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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 669, 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 adscrip 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.).


P. Par. = Les Papyrus Grecs du Musée du Louvre (Notice et Extraits, t. xlviii. 2), by W. Brunet de Presle et E. Egger.


I. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

654. NEW SAYINGS OF JESUS.

24.4 × 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 σὺ 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 τοῖοι οἱ λόγοι are intolerable, even in third century Greek, and γνωσθε in l. 20 and αποκαλυφθησθαι in l. 29 are forms that require correction; while several instances of the interchange of letters occur, e.g. ει and η in l. 8 βασιλευσαι, αι and ε in l. 23 επερώης, and probably in l. 18 γνωσθαι (cf. note ad loc.), τ and θ in l. 31 θεραμμενον, and perhaps ν 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; πατὴρ in l. 19 and οὐρανός 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. II. 1-5.

{oil} τοῖοι οἱ λόγοι οἰ [.......+.. ods ἐλά-
λησεν ᾿Ιη(σοῦ)ς ὁ ζῶν Kbpis?.......- we
καὶ Θωμᾷ καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτοῖς" πᾶς ὅστις
ἲν τῶν λόγων τοῦτων ἀκούσῃ ἂν
οὐ μὴ γεύσηται.

'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 of {. For ἀκούειν with the genitive in the sense of 'hearken to' as distinguished from merely hearing cf. e.g. Luke vi. 47 πᾶς ὁ... ἀκούειν μετὰ τῶν λόγων καὶ σοὶ ἀκούασας ἂν τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσῃ, oḥ μὴ γεύσηται, cf. Matt. xvi. 28, Mark ix. 1, Luke ix. 27, and especially John viii. 52 ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον μου γεύσῃ, oḥ μὴ γεύσηται, τηρήσῃ τὸν σοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. In these passages of the Synoptists τηρήσῃ simply means 'die' in the literal sense; but here no doubt, as in the passage in
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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 1. 1 requires some correction, of τοῖοι of λόγοι of being extremely ugly. The corruption of οὗτοι into τοῖοι is not very likely, though cf. Luke xxiv. 44 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς, οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὗ τὰ λαλήσα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι δὲν σὺν ὑμῖν. But since τοῖος is found in late prose writers for τοιάδε, the simplest course is to omit the initial τοῖ. The εἰ of this εἰ being in a crack is not clear in the photograph, but is quite certain. The restoration of 1. 2 presents the chief difficulty. Κύριος is very doubtful; καὶ followed by e.g. ἀποθανόν 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 Ματθαίῳ (or Ματθαίῳ) 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. Litteral., I. p. 14; (2) a phrase such as τοῖς τοῖς ἄλλοις or τοῖς (ἵπτερον; so Bartlet, cf. I. 32 and John xx. 26 καὶ ἐκεῖ οὐκ ἦσαν καὶ Θωμᾶς; (3) Ἰούδας καὶ Θωμᾶς; suggested by Prof. Lake, who compares the frequent occurrence of the double name Ἰούδας καὶ Θωμᾶς is 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 il. 1-3, οἱ λόγοι... ἐλάλησεν Ἰησοῦς... καὶ εἶπεν, and the formulae employed in introducing several of the earliest citations of our Lord's Sayings, especially I Clem. 13 μάλιστα μεμνημένοι τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ οὗ τὰ λαλήσαι διδάσκατο... . κἀπείτε ὡσα μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ Θωμᾶς. Rendel Harris had already (Contemp. Rev. 1897, p. 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 654.

First Saying. Ii. 5-9.

[λέγει Ἰησοῦς]

μὴ παυσάσθω ὁ ζητῶν... ἕως ἂν εὑρῇ καὶ ὅταν εὑρῇ θαμβηθήσεται καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει.

'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 (Strom. ii. 9. 45) κἂν τῷ καθ' Ἑβραίους ἐλαλήσῃ καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει καὶ θαμβηθεὶς βασιλεύσει.
βασιλεύσει γέγραπται καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαήσεται. In Strom. v. 14. 96 (a passage to which Zahn first called attention, Gesch. d. NT. Kan. ii. p. 657) he quotes the Saying in a fuller and obviously more accurate form which agrees almost exactly with the papyrus, but without stating his source:—οὐ πάντασιν ὁ ζητῶν ἕως ἂν εὑρήσῃ, εὑρών δὲ θαμβηθείς, θαμβηθεὶς δὲ βασιλεύσῃ, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἐπαναπαήσεται. The word after ζητῶν in l. 6 is very likely the object of ζητῶν (τὴν Conv? ; τὴν βασιλείαν is too long), but it may be another participle depending on παυσάσθω or an adverb. This part of the saying is parallel to Matt. vii. 7 (=Luke xi. 9) ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε. The supplements in ll. 7-8 are already rather long in comparison with the length of lines required in ll. 15, 25, and 30, so that it is improbable that ἐπαναπαήσεται is to be supplied or that ὁ occurred in the papyrus before θαμβηθείς and βασιλεύσεις (cf. the first quotation from Clement). ὁ δὲ in place of καί is of course possible in l. 7, but since the papyrus has καί and not δὲ in l. 8 καί is more likely also in l. 7. The occurrence of θαμβηθείς, not θαυμάσας, in ll. 7-8, confirms Zahn's acute suggestion (Gesch. d. NT. Kan. ii. p. 657) that θαμβηθείς was the original word; but we should not accept his ingenious explanation of it as a mistranslation of a Hebrew or Aramaic verb which could also mean θαμβήσεις, and his view that συντετριμμένος (cf. Luke iv. 18) would have been the right term. The attractiveness of this kind of conjecture is, as we have recently had occasion to remark (103 introd.), only equalled by its uncertainty. Now that the Saying is known in its completer form, and if we disregard the particular object (to show that the beginning of philosophy is wonder) to which Clement in the first of his two quotations turns it, this description of the successive stages in the attainment of the kingdom of Heaven seems to us decidedly striking, and by no means so far removed from the Anschauungen des echten Urchristenthums as Resch (Agrapha, pp. 378-9) considers. To the probable reference to it in II Clem. v. 5 (cf. the next note) ὁ δὲ ἐπαναπάθητος τοῦ Χριστοῦ μεγάλη καὶ θαυμαστή ἐστιν καὶ ἀνάπαυσις τῆς μελλούσης βασιλείας καὶ ζωῆς αἰωνίου, quoted by Resch (l.c.), Mr. Badham adds a remarkable one in the Acts of Thomas (ed. Bonnet, p. 243) οἱ δὲ μεταλαμβάνοντες τῶν ἐκεί ἀγαθῶν ἀναπαύονται καὶ ἀναπαύομενοι βασιλεύοντος 1.

As Dr. Bartlel aptly remarks, the idea of the necessity for strenuous effort in order to attain to the kingdom has much in common, not only with the 3rd Saying οὐκ ἀποκλίσει ἄνθρωπος αὐτῷ, but with the 5th Logion (‘Raise the stone and there thou shalt find me’); cf. pp. 12-3.

Second Saying. ll. 9-21.

λέγει Ἰησοῦς ... τίνες
10 οἱ ἐλκοντες ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰ
ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐραῖοι ἔστιν; 

1 Since this volume was put into type, Harnack has expressed his views of this Agraphon in Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad. 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.
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 they 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 οὐρανῶν, St. Matthew's phrase, for St. Luke's τοῦ θεοῦ which is too short for the lacuna, and those in l. 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 l. 10-12—οἱ ἔλκοντες, 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 res ὑμᾶς καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν and, on the other hand, l. 10 of ἔλκοντες ἡμᾶς followed in l. 11 by ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐραϊνῷ, whereby we restore οἱ ἔλκοντες 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 τίνες in l. 9; cf. the 5th Saying, which is an answer to a question. A difficulty then arises that we have ἔλκοντες ἡμᾶς in l. 10 but ἐλκον]τες ἡμᾶς in ll. 14-5. This may be a mere accident due to the common confusion of ἡμῖν and ἡμῖν in papyri of this period, and perhaps ἡμῖν should be read in both cases. But ἡμῖν 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 τίνες was ἐρωτᾶτε or the like. There remains, however, the greatest crux of all, the meaning of ἔλκοντες. 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 ἐλκύειν in John vi. 44 εὰν μὴ ὁ πατὴρ... ἐλκύσῃ αὐτὸν and xii. 32 πάντα ἐλκύσω πρὸς ἐμαυτόν: Mr. Badham compares Clem. Alex. Strom. vi. 6 τοῖς πεταῖς γυμ (i.e. wild beasts of sinners) προτρέπει ὁ Κύριος τοῖς δὲ ἂν ἐγχειρήσῃ καὶ χεῖρα ὑφείμα καὶ ἀνέλκει, and ebhd. v. 12 ἡ ἱερὼς τοῦ Δόγου... πάντα τὰν καταδεξάμενον καὶ ἐντὸς ἐαυτοῦ πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἔλκει. A phrase such as εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν is required to explain ἕλκοντες, though even with this addition the use of that word in such a context must be admitted to be difficult. The idea in II. 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 ἄλογα ζῷα possibly had some τοῦ θείου ἔννοια, 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 (I. 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 σεαυτὸν is thus given a fresh significance. Mr. Badham well compares Clem. Paedag. iii. 1 ἢν ὃν ὡς εὐκοπή πάντων μεγίστον μαθημάτων τὸ γράμμα αὐτῶν ἐπήκιν γὰρ τις τε αὐτῷ γνῶσθαι. For the restoration of I. 16, cf. I. 18. ταύτην in I. 17 is the βασιλεία. This line may have ended with something like ὅπως οὖν, if we are right in correcting γνώσεσθαι to γνώσεσθε (cf. the similar confusion in I. 23). For ὑμῶν, which is required by the context in I. 18, cf. e.g. Luke xx. 36. ἐν I. 19 (πι is equally possible) is perhaps the beginning of an adjective, but τοι ὑμῶν ὑμῶν, e.g., might also be read. Οὐ γνῶσθε in I. 20 is to be emended is uncertain; we suggest γνῶσθε(τε), but the corruption may go deeper. εἰ is perhaps ἐν τῷ τῆς βασιλείας. ηπτοῖ in I. 21 is very obscure; the letter following τ may be ε, ο, or ω; but neither if τ is the article, nor if ηπτοῖ is one word, does any suitable restoration suggest itself. ηπτοῖ can hardly be a participle, for if λέγει Ἰησοῦς 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 ἡ πίλοι, with ἐν τῇ πόλει τοῦ θεοῦ in I. 20, as Blass suggests, comparing for the omission of ὅτα, Mark vi. 20 εἰς ὅταν αὐτὸν ἄνθρωπον ἔλκειν. Another and quite different restoration of the early part of this Saying is suggested by Dr. Bartlet, who would read λέγεται τῷ τοῖς ἔρημοι; μὴ φοβείσθωσαν ὁ ἔλκοντες ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὑμῶν γῆς ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐραϊνῷ καὶ ὑφ᾽ ὑμῖν ἔσται τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ πᾶν ζῶον δ᾽ τι ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἔστιν τὰ τε ἐπὶ γῆς καὶ ἡ θαλάττῃ, comparing the idea in Epistle of Barnabas, vi. 12 and 18 τὶν ὁ δυνάμενος νῦν ἄρχειν θηρίων ἢ ἰχθύων ἢ πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; αἰσθάνεσθαι γὰρ ὁ φοβείσθωσαν ὁ ἔλκοντες ὁ ἄρχειν ἑξουσίαν ἐστίν, ἵνα τις ὁ πρότερος κυρίευσῃ. εἰ οὖν οὐ γίνεται τοῦτο ὁ δυνάμενος ὁ πρώτος κυρίευσῃ καὶ γινώσκετε, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι ἡ ἐπιδημία ἡ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ τῆς σαρκὸς ταύτης μικρά ἐστι καὶ ὀλιγοχρόνιος, ἡ δὲ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ Χριστοῦ κιτιλ. (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 ἕλκοντες alone without an explanatory phrase is not a satisfactory word for 'persecute,' 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 ἕλκοντες and the resulting parallelism between the two halves of II. 9-16 which we have suggested.
Third Saying. ll. 21-7.

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' (εἰδήσετε, 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 καί ἑφη αὐτῷ καὶ ποῦ εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ δίκαιοι ἣ ποῖος ἔστων ὁ αἰών ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶν ταύτηρ ἐχοντες τὴν δόξαν, § 5 κατ' ἑστιν ὁ τόπος τῶν ἀρχέρων (l. ἀρχαίων, Bartlet) ἐμῶν τῶν δικαίων ἁθρόπων, taking ἀρχαίων to be equivalent to πρεσβυτέρων in Heb. xi. 2, or to πατέρων; cf. Matt. v. 21, 33 ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις and Luke ix. 8, 19. But the problem was an old one. Lines 25-6 πολλοί... πρῶτοι follow Mark x. 31 (= Matt. xix. 30) πολλοὶ δὲ ἔσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι. In the insertion of ὑμοί before ἔσχατοι the papyrus agrees with BC and many MSS. in Mark x. 31; ND and other MSS. omit ὑμοί there, and in Matt. xix. 30 ὑμοί is generally omitted, though found in C and some others. Luke xiii. 30 is rather longer, καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι καὶ ἐσονται πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ εἰσὶν πρῶτοι οἱ ἔσονται ἔσχατοι. ζωὴν αἰώνιον (αἰώνιον) κληρονομήσουν (Matt. xiii. 29) and μετ' ἑμοί βασιλείαν (αἰώναν) εἰσίν (cf. John iii. 16, 36, v. 24, &c.) is possible.

Fourth Saying. ll. 27-31.

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 οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ
gnωσθήσεται, Luke xii. 2 οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστίν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθῆται καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ
gnωσθῆται: cf. Mark iv. 22 οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν ὃν μὴ ἴνα φανερωθῇ οὔδε ἐγένετο ἀπόκρυφον ἀλλ' ἴνα ἔλθῃ ἔς 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 ὅ ὁ φανερωθῆται suggests the hand of an editor), while that of the second half diverges from all three. τεθαμμένον makes a more forcible contrast to κρυπτὸν than the corresponding word in the Synoptists, which is merely a synonym. Instead of ἐγερθήσεται 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. ll. 32–42.

[ἐξἰετάξουσιν αὐτὸν of μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ
[Ἀ€
[πῶς νηστεύσομεν καὶ πῶς...

...καὶ τί πρατηρήσαμεν...
...
...ζηκαὶ μὴ ποιεῖτε...
...μηθαῖς ἄντι
...μοι ὀ[ποκεριν]

τ χέει Πησσσοο τ---,
[α oo = sJeerat μὴ ποιεῖτε se. eee nee
[ητα Ἴην ἀληθείαι ED. cin tes > > ἘΣ
τ ἢ ηκεκρίυ τ.

ἼὌΠροΨψοΨσΠπ μα καρι OS) ἐστ... 6 ave foi >
ποτ᾿ πῆι το ca es
τ τ ΤΠ στ τ τὺ ᾿

‘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 ἔταξεν τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξετάζων αὐτῶν ὅτι τίς εἶ; εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ κύριος ἐστιν. αὐτοῦ in l. 1 is not very satisfactory, but something more than μαθηταί is required, and cf. 655. 17–8. Φαρισαῖοι 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 (προσευχομένοι μεθα?), 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. xix. 16–22 and Luke xlviii. 18–22, but the occurrence of ἀλήθεια and ἀϊπόκ[ὑμμένον (?)] suggests that the language was more Johanne in character. Line 39, as Prof. Lake remarks, could be restored on the basis of Rev. ii 17 τὸ πανίν [τὸ κεκρυμμένον. 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 r1th 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 five Sayings partly recorded in 654 begin like those in 1 with the simple formula λέγει Ἰησοῦς; 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 ἀπεριπτώμενος, 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 6th 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 (1) 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, νηστεύσητε and σαββατίζητε 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 ὑστερον 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 ll. 9-16), and the Christian turn given to the proverbial γνῶθι σεαυτόν (ll. 16-21), may point to a later stage of thought than that found in the Canonical 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 Pistis Sophia. 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 ἐξετάζουσιν 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 λόγια, 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 λόγια. 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 ο ζῶν in l. 2 owing to the uncertainty attaching to the word that follows; but the phrase ο ζῶν 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-resurrectional 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 ll. 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 ἐλάλησεν and ἐφη 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 ἐξετάζουσι 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 ll. 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 con-templated 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 from the parallelism between 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 resumé 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 αὐτόν (and probably αὐτοῦ) in 654. 32; and it will very likely be pointed out that such a passage as 655. 17–23 would by the insertion of Ἰησοῦς after λέγει make a context and Saying in form exactly resembling 654. 32 sqq. But the use of αὐτόν causes no ambiguity where it is found in one of a series of Sayings each beginning λέγει Ἰησοῦς, 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 Ἰησοῦς there follows two historic presents, ἐξετάζουσιν and λέγουσιν, and is therefore presumably itself a historic present; and if λέγει Ἰησοῦς is a historic present in one case, it should be so throughout 654 and 1. This context therefore confirms the explanation of λέγει Ἰησοῦς in 1 suggested by Zahn. Are we to follow him in his next inference that the formula λέγει Ἰησοῦς 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 (Two 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 Ἰησοῦς (ll. 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, Ἰησοῦς would have been omitted. It is, we think, much more probable that the formula λέγει Ἰησοῦς 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 Ἰησοῦς 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 λόγια, 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, premising 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 Engratite, as Origen and Epiphanius declared; the view of Zahn (Gesch. d. NT. Kan. ii. pp. 628 sqq.), 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 Batiffol (Revue Biblique, 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
has 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 graver 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
Marthaio 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
(ap. 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 ἐκλογαί 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,
ote), 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 ll. 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 (Refut. v. 7) ὁδ' ἀυτῶν ἑπιμαρτυρεῖν φασὶ (sc. the Naassenes) τῷ λόγῳ τὰ Λασσάρων μνημέρα αὖλλα καὶ Φρυγῶν περὶ τῶν γεγονότων καὶ γινομένων καὶ ἐτοιμασάντων ἔτη μακραίνεται ὁμοῦ καὶ φανερομένην φύσιν ἥνπερ φησὶ τὴν ἐντὸς ἀνθρώπων βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν ἔφανομεν, περὶ τὴν διαρρήδην εὐαγγελίαν παραδίδοντες οὕτως ἐμὲ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρήσει ἐν παιδίοις ἀπὸ ἐτῶν ἑπτά; ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τεσσαρακοσίῳ αἰῶνι κρυβόμενος φανεροῦμαι. Here we have two remarkable points of contact with 654, the mention of Thomas coupled with the ἐντὸς 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. 90–8 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 περικοπή 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 l. 24 the neutral word τόπος in a passage in which αἰῶν, as is shown by the parallel from the Apocalypse 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 Φιλίππῳ 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 (Refut. vii. 20) Βασιλείδης τοῖς καὶ Ἰσίδωρος ... φασίν εἰρηκέναι Ματθίαν αὐτοῖς λόγους ἀποκρύφους, ὅσι ήκονα παρὰ τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ ἰδιαιτεῖς. 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 παρόντα, 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 ἰδιαιτεῖς, 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-resurrectional; 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 \textit{ex hypothesi} 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 \textit{λόγοι}, 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 \textit{λόγοι ᾿Ιησοῦ}. 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, \textit{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
to be found in 1; but even if it be conceded (and there is good reason for not con-
ceding 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 theCanonical 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 remark-
able 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 modifi-
cations, 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
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 unbiased
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. (d) and (e), 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 xxxv) 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 εἰ and η causes the form εἰλικρίνει 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. Col. ii.

(a) [...][ΠΟ ΠΡΟΩ Ji[. . . . . . .
[...][Ε ΔΦ ΕΠΠ[. . . . . . .
[...][ΡΩΙ ΜΗΤΕ [.
[...][ΜΩΝ ΤΙ ΦΑ[. 
5 [........] ΤΗ CT[. .
[........] ΤΙ ΕΝΔΥ[. .
(b) [..][ΚΟΕ][. . . ] ΚΡΕ ΚΡ[. . . .
[..][ΚΕ][. . . . ] ΤΕΝ [.
[...][ΝΕΝ ΑΤΙ][. . . ] ΝΞ[. .
10 ΝΕΙ ΟΥΑΕ N][. . ]ΕΙ[. .
[ΕΝ ΤΗΝ ΤΟΝ ΤΟΝ[. . . ]Νɔ[. .
[ΜΑ ΤΩ][ΕΝ[. . . ] ΚΑΙ
ΥΜΕΙΤ ΤΗΝ ΤΟΝ ΠΡΟΣΩΗ
ΕΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΕΙΛΙΚΙΑ[. .
15 ΥΜΩΝ ΑΥΤΟ[. . ]ΩΣΕΙ
ΥΜΕΙΝ ΤΟ ΕΝΔΥΜΑ Y
ΜΩΝ ΑΕΥΟΥΚΙΝ ΑΥ
ΤΟ ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ
ΝΠΕ ΗΜΕΙΝ ΕΛΦΑ
20 ΝΗΣ ΕΕΙ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΤΕ
ΣΕ ΩΨΟΜΕΘΑ ΛΕΓΕΙ

(c) Θ
30 ΛΕ[ .
35 Ν - [ 
40 [ ]
(δ) ΕΛ[ ]
45 ΚΡΥΨ[ ]

(6) ΤΗ[ ]

[ ]

[ ]

[ ]

[ ]
ΟΤΑΝ ΕΚΔΥΣΧΟΙΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΜΗ ΛΙΣΧΥΝΘΗΤΕ

κο[...

(d) . . . .  (e) . . .

\[\text{τίν}

(f) . . .

[g] . . .  (h) . . .

\[\text{κα[...}

[I] ΠΟΤΩ ΠΡΩΙ ΕΙ[...]

[μήτε] ἀφ' ἐστὶ[...]

[ἐως π]ρωι μήτε [τῇ]

[προφήμ] ὑ[']μῶν τί [φά-

[γ]ητε μήτε] τῇ οτ[ο-

[λῇ ὑμῶν] τί [ἐνδό-

[ση]σθε. [πολ]λῶ κρεί[...]

[σον]ές [ἐστε] ὑμῶν [κρί-

[νον ἀτίνα α'][...]

[νε]υθεί[...]

[ἐν ἔχουσ|ες ἐ]|[...]

[μα τί ἐν[...]

[. . . . . . . .]

41 ἔλεγε: τήν κλείδα
tῆς [γνώσεως ἐ-

45 έ[...]

ΤΗΣ ΟΧΥΡΡΥΝΧΟΣ ΠΑΠΥΡΙ
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 (lack?)... 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 ye opened not.’

1-7. Cf. Matt. vi. 25 μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ἡμῶν τί φάγητε μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσησθε. οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλείον ἐστὶ τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος; Luke xii. 22-3 μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε. ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πλείον ἐστιν τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος. The papyrus probably had μὴ μεριμνᾶτε at the beginning of the sentence but differs (1) by the addition of ἀπὸ πρωί... ἕως πρωί, (2) by the use of a different word for σῶμα and probably for ψυχὴ, though it is possible that τῷ σώματι or τῇ ψυχῇ preceded ἀπὸ πρωί 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 ἐπὶ προῖ... στολῆν 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 στολῇ is correct στολῆ cannot be avoided, and with the reading τῆς it is difficult to find any suitable word; cf. also e.g. 839 ἔλεε μοι γυμνὸν... ἡγόρασα αὐτῶι στολῆν.

7-13. Cf. Matt. vi. 28 καὶ περὶ ἐνδύματος τί μεριμνᾶτε; καταμάθετε τα κρίνα τοῦ ἀγροῦ πώς αὐξάνονται· οὐ κοπιῶσι οὐδὲ νήθουσιν· λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι αὐτῶι ἐνδέετε ὡς ἐν τοῦτοι, Luke xii. 27 καταμάθετε τα κρίνα πώς αὐξάνει· οὐ κοπιᾷ οὐδὲ ἐντεῖρ· λέγω δὲ ἐμῶν οὐδὲ κ.τ.λ. and Matt. vii. 26 οὖς ἐμὶς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε αὐτῶι (sc. τῶν πετεινῶν); Luke xii. 24 πόσῳ μᾶλλον ἐμὶς διαφέρετε τῶν πετεινῶν. 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 (i) 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. 1-2 and 9-10 which results from our proposed combination of the two fragments, τῶν κρίνων and αὐξάνειν, 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 even in l. 12 suggests nothing but εἰδο[θετε], which does not suit τί, and there are many points of uncertainty. At the end of l. 10 the letter before τ is more like Γ, Κ, or Θ than Ε, so that οὗτο[ι] εἰδο[θε] (cf. Luke xii. 27) is not very satisfactory. ΜΑΤΩΙΣ 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 το[ι]ΜΑΤΩΙΣ 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, Μ or Ν and Δ or, less probably, Α or Λ. ΕΝΔΥΜΑΝΩΝ, a rare word not found in the N. T., but not inappropriate here, is possible; but εἰ[δο]τε εἰ[δο]τε ματωτε [εἰθε] is unlikely. It is also possible to connect καὶ ἐμὶς with τί instead of with the preceding words, but this does not help towards making the restoration of l. 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.

13-5. Cf. Matt. vi. 27 τίς δὲ ἐξ ἡμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται προσδεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτῶι πῆχυν
and Luke xii. 25 τί δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ προσθεῖναι πῆχυν ἡμῶν; 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 κρίνα. In l. 13 προσθεῖναι(η) could be read in place of προσθεῖναι(η); there does not seem to be room for προσθεῖναι(η).

15-6. Cf. Matt. vi. 31-3 μὴ οὖν μεριμνήσητε λέγοντες τί φάγωμεν ἢ τί πίωμεν.... οἶδεν γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ἀλλὰ γνώσετε τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλευσόμεθα. 'The 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:--τῇ Σαλώμῃ πυνθανομένῃ μέχρι πότε θάνατος ισχύσει εἶπεν ὁ κύριος μέχρις ἂν ὑμεῖς γυναῖκες τίκτετε. καὶ ἡ Σαλώμη εἶπεν αὐτῷ καλῶν γὰρ σὺντράπηκας μὴ τεκοῦσα; ὁ δὲ κύριος ἠμείψατο λέγων πᾶσαν φάγε βοτάνην, τὴν δὲ πικρίαν μὴ φάγῃς. πυνθανομένης δὲ τῆς Σαλώμης πότε γνωσθήσεται τὰ περὶ ὧν ἠρετο τὰ ἕν, καὶ τὸ ἀρρεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυς. The chief differences between the two passages are (1) the setting, the questioner being in the Gospel according to the Egyptians Salome, and in the papyrus the disciples, (2) the simpler language of the papyrus as contrasted with the more literary and elaborated phrase τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα πατήσητε, (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 ἀσχυνθῆτε with something like καὶ ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἕν, καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυς. The meaning in either case being that Christ's kingdom on earth would not be manifested until man had returned to the state of innocence which existed before the Fall, and in which sexual ideas and relations had no place. The chief differences between the two passages are (1) the setting, the questioner being in the Gospel according to the Egyptians Salome, and in the papyrus the disciples, (2) the simpler language of the papyrus as contrasted with the more literary and elaborated phrase τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα πατήσητε, (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 ἀσχυνθῆτε with something like καὶ ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἕν, κ.τ.λ., is of course uncertain, but Fr. (a), which probably belongs to the bottom of this column, is concerned with something different.

25. φωτεινός: the corrector's spelling φωτεινόν is commoner than φωτινόν. Perhaps this passage was parallel to Matt. vi. 22-3 (Sermon on the Mount) ἐὰν δὲ ὁ φιλθαμὸς σου ἄπλον, δὸν το σώμα σου φωτεινὸν ἔσται, κ.τ.λ.; cf. Luke xi. 34-6. But the papyrus must in any case have differed largely in its language, and κόσμῳ (9) in L 26 suggests a Johannine colouring.

30. The Λ of Α€{ project somewhat, but since the whole column trends 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 ἀοί
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 τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα πατήσῃς, 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 αἰσχυνθῆτε there is no security that ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἕν, 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 ἡ βασιλεία), and is put into the mouth of τούτων 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 abridgement 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 ἔνδυμα πατήσητε. 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 Agōrapha (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 (Agōrapha, 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... πατήσητε 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 γίνεσθαι τὰ δύο ἐν, 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 Agōrapha.

656. GENESIS.

Height 24·4 cm. Plate II (c 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 uncials 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 θεός, κύριος, &c., but this may of course be no more than an individual peculiarity. The only abbreviation that occurs is the horizontal stroke instead of », 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 (N) 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 (=), are unascertainable in xx. 4-11 and xxiv. 28-30, 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 N, A, or D, though, of course, too little of N 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-Lucianic, but it has two readings characteristic of Lagarde’s Lucianic group (=Holmes 19, 108, 118), γένους for τοῦ γένους in xix. 38 and the omission of ἐκείθερ (with the Hebrew) in xxiv. 38. Readings common to this group and other cursives are ἐκεῖνη for ταύτῃ in xix. 33, and αὐτῷ for ἀνθρωπον in xx. 8. On the other hand, the papyrus opposes the Lucianic group in the addition of τῇ νυκτα ἐκεῖνη in xix. 35, and the omission of ἐφοβήθην... αὐτῇ 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.

recto xv. 5–9.

( ) [ABpap Sos] μοι τους ανδρας την δε γενοσ εσεν
των σαι σατων εο αμπρι σατων
κατ επιστευν ιτην δε ἱππος λαβε σεαυτω
[πα μου προς την θεον των υπ]
[μυισθον ος εκτισεν τουν ουρα]
[των εως σφαιρωτηρος]

(b) Verso xix. 32–xx. 2.

recto xx. 2–11.

μετ αυτον και εξαναστησω
μεν εκ του πατρος ημων σπερ
μα εποτισαμενε δε τον πατερα

25 αυτων οινον εν τη νυκτι εκει
νη και εισελθουσα η πρεσβυτε

[δε Αμιβελεχ β]ασιλευς Γερα

65 [προς και ελαβεν την Σαρρα και]
[εισηλθεν ο θεος] προς Αμιβε

[λεχ εν υπνω την] νυκτα και ει
[πεν ιδου συ αποβησκεισ πε]
The text is in ancient Greek and contains a fragment of a religious narrative. It discusses various episodes and events, possibly from biblical or other religious contexts. The text is dense and requires careful study for understanding its full context. The specific details and context of the text are not immediately clear from the snippet provided.
\( \text{THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI} \)

[Σα]ρρας τής γυνα[ίκο]ς αυτού
[αδε]λφή μου εσ[τίν] α[πιστεί]λεν

\[ \varepsilon \]ποίησας τούτο εἰπεν δὲ Αβρααμ
[εἰ]πα γαρ [α]ρα οὐκ εστίν θεο[σεβεία
[ε]ν τώ τοπῷ τούτῳ εμὲ τίς απὸ

115 [κτείν]ωσίν ενεκεν τής γυ[ναί]

(c) Recto xxiv. 28–37.

δραμοῦσα η παῖς απηγγείλε[ν]
eis τον οἰκον τὴν μητρος αυτῆς

ta κατα ρηματα ταυτα τη δε Ρεβεκ

110 κα [α]βελ[φ]ος ην ω ωνομα Λαβαν
και εδραμεν Λαβαν προς τον αν
θρωπον εξω επι της πηγῆς και
eγενετ[ο] η[νικα ειδεν τα ευνοια
ta και τα ψελια περι τας χειρας της

αδελφης αυτου και ετ[ε] η[κου

σεν τα ρηματα Ρεβε[κ]κας της της
αδ[ε]λφης [αυτου] λεγουσης ου
tως λελαιηη[η]κεν μοι ο ανθρωπος και
και ε[θή]ς [πρ]ος τον ανθρωπον ε

120 στηκοτος αυτου επι των καμη
ltων επι της πηγης και ειπε[ν αυ

το δ]ευρο εισελθε ευλογητος κύριος

ινα τα εστηκας εξω εγω δε ητη[ι]

μακα την οικιαν και τοπον ταις

αδελφοις εισηλθεν δε ανθρω

πος εις τη[ν]ν ο[ικια]ν και απεσαε[ν

τας κα][μη[λους και αδωκεν αχυρα[και χορ][σαματα ταις καμηλοις]
και ου[δορ] τοις ποσιν αυτου και τ[οις

130 [ποσι] των ανθρω[πων του] με[τ] αμ
[tou και παρθηγεκεν

3 lines lost

Verso xxiv. 38–47.

150

[πο]ρευση και εις την φυ[λη]ν μου
και ηλημψη γυναικα των υιω μου

155 και ειπεν μοι ο θεος ο ευνοε[τη]

160 αν εναι αυτου αυτος απο

στηλει τον αγγελου αυτου με

165 ο αυτου εκ της φυλης μου εκ του

οικου του πατρος μου τοτε αθω

ος εση απο της αρας η[μιν ηρας]

τα εισελθηε εις την ημην

170 ουαι και μη σοι δωσιν και εση αθω

αριθμητος απο του ορκου μου και ελθ[θ]ον

[ση]μερον εσι την πηγην ει[πα κω

[με ο θε]ος του κυριου μου Αβρααμ

[ευοδοις την ονομα μου η[μιν εγου]

[πορευση και εις την φυλης μου

175 [δωρ] ει[κ]η[ς υδριασ] σου και ειπη

[μοι πις σου και ταις καμηλοις σου υ]
656. THEOLOGICAL FRAGMENTS

135 \[\text{[\text{καί} \text{Αβρααμ]} \text{εγω} \text{ει}μι} \ldots \ldots \ldots \text{τον} \text{κυριον} \text{[\text{μου} \text{σφοδρα}}
\text{και} \text{υψωθη} \text{[\text{και} \text{εδ[ωκεν} \text{αντω}}
\text{προβατα} \text{και} \text{μοσχοις} \text{και}}
\text{γ} \text{αργυριον} \text{και} \text{π[αιδισκας} \text{και}}
\text{[\text{μου} \text{Αβρααμ]} \text{και} \text{γενετο} \text{εν} \text{τω}}\]
\text{συντελεσαι} \text{με} \text{λαλουντα} \text{εν} \text{τη}
\text{διανοια} \text{ευθυς} \text{[\text{P[\text{εβεκκα} \text{ε[ς}}}
\text{[\text{ρευετο} \text{ε[ουσ}α την} \text{υδηριαν} \text{επι}}
\text{[\text{των} \text{ωμ[ν} \text{και} \text{[\text{τεθη} \text{επι}}\text{τηχνη}
\text{πηγη[ν} \text{και} \text{υδερευσατο} \text{ειτα} \text{δε} \text{αυ}
\text{[\text{τη} \text{πο}τισον} \text{και} \text{και} \text{σπευσασα} \text{και}
\text{θελε]ν} \text{την} \text{υδηριαν} \text{αφ} \text{αυτης} \text{και}
\text{ειπε]ν} \text{πει]ε} \text{και} \text{και} \text{και} \text{και}
\text{[\text{λο]ς} \text{μου} \text{εποτισε} \text{και} \text{και} \text{και}
\text{[\text{ντη]} \text{μου} \text{και} \text{και} \text{και} \text{και}}
\text{2 lines lost}

\[\text{[\text{δρευσομαι} \text{αντη}} \text{[\text{η} \text{γυνη} \text{ην} \text{ητοι}}
\text{μασεν} \text{κυριοσ} \text{τα} \text{θεραποντι} \text{αντου}
\text{[\text{Ισαακ} \text{και} \text{εν} \text{τουτω} \text{γυνωσομαι} \text{ο}}
\text{[\text{τι} \text{πετοη]} \text{και} \text{ελε[ς} \text{τω} \text{κυριω}}
\text{[\text{μου} \text{Αβρααμ]} \text{και} \text{γενετο} \text{εν} \text{τω}}
\text{συντελεσαι} \text{και} \text{λαλουντα} \text{εν} \text{τη}
\text{διανοια} \text{ευθυς} \text{[\text{P[\text{εβεκκα} \text{ε[ς}}}
\text{[\text{ρευετο} \text{ε[ουσ}α την} \text{υδηριαν} \text{επι}}
\text{[\text{των} \text{ωμ[ν} \text{και} \text{[\text{τεθη} \text{επι}}\text{τηχνη}
\text{πηγη[ν} \text{και} \text{υδερευσατο} \text{ειτα} \text{δε} \text{αυ}
\text{[\text{τη} \text{πο}τισον} \text{και} \text{και} \text{σπευσασα} \και}
\text{θελε]ν} \text{την} \text{υδηριαν} \text{αφ} \text{αυτης} \και}
\text{ειπε]ν} \text{πει]ε} \και \και \και \και
\text{[\text{λο]ς} \text{μου} \text{εποτισε} \και} \text{και} \και \και
\text{[\text{ντη]} \text{μου} \text{και} \text{και} \και \και}

\[\text{[\text{δρευσομαι} \text{αντη}} \text{[\text{η} \text{γυνη} \text{ην} \text{ητοι}}
\text{μασεν} \text{κυριοσ} \text{τα} \text{θεραποντι} \text{αντου}
\text{[\text{Ισαακ} \text{και} \text{εν} \text{τουτω} \text{γυνωσομαι} \text{ο}}
\text{[\text{τι} \text{πετοη]} \text{και} \text{ελε[ς} \text{τω} \text{κυριω}}
\text{[\text{μου} \text{Αβρααμ]} \text{και} \text{γενετο} \text{εν} \text{τω}}
\text{συντελεσαι} \text{και} \text{λαλουντα} \text{εν} \text{τη}
\text{διανοια} \text{ευθυς} \text{[\text{P[\text{εβεκκα} \text{ε[ς}}}
\text{[\text{ρευετο} \text{ε[ουσ}α την} \text{υδηριαν} \text{επι}}
\text{[\text{των} \text{ωμ[ν} \text{και} \text{[\text{τεθη} \text{επι}}\text{τηχνη}
\text{πηγη[ν} \text{και} \text{υδερευσατο} \text{ειτα} \text{δε} \text{αυ}
\text{[\text{τη} \text{πο}τισον} \text{και} \text{και} \text{σπευσασα} \και}
\text{θελε]ν} \text{την} \text{υδηριαν} \text{αφ} \text{αυτης} \και}
\text{ειπε]ν} \text{πει]ε} \και \και \και \και
\text{[\text{λο]ς} \text{μου} \text{εποτισε} \και} \text{και} \και \και

1. \[\text{[\text{Αβρααμ} \text{δο}ι] is somewhat short for the lacuna, but to add \text{προς} \text{would make the}
\text{supplement rather long.}
4. \text{The deletion of \text{ι} may be due to either the first or second hand; \text{εκτενο} \text{AD.}}
13. \text{προς} \text{αντω}: \text{so most cursives; \text{αντω}} \text{AD.} \text{The \text{ε} \text{of \text{εγιω} seems to have been}
\text{altered from some other letter.}
16. \[\text{[\text{κΙληρονομησαι: so A; κλ, αντη D.}}
17. \text{A blank space, sufficient for four letters, was left by the original scribe between \text{τα}
\text{και, and in this \text{κυριος} was inserted by the second hand; cf. ll. 122, 155, and 166.}
25. \text{εκειόν: so a number of cursives, including the 'Lucianic' group; \text{ταυτη} \text{ADE.}}
27. \text{αυτης which is read after \text{πατρος} by \text{ADE seems to have been omitted by the}
D
papyrus, the line being quite long enough without it. On the other hand τὴν νυκτα εκεινην is omitted in D.

28. εδη: the same spelling for ηδε recurs in l. 43; εγνω D in both places.

32. τὴ νεωτερα: so the Codex Caesareus and several cursive; προς τὴν νεωτεραν ADE. 

36. μ of μετ has been altered from α.

37-8. εκ... [σπερμα: so AD; σπ. εκ του π. νεωτεραν 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 τὴ νεωτερα, but there is no ground for attributing this to the papyrus.

56 (margin), 74, 106, 130, 134, 135.

43. εδη: cf. l. 28, note.

47. There would be room for two or three more letters in this line.

56-7. εκινησεν Se: και εκινησεν ADE. There is not sufficient room in the lacuna for the usual ν εφελκυστικων, still less for το.

57. προς Ba: 580 AD 3 ews λιβα E.

62. A has οτι 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 εφοβηθη γαρ ειπε (οτι) γυνη μου εστιν μη ποτε αποκτεινωσιν αυτον οι ανδρες της πολεως δι αυτην (ADE), as do the cursives 15 (first hand), 82, 106, 107, 135.

64. Αβιμελεχ or Αβιμελεχ is the regular spelling of the name in this text. Αβιμελεχ ADE.

67. There is evidently not room in the lacuna for A's reading επεν αυτω ιδου συ αποβηθηκες, and the omission of αυτω is more probable (so DE and many cursive) than that of συ (om. E).

74. E inserts οτι before αδελφη here and αδελφος in l. 75.

79. καθαρα καθαρα: so A; καρδια καθαρα E.

80. εφοβηθη γαρ εφοβηθην Α, εφοβηθην E.

81. Καιω (εγνω 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.

αμαρτειν, the reading of the first hand, is that of AE.

86. ζηση: so A; ζησει E.

93. ανδρες: so a number of cursive; ανδρεσ ΑΕ.

104. τε: so Α; 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 ἀποκτείνουσι was corrected to ἀποκτείνεσθαι than vice versa. ἀποκτείνουσι ΛΕ; ἀποκτείνεσθαι occurs in the cursive 72; cf. l. 165, note.

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

112. τῆς πηγῆς: τῆν πηγὴν A. The genitive seems to have come in from the next verse.

113. εἶδον: εἶδον Α.

114. περί: ἐπὶ A, ἐν τοῖς χερσὶ a number of the cursives.

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

123. ητίοιμα: so ΝΔ; ητοιμάσα Α.

126. απεσαΐετε: so ΝΔ; απεσαΐετε Α.

129. The papyrus agrees with A in omitting εὐφασθα which ΝΔ add after υδάρω.

135-6. The reading of the papyrus here cannot be determined; ΝΔ have κύριος ἔσχεν, D [κύριος ἔσχε] κύριος ἔσχεν or εὐφασθαν 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.

A has προδότα καὶ μοσχὸν καὶ ἀργυρὸν καὶ χρυσὸν παιδᾶς καὶ παιδισκὰς καμηλοὺς καὶ οἰνοῦ, D leaves out the καὶ after μοσχὸν, transposes ἀργυρὸν καὶ χρυσὸν καὶ inserts καὶ before παιδᾶς. It is just possible that the papyrus agreed with D in reading μοσχὸν χρυσὸν καὶ, but παιδᾶς καὶ παιδισκὰς καὶ can evidently not be got into l. 139, and more probably both χρυσὸν and καὶ παιδᾶς 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 υἱῦν and that ἔνα was omitted, as in D.

143. αὐτὸν: or αὐτῆν (D).

144. The length of the lacuna indicates that the text agreed with D and the second corrector of Ν in adding παιαμα before the simple σοι of ΝΑ.

152. After με αμο ΝΔ add εκεῖθεν. The papyrus here supports the ‘Lucianic’ cursives 19 and 108.

154. πορευθησέται: so a number of cursives; πορευθῇ Α, πορευεσται ΝΔ.

155. ο θεὸς: κυρίος ο θεὸς Α, ομ. ο θεὸς ΝΔ.

156. ενακτον: so ΛΔ and the second corrector of Ν; ενακτον Ν. ἀποστελεῖ: so ΝΔ; ἐξαποστελεῖ Α.

160. η: καί MSS.

161. απὸ: so ΝΔ; εκ Α.

163. αἰσθῆτε: αἰθῆε ΑΔ.

164. δοξῆς: this is the order in many of the cursives; δοξῆν σοι ΛΔ. καὶ before εἰσῃ is omitted by D.

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

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

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

170. της πηγης: SOND; την πηγην A.

171. και αι; so D; και αι NA.

172. εξελευσονται: so ΑΔ; εκπορευονται Ν. The papyrus seems to have had ανυλησαι, which is found in some of the cursives; υδρευναι, the better supported reading, is too long.

174. [εα]ς: the papyrus follows the vulgar spelling. εω was originally omitted, and was added by the second hand.

μεικρον 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 μου may have been written at the end of l. 175, and the variant of Ν πιε και ου or of Δ και ου πιε is quite possible.

178. δσατοι αυτου (Ν) seems more likely than εαυτου δσατοι (ΑΔ), for though the supposed θ may equally well be ε the line is already rather long and the lacuna in l. 179 is sufficiently filled with Ισαακ και.

181. εν τω: προ του ΝΑ, πριν η D.

185. Though the κ of και is not quite certain and still less the α of κατεβη, the papyrus clearly agreed with ΑΔ in omitting αυτης which is read after αυτης by Ν.

188. A here has την υδριαν επι του βραχωα αυτης αφ εαυτης και ειπε, while ΝΔ omit επι του βραχωα. 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.

187. μεικρον is also the spelling of δω.

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 668, 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 στίχοι 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 ἵνα. Orthography is not a strong point, instances of the confusion common at this period between ι and ει, η and α, ι and αι, 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 Ν 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.

\[\text{καταργησῃ τοῦ} \text{ τὸ κράτος} \text{ εὐοῦντα} \text{ τὸ} \text{ θανάτου} \]
\[\text{τουτεστὶ} \text{ τοῦ} \text{ διαβολοῦ} : \text{ καὶ} \text{ απαλλαξῆ} \text{ του} \]
\[\text{τοὺς οἱ} \text{ φόβῳ} \text{ θανάτου} \text{ διὰ} \text{ παντὶ} \text{ τῶν} \text{ τῶν} \text{ ζήν} \]
\[\text{5 [νοχοὶ} \text{ ήσαν} \text{ δοῦλειας} : \text{ οὐ γαρ} \text{ δὴ} \text{ ποὺ} \text{ αγγελῶν} \]
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[epί1αμβανεται] αλλα σπερματος Αβρααμ επι
[αρμβανεται οθεν ωφιλεν κατα παντα τους α]
[δελφοις ομωθηναι : ινα ελεημον γενηται
[και πιστος αρχη]ρευς τα προς τον θυ εις το ειλαο
10 [κεσθαι τας αμαρτιας του λαου : εν ω γαρ πεπον
[θεν αυτος πιρασθεις : δυναται τοις πιραζομε
[νοις βοηθησαι οθεν αδελφοι αγιοι κλησεως ε
[πομανιου μετοχιου : κατανοησατε τον αποστολο
[και αρχηρεια της ομολογιας ημων ιν πιστον οντα
15 [το ποιησαντι αυτων : ως κε Μωυσης εν τω οικω
[αυτου πλειονος γαρ δοξης ουτος παρα Μωυσην
[ηξωται καθ ο]αυτον πλειονα τιμην εχει του [ο]ικου : ο
[κατασκευασας αυτων : πας γαρ οικος κατασκα
[αζεται υπο τινος : ο δε παντα κατασκευασας : δες
20 [και Μωυσης μεν πιστος εν ωλο τω οικω αυτου
[ως θεραπων εις μαρτυριων : των λαληθσμοε
[νουν Χυ δε] οι ωριος επι του οικου αυτου ου οικος
[εσμεν ημει]ς : ειν την παρρησιαν και το καυχη
[μα της ελπιδος κατασκωμεν : διο καθως λεγει
25 [το πνα το αγιου σημερον εαν της φωνης αυτου
[ακουση]τηι η γινηνηνες τας καρδιας υμων
[ως εν τω παραπεμψαμε κατα την ημεραν του
[πιρασμου εν τη ορισμω υπερ ημεραν αν πατερες υμω

Col. ii.

μη
30 εν δικιασαι και ειδον τα εργα μου τεσσερακοντα
ετη [διβο προσωκθεισα τη γενεα ταυτη και ειπ]ον
αει [πλα]νω[ηται εν τη καρδια αυτων διο ουκ εγνωςαν
τας οδους μο]υ ως ομωσα εν τη οργη μου ει εισ][ε
λευσουν]ται εις] την καταπαυσιν μου : βλεπεται αιδει
35 φοι μη] ποτε εστε εν τινι υμων καρδια πονηρα
[απιστια]σι : εν τω αποστηναι απο θυ ζωντως : αλ ]
[λα] πα]ρακαλεσαι εαυτους καθ εκαστην ημε
40 [χοίρ] γαρ τον Χ' εγενναμένον εαυτήν ἐστιν τῆς φίλης ἀπατής καταπαυτείς ὁ Κυρίος ἐν τῷ Αἴγυπτῳ. Τεσσαράκοντα δὲ ἔτη οὐκ ἠμαρτήσαν τις αὐτῷ· ὡς εἰς τὸν κόσμον γενηθεῖν.
Ἴππος ἔργον περὶ τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν Καρδιῶν υἱῶν ἡμέρας. ἐκ τῶν ἀποθητῶν οὐκ ἔτι ἀντικατέστησεν ἡμείς τὴν καταπαύσιν αὐτοῦ. Διαφέρει δὲ ἡ σοφία καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἦν κτισμὸς ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. Καὶ οὐκ εἶναι γυμναὶ καὶ τετράχρησται τοσοῦτοι ἀφίθαιας. Θεὸς τοὺς θυσίας ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μετριοπαθεῖς διὰ τῶν ἀγνωστῶν καὶ πλανωμένων εἰς πρὸς τὸν θυσίαν προσφέρῃσθαι οὐ μόνον τῷ θυσιῶν μετριοπαθεῖς διὰ τῶν αἴγνοστων καὶ πλανωμένων εἰς πρὸς τὸν θυσίαν προσφέρῃσθαι. Θεὸς τοὺς θυσίας ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μετριοπαθεῖς διὰ τῶν αἴγνοστων καὶ πλανωμένων εἰς πρὸς τὸν θυσίαν προσφέρῃσθαι o ναμένος τοὺς αὐτοὺς καὶ πλανωμένοις ἐπει

Col. iv. 12

ν ἐκ τῶν θυσίων μετα τοσοῦτον χρόνον καὶ δικαιομένοις αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς αὐτῶν διστομον καὶ δικαιομένοις αὐτῶν ποτὲ αὐτῶν μυελοὺς καὶ κίριτικοὺς ἐνθυμησεων καὶ ἅνων καρδεῖας: καὶ οὐκ εἶναι γυμναὶ καὶ τετράχρησται τοσοῦτοι ἀφίθαιας. Θεὸς τοὺς θυσίας ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μετριοπαθεῖς διὰ τῶν αἴγνοστων καὶ πλανωμένων εἰς πρὸς τὸν θυσίαν προσφέρῃσθαι οὐ μόνον τῷ θυσιῶν μετριοπαθεῖς διὰ τῶν αἴγνοστων καὶ πλανωμένων εἰς πρὸς τὸν θυσίαν προσφέρῃσθαι.
καὶ αὐτὸς περὶ ἰκεῖται ἀσθενείαν καὶ δι’ αὐτὴν
οὕλει καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ οὕτως καὶ περὶ εαυτοῦ
πρὸς ἀμαρτίων καὶ οὐχ εἰ

105 αὐτῷ τὸ ἱερὸν τὴν τιμὴν ἀλλὰ καλοῦμεν
ναὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ [θὺ οὕτως καὶ οἱ] Ἱσο οὐχ εαυτοῦ εἴδο
ἐσεν γενν[θέναι αρχιερεῖα ἀλλὸς] ὁ λαλήσας

12 columns lost.

Col. v.

[προσφέρονται το]περετελεῖν ἀμαρτίαν : οὔτος δὲ [μιᾶν ν]
[περὶ ἀμαρτίων] προσενέκας θυσίαν εἰς τὸ δηνεκές
[εικάθησαν εἰς δεξιά] τοῦ ἃ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδικόμενός
[εἰς τὸ ἐροὶ οὐποδίσιον τῶν ποδίς οὐδὲν αὐτοῦ]
[μιᾶ γαρ προσφορὰ περετελεικεν εἰς τὸ δηνεκῆς τοὺς
115 [δυναται] περιελεῖν ἁμαρτίαν : οὔτος δὲ [μιᾶν ν]
[περὶ αμαρτίων] προσενέκας θυσίαν εἰς τὸ δηνεκές
[εικάθησαν εἰς δεξιά] τοῦ ἃ τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδικόμενός
[εἰς τὸ ἐροὶ οὐποδίσιον τῶν ποδίς οὐδὲν αὐτοῦ]
[μιᾶ γαρ προσφορὰ περετελεικεν εἰς τὸ δηνεκῆς τοὺς
120 [ἀγιασμένοι]ς : μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ημεῖς καὶ τὸ πινακί
tὸ αἰγίνυ μετὰ γαρ τὸ εἰρήκειαν αὐτὴ δὲ τῇ διάθηκη
tὴν διάθηκαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετὰ τας ἡμερὰς εἰς
[να]ς λεγεῖ καὶ διὸς νομοὶ μου ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῷ
[καὶ ἐπὶ τῇ διάνοιαν αὐτῶν [λα]] εἰς γραφὲς αὐτοὺς
125 [καὶ τῶν αμ]αρτίων καὶ [τ]ῶν ανομίων αὐτῶν οὐ μι
[μηνισθοῦμαι εἰς ὑμῖν εἰς ἀφεισις τῶν το[π]ῶν οὐκ]
[ἐπὶ προσφορὰ περὶ αμαρτίαις : εἰσοδὸν αὐτῶν διὰ]
[διὰ τὰ παραφθοὶ τῶν αμαρτίων των αἰσθάνεται διὰ τῶν]
[ἀμαρτίων τοῦ ἤν τῶν ἀνομίων αὐτῶν]
130 [θυμὶ] τὸ καταπετασμός [που] εὐτυχὸς ἀμαρτίων καὶ ἡ ἔρεια μεγάν
[ἐπὶ] τοῦ οἰκον τῷ θύμῳ προσφέρωμεν μετὰ
ποίσω δοκεῖτε χειρονος αξιωθησεται τιμωριας ο τον υ[αν]ον [θυ καταπατησας και το αιμα της διαθηκης

135 κοινον ηγησομενος εν ω ηγιασθη και το πνα της χαριτως ενυρισας οιδαμεν τοι αυτοι φοβερον το εμπεσεν εις χειρας θυζωντος : [αναμιμνησκεσθε δε τας προτερον ημε]

140 ρος εν α[ις φωτισθεντες πολην αθλησιν υπεμεινατε παθηματων τουτο μεν ονειδισμοι τε και θλιψειν

Col. vii.

ξδ

[θεα]τρις οι : τουτο δε κοινωνια των ουτως [αναστρεφομενων γενηθεστε : και γαρ τοις δεσ]


[του]ς αιωνας ηματι δυε εις το μη εκ φιλομενων το

160 [βλη]πομενον γεγονηναι : πιστει πλειονα δευσιν Αβελα
165 o ὃς: πρὸ γὰρ τῆς μεταβεσσεως μεμαρτυρηται ευηρεστηκε

Col. viii.

[ξε]

ναί τω θῶ [χαιρε δὲ πιστεως αδύνατον ευαρεστησαι πιστευσαι γὰρ δει τον προσερχομενον θῶ ναὶ εἰς εστὶν καὶ τοις ἑξήτουσιν αὐτὸν μισθαποδοτὴς γίνεται πιστει

170 χρηματισθείς Νομε περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομενῶν ευλαβηθεὶς κατεσκευασεν κιβωτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ [δι' ἵδειν θανατὸν καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκετο διότι μετεθηκεν αἴνετο μὸ 

o Os : μπη τῆς μεταθεσεως μεμαρτυρηται ευηρεστηκε

175 λεν λαμβάνειν εἰς κληρονομιαν καὶ εξηλθεν μὴ επι σταμενον π’ οὐ ερχεται πιστει παρωκέσω εἰς γῆν τῆς επαγγελιας ἐξίεδεχετο yap τὴν τοὺς θεμελιους εχουσαν πο ἡσικὸν καὶ ἴακόμεν τῶν συνκληρονομων εἰς επαγγελιας της αὐτῆς : εξιδεχητο γαρ την τους θεμελιους εχουσαν πο

180 λιν : ἡς τεχνίτης καὶ δημιουργὸς ο ὃς πιστει καὶ αὐτης αρρα δυναμίν εἰς καταβολὴν σπερματος ελαβεν καὶ πα ρα καιρον ἡλικιας επει πιστου ἡγησατο τον επαγγελιαμ

νον διο καὶ αφ ενος εγεννηθησαν καὶ ταῦτα γενεκρω μενου : καὶ ὅσα τα αστρα του ουρανον τω πληθει και

185 ὡς ἡ αμοι ἡ [παρα το χείλους της θαλασσης η αναριθμητος κατα πιστιν αἴπεθανον ουτοι παντες μη κομισαμενοι τας [ε]παγγελειας αλλα πορρωθεν αυταις ἵδοτες και ας [π]ασαινειν καὶ ομολογησαντες οτι ξενοι και παρεπιδημοι [ε]ισιν επι της γῆς

1 column lost.
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Col. ix.

190
εξ
[πρωτοτοκα θιγη αίρτων : πιστει διεβήσαν την Ερυθραν xì. 28
[θαλασσαν ως δια ξηρας γης : η[ς] πειραν λαβοντες οι Αιγι
[πτιοι κατεποθήσαν] πιστει τα τιχη Ιεριχω επεσαν κυκλω
[θεντα ειτα ημερας : πιστει Πααβ τη πορην ου συνηπω
195 [λετο τοις απιθησασιν] δεξαμενη τους κατασκοπους μετ'
[ειρηνης και τι ετι λει]γω επιλυψει γαρ με διηνομενον ο χρο
[νος περι Γεδεων Βαρ[ακ' Σαμψω Ιεβθαε Δανιελ' τε και Σαμουη]
[και των προφητων] οι δια πιστεως καπγουνοιαντο βασιλειας
[ηργασαντο δικαιουσι]ην : επετυχον επαγγελλων [:] εφρα
200 [ξαν στοματα λεοντων : εσβεσαν δυναμιν πυρος [:] εφυ
[γον στοματα μαγισ]ης : εδυναμωθησαν απο ασθενει
[ας εγενηθησαν ει]χυρων εμε πολεμοι παρεμβολαι εκειν
[νον αλλοτριων ει]αβον γυνεκε[ι.] εξ ανασταισων τους
[νεκρους αυτων α]υλλοι δε ετοιμα]νισθησαν ου προσοδεια
205 [μενοι την απολυτ]ρωσιν ινα κρειττοιοι αναστασεως
[τυχωσιν ετεροι δε] εμπεγμων και ταστειγων πειραι
[ελαιβον ετι δε δεσμων και φυλακης : ελιβασθησαν
[επισθε]σαν ετι]λαβον ευθυνοιι [και μηλωταιν εγιοις δερμα
210 [σιν υπερομοιον]ι θελιβομενοι : κακουχομενοι
[ον ουκ ευ και αγιους] ο [κο]σμοι : επι ερμηνειας πλανωμε
[νοι και ορει και στηλεις και ταις οπαις η]γης : και
[ουτου παντες μαρτυρ]θεντες δια της πιστεως ουκ εκμη
[σαντο την επι]γειαλ]ειαν του θυ περι ημων κριτων
215 [τι προβλεψαμενοι ινα μη] χωρις ημων τελειωθωσε[ι]
[τοιγαρουν και] ημεις τοσουτον εγντες περικεμενον

Col. x.

ην
ημιν γεφος μαρτυρων ογκον : αποθεμενοι παντα και
την ευπεριστατον αμαρτειαν δι υπομονης τρεχων το

xi. 28
220 προκειμένον ἡμεῖς ἁγώνα ἀφορούμε τις τον τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγόν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ίν οὐ αντι τῆς προκειμένης αυτῷ χαρᾶς ὑπερεινεν τον σταυρὸν ἀισχύνης καταφρονησάς εἰς δεξιὰ τε τοῦ θρονοῦ τοῦ δὲ κεκαθικέν τις ὑπομενεν τῷ καθίσματι τῶν αμαρτωλῶν. εἰς αὖ τους αντιλογίαν ἵνα μὴ καμήσῃ τοις ψυχαῖς εκκλήσμενοι νοι οὐσίως μερίς αἰτικατεστητε πρὸς τὴν αἱματοκρατίαν ἄγων γίνομεν καὶ εκκλησθαι τῆς παρακλήσεως ητὶς ὑμεῖς ὡς ὑμεῖς διαλεγεῖται ὑπὸ μοῦ μὴ ὁλιγωρεῖς παϊδεῖς ἀς καὶ μη ἐγγύθην ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ εἰκονομητος : οὐ γαρ αἱματοκρατίας ὑπομενεῖ των αμαρτωλῶν ἵνα μη καμήτω τοις ψυχαῖς εκλελυμενοι : οὕπω μεχρὶ αἰματοκρατοῦν τοις διαλεγεῖται : εἰς τοὺς μεν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πιστεύσαοι εἰς ὑμεῖς αὐτοῖς ἀναλογίζεται : εἰς τοὺς μη αὐτοῖς ἀναλογίζεται αὐτοῖς παντεῖς ὑμεῖς προσφέρεται εἰς τοὺς μη αὐτοῖς παντεῖς ὑμεῖς προσφέρεται τῇ αἰματοκρατίᾳ τοῦ θυ μη νεκροῦ ὑπὸ καὶ τοῦ αἰματοκρατοῦν τοῦ θυ μη νεκροῦ δικαιοσύνης διὸ τας παρειμενας χειρας καὶ τὰ παρακλήσεις μὲν παιδευτας καὶ ενετρεπομεθα : οὐ πολὺ δὲ μαλ λον ὑποτάγησομεθα τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευματος καὶ ἡ σομεν : οἱ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς ὅλιγας ἡμερας κατα τὸ δοκοῦ αὐτοῖς επιαιδεύον : ο ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον εἰς τὸ μετα λαβεῖν τῆς αἰγιντατῆς αὐτοῦ : πασα δὲ παῖδεια προος ἐπὶ τὸν εἰρηνικὸν τοῖς δι αὐτῆς γεγυμνασμένοις αποδίδωσι
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τε γαρ οτι και μετεπειτα θελων κληρονομησαι την ευλογι

14. l(ησου)ν: so ABCD, &c., W-H.; Χριστου Ιησου EKL, &c., T-R.
15. εν τω οικω: so B; εν αλω τω οικω SACDE, &c., T-R., W-H. αλω may have come in from verse 5.
16. δοξης: so KLM, &c., T-R.; δοξα ιησου ντος SACDE, &c., W-H.
19. πνευμα: so SACDGM, &c., W-H.; τη π. EL, &c., T-R.
23. επω: so BE, &c., W-H.; επερε AC, &c., T-R. κ of καθημερα has been altered apparently from χ.
24. επι εδοσ κατασχομεν: so B; επι μεχρι τελους βεβαιαν κατασχομεν SACDE, &c., T-R., W-H. The phrase μεχρι τελους βεβαιαν κατασχομεν recurs in verse 14 and may have come in from here in that passage.
31. προσωκεθαι: l. προσώχθαι; the θ has been altered from τ.
32. εν τη καιρα αυτων διο: τη καιρα αυτοι de 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. παρακαλεσατε is another otherwise unattested reading: παρακαλετε MSS.
38. εν τω ημων: so M; ενερε other MSS., T-R., W-H.
42. A double point may be lost after σχομεν.
50. παίραϊκεςατε is another otherwise unattested reading: παρακαλετε MSS.
52. The first ε of εισελευηθειν is written over a double point.
58. συνκεκραιμενος: so ABCD, &c., W-H. in text; συνκεκραιμενος Ν, W-H. mg., συγκεκραμενος T-R.
59. γαρ: so BDE, &c.; γαρ SAC.
60. την was certainly omitted before καταπαυσω as in BD; την is found in other MSS. and is read by W-H. and T-R.
63. την: γαρ την T-R., W-H. with all MSS. except 1091st- which agrees with the papyrus in omitting γαρ.
64. καθεπαυσες is a mistake for καθεπαυσεσ.
66. εισελευσοινται: so D and some cursives; ει εισελευσονται other MSS., T-R., W-H.
70-1. The vestiges of την δεωσ are very slight, but are a sufficient indication that the papyrus read πρωμηται with SACDE, &c., W-H., rather than ειρηται (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. ευρωμεν: so SACDE, &c., T-R., W-H.; ευροθει B.
85. ειρωνων is for ειρωνων.
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 καθωσπερ (SABD) or καθωσπερ και (om, και CD) Λαιρων 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 ἐντῶς καὶ οἱ χριστοί; but even without these words the line would remain rather too long. To omit καθωσπερ καὶ Ααρων suits the space better and does not damage the sense.

112. The papyrus may of course have read αἵματος (DE) for σωμάτος and ἀρχιερεὺς (AC) for ἡμέρας (NDKEL).

115. αμαρτίας: αμαρτίας MSS.

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

118. εξήρει: εξήρει αυτὸν MSS. The superfluous ι in ποδῷν was a slip due to the preceding ἄποστολοι.

124. The scribe apparently began to write αὐτοὺς before εμπαιο, but that the a was meant to be deleted is not certain and its partial effacement may be accidental.

125-6. μἐμπαιοθάμαται: I, μ (μπαιόθαμα)μαι.

127. αμαρτίας: αμαρτίας MSS. The second ε of εχοντες has been altered from a.

129. τας προτεράς μερας: so T-R., W-H., with most MSS.; τας πρ. αμαρτίας Ν, τας προτεράς ἡμέρας D.

132. δεσμίωσι: so AD, W-H.; δεσμίως μου NEHKL, &c., T-R. We cannot of course be sure that the papyrus did not have δεσμίως, but the absence of μου is the important thing and is much in favour of δεσμίως.


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

152. χρονισει: so ND, W-H.; χρονιει AE, &c., T-R.

153-3. The papyrus certainly agreed with DE, &c., in omitting μου, which is found in ΝΑ after δικαιος. δικαιος μου W-H., δικαίος T-R.

153. πιστεως: πιστεω μου D.

154. μου η ψυχη: so DE; η ψ. μου T-R., W-H., with other MSS.

156. πραγματων εις αυτοτης (I. επαστατης) is the reverse order to that of all the MSS.; πραγματων is usually connected with βελτιμοευς.

157. αυτη: so two cursives (47, 115); εις αυτη other MSS., T-H., W-H.

159-60. το βελτιμοευς: so ΝΑ ΔΕ; τα βελτιμοευ ΚΛ, &c., T-R.

161. προστηρεσεν: προστηρεσεν τω θεω MSS.

162. αυτω τω θεω: αυτου was originally written but was altered to αυτω. αυτω τω θεω ΝΑΔ, αυτω τον θεου ΕΚΛ, &c., T-R., W-H.


165. ευσταθειου: so ΚΛ, &c., T-R.; ευσταθειου ΝΑΔΕ, W-H.

166. ευσταθιευς: so DE; ευστ. ΑΚΛ, W-H., T-R. If ευσταθιευς was correctly written this line was somewhat longer than those preceding.

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

169. ἐπικατινευς: so P only; εκπατινευς other MSS., T-R., W-H.

175. λαμβανειν εις Αλ.: the usual reading; Αλ. λαμβανειν Ν.

177. Ισα: also the spelling of D; Ισας other MSS., T-R., W-H.

180. αυτης | αφα is for αυτη Σαρρα. The papyrus agreed with ΝΑΕ, &c., in omitting στειρα or στειρα ουσα which is found after Σαρρα (or after δυναμιν or ελαζειν) in D and other MSS.
The Oxyrhynchus Papyri

182. It is practically certain that the papyrus did not read ετεκευ after ἡλικίας with EKL and other MSS. (so T-R.). It is omitted in NAD, W-H.

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

186. Considerations of space make κωμοσμενοι (N, &c., W-H.) preferable to λαβοντες (DE, &c., T-R.).

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

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

192. ἐνθα γή: so NADE, W-H.; om. γής KL, &c., T-R.

193. ἐπεσαν: so NAD, W-H.; ἐπεσε EKL, T-R.

194. τοι: ἐπεσαν πορη Ν.

196. γερ με: so EKL, &c., T-R.; με γερ NAD, W-H.

197. The papyrus agrees with Δ (so W-H.) in the omission of conjunctions between the names as far as Δανείδ. B. τε και Ε. και' I. T-R. with other MSS. The spelling Σαμφω is attested as a variant by D. The ι of Δανείδ was originally omitted; Δανείδ ND, W-H., Δαννί, Δαδ, and Δαδιδ (T-R.) other MSS.

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

211. τοι: so NA, W-H.; τον DE, &c., T-R.

212. τοι: Ν τρελουσαν.

221. του σταυρου: so D; om. του other MSS., T-R., W-H.

222. καθηκεν: so the uncial, W-H.; καθησεν T-R. with some minuscules.

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

224. αυτους: so a corrector of Δ; αυτως NDE, W-H., αυτυν Α, αυτον ΚΛ, T-R.

225. εκελευοι: so D; εκελευμοι other MSS., T-R., W-H.

226. μεχρις: so ἐνεκροις other MSS., T-R., W-H.

227. αγωνιζομενοι: αγωνιζομενοι MSS.

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

232. τοι γερ: so NA, W-H.; τοι γερ εστω DE, &c., T-R.

233. και ουχ εις εστε is also the order of NAD, W-H.; εστε κ. ο. κ. οι, KL, &c., T-R.

235. πολυ δε: δε is also attested as a variant by D and was added by the third corrector of N; πολυ NAD, W-H., πολλω ΚΛ, &c., T-R.

239. αγιοστης is a graphical error for αγιοστης. πασα δε is the reading of ΑΚΛ, &c., T-R.; πασα μεν N, &c., W-H.

241. The ε of ερχουκον has apparently been corrected and the η of αυτης was altered from ο or οι, which perhaps reflects the variant δε αυτων recorded in D; but it may well have been a mere slip.
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, *Sitzungsber. Berl. Akad.* 1893; Harnack, *Theol. Literaturz.* 1894, p. 38), the other at Vienna (Wessely, *Sitzungsber. Wien. Akad.* 1894; Harnack, *Theol. Literaturz.* 1894, p. 162). Both of those documents were from the Fayum; 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...
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 θυσιῶν ἡρημένοις, omitting ἱερῶν.

6. αἴ μέν is written in the original rather below the line and there are traces of ink over αἰ, 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, πανδημεὶ πάντας ἄνδρας ἅμα γυναῖξι καὶ ὡκείσι καὶ αὐτοῖς ὑπομαζίοις παινὶ θείων καὶ σπένδειν, 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, Παρθένειον and Ode.

Fragments of a roll containing parts of at least five columns of lyric poetry in Pindaric dialect, written in good-sized round uncialls, 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 (662); 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 comprising 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 (I. 29) the father of the Pagondas (I. 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 Δαφνηφορικά ὡς εἰς γένος 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 Παρθενείων 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 (I. 12), but, as is shown by the occurrence of a masculine participle (I. 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 Παρθένειον 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 χωρὶς ὅτι μὴ τὰ Παρθένεια καὶ εἴ τινα τούτων ὁμοίας ἀπαιτεῖ κατασκευάς διαφαίνεται δὲ τίς ὁμοία κἀν τούτοις εὐγένεια καὶ σεμνότης ἁρμονίας τῶν ἀρχαίων φωλάττουσα πίνων. Strophes and epodes consist alike of five verses having a prevailing choriambic element. The scheme is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strophes</th>
<th>Epodes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \overline{\text{ο}} \text{-} \overline{\text{x}} \text{-} \overline{\text{i}} \text{-} \overline{\text{α}} \text{-} \overline{\text{κωυ}} )</td>
<td>( \text{ο} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{ο} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} )</td>
<td>( \text{ο} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{ο} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} )</td>
<td>( \text{ο} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{ο} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} \text{-} \text{o} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We append the scheme of the metre:

**Strophes.**

- - - - -
- - - - - -
- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - |
- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - (.= 1. 5)

**Epodes.**

- - - - - -
- - - - - - -
- - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - -
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - (.= 1. 5)

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

Col. i.

[21 letters]

[21 letters]

[21 letters]

[21 letters]
Col. ii.

[-] ΧΡΥΣΟΠ[·]
[-] ΔΩΜ[·] ΔΕΚΕΟΤ[·] ΜΕ [·] ΤΙΟΓ[·] ΚΩ[·] ΤΙΟΝΑΚΡΙΝ[·]

25 ΑΛΑΣΩΣΑΜΕΝΕΤΕΠΣΟΝΩΚΕΣOCUS
ΧΕΡΚΙΝΣΤΗΝΜΑΛΑΚΑΙΧΙΝΟΡΠΑΚΑΓΙΑΟΝ
ΔΑΦΝΑΧΟΕΙΟΙΚΑΙΣΑΝ
ΔΟΣΗΝΙΟΛΑΔΑΧΤΩΜΟΝ

30 ΥΠΟΤΕΠΣΑΓΩΝΔΑ[·] ΥΜΗΝΗΧΩΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΙΟΘΑΛ
ΛΟΙΚΑΠΑΘΕΙΝΙΟΚΑΡΑ

35 ΜΗΜΗΧΟΜΑΙΩΙΑΙΚ[·]

Τ ΚΕΙΝΟΝΟΣΖΕΦΥΡΟΥΤΕΙΓΑΖΕΙΠΝΟΑΚ
ΛΙΨΗΡΑΣ ΟΠΟΤΑΝΤΕΧΕΙΙΜΩΝΟΙΩΝΘΕΝΕΙ
ΦΙΠΙΣΩΝΟΠΟΡΕΣΕΠΙ

40 ΥΠΕΡΧΗΝΗΚΟΥΛΟΝΤΕΠΟΝΤΟΥ

[-] ΠΑΝΕΤΑΡΑΞΕΚΑΙ

στρ. α'

στρ. β'

στρ. γ'

-Col. iii.

[·] ΦΕΝ[·]
[-] ΔΑΙΚΜ[·] ΖΩΝΗΑ[·] ΛΑΜΕΝ[·] ΑΠΑΡΟΙΘ[·] ΑΙΔΑΛΛΟΙΠΕΙΣΕΠΙΝΑΔΑ[·]

45 ΖΕΥΣΟΙΔΕΜΕΤΡΕΤΕΙ
ΠΑΡΘΕΝΗΛΑΜΕΝΦΡΟΝΕΙΝ
ΓΑΩΣΙΑΝΤΕΓΕΘΕΩΘΑΙ
ΑΝΔΡΟΣΟΥΤΕΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣΩΝΟΛΕΣΙΝΕΝ

— ə — ə ə χρυσοπ[·]πλ ə — ə —
— ə ə — ə — ə —
[πολ]ιά μεν [τ]ά πάροιθ ə — ə — — στρ. γ'/*
[δ]αίδαλλος ἐπεσειν τά ə ə ə — ə —

Zeus oĩ, ἐμὲ δὲ πρέπει
παρθενήμα μὲν φρονεῖν
γλώσσα τα λέγεσθαι.
ἀνδρός ə οὕτω γυναικὸς δὲν θάλεσσιν ἔγ- ἀντ. γ'
κειμαίχρημ[.]δαθείναιοιδάνπροσφορον·
50 πισταδατακεί
μαρτυχαλθωνεξχορον
εκλοιρτείνεγγυς
αλλπρόσεναιακτιμαφοταν
ταιπαλαινυν
55 ταμπίκτιονεκκιν
πιπωντωτικοδωντό[.]]
γνωτικειπικακιν.
50 [.]αιεναιονεκκινοκχη[.]...
ταιδεενοτιτωνιας[.]α
60 χαίταντεφανοικέκος
ληθεν’εντεπικαιπερπ[.]

Col. iv.

...[.]...

ρίξα τε ο — —
[σε]μυνὸν ἢν ο — — — — — —
— ἐπταπολιοίσθιν.
65 ἐνηκεν καὶ ἐπείτα διομενής χόλος ο — — ἐπταπολιοίσθιν.
τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐνηκεν μερίμνας σώφρονος
ἐχθρὰν οὐ παλίγ — — δίκας διδοὺς
πίστας (5) ἐφίλησεν.
60 ἄν λαβεὶν ἀοιδὰν πρόσφορον.

...[.]...

ρίξα τε ο — —
[σε]μυνὸν ἢν ο — — — — — —
— ἐπταπολιοίσθιν.
65 ἐνηκεν καὶ ἐπείτα διομενής χόλος ο — — ἐπταπολιοίσθιν.
τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐνηκεν μερίμνας σώφρονος
ἐχθρὰν οὐ παλίγ — — δίκας διδοὺς
πίστας (5) ἐφίλησεν.
60 ἄν λαβεὶν ἀοιδὰν πρόσφορον.
Ψ ΖΕΥΞΑΙ. δ ὁ μον ν᾽ ἕν ζεύξαϊσα ἊΣ

80 ΤΜΗΝΥΝΝΕΚΤΑ[.......]ΝΑΣΕΜΑΚ

ΔΙΨΩΝΤΕΑ[.......]ΠΑΡΑΛΥΡΟΝ

Θ

ΟΙΧΕΧΟΝ ἐ[.......]

Col. v.

\[\textbf{Fragments.}\]

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
(a) & (b) & (c) & (d) \\
\hline
\texttt{PH} & \texttt{Q} & \texttt{MA} & \texttt{CA}

95 \texttt{TAI}[ & \texttt{CAL}[ & \texttt{ACTE}[ & \texttt{CTAPIAN}

\texttt{AEIA[} & \texttt{EOMOC[} & \texttt{NAIO[} & \texttt{AIK[}

\texttt{Q[} & \texttt{ENAIK[} & \texttt{PA} & .

\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
(e) & (f) & (g) & (h) & (i) \\
\hline
\texttt{ANTI[} & \texttt{NA[} & \texttt{AT[} & . & .

110 \texttt{NAT[} & . & \texttt{IM[} & \texttt{N} & .

115 \texttt{ATI[} & . & \texttt{H[} & \texttt{OI[} & .

120 . & . & . & . & .

\hline
\end{tabular}
1-4. At the top of this column considerable difficulties arise with regard to the place of the two fragments (4) and (4), which appear in this position in Plate III. Fr. (4) especially looks as if it should be put here, for the tops of the letters TIC in the fifth line exactly suit μάντις. 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.

ll. 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 reft of offspring and utterly overthrown, stricken by a violent fate, lives escaping sad distress; for before...

7. κεκριμέναι: cf. Ἁν. vi. 3 δείπνησε δὲ πᾶσα κεκριμένα 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 πόλις or πόλεως. 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 Αἰολάδᾳ 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. 662. 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 [πρφων], a favourite word of Pindar, cf. e.g. Pyth. v. 117 θεὸς δὲ οἱ τὸ viv τε πρόφων τελεῖ δύνασιν.

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

33. σειρῆνα δὲ κόμπον... ὃς Ζεφύρου, κ.τ.λ.; cf. Schol. on Homer, Od. μ. 168-9 (γαλήνη ἐπλεύσετο γηρεμία κοίμησε δὲ κύματα δαιμόνων ἑνεκὴν Ήσίοδος καὶ τοὺς ἀνέμους θέλγειν αὐτὰς (σ. τὰς Σειρῆνας) ἐφη).

34. ΛΑΙΧΚΩΝ is apparently a mistake for αἰλίσκων; cf. Ol. iv. 2 ὄρας ἐπὶ τοιοκλοφόρμιγγος αἰσθᾶσ ψηφισμέναι. The initial Λ could equally well be Δ but hardly N, nor does ναίσκων give so good a sense.

37. M of ΞΕΙΜΩΝΟϹ has been altered from N.

38-9. φρίσων Βορέας: cf. Pyth. iv. 81 φρίσουσα τοιοφόροι which a scholiast explains φρίσσων πιούσα τοιοφόροι. ΕΠΙϹΠΕΡΧΗΣ is a mistake for ΕΠΙϹΠΕΡΧΗ; cf. for the word Od. ε. 304 ετάραξε δὲ πόντον, ἐπισίφρωσα δ᾽ ἄλλα. We transpose ὠκύαλον and πόντον on account of the metre though this change does not effect an absolute correspondence, ———ΟΟΟ——. ὠκύαλον ῥιπή occurs in Opp. Hal. 2. 535.

40. The sense seems to require the substitution of έμώλαξεν for the ΕΤΑΡΑΞΕ of the papyrus; cf. Fr. 133 (probably Pindar) of the Adespota in Bergk, Poet. Lyr. ἐπερχόμενον τε μαλάξοντας μετά πόντου ὠκύας τ᾽ ἀνέμων ῥιπάς. The displacement of έμώλαξεν by έτάραξεν would be easy in such a context; cf. the passage from Od. ε quoted in the note on ll. 38-9. ΚΑΙ belongs to the next line.

42. The reading of this line is difficult. There is a stroke passing through the middle of Κ 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 Z may be Ε. The dot which appears above the first N is very likely the tip of a letter like Ρ or Φ from the line above.
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 Agasticles 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...

Cf. Pindar, *Nem.* xi. 18 μελιγδούποισι δαίδαλθέντα μελιζέμεν δαιδαίς. The A of TA was altered apparently from O.

The alteration of ἈΓΑΣΙΚΛΕΙ to ἈΓΑΣΙΛΕΙ is necessary for the metre. Who this Agasticles was is obscure; perhaps he was the παῖς ἀμφιθαλής who ἄρχει τῆς δαφνηφορίας according to the account of Proclus ap. Photius 2512 σε, 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 πιστῶν πρώτος cf. *Pyth.* i. 88, and xii. 27 πιστῶν αὐτοῖς μάρτυρες.

τιμαθεῖσιν: *TIMAΘΕΝΤΑΣ* the papyrus, and the accusative may possibly have been justified by the sequel; but as the passage stands τιμαθεῖσιν τὰ πάλαι οὐ τιμαθεῖσθοι 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. *Isth.* iii. 25-6 τιμᾶντες ἀμφικτίονες λέγονται πρόξενοι τ' ἀμφικτίονων. It is noticeable that the papyrus has the spelling ἀμφικτίονες which was restored to the text of Pindar by Boeckh in place of the MSS. reading ἀμφικτύονες.

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

ναόν is a necessary correction of the papyrus reading *NAOT.*

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.

Another disturbance in the metre has occurred in this line, which will not scan with ἑπταπύλοις as the first word. The vestiges before the lacuna suggest a round letter like € or 0, and *ΕΠΙΠΥΛΩΙΟΙΘΒΑΙΚ* (or possibly *ΕΠΙΠΥΛΩΙΟΙΘΕΒΑΙΚ*) may have been written for *ΘΗΪΒΑΙΣ ἕπταπύλοισι.* But it is just possible to read *ΕΠΙΠΥΛΩΙΟΙΘΕΒΑΙΚ* (or *ΕΠΙΠΥΛΩΙΟΙΘΕΒΑΙΚ*), and to suppose that the missing syllable at the beginning of the line was transposed to l. 63.

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

The transference of σώφρονος to this line is necessary *metri gratia.* For μέριμνα in
the sense of ambition for distinction in the games cf. e.g. Ol. i. 109–11 ωὸς ἐπίτροπος ἔων
τιναίς μὴ δέσαι... Ηρώων 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 ἐχθρὰν ἔριν is fairly satisfactory, though NE hardly fills the space between
the A and P.

69. With πιτγάς 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 Λέων to Λέων or
Τριφών to Τριφών. The person addressed may be Aeoladas or Pagondas, but his identity
is of course quite obscure. With regard to the mutilated adjective agreeing with ποδί,
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 Ν or the lower half of a letter
like I 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 παί
is read as a disyllable; πάις has been conjectured in Ol. ii. 84. ἐξελβίρω is unsuitable;
ἐναρτίμω might do.

73. CXEΔ[1]Ν: the facsimile is again deceptive, transforming the X into Ε and Ε
into C. There might be room for two narrow letters between Δ and Ν, but σχεδίαν
is hardly to be avoided, though δάφνα εἰπατολοι σχεδίαν βαιναία is not very satisfactory.

75. Δαισιστρότα is another name for which no authority can be cited, but it is quite
a possible form, στροτός being the Boeotian for στρατός. 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
Pindar, Fr. 75. το δν (v. l. τω) βρόμων δν (v. l. τω) Εριβέων τε βραγοί καλομεν. The Λ of the
second ΑΝ is more like Α. ἐπασκεῖν is a Pindaric word; cf. Neim. ix. 10 ἐπασκήσω κλυτούσ
ἡρας τιμαίες, and Fr. 194. 4.

80–2. ‘Do not when in sight of the nectar from my spring go thirsty away to
a salt stream.’ νικταρ 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 καί ἐγώ νικταρ χεινόν, Μοισῶν δόσιν, αιθοφόροις ἀερὰς πέμπων, γλυκὸν καρπὸν
φρεσκό, ἱλάσκομαι. 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 δεψάντι seems preferable to the correction
or variant δεψάντ(ε) since there is no certain instance in Pindar of the latter elision; but
of course the question cannot be decided without the following words: δεψάντι δῆν, e.g.,
would give a good sense. It is noticeable that in the next line, though the substitution
of Θ for the second X is necessary, the X has not been crossed out.

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

Fr. (m) 128. CHPA[ ] is very intractable, leading only to ΣΗΡ or ΣΗΡΑΓΧ in some form;
but the first letter is plainly C and not Θ.

Fr. (r) 140. Above N to the right is a mark like a grave accent.
660. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

660. Paean.

Fr. (a) 13.1 x 9 cm.

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 pæan was composed. Neither is there much clue to the identity of the author; but Blass points out that, while ἀνθώς (1. 8) indicates a lyric poet, the form νέας for νας 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)  
[. . ] [. . ]χεοδ. [. ] ψηφάρα[ ]]ον εσσεσθ' αι  
ξες' ἵπαισιν αναρσιῶν τ[ ]]άμορον [  
oιστὼν δούρων τε σιδάροι  
βρίσει νείς αἰθεων μᾶλις[τ ]]μον φα[  
5 ὡ πολεμονδε κορυσσομε[ν ]]ομενος[  
θεσπειας δ ἀπο κνίσας μ[ ]]ομενος[  
κ[ . . . ] πολλακις Πηθοι πτ[ ]]ομεν το[ αἰσια γναμψε[ι  
εσσομε[ε]νου δ' νεος ου μελξ .[  
10 [ε]παίσιν συν αλιοι τριτα[  
[ε]παίσιν α . χεν . ουλα . [  
[ . ]οιν αυτικα δε σκοπιας οι[  
[ . ]]το μεταχρονιαι . [  
[ . ]]νονι . γαν εραταν [  
15 [ε]παίαν δ αρα νυκτα κ[  
μαιρτρυμεναι δ[ . ]ξ[ [ . . ]ας' ἵπαισιν ηδον' [. ]  
[ . . ]]ω πρω[ . . ]ε[  

Fr. (δ)
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—απειρασιν, τ(τ᾽)ις μορον, σιδαροιτοιμων—difficulties arise in the remainder. In l. 4 κενοι is possible, but not, we think, χορον; the letter before χ is probably η, ι, or κ, but not α. In l. 5 the doubtful ο might possibly be ν, but κορυσσομεῖνων could not be got into the space if there was no gap in ll. 1-2, nor could μελομενοῖ (cf. Homer, II. xxi, 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 a of μορον 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. Πυθοι πὶ: or πυθοιτ. ἢ

11 sqq. There is some uncertainty with regard to the number of letters lost at the beginnings of the lines. In ll. 10 two letters are required before παιασί ἔν, and since there are three other instances of κτάσων or ιεπαιηων in the fragment κτάσων can hardly be avoided. In l. 11 there is rather less room, but something must have stood before παιασί, and if the column leaned slightly to the right there would not be much difficulty in getting κτασιων into the space. κατάπυρσανα 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 αυχεν. ου or αυχενει. ου.

13. μεταχρονιαι: cf. Hesiod, Θεог. 269 μεταχρόνιαι γὰρ ἴαλλον (of the Harpies), where μεταχρονιαι is explained as equivalent to μετώρων.

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, 686, 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 τρεῖζανον, συκάμειον and apparently χωρίζων may be noted.

Col. i.

[ποτάς ἱεράς βῆλας]
καὶ τῷ λαθρεῖ αμφυριζέντος
καὶ με δικτύωις

10] το θεριον
[ον ὁ Παλαιμόνες

15] ἀπωθε τον φθόρον
662. **Epigrams.**

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 Prexos 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 tinos euσa γυναι Παρην υπο κιόνα κ[ε][smsai
[Πρηξω Καλλιτελευς και ποδ]βαπτ Σαμιη
[tis δε σε και κτερειζε Θεοκρ]τοσ ω με γεγανε
5 [εξεδοσαν θυσκεις δ εκ τινος] εκ τ[ο]κετου
[eυσα ποσουν ετεων δυο κιοκε]τον η ρα γ ατεκνο
[ουκ αλλα τριετη Καλλιτελην ελειτον
[ζωοι σοι κεινος γε και ει βαθυ] γηρας ικοιτο
[kαι σοι ξευε ποροι παντα Τυχ]η τα καλα
10 [Αντιπατρου]
[φραζε γυναι γενεν ονο]μα χθονα : Καλλιτελης μεν
[o σπειρας Πραξω δ ουνομα γη] δε Σαμος
[σαμα δε τις τοδ εκωσε Θεο]κριτοσ ο πριν αδικα
[αμετερα λυσας αμματα παρθενιαν
15 [πως δε θανες λοχιοισιν εν] αλγεσιν ειπε δε ποιαν
[ηλθες ες ηλικιην διασκα]ις ενδεκετη

[ι] και απαις νοι ξευε λε]ριτα γαι εν νεοτατι
[Καλλιτελη . . . . . . . .] τιε νη[πιαχον]
[ελθου ες αλβισθην πολιην] τριχ(α και σων οδιμετα
20 [ουριου ιθυνοι παντα Τυχη βισον]

Col. ii.

Αμυντου
αυξαλεας νοη[.] ον υπ οφρυον ανθεσι δακρυ
ν[.]αιων ενβαι[.] ]εις ψ[.] αο[.]απης σπιλαδι
φραζε γυναι τις εουσα καλι εκ τινος ειπε τε πατρην
25 νη[.]οια εθανες νουσου υπ αργαληης
ουνομα κεν Πραξω Σαμιη ξενε εκ δε γονης
Καλλιτελεὺς γενομαν αλλ εθανον τοκετων
tis de ταφον σταλωσε Θεουκριτος η με συνευνον
 ανδρι δοσαν ποιην δ ηλθες ες ηλικιην
30 επταετις τρις ενοι γενομαν ετη η ρα γ ατεκνος
ου Καλλιτελης τριετη παιδα δομω λιπομαν
Αμνιτου
tas πεσαρος ατρεστουν Δακεδαιμονα τας κερα μουνας
πολλακις αν πολεσι δημιου εφριξεν Αρης
35 νυν νυ αικατοι Φιλοποιμενι δουρι τ Αχ[α]ων
πρημης εκ τρισαν ηριτε μωριδαν
ασκεπος οιωνι δε περιζμυχηρον ιδοντες
μυρονται πεδιον δου τε [π]. . .]φεστος
40 [. .]βας δερκομενα[. . . . . . . a]κροπο[λ . .]

Col. iii.
Λεωνιδου
Ακρωριται Πανι και ενπα[. . . . .] γυμφαίς
[Γ]λήμις ο συγκειτων δωρα [κ'υμγεσίς]
ταταν τε προτομαν και δ[. . . . . . . . . ]ησ [. . .]
45 βυρσαν και ροθους τουτο[δ' ανεθηκε] λοιμας
Πανω και νυμπα τονδ[. . . . . . . . .] αγ|ρευτηρα
Γληνων αεξησαθαι ιαι[. . . . . . . . .]
Αντιπατρο'ν
σιλαιων αλοχοις αντρησαν ηδε κερασται
50 τασδ Ακρωριται Πανι και γγεμονι
και προτομαν ακμητα καζ αυτο νεον τοδε καπρου
δερμα το μηδ αυτο ρηγνυμενον χαλυνοι
Γληνως ανηρτησε καλας χαριτου[ιονι] αγρας
δεικνυς εφθιμον κουρον Ομαφαγε[. . .]
55 [Α[εων]δ'ου]
δρμυνονομου
Fragments.

(a) 

(b) 60 ξαπο

4. τεγυνεις (or τεγυνεις) is for γονῆες.

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

14. παρθενιας: l. παρθενιασ or -ης.

17. The s above the line is clear enough, and the letter below is apparently ι and not π. γάρ is of course the right reading.

18-20. The question of the position of the two fragments (a) and (b) at the bottom of this column has already had to be considered in connexion with the text on the recto; cf. note on 659. 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 καλλιτέλη τριετῆ παίδ᾽ ἔτι νηπίαχον. Before νηπίαχον however there is a clear e; perhaps ετε ο or ετε for ετε was written. τρια and οδια 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, καὶ σύ γ᾽ ὁ δῖῖτα οὔριον ἰθύνοις --- ὦ ὦ — Bior|οὐ would give an intelligible variant; but apart from the difficulty of reading υν and τον this also upset τιηιακον, with which the first line of Fr. (b) is inconsistent, and does not account for the space between τιηιακον and καὶ; moreover on turning to the recto the resulting readings αἰτίσα, αειδομοσί, ηναικί (cf. 659 Frs. (2), (6)) 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.

22-31. "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. ε of ἐκ was converted from ι and the letters ιοι have also been corrected.
25. καὶ ποίας ἔθανες. νηπιας seems to have been originally written, the π being subsequently converted into ο and another π added above the line. Whether the initial π, of which only a slight vestige remains, was at the same time altered is doubtful owing to a hole in the papyrus.
26. κὼ is a mistake for μίν.
31. The superfluous ου at the beginning of the line is due to the analogy of the two previous epigrams: cf. ll. 7 and 17. 1. Καλλιτέληιν.
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 three ten thousand foes, beneath unconquered Philopoemen and the spears of the Achaeans; and the birds looking upon the smoking plain mourn ...'
33–4. τὰν πάρος... τᾶς χέρα... πολλάκις ἐν πολέσιν. The last word is however very doubtful; πο may be τω and π may be ε, while of the supposed ε only a slight vestige of the base is left. Blass would retain νω and read πόλεων or πολέων. A couplet has fallen out either before or after ll. 33–4, since there is nothing to govern λακεδαίμονα. Perhaps, as suggested above, ll. 22–3 should come in here, though they do not seem particularly appropriate.
35. δ᾽ should perhaps be inserted after πνν.
36. μυριάδων.
37. ζ of περιζυχηρον (= περισμυχηρόν) has been corrected.
38. The letters in the latter part of the line are much damaged; the Φ could equally well be Ψ, ει may be άι or εί, and for the supposed π, which is not satisfactory, η should perhaps be substituted.
39–40. The letters ξεπενί and Ἰκροποῖ 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 ἀκρόπολις in some form fits the context in ll. 40 very well; moreover above ρ of Ἰκροποῖ is the end of a long stroke descending from the line above, which just suits the Φ or Ψ after the lacuna in l. 38. The cumulative effect of these considerations is undeniably strong.
42–7. 'To Pan of Acroria 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. Ἀκρώρεια was the name of a mountain peak in Sicyon, and Ἀκρωρείης is given by Steph. Byz. as a local epithet of Dionysus. The mutilated word before νυμφαί was probably some adjective ending in -ηις (cf. l. 49), but the space is very short for ζω... ζο... as required by the metre, and a corruption may be suspected.
43. 1. Γλῆνις as in ll. 47 and 53. For κυναγεσιής cf. Anth. Pal. vi. 183. 2; σφυναγεσιής (vi. 34. 4) could also be read.
44. The first α of ταῦτα has been corrected, and to make the result clearer another τ was added above the line.
45. Cf. Anth. Pal. vi. 34. 2 καὶ κάπρων τῶθεν καθαψε πόδας. καθαψε might of course be read for αἰενεθηκε here, but the meaning would not be affected.

46. νύμφαι. Ἰρευτηρα must be θηρευτῆρα or ἀγρευτῆρα; perhaps τῶθεν ἀγρευτῆρα καθαψε might of course be read for αἰενεθηκε here, but the meaning would not be affected.

47. ἀεξήσαιτ᾽ followed by something like αἰεν ἀγραῖς καλαῖς; but the remains of the letter after αιε suggest δ, ζ, or ξ. Cf. Anth. Pal. vi. 34. 5-6 ἀλλ᾽ ὦ Πὰν σκοπιῆτα καὶ εἰς ὀπίσω Πολύαινον ἑαγρον πέμποις νία Σιμύλεω.

49-54. 'To the cave-dwelling mates of the Sileni and to horned Pan of Acroria 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.'

50. νυμοαῖ for νύμφαι in l. 46. The top of the o is missing, but β seems excluded.

51. ἀκμήτα may be interpreted in the sense of 'uninjured' or 'permanent' on the analogy of πυλαὶ ἀκμῆτες in Anth. Pal. ix. 526 or may be regarded as an epithet which strictly applies only to the living animal (cf. Soph. Antig. 353 οὐρεῖον τ᾽ ἀκμῆτα ταύρον).

52. χαλυμοῖ is for χαλυμοί; cf. νυμοαῖ for νύμφαι in l. 46. The top of the o is missing, but β seems excluded.

54. Λυσσεῖον is for ἄλκιμον ἀγρευτῆρα. The rest of the epigram was never added.

663. ARGUMENT OF CRATINUS' ΔΙΟΝΥΣΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ.

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) Κρατείνου occurs, not where it would be expected at the end, but at the top of the last column, and is written in much larger uncials. What is meant by this comedy being called the '8th' is uncertain. Similar numbers are assigned to extant Greek plays in their arguments, e.g. the Antigone of Sophocles is the '32nd,' the Akestis 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 Dionysaléxandros also it is very improbable that the arrangement according to which that play was
the 8th was chronological. Körte 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; ‘Ερμ(η) in l. 5 and παραδοθησόμενο(ν) in l. 40 are written ερμ’ and παραδοθησομενο’. καὶ takes various forms, κ’ in l. 6, κς in ll. 9, 17, 33, and 43, κ in ll. 11 and 21. μ’ for Μ’ occurs in ll. 7 and 38, and δ’ for δ’ 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 Διονυσαλέξανδρος, 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 Meineke considered ᾿Αλέξανδρος 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 ᾿Αλέξανδρος 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 ποιμὴν καθέστηκ’ αἰπόλος καὶ βουκόλος 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 Dionysalexandrinus ὁ δ’ ἡλιθιος ὁσπέρ 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 Achaeans, 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.

Col. i. Col. ii.

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

\[ \text{Διονυσός\; αλέξανδρος} \]

\[ \text{Κρατίεινου} \]

\[ \text{τόν\; Αλέξανδρον\; κ(αί)\; τήν\; μ(εν)\; Ελενη(ν)} \]

\[ \text{κρυφάς\; εαυτόν\; δε\; εἰς\; κρίσι(ν)} \]

\[ \text{μ(ε)τ(α)\; σκευασάς\; ύπομενει} \]

\[ \text{το\; μελλόν\; παραγένο} \]

\[ \text{μενός\; δε\; Αλέξανδρος\; κ(αί)\; φωρά} \]

\[ \text{σας\; εκατερο(γ)\; αγειν\; επί\; τας} \]

\[ \text{νασ\; πρ(ο)\; ταττει\; ως\; παράδωσων} \]

\[ \text{τοις\; Ἀχαιο(σ)\; οκνουσῆς\; δε\; της} \]

\[ \text{Ελενη(ς)\; ταύτην\; μ(εν)\; οικτειράς} \]

\[ \text{ως\; γυναίχ\; εξ(ον)\; επικατεχ(εί)} \]

\[ \text{τον\; Διονυσο(ν)\; ως\; παραδόθη} \]

\[ \text{σομενο(ν)\; αποστελλει\; σων} \]

\[ \text{ἀκολουθ(ου)\; δε\; οι\; σατυ(ροι)\; παρακαλοῦν}\]

\[ \text{τε\; τε\; κ(αί)\; ου\; προδοσειν} \]

\[ \text{αυτον\; φακοντες\; κωμω} \]

\[ \text{δε\; ετί\; τω\; δραματι\; Πε} \]

\[ \text{ρικήσι\; μαλα\; πίθαιν\; δι} \]
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 απερχεται, as Körte suggests. ανωτέρων: sc. the satyrs (cf. l. 42), as Blass thinks. Though of course this is not a satyr 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 ll. 11-2 are very appropriate too to the satyrs, who occur in l. 42 as if they had been mentioned before.

8. πιναι ποιησει ( ) is corrupt. Blass suggests νπερ του ποιησει(του), which makes good sense but is a rather drastic change; cf. however the next note. Körte prefers πιναι(του) ποιησει(του), which is nearer to the text of the papyrus.

12. παραγεγεγομενων seems to be a mistake for some word like ποτονομενων. Körte suggests παραγεγεγομενων.

30. Perhaps ουσιερα τυραννον ου ταρχαι(ον); cf. Ar. Ran. 558-60 το πολυ ταρχαιον εικα ειρηκα πο. με Διοτζ, αει του τυραννον την χιλιονια ταλαν, αν αει τουτου τοις ταλανων κατηγον. γαρον is also possible; cf. Crat. Fr. inc. 280 α ταλανο των διαπλως εστα γαρον. Körte prefers ορην ου χρων, ταλανον being the technical word in Athenaeus p. 122 for a bird-basket.
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 ἔφης ὁ [, l. 81 ἐπολαβὼν). Fr. (b), containing another nearly complete column, is also in dialogue form. Here the persons are, besides the narrator (ἔφης, 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. Polyaenus, who adds an episode of the abduction of the girl by her lover (Strategem. 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 els οἶκον for εἰς (rv) 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 Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία—assuming the authenticity of that work:—compare e.g. ll. 3–6 (Σόλων) προλέγων Ἀθηναῖας ἃς Πεισίστρατος ἐπιβουλεύει τυραννίδι πείθειν αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἦν δυνατός with Ath. Pol. 14. 2 ὅσοι μὲν γὰρ ἀγνοοῦσι Πεισίστρατον ἐπιτιθέμενον τυρακ[είδι] ... ἐπεὶ δὲ λέγων [οὐκ ἐπείδειν, ll. 8–9 ἀποδημαὶ ποιησάμενοι with Ath. Pol. 11. 1, 13. 1 ἀποδημαὶ
ἐποιήσατο, ll. 23–4 διὰ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων κατάστασιν with Ath. Pol. 42. 1 ἡ νῦν κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας, ll. 25–6 οὐδεὶς ἐπεδεδώκει πρὸς μεγαλοφύειαν with Ath. Pol. 37. 2 πολὺ πρὸς ὠμότητα (cf. l. 112) καὶ πονηρίαν ἐπέδοσαν; cf. also l. 115 τίνι ταύτῃ ἐφη] and Arist. Fr. 44 τί τοῦτ᾽ ἔφη. 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 x 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, 165, 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.

\[(a)\]

(\(\text{Col. i.} \)) \(\text{Col. ii.}\)

\(\text{προτερον η Πισιστρατον λαβειν} \) [θεω]

\(\text{την αρχην απεδημησεν επει} \) [ ]
δὴ προλεγομένων Αθηναίοις σου
Πισιστράτου επιβουλευει τι
5 ραννιδι πιθεῖν αυτοὺς ουκ ἦν
δυνατός· εγὼ δὲ καταμείνας

ηδὴ Πισιστράτου τυραννίσκον
τος αποδημον εντευθὲν
ποιησαμενος εν Ἰωνίαι μετα

10 Σολωνος διετρίβον· χρονοι
δε των φιλων σπουδαζον
tων ηκει με· και μαλιστα
Πισιστράτου δια την οικειο

15 επανηλθον Αθηναζη κατε
λιτον μεν ουν ενταβα ται
da Θρασυβουλον τον Φιλο

20 θον και την οψιν και τον τρο
πον πολυ διαφεροντα των
ηλικιωτων τεταπεινωμε

25 oudeis epebēdēkei προς με
γαλοψαν. παντας δε υπερε
βαλεν ἵπποτροφιαι και κυ
νησισιας και ταις ἀλλας δαπα
ναις] δ[ε]βεβηλτο δ εν τηι πο

30 λει της νεωτερας του του
του Πισιστρατου θυγατερων
εραν ἵδων αρρηφορουσαν·

Αγνοθεω ουν ο παππος αυ
του παρ ωι και τρεφομενος

κεματι
κακεινη
πανει
νησυμι
35 ετυγχανεν ο Θρασυβουλος
dia to tou patros kai tis
μητρος ωρθαι πολει
thein: παραχυμενη ει μοι
dokei pross tov kai
40 eis oikous syngenei te autois
onta kai kataleleimenedon
epitropou upo tou Philomhe
lous kagw malia prothymos
ebadiqou kai yar he en iho
45 yra to souniathiein Agy

(b) Col. iii.

μεν ουτως πιθανω ειουκεν
ei toinun ephn alitha taum [e
stin ouv an Periandrou lo
stitelouch mallo arxein hy y
95 φ ετερου απιμεθαι ou't allow
othein tov[v] phaiolos arxonun
doxo yar av[v]on ephn ev tois
philatos [komieisathai tas amar
tias: ti yar [philiteron anvbri
100 yovn exouw] patridoso kai
[kata phusin [eikeiow anbrow
[π]on: upo[labbn]on ouv o Arp
[φ]rnon alithṿη νη Αι' eph he le
[γ]eis kai bovin[labn]mena sou mar
105 [τ]υρησαι eyw kai Adeimantas
[ο]υτωσι παραγένομενοι νυν
[Πε]riandrou dia tin omotη
[τ]α megaly panoa sumforai
[π]eripseonti kai o Pisiстра
110 [τ]οσ tini taumη ephη: eyw ei

Col. iv.

υπολαβω[ν] τ
νηδ
γαρ η[ν]
ρων [ν]
85 μη γ[λ]
taisa[ν]
γον [ν]
[[στ]μ]
οσω[ν]
90 αυτο[ν]
115 [μενοι Βακχῦ[αδαι] σύ[γγενεία] |περιανδρίου mare |ρα λαβεῖν την αρχή[ν ἑκ][ρα]
[το]ν τὴν ἀρχήν το[ῦτον τὸ]
[μεν] πλήθος εφυγε τфесс[...] |καλοῦν
[...] |μενοι ΓΣ αΤ συ[γγενεία]

120 [...] επ[.]ον οὖν ὑ[.]ε[.]ει[...] |κατα confiscation
[...] ενε[.] τεσ [.] α[.] [...]
[...] ῥ[.]ο[ν]ε[.] μερα[.] [...]
[...] ενη β[.] [...]
[...] ο[.]ι[.] επ[[.] ...] |κατα confiscation
[...] οι απ[.] [...] |κατα confiscation

125 [...] προ το[ν Περιανδρ[.] |ρον [...]
[...] σι μοι τ[.]πλ[.]ς α[.] ε[.]ίν [...]
[...] νποτ.] [... ο[.] ώπερ το[ῦν Π[...] |κατα confiscation
[ρια]νδρον. και[.] τις ε[.]ισα[...] |κατα confiscation
[.] κέλευσα[.] [... στ[.] [...]

130 [...] νειν οἰ [...].] λεται[ [...]
[...] η[.] ε[.] ε[.] ι[.] προτε[.] [...]
[.] λομα[.] Κ[.] [... βουλ[[.] [...]
[.] κω[.] στ[.] [...[...] |κατα confiscation
[.] ειοτ[.] [...[...]

135 [...] εντο[...] [...[...] |κατα confiscation

(c) 150 [...] |κατα confiscation
(Solon) before Pisistratus seized the government went abroad; for his warnings to the Athenians that Pisistratus was aiming at a tyranny failed to convince them. I however stayed on; but when the tyranny of Pisistratus was already established I left the country and lived in Ionia with Solon. After some time my friends were anxious for my return, and particularly Pisistratus, on account of our intimacy; so as Solon urged it I went back to Athens. Now I had left there a boy named Thrasybulus, the son of Philomelus. I found him grown into a very handsome and virtuous young man, far superior in looks and manners to the others of his age; for in the general debasement due to the political situation no one had advanced to any nobility of character. He surpassed them all in horse-breeding and the chase and other such expensive pursuits; and it was said against him in the city that he was in love with the younger daughter of Pisistratus, whom he had seen carrying the vessels of Athene. His grandfather Hagnoteus in whose house it happened that Thrasybulus, who had been bereft of both father and mother, was being brought up, being, I think, a little annoyed with him, invited me to his house as I was their kinsman and had been left guardian by Philomelus. I was very ready to go, for Hagnoteus' company was a pleasure to me...

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 usurper. The Ἀθηναίων 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 (i. 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, χρονός in l. 10 here is too vague to build any argument upon; according to Heracleides Ponticus he survived the overthrow of the constitution συχνὸν χρόνον, according to Phanias of Ephesus less than two years (both ap. Plutarch, Sol. 32).

5. 1. πείθειν.
11. This construction of σπουδάζειν with the infinitive is common in Aristotle, e.g. Ath. Pol. 38. 4 ὅσα αὐτὸς ἐσπούδασεν ἐλθεῖν.
15. κατελιπον is probably for κατέλειπον.
26. 1. ὑπερεβάλ(λ)ειν.
29-32. This is the first mention of a second daughter of Pisistratus. With ἀρρηφορουσαν cf. Polyænus, Strategem. 5. 14 Ὑπερεβάλλειν Ὑπερεβάλλειν τῆς Πεισιστράτου θυγατρὸς ἐφίλησεν πομπεύουσαν αὐτὴν προσφέραμεν ἐφίλησεν. Apparently the author of our dialogue either did not know of or did not accept this more romantic version, for ἀρρηφορουσαν and πομπεύουσαν can hardly refer to different occasions. For διαβάλλεισθαι with the infin. cf. Hdn. 2. 6. 10 ἀλλ' ἐπερ εἴπερ διεξάγοις μεταξασκεῖις εἶναι, but the construction is unusual.
37. ὀρφανός: 1. ὀρφανός.
82. All that remains of the supposed τ over the line is a rather coarse horizontal stroke, immediately above a break in the papyrus.
88. The letters ὁστ have each had a short horizontal stroke drawn through them, probably by the first hand; the doubtful ι 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 Ariphron, "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 Bacchiadae, as they are called, ruled the city. When he became supreme the majority of them fled... a few however remained...?"

98. [κομιεῖσθαι τας ἀμαρτιας in the sense of κομιεῖσθαι τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν is a curious expression, though cf. Arist. Eth. Nic. ix. 7 κομιουμένους τὰς χάριτας.

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 (Rheinisches Museum, vol. xlv. 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 Tenea and Sigeum (Arist. Rhet. 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. 20, 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 μή τας σεμφοράς: to what this refers is not clear. As the Bacchiadae 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 ἦν διαγωρρ' ἦ, καὶ οὗτος Βακχιάδαι καλεόμενοι ἔνεμον τὴν πόλιν ἐδίδοσαν δὲ καὶ ἔγνατο ἐξ ἀλλήλων. It is doubtful whether the mistake of the original hand in the spelling of the name was anything more than ι for ι; but there is barely room in the lacuna for [aαα].

119. καὶ: the third letter is quite uncertain; perhaps κατ' ἐμεπαν | απελευθ' αν οὖν. The question of the reading here is complicated by the doubt concerning the position of the fragment containing the first part of ll. 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 π; the rest of the π (which apart from the fragment could be read as ρ) is on the upper piece. Another break occurs between ll. 133-4, but here the junction is almost certain. The latter parts of
ll. 128 | τοις εισαί... 132 ] βουί 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 Δημηγορικά (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 ξένοι, 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 (ξένοι) settled there.' The papyrus fills in some of the intermediate details passed over by the historian. We hear of an expedition of ξένοι from Enna and Cacyrum against Gela, which received aid from Syracuse. This was apparently followed by overtures from the ξένοι 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 Cratus, 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 Cratus. 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.

1. Ομφαλίωι : cf. Cic. Verr. 4. 48 Hennium nemore, qui locus ... umbilicus Siciliae nominatur, and the spurious line in Callim. H. in Cer. 6. 15 τρὶς δ᾽ επὶ κολλίσσει νῆσον δραμει ομφαλὸν ἕνναν.

2. Κακυρωί: 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 Topogr. Hist. Atlas is probably not far from the truth.

5. All that remains of the letter at the end of the line is a straight stroke which
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suggests ε, η, or i. ρ is not impossible, but there is no trace of the tail, and we therefore hesitate to introduce πριεσβεία, which is otherwise attractive, into the text.

10. Γλαυκων 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 Σικανῶν, citing the Σικελικά of Philistus. Its position is unknown; no doubt it was in the neighbourhood of Agrigentum.

22. The vestiges of the letter after ηπε 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 Ακρογάμματα, e.g. η or το 'Ακρογάμματα.

666. ARISTOTLE, Προτρεπτικός.

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 Προτρεπτικός 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 Προτρεπτικός, 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 uncialis, 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, Gnomologiae, 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.

Col. i.  
\[\chi\eta\]  
\[\rho\epsilon\iota\]  
\[\tau\epsilon\]  
\[\rho\delta\omicron\nu\]  
5  
\[\alpha\tau\eta\]  
\[\phi\iota\alpha\nu\]  
\[\tau\omicron\nu\]  
\[\lambda\alpha\sigma\]  
\[\pi\lambda\epsilon\]  
\[\nu\nu\]  
\[\mu\epsilon\gamma\]  
10  
\[\delta\epsilon\nu\]  
\[\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\omicron\sigma\]  
\[\lambda\alpha\nu\]  
\[\kappa\omicron\]  
15  
23 lines lost.

Col. ii.  
\[\tau\epsilon\ \pi\rho\alpha\tau\tau\epsilon\iota\varepsilon\ \tau\omega\nu\]  
\[\delta\epsilon\omicron\tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\iota\ \pi\rho\omicron\]  
60  
\[\kappa\omega\lambda\nu\eta\ \delta\iota\ \delta\epsilon\iota\]  
\[\tau\eta\nu\]  
65  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\mu\omicron\iota\nu\iota\]  
20 
\[\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\]  
\[\lambda\alpha\kappa\tau\omicron\theta\sigma\delta\alpha\imath\iota\]  
\[\nu\omicron\ \epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\]  
70  
\[\tau\nu\ \pi\sigma\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \pi\sigma\nu\]  
\[\kappa\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \kappa\chi\alpha\]  
115  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \psi\chi\nu\ \delta\iota\]  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \psi\chi\nu\ \delta\iota\]  
125  
\[120 \omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\ \gamma\alpha\ \epsilon\iota\ \tau\iota\]  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \psi\chi\nu\ \delta\iota\]  
130  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \psi\chi\nu\ \delta\iota\]  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \psi\chi\nu\ \delta\iota\]  
135

Col. iii.  
115  
\[\delta\iota\ \tau\iota\ \psi\chi\nu\ \alpha\gamma\]  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \pi\lambda\omicron\nu\ \alpha\gamma\]  
\[\eta\theta\eta\epsilon\iota\nu\ \omega\nu\]  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \psi\chi\nu\ \delta\iota\]  
125  
\[\delta\iota\ \tau\iota\ \psi\chi\nu\ \delta\iota\]  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \psi\chi\nu\ \delta\iota\]  
130  
\[135 \omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\nu\ \eta\ \pi\sigma\nu\]  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \psi\chi\nu\ \delta\iota\]  
140  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \psi\chi\nu\ \delta\iota\]  
\[\tau\eta\nu\ \psi\chi\nu\ \delta\iota\]  
145

G 2
των προειρήμε
νων αυτω παρη
tον αυτον δ[ε] τρο
πον και ψυχὴν
eαν ηι πεπαιδευ
μενη την τοιαν
tην και τον τοιον
tον ανδρωτον
ευθαμονα προσ
αγορευτεον εστιν
ουκ αν τοις εκτος
ηι λαμπρως κε
χερηγημενος
αυτος μηδενος
αξιος αξιος
[ιππον εαν ψυλι
χρυσα και σκευ
εεχηι πολυτε
λια φαυλος αν
του τοιωτον
αξιον τινος τοιον
ομεν [τινος νο
μιζομεν] ειναι
αλλ εαν διακειμε
νος (ηι) στουδαιως
τουτον μαλλον
eπαινουμεν
χωρεις δε των ει
ρημενον συμ
βαινει τοις μηδε
νος αξιοις ουσιν
οται τυχωσι χο
ρηγιας και των
σιασ αυτιαν τοις
γαρ διακειμε[νοι]
ta peri τηn ψυ
χην κακως ου
tε πλουτος ουτ ι
σχυς ουτε καλλος
των αγαθων εστιν
αλλ οσωι περ αν α[ν]
tai μαλλον αι δια
βεσεις καθ υπ[ερ]
βολην υπαρξη(ος)
tουσωμεν
και πλειον τον
κεκτημενον
βλαπτουσι (εαν) αρι[ευ]
φρουσεωσ [πα
ραγινωνται[ε το
γαρ μη παιδι[ε μα
χαιραι τουτ [εστι
το μη τοις φιαυ
λοις την εξουισι
αν εγχειριζε[ειν
την δε φρονησιν
απαντες αν ομολο
γησειαν εις το [μαν
θανειν γενεσθαι (και)
ζητειν ου τας [δυ
ναεις φιλοσοφια
περιειληφει φο[σ]
te πως ουκ απ[ρο
φασιστος φιλο[φο
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 domesticities 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, θεωρουσαν referred to some preceding substantive such as ή τῶν σπουδαίων ἀρετῶν. But more probably some correction is required; the simplest perhaps is to emend θεωρουσαν to θεωρουσατ or θεωρουσας, with the sense given in our translation. Other expedients would be to read τούτων for τούτων, 'the wretched state of mind which neglects this,' or to insert τι after τούτων, 'which pays great consideration to any of these external things,' but the latter interpretation of θεωρουσαν is hardly so natural.

65. The extracts of Stobaeus and Maximus Mon. begin after κα. νομίζει δέ M, νομίζει A, νομίζων Tr., νομίζομεν δέ Max., νομίζειν δέ Laur.

68. γινεσθαι: so Max., Laur.; γίγνεσθαι MA, Tr.

69. μάλλον ν.; μᾶλλον δ(έ) MA, Max., Laur., ἀλλ᾽ εὖ Tr.

70-2. πὼς την Ψυχην: τὴν Ψυχῆ εὖ MA, A, Tr., Max., Laur. Above the o of πως 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 πως has not been cancelled, and if the intention was to indicate a reading εὖ πως the εὖ should have been written further to the left.

73. σωμα ου το: so MA, Max., Laur.; οὐδὲ τὸ σώμα αὑτό Tr.

76. τις αν: 580 ΜΑ, Max., Laur.; τις εὖ A, τις Tr.

78. Considerations of space made it more probable that ἐνεστὶν or ἠνεστὶν (A, Tr., Max., Laur.) was written than ἐνεστὶν (M).

82. προειρημενων: so MSS. except Max., where παρακειμενων is found.

85. ψυχῆ: so M, Tr., Max., Laur.; ψυχῆ A.

86. εἰν εἰ πεπ.: so M, Tr., Max., Laur.; ἐνεστὶν δὲ εἰν πεπ. Tr.

88. κα: Laur. substitutes εἰ. τοιοῦτον is omitted in Max.

92. τοι: so MA, Laur.; τις Tr., Max.
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93. λαμπρῶς: so MA?, Max., Laur.; λαμπρὸς A¹, Tr.; κεκοσμημένος MSS. (κεκοσμημένος Laur., putting λαμπρῶς after κεκοσμ.);
95. αὐτοῖς: Max. and Laur. add ἄν.
96. οὖν: so Α¹ (and conjecturally Meineke); οὖντι A' and the other MSS.
97. καὶ ἡμιλία: εἰν τῇ ἡμίλιᾳ MA, Max., Laur.; κἀ τῇ ἡμίλιᾳ Tr.
100. The papyrus does not support Meineke's insertion of αὐτοῖς before φιάλοις which is adopted by Rose.
105. καὶ: δέ ἂν MSS. except Laur., which has ἢν ἂν and adds ὡς before σπουδάσοις.
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 πλευρονσαπει conceals something like πλέων ἄξια, and we may either add συμβή (cf. ll. 125–7) and place a comma after κτήμα, when the sense will be as in the translation above, or connecting τῶν διά της ψυχῆς αγαθῶν with τυχῶσι insert ὡς or ὡς (so Diels) before πάντων αἰσχιστῶν. '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.'
122. τοὺς is omitted in the MSS.
126. πλεύος: πλεύοις MSS.
128. συμβεβήκε: συμβεβήκε MSS.
130. τοῦτον εἰπαί: so MSS. except A, which transposes the words.
131. The excerpt of Maximus ends here.
153–5. Stobaeus here has χωρὶς φρονήσεως παραγενόμενοι, which is the conclusion of his quotation. In ll. 153 we have supposed that the repetition of ἄν led to the loss of τῶν. To read «αν χωρίς would make the line too long.
164. There would hardly be room for the necessary καὶ after γιγνεσθῆ, but the homoioteleuton may easily have caused its omission; cf. note on 153–5.
169. φιλοσοφήτων was the key-note of the Προτρεπτικός, as of the similarly named work of Iamblichus: cf. Bywater, ibid., pp. 68–9.
Aristoxenus, the greatest name among the ancient writers upon musical theory; and there is no reason why the piece should not come from his 'Αρμονικά Στοιχεῖα 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 (ἁρμονία) 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 (διάζευξις), 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):—

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hiparw} & \quad \text{mesw} \\
+ \quad \quad + \\
\nuetaw (\sigmaυμμεταν) & \quad \nuetaw (\deltaιαζευμεταν) & \quad \text{interpoliations}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
 t & d & d \\
\hline
d & d & c \\
\hline
d & d & c \\
\hline
d & d & c \\
\end{array}
\]
or in modern notation:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\mu\varepsilon\omicron\delta\omicron \quad \sigma\nu\nu\alpha\phi \quad \eta\tau\omicron \quad (\sigma\upsilon\nu\mu\mu\mu\omicron\nu) \\
\upsilon\pi\omicron\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron \omega\nu
\end{array}
\]

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 \(\pi\rho\rho\sigma\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\alpha\nu\omicron\omicron\omega\nu\).

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 \(d\ d'\ c\ d\ d'\ c\). 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 \(\upsilon\pi\omicron\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron\) and \(\mu\varepsilon\omicron\delta\omicron\), \(\mu\varepsilon\omicron\delta\omicron\) and \(\eta\tau\omicron\) (\(\sigma\upsilon\nu\mu\mu\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\)), \(\eta\tau\omicron\) (\(\delta\iota\iota\iota\epsilon\zeta\iota\gamma\iota\mu\iota\nu\omicron\nu\)) and \(\upsilon\pi\omicron\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\omicron\). Disjunction, on the other hand, is only found in the case of the tetrachords \(\mu\varepsilon\omicron\delta\omicron\) and \(\eta\tau\omicron\) (\(\delta\iota\iota\iota\epsilon\zeta\iota\gamma\iota\mu\iota\nu\omicron\nu\)). To the given scheme is then (ll. 19 sqq.) added at the lower extremity a tone, corresponding to the \(\pi\rho\rho\sigma\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\alpha\nu\omicron\omicron\omega\nu\) (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 \(\textit{ad loc.}\)
667. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

1-30. ‘[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 ὀλγ and ἐν μέρει as well as with διὰ τῶν ἑπτε and
Scales might be curtailed either by diminishing their compass, i.e. dropping notes at the extremities (ἐν μέρει), or by omitting inner notes (ὑπερβατῶς); cf. Aristox. Harm. p. 17. 30 (Meibom), and Aristid. Quint. pp. 15-6 τά μὲν αὐτῶν ἐστι συνεχή, ὡς τά διὰ τῶν ἐξε αἰφνύων, τά δὲ ὑπερβατά, ὡς τά διὰ τῶν μὴ ἐφεξής μελῳδοῖμαι. For συναφή and διάζευξις generally cf. Aristox. Harm. p. 58. 15 sqq. τὰ πολλὰ 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 δεῖν ἡμᾶς must be understood with σημαίνειν; but the change of subject is very awkward, and we prefer to suppose with Mr. Macran that ὁμη was dropped out before σημαινεῖν. The similarity of the following syllable σή would help to account for the loss.

15. ἐν τοπῶι τινι: SC. κεῖται ἡ συναφή οὐ κεῖσθαι τὴν συναφήν, according as τινι is accented τίνι or τινί. τόπος means technically region or direction of the scale.

22 sqq. This sentence is the erux 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 διων has fallen out of the text before τῶν εἰρημένων.

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 praenomina, 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 Masiniss(ae), 207 omnib(us). 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 consuls 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 intercessit) are not surprising; but forms such as coniurium for connubium (l. 17), fictie grimonibus for fictis criminibus (l. 72), planus for primus (l. 217), and still more pugnamentasi (Ὁ Pergamenos missi, l. 111), trigem reddeterbuit (Ὁ... 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 Chartaginiensium in l. 22, fodem to fidem 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 accidence 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, 665, 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’ Κεστοί (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. 188–90, 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.


[. . . . . . .]s pax iterum data est. P. Lepidinum {maximus}
[pontif] ex maximus Q. Fabium pr(aetorem) quod flamen
[Quirin]alem erat proficiisci in Sardiniam
[. . . . . . .]nt. Ant[i]ncho regi pax data. Lusitani
[vastati.] Rhodonia desoli deducta.
[Glabr]io censuram petens minantes
[accusationem compellitoribus composito
[destiti].

lib(er) xxxviii

[Ambra]cia capta.

[Gallog]raecis in Pamphylia proelio vastatis
[. . . . . . .]a liberata. Origiacontis captian nobilis
[centurionem cuius vim pass(a) erat aurum admit
[t . . . . .] poscentem occidit caputque eius ad virum
[secum? tuit.] Campanis coniurium datum. [ ]
[inter Achaieos et Lacedaemonios cruenta [pra]elia.

[M. Valerio Julius Calinatore cos. B.C. 188.

[. . . . . . .]a ex Gallograecia per Cra. [. . . .
[ducta. L. M]nucius Myrtius et L. Man[i]lius
[per legatos Chartaginien[i]ium qui
[pulsi erant] axis?].

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

25 [P. Scipio] Africanus a Quintis Metellis die[s]{
{dicta in Livratum ab[i]t, qui ne revocaretur
[Gracchus t[vib(unus)] p(ebis) intercessit. L. Cornelius


Col. ii.

Scipio damnatus....]. eni.

[lib(er) xxxv]iiii

per C. Flaminiun et M. Aemiliun cos. Ligures
perdomiti. viae Flaminia et Aemiliana munita[e.

Latinorum [{.............}num caecata

ab Roma redire. Manlius ]m de Gallo-

graecis in furiurnpho {...........}an[. pecunia

qua trans[alata] crat....]is f[e][s]oluta.


His[pania meretri]ce et pupillo

Aebutio guem T. Sempronius] Rutilius
tutor et mater Duronia currence scriberant

indiciun re referentibus Bacchae-

(n)alia sub[la]ta {...........}His[pan[i]

subacti. at[letarum cor]tamina

primum a Fulvio Nobiliore edita.

Gall(i)s) in Italianam transgressis Ma[rcellum

[per]nasit [ut trans Alpes redire]nt. L. Cornelius

Scipio post bellum Antiochi] ludos voti-

vos con[lata pecunia feci].


Ligures fu[gati. {...........}llis accepta

B.C. 186.

50 P. Claudio Pulchi[o L. Porcio Licinio cos.

hominem ced α [a Naevio pr(acter) ven[efici(i) dannati.

L. Quintius Flamininus ...] Gallia

guod Philippo [Poeno scorto] suo desider-

rante gladiatiorium spectaculum

B.C. 185.

37. 1 Felczenia. 39. 1. currence scriberant. 40. 1. indiciun. 44. 1. Ma[rcellus.

51. 1. hominum circa d[uo] (millia)?
Col. iii.

55 sua manu Bonum nobilem occiderat
a lanatone consore senatu motus est.
vastaita Porcia [facta].

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

60 ludis fune(bris) [......... in foro tabernaculis po(sitis eventi id quod
nate\c e\cin\erat (taberna\eula ......
in foro futura. \[16 letters
dim[. . . ] . m. Hau\nibilal 12 letters

65 \[. . . . . . . \] pher 19 letters

l\(i\)ber(xxx


[. . . . . . .] bellun \[ 16 letters
[. . . . . . . \] ellitesin \[ 16 "

70 [. . . . . . . ] Theoxena 15 "
in mare m[. . . . . . .] sugien, ........ Demetrius
ficte grimonibus [ accusatus . . . .
per patrem coactu\s 14 letters

P. Lentulo M. Paebio [cos.]

in agro L. Neryllii scribae libri Numae inventi.

A. Postumio C. [Calpurnio] [cos.]
cum Liguribus Hispani subacti.
L. Livius trib(uns) pl(ebis) quod [annos nati quemque
magistratum pete\rent rogatio lata

est.

Q. Fulvio M. Manlio 6\(i\)os.

M. Lepidi et Fulvii Nobili\ors .......

55. 1. Be\(u\)m. 56. 1. M. Catone for lanatone. 57. 1. basilica for vastaita.
62. 1. vel(e) for nate(s). 67. 1. Baebio for Berio. 72. 1. fictis crim\(i\)bus.
1. Cornelio (or Cethego) for Lentulo and Baebio for Paebio.
1. \(a\) L. Villio for L. Livius and quot for quod.

Col. iv.

adversus Chajri\(g\)ini\(e\)nes. Lusitani va\(s\)tati. Book 48 (B.C. 150).
C. Cornelii\(s . . . \) ecus quod P. Decim su\[. . . .

H
a. ictam ingem(a)m stupraverat d ci[. . . .

damnatus.

lib[er]] xxxviv[iii

L. Marcio Censorino M. Man(i)lio cos.
bellum Punicum tertium exortum. Uticenses
[denigne locant auxiliate. Chartaginenses
[ius] deditionem venerunt, iussi omn[e]g[a] [sua
in alium locum transferr[e] m[e]. . . . . . . . .
redierunt. Romanos . . . . . .

pepulerunt. Scipio\  21 letters

Aemilian[i] f[ll]dem p[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Aemilian[i] virtute exercitus qui obsessus
a Poenis erat liberatus. 16 letters
per Caridemum poe[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Ser. Ga(l)ba a Lusitanis reus product[. . . .

fili quos flens compl[xus est. Andrisco . .
tii se Philipp[i]um ferente Macedonia
per arma occupata. [ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
Man(i)lio et Marc(i)o \cos. quarti ludi saecula-
[re[s] factos quos op\rtuit Diti ex Sibyllinis

[terennii faci sunt.

\ lib er[.] l

per socios popu\li Romani Pseudophilippus
in ultimam \[ . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
l[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .

Prusias?

90. l. auxiliati; cf. p. 104. 101. l. filii\m.

Col. v.

[rex Bithyniae positus est. ad Attalum regem
[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
in pugnamentasi sunt legati Marco
[. . . podagricus A. Hostilius Mancinus capite
[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
a quondam L. Manilius Volso stolidus
[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
ligationem dixerunt M. Cato respondit

nec caput\ nec pedes nec cor habere\[nt]. M. Scal\n[i]us\[n]us
[. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
am tulit \(de\) in stupro deprehensi(s).

[Sp. Albino L. Piso\ne cos.

Book 49.

B. C. 149.

Book 50.

B. C. 148.
[Masinis(sa) ulterior senectutis liberos III

[. . . . . .]s religuit decedens, cuius re-

120 [gnum natu max]inis filis per miliaannum distributum.
[Marcellus leg]atus ad Masinissam missus

[obrutas. Ha]ydrubal quod adfinis Masinissae erat

[. . . . . .]ta subselli socius est. Scipio Aemilianus
[consul creat]us.


[Inventii pr(atoris) in Thessalia exercitus caesus.
[Philippus a] Metello captus. sacrum

[. . . et laur]us soci maximo incendio

[ inviolata. ]

130 [ lib(er) li]

[P. Corneliio C. Livio] cos.

[. . . . Cartha]ginein Appius crudelissime

[. . . . . .]ne obsidentiis Romanos non

[. . . . Carthagi]nem crebris proeli(is).

135 [per Achaoram pr(aetorem) Corinthi legati Romano

[pulsati. Lusitani subalti.

111. 1. in Pergamenos (l) missi for pugnamentasi (cf. p. 105) and M(arcus) . . . for

Marco. 114. 1. legationem. 120. 1. Aemilianum for miliaannum. 123. 1. occisus


Book 51.

Col. vi.

Cu. Cornelio L. Mumnio cos.

[pr]e Scipionem Carthago

[d]'irepta. qu[]

140 visset uxore rem
duobus filis
potestate [ Aemilia qu]

[ lib(er) lii

145 L. Muniano C(orninthum diruit.
uxore o[ peruriam[ a Lusitanis clades
accepta. [ ]

H 2
Q. Fabio Maximo L. Hostilio cos.  
M. Petronii adversus Viriathum  
Ser. Galba L. [Cotta cos.  
L. Metellus consulatum [  
qui invisiis plebi petitur  
Syria va[stata  
con]ten[i[  
liber) liii  
Q. Metello [Appio Claudio cos.  
Rethog[en  
liberos  
proposito a[  
occidit, a Tyresio quem devicit gladiu[n  
don[dono accepit sagul[que remi[ss[am[i[  
[Metellus cos. a Lusitanis vexat]us. ]  
[s]igna statui(a)s tabulas Corinth[ias L. M[ummius  
distribuit circa oppida et Rom[. . . .]vit.  
Q. Fabius Maximus Lusitanis caesis ]  
Viriathum fugavit.  
lib(er) liiiii  
Pompeius cos. a[n] Nu(a)mantinis d(evictu)s. in  
Scordiscis cladis accepta.  
Appius Claudius evicit ne duos [delectus?] annus  
haberet. Uemilius Torquatus D. [ila]num  
filium su(m) de Macedonia damnavit; f(uneri  
on interfuit, c[ademe] die [i.n do]mo] sua  
consultantibus respondit.
185. [Q.] Fabius Maximus a Viriath[i]o devictus de-
[fermum cum hostibus pacem fecit. Q. Oecius
[insidiis Lus[i]stanorum fortissime
[pugnavit. linae devota est aqua An[n]io. aqua
[Marcia in Capitolium contra Sibyllae carmina

190 [perducta.]

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

Col. viii.

Chaldaei urbe ti[i] 20 letters
A. Cabinius vernde ....... rogationem tulit
suffragium per tabellam ferri. ...........

195. Servilius Caepio a[b]equitibus quos periculo
obiecerat clavo [ictus] 15 letters
Audax Minurus <D>italico 17 "
Viriathum ingula|verunt.
lib(er) [tv

P. Sc[e]pio D. Junio [cos.
interfectores Viriath[i] ......... praeclium
negatum, eum Scipi[onem Nasicam et
decemviri[m co]s. Lici[nus et Curiatius
trib(uni) pl[ebis] in car[er]em [coll]ocarent,........

205. precibus populi mult[e]a remissa. ...........
trib(unus) pl[ebis] pro commodis populi ..............
omnibus luci exspavt, co[.]un[.] ......... des-
serto[s in comitio virgis cae]si sestertis
singulis venierunt.

210. P. Africanus cum L. Cottam [accu]sar[et ..... 
magnitudinem nominis ]. cae[.]
Diodotus Tryphon An[tiochum] [regem occi-
dit Suriague potitus est. ]
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Fr. (a). Fr. (b). Fr. (c). Fr. (d).

... ... ... ...
] Sullanis [ ... ... ...
] neum [ ... ...
] 220 ye non re[ ...
] [ ... ...
] 230 ... ... ...
] sami[n ... ...
] is me [ ...
] avit p[ ...
] estodia[ ...
] 225 ... ...
][ ... ...
][ ... ...
][ ... ...
][ ... ...
]

1. Cf. Livy 37. 46.
2. Cf. 37. 47.
3. It is probably Aetoli**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.
4. P. Lepidinus: his correct name was P. Licinius (37. 51). maximus is a repetition of part of his title.
5. [. . . .]ant: this word must be corrupt; tenuit or retinuit (cf. 37. 51) would be expected.
6. Anti[cho regi pax data: cf. 37. 55.]
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. Probably Phrygia or Asia tota.
14-17. For the story of Ortiagon's wife see 38. 24. *captian* must be *captiva*, but *uxor* is much wanted and *nobilis* is probably corrupt. Possibly *an nobile* is due to a reminiscence of the words *Ancyram nobilem* which occur at the beginning of the chapter.

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.


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.


49. The defeat of the Ligurians by the two consuls occurs in 39. 32, and the next event related is the elections. What *illis accepfa* refers to is not clear. Possibly *multa millia capti* was meant (cf. 39. 32 *multa militia hominum in ipsi capit*); or *illis* may represent part of *cladis*, and *in or a Hispanis* may be supplied (cf. ll. 174-5 and 212), the reference being to the defeat mentioned in ch. 30. 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 *quod*.

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. *Hannibal*: a reference to his death; cf. 39. 51.
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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]; [f]ugient se dedid (or iecit). Livy’s phrase is in mare sese detecit.
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 co anno rogatio primum lata est ab L. Villio tribuno plebis quot annos nati quemque magistratuum peterent caperentque.
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 Cha[r]aginiones: i.e. the war with Masinissa; cf. Epit. 48 ad fin. Carthaginenses cum adversus foedus bellum Masinissae intulissent ...
84. Probably Cethlecus, i.e. Cethegus; cf. l. 14 Origiacontis for Ortiagonis. 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. 160.
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 auxiliati (sc. sunt), and locant perhaps conceals the object (? Romanis). locant auxilium, 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.
91-3. Cf. Epit. 49 tunc cum ex auctoritate patrum inerent (sc. consules) ut in alium locum dum a mari decem milia passuum ne minus remotum oppidum facerent, indignitate rei ad rebellandum Carthaginenses compulerunt. For facerent Gronovius had conjectured /ransferrent, which seems to have been the verb employed in l. 92. The embassy of the Carthaginians mentioned in ll. 90-1 came to Rome (cf. Epit. legati triginta Roman venuerunt per quos se Carthaginenses dederunt); 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 *tra'nsferr'e may well be a mistake for in. The whole phrase would then be an antithesis to *in dedicit iun venit*um in l. 91.

93-5. The subject of *pepul'eren* 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, *Pun.* 98-9.

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

97-8. Who this Charidemus was is unknown. *polf* is possibly *poélam*.

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 *filii* may be read.

101. Unless *Philii* is an error for *Perseus*, Reid is probably right in correcting *iis se Philippo to Per'ese Philippum;* cf. Epit. *Perseis se filium feras et mulato nomine Philippus vocatus*... *totam Macedoniae aut voluntate incolumitum 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 Didi patri ludi ad Terentum ex praecepto librorum Sibyllinarum facti, qui ante annum centesimum primo Punico bello quingentesimo et altero anno ad urbe condita facti erant.* This is confirmed by a passage in Censorinus, *De die natalit.* 17. 8, to which our attention was called by Kornemann and Wissowa, *de quadrarum ludorum anno triplex sententia est.* *Antias enim et Varro et Livius relatos esse prodiderunt L. Marcio Censorino, M. Manilio consulis post Romam conditam anno sexcentesimo quinto.* *Ad Pisos Censorios et Cn. Gellii sed et Cassius Hemina qui illo tempore vivebat post annum factos tertium affirmant L. Cornelio Lentulo, L. Mammio Achato* consulis, *id est anno sexcentesimo octavo.* *in quindeinde virorum autem commentariis notantur sub anno sexcentesimo octavo Marm. Aemilio Lepido, L. Aurelio Oreste* consulis. The restorations of *Il. 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.

107-8. Cf. Epit. 50 *Thessalia cum et illam invadere armis alque occupare Pseudo-philippus vellet per legatos Romanorum auxilios Achaororum defensa est.*

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 *Prusias in l. 109* is right, *positum* is probably corrupt for some word meaning 'killed' (*locutius, cf. l. 123*); but (de)*positus is just possible, for Prusias seems to have been first abandoned by his subjects (Justin 34. 4). *depono* in the sense of 'depose' is however not classical. Kornemann would retain *positus* 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. *si* before *sunt* must be the termination of a participle such as *missi;* but what is *pugnamenta?* *Pergamenos* is not very satisfactory since the mention of Pergamus seems unnecessary after *ad Altalam regem.* The names of the ambassadors are given only by Polybius (37. 1b) as Marcus Licinius (gouty), Aulus Mancinus (broken head), and Lucius Malleolos (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 *Tolso* (Vulso). The Manlii Vulsones were a distinguished patrician family in
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the earlier part of the republic, and members of it were consuls as late as B.C. 189 and 178. Marco in l. 111 is probably M(arco) followed by the first part of another name which was more probably a cognomen (?Archias) than Licinius.

The first half of l. 113 seems to be corrupt. ½ may be the termination of test/a (cf. Polybius, B.c. 6. 9. 29 τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐπικορείας); but a participle is also required, and even if there were space for it before test/a 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 repulsam be supplied? A certain tribune 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 Scantini accused 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, Strabo, pp. 703). He therefore thinks that the present passage refers to the passing of the Lex Scantinia, and that Yam is corrupt for the termination of plebisctum, while in stupro deprehensi is for de in stupro deprehensis.

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 . . . adae etiam in senectam sivegit ut post sex tum et octogesimum annum filium genuerit. intre tres liberos eius, maximum natus Micipsam, Gulussam, Mastanabalem . . . 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.

121-2. Cf. Epit. ex tribus legatis qui ad Masinissam missi fuerant, Claudius Marcellus coorta tempestate obrulus est.


125. The Epitome is more explicit: M. Manilius aliquot urbes circumpostlas Carthaginis 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 ueretur, sacrarium et ex duabus altera laurus ex mediis ignibus invidiata exstiterunt, upon which passage the restorations of ll. 128-9 are based. sori is corrupt, possibly for Opis.

130. The blank space between ll. 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 at 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 Achaesi pulsati sint Corinthi. The Achaean praetor referred to was Critolaus.

136. The simplest correction for subalti is subacti, but no victory over the Lusitanians 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 a victory over the Lusitanians 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 Lusitani 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 Lusitanians.

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. wxore: 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 clades 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 Attalus and Prusias in B.C. 156 is mentioned in Polyb. 32. 36, 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 sic 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' candidacy 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 l. 164-6 and 167. For invisius plebi ob nimiam severitatem et ideo post duas refusiias consul aegre factus.

161-3. Reid is no doubt right in connecting this passage with the story told by Valerius Maximus (v. 1. 5) of Rhoetogenes' 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*) nobilitate ac virtute Celtiberos omnes praestantem . . . succumbere sibi coigit; nec erubuit flagrantissimi pectoris iuvenis gladium ei suum et sagulum . . . tradere. *ille vero ciam petitii ut hospitii iure inter se inunti essent . . . This corresponds to *a Tyrezzo, &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 *sagulique remisso* is an ablative absolute and *sagulique* is not to be altered to *sagulumque*. With regard to the name of the Celtiberian, the form *Tyrezzo* found in l. 164 is supported by Orosius v. 8. 1 (a reference which we owe to Dr. Greenidge), where a *Celticus princeps* called *Tyreus* 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 proconsulti*; 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 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 Quinctius, 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 Quinctius 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, *Zeitf. p. 69. J. 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 Oblivio.

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. 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 (Iber. 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 ἐπιόντος ἔτους Κοίνῳ μὲν ὁ ἀδελφὸς Αἰμιλιανὸς Φάβιος Μάξιμος Σερουλιανός (Αἰμιλιανὸς MS.) ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν στρατηγίαν διὰ διακόσιον 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 ἐπιόντος 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
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 (I. 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 Servilianus 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 Amelianus and the arrival of Fabius Maximus Servilianus. The governorship of Amelianus is expressly stated by Appian to have lasted two years (Iber. 65). Amelianus was consul in B.C. 145, and that the years of his governorship were B.C. 145–4 is unquestionable; cf. Epit. 52 tantumque timoris is hostis intulit ut adversus eum consulari opus esset et duce et exercitu. The disaster to Plautius which led to sending an experienced general is, as we have said, very likely alluded to in l. 147 of the papyrus, and l. 151 may well refer to the dispatch of Amelianus. So far as is known, Amelianus 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 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 Servilianus 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 Amelianus in B.C. 144 and B.C. 145, Appian proceeds (ed. Mendelssohn): καὶ τάδε μὲν ὁ Ἀμελιανὸς (Σερουιλιανὸς MS.) ἐργασάμενος ἐς Ρώμην ἀπῇρε διαδεξαμένου τὴν ἀρχὴν Κοϊντου Πομπηίου (τοῦ) Ἀθου. (ὁ δὲ ἀδελφός αὐτοῦ Μάξιμος Λιμυλαῖος MS., omitted by editors). ἐφ᾽ οἷς ὁ Ὀυρίαθος οὐχ οἷς ἔτι καταφρονῶν Ἄρουακοὺς καὶ Τίτθους καὶ Βέλλους . . . ἀπέστησεν ἀπὸ Ὥμυλαν, καὶ πολεμῶν ἄλλου οὖν ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτῶν ἐπολέμουν ὡς ἐκ πόλεως ἀνών μᾶλ Νομαντίῳ ἑγοῦστιν . . . καὶ συνάξω καὶ τάδε ἐς ἐν μετ᾽ Οὐρίαθου. Οὐρίαθος μὲν ἐπὶ δάσει τῆς Άρουαίας εἶναι εὐρήσθη στρατηγῷ Ὥμυλίας Κοϊντοῦ (Q. Pomptio in a 16th century translation of Appian made from another MS., now lost) συνεπλέκετο, καὶ . . . ξέτεινε τῶν Κοϊντίου ἐς (τοῦ) Κοϊντίου MS.) χειλίως καὶ σημεια τινα ἔπρασε . . . Κοϊντου (Κοϊντοῦ MS.) διὰ διδάκεν καὶ σφαγίων ὠς ἐκμισοφώνοις, ὡς ἐν Κορδύβῃ χείφαται τῶν . . . τοῦ δ᾽ ἐπούσθος ἄτομον Κοϊντοῦ (Κοϊντοῦ other editors) μὲν τὸ τῆς Λυμυλαίως Φάθους Μάξιμος Σερουελαιὼς (Λυμυλαῖος MS.) ὑπὸ ἐν τῇ στρατηγίᾳ ἐδιδόθη. From this confused and corrupt account it has been generally inferred that a praetor Quinctius succeeded Fabius Amelianus in Southern Spain in B.C. 143, was defeated in that year and was succeeded in B.C. 142 by Q. Fabius Servilianus. 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 Servilianus 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 Spains in 142 B.C. it is not at all surprising that mistakes should arise, and if Κοίντιος in Iber. 66-7 is a corruption of Λούκιος 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 Κοίντιον Πομπηίου Αὔλου is obviously quite corrupt. The insertion of τοῦ before Αὔλου (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 Κοίντιος Πομπηίου Αὔλου mentioned in Iber. 76. That Q. Pompeius was consul in B.C. 141 and succeeded Q. Metellus as governor of Northern Spain in the same year (cf. l. 174). His cognomen was Rufus, so that editors bracket Αὔλου 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 that in the second year a separate governor was sent to the Southern province. On this hypothesis we would suggest that Κοίντιος Πομπηίου Αὔλου in Iber. 65 is corrupt for Κοίντιος Καικίλιου Μετέλλου, and that the following words δὲ διέλθε τοῖς Μάξιμοι Λυκίλανος, 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.?) Quinctius praetor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>L. Caecilius Metellus cons. Q. Fab. Max. Servilianus cons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Q. Fab. Max. Servilianus proc. Q. Servilius Caepio cons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Later Q. Servilius Caepio cons.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Q. Servilius Caepio proc. Q. Servilius Caepio proc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

168-9. Epit. mentions the triumph of Mummius at the end of Book 52, L. Mummius de Achaeis triumphavit, signa areae 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 oppida are meant the country towns of Italy, and perhaps of the provinces as well.

171-2. On the victory of Q. Fabius (Maximus Servilianus) cf. Epit. 53 a Q. Fabio proconsule pars magna Lusitaniae expugnatis aliquot urbis recepta est, and, for the chronology, l. 167, note.

174. This defeat of Q. Pompeius by the Numantines agrees with the received chronology; cf. Epit. 54 ad init. and l. 167, note. For d[evictus] 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, Gna. Caepio.

176. The corruption of Sapiente 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 stipendia] 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. Assillium is for Asellum; cf. Gell. 3. 4, where a tribune called Claudius Asellus is mentioned as having accused the younger Scipio Africanus post quam 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. redderetur is probably for deterruit, and if leges 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 Assellum tribunum plebis interpellantem profectionem suam lictores . . . ens deterruit. What form the interpellation took is not clear. Did the tribune veto the Lex Curia conferre 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 tribunicis plebis ne quaes param tercias copias sequer poteret. 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 *pugnavit* 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 Aquaeductibus Caesarum*. He there states that in b.c. 144 the praetor Marcius 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: *co tempore decemviri dom altis ex causis libros Sibyllinos inspiciunt invenisse dicuntur* (space in MS.; supply *sed*). *aqua Martiam seu potius Anienem, de hoc enim constantius traditur, in Capitolium perducti, deque ca re in senatu M. Lepido pro collegio verba faciente actum Appio Claudio Q. Caecilio consulibus* (b.c. 143); *sed etroque tempore vicissa 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 Anienem, 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 *recta*. 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 Anienem, 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 Hispallus praetor peregrinus M. Popilio Laenate Cn. Calpurnio coss. *edicto Chaldaeos intra decimum diem abire et Italia iussit*, a passage no doubt based upon Livy.

193–4. On the *Lex Gabinius tabellaria* see Cic. Legg. iii. 35. Cicero says that it was *lata ab homine ignoto et sordido*, which confirms the present reference to Gabinius’ base ancestry. What degree of relationship to the *verna* was alleged by Livy is uncertain. *vernof ilius* 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. 460), the phrase *vernae filius* does not suggest the meaning ‘son of freedman’ or ‘of a freedwoman’, though perhaps not incompatible with it. *vernae 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 Gabinius who held a command in Illyria 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 Boissevain), in consequence of his apportioning to them a specially dangerous operation. Caepio had to take refuge from
their violence in flight, and with this clue the passage may be restored on the lines which we have suggested. 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 ietu (of Tiberius Gracchus' death).

197–8. 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, διαφθαρέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ Καπινίωνος δώροις τέ μεγάλοι καὶ υποσχέσεισι πόλλαις. The Epitome does not mention either, but Vitiathus a proditoribus consilio Serviliz Caepionis interfecit 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 irridente Curiale tribuno plebis impositum, et D. Iunio Bruto consulibus delictum habentibus in conspectu tironum res saluberrimi exempli facta est: nam C. Matienus accusatus est apud tribunos plebis quod exercitum in Hispania deseruisset, damnatusque sub furca diu virgis caesus est, et sestertio nummo venit. tribuni plebis quiæ non impetrarent ut sibi denos quos vellent milites eximere liceret, consules in carcerem duci iussunt. 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 Curilius, 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 Scipionem is very doubtful. There may have been some corruption as in the case of Decimium Brutum in I. 203.

205–7. (ab) omnibus luctus seems a better correction of omnib. luctu than omnibus luctui, 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. xxi. 10) florum quidem populus Romanus honorum Scipioni tantum habuit. Serapio cognominate honor propter similitudinem suarit cuialiam negotiatoris, obierat in tribunatu plebei admodum gratus dignusque Africanorum familia, ne erat in bonis funeris impena. assis ergo contulit populus ac funus elocavit quaque praeterferebatur florae et spectum omnium sparso. 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. cf. jun, 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 (Strat.
iv. 1. 20), agrees with the papyrus, *qui exercitum desixerant damnati*, *virgis casti publice venierunt*. *Sesterii singuli* is equivalent to *sesterio nummo singuli*.

210. 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 Murena* 58 *saepè hoc maiores natu dicere audivi hanc accusatoris eximiam dignitatem plurimum L. Cottae profuisse*. Non ingerunt sapientissimi homines qui tum rem illum indicabant ita quemquam cadere in iudicio ut nimis adversarii viribus abiectus videretur (cf. *Divin. in Caec.* 21), though Appian (*Bell. Civ.* i. 22) is probably right in saying that bribery was employed. *Proprer* magnitudinem noninis would accord very well with the *eximia dignitas* of Cicero. The objection to this interpretation is that Cicero (*Pro Mur.* and *Divin. in Caecil. locc. cilt*) 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 Caecil.* occurs the remark L. Cottam P. Africanus ante secundum consulatum et censuram dicitur 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. 139 (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 iudicis*, and the circumstance that Cicero mentions it (*Divin. in Caec. l. c.*) together with the trial of Aquillius 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 Murena* 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. *Lusitani vastati*: the proceedings of D. Junius Brutus in Southern Spain are meant; cf. Epit. 55 *Junius Brutus consul in Hispania iis qui sub Viriatho militaverant agros et oppidum dedì*, quod *Valentia vocatum est*, Appian, *Iber.* 71, and notes on ll. 167 and 216-7. *a* *Numantinis clades accepta*: 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.
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. mak. St. iii. p. 283), chiefly on the evidence of coins.


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

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

669. Metrological Work.

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 σχοινίον, the measure of length usually employed in land-surveys, of which the square was the aroura. 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 οἰκοπεδικὸς πῆχυς, a peculiar kind of cubit which differed from the three previously mentioned, and ll. 11-24 of the measurements and uses of the ξύλον. 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 δκαινα or perhaps δμμα. 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 σχοινίον and οἰκοπεδικὸς 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 ξύλον, 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 Papyrforschung 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.

[ἔχει τὸ σχοινίον] τὸ γεωμετρικὸν ὀγθοα η,  
[tὸ δὲ ὀγθοα ἐχει] πῆχις iβ, ὡστε ἐχειν τὸ  
[σχοινίον τὸ γεωμετρικὸν πῆχις ὑ].  
[tὸ δὲ . . . . . . . . .] ηὲ νὶ πῆχις ρ.  
5 [ὁ ἐνθυμετρικὸς πῆχις ἐστὶν ὁ κατὰ  
[μήκος μόνον] μετρούμενος, ἐμβαδικὸς  
[ὅ κατὰ μήκος καὶ πλάτος, στερεός δὲ ὁ κα-  
[τὰ μήκος καὶ πλάτος καὶ βάθος ἢται νύσω.]  
[ὁ . . . . . . . . .] s ὁ ἰκοπεδικὸς πῆχις ἐ-  
10 [χεὶ ἐμβαδικὸς πῆχις ρ.  
[τὸ δὲ ξύλῳ καταμετρῖτα] τὰ ναύβια. τὸ μὲν βα-  
[σιλικὸν ἐστὶ πῆχων γ,  
[παλαιστὼν ] η,  
[δακτύλων ] οβ.  
15 [τὸ δὲ . . . . . . . . .] ἐστὶν πῆχων ββ',  
[παλαιστὼν ] ισ,  
[δακτύλων ] ξδ.  
[ὁσι' ἐχειν τὸ σχοινίον] τὸ γεωμετρικὸν  
[ξύλα βασιλικὰ] Κβ,  
20 [ξύλα . . . . . . .] λς.  
[. . . . . . . τετραγώνου ἐχει ξύλου α,  
[. . . . . . . . ] α,  
[. . . . . . . . πῆχις γ,]
1. 1. δύνασθαι. 3. 1. πήχεις. 5. 1. πήχεις. 8. 1. ήτοι. 19. Α of AS corr. from ο.
1. πῆχυς.

Col. ii.

μέτρων ἵδη ἐστιν πέντε δάκτυλοι
παλαιστής λιχν[ν]άς στιθαμεί ποὺς πυγών
πήχεις βήμα ξύλον [όργυιά κάλαμος
ἄκενα ἄμμα πλέθρον [ιούγερον στάτι-
30 ον διάυλον μίλιον. θ'. . . . .
oi β παλαισταί λιχν[ν]άς, οι γ παλαισταί
στιθαμεί, οι δ ποὺς αἰ. . . . . . . , οἱ ε
πήχεις λυνούφικος [καὶ . . . . . . . ήτοι
πυγών, οἱ σ παλαισταί [πήχεις δημό-
35 σιος κὲ τεκτονικός, οἱ [ς παλαισταί πήχεις
Νιλομετρικός, οἱ η πήχεις . . . . . . .
oi i βήμα, βήμα δὲ ἐστίν ἡ διάστασις
τῶν ποδῶν. οἱ γ πήχεις εξ ξύλον δη-
μόσιον, οἱ δ όργυιά, όργυιά δὲ ἐστίν
40 η διάστασις τῶν χιρῶν, οἱ πήχεις
κάλαμος, οἱ καὶ άκενα, οἱ [ . . . . . . .
oi εἰσὶ πήχεις.

δάκτυλοι φ πάντα κατί. . . . . . . τού-
του μίλιον καὶ σύμμετρα [καὶ τὰ ἐλάσ-
45 σονα τούτου μεσετεθεῖται [. . . . . . . .
δ . . . [. . . . . . . . . . . . . .

27. 1. παλαιστής: so in ll. 31, 34. 33. λυνούφικος Pap. 35. 1. καὶ. 37. οἱ τ
Pap. 39. όργυια Pap. 42. πήχεις Pap.

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. Ναύβια are measured by the ξύλον; the royal ξύλον contains 3 cubits, 18 παλαιστάι, 72 δάκτυλοι, while the... ξύλον contains 2 2/3 cubits, 16 παλαιστάι and 64 δάκτυλοι; so that the schoenium used in land-survey contains 32 royal ξύλα and 36... ξύλα.

31-41. '2 παλαιστάι make λιχάς, 3 παλαιστάι α σπιθαμή, 4 παλαιστάι an (Egyptian ?) foot, 5 a cloth-weaver's cubit... 6 παλαιστάι a public and a carpenter's cubit, 7 παλαιστάι a Nilometric cubit, 8 παλαιστάι a... cubit, 10 παλαιστάι a βῆμα, which is the distance of the outstretched feet. 3 cubits make a public ξύλον, 4 cubits an ὀργυιά, which is the distance of the outstretched hands. ... cubits make a κάλαμος, 6 2/3 an ἀκανθα.'

1-4. On this σχοινίον, which was unknown when Hultsch wrote his Metrologie, 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 σχοινίον corresponded to the ancient Egyptian measure κηθεν or κηθε νυν of 100 royal cubits, but nevertheless was divided into the series 1 1/3, 1 1/6, 3 1/3 and so on like the aoura. The papyrus now shows that in surveying land the σχοινίον was sometimes treated as having 96 cubits, probably for the sake of convenient fractions, but that there was also a σχοινίον of 100 cubits. The name of the latter in l. 4 may be οἰκοπεδικὸν. The ratio of these two σχοινία of 96 and 100 cubits corresponds, as Mr. Smyly remarks, to the ratio of 24:25 between two kinds of cubits in Roman times; cf. note on ll. 34-5.

9-10. The οἰκοπεδικὸς πῆχυς 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 οἰκοπεδικὸς πῆχυς contained 100 square cubits. The adjective lost in the lacuna is very likely περιστάτικος ( ) which is found in P. Brit. Mus. 119 and Wilcken, Ost. II. 1301 before πήχεις as a measure of area. But how the abbreviation is to be resolved is uncertain. Wilcken (Ost. I. p. 780) suggests περιστατικός : περιστατικός 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 πῆχεις, those in ll. 13 and 16 must refer to παλαιστάι, of which there were 6 in an ordinary πῆχυς (cf. ll. 34-5), and those in ll. 14 and 17 to δάκτυλοι of which 4 make a παλαιστής. 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 ναύβιον, which is known to be a measure of cubic capacity. There is only one measure of length known to have contained 3 πῆχεις, and that is the ξύλον (l. 38), and though no ξύλον of 2 2/3 πῆχεις was known previously, the fact that in ll. 38-9 the ξύλον of 3 πῆχεις is called δημόσιον 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 δὲ ξύλῳ καταμετρὰ τὰ, 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 γεωμετρικὸν (l. 18) has already (l. 1) been applied to the σχοινίον, 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 πῆχεις is in l. 11 called βασιλικὸν, while in l. 38 it is said to be δημόσιον; but in view of the extent to which δημόσιος in Roman
times supplanted the Ptolemaic term βασιλικός (e.g. in connexion with τράπεζα and γεωργός; cf. 600. 13, note), this objection is not serious. The chief interest of this section about the ξύλον lies in the light which it throws upon the size of the ναύβιον (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 ξύλον was the particular measure used for calculating ναύβια, it is difficult to avoid the inference that a ναύβιον was a ξύλον in length, and since there is every reason to think that its dimensions were equal, most probably a ναύβιον was a cubic ξύλον, and as there were two sizes of ξύλον so there were also two kinds of ναύβια.

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 μῆκος is to be supplied at the beginning of l. 21 and [τὸ δὲ πλάτος ξύλον] in l. 22, and that the four-sided figure in question was the square face of a ναύβιον or cube measuring 3 πήχεις each way. ναύβια are probably still under discussion in l. 24.

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

29. ἄκενα: both forms ἄκενα and ἄκεναι 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 μίλιον like those in Tabulae Heroniana III and VII. The only larger measures of length were the σχοῖνος and παρασάγγης. δῖ may be the beginning of δάκτυλοι, since the following details proceed in an ascending scale, and ought to have begun with the smallest measure. But we should expect of δ δάκτυλοι παλαιστής, which is much too long, and the δάκτυλος has a section devoted to it in ll. 43 sqq.

31. The size ascribed in the papyrus to the λυχνία, σπιθαμή (l. 32), πυγών (l. 34), βῆκα (l. 37), ὁργύια (l. 39), and ἄκαινα (l. 41), agree with the statements of the Tabulae Heroniana 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 Ῥωμαϊκός or Ἰταλικὸς πούς of 3¼ παλαισταί are βασιλικός, Πτολεμαϊκός, and Φιλεταιρικός; but none of these will suit. Αἰγύπτιος is not unlikely; the first letter is certainly a or Α, ε or μ being excluded.

33. καί might be supplied in l. 32 instead of of ε, which would then follow λυχνιφῆκος; 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 instead of 4.

34-5. This cubit of 6 παλαισταί is the common πῆχυς, found in the Tabulae Heroniana, but is there also called λυχνιφῆκος and ξυλοπριστικός. A πῆχυς τέλειος ξυλικὸς τεκτονικός occurs in P. Brit. Mus. 154. 7; for δημόσιος cf. l. 38 ξύλον δημόσιον and l. 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, ap. 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 σχοῖνος in l. 3.

35-6. The title Νιλομετρικὸς πῆχυς 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 ἄδιδα 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).
This cubit of 8 παλαισταί or 2 feet is frequently mentioned in the Tabulae Heronianae, but without any special designation. Since it was apparently introduced into Egypt by the Romans (Hultsch, Script. Metrol. p. 42, Metrol. p. 618), "Papatkos or Ιταλικός is very likely to be supplied in the lacuna.

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

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

40. The κάλαμος, which was according to Tabulae Heronianae I an ancient Egyptian land-measure, is stated in the same table (Hultsch, Script. Metrol. p. 183. 3) to contain 63 cubits or 10 feet of 4 παλαισταί. This is also the size assigned in the Tabulae Heronianae to the ἄκαινα or ἄκενα; cf. l. 41. Hence Hultsch supposed that κάλαμος and ἄκαινα were convertible terms. But from the position occupied by the κάλαμος here between the ὀργυία of 4 πήχεις and the ἄκαινα of 63, its size should be not 63, but something between 4 and 63 cubits. A μέτρον τοῦ καλάμον 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 13 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 273 παλαισταί mentioned by Pediasmus, a Byzantine writer of the fourteenth century (Hultsch, op. cit. i. p. 58 and ii. p. 147). This κάλαμος would contain 48 cubits of 6 παλαισταί; and 42 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 48 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 ἄκαινα, which has the customary 63 cubits, came no doubt a higher unit of measurement, very likely the βῆμα (40 cubits), which follows the ἄκαινα in l. 29. οἱ εἰσί 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 τοῖς εἰσί 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 Heronianae I and II ἐλάχιστον δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ δάκτυλος καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐλάττονα μόρια καλεῖται, and III δάκτυλος πρῶτος ἐστὶν ὧσπερ καὶ μονάς. Line 43 is probably to be restored κατὰμετρεῖται τὰ τοῦτον, with [καὶ φι] in l. 44; cf. l. 11.

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 Hephaestus 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 ἐλπὶς ἂν ἐποι [λόγους ...], 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 νη— or νη—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 uncial 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 uncial 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 ἱαρός (l. 6) is indeed not found in the traditional Pindaric dialect, but it has a parallel in σκιαρός (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 μέλη of this description. The paragraphus 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.
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 601, and probably, like that papyrus, of the latter part of the second century. The accents seem to have been added later.

670. 15.6 × 3.7 cm.

671. Fr. (a) 9.6 × 7.3, Fr. (b) 15.5 × 8.1 cm.
1-2. A name, possibly Νικ[ ] (cf. introd.), is to be supplied after λογον. Δα[ ] may be read in place of Δε[ ] 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 x 5.5 cm.

[Δ Νηρηίδες
τό Εδίδαχθη
τοις ταφον αντιασθήσει
ων διά εις πολυποικίλι,
και κοιν(ο)ίς,
ουπω πορφυρεψ η[]
ντον περε]
και κοιν([ο)ίς,
ουπω πορφυρεψ πή[)
θεσπεσιον ε,
θασπεσιον ε,
ουπω πορφυρεψ πή[)
θεσπεσιον ε,
θασπεσιον ε,
ουπω πορφυρεψ πή[)

673. 10 x 4.7 cm.

[ἐδων θερα[]
[μοσταρασ[]
[μενα γλυκι[]
[. ἵπποβοτ[ε]
[. ἵπποβοτ[ε]
[. ἵπποβοτ[ε]
[. ἵπποβοτ[ε]
[μενοις ολυ[.]
[μενοις ολυ[.]
[μενοις ολυ[.]
[μενοις ολυ[.]
[μενοις ολυ[.]
[μενοις ολυ[.]
[. ἵπποβοτ[ε]
[. ἵπποβοτ[ε]
[. ἵπποβοτ[ε]
[. ἵπποβοτ[ε]
[. ἵπποβοτ[ε]

672. 9. The high point is really over the ν 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 Περιδων θεραπων and οθριοσταρα, as Blass suggests.

4. The letter before ἵπποβοτ[ε] has been corrected.

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

9. ἰλικαμοις is no doubt part of a compound adjective like εὐπλόκαμος or καλλιπλόκαμος.

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

[The text is transcribed here with the help of the provided images.]

1. 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. ο or ω might be read in place of ο between ν and δ.


7. The letters of ἵδε 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 o enclosed between two dots (cf. e.g. 16. ii. 4) has been written above the letter after πολλ, which is probably ω. The words may be divided Ἰον πολλ... or μν απολ... .

675. 11.8 x 14.5 cm.

Col. i. Col. ii.

παιαν φιλοστεφα[νω]       κε[. .] μελψφ[. .]...
μελπ[ον]τες α[. .]       κελαδον παια[. .]
ιεραν κ[α]τεχων [. . . .]         μελεισι στεψα[. . . .]
Αλεξαν[δρ]ειαν [. . . .]         ευερων πελα[νον . . .]
5 πολιν [... και βα[. . . .]] 15 θυμα δεδωκατ[ε . . .]
1. \(\pi\alpha\nu\), if right, no doubt ended the line, but there would be room for two letters more.

8. There is a blank space before \(\mu\epsilon\nu\), which is possibly the name of the speaker, e.g. \(\Delta\epsilon\nu\chi\lambda\alpha\omega\). Apparently there was also a slight space between this and the preceding line.

16. \(\sigma\phi\alpha\lambda\omega\) is a word of the use of which there is no other example. The root is that of \(\sigma\phi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\) and \(\omega\phi\alpha\lambda\).
677. 8.6 x 3.9 cm.

There is a blank space in the papyrus on either side of τινι λαλεις. Probably two feet are to be supplied at the end of the line.

8. σαρπα is apparently for ἐνήνεγμαι or ηἴνιγμαι. The doubtful γ 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 ω.

8. The syllable preceding τη 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 uncials 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, uncials, 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, π 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 uncials, 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 uncials, probably of the middle or latter half of the third century.
679–684. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

38–45. These lines are written smaller and closer together than the rest.

680. 6:5 × 4 cm.
3. τι is very doubtful; the vestiges representing τ might be taken for a double point.

14. Or ὑπογο.

681. 11 X 7.1 cm.

[ταρο. [. . . . . π]ροτε] 1) γεγονασι τους α...α.ι
[ις αυτα β[εια. ...] . . .] 2) πλειστοι των προσπε
[. τοικ. [. . [.υ. ποτ[. . . . .]] 10 [υτων Τριβάλλ[ων και]
[κρονομ. . το. . τ[. . . .]]] ] προτερον μεν.. τ]
[και κρατηθεντων των] 5 ) μηνν την προς τον
Τριβάλλων ο[ι] μεν α[Λ]λοι κατα
[μετε ειλον τε δ[ι. .].]ει] καθεκουσαν νυν δε
[...] 15 ] καλουμενων και

6. If Τριβάλλων 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 α and ι is very likely σι. Above the o of τοις 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) [τα]ις δημοκρατιας οι
νομοι παντ[ων εις των]
[ε]ν τη τολε[ς] κυριοι και
[μον]οις εκασ[τ] . . . . . .
5 μοις τε [. . . . . . . .]
[,]υ ουδ[ε] 12 letters
.. . . .

Fr. (b) 7 [12 letters ] δημ[

15 [.] δε δημο. . . . . . . . ω
[α]υδρες Ἀ[θηναιοι]

1. [τα]ις was probably preceded by ἐν. Mr. Smyly aptly quotes Hyperides, Euxenip. xxi. εν δημοκρατία κυριοι οι νομοι δουνται καὶ αἱ εἰσαγγελίαι καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι κρίσεις κατὰ τοὺς νόμους εἰσίν τί δικαστήριον.

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

679–684. NEW CLASSICAL FRAGMENTS

683.

\[\text{tra kυρίον}\]
\[\text{αβασης αυ}\]
\[\text{ο'ρομαστον}\]
\[\text{ε φησι τας}\]
\[\text{τοι ν ιστοριον}\]
\[\text{πο δε τους}\]
\[\text{ακατον λα}\]
\[\text{τον πρεσβευ}\]
\[\text{υν ο και}\]
\[\text{κερνα δι}\]
\[\text{υτων κομι}\]
\[\text{ειων εις}\]
\[\text{παραλαβειν}\]
\[\text{ευ}\]

15. \textit{akaton} may be a complete word; cf. l. 18 \textit{kerya}.

684.

\[\text{τι δοσεις ο ν\\da\\ldots}\\ldots\]
\[\text{ν εργων ευς εισιν \ldots}\\ldots\]
\[\text{σων βουλνται πραγματι\\ldots}\\ldots\]
\[\text{νειν εχει δε τινα και αυ\\ldots}\\ldots\]
5. \textit{ευγενεσταρα[ν]} η τροπο δε ε\ldots
\[\text{χρη} \mu\alpha[λ]ον παιδευειν του[ς] προ[σελευ}
\[\text{σο\'ι μεν βασιλει η του αξιωματος}
\[\text{διαφορα τι μεν παραφει\\ldots}\\ldots\]
15. \ldots\text{του και πυρρος \[ον\]δεν δε ουτω \ldots}
\[\text{και κυμαει και ανα\'ι ας}
\[\text{θυμος βασ[ἠλεως] α\ldots}
\[\text{του και πυρος \[οιδεν δε ουτω \ldots}

5. \textit{ευγενεσταρα[ν]}: the final \textit{v} scarcely fills the available space, and another letter may be lost.
6. The second \textit{v} of \textit{μαλλον} if written would be very cramped and may have been omitted.
9. The traces of the supposed \textit{ο} after \ldots \textit{β} are rather closer than they should be.
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 i. βυσινου might be read, but would make no sense here. Perhaps there is some corruption.

14. κυματων would be expected and should no doubt be restored (cf. l. 16 κυμαινει); perhaps καυματων was written by mistake.

18. παλη: l. παλαι or πολη? There is room for a letter between π and a, but the a 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 x 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 ε]πι καπρων
θη]ρητρων
μ[εμαωτες·
πεσοιθ]ως. η ἢ αλλ' ὅτε δή π'
] αλλος.
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730 ἐποίητο αμφιγύοιςίν ν αυτός | ἄνει αντι [.....

728. The marginal note evidently refers to the Aristarchean method of writing δε δή, namely ὅτε δή, and implies that the word had the Aristarchean accent in the text. Cf. Schol. A on λ 493 Ἀρισταρχος ὅτε δή ὡς δηλαδὴ παραδίγματος ἀνεγίνωσκε, and the discussion of the question in the scholia of Ammonius, 221. i. 1-8, where the ordinary accentuation is upheld. For the reference to the Κοινή cf. 445.

731. The scholium appears to be an explanation of the word ἀμφιγύοιςίν which it interprets in the sense of 'pointed at both ends'; cf. Apollonius' Lexicon, s.v. τοὺς ἄκρων ἑκάτερον μέρος ἥνα ἵνα δύνασθαι δυναμένους. After μέρος something like ἄκρον ἔχουσιν must be supplied; cf. Schol. A on ν 147 οἱ δὲ μεταφορικῶς ἀπὸ τῶν γυών, ὅτι ἑκάτερων ἄκρων ἔχει. The note may have been continued in a third shorter line, and there is a faint mark below the ν of μέρος which (if it be ink) would suit an ε.

732. The marginal note below this line, which should refer to l. 733 σταίησαν τῶν δὲ τράπετο χρώς, οὐδὲ τίς ἔτλη, is obscure. The only word here of which an explanation seems at all likely to have been given is τράπετο, which in the Schol. Didymi is glossed ἠλλάσσετο ἡ ἰδέα 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 along one. Λαῦτ. [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, 686 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. 7:3 X 5:1 cm.  Plate VII.

ii. 50 [αυταρ ο κηρυ]κεσι λίγυρβδογγοισι
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[κηρυσσειν αγ]ορην δε κα'ρηκομωσοντας
[οι μεν εκηρυςον τοι δ η'γειροντο
[βουλην δε πρωτον μεγαθυμ'ων
[Νεστορει παρα νη Πυλογενιεος
55 [τους ο γε συνκ]αλεσας πυκνην
[kλυτε φιλοι θειος μου ευνυνιον
[αμβροσιην δια νυκτα μαλιστα []
[ειδος τε μεγ][εθος τε φυον τ αγ'/χιατα

53. The papyrus probably read βουλη, as do the great majority of the MSS.; but the lacuna is too large to give a real clue. βουλη Ludwich, with Aristoph. and Aristarch.
54. Πυλογειεος: so Lud. with AB, &c.; Πυληγ. SM, &c.
55. θειος: so MSS. and Aristarch.; θειον Zenod.

687. Col. i. 7·9 X 4·5 cm. Col. ii. Plate VII.

> τους δ εγω
αμφ[οτερων
αλλ ο[τε
σταν[τον
210

> αμφ[ω
αλλ ο[τε
ητιοι
παυρ[α
ουδ α'φαμαρτοεπης
215
αλλ οτε

207. There is a diple against this line in Ven. A with the note ὅτι παραλλήλως έξεινοπ και εφίλησα το γορ φαλείν ενωτε ἀντι τον ζυζειν τίθησιν.

211. Ven. A has a diple periestigmene opposite this line.

688. 8·1 X 4·5 cm. Plate VII.

οι δ ετι καμ μεσον
ας τε λεων εφο[βησε

[α]ιεν αποκτειν[οω]
πολλοι δε πρηνεις
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πασας τη δε τ η αφαινεται

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 uncial inscribed letters, 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.

...
690, 691. Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica III.

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 uncialts, which may be attributed to the second century. The texts are remarkable for the confirmation of two conjectures, Porson’s ναυτίλοι for ναῦται appearing in l. 745, and Stephanus’ correction of μέτα 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.

[Χάλκιοντη ως] ὤμιμι
[ως εργῳ μη γ]άρ μ’οι
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[ UserType 691. ]

730 [ει ετι σε αυτοι ψυχης προφερεστε ρων]
[σον θείην [οι δη μοι []
[κηδεμονες τε φιλοι κα[i
[φημι μι κασιγνητην τε []
[ισον ετει κενοις με τεω]

735 [πυρηνιν ας αιει []
[αλι] ιθε κευθε δ' εμην]

738 [οισομαι εις Εκατης θελκηρια]

740 [ος] η γ' εκ θαλαμοιο []

690. 730. ει ετι: the papyrus probably had the ordinary reading, which would quite fill the lacuna; ει γε τι Merkel, ει κε τι Wellauer.
733. κασιγνητην: so L; 1. κασιγνητη with G, Merkel.
735. άς: so L (δε): άς G, Merkel.
738. The papyrus agrees with the other MSS. in omitting the line (739) cited in the scholia of L οισομενη ους αυτοι τοις νεκυος δωρε, with οισομαι for οίσομαι in L. 738.
745. [ναυτιλοι: καιται MSS., ναυτιλο Porson, which restores the metre and is adopted by Merkel. ναυτιλ should disappear from future editions.
691. 909. μιετα: so Stephanus, a correction which has generally been accepted in place of the MSS. reading κατα.

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, 698), 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.

... [ὑπερείτες αὐτούς τοῖς μεσαίοις κατά την προσεειπήσης μετεκραύγασιν] ἐκ τοῖς μυθιάσιν επιστοῖς ὑπεισάσασα ὑπεστήσας τοῖς μυθιάσιν επιστοῖς οὐ συμψήνησιν ὑπεισάσασα προ ἐπιβίημεν αἰταμαθοῦς ὡς καὶ αὑτοὺς μακραίνειν πριν τὸν γενεον εὐκριόφιν' μετα τοῦ παθεῖν προσεειπήσαμεν ἔπειροι περαιὴης βαλλον δὲ κραιπνοὺς ἐπιδοκοῖν πισμάτα νηος εἶπ ηπείροιο περαιὴης ἐμεῖσας Αἰλιτσαί προ γαρ τ' α'μαφανδα [τετυκται]


90 [ποιῆσαι, μηδ' ἐνθεν εκ[αστερ]ιώ ρωμηθὲισαν

80. επ.: so L; δ' G, Merkel.
86. τον γ': τώνδε G (Merkel), τῶνδε 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 ἑκαστέρῳ; ἑκατέρῳ 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 x 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 uncialst, 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.

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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140

śke to kō ὁ τὰλαεργὸς

20 Ἀλκμηνας νῦν ἰς [

σὺν δι αὐτῆς κατεβ[αίνεν

ατίς κυανεάν οὐχ [ξ

ἀλλὰ δι(τη)κεαίς· βα[θὺν

αιετο[ς] ὁ[ς] μέγα λά[ιτμα

7

25 ἃμος δ' αντελλον[τή

ἀρνα νέον βοσκο[ντί

[τα][μος ναυτιλί[α]]ς [ξ

[η]ρώων· κο[ιλ]αν δε [ξ

Ἐλ[λ]άσπωτον ἰκόντο

30 εἰσω δ ὡρμὸν ἰκο[ν]το

αὐλακάς εὐφυνοντί

ἐκβαντες δ ἐπὶ θείνα

[δεὶ[ε]λνο[ι]ς]· πολλοὶ δε[ε]

[λει[μ]]ων [σφι]ν πα[ρεκεῖτο

19. κω: χὸ MSS.

20. Ἀλκμηνας: so most MSS. 'Ἀλκμήνης 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 δι(κεαίως is corr. to δι(κεαίζε.

25. It is not certain what was written above the initial α. The supposed η between two points (i.e. ημος for ομος) is possibly an accent and breathing.

30. εἰσω: ἕθετο MSS., Z. ἕτετο is a repetition from the previous line.

34. [σφι]ν πα[ρεκεῖτο: γάρ σφιν ἰκέτο 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 ὅλθ(εως), Ψεναμοῖν(ις) ἀπὸ Ταλαώ.
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 ν 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...
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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.

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

Fr. (c)  Col. v.  32. 4.

Fr. (d)  Col. vii.  34. 3.

[κην οι[ς] μηδε επεδειν οιον
[τη ηρ] φευγουντες τε γαρ εν
[κρατου] και[ν αναχωρουσιν επε]

Col. vi. 33. 2.
χωρ[λον ρε]
30 θοτη[ει και] υπο της πριν εν
[οι] οι Δακεδαιμονιοι [ου[ικ ed]ν]
[ναντο] διωκειν σπα εχον
[τες χρονου μεν ευν τινα]
35 ολιγον ουτως προς αληθους
[ηρο] διωκοντο των δε
[Δακεδαιμονιων ουκετον ο]
[δεως] επεεχιν ης προσπειπτο
[εν δυναμενων γνον]ντες αυ
40 τους ο[ι] ψειλου βρα[τερους ηδη]
αντα τωι αμυνεσθαι και
αυτοι τηι τε υσει των θαρρη[ειν]
το πλειοντον ειληφοντες πολ
λαπλασιοι φαινομενοι και

45 ξυνειδησμενοι μαλλον μη
κετ ειδους αυτους ομοιως
σφισιν φαινεσθαι οτι[ει] ουκ ευνυς
αξια της προφορια[ς] επε
[πονθεσαν οπιτπερ στε πρω]
50 [του απεβαινον] τηι γ[υ[οιμη]
[δεδουλωμενοι] ως επι οι
[δακε][δαιμονιους] καταφρονη
[σαντες και ει] βοη[σαιντεσ]
[αθροι φορησαν ευτ αυτους]
55 [και εβαλλον ιε]θο[ις]

2 lines lost. istogram. ovōtes
ν[ι]|01
ν[ι]01
π|05
90 ε[σ]πινής
ξυμπτωμάτι
[μ][γαλω[ι]
100 μ[σπυλαίς
τ|ηι
τ|ων

4. ἀπροσδοκητῶς: for the variant ἀπροσδοκητοις, which is not otherwise recorded, cf. e.g. ii. 93. 4 ἀπροσδοκητός ἐπιπεσόντες. It may be doubted whether αὐτοῖς was retained with this reading or was replaced by αὐτοῖς.

5. η: the omission of iota adscript is unusual in this papyrus.

6. ε[ω|α]ν: this is the order of CEGMF,; ἂν εἶναι ΑΒΕ. IO—I. ἀναλαμβανόντας ete was the original order, but ers was subsequently inserted at the end of l. 10 and cancelled in l. 11. ἐτι ἀναλαμβάνοντας is the reading of all MSS. Hude prints κἀναλαμβάνοντας, a modification of Abresch's conjecture καὶ ἀναλαμβ.

12. It is unfortunate that the beginning of this line is lost since editors have suspected a corruption in λαθόντες τὴν ἀπόβασιν. The ordinary reading suits the size of the lacuna well enough.

13. τας ναυς, 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.

14. ἐπεβαίνον: ἐππαί MSS. The new variant is supported by other examples in Thucydides of κατὰ ὑπὲρ τὸ εἰσόθε, e.g. in this book 17. 2, 55. 2, 67. 4.

16. ἀπεβαινεν: ἐπεβαινον, the reading of the MSS., has been commonly changed by editors to ἀπεβαινον, an alteration which is now sanctioned by the papyrus. The singular ἀπεβαινεν may also well be right.

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

23. ψελτοι καὶ οἱ: so the MSS. The papyrus gives no support to the suggested emendations (ψιλοί καὶ σοι Cobet, ψιλοί καὶ Madvig).

28. [ἐκρατουν]: there would not be room for Hude's conjecture ἐκρατοῦντο.

29. Similar insertions of ν ἐφελκυστικῶν occur in l. 47, 16. ii. 9, &c.

30. The original omission of χωριων τε may have been caused by the homoioarchon of χαλεποτητί, but it is noticeable that the words have not been supplied in quite their right position.

35. The addition of the ς of ουτως is parallel to the insertions of final ν; cf. note on l. 29. ὁδῳ MSS., Hude.

38. ἐπεξεῖν: ἐπεκθεῖν MSS. ἐπεξεῖν here might be supported by such a use as τὰς
The superscribed reading, ἁμφισθαῖ, is that of the MSS., but ἀμφισθαῖ is far preferable. It is noticeable that the interlinear a 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 τοῦ βαρρεῖν τὸ πλεῖστον, Dobree's conjecture πιστόν 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 ι 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 τοῦ βαρρεῖν or βαρρεῖν 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 τῶι 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 τοῦ 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 πολὺ in l. 63.

45. The i written above ει of ἔξωθενησεν has been again cancelled.

47. σφίσι 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. δià τὸ aυτῇ is the MSS. reading. The o of το has been corrected from ε (?) .

61. συγκλησαντες : elsewhere in the papyrus υν is written.

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

63. ου πολὺ σεχώραν: δ' ου πολὺ ἀπέξει MSS.

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

66. The alternative spelling πλεον is that of the MSS.

71. διαφέυγοντες: l. διαφεύγωντες, with the MSS.

72. πίρος: ἐς MSS. The z is quite certain.

76. [ον Αθηναῖοι: καὶ of ᾿Αθ. MSS. It is just possible, though unlikely, that the papyrus had καὶ at the end of the previous line; there is not room in l. 76 for καὶ before οι.

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

86. [περιμενον,] 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. πιστεύοντες: πιστεύοντες MSS. The reading of the papyrus may be right.
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* (463), 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.

I. 6. § 3

γαρ ἐφη ἀκούσας ποτὲ σου ὁτι εἰκοτως αν κα[ι] παρα θε

καὶ πρακτικωτέροις εἰς οὑσπερ καὶ παρ άνθρωποις. οὔτε

μη ό[π]οτε εν αποροις εἰς τοτε κολακευοι. ἀλλ [ο]τε αριστα


5 λον δ εφησθα χρηναι ὡσαυτως επιμελεισθα[ι] ουκουν νῦ

ἐφη ω πα[ι] δι εκεινας τας επιμελειας ηδειαν μεν ερχη

π[τ]ρος τους θεους δεησομενος ελπιεις δε μ[α]λλον τευχη

σοιων δ εαν δεη ὃτι συνειδευει σαυτω δοκει[σ] ου] πωποτε

αμελησαις αυτων· πανυ μεν ουν εφη ω πατ[ε]ρ ως προσ

κατο

10 φιλους μοι τους θεους οντας ουτω διακεκιμενα· [οι] το· τι γαρ ε

φη ο παι εκεινα μεμησαι· α ποτε εδοκει ἡμ[η]νιν· οποσα γαρ

δηπον δεδωκασιν οι θε[οι] μαθοντας άνθρωποις βελτι

[ο]ν πραττειν. η ανεπιστημονας αυτων οντας· και εργαζο

μενους μαλλον ανυειν η αργουντας και ἐπιμελομεν


[π]α[ρ]εχοντας αυτους οιους δει, ουτους ημιν εδοκεις δειν καὶ

[αιτ]εις[ι] εις τα αγαθα παρα των θεων· ναι μα Δι ε[φ]η ο Κυρος

§ 6

§ 5

σου γ

μεμημαι μενοι· [ου] τας ακούσας και αρ α[ν]αγκη νη

πει[ε]θεισας τω θεους τουτων και οιδα σε επιτιθεντα αυ

20 π[ου]ις ουδε θεμις εις αιτεισθαι παρα των θεων ουτε

ιπ[τ]ε[ε]ινυν μη μαθοντας ἑπομαιχοντας νυκαι· ουτε

μη [η] επισταμενους το[κε]νειν το[κε]νοντας κρατειν των ε

[πιστ]εμενον το[κε]νειν ουτε μη επισταμενους κυβερ

ναι[ν] σωζειν εις[ε][σ]θαι ναιν κυβερνοντας· [ο]υτε μη σπει

πτον


φ[πι][α][κε][με][νον]ς γε εν πολεμω σωτηριαν αιτεισθαι· πα

ρ[α][γα]ρ τους των θεων θε[ς]μους ταυτα και τα τοιαυτα πα

1. 2
τα εἰναὶ τοὺς δ' ε[α']θεμίστα ευχομένους. ομό[ϊ]ως εφησθα [είκο]ς ε[ι]ναι παρα θεων ατυχειν. ὡσπερ και παρ ανθρωπω
30 [απ']κ[τ]ειν τους παραμόρφοις δεομένους' εκείνων δε ε §7
[φη] ω πται επελαθον α ποτε εγω και συ ελογ[ι]ομεθα. ως
[ικα']νον' ας ει χαι καλων αν[δ']ρι εργ[υ]ον ει τις δυναιτο επιμε
[λη']θηκαί οπ'ως αυτος καλος τε καγαθος δοκ[ι]μως γενοιτο
[και] τα ε[πιση]δεια [ο]πως αυτος τε και οι οικευται ικανος
[τες οιους δει τουτο] του θαυμασθον δη[που] ημ[ιν] γοτε [ε
[φαινετο] και μα Α'] εφη [ω π'ατερ] μεμηνηι κατι του
§8
40 [το σου λεγοντος σ'μεδ[ικε]ι και εμοι υπερμε]γεθεις ει
[και εργον το καλως αρ]χειν και ν[υν γ εφ] ταυτα μ[οι δο
[κει] οταν προς αυτο το [αρχειν [σκοπον λογισω]μαι ο
[ταν και λοι]πεοι ανθρωπως ιδων κατανο
[ηνω οιον τε οντες δι]λαγι[γονται αρχοντες και οι οι οντε]
45 [ανταγωνισται ημι]ν εισονται πανυ μοι δοκει αισχρον ει
]οντας
[και τοιοντος υποπ]τηδειαν ει

14 lines lost

Recto.

61 ερχη τους παρα Κυναζαρε[ω'] χρημασιν εγωγε εφη ο Κυρος' §9
οισθα δε εφη οποσα αυτωι εστιν. μα τον Δι εφη ο Κυρος'
ομω δε
ου μεν δη ομοι δη' τοιως πιστεις τοις αθηνοις' οτι
δε πολλων μεν ου δεησει πολλα δε και αλλα νυν αναγ
65 κη δαπαναν αυτων γινωσκει' γινωσκω εφη ο Κυρος'

εαν ουν εφη αυτων επιληπη η δαπανη και ε[ι]ων ψευδη
ταν' πως σοι εγει τα της στρατιας δηλον οτι ου καλως'
αταρ εφη ο πατερ συ ει ενοραις τινα πορον και απ εμου
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70 rotas εφη ο παι τουτο ει τις [αυ] απο σου πορος προσγε
νοτο· απο τινος δε μαλλον [ει]κοσ πορον γενεσθαι η α
π[o] του δυναμιν εχοντος· σου σε πεζην μεν δυναμιν ε
χων ενεβενδε ε[ρχ]η ανθ ης οιδ οτι πολλαπλασιαν άλλη
ουκ αν δεξαιο· [ιπτικον δε σοι οπερ κρατιστον] το Μηδ

75 ινα μελετη επιλιπη [[τι]] νομα ων δει υπαρχην· και εθους
ενεκα μηναμενου προσφοδου πορον· το[δε] ε δε [παν

80 [τον] μαλιστα μοι μεμνησο μηδεποτε αναμενειν το]
ποριζεσθαι τα επιτη[δε]α [εστ] αν η χρεια σε αγακαση αλλ
οταν μαλιστα ευπορης τοτε προ της αποριας μη[α]λλον μη
χανω και γαρ τευτει μαλλον παρ ου αν δεη μη σπορειν
δοκον· και αναιτιος ε[σε] πι[α]ρα τοις [σε]αυτων στρατιωτας

85 εκ τουτον δε μαλλον [κειε] υπο αλλοιν] αξιον τευη και ην
τινα βουλη ευ ποιησα[ι] την δυναμει τη κακος μαλλον
εος αν εχης τα δευτα οι στρατιωται νπηρητησουσι σοι
και πιστικωτατους δε λογους σαφ ἵσθε τοτε δυνησει λε
γειν· οτανπερ και ενδεκινοθαι μαλιστα δινη ποιειν i

90 κανος οω Και ευ και κα[κως αλλ] εφη ο π[ατερ aλ]ανος τε

§ 11

μοι δοκεις ταυτα παντα καλος λεγειν και οτι [[ου]] [μεν
νυν λημψονται οι στρατιωται οι δε[χεις αυτων ερι Χαρι
εισαται· υπαρ εφ οις αυτως Κουαξαρης αγιεται συμμαχους
τι οτι δ αν προς τοις ειρη[μενοις λαμβανη τις ταυτα και τι

95 μην ν[οιξ]οις Και [χαιριν τουτων εικος ειδεναι το δεκο
το δ εχοντι δεικται εις οις μεν φιλους ευ ποιουντας αντ
[α]ξεοις εις αυτα διεχοντας εχοντα πεξη[αθαι τισασθαι ε
]
v[πεις]αμελειν τι[ο]υ ποροπεσθαι οιει τι [εφη ηπτου τι τουτο αι
[σ]χρον ειναι η ει τις εχων [μεν αγροις εχων δε εργατας
οἶς αὖ εργαζόστο ἑπείτα [εἰόν δ᾽ ἡ γην αργουσαν αὖν]
[φελῆτον εἰναι ὡς γ᾽ ἐμου ἐφή μηδέποτε αμελήσοντος τοῦ]
[τὰ εἰπηθεία τοῖς στρατιωταῖς συμμηχανασθαι]

105

[πρὸς] η̣[αι]

οὖν καὶ ταξιν ὁλὴν εκαλεὶ δὲ καὶ ετίμα ὅποτε τινάς ἰδοι  
Π. 1. § 30
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16. αὐτοὺς (i.e. αὐτοῖς): ἐστοῖς D, Bod., Stob.; ἐστοὶ τοιτοὺς ἐστοῖς AGR, Dind.;
καὶ οὖν τοιτοὺς ἐστοῖς Et.
17. τα ἀγαθά: so D; τά ἀγαθά AGR, Et., Stob., Dind.; τά ἀγαθά τά Bod.
18. θαυμάζει: so D, Bod.; τοιούτων G; τοιοῦτα AR, Et., Dind. There is certainly not room for τοιοῦτα.
ην: so D, Bod., Stob.; τοι εἰς AGR, Et., Dind.
καὶ οὖν τοιοῦτος αὐτῷ: so D, Bod.; καὶ οὖν τοιοῦτος αὐτῷ Stob.; ἔπειτα ἔπειτα G (second hand in margin.);
καὶ γὰρ οὖν σε λέγοντα ἄν AG (first hand) R, Et., Dind.
20. οὖτε: οὖτε cor. to οὖτε by second hand Bod.; οὖτε other MSS., Dind. Similarly with οὖτε in l. 21.
23. οὐδενεν: so D, Bod., Stob.; om. AGR, Et., Dind.
[οὔτε: so Stob.; οὔτε MSS., Dind.
περί οὔτε: so MSS., Dind.; περί παραγόντα (Stob.) is equally possible.
25. αὐτοὺς αἰτίων: so DG (second hand), Bod., Stob. AG (first hand) R, Et. agree with the original reading of the papyrus in omitting στοὺν (so Dind.).
οὖτε: οὖτε MSS., Stob., Dind.
26. παρὰ: so D, Bod., Et., Stob., Dind.; περί G.
27. ταύτα καὶ τα τοιαύτα παρὰ: so Bod., Stob., and (with the omission of πάντα) D;
πάντα τά τοιαύτα AGR, Et., Dind.
28. αἴθεμιστα: so AG (corrected) LM, Bod., Stob.; ἀθέμιστα DEHRG (first hand),
Et., Dind.
παρί: so Stob.; παρί MSS., Dind.
30. παραγόντα: so ADGR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; τά παράγοντα Et.
καὶ εἰς: so G (second hand in margin.) Bod.; δὲ AG (first hand) R, Et., Dind.
31. a παρί: so ADG, Bod., Et., Dind.; οὖτε R.
32. aν: om. MSS., Dind. After δόνατο Bod. has ἐνδέτι (sic).
33. aντις: so D, Bod.; ἄντις αὐτῷ AGR, Et., Dind.
καλοὶ: τε: τε καλὸς MSS., Dind.
34. ὁδύ: so ADG, Bod., Et., Dind.; om. R.
35. εἰς: so MSS. here and in l. 37; τάπιτῆσει Dind.
[ὁπατος: so D, Bod.; om. AGR, Et., Dind.
καὶ οὐκ: so AD, Bod., Et., Dind.; om. G.; above the line in R.
36. παραπότα: so D, Bod.; ὅπως ἄν AGR, Et., Dind.
παράνομα: so ADGR, Bod., Stob., Dind.; τὰ παράνομα Et.
δὲ ἐφε: so G (second hand in margin.), Bod.; δὲ AG (first hand) R, Et., Dind.
37. a παρί: so ADG, Bod., Et., Dind.; οὖτε R.
38. αἴθεμιστα: so ADG, Bod., Et., Dind.; ἀθέμιστα DEHRG (first hand),
Et., Dind.
39. αἴθεμιστα: so ADG, Bod., Et., Dind.; ἀθέμιστα DEHRG (first hand),
Et., Dind.
of Stobaeus ταῦτα μοι δοκεῖ, which suits the lacuna best. ταῦτα μοι τὰ αὐτὰ AG, and, with the addition of δοκεῖ, CR, Et.; ταῦτα μοι δοκεῖ ταῦτα D.

43. [μεταφ.: so D, Stob.; μεταφέ AG, Et., Dind.] Which reading the papyrus had is uncertain.

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

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

61. ἐρχεῖ: so MSS.; ἐρχεῖ Dind.

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

ἐγωγέ: ἔγωγεν Dind.

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

62. εστιν: οἵτι MSS.; Dind.

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

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

64. οὐ δὲ ἔφη: so D; οὐ δὲ ἔφη CR; δεήσει AG, Dind.; οὐ δεήσει Et.

65. γινώσκει: om. Bod.; ἐκ τῶν ἐγνώσκεις AGR, Et., Dind.; ἐκ τῶν οὖ ἐγνώσκεις D in marg. by later hand; δαπανῶν δὲ καὶ ἐγνώσκεις Hug following Madvig.


68. ἐρχεῖ: so MSS.; ἐρχεῖ Dind.

69. μεν: so AGR, Bod., Dind.; οὐ μὲν δὴ Bod. Et. places μέν after δύναμιν.

70. «πορ: so MSS.; ἐρχεῖ Dind.

71. εὖ οἶδ᾽: so AG (first hand) R, Dind.; τοῦτο δὲ παι αὐτὸν (in marg. second hand), Bod., Stob. Flor. 48. 70; δὲ παῖ Ετ.

72. μεν: so AGR, Bod., Dind.; οὐ μὲν D, Et.

προσγενομενον: so DR, Bod., Dind. AG, Et. agree with the reading of the first hand προσγενομῆς.

70. ὦ παῖ τοῦτο: so AG (first hand) R, Dind.; τοῦτο δὲ παῖ ΑΓ (in marg. second hand), Bod., Stob. Flor. 48. 70; δὲ παῖ Ετ.

προσγενομενον: so D, Bod., Stob., Dind.; γίνεται ΑΓ (first hand, τακτικῶν being added in the margin) R, Et.

71. δε: so ADGR, Et., Stob., Dind.; δὲ Bod.

προσγενομενον: so D, Stob.; ἐκ τῶν οὐ γνώσκεις CAGK, Et., Dind.; om. Bod., which also omits πῶρον.


ἐκ τῶν δὲ: so D, Bod., Et.; ἐκτὸςἐκ τῶν AGR, Dind.

73. ἐρχεῖ: so MSS.; ἐρχεῖ Dind.

οὐ: so AG (first hand) R, Et., Dind.; τοῦ δὲ ΑΓ (second hand), Bod.
74. Ἔπειτα, so ADG, Bod., Et. ; τῶν Μήδων Bod., Et.
75. συμμαχοῦ: so ADG, Bod., Dind.; om. R; δοκεῖ εἶναι σύμμαχον ἔσται Et.
76. δοκεῖ: so Bod.; δοκεῖ τι (apparently) D; δοκεῖ σοι AGR, Et., Dind.
77. πάθη: so ADG, Bod., Dind.; πάθοι Et.
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79. καὶ εἶθι; ὅσα αὐτῆς ἔχειν σάφεις τὰν δύνατα, λέγειν Et.
80. with the exception of ἔχεις for ἔχως, AGR, Et., Dind.; ἕως ὅταν ἔχεις σάφεις τὰν δύνατα, λέγειν Et.
81. πιστικωτατοὺς δὲ λογους καὶ πιστικωτέρους σάφ᾽ ἴσθι δυνήσει τότε λέγειν AG and, with δυνήσει λόγους, R; πιστικωτέρους σάφ᾽ ἴσθι λόγους δυνήσει τότε λέγειν Dind. It is tolerably certain that the papyrus had δυνήσει not δυνήση.
82. ἐστὶν τῶν ἄλλων οὗ καὶ ἔτι AGR and, with λέγεις, Et., Dind., and (omitting πάντα and with καλῶς. τὰ ταῦτα λέγεις λόγοι Dind.) so ADG, Bod., Stob.; καὶ πιστικωτέρους τοὺς λόγους κ.τ.λ.corr. τό και πιστικωτάτους τοὺς λόγους κ.τ.λ. Bod.; καὶ πιστικωτάτους αὐτῆς ἔχεις δυνήσῃ λόγους τότε λέγειν Et.; πιστικωτάτους αὐτῆς ἔχεις δυνήσῃ λόγους τότε λέγειν AG and, with δυνήσῃ λόγους, R; πιστικωτάτους αὐτῆς ἔχεις δυνήσῃ λόγοι τότε λέγειν Dind. It is tolerably certain that the papyrus had δυνήσει not δυνήση.
83. πιστικωτάτους λογους τὸν τὸν τοῦτον διοίκησιν ἔχεις Dind.; τὸν τὸν τοῦτον διοίκησιν ἔχεις τὸν τοῦτον τοὺς λόγους καὶ το mamma
92. τούτων χάριν MSS. (except Et. χάριν τούτων) Dind.; but there is not room for τούτων in the lacuna.

93. αυτοὺς: so ADGR, Bod., Dind.; αὐτά Et.
Κυκάρης αγκετας: so AGR, Et., Dind.; ἀγετας Κυκάρης D, Bod.; ἐπάγεται Cobet, followed by Hug.

95. For εἰκὸς D and Bod. have πλείστην εἰκός, and πλείστην is added in the margin of G by a later hand. There is not room for πλείστην in the lacuna, so the papyrus probably agreed in omitting it with AG (first hand) R, Et., Dind.

96. το: so AG, Dind.; τὸν D, Bod.; τὸ Et.
εξορια: so ADG (second hand) R, Bod., Dind.; ἔχοντι G (first hand); ἔχοντι (with a above ἔ) μὲν Et., omitting μὲν after ἐστι. The supplement at the end of the line is longer than it should be by three or four letters, but the only variant is ποιοῦντα (R) for ποιοῦντας ADG (corrected), Dind.

97. ἐστι: so DGR, Bod., Et., Dind.; ἐστι' A.
εξορια is bracketed by Hug, following Madvig.

98. πορίζεσθαι: so ADG, Dind., agreeing with the first hand; πορίζειν R, Bod., agreeing with the corrector.

τι: so ADGR, Bod., Dind.; τοιοῦτο G, Dind.

100. δὴ: so G in marg.; om. ADR, Et., Dind. The reading of the papyrus is uncertain.

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, τοιαῦτα μὲν... Περσίδος, 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
FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

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 uncialis, which probably date from the earlier part of the third century.
1-4. The conclusion of ch. 25 (περὶ δειλίας) in the ordinary version is καὶ διηγεῖσθαι ὡς κινδυνεύσας ἕνα σέσωκα τῶν φίλων” καὶ εἰσάγειν πρὸς τὸν κατακείμενον σκεπσομένου τοὺς δημότας καὶ τοὺς φιλάτες, καὶ τούτων ἕματα ἑυγείηθαι ὡς ἀκότα αὐτῶν τῶν ἐκείνου χειρῶν ἐπὶ σκηνήν ἔκόμισεν. If λεγεμ in l. 2 is right there is no room for εκομισεν. ιτην (not φυλετην), which is an alternative, suggests nothing. In l. 4 after νην is a broad blank space marking the end of the chapter.

5. (ἢ, 26 (περὶ ὀλιγαρχίας) begins δόξειεν (δ) ἂν εἶναι ἡ ὀλιγαρχία φιλαρχία τις ἰσχυρῶς κέρδους γλιχομένη. ὁ δὲ ὀλιγαρχικὸς τοιοῦτος οἷος τοῦ δήμου βουλευομένου (βουλομ. MSS.) τίνας τῷ ἀρχόντῃ προαιρήσεται (προαιρ. MSS.) τῆς πομπῆς τοὺς συνεπιμελησομένους παρελθὼν ἀποφήνασθαι (ἀποφήνας ἔχει MSS.) ὡς δεῖ αὐτοκράτορας τούτους ἐκαὶ κἂν ἄλλοι προβάλλων δέκα λέγειν ἱκανὸς εἷς ἐστιν, τοῦτον δὲ ὅτι δεῖ ἄνδρα εἶναι. καὶ τῶν ἐπῶν τοῦτο ἕν μόνον κατέχει, ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαθόν, κιτιλ. (omitting εἷς βασιλεύς). The definition of ὀλιγαρχία has generally been recognized as unsatisfactory and the MSS. disagree, Pal.-Vat. omitting φιλαρχία and the others reading ἰσχυροῦ for ἰσχυρῶς. The papyrus variant wyvos, 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 ι, 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 μεν, 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 x 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
700. FRAGMENTS OF EXTANT CLASSICAL AUTHORS

marks that occur. Our collations in this and the other oratorical fragments (701–4) are with the Teubner edition of Blass.

3. ὑμᾶς, which Bl(ass) omits after ἀναμνῆσαι 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 τότε or ποτε, like the other MSS. [τότε] Bl.

14. ευτυχηκεῖσαν: ἠὐτυχήκεσαν Bl.

18. ισχυον [ουτως: οὕτως ἴσχυον MSS.

22–3. The usual reading here is καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἄπασιν ἔρις, but some MSS. (including FYQO) omit παρά, O adding "Ελλήσιν after ἄπασιν, 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 τοῦτοις and ἵστε. καὶ παρα or ἄνωθεν might be read, or we may suppose that the scribe was led by the homoioteleuton of τούτοις and ἄλλοις to write simply τοῦτοις ἅπασιν. The entry at the bottom of the column (probably by a second hand), where O's variant Ελλησι is followed by "καὶ after ἅπασιν (cf. e.g. 223. 126), evidently refers to this passage; but how much, if anything, stood before Ελλησι cannot of course be determined. In l. 23 1. τεραχή.

701. Demosthenes, Contra Timocratem.

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 uncial (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 εὖν
[δέκα εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον]

Col. ii.

5 ἡ ἀποτελεσμα τοῦ ἀργυρίου τιμῆς
δὲ ἀργυρίῳ τιμήν τε
θῆνεν ἐκτελεσθὼν τε
ὡς αὐτοῦ ἐκτελεσθὼν τι

15 ἐαν δὲ ἀργυρίῳ τι

μηθι μηθι

ἐκτελεσθὼν τε

πεπαυσόν εὖν

οὐν οὐδω εὖν
10 ὁθὴν ακονετε ὦ

Andres dikastai le

γε αυτοις αυτο του
to παλιν

ἔμοις

20 τιωτερα τις δυο

θεὶ του δεδεσθαι

tεως αν εκτ[ε]ιωσω
sin tous alontas

702. Demosthenes, Contra Boeotum.

13:5 x 6:5 cm.

A small fragment from Demosthenes' oration against Boeotus, pp. 1023-4, written in good-sized uncials 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.

θη και [τ]αυτα λεγ[ω]
εκ τουτων των μ[αρ]
τυριω[ν] εισεσθε
νο[π]τυριαι
5 τοσαυτα τουνν [ε]
μου ελ[α]τουμενου
φανερως ουτοι []
νυν σχ[ε]ται[ων] και

7. ουτοι: so MSS.; οτοι Bl.(ass).
8. νυν: so Bl. with S, &c.; νοι FQ.
9. η[ν]υ: so FQ; και την Bl. with S, &c.
10. μου: so τ; με Bl. with S, &c.

703. Aeschines, In Ctesiphontem.

9 x 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.
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8. ζώντων: the MSS. have ὁρώντων φρονούντων βλεπόντων. Whether the papyrus inserted ζώντων before ὁρώντων or had ζώντων in place of one of the other three verbs (probably ὁρώντων) cannot be determined. ζώντων makes a more forcible prelude than ὁρώντων to φρονούντων βλεπόντων.

14-5. απορίαν εσεσθαι: ἔσεσθαι απορίαν Bl. with MSS. The papyrus reading avoids a hiatus.

16. δὴ: om. MSS., Bl. The insertion of δὴ is an improvement.

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 of the usual third century type. The text contains no striking variants.

Col. i.

[προελεσθα]ι και § 16
[μισασθαι προς αλ]
[ληθα] και ταξα
[σθα]ι κατα τροπον
5 ετι δε των καιρων
μη διαμαρτειν αλ
[λα] και τοις ευθυμην
μασι παρεποντως
ολοι] τον λογον κα
10 τα[π]οι[σ]ιε[ι]αι και[ι
τοις ονομασιν ευ

Col. ii.

των διδακτων
παραλίπειν περι
δε των λογιπων
toioitoyn auton
20 παραδειγμα παρα
σχειν ωστε τους
εκτυμωθεντας και
μιμησησθαι δυ

§ 18
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 πόλεμος 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 praefect, 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 Antinoé (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 τὸ ὅμοιον δὴ καὶ τὸ τούτου φυλαχθήσεται). It is pleasing to know that Oxyrhynchus enjoyed the fruits of Aurelius Horion's generosity for more than a century; for in 60, 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
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.

\[\text{[Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Λούκιος Σ]ἐπὶ} \text{μᾶς[s]}
\text{[Σευφής} \text{Εὐσεβῆς Περτίναξ Σὲβαστὸς}
\text{[Άραβικὸς Αἰαίδανυκὸς Πα]ρὶ[δικὸς}
\text{[Μέγιστος καὶ Αὐτοκράτωρ Κ[αὶ]σαρ}
\text{[Mάρκος Αὐρήλιος Αὐτοκρατορὸς Εὐσεβῆς}
\text{[Σὲβαστὸς]}
\text{[Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ Λούκιος Σ]ἐπὶ} \text{μᾶς}
\text{[ηγα[....] ἐπεθα-}
\text{[15 letters]. ηθα[....] ἐπεθα-}
\text{[13 " τῶν Ὀξυρυγχειτῶν [.]οτρ-}
\text{[16 " ἄρρημα... αγ... []ν}
\text{[16 " [α...[.]ετ...[.]Α[...]
\text{[15 " μας εἰς [... . . . . . . . .]
\text{[15 " πιασι [. . . . . . . . .]
\text{[15 " ἔστιν [δὲ ἡ ᾧ ἱδίωσι.}
\text{[15 οἰς εὐμενεστάτοι Αὐτοκράτοροι [Σ]ευφή} \text{ρων τοῖς πάντων [δ]ιορόσων}
\text{[σωτῆροι καὶ εὐεργεταις Αὐρήλιος}
\text{[Περίκες γενόμενοι στρατηγὸς καὶ ἄρχε-}
\text{[δικασθῆς τῆς λαμπρότητις πόλεως ὁν [Ε]ρεῖαν]
\text{[Αλεξανδρέων] χαίρειν.}
\text{[. . . . οὶ φίλαι ὑπέτατοι Αὐτοκράτορος}
\text{[14 letters]. η ὑπὲρα μεγάλῃ}
\text{[14 " ἐνεὶ καὶ ἔτι [σ]φοβός}
\text{[13 " ο[...] καθό[...] κισέν... ν}
\text{[15 " [τιτ.]στι[...]σ[... .].]σ}
Col. ii.

30 πλείω δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους εὔνοια καὶ πίστις καὶ φιλία ἣν ἐνεδείξαντο κατὰ τὸν πρὸς Ἑλευθάνους πόλεμον συμμαχῆσαντες καὶ ἐτὶ καὶ νῦν τὴν τῶν ἐπινεικίων ἡμέραν ἕκαστον ἑτοὺς πανηγυρίζοντας.

35 ἑτειμησάτε μὲν οὖν καὶ ὑμεῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπίδημοι καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπιδημήσατε τῷ ἔθνει πρώτοι μετὰ Πηλουσίωτας μεταδόντας τῆς εἰς τὸ δίκαστήριον ὑμῶν εἰσόδου, γνωρίζει δὲ τὴν πόλιν καὶ ὁ λαμπρότατος Δαῖτος ἐπὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις καὶ ἐλευθερώτατοι ἔχουσαν τοὺς ἐνοικοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπιεικεστάτους. διαδίτην μὲν οὖν καὶ τὸν ἡμετέρων καταλιπεῖ Τὴ τρῆμα καὶ τοὺς ἑπίσταντας, οὐκ ἔλαττον ᾿Αττικῶν μυρίων τας ἀγωνίζεσθαί τε καὶ φυλάσσεσθαι καθὰ ἐπὶ τῶν προτέρων ὥρισται, τὸν δὲ ἀγωνισμένον τόϊκον χωρεῖν εἰς ἔπαθλα ἐφήβων τῶν παρ᾽ αὐτῶν συναγόμενον περὶ τῶν ἀγωνίζοντες. καὶ ἀξιῶ κελεύει τὰ χρήματα μηδενὶ εἰς ἀλλὰ μηδὲν περί σπάνιν.

166 THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

Col. iii.

55 Εὐσεβῆς Περτίναξ Σεβαστός Ἀραβικὸς Ἀδιαβηνικὸς
Παρθικὸς Μεγίστος [κ]αι Αὐτοκράτωρ Καῖσαρ
Μάρκους Άφρηλιος Ἀντωνίνος Εὐσεβῆς Σεβαστὸς

Αὐρήλιος Ὑπεράνω

χαίρειν.

ἀποδεχόμεθα σε καὶ ταύτης τῆς ἐπιδόσεως ἡν

60 ἀξιοῖς ἐπιδοῦναι ταῖς κώμαι τῶν Ὀξυρυγχείτων
ἀποδιδοὺς ἀμοιβὴν ἐκτάσεως. τὸ δὲ ὁμοίως ἐδρα καὶ
ἐπὶ τούτου φιλανθρωπίας καὶ καθότι ἡ ἥθελησας ἀμε-
τάστρεπτον εἰς ἐτερῶν τι διαπανήσ|ει|μεν τῆ ν χαριν.

65 τοις εὐμενεστάτοις Αὐτοκράτορι Σεῖοὔρῳ καὶ Ἀντωνίῳ

toις πάντων ἀνθρώπων σωτήρσιν καὶ εὐεργέταις

Αὐρήλιος Ὑπεράνων γενόμενος στρατηγὸς καὶ ἀρχιδικασ-
tῆς τῆς λαμπρότατης πόλεως τῶν Ἀλεξανδρεοῦ τῶν

κώμαι τινες τῶν Ὀξυρυγχείτου νομοῦ, ὦ φιλανθρωπότητοι Αὐτοκράτορες,

ἐν εἰς τῆς ἐγώ τε καὶ τοῦ φιλανθρώπου καὶ τοῦ χρησίμου στοχα-
ζόμενος βούλομαι εἰς ἀνάκτησιν αὐτῶν βραχεῖαν ἑκάστῃ ποιῆσαι εἰς συνώνο

χίορτου οὗ ἡ πρόσοδος κατατεθήσεται εἰς τροφὰς καὶ

dιαπάνας τῶν κατ᾽ ἔτος λειτουργησόντων ἐπὶ τῷ

55. Σεβαστὸς inserted later, τοι being above the line. 1. Ἀραβικὸς. s of Ἀδιαβηνικὸς
corr. from v. 56. 1. Παρθικὸς Μεγίστος. 57. Final s of εὐσεβῆ inserted above the

corr. from v. 70. úοι Pap. 74. 1. ἡμετέραι(?).
8. The first word probably was or corresponded to ἀποδεχόμεθα; cf. l. 59.
20. The position of χαίρειν after, instead of before, the nominative (cf. l. 68), is unusual.
42. Perhaps διὰ δὲ ταῦτα.
46. οὐκ ἔλαττον ᾿Αττικῶν μυρίων would refer to the sum which Aurelius Horion proposed to spend, but if ταλάντων is supplied at the end of l. 45 (it cannot come in l. 46) the amount seems enormous. Possibly Λατικῶν is masculine and should be separated from μυρίων.
47. δανείζεσθαι: 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. ᾿Αντ οἷς 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 γο, but the second ν could equally well be i. For νυ, εων can be read.

54-79. 'The Emperor Caesar Lucius Septimius Severus Pius Pertinax Augustus Arabicus Adiabenicus Parthicus 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 saviours and benefactors of the world, Aurelius Horion, formerly strategus and archidicastes 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 burdensome demands of the annual λειτουργίας 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 λειτουργίας on condition that . . .'

61. ἀμοιβὴν ἐνκτήσεως 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 λειτουργίας.

62-3. ἀμετάστρεπτον εἰς ἕτερον κ.τ.λ.: two ideas seem to be confused, (1) the gift is to be ἀμετάστρεπτον, (2) it is forbidden (sc. μὴ ἔξεσται) to spend it on other purposes.

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

77. εἰς συνωνὴν χόρτου: 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 λειτουργίαι. 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] Ἄγυπτιὼς
[18 letters] τοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀναγνώστω τὸ χειρόγραφον Ἀλοῦπος
[14 letters] Ἐξουσίας τῶν ἀπελευθερωσάντων
[15 letters] Ἀλυπτίων νόμοις ὁδεῖν περὶ τῆς
[10 letters] Ἀπαρέξωνα Ἡρακλείδη τῷ πάτρωι
[10 letters] κατὰ τῶν νόμων. καὶ τῷ Ἀπαρέξων αἰτεῖν
[9 letters] Σε κελεύσω.
6. βασιλευστιμωνε γ. κ.π.λ.: cf. e.g. P. Catt. iv. 12, 19, and P. Goodsp. 29. iii. 1, where read Δισθεραίας (? ) λαθήςας.

9. τοῖς ἀστικοῖς νόμοις: cf. the common use of ἀστός and ἀστῆ 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 (l'Egitto, 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. I. p. 58) and the τῆς χώρας νόμοι in P. Taur. i. iv. 17 and vii. 9.

13. ξυϊλοκοπηθῆναι: cf. 653 ἐὰν μὴ ποιήσῃ οὐ μόνον κατακρίθησθαι ἀλλὰ καὶ δαπαγεῖ. Perhaps Ἡρακλείδης 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(οὶ) τόπ(οι) ἐν ψιλοῖς κέλλαι ἐμποίοιμαι ?) ὑπὸ τῶν ᾿Ιουδαίων and of τόπ(οι) ἱερατικοί.

Col. i.

ρῆν.

ἐν δημοσίων καί
Walon ὑπὲρ φόρου οἴνου ᾿ « 7 » ἑϊξαετίας ἔκτακτα Ἰων ἐπὶ τὴν αἰὐ)τὴν ἑξαετίαν δημοσίων ἈΝ fol 4 , DS DS ~ Δ « 4 , δὲ λοιπῇ διετίᾳ τελέσαι τὰ διὰ τῆς μισθώσεως ὑπὲρ φόρου ἀνειλημμένα ἀνασίτησαί τε τὰς τοῦ κτήματος καὶ μηδὲ τὰς πλάτας περιβεβληκέναι. τούτων οὕτως ἐχόντων τῷ 10 (ἔτει) Ἅδριανος τοῦ κυρίου ἐνεργοῦ Καίσαρος τοῖς διηλωθεῖσι μέτροις ὡρισμένοις. ὅν περ λαβόντα τὰς (δραχμὰς) ᾿Β τὸν μὲν τροχὸν μὴ πεποιηκέναι καὶ μηδὲ τὰς πλάτας περιβεβληκέναι. τούτων οὕτως ἐξόντων τῷ ᾿Ιθ (έτει) Ἀδριανοῦ Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου ἐγγυητής
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...

4. ἐκτακτα: cf. 646 ἃ ἔσται καὶ ἐκτακτον τοῦ ... ἄφελικος.

8-9. The value of the two pairs of βόες, 460 drachmae, was apparently included in the 2000 drachmae received by Philinus from Demetria (cf. ll. 26-9), and l. 9 is probably to be restored τιμὴ ὑπὸ τοῦ ... Δημητρίας ἡμ[ες] β βοῶν (δραχμαί) ν. Cf. 729. 39 sqq., where βόες are a good deal more expensive. καταθή might perhaps be read τά καθή[κουτα (?)], the κα being above the line.

10. σύμφυτα: cf. 729. 22. ἐμφορος is otherwise known only from Hesychius, ἐμφορα' προβεβλημένα' ἀγέλη προβάτων, where commentators have supposed some corruption.

15-7. The restoration of these lines, which involve the relations of Plutarchus to Demetria and the brothers, is a doubtful matter. If Δημητρία is made the subject of προπεποίηται, the nominatives ὁ νεότερος ... μισθωσάμενοι, are left suspended. We are
therefore inclined to read Δημητρία, connecting ο νεώτερος with προπεποίηται, and suggest ἕπορον [ἄρωρον ...] ἐξ ἣς τῇ ἰἀρουρῶν ἐξ ἣς τῇ δημητρίᾳ προπεποίηται τοῖς ἱἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις μισθώσεωι κ.λ. περὶ τοῦ ὀξυρυγχείτην is unusual; ἐν τῷ ᾿Ο. would be expected.

23. διαψειλοῦ 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, Οἰ. I. p. 404). These are entries in two very closely related taxing-lists from Soconopaei Nesus, B. G. U. 10. 8 ψυγμοῦ καὶ διαψειλ(ου or -ων) (ἄρωρον) κ.δ. and 277. ii. 5 διαψιγματῶν καὶ διαψειλων πρὸς ἐλαιῶν(ι) (ἄρωρον) κ.δ., the heading in each case being followed by two or three names. The 54 arourae are evidently the same in both documents, and consisted of a ψυγμός or διαψύγματα (cf. P. Tebt. 86. 45 and 522. 4) and διαψειλα or διαψειλος γῆ, upon which certain payments had to be made by the persons named. How διαψειλος differed from ῥήγα γῆ, if at all, does not appear. The word is found in Hesychius, ψηφῶν ψεβδός, διαψειλος.

25. ἀνειλημένα: the verb recurs in the same unusual sense in l. 35. B. G. U. 277. ii. 10 οἱ φερ(οντε) ἐν στάσει φερ(οντε) is hardly parallel.

26. πωμαρίου is of course the Latin pomarium. The use of πλάτας or πλάτης occurs in several inscriptions from Aphrodisias (e. g. C. I. Ἁ. 2824; cf. Boeckh’s remarks ad loc.) meaning apparently the substructure of a funerary monument. Here the πλάτας seem to be surrounding walls; cf. l. 32 τὰ πλάται περιβληκέναι.

37. Apparently not ἱμενας. The supposed δ of δε 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 ½ 3/4) being mentioned, as well as the καλαπατ(ού) καταχθέντος γόμου ἐκ τοῦ ὑπὸ σοῦ νομοῦ, 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.

[X]

[Ἀντίώνιος Αἰλιανὸς στρατηγῷ Διοπ(ολίτου) Θεβ(αίδος) κατασκεύαστος γόμου ἐκ τοῦ ὑπὸ σοῦ νομοῦ]
2–13. '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 Ιαύσιος 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 4 per cent. of earth. Accordingly exact at your own risk from the sitologi who shipped the wheat the difference on the whole amount of the corn, 50 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. ν (ἡμιον) 2: 2½ per cent. on 2000 artabae (l. 4) is 50 artabae, so Antonius Aelianus has added on 3 art.

13. χ(λιάρχου): or perhaps (δεκαδά)(χω). The χ is drawn through the χ.

14. The meaning of this line is obscure. For ἐκσ(μακών) cf. P. Petrie II. 12 (1) verso. Β might be read instead of κ, and there is a horizontal stroke above α. ἐκ(τοστοι) cannot be read. ἐπιστολάς is apparently to be supplied after δό. 
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 Ἀντινοῖτης. 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 λιμνῆ (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.
Fr. (a) 7 x 13.5 cm.  
B.C. III.

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 ὠρογράφος, i.e. a precis-writer, a title not hitherto found on a papyrus, an ἔφοδος 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) ὡρογράφω, ἐφόδωι or καμηλίτη: is probably to be supplied at the beginnings of ll. 7 and 8.

(a)

[...] χρημ[ά]τισον το[ῖς]
ἐν τῶι Ὀξυρυγχίτηι βυβλιαφόροι
ἀνδράςι με ὡρογράφοι α
ἐφόδωι α καμηλίτηι α, / μζ,
5 τοῦ Θωὺθ τοῦ ζ (étous) κατά

(b)

[... ] (ταλαντ ) [ ]
α (τάλαντον) α [ ]
α (τάλαντον) α [ ]

711. Census—List.

7 x 18.5 cm. 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.

\[\text{ἔκαστα...[...]}\,\text{[...]}\,\text{εῷρων κατὰ τὸ παρόν...[...]}\,\text{μενα...[...]}\,\text{ς}.
\text{καὶ ἀλλων τῶν υἱῶν ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵερος (ἔτους) Καῖσαρος λελα-\text{οὺν ογραφημένων ἐπι...[...]}\,\text{βρ...[...]}\,\text{ών ἐφηβευκότων ὁμοιώς κατὰ τὸ παρὸν...[...]}\,\text{μενα...[...]}\,\text{ς}.
\text{καὶ ἀλλων τῶν υἱῶν ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵερος (ἔτους) Καῖσαρος λελα-\text{οὺν ογραφημένων ἐπι...[...]}\,\text{βρ...[...]}\,\text{ών ἐφηβευκότων ὁμοιώς κατὰ τὸ παρὸν...[...]}\,\text{μενα...[...]}\,\text{ς}.
\]

2. τοσ may be the article and connected with the participle following παρόν, or the termination of a word in the previous line like τελοῦντας. Cf. P. Tebt. 103. 1-3 λαογρ(αφία) \[\ldots\,\text{τελοῦντας} \,\text{οὖν σώτηρας, and τελῶν (so Wilcken) σώτηρας in P. Grenf. I. 45. 8.}\]

4. \[\text{φ} 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 \[\text{έρος. But it does not seem possible to get either another year or a conjunction into the short space available, and we therefore conclude that λελαογραφημένων and ἐφηβευκότων are to be taken together, with some qualifying term between them; } \text{ἐπί} \,\text{[ἀμ} \,\text{ίφων ἐφηβευκότων} \,\text{μενος ὡς πρίῳ τοῦ ἵερος (ἔτους) Καῖσαρος λελα-\text{οὺν ογραφημένων ἐπι...[...]}\,\text{βρ...[...]}\,\text{ών ἐφηβευκότων ὁμοιώς κατὰ τὸ παρὸν...[...]}\,\text{μενα...[...]}\,\text{ς}.
\]

5-6. ὡς πρίῳ τοῦ ἵερος (ἔτους): cf. similar instances of the use of πρὶς in 257. 25, 481. 15.

712. Collection of a Debt.

11.5 x 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 ξενικῶν πρᾶκτορ. 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 Pathermoushis, 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 ὀικία, 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 236), 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. cc.) 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 ξένος 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 ἐπιτηρηταῖ 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 (Μωνθμερεύ and its toparchy, Νομασείτης, in l. 20, are both unknown), while the nome to which the officials addressed by the ἐπιτηρηταῖ 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 μισθωταῖ 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
year of Antoninus mentioned in l. 13 (cf. ll. 16–8), and may be as late as the beginning of Commodus' reign; cf. note on l. 7.

καὶ ὁ ἐπιτη(ρηται) ξενικῶν πρα(κτ(ορειας) Ἀθρε(ε[β[ίτου]])
β[β]λιο[φ[όλ(ε[ξην]]) ἐγκ[ή[σεων] β[ατ[. . .].]
]μο[σ] παραδεί[ξεως υ[ψ] ἢν ἐστιν ε [. [
] κατά[σχετε ο[ν] πρὸς ἐνεχυρασίαν ἢν παρεθ[]
Pαθερμοῦθι καὶ ὁ ἀ[δελφός] αὐ[τοῦ Ποτάμων Θανώχιος το[ῦ] [.]. ἢνιος ἀπὸ . [
] τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῶι καὶ τῶι ἀ[δελφῷ] αὐ[τοῦ Παθερ-
]μοῦθι (μ)ο[βί] οἰκ[ίαν καὶ αὐ[λήν]
] ἀργυρ(ία) (δραχμ[ᾶ]) τ καὶ τόκους καὶ τέλη
καὶ δα[πάνας], πρω(τ[ο]πραξ[ίας] ο[ὐ][στ]ὴ(ς) τὸ δη[μοσίῳ] καὶ:
(ἔτους) .] // Πατ[ύ] κ.

2nd hand
καὶ ο[μ] ἐπιπρηταῖς ξενικῶν πρακτορίας Ἀθρε[ητοῦ]
πα[ρὰ]

10
καὶ τοῦ Ποτάμωνος ἀδ[ελφοῦ] Παθερμοῦθιος ἐς ἀλληλεγγύης κατὰ

15
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20
ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς τριακοσίας καὶ τόκους καὶ τέλευτας καὶ πρακτορικὰς καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δαπάνας
μα τοῦ Σουλπικίου Σιμίλιου δι

1. [Ἀ]ργυρίου is possible at the end of the line.
2. The occurrence of two dashes after the number of the regnal year and the omission of the Emperor's name point to a date in Commodus' reign, when both these practices became common. The difficulty is that the debt was contracted in A.D. 146-7; cf. l. 13. The mention of Sulpicius Similis in l. 22 recalls the praefect of that name in 237. viii. 27, whose date is not certain; cf. p. 262.

13. ἀρχεῖον: the use of this term suggests that Oxyrhynchus was not meant, since ἀγορανομεῖον or ῥημονεῖον are the more usual terms, though an ἀρχεῖον probably at Oxyrhynchus is found in 609. 3.

(6) 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 (παράθεσις) 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 (κατέσχον) 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 ἀπογραφὴ 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 ἀπογραφαὶ, 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[ν]ίωι καὶ  
Διογένει βιβλιοφύλαξι

2nd hand  

παρὰ Δεονίδου Διοδώρου τοῦ  
Διοδώρου μητρὸς Σαραεύτος Δεονίδου ἀπὸ Ὄξυρύγχου πόλεως.  
καθ' ἢν οἱ γονεῖς μου Διοδώρος Δίο-  
δώρου τοῦ Ἀγαθείνου καὶ Σαραεύς  
Δεονίδου τοῦ Ἀλέξανδρου μη-

5  

10 τρὸς Ἰσιδώρας Κάλα ἀπ[δ] τῆς αὐτῆς  
πόλεως πεποίηται πρὸς ἀλ-  
λήλους τοῦ γάμου συνγραφήν διὰ  
τοῦ ἐν Ὄξυρύγχου πόλει ἀγορανο-

15 Κλαυδίου μηνὶ Σεβαστῷ κατέσ-

χον τῇ ἐπεὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐτελεύτησεν ἐπὶ ἐ-  
μοὶ καὶ ἀδελφοῖς μου Διοδώρῳ  
καὶ Θαῦμα καὶ τὰ αὐτὸς εἰς ἡμᾶς  
καθῆκατο σεβάστως, ἡ δὲ μήτηρ ἀρὶ ἄν  
ἐχεὶ περὶ ἡμᾶς ἀρουρῶν

20 ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ πατὴρ ἐτελεύτησεν ἐπὶ ἐ-  
μοὶ καὶ ἀδελφοῖς μου Διοδώρῳ  
καὶ Θαῦμα καὶ τὰ αὐτῶς εἰς ἡμᾶς  
καθήκατο σεβάστως, ἡ δὲ μήτηρ ἁρὶ ἄν

25 ἐννέα ἡμίσους περὶ δὲ {περὶ δὲ}  
Πεεννὼ ἐκ τῆς Θρασυμάχου παρ-

30 νοις μου ἀδελφοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν πε-

πρὶ Νέσλα ἐκατέρῳ ἀρουράς τέσσα-
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pas διὰ τῆς περὶ γάμου αὐτοῦ συγγρα-
[φῆς] αἴ εἰσι τὸ τρίτον τῶν προκειμέ-

νων ἄρουρῶν δεκάδυο, ἀπογρά-
35 φομαι καὶ αὐτὸς πρὸς παράθεσιν
κατοχὴν τῶν λοιπῶν τῆς μη-
τρὸς ἄρουρῶν τεσσάρων. ἡ δὲ προ-
κειμένη τῶν γονέων μου συγγρα-
φή ἔσται ἐνθέσαμας καὶ ἀπερ-

3rd hand
Δημήτριος σεση(μείωμαι). ἔτους πρῶτου
Αὐτοκράτορος Νερούα Καίσαρος
45 Σεβαστοῦ Φαμενωθ ιθ.

3rd hand
Αὐτοκράτορος Νερούα [Καίσαρος
ςαρᾶευς corr.
Θρασύμαχος ηθ.]

8. Second a of σαρᾶευς corr.

1. Inserted on the register.

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

1 The editor reads κωλύειν, 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 μηδέν in place of καὶ τῷ before ἔσεσθαι ἐμπόδιον.
12. The marriage contract referred to contained also testamentary dispositions; cf. C. P. R. 28, § sqq.
20. ἐπ᾽ ἐμοὶ καὶ ἀδελφοῖς: cf. 481. 17-8, &c.
26. τῆς Θρασυμάχου παρειμένης: παριέναι 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.

Φιλονείκωι τῶι καὶ Ἐρμιοδόρῳ βασιλείας καὶ Διονυσίῳ καὶ ἔτερῳ Διονυσίῳ
βιβλιοφυλάξις καὶ ἐπικριταῖς καὶ ἀπολλωνίῳ ἐξηγηίτεύσαντι
γραμματεῖς πόλεως παρὰ Ἀδριανοῦ

Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου, δόθεν διήλων εἶναί με (δδεκάδραχμον)
διὰ λαογραφίας β (ἐτους) Ἀδριανοῦ

Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου(ν)
ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ [ἀμ-]
φόδου καὶ ὀμνύω
Αὐτοκράτορα
Καίσαρα Τραίανον

Ἀδριανὸν Σεβαστὸν
μὴ ἔψευσθαι. (ἐτους) 5
Αὐτοκράτορος
Καίσαρος Τραιανοῦ

['Αβατον Νότου Κρήτη-]
πεῖδος [. . . . . . .

Kαίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
κυρίου, δόθεν δη-
λώ εἶναί με (δδεκάδραχμον)
διὰ λαογραφίας
β (ἐτους) Ἀδριανοῦ

Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου(ν)
ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ [ἀμ-
φόδου καὶ ὀμνύω
Αὐτοκράτορα
Καίσαρα Τραίανον

Ἀδριανὸν Σεβαστὸν
μὴ ἔψευσθαι. (ἐτους) 5
Αὐτοκράτορος
Καίσαρος Τραιανοῦ

'Αβατον Νότου Κρήτη-]
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οἰκογεινὴς ἐκ
15 δούλης . . . . . .
τρ[.][.]ης . . . . . . προσ-
βέβηκεν εἰς (πρισκαὶδεκαέτεις)
τῷ διελθόντι ἔτει Ἀδριανοῦ
ε (ἐτεὶ) Ἀδριανοῦ

'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 βασιλικὸς γραμματεύς. 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 βασιλικὸς γραμματεύς recurs in this connexion in 257. 15 and B. G. U. 562. 17. Applications of this class from the Fayûm are usually sent to ex-gymnasiarchs ὀντες πρὸς τῇ ἐπικρίσει.

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 (δωδεκάδραχμον) δὲ ὀρθόλογον λαογραφίας.

37-8. A similar docket occurs in 478, and ἐπικρίται 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.

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 ἀπογραφή of real property took place; cf. B. G. U. 420 and 459, and 287. 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.
Ἡρᾶι καὶ Ὄριγένει γεγυμίνασιαρχηκόσι) βιβλιοφόλακι ἐνκτῆ(σεων) Ἡρα-
κλεσι(οίτων)
παρὰ Γοργίου καὶ Γαλέστου ἀμφοτέρων
Πολέμωνος τοῦ Γοργίου μητρὸς Διονυσιά-
5 δος τῆς Γαλέστου τῶν ἀπὸ κώμης
Τουμῆσεως. ἀπογραφόμεθα ἱδίωι
κινδύνωι κοινῶς ἐξ ἔσον εἰς τὸ ἐνε(σ-
τὸς) ἵ(το) Αδριανὸν Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
κατὰ τὰ κελευθέντα τὰ ἐληλυθότ(α)
10 εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ ὀνόματος τοῦ μετηλ-
λαχότος ἡμῶν πατρὸς Πολέμωνος
Γοργίου μητρὸς Ταποντώτος ἀπὸ
τῆς αὐτῆς Τοεμίσεως, τὸ ἐπιβάλλ|
αὐτοὺ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ Τοεμίσει τρῖτον
15 μέρος οἰκίας καὶ τὸ ἐπιβάλλι(ον) αὐτῶι
μέρος ψιλοῦ τόπου, καὶ πρότερον
τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ Ἑλένης Γοργίου
μητρὸς τῆς αὐτῆς Ταποντῶτος
κατὰ διαθήκην τῆς καὶ λυθεῖσαν
20 τῶι Ιβ (ἔτει) Ἀδριανὸν Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
περὶ κώμην Ἰβίωνα Παχνοῦβιν ἐκ τοῦ
Ζωίλου καὶ Νουμήνου κλήρου γῆς
κατοικικῆς ἡμῖν τέταρτον
δῦνου καὶ περὶ Ψελεμαχ( ) ἐκ τοῦ Μενι-
25 που καὶ Ἀρτεμίδωρος κλ(ήρου) γῆς κατοικ(κ)ή(ς)
ἀρούρης τέταρτον. καὶ ὀμνύσμεν
τὴν Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τραιανοῦ
Ἀδριανὸ Σεβαστοῦ τῆ(ν) καὶ τοῦ(ς) πατρὸ(υς)
θεοῦ ἐς ἕγ(κας) καὶ ἐπ( ἀληθ(είας) ἐπιθεωμέκ(όνω) τῆ(ν)
30 προκιμένη(ν) ἀπογραφή(ν) καὶ μηδὲν διεψεύσθ(αι)
ἡ ἐνοχ(αίρετο) εἰς τῶι ὀρκωι. (ἔτους) ἵ(το) Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τραιανοῦ
Ἀδριανὸ Σεβαστοῦ μηνὸς Καίσαρείου ἐπ(αγομέκοι) e.

2nd hand Γοργίας ὁ προγεγραμμένος ἐπιθέω.
To Heras and Origenes, ex-gymnasiarchs, keepers of the records of real property in the Heracleopolite nome, from Gorgias and Galestus both sons of Polemon son of Gorgias, their mother being Dionysias daughter of Galestus, from the village of Toémisis. 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 Toémisis, viz. the third share which fell to him of a house at the said Toémisis 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 Pachnoubis in the holding of Zoilus and Numenius 3 arourae of catoeic land, and near Pselemach( ) in the holding of Menippus and Artemidorus 4 aroura of catoeic 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.  1, 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 ο of ἀπό the scribe has written μη, which makes no sense and seems to be a mere error.

36. ἀδιακ(ρίτως) apparently corresponds to κοινῶς ἐξ ἴσου 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 combination of circumstances led to the present request for an auction (ὅθεν ἐπιδίδομεν, 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 manu-
mitted 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 ὅθεν in l. 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.

Ἀσκληπιάδη τῷ καὶ Σαραπίωνι γυμνασιάρχῳ
[Χαίρειν]
παρὰ ᾽Ορίωνος Πανεχώτου τοῦ Δωράτου μη-
τρος Ταυρίων καὶ ᾿Απολλωνίου Δωρίωνος
5 τοῦ ᾽Ηράτου μητρος Θαήσιος καὶ ᾿Αβασκάντου
ἀπελεύθερον Σάμου ᾽Ηρακλείδου τῶν τριών
ἀπὸ ᾽Οξυρύγχου πόλεως ἐπιτρόπων ἀφηλί-
κων τέκνων Θέωνος τοῦ καὶ Ἰδιούγειου
Εὐδαιμονίδος μητρός Σινθεῦτος καὶ Δι-
10 ονυσίου καὶ Θαήσιος ἀμφοτέρων μητρός
Ταυρίων τῶν τριών ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως.
ὑπάρχει τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀφηλίκητι τῇ μὲν Εὐδαι-
μονίδοι ἐκτὸς μέρος τῷ ἐπὶ Διονυσίῳ καὶ
Θαήσει ἥμισυ μέρος τῷ ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ δήμοφρον
15 μέρος πατρικοῦ αὐτῶν δοῦλον Σαραπίωνος
ὁς (ἐτῶν) λ ὡς τὸ λοιπὸν τρίτον ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐπιδείδομεν τὸ βιβλίον τὸν δηλούμενον εἰς ἀδελφόν οὗ τὸ λοιπὸν τρίτον ὡς τὸν ὁμοπατρίου αὐτῶν ἀδελφοῦ ἠλευθερώται ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ. ὅθεν ἐπιδίδομεν τὸ βιβλίον ἀξιοῦντες κατὰ τὴν προκήρυξιν γενέσθαι καὶ τὴν ἀμείνον ἀἵρεσιν διδόντι παραδοθῆναι. (ἔτους) κ Ἀυτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Μάρκου Αὐρηλίου Κομμόδου Ἀντωνίνου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ ᾿ἀρμενιακοῦ Μηδικοῦ Παρθικοῦ Σαρματικοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Μεγίστου Βρεταν[ι]κοῦ Θώθ. (2nd hand) 'Qpiwv Πανεχώτου ἐπιδέδωκα. (3rd hand) [Ἀπο]λλοῖος Δωρόνων συνεπιδέδωκα. (4th hand) Ἀβάσκαντος ἀπελευθεροῖς Σάμου ᾿Ηρακλείδου καὶ Διονυσίου ἔγραψα ὑπὲὶ αὐτοῦ μὴ εἰδότος γράμματα. Τῷ Ασκληπιάδε, also called Sarapion, gymnasiarch, greeting, from Horion son of Panechotes son of Doras, his mother being Taous, and from Apollonius son of Dorion son of Heras, his mother being Thaesis, and from Abascantus, freedman of Samus son of Heraclides, all three of Oxyrhynchus and guardians of the children of Theon also called Dionysius, namely Eudaemonis, whose mother is Sintheus, and Dionysius and Thaesis, whose mother is Tauris, being minors and all three of the said city. The said minors own, Eudaemonis one-sixth and Dionysius and Thaesis a half, together two-thirds, of a slave of their father’s named Sarapion, aged about 30 years, the remaining third share of whom, belonging to Diogenes their brother on the father’s side, has been set free by him. We therefore present this memorandum requesting that in respect of (?) the aforesaid two-thirds a public auction should be held, and that the property should be handed over to the highest bidder. The 27th year of the Emperor Caesar Marcus Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Pius Felix Augustus Armeniacus Medicus Parthicus Sarmaticus Germanicus Maximus Britannicus, Thoth.’ Signatures of Horion, Apollonius and Abascantus, that of the last-named being written for him by Diogenes son of Theon. 19–20. The exact meaning of this passage is uncertain owing to the ambiguity of κατά, which may be connected with either ἀξιοῦντες or τὴν προκήρυξιν γενέσθαι. In the former case κατά means ‘because of,’ and the request would be for the sale of the whole slave; in the latter κατά signifies ‘in respect of’ (cf. 723. 14), and no more than the two-thirds would be involved,—a sense which would have been more clearly expressed by the simple genitive τοῦ . . . μέρους. 22. ἀἵρεσιν διδόντι: cf. B. G. U. 656, an advertisement of property to let, εἰς βουλήματι μεθόσωσθαι . . . προσερχόμενοι τὸς πρὸς τοῦτον ἀἵρεσιν (1. ἀἵρεσιν) διδόντες.
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.
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2. [...] ἠμεὔψατο or [...] ἀντημεΐψατο would suit the context. For [...] γάμασμα cf. l. 14.

5. The meaning and even the construction of πρὸς τὸ δίλετον (the reading of which is quite certain) is very obscure. From l. 12 it appears that the δίλετον 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 δίλετον, it is tempting to connect πρὸς τὸ δ. with συμβάλλω αὐτῷ in l. 4; but the intervening words εὑρίσκω αὐτὸ are then very difficult. Possibly πρὸς τὸ δ. is parallel to μείζω δύο ταῖς ἑκατόν in l. 9, since the general construction of ll. 4-5 and 8-9 seems to be the same; but πρὸς τὸ δ. can by itself hardly mean 'equal to the δίλετον' and ἴσον would have to be supplied.

el τὴν αι|: probably el τὴν αὐτοῦ, i.e. the person referred to in l. 2, or τὴν Ἀ|... 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).

[Τίτῳ Κλαυδίῳ Ε]ενοφώντι [τῷ κρατίστῳ ἐπιστρατηγῷ
[παρὰ ........] Ἀνθεστίου Πρεῖζιου τοῦ καὶ Λολλιανοῦ
[ 12 letters σχαντός καὶ ἀρχιερατεύσαντος
[ 10 „ τῆς Ὁξυρυγχειτῶν πόλεως
5 [..... ἐπιριάμην μὲν παρὰ Διονυσίου
[ 12 letters οὐν σὺν τῷ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τὰς περὶ Σέννιν
[...... υπαρχοῦσας αὐτῷ ἐκ διαιρέσεως γενομένης πρὸς
[...... καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Απολλώνιον νεώτερον ἄρουρας [σει]τικάς [πευτήκον-
To his highness the epistrategus Titus Claudius Xenophon from . . . Antistius Primus also called Lollianus, . . ., ex-chief-priest . . . of the city of Oxyrhynchus . . . I bought from Dionysius . . . with Alexander the land at Sennis . . . belonging to him in consequence of the division made with . . . and his brother Apollonius the younger, namely 52½ ares of corn-land and ½ ares of building-land, free from obligations in respect of Crown land or Imperial estates or temple-land, in accordance with the division made by me with the (my?) brothers, the taxes upon the private land only being paid by me. A very long while afterwards, forty years having elapsed, it somehow happened after the death of the seller Dionysius that the komogrammateus of . . ., to whose district Sennis also belongs, in answer to an inquiry concerning the landlord from whom the
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 ἀγορανομεῖται, the municipal titles being usually arranged on an ascending scale; cf. Preisigke, Städtisches Beamtenwesen in röm. Ägä. p. 31.

8. [σειτικάς; or possibly [ἰδιω]τικάς (cf. ll. 11 and 27), but [σειτικάς makes a better contrast to ἐν οἴ κοπέδοις, if that be right.


13. ...] a is the name of a village or ἐποίκιον.

14. κτήνιον, if right, is an objective genitive depending upon ἐπερωτήσεως; cf. l. 28. An alternative supplement is πράκτορος constructed subjectively, but the relative παί οὐ is then awkward.

δημοσίων: i.e. the rent, the rate of which upon βασιλικὴ γῆ was usually about 4 artabae the aroura; in the present case it was 3½ artabae. In l. 11 on the other hand δημόσια has its ordinary meaning of taxes.

16. συνανάμιγος appears to be a new compound.

18. Perhaps [τοῦ Ἀλέξανδρον ου or [τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου. But it would appear from l. 12 that there was only one πράτης.

25. enoεν at the end of the line is clearly written, but suggests nothing; some word like ἐπισκέψασθαι is wanted.

719. REGISTRATION OF A DEED.

19·8 x 16·6 cm. A.D. 193.

A notice addressed to the strategus by a certain Didymus of an authorization received by him from the archidicastes 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 Nanaeum at Alexandria (cf. l. 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 Gradenwitz (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 κατακεχωρισμένον (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 archidicastes of contracts without any reference to καταχωρισμός 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.

'Αχιλλᾶ τῷ καὶ Κασίῳ στρατηγῷ
2nd hand παρὰ Διδύμου Ἀμμωνίου μητρὸς Ἐλένης ἀπὸ ᾿Ιουστὸς Ἡλίου πόλεως.
οἷ ἐποίησεν ἐκ τοῦ καταλογείου χρηματισμῶν ἵστων ἀντίγραφον: Οὐιτάλιος ἱερεὺς καὶ ἀρχιδικαστής ᾿Οξυρυγχείτου στρατηγοῦ. τοῦ δεδομένου ὑπομνήματος μεταδόθητος ὡς
5 ὑπόκειται. ἐπρωσο. (ἔτους) Β Γαίου Πεσκενίου Νέγερος Ἰωάννου Ἡσαβατοῦ ἔγραψα. ἐπὶ ψηφιδίῳ Φαώφι κη.

Οὐ ἡταλίῳ ἱερῖ δπξίδιαλορ καὶ πρίος τῇ κελελεία τῶν χρηματιστῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κριτηρίων παρὰ Διδύμου Ἁμμωνίου μητρὸς Ἐλένης ἀπὸ τῆς Ἡλίου πόλεως. τοῦ προημένου μοι ἀπλοῦ χειρογράφ[ου] ἀντι- [γραφ] ὑπόκειται.


Παποντῶς Βίθυος μητρὸς Τσενπαχοῦτος ἀπὸ τοῦ Τρύφωνος Ἱσείου τοῦ Ἡλίου πόλεως χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ πεπρακέναι καὶ παρακερεῖκέναι σοι ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν εἰς τῶν ἁλίῳ χρόνων ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων μου ἐν τῷ [αὐτῷ] Τρύφωνος Ἑσείῳ ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ νότου μέρες τῆς κάμης ἰμισείοις [μήλοιο]

10 οἰκίαν δύο διατέγου καὶ αλλόριον κοινῶν πρὸς τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου Παοῦ, ὅπε γείτονες τῆς μὲν μᾶς τοῦ αλΘρίου νότου εἴσοδο καὶ έξοδος βορρᾶ [κλη] ρΟνάμου Διογάτοις ἁπλοῦτος κληρούμον."Ορου λιβὸς δημοσία[ί]α βύ- μη, τῆς (δὲ) δευτέρας νότου Παποντῶτος Μοῦθιος βορρᾶ Ἡρακλείδου ὡριστάνοις ἀπηλίστου δημοσίων ρύμη λιβὸς Μιύσιος Μέλανος,

20 τιμῆς τῆς συμπεφωνημένης πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὑπὲρ παραχωρητικοῦ ἀργυροῦ Σεβαστοῦ νομίσματος δραχμῶν διασκελών[ν] ας αὐτοῦ ἀπὸχον παρὰ σοῦ διὰ [χειρὸς ..... ]δρασθη γενέμονος βεβαιούν ὃ με αὐτὰς τῆς οἰκίας καθαρὰς ἀπὸ τε δημοσίων καὶ ἰδιωτικών ὀφιλής καὶ ἀπὸ ἀπογραφῆς αὐτοῦ [καὶ] [εἰς]δοὺς

30 ὅπενονον ἀλλο καὶ ἐξουσία σοι ὡς εἴρων παραχωρεῖν καὶ διοικεῖν καὶ[ί] ἐπιτελεῖν περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς ἐν αἰρήι. κυρία [ἡ δημοσίως γραφεῖσαι ὡς] ἐμοῦ τοῦ Παποντῶτος ἵδιόργαφος ὑπὲρ διελατοῦ καὶ ἀπογραφῆς ὡς ἐν δημοσίῳ κατακεχωρισμένη. (ἔτους) ο Πεισκεννίου Νίγερος Ἰουστοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Παῦνι κ. βουλόμενος ὡν

35 ἐν δημοσίῳ γενέσθαι τὸ αὐθεντικὸν χειρόγραφον διδοὺς τὰς ὀρισθέας (δραχμᾶς) ἰβ ἐνεκα τοῦ μή περιέχειν μὲ τὸ περὶ [δημοσίων σωστὰ διαστολὰς καὶ μοναχῶν δημοσιοῦσθαι αὐτῶν] ὑπαλλάθων τὸ αὐθεντικὸν χειρόγραφον ἐχειν μου χειρογραφίαν [περὶ τοῦ εἶναι αὐτὸ ἱδιόγραφον τοῦ Παποντῶτος συνκαταχωρισθεῖς ταύτῃ τῷ

35 ύπομνή[ματι] εἰς τὴν Ἀδριανῆν βιβλίου ἰθήκην εἰς [2. Second δ of διδύμου corr. from first half of a μ. 5. φαωφι apparently over an erasure. 7. τηρι Pap. 9. 1. προσεμένου. 10. χ of τεσπαχοντος corr. from γ by another hand. 11. απολλώνιου corr. from ἀμμωνίου by another hand. 14. 1. ἡμιον. 31. A correction after με; cf. note below. 33. 1. εχου]
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 archidicastes, to the strategus of the Oxyrhynchite nome, greeting. Let a copy of the petition which has been presented be served as follows. Good-bye. The 2nd year of Gaïus Pescennius Niger Justus Augustus, Phaophi 28. Signed by me ... Written by me, Polemon son of ... scribe of the record office. ... To Vitalius, priest, archidicastes 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 Tryphonis in the Oxyrhynchite nome, to Didymus son of Apollonius 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 Tryphonis in the southern part of the village a half share of two houses, one having two storeys, 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 Miusis 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 Gaïus 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..."
in our translation the διαστολαὶ περὶ δημοσιώσεως 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.

21.5 x 9.8 cm. A.D. 247. Plate VII.

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.

---

[C][audio] Valerio Firmo praef(ecto) Aeg(ypti)
ab Aurelia{e} Ammounario.
rogo domine des mihi
auctorem Aur[el]ium Plutammonem
5 e lege Iul[ia] Titia et ... [...
dai uni do(minis) no(stris) Philippo Aug(usto) ii et
Philippo Caesarii e(o)n(u)s[ulibus].

2nd hand [Α]υρηλία 'Αμμωνάριον [ἐπιθέωκα.
3rd hand [Α]υρηλία Πλουτάμμ[ων εὐδοκῶ τῇ
10 δέ[σσι]
4th hand (έτους) δ Tūβi t. [ ]
5th hand.quo ne ab., ............
ab[eat Plutammonem
c e leg(e) Iul[ia] et [Titia auctorem
15 do. (6th hand?) cēpi.


'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 consulsip of our lords Philippus Augustus
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 ψ 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 Atilia . . . in provinciis vero a prassidibus 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 α, ε, ι, σ, or ι, and the second α, 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 ὁφησανθαι, 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, 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 drachmas 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 ὑπολόγου βασιλικῆς is regarded as including both the confiscated κλῆροι and certain ἱερὰ γῆ which must also have reverted to the government.

12. παραδειγμένης ταύτας: cf. P. Amh. 68. 20, where παραδειγμένη [ταύτας] is no doubt to be read, P. Tebt. 79. 16, &c.


14-5. The supplements are taken from P. Amh. 68. Other conditions on the lines of P. Amh. 68 presumably followed.

This document, which contains a formal emancipation of a female slave, drawn up before the agoranomos 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 Hernals. 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 718, 723, a similar but much shorter example of a second century manumission, 499 and 349, which are letters to the agoranomos 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 718 and, as it now appears, in P. Edmondstone 6. That the previous owner of the 3 was a different person from the two owners of the 2 is not stated directly but is in the light of 718 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.

*ἔτους δεκάτου Ἀὐτοκράτορ[os Καίσαρος Δομιτιανοῦ
Σεβαστοῦ Γερμανικοῦ Τε[ρ]βερσταίου
ἐπαγ(μένων) (2nd hand) ἃ Σεβ[α]τη (1st hand) μη[νὸς] Καίσαρειον
ἐπαγ(μένων) (2nd hand) ἃ Σεβα[τη] (1st hand) ἐν ὸ-
ξυρύγχων πόλει τῆς Θηβαίδος ἐπ' ἀγορανό-

μον Ψαμμίων τριῶν

άφεικαν ἅ{ν}λεβερεν ὑπὸ ἴπτο ῾Αὐτὴν Ἡλιαθείνι
ὡς (ἐτῶν) κρέασι μελέχρως μακροπρόσωπος
[οὐ]λης μέσῳ καὶ Σαραπίας ὡς (ἐτῶν) . μέσος
[μ]ελίιχρως μακροπρόσωπος ou(λη) ...........

λης Ἀπολλωνιούτος ὡς (ἐτῶν) κρέασι μελέχρωτος
[μακροπροσώπου οὐλη ποδὶ δι[εκ]<φ> .........
ἐξαπεριανερομένης (ταλάντων) δι.
[...] τῶν τού ἀφετηριανερομένου . τριῶν
[μερο]ι/z ἀργυρίου ἐπισήμου δραχμῶν

μητρὸς Σαραπίας ὡς (ἐτῶν) ἩΗρακλᾶς Τρύφωνοις τοῦ...

μητρὸς Ταυρινόφροσ Παναχεί. . ... ἀπὸ τῆς
[α]ὐτῆς πόλεως ὡς (ἐτῶν) λα μέσος μελέχρως
μακροπρόσωπος ou(λη) ὑπὲρ γάννυ δεξ[αί]ν

ἀργυρίου Ἐβεστοῦ νομισμάτοσ δραχμῶν

καὶ Ραμμυθοῦντος Ἀχιλλεί
καὶ Σαραπία ἩΡακλᾶς Τρύφωνας τοῦ . . . . .

μητρὸς Ταυρινόφροσ Παναχεί. . ... ἀπὸ τῆς
[α]ὐτῆς πόλεως ὡς (ἐτῶν) λα μέσος μελέχρως
μακροπρόσωπος ou(λη) ὑπὲρ γάννυ δεξ[αί]ν

ἀργυρίου Ἐβεστοῦ νομισμάτοσ δραχμῶν

Διακοσίων χαλκου ταξινομείον . . . . . .

χολῶν, οὐκ ἐξόντος τοῦ ἈΧιλλεί οὐθ'[αί] ἀλλω
[ὖ]περ αὐτοῦ ἀπαιτήσιν που[ίασθαι] παρὰ τῆς Ἀπολ-
[λ]υκούντος οὐθὲ τῶν τ[α]ρ' αὐτῆς τῶν προκει-
On the verso

ἐπαγω(μένων) σ' [ 

16. π of ποδὶ corr. from δ. 36. ἱππολήμπος. 39. Ἀπολλωνοῦτίος.
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 Διὰ Γῆς Ἡλίου, cf. 48. 6, &c.

12. ἐν ἀγυίᾳ is supplied from the newly found emancipation (cf. introd.); cf. ἐν ἀγυίᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ in Il. 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 ἀργύριον 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 previously set free. On the whole we think the latter hypothesis is more likely. The talents are in either case probably copper.

19. ἀργυρίου ἐπισήμου: the newly found emancipation has ἀργ. ἐπ. ἀργυρίων ἐπίσημον (sc. the slave) τῷ Θέων (the owner)... λύτρων ἀργ. δραχμῶν δέκα καὶ τέτακται ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ (sc. the slave) τῷ Θέων (the owner) ἥπερ Θεοῖς (the owner)... λύτρων ἀργ. δραχμῶν δέκα καὶ τέτακται ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ (sc. the slave) τῷ Θέων (the owner)...

5 μητρὸς Ταπαμῶνος καὶ Ὑκαλῆτι ἐκ μητρὸς Θαήσιος καὶ τῇ ταύτῃ θυγατρὶ Αὐρηλίᾳ Λουσίᾳ γενομένοις μοι δούλοις ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐπιβάλλοντος μέρους χαίρειν. ὁμολογῶ ἑκουσίως καὶ αὐθαιρέτως καὶ ἀμετανοήτως ἀφικέναι ὑμᾶς ἐλευθέρους τοῦ ἐπιβάλλοντος μέρους ὑπὸ Γῆν καὶ Οὐρανὸν κατ᾽ ἐυσεβίαν.
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 introd. to that papyrus.
2 ἐπὶ ἀγορανόμων ἀφεῖκεν ἐλευθέραν ὑπὸ Δία Γῆν "Ηλιον ᾿Αγαθείνου μητρὸς Τσεεί Θέωνος ᾿Ηρακλείδου

3 30 letters ἀπὶ 'Οξυρύγχων πόλεως ἐν ἀγυιᾷ τῆς ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῷ οἰκογενεῖ ἢ δόλις ΔΗΜΗΤΡΟῦΤΟΣ

4 δούλην 50 letters ἀπὸ ᾿Οξυρύγχων πόλεως ἐν ἀγυιᾷ τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῷ οἰκογενεῖ ἢ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΟῦΤΟΣ

5 55 letters (2nd hand) ὑπὰ τῶν ἐν ἀγυιᾷ της, ἐξ ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτῷ οἰκογενεῖ ἢ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΟῦΤΟΣ

6 50 letters 

1. δηθαῖδες Ραπ. 3. ἐπαρχουσαν Ραπ. 5. αὐγὰ Ραπ.

2. τοῦ seems to have been omitted before 'Ηρακλείδου. The name Τσεεί occurs also in

78. 5 μητρὸς Τσεεί Καλλίου.

4. The vestiges following ἦδι possibly represent the γνωστήρ, 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 ἦδι in 496. 16 where a γνωστήρ is mentioned at the end of a contract. A description of the slave and perhaps the amount of the λύτρα were given at the beginning of this line (cf. 722. 15 sqq.; but δὲ is not a possible reading.

5. After σὺν ἀλ(λοις) the papyrus not improbably proceeded ἐπὶ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου; cf. 98. 2 (corr. by Wilcken) ὁ σὺν ἀλ(λοις) ἐπὶ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου. This restoration would accord very well with our present explanation of the position occupied by the writers of 49 and 49 (cf. 722. 19, note); but what exactly did limits here is uncertain.

724. APPRENTICESHIP TO A SHORTHAND-WRITER.

18.3 × 21.3 cm. A.D. 155.

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.

Παῖδες ἕκτος ὁ καὶ Πανάρης τῶν κεκοσμητευκότων τῆς 'Οξυρυγχειτῶν πόλεως διὰ Γεμέλλου φίλου ᾿Απολλωνίων σημιογράφῳ χαίρειν. συνάστησά σοι Χαιράμμων δοῦλον πρὸς μάθησιν σημειῶν ὧν ἐπίσταται ὁ νῦν σου ΔιοἸνύσιος ἐπὶ χρόνον ἐτη δύο ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος μηνὸς Φαμενῶθ τοῦ
contracts

5 ὀκτωκαιδεκάτου ἔτους Ἀντωνίνου Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου μισθοῦ τοῦ συμπεφω
νήμουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀργυρίου δραχμῶν ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἑορτι-
κῶν, εἰς ὦν ἔσχες τὴν πρώτην δύσιν ἐν δραχμαῖς τεσσαράκοντα, τὴν δὲ
dευτέραν λήψῃ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀνειληφότος τὸ κομεντάρίου ὄλον ἐν δρα-
χαίς τεσσαράκοντα, τὴν δὲ τρίτην λήψῃ ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ χρόνου τοῦ

10 παιδὸς ἐκ παντὸς λόγου πεζοῦ γράφοντος καὶ ἀναγεινώσκον τοὺς ἀμέμπτως
tὰς {δὲ} λοιπὰς δραχμὰς τεσσαράκοντα. εἰς δὲ ἐντὸς τοῦ χρόνου αὐτοῦ ἀπαρτίσῃς οὐκ ἐκδέξομαι τὴν προκειμένην προθεσμίαν, οὐκ ἐξόντος μοι ἐντὸς τοῦ χρόνου τοῦ παιδὰ ἀποσπᾶν, παραμενεῖ δὲ σῷ μετὰ τὸν χρόνον ὅσα

ἐὰν ἀργήσῃ ἡμέρας ἢ μῆνας. (ἔτους) ἡ Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Τίτου
Ἀλλίου Ἄδριανοῦ

15 Ἀντωνίνου Σεβαστοῦ Ἐὐσεβοῦς Φαμενῶθ ε.

3. σ of σου corr. from μ.
7. χ of δραχμαις corr. from γ.
9. λήψει.
11. η of ημερως rewritten.

'Panechotes also called Panares, ex-cosmetes of Oxyrhynchus, through his friend
Gemmellus, to Apollonius, writer of shorthand, greeting. I have placed with you my slave
Chaerammon 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
no work. The 18th year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus
Pius, Phamenoth 5.'
A contract between Ischyrion and Heraclas, in which the former apprentices to the latter a boy called Thonis, probably the ward of Ischyrion, 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.

[Ὁμολογοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις ᾿Ισχυρίων ῾Ηραδίωνος
[μητρὸς ἐγείρας ἀπό ᾿Οξυρύγχων πόλεως καὶ
[῾Ηρακλᾶς Σαραπίωνος τοῦ καὶ Δέοντος ῾Ηρακλεί-
[δ[ο]]ποῦ μητρὸς ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως
5 [γέρδιος ὁ μὲν ῾Ισχυρίων εὐθείασθαι τῷ ῾Ηρα-
[κλᾶς τῶν τοῦ ἐκατὸς ....... ἀδελφοῦ ὥς ὁ μὲν ῾Ισχυ-
[ρίων ἐγείρας τῷ διδάσκαλῳ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀδελφοῦ τῶν ὁμοίων μαθητῶν, καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἔτη δύο
10 ἐξει αὐτῶν προσεδρεύοντα τῷ διδάσκαλῳ ἐπὶ τῶν δεδομένων χρηματίσμων καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ ἀνατολῆς ἤλιου μέχρι δύσεως, ποιουσάν πάντα τὰ ἐπιταχθέντα καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἔτη δύο ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ διδάσκαλου ὡς ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοίων 15 ὁμαιτητῶν, [τρεφώμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ ῾Ισχυρίων. καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἔτη δύο καὶ μήνας ἐπὶ τοῦ τρίτου ἐνιαυτοῦ συνδίκον δώσει ὑπὲρ μισθοῦ τοῦ παιδὸς ὁ ῾Ηρακλᾶς, τοῖς δὲ λατοποῖς μησὶ πέντε τοῦ αὐ-
20 τοῦ τρίτου ἐνιαυτοῦ χρηματίσμων ὁ ῾Ηρακλᾶς ὑπὲρ μισθοῦ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μαθητοῦ κατὰ μήνα δραχμὰς δεκάδου καὶ τῷ τε-

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

725. Apprenticeship to a Weaver.

30-7 X 11 cm.  A.D. 183.
τάρτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ ὁμοίως κατὰ μήνα
ὑπὲρ μισθῶν δραχμῶν δεκάες καὶ τῶν
πέρπτων ἐνιαυτῷ ὁμοίως κατὰ μήνα
δραχμὰς εἴκοσι τεσσάρας, καὶ κατασκευάσει ᾽Ἡρακλᾶς τῷ αὐτῷ μαθητῇ τῷ μὲν ἐνεστώτι τετάρτῳ καὶ εἰκοστῷ ἦτει
Χ[ι]τῶνα ἐξίων δραχμῶν δεκάες, τῷ [δὲ]

латόντι καὶ (ἐτεῖ) ἔτερον χιτῶνα ἐξίων δραχμῶν εἴκοσι, καὶ [τῇ] κτ (ἐτεὶ) ὁμοίως ἀλλο[ν] χιτῶνα ἐξίων δραχμῶν εἴκοσι ὑπὲρ μισθῶν δραχμὰς δεκάες καὶ τῷ πέμπτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ ὁμοίως κατὰ μῆνα δραχμὰς εἴκοσι τέσσαρας, καὶ κατασκευάσει ᾽Ηρακλᾶς τῷ αὐτῷ μαθητῇ τῷ μὲν ἐνεστώτι τετάρτῳ καὶ εἰκοστῷ ἦτει
Χ[ι]τῶνα ἐξίων δραχμῶν δεκάες, τῷ [δὲ]

τῶν ἀργήσῃ [ἡ ἄρτην ἐκκρουομένου τίνων μισθῶν τῶν ἀργήσῃ ἢ ἀσθενήσῃ ἢ ἀτακτήσῃ ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ αἰτίαν ἡμέρας ἐπὶ τὰς ἴσας ἐπάναγκει παρέξει αὐτὸν ὁ ᾿Ισχυρίωνος, διὰ τὸ ἐπὶ τούτως ἑστάσθαι. ὁ δὲ ὁ ᾿Ηρακλᾶς εὐδοκῶν τούτοις πᾶσι καὶ ἐκ δειδάξειν τὸν μαθητὴν τὴν δηλουμένην τέχνην ἐν τῷ πενταετὶ χρόνῳ καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίσταται καὶ χορηγήσει τοὺς μηνιαίους μισθοὺς καθὼς πρόκειται ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀγδόου μηνὸς τοῦ τρίτου ἐνιαυτοῦ. καὶ μὴ ἐξεῖναι μηδενὶ αὐτῶν παραβαῖνει τι τῶν προκειμένων ἢ ὁ παραβὰς ἐκτείσι τῷ ἐνμένοντι ἐπιτείμου δραχμὰς ἑκατὸν εἰς τὸ δημόσιον τὰς ἴσας. κύριον τὸ ὁμολόγημα. (ἔτους) κὸ Ἀὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
'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. I, Thonis also called Morous, son of Harthonis, wrote for him as he was illiterate.'
726. **APPOINTMENT OF A REPRESENTATIVE.**

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 261, which are contracts of the same kind. The document is incomplete, the name of the representative and the date not having been filled in.

"Ἔτους ἐννεακαιδεκάτου Αὐτοκράτορος
Καῖσαρος Τραϊ[ν]ανό[ῦ] 'Αδριανό[ῦ]
Σεβαστοῦ Τύβ[ι][] ἐν 'Οξυρύγ-χων πόλει τῆς Ὑβαίδος. ὡμο-
5 λογεῖ Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀπολλωνίου ἀπὸ τοῦ Δι[ο]γένους μητρὸς Τανεχω-
tαρίου τῆς [και] Εὐτέρπης Διογέ-
nου ἀπ' 'Οξυρύγχων πόλεως

ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως, ἐν ἀγυιᾷ,
10 οὐ δυνάμενος δι' α[ί]σθενείαν
πλείσατε ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ νομοῦ

diaλογισμ[δ]ιν, αὐτόθεν συν-
εστακέναι τὸν
tὸν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ λόγον ποιησό-
15 μενον περὶ τῶν πρὸς αὐτόν
ζητηθησομένων ἐπὶ τῷ
κρατίστῳ ἡγεμόνῳ Πετρωνίῳ

[Μαμ]ερτεῖνον καὶ τοῦ ἐπιστρατή-
[γο]ῦ Γελλίου Βαίσι[ου] ἢ κ[αὶ]
20 ἐπὶ τῶν κριτῶν κ[αὶ] πάντα ἐπιτελε-
σοντα περὶ τῶν [κ]ατὰ τὴν σύστασιν,
εὐδοκεῖ γὰρ ἐπὶ τούτους.

[κυρία ἢ ὁμολογία].

'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 Tanchehotarion 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 87. 3; the word after Νικάνορα there is perhaps a patronymic.
19. Γελλίου Βαίς[ου]: 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 συγχώρησις, 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. 350. 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 συγχώρησις. The procedure here is apparently to be distinguished from that exemplified in 710; cf. introd., to that papyrus.
20 ἵνα διαπωλήσονται συνεστακότερον ἐκ τῆς ἀνθρώπου πίστεως, διὸ τῆς πρὸς τούτους ὁποῖας συνηχηματικοὶ τίτλοι τῷ Ὁφελάτῳ ἐκατά [τι]ῶν προκειμένων ἐπιτελοῦντι, καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃς ἄλλος ἐὰν ἐπετελεσθῇ ἀπὸ μὴν ἐκατόν διαπέμψεσιν [ἀυτοὶ]ς πάντα δὲ ἐπιτελεσθούντα καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλους παρουσία ἐξῆν, ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ συνιστανόμενος Ὁφελάτως εὐδοκεῖ ἐκείνης τῷ Ὁφελάτῳ καὶ Ἀπολινάριος ὁ καὶ Ἰουλιανὸς ἀλλήλων γραμμάτων παντοῖον πάντων ἀξοῦμεν. ἔτους ἑπτακαὶ ἅδεκα Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος

30 Ἀπὸν Αἰλίου Ἀπιανοῦ Ἀντιουμείνου Σεβαστοῦ Ἐὐσεβοῦς Μεχείρ β. 2nd hand Ἀμμώνιος... a( )

5. 1. νῦν διαποτισθενος. 6. ο of διο corr. from a? 8. 1. Ὁφελάτως τοῦ Ὁ, or Ὁφελάτως ὃ. 10. Ιουλιανὸς Παρ. 24. 1. διαπέμψεσιν... ἐπιτελοῦσιν.

'To . . . son of Isidorus the ex-exegetes, late strategus of the city, priest, archidicastes and superintendent of the chrematistae and the other courts, through the deputy archidicastes Demetrius son of Heraclides the ex-exegetes, from Gaius Marcius Apion also called Diogenes and Gaius Marcius Apolinarius also called Julianus and however we are styled, and from Ophelas son of Ophelas, of Oxyrhynchus. Gaius Marcius Apion also called Diogenes and Gaius Marcius 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 Apollonarianus also called Nicaret, 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 assents to this authorization; and all bonds of every kind which Apion also called Diogenes and Apolinarius also called Julianus hold of each other remain in force. We request (your concurrence). The 17th year of the Emperor Caesar Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Pius, Mecheir 2.'
stands by itself, as here. Wilcken (Archiv, I. p. 176) and Mitteis (ibid. p. 350) both consider that the object to be supplied after ἀξιοῦμεν is σωματισμόν, on the strength of 268, where the preceding sentence is ἐν δὲ τοῖς προκειμένοις οὐκ ἔνεστι σωματισμόν). This was also our own view when editing that papyrus; but in consideration of the uncertainty concerning the meaning of the word σωματισμός, and the fact that here as well as in B. G. U. 729 ἀξιοῦ(μεν) is found by itself, we retain the doubts expressed in the note upon P. Fay. Towns 33. 18-9 as to whether in 268 ἀξιοῦ(μεν) 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.

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.

[Ἐκαρπώνησαν Παθώτης καὶ Δ[ε] βιός ἀμφότεροι χρη-
[ματίζων] ἐγ μητρὸς Ἀρσείτῳς ἀπὸ κώμης Θῶ-
[σεως Διογένεις Ἀμίτος μητρὸς Ἀβεῖτος ἀπὸ
τῆς αὐτῆς Ἐσβεως Ἀμίτος μητρὸς Ἀβεῖτος ἀπὸ
τῆς αὐτῆς Θῶσβεως ἀπὸ Ἀμεινᾶς Ὁρίωνος ἀπ’
῾Οξυρύγχου πόλεως περὶ τὴν αὐτὴν Θῶσβιν ἐκ τοῦ Χαριξείου
κλήρου ἀπὸ ἀρουρᾶς τρεῖς ἐκ μέτρων ἀργυρίου δραὶχμῶν τριῶν ἡ'
ἐπὶ τὸν ἐκαρπωνείον τοῦ ἐδάφους ἐν τῆς τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος πέμπτου ἕτους
Αὐτῶν Καίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου. ἐὰν δὲ
μὴ ἀποδοῖ τῇ ὡρισμένῃ προθεσμίᾳ ἐκτίσει τὰς τοῦ ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς διακο-
20 σίας ἐβδομήκοντα ἑκάστης μνᾶς κατὰ μῆνα ἑκάστης, τῆς πράξεως οὖσης τῷ Ἀπίωνι ἐκ τοῦ Διογένους καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόν-
των αὐτῶ πάντων καθάπερ ἐγ δίκης.
25 [κ’]υρία ή καρπωνεία. ἐτους πέμπτου Λύτοκράτορος [ΚαΪσαρὸς Τίτου Αἰλίου Διορίανὸ] Αὐτωνείνου [Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς Φαρμοῦθι κυ. (2nd hand) Παθό-
[τις καὶ Δίβιτος ἀμφότεροι ἐκ μητρὸς Ἀρσείτος (κ’)] εκαρπονήκαμεν τῷ Διόγενει τῶν τοῦ χόρτου ἄροτρας τρεῖς ἐκ γεωμε-
τρίας φόρου ἀργυρίου δραχμῶν διακοσίων ὁδομήκοντα ἕξ ὡς πρόκει-
ται. Διονύσιος Διονύσιος ἔγραψε ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν μὴ εἰς τότεν γράμματα.
30 Χρόνος ὁ αὐτὸς.
35 Χρόνος ὁ αὐτὸς.

3rd hand Ἀπίων Ὑπερείνονος Διογένει Ἀμύστος χαίρειν. ἐσχοῦν παρὰ σοῦ τὰς συνπε-
φονημένας ὑπὲρ τιμῆς χόρτου ἄργυρι-
[ο]ν δραχμὰς διακοσίας ἐβδομήκοντα ἑκάτων ὡς πρόκει-
ται. Διονύσιος Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβους ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν μὴ εἰς τότεν γράμματα.

[ἔτους] ΕΠΕΙΦ Β.

20. 1. ἡμιολίᾳ. 32. 1. ἑβδομήκοντα. 33. 1. Διονύσιος Διονύσιον. 34. 1. εἰδότων.

1 Pathotes and Livius, both styled as having Harseis for their mother, from the village of Thosbis, have sold to Diogenes son of Amois and Abeis, from the said Thosbis, out of the land belonging to Apion son of Horion, of Oxyrhynchus, which they cultivate at Thosbis in the holding of Charixinus, consisting of 20 arourae, the crop of hay upon three arourae as fixed by a survey in the eastern part for 276 drachmae of silver, on condition that Diogenes may cut the crop bought by him and transport it to any place that he may choose, and shall hand over to the aforesaid Apion who is the owner of the land the 276 drachmae of silver before Epeiph 10 of the present 5th year of Antoninus Caesar the lord. If he fails to pay it within the stipulated date he shall forfeit the 276 drachmae of silver increased by one half, with interest at the rate of a drachma a month for each mina, Apion
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, Pathotes and Livius, our mother being Harseis, have sold to Diogenes the crop of 3 aourae 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.

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 Ptollas. 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 (χερσάμεπελον, 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 κτῆμα and a καλαμεία. 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 καλαμεία (ll. 3–4 and 25–7) are unfortunately very imperfect,
and the connexion between the vines and the κάλαμος 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 (ὀπωροφυλακία), 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 κτῆμα (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] δραχμῶν τριακοσίων, τὴν δὲ ἀν[α]βολὴν ποιήσονται ἀπὸ τῶν ἐδίγμων ἀναβολῶν. τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ τοῦ ἀρχαίου κτήματος χώματος υδροφυλακίαν μέχρι τοῦ ὄρους
8 [37 letters] τῷ τοῦ ἀρχαίου κτήματος μισθωτῇ, τῆς κατ’ ἑτέρον ἀπεργασίας τοῦ αὐτοῦ χώματος εἶναιντ εὐρεία ἤν ἔσται πρὸς μόνον τῶν μεμισθωκότα, τῶν τοῦ αὐτοῦ νεοφύτου χω-
9 [ματων 32 letters ] πρὸ{ς} ἵπτος τοὺς μεμισθωμένους, ὁμοίως καὶ τοῦ νοτίου χώματος μέχρι τοῦ ὄρους, τοῦ μεμισθωκότος Σαραπίωνος παρέχοντος αὐτοῖς κατ’ ἑτέρο κατεσχεῖ ὤνοις δεκάτες
10 [............., ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ εἰσιόντος τρίτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἤτοι ἐπὶ τὴν λιστὴν τριετίαν δώσωσι τῷ μεμισθωκοτι κατ’ ἑτέρο τοῦ ὄρους ὁμοίως ἐκατότον. τῆν δὲ αὐταρκίαν κόπον περιστερῶν πρὸς κοπρισμόν τοῦ κτή-
11 [ματος δώσοσιν οἱ μεμισθωμένοι κατὰ τὸ ἡμιστὶ καὶ ὁ μεμισθωκὸς κατὰ τὸ ἕτερον ἡμιστὶ. ὃν δὲ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ Σαραπίων υδροφυλακία φυλάσσαι τῷ τῆς ὀποίας καιρῷ φύλακα πέμψει, τοῦ ὀφωνίου ὄντος πρὸς αὐτὸν
12 [37 letters] μηχανῆς καὶ τῆς ταύτης κ.]...]ας ἐσται τὰ μὲν ἔδελα πρὸς τὸν Σαραπίωνα, οἱ δὲ τεκτονικοὶ μισθοὶ καὶ ἥ τοῦ τεκτονοὺς σύνταξις ἐσται πρὸς τοὺς μεμισθωμένους. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ νοῦν
13 [τροχοῦ 31 letters ] καὶ δώσει τοῖς αὐτοῖς μεμισθωμένοις εἰς λόγον προχρείας ἀργυρίου δραχμὰς τρισχειλίας, ἐξ ὧν ὑπολογίζωσιν τὸν τοῦ τέκτονος σύνταξις ἔσται πρὸς τοὺς μεμισθωμένους. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ νοῦν
14 [τοῦ κτήματος ἀπὸ Φαῶφι εἰκάδος τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος δευτέρου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἤτοι ἐκατότον καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἤτοι ἀκολούθως η ἐχει ὁ Σαραπίων μισθώσει ἤν καὶ εἶναι κυρίαν δραχμάς δίσχειλας
15 [30 letters] ἀς ἀποδώσει αὐτοῖς τὸ μὲν Ἀθύρ μηνὶ δραχμάς διακοσίας τὸ βιῆς (διακοσίας) καὶ Μέχελρ τὰς λοιπὰς δραχμὰς ἐξακοσίας, τὰς δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ δραχμὰς τρισχειλίας ἀποδώσουσι εξενίαων.
16 [τα 35 letters] ἰσοταυον ἄτοκος. τὰ (δὲ) [δέοι]τα καθηνη παρὰ τῷ υδροπαρόχῳ βοᾶς πέντε καὶ μόσχους τρεῖς παραλήμψονται οἱ αὐτοὶ μεμισθωμένοι ἐν συντιμήσει τῇ εἰκάδι τοῦ
17 [Φαῶφι τοῦ τρίτου καὶ εἰκοστοῦ ἤτοι, καὶ συντιμίζονται τῇ συντιμίζονται
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άπόδοσιν τοῦ λήγοντος χρόνου. ἐὰν δὲ χρεία γένητε ἐτέρας προ-
χρήσεως δώσει αὐτοῖς ὁ μεμισθωκός, λαβόντες καὶ τάξονται δρα-
18 [χμ 31 letters ἐπάν]αγκον οὖν οἱ αὐτοὶ μεμ[ισθωμένοι] ἐκαστα ἐπιτελεί-
tοσαν ὅσ πρόκιται ἀμέρπτως μηθὲν ἐκκαιρον ἓοντος γείνεσθαι πρὸς
τὸ μὴ καταβλάπτεσθαι τὴν ἀμπελὸν μηθὲν.
19 [35 letters ἀπὸδότωσαν τὸ μεμισθωκὸς τὸν τόν μὲν οἰνὸν παρὰ ληνὸν
νέον ἀδολον ἐκατέρου μέρους παρέχοντος παρὰ ληνὸν τὸν αὐτάρκη
κέραμον, οὐ δὲ ἐὰν μὴ κατὰ καιρὸν ἔρ-
20 [γάζωνται 29 letters] ἐπαν ὑπὸ διπλοῦν, τοῦ δὲ κατα-
lιπτείν τήν μίσθωσιν ἐντὸς τοῦ χρόνου ἐπιτίμου ἄργυριον ἄρχαμάς
πεντακοσίας καὶ εἰς τὸ δημόσιον τὰς ἔσσε σαρπίς
21 [τὸ τὴν μίσθωσιν μένειν κυρίαι /[.]π, καὶ ἡ πράξει ἐστο [τ]ῇ
μεμισθωκὸτα ἐκ τῶν μεμισθωμένων ἀλληλεγγυήν ὄντων εἰς
ἐκτίσιν καὶ ἐξ οὐ ἐὰν αὐτῶν αἰρήται καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων
αὐτοῖς πάν-
22 [τῶν καθάπερ ἐγ δίκης. καὶ μετὰ τῶν χρόνων παραδότωσαν οἱ μεμισθω-
μένοι τῷ κτήματι καὶ τὴν καλαμείαν σύνφυτα καὶ ἐπιμεμελημένα
καὶ καθαρὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ θρύον καὶ βοτάνης καὶ δείσης πάσης καὶ τὰ
φυτὰ εὐθαλοῦντα καὶ
23 [37 letters ἐπαν]ακωμένας καὶ τὰ [τοῦ κτήματος χώματα ἐστε-
γαμένα καὶ ὑδροπεφυλακημένα καὶ άς ἀν παραλάβωσι θύρας καὶ
κλείσι καὶ τὴν μηχανῆν 5τριῆς] ὕπλην
24 [34 letters] ποιήσονται τῶν ποτισμοῦς τοῦ [κτήματος καὶ τῆς καλα-
μείας] πεμπταινόν πρὸς ἄρσεκ[α]ὶ τὸν Ἐπαριῶνος καὶ τὴν τοῦ
κατὰ τὸν Ἐπαριῶνον οἶνου μεταφορὰν ἀπὸ τῆς
25 [40 letters] εὐνησίν κ[.].......] ἐφ’ ὅσον ἐνην . . . [.].....]μται,
ἐτὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ μεμισθωμένοι ὑπολείψουσι μ[ετ’]ὰ τῶν χρόνων
τὸν τότε τῆς καλαμείας κάλαμον
26 [40 letters] ν τῷ ἐξῆς [.]....] ἐτὶ διὰ τὸ κατ’ [.].............]. χρ
ἐτέρῳ μισ[θο].......] , εἰ ἐπικείμενον τῆς κ[’]αλαμείας κάλαμον
ἂν π[.,].] τοῦ διελθόντος ἐτοὺς
27 [38 letters] Σαραπιῶν [ 16 letters ἐκείνη[ς]. 14 letters ]ον
οίνῳ [ 15 letters ]ον φ.....μέτρῳ π[.,].]............. οἰνοῦν
τοῦ Ἐπαριῶνος.
28 τοῦ μέσφο τοῦ κτήματος τὴν δὲ μη|χανήν ἀναβαλεὶ ὁ με|μισθωκός λίθαις διαπάνως ἀπὸ μη|νὸς Παχών, τὴν δὲ σκαφὴν τῆς πλακάδος τοῦ ὑποδοχῆς ἐσται ὕπο

29 τέ τῶν μεμισθωμένων κατὰ τὸ ἡμισίων καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ μεμισθωκότος κατὰ τὸ ἔτερον ἡμισίων. τὴν δὲ κατ’ ἐτος χυλοσωμάτων και ἐκαστον τῶν κατὰ καὶ ρίζων ἔργων ποιήσουν οἱ μεμισθωμένοι ἐπακολουθοῦν.

30 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ πάντα γενέσθαι. μισθῶσει δὲ ὁ μεμισθωκός τοῖς μεμισθωμένοις ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰσίωτως τρίτω καὶ εἰκ[α]στω τῆς ἑπτά ἔτους ἑκατόν ἕκαστος κατ’ ἐτος γραμμάτων ἐξηκοσίων κατὰ ἡμισίους μέρος τῶν

31 τὸ τοῦ Σαραπίωνος αἰροντεύων γνήσιος ἐκάστοτε και ἐχθρομένων χορής κατ’ ἐτος ἐνοικιάζων ἔτος ξυλοτομίαν κατ’ ἐτος σπειραὶ καὶ ἀμπελῶνος ἐπὶ τῶν ἐντὸς πλαστῶν χερσάμπετ

32 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ πάντα γενέσθαι τὸν ὄνομα, τῶν δὲ ἐν τῷ κτήματι ροδῶν ἔτος ξυλός κατ’ ἐτος τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ Σαραπίωνος τῶν μεμι-

33 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει τῆς ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

34 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

35 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

36 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

37 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

38 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

39 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

40 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

41 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

42 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

43 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

44 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

45 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

46 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

47 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

48 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

49 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-

50 τοῦ Σαραπίωνος καὶ παρέξει της ἐν αἷς ἐστὶ τρόφος ὡς ἐκ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος κατ’ ἐτος συν-
8. 1. ὑσθε for ἤσθαι. 9. μονοι above the line. vs of tovs corr. from ν. μεν of μεμισθώμενου corr. from κοτα. 10. ἱ. κόπρου. 13. a of διδαμείαι corr. from o. π of ύδραπαρχον συντείμ. from σ. 14. First τ of τρίτων corr. from δ. μ of δραχμῖνος corr. from σ. 1. δραχμία διαιρέσεως. 16. πα of νόθαρα πορ χρ. from φυ. 17. γ of γενετ. corr. from ν. 1. γένηται. 1. προχρήσεως. e of ὄνωσι corr. from o. 18. 1. ἔστωτε. 22. a και before καθάρα corr. 23. και before νόθαρ χρ. corr. 24. αλλής of καλαμίς corr. 28. l. ή δὲ σκαφή. της. 30. e of μισθώσεις corr. from εν. 31. 1. ἱσάτως και ἀχρευμόνιος. 35. 1. μεμισθώμεθα τὸν ἀμπελῶνα. 36. 1. ἡμισείας. 37. κει of προκειται ὡς πρὸς ἐκείνων. 38. 1. Φαῦβι. 39. παρ του ἀντ(ο)ν σαραπ(ω)νος above the line. 42. 1. ἔλασσονοι. 44. l. παραδώσομεν. ἴσα Pap.

3. καλαμεῖν : 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 κτήμα is coupled with the καλαμεῖα), but from other leases of ἀμπελῶνες; cf. C. P. R. 224. 11-2 ὡν καλαμουργίαν ἐκ κανη... τών αὐτάρκη κάλαμον καὶ σχοινία, P. Brit. Mus. 163. 22-5, where read καὶ τῶν οὖσα καλαμίαν ἀναχώσους κατ᾽ ἐτῶν ἐκκατον καὶ τῶν ἀμπὲς ἑλών τῆς καλαμουργίας... ὁμεν κατ᾽ ἐτου... , and P. Tebt. 120. 141 καὶ καλαμουργήσεως... ἔκαστος καὶ ἀντλήσει, On the other hand κάλαμος was sometimes cultivated by itself, as is shown by B. G. U. 358. 13, where a καλαμία corresponds to an ἀλάμων; cf. P. Brit. Mus. 195 (β). 11 and B. G. U. 619. ii. 19 and 776. 10, which mention κάλαμος Ἑλληνικός, contrasted apparently with κάλαμος Ἰνδικός (P. Brit. Mus. 191. 11; cf. Wilcken, Archiv, I. p. 150). In P. Tebt. 5. 199 καλαμεῖα is mentioned as being required for
embankments (cf. note ad loc.); but though this section dealing with κάλαμος in 729 is immediately followed by one dealing with embankments (cf. P. Brit. Mus. 163. 22) the καλαμεῖα in an ἀμπελών would seem to be a crop of reeds planted between or under the vines. According to l. 22 the καλαμεῖα equally with the κτῆμα had to be handed over σύνφυτα καὶ ἐπιμεμελημένα κ.τ.λ.

5. χοῦν is to be supplied as the object of εἰσάξουυσι; cf. l. 6. In the first year of the lease the responsibility for the χωματισμός 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 κτῆμα, and the adjoining ἀρχαῖον κτῆμα was leased to some one else, the μισθωτής of l. 8. The embankment which is the subject of ll. 7–8 probably divided the two κτήματα, and the arrangement is that for the υδροφυλακία Sarapion and the other μισθωτής are jointly responsible, but for the ἀπεργασία Sarapion alone. For certain embankments of the νεόφυτον κτῆμα 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 (σακυγείο) 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 Τύμα than 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 ἐξενίαυτα in l. 15 cf. P. Amh. 85. 14, 86. 11, and P. Par. 25. 12. The second of these instances, in which ἐξενίαυτα follows καρ' ἔτος, shows that it must have meant something different; and the sense 'annually' would not be suitable for 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 ἐπίφανα πρόγραμμα. The most suitable meaning for ἐξενίαυτα in all these contexts is 'within (or 'for') the whole year.' In B. G. U. 920. 18 the editor reads ἐνενίαυτα κατ' ἔτος, where too ἐξενίαυτα 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 they 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 δραχμιαίον τόκον.
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. πλακάς 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 ἕως τὰ πάντα ἔρεσκόντωσι; cf. l. 24.

30-2. This χερσάμπελος is distinct from the ἀμπελών which is the subject of the main contract; cf. introd. ἐντὸς πλαστῶν in l. 30 seems to mean 'enclosed by a mud wall.'

32. ἰδῖα: this is the first mention in a papyrus of the cultivation of roses. In P. Brit. Mus. 163, 17, where for the editor's ἀφρ[ο]δίί σίων Wilcken (Archiv, I. p. 150) suggested ἀργ(ῶν) ῥ᾽ οἰδίων, the correct reading is ἀκροδρύων, i.e. ἀκροδρύων.

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 χερσάμπελος (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.

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.
'Εμίσθωσεν Σαράπιον Ῥωδόν Ἀπολλωνίου ὁ οὗ τὸν φόρον κομίσῃ τῷ ἔως ἂν τὸν φόρον κομίσῃ
이는 ὁ Ἐμίσθωσεν ὁ οὗ τὸν φόρον κομίσῃ τῷ ἔως ἂν τὸν φόρον κομίσῃ

Πέρῃ τῆς ἐπιγονῆς εἰς τὸ ἐνεστὸς τὸ πεντεκαίδεκατον ἔτος
Πέρῃ τῆς ἐπιγονῆς εἰς τὸ ἐνεστὸς τὸ πεντεκαίδεκατον ἔτος

τὸν Αἰαναοῦ Καῖσαρὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἀπὸ τῆς Δέκατον ἔτος Παῦνι μηνὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔτους,
τὸν Αἰαναοῦ Καῖσαρὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἀπὸ τῆς Δέκατον ἔτος Παῦνι μηνὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔτους,

ὁ δὲ ἂν προσφειλέσῃ ὁ μεμισθωμένος ἀποτεισάτω
ὁ δὲ ἂν προσφειλέσῃ ὁ μεμισθωμένος ἀποτεισάτω

τῆς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι καὶ σπονδωσις (ἔτους) ιε Αὐτοκράτορος
τῆς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι καὶ σπονδωσις (ἔτους) ιε Αὐτοκράτορος

On the verso
On the verso

2. Ὁ ᾽Οξυρυνχοῦς Πάπυρος
2. Ὁ ᾽Οξυρυνχοῦς Πάπυρος

2. Οὐαλερίῳ. 20. ο οτὸν corr. from ο. 21. ε of δε corr. from ι(?). 39.
2. Οὐαλερίῳ. 20. ο οτὸν corr. from ο. 21. ε of δε corr. from ι(?). 39.

‘Σαράπιον son of Herodes, of Oxyrhynchus, has leased to Valerius son of Apollonius, of the village of Senepta, 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 arouae in the holding of Damon, to be cultivated with grass for cutting and grazing at a fixed rent of 120 silver drachmae and 4 drachmae 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
year of the Emperor Caesar Trajanus Hadrianus Augustus, A.D. 19. (Signed) I, Valerius son of Apollonius, have leased the land at a rent of 120 silver drachmae.

8-9. basilike... ek tov Damouos klhrou: i.e. the land was part of a confiscated klhrou; cf. 721. 4-6.

10. xylameisai khirof: cf. 101. 11, 280. 12, 15, and 409. 15 where khirof is to be read for khrion.

13. spoudai... panepisth: for the payment on account of spoudai 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. [phorou [apIoitou] is perhaps to be read, but does not very well suit the remaining vestiges of letters.

731. ENGAGEMENT OF SERVICES.

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 oposion 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.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

δραχμ[ς δεκατρίς δύο ὀβολοῦς. ἦς ἡ-
μέρας ἔως ἐικτίσω ἀργυρίου δραχμὴν μί-
αν δύο ὀβουοῦς. ἡ ὁμολογία τῆς {α}πα-
ραμονῆς ήδε κυρία ἔστω ὡς κατακεχωρι-
15 μένη.

3. Πεσσαρκοκόστου ἕκαστοῦ.

'... of the 39th year of Caesar to Thoth of the 40th year of Caesar, on condition that I give you my services on the 9th and 10th of each month and for two days at the festival of Isis and three days at the time of the stars of Hera; and if you require me you shall pay me 1 drachma 2 obols of silver daily, or a fixed yearly salary of 40 drachmae of silver, and a present of 13 drachmae 2 obols of silver; and for every day that I am unemployed I will forfeit 1 drachma 2 obols of silver. This contract of engagement shall be valid as if publicly registered. The 38th year of Caesar...

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. 392 a 27 ὁ τοῦ Ψωφόμου ὄν Ἀφροδίτης οἱ δὲ "Ἡρας προσαγορεύονται, Pliny, H. N. 2. 8, &c.); but why the plural ἄστροις 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. ἦς ἡμέρας δὲ ἐάν would be expected, but this was certainly not written. The ε after the lacuna is nearly sure and this may represent δ᾽; but the letter after ἡμέρας if not η must be ν and is certainly neither δ nor ε.

14. There is not room for ἐν δημοσίῳ.

(c) RECEIPTS.

732. RECEIPT FOR THE TAX ON FERRY-BOATS.

A receipt issued by two farmers of the ὁμὴ πορθμεῖων 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 πορθμεῖως, 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.

"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 A..., and other (villages) for the present 13th year of Antoninus Caesar the lord, to Achillas son of Thoönis 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. **Receipt**

A receipt for the tax on pigs (cf. 286, 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.
I (ἔτους Ἀντωνείνου) Κάίσαρος τοῦ κυρίου
Παχὼν δ. [δ]έγρα(ψε) Διογ(ένει) πρά(κτορι) ἀργυ(ρικῶν)
Μ . [ . . . ] πλατ(ειας) Ἀμόις δ κ(αὶ) Παπο(ντῶς) Διοδό(χου)
υκ(ής) [τοῦ] αὐ(τοῦ, ἑ (ἔτους) (δραχμῆς) μίαν (πεντώβολον) (ημιωβέλιον), /
(δραχμῆς) α (πεντώβολον) (ημιωβέλιον).
5 Τ . Ῥ[. . .] . o[. . .]υ(δε) μη(τρὸς) Ταπο(ντῶτος) λαογρα(φίας)
τοῦ αὐ(τοῦ) (ἔτους) (δραχμᾶς) τ (έσίσαρας, ύκ(ής) α (πεντώβολον) (ημιωβέλιον).

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 5½ 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.

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 γλ- and σ-, are uncertain, being probably both new.

Ε (ἔτους) Αὐρηλίων Ἀντωνίνου καὶ Οὐήρου τῶν
κυρίων Σεβαστῶν Φαμε(νῶθ) κ. δέγρα(ψε) Κλάρῳ
χ(ριστῇ) πρα(κτόρων) ἀργυ(ρικῶν) μὲ(σις) τοπ(αρχίας) Πέτνη Τακολ( )
τόπ(ῶν) δι(ά)
Αμμων(ίου) βοη(θοῦ) γλα( ) καὶ σή( ) ε (ἔτους) Κλεών
5 [. . .]γου Τακολ( ) δραχ(μῆς) μία(ν) τετρώβολον(ον),
/ (δραχμῆς) α (τετρώβολον).

3. The Πέτνη τόποι are known from 595, 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.

Col. ii.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sadus} & \quad \text{Barichius} \\
\text{Marrius Coma} & \quad \text{Zebidius} \\
\text{Valerius Isidori} & \quad \text{Malichus Sal} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Col. iii.

\[
\begin{align*}
5 \text{Malochos} & \quad \text{Sados} \\
\text{Koparino} & \quad \text{Themis} \\
\text{Oikarios} & \quad \text{Salmo} \\
\text{Xarpe} & \quad \text{Zebidius} \\
\text{Euphron} & \quad \text{Malichus Sal} \\
10 \text{Tekonta.} & \quad \text{Psenosirius} \\
\text{Itevat} & \quad \text{Roman} \\
\text{Cognativa} & \quad \text{Ethiopian} \\
\text{Beleis} & \quad \text{Themes} \\
\text{Zabdius} & \quad \text{Barichius} \\
\text{Sabimus} & \quad \text{Iulius} \\
\text{Malachi} & \quad \text{Ethiopian} \\
\text{Etiopicus} & \quad \text{Pascibius} \\
\end{align*}
\]
6–7. Κωμαρίνου . . . οἰκονόμῳ οὐικαρίῳ.

7. First ε of εμετρηθησαν corr. from o (?).

8. Πρώτων.

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 vii in l. 10 is wrong. The only case in which any difficulty arises is in l. 13, where Beleus 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 Avitus 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 Comarini; cf. l. 6.

5. Μαλωχώς: hardly Μαλωχᾶς, though that name occurs in a Palmyra inscription, C. I. G. 4497.

6. Καισάρων οἰκονόμου οὐικαρίου: cf. B. G. U. 156. 3 and 102. 1, where οἰκονόμος is probably to be read between Καίσαρος and οὐικάριος.

14. The marginal additions here and in l. 19 are obscure; cognlega is perhaps collega, but what is riez? The first letter may be a but the second does not at all resemble p, nor would aphex 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[...]

eis [. . . ] (δραχμαί) δ, βα . [. . . ] [. . . ] διὰ

κοράξου (δραχμαι) i,

γογυλίδος εἰς ταριχείαν (δραχμη) α (δβολοι δβο),
καλκίου μισθοῦ εἰς βάψαι (ὀβολοὶ δύο ?)
άλος (ὀβολοὶ δύο ?),
ἀλεστρα (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβης) ἃ ἐπὶ τῆς ἱ(τι) (τριάβολον ?),
θρύων εἰς τοὺς ἄρτους (ὀβολοὶ δύο),
ήπητρα εἰς φαινόλην Κοράξου (ὀβολὸς) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
eἰς κατανθρωπίσμον γυναικὸς)
Γεμέλλου (τετράβολον ?),
μύρον εἰς ἀποστολὴν τοῦ θησ.
θυγατρὸς Φνᾶς (τετράβολον).
κβ. ἑλασιν χαimentary α (δραχμαὶ) δ (τετράβολον),
κηροῦ καὶ γραφείου παιδ(ῶν) (ὀβολοὶ),
ἄρτου καθαροῦ Πρίμα[ς] (ἡμιωβέλιον),
eἰς κ[α]τανθρωπίσμον Τύχης (τριάβολον).
Μεὖ(ε) θ. [ 20 letters ] (δραχμὴ) α (τριάβολον)
3. φ of Ἰαφί rewritten (?)

Col. iii.

Ends of 3 lines.
1. σ[...]ερ[...] (ὀβολοὶ δύο),
κ[...]ν ... (ἡμιωβέλιον),
30 ἄπτατι (δραχμαὶ) β (ὀβολοὶ δύο),
ἀνὸν ἐν τῇ πόλ(ε) ἄλεστρα ἄρτων
(πυροῦ) (ἀρταβῶν) β διὰ [Ἰ]στάτος (δραχμῆ) α (ὀβολοὶ δύο).

35 ἄριστῳ (γεὶδ[δι]οῦ) (ὀβολοὶ),
ἀσπαράγω(ν) δίπνῳ ᾿Αντ(ᾶτοΞ) ὅτ᾽ εἰς τὸ περίδ᾽ πνο(ν) ᾿4θη( ) γναφέω(ς) (ἡμιωβέλιον), καὶ παιδαρ(οί)ς δίπνῳ κράμβη(ς) (ἡμιωβέλιον), π΄... [.]. παιδίῳ (ἡμιωβέλιον)

Parts of 2 lines.

25. Second ε of caparuoy corr. from ο (?). 36. First a of ἀσπαραγω(ν) corr. from δ.

Col. iv.


47. γάλακτος παιδ(ῶν) (ἡμιωβέλιον), ἄρτου καθαροῦ (ἡμιωβέλιον).

50 17. Σεκοῦντα παιδ(ῶν) ἵτριον (ἡμιωβέλιον),

10. τισάνης ὀμ(οίως) (ἡμιωβέλιον).

κ. ὀψαρίου (ὁβολός), ἄρτου καθαροῦ (ἡμιωβέλιον), εἰς κατανθρωπ(ἰσμὸν) Ἀντ(ᾶτοΞ) (ὁβολοὶ δύο),

55 καὶ εἰς Ταπτολλοῦτος Καικιλ(ίου) (τριώβολον), γενεσίοις Τρυφᾶτος στεφά(νων) (ὁβολοὶ δύο), γε(νε)σίοις [.]. [.]. ὁ( ) στεφά(νων) (ὁβολοὶ δύο).

κα. ῥόας παιδιῶν) (ὀβολός), παιγνίω(ν) καὶ εποιρω(ν) παιδ(ῶν) (ἡμιωβέλιον),

60 ξύτου (τριώβολον), ὀψου (ὁβολός).

κβ. ὀψαρί[ο]ν (ὁβολός).

Part of 1 line.

50. 1. Σεκοῦντα (cf. 1. 81). 54. αντ of αντ( ) rewritten.
7°

736. ACCOUNTS

Col. v.

Parts of 4 lines.

70 Θαῆσις [. . . ἡ]με(ρῶν) β [(πεντάβολον),
μὴτηρ [Ἀμ]μονάτο(ς) ἡμε(ρῶν) ]

καθ. ἀλεστρα (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβης) α (τετράβολον),
ἀλμυρίδος μα( ) β (ὁβολοὶ δύο),

75 ἀλὸς (ὁβολός),
λίνον καὶ βαφίδος (ὁβολός),
ἀλεστρα (πυροῦ) (ἀρτάβης) α διὰ Θεοδό(ρου) (τετράβολον),
κέρκιστρα φαί(ναλού) (δραχμῆ) σ (ὁβολοὶ δύο),
ἀρτω(ν) καθαρω(ν) [Φαγ] ... τι( ) (δραχμῆ) α,
περιστεράς [πα]θίδων (ὁβολός),

80 ἀρτου καθαροῦ ὑμ(οίως) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
Σεκούντῳ παι(ῶν) ἵππων (ἡμιωβέλιον)
καὶ σεμιδάρεως ἤρας (ἡμιωβέλιον),
γάλακτος (ἡμιωβέλιον),
μύρον ε[ίς] ταφῆς θυγατρὸς

85 [Π]ιασίτ[ος] (δραχμῆ) α.

82. 1. σεμιδάλεως.

On the verso opposite Col. v.

Parts of 2 lines.

1. αμ[ . . . ]γ( ) γυ[ν]α[ίξι] συνα[ . . . ] (δραχμαί) β (τριώβολον),
πρ[φ]αγ(ων) ταξις γυνα[ίξ]

90 ἡμε(ρῶν) β (ὁβολοὶ δύο) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
κόλλητα λυχνίας (ὁβολοὶ δύο) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
ἐρεβυκ[θ]ον [ὁτὶ] ὀδ[ε]

ἐδείπνει [. . . .] [. . .] ζ[(ς)] (ὁβολός) (ἡμιωβέλιον),
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εἰς κατανθρωπισμὸν

Δαφ[ο]δίκης (δόβολοὶ δύο ?)

[...] εἰς τὰ ἀρτ. [...] [...]

Στράτου εἰς τὴν ἀπ’ βς ἐπὶ τὰς ἀπολογίαν (δραχμαὶ Ὡ) δικαιομένην τῶν τοῦ ἄμμου ἐπὶ τὰς ἀπολογίαν [...]

"Ἡρωῖν ἐτοίμασεν τὰ κεταλύματα (δραχμός) [...]."

κόλλητα χαλκίου (ἡμιωβέλιον).

Ich. 1-95. The 21st: ... through Zm ... for the cloak of Coraxus, 10 drachmae; 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 (?) 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 Issas, 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 ½ ob.; omelettes for the bread 2½ ob. The 17th: milk for the children ½ ob.; pure bread ½ ob. The 18th: to Secundas, 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 Caecilius 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.; Thaesis ... for 2 days 5 ob.; the mother of Ammonas for 2 days ... Taarpaësis 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 30th: ... 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. ἄλεστρα: cf. l. 10 ἄλεστρα, l. 77 κέρκισι τρα, l. 91 κόλλητα, 739. 4 καινοτόμερα. ἄλεστρα had already occurred in P. Tebt. 120 introd., where it should be regarded as a neuter plural, as should also ἐφαντρέα in P. Tebt. 117. 37, &c.

11. εἰς κατανθρωπισμὸν: cf. ll. 17, 53, and 92, where the expression recurs, the object being apparently always a woman. Neither κατανθρωπισμὸν nor κατανθρωπίζειν appears to be otherwise attested.

28. The ὣ of ὁμίς here and elsewhere is written above the line (so too δίκη 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 3 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 $asses$) and the numerals of the days of the month, and are not infrequently added after words which are not abbreviated.

Col. i.

\[
\begin{align*}
[a(nte) & d(ien)] \textit{Novas Iulias} \\
\text{[cond]uctei} & iv \text{ } a(asses) \text{ } xvi \\
\text{\textbar{\textbar}}i & ii \text{ } [a(asses)] \text{ } vii \\
\text{[cond]uctei} & ii \text{ } [a(asses)] \text{ } viii \\
5 \text{ } \text{\textbar{\textbar}}x & ii \text{ } a(asses) \text{ } vii \\
\text{[cond]uctei} & ii \text{ } a(asses) \text{ } viii \\
\text{\textbar{\textbar}}ii & ii \text{ } a(asses) \text{ } vii \\
\text{[cond]uctei} & ii \text{ } a(asses) \text{ } viii \\
\text{\textbar{\textbar}}x & ii \text{ } a(asses) \text{ } vii \\
10 & \text{co[n]ductei} ii \text{ } a(asses) \text{ } viii
\end{align*}
\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Col. i</th>
<th>Col. ii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. a(sses): this abbreviation is common in the Pompeian inscriptions; cf. C. I. L. IV, index. The occurrence of asses in an account of this kind is however very singular. Presumably the money though reckoned in asses was paid in obols, three of which would be the equivalent of 2 asses.

5. xix: cf. l. 21, where xii is written for xvii; for the sums of asses, on the other hand, xvi 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. Sextilia is a curious form; the a has been corrected, but was apparently altered from another letter, not itself deleted. For the numeral xix cf. note on l. 5.

738. Account of Food.

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.

διπνοι ε·

διπνοι ζ·
"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 (i)."

9. σιδυτή is a new word. The πτέρυγες were probably smaller than the ὄρνις.

739. PRIVATE ACCOUNT.

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.

'Εξει Ἰσᾶς παρὰ Ἀπολλωνίου ἀπὸ Κύνου (δραχμὰς) μ.]

2 δα(πάνης)· τιμὴν Χ[.] [N]έκθετι (δραχμαὶ) κη, σειτοποήτρων (δραχμὴ) α (τετράβολον),

5 [[ἐλαίου (δραχμαὶ) δ (δβολοὶ δύο).]]

8. ἄλεστρα (πεντάβολον), κονίου εἰς πρὸσφαγίου (ὀβολός).

9. κοφίνων γ (τετράβολον) (ἡμιοβέλιον).

10 προσφαγίου οἰκοδ(όμου) (ὀβολός), ἐλαίου χοῦς (δραχμαί) δ (δβολοὶ δύο). / μ (τριώβολον) (ἡμιοβέλιον).

11 προσφαγίου οἰκοδ(όμου) (ὀβολός).

12 ἐργάτου (τετράβολον ?), οἰκοδ(όμος) προσφαγίου (ὀβολός),

15 τέκτου[ος . . . ]

16. τιμῆς ἐλα[ίου] (δραχμαί) δ (τριώβολον ?).
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πορφύρας (δραχμαὶ) κ, σπημονίος εἰς γυναικείον ἵματον.

20 Φιλοποτέρω [.] [.] [.] [.] β [κβ. τιμῆς] ἐλαίου [(δραχμαὶ) δ] (ὁβολοὶ δύο).

/ [.] .

5. This line enclosed in round brackets. 7. πηταοφαγον.

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., for a woman’s robe ... , to Philoutarion ... 22nd, price of oil 4 dr. 2 ob. Total ...’

2. Κύνου, if correct, is the name of a village, but the writer is careless about his cases (cf. 1. 7), and he may mean Κυνῶν, i.e. Cynopolis.

4. σειτοπτικρων: cf. the similar forms ἄλεστρα (I. 6), ἤπητρα, &c. (786. 10 and note on 786. 7).

5. The amount of oil which is not stated here and in l. 21 was no doubt 1 χοῦς: cf. l. 11.

740. ACCOUNT OF CORN.

21·2 × 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 I. 36 of the recto no doubt refers to these emperors.

Col. i.

Ends of 13 lines.

Col. ii.

Col. iii.

Col. i.

Col. ii.
14. Μερμέρθων (cf. 823) is restored from l. 16; cf. the position of Πέλα in ll. 20–1. The genitive Μερμέρθων occurs in a papyrus found last winter.

15. γνησίων δηέμοσίων: cf. P. Amh. 86. 10 and note. ἀρταβιεία and ναύβιον are meant, though perhaps not exclusively.

16. μιᾶς ἀντὶ μιᾶς: cf. 1.18, and P. Amh. 87. 21–2, note. The meaning here is that half the artabaie were paid on one measure (the name of which is lost in 1. 14–6), half on the measure ἐμβίον, which is new and which we have supposed to be σιτολικῷ on the analogy of μέτρῳ ἀγορανομικῷ in 836.

17. ἐμβίον: this measure is also new. Perhaps ἐμβολικῷ, i.e. the measure generally used in corn sent by boat to Alexandria. It was no doubt smaller than the δημόσιον μέτρον; cf. 1. 21, note.

18. ἰδιωτικῶς: the point of this remark (cf. Il. 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 ἰδιωτικῶς 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 ἰδιωτικῶς is converted into a slightly smaller sum θέματος δημοσίου καθαροῦ, and note ad loc. But since the payment in l. 19, although ἰδιωτικῶς, is μέτρῳ δημοσίῳ, ἰδιωτικῶς cannot refer to a private measure, and would be a curious expression to imply that the corn in question was not καθαρὸς.

20. ἰδιωτικῶς: the point of this 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 ἰδιωτικῶς 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 ἰδιωτικῶς is converted into a slightly smaller sum θέματος δημοσίου καθαροῦ, and note ad loc. But since the payment in l. 19, although ἰδιωτικῶς, is μέτρῳ δημοσίῳ, ἰδιωτικῶς cannot refer to a private measure, and would be a curious expression to imply that the corn in question was not καθαρὸς.

21. 3 of 26 artabaie is 816 art., a sum which the writer expresses by 816 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 φορικῷ (μέτρῳ) (P. Brit. Mus. 125; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 232–3). The fact that it is the artaba of 42 choenices which is here μέτρῳ δημοσίῳ 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 μέτρῳ δημοσίῳ in Roman times always implied an artaba of 42 choenices.

22–3. These charges for donkey transport, with the σιτολογικών (a new term, probably meaning a bakshish for the σιτολόγος) and σιτομετρικών (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 προσμετρούμενα which occur in the official receipts of this period; cf. P. Tebt. I. pp. 411–2.

24. σιτολ(όγοι): 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, 524½ artabae 2 choenices, is here converted into 493 art. 8 choen. δήμαρχος δημοσίου καθαροῦ, 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 ἰδιωτικῶς 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’. αὐτοῦ cannot be read.

35. Θεωΐ: Θώλθεως (cf. l. 14, note) or at least a place name would be expected.

37. Since we do not know which artaba was being employed, it is uncertain how the writer expressed ¾ art. at the end of the line.

44. The μήτηρ τῶν ἀφηλίκων, if 'Ηρακλεί(δην) is right in l. 43, is the 'Ηρακλεία 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.

**Διγ(ος) έντολικών Εθγενέτο-**

- ἰππικών
- κελλάριον τριλάγυνον
- γεργαθὸς
- γεργαθὸς

**[ρο]ς έν δισακιδίῳ**

- αφρις διπλή καρίων
- ἀλλα μεικρά
- γεργαθὸς
- αφρις διπλή καρίων
- διπλή καρίων
- ἀρνικίς

**κελλάριον τριλάγυνον**

- μελλάριον τριλάγυνον
- αφρις διπλή καρίων
- γεργαθὸς
- ἀλλα μεικρά
- ἀρνικίς

**βι. ἀναβολή**

- βι. ἀναβολή
- μελλάριον τριλάγυνον
- αφρις διπλή καρίων
- γεργαθὸς
- ἀλλα μεικρά
- ἀρνικίς

**θέσεις**

- θέσεις
- μελλάριον τριλάγυνον
- αφρις διπλή καρίων
- γεργαθὸς
- ἀλλα μεικρά
- ἀρνικίς

**15 ἐν οἷς υελα(ξ) ἡμισυν-**

- 15 ἐν οἷς υελα(ξ)
- 15 ἐν οἷς υελα(ξ)
- 15 ἐν οἷς υελα(ξ)
- 15 ἐν οἷς υελα(ξ)
‘Account of articles at order of Eugenetor 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 saucer.’

4. δικλεο(τ) μεκρα(τ) 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 κέρα.

5. γεργαθός is probably for γεργαθός, meaning a wicker basket.

8. σόλια: or perhaps σέλια, which however is still more difficult. σόλιον might be a diminutive of σόλος or an adjective from Σόλης, but neither is very suitable. It is hardly likely that the word is connected with σολή, for which σολή 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 ε 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 ἀναβολίδιον is found in Macarius, Ἀροφίθ. Πατρ. 33 ἀναβολίδιον μεστὸν ψωμίων. In the preceding word the vestiges before the lacuna suit only a round letter such as θ, θ, ο, or σ; possibly βιβλίων. There are two dots like a diaeresis above the ι, but they are perhaps accidental.

14. προχείρια 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.

'Αντᾶς Φ[αύσ]τωι πλεῖστα χαίρειν. παράλαβε παρὰ Πόθου τὸν κάλαμον παναϊρίῳ καὶ ἀπόστειλόν μιᾶς δέσμας παρείληφες καὶ O[έ|ος αὐτὰς εἰς τόπον ἀσφάλως ἵνα τῇ ἀναβάσει αὐτὰς ἄξωμεν. παράδος δέ τινι τῶν φίλων ἀριθμῷ αὐτὰς ἵνα πάλιν φίλοις ἡμεῖς παραδοῖ, καὶ ἐάν τι δύνῃ σὺ ἔϊ. .. Ἱνὰϊ μοι δὸς ἐργασίαν ἔρρωσο. (ἔτους) κη [Καίσαρος Παύνι a.]

On the verso

Φαυστῶι [.....]ετευν. ( ) εἰς Νέκλην.

'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 τ. (Addressed) To Faustus ... at Nekle.'
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743. LETTER TO A FRIEND.

21.5 X 17.7 cm.

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 δέ σε καὶ τὸν Καίσαρος
] ἀναγνωρίσατε, δει γὰρ σε

Col. ii.

ei καὶ π[ρ]ὸς ἄλλους εἶχον πρᾶγμα

20 βοηθῶν αὐτοῦ γ[ε]νεύθαι διὰ ἣν
ἔχομεν[α] πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ φιλίαν, καὶ
γὰρ ἐγὼ ὅλος διαπον' ὁμοίαν εἰ Ἑλενος
χαλκοῦς ἀπόλεισθαι, παραγενομένου
γὰρ Δαμάτος εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν ἡλ-

25 θαμεν ἐπὶ Ἐπαφρόδειτον καὶ εὐφρέ-
θη μήτε εἰληφὼς μήτε δεδώκοις).
οἵτι ἐγὼ αὐτῷ διαστολὰς δεδώκοις
τὸ βαδίσαι εἰς ᾿Αλεξάνδρειαν χάριν

30 φορίων καὶ τὰ νῦν ἐπειπέτομοφά
αὐτῶν πάντα συνιδέει καὶ περὶ πάν-
των αὐτῷ τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν δέδωκα.
ἐν οἷς ἐὰν συν προσδεῖται συνπρο-
γενέσθαι αὐτῶι ὡς ἀνθομολογη(σομένῳ)

35 ὑπέρ σου αὐτῶι ὡς ὑπ' ἐρ' μου. ἐν τῷ δέ
με περισφάσθαι οὐκ ἡμεῖς οὕτωι
καὶ συντυχεῖν Ἀπολλωνίῳ τῷ Διμικῷ ἑνα
αὐτῷ αὐτὰ ταῦτα ὑποδίξω, καὶ συ
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.

"I larion{a} 'Aliti tý̂ ́̂ ́ φεί̂ ῆτa χαί̂ rô eii kai Bερού̂ ti tý̂ ́̂ ́ kurî a mou kai 'Apollω̂ -nár̂ î n. γί̂ νω̂ sse ó̂ s é̂ ti kai νή̂ n én 'Aleξan̂ dr̂ e(í̂ a) (é̂ )smê n̂ μη̂ ἁγωνι̂ ï̂ s é̂ an̂ ó̂ l̂ ô s cî̂ s-5 pο̂ rε̂ ô nται̂ , é̂ ĝ ω̂ é̂ n 'Aleξan̂ dr̂ e(í̂ a) mέ̂ n̂ ô ́

R 2
ἐρωτῶ σε Kal παρακαλῶ σε ἐπιμέλθητι τῷ παιδίῳ καὶ ἐὰν εὐθὺς ὀψών: ον λάβωμεν ἀποστελῶ σε ἄνω. ἐὰν πολλαπολλων τέκης ἐὰν ἢν ἄρσεν νοι ἢν ἢν θήλεα ἐκβάλε. εἰρήκας δὲ Ἀφροδισιάτι ὅτι μή με ἐπιλάθης: πῶς δύναμαι ἐπιλάθειν; ἐρωτῶ σε οὖν ἵνα μὴ ἀγωνιάσης.

(ἔτους) κθ Καίσαρος Παύνι κυ.

On the verso

᾿Ιλαρίων ᾿Αλίτι ἀπόδοσ.

2. 1. ᾿Απολλωναρίῳ. 8. 1. σοι. 11. δὲ

‘Ilarion to Alis his sister, many greetings, and to my dear Berous and Apollonarion. 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 (Apollonarion?) 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. ἐὰν πολλαπολλων τέκης is very obscure. If the second person τέκης 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 πολλῶν. If τέκης is altered to τέκη we might suppose that an animal was the subject and divide πολλ(ά) Ἀπόλλων; but Ἀπόλλων is not a likely name for an animal. Perhaps πολλαπλακών conceals Ἀπολλωναρίον (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.
ἀδελφῆς πολλά νυντειράμων ἕκας ἐπὶ διὰ τῶν ἀνακενόμενον μηδὲν ὡς ἔθεσα καὶ ἔστησα διὰ τὴν Θεοφίλου, μὴ ἀποδεδωκότι. ἔρρωσο.

On the verso

Γαίω ρουστίωι

6. νοικοιcorr. from ι.

4. πολειτάρχου: πολειτάρχαι 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 ἄνωθεν is most likely a perfect participle; the letter before ἕρωσο may be λ, σ, or τ.

6. ἐν Ὀξυρύγχοις: a village Ὀξυρύγχα 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 Ὀξυρύγχων or Ὀξυρύγχην πόλις is the normal form. The sentence οὐκ οἶδας ... ἀποδεδωκότι may be interrogative.
746. LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.

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 Ἡρακλείδηι τῶι ἀδελφῶι
πλείστα χαίρειν καὶ υγιαίνειν.
Εμφόβιος (ὁ) ἀποδ[δοὺς σοι τήν
ἐπιστολὴν ἐστὶι.. .κί. ].μ. φ[ι]ηρί
5 [.].ερίου, καὶ ἡράτησεν με γράψαι σοι.
προφέρεται ἔχειν πραγμάτιν
[ἐν τῇ] Κερκεμούνι. τότε οὖν ἔδει
σοι φαινεται σπουδάσεις κατά τὸ
δίκαιον. τὰ δ' ἀλλα σεαυτοῦ ἐπιμελεῖν
10 ὑγιαίνῃς.
ἔρρωσο.

(ἔτους) γ Τιβερίου Καίσαρος Σεβαστοῦ Φαῶφι γ.

On the verso

Ἡρακλείδηι βα(σιλικὼ) γρα(ματεῖ) Ὠξην(ρυγχίτου) Κυνοπ(ολίτου).

'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 ηητί are on a separate fragment, the position of which is doubtful.

13. There seems to be an ellipse of καὶ after Ὠξην(ρυγχίτου), though the fact that a basilicogrammateus should have more than one nome under his jurisdiction is remarkable.
747. *PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE*

747. **INVITATION TO A FEAST.**

5·1 × 7·3 cm. Late second or third century.

An invitation to a feast given by a cavalry officer; cf. 110 and 523.

*Kalēi se ὃ (dekādarp)χ(os) eis tʰn ãení-

an éantov tʰ σ Kalán-

dais ἀπὸ ὧφ(ας) η.

2. τη of ταυτου 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 ὠ[ἰ] τελεσσας. 113 Κ[λαυτάμητρης. Third century, written in sloping oval uncial 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 uncial.

750. 8 x 6.3 cm. Parts of ii. 57–73. 62 τ[ο]σσία. 63 εμεθῆες. 65 ε[κε]λευε. Third century, written in sloping oval uncial.

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 νοσ. 40 ὄφε[ι]λος. First ο of ἄγονος above an α crossed out. 47 αγε[ρες corrected from [ερες]. 48 γ of ἀγγες above the line. 50 πολη[π] corr. from πολη, 51 κατ[φει]ν. 53 ἐφωτος. ἐ[ε] of ε[ε]κει above the line. 54 οι of χράσμοι 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 ά[υ] μοι; a second hand seems to have corrected ν and has added ἐπι above μοι. Third century, written in sloping oval uncial.

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 ετρατων[ων] άγω. 381 πάρ ά[σια, 382 ἀ[χουτ] ο[ε] corr. to ἀ[χουτ η[ε(?). 387 ε of εων above the line. Third century, written in sloping oval uncial.

754. 5.5 x 2.5 cm. On the recto ends of 7 lines of a document mentioning a γ[μουργίς]. First century. On the verso a few letters from iv. 532–539. 535 πε[δειμε]θη. 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
of v. 130–173, forming a complete column, with numerous stops, accents, breathings, and marks of elision and quantity (all probably added later). 134 εὑρίσκω [ε ᾿|χθ}. 151 ἐξεναρμήξων. 153 ι of λυγρων added by a second hand. Third century, written in an upright hand of the oval type.

756. 6.8 \times 8.2 \text{ 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 κυρανεουσα. 382 ἀναλατο. 384 λυ of ἀλγε [corr. 388 θ of ενθ added above the line (?). 390 η of ενηγγεῖλεν above a, which is crossed through, ξ having been also corrected. Late third or fourth century, written in a semi-uncial hand.

757. 4.2 \times 3 \text{ cm.} Parts of v. 578–586. 582 ευ δ. First century, written in round uncial.

758. 9.6 \times 11.4 \text{ cm.} v. 583–596, the lines being nearly complete, from the top of a column, with stops, breathings, accents and elision-marks. 583 εὐφηκέν σα. 586 δε κα. 587 εὐστηκε. 588 ἤπων ... πέσον εν. Late second or third century, written in a neat uncial hand of the oval type.

759. 12.7 \times 2.9 \text{ 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 αυτῆς ἐπινέει, confirming the conjecture of Brandreth. Third century, written in a neat upright uncial hand of the oval type.

760. Fr. (8) 7.3 \times 4.9 \text{ 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 χωσην above the line. First century, written in round upright uncial.

761. 21 \times 11 \text{ 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 II. 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 \times 8.5 \text{ 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 ἐντο. 30 μαχησίομεθ. 31 omitted. Third century, written in small upright uncial.

763. 24.4 \times 10 \text{ 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 πουτοποροσιν added by a second hand. 73 Πραξαχαιων. 77 τ of ἔλη added above the line by a second hand. 112 Final τ of Ἐριμίδη added above the line by a second hand. τον τε τρομέουσα (a new reading; cf. ὑποτρομέουσα in Vindob. 61). 113 Ἀχιλλευς.
133 i of ὀμηροῦν added above the line by a second hand. Third century, written in good-sized oval uncial.

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 uncial.

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 i of προφερήσατι added above the line. 324 δὲ τέ. 325 v of iαυων above λλ crossed out. Third century, written in oval uncial.

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 uncial.

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 uncial.

768. 14 x 12.9 cm. Fragment from the top of a column, containing parts of xi. 736-764. 739 Αἰγηδάο. 740 ξανθίην. 750 αμάδαγα. 755 [aluros. 756 Βουβρασίου. 757 Αλεσίου. 758 Παλλάς Αθηνη. 760 Βουβρασίου. Third century, written in sloping oval uncial.

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 γηθησάειε. With v iι above Α. 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[ευν. 374 In the margin επαινέσομαι and below it αινίζομαι, referring to the variants αινίζομαι and αινίζομαι; cf. Schol. A αινίζομ' φέρεται καὶ διὰ τοῦ ξ αινίζομαι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπαινέσομαι. Ζηνόδοτος αἰνίσσωμαι. 410 In the margin between this and l. 411 is a critical sign shaped like ὃ. Second century, written in round upright uncial.

771. 14 x 7.8 cm. On the recto beginnings of xv. 736-746, with occasional breathings and accents. 740 κακλιμ[εν. 742 ai and first w of μαμωνων above ε and o. 744 i of κηλειω added later (by a second hand?). At the end a coronis and the title in large letters Λιανδ[οσ o. Late second or early third century, written in handsome good-sized uncial 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 αγχοτετρ[οι. 363 av αἰμωτι. 369 Final i of Μενουτισ[ει added above the line. 371 a of αἰθρι corr. from ξ. 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 εχθρ]ρεις is ζητ(...) 368 δασῳρτα. 369 ν of νος corr. 372 (end of the line) \[ν or ] ν. 401 [εἰδομένη[\[ν]]. 407 omitted. 408 ε of θεοί added above the line by a second hand. Διδαξίας. Second century, written in very large heavy uncial (cf. 661), the letters measuring 5 mm. in height.

774. 4.5 x 7.5 cm. Parts of iii. 226–231. 227 εωρις, the ε being added by a second hand above a crossed through. 228 θεὸς ε, the s being corrected from ?. Third century, written in good-sized sloping oval uncial.

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 αλεθείται above η crossed through. 399 omitted. Third century, written in sloping oval uncial.

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 uncial.

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 uncial, 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 αφραδιησιν added above the line; similarly final i of δεκαητι in 29, τωι and αλλωι in 32. 31 επελαβέ. 34 επεσσι. 38 εσσι. 42 νεισομεθα. 46 βουλη τε. Late second or third century, written in handsome round upright uncial. 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 δὴ Τρωεσσι with φιν (in a second hand) above εσσι. 539 βιβλιοντα. 544 φ of νοσθην above τ crossed out. αφειστηκε. 545 μιν with + above + 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 δε δαιρα. 295 δ of δουρε corr. Third century, written in rather small sloping oval uncial.

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 γενέσθαι. Third century, written in rather small sloping oval uncial.

783. 11.7 x 4.4 cm. Ends of xvii. 410-428, with stops. 417 αλλωι. Late first century B.C., written in good-sized irregular uncial.
VI. DESCRIPTIONS OF MISCELLANEOUS DOCUMENTS

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 προσ/ (i.e. προσγίνονται) τιμῆ(ς) (πυροῦ) (ἡμίσους) τοῦ πεπραμένου Διδύμῳ Ἄρ (i.e. 1100 copper drachmae), [λυτρά ἱερῶν ἐγ] μενος φ, ἰχθυδίου κ, ζύτους ι, φῶν β κε, ἐλαίου κ(τύλης) α ρπ, οἴνου κ(εραμίων) β (τάλαντον) α, and payments for Ἑλληνικῶν, A conversion of silver into copper drachmae occurs, τιμῆ(ς) ἀργυ(ρίου) (ὃραχ-μῶν) ἡ ὑπ(ὲρ) τοῦ πατρὸ(ς) "By (a ratio of 337½ : 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 ὁμολογῶ παρε ληφέναι Ξένωνα "Ἡρακλέους παρὰ σοῦ ὃν καὶ παρέξομαι ἐν τῶι ἐμφανεῖ ἐκτὸς ἱεροῦ βωμοῦ τεμένους πάσης σκέπης. About A.D. 1. 12 lines in all.

786. 14.3 x 8.4 cm. Conclusion of a census-return on oath, written by Aristion and Didymus on Tubi 30 of the third year of Hadrian (A.D. 119), the portion preserved corresponding to 480. 7 sqq. προγεγραμμένων (cf. 480. 1) is apparently written ἀγεγραμμένων. Below the signatures in two different hands are official dockets κατεχ(ωρίσθη) λαογρ(άφοις) Νό(του) Δρό(μου) xpd(vos) ὁ αὐ(τός), and κατεχωρίσθη λαογρ(άφοις) ᾿Ἱπ(πέων) Παρε(μβολῆς) χρό(νος) 6 αὐ(τός). 20 lines, which are complete except the first.


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 based 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.
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 ἁλτηρίῳ (a ratio of 485 : 1) occurs; among the other items are μέμβραδος (‘anchovy’). Early first century B.C. In Col. i of the recto the first 8 lines are complete, the rest being imperfect throughout.

789. 9.7 x 13 cm. Part of a letter. Lines 2–9 ἐδώκα σοι ἐν Ὅξυρ{ὑ(γχω} Διονυσίου Φανίου ἐπιστολείδιον κεχαραγμέ(νον) εἰς ἡμᾶ(ν) Καίσαρείου τοῦ διελθόντος τι (ἔτους) περὶ τοῦ σε δούνας ὧν καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Διονύ(σιος) ἔσχεν παρ’ ἐμοῦ (πυροῦ) (ἀρταβῶν) 68’ χ(οινίκων) σ. The tenth year probably refers to Tiberius or Claudius. ΤΙ 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. ἐπιστάτατε 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 ἐπιμέμνησμαι ᾿Αμμωνίῳ τῶι ἀδελφῷ περὶ ἀργυ(ρίου) (δραχμῶν) τεσσαράκοντα ὀκτὼ εἰς συναγορασ(ὸν) ἐρίων... Addressed on the verso ᾿Απολλωνίωι. About A.D. 1. Incomplete, the end being lost. 12 lines.

792. 8.4 x 27.2 cm. On the recto an incomplete account of payments of wheat to various persons, containing 19 lines. On the verso another practically complete account of receipts and payments, mentioning λιττο[ψ]ρφ(οῦ) μ, Φωσφόρῳ καὶ τῷ ἄλλῳ 2 κ, να(λοῦ) πορ(είων) ὃ ζι, Φωσφόρῳ καὶ αὖ... ζί εἰς ἐφόδια Φ p. 4 perhaps means δραχμαί. 13 lines. The writing on the recto is across 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 δημόσιον by various persons ἀπὸ διαστολῆς of other persons. Dated in the seventh year of Domitian, Caesarius 16 (A.D. 88). Nearly complete. 18 lines.

794. 21.2 x 15.6 cm. Conclusion of a contract for the sale of 17 arourae of catocic land, with the signatures, which are nearly complete, and following the same formula as 604. The seller was Asclepiades, the buyer a woman called Σιντότις (Ὁ) or Σιντότον, and the price 500 drachmae of silver. The land was περὶ θὼτιν ἐκ τοῦ Ῥωπούα ναύ(λου) πορ(είων) ὃ Zn, Φωσφόρῳ καὶ αὖ... ζί ἐπὶ ἐφόδια Φ p. 4 perhaps means δραχμαί. 36 lines.

795. Fr. (a) 4.5 x 13.3 cm. Two fragments of a marriage-contract dated in the reign of Domitian (A.D. 81–96). The husband is called Heraclides, the wife (?) Sarapous. Line 4 γαμετὴν φερνὴν προσφερομένην προσφερομένην δικτυλίου χρυσοῦ τεταρτῶν (cf. 496. 6, note), and lower down γεμενάν κατὰ τοὺς τῆς χώρας νόμους occurs. Written across the fibres. Parts of 12 lines in all.
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796. 3 x 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 παραφέρνοις κλαλίων ἀργυρῶν (ξέγος (?)). For κλαλίον = κλανίον ('bracelet') cf. 114. II. Written across the fibres.

797. 5.5 x 10 cm. On the recto an entry concerning the measurement of the land of Thotsutaios, διάφορον σχο(νισμοῦ) Ὀθοσταῖος τοῦ "Ωμοῦ τῶν ἐν τῇ συ( ) τῶν πα( ) ἀπὸ τοῦ ιε τοῦ καὶ ιβ (ἐτού) περὶ κό(μην) ... For διάφορον σχο(νισμοῦ) 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 κω(μο)γγρ(αμματεύς).

798. 7.8 x 9.2 cm. Conclusion of a letter, ending ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς τοῦ ἀγοραστοῦ πρὸς ταῦτα ἀποδοῦναι, ὡς δ᾽ ἂν παραγένωται οἱ σιτιλογοὶ ἐπὶ τὴν παράληψιν τῶν σιτικῶν ἀπομετρήσομεν ἅμα καὶ ταῦτα. ἔρρωσο. (ἔτους) Κυ Φαῶφι. The twenty-third year probably refers to Epiphanes (B.C. 183). 8 lines.

799. 30.5 x 25 cm. One complete and one incomplete column of an account of sums owed and interest upon them, beginning τῶν ἐν ᾿Αλεξανδρῆᾳ ασσχηκε (?). ἃ ἔσχηκε) Xετποτ Οἰνω(ς) ἐν πλοίῳ. Then follows a list of names and amounts, e.g. Ταυρείνου καὶ Σενείθου (δραχμαί) τ τόκ(ου) ἕως Μεσορὴ (δραχμαί) of. The second column is also concerned with loans; εἰς ἀδαμσμόν occurs. About A.D. 153.

800. 18.7 x 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 λόγο(ν) (δωδεκα)μένου [, ἐδηλώθη διαγεγράφθαι [, νομοῦ τοῦ τῶν τρόπον τοῦτον [, ποιαμέν τῷ 15 (ἐτεί) Ἀντωνίνου Καλασαρος τοῦ κυρίων, Φήλικος τοῦ ἐν πολεμοῦ ἡγεμονεύσαντος ἐργατεία ἐκ τῶν, αἱρεθέντων έξ εἰς σιτιλογίων ύπό Ὀρκικάλ ... προχρείας ἐκ τοῦ κυριακοῦ λόγου εἰς τὴν [, Written about A.D. 153.

801. 19.2 x 12.3 cm. Fragment of a notification addressed to Euangelius also called Sarapion, strategus, by Diogenes, enclosing an authorization to the strategus from the archidicastes 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 archidicastes to the strategus is dated Thoth 18 (probably of the same year). 33 lines, of which the ends are lost.

802. 7 x 7 cm. Parts of 11 lines from the beginning of a contract, one of the parties being called Σιμάριστος. Dated in the 19th year of Ptolemy (Alexander the god) Philometor and Berenice, i.e. B.C. 101-95. On the verso a docket.

803. 15 x 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 ἐπιστατείας φυλακίων ἀντὶ τῶν κατ’ ἐτος ἐλ ὁ δημόσιον ὁμολογούμενον διαγράφεσθαι (φυλαχών) Τ’ ἀπῃτήσαυμεν βιαιότερον τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ νομοῦ φύλακας ὕπὸ τε τοῦ [. . . . . . . . καὶ] Πολεμαλοῦ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ . . . Late first century B.C. On the verso part of two columns of an account.

804. Width 9-9 cm. Horoscope dated in the twenty-seventh year of Augustus, Phaophi 5 περὶ ἡμέρας γ τῆς ἡμέρας (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 ἔχει κινδύνους φυλάσσεται τὸ δημόσιον ὁμολογουμένων μῦχρυ του Ἁρεως. Incomplete, being broken in the middle. 15 lines in all.


806. 15-9 × 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 ἱερεῦσι Θούριος 'Α, Κεφαλᾷ χρυσοχύῳ 'Ο, Σαραπίωνι ἠς πραγματήαν 'Αφ, διὰ τῆς Ἀσκληπιάδου τραπέζης λάξοις τῶν (τάλαντον) α. Complete. 21 lines.

807. 16-8 × 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 τοῦ ὑδατού πάλιν παραγαγόμενοι, και Ἀρσινόης ἰδία μυγες αἱ γίνεται τῆς κώμης πρὸς ταῖς 'Αρσινόης ἰδία μυγες. The sheep which were Ἀρσινόης ἰδία as contrasted with those that were private property seem to have been subject to a special impost (φόρος), payable nominally to Arsinoe (i.e. Arsinoe Philadelphus probably), but really of course to the State; cf. the ἀπόμοιρα in the Revenue Papyrus. About A.D. 1. On the verso part of an account.

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 μης, is practically complete, and there are parts of another in three separate fragments. The first entry is ἔννυαΠαλώσει ὁμολογεῖ Ἁρτάσης Ἐρμωμυροῦς τοῦ [. . . . . . . . οὐς ἀπ᾿ Ὀξείργαλεως παλιουρει Πετσώριοι ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς κώμης Παλώσεως Ἰομοσεφάδως τουσ τριήμερον ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς κωμῆς τῶν ἡμέρας (τῶν) παρὰ εἰς (ἐν) παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἀργυρίου (δραχμῶν) ὀρειχάμβας σι κεφαλής αὐτῆς ἐδώ ἐν τῆς αὐτῆς κωμῆς ἡμέρας τῶν ἐν ἑαυτῆς (ὑπὸ τῆς) (ἐνεκτὶ) μηπὶ Νερωνείον Σεβαστῶι τοῦ μηπὶ Νερωνείον τοῦ τα (ἔτους), εἰς( ) λεγε (μένη?).
A marginal note (probably by the second hand) has } ποκχ( ) ἐν ἀπὸ(γραφῆ) τ(ἐτος). The other entries refer to loans ἐν Σεφώι, ἐν Κεσμού(ει) or ἐν Τήει, and follow the same formula with similar later additions. The month after ἡθέ(τισται), (which is once written ἡθέτισ(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 μισθώσασθαι) addressed to Claudia Ptolema by Dioscorus for the lease of 3 arouae of βασιλική γῆ near Sinarou in the κλῆρος of Xenon for the nineteenth year of Hadrian (A.D. 134-5). The land, being ἐκ μέρους ἐν ἀβρόχου (l. -χα), was to be irrigated by the lessee at his own expense and cultivated χόρτῳ εἰς κοπὴν καὶ θερινὴν ἐπινομήν 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 Ant[as?] beginning καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἐγραφα εὐχαριστῶν Ἑρμίππου (1. -πῳ) ὅτι πάντα μοι ποιεῖ εἰς τὴν σὴν καταλογὴν (cf. 787), καὶ τὰ νῦν εἴ σοι φαίνειται γράψον 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) πεπι- ασται Λοκρίων [, (l. 6) ρικαρις ὑπὸ Λουκίου (ὑπ. Α. above the line) ἤκουσα γὰρ ὅϊτι [, (l. 7) τὴν λωρίκαν αὐτοῦ [. 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 πακτωνίασι... ἀπὸ Θελβώι...., Κῦνος Πτολεμαίου τῶν ἀπὸ Εὐεργῆ- τ[ίδοις... 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 Ὀνθονόβει (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. ἱστιάφρον καὶ ἱσσοῦς 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 'Αντέρωτος Λοκρητίου Παχὼν β (δραχμαί) 
ν (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(άς) δ πεπράσσε(σ)θαί δι' έμοι ἀνά δραχ(μαί) πέιτε, τὰ 
kορ(ιά ?) εκ δραχ(μῶν) εξ (τριωβόλου). 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], 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 13 cm. Beginning of a letter from Lysimachus to his brother. 
εὖ πράσσειν takes the place of χαίρειν. About A.D. 1. 4 lines.

823. 24 x 10.2 cm. Fragment of the conclusion of a lease of land near 
Μεμφείδα? 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 
καί 'Αμμωνίῳ καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτοῖς μισθωταῖς ἐξεικνύτης πρακτορείας παρὰ Σαραπίων[ι] 
προγραμματινῷ Μέμφεως Μεζ[ε]μήθ[ε]το[ν]. Λόγος λήμματος καὶ ἀναλώματος μηνῶν 
τριῶν ἀπὸ Φαρμοῦθι ἕως Παῦνι τοῦ ε[(του)]... The beginnings of lines of 
a second column are preserved, containing a list of entries each commencing 
with π(αρά). On the importance of this papyrus for the ξενικὴ πρακτορεία 
see 712. introd. Second century. On the verso in a different hand (?) 
parts of the first 6 lines of a document mentioning the ἑγκτήσεων βιβλιο-
φυλάκων, perhaps the draft of a declaration.

826. 9.5 x 11.9 cm. Fragment of the conclusion of a notice sent to some 
official, apparently an announcement of a death. Lines 1 sqq. Δίὸν[α] 
Χαριτ. ( ) γέρδιον [μετῆλαξε; τὸν] βιον τῶι ἔστωτι μηνὶ Τυβίτι τοῦ δευτέρου(ν) 
(καὶ) τριακο[σ]τοῦ ἔτους Καίσαρος. διὸ ἄξιω ἐὰν φαινήται καταχωρισθῆναι τούτω 
[....... ἐν] τοῖς παρὰ σοι βιβλίων... A. D. 3. 9 lines. On the verso the 
beginning of an account.

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 ἐτοὺς ζ [ . . . οῦ] Ὀξ(υρύγχων) τὸ(λεί) τῆς Ὀθηβ[αλδ(os)]. ὁμοίοιοι λογεῖ Λεπτίνης . μούνακτος Μακεδών τῶν Σωγρυάριοι πεζῶν Ἦρακλείνη[ . . .]. The sovereign is Ptolemy Soter II, and the date therefore B.C. 111-0. 9 lines.

832. 14 x 21.3 cm. Parts of two columns of a taxing-list of some kind. Col. ii begins γίνεται τὸ π(ᾶν ὃ) ἐπικεφαλαίου, ὀδ(ρο) θηλυκὰ ριζ, / (οῦ) Βῆσατ(ως). The fifteenth year of Augustus (B.C. 15-4) is mentioned in Col. i. In the blank space between the columns a second hand has written Ζεῦ 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 εἰς Ὀμβοῦς. 6 lines.

835. 19.8 x 12.8 cm. An offer to purchase confiscated land at Pela, addressed to Gaius Sep[plius Rufus; cf. 721, which has the same formula. The purchase price, which was to be paid ἐπὶ τὴν ἐν τῷ Σαραπείῳ δημοσίαν ἐπιτραπέζαν, was not less than 100 drachmae. The earlier portion is much mutilated. For the conclusion see 721. 14-5, note. About A.D. 13. 14 lines.

836. 13.5 x 12.8 cm. Loan of 32 artabae πυροῦ στερεοῦ from Theoxenus to two Πέρσαι τῆς ἐπιγονίας and a third person. Lines 6 sqq. ἀποδότωσαν δὲ οἱ δεδανεισμένοι Θεοζενίω τὰς τριάκοντα δύο ἁρτάβας τῶν πυρῶν ἐν μηνὶ. Παῦνι τῷ έκκαιδεκάτῳ ἐτοὺς ἐν 'Οξυργχ(ων) πολέι πυρῶν στερεῶν νέον καθαρῶν ἰδιόλοι μέτρῳ τετραχοικῷ ἀγ(οραμικῷ καταστήσαντες τὸς ἱδιός ἄνδρα Ἰλίωμασι κ.τ.λ. For
μέτρον ἀγορανομικόν cf. 740. 17, note, and for the formula cf. the late Ptolemaic loans from Gebelên, 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. 18·6 x 15·5 cm. Will of Apollos daughter of Paēsis, 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 φερή and παράφερνα 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 Ἱππαλκείδου ἐποίκιον from Diogenes to two persons, with the signature of the lessor. The formula follows that of e.g. 499. The conclusion is τῆς ἐπιπομῆς οὖσης τοῦ Διογένους. κυρία ἡ μίθωσις. 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 ἐναυάγησεν κατὰ Πτολεμαίδα καὶ ἦλθέ μοι γυμνὸς κεκινδυνευκώς. εὐθέως ἠγύρασα αὐτῶι στολὴν. Ἀ μαχαιροφόρος is mentioned, apparently as the bearer of the letter. Early first century A.D. Incomplete. 26 lines.

APPENDIX I

Addenda and Corrigenda to Oxyrhynchus Papyri Part II and Fayûm Towns and their Papyri.

For the literature connected with these volumes see the successive bibliographies of papyri by Wileken 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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Part. II. 211. 34. ἰ′ [παμφ]ν for [ἀρ. ... .] (Weil) is possible.

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 μ in l. 15.

211. 28. τον should very likely be read in place of τος, but there is not room for τοναθναι νοιωσι (Fraccaroli).

216. 26. 8 It is a misprint for ἄγαθοί νοιωσι.

217. 2. Any is a misprint for ἄγαθοί νοιωσι. 218. The position in Col. ii conjecturally assigned by us to Fr. (c) may be considered certain. Line 26 is ραν σίμφερει (or, as Crénert suggests, ἐιπιφερει), 27 ὑπερ τίς [οδσ[, 28 Αριξ[ανος και Ζηνζοδος (cf. our note ad loc.), 29 perhaps [ἐν το ὑπερ ταφον (ἐν
tος Crénert). Fragment (d) probably joins Fr. (a) so that Fr. (a) 18 and Fr. (d) 1 form one line, i.e. οὐφοσ τὸ. Fr. (e) probably belongs to the bottom of Fr. (a) ii.

220. A newly-found fragment, apparently from the top of a column, contains the beginnings of two lines τυγχαῖν and μα' γι Cf. 221 ad fin.

221. 1. 1. ore for re (Ludwicht).

2. τα βαρυτον[α (Ludwich) is not very suitable.

23. τοφ before διαρροον (Ludwich) is possible.

21. Possibly αποφευγει (Ludwicht), but the doubtful letter is more like η or ι.

22. i. 1. κε [εἰλαίντο (Ludwich).

6. 1. πλειο for εἐπλειο (Diels).

23-4. 1. κε' (noo εἰλαί

25. [πτερνυ (Ludwicht) is possible.

26-7. 1. γεγ'ουν (Ludwicht).

25. ἱπτίωτην (Ludwicht) is possible.

26-7. 1. yey ove|vat (Ludwicht).

26. The vestiges before α are too faint to afford a clue.

27. τοὴν before διαρροον (Ludwich) is possible, but the letter following το is more like η than o. The η of τροφην is certain.
xiv. 25. γ at the end of the line is extremely doubtful. There are more probably two letters.

26. στενομ[εν]ν [γε] (Ludwich) is possible.

xvi. 20–1. ε[π]τ ροι (Ludwich) is possible, but the π is extremely doubtful.

xvii. 12. ε[π]οφ (Ludwich) is possible.

Fr. (a) 5. Λθι[φκη] (Crénert) 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 ατ ασιος (cf. I. xxi. 318–21) indicates that it belongs to the column lost before Col. xvi.

\[\text{[\ldots\ld\]
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255. 16. [ε'] [υ']γαος for [. . . ]πως.
265. 39. 1. ὑδραυλίτων.
269. ii. 2. [μ]εκρο [μ]εκρ (Wilam.)
270. 25. A line has dropped out of the text. 1. καὶ ὠνημένς ἀρούραις ἐξ ἡμέρας ταῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατοικοῦσι καὶ ὠνημένς εἰς κατοικίαν κ.τ.λ. (Goodspeed).
273. 5. 1. κατά [Ῥωμαίων ἐ]θη ὑπὸ κ.τ.λ.
8. The letters following ou might be read as tou.
274. 22. 1. ἑτεροκαθαρλ(υ)ίς for ἑτεροκαθαρλ(υ)ύς (Wessely).
24-5. [ἐμβαλεύ]σεως (Wessely) is possible.
286. 19. 1. ἀποδοσεῖν (i.e. ἀποδοσίς) for ἀποδοσίς (Wilam.).
287. 7. 1. πάσα for πάσα α.
289. 3. The abbreviation beginning with σ which recurs in this papyrus is probably σό(μ)πα(υ) ; cf. 574.
298. 42. γ is a misprint for υ.

Fayum Towns and their Papyri.

2. iii. 16. δ ἀντικτὸς (τριακτικτὸς) for σε . . . με[..] [. . .] a (Weil) is possible.
23. σ [σ]αθ for [ . . .] a (Weil) is possible.
32. 1. αὐτῆρ for αὐτὴν (Weil).
8. 10. [ε] is a misprint for [ρε].
10. This fragment has been identified by Plasberg and Ferrini as coming from Ulpian, Lit. xlv. (Dig. xxix. 1. 1). 3. l. proferri for professi. 6. 1. eriga for εἰς ε. 10. l. milites festeantia. 11. l. facti'nt for essi'nt.
11. 22. 1. τὸ φῶς ἐχων (Wilcken).
12. introd. p. 117. 5. ὑπάρχουσα for ὑπάρχωσια (Weil). The edict is assigned by Dessau to Julian instead of Severus Alexander.
6. εἰ τι (Wilamowitz) can be read in place of em. 8. εὑ before καὶ ταῦτα is corrected by Wilamowitz to ἐτι.
15. ἐξ ἀπαύνων κατεῖν | χρημάτων (Wilamowitz) is better than our ἐξ ἀπάντων | χρηματισθεὶς.
23. introd. l. Ταμαύεω(ς) for Ταμαυσίω(ς) (Smuly); cf. the modern Tamia.
23 (a). 5-6. 1. ᾿Οκαονεῖτων . . . Μεθηλίης (Weil).
27. 32. 1. γνωρίζω(ς) for ἀγνωρίζω (Wessely).
42 (a) 15. l. γραμματ(ούς) for γραμματ(εός); cf. P. Tebt. I. p. 28.
46. 3. 1. προδρομ(ί) for . . . γ ( ).
48. 3. 1. πρόδρομος (Weil). 'stepson' (Wilcken).
50. 5. 1. δόμημα (Weil) for Δωμήματος (Wilcken).
67-76. 1. τετελ(ωνυμία) for τετελεονυμία (Wilcken).
73. 1. l. ἀντεσυμβόλ(ημα) Ἀναστάς τε(λωνυμία) (Wilcken). Similarly in 74. 1. 1 ἀντε-συμβολ(ημα).
96. 1. Λ. Δ. 143 for Λ. Δ. 122.
110. 1. Βελλίηνου (Wilamowitz).
15. l. πονίσεως for λος(σ)άνωσαν (Wilamowitz).
APPENDIX II

A revised text of Part III, no. 405 (Irenaeus, 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 Irenaeus' 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 Irenaeus' 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) σὺ εἶ in place of οὗτός ἐστιν, and a variant peculiar to D (ὡς for ὡσεῖ before περιστέραι) occurs in l. 25 (Lat. quasi). ‘These two unsuspected coincidences between Irenaeus and D, of which the one is misrepresented, the other inevitably obscured by the Latin translator, indicate that the extent of the agreement between Irenaeus' 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).
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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.

Bodleian = Bodleian Library, Oxford. The references are to the hand-list of MSS.

Bradfield = Library of Bradfield College, Berks.

Bristol = Bristol Museum.
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.
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.
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. £ 7 (P).
2. Pennsyl. 2746.
3. Chicago.
5. Bod. Gr. th. £ 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.
24. Yale.
26. B. M. 744.
27. Chicago.
29. Pennsyl. 2748.
30. B. M. 745.
32. Bod. Lat. class. e. 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.
THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI

236. B. M. 788.
237. Bod. Gr. class.
  a. 8 (P).
239. Pennsyl. 2758.
240. B. M. 789.
  692. 241.
242. Graz.
243. B. M. 790.
244. B. M. 791.
245. Pennsyl. 2759.
246. Camb. 4052.
247. Glasgow.
248. Camb. 4053.
249. Yale.
250. Am.
251. B. M. 792.
252. Melbourne Pap. 3.
254. Camb. 4054.
255. Vict.
256. B. M. 1187.
257. Am.
258. Pennsyl. 2760.
259. B. M. 793.
260. Am.
261. Am.
262. Am.
263. Cambridge Pap. 3.
264. Cambridge Pap. 4.
265. Cambridge Pap. 5.
266. Cambridge Pap. 6.
267. Cambridge Pap. 7.
268. Cambridge Pap. 8.
269. Cambridge Pap. 9.
270. Cambridge Pap. 10.
271. Cambridge Pap. 11.
275. Cambridge Pap. 15.
276. Cambridge Pap. 16.
277. Cambridge Pap. 17.
278. Cambridge Pap. 18.
279. Cambridge Pap. 19.
280. Cambridge Pap. 20.
282. Yale.
283. Bristol.
284. Harvard 2219.
285. B. M. 796.
286. B. M. 797.
287. Am.
288. B. M. 798.
289. B. M. 799.
290. Pennsyl. 2761.
291. B. M. 800.
292. Camb. 4057.
293. Am.
295. Am.
296. Johns Hopkins.
297. Am.
298. Johns Hopkins.
299. Bradfield.
300. Bradfield.
301. B. M. 801.
302. Bod. Gr. class.
  g. 47 (P).
303. Bod. Gr. class.
  g. 48 (P).
304. Camb. 4058.
305. Bod. Gr. class.
  c. 48 (P).
306. Cairo 10003.
307. Cairo 10012.
309. Edinburgh.
310. Glasgow.
312. Owen's Coll.
313. Camb. 4059.
315. Bod. Gr. class.
  d. 65 (P).
316. Bod. Gr. class.
  c. 78 (P).
317. Columbia.
318. B. M. 802.
320. Princeton 0132.
  692. 320.
321. Bod. Gr. class.
  d. 66 (P).
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. Pennsyl. 2763.
328. Harvard 2221.
329. Yale.
331. Johns Hopkins.
332. Princeton 0132.
  692. 332.
333. Princeton 0132.
  692. 333.
335. Camb. 4060.
337. Edinburgh.
338. Glasgow.
339. B. M. 803.
341. Owen's Coll.
342. Camb. 4061.
344. Pennsyl. 2764.
345. Columbia.
346. Melbourne Pap.
  4.
347. Camb. 4062.
348. Pennsyl. 2765.
349. Pennsyl. 2766.
350. Camb. 4063.
351. Yale.
352. Columbia.
353. Johns Hopkins.
354. B. M. 804.
357. Princeton 0132.
  692. 357.
358. Columbia.
359. Glasgow.
360. Bod. Gr. class.
  c. 81 (P).
361. Bod. Gr. class.
  c. 82 (P).
362. Harvard 2222.
363. Camb. 4065.
367. B. M. 805.
368. Graz.
369. Hamilton.
370. B. M. 806.
372. Vict.
373. Bod. Gr. class.
  f. 70 (P).
374. B. M. 807.
375. Camb. 4066.
376. Edinburgh.
377. B. M. 808.
378. B. M. 809.
379. Bod. Gr. class.
  c. 83 (P).
380. Camb. 4067.
381. B. M. 810.
382. B. M. 811.
383. Camb. 4068.
384. B. M. 812.
386. Bod. Gr. class.
  f. 71 (P).
387. Bod. Gr. class.
  c. 84 (P).
389. Bod. Gr. class.
  c. 85 (P).
390. Bod. Gr. class.
  d. 68 (P).
391. B. M. 813.
392. Am.
393. Yale.
394. Camb. 4069.
395. Am.
396. B. M. 814.
397. Bod. Gr. class.
  d. 69 (P).
398. Bod. Gr. class.
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I. NEW LITERARY FRAGMENTS1.

(a) Greek.

ἀβάστακτος p. 262.
ἀγαθός 664. 19; 668. 115; 670. 12.
Ἀγασικῆς 659. 50.
ἦν 663. 35.
ἄγιλαξσθαι 659. 93.
ἄγιασ 659. 27; 674. 7.
Ἄρνόθος 664. 33; 45.
ἄφρος 662. 53.
ἄγειν 663. 35.
ἄγλαίζεσθαι 659. 93.
ἄγλαός 659. 27; 674. 7.
᾿Αγνόθεος 664. 33, 45.
ἄγρα 662. 53.
ἄγρευτήρ 662. 46 (?).
ἄγριος 661. 3 (?)
᾿Αδείμαντος 664. 105.
ἄιε 667. 8; 670. 4.
ἀίειν 662. 47.
ἄθρατος 659. 14, 24.
Ἄθηνα 663. 15.
Ἁθηνάε 664. 15.
Ἄθηναιος 663. 48; 664. 3; 660. 6; 662. 16.
ἄδειν 671. 16.
ἄνγλος p. 263.
ἀγλήεις 664. 42, 103.
ἄισια 660. 10.
ἄλλα 659. 26, 68; 662. 27; 671. 17; 679. 7.
ἄλλος 664. 23, 28, 95; 670. 1; 681. 6.
ἁλμυρός 659. 35, 49; 660. 23 (?)
ἄλοχος 662. 49.
ἄισια 661. 26.
ἄναπτεσθαί 670. 5 (i).
ἄμαρτα 664. 98.
ἀμαρος 660. 2.
ἀμπυρίζειν 660. 17.
Ἀμιάντας 662. 21, 32.
ἀμφιβαίνειν 659. 7, 19.
ἀμφικτύνης 659. 55.
ἀπάν 654. 4; 659. 11; 662. 34 (i); 663. 43; 664. 93; 666. 162; 670. 1; 671. 1.
ἀνάγκη 659. 18.
ἀναφέραν 662. 53.
ἀναφέραι 654. 16.
ἀναφέρον 664. 8.
ἀνάρτητος 660. 2.
ἀναστρέφειν 660. 8.
ἀνάπλος 668. 153 (?).
ἀνέρ 659. 8, 48, 66; 662. 29; 664. 99; 682. 16.
ἀνέκδος 662. 22.
ἀνεπίστος 654. 22; 664. 101.
ἀνέπιστος 659. 19.
ἀνέκιντος 662. 35.
ἀναγνώσκειν 655. 46.
ἀναγράφειν 672. 7.
Ἀντίκαιρος 662. 48.
ἀναφέρει 663. 49.
ἀνέρα 667. 28.
ἀξία 662. 112, 116 (i).
ἀξίωμα 654. 35, 49; 660. 23 (?)
ἀπατα 666. 162.
ἀπείρατος 660. 1.
ἀπό 654. 29; 655. 1, 2; 660. 6.
ἀποδιαλέχειν 664. 2.
ἀποδοχέοι 654. 29.
ἀποκαλύπτειν 654. 22.
ἀποκρύπτειν 654. 39.
Ἀπόλλων 674. 8 (?).
ἀποστείλειν 663. 41; 670. 3, 17.
ἀποστείλειν 663. 14.
ἀποστείλει 663. 168.

1 Excluding 658 and 669, which are classed with the non-literary documents.
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ἀποθέ 661. 15.

ἀρι 660. 15; 670. 8, 17.

ἀφα 678. 6 (?).

ἀγαλεός 662. 25.

ἀρετή 659. 9.

"Απν 662. 34.

ἀριος (?) 661. 3.

᾿Αρίφρων 664. 102.

ἀρρηφορείν 664. 32.

ἄρχειν 664. 9, 15, 17.

᾿Αρχέλαος p. 261.

ἀστυφέλικτος 670. 9.

ἁτέ 664. 17.

ἁτεκνὸς 662. 33.

᾿Αττική 680. 5.

ἀτυχία 666. 65.

αὖθι 661. 26.

αὖθις (αὖτις) 661. 23.

αὐλίσκος 659. 34.

αὐξάνειν 655. 9.

αὔξειν 659. 129.

αὐτίκα 660. 12.

αὐτοκράτωρ 684. 18.

αὐχμαλέος 662. 22.

᾿Αφροδίτη 663. 17.

᾿Αχαιός 662. 35; 663. 24, 37.

βαδίζειν 664. 44.

βαίνειν 659. 74.

Βακχιάδαι 664. 115.

βαρύς 667. 21.

βασιλεία 654. 7, 15; 679. 42.

βασιλεύειν 665. 8.

βασιλεύς 671. 4, 14 (?), 21; 665. 7, 12, 17.

βίαιος 659. 17.

βιόθεν 665. 4.

βολὴ 664. 132.
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θέμεθα 674. 5.
Θεόκριτος 662. 28.
θεός 677. 9.
θεσπέσιος 660. 6; 671. 10.
Θῆβαι 659. 25.
θήρ 672. 8.
θηρίον 661. τι.
θνητός 659. 15.
Θρασύβουλος 664. 17, 35.
θυγάτηρ 659. 72; 664. 31.
θῦμα 675. 15.
θυμός 684. 17.
Θωμᾶς 654. 3.
Ἴδη 663. 23.
ἴδιος 674. 7.
ἰεπαιάν 660. 2 εἴϑαέῤ.
ἱεραπόλος 659. 6.
ἱερός 661. 16; 674. 6 (iapis); 675. 3.
῾Ιησοῦς 654. 2 ef saep.
ἱμείρειν 671. 22.
Ἱμεραῖοι 6865. 15.
ἱππεύς 679. 20.
ἱππόβοτος 678. 4.
ἵππος 659. 56.
ἱπποτροφία 664. 27.
ἱστορία 688. 13.
Ἰτωνία 659. 50.
ἴφθιμος 662. 54.
ἰχθύς 654. 14.
Ἰωνία 664. 9.
καθάπερ 667. 26.
καθήκειν 681. 13.
κακός 678. 4.
Κάκυρον 665. 2.
καλεῖν 664. 114; 681. 15.
Καλλιτέλης 662. 27, 31.
καλός 662. 53. καλὸς κάγιιθος 664. το. κάλλιστος 663. 1.
κάματος 659. 19.
καπνύς 662. 39.
κάρα 659. 10, 32.
κατά 663. 16; 664. 101.
καταγράφων 661. 27 (?).
καταλείπειν 664. 15, 37, 41.
κατέχειν 681. 63.
κατάρριφος 661. 5.
κατάστασις 664. 15.
κατέστησις 664. 24.
κατέστησις 675. 3.
κατασκευή 659. 30.
κατασκευή 669. 8; 667. 3.
καταλαμβάνειν 664. 18.
καταλείπειν 664. 15, 37, 41.
καταλαμβάνειν 664. 18.
καταγράφων 661. 27 (?).
κατάστασις 664. 24.
κατέστησις 675. 3.
κατασκευή 659. 30.
κατασκευή 669. 8; 667. 3.
καταλαμβάνειν 664. 18.
καταλείπειν 664. 15, 37, 41.
καταλαμβάνειν 664. 18.
καταγράφων 661. 27 (?).
κατάστασις 664. 24.
κατέστησις 675. 3.
κατασκευή 659. 30.
κατασκευή 669. 8; 667. 3.
καταλαμβάνειν 664. 18.
καταλείπειν 664. 15, 37, 41.
καταλαμβάνειν 664. 18.
καταγράφων 661. 27 (?).
κατάστασις 664. 24.
κατέστησις 675. 3.
κατασκευή 659. 30.
κατασκευή 669. 8; 667. 3.
καταλαμβάνειν 664. 18.
καταλείπειν 664. 15, 37, 41.
καταλαμβάνειν 664. 18.
καταγράφων 661. 27 (?).
κατάστασις 664. 24.
κατέστησις 675. 3.
κατασκευή 659. 30.
κατασκευή 669. 8; 667. 3.
καταλαμβάνειν 664. 18.
καταλείπειν 664. 15, 37, 41.
καταλαμβάνειν 664. 18.
καταγράφων 661. 27 (?).
κατάστασις 664. 24.
κατέστησις 675. 3.
κατασκευή 659. 30.
κατασκευή 669. 8; 667. 3.
μέλος 675. 13.
μέλες 675. 2, 11.
μελδεῖν 667. 6.
μέν 659. 43, 46; 660. 8; 662. 26; 663. 7, 14, 38; 664. 91; 667. 1, 8; 684. 8, 13, 23.
μέν οὖν 664. τό.
μένος 661. 3:
μέριμνα 659. 66.
μερίς 679. 13 (Ὁ).
μέρος 667. 4.
μέση 667. 9, 17, 18.
μετά 663. 20, 23; 664. 9.
μετασκευάζειν 668, 32.
μεταχρόνιος ΒΒΟ. 13.
μή 654. 6, 37; 655. 23; 659. 16, 80; 661. 23; 663. 4; 664. 85; 666. 156, 158; 670. 23; 679. 7, 9. οὐ μή 654. 5.
μηδέ 662. 52.
μηδείς 659. 9; 6686. III.
μῆδος 659. 76.
μυρίας 662, 36.
μυρίος 659. 78, 670.
ναίειν 659. τοῦ (?).
ναός 659. 59.
ναῦς 660. 4; 663. 36.
νεκρός π. 261.
νέκταρ 659. 8ο.
νέος 662. 51.
νεώτερος 664. 10.
νιν 676. 13.
νίκη 659. 57.
νίκαιν 665, 18.
νιν 676. 13.
νόμος 682. 2, 11.
ἵνομος 678. 5.
νόσος 662. 25.
Νοούνιος 677. 7.
νοῦς 664. 100.
νόμος 684. 42, 46.
νέων 659. 54, 70, 80; 662. 35; 671. 12; 681. 13.
νέων 664. 106.
νεύο 660. 15.
νήμα 662. 26; 665. 2, 6, 9, 19.
νυν 659. 35; 659. 76; 662. 45, 46 (?).
νύκτα 674. 5.
νύν 659. 54, 70, 80; 662. 35; 671. 12; 681. 13.
νυνί 664. τού.
νύξ 660. 15.
νήθειν 655. 10,
νηρήσις 672. 5.
νηστεύειν 654. 33.
νήτη 667. 9, 17, 19.
νῆστα 667. 9, 17, 19.
νυτί 667. 9, 17, 19.
νῦν 659. 54, 70, 80; 662. 35; 671. 12; 681. 13.
νῦν 664. 106.
νέων 662. 35; 670. 8.
νήθειν 655. 10,
νηρήσις 672. 5.
νηστεύειν 654. 33.
νήτη 667. 9, 17, 19.
νῆστα 667. 9, 17, 19.
νῦν 659. 54, 70, 80; 662. 35; 671. 12; 681. 13.
νῦν 664. 106.
νέων 662. 35; 670. 8.
νήθειν 655. 10,
νηρήσις 672. 5.
νηστεύειν 654. 33.
νήτη 667. 9, 17, 19.
νῆστα 667. 9, 17, 19.
νῦν 659. 54, 70, 80; 662. 35; 671. 12; 681. 13.
νῦν 664. 106.
νέων 662. 35; 670. 8.
νήθειν 655. 10,
νηρήσις 672. 5.
νηστεύειν 654. 33.
νήτη 667. 9, 17, 19.
νῆστα 667. 9, 17, 19.
νῦν 659. 54, 70, 80; 662. 35; 671. 12; 681. 13.
νῦν 664. 106.
νέων 662. 35; 670. 8.
νήθειν 655. 10,
νηρήσις 672. 5.
νηστεύειν 654. 33.
νήτη 667. 9, 17, 19.
νῆστα 667. 9, 17, 19.
νῦν 659. 54, 70, 80; 662. 35; 671. 12; 681. 13.
νῦν 664. 106.
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παραδίδοναι 668. 36, 40; 679. 5.
παρακαλεῖν 663. 42.
παραλαμβάνειν 663. 10.
παρακαλέσαι 663. 21 (?).
παρατηρεῖν B54. 35.
παραφαίνειν 663. το.
παρεῖναι 670. 18.
παρθενήϊος 669. 46.
παρθένιος 659. 32.
Παρνασσός 674. 5.
πάροιθε 659. 43.
πάρος 662. 33.
pάσα 659. 8; 668. 4 (?); 664. 26; 666. 118; 682. 2.
pατήρ 654. το; 664. 36, 56, 112.
pάτρα 662. 24.
pατρίς 664. 100.
pαύειν 682. 12, παύεσθαι 654. 6.
pεδίλον B59. 74.
pεδίον 662. 38.
pειθαρχεῖν 677. 4.
pείθειν 664. 5.
Πεισίστρατος 664. 1 ef saep.
pέλανος 675. 14.
pερί 654. 24.
pερίειναι p. 262.
pεριζμύχηρος 662. 37.
pεριλαμβάνειν 666. 167.
pεριπίπτειν 684. 109.
pετεινόν 654. 12.
pιερίδες 678. 1 (?).
pιθανός 668. 46; 664. gt.
pίσα 659. 61.
pιστός 659. 50, 69.
pλίθοι 659. 71.
pλίθος 664. 26.
pλόγοι 664. 9; 664. 116 (?).
πλείστος 661. 9.
πλήθος 664. 118.
πλησιάζειν 664. 126.
πλάκαμος 673. 9.
pλοιοί 659. 36.
pλοιών 654. 37; 664. 9; 667. 10.
pοιητής 663. 8 (?).
pοίοι 662. 25, 29.
πλοία 664. 16, 48. πολεμών 660. 5.
πόλα 664. 29, 114; 675. 5; 682. 3.
pολιτεία 664. 29, 114; 675. 5.
pολλάκις 662. 34.
pολυγνωτος 659. 56.
pολυποίκιλος 672. 9.
pολειασθαι 663. 43; 664. 21; 667. 6; 674. 8 (?).
pολυώνυμος 675. 17.
pολυώνυμος 659. 32.
pόλεμος 668. τό, 48; πόλεμον 660. 5.
pόλις 664. 29, 114; 675. 5; 682. 3.
pολύβιον 659. 53.
pορφύρεος B71. το.
pοταμός Ὁ. 262.
pότε 654. 12.
pότερον 667. 15.
pότερος 661. 16.
pούς 665. 20; 662. 45; 670. 12.
pρᾶγμα θδά. 24; 684. 3.
pράξα 662. 26.
pράσσειν 666. 58.
pράττειν 664. 5.
Πραξώ 662. 26.
pρεπεῖν B59. 45.
pρεσβεύει 683. 16.
pρηνής 662. 36.
pρίν 659. 20.
pρός 668. 7; 664. 25, 39, 125; 665. 16; 681. 12; 684. 12, 20, 21.
pρόσθε 670. 12.
pροσέρχεσθαι 684. 6, 22.
pρόσθε 664. 111.
pροσαρέστη 666. 59.
pροσβάλλειν B59. 24.
pροσβάλλειν 660. 36.
pροσβάλλειν 659. 36.
pροσβάλλειν 659. 53.
pρό 663. 7; 664. 25, 39; 125; 665. 16; 681. 12; 684. 12, 20, 21.
pροσπαθεύει 664. 6, 22.
pροσέβη 670. 12.
pροσκοπεί 667. 5.
pροσκοπεί 667. 21.
pροσκόπων 663. 30.
pροστάτη 678. 5.
pροστάτη 655. 13.
pροσφορά 659. 49.
pρότερης 664. 1; 681. 1 (?), 11.
pροτομή 662. 44, 51.
pροφέρειν 667. 29.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>στρατόπεδον</td>
<td>679. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σύ</td>
<td>654. 28, 29; 655. 21; 659. 71 (riv); 661. 23 (τιν); 664. 104; 671. 22; 676. 9; 678. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συγγείτων</td>
<td>662. 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συγγένεια</td>
<td>664. 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συγγενής</td>
<td>664. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμβαίνειν</td>
<td>668. 110; 677. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συμφορά</td>
<td>664. 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σύν</td>
<td>660. το.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνακολουθεῖν</td>
<td>668. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναφή</td>
<td>667. 3, II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνδιατρίβειν</td>
<td>664. 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σύνευνος</td>
<td>662. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Συρακόσιοι</td>
<td>665. 4, 6, 8, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σύστημα</td>
<td>667. 13, 26, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σφάλλειν</td>
<td>659. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σφάλος</td>
<td>676. τό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σχεδόν</td>
<td>659. 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σχῆμα</td>
<td>667. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σῶμα</td>
<td>689. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σώφρων</td>
<td>659. 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τάλαρος</td>
<td>663. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταπεινοῦν</td>
<td>664. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταράσσειν</td>
<td>659. 40 (μαλασσεῖν ἢ); 684. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ταρτάριος</td>
<td>670. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τάσσειν</td>
<td>659. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τάφος</td>
<td>662. 28; 672. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τελεῖν</td>
<td>659. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τελευτᾶν</td>
<td>p. 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τεός</td>
<td>670. 14, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τεχνήεις</td>
<td>670. τι (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τηλικόσδε</td>
<td>684. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίειν</td>
<td>659. 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τιθέναι</td>
<td>666. 15 (ἢ); 680. 7; 682. τι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίκτειν</td>
<td>670. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τιμᾶν</td>
<td>659. 53; 672. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τιμή</td>
<td>669. 6; 684. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τις</td>
<td>668. 8; 664. 38, 128; 666. 59; 667. τι; 684. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τιμητικός</td>
<td>654. 35; 655. 4, 6, 12; 662. 24, 28; 664. 99, 110; 670. 1; 671. 1; 677. 6; 684. 8, 9, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φαίνεσθαι</td>
<td>667. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φάναι</td>
<td>664. 92, 97, 103, 110; 670. 8; 683. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φανερός</td>
<td>654. 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φάσκειν</td>
<td>663. 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φάνη</td>
<td>666. 53 (῾);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φάπλος</td>
<td>664. 96; 666. 158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φέρειν</td>
<td>677. 8 (῾);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φεύγειν</td>
<td>663. 55; 664. 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φεύξεσθαι</td>
<td>664. 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθάνειν</td>
<td>659. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθάσειν</td>
<td>661. 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθίνω</td>
<td>659. 11; 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθόνος</td>
<td>659. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθόρος</td>
<td>661. 14; 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φθόριον</td>
<td>663. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλος</td>
<td>664. 11; 670. 6, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλτρος</td>
<td>664. 99; φίλτατος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλος</td>
<td>666. 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλος</td>
<td>666. 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλοστέφανος</td>
<td>675. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιάζειν</td>
<td>664. 23; 664. III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιάζεισθαι</td>
<td>665. 39; 663. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιάζειν</td>
<td>665. 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλος</td>
<td>666. 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φίλος</td>
<td>664. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλικός</td>
<td>663. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φιλικός</td>
<td>665. 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαίνειν</td>
<td>659. 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαλεπαίνει</td>
<td>664. 78 (῾)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χαλύψ</td>
<td>662. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χάρις</td>
<td>659. 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χείρον</td>
<td>659. 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χείρον</td>
<td>659. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χείρ</td>
<td>659. 27; 662. 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χείλεκα</td>
<td>663. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χείλωσι</td>
<td>659. 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χείλος</td>
<td>660. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χειρογράφειν</td>
<td>666. 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χειρογραφία</td>
<td>668. 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χειρός</td>
<td>669. 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρήσι</td>
<td>659. 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρήσιμα</td>
<td>684. 19, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρώμα</td>
<td>659. 14; 664. 10, 79 (῾)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρώμα</td>
<td>660. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρώματικός</td>
<td>671. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρωσκόπελος</td>
<td>659. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χρωστικός</td>
<td>667. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χορτάζειν</td>
<td>670. 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I. NEW LITERARY FRAGMENTS

\[ \text{χωλός} 670. 11. \]
\[ \text{χώρα} 663. 25. \]
\[ \text{χωρίς} 666. \]
\[ \text{ψυχή} 665. 115. \]
\[ a 25, 43, 56, 97, 164, 167, 174, 185, 212. \]
\[ ab 33. \]
\[ abire 26. \]
\[ accipere 49, 148, 165, 175. \]
\[ accusatio 9. \]
\[ ad 16, 110, 121. \]
\[ admittere 15. \]
\[ adversus 83, 151. \]
\[ Aebutius 38. \]
\[ Aemilia 143. \]
\[ Aemiliana via 31. \]
\[ Aemiliana via 31. \]
\[ Aemilius, L. Aem. 67. M. \]
\[ Aemilius, L. Aem. 67. M. \]
\[ affinis 122. \]
\[ Africa 125. \]
\[ Africanus, P. Cornelius Scipio A. (the elder) 25, (the younger) 210, and see Scipio. \]
\[ Aemilius, L. Aem. 67. M. \]
\[ Aulus 76, 112, 193. \]
\[ aureum 15. \]
\[ auxilliari 90. \]
\[ Bacchanalia 40. \]
\[ Baebius, Cn. Baeb. 67. M. \]
\[ Baeb. 74. \]
\[ basilica 57. \]
\[ bellum 68, 89. \]
\[ benigne 90. \]
\[ Bithynia 110. \]
\[ Boii 55. \]
\[ Bononia 7. \]
\[ Brutus 203, 216. \]
\[ caedere 1, 126, 171, 208. \]
\[ Caepio, Cn. Caepio 170. \]
\[ Q. Servilius Caep. 176, 182, 195. \]
\[ Caius 30, 76, 84, 191, 215. \]
\[ Campani 17. \]
\[ canere 62. \]
\[ capere 12, 127. \]
\[ Capitolium 189. \]
\[ captiva 14. \]
\[ caput 16, 112. \]
\[ carcer 204. \]
\[ carmen 105, 189. \]
\[ Carthaginenses 22, 83, 90. \]
\[ Carthago 132, 134. \]
\[ Cato 56, 114. \]
\[ censor 56. \]
\[ Censorinus 88. \]
\[ censura 8. \]
\[ centurio 15. \]
\[ certamen 42. \]
\[ Chaldæi 192. \]
\[ Charidemus 98. \]
\[ circa 51 (?), 169. \]
\[ circumscribere 39. \]
\[ clades 175. \]
\[ Claudia, Apptius Claudius \]
\[ (a) 48, (b) 177. \]
\[ M. Claud. \]
\[ Marcellus 58. Ti. Claud. \]
\[ Asellus 182. P. Claud. \]
\[ Pulcher 50. \]
\[ clavus (clava?) 196. \]
\[ Cnæus 2, 66, 137, 170, 191. \]
\[ cogere 32, 73. \]
\[ comitium 208. \]
\[ commodo 206. \]
\[ competitor 9. \]
\[ compositum (l. propositum ?) 9. \]
\[ conferre 47. \]
\[ conniurium. See connubium. \]
\[ connubium 17. \]
\[ consul passim. \]
\[ consultare 181. \]
\[ contra 189. \]
\[ cor 115. \]
\[ Corinthius 168. \]
\[ Corinthus 135, 145. \]
\[ Cornelius, C. Corn. 84. \]
\[ Corn. 137. L. Corn. Scipio \]
\[ 27, 45. P. Corn. Scipio \]
\[ see Scipio. \]
\[ Cotta 210. \]
\[ Crassus 59. \]
\[ creber 134. \]
\[ crimen 72. \]
\[ crudelissime 132. \]
\[ cruentus 18. \]
\[ cum (conjunctio) 210. \]
\[ cum (preposition) 77, 186. \]

(b) Latin (683).

\[ \text{a} 25, 43, 56, 97, 164, 167, 174, 185, 212. \]
\[ ab 33. \]
\[ abire 26. \]
\[ accipere 49, 148, 165, 175. \]
\[ ad 16, 110, 121. \]
\[ admittere 15. \]
\[ adversus 83, 151. \]
\[ Aebutius 38. \]
\[ Aemilia 143. \]
\[ Aemiliana via 31. \]
\[ Aemilius, L. Aem. 67. M. \]
\[ Aemilius, L. Aem. 67. M. \]
\[ affinis 122. \]
\[ Africa 125. \]
\[ Africanus, P. Cornelius Scipio A. (the elder) 25, (the younger) 210, and see Scipio. \]
\[ Aemilius, L. Aem. 67. M. \]
\[ ager 75. \]
\[ aliqu 92. \]
\[ Ambracia 12. \]
\[ amicitia 165. \]
\[ Anio 188. \]
\[ annus 177. \]
\[ Antiochus 6, 213. \]
\[ Appius (= Hasdrubal?) 132. \]
\[ Appius Claudius (a) 48, (b) 177. \]
\[ aqua 188. \]
\[ arma 102. \]
\[ Asellus 182. \]
\[ athleta 42. \]
\[ Attalus 110. \]
\[ Audax 197. \]

---

\[ \text{ὦ B61. 9, 13; 662. 46.} \]
\[ \text{ὠκέως B59. 26.} \]
\[ \text{ὠκύαλος 659. 39.} \]
\[ \text{ὠκύπους 659. 56.} \]

\[ \text{(b) Latin (683).} \]

---
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\[ \text{ὦ B61. 9, 13; 662. 46.} \]
\[ \text{ὠκέως B59. 26.} \]
\[ \text{ὠκύαλος 659. 39.} \]
\[ \text{ὠκύπους 659. 56.} \]
Flamininus 52.
Flaminius 24.
flere 100.
flumen 217.
fortissime 187.
forum 63.
fugare 49, 172.
Fulvius, Q. Fulv. 81. Fulv. Nobilius 43, 82.
funebris 60.

Gabinius 193.
Galba 152.
Gallia 52.
Gallograccia 20.
Gallograccius 13, 33.
Gallus 44.
gladiatorius 54.

habere 115, 178.
Hannibal 64.
Hasdrubal 122.
Hispala 37.
Hispania 41, 77.
Hispania 1, 216.
homo 51.
hostis 186.

idem 180.
incendium 128.
dicentium 40 (?).
ingenius 85.
insidiae 187.
tercedere 27.
terresse 180.
terpector 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.
Latinii 32.
legatio 114.
legatus 111, 121, 135.
Lentulus. See P. Cornelius Scipio.
liber 11, 66, 87, 173, 199.
liberare 14, 97.
liberis 118, 162.
lieto 184.
Ligures 30, 49, 77.
Litteratum 26.
Livius 19, and see Villius.
locus 92.
Ludus 46, 60.
lugere (?) 207.

Macedonia 179.
magistratus 79.
magnitudo 211.
Mancinus 112, 215.
Manilius, M. Manil. 88, 103. L. Manil. Vulso 113.
Manius 88.
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.

edere 43.
esse 5, 63, 122.
et 18, 21, 37, 38, 82, 103, 169.
evincere 177.
ex 20.
expressus 96, 126.
exsiriae 89.
exspirare 207.

Fabius, Q. Fabius 4. Q. Fabius Maximus 149, 171, 185.
facere 104, 186.
Fecenia 37.
ferre 116.
vides 95.
filius 100, 101, 120, 141, 179.
fingere 72.
flamen 4.
Flaminia via 30.
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Metellus, L. Metell. 167. Q.
Metell. 127, 153 (?), 160.
milla (siglum) 51.
minari 8.
Minucius 21.
Minurus 197.
mittere 121.
multa 205.
Nummius 145, 168.
munire 31.
Myrtilus 21.

ne 26, 177.
 nec 115.
ne 202.
Nobilior 82.
nobilis 14.
nomen 211.
non 133, 189, 220.
Numantini 174, 212.
obicere 196.
Oblivio 217.
obsidere 133.
occidere 16, 123 (?), 164.
Ocius 186.
occupare 102.
omnis 91, 207.
oppidum 169.
Ortiagon 14.

Pamphylia 13.
pater 73.
pati 15.
pax 3, 6, 186.
pecunia 34.
pellere 94.
pensare (?i 16.
per 20, 30, 73, 98, 102, 107, 120, 138, 194.
perdomare 31.
Pergameni (? 111.
persolvere 35.
persuadere 45.
pes 115.
peter 8, 79, 156.
Petillius, L. Petill. 75. Q.
Petill. 25.
Petronius 150.

planus. See primus.
ples 27, 78, 183, 204, 206.
poenius 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.
praedex 214.
preda 20.
prefectio 4, 135.
prefex 205.
primus 43.
primum 217.
pro 206.
producere 99.
proelium 13, 18, 134.
proficit 183.
profectio 5.
propomium 9 (?), 163.
prospere 125.
Publius 3, 50, 59, 74, 84, 200, 219.
Publicher 50.
pupilis 37.
Punicus 89.

re 16, 165, 180, 214.
qui 5, 22, 26, 35, 38, 100, 104, 119, 155, 164.
Quirinalis 5.
Quintius 52.
Quintus 4, 25, 81, 149, 160, 170, 171, 186.
quo 4, 53, 84, 122.
quondam 113.
quot 78.
redire 93.
referre 40.
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.
sacrament 127.
sagulum 165.
Salassus. See Sapiens.
Salinator 19.
Sapiens 176.
Sardinia 5.
Scantinius 115.
Scordisci 175.
scriba 75.
se 101.
set 9.
Sibylla 189.
signum 168.
Silanus 178.
singuli 209.
socius 107, and see occidere.
spectaculum 54.
Spurios 36.
status 168.
stolidus 113.
stupare 85.
supremum 116.
sujigere 42, 136.
sussellum 123.
suffragium 194.
Sullani 218.
suus 53, 55, 179, 180, 184. Syria 157, 214.

II. KINGS AND EMPERORS.

᾿Αρσινόη (Philadelphus?) 807.
Ptolemy Alexander I.

Πτολ. [ὁ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος θεὸς] Φιλομήτωρ καὶ Βερενίκη 803. om. Βερενίκη 824.

Augustus.

Καῖσαρ 711. 3, 6; 721. 4 et saep.; 731. 2, 4, 15; 742. 16; 743. 17, 44; 744. 15; 826.

Tiberius.

Τιβέριος Καῖσαρ Σεβαστὸς 746. 12.

Claudius.

Θεὸς Κλαύδιος 713. 15; 803.

Domitian.

Ἄντωνος Καῖσ. Δομιτιανὸς Σεβαστὸς οἰκονομὸς 722. 2.

Nerva.

Ἄντωνος. Νέρωνας Καῖσ. Σεβαστὸς 713. 41, 44.

Hadrian.

Ἄντωνος. Καῖσ. Τραianiὸς Ἀδριανὸς Σεβ. 714. 28, 32; 715. 27, 32; 728. 2; 729. 34, 38; 730. 32. Ἄδριανὸς Καῖσ. ὁ κύριος 707. 19, 33; 714. 19, 24; 715. 8, 20; 730. 6.

Antoninus Pius.

Ἄντωνος. Καῖσ. Τίτος Αἰλίος Ἀδριανὸς Ἀντωνῖνος Σεβ. Εὐσεβὴς 723. 1; 724. 14; 728. 25; 729. 45; 732. 6. om. Τίτος 727. 29. Τίτως Αἰλίος Ἀδριανὸς Ἀντωνῖνος Καῖσ. ὁ κύριος 729. 39. Ἀντωνῖνος Καῖσ. ὁ κύριος 712. 13; 724. 5; 728. 17, 41; 732. 3; 733. 1; 800.
### III. MONTHS AND DAYS

**Marcus Aurelius and Verus.**

Aurēlios 'Antawnios καὶ Οὐήρος οἱ κύριοι Σεβ. 734. 1.

**Commodus.**

Aύτοκρ. Καῖσ. Μάρκος Λιρήλιος Κόμμοδος 'Αντώνιος Εὐτυχῆς Εὔρυχῆς Σεβ. 'Αρμ. Μηθ. Παρθ. Σαρμ. Γερμ. Μέγιστος Βρετ. 716. 23.

Aύτοκρ. Καῖσ. Μάρκος Λιρήλιος Κόμμοδος 'Αντώνιος Σεβ. 'Αρμ. Μηθ. Παρθ. Σαρμ. Γερμ. Μέγιστος 725. 57.

**Pescennius Niger.**

Γάιος Πεσκέννιος Νήγερ Τιώστος Σεβ. 719. 5, 28. Cf. 801.

**Septimius Severus and Caracalla.**

Aύτοκρ. Καῖσ. Λούκιος Σεπτίμιος Μισσοπός Εὐσεβῆς Εὐτυχῆς Σεβ. 'Αρμ. 'Αδιαβην. Παρθ. Μέγιστος καὶ Αύτοκρ. Καῖσ. Μάρκος Αυρήλιος Αντωνῖος Σεβ. 705. 1, 54.

Aύτοκρ. Καῖσ. Μάρκος Αυρήλιος Αντωνῖος Σεβ. 705. 15, 65.

Aύτοκρατορες 705. 19, 70.

**Philippe.**

Philippus Augustus ii et Philippus Caesar cos. 720. 6.

**Decius.**

Aύτοκρ. Καῖσ. Γάιος Μέσσιος Κύιντος Τραιανός Δέκιος Εὐσεβῆς Εὐτυχῆς Σεβ. 658. 18.

---

### III. MONTHS AND DAYS.

(a) **Months.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δέρτροι (Τῦβι)</td>
<td>723. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulius</td>
<td>737. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaisaríncos (Μεσορῆ)</td>
<td>715. 33</td>
<td>722. 3</td>
<td>789; 793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neroíncos (Χοίακ)</td>
<td>808.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Νερώνειος (Χοίακ)</td>
<td>808.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sextilis</td>
<td>737. 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σεβαστάτης (Θάβ)</td>
<td>713. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σεβαστή (Caesarius, 6th intercalary day)</td>
<td>722. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) **Days.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐπαγγέλων ἡμέρα</td>
<td>715. 33, 37</td>
<td>722. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idus</td>
<td>737. 5 et saer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaládesai</td>
<td>747. 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalendae</td>
<td>737. 21.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonae</td>
<td>737. 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σεβαστή (Caesarius, 6th intercalary day)</td>
<td>722. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. PERSONAL NAMES.

A'βάσκανος 716. 5, 29.
A'βεῖς 718. 3.
A'γαθίνος father of Diodorus 718. 8; 723. 2.
A'δη( ) 736. 37.
A'δριναρός, Ουαλέριος 'Αθ. 800.
A'λιανός, 'Αντώνιος Αι. 708. 2, 15.
A'λιανός father of Leonides 713. 9.
A'λις 744. 1, 16.
A'μμώνιος 736. 35.
A'μμώνιος father of Achilles 722. 11.
A'μμώνιος son of Apollonides 729. 35, 38.
A'μμώνιος (or 'Απολλώνιος) father of Didymus 719. 2, 8, ii.
A'μόις father of Diogenes 728. 3, 36.
A'μόις also called Papontos, son of Diodorus 739. 3.
A'ρθωνίς father of Thonis also called Morous 725. 63.
A'ρχελαος 718. 2, 32.
A'ρχελαος Πρεῖμος also called Lollianus 718. 2, 32.
A'ρτεμις 745. 2.
A'χιλλεύς son of Ammonius 722. 27, 35.
A'χορίνις 807.
A'φροδισιάς 744. τι.
Bάσσος, Τέλλιος Β. epistrategus 726. 19.
Bελευς 735. 12, 13.
Bεροῦς 786. 71; 744. 2.
Bεθούς 832.
Bίθος father of Papontos 719. 10.
C'ανος son of Sipos 708. 4.
C'λωνius, Gradius Av. 735. 16.
A'χιλλεύς son of Thonis 732. 3.
A'χιλλεύς also called Casius, strategus 719. 1.
A'χιλλεύς also called Casius, strategus 719. 1.
A'χιλλεύς also called Casius, strategus 719. 1.
A'χιλλεύς also called Casius, strategus 719. 1.
A'χιλλεύς also called Casius, strategus 719. 1.
A'χιλλεύς also called Casius, strategus 719. 1.
A'χιλλεύς also called Casius, strategus 719. 1.
A'χιλλεύς also called Casius, strategus 719. 1.
A'χιλλεύς also called Casius, strategus 719. 1.
IV. PERSONAL NAMES

Γάιος Μάρκιος 'Απίων also called Diogenes 727. 6, 9, 27.
Γάιος Μάρκιος 'Απολινάριος also called Julianus 727. 6, 9, 27.
Γάιος Ῥούστος 745. 11.
Γάιος Σέππιος Ῥούφος 721. 8, 335.
Γάιος Σέππιος Ῥούφος 721. 8, 335.
Γάιος Βάσσος epistrategus 726. 19.
Γέμελλος 724. 2, 736. 12.
Γή 725. 6.
Περγάς father of Polemon 715. 3, 12, 17.
Περγάς son of Polemon 715. 2, 34.
Γαλέστος 715. 5.
Παλέστος son of Polemon 715. 2.
Δάμων 730. 9.
Δημήτρια 707. 8 et saxfr.
Δημήτριος 825.
Δημήτριος father of Apollonius 724. 4.
Δημήτριος βιβλιοφύλαξ 714. 3, 4.
Δημήτριος deputy archidicastes, son of Heraclides 727. 4.
Δημητροῦς 723. 3.
Δεδυμος 784.; 786.; 791.
Δεδυμος son of Ammonius or Apollonius 719. 2, 8, 11.
Δεδυμος son of Charit ... 826.
Δεδυμος son of Diogenes (?) 837.
Δεδυμος father of Diodorus 713. 5, 7; 729. 2.
Δεδυμος father of Agathinus 713. 5, 7; 729. 2.
Δεδυμος son of Diodorus 713. 4, 21.
Δεδυμος daughter of Galesius 715. 5.
Δεδυμος 718. 5, 12, 17; 790.
Δεδυμος son of Apollonius 724. 4.
Δεδυμος son of Apollonius 724. 4.
Δεδυμος son of Amois 726. 4.
Δεδυμος son of Charit ... 826.
Δεδυμος son of Diogenes (?) 837.
Δεδυμος father of Diodorus 713. 5, 7; 729. 2.
Δεδυμος son of Diodorus 713. 4, 21.
Δεδυμος daughter of Galesius 715. 5.
Δεδυμος 718. 5, 12, 17; 790.
IV. PERSONAL NAMES

Madoxas oplio 735. 5.
Mamertinos, Petronius M. praefect 726. 17.
Marexos, Gaios M. Apianos also called
Julianus 727. 6, 9, 27.
Marrius son of Comarinius (?) 735. 3.
Melas father of Miusis 719. 19.
Mepistos 715. 24.
Mepis son of Melas 719. 19.
Mepis, x( ) father of Pathotes 740. 40.
Mepis father of Papontos 719. 18.
Mepis also called Thonis, son of Harthonis 725. 63.
Mepis father of Leptines 831.
Nepotelemos father of ... on 712. 9.
Nextheus 739. 3.
Nicerita, Oialeria 'Apollovanrion also called N. 727. 18.
Nepheus 715. 22.
Xinophos, Tito Klaudios X. epistrategus 718 1.
Xinos 810.
Xenos son of Heraclis 785.
'Osthovit 815.
Oialeria 'Apollovanrion also called Icariate 727. 16.
Oialerion 'Adragonarios 800.
Oialerion son of Apollonius 730. 2, 34.
Oialerion Theodosios also called Polion 727. 16.
Ostator imperial steward, son of Comarinius 735. 5.
Ostalios archidicas 719. 3, 7.
Pacebius 735. 30.
Paios 837.
Patevmotheus son of Thanochis 712. 6, 12.
Patevthos 729. 1, 27.
Patevthos son of Moimes, ch ... 740. 40.
Painhos also called Panechotes, ex-competentes 724. 1.
Paphirostaios father of ... nychus 708. 17.
Pantei ... 722. 22.
Pantechitos son of Doras 716. 3, 27.
Pantechitos also called Panares, ex-competentes 724. 1.
Pantinos 858. 5.
Paochis son of Bithys 719. 15.

Papontos also called Amois, son of Diodorus 733. 3.
Papontos son of Bithys 719. 10, 27, 34.
Papontos son of Mouthis 719. 18.
Papalos 740. 20.
Paochis 736. 85 (?).
Paochis son of Petsiris 808.
Pecemis father of Leonas 732. 1, 9.
Pellus 811.
Pettaius 732. 32.
Pettaius father of Pausiris 809.
Pephantos also called Thonis 726. 17.
Pithos 743. 2.
Polirios 719. 6.
Polimios son of Gorgias 715. 4, 11.
Polimos son of Tryphon 731. 2, 9.
Pomimos son of Thanochis 712. 4 et 33p.
Plaios, Anthepion II. also called Lollianus 718. 2, 32.
Pithos 736. 17.
Pithos, Claudius 5, 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 5, 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
Pithos, Claudius 785. 14.
V. GEOGRAPHICAL.

(a) COUNTRIES, NOMES, TOPARCHIES, CITIES.

Aegyptus 720. 1.
"Αθριβίτης 712. 1, 8.
Αλγυπτιού 706. 1, 7.
Αλγυπτως 727. 11.

ΙΔΙΩΝ ΠΟΛΕΩΝ 709. 9; 743. 24; 744. 3, 5; 799. "Αλεξανδρεία 705. 20, 68.
"Αλεξανδρείας πόλεως 705. 20, 68.
"Αληθινής βιβλιοφύλαξ 715. 1.
"Αριων father of Apion 728. 5, 36.
"Αριων son of Heracleides 719. 19.
"Αριων son of Panechotes 716. 3, 27.
"Αριων 719. 17.
"Αριων father of Thotsutaius 797.
"Αριων father of Apollos 887.
"Αριων father of Ophelas 727. 8.
"Αριων son of Ophelas 727. 8, 12, 22, 26

Truphon 735. 27.
Τατακι δaughter of Theon 723. 2.
Τεντακιούς 719. 10.
Τέχη 736. 18.

Valerius, Claudius V. Firmus praefect 720. 1.
Valerius son of Isidorus 735. 4.

Φωίαi father of Dionysius 789.
Φωίατος 742. 1, 17.
Φωλίς praefect 800.
Φωλίνας 707. 12, 18, 34.
Φωλινεικος also called Hermodorus, basilicom-grammatheus 714. 1.

Χαράμμων 724. 3.
Χαρήμων 725. 5.
Χαρίζων 728. 6.
Χαρισματικόρος 728. 26.
Χαρτ. ( ) father of Didymus 826.

Ψάμμις agoranomus 722. 5.
Ψεναμοῦνις introd.

"Ορίων father of Heraclides 719. 19.
"Ορίων father of Thotsutaius 797.
"Ορίων father of Apollos 887.
"Ορίων father of Ophelas 727. 8.
"Ορίων son of Ophelas 727. 8, 12, 22, 26
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เมทรลίτης p. 263.

*Ομβοί 834.

*Οξυρύγχοι (Dat. ?='0€. πόλις) 745. 6.

Πέμπτης τῆς ἐπιγονῆς 7380. 4; 8386.

Παγκῦλις 782. 5.

Παἴλε 740. 43.

Περιβλητία 709. 5.

Περιβλητία p. 263.

Πηλεύσιον 709. 4.

Πηλουσιῶται 705. 37.

Πτολεμαίς 839.

Πεπελλών 740. 40; 808.

Πέπελλων (not Oxyrh.) 712. 20.

χώρα, ἡ κάτω x. 709. 8.

(6) VILLAGES, ἐποίκια, τόποι.

Εὐεργέτης 814.

*Ηρακλείδου ἐποίκιον 838.

Θελήω 814.

Θεσ. 740. 35.

Θ. θόδωρ 794.

Θήλης 895. introd.; 740. 35.

Θίασις 721. 9; 728. 2, 4, 6.

*Ισιων Παχνοῦβις (Heracleop.) 715. 21.

*Ισιων 'Λ... 732. 2.

*Ισιων Τρύφωνος 719. 10, 14.

Κερκεμοῦνις 746. 7; 887.

Κερκινοῦς 749. 40; 808.

Κύνω (≡Κυνῶι?) 739. 2.

Μαγδώλα 740. 43.

Μηδειρῆ(α?) 740. 16; 823.

Μνημή 784.

Μνημερεύ (not Oxyrh.) 712. 20.

Νέκλη 742. 17.

Νημέρα 797.

Νίσα Λα 713. 24, 31.

*Οξυρύγχοι (Dat. ?='0€. πόλις) 745. 6.

Παγκῦλις 732. 5.

Πεπελλών 808.

Πεπελλών 740. 24.

Πεπελλων 713. 26.

Πέλμα 740. 20, 21, 37, 38; 835.

Πέτνη Τακωλ( ) τόποι 734. 3.
INDICES

Σενεκελέ 740. 26.
Σενίπτα 730. 3, 39.
Σινώς 718. 13.
Σενοκωμέ 740. 37, 38.
Σεράφης 707. 20; 740. 18.
Σεφώ 808.
Σεραπί 810.

Τακολ( ) 734. 3, 5.

Σεφώ 808.
Τακόνα 743. 26, Τακόνα 743. 29.
Σένεπτα 780. 3, 39. Ταλαώ 695. introd.
Σέννις 718. 13. Ταμοῦς (Fayfim) p. 263.
Σενοκωμί 740. 37, 38. Τεποῦς 721. 9.
Σερῦφις 707. 20; 740. 18. Τής 808.
Σεφώ 808. Ταμοῦς (Heracleop.) 715. 6, 13, 14.
Σεφώ 808. Τεποῦς (Heracleop.) 715. 6, 13, 14.

(c) κληροί.

Δάμων 730. 9.
Εὔφρον 794.
Δάμων 730. 9.
Εὔφρον 794.

(c) Buildings, &c.

'Αδριανή βιβλιοθήκη 719. 35.
Σαραπείον 786, 25; 882; 835.

(d) δήμοι.

'Ιππεων Παρεμβολής 786.
Νότου Δρόμου 786.
Νότου Κρηπίδος 714. τι.
Λόδων Παρεμβολῆς 786.
Νότου Κρηπίδος 714. 11.

(e) BUILDINGS, &c.

VI. RELIGION.

(a) Gods.

Γη 722. 6.
Δάμων 730. 9.
Εὔφρον 794.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
Θεός 658. 8; 716. 28. Cf. Index ii.
VII. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS

(δ) Priests.

ἀρχιερατεύσας 718. 3.

ἱερεὺς 718. 3.

ἱερ. καὶ ἀρχιδικαστής 719.

(ε) Miscellaneous.

ἄστρα Ἥρας 781. 6.

θυσία 658. 2.

ἱερ. ιερίτης 721. 7.

VII. OFFICIAL AND MILITARY TERMS.

ἀγοραπόμος 722. 4.

ἀγνητής 788.

ἀριθμός, πρώτων ἀριθμῶν ἱππεύς 735. 8.


βιβλιοφύλαξ 718. 3, 20, 26.

δεκάδαρχος 747. 1.

ἐξηγητεύσας 714. 6.

ἐξηγητής (of Alexandria) 727. 1, 5.

ἐπικριτής 714. 5, 38.

ἐπιστατεία φιλακτών 803.

ἐπιστράτηγος, Τέλλιος Βάσσος (A.D. 135) 728. 18. Ξενικάρχος (A.D. 180-92) 718. 1.

ἐπιστράτης ξενικών πρακτορείας 712. 1, 8.

ἐπιτηρητής εἰρηνικῶν πρακτορείας 712. 1, 8.

ἐφαρμοκρίτης 710. 4.

ἐφιππάρχον, Ἰονία (c. A.D. 135) 800.


ἱερά 658. 1, 12; 784.

ἱερά (' temple') 785.

Ἱσεία 791. 5.

ἱερατικοὶ τόποι 727. introd.

ἱερατικοὶ τόποι 727. introd.

ἱερά 721. 7.

ἱερά (' offering') 784. 1, 12; 784.

ἱερά (' temple') 785.

ὃς 731. 5.


**INDICES**

πρακτικές ξενικῶν 712. 1, 8; 825.  
πράκτωρ ἁργυρικῶν 733. 2; 734. 3.  
σιτολόγος 708. 10, 21; 740. 24, 26; 798; 833.  

topoγραμματεύς 833.  
ὑπηρέτης 712. 17.  
φυλακίστας 803.  
φύλαξ 803.  
χειριστής 734. 2.  
χιλιαρχος 708. 13.  
χρηματιστής 710. 7; 727. 3.  
ἀφογράφος 710. 3.  

**VIII. WEIGHTS, MEASURES, AND COINS.**

(a) Weights and Measures.  

**δέκαω** 669. 29, 41.  
Δύμα 669. 29.  
Δροφα 713. 24 et scep.; 715. 26; 718. 8 et  
scep.; 721. 10, 11, 14; 738. 7, 8, 39;  
729. 33; 730. 8, 39; 740. 41 et scep.  
Δράταθ 708. 4, 11, 17, 19; 718. 15; 735.  
9; 736. 8 et scep.; 788; 789; 836.  
Βήμα 669. 28, 37.  
Δάκτυλος 669. 14, 17, 26, 43.  
Δάκυμη 742. 4, 13.  
Διανυσί 669. 30.  
Εἰκαστή 708. 8, 9, 20.  
Κάλαμος 669. 28, 41.  
Κεράμιον 729. 36; 745. 1; 784.  
Κοτύλη 784.  
Λεχίς 669. 27, 31.  
Μέτρον 669. 26; 707. 26, 28, 30; 717. 1, 2;  
729. 27. μ. ἄγαναμοικά 836. μ. δημάτιαν  
740. 18, 20. μ. ἐμβ(ολικόν) 740. 18.  
μ. στοιχαλομάθαν 740. 17. μ. τετραγώνοιν  
ἄγαναμοικά 836. μ. χαλκόν 717. 8.  
Μύλων 669. 30.  

**ναύδαιον** 669. 11, 24.  
Ξύλον 669. 11, 20, 21, 28. έπ. Βασιλικόν 669.  
11, 19. έπ. δημόσιον 669. 38.  
Δύδαιον 669. 1, 2.  
Οργινά 669. 28, 39.  
Παλαιστή 669. 13, 16, 27, 31, 34.  
Πηχήν 669. 2 et scep. π. δημόσιοι 669. 34.  
π. ἐμβαδικός 669. 6, 10. π. εὐθυμετρικός  
669. 5. π. λειμορικός 669. 33. π. Νειλο-  
μετρικός 669. 35. π. οἰκοτεκτόνος 669. 9.  
π. στερεός 669. 7. π. τεκτονικός 669. 35.  
Πλέον 669. 29.  
Ποῦσ 669. 27, 32.  
Πυγών 669. 27, 34.  
Σπεδαμή 669. 27, 32.  
Στάδιον 669. 29.  
Σχοινίον 669. 1, 3, 18.  
Τετάρτη 795.  
Χοῖνιξ 740. 18 et scep.; 789.  
Χοῖνη 736. 15; 739. 11; 819.  

τετάρτη 795.
IX. TAXES

(6) Coins.

ἀργυρίων 706. 3; 712. 6, 15; 724. 6; 728. 9 et saep.; 729. 6, 13, 20, 40; 730. 12, 37; 731. 8, 9, 10, 12; 784; 788; 791; 808. ἀργ. ἐπίσημον 722. 19. ἀργ. Σεβαστοῦ νομίσματος 719. 21; 722. 25. as 737. 2 et saep.

δραχμία 707. 8 et saep.; 712. 6, 14, 15, 21; 719. 21, 31; 722. 19, 25; 724. 6 et saep.; 725. 22 et saep.; 728. 9 et saep.; 729. 6 et saep.; 730. 12, 14, 37; 731. 8, 9, 11, 12; 732. 5 et saep.; 733. 4, 6; 736. 2 et saep.; 739. 2 et saep.; 742. 14; 745. 1; 784; 789; 791-2; 799; 803; 808; 817; 819.

δραχμιαῖος τόκος 712. 14; 728. 20.

ἡμιωβέλιον 733. 4, 6; 739. 12 et saep.; 739. 8, 11.

IX. TAXES.

ἀργυρικά 733. 2; 734. 3.

γλυ( ) 734. 4.

γραμματικῶν p. 263.

ἐπικεφάλαιον 832.

λαογραφία 714. 23; 733. 5.

ναύλου πορείων 762.

ζευκά 712. 1, 8; 825.

οἴνου τέλος 788.

μνᾶ 728. 21.

ὀξυλιαίος 729. 10.

ὀξυλός 731. 8, 11, 13; 739. 5 et saep.; 739. 7 et saep.

πεισώβολον 733. 4, 6; 736. 68 et saep.; 739. 6.

semis (¼ as) 737. 11 et saep.

τάλαντον 710. 6-8; 722. 17, 26; 784; 808. τετρώβολον 722. 20; 734. 5, 6; 736. 12 et saep.; 739. 4, 13.

τρίωβολον 736. 8 et saep.; 739. 11, 16; 819.

### X. GENERAL INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN WORDS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Word</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀβιρή</td>
<td>720. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄβροχος</td>
<td>740. 45; 810.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄγειν</td>
<td>742. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄγεωργητος</td>
<td>705. 45; 810.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγοράζειν</td>
<td>717. 3; 742. 12; 745. 2; 839.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγορανομεῖον</td>
<td>718. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγορανομικός</td>
<td>886.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγορανόμος</td>
<td>722. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγοραστός</td>
<td>798.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγυιά</td>
<td>722. 12, 34; 723. 5; 726. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγωνιᾶν</td>
<td>744. 4, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀγωνίζεσθαι</td>
<td>705. 50, 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδελφή</td>
<td>715. 17; 744. 1; 745. τ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδελφιδοῦς</td>
<td>727. τό</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδελφός</td>
<td>707. 34; 712. 5, 12; 718. 21, 30; 718. 17; 717. 6; 718. 8, 10; 719. 15; 725. 6; 746. 1; 791.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδιακρίτως</td>
<td>715. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδικος</td>
<td>717. 10; 718. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄδολος</td>
<td>729. 19; 836.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἴθριον</td>
<td>719. 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἴξ</td>
<td>807.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἱρεῖν</td>
<td>719. 26; 728. 12; 729. 21, 31, 41, 43; 787; 800.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἱρεσις</td>
<td>716. 22; 729. 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰτεῖν</td>
<td>709. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰτητής</td>
<td>788.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰτία</td>
<td>725. 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἴσχους</td>
<td>669. 29, 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἰκίδιον</td>
<td>719. 3, 4, 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλήθεια</td>
<td>715. 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλάσσειν</td>
<td>729. 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλληλεγγύη</td>
<td>712. 12, 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλληλεγγύος</td>
<td>729. 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλήλους</td>
<td>718. 21, 16; 719. 20; 724. 12; 727. 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁλμυρίς</td>
<td>715. 29; 740. 46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αἷμα</td>
<td>658. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁμίνων</td>
<td>716. 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Word</td>
<td>Latin Equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀξιοῦν</td>
<td>705. 14; 705. 29; 705. 30; 705. 31; 716. 19; 719. 32; 727. 29; 805; 826.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀξίωσις</td>
<td>705. 14; 705. 29; 705. 30; 705. 31; 716. 19; 719. 32; 727. 29; 805; 826.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπαιτεῖν</td>
<td>718. 23; 727. 18; 803.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπαίτησις</td>
<td>718. 14; 722. 28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπαρτίζειν</td>
<td>724. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπελεύθερος</td>
<td>706. 2; 716. 6, 29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπελευθεροῦν</td>
<td>706. 8; 722. 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπεργασία</td>
<td>729. 2, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπέρχεσθαι</td>
<td>709. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπέρχεσθαι</td>
<td>709. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπέρχεσθαι</td>
<td>709. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπέχειν</td>
<td>719. 22; 808.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπηλιώτης</td>
<td>719. 17; 728. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁπλοῦς</td>
<td>719. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπογράφειν</td>
<td>718. 34; 715. 6, 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπογραφή</td>
<td>715. 30; 719. 24; 808.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποδέχεσθαι</td>
<td>705. 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποδέχεσθαι</td>
<td>705. 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποδέχεσθαι</td>
<td>705. 59.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποδόσις</td>
<td>712. 16; 729. 17; 808.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπολλύναι</td>
<td>748. 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπομετρεῖν</td>
<td>798.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποσπᾶν</td>
<td>724. 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποστέλλειν</td>
<td>742. 5; 744. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποστερητής</td>
<td>745. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποστολή</td>
<td>736. 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπότακτος</td>
<td>729. 31; 730. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποτίνειν</td>
<td>730. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποφαίνειν</td>
<td>708.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀριθμός</td>
<td>735. 8; 742. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀριστερός</td>
<td>722. το; 728. 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄριστον</td>
<td>786. 23, 28, 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρνακίς</td>
<td>741. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρουρα</td>
<td>729. 7, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχαῖος</td>
<td>729. 7, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχαῖον</td>
<td>712. 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρχισας</td>
<td>See Index VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρχωματεῖν</td>
<td>718. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁς</td>
<td>737. 2. et sspf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσβέστια</td>
<td>726. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσβεστίν</td>
<td>725. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπασθαι</td>
<td>745. 9; 805.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσπάραγος</td>
<td>736. 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπορος</td>
<td>740. 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπορος</td>
<td>709. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀστικός</td>
<td>708. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀστρον</td>
<td>745. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποστερητής</td>
<td>745. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρνακίς</td>
<td>741. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρουρα</td>
<td>729. 7, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχαῖος</td>
<td>729. 7, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχεῖον</td>
<td>712. 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἂν</td>
<td>737. 2. et sspf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσβέστια</td>
<td>726. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσβεστίν</td>
<td>725. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπασθαι</td>
<td>745. 9; 805.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσπάραγος</td>
<td>736. 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπορος</td>
<td>740. 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπορος</td>
<td>709. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀστικός</td>
<td>708. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀστρον</td>
<td>745. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποστερητής</td>
<td>745. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρουρα</td>
<td>729. 7, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχαῖος</td>
<td>729. 7, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχαῖον</td>
<td>712. 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρχισας</td>
<td>See Index VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρχωματεῖν</td>
<td>718. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἁς</td>
<td>737. 2. et sspf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσβέστια</td>
<td>726. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσβεστίν</td>
<td>725. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπασθαι</td>
<td>745. 9; 805.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσπάραγος</td>
<td>736. 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπορος</td>
<td>740. 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπορος</td>
<td>709. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀστικός</td>
<td>708. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀστρον</td>
<td>745. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποστερητής</td>
<td>745. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρουρα</td>
<td>729. 7, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχαῖος</td>
<td>729. 7, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀρχεῖον</td>
<td>712. 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἂν</td>
<td>737. 2. et sspf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσβέστια</td>
<td>726. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσβεστίν</td>
<td>725. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπασθαι</td>
<td>745. 9; 805.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀσπάραγος</td>
<td>736. 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπορος</td>
<td>740. 42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄσπορος</td>
<td>709. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀστικός</td>
<td>708. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀστρον</td>
<td>745. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποστερητής</td>
<td>745. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἄρουρα</td>
<td>729. 7, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βλάβος</td>
<td>729. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βοᾶν</td>
<td>717. 9, 12, 13, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βοηθός</td>
<td>743. 4 ; 743. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βοικός</td>
<td>729. 39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βούλεσθαι</td>
<td>705. 76; 719. 29; 721. 3; 729. 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βουλεύειν</td>
<td>706. 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βορρᾶς</td>
<td>719. 16, 18; 729. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βοτάνη</td>
<td>729. 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bots</td>
<td>707. 9; 729. 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βραχύς</td>
<td>705. 77.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bwrodroyew</td>
<td>708. 7, 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βῶλος</td>
<td>708. 8, 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βωμός</td>
<td>785.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάλα</td>
<td>736. 48, 83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάμος</td>
<td>713. 12, 32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γείτων</td>
<td>719. τό.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γενεά</td>
<td>718. τό.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γενέσια</td>
<td>736. 56, 57.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γένημα</td>
<td>729. 36.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γένος</td>
<td>727. 20; 729. 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γέρδιος</td>
<td>725. 5; 786. 23, 27, 28, 35; 826.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεύεσθαι</td>
<td>658. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεωμετρία</td>
<td>728. 9, 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεωμετρικός</td>
<td>669. I, 3, 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεωργεῖν</td>
<td>718. 19, 23; 728. 4; 740. 38, 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γεωργός</td>
<td>740. 16, 21, 33, 35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γῆ</td>
<td>706. 67; 707. 34; 709. 6; 713. 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; 507; 832.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυναικεῖος</td>
<td>739. 18; 741. 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυνή</td>
<td>736. 11, 88, 89.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυμνάσιον</td>
<td>738. 16; 808.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυμνασίαρχος</td>
<td>716. 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γυμνος</td>
<td>839.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γιγνώσκειν</td>
<td>743. 27; 744. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γλυί</td>
<td>784. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γνήσιος</td>
<td>740. 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γνώμη</td>
<td>729. 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γνωρίζειν</td>
<td>705. 39; 718. 20; p. 263.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γνωστήρ</td>
<td>722, 31; 723. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γιγνώσκειν</td>
<td>743. 27; 744. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάλα</td>
<td>736. 48, 83.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάμος</td>
<td>713. 7, 38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>722. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>722. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>722. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>722. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>722. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>722. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>722. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>722. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>722. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>722. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>729. 40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γάστον</td>
<td>722. 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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dημοσίωσις 719. 31.
διαγράφειν 707. 22; 721. 12; 733. 2; 734. 2; 800; 803.
dιαβήσεται 715. 19.
dιάφρασις 718. 7, 10.
dιαλογισμός 709. 2; 726. 12.
dιαπεμπεῖν 727. 24.
dιαπονεῖν 748. 22.
dιαπωλεῖν 721. 20.
dιαστάσις 669. 37, 40.
dιαστολή 719. 32; 748. 28; 798.
dιατάσσειν 718. 25.
dιάφορον 708. 11, 22; 797; 893. 8.
dιάψευδεσθαι 715. 30.
dιάψιλος 707. 23.
dιδάσκαλος 725. 10, 14, 43.
dιδόναι 716. 22; 719. 4, 30; 725. 18; 729. 10, 13, 17; 781. 7, 10; 740. 15 et seq.
dιέπειν 727. 5.
dιέρχεσθαι 712. 18; 714. 18; 729. 26; 789.
dιετία 707. 24.
dιεύτυχειν 718. 31.
dικαίος 717. 10; 746. 9; 787.
dικαστήριον 705. 38.
dίκη 728. 24.
dίλετον 717. 5, 12.
dίμοιρος 716. 14, 20.
dίστεγος 719. 15.
dόκειν 718. 24.
dόξω 720. 3, 6.
dόμοιος 724. 7.
dόξα 714. 15; 723. 14; 723. 3.
dόξος 714. 13; 716. 15; 724. 3.
dραχμή. See Index VIII (d).
dραχμαίον 712. 14; 728. 21.
dρόμος 717. 17; p. 263.
dύσις 729. 10; 727. 11; 742. 10; 743. 36; 744. 12.
δόσις 719. 31.
dοῦλος 714. 13; 716. 15; 724. 3.
dοὺς 725. 12.
dοὐδεκάδραχμον 714. 22.
dωδεκάμηνον 800.

c 720. 5, 14.
c ὁ 729. 18.
c ἀντι 729. 4, 8.
c ἀγγείον 707. 20.
c ἤγγισεν 707. 33.
c ἀγκαλίου 728. 40.
c ἠγγίσει 705. 61; 713. 1; 715. 1; 825.
c ἄθικος 728. 15.
c ἀθίκος 705. 43, 62.
c ἀθικός 729. 7.
c ἀθος 705. 37.
c ἀθος p. 263.
c ἀθος 718. 32; 718. 12; 725. 64; 728. 34; 728. 37; 745. 6, 8.
c ἀθος 689. 26; 719. 24.
c ἀθος 718. 22.
c ἀτ τις αὐτό μισθός 740. 17, 18.
c ἀτάγων 729. 5, 6.
c ἀτάκοιος 736. 97.
c ἀτάκοινοι 721. 8; 725. 30; 729. 2, 14, 30.
c ἀτάκοινοι 705. 39; 719. 16.
c ἀτακομίσταται 717. 5, 7; 744. 4.
c ἀτακομίστως 717. 12.
c ἀτακομίστως 717. 2.
c ἀτακομίστως 705. 35, 77; 711. 1; 725. 11; 727. 32; 728. 21; 729. 18, 29, 37.
c ἀτακομίστως 713. 31; 729. 19.
c ἀτακομίστως 708. 8, 9, 20.
c ἀτακομίστως 708. 7, 19; 729. 36.
c ἀτακομίστως 744. 10.
c ἀτακομίστως 717. 1.
c ἀτακομίστως 724. 12.
c ἀτακομίστως 725. 47.
c ἀτακομίστως 725. 5; 835.
c ἀτακομίστως 729. 18.
c ἀτακομίστως 725. 37.
c ἀτακομίστως 729. 41.
c ἀτακομίστως 727. 19.
c ἀτακομίστως 707. 4.
c ἀτακομίστως 725. 55; 728. 19; 731. 12.
c ἀτακομίστως 729. 21.
c ἀτακομίστως 743. 29.
c ἀτακομίστως 736. 15; 730. 5, 11, 16, 21; 784.
c ἀτακομίστως 689. 44; 705. 46; 708. 7; 20; 729. 42.
c ἀτακομίστως 705. 40; 722. 6.
c ἀτακομίστως 718. 11.
c ἀτακομίστως 729. 31; 723. 4.
c ἀτακομίστως p. 263.
ἐμβάλλειν 708. 9, 21; 717. 1, 15.
ἐμμένειν 708. 9, 21; 717. 1, 15.
ἐμποιεῖν (Ὁ) 707. introd.
ἐνδεικνύναι 705. 32.
ἐνεχυρασία 712. 3, 10, 15, 16, 19.
ἐνεχυροῦν 729. 44.
ἐνεχθέσθαι 719. 55.
ἐνεχύρωσις 712. 4, 15.
ἐνεχύρωσιν 729. 44.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνθέσμος 713. 39.
ἐνδίνειν 712. 39.
ἐνδοκεῖν 705. 41.
ἐνοίκεῖν 705. 41.
ἐνοίκησις 729. 34.
ἐνοίκιον 729. 34.
ἐνοχλεῖν 705. 71.
ἐνοχλεῖσθαι 705. 71.
ἐνοχλημέναι 705. 71.
ἐνοχλημέναι 705. 71.
ἐνεχύρωσις 712. 39.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
ἐνεχύρωσται 729. 34.
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εὐεργέτης 705. 17, 66.
eὐθαλεῖν 729. 22.
eὐθέως 839. εὐθύς 744. 7.
eὐθυμετρικός 669. 5.
eὐλόγως 718. 28.
eὐμενής 705. 15, 65.
eὔνοια 705. 31.
eὑρίσκειν 717. 5, 8; 743. 25.
eὐσχήμων 800.
eὐτυχεῖν 805.
eὐχαριστεῖν 811.
ἐφηβεύειν 711. 4.
ἐφήβος 705. 49.
ἐφόδιον 792. 
ἐφοδος 710. 4.
ζεῦγος 707. 9; 741. 8, 9.
ζητεῖν 726. 16; 805.
ζυμουργός 754.
Giros 736. 27, 60; 784.
ἡγεμονεύειν 707. 10.
ἡγεμών. See Index VII.
ἡμέρα 705. 35; 718. 40; 724. 14; 725. 12, 37, 41, 43; 731. 7, 11; 736. 68–71, 90; 804. ἐπαγόμεναι ἤμ. See Index III (b).
ἡμετέρος 707. 10.
ἡμαρτάνων 703. 6.
ἡμιαρτάβιον 708. 6.
ἡμιολία 728. 20; 780. 27; 833.
ἡμίσεια 729. 36.
ἡμίσυνθεσις 741. 15.
ἡμιωβέλιον. See Index VIII (ὁ).
ἦπαρ 738. 3.
ἤπητρα 736. το.
ἤτοι 669. 8.
ἴδιος 712. 19; 715. 6; 729. 12.
ἰδιωτικός 115. 37; 718. 11, 27; 719. 24.
ἰδιωτικῶς 740. 20, 28, 32.
ἱερατικός 707. introd.
ἱερές. See Index VI (4).
ἱερόν 658. 1, 22; 784; 785.
ἱστάναι 709. 2; 718. 30; 743. 6, 8; 743. 37, 43; 744. 13; 745. 10; 746. 10; 805.
ἴππαρχος 709. 4.
ἵππαρχος 790.
ἱππεύς 735. 8.
ἱππικός 741. 11.
ἰσάτις 729. 31.
Ἱσέια 781. 5.
ἴσος 715. 7; 722. 13; 725. 42, 56; 729. 20,

καθάρτις 735. 12.
καθάρτις 741. 25.
καθαρός 708. 5, 18; 718. 9; 729. 22; 730. 17, 26, 49, 53, 78, 80; 740. 29; 836.
καθαρτάναι 727. 19; 880.
καθήλων 705. 47; 727. 24.
καθήκερ 738. 24.
καθωρός 705. 5, 18; 718. 9; 729. 22; 730.
καλαμος 729. 4, 25, 26; 742. 2.
καλαμουργία 729. 4.
καλάνδαι 747. 2. Kalendae 787. 21.
καλεῖν 747. 1.
καλέων 705. 40; 805. καλός 745. 8.
καμάρα 729. 34.
καμηλίτης 710. 4.
καρπός 721. 7; 729. 32; 730. 19.
καρπωνεῖν 728. 1, 10, 29.
καρπος 729. 22.
καλέων 658. 15; 736. 14, 84.
καλάμος 729. 4, 25, 26; 742. 2.
κατάγειν 708. 3, 10.
κατάλογος 709. 2; 718. 30; 743. 6, 8; 743. 37, 43; 744. 13; 745. 10; 746. 10; 805.
καταφύλαττειν 715. 37; 729. 18.
κατάγειν 709. 2; 718. 30; 729. 20.
καταλογούν 719. 3, 6.
καταλογία 757; 811.
καταμετρεῖν 669. 11.
κατανθρωπισμός 736. 11, 18, 54, 94.
κατάνταυν 713. 23.
catasekeus 725. 26.
catapost 708. introd.
catartiseus 705. 78; 707. 9.
cataxwarizeus 714. 37; 715. 36; 719. 38; 731. 14; 786. 826.
catexes 712. 3; 713. 15.
catakeus 705. 24.
catasek 715. 23, 25.
catex 713. 36.
cat 709. 8.
celleu 658. 10; 705. 51; 706. 13; 708. 6, 10; Χ115. ἢ» wal 15.
celle 707. introd.
keleuarion 741. 12.
kelemion 729. 36; 745. 1; 784.
kefamos 729. 19.
kerkastera 736. 77.
kefalaios 805.
kepros 736. 16.
keiton (= χιτόν) 736.99.
keudweneus 705. 73; 839.
kivnoos 708. 10, 22; 712. 19; 716. 7, 36; 730.16; 804.
kladion 796.
kleis 729. 23.
kleronos 719. 16, 17.
klepos 715. 22, 25; 721.6; 728.7; 730.9; 794; 810. Cf. Index V (e).
klerou ( ) 833.
kouvoes 719. 15; 729. 32; 740. 43. kouvoues 715.7; 729. 5, 6.
kalligrafa 736. 91, 100.
komektairo 724. 8.
koumeion 708. 14; 730. 20.
kouos 739. 7.
kopp 720. 3; 810.
kopros 720. 10.
kopos 720. 10.
k.opos 729. 11.
kopros 729. 10.
kopaion 819.
koparkeus 724. 1.
kotula 784.
kofos 739. 8.
krafeus 717. 1, 9, 11, 13.
krateus 720. 17.
krate 708. 8, 20.
kratelegikon 708. 6, 19.
krateiron 718. 8; 727. 4.
krate 728. 20.
ktosai 705. 70.
kthma 707. 23; 25, 31; 729. 5 et saep.
kthma 729. 16, 39-41, 43.
kthma 715. 14.
ktheun 717. 4.
kuriakos logos 800.
kurieus 730. 19.
kuros ('lord') 728. 15; 744. 2. Cf. Index II.
kurius (valid') 719. 26; 725. 56; 727. 26; 728. 25; 729. 14, 34; 730. 31; 731. 14; 838.
kurif 705. 60, 69; and see Index V (b).
kourografettes 718. 13, 20, 26.
laamades 707. 26, 29; 724. 8, 9; 729. 17, 41; 743. 26; 744. 8.
lampros 705. 19, 39, 68.
lambades 705. 30.
lados 803.
lagografie 711. 3.
lagografia 714. 23; 733. 5.
lagogafos 786.
ligeus 706. 11; 707. 14; 717.2; 744.11.
leitourgyen 705. 79; 731. 4.
leitourgia 705.72.
leitourgyes 793.
lex Ilia et Titia 720.5, 14.
ligeus 729.17.
lhima 825.
lhpos 729. 19.
lhros 736. 75.
linohipicos 869. 33.
lhne 869. 27, 31.
lip 719. 17, 19.
logastikon 709. 1, 10.
lhgoos 705. 30; 708.13; 724.10; 725.36; 726. 14; 727. 23; 729. 13; 732. 5; 740. 30; 741.1; 800; 825.
loipos 707. 24; 709. 8, 12, 713.36; 716. 16; 724. 11; 725. 19; 729. 4 et saep.; 732. 13; 740. 32.
luein 715. 19; 745. 6; 808.
lutros 723. 30, 40; 784.
luxida 736. 91.
larica 812.

μα( ) 736. 73.
magister 737. 12 et saep.
mabris 724. 3; 725.7.
mabhnis 725. 15, 21, 27, 48.
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πλίθος 707. 28.
πλοῖον 799; 805.
πλοῦς 727, τι.
ποιεῖν 105. 77; 107. 29; 709. 3; 718. 11; 718. τὸ, 14; 722. 28, 36; 725. 13, 44; 726. TAs Δ. Ὁ; 7A. 7, 24, 20, 21; 743. 40; 745. 8; 787; 811.
πόλεμος 705. 33.
πόλις (= Alexandria) 727. 2. (= Oxyrhynchus) 658. 2, 6; 705. 22, 39, 43; 714. 7; 732. 2; 786. 31. Cf. Index V (a).
πολιτάρχης 748. 4.
πορεῖον 792.
πόρθμειος 732. 4.
πορθμίς 732. 2.
πορίζειν 719. 2.
πορφύρα 739. 16.
πόσος 742. 4.
ποταμός 800.
ποτέ 48. 7.
ποτήριον 741, 17.
ποτίζειν p. 263.
ποτισμός 729. 13, 24.
πούς 669. 27, 32, 38; 722. 16; 723. 5.
πρᾶγμα 706. 4; 743. το.
πραγματεία 806.
πραγματευτής 825.
πραγμάτιον 746. 6.
πρακτορεία 712. 1, 8; 825.
πρακτορικός 12. 21.
πράβων 718. 12.
πράξις 712. 11; 728. 22; 729. 21; 730. 27.
πράσον 736. 28.
πράσσειν 708. 10, 21; 718. 25; 822.
πράκτωρ 738. 2; 784. 3.
πρᾶξις 712. 11; 728. 22; 729. 21; 730. 27.
πρῶτος, πρῶτοι ἀριθμοί 736. 8.
πτέρυξ 788. το.
πυγών 669. 27, 34.
πυκνός 717. 16. πυκνότερον 806.
πυρός 708. 4 ef saep.; 718. 15; 735. 9; 736. 8 ef saep.; 740. 28, 31, 32, 40; 784; 789; 833; 836.
πωλεῖν 729. 43.
πῶς 744, 12; 745. 6.
quo 720. 12.
ῥαβίς 736. 75.
ῥήτωρ 707. 13.
ῥόα 736. 58.
ῥοδών 729. 32.
rogare 720. 3.
ῥύμη 719. 17, 19.
σανδάλιον 741, 10.
σεμίδαλις 736. 82.
σημαίνειν 833.
σημειογράφος 724. 2.
σημεῖον 724. 3.
σημεῖον 825.
σημεύειν 833.
σιδυτός 738. 9.
σιτικός 718. 8; 798.
σίτινος 729. 32.
σιτολογικός 740. 17, 22, 27.
σιτολόγος. See Index VII.
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τρίβανον 661. introd.
τρίτεια 729. 4, 5, 10.
τριάδιον 741. 12.
τριάδικηστατή 714. 17.
τριάδικον. See Index VIII (b).
τρίάδικος 729. 31, 32; 730. 12, 20, 23; 732. 4.

φορμέα 705. 7, 20, 58, 68; 708. 2, 15; 716. 2; 719. 4, 12; 724. 2; 728. 37; 732. 4; 735. 7; 742. 1; 744. 1; 746. 2.
χαλκοϋς 795.
χαλκοχόος 806.
χων 729. 6.
χαλκός 722, 26; 743. 23.
χαρά 705. 3, 50; 833.
χόρτος 705. 78; 728. 8, 38; 730. 18; 810.
χριστιανός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
χριστιανικός 729. 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>χωρίον</th>
<th>705. 70.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>χωρίς</td>
<td>719. 27; 724. 6; 725. 45; 729. 30, 31, 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψυόδεσθαι</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>δε</td>
<td>736. 92.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνείσθαι</td>
<td>721. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰνή</td>
<td>732. 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀδύν</td>
<td>784.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὧρα</td>
<td>747. 3; 804.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅρογράφος</td>
<td>710. 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὡστε</td>
<td>729. 31; 730. 10; 743. 27.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NO. 659, COLS. i–ii, AND FRAGMENTS (a)–(l)
Chrysone sçoll
Chalæi urpët!
Acabunus eueri
Suëpacciumért.
Sæbrius eërio.
Oçièçéréat eëmò
Auctiùmírus it
Aurëshomíquïa

No. 668, col. viii
EGYPT EXPLORATION FUND.

GRAECO-ROMAN BRANCH.

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.

A subscription of One Guinea to the Branch entitles subscribers to the annual volume, and also to the annual Archaeological Report. A donation of £25 constitutes life membership. Subscriptions may be sent to the Honorary Treasurers—for England, Mr. H. A. Grueber; and for America, Mr. Gardiner M. Lane.
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ANNUAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORTS.

(Yearly Summaries by F. G. KENYON, W. E. CRUM, and the Officers of the Society, with Maps.)

Edited by F. L. GRIFFITH.

THE SEASON’S WORK. For 1890–1. By ED. NAVILLE, PERCY E. NEWBERRY, and G. W. FRASER. 21s. 6d.

For 1892–3. 21s. 6d.

" 1893–4. 21s. 6d.


" 1895–6. 21s. With Illustrated Article on the Transport of Obelisks by ED. NAVILLE.

" 1896–7. 21s. 6d. With Articles on Oxyrhynchus and its Papyri by B. P. GRENFELL, and a Thucydides Papyrus from Oxyrhynchus by A. S. HUNT.

" 1897–8. 21s. 6d. With Illustrated Article on Excavations at Hierakonpolis by W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE.

" 1898–9. 21s. 6d. With Article on the Position of Lake Moeris by B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT.

" 1899–1900. 21s. 6d. With Article on Knossos in its Egyptian Relations by A. J. EVANS.

" 1900–1. 21s. 6d.

" 1901–2. 21s. 6d.

" 1902–3. 21s. 6d.

SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS.

APOTIA IHSYO: ‘Sayings of Our Lord,’ from an Early Greek Papyrus. By B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT. 2s. (with Collotypes) 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.

GUIDE TO TEMPLE OF DEIR EL BAHARI. With Plan. 6d.

COPTIC OSTRACA. By W. E. CRUM. 10s. 6d. nett.
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