.). Such conjunction would occur in three places in the perfect scale (ll. 10 sqq.; see the scheme above), i.e. in the tetrachords υπατών and μεσών, μεσών and ητών (συνημένων), ητών (διεξεγμένων) and υπερβολαίων. Disjunction, on the other hand, is only found in the case of the tetrachords μεσών and ητών (διεξεγμένων). To the given scheme is then (ll. 19 sqq.) added at the lower extremity a tone, corresponding to the προσλαμβανόμενος (see above), and the resulting eight-note system is said to occur in the same three combinations as before (ll. 22 sqq.). Here, however, a difficulty arises, for as will be seen on reference to the perfect scale such a scheme occurs in it not thrice but twice only, i.e. in the two halves of the 'greater complete system.' The simplest remedy is to suppose a defect in the text; cf. note ad loc.
667. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

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

2–7. μελωδοιτο is to be taken with ολη and εν μερει as well as with δια των εξης and
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υπερβατώς. Scales might be curtailed either by diminishing their compass, i.e. dropping notes at the extremities (ἐν μερεί), or by omitting inner notes (υπερβατώς); cf. Aristox. Harm. p. 17. 30 (Meibom), and Aristid. Quint. pp. 15-6 τὰ μὲν αὐτῶν ἐστὶν συνεχῆ, ὡς τὰ διὰ τῶν ἑξῆς φθόγγων, τὰ δὲ υπερβατά, ὡς τὰ διὰ τῶν μη ἐφεξῆς μελῳδούμενα. For συναφή and διαζευγεῖ generally cf. Aristox. Harm. p. 58. 15 sqq. τα πολλα in l. 6 seems otiose.

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

15. ἐν τοπω τιν: sc. κάτω ἡ συναφή οτ κύστιν τὴν συναφῆ, according as τιν is accented τιν οτ τιν. τόπος means technically region or direction of the scale.

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

668. Epitome of Livy, XXXVII-XL and XLVIII-LV.

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

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

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

After Col. iii a good many columns are lost which contained the epitome of Books 41–7. With Col. iv begins the second and important section of the epitome, giving a few lines from the end of Book 48 and most of Books 49–55. Col. iv–vi and vii–viii are continuous, but between Cols. vi and vii one column is lost, as is proved by the lacuna in the Epistle to the Hebrews at the corresponding point. Books 50, 54, and 55 are the best preserved, then come 49 and 51. Of Book 52 we have only the beginnings of lines, and Book 53, which was treated at exceptional length, is spoilt by the loss of a whole column. The period with which the papyrus deals, B.C. 150–137, is one of great interest. Abroad there were the Third Punic, Fourth Macedonian (against Pseudophilippus), Achaean, and Spanish Wars, and at home events were leading up to the Gracchan revolution. The existing authorities are far from satisfactory. For
foreign affairs the only sources of the first rank are the fragments of Polybius and the extant epitome of Livy. Where these fail we are dependent mainly upon Appian, supplemented occasionally by such writers as Valerius Maximus, Florus, Eutropius, and Orosius. Of the internal history almost nothing is known except what is to be gleaned from the epitome of Livy and some references in Cicero. Thus wherever the papyrus supplements the existing epitome, the information is extremely welcome, and fortunately they differ from each other in two important respects. The extant epitome (henceforth called Epit.) is a connected narrative, and though the sequence of events is chronological to the same extent as the original history, the epitomizer has not thought it worth while to make clear to which year every event recorded belongs. The papyrus on the other hand being arranged on strict chronological principles, not only do we learn the precise year to which each event mentioned in it was assigned by Livy, but the dates for the parallel portions of Epit. can now be exactly determined, a proceeding which entails several changes in the chronology which Epit. has hitherto been supposed to prove. Secondly, though Epit. is as a rule much longer than the papyrus because it often describes events in greater detail, the brief summary in the latter frequently includes events which are passed over in Epit. Some of these are naturally trivial (e.g. ll. 84-5, 111-5, and 164-6), but others are quite important. The proportion allotted to the different books in Epit. is very uneven. Thus Book 49 in Epit. occupies a good deal of space, the epitomizer entering into some detail both with regard to the Third Punic War and the rise of the pretender in Macedonia. Beside this the account of Book 49 in the papyrus (ll. 87-105) is very meagre, though even so it mentions at least one event which does not occur in Epit. On the other hand Book 53 of Epit. is dismissed in a few lines, the author apparently attaching little importance to the events of B.C. 143-1, and Book 54 (B. C. 141-139) does not occupy much space. Here the papyrus is considerably fuller than Epit., the proportion assigned to each book being more equal. Which of the two epitomes was constructed first is uncertain. The extant one is now generally considered to have been composed not earlier than the second century, and Zangemeister (Festschr. d. xxxvi philol. Versamml. 1882, pp. 86 sqq.) would assign it to the fourth, while the author of the compilation in the papyrus no doubt lived in the second or third century, when chronological epitomes were much in vogue in Egypt; cf. 12, 685, and the Strassburg fragment edited by Keil. The numerous errors in the text show that we have to deal with a copy some degrees removed from the original composition; but the interval of time need not be long, as is shown by the Oxyrhynchus fragment of Julius Africanus' Ἐκτοι (412), which though written within about fifty years of the composition of
that work is already quite corrupt. The discovery of an epitome of Livy in which the names of the consuls in the ablative case are prefixed to the events of each year goes far to confirm an acute conjecture of Mommsen (Abb. d. k. Sächs. Ges. viii. p. 552), who inferred from the internal evidence of Cassiodorus and Orosius that an epitome of such a character, rather than Livy’s complete work, lay at the basis of those authors’ compilations; the papyrus is, however, much less elaborate than the epitome of which the existence was postulated by Mommsen, and which Zangemeister (ibid.) even regards as the basis of the extant epitome of Livy.

We append a brief summary of the chief historical results to be gained from the new find. In foreign affairs the papyrus gives no new information about the Third Punic and Achaean Wars and confirms the generally received view. The chronology of the Macedonian war against Pseudophilippus, which was previously somewhat uncertain, is now fixed more precisely; cf. ll. 101, 106, and 126–7, note. The names of the ambassadors to Bithynia in B.C. 149, which are given in ll. 112–3, enable us to emend a corruption in the name of one of them as found in Polybius; and a hitherto unknown defeat of the Romans in B.C. 141 in Illyria is recorded in l. 175. But much more valuable are the references to the Spanish war, especially the campaigns against Viriathus. Not only does the papyrus supply new facts of importance, a victory (apparently) in B.C. 147 (l. 136), the defeat of L. Metellus in B.C. 142 (l. 167), and the delay of Q. Caepio (ll. 182–4); but it is now for the first time possible to construct the right chronology of the governors of Southern Spain in B.C. 145–39, and the chief events connected with them. Hitherto the few references to the Spanish war in Epit. were insufficient to correct the unsatisfactory account in Appian, whose text is in parts defective. A detailed examination of the changes introduced into the received chronology of this war and of the new light thrown upon Appian is given in the note on l. 167. More interesting, however, than defeats and victories are the references in the papyrus to home affairs. With regard to events previously known the most striking novelty is the date of the famous accusation of L. Aurelius Cotta by Scipio Africanus, which is placed by the papyrus in B.C. 138 in place of B.C. 133–29, a change which brings about a conflict between Livy and Cicero. Lines 115–6 probably fix the hitherto uncertain date of the Lex Scantinia. Among details which are new are the important military reform introduced by Appius Claudius in B.C. 140 (ll. 177–8), the dispute between the consul and the tribunes in the same year (ll. 182–4), and the statement about the ancestry of A. Gabinius, author of the Lex Gabinia (l. 193). It is also a matter of interest that we can now connect with Livy several statements of later writers, e.g. Dio Cassius (ll. 195–6, note), Valerius
Maximus (notes on ll. 161–3, 164–6, and 192), Frontinus (ll. 188–92, note), and Obsequens (ll. 127–9, note). Though the sadly imperfect condition of the text prevents this list from being much longer, and the numerous fragmentary references to hitherto unknown events serve only to accentuate the sense of loss, the papyrus is nevertheless a very serviceable addition to the authorities for the period from B.C. 150–139, and is a welcome violation of the monopoly hitherto enjoyed by Greek philology in the recovery of classical literature from Egypt.

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

Col. i.

[in Hispa]nia Romani caesi.


[B.C. 189.


[. . . . . . . .]s pax iterum data est. P. Lepidinus {maximus}

[pontif] ex maximus Q. Fabium pr(ætorem) quod flamen

[Quirin]alem erat proficisci in Sardiniam

[. . . . . . . .]ant. Ant[i]cho regi pax data. Lusitani

[vastati] Rhodonia desoli deducta.

[Glabrio] censuram petens minantes

[accusa]tionem compellitoribus composito

[destitit].

lib(er) xxxviii

[Ambrachia capta.

[Gallo]raecis in Pamphylia proelio vastatis

[. . . . . . . .]a libcrata. Origiaisontis capitan nobilis

[centurionem cuius vim pass(a) erat aurum admit

[i . . . .] poscentem occidit caputque eius ad virum

[scum? tuit.] Campanis coniurium datum. [ ]

[inter AchaEEs et Lacedaemonios cruenta [pr]aelia.

[M. Valerio] julio Calinatore cos.

[B.C. 188.

[M. Valerio] julio Calinatore cos.

[. . . . . . . .]a ex Gallograecia per Cra. [. . . .

[ducta. L. M]iuneius Myrtilus et L. M{ani}li

[per legatos Chartaginien[s]ium qui

[pulsi cran]e (aeveci ?).

[M. Aemilio C. Flaminio cos.

[B.C. 187.]
25 [P. Scipio] Africannus a Quintis Metellis die[s] |
   [dicta in L]iyratum abi(t), qui ne revocaretur
   [Gracchus c]urib(umus) pl(ebis) intergessit. L. Cornelius

l. Petillus for Metellis. 26. l. Li[sternum]. 27. l. intercessit.

Col. ii.

Scipio damnatus . . . . , eni.
   [lib(er) xxxv]iiii

30 per C. Flaminiun et M. Aemiliun cos. Ligures
   perdomiti. qiae Flaminia et Aemiliana munita.e.
   Latinorum . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
   ab Roma re[dire]. Manlius . .m de Gallo-
   gracie in {rionpho . . . . . .]an. p(c)ucnia
   quae trans(lata erat . . . .]is p(e)r(s)oluta.
   Sp. Postumio [Q. Marcio cos.]
   Hispala Facenia meretri[ce et pupillo
   Aebutio gu[em T. Sempronius] Rutilius
   tutor et ma[ter Duronia c]urcensriberant
   iudicum re[ferentibus Barc[cha-
   (n)alia subla[tara . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
   subacti. at[hletarum car]tanina
   primum a Fil[l]cio Nobilior[e edita.
   Gall[i]s] in Itali[am transgressim Ma[rcel]
   [p]ersuasit [ut trans Alpes redire]nt. L. Cornelius
   Scipio pos[t bellum Antioch[i] ludos voti-
   vos co[n]lata pecunia feci].
   Ligures ful[gati. . . . . .]llis accepta

40 P. Claudiu[O Pulcher]o L. Porcio Li[ciniou cos.
   homini ce[d [a Nacciu pr(actor) ven]efici(i) damnati.
   L. Quintius Flamininus . . . ] Gallia
   quod Philippo [Pomo scorto] suo desider-
   rante gladiat(ori)um spectaculum

45

37. l. F[acenia]. 39. l. curcensriberant. 40. l. iudicium. 44. l. Ma[rcel]

51. l. hominum circa d(uo) (milia)?
Col. iii.

sua manu Bonù'm nobilem occiderat
a lanatone cen'sore senatu motus est.

vastaita Porcia [facta.

M. Claudio Marcello [Q. Fabio Labone cos.
P. Licini Crassi pontificis maximi

ludis fune(b)ribus [......... in foro
tabernaculis po'sitis evenit id quod
nate's c'éçin'e'rat [tabernacula ......
in foro futura. 16 letters
dim. . . . . m. Han nibal 12 letters

fl[. . . . ]nte[ 19 letters

[.........] bellum p[ 16 letters
[.........]ëllitesin[ 16 "

Theoxen[a 15 "
in mare m[.jgien[. . . . . . . . . Demetrius
fictie grimonibus [accusatus. ...... per patrem coactu's 14 letters

P. Lentulo M. Paebio [cos.

in agro L. Nerylli sc'ribae libri Numae inventi.

A. Postumio C. [Calpurnio] [cos.
cum Liguribus Hisp'ani subacti.
L. Livius trib(unus) pl(cbris) quod [anos nati quemque
magistratum pete'rent rogatio lata

est.

Q. Fulvio M. Manlio cos.
M. Lepidi et Fulvii Nobilioris . . . . .

55. l. Boiu'm. 56. l. M. Catone [for lanatone. 57. l. basilica for vastaita.
62. l. va'te's [for nate's]. 67. l. Baebio [for Berio. 72. l. fictis criminibus. 74.
l. Cornelio (or Cethego) [for Lentulo and Baebio [for Paebio. 75. l. Petilli [for Neryll.i. 78.
l. a L. Villio [for L. Livius and quot for quod.

Col. iv.

adversus Cha'r'taginienses. Lusitani va'stati. Book 48 (b. C. 150).
C. Corneliu's . . . . ecus quod P. Decim su'. . . .

II
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

85 a. ietam ingenii am stupraverat d c[i. . . .
li[b(er)] xxxv[i]iii
L. Marcio Censorino M. Man[i]lio cos.
bellum Punicum tertium exortum. Utic[enses
[θ]enigne locant auxilie. Chartagin[es]
[θn] edicionem venerunt, iussi omn[a] [sua
in alium locum transferr[e] m[. . . . . . . .
redierunt. Roman[i]os . . . . .
pepulierunt. Scipio [21 letters

90 Aemiliani f[[c]]dem p[. . . . . . . . . . Aemi-
liani virtute exercitus qui obsessus
a Poenis erat liberatus. 16 letters
per Caridemum poe[. . . . . . Ser. Galba a Lusi-
tanis reus product[ 20 letters
fili quos flens conjplexus est. Andrisco . .
tii se Philipp[i]m ferente Macedonia
per arma occupata. [ 20 letters
Man[i]lio et Marc[i]o cos. quarti ludi sacula-
re[s] factos quos oportuit Diti ex Sibyllinis
carminibus (Terpentiti facti sunt.

[ lib(er) l

per socios populi Romani Pseudophilippus
in ultimam c[ 24 letters
lat[i. . .]p[. . .]h[ 17 " Prusias?

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

Col. v.

110 [rex Bithyniae positus est. ad Attalum regem
[. . . . . .] in pugnamentasi sunt legati Marco
[ . . podagrius A. Hostilius Manecinus capite
[. . . . . .]a quondam L. Manilius Volso stolidus
[. . . . . .] ligationem dixerunt M. Cato respondit
115 [nec caput] nec pedes nec cor habere{ut}. M. Sec[n]ti(um)
[. . . . . . . .]am tulit (de) in stupro deprehensi(s).
[Masinis(sa) ultimae senectutis liberos IIII
[...... ....]s reliquit decedens, euis re-
[...gnum natu maximis filis per miliaannum distributum.
[Marcellus legieatus ad Masinissam missus
[obnitus. Hadsdrubal quod adfinis Masinis(sa) crat
[...... ......]a subselli socius est. Scipio Aemilianus
[consul creatus.

M. Manilius] in Africa[m] pr'ospere dimicatus [es].
[Iuentii pr(aetoris) i]n Thessalia exercitus caesus.
[Philippus a] Metello captus. sacerrum
[..... et laur'us soci maximo incendo
[inviolata. ]

[lib(er) li]
[P. Cornelio C. Livio] cos.
[..... Cartha'ginein Appius crudelissime
[...... ......]ne obsidentiis Romanos non
[..... Carthaginem crebris proeli(is).

[per Achaeorum pr(aetorem) Corinti legati Romano
[pulsati. Lu'sitani subalti.

111. l. in Pergamens (?) misi for pugnamentasi (cf. p. 105) and M(arcus), . . . for Marco.
114. l. legationem. 120. l. Aemilianum for miliaannum. 123. l. occisus
for socius. 125. l. dimicavit for dimicatus [es]. 133. l. obsidentes. 135. l. Romani.

Col. vi.

Cn. Corneliio L. Mumio cos.
[p]er Scipionem Carthago
[d]irecta. qui

visset uxorem
duobus filiis
potestate [Aemilia qu]

[lib(er) lII]

L. Mumanus C(orinthum diruit.
uxore o
perurians] a Lusitanis clades
accepta. [H 2
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Q. Fabio Maximo L. Hostilio cos. M. Petronii adversus Viriathum
Ser. Galba L. [Cotta cos. L. Metellus consulatum]
qui invisus plebi petitur?
Syria vad stata consilen[
]
lib(er) liii Q. Metello [Appio Claudio cos. Ret hog'en
liberos i .[ proposito a]

145. l. Mummius.

One column lost.

Col. vii.

occidit, a Tyresio quem devictj, gladiu'm
don0 acceptit saguloque remissso amici-
[i'ae dextram dedit.
[Metellus cos. a Lusitanis vexatus. ]
[signa statu(a)s tabulas Corinthias L. Mummii

distribuit circa oppida et Rom[]. . . . .vita.

Q. Fabius Maximus Lusitanis ca'esis ]
Viriathum fugavit.

lib(er) liii Pompeius cos. a{n} Nu(a)mantinis d'evictu's. in
Scordiscis cladis accepta.

[Q. Caepione [C. Laelio Salasso cos. Ap-pius Claudius evicit ne duo[ delectus?] annus
haberet. Uemilius Torquatm D. S ila]num
filium suum de Macedonia damnavit, f]neri
non interfuit, cedemque die [i n d'om] sua
consultantibus respondit.
[C]aepio cos. indelegem Ti. Claudiam Assilium
tr{i}b(uum) pl(ebis) interpellantem profectionem
suam i{ctores trigem reddeterbuit.

185 [Q.] Fabius Maximus a Viriath{i}o devictus de-
formem cum hostibus pacem fecit. Q. Octavius
[......] in insidiis Luc[s]itanorum fortissine
pugnavit. ... sine devota est aqua An{n}io. aqua
Marcia in Cap[t]itolium contra Sibyllae carmina
[perducta.]

176. l. Sapiente for Salasso. 178. l. T. Manlius for Uemilius. 182. l. Claudium
Asellum. 184. l. ens detrerruit; cf. p. 112.

Col. viii.

Chaldaei urbe t{i}l 20 letters
A. Cabinius verne ... rogationem tulit
suffragium per tabellam ferr. .........

195 Servilius Caepio a{b equitis quos periculo
obicerat clavo iectus 15 letters
Audax Minurus {D}ita[lo] 17 "
Viriathum ingula[verunt.

lib[er] [tv

200 P. Sc{i}pio D. Iunio [cos.
interfectores Viriathi ... praelium
negatum. cum Scipio[lem Nasicam et
decennvi[um co]. S[ci]thii et Cur[iatius]
trib[unii] pl(ebis) in car[er]em [o].locarent, .........

205 precibus populi mult[a] remissa. .........
trib[unus] pl(ebis) pro commodis populi .........
omnib(us) lueti expiravit. co[.].nu[.]. ...... de-
sertores in comm[io] virgis cae[.]. si sestertiis
singulis venierunt.

210 P. Africanus cum L. Cottam [accusaret ........
magnitudinem nom[inis ...]. cae[.]. ........
Lusitan[i]i vastati. a{n} N[u]man[us] itis clades accepta.
Diodotus Tryphon Ant[iochum regem occi-
dit Suriague potitus e[st. ]}


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

| . . . . . . | . . . . . | 235 | . . . . . |
| Sullanis [ ] | [amili[i | [his[i | [vir[i |
| neum [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| e nou re[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| co's. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| samin[ ] | [s me . [ |
| avit [ ] | custodia[ |
| . . . . . | [ ] [ ] |
| . . . . . . | [ ] [ ] |

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

P. Lepidinus: his correct name was P. Licinius (37. 51). maximus is a repetition of part of his title.

6. [. . . . ant: this word must be corrupt; lenuit or retinuit (cf. 37. 51) would be expected.

Antipho regi pax data: cf. 37. 55.

Lusitani [vastati]: cf. 37. 57 and for vastati ll. 13, 83, and 212.

7. Two events seem to be confused here, the Rhodian embassy about Soli (ch. 56 ad fin.) and the foundation of Bononia (ch. 57), the latter being what is really meant, as shown by the intervening mention of the Lusitanians, de Soli(s), if more than a mere interpolation from ch. 56, probably represents colonia or de Gallis.

8–10. Cf. 37. 57; destitit is the word used by Livy.


13. Cf. 38. 12 sqq. in Pamphylia, as Prof. Kornemann remarks, is not strictly accurate, the Gallograeci being defeated in Galatia.

14-17. For the story of Ortiagon's wife see 38. 24. captiun must be captiva, but uxor is much wanted and nobilis is probably corrupt. Possibly an nobilis is due to a reminiscence of the words Anigram nobilum which occur at the beginning of the chapter. admit . . . also seems to be a corruption of a word meaning 'promised,' while poscentem is for pensantem, the word used by Livy.

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

19. Cf. 38. 35.
21-3. Cf. 38. 42.
24. Cf. 38. 42.
25-7. Cf. 38. 50-3. Though die dicta or dicto is necessary for the construction, it is very likely that the scribe wrote dies dicta or dictus.

30-1. Cf. 39. 2.
32-3. Cf. 39. 3.
33-5. Cf. 39. 6-7.
41-2. His pan i. subacti: cf. 39. 21, referring to the victory of C. Atinius.
44-5. Cf. 39. 22, where the incursion of the Gauls is described. But the apparent mention of Marcellus refers to ch. 54, where it is stated that in B.C. 183 they retired to their own country, Marcellus being then consul (cf. also ch. 45). The epitomizer seems therefore to have made the same kind of mistake as in connexion with the concession to the Campanians; cf. l. 17, note.

45-7. Cf. 39. 22 L. Scripio ludos . . . quos bello Antiochi vovissee sese diebat ex collata ad id pecunia . . . fecti.
49. The defeat of the Ligurians by the two consuls occurs in 39. 32, and the next event related is the elections. What illis accepta refers to is not clear. Possibly multa m'illa capta was meant (cf. 39. 32 multa m'illa hominum in iis cepit); or illis may represent part of cladis, and in or a Hispmini may be supplied (cf. ll. 174-5 and 212), the reference being to the defeat mentioned in ch. 36. This however was soon remedied, and a mention of this campaign would have been expected to precede instead of following the allusion to the Ligurian war.

51. Cf. 39. 41.
52-6. Cf. 39. 42. If . . . Gallia is not corrupt it is out of place, and ought to follow quaod.
57. Cf. 39. 44.
58. Cf. 39. 45.
59-63. Cf. 39. 46.
63-4. A reference to the capture and death of Philopoemen at the hands of the Messenians probably occurred here; cf. 39. 49-50.
64. Hanribal: a reference to his death; cf. 39. 51.
67. Cf. 39. 56.
68. Perhaps [Hispani] should be restored before bellum; cf. 40. 1.
70-1. Cf. 40. 4. Prof. Reid suggests in mare[m] *fingiunt se dedit* (or ictui). Livy’s phrase is in mare sese defect.
72. Cf. 40. 6-16. It is not clear whether *per patrem coactus* in l. 73 also refers to the accusation against Demetrius or to his death by poisoning, which is described in 40. 24. coactus does not seem to be right on either hypothesis.
74. Cf. 40. 18.
75. Cf. 40. 29. The restoration is however rather long for the lacuna.
76. Cf. 40. 35.
77. Cf. 40. 39-41.
78-80. Cf. 40. 44 eo anno rogatio primum lata est ab L. Villio tribun foedus quo nos anni nati quemque magistratum peterent caperenique.
81. Cf. 40. 45.
82. Cf. 40. 45-6. *composita inimicitia* may be supplied. After this several columns are lost, corresponding to the break between 657. iv and v.
83. *adversus Chairaginienses*: i.e. the war with Masinissa; cf. Epit. 48 ad fin. Carthaginienses cum adversus foedus bellum Masinissae intulissent ...
Lustiani va stated; cf. l. 212. The reference is to the treacherous attack of Sulpicius Galba (cf. l. 98), on which see Appian, *Iber. 59-60*, Orosius, *iv. 21. 10*, Val. *Max. ix. 62*, and *Sueton. Galba 3*. Epit. 48 has *Ser. Sulpicius Galba praetor male adversus Lustianos pugnavit*, which has generally been interpreted as implying a defeat of the Romans. But, as Kornemann remarks, it is now clear that *male* means not ‘unsuccessfully’ but ‘dishonourably.’
84. Probably Cethegus, i.e. Cethegus; cf. l. 14 Origianontis for Ortiagonitis. The incident is not recorded elsewhere, nor is any C. Cornelius Cethegus known at this period. L. Cornelius Cethegus was one of the accusers of Galba (Epit. 49) and M. Cornelius Cethegus was consul in B.C. 166.
Decim seems to be corrupt for *Decimi* or *Decii*, and *su* is very likely the beginning of a cognomen. What *a. iictam* (or *auctam*) in l. 85 is obscure; Reid suggests *autilus*. Kornemann prefers *Deci(n)um* . . . *ingenium*, comparing Val. *Max. vi. 1. 10* quod cum ingenuo adslescentulo stupri commercium habuisset. The doubtful *u* after *d c* can be *i*.
87-93. ‘Book 49. Consulship of L. Marcius Censorinus and M. Manilius. The Third Punic War began. The inhabitants of Utica willingly assisted (the Romans). The Carthaginians surrendered; being ordered to transfer all their possessions to another site they returned ...’
90. *auxiliare* is for *auxilliari* (*sc. sunt*), and *locant* perhaps conceals the object (? Romanis). *locant auxiliare* though in itself a possible phrase, is unlikely, for the verbs in the papyrus are uniformly in the perfect tense and generally come at the end of the sentence.
91-1. Cf. Epit. 49 tene cum *ex auxiliari patriarum inderent* (*sc. consules*) *ut in allium locum dum a mari decem milia passuum ne minus renovum oppidum facerent*, indignitate ret ad rebellandum Carthaginenses compulsurunt. For *facerent* Gronovius had conjectured *transferrrent*, which seems to have been the verb employed in l. 92. The embassy of the Carthaginians mentioned in l. 90-1 came to Rome (cf. Epit. *legati triginta Romam venurunt per guos se Carthaginenses dedurunt*); but the demand to evacuate Carthage was made by the consuls after reaching Africa, and if *redierunt* refers to the return of the ambassadors to Carthage, the statement of the papyrus is inaccurate. It is more likely that
redierunt refers to the renewal of the war. m after transferr'e may well be a mistake for in. The whole phrase would then be an antithesis to in dedicacione venerunt in l. 97.

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

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

97-8. Who this Charidemus was is unknown. poed is possibly poetam.

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

101. Unless Philippus is an error for Persei, Reid is probably right in correcting 'tii se Philippi to Persei se Philippum; cf. Epit. Persei se filium fereb et mutato nomine Philippus vocatus... totam Macedoniam aut voluntate incolentium aut armis occupavit.

103-5. The Epitome of Book 49 ends with the description of the revolt of Macedonia, but carminibus in l. 105 strongly suggests that this passage refers to the celebration of the games of Dis at Terentum in accordance with the Sibylline books, a fact which is mentioned near the beginning of Epit. 49 Diti patri iudi ad Terentum ex praeceto librorum Sibyllinorum facti, qui ante annum centesimum primo Punico bello quingentesimo et altero anno ab urbe condita facti erant. This is confirmed by a passage in Censorinus, De die natali 17.8, to which our attention was called by Kornemann and Wissowa, de quarum ludorum anno triplex sententia est. Antias enim et Varro et Livius relativus esse prodiderunt L. Marcio Censorino, M. Mamilio consilibus post Roman conditam anno sexcentesimo quinto. at Piso Censorius et Cn. Gellius sod et Cassius Hemina qui illo tempore vivebat post annum factos tertium affirmant Cn. Cornelio Lentulo, L. Mamilio Achaico consilibus, id est anno sexcentesimo octavo. in quindeicem virorum autem commenatariiis notatur sub anno sexcentesimo viicesimo octavo Mam. Aemilio Lepido, L. Aurelio Oreste consilibus. The restorations of ll. 103-4 are due to Wissowa, who (Religion und Kultus der Römer, p. 364) considers that Livy's date for the games (b.c. 149) is wrong, and that Cassius Hemina was right in assigning them to b.c. 146.


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

110. The death of Prusias is noticed in Epit. If Prustas in l. 109 is right, posilus is probably corrupt for some word meaning 'killed' (? occisus, cf. l. 123); but (de)posilus is just possible, for Prusias seems to have been first abandoned by his subjects (Justin 34.4). depone in the sense of 'depose' is however not classical. Kornemann would retain posilus and supply Nicomedes in l. 109.

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

Line 111 is very corrupt. st before sunt must be the termination of a participle such as missis; but what is pagnamenta? Pergamenos is not very satisfactory since the mention of Pergamus seems unnecessary after ad Attalum regem. The names of the ambassadors are given only by Polybius (37.17) as Marcus Licinius (gouty), Aulus Mancinus (broken head), and Lucius Malleolus (the fool). The last name can now be corrected to Manlius, which is meant by Manlius in the papyrus as is shown by the cognomen Volso (Vulso). The Manlii Vulsones were a distinguished patrician family in
the earlier part of the republic, and members of it were consuls as late as B.C. 189 and 178. *M@rcus* in l. 111 is probably *Marcus* followed by the first part of another name which was more probably a cognomen (*Archia*) than *Licinius*.

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

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

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


128-34. Cf. Epit. *P. Scipio Aemilianus cum aedilitatem peteret . . . legibus solutus et consul creatus est.*

125. The Epitome is more explicit: *M. Manilius aliquid urbes circumpositas Carthaginii expugnavit.*


127-9. The burning of the *sacrarium* is not mentioned in Epit., but is explained, as Kornemann and Wissowa point out, by Obsequens 19 (78) *vasto incendio Romae cum regia quoque urgetur, sacrarium et ex duabus altera tourus ex medii ignibus inviolata exstiterunt, upon which passage the restorations of li. 128-9 are based. *soci* is corrupt, possibly for *Ops.*

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

132-4. This passage is very corrupt. No Appius is known in connexion with the operations at Carthage in this period. crudelissime suggests that Appius is a mistake for Hasdrubal, and that ll. 132–3 refer to the cruelty of Hasdrubal towards the Roman prisoners described by Appian (Pun. 118).

135–6. Cf. Epit. quod legati populi Romani ab Achaes pulsati sint Corinthi. The Achaean praetor referred to was Critolaus.

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

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

139–43. These lines, as Kornemann and Reid suggest, probably refer to the story of the death of Hasdrubal’s wife, who first threw her two children into the flames; cf. Epit. 51.


146. muro: probably, as Kornemann remarks, this entry refers to the death of Diaeus by poison after killing his wife; cf. Pausan. vii. 16. 2–4, Zonaras ix. 86, Auctor de vir. ill. 60.

147–8. a Lusitanis alacres accepta (cf. l. 175) may refer to the defeats of Vetilius and C. Plautius mentioned in Epit., or to one of them; cf. note on l. 136.

150. A certain C. Petronius who was an ambassador to Atalus and Prusias in B.C. 156 is mentioned in Polyb. 32. 26, but no M. Petronius is known at this period.

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

153. L. Metellus is perhaps the brother of Quintus and the consul in B.C. 142; cf. l. 167, note. But the mention of consulatum suggests a reference to the two failures of Q. Metellus’ candidature for the consulship before he obtained it for B.C. 143, and Kornemann is probably right in regarding L. as a mistake for Q. On the confusion of the two brothers cf. notes on ll. 164–6 and 167. For invisus plebi cf. Auct. de viris illust. 61 invisa plebi ob nimium severitatem et id quod duas repulsas consul aggre factus.

161–3. Reid is no doubt right in connecting this passage with the story told by Valerius Maximus (v. 1. 5) of Rhoeotogenes’ children, to save whom Q. Metellus abandoned the siege of a town in Spain.

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

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

b.c. 143. Q. Caecilius Metellus, governor of Northern Spain, is successful, but the praetor Quinticius, governor of Southern Spain, is defeated by Viriathus.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

b.c. 141. Victory of Q. Fabius Maximus over Viriathus (ll. 171–2). Defeat of Q. Pompeius (l. 174).
b.c. 140. Q. Caepio delayed in starting for his province (ll. 182-4). Q. Fabius is defeated, and concludes a disgraceful peace with Viriathus (ll. 185-6). Q. Occius distinguishes himself in an engagement with the Lusitanians, in which the Romans fell into an ambush (ll. 186-8).

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

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

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

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

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

Nor does the transference of Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus' governorship to b.c. 141-0 produce any serious conflict with other statements. That Livy assigned these two years to him rather than b.c. 142-1 might have been guessed from the extant Epitome, for he was consul in b.c. 142, yet Epit. 53 mentions his successes as proconsul, and Epit. 54 (ad fin.) his defeat. But these indications that Fabius was already proconsul when he became governor of Southern Spain—a fact which is made quite clear by the papyrus—were disregarded, partly owing to the statement of Orosius (v. 4) that Fabius in his consulship (i.e. in b.c. 142) fought against Viriathus, partly owing to an inference from Appian, Iber. 67, where the opening words τοῦ ἐπίφορος ἔτους Καῦτος μὲν ὁ ἄλλος Αἰμηλαίος Φίμης Μάξιμος Ἑρυζολάνδως (Ἀμυλαίων MS.) ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν στρατηγιαν διάδοχον have in connexion with the preceding events been supposed to refer to b.c. 142. To leave for the moment the question which year Appian meant by τοῦ ἐπίφορος ἔτους, his account of Fabius Servilianus' achievements accords well enough with that of Livy. It is true that the successes of Fabius in Appian's account seem to belong to the later rather than to the earlier part of his
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governorship, but it is not difficult to suppose that Appian omitted to record some trifling successes such as the capture of Baccia mentioned by Orosius (l. c.), probably one of the urbes which were expugnatae according to Epit. 53; cf. ll. 171-2. Two campaigns are implied by Appian, as is more clearly stated by Livy; but Appian does not call Servilius consul. Where the facts known from Livy conflict seriously with at any rate the present text of Appian is in the events which took place between the departure of Fabius Maximus Aemilianus and the arrival of Fabius Maximus Servilius. The governorship of Aemilianus is expressly stated by Appian to have lasted two years (Iber. 65). Aemilianus was consul in b.c. 145, and that the years of his governorship were b.c. 145-4 is unquestionable; cf. Epit. 52 lantumque timoris ist hostis intulit ut adversus eum consulari opus esset et ducet exercitu. The disaster to Plautius which led to sending an experienced general is, as we have said, very likely alluded to in I. 147 of the papyrus, and l. 151 may well refer to the dispatch of Aemilianus. So far as is known, Aemilianus had both Spain under his command; but who succeeded him on his departure in b.c. 143? Northern Spain at any rate seems to have fallen to the consul for b.c. 143 Q. Caecilius Metellus (cf. Val. Max. iii. 2. 21, ix. 3. 7; Appian, Iber. 76), and that he remained as proconsul in b.c. 142 is attested by Epit. 53; but the question who obtained Southern Spain is very complicated. From Val. Max. ix. 3. 7, where Q. Metellus utramque Hispaniam consul prius, deinde proconsul... subgesisset it is the reading of the MSS., it would be inferred that Metellus was governor of both Spain; but utramque has been altered by some editors to provinciam on the ground that Metellus was only governor of Northern Spain, the governorship of Southern Spain in b.c. 143 being generally assigned to Quinctius, who is supposed to have been a praetor and to have been the immediate predecessor of Fabius Servilius on the evidence of Appian, Iber. 65-7. This passage, which is very corrupt, now requires a fresh examination in the light of the new evidence. After recounting the achievements of Fabius Aemilianus in b.c. 145 and b.c. 144, Appian proceeds (ed. Mendelssohn): καὶ τάδε μὲν ἄρει Λιμιλίανσ (Σερουλιανος MS.) ἐργασάμενος ἐς Ρώμην ἀπῆρε διαδεξεῖμαι τήν ἀρχήν Κοῦντον Πιμηθίου (τοὺ) Λδνην (ὁ δέ αἴθλητος αὐτοῦ Μάξιμος Λιμιλίανος MS., omitted by editors). ἐφ' οὖς ὁ Οὐρίαστος οἷς ομοίως ἔτη κατασφένουν Αρουνακοῦ καὶ Τίθυνθοι καὶ Βλλαυοι... ἀπέστησιν ἀπὸ Ρωμαίων. καὶ πολεμῶν ἄλλων ὁδε ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν ἐπόλιμοι ὡς ἐκ πᾶλωσ αὐτῶν μᾶς Νοματίστων ἐγγυότα. καὶ τοιγάζω καὶ τάδε ἐν ὑπ μετ Οὐρίαστον. ἐστὶ άκατέργα ὑπ τῆς 'Ισημίας ἐτέρῳ στρατηγῷ Ρωμαίων Κοῦντον (Q. Pompeio in a 16th century translation of Appian made from another MS., now lost) συνεπέλεξε, καὶ... ἐκείνες τῶν Κοῦντων ἐς (τοὺς Κοῦντιους ΜΣ.) χίλιοι καὶ σημεία τῶν ὅρασα... Κοῦντον (Κοῖνων MS.) ἐκ διλών καὶ ἀπείρων οἶκον ἐπισφοδροῦσε, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ πολεμῷ χαμαύμοντος ἐκ μέγιστον μετοπέρῳ... τοῦ δ' ἐποίητος ἐκεῖνον Κοῦντον (Κοῖνων other editors) μὲν ὁ ἀδελφὸς Λιμιλίανος Φάδιος Μάξιμος Σερουλιανος (Λιμιλίανος MS.) ἔλεγεν ἐπὶ τήν στρατηγικήν διάδοχον. From this confused and corrupt account it has been generally inferred that a praetor Quinctius succeeded Fabius Aemilianus in Southern Spain in b.c. 143, was defeated in that year and was succeeded in b.c. 142 by Q. Fabius Servilius. We now know that in Livy's account the governor in b.c. 142 was the consul for that year, L. Metellus, and that Fabius Servilius became governor in b.c. 141. Assuming that Livy is right, the discrepancy may be explained in two ways: either Appian has made several mistakes in his facts or the MS. is still more deeply corrupt than it has appeared to be. On the first hypothesis Quinctius or Quintus, the supposed praetor, may he retained, for owing to the loss of a column between Cols. vi and vii of the papyrus it is uncertain who in Livy's history was the governor of Southern Spain in b.c. 143. We must however assume that Appian omitted L. Metellus altogether, thus setting the chronology wrong by a year. But considering the corruptions in the proper names in Appian, Iber. 65-7, it is, we think, far more likely that the story of the defeat of the supposed Quinctius, who appears
nowhere else in history, is a distortion of the defeat of L. Metellus mentioned by Livy. With two brothers, Q. Metellus and L. Metellus, governing the two Spanis in 142 B.C. it is not at all surprising that mistakes should arise, and if Κόντιος in Iber. 66–7 is a corruption of Λοίκιος or Καικίλιος, there will be no conflict between Livy and Appian as to the predecessor of Fabius Servilianus. Dismissing therefore the supposed Quinctius, there still remains the governorship of Southern Spain for B.C. 143 to be accounted for. The passage in Appian referring to Aemilianus' successor Κόντιον Πομηνίου Λέδων is obviously quite corrupt. The insertion of τοῖς before Λέδων (Schweighauser, followed by Mendelssohn) does little to mend matters. There is no point in the mention of the father's praenomen and there is clearly a confusion in the text between this person and the Κόντιος Πομηνίου Λέδων mentioned in Iber. 76. That Q. Pompeius was consul in B.C. 144 and succeeded Q. Metellus as governor of Northern Spain in the same year (cf. l. 174). His cognomen was Rufus, so that editors bracket Aedω in ch. 76. In any case this Quintus Pompeius cannot be the successor of Aemilianus in B.C. 143, and the best course seems to be to fall back on the statement of Valerius Maximus (ix. 3. 7, v. sup.) that Q. Metellus governed utramque Hispaniam. Seeing that Aemilianus governed both provinces for two years, there is not the least difficulty in supposing that his successor did the same for one, but in the second year a separate governor was sent to the Southern province. On this hypothesis we would suggest that Κόντιον Πομηνίου Λέδων in Iber. 65 is corrupt for Κόντιον Καικίλιον Ματτίλου, and that the following words δε ἄνελθος αὐτῶν Μάξιμου Λεμπρίνου, which are simply omitted by editors, really contained a reference to the brother of Q. Metellus, L. Metellus. The sentence is in that case incomplete and the lacuna may well have supplied some details about the events of B.C. 143–2 which would have made ch. 66 much more intelligible. Our conclusion therefore is that the divergence between Livy and Appian's account of the war against Viriathus is due less to mistakes on the part of Appian than to the extraordinary perversions of the proper names in the MS. of the Iberica, and that Appian's chronology of this war can without much difficulty be made consistent with the newly found material.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Livy</th>
<th>Mommsen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>(Q. Caecilius Metellus cons.)</td>
<td>Quinctius praetor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>L. Caecilius Metellus cons.</td>
<td>Q. Fab. Max. Servilianus cons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Q. Fab. Max. Servilianus proc.</td>
<td>Q. Servilianus Caepio cons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Later Q. Servilius Caepio cons.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Q. Servilianus Caepio proc.</td>
<td>Q. Servilianus Caepio proc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


174. This defeat of Q. Pompeius by the Numantines agrees with the received chronology; cf. Epit. 54 ad init. and l. 167, note. For *devicta* cf. l. 185.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

193-4. On the Lex Gabinia tabellaria see Cic. Legg. iii. 35. Cicero says that it was lata ab homo ignoto et sordido, which confirms the present reference to Gabinius' base ancestry. What degree of relationship to the verma was alleged by Livy is uncertain. verae filii is unlikely, for the son of a slave could not be made tribune, and though two cases at least of the son of a freedman becoming tribune are known (Mommsen, Staatsrecht, i. p. 465), the phrase verae filii does not suggest the meaning 'son of freedman' or 'of a freedwoman,' though perhaps not incompatible with it. verae nepos is better, but of course some more indefinite word may have been employed. It has been generally supposed that A. Gabinius the tribune was the son of the Gabinii who held a command in Ilyria under L. Anicius in B.C. 167 (Livy 45. 26); but this is quite uncertain.

195-6. As Warde Fowler suggests, it is probable that these two lines refer to the mutiny of Caepio's cavalry mentioned by Dio (Fr. 78 Boisseevain), in consequence of his apporitoning to them a specially dangerous operation. Caepio had to take refuge from
their violence in flight. Since a nail is not a very effective weapon of attack, *clavo* may be altered to *clava*, a 'cudgel' or 'foil.' Reid well compares Oros. v. 9 *clavae iictu* (of Tiberius Gracchus' death).

107-8. The names of the murderers of Viriathus are not given in Epit., but occur in Appian, *Iber.* 74, where they agree with the papyrus, and in Diodorus exc. c. 24, where Nikorones is found instead of Minurus.

201-2. For the refusal of a reward to Viriathus' murderers cf. Dio, Fr. 80, and Eutropius, iv. 16. Appian (Iber. 74) mentions the bribe, but not the refusal, *διαφθοράς ἅπετο τῷ Καπίονισ δόρος τε μεγάλοις καὶ ὑποσχέσεις πολλαῖς.* The Epitome does not mention either, but has *Viriathus a proditionibus consilio Servilii Caepionis interfactus est.* From the fact that the refusal took place in the year after Viriathus' death it clearly came from the senate; and if there is any truth in the story of Dio and Eutropius about the answer given to the murderers that the Romans did not approve of a general being killed by his own soldiers, this must have been made by the senate, not, as they state, by Caepio.

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

205-7. (ab) omnibus luctus seems a better correction of *omnibus luctu* though whether Livy would have used *luctus* is doubtful; cf. note on l. 110. These lines refer to the death in b.c. 138 of a popular tribune who 'having done much for the good of the people expired amid universal regret.' His name was given at the end of l. 205. It would be expected that this individual was important enough to be known to history, and, as Warde Fowler and Reid suggest, there may well be a connexion between ll. 205-7 and a passage in Pliny (H. N. xxii. 10) *florum quidem populus Romanus honorem Scipioni tantum habuit.* Serapio cognominabatur propter similitudinem suarum cuitudum negotiatoris, obierat in tribunatu plebei admodum gratas dignusque Africano rum familia, nec erat in bonis funeris imensa. assos ergo contulit populus ac funus locavit vulgque praefecerentur flores e prospectu omni sparsit. Whether by *Serapio* Pliny meant Scipio Nasica Corculum, the consul of b.c. 162 and 155, or his son, the consul of b.c. 138, in either case the statement that he died as tribune is an extraordinary error. It is very significant that the papyrus also mentions the death of a popular tribune immediately after a mention of Scipio Nasica the younger, and, as Warde Fowler remarks, if something like *Nasicae filius or frater* be restored at the end of l. 205 and Pliny's *Serapio* be the same person, the difficulties in the Pliny passage would be largely reduced.

207-9. *sed, ut* may be the beginning of a short sentence complete in itself. If it is connected with ll. 208-9, it probably refers to the part taken by the consuls in the punishment of the deserters. On this cf. the passage from Epit. 55 quoted in ll. 202-5, note, where only one individual, C. Matienus, is mentioned. Frontinus, however (Stratig.
iv. 1. 20), agrees with the papyrus, *qui exercitum deseruerat damnati, virgis causi publice veniuerat*. _sesteriis singulis_ is equivalent to _sestertio nummo singuli._

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

On the whole, in spite of the evidence of Appian who connects the acquittal of Cotta with C. Gracchus' law _de iudiciis_, and the circumstance that Cicero mentions it (_Divin. in Caecl. l. c._) together with the trial of Aquiliius which certainly seems to have taken place after Scipio's return from Numantia, we incline to the view not only that Livy placed the trial of Cotta in B.C. 138 but that he was right in so doing. Cicero, in the _Pro Mur. 58_ passage at any rate, had a point to make which would be helped by assigning the trial to the period after Scipio's second consulship, and it is not difficult to suppose him guilty of a chronological error in a speech. Moreover, the commentary of Pseudo-Asconius seems to indicate that there were ancient doubts as to Cicero's correctness on this matter; and if Livy was right with regard to the date of the trial, L. Cotta was probably the consul of B.C. 144, who, as Valerius Maximus states (vi. 4. 2), was in that year prevented by Scipio from going to Lusitania, and against whom Scipio may well have continued to bear a grudge.

212. _Lusilani vastati_: the proceedings of D. Junius Brutus in Southern Spain are meant; cf. Epit. 55 _Junius Brutus consul in Hispania iis qui sub Viritho militaverant agros et oppidum dedi_, quod _Valentia vocatum est_, Appian, _Iber. 71_, and notes on ll. 167 and 216-7.

a _Numan'tiā_: for the restoration cf. l. 175. The allusion is to the defeat of M. Popilius; cf. Epit., which is more detailed, and l. 167, note.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

213-4. Cf. Epit. which is longer in its account of Antiochus’ death but mentions it at the end of the book after the successes of Brutus, and omits the detail that Diodotus took possession of Syria. The year to which Antiochus’ death is referred by the papyrus (B.C. 138) conflicts with the date (B.C. 143-2) recently proposed by Niese (Gesch. d. gr. u. maked. Sl. iii. p. 283), chiefly on the evidence of coins.


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

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

669. Metrological Work.

17:5 x 15:3 cm.

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

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

Col. i.

[ἐχει τὸ σχοινίον] τὸ γεωμετρικὸν ὄγδοα η,
[τὸ δὲ ὄγδοον ἐχει] πῆχεισ ιβ, όστε ἐχειν τὸ
[σχοινίον τὸ γεωμετρικὸν πηχῶν 95.
[τὸ δὲ .............] κῶν ἐστιν πηχῶν ρ.
5 [ὁ εὐθυμετρικὸς πῆχεις ἐστιν ὁ κατὰ
[μῆκος μόνον] μετρούμενος, ἐμβαδικὸς
[δὲ ὁ κατὰ μῆκος καὶ πλάτος, στερεὸς δὲ ὁ κα-
[τὰ μὴς καὶ πλάτος καὶ βάθος ἦται ὄψος.
[ϑ .............] s ὁ ἱκοπεδικὸς πῆχες ἐ-
10 [χει ἐμβαδικὸς πῆχεις ρ.
[τὸ δὲ ξύλῳ καταμετρήτα] τὰ ναύβια: τὸ μὲν βα-
[σιλικὸν ἐστι πηχῶν γ,]
[παλαιστῶν ] ιη,
[δακτύλων ] οβ.
15 [τὸ δὲ .............] ἐστιν πηχῶν ββ',
[παλαιστῶν ] ις,
[δακτύλων ] ξδ.
[ὡς ἐχειν τὸ σχοινίον] τὸ γεωμετρικὸν
[ξύλα βασιλικὰ ] λβ,
20 [ξύλα ............. ] λς.
[............. τετ]παγώνου ἐχει ξύλον α,
[............. ] α,
[............. πηχεὶς γ,]
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[. . . . . . . . . . . . . δημοσίου ναυ-
25 [βι
. . . . . . . . . . . .
]

1. l. δύοα. 3. l. πῆχυς. 5. l. πῆχυς. 8. l. ἤτοι. 9. ἵκοπεδίκος Παπ.
1. πῆχυς. 19. λ of λβ corr. from o.

Col. ii.

μέτρων ἵδη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀδερ δάκτυλος
παλεστής λιχ{v}άς σπ[ειρμή] ποὺς πυγῶν
πῆχυς βῆμα ξύλον [ὀργυιά κάλαμος
άκενα ἄμμα πλέβρων [ιούγερον σταδί-
30 ον διάυλον μίλιον. δ'.

οι β' παλεσταὶ λιχ{v}άς, οἱ γ' παλεσταὶ
σπειρμῆ, οἱ δ' ποὺς γ', οἱ ε' πῆχυς λινούφικος [καὶ . . . . . . ήτοι
πυγῶν, οἱ σ' παλεσταὶ πῆχυς δημό-
35 σιος κε 'τεκτονικὸς, οἱ {ι} παλεσταὶ πῆχυς
Νιλομετρικός, οἱ η πῆχυς . . . . . .
οἱ i βῆμα, βῆμα δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ διάστασις
tῶν ποδῶν. οἱ γ' πῆχυες ξύλον δη-
μόσις'ον, οἱ δ' ὀργυιά, ἀργυιά δὲ ἐστὶν
40 ἡ διάστασις τῶν χιροίν, οἱ πῆχυες
κάλαμος, οἱ ε' ἄκενα, οἱ [. . . . . . . .
οἱ εἰςι πῆχυς.

δάκτυλος δ' πάντα κατ' . . . . . . . τοὺ-
τον μίζονα καὶ σύμμετρα [καὶ τὰ ἐλάσ-
45 σονα τούτου μεσειτεῖεται [. . . . . . . . .
δ' . . . [.]. λιχυ{v}. λιχυ{v}. . . . . . .
. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

27. l. παλαιστής: so in ll. 31, 34. 33. λινούφικος Παπ. 35. l. καὶ. 37. οἱ τ
Pap. 39. ὀργυῖα Παπ. 43. πῆχυς Παπ.

1–20. 'The schoenium used in land-survey has 8 eighths, and the eighth has 12 cubits, so that the schoenium used in land-survey has 96 cubits, while the . . . schoenium has
100 cubits. The linear cubit is that which is measured by length alone, the plane cubit is that which is measured by length and breadth; the solid cubit is that which is measured by length and breadth and depth or height. The ... building cubit contains 100 plane cubits. Ναύσια are measured by the ξύλον; the royal ξύλον contains 3 cubits, 18 παλαισταί, 72 δόξταλοι, while the ... ξύλον contains 2 1/2 cubits, 16 παλαισταί and 64 δόξταλοι; so that the schoenium used in land-survey contains 32 royal ξύλα and 36 ... ξύλα.

31-41. '2 παλαισταί make a λιχώδ, 3 παλαισταί a σπειρον, 4 παλαισταί an (Egyptian?) foot, 5 a cloth-weaver’s cubit, ... 6 παλαισταί a public and a carpenter’s cubit, 7 παλαισταί a Nilometric cubit, 8 παλαισταί a ... cubit, 10 παλαισταί a βήμα, which is the distance of the outstretched feet. 3 cubits make a public ξύλον, 4 cubits an ᾱργηιά, which is the distance of the outstretched hands. ... cubits make a κάλαμος, 6 1/2 an ᾱκώια.

1-4. On this σχοινία, which was unknown when Hultsch wrote his Metrologic, see Kenyon, P. Brit. Mus. II. p. 130, and P. Tebt. I. p. 386. The details of the papyrus exactly fit the previous evidence, which was that the σχοινία corresponded to the ancient Egyptian measure κηλ or κηλο νυχ of 100 royal cubits, but nevertheless was divided into the series 1 1/2, 10, 15, 3 1/2, and so on like the aura. The papyrus now shows that in surveying land the σχοινία was sometimes treated as having 96 cubits, probably for the sake of convenient fractions, but that there was also a σχοινία of 100 cubits. The name of the latter in I. 4 may be οἰκοπεδικόν. The ratio of these two σχοινία of 96 and 100 cubits corresponds, as Mr. Smly remarks, to the ratio of 24:25 between two kinds of cubits in Roman times; cf. note on ll. 34-5.

9-10. The οἰκοπεδικόν πῆχες was supposed by A. Peyron (P. Taur. I. pp. 133-6) to be a parallelogram measuring 100 cubits by 1 cubit. His explanation, which has been accepted by all editors, is now confirmed by the papyrus, which states that an οἰκοπεδικόν πῆχες contained 100 square cubits. The adjective lost in the lacuna is very likely περιστ( ) which is found in P. Brit. Mus. i19 and Wilcken, Ost. II. i301 before πῆχες as a measure of area. But how the abbreviation is to be resolved is uncertain. Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 780) suggests περιστοιχίον: περιστοιχίον seems to us more likely.

11-20. The restoration of this important passage, though at first sight it may seem rather hazardous, is really practically certain. It is clear from τὸ μέν in l. 11 that the figures in ll. 12-4 are contrasted with those in ll. 15-7, and since those in ll. 12 and 15 refer to πῆχες, those in ll. 13 and 16 must refer to παλαισταί, of which there were 6 in an ordinary πῆχες (cf. ll. 34-5), and those in ll. 14 and 17 to δόξταλοι of which 4 make a παλαιστήρια. This being granted, the figures in ll. 12-7 refer to a measure of length, and the substantive to be supplied with τὸ μέν cannot be νοῦς, which is known to be a measure of cubic capacity. There is only one measure of length known to have contained 3 πῆχες, and that is the ξύλον (l. 38), and though no ξύλον of 2 1/2 πῆχες was known previously, the fact that in ll. 38-9 the ξύλον of 3 πῆχες is called δημοσίον indicates that, as would be expected, more than one kind was in use. If then τὸ μέν in l. 11 means a particular kind of ξύλον, some such restoration as τὸ ξύλον καταμετρήτω, τὸ μέν becomes necessary, and the correctness of this hypothesis is confirmed by ll. 18-20. The figure in l. 20 stands to that in l. 19 in the same proportion (9:8) as those in ll. 12-4 to those in ll. 15-7. τὸ γεωμετρικόν (l. 18) has already (l. 1) been applied to the σχοινία, and l. 19 with the restoration suggested will be the corollary of l. 3. The only difficulty that arises is that the ξύλον of 3 πῆχες is in l. 11 called βασιλείων while in l. 38 it is said to be δημοσίον; but in view of the extent to which δημόσιος in Roman
times supplanted the Ptolemaic term *basilikós* (e.g. in connexion with τράπεζα and γεωργίας; cf. 500. 13, note), this objection is not serious. The chief interest of this section about the ξίλον lies in the light which it throws upon the size of the ναύσσων (l. 11). On that obscure cubic measure used in digging operations see P. Tebt. 5. 15, note, and P. Petrie III. From the fact that the ξίλον was the particular measure used for calculating ναύσσω, it is difficult to avoid the inference that a ναύσσω was a ξίλον in length, and since there is every reason to think that its dimensions were equal, most probably a ναύσσω was a cubic ξίλον, and as there were two sizes of ξίλον so there were also two kinds of ναύσσω.

21-5. The subject of these lines is obscure; but from the occurrence of τετράγωνον in l. 21 it appears that some area was under discussion. It is not unlikely that τὸ μὲν μέγεθος is to be supplied at the beginning of l. 21 and τὸ δὲ πλάτος ξίλον in l. 22, and that the four-sided figure in question was the square face of a ναύσσων or cube measuring 3 πέντεικα each way. ναύσσω is probably still under discussion in l. 24.

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

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

30. It is probable that the list ended with μέθεν like those in *Tabulae Heronianae* III and VII. The only larger measures of length were the σχόνιο σπαρασάργης. διά is the beginning of διάκεφαλον, since the following details proceed in an ascending scale, and ought to have begun with the smallest measure. But we should expect αἱ διάκεφαλι παραστη, which is much too long, and the διάκεφαλον has a section devoted to it in ll. 43 sqq.

31. The size ascribed in the papyrus to the λιχώδες, σπαρασάργη (l. 32), πυγών (l. 34), βόμβα (l. 37), ὀργών (l. 39), and άκέα (l. 41), agree with the statements of the *Tabulae Heronianae* and add no new facts.

32. The names given by the ancient metrologists to the ordinary foot of 4 παλαισταί to distinguish it from the ἐρμοικός or ἦρμοικός ποῦς of 3⅓ παλαισταί are βασιλικός, Πτεραιμικός, and Φιλεκατομές; but none of these will suit. Αἰγύπτιος is not unlikely; the first letter is certainly α or λ, δ or μ being excluded.

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

34-5. This cubit of 6 παλαισταί is the common πέντεικα, found in the *Tabulae Heronianae*, but is there also called λιχώδες and ξυλοπηρίστηκος. Αἱ πέντεικα τέλεως ξυλικά τετούκες occurs in P. Brit. Mus. 154, 7; for δημόσιος cf. l. 38 ξίλον δημοσίον and ll. 11-20, note. There was another cubit introduced into Egypt in Roman times which stood to the cubit of 6 παλαισταί in the ratio of 25:24 (Hultsch, *op. cit.* Wilcken, *Ost.* I. p. 753), but this does not seem to be mentioned here by the papyrus, though it is perhaps, as Mr. Smyly suggests, implied by the number, 96, of cubits in a σχοινίον in l. 3.

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

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

38–9. No ἔδώς except that of 3 cubits was known previously; on the δημόσιον and the other ἔδων with which it was contrasted see ll. 11–20, note.

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

41–2. After the ἀκανθα, which has the customary 6\(\frac{3}{4}\) cubits, came no doubt a higher unit of measurement, very likely the ἄρμα (40 cubits), which follows the ἀκανθα in l. 29. οἱ εἰσὶ πήχεις may be corrupt for οἱ (a figure) πήχεις, followed by another unit of measurement omitted. But it is more likely to be something like τὰ ζώα εἰσὶ πήχεις (cf. 654. 1), 'so much for cubits.'

43–5. The meaning is that the δάκτυλος being the smallest measure of length with a name, all other measures of length are referred to it as the unit; cf. Tabulae Heronianiæ I and II ἀλέκχων δὲ τῶν ἐστὶ δάκτυλος καὶ πάσα τὰ ἐλαττονομέρεια καλλίτατα, and III δάκτυλος πρῶτος ἐστίν ὁδιπερ καὶ μονός. Line 43 is probably to be restored καταμετρεῖται τὰ τούτων, with καὶ ὀφ. in l. 44; cf. l. II.

670–678. Poetical Fragments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

670. 15.6 x 3.7 cm.

Δεις τι δ' αυ ταλλο π. [ ]
ν δέ καὶ αυτὸς απ[ ]
[ ] . [ ] αυτοματος λιπεν [ ]
ως [ . ] καζοουν αε γε[ ]
[ ] ο θα[ . ]. εουσα φιλο[ ]
ν αρ εισωμεσθα σιδηρ[ ]
5]λε Ταρταρισου αλυκτοπεδησι π[ ]
]ε φλη λουσειεν επιζω[ ]
παντοθεν [αμ'φιβεβηκε τ][ ]
ως αρ εψη [ . . . υψι μεμμ[ ]
]ν ασηρφελικτου εωρ[ ]
[ ] γαρ παραϊσι τεοις [ ]
]ημετεροι π... ντοφ[ ]
]ν εγχος . . εοχε τα[ ]
20]ην ιδε . [ . ] και παλ[ ]
] και Διορισος ε . [ ]
10]σ(α)[ . . . ] τεκες υί[ ]
τεχνηεις [και] χωλος εων [ ]
]σ προσθε προδον αγαθ[ ]
]μενοι . . . τεεισκοτε . [ ]
25]σοθαι γλυκερεων εψι[ ]
]εως παις ουτος εμοι[ ]

6. ν of λοης is corrected apparently by the second hand from τ.
18. The mistake corrected was the common one of writing α for ε; the same thing has happened in l. 25.

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

τινας αν ειποι [λογους προς[ ]
τον υπ[ . ]ν τον Δε[ ]
ν[ ] ατρεκες αιγληεσσα[ ]
[ . . . . . . ] . βασιλ[ ]
κ[ . . . . ] . ωρε βασιλευς [ ]
5 α[ . . . ] . ασθενσασθ[ ]
[ . . . . . ] . μκειτη[ ]
[ . . . . . ] . νη εγησι[ ]
15 [σκη]πτρον εχει . [ ]
]χρυσον αθησαρ[ ]
]αλλα[α] κλωις εμος οσι[ ]
1-2. A name, possibly Νι( ) (cf. introd.), is to be supplied after λόγος. Δο[ may be read in place of Δό in l. 2. This may be the top of the column.

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

672. 8 × 5.5 cm.

673. 10 × 4.7 cm.

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

673. 1-2. Perhaps Περὶδιψίων θεράπων and ὀδρίμηστρα, as Blass suggests.

4. The letter before ἰππόβοτο[ has been corrected.

5. The mutilated letter before the lacuna might be e. g. μ or ν; ὁλυμπότον.

9. πλοκαμός is no doubt part of a compound adjective like εἰπλοκαμός or καλλιπλοκαμός.

10. The doubtful ν has been converted from ω by a second hand, which also crossed out the δ.
674. 5.1 × 5.2 cm.

\[\pi\tau\alpha\lambda\iota\]
\[\lambda\omega\nu\epsilon\nu\omega\.\.\.\]
\[\lambda\omega\nu\epsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\]
\[\epsilon\nu\iota\Delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\iota\nu\alpha\delta\]
5 \(\epsilon\) Παρνασσον \(\theta\epsilon\mu\iota\theta\lambda\alpha\)
\[\iota\iota\sigma\tau\rho\phi\iota\nu\iota\tau\rho\iota\iota\iota\iota\]
\[\alpha\mu\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\lambda\alpha\iota\iota\iota\iota\]
5. The letters of this first line are smaller than those in the lines below and differently formed, and they might be by another hand; but there is no trace of an erasure, nor can the words be an interlinear addition.
4. ιυ or ιω might be read in place of α between ν and δ.
5. \(\delta\)ιμέ\(\theta\)λα; cf. Pindar, Pyth. iv. 180 Παι\(\gamma\)α\(\omega\) θεμέ\(\theta\)λαι. Perhaps \(\tau\rho\iota\iota\mu\epsilon\) δ\(\iota\) Κ.Λ., as Blass suggests.
7. The letters of \(\omega\)ιω\(\alpha\) are smaller than usual and have a slight slope, while elsewhere the hand is upright; they seem to have been written by the original scribe, but may be a marginal note or gloss.
8. Something like an ο enclosed between two dots (cf. e.g. 16. ii. 4) has been written above the letter after \(\pi\alpha\lambda\), which is probably ο. The words may be divided \([\nu\alpha\pi\alpha\lambda\.\.\.\] or \(\nu\iota\pi\alpha\lambda\.\.\.\)

675. 11.8 × 14.5 cm.

Col. i.  
\[\pi\alpha\iota\alpha\nu\iota\ \varphi\iota\lambda\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon\phi\alpha\iota\nu\iota\]
\[\mu\epsilon\lambda\sigma\iota\ omega\\.\.\.\]

Col. ii.  
\[k\epsilon\.\.\.\] \(\mu\epsilon\lambda\psi\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\iota\]
\[k\epsilon\lambda\alpha\o\iota\pi\alpha\iota\]
\[\alpha\epsilon\iota\rho\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\chi\omega\\.\.\.\]
\[\alpha\lambda\epsilon\zeta\alpha\iota\delta\rho\iota\epsilon\iota\alpha\iota\]
5 \(\pi\o\iota\nu\iota\.\.\.\) κα\(\iota\) β\(\alpha\.\.\.\)
omou π[. .]ωμερ[. . .] σταις εν ωδαίς[. . .]
tais δε [πολυωνυμοι ιλ[. . .]
σπονδα[. . .] σαν δε φ[. . .]
δοιανμ [. . .]ουτοφ[. . .]
10 σεβιο]

1. ποιμν: the vestiges of the last two letters are very slight, but ι is much more probable than α.
2. There is a short blank space between μελαποντες and the letter following.
3. Κ[. .]τεχνου is very uncertain; the letter after ν could be almost anything. π[. .]οεχων is quite possible.
9. Probably -δωις νερ[. . .]

673. 5 x 7.4 cm.

Col. i. Col. ii.

[μν]
[ην]
[βετει]
[. . .]
[. . .]

σ[εμν]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]

[. . .]
677. 8.6 \times 3.9 \text{ cm.} \\

678. 11 \times 4 \text{ cm.} \\

677. 6. There is a blank space in the papyrus on either side of \( \tau \nu \iota \lambda \alpha \lambda \iota \varepsilon \iota \). Probably two feet are to be supplied at the end of the line.

8. \( \epsilon \iota \nu \gamma \mu \mu \alpha \) is apparently for \( \epsilon \iota \nu \gamma \mu \mu \alpha \) or \( \eta \iota \nu \gamma \mu \mu \alpha \). The doubtful \( \gamma \) might be \( i \), but that gives no word.

9. Cf. 409. 86, &c.

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

8. The syllable preceding \( \tau \eta \) had an acute accent.


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

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

682. Two fragments, both probably from the same column, of which one of them forms the top. The graceful upright hand seems, like that of 699, to be a rather early example of the oval type, and it may go back to the latter part of the second or the beginning of the third century. The common angular sign is used for filling up a short line (l. 12). The pieces are part of an oration, perhaps a lost speech of Hyperides.

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

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

679. 12·5 x 6·1 cm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>. . . . . ηων Ελληνικων</td>
<td>τε· [</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>. . . . .gruntov ey Κιλικι</td>
<td>a[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αи απεσταλμενων νυ Αλε</td>
<td>r[</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
679–684. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

680. 6.5 x 4 cm.

[...], οἱ Κιλκίκοι [...]
6.5 cm. 6.5 cm.

679-684.

Ἐνδροῦ νυστέρον [...] αὖν
5 [...]. τὸν παραδοθῆναι
[...] ἑπιμελείαν
[...] αὐτὰ αὖ ὁ μὴ ἔλθοι
[...] τὴν ἡσυχίαν εἷς [...]
[...] λαμβανόμενες μὴ εἰσίν
10 [...], τῶν τόχον καθέστω
τῶν [...] βε δισμερισθῶ
σιν [...] τοῦ στρατοπεδοῦς
δο [...] τῶν μερίδων
15 [...] τυται
15 [...] ηειν δέσιν
[...] δοξαστοῖς
[...] αὐτών
λ [...]. ὑπηρετᾶς εἰς [...]s
[...] ὑν τῶν προ [...]
20 [...] ἐπεξεῖν α[...] ἐκα [...]
10 γράμμα [...] τερμὸν [...]
[...] τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ [...]
[...] δικαίων [...]
[...]. το[ [...]]. αὐ[ [...]]
[...]. ὑποστρέψαί [...]
5 Ἀττικῆς μετ[ [...]]
τοὺς Ἀθηναῖοι[...] [...]
π αὐτοῦ τεθείσιν [...]
to [...]. αὐ[ [...]]

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

11. Or ὑπογω.

681. 11 x 7.1 cm.  

\[\tau\rho\rho\varepsilon\ldots \pi\rho\varepsilon\]  

[γεγοναί τοις α...α...i]  

[πλειστοὶ τ[ω]ψ προσπε]  

10 [\nuτων Τρ[ιβαλλω]ψ και]  

[προτερον μεν...τ]  

[και κρατηθεὶ[τω]ψ των]  

5 [\kαλομενων και]  

\[Τριβαλλων ό[ι] μεν \[α[Λ]νοι κατα]  

[κ'αθηκουσαν νυν δε]  

\[\tau\'ων Παινονων των α]  

6. If Τριβαλλων is right not more than six letters are missing at the beginnings of ll. 1-9 or from seven to eight in the remainder.

8. The letter between ο and τ is very likely σ. Above the a of των is a spot of ink which seems to be accidental.

682.  

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

Fr. (a) \[\tau\]α[ες δημοκρατιαις οι]  

[νομοι παντ[ω]ψ εις των]  

[εν τη πολε[ε]ι κυριοι και]  

10 [\ν[ι]ων εκαστ[ε]] ...  

[αυτος νομον θησειν]  

5 μους τ[ε ... i ...]  

[και παυσειν ευν]  

[τοις δικαστηριοις ρ[αι]  

\[διως αποφευγοντας\]  

Fr. (b) \[12 letters \]  

\[7 \]  

Fr. (b) \[12 letters \]  

15 [\[1\] \[δε δημο...οι...ω]  

[ανδρες Α[θηναιοι]  

1. \[τ\]ας was probably preceded by ev. Mr. Smyly aptly quotes Hyperides, Euxeniph. xxii. ev δημοκρατια κυριοι οι νομοι ἔσονται και αι εἰσαγγελια και αι ἄλλαι κρίσεις κατὰ τοὺς νόμους εἰσαγαγει εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον.

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

15. [ε] πε δημοκρατιας ου δημοκρατιας ου [η] πε δημοκρατιας are possible supplements.
679–684. **NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS**

683. 9·3 × 4·4 cm.

683._1

15. _akaton_ may be a complete word; cf. l. 18 _κερα_.

684. 12 × 6·5 cm.

5. _ευγρατερα[ν]_: the final ν scarcely fills the available space, and another letter may be lost.

6. The second λ of _μαλ(_, if written, would be very cramped and may have been omitted.

9. The traces of the supposed ο after _β_ are rather closer than they should be.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

both to the β and to the following ν and perhaps do not represent a letter, and on the other hand a narrow letter may be lost between the doubtful σ and τ. θοδοσινων . . . εινηρον might be read, but would make no sense here. Perhaps there is some corruption.

14. ευματων would be expected and should no doubt be restored (cf. l. 16 ευμαυει); perhaps καματων was written by mistake.

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

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

III. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

685. Homer, Iliad XVII.

12.5 × 10.5 cm.

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

725 επι καπρων
θηρητηρων·
μεματωτες·
πεποιθως. η ἐαλλ' ὅτε δή ρ'
] αλλος.
728. The marginal note evidently refers to the Aristarchean method of writing ὅτε δ', namely ὅτε, and implies that the word had the Aristarchean accent in the text. Cf. Schol. A on λ 493 'Ἀρισταρχος ὅτε ὅτε δ' ἐς δηλοῦ ἀρνητάτον ἀνεγίνωσκε, and the discussion of the question in the scholia of Ammonius, 221. ii. 1–8, where the ordinary accentuation is upheld. For the reference to the Κουτή cf. 445.

731. The scholium appears to be an explanation of the word ἐμφεύγωσιν which it interprets in the sense of 'pointed at both ends'; cf. Apollonius' Lexicon, s.v. τοις ε' ἐκατέρων μέροις γυώσας διυφέρει. After μέροι something like ἄκρον ἔχωσιι must be supplied; cf. Schol. A on λ 147 οἱ δὲ μετασφορίκος ἄκρον τών γράμμων ὁτι ἐκατέρωθεν ἄκρον ἔχει. The note may have been continued in a third shorter line, and there is a faint mark below the ν of μέροι which (if it be ink) would suit a σ.

732. The marginal note below this line, which should refer to l. 733 στοῖχοι τῶν ἐς τρίστος χρώς, οὐθε τις ἔτη, is obscure. The only word here of which an explanation seems at all likely to have been given is τρίστος, which in the Schol. Didymi is glossed ἠλλάσσετο ἡ ἕδα τοῦ προσώπου; but the present note was phrased differently. The doubtful λ may be μ and four or five letters may be lost in front of it since l. 733 is not a long one. Λαυτ. [ cannot be read.

686-688. Homer, Iliad II, III, and XI.

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

686.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

[κηρυσσειν αγ]ορην δε καρηκομοουντας
[οι μεν εκηρου]ουσον τοι δ ηγειρουτο
[βουλην δε πρωτον μεγαθυρ]ον
[Νεστορεη] παρα νη Πυλαιενεος
55 [τους ο γε συν]κ]αλεσας πυκνην
[kλυτε] φιλοι θειος μου ενυπνιον
[αμβροσια]ν δια νυκτα μαλιστα [ ]
[eidos τε μεγ]εδος τε φυν ι αγ]χιστα

53. The papyrus probably read βουλην, as do the great majority of the MSS.; but the lacuna is too large to give a real clue. Βουλή Ludwig, with Aristoph. and Aristarch.
54. Πυλαιενεος: so Lud. with AB, &c.; Πυληγ, SM, &c.
55. θινος: so MSS. and Aristarch.; θινο Zenod.

687. 8.1 x 4.5 cm.

Col. i.

7.9 x 4.5 cm.

Col. ii.

Plate VII.

> τους δ εγω
αμφιοτερον
αλλ ο[τε]
στα[δων 210

> αμφιω
αλλ ο[τε]
ητι[οι
παρ[α
ουδ αιφαμαρτοεπης 215
αλλ οτε

207. There is a diple against this line in Ven. A with the note δι παραλληλος εξεινοσα
και οφιλησα το γορ φιλειν ενοτε αντι του ζυκειν τιθουν.
211. Ven. A has a diple periestigmene opposite this line.

688. 134

8.1 x 4.5 cm.

Plate VII.

οι δ ετι καμ μεσο[ν
ας τε λεων εφοιβησε
[α]εν αποκτειν[ων
πολλοι δε πρη[νεις
689. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

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

689. HESIOD, Scutum.

Fr. (a) 9·2 x 3·6 cm.

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

[σποις μαστιητην ικοντο δε μακλ[ιων] Ολυμπων
[υιος δ Αλκμηνής και κυ[θ]αλιμος Ιολ[ιας]
[νυσων αισθά] δ επειτα π[ολιν] Μη[θ]α[ис] [ι]κοντο

470 [σποις οικυποδεσσα'ν αγαρ γ]αυκωπ[ίς] Αθήνη
[Kυκλων δ αν Κ]ηνξ θαπτεν [κ]αι λασος [απειρων
[οι ρ εγγυς ναιον πόλιας κλε[ι]τον βασιλη]ν

475 [Αρνην τ ηδ Ελ]ηκην' παλλος [δ επιε]ι' γερε[το] λα'ος
[τιμωντες Κηνκα] φιλον μ[α]καρε[σα] θεοισιν
[τον δε ταφον και α]ήμα αίδε[ς] ποιησεν Αναιρ[ου]
[ομβρων χειμερι]ωι πληθον [τως γαρ μιν Απ]αλλον
[Ἡτοίμασιν ἥπως ὅιτι πα κλει[τας εκατομβάς]

480 [ος τις άγοι Πυθοίδε] βιη σύλασκε δοκεων

466. μακάρων is for μακρων, a case of the common confusion of λ and ρ.

473. πολυς: πόλος Rzach with E, πόλος other MSS.; the papyrus reading will at least scan.

474-5. Rzach follows Goettling in regarding these two lines as a later addition. The papyrus shows that they belong to an ancient tradition. εἰπεῖτ'ετο in l. 475 is a new variant; ἔγειρε, ἔγειρε or ἔγειρετο MSS.

480. βιη σύλασκε is the ordinary reading. The scribe seems to have imagined that the verb was σύλασκε; what he supposed the σ meant or why he made a mark like a sign of elision after the overwritten i we are unable to conjecture. There is a break in the papyrus immediately below this line; the title of the book presumably followed as usual.

690, 691. Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica III.

690 13 x 5.2 cm., 691 3.3 x 3.3 cm.

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

690.

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

[Χαλκιοπή ως] ὑμ[μι]
[ως ἑρξω μη γ]αρ μ[ι]οι
692. APOLLONIUS RHODIUS, ARGONAUTICA IV.

11.5 x 8.7 cm.

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

\[\text{[ηρως μετα [τηνηθε θοις ελαασκον ερέτμος]}
\[\text{[ουτω τε]σαματα νησω ε[π ηπειροιο περαιης]}
\[\text{[βαλλον α] δε κραιπνους [χερσο ποδας ηκεν Ηησος]}

80 [ε]ψοιν επ ικριδθιν μετα [δε Φροντις τε και Αργος]
[νιε δω δω Φριξ[ου] χαμαθις θορευ η δ αρα τουγκε]
[γον]ων [αμφοτερηθαι περισχομενη προσεειπεν]
[εκ] με φιλοι μωσαθε δυσαμερον ους δε και απους]
[ομε]ας Α' τησα προ γαρ τ αναφαιδα [τεσυκται]

85 [π]αντα μαλ ουδε τι μυχρος ικανεται αλλ επι νη]
[φε]ψυγωμεν πρεν την γ(ε) θουν επιβηγεμεναι ιππων]
[δω]ςω δε χρυσειου εγω δερος ευνησασα]
[φρομον ωφιν τυν δε θεους [εν]ι σοιηυν επαιρου]
[ξειν]ει τεων μνων επι[ιστορας] ους μοι υπεσθης

90 [ποιησαι] μη δ ενθεν εκαστριω ρωμι̣θεισαν

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

693. Sophocles, Electra.

8·6 × 3·6 cm.

A narrow strip from the top of a column, containing ll. 993–1007 of Sophocles' Electra. The MS., which is a good specimen of the oval type of uncial, was probably written in the first half of the third century. The correction in l. 1002 and the occasional lection signs, with the exception of the mark of elision in l. 993, are probably all by the original scribe. A rare variant occurs in l. 995. Our collation is derived from the Jahn-Michaelis edition of 1882.
694. THEOCRITUS, Idyl XIII.

14.2 x 8.4 cm.

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

20 Αλκμηνας νίος [\n
\[\text{συν δ ἀυ[γ]ω κατεβ[αινεν} \]

\[\text{ατις κυνάειν οὐ, Χ} \]

\[\text{ἐλλα δ[ε]ξιῶτε, βα[θυν} \]

\[\text{αιετ[oς] ὁ[ς] μέγα λά[στημα} \]

\[\text{η} \]

25 ἄμος δ αντελλον[τι] \n
\[\text{άρνα νέον βοσκο[ντι} \]

\[\text{τ[α]μος ναυτιλ[α]ξ[ε]ς} [\n
\[\text{ηρῶων κο[ιλ]αυν δε [} \]

\[\text{ἔλ[λ]άποντον έκόντω} \]

30 εἰσω δ ὄμον ικον[το} \n
\[\text{αυλακας ευρήνοντ[ι} \]

\[\text{ἐκβα[ντες δ επι θε[ίνα} \]

\[\text{[δε[ε][λ][ν][ο][ς]} \]

\[\text{πολλοι δ[ε} \]

\[\text{[λειμ][ων [ς][φ][ι][υ] πα[ρεκείτο} \]

19. κω : χω MSS.
20. Αλκμηνας : so most MSS. Αλκμήνης Z(iegler) following the Ambrosianus.
21. Against this line are two dashes, of which the meaning, if any, is obscure.
22-4 were rejected by Ahrens. In l. 23 δ[ε]ξιῶτε is corr. to δ[ε]ξιῶτε.
25. It is not certain what was written above the initial a. The supposed η between two points (i.e. ημως for ςμως) is possibly an accent and breathing.
30. ικον[το : έκεντο MSS., Z. έκεντο is a repetition from the previous line.
34. [ς][φ][ι][υ] πα[ρεκείτο : γάρ σφυν έκεντο MSS., Z.

695. Herodotus V.

24.3 x 7.6 cm.

Part of chapters 104–5 of Herodotus, Book V, written in a good-sized third century uncial hand of the broad oval type. Two corrections and a breathing have been inserted by a second hand. The text offers no variants from that of Stein. On the verso, in a late third or early fourth century cursive hand, is part of a list of names of persons, with sometimes a statement of the villages to which they belonged, e.g. . . . ἀπὸ Θωλθ(εως), Φεναμοίτ(ις) ἀπὸ Ταλαώ.
696. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS 141

[τας Κυ]πριμ[ι]ς συναπι
στασθαυ γρ upstairs μεν δη [αλ
λους ανεπεισε Αμαθδουν
σιους δε ου βρνλ[ι]μενους
κεκ προσκατμενοις
Ουγελιος μεν ινν επο
λιαρκει Αμαθοντ[OF
βασιλει δε Δαρει[ω] φος
10 ε[ξα]γγ[ε]ι[σ]ην [Σ' αμ' δ'] ης α
κοινας εμπεπρησθαι[ι
ντ[ν] τε] Αθηναιαιων [και
[ω]ρων ου δε ηγημιο
να γενεσθαι της συλλο
15 [γη]ς ωστε ταυτα συνν
φαινηναι του Μικ[η]οι
ον Αρισταγ[γ]ορην παρωτα
με[ν] λ[ε]γεται [αυτον [ως
επυθετ[ο] ταυτα Ιον[ων
20 ουδενα λο[γ]ν ποιησα[α
μενον ευ ειδοτα ας ου

22. The second a of καιρα has been corrected from o; i.e. the first hand wrote ουκ απομακρυνσα, which was altered to ου καταπραξωςα.
23. Final ε of αποσταντες was put in (by the first hand) later.

696. THUCYDIDES IV.

Fr. (c) 15 x 19 cm.

In view of the peculiar excellence of the Oxyrhynchus Thucydides papyrus originally published in the Egypt Exploration Fund’s Archaeological Report for 1896–7, and reprinted as P. Oxy. 16, the discovery of some more fragments of the same MS. was a welcome surprise. The new pieces comprise portions of six more columns, covering, with considerable lacunae, chapters 28 to 35 of the fourth book; and at the same time supply some of the missing beginnings of lines in the first column of the fragment originally found, which succeeded immediately.

The present part of the MS. possesses the same features which distinguished that published previously, and readers are referred to the description given in P. Oxy. I. p. 40. We see no reason for altering the date (first century A.D.) there proposed for the papyrus. We are, however, inclined to doubt whether the final ρ which has been inserted occasionally in the text is after all by a hand different from that to which the other numerous corrections and variae lectiones
are apparently due, and which is not to be distinguished from that of the original scribe.

As before, the papyrus shows a number of small differences from the ordinary text, the most noteworthy being those in ll. 4, 13, 16, 38, 62–3 and 87. Our collation is with the text of Hude.

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

... amartηματα ωστε προσπει πτειν α[ν αυτους απροσδοκη
κ]αι
[Iμβριους τους παροντας και] πελ

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

π]ρωτος
[φυλακας οις επεδρα]μον ευθυς
10 [διαφθειρουσιν εν τε] ταις ευναις ει[ ]
[αναλαβαντ]ας τει. τα οπλα
[kαι λαβοντες τ]ην αποβασιν οι
tai рως
[ομενων αυτ]ων κατα το ειω
[θος εσ εφορμον της] νυκτος πλειν

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

... χαρησιει[ν οι π[ολ]ε]
[μοι εσεθαι τ]ειλοι] και οι απο
[ρωτατοι] τοξ[ειμα]σι και α
25 [κο]πτιο[ς] και λιθο]ς και σφεν

63 λον δια το εν τοι αυτω ανα
FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

696.

Col. vi. 33. 2.

χωρ[']ἀν τις


[ὅρ]μισας τραχεοῦ[ν] ο[ντὸν] εν


[ναντο] διωκειν οπλα εχον


[η]ρ[ο]βολισαντο των δε

[Δ]ακ[ε]δαιμονοι ουκετι ο


[εν] δυ[ν]μενοι γ[ν]όντες αυ


αυντας τοις αμνησθαι και


το π[λ]ειστον ειληφ[ο]τες πολ

λαπλασιοι φαινομενοι και

[ε]ι[κ]

45 ξυν-ει[θ]ισμενοι μαλλον μη

κετι δεινους αυτους ομους

σφαιρ[ν] φαινεσθαι] στ[ι] ουκ ευθυς

αξια της προχαδθα[ι] επ[ε]

πονθεσαν ωψιπερ στε πρω


[δεδουλωμενοι] ους επι[ε] Δακε

[δα[ι]μονοι] καταφρονη

[σαν]τες και εμ(βο)σα[ν]τες

[α]θροι ορμησαν επι αυτοις

55 [κα]ι εβαλλον λε[β]ο[ις]

στρεφεσθαι συγκλησαντες

"εχωρησαν ες το εσχατον ερυ

μα της ημερας ου πολυ απεχον

και τους εαυτους φυλακας ως

65 δε ενεδοσαν επανθα δη πολ

ηλω ετι πλει-ονι βοηθε τεθαρ

ρηκτες οι ψειλοι επεκειντο.

και των Δακεδαιμωνων

οσοι μεν υποχωρουντες εν

70 κατελαβαντον απεθανη

σκον οι δ πολλαι διαφευγον

τες προσ ομα μετα των

ταυτη(ι) φυλακων εταξαι

το παρα πατιν ως αμνουμε

75 [νοι] [νι]πτερη[ν] επιμαχουν []

[οι δ Αθη]ναιοι επισπο[μενοι]

τε[πειροθ]οιδον μ εν αυτων και

κυκλωυν χορ[ου]ν ισχυ

ουκ ειχον προσιτατες

80 δε εξ εναντιας ωσαθαι επει

[που]το και χρονον μεν

[πολυ και της ημερας το πλει] [στον ταλαιπωρεμε] αμφιφο

[τερο υπο] τε της μαχης ιται


[πειρομενο] οι μεν

...
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI


2 lines lost. 2\(\lambda\omega\)
\(\nu[\xi]\omega\)
\(\nu\tau\varepsilon\)
\(\pi\omega\)
90 \(\varepsilon\xi\alpha\pi\nu\eta\sigma\)
\[\]
100 \(\mu\sigma\nu\lambda\alpha\iota\)
\(\tau\eta\)
\(\tau\omega\)

\(\eta\) for the variant \(\alpha\rho\rho\sigma\delta\kappa\eta\tau\omega\), which is not otherwise recorded, cf. e.g. ii. 93. 4 \(\alpha\rho\rho\sigma\delta\kappa\eta\tau\omega\) \(\varepsilon\tau\varepsilon\varepsilon\tau\omega\tau\iota\varepsilon\). It may be doubted whether \(\alpha\tau\omega\iota\varepsilon\) was retained with this reading or was replaced by \(\alpha\tau\omega\iota\varepsilon\).

5. \(\iota\tau\alpha\iota\) this is the order of CEGMF; \(\nu\iota\tau\alpha\iota\) ABF.

10-1. \(\alpha\nu\alpha\lambda\mu\beta\alpha\iota\nu\tau\alpha\tau\) \(\tau\tau\) was the original order, but \(\tau\tau\) was subsequently inserted at the end of l. 10 and cancelled in l. 11. \(\tau\tau\) \(\alpha\nu\alpha\lambda\mu\beta\alpha\iota\nu\tau\alpha\tau\) is the reading of all MSS. Hude prints \(\kappa\alpha\nu\alpha\lambda\mu\beta\alpha\iota\nu\tau\alpha\tau\), a modification of Abresch's conjecture \(\kappa\alpha\nu\alpha\lambda\beta\).

11. It is unfortunate that the beginning of this line is lost since editors have suspected a corruption in \(\lambda\alpha\beta\omega\tau\epsilon\iota\). The ordinary reading suits the size of the lacuna well enough.

12. \(\tau\alpha\omega\nu\alpha\), which is added above the line, is found in all MSS. It is not absolutely essential, and may be an explanatory adscript which has become incorporated into the text.

13. \(\nu\iota\nu\tau\alpha\tau\) \(\nu\iota\varepsilon\) MSS. The new variant is supported by other examples in Thucydides of \(\sigma\tau\alpha\omega\) \(\nu\iota\tau\pi\iota\alpha\tau\). e.g. in this book 17, 2, 55, 2, 67, 4.

14. \(\nu\iota\tau\alpha\omega\nu\) \(\nu\iota\tau\alpha\omega\nu\) \(\nu\iota\tau\alpha\omega\nu\) \(\nu\iota\tau\alpha\omega\nu\) is rather long for the lacuna, and possibly \(\tau\tau\) was omitted.

16. \(\alpha\tau\varepsilon\beta\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\) : \(\alpha\tau\varepsilon\beta\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\), the reading of the MSS., has been commonly changed by editors to \(\alpha\tau\varepsilon\beta\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\), an alteration which is now sanctioned by the papyrus. The singular \(\alpha\tau\varepsilon\beta\alpha\iota\nu\alpha\) may also well be right.

21. Similar insertions of \(\nu\iota\tau\pi\iota\alpha\tau\pi\iota\) occur in l. 47, 16. ii. 9, &c.

22. Eleven lines are lost at the top of this column.

23. \(\psi\iota\alpha\iota\) \(\psi\iota\alpha\iota\) \(\psi\iota\alpha\iota\) \(\psi\iota\alpha\iota\) MSS., Hude. The papyrus gives no support to the suggested emendations (\(\psi\iota\alpha\iota\) \(\psi\iota\alpha\iota\) \(\psi\iota\alpha\iota\) \(\psi\iota\alpha\iota\) Cobet, \(\psi\iota\alpha\iota\) \(\psi\iota\alpha\iota\) Madvig).

25. \(\varepsilon\lambda\iota\tau\iota\nu\) : \(\varepsilon\lambda\iota\tau\iota\nu\) here might be supported by such a use as \(\tau\alpha\iota\).
éni σφυς ναὶς ἐπεχώσας (viii. 105. 3), but it may be a mere graphical error; επεκθω would be more likely to become επεχω than vice versa. The i has been rewritten.

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

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

45. The i written above ei of ἔσυνθαμβένου has been again cancelled.

47. σφυς MSS., H.; cf. l. 29.

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

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

61. συγκλησατές; elsewhere in the papyrus εω is written.

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

63. ον πολν σπέχαν: δ' ον πολν ἀπέλγε MSS.

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

67. MSS. The alternative spelling πλεοῦν is that of the MSS.

71. διαφεύγουσι: l. διαφεύγουσι, with the MSS.

72. προς: ετ MSS. The π is quite certain.

76. [οι δ' Αδηγειοί: καὶ οἱ Αδ. MSS. It is just possible, though unlikely, that the papyrus had και at the end of the previous line; there is not room in l. 76 for και before oi.

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

86. [περωμεν:; scarcely fills the lacuna, in which three or four more letters would be expected.

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

87-8. πιστεύωμε: πιστεύωμε MSS. The reading of the papyrus may be right.
697. Xenophon, Cyropaedia I.

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

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

The MSS. of the Cyropaedia divide into two main families; one group consists of AG, which are the basis of Dindorf’s edition, C, which in the early part of the Cyropaedia supports AG and is the basis of Hug’s edition, and the Etonensis (Et.); while the other group consists of Dindorf’s D and the Bodleianus (Bod.), and is supported through a large portion of the passage covered by the papyrus by Stobaeus. The character of Dindorf’s R and the relation of it to the two main groups is uncertain. The papyrus on the whole supports the group represented by D, Bod. and Stobaeus, with which its readings agree against the AGC, Et., group about twice as often as vice versa, and adds a number of variants peculiar to itself. Though not of equal importance to that of the Oxyrhynchus fragment of the Anabasis (468), the text of which seems to represent the archetype from which the existing MSS. of that work are descended in two main traditions, the papyrus is of considerable interest.

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

Verso.
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[raw content]

14 lines lost

Recto.

61 ἐρχη τοὺς παρὰ Κυαξαρέ[()]' χρημασίν. εγώγε εφὴ ὁ Κυρος. § 9

οὐσθά δὲ εφὴ ὁποσά αὐτω εστίν. μα τὸν Δι: εφὴ ὁ Κυρος'.

ομω δὲ

οὐ μὲν δὴ ὁμος δὴ. τούτοις πιστείς τοῖς αδηλοῖς'. στὶ

δὲ πόλων μὲν ὀν δεησε πολλα δὲ και ἀλλα νυν αναγ

65 κη δαπαναν αὐτων γιωσκείς. γιωσκο εφὴ ὁ Κυρος'.

ἐαν οὖν εφὴ αὐτων επιληπη η δαπανη και ε[()]'ων ψευδη

tαι. πως σοι ἐξει τα της οπτατιας δῆλον στι οὐ καλως'.

ἀταρ εφὴ ω πατερ σοι ἐνοραίς τυνα πορον και απ' αμου
ematics, 1905.
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100 [οις αν εργαζότατε επείτησέ [εισιν δ’] θην γην αργοσαν ανω
φέλητον ευαι γε εμον εφη μηδέποτε αμελησοντος του]
[τα επιπθέδεα τοις στρατιωτασις συμμαχανασθαι
[
]

]

]

προς [σε []

]

ολον και τα’ ειν [ολην εκαλει δε και ετιμα οποτε τινας ιδια

II. 1. § 30

109 και τουτο []

2. πρακτικώτερος: so ADGR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; πραγματικότερος Et.
3. κολακεων: so ADG, Bod., Et., Dind.; κολακεινον R first hand.

αριστα: τα δροσα CDGR, Bod., Et., Dind.; αριστα A, Stob.
4. μεμνωτο: so AG (first hand, with η above the line in a later hand), Et., Dind.;
μεμνητο L; μεμνωτο corrected by the first hand to μεμνητο Bod.; μεμνητο D; μεμνητα Stob.
5. ωσατως: so DR, Bod.; ωσατως ουτως AG (with dots over ουτως), Et., Stob., Dind.
επιμελεσθασι: so MSS.; επιμελεσθασι Dind.
6. δι: so D, Bod., Stob.; δι’ γε AG, Dind.; δια Et.
ερχη: so MSS.; ερχει Dind.
7. θεων δεσποινος: so ADG (first hand) R, Et., Dind.; θεων δεσποινος ουτω διακειμενος
G marg. in later hand, and with ουτως Bod. which adds ἀληθεις δε ου πώσον'.

τευχθαν: so AGR, Bod., Et., Dind.; τευχθεινα D.
8. εις: so ADGR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; αν Et.
συγκεντρωσαν σατως: so MSS., Dind.; συγκεντρωσαν εαυτοι Stob.
9. προς φιλον, the original reading of the papyrus, agrees with AGR, Et., Dind.;
προσφυλετην, the correction, with D, Bod., Stob.
10. τους θεων οντας: so D, Bod., Stob.; οντας τοις θεωσ AG, Et., Dind.
11. οι πα: so DR, Bod., Stob.; ο πατηρ AG, Dind.; ο πατηρ C, Et., which has
ο above δ.

εκεινα μεμνησαι: so D, Bod.; μεμνησα ἐκείνα AGR, Et., Stob., Dind.
οποσα γαρ δησουν: so Bod., Stob.; ἄποδασερ δησου D, with dots over πο by a later
hand; οδ ἄπειρ R; οδ ἄπειρ AG, Et., Dind.
12. δεδωκασιν: so MSS., Dind.; δεδωκασιν ἡμιν Stob.
13. αυτειν: so AG (second hand), Dind.; αυτειν D, Stob.; αυτειν G (first hand) R
in an erasure, Et.

ἐν τι[μελον]γενει: so DR, Stob., Dind.; ἐπιμελαιμένους AG, Et. For βελτι[ων], κτλ.,
Bod. has και εργαζομενους μᾶλλον αυτεις ἡ ἀργομεν δες και ἐπιμελαιμένους ἀσφαλιστηρον γ’ ἀν
dιάγεν.
15. αν: so MSS. and Stob.; om. Dind. following Stephanus.
17. ον; om. Bod., Dind.; τά άγαθά ΑΓΡ, Et., Stob., Dind.; τά άγαθά τά Bod.
18. ον; so D, Bod.; τοιούτων G; τοιούτα AR, Et., Dind. There is certainly not room for Τοιούτα.
19. οντο; so D, Bod., Stob.; με ΑΓΡ, Et., Dind.
20. οντι; so D, Bod., Stob.; om. ΑGR, Et., Dind.
22. οντε; ούτως corr. to ούτε by second hand Bod.; ούτε other MSS., Dind. Similarly with οντε in l. 21.
23. τοιούτων; so D, Bod., Stob.; om. ΑGR, Et., Dind.
24. τοιούτων; so DGR, Bod., Et., Stob., Dind.; έκείνη A.
25. αντι: so Stob.; ούτε MSS., Dind.
26. αντι: so MSS., Dind.; αντι(βο)τ: so MSS., Dind.; αντι(βο)τας (Stob.) is equally possible.
27. τοιούτα και τα τοιούτα πατρα: so Bod., Stob., and (with the omission of πάντα) D; πάντα τά τοιούτα ΑΓΡ, Et., Dind.
28. αδέμιστα: so AG (corrected) ΛΜ, Bod., Stob.; αδεμιστα DEHRG (first hand), Et., Dind.
29. θεων; so ADG, Stob., Dind.; τῶν θεών R, Et.
31. αντι; so ADG, Bod., Et., Dind.; άποτε R.
32. άν; om. MSS., Dind. After δύνατο Bod. has άνδρη (sic).
33. άποτε: so D, Bod.; άποτε άν ΑGR, Et., Dind.
34. καλως τε: so Καλος MSS., Dind.
35. δοκιμω; so ADG, Bod., Et., Dind.; om. R.
36. τα άπειρα δεια; so MSS. here and in l. 37; τάπειρα δεια Dind.
37. άπονα: so D, Bod.; om. ΑGR, Et., Dind.
38. αν; so AD, Bod., Et., Dind.; om. G.; above the line in R.
39. αντι; so D, Bod.; άποτε άποτος ΑGR, Dind.; αγαθος άποτος ούτος Et.
40. και τοιουτοι αντος: so D, Bod.; επιστολες ΑΓ, Et., Dind.; έψι with dots underneath before επιστολατα L.
41. εκουςαι απαντα; so D, Bod.; εκουςαι πάντα ΑΓΡ, Et., Dind. What reading the papyrus had is uncertain.
42. αυτας: so ΑΓΡ, Et., Dind.
43. τοιος: so D, Bod., Stob.; αυτος MSS., Dind.
44. τοιος: so ADG, Bod., Et., Dind.; άτε σου D. It is unlikely that the papyrus had D's reading for άτος is rather long for the end of l. 39.
45. τοιαυτας: so D, Bod., Stob.; αυτοι MSS., Dind.
46. τοιαυτας γ; γ is omitted by R, Et., and Stob., inserted in ADG, Bod. (so Dind.). Considerations of space make it probable that the papyrus read γ. 
47. τοιαυτα] ία οι δοκει: the restoration of this is uncertain. We have followed the reading
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of Stobaeus ταύτα μου δοκεῖ, which suits the lacuna best. ταύτα μου τὰ αὐτὰ AG, and, with the addition of δοκεῖ, CR, Et.; ταύτα μου δοκεῖ ταύτα D.

43. [μετοικ.:] so D, Stob.; μέστοις AGR, Et., Dind. Which reading the papyrus had is uncertain.

44. [οὖν τε]: so D; om. τε RG (second hand in marg.), Dind.; οὖν τε οὖν τε διαγέρωνται ἄρχουσε καὶ is omitted by AG (first hand), Et., owing to homoioteleuton.

46. The restoration is uncertain. CR, Et. have εἶναι τοιοῦτος αὐτοῖς ὑποστήθαι, and so D with the omission of τὸ; εἶναι τοιοῦτος ὑποστῆ. A (so Dind.); εἶναι τοιοῦτος (apparently) ὑποστῆ, G, αὐτοῖς ὑποστῆς being added over the line by a later hand. Probably the papyrus originally had εἶναι τοιοῦτος ὑποστήθαι, οὖνται and perhaps αὐτοῖς being added over the line by the corrector.

61. ρῆχα: so MSS.; ῥῆχα Dind.

Κωβάρια, the corrected reading of the papyrus, agrees with D. CAGR agree with the reading of the first hand Κωβάρια. Κωβάρια D, Bod., Dind.

εἴρητα: ἔγραμ. Dind.

61-2. ο Κύριος σαβατ δὲ ἔφη: ο Κύριος τι δὲ ἔφη σαβατ CDR, Bod., Et., and in marg. by a later hand G, Dind.; om. AG (first hand).

62. εὐστ.: ιατρ., MSS., Dind.

63. ομως δο, the reading of the first hand, is clearly an error, and ought to have been erased by the corrector when he inserted ομως δο. οὐ μὲν δὴ σαβατ δῆμος δὲ D; οὐ μὲν δὴ δῆμος δὲ AGR, Bod., Et., Dind.

πιστευεῖ: so most MSS., Dind.; πιστεύει Bod.

64. υπὸ δήμου: σαφείς D, Bod.; σαφείς CR, Dind.; σαφείς Et.

πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα μὲν ἀναγκὴ διαπανοῦν αὐτόν: om. αὐτόν AGR, Et., Dind.; πολλά δὲ ἀναγκή αὐτὸν νῦν διαπανοῦν D, Bod.


66. εαυ τι οὖν ἔφη αυτον ἐπελήξῃ τὴν διαπανὴ καὶ: εἰν οὐν ἔφη αυτοῦ ἡ διαπάνῃ ὑπολείπῃ ἢ καὶ D, and with ὑπολείπῃ for ὑπολείπῃ Bod. ἢν οὐν ἔφη ἐπελήξῃ αὐτοῦ ἡ διαπάνῃ ἢ καὶ A, Et., Dind., R (with ἐπελήξῃ by the first hand) and (with ἢ added by a later hand) G.

ψευδῖται: so D; ψευδῆ A; ψευδῖται G, Bod.; ψευδῖται CR, Et., Dind.

67. πῶς σαφείς: so CDR, Bod., Et.; ὁ παῖ πῶς ἄρ′ ἐξεί (or perhaps ἄρ′) G, Dind.; ὁ παῖ πῶς ἄρες οἱκ. Ἀ.

δικαίως οὐ καὶ καλῶς: so AGR, Et., Dind.; οὐ καλῶς δήλων ὅτι D and (reading δηλῶντι) Bod.

68. εἴρη ως πατερ: so AGR, Et., Dind.; ὁ παῖτερ ἔφη D, Bod.

69. προσγενημένων: so DR, Bod., Dind. AG, Et. agree with the reading of the first hand προσγενήμενων.


εἰ τις [αἱ]: so DG (second hand in marg.), Bod.; εἰ τις Stob.; πῶς ἄν R; ποῦ ἄν AG (first hand), Dind.; τά ἰδια Et.

προσγενήσεται: so D, Bod., Stob., Dind.; γένοσε AG (first hand, τακτικῶν being added in the margin) R, Et.

71. ὁ: so ADGR, Et., Stob., Dind.; ὁ δι’ Bod.

εἴρη: so D, Stob.; εἴρη ἐκτὰ CAGR, Et., Dind.; om. Bod., which also omits πάρον. γένοσθαι: so D, Bod., Et., Stob. (Hug); προσγενεσθαι AGR, Dind.


εἰρήν ειδέναι: so D, Bod., Et.; εἴδειν δὲ εἰρήν AGR, Dind.

73. εἴρη: so MSS.; ἔγραμ Dind.

οὔ: so AG (first hand) R, Et., Dind.; εἴ ὁδ’ DG (second hand), Bod.
74. Μηθωρ: so ADGR, Dind.; τῶν Μήθωρ Bod., Et.
75. αυμμαχομ: so ADG, Bod., Dind.; om. R; δοκεί εἰσαι σύμμαχον έσται Et.
δοκεί: so Bod.; δοκεί τι (apparently) D; δοκεί σου AGR, Et., Dind.
77. παθή: so ADGR, Bod., Dind.; πάθα Et.
κοινω: this word is placed before συν by the MSS. and Dind.
78. επιλιπτ.: so AGR, Et., Dind.; ύπολειπτή Β, Bod.
υμάς: so ADGR, Bod., Dind.; ήμάς Et.
εἴθους: 'εἴθους δ' Dind. with all MSS. except Et., which has καί 'εἴθους μοι μέριμνην added
by a second hand in the margin against έκακα μεθανάσθαι προσάδων πόρων τάς δέ πάνω πόλεις πάσω
μάλιστα.
79. μηθωρ: so D, Bod.; μεθανάσθαι AGR, Et., Dind.
tο[θ]= : so CDR, Bod., Et., Stob. Flor. 48. 71, Dind.; τό AG.
81. τα επιστ. δ' έλασ: cf. note on l. 34.
ε'τ' : so ADG, Bod., Et., Stob., Anon. ap. Boisson, Anecd. i. p. 113, Dind.; έτος R.
82. σταυρον ... επιστροφέ: so AGR (second hand), Et., Stob., Anon., Dind.; ότα ... επιστροφέ D;
οτέ μέν ... επιστροφέ Β, ήτο ... επιστροφέ R (first hand),
μ(άλλης μέριμνη): so DG (in marg. by second hand), Stob.; om. μ(άλλης AG (first hand)
R, Et., Anon., Dind.
83. τευχή: so D, Anon. (?), Et., Dind.; τευχή Α; τευχή GR, Bod., Stob.
οπεριείκη δοκων: so D, Bod., Stob.; οπεριείκη δοκών εϊσαι Α, Et., Anon., G (omitting δοκών),
and (στρογγοι being added in a later hand) L, Dind. απεριείκη εϊσαι is too long
for the lacuna.
84. και: so D, Stob.; καί έτι GR, Bod., Et., Dind.; καί αίτι Α.
σταυρομ: so perhaps R (first hand, σ being over an erasure); αὐτοῦ AL (first hand);
cταυροτ D; σταυρού G, Et., Stob., Dind.; σταυρόν (σ corr. from τ) Bod.
85. σταυρο: so ADGR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; ταύτων Et.
δε: so ADR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; δὴ G.
αλλον[π]: so AGR, Et., Dind.; τῶν ἄλλων D, Bod., Stob.
86. των: so AG (second hand) R, Bod., Dind.; των DG (first hand?), Et., Stob.
βολων: so ADGR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; βολές Et.
eυ: so D, Bod., Et.; ἐ εΔGR, Stob., Dind.
παραγορι: so ADG, Bod., Et., Stob., Dind.; παραγορι R (first hand apparently).
την δυνάμει: so here AGR, Et., Dind.; D, Bod., and Stob. place it after βολάς.
87. ες αν ομιλε τα δεκα τοις στρατιωτικοις υπηργοιαν σωι: so, with the exception of έξωι
for έξωι AGR, Et., Dind.; ές δω έξωι δπ. σοι αι ατρ. έξωιτε τα δεκατα D, Bod.; υπηργοιανοι
οι στρατιωτικοις έξωιτε τα δεκατα Στοβ.
88. πιστικωτάτους δε λεγων σαφ εαθε τοτε δυσηρε λεγειν: so, with δυσηρε corrected from
dυσηρε by second hand, D, and, with δυσηρε, Stob.; πιστικώτερου τους δε λεγων κτλ. corr.
to και πιστικώτατους τους λεγων κτλ. Bod.; και πιστικώτατοι σιβ ήθε δυσηρε λέγων τότε
λέγειν Et.; πιστικώτερους σαφ ήθε δυσηρε τότε λέγειν AG and, with δυσηρε λέγων, R;
πιστικώτερους σαφ ήθε δυσηρε δυσηρε τότε λέγειν Dind. It is tolerably certain that the
papyrus had δυσηρε not δυσηρε.
89. σταυροσ: so CDR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; σταυροσ A; σταυροσ G; σταυροσ Et.
παιει εαθενω ων και εν: so D, Stob.; και εν παίειν λεγών δω AGR, Et., Dind.; εν παίειν
λεγών ων και κακως (και κακος εν τασατα) Bod.
91. δοκείς ταυτα παντα καλως λειγειν: so D; καλως δοκείς ταυτα λέγειν παντα AGR and
(λέγειν) Et., Dind., and (omitting παντα and with καλως ... ταυτα εν τασατα) Bod.
α[m]νυν λεγωματα: so DR; α μνυν αυ νυν ληψε. Bod.; α μνυν αυ νυν ληψε. G (first hand),
with μνυν αυ νυν added in marg. by a later hand; δω μνυν νυν λεγοματα ληψεθαλα Α, Et., Dind.,
with which the reading of the first hand in the papyrus so far agrees in having νυν.
Two fragments from the conclusion of the first book of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, with the title, which is written, as usual, below the final column. We assign the small detached piece from § 45 to the previous column owing to the height of the papyrus. It is remarkable that what according to the accepted division are the opening words of Book ii, ης άγκτα μέν . . . Περιεύνον, are here made the last sentence of Book i. The text does not otherwise differ from that of Dindorf.

On the verso of the papyrus are parts of two columns of a money-account in a cursive hand, which apparently is not later than about the middle of the third century. The text on the recto, therefore, which is written in sloping
699. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

Oval uncials of the common type, is to be assigned to the earlier part of the century.

Col. i.

υπ αυτων τουτων δικειν [μιχειρ των οριων της Περ]
edosan pollois δ' όυκ ηη [κεσεν]

Col. ii.

ουδεν θαυμαστην ου
γαρ αναγκη αυτωις εστιν
5 ων αν μη εθελωσιν [επι
μελεσθαι τοιαυτα [μεν δη
αφικοντο διαλεγομενοι

5. The vestiges are rather in favour of εθελωσιν (R), but θελωσιν (ADG) is not impossible.
6. τοιαυτα: so AD; ταυτα G corr. marg.
As already observed in the introduction, this sentence commences the next Book according to the ordinary division.

699. THEOPHRASTUS, Characters.

7 x 4.2 cm.

The text of the Characters of Theophrastus is notoriously insecure, and offers a problem upon which an early papyrus of any part of the book might be expected to throw some light. The present fragment, which contains the end of ch. 25 and the beginning of ch. 26, is however disappointing in this respect, giving a version which seems to be not less of the nature of a compendium than that of the Codex Monacensis. Unfortunately that MS. includes only the first twenty-one chapters so that an actual comparison is not possible. The interest of the papyrus, therefore, chiefly lies in showing the antiquity of such compendia of the Characters. It is written in rather small oval uncials, which probably date from the earlier part of the third century.
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1-4. The conclusion of ch. 25 (περὶ δειλίας) in the ordinary version is καὶ διαγείρθη ὡς κυκλινείας ἐνά σίσωκα τῶν ἕλων· καὶ εἰσόγειν πρὸς τὸν κατασκίμαν σκέψωμιν τοῖς δημόσιοι καὶ τοῖς φιλάτας, καὶ τούτον ἁμα ἐκάστο τι διαγείρθη ὡς αὐτὸς αὐτὸν ταῖς ἑαυτοῖς ἱπτικῇ ἐκώσειν. Η λέγει, in l. 2 is right there is no room for εἰκώσεις. Λητη (not φιλάτη), which is an alternative, suggests nothing. In l. 4 after [νην] is a broad blank space marking the end of the chapter.

5. Ch. 26 (περὶ ὀλιγαρχίας) begins δόξεων (δ') δὲ εἶναι ἡ ὀλιγαρχία φιλαρχία τε κισχυρὸς κέρδως γλυκομήν. ὃ δὲ ὀλιγαρχικὸς τοιοῦτος οἶος τοῦ δῆμου βουλευτικοῦ (βουλοῦ. MSS.) τίνας τῷ ἄρχοντι προσαρμοσθαι (προαιρ. MSS.) τῆς ποιμής τῶν συνεμελησιφρόνων παρελθέν τῶν ἀποφήματα (ἀποφήμα τὰς ΜΣ.; ὃς δὲ αὐτοκράτορα τοῦτον εἶναι κἂν ἄλλοι προβηλλοῦντο δέκα λέγει ταῖς εἰς ἄστιν, τοῦτον οὐ δέ οὔτε ἐπί τότε εἶναι, καὶ τῶν Ὀμήρου ἐπί τούτο ἐν μόνου κατέχειν, διὶ οὐκ ἄγαθον, κ.τ.λ. (omitting εἰς βασιλείας). The definition of ὀλιγαρχία has generally been recognized as unsatisfactory and the MSS. disagree, Pal.-Vat. omitting φιλαρχία and the others reading ισχυρῶς for ισχυρὸς. The papyrus variant ισχυρός, which gives the sense aimed at by Fischer’s emendation of κέρδους to κράτους, is very likely right, though the word at the end of l. 6 remains doubtful. The first letter, if not υ, seems to be γ, η, or π. Besides being much more compressed the text of the papyrus shows a different order, ll. 12-4 corresponding to what in the MSS. precedes the Homeric quotation. In ll. 9 sqq. it is not certain that μν, νος, κ.τ.λ. are the beginnings of the lines since the papyrus is broken immediately before those letters; but the arrangement proposed is the most probable.

700. DEMOSTHENES, De Corona.

14·5 × 4·4 cm.

This fragment is a strip from the bottom of a column containing parts of pp. 230-1 of the De Corona. The lines being incomplete both at beginning and end, it is doubtful how they should be divided; the arrangement given below is therefore hypothetical. The hand is a rather irregular upright uncial of medium size, and more probably of the second century than the third. A high point is occasionally used, this and the diaeresis being the only lection
marks that occur. Our collations in this and the other oratorical fragments (701-4) are with the Teubner edition of Blas.

5 ρον εκα|στα θεωρη[ν] Φωκί
cou συνήςταντος πολεμ[ι]ον ου δι ε
με ου γαρ] εγωγε επολιτεύομην πω
tote πρωτον μεν υμ[ες ο[υ]τω διε
[κεισθε ωςε Φωκεας μεν βουλε]
10 σαι σω|βηναι και|περ ου δικαια ποι
ουντα]ς οροντες [Θηβαιοις δε ο
τιαυ αυ] εφησθηναι πο[θουσιν
ουκ αλογως] [ο]υδ άδικως α[υ]τοις οργι
[σομενοι ο]ης γαρ ευτυχησαν εν
15 Λευκτρο|ις [ο]υ μετριως εκε|χρηντο ε
πειτα τη Π]ε[ξοπονησοσ αφ[ιισα δι
εισθηκει] και ουθ ο[ι] μισο[ντες
Λακεδαι]μονιοι ισχυον [ου]τος
ωστε ανελειν αυτοις ουθ οι προ
20 τερον δι] εκεινω[ν αρχοντες κυ
ριοι τοι] πολεων ησαν: α[λλα της
ην ακρι]τοι και παρα τουτοις . . . .
. . ερι]ς και ταραχην ταυτα δε ο
ρον ο Φιλ]ιπποι ου γαρ ην α[φαινη
ματα αν]αλισκοι παντας [|

3. διωγε, which Bl(ass) omits after ανομη~σαι with SL, may have stood in the papyrus.
4. παροντα which was first written was a mere slip.
5. The correction is probably by a second hand.
8. The papyrus most likely had either τοῦτο or ποτα, like the other MSS. [τότε] Bl.
14. ευτυχήσον: ητυχήσον Bl.
18. ἰχθον [οὐσις: οὐσις ἰχθον MSS.

22–3. The usual reading here is καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἄπαντι ἤμι, but some MSS. (including FYQO) omit παρὰ, O adding ἔλληνισι after ἄπαντι, which is noticed as a variant also in FQ. It is manifest that none of these readings suits the papyrus, for only six or seven letters are required between τουτοὶς καὶ ἤμι. καὶ παρὰν οὐ σαπάην might be read, or we may suppose that the scribe was led by the homoioteleuton of τότος and ἄλλως to write simply τούτος σαπάην. The entry at the bottom of the column (probably by a second hand), where O's variant ἔλληνισι is followed by ἔνω (cf. e.g. 223. 126), evidently refers to this passage; but how much, if anything, stood before ἔλληνισι cannot of course be determined. In l. 23 l. τῷραχή.

701. DEMOSTHENES, Contra Timocretam.

15.7 x 14.6 cm.

Parts of three rather short and narrow columns (about 16 x 5 cm.), covering pp. 720–1 of Demosthenes' speech against Timocrates. Of the first and third columns only a few letters remain, but the lower portion of the intervening one is complete. The text, which is written in handsome round uncialis (cf. 661, Plate v), probably of the end of the second century or of the first half of the third, seems, so far as can be judged, to be a fairly good one.

Col. i.

τοὺς ἐν
[δέκα εἰς τὸ δίκαισθη]
[μεροὺς αὐτὸς αὖ]

Col. ii.

5 ἡ ἀποτ[ε]σθα[ί εαν
δὲ ἀργυροῦν τιμή
θην δεδεσθὼ τε
ως αὖ ἐκτισθή ο τι
αὐτὸν καταγω

15 εαν δὲ ἀργυριοῦν τι
μηθη δεδεσθὼ
τεως αὖ εκτ[ε][ε]ισθη:

πεπανούσο εστὶν
ουν οπως εναν
Demosthenes, Contra Boeotum.

A small fragment from Demosthenes' oration against Boeotus, pp. 1023-4, written in good-sized uncial which on the whole approximate to the square...
type, though ϵ and C have a tendency to become narrow, and which we should ascribe to the second century, and perhaps the earlier part of it. The text has no variants of importance.

\[\begin{align*}
\text{δεινοπαθὼν τήν} & \\
\text{προῖκα μου τῆς μὴ} & \\
\text{πρὸς ἀποστερησῆι} & \\
\text{ἀλλ' \ νμεῖς \ ω \ αὐτὸσ' \ δρεῖ} & \text{p. 1024} \\
\text{δικάσ'τα} & \\
\text{πρὸς Διὸς} & \\
\text{καὶ \ θεῶν \ μὴ \ κατὰ} & \\
\text{πλαγιήτε} & \\
\text{υπὸ τῆς} & \\
\end{align*}\]

7. \(\text{oμούσι: so MSS. ; \ οἴτος Bll(ass)}\).
8. \(\text{ννν: so Bl. with S, &c. ; ννν FQ.}\)
9. \(\text{τήν: so FQ ; καὶ τήν Bl. with S, &c.}\)
10. \(\text{μοῦ: so ρ; \ μὲ Bl. with S, &c.}\)

703. **Aeschines, In Ctesiphontem.**

\(9 \times 9\) cm.

This small fragment, containing parts of §§ 94 and 96 of Aeschines' speech against Ctesiphon, belongs to what must have been an exceptionally interesting text, for in spite of its insignificant size it has three new readings, all of which are or may be improvements. The handwriting is in oval sloping uncial of the usual third century type. High stops and a paragraphus occur.

**Col. i.**

\[\begin{align*}
10 \begin{align*}
\text{αλλο} & \text{ω'[ς] \ τῆ[α]ν} & \text{[Ε]} & \text{αλη[ν]ων} & \\
\text{ους} & \text{βουλεσθαι} & \text{[κ']ρο[ινων'ειν]} & \\
\text{τῆς} & \text{συνταξεως' \ ωστ[ε]} & \\
\text{ουτε} & \text{χρηματων} & \text{ούτε} & \\
\text{στρατιωτ[ων] \ απορία[ν]} & \\
\text{15} & \text{εσεσθαι' καὶ \ ταυτα \ μεν} & \\
\end{align*}
\end{align*}\]

**Col. ii.**

\[\begin{align*}
\text{δη \ τα \ φανερα' \ εφη} & \text{δι[ε]} & \\
\end{align*}\]
704. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

704. Isocrates, Contra Sophistas.

7.9 x 10.3 cm.

Parts of two columns containing portions of §§ 16–18 of Isocrates' oration (xiii) against the sophists, written in sloping oval uncial letters of the usual third century type. The text contains no striking variants.

Col. i. Col. ii.

[προελευσθαί καὶ] § 16
[μέγασθαί πρὸς αλ] τῶν διδάκτων
[ληθα] καὶ τάξα
[σθα] κατὰ τροπὸν

5 ἐτὶ δὲ τῶν καίρων

μὴ διαμαρτεῖν ἀλ
[λά] καὶ τοῖς εὐθυμή[η]

μασ[ε] πρεποῦσης

ολοι[ν] τὸν λόγον κα

10 τὰ[π]ο[ι]κελαὶ κα[ὶ]

τοῖς οὐνομασίν εὐ
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

μυθωμε και μ'ουσι

[k]'ορ ειπεν ταύτα § 17

δε πολλης επιμε

νηθεντα[ς ευθυς

και χ[αριστερον

των αλλων φαι

2. [μισουσι: so ΓΔ (first hand) ΕΘ; Bl. follows Plan. and Δ (corr.) in reading μίσω, which is too short to suit the papyrus. Cf. the next note.

3-4. ταξις θαμ: so ΓΔΘ; τάξιν Bl.

23. μμοσοσι: μμοσοσι Bl. with ΓΔΘ; μμοσοσι vulgo. The papyrus reading is an error for μμοσοσι.

25. ανθρωποερον by itself is not sufficient to fill up this line; τε or τι, which is not found in the MSS, may be inserted.

IV. DOCUMENTS, CHIEFLY OF THE ROMAN PERIOD.

(a) OFFICIAL.

705. TWO PETITIONS TO THE EMPERORS WITH REPLIES.

21·2 x 46 cm. A.D. 200-2.

A generous effort to lighten some of the burdens which weighed upon the unfortunate Egyptians in the Roman period is recorded in these copies of two petitions to Septimius Severus and Caracalla, to which the Emperors' replies are, as usual, prefixed instead of being appended. The document, which is written in a rude uncial hand on the verso of 740, contained four columns, but of these the first and last are too incomplete to have any value. A mention of the praefect Laetus in l. 40 fixes the date within the years 200-2.

The writer of both petitions is Aurelius Horion, who had held high offices at Alexandria and was a rich landowner in the Oxyrhynchite nome; his object
in both cases was to secure the Imperial guarantee that certain benefactions which he proposed to found in that district would be permanently maintained. In the first petition (ll. 15-53) it is Oxyrhynchus itself which is to be the recipient of his favour, and the earlier part of the letter, as far as l. 42, is devoted to an interesting sketch of the claims which that city possessed upon the Imperial consideration. After the lengthy introduction (ll. 15-21), which can be restored on the analogy of ll. 65-8, and nine mutilated lines, Aurelius Horion reminds the Emperors (ll. 31-5) of the loyalty, fidelity, and friendship towards the Romans which the Oxyrhynchites had displayed both by helping them in the war against the Jews, and continuing up to the present to celebrate the day of victory by an annual festival. This war refers to some Jewish rising in Egypt which perhaps took place not long before the date of the letter, like the Jewish rebellion in the reign of Hadrian mentioned in B. G. U. 889; but it would seem from the use of the word πολεμος to have been on a larger scale than the revolt in Hadrian's time. Aurelius Horion's next argument (ll. 36-9) is Moreover, you yourselves honoured the Oxyrhynchites when you visited the country, by allowing them to enter your judgement-seat first after the Pelusiots. This well illustrates the importance which Oxyrhynchus had attained by A.D. 200, when it was one of the chief towns in Egypt, and already ranked above Memphis. Thirdly (ll. 39-42), Aurelius Horion appeals to the opinion of the city held by the prefect, Laetus, who will, he says, bear evidence in its favour. After these preliminaries the writer comes to his scheme (ll. 42-51). Owing to the imperfect condition of ll. 42-6 the details are not quite clear, but apparently Aurelius Horion proposed to devote, nominally in the form of a loan, a large sum of money which was to be invested, and of which the interest was to be expended upon maintaining the annual contests of ephebi at Oxyrhynchus upon the same scale of splendour as that of similar contests elsewhere, perhaps at Antinoe (cf. l. 50, note). The petition concludes (ll. 51-3) with the request that the Emperors will give orders forbidding the diversion of the benefaction to any other purpose than that intended by its founder. The answer of the Emperors (ll. 1-14) is for the most part lost, but that it was of a favourable character is made certain by direct references to it in their answer to the second petition (cf. l. 59 καὶ ταύτης, 61 τῷ ἄμοιν δὴ καὶ [π] τούτῳ φιλαξθέται). It is pleasing to know that Oxyrhynchus enjoyed the fruits of Aurelius Horion's generosity for more than a century; for in 80, written in A.D. 323, we find the logistes, unmindful of the clash of empires, quietly issuing a notice that the gymnastic display by the ephebi will take place on the following day.

The second petition (ll. 65-90) is practically complete, so far as it goes, and
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deals with a plan for benefiting certain villages in the Oxyrhynchite nome, the inhabitants of which had been so exhausted by the annual λειτουργίαι in the form of contributions to the State and compulsory obligations to act as guards that there was a prospect of the land being deserted. Aurelius Horion therefore proposed to present each village with a sum of money to be invested in hay, the yearly revenue being devoted to the assistance of the inhabitants on whom the λειτουργίαι fell. To this the Emperors reply (ll. 54–63), signifying their approval of this scheme as of the former one, and guaranteeing the continuance of the benefaction.

Col. i.

[Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Δούκιος Σ]επτήμ.ιο'ς
[Σκούρος Εὐσεβῆς Περτίναξ Σ]εβαστὸς
[Ἀραβικός Ἀδιαβρικὸς Πα]θικὸς
[Μέγιστος καὶ Αὐτ[οκράτωρ Κ[αί]σαρ
5 [Μάρκος Αὐρήλιος Ἀυ]τωνύμος Εὐ[σεβής
[Σεβαστὸς ]

[Αὐρήλιῳ Ωρείων Ὑδέρειν.
[ 15 letters ] . ηχο[. . . . . . .] ἐπεθυμ.
[ 13 ] τὸν Ὀξυρυγχεῖτον ]συ-
[ 15 ] μας εἰς τ[. . . . . . .]ν

5 [τοῖς εὐμενεστάτοις Αὐτοκράτοροι [Σ]εο[. . . . .]ρρ
[καὶ Αὐτονύμῳ τοῖς] πάντων [ἀ] γραφῶν
[σωτηρίᾳ καὶ εὐεργεταῖς Αὐρήλιος
[Ωρείων γενόμενοι στρατηγὸς καὶ ἀρχι-
[δικάστῃς τῆς λαμπροτάτης πόλεις τῶν
20 [Ἀλεξανδρεῖων] χαίρειν.
[ . . . . ὁ φιλανθρωπῶν]πάτατοι Αὐτοκράτορες
[ 14 letters ] . τῇ πόλει μεγάλῃ

Col. ii.

α', . . . . . . .]ον καὶ αλ[. . . σαμ[. . . λοι[. . . .

30 . . [.] π'λειόω δὲν ὁ [λ'γος ἐμὲ τί. . . λ'ανθά'νει,] πρόσεπτε[ι] δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ πρὸς Ῥώμαιον εὐ'οι-ά τε καὶ πίστις καὶ φιλία ἦν ἐνεδείξαντο καὶ κατὰ τὸν πρὸς Ἑλουθάιους πόλεμον συμμαχή-

35 παντας καὶ ἔτι καὶ νῦν τὴν τῶν ἐπινεικίων ἡμέραν ἑκάστου έτους πανηγυρίζοντας.

ἐτειμήσατε μὲν οὖν καὶ ύμεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐπιδη-

μῆσα[α]ντες τῷ ἔθει πρῶτοι μετὰ Πηλου-

σιώτας μεταδότας τής εἰς τὸ δ'ίκαιατήριον ὑμῶν εἰσόδου, γνωρίζει δὲ τὴν πόλιν καὶ ὁ λαμπρότα-

τος Δαίτος ἐπὶ τε τοῖς καλλίστοις καὶ ἐλευθερω-

τάτοις ἔχοντας τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντ' ἰς καὶ πτ. . . .

μειο[.] ἐπιεικεστάτοις. διαδ' 13 letters
tὴν πόλιν ἡθέλησα μηδ[.] 13 "
tὼ[ν] ἠμετέρων καταλιπ[.] 13 "

45 τρη[.]ἐμῦν καὶ τοὺς ὑπνυμ[.] 13 "


τας δανείζεσθαι τε καὶ φυλ[ασσε]βαὶ καθὰ ἐπὶ

τῶν προτέρων ὄρισται, τὲν δὲ] σ[ν]αγόμενον

τῷ[κ]ν χαρέων εἰς ἑπαθλὰ ἐφήβων τῶν παρ' αὐ-

το[ς] καὶ τοῖς ἀγωνιομένων ἐφ' οῖς καὶ[.] οἱ Ἀγ-

t[ι[ο[ς]] γ[ο[ι][ς]]] μὲν ἀγωνίζοντε. καὶ ἀξιώ
καὶ ταῦτα χρήματα μηδενὶ ἐξεῖν[α]ε εἰς ἄλ-

Col. iii.

Αὐτοκράτωρ Κάισαρ Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Α.[ο]ύκιος [Σεμπτίμιος Σεμπτίμιος Σεμπτίμιος Σεμπτίμιος Σεμπτίμιος]

55 Ἐυσεβῆς[ς] ΠερτύναζΣεβαστός Αραβικός Ἀραβικός Παρθικός Μεγίστον Κ[α]ί Αὐτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ

Μάρκος[ς] Αὐρήλιος Αὐτοκράτορ Καίσαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ Κάισαρ

60 Αὐρήλιος ‘Ορέων Χαίρειν.

ἀποδεχόμεθα σε καὶ ταύτης τῆς ἐπιδίδεσις ἢν

τοῖς εὐμενεστάτοις Αὐτοκράτορι Σεμπτίμιος Σεμπτίμιος Σεμπτίμιος Σεμπτίμιος Σεμπτίμιος Σεμπτίμιος Σεμπτίμιος Σεμπτίμιος

τοῖς πάντων ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίαν [κ]αὶ εὐεργεταῖς

Ἀψεβῆς Παρθικός Ἐπίσκοπος καὶ Ἀρχιδιάκος-

κώμαι τινες τοῦ Ἀραβικοῦ ομοίου, ὁ φιλανθρωπάτα-

τοῖς Αὐτοκράτορες, ἐν αἷς ἐγώ τε (καὶ) οἱ υἱοὶ μου χαίρειν κεκτήμε-

θα σφίξθοντος ἐξησθένησαν ἐνοχλοῦμεναι ὑπὸ τῶν κατ᾽ ἐτος

λειτουργίων τοῦ τε ταμείου καὶ τῆς παρα[φρά]σις τῶν τότων, κυνδυνεύοντε τε τῷ μὲν ταμείῳ παραπολέ-

σθαι τὴν δὲ ὑμετέραν γῆν ἀγεώργητον καταλιπεῖν.

75 ἐγὼ [ο]ὐν καὶ τοῦ φιλανθρώπου καὶ τοῦ χρησίμου στοχαι-

τοῖς ὑμεῖς βούκολαι εἰς ἀνάκτησιν αὐτῶν ἐπίδοσίν τινα βραχεῖαν ἐκάστη ποιήσασθαι εἰς συνωνήν

χάρτιν οὗ ἡ πρόσοδος κατατεθήσεται εἰς τροφάς καὶ

βαπάρας τῶν κατ’ ἐτος λειτουργήσοντων ἐπὶ τῷ

55. Ἐ σεβαστὸς inserted later, τοι being above the line. 1. Ἀραβικός. s of ἀδιαβροῦς corr. from v. 56. ν. Parth. Μεγίστον. 57. Final s of Ἐυσεβῆς inserted above the line. 70. ἰδίω. 74. ἡμετέρα (?)

Col. iv.

(80) lost, (81) [, (82) λ[, (83) τ[, (84) τ[τ[, (85) β[β[, (86) ετ[, (87) και[, (88) μπ[[, (89) τον[, (90) φ[. [
8. The first word probably was or corresponded to ἀποδεξίωμεθα; cf. l. 59.

20. The position of χαίρειν after, instead of before, the nominative (cf. l. 68), is unusual.

42. Perhaps διὰ δ’ ταῦτα.

46. ὁκ ἀποτίτων ἄττικῶν μυρίων would refer to the sum which Aurelius Horion proposed to spend, but if ἀποτιτῶν is supplied at the end of l. 45 (it cannot come in l. 46) the amount seems enormous. Possibly ἄττικῶν is masculine and should be separated from μυρίων.

47. δανίζεσθαι: the benefaction apparently took the form of a loan to the city, but since the interest was devoted to public purposes, it was to all intents a gift; cf. the similar case in ll. 76–8.

50. Ἰτι; νῦν is very doubtful, though a proper name would be expected. The ν at the end of l. 50 is fairly certain, the only alternative being γε, but the second ν could equally well be i. For νυ, ειων can be read.

54–79. 'The Emperor Caesar Lucius Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax Augustus Arabicus Adiabenicus Parthenicus Maximus and the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius Augustus to Aurelius Horion, greeting. We approve of this benefaction also which you request leave to confer upon the villages of the Oxyrhynchite nome, giving (to different persons) a succession in the enjoyment of it (?). The same rule shall be observed in this case also, and, as you wish, no change shall be introduced which would divert the gift to any other purpose.

'The request is as follows:—

'To the most gracious Emperors, Severus and Antoninus, the savours and benefactors of the world, Aurelius Horion, formerly strategus and archidaces of the most illustrious city of Alexandria, greeting. Certain villages in the Oxyrhynchite nome, most humane Emperors, in which both I and my sons own estates, are utterly exhausted by the burden-some demands of the annual δανίζεσθαι required both for the Treasury and the protection of the districts, and there is a danger of their being ruined as far as the Treasury is concerned and leaving our (?) land uncultivated. Accordingly having before me a both humane and useful object I wish, in order that they may recover, to make a trifling benefaction to each one for the purchase of hay, the revenue of which shall be devoted to the maintenance and support of those who are annually subject to the δανίζεσθαι on condition that . . . ?'

61. αὐτῶν ἑυστήρεως no doubt refers to something which was explained more fully in ll. 80 sqq., and owing to the loss of these the meaning is uncertain. We have supposed the sense to be that the inhabitants would enjoy the fruit of the benefaction successively as they were called upon to undertake the δανίζεσθαι.

62–3. ἀμετάστρητον εἰς ἔτερον κ.τ.λ.: two ideas seem to be confused, (1) the gift is to be ἀμετάστρητον, (2) it is forbidden (sc. μὴ ἔξεται) to spend it on other purposes.

74. ἀρσέως may be right, referring to ἑυστήρεος or ὑστηρίκη γῆ; but since the scribe is not very accurate, and Aurelius Horion has mentioned his own land in l. 70, the correction ἀρσέως is more probable.

77. εἰς συνωφνήν Χ' ἀρτιον: cf. 507. 24. The details of the scheme are somewhat obscure, but it is clear that the benefaction would extend over a series of years, and unless the ἐπίδοσις was an annual present (in which case the necessity for having an Imperial guarantee for its continuance seems pointless), it must have been a capital sum of money which produced a yearly revenue; cf. the first petition, especially ll. 48–9. Apparently the revenue of the ἐπίδοσις was to be assigned to the different villages, i.e. placed in charge
of the chief men, and invested in hay, the profits from the sale of which were to be assigned to the persons who in any year were burdened with λειτουργία. Why Aurelius Horion selected this particular form for his benefaction we cannot say; but 507 suggests that good profits were to be made out of hay, presumably by buying it cheap and selling it dear.


16-6 x 10-8 cm. About A.D. 115.

Conclusion of a report of a case tried before M. Rutilius Lupus, praefect in A.D. 114-7. The litigants were Damarion, apparently a freedman, and his patron Heraclides; but owing to the mutilation of the papyrus the precise nature of the question at issue is not clear. Damarion asserted that Heraclides had accepted from him a sum of money in settlement of all claims, but the praefect nevertheless gave an entirely adverse judgement, and threatened to have him beaten if further complaints were made. The most interesting point is the opposition between the native Egyptian law and the ἀστικοὶ νόμοι, i.e. the law of Alexandria, which conferred certain powers upon the patrons of liberated slaves in relation to the slaves so liberated, and upon which the decision of the praefect is based. No doubt Heraclides was an Alexandrian citizen.

[ 11 letters ] παρ' Ἀγνυτίγις 18 letters
[ τοῦς ἀπελευθ[έ]ρους τοῖς πάτρωι, τῶν δὲ Ἡρα[κ]λείδην
[ 5 πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ] ἀναγύνοντο τὸ χειρόγραφον Δούπος
[ βουλευσάμενος μετὰ τῶν φίλων ἀπεφήνατο οὕτως· [ἐν μὲν τοῖς τῶν] Ἀγνυτίων νόμοις οὔθεν περὶ τῆς
[ 14 letters ] ης ἐξουσίας τῶν ἀπελευθεροσάντων
[ 15 16 ] ἁ]κολουθοῖς τοῖς ἀστικοῖς νόμοις
[ 11 12 ] ου καὶ προστήθημι εὰν σε μέμψηται
6. βαουευτόμενος κ.τ.λ.: cf. e.g. P. Catt. iv. 12, 19, and P. Goodsp. 29. iii. 1, where read ἄφετε(τ) ἡμᾶς.
7. τοῖς ἀστικοῖς νόμοις: cf. the common use of ἀστικός and ἀστή to designate citizens of Alexandria, e.g. 271. 3, 477. 14. That Alexandrians enjoyed certain privileges, especially with regard to taxation, is well-known, but the present seems to be the first direct reference to a peculiar code of law. Lumbroso had indeed already inferred (I'EgiHo, p. 65) from the distinction drawn between citizens of Alexandria and others in the matter of corporal punishment (Philo, in Flac. c. 10) that there were also differences of law and procedure; and this view now finds ample confirmation. Cf. the contrast in the Ptolemaic period between the πολιτικοὶ νόμοι (i.e. laws particularly affecting the Greeks, P. Tebt. 1. p. 58) and the τῆς χώρας νόμοι in P. Taur. 1. iv. 17 and vii. 9.
8. ἑλεοκοπηθῆναι: cf. 653 ἐὰν μὴ ποιήσῃς οὐ μόνον κατακριθῆς ἄλλα καὶ διαρρέει. Perhaps Ἡρακλεῖδης is to be supplied at the beginning of the line, though this would place Damarion entirely at his opponent's mercy.


26 x 31.5 cm. About A.D. 136.

What remains of this account of a trial before some magistrate—the particular court is not specified—consists chiefly of the opening speech of the counsel for the plaintiff Plutarchus. The prime cause of the dispute was the failure of one of the defendants, Philinus, to fulfil the terms of a contract, a copy of which is prefixed (Col. i), made by him with a woman named Demetria for the lease of a vineyard and orchard. Philinus had undertaken to carry out certain improvements, in consideration of which he had received from Demetria a sum of 2000 drachmae. The promised improvements, however, were not effected; and the obligations of Philinus were subsequently taken over by his brother Antistius. At the expiration of the term of the lease the land seems to have been let to a new tenant, the plaintiff Plutarchus (cf. note on ll. 15–7); but the papyrus breaks off before the relation of the latter to the two brothers or the occasion of the present dispute are elucidated.

This document is on the verso of the papyrus. The recto is occupied with three columns of a survey of different pieces of land, written probably early in the second century. Mention is made of ψιλ(οί) τὸπ(οί) ἐν οἰ[σ] κέλλαι ἐμπ(οιύμεναι ?) ὑπὸ τῶν ἱουθαιων and of τὸπ(οί) ἱερατικοί.

Col. i.

ρησι

Ἐν δημοσίων καὶ
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

\[\pi\ldots \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \phi\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\nu \epsilon\xi\alpha\epsilon\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu\]  

5 \[\ldots \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \phi\omicron\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu \epsilon\xi\alpha\epsilon\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu \delta\nu\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\]  
6 \[\ldots \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \phi\omicron\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu \epsilon\xi\alpha\epsilon\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu \delta\nu\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\]  
7 \[\ldots \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \phi\omicron\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu \epsilon\xi\alpha\epsilon\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu \delta\nu\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\]  
8 \[\ldots \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \phi\omicron\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu \epsilon\xi\alpha\epsilon\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu \delta\nu\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\]  
9 \[\ldots \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \phi\omicron\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu \epsilon\xi\alpha\epsilon\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu \delta\nu\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\]  
10 \[\ldots \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho \phi\omicron\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu \epsilon\xi\alpha\epsilon\alpha\tau\iota\varsigma\alpha\varsigma\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu \delta\nu\mu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\]  

Col. ii.

\[\text{Πλούταρχος} \ldots \text{πρὸς} \text{Φιλίν} \text{οῦ καὶ Ἀνθέστιον ἀμφιτεροῦσ} \ldots \text{ἀπὸ Ὀξυρύγχων π} \delta \text{ἰερῶσ.} \text{Σαραπίων ῥήτωρ ὑπέρ} \text{Πλούταρχος ἐιπεν} \text{ὁ συνηγοροῦμενος Πλούταρχος ἐμισθώ-} \]

15 \[σατο παρὰ Δημητρίας τινὰ προῖ τῶν Ὀξυρυγχείτην ὑπαρβη\]

16 \[\text{[21 letters]} \text{ἡ Δημητρία προτεστάθηκεν τοῖς} \text{μισθοσκο} \text{ματοὶ} \text{γραμμ} \text{τῶν ἀντιτι} \text{τὰ γαίμα-} \text{νον Φιλιν} \text{οῦ} \text{μισθοσκόμεος παρὰ αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἵσ} \text{(ἔτους) Ἀδρια} \text{νοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἔτη ἔξ ἁμπελώνα καὶ πώ-} \]

20 \[μάριαν περὶ κῶμην Σερβίνιν καὶ ἐνγραπτόν μισθώσων διὰ ἑς} \text{δεδηλωθεὶς} \text{ἐν μὲν τῇ πρώτῃ τετραετεῖα μηδὲν ὑπὲρ φόρου} \text{τελέσαι ἀλλὰ μόνα} \text{[τῇ} \text{δημόσια διαγράφει ἐπὶ τῷ πάσαν} \text{τὴν ἐν τῷ κτήματι διάφευγον γῆν ἀνάξα} \text{ἀμπελώ τῇ} \text{δὲ λοιπὴ διετέρᾳ τελεσά τὰ διὰ τῆς} \text{μισθώσεως ὑπὲρ φό-} \]

25 \[ρου ἀνειλημμένα ἀναφάρῃσι τε τὰς τοῦ κτήματος} \text{καὶ} \text{πομαρίων πλάτας ἐπὶ μέτροις καὶ λαμβάνοντα} \text{παρὰ τῆς} \text{Δημητρίας (δραχμαῖς) Β} \text{ἀνοικοδομήσαι} \text{τροχὸν ἐκ και-} \text{νῆς ἐξ διπτής} \text{πλίνθου ἐπὶ μέτροις ὀρισμένοις.} \text{ὅπερ} \text{λαβόντα} \text{τὰς} \text{(δραχμαῖς) Β} \text{τῶν μὲν τροχῶν μὴ πεποιηκέναι} \text{καὶ} \text{μηδὲ} \text{τὰς} \text{πλάτας} \text{περιβεβληκέναι.} \text{τοῦτον} \text{οὕτως} \text{ἐξόντων} \text{τῷ ἰδίῳ ἀντιτι} \text{τα ἀσπέττιστον κατα-} \text{λειποῦσέ} \text{νὰ} \text{τὸ κτήματος} \text{τέλειον} \text{ἐμεληκέναι} \text{καὶ} \text{μηδὲ} \text{τὰς} \text{πλάτας} \text{περιβεβληκέναι.} \text{τοῦτον} \text{οὗτος} \text{ἐξόντων} \text{τῷ ἰδίῳ} \text{ἐγνηθής}
Col. ii. 'Plutarchus son of ... against Philinus and Antistius, both sons of ..., of Oxyrhynchus. Sarapion, advocate for Plutarchus, said:—My client Plutarchus leased from Demetria a property in the Oxyrhynchite nome following upon (?) a lease previously made with Demetria by Philinus, the younger of our opponents, who rented from her for 6 years from the 14th year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord a vineyard and orchard at the village of Seruphis in accordance with a written agreement, in which it was stated that in the first four years he should be charged no rent but only pay the taxes on condition of his planting vines over the whole of the open space in the vineyard, that for the remaining two years he should pay the rent set forth in the lease, that he should restore on a certain scale the walls (?) of the vineyard and orchard, and on receiving from Demetria 2000 drachmae should build on a fixed scale a new wheel of baked brick. It appears that having taken the 2000 drachmae he did not make the wheel according to the stated scale, but left it uncompleted and entirely neglected the vineyard, not even putting up the walls round it. In these circumstances in the 19th year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord Antistius became surety on behalf of his brother Philinus for all the obligations of the lease and himself took over ...'
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

therefore inclined to read Δημητρία, connecting ὅ νύστερος with προπεσαντα, and suggest ἐπαρξην [ἀρουρών . . . . . . ἐξ ἦς Τη ἀντί (ορ σὺν τῇ)] Δημητρία προπεσαντα τοις [ἐμπροσθεν χρόνοις μοι]σεως ἑκ., κτ.λ. περι τὸν 'Οξουργέτην is unusual; ἐν τῷ ὦ. would be expected.

23. διαψευδον γῆν: this phrase, which here occurs for the first time, throws light upon two passages in the B. G. U. which have hitherto remained unexplained (cf. Wilcken, Ort. I. p. 404). These are entries in two very closely related taxisting-lists from Sconopaei Nesus, B. G. U. 10. 8 ψυγοδ και διαψευδις (ου ορ -ων) (ἀρουρών) νδ and 277. ii. 5 διαψευδον και διαψευδον πρὸς ἐκασθ(ν) (ἀρουρών) νδ, the heading in each case being followed by two or three names. The 54 auroreae are evidently the same in both documents, and consisted of a ψυγος or διαψευδα (cf. P. Tebt. 86. 45 and 522. 4) and διαψευδον ου διαψευδον γη, upon which certain payments had to be made by the persons named. How διαψευδο differed from ψυγο, if at all, does not appear. The word is found in Hesychius, Ψψευδό, διαψευδο.

25. ἀναθηματα: the verb recurs in the same unusual sense in l. 35. B. G. U. 277. ii. 10 οι φοι(ραι) ἐν οὐσικα φοι ἀναθηματαιναι is hardly parallel.

26. πωμαρίων is of course the Latin pomerium. The use of πλάτας here is strange. The word πλάτας or πλάτης occurs in several inscriptions from Aphrodisias (e.g. C. I.G. 2824; cf. Boeckh's remarks ad loc.) meaning apparently the substructure of a funerary monument. Here the πλάτα seem to be surrounding walls; cf. l. 32 τοις πλάταις περιβληται.

37. Apparently not ἱμηνος. The supposed δ of δι is more like α.

708. TWO LETTERS TO A STRATEGUS.

The recto of this papyrus contains part of an account of corn, very large amounts in artabae (e.g. 168, 486 1/3 1/8) being mentioned, as well as the κ[λατασyperαι] κθ (ετος), which refers to the reign of Commodus more probably than to that of Caracalla. On the verso are copies of two letters from Antonius Aelianus, a high official whose rank is not stated, but who was probably epistrategus or dioecetes, to the strategus of the Diospolite nome in the Thebaid, stating that two ship-loads of wheat from that nome had on examination proved to be adulterated with barley and earth, and ordering the strategus to exact the deficiency from the sitologi responsible for it. From a mention of a chiliarch in l. 13 it appears that the corn was required for military purposes. The first letter, which is practically complete, is dated in the 29th year, probably of the reign of Commodus. The second follows the same formula, so far as it goes.

[ ]κ
[Aντ'ωνιος Αλιανὸς στρα(τηγο) Διος(ολίτου) Θηβ(αίδος) χρ(ίεων).
[τού] καταχθέων γήμου εκ τού ὑπὸ σοι νομοῦ]
Antonius Aelianus to the strategus of the Diospolite nome in the Thebaid, greeting. Since the cargo dispatched from the nome under you in charge of Jausis son of Sipos and his companions, amounting to 2000 artabae of wheat, appeared at the weighing of the samples to have been adulterated, I ordered that the amount of barley and earth in half an artaba of it should be ascertained, and it proved to be under measure by 2 per cent. of barley and likewise \( \frac{1}{100} \) per cent. of earth. Accordingly exact at your own risk from the situologi who shipped the wheat the difference on the whole amount of the corn, 50\( \frac{1}{2} \) artabae of wheat, and the extra payments and other expenses, and when you have added this total to the account of the chiliarch let me know. The 29th year, Phaophi 30."

11. \( \nu \) (\( \eta \mu \sigma \nu \)) 8: 2\( \frac{1}{2} \) per cent. on 2000 artabae (l. 4) is 50 artabae, so Antonius Aelianus has added 3\( \frac{1}{2} \) art.

13. \( \chi \) (\( \lambda \alpha \rho \chi \nu \)): or perhaps (\( \delta \kappa \alpha \delta \alpha \delta \))\( \chi \nu \). The \( \iota \) is drawn through the \( \chi \).

14. The meaning of this line is obscure. For \( \epsilon \kappa \omega \) (\( \mu \sigma \alpha \mu \eta \)) cf. P. Petrie II. 12 (1) verso. \( \beta \) might be read instead of \( \kappa \), and there is a horizontal stroke above \( \alpha \). \( \epsilon \kappa \omega \) (\( \tau \sigma \sigma \tau \)) cannot be read. \( \iota \sigma \tau \omega \lambda \iota \) is apparently to be supplied after \( \delta \omega \).
This fragment of a letter gives some important geographical information about Egypt in the first century. It describes a tour of inspection throughout the country about to be taken by a high official, probably the praefect or δικαιοδότης. Starting from a place which is not mentioned (Alexandria?), he was to go first to Pelusium, thence through the nomes situated along the eastern side of the Delta, the Tanite and Sethroite, Arabia, and another nome, not previously found in Greek (l. 6, note), to Memphis. Next he was to travel direct to the Thebaid, and come back through the Heptanomis, the Arsinoite nome, and the other nomes in the Delta which he had not visited on his upward journey, finally reaching Alexandria. The chief point of interest is the mention of the Heptanomis and Arsinoite nome. Wilcken (Ost. I. pp. 423-7) attributes the creation of the Heptanomis to the period between A.D. 68, when the edict of Tiberius Alexander seems to be ignorant of its existence, and 130, and adopts the view of Schwarz (Rhein. Mus. 1896, p. 637) that the Arsinoite nome originally belonged to the Heptanomis, but was separated from it by Hadrian to make room for the newly-founded Antinoite nome. The papyrus, however, which quite certainly belongs to the first century and yet mentions the Arsinoite nome as distinct from the Heptanomis, disposes of Schwarz’s hypothesis altogether, and pushes back the latest possible date of the creation of the Heptanomis far into the first century. The handwriting of the papyrus is by no means of a late first century type, and we should assign it to the reign of Claudius or Nero rather than to that of one of the Flavian emperors. In any case it is now clear, on the one hand, that the Arsinoite nome was on account of its isolated position never reckoned in the Heptanomis, and on the other, that some hitherto unsuspected nome belonged to the Heptanomis before the creation of the Ἀντινοίτης. The most probable explanation is that Antinoite was a new name given to a previously existing nome, and that Hadrian only did what Ptolemy Philadelphus had done in the case of the λυμή (Rev. Laws, p. xlix). Strabo, who is a little earlier than the papyrus, does not help; but his list of nomes has not so far accorded very well with the evidence of Ptolemaic and Roman papyri.

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

\[[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots]\sigma\nu \quad [\cdot] \tau\omicron \, \lambda\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\theta\omicron\varphi\iota\omicron\omicron\nu \ldots\ldots\]
710. OFFICIAL

[διαλογίσμου ἑστάθη ἕνα τῇ [. . . . . . .]
[. . . . ον τὸν ἀνάπλων ποιήσῃ καὶ
[. . . .] εἰς Πελοποίου ἀπελθὼν διαλο-
5 [γίσης] ταῖς Τανίτης Σεβροῖτην Ἄραβιαν
[Αὐ]ίαν, ἐν Μένφει γενόμενος ὁμοίως
Θηβαιδαν ἑπτὰ νομοὺς Ἀρσινοῖτην,
tοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς τῆς κάτω χώρας ὑπομοῦσ
eἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν. ταῦτα δὲ οἳ [. . . . .
10 ἑστάθη ἐις δὲ τά λογιστηρία τιμὰ
κατ’ ἀνδρὰ πάντων τῶν αὐτί. [. . . . . . .]
aἰτοῦ[μεθα. λοιπὸν οὖν ἐι. [. . . . . . .
 [. . . γ]ραμματεῖς ἀχρι [. . . . . . .
 [. . . .] ἀσποροι τῆς δι. ὀτρ [. . . . . . .
15 [. . . σ]παλείσασ [.]
[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]
[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .]
On the verso Θέων δ[i


6. [Αὐ]ία (or possibly [Αἰα]ων) was suggested by Mr. Griffith. It refers to the district called in hieroglyphics 'An situated on the Eastern side of the Delta (Brugsch, Dict. Géogr. p. 119), and known to Pliny (H. N. vi. 29) a sinu Laecanitico (l. Aelanitico) alter sinus quem Arabes Aeun vocant in quo Heroon oppidum est. Brugsch considers it to have been part of the Memphite nome.

710. ORDER FOR PAYMENT.

Fr. (a) 7 x 13.5 cm. B.C. 111.

This papyrus, which is one of the few Ptolemaic documents found at Oxyrhynchus, contained an order, probably addressed to a royal bank by an official, to pay various sums of money to 47 persons. Of these 44 were carrying documents, and they were accompanied by a ὑφογράφος, i.e. a precis-writer, a title not hitherto found on a papyrus, an ἐφοδος who acted as escort, and
a 'camel-man,' this being one of the rare references to the use of camels in the Ptolemaic period. The 7th year mentioned in 1. 5 must on palaeographical grounds belong to the reign of Ptolemy Soter II. In Fr. (b) ὄρογράφων, ἐφόδων στ καπηλίτης is probably to be supplied at the beginnings of II. 7 and 8.

\( \frac{(a)}{\text{[...]} \chiρημ[θε]ποσον το]ς} \quad \frac{(b)}{(ταλαντ)} \)

\( \text{ἐν τοι 'Οξερωγραφαι βυβλιαφροι} \quad \text{α (ταλαντον) α} \)

\( \text{ἀνδράσι μὲ ὄρογράφων α} \quad \text{α (ταλαντον) α} \)

\( \text{ἐφόδων α καπηλίτης α, } μζ, \)

\( \text{το } \Thetaωθ το } \zeta (\text{έτους) κατά} \)

### 711. Census–List.

\( 7 \times 18.5 \text{ cm.} \quad \text{About B.C. 14.} \)

A fragment from an official statement or list connected with the census and poll-tax. There are parts of two columns, but the first has only the ends of lines (not printed), and the second is, unfortunately, disfigured by lacunae which deprive it of much of its value, though any fresh items of information may be welcomed on the interesting question of the Egyptian census in the early years of Augustus. The existing evidence on the subject was collected in P. Oxy. II. pp. 207–14, where it was shown that the fourteen years' census-cycle could be traced back with security to A.D. 19–20, and with probability to A.D. 5–6 and B.C. 10–9, but no further, although censuses and poll-tax are attested still earlier in Augustus' reign, and now appear from the Tebtunis papyri (103, introd.) to go far back into the first century B.C. The present document mentions certain 'youths (ἐφηβευκότες) registered (or 'entered') on a poll-tax list by us (the λαογράφοι?) in the 15th year of Caesar,' ἐφηβευκότες in this context probably meaning boys above the age of fourteen, when they became liable to the tax in question. Reference is also made to a wrong entry in a previous list of some persons 'as having... before the 6th year.' This is too vague to be of much use; but the 6th year (B.C. 25–4) would seem to be a recognized landmark in the history of the census or the poll-tax, and some important step in the reorganization of the system may possibly have then been made. The
6th year, however, does not fall in with the fourteen years’ cycle, being one year too early.

On the verso of the papyrus are parts of two columns, written not much later than the recto, of a series of names with some figures opposite, no doubt a taxing-list of some kind, and not improbably also concerned with the poll-tax.

\[
\text{ἐκαστ} \ldots [\ldots] [\ldots \ldots] \alpha \beta\gamma\delta \\
\text{τοι} \ όμοιος \ κατά \ τὸ \ παρόν \ldots [\ldots] \mu\nu\mu\rho\sigma\tau\iota\chi\varepsilon \\
\text{kai} \ άλλων \ τῶν \ υφί \ ήμών \ επί \ τοῦ \ ιε \ (έτους) \ Καίσαρος \ λελά-
\text{oυ}
\text{ογραφημένων} \ επι[\ldots]φι[\ldots]ων \ εφημενεκάπτων \ ος \\
5 \ kai \ \epsilon \ \kappa \ ραλογισμ[\sigma\theta\nu\ldots]. \ \mu\nu\sigma\nu \ ός \ \pi\rho\delta \ τρού \\
\sigma \ (έτους) \ Καίσαρος[\ldots]φι[\ldots]των \ \pi[\ldots]ρων \ \epsilon[\ldots\ldotsν[\ldots]] \\
\ομο[\ldots]
\text{[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots]}
\]

2. τοι may be the article and connected with the participle following παρόν, or the termination of a word in the previous line like τελοῖτος. Cf. P. Tebt. 103. 1–3 λαογρ(μφία) 
\ldots τελοῖ[\sigma\tau\iota\ων \ σύνταξις, \ and \ τελοῖ \ (so \ Wilcken) \ σύνταξις \ in \ P. \ Græc. \ I. 45. 8.

4. ΕΠΙ is quite doubtful, since all that remains of the letter is part of a long vertical stroke projecting above the lacuna, which might equally well represent e.g. the sign for έτος. But it does not seem possible to get either another year or a conjunction into the short space available, and we therefore conclude that λελαογραφημένων and εφημενεκάπτων are to be taken together, with some qualifying term between them; επι[\αυ\φι\Ων might suit. 
At the end of the line ως with ω written above the ω is difficult; if ως was intended the accusative may be governed by ]. ομος in l. 5.

5–6. ός \ \pi\rho\delta \ τρού \ σ \ (έτους) \ : \ cf. similar instances of the use of \πρά in 257. 25, 481. 15.

712. Collection of a Debt.

11.5 × 10.3 cm. Late second century.

The imperfect condition of this papyrus is much to be deplored, for if more complete it would probably have gone far to solve the uncertainties attaching to the functions of that much discussed official, the ξευκάπω πράκτορ. As it is, the lines being throughout incomplete both at the beginnings and ends, and the amount lost being shown by ll. 12–3 to exceed 40 letters between each line, the papyrus whets our curiosity without satisfying it. There are two documents,
the first written (ll. 9 sqq.) being an application to the overseers of the ξενικῶν πρακτορία of the Athribite nome from a member of the Sosicosmian tribe, stating that he had in A.D. 146–7 lent 300 drachmae at interest to two brothers, called Potamon and Pathermouthis, upon the security of some house-property at Monthmereu. Repayment not having been made at the proper time, a writ was served upon the brothers (ll. 16–7), but since this had no effect, the applicant requests the overseers to foreclose upon the house and exact payment (ll. 18–21). In the margin above this application is (ll. 1–7) a letter from the overseers to the keepers of the record office, apparently requesting them to take possession of the property and collect the debt and interest, as well as the miscellaneous charges for collection made by the State. The title, ἐπιτηρηταὶ ξενικῶν πρακτορίας, is new, and, since ἐπιτηρηταὶ are generally connected with ὄνα, suggests that the profits made by the State from collecting debts were farmed out, like most other revenues. That this was actually the case is proved by 825, an account rendered to the μισθωταὶ ξενικῶν πρακτορίας by one of their πραγματευταὶ. By the second century therefore, at any rate, the functions which in the Ptolemaic period and perhaps still in the first century A.D. seem to have been combined in the person of the ξενικῶν πράκτωρ (cf. P. Tebt. 5. 221, note, and 286), were divided, and we find side by side the parallel bodies of official ἐπιτηρηταὶ and private μισθωταὶ with subordinate πραγματευταὶ. But while 712 and 825 are a valuable illustration of the second term in the phrase ξενικῶν πρακτορία, they throw little light upon the first, in which the main difficulty lies. The explanation of ξενικῶν which we offered (ll. 9 sqq.) that it means debts contracted by ξένοι, i.e. persons living at places outside the district to which they properly belonged, still remains the only one which rests on the evidence of parallels from the use of ξένος in papyri, though it is not clear why e.g. in P. Tebt. 5. 221 debts of ξένοι should be a subject of legislation and not debts in general. Our hypothesis gains some support from the circumstance—which may be a mere accident, but if so is a very remarkable coincidence—that both 712 and 825 have to do with debts from persons who were not living in the Oxyrhynchite nome. In 712 the ἐπιτηρηταὶ belong to the Athribite nome, but about the property distrained upon the only fact that is certain is that it was not in the Oxyrhynchite nome (Μωσθμέρευ and its toparchy, Νοροσέλης, in l. 20, are both unknown), while the nome to which the officials addressed by the ἐπιτηρηταὶ belonged, as well as that of the writer of the application, is doubtful; cf. notes on ll. 1 and 13. In 825 the πραγματευτής was concerned with the Memphite nome, but that the μισθωταὶ belonged to the Oxyrhynchite nome has only a general probability resting on the provenance of the document.

The date of the papyrus is lost, but it was certainly posterior to the 10th
καὶ ὦν ἑπιτη(ρηταί) ἐξεικ(ῶν) πρα(κτ(ο)ρείας) Ἀθρε(ἱςτού)]
[μοφ[φ][ο] παραδειξ(ε)ως υφ[φ][α] ἤ[η] ἐστιν ε [. .]
] κατάσχετε οὖν πρὸς ἐνεχυρασίαν ἥν πάρε[β]
Παθερμοῦθις καὶ ὁ ἄδελφος] αὐτοῦ Ποτάμων Θανάκχιος τοῦ [. . .]. ητοις ἀπὸ . [
[τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῶι καὶ τῶι ἄδελφῳ αὐτοῦ Παθερ-
(μ)οθι οἰκ[ι]αν καὶ αὐ[λ]ήν]
] ἀργυ[ρίου] (δραχ[μ]ᾶς) τ καὶ τόκους καὶ τέλη
καὶ δαπ[ά]νας), προκ(τοπραξ[ί]ας) οὐσ(η) τῷ δη[μ]οσίῳ καἰ]
(ἐτους . .) // Παῦει κ.

καὶ ὦν(ε)πιτη(ρηταί) ἐξεικ(ῶν) πρα(κτ(ο)ρείας) Ἀθρ[ε]β[ιτου]
παρά [. . .] ἡ ὠνος τοῦ Νεοπτολέμου Σωσικοσμείου τοῦ καὶ Ἡλί[κ]ιστοῦ [. . .]
[ν χρημ[α]τισ(μ)ῶν ἐνεχυρασίας ὄ[ν] τὸ ἐτερον ἄ[ν]]
ἐ[πι] πρᾶξ[ε]ως τῶν ὀφειλομένων μο[ι] ὑπὸ Ποτά-
μωνος (Θανάκχιος τοῦ . . ητοις, καὶ τοῦ Ποτάμωνος ἁ[δ]ὲ[δ]έλ[φ]οι Παθερμοῦθιος ἐ[ξ]
ἀλληλεγγύης κατὰ
δημοσίων χρηματισμῶν γεγονότα

διὰ τοῦ ἐν πόλει ἀρ'χειοῦ τῷ δεκάτῳ ἑτε[ι] Ἀ[ν]τ[ο]νείουν Καίσαρος
δραχμ[ὰ]ν [α] [μ][ω]ν]

dιακοσίων

ἐνεχυ[ρ]ασίας ἀντιγράφου
Παθερμοῦθι καὶ τῷ ἄδελφῳ] αὐτοῦ Ποτα[μών] διὰ Ἔβρη[γ]νιον ὑπηρέτου
τῆς ἐ[ν] τ[ῶ]υ
κα[ὶ] αὐ[λ]ήν

N 2
Applications to Officials.

713. Claim of Ownership.

A declaration addressed to the keepers of the record office by a certain Leonides, requesting the formal registration (παράδεισις) of his prospective right to some property at present in the ownership of his mother. The claim to the property in question depended upon the marriage contract of the writer's parents, in which their joint possessions were secured (καλέσθων) on their demise to their children. The father had died, and his property had been duly divided between Leonides and his brother and sister. The mother was still living, and had already made over two-thirds of her real estate to this brother and sister upon the marriage of the pair. Leonides, who was probably the younger son, therefore wished that note should be taken of this division, and that his own title to the remaining third of the property should be placed on record.

The document is dated in Phamenoth of the 1st year of Nerva, i.e. A.D. 97. It is not known that a general ἀπογραφή of real property occurred in that year, while 481 shows that such a registration took place in A.D. 99. There is evidence that general ἀπογραφαί, separated only by a two years’ interval, were held in A.D. 129 and 131 (75, 715, B.G. U. 420, &c.), but that these both
affected the same nome is not yet ascertained. Pending further data it will therefore be best to suppose that the present was a special declaration called forth by the peculiar circumstances of the case.

1st hand

παρετέθη(η).

Δημητρίωι καὶ Ἀπολλω(νίου καὶ

Διογένει βιβλιοφύλαξ).

2nd hand

παρὰ Λεωνίδου Διοδώρου τοῦ

5 Διοδώρου μητρὸς Σαραεύτος Λεω-

νίδου ἀπὸ Ὄξυρυγχον πόλεως.

καθ ἴνα οἱ γονεῖς μοι Διόδωρος Δίο-

δώρου τοῦ Ἀγαθείνου καὶ Σαραεύς

Λεωνίδου τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου μη-

10 τρὸς Ἰσιδώρας Κάλα ἀπ[δ] τῆς αὐτῆς

πόλεως πεποίηται πρὸς ἀλ-

λήλους τοῦ γάμου συγγραφὴν διὰ

τοῦ ἐν Ὄξυρυγχον πόλει ἀγορανο-

μίου τῷ δωδεκάτῳ ἔτει θεοῦ

15 Ἐκλείδιον μηνὶ Σεβαστῷ κατέσ-

χον τῇ ἐς ἀλλήλων γενεῖ τὰ

ἐαυτῶν πάντα πρὸς τὸ μετὰ τὴν

tελευτὴν αὐτῶν βεβαιῶς καὶ

ἀναφαίρεται εἰναι τῶν τέκνων,

20 ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ πατὴρ ἐτελεύτησεν ἐπὶ ἐ-

μοὶ καὶ ἄδελφοίς μου Διοδώρῳ

καὶ Θαῖδι καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν ἐς ἡμᾶς

κατήντησε, ἦ δὲ μήτηρ ἀφ’ ἄν

ἔχει περὶ μὲν Νέσλα ἄρουρῶν

25 ἐννέα ἡμίσους περὶ δὲ {περὶ δὲ}

Πειρεῖν ὡς τῆς Ἑραςμαχίου παρ-

eιμένης ἄρουρῶν δύο ἡμίσους

τῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἄρουρῶν δεκα-

δυο ἐμερίσει τοῖς προγεγραμμέ-

30 νοις μοι ἄδελφοι[ι]ς ἀπὸ τῶν πε-

ρὶ Νέσλα ἐκατέρῳ ἄρουρας τέσσα-
To Demetrius and Apollonius and Diogenes, keepers of the records, from Leonides son of Diodorus son of Diodorus, his mother being Saraeus daughter of Leonides, of Oxyrhynchus. My parents, Diodorus son of Diodorus son of Agathinus, and Saraeus daughter of Leonides son of Alexander, her mother being Isidora daughter of Calas, of the said city, in accordance with the contract of marriage made between them through the record office of the said city in the month Sebastus of the 12th year of the deified Claudius settled upon their joint issue the whole of their property, in order that after their death it might be the secure and inalienable possession of their children; and whereas my father died leaving me and my brother and sister, Diodorus and Thais, his heirs, and his property devolved upon us, and whereas our mother possesses at Nesla 9^ 1/2 arourae and at Peenno 2^ 1/2 arourae of the concessional (?) land of Thrasymachus, together making 12 arourae, and bestowed upon my brother and sister aforesaid through their marriage contract 4 each of the arourae at Nesla, that is one-third of the aforesaid 12 arourae: I too declare for registration my right to the remaining 4 arourae of my mother; and the aforesaid contract of my parent's remains in force and uncancelled to the present day. The 1st year of the Emperor Nerva Caesar Augustus, Pharmenoth 19. Signature of Demetrius and date.

1. paratheidai and paradesai (cf. l. 35 below) are specially used of the declaration and registration through the bibliafylakes of claims to property. The verb has this technical sense e.g. in 237. iv. 38 paratheidosei diá toû bibliafylakion and viii. 34 paratheidosein de kai ai geunaikei tais epoastasiêi tîn andhrâv. Cf. also B. G. U. 73. 10 eqq. épastisthai toîs . . . [β]bibliafylakion . . . pioúndasphi mi tâ tîn paratheidous, and 243. 9 epidiwmu eis tîn paratheidous geunidhâ, and 14 prosoxairei(menon) diá toû bibliafylakion.1

1 The editor reads koi(ouv), but this makes no sense, and the correction proposed, which is palaeographically very close, seems in the light of the passages quoted above practically secure. The context in the Berlin papyrus further requires a negative like µηδεν in place of kai tâ before ἔσωθα ἐμπόλειαν.
The marriage contract referred to contained also testamentary dispositions; cf. C. P. R. 28, 8 sqq.

20. ἐπ’ ἐμὺ καὶ ἀδελφοῖς: sc. κληρονόμοις; cf. 481. 17–8, &c.

26. τῆς Ὀρασιάδος παρεμένης: παρεῖναι as a technical term applied to land seems to be new, and the present passage gives no clue to the meaning; perhaps ‘conceded to’ or ‘abandoned.’

714. Selection of Boys (ἐπίκρισις).

Fr. (a) 4·2 x 5, Fr. (b) 29 x 5 cm. A.D. 122.

An application addressed to a variety of officials by an Oxyrhynchite who enjoyed the privilege of paying a reduced poll-tax of 12 drachmae, requesting that a slave who had been born in his house and had reached the age of thirteen might be placed on the same privileged list. This papyrus thus confirms the evidence of 478 and B.G. U. 324, that the liability of slaves in respect of poll-tax was determined by that of their owners. A discussion of the general question of ἐπίκρισις is given in P. Oxy. II. pp. 217 sqq.

This papyrus is interesting palaeographically, being carefully written in a semi-uncial hand approximating to the sloping oval type, examples of which are often too indiscriminately assigned to the third century.

 Kaίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου, ὅθεν δην- λῶ εἶναι μὲ (δοθεκάδραχμον)
 ὑα λαογραφίας
 β (ἐτοὺς) Ἀδριανοῦ

 Καισαρα Τραιανὸν

 'Αδριανὸν Σεβαστὸν μὴ ἐψευσθαί. (ἐτοὺς) Ταύτακρατορος
 Καισαρος Τραιανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ
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15 δούλης ... 

τρ]σικαίδεκα …

βαΣιλικός γραμματέας

tὸ διελθόντι

ἐν (ἐτεί) Ἀδριατοῦ

35 Σεβαστοῦ Με-

χερὶ κ.

2nd hand κατεξ(ωρίσθη)

ἐπικρίταις, χρόνος ᾧ ἀιτίος).

'To Philonicus also called Hermodorus, basilico-grammateus, and Dionysius and a second Dionysius, keepers of the archives and officers in charge of the selection, and to Apollonius, ex-exegetes and scribe of the city, from Apollonius ... of the city of Oxyrhynchus, living in the West Quay quarter. My slave ..., born in the house to my female slave ..., has reached the age of 13 years in the past 5th year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord. I therefore declare that I am rated at 12 drachmae by a poll-tax list of the 2nd year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord at the said quarter, and I swear by the Emperor Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus that I have made no false statement.' Date and docket of registration.

1-7. The papyrus is incomplete at the top and there are traces of ink above the first line, so no doubt the strategus (cf. 257. 14) preceded the basilikos γραμματέας. It is noteworthy that only two persons in this long list of officials, namely the βιβλιοφύλακες, are called ἐπικρίται (cf. P. Fay. Towns 27. 3, and B. G. U. 562. 15, where ἐπικρίτου should be read); while 478 is addressed to the βιβλιοφύλακες alone. The basilikos γραμματέως recurs in this connexion in 257. 15 and B. G. U. 562. 17. Applications of this class from the Fayum are usually sent to ex-gymnasiarchs δωρε πρὸς τὴν ἐπικρίσιν.

13-4. The supplements hardly fill the available space, but the lines vary a good deal in length.

23. διὰ λαογραφίας: cf. 478. 22-3 (δωδεκάθραυσι) δὲ ὀρθόλγον λαογραφίας.

37-8. A similar docket occurs in 478, and ἐπικρίταισ may now be supplied there at the end of l. 49 on the analogy of the present papyrus; cf. also 786.

715. REGISTRATION OF PROPERTY.

30.7 × 11.5 cm. A.D. 131.

A return of house-property in the Heracleopolite nome, addressed, as usual, to the keepers of the archives, in A.D. 131, when a general λαογραφία of real property took place; cf. B. G. U. 420 and 459, and 237. viii. 31, note. The formula is practically the same as that found in the Oxyrhynchus returns, e.g. 75 and 481. At the end is a docket of the βιβλιοφύλαξ.
715. APPLICATIONS TO OFFICIALS

Ηραί καὶ Ὠριγένει γεγυμ(νεςιαρχηκόσι) βιβλιοφόλακι ἐνκτή(σεω) Ἡρα-
κλεοπ(σάτου)

παρὰ Γοργίου καὶ Γαλέστου ἄμφοτέρων
Πολέμωνος τοῦ Γοργίου μητρὸς Διονυσία-

5 δος τῆς Γαλέστου τῶν ἀπὸ κώμης
Τομίσεως. ἀπογραφόμεθα ἰδίωι
κινδύνωι κοινῶς ἔξ ἱσοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐνε(σ-
tὸς ἤς Ὡδριανὸν Καῖσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
κατὰ τὰ κελευθέντα τὰ ἐληλυθότ(α)

10 εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ ὀφύματος τοῦ μετηλ-
λαχίτος ἡμῶν πατρὸς Πολέμωνος
Γοργίου μητρὸς Ταποντῶτος ἀπὸ
τῆς αὐτῆς Τομίσεως, τὸ ἐπιβάλλ[ον]
aυτῶι ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ Τομίσεις τρίτον

15 μέρος οἰκίας καὶ τὸ ἐπιβάλλον αὐτῶι
μέρος ψυλῶι τόσου, καὶ πρότερον
τῆς ἅδελφῆς αὐτοῦ Ἐλένης Γοργίου
μητρὸς τῆς αὐτῆς Ταποντῶτος
κατὰ διαθήκην τὴν καὶ λυθέσαν

20 τοῦ Ἱβ (ἐτεῖ) Ὡδριανὸν Καῖσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
περὶ κώμην Ἰβίωνα Παχνοβίων ἐκ τοῦ
Σῳδίου καὶ Νομηνίου κλήρου γῆς
κατοικικῆς ἡμῶν τέταρτον
ὁγδοῦν καὶ περὶ Ἡσελμαχί( ) ἐκ τοῦ Μενίπ-

25 ποῦ καὶ Ἀρτεμιδώρου κλή(ρου) γῆς κατοικ[ε]ίς
ἀροῦρης τέταρτον. καὶ ὄμνομεν
τῆς Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καῖσαρος Τραιανοῦ
Ὠδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ τύχ(ην) καὶ τοῦ(ς) πατρώ(ν)
θεοῦ ἔξ ὑγ(ειάς) καὶ ἕπ ἀληθείας ἐπιεδεωκ(ἐναι) τῆν

30 προκιμένη(ν) ἀπογραφή(ν) καὶ μηδὲν διεψεις(αὶ)
ἡ ἐνοχοὶ εἰς ὃς ὁ ὄρκοι. (ἐτοὺς) ἢ
Αὐτοκράτορος Καῖσαρος Τραιανοῦ
Ὠδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ μηνὸς Καισαρείου ἐπ(αγομένων) ε.

2nd hand Γοργίας ὁ προγεγραμμένος ἐπι(δέω).
35 κα. (3rd hand) Ἡρᾶς γεγυ(μνασιαρχηκόως) διὰ Ἰππος( ) γραμμ(ατέως) ουσταθ(ἐντος)
καί(τα)κα(χλωρίκα) διακ(ρίτως;) κινδ(ύνη) τῶν ἀπογρα(φομένω) μηδενός
[δημοσίων ἡ διαφορικ(δ) καταβλαπ(τομένω).] ἐπαγα(μένων) ε.


'To Heras and Origenes, ex-gymnasiarchs, keepers of the records of real property in
the Heracleopolite nome, from Gorgias and Galesus both sons of Polemon son of Gorgias,
their mother being Dionysias daughter of Galestus, from the village of Toemisis. We
register at our own risk jointly and equally for the present 15th year of Hadrianus Caesar
the lord in accordance with the command the property which has devolved upon us from
our deceased father Polemon son of Gorgias and Tapontos, from the said Toemisis, viz.
the third share which fell to him of a house at the said Toemisis and his share of a piece
of open ground, and what previously belonged to his sister Helene daughter of Gorgias and
the said Tapontos, in accordance with a will which was opened in the 12th year of Hadrianus
Caesar the lord, near the village of Ibion Pachnoutis in the holding of Zoilus and Numerius
1/4 aroura of catoecic land, and near Pselemach( ) in the holding of Minippus and
Artemidorus 1/2 aroura of catoecic land. And we swear by the Fortune of the Emperor
Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus and by our ancestral gods that we have honestly and
truly presented the foregoing declaration and that we have made no false statement,
or may we be liable to the penalties of the oath. The 15th year of the Emperor Caesar
Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus, 5th intercalary day of the month Caesareus. I, Gorgias the
aforesaid, have presented the declaration. I, Heras ex-gymnasiarch, through Hippod( ),
scribe, my representative, have entered it on the register jointly at the risk of the declaring
parties, no public or private interests being injured. 5th intercalary day.'

10. Above the o of ἀπὸ the scribe has written μη, which makes no sense and seems to
be a mere error.
36. ἀδαι(μίτως) apparently corresponds to κουνῶς ἐξ ἑσυν in l. 7.

716. Auction of a Slave.

18.8 x 11.8 cm.

A.D. 186.

An application to a gymnasiarch from the guardians of three minors for
a public auction of their wards' respective shares, amounting to two-thirds in
all, of a male slave. The remaining third part of the slave was the property
of the minors' half-brother, but had been emancipated by him; and this com-
bination of circumstances led to the present request for an auction (ὁβερ ἐπιδίομεν,
l. 18), though the legal point involved is not very clear. It is however certain,
as Professor Mitteis remarks, that neither this papyrus nor 722, where a partial
manumission is also concerned, can be brought under Roman law, according to which, at this period, in the case of a joint ownership of a slave, a manumitted share simply passed to the other owners (Ulpian, Fr. i. 18). There can therefore be only a question of Greek or Egyptian law; and in the absence of parallels recourse must be had to more or less probable hypotheses. At the outset a doubt arises whether or not the partial manumission was the direct cause of the public auction. It is quite possible that the parties concerned merely wished to wind up their joint ownership, and that the details respecting the liberated share are accidental. If, however, the manumission was an essential factor, as δεν in 1. 18 would rather indicate, the course here followed may be supposed to have been prescribed either in the interest of the slave or of the owners. In a sale by public auction the rights of a partially freed slave could be safeguarded in a manner which would not be practicable in a private treaty; and this consideration supplies a very likely explanation of the present proceedings. Or, on the other hand, as Mitteis suggests, a sale by auction would protect an owner who wished to retain his share of a slave against a partner or partners who desired manumission. A sale of this kind would place the larger owner at an advantage against the smaller, since the former, if successful, would pay the latter only a fraction of the purchase-money, while the higher the bid of the small owner the greater the sum due from him to the predominant partner.

'Ασκληπιάδη τῷ καὶ Σαραπίωνι γυμνασιάρχῳ

[Χαίρε]ιν

παρὰ 'Ωριόνοις Πανεχώτου τοῦ Δωράτου μητρὸς Ταύρης καὶ Ἀπολλωνίου Δωρίωνος

5 τοῦ Ἡράτου μητρὸς Θαῦσιος καὶ Ἀβασκάντου ἀπελεύθερον Σάμου Ἡρακλείδου τῶν τριών ἀπὸ Ὅξυρύγχων πόλεως ἐπιτρόπων ἀφηλικῶν τέκνων Θέωνος τοῦ καὶ Διονύσιου Ἑυδαιμονίδος μητρὸς Σινθεῦτος καὶ Δι-

10 ονυσίου καὶ Θαῦσιος ἀμφοτέρων μητρὸς Ταύρης τῶν τριών ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως. ὑπάρχει τοῦτος αὐτοῖς ἀφήλικες τῇ μὲν Ἑυδαιμονίδες ἐκτὸς μέρος τῷ δὲ Διονύσῳ καὶ Θαῦσι εἶμιν μέρος τὸ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ δίμοιρον

15 μέρος πατρικὸ αὐτῶν δούλου Σαραπίωνος
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

188

-growi (etou) & oü το λοιπòν τρίτων ύν τού ὄμοπα-
-trίων αυτών ἀδελφος Διογένε[ν] 'ηλευθε-
-ραται ύπ\' αὐτοῦ. δὴν ἐπιδιδομένοι το βιβλί-
-διον ἔξειούτες κατὰ τὸ δηλούμενον

20 τῶν ἀρηλικών δίμωρον μέρος τὴν προ-
-
kήρυξιν γενέσθαι καὶ τὴν ἁμείνονα
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PETITIONS

717. Petition.

17.5 × 20.5 cm. Late 1st century B.C.

Part of a complaint addressed, no doubt, to some official, with reference to a dispute about the fairness of a measure between the writer, who seems to have been responsible for a cargo of corn, and another person. Owing to the imperfect condition of the papyrus, of which a preceding column or columns are lost, and of which only the first line is complete, the details are obscure. A curious new word, διλετον, occurs in ll. 5 and probably 12, apparently denoting some kind of measure. The writer's style suggests that he was still labouring under much excitement.

μέτρων ἐνβάλλομεν. ἐκβοῶντος δὲ μου καὶ κράζοντος τὰ τοσαῦτα
[ ...... ]ψατο με λέγων ὅτι τοῖς μέτροις σου οὐ θέλω ἰσχρῆσασθαι, Ἡ-
[νάγκασμαι] δὲ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ [ἀ]λλο μέτρον ἀγοράσαι. ἀγοράσαντος δὲ μου
[αὐτὸ παρέχω ἔχων τὴν κυβερνήτην καὶ συμβάλλο αὐτὸ κατε-
5 [ ...... ] εὑρίσκωι αὐτὸ πρὸς τὸ διλετον, εἰσπορεύομαι εἰς τὴν αὐ-
[ ...... ἔχων ἄντὸ καὶ παραλαμβάνω Ἀσίην τὸν ἄδειλον Ἰερατίππου
[ ...... ] . οὖν εἰσπορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν στρατηγὸν ἔχων αὐτὸ καὶ
[συμβάλλω] αὐτὸ πρὸς τὸ χαλκοῦν μέτρον ἐν τῷ συνεδρείῳ, εὑρίσ-
[κω αὐτὸ . . . . ] μείζων δύο ταῖς ἐκατόν. ἐγὼ οὖν ἔβοι καὶ ἐκραζὼν
10 [ ...... ] ἐρων τὸ χαλκοῦν ἀδικὸν ἔστι καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιον
[ 12 letters] ἐν τῶι συνεδρείοι σὺν τῶι στρατηγῷ ἐκράζοσαν
[ 22 ] " βρώντων δ' αὐτῶν εἰσφέρω τὸ δίλε-
[τον 21 letters] ] βοῶν καὶ κράζων ὅτι τούτο ἔστι
[ 26 letters] Ἦ]ἀγκασμαι βοῶν αὐτῶι ὅτι
15 [ 28 ] " δὲ οὐκ ἐνβάλλομαι ὅδε
[ 28 ] " ], ἐντυγχάνωντος πυκνά
[ 24 ] " τιθ' ὅρμου τι[

4. 1. συμβάλλω. 16. 1. ἐντυγχάνωντος.
2. [. . . ημείς ψάρο or [άστημε]ψάρω would suit the context. For ἡ νάγκασμα cf. l. 14.

5. The meaning and even the construction of πρὸς τῷ διότου (the reading of which is quite certain) is very obscure. From l. 12 it appears that the διότου was portable, and perhaps it was a species of measure, though whether it was that to which the writer’s opponent objected (l. 2) or an official measure of some kind is not clear. Assuming this to be the meaning of διότου, it is tempting to connect πρὸς τῷ διό. with συμβάλλω αὐτῷ in l. 4; but the intervening words εἰρήσκω αὐτῷ are then very difficult. Possibly πρὸς τῷ διό. is parallel to μεῖζω διό ταῖς εκστάσεων in l. 9, since the general construction of ll. 4-5 and 8-9 seems to be the same; but πρὸς τῷ διό. can by itself hardly mean ‘equal to the διότου’ and ἤσον would have to be supplied.

eἰς τὴν αἰ|: probably eἰς τὴν αἰ|ντων, i.e. the person referred to in l. 2, or τὸν Ἀδ: . . .

8. For the use of bronze in official measures cf. P. Tebt. 5. 85-92, and P. Amh. 43. 9-10.

718. Petition to the Epistrategus.

25·8 X 17·5 cm.  a. d. 180-192.

A petition from Antistius Primus, who had held the chief priesthood and other offices at Oxyrhynchus, complaining that a payment due to the government upon 4 arourae of Crown land had been demanded from him, although his property included no land of that character. The land in question had perhaps been the subject of a perpetual lease, and owing to lapse of time and deficiencies in the survey-lists its identity had become doubtful; cf. a similar case in P. Amh. 68. 52 sqq.

From the character of the handwriting the papyrus must belong to the latter half of the second century, and there can be little doubt that the Xenophon here addressed, who was evidently a high official, was T. Claudius Xenophon, known to have been epistrategus in the reign of Commodus (C. I. L. III. 6575, 8042).

[Tίτω Κλαυδίῳ Ε]ενφώντι [τῷ κρατίστῳ ἑπιστρατήγῳ
[παρὰ . . . . . . . . . . Αἰνθεστίῳ Πρείχου τοῦ καὶ Λόλλανῳ
[12 letters σαντος καὶ ἀρχιερατεύσαντος
[10 τῆς] Ὀξυρυγχείτων [πόλεως

5 [. . . . ἐπιράμην μὲν παρὰ Διονυσίου
[12 letters ὥν σὺν τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τὰς περὶ Σέινν
[. . . . ὑπαρχόσας αὐτῷ ἐκ διαιρέσεως γενομένης πρὸς
[. . . . καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἀπολλώνιον νεώτερον ἀρουρας [σε]χεισάς πεντήκον-
718. PETITIONS

10 οὐδενὶς καὶ ἵνα ἕμισον καθαρὰς ἀπὸ βασιλικῆς καὶ

15 ἀνάφηκεν βασιλικῆς ἐν πυρῷ ἀρτάβαις διεκάπετε προσφώνησαν

20 γονίτοσι μὴ διόλως γνωρίζοντος τί τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ κομωγραμματέως

25 ἐστιν τοῦτο πράξει ἐπιστείλη κατὰ τὰ διατεταγμένα ενιερ

2nd hand [ . . . . . . . Αὐθέστιος Πρεῖμος ὁ καὶ Ἀς Λολλιάνου διὰ Βασιλικὴν]

25. 1. πρόξιμι. 26. π of υπὸ corr.?
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Demand should be made of the imposts for 4 arourae of Crown land amounting to 15 artabae of wheat, stated that these 4 arourae of Crown land were included in the 53 arourae belonging to me which I bought from Dionysius and..., and that therefore the imposts ought to be paid by me..., although I have never had Crown land included in mine nor cultivate any and am altogether ignorant of the statements of the komogrammateus, and although the imposts for the said 4 arourae have for years been paid in the regular course by others. Therefore since I have incurred no small loss and it is unjust that I should be asked to pay the imposts on land which does not belong to me and which I do not cultivate, I beg you, if you think fit, to write to the strategus of the nome, in order that in accordance with the decrees he may direct the officials whose duty it is to...the 4 arourae of Crown land declared by the komogrammateus to be included in my private land, and may state the owner from whom the demand for the imposts may reasonably be made; for I shall retain a claim for the sums with which I was wrongfully charged against the person proved to be responsible for the payment, that so I may obtain relief. Farewell. (Signed) Presented by me, ... Antistius Primus also called Lollianus, through Apollonius...

3. Probably ἀγοραυομόντος, the municipal titles being usually arranged on an ascending scale; cf. Preisigke, Städtisches Beamtenwesen in röm. Agg. p. 31.
8. [σείγιας: or possibly δίκηιas (cf. ll. 11 and 27), but [σείγιας makes a better contrast to ἐν ὀικοπέδων, if that be right.
13. ἃ is the name of a village or ἐπώκου.
14. θείρηρος, if right, is an objective genitive depending upon εἰρηνειάων; cf. l. 28. An alternative supplement is πράσπρος constructed subjectively, but the relative παρ' ὧν is then awkward.
δημοσίων: i.e. the rent, the rate of which upon βασιλικῆ γῆ was usually about 4 artabae the aura; in the present case it was 3¼ artabae. In l. 11 on the other hand δημόσων has its ordinary meaning of taxes.
16. συναγάμαγος appears to be a new compound.
18. Perhaps τοῦ 'Αλεξάνδρου or τοῦ 'Απολλωνίου. But it would appear from l. 12 that there was only one πρίγης.
25. εῦνοι at the end of the line is clearly written, but suggests nothing; some word like ἐπισκέψασθαι is wanted.

719. Registration of a Deed.

193 x 166 cm. A.D. 193.

A notice addressed to the strategus by a certain Didymus of an authorization received by him from the archidacastes in answer to an application which he had made for the registration of a purchase of some house property. A copy of the application, itself enclosing a copy of the agreement of sale, is appended, and gives some interesting information concerning the formalities attending this process of registration, which we think has not hitherto been understood. Texts
of the same class already published are B. G. U. 455, 578 and 717, to which an important Leipzig papyrus will shortly be added (cf. P. Grenf. II. 71. 6, B. G. U. 970, 20-2, 983. 10). The object in all these cases is to effect the 'publication' (δημοσίωσις) of private agreements made by note of hand (χειρόγραφα), and the publication consisted in the registration of the agreements at the Library of Hadrian and the Nanacum at Alexandria (cf. I. 35 below, B. G. U. 578. 19, and 34). For such registration of a copy of an agreement the fixed charge of 12 drachmae was payable (ll. 30-1), to which is added in the Leipzig papyrus a tax proportionate to the value involved; a declaration had to be made that the document registered was really written by the person by whom it purported to have been issued (ll. 33-4, B. G. U. 717. 26, &c.); and a notice of the transaction was served in the ordinary way through the strategus upon the other contracting party, who would of course raise objections if any irregularity had occurred (ll. 3-4). We are unable to find here, with Gradewitz (Einführung, pp. 36-7), any question of a comparison of deeds or handwriting. The purpose was rather to obtain for the agreement concerned a validity which, as a mere χειρόγραφον, it did not previously possess, notwithstanding the formula ὡς ἐν δημοσίῳ καταχωρισμὸν (l. 28, &c.). In B. G. U. 578 the δημοσίωσις was preparatory to an action at law arising out of the non-fulfilment of the terms of the χειρόγραφον. In the other cases no such purpose is specified, and the step taken is only precautionary. This δημοσίωσις of χειρόγραφα is to be distinguished from the simple notification to the archidicasts of contracts without any reference to καταχωρισμὸς at the two libraries (cf. 727, introd.).

The papyrus bears the date Phaophi of the 2nd year of Pescennius Niger; other documents dated shortly before the collapse of his power are 801 and P. Grenf. II. 60.

'Αχιλλῆ τῷ καὶ Κασίῳ στρα(τη)γῷ
2nd hand παρὰ Διδύμου Ἀμμωνίων μητρὸς Ἑλένης ἀπὸ ὧν Ἑλίου πῶλ(εω)ς.
οὕτω ἐποίησα
ἐκ τοῦ καταλογεῖον χρηματισμοῦ ἐστιν ἀντίγραφον. Οἱτάλως [ὁ ἱερεύς καὶ
[ἀρχιδιακόντης Ὁχλῆργχείτου στρα(τη)γῷ] χαίρειν). τοῦ δεδομένου ὑπομήνατος ἀντὶ[γραφοῦ] μεταθεο(θη)τω ὡς
5 [ὑπόκ(ειταί)]. ἐρρωσο. (έτως) β Γαίον Πεσκεννίον Νέγερος ᾿Ιουστοῦ
Σεβαστ[οῦ] Φαώφι χγ.
[. . . . ] ηγη.(. ) [σ]εση(ε)μ(ε)ρ[ματ]. Πολε·[ω]ν Πα. . [.] γραμμ[ατ]ειν(ευς)
kαταλογείειν . πο( ) ἐγ[ραψα].
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI


15 οἰκίων δύο διστέγου καὶ ἀδῆρίων κοινῶν πρὸς τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου Παοῦν, δοὺ γείτονες τῆς μὲν μίας τοῦ ἀδῆρίου νῦν εἰσόδους καὶ ἐξόδους βορρᾶ [κλυ- ρονόμους Διογάτου ἀπλησίοντος κληρονόμους ὶς ἐμπόθε πνεύμο[ν] ἐς ἔσεθεν 

20 τιμῆς τῆς συμπεφωνημένης πρὸς ἀλλήλων υπὲρ παραχωρητι- κοῦ ἁγιαρίου Σεβαστοῦ νομίσματος δραχμῶν δισεκάδος] ἐς 

25 αὐτὸθε ἀπεβαίνειν παρὰ σοῦ διὰ [χειρὸς . . . .] δραση γενώμενος 

2. Second δ of διδύμου corr. from first half of a μ. 5. φασίθι apparently over an erasure. 7. ἰερ Παπ. 9. 1. προεμένου. 10. χ of ταπεινα牢固树立 corr. from γ by another hand. 11. σπαλλωνίου corr. from ἀρμονίου by another hand. 14. 1. ἡμεῖς. 31. A correction after με; cf. note below. 33. 1. ἐλαυ.
719. **PETITIONS**

'To Achilles also called Casius, strategus, from Didymus son of Ammonius and Helene, a settler from Heliopolis. Appended is a copy of the official response received by me from the record office. Vitalius, priest and archidicasts, to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome, greeting. Let a copy of the petition which has been presented be served as follows. Good-by. The 2nd year of Gaius Pescennius Niger Justus Augustus, Phaophi 28. Signed by me ... Written by me, Polemon son of ... scribe of the record office. ... To Vitalius, priest, archidicasts and superintendent of the chrematistae and other courts, from Didymus son of Ammonius and Helene, a settler from Heliopolis. Appended is a copy of the bond issued singly to me. Papontos son of Bithys and Tsenpachous, of Ision Tryphon in the Oxyrhynchite nome, to Didymus son of Apolloion and Helene, a settler from Heliopolis, greeting. I acknowledge that I have sold and ceded to you from henceforth for ever of my property in the said Ision Tryphon in the southern part of the village a half share of two houses, one having two storces, the other a yard, owned jointly by me and my brother Paous, the boundaries of which are, of the one with the yard, on the south an entrance and exit, on the north the property of the heirs of Diogas, on the east that of the heirs of Horus, on the west a public road, and of the other, on the south the property of Papontos son of Mouthis, on the north that of Heraclides son of Horion, on the east a public road, on the west the property of Musis son of Melas, at the price agreed upon between us for the cession namely 2000 drachmae of the Imperial silver coinage, which sum I have received immediately from hand to hand ...; and I guarantee the houses free from public and private debts and unaffected by persons' property-returns or any other claims, the right resting with you to cede to others and to manage and dispose of them as you choose. This contract, written by me, Papontos, in my own hand without erasure or insertion, is valid as though publicly registered. The 1st year of Gaius Pescennius Niger Justus Augustus, Pauni 20. Being therefore desirous that the authentic bond should be publicly registered I offer the prescribed 12 drachmae, in order that the regulations concerning publication may not apply to me (?), and that a single copy may be published, and request you to take this authentic bond bearing my attestation that it is the autograph of Papontos and register it together with this petition at the Library of Hadrian ...'.

3. ἐκ τῶν: in 485. 3 ἐκ should also be read instead of πα(ρα).

6. γραμματ(εῖος) καταλογγεῖοι: this no doubt was also the position of Hephaestion in 485. 8 and Flavius Aurelius in B. G. U. 578. 8. The καταλογγεῖον was presumably at Alexandria.

22. Ἰδρυσθ η looks like the termination of a place name.

23-4. καθαρόι ... ἀπὸ ἀπογραφὴς: cf. 577 καθαρόν (a share of a house) ἀπὸ ἀπογραφὴς πάντως καὶ ἀπὸ γεωργίας βασιλείας καὶ οἰκισμίως καὶ παντὸς εἴδους.


31-2. This is an obscure passage, the difficulties being increased by a slight uncertainty concerning the reading of με, which is followed in the original by something having the appearance of a tall ν. To read μον is unsatisfactory because the ε does not seem to have been touched, and we prefer to suppose that the tail of the φ of χειρόγραφων in l. 30, which is immediately above, descended into the line below and was cut off by a curved cross-stroke, so producing the effect of a ν. With μον, supposing that were intended, the meaning would be 'because it (the χειρόγραφον) does not comprise my διαστολή?; and the words may be construed in a somewhat similar sense with the more probable reading με because I do not possess the orders for publication,' the reference to the διαστολή being in either case quite unexplained. On the view adopted
in our translation the διαστολὴ περὶ δημοσιοφόρους may be supposed to have prescribed certain penalties or disabilities if the form of procedure followed by the petitioner was neglected.

720. Request for a Guardian.

A petition in Latin addressed to the praefect, Claudius Valerius Firmus, by a woman named Aurelia Ammonarion, that he would appoint a particular person as her guardian in accordance with the lex Iulia et Titia. This measure, which is supposed to have been passed in B.C. 31, empowered the praefects of provinces to assign guardians to women and minors who were without them. Appended to the document, which is signed in Greek by the petitioner and her proposed guardian, is the reply of the praefect making the appointment as desired. The rarity of accurately-dated specimens of Latin cursive gives the papyrus a considerable palaeographical interest.

To Claudius Valerius Firmus, praefect of Egypt, from Aurelia Ammonarion. I beg, my lord, that you will grant me as my guardian Aurelius Plutammon in accordance with the lex Iulia Titia . . . Dated in the consulship of our lords Philippus Augustus
721. **CONTRACTS**

for the 2nd time and Philippus Caesar. (Signed) I, Aurelia Ammonarion, have presented the petition. I, Aurelius Plutammon, assent to the request. The 4th year, Tubi 10. (Endorsed) In order that... may not be absent, I appoint Plutammon as guardian in accordance with the lex *Julia et Titia*. Received by me."

1. Valerius Firmus is already known as praefect at this time from P. Amh. 72 (A.D. 246) and 81 (A.D. 247). With regard to the date of P. Amh. 72 Wilcken considers (Archiv, II. p. 127) that the regnal year should be read as 7 instead of γ, as in our text; but we still hold that γ is right and that the facsimile, so far from throwing any doubt upon our reading, thoroughly confirms it.

5. *lege Julia Titia*: cf. Gaius, Inst. i. § 185 si cui nullus omnino tutor sit, ei datur in urbe Roma ex lege Atilla... in provinciis vero a praesidibus provinciarum ex lege *Julia et Titia*. In the official signature below (l. 14) the more usual and probably more correct form *Julia et Titia* is used. The *et* has sometimes been regarded as a reason for supposing that there were two leges, a *Julia* and a *Titia*, but the conclusion is by no means necessary.

Of the mutilated word at the end of the line the first letter may be *a*, *e*, *i*, *s*, or *t*, and the second *a*, *r*, *m*, *n*, or *x*.

---

(d) **CONTRACTS.**

721. **SALE OF CROWN LAND.**

*15 × 16.5 cm.*

A.D. 13-14.

An offer addressed by two persons to Gaius Seppius Rufus, perhaps idilogus, for the purchase of 19 arourae of land which had reverted to the State and was at the time uncultivated, at the price of 12 drachmae per aroura. The document follows, so far as it goes, the same formula as P. Amh. 68. 17-24, which Mitteis is no doubt right in explaining, not as a sale in the strict sense, but as an example of emphyteusis or hereditary lease (*Zeitschr. Savigny-St.* 1901, pp. 151 sqq.)—a custom for which we now have evidence in Egypt as early as the second century B.C. (cf. P. Tebt. I. 5. 12). That this is the true nature of the transaction, in spite of the use of the term *ωνυρασθαυ*, is shown both by the lowness of the price—in P. Amh. 68. 21, 20 drachmae, here only 12—and by the provision in the Amherst papyrus for an annual rent. Cf. 835, which is a similar offer for the *'purchase'* of land addressed to the same official as 721, and P. Amh. 97. The document was never completed, blank spaces being left for some of the dates.
To Gaius Seppius Rufus from Polemon son of Tryphon and Archelaus son of...

We wish to purchase in the Oxyrhynchite nome of the Crown land returned as unproductive up to the... year of Caesar, from the holdings which were confiscated in the... year of Caesar and became unfruitful and the holdings confiscated up to and including the... year of Caesar, exclusive of temple land, for cultivation in the coming 44th year of Caesar—namely Polemon at Thosbis and Tepouis in the upper toparchy fifteen arourae, total 15 arourae, and Archelaus at... in the toparchy of Thmoisepho, four arourae, total 4 arourae, total 19 arourae, with the understanding that on these being assigned to us we shall pay into the local State-bank the price ordered for each aroura, 12 drachmae of silver, and shall have for their reclamation and cultivation immunity from taxation for three years from the coming 44th year of Caesar...
The saleable land ἵππον ἁπαθικής is regarded as including both the confiscated κλήροι and certain ἴερα γῆ which must also have reverted to the government.

12. παραδείγματα ταύτης: cf. P. Amh. 68. 20, where παραδείγματα ταύτης is no doubt to be read, P. Tebt. 79. 16, &c.

13. τὴν κεκελευθησεὶ τιμὴν: cf. P. Amh. 68. 20 τὴν κέλευθησα android ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ Δοικίου Ἰουλίου [Ὁ ἵππος τείνω τοῖς ἰγερόμαν ὑπὲρ]

14-5. The supplements are taken from P. Amh. 68. 21. Other conditions on the lines of P. Amh. 68 presumably followed. 835 concludes ἔξω ἑπιστέλλειν...] καὶ τῶν γραμματέων ἐκδόθων μια τῶν... πέρι ταύτας χρηματισμοῖς, and something of this kind apparently underlies P. Amh. 68. 23-4.

722. EMANCIPATION OF A SLAVE.

This document, which contains a formal emancipation of a female slave, drawn up before the agoranomia and concluding with an acknowledgement of the ransom, is of great interest as being the first specimen of its class from Egypt which is prior to the introduction of the constitutio Antonina, and illustrating the differences between Graeco-Egyptian and Roman law on the subject of manumission. Of the two previously known parallels, B. G. U. 96, which is a mere fragment, belongs to the third century and the Papyrus Edmondstone (facsimile in Young's Hieroglyphics, ii, Plate 46; text in Curtius, Anec. Delph. App. 1, Wessely, Jahresber. des k. k. Staatsgym. in Hernalis, xiii, pp. 47-8) to A. D. 354. Since the publications of the latter papyrus are somewhat inaccessible, we append the text of it on p. 202. Other papyri concerning the emancipation of slaves are 716, 723, a similar but much shorter example of a second century manumission, 48-9 and 349, which are letters to the agoranomia authorizing them to liberate slaves. The ends of lines are lost throughout 722, but can in part be restored either from the context or from a comparison with another and quite complete specimen of an emancipation, written in the reign of Commodus, which we opportunely found in January, 1904. The most striking feature of 722 is the circumstance that it is concerned, not with the emancipation of an individual whose status was entirely that of a slave, but with a joint manumission by two brothers of the third part of a slave who as regards the other two-thirds had already been made free; cf. the parallel case in 716 and, as it now appears, in P. Edmondstone 6. That the previous owner of the ⅛ was a different person from the two owners of the ⅜ is not stated directly but is in the light of 716 likely enough. It is also noticeable that the
ransom is paid, not by the slave herself or by a banker, but by a private individual, perhaps her prospective husband, and that a distinction is drawn between the λύτρα paid to the owner and a small sum in silver which probably went to the State; cf. note on l. 19.

"Ετοὺς δεκάτου Αὐτοκράτορίσο καὶ Καίσαρος Δομιτιανὸν
Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Ἰππείρβερεταιόν
ἐπαγομένων) (2nd hand) ἵππα(στῇ) (1st hand) μην(νὸς) Καισαρείου
ἐπαγομένων) (2nd hand) ἵππα(στῇ) (1st hand) ἐν Ὀ-"
The 10th year of the Emperor Caesar Domitianus Augustus Germanicus, on the 6th intercalary day of Hyperberetaeus, dies Augustus, which is the 6th intercalary day of the month Caesarius, dies Augustus, at Oxyrhynchus in the Thebaid, before three agoranomi called Psammis, Achilles, aged about 20 years, of middle height, fair, having a long face and a scar on the middle of his forehead, and Sarapas, aged about 20 years, of middle height, fair, having a long face and a scar on his left shin, both sons of Ammonius, their mother being Sarapous daughter of ..., all of Oxyrhynchus, have set free under sanction of Zeus, Earth, and Sun (the deed being drawn up in the street) the third part which they jointly own of the slave who has been freed as regards the other two-thirds, Apollonous, aged about 26 years, of middle height, fair, having a long face and a scar on the right foot, ... for ... drachmae 4 obols of coined silver and the ransom paid to Achilles and Sarapas by Heraclis son of Tryphon son of ..., his mother being Taonnophris daughter of ... of the said city, aged about 31 years, of middle height, fair, having a long face and a scar above his right knee, namely 200 drachmae of Imperial silver coin and ... talents 1000 drachmae of copper; Achilles or any one else on his behalf being forbidden to make any demand of the aforesaid ransom from Apollonous or her assigns, or to ... The certifier of the manumission is ... son of Petæsis, his mother being ..., of the said city, aged about 40 years, of middle height, fair, having a long face and a scar upon his ... shin, in the same street.

1, Achilles, have with my brother Sarapas effected the emancipation of the third part of the slave Apollonous, and I have received the ransom, two hundred drachmae of silver ...
1. Since the papyrus must on palaeographical grounds be assigned to the end of the first or the early part of the second century, the coincidence of a 6th intercalary day with the 10th year of an emperor called Germanicus fixes the reign as that of either Domitian or Trajan. The supplement at the end of l. 1 is in any case long compared with the 10 letters which are missing in l. 2, and Domitian is therefore preferable.

6. Cf. the similar beginning of P. Edmondst. 6 sqq. For Δία γ' ἡν Ἡλιων, cf. 48. 6, &c.

12. ἐν ἀγμα is supplied from the newly found emancipation (cf. introd.); cf. ἐν ἄγμα] τῇ αὐτῇ in l. 34–5. We are inclined to think that this formula, which so far is only known at Oxyrhynchus, regularly implies the execution of the document before the agoranomi, who are mentioned much less frequently in Oxyrhynchus contracts than elsewhere.

16–9. The newly found emancipation proceeds straight from the description of the slave to the mention of the ἀγγείρων ἐπίσημον corresponding to l. 19, and owing to the lacunae it is not clear whether the sum mentioned in l. 17 is the ransom of the whole slave or of the 2/3 previously set free. On the whole we think the latter hypothesis is more likely. The talents are in either case probably copper.

19. ἀγγείρων ἐπίσημον: the newly found emancipation has ἄγγ. ἐπίσ. δραχμάς δέκα καὶ ἐν τίτασται ὑπὸ ἁύτου (sc. the slave) τῷ Θεωρ (the owner)... λέγεται ἄγγ. ἄργ. δραχ. πεντακοσίων, on the analogy of which we have supplied λέγεται in l. 24. It is clear from that papyrus that a distinction was drawn between the payment in ἀγγείρου ἐπίσημον and the ransom paid to the owner, and from 48 and 49 in which the same amount of ἀγγείρου ἐπίσημον, 10 drachmae, is coupled with different sums expressed in copper, there would seem to have been a normal charge of 10 drachmae in addition to the ransom, in spite of 722, 19–20, where the amount of ἄγγ. ἐπίσ. cannot be 10 drachmae. The divergence of 722 at this point may be due to the fact that it is concerned with the emancipation of only part of a slave. To whom these 10 drachmae were paid is not made clear, but it is probable that the State in some form was the recipient. Nowhere in connexion with these emancipations under Graeco-Egyptian law is there a mention of the τις εἰκόνα, though levied under Roman law, which appears in B. G. U. 96. 8 (τῆς [εἰκόνας ἐκκοστή]; but if, as we are now disposed to think, the status of the persons who wrote 48–9 was that of farmers of the ἐκκοστή and 48–9 stand towards such documents as 722 in the same kind of relation as 241–3 towards contracts for sale or mortgage, there must have been a tax upon the emancipation of slaves apart from the 10 drachmae ἀγγείρου ἐπίσημον.

Papyrus Edmondstone.

A.D. 354.
723. EMANCIPATION OF A SLAVE.

17$\cdot$3 x 21$\cdot$2 cm.  AD. 138-161.

This document, recording the formal emancipation of a female slave, follows the same formula as 722, but is simpler and more compressed. A good deal is lost at the beginnings of the lines, including, unfortunately, the details concerning the λύτρα; but a comparison with 722 renders the general sense clear enough. Cf. the intro. to that papyrus.

1 ["Ερομεν Αὐτοκρατόρος Καῖσαρος Ῥωμαϊκὸς Ἐπικράτειρα Ἐκπομπὴν Ἐπικράτειραν Ἐπικράτειρας Σεβαστῆς Αὐτοκρατορίας Καῖσαρος Φιλοτεχνίας Εἰς τὴν Θεσσαλίαν. Καὶ πολέμησεν τὴν Θεσσαλίαν. Καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν τὸν Ἱβραϊκὸν Παπισμὸν. Καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν Παπισμὸν. Καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν Παπισμὸν. Καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν Παπισμὸν.
2 επ’ αγορανόμου αδείκεν ελευθέραν ὑπὸ Δία Γῆν Ἡλιον ] Διο-
δάρου τοῦ Ἀγαθείνου μητρὸς Τσει Θέωνος Ἡρακλείδου
3 30 letters ἀπ’ Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως ἐν ἀγνίᾳ τῇ ν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῷ
οἰκογενεὶ ἐκ δούλης Δημητριῶτος
4 δούλην 50 letters ]δε...[ γνωστή τῆς ελευθερώσεως Σαραπίων
Ἀσκληπιάδου
5 55 letters (2nd hand) ὡς] (ἐτών) ν ὧ[μή] ποδὶς(ερῶ) (1st hand)
ἐν ἀγνίᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ (2nd hand) διὰ Χαίρημονος τοῦ σὺν ἄλ(λοις)
6 50 letters ]

1. θησαυρὸς Ραπ. 2. ὑπαρχουσαν Ραπ. 5. αγνία Ραπ.

2. τοῦ seems to have been omitted before Ἡρακλείδου. The name Τσει occurs also in
76. 5 μητρὸς Τσει Καλλίδου.

4. The vestiges following ]δε possibly represent the γνωστή, the intervening space
being accounted for by the junction at this point of two selides. Shorter blank spaces
have been left in the corresponding part of the two preceding lines. In that case ]δε
γνωστή should be read; but the traces do not suit γνωστή particularly well, and there is no ]δε
in 496. 16 where a γνωστή is mentioned at the end of a contract. A description of the slave and perhaps the amount of the λίτρα was given at the beginning of this line (cf. 722.
15 sqq.); but ]δε is not a possible reading.

5. After σὺν ἄλ(λοις) the papyrus not improbably proceeded ἐπὶ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου; cf. 96. 2
(corr. by Wilcken) ὃ σὺν ἄλ(λοις) ἐπὶ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου). This restoration would accord
very well with our present explanation of the position occupied by the writers of 48 and 49
(cf. 722. 19, note); but what exactly ]δε implies here is uncertain.

724. Apprenticeship to a Shorthand-Writer.

Contract whereby an ex-cosmetes of Oxyrhynchus apprenticed his slave
to a shorthand-writer for two years to be taught to read and write shorthand,
the teacher receiving 120 drachmae in all. The contract was drawn up by an
unprofessional scribe, and the language is often confused.

Πα[νε]χάτης ὁ καὶ Πανάρης τῶν κεκοσμητευκότων τῆς Ὀξυρύγχωτος
πόλεως διὰ Γεμέλλου φίλου Ἀπολλωνίῳ σημειογράφοι χαίρεν. συνέστησά σοι
Χαίράμμωνα δούλου πρὸς μάθησιν σημειῶν ὡς ἐπίσταται ὁ νῦς σου
Δι(ρ)ύσιος ἐπὶ χρόνον ἑτη δύο ἄπο τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος μηνὸς Φαμενῶθ τοῦ
5 ὠκτωκαϊδεκάτου ἔτους Ἀντωνίνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου μισθοῦ τοῦ συμπεφω

νυμένου πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀργυρίου δραχμῶν ἕκατον ἔκοσι χρώις ἑορτι-

κών, ἐξ ὧν ἔσχες τὴν πρώτην δόσιν ἐν δραχμαῖς τεσσαράκοντα, τὴν δὲ

dευτέραν λήψει τοῦ παιδὸς ἀνειληφώτος τὸ κομεντάριον ὅλον ἐν δρα-
χ' μαίας τεσσαράκοντα, τὴν δὲ τρίτην λήψομαι ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ χρόνου τοῦ

10 παιδὸς ἐκ παντὸς λόγου πεζοῦ γράφοντος καὶ ἀναγεινώσχον τοῖς ἀμέριτοις
tὰς {δὲ} λοιπὰς δραχμὰς τεσσαράκοντα. ἐὰν δὲ ἐντὸς τοῦ χρόνου αὐτῶν
ἀπαρτίσης οὐκ ἐκδέξομαι τὴν προκειμένην προθεμ[ὶ]ἀν, οὐκ ἐξόντος

µοι ἐντὸς τοῦ χρόνου τοῦ παιδα ἀποσπάν, παραμενεὶ δὲ σ'o] μετὰ [τοῦ χρόνου

όσα

ἐὰν ἄργηση ἡμέρας ή µήνας. (ἔτους) ἡ Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτου

Ἀλλιὸν Ἀδριανοῦ

15 Ἀντωνίνου Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβίου Φαμενίδο ε.

3. ο of σου corr. from μ. 7. χ of δραχμας corr. from γ. 9. λήψει. 12. 

ξ of εκδεξομαι corr. from χ. 14. η of ηµερας rewritten.

 Panechotes also called Panares, ex-cosmetes of Oxyrhynchus, through his friend

Gemellus, to Apollonius, writer of shorthand, greeting. I have placed with you my slave

Cheraemimon to be taught the signs which your son Dionysius knows, for a period of two

years dating from the present month Phamenoth of the 18th year of Antoninus Caesar the

lord at the salary agreed upon between us, 120 silver drachmae, not including feast-days;

of which sum you have received the first instalment amounting to 40 drachmae, and you

will receive the second instalment consisting of 40 drachmae when the boy has learnt

the whole system, and the third you will receive at the end of the period when the boy

writes fluently in every respect and reads faultlessly, viz. the remaining 40 drachmae.

If you make him perfect within the period, I will not wait for the aforesaid limit; but it is

not lawful for me to take the boy away before the end of the period, and he shall remain

with you after the expiration of it for as many days or months as he may have done

work. The 18th year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus

Pius, Phamenoth 5.

6. χρώις ἑορτικῶν: sc. ἡµερῶν (cf. 725. 36-7), though the phrase is out of place.

8. κομεντάριον: a Graecized form of commentarium seems to be intended, though the
doubtful µ is more like λο.

11-3. The clause οὐκ ἐξόντος κ.τ.λ., which is regularly found in contracts of apprentice-

ship (cf. e. g. 725. 53-6), comes in somewhat awkwardly here after the clause ἐὰν δὲ ἐντὸς κ.τ.λ.
The meaning is that if the boy was perfect in less than two years, his owner would not

insist on his staying with the teacher unless the teacher wished to keep him, but the boy’s

owner was prevented from taking him away before the boy was perfect and so evading the

payment of the second and third instalment.
A contract between Ischyron and Heraclas, in which the former apprentices to the latter a boy called Thonis, probably the ward of Ischyron, for five years, to be taught the trade of weaving. Arrangements are made for the provision of wages (after two years and seven months) and clothes for Thonis by Heraclas on an ascending scale, and for the case of Thonis' absence from his work for more than the 20 days allowed for holidays. Cf. 275, a similar contract with a weaver written 120 years previously, upon which the supplements in ll. 1–5 are based.

[Ὁμολογούσιν ἀλλήλοις Ἰσχύριον Ἡραδίωνος
[μητρὸς ............. ἀπ’ Ὀξυφόλυγχων πόλεως καὶ
[Ἡρακλᾶς Σαραπίουνος τοῦ καὶ Δέοντος Ἡρακλεί-
[δίῳ μητρὸς ............. ἀπὸ] τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως
5 [γέρδιοις ὡς μὲν Ἰσχύριοιν ἑγ]δεδοσθαι τῷ Ἡρα-
[κλᾶς τῶν τοῦθεν ............. ].... [. .] ἄδελφοῦ
. [. .] ον Ὀξυφόλυγχων ἠφεθή[ικα π]ρὸς [μ]άθησιν τῆς δη-
[λο][μένης [τ]έχνης ἀπὸ νεομη[μής τοῦ] ἑξῆς
μηνὸς Φασώφι[ι] ἔπι χρόνον ἐτη πέντε, καὶ παρ-
10 ἐξει αὐτοῦ προσεδρεύοντα τῷ διδασκάλῳ
ἐπὶ τῶν δηλο[μένουν χρόνον καὶ] ἐκάστην
ημέραν ἀπὸ ἀ[υτολῆ)] ἴ[λον] μέχρι δύσης,
ποιοῦντα πάντα τὰ ἐπιταχθήσομενα [ἀ]υτὸν
ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ διδασκάλου ὥς ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοί-
15 ων μαθητῶν, [τρεφόμενου ὕπο τοῦ Ἰσχύ-
[ρί]ονος. καὶ τὰ μὲν] πρῶτα ἐτη δύο
καὶ μὴνας ἐπὶ τοῦ τρίτου ἐνιαυτοῦ
οὐδὲν δῶσει ὑπὲρ μισθὸν τοῦ παιδὸς ὁ Ἡρα-
κλᾶς, τοῖς δὲ λαοποῖς μησὶ πέντε τοῦ αὐ-
20 τοῦ τρίτου ἐνιαυτοῦ χορηγῆσαι ὁ Ἡρα-
κλᾶς ὑπὲρ μισθὸν τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαθητοῦ
κατὰ μὴνα δραχμᾶς δεκάδου καὶ τῷ τε-
τάρτη ἐνιαυτῷ ὁμοίως κατὰ μῆνα
ὑπὲρ μισθῶν δραχμᾶς δεκάες καὶ τῷ
25 πέμπτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ ὁμοίως κατὰ μῆνα δραχμὰς εἰκοσὶ τέσσαρας, καὶ κατασκευάσει ὁ Ἡρακλῆς τῷ αὐτῷ μαθητῇ τῷ μὲν ἐνεστώτι τετάρτῳ καὶ εἰκοστῷ ἔτει
χίτωνα ἄξιον δραχμῶν δεκαές, τῷ [δὲ
30 ἴσιντι κε (ἐτεί) ἔτερον χιτῶνα ἄξιον δραχμῶν εἰκοσὶ, καὶ τῷ κυρίῳ ὁμοίως ἄλλοις χιτῶνοι ἀξίου ἄξιοι δραχμῶν εἴκοσὶ τεσσάρων,
καὶ τῷ Ηρακλῆι χιτώνα [ἀξίου δραχμῶν εἰκοσὶ ὀκτώ, καὶ τῷ κυρίῳ (ἐτεί) ὁμοίως ἄλλοις χιτῶνοι ἄξιοι δραχμῶν τριάκοντα δύο. ἀργήσει δὲ ὁ παῖς εἰς λόγον ἐορτῶν κατʼ ἐτος ἡμέρας εἰκοσὶ, οὐδενὸς ἐκκρυμμένον
τῷ μισθῶν τούτων ἀριθμὸν ἐκτὸς χρόνου ἐκ
χορηγηθηκόντας μισθών, ἐκεῖ δὲ πλείονας τούς.
40 τῶν ἀργήσεως ἡ ἀσθενήσας ἡ ἀτακτήσῃ ἡ
dει ἄλλην τινὰ αἰτίαν ἡμέρας ἐπὶ τάς
[ἐφισος ἐπάναγκες] παρέξει αὐτὸν ὁ Ἡρακλῆς
ων τῷ διδασκαλίῳ ἡμέρας παραμένοντα
καὶ ποιοῦντα πάντα καθὼς πρόκειται
45 χωρίς μισθοῦ, τρέφομεν ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἡρακλῆος, διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τούτως ἐστάσθαι. ὁ [δὲ] Ἡρακλῆς εὐδοκῶν τούτως πᾶσι καὶ ἐκ δειδάξεων τὸν μαθητήν τὴν ἀλογισμένην τέχνην ἐν τῷ πειναστεῖ χρόνῳ
50 καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπιστάται καὶ χορηγήσεις
tοῦ ποιημάτων μισθοῦς καθὼς πρόκειται,
τα[ι] ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐχίδον μηνὸς τοῦ τρίτου ἐνιαυτοῦ. καὶ μὴ ἔξετο ἀρχὲν σαν παραβιάζειν τοὺς προκειμένους ἢ ὁ παραβας
55 ἐκτείνει τῷ ἐνεμένοντι εἰπεῖν δραχμᾶς ἐκατόν καὶ εἶς ὁ δημόσιον τὰς ἱεραρχικούς. (ἐτοὺς) καὶ Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καῖσαρος
16. τ of ετη corr. from ε. 30. ἵστορι Ραπ. 34. ἀλλ' ᾿ω above the line. 35. τι of αδεω corr. from δε. 52. σφυου corr 56. ἵστος Ραπ. 63. τ of μορος rewritten (?)

1 'Ischyron son of Heradion and . . . of Oxyrhynchus, and Heraclas son of Sarapion also called Leon, son of Heraclides, his mother being . . . of the said city, weaver, agree with each other as follows:—Ischyron on the one part that he has apprenticed to Heraclas . . . Thonis, a minor, to be taught the art of weaving for a period of five years starting from the 1st of next month, Phaophi, and will produce him to attend the teacher, for the stipulated period every day from sunrise to sunset, performing all the orders that may be given to him by the said teacher on the same terms as the other apprentices, and being fed by Ischyron. For the first 2 years and 7 months of the 3rd year Heraclas shall pay nothing for the boy's wages, but in the remaining 5 months of the said 3rd year Heraclas shall pay for the wages of the said apprentice 12 drachmae a month, and in the 4th year likewise for wages 16 drachmae a month, and in the 5th year likewise 24 drachmae a month; and Heraclas shall furnish for the said apprentice in the present 24th year a tunic worth 16 drachmae, and in the coming 25th year a second tunic worth 20 drachmae, and likewise in the 26th year another tunic worth 24 drachmae, and in the 27th year another tunic worth 28 drachmae, and likewise in the 28th year another tunic worth 32 drachmae. The boy shall have 20 holidays in the year on account of festivals without any deduction from his wages after the payment of wages begins; but if he exceeds this number of days from idleness or ill-health or disobedience or any other reason, Ischyron must produce him for the teacher during an equivalent number of days, during which he shall remain and perform all his duties, as aforesaid, without wages, being fed by the said Ischyron, because the contract has been made on these terms. Heraclas on the other part consents to all these provisions, and agrees to instruct the apprentice in the aforesaid art within the period of 5 years as thoroughly as he knows it himself, and to pay the monthly wages as above, beginning with the 8th month of the 3rd year. Neither party is permitted to violate any of the aforesaid provisions, the penalty for such violation being a fine of 100 drachmae to the party abiding by the contract and to the Treasury an equal sum. This agreement is valid. The 24th year of the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Augustus Armenianus Medicus Parthicus Sarmaticus Germanicus Maximus, Thoth 25. 1, Heraclas son of Sarapion also called Leon, have made this contract and consent to all the aforesaid provisions. 1, Thonis also called Morous, son of Harthonis, wrote for him as he was illiterate.'
726. **CONTRACTS**

20 \times 9.2 \text{ cm.} \quad \text{A.D. 135.}

This is an agreement by which Apollonius authorizes another person to appear for him in some legal proceedings in which he was concerned, being prevented by illness from attending in person; cf. 97 and 281, which are contracts of the same kind. The document is incomplete, the name of the representative and the date not having been filled in.

"Ετούς ἐννεακαϊδεκάτου Αὐτοκράτορος
Καίσαρος Τραϊ[ν]ανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ
Σεβαστοῦ Τύβη[,] ἐν Ὀξυρυγκέων πόλεως τῆς Θηβαίδος. ὁμο
5 λογεῖ Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλώνιον τοῦ Δ[ι]ογένους μητρὸς Τανεχω-
ταρίου τῆς [καὶ] Εὐτέρπης Διογέ-

4 νοὺς ἀπʼ Ὀξυρυγκέων πόλεως

8 ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως, ἐν ἀγυιᾷ,
10 οὐ δυνάμενος δεῖ ἅ[σ]θενεαν πλείσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ νομοῦ

diaλογισμ[ὁ]γν, αὐτόθεν συν-
eιστακέναι τὸν
tὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ λόγον ποιησό-

15 μενον περὶ τῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν

δητηθησομεν ἐπὶ τοῦ κρατίστου ἡγεμόνος Πετρωνίου
[Mμ]ερεύνου καὶ τοῦ ἐπιστρατη-
[y]γο[ν] Τελλίου Βάσισου ἢ Κ[α] ἐφ’ ἐτέ-

20 ρων κριτῶν κ[αί] πάντα ἐπιτελέ-

σοντα περὶ τῶν κ[αί] τὴν σύστασιν,
eὐδοκεῖ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦτοις.

[kυρία ἡ ὀμολογία.]

'The 19th year of the Emperor Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus, Tubi , at Oxyrhynchus in the Thebaid. Apollonius son of Apollonius son of Diogenes, his mother being Tanechotarion also called Euterpe, daughter of Diogenes, of Oxyrhynchus, acknowledges to , of the said city (the contract taking place in the street), since he is unable through sickness to make the voyage to the assize of the nome, that he has forthwith appointed to represent him in the inquiry to be held against him before his highness the praefect Petronius Mamertinus or the epistrategus Gellius Bassus or other judges, and to carry out everything concerned with the trial; for he gives his consent on these terms. The agreement is valid.'


14. τὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ: so no doubt in 97. 3; the word after Νικάφορα there is perhaps a patronymic.

19. Τελλίου Βάσισου: Bassus is mentioned as epistrategus seven years earlier in 237. vii. 22.

This is a deed drawn up by two brothers, who were Roman citizens and owned property at Oxyrhynchus, authorizing an agent to act in their absence from Egypt for a nephew and niece whose guardians they were. The document, which is called a συγχωρήσις, is addressed to the archidicastes, whose official cognizance of the transaction was desired. Other instances of private contracts being sent to the archidicastes are 268, B.G.U. 729 and 741, the juristic significance of which is discussed by Gradenwitz, *Einführung*, pp. 91–2, and Mitteis, *Archiv*, I. p. 330. It is noticeable that, with the exception of 268, the persons concerned in all these cases are Roman citizens, and that the documents usually take the form of a συγχωρήσις. The procedure here is apparently to be distinguished from that exemplified in 719; cf. introd. to that papyrus.

20 pro's oys éaan déèi kai géνi διαπολήσοντα à éaan déon ò tì àυτού πístei, dìo toutìs pro's toutìs óntas συνχρημα-
τίζειν τó' Ωφέλας ἕκαστα [tì]ν προκειμένων ἐπιτελήσω-
ti, kai λόγοις δὲ éaan ἐπιτελέσῃ κατά μήνα ἕκαστον
diape[μ]ψώμενον [αυτοῖς] πάντα δὲ ἐπιτελέσοντα κα-
25 ò δὲ αυτοὺς παρόων έξήν, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ συνιστανόμενος
'Ωφέλας εὑροκεί τῇ δὲ συγχωρήσει, κυρίων ὄντων
δὲν ἔχοντι ο τε 'Απίων ὁ καὶ Διογένης καὶ Ἀπολινάριος
ό καὶ Ἰουλιανός ἀλλήλων γραμμάτων παντοῖοι πάν-
tων. αὖ[μέν]έν. ἐτούς ἐπτακε[ί]δεκάτου Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος)
30 Ἀλλόν Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀιτιολονίου Σέβαστοϋ Εὐσέβους
Μεχείρ β.

and hand Ἀμμάριος... a( )


'To . . . , son of Isidorus the ex-exegetes, late strategus of the city, priest, archi-
dicastes and superintendent of the chrematistae and the other courts, through the deputy
archidicastes Demetrius son of Heraclides the ex-exegetes, from Gaius Marciius Apion also
called Diogenes and Gaius Marciius Apolinarius also called Julianus and however we are
styled, and from Ophelas son of Ophelas, of Oxyrhynchus. Gaius Marciius Apion also
called Diogenes and Gaius Marciius Apolinarius also called Julianus, being at present unable
to make the voyage to Egypt, agree that they have appointed the aforesaid Ophelas,
who is the agent for their property in the Oxyrhynchite nome, by the terms of the present
authorization to act for and take charge of their brother's children Valerius Theodotus
also called Polion and Valeria Apollonaria also called Nicarete, who are minors and their
wards, and further to collect rents and to make such leases as may be necessary, and
to appear against persons and to sell off produce as may be needful on his own authority.
Accordingly let those concerned do business with Ophelas in the discharge of all the
aforesaid duties; and he shall forward to the said parties accounts of all his acts every
month, and shall have power to act in all things no less than they themselves would
have if present. Ophelas the appointed representative asents to this authorization;
and all bonds of every kind which Apion also called Diogenes and Apolinarius also called
Julianus hold of each other remains in force. We request (your concurrence). The 17th year of the Emperor Caesar Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, Mecheir 2.'

19. καταστρήματος: for καθίσταιδον in the sense of appearing at legal proceedings
cf. e. g. B. G. U. 613. 14 καταστήματεν καὶ θεοὶ δόματον, and the frequent instances of κατάστασις.
21. The construction is here somewhat awkward, the series of future participles which
depend upon συνεπιστέκαται in L. 12 being interrupted by the parenthetical sentence διὸ τοῦτο . . .
συνχρηματίζειν . . . ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, which would better have been kept till the end.
stands by itself, as here. Wilcken (Archiw. I. p. 176) and Mitteis (ibid. p. 350) both consider that the object to be supplied after ἀξιόμενον is σωματισμόν, on the strength of 288, where the preceding sentence is εἰ δὲ τοῖς προκειμένοις οἷς ἐννοεῖ σωματισμόν. This was also our own view when editing that papyrus; but in consideration of the uncertainty concerning the meaning of the word σωματισμόν, and the fact that here as well as in B. G. U. 729 άξιοῦμεν is found by itself, we retain the doubts expressed in the note upon P. Fay. Towns 33. 18–9 as to whether in 288 άξιοῦμεν is to be connected with the clause immediately preceding. We should therefore prefer to understand some more general term.

728. Sale of a Crop.

A.D. 142.

27 x 11.9 cm.

A contract of a somewhat novel character, called a καρπωνεία, by which two tenants sell part of their crops standing, the money to be paid by the purchaser within a given time direct to the landlord, who has the same rights of execution as in the case of a loan. At the end is an acknowledgement from the landlord of the receipt of the money.

μὴ ἀποδῷ τῇ ὀρισμένῃ προθεσμίᾳ
ekτίσει τὰς τοῦ ἄργυρίου δραχμὰς διάκο-
20 σιὰς ἐβδομήκοντα ἕξ σὺν ἡμιωλίᾳ καὶ τὸ-
κὸν δραχμιαίον ἐκάστης μνᾶς κατὰ μὴνα
ἐκαστον, τῆς πράξεως οὐσίας τῷ Ἀπίωνι
ἐκ τοῦ Διογένους καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόν-
[τ]ῶν αὐτῷ πάντων καθάπερ ἐγ γίκης.
25 [κ']υρία ἡ καρπωνεία. ἔτους πέμπτου Αὐτοκράτορος
[Καῖσαρος Τίτου Αἰλίου Ὀδριανοῦ Ἀντωνείνου
[Σε]μαστοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς Φαρμοθη κγ. (2nd hand) Παῦ-
[τ]ῆς καὶ Λίβιος ἀμφότεροι ἐκ μητρὸς
Ἀρσείτος (κ)εκαρποῦκαμεν τῷ Διώγειν
30 τὰς τοῦ χρότου ἀροῦμας τρεῖς ἐκ γεωμε-
τρίας φόρου ἄργυρίου δραχμῶν δια-
κοσίων οὐδομήκοντα ἕξ ὡς πρόκει-
ται. Διονύσιος Διονύσιος ἔγραφα
ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν μὴ εἰτότων γράμματα.
35 χρόνοις ὁ αὐτὸς.

3rd hand Ἀπίων Ὄραυνος Διογένει Ἀμύτος
χαίρειν. ἔσχον παρὰ σοῦ τὰς συντε-
φοινημένας ὑπὲρ τιμῆς χρότου ἄργυρι-
[ο]ν δραχμὰς διακοσίας ἐβδομήκοντα
40 [ἕξ καὶ οὐδέν σοι ἐνκαλὸ δις πρόκειται.
[(ἐτους) ἐ Ἀ]ντωνείνου Καῖσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
[Ἐπε]φ β.
having the right of execution upon both Diogenes and all his property as if in accordance with a legal decision. This sale of a crop is valid. The 5th year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius, Pharmouthi 23. We, Patheutes and Livius, our mother being Harseis, have sold to Diogenes the crop of 3 arourae of hay as fixed by a survey for the payment of 276 drachmae of silver, as aforesaid. I, Dionysius son of Dionysius, wrote for them as they were illiterate. The same date. Apion son of Horion to Diogenes son of Amois, greeting. I have received from you the 276 drachmae which were agreed upon for the price of the hay and I make no complaint against you, as aforesaid. The 5th year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, Epeiph 2.'

729. Lease of a Vineyard.

21 x 29.7 cm. A.D. 137.

A contract for the sub-lease of a vineyard for four years from Sarapion, who was himself a lessee (cf. l. 14), to Ammonius and Ptoilas. The body of the document (ll. 1–35) is written in a very small hand in lines of exceptional length, of which the first 35–40 letters on the average are lost, while a few lines at the beginning are also wanting, being represented only by a detached fragment which is illegible and half decayed.

No extant lease of the Roman period has been drawn up with such elaboration of detail as the present document, and though P. Tebt. I. 105, of the second century B.C., is equally long its formula is quite different. Of the known leases of vineyards C. P. R. 244 is a mere fragment, and P. Brit. Mus. 163 is incomplete in the most important part. Hence the restoration of the lacunae in 729, which was moreover written by a somewhat careless scribe, is far from easy, and the sense of some of the provisions is obscure, though the general construction and meaning are usually intelligible.

The rent paid for the ἀμπελών, the extent of which does not appear, was (ll. 36–7) half the vine produce in addition to 50 jars of wine and perhaps a sum of money or corn; but that does not seem to include the rent of a piece of dry land which had once been a vineyard (Ἀραβάντα, l. 30). This is leased (ll. 30–32) for three years, starting from a year after the date of the contract itself, and was to be cultivated as the lessees chose with the usual exceptions of the more exhausting crops, the rent being 60 drachmae and perhaps half the produce. The ἀμπελών is subdivided in l. 22 into a κτήμα and a καλαμέα. The former term refers mainly to the vines (though including a rose garden, v. inf.), the latter apparently to a crop of some kind of reeds; but the passages dealing with the καλαμέα (ll. 3–4 and 25–7) are unfortunately very imperfect,
and the connexion between the vines and the κάλομος is not made clear; cf. l. 3, note. Lines 5–10 deal with the embankments (χωματισμός), ll. 10–11 with the manuring (κοπρισμός), l. 11 with the watching of the fruit (ὀπωροφορλακία), ll. 12–8 with the irrigation, for which the lessees were to receive a loan of both money and cattle, ll. 18–22 with the payment of the rent and penalties for failure to carry out the terms of the contract. Lines 22–7 regulate the condition in which the vineyard was to be delivered up at the end of the lease, while ll. 27–30 are concerned with the apportionment of the various ἔργα. After a section dealing with the lease of the χερσάμπελος (ll. 30–2) follows one concerning a rose garden in the κτήμα (ll. 32–3), and the lease concludes with the usual clause assigning the taxes to the lessor (ll. 33–4), and another by which two rooms in a farmhouse are secured to the lessees (l. 34). Lines 35–8 contain the signature of the lessees, written for them in a large uncultivated hand by Ptolemaeus, while in ll. 38–46 is a supplementary agreement in a third hand, drawn up a year after the original contract, and acknowledging firstly (ll. 38–44) the loan of the cattle mentioned in l. 16, and secondly (ll. 44–5) another loan of which the previous mention is lost.
7 [ 36 letters ] δραχμών τριακοσίων, τὴν δὲ ἀν[α]βολὴν ποιήσονται ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξής ἀναβολῶν. τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ τοῦ ἄρχαιον κτήματος χώματος ὑδροφιλάκιαν μέχρι τοῦ ὄρους
8 [ 37 letters ] τῷ τοῦ ἄρχαιον κτήματος μισθώτῃ, τῆς κατ’ ἑτος ἀπεργασίας τοῦ αὐτοῦ χώματος ἐάνπερ χρεία ἢν ἔσται πρὸς μόνον τῶν μεμισθωκότα, τῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ νεωφύτων χω-
9 [μάτων 32 letters ] πρὸ{ς}s μόνος τοὺς μεμισθωμένους, ὁμοίως καὶ τοῦ νυτίνου χώματος μέχρι τοῦ ὄρους, τοῦ μεμισθωκότος Ἀραπτίων παρέχοντοι αὐτοῖς κατ’ ἑτος ἀμισθεὶ ὄνους δεκαπεντε
10 [ ............ , ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ εἰσίντος τρίτου καὶ] εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους ἐπὶ τὴν λοιπὴν τριετίαν διόσωσι τῷ μεμισθωκότι κατ’ ἑτος τυρων ὀβολίαιος ἕκατον. τὴν δὲ αὐταρκίαν κόπον περιστερῶν πρὸς κοπρισμὸν τοῦ κτή-
11 [ματός δώσουσιν οἱ μεμισθωμένοι κατὰ τὸ ἡμισὺ] καὶ ὁ μεμισθωκός κατὰ τὸ ἐξής ἡμισὺ. δὲ δὲ ἐὰν βούλησθαι ὁ Ἀραπτίων ὀπωροφόρλακα φυλάσσῃ(ν) τῷ τῆς ὑπάρας καιρῷ φύλακα πέμψῃ, τοῦ ὄψων ὄντος πρὸς αὐτὸν
12 [ 37 letters ] μηχανής καὶ τῆς ταύτης κ[... ]ς ἔσται τὰ μὲν ἐλλα πρὸς τῶν Ἀραπτίων, οἱ δὲ τεκτονικοὶ μισθοὶ καὶ ἡ τοῦ τέκτονος σύνταξίς ἔσται πρὸς τῶν μεμισθωμένους. ἐὰν δὲ καίνοι
13 [τροχοῦ 31 letters ] καὶ δώσει τοῖς αὐτοῖς μεμισθωμένοις εἰς λόγον προχρείας ἀρχικοῦ δραχμᾶς τρισχεῖλας, ἐξ δὲ ύπολογισμὸς(ν)δήσουσιν αἱ διδόμεναι τοῖς υδροπαρόχοις ὑπὲρ ποτηρίων τοῦ αὐ-
14 [τοῦ κτήματος ἀπὸ Φαώφι εἰκάδος τοῦ ἑνεστὼτος δευτέρου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους ἔως Φαώφι εἰκάδος τοῦ εἰσίντος τρίτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους ἰκολούθος ἦ ἔχει οἱ Ἀραπτίων μισθώσει ἢν καὶ εἶναι κυρίαι δραχμάς δισχείλας
15 [ 36 letters ] ὁς ἀποδώσει αὐτοῖς τῷ μὲν Ἀδύν μην ἀρραχμᾶς διακοσίας Ττββί (διακοσίας) καὶ Μεχείρ τὰς λοιπὰς δραχμᾶς ἐξακοσίας, τὰς δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτὸ δραχμᾶς τρισχεῖλας ἀποδώσουσι εξενιάν-
16 [τα 35 letters ] τουσι ὦνων ἄτοκους. τὰ (ἐκ) [δε]φύτα κτήνη παρὰ τῷ υδροπαράχῳ βίαις πέντε καὶ μόσχους τρεῖς παραλήψονται οἱ αὐτοὶ μεμισθωμένοι ἐν συντιμίσει τῇ εἰκάδι τοῦ
17 [Φαώφι τοῦ τρίτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἔτους, καὶ συνγράψονται τῆς συντιμήσεις
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άπόδοσιν τοῦ λήγοντος χρόνου. ἦν δὲ χρεία γένετε ἐτέρας προ- χρήσεως δώσει αὐτοῖς ὁ μεμισθωκός, λαβόντες καὶ τάξαται δρα-

18 [Χμ] 31 letters ἐπάναγκον οὖν οἱ αὐτοὶ μεμ(['σθομένοι ἕκαστα ἐπιτελεί-

19 [ 35 letters ἀπρόδοτατον τῷ μεμισθωκότι τῶν μὲν οίνον παρὰ θηνῶν

20 [γάζωντα] 29 letters μηνοὺς φυτοῦ τῷ βλάβος διπλοῦν, τοῦ δὲ κατα-

21 [τοῦ τὴν μισθωσίν οὖν τοῦ χρόνου ἐπιτίμιον ἀργυρίον δραχμᾶς

22 [των καθαπερ ἐγ δίκης. καὶ μετὰ τῶν χρόνων παραδότοσιν οἱ μεμισθω-

23 [ 37 letters μι κεχαρακωμένας καὶ τὰ [τοῦ κτήματος χώματα ἑστε-

24 [ 34 letters ποιήσων τοὺς ποισόμοις τοῦ [κτήματος καὶ τῆς καλα-

25 [ 40 letters ἕνησιν κ[.........] ἐφ' οὖν ἐνην . ε . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ηται,

26 [ 40 letters μυ τῷ ἐξής . . . . . . . ητε διὰ τὸ καὶ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . \, μᾶ

27 [ 38 letters Σα'ραπίων . [ 16 letters ὁκεῖσθε[ε][. 14 letters ὁν

14 letters ]ον οίνον [ 15 letters ]ον φ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . ομικον

τοῦ Σαραπίωνος
28 [ 36 letters τ]δ[] μέσῳ τοῦ κ[ήματος τ]ῆν δὲ μη[χανήν ἀναβάλει ὁ με[μισθωκός ἰδίαις δαπάναις ἀπὸ μη[νὸς Παχών, τῆν δὲ σκαφήν τῆς πλακάδος τοῦ ὑποδοχίου ἔσται ὑπό
29 [τ]έ τῶν μεμισθωμένων κατὰ τὸ ἥμισυ καὶ] ὑπὸ τοῦ μεμισθωκότος κατὰ τὸ ἔτερον ἥμισυν. τῆν δὲ κατ’ ἐτος ἡλιότομαν καὶ ἐκαστὸν τῶν κατὰ καὶρ[]δ’ ἐργαν ποιητήθουσι οἱ μεμισθωμένοι ἐπακολουθοῦν.
30 [το]ς τοῦ Σαραπίωνος [20 letters ὡς αὐτῷ πάντα γενέσθαι. μισθώσει δὲ ὁ μεμισθωκός τοῖς μεμισθωμένοις ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰσίν τοῖς τρῖτον καὶ εἰκόσιτον ἔτους ἑπὶ χρόνον ἔτη τρία τῆν ἐντὸς πλαστῶν χερσάμπη-
31 [λ]ον 33 letters ἀρουρῆτοι δοτε κατ’ ἐτος σπείραι καὶ ἐξυλαμήσαι αἰς
32 [ 37 letters ] ἐν αἰς ἐστίν τροχὸς ὡς ἐκατ’ ἐτος κοινότερον συν-
33 [σ]ωμένων 29 letters [τοι.] παρέξι τῆς ἑξαλογείας, τῶν κατ’ ἐτος
34 [ 28 letters καὶ παρέξει] ὁ αὐτὸς Σαραπίων τοῖς μεμισθωμένοις πρὸς
35 [Κα]ίσαρος Τραιανοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Φα[δ]φι ἢ. (2nd hand) Ἀμμόν Ἀπολλωνίου καὶ Πτολλᾶς Δουκίου μεμισθώμετα τῶν ἀντέλων ἐπὶ
36 [φόρου] τῆς ἡμισίας τοῦ ἐκβησθομένου οὐνικοῦ γενήματος καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς
37 [τ]α 20 letters ἐκατ’ ἐτος [ποιήσαμεν] δὲ πρόκειται. Πτολεμαῖος
38 [γ]ράμματα. ἐτούς δευτερόμενοι καὶ εἰκοστοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τραι-
39 [Ἀ]πολλωνίδου καὶ Πτολℓᾶς Δουκίου ἐσ]χομεν παρὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ Σαρα-
πίωνος) καὶ τῇ κ τοῦ Φαδψι τοῦ δευτέρου ἔτους Τίτου Ἀλλίου Ἀδριανοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου βουκᾶ κτήμη μόσχου
μὲν τελείους
8. 1. ὥσθεν for ἢσθαι. 9. ε ὅτε ὁποῖον above the line. us of τοὐς corrig. from μ. μεν of μεμισθωμένου corrig. from κοτα. 10. 1. κόπτων. 13. a of διδομένου corrig. from σ. π of υδροσαροσ corrig. from σ. 14. First τ of τριστον corrig. from δ. μ of δραχμα corrig. from σ. 1. δραχμαί διαςχίδια. 16. τα of υδροσαρων corrig. from φυ. 17. γ of γενήται corrig. from ν. 1. γένηται. 1. προχρήσεως. ε of δώσει corrig. from σ. 18. 1. εἰσέπετε. 22. a και before καθαρα corrig. 23. και before υδρόσ corrig. 24. αλαρε of καλαμι corrig. 28. 1. ἐδεικνύεται. της corrig. 30. ει of μεθασωει corrig. from εαν. 31. i. ιοσεμεν και ἄρομενοι. 32. 1. μεμισθωμευτα τον ἄμπελων. 35. 1. άροτριopia corrig. from ου. 36. 1. άροτριοι. 37. κει of προκειαται... ἐδίστων. 38. 1. Φαώβη. 39. παρ' του αυτ(ον) σαρασωινος above the line. 42. 1. ελάστωνος. 44. 1. παραδώσομεν. ἵσα Παρ. 3. καλαμίαν: that a special connexion exists between the cultivation of κάλαμος and vine-growing is apparent not only from the present document (cf. especially ll. 22 and 24, where the κήπα is coupled with the καλαμία, but from other leases of ἀμπέλων; cf. C. P. R. 224. 11-2)ν καλαμοσωρίαν ἐκ καψῆ... τού αὐτάρκη κάλαμον και ἁχοῖνα, P. Brit. Mus. 163. 22-5, where read καὶ τῆς ὧν ἀναδυόμενον κατ' ἔκκοστον καὶ τοῦ ἠμπελοῶν τῆς καλμιοσωρίας... σμεν κατ' ἔκκοστον... καὶ καλαμουργῆσα... ἐκκοστού καὶ ἀναλήσησα. On the other hand κάλαμος was sometimes cultivated by itself, as is shown by B. G. U. 558. 13, where a καλαμία corresponds to an ἐλαίων; cf. P. Brit. Mus. 195 (δ). 11 and B. G. U. 619. ii. 19 and 776. 10, which mention κάλαμος ἕλληνικά, contrasted apparently with κάλαμος ἑλληνικός (P. Brit. Mus. 191. 11); cf. Wilcken, Archiv, I. p. 159). In P. Tebth. 5. 199 καλαμεία is mentioned as being required for
embankments (cf. note *ad loc.); but though this section dealing with καλαμεία in 729 is immediately followed by one dealing with embankments (cf. P. Brit. Mus. 163. 22) the καλαμεία in an ἀμπελών would seem to be a crop of reeds planted between or under the vines. According to l. 22 the καλαμεία equally with the κήμα had to be handed over σώφυτα καὶ ἐπιμελημένα κ.τ.λ.

5. οὐν is to be supplied as the object of εἰσάγων; cf. l. 6. In the first year of the lease the responsibility for the ἔμπαττομα was shared equally by the lessor and lessees. In the succeeding three years (ll. 6–7) the responsibility continues to be equally divided, but a payment of 300 drachmae comes in, the nature of which is obscure.

7–9. Apparently the contract is concerned with the lease of the newly reclaimed κήμα, and the adjoining ἀρχαῖον κήμα was leased to some one else, the μοισθωτὴς of l. 8. The embankment which is the subject of ll. 7–8 probably divided the two κήματα, and the arrangement is that for the ἐμποφλακτὶς Sarapion and the other μοισθωτὴς are jointly responsible, but for the ἐπεργασία Sarapion alone. For certain embankments of the νεοφροτον κήμα on the other hand the lessees were responsible, as well as for the 'southern embankment' (ll. 8–9), Sarapion supplying them with 15 donkeys annually, in return for which they were to pay him in each of the last three years of the lease 100 cheeses worth an obol apiece (ll. 9–10).

10–11. 'The necessary amount of pigeon's dung for manuring the vineyard shall be provided half by the lessees and the other half by the lessor. Sarapion shall send any guard whom he chooses in order to protect the fruit at the time of bearing, being himself responsible for the payment of him.'

12. A new waterwheel (ταβίζεθ) was required, Sarapion paying for the wood, the lessees for the construction.

13–6. A loan of 3000 drachmae is to be advanced by Sarapion to the lessees, but from this is to be deducted 2000 dr. paid to the persons who supplied the water for the current year in accordance with Sarapion's lease of the land from them. The remaining 1000 dr. were to be paid in three instalments in the earlier half of the year. In l. 15 only 800 dr. are accounted for, but it is more likely that διακοσίας has been omitted after Τέθ after that it is to be supplied at the beginning of l. 15. The whole 3000 dr. were to be repaid to Sarapion without interest at the time of the vintage towards the end of the first year of the lease. The large amount paid for water makes it probable that this came not from a well but from a newly-made channel. For εξωάνατα in l. 15 cf. P. Anh. 85. 14, 86. 11, and P. Par. 25. 12. The second of these instances, in which εξωάνατα follows κατ' ἐτος, shows that it must have meant something different; and the sense 'annually' would not suit the present passage, for it is clear that the loan which is the subject of ll. 13–6 refers to a single occasion; cf. l. 17, where it is contrasted with the ἐτος πρόχρησις. The most suitable meaning for εξωάνατα in all these contexts is 'within (or for) the whole year.' In B. G. U. 920. 18 the editor reads ἐνεώσατα κατ' ἐτος, where 100 εξωάνατα was probably intended if not the actual reading.

16–7. With this passage cf. ll. 39–44, which refer to the carrying out of this stipulation. The oxen were required for working the waterwheel, and according to l. 39 were actually supplied a year after the date of the lease by Sarapion, but from the present passage they would seem to have been deposited with the persons who supplied the water. They were to be received 'at a valuation' and an agreement was at the same time to be made about the return of this valuation at the expiration of the lease. The details of the repayment are specified in ll. 41–4.

17–8. The 2000 drachmae for water (l. 14) were probably an annual charge, and hence a second loan from the lessor might be required. For this the lessees paid interest, if we restore ὑμηρ'χμαίον τίκων.
18-24. 'The said lessees are therefore required to perform all the aforesaid duties blamelessly, leaving nothing undone at the right season, so that no damage may accrue to the vineyard...and they shall pay to the lessor the wine at the vat, new and unadulterated, each party providing at the vat a sufficient number of jars, and for every failure to perform work at the proper time...twice the amount of the damage, and for giving up the lease before the end of the period a fine of 500 silver drachmae and to the Treasury an equal sum without affecting the validity of the lease, and the lessor shall have the right of execution both upon the lessees who are each other's sureties for payment, and upon whichever of them he chooses and upon all their property, as if in accordance with a legal decision. And at the end of the period the lessees shall deliver the vine-land and reed-land planted, well cared for, free from rushes, grass and weeds of all kinds, and the plants healthy...and the...palisaded, the embankments of the vineyard firm and watertight, and also any doors and keys they may have received, and the waterwheel in good repair except...; and they shall irrigate the vine-land and reed-land every fifth day to the satisfaction of Sarapion, and shall transfer Sarapion's share of the wine from the...'.

28. The μηχανή is presumably that mentioned in l. 12, but the technical meaning of ἀναβάλλειν here is obscure. πλακία is a new word meaning the lower part of the wine receptacle, which was below the ground level.

30. The lacuna at the beginning may be filled up ἀστεί πίστις ἀρεσκόντως; cf. l. 24.

30-2. This χρησίμεται is distinct from the ἐμπελών which is the subject of the main contract; cf. introd. ἔτος πλατείας in l. 30 seems to mean 'enclosed by a mud wall.'


40-4. The total number of calves to be provided according to l. 16 was 3, and of βόες 5. Here however the calves were probably 5, for the βόες are 3. The cattle were valued at 2500 dr. altogether, and at the end of the lease Sarapion had the choice of receiving this sum or the animals at a new valuation. If this was less than the former one, the lessees had to make up the difference to Sarapion. If the fresh valuation was higher, apparently Sarapion paid them the difference. If the lessees wished to change or sell the cattle, they might do so with Sarapion's consent.

44-5. These lines clearly refer to something contained in the main contract, but though we should expect a mention here of the χρησίμεται (ll. 30-2) which was to be leased after one year, the remains of l. 44 suggest something quite different, which must have occurred in one of the lost provisions.

730. LEASE OF DOMAIN LAND.

19·5 X 7·3 cm.       A.D. 130.

A sub-lease of 5 arourae of domain land at Senepa for one year, at the rent of 24 drachmae per aroura, with an extra payment of 4 drachmae. The crop specified is grass, while the other provisions follow the usual formulae; cf. e.g. 499.
Sarapion son of Herodes, of Oxyrhynchus, has leased to Valerius son of Apollonius, of the village of Senepa, a Persian of the Epigone, for the current 15th year of Hadrianus Caesar the lord, out of the domain land standing in his name 5 arourae in the holding of Damon, to be cultivated with grass for cutting and grazing at a fixed rent of 120 silver drachmas and 4 drachmas for the slaves for a libation on account of all the land, the rent being secured against every risk, and the taxes on the land being paid by the lessor, who shall also be the owner of the crop until he receives the rent. If this lease is guaranteed, the lessee shall pay the rent in the month Pauni of the said year, and the lessee shall forfeit any arrears increased by one half; and the lessor shall have the right of execution upon the lessee and upon all his property. This lease is valid. The 15th
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year of the Emperor Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus, Athur 19. (Signed) I, Valerius, son of Apollonius, have leased the land at a rent of 120 silver drachmae.

8–9. *basilikēs... ek toû Dāmounos klēpoû* : i.e. the land was part of a confiscated ἑλήρων; cf. 721. 4–6.

10. ἔλαμψα αὐτήρ: cf. 101. 11, 280. 12, 15, and 409. 15 where χήρησι is to be read for χήρων.

13. *σπουδὴ... ποιδίον*: for the payment on account of σπουδή in leases cf. 101. 19 and 610, and note on 525. 7. In the present case it was for the benefit of the slaves employed in the cultivation of the land.

35. The paragraphus below this line marks the conclusion of the lease, and the signature was intended to begin below it.

36–7. (φὸρον [ιπτομακρύν] is perhaps to be read, but does not very well suit the remaining vestiges of letters.

### 731. **Engagement of Services.**

11.7 x 13.4. A.D. 8–9.

A contract for services to be rendered on certain specified occasions, among which are the festivals of Isis and Hera, at a salary of 40 drachmae a year, besides an ῥήψων of 13 drachmae 2 obols. The commencement of the contract is lost, and the nature of the services to be performed is uncertain; but it may be conjectured on the analogy of e.g. 475, P. Grenf. II. 67, and P. Brit. Mus. 331 (cf. Archiv, I. p. 153), that the person engaged was an *artiste* of some kind, though to judge from the scale of remuneration, not of a very high class. The document was drawn up by a careless scribe, who makes a number of mistakes.
TtiE.

OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

8[.](].

7)−

146[.].

31.6

15.1

182[.].

15.8

14.6

138

5-6. For the feast of Isis cf. P. Fay. Towns 118. 13. The star of Hera was another name for the planet Venus (cf. Arist. de Mundo, p. 392a 27 ὁ τοῦ Φωσφόρου ἐν Ἀφροδίτης οἱ δὲ Ἡρᾶς προσωρινῶν, Pliny, H. N. 2. 8, &c.); but why the plural ἅστρως is here used is not clear. References to the cult of Hera in Egypt are rare; cf. 483. 3, note.

8–9. The 29 days in the year specified in ll. 4–6 seem to be treated as 30, which at 1 dr. 2 obols a day make the 40 dr.

11–2. ἡ ἡμέρα ὅλη would be expected, but this was certainly not written. The ε after the lacuna is nearly sure and this may represent δέ; but the letter after ἡμέρα if not η must be ν and is certainly neither δ nor ε.

14. There is not room for εν δημοσίῳ.

(c) RECEIPTS.

732. RECEIPT FOR THE TAX ON FERRY-BOATS.

18·2 × 23 cm.  A.D. 150.

A receipt issued by two farmers of the ἄνη παρθήμεων at Oxyrhynchus and certain villages to two persons who apparently were ferrymen at one of these villages, acknowledging the payment first of 200 and subsequently of 100 drachmae for φόρος παρθημέων, the total, 300 drachmae, being probably the whole sum due from them for a year. This impost, the title of which is new, seems
to be a tax upon the profits of privately owned ferry-boats rather than a revenue derived from a State monopoly, though the latter interpretation is also possible.

'Ἡλιόδωρος Ἡλιοδώρου καὶ Λεοντ[ᾶς Π][εκύριος] ἀπὸ Ὀξυρύγχων πόλεως τελῶναι ὡνὴς προθμίδων πόλεως καὶ Ἰσίου Α'[... καὶ Αἰλλων τ[ὸ] ἑνεστὸς ἤγ.

Ἀντωνίνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου Ἀχιλλάτι Θοψίος [καὶ Ἀπίτ[ὶ Ἀπίτ[ὸς]

ἀπὸ τῆς αὐ[τῆς]

πόλεως χαίρειν. ἔσχομεν παρ' ἑμῶν ἀφ' ὅν ἐφίλετε ἡμῖν ὑπ' ἑ[ὴ]ρ φόρου προ-

θείου Πανκύλως ἐπὶ λόγου δραχμῶς διακ[οσίας], γίν[ονται] (δραχμαί) σ.

[ἐτοῦς] ἤγ.

Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτου Διόνυσος Άριστοῦ Ἀντωνίνου Σεβαστοῦ Ἐνεσθοῦς Τύβι κ[.] (2nd hand) 'Ἡλιόδωρος ὁ προγεγραμμένες ἐσ-

χον σὺν τῷ Λεωντάτῃ τὰς πρὸ[γε]κιμένας δραχμάς διακοσίας, γί[νονται] (δραχμαί) σ. (3rd hand) Λεοντᾶς Πεκύριος

10 ὁ προγεγραμμένος ἐσχον σὺν τῷ Ἡλιοδώρῳ

[τ']δ[ὲς προκιμένας δραχμάς δι[ἀ]κοσίας. ἁρώνος


2. 1. πορθμίδων. ἰσιοὺς Γαρ. 4. 1. πορθμίδων. 7. 1. προγεγραμμένοι. 8. κ ὁ δικημένας

corr. from γ. 9. 1. διακοσίας. 13. 1. λοιπά(ς).

'Heliodorus son of Heliodorus and Leontas son of Pekuris, of Oxyrhynchus, farmers of the contract for the tax on ferry-boats at the city, Ision Α... and other (villages) for the present 13th year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, to Achillas son of Theo尼斯 and Apeis son of Apeis, of the said city, greeting. We have received from you on account out of the sum which you owe us for the revenue from ferry-boats at Pankulis two hundred drachmae, total 200 dr.' Date and signatures of Heliodorus and Leontas, followed by their further acknowledgements of the remaining hundred drachmae.

733. Tax-Receipt.

12 X 9.7 cm. A.D. 147.

A receipt for the tax on pigs (cf. 288, introd.) and poll-tax paid by an inhabitant of Oxyrhynchus and his son. The payments are no doubt instalments of the whole amount due for a year.

Q
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I (ἐτος) Ἀντωνινὐνον Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
Παχὼν ῥ. [ἢ]έγρα(ψε) Διογ(έμει) πρά(κτορι) ἀργυ(ρικῶν)
Μ. [. . . ] πλατ(είας) Ἀμοῖς ὀ καὶ Παπο(ντώς) Διοδώ(ρου)
ὑικ(ῆς) [τοῦ] αὐ(τοῦ) ἰ (ἐτους) (δραχμῆν) μίαν (πεντάβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον), / (δραχμῆ) α (πεντάβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον).
5 Ῥ. [. . . ] ο[. . .] υιδ(ῆς) μη(τρῶς) Ταπο(ντῶτος) λαογρα(φίας)
τοῦ αὐ(τοῦ) ἰ (ἐτους) (δραχμᾶς) τ[έσ]σαράς, ὑικ(ῆς) α (πεντάβολον) (ἡμιωβέλιον).

2. π of παχὼν corr. from δ. The following δ is corrected.

'The 10th year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, Pachon 4. Amois also called Papontos, son of Diodorus, has paid to Diogenes, collector of money taxes of M ... street, for the pig-tax of the said 10th year 1 drachma 5¼ obols, total 1 dr. 5½ ob. T ..., his son, his mother being Tapontos, has paid for the poll-tax of the said 10th year 4 drachmae, for the pig-tax 1 drachma 5½ obols.'

734. TAX-RECEIPT.

10-4 X 9-7 cm. A.D. 165.

A receipt for the payment of 1 drachma 4 obols by Cleon to an agent of the tax-collectors of a subdivision of the middle toparchy. The names of the taxes, which are abbreviated γλ̄ and σ̄, are uncertain, being probably both new.

Ε (ἐτος) Ἀὑρηλίων Ἀντωνίνου καὶ Οὐήρου τῶν
κυρίων Σεβαστῶν Φαρε(νοθ) κζ. δέγρα(ψε) Κλάρω
χι(ριστῆ) πρα(κτόρων) ἀργυ(ρικῶν) μέ(σης) τοπ(αρχίας) Πέτνη Τακολ( )
τόπ(ον) δι(α)
Ἀμμο(νοῦ) βοη(θοῦ) γλη( ) καὶ ση( ) ε (ἐτους) Κλέων
5 [. . . ] ου Τακολ( ) δραχ(μῆν) μία(ν) τετράβολ(ον), /
(δραχμῆ) α (τετράβολον).

3. The Πέτνη τόποι are known from 505, but the addition of Τακολ( ), which recurs in 1, 5, is new.
This is a fragment of a Graeco-Latin register or account, concerning a detachment of troops (cf. 43 recto). Lines 5–11 contain a copy of a receipt in Greek from an optio, or adjutant, to an imperial deputy-procurator for 50 artabae of wheat paid to a number of cavalrymen, whose names in Latin precede. A list of six footsoldiers follows, which was presumably succeeded by another receipt in Greek recording a payment to them. There are a few Latin letters (apparently belonging to names) from the ends of lines of the previous column, and what remains of Col. iii is occupied with more names in Latin. One or two of these soldiers' names indicate Hebrew extraction.

The receipt is dated in the 14th year of a joint reign, which on palaeographical grounds is probably that of Septimius Severus and Caracalla.
3–4. The pairs of names here and in ll. 13–7 are placed rather far apart and look at first sight as if they were independent; but with one exception either the second name has a genitive termination or the first may be a gentile name, while unless the names are connected the number vi in l. 10 is wrong. The only case in which any difficulty arises is in l. 13, where Belius and Zabdius certainly seem to be separate names; but the distance between them is greater than in any of the other cases. Possibly Gradius and Avidus in l. 16, where again the space is very wide, should also be separated, thus making the number 6. In l. 3 the second name is perhaps Comarjini; cf. l. 6.

5. Ἀκρωγός: hardly Ἀκρωγαῖς, though that name occurs in a Palmyra inscription, C. I. G. 4497.

6. Καίσαριν οἰκονύμῳ οἰκυρίῳ: cf. B. G. U. 156. 3 and 102. 1, where οἰκονύμος is probably to be read between Καίσαρος and οἰκυρίος.

14. The marginal additions here and in l. 19 are obscure; cognēga is perhaps collega, but what is rīex? The first letter may be ἂ but the second does not at all resemble ρ, nor would ῥέξ be a very likely word here.

736. **PRIVATE ACCOUNT.**

17.3 × 54.3 cm. About A.D. 1.

Of this lengthy account of private expenses parts of seven columns in all remain, five on the recto and two on the verso; the first column of the recto, however, which is separated from those following by a broad blank space, is too fragmentary to be worth reproducing, and the same may be said of a narrow half-effaced column corresponding to this one but written in the reverse direction on the back. The remainder is in fairly good condition, but the papyrus is broken at the top and bottom, and the short column on the verso is sometimes difficult to decipher owing to discolouration. The various payments are arranged according to the days of the month, and some interesting items and prices occur.

Col. ii.

κα. φα[ ]

εἰς [15 letters] . . . (δραχμαί) 8,

βα[ . . .] . . . [ . . ψ. . . ] διὰ

Ζι[. . .] . . . φαίνονταν Κοράζου (δραχμαί) 1,

γο[γ]γυλόσ εἰς ταριχεῖαν (δραχμή) α (δίβολοι δύο),
736. ACCOUNTS 229

χαλκίου μισθοῦ εἰς βάψαι (ὁβολοὶ δῶ?)
ἀλὸς (ὁβολὸς?),
ἀλεστρα (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβης) α ἐπὶ τῆς ἑη (τριάβολον ?),
θρῦνο εἰς τοὺς ἄρτους (ὁβολοὶ δῶ),
10 ἡπτετρα εἰς φαινόλην ᾿Κοράξου (ὁβολὸς) (ἥμιοβέλιον),
eἰς κατανθρωπίσμον γυναικῶς
Γεμέλλην (τετράβολον ?),
μῦρον εἰς ἀποστολῆς ταφῆς
θυγατρὸς Φνᾶς (τετράβολον).
15 κβ. ἐλαίου χοῦς α (δραχμαί) δ (τετράβολον),
κηρῷ καὶ γραψίμῳ παιδῖ(ῶν) (ὁβολὸς),
ἄρτου καθαροῦ Πρίμας (ήμιοβέλιον),
eἰς κ[α]τανθρωπίσμον Τόχης (τριάβολον).
Μεχ(εἰρ) Θ. [20 letters] (δραχμή) α (τριάβολον)

3. φ of ἕφ[ rewritten (?)].

Col. iii.

Ends of 3 lines.

υ. όλ. ... ἐκ. [.] ἀρίστω γ]ερῦδ(ου) (ὁβολὸς),
κῆ[.]. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . (ήμιοβέλιον),
25 εἰς τὸ Σαραπίων (ὁβολοὶ δῶ),
ἄρτου καθαροῦ παιδ(ῶν) (ήμιοβέλιον),
ζύτου γ]ερῦδ(ου) (ὁβολοὶ δῶ),
πράσων ἄριστο γερῦδ(ου) (ὁβολὸς),
περιστεράς (ὁβολὸς),
30 Ἀντάτι (δραχμαί) β (ὁβολοὶ δῶ),
νω ἐν τῇ πόλ(ει) ἀλεστρα ἄρτων
(pυροῦ) (ἀρταβῶν) β διὰ [Γ]Σάτος (δραχμή) α (ὁβολοὶ δῶ).
1a. ἐν παρεμβο[λ]ῇ διὰ Θεοδάρου
ἀλεστρα] ἄφ[τε]υν (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβης) α (τετράβολον),
35 ἄριστῳ [γε]ερῦδ(ου)] (ὁβολὸς),
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ἀσπαράγω(ν) [δί]πυς Ἀντ(άτος) ὅτ' εἰς
tο περίδηπ(μ)νω(ν) Ἀθη( ) γναφέως(ς) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
καὶ παιδαρίους διήνωρ κράμβη(ς) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
π ... [ ] ... παιδώφ (ἡμιωβέλιον)
Parts of 2 lines.

25. Second 1 of σοραπιων corr. from ϊ (?). 36. First a of ἀσπαράγω(ν) corr. from δ.

Col. iv.

46 15. προ[σφαγ]ίου (ἡμιωβέλιον),
θρό'ων εlicted δρτους (ὁβολοὶ δύο) (ἡμιωβέλιον).
15. γάλακτος παιδ(ων) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
ἀρτου καθαροῦ (ἡμιωβέλιον).

50 1η. Σεκουντα παιδ(ων) ἴτριον (ἡμιωβέλιον).
1θ. τισάνης ὁμ(οίως) (ἡμιωβέλιον).
κ. ὑφαρίου (ὁβολὸς),
ἀρτου καθαροῦ (ἡμιωβέλιον),
eis κατανθρωπ(ημοῦ) Ἀρτο(νίας ?) (ὁβολοὶ δύο),

55 καὶ εἰς Ταππολλοῦτος Καυμᾶ(ίου ?) (τριῶβολον),
γενεσίως Τρυφάτωσ στεφά(νων) (ὁβολοὶ δύο),
ge(νε)σίοις [ ] . [ ] . α( ) στεφά(νων) (ὁβολοὶ δύο).
κα. δόας παιδ(ων) [ ] (ὁβολὸς),
παγνίω(υ) καὶ ἐπονημιο(ν) παιδ(ων) (ἡμιωβέλιον),

60 ζῶτου (τριῶβολον),
ὑγοῦ (ὁβολὸς).
κβ. ὑφαρί[οv] (ὁβολὸς).
Part of 1 line.

50. l. Σεκουντа (cf. l. 81). 54. αντ of αντ( ) rewritten.
736. ACCOUNTS

Col. v.

Parts of 4 lines.

Θαῦσις [. . . ἡ]με(ρῶν) β [(πεντάβολον),
μήτηρ [(Ἀμ]ίμωνάτος) ἡμε(ρῶν) []
70 Ταραπανῆς ἡμε(ρῶν) [β] πεντάβολον,
Βερούς ὄμ(οίως) ἡμε(ρῶν) i (δραχμαί) δ (ὀβολός).
κδ. ἀλεστρα (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβης) α (τετράβολον),
ἀλμυρίδος μα( ) β (ὀβολοὶ δύο),
ἀλὸς (ὀβολός),
75 λίνον καὶ ραφίδος (ὀβολός),
ἀλεστρα (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβης) α διὰ Θεοδό(ρου) (τετράβολον),
κέρκισ[τ]ρα φα[ί]νόλ(ου) (δραχμὴ) α (ὀβολοὶ δύο),
ἀρτο[ν] καθαρῶ(ν) Φ[ι]. . . ]το( ) (δραχμὴ) α,
περιστερᾶς (παιδ[ῶν]) (ὀβολός),
80 ἀρτον κ[αθαροῦ ὄμ(οίως) (ημιωβέλιον),
Σκούντω παῖδ[ῶν] [ηρί[ου]] (ημιωβέλιον)
καὶ σεμιδάρεως ἥπας (ημιωβέλιον),
γάλακτος (ημιωβέλιον),
μύρον ε[ἰς] ταφῆς θυγατρῶς
85 [Π[ίσιθος] (δραχμὴ) α.

82. l. σεμιδάλεως.

On the verso opposite Col. v.

Parts of 2 lines.

τ. αμ[ . . ]γ( ) γυν[ν]αίξι συνα[ . . . ] (δραχμαί) β (τριώβολον),
πρόφαγμα[ν] ταῖς γυναιξί:
90 ἡμε(ρῶν) β (ὀβολοὶ δύο) (ημιωβέλιον),
κόλλητρα λυχνίας (ὀβολοὶ δύο) (ημιωβέλιον),
ἔρεβίθων [ὅτε δόθη
edείπνευ . . . .] . [(ο]ς (ὀβολός) (ημιωβέλιον),
232
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εἰς κατανθρώπισμόν

95  
"
Δαφοδίκησ (δ' θολοί δύο τοῖς Δαφοδίκησ 
..."
Στράτου εἰς τήν νε. αῤη. ζε. εἰς βολήν (δραχμαί) δ', 
..."
[... δαφονή( ... τα ... ...] σ [ 
"Ηρωίου εἰς τ... ἥμισσαν?] (δραχμή?) [ ...],

100  
κόλλητα χαλκίου (ἡμιωβελίον).

'Il. 1-95. The 21st: ... through Zm... for the cloak of Coraxus, 10 drachmæ; turnips for pickling 1 dr. 2 obols; for the kettle, payment for enamelling 2 ob.; salt 1 ob.; cost of grinding 1 artaba of wheat on the 18th 3 ob.; omelette for the bread 2 ob.; cost of mending the cloak of Coraxus 1½ ob.; for treating (i) the wife of Gemellus 4 ob.; perfume for the dispatch of the mummy of the daughter of Phna 4 ob. The 22nd: a chous of oil 4 dr. 4 ob.; wax and stilus for the children 1 ob.; pure bread for Prima ½ ob.; for treating Tyche 3 ob. 9th Mecheir... the 10th: ... for the weaver's breakfast 1 ob.; ... for the Sarapeum 2 ob.; pure bread for the children ½ ob.; beer for the weaver 1 ob.; leeks for the weaver's breakfast 1 ob.; a pigeon 1 ob.; to Antas 2 dr. 2 ob.; up at the city for the bread, cost of grinding 2 artabae of wheat, through Isas, 1 dr. 2 ob. The 11th: at the camp, through Theodorus, for the bread, cost of grinding 1 artaba of wheat 4 ob.; for the weaver's breakfast 1 ob.; asparagus for the dinner of Antas when (he went) to the funeral feast of Athe... the fuller ½ ob.; and to the slaves (?), for a cabbage for dinner ½ ob.; to the child ½ ob.; ... The 16th: a relish 3 ob.; omelettes for the bread 2½ ob. The 17th: milk for the children ½ ob.; pure bread ½ ob. The 18th: to Secundus, a cake for the children ½ ob. The 19th: barley water for the same ½ ob. The 20th: sauce 1 ob.; pure bread ½ ob.; for treating Antonia 2 ob.; and for Taptollous daughter of Caccilius 3 ob.; on the birthday of Tryphas, for garlands 2 ob.; on the birthday of... for garlands 2 ob. The 21st: pomegranates for the children 1 ob.; playthings and... for the children 1 ob.; beer 3 ob.; sauce 1 ob. The 22nd: sauce 1 ob.; Thaësis... for 2 days 5 ob.; the mother of Ammonas for... days...; Taarpaesis for 2 days 5 ob.; Berous similarly for 10 days 4 dr. 1 ob. The 24th: cost of grinding 1 artaba of wheat 4 ob.; 2... of pickle 2 ob.; salt 1 ob.; a needle and thread 1 ob.; cost of grinding 1 artaba of wheat, through Theodorus, 4 ob.; cost of weaving a cloak 1 dr. 2 ob.; pure bread for Ph... 1 dr.; a pigeon for the children 1 ob.; pure bread for the same ½ ob.; to Secundus for a cake for the children ½ ob., and for dry meal ½ ob.; milk ½ ob.; perfume for the mummy of the daughter of Pasis 1 dr. ... The 10th: for the women 2 dr. 3 ob.; relishes for the women on 2 days 2½ ob.; cost of tinkering a lamp 2½ ob.; pulse when... was dining here 1½ ob.; for treating Laodice 2½ ob.'

7. δήστρα: cf. I. 10 ἰερήμα, 1. 77 κύρικοι, 1. 91 κόλλητα, 739. 4 αἰτιστήρα. ἰερήμα had already occurred in P. Tebt. 120 introd., where it should be regarded as a neuter plural, as should also ἰερήμα in P. Tebt. 117. 37, &c.

11. εἰς κατανθρώπισμόν: cf. ll. 17, 53, and 93, where the expression recurs, the object being apparently always a woman. Neither κατανθρώπισμός ότι κατανθρώπισμός appears to be otherwise attested.

28. The ω of ἔριστρα here and elsewhere is written above the line (so too ἔριστρα in
An account of wages paid on different days to 'weavers,' 'hired persons,' and a 'master' or 'foreman.' The wages, which are reckoned in asses, are at the rate of 3½ for a weaver, 4 for a 'hired man,' and 6 for the foreman. We give the text of two columns, which are contained on separate pieces of papyrus but seem to be consecutive; there is a large blank space after Col. ii, which was the end of the roll. A few small fragments of some other columns also remain. The account is written in a clear cursive hand which is probably of the reign of Augustus, the papyrus being one of a large find belonging practically entirely to that period. Points are commonly used after abbreviations (but not with a for asces) and the numerals of the days of the month, and are not infrequently added after words which are not abbreviated.

Col. i.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Wage (asses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[asscs] vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[asscs] vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[asscs] vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[asscs] vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[asscs] vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[asscs] vii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note*: The account is written in a clear cursive hand which is probably of the reign of Augustus, the papyrus being one of a large find belonging practically entirely to that period. Points are commonly used after abbreviations (but not with a for asces) and the numerals of the days of the month, and are not infrequently added after words which are not abbreviated.
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v I(du) s textor(es) iii a(sses) x s(emis)
magister a(sses) vi

iv I(du) s textor(es) iii a(sses) x s(emis)
magister a(sses) vi

iii I(du) s textor(es) iii a(sses) x s(emis)
magister a(sses) vi

Col. ii.

\[\text{magister} \quad a(sses) \quad x \quad s(emis)\]

\[\text{magister} \quad a(sses) \quad vi\]

\[\text{a(ntc) d(iem) xiiix K(alendas) Sextilias} \quad a(sses) \quad x \quad s(emis)\]

21. a of sextilias cor. from 1(?)

2. a(sses): this abbreviation is common in the Pompeian inscriptions; cf. C. I. L. IV, index. The occurrence of assae in an account of this kind is however very singular. Presumably the money though reckoned in assae was paid in obols, three of which would be the equivalent of 2 assae.

5. xiiix: cf. l. 21, where xiiix is written for xviii; for the sums of assae, on the other hand, xiii is regularly used.

17-9. If this column immediately follows Col. i, which from the dates seems most probable, there is nothing lost at the beginnings of these lines and i in l. 19 stands for pridie.

21. Sextilias is a curious form; the a has been corrected, but was apparently altered from another letter, not itself deleted. For the numeral xiiix cf. note on l. 5.

738. Account of Food.

13.5 x 10.3 cm. About A.D. 1.

A fragment of an account of articles of food consumed on different days; cf. 108. The ends of lines of a preceding column are preserved.
739. ACCOUNTS

Kανωτικὸν ἄρτιδια βε, ὄρνις σίδυτη ἐξ ὑδατοὺς α, δίπνῳ γ. 10 πτέρυγας βε.
5 ὀστρεά i, . . . . . .
θρίδαξ α.

'For dinner on the 5th a Canopic liver; for dinner on the 6th 10 oysters, 1 lettuce; for dinner on the 7th 2 small loaves, 1 bird . . . from the water, 2 snipe (?).'

9. σίδυτη is a new word. The πτέρυγας were probably smaller than the ὄρνις.

739. Private Account.

32 x 10 cm. About A.D. 1.

A private account for a month, reckoned in silver drachmae and copper obols. Lines 1-2 mention a receipt, ll. 3-22 give an account of expenditure for various purposes. The account is written on the verso, the recto being blank.

"Ἐξει Ἰσᾶς παρὰ Ἀπολλωνίῳ ἀπὸ Κύνου (δραχμᾶς) μ. [  
4 δα(πάνης) τυ(μῆς) χ(α(πέρι)τι (δραχμαί) κη, 
σειστοπήτρων (δραχμῆ) α (τετράβολον),
5 [[ἐλαίων (δραχμαί) δ (ὀβολοί δύο).]]
6. ἀλέστρα (πεντάβολον),
κονίου εἰς πρόσφαγίον (ὀβολός).
7. κοφάνων γ (τετράβολον) (ημιοβέλιον).
5. βατανίων (ὀβολοί δύο),
10 προσφαγίον οἰκόδ(όμου) (ὀβολός),
ἐλαίων χοῦς (δραχμαί) δ (ὀβολοί δύο). / μ (τριώβολον) (ημιοβέλιον).
ζ. προσφαγίον οἰκόδ(όμου) (ὀβολός).
θ. ἐργάτου (τετράβολον ?),
οἰκοδ(όμου) πρ(οσφαγίον) (ὀβολός),
15 τέκτων[ος . ]
ιγ. τυ(μῆς) ἐλαί[ίον] (δραχμαί)] δ (τριώβολον ?),
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πορφύρας (δραχμαί) Κ,
στήμων [ος εἰς γυναική] [εἴ] [ον]
ιμάτει' [ον .]
Φιλοπαιρίω [•] [•] [•] [•] β [•]
κβ. τιμησ ἐλαίου ((δραχμαί) δ) (ὀβολοὶ δέο).
/

5. This line enclosed in round brackets. 7. πρ[οφάγον.

'Isas has received from Apollonius, an inhabitant of Cynus, 4[,] drachmae. Deduct on account of expenses: price of ... paid to Nechtheus 28 dr., for making bread 1 dr. 4 ob., (for oil 4 dr. 2 ob., erased). On the 4th, for grinding 5 ob., powder (?) for a relish 1 ob. 5th, 3 baskets 4½ ob. 6th, plates 2 ob., a relish for the builder 1 ob., a chous of oil 4 dr. 2 ob. Total 40 dr. 3½ ob. 7th, a relish for the builder 1 ob. 9th, for the workman 4 ob., a relish for the builder 1 ob., the carpenter ... 13th, price of oil 4 dr. 3 ob., purple 20 dr., thread for a woman's robe ..., to Philoutarion ... 22nd, price of oil 4 dr. 2 ob. 'Total ...

2. Κύνος, if correct, is the name of a village, but the writer is careless about his cases (cf. l. 7), and he may mean Κυνός, i.e., Cynopolis.

4. σειτωπόπερα: cf. the similar forms ἀλεστρα (l. 6), ἐπιτρα, &c. (736. 10 and note on 736. 7).

5. The amount of oil which is not stated here and in l. 21 was no doubt 1 χοῖς: cf. l. 11.

740. Account of Corn.

21.2 x 46 cm.  About A.D. 200.

An account of corn, arranged according to different villages, apparently from the day-book of a private individual rather than an official. Of Col. i only the ends of lines are preserved, but Col. ii is practically complete, and Col. iii has lost only a few letters at the ends of lines. There is also a detached fragment (not printed) belonging to another column.

Cols. i and ii are apparently concerned with corn paid out, and the sum given in ll. 28–9, added to the 30 artabae accounted for in ll. 30–1, is subtracted from a previously mentioned total, leaving the remainder stated in l. 32. The rest of Col. iii deals with receipts from rents. The papyrus provides some interesting new information about the names and character of different measures of corn, and a curious conversion occurs in l. 29. On the verso are copies of
petitions to Septimius Severus and Caracalla (705), and the 9th year mentioned in l. 36 of the recto no doubt refers to these emperors.

Col. i.

Ends of 13 lines.

Col. ii.

17 μιᾶς ἀντὶ μιᾶς μέτρω σιτολ(ογικῷ) Ἡρῳ[.. .], ν (ἀρτάβαι) [ . . . . . .]
18 Σερόφως: μέτ(ρφ) δ(ημοσίῳ) μιᾶς ἀντὶ μιᾶς ἐμβ( . ) (ἀρτάβαι) κβ χ(οίνικες) ζ, καὶ ἐδόθησαν ὑπὲρ φορέτρου ὄνηλ(ατῶν) (ἀρτάβαι). χ(οίνικες) γ, Πέλα: ἰδιωτικῷ μέτ(ρφ) δ(ημοσίῳ) διὰ Πασαλίμιος
21 γεωργ(οῦ) Πέλα θέμ(ατος) ἀπό (ἀρτάβαι) κ' τό γ' (ἀρτάβαι) η (ημίσιον)
22 καὶ ἐδόθη(η) ὑπὲρ φορέτ(ρου) ὄνηλ(ατῶν) καὶ σιτολο[γικο] βαι καὶ σιτομετρικοῦ τῶν προκ(ειμένων) (ἀρτάβων) η (ημίσιον) χ(οίνικων) ζ (ἀρτάβησι) (ημίσι τέταρτον) χ(οίνικες) β, Παώμεως: ἐμετρήθη(ησαν) σιτολ(ογίοι) [ . . . . . . ] (ἀρτάβαι) ἵ, καὶ ἐδόθη(ησαν) ὑπ(ἐρ) φορέτ(ρου) ὄνηλ(ατῶν) καὶ σιτομ(ετρικοῦ) τῶν προκ(ειμένων) (ἀρταβών) ἵ (ἀρταβ̃ ) χ(οίνικες) γ.
26 Σενεκελεύ: ἐμετρήθη(ησαν) σιτολ(ογίοι) θέμα[τος . . . . . . . (ἀρτάβαι)] . , καὶ ἐδόθη(ησαν) ὑπ(ἐρ) σιτολογ(ίκοι) καὶ φορέτ(ρου) χ(οίνικες) [,]
28 (ἀναλομάτος) ιδιωτικῶς (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβαι) νβ β' χ(οίνικες) β, καὶ θέματος δημοσίου καθαρἀ( ἢρταβαι) μ[θ (ημίσι τέταρτον) χ(οίνικες) θ]
30 καὶ ἐπάρθησαν ὡς ἐπάνω [διὰ τὸ] γ Λογοῦ δεδήλωσι τιομά κυνὰς Μεσορῆ [](ἀρτάβαι) λ] (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβαι) λ.

Col. iii.

32 λοιπαὶ [διοικῆσ] πυροῦ ἢρταβαι . . .
33 καὶ ἐν θέματι ὁμοίως διδομένου ὑπὸ γεωργ(οῦ) . . . .
34 κατὰ μίαςνυσιν [([ἀρτάβαι)]. . .
35 Θώλθεως: ἐμετρήθησαν διὰ Ἡράτης γεωργ(οῦ) Θεω... (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβαι)...
36 ο ἀλ(τὸς) ἀπὸ σπερμ(άτων) θ (ἐτοὺς) (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβαι) γ, / [(πυροῦ)
(ἀρτάβαι)].
37 Πέλα: ἐν πεδίοις Σενοκωμ[.]. . . παρὰ [......]
38 Διογένους τοῦ Σαραπ(ίωνος) γεωρ(γοῦντος) ... ( ) περὶ Πέλα [......]
39 σος Σενοκωμ[ ] . . ἀπὸ (ἀρτάβων) λ τὸ [......]
40 Κεσμοῦχεως: παρὰ Παθώτου Μομεστ.]Χ( ) γεωργ(οῦντος) [.....]
41 (ἀρνόματος) η (ἡμιον τέταρτον) ἀπὸ (ἀρταβών) θ κτὶ τὸ γ' [(ἀρτάβαι) θ [.....]
42 παρὰ Ἡρακλείδου ἐπιτρόπον Ἡρ(α)κλ[είδου]ς [.....] η [.....]
43 στόρησεν ἑπὶ Μαγδάλ(ων) καὶ(νῆ) πρὸς Ἡρακλείδ[ήν] κατὰ τὸ (ἡμιον) γ'
44 καὶ πρὸς τὴν μήτερα τῶν ἁφηλ(ικῶν) κ[α]τὰ τὸ η καὶ ι πρὸς τοὺς
45 ἁφηλ(ικῶν) κατὰ τὸ κβ', ἄββα[θ(ον)] (ἀρουραί) κβ [. . . ] Λ [.....]
46 ἐγ μέροι(υς) (ἀρουρών) ις, χέρσου καὶ χω(μάτων ?) καὶ ἄλμ(υρίδος)
[.....]
47 τοῦ αὐτ(οῦ) [μ]έρο(υς) τῶν ἁφηλ(ικῶν) (ἀρουραί) α(ἡμιον). [. . . ] επη( ) γ'
48 [. . . ] [�.] ( ) ε[.]β ό[.] διον γ' ε[....] ( ) (ἀρτάβαι) λ [. . .]
49 / [θεμα[το]] (ἀρτάβαι) [,] γ (ἡμιον).

14. Μεμερίζον (cf. 823) is restored from l. 16; cf. the position of Πέλα in ll. 20–1. The genitive Μεμερίζον occurs in a papyrus found last winter.

15. γ)νησίων δημοσίων: cf. P. Amh. 86. 10 and note. άρταιεια and ομίσθοι are meant, though perhaps not exclusively.
17. μᾶς ἀντὶ μᾶς: cf. l. 18, and P. Amh. 87. 21–2, note. The meaning here is that half the artabae were paid on one measure (the name of which is lost in ll. 14–6), half on the measure στολ( ), which is new and which we have supposed to be στολ(ἀμικό) on the analogy of μέτρω δημοφαινομένῳ in 836.
18. ἐμώθι( ): this measure is also new. Perhaps ἐμώθι(οκ) ὁ(ωκ), i.e. the measure generally used in corn sent by boat to Alexandria. It was no doubt smaller than the δημόσιων μέτρων; cf. l. 21, note.
20. ἡμισθίων: this point of the remark (cf. ll. 28 and 32) is not quite clear. We might suppose that the writer was contrasting the present private payment with other official ones in the same account, but from l. 28 it appears that all the items in Col. ii concern his private account, and to assume that he failed to keep official and private accounts distinct is not satisfactory. An alternative explanation is to suppose that ἡμισθίων refers not to the nature of the account but to the character of the corn; cf. ll. 28–9, where an amount of corn which is apparently ἡμισθίων is converted into a slightly smaller sum δημοσίων δημοσίων κεδαρίῳ, and note ad loc. But since the payment in l. 19, although ἡμισθίως, is μέτρῳ δημοσίῳ, ἡμισθίως cannot refer to a private measure, and would be a curious expression to imply that the corn in question was not κεδαρίῳ.
21. 3 of 26 artabae is 8½ art., a sum which the writer expresses by 8½ art. 7 choenices.
This implies, if his arithmetic is correct, the artaba of 42 choenices, the largest of the different artabae in use in Egypt, and in the fourth century called the artaba θορκός (μέτρω) (P. Brit. Mus. 125; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 232–3). The fact that it is the artaba of 42 choenices which is here μέτρω δήμοσίω is important, for the official artaba in Roman times has often supposed to be much smaller, though, as we pointed out (P. Tebt. ibid.), on insufficient grounds. But it would not be safe to infer from the present passage alone that the mention of μέτρω δήμοσίω in Roman times always implied an artaba of 42 choenices.

22–3. These charges for donkey transport, with the στολογικόν (a new term, probably meaning a bakhshish for the στολός) and στομετρικόν (also new as an impost for measuring the corn), all of which are supplementary of the main payment (cf. ll. 19, 25, and 27), are probably included in the προσμετρωμένα which occur in the official receipts of this period; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 411–2.

24. στολά(γων): this does not necessarily imply that the payment was for taxation purposes; cf. P. Oxy. III. p. 251.

28–9. The sum of the foregoing items, 52½ artabae 2 choenices, is here converted into 49½ art. 8 choen. δύμας δήμου καθαραί, whatever that precisely means. The reduction is probably due to two causes at least, (1) the fact that in the preceding items artabae of different sizes were employed, and that some of them were smaller than the artaba meant in l. 29, which very likely contained 42 choenices (cf. l. 21, note); (2) the fact that these artabae διωτ(είσ) were partially or even wholly not καθαραί; cf. P. Tebt. I. 92. 9–11.

30. The doubtful γ has a horizontal stroke over it and seems to mean ‘3rd’. αὐτ(ον) cannot be read.

35. ὑσώ: θυσίδεως (cf. l. 14, note) or at least a place name would be expected.

41. Since we do not know which artaba was being employed, it is uncertain how the writer expressed ⅔ art. at the end of the line.

44. The μήτηρ τῶν ἀφηλίκων, if Ἱππακληίδε (δήν) is right in l. 43, is the Ἱππακλεία mentioned in l. 42.

741. List of Articles.

16·5 x 9·5 cm. Second century.

A list of miscellaneous articles, containing, as such lists commonly do, a number of rare or unknown words.

Δύγ(ος) ἐντολικῶν Εὐγενέτο-     ἰππικόν      α,
[ρο]ς ἐν δισακίδιῳ     κελλάριον τριλάγυνον     α,
σφυρίς διπλῆ καρίων     βι. [.]ον ἀναβολή     α,
ἀλλα μεικρά     ε,     προχείρια     β,
5 γεργαθὸς     α,     15 ἐν ὀίς υελα(εῖ) ἡμισυν-     γ,
ἀρνακίς     α,     Θέσεις
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ψήκτρα α, ποτηρίων δεκατ( ) δ σωτ( ) η, σόλια ἄρσεικά ξεύγ(η) η, βάτελλαι δ, [γυμαλακεία ξεύγ(η)] τ, σκούτλαι β, σανδάλια ὄνικ(δ) β, 20 βζύβαφων [I] Α.

7. τ of ψήκτρα above the line. 11. ὑππικον Pap. 15. ὕελα Pap.

'Account of articles at order of Eugenius in a double sack:—1 double basket of nuts, 5 other small ones, 1 wicker crate, 1 sheepskin, 1 scraper, 8 pairs of men's..., 6 pairs of women's ditto, 2 donkey straps (?), 1 horse's ditto, 1 three-flagon jar, 1 bag (?) of..., 2 hold-alls containing 3 half-sets of glass, 4... cups and 1..., 4 plates, 2 bowls, 1 sauce.'

4. ἅλα(ξ) μειρά(ξ) should perhaps be read, as the writer seems to have a tendency to omit final ε (cf. l. 15) and five baskets must be meant; but the neuter may refer to κάρυα.

5. γεργαθός is probably for γεργαθός, meaning a wicker basket.

8. σόλια: or perhaps σύλια, which however is still more difficult. σόλιον might be a diminutive of σόλος or an adjective from σόλοι, but neither is very suitable. It is hardly likely that the word is connected with στολή, for which στολή was a late Attic form (cf. Du Cange s.v.), though some article of attire is evidently meant. Mr. Smyly suggests a connexion with the Latin soliar.

10. σανδάλια may mean 'bands' of some kind, the word being used for a medical bandage by Oribasius. But the reading is extremely doubtful; the second letter could be ξ and of the first only the smallest vestiges remain.


13. ἀναβολή, since it governs a genitive plural, looks like a receptacle of some kind, a sense in which ἀναβολίδων is found in Macarius, Aροπηθ. Πατρ. 33 ἀναβολίδων μεστῶν ψωμίων. In the preceding word the vestiges before the lacuna suit only a round letter such as β, θ, η, or σ; possibly βζύβαφων. There are two dots like a diaeresis above the η, but they are perhaps accidental.

14. προψέφαρα are cases or boxes, since they contained glass; but the word is apparently new.

15. Mr. Smyly compares Martial iv. 46. 15 septenaria synthesis.

17. The cups are divided into two kinds, but what these are is obscure.

18. βάτελλαι: probably the Latin patella.

A letter from Antas to Faustus, chiefly concerning reeds (κάλαμος), written like many other letters of this period in vulgar Greek.

'Αντάς Φιλάου τοις πλείονα χαίρειν.  
παράλαμβανε παρὰ Πόθουν τὸν κάλαμον,  
μοί παναριθμοὺ καὶ ἀπόδοτα ἡμῖν  
μοί πόσος δέσμας παρεῖληφη.  
5 καὶ θείᾳ αὐτᾶς εἰς τόπον ἄσφαλέα  
τὴν ἀναβάσει αὐτᾶς  
ἀξιομεν. παράδος δέ τινι  
τῶν φίλων ἀριθμῷ αὐτᾶς ἐνα  
πάλιν φίλους ἡμεῖν παραδοῦναι.

10 ἄσφαλῆς καὶ ἐὰν τῇ δύνῃ  
σὺ τῇ . . . γναί μοι δῶς ἐργασίαν.  
ἀγὼ . . . . . . . σα ἐμὲ ἡγορακώναι  
παρὰ . . . . . . οὗ τὴν χιλιάν δέσμην  
(δραχμῶν) δεκαπενήγετε. μὴ ἀμελήσῃς.  
15 ἔρρωσον.

(ἐτοις) καὶ [Καλλισάριος Παῦλον a.]

On the verso

Φαυστῶι [. . . . . . .]ευν . ( ) εἰς Νέκλη.

'Antas to Faustus, many greetings. Take over from Pothus the reeds all together, and send me word how many bundles you have received, and put them in a safe place in order that we may take them on the journey up. Deliver a certain number of them to one of our friends in order that a friend may deliver them to me safely, and if you can . . . give your attention to it . . . I have bought from (Pothus?) the 1000 bundles for 15 drachmae. Don't forget. Good-bye. The 28th year of Caesar, Pauni 1. (Addressed) To Faustus . . . at Nekle.'
743. Letter to a Friend.

A letter in two columns, of which the first is much broken. The greater part is concerned with the explanation of the writer's reasons for sending Damas, whom he recommends to his friend's good offices.

Col. i.

Parts of 16 lines.

17 ) θέλω δὲ σὲ καὶ τὸν Καίσαρος
      ) ἀναγνωσιν, δὲι γὰρ σὲ

Col. ii.

eι καὶ π[ρ]ός ἄλλοις εἶχον πράγμα
20 βοηθῶν αὐτοῦ γ(ε)νέσθαι διὰ ἥν
   ἐχομὲν) πρὸς ἑαυτόν φιλίαν. καὶ
   γὰρ ἐγὼ δῆλος διαπον' ὅμοια ἐι "Ελε-
   νος χαλκοὺς ἀπόλε[σ]εν, παραγενομ(ένον)
   γὰρ Δαματός εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἡλ-
25 θαμεν ἐπὶ Ὁπαθρόδειτον καὶ εὐρέ-
   θη μήτε εἰληφὼς μήτε δεδωκό(σ).)
   ὥστ' ἀν τοῦτο σε θέλω γεινάσειν
   ὅτι ἐγὼ αὐτῷ διαστολάς δεδόκειν
   τὸ βαδίσα τε ἞ακτανα χάριν τῶν ἐκ-
30 φορών καὶ τὰ νῦν ἐπειτέπομφα
   αὐτόν πάντα συνλέξαι καὶ περὶ πάν-
   των αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν δέδωκα.
   ἐν οἷς ἐὰν σοῦ προσδεχόμενος συνπρο-
   γενέοις αὐτῷ ὁς ἀνθρωπολογ(ικ)εύο) καί ὑ
35 ὑπὲρ σου οὐτῶς ὅς ὑπ(έρ) μου. ἐν τῷ δὲ
   με περισπασθαὶ οὐκ ἡδυνάσθην
   συντυχεῖν Ἀπολλω(νίῳ) τῷ Διβικῷ ἔνα
   αὐτῷ αὐτὰ ταῦτα ὑποδίξω. καὶ σὺ
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dē ὑπὲρ ὄν ἐὰν θέλῃς γράφε μοι καὶ ἀνό- 40 κνως ποήσω, Δαμᾶς γὰρ μοι ἀνθωμολ(ογήσατο) ἑπὶ τοῦ ταχύν αὐτὸν ἑλθεῖν, ὑφηγήσεται γὰρ σοι.

[σ’εατο(φ) ἑπιμε(λοῒ) ἵν’ ὑγ(καίνης). ἑπισκοπ(οὐ) τοὺς σοὺς πάντεῖς.

ἐρρε[σο.] (ἔτους) κτ Καίσαρος Ἀβδῆς(κυ).]

20. ν ὄν ἑις κορρ. 22. ἑ δοκεῖ. 23. ἑ ἀπόλευ[σεν]. 43. λ. πάνασα(ς).

... I wish you and the ... of Caesar to read this (?), for although (?I?) have had trouble with others you must assist him for the sake of our friendship. I am quite upset at Helenos' loss of the money; for when Damas arrived at Alexandria, we came to Epaphroditus, and it was discovered that he had neither received nor paid anything. I wish you therefore to know this that I had given him orders to go to Takona for the rents, and now I have dispatched him to collect them all and have entrusted to him the care of the whole matter. Whatever service he may require from you, stand by him, as he will agree in everything for you just as for me. Owing to my worries I was unable to meet Apollonius the Libyan in order to inform him of this. Write to me yourself about anything you want, and I will do it without hesitation; for Damas has agreed in everything with me. It is well for him to come quickly, for he will instruct you. Take care of yourself so that you may remain in good health. Look after all your household. Good-bye. The 29th year of Caesar, Phaophi 6.'

18. Some word like ἀκονύμον is probably to be supplied at the beginning.
19. ἑλὼν whether first singular or third plural is difficult; ἑλῆς would be expected.
34. ἀνθωμολογη(σομεῖῳ): cf. P. Tebt. 21. 6, P. Par. 42. 7.

744. LETTER OF ILARION.

25 x 14.7 cm.

A letter from a man who had gone to Alexandria, addressed to his sister (who was no doubt his wife), and to two other women, regarding certain domestic matters. A curious injunction occurs in ll. 9-10.

'Ιλαρίων{α} Ἅλητι τῇ ἀδελφῆι πλέοστα χαὶ- 40 ρεῖν καὶ Βεροῦτι τῇ κυρίᾳ μοι καὶ Ἀπολλω- νάριν. γίνωσκε ὡς ἐγὼ καὶ νῦν ἐν Ἀλέξαν- δρε(ί)α (ἐ)σμεν· μὴ ἀγωνιῶσ ἐὰν δῶς εἰσ- 5 πορεύονται, ἐγὼ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ μένω.

R 2
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ἐρωτῶ σε καὶ παρακαλῶ σε ἐπιμελήθω(ητι) τῷ παιδίῳ καὶ ἔαν εὐθὺς ὀψών
ον λάβωμεν ἀποστελῶ σε ἀνώ. ἔαν
πολλαπόλλων τέκνη ἔαν ἢν ἄρσε-
10 νον ἄφες, ἐὰν ἢν θῆλεα ἐκβαλε.
εἴρηκας δὲ Ἀφροδισίατι ὅτι μή με
ἐπιλάθης· πῶς δύναμαι σε ἐπι-
λαθεῖν; ἐρωτῶ σε ὧν ἦν μὴ ἀγω-
νιάσῃ.
15 (έτους) κη Καίσαρος Πάντι κυ.

On the verso

'Ἰλαρίων Ἀλίτη ἀπόδος.

2. 1. Ἀπολλωναρίῳ. 8. 1. σου. 11. ἰε above the line.

'Ilarion to Alis his sister, many greetings, and to my dear Berous and Apollonarian. Know that I am still even now at Alexandria; and do not worry if they come back altogether (?), but I remain at Alexandria. I urge and entreat you to be careful of the child, and if I receive a present soon I will send it up to you. If (Apollonarian ?) bears offspring, if it is a male let it be, if a female expose it. You told Aphrodisias “Don’t forget me.” How can I forget you? I urge you therefore not to worry. The 29th year of Caesar, Pauni 23. (Addressed.) Deliver from Ilarion to Alis.'

8–10. ἔαν πολλαπόλλων τέκνη is very obscure. If the second person τέκνη is right, this passage must refer to the exposure of a female infant. But πολλά would be most extraordinary, apart from the difficulty of constructing πολλών. If τέκνη is altered to τέκνη we might suppose that an animal was the subject and divide πολλά(τι) Ἀπόλλων; but Ἀπόλλων is not a likely name for an animal. Perhaps πολλαπόλλων conceals Ἀπολλωνίριον (cf. l. 2); for the use of the second person cf. e.g. 295. 7.

745. Letter to Gaius Rustius.

11.1 x 18.8 cm. About A.D. 1.

Conclusion of a letter, chiefly concerned with money matters. The writer had evidently been in financial difficulties, and was afraid of their recurrence; but the loss of the beginning of the letter makes the transactions under discussion rather obscure. The addressee has a Roman name.
On the verso

Γαίων Ρουστίων οἱ

6. v of οίκον corr. from υἱον.

...from my sister 65 jars of wine and 10 drachmae, and you bought the wine at 6 drachmae, for which you drew me up a bond through Artemas that the said Antas would make the repayment because you had... as you promised through the politarch Theophilus, in order that everything may not be completely... and we go bankrupt again without any necessity. You don’t know how he treated me at Oxyrhynchus(?), not like a man who had paid but like a defrauder and a debtor. I ask you therefore not to do otherwise; but I know that you will do everything well. I do not want to have any dispute with you, as you are my friend. Salute all your household, and take care of your health. Good-bye. (Addressed) To Gaius Rustius...'

4. πολειτάρχου; πολειτάρχας are known at Thessalonica from Acts xvii. 6 and C. I. G. 1967, but the title is new in Egyptian papyri.

The mutilated word before ἀνοθεν is most likely a perfect participle; the letter before η[ seems to be λ, σ, or τ.

6. ἐν Ὄξυρνγχας: a village Ὅξυρνγχα is known in the Fayum but not in the Oxyrhynchite nome, and it is difficult to believe that the metropolis is not here meant, though Ὅξυρνγχα or Ὅξυρνχατων πόλις is the normal form. The sentence οίκον αδια... ἀποδεδωκότι may be interrogative.
746. Letter of Recommendation.

23.2 x 13.5 cm. A.D. 16.

A letter from Theon to his brother Heraclides, a basilicogrammateus, introducing the bearer, Hermophilus. Theon is perhaps the same as the writer of 292, a similar letter of recommendation addressed to the dioecetes on behalf of a brother named Heraclides. Cf. also 787.

Θέων Ἡρακλείδη τῷ ἀδελφῷ
πλέιστα χαῖρειν καὶ ύγιαίνειν.
Ἐρμόφιλος (ὁ) ἀποδίδοις σοι τὴν
ἐπιστολὴν [ἐ]+στ[ε] [. .] κ[. .]μ. φ[. .]ηρί
5 [.].ερίων, καὶ ἡρᾷησέν με γράψαι σοι.
[π]ροφέρεται ἔχειν πραγμάτιον
[ἐν τῇ] Κερκεμοῦνι. τότε ὅπε νῦν ἔλαν
σοι φα[ι]νηταὶ σπουδάσεις κατὰ τὸ
δίκαιον. τὰ δ’ ἄλλα σεαυτὸ ἐπιμελοῦ
10 ὡ’ ύγιαίνης.
ἐρωσο.
(ἐτου) γὰρ Τιβέριον Καίσαρος Σεβαστὸν Φαώφι γ.

On the verso


‘Theon to Heraclides his brother, many greetings and wishes for good health. Hermophilus the bearer of this letter is (the friend or relative) of...erius, and asked me to write to you. Hermophilus declares that he has business at Kerkemounis. Please therefore further him in this matter, as is just. For the rest take care of yourself that you may remain in good health. Good-bye. The 3rd year of Tiberius Caesar Augustus, Phaophi 3. (Addressed) To Heraclides, basilicogrammateus of the Oxyrhynchite and Cynopolite nomes.’

4. The letters στ[ε] are on a separate fragment, the position of which is doubtful.
13. There seems to be an ellipse of καὶ after Ὀξίν[ρυγχίτου], though the fact that a basilicogrammateus should have more than one nome under his jurisdiction is remarkable.
747. INVITATION TO A FEAST.

5·1 x 7·3 cm. Late second or third century.

An invitation to a feast given by a cavalry officer; cf. 110 and 523.

Καλεῖ σε ὁ (δεκάδαρ)χ(ος) εἰς τὴν ξενί-
αν ἑαυτοῦ τῇ σὲ καλάν-
δαῖς ἀπὸ ὧρ(ας) η.

2. υτ of εαυτου corr. from ν.

'The decurion invites you to his party on the sixth day before the Calends at eight o'clock.'
V. COLLATIONS OF HOMERIC FRAGMENTS

(The collations of II. i-xii and the Odyssey are with the text of Ludwich, those of II. xiii-xxiv with that of La Roche.)

(a) Iliad.

748. 16.1 x 6.6 cm. Ends of i. 107-116, with occasional stops and elision-marks. 108 ὄψακ τελεσσας. 113 Ἐλευθεριάς. Third century, written in sloping oval uncialls of good size.

749. 10.3 x 10 cm. Ends of i. 160-176 from the bottom of a column. Second century, written in heavy round uncialls.

750. 8 x 6.3 cm. Parts of ii. 57-73. 62 τῷσσοντα. 63 εγερθες. 65 ἐκέλευε. Third century, written in sloping oval uncialls.

751. 19.6 x 9.2 cm. Part of a column containing iii. 30-55, with numerous stops and accents, and several corrections (probably by a second hand). 37 ιος. 40 οφιλος. First o of ἄγους above an a crossed out. 47 ἀγερθεις corrected from ἀγερθεῆς. 48 γ of ἀγγευς above the line. 50 πολης cor. from πολης. 51 κατησεν. 53 ἡφαίστως. s of εχεις above the line. 54 οι of χραίσμων above η crossed out. Late second or third century, written in a neat uncial hand of the oval type.

752. 11 x 8 cm. Beginnings of iv. 87-96, with numerous stops, breathings and accents. 93 The first hand had η ρ αγρ μου; a second hand seems to have corrected ν and has added δε above μου. Third century, written in sloping oval uncialls.

753. 19.2 x 6.4 cm. On the recto part of a second or third century account. On the verso parts of iv. 364-398, with numerous stops, breathings and accents. 369 is omitted, as in A. 378 εστρατουν[.]θ' [.] 381 πάρ ἀδίανια. 382 ὁκοῦστο ὁ[.]ε corr. to ὁκοῦστο ἡ[.]ε (?) 387 ε of εων above the line. Third century, written in sloping oval uncialls.

754. 5.5 x 2.5 cm. On the recto ends of 7 lines of a document mentioning a ὄμουργ(ός). First century. On the verso a few letters from iv. 532-539. 535 πέδε[.]μυκθη. First century, written in a good-sized irregular uncial hand.

755. 19 x 6 cm. On the recto part of a document in a cursive hand of the early part of the third century. On the verso a few letters from the ends
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of v. 130–173, forming a complete column, with numerous stops, accents, breathings, and marks of elision and quantity (all probably added later). 134 ευ[ ]χθη. 151 εξε[ ]ρευεν. 153 το[ ]ρω added by a second hand. Third century, written in an upright hand of the oval type.

756. 6.8 × 8.2 cm. Fragment of the bottom of a leaf from a book, containing on the recto the ends of v. 324–334, and on the verso parts of 379–390, with elision-marks. 332 κραμασσαται. 382 τετλατη. 384 λγ of αλγει corr. 388 θ of ενθ added above the line (?). απολυτο. 390 η of εηγγειλεν above α, which is crossed through, ξ having been also corrected. Late third or fourth century, written in a semi-uncial hand.

757. 4.2 × 3 cm. Parts of v. 578–586. 582 ευ δ. First century, written in round uncials.

758. 9.6 × 11.4 cm. v. 583–596, the lines being nearly complete, from the top of a column, with stops, breathings, accents and elision-marks. 583 ελευ[ ]ρα. 586 δε και. 587 ευστηκε. 588 επιων ... πεσον εν. Late second or third century, written in a neat uncial hand of the oval type.

759. 12.7 × 2.9 cm. A few letters from the ends of v. 662–682, from the end of a column, with stops (high and low point) and accents. 667 αμ[ ]φις εποιε[ ]ς, confirming the conjecture of Brandreth. Third century, written in a neat upright uncial hand of the oval type.

760. Fr. (b) 7.3 × 4.9 cm. Two fragments, the first containing a few letters from the beginnings of v. 715–718, the second parts of 720–729. 724 ε of χοιρεην above the line. First century, written in round upright uncials.

761. 21 × 11 cm. On the recto part of an effaced document. On the verso vi. 147 and 148, and, after a lacuna which may have contained 2 lines, parts of ll. 147 and 149 and another line, the whole being a writing exercise. 148 τηλεθωσα. Late first century B.C., written in a large semi-uncial hand.

762. 19.8 × 8.5 cm. On the recto ends of lines of a list of persons, written in a cursive hand in the late second or early third century. On the verso the latter parts of vii. 1–35, forming a complete column. 5 ελατησων. 16 δυτο. 30 μαχηρ[ ]μεθ. 31 omitted. Third century, written in small upright uncials.

763. 24.4 × 10 cm. Part of a leaf from a book, containing on the recto the latter portions of vii. 68–101, and on the verso the earlier portions of 69–134, with stops, breathings and accents. 72 ν of ποντοπορουσων added by a second hand. 73 Ποβαχαιων. 77 το[ ]ρυ added above the line by a second hand. 112 Final τ of Πριμιδη added above the line by a second hand. τον τε τρομενων (a new reading; cf. υποτρομεοντα in Vindob. 61). 113 Αχιλλευς.
133 τ of ὀξυρυνκω added above the line by a second hand. Third century, written in good-sized oval uncials.

764. 9.6 x 2.8 cm. A few letters from the beginnings of viii. 109-122, with stops, breathings and accents. Third century, written in oval uncials.

765. 8.1 x 5.4 cm. Ends of ix. 320-333, with stops, breathings and accents (oxytones having a grave accent on the final syllable). 323 First ἄ of προφερµεν added above the line. 324 δὲ τέ. 325 ν of ιανων above λλ crossed out. Third century, written in oval uncials.

766. 5.8 x 5.8 cm. A few letters from the ends of x. 542-547, from the bottom of a column, with occasional accents. Third century, written in sloping oval uncials.

767. 6.6 x 4.3 cm. A few letters from the ends of xi. 555-561, with stops. Second century, written in good-sized round uncials.


769. Fr. (a) 4.5 x 3.1 cm. Two fragments containing a few letters from xiii. 308-317 and 342-347, with accents. 316 omitted. 344 γηθηρ[ε]ε λ. [with ν ϒ] above λ. Late second or third century, written in a neat uncial hand of the oval type.

770. 4.7 x 7.9 cm. A few letters from the ends of xiii. 372-377 and the beginnings of 405-413, with stops, breathings and accents. 372 πη[ίε]ν. 374 In the margin ἐπανεσθοιαι and below it αἰνίζομαι, referring to the variants αἰνίζομαι and αἰνίζομαι; cf. Schol. A αἰνίζων· φέρεται καὶ διὰ τοῦ ἐ αἰνίζομαι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπανεσθοιαι. Ζηνόδωτος αἰνίζομαι. 410 In the margin between this and l. 411 is a critical sign shaped like ἐ. Second century, written in round upright uncials.

771. 14 x 7.8 cm. On the recto beginnings of xv. 736-746, with occasional breathings and accents. 740 κακλιμ[ε]ναι. 742 αὶ and first ω of μαμωνω above ε and o. 744 τ of κηλεω added later (by a second hand?). At the end a coronis and the title in large letters Ιαλα[δος o. Late second or early third century, written in handsome good-sized uncials of the oval type. On the verso 12 nearly complete lines of a money-account in third century cursive.

772. 10.2 x 5.9 cm. Ends of xvii. 353-373, with stops, breathings and accents. 361 αγ[χπ]οτικω. 363 αυ αiostream. 369 Final ἦ of Μενουτιαδω added above the line. 371 a of αιτηρι corr. from ε. Second or third century, written in a rather small uncial hand.
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(b) Odyssey.

773. Height of roll 24.4 cm. Seven fragments from four columns of a MS. of ii, containing a few letters from 304-312, 339-357 (top of a column), ends of 362-374 (top of a column), and parts of 386-410 (a whole column), with stops (high and middle point) and occasional accents. 341 above εξαγερέσεις is διὰ ... ἔνδοκοι τε θεοῦ. 369 νοῦς corr. 372 (end of the line) ἡ η or ἡν. 401 [εὐδομενην [v]]. 407 omitted. 408 κοινής. Second century, written in very large heavy uncialς (cf. 661), the letters measuring 5 mm. in height.

774. 4.5 x 7.5 cm. Parts of iii. 226-231. 227 εἰπῆς, the e being added by a second hand above a crossed through. 228 θεός εἰ, the s being corrected from i (?). Third century, written in good-sized sloping oval uncialς.

775. 8.4 x 4.1 cm. Parts of iv. 388-400 from the bottom of a column, with occasional breathings and accents. 396 a of ἀληθείας above η crossed through. 399 omitted. Third century, written in sloping oval uncialς.

776. 6.2 x 2.4 cm. A few letters from iv. 520-529 from the bottom of a column, with occasional accents. First or early second century, written in round uncialς.

777. 12.2 x 8.8 cm. Part of the lower portion of a leaf of a book, containing on the recto the beginnings of v. 7-17 and on the verso the ends of 34-44, with stops, breathings and accents. Fourth century, written in good-sized sloping oval uncialς, in brown ink.

778. 20.6 x 17.2 cm. On the recto a nearly complete column containing x. 26-50, with stops (high, middle and low point). 27 Second i of αφροίνυσιν added above the line; similarly final i of δεκατης in 29, τῶν and αλλω in 32. 31 ἑπελλαβε. 34 επέσσατ. 38 εσύ. 42 νεισσαμεθα. 46 βουλή τε. Late second or third century, written in handsome round upright uncialς. On the verso parts of the last 7 lines of a letter in a cursive hand of the late third century.

779. 6.2 x 9.6 cm. x. 124-130 from the top of a column, the lines being nearly complete, with breathings and accents. Late second or third century, written in a clear cursive hand.

780. 17.7 x 8.5 cm. A few letters from the ends of xi. 471-493, and the earlier portions of 523-545, from the bottoms of columns, with stops and occasional accents. 533 δή Τρωεστσι with οὐ (in a second hand) above εσύ. 539 βιβδῶσα. 544 φ of νοσφίν above τ crossed out. αφειστηκει. 545 μὺ with e above i added by a second hand. Second century (?), written in an uncial hand of the oval type and archaic appearance, Σ being formed Ξ.
781. 6 x 3.8 cm. Fragment of a leaf from a book, containing on the recto parts of xvi. 243-256, and on the verso the ends of 288-301, with stops, breathings and accents (in lighter ink). 293 θε δαιρα. 295 δ of δουρε corr. Third century, written in rather small sloping oval uncials.

782. 7.3 x 5.3 cm. Fragment of the bottom of a leaf of a book containing on the verso parts of xvii. 137-148, and on the recto ends of 182-193, with stops and accents (in lighter ink). 187 γευζοσαι. Third century, written in rather small sloping oval uncials.

783. 11.7 x 4.4 cm. Ends of xvii. 410-428, with stops. 417 αλαωι. Late first century B.C., written in good-sized irregular uncials.
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784. Fourteen fragments of a document containing on both sides several columns, the recto consisting for the most part of lists of persons, the verso of a private account (continued on the recto), which mentions καὶ προσφορὰς (i.e. προσγύνωνται) τιμὴς (πυροῦ) (ὑμίσους) τοῦ πεπραμένου Διδύμῳ Αρπ (i.e. 1100 copper drachmae), Ἀντίπαρα ἰερῶν ἐν Μούχεω(ς) φιλ. ἤθουλο κ. ζύτους ι. φών ι. καὶ ἐλαῖον κο(τῆλης) αρ. αἰν. οἷον κεραμίων β. (τάλαιναν) α. and payments for 'Ελληνικῶν. A conversion of silver into copper drachmae occurs, τιμὴς (ἄργυρος) (ἄργυρους) ἡ ἐπί(τρο) τοῦ πατρὸς 'Βψ (a ratio of 337 1/3 : 1, which is unusually low; cf. P. Tebt. I. p. 580 1). First century B.C.

785. 14.7 x 9 cm. An undertaking by a surety to produce a certain individual who had been committed to his charge; cf. 259. After the first 5 lines, which seem to have contained the address but are much broken, the papyrus concludes ὁμολογεῖται Χάρακλεος παρὰ σοῦ ὃν καὶ παρέδομαι ἐν τῶι ἐμφανεῖ ἐκτὸς ἰερὸν βαμοῦ τεμεῖνος πάσης σκέπης. About λ. d. 1. 12 lines in all.

786. 14.3 x 8.4 cm. Conclusion of a census-return on oath, written by Ariston and Didymus on Tubi 30 of the third year of Hadrian (λ. d. 119), the portion preserved corresponding to 480. 7 sqq. προγεγραμμένον (cf. 480. 15) is apparently written ἀγεῖ. Below the signatures in two different hands are official dockets καταχωρίσθη (λογοφυ) λαογράφοις Σότ(ον) Δρό(μου) χρό(ίοι) ὁ αὐτός, and καταχωρίσθη λαογράφοις 'Ἰπποκράτου Παρε(μβολής) χρό(ίοι) ὁ αὐτός. 20 lines, which are complete except for the first.

787. 19.9 x 13.3 cm. Concluding part of a letter of recommendation (cf. 748). The first 5 lines are ὧς ἐστὶν ἡμέτερος. ἤτοι καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ αὐτῶν ἀνεπτυχέον καὶ ἐν ἐν αὐτῷ προσδέχεται [ποι] ἐκ δικαίου εἰς τὴν ἑπτήν καταλόγου λαογραφίας αὑτῶν. [σῶ] δε ἐπὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γραφεῖ. Dated in the second year of Tiberius, Pharmouthi 11 (λ. d. 16). 9 lines.

1 The problems of Ptolemaic copper coinage have recently been discussed by Hultsch in Abhand. d. Königl. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., 1903. We regret to be compelled to observe that owing to the adoption of Revillout's long exploded theories on demotic, and the failure to appreciate the evidence of the Tebtunis papyri with the arguments brought against the 120 : 1 ratio in our App. ii to that volume, the article seems to us a step backwards rather than forwards.
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788. 11.7 x 10 cm. On both recto and verso parts of two columns of a private account in copper drachmae. A conversion of silver into copper (δραχμαί) δ ’ΑΤμ (a ratio of 485 : 1) occurs; among the other items are ἄρταβδων παρη( ) Ἀ, αἰτητή ρ, τέλος οἴκου 'Βυ, μεμβράδες ('anchovy'). Early first century B.C. In Col. i of the recto the first 8 lines are complete, the being imperfect throughout.

789. 9.7 x 13 cm. Part of a letter. Lines 2–9 ἐδωκά σου ἐν Ἤζηρ[δ(γχων)] Διονυσίου Φανόν ἐπιστολεύδιον κεχαραγμένον εἰς ἑι μηδο(σ) Καισαρείου τοῦ διελθόντος ι (έτους) περὶ τοῦ σε δοῦναί μου ἵσος ὧν καὶ αὐτός ὀ Διονύ(σιος) ἔσχεν παρ ἐμοι (περοῦ) ἄρταβδων ὃ ὁ(σινκώ)ς. The tenth year probably refers to Tiberius or Claudius. 11 lines.

790. 8.7 x 12.8 cm. Beginnings of 8 lines of an official letter from Dionysius to Ptolemaeus enclosing a copy of another letter. ἐπιστάται τῶν ἵππαρχων are mentioned. Late second century B.C. Written across the fibres. On the verso beginnings of 6 more lines in a different hand.

791. 14.7 x 6 cm. Letter from Didymus to his brother Apollonius, beginning ἐπιμέμησας Ἀρμονίῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ περὶ ἄργυρ(ίου) δραχμών τεσσαράκοντα ἥκτῳ εἰς συναγορασμῶν ἑρών . . . Addressed on the verso Ἀπολλωνίῳ. About Λ. Δ. I. Incomplete, the end being lost. 12 lines.

792. 8.4 x 27.2 cm. On the recto an incomplete account of wheat to various persons, containing 19 lines. On the verso another practically complete account of receipts and payments, mentioning λυτο[ν]γο(δι) μῦ, Φωσφόρῳ καὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ ζ ζ, ναῦ(λου) πορεί(ων) δ ζ η, Φωσφόρῳ καὶ αὐ . υ(γ) εἰς ἐφόδου(α ) ζ μ. ζ perhaps means δραχμαί. 13 lines. The writing on the recto is the fibres, that on the verso along them. First century B.C.

793. 24 x 11.5 cm. Acknowledgement of payments of wheat εἰς τὸ δῆμος τῶν by various persons ἀπὸ διαστολη(ῆς) of other persons. Dated in the seventh year of Domitian, Caesarius 16 (Λ. Δ. 88). Nearly complete. 18 lines.

794. 21.2 x 15.6 cm. Conclusion of a contract for the sale of 14 arourae of catoecc land, with the signatures, which are nearly complete, and following the same formula as 504. The seller was Asclepiades, the buyer a woman called Συντότης (? ) or Συντότων, and the price 500 drachmae of silver. The land was περὶ Θ., ἅθαμ ἐκ τοῦ Ἐβίφυνων αλη κλῆρον (sic). Written in the fifth year of Domitian (Λ. Δ. 85–6). 36 lines.

795. Fr. (a) 4.5 x 13.3 cm. Two fragments of a marriage-contract dated in the reign of Domitian (Λ. Δ. 81–96). The husband is called Heraclides, the wife (?) Sarapous. Line 4 γραμμῆν φερίνην προσφερέμενην δο[κτίλων] χρυσοῦν τεταρτάρην (cf. 406. 6, note), and lower down τευμένην κατά τοὺς τῆς χώρας νόμους occurs. Written across the fibres. Parts of 12 lines in all.
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796. 3 × 8.3 cm. Parts of 7 lines from the beginning of a marriage-contract written in the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98–117), mentioning ἐν παραφέρουσι κλαλίων ἄργυρων ζεύγος (?). For κλαλίων = κλαλίων (‘bracelet’) cf. 114. II. Written across the fibres.

797. 5.5 × 10 cm. On the recto an entry concerning the measurement of the land of Thotsutaios, διάφορον σχολισμοῦ Θοστεαίος τοῦ "Ωρον τῶν ἐν τῇ συ( ) τῶν πα( ) ἀπὸ τοῦ ιε τοῦ καὶ ιβ (ἐτοὺς) περὶ κό(μης) . . . For διάφορον σχολισμὸν cf. P. Tebt. I. p. 229. The reign is that of Cleopatra III and Ptolemy Alexander (B.C. 103–2). 4 lines. On the verso 2 lines from the beginning of a document mentioning Νεμέρα κολμύρῳ(ς)ματείας.

798. 7.8 × 9.2 cm. Conclusion of a letter, ending ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ ἀγοραστοῦ πρὸς ταῦτα ἀποδίναμι, ὅσ ὁ ἀν παραγείνοιται οἱ συνολογοὶ ἐπὶ τὴν παράληψιν τῶν στικῶν ἀπομετρήσαμεν ἄμα καὶ τοῦτο. ἔρωσο. (ἐτοὺς) κυ Φασφί. The twenty-third year probably refers to Epiphanes (B.C. 183). 8 lines.

799. 30.5 × 25 cm. One complete and one incomplete column of an account of sums owed and interest upon them, beginning iv AXiavbpija €(?). Then follows a list of names and amounts, e.g. /()(). The second column is also concerned with loans; εἰς δανισμὸν occurs. About A.D. 153. 34 lines.

800. 18.7 × 12.5 cm. Beginnings of 19 lines of an official document enclosing a letter of Valerius Athenodorus. Lines 4–10 (which begin a new section, as is indicated by the size of the initial letter) Καὶ διὰ λόγον(ν) (διωδικαί)μην[ , ἐπιλύσθη διαγεγράφθαι [ , νομοῦ τοῦ τοῦ τρόπον τοῦ τοῦτον [ , ποιμανοῦ τῷ ις (ἐτεί) Ἄστωνον Κάπασαν τοῦ κυρίαν, Φίλικος τοῦ ἡγομονεύσας ἐργατεία ἐκ τῶν[ , αἱρεθέντων εἰς εὐσχημόνων ὑπὸ Ἡρακλῆ . . . προχρείας ἐκ τοῦ κυριακοῦ λόγον εἰς τὴν [. Written about A.D. 153.

801. 19.2 × 12.3 cm. Fragment of a notification addressed to Euangelius also called Sarapion, strategus, by Diogenes, enclosing an authorization to the strategus from the archidicales in answer to a petition by Diogenes. Cf. 485 and 719. In the upper margin is a short note from the strategus (cf. B. G. U. 578. 1) dated in the second year of Gaius Pescennius Niger (A.D. 193). The letter of the archidicales to the strategus is dated Thoth 18 (probably of the same year). 35 lines, of which the ends are lost.

802. 7 × 7 cm. Parts of 11 lines from the beginning of a contract, one of the parties being called Σιμάρματος. Dated in the 11.[th] year of Ptolemy (the angel the god) Philometor and Berenice, i.e. B.C. 101–95. On the verso a docket.

803. 15 × 5 cm. Fragment of an official letter or petition, containing 3 com-
plete and 3 incomplete lines, with traces of a preceding column. Lines 2–5
καὶ ἀπὸ ἐπιστατέας φίλακτόν ἀντὶ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος εἰς τῷ δημόσιον όμολογουμένων
dιαγράφεσθαι (δραχμών) Τ’ ἀπητήρια ὑπανώθερον τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ νομοῦ φύλακας
ἐπὸ τῇ τοῦ . . . . . καὶ] Πολεμαίου τοῦ στρατηγοῦ . . . Late first century
b. c. On the verso parts of two columns of an account.

804. Width 9-9 cm. Horoscope dated in the twenty-seventh year of Aug-
gustus, Phaophi 5 περὶ ἀρα(ν) γ τῆς ἡμέρας(ς) (Oct. 2 (?) A.D. 4). The sun was
in Libra, the moon in Pisces, Saturn in Taurus, Jupiter in Cancer, Mars in
Virgo. Taurus was setting, and Aquarius at the nadir. After the astro-
nomical details the papyrus concludes ἐξεὶ κυνόνων φιλάσσων ἐως ἡμερῶ(ν)
μ’ χάρω τοῦ Ἀρεως. Incomplete, being broken in the middle. 15 lines in all.

805. 6-6 x 7-6 cm. Conclusion of a letter written on Epeiph 20 of the fifth
year of Augustus (v. e. B. C. 25). Lines 2 sqq. ζυτο γὰρ τῶν ἄνθρωπον. ἐν δὲ
τῶν ἐρχομένων πλούσιον καλὰ φάσει ἐλέησον παρ’ [ἐμοῦ, ἄξιον δὲ ἀντιφωνεῖν
[μ’ τις προπόστερον. ἀποτάξον πάντας τῶν παρ’ ἡμῶν καὶ σεαυτὸς ἐπιμελέον ἐν’ ἡμᾶς

806. 15-9 x 35-4 cm. Account, in two columns, of expenditure of copper
money for various purposes in the tenth year (of Augustus, i. e. B. C. 21–0).
Among the items are ἀρεβεῦς Ὁσίρησος ’Δ, Κεφαλὰ χρυσοχῶφ Το, Σαραπίων ἐτος
προγραμμάτων ’Αφ, διὰ τῆς ’Ασκληπιάδου τραπέζης λίβεος (τάλαντον) a. Complete.
21 lines.

807. 16-8 x 21-1 cm. Fragment of an official list of sheep and goats belonging
to different persons at a village. Col. i contains the ends of 5 lines.
Col. ii has ὅπως αὐτοῦ τῶν πι, ἄγγες (ς) ὅ, καὶ Ὁσίρησας φομακά με, Ἀρσάκιος τῶν
μ’ ἄγγες γ. / ἄγγος ζ· γίνεται τῆς κάμης πρὸ (βατο) ’Δσμα ἄγγες τὸ, ἀν Ὁσίρης
φομακά σμ. The sheep which were Ὁσίρης φομακά as contrasted with those
that were private property seem to have been subject to a special
impost (φόρος), payable nominally to Arsinoē (i. e. Arsinoē Philadelphus
probably), but really of course to the State; cf. the apóμορα in the Revenue

808. Height 36 cm. A list of abstracts (διαστρώματα) of contracts for loan;
cf. 274 and P. Oxy. II. p. 176. One column, numbered at the top μκε, is
practically complete, and there are parts of another in three separate
fragments. The first entry is [ἐν] Παλάςει ὁμολαγεῖ ”Ἀρταλὸς Ἔρμων[θος
tοῦ . . . . . . ὁ] τῆς ὁ[ν] ’Οξ(ο)γ’ χω(ω) πόλεως Παυσάμου Πεταίριος ἀπὸ τή(ς) ἀδ(τῆς)
kώμης Παλαίσσας Ὀμο(νεκφω) τοῦ ἀρχαῖς ἀπέχ(ειν) παρ’ ἀυτοῦ ἄργυριοι (δραχμαὶ)
σι κεφαλαὶ (ἀλλ) ἀν ἐδάνυ(σεν) αὐτῶ διὰ τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀδ(τῆ) κώμη γραφοῦ τῷ ἑνεχ(τῶι)
(ἐτέ) μη[ν] Νερωνείου Σεβαστώι ἔδ, ἀπό(οςις) δ’ μη[ν] Νερωνείου
Σεβαστώι καὶ ἀπό(οςις) λ μη[ν] Νερωνείου τοῦ ἔτους, ἐγχ(κ) λει(πό)μενη;
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A marginal note (probably by the second hand) has ] ποξ( ) εν απο(γραμμ)ι (ιτους). The other entries refer to loans εν Σεφω, εν Κεσμούχ(ει) or εν Τή(ει), and follow the same formula with similar later additions. The month after ηθέ(τυσταί), (which is once written ηθέτυος(ται)), is uniformly that in which the contract was drawn up. θεὸς Κλαύδιος is mentioned, and the papyrus was probably written in the reign of Nero (A.D. 54–68). 43 lines in Col. i, besides the marginal notes.

809. 16.7 x 6.4 cm. Ends of 22 lines from the beginning of a contract drawn up before the agoranomi for the sale (?) of a female slave called Τεχωσοῦς. Dated in the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98–117).

810. 14.6 x 10 cm. Proposal (ἐπιδέχομαι μισθόσωσθαι) addressed to Claudia Ptolema by Dioscorus for the lease of 3 arourae of βασιλικῆ γῆ near Sinaru in the κλῆρος of Xenon for the nineteenth year of Hadrian (A.D. 134–5). The land, being ἐκ μέρους ἐν ἀβραχω (l. -χφ), was to be irrigated by the lessee at his own expense and cultivated χόρτῳ εἰς κοπῆν καὶ θερμήν ἐπωμῆν at the total rent of 120 drachmae, the δημόσια being paid by the lessor. Cf. 730, the formula of which is almost identical. Nearly complete, but broken at the bottom. Title on the verso. 27 lines.

811. 7.7 x 9.4 cm. 8 lines from the beginning of a letter from Πέλλις to Ανθ[α;?] beginning καὶ τὸ πρώτον ἔγραψαι σοι: εὑχαριστῶν Ἐρμίππου (l. -πφ) ὅτι πάντα μοι ποιεῖ εἰς τὴν σὴν καταλογὴν (cf. 787), καὶ τὰ εὖν εἰ σοι φαίνεται γράψαν αὐτῷ... Address on the verso. About A.D. 1.

812. 10.2 x 8.3 cm. Fragment of a letter containing in a postscript (l. 5) πεπί-ασται Λοκρίων [, (l. 6) ρικαρίς ὑπὸ Λουκίου (ὑπ. Λ. above the line) ὑκονυα γάρ δῆ;] [, (l. 7) τὴν λαμίκαν αὑτῷ [. Dated in the twenty-fifth year of Augustus, Athur (B.C. 5). 8 lines.

813. 15 x 11.7 cm. Conclusion of a letter in which the writer requests that a cargo of barley may be sent to him. About A.D. 1. 7 lines.

814. 21.5 x 11.6 cm. Fragment of an account in two columns. Among the entries are πακτωμάτας... ἀπὸ Θελβά... Κύνος Πτολεμαίου τῶν ἀπὸ Ἐνεργε-τίδος... Written in the fourth year (probably of Tiberius, i.e. A.D. 17–8). 15 incomplete lines in Col. ii.

815. 27.9 x 11.3 cm. Fragment of an account containing names and sums of money arranged under different dates, the beginnings of lines being lost. The proper name Ὄρθωρξεί (dative) occurs. About A.D. 1. 19 lines.

816. Fr. (a) 14.3 x 13.1 cm. Three fragments of an account containing names and sums of money. ἐξ Ἱσδώρου καὶ ἦσοῦς occurs. 10 incomplete lines in Fr. (a). On the verso part of another account mentioning the twenty-fifth year (of Augustus, i.e. B.C. 6–5).
817. 9.7 x 20 cm. 5 nearly complete lines from the top of a column containing a list of names and sums of money, a larger and a smaller, the second being probably interest, e.g. δ (διὰ 'Ἀντέρωτος Λοκήττιον Παχών β (δραχμαί) ρψ (δραχμαί) η. The twenty-first year (of Augustus, i.e. B.C. 10-9) is mentioned. On the verso part of another account.

818. 6.8 x 9 cm. Ends of the first 7 lines of a contract dated in the thirty-fourth year of Augustus (A.D. 4-5), written in a semi-uncial hand.

819. 8.6 x 10.6 cm. Conclusion of a letter concerning the sale of wine or oil, ending τά δὲ προκείμενα χ(δας) δ' πεπράσ {σ}οι: δὲ' ἐκου ὡν ὀνα δραχ(μας) πέντε, τά κόρινδα? ἐκ δραχ(μα)ν ἐκ (τριώβιδαιν). About A.D. 1. 6 lines.

820. 10.2 x 17.9 cm. End of a letter containing the date (twenty-seventh year of Augustus, Tubi 1[1], i.e. B.C. 3) and a postscript of 7 lines, giving various directions.

821. 11.5 x 6.2 cm. Ends of the first 9 lines of a letter to a daughter. About A.D. 1.

822. 5.4 x 1.3 cm. Beginning of a letter from Lysimachus to his brother. εὖ πράσσεσαι takes the place of χαίρεσαι. About A.D. 1. 4 lines.

823. 2.4 x 10.2 cm. Fragment of the conclusion of a lease of land near Μεμέρῳδα. Cf. 277. Dated in the twenty-fifth year of Augustus, Phaophi (B.C. 6). Written on the verso, the recto being blank. 13 incomplete lines.

824. 4.8 x 2.5 cm. Fragment containing parts of the first 10 lines of a contract dated in the sole reign of Ptolemy (Alexander the god) Philometor (B.C. 101-88).

825. 7.8 x 15.9 cm. Beginning of an account of which the heading is Δημητρίῳ καὶ Αμωνίᾳ καὶ τοῖς σίν ἀυτοῦ μισθωταῖς ξεινηκὴ πρακτορείας παρὰ Σαραπίωνοι[ς] προαγαμενου Μέμφεως Μῆμ[ε]φ[ε]γον. Λόγος λήμματος καὶ ἀπαλώματος μινων τριῶν ἀποφασίζει τοῦ Παῦτο τοῦ ε (ἐτούς) . . . . The beginnings of lines of a second column are preserved, containing a list of entries each commencing with π(αρ). On the importance of this papyrus for the ξεινηκὴ πρακτορεία see 712. introd. Second century. On the verso in a different hand (?) parts of the first 6 lines of a document mentioning the ἐγκήσεων βιβλιοφυλάκων, perhaps the draft of a declaration.


827. 13.5 x 6.8 cm. Part of a list of names. About A.D. 1. 18 lines.
VI. DESCRIPTIONS OF MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS

828. 5.8 x 10 cm. Parts of 6 lines of a petition concerning the measurements of a piece of land. Early first century B.C. On the verso parts of 6 much effaced lines of another document.

829. 12.3 x 9.3 cm. Part of a letter from Σωγένης to his sister. About A.D. 1. 13 lines.

830. 15.3 x 5.6 cm. End of 17 lines of an official letter, enclosing other documents. Phaophi 28 of the twenty-first year (of Philometor probably, i.e. B.C. 155) is mentioned. Written across the fibres. On the verso part of a line.

831. Fr. (a) 6.1 x 9.2 cm. Two fragments of a contract beginning ἔτους ζ [. . . ἐν] Οἰκ(υφόχων) πόλει τής ὘θῆς η[ἰδ住址]. ὁμολογεῖ λεπτώ[ψ]. ομάνακτος Μακεδόνι τῶν Σωγιανάρος πεζῶν Ἰρακλείδη[. . . . .]. The sovereign is Ptolemy Soter II, and the date therefore B.C. 111–0. 8 lines.

832. 14 x 21.3 cm. Parts of two columns of a taxing-list of some kind. Col. ii begins ὑποτάξιον τό παράδοσιν ἐπικεφαλαίων, Τεωσος ἀργενεύκα ρυ, θηλικά μιζ, /[συζ] Βησάτος(. . .). The fifteenth year of Augustus (B.C. 16–5) is mentioned in Col. i. In the blank space between the columns a second hand has written Ζέβ μάκαρ ἀθανάτων, and a third the beginning of an acknowledgement of a payment at the Serapeum of Oxyrhynchus. On the verso traces of two other documents.


834. 4.5 x 9.8 cm. Conclusion of a letter dated in the twenty-sixth year of Augustus, Mesore (B.C. 4), mentioning a voyage eis Ὀμβένω[. 6 lines.

835. 19.8 x 12.8 cm. An offer to purchase confiscated land at Pela, addressed to Gaius Sep[ius] Rufus; cf. 721, which has the same formula. The purchase price, which was to be paid ἐπ[ί] τής ἐπ[ι] τῷ Σαρ[π]ατεφω δημοσίων [τραπεζ[α]] was not less than 100 drachmae. The earlier portion is much mutilated. For the conclusion sec 721. 14–5, note. About A.D. 13. 14 lines.

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

μέτρου ἀγορασμικὸν cf. 740. 17, note, and for the formula cf. the late Ptolemaic loans from Gebelén, e.g. P. Grenf. I. 23. First century B.C.; the sixteenth year refers to Neos Dionysus (B.C. 66–5) or Augustus (B.C. 15–4). Nearly complete, but broken at the beginning. 30 lines. The papyrus has been gummed on to two similar documents, of which parts of a few lines are preserved.

837. 18.5 x 15.5 cm. Will of Apollos daughter of Paéisis, leaving her property at Kerkemounis jointly to Didymus son of Dio[genes], probably a son by her first marriage, and to the offspring of her present marriage with Apollos son of Ophelas, with provisions for the φεινή and παράφεινα of a daughter and for the guardianship of the children. Dated in the second year of Hadrian (A.D. 117–8). Cf. 489–95. Written across the fibres. 30 lines, of which only the beginnings are preserved.

838. 30.5 x 9.5 cm. Lease of land at the Ἰσακλαίδου ἐποίκων from Diogenes to two persons, with the signature of the lessor. The formula follows that of e.g. 499. The conclusion is τής ἐπισόμης ὀνήσι τοῦ Διογένους. κυρία ἡ μίσθωσίς. Dated in the twenty-first year of Hadrian, Thoth (A.D. 136). Incomplete. 52 lines.

839. 27.5 x 17.1 cm. Letter from Eutychides to his mother, the earlier part describing an accident to a boat. Lines 6 sqq. ὡς ἐναπόγησεν κατὰ Πτολεμαία καὶ ἡλθὲ μοι γυμνὸς κεκινδυνωκὼς. εἰδέως ἡμῖρασα αὐτῶι στολὴν. Α μαχαιροφῶρος is mentioned, apparently as the bearer of the letter. Early first century A.D. Incomplete. 26 lines.
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APPENDIX I

Addenda and Corrigenda to Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part II and Fayum Towns and their Papyri.

For the literature connected with these volumes see the successive bibliographies of papyri by Wilcken in the Archiv, and by de Ricci in the Revue des études grecques. After an examination of the articles in question and a comparison with the papyri, we give here a list of those suggestions which both affect our transcriptions of the texts and are satisfactory. Proposed alterations which are unsuitable, or are based upon alternatives mentioned in our notes, or in the case of literary texts are confined to the supplements of lacunae, are generally ignored. Where the source of the correction is not indicated, it is our own.
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214. Recto 7. The vestige of a letter before α is too slight to afford any clue. The same remark applies to the two letters after με in l. 15.  
18. Possibly υοιονον ρχευν (Ludwich).  
Verso 11. Possibly αί πελα γοί ε (Platt), but it is not certain that a letter is lost after ελα, and the following vestiges suit ε better than α. Perhaps πελάγης εως (Bolling).

12. τ...[...] αδ: the doubtful τ may be π, but neither πεπιμεμερος (Platt) nor πετχοθερος (Bolling) seem to suit.

13. μ...λαν: the first letter is more like ν than μ.

14. l. απερπακεντος (Ludwich) at the end of the line.

215. i. 28. οφει should very likely be read in place of θφει, but there is not room for ἀγαθον τον ου (Fraccaroli).

216. i. 2. λην is a misprint for λης.

218. The position in Col. ii conjecturally assigned by us to Fr. (ε) may be considered certain. Line 26 is ραυ συμφερει [or, as Crönert suggests, επιφερει], 27 νυερ της αλης [28 Αρχελαυς και Ζηροδος (cf. our note ad loc.), 29 perhaps εν τοις περι ταφον (εν τοις Crönert). Fragment (β) probably joins Fr. (α) so that Fr. (α) l. 18 and Fr. (β) l. 1 form one line, i.e. τωται το. Fr. (ε) probably belongs to the bottom of Fr. (α) ii.

219. 11. λυθετες κειστα (i.e. κεστα) (Platt) is possible.

217. For ερεμων ἀπεξήλωσε Wilamowitz suggests αργεβεξετρωσεν. θ in place of ο is possible, but the first letter is more like ν than ο. The η of τρωσεν is certain.

220. A newly-found fragment, apparently from the top of a column, contains the beginnings of two lines τυχγοιν and ματα γ. Cf. 221 ad fin.

x. 16. The penultimate letter before σαι is ι or κ.

xi. 20. επι ητιμων (Leo) is possible, but διε απω for the preceding letters is unsuitable.

221. i. l. την for τε (Ludwich).

2. τα βαφυσα (Ludwich) is not very suitable.

17. του before διαραυν (Ludwich) is possible.

21. Possibly αποφηγει (Ludwich), but the doubtful letter is more like η or ι.

ii. 3. l. νεχρα (Allen).

9. τετελευσεν (Wilamowitz).

ii. 2. The traces of a letter before σελαυ suit ο or ι better than ν. The papyrus has δελιον, i.e. the first hand wrote δελιον which was corrected to δελιον (Diels).

3. l. Τυρως for γ Μαρος (Diels).

6. l. πελευο for επελευ (Diels).

23–4. l. κε κ' [τοσο ελα'τα] (Ludwich).

25. πτεραυν (Ludwich) is possible.

26–7. l. γγερευγει (Diels).

iv. 18. The vestiges before αι are too faint to afford a clue.

vi. 11. σαβανθασα υ γανος (Ludwich) is possible.

vii. 5. παρι ιδανακροντι (Platt, Ludwich) cannot be read, but ουτως δε και ιδανακρων is possible.

15. l. τουτον for τατι...ν.

ix. 1. l. ιτισι [....] γαρ [for σαν τα... κα...] πασ'.

9. δε περιπερος for δ επιρουερος (Ludwich) is just possible, but the letter following π is more like φ than ε.

15. l. κρανα Μαλακας γ for κρανα ελικον (Wilamowitz).

xii. 10. The vestiges on either side of π are too slight to give a clue.

26. παι might be read instead of του.
xiv, 25. γ at the end of the line is extremely doubtful. There are more probably two letters.

26. στιγμάτυ/μα (Ludwich) is possible.

xvi, 20-1. ε/ν μεωρ (Ludwich) is possible, but the π is extremely doubtful.

xvii, 12. ε/ν αοις (Ludwich) is possible.

Fr. (a) 5. Δομή/ω/νης (Cronert) is possible.

The beginnings of 12 lines are contained on a new fragment which the recto (cf. 220) seems to show is from near the bottom of a column, while l. 9 ut aoios (cf. II. xxi. 318-21) indicates that it belongs to the column lost before Col. xvi.

....

ξα ποταμ[  
τοναπτ[  
υπ αοιος ]

ιο μας εκ Τ[  
αβαστα[  
[π]εριοντ[  
[.] Τεντ[  
[.] Λαξ[ 

228. 17. ου(τως) Καρτης (Diels) can be read.

230. 32. εστωμιν is a misprint for εστωμιν.

239. 2. Insert η after ευκασθή.

237. iv, 8. 1. ἒλεγχομένη (Gradenwitz),

17. l. τῷ Ακελπηπίῳ [ἀπ] Ιοδεδεκάνη (Grad.).

21. l. το̣ι̣ γάρ Ακελπηπίῳ τῷ καθ [ἐτε] [ἀ]π[αυτούντος (Grad.).

26. l. δ’μολυσσημα κενωσηθαί [με] (or [μο] (Grad.).

30. l. τῇ δὲ μηρίαν ὀσια[ (Grad.).

33. ἐπισταμένων[ν] (Grad.) is possible.

v. 7. [ον] is a mistake for [οι (Grad.).

7-8. l. κασαλάβη ἄβων [ἐ] τέ [ἀνάπεψαν.

16. l. ἀντομομήτη στὰς (Blass).

34. l. διὰ before χρησμωσάμων (Grad.).

38. l. δύνασθαι [θ] [αι (Grad.).

42. l. μή [ἀμελθήρας.

vi. 18. l. οἶνωσ (Blass).


24. l. ἐπὶ τῆς μη[η]τροφε ὀσίάς βουλήθησθα σομεν. (Grad.).

25. l. ἀπάλλαττ... (Grad.).

31. l. τὸ... παρθέν[ι] εὶ [ο]ικ ἐξάν.

vii. 22. l. ὑπὸ λοιπῆς (i.e. λυπῆς for ύπολοιπῆς (Wilamowitz).

23. l. ἤρκεσθαι for ἤκουκεσθαι (Wilam.).

26-7. ἐνέγκαστος is a mistake for ἐνέγκαστα (Wilam.).

40. l. μετὰ ἀλλα for μετάλλα (Grad.).

viii, 24-5. 1. ταῖς γαμουμέναις[ς] διὰ τῷ Και (Grad., G-H.).

27. l. ὑπὸ for τοῦ. KY (referring to Trajan’s reign) can be read, as Stein suggested, for KY, but cf. 712. 7, where a Sulpicius Similis is mentioned certainly long after Trajan’s time and perhaps in the reign of Commodus.
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265. 39. l. ὑπερμάτων.
269. ii. 2. l. μυκρώ for [Μ]άκρο (Wilam.).
270. 25. A line has dropped out of the text. l. καὶ ὠμήριοι ὑμνεῖς ἡμίσει τοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ ἀετό κατακεκίσκας καὶ ὠμήριοι ὑμνεῖς ἑκατοκιά κ.τ.λ. (Goodspeed).
273. 5. l. κατὰ [Ῥω]μαίων ζθη ὑπὸ κ.τ.λ.
8. The letters following ωU might be read as του.
274. 22. l. ἐπικατάθειλον (γη) for ἐπικατακαθηλον(οὐδενος) (Wessely).
24-5. [ἐ]μμαθετεύσεως (Wessely) is possible.
286. 10. 1. ἀποδώσεως (i.e. ἀποδώσων) for ἀποδώσειν (Wilam.).
287. 7. l. πίνακα for πίναγ(α).
289. 3. The abbreviation beginning with Σ which recurs in this papyrus is probably σΩ(μ)πα(ν); cf. 574.
398. 42. υ is a misprint for ρ.

Fayum Towns and their Papyri.

2. iii. 16. δ ἀλεων [τ]ρ[ε]χα for σε . . . [μ]ε[λ] . . . . . . . . . . . a (Weil) is possible.
23. l. ιτεθα for [. . .]θ (Weil) is possible.
32. l. αγρυφω for αγρύφω (Weil).
8. 10. [ε] is a misprint for [τε].
10. This fragment has been identified by Plasberg and Ferrini as coming from Ulpian, Lib. xlv. Dig. xxix. 1. 3. l. προσφίρι for προσφιρεί. 6. l. εἰργα for εἰςε. 10. l. μιλίκες (εσταμένα). 11. l. χατειν' for επιει.
12. 22. l. τ[ε] δ' ε' άλμες ἔχου (Wilcken).
10. introd. p. 117. l. 5. ο[π]τ]σος (de Ricci) for ὄποσ is possible. The edict is assigned by Dessau to Julian instead of Severus Alexander.
6. ειτ (Wilamowitz) can be read in place of επι.
8. ειπ before καὶ ταῦτα is corrected by Wilamowitz to ἕτι.
15. εξ ἀτάντων [γ]ρατέων | χρημάτων (Wilamowitz) is better than our εξ ἀτάντων | χρηματίζεσθαι.
23. introd. 1. Ταμανεός(ες) for Ταμανων( ). (Smyly); cf. the modern Tamā. 23 (a). 5-6. l. Κοβανείτου . . . Μεθησείτων.
32. 32. 1. γνωριζο for γερμιζω (Wessely).
46. 3. l. προδε for . . γ( ).
48. 3. l. πρόγανο for πρόγανον (Wilcken).
50. 5. l. δρόμων for Δωάμων (Wilcken).
67-76. l. τετελ[ῶν][ν]α for τετελεί(σται) (Wilcken).
73. 1. l. ἄντεσυμβαλλέο[ν] (ήσε) ἤπασις τελ. (ὑπηρεσίμμενος) (Wilcken). Similarly in 74. 1. l. ὄπως-
συβιβάζο[ν] (ψε).
96. 1. L. D. 143 for L. D. 122.
110. 1. l. Βελλερίνα (Wilamowitz).
APPENDIX II

A revised text of Part III, no. 405 (Irenæus, Contra Haereses, iii. 9).

The seven fragments of an early Christian work published as 405 were identified by Dr. J. Armitage Robinson as belonging to the lost Greek original of Irenæus' treatise Contra Haereses, which is extant only in a Latin translation, and when fitted together correspond to part of iii. 9. A provisional reconstruction was given by him in Athenæum, Oct. 24, 1903; cf. our note, ibid., Nov. 7, and that of Dr. Rendel Harris, ibid., Nov. 14. We now print a revised text of the whole. The chief interest of the discovery lies in the resulting correspondence between the readings of Irenæus' quotation from Matt. iii. 16-7 in ll. 23-9 and those of the Codex Bezae. The Latin translation there has the ordinary reading *Hic est* (*filius meus*), whereas the original agrees with D in having (l. 28) *eit* in place of *οίδας εἶναι*, and a variant peculiar to D (*us* for *ως* before περιστέραυ) occurs in l. 25 (Lat. *quasi*). 'These two unsuspected coincidences between Irenæus and D, of which the one is misrepresented, the other inevitably obscured by the Latin translator, indicate that the extent of the agreement between Irenæus' quotations and the text of the Codex Bezae is even larger than what the imperfect evidence of the Latin translation has led critics to suppose' (Athen., Nov. 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i.</th>
<th>Col. ii.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[. . .] [.] [. . . . . . . . . χρι]</td>
<td>[. . . . λιβαρ[ν]ν δε οτι λο ο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[στο[υ] σου [ωμοσευ κς τ]ω Α[αυ]</td>
<td>[και γν]ωστος [αν τη Ιουδαια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ειδ α'ληθεια'ν κα'λι ων μη αθε</td>
<td>[γεν'ορενος κα'ει εμφανης τοις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[τ]ηρ[σε]ι [α'υτου εκ κ]αρ'που της</td>
<td>μη ζητουσιν [αυτον και επι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 κοιλιασ σου θησ[ι]μαι επι θρο</td>
<td>του βαπτισμου φησι Μαθαι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[νου σου κα'λι παλιν]' γνωστος</td>
<td>&gt; ος. ανεω[χθησαν οι ουρανοι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[εν τη Ιουδαια ο λος κα'ει εγεινη</td>
<td>&gt; και ειδεν το πα του θα κατα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[θη εν ειρηνη ο το]πος αυτου</td>
<td>25 &gt; βαινον ως περιστεραν και</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

264
APPENDIX III

List of Oxyrhynchus and Fayum Papyri distributed.

We give here a list of the papyri published in Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Parts I–III, and Fayum Towns and their Papyri, which have been presented to different museums and libraries. Those papyri which do not appear have for various reasons not yet been distributed and are still at Queen’s College, Oxford. Where ascertainable, we have added the present reference numbers in the catalogues of the several institutions to which the papyri now belong. The following abbreviations are employed:—

Am. = America. The papyri under this heading have only recently been sent to America, and details of the distribution are not yet forthcoming.

B. M. = British Museum. The numbers refer to the catalogue of papyri.

Belfast = Chadwick Museum, Bolton, Lancs.

Bristol = Bristol Museum.
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List of Oxyrhynchus and Fayum Papyri distributed.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Brussels = Musées Royaux, Brussels, Belgium.
Cairo = Museum of Antiquities, Cairo. The numbers are those of the inventory; cf. our Catalogue of Greek Papyri in the Cairo Museum.
Camb. = Cambridge University Library. The numbers refer to the "Additions."
Chicago = Haskell Museum, University of Chicago, U.S.A. The papyri are all numbered "Accession 33."
Clifton = Library of Clifton College, Bristol.
Columbia = Library of Columbia University, New York, U.S.A.
Dublin = Library of Trinity College, Dublin.
Dundee = Library of University College, Dundee.
Edinburgh = Library of Edinburgh University.
Eton = Library of Eton College, Windsor.
Glasgow = Library of Glasgow University.
Graz = Library of Graz University, Austria.
Haileybury = Library of Haileybury College, Hertford.
Hamilton = Hamilton College, U.S.A.
Harrow = Library of Harrow School.
Harvard = Semitic Museum of Harvard University, Mass., U.S.A.
Holloway = Library of Holloway College, Egham.
Johns Hopkins = Library of Johns Hopkins University, Maryland, U.S.A.
Liverpool = Liverpool Free Public Museum.
Melbourne = Library of Melbourne University, Victoria.
Owen's Coll. = Museum of Owen's College, Manchester.
Pennsylvania = Library of Pennsylvania University, U.S.A.
Princeton = Library of Princeton University, N.J., U.S.A.
Repton = Library of Repton School, Burton-on-Trent.
Rugby = Library of Rugby School.
Smiths. = Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.
St. Andrews = Library of St. Andrews University.
Toronto = Toronto University, Canada.
Vassar = Library of Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, U.S.A.
Vict. = Museum of Victoria University, Toronto, Canada.
Winchester = Library of Winchester College.
Yale = Library of Yale University, U.S.A.

Oxyrhynchus Papyri.

1. Bod. Gr. th. c. 7 (P).
2. Pennsyl. 2746.
3. Chicago.
5. Bod. Gr. th. f. 9 (P).
7. B. M. 739.
10. Yale.
11. B. M. 740.
13. Columbia.
15. Glasgow.
17. Johns Hopkins.
18. B. M. 741.
20. B. M. 742.
22. B. M. 743.
23. Camb. 4930.
24. Yale.
26. B. M. 744.
27. Chicago.
29. Pennsyl. 2748.
30. B. M. 745.
32. Bod. Lat. class. c. 3 (P).
33. Pennsyl. 2749.
34. Bod. Gr. class. d. 60 (P).
35. B. M. 746.
36. Cairo 10002.
37. Cairo 10001.
38. Camb. 4032.
39. Cairo 10073.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDIX III</th>
<th>267</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB. B. B.</td>
<td>747.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. B. M. 748.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. B. M. 749.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Pennsyl. 2750.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Harvard 2212.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. B. M. 750.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Harrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Edinburgh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Glasgow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. B. M. 751.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Chicago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. (3 copies). Camb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4033-5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Camb. 4036.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Johns Hopkins.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. B. M. 752.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. B. M. 753.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Camb. 4037.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Bod. Gr. class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 61 (P).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Cairo 10007.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Princeton 0132.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692. 64.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Pennsyl. 2751.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Camb. 4038.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 (2 copies). B. M. 754.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Owen's Coll.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Chicago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Vassar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. B. M. 755.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Glasgow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 (a). Chicago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Owen's Coll.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Hamilton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Chicago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Camb. 4039.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. B. M. 756.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80. Winchester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. B. M. 757.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82. B. M. 758.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83. Rugby.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83 (a). Repton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84. B. M. 759.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. B. M. 760.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86. Camb. 4040.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. Pennsyl. 2752.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. Cairo 10008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. B. M. 761.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Holloway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Harvard 2213.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. B. M. 762.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. B. M. 763.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Holloway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. Camb. 4041.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. Edinburgh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. B. M. 764.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Edinburgh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. Chicago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. B. M. 766.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. B. M. 767.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Camb. 4042.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. Chicago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. Cairo 10006.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. Pennsyl. 2753.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. Eton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. Clifton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. Harrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113. Cairo 10011.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114. Eton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115. Yale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116. Clifton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117. Chicago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118. Camb. 4043.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119. Bod. Gr. class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 66 (P).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120. Haileybury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121. Chicago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122. B. M. 768.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123. Cairo 10014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. Winchester.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. Cairo 10062.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. Cairo 10085.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. Cairo 10084.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128. Cairo 10121.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129. Cairo 10082.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130. Cairo 10072.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131. Cairo 10063.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132. Cairo 10133.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133. Cairo 10056.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134. Cairo 10053.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135. Cairo 10018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136. Cairo 10103.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137. Cairo 10034.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138. Cairo 10100.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139. Cairo 10049.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140. Cairo 10057.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141. Cairo 10096.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142. B. M. 769.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143. B. M. 770.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144. Cairo 10071.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145. Cairo 10066.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146. Cairo 10076.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147. Cairo 10074.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148. Cairo 10075.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149. Cairo 10045.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150. Cairo 10051.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151. Cairo 10094.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152. Cairo 10048.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153. Cairo 10044.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154. Cairo 10102.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155. Cairo 10020.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156. Cairo 10035.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157. Cairo 10042.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158. Cairo 10043.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159-63. Chicago.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164. B. M. 771.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165. Camb. 4044.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166. Bod. Gr. class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 47 (P).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167. Bod. Gr. class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 67 (P).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168. Pennsyl. 2754.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169. Vassar.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171. Camb. 4045.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175. Bristol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176. Brussels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177. Bod. Gr. class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 62 (P).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178. Hamilton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179. B. M. 772.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181. Pennsyl. 2755.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182. Bod. Gr. class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 68 (P).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185. Glasgow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186. Bod. Gr. class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 69 (P).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187. Melbourne Pap. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188. Bod. Gr. class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 63 (P).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189. B. M. 773.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192. Camb. 4046.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193. B. M. 774.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194. Pennsyl. 2756.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195. B. M. 775.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197. B. M. 776.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198. B. M. 777.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199. B. M. 778.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201. B. M. 779.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204. Edinburgh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205. B. M. 780.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206. Yale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207. B. M. 781.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208. B. M. 782.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211. Am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212. B. M. 1180.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213. Am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214. B. M. 1181.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215. B. M. 1182.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216. Yale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217. Camb. 4049.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218. B. M. 1183.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219. Am.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220-1. B. M. 1184.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222. B. M. 1185.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223. Bod. Gr. class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. 8 (P).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224. B. M. 783.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225. B. M. 784.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226. Columbia.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227. B. M. 785.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228. Bod. Gr. class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 64 (P).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229. B. M. 786.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231. Camb. 4050.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232. B. M. 787.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233. Pennsyl. 2757.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235. Camb. 4051.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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236. B. M. 788.
237. Bod. Gr. class. a. 8 (P).
239. Pennsyl. 2758.
240. B. M. 789.

266. Cairo 10003.
267. Cairo 10012.
269. Edinburgh.
270. Glasgow.
272. Owen's Coll.
274. Harvard 2220.
275. Bod. Gr. class. d. 65 (P).
276. Bod. Gr. class. c. 78 (P).
277. Columbia.
278. B. M. 802.
279. Johns Hopkins.
280. Princeton 0132.
281. Bod. Gr. class. d. 66 (P).
282. Bod. Gr. class. c. 49 (P).
283. Pennsyl. 2762.
284. Bod. Gr. class. c. 80 (P).
286. Bod. Gr. class. c. 79 (P).
287. Am. 798.
288. B. M. 799.
289. Pennsyl. 2761.
290. B. M. 800.
291. Cambridge.
292. Cambr. 4057.
293-5. Am.
295-7. Am.
296. Bradfield.
297. Cambridge.
298. Bod. Gr. class. g. 47 (P).
299. Bod. Gr. class. g. 48 (P).
300. Bod. Gr. class. c. 49 (P).
301. B. M. 801.
302. Bod. Gr. class. c. 48 (P).
303. Bod. Gr. class. c. 47 (P).
304. Cambridge.
305. Bod. Gr. class. c. 45 (P).
306. Cairo 10003.
307. Cairo 10012.
308. Edinburgh.
309. Glasgow.
310. St. Andrews.
311. Owen's Coll.
312. Cambr. 4059.
313. Harvard 2220.
315. Bod. Gr. class. c. 78 (P).
316. Bod. Gr. class. d. 65 (P).
317. Columbia.
318. B. M. 802.
320. Princeton 0132.
322. Bod. Gr. class. c. 49 (P).
323. Pennsyl. 2762.
324. Bod. Gr. class. c. 80 (P).
325. Bod. Gr. class. d. 67 (P).
326. Bod. Gr. class. c. 79 (P).
327. Pen. 2763.
328. Harvard 2221.
329. Yale.
331. Johns Hopkins.
332. Princeton 0132.
333. Princeton 0132.
335. Cambridge.
337. Edinburgh.
338. Glasgow.
339. B. M. 803.
341. Owen's Coll.
342. Cambridge.
344. Pennsyl. 2764.
345. Columbia.
346. Melbourne Pap.
347. Cambridge.
348. Pennsylvania 2765.
349. Pennsylvania 2766.
350. Cambridge.
351. Yale.
352. Columbia.
353. Johns Hopkins.
354. B. M. 804.
355. Cambridge.
357. Princeton 0132.
362. Harvard 2222.
363. Cambridge.
367. B. M. 805.
368. Graz.
369. Hamilton.
370. B. M. 806.
372. Vicet.
373. Bod. Gr. class. f. 70 (P).
374. B. M. 807.
375. Cambridge.
376. Edinburgh.
377. B. M. 808.
378. B. M. 809.
379. Bod. Gr. class. c. 83 (P).
380. Cambridge.
381. B. M. 810.
382. B. M. 811.
383. Cambridge.
384. B. M. 812.
385. Cambridge.
386. Bod. Gr. class. f. 71 (P).
387. Cambridge.
388. Cambridge.
389. Cambridge.
390. Bod. Gr. class. d. 67 (P).
391. B. M. 813.
392. Cambridge.
393. Yale.
394. Cambridge.
395. Cambridge.
396. B. M. 814.
397. Cambridge.
398. Cambridge.
399. Cambridge.
400. Bod. Gr. class. d. 70 (P).
401-2. Cambridge.
402. B. M. 1189.
403. Cambridge.
405. Brussels.
406. Graz.
408-3. Cambridge.
409. Bod. Gr. class. c. 54 (P).
410-6. Cambridge.
411. Vict.
412-6. Cambridge.
413. Vict.
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463. Bod. Gr. class.  
a. 7 (P).
469. Am.
476. Am.
479-80. Am.
482. Am.
484. Brussels.
487. Am.
499. Vict.
502-3. Am.
505. Am.
508. Am.
510. Am.
512. Am.
516-8. Am.

522-3. Am.
526-7. Am.
529. Am.
531-2. Am.
534-41. Am.
542. Owen’s Coll.
550. B. M. 1191.
551-3. Am.
554. Graz.
555-7. Am.
558. Belfast.
559. Am.
560. Vict.
561-72. Am.

573. Brussels.
575. Am.
577-8. Am.
580. Am.
581. Dundee.
582-8. Am.
589. Graz.
590-8. Am.
603. Graz.
604. Bolton.
605-7. Am.
608. Vict.
609-10. Am.
612-3. Am.

614. Owen’s Coll.
615-33. Am.
631. Bod. Gr. class.
\( d. 73 \) (P).
635. Bod. Gr. class.
\( e. 86 \) (P).
636. Graz.
637. Vict.
633-43. Am.
644. Graz.
645. Am.
647. Graz.
648-50. Am.
651. Belfast.
652. Am.

Fayum Papyri.

1. Camb. 4070.
2. B. M. 1192.
3. B. M. 815.
4. B. M. 816.
5. Dr. W. C. Winslow.
6. Cairo 10764.
7. B. M. 817.
8. Toronto.
9. Am.
10. Bod. Lat. class. g.
\( 5 \) (P).
11. Cairo 10765.
12. B. M. 818.
15. Graz.
16. B. M. 819.
17. Bod. Gr. class.
\( c. 52 \) (P).
18. B. M. 1193.
19 (a). B. M. 1194.
18 (b). Brussels.
19-20. Am.
21. Cairo 10766.
22-3. Am.
23 (a). Bod. Gr. class.
\( c. 53 \) (P).
24. Cairo 10869.
25. Yale.
27. Brussels.
28. Vassar.
32. Princeton 0132. 340. 32.
33. Johns Hopkins.
34. Cairo 10768.
35. Cairo 10769.
36. Cairo 10770.
37. Cairo 10235.
38. B. M. 820.
39. Cairo 10771.
40. Brussels.
42 (a). B. M. 1195.
42 (b). B. M. 1196.
43. B. M. 821.
44. B. M. 822.
45. B. M. 823.
46. Owen’s Coll.
47. Cairo 10772.
47 (a). Cairo 10773.
48. Cairo 10774.
49. Cairo 10775.
50. Cairo 10776.
51. Cairo 10777.
52. Cairo 10778.
52 (a). Cairo 10779.
53. Am.
54. Cairo 10780.
55. Vict.
56. Cairo 10781.
57. Cairo 10225.
58-60. Am.
60. Cairo 10782.
61. Cairo 10221.
63-5. Am.
66. Cairo 10231.
67. Vict.
68. B. M. 824 (a).
69. Cairo 10239.
70. Cairo 10240.
71. Pennsyl. 2768.
72. Graz.
73. Cairo 10236.
74. Cairo 10237.
75. Johns Hopkins.
76. Princeton 0132. 340. 76.
77. Am.
78. Smiths. 217856.
79. Cairo 10241.
80-1. Am.
82. Cairo 10783.
83. Cairo 10784.
84. Cairo 10224.
85. Cairo 10785.
86. 86 (a). Am.
87. B. M. 825.
88. Pennsyl. 2769.
89. B. M. 826.
90. Cairo 10786.
91. Cairo 10787.
92. Harvard 2223.
93. Brussels.
94. Am.
95. Cairo 10788.
96. Cairo 10789.
97. Cairo 10790.
98. Cairo 10791.
99. Cairo 10792.
100. Cairo 10793.
101. Smiths. 217851.
102. Cairo 10794.
103. Am.
104. Cairo 10795.
105. B. M. 1196.
106. Am.
107. Cairo 10796.
108. Cairo 10797.
109. Cairo 10798.
110. Am.
111. Vict.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10799.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>Graz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>Am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119-20.</td>
<td>Am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10800.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10801.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10802.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10803.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10804.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10805.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10824.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10824.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10807.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10808.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10809.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>Rugby.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10795.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10810.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>Columbia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10811.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137-8.</td>
<td>Am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10812.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>B. M.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10217.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10247.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10242.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10219.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>Am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147-50.</td>
<td>Am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td>B. M.</td>
<td>827.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10220.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td>Graz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.</td>
<td>Am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.</td>
<td>Vict.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.</td>
<td>Am.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10218.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10234.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10232.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163.</td>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>10233.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164.</td>
<td>Columbia.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165.</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166.</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>0132.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDICES
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(a) Greek.

ἀδάστασις p. 262.
ἀ夸大 664. 19; 666. 115; 670. 12.
'Αγαστήλης 659. 50.
'Ἀγίων 663. 35.
ἀγλαίδεσθαι 659. 93.
ἀγλαίδ 659. 27; 674. 7.
'Αγρόθος 664. 33, 45.
ἀγρά 663. 53.
ἀγρευκθ 662. 46 (?).
ἀγριος 661. 3 (?).
'Άδειμαντος 664. 105.
ἄι 667. 8; 670. 4.
ἀίδει 662. 47.
ἀιάνιεσθαι 659. 14, 24.
ἀ'θηνα 663. 15.
ἀ'θηναξ 664. 15.
ἀ'θηναος 663. 48; 664. 3; 680. 6; 682. 16.
ἀθριν 671. 16.
ἀθγον p. 263.
ἀθγηθες 671. 3.
ἀτι 660. 8.
Ἀλακαδας 659. 12, 29.
αίμων 665. 22; 681. 7.
αἰγών, αἰγώντος 666. 119.
αἰγόχων 655. 23; 666. 48.
αἰφηρος 659. 37.
ἀκατάσχετος 684. 19.
ἀκαταταχθ 683. 15.
ἀκάτος 683. 15.
ἀκάθος 682. 13.
ἀκμή 682. 51.
ακούειν 663. 23.
Ἀκραγαννήσι 665. 12, 16, 20, 23.
ἀκράπδρυς 662. 40 (?).
Ἀκραπίτης 663. 42, 50.
ἀκόλυτος 664. 21.
Ἀλεξανδρεία 675. 4.
Ἀλεξιπόρος 663. 29, 34; 679. 3.
ἀλήθεια 654. 38.
ἀληθῆς 664. 92, 103.
ἀλλος 660. 10.
ἀλλα 659. 26, 68; 662. 27; 671. 17; 679. 7.
ἀλλος 664. 23, 28, 95; 670. 1; 681. 6.
ἀλμυρός 659. 81.
ἀλκοος 662. 49.
ἀλς 661. 26.
ἀλκυστερία 670. 5 (?).
ἀμαρτία 664. 98.
ἀμαρτός 660. 2.
ἀμπυρίζων 661. 17.
'Ἀμαρτωλος 662. 21, 32.
ἀμφί 659. 53, 59.
ἀμφιβαίνειν 670. 7.
ἀμφισκίονες 659. 55.
ἀν 654. 4; 659. 11; 662. 34 (?) 663. 43; 664. 93; 666. 162; 670. 1; 671. 1.
ἀνάγκη 659. 18.
ἀναρτίας 662. 53.
ἀνατέλειν 634. 16.

ἀναπαύεσθαι 654. 8.
ἀνάφοις 660. 2.
ἀναστρέφειν 630. 8.
ἀνέφι 666. 153 (?) 659. 8, 48, 66; 662. 29; 664. 99; 682. 16.
ἀνδρος 662. 22.
ἀνθρωπος 654. 22; 664. 101.
ἀναφέρος 659. 19.
ἀνίψτωμ 662. 35.
ἀναγγέλλω 655. 46.
ἀνίσταις 672. 7.
Ἄντισπαρος 662. 48.
ἀντρής 662. 49.
ἀνώτερος 667. 23.
ἀξίως 662. 112, 116 (?).
ἀξιωμα 684. 7.
ἀξιοθ 659. 35, 49; 660. 23 (?) 666. 162.
ἀπείρως 660. 1.
ἀπὸ 654. 29; 655. 1, 2; 660. 6.
ἀποδαμείν 664. 2.
ἀποδημία 664. 8, 80.
ἀποκαλίστως 654. 29.
ἀποκέφαλων 654. 22.
ἀποκρύπτειν 654. 39.
'Απόλλων 674. 8 (?).
ἀποστέλλειν 663. 41; 679. 3, 17.
ἀποφεύγειν 682. 14.
ἀπορρουσαστως 666. 168.

1 Excluding 658 and 660, which are classed with the non-literary documents.
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βιβλικών 660. 104; 634. 3.

δήμων 662. 34; 670. 23.

δημοκρατία 662. 1, 15 (?).

Δία 663. 46; 664. 13, 23.

36, 107; 666. 115; 667. 5.

διαμέλισθη 664. 29.

διδασκάλες 667. 8.

διδασκείσθαι 663. 9.

διδασκέτει 663. 1, 11.

διδασκόμενοι 664. 10.

διδάσκωσθαι 664. 21.

διδάσκωσθαι 684. 8.

διδάσκωσθαι 672. 6.

διδάσκωσθαι 655. 15; 659. 68;

662. 29; 675. 15.

διακατήρυμα 663. 13.

δίκη 659. 68.

δίκτυω 661. 7.

διδάσκωσθαι 666. 61.

διδάσκωσθαι 663. 9.


διδασκάλεθαι 663. 11, 49; 670. 22.

δίκη 672. 9.

διψή 659. 81.

διψέω 664. 39, 97; 679. 16.

διψέω 662. 31.

διψή 660. 3; 662. 35.

δράμα 665. 3.

δριμοφόρος 662. 56 (?).

δύναμις 662. 165.

δύναμις 667. 16; 678. 6 (?).

δύναμις 664. 6.

δύναμις 677. 9.

δύναμις 663. 43.

δώδεκα 666. 105; 678. 1.

δωδεκάτω 664. 18, 20; 663. 31.

διήνεμον 670. 23.

διήνεμον 659. 48.

διήνεμον 666. 160.

διήνεμον 670. 20.

διήνεμον 659. 45; 69; 661. 7.

διήνεμον 662. 24; 662. 28; 664. 6.

διήνεμον 664. 13.

διήνεμον 659. 45; 670. 17.

διήνεμον 684. 13.

διήνεμον 654. 13 ελ επερ.; 665.
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κύριος 654. 2 (?); 633. 1.
Κύψελος 684. 111.
κώφ 666. 52 (?).
kαλλίει 666. 61.
kαμάζειν 663. 44.

Δακεδαίμων 662. 33; 663. 21.
λαλεῖν 654. 1; 677. 6.
λαμαζίκαι 664. 1, 113, 116;
679. 9.

λακαδέμεια 659. 49.
λέγειν 654. 3 et s. 655.
17, 21; 659. 47; 661.
22; 662. 24; 664. 103.
110; 666. 102; 677. 25;
671. 1.

λείτειν 662. 31; 670. 3.
λειψώδης 662. 41, 55.
λήγειν 651. 18.
λιπτότεσκος 659. 16.
λόγος 654. 1, 4.
λατρέων 662. 39.
λοίδες 659. 23.
λοιφές 670. 6.

λυτέων 677. 3.
λυστελλόμενον 664. 93.
λύτων 659. 34.

μαθητής 655. 18.
μακάριός 654. 40.
μίδα 663. 46; 664. 19, 43;
654. 13, μίδαλλον 664. 94;
658. 6, μαίλιστα 660. 4;
664. 12.
μαλακον 659. 27.
μαλάσσειον 659. 40 (ταράττειν

μαθηματικόν 666. 163.
μαστίς 659. 5.
μαστίγων 664. 104.
μαστηρεύω 660. 16.
μαστός 659. 51.
μάχη 666. 156.
μίγα 665. 8, 17.
μεγαλοφυέων 664. 25.
μέγας 664. 108, 116; 680.
3; 684. 17.
μετάκιον 664. 18.
μετάπτων 659. 10. Μέλαιν p. 261.
μέλλειν 660. 9 (?); 693. 33.
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παραδόσεως 663. 36, 40; 679. 5.
παρακαλεῖν 663. 42.
παραδομῆσαι 663. 21 (?).
παρατηρεῖν 664. 35.
παραφάγεαι 663. 10.
παραγωγή 670. 18.
παράθεσις 659. 46.
παράθεσις 659. 32.
παραπασαγέ 674. 5.
πάρωθε 659. 43.
πάρος 662. 33.
πᾶς 659. 8; 663. 4 (?); 664. 26; 666. 118; 682. 2.
πατήρ 654. 19; 604. 36, 56, 112.
πάτρα 662. 24.
πατρί 661. 100.
παύειν 682. 12. παύεαθη 654. 6.
πέδαλον 659. 74.
πέδαλον 662. 38.
πεθαρχεῖν 677. 4.
πεθάνει 664. 5.
Πεισόστρατος 664. 1 el saep.
πέλανον 675. 14.
πέπλον 659. 26.
πέρι 654. 24.
Περιανύρφ 664. 93 el saep.
περισκόπη 664. 262.
περιμαζοχίζει 662. 37.
Περικλῆς 663. 45.
περιλαμβάνει 668. 167.
περιπάτησεν 604. 109.
πετεινόν 654. 12.
Περίδεις 673. 1 (?).
πεθανόν 663. 46; 664. 91.
Πίσιώ 659. 61.
πιστός 659. 59, 69.
πλείων 663. 20.
πλείων 66. 116 (?). πλείστος 681. 9.
πλήθος 664. 118.
πληραίζειν 664. 126.
πλησίον 673. 9.
ποιήθηκεν 659. 36.
ποιητής 654. 37; 664. 9; 667. 10.
ποιήτης 663. 8 (?).
ποίων 662. 25, 29.
πόλεμοι 663. 16, 48. πόλεμοι 660. 5.
πόλει 664. 29, 114; 675. 5; 682. 3.
πολειτεία 683. 5.
πολλαίς 660. 7; 662. 34.
πολυβάσιον 659. 56.
πολυπάκοιοι 672. 9.
πολύ 654. 25; 655. 7; 659. 43; 662. 34 (?); 664. 21; 667. 6; 674. 3 (?).
πολυώκουσις 675. 17.
ποντιάς 673. 8.
πόντος 659. 39; 661. 24.
πορφυρίζει 671. 19.
ποταμός p. 262.
πότε 655. 19, 20.
πότερον 687. 15.
ποτί, ποτίς 661. 16.
πού 659. 70; 662. 45; 670. 12.
πράγμα 664. 24; 684. 3.
πράσινον 666. 59.
πράσινον 666. 27.
πράπτει 659. 45.
πραβείζει 683. 16.
πραχής 682. 36.
προς 659. 20.
πρὸς 664. 111.
προαγαθόν 666. 59.
προβολόν 663. 43.
προβολήματα 664. 43.
προβλέγειν 664. 3.
προβλέψια 659. 53.
πρός 663. 7; 664. 25, 39; 125; 665. 16; 681. 12; 684. 12, 20, 21.
προστριχεύειν 664. 6, 22.
προσάθε 670. 12.
προσέβη 677. 5.
προσκύνησαν 667. 21.
προστάσεως 663. 36.
προστάτης 678. 5.
προστάτικα 655. 13.
πρόσφορα 659. 49.
πρόστρεφων 664. 1; 681. 1 (?), 11.
προφήτης 662. 44, 51.
προφέρειν 667. 29.
προφεύγειν 659. 19.
πρόβατα 659. 24.
πρόξιμος 684. 20.
πρωί 655. 1, 3.
πρωτός 654. 25, 26; 659. 72.
Πριμή 660. 7 (?).
πρυτείς 681. 19.
πυράκεως 659. 7 (?).
πῦρ 684. 15.
πῦρταν 661. 19.
πυροπολεῖν 663. 24.
πῶς 654. 33, 34; 666. 168.
πῶς 688. 70.
παῦ 662. 30.
παῦδων 632. 13.
παῦδων 662. 52.
πᾶ 659. 62.
μιν 659. 40.
μίστες 661. 26.
μέθος 662. 45.
Σάλτυρος 603. 42.
σαμώσθη 601. 25.
σειρὴν 659. 33.
σείρειν 659. 93.
σημείων 667. 14.
σημεία 659. 128.
σύνος 659. 37.
σύνεξιν 659. 36.
σύγη 659. 9.
σύγηρα 670. 17. σύγηρα 660. 3.
Συλήμα 662. 49.
Συλημάτων 671. 15, 20.
συνεκτικὰ 600. 12.
Σύλλογο 680. 9.
Σύλλογοι 664. 10, 14.
σπάν 676. 14.
σπλαθάοι 662. 23.
σπουδῆς 675. 8.
σπουδαίζων 664. 11.
σταθῆς 659. 29.
σταθήματος 659. 71.
στήφοις 675. 13.
στηληον 602. 28.
στολή 660. 19.
στολή 655. 5.
στρατεία 665. 3, 13.
 Indices

στρατόπεδων 679. 12.
γι' 654. 28, 29; 655. 21.
τοί 650. 71 (τίν); 661. 23
(τί); 664. 104; 671. 22,
676. 9; 678. 4.
αγγειών 662. 43.
αγγέλια 664. 115.
αγγελικής 664. 40.
συμβαίνουσα 666. 110; 687.
11.
συμφορά 664. 108.
σφιν 660. 10.
σωκολατών 663. 41.
συναφή 667. 3, 11.
συνεισφέρουν 664. 45.
σύνεισέναι 662. 28.
Συρακώσιος 665. 4, 6, 8, 21,
σύντομα 667. 13, 26, 30.
σφιγξενα 659. 17.
σφίλοι 676. 16.
σκότα 659. 73.
σκόμμα 667. 23.
σώμα 659. 15.
σώφρον 659. 66.

taxáres 663. 30.
tαυτικόν 664. 22.
tανάσεων 659. 40 (I. μαλάσ-
σεων); 684. 8.
Ταρσάριος 670. 5.
tάσεως 659. 13.
tάφος 662. 28; 672. 7.
tελεία 659. 5.
tελευτάν π. 261.
tός 670. 14, 18.
τέρπειν 674. 6.
tερεμένη 670. 11 (.),
tερτίο περί 654. 23.
tέτει 659. 92.
tέθεια 666. 15 (.), 650. 7;
662. 11.
tίκτειν 670. 10.
tιμή 659. 53; 672. 4.
tιμή 659. 6; 664. 20.
tις 663. 8; 664. 38, 128;
666. 59; 667. 15; 664. 4.
tίς 654. 35; 655. 4. 6, 12,
13; 662. 24, 28; 664.
99, 110; 670. 1; 671. 1;
677. 6; 654. 8, 9, 10.

τύραμας π. 261.
tόινν 664. 92.
tοίος 664. 1.
tοάδε 684. 22.
tοάυτος 664. 11.
tοκετής 662. 27.
tολµ[ 664. 64.
tομάος 667. 20.
tόπος 651. 24; 667. 15.
τραχύνειν 664. 38.
tριά 667. 12, 25.
tρίφειν 664. 34.
τρίχευν 677. 2.
τρειβάλλων 631. 6, 10.
τρίτης 662. 31.
τρίς 662. 30.
tρυσός 662. 36.
tρύτα 660. 10.
tρυπάβλον 678. 3.
tρύπας 664. 20; 677. 5;
664. 5.
tρυγάνων 661. 17; 664. 35;
666. 113; 677. 3; p. 261.
tυραννίς 664. 7.
tυραννίς 663. 14; 664. 4.

νίδας 659. 30; 660. 9; 664.
120; 670. 10; 671. 2.
νείμει 654. 15 el. σαρφ.;
655. 1 el. σαρφ.; 682. 4.
νείμει 659. 31.
νείµος 675. 9 (πτ).
νεύρεται 663. 18.
νεύται 676. 16.
νέφερ 664. 127.
νετρίλλειοι 664. 26.
νεπερβοτός 667. 7.
νεπερβόλαια 667. 18.
νεσεφτής 679. 18.
νήσος 664. 13; 659. 9, 34;
662. 22, 25, 35; 664. 42;
94; 665. 20; 670. 24;
679. 3; 680. 14.
νηστίπτοντες 654. 81, 102.
νηστίρεις 663. 32.
νηστυρίς 660. 12.
νήστερον 670. 4 (πτ).

φαινομένων 667. 9.

φαίναι 664. 92, 97, 103, 110;
670. 8; 683. 4.
φανερός 654. 30.
φάσικες 663. 44.
φάνη 666. 53 (πτ).
φάτος 664. 96; 666. 158.
φέρειν 677. 8 (πτ).
φέργειν 663. 25; 664. 118;
666. 64.
φθορας 659. 8.
φθάντος 661. 15.
φθίλων 659. 11, 69.
φθίλωρας 664. 17, 42.
φθιλομάχις 662. 35.
φίλος 664. 11; 670. 6, 15.
φίλτρος 664. 99. φίλτρον 664.
98.

φιλοσοφικής 666. 169.
φιλοσοφία 666. 166.
φιλοστέρφων 675. 1.
φραζέων 662. 24; 664. 111.
φρίσεως 659. 38; 662. 34.
φροκείς 659. 46.
φρονήμας 666. 161.
φύσεις 664. 101.
φωνας 663. 34.
φωτείνος 655. 25.

χαίτης 659. 60.
χαλεποποιείσθαι 664. 78 (πτ).
χαλυβυς 662. 52.
χάρις 659. 24.
χαρτίσσων 662. 53.
χειμών 659. 37.
χέρ 659. 27; 682. 33.
χλευάζως 663. 12.
χόδος 659. 65.
χος 660. 4.
χρησιμοποιεί 666. 93.
χρησμον 666. 113.
χρόνος 659. 51.
χρώμας 659. 49.
χρήσιμα 664. 19, 23.
χρόνος 659. 14; 664. 10;
70 (πτ).
χρυσαί 660. 22.
χρυσάνθως 671. 16.
χρυσάνθεσις 659. 21.
χρυσωτομίκης 667. 1.
χρυσάθια 670. 16.
I. NEW LITERARY FRAGMENTS

ñ 361. 9, 13; 362. 46.  
ñdd 375. 16.  
ñkkad 359. 39.  
ñkkpous 359. 56.  
ñpmegg 364. 107.  
ñ 359. 5; 363. 36, 39, 40, 47; 355. 18.  
ñppn 363. 30.  
ñpke 366. 167; 367. 13.  

(b) Latin (363).

a 25, 43, 56, 97, 164, 167, 174, 185, 212.
ab 33.
abire 26.
accipere 49, 148, 165, 175.
accusatio 9.
ad 16, 110, 121.
admittere 15.
adversus 83, 151.
Aebutius 38.
Aemilia 143.
Aemiliana via 31.
Aemilianus 95, 120, 123, and see Scipio.
affinis 122.
Africa 125.
Africanus, P. Cornelius Scipio A. (the elder) 25, (the younger) 210, and see Scipio.
ager 75.
Aulus 76, 112, 193.
aurum 15.
auxilliari 90.
Aulus 76, 112, 193.
aurum 15.
auxilliari 90.

Bacchanalia 40.
basilica 57.
bellum 68, 89.
beneigne 90.
Bithynia 110.
Boii 55.
Bononia 7.
Brutus 203, 216.
caedere 1, 126, 171, 208.
Caepio, Cn. Caepio 170.
Q. Servilius Caep. 176, 182, 195.
Caius 30, 76, 84, 191, 215.
Campani 17.
canere 62.
capere 12, 127.
Capitolium 189.
captiva 14.
caput 16, 112.
carcer 204.
carmen 105, 189.
Carthaginenses 22, 83, 90.
Carthago 132, 134.
Cato 56, 114.
censor 56.
Censorinus 88.
censura 8.
centurio 15.
certamen 42.
Chaldæi 192.
Charidenus 98.
circa 51 (?), 160.
circumscribere 39.
claedes 175.
Claudius, Appius Claudius (a) 48, (b) 177. M. Claud.
Marcellus 58. Ti. Claud.
Asellus 182. P. Claud.
Pulcher 50.
clauus (clava?) 196.
Cnaeus 2, 66, 137, 170, 191.
cogere 32, 73.
comitium 208.
commodum 206.
competitor 9.
compositum (l. propositum?) 9.
conferre 47.
coniurium. See connubium.
connubium 17.
consul passim.
consulatus 153.
consultare 181.
contra 189.
cor 115.
Corinthus 168.
Corinthus 135, 145.
Cotta 210.
Crassus 59.
creber 134.
crimen 72.
cruelissimes 132.
cruentus 18.
cum (conjunction) 210.
cum (preposition) 77, 186.

circa 51 (?), 160.
circumscribere 39.
claedes 175.
Claudius, Appius Claudius (a) 48, (b) 177. M. Claud.
Marcellus 58. Ti. Claud.
Asellus 182. P. Claud.
Pulcher 50.
clauus (clava?) 196.
Cnaeus 2, 66, 137, 170, 191.
cogere 32, 73.
comitium 208.
commodum 206.
competitor 9.
compositum (l. propositum?) 9.
conferre 47.
coniurium. See connubium.
connubium 17.
consul passim.
consulatus 153.
consultare 181.
contra 189.
cor 115.
Corinthus 168.
Corinthus 135, 145.
Cotta 210.
Crassus 59.
creber 134.
crimen 72.
cruelissimes 132.
cruentus 18.
cum (conjunction) 210.
cum (preposition) 77, 186.
d (= duo?) 51.
damnare 28, 51, 86, 179.
dare 3, 6, 17, 166.
de 33, 179.
decedere 119.
decimus 178, 200, 203, 216.
Decius (?) 89.
deditio 91.
deducere 7.
devonis 185.
deprehendere 116.
desertor 207.
desiderare 53.
deterre(?r) 184.
devincere 164, 185.
devovere 188.
dextra 166.
dicare 114.
dies 25, 180.
dimicare 125.
Diodotus 213.
diripere 138.
distribuere 120, 169.
Ditalco 197.
domus 180.
donum 165.
duo 141, 177.
edere 43.
esse 5, 63, 122.
et 18, 21, 37, 38, 82, 103, 169.
evincere 177.
ex 20.
exercitius 96, 126.
exoriri 89.
exspirare 207.
Fabius, Q. Fabius 4. Q. Fa-
bius Maximus 149, 171, 185.
sacere 104, 186.
Fecenia 37.
ferre 116.
vides 95.
filius 100, 101, 120, 141, 179.
fingere 72.
flamen 4.
Flaminia via 30.

Flamininus 52.
Flaminius 24.
fere 100.
flumen 217.
forcissime 187.
forum 63.
figurate 49, 172.
Fulvius, Q. Fulv. 81. Fulv.
Nobilior 43, 82.
funebris 60.

Gabinius 193.
Galla 152.
Gallia 52.
Gallogræcia 20.
Gallogræci 13, 33.
Gallus 44.
gladiatorius 54.
habere 115, 178.
 Hannibal 64.
Hasdrubal 122.
Hispæla 37.
Hispani 41, 77.
Hispania 1, 216.
homo 51.
Hostilius, A. Host. Mancinus
112. C. Host. Mancinus
215.
hostis 186.

idem 180.
in 5, 34, 63, 71, 75, 91, 92,
108, 111, 116, 125, 126,
174, 180, 187, 204, 208,
216.
incendium 128.
indicium 40 (?)
ingenuus 85.
insidiae 187.
tercedere 27.
teresse 180.
terrector 201.
terpellare 183.
invisus 155.
Italia 44.
iterum 3.
iubere 91.
judicium. See indicium.
jugulare 198.
Iunius Brutus 200, 203, 216.
Lacedaemonii 18.
Laelius 176.
Latini 32.
legatio 114.
legatus 111, 121, 135.
Lentulus. See P. Cornelius
Scipio.
liber 11, 66, 87, 173, 199.
liberare 14, 97.
liberi 118, 162.
Licinius 203. P. Licin. Cras-
sus 59. P. Licin. 3. L.
Porcius Licin. 50.
lictor 184.
Ligures 30, 49, 77.
Livius 19, and see Villius.
locus 92.
Lucius 21, 27, 45, 52, 67, 75,
78, 88, 113, 145, 152, 153,
210.
ludus 46, 60.
lugere (?) 207.
Lusitani 6, 83, 98, 136, 167,
171, 187, 212.
Macedonia 179.
magistratus 79.
magnitudo 211.
Mancinus 112, 215.
Manilius, M. Manili. 88, 103.
Manius 88.
Manlius, Cn. Manil. 2. L.
Manil. 21. M. Manil. 81.
T. Manil. Torquatus 178.
manus 55.
Marcellus 44. M. Claudius
Marcell. 58.
Marcius Censorinus 88, 103.
Marcus 58, 74, 81, 82, 111,
114, 115, 150, 215.
mare 71.
Masinissa 121, 122.
mater 38.
maximus 3, 4, 120, 128.
Maximus 149, 171, 185.
Metellus, L. Metell. 167. Q.
Metell. 127, 153 (?), 160.
milla (siglum) 51.
minari 8.
Minucius 21.
Minurus 197.
mittere 121.
multa 205.
Munnius 145, 168.
munire 31.
Mytilius 21.
ne 26, 177.
nec 115.
negare 202.
Nobilior 82.
nobilis 14.
nomen 211.
non 133, 180, 220.
Numantini 174, 212.
obicere 196.
Obilvio 217.
obidere 133.
occidere 16, 123 (?), 164.
Occius 186.
occupare 102.
onnis 91, 207.
oppidum 169.
Orticon 14.
Pamphylia 13.
pater 73.
pat拉 15.
pax 3, 6, 186.
pecunia 34.
pellere 94.
pensare (?) 16.
per 20, 30, 73, 98, 102, 107, 120, 138, 194.
perorare 31.
Pergameni (?) 111.
persolvere 35.
persuadere 45.
pes 115.
petere 8, 79, 156.
Petillius, L. Petill. 75. Q.
Petill. 25.
Petronius 150.
Piso 191.
planus. See primus.
plebs 27, 78, 183, 204, 206.
podagricus 112.
Poenus 97.
Pompeius 170, 174.
pontifex 4.
Popilius 191.
populus 107, 205, 206.
Porcia basilica 57.
poscere. See pensare.
post 46.
Post. 36.
potestas 142.
potiri 214.
praedae 20.
praetor 4, 135.
prex 205.
primum 43.
primus 217.
pro 206.
produere 99.
proficisci 5.
propositum 9 (?), 163.
prospere 125.
Publius 3, 50, 59, 74, 84, 200, 219.
Pulcher 50.
pupillus 37.
Punicus 89.

de 16, 165, 180, 214.
qui 5, 22, 26, 35, 38, 100, 104, 119, 155, 164.
Quininalis 5.
Quintus 52.
Quintus 4, 25, 81, 149, 160, 170, 171, 186.
qua 4, 53, 84, 122.
quondam 113.
quit 78.
redire 93.
referre 49.
regnum 119.
relinquere 119.
remittere 165.
res 216.
respondere 114, 181.
Rethogenes 161.
reus 99.
revocare 26.
rex 6, 110.
Roma 33, 169.
Romanus 1, 93, 133, 135.
Rutilius 38.
sacrarium 127.
sagulum 165.
Salassus. See Sapiens.
Salinator 19.
Sapiens 176.
Sardinia 5.
Scantinius 115.
Scipio, L. Cornelius Scipio 27, 45. P. Corn. Scipio
Africanus 25. P. Corn.
Scip. Aemilianus 74, 94.
120, 123, 138, 210. P.
Scordisci 175.
scriba 75.
se 101.
set extinctus 118.
Sergius 152.
Servilius Caepio 176, 182,
195.
Sibylla 189.
signum 168.
Silanus 178.
singuli 209.
socius 107, and see occidere.
spectaculum 54.
Spurius 36.
statua 168.
stoicus 113.
stupare 85.
stuprum 116.
subigere 42, 136.
sufragram 194.
Sullani 218.
| suus 53, 55, 179, 180, 184. | Syria 157, 214. |
| tabella 194. | tabernaculum 61. |
| tabula 168. | tertius 89. |
| Tiberius 182. | Titus 178. |
| Theoxena 70. | Thessalia 126. |
| Torquatus 178. | transferre 35. |
| transire 217. | tribunus 27, 78, 183, 204, 206. |
| Tryphon 213. | tutor 38. |
| Tytesius 164. | ultimus 108, 118. |
| urbs 192. | urbs 89. |
| Ulicences 89. | vastare 13, 83, 157, 212. |
| vastare 62. | vates 62. |
| veneficium 51. | venire (veneo) 209. |
| venire (venio) 91. | vexare 167. |
| Vellius 78. | vir 16. |
| virga 208. | Viriathus 172, 185, 198, 201. |
| virtus 96. | vis 15. |
| votivus 46. | Vulso 113. |

---

**II. KINGS AND EMPERORS.**

'Αραβία (Philadelphus?) 807.

**Ptolemy Alexander I.**

Πτολ. [ὁ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος θεός] Φιλομήτωρ καὶ Βερενίκη 802. om. Βερενίκη 824.

**Augustus.**

Καίσαρ 711. 3, 6; 721. 4 et s. p.; 731. 2, 4, 15; 742. 16; 743. 17, 44; 744. 15; 829.

**Tiberius.**

Τιβέριος Καίσαρ Σεβαστός 746. 12.

**Claudius.**

Θεὸς Κλαύδιος 713. 15; 803.

**Domitian.**

Αὐτοκρ. Καίσαρ Δαμιανός Σεβαστός Γερμανικός 722. 2.

**Nerva.**

Αὐτοκρ. Νέρωνας Καίσαρ. Σεβαστός 713. 41, 44.

**Hadrian.**

Αὐτοκρ. Καίσαρ Τραянός 'Αδριανός Σεβ. 714. 28, 32; 715. 27, 32; 728. 2; 729. 34, 38; 730. 32.

'Αδριανός Καίσαρ. ὁ κύριος 707. 19, 33; 714. 19, 24; 715. 8, 20; 730. 6.

**Antoninus Pius.**

Αὐτοκρ. Καίσαρ. Τίτος ΑΠΙΛΟΣ 'Αδριανός Αντωνίνος Σεβ. Εὐσεβῆς 723. 1; 724. 14; 728. 25; 729. 45; 732. 6. om. Τίτος 727. 29.

Τίτος ΑΠΙΛΟΣ 'Αδριανός 'Αντωνίνος Καίσαρ. ὁ κύριος 729. 39.

'Αντωνίνος Καίσαρ. ὁ κύριος 712. 13; 724. 5; 728. 17, 41; 732. 3; 733. 1; 800.
III. MONTHS AND DAYS

Marcus Aurelius and Verus.

Δύρηλος Ἀντωνίνος καὶ Οὐήρος οἱ κύριοι Σεβ. 734. 1.

Commodus.

Αὐτοκρ. Καίσ. Μάρκος Δύρηλος Κόμμωδος Ἀντωνίνος Εὐσεβῆς Εὔτεχῆς Σεβ. Ἀρμ. Μηδ. Παρθ. Σαμμ. Γερμ. Μέγατος 716. 23.

Pescennius Niger.

Γαίος Πεσκένιος Νίγερ Ίοῦστος Σεβ. 719. 5, 28. Cf. 801.

Septimius Severus and Caracalla.

Αὐτοκρ. Καίσ. Λαῖκες Σεπτέμβρος Σεουήρος Εὐσεβῆς Περτινᾶξ Σεβ. Ἀρμ. Ἀλμηνίαν. Παρθ. Μέγατος καὶ Αὐτοκρ. Καίσ. Μάρκος Δύρηλος Ἀντωνίνος Εὐσεβῆς Σεβ. 705. 1, 54.

Decius.

Αὐτοκρ. Καίσ. Γαίος Μέσσιας Κύντος Τραϊῶν Δίκαιος Εὐσεβῆς Εὔτεχῆς. Σεβ. 658. 18.

III. MONTHS AND DAYS.

(a) Months.

Δυστρός (Τυβί) 723. 1.
Iulius 737. 1.
Kaisárion (Μεσόρη) 715. 33; 722. 3; 789; 793.
Nerónios (Χολάκ) 808.

Nerónios Σεβαστός (Χολάκ) 808.
Σεβαστός (Θώδ) 713. 15.
Sextilis 737. 21.
Ὑπερβερήταιος (Μεσόρη) 722. 2.

(b) Days.

ἐποχήμενοι ἡμέραι, ε 715. 33, 37; ζ 722. 3, 43.
Idus 737. 5 et σαρή.
Kalendae 747. 2.

Kalendae Sextiliae 737. 21.
Nonae Iuliae 737. 1.
Σεβαστῇ (Caesarius, 6th intercalary day) 722. 3.
IV. PERSONAL NAMES.

'Αβδάκκαιος 716. 5, 29.
'Αβέτε 728. 3.
'Αγαθάνων father of Diodorus 713. 8; 723. 2.
'Αθη( ) 736. 37.
'Αδνῶθροος, Οινδέροος *Αθ. 800.
'Αλεξάνδρος 718. 6.
'Αλεξάνδρος father of Leonides 713. 9.
'Αλες 744. 1, 16.
'Αμμανάθε 736. 69.
'Αμμανάθε 734. 4; 791; 825.
'Αμμάναθος father of Achilles 722. 11.
'Αμμάναθος son of Apollonides 729. 35, 38.
'Αμμάναθος (or *Αλλανάθος) father of Didymus 719. 2, 8, 11.
'Αμφος father of Diogenes 728. 3, 36.
'Αμφος also called Papontos, son of Diodorus 733. 3.
'Αρθείστου 707. 12, 34.
'Αρθείστου Περίιος also called Lollianus 718. 2, 32.
'Αρτίνες 736. 30, 36; 742. 1; 745. 3; 811 (?).
'Αρτίρως son of Lucretius 817.
'Αρτίνες 736. 54.
'Αρτίνες Δημιούς 708. 2, 15.
'Απείρος son of Apelles 732. 3.
'Απίου, Γάιος Μάρκας *Απ. also called Diogenes 727. 6, 19, 27.
'Απίου son of Heron 728. 5, 14, 22, 36.
'Αρτιλιείρος, Γάιος Μάρκας *Απ. also called Julianus 727. 7, 10, 27.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος 744. 2.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος, Ουαλερία *Απ. also called Nica- rite 727. 17.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος father of Ammonius 729. 35.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος 714. 8; 718. 8, 32; 739. 1; 791.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος son of Ammonius 726. 5.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος *Βιλλαλάς 713. 2.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος (or *Αμμάναθος) father of Didymus 719. 2, 8, 11.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος son of Diogenes 726. 5.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος father of Dionysius 724. 2.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος son of Dorion 716. 4, 28.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος Libyan 743. 37.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος scribe of the city 714. 6.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος father of Valerius 730. 2, 35.
'Απόλλωνιαρχος 722. 15, 28, 39.
'Απολλός son of Ophelas 837.
'Απολλός daughter of Paësis 837.
'Αργες planet 804.
'Αριθώμος father of Thonis also called Morus 725. 63.
'Αριστιών 786.
'Αρισταίος son of Heron 808.
'Αρσίτες 728. 2, 29.
'Αρτεμία 745. 2.
'Αρτεμιθρός 715. 24.
'Αρχίλαος 721. 10.
'Ασίτες 717. 6.
'Ασελπιωθίς 784; 806.
'Ασελπιωθίς also called Sarapion, gymnasarch 716. 1.
'Ασελπιωθίς father of Sarapion 723. 4.
'Αφρηλία 'Αρμωνιόκον 720. 8. Aurelia Ammonarion 720. 2.
'Αφρηλία Λαις daughter of AureliusL . . . . thion 658. 15.
'Αφρηλίος Δαίσκερας son of Aurelius L . . . . thion 658. 13.
'Αφρηλίος Λ. . . . , βίων son of Theodorus 658. 3.
'Αφρηλίος Πλαττάμμων 720. 9, 13; Aurelius Plutammon 720. 4.
'Αφρηλίος 'Ωριον ex-archidicastes 705. 7, 18, 58, 67.
[?]'άνατες son of Sipos 708. 4.
'Avidus, Gradius Av. 735. 16.
'Αχιλλίς son of Thonis 732. 3.
'Αχιλλίς son of Ammonius 722. 27, 35.
'Αχιλλίς also called Casius, strategus 719. 1.
'Αχνυίας 807.
'Αφροδιτίας 744. 11.
'Αριστιών 716. 19.
'Βάσειος, Γέλλας B, epistrategus 726. 19.
'Βελεύς 736. 12, 13.
'Βερνέας 736. 71; 744. 2.
'Βηθέας 832.
'Βίδερ father of Papontos 719. 10.
'Χοί 735. 29.
'Κλαύδιος Βελεύς Firmus praefect 720. 1.
'Κλαύδιος Sabinus 735. 14.
'Κομπρίνας (?) father of Marrius 735. 3.
'Κόμπρινος (?) 785. 27.
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Διονύσιος father of Dionysius 728. 33.
Διονύσιος son of Dionysius 728. 33.
Διονύσιος son of Phania 789.
Διονύσιος also called Theon 716. 8, 31.
Διονύσιος son of Theon also called Dionysius 716. 9, 13.
Δίδακτορος 610.
Δίδακτορος, Διοφέλες Δ., son of Aurelius L. . . . thion 658. 13.
Διόρος father of Panechotes 716. 3.
Διόρος son of Heras 716. 4, 28.

Ερμήνων 712. 17.
'Ελένη 719. 2, 11.
'Ελένη daughter of Gorgias 715. 17.
'Ελευθ. 743. 22.
'Επαφράδητος 743. 25.
'Εράσιππος 717. 6.
'Ερμύππος 811.
'Ερμύππος also called Philonicus, basilicogrammateus 714. 2.
'Ερμύππος 746. 3.
'Ερμών father of Harpalus 808.
Ετιοπίος (?) 735. 29.
Εγχύλων also called Sarapion, strategus 801.
Εὐγενέτορ 741. 1.
Εὐδαμωνία daughter of Theon also called Dionysius 716. 9, 12.
Εὐσέβια also called Tanechotarion, daughter of Diogenes 726. 7.
Εὐσεβίας 809.
Εὐθύμων 784.

Firmus, Claudius Valerius F. praefect 720. 1.

Zabdius 735. 13.
Zebidius 735. 23.
Ζεὺς 722. 6.
Ζηρ . . . 736. 4.
Ζώλος 715. 22.
Ζώλος father of Ptolemaeus 729. 37.

'Ηλλάδοφωρ father of Heliodorus 732. 1.
'Ηλλάδοφωρ son of Heliodorus 732. 1 et sic.
'Ηλλάς 722. 6.
'Ηρα goddess 731. 6.
'Ηραδίων 725. 1.
'Ηρακλῆς 800.
'Ιμακλίνε son of Sarapion also called Leon 725. 3 el saep.
'Ιρακλίς son of Tryphon 722. 21.
'Ιρακλίδα 740. 42.
'Ιρακλίδης 706. 2, 10; 740. 42, 43; 795; 831.
'Ιρακλίδης basilicogrammateus 748. 1, 13.
'Ιρακλίδης ex-exegetes, father of Demetrius 727. 4.
'Ιρακλίδης son of Horion 719. 18.
'Ιρακλίδης father of Samus 716. 6, 30.
'Ιρακλίδης father of Sarapion also called Leon 725. 3.
'Ιρακλίδης father of Theon 723. 2.
'Ιρακλής father of Xenon 785.
'Ιρις 740. 35.
'Ιρις βιβλιοφιλάξ 715. 1, 35.
'Ιρίς father of Dorion 718. 5.
'Ιριάδης father of Sarapion 730. 1.
'Ιρων 736. 99; 740. 17 (?).

Thetaĩs 716. 5; 730. 68.
Θηθής daughter of Theon also called Dionysius 716. 10, 14.
Θηθής daughter of Diodorus 713. 22.
Θηθής son of ... etis and father of Patermouthis 712. 4.
Θηθόδωρος, Θωλέρως Θ. also called Pilion 727. 17.
Θηθόδωρος 736. 33, 76.
Θηθόδωρος father of Aurelius L. ... thion 658. 4.
Θηθυξίς 836.
Θηθύλωρ poliarch 745. 4.
Θιων 740. 35 (?); 746. 1; 799.
Θιων also called Dionysius 716. 8, 31.
Θιων son of Heracleides 723. 2.
Θωρίς god 806.
Θυάτερος son of Horus 797.
Θωνīs father of Achillas 732. 3.
Θρασύμεχος 713. 26.
Θών 725. 7.
Θών also called Morus, son of Harthonis 725. 63.

Iebael 735. 18.
Ierraeanus son of Macchana 735. 15.
'Iηριώτης 816.
'Iηριώτων 744. 1, 16.
'Iουσίακος, Ιωσίς Μάρκος 'Απολυτίμουs also called J. 727. 7, 10, 28.

'Ιππαδό( ) 715. 35.
1. r. μ., archidicastes, son of Isidorns 727. 1.
'Ιππάς 736. 32; 730. 1.
'Ισάωρα daughter of Calas 713. 10.
'Ισάωρος 816.
'Ισάωρος ex-exegetes, father of I. r. m. 727. 1.
'Ισάωρος father of Valerius 735. 4.
'Iσάωρος son of Heradion 728. 1, 15, 46.
Ιουλία Τιτία lex 730. 5, 14.
Ιουλius 735. 28.

Κακίλλος 738. 55.
Κάθα 713. 10.
Κάστορ, 'Αγηλείς also called C. 719. 1.
Κεφάλας 806.
Κλάρος 734. 2.
Κλαυνά Πτολέμαος 810.
Κλαδόν, Τιτος Κ. Σαποφόρος epistrategus 718. 1.
Κλέαν 734. 4.
Κύριαξ 736. 4, 10.
Κύιος son of Ptolemæus 814.
Καμαμίς father of Victor imperial steward 735. 6.

Λαίς, Λαφριά Λ. daughter of Aurelius L. ... thion 658. 15.
Λαίτωs praefect 705. 40.
Λαύδηκα 738. 95.
Λεωνας son of Pekuris 732. 1 el saep.
Λευτίνος son of ... monax 831.
Λέων, Σαραπιών also called L., son of Heraclides 725. 3, 61.
Λεωνίδης son of Alexander 713. 5, 9.
Λεωνίδης son of Diodorus 713. 4.
Λ ... θαος, Λαφριά Λ. son of Theodorus 858. 3.
Λέβας 728. 1, 28.
Λεκτίτιος father of Anterōs 817.
Λακρίων 812.
Λαλλανδιός, 'Ανδρίτιος Πρείμος also called L. 718. 2, 32.
Λαύκιος 812.
Λαύκιος father of Ptollas 729. 35.
Λαύκιος praefect 706. 5.
Λαντίμαχος 822.

Macchana father of Ierraeanus 735. 15.
Malichus son of Sa' 735. 24.
Malichus father of Themes 735. 17.
IV. PERSONAL NAMES
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Malmesby 735. 5.
Mamreitinos, Petronios M. praefect 728. 17.
Marmos, Gaius M. 'Apion Also called Diogenes 728. 6, 9, 27.
Marmos, Gaius M. 'Apollonarios also called Julianus 727. 6, 9, 27.
Marrius son of Comarinus (?) 735. 3.
Melaus father of Miusius 719. 19.
Mepentos 715. 24.
Mesius son of Melas 710. 19.
Meymer. r( ) father of Pathotes 740. 40.
Meytani father of Papontos 719. 18.
Mepores also called Thonis, son of Harthonis 725. 63.
Meponis also called Leptines 837. 4.
Mespius father of . . . on 712. 9.
Mespleis 739. 3.
Mesperis, Oulalemia 'Apollonariou also called N. 727. 18.
Mespius son of Comarinus 735. 5.
Mespius Archidicles 719. 3, 7.
Mespius 837.
Mespetrio son of Thanochis 712. 6, 12.
Mespius 728. 1, 27.
Mespius son of Moimes, ch . . . 740. 40.
Mespius also called Panechotes, ex-cosmetes 724. 1.
Mespius father of . . . Nychus 708. 17.
Mespius . . . 722. 22.
Mespius son of Doras 718. 3, 27.
Mespius also called Panares, ex-cosmetes 724. 1.
Mespius 658. 5.
Mepoi son of Bithys 710. 15.

Papouros also called Amois, son of Diodorus 733. 3.
Papouros son of Bithys 719. 10, 27, 34.
Papouros son of Mothis 719. 18.
Papouros 740. 29.
Passus 738. 85 (?).
Passus son of Petsiris 808.
Passus father of Leonidas 732. 1, 9.
Passus 811.
Passus 722. 32.
Passus father of Pausiris 808.
Passus Petronios Mamreitinos praefect 726. 17.
Passus 707. 14.
Passus 742. 2.
Passus 719. 6.
Passus son of Gorgias 715. 4, 11.
Passus son of Tryphon 721. 2, 9.
Passus son of Thanochis 712. 4 et seq.
Passus, 'Anastasios II. also called Lollianus 718. 2, 32.
Passus 736. 17.
Passus, Claudia 735. 25.
Passus, Claudia 810.
Passus 790.
Passus father of Kunus 814.
Passus strategus 803.
Passus son of Zoilus 729. 37.
Passus son of Lucius 729. 35.
Passus, Oulalimos Theodosios also called P. 727. 17.

Romanus 725. 26.
'Romius, Gaius 'P. 745. 11.
'Romius, Gaius 745. 'P. 721. 1; 835.

Sabinus, Claudius S. 735. 14.
Saddus 735. 2, 20.
Salmes 725. 32.
Salmes son of Heracleides 716. 6, 30.
Salamis daughter of Leonides 713. 5, 8.
Salamis son of Ammonius 722. 6, 21, 37.
Salamis 707. 13; 716. 15; 729. 5 et seq.; 806; 825.
Salamis also called Asclepiades, gymnasarch 716. 1.
Salamis father of Diogenes 740. 38.
Salamis also called Evangelius, strategus 801.
Salamis son of Heracleides 723. 4.
V. GEOGRAPHICAL.

(a) COUNTRIES, NOMES, TOPARCHIES, CITIES.

Aegyptus 720. 1.
'Aegyptios 721. 1, 8.
Aegiptios 706. 1, 7.
Aegyptos 727. 11.

'Αλεξάνδροι 709. 9; 743. 24; 744. 3, 5; 790. 'Αλεξάνδρειον πόλις 705. 20, 68.

'Απελάς father of Apollon 837.
'Απελάς father of Ophelas 727. 8.
'Απελάς son of Ophelas 727. 8, 12, 22, 26

Truphon 735. 27.
Tessi daughter of Theon 723. 2.
Tatēnpachous 719. 10.
Τύχα 736. 18.

Valerius, Claudius V. Firmus praefect 720. 1.
Valerius son of Isidorus 735. 4.

Φωνᾶs father of Dionysius 789.
Φούστος 742. 1, 17.
'Υπλες praefect 800.
'Υπέδωs 707. 12, 18, 34.
'Υπάνθειαs also called Hermodorus, basilicogrammataus 714. 1.
'Υπαντίμωs 739. 20.
'Υπόδ 736. 14.
'Υπαπθόρις 792.

Χαρῖμωs 724. 3.
Χαρίμως 723. 5.
Χάριτζειος 728. 6.
Χαρύt ( ) father of Didymus 826.

'Υψίμος agoranomus 722. 5.
'Υψιμοίς 695. introd.

'Οριγίνης βιβλιοφάπλαξ 715. 1.
'Ορίωs father of Apion 728. 5, 36.
'Ορίωs father of Heracleides 719. 19.
'Ορίωs son of Panechotes 716. 3, 27.
'Οροs 719. 17.
'Οροs father of Thossaitas 797.
'Ομήλας father of Apollon 837.
'Ομήλας father of Ophelas 727. 8.

Ταύραs 736. 50 (?).
V. GEOGRAPHICAL

'Αραβία 709. 5.
'Αρασίν 709. 7.
'Αττικᾶς 705. 46.
[Δυτική] 709. 6.

Δυτικήπερ 708. 12.

'Ελληνικὸς 784.
'Εστά νομοὶ 709. 7.

'Ηπάτων πόλεις 719. 2, 9, 12.
'Ηρακλεοπολίτης 715. 1.

Θησαύρος 708. 2, 15; 709. 7; 722. 4; 723. 1; 726. 4; 831.

Ιουβαία 705. 33; 707. introd.

Καβδασίτης p. 263.
Καλαυτικὸς 738. 2.
κάτω χώρα 709. 8.
Καθοπολίτης 746. 13.
Κόλων (οι Κυρών;) 739. 2.

Λιβαδίος 743. 37.

Μακεδόν τῶν Σαργολόχων πεζῶν 831.
Μέρφης 709. 6; 825.
Μεσφίτης 825.

Μετριάτης p. 263.

'Ομβρία 834.
'Οξυμηχαίνοι 705. 9, 60.
'Οξυμηχαίνοι (νομός) 705. 69; 707. 15; 710. 2; 719. 4, 11; 721. 3; 727. 13; 746. 13; 833.
'Οξυμηχαίνων πόλεις 718. 4; 724. 1.
'Οξυμήχανων πόλεις 707. 13; 713. 6, 13; 716. 7; 722. 4, 12; 723. 1; 725. 2; 726. 3, 8; 727. 9; 728. 5; 730. 2; 732. 1; 789; 808; 831; 836.
'Οξυμηχαίνων (?) 746. 6.

Πέρσης τῆς ἐπιγενῆς 730. 4; 836.
Πελασγῶν 708. 4.
Πελαεύσιτης 705. 37.
Pολεμαῖος 839.

'Ρωμαίοι 705. 31; p. 263.

Σεβροίτης 709. 5.

Σταύρη 709. 5.

τοπαρχία, ᾠν 721. 9.
Ομοσπονδία 721. 11; 808.
μέση 734. 3.

Σαρασαίτης (not Οξυρ.) 712. 20.

χώρα, ἢ κάτω χ. 709. 8.

(b) VILLAGES, ἐποίκια, τόποι.

Εὐφρέντης 814.

'Ηρακλείουν ἐποίκιον 838.

Θηλία 814.
Θεοί 740. 35.
Θ: θᾶθες 794.
Θάλασσα 865. introd.; 740. 35.
Θάλασσα 721. 9; 728. 2, 4, 6.

'Ισιών Παρυνθίνος (Heracleop.) 715. 21.
'Ισιών 'Α... 732. 2.
'Ισιών Τριφλών 719. 10, 14.

Κερκετούμισ 740. 7; 837.
Κερκετούμισ 740. 40; 808.
Κέντρον (=Κεντρόν?) 739. 2.

Μαγδόλα 740. 43.
Μεριμήδαιος 740. 16; 823.
Μουχίς 784.
Μαμηθρευίκ (not Οξυρ.) 712. 20.

Νέκλια 742. 17.
Νέμρα 797.
Νέσταλα 713. 24, 31.

'Οξυμηχαίνος (Dat.=? Oξ. πόλεις) 745. 6.

Παγκελίς 732. 5.
Παλάκας 808.
Παλομας 740. 24.
Παντοβόλος 713. 26.
Πέλα 740. 20, 21, 37, 38; 835.
Πέντη Τεχνικ ( ) τόποι 734. 3.
INDICES

Σενεκλεύ 740. 26.
Σερέπτα 730. 3, 39.
Σένιος 718. 13.
Σενοκοφί 740. 37, 38.
Σερίφις 707. 20; 740. 18.
Σεφώ 808.
Σιμαρό 810.
Τακολ( ) 734 3, 5.

Τακόνα 743. 29.
Ταλαόν 695. introd.
Ταμαίδος (Fayûm) p. 263.
Τεταυίς 721. 9.
Τίτος 808.
Τομήτες (Heracleop.) 715. 6, 13, 14.
Τρόφωνος Ἱστον 719. 10, 14.
Τελεραχ( ) (Heracleop.) 715. 24.

(ε) κλῆροι.

Διάμοιος 730. 9.
Εὔθρονος αλα 794.
Ζωίλαος καὶ Νουμανίον 715. 22.
Ορασμάχον παραμήνη 713. 26.

Μνηστόν καὶ Ἀρτεμίδωρον 715. 24.
Σένιος 810.
Χαρείτον 728. 6.

(δ) διμϕόδα.

'Ὑσφίων Παρεμβολής 786.

Νότου Δρόμων 786.
Νότου Κρηπίδος 714. 11.

(ε) Buildings, &c.

'Αδρανὴ βιβλιοθήκη 719. 35.

Σαρασαίων 736. 25; 832; 835.

(φ) Deme and Tribe.

Σωσικόδημος δ καὶ Ἡλί (7) 712. 9.

VI. RELIGION.

(α) Gods.

Γῆ 722. 6.
Ζεύς 722. 6.
Ἠλώς 722. 6.

Ἡρα 731. 6.

Θεός 658. 8; 715. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Οὐράς 806.
VII. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS

(6) Priests.

ἀρχιερεύς 718. 3.

ἱερέας Θεόρος 806. ἱερ. καὶ ἀρχιδικαστὴς 719. 3; 727. 2.

(c) Miscellaneous.

ἀστρα "Ἡρας 731. 6.

θυσία 658. 2.

ἱερὰ ἱεροῦ τόπον 707. introd.

ἱερὸν (‘offering’) 658. 1, 12; 784.

ἱερὸν (‘temple’) 785.

ἵστημι 731. 5.

VII. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS.

ἀγοραμάτος 722. 4.

ἀιτητής 788.

ἀριθμός, πρώτων ἀριθμῶν ἱππείς 735. 8.

ἀρχιδικαστὴς, ἵππος ἱεροῦ καὶ ἀρχιδικαστὴς 174. 2. Ὀξιδίλλιος ἱερ. καὶ ἀρχιδικαστὴς 727. 2. Αἱσῆλειδου διέτατον τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχιδικαστείαν (A.D. 154) 727. 4.

βασιλείας γραμματέως, 'Ἡρακλείδης (A.D. 16) 746. 1, 13, 34. Ψυλλάσυκος ο ἡ καὶ Ἐρμόδωρος (A.D. 122) 714. 1.

βιβλιοφίλος 712. 1; 713. 3; 714. 5; 715. 1, 4. Βοήθος 734. 4.

γεγονακομητικός 715. 1, 35.

γραμματέως 709. 13; 715. 35; 835. βασιλείας γρ. See βασιλείας. γρ. καταλογείου 716. 9. γρ. πόλεως 714. 7. γυμνασιαρχός 716. 1.

δικάδαρχος 747. 1.

ἐξαρχητήρεως 714. 6.

ἐξαρχητής (of Alexandria) 727. 1, 5.

ἐπικρατῆς 714. 5, 38.

ἐπιστατής φυλακτών 803.

ἐπιστατής τῶν ἱππώρυχων 790.

ἐπιστράτηγος, Υπάλλος Βάσσος (A.D. 135) 726. 18. Σευσφόρως (A.D. 180-92) 718. 1.

ἐπιστρήθης ξενικῶν πρακτορείᾳ 712. 1, 8.

ἐπιστρήθης 710. 4.
INDICES
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πρακτική ξενικῶν 712. 1, 8; 825.
πράκτορ ώρημικῶν 733. 2; 734. 3.
σιτολόγος 708. 10, 21; 740. 24, 26; 708; 833.
στατηρίσε 708. 2, 18; 717. 7, II; 718. 24.
(Of Alexandria) '1... '1πετόφων γενόμενος
στρ. (A.D. 154) 727. 2. Άλφαλος 'Ωρίων
γενόμ. στρ. (A.D. 200-2) 705. 18, 67. (Of
Oxyrhynchus) Ἱπτερίατος (laic 1st cent.
π. c.) 803. 'Αχίλλευς δ καὶ Κάσιος (A.D. 193)
719. 1, 4.

τασπιγραμματεύς 833.

ὑπηρέτης 712. 17.

φυλακῆς 803.

φύλαξ 803.

χειράρχης 734. 2.

χειράρχης 708. 13.

χρηματίστης 719. 7; 727. 3.

ώραγράφος 710. 3.

VIII. WEIGHTS, MEASURES, AND COINS.

(a) Weights and Measures.

ἄκανθ 669. 29, 41.

(KP 669. 29.

άρουσα 713. 24 et sacf.; 715. 26; 718. 8 et
sacf.; 721. 10, 11, 14; 728. 7, 8, 30;
729. 23; 730. 8, 39; 740. 41 et sacf.

άρμαθα 708. 4, 11, 17, 19; 718. 15; 735.
9; 736. 8 et sacf.; 788; 789; 836.

βάτω 669. 28, 37.

δίκτυλος 669. 14, 17, 26, 43.

δίσμη 742. 4, 13.

διανοα 669. 30.

ἐκατοστή 708. 8, 9, 20.

κέλαμος 669. 28, 41.

κράμιον 729. 36; 745. 1; 784.

κοτάλη 784.

λιχίς 669. 27, 31.

μέτρων 669. 26; 707. 26, 28, 30; 717. 1, 2;
729. 27. μ. ἀγρονομικῶν 836. μ. δημόσιων
740. 18, 20. μ. ἐμβ(ολικῶν?) 740. 18.
μ. στατηρίσων 740. 17. μ. τετραγώνων
ἀγρονομικῶν 836. μ. χαλκοῦ 717. 8.
μιλιον 669. 30.

κοῦβας 669. 11, 24.

ξύλων 669. 11, 20, 21, 28. Χ. βασιλικῶν 669.
11, 19. Χ. δημόσιων 669. 38.

ώδευς 669. 1, 2.

ὡρωμα 669. 28, 39.

παλαιστής 669. 13, 16, 27, 31, 34.

πήχες 669. 2 et sacf. π. δημόσιος 669. 34.
π. ἐφαρμοσμένος 669. 6. 10. π. εὐθυμετρικὸς
669. 5. π. λυσιόφικος 669. 33. π. Νεο-
μετρικός 669. 35. π. ὁλοστερικός 669. 9.
π. στερεές 669. 7. π. τετραγώνως 669. 35.

πλέθρων 669. 29.

πυρός 669. 27, 32.

πυρών 669. 27, 34.

σπαθαριά 669. 27, 32.

στάδιον 669. 29.

σχοινίον 669. 1, 3, 18.

τετάρτη 705.

χοινές 740. 18 et sacf.; 789.

χούσ 736. 15; 739. 11; 819.
IX. TAXES

(b) COINS.

ἀργυροὶ 706. 3; 712. 6, 15; 724. 6; 728. 9 et sacf.; 729. 6, 13, 20, 40; 730. 12, 37; 731. 8, 9, 10, 12; 764; 788; 791; 808. ἀγρ. ἑπίσημον 722. 19. ἀγρ. σεβαστοῦ νομίσματος 719. 21; 722. 25. 8737. 2 et sacf.

δραχμή 707. 8 et sacf.; 712. 6, 14, 15, 21; 719. 21, 31; 722. 19, 25; 724. 6 et sacf.; 725. 22 et sacf.; 728. 9 et sacf.; 729. 6 et sacf.; 730. 12, 14, 37; 731. 8, 9, 11, 12; 732. 5 et sacf.; 733. 4, 6; 736. 2 et sacf.; 739. 2 et sacf.; 742. 14; 745. 1; 784; 788; 791–2; 799; 803; 808, 817; 819. δραχμαῖος τόκος 712. 14; 728. 20.

ἡμιωβδλίου 733. 4, 6; 739. 12 et sacf.; 739. 8, 11.

μνᾶ 728. 21.

δβδλιοί 729. 10.

δβδλός 731. 8, 11, 13; 739. 5 et sacf.; 739. 7 et sacf.

πεντάβδλον 733. 4, 6; 736. 68 et sacf.; 739. 6.

σεμίς (½ as) 737. 11 et sacf.

τίλικτον 710. 6–8; 722. 17, 26; 784; 808. τετράβδλον 722. 20; 734. 5, 6; 738. 12 et sacf.; 739. 4, 13.

τρίβδλον 736. 8 et sacf.; 739. 11, 16; 819.

### X. General Index of Greek and Latin Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abire</td>
<td>720, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄβροχος</td>
<td>740, 45; 810.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγείν</td>
<td>742. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγέφροτος</td>
<td>705, 74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγοράζειν</td>
<td>717, 3; 742, 12; 745, 2; 839.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγωνισμόν</td>
<td>713, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγωνισμός</td>
<td>722, 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγώνισμον</td>
<td>798.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγνία</td>
<td>722, 12, 34; 723, 5; 726, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγώνισμον</td>
<td>744, 4, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγωνισμόν</td>
<td>705, 50, 51.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδηλφή</td>
<td>715, 17; 744, 1; 745, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδηλφιδῶν</td>
<td>727, 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδηλφός</td>
<td>707, 34; 712, 5, 12; 713, 21, 30; 716, 17; 717, 6; 718, 8, 10; 719, 15; 725, 6; 743, 1; 701.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδιακρίτως</td>
<td>715, 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδίκος</td>
<td>717, 10; 718, 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδόκοι</td>
<td>729, 19; 836.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀεί</td>
<td>658, 6; 719, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀείτιζεν</td>
<td>808.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀείθρον</td>
<td>719, 15, 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰξ</td>
<td>807.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἴρειν</td>
<td>719, 26; 723, 12; 729, 21, 31, 41, 43; 787; 800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἴρεινα</td>
<td>716, 22; 729, 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰτεῖν</td>
<td>709, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰτηθεί</td>
<td>788.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰτία</td>
<td>725, 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκαίνα</td>
<td>669, 29, 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκίνδυνος</td>
<td>730, 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκόλουθος</td>
<td>706, 9; 718, 10; 729, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀκούειν</td>
<td>812.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλα</td>
<td>(sic) 794.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλετήρα</td>
<td>738, 8, 31, 34, 72, 76; 739, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλήθεια</td>
<td>715, 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλάζειν</td>
<td>729, 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλακτιζεῖν</td>
<td>712, 12, 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλαγμόν</td>
<td>729, 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλάζειν</td>
<td>713, 11, 16; 719, 20; 724, 6; 727, 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλμυρός</td>
<td>734, 7, 3; 740, 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλτές</td>
<td>658, 13; 798.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλμείναν</td>
<td>716, 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμελεῖν</td>
<td>707, 31; 742, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμέμπτως</td>
<td>724, 10; 728, 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμετάσκεπτον</td>
<td>708, 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμφόθεν</td>
<td>729, 2.9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμφότερος</td>
<td>707, 12; 715, 2; 716, 10; 723, 1, 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναβάλλειν</td>
<td>729, 6, 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάβασις</td>
<td>742, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάβασις</td>
<td>729, 6, 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναγγέλσειν</td>
<td>708, 5; 724, 10; 743, 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναγκάζειν</td>
<td>717, 2, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναγράφειν</td>
<td>730, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάρτησις</td>
<td>705, 76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναλαμβάνειν</td>
<td>707, 25, 35; 719, 32; 721, 5, 6, 7; 724, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάλωμα</td>
<td>740, 28; 825; 836.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνέπτυχες</td>
<td>709, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναπαρατήρημα</td>
<td>p. 262.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνακτησάτων</td>
<td>745, 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναφαίρετον</td>
<td>713, 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναπολή</td>
<td>725, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ανεί( )</td>
<td>833.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνῆρ</td>
<td>710, 3; 719, 24. καὶ ἄνδρα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθιολογεῖν</td>
<td>743, 34, 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνθρώπος</td>
<td>705, 16, 66; 805.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντιστάτων</td>
<td>707, 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνακατευθύνειν</td>
<td>707, 27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάκοινος</td>
<td>743, 39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντίγραφον</td>
<td>719, 3, 4, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντικήμον</td>
<td>722, 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντιποιίες</td>
<td>719, 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντισυμβολήν</td>
<td>p. 263.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντιστάσειν</td>
<td>707, 17, 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀντισφαίρειν</td>
<td>805.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνέκορα</td>
<td>p. 262.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνοι</td>
<td>712, 20; 721, 19; 736, 31; 744, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνωθεν</td>
<td>718, 21; 745, 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀξίος</td>
<td>725, 29–35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin Word</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aecus</td>
<td>658, 16; 705, 51, 60; 710, 19; 719.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aecusis</td>
<td>705, 14, 64.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aepistōmē</td>
<td>718, 23, 29; 727, 18; 803.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aepistēmos</td>
<td>718, 14; 722, 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aepistēmēn</td>
<td>724, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apleleia</td>
<td>706, 2; 716, 6, 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aplelebrēs</td>
<td>706, 8; 722, 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperagia</td>
<td>729, 2, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperibitos</td>
<td>713, 39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apērēkonta</td>
<td>709, 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aplekēmen</td>
<td>719, 22; 808.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperēskhe</td>
<td>719, 17, 19; 728, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aplecs</td>
<td>719, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperodēmēnia</td>
<td>718, 34; 715, 6, 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperodēphē</td>
<td>715, 30; 719, 24; 808.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperodēthea</td>
<td>705, 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperolēmenv</td>
<td>705, 61; 718, 18, 21; 728, 18; 729, 15, 19, 42, 43; 730, 22; 744, 15; 745, 7; 746, 3; 798, 836.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperōdēs</td>
<td>712, 16; 728, 17; 808.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperōdēskei</td>
<td>718, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apokos</td>
<td>719, 2, 9, 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apokalēmenv</td>
<td>708, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aplekēmen</td>
<td>743, 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperokos</td>
<td>798.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apero</td>
<td>724, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperosteleia</td>
<td>743, 3; 744, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēرة</td>
<td>745, 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>736, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>729, 31; 730, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>730, 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlēn</td>
<td>706, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>724, 14; 725, 35, 40; 731, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperoste</td>
<td>738, 2; 734, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>736, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>729, 31; 730, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>730, 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>706, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>724, 14; 725, 35, 40; 731, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>738, 2; 734, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>736, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>729, 31; 730, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>730, 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>706, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>724, 14; 725, 35, 40; 731, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>738, 2; 734, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>736, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>729, 31; 730, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>730, 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>706, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>724, 14; 725, 35, 40; 731, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>738, 2; 734, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>736, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>729, 31; 730, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>730, 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>706, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>724, 14; 725, 35, 40; 731, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>738, 2; 734, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>736, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>729, 31; 730, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>730, 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>706, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>724, 14; 725, 35, 40; 731, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>738, 2; 734, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>736, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>729, 31; 730, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>730, 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>706, 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>724, 14; 725, 35, 40; 731, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>738, 2; 734, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>736, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>729, 31; 730, 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlos</td>
<td>730, 26.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aperostēlē</td>
<td>706, 6.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDICES

Βίσις 729. 20.
Βοήθ. 717. 9, 12, 13, 14.
Βορεάς 734. 4; 743. 20.
Βοτός 729. 30.
Βοιλεταί 705. 76; 719. 29; 721. 3; 729. 11.
Βολλινείν 706. 6.
Βολύης 719. 16, 18; 729. 7.
Βούδαν 729. 22.
Βούδια 707. 9; 729. 16.
Βραχύς 705. 77.
Βροδογέντ 708. 7, 19.
Βέλωος 708. 8, 20.
Βερός 785.

capere 720. 15.
collega (?) 735. 14.
conduere 737. 2 et saxep. consul 720. 7.

γάλα 736. 48, 83.
γαμέτος 795.
γάμος 713. 12, 32.
γαίτυς 719. 16.
γενέα 713. 16.
γενεία 738. 56, 57.
γένος 728. 36.
γένος 727. 20; 729. 31.
γέραις 725. 5; 736. 23, 27, 28, 35; 826.
γείσωσαν 659. 12.
γεωμετρία 729. 9, 30.
γεωμετρικός 669. 1, 3, 18.
γεωργίν 718. 19, 23; 728. 4; 740. 38, 40.
γεωργός 740. 16, 21, 33, 35.
γῆ 705. 74; 707. 23, 36; 715. 22, 25; 718. 24; 730. 8, 17, 36; 810. Cf. βασιλικός
and ἱππος. 17 722. 6.
γύναικα 705. 18, 67; 707. 34; 709. 6; 712. 16; 716. 21; 718. 29; 719. 22, 30; 721. 6; 727. 1, 4; 729. 17, 18, 30; 732.
5, 9; 743. 20, 41; 745. 5; 807; 832.
γυνώσσεσσες 743. 27; 744. 3.
γυνή ( ) 734. 4.

γυνάζεσσες 736. 37.
γυναικος 740. 14.
γυμνη 729. 43.
γυμνίζεσσες 705. 39; 718. 20; p. 263.
γυναστήρ 722. 31; 723. 4.
γυναγχίλε 736. 5.
γυμνος 708. 3, 16.

γυνής 713. 7, 38.
γυνή 729. 40.
γών 722. 24.
γραμμα 716. 32; 725. 64; 727. 28; 728. 34.
γραμματέος. See Index VII.
γραμματικός. p. 263.
γράφειν 706. 3; 716. 31; 718. 24; 719. 6, 27; 724. 10; 725. 63; 728. 33; 729.
37; 743. 39; 746. 5; 787; 811.
γράφειν 736. 16; 805.
γυμνασιαρχός 715. 1.
γυμνασιαρχός 716. 1.
γυμνός 839.
γυμνακτήν 739. 18; 741. 9.
γυμνή 736. 11, 88, 89.
γυμνάδα (γυμναδός) 741. 5.

δικτύλλον 785.
δάκτυλον 669. 14, 17, 26, 43.
δαντίζω 705. 47; 808; 839.
δανεισμός 789.
δαπανά 705. 63.
δαπάνη 705. 79; 708. 12; 712. 6; 729. 28; 736. 98; 739. 3.
δατε 720. 3, 6, 15.
δήσις 720. 10.
δείγμα 708. 5, 18.
δείκνυ 719. 14, 18, 29; 727. 19, 20; 729. 4, 5, 16; 743. 8. δείδαν 718. 24.
δειπνεῖν 736. 93.
δείπνον 736. 36; 738. 1, 4, 7.
δείης 729. 22.
δεκαδάρχης 747. 1.
δεκατ( ) 741. 17.
δεξίας 722. 24.
δέσμη 742. 4, 13.
δῆ 705. 61.
δηλαῖον 707. 21, 30; 708. 13; 714. 21.
δηλ. 716. 19; 725. 7, 11, 48; 740. 30; 800.
δημοσίους 669. 24; 707. 2, 15; 715. 37.
τοῦ δημ. 712. 6; 719. 28, 30; 725. 56.
729. 20; 793. 803. (τοῦ) δημ. 707. 22.
718. 11 el saxep.; 729. 33; 730. 17; 740. 14; 810. δημ. θέμα ( ) 740. 29. δημ.
μέτρων 740. 18, 20. δημ. ξίδων 669. 38.
δημ. ἄρθρο 719. 23. δημ. πίθυς 669. 34.
δημ. ρύη 719. 17, 19. δημ. τράπεζα 721. 13; 835. δημ. χρηματισμός 712. 12.
δημοσίαν 719. 32.
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dημοσίωσις 719. 31.
dιαγράφειν 707. 22; 721. 12; 733. 2; 734. 2; 800; 803.
dιαβήση 715. 19.
dιάφερει 718. 7; 10.
dιαλογίζεται 709. 4.
dιαλογισμός 709. 2; 726. 12.
dιαπείρησις 727. 24.
dιαπείρων 743. 22.
dιάπωλων 727. 20.
dιάπτασις 669. 37; 40.
dιάστολή 719. 32; 743. 28; 783.
dιαπτώσις 719. 25.
dιατείλων 688. 8.
dίαυλον 669. 30.
dίάφαρμον 708. 11, 22; 707; 833.
dιαφέροντιά 715. 30.
dιάφύλαξ 707. 23.
dιάδοχος 725. 10, 14, 43.
dιάδοσις 716. 22; 719. 4, 30; 725. 18; 729. 10, 13, 17; 731. 7, 10; 740. 15 et seq.; 742. 11; 743. 26, 28, 32; 789.
dιείμεν 727. 5.
dιέφραξαν 712. 18; 714. 18; 729. 26; 789.
dιειρήσεις 707. 24.
dιεισίνες 718. 31.
dιέκκαις 717. 10; 746. 9; 757.
dιέκκοσμήνων 705. 38.
dιέκυκλητον 724. 24.
dιέλευσον 717. 5; 12.
dιέμαρα 718. 14, 20.
dιήθεν 727. 21; 826.
dιέπλοιος 729. 20; 741. 3.
dιεσκαλών 741. 2.
dιεστρώφω 719. 15.
dιέκυκλης 718. 24.
dομινίνας 720. 3, 6.
dόνας 724. 7.
dόναλή 714. 15; 722. 14; 723. 3.
dόναλος 714. 13; 716. 15; 724. 3.
dραμα. See Index VIII (b).
dραμάνων 712. 14; 728. 21.
dρόμος 717. 17; p. 263.
dύνασθαι 726. 10; 727. 11; 742. 10; 743. 36; 744. 12.
dύτης 725. 12.
dωδεκάδραμιον 714. 22.
dωδεκάκυμικόν 800.

ε 720. 5, 14.
εὖ 729. 18.
ἐάντερ 729. 4, 8.
ἐγγραπτός 707. 20.
ἐγγραφή 707. 33.
ἐγκαλεῖν 728. 46.
ἐγκτήσεις 705. 61; 712. 1; 715. 1; 825.
ἐδιαφορά 728. 15.
ἐδέξις 705. 43; 62.
ἐδύς 729. 7.
ἐδώς 705. 37.
ἐδώρ π. 263.
ἐδίδαξαν 718. 32; 718. 12; 725. 64; 728. 34; 729. 37; 745. 6, 8.
ἐδοσ 669. 26; 719. 24.
ἐδος 718. 22.
ἐξ, μεσάν ἀντί μὲν 740. 17, 18.
ἐξάψυχος 729. 5, 6.
ἐξαφθονή 736. 97.
ἐξίδοντες 721. 8; 725. 30; 729. 2, 14, 30.
ἐξάποδος 705. 39; 719. 16.
ἐξαιρετικάθανατα 717. 5, 7; 744. 4.
ἐξαφθείρων 717. 12.
ἐξαρχήθαι 717. 2.
ἐκατερος 705. 35, 77; 711. 1; 725. 11; 727. 22; 728. 21; 729. 18, 29, 37.
ἐκάτερος 713. 31; 729. 19.
ἐκατοστάθη 708. 8, 9, 20.
ἐκδιώκων 708. 7, 19; 729. 36.
ἐκδιδύλλων 744. 10.
ἐκδοιαν 717. 1.
ἐκέχεοσθα 724. 12.
ἐκδιδάκτων 725. 47.
ἐκδιδίδοντες 735. 5; 835.
ἐκκαρος 729. 18.
ἐκκρότων 725. 37.
ἐκλογή 729. 41.
ἐκμαθαθείον 727. 19.
ἐκτακτος 707. 4.
ἐκτίνεις 725. 55; 728. 19; 731. 12.
ἐκτίτις 729. 21.
ἐκφύομεν 743. 29.
ἐλαλῶν 736. 15; 739. 5, 11, 16, 21; 784.
ἐλάσσων 669. 44; 705. 46; 708. 7, 20; 729. 42.
ἐλεύθερος 705. 40; 722. 6.
ἐλευθερίαν 718. 11.
ἐλευθερίασθαι 722. 31; 723. 4.
ἐμβιβάζων ? 740. 18.
ἐμφάνισεις p. 263.
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εἰργάτης 705. 17, 66.
εἴθαλείς 729. 22.
εἴθαις 839. εἴδες 744. 7.
εἴδουμεν 669. 5.
εἴλόγος 718. 28.
εἴρηκτες 705. 15, 65.
εἶραν 705. 31.
εἴρησαν 717. 5, 8; 743. 25.
εἴρηχεν 800.
εἴρηται 805.
εἴρησαται 811.
εἴρησαν 711. 4.
εἴρησαν 705. 49.
εἴρησαν 782.
εἴρησαν 710. 4.

ζέγον 707. 9; 741. 8, 9.
ζέγον 728. 16; 805.
ζέγορος 754.
ζέσθαι 736. 27, 60; 784.

 hollandiæ 800.
 hollandî. See Index VII.
 ἡλικια 705. 35; 713. 40; 724. 14; 725. 12.
 ἡλικια 736. 63; 731. 7, 11; 736. 68-71, 90.
 ἡλικια 804. ἢπαγόμενα ἡμ. See Index III (b).
 ἡμέτορα 787. 67.
 ἡμαρτάνω 708. 6.
 ἡμικλαυθώ 728. 20; 730. 27; 833.
 ἡμισέπεια 729. 36.
 ἡμισεμινθές 741. 15.
 ἡμισεμινθές. See Index VIII (b).
 ἠπατά 738. 3.
 ἠπάτη 736. 10.
 ἠπάτα 689. 8.

 ἄθλον 717. 2; 743. 17, 27, 39; 745. 8.
 ἄθθων 740. 21, 26, 29, 33, 49.
 ἄθος. See Index VI (a).
 ἄθροις 720. 10.
 ἅθριακος 833.
 ἅθρια 744. 10.
 ἅθρια 744. 2.
 ἅθρια 738. 6.
 ἅθρια, (ἄρια) 736. 9, 47.
 ἅριον 729. 22.
 ἅριατή 658. 15; 730. 14, 84.
 ἅρια 658. 7, 11.
 ἅρια 729. 23.
 ἅρια πάρδο 658. 2.

 ἰδωροφαίνω 719. 27, 34.
 ἰδεος 712. 19; 715. 6; 720. 28; 807; 836.
 ἰδιωτικός 715. 37; 718. 11, 27; 719. 24.
 ἰδιωτικός 740. 20, 28, 32.
 ἰδιωτικός 707. introd.
 ἱερείς. See Index VI (b).
 ἱερόν 653. 1, 22; 784; 785.
 ἱερος, ἱερος (τό) 721. 7.
 ἱεροτικός 738. 19.
 ἱηος 709. 2; 718. 30; 742. 6, 8; 743. 37.
 ἱηος 744. 13; 745. 10; 746. 10; 805.
 ἱπαρχός 780.
 ἱππικός 735. 8.
 ἱππικός 741. 11.
 ἱσάτες 729. 31.
 ἱσείς 731. 5.
 ἰσος 715. 7; 722. 13; 725. 42, 56; 729. 20.
 ἰσος 836. 2.
 ἰσοτάκης 709. 2; 725. 46; 731. 9.
 ἰσοτάκης 735. 12.
 ἱτεμο 730. 50, 81.

 καθαί 705. 47; 727. 24.
 καθάστηρ 738. 24.
 καθάρω 705. 5, 18; 718. 9; 720. 22; 730.
 καθάρισα 727. 19; 836.
 καθάπετα 705. 62.
 καθάσω 725. 44; 50, 51.
 καθάσω 707. 7, 27; 729. 12.
 καθάσω 729. 5, 11, 19, 29.
 καθάσω 730. 3, 22, 24-6.
 καθάσω 744. 28, 45; 729. 4, 25, 26; 742. 4.
 καθαρισμία 734. 9.
 καθαρισμία 747. 2. Kalendsae 737. 21.
 καθίλευτε 747. 1.
 καθόλου 705. 40; 805. καθόλου 745. 8.
 καθόρα 729. 34.
 καμηλίτης 710. 4.
 καρπός 721. 7; 729. 32; 730. 19.
 καρπωτικός 728. 25.
 καρπωτικός 728. 1, 10, 29.
 καρπωτικός 741. 13.
 καταβιβαστει 715. 37; 729. 18.
 κατάγειν 708. 3, 16.
 καταλείψεις 705. 44, 74; 707. 30; 729. 20.
 καταλογισμών 719. 3, 6.
 καταλογισμός 757; 811.
 κατασκευασμός 836. 11.
 κατασκευασμός 736. 11, 18, 54, 94.
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κατασκευάζων 713. 23.
κατασκευάζων 725. 26.
καταποτά 708. introd.
καταπτέθηκε 705. 78; 707. 9.
καταπτέθηκε 714. 37; 715. 36; 710. 38; 731. 14; 786. 826.
κατέχειν 713. 23; 713. 15.
κατοικεῖν 705. 24.
κατοικεῖν 715. 23, 25.
κατοική 713. 36.
κλήτη 708. 8.
κλεῖδεα 658. 10; 705. 51; 706. 13; 708. 6, 19; 715. 9; 721. 13.
κλαδίζειν introd.
κληρονόμος 719. 16, 17.
κλήσις 715. 22, 25; 721. 6; 728. 7; 730. 9.
κλήσις 704. 810. Cf. Index V (c).
κληρογενή 833.
κοινός 719. 15; 729. 32; 740. 43. κοινός 715. 7; 729. 5; 6.
κοινότητα 736. 91, 100.
κομματάριον 724. 8.
κομώει 708. 14; 730. 20.
κομίσθη 739. 7.
κοπή 729. 3; 810.
κοπησματικός 720. 10.
κόπρος 729. 10.
κόπτειν 728. 11.
κόρα 810.
κοσμητέασιν 724. 1.
κοτήλη 784.
κόσμος 739. 8.
κράτζω 717. 1, 9, 11, 13.
κράτιστος 728. 17.
κράτις 708. 8, 20.
κράτος 709. 6, 19.
κράτος 719. 8; 727. 4.
κτόσον 705. 70.
κτήμα 707. 23, 25, 31; 729. 5 et saep.
κτήμα 720. 16, 39–41, 43.
κτήμα 718. 14.
κυβερνήτης 717. 4.
κυβερνός λόγος 800.
κυματεύνω 730. 19.
κύριος ('lord') 728. 15; 744. 2. Cf. Index II.
κύριος ('valid') 719. 20; 725. 56; 727. 26; 728. 25; 729. 14, 34; 730. 31; 731. 14; 838.
κόμη 705. 60, 69; and see Index V (b).
κομογραμματέας 718. 13, 20, 26.
λαμβάνω 707. 26, 29; 724. 8, 9; 729. 17, 41; 743. 26; 744. 8.
λαμβάνω 705. 19, 39, 68.
λαυάνων 705. 30.
λαξίς 808.
λαξιγραφεῖν 711. 3.
λαξιγραφία 714. 23; 733. 5.
λαξιγράφος 786.
λέγω 706. 11; 707. 14; 717. 2; 744. 11.
λειτουργεῖν 705. 79; 731. 4.
λειτουργός 706. 72.
λειτουργός 792.
lex Julia et Titia 720. 5, 14.
λίγειν 729. 17.
λίμνη 826.
λίμνη 729. 19.
λίμνω 736. 75.
λειαφικός 869. 33.
λειχή 869. 27, 31.
λψ 719. 17, 19.
λογαστήριον 709. 1, 10.
λόγος 705. 30; 708. 13; 724. 10; 725. 36; 726. 14; 727. 23; 729. 13; 732. 5; 740. 30; 741. 1; 800; 825.
λυπάω 707. 24; 709. 8, 12; 713. 36; 716. 16; 724. 11; 725. 19; 729. 4 et saep.: 732. 13; 740. 32.
λύειν 716. 19; 745. 6; 808.
λύστερον 722. 30, 40; 784.
λυσία 736. 91.
λωρίσκα 812.
μα( ) 736. 73.
magister 737. 12 et saep.
μαθησις 724. 3; 725. 7.
μαθησις 725. 15, 21, 27, 48.
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νευλομετρεύον 669. 36.
νομηρία 725. 8.
νόσος 707. 17; 718. 8; 729. 19; 836.
νοῦ τοῦ 729. 8.
νόμαρα 719. 21; 723. 25.
νόμος, τῶν Ἀλγυπτίων ν. 706. 7. ἀστικοί ν. 706. 9. τῆς χώρας ν. 795.
νομός, Ἐπτά νομοί 709. 7.
νότιος 729. 9.
νότος 719. 14, 16, 18.
νῦν, τὰ νῦν 811.

ξεία 747. 1.
ξεικός 712. 1, 8; 825.
ξηρός 736. 82.
ξηλαρχόν 729. 31; 730. 10.
ξυλοκοπή 706. 13.
ξυλολογεῖα 729. 33.
ξυλοσκοία 729. 29.

...

μακροπρόσωπος 722. 7, 16, 24, 33.
μαχαροφόρος 839.
μέγας 705. 22.
μέγας 669. 44; 717. 9; 729. 43.
μελίχρως 732. 7, 9.
μέτρος 788.
μέτρον 706. 12.
μέν νῦν 705. 36.
μέσεις 744. 5.
μέσεις 713. 29.
μέσος 707. 7; 715. 15, 16; 716. 13-5, 20; 719. 14; 722. 13; 728. 8; 729. 19, 31; 740. 46, 47; 810.
μεστεῖν 669. 45.
μέσος 722. 7 et s. c.; 729. 28; 734. 3.
μεταβάλλειν 728. 13.
μεταδόσεις 705. 38; 712. 16; 719. 4.
μεταλλάσσειν 715. 10.
μεταφέρειν 728. 11.
μεταφέρει 729. 34.
μεταφέρει 669. 6; 735. 7; 740. 24, 26, 35.
μετέπειν. See Index VIII (a).
μέταπον 722. 8.
μέτρος 725. 12; 729. 7, 9; 731. 3.
μηδί 669. 6, 7.
μήδεις 751. 51.
μήτηρ 658. 4; 713. 5, 9, 23, 36; 715. 3, 12, 18; 716. 3, 5, 9, 10; 719. 2, 8, 10, 11; 722. 11, 22, 32; 723. 2; 726. 6; 728. 2; 3, 28; 733. 5; 736. 69; 740. 44.
μηχανή 729. 12, 23, 28.
μηχανής 741. 4.
μηχανή 669. 39.
μηχανή 724. 5; 725. 18 et s. c.; 729. 12; 731. 8; 736. 6.
μετάδον 707. 14, 18; 729. 3 et s. c.; 730. 1 et s. c.; 810.
μεταδοθεις 707. 17, 20, 24, 35; 729. 14, 20, 34, 41; 730. 21, 31, 39; 740. 34; 838.
μετανόησε 729. 8; 825.
μύ 728. 21.
μύνα 719. 32.
μύον 707. 22; 718. 11; 729. 8, 9.
μύσος 729. 16, 39.
μύρων 736. 13, 84.

...
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όνος 729. 9.
όξιδβαρον 741. 20.
όσον 728. 11.
ότιοιων 735. 5.
όττες 707. 28.
όταρα 729. 11.
ότωροβάλαξ 729. 11.
ότος 718. 12.
όργανα 669. 28, 39.
όρίζων 705. 48; 707. 28; 719. 31; 728. 18, 36.
όρος 715. 31.
ὀρνη 738. 9.
ὀρός 729. 7, 9.
ὀσον 724. 13; 729. 25.
ὀστερ 729. 6, 40.
ὀστισαύν 719. 25.
ὀστρεχ 738. 5.
ὀτε 736. 36, 92.
ότη 717. 2, 13; 743. 28; 744. 11; 745. 8; 811; 812.
οὐκάριος 735. 6.
οὖλή 722. 8, 16, 24, 34; 723. 5.
οὔτως 708. 6; 707. 32; 743. 35.
ὀψελιν 712. 11; 732. 4.
ὀψελῆ 719. 24.
ὀψιμίσον 729. 31.
ὀψίδιον 738. 52, 62.
ὀψιν 736. 61.
ὀψώνιον 729. 11; 731. 10; 744. 7.

πα ( ) 797.
παίγνιον 736. 59.
παθάμον 730. 14; 736. 38.
παθδών 736. 39; 744. 7.
ποίς 724. 8, 10, 13; 725. 18, 36; 736. 16.
περιάστρες 736. 31.
περικρίσθενθα. See Index VIII (a).
περίτετες 742. 9; 745. 5.
πάμπολυν 718. 11.
παραβάρμος 742. 3.
παραγράφων 705. 35.
πανταί 727. 28.
παραβώνα 725. 53, 54.
παραγγείλων 743. 23; 798.
παραδεικνύει 721. 12.
παραδείξατε 712. 2.
παραδόουσα 716. 22; 729. 22, 44; 742. 7, 9.
παραδώσα 713. 35.

παρακαλεῖν 744. 6.
παρακαισάειν 717. 6; 729. 16, 23; 742. 2, 4; 785.
παραληψις 799.
παραλογισμός 711. 5.
παραμένων 724. 13; 725. 43.
παραμονή 731. 13.
παραπολεμάσα 705. 73.
παρατιθέοντα 713. 1.
παράφημα 796; 837.
παραφύλλει 705. 72.
παραγωγών 719. 12, 25.
παραχώρητων 719. 20.
παρείδως 711. 2; 727. 11, 25.
παρεμβολή 736. 33.
παρέξ 729. 33.
παρέχειν 717. 4; 725. 9, 42; 729. 4, 9, 19; 785.
παρη( ) 788.
παρεκά, παρεμένει 713. 26.
πατήρ 713. 20; 715. 11; 784.
πατρικός 716. 15.
πάτρων 706. 2, 10.
πατρός 715. 28.
πεδαῖος 736. 12.
πεδίου 740. 37.
πείσ 724. 10; 831.
πείματις 729. 11.
πειμπαίος 729. 24.
πενταετής 725. 49.
πεντάβαλω. See Index VIII (i).
περιβάλλειν 707. 32.
περιδειπνον 736. 37.
περίγειμ 719. 31.
περιστών 705. 53; 743. 36.
περιστερά 729. 10; 736. 29, 79.
πηγέας. See Index VIII (a).
πηγάζειν 812.
πηγάζειν 719. 12; 740. 30; 784; 819.
πιάττιν 705. 32; 727. 21.
πλακάς 729. 28.
πλαστός 729. 30.
πλαστία 733. 3.
πλάτης 707. 26, 32.
πλάτων 669. 7, 8.
πλάθρον 669. 29.
πλέν 726. 11.
πλέστα 742. 1; 744. 1; 746. 2.
πλείων 705. 30; 712. 18; 725. 39; 833.
πλῆν 721. 7; 729. 23.
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πλέφπος 707. 28.
πλοῦς 799; 805.
πλοῦς 727. 11.
ποιεῖν 705. 77; 707. 29; 709. 3; 713. 11; 718. 10, 14; 722. 28, 36; 726. 13, 44; 726. 14; 727. 11; 729. 7. 24, 29, 37; 743. 40; 745. 8; 787. 811.
πολέμων 705. 33.
πόλει (= Alexandria) 727. 2. (= Oxyrhynchus) 655. 2, 6; 705. 22, 39, 43; 714. 7; 732. 2; 736. 31. Cf. Index V (a).
πολύτροπης 745. 4.
πορεία 792.
πόρομεσος 732. 4.
πορομέσας 732. 2.
ποροί 719. 2.
ποροφύρα 739. 16.
πόσος 742. 4.
ποστομός 800.
ποτέ 745. 7.
ποτίμων 741. 17.
ποτίσμα 263.
ποτισμός 729. 13, 24.
ποῦ 689. 27, 32, 38; 722. 16; 723. 5.
πράγμα 706. 4; 743. 19.
πραγματευτής 825.
πραγμάτων 748. 6.
πρακτορεία 712. 1, 8; 825.
πρακτορικός 712. 21.
πράκτωρ 733. 2; 734. 3.
πράξα 712. 11; 728. 22; 729. 21; 730. 27.
πράξας 730. 28.
πράσατον 708. 10. 21; 718. 25; 822.
πρίτμη 718. 12.
πρίτμαθα 718. 5. 17.
πρίξαθαν 807.
προγράφειν 713. 29; 715. 34; 727. 12; 729. 14; 732. 7, 10; 756.
προδημαία 724. 12; 728. 18.
προέων 719. 9.
προκλήσιμον 713. 33, 37; 715. 30; 724. 12; 725. 44, 51, 54, 62; 727. 22; 728. 32, 40; 728. 18, 37, 42; 732. 8, 11, 14; 735. 8; 740. 23, 25; 818.
προκήρυξις 718. 20.
προποιεῖν 707. 16.
προσβάλλειν 714. 16.
προσψηγμός 784.
προσδιάδειρα 743. 33.
προσέδρειαν 725. 10.
προσιναι 705. 31.
προσέρχεσθαι 787.
προσμετρεῖν 708. 12.
πρόσοδος 705. 78.
προσφάλειν 730. 25.
προστασίαν 708. 12; 708. 12.
προσφάγον 736. 46, 89; 739. 7, 10, 12, 14.
προσβήμα 795.
προσφωνεῖν 718. 15, 26, 28.
πράτερον 705. 48. πράτερον 715. 16.
προφέρειν 748. 6.
προχείρισε 741. 14.
προχειρίσε 729. 13; 800.
πρόχρησις 729. 17.
πρωτοπραξία 712. 6.
πρώτος, πρύταν πρωτο 735. 8.
πτέρινης 738. 10.
πτυχών 869. 27, 34.
πυκνός 717. 16. πυκνότερον 805.
πυρός 708. 4 et s. p.; 718. 15; 735. 9; 736. 8 et s. p.; 740. 28, 31, 32, 40; 784. 789; 833; 836.
πολεῖν 729. 43.
πομάδρου 707. 19, 26.
πός 744. 12; 745. 6.

quo 720. 12.
ραβία 736. 75.
ρήμων 707. 13.
ρίδα 736. 58.
ραδίων 729. 32.
ρογάτες 720. 3.
μύη 719. 17, 19.
μυστικά, ἑκρωσί 719. 5; 742. 15; 743. 44; 745. 10; 746. 11; 709; 805.
σαββάλων 741. 10.
σεμιδίδια 738. 82.
σημαινών 833.
σημειογράφω 724. 2.
σημείων 724. 3.
σημείων, σημειώματος 713. 43; 719. 6.
σεμι 737. 11 et s. p.
σίδερος 738. 9.
στεικός 718. 8; 798.
στίγμος 729. 44.
στιχολογικά 740. 17, 23, 27.
στιχολόγος. See Index VII.
INDICES

στομηρικών 740. 23; 25.
στουσάμων 739. 4.
σίτου 708. 11, 22.
σκαφή 729. 28.
σκέπθε 785.
σκουλιον 741. 19.
σόλων 741. 8.
σπείρων 729. 31.
στέιχεον 665. 7, 11.
στίχομα 740. 36; 833.
στιθάμι 669. 27, 32.
στομάχη 739. 12.
στοππάξεων 746. 5.
στεγάζων 729. 23.
στειράς 669. 7; 836.
στέφανος 736. 55, 57.
στήμων 739. 18.
στολή 839.
στοιχίζοντας 705. 75.
στρατηγός. See Index VII.
αν( ) 734. 4; 797.
συγγράφων 707. 35; 729. 17.
συγγράφη 713. 12, 32, 38.
συγκαταγράφων 719. 34.
συγκρητιζόν 727. 21.
συγκρητίσεως 727. 9.
συγκρίσεις 727. 14, 26.
συγκαίμας 661. introd.
συλλόγων 743. 31.
συμβάλλοντας 717. 4.
συμμαχών 705. 33.
συμμετρος 669. 44.
συμπλήρωσις 729. 42.
συμπρογράφοντάς 743. 33.
σύμφωνος 707. 10; 729. 22.
συμφωνεῖν 719. 20; 724. 5; 728. 37; 729. 32.
συμφέρειν 705. 48; 708. 11, 22; 833.
συναγωγοί 791.
συνανίμηνες 718. 16, 19, 27.
συνεδρίεσιν 717. 8, 11.
συνεπιδόσις 716. 28, 30.
συνεργείων 707. 14.
συνστάσεως 715. 35; 724. 2; 726. 12; 727. 12, 25; 787.
συντάξεις 729. 12.
συντιμών 729. 42.
συντίμησις 729. 16, 17, 40-2.
συνυγχάινει 743. 37.
συνωφή 705. 77.
σύνστασις 728. 21.
σφάδρα 705. 71.
σφερῆ 741. 3.
σφανών 669. 1, 3, 18.
σφωνημάτων 797.
σώζεται 705. 23.
σωτηρ 705. 7; 66.
τάλαμων. See Index VIII (b).
ταμιόν 705. 72, 73.
τά εν 811.
ταραχές 736. 5.
τάσσεται 722. 20; 729. 17.
ταφή 736. 13, 84.
ταχύν 743. 21.
τέκνων 713. 19; 716. 8.
τεκτωνικά 669. 35; 729. 12.
τέκτων 729. 12; 739. 15.
τελεύτων 707. 22, 24.
τέλειος 707. 31; 729. 39, 40.
τελευτάν 713. 20.
τελευτή 713. 18.
τέλος 712. 6, 21; 724. 9; 788.
τελωνευμ 729. 263.
τελώνης 732. 2.
τέμνονς 785.
τετάρτη 795.
τετράγωνος 669. 21.
τετραετία 707. 21.
τετραυίκον 836.
τετράψελφων. See Index VIII (d).
τέχνη 725. 8, 49.
τεκτων 737. 3 et seq.
τεθύλαι 725. 61; 742. 5; 745. 2.
τίτλων 744. 9.
τίμων 705. 36.
τιμή 719. 20; 728. 38; 739. 3, 16, 21; 734; 798.
τιμών 736. 31.
τόκος 705. 49; 712. 6, 14, 21; 728. 20; 799.
τοπορχία 734. 3; 808. Cf. Index V (a).
τοπογραμματών 833.
τόπος 705. 73; 707. introd.; 715. 16; 721. 12; 734. 3; 742. 5; 833.
τοσούτος 717. 1.
τράπεζα, ἐνημοσία τρ. 721. 13; 835. 'Ασολή- παιδίου τρ. 806.
τρεῖβει 725. 15, 45; 729. 40.
X. GENERAL INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN WORDS

trébain 661. introd.
tréa 729. 4, 5, 10.
tréágoúvos 741. 12.
tréaskeísketai 714. 17.
tréásbolon. See Index VIII (b).
trópos 800.
tróphi 705. 78.
tróchos 707. 7, 27, 29; 729. 32.
tyrós 729. 10.
túgya 716. 27.

ýgia 715. 29.
ýmason 715. 24; 743. 43; 745. 10; 746. 2; 805.
ýmías 729. 23; p. 263.
ýmía 729. 23.
ýndróphar Kosovo 729. 13, 16.
ýndróphlaiveía 729. 23.
ýndróphlaieía 729. 7.
ýnpor 738. 9.
ýnptoi 741. 15.
ýuk 733. 4, 6.
ývos 658. 13; 705. 70; 724. 3; 727. 5.
ýporifás 707. 15.
ýporíkhis 712. 5; 716. 12; 718. 16; 719. 13; 722. 12; 723. 3; 727. 13; 728. 23; 729. 21; 730. 30.
ýppáreita 712. 17.
ýppáxeiše 745. 4.
ýppadékkoína 743. 38.
ýppadóces 729. 28.
ýppaleítevos 729. 6, 25.
ýppalëgos 729. 28.
ýppalëges 729. 13.
ýppalëgos 729. 14.
ýppapário 730. 35.
ýppaparios 729. 6, 25.
ýppaparios 729. 35.
ýppas 714. 4.
ýppas 718. 11.
ýpphagétheia 743. 42.
ýpphos 669. 8.

fýgas p. 264.
faínos 708. 5, 18; 718. 30; 746. 8; 811; 826.
faísake 736. 4, 10, 77.
faíske 805.
feóphor 795; 837.
feóphorímpos 705. 21, 69, 75.
feópa 705. 32; 743. 21.
feópos 706. 6; 724. 2; 743. 8, 9; 745. 9.
feóntai 740. 19, 22, 25, 27.

φορέως 807.
φύρος 707. 3; 21, 24; 727. 18; 728. 31; 729. 31, 32; 730. 12, 20, 23; 732. 4.
φυντίζειν 727. 15.
φυντισσει 727. 14.
φύλακτης 803.
φύλαξ 729. 11; 803.
φύλασσον 705. 47, 62; 729. 11; 804.
ψυκόν 729. 20, 22.
χάριν 705. 7, 20, 58, 68; 708. 2, 15; 716.
χάρις 719. 4, 12; 724. 2; 728. 37; 732. 4; 735. 7. 742. 1; 744. 1; 746. 2.
χάλκον 736. 6, 100.
χάλκος 722. 26; 743. 23.
χαλκούς 717. 8, 10.
χάρις 705. 63. χάριν 743. 29; 804.
χείρ 669. 40.
χειριστής 734. 2.
χειρό( ) 799.
χειρογραφία 719. 33.
χειρόγραφον 706. 4, 5; 719. 9, 30, 33; 745. 2.
χεράμπτελος 729. 30.
χείρος 740. 46.
χ(? ) 739. 3.
χελάρχος 708. 13.
χελαρχός 661. introd.
χιτών 725. 29-34; (κιθών) 736. 99.
χοινξ 740. 18 el scer.; 789.
χορηγίν 725. 20, 39, 50; 833.
χόρτος 705. 78; 728. 8, 38; 730. 10; 810.
χός (‘mound’) 729. 6.
χος (measure). See Index VIII (v).
χρεία 729. 4, 8, 17; 731. 7; 745. 6.
χρήμα 705. 52.
χρηματίζειν 710. 1; 727. 8; 728. 1.
χρηματιζέως 712. 10; 719. 3; 835.
χρηματιστής 719. 7; 727. 3.
χρήζει 745. 6.
χρήσιμος 705. 75.
χρόνος 707. 11; 712. 18; 714. 38; 718. 11; 719. 13; 724. 4, 9, 11, 13; 725. 9, 11, 38, 49; 728. 35; 729. 17 el scer.; 732. 11; 786.
χρυσός 795.
χρυσοχοία 806.
χάμα 729. 5, 8, 9, 23; 740. 46 (?).
χώρα 709. 8; 795.
χωρίν 705. 40.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Indices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>χωρίον</td>
<td>705. 70, 719. 27; 724. 6; 725. 45; 729. 30, 31, 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χωρίς</td>
<td>714. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψευδεσθαι</td>
<td>714. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψήκτρα</td>
<td>741. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψιλός</td>
<td>707. introd.; 715. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διδ</td>
<td>730. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνείπαι</td>
<td>721. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνὴ</td>
<td>732. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἕλλον</td>
<td>784.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὥρα</td>
<td>747. 3; 804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀφογράφος</td>
<td>710. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὡςετε</td>
<td>729. 31; 730. 10; 743. 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THE EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND, which has conducted Archaeological research in Egypt continuously since 1883, in 1897 started a special department, called the Graeco-Roman Branch, for the discovery and publication of remains of classical antiquity and early Christianity in Egypt. It is hoped to complete in the next few years the systematic excavation of the site of Oxyrhynchus under the direction of Drs. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.

The Graeco-Roman Branch issues annual volumes, each of about 300 quarto pages, with facsimile plates of the more important papyri, under the editorship of Drs. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt.
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VIII. BUBASTIS. For 1889-90. By Edouard Naville. Fifty-four Plates and Plans. 35s.

IX. TWO HIEROGLYPHIC PAPYRI FROM TANIS. An Extra Volume. Containing:
   I. THE SIGN PAPYRUS (a Syllabary). By F. L. Griffith.
   II. THE GEOGRAPHICAL PAPYRUS (an Almanack). By W. M. Flinders Petrie. With Remarks by Professor Heinrich Brugsch. (Out of print.)


XIII. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part I. For 1893-4. By Edouard Naville. Plates 1-XXIV (three coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.

XIV. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part II. For 1894-5. By Edouard Naville. Plates XXV-LV (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.


XVII. DENDEREH. For 1897–8. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Thirty-eight Plates. 25s. (Extra Plates of Inscriptions. Forty Plates. 10s.)


XIX. DEIR EL BAHARI, Part IV. For 1899–1900. By Edouard Naville. Plates LXXXVII-CXVIII (two coloured) with Description. Royal folio. 30s.

XX. DIOSSPOLIS PARVA. An Extra Volume. By W. M. Flinders Petrie. Forty-nine Plates. 25s. (Out of print.)
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ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Edited by F. Ll. Griffith.


ANNUAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS.

(Yearly Summaries by F. G. Kenyon, W. E. Crum, and the Officers of the Society, with Maps.)

Edited by F. Ll. Griffith.


For 1892–3. 21. 6d.
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For 1897–8. 21. 6d. With Illustrated Article on Excavations at Hierakonpolis by W. M. Flinders Petrie.


For 1899–1900. 21. 6d. With Article on Knossos in Its Egyptian Relations by A. J. Evans.

For 1900–1. 21. 6d.

For 1901–2. 21. 6d.

For 1902–3. 21. 6d.
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ΛΟΓΙΑ ΠΛΑΤΩΝ: 'Sayings of Our Lord,' from an Early Greek Papyrus. By B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. 2s. (with Collootypes) and 6d. nett.

NEW SAYINGS OF JESUS AND FRAGMENT OF A LOST GOSPEL, from Oxyrhynchus. By B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. 1s. nett.

ATLAS OF ANCIENT EGYPT. With Letterpress and Index. (Second Edition.) 3s. 6d. With Plan. 6d.

GUIDE TO TEMPLE OF DEIR EL BAHARI. With Plan. 6d.

COPTIC OSTRACA. By W. E. Crum. 10s. 6d. nett.

Slides from Fund Photographs

may be obtained through Messrs. Newton & Co., 3 Fleet Street, E.C.;

and Prints from Mr. R. C. Murray, 37 Dartmouth Park Hill, N.W.

Offices of the Egypt Exploration Fund:

37 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON, W.C., AND
8 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS., U.S.A.

Agents:

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & Co.,
PATERNOSTER HOUSE, CHARING CROSS ROAD, W.C.
BERNARD QUARITCH, 15 PICCADILLY, W.
ASHER & Co., 13 BEDFORD STREET, COVENT GARDEN, W.C.
HENRY FROWDE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.