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The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author. Because of the way in which the word-processing system used to produce this thesis is set up, the lunate sigma was not available; thus in the lower case the traditional medial form has been used in all positions of a word both in the papyrus texts themselves and in quotations from already published papyri. Otherwise, the form of sigma for the final position has been used where appropriate.

Accents have been added to the Greek by hand, except for the text of papyrus transcriptions; minimal punctuation has been added to facilitate comprehension of the papyrus texts, but in all cases, accents, breathings, diaeresis, high stops and marginal markings are all original.
This edition of twenty-one papyri from Oxyrhynchos falls into two parts, one literary, one documentary. The literary section contains three fragments of the second book of the Iliad, one of which presents some comparatively rare speaker indications; there are also nine fragments of scholia minora to the second book of the Iliad. These pieces, though exhibiting the same sort of material, come from a wide range of contexts, from the schoolroom to the library shelf. We have tried to demonstrate the enormous and all-pervasive influence of the glossographic material with a series of testimonia not attempted before, to our knowledge, to this extent. Much of the illustrative material comes from unpublished manuscripts in London, Florence and Rome. We hope thereby to trace a continuous line of development of this type of scholarship from the fifth century B.C. down to the Middle Ages.

The second part of the thesis consists of nine miscellaneous documents, ranging in date from the second to the sixth century A.D. Some are of well-known and well studied types (e.g. the arrest warrant or notification of death); there are two letters, one private family letter and one from one strategos to another, providing glimpses of two very different aspects of Graeco-Roman life in Egypt; finally, there are documents of types not closely paralleled elsewhere, which are of especial interest, particularly the seed-corn receipt and the axle document, the latter securely dated to the fifth century, which has left us little in the way of papyri.
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**Books**

Schubart Griechische Paläographie
         München, 1925.
The nine fragments of scholia minora edited here all pertain to book two of the Iliad; the passages covered are lines 24 - 40, 50 - 109, 214 - 217, 274 - 291 and 307 - 318, 303 - 307 and 321 - 328, 463 - 470 and 479 - 493, 593(?) - 645 and 633 - 655. Despite Wilamowitz's injunction more than one hundred years ago that scholarship required an edition of the related D-Scholia, it was not until Henrich's work that the importance of this type of material was finally recognised. The extreme antiquity of the practice of glossing difficult words from the text of Homer is well known and we can see how this mass of material had enormous influence, being reflected in different types of school exercise (the various kinds of paraphrase), the D-Scholia, to a lesser extent the grammarians and Sch.Mai. and ultimately (though not, of course, directly) the Byzantine and later mediaeval lexica.

It is this enormous influence that we have tried to demonstrate with the testimonia provided and it is our intention to clarify beforehand the status of the parallels drawn and their relative importance. It has been usual, up to now, when editing such papyri to quote a few papyrological parallels, the D-Scholia and perhaps Bekker's paraphrase, especially if these agree with the lemma and gloss as they stand in the papyrus being edited. In our view this is very misleading: unless all the glosses for one particular lemma are cited, including those which do not agree with the gloss as it stands in the papyrus, we can have no idea of the comparative influence of our particular gloss; as a result the testimonia for lemma-gloss groups that have no parallels anywhere are as long as those for lemma-gloss groups that are common. What is remarkable, is that the same two or three glosses for one particular lemma occur again and again, whatever the case (if the lemma is a noun), whatever the tense, mood or voice (if a verb).

1"Zu den Iliasscholien", Hermes 23 (1888). "...diese Scholien brauchen nicht öfter als einmal gedruckt zu werden: aber den einen Abdruck fordert die Wissenschaft."
The material of the introductory notes is ordered in the same way as that of the testimonia, i.e. (a) scholia minora on papyrus and the D-Scholia, (b) the grammarians, including the Epimerismoi, (c) paraphrase and (d) lexica. For the scholia minora on papyrus we have used Rafaelli’s list¹ and as many more recently published examples as we have found. For the D-Scholia we have consulted all four principal manuscripts for the appropriate passages of book two and used Lascaris’ edition (cross-referenced with Lushington-Prendergast’s concordance²) for the other parallels from D. For the grammarians, we have simply quoted parallels; this work is not the place to enter into the various problems of attribution (e.g. see Pauly-Wissowa on the difficulties associated with Lentz’s edition of Herodian); also, the aims of the grammarians and epimerismoi-writers were different to those of the reader simply trying to understand the text. We shall consider briefly, however, the problem of the alphabetically-arranged epimerismoi, as they appear in Cramer’s edition.

The lexica are perhaps the most eloquent testimony to the influence of scholia minora; lemma-gloss groups and even an occasional fragment of paraphrase (e.g. Et. Mag. 373,11, s.v. ἐρήμωςν) find their way into many late antique and mediaeval lexica, and the testimonia given here amply confirm several well-known relationships, e.g. Cyrillus > Synagoge > Photios and Suidas. We intend to discuss only the material that is relatively unknown (e.g. the Αἴξεις-'Ομηρικαί and the D-Scholia) and make no attempt to repeat what is excellently discussed elsewhere, such as Latte on Hesychius. Note that since only glossographic (and a certain amount of exegetic) material is being considered and not the long etymologies, the absence of a reference to any grammarians, epimerismoi or later lexica does not imply that the lemma in question is not dealt with in those places, but merely that there is no glossographic material in these sources.

¹"Repertorio dei Papiri Continenti Scholia Minora in Homerurn", Ricerche di Filologia Classica II.
²Except for those words that are so common that to look up every occurrence would be time-consuming and of little profit e.g. We have not looked up all instances of εὖ μὲν or ἔσται nor of ἔσται for ἔσται. Some other words are also too common to bother with every example, e.g. ἔμπαρ, λαοί, μέγα.
The various types of Homerica on papyrus have been fully discussed elsewhere and it will suffice for our purposes to reiterate a few basic points. For "scholia minora" we may take Montanari's definition: "Per scholia minora intendiamo un arrangiamento che presenta il testo omerico frantumato in una serie di lemmi isolati l'uno dall'altro, costituiti da singole parole o espressioni opportunamente scelte, cui segue una Worterklärung che può essere anche plurima (per es. μήνιν: χόλον, ὤρην, θυμόν) ed alla quale sporadicamente ed occasionalmente può accompagnarsi qualche altro elemento esegetico o grammaticale; lemmi e interpretazioni sono ordinati sinotticamente in due serie, per lo più in due colonne parallele o affrontate, oppure in successione continua senza che ogni lemma inizi per forza un nuovo rigo." All one might add is that occasionally in the papyri, the lemma consists of two or three words, the corresponding gloss being of similar length. Couplings of this type may perhaps rather be termed "elements of paraphrase", especially when one or more of the words of the lemma remain unchanged in the gloss. e.g. P. Strassb. inv. 332: ερη[ν]|ς|ς [τε θυ]μον κατασχοι την ορην. Elements of this type are more frequent in the D-Scholia and we shall be discussing them with the composition of the D-Scholia later.

In an unpublished dissertation, del Pistoia distinguishes between two types of possible single word glosses for a lemma: formal variants, which give the Attic form of the epic word, and synonyms. Of the former is said: "Queste [interpretazioni] rappresentano il grado intermedio di evoluzione linguistica tra il lemma omerico e il corrispondente termine in uso nella koiné e testimoniano l'influsso esercitato dalla tradizione attraverso le grammatiche scolastiche e che, nel caso particolare, è rappresentata dal dialetto attico, modello espressivo della prosa letteraria dall'età ellenistica in poi." From del Pistoia's dissertation, it emerges that there is a certain

1 Montanari "Gli Homerica su Papiro" Ricerche di Filologia Classica, II and Henrichs (ZPE 7) "Prolegomena".
3 "Interpretazioni Lessicali Omeriche" (see bibliography). Professor Manfredi very kindly made this dissertation available to me during my stay at the Istituto Papirologico "G. Vitelli".
tendency to maintain particular glosses for particular
lemmata (as we stated above), even though the former may not
actually be the word used in the current koiné

Frequently also, the papyri provide an explanation,
previously thought only to be attested in later lexica. As
Henrichs says1: "Bestenfalls gelingt es, das relative Alter
einzelner Interpretamente zu erweisen oder bestimmte
Überlieferungstendenzen aufzuzeigen (wie z.B. Verkürzung,
Vereinfachung, Verschlimmbesserung, Beeinflussung des
Interpretaments durch ein anderes Lemma, Störung der
logischen Reihenfolge innerhalb der Teile eines
Interpretaments). So läßt sich den Papyri mit Scholia
Minora sehr häufig entnehmen, daß beispielsweise ein
Interpretament, das sich sonst nur bei Hesych findet,
bereits im 2. Jh. n. Chr. in derselben Form umlief; dagegen
läßt sich nur selten bestimmen, durch welche Zwischenträger
dieses Interpretament von der durch den Papyrus
repräsentierten Überlieferungsstufe in den Hesych oder ein
anderes zu Eustathios gelangt ist."

It remains to note that scholia minora are often
published under other rubrics: "scholastic exercise",
"glossary", even "paraphrase". This should be borne in
mind, for here the term "paraphrase" refers to a continuous
grammatical or rhetorical rendition (see later section on
this). Also, the D-Scholia will always be referred to as
such, and not by the terms "scholia minora", "scholia
vulgata" or "scholia Didymi" which have been used for them
in the past.

Though the provenance of some of these fragments is the
schoolroom, scholia minora may also be quite formally
written out (presumably for sale - see fragments 6 and 7)
or be the personal notes of an erudite reader (see fragment
9, and possibly 8) in which case the hand is usually quite
informal. Fragments 6 and 7 come from a codex; 1,3 and 8
probably come from longer rolls while fragment 2 is written
on the back of a document. Fragment 4 is likewise written
on the back of a document, but might have been part of a
"book" - see introduction ad. loc.

---

1ZPE 7(1971), prolegomena, p.106.
This subject, for which our evidence in the early stages is admittedly poor, has been thoroughly investigated elsewhere. It remains for us only to emphasise the antiquity of this activity. That it was already on the school curriculum in the fifth century B.C. is shown by the now famous fragment of Aristophanes: "Quis Hodie nescit Aristophanis Fabulam, in qua Civem Atheniensem induxit cum duobus filiis, uno bonis probisque maiorum moribus adhaerente, altero novae disciplinae illeque corrupto. Hunc ut convincat pater sophistarum rhetorumque detestans, nec Homericas glossas scire coarguit..." πρὸς ταῦτα σὺ λέξους ὦ Ομηρείους γλώττας, τι καλοῦσι κόρυμβα;..." 2 From an early stage, authors made use of multiple meanings: Wilamowitz gives two examples: 3 the first is in the Hymn to Hermes, where (in l. 503) the cattle are driven "ποτὶ ζάθεον λειμώνα". This can hardly be connected with any meanings given by derivation from θέος (εὐδαιμων, θαυμαστός) he says, and should probably be taken to mean εὐωδής, a secondary meaning which we find in a glossographic source (cf. Hesychius, s.v.). He cites further examples from Aeschylus: "Auf Grund der Glossographenerklärung, die er ἐν καθαριστώ έρεχθεί, hat Aischylos gesagt εξ ὀμμάτων δὲ δίψων πίπτουσι μου σταχόνς ἄφαρκτοι (Choeph. 185) wo δίψως nicht trocken bedeutet, wie Ag. 495, sondern ἄτηςιν βεβολημένον, wie in dem epischen Verse, den Nauck bei Cramer An. Par. III, 162 aufgefunden hat. Aischylos hat auch τοῦς für ἄναθθος, wie die Glossographen, Hik. 400 εἰ ποῦ τι μὴ τοῖον τύχη, er hat ἀπέρος im Sinne von προσήνης Ag. 276 ἀλλὰ στέιναν τις ἀπέρος φάτις, wo alle Conjecturen durch die Anerkennung dieser Bedeutung wegfallen. Wackernagel 4 gives some more examples from Aeschylus, and some also from Sophocles ("Soph. Aias 1167 εὐρύεντα, das die Homerexegese vielfach zu εὐρύς zog, im Sinne vom "breit") and Euripides ("εὖνις das eigentlich

---

1 In addition to the works cited here, see Latte "Glossographika" (Philologus 80 (1925)) which concentrates on the glossing of dialect words; Lehrs "De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis", especially the second dissertation "De Aristarchia Vocabulorum Homericorum Interpretazione" and Pfeiffer's "History of Classical Scholarship" in the earlier chps.
2 Lehrs op. cit. p. 36.
3 "Isylos von Epidauros" U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Berlin 1886, where there is an excursus on the epithet "ξάθεος".
4 "Kleine Schriften I" p. 728 ff.
"indigens, orbus" bedeutet und so auch noch in Tragödie gebraucht wird, wegen έννέτης u.s.w. im Sinne von Gattin, Soph. Trach 563. Eurip. Orest. 929 Iph. Aul. 397,807")

Montanari\(^1\) cites an interesting example from the fourth century, a fragment of the comic poet Eubulus (cited in Eustathius) describing some sharlatan, profiteering philosophers as "οὐτοὶ ἀνιπτόποδες χαμαιεύναδες ἄερόικοι, ἀνόσιοι λάρνγες". This is clearly a reference to a line of Homer (Π 235) where the Selli are described in similar fashion: "ἀμφὶ δὲ Σελλῳὶ σοὶ ναίοισ᾿ ὑποσχᾶται ἀνιπτόποδες χαμαιεύναι". The meaning given in most of the scholia derives the word from α + νίπτω + πούς, i.e. the priests do not wash their feet - "costumanza dei sacerdoti dodonei (accanto a quello di dormire per terra: χαμαιεύναι)". However, besides the meaning "not washing their feet, like pigs" (χαμαιεύναδες is used of pigs in the Odyssey, at Κ 243, Ξ 15), Eubulus seems to be playing on a secondary meaning, which would derive the word from ἀνίπταμαι + πούς. As a result he coins the word ἀερόικοι, "who live in the air", "with their heads in the air", which matches well with the bT commentary on the same line of Homer: "...ο̣ὶ δὲ ἀνιπτόποδας ἀνιπταμένους ταῖς διανοίαις, μετεωρολόγους". The joke is carried yet further when we see that χαμαιεύναι is explained as "χαμαὶ ὅντες καὶ τὰ πόρρω σκοποῦντες" in bT. Montanari draws the following conclusion:"Di questa glossa pre-alessandrina è rimasta testimonianza solo negli scoli di tradizione bizantina: se era noto a Eubulo, che la sfruttò nel IV sec., essa nacque in epoca ancora classica, fu recepita nei lavori (commentari, raccolte lessicografiche) dei filologi di Alessandria e da questi si trasmise - attraverso tutti i passaggi che tale cammino conobbe - ai corpora di scoli messi insieme e redatti nell’età bizantina". With the advent of the hellenistic age came the scholarly activity at Alexandria, but this field is too large and not within the scope of this present work. Suffice to say that even Aristarchus engaged in glossographic activity (e.g. the exegetical scholion on Χ 430: ἀδινοῦ: ῶκτροῦ κατὰ Αἰτωλοῦς Ὀρίσταρχος ἄθροου, where ἄθροου probably represents a gloss rather than a textual variant) as did Zenodotus and

\(^1\) Rendiconti dell’Istituto Lombardo (Rendiconti Letterari) 110 (1976).
The huge number of papyri with the text of Homer, ranging from broad-margined luxury copies to two or three-line schoolboy copying exercises, testifies to his enduring popularity. It is thus hardly surprising to find Homer to be the most studied author among the exegetical and scholastic papyri as well.

THE D-SCHOLIA

There are two types of manuscripts of the D-Scholia—those containing a continuous text and those where the scholia are arranged with the Homeric text; in the case of Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1315, lines of the epic alternate with lines of a continuous paraphrase, and these couplets are occasionally interrupted by the text of the exegetic and mythographic material, with the glossographic and smaller periphrastic elements relegated to the margin.

There are four principal manuscripts of the D-Scholia containing continuous text: C, H, R and V. A fifth manuscript, Z α 25 at Grottaferrata, reported as a new discovery by Wilson and assigned to the same hand as that of V, has already been mentioned and discussed by Pertusi, Allen, Schimberg and Ludwich (twice), who says: "Vor einiger Zeit machte eine andere, ebenfalls ziemlich entlegene Bibliothek viel von sich reden: warum sollten nicht auch die dort aufbewahrten Iliasscholien einmal durch einen unbesonnenen Touristen zu verdientem Ruhm und Ansehen gelangen? Ich meine die βιβλιοθήκη Κρυπτοφέρης in Grottaferrata bei Frascati und den dortigen Codex Z β 11...[N.B. the classification of the manuscript has changed]...Man sieht es sind die falschlich so genannten Scholia Didymi, von denen wir jedenfalls ältere und vollständigere Codices haben". However, Wilson’s article is still useful as an exact description of the manuscript.

1See Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 115.
2See Montanari "Studi di Filologia Omerica Antica", intro. n. 23; Schimberg "Zur Handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Scholia Didymi" Teil III, p. 31; Ludwich "Textkritische Untersuchungen über die Mythologischen Scholien zu Homers Ilias I" p.4. no. 26; Allen "Manuscripts of the Iliad in Rome" (Classical Review 4 (1890)) p. 290.
3"Die Iliasscholien in Wilhelm Dindorfs Bearbeitung" RhMus 32 (1877) p. 187.
C is the oldest and most discussed of the four manuscripts ("R" in Schimberg\(^1\)). The first half of it is in Rome and contains D-Scholia up to the end of book E; the second half is in Spain and has been published in part by de Marco\(^2\). The manuscript differs noticeably from the other three: "C infatti è senza dubbio il codice più autorevole della nostra tradizione e quello che offre insieme... maggiore numero di varianti nei lemmi che non qualunque altro manoscritto omerico ed in ciò consiste una parte non trascurabile della sua importanza, ma di assai maggior rilievo è il fatto che C pur accordandosi nel corso dei primi libri agli altri mss. della nostra tradizione, al V comincia a distaccarsene e per il sesto... procede per proprio conto... procedendo oltre però si nota che ad E 396 il nostro si distacca dai rimanenti codici e riporta tradizione del tutto nuova ed ignota fino ad E 481; le due tradizioni (C, gli altri mss.) concordano di nuovo sino ad E 723, poi C, per la restante parte del quinto libro e per tutto il sesto si differenzia dalla tradizione nota ed offre scoli o inediti, o assai differenti nella lezione da quelli noti dalle altre raccolte..."\(^3\)

C is datable on palaeographical grounds to the end of the ninth century. Though comparatively free of corruption, it is not an autograph, as a few errors show: Sittl\(^4\) cites the following (\(\Delta 469\)):

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ξυστιω} & : \text{εξεσμένω} \\
\text{δόρατι} & : \text{χαλκήρει σιδήρω} \ ήμοσμένω
\end{align*}\]

which should read:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ξυστιω} & : \text{εξεσμένω} \\
\text{δόρατι} & : \text{χαλκήρει σιδήρω} \ ήμοσμένω
\end{align*}\]

Sittl lists some other characteristics: elided words are written out; \(\rho, \kappa, \psi\) and \(\xi\) at the ends of words are followed by an apostrophe, as is \(\omicron\): "Diese Schreibung, die auch in anderen Handschriften vorkommt, geht auf Grammatikervorschriften, wonach \(\omicron\) aus \(\omicron\) verkürzt ist und Doppelkonsonanten... einer Stütze bedürfen, zurück."; iota adscript is usually missing; nu ephelkystikon is often

\(^{1}\)For the Schimberg articles, see bibliography.

\(^{2}\) "Da un manoscritto degli "Sch.Min." all’Iliade..." see bibliography.

\(^{3}\) "Sulla Tradizione Manoscritta degli Sch. Min. all’Iliade..."

used where it does not occur in the Homeric text; there is occasional assimilation; the manuscript often has the augment where it is not required (e.g. B 35 δ'λιπεν and B 317 τέκνα ἐφαγεν); the manuscript is influenced by late Greek pronunciation and shows confusion between ε and αι, ο and ω, ει, ι and η, ει and υι, υ and υι, οι and υ. More details of the prefatory contents of C can be found in Part I of Schimberg's work.

H (S in Schimberg) dates to the twelfth century; R (P in Schimberg) also dates to the twelfth; V (also V in Schimberg) dates to the eleventh century. It is on a descendant of V that the edition princeps of Lascaris and the subsequent reprint by Asulanus are based. Further details of H, R and V may be found in the relevant Vatican catalogues, where information concerning missing folia etc. is given.

Schimberg was the first to try and establish the relationship of these manuscripts to each other, and his stemma, which includes D as it stands in the Venetus A manuscript, is as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
a \\
| \\
| \\
+--u--+--v--+
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
x \\
C \\
H \\
A \\
| \\
V \\
R \\
La
\end{array}
\]

We shall not detail how this stemma was reached as Schimberg's results are wrong in part. De Marco\(^1\) compares the opening of book five in C with that in HRVLa and shows that the text in C is much fuller, though HRVLa is not simply an abstract of C, containing, as it does, elements that are foreign to C. He found that C often gives scholia in a version unknown to HRVLa or A and also contains readings for the lemmata not found in the other manuscripts: "È dunque chiaro da quanto siam venuti sin qui esponendo che lo stemma tracciato dallo Schimberg va, almeno

\(^1\)Sulla tradizione manoscritta degli Sch. Min. all'Iliade..."
De Marco also criticises the second half of Schimberg's stemma, saying that it is not enough to list those cases where RV does not agree with La: "... in tutto il libro primo lo Schimberg può citar solo venti casi tra glosse e scoli in cui la lezione RV concorda di contro a quella La; orbene se noi imprendiamo a considerare solo una sessantina di versi del primo libro stesso...vedremo che le discordanze tra V ed R sono assai più numerose delle concordanze citate dallo Schimberg." In fact, since the number of variants in R over against VLa is greater than RV over against La, the second half of Schimberg's stemma must also be modified; "...già dai sessanta versi del I libro esaminati appare l'accordo tra VLa di contro ad R; sembrerebbe dunque che archetipo di La sia da ritenere un codice assai affine a V, il quale però offrisse qua e là qualche cosa di più che non V stesso..." De Marco thinks that Lascaris might have used V and made occasional reference to a commentary of the bT type in a few places. The final stemma, as established by de Marco, is as follows:
It is to be hoped, of course, that when the definitive edition of the D-Scholia is published, the variant readings in the lemmata (quite often given in all four manuscripts) will be collected together and used towards an edition of Homer (Allen’s text only takes account of the variants in C).

In parts two and three of his work, Schimberg discusses those manuscripts which contain D-Scholia alongside the Homeric text itself. In addition to CHRVLa, Venetus A and the Grottaferrata manuscript, he gives details of no less than twenty-nine other manuscripts containing D-Scholia. His only conclusion, however, which we are not in a position to confirm or disprove, is to add a third branch, w, to the u and v branches of his stemma, also derived from the archetype α; to his stem w he attributes only Codex Riccardianus 30 and Codex Ambrosianus L 116. For the relative importance of the other twenty-seven manuscripts, see Schimberg ad. loc.

From our own consultation of the four principal manuscripts, de Marco’s version of the stemma is confirmed. We take this opportunity to list some examples.

Readings Unique to C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B 29</td>
<td>ἔλοις: πορθήσεις, λάβοις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 33</td>
<td>ἐκ Δίος: παρά τοῦ Δίος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 33</td>
<td>φρεσί: ταῖς διανοιαῖς, τοῦτέστι ἄλλα σὺ τὸ λεχθέν σοι κατὰ νοῦν ἔχε καὶ μέμνησο [HRVLa om. ἄλλα σὺ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 35</td>
<td>ἀπεβήσατο: ἀπέβη ἡ ἀνεκώρησε αὐτοῦ [HRVLa simply read ἀπέβη, ἀνεκώρησε]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ?</td>
<td>νεῶν ἀπο: ἀπὸ [H] ἀποθεν [RV] τῶν πλοίων This is omitted by C and La - is this an intrusion from B 91? The scholion is found after the the scholion on Πυλοιγένεος.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 53</td>
<td>γερόντων: ἐντίμων, πρεσβυτέρων [HVLa; C has πρεσβύτων for πρεσβυτέρων; R omits the scholion]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1There is also a manuscript in Paris of the last few books of D. We are grateful to Professor Montanari for this information.
Omissions and Additions in the Other Manuscripts

Scholia omitted by C and appearing in all other manuscripts probably represent subsequent additions to the original redactor's text. Examples in H:

B 71 (See above).
B 90 άι μέν τένθα : καί αί μέν τῶν μελισσαῶν ἐνταῦθα πέτονται, αἱ δὲ ἐκεῖσε (καὶ ἀθρόως [ad. RVLa]; ἀθρόως καὶ αὐτάρχως [ad. H])
B 301 ἵδεμεν ἵσμεν [CRVLa], οἶδαμεν [HRVLa]
B 332 ἀστύν : πόλιν [om. H]
R makes omissions on a more regular basis, which could be the result of carelessness or a fault in R's mastercopy, e.g. the scholia on ϕιάδος κα. φαίμεν, νοσφιζοίμεθα, ἴδεν, μεγαρίστος, εὐχεται, βουλής εξήρκε, νέεσθαι, ἐπανέστησαν, πείθοντο θε and ποίμεν (B 81 - 85) are all omitted in R, as is the whole of the mythographical scholion on πολύαρτι (B 106). We should add that the relevant folia for B 463 - 490 were missing in R; and for B 600 - 650 the relevant folia are missing in both H and R.

Occasionally the first of two glosses (which may or may not be followed by other exegetic material) drops out in the later manuscripts (HRV). Sometimes the initial gloss of two only drops out in R and V, confirming the u and v branches of Schimberg's original stemma. Examples of this may be found in the testimonia sections of the papyri edited here, e.g. διακτόρωι (B 103), θέμεναι (B 285), ἵπποτα (B 336).

The readings, omissions and additions unique to V confirm both that Lascaris' editio princeps is based on a manuscript similar to V, and also that this manuscript cannot be V itself, unless we impute a large amount of editorial work to Lascaris.

B 27 κήδεται : φροντίζει [CHRLa]
ηδέλεστει : καὶ ἐλεεὶ [CHRLa]

B 57 ἀμβροσίην διὰ νύκτα : διὰ τῆς θείας νυκτὸς [CHVLa] γιγνεται ἀπὸ τοῦ βροτὸς βροτή καὶ τροπῆ τοῦ τῷ εἰς σὸν βροσία καὶ ἀμβροσία, ἐν ἦν οἱ βροτοὶ οὐ πορεύονται [γιγνεται etc. VLa only]

B 87 ἐθνεὰ : ἐθνη. πλήθη [CHRVLa] πρώτῃ δὲ αὐτῇ παραβολή τώι ποιητῆπρώτῃ etc. VLa only]

B 101 κάμε : ἐκάμε, κατεκέρασε [CHRVLa] καμὼν ἕτευξεν. ἀναστροφῇ δὲ ὁ τρόπος [καμὼν...VLa only]

B 276 ἁγήνωρ : (See above)

Smaller corrections of what stands in the manuscripts (when this is unique to V) could indeed stem from the hand of Lascaris (see, for example, B 312 in the next section). As two of the three additions above (on B 87 and B 101) are bT scholia, we may assume that V, or V's mastercopy was interpolated with a few exegetical scholia.
Before leaving the individual manuscripts, we wish to make one small point not made before – C sometimes joins two scholia together with a copulative δὲ, presumably to add a little variety to a somewhat laborious text. Some examples:

B 25 καὶ τόσσα: καὶ τοσσάτα. μέμηλεν δὲ διὰ φροντίδος ἔστι.
B 58 έιδος: τὸν τῆς ὅψεως χαρακτήρα. μέγεθος δὲ πρὸς ὑπακουστεόν τὸ τοῦ σώματος.
B 318 θῆκεν: ἔθηκεν, ἐποίησε. θεὸς δὲ ὅσπερ ἐφηνεν ὡστις αὐτὸν φανῆναι ἐποίησεν Ζεὺς ὑπ. also:
B 642 ξανθὸς: καλὸς ἢ ὁ πυρροκόμης. Μελέαγρος Οἰνέως παῖς, βασιλεὺς Ἀιτωλῶν.

The Two Branches of the Stemma and the Archetype

Several of the variant readings found confirmed the ι and ιη branches of Schimberg’s stemma, i.e. CH against RV. Some examples would be:

B 35 τὸν ἃ λύπη: τοῦτον δὲ κατέλιπεν. αὐτοῦ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον [CH; RVLα has αὐτοῦ as separate lemma, with the gloss starting ἀντὶ τοῦ...]
B 53 βούλην δὲ: ἐνταῦθα τὸ προβούλεμα [all] λέγει [ad. CH]
B 92 ἐστιχόωντο: ἐν τάξιν παρεγένοντο [RVLα; paragínonton CH]
B 100 - 101 ἀνὰ δ’ ἐστί: ἀνέστη δὲ [all] ἢ ἀνέχων τὸ σκῆτον ἐστη [ad. RVLα]
B 103 διακτόρωι: διακόνωι [C only] διάγοντας τὰς ἀγγελίας τῶν θεῶν [all] ἢ διατόρωι καὶ σαφεῖ κατὰ τὸ λέγειν, ἢ τῶι διαγγέλοντι [καὶ σημαίνοντι ad.CH] τὰς ἐργασίας [ἀγγελίας H; ἢ διατόρωι... omitted in R]
B 275 λωβητήρα: τὸν [CH only] ύβριστήν
B 275 ἐσχέν: ἐπέσχεν, ἐκώλυσε [CHLa only; RV has ἐπέσχεν: ἐκώλυσεν]
B 278 ἀνὰ δ’[δὲ C] ὁ πτολύπορος [πολύ- R] Ὀδύσσεως ἐστὶ [La misprint]: τὸ ἔξης. ἀνέστη δὲ ὁ τὰς πόλεις πόρθων Ὀδύσσεως ὁ [τὰς πόλεις πόρθων καὶ ad R1] πολεμικὸς [CH; πολεμικός RVLα] Ὀδύσσεως
B 282 ἐπιφρασσάτο: ἐπικέψαντο [-ονται C] ἐπινοήσωσιν, μάθωσιν [CH; μάθην RV]
B 285 θέμεναι: θεῖναι [CH only] ποιῆσαι [all]
We should finally consider a few examples to demonstrate that all four manuscripts are derived from the same archetype, α:

B 72 αἰ' κέν πως: ὅπως ἄν [CVLa] ἦν πως [HR]
B 275 ἐπεσθόλον: ἐπεσιν [CVLa] ἐπεσιν [HR] etc.
[from νήπια...CV only; HRLa has as a separate item: νήπια : μικρὰ]

The Editions

We have seen that the edition of Lascaris (Rome, 1517) is based on a manuscript similar to, but not identical with V. The smaller details which the Lascaris edition seems to have in common with the other manuscripts (e.g. νέωνάπο etc. (?B 91, see above), θωρήξωμεν etc. (B 72, see above)) could either be derived from La’s mastercopy or be the result of some collative/editorial activity on the part of Lascaris. As we saw, V is the furthest from the archetype a and has suffered from a certain amount of interpolation.

Lascaris’ edition was reprinted in 1521 in Venice by F. Asulanus, along with other Homero-exegetical works; he was also responsible for the first edition of the Odyssey D-Scholia (a much slighter volume, dating from 1528). Sadly, Asulanus’ edition is full of misprints and it is
unfortunate that van der Valk's analyses should have been based on this version. We have examined two other editions - that of Schrevelius (Amsterdam 1656) and that of Barnes (Cambridge 1711). Both of these include the text of Homer as well; there is also what seems to be a reprint of the Schrevelius edition (Oxford, 1780 - no editor given).

Schrevelius passes practically no comment on the scholia: "Scholia addidimus brevia illa quidem, sed ut iudico, plurimi facienda et utilitate excellentia... an vero illa Scholia Didymi [an attribution first made by Asulanus] sint, an vero aliorum, pro certo hoc dicere non possemus: ego tamen incertum καὶ αὐτοῦ ἀριθμὸς arbitrör, quia non raro in his citatur Didymus: nisi forte alius ab isto, qui χαλκέντερος est cognominatus, et ter mille et quingentos libros ab Athenaeo elucubrassse dicitur, hunc ipsum citet."

Unfortunately, he gives no indication of the provenance of his text of the D-Scholia, though it is generally assumed that he used the Lascaris edition. Wassenburgh condemns the additions made by Schrevelius: "...cum quod reliquarum omnium fons [i.e. the Lascaris edition] erat et splendissima, tum quoque ut sic Schrevelii additamenta, falsa plerumque et futilia (quibus tamen infectae sunt editiones elegantissimae Hackiana, Cantabrigiensem et Oxoniensis)...."

However, in the preface to his edition, Barnes gives some more details of his sources. For the Odyssey he used a manuscript in Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge (which only goes as far as η 54) and an edition of the Odyssey text with the scholia written by a previous owner of the book, into the margin. This copy is still, in fact, in the library of Eton College. For the Iliad he says: "Haec scholia nos alicubi Auctiora at ubique longe Emendatiora dedimus, adhibitis simul, praeter mss. illa, Gonvillo-Caiense et Aloysianum [the Eton copy] optimis et Antiquissimis Editionibus, viz. Aldina [the Asulanus reprint] Momrithana, Bedrotiana necnon Cantabrigiensi et Oxoniensi, Schrevelianam enim omitto, Editionibus Oxoniensis autem Iliados cum Scholiis Editio, anno 1695, suppeditavit mihi...." We can see, than that some of the changes made by Barnes were made independently of Schrevelius.
Since it is a task beyond the scope of this work to trace the printed history of the D-Scholia in full, we wish to detail just one point: the origins of these small additions in the early editions. Note that even as early as Schrevelius, the scholia were printed merely as footnotes to the Homeric text proper and there was presumably a similar format in the other early editions. Later editions were simply reprints of earlier ones - see the preface to Heyne’s 1834 edition: "Professus eram me de antiquiore carminis Homerici habitu in ipsis Scholiis antiquioribus pauciora, quam speraveram, reperisse; contra multa parum utilia a grammaticis esse allata: hoc utique valere non poterat ad omnem operam in iis positam sugillandam, et ipsam lectionis varietatem ex codicibus nondum inspectis et editionibus sine consilio antea adhibitis enotatatam elevandam."


A few examples: B 72 θωρήξομεν : καθοπλίσωμεν [C; oπλίσωμεν. ίώνων η συστολή La; others omit]. To La, Barnes and Schrevelius add "αντί τού θωρήξωμεν". B 87 μελισσάων : μελισσάων [καὶ ad. C] ἐστὶ δὲ τὸ σχῆμα ἐπέκτασις, ἰδιὸν δὲ ἰώνων [ἴδιον etc. om. R]. For ἰδιὸν δὲ ἰώνων Barnes and Schrevelius have ἰδιὸν Αἰολέων καθάπερ τὸ μελισσάων 'Ιώνων. To the scholion on B 99 ἐρήμους : ἡρημύθησαν...Schrevelius adds:"το ἡρημύθησαν παθητικὸν ἐνεργητικῶς ἀπτικίζει" To the scholion on B 312, Schrevelius adds:"πεπτωκότεσθαι υπὸ φύλλοις, ἐν οὐδὲ τεχθέντες πρῶτον. τὰ γὰρ ἤτα ἐν τῷ ὄστοκειν πίπτει ἐκ πρωκτοῦ τῆς ὑπνίδου". B 651 ἐνυαλίωι : τῶι 'Αρει / ἀνδρειφόντι [-I- C] : ἀνδρασ φονεύοντι [CVLa and Barnes; folios missing in H and R] Schrevelius has instead of these two scholia: ἐνυαλίωι ἀνδρειφόντι : ἐνυαλίος προσηγορικὸς τε καὶ ἐπιθέτως λέγεται παῖς 'Ενυσοῦ καὶ 'Αρεως τουτέστι, πολεμικὸς. ἐνυαλίοι ἀνδρες

1At the end of the "Monitum" Heyne says:"Huiic novae editioni...accesserunt Scholia Minora...ad fidem editionis Romanae ab interpolationibus liberata, necon Heraclidis Allegoriae Homericae cod. Vat. 871 ope a Bastio plurimis locis castigatae et sub finem insigniter locupletae...".
THE COMPOSITION OF THE D-SCHOLIA

"Il corpus degli Scholia D consta, com'è noto per la maggior parte, di due componenti fondamentali: primo le glosse, cioè spiegazioni di natura glossografica di singole parole o espressioni del testo omerico, un grosso insieme di Wortererkärungen di tipo parafrastico, che segue passo passo il testo poetico, frantumato in lemmi (differenza rispetto alle parafrasi continue bizantine); secondo, un insieme di trattazioni più ampie costituite sostanzialmente da istoria e ζητήματα; a tutto questo si aggiunge una quantità relativamente non grande di annotazioni grammaticali ed esegetiche; infine, il corpus è caraterrizzato costantemente dalla presenza delle hypotheseis, normalmente in numero di due per ciascun canto, di solito la prima più breve e concisa, la seconda più lunga e discorsive." Montanari’s definition¹ provides a good starting point for this otherwise relatively unexplored field. We shall not be considering the hypotheseis, other than to note that the books with only one hypothesis are A and all the books from K onwards, or the mythographical scholia². Van der Valk is the only scholar to date to have made any attempt at a long analysis of the D-Scholia³. However, his analyses are more convincing in individual details than in the overall conclusions. Also, as pointed out above, he used the somewhat defective edition of Asulanus. One example springs to light: van der Valk draws our attention to a comment of Herodian on B 316 "where A, D and bT offer the same scholion on the accentuation of πτερύγος: παροξυτόνως καὶ ὁ μὲν κανὼν θέλει προπαροξυτόνως ὥς δοιδυκός...The situation is uncertain, for we may have to deal with a D scholion which goes back on a common source of bT and D and has been taken over by VMK or we are confronted

¹"Gli Homerica su Papiro - per una Distinzione di Generi" in Ricerche di Filologia Classica II.
²For a bibliography on this subject, see Montanari, op. cit. n.12.
³"Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad", vol. 1, ch. 6.
with a scholion of Herodian which has found its way into both D and bT". The only difference between the scholia - as van der Valk notes - is that A offers δοικυκος, D ὀρτυγος and T θεύδος. However, his picture of the situation is not full, since HRVLa offers ὀρτυγος, but C, the oldest manuscript, offers θεύδος like T, showing that D and bT probably took their scholion from the same source, and that VMK took the scholion over independently; perhaps VMK/A influenced later manuscripts of D.

Erbse summarises excellently in his review of van der Valk's first volume, van der Valk's overview of the composition of D: "...Teile des Corpus seien dem Lexikon des Apollonios Sophist en entnommen, andere den Schriften des VMK; die mit bT-Scholien verwandten Stücke entstammten aus einer gemeinsamen Vorlage ("CS") welche neben den exegetischen Deutungen ältere Worterklärungen enthielt ("GS"). Diese seien z.T. aus den Übersetzungen der alten Glossographen abgeleitet, "GS" selbst könne jedoch nicht älter sein als Aristarch...Da die einzelnen Bestandteile nachweislich gesondert existiert haben...ist Entstehung des Corpus erst nach den dunklen Jahrhunderten wahrscheinlich..." Erbse says he remains unconvinced by any of van der Valk's "Trennfehler" (to prove the existence of a common source of the material common to D and the Sch. Mai.) and indeed, the sporadic use of the more learned material in D might suggest that it came to D via one of D's exegetical sources, rather than being derived directly from a lengthy learned commentary.

In an earlier article, Erbse had attributed some of Apollonios Rhodios' more imaginative uses of Homeric words to his reading of a pre-Aristarchean glossographic corpus also used by D, e.g. Ap. Rh. III 168 "Ηρωες...Ηγορώντο". The meaning here is clearly "they assembled". Since the verb elsewhere means "to speak in assembly" Erbse compares the line to D on ΔI: Ἡγορώντο: διειλέγοντο, ἐκκλησιάζοντο, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγοραστέων, ἦς οὗ ἰθορίζοντο. Van der Valk points out that ἰθορίζοντο is in fact an Aristarchean interpretation (attested in Porphyrius) and that ἦς οὗ (as ὁ ἔστι, οὖν and γὰρ) is a copula used by D to join two different sources, some times

\[1\] "Homerscholien und Hellenistische Glossare bei Apollonios Rhodios" Hermes 81 (1953).
even when the two interpretations disagree, as here. However, van der Valk does not consider the possibility that such simple glossographic alternatives are pre-Aristarchen in origin, and that even if Aristarchus gave the interpretation ἰθροίζων at Δ1, he may well have simply been giving the current, well-known version. Erbse cites other cases of Apollonios Rhodios' following γλῶσσαγράφοι (as seen in D) and says: "Da sich infolge unserer dürftigen Kenntnis der voraristarchischen Homererklärung kein Glossar namhaft machen läßt, das ein solches Stadium zwischen den unwissenschaftlichen und der späteren alexandrinischen Worterklärung repräsentieren könnte, empfiehlt sich die Annahme, Apollonios habe mit einem Homer-»Kommentar« gearbeitet, den man als Vorstufe unserer D-Scholien ansprechen möchte. Zahlreiche Übereinstimmungen seiner angeblich eigenwilligen Umdeutungen mit den in D überlieferten Interpretamenten liefern die Bestätigung". Cf. Montanari's work on the Eubulus fragment cited above.

One should mention briefly Gattiker's work on the relation of the D-Scholia to the lexicon of Ap. Soph. The extremely eccentric nature of his work is partly to be blamed on the lack of papyrological evidence available to him. He makes many mistakes - one of which is to include in his survey of papyri, not simply scholia minora (the fragments published by Reitzenstein¹ and Wilamowitz²) but also the Sch. Mai. of P. Oxy. VIII 1086 (presumably included for its glossographic elements) and comes up with the following series: Aristarchus > Aristarchus' pupils > P. Oxy. VIII 1086 > Apollonios Sophistes > Achmûm papyrus³ > Straßburg papyrus⁴ > Payûm papyrus⁵. As well as this extraordinary sequence, Gattiker believes the D-Scholia to be very similar to P. Oxy. VIII 1086 and thus places D much too early, as a product of the Aristarchean school; D thus becomes, for him, a major source of the lexicon of Apollonios Sophistes: "Die ιστορίαι, ζητήματα und σημειώσεις und sonstigen erklärenden Glossen sind also erst nachträglich.

¹"Zu den Iliasscholien" Hermes 35 (1900).
²"Zu den Iliasscholien" Hermes 23 (1888).
³Published by Wilamowitz, op. cit. in previous note.
⁴Published by Reitzenstein, op. cit. n.i.
⁵Published by Wilamowitz.
hinzugekommen". Since the three elements mentioned form a substantial part of D, it is difficult to accept that they were all included simply "nachträglich". If Gattiker had examined D more closely, he would have found several references datable to later than Ap. Soph. and indeed, van der Valk gives the date of the latest redactor as the early sixth century. Gattiker then proceeds to the incredible conclusion that Apollonios' lexicon is an alphabetised version of the D-Scholia! The "unfinished state" of the lexicon (whose main characteristic, for Gattiker, is incomplete alphabetisation) shows that Apollonios never properly finished the work and that its lack of success was due to the availability of the D-Scholia, much easier to follow when reading Homer; which is why, according to Gattiker, we have only one manuscript of Ap. Soph. but several of D. Since we now know more about the habits of early lexicographers (i.e. word lists were not subjected to thorough alphabetisation, epitomists did render lexica into more abbreviated forms) we can see that Gattiker's conclusions are simply wrong. However, two important points emerge from his work: there is a large number of correspondences between Ap. Soph. and D and the papyri: we are reminded once more of the osmotic nature of the mass of glossographic and periphrastic material pertaining to Homer. Also, Gattiker places constant emphasis on the elements of paraphrase in D, though he draws the incorrect conclusion (as Lehrs had done - see later section on paraphrase) that D consists of a "zerbrockelte Paraphrase".

The paraphrase element of D has never been fully discussed; for our purposes we shall consider any rendition of two or more consecutive words from the Homeric text an element of paraphrase. The paraphrase published by Bekker as the appendix to his edition of the Sch. Mai. exists in many slightly varying forms (see later for more details) and indeed, Bekker was able to supplement the gaps in his manuscript with others, e.g. the Catalogue of Ships is taken from the paraphrase printed by Wassenburgh.

1Gattiker is followed in this error even by Erbse, in his review of "Hapax Legomena...11 Lexicon di Apollonio Sofista" by F. Martinazzoli in Gnomon 31 (1959).
2Researches, p. 203 - 204.
The close connections between D and PB have been noted before, often; frequently, one of the glosses provided in D for a word of the Homeric text is the same as that given in PB; the small periphrastic elements in D are often identical to PB; sometimes, where every single word of the Homeric text is glossed in D, if all these glosses are strung together, they provide a paraphrase very similar to PB, sometimes identical. An example of these characteristics would be B 35 - 36; the text of D is as follows:

\[\text{ὅς ἀρα φωνήσας: οὔτως δὲ εἶπὼν} \]
\[\alphaπεθάνατο: ἀπέβη, ἀνεχώρησε [ἀπέβη ἢ ἀνεχώρησε αὐτοῦ C] \]
\[τὸν δὲ λίπε: τοῦτον δὲ κατέλιπεν \]
\[αὐτοῦ [δὲ ad. CH]: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον [in CH this appears as part of the gloss on τὸν δὲ λίπε] \]
\[τὰ φρονέστα: ταῦτα λογιζόμενον \]
\[θυμόν: ψυχήν [om. C] \]
\[αρ': ἂτινα δή \]
\[οὐ τελέσθαι: οὐ τελειωθήσεθαι, οὐ πληρωθήσεθαι \]
\[ἐμελλεν: ἐμελλε, ἐώικεί [This scholion appears before previous gloss in H; ἐμελλε om. R, which has one letter erased after ἐώικεί] \]

Compare this with PB: οὔτω δὲ εἶπὼν (nearly identical with D) - ἀπῆλθε (PB not the same as either of the D glosses) - τὸν δὲ κατέλιπεν (second half identical to D) - ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ (similar to D) - ταῦτα λογιζόμενον (= D, though not in C) - κατὰ τὴν ψυχήν (= D) - ἂ δή (similar to D) - οὐ πληρωθήσεσθαι (= D, second gloss) - ἐμελλεν (= D, first gloss). Note that the glosses given in D do form a continuous paraphrase when put together (with the exception here of ψυχήν), taking only one gloss, of course, when there are two. It is important to realise that PB cannot have been contructed from D, as so many of the Homeric words, especially in the later books of D, go unglossed or unparaphrased, and sometimes the glosses or paraphrases in D have no parallel in PB; likewise, D could not be exclusively derived from PB for the same reason. Yet, the correspondences between D and PB are not limited to single word glosses, and small periphrastic elements, even whole lines recur word for word in PB. For our purposes, we have examined the first fifty lines of
several books, and about half of book B; here are the periphrastic elements of the first fifty lines of book three of D, with PB in brackets: 1 έπειδή δ' (=); Π 1 ύπο τῶν ἡγεμόνων ἦ σύν τοῖς ἡγεμοσίν (σύν τοῖς ἡγεμοσίν); 2 ὡς ὄρνιθες (=); 6 θάνατον ἐπιφέρουσαι (φιλονείκιαν ἐπιφέρουσαι); 8 οί δ' Ἐλλήνες (=); 8 μετὰ πολλῆς δυνάμεως ἦ ὀργής (μετὰ πολλῆς δυνάμεως); 9 εν τῇ ψυχῇ (=); 12 ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον γὰρ τις βλέπει (=); 12 ὅσον ἐπὶ λίθου βολὴν (ὁσον ἐπὶ λίθου βολή ἦ ὅσον ἐπιπέμπει λίθον); 15 οὕτω δὲ ὅποτε (=); 15 ἀλλήλοις ἐπερχόμενοι (=); 21 ὡς οὖν τοῦτον (τοῦτον οὖν ὡς); 23 καθάπερ λέων (=); 23 μεγάλῳ ζωί πεπτυχόν (μεγάλου ζωίου πεπτυχόν); 29 ἐκ τῶν ἀρματῶν (=); 29 σύν τοῖς ὀπλαῖς (=); 35 ψχρίσας δὲ αὐτῶν (=); 39 τὸ ἔδος βέλτιστο (=); 40 ἡ γεννηθεὶς προγάμου ἀπολέσθαι (=); 41 καὶ δὴ τοῦτο ἠθελον (=); 41 καὶ γὰρ οὕτω πολυβέλτιον ἦν ἡμῖν (=); 42 καὶ ἐμπροσθεν τῶν λοιπῶν ὑποβλεπόμενον διὰ μίσος (PB omits διὰ μίσος); 47 ἄγαν εὐαρμόστους ἢ ἐπεράστους φίλους τουτέστιν αὐτῶι ὅμοιοις φίλους καὶ ἀρπαγάς συναθροίσας (φίλους εὐαρμόστους (τουτέστιν αὐτῶι ὅμοιοις φίλους ἀρπαγάς συναθροίσας); 49 ἐκ τῆς ἀλλοδαπῆς καὶ μακρὰν ἀπεχούσης γῆς ἢ ἀπίς τῆς Πελοποννήσου (ἐκ τῆς ἀλλοδαπῆς γῆς τῆς Πελοποννήσου).

We can see that a large number of correspondences for both smaller and larger periphrastic elements, including a remarkable one at 1. 47; there is a similar occurrence at Δ 41: D gives (for ἐγγεγάζασι) ἐκγεγένηται, κατοικοῦσι and PB ἐκγεγένηται (κατοικοῦσι). One possible explanation of the double explanations is that PB has been interpolated occasionally from D; yet that will not explain the other correspondences. Let us consider book four: Δ 2 ἐν τῷ κεχρυμένω ἑως καὶ καλωὶ τόπῳ (=); Δ 2 ἐν αὐτοῖς δε (=); Δ 3 οὕτω δε (=); Δ 10 τούτῳ δε δη (PB omits δη); Δ 13 ἀλλή μὲν νίκη (=); Δ 16 ἐν ἀμφοτέροις Τριωσὶ καὶ Ἐλλησιν (Τριωσὶ καὶ Ἐλλησιν ἐν ἀμφοτέροις); Δ 17 εἰ δε οὕτως (=); Δ 18 ὅντως γὰρ οἴκοιτο (=); Δ 22 ἢ μὲν Ἀθηνά (=); Δ 22 οὕτως ἐθέδησε (=); Δ 29 οὐ μὴν συναινοῦμεν σοι οἱ λοιποὶ θεοὶ (=); Δ 31 τι δ σε (=); Δ 35 ὦμον φάγοις (=); Δ 37 πράξεν ὑπὸ αὐν βούληι (=); Δ 37 μὴ αὐτὴ ἡ φιλονείκια (=); Δ 40 ὅπως αὐ υ ( = ); Δ 41 ἔν αν ἑννυλη ( = ); Δ 42 ἀλλὰ συγχωρήσας μοι (=); Δ 44 οἴσαι γὰρ ὑπὸ τὸν ἡλίου καὶ τὸν τοὺς ἀστέρας ἑχοντα οὐρανόν (αἴτινες γὰρ υψίλιω καὶ οὐρανῷ τοὶ ἀστέρας ἑχοντι); Δ 49 ταύτης γὰρ τῆς τιμῆς κατηξιώθημεν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (=).

Towards the end of the Iliad, where the commentary becomes more sporadic, the correspondences become relatively infrequent. Book P exhibits the same amount of correspondence as Γ, Π and ψ have very little: Π 9 κατέχει σπουδάζουσαν αὐτήν (καὶ σπεῦδουσαν κωλυεῖ); Π 16 ὑπὲρ ὅν ἀμφοτέρων (περί
To what can we attribute these PB – D correspondences? We believe that one of D’s exegetical sources included a large number of paraphrastic elements, with or without further exegesis attached, e.g. D on Δ 2 – χρυσέωι εν δαπέδωι: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν τῶι κεχρυσμένῳ καὶ καλῶι τόπῳ. ἵστεον δὲ ὅτι ὅταν μὲν στερεῶν λέγειν βούληται, τότε πολυχαλκόν φησιν, ὅταν δὲ καλῶν χρυσοῦν λει τὸν οὐρανὸν. i.e. the periphrastic elements may have been part of the exegetical commentary used by D, or a separate exegetical source; or both the last two possibilities may apply. Even the correspondences at Γ 47 and Δ 41 could have been taken from an exegetical source common to D and PB, though there it is seems much more probable that PB was supra-glossed from D and that the person responsible for this became tired in the later books; this person may have reworked a paraphrase with D to hand, replacing phrases here and there with ones he preferred from D.

What form might D’s paraphrastic source have taken? Whatever it was, it must have predated D (compiled at some point between the early sixth century and the late ninth century) and PB. We would like to bring forward the evidence of two papyri – P. Vindob. Gr. 262211 and a Cairo fragment, JE 456122. The first one presented difficulties for its original editor, but we can now see that they are of identical type. Both are fragments of papyrus codices of the sixth century and in both cases the editor could not decide whether to class them as scholia minora or paraphrase. Both present two columns of words - the Homeric ones on the left hand side, with the glosses on the right - the important factor being that every single word of the Homeric text, however simple, is treated. As a result, if all the glosses are written out together, a continuous

1"P. Vindob. Gr. 26221 Riconsiderato" G. Bastianini; Prometheus 6 (1980).
2"Scholia Minora o Parafrasi a Homerus..." C. Galazzi; ZPE 64 (1986).
grammatical paraphrase emerges. In the Vienna fragment only the verso preserves the glosses (- we give the text with Bastianini’s restorations):

A 609 Ολυμπιος
   αστεροπητης
   ο επι τωι Ολυμπιω <ι>σιω
A 610 ενθα παρος
   κοιμαθ'
   οηπου προ τουτου
   οτε μινι
   γλυκυς υπνοι υ
   ικανοι

This gives a paraphrase as follows:

ο επι τωι Ολυμπιω <ι>σιω, ο τας αστραπας ποιων, οπου προ τουτου εκοιματο οτε αυτον ο γλυκυς υπνος καταλαμβανοι.

In the Cairo fragment, only the recto preserves the glosses (- we give the text as it is presented by Galazzi):

A 43 ως εφατο
   ευχομενος
   του δε
   εκλευ
   Φοιβος Απολλων
   αμιαντο]<σ’Απο[λ]λιω[ν]
A 44 βη δε
   κατ Ουλυποιο
   των ακρωτηριων του Ολυμπου
   χωμενος
   κηρ
   τοξα
   ωμοιοιν
   εξον

Galazzi’s notes are of extreme importance here; for simplicity’s sake we have listed all the possibilities he suggests for supplements in round brackets:


For παροςBastianini says: “La parafrasi...che figura nel nostro codice cioè (se la lettura è esatta) prò τουτου, non sembra attestata altrove”.

1
We should add that in fact the supplement in 1.5 - 6 could simply read ο] κα[θαρό]ς Απόλλων; we have found examples of papyri where one letter of a word is split off from the rest over two lines (see fragment 8, lines 623 - 624). cf. PB:

οὔτως εἴπε προσευχόμενος: τούτου δὲ ὑπήκουεν ὁ καθαρὸς Ἀπόλλων. ἔξεβη δὲ τῶν ἀκρωτηρίων τοῦ Ὁλόμπου ὁρηξόμενος τὴν ψυχήν, τόξον ἐν τοῖς ὑμῶν ἔχων...

Of course, in both these fragments, one can only really consider those correspondences between what actually physically remains in the papyrus and what stands in the paraphrases (it is circular to restore one from the other). Nevertheless, the similarities between PB and these sixth century fragments is remarkable. Galazzi cautions us that we cannot immediately conclude from two such tiny fragments that every word of Homer was glossed in these codices, and we must agree. Yet it is possible to hypothesise that texts of this kind were the immediate predecessors of continuous grammatical paraphrases of the "Psellos" type (though, of course, continuous grammatical paraphrase existed before this); perhaps such codices existed for one or two books only (cf. fragments 6 and 7), the earlier books being more popular, as we find with the papyrus remains both of Homeric text and scholia minora. One can imagine someone writing out the "gloss column" of such a codex to form a continuous paraphrase, though it is more difficult to imagine quite what they would have done for the later books. The paraphrase could have been incorporated into into D either directly, along with an exegetical commentary, or indirectly, via an exegetical commentary. If one were to allow time for this small codex type to develop in length and importance (i.e. to provide sufficient material for all the books of the Iliad, as we have in PB), then one could place the date of its composition and thus that of the composition of the D-Scholia nearer the end of the three centuries during which composition could have taken place, bringing us to the late eighth century, a plausible date for the archetype of C. Of course D might have used the paraphrastic material from an earlier stage in its development.
To the evidence of these two small codices may be added some proof of a slightly different nature. Remondon published a fragment of the Aeneid on papyrus, broken up and translated into Greek word by word in near identical fashion to the Homer codices. He lists several other examples of the same type of text (to which should be added P. Oxy. L, 3553 and P. Colt II, 1) and notes that they have been found in several places in the Middle East (cf. discussion of the Aristophanes codex below): "Ainsi, cet usage de traductions juxtalinéaires était répandu dans tout le Proche-Orient à une époque assez délimitée". The time span over which these Aeneid texts occur also fits well with our Homer codices. The most recent treatment of this type of text is that of Maehler who compares his text with that of P. Ryl. III, 478, which he finds to be extremely close in choice of words used for translation. He concludes that the translator had a general Latin - Greek dictionary to hand, which occasionally gave more than one meaning for each Latin word; the dictionary was intended "weniger für die hohen römischen Verwaltungsbamten als vielmehr für die unter ihnen stehenden griechischen Beamten...". Most important for our purposes, however, is that the Greek cannot be written out as a continuous translation of the text of Virgil: "Von besonderem Interesse ist natürlich die griechischen Übersetzung. Fortlaufend gelesen macht der griechische Text einen recht befremdlichen Eindruck, vergleicht man ihn jedoch Wort für Wort mit dem lateinischen, erweist er sich fast immer als wörtlich genaue Übersetzung. Daraus folgt, daß die Übersetzung auch auf diese Weise zustandegekommen ist, nämlich Wort für Wort und nicht als zusammenhängender Text..."

What, then, was D's glossographic source? Although a Homeric lexicon seems likely, a glance at any of his sets of Lascaris references collected in the testimonia will show that D does not always give the same gloss for the same lemma (as one might have expected, had the redactor of D used a lexicon). Further, we can see that D certain does not use the Lex. Hom., though they frequently coincide. Perhaps

1 "A Propos d'un Papyrus de l'Enéide...avec Traduction Grecque." JJP 4 (1950).
D used extensive scholia minora, by which we mean here sch. min. where two or three words were given for each word of the Homeric text; sadly such a text has not survived - yet it is hard to imagine the redactor of D culling so many glosses from piles of simple scholia minora, when he already had several other books to hand (exegetical, mythographic etc.).

There is one other possibility - did the redactor of D use a text of Homer with interlinear/marginal glosses/paraphrastic elements? Zuntz¹, in his search for antecedents for an archetype of an Aristophanes text with scholia points to "spätantike Randscholienbücher". Interestingly enough, these texts come from Palestine (cf. supra), but are limited in scope (they are all biblical). However, Zuntz's description of their format, if applied to a text of Homer, would be a plausible glossographic source for D: "Die Hesychianischen Erklärungen...sind, besonders in den Psalmen, überaus primitiv: ein Synonym für ein seltenes Wort des Textes, knappe erleichternde Paraphrasen, eine kurze Hinleitung zu allegorischer Auffassung des Textes..."

Note that Zuntz claims that these texts were not meant for personal study, but to help Christians understand the texts as they were read out.

Of course, now we also have other literary papyri with small numbers of marginal glosses and comments (e.g. P. Oxy. V.841) in addition to manuscripts with margins full of scholia (e.g P. Oxy. XX.2258) and Zuntz recognised the importance of these when his work on Aristophanes was reprinted. The fourth century fragment of Aristophanes with scholia published by Zuntz there was further examined by Maehler² when he published the adjoining scrap. The parchment scraps are important because they seemed to bridge the gap between papyri with hypomnemata and later codices with margins full of scholia.

GRAMMARIANS AND EPIMERISMOI

²"Ein Fragment aus Aristophanes' Rittern mit Scholien", Hermes 96 (1968).
Apart from the incorrect conclusions of Gattiker (followed by Erbse\(^1\)) regarding Ap. Soph., it remains to sketch a few problems in outline.

**Apion and Apion’s Glossary**

Since the publication by Ludwich of Apion’s glossary, there has been much discussion as to its authenticity. The most recent treatment of Apion is that of Neitzel, and the glossary and fragments of Apion derived from other sources are dealt with quite separately. Neitzel gives two main differences between Apion’s interpretations as derived from secondary sources and those of the Apionic glossary: (i) the glossary gives hardly any etymologies, and (ii) with the exceptions of ἀπαλάμνος and ἱον, no hapax legomena are treated. "Zum ersten Punkt läßt sich sagen, daß das Glossar in seiner ursprünglicher Form gewiß Etymologien enthalten haben muß, worauf die wenigen Überbleibsel hindeuten...Der zweite auffällige Unterschied kann dadurch erklärt werden, daß der Exzerptor eine besondere Vorliebe für Homonyme hatte...Auf der anderen Seite lassen sich formale Ähnlichkeiten zwischen dem Glossar und Apion finden: auch bei Apion gibt es Homonymen-Glossen und in mehreren Fällen belegt er seine Erklärungen durch Homerzitate."

As van der Valk demonstrates\(^2\), the Apionic glossary frequently offers more than either D or Ap. Soph. and often the interpretations are particular to one passage only, e.g. πασάκειν (Ap. 99,2) which is rendered λέγειν, μηνύειν καὶ τὸ καὶςιν where καὶςιν can only refer to Φ 333, πασάκει εὖ (!?). Neitzel, however, notes that this same tendency to individualised interpretations is present in the Apionic fragments derived from secondary sources:"Van der Valk behauptet also, die Erklärungsmethoden unterschieden sich grundsätzlich, weil Apion seine Erklärungen auf Etymologien aufbaue, das Glossar hingegen auf dem Verständnis des homerischen Kontextes. Damit aber hat er ein falsches Bild von Apions Vorgehen gezeichnet:(1) in vielen Apion-Fragmenten wird nämlich nur eine Übersetzung ohne jede

\(^1\)See further, however, Erbse’s Abschnitt on Ap. Soph. in his “Beiträge zur Überlieferungsgeschichte der Iliasscholien...”

\(^2\)Researches, vol. 1 p. 298.

Neitzel goes on to examine the seventeen items that the Apionic glossary and the extant Apion fragments have in common. Four correspond exactly, so much so that one might assume that the glossary itself was the source of the fragments (for Eustathios, An. Ox. and the Et. Gen.) - then, of course, we still cannot tell whether the attribution to Apion is correct. However, Ap. Soph. also has these four fragments in almost identical form, so confirming the attribution.

Neitzel explains away the discrepancies between a further six of the items held in common by Apion and the glossary by supposing that Ap. Soph. only attributed to Apion those interpretations that were clearly meant for one particular place only, i.e. the definitions appearing in the glossary are also found in Ap. Soph., but only one of the interpretations is there attributed to Apion. A further group of four items held in common may have their discrepancies explained away if one assumes that Ap. Soph. cites Apionic etymologies, and not the glosses, with which the glossary is more concerned. The last three items held in common present difficulties; see Neitzel, p. 323 - 325. The fragments are often concerned with hapax legomena, whereas the glossary is concerned with words of many meanings.
Moschopulos' work on Homer has three elements - a paraphrase, scholia and interlinear glosses. As Melandri has shown\textsuperscript{1}, there are frequently close connections in the phraseology and vocabulary of these three elements, when they relate to the same Homeric passage. Melandri notes\textsuperscript{2} that certain formulae tend to introduce these correspondences: \textsuperscript{\textalpha\textnu\textta} (first position in any scholion); \textsuperscript{\texteta\textvo\nu} ("detta formula compare essenzialmente a conclusione di un processo esplicativo"); \textsuperscript{\texteta\textro\i} ("si ritrova essenzialmente a conclusione di un processo esplicativo"). \textsuperscript{\delta\eta\lambda\om} is also used frequently ("vale ad introdurre nello scolio termine o espressione uguali a quelli della parafrasi") as are, less frequently, certain other expressions (e.g. \texttau\nu\textomici, \textetaxi \textro\i \textpi\nu\textou\omici). Unfortunately, we have only had recourse to the defective edition of Scherpezeelius\textsuperscript{3}, which only has the scholia, taken from an Amsterdam manuscript: "In detto codice ritroviamo come opera autonoma solo, e molto lacunosi, gli scholii."\textsuperscript{4} It should also be noted that the published version of the paraphrase to book B is based on five manuscripts, all of which are representatives of only one branch of a manuscript tradition that has two branches.

The Epimerismoi

Dyck has already treated the Epimerismoi excellently in the introduction to his edition of the epimerismoi pertaining to book A of the Iliad: "To judge from the elementary grammatical explanations which make up a good deal of its content, our work was evidently intended for use as a school textbook. However, one peculiarity of our work qua schoolbook should be noted. The author of the original Ep. Hom. seems to have conceived his task too narrowly in one respect: though he carefully listed part of speech, \textomici, \textpi\omici etc. he often neglected to give the meaning of the word glossed. In later redactions this default was supplied from

\textsuperscript{1}See articles cited in bibliography.
\textsuperscript{2}"Rapporti fra Scolii e Parafrasi..."
\textsuperscript{3}In "Rapporti fra Scolii e Parafrasi...", Melandri cites the details of publication incorrectly; the book was printed in Amsterdam in 1702 and reprinted in 1719 in Trajecti ad Rhenum.
\textsuperscript{4}"Rapporti..." p. 41.
lexica or the D-Scholia*. The latest datable reference (a quotation from Cosmas of Jerusalem [first half of the eighth century]) and the date of the first work to cite the Epimerismoi [the Et. Gud., dated to the second half of the ninth century] place the composition date of the Epimerismoi in about the middle of the ninth century.

The epimerismoi are cited here in the testimonia in the alphabetically-arranged version published by Cramer in An. Ox. Analyses made by Sauppe\(^1\) and Reitzenstein\(^2\) have shown that the lemmata are taken, for each letter, from books B, \(\Gamma\) and A (in that order) and appear in the order in which they occur in the Homeric text; the alphabetically arranged epimerismoi are an alphabetised version of the original scholia-epimerismoi which have undergone a certain amount of subsequent interpolation. The primacy of the scholia-epimerismoi can easily be demonstrated: An. Ox. I, 15, 13 has an entry on ἀμφισχύναν (B 316) which begins: "μετοχὴν θηλυκὴ ἐκ τοῦ ἀμφίσχον, τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ ἵα ἢ ἐκπεμπομένη βοὴ..." but then continues with an explanation of ἀνωσὶ (B 323) before continuing: "...λοιπὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἵα γέγονεν ἰάχω καὶ ἱαχῆ καὶ ἀμφίσχον..." The compiler of the alphabetically arranged epimerismoi has used at least two sets of scholia-epimerismoi, but after copying out the his first scholion-epimerismos, he continued by copying out the scholion-epimerismos on ἀνωσὶ before adding a second epimerismos on ἀμφισχύναν. It is easy to see how the confusion arose if we compare the entry on ἀνωσὶ (An. Ox. I, 42, 4) which derived ἀνωσὶ from ἵα as well. We shall return briefly to the epimerismoi when considering the Etymologicum Gudianum.

PARAPHRASE

The history of paraphrase, as far as we can trace it, reaches almost as far back as that of glossing. The first paraphrase known to us is that in Plato's Republic (393d). He attempts to differentiate between tragedy and comedy which copy reality, and dithyramb which is the personal expression of the poet; epic holds a middle position, in that it both narrates and mimics reality. "Um nun den

---

1In his review of Cramer's edition in the Zeitschrift für die Altertumswissenschaft 2 (1835).
2"Geschichte der Griechischen Etymologika", pp. 105 - 209.
Unterschied zwischen der einfachen Erzählung und der durch Nachbildung entstehenden anschaulicher zu machen, zeigt Plato, wie die Reden des Chryses...und des Agamemnon...ohne Nachbildung, also in einfacher Erzählung, etwa hätten wiedergegeben werden können, und paraphrasiert zu diesem Zweck die ganze Stelle A 18 - 42."¹

Paraphrase was a common school exercise to aid the comprehension of literary texts, and not only Homer was paraphrased. That the same exercise was practised in Roman schools, we know from Quntilian I, 9, 2: "Igitur Aesopi fabellas, quae fabulis nutricularum proxime succedunt, narrare sermone puro et nihil se supra modum extollente, deinde eandem gracilitatem stilo exigere condiscant; versus primo solvere, mox mutatis verbis interpretari, tum paraphrasi audacius vertere, qua et breviare quaedam et exornare, salvo modo poetae sensu, permittitur". Quintilian also explains (X, 5, 5) that paraphrasis means aemulatio rather than just interpretatio².

The basic distinction between types of paraphrase is that some are grammatical, some rhetorical; sometimes the boundary between the two is not entirely clear and some distinguish between two types of rhetorical paraphrase - one of which adheres more closely to the text, and the other of which is freer. Clearly, it is the grammatical type that concerns us here and various examples will be discussed in the following section. The rhetorical type was used as an exercise in schools of rhetoric and we have examples from several later orators: Hermogenes³, Aristeides⁴ and Sopatros⁵. A brief comparison will show the difference between the rhetorical and grammatical types and thus how the former are not very relevant to our purposes here:

P 629 - 632


¹For an excellent summary of the subject of paraphrase in schools, see "On the Origins of Greek Romance" by Giangrande, in Eranos (1962), pp 152 - 155, with further literature.

²Giangrande, op. cit. p. 153, n,1.
³Ludwich, op. cit. p. 488ff.
⁴See especially "Aus Sopatros' METAPIOIDESE" RhMus 72 (1918).
PARAPHRASE ON PAPYRUS AND PARCHMENT

We have seen that the D-Scholia feature fragments of paraphrase ranging from a few words to whole lines. This is also the case with the early scholia maiora on papyrus, e.g. P. Oxy. II 221 (early first century A.D.), col. xii, l. 4 - 6: "Κομμνο[υ απαίζας :] αφιόμηνος [α]μεν του κρημνου"; or col. xvii, l. 10 - 11: "καλεστο δις ποταμοι [:] η [ισχυρος ποταμος. See also P. Oxy. VIII 1086 (first century B.C.)

There are not many examples of Homeric paraphrase on papyrus or tablets, and the ones we do possess are of both the grammatical and rhetorical types. However, included under the rubric "paraphrase" are some fragments that should perhaps be called summaries. We refer particularly to P. Köln IV 180, which is a fragment of a papyrus codex of the sixth or seventh century, and is described as follows: "Die Paraphrasehält sich eng an den Homertext, wobei kleinere Details übergegangen werden...die vorliegende Papyrusparaphrase lehnt sich eng an den Text an und bemüht sich um einfache Wortwahl. Sie ist wohl unter die grammatischen Paraphrasen zu rechnen." The recto leaves very much unaccounted for, and in fact merely seems to be a list of battle victims; likewise the few lines on the verso seem to cover more than ten lines of Homeric text. We would hesitate to call the text a paraphrase at all. The nearest parallel, however, is a school exercise published in EtPap

1op. cit. p. 506.
2Both these papyri are analysed in Howald's article "Zu Den Ilias-scholien", RhMus 72 (1918).
III (1936). It seems to be a prose summary of the sixth book of the Iliad (related, in that sense, to the better known hypothesis type) which contains a substantial quotation from Hector's reply to Andromache's plea. This is also related to the so-called "anthologies", memorable passages joined together with rather pedestrian prose.

Similar to P. Köln IV 180 might be the tiny fragment P. Colon. inv. 1755. Unlike P. Köln IV 180, no details appear to be left out (though the fragment is too small to draw any conclusions from that), but the impression is one of summary rather than paraphrase. P. Ant. III 143 appears to be a grammatical rather than a rhetorical paraphrase, though sadly it is in a somewhat fragmentary state.

Sometimes the distinction "rhetorical" is applied, we feel, too readily to a paraphrase. We refer to P. Erl. 3, L.N. 5 dating from the second century and written in a "deutliche Buchschrift mit Anlehnung an die Geschäftsschrift"; Schubart states firmly that it is a product of a "Rhetorenschule". Yet what remains seems to cling reasonably close to the Homeric text, and indeed, has many correspondences with PB. Was it perhaps a school exercise on a single sheet limited to the exchanges made by the gods of Olympus in council?

A similar text, following the Homeric lines carefully, but with perhaps more select words than usual, is the "Tablette Homérique", the recto of which gives a paraphrase of Δ 349 - 363. This is certainly a grammatical paraphrase. The editors, however, make a slight error of judgment concerning its author: "On pourrait enfin se poser une dernière question - la traduction de notre tablette, est-elle l'œuvre d'un étudiant ou d'un maître, ou bien, ne fait-elle que reproduire les termes d'une traduction traditionelle, issue par exemple, des travaux de l'école d'Alexandrie? Les rencontres qui viennent d'être signalées

---

1 "Greek Literary Papyri from the Strasbourg Collection".
2 Cf. also P. Bon. 10: "Piccolo frammento mutilo in alto, completo forse in basso...pare trattarsi di un testo mitografico, dove si narrino i fatti esposti al principio dell'Iliade, o di una esercitazione scolastica".
3 See most recently, "Three New Homerica on Papyrus", T. Renner HSCP 83 (1979), with further literature.
4 "Iliasparaphrase" published by Henrichs, ZPE 1 (1967).
avec les scholies de Didyme et la traduction de Psellos sont trop nombreuses pour qu'on puisse admettre la première hypothèse". However, as we shall see in the testimonia, since the same interpretations found their way into scholia minora, paraphrase, lexica and so on, there is no reason why this paraphrase should not be a pupil's copy of his teacher's work, which would have been based on the traditional material.

Possibly the most interesting example on papyrus is P.S.I. XII 1276 This is an early (first century A.D.?) roll with the Homeric text and the grammatical Homeric paraphrase; its format is, as far as extant evidence shows, unique: the text and paraphrase are written in couplets, a line of text followed by a line of paraphrase, which is slightly indented. It covers the Catalogue of Ships, but unfortunately the Catalogue is omitted from many mediaeval paraphrases, but Wassenburgh's (one of the few to contain it) does exhibit some correspondences: indeed, the papyrus is sometimes even simpler in expression, e.g. ο θεοίδης ηρχε Πολυζεινος (PW: ἤγείτο Πολύζεινος ο θεοίς ὄμοιος).

One paraphrase that does fall into the "rhetorical" category is that of Bodleian Greek Inscription 3019. This is a set of wooden tablets which comprise a schoolbook - apart from the paraphrase of Homer, it contains declensions of nouns, fraction tables, the conjugation of ποιειν, some Coptic (an extract from psalm 43) and an exercise known as χρείας κλύσις; the paraphrase itself is an "elaborate rhetorical retelling of Iliad A 1 - 21". There is an interesting point of comparison between the rhetorical question and answer in the Homeric text ("τις τ' ἄρ σφυε θεῶν έρωτι ξυνέκε μαχεσθαι: Λητοῦ καὶ Δίος υἱός...") and its rendition in the rhetorical paraphrase: η μεν υποθεσίς της διαφορας του Αγαμεμνονος και του Αχιλλεως εξ ουδενος αλλου εφι η εξ αυτου του Απόλλωνος...". If this type of exercise can be produced in school, then we find little reason to make P. Erl. 3 L.N.5 the product of a school of rhetoric rather than a rhetorical exercise done in school.

1"A School-Book from the Sayce Collection", P. Parsons ZPE 6 (1970).
It is appropriate here to make a few remarks about the continuous paraphrases cited in the testimonia. Lehrs gives a lengthy description and analysis of PB. Useful as his work is in some respects, it is faulty on three points: (a) the presence of alternative renditions for individual words introduced by is attributed to the fact that the paraphrase was meant to be read as an aid to comprehension; though this is true, Lehrs omits to consider the possibility that interlinear glosses have subsequently been copied into a continuous text or that they might already have been present in the source; (b) his analysis of how the same word is rendered at different places is perhaps misguided — what Lehrs considered to be the deliberate variations in rendition of a particular word or phrase each time it occurred, made by the compositor of the paraphrase (in fact a manifestation of his "originality") we could simply interpret as what the writer found in his source: if one looks up every occurrence of one particular lemma in D, one finds that two or three different explanations will be found; (c) he does not note the similarities between PB and D.

We have said that PB comes in several versions: it seems that copyists of paraphrases frequently had their own ideas for alternative interpretations which they inserted, and which were subsequently copied (as in Bekker) or used to replace the existing interpretation. Ludwich examined seven versions of the so-called Psellos paraphrase and came to the conclusion that the Psellos type had two branches. His results may be tabulated here. Key: A = Ambrosianus A 181 (13th century); L = Ambrosianus L 116 (13th century); N = Ambrosianus I 24 (16th century); X = Laurentianus XXXII 42 (15th century — here the text bears the title "Παράφρασις τοῦ Ψελλοῦ εἰς τὴν 'Πιλάδα τοῦ 'Ομήρου"); R = Riccardianus 30 (13th century with 15th century additions); b = our PB, for the most part Paris. reg. 2690; w = Wassenburgh’s paraphrase. Wassenburgh gives very few details of the manuscript he used, a "codex Amstelodamensis Societatis Remonstrantium"; he merely comments on the attribution to Psellos: "Hanc paraphrasin primi codicis possessores, a Michaele Psello Eustathii amico et aequali, paratam crediderunt; sed eam

1In "Die Pindarscholien" — see bibliography.
2In "Mitteilungen aus dem Griechischen Paraphrasen-Literatur..."
It will be seen from this that Wassenburgh’s paraphrase is the most similar to Bekker’s. Yet, even between these two there are frequent divergences over choice of vocabulary. The following is taken from B 300:...εἰ ἄληθες (b; -ῶς w) ὁ Κάλχας μαντεύεται ἢ καὶ οὐδαμῶς. καλῶς γὰρ δὴ τούτο οὐδαμὲν (b; γινώσκομεν w) ἐν ταῖς διανοιαῖς ἐστέ δὲ πάντες μάρτυρες ὑσοῦς μὴ προκαθαρπάσας ὁ θάνατος ἀπήλθεν (b; for ὅσους...w reads οὐς μηδαμῶς αἱ θανατηφόροι μοιραὶ ἀπῆλθον κομίζουσαι) χεῖς καὶ πρώην ὅτε (b; ὅποτε w) εἰς τὴν Ἀθηνᾶα ἀν nhes τῶν Ἑλλήνων συνηθροίζοντο κακωτικά (b; κακὰ w) τοῦ Πριάμωι καὶ τοῖς Τρωσὶ κομίζουσαι.

If we compare the Psellos A and B versions (e.g. for lines B 474 - 493) we see that all the variants from A in the B version coincide with interpretations (both glosses and paraphrase elements) given in D. Another very interesting comparison is between the two sixth century papyrus codices discussed above and the possible Psellos versions. For A 43 - 45, the Psellos type is the same in all manuscripts given in Ludwich. However, for A 609 - 610, Ludwich cites both A and B types1 (for the text of the papyrus codex, see above). Psellos A: ὁ Ολυμπίκος καὶ ἀστράπτων, ὅπου πρότερον ἐκοιμᾶτο, ὅτε αὐτὸν ὁ ἢδις ὑπὸς καταλάβοι. Psellos B: ὁ σύρανιος, ὁ τῶν ἀστέρων αἰτίως, ὅπου πρότερον ἐκοιμᾶτο, ὅτε αὐτὸν ὁ γλυκὸς ὑπὸς κατελαμβάνει. P. Vindob. Gr. 26221 clearly does not correspond to either the A or B type, having one variant in common and one with A (the mood of the last verb).

Ludwich, examining the opening of several books in both recensions says:“Verfolgen wir die Psellos-Paraphrase ins vierte Buch der Ilias, so finden wir auch hier dieselbe

---

1“Mitteilungen...” p. 520.
Spaltung in zwei Recensionen; b steht wieder ganz isoliert... Die Trennung von Psellos A und B setzt sich in den Rhapsodien E, Z, H weiter fort. He notes "daß die beiden Recensionen der Psellos-Paraphrase sich mehr und mehr einander nähern, indem die Unterschiede immer spärliche werden... Im neunten Buche ist die schon früher, wie wir sahen, angebahnte Ausgleichung der beiden Psellos-Recensionen wenigstens in meinen Quellen eine vollendete Thatsache..."

It may be that the B type is secondary, being the A type reworked with D (as we suggested above) or using the source from which D took his material. Although Ludwich was very wide of the mark with his dating of the D-Scholia ("eleventh century or earlier") and wrong in thinking that the various renditions in D would have had to have been taken from various paraphrases, we do believe he was nearer the truth when he said: "Aus der Version des Psellos sind die Glossen der Scholia Vulgata nicht entnommen, wohl aber liesse sich denken, daß sie ehemals einer älteren (jetzt verlorenen) fortlaufenden Homer-Übersetzung angehörten, die der Compilator der Vulgärscholien excerpierte."

**The Vatican Paraphrase**

The paraphrase of codex Vat. Gr. 1315, briefly mentioned and described by Ludwich¹, is an interlinear paraphrase of the twelfth century. A comparison between it and the Psellos type, for lines B 474 - 493 shows that it conforms largely to the Psellos A type, though on two points of detail (B 480 μέγέτος (with PB) and B 486 where it reads οὐδαμὸς τὶ οὐδαμὲν cf. PB, which should probably read οὐδὲ τι ἐπιστάμεθα for the nonsensical οὐκέτι ἐπιστάμεθα) it agrees with Psellos B. Professor Montanari has also pointed out² that the scribe (or his mastercopy) has replaced several interpretations with other variants, giving a "mélange". Until critical editions of paraphrases become available, it will be difficult to assess the value of this manuscript, but we have cited it here, not only because it may represent

¹"Mitteilungen..." p. 508.
²Personal communication.
a version of the Psellos A type (otherwise not available in print, apart from Ludwich's samples) but also because occasionally it offers one of the very few parallels for a particular gloss - see, for example, the testimonia on ὀλυμποεῖα (B 94) in fragment 2.

Moschopulos and Gaza

We have already seen the correspondences between Moschopulos' paraphrase and his scholia; his use of the D-Scholia as a source has already been discussed by Melandri\(^1\). Here we should like to give some background to the relatively unknown Gaza paraphrase. Ludwich describes it as "eine eigenthümliche Überarbeitung und Fortsetzung der Paraphrase des Moschopulos." The preface of the editor unfortunately gives us little information, simply giving details of how he proceeded with his edition. The editor states what Ludwich assumed, i.e. that the manuscript was composed by Gaza and that it contained his work: "ολα τατα [i.e. the διαφοραι ἐπιγραφαι on the first page of the manuscript] ἀποδεικνύονται πιθανότατα ὅτι τὸ τόσον ὑραίον τοῦτο ἀντίγραφον ἔστι τὸ περισπούδαστον ἐκεῖνο, ὅπερ ἐγράφη ἰδιοχείριος ἀπὸ τὸν περικλεισσατὸν τοῦ αἰώνος τοῦ Θεόδωρον τὸν Γαζάν διὰ Φραγκίσκον τὸν Φίλελφον." Further on, he compares Gaza's paraphrase with the Psellos type: "ἐκ τῆς μικρῆς ταύτης συγκρίσεως τῶν ὀλίγων τούπων στίχων δύναται τιμίων, ὅποια βαθύτης καὶ ἀκρίβεια ὁποία κρίσεις καὶ ὑπεροχὴ θεωρεῖται μεταξὺ τῆς προκειμένης καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν παραφράσεων". There are occasional variants from Moschopulos' version for the first one and a half books of the Iliad - perhaps intended as improvements by Gaza; where Gaza does present a variant, it is not found in the papyri and smacks more of the Byzantine age (- examples can be found in the testimonia).

LEXICA

Apart from the few fragments of the lexicon of Ap. Soph., our evidence for lexica on papyrus is meagre. Naoumides\(^2\) distinguishes two types of format - one with the lemmata in ekthesis and an older one with the lemmata and

\(^1\)La Parafrasi di M. Moschopulo ad Hom A - B 493 e la Tradizione esegetica e lessicografica..."

\(^2\)Greek Lexicography in the Papyri".
glosses written in two columns (the format common to scholia minora). The later form (with lemmata in ekthesis) can be contrasted with the form of the commentaries, where lemmata and commentary are written continuously. Naoumides observes that the lemmata in papyrus lexica are listed in the form in which they are given in a particular text, and that the meaning given is also usually restricted to that context: etymologies and grammatical explanations are rare. When lexica were subsequently compiled into larger lexica, all the lemmata taken from one particular source often form distinct groups (as is the case, for example, with the Et. Gen., for which see later). Unfortunately, none of the lexica on papyrus (as listed by Naoumides), even the fragments attributed to Ap.Soph. (with one exception) has provided a coincidence or shed any further light on the Homeric material we are dealing with here (- note that a large proportion of the papyri listed by Naoumides are fragments of rhetorical lexica).

Cyrillus and Hesychius

It has long been known\(^1\) that Hesychius’ lexicon as it stands in our one manuscript is heavily interpolated with items drawn from the lexicon of Cyrillus. Since the picture is made more complicated by the fact that Diogenianus was a source for both Cyrillus and Hesychius and thus we cannot always know whether the Diogenianus glosses in Hesychius are attributable to Hesychius or interpolation from Cyrillus, we have cited the Hesychius entries exactly as they are printed in Latte. As there is nothing to add to Latte’s prolegomena, we should like to outline a few points concerning Cyrillus.

Drachmann\(^2\) finds no reason to doubt the attribution to Cyrillus of this lexicon, which is well represented in the manuscript tradition; there is in fact, a quotation from one gloss with the subscript \(\delta\mu\gamma\alpha\zeta\) \(\theta\eta\) \(\kappa\nu\rho\iota\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma\) which would confirm that it was composed in his lifetime. Since the lexicon has come down to us in several different recensions, it is difficult to be sure about his sources, but Drachmann

\(^1\)“Die Überarbeitung des Lexicons des Hesychius”, R. Reitzenstein, RhMus 43 (1888).
\(^2\)“Die Überlieferung des Cyrillgl<
gives the following:

(1) Homer (in der Regel stimmen die Homerglossen wörtlich zu den sogenannten D-Scholien); (2) die Bibel; (3) ein Euripides-Glossar, stark verdorben und mit den erhaltenen Scholien nicht übereinstimmend...Dazu kommt zerstreuter (4) Glossen aus Josephus und andern antiken Schriftstellern (Platon, Demosthenes; nebst der medizinische Literatur, der hellenistische Poesie usw.)''.

Drach. notes, however, that the entries referring to Plato, Demosthenes, Attic comedy, and possibly even Herodotus, may well derive from an atticistic source. After this, the remaining entries are to be divided into two groups: those probably taken from Diogenianus (not occurring in Hesychius, or occurring in a different form to that in Cyrillus, and thus not interpolated from him) and a very large group of entries (in fact about two thirds of the whole lexicon) of everyday words, including prepositional compounds. Of these, Drachmann says:"Sie werden vermutlich, wie Wilamowitz in einer - ungedruckten - Vorlesung bemerkt hat, im Allgemeinen bei den christlichen Klassikern, eventuell bei Cyrill selbst zu suchen sein, aber der Sprachgebrauch dieser Schriftsteller ist bekanntlich ungenügend erschlossen".

The older manuscripts of Cyrillus have two columns to a page - one with lemma, the other with gloss; the more recent ones also have two columns a page, but with a smaller space inbetween and with the text written continuously, i.e. lemma and gloss following in continuous sequence. Although the lemmata are ordered to three letters, this was not always so, and a division into groups ordered to two letters (e.g. ἀρχη το β μετά το α) shows that this was probably the original design. Drachmann distinguishes three recensions: V (the Vatican recension - "Diese Rezension ist von einer nicht geringen Anzahl alter Hss. vertreten, die einen vollkommen festen Text bieten; nur die Orthographie und Prosodie ist schwankend und durchgängig stark verwahrlost. Die 3-Buchstaben Ordnung ist ziemlich streng gewahrt. Viele der Hss. sind verstümmelt, besonders am Anfang"); g (the Laurentian recension) - "Diese Rezension ist nur durch eine geringe Anzahl von Hss. vertreten. Sie bietet die Glossen der V-Rezension fast vollständig und in der Hauptsache in derselben Reihenfolge, aber mit vielen Zusätzen, so daß sie viel reicher als V ist. Die 3-Buchstaben-Ordnung wird oft
durchgebrochen. Die Prosodie und Orthographie der g-Hss. ist, auch im gemeinsamen Stoff, bedeutend korrekter als V..."; A (the Vallicellianus recension) - Drachmann gives fewer details about this group, though he does say of Vallicellianus E 11, the principal representative of this group, that "die Orthographie des alten Textes [it is a ninth/tenth century manuscript with many later additions] ist im Ganzen besser als die der Vatikaner-Rezension; prosodische Zeichen fehlen nicht selten."

The g recension\(^1\) is basically an expanded version of the V recension. The intrusive glosses occasionally fall into series; some of the interpolations recur in the A recension, which has further interpolations. These derive in part from Hesychius, the Synagoge and the Et. Mag.; the remaining portion of interpolations in the A recension are lemma - gloss groups of a theological nature. Full details can be found in Drachmann.

Apart from the references to Cyrillus manuscripts cited with Hesychius, four Cyrillus manuscripts are quoted here, to highlight those glosses in Schmidt’s edition of Hesychius (π - ω) which may go back to interpolation from Cyrillus (though of course the lemma - gloss group may have been derived separately by Cyrillus and Hesychius from Diogenianus - it is beyond the scope of this work to ascertain the exact status of those Cyrillus parallels) and to adduce parallels from Cyrillus not accounted for in the Hesychian interpolations. Unfortunately, two of these four manuscripts are not accounted for in Drachmann’s work. Codex Barberinianus 39 is a small copy, without an attribution to Cyrillus; it frequently coincides in its readings with the Codex Urbinas Graecus 157. The British Library Additional Manuscript 13,773 is a parchment codex from the dissolved monastery of Saint Mark, a large number of whose manuscripts are in the Laurentian library, Florence. The first folio bears the rubric: "Hoc est lectionarium S. Cyrilli, sed valde mendosum".

The other two manuscripts are accounted for by Drachmann; both belong to the Vatican recension. Codex Etonensis 86 is a copy on paper, made in 1619, of Codex Vaticanus Graecus 2130, B in Drachmann, who describes B as

\(^1\)For more details, see Drachmann, op. cit., p. 26.
follows: "Die Handschrift ist in Minuskel, vielleicht noch aus dem X. Jahrhundert, sauber und gleichmässig". Finally, Codex Urbinas 157 (which also contains the Λέξεως 'Ομηρικά'), U in Drachmann, who describes it as follows: "Die Handschrift gehört ihrem Text nach entschieden zur Rezension V, hat aber 4-Buchstaben-Ordnung". Drachmann fails to note that following the text of the lexicon proper is another section entitled τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ; although it usually agrees with Barb. Gr. 39, occasionally it offers an interesting interpolation. Citations from this section are marked U*.

It remains briefly to mention that Cyrillus is one of the very few late antique lexica represented on papyrus. Remains of a seventh century papyrus codex1 were found at Nessana, which consists of thirty-two pages. Pages 23 - 30 contain a theological tract but pages 1 - 22 contain the remains of 111 lemmata. Maas2 later saw that all 111 lemmata occur in Cyrillus, though the codex represents an epitomised version of the text - for example, there only seem to be four entries beginning with ξ. It is of little help here, as very few of the glosses are preserved. We may also have another very small fragment preserved on parchment - though only three lemmata - gloss groups survive.3

The Synagoge

The Synagoge (Συναγωγὴ Λέξεων Χρησίμων) is an expanded version of the lexicon of Cyrillus. It has come down to us in two forms - A (as in the Codex Coislinianus 345, of which only the letter α has been published4) and B (as in the Codex Coislinianus 347).5 Unfortunately, B contains several glosses that are clearly the addition of the last copyist; one of his sources was the Et. Gen. (cf. the entry 'Ἀρμάτιον μέλος...ἐρήται ἐς τὸν ἐτυμολόγον). About three quarters of the Synagoge is taken from Cyrillus. Wentzel6 gives further

---

1Published in "Excavations at Nessana, vol. 2 - Literary Papyri".
3*Neue Texte aus dem Antiken Unterricht*, H. Harrauer and P. J. Sijpesteijn (Vienna 1985), section VIIIlf (= Lexicographisches). = Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek XV.
4By Boysen. See bibliography.
5α was published by Bekker is his Anecdota Graeca; the whole lexicon was published by Bachmann in his Anecdota Graeca.
6*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Griechischen Lexicographie*. 

Unfortunately, Bachmann's edition is not very carefully carried out (e.g. occasional marginal glosses are included in the main text without any indication that they are marginal). Sometimes it has been possible to cite the A version of the Synagoge (both from Boysen's edition and references given in Adler's edition of Suidas). The B version contains several errors not present in A or in Photios or Suidas; an example given by Reitzenstein is Syn. (Bachmann) 356,6 where B contaminates the two entries ἄμαστοι and ἄμαστοις, which occur as separate entries in both Photios and Suidas. There is one further manuscript of the Synagoge - the A version - in Berlin, described by Reitzenstein as "eine furchtbare entstellte Papierhandschrift des XV oder XVI Jahrhunderts". However, the scribe has made hundreds of additions of his own which were analysed in detail by Maas¹: some of the additions are highly personal and amusing.

Photios and Suidas

The Synagoge is the principal source of both Photios and Suidas; they have thousands of entries in common with each other, taken from the Synagoge. Both Photios and Suidas have only a few Synagoge entries exclusive to themselves. Wentzel² gives more details: "In zahlreichen richtigen Lesarten gehen [Photios und Suidas] zusammen mit A gegen B,

¹*Der Vergnügter Lexicograph*.
²op. cit.
oder mit B gegen A, d.h. sie kennen die Schreibfehler beider Handschriften nicht. [Photios und Suidas] haben mehrere Corruptelien mit A gemeinsam, darunter schwerer wiegende Auslassungen. Auch mit B gehen [Photios und Suidas] in Corruptelien gegen A zusammen, auch hier mehrfach in Auslassungen..." Occasionally, Photios offers a correct reading not found in Synagoge A or B or Suidas; more frequently Suidas offers a correct reading not found in Synagoge A or B or Photios; both Photios and Suidas, then, used an earlier version of the Synagoge.

There is not space to discuss in details the other sources of Photios. Suffice to say that he also used some atticistic sources ("...die Heidelgberger Epitome des Harpokration, und die beiden im ersten Bande von Bekkers Anecdota Graeca veröffentlichten Glossare, des Coisl. 345, die Δικόν ὀνόματα und die Αξίως ἡπτορικαί...") analysed by Wentzel\(^1\) and Reitzenstein\(^2\). The most up-to-date analysis is that of Theodoridis, in the introduction to his edition of Photios, following the discovery of the only more or less complete manuscript. One of Suidas’ main sources is the Lexicon Ambrosianum; those entries in Suidas taken from this are marked with a Δ, and this has been retained here. Further details of Suidas’ sources may be found in Adler’s introduction and her entry in the Real-Enzyklopadie.

The Αξίως ἡπτορικαί

This is almost certainly the least well known of the lexica we are dealing with here; yet it is the most directly relevant. It has only ever been published in part (α-ε) and that publication is extremely rare. De Marco based his text on two manuscripts: the codex Selastadiensis 107 (dating to the tenth century) and the codex Urbinas 157, which has been cited here for lemmata after epsilon; in both cases the lexicon follows that of Cyrillus. There is in fact also a third manuscript, in Oxford\(^3\). The title given in the manuscripts is Αξίως ἡπτορικαί κατὰ στοιχεῖον. The many errors that the two manuscripts de Marco used have in common

---

1\(^\) Zu den atticistischen Glossen in dem Lexicon des Photios*, Hermes 30 (1895).
2\(^\) In his introduction to "Der Anfang des Lexicons des Photios".
3\(^\) See Montanari, "Gli Homerica su Papiro", n.6.
show that they derive from the same archetype; the meanings are frequently limited to one context in the Homeric text only. Groups of lemmata ordered alphabetically to two letters occur strictly in the order in which the lemmata occur in the text of Homer. De Marco cites the following example for lemmata beginning with δι-: δίεσθαι (M 304), διαβάς (M 458), διαίωσο (N 30), δίες (for δης, N 260), διαφθέρσει (N 625), διαδράκοι (Σ 344), διακριδόν (O 108) διίπτετος (Π 174), διφόν (Π 747) διά προ δὲ χαλκὸν ἐλασσε (Π 821), δινείθην (for δινείσθην, Ρ 680) δίκης (Τ 180). Some of the mistakes can be attributed to mistranscription of majuscule letters (e.g. δηριλαθον written for ΔΗΡΙΑΛΑΘΟΝ or μέγας for μέλας). U has also suffered a certain amount of interpolation from the Cyrillus lexicon.

The principal sources of the lexicon seem to be Ap. Soph. and Hesychius, both of which contain readings and interpretations of earlier grammarians, especially Aristarchus; there are also coincidences with the Γλώσσαι Ὀμηρικαί attributed to Apion. N.B. De Marco says that the elements common to Hesychius and this lexicon were taken from Hesychius and not interpolated from this lexicon into Hesychius, as this lexicon provides readings that correct those given in our one manuscript of Hesychius.

Sometimes the interpretation offered by the lexicon is misguided, e.g. ἀπειλῆσο: ἀπαγγέλωμαι (-λο- codd.), though ἀπειλῆσο is always future in Homer and not aorist subjunctive. Of course, much material coincides with that given in the papyri and the scholia maiora; D can often correct a bad reading in the lexicon, the reverse being true only much more infrequently.

The Αξείς Ὀμηρικαί have little in common with the later lexica, though de Marco posits them as one of the sources of the lexicon Ambrosianum from which Suidas may have taken those few Homeric entries not derived from the Synagoge. Finally the date of the lexicon: de Marco opines: "Quod [archetypum] qua aetate factum sit quamquam certo constitui nequit, vitia tamen quae supra attigimus illorum saeculorum ab VIII ad X usque, quibus litterae Graecae maxime languebant, propria esse videntur; tum igitur nostras Αξείς veri non est dissimile ex cuisdam Homeri libri marginibus...in archetypum migrasse a quo in libros Romanum et Gallicum transierunt."
The Etymologicum Magnum and the Etymologicum Genuinum

The Et. Gen. is one of the principal sources of the Et. Mag. as Reitzenstein\(^1\) has so excellently demonstrated; when entries are given to a particular source in the Et. Mag. then the Et. Gen. is referred to as the ἔτυμολογικὸν μέγα. It exists in only two manuscripts: A (Vaticanus Graecus 1818) and B (Laurentianus Sancti Marci 304, a codex very damaged by dampness and illegible in parts; it also often abbreviates the entries as they stand in A).

Reitzenstein\(^2\) has shown from his analyses of the letter alpha in the Et. Gen. that for each group of entries ordered to three letters (i.e. all those beginning with αμα-, then those beginning αμβ-, αμε- etc.) a definite sequence occurs every time: Methodios, Choiroboskos, Orion, Oros, Apollonios, Hesiod, Homer scholia, Herodian and Orion again; of course, each group does not have entries from each source, but they always occur in the order given here. As Reitzenstein says: "Erscheinen Glossen aus einem und demselben Werk häufiger in kleinen Gruppen zusammen und in bestimmter Abfolge zu anderen, so ist das Werk von dem Verfasser direkt benutzt". The lexicon contains references to Photios\(^3\), and indeed, one of the Et. Gen.'s sources is Photios' lexicon\(^4\); however, Reitzenstein adduces proof that Photios used the Et. Gen. himself\(^5\) - so it was composed within the lifetime of Photios.

With reference to the Et. Mag., Reitzenstein notes that the series of Methodios entries are taken up wholesale by the compiler of the Et. Mag.\(^6\) from the Et. Gen. Kopp\(^7\) was the first to realise that the AİMΟΔΕΙΝ lexicon was one of the other sources of the Et. Mag. Not all the entries in the Et. Mag. attributed to the AİMΟΔΕΙΝ lexicon occur in the text as it is printed in Sturz's edition, so that version must be an epitome, and a hurried one at that. As Kopp says: "...excerpiert von einem elenden Schreiber, der in

---

\(^1\) "Das echte ἔτυμολογικὸν μέγα und das ἔτυμολογικὸν ἄλλο", Philologus 48 (1889).
\(^2\) "Die Geschichte der Griechischen Etymologika", chp. 1, p. 11ff.
\(^3\) op. cit. p. 56ff.
\(^4\) op. cit. p. 61ff.
\(^5\) op. cit. p. 63ff.
\(^6\) "Das Etymologische Werk des Methodius", Philologus 49 (1890).
\(^7\) "Zur Quellenkunde des Etymologicum Magnum".
möglicher großer Eile seine Arbeit herunterpfuschte." Most of the AIMOAEIN lexicon as we have it does recur in the Et. Mag. As an example of the epitomist's hurried work, one could cite 426,38ff.: "μελιταία, κυνήγια: μικρά παρά το μέλλω το φροντίζω τα ἐπιμελείας χρείαν ἔχοντα, ἀπὸ τῆς Μελίτης νήσου γίνεται μελιταία", though some of the confusion could be due to the manuscript. De Stefani¹ has analysed the sources of this lexicon and found that the ten entries after ανυντο are Homeric, and similar to the Epimerismoi as printed in Cramer's An.Ox., vol. 1. Thereafter, the entries are epimerismoi on a group of four Byzantine historians.

The Etymologicum Gudianum

This is the other principal source of the Et. Mag., where it is referred to as the ἐτυμολογικὸν ἄλλο. The history of this work is much more complex than that of the Et. Gen. The fate of these two etymologika² became entwined, when, in the eleventh century, an owner of a copy of the Et. Gud. whose central folia were missing (in fact, from the middle of the entry on ἵφι to the middle of the entry on λέγω) filled the gap with a copy of the requisite section from the Et. Gen. (or rather, the A rather than the slightly abbreviated B version). All copies of this "mixed" etymologikon were made in the Cretan city of Chandaka. Colonna found that the oldest copy of this "mixed" text is probably codex Vaticanus 1708. After further analyses, Reitzenstein came to the conclusion that this mixed version was subsequently reworked in the middle section with a text that provided the Et. Gud., to produce a second mixed type, that exists in several manuscripts. Reitzenstein shows that the genuine text of the Et. Gud. used for this reworking was probably already interpolated from Cyrillicus.

One of the main sources of the Et.Gud. are the Epimerismoi. The autograph manuscript does in fact exist and is codex Barberinianus 70. It is written in several hands, the main text probably in three, with more hands in

¹Per le fonti del Lexicon AIMOAEIN
²Geschichte" p. 74ff. See also articles by Colonna in bibliography.
the marginal and interlinear additions. De Stefani realised that Reitzenstein had misinterpreted a particular group of symbols used by the writers of the manuscript. Reitzenstein could not interpret satisfactorily the third symbol, but gave the meaning of the first two as Γαύργιος ὁ Χορσοσκός and Φώτος; however, de Stefani saw that the three symbols stood before entries explaining words in the three iambic canons of John Damascenus.

The text of the Et.Gud. as it is printed in Sturz frequently has synonyms for Homeric lemmata before the entry continues with an epimerismos, e.g. 527,30: τετράχων, ψυχοντερ, παρὰ τὸ ταράσσω, ταράξω, τεταράχω... In all cases, as far as we could ascertain where the codex Barberinianus 70 gives a gloss to a Homeric lemma, prior to an epimerismos, we found that the gloss is an addition in a much smaller script and seemingly not by any of the hands of the main text. Sometimes the addition is made in a gap left in the manuscript between the lemma and the start of the epimerismos (as though the gap had been left specifically for that purpose) and sometimes the gloss is an interlinear addition above the beginning of the epimerismos. All these Homeric glosses coincide with those given in the D-Scholia. Indeed, the compiler of the Et. Gud. clearly used an earlier manuscript of D, because for the entry θεότωμαι (258,1 in Sturz), the glosses given are θεότωμαι, ποιησαί, which is what D has for B 285, but only in C and H, which represent the u branch of Schimberg's stemma. We saw above that sometimes only C provides a gloss which is omitted by HRV; sometimes, as here, a gloss is given by CH but not by RV; since the u branch does seem to be older than the v branch, we may perhaps conclude that those elements (mainly glossographic) found in u but not in v, dropped out only after the composition of the Et. Gud. Further examples of these
secondary Homeric additions which became incorporated into the main text of the Et. Gud. later may be found in the testimonia (e.g. ἱππόβοτος, ἱππότα, ἵστε etc.)

Conclusion


2Certainly the Homeric glosses in Cyrillus do not seem to bear a direct relation to the Apionic glossary or Apollonios' lexicon as we have them.
interpolierten Rezension von alphabetischen oder nichtalphabetischen Sammlungen von Scholia Minora stammen".

Of course, the individual history of each gloss would be impossible to trace, but occasionally we are rewarded, as pointed out above, with the discovery in a papyrus fragment, of a scholion predating by several centuries its occurrence in the lexica and scholia.
Introduction

These two adjoining fragments come from a low roll, containing scholia minora to B 24 - 40; between twelve and fourteen letters are lost to the left. If we can restore the tiny remnant of the next column as το[υς and πουκινηυ, then this would refer to line 55, and the roll would only have to be about another 2.5cm higher than what is preserved to cover the intervening fifteen lines. The fragment actually measures 5.3cm x 10.8cm with 0.7cm of the upper margin preserved. One of the most notable features of the fragment is the use of oblique lines to separate lemma - gloss groups on the same line, as a space-saving device. There are few parallels for this and we are grateful to Roberta Barbis for access to her unpublished dissertation and much useful discussion. In *P.S.I. II 115*, a fragment of Homer's Odyssey (φ 421 - 45) there is an oblique line between lines 437 and 438: Barbis thinks that this is a slip of the pen and that a high stop was originally intended; in *P.S.I. II 120*, an anthology of sententiae from the fourth century, a reader seems to have marked out a favourite passage with two oblique lines; *P. Oxy. XVII 2085*, scholia on Euphorion (?) dating to the early second century, has an oblique line at the start of line 27 (fr. 3), which is connected with another, different, sign in the previous line by the editors - they suggest it may signify an omission from the text. None of these, then, is related to what we have here. The only occurrences of oblique lines as space-saving devices are *P.S.I I 65*, a series of phrases alluding to certain passages of the bible that bear little relation to each other, and are separated by oblique lines; however, the best parallel by far is a fragment published in two parts as *P. Oxy. XLIV 3158* (which contains the upper portion of the column) and *P. Yale II 127* (containing the lower portion). This column of text contains scholia minora to the Iliad (E 655 - 725) and is dated to the late second or early third century, a plausible date for our fragment as well.
The script of our fragment is quite formal at the top of the column (note the carefully formed alphas and beta in line 1) but becomes slightly more informal further down the column (note the cursive epsilon in line 15). The hand is quite heavily serifed. One parallel, P. Oxy. XIII 1622 (= Schubart Abb. 80) is assigned to the first half of the second century, but we feel that our fragment should be placed at the end of the second century, as it must post-date Ap. Soph. (see note to line 2 etc.). Another parallel for this small rounded hand might be P. Oxy. XVIII 2161 (= GMAW, 2nd edition, pl. 24).

Text

βουληφορον | προς ον αι βουλαι
αναφερον- | ηται για περανθέσι
λαοι | ὁχλοι
επιτετραφάται | επιτετραγμένο|ι
τοσα | τοσαυτα
μεμπέλε εν ε- | πιμελεια<ι> εστιν
ξυνες | πακουσον
| μεγα μεγαλωσ'
κηδεται φ- | βοντιζει
ελεαιρει ε- | λεει
αιρετω κατα- | λαμβανετω
ευταν ην- | ηκαν
μελιφων πρ- | οσηνησ
α- | πεθησατο απηλθε
λιπε κατελιπ- | ξο/νε ουτοσπ|ερ
αιρησειν πορ- | θησειν
tοι| πυ| Πριαμου πολιν | Ιπν Iλιων
ηματι ημε- | παι/νηπιος αφων
μηδετο | διενοξετο
θησειν π- | οιησειν/αλ[γεα]. . . |
στοναχασ | στεναχιουσ|
κρατερασ | ισχυρασ
υσμινασ | μαχασ
. | . | .
1 - 2) The explanation is not paralleled in identical form anywhere, though the two ideas contained in it (ἀναφέρονταi and περανθώσης) are paralleled in two separate scholia (on Η 126 and Α 144 - see testimonia). It is conceivable that the explanation is based on that of Ap. Soph., writing in the second half of the second century. Interestingly enough, this explanation was perhaps more common than we realise (or than the extant single-word glosses would lead us to think), since it is echoed in PM. The reading ἵνα is however, very uncertain, as the letters are very rubbed. The very strange error in line 2 (epsilon written for omega, but subsequently corrected) only has one parallel in Gignac - P. Oxy. XVI 1953, which has (l. 15) παντελὼς for παντελῆς; the fragment dates to the sixth century; of three examples cited by Gignac for the change ω > ε, two date to the sixth century and only one (P. Princ. I 73, which has in l. 17 ερεοθαί for ερρωθαί and is assigned to the third century) is near our fragment in date.

3) The gloss is paralleled everywhere. There are two possible supplements for the start of the line - λαοὶ δῆμοι,] ὁχλοι or ὁ ὑπνί [cf. D]Λαοί] ὁχλοι.

4) We see here another comparatively rare error, cf. Gignac in the section on omission and insertion of medial nasals: "Medial nasals sometimes interchange, so that μ is written for ν; the converse rarely occurs". The majority of parallels for nu written for mu are dated to the early second century (e.g. P. Ross. Georg. II 15, l. 36, πνην for πνήν, dated to 98 - 102 A.D. or P. Lugd. Bat. III 10, l. 21, δράκων for δράκω, dated 98 - 117 A.D.). Incidentally, it should be noted that the codex Coislinianus 345 has an error in Ap.Soph. (see testimonia) and for ἱακόν we should read ἱοινον: cf. Moschopulos` explanation of this word and the epimerismos at An.Ox. I,127,13.

6) An example of a papyrus fragment giving an explanation otherwise paralleled only in much later lexica (in this case Hesychius and Lex.Hom.).

7) A compound of ἀκούω is not attested as a gloss on ξύνης. However, both ἵπ- and Ἰπ- are possible - cf. parallels drawn by Gallazzi in his restoration in J.E. 45612
(ZPE 64 (1986)) of the gloss on ἐκλεισε. The gap at the start could be supplemented in two ways: ξυνες συνες ἐπακουσαν or ὡκα ταχεώς [cf. D]/ξυνες εἰπακουσον - there is variation of up to four letters in the length of the definite supplements that we have.

13) Note that our earliest parallel for this gloss is again Ap.Soph.

15) Although only one letter remains of the lemma - gloss group before ὅ νε, we feel that the supplement λιπε κατελίπε is highly possible as λείπω is always glossed with the compound καταλείπω. Thus we have provided fairly full testimonia.

19) This gloss on μηδετο is unparalleled anywhere, it seems. The Et.Gen. entry offers the tantalising subscription "οὐ τώς ἀπολλώνιος" and it is tempting indeed to attribute the definition to Ap.Soph., cf. notes to lines 1 - 2 and 13.

Testimonia

Line 1 βουληφόρον (1) D in A 144 - βουληφόρος: βουλευτής (2) cf. sch.mai. in H 126 (bT) ὁ φέρων εἰς πέρας ἀ βουλεταί; sch.mai. in A 144 (bT) ὃ τα κοινὰ τῆς βουλῆς ἐπαναφέρεται ; Ap.Soph.52,30 ποτὲ μὲν βασιλεῖς...ποτὲ δὲ ἐπιθετικῶς αἰ ἐκκλησίαι ἐν αἷς αἱ βουλαὶ ἀναφέρονται (3) PB,PW, PV βουλευτικόν ὅφων ἀ βουλαὶ ἀναφέρονται PG ὕψων ἀ βουλαὶ κυροῦνται (4) Lex.Hom.67 βουλευτής SU Cyr. βουληφόρος βουλευτῆς B & B.L. Hes.α932 βουληφόροι: καὶ ἐπιθετικῶς μὲν αἱ ἐκκλησίαι, κυρίως δὲ βασιλεῖς; α 933 βουληφόρον: σύμβουλον. ὁὶ δὲ δεινὸν βουλευσάσθαι, ὁὶ δὲ βουλευτὴν Syn.181,7 (= Sud.β438) βουληφόρος: πρόβουλος, ἀρχίβουλος Phot.b,231 βουληφόρος: πρόβουλος, ἄρχιβουλος, ἡγεμόν., ἄρχων Et.Gen. πρόβουλος, ἀρχίβουλος, ἡγεμόν., ἄρχων, βουλευτικός (= Et.Mag.208,43) Et.Gud. (very long etymology).


1Published in BASP 8 (1971), p.91 - 98.
2Published by Wilamowitz in Hermes 23 (1888).
Cyr. (in Drachmann appendix) λαός: ὄχλος AS; λαός: χώρος, ὄχλος, πλήθος, δήμος, ἔθνος S Et.Gen. (lacking) Et.Mag. 553,6 λαός: οἱ ὄχλοι...


Line 8 ξύνες (1) D in B 26 ξύνες: σύνες, ἀκουσον... (2) / (3) PB, PW, PV ἄκουσον PM, PG σύνες (4) Cyr. ξύνες: σύνες, ἀκουσόν B Hes. ἡ736 ξύνες: σύνες, ἀκουσόν ASvgn Phot. ξύνες λέγουσι καὶ σύνες Sud. 132 A ξύνες: σύνες, ἀκουσόν... Et.Gen. σύνες, ἀκουσόν (=Et.Mag. 611,52).
Line 8 mega (1) P. Oxy. XXIV 2405 (sch. in A 78) [μεγα] μεγαλως P. Oxy. VIII 1086 (sch. in B 874) μεγα αντι του μεγαλως P. Strassb. inv. gr. 331 (sch. in A 158) μεγαναδε[τα] D in B 27 μεγα: μεγαλως (2) Ap. Soph. 110,11 επι μεν του όνοματικον "μεγα μεν κλεος" επι δε του μεγαλους "Zeus με μέγα Κρονίδης" Ap. 325,21 μεγα: το καθεαυτο μεγα και το μεγαλως... (3) PB, PW, PV μεγαλως PM (μεγαλην ήχει σου φροντιδα) PG (έχει μεγαλην σου φροντιδα) (4) Hes. 5444 μεγα: μεγαλως, πολυ Sud. 348 μεγα: αντι του μεγαλους... Et. Mag. 574,1ff. μεγα: σημαινει τρια...σημαινει και το μεγαλως...


1Published in "Scholia Minora I", ZPE 7 (1971).
2Published by Calderini in "Commenti Minori al Testo di Omero". A marginal addition of the Vitelli Institute copy of the volume of Aegyptus suggests the following reading (in pencil): "αφοντιστως εξειν." Cf. however, Lex. Hom.
3See articles by Cockle (in BICS 28 (1981)) and Haslam (ZPE 40 (1982)).
"κήδετο γὰρ δαναῦν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐφροντίζειν. Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ ἄντι τοῦ ἦνιάτου, καὶ ἔστι μετὰ τῆς περὶ, ἵναι "ἡνιάτο γὰρ περὶ δαναῦν..." Et.Gud.318,34 κήδεσθαι, τὸ λυπεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ φροντίζειν, ἐρημαί οἷς τὸ κήδω (not found in Barb.Gr. 70) 318,36 κήδω τὸ φροντίζω...(καὶ κήδω τὸ λυπώ added in interlinear space above space between end of κήδω τὸ φροντίζω... and start of next definition which is κήδω σημαίνει τὸ θάπτω... in the manuscript) 318,52 κήδετο: ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος ἀντὶ τοῦ ἦνιάτου, καὶ ἔστι μετὰ τῆς περὶ, δηλοὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐφροντίζε... Line 10 ἑλέαριε (1) D in B 27 ἡδ'ἐλέαριε: καὶ ἑλεῖ [CHRLα; added by a second hand in H] (2) Ap.Soph.66,2 ἑλέαριε: ἑλεῖ Mosch. ἑλέαριε: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑλεῖ (3) PB,PW,PV,PM,PG καὶ ἑλεῖ (4) Hes.ε1938 ἑλέαριε: ὑκτεῖρε, ἑλεῖ

Line 11 αἱρεῖτω (1) P. Berol. inv. 115181 (sch. in Γ446) [αἱρεῖ λῃθ][βανὶ D in B 34 αἱρεῖτω: καταλαμβανέτω D in B 141 αἱρήσουμεν: πορθήσουμεν, λάβωμεν D in B 329 αἱρήσουμεν: πορθήσουμεν D in Γ446 αἱρεῖ: καταλαμβάνει, κρατεῖ D in P 488 αἱρήσουμεν: λήψεσθαι D in Ω 206 αἱρεῖσαι: λήψεται (2) sch.mai. in P 463 (bT) ἀρέεις: καταλαμβάνεν...νῦν δὲ ἀνήρει Herod.(περ' Πλατονίκης Προσωδίας) Π,118,7 τὸ αἱρὲ περισσόμενον δασύνεται, σημαίνον τὸ καταλαμβάνω Ap.Soph.292,20 αἱρήσειν β': λήψεσθαι ἂ πορθήσειν (3) PB,FW, καταλαμβανότω PV λαμβανότω PM,PG κατακρατεῖτω (4) Hes.α2065 αἱρεῖτω: καταλαμβανέω; α2081 αἱρήσαντες: πορθήσαντες; α2085 *αἱρήσουμεν: πορθήσουμεν νγΑ ἐξερημόσουμεν νγ Cyρ. αἱρήσουμεν: πορθήσουμεν, ἐξερημόσουμεν B & B.L.; B reads ἐξερημόσουμεν) Lex.Hom.179 αἱρήσουμεν: πορθήσουμεν Syn.45,11-12 αἱρήσειν: συλλαβέω, ἐλκύσαι, χειρόσασθαι, πορθήσαι; 45,13 αἱρεῖ: καταλαμβάνει 45,14 αἱρήσεις: λάβειν 48,7 αἱρείν: λαμβάνει καὶ καταλαμβάνειν Phot.α641 αἱρεῖ: καταλαμβάνει; α643 (=Sud.α1306) αἱρήσεις;[κρατήσειν ad. Sud.] συλλαβεῖν, ἐλκύσαι, χειρόσασθαι; α644 αἱρήσασθαι: λάβειν (= Sud.α1305); α645 αἱρήσουμεν: λήψομαι, σκέψομαι, βουλέσομαι, ἐκλέξομαι (= Sud.α1308 which omits ἐκλέξομαι) Sud.α1309 αἱρείτω: κατασχέω; α1297 αἱρεῖ: καταλαμβάνει, καὶ αἱρεῖν κατὰ κράτος τι λαμβάνειν καὶ καταλαμβάνειν Et.Gen.Β αἱρεῖτω: ἄ καταλαβεί Et.Mag.37,54 αἱρῶ σημαίνει ἔξ...αἰρέω αἱρὸ τὸ πόρθω, ὡς τὸ "φη γὰρ ὁ γαίρησειν Πριάμου πόλιν" ἀντὶ τοῦ πορθῆσειν. αἱρῶ τὸ καταλαμβάνω, ἔξ οὖ "μὴ δὲ σε λήθη αἱρεῖτω" καταλαμβανέω... Et.Gud.53,7 αἱρεῖτω: ἐκ τοῦ αἱρῶ, τὸ καταβάλλω...; 53,9 αἱρήσειν: πορθήσειν


2Published in ForschBer 10 (1968) p.113ff.
Asp; e7232 εὑτε: ἡνίκα, ὡτε, καὶ καλῶς Sud.e3765 εὑτε: ἐστί καὶ χρονικόν, ἀντί τοῦ ἡνίκα... Et.Mag.398,40 εὑταν πολλοί [...] Ἐλλάδος α', ἀντί τοῦ ὀπόταν...

Line 13 μελίφρων (1) D in B 34 μελίφρων: ὁ ἡδύς (2) Ap.Soph.110,24 μελίφρων: προσφήνης, διὰ τὸ γλυκαίνει τὰς φρένας Mosch. "ὁ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ μέλιτος γλυκύτητα ἡδύς..." (3) PB, PW ἡδύς PV γλυκὺς PM, PG ὁ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ μέλιτος γλυκύτητα ἡδύνων (4) Hes.μ739 μελίφρωνα: προσφήνη, καὶ ἡδέα, διὰ τὸ γλυκαίνει τὰς φρένας καὶ μελίφρων, τὸ αὐτὸ Ag Syn.297,16 ἡδύς, γλυκαίνων τὰς φρένας (= Sud.μ530) Et.Gud.386,7...ο γλυκαίνων τὰς φρένας


Line 15 λίπε (1) P. Strassb. inv. gr. 1015 (sch. in E 204) λίπον κατελίπον Tablette Homérique (sch. in Δ 364) λίπεν: κατελίπεν D in B 35 τὸν δὲ λίπεν: τὸῦτον δὲ κατέλιπεν (2) / (3) PB, PW, PV, PM, PG κατελίπεν (4) Hes.λ1093 λίπεν: κατελίπεν. ελειφθή Lex.Hom. λίπες: κατελίπες (ms. has λείπες:κατελείπες);λείπει: καταλείπει(1); λίπον: κατελίπον (ms. has λείπον: κατελείπον); λίποιτο: καταλίποιτο (ms. has λείποτο: καταλείποτο)

Line 15 ὁ γε (1) P. Oxy. XXIV 2405 (sch. in A 65) [ο γε] ουτος γε (sch. in A 116) το γε: τοῦτο [γε] (2) / (3) PB, PW, PV, PM, PG οὐτός (4) cf. Lex.Hom. ὁ γάρ: αὐτός γάρ Hes. ὅγε: οὖτος γε Syn.312,9 ὅγε: ὁ δὲ

Line 16 αἵρήσειν (1) / (2) See under αἵρεσιν (3) PB, PW, PV porbήσειν PM, PG αἵρήσειν (4) See under αἵρεσιν.


άφρων (Β 873), ἀπειρός (3) PB, PW, ἀνότος PV, PM, PG ἀφρων (4) Lex. Hom. νήπια: μικρότατα Cyr. νήπιον: μικρὸν ἢ ἀφρόνεστατον B.L. Hes.v506 νήπιον: νεογνὸν, νεώτερον μικρὸν [ɡn]; ἀνότον: ἀφρων, ἢ ἀφρόνεστατον gn Syn.308,28 νήπιοι: ἄφρονες, ἀνότοι Συd.v325 νήπιος: ἀφρων, ἀνότος...

Et. Mag.604,14 (not from Et. Gen.) νήπιος: ἀφρων, ἀνότος, παρὰ τὸ ἥπιος, πλεονάσμιω τοῦ ὕ πράος... ἦ νήπιος καὶ κατὰ συγκοπὴν νήπιος ὁ μὴ δυναμένος λέγειν... cf. Lex. Cyr. (An. Par. IV, 186,21) νήπιος καὶ νήπιος κατὰ συναλληφῆν ὁ λέγειν μὴ δυναμένος, οὔτω Φιλόξενος, ἦπιος γὰρ ὁ πράος

Line 19 μήδετο (1) P. Harris I 10 (sch. in B 384) μεδεσθον ἄφρωντιζεσθω D in B 38 μήδετο: ἐβουλεύτω D in B 360 εὐ μήδες: σὺ δὲ καλὸς 


μῆδε: bouleύματα; μήδε: bouleυόμενον Με.1151 *μήδετο: ἐβουλεύοι, ἐτεχνάζετο, ἐβουλεύοτον ASp; μι1153 μηθ'μενον: ποιῶν, bouleυόμενον 


Et. Mag. 575,1 (μήδεν entry) ἦ παρὰ τὸ μήδω τὸ bouleύομαι...

Line 20 θήσειν (1) D in B 39 θήσειν: ποιήσειν (2) / (3) PB, PW ποιήσειν PV, PM, PG ἐπιθήσειν (4) Hes.0552 θήσει: ὑποθήσεται, ποιήσει (in 1 101) Syn.256,20 θήσομαι: ὁρίσω, ποιήσω, ἀναδείξω 

Et. Gud. 262,29 θήσειν: ἀφορίζειν, ποιήσειν (in fact a marginal addition in the autograph ms.); 262,30 θήσειν σημαίνει δύο, τὸ ποιεῖν καὶ τὸ θηλάζειν... (main text entry in autograph)

Line 21 στοναχας (1) D in B 39, B 356, B 590 στοναχας τε: καὶ στεναγμοὺς (2) / (3) PB, PW, PV, PM, PG στεναγμοὺς (4) Lex. Hom. 


B Et. Gud. (folio missing)

Line 22 κρατεράς (1) D in B 40 κατὰ κρατερὰς ύσμινας: κατὰ τὰς ἴσχυρας máχας (2) / (3) PB, PW κραταίας PV ἴσχυρας PM, PG κρατεράς 

(4) Lex. Hom. κρατεράς: ἴσχυρας Hes. κ3997 *κρατερόν: ἴσχυρόν 


κρατερός: ἴσχυρος, ἀπειλητικός Et. Gud. (folio missing)

Line 23 ύσμινας (1) See under κρατεράς (2) / (3) PB, PW, PV, PM, PG máχας (4) Lex. Hom. ύσμινας: máχας: ύσμην: máχη 

Hes. α831 ύσμινας: máχας; α832 ύσμην: máχη, παράταξις, ταραχῆ, σύνοδος
This sheet of papyrus bears the remains of two columns of sch. min. on the verso of an extremely badly preserved document. The layout (two parallel columns of lemmata and glosses, interrupted only when the explanation runs to more than a few words, in which case the second and successive lines start below the lemma but are slightly indented - see, for example, col.i, lines 17–20) is not strictly adhered to; since there also seem to be dictation errors (e.g. see note to col.i, l.19) this is certainly a school exercise, covering B 50–109+. The papyrus is split down the middle, between the columns, but the text is continuous between the two halves. The pieces are badly mutilated around the edges, several fibres have been stripped off in the course of time and there are many worm-holes. The original height was 15.6cm with a margin of 0.8cm at the top and 1.2cm at the bottom; the first piece is 7.6cm wide and the second 6.1cm at its widest point. However, the second piece would have been at least 7cm wide (estimating from the space required for supplements), giving a total original minimum width of ca. 14.6cm. Iota adscript is not written.

The third fragment, which clearly belongs to the bottom of column two (owing to a marked difference in colouration which stretches for the whole height of the column) bears only a few letters. The fragment belongs approximately under the column of glosses in col. ii and the highest it can be placed is with its line 1 corresponding to line 22 of col. ii. Because at this point it seems that there were several longer scholia in succession (cf. D), fragment three
is of little help in reconstructing the text, since the scholia at the base of col. ii do not correspond to any we have found.

The hand is quite informal; letters occasionally touch, but there are no real ligatures. Because of its informality, it is not really bilinear. The letter kappa is usually wide and this hand may perhaps be placed at the very start of the third century, between the hand of fragment 1 and that of fragment 4 (see introductions to both of these).

Text - Column 1

λιγυφθοιγησοισι  οξυφωνοισι
ηνερο[y][t]ολι  συνηθροίζοντο
ι[ζε]  [ε]  εκαθίζεν
πυρ[κιν]νη  συνετην
πρ[θυν]νετο  παρεσκευαζε[ι]
ε[γυπ][πν]ιον  ενυπνον
ε[ωκε]ι  ωμιοιντο
απ[οπταμ]ενος  αποστασ[ι]
ανη[κε][]  εφηκε
η θεμις εστι  ως πρόση[σ]ιν ε-

στι

πολυκλη[σισ]αι  πολυκαθέ[δ]ροις
ερη[τυ]ειν  κωλυειν
νμαθοεντος  ουτως ημα[θ]οεις η

Πυλος καλείται από του..[ 15
-θεοντος ποσάμου

ηνη[τρ]εσ  ηγεμονεσ
μελ[θο]ντες  βασίλεισ
κεν[φέ]μεν  μεμφειν
νοσ[φιζ]ομεθα  χωριζομεθα
νε[ε]σταί  πορ[ε]ςταί
ποιμενι λασων  βι[ασ]ιλει τοιν οχλων
σκηπτο[υ]χοι  σκηπτοφορ[οι
επεσε[ν]υντο  εφωρμουν]
αδιν[λ]αων  αθρων
γλα[φ]υρησ  κοιλησ
βοτρ[υδο][ν]  βοτρυσι
ειαρινοισιν[  εφηγ[ο][
αλις ] [δαφι]λω[ς

20
25
πεποτηνα]ται
πετον[ται
ηιονος
|αιγ]ιαλο[ν

Text - Column 2

εστίχρων[το]
ιλαδόν
οσσα[φη[μη]
δεδ[η]ει
ιεναι]
οτρ[ι]νουσα
τε]τρη[χει]
στεν[αχι]ζε
ι[ζον]των
ομ]αδος
σχ[λ]οιατ
ερ[η]η[τε]ψ[θεν]
κλαμε
δι]ακτορ]ω
αργειφο]ντη

φονεύ]σεν η επι Αργ]ο]
|σ
π[λη] [ξιππω [ ]
 ) . . .

ιππικω
επικλειθε] 
σ το

ερεισα]μενο]ς
μετη]δα

Text - Fragment 3

]ειν
] δε
]. ολ
].
]]
]. 5
]. σι
]. τοσ]
]. σι
2) The lower horizontal of zeta is just visible.

6) The word ευπνον is not attested elsewhere, and it would seem most likely that the explanation intended was ἐν ὑπνω, and that the similarity of this to ἐνύπνον produced ευπνον.

8) Though ἀποστάς is feasible (despite being unattested), one wonders whether ἀποστάς was in fact not intended (cf. D, Hes.).

9) The compound αφ- instead of αφ- only seems to be attested in the exegetical scholion on Φ 523 (see testimonia).

11) All that this line contains is the ἀν of το γε, continued from line 10. Note the indentation for the continuation of the scholion.

14 - 16) It is highly unfortunate that the crucial letters of this scholion are lost: did the papyrus read μαθοντος or ημαθοντος? Here are remains of two letters here, but a third could have been part of the papyrus now broken off. All that remains of the first letter after του is a vertical descender. Ap.Soph. and P.Iand.I 2 give the origin of the epithet as the river running by Pylos, though Ap.Soph. calls it μαθος and the papyrus Άμαθο, which comes again in the Et.Mag. The exegetical scholion on B 77 gives ...η Άμαθος ποταμος Πυλος... (obelisation by Erbse).

19) We must restore κεφέμεν (for φαίμεν) μεμφείν. Unfortunately, this is nonsensical and we can only presume that the word μεμφείν featured in the teacher's explanation of the Homeric lemma.

21) Ρεάδ νεοτάς, πορευώσάται. Tau for theta is a common error in the papyri, see Gignac, I, p.87.

23) Although the form σκηπτοφόρος is by far the commoner of the two, σκηπτοφόρος does occur once in the papyri - though this might reasonably be attributed to scribal error.

24) For ου for ω, see Gignac, I, p. 208.
27) Not attested elsewhere. The interpretation θορυμία is rather bold grammatically and one wonders if this is all the scribe wrote down of a longer explanation given by the teacher.

Commentary - Column 2

3) The scribe has written φημη, the first part of the explanation οςωα in the lemmata column.

4) This rendition of δεπητι is unique, and the idea of φημη actually shouting at the Greek army is novel; the commanding idea was usually put on ότρυνοσμα in antiquity. Of course it is difficult to provide a proper supplement - διαβοη[σι] can only be future (διαβοη[σα]i) or aorist participle (διαβοη[σα]), the latter, perhaps, being preferable, though neither is entirely intelligible. The explanation might simply be that the writer misheard his teacher - though it is hard to imagine, as with μημφην in column one, exactly what was intended.

5) Though the lemma is lost, and ηναι is usually glossed πορευησωαι (examples too numerous to list), the gloss πορευησαι also occurs. In section two of the testimonia, only the πορευησαι parallels are listed.

6) A rare gloss, only paralleled in Hes. and P.V.

8) The gloss could be supplemented as εσπεν[ε] (cf. D, P.Oxy. VIII 1086, PB, PW) or εσπεν[αζε] (Cyr., Syn.). Note that P. Colon. inv. 53 on B 95 should be restored to read στεναχιζειο ηχον απετελει (cf. D in B 95 ύπο δ' διεσταχιζετο ναια: υπεστενε η γι και ηχον απετελει).

9) The use of καθημαι rather than καθιζω to gloss ιζω is only paralleled in Cyr. and Et.Mag.

15 - 17) Much searching has not produced a parallel with identical wording. We suspect that we have in fact an abbreviated version of a teacher's comment on this word. The word at the start of line 16 should probably be supplemented as Εφον[ους], referring to the legend that Hermes slew Argos when he was acting as guard to Io, after Zeus had become enamoured of Io and Hera had set up Argos to keep his several eyes on her. This legend is repeated in all the sources that give more than a single-word gloss. One would expect τωι Ερμα to be followed by ον Αργον, but

1Edited by Henrichs in ZPE 7 (1971).
the trace of a single letter after Ερμη is not compatible with omicron. This first explanation of the origin of Hermes' title is followed by a second one introduced by η, but sadly it is irredeemable. The word Argos features, but in an abbreviated form (a descending oblique line over the omicron), and the supplement is probably έπι Άργος(ς). Another explanation involving Argos would be the legend that Hermes is supposed to have appeared first in Argos (cf. An.Ox.I,84,19ff., Et.Gen., Et.Mag.), but the preposition έπι would seem to militate against this interpretation. One might just imagine a version of this (as given in the epimerismos "...ότι ἐν Άργοις τὰς φαντασίας περίπευεν"): "έπι Άργος [ἐπεμψε φαντασίας]" i.e. he sent likenesses of himself to Argos.

19) επικλίθεις means "leaning on" or "inclined to". We can find no trace of this word in any scholion on τοῦκτος, so must assume that it is part of one of the longer scholia following that.

Testimonia - Column 1


Line 2 ἤγεροντο (1) D in A 57 ἤγερθεν: συνηθροίσθεσαν D in A 142 ἤγερσαμεν: συναθροίσθεσαμεν D in B 52 ἤγεροντο: συνηθροίζοντο D in B 304 ἤγεροντο: συνηθροίζοντο D in B 438 ἤγερσαμένων ἀθροιζόντων D in B 664, Γ 47 άγερσας: συναθροίσασας D in Γ 231 ἤγερθοντο: συνηθροίζοντο D in M 82 ἤγερθοντο: ἀπαιρωροῦντο, ἐκρέμαντο P. Hamb. inv. 736v (sch. in B 94)1 (ἀγερόντο ήθροιζοντο P. Colon. inv. 53 (sch. in B 94)2 οἱ δ’ἀγεροντο ήθροιζοντο P. Oxy. ΞΣΩΧ 2405 (sch. in A 126) επαγερεῖ: συν[αθροίζει(ν)] (2) Ap.Soph.7,1 ἤγερσαμεν: συναθροίσθεσαμεν sch.mai. in X 475 θυμός ἤγερθεν: ἤθροισθη ἡ ψυχή... (βΤ) (3)

1Henrichs, "Scholia Minora IV".
2Henrichs, "Scholia Minora II".
Tablette Homérique (paraphrase of ἐγείρομεν at Δ 352)

Line 3 ἵζε (1) P. Amh. II 18 (col.vi, sch. in Od.o 134) ἐξέσθην: εκαθηντο δυικως D in B 53 ἵζε: ἐκάθισε, καθίδρυσε (om. R) D in B 96 ἵζοντον: καθιζόντων D in B 792 ἵζε: ἐκάθητο D in Γ 162 ἵζεν: καθέζου D in Γ 326 ἵζοντα ἐκαθέζοντα (2) / (3) P. Eri. 3 (paraphrase of καθέζητο at A 536) ἐκαθέζησθη PB, PW ἐκαθέζητο PV ἐκάθισε PM, PG ἐκάθισεν (4) Hes.1347 ἵζεν: ἐκάθισεν n; 1346 ἵζει: καθίζει Avgn Curt. ἵζει: καθίζει B & B.L. Syn.260,27 (= Sud.120) ἵζει: καθίζει η’ καθηται Et.Mag.469,28 ἵζευ καὶ ἵζεο: αντ’ του καθέζου; 469,35 ἵζω: τὸ κάθημα... Et.Gud.273,26 ἵζευ καὶ ἵζεο, καθέζου (καὶ ἵζεο, καθέζου later addition in gap before rest of entry, which = Et.Mag.469,28ff., except that after παρατακτικὸν it inserts προστατικὸν; it also reads λοιπὸν ἐστὶ τὸ ῥῆμα) 273,35 ἵζω τὸ κάθημα...


Line 5 ἤρτυνετο (1) P. Ryl. I 25 ("lexicon" to Σ, sch. in Σ 379) πρωτε[κτεσκεύα]ζε D in B 55 ἤρτυνετο: παρασκεύασεν, ἐποίησεν D in Δ 216 ἄρτυνθη: παρασκεύασθη, ἦτοιμασθη D in M 43 ἄρτυνατες: παρασκεύαντες, ἐτοιμάσαντες D in M 86 ἄρτυνατες: παρασκεύαντες,

Line 6 ἐνύπνιον (1) D in B 56 κατά τοὺς ύπνους (2) Mosch. τὸ ἐνύπνιον ένιστε μὲν ἐπιρρηματικῶς λέγεται, καὶ λαμβάνεται ἀντὶ τοῦ κατὰ τοὺς ύπνους... Or. (Excerpta 86) ἐνύπνιον: διὰ τὸ ἐν ύπνοι καὶ μόνον (3) PB, PW κατὰ τοὺς ύπνους PV καθ’ ύπνουν PM, PG ἐν τοῖς ύπνοις (4) Hes.e3441 ἐνύπνιον: όπαρ Lex.Hom. ἐνύπνιον: ἐν τῷ ύπνῳ SU Sud.e1503 ἐνύπνιον: ἐφόσον τις τούς οὐκερον δὲ παυμοένων τῶν ύπνων, εγέιρον καὶ ὅρινον τὴν ψυχήν... Et.Mag.345,48 κατὰ τοὺς ύπνους. οὐνομαστικὸν ἐπίρρημα, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνύπνιος, ἢ ἐν ύπνοι Et.Gud.481,6 ...ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνυπνίως ἢ ἐν ύπνοι...; 480,8 ἐν ύπνοι ὡ καὶ μόνον


Line 8 ἀποπάμενος (1) D in B 71 ἀποπατα, ταχέως ἀπελθών (2) / (3) PB, PW ταχέως ἀπελθῶν PF πετασθεις PM, PG ἀποπάμενος (4) Hes.a6563 ἀποπάμενος: ἀποπατα Συγ. ἀποπατάι: πετασθῆ, ἀπέλθη B & B.L.

Line 9 ἀνήκεν (1) D in B 71 κατέλιπε, ἀφῆκεν D in E 405 ἀνήκεν: ἀνέπεισε D in Z 256, H 25 ἀνήκεν: ἀνέπεισεν (2) cf. sch.mai. in Φ 523 ἀνήκε: ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐφῆκε A (im) (3) PB, PW κατέλιπε PV, PM, PG ἀφῆκεν (4) Hes.a5042 ἀνήκε: ἐίασεν (n) ἀπέλυσεν (vGan) ἐρρύσατο, ἐξήγαγεν, παρόρμησεν Συγ. ἀνήκε: ἐίασεν, ἀπέλυσεν, ἐδοκεν, ἀνίεις, ἀφείς B Lex.Hom. ἀνήκε: ἀνέπεισεν Syn.96,3 ἀνήκεν: ἀφῆκεν (= Sud.a2403) (Et.Gen., sim. to Et.Mag.106,56, and Et.Gud., etymologies only)

дε τού ἄρμοζοντος καὶ καθήκοντος (quotes I 33) ἐπὶ δε τῶν νόμων (quotes I 156) (3) PB, PW ὡς νεομίσται PV καθ’ νόμος ἐστὶ PM, PG καθ’ πρέπον ἢν εἰπὶ (4) Hes. 0236 *δίκαιον (ASvg) ἀξίον, πρέπον SVg καὶ δίκη (n) ἢ ἰπροσήκει. καὶ ἡ τιμ. καὶ το τίξιμα καὶ τό ἄρμοζον (s) ἢ θεμιστὶ (B 73) καὶ χύμος (n) Συγ. θέμι: δίκαιον, πρέπον, δυνατόν B Syn. 255, 1 θέμιν: δικαιοσύνη (= Sud. 0114 & Phot.) Sud. 0115 θέμι: το δίκαιον (= Syn. A) Et. Gen. ἐστὶ ὄνομα (καὶ αδ. B) δηλοὶ δε το πρέπον καὶ η σωματειδῆς θεᾶ... cf. Et. Mag. 445, 13 δηλοὶ καὶ το πρέπον καὶ την σωματικὴν θεάν... Et. Gud. (Sturz 258, 6 & ms.) το δίκαιον καὶ πρέπον

Line 11 πολυκλήσισι 1) D in πολυκλήσισι: πολυκαθέδριος, εξ οὐ πολυκόπως, κληίδες γὰρ καλοῦνται αἱ τῶν ἐρεσσόντων καθέδραι D in B 175 πολυκλήσισι: πολυκαθέδριος (2) Ap. Soph. 133, 5 πολυκλήσισι: ταῖς πολυκαθέδριοι ναῦσι, κληίδες γὰρ αἱ τούτων καθέδραι cf. sch. mai. in B 74 πολυκλήσισι: κλῆς παρὰ τὸ κλάσθαι ἐπ’ αὐτῆς καθεξόμενους A. BT (3) PB, PW, PV πολυκαθέδριος PM, PG πολυκαθέδρων (4) Hes. π2868 πολυκλήσισι: πολυκαθέδριος πολυζύγιοι [λεπίδες] ταῖς ναῦσι, ἀπὸ τοῦ κλίνεσθαι ἐν αὐταῖς τοὺς ἐρέσσοντας Lex. Hom. πολυκλήσισι: πολυκαθέδριος Sud. π1975 Δ πολυκλήσι: πολυκαθέδριος καὶ πολυκλήσιν ὁμοίως Et. Mag. 518, 26 κληίδες... το κλῆς μετά τοῦ πολύς γίνεται πολυκλήσι... Ἰλίαδος βήτα "καὶ φεύγειν... κελεύων” πολυκαθέδριος, εξ οὐ πολυκόπως...


Line 15 ἡμαθέντος (1) P. Iand. I 2 τηλ.]ου επ’ Ἀλφεω[ι, νεατῇ Πουλο ημαθέντος ψιλω[ ατο τοῦ Ἀμαθου[ ωσπερ καὶ η... D in B 77 ψαμμόδους, τραχείας, ἀμαθος γὰρ ἡ ψάμμος D in I 153 ἡμαθέντος: ἀμαμάδους (2) Ap. Soph. 83, 30 ἡμαθέντος: ἤτοι τοῦ ἁμαθου πολλὴν ἐχοντος, εξ ο which ἡ πεδεινος δηλοῦται τοτος, ἢ παρ’ ῥει ο Μαθοεις ποταμος cf. sch. mai. in B 77 ἡμαθέντος: παραθαλασσίας ἢ ΣΗ Ημαθος ποταμος

1 Published by Henrichs in "Scholia Minora II".
IIuXou bT [Erbse notes: nomen fluvii apud Strab. 8,3,1 (p.366) et 8,3,14 (p.344)] (3) PB ψαμώδους PW ψαμώδιδος PV ἀμμόδους PM ψαμώδη PG ἀμμόδους (4) Hes.η411 *ημαθόεις: ἀμμόδης (ASg); η412 ἱμαθόντος: τὴν ψαμώδη, ἦτοι πολλὴν ἄμαθον ἔχοντα, ἐξ οὗ ὁ πολαίμος δηλοῦται, ἡ παρ’ὸν δέει Ἡμαθείς ποταμός, ἡ μεσημβρινοῦ, ἡ ἀπὸ Ἡμάθου ἄμος Syn.250,18 ἱμαθόντος: ἀμμόδους Sud.η278 ἱμαθόεις: ἱμαθόντος, ἀμμόδους (sic) Et.Gen. ἀμμόδης τραχεία, παρὰ τὴν ἱμαθείας και ἱμαθείας. Et.Mag.428,51 ψαμώδης, τραχεία, παρὰ τὴν ἄμον, ἱμαθείας καὶ ἱμαθείας [ὡς ἱμαθείας] εὐήνειος, ἡ ἀπὸ Ἡμάθου, ποταμοῦ παραρρέοντος...


Published by Henrichs in "Scholia Minora III".
Line 25 ἀδινάων (1) D in B 87 τῶν ἁθνὶ καὶ ἀθροίς πετομένων... D in B 469 ἀδινάων: ἀθρόως πετομένων D in II 481 ἁδινόν: πυκνὸν, συνετὸν D in Σ 124 ἁδινόν: ἐλεεινόν, οἰκτρόν D in Σ 316 ἁδινοῦ: ὀξέος, οἰκτρῶ D in Τ 214 ἁδινῶς ἀνενείκατο: ἀθροὺς καὶ ἐλεεινῶς καὶ οἰκτρῶς ἀνέκραξε, ἢ ὄνοι εἰ ἀνεστενάζε, καὶ πολὺ ἤγαγε πνεῦμα D in X 430 ἁδινοῦ: νῦν ἐλεεινοῦ, οἰκτρῶ D in Ψ 17 ἁδινοῦ: νῦν πυκνοῦ, συνεχοῦς in Ω 747 ἁδινοῦ: συνεχοῦς, οἰκτρῶ (2) Herod. 31,18 (περὶ ἱλιακῆς προσωδίας β΄ ἁδινῶν: δασυνετεῖ οἱ ἁδινῶν, ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ ἁθνὶ καὶ ἁδινοὺς ἡ κίνησις. Αρ. Σοφ. 8,27...ὁ τῶν ἁθρῶν καὶ πολλῶν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁθν... cf. sch.mai. in B 460 ἁδινῶν: ἀθρῶς ἑπαμένων (bT), sch.mai. in X 430 ἁδινοῦ: οἰκτρῶ κατὰ Ἄιτωλοὺς, Ἀρίσταρχος ἁθρόου (bT), sch.mai. in Ψ 17 ἁδινοῦ...γοῦν: ἁθρόου, οἰκτροῦ... (bT), sch.mai. in Ω 12 ἁδινά: ἀθρῶς παρὰ τὸ ἁθν, ἡ ἁδιαλείπτως (bT) (3) PB, PW, PM, PG ἁθρῶς...ἐρχομένων (4) Hes. a 1138* ἁδινῶν ἁθρῶν η ἀπαλῶν (Ψ 326) Cygm. ἁδινῶς: ἁθρόα B.L. Lex. Hom. ἁδινός ἁθρῶς ΣU Sud. a 498 Δ ἁδινά: αὐτὶ τοῦ ἁθροὶ, πάντες Ετ. Gen. (b) ἁδινῶν: παρὰ τὸ ἁθν τὸ σημαίνον τὸ πλήρες, γέγονεν ἁδινὸς... Ετ. Mag. 17, 29 ἁδινῶαν: παρὰ τὸ ἁθν, ὁ σημαίνει ἁδιαλείπτως καὶ πλήρες γίνεται...καὶ ἁδινώτερον (π 216) τὸ ἁθρῶς, ἡ οἰκτρότερον...

Line 26 γλαφυρῆς (1) D in B 88 πέτρης ἐκ γλαφυρῆς: ἐκ τῆς [τινὸς C] κούλης πέτρας D in B 516 γλαφυρᾶς: βαθείας, κοῦλαι D in Γ 119 γλαφυρᾶς: κούλας (2) Αρ. 306, 1-2 γλαφυρῆ γ': βαθεία (B 516) ἡ μελαινα καὶ ποικίλη καὶ πολὺς Θεσσαλική Αρ. Σοφ. 55, 3 γλαφυρᾶς: κοῦλαι (3) PB, PW, PM, PG κούλης PV βαθείας (4) Hes. y 621 γλαφυρᾶς: κοῦλαι (gS) βαθείαι (S - B 516); y 632 γλαφυρὰς: ἀνθηρᾶς, ἀλλ' ἐν κούλες ἡ βαθείας; y 623 γλαφυρῶν: τερπνῶν (SP) κοῦλον (vgSP) ὑδ., βαθύ (vgPn); y 624 γλαφυρὸς: ἀνθηρὸς Σ(P) λαμπρός, τερπνός Σ κούλας, ἡδύς, βαθύς Cygm. γλαφυρῶν: ἡδύ, κοῦλον, ἐμπυρον, ἀκριβές, βαθύ, λαμπρόν B γλαφυρῶν: ἡδύ B.L. Syn. 185, 21 (= Sud. y 283) γλαφυρῶν: ἡδύ, κοῦλον, βαθύ, σοφόν, ἐμπυρον, ἀκριβές Phot. y134 (as Syn. but adds λαμπρόν) Ετ. Gen. γλαφυρῶν: ἡδύ, κοῦλον, βαθύ, σοφόν, ἐμπυρον, ἀκριβές... cf. Ετ. Mag. 233, 44 Ετ. Gud. γλαφυρῆς: κούλαις... [an addition above in ms.] Ετ. Gud.(cod. z only) 313, 18 γλαφυρῶν...ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ κοῦλου καὶ βαθείς... 318, 20 γλαφυρῶν...κοῦλον... Ετ. AIM. 622, 28 γλαφυρῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ κοῦλου...
Line 27 βοτρυόν (1) D in B 88 βοτρυόν [δε πέτονται ad. C]: συνεστραμμέναι και συνημέναι ώς εν βότρυος σχήματι. (2) Αρ. Σοφ. 52, 24 βοτρυόν: ἐτέρα τῆς ἐτέρας ἐχομένη ώς οἱ βότρυς τας ράγας ἔχουσι (3) PB, PW, PV ἐν σχήματι δε βότρυος PM κατὰ τὰς ἐν τῷ βότρυ ράγας PG κατὰ στροφάς (4) Ησ. β859 *βοτρυόν: ἐτέρα τῆς ἐτέρας ἐχομένη, ώς οἱ βότρυς τας ράγας ἔχουσιν (g) καὶ κατὰ συστροφὴν η διαμετρήματος όμοιο (n) Sin. 181, 5 ἐπαλλήλως (codd. -ous) ἔτερα τῆς ἐτέρας ἐχομένη Phot. β223 ἐπαλλήλως (then as Sin.; than adds): ώς αἱ ράγαι τῶν βοτρύων Sud. β408 (as Phot, except that it reads ἐπαλλήλως and omits αἱ) Et. Mag. 206, 3 συνεστραμμέναι καὶ συνημέναι ώς εν βότρυος σχήματι...


Line 29 ἀλίς (1) P. Amh. II 18 (sch. in ο77) ἀλίς ικανοίς R. Οξυ. II 221 (sch. in Φ236) ἀλίς: αἱ θρόων D in B 90 ἀλίς: δαφνίδως πολλαὶ καὶ [καὶ om. C] ἀλίμοι D in Γ 384 ἀλίς: ὀμοῦ πολλαὶ D in I 139 ἀλίς: δαφνίδως D in Σ 122 ἀλίς: δαφνίδως, ικανοὶς D in P 54 ἀλίς: πολὺ, ἄθροῶς (2) Αρ. (cf. Ησ. α1147) Οξ. 27, 1 ἀλίς τὸ ἐπίρρημα, δηλοῦν τὸ δαφνίδως καὶ πολὺ Αρ. Σοφ. 24, 17 ἀλίς: ἄθροῶς, ικανῶς An. Οξ. Ι. 3, 22 ἀλίς: ικανῶς, ἐπίρρημα μεσόττος (3) PB, PW δαφνίδως PV ικανῶς PM, PG ἄρκουντως (4) Ησ. α1147 ἀλίς: ὡς Ἀπών θρόων ἡ ἐσχάρα) Συγ. ἀλίς: ἄρκετον, πληρέστατον B & B.L. Sin. 67, 18 (= Phot. a961) ικανῶς, δαφνίδως Sud. α1244 δαφνίδως, ικανῶς Et. Gen. ἀλίς: τὸ πληρὲς (καὶ ad. B) κεκορησμένον αὐτάρκως ἀμα... cf. Et. Mag. 64, 48 ...τὸ ικανῶς καὶ αὐτάρκως, τὸ πληρὲς καὶ κεκορησμένον... Et. Gud. 90, 7 ἀλίς: ικανῶς...

Line 30 πεποτήσαται (1) D in B 90 πέτονται (2) / (3) PB, PW, PV, PG PM πέτονται (4) Ησ. π1501 ἵππανται ("ἵππανται codd. em. Mus. ") Sud. π1017 πεποτήσται: ἀνέπτη, ἀνεκουφισθῆ... (Et. Gen. (= Et. Mag, 662, 19) etymology only) Et. Gud. 460, 53 πεποτήσαται: πεποτηταί, παρά τὸ πότῳ, ποτήσω, πεποτήθα, πεποτήσαι καὶ τὸ Ἰωνικὸν πεποτήσαι...(contrast Et. Mag.)

Line 31 ἰδίονος (1) D in B 92 ἰδίονος: ηγιαλοῦ D in M 32 ἰδίονα: αἰγιαλοῦ. οὔτω δὲ καλεῖται ὁ παραθαλάσσιος καὶ ὁ δεύσμος τόπος παρὰ τὸ τέκνον D in Υ 148 ἰδίονος: ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰγιαλοῦ (2) Οξ. 67, 13 ἰδίον: οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἵππαν εξ ἀλόσο καὶ παρατέινεσθαι τοῦς αἰγιαλοὺς Αρ. 318, 10 ἰδίον: αἰγιαλοὶ καὶ πολῖς' Λακαική' cf. sch. mai in B 92 ἰδίονος: οὐ λέγεται ὁ τῶν
κυμάτων κτύπος ἀλλ' αὐτός ὁ ἀγιαλός... (b) (3) PB, PW, PV, PM, PG

αἰγιαλοῦ (4) Hes. η262 ήίνα: ἀκτὴν, αἰγιαλὸν (ASvg); η263 ήίνες: ἀκτά, αἰγιαλοὶ Syn. 249, 24 ήίνα: αἰγιαλόν, ὠχθαν Sud. η14 ήίνα: αἰγιαλόν, ὠχθην Lex. Hom. ήίνος: αἰγιαλοῦ Et. Gud. 238, 55 ήίνων: ο αἰγιαλός...

(marginal addition in ms. ήίνα καὶ ήίνα: αἰγιαλόν ὥ ὠχθαν... (-

the continuation is illegible))

Testimonia - Column 2


Line 3 ὁσσά (1) D in B 93 θεία φήμη καὶ κληδῶν (2) Ap. 329, 2 ὁσσά: ψιλὸς ἢ κληδῶν... Herod. II, 562, 11-12 (περὶ ὀρθογραφίας) ὀπετοῦσθη, κληδονιζέσθαι, ὀπτεύσθαι ὄμορφοις - ὁσσα κληδῶν καὶ φήμη Ap. Soph. 123, 23 ὁσσα: κληδῶν, φήμη ἐκ θεοῦ, ὀθεν καὶ οἱ Ἀττικοὶ ὀπτεύσθαι λέγουσι τὸ κληδονίζειν cf. sch. mai. in A 105...όν γαρ χρὴ ταί ὀμηρος ὄσση ψιλῶς ἐπὶ τῆς φώνης, μάλλον δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς θείας κληδόνος (Ariston. A) and sch. mai. in B 93 ὁσσα: ὃ τοι ὁσσα ἢ θεία κληδῶν, οἱ δὲ νεωτεροι ψιλῶς ἐπὶ πάσης φώνης (Ariston. Aim.) (3) PB, PW, PM, PG

1 Published by Henrichs in "Scholia Minora II".
Line 4 δεδένει (1) Π. Colon. inv. 53 1 δεδένει εξεκ<ek>αυτ<or> η[ D in B 93 εξηπτο, διεγήγητο D in E 4 τοιον οι πού δαίε: τοιούτον αυτού πού ἀνήπτο D in M 35 δεδένει: εξηπτο, διεγήγητο D in P 253 δεδένειν: εξηπταται, διεγήγηται D in Y 18 δεδένε: φαίνεται, φλέγει (2) Αρ. Soph. 57,19 δεδένει: εφαίνεν, εκαίτο (3) ΠΒ,ΠΩ διεγήγητο ΠΡ,ΠΩ λαμπρῶς ἐκπρύττετο (4) Χεσ. 5380 *δεδένε: εξεγήγητο, διεκάκαυτο Sup; 5376 δεδένε: μικτὴ Phot. 078 δεδένε: φεύγει η φλέγει Syn. 189,5 δεδένε: φεύγει η φλέγει Sud. 144 δεδένε: φλέγει Ετ. Gen. (folio torn in Α, Β;) δεδένε: εξηπτο, διεγήγητο...

Line 5 ιέναι (1) D in Α 227 παραγένεσθαι D in B 94 παραγένεσθαι [C: -γν-] D in B 348, Γ 119 παραγένεσθαι D in I 592 βῆ διέναι: εφορμήσας ἐπήλθεν D in Π 87 ιέναι πάλιν: ἀντὶ τοῦ ιθί, καὶ παραγήγον(2) Αρ. 311,13 εἰμὶ β...βαρυνόμενον τὸ πορεύομαι cf. Σ 320,2 ιθί: πορεύου, παραγήγον cf. sch.mai. in H 46 ιόν: ὁτι ἀντὶ τοῦ πορεύεσθαι (Αριστοτ. Α), sch.mai. in Δ 186 βασκιθί ἧρι ταχεῖα...δῦο γὰρ λόγιοι αὐτοτελεῖς "πορεύθητι ταχέως ἧρι" τοῦτον εἶπε τὸν λόγον "Εκτορι" (Νικ. Α) sch.mai. in Ν 191 {αλλ'ου πι} χρόος εἰσατό: λείπει δὴ διὰ, διὰ τοῦ χρόος ἐπορεύθη, παρὰ τὸ ιέναι... (Τ) sch.mai. in Ο 82 ἐνθείη η ένθα: Ἀρισταρχος "εἰς ν" ἀντὶ τοῦ πορευθεὶς ν ἐκ τοῦ εἰμὶ... (Τ) sch.mai. in Ο 82 ἄλλως...ο δε λόγος, εἰς εκείνην τὴν χώραν η εκείνην πορευθεῖν. (Τ) (3) Tablette Homérique (paraphrase of Δ 362, ιθι) πορεύου ΠΒ,ΠΩ παραγένεσθαι ΠΒ,ΠΩ πορεύθηναι PM,ΠΩ ἐρχεθαί (4) Χεσ. 1265 ιέναι: πορεύθηναι ASvgn Cyr. ιέναι: πορεύθηναι B & Β. L. Syn. 260,15 (= Sud. 150) ιέναι: πορεύθηναι η πορεύθηναι Ετ. Mag. 467,1 ιέναι: παραγένεσθαι ἐκ τοῦ ιῷμι τὸ πορεύομαι Ετ. Gud. 272,24 (main text entry in ms.) ιέναι: εκ τοῦ εἰμὶ τὸ πορεύομαι...

Line 6 οτρύνουσα (1) Π. Hamb. inv. 736v2 [οτρύνουσα] παρομωσα Π. Colon. inv. 53 οτρύνουσα παρομο[σα D in B 94 παρακελευμένη, παρομώσα D in B 451 οτρύνουσα: παρομώσα ἐς τὸν πόλεμον D in Δ 268 οτρυν: προτρῆσα, παρώρμα D in Δ 286 οτρύνεμεν: παρομών D in K 55 οτρυνεν: διὰ παρακλήσεως παρομω (2) Αρ. Soph., s.v. οτρηροὶ 123,27 ...καὶ τὸ οτρύνειν, ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐννοιας, ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ παρομῶν, καὶ οτρυντος ἡ ἐπικέλευσις cf. sch.mai. in Ο 199 <οτρύνοντος>: κελεύουσα ἡ ἐπιτάσσοντος (bΤ), sch.mai. in N 229 οτρύνεις: ἐννοίως ἀντὶ παρωχικεμένον τὸ οτρύνεις... (ΑΤ) (3) ΠΒ,ΠΩ παρακελευμένη ΠΒ παροξύνουσα PM,ΠΩ παρομώσα (4) Χεσ. 01520

1 Published by Henrichs in "Scholia Minora II".
2 Published by Henrichs in "Scholia Minora III".

Line 7 τέτρηξει (1) D in B 95 ἐτετάρχυτο ὑπὸ θορύβου, θορυβόδης [−ο− C] ἢν D in H 346 τετρήκυναι: τραχεῖα καί βαρβαρόδης ἡ τετραχύμενη ὑπὸ τοῦ θορύβου (2) Herod.II,590,10 (περὶ ὀρθογραφίας) τέτρηξει: τετράχυντο, τετάρακτο... Mosch. τέτρηξει...ἀντί τοῦ ἐτεταρχῆκτο... cf. sch.mai. in H 346 τετρήκυναι: τεταραγμένη... (AbT) (3) PB,PW,PM,PG ἐτετάρακτο PV ἐτεταράκθη (4) Hes.τ646 τέτρηξει: τετράχυντο, πεπτύκωτο, τετάρακτο ἡ θορύβου πλήρες ἢν Syn.385,24 τετρήκυναι: τεταραγμένη Sud.τ411 Δ τετρήκυναι: τραχυνωμένη καὶ τέτρηξε ἐτετάρχυντο Lex.Hom. ἐτετάρχυντο ὑπὸ τοῦ θορύβου Et.Gen. (A missing section of folio here; B thus −) τέτρηξει: ἐτεταράκτο ἀπὸ τοῦ ταράσσω... Ετ.Μag.754,45 τέτρηξε: "τέτρηξε δ' ἁγορ' ἐτετάρακτο, ἀπὸ τοῦ ταράσσω...καὶ ἁγορῇ τετρήκυναι, ἡ τραχεῖα καὶ θορυβόδης, ἡ τεταραχύμενη ὑπὸ τοῦ θορύβου ἀπὸ τοῦ ταράσσω ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ τραχύνω. Et.Gud. τέτρηξει: ἐτετάρχυντο, παρὰ τὸ ταράσσω (ἐτετάρχυντο is an interlinear addition above)

Line 8 στεναχίζετο (1) P. Hamb. inv. 736v [στεναχίζετο ε]στενοῦτο P. Colon. inv. 53 στεναχίζετο ηχον απέτελει P. Oxy. XI 1086 (sch. B 784 in col.ii, 1.52) στεναχίζετο αντὶ τοῦ εστενεν... D in B 95 ὑπὸ δὲ στεναχίζετο γαία: ὑπέστενε δε ἡ γη καὶ ηχον ἀπέτελει D in B 784 ὑπεστεναχίζε: ὑπέστενε, ἦχει (2) / (3) P. Oxy. XI 1086 paraphrases ὑπεστεναχίζετο at B 781 as ὑπέστενε PB,PW ὑπέστενε PV,PM,PG ὑπήχει (4) Hes.s1743 στεναχίζετο: ἀνέστενεν; σ1744 στενάχοντι: στένοντι; σ1745 στένει: δυσπαθεῖ, στενοχωρέιται, στενάζει Συγ. στένει: στενάζει U στένοντα: στενοχωροῦντα; στενοχόντι: στενοῦντι U* Syn.370,9 (=Sud.s1036) στένει: στενάζει

Line 9 ἢζοντων (1), (2) & (4) See testimonia for col.i, 1.3 (3) PB,PW,PM καθεξομένων PM,PG καθιζόντων

Line 10 ὀμάδος (1) P. Colon. inv. 53 ομάδος θορυβὸς D in B 96 ομάδος δ'ην: θορυβὸς δ'ην D in K 13 ομάδον τάνθρωπον: καὶ ἐνταῦθα σκόπει θορυβοῦς τῶν βαρβάρων D in N 797 θεσπεσίῳ ομάδωι: θείω θορυβῶι D in O 689 ομάδωι: θορυβῶι, πλήθει (2) Ap.Soph.120,18
όμαδος: θόρυβος παρά το οίμα ουδέν Μοσχ. ομάδος] βοή σύμμικτος, από το οίμα ουδέν... cf. sch.mai. in B 96 ...πλείων γαρ ἂν τὸ θόρυβος (ΑβΤ) sch.mai. in H 307-7 <μετὰ λαὸν Ἀχαϊῶν...> ἐς Τρώων ομαδὸν Τκαλοντι καὶ ομαδὸν καλὸς διέστειλε, πανταχοῦ δὲ τὸ θορυβώδης ὑποσημαίνει τῶν Τρώων (T) ἑπὶ μὲν Αἰαντὸς τὸ λαὸν, ἐπὶ δὲ Ἕκτορος ομαδὸν φησὶ διαστείλας, αἰὲ γὰρ θορυβώδεις αὐτούς ἑκδέχεται (b) (3) PB, PW, PV θορυβος δὴν ΠΜ, ΠΓ βοη δὲ συμμίκτος ἂν (4) Hes. 0669 ομαδὸς: ἀθροίσεις νῦ θορυβος ASNys όχλος, τάραχος, στρατὸς ἕπο τοῦ οίμα <ουδ'ν> ἔ Συγρ. ομάδος: θόρυβος B Syn. 317,1 ομαδὸς: θορυβος, ἀπὸ το οἰμα ουδέν Συδ. 0226 Δ ομάδος: θορυβος Et.Gen. θορυβος, κραυγη, οἷον εἰ ἀναυδώς τις ὃν, παρὰ τῷ πολλοὺς οἵμα ουδέν (not legible in B) Et.Mag. 623,18 "ομαδος δὲν καὶ Πλάδος θ' (then as Et.Gen.) Et.Gud. 426,56 (marginal entry in ms.) ομαδος: θορυβος, κραυγη, παρα το οιμα ουδέν

Line 11 σχοίατο (1) P. Hamb. inv. 736v σχοίατο [e]πισχοι D in B 98 ἀπόσχοιτο [C: ἀπόσχοιτο], παύσαιτο (2) sch.mai. in N 608 έσχοτο: ἐπεσχε τὴν ὀρμήν τοῦ δόρατος (bΤ) Μοσχ. σχοίατο] ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπίσχοιν έαυτούς (3) PB, PW ἀπόσχοινo PV παύσαιτο PM, PG επίσχοιν εαυτούς (4) Hes. σο3035 σχοίαι[ν]το: παύσαιτο, ἐπίσχοιν Lex.Hom. ἐσχεν: ἐπεσχεν, ἐπαυσεν SU

Line 12 ἐρήμευθεν (1) See testimonia to col.i, 1.12; also D in B 99 ἐρήμευθεν: κατείχον έκαστος τὰς έαυτοῦ καθέδρας (2) See testimonia in col.i; also Mosch. ἐρήμευθεν]...ἀλλάτις δὲ ἐνταῦθα ἀντὶ τοῦ κατέσχοντο... Απ. Soph. 76, 5 ἐρήμευθεν: διακάτεσχον (3) PB, PW κατείχον PV, PM, PG κατεσχον (4) See testimonia to col.i; also Hes. ε5796 ἐρήμευθεν: διακάτεσχον Συδ. ε2974 Δ ἐρήμευθεν: κατεσχεν Et.Mag. 373,11 ἐρήμευθεν δὲ καθέδρας: ἀντὶ τοῦ κατείχον έκαστος τὰς έαυτῶν καθέδρας

Line 13 κάμε (1) D in B 101 ἐκαμε: κατασκεύασε [CHRVLa; VLa add: ] καμων ετευξεν, ἀναστροφὴ δὲ τὸ τρόπος; [CH only] τεύχων: κατασκευάζον (2) Mosch. κάμε τεύχων] ἀντὶ τοῦ καμων κατασκεύασε... (3) PB, PW, PV έκαμε κατασκευάσας PM, PG ποιῆσας κατασκεύασα (4) Hes. κ587 κάμεν: ἐκοπίασεν Lex.Hom. κάμεν: ἐκοπίασαμεν Et.Mag. 488, 21 (not found in Et.Gen.) κάμων σημαίνει τέσσαρα...το κατασκευάζω, ως το "κάμε τεύχων"

Line 14 διακτόρωι (1) P. Amh. II 18 (sch. in o 185, col. xiv) διακτόρωι: τον διαγοντος τας αγγελιας η διατορου [και σαφνισ[η]] τω λογοι P. Colon. inv. 906 (sch. in α 84) δ[ιακτόρων τας αγγελια][ας διαγον][τα D in B 103 διακτόρωι: διακόνωι [C only] διάγοντι τας αγγελιας τον Θεον [CHRVLa; then CHVLa add: ] ἡ διατορω καὶ σαφει κατα το λέγειν, ἐ το διαγγελοντι καὶ σημαινοντι [και σ. om. VLa] τας ἑργασιας [αγγελιας H] (2) Or. 50,1 διακτορος: διατορος τις οιν
Διάκτερο: διάγνω τάς ἀγγελίας, λέγει δὲ τὸν Ὑμίν (3)

Ἀριστ. 58, 17

Line 15 Ἀργειφόντη (1) D in B 103 ἀρρώς καὶ καθαρῶς φόνου,

εἰρηνικός γὰρ ὁ θεός D in II 181 Ἀργειφόντης: ὁ Ὑμίν, ἀγνὸς καὶ ἄρρως, καὶ καθαρὸς φόνου. εἰρηνικός γὰρ ὁ θεός (2) Ἀριστ. 42, 10 Ἀργειφόντης: ἡ ὁ ἀρρώς φόνου καὶ καθαρῶς, εὐίοι δὲ τὸν ἀρρώς φόνου, ἡ καταργοῦντα τοὺς φόνους εἰρηνικὸς γὰρ ὁ θεός ἦ διὰ τὸ Ἀργον φονεύσαι τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς ἰδίας Ἐρμής.

Iouς φύλακα. ἔννοι δὲ ὁ ἐν Ὄργῃ πρώτων πεφηνός sch. mai. in B 101-7 ἀρρώς φόνου... ἀγρόφοντης, ἀγρέφοντης καὶ ἀργεφόντης, ὡς πλεόν, πλεῖν, Νεόλαος, Νείλεως. τὸν γὰρ Ιους ἑρωτα σὺν ὀδὸν τοῦ μνήμης, πέπλασται δὲ τοῖς νεότεροις τὰ περὶ τὸν Ἀργον (bT) sch. mai. in a 38 Ἀργεφόντην: ἡ τὸν ἀρρώς καὶ καθαρῶς φόνου, ἡ τὸν φονεύσαντα Ἀργον τὸν πολυματον, ὡς ἐφύλασε τὴν ἴω, ἡ τὸν φονεύσαντα τῆς ἀργίας, ἡ ὀστὶς τοὺς ἄρρως καὶ ἀπράκτους λογισμοὺς ἀναρικεῖ An. Ox. I, 84, 19 ὃ Ἐρμής καὶ ὁ ἁράς, ὃ ὁφι κατὰ τὴν Ἀργεφόντην γλῶσσαν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ὁφιν τὸν Πυθώνα ἀνείλον ἀργεφόντης ἐκλήθη, ὁ σὺν ὀφικόντος, ἡ ὁ ἄρρως φόνευς, ὡς ἐν Ἀργεφόντης τὰς φαντασιας πεμπει, ὡς δὲ ὅτι Ἀργον τὸν Ιους φύλακα ἐφόνευσε (3) PB, PW, PV καθαρῶς φόνου ΡΜ, ΡΓ τῷ τὸν Ἀργον πανόπτην πεφηνεύκοτο (4) Ἀριστ. 7036 καθαροφόνης, λευκοφόνης, ἐν Ὅργῃ πρῶτων πεφηνός. ἡ καταργοῦν τοὺς φόνους ἡ ταχεῖς καὶ τρανὸς ἀποφαινόμενος ἀμφότερα δ’ ἄν εἴπερ περὶ τὸν θεὸν ταύτα. διὰ τὴν εὐπορίαν τῶν ὅνυματος τῶν ταχείων διὰ τὴν δείκτη τὸ σάφος ἐρμηνεύσειν, Ἐρμῆς γονὴν ὕμνωμαδέν διὰ τὸ εἰρέμος τις ἐναι, ὡς ἐτείον ἐμήσατο, ὅπερ ἑστὶν λέγειν. ὃ γὰρ Ἐρμῆς λόγος ἐστι; ἀ7052 ἀργεφόντη: καθαροφόνω; ἀ7022 ἀργεφόντης: ὁ Ἐρμῆς ὁ ἄρρως φόνου A Sud. a3772 Δ ἀργεφόντη: ὁ Ἐρμῆς Ἐτ. Γεν. & Ἐτ. Μαγ. 136, 49 (not legible in B ms. of Ἐτ. Γεν.) Ἐτ. Γεν. begins ἐστὶ δὲ ἐπιθέτου τοῦ Ἐρμοῦ λέγεται δὲ ἀργεφόντης ὥ ὁ ἄρρως φόνου ἐστὶ Ἐτ. Μαγ. begins ἐπίθετον. Ἐρμοῦς ἥ ὁ ἄρρως ἐστὶ φόνου both continue τοῦτον καθαρῶς, ὁ αὐτός γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦ λόγου ὥ ὁ ἐν Ὅργῃ πεφηνός, ὁ γὰρ Ἐρμῆς πρῶτον ἐν τῷ Ὅργῃ ἐκδόθη, ἡ ὁ ἐναργείς ταξιστασιας ποιήσει, ἐπάνω γὰρ ὡς φασὶ τῶν ὄνειρῶν ἐστι ὁ Ἐρμῆς, ἡ ἐπείδη τὸν Ἀργον ἐφονεύσειν (though Ἐτ. Γεν. o omits πεφηνός... Ὅργῃ) Ἐτ. Γεν.
This fragment contains the remains of very comprehensive scholia minora on B 214 - 227, though for the most part, only lemmata remain. Its maximum dimensions are 3.1cm x 9.6cm; 0.6cm remain of the upper margin. There are breathings and accents by the first hand and the letters are sometimes very widely spaced. The text runs parallel to the fibres of this rather poor quality papyrus.

The hand is quite formal and there are no ligatures. Some letters are exceptionally broad, and the roughly bilinear hand is probably to be attributed to the early fourth century, as it bears some resemblance to the "strenger Stil" (see introduction to fragment 5) and also to early biblical maiuscule (see example cited below). The bilinearity is broken only by the upsilon and the chi - the phi in line 5 is possibly exceptional, and was probably meant to mark out the two-line gloss from the other single
line lemma-gloss groups. A comparable hand is that of B.K.T.
V.2 (= Schubart, Abb. 94), assigned to the early fourth
century.

Text

eriζem[εναι] 1
eisato[
γελοιο[ν]n
αισχιστοσ[
—φολκοσ [ 5
γο στου[
συνολωκο[τε συνπεπτω
κοπ[ε(σ)
ύπερθε
φοξος [ 10
ψεδνη[
επενηνο[θε
λαχνη[
νεικειε[σκε
ο]ξεα [ 15
κε]κληνψ[σ]
]πονειδε[
κοτε]οντι[ο
ν]με]εσεν[θεν
νε]ικε[]e 20
π]λει[αι
ε]ξαιρετοι
].[

Commentary

3) Diaeresis over the second iota.

5 - 6) There is a horizontal stroke in the margin, presumeably to draw attention to this rare word. The letter remnants in line 6 suggest the supplement -νο[υ]σ του[σ] and one might complete the gloss [ἐχων εἰλκυσμέ]νους τού[σ] ὀφθαλμο[ῦσ] or [ἐχων ἐστραμμέ]νους τού[σ] ὀφθαλμο[ῦσ], cf. An.Ox.I,423,26.
7 - 8) The remnant κοτ- in line 8 suggests that this unfamiliar dual perfect participle was glossed with a more regular dual perfect participle or an ordinary perfect participle.

9) There are the remains of a rough breathing and accent over the initial upsilon.

17) What stands at the start of the line is certainly a pi and cannot really be construed as a gamma followed by an apostrophe. The error was either already present in the scribe's master copy, or he misread a gamma followed by an apostrophe in his text of Homer.

19) The gap in the papyrus contained the single letter μ: the letter must have been very wide and the letters very widely spaced at this point.

20) The scribe wrote νεικεσκε for νεικεψκε at this point, either by dittography with line 14 or because the error was already present in his text of Homer.

Testimonia


Line 7 - 8 συνοχωκότε (1) P. Oxy. LVI 3832 συνοχωκότες συνοχωκοτες(σ) D in B 218 συνπεπτωκώτες, συνημένοι (2) sch.mai in B 218 συνοχωκότε: ὑπὸ τοῦ συνοχωκος, ὁ ἔστι συμπεπτωκώτες (bT) (3) PB,PW συμπεπτωκώτες PM,PG συνερχομένοι (4) Et.Gen. (A only, missing in B) συνοχωκότες: συμπεπτωκότες, συνοχηκός, καὶ τρόπῳ τοῦ ἰ
εἰς ὦ Ἐτ.Μαγ.735,46 συμπεπτωκότες, συνημένω, Ἱλιάδος β'
Ἐτ.Γυδ.516,14 (folio missing in ms.) συνοχωκότες: συμπεπακότες (sic)
Introduction

This fragment bears the remains of two columns of scholia minora, covering B 277 - 293 and B 307 - 318 respectively. Only the right-hand part of the first column remains, the lemmata having to be restored. The original must have been quite tall; column one covers 16 lines with certainty and column two 11 lines, so the intervening 14 lines would double the present height of the papyrus. At its tallest the fragment measures 16.2cm and at its widest 14cm; parts of the lower margin are preserved, being about 1.7cm at its greatest. The text is written on the verso of a poor quality piece of papyrus (note especially the bundle of fibres at a slant to the vertical fibres on this side); the recto contains an undated sitologos document, listing receipts of corn. The papyrus subsequently suffered a somewhat ignominious fate, as a piece of toilet paper - the stains were examined by an archaeobotanist at the Institute of Archaeology, who found them to contain wheat husks. The text has no diacritical marks, punctuation or accents. One of the most interesting features of the papyrus, is that underneath the remaining first column, and twice under the second column, single letters appear, possibly numbers (though one could be accounted for by restoring φανερον επο[ησις]ε at the end of column 2). The two single letters under the second column are certainly epsilon (= 5) but the single letter under the second half of the first column is more difficult: what is left of the letter is not easily reconcilable with any of the forms of epsilon used by this hand. However, if we take this sheet as "sheet 5" and project that the left-hand column went back as far as B 260, four sheets of scholia minora of equal size would bring us back to the start of book B. Perhaps the sheets were pasted together in a makeshift roll, or were bound together with a thong - as with sets of wooden or waxed tablets.

The format may be compared to that of fragment 2: the lemmata and glosses do not form sub-columns of their own within a main column, and any part of a gloss that has to be
fitted onto a subsequent line is not aligned under the beginning of the gloss, rather it is simply written slightly indented below the lemma (cf. fragment 2, col. i, lines 10 - 11).

The hand is fairly rapid and informal, and although the letters frequently touch, the only true ligature is between epsilon and iota, thus: \( \varepsilon \). Sometimes the second stroke of epsilon (which is formed thus: \( \varepsilon \)) overlaps with the first to produce \( \varepsilon - \) see col. i, 1.12. The horizontal strokes of the zeta are very curvy (col. ii, 1.6). The script wavers between carefully formed letters (e.g. \( \Delta \Gamma \Lambda \) in the penultimate line of col. ii) and more cursive ones (e.g. \( \Sigma \Upsilon \Upsilon \Psi \Psi \), col. ii, 1.18). The letters are generally rounded and two parallels might be Schubart Abb.47 (= P. Giss. 40 II) and Seider II 45 (= P. Chester Beatty X [968]), both of which are assigned to the early third century.

Text - Column 1

| \( \alpha \)ν | 1 |
| \( \alpha \)π |  |
| \( \theta \)ρ |  |
| oνειδειοισ oνει |  |
| \( \delta \)στ[ικοισ | 5 |
| \( \pi \)λθυσ το |  |
| πτολιπορθο |  |
| \( \sigma \)ο τας πο[λεισ |  |
| \( \pi \)ορθον |  |
| ειδομενη ο |  |
| \( \mu \)οι[ωμ\]ενη | 10 |
| ανωγει π |  |
| νυστατοι ε |  |
| επιφρασσ |  |
| νο |  |
| ελεγχιστον |  |
| \( \eta \)σειαν |  |
| στ | 15 |
| \( \theta \)εμεναι |  |
| υποσχεσιν |  |
| α |  |
| υπεσταν |  |
| στειχοντεσ | 20 |
πλατάνιστω πλατανό
αγλαοίν καλόν
σημία σημείων
σμερδιάλεοσ καταπληκτικός
dαφοίνος πυρρούσ
ολυμπιος ο Ζεύς
φώσδε είσ το φανερον
eπαίξασ εφόρμησασ
ορούσε ωρίμησε
στρουθιο τρούθο
πεταλοίο φυλλοίο
υποπεπτημέτες υπο-
πεπτώκοτεσ
eλεεινα ελαιεινος
ζητημο τασ τρίζοντασ
αμφε ποτατο περιπε-
tατρ
ελελιζαμενος συστρεφασ
αμφιαχυιαν περι των
teχνων οδυρομελήνην
αρειζήλον αγαν φανερον
εφηνε φανερον εποίησε

ε
ε
Commentary - Column 1

1 - 3) Only two letters really remain visible on each line. Lines 2 and 3 could be supplemented as follows: ανησει  ορμησει  ανατειςησι  and αγησωρ  αυθαδησηθαρασισ (cf. D). However, these would be the only double glosses in the fragment, and two consecutive pairs of double glosses make the supplement unlikely.

12) To restore this line correctly, we must assume that the scribe wrote ε for αι (cf. col. ii, 1.14) and ει for ι. For the αι>ε and ε>αι interchanges, see Gignac I, p.192-3.

17 - 18) The interchanges υ>ε and ε>υ are well attested in the papyri.

23) Though only one letter of this lemma-gloss group remains, we feel sure that the supplement should be εκπεροανητηπορησανη as έκπεροθω is always glossed with πορθςω - see testimonia.

26) Though this gloss can hardly be refer to anything else, and πορς[ should be restored as πορςλυσαται, the only parallel found for πάρπαρερεσαται is the reading of the ms. R of D (see testimonia).

Commentary - Column 2

5) It is interesting to note that two seemingly contradictory interpretations of the same lemma (i.e. both "red" and "black" for δαφωνός) already co-existed at an early date (- both interpretations appear in the Apionic glossary). Now that both interpretations are attested in the papyri (see next fragment for the gloss "black"), we see that both were probably of equal currency.

8) ἔπαιζας is attested as a reading in the Homeric text in one manuscript (coll. Nov. Oxon. 298). However, the scribe may have written επ- by confusion with ἐφορμῆσας or by the usual confusion of υ and ε (cf. col.i, 1.17).

14) Read ελαινως and cf. note to col.i, 1.12.

21) The reading given here by fragment 5 is αἰζηλος, thus, for the sake of comparison, we have listed all parallels for both readings together in the testimonia. Though the reading αριζηλον is much commoner, αἰζηλον is the
reading of the ms. of Ap.Soph. (or, to be more precise, ἀνείδειος - see testimonia). One wonders also if this was the reading with which Herodian was acquainted: fragment 5 seems to be influenced by Herodian in other respects (see note to fragment 5, 1.15). Lehrs attributes the reading ultimately to Aristarchos1: "Non dubitandum quin Aristarchea lectio ἀνείδειος fuerit quem in suis exemplaribus habuit Apollonios lex. Homerici auctor...cuius vocabuli memoriam praeterea servarunt Hesychius et Etymologus..." It is also interesting to note that the obviously more advanced glosses of fragment 5 imply the teachings of the grammarians, whereas the lowly fragment 4, a school product perhaps, preserves the commoner reading, which has persisted through time at the expense of the other. By the time of Basileidas (a grammarian cited only twice in our extant literature - in the Et.Mag. (taken from the Et.Gen.) and in the Et.Gud., s.v. ἄρκτος 198,12ff.) the meaning of the two words in this context had become so unclear that he derived ἀρίζηλος from ἀνείδειος with the implication that the two mean the same thing.

Testimonia - Column 1

Line 4 ὀνείδειος (1) P. Oxy. XLV 3238 (sch. in A 519) ὀνείδειος: ὀνειδιστικός D in A 519 ὀνείδειος: ὀνειδιστικός, ὑβριστικός...ἐρεθιστικός D in B 277 ὀνειδιστικός, ὑβριστικός D in Π 628 οὗτοι τρέχει ὀνείδειος ἐπέσσασι...: ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδὲ ὀνειδιζόμενοι οὐδὲ κακολογούμενοι (2) / (3) PB,PW,PF ὀνειδιστικός PM,PG ὑβριστικός(οῖς) (4) Lex.Hom. ὀνείδειος: ὀνειδιστικός Sud.o335 Δ ὀνείδειος λόγος: ὁ ὀνειδιστικός

Line 6 ἡ πλῆθυς (1) D in B 143 μετὰ πλῆθυν: ἐν τῷ πλῆθει D in B 278 τὸ πλῆθος D in B288 πλῆθυν: τὸ πλῆθος D in E 676 κατὰ πλῆθυν: εἰς τὸ πλῆθος D in Ο 305 ἡ πλῆθυς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν ἀπονέαντο D in Π 221 πλῆθυν διηκμένος: πλῆθος δεδομένος (2) Mosch. ὡς φάσαν ἡ πλῆθυς] περιληπτικόν ἐστιν ὁνόμα ἡ πλῆθυς ἐνικήτω ὕφων πλῆθος συμαίνον (3) PB,PW,PF,PG τὸ πλῆθος PM ἡ πλῆθυς (4) Hes.π2549 πλῆθως: ὀχλος, δῆμος (Does this perhaps represent a confused version of two scholia minora? i.e. πλῆθως:<πλῆθος> and ὀχλος: δῆμος (cf. fragment 1)?) Cyr. πλῆθως: πλῆθος Barb.Gr. & U

1ΑΗΤ 1,213,27.
Line 7 πτολίπορθος (1) P. Turner 13 (col. ii, sch. in)
πτ[ό]λειθρόν: πολισμα πολίς D in B 278 ἀνα δ'[de C] ἐ επιλοπόρθος
Οδυσσεὺς ἔστ[ι] R πτολίπορθος: with third vertical erased]: τὸ ἔξις.
ἀνέστη δὲ τὰς πόλεις πόρθων Ὀδυσσεὺς ὁ [τὰς πόλεις πόρθων καὶ ad. R]
πολεμικὸς [for πολεμικὸς RVLa read πολεμικὸς διακείμενος] Ὀδυσσεὺς...
D in B728 πτολίπορθωι: πόλεις πορθοῦντι, πολεμικῶι D in E 333 πτολίπορθος:
πόλεις πορθοῦσα, πολεμικα... (2) / (3) PB ὁ τὰς πόλεις πόρθων (ὁ πολεμικὸς)
PW, PV ὁ τὰς πόλεις πόρθων PM ἐν ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ μηχαναῖς πορθῆσας
tὸ Ἰλιον καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐξωρέως πτολίπορθος PG ὁ τὰς αὐτοῦ μηχαναίς
πόρθων τὰς πόλεις (4) Hes. π4242 πτολίπορθος: πολεμιστής, ἀπὸ τοῦ τὰς
πόλεις πόρθειν Syn. 354, 15 (= Sud. π3042) πτολίπορθος: ἀνδρείας πόλεις
πόρθων Lex. Hom. πτολίμορθα: πόλεις πορθοῦντα (sic) Et. Mag. 694, 42
...ο'^$', καὶ πτολίπορθος ὁ τὰς πόλεις πόρθων. Et. Gud. 486, 6 πόλεις πορθοῦσα,
pολεμικὴ γίνεται ἐκ τοῦ πέρθω [γίνεται ad. ms.]

Line 9 εἰδομένη (1) D in B 280 ὤμοιοθεῖσα D in E 462 εἰδομένος:
ὁμωθεῖς (2) Ox. 80, 4 ἵσος: παρὰ τὸ εἶδο, τὸ ὤμοιο sch. mai. in Χ 132
ἵσος: τινὲς διὰ τῆς ἐν διδήγογον ἀντὶ τοῦ ὤμοιος, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ "εἰσάμενος"
ἀντὶ τοῦ ὤμοιος (Τ) (3) PB, PW, PV ὤμοιοθεῖσα PM, PG ὤμοιομένη (4)
Hes. e769 εἰδομένη: εἰοκίτα, ὤμοιωμένη ρ; e779 *εἰδομένη: ὤμοιοθεῖσαν Α;
e771 εἰδομένος: ἐιοκίτος ὤμοιωμένοι τ. v. οὐριν τ. v. Gr. εἰδομένη: ὤμοιομένη
Barb. Gr. & U* εἰδομένος: ὤμοιοθεῖς Β εἰδοθαι: ὤμοιοὐθαί, φαίνεσθαι Β
& B. L. Syn. 208, 8 (= Sud. ει38) εἰδομένη: ὤμοιοθεῖσα Et. Mag. 306, 31
εἰσάμενος: ὤμοιοθεῖς, ἐκ τοῦ εἶδο τὸ ὤμοιο... Et. AIM. 624, 12 σημαίνει δὲ τὸ
εἶδος τ. εἰδῶ τὸ ὤμοιο...

Line 10 ἀνώγη (1) P. Turner 13 (col. viii, sch. in A 313)
ἀνωγεν: εκέλευεν P. Oxy. XLV 3237 (sch. in A 313) ἀνωγεν:
παρεκελευτο D in A 313 ἀνωγεν: εκέλευεν D in B 280 εκέλευεν [CRVLa]
ἐκέλευεν [R] D in Δ 263 ἀνωγεν: κελεύοι D in Δ 301 ἀνωγεν: εκέλευεν D
in Π 8 ἀνωγεν: παρεκελευτε, ἐθελεi (2) Ap. Soph. 31, 19 ἀνωγεν:
κελευειν, κυρίως δὲ ἀνακτος ἐπίταξις An. Ox. I, 14, 3 ἀνωγεν:...τοῖς γὰρ
ἀνάςουσι καὶ ἀρχουσι πέφυκε το κελευειν... (3) PB εκέλευεν PW, PV
εκέλευεν PM, PG προσέτατε (4) Hes. α5583 *ἀνωγεν: παρεκελευται AS;
α5584 *ἀνωγεν: εκέλευεν νΓΑ Τμ. ἀνωγεν: εκέλευεν B Sud. α2581 Δ
ἀνωγεν: παρεκελεύσατο Et. Gen. (A - B illegible) ἀνωγεν:...ἀντὶ τοῦ
ἐκέλευεν Et. Mag. 115, 23 ἀνωγεν: "λαοῦς..." εκέλευεν Et. Gud. 156, 4
ἀνωγεν:...τοῖς γὰρ ἀνάςουσι καὶ ἀρχουσι πέφυκε το κελευειν

Line 11 ύστατοι (1) / (2) / (3) PB, PW, PV, PM, PG έσχατοι (4)
Hes. v846 ύστατα: έσχατοι; v847 ύστατον: έσχατον, τελευταῖον Sud. v686 (=
Syn. A) ύστατος: τελευταῖος, έσχατος Et. Gen. (= Et. Mag. 785, 10)
ύστατος: έσχατος... Et. Gud. 546, 2 ύστατος: ο έσχατος, ο τελευταῖος... (the
glosses are an interlinear addition above in the ms.)
Line 12 ἐπιφρασασιάτο (1) D in B 282 ἐπισκέψαντο [-ονται C] ἐπινοήσασιν, μάθωσιν [μάθωσιν CH, μάθην VR; La omits ἐπ. μα.] D in N 741 ἐπιφρασασιάμεθα: ἐπινοῆσαμεν (2) / (3) P. Er]. 3 (paraphrase of συμφάσατο at A 540) συνε[βο]ύλευσατο ΠΒ ἐπισκέψαντο (ἐπινοήσασιν) ΠΒ νοησαίαν ΠΒ ἐννοησαίαν ΡΜ, ΡΓ γνώεν (4) Hes.ε5396 ἐπιφρασασιάμεθα: σκεφάσαμεν AS; ε5397 ἐπιφράσεσθαι: ὑπονοήσαι ἦ ἐπινοήσα; φ829 φραζέ: δεικνύει, σημαίνει, λέγει, δηηείται, σκεπτεται, διανοεῖται Syn.409,3 φραζόμενος: σκεπτόμενος, διανουόμενος; Sud.ε7254 ἐπιφρασθείς: ενθυμηθείς, διαλογισόμενος Et. Mag. 799, 16 φραζω...ek toutow το ἐπιφρασασιατο, ἀντι του ἐπισκέψαντο, ἐπινοήσασιν, μάθωσιν...


Line 16 θέμεναι (1) D in B 285 θέουα [om. RVLa] D in Δ 57 θέμεναι: θεύναι, ποησάι (2) / (3) ΡΒ, ΡΓ, ΡΓ, ΡΓ ποιησαι PM ποιεῖν (4) Hes.θ230 θέμεναι: καταβαλοῦσαι Et. Gud. 258, 1 θέμεναι: θεύναι, ποιῆσαι. οι κανόνες επ των εἰς ἀπαρεμφάτων [θεύναι,ποιήσαι - in a gap left between θέμεναι and οι κανόνες]

Line 17 ὑπόσχεσιν (1) D in B 286 ὑπόνταξιν D in B 349 ψεῦδος ὑπόσχεσις: ψεῦδος ὑπόσχεσις (2) / (3) ΡΒ σύνταξιν ΡΓ, ΡΓ ἐπαγγελίαν ΡΜ, ΡΓ ὑπόσχεσιν (4) Hes.ν766 ὑποσχέσεις: ἐπαγγελία Cyg. ὑποσχόμενος: ἐπαγγελόμενος Ρ* ὑπόσχετο:ἐπηγείλατο Ρ* & Barb. Gr. Syn.399,20 (= Phot.) ὑπόσχεται: ἐκτεινα; 399,21 (= Phot.) ὑπόσχεται: ὑπολαβέναι, ἀπαιτηθήναι, ὑποθεῖναι; 399,22 ὑπόσχουμεν: ὑποβάλλωμεν Et. Gud. 545, 23 (= ms.) ὑπόσχεσις ἐπαγγελίας διαφέρει...

Line 19 ὑπέσταν (1) D in B 286 ἦνπερ ὑπέσταν: ἦντον ὑπέσχοντό σοι D in Δ 267 ὑπέσταν: ὑπεσχόμην D in E 715, Τ 195 ὑπέσταν: ὑπεσχόμεθα D in I 515 ὑπέστα: ὑπέσχετο (2) sch. mai. in E 269 ὑπόσχον; ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑποστήσας καὶ "ὑπέστημεν" ὑπεσχόμεθα (Τ) (3) ΡΒ ὑπέσχοντο ΡΓ, ΡΓ ἐπηγεῖλαντο ΡΜ, ΡΓ ὑπέσχοντο (4) Hes.υ513 ὑπέσταν: ὑπέστησαν”, ἐπηγεῖλαντο Syn.396,29 (= Sud.υ397) ὑπέστησαν: ὑπεσχόμθα Lex. Hom. ὑπέσταν: ἐπηγεῖλαντο

line 22 ἵπποβότοιο (1) D in B 287, Γ 75, Z 152 ἵπποτρόφου (2) 
Ap.Soph.92,11 ἵπποβότον ἢ ἤπιους μεγαλόβου. τὸ γὰρ ἤπιον ἐπὶ τοῦ 
μεγάλου, ὡς ἤποπόπαρημον, τὸν 
μεγαλόπαρημον (3) PB,PW, PV, PM, PG ἵπποτρόφου (4) Hes.812 
ἵπποβότοιο: ἦπιος. 1813 ἤπιοβότον: ἥπιος μεγαλόβοτον, καὶ 
εὐχείον, τὸ γὰρ ἤπιον ὅνομα ἐπὶ τοῦ μεγάλου τίθεται Syn.263,1-2 (=Sud.553) ἵπποβότος: μεγάλην γῆν ἐχον. 
δυναμένος ἢπιοὺς τρέφειν 
Lex.Hom. ἵπποβότοιο: ἦπικωτάτου (N.B. U uses this gloss also 
for ἥπιοβότος, ἤπιοδαμοῖς, ἤπιοδαμῶς, ἤπιοκορυστά, ἤπιοτα!) 
Et.Gud.281,19 ἵπποβότος: ἤπποτροφός...

line 23 ἐκπέρσαντα (1) P. Berol. inv. 50141 (sch. in A 
21) ἐκπέρσαι: ἐκπορθήσαι D in A 19 ἐκπέρσαι: ἐκπορθήσαι, καταστρέψαι D 
in B 113 ἐκπέρσαντα: ἐκπορθήσαντα D in A 164 ἐκπέρσωσιν: ἐκπορθήσωσι, 
καταστρέψωσι (2) sch.mai. in B 288 ἴλον ἐκπέρσαντι: πορθήσαντι σοι 
τὸ ἴλον συναπονεέσθαι (T) (3) PB,PW, PV, PM, PG ἐκπορθήσαντ(ι) (4) 
Hes.e1609 ἐκπέρσαι: ἐκπορθήσαι ἰγὴ ἐλείν, λαβεῖν; ε1610 ἐκπέρσαντα: 
ἐκπορθήσαντα; ω1611 ἐκπέρσωσιν: ἐκπορθήσωσιν Syn.214,8 (= Sud.e565) 
ἐκπέρσαι: ἐκπορθήσαι

line 26 νέεσθαι (1) D in B 290 οἶκονδε νέεσθαι: εἰς τὸν οἶκον 
πορεύεσθαι [παραγένεσθαι R] See also testimonia, fragment 2, 
col.i, 1.21 (2) See testimonia, frag. 2, col.i, 1.21 (3) PB 
πορεύεσθαι PW, PV ἐπανελθένι PM, PG ἀπείναι (4) See 
testimonia, frag. 2, col.i, 1.21.

line 27 ἀνιχνέντα (1) D in B 291 τὴν ψυχὴν ὀδυνηθέντα (2) 
Or.612,10 ἀνία ἡ λύπη (3) PB ἀνιαβέντα PW ὀδυνηθέντα PV 
λυπηθέντα PM, PG ἀληγάσαντα (4) Hes.a5193 ἀνιχνέντα: λυπηθέντα τῷ 
Cyρ. ἀνισώμα: λυποῦμαι; ἀνίαμα: δακνωμαί, λυποῖμαι B.L. 
Syn.99,1 (= Phot.a1994) ἀνιχνέσαι: λυπηθέσαι Sud.a2463 ἀνιχνέθην: λυπηθέντα

Line 28 ἀσχαλάει (1) D in B 293 λυπεῖται, ἀσχάλει D in X 412 
ἀσχαλώσα: δυσανασχετοῦντα, λυπούμενον D in Ω 403 ἀσχαλώσα: 
δυσανασχετοῦν, λυποῦνται (2) Or.20,34 (= frag. incertioris 
sedis in Theodoridis’ edition) ἀσχαλάν: παρὰ τὸ ἄχο τὸ 
λυπ...οτὸς Φιλόξενος. (3) PB, PW, PV λυπεῖται PM, PG ἀσχάλει (4) 
Hes.a7970 ἀσχαλάει: δυσανασχέτες; a7971 ἀσχάλει: ὀχλοῦται, *λυπεῖται, 
ἀθυμε ν γ(AS) ἄδημοιν ο ἀγανακτεῖ Cyρ. ἀσχάλει: λυπεῖται, ἀθυμε,
Testimonia - Column 2

Line 1 πλατανίστωι (1) D in B 307 πλατάνωι (2) / (3) PB,PW,PV,PM,PG πλατάνωι (4) Hes.π2474 πλατανίστον: πλατάνων Lex.Hom. πλατανίστον: τὴν πλάτανον Et.Mag.674,39 & Et.Gud. (etymologies only)

(1) Αγλασον (1) P. Amh. II 19 (col. vii, sch. in A 575) [αγλασος] λαμπρος D in A 23, A 213 αγλασι: καλα D in B 307, B 506 καλον (2) Ap.289,24 αγλασιν γραμματικον[ην] διανυγεται, μεγα, λαμπρον (3) PB καλον και λαμπρον PW, PV λαμπρον PM, PG διειδεις (4) Hes.α588 αγλασι: *λαμπρα, καλα (P)η ανθηρα; α597 *αγλασι: λαμπροι (P); α600 αγλασιν...γλαφυρον Κρήτης και Κύπριοι; α601 *αγλασιν εδραν: λαμπραν καθεδραν νgAn Cyg. αγλασι: λαμπροι; αγλασι: λαμπρος, εντιμος B αγλασι: λαμπροι B.L.

Line 3 σημαν (1) D in B 308 σημα (2) / (3) A 381 σηματα φαινον: σημεια φανερα ποιον... D in Z 419 σημα: ταφον D in H 189 σημαν: σημειον D in K 415 σηματι: ταφωι D in X 30 σημα: σημειον D in Ψ 331 σημα: σημειον D in Ω 349 μεγα σημα...ταφον (2) Ap.Soph.141,6 σημα έπι μεν του σημειου...και παλιν...έστω δε και έπι το ταφου. Ap.331,7 σημα: σημειον τ ταφον sch.mai. in Ζ 178 σημα κακον: οτι σημεια λεγει, ου γραμματα... (Ariston. A) (3) PB,PM,PG σημειον PWτερωσιον PV τερας τι (4) Hes.α492 σημα: ταφος, μνημα, η ναου ειδος [σημαια, σημειον] Cyg. σηματα: σημεια, τερατα. Αττικο δε μνηματα U & Barb.Gr. Sud.σ308 σημα: τ ταφος Lex.Hom. σηματα: σημεια τ ταφοι. σημα ταφος και σημειον Et.Mag.711,8 σημα...το σημειον...

Line 4 σμερδαλεος (1) D in B 309, (Ε 302) καταπληκτικος, φοβερος (2) sch.mai. in B 309 (T = D) Ap.Soph.143,8 σμερδον: δεινον, καταπληκτικον Herod. (περι ορθογραφιας) II,424,14 ...σμερδαλεος ο καταπληκτικος και καλεπος... An. Ox.Ι, 390,19 σμερδαλεα...μεριζεται γαρ ἡ ψυχη των ορων του φοβου, και ουκ εα ον αυτοι μενειν... (3) PB, PW, PV καταπληκτικον(ν) PM, PG στιβοντας εχουν τους οφθαλμους και την όρασι η κεφαλουντας (4) Hes.σ1231 σμερδαλεον: φοβερον, καταπληκτικον Cyg.
σμερδαλέος: φοβερός, καταπληκτικός U & Barb.Gr. σμερδνόν: δεινόν, καταπληκτικόν U* 

Line 5 δαφινος (1) D in B 308 νώτα δαφινος: πυρρός κατά τὰ νώτα ἡ ἀγαν φόνιος D in K 23 δαφινος: ἀντὶ τοῦ δαφινοῦ, φονευτικό... D in Λ 474 δαφινοι: φονίοι ἡ πυρροι (2) sch mai. in K 23 λιῶν φονευτικῶν, τίνες δὲ πυρρόν (bT) sch mai. in K 23 φοβερὸν, καταπληκτικὸν, ἡ τὸ ἐκ δαφινοῦ καὶ καταπληκτικοῦ λέοντος (Ail) Ap.Soph.56,11 ὁ μεγάλως φονίου (καὶ) ἐρυθρός, ἐννιοὶ δὲ δαφινοῦ τὸν μεγάλος φόνιον ἀπ.307,8 δαφινοὺς γ' ὁ πυρρος, ἡ μέλας καὶ ὁ φόνιος Οἰ.43,1 δαφινος: μέλας, φοινην γαρ τὸ μέλαν... An.Ox.1,110,26 ἐκ τοῦ φονίου ἡ πυρρός... (3) ΠΒ πυρρός ΠΒ ἐρυθρός ΠΒ πυρός (sic!) ΠΜ,ΠΓ φοινίκου (4) Hes.6334 δαφινοι: λιῶν φονίοι; δι.35 δαφινόν: μέλαν, δεινόν, ποικίλον, ἐρυθρόν, πυρρόν Lex.Hom. δαφινοι: μέλας Et.Gen. (= Et.Mag.250,21) δαφινοι: πυρρός κατὰ νώτα, παρὰ τὸ δαῖμ. ὁ ἀγαν φόνιος παρὰ τὸ δα καὶ τὸ φόνος, ὁ πυρρος ἡ ἐρυθρός ἡ μέλας καὶ μάλλον παρὰ τὸ δα καὶ τὸ φόνος ἵνα ὁ μεγάλως φονίος, τούτεστιν ὁ μέλας, φόνος γαρ τὸ σίμα... Et.Gud.335,5 δαφινοι: ἐκ τοῦ φονίου, ὁ πυρρος καὶ τούτῳ ἐκ τοῦ φόνος... 335,14 δαφινοι: ὁ μέλας. τὸ δὲ ἐκ ἐπιτακτικὸν. καὶ εἰς τὸ φοινικοῦν.

Line 6 ολύμπιος (1) D in Α 353 ολύμπιος: ὁ τὸν ολυμπόν κατοίκων 
Zeus D in B 309 ο Zeus (2) / (3) ΠΒ,ΠΒ,ΠΒ ο Ζεὺς ΠΜ,ΠΓ ο οὐράνιος 
Zeus (4) Hes.6564 ολύμπιος: οὐράνιος rASvg Cyg. ολύμπιος: οὐράνιος, 
θαυμαστός B

Line 7 φῶς δὲ (1) D in B 309 εἰς τὸ φῶς D in Π 188 πρὸ φῶς δὲ: 
εἰς τὸ φῶς, καὶ εἰς τὸ φανερόν... (2) sch mai. in B 309 εἰς φανερὸν (Τ) (3) 
ΠΒ,ΠΜ,ΠΓ εἰς τὸ φῶς ΠΒ,ΠΒ εἰς φῶς (4) / 

Line 8 επαιξα (1) P. Strassb. inv. gr. 1015 (sch. in E 98) επαιξασσαι: εφόρμησαντα D in B 146, B 310, (Ε 98), (Ε 325), (Ε 263), (Ε 323), (Κ 369) εφορμήσας D in Γ 369 επαιξας: ἐπιδραμῶν, εφορμήσας D in Λ 361 ἐπαιξασσαι: ἐπιεικῶν, ἐφορμήν D in Ψ 64 'Εκτορ' ἐπαιξασσαι: ἐπὶ 'Εκτορα ὀρμῶν (2) Οἰ.612,36 αἴσι παρὰ τὸ ἀίσισο, τὸ ὀρμῷ... sch mai. in B 146 ...επαιξας δὲ ἀναβας αἰγιδόθης πνεύμασα (bT) sch mai. in N 513 οὔτ ἀρ' 
ἐπαιξα... οὕτε ὀρμῆσαι ἐπὶ τὸ ἱδιον βέλος... (bT) (3) ΠΒ ὑπεξελθὼν ΠΒ,ΠΒ

Line 10 στρούθου (1) D in B 311 στρούθου (2) / (3) PB, PW, PV, PM, PG στρούθου (4) Lex.Hom. στρούθου: στρούθου

Line 11 πετάλιοις (1) D in πετάλιοις [-λα- R]: φύλλοις (2) Ap.Soph.130,33 πέταλα: φύλλα, καὶ ψυπτέτηλα τὴν εἰς ύψος φύλλα ἐχουσαν (3) PB, PW, PV, PM, PG φύλλοις (4) Hes.π2045 πέταλα[...]ν: φύλλον...

Line 12 ὑποπεπτίστες (1) D in B 312 ὑπωπεπτωκότες, ὑποκειμένοι [ὑποκειμ. om. H] (2) Mosch. ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑποκειμένοι, ἀπὸ ὑπωπεπτωκότες, κατὰ συγκοπὴν ὑποπεπτίστες... (3) PB, PW, PV ὑπωπεπτωκότες PM, PG ὑποκειμένα (4) Lex.Hom. ὑπωπεπτίστας: ὑπωπεπτωκότας Sud.υ567 ὑπωπεπτίστα: ὑπωπεπτάντα

Line 13 ἔλεεινά (1) D in B 314 ἐλεεινός, οἰκτρός (2) / (3) PB, PW, PV, PM, PG ἐλεεινῶς (4) Hes.ε1961 ἐλεεινά: οἰκτρά, μ *οἰκτρῶς, ἐλεεινός Sn Sud.ε781 Δ ἐλεεινός: ο ἐλεέος ἅξιος (Et.Gen. (= Et.Mag.327,28) derivations) Et.Mag.452,5 ἐλεεινός...οὖτως καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλεέος γίνεται ἐλεεινός, ἐλέους ἅξιος...

Line 15 τετριγώτας (1) D in B 314 τρίζοντας, κράζοντας, ποιὰν τινα φωνὴν ἀποτελοῦντας D in Ψ 101 τετριγώτα: τρίζουσα, ποίον ἤχον ἀποτελοῦσα D in Ψ 714 τετρίζει: έτριζεν (2) Ap.Soph.156,1 τρίζουσαι, τῶν πεποιημένων ἡ λέξει Mosch.: ποιὰ φωνὴ, ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν νυκτερίδων κυρίως τιθέται Οx.152,24 τρίζο, παρὰ τὸ τρῶ, τρίζω παράγον ἐνδοὶ δὲ ὁδυνηρὰν τινα φωνὴν ἐνθ' ὁ γε τοὺς ἐλεεινά κατῆπε πετριγώτας sch.mai. in Ψ 101 τετριγώτα: ἐλεεινά βοῶσα ώς ἐπὶ τῶν γεοσσῶν (BT) (3) PB, PW, PV, PM, PG τρίζοντα(c) (4) Hes.τ648 τετρίζει: έτριζεν; τ649 τετρίζε: τρίζει [τετριγώτα]; τ650 τετριγώτας: τρίζοντας; τ651 τετριγώτα: [τετριγώτα] τρίζουσα Cyr. τρίζοντας
U & Barb.Gr. Syn. 385,23 

τετριζούσα τριζουσα 385,22 (= Sud.412) 

τριζούσα λεξ. Hom. 

τριζούσα 

Line 16 ἀμφεπότατο (1) D in B 315 περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπέτατο (2) / 
(3) PB περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπέτατο PW, PV, PM, PG περιεπέτατο (4) Hes.α3293 
ἀμφεπότατο: περιεπέτατο Et.Gen. (= Et. Mag. 88, 47) περὶ τῶν τεκνῶν αὐτῆς λυπομένη ἐπέτατο 

Line 18 (1) wooden tablet¹ (sch. in A 39) ελελίκτο: εστρέφετο P. Colon. inv. 2281² (col.iii, sch. in A 530) ελελίκεν 

scrib[en] ["Man kann auch scrib[en] I [scrib] lesen...Das 
Wort ist belegt bei Diod. 13,101 und Eust. 494,22 zu Δ437] D in A 530 ελελίκεν: εκινήσεν, ἐσείσει D in B 316 ἐπιστραφεὶς [CH only] D in E 497 ἐλελίχθη: συνεστράφησαν, μεταβαλλόμενοι εἰλήφθησαν D in Z 109 

ἐλελίχθησαν: συνεστράφησαν D in Θ 199 ελελίκεν: εκινήσεγ D in Θ 340 

ελισσόμενος: συστραφόμενος D in M 74 ἐλιχθέντων D in M 408, M 467, N 204 ἐλιξάμενος: ἐπιστραφεῖς D in N 558 ἐλελίκτο: ἐιλεῖτο, ἐστρέφετο D in P 278 ἐλελίξει: συνείλησε, συνέστρεψεν D in P 728 ἐλείξεται: 

ἐπιστρέφεται D in Σ 372 ἐλισσόμενον: νῦν κακοπαθοῦντα, ἑνεργοῦντα D in Φ 11 ἐλισσόμενοι: στραφομένοι D in X 95 ἐλισσόμενος: συστραφόμενος, 

εἰλούμενος D in X 448 ἐλελίχθη: κλονείδος ἐσείσθη ὑπὸ τρόμου D in Ψ 309 

ἐλίσσεμεν: ἐιλεῖν, κάμπτειν D in Ψ 846 ἐλισσόμενη: συστραφομένη (2) 

Ap. Soph. 66, 5 ἐλελίξει: συνεστρέψεν, συνέσεισεν 66, 6 ἐλελιχθέντες: 

συστραφέντες, μεταβαλλόμενοι An. Ox. I, 138, 5 μετοχῇ ἐκ τοῦ ἐλελίσσω, 

tοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ εἰλῷ, τὸ συστρέφω... (3) P. Erl. 3 (paraphrase of ελελίξεν at A 530) ἐι[σείσειν] επιστραφεῖς PW συστραφέις PV (/) PM, PG κάμψα (4) Hes. ε1981 ἐλελίκτο: συνέστρατο: ε1982 *ἐλελιξάμενος: σείσας 

*ἐπιστραφεῖς g συστραφάς S; ει1083 ἐλελίξει: *διεσείσεις AS ἐκίνησεν, ἐκράδανεν, συστραφθαν ἐποίησεn Syn. 215, 27 (=Sud. ε787) ἐλελιξάμενος: 

ἐπιστραφεῖς Syn. 215, 28 (=Sud. ε788) ἐλελιχθησαν: συστραφόταν 

Et. Gud. 453, 3 ἐλελιξάμενος...ἐπιστραφεῖς, μετοχῇ ἐκ τοῦ ἐλελίσσω, τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ εἰλῷ, τὸ συστρέφω... 

Line 19 ἀμφιαχύναν (1) D in B 316 περὶ τῶν τεκνῶν [τὰ τέκνα 

RVLα] αὐτῆς θρηνοῦσαν (2) An. Ox. I, 15, 13 μετοχῇ θηλυκῇ ἐκ τοῦ ἀμφιάχω, τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ ἵα ἐκπεμπομένη βοή... continues with a 
digression on anewοι)... λοιπὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἵα γέγονεν ἵαχω καὶ ἱαχῇ καὶ ἀμφιάχω... (3) PB περὶ τῶν τεκνῶν θρηνοῦσαν PW τρυζουσαν PV (/) PM σὺν γώι περιπετομένη PG σὺν γώι pετομένην (4) Hes. α3948 *ἀμφιαχῦνα:

¹Published in CE 43 (1968) p. 114ff. 
²Published in "Scholia Minora II".
**περί τῶν τέκνων ὀδυρομένη (νγS) ἡ κραυγάζουσα ἡ φωνοῦσα Συγ. περὶ τῶν τέκνων ὀδυρομένη Β & Β.Σ. Ετ.Μαγ. 88,52 ἵα, ἡ ἐκπεμπομένη βοὴ...περιβούσα ἡ τρύγουσα...**

This fragment contains scholia minora to B 303 – 336. The scholia are written across the fibres, though the "recto" is bare. The fragment was folded in antiquity, as the pattern of worm-holes and breakages show; it is quite a dark brown in colour. There are no margins at top or bottom, so the original height is not calculable. The text is almost complete on the right-hand side and between six and ten letters are missing from the left-hand side; however, they are easily supplemented as it is mainly only the lemmata that are missing. At its tallest the fragment measures 11.9cm, at its widest, 6.7cm.

Its contents seem to set it apart from those scholia minora originating in schools (see, for example, notes to lines 4 and 15) and if we have conjectured correctly, then the fragment post-dates Herodian. One thing is clear: the fragment consists of a student's lecture notes. A most interesting comparison is between fragment 5 and fragment 4 that covers the same lines; in fragment 4, many more words are glossed, whereas here only those words are glossed that might have proved more taxing. While one could imagine fragment 4 as being a predecessor of the two paraphrase/scholia minora fragments discussed in the introduction (where every word is glossed and the resulting glosses can be strung together to form a translation), fragment 5 is more the predecessor of an exegetical commentary, as we find in fragments 6 and 7. The testimonia for those words which also occur in fragment four may be found under fragment 4 and not here.
The hand is of the "strenger Stil" type (see Schubart, p.124ff.), known to us from several hundred examples, the earliest of which is generally considered to be the British Museum Bakchylides papyrus (late second century). The type is further classifiable into several sub-groups, currently being studied by Prof. Messeri, whose conclusions we cannot anticipate here.1 The scribe of this papyrus, writing in the third century, maintained bilinearity (with the exceptions of the protruding strokes of phi and the small omicron), but perhaps was not very practised, since the slant common to this type is not evenly maintained.

Text

Auλίς πολ ις της [Βοιω]τιας 1
ηγερεθον [το συνα[θρό]ζοντο
πλατανις [τω πλατανῳ
δαφοινος μ ελας
σμερδαλεο [ν καταπλη<κτι>κον
ορουσεν ωρ [μωσε
πεταλοις [φυλλοις
υποπε [τηωτες υποκειμενοι
αμφιπό [ιατο περιπετατο
ελελιζαμ [ενος συστραφεις
αμφιαχυ [ιαν περι αυτων κραζουσαν
αιζηλον αδη [λον αφανη
λαιν λιθ [ον
πελωρα ιπερατα
ανεω αφ [ωνην οιον ανιωρι
εφηνε φ [ανερον και εγηθηλον εθηκε
οψιτελεσ [τον [με]τα πολλων χρονον
] Τελεσθησουςεμεν[ον
κλεος φ [ημην[δοξα]ς
μιμνητε [μενετε]
[20
eιο κεν [εμοσιαν
μεγιαχον ε [κραυγαζον
κοναβηςαν ] τον [η]χον απετελε[σαν
ιπποτα [φ]υγιας

1We are grateful to Prof. Messeri for much help with this type of hand.
Commentary

4) Cf. note to frag. 4, col. ii, 1.5.

5) The reading συμερδαλέον is not otherwise attested, and in any case is not grammatically feasible. One wonders if the teacher was reporting the opinion of a famous scholar, and thus used an expression containing an accusative and infinitive; a similar explanation would obtain for the accusatives of the glosses in line 19. The omission of three letters in καταπλη<κπ>κον is perhaps a sign of haste.

10) A form of συστρέφω with double sigma is not attested and may represent a misguided attempt at assimilation by the writer.

12) For this reading and its alternative ἄριζηλον cf. frag. 4, note to col. ii, 1.18.

15) This word in its various forms seemed to present problems in antiquity. ἄνεος and ἄνως are attested in the lexica; ἄνεςι was construed as an adjective in Attic form, and ἄνεος as an adverb. Though ἄνως features in the lexica as the precursor of ἄνεος, we think it unlikely that for the strange, otherwise unattested form given here in the fragment (ἀνωο[ι]) this was what the scribe had in mind. We believe that the expression οἰον ἄνωο[ι] resulted from a comment very similar to that attributed to Herodian (from the Venetus A manuscript): "ὁ δὲ δὲ μετὰ τοῦ τὸ ὁίον οἱ ἄνεως, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ "ἡ δ' ἁνεω δὴν ἥστο" δίχα τοῦ τοῦ. The scribe may have misunderstood and put his iota in the wrong place; the termination -οι may also have resulted from a misunderstanding of οἱ ἀνεωι. Alternatively, the scribe may have simply written iota for epsilon as the discussion was about iotas.

16) Note the assimilation; cf. Gignac I p. 174.

17) The form πολλαν is not unparalleled. Gignac (II p. 143-4) says: "The nominative and accusative masculine and neuter sporadically have the stem πολλ-...This is an orthographic variant involving the identification of single and double consonants rather than a new formation." However, all the examples he cites are late (sixth - seventh century).
24) The traces left in 1.24 should in all probability be supplemented φυγας, a frequent gloss for ἵππος. Aristonikos denied that ἵππος should be interpreted as φυγας when applied to Οἶνως (see the scholia on Σ 117, 119 and 120). The meaning φυγας is given in Ap.Soph., who applies it to Φοίνιξ ("...quod non est apud Homerum, quamquam est ἵππιατα Φοίνιξ (Π 196)..."1). It also came to be applied to Nestor at this point, but sadly we cannot tell whether our fragment merely perpetuated the meaning φυγας, taken up by the neoteroi, or whether it rejected it.

Testimonia


Line 2 ἡγερέθοντο (1), (3) & (4) See testimonia to fragment 2, col. i, 1.2. (3) PB,PW,PV συνηθροίζοντο PM,PG ηθροϊζοντο


Line 14 πέλωρα (1) D in B 321 μέγιστα σημεῖα D in Σ 410 πέλωρ: μέγιστον (2) sch.mai. in Σ 410 πέλωρ αἵττον...ἐστιν ὄν τέρας μέγα... (Τ) (3) ΠΒ φοβερὰ μέγιστα σημεῖα ΠΒ φοβερὰ σημεῖα PV (/) PM,PG μεγάλως φοβερά πράγματα (4) Hes.πi1368 πέλωρα: θηρία, δείπνα, τέρατα, σημεῖα μεγάλα Cyr. πέλωρον: μέγαν U & Barb.Gr. Syn.336,5 πέλωρ: μέγα τέρας τι Sud.πi50 πέλωρ: μέγα περοστειον Et.Gen. πέλωρ: βούλεται γάρ εἶναι

1Lehrs, "De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis", p. 105.
I. Άνεω (1) D in B 323 Άνεω: ένεωi [C only] Άνεωi [H only] αφωνοι. κατα στηρήσει της ισχυς, ο εστι της φωνης. D in I 30 Άνεω: 'αφωνοι, 'συχοι (2) Ox.19, 33 Άνεω: ια, η φωνη, πλ. του ω ισχυ. άπο του 'επι πάσαν άκοην ιέναι. και κατα στηρήσει ιέναι άνιος, ως χώρα, άχωρος. μεταθέτει του τ εις ἐ, Άνεως, και 'Αττικῶς Άνεως. Ησυχ.ΙΙ,135,5 (peri οδυνησίας προσδιαίας) Άνεω: συν τω τ το Άνεωι. ευθεία έστι πληθυντική από του Άνεως. Μοσχ. 'άφωνοι μετ' εκπλήξεως. απο του στερητικοῦ α και του αυχ, το φων, άναυς και 'Αττικῶς Άνεως... sch mai. in B 323 τιπτ Άνεω: κατα στηρήσει της ισχυς, ο εστι της φωνης... An.ΟΧ.Ι,15,13...εξ αυτω τοιος, και μετα του στερητικου α ιιος και ιιας, ο 'αφωνος, και το 'Αττικον Άνεως και Άνεω... An.ΟΧ.Ι,42,4 Άνεως: τουτο σχηματιζεται διττοω. η γαρ εκ του ια εστι, και σημαινε την φωνην...μετα του στερητικου α άνιος...και το 'Αττικον Άνεως. η παρα το αυχ το φων γινεται άναυς ο 'αφωνος και αποβολη του υ άναυς... Αρ.Σωφ.32,11 Άνεω: εκπληξομενοι, και σιον άνωτοι, ρφωνοι διεκπληξεν... (3) PB άνεωi (και αφωνοι) PW ήσυχοι PV (/) PM,PG αφωνοι μετ'εκπληξεως... (4) Ηεσ.α5028 άνεωi: *'άφωνοι Α ένεωι, και εκπληξει ήσυχοι Συγ. ένεως: κωφος, ἀνέσθητος B Συν.221,15 ένεως: 'αφωνος, κωφος, ενέστηκως, νωδος, νωχελης Lex.Hom. άνεωι: επαυσα<ν>τo U [haec, in a ad Ι84 applicta, non ad άνεωi sed ad έσχοντο (μάχης) respiciant, cui voce D necnon Hesychius s.v. έσχοντο tribuerunt.] Ετ.Γεν. άνεως: ο 'αφωνος. "τίπτ'άνεωι έγινεσθε:" έστιν ια η φωνη και τη θυγ. του ω ισχυ [a τοι ιoθ mss.] δια το τυ πάσαν άκοην ιέναι. εξ αυτου γίνεται ιος και αιως και [αιως και om. ΑI] άνιος ο 'αφωνος, και μεταθεσει του τ εις ε Άνεως και άττικώς δια του ω Άνεως. η απο του αυχ του σημαινοντος το φων γινεται ημιατοι και νομιμαι... Μοσχ. B αιως και άναυς ως αιως αναινος, και κατα αποκοπην του υ άναυς και άττικως Άνεως, ως ναος νεως και λαος λεως. Ετ.Γεν. ένεως: 'αφωνος, απο του την ιων παρεωτω εξειν Ετ.Γευ.142,12 ουτως ουν και ια άνιος και το 'Αττικον άνεως ως και προειπομεν, η παρα το αυχ το φων γινεται άναυς, ο 'αφωνος και αποβολη του ή άναυς... Ετ.Μαγ.340,48 ένεως: απο του την ιων παρεαυτω εξειν. η ο δια μωραι θαραγως και αμνημων, άφου και έμεξειν λεγουσι το δια μωραιν περιβλεποντας... Ετ.Μαγ.104,16 (a version of An.OX. Ι,42,4)... Line 17 άφιτελοστον (1) D in B 325 Όφε και βραδεως τελεσθηςομενον (2) Mosch. ...βραδυ και όφε του χρόνου αποβησόμενον Αρ.Σωφ.125,30 όφιμον, άφιτελοστον: όφε άρξαμενον τελειουσθαι και [ώφιτ.] άφε πελεσθηςομενον (3) PB Όφε και βραδεως τελεσθηςομενον PW
Line 19 κλέος (1) D in B 325 δόξα D in Ε 3 κλέος εσθλών: δόξαν ἀγαθὴν D in I 413 κλέος ἀφίτον: ἀθάνατος δόξα, καὶ φήμη D in Α 21 κλέος: φήμη D in Α 227 μετὰ κλέος ἵκετ' Ἀχαιῶν: μετὰ τὴν ἀκών τῆς ἐπιστρατείας τῶν Ἑλλήνων κληδόνα ἡ φήμη ἀκουσά... D in X 514 (δόξαν) (2) Αρ. 321,19 κλέος: φήμη, δόξα, κληδόν Αρ. Σωφ. 100, 3 κλέος: φήμη. "ημεῖς δὲ κλέος οἴνον ἀκουσώμεν" σημαίνει καὶ τὴν καθήμας δόξαν (3) ΒΒ, ΠΒ δόξα ΠΒ (/) ΠΒ, ΠΓ φήμη (4) Ησ. κ.2926 κλέος: δόξα σ. ΑΣγν τιμή s φήμη n ἀγαθή...ο ἐστιν ἑπαίνον pς Συγ. κλέος: δόξα B Συγ. 278, 25 (=Συδ. κ.1729) κλέος: δόξα Συγ. A κλέος: Πινάραρος. οὐκ ὄδικα ὡς τὸν φησίν κλέος, κέλεος κατὰ συγκοπὴν κλέος... Συγ. Β κλέος: παρὰ τὸ κλαίω...λεγεῖται γὰρ κλέος ἡ δόξα ἡ ἐξακουσώμεν φήμη Συγ. 517, 15 κλέος: ἡ δόξα, παρὰ τὸ κλεῖω τὸ δόξαζω...δοξύναι σε δεῖ Συγ. 326, 3 κλέος καὶ δυσκλεά: παρὰ τὸ δυσμορίον καὶ τὸ κλέος. τὸ δὲ κλέος παρὰ τὸ κλεῖω τὸ δόξαζω.

Line 20 μιμήτη (1) D in B 331 μένετε D in Α 340 μιμήτη: περιμένετε D in Ε 94 μένον: ἐμενόν (2) / (3) ΒΒ μένετε ΠΒ, ΠΓ μείνατε ΠΜ, ΠΓ μένετε (4) Ησ. μ.1381 μιμνάζετε: μιμήτη, μένετε Συγ. Μιμήτη: μένεται: μένεται

Line 21 εἰς ὁ' κεν (1) D in B 332 ἐβας ὁ' ἀν (2) / (3) ΒΒ, ΠΒ, ΠΓ ἐβας ὁ' ἀν ΠΒ ὡς ἀν ΠΜ, ΠΓ ἐβας ὁ' ἀν (4) Ησ. ε.1171 εἰς ὁ' κεν: ἐβας ὁ' ἀν Συγ. 211, 13 εἰς ὁτι δῆ: ἐβας ὁ' ἀν Συγ. Μιμήτη: εἰς ὁ' κεν: ἐβας ὁ' ἀν ΣΥ

Line 22 (μέγ'ίαχον (1) Π. Οξυ. XLV 3238 (sch. in Α 482) ιαχε: εφονει D in Α 482 μεγάλ'ιαχε: μεγάλος ἡ'χει D in B 333 μέγιαχον: μεγάλος ἐβόησαν [CH] D in B 394 ιαχον: ἠχησαν, ἐβόησαν D in Α 506 μεγιαχον: μεγα ἐβόησαν D in E 302 ιαχον: ἐβοῆσαν, κράζων D in E 343 ιαχοῦσα: βοῆσασα, κραζάσα D in H 468 ιαχον: κραζόν D in Υ 62: ιαχον: ἐβόσα D in Φ 10 ἀμφὶ περὶ μεγαλίαχο: μέγα περίῆχουν (2) Αρ. 319, 27 ἰαχεν: βοᾶν, ἰαχεὶν (3) ΒΒ, ΠΓ μεγάλωπεδ' ἐβόησαν ΠΓ μεγ' ἐβόησαν PG μεγάλος ἠχησαν ΠΜ μεγα βοῆσαντες (4) Ησ. ι.106 ἰαχε: φανεί, φοίει ἠχησε μ; ι.108 ιαχεν: ἠχησεν, ἐβόησεν ΑΣγν ἐκραύγασεν Κυρ. ἰαχεν: ἠχησεν, ἐβόησεν B Συγ. 259, 24 ἰαχη: βοῆ, ἰαχο, ἡ θρήνος Sud. 169 ἰαχη: ἐβόησεν Ετ. Κουν. (not found in ms.) ἰαχη: ἠχησαν, ἐβόησαν Ετ. Κουν. 269, 47 (main text entry in ms.) ἰαχ: εκ τοῦ ἱαχ, τοῦτο παρὰ τὸ ἵα ὁ σημαίνει τὴν φωνήν...
Line 23 κονάβησαν (1) Din B 334, ήχησαν [C adds long comment]  
(2) Mosch. περιεκονάβησαν An. Ox. II, 484, 32-4 (λέεις εκ του θεολόγου) κοναβίζειν: τὸ ἵχον ἀποτελεῖν καὶ βοᾶν σὺν παραχῇ καὶ δορῷβω 
(3) PB, PM, PG περιήχησαν PW, PV ήχησαν (4) Hes. καθαρήσατι: ήχησει (ASN) ψοφήσει π; καθαρήσατι: ήχεος, ψόφος ASvng κρότος 
Cyr. κόναβος: ήχος, ψόφος Β Syn. 281, 13 (= Sud. καθαρήσατι: ψόφος, ήχος Lex. Hom. κονάβησαν: ἤχει, ἐφοβα, κόνησε τῇ γῇ (sic!) 
κόναβος: κονάβησαν ἠχησαν, παρὰ τὸ κόναβος, κονάβω, τούτο παρὰ τῷ τὴν βοην ἀκούσων 336, 41 κόναβος: Ἦχω, παρὰ τὸ κόναβος, τούτο δὲ παρὰ τὸ δονδόναβο καὶ κόναβος. τούτο παρὰ τὸ κόνις, κυρίως γὰρ λέγεται κόναβος, ἢ ἐν τῇ γῇ βοῆ: Et.Mag. 528, 10 κόναβος: [ὁ] Ἦχος, παρὰ τὸ βοῆν κίνειν  

These two fragments stem from the same papyrus codex. The codex is datable to the third century on palaeographical grounds, making these two small fragments quite exceptional. Fragment 6 is too small to yield much information; one side has the remains only of lemmata, the other of some glosses (supplementable from D). It is 5.2cm at its highest and 3.6cm at its widest; there is also a generous margin of 2.8cm on the "recto" and 2.6cm on the "verso". Since fragment 7 covers approximately twenty lines of Homeric text on each side, we can project that these two fragments did not come from the same sheet within a fascicule. There are some accents by the first hand on the "recto" of fragment 7. The circumflex falls between the two letters of a diphthong, and not over the second.

Fragment 7 has a maximum height of 9.2cm and width of 6.2cm. Calculating from the "verso", where three letters are missing from the left-hand side (where the fragment is most complete) and allowing 0.8cm for these letters and 2.6cm for the margin, we can project an original width of 10.1cm. Unfortunately, the original height cannot be calculated with any certainty. However, if we were to place it in any of the categories given by Turner ¹ it could be group 8, where the breadth is approximately half the height. The examples cited in this group² are all from the very earliest stages of the development of the codex. Skeat and Roberts³ note, with Turner etc. that the majority of early codices are from Christian contexts. The remaining early codices are very mixed in nature⁴ and their list includes two fragments of Homer and one fragment of a Homeric lexicon (P. Oxy. XXX 2517 - subsequently attributed to Ap.Soph. by Alpers). Two main reasons for the adoption of the codex

¹In "Typology of the Early Codex", chp.2.
³"The Birth of the Codex".
⁴See Skeat and Roberts, op.cit., p. 71.
form seem to be cheapness\textsuperscript{1} and convenience of consultation\textsuperscript{2}
. The fact that it took so long for non-Christians to adopt what is primarily a Christian format is attributed by Skeat and Roberts to the sheer conservatism of the scriptoria.

These fragments are written in a neat, basically bilinear hand in the "strenger Stil", with a slight inclination. The bilinearity is only interrupted by the small sigma and omicron and the vertical strokes of phi and rho (and occasionally iota). The central horizontal stroke of epsilon protrudes further to the right than the basic oval shape of the letter. This is the most formal hand among the nine Homerica edited here and there are no ligatures. The hand, and the lack of aural comprehension and morphological errors we find in the other fragments would seem to indicate a little book meant for sale. Since fragment 7 finishes just before the Catalogue of Ships, it may well have been the last page of the booklet (- the same length as Moschopulos' "Technologia"). Alternatively, the booklet might have covered all of books A and B, or just B.

\textbf{Text - Fragment 6}

"Recto" (\(\downarrow\))

\begin{tabular}{l}
Αὐλίσ πολίσ Βοιω & πιας \\
ηγερεθόντο συνηθρ & \textit{vacat} \\
ερδομεν επετε & ιουμεν \\
πλαταιστω πλα & \textit{\(\gamma\)} \\
? αγλαον λαμπρο & \textit{\(\gamma\)}
\end{tabular}

"Verso" (\(\rightarrow\))

πελ\(\omega\)α
αναλω
οφι\(\mu\)ον

\textsuperscript{1}See Skeat, "The Length of the Papyrus Roll and the Cost-Advantage of the Codex", ZPE 45 (1982).

\textsuperscript{2}Skeat and Roberts' list includes items handily contained in a single volume, e.g. P. Oxy. XLIV 3157 (Plato's Republic) and lexica, treatises and manuals which a reader might want to peruse rapidly.
οφιτήλεστον
[ι
ου]
ετε[α
πτολεμιζομεν

Testimonia, "Recto"

For Αὐλίς and ἡγερέθοντο, see under fragment 5; for πλατανίστω and ἀγλαόν, see under fragment 4.

Line 4 ἔρδομεν (1) D in B 306 ἐπετελοῦμεν, ἐθύμεν D in I 536 ἔρδοσκεν: εἰργάζετο, ἐπράττεν D in Σ 26 ἀποθύμια ἔρδοι: ἐχθρὰ πράξοι (2) Ἀρ. 315, 6 ἔρδειν: θύειν καὶ πράττειν (3) PB ἐπετελοῦμεν PW, PV, PM, PG ἐθύμεν (4) Ηε. e5678 ἔρδομενον: θυūμενον; e5679 ἔρδοντων: πλουτούντων, θυόντων, τελοῦντων, πρασσόντων Συγ. ἔρδουν: ἐπετέλουν B Λεξ. Ηομ. ἔρδομεν: ἐθύμεν Et. Gud. 517, 19 [cod. z] ἔρδω: σημαίνει β' τὸ ποτίζω...καὶ ἔρδω τὸ πράττω... Et. Mag. 370, 16 ἔρδω: τὸ πράττω... 701, 36 ἔρζαι: παρὰ τὸ ἔρδω, τὸ θύω...

Text - Fragment 7

"Recto" (¶)

[ο[)
]μενων τα σ[υναγε
λ]αστικα των ορ[νεων
ο]ταν προλαβη ζ[ην πτης
ε]ι αναμενειν ζ[ιωθε
]τα υστερα
σα] ιαγει ηχει []
Σκα] μανδριον το παρ[α τω
Σκ]αμανδρω πεδ[ιω
εσ]τι δε ποταμοσ Τροιασ
κον] ζαβιζε ηχει ά[ια γη
ανθεμ] ζεντι ανθη εχοντι
ωρη] ιποι εαρι
σταθμον] ιεπαυλιν
ποιμνιο] ιν την του ποιμε
νος]ιεπαυλιν

15
"Verso" (->)

Commentary - "Recto"

1 - 6) The explanation in lines 2 to 6, only otherwise found in D, differs from that version in that it gives ὑστέρα instead of ὑστεροῦντα. For lines 1 to 2 one might suggest the following supplement: προκαθήκοντων καθεξ[ο]μενων, cf. PB,PW,PV,PO. As we have seen elsewhere, where the explanation of a lemma takes more that one word, the subsequent lines are indented; compare lines 8 to 10.

7) Circumflexes by the first hand.

8 - 10) This simple piece of exegesis is not paralleled anywhere, though cf. Lex.Hom.

11) Testimonia for κοναβιζε may be found under fragment 5. This is the only place in fragments 6 and 7 where two lemmata are dealt with on the same line. Though the lemma-gloss group ᾰια γι might seem to present a problem (αῖα is not in the text at this point, and in fact only occurs at Γ 243 in the Iliad); it must refer to B 465 and be a new reading for the final foot of that hexameter, i.e. αὐτὰρ ὑπά. This reading is otherwise unattested. It has one distinct advantage over χθών in that it avoids the final
There are seven other instances of χθῶv in the final position in the Iliad. Four (∆182, Θ150, Λ740, Φ387) have the formula εὐρεία χθῶv and one has περί χθῶv (Τ362) - in none of these cases could αία be conjectured as a reading in the final foot. Only in two instances could it be conjectured as a reading in the final foot, i.e. assuming that a gloss χθῶv, interlinear or marginal, somehow worked its way into the text P360: αίανα δὲ χθῶv and II384 βεβριθε χθῶv. The accents on κονάβιζε, ηχῆi and âα are by the scribe.

13) Since the gloss τωι εαρι clearly refers to ωρηi (B468), this must be part of the supplement. As there would not be space for a further lemma-gloss group, we should perhaps supply (πα) εν τωι εαρι or something similar. The accent on ανθεμόενη is by the scribe.

15 - 16) This interpretation is otherwise unattested.

Commentary - "Verso"

1 - 2) Since only one letter is certain, it would be foolish to suggest any supplement, other than to note that οπλισν is part of the explanation given in D.

5) Various supplements are possible: συ[νημεμαθαι (PW, PV), συνασθροιζομενοι (Lex.Hom.), συνεστραμμεναις, συνηθροισμενοις (Hes.), συνασθροιζοντες (Syn.). See testimonia for more details.

8 - 9) Note that the scholiast has opted for the standardised koiné forms in both cases.

10) It seems that the writer of this codex became impatient, because this lemma-gloss group occurs out of sequence. Though the supplement is probably ἓνην, this lemma-gloss group presents certain problems. ᾧαι, the parallel verb at B489 is glossed by D with an optative (- ὑπάρχονεν; note however, that C omits ἵαι: ὑπάρχονεν). Why, then, is ἰαι ν glossed with a simple indicative, both here and in D? (N.B. There are other theoretical possibilities for a supplement here which would not present the problems of this indicative - ἓνην ὄν or ἰαι ἣ(μιν ἰη; but both of these would be unattested). Horn2 notes that the form ἓν came to

1See West, "Introduction to Greek Metre", p. 21.
2"The Use of the Subjunctive and Optative Moods in the Non-Literary Papyri", p. 27.
be used for 'n sometimes. "In several passages in the New Testament, certain uncial manuscripts read 'nv for 'h in the third person singular of the present subjunctive..."While these may be simple errors, due to the tendency to add moveable ν, the occurrence of the same 'nv in papyri, particularly in private letters, would lead us to suppose that 'nv in certain phrases might be the natural form with the common people. The papyri in which this 'nv occurs date from the first century B.C. to the fourth century of our era. In private letters this occurs during the whole period; there are occasional instances in official documents." It is possible that such an error found its way into our codex, but we feel that there is a better answer, that lies in the C manuscript of D. HVLa (folio missing in R) give ενείη: ενην [H adds ενύπηρχεν]. C, however, gives us a new reading for the lemma: ενηεν: ενην (cf. Sud.ε1314) This new reading is corroborated by An.Ox.IV,318,1, which quotes the previous line thus: ουδεμυ αδεκα μεν γλωσσαι, δεκα δε στοματηεν. It seems that one version of the text of Homer had two imperfect indicatives and not two aorist optatives. The forms 'νεν and ενενεν could easily have been transmuted to ενεν and ενειη (for η > ε see Gignac I,p.239ff.) or changed by zealous grammarians. The construction, as it stands in the vulgate text, is paralleled at Λ 386f. What is remarkable is that the confusion in the text of the papyrus is mirrored by a confusion in the text of D, which runs as follows: έσπετε: λέγετε μοι ω μούσαι. διο το ε πιλωτεον [-ούται C]. οδε λόγος έσπατε νυν μοι μούσαι οίτινες ήγεμόνες, άρχους γαρ νην ένεο πλήθυν δουκ αν έγιν ειρησμουι [μυθήσομαι La] τοιτεστιν έίσω. ουδεμυ δεκα πλασίων εμαυτου γένομαι υμών γαρ ἐστι το έργον. φονη δ'άρρηκτος. και δια τούτον δηλοι, ότι οσωμα η φωνη. La prints άρχους...μυθήσομαι and φωνη δ'άρρηκτος in capitals as though they were lemmata; though the second one could be construed as one, the first is clearly the result of some confusion (what follows in La after αρχους...μυθήσομαι does not appear to have much to do with the "lemma"). In D too, μυθήσομαι, ονομήνω, and άρρηκτος are not in place; but in the papyrus the confusion is after ενειη, whereas in D, the similar confusion occurs after εσπετε. It would be gratifying to think that the confusion had persisted through.
the later Greek and Byzantine periods, down to the composition of D, until we realise that the passage starting ὀδελόγος as quoted above is missing from the C manuscript.

Testimonia - "Recto"

Line 1 σπαραγεῖ (1) D in B 465 ήχεῖ (2) sch.mai. in B 463 Ἀρίσταρχος οὐτός ἐφί “σπαραγεῖ” τε γαῖα εἰς βραχεῖαν τελευτάσα τὸν ἢχον ἐμεύσιν” (Did. bT) An. Ox. I, 385, 16 σπαραγῶ: ἐκ τοῦ σμάραγγος ὁ φόφος καὶ ὁ ἢχος...κυρίως γὰρ λέγεται σμάραγγος ὁ ἀπὸ σπαραγμοῦ ἢχος. ἐκ τοῦ σμάραγγος γίνεται σμαράγγω... (quotes B 463:) ἀντί τοῦ ψοφεί καὶ κτυπεῖ... Ap. Soph. 143, 7 σμάραγγος: ψοφοὺς ἡ κίνησις... (3) PB, PW, PV, PO ήχεῖ PM, PG ἀντίχει (4) Hes. s1224 σπαραγεῖ: ἠχεῖ, ψοφεῖ Cyr. σμάραγγος: κίνησις, βρόμος, ψόφος U* & Barb. Gr. Lex. Hom. σπαραγεῖ: ἠχεῖ Et. Gen. σμαραγεῖ: ἠχεῖ. “σπαραγεῖ δὲ τε πόντον” παρὰ τὸ σπαράσσω, σμάραγγος καὶ σμάραγγος κυρίως γὰρ σμάραγγος ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ σπαραγμοῦ (σμαραγμοῦ B) ἢχος... Et. Mag. 720, 51 σμαραγεῖ: ψοφεῖ, κτυπεῖ. ἀπὸ τοῦ σμάραγγος, σμαραγδῶ. τοῦτο παρὰ τὸ σπαράσσω, σμαράγγος καὶ σμάραγγος ψοφοὺς, ἢχος. κυρίως γὰρ σμάραγγος, ὁ ἀπὸ σπαραγμοῦ ἢχος... Et. Gud. 506, 5 σμαραγδῶ, ἐκ τοῦ σμάραγγος, ὁ σμαίνει τὸν ψοφον καὶ ἢχον...

Line 7 Σκαμάνδριον (1) D in B 465 (2) / (3) PB τῶι τοῦ Σκαμάνδριον PW τῶι περὶ Σκαμάνδριον PV τὸ παρὰ Σκαμάνδρωι PO τὸ Σκαμάνδριον PM, PG τὸ τοῦ Σκαμάνδριον (4) Hes. s829 Σκαμάνδριος πόταμος, ὃς καὶ Ξάνθος καλεῖται Sud. s528 Δ Σκαμάνδριος: πόταμος... Lex. Hom. Σκαμάνδριος: ἀπὸ Σκαμάνδρου. Σκαμάνδριος ἐστὶ πόταμος Ῥήιου (ms.: Ἡλίου)

Line 11 κονάβιζε (1), (2) & (4) See fragment 5. (3) PB, PW, PV, PO ήχει PM, PG ὑπήχει

Line 11 ἀἴα (1) D in B 465 χόων: ἡ γῆ D in B 850 άἰα: γῆ, ἡ ὡς τινες ἐπὶ πόταμος κρήνη, οὐτὸς λεγομένη D in Γ 243 αἰα: γῆ D in Θ 1 πάσαν ἐπιάν: ἐπὶ πόταμος τῆν γῆν D in N 4 αίαν: γῆν (2) / (3) PB, PW, PV, PO ἢ ἡ γῆ PM ἡ γῆ PG ἡ γῆ ἢ (4) Hes. α1654 ἀἰα: γῆ (vgbp) γαῖα (p) κατάφαιρεσιν τοῦ γ, καὶ ὡς τινες, κρήνη ἐν Παθαλαγονίαι Sud. α12 Δ αἰα: ἡ γῆ
Line 12 ανθεμόεντι (1) D in B 467 άνθη εχοντι ή άνθη φεροντι
[άνθη εχοντι ή om. C] D in B 695 ανθεμόεντα: άνθη φεροντα, φυτον
θαλερόν D in Ψ 885 ανθεμόεντα: ήτοι ούκ είς πυρ χρῆσμον
άλλαναθεματικον ή άνθεμοδή (2) Ap.Soph.35,4 ανθεμόεντα:
αναθηματικον ή διηνθισμένον ποικίλως (3) PB,PW,PV,PO άνθη φεροντι PM
τωι επι την των ανθέων ἐκφυσιν εὐφυώς εχοντι PG τωι ευ εχοντι ανθέων (4)
Hes.a5116 ανθεμόεντα: ανθοθορωι, ανθηρωι, ή ευωδει [ανθηματικον]
Cyg. ανθεμόεντα: διηνθισμένα, ποικιλον B.I. Syn.97,1 (= Phot.a1945)
ανθεμόεντα: αναθηματικον, διηνθισμένον, ποικιλον Lex.Hom. άνθη εχοντι U

Line 13 ὤρη (1) D in Π 643 ὤρη ἐν εἰαρίνη: ἐν τῇ τοῦ ἔαρος
ὡραι (2) / (3) PB εν τῷ καίρῳ τοῦ ἔαρος PW,PV,PO,PM,PG ἐν τῷ ἔαρι
(4) Hes.ο280 ὤρα: το ἔαρ, ή θέρος, ή μορφή; ο281 ὤρα: καιρός, κάλλος,
tροπή, εὐμορφία...; o283 ὤρα ἐτους: καιρός ἐτους, το ἔαρ καὶ το θέρος
Cyg. ὤρα ἐτους: το ἔαρ καὶ το θέρος, καιρός ἐτους; ὥρα: καλλωπισμός, εὐμορφία;
Syn.421,34 - 422,2 ὥρα: κάλλος, καιρό δρότος, εὐμορφία, ψηλῶς δὲ,
φροντις. ἐνθεν ἀλῆμων λεγόμεν, τον ὁλίγην φροντίδα εχοντα Syn.422,3 (=
Sud.ω153) ὥρα ἐτους: το ἔαρ καὶ το θέρος, καιρός ἐτους Lex.Hom. ὤρη: τοῦ
καιροῦ τοῦ ἔαρος

Line 14 στάθμον (1) D in B 470 κατά στάθμον: κατά την ἑπαυλιν D
in E 140,Ε 557,Π 752 στάθμους: τὰς ἑπαύλεις (2) sch.mai. in E 140 ἀλλὰ
κατά στάθμους: ὅτι στάθμους τας κατάγγρον ἑπαύλεις... (Ariston. A) (3)
PB,PW,PV,PO,PM,PG ἑπαυλιν (4) Hes.ρ1604 στάθμοι: ἑπαύλεις, ὅπου
ἰστανται ἢποι καὶ βοές... Cyg. στάθμοι: ἑπαύλεις ή τόποις U & Barb.Gr.
Lex.Hom. στάθμον: τὰς ἑπαύλεις

Line 15 ποιμνίων: ποιμενικόν (1) D in B 470 ποιμνίον:
ποιμενικόν (2) Or.135,22 ποιμίνον: ποιμένιον, καὶ συγκοπῆι ποιμίνον
Mosch. ποιμνίων: ποιμενικός κοινον, ποιμνίος πονητικόν (3) PV
ποιμνικήν PB,PW,PO,PM,PG ποιμενικήν (4) Lex.Hom. ποιμνίον:
ποιμενικόν

Testimonia - "Verso"

Line 3 στέρνον (1) D in B 479 στήθος D in Γ 194 ἢδε στέρνοσι:
καὶ τοῖς στέρνοις D in Ν 290 στέρνοιν: στήθων (2) Ap.Soph.144,16
στέρνον: στήθος (3) PB στήθος PW,PV στήθη PM,PG στέρνον (4)
Hes.σ1775 στέρνον: στήθος, διανόιαν, φρένα Et.Mag.726,12 στέρνον:...το
στήθος...
Line 4 ἀγέληφι (1) D in Β 480 ἐν τῇ ἀγέλῃ, ἐν τῷ πλῆθει... (2) / (3) PB ἐν τῇ ἀγέλῃ ΠΨ,ΠΨ,ΠΜ,ΠΓ ἐν ἀγέλῃ (4) Hes. α438 ἀγέληφι: ἐν ἀγέλαις Αν Συδ.α193 Δ ἀγέληφιν: ἐκ τῆς ἀγέλης Λεξ.Ημ. ἀγέληφι: ἐν τῇ ἀγέλῃ ΣΥ

Line 5 ἀγρομένησι (1) D in Β 481 ἰθροισμέναις [-οις C] (2) An.Οξ.Ι,15,7 ἐστίν ἀγείρω το συναθροίζω τὸ παθητικόν, ἀγείρομαι καὶ ἀγείρομενος καὶ ταῖς ἀγρομέναις κατὰ ποιητικὴν τροπὴν τοῦ δείκτην (3) PB ἰθροισμέναις ΠΨ,ΠΨ συνιημέναις ΠΜ,ΠΓ ἰθροισμένοις (4) Hes. α823 ἀγρομένησι: συνεστραμμέναις, συνηθροισμέναις Syn.15,11 (= Phot.α268 & Συδ.α367) ἀγρομένου: συναθροίζοντες Et.Γευ.17,14 ἀγρομένησι: ἐστίν ἀγείρω, τὸ συναθροίζω... Λεξ.Ημ. ἀγρομένου: συναθροίζομένου ΣΥ

Line 6 ἐσπετε (1) D in Β 484 ἐσπετε: λέγετε μοι ὁ μουᾶσαι... D in Σ 508 ἐσπετε: λέγετε (2) sch. mai. in Β 484 <ἐσπετε> ψιλώτεον, ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ ἐπο ἐστὶ τοῦ σημαίνοντος τὸ λέγω... (3) PB λέγετε ΠΨ,ΠΨ,ΠΜ,ΠΓ ἐσπετε (4) Hes. ξ6310 *ἐσπετε: ἐσπετε AS ἐξενέεισθε οὐκολουθεῖτε ἡ ἱστορεῖτε, ἱκουσάτε Syn.237,19 (= Συδ.ξ189) ἐσπετε: εἰπεῖν ποίησατε Et.Γευ. ἐσπετε: τὸ φιλούμενον σημαίνει τὸ λέγω... Et.Μαγ.383,48 ἐσπετε: λέγετε μοι ὁ Μουᾶσαι, εἰπέτε, ἐξενέεσθε... (then as Et.Γευ.)

Line 7 ἦστε (1) P. Οξυ. ΞΧΙΒ 2405 (sch. in Α 119) εώς: ω καὶ υπάρχω (2) Ap.311,13 εἰμὶ β´ ὄξυνόμενον τὸ ὑπάρχω, βαρυνόμενον τὸ πορεύομαι 316,8 ἦστε β´: ὑπάρχετε καὶ ἦσται, ἀντὶ τοῦ γεννήσαται Ap.Σοφ.80,27 ἐώς: ω, ὑπάρχω 77,30 ἦστε: γενεσθε "ἀνέρες ἦστε φίλοι" ἐὰν δὲ ἦστε ὁριστικῶς, ὑπάρχετε. ἦστε δὲ πάντες μάρτυροι" (P 185 and B 301) Οξ.60,11 εὖς: παρὰ τὸ ἐώς τὸ ὑπάρχω... 77,12 ἰνες τὰ νεόδρα. παρὰ τὸ ἐώς ῥῆμα τὸ ὑπάρχω... (!) Αν.Οξ.Ι,133,15 ἦστω: ᾱδημα προστακτικόν, εἰμὶ τὸ ὑπάρχω... (3) PB,ΠΨ,ΠΨ τυχάνετε PM,ΠΓ ἦστε (4) Hes. ξ6372 *ἐστε: ἢμεῖς ὑπάρχετε οὐτόνως Α βαρυτόνως δε γίνεσθε; ξ6430 ἦστω: *γενέσθω ASvgn αἰδίων ὑπάρχων, ὑπάρξεις; ξ4040 *ἐστα: ὑπάρχετα, ὁντα ν; ξ7740 ἐως: ἵδιον αὐτοῦ δασείως (Ξ 211) ψιλῶς δὲ ὑπάρχων (Α 131) Avgb Συγ. εἰμὶ: ὑπάρχω B.L. εὼν: ὑπάρχων B Lex.Ημ. ἦστε δὲ: ὑπάρχετε δὲ ΣΥ; ἀγαθός περ ἐὼν: καίπερ ἀγαθὸς ὑπάρχον ΣΥ; ἦσθι: ὑπάρχεις SU; ἦστιν: ὑπάρχει[n] ΣΥ Sud.ξ3232 Δ ἦστω: ὑπάρχετω; ξ3124 Δ ἐνν: ὑπήρχεν; ξ3211 ἦστι: ὑπάρχει; ξι53 Δ εἰ: ὑπάρχαι; εἰ152 Δ εἰμὶ: ὑπάρχω... Et.Γευ. ἦστω: ὑπάρχετω...ἐκ τοῦ ἔως, εἰμί, παράγων τὸ πληθυντικὸν ἐμὲν... Et.Μαγ.301,32 εἰς: τὸ ὑπάρχουσι, γίνεται ἐκ τοῦ εἷ, τὸ τρίτον εἰς... Et.Γευ.422,3 εἰμί: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔως γεγονε τοῦ σημαίνοντος τὸ ὑπάρχω...

Line 8 ὢστε (1) D in Β 485 ὢστε τε: καὶ ἐπίστασθε (2) / (3) PB ἐπίστασθε ΠΨ,ΠΨ γινώσκετε ΠΨ,ΠΨ τὸν ἐπιστήμην ἐξετε (4) Hes. ι1009 *ἐστε: γινώσκετε ASvgn οἴδατε πγ Συγ. ἐστε: γνωτε, γινώσκετε B ἦσθε: ἐπίστασθε; ἦσθιον: γινωσκέτω B.L. Syn.263,31 (= Sud.ι680) ὢστε:
This group of fragments has four larger (a = 8.2cm x 5.8cm; b = 3.2cm x 11.4cm; c = 18.8cm x 8.0cm; d = 2.6cm x 5.8cm) pieces, two smaller (e = 1.6cm x 2.2cm; f = 3.2cm x 2.0cm) pieces and several other small, unplaceable pieces, which only bear traces of writing and the largest of which measures 3.0cm x 2.4cm. Pieces a - c contain scholia minora to B 600 - 645. Piece d only bears traces; however, it seems to fit vertically between pieces a and c. If this is correct, then the papyrus was originally 19.7cm high; the upper margin measures 1.6cm and the lower 2.0cm on the left-hand column and 1.5 in the right-hand column. The papyrus sheet would have been about 17.6cm wide. This group of pieces forms part of a roll since the top of the first column begins mid-sentence and pieces e and f may come from a previous column. The contents are somewhat banal and present nothing of interest in the way of glosses, exegesis or new readings.
The papyrus has accents by the first hand, and is very dark brown in colour, indicating that it may have been found in damp conditions. The hand is quite informal, and upright. Its informality makes it very difficult to date, though as parallels one could cite the Herondas papyrus (= Schubart, Abb. 82) or P. Bodmer II (= Seider II, pl.44), both assigned to the middle of the second century.

Pieces e and f - Remains of a Previous Column?

e [παρ]
 [κα]

f [μένοσ]
 [συνκλε] [ ]

Piece e could be supplemented to refer to line 593, thus: Κυ[παρ[ισσηεντα πολισ της Αρπ]κα[δης].

If the reading is correct in piece f is correct, then it could refer to ευχ[μενος in line 597, though no supplement is immediately obvious for the following line. The verso of this fragment has writing in a second hand on it, and reads as follows:

[σεν][
 [....[
 [δοστ][
 [δμου[ 
 [τατα[ 
 [ ]

A word-search on Ibycus has shown that it is not part of a known text, though the most frequent and obvious supplement for line 4 would be Κα[δμου - a short mythographical note jotted down by the owner of the papyrus perhaps.
Text - Column 1

[σφέλεντο αφειλάντο]
[αιπυτιόν τὸν αἰπυ]
[...[ ]]
[κιθαρίστην τὴν κι]
[θαρ[ωδιαν]]
[...[ ]]
[...[ ]]
[ηνεμοεσσαν]
[...[ ]]
[μα[ντινεν]
[...[ ]]
[βου[ρασίον ἅτα]]
[...[ ]]
[εερ[γει περιεχει]
[επ[εοι] ὃ[ι η]λειοι]
[ηγ[ησασ]θην ηρχον]
[θε[σείδησ] θεο[σ] 
[μοι]λο]

Commentary - Column 1

1) The gloss αφειλάντο is only otherwise attested in the C manuscript of D. The termination -το has been added above, as if the original intention had been to write αφειλάν

12) No supplement obvious - see testimonia

Text - Column 2

[ε]
[...το]
[...[ ]]
[μιλτοπαρην̄ αι τας]
[πρφρασ̄ μεμιλτω̄ 
[μενοι]
[ἀγ'χιαλον παράθα]

5
Commentary - Column 2

1) One might restore ενοσι[φυλλον], 1.632. The apostrophes in lines 6 and 9 are original, as is the accent in line 8.

8) One usually finds the preposition περί instead of κατά, the latter being found with the expression κατὰ μάχην. See testimonia.

Testimonia - Column 1

Line 1 ἀφελοντο (1) D in B 600 ἀφείλοντο [-αντο C] (2) / (3) PW,PV ἐστέρησαν PG ἀφείλοντο (4) /

Line 2 αἵπτυιον (1) D in B 604 αἵπτυιον παρὰ τύμβων: παρὰ τὸν τοῦ Αἰπύτου τάφον... (2) Ap.Soph.13,12 Αἵπτυιον: τὸν τοῦ Αἰπύτου ἀἵπτυιον παρὰ τύμβων ἔστι δὲ οὕτως τῶν Ἀρκαδικῶν ἥρωων, περὶ οὖ ἡσίαν Ἡσίαδος "Αἵπτυιος αὐτ᾽έκειτο Γλησσηνορά τε Περίθθον τε". (3) PW,PV,PG τοῦ Ἀἵπτου (4) Hes.a2058 αἵπτυιον: [ὑψηλόν] τὸν τοῦ Αἰπύτου... Lex.Hom. Αἵπτυιον παρὰ τύμβων: ἐπὶ τάφον τοῦ Αἰπύτου S (cor. et sup. D)


Line (16) ἦγησάθην (1) D in B 620 ἠγούντο (2) / (3) P.S.I. XII 1276 (paraphrase of ἦγησάθην) ἠγούντο PW, PV ἦγησαντο PG ἠγεμόνευν (4) Hes. n67 ἦγησατο: ἤρξεν, ὄθησεν ἐγένετο


Testimonia - Column 2

Line 3 μιλτοπάρηκιοι (1) D in B 637 μίλτωι τὰς πρώτας βεβαιμέναι [C] μίλτωι τὰς πρώτας ἐχουσαί βεβαιμένας [VLα] (2) Ap. Soph. 112, 32 μιλτόπρωροι, τοῦτε δὲ ἐπὶ μιὸν τῶν Ὄδυσσεως γεών (3) PW μηλωτὰ τὰς πρώμιλτόπρωροι, τοῦτε δὲ ἐπὶ μιὸν τῶν Ὅδυσσεως γεών (3) PW μηλωτὰ τὰς καὶ πρώτας βεβαιμένας ἐχουσαί μίλτωι (4) Hes. μ1360 μιλτόπρωριοι. τὰ ἐκατέρωθεν τῆς πρώτης καὶ πρώτας μεμιλτώμενας ἐχουσάι. οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ φοινικοπαρετού ἐξούσιον Sud. μ1070 βεβαιμένας ἐχουσαί τὰς πρώτας

Line 6 ἀγχίαλον (1) D in B 640 τὸν παραθαλασσίον τόπον [C only] (2) Ap. 290, 8 ἀγχίαλον β': τὸ παράλιον, καὶ κύριον ὄνομα (Ε 609) Or. 611, 5-6 ἀγχιαλὸς παρὰ τὸ τῆν ἀλα ἐκεί ἀγνυθα... Or. (excerpta)
This tiny fragment is of some interest. The recto has the remains of an unidentified literary text. The verso has the remains, in a small, crabbed, cursive hand, of some scholia minora on B 633 (?) - B 655. The nature of the hand would lead one to think that this fragment contained someone’s notes, copied for personal use. It measures 3.6cm x 5.1cm and is dark brown in colour. With one exception, the lemmata treated are all polysyllabic.

The hand is difficult to date owing to its personal nature. The most cursively formed letters are mu (ϝ) and epsilon (ε'); however, real ligatures are few in number. A less cursive version of the same hand might resemble the hand of fragment 1, assigned to the early third century.

Text

|инф|
|.-|
Commentary

4) For the traces of the horizontal stroke before those letters that remain, see note to line 8. The letter after kappa might be ρ, in which case it would be ὀρο(σ) Κροκυλή; in this case, our fragment would go against the usual interpretation as a city (cf. Hes., Sud. etc.). Reading ε[ we would be able to supplement Νηριτον ὀρο(σ) Κε[φαλληνιασ, though D reads Νηριτον: ὀρος Ιθάκης / Αἰγιλίτα: πόλις τῆς Κεφαλληνίας. Note that the writer omitted the word ὀροσ in error and simply added ὀρο above the line.

5) It is tempting to relate the remains here to the previous gloss - the letters cross the vertical space found between the column of lemmata and the column of glosses, and so were perhaps a continuation of the gloss on Νηριτον; perhaps the word explained ενωσφυλλον. Unfortunately, no gloss fitting these letters exactly could be found. One possible supplement might be ἑττοιωθάμοντε - though this is a rare word and probably only used of trees.

6) Restore μιλτοπαρηγιοι μιλ[τώι and cf. testimonia to fragment 8, col.ii, l.3.

8) If the supplement is correct for the lemma, then the ink remains of the gloss column could be construed as προσετακτο. A long horizontal line has been drawn under the lemma - a similar line was drawn under the lemma in line 4.
Parallels for such long, dividing lines might be P. Ryl. III 464 (lines 11 - 12) or P. Mil. Vogl. VI 263 (lines 6 - 7) dating from the third and fourth centuries respectively.

9) Iotacism.

13) For the two possible supplements given, cf. testimonia. The spelling ἀνδριφόντης is given by Hes. (Cyr.) as well as some manuscripts of Homer, and should not perhaps be dismissed out of hand as an iotacism\(^1\). The end of the line is usually scanned:

\[
\text{'Ενυαλιώ ἀνδριφόντης;}
\]

\[\uparrow\text{− }\uparrow\text{− }\uparrow\text{− }\uparrow\]

with synezeisis in the penultimate foot. A further possibility would be to endow the \(\upsilon\) with consonantal value - though the \(\alpha\) of Ευαλις is short elsewhere. This would give the scansion:

\[
\text{'Ενυαιώ ἀνδριφόντης;}
\]

\[\uparrow\text{− }\uparrow\text{− }\uparrow\text{− }\]

with correction of the final syllable of 'Ενυαιώ and hiatus. However, the answer may be to read ἀνδριφόντης and scan thus:

\[
\text{'Ενυαιώ ἀνδριφόντης;}
\]

\[\uparrow\text{− }\uparrow\text{− }\uparrow\text{− }\]

This scansion of ἀνδριφόντης does have parallels\(^2\): "il arrive même qu’un groupe de trois consonnes dont la première est une nasale n’allonge pas la syllabe précédente..." He cites the following examples: Κ 65 ἄχροτγέον άλληλοιν; Σ 76 νύξ άχροτη; Π 857 & Χ 363 άθροτήτα καὶ ή'βην; Ω 6 άθροτήτα τε καὶ μένος ή'ν.

Macleod\(^3\) comments as follows on Ω 6: "It seems likely that [άθροτήτα] was the original form of the word in the text, even though the older manuscripts have άθροτήτα..."

Testimonia

Line 5 (for comparison only) είνοσίφυλλον (1) D in B 632 κινησίφυλλον καὶ πολυδένδρον... (2) / (3) PW κινησίφυλλον (η' πολυδένδρον) PV κινησίφυλλον PG σύνδενδρον καὶ κινησίφυλλον (4) Hes.e980 σύνδενδρον, κινησίφυλλον...

\(^1\)See Chantraine, "Grammaire Homérique", p.84 and p.109.
\(^3\)"The Iliad - Book XXIV".
Line 8 'ετεταλτο (1) D in B 644 'ετετακτο [τετακτο V]: προσετέτακτο, ἐνεκχειριστό [ἐνεκχειριστό C; ἐκχειριστό V - missing in La] Later there is also τώι δ'ετεταλτο [La τώι δ'ετ' παντ'ετεταλτοι: τούτωι δε προσετέτακτο, ἐκχειριστό [thus far La only; CVLa add:] ἐπι τούτωι δε [δε τούτο C] ἂν το πᾶν τής ἐξουσίας (2) / (3) PW, PV επί δε τούτωι ἂν το πᾶν τής ἐξουσίας PG τούτωι δε προσετέτακτο πάντη (4) Hes.e6589 ἐντεταλμένων ἂν, ἐπετετραπτο Συγ. ἐπετάθατο: 'ετετάκτο B & B.L.

Line 9 δουρείκλυτος (1), (2) & (4) See testimia to fragment 8. (3) PW, PV ο ἕνδοξος περὶ τὸ δόρυ PG ο κατά τὴν μάχην ἕνδοξος

Line 10 ἀργινόντα (1) D in B 647 λευκόγειον (2) Ap.Soph.43,2 λευκὸν καὶ ἀργινόδη... (3) PW, PV, PG λευκόγειον (4) Syn.141.12 (= Phot.a2778) ἀργιλώδης γῆ, λευκὴ καὶ καθαρὰ Sud.a3777 Δ'ἀργινόντες, ἀργινόντος: λευκὸν


Line 12 ἐνυαλιώ (1) D in B 651 [VLa only] τῶι Ἀρεί D in P 211 ἐνυαλιώς: πολέμικός (2) explained as Ares at sch.mai. N 518-9, P 211, Y 69, Y 132 (3) PW, PV 'Ενυαλίωι PG "Ἀρεί (4) Hes.e3432'Ενυαλίωι: τῶι Ἀρεί Avg; e3431 'Ενυάλιοι: ο'Ἀρης, ἂ ὁ τοῦτον ύιός, διὰ τὴν'Ενυώ, ἂ * πολέμικός ASp ἂ ὁ πολεμιστής vgn Lex.Hom. 'Ενυαλίωι: τῶι Ἀρεί SU Sud.e1498 ἐνυαλίως: πολεμικός...; v7 ύλιος: πολέμιος, καὶ ἐνυαλίος Et.Gud.481,1 ἐνυαλίον ἐπιχούση...πολεμικὸν

Line 13 ἀνδρείφοντι (1) D in B 651, Θ264, P 259 ἀνδράς φονεύοντι D in H 166 ἀνδρείφοντι: ἀνδροφόνω (2) Herod.II,476,6 (discusses derivation of variants ἀνδρι— and ἀνδρι-) (3) PW, PV, PG ἀνδράς φονεύοντι (4) Hes.a4742 ἀνδρείφοντις: ἀνδροφόνος Συγ. ἀνδριφοντίς: ἀνδροφόνος B & B.L. Lex.Hom. ἀνδρείφοντι: ἀνδράς φονεύοντι Sud.a2166 Δ ἀνδρείφοντις: ὁ ἀνδροφόνος Et.Mag.102,13 ἀνδρείφοντις: ὁ φονεύων τους ἀνδρας...

Line 15 τρίχα (1) D in Β 655 διὰ τρίχα κοσμηθέντες: τριχῶς ταχθέντες (2) / (3) PW τριχῶς PV τριχῇ PG εἰς τρεῖς μοιρὰς (4) Hes. t 1459 τρίχα: τριχῶς; t 1463 τριχῇ: εἰς τρία μέρη; t 1465 τριχῇ: το ὅ αυτό καὶ τὸ τρίχα, ἢ τὸ τρίτον μέρος Cyg. τριχῇ: εἰς τρία μέρη Barb. Gr. & U Syn. 390, 14 (= Sud. t 1033) τρίχα: τριχῶς Et. Gen. B τρίχα: τριχῶς... Et. Mag. 768, 33 τρίχαθε...εστὶν ἐπιρρῆμα μεσοτῆτος, παράκληθε έκ τοῦ τρίχα βαρυτόνου, σημαίνει τὸ τριχῶς...
"It is recorded in the Burmese chronicles that king Anorahta "placed the thirty sets of the Pitaka" - the Theravada Buddhist scriptures which he had brought into his kingdom - "in a shrine studded all over with precious stones and had the noble order of monks give instruction in them". This event is said to have taken place in the second half of the eleventh century AD. Instruction in the Pitaka and in Pali, the language in which they were written, is still given today and has had profound effects on the language and literature of the Burmese...Nissaya are works in which each word or phrase of a Pali text is followed immediately by its Burmese translation. [In some Nissaya the Burmese incorporates material, literary or explanatory, additional to the Pali text. Tin Luin...classifies four types of Nissaya: verbatim, free, ornate and translation with short notes].\(^1\)

The format of such Nissaya is as follows: - (word of Pali) ||(Burmese equivalent of a full-stop) - (word of Burmese) ||. Both this format and the types given above bear a remarkable resemblance to the scholia minora and paraphrases discussed here. What is remarkable about Nissaya Burmese is that since Pali is an Indo-European language, and Burmese a Sino-Tibetan one, a word by word rendition entailed much adaptation - in the form of suffixes - of the Burmese to convey the Indo-European elements of Pali grammar and syntax. Similar adaptations can be found in Tibetan translations of Pali texts (the oldest examples of which date back to the eighth century). Of course, Buddhist scholarship originated in India, which had great exegetical and commentatorial traditions in writing. In old Burmese schools, the monk would read some of the text aloud and then explain it. We can imagine a similar situation in Greek schools in Egypt, with the pupil writing down those words he did not understand. We are grateful to Doctors Okell, Söhnen and Skorupski of S.O.A.S. for much interesting discussion on this topic.\(^2\)

\(^1\)"Nissaya Burmese - A Case of Systematic Adaptation to a Foreign Grammar and Syntax", Lingua 15 (1965).

\(^2\)Coincidentally, Dr. Okell was originally a Greats man from Oxford, and had rooms opposite a certain Professor Hunt...
THREE FRAGMENTS OF ILIAD B

The following three fragments contain parts of the second book of the Iliad and cover B 43 - 125 (65 - 85 in lacuna), B 191 - 287 (227 - 253 in lacuna) and B 404 - 412. They are all good quality texts, and one has a few small additions in a second hand. For papyri of Iliad B, see Pack (2nd edition) 623 - 679 and the list of other papyri published since 1965 by Bouquiaux-Simon. Book B is the second best represented book of the Iliad after book A, and the first half is better represented than the Catalogue of Ships. None of the fragments here joins with any published one; both Ludwich's and Allen's edition have been consulted.

FRAGMENT 1 - P. Oxy. 15 2B.40/F(a)
Plate 11

Introduction

This fragment covering B 43 - 125 (65 - 85 in lacuna) comes from the beginning of a roll which almost certainly contained the whole of book B. Since we only have the right-hand part of the first column (in fact the second of the roll) and the left-hand half of the second (in fact the third of the roll), calculations cannot be absolutely certain; however, the columns seem to have been approximately 16cm wide and the intercolumnar space 2.5cm. Since the text was written with about 43 lines to the column, the twenty-one columns required to complete the book would take up 388.5cm. The average roll was approximately 320 - 360cm long (based on the commonest breadth of individual sheets, 16 - 18cm) but we would need a roll of twenty sheets of 20cm width to contain the whole of book B - a kollesis visible in the intercolumnar space between the two extant columns would seem to confirm that the sheets used for this roll were approximately 20cm wide.

1"Un Nouveau Fragment Homérique d'Oxyrhynchos" CE 60 (1985).
The dimensions of the papyrus as it stands are 18.5cm x 24.2cm; the upper margin seem to be preserved in full in parts and measures 2.4cm. The height of the column (calculating from the half column, column ii) is about 23cm, and with two equal margins, the height of the roll would have been about 28cm. Though roll-length has been much discussed, roll-height is a little explored subject. Lewis in his discussion of Pliny’s description of papyrus says: “Pliny’s failure to speak of height of sheets is unimportant (asserts Leclercq) because the ratio of height to width was constant. Nothing could be further from the truth. As E.G. Turner remarks in a letter to me: “In a roll, my experience is that the width of sheets often varies considerably. But the maker, if he is to make a roll of really imposing dimensions, must make his sheets of a certain minimum height. In saying nothing about this and talking about latitudo Pliny seems to me to show that he does not really know the problem at first hand.”" However, Lewis later acknowledged a short article by Bülow-Jacobsen who says: "With latitudo earum, Pliny refers to formats of chartae = rolls, which is how papyrus was sold and how Pliny must have known it. In fact, at the end of 77 he has already told us how the sheets are joined into rolls. He has also told us that the length of the roll is twenty sheets...so latitudo in the passage under discussion is the important dimension of the roll, i.e. the one we today call height when speaking of papyri, but which would be called width or breadth by most people describing a roll of paper as an object." However, since the Roman digit = 1.85cm, the "factory-finished widths of papyrus, as given by Pliny, range from 24 down to 11cm". If we are to accept Bülow-Jacobsen’s interpretation, then 24cm is the maximum height of any constituent sheet of a roll, and this is clearly not the case. Turner confesses that little work has been done on roll-heights but does say this much: "The

4Lewis, "Papyrus in Classical Antiquity", p.56.
6op.cit., p.54, n.14.
7op. cit., p.44.
largest known [sheet] is 46cm high, but it is rare to find one more than about 37cm in the Roman period, and 28 - 30cm is a good height then."

Iota adscript is written and there are some accents, rough breathings, stops, elision marks, marks of prosody and a stichometric mark, all by the first hand. The hand is of the type known as the "severe style"; the general impression of bilinearity is interrupted by the verticals of tau, upsilon and phi; the central stroke of epsilon protrudes beyond the two outer horizontal strokes, and the letter is almost rectangular; zeta is very wide; omicron and omega are suspended from an imaginary upper line; the hook of alpha reaches far into the bottom left-hand corner of the imaginary square within which it is inscribed; there is one very slight decorative tendency - a small curl at the end of some strokes, e.g. chi (χ), lambda (Λ), and occasionally tau (Τ). One could compare P. Berol. 9968 (= Seider II,33) of the third century, though here the sigmas are squatter and the vertical strokes of mu are not parallel as they are in our papyrus; P. Oxy. XLV 3215 (pl.1), assigned to the second century, though if that is the case, then it must be the end of the second century as the style only had currency from the end of the second to the start of the fourth century; P. Oxy. XLII 3008 (pl. 6) also assigned to the third century. The papyrus has a slightly yellow sheen as it has been treated with κέδριον ἔλαιον, a crude oil of turpentine applied to literary texts to protect them against bookworm.

The main problem presented by the papyrus is the ambiguous nature of the strokes above some of the letters; some are definitely prosodic markings, some definitely acute and grave accents, but some are ambiguous. The papyrus shows some of the characteristics outlined by Laum in his chapter nine: "Die gesteigerte Produktion im III. Jahrh. hat nun sowohl die Schreiber als auch besonders die Diorthoten zu schneller Arbeit veranlaßt. Die Eile, mit der der Korrektor von links nach rechts hin über die Zeile, Zeichen setzend, hingeh, bewirkt bald, daß er nicht mehr weit genug nach links hinübergreift oder den Strich des Gravis zu weit nach rechts durchzieht...Zunächst hat hierin die

2"Das Alexandrinische Akzentuationssystem", Paderborn 1928.
3"Übergang vom Alexandrinischen zum Byzantinischen System".
Verschiebung von Akut und Spiritus auf den zweiten Teil der Diphthonge ihren Grund. Auch der Zirkumflex rückt immer weiter nach rechts dem zweiten Vokal zu." i.e. whereas previously a grave was placed, in oxytone and perispomenon words on the syllable before the syllable with the acute accent, it worked its way over to the right onto the "acute" syllable, even in cases where this is followed by punctuation or an enclitic. There are even examples of both types of use of the grave accent for the same word in the same papyrus - Laum cites also cites cases of polysyllabic oxytone words with more than two grave accents. We have one definite grave accent (col.ii, 1.13) and two slightly ambiguous ones (col.ii, 1.4 and 1.14). If accents did have a tendency to move towards the right, then that would explain the odd position of some of the marks in col.ii. Some acute accents are written directly over the letter to which they refer and certainly all possible prosodic marks are written over the letter to which they refer. In the transcription, we have marked in only those marks given by the scribe. There is one small unplaced fragment as follows:

The text might be placed at 1.88 (ἐρχομενάων) or 1.124 (ἀρθομηθέμεναι), though as traces can be seen above the extant letters, and the former restoration comes from the end of a longer line, the latter restoration is more plausible.

Text - Column 1

καλὸν νηγατεων, περὶ δὲ μεγάλα β[αλλε]το φαροσ· 1
ποσσο δ’υπο λιπαροισιν έδησ]ατο κ[αλ]α πέδιλα·
αμφὶ δ’αρωμοισιν βαλετο έξ[ι]φοσ αρ[γυρό][ή]λον·
eιλετο δε σκηπτρον πατρωιο]γν αφθ[ι][τον] αιει·
συντοι έβη κατα νησι Αχαιων έι [κακος ι]τούων·
Ηως μεν ρα θεα προβησ[σ]ατο μακρον [οι]μπον
Ζηνι φως ερεουσα και α]λλοις αθανα[τοι]σιν·
αυταρ ο κηρυκεσιι λιγυφ[θογ]υ[σισ]κε[ς][ε]ν·

1Laum, op.cit., p.460.
2op. cit., p. 462.
Commentary - Column 1

4) Possible traces of an accent over the initial alpha of αφθινον.

6) The reading προσεβήσατο for προσεβήσετο is attested as a variant in many manuscripts, and also occurs in P. Köln IV 181; that part of the word is in lacuna in P. Oxy. XXXVI 2747 and the variant is not listed as occurring in the Hawara Homer.

9) Possible traces of an acute accent over the alpha of καρη.

11) There are traces of a horizontal stroke over the upsilon of μεγαθυμων; it is directly over the letter, so is perhaps to be interpreted as a prosodic mark. However, one might find it surprising that an ancient reader found it difficult to establish the quantity of this particular syllable. The iota of ζε has a rough breathing, diaeresis and an acute accent (- an error for a circumflex).

14) The reading σνυπνιος is attested in only one manuscript (Laur. XXXII,15, twelvth century). However, the scribe may have imagined the dream in personified form (as a male daimon?) or the error arisen by confusion with the termination of ονειρος.

15) The acute accent over the first alpha of μαλιστα remains.
20) Ludwich lists only two manuscripts that have the nu ephelkystikon here.

Text - Column 2

σχημπτουχοι βασιληθεσεπεσευνοντο δε λαοι
ηυτε ἐθνεα ἐσι μελησασων αδινασων
πετρησεκ γλαφυρησαιε νεον ερχομενοισιν
βοτρυδον δε πετονται επι αγεθεσι ειαρνουσιν
αι μεν τενθα ἀλισ πειτοτραται αι δε τε ενθα
ψο των θηνεα πολι[λ]α νεων απο και κλισιαν
η[ιο]νοσι προπαροιθε βαθεισι εστιχουντο
[ε]ιλαιδον εις αγορην με[τα δε σφαιν οσσα δεδηι
οτρουνουσιν διο[σ] αγνιοςοι, οι δε [αγεροντο
tετρειχει δ' ἀγορηπ' ὑπο δε στεναξιετο γαια
λαιν πε[ξινων ωμαδοσθην]ν, εννεα δε σφαεσ
κηρυκεο βοδωντες ερητυνοι, ει ποταυνησ
σχοιαταικοδσειαν δε διοτρεφων βασιλην
σπουδη δέδετο λαδ[ι]ς ερητυβεν δε καθεδρασ
παυσιμενοι κλαγησια ανα δε κρειων Αγαμεμνων
εστη σκηπτρον ἔχων το μεν Ηφαιιτος καμε τευχων
[Η]φαιιτος μεν δουκε[ι Δι Κρονιων] ανακτι
αυτιταρ άρα Ζευς δουκε [διακτορωι αργειοντη]
Ερμειας δ[ε] αναδ δουκι[ειν Πελοπι πληξιπωι
αοιταρ [ο αυτι]ς Πελοψ δώκι Ατρει παντι ποιμενι λαων
[Ατρ]ευς [δε δη][η]σκων ελιπεν πολυαρνι Θεστη
[αυ][ια]π ο [αυτε] Θωειστρ Αγαμεμνονι λειπε φορναι
[πολλης]σιν νησοια και Αργει παντι ανασσειν
[τω ο γ] ερειςα μενοσ επε' Αργειοισι μετηυδα
[ω φιλοι]οι ηρωε δαιναοι θεραποντες Αρησ
Ζευς με μεγα Κρο[νιδης ατ]ει ενεδηςε βαρειη
σχετι [ος ο] πριν μεν μοι υπεσητο και κατενευςεν
[Ἰ][λιον ε[κ]τε]ραντε[ι]υειχεον απονεσθαι
νυν δε κ[α]κην απατην βουλευσατο και με κελευεν
dυσκ[λεα Αργοσ ̣]<κεθαι, επει πολιν ωλεσα λαον
ο[η]τω που Δι[ι μ'ελλει υπερεμενει φιλον ειναι
ο[σ] δη[η]σκω λολων πολιων [κατελυσε καρηνα
ηδ'ετι και λυθει του γαρ κρατος εστι μεγιστον
αισχρον [ναρ] τοδε γ'εστι και εσσομενοισι πυθεσθαι
μαφ ου[το] τοιοντε τοσονδε τε λαον Αχαιων
απρηκ[τον] πολεμοιν πολεμιζειν ηδε μαχεσθαι

35
Commentary - Column 2

2) As with col.i, 1.53, there is an ambiguous stroke here; there is what must be an acute accent for the upsilon of υπερ, but it is so far to the right that it is more or less over the tau; it is almost flat. A similar stroke - this time completely flat - can be found over the theta of ΘΕΝΑ: this could be either an acute accent or a longum. Prosodic markings in papyri are comparatively rare: the Hawara Homer has longa and brevia, as does P. Oxy. LIII 3695 (lyric - see fragment 12, lines 3 and 5), P. Oxy. LIII 3697 (unidentified choral lyric with the Doric alpha marked long), P. Oxy. LIII 3704 & 3707 (hardly surprising since the former is a text with musical notation and the latter a treatise on metre) and P.Oxy. IV 773\footnote{Republished by Lameere in "Aperçues de Paléographie Homérique", 1960 = Scriptorium Supplement 4.} marks long alphas in fragment b and c\footnote{Lameere, op. cit., p.122-3.}. Where markings do occur, they are scant and are present only to justify otherwise ambiguous syllables.

4) The stroke over the second omicron of ΒΟΤΠΥΑΩΝ is very difficult; it is almost certainly a longum - the reader would perhaps need to have been reassured that the syllable was scanned long. However, it is slightly tilted to the left, so it could also be a grave accent.

5) The stroke over the epsilon of ΜΕΝ is perhaps sufficiently tilted to be an acute; however, as above, a longum would not be at all surprising to indicate the scansion of this vowel that is short by nature. There is a dot over the end of the cross-stroke of tau to indicate the elision; furthermore there is a stroke over the nu of ΕΘΕΑ. As with ΘΕΝΑ above, it could either indicate the acute or the scansion of the vowel.
6) There is, again, a horizontal stroke, not over the initial epsilon of \( E\Theta N\)E\( A\), but over the (now rubbed) theta.

9) The short horizontal stroke over the upsilon of \( O\)TP\( Y\)NO\( Y\)\( Z\) is again either an accent or a longum. The elision mark resembles a modern apostrophe. There is a horizontal stroke over the space between the epsilon and nu of \( I\)EN\( A\), which has to be an acute accent.

10) The spelling TETPE\( X\)EI is not attested in any manuscript given by Ludwich or Allen. The mistake is very common in documents (see Gignac, I, p.239).

11) The horizontal stroke over the omicron of \( I\)Z\( O\)NT\( O\)N is ambiguous.

In the margin to the left of this line is written, very clearly, with horizontal lines above and below, the stichometric letter alpha \((= 100)\). This is somewhat puzzling; one might expect an error of one or two, but a miscount/miscalculation of four is slightly more serious. There are no "additional" lines attested for B 1 - 42 and B 65 - 85 (the parts missing up to this point). The best study of stichometric problems is still that of Ohly\(^1\). In chapter two\(^2\) he lists and describes the principal papyri known to him with stichometric markings. Of the eighteen Homer papyri he lists, only in three cases do the figures in the margin exhibit an error of more than two between two figures supposedly 100 lines apart: a papyrus published in the Journal of Philology\(^3\) has, in book N, B next to line 198, \( \Gamma \) next to line 303, \( \Delta \) next to line 407 and \( Z \) next to line 601; \( P. \) Oxy. \( II \) 223, which contains parts of book E, has \( \Delta \) next to line 101, B next to line 200 and \( \Gamma \) next to line 296; \( P. \) Ross.-Georg. \( I \) 4 has \( \Delta \) next to P 419. Ohly gives details of scribal fees from Diocletian's price edict\(^4\) and draws attention to the Morgan Iliad\(^5\), where the scribe tends to overestimate the number of lines he has written, while the corrector underestimates: "Die Erscheinung erklärt sich einfach aus dem ursprünglichen Zweck unserer Gewohnheit. Um etwas mehr zu verdienen, vindiziert sich der Kopist mehr, als er in Wirklichkeit geschrieben; der Korrektor, mit dem

\(^{1}\)"Stichometrische Untersuchungen", Leipzig 1928.
\(^{2}\)"Die Stichometrie der Ägyptischen Papyri".
\(^{3}\)26 (1898).
\(^{4}\)op. cit., p.90.
\(^{5}\)Published in Sitzungsberichte der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften" for 1912, p.119ff.
Verleger eng verbunden, sucht seinerseits den Lohn des Schreibers herabzudrücken." This seems plausible in theory, but the scribe already earns so little (according to the price edict) that differences of a few lines could not actually be accounted for (i.e. there was not a sufficiently small coin!). Ohly discusses the various other possible uses of stichometric marks, all of which are implausible for one reason or another. He himself rejects Schubarts theory that the scribes were required to estimate roll-length\(^1\); he suggest that customers would be concerned that they were getting correct copies - though it would have to be a very discerning customer who knew the precise length of any work he wanted to buy. His other suggestions - that stichometric letters were used for library cataloguing purposes or to facilitate quotation are also plausible, but unlikely (though there is a small amount of evidence for the quotation-facilitation thoery). Ohly returns to the initial reason for the presence of stichometric letters - the calculation of the scribe's wage: "Nach den durchgesprochenen Papyri scheinen die Verleger nur sehr selten Exemplare mit genauer Zeilenzählung, nach denen ein Gelehrter selbst zitieren oder die ein wissenschaftlich interessierter Leser bei der Lektüre von philologischen Schriften mit exakter Zitation nachschlagen konnte auf den Markt gebracht zu haben. Ihre Absatzmöglichkeit war zu genug. In den meisten Büchern scheint die Marginalstichometrie nur als Hilfe bei der Schreibleistung gedient zu haben". Clearly the stichometric letters were only a guide, as our scribe has not erred in his own favour. An alternative explanation would be that the scribe miscounted the first column by three, and, thinking that there were 45 lines to a column, multiplied by two mentally (to reach 90) and then marked the tenth line in the column as line 100.

12) The eta and upsilon of \(\text{ΚΗΡΥΚΕΣ}\) both have suprascript strokes. The first is only a trace and is ambiguous; the second must be a longum.

13) There is a small apostrophe over the horizontal bar of tau to indicate elision, followed by a high stop. The horizontal stroke over the upsilon of \(\text{ΑΚΟΥΣΕΙΑΝ}\) looks like

\(^{1}\)Ohly, op. cit., p.96.
a longum - yet one fails to understand how such a syllable could have presented a problem. There are the remains of a grave accent over the ΔΕ.

14) The stroke over the omicron is flat, but has to be an accent.

19, 21, 34) Ambiguous strokes over ΕΡΜΕΙΑΣ, ΘΗΗ[ΣΚΩΝ and ΑΙΣΧΡΟΝ respectively.

FRAGMENT 2 - P. Oxy. 9 1B.181/E(c)
Plate 12

Introduction

This large piece contains the remains of two columns of Iliad, covering B 191 - 226 and B 254 - 287; there are corrections by what appears to be another hand, and marginal additions by another. The hand of the main text has no accents or diacritical marks, but does have high stops; the hand of the marginalia is much more cursive and uses accents and abbreviations. The top of both columns is present, but the papyrus seems to have been cut down to size, though the verso is blank. At its widest, the upper margin measures 0.7cm. The right-hand side of the papyrus seems to be fairly straight and the portion stretching furthest to the left also has a straight edge - indeed, remains of the sheet that was previously gummed down over the left-hand edge of our sheet are still visible. The right-hand side of our sheet, then, would have been stuck down over the following one and rubbed to make the join less obvious; the rubbing would explain the slightly jagged appearance of the right-hand edge. Our piece is then a sheet that has come unstuck at the kolleseis. It is just under 20cm wide and is 20cm at its highest point. The two layers of fibres in the papyrus clearly did not adhere very well to each other in antiquity - see note to col.ii, lines 30 - 31.

What is extant of the left-hand and right-hand columns contains 35 lines. The columns would thus have contained 63 lines originally, making our left-hand column the fourth in
the book. As the 35 extant lines cover 18.5cm, 63 lines would have covered 33.3cm. The intercolumnar space is quite narrow, so the margins may have been also, but even with a margin of 2cm at top and bottom, the height of the roll would have been 37.3cm. This is exceptionally high (see introduction to previous fragment). Since the columns are approximately 11cm wide, this sheet would have been the third of the book. However, since one column of text plus intercolumnar space is approximately 13cm, and book B, at 63 lines a column, would require only 182cm of roll, it is unlikely that this roll contained just book B. At 63 lines a column, book A would require 10 columns, which would cover 130+cm (+ = extra space at start and between books); thus a roll containing A and B would be 312+cm, which is a very plausible length. Thus our two columns would have been the fourteenth and fifteenth of the roll, and our sheet the seventh of the roll, allowing for an overlap of about 1cm at the kolleses.

We have two types of marginalia here: a marginal gloss on a word of the Homeric text, and speaker indications. The gloss is written just before col.ii, 1.21 and reads ἐπραχ(.). We would suggest that this refers to ἔρεξεν at the end of the line, which is glossed this way in many places, cf. D in B 274 ἔρεξεν: ἐπραχ, D in B 195 ἑξη: ποιήση, πράξη, D in B 802 ἑξαι: πράξαι D in Γ 354 κακά ἑξαι: κακά πράξαι D in Ε 373 ἑξουσαν: πράτουσαν. ἑξεῖν was interpreted both πράτω and θεω (cf. Ap.Soph., s.v. ἑξεῖς, Phot., s.v. ἑξεῖς, Hes., s.v. ἑξεῖς), but where the interpretation was "to do" rather than "to sacrifice" the verb πράτω was the one usually used, though ποίεω and τελέω appear occasionally. Further examples may of course be found in PB, which uses πράτω for ἑξω at B 274, B 802, Γ354, I 453, K 49, K 51, K 282, K 525, O 586, Σ 455, T 90, Y 186, X 305 and Ψ 570, but δράω at B 195 and καταργω at E 373. Marginal and interlinear glosses are comparatively rare in the papyri: in fact we have found only P. Ant. III 174 and P. Oxy. XI 1397 as parallels.

Marginalia in the form of small scholia or textual variants are commoner - e.g. the Hawara Homer, P. Lond. Lit. 301, P. Lond. Lit. 272, P. Ryl. I 53, P. Oxy. II 223, P.
Oxy. III 445 and P.Oxy. IV 685. Marginalia and commentaries were the subject of a doctoral thesis by McNamee\textsuperscript{1}. Since ερεξε is lost from the text, we cannot tell if the scribe indicated in any way, if at all, that a gloss on the word could be found in the margin.

Speaker designations are better attested in the papyri. In col.\textit{ii}, next to lines 12 and 25 we see the sign π, which is to be interpreted as πο(ητης), poet, indicating that what followed was narrative. In the more cursive hand we see, next to line 20 in col.\textit{ii}:

\begin{verbatim}
 ειστω.
 ελληνω.
 A60
\end{verbatim}

Further down, next to line 33, we see:

\begin{verbatim}
 οδυσσευσ
 Ακ
 α[.]αμμυρ
\end{verbatim}

Since the symbol for poet is by the first hand, one wonders whether these speaker indications are also by that hand, added later. The indications are to be restored as follows: εισ των 'Ελληνων πρ(όσ) 'Οδυςσευσ and 'Οδυςσευσ πρ(όσ) 'Α[γ]αμέμνον(ονα). Apart from πο(ητης) in the Theocritus papyri published by Hunt and Johnson (fifth - sixth century) at XXVI,1 (B fol.7, recto) and X,56 (B fol.1, verso) these indications are only found in Homeric papyri of the first to third centuries. P. Grenf. I 2 (assigned to the first - second centuries, containing part of Iliad \(\theta\)) has πο(ητης) by 1.97 and Διομηδης by 1.103 (though his speech begins at 1.102, and next to 1.102 there is a Δ in the margin). P. Harris I 123 (assigned to the third century, containing the opening of the Odyssey) has πο(ητης) by 1.1. P. Fay. 209 (assigned to the first century, containing \(\Gamma 214 - 224\)) also has the πο(ητης) symbol, but as McNamee points out\textsuperscript{2}, it must refer to the next column, since \(\Gamma 214 - 224\) all comes from one speech. When P.Lond. Lit. 28\textsuperscript{3} was first examined, the editor said\textsuperscript{4}: "Praefiguntur unicuique ητης nomina personarum,

\textsuperscript{1}"Marginalia and Commentaries in Greek Literary Papyri", Duke University thesis 1977.

\textsuperscript{2}"Abbreviations in Greek Literary Papyri and Ostraca", Michigan 1981, = BASP Supplement no. 3. p. 83.

\textsuperscript{3}The "Bankes Homer". See Turner, "Greek Papyri", pl. 4.

\textsuperscript{4}"Iliadis Codex Aegyptiacus", Philological Museum 1 (1832). Editor simply given as "G.C.L.".
v.g. Θεὶς ν.128, Ἀχιλλεὺς ν.139, et sic deinceps. Singulis versibus qui excipiunt praefigitur sigla hac forma τοῦ, πο(ηηη) (monente Bankesio) significans. The editor adds, somewhat hopefully in our view, the explanation: "Notavit ergo librarius διηγήσεως et μυθέσεως differentiam quam Plato tam luculenter exponit." P. Oxy. II 223 (assigned to the first half of the third century and containing parts of book E) has speaker indications in columns ix, x and xiii, and though we see at 1.204 Παν[δ]αρ(ος) πρ(ος) Αἰνιαν, there is a slight variant in expression at 1.218 Αἰνιας πανδαρ(ω) and 1.241 Στεν(ελος) Διο(μηδε). Schwartz published two such Homeric papyri, the first covering Α 342 - 390 and the second Α 215 - 442 (which has a document on the verso dated to 194AD)\(^1\). P. Oxy. LVI 3827 (assigned to the second century and containing Λ 337 - 361) has, in col. ii (for 1.404) Οδυς[ευς] πρ(ος) εαυτο[ν].

The most notable parallel, however, is P. Lond. Lit. 6 of the first century, which covers Β 251 - 875. Here we find the indication πο(ν) by lines 419 and 441; furthermore, there is τ[ο] των Αχαιων(ος) επαινω(ν) Οδυσσα by 1.272, Οδυσσεως πρ(ος) Αγαμεμ(νος) by 1.284 and [Νεστωρ] πρ([ος]) τ[ο(ος)] Αχαι[ο(ος)] by 1.337. One would like to think, as was suggested by the editor of the Bankes Homer, that scribes and scholars were concerned with poetic and mimetic reality, and the small number of such texts would not necessarily militate against this, but it seems unlikely to us. Presumably it was simply a method of clarifying the text for the reader, in much the same way as punctuation.

The hand is assignable to the second century and may be compared with that of the Hawara Homer\(^2\) especially in the form of the kappa (κ). In both, serifs are present and bilinearity is interrupted only by phi and psi. Our hand is more informal and there is a tendency for strokes to curve in letters such as alpha (α), delta (Δ) and even nu (ν).

\(^1\)"Papyrus Homériques", I in BIFAO 46 (1947) and II in BIFAO 54 (1954).
\(^2\)GMAW, 2nd edition, pl.13.
αλλ' αυτός τε καθ' ἐσο καὶ ἀλλοιοσ ἱδρυε λαοὺς

νῦν μὲν πειράται ταχα διψεται υιας [Ἀχαίων ·
ἐν βουλῇ δ ὅυ παντες ακούσαμεν οιον εἰπε·
μή τι χαλωσαμενος τεξη κακον υιας Ἀχαίων ·
θυμοὶ] δε μεγας εστι διοτρέφουν βασιληνων
τιμῇ δ εκ Διὸς εστι φιλει δε ε μητιετα Ζευς
ον δ αυ δήμου αγ[ήδρ[α]δ]δοι[ι] βουωντα τ εφευροι·
τον σκηπτρωι ελασσασκ[εν] ομοκλησασκε τε μυθω
δαιμονι ατρέμασι] η[σο και] α[λλων] μυθων ακουε
οι τε φερτεροι εισι, συ δ[απτολεμου και] αγα[λκις]
ουτε ποτεν πολεμωι εναριβ[μιοσ] ουτεν βουληι]
ου]κ αγαθον πολυκορανιν εις κοιρανος ε[α]τω
εις] βασιλευς ωι δωκε Κρονου παια αγ[η]μομητεω
ω[σι] ω[ τε κο[ι]πα"γων διεπε στρατον οι δ αη[η]ρην δε
αυτις επεσευνοτο νεων απο [και] κῆληςαων
ηηηι οσ οτε κο[ι]α πολυφλοιοσ[β]οιοι θαλασσης
αγιαλωι μεγαλωι βρεμεται σμαραγι δε τ[ε ποντος
αλλοι] μεν ρ εξοντο ερητυθεν δε καθ εδ[ρασ]
οσ ρ] επεα[α]φρεσιν ηιοιν ακοσμα τε πο[λλα τε η[ηδ]
μαι]ψ αταρ ου κατα κοσμον ερι[ζεμεγι[αι] βασιλευσι
αλλ] τι [οι] εισατο γελοιον Αργεοισιν
εμιλεναι αισχιστος δε ανηρ γ]πο Μιον ηλθεν
φολκος ε[ν χη]ψωδ δ ετερον πο[ιδα τ]ιω δ[ε οι] ω[σ]
κυρτω επι [η]θοι[ς] συνοχωκοτε αμαρα υπερθε
φοξω σεν ηε κηφαλην ο[ζωδν] δ επιεγη[νοθε] λαχνη
εχθιστος δ Ἀχιλης μαλιστην η[ηδ] Οδυσση
τον υαρ νεικεισκε τον αυτ Ἀγαμεμνονι δι[ιοι]
ο[ξεα κεκληνωσ λεγ ονειδεα τ]ω αρ Ἀχαιοι
εκπαγλως κοτεοντο νεμεσσ[θ]εν υ τ εν[ι] τυμω
αυταρ ο μακρα βων Ἀγαμεμνονα] γικες [μ]υθωι
Ἀτρειδη, τεο δ αυτ επιμεμφαει ηδε χατιζειος
πλεια τοι θ[αλκου κλισια] πολλαι δε γυναικειοσ
4 - 5) The two lines appear to have no function

6) διοπτρέψων βασιληων is the Zenodotean reading (see Allen and Ludwich ad loc.) as opposed to the Aristarchean one.

14) The dubious line 206 is omitted, as in many manuscripts, the Hawara Homer, P. Mil. Vogl. I 2 and P. Tebt. I 4.

22) The iota is omitted here, presumably in error, as it is written elsewhere (e.g. ΗΕΙΝ in the following line).

29) Just above the beginning of the word ψεδνη is an interlinear addition by a corrector, whose hand resembles that of the main text, but is not so competent. Since we have lost what comes before the -λην, we can only assume that originally κεφαλην was not written in the text; no variant is listed here, so it is impossible to conjecture what error the scribe might have made.

Text - Column 2

τοι νυν Ατρειδηνι Αγ(αμεμνονι ποιμενι λαων
ησαιι ονιδιιζιων στι οι μαλα πολλα διδουσιν
ηρωεσι Δαναοι συ[ de κερτομεων αγορευεισ
αλλ ακ τοι ερωντο de κ[αι...][].
ει κ [ετι σ αφαινοντα] [.....] 5
μηκετ επειτ Οδυσσει[.....] [μηδ ετι Τηλεμαχοι[πατ]ηρ κεκ[λημενος ειην
ει μη ενω σε λαβων σηπο μιεν φιλα ει[ματα δυσω
χλαιναν τ ηδε χιτωνα τα[...] 10
αυτον δε κλαιοντα θοα[σ ε]ηπι γηασ[ αφησω
κε[ ]]αγορηπιν αεικ.... πληηηπιν
ωσ μεταφρε[νον ηδε και ωμω
πληξεν ο δ iδ [.....] [συμοδιξ iδ] αιματοεσσα μετα[φρενου εξυπανεστη
σκηπτρου υπο χρυσον ο δ αρ εξ[ετο ταρβησεν τε
αληηπασσα δ ιξριον ιδων απομο[ρφατο δακρυ
οι δε και αχνυμενοι περ επ αυ[τωι ηδυ γελασσαν
ωδε δε τις ειπεςκεν ιδων ε[σ πληπον αλλου
[ω] ποποι η δε μυρι Ο[δυσσευσ εσθλα εοργη
Owing to much fibre-stripping and rubbing of letter, we have left spaces for those parts of the papyrus where no ink is visible but words must have stood.

1) Here as elsewhere, the papyrus seems to have been faulty in antiquity, and the upper layer of fibres is missing in parts, and the scribe was compelled to write directly onto the layer of vertical fibres beneath - here, τω[ is written on the horizontal fibres but ]ηια[ is written onto the vertical fibres below.

2) Iotacism.

11) Before αείκεσσαι the papyrus definitely reads αγορησιν, a reading attested nowhere else, though probably arising from the influence of the two following dative endings. The letter preceding alpha is very difficult to interpret: there are certainly the remains of a vertical stroke, and before that, perhaps, a horizontal stroke, though the traces fit neither theta nor eta. The first letter of the word is almost certainly kappa and what follows would be compatible with κεκ[, giving κεκληγωσ
perhaps; however, the termination would not fit the traces as they stand, and it would be very difficult to construe this with πληγίσων at the end of the line (if indeed, that is how we are to restore πλ[).

12) Some traces are also visible on the lower layer of fibres, so there was some stripping here too in antiquity. In the margin are the remains of the symbol \( \wedge \), π\(\eta\eta\sigma\) - see introduction.

21) The scribe wrote μεγαθροσφι. The corrector, has tried to put the correct reading in, but written ρισσ over the deleted letters in error.

24) Iotacism.

27 - 28 (=) 29 - 30) There seems to have been quite a lot of the upper layer missing here, since the scribe has written out these two lines twice. The letters written on the lower layer are somewhat fuzzy. Parts of lines 32, 33 and 35 also seem to have encroached on areas with only one layer of papyrus. The variant \(\tau\)τι is not listed in Ludwich. It could have come about because of the similarity in sound between tau and theta and similarity to the termination of the word πρωτι. \(\tau\)τι works as a variant, though it would leave the sons of the Achaeans uncomfortably without their article.

FRAGMENT 3 - P. Oxy. 38 3B.79/E(1 - 2)b

Plate 13

Introduction

This papyrus presents nothing of textual interest and has no punctuation, accents or diacritical marks. The papyrus is mid-brown and the first hand is well-executed and could be regarded as an early version of the biblical maiuscule (see below). The fragment contains the top of a column starting at B 407; its dimensions are 9.2cm x 8.2cm. The most remarkable feature of the fragment is the size of its upper margin - 3.5cm - and the intercolumnar space - about 5.2cm of blank papyrus are preserved to the left of the text at one point (though of course the blank may simply
correspond to a series of short lines in the previous column). A corrector has added lines 405 - 407 in the upper margin in a considerably more untidy hand; the addition shows no variants either. The hand is similar to the biblical maiuscle, even in the angle of the pen and is bilinear apart from the vertical descenders of upsilon and rho (whose upper loop is very small). The letters epsilon, theta, omicron and sigma are not oval and the mu is formed from four separate strokes and not of three with a low central bow (μ) as we find in the earliest antecedents of the biblical maiuscle (e.g. the Hawara Homer). The most notable parallel is P. Oxy. II 224 whose editors describe the hand as follows: "...a large heavy formal uncial resembling that of the great biblical codices and the Demosthenes fragment facsimiled in P. Oxy. I, pl.iii (= 25). Like that fragment, the present papyrus was found with documents belonging to the later Roman period, and the date of both is certainly not posterior to 300AD..." Our papyrus is different principally in its pen angle - whereas P. Oxy. II 224 is written with the flat edge of the pen parallel to the horizontal fibres, our papyrus was written with the pen at the angle that was de rigueur for the biblical maiuscle later. Therefore, one could assign this fragment to the first half of the fourth century. Cf also Schubart, Abb. 93 (= BKT V 1) assigned to the end of the third century, and GMAW, 2nd edition, pl.26 (= P. Oxy. XXII 2334), assigned to the third - fourth century by Turner and to the fourth by Cavallo.

Text

Νεστόρα μεν πρωτιστα καί Ιδομένη ανακτα αυτορ ε[πειτ Αί]ξετε διω κ[αί Τυδεος υιον εκτον[ δ αυ]τ' Όδυσση[α Δι] μητιν αταλαντων

αυτοματος δε οι ηλθε[ βοην αγαθος Μενελαος ηδεε γαρ κατα θυμον] αδελφεον, ως επονειτο βουν δε περιστησαντο κ[α]ι ουλοχυτας ανελοντο

2= Cavallo, op. cit., pl.6.
Ζεῦ κυδισήτε μεγίστε κελαι[νε]φες αι[θε]ρι να[ων]
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Introduction

This death notice dates to 29/1/179 AD, and measures 6.1cm x 27.2cm; it is complete, though has suffered from the ravages of worms during the course of time. The upper margin is 1.5cm wide, though the text does not fill the entire length of the papyrus, and 10.5cm is left blank at the bottom. There is a small addition towards the bottom of the papyrus, but it cannot be deciphered, nor even established in which hand it is in. Death notices have been the subject of an exhaustive study by Casarico\(^1\), who republished all death notices in chronological order and tabulated their phraseology according to nome, analysing the form in the introduction. She usefully lists all the previous literature on the subject\(^2\). Since her work, five other death notices have appeared; three were published by Duttenhöfer\(^3\), one as P. Prag. I 19 and one by Molyviati-Toptsi\(^4\). Note that of the three death certificates listed by the latter as to be added to Casarico, the first two are in fact in Casarico (SB XVI 12383 and SB XVI 12712) and the third (P. Sakaon 50) is not in fact properly speaking a death certificate, but merely a report of death dated to 317AD. The death notice edited here for the first time displays some variants from the usual form, though follows the standard Oxyrhynchite type in outline.

There were probably three copies of each death notice\(^5\): "...una indirizzata al funzionario responsabile dell’amministrazione fiscale del nome (βασιλικός γραμματέας), che doveva chiedere la verifica della denuncia ai funzionari locali (γραμματέας μητροπόλεως nelle metropoli, κωμογραμματέας nei villaggi) ai quali veniva indirizzata una seconda copia;"
gli stessi poi ne rilasciavano una terza con il visto al dichiarante (un esempio di queste potrebbero essere quelle con la nota κατακεκυρισταὶ κατεχωρίσθη ε ἐσχον τοῦτο τὸ ἴδιον). Inoltre ogni funzionario interessato doveva, con ogni probabilità, far redigere almeno una copia della denuncia da inserire in archivio, dopo la verifica della stessa; non si spiegherebbe altrimenti la denuncia SB VI 9627a,b di cui si hanno due copie indirizzate allo stesso funzionario. Ours, then, is clearly the copy that would have been retained by the declarant, as it has the subscription of the komogrammateus.

One subject not covered fully by Casarico, in our view, is the adducing of evidence concerning laographia. The frequency with which death notices occur reflect the simultaneous decline of laographia. This decline is discussed by Bell¹ and Wallace². Wallace cites O. Strass. 118 as our latest laographia receipt, probably dating from 243 AD. To those receipts listed by Wallace may now also be added P. Oxy. XLIII 3107 (238 AD), P. Oxy. XLIV 3172 (219 AD), P. Lug. Bat. XIX 14 (248 AD), P. Strassb. 378 (215 AD), P. Alex. 16 (222 - 4 AD), P. Vindob. Salamons 14 (242 AD) and P. München III 111 (222 - 235 AD). For poll tax receipts in general, see O. Tebt. Pad. I 1 - 27 for the most recent list and add (apart from those already given post-dating the Constitutio Antoniniana), P. Strassb. 724, P. Cairo. Mich. II 359 and P. Athen. 513. Our latest evidence for the poll tax now seems to be P. Oxy. XLIII 3114, dating from 267 AD. An Aurelius Polydeuces reports to the phylarch that his name has been left off the poll tax list. There are also death notices from the third century concerning adults who are λαογραφούμενοι - one dated to 237 AD (SB I 5136) and two simply assigned to the third century (P. Bouriant 26 and SB I 5176).

It is not clear why the poll tax went into decline, but the lack of receipts and other references from the third century is remarkable. The only death notices later than this are all addressed to the systates and come from the Oxyrhynchite nome. In two (P. Oxy. XLIII 3141 (299 - 300 AD) and P. Oxy. XII 1551 (304 AD)), the status of the deceased

³Published in Seg. 60 (1980), p.149 - 52.
is simply described as ἀναγραφόμενος, and in the third, an unedited Oxyrhynchus papyri of 311 AD, there is no reference to the deceased's status. The systates, an official first attested in P.S.I. III 164 (286 - 287 AD), was previously thought to be unique to the Oxyrhynchite nome; there is now also an occurrence of the word in P. Panop. Beatty. Of course, it is still not clear why notifications of death were submitted in the cases of minors or people over sixty (i.e. those no longer liable for the poll tax) other than a desire to keep tabs on the population.

Although our latest census date is 257 - 258 AD, if we project hypothetical census dates at fourteen yearly intervals after this, we arrive at some interesting results concerning the beginnings of the indiction system. After 257 - 8 AD, the following censuses would have been 271 - 2, 285 - 6, 299 - 300 and 313 - 4 AD. 287 AD was the year of the first tax-schedule issued on the new system (in May - June). From 287 AD to 302 AD there were three cycles of five-year tax schedules. It is then generally assumed that the fifteen year indiction cycle was introduced in 314 - 315 AD, though retrospectively, as being already the third year of the cycle. Although different kinds of information would clearly be required for a land-based tax assessment from that collected in the censuses, yet it is very tempting to suggest that Egypt waited until one more census had been completed before introducing the new indiction cycle. It must also be borne in mind that the system may have varied from nome to nome. In the Oxyrhynchite nome, our earliest attestation of the systates coincides with the first trial epigraphe (though the editors suggest that his titulature does not have a "ring of novelty"). Thus we might conclude that laographia was finally phased out with the introduction of the epigraphai; yet the habit of submitting death notices did not die out until the introduction of the indiction system proper, even though there appears to be no obvious explanation for this.

1We are grateful to Dominic Montserrat for showing us this papyrus.
2See S.P. II, p.26ff., "Die Jüngsten Volkszählungen und die Ältesten Indictionen in Ägypten" (Wilcken).
3See the extremely important article on this subject by Thomas, in BASP 15 (1978), "Epigraphai and Indictions in the Reign of Diocletian".
Bagnall and Worp\textsuperscript{1} cite at the end of their introduction the various papyri which concern the possible date of introduction of the first fifteen year induction cycle: P.S.I. VII 820, which seems to indicate that the coming induction cycle was known in April 314 AD; P. Cair. Isid. 122, a rent receipt dated 28/7/315 AD, which acknowledges receipt of rent for the second and third indications; similarly retrospective is P. Cair. Isid. 55 of 18/11/314 AD, a receipt for rent for the (then passed) second indication; P. Erl. 52 mentions expenditure of the "first" induction dated May 214 – this must relate to expenditure since the issue of the first tax-schedule (which was called the second elsewhere); finally there is P. Col. VII 141a, a "receipt for taxes paid in barley of induction 2, paid during the harvest of that induction". If, as Bagnall and Worp conclude, the cycle was introduced in the summer of 314 AD, then this would follow exactly on a projected census date. Unfortunately, there is no immediately clear reason for retaining a census after the abandonment of laographia (and one could not posit the continuance of laographia through the first epigraphai down to 214 AD, in the light of our total lack of documentary evidence). Perhaps the census was retained simply through habit; for a system based on epigraphai one would not require a population list, but a list of land-owners and their holdings – a document like B.G.U. XI 2072 ("Liste von Kleruchen") where the editor suggests: "Diese Rolle was also eine Art Grundbuch oder Kataster. Daß sie auch als Grundlage für die Vernalagung zur Grundsteuer gedient hat, ist möglich..." For the system of assessment one could imagine a scenario similar to that outlined in P. Hamb. III 202 (introduction); Bagnall and Worp discuss the issuing of tax schedules in chapter 4.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1}"Chronological Systems in Byzantine Egypt", Holland, 1978. 
\textsuperscript{2}p.22ff.
Translation

From Amois, also known as Dionysios, son of Diogenes and whose mother is Isarous, from the city of Oxyrhynchos. My slave Eutyches, also known as Psiathas, an adult, registered in the quarter of Platias, died a while ago, so I am making this declaration, seeing fit that his name should be written into the list of the dead as is proper, and I swear by the fortune of the emperors Marcus
Aurelius Antoninus Pius Caesar and Lucius Aurelius Commodus
Pius Caesar, that I have not lied. <m2> In the 19th year of
the emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Pius Armeniacus
Medicus Parthicus Germanicus Sarmaticus Augustus Caesar and
Lucius Aurelius Commodus Pius Armeniacus Medicus Parthicus
Germanicus Sarmaticus Augustus Caesar, mecheir 4. I, Amois,
also known as (Dionysios) have sworn. <m3> I, Ptol( ),
komogrammateus, have a copy of this.

Commentary

1) Nearly all notifications of death open with the
formula τι θανεί παρά τον δεινος; those addressed to the
basilikos grammateus usually have an additional note at the
end in the hand of the royal scribe, asking the local scribe
(either the komogrammateus or the grammateis of the
metropolis) to certify the death1. Only three other death
notices actually lack an addressee, as this one does: B.G.U.
XI 2021 of 215 AD, P. Oxy. LII 3689 of 226 AD and SB I 5136
of 237 AD (= Casarico numbers 73, 74 bis and 78). Casarico
adopts the explanation given by the editor of B.G.U. XI
2021: "Merkwürdig ist, daß am Anfang die Adresse
fehlt...vielleicht ist es eine im Büro des βασιλικὸς γραμματέως
gemachte Abschrift..." This suggestion would obtain better
if the copy were for retention in the office of the
basilikos grammateus, but this cannot apply either to B.G.U.
XI 2021 (as it was forwarded to the komogrammateus) or to
our papyrus since it has the subscription of the
komogrammateus. Was ours then the original declaration,
forwarded from the office of the basilikos grammateus? It
could not be a copy made in the office of the basilikos
grammateus and forwarded to the komogrammateus, since it
would be impossible to explain the presence of more than one
hand. Although our document may have arrived via the office
of the basilikos grammateus, it would have to be an original
sent there from a notary or scribe. We do have an example
of a notification of death in duplicate, with one copy

1See Casarico, introduction, p.20.
addressed to the basilikos grammateus and one to the komogrammateus, but practice may well have differed from period to period.

1) Like most metropolites, Amois is of mixed Greek and Egyptian descent. As is usual, the age and occupation of the declarant are not indicated, but his paternity, maternity and place of origin are.

4) Death notices concerning slaves were comparatively uncommon. The only other ones are P. Oxy. II 262 (61 AD), P. Oxy. XLIX 3510 (78 - 79 AD), P. Oxy. XLI 2957 (91 AD), B.G.U. III 773 (100 AD), P. Oxy. XXXI 2564 (153 AD), P. Strassb. 528 (145 - 160 AD), P. Oxy. VII 1030 (212 AD) and SB I 5137 (237 AD), = Casarico numbers 9, 15, 17, 19, 44, 50, 71, 77. Here, as in the other notifications concerning slaves, the master makes the declaration. The slave too has one Greek and one Egyptian name.

5) τελ( ) This abbreviation does not seem to occur elsewhere in death notices, though τελ(ων) might be a possibility as it is always associated with a named tax (τελόν τα ἐπικεφάλαια, τελόν τὴν λαογραφίαν). One might at this point expect the profession of the deceased1 - κτενιστής, ἐριστείς, ἱεροτέκτων, τέκτων, ἱερεύς, γέρδιος or ἀτεχνὸς. Only the last two occupations are attested for slaves, and in one case (B.G.U. III 773) no occupation is given at all. The correct realisation almost certainly lies in P. Mich. X 579 which is of similar date (ca. 150 AD); in it the deceased is described as τελειος, adult. This is an indication of the deceased's fiscal status, i.e. he is neither ἀφήλις (under fourteen) nor ὑπερετής (over sixty - cf. B.G.U. XI 2087 (lines 4 - 5): "αφηλις μην τελων τοις τελεσα λαογραφαιας(σ)" and SB IV 7359 (lines 7 - 8): "ὑπερετής απολελυμενος της λαογραφαιας"). Usually, an adult's poll-tax liability is indicated simply by the expression αναγραφωμενος (ἐπ’αμφοδου). As is normal in notifications of deaths of slaves, the slave's parentage is not given. Though slaves were liable for poll-tax, they were paid for by their masters, who paid the same amount for the slave as that for which they were liable. We have applications for the epicrisis of slaves (e.g. B.G.U. I 324, P.S.I. VII 732 etc.). Wallace2

---

1See Casarico, introduction p. 16.
2"Taxation in Egypt...", chp. 7.
says: "The proof of the privileged status of the master alone was sufficient to sustain the epicrisis of a slave". For poll-tax lists, see P. Lon. II 257 - 259 (p.19 - 42).

6) Rink¹ comments on this amphodon as follows: "Das «Hauptstraße-Viertel» von Oxyrhynchos hat in den ägyptischen Papyri nicht seinesgleichen. Wohl sind πλατεία in den meisten Städten überliefert, einen gleich Viertelnamen finden wir jedoch nirgends."

7) The date of Eutyches' death is left vague (ἐπὶ παλαι) and the expression only occurs in four other death notices - B.G.U. XIII 2230ii (160 AD), P. Oxy. XXXVI 2761 (161 - 169 AD), P. Fay. 237 (second - third century) and P. Prag. I 19 (of 177 - 180 AD).

8) As usual, the request that the deceased's name be added to the list of the dead follows. In all nomes the request involves the verbs ἐπιδίδωμι and/or ἀξίω. The verb that follows is ταγήναι in the Arsinoite nome and ἀναγραφήναι in the Oxyrhynchite nome, bar 5 [6] cases (Casarico numbers 1, 56, 65, 81, 82, [75]) out of the 23 Oxyrhynchite examples in Casarico's work. Where ἐπιδίδωμι is used in conjunction with ἀξίω, the latter is usually given in the participle. Exact parallels for the expression διὸ ἐπιδίδωμι τὸ υπομήνα ἀξίων ἀναγραφήναι αὐτὸν may be found in P. Oxy. I 173 (of 174 AD), P. Merton II 84 (of 201 AD) and P. Oxy. VII 1030 (of 212 AD). Indeed, the Oxyrhynchite formula for the second half of the third century seems to be διὸ ἐπιδίδωμι ἀξίων whereas earlier it was rather ἀξίω ἀναγραφήναι.

10) The expression ἐις τὴν | τῶν ὁμοιῶν ταξικὲς is unique. Though ταξικ might be considered an iotaism for ταξικ, the accusative τὴν in the previous line is clear. The normal expression is ἐν τῇ τῶν ὁμοίων/τετελευτηκότων τάξει. This itself would seem to be an ellipse for a longer expression, which we find in P. Oxy. XLIV 3510 (lines 14ff.): "ἀξίων οὖν | ἀναγραφέσθαι τοιοῦτοι εν τῇ ταξικῇ | τῶν τετελευτηκότων του αὐτοῦ | ετὸς ως εἰπὶ τῶν [ο]μοιῶν". For οὶ > ν, see Gignac I, p.197. Casarico fails to mention P. Lon. II 259 (p.36 - 42), which is a list of "persons who have ceased to be liable to the tax, either from having reached the age of exemption or by death." Line 65 has the abbreviation [τελ(ευτηκότων); while not a ταξικ τετελευτηκότων, it clearly

contains information derived from a τάξις τετελευτηκότων. There is also an unnumbered Hawara papyrus with the abbreviation τελ( ) and which is listed by Wilcken as being a τάξις τετελευτηκότων. Casarico says: "L'ipotesi del Wilcken pare fondata unicamente sullo scioglimento di τελ( ) = τελ(ευτησαντες) ma se fosse una lista di morti normale, sarebbe τετελευτηκοτες; poterebbe essere τελ(ουντες) come paganti qualche tassa." Cf. note to 1.5 - one might also suggest τελ(ειοι).

12) την...τυχην The occurrence of this expression in oaths in notifications of death is not so common, and occurs in P. Oxy. XXXVI 2761 (161 - 169 AD), P. Merton II 84 (201 AD), P. Oxy. VII 1030 (212 AD) and P. Oxy. LII 3689 (of 226 AD). In the Oxyrhynchite nome, the expression seems to be limited to the second half of the second and the first half of the third centuries.

18) The initial epsilon of the infinitive also has to be supplied at P. Oxy. XXXVI 2761 (161 - 169 AD). For the omission of the augment, see Gignac II, p.225 and Mandilaras, section 236.

25) μεχερδ A very large proportion of notifications of death are made in the month of mecheir. Brashear follows Montevecchi in assuming that those whose deaths were registered before the half year was up were only liable for half the amount of poll-tax. The date here is January 29th, 179 AD. At the end of the line one would expect Αμοισο και Διονυσος, but the traces after he initial delta do not conform well. Also, there is a slight interlinear trace above the word, indicating that it was probably abbreviated. Amois seems to have dated the document himself, as well as giving his oath (1.18f.). The first part of the text was probably dictated by Amois to the scribe.

26) What follows must be the subscription of the komogrammateus, though it is very cursive. The two commonest names in Πτολ- are Πτολ(εμαιος) and Πτολ(λασ); the spot above the word is probably an ink-blot. We have the

---

1Published in APF 5 (1913), p.395 - 6.
2Introduction, note 40.
5"Ricerche di Sociologia nei Documenti dell'Egitto Greco-Romano", Aeg. 26 (1946).
initial kappa of komogrammateus and what follows after the lacuna is indecipherable as a letter and must be an abbreviation slash attached to a very cursively formed letter. All the death notifications bearing this subscription are signed by the komogrammateus, with the exception of P. Oxy. VII 1030, which is signed by the amphodogrammateus.

27) The verb is always in the aorist, with the exception of P. Ross.-Georg. II 11, which has εχω την ισην (ισην also being exceptional).

DOCUMENT 2 - P. Oxy. 24 3B.75/E(a)
ARREST WARRANT - Late Second Century
Plate 15

Introduction

This arrest warrant is complete, and measures 10.1cm x 7.1cm. It is written across the fibres, so that it might be less easily erased\(^1\), though there are several examples of arrest warrants not written across the fibres. The ink is occasionally smudged and there are several holes, though these do not prevent the text's being deciphered in its entirety. The principal study on arrest warrants is that of Hagedorn\(^2\) and the most recent list that of Bülow-Jacobsen\(^3\).

Most of the topographically identifiable arrest warrants come from the Oxyrhynchite and Arsinoite nomes, and Hagedorn has identified the formulae for the warrants from the different nomes. The Arsinoite is: ἀναπέμψεν (πέμψετε) τὸν δεῖνα ἐγκαλοῦμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ δείνοντος ἔξαυτησ; the Oxyrhynchite runs as follows: πέμψεν τὸν δεῖνα ἐντυχάντος τοῦ δείνοσ. Hagedorn notes six examples which correspond exactly to this formula (note 16) and a further fourteen that correspond more or less to it. Ours corresponds exactly to the formula, with the

\(^1\)We are grateful to Prof. Pruneti for this suggestion.
exception that the reason for arrest is added. Our papyrus is quite small - Youtie\(^1\) suggests 15cm - 25.1cm for the width of arrest warrants, and 4.5cm to 10cm for the height, though see Browne's slight modifications\(^2\).

This warrant is to be dated before the middle of the third century: Gagos\(^3\) has assembled evidence to show that the archepheodos in the Oxyrhynchite nome decreases in importance at some stage between 245 - 257 AD (when the komarchai were introduced) and 256 AD (a dated arrest warrant addressed to the komarchai by the prytanis, P. Oxy. XLII 3035). Gagos' evidence suggests that the komarchai took on the responsibilities of the archepheodos and the komogrammateus. After this date it no longer seems to be the strategos who issues the warrants, but officials on a village level. These changes and shifts of function are additional to other changes already detailed by Parsons\(^4\) during the reign of Philippus Arabs. However, it is not known whether these reforms were instituted by Philippus Arabs himself.

The most interesting aspect of this fragment is that the reason for arrest is given, something that occurs only in a handful of those listed by Bülow-Jacobsen. P. Oxy. VI 969 (early second century) concerns the arrest of Apollonios περὶ κατασφοράς; SB XVI 12313 (second century) concerns an offence about δημοσίος πυρος; P. Turner 46 is a summons (dating to the fourth century) of the annona collectors ενεκέν της φωμαρίας της κρίθης; P. Oxy. XII 1505 (fourth century) concerns debt ("Ἀνοβαν καὶ Διουνσιὸν καὶ Ἀμῳν[ιο]ν η τούτων τα γενη [κ[ι]αταγομενους] τα αργυρια απερ χρεωτου[ς]"), as does P. Oxy. XII 1506 (fourth century) - "χρειας ενεκεν". The most detailed reason given for arrest is P. Med. 42 of the sixth century: "Φιλοξενω συμμαχω | Αμαιεω τον γεωργον αιτιασα τους περισυνους αγροφιλακας ωσ παρα την αμελειαν | αυτην βλαβην υπομεμνηκως μηχανικων οργανων τη[σ αυ]του μηχανης. αυτ[ους] τοιων εκπεμψων επι την πολιν..." An even longer (though very similar) explanation can be found in P.S.I. I 47, also of the sixth century. SB XII 11106 also concerns debt, though this time.

---

\(^3\)In a paper given at the 19th International Papyrological Congress held in Cairo in September 1989; the proceedings have yet to appear.
\(^4\)"Philippus Arabs and Egypt", JRS 57 (1967).
tax-related: "παραστήσεως τα ονόματα τα εξήγησαμενα απο των πρακτικων της Βακχιάδος" and in P. Oxy. XXXI 2575, Andromachos appears to have committed some offence related to the dyeing trade ("...ἐνυπ[χ]ον[τ]ων ἡθων ἐβαφκης..."). These papyri represent just over ten per cent of the papyri listed by Bülow-Jacobsen.

We can see that the offences fall into two categories - debt and farming-related misdeeds. In our case it may be that Hermogenes and Horion have misappropriated some land (- perhaps their portion was not flooded during the inundation) or simply claimed some land as their own by sowing it.

As with most arrest warrants, this document bears no date. The hand is clear, but has several cursive features - note the ligature αρχ- in line 1 and the distorted ν of ωριωνα in line 3. The nearest parallels one could cite are both dated to the end of the second century: P. Ryl. II 176 (= Seider I,38), dated 201 - 202 AD, where the same (admittedly common documentary) form of epsilon may be seen; and Schubart Abb. 42 (first hand) dated to 194 AD.

Text

ἀρχεφόδωι Ἰσοῦ Τρυφώνου
πεμψον Ἐρμογενῆ Παυλου
καὶ Ωριωνα Παυσιρίωνον ενυχον-
tοσ Πλουταρχου περι δημοσια γης
XXX XXX XXX

Translation

To the archephodos of Iseion Truphonos. Send Hermogenes son of Paulos and Horion son of Pausirion on the accusation of Ploutarchhos concerning public land. XXXXXXXXXX

Commentary
1) The archephodos was the chief of the village police. For details of his office, see Oertel ("Die Liturgie") pp.275 - 277: "Spezialorgan für die Leitung der dem Dorfe obliegenden Polizeigeschäfte, das jedoch gelegentlich für das Dorf auch anderweitige Funktionen ausübt. Der ἀρχῆφοδος - vielfach sind es auch mehrere (zwei ?) - untersteht dem Gau - (bzw. Toparchie-)beamten und den mit der Wahrnehmung des Sicherheitsdienstes betrauten Militärpersonen direkt, ist rangmäßig den Dorfältesten nachgeordnet und steht seinerseits über den Dorf-φύλακς". However, the archephodos' function changes in the middle of the third century (see introduction). The first dated appearance of the archephodos in the Oxyrhynchite nome is P. Oxy. I 69 (190 AD) and the last P. Oxy. I 80 (238 AD or 244 AD), but palaeographical evidence suggests that the office existed in the early second century (e.g. P. Oxy. VI 969). Bülow-Jacobsen's list gives several arrest warrants simply assigned to the second (e.g. numbers 20 - 24). The office was adopted earlier elsewhere (as far as we can deduce from our evidence) - the early first century in the Arsinoite nome (P. Tebt. I 90) and later first century in the Herakleopolite nome (B.G.U. VIII 1855) etc. See introduction to P. Oxy. XXXI 2576. One wonders if the ἕκαστονταρχος, who has certain police functions, was also empowered to issue arrest warrants (perhaps after the changes under Philippus Arabs?). His non-military functions have not been investigated in full, nor his relationship to the archephodos clearly defined; the subject clearly warrants further investigation.

5) The crosses are present to prevent any additions to the warrant after it had left the office of the strategos. That arrest warrants did originate in the strategos' office is demonstrated by Nicole1.

1"Le Cachet du Stratège et les Archéphodes", APF 3 (1906).
Introduction

This is an extremely interesting document; it is rectangular in format, measuring 27.4cm x 12.2cm. The text is well preserved, though about a quarter of it is missing from the right-hand side. Its form is simple, and consists of an order by Mousaios to Petros, son of Stephanion, to pay Abraamios, πραγματευτής, the money he is owed for twelve axles (he has) bought from someone. There are two hands in the document, and the second is not as clear as the first. Both hands have used several types of abbreviation: the symbol ^ for χαπελευ; the oblique slash ( / ), as in πρ in line 1 or ν/χρ/ in line 4; raised letters, e.g. πη or αγαρα in line 1; we also see the common s-shaped stroke (ʃ). It is interesting that Abraamios uses this in preference to a raised final letter in his subscription (compare πηʃ in line 4 with πηΧ in line 1), though he repeats the abbreviation used by the first hand (πρ) in line 5. The document is also valuable as it dates from the fifth century, which is not well represented in the papyrological record.

Unfortunately, the people named in the document cannot be identified with any individuals already known to us (see note to line 1). The document clearly implies a large estate at work: the πρασπίον was the central estate office and seems to have been a complex of buildings and associated land (see note to line 2), though it is not clear whether this land was simply that adjoining the office or land administered differently from other lands of the estate (perhaps not contiguous). The Apionic estates of more than a century later than this document are well attested and researched, but even in this document we may be able to trace the outline of an Apionic type administrative structure. Mousaios would seem to be the landlord’s agent - compare Hardy’s description1 of such an agent from the Apion estate: “He was apparently in control of financial matters -

---

1"Large Estates of Byzantine Egypt", New York 1931.
seeing that the taxes are sent to Alexandria [P. Oxy. XVI 1844], exercising some control over accounting [P. Oxy. XVI 1845 and 1854] giving orders for the transfer of payments [P. Oxy. XVI 1848]. For the arbitration of disputes, he was apparently the highest authority on the spot to be called in [P. Oxy. XVI 1853 and 1867]. He was naturally a travelling official...". The pronoetes of the Apion estate was a district collector of rents etc.\footnote{See Hardy, op. cit., p.88ff.} Our Petros would fit well into Hardy's description of the other tasks of the pronoetes:"...we find pronoetai making most of the estate disbursements in their districts. They pay salaries and wages, issue the estate's donations to the local churches, provide for the repair of machinery, the construction of cisterns and building operations generally, purchase reeds for newly planted vines, and are sometimes used by the central management to pay for items on the general estate account...Receipts for the issue of machinery are addressed to the proprietor personally, but in many cases such expenses appear in the accounts of pronoetai [e.g. P. Bad. 95, P. Cairo. Byz. 67139 and P. Oxy. XVI 1911 (lines 160 - 164)]..." Hardy goes on to describe the pronoetes' pay and terms of contract\footnote{op. cit. p.92ff.}. Of course, there is no way of telling whether the estate in this document was divided up into districts, each headed by a dioiketes (as on the Apion estates). Abraamios is simply an executive official. The word πραγματευτής does not seem to have any fixed sense in the papyri (see note to line 2), though perhaps the most relevant document is P.S.I. I 60 of 595 AD: the pragmateutes responsible for delivering the axle is a certain Victor; it he is the same Victor as that of the Victor correspondence (P. Oxy. XVI 1844, 1854 and 1937) then πραγματευτής in those documents would mean "landlord's agent". Since we have already suggested that Mousaios is the landlord's agent, if Abraamios is as well, then we must be dealing with an estate of some size. Of course, it may be that Mousaios just had the specialised function of authorising payments, and that Abraamios alone was the agent.
The axles were presumably intended for irrigation machines (for a commoner type of document, the irrigation machine axle receipt, see note to line 1). The various types of irrigation machine are listed and discussed by White. The two most likely possibilities are the saqqiyah or shadouf. The saqqiyah is described by Schnebel as follows: "Zwei gegenüberstehende Mauerchen tragen einen gewaltigen quer überlegten rohen Palmstamm. Er ist die obere, einige Hölzer die untere Stütze einer an beiden Enden zugespitzten vertikalen Holzwalze, welche durch eine wagrecht oder schräg davon ausgehende Stange vermittelst Zugviehs in Drehung versetzt wird. Damit dreht sich unten ein beweglich mit der Walze verbundenes Zahnrad; dieses bewegt ein tief in den Boden eingelassenes zweites Zahnrad und mit dessen unterirdisch verlängerter Horizontalachse muß sich das eigentliche Wasserrad gleichfalls drehen. An letzteres ist ein sogenannter endloser Strick gelegt, welcher unten in das Wasserbecken eintaucht. An dem Strick sind in gewissen Zwischenräumen Tonkrüge angebunden, und zwar so geschickt liegend, daß sie unten im Brunnen sich mit Wasser füllen und erst ganz oben über dem Rad angekommen sich in ein daselbst befindliches Becken der Reihe nach entleeren." Archaeological evidence is given by Winlock and Crum, though their claim that "the wheel was introduced in Roman times is borne out by the fact that the nomenclature of the parts of the saqiyyeh Arabic today is clearly derived from the Greek..." is in itself suspect and in fact definitely wrong. Caton-Thompson and Gardner discovered remains of one in an early Ptolemaic reservoir and suggested a Persian date for the introduction of the saqqiyah into Egypt. The Lexicon der Ägyptologie says that it was indispensable for large-scale spring or summer cultivation, had a lift potential of 3.5m and was capable of irrigating up to 10 hectares.

The other possible machine is the shadouf, described by Schnebel as follows: "Bei dem heutigen Schaduf errichtet man zwei etwa fünf Fuß hohe und etwa drei Fuß..."
auseinanderstehende Pfeiler aus Holz oder Lehm, welche oben ein Querholz, auf dem quer eine Holzstange festgebunden ist, verbindet. An dem Ende dieser Stange ist ein Klumpen Lehm als Gewicht befestigt, während am andern Ende ein Stab hängt, der zu untere eine Art Schüssel aus Korbfl echt oder einen Sack aus Leder oder Leinwand trägt. Ein neben dem Schaduf stehender Mann ergreift den Stab, taucht es etwa 8 Fuß hoch, wobei der Lehmklumpen als Gegengewicht dient, und gießt das Wasser in das auf die Felder führende Rinnsal. White’s description is identical, though he fails to acknowledge Schnebel.

The whole subject of irrigation machines has been treated most recently by Oleson, who collects the papyrological evidence for them in his chapter three. Until the second century AD, the shadouf is referred to as κηλων and κηλώνειον. Oleson says: "Since the shaduf has continued to serve as an important means of irrigation up to the present, the disappearance of κήλων and κηλώνειον from he papyri after the second century has the...effect of bolstering my contention that not all devices in papyri termed μηχανή and ὁργανόν should be considered sāqiyas or water-wheels...Bonneau interprets this disappearance as an indication that these devices simply were not taxed, and thus not subject to the administrative record...Skeat asserts that the terms were replaced after the second century with ὅνος...The relevant documents, however, (P. Mert. I 41, P. Mich. XIV 682, P. Oxy. XVIII 2197) are not conclusive. The most interesting among the papyri he cites concerning shadoufs (- for the most part the shadouf features simply in account or in the terms of a lease) is P. Cairo Zen. II 59155 of 27/12/256 B.C. Here Apollonios writes that the king has instructed him to sow a second crop; Zenon is to harvest the early corn, water the land, erecting shadoufs if necessary, flood the land for five days only and then plant a crop of three-month wheat. The shadouf clearly had distinct advantages in this case, owing to the ease with which it is constructed and dismantled.

1op. cit., chp. 6 "Drainage and Irrigation".
2"Greek and Roman Mechanical Water-Lifting Devices", Boston 1983.
3op. cit. p.130.
The wood of the machine may well have been acacia. Winlock and Crum found a large hook (43cm long) made of acacia wood with a palm-fibre rope still attached. This was identified by their workmen as coming from a shadouf. The first representations of the shadouf are in three Theban tombs; these wall-paintings show water being lifted out of a canal to irrigate date palms and well as other orchard trees, and to fill pools: "Primary use of the shaduf was to lift water 1 - 2m out of a well, canal or river for gardens or small pilots as well as for drinking water. Although locally allowing cultivation of summer crops on higher ground, shaduf irrigation was horticultural in nature and impractical for extensive summer cropping..." Since our axles were left at the entrance of the orchard, they may well have been intended for use there, so we should almost certainly conclude that the axles were intended for shadoufs and not for saqqiyahs.

Max Eyth describes the shadouf in his book in much the same way as Schnebel, and his comments are particularly valuable as they are based on personal observation of local circumstances: "Die ganze Maschine hat jedenfalls den Vortheil, daß sie in einer Stunde construirt und montirt werden kann. Ist sie an den steilen Uferrändern des Flusses angebracht, so schöpft ein Mann mit einem Apparat 2 bis 3 Meter hoch. Verschwindet in der Nacht die Vorrichtung samt dem Stück Land, auf dem sie stand, was häufig vorkommt, so hat es nicht viel zu sagen. Mit ein paar Stöcken ist eine neue geschaffen. Sinkt der Nil tiefer, so werden 2 oder gar 3 über einander angebracht, die mit Hilfe von kleinen, aus Lehm und Stroh gebauten Reservoirs sich stufenförmig das Wasser zuwerfen. Zwei bis drei Mann versehen in solchen Fällen 1/2 Faden pro Tag." Since one Fad = 0.45 hectares, then his men will be irrigating approximately 0.225 hectares a day, i.e. 225 square metres. If we take this figure and assume that the twelve axles were used simultaneously, then we may calculate the size of the orchard as 2.7 hectares.

1 op. cit., p. 64.
2 Lexicon der Ägyptologie, s.v. Schaduf.
3 "Chef-Ingenieur des Erbprinzen Halim Pascha Königl. Hoheit in Cairo".
4 "Das Agricultur-Maschinenwesen in Aegypten", Stuttgart 1867.
Mousaios  Πετρω<ι>  πρ(ονοητηι)  Στεφανιωνοσ  χα(ιρειν)
παρασχο[ν]  Αβρααμιω<ι>  πραγματευτη<ι>  υπερ  τιμησ  αξονων  ια
πηχ(ων)  ιβ  αγορασθ(εντων)  παρ[α]  .......  και
βληθ(εντων?)  εισ  τα  επιστυλ(ι)α  του  πωμαριου  του  προαστου
χρυσου  νομισματια  ειξ(ε)  τεταρτον
γι(νεται)  χρ(ουσου)  νο(μισματια)  γδ  μον(α)
<m2>  σεσημειωσται  υπερ  αξονων  δωδεκαι
ενδεκα  πηχ(ων)  α(ξι)ων  χρυσου
νο(μισματιων)
<m1>  (ετουσ)  ρει  πο  φαμενωθ  τζ/  ινδ(ι)κ(τιωνοσ)
<m2>  εισ  Πετρον  προ(νοητην)  Στεφανιωνοσ

1 πρ  2 πη  3 βλη  4 μον

Translation

<m1>  Mousaios  to  Petros  the  pronoeites,  son  of
Stephanion,  greetings!  Give  to  Abraamios  the  agent  for  the
price  of  twelve  axles  of  eleven  cubits  length  bought  from
[...  and]  left  (?)  at  the  entrance  to  the  orchard  of  the
estate  office,  the  sum  of  [six  and  a  quarter]  gold
nomismatia  =  6  1/4  solidi  only.  In  the  115th  and  84th  year,
phamenoth 3,  7th  indiction.

<m2>  I  have  signed  for  twelve  axles  of  eleven  cubits
length  worth  [6  1/4]  gold  [nomismatia].  For  Petros  the
pronoeites,  son  of  Stephanion.

Commentary

1)  Mousaios,  Αβρααμιος,  Στεφανιων  The  only  documents  of
similar  date  containing  individuals  of  this  name  cannot  be
connected  with  a  man  of  such  importance  as  our  Mousaios  is:
P.  Oxy.  L  3583  (444  AD)  has  a  Mousaios  requesting  that  some
private  land  be  transferred  from  his  father's  name  to  that  of
someone  else  (a  purchaser?)  for  taxation  purposes;  another
Mousaios  signs  the  receipt  P.S.I.  VI  695.  There  is
an  Aurelius  Abraamios  in  P.  Köln  V  234  (431  AD),  who  makes  a
complaint ("...durch die Nachlässigkeit der Flurwächter des Dorfes Panenei sei an einer Bewässerungsanlage während der Nacht Schaden entstanden..."); however, there is no immediately apparent reason to identify this Abraamios with the one in our document. The name Stephanion is not frequently attested in the papyri; apart from P. Laur. 2 (93 - 95 AD, Arsinoite nome?), the other attestations of the name all come from Oxyrhynchos and all from dates later than our document - P. Oxy. VI 1191 and P. Oxy. XIV 2034 (both assigned to the sixth century), P. Oxy. XIX 2244 (assigned to the sixth or seventh century) and P. Oxy. XXVII 2480 (565 - 566 AD).

2) πραγματευτὴς This appears to have been a general term for agent/executor, and appears in many different types of document. At a later date he seems to have lent money - P. Lon. V 1882 (p.275, sixth century) and P. Oxy. VIII 1130 (484 AD), a contract of a loan of 10 solidi for a period of six months; the editors of the latter document translate the word as "dealer". The πραγματευτής frequently occurs in tax-related documents - he seem to have been responsible for the collection of various taxes: P. Tebt. II 580 (second - third century), a receipt for εγκυκλίων paid to the account of a monarch from two agents; similar documents are P. Tebt. II 605 (205 AD), P. Tebt. II 607 (194 AD), B.G.U. II 383 (second - third century, Fayûm), P. Grenf. II 58 (175 AD, Fayûm), B.G.U. I 356 (213 AD), P.S.I. VII 809 (fourth - fifth century), etc. Elsewhere we see the πραγματευτής acting in various capacities as agent and executor; P.S.I. I 60 has already been mentioned, with an agent managing the affairs of an estate; a strategos seems to have had a pragmateutes (P. Oxy. X 1257, third century); he is responsible for accounts (P. Oxy. IV 825, second century); he authorises entertainment (SB V 7557, late second century); he is responsible for conveying important petitions (P. Oxy. XVII 2130, 267 AD, where Aurelios Sarapion objects to a liturgical office connected with the gymnasiarchy); he acts on behalf of senators (P. Oxy. XX 2271, (mid-third century - "a receipt issued by the public bankers for payments on the account of the administration of rent" - drawn up for two senators through an agent). We also see agents making payments themselves - P. Oxy. XII
1514 (274 or 280 AD), where the agent is ordered to pay two artabai of barley to an ass-driver and the editors describe him as "a subordinate official of some kind", P. Oxy. XX 2286 (274 or 280 AD) and P. Oxy. XII 1569 (third century) where an agent is ordered to pay a builder six jars of wine. We can see that the term pragmeteutes had no fixed meaning and varied in usage chronologically and topographically.

2) ἀξόνων Axles were clearly of great importance. There are several contracts for the lease of agricultural land which include details of all the associated machinery: S.P. XXII 177 (137 AD, provenance unknown), P. Fay. 95 (second century), SB XVI 12519 (104 - 105 AD, Theadelphia) and P. Ross.-Georg. II 19 (141 AD, Oxyrhynchos). The Heroneinos archive contains much information about axles that is of interest. We find axles being rented out - presumably at important agricultural times (the inundation) - at a rate of four drachmai a day: SB VI 9408 (250 - 253/6 AD, col.v, 1.86) τοι αυτωι αναστρομον αξόνα καινὸν εἰς κτῆμα κολοκυνθ(ων) ἦμ(ερων) ἦμ(ερων) (πεντε) (δραχμαί) (εἰκοσι) and SB VI 9409 (no.6, col.ii, 1.26) ανασκόρμον αξόνα καινὸν εἰς ἡμερὰς (δυο) (δραχμαί) (οκτω). A later entry (SB VI 9409, no.7, col.vi, lines 93 - 99) records the transfer of an axle from a store of eight to the allotment cited in SB VI 9408 (col.v, 1.86) above. The length of an axle, in cubits, is often given, though not always. Perhaps the length was only given when it differed from a standard length. The importance of an axle’s length was not simply so that it would be guaranteed to reach the water level: we learn from P. Flor. II 262 (no date) that the axle-maker charged by the cubit: "ἀπηλαξὺν γὰρ τοῦτον πηχῖν | δραχμῶν δέκα" ("..poiché allora valutō (Hermes) il cubito a dieci dramme...") There are several letters in the archive on the subject of axles: P. Flor. II 199 concerns the collection of axles, and P. Flor. II 248 the provision of fodder for oxen pulling a cart transporting an axle. P. Flor. II 160 from Alypios, asks the price of wine as he has authorised that the axles be paid for in wine. There are requests for axles - P. Flor. II 215:"ενα αξόνα ενναπηχὶν εξαυτῆς αναπέμψατε" and P. Flor. II 175:"παντὶ τροπῳ αξόνα [[ε]] αλλὸν επειτήδειον ευρέτε [[[μ]]] ἤμεν πηχῖν δέκα | ἦ καὶ πλείνοσ ...επεί εξεβνησ καταχεν ὁ τῶν ἐκεῖ ἀλλὰ ἦτω επειτήδειο εἀν μὲν μεντοι αγοραστος | ἦν δῆλοι απὸ τινος τεκτονος ἡγορασθη και τα μετρα [[ε]]
P. Flor. II 262 is also of interest for another reason - one can conclude that the maker was paid in advance; it is noteworthy that again the oxen are sent to collect the axle; Hermes the farmer has had 160 drachmas for two axles of eight cubits, but one axle of nine and a half cubits is required. In an account roll from the Heroneinos archive (SB XVI 12382) there is an entry for a nine and a half cubit axle which has subsequently been deleted. It may be that it refers to the same axle as given in P. Flor. II 262 and that the item was deleted because money had already been given for an original order of two axles of eight cubits length. We would have to assume that lengths of less than a cubit were ignored when calculating the price of an axle. It is not clear whether the axles in the Heroneinos archive are for saqqiyahs or shadoufs. The axles range in length from 8 (P. Flor. II 262) to 9 (P. Flor. II 215) to 9 1/2 (P. Flor. II 262) to 10 cubits (P. Flor. II 175). Thus the axles in our document are the longest axles attested. The price of them will be discussed later.

There is one other type of document concerning axles - the rather complex receipts made by workers of the land in the later period. The type has been analysed by Daris. Nearly all the documents of this type are connected with the Apion family estate and they all date from the sixth and early seventh century. There are also similar receipts for other types of farm equipment, e.g. P. Oxy. XVI 1983 (535 AD, for parts of a mill) and P. Oxy. XVI 1984 to 1991 (ranging in date from 523(?) AD to 616 AD).

The importance of stating from whom the axle was bought (cf. P. Flor. II 175 and P. Oxy. XVI 1911, col.vii, 1.166 and col.viii, 1.191) was presumably to know whom to blame, should the goods turn out to be faulty.

...καί] If one restores καί at the end of the line and the restoration in the line below is correct, then there is room for a name of approximately eight letters.

---

2 "Dai Papiri Inediti della Raccolta Milanese - Ricevuta per la Consegna di un Argano", Aeg. 37 (1957) p.94ff. For the evidence concerning the varying terminology of ὀργανὸν and μήχανη see the article by Calderini "Appunti di Terminologia Secondo i Documenti dei Papiri", Aeg. 1 (1920).
3) επισυλλαμα Though Liddell and Scott translate this as "architrave", a meaning which no doubt obtains at SB V 8267 (1.40 - 41, 5 B.C.), it could also be more loosely translated as "entrance" (as in P.S.I. V 496 (258 - 257 B.C.), SB XVI 11958 (col.i, 1.41 of 117 AD) or B.G.U. IV 1028 (1.19, second century). A form with double lambda does not seem to be attested elsewhere and should be attributed to scribal error.

3) προσπον The commoner meaning of the word προσπον is "suburb" and occurs in this sense in P. Strassb. IV 285 (200 AD), SB VI 9203 (222 - 235 AD), P. Ross.Georg. III 55 (seventh century), P. Hermop. 48 (fifth century), SB V 8444 (68 AD), and P. Grenf. II 68 and 70 (269 AD). However, in our document, the meaning is clearly "estate office". Hardy says1: "...there seems to have been, even in minor districts, a definite building as a centre of estate administration. The word προσπον, which perhaps in its exact sense means suburban house, but is not always confined to that meaning, is found in this connection. The Apion estate had one, apparently near Oxyrhynchus (P. Oxy. VI 915 and P.S.I. VIII 555, lines 2 and 17). The patrician Sophia owned one in the village of the Syrians (P. Klein. Form. 1029). We hear of baths in such buildings (P.S.I. VIII 955, P. Oxy. VI 915 and of a large one with a kitchen in the court (P. Basel. 19)." A definitive article on the various senses of the word has been written by Husson2; since she deals with all the papyri mentioning προσπον in the sense we have here3, it remains to mention P. Wisc. II 66 (584 AD) which shows that the Apion family continued to improve their bathroom facilities. In that case, P.S.I. VIII 955 (assigned to the sixth century) may be related to P. Wisc. II 66 and not P. Oxy. VI 915, as Husson says.

χρυσον νομισματα The solidus (aureus). The solidus referred to is that first issued by Constantine, struck at 72 to the pound4. Jones says: "The solidus was theoretically divided into 24 siliquae (in Greek, carats, κερατα) but no gold coins were ever issued below the semissis (12 siliquae)

---

1op. cit., chp.5 "Estate Management".
3op. cit., p.192 - 196. ∘
and tremissis (8 siliquae)... By the end of the fourth century solidi became so abundant that the levies and payments in kind could be commuted and all taxes and salaries paid in gold, while most private transactions except the smallest were conducted in gold." Thus, though the 6 1/4 solidi were probably paid mostly in gold, the 1/4 solidus was probably paid with nummi. Jones¹ says: "The denarius [theoretical subdivision of the solidus] was not, of course, a coin. In 324 the nummus, the principal copper coin, had a value of 25 denarii, so that a solidus could be bought with 174 nummi. During the fourth century the successive issues must have been assigned higher and higher face values in denarii, while at the same time the coins tended to become smaller and smaller. The peculiar conservatism of the Egyptians who went on reckoning in the old units of the drachma and denarius long after they had ceased to be coins, enables us to trace the course of inflation; it appears from the figures given above that from the time when Constantine conquered the East (324) till the reign of Julian (360 - 3) the inflation was extremely rapid. During these forty years the value of the denarius sank from about 4 500 to the solidus to about 30 000 000. Thereafter the movement was checked and in the next thirty years the denarius sank by only 50 per cent...[In the following century] the Egyptians continued to reckon in notional denarii and not in actual coins, and thus our accounts present a faithful picture of the progress of the inflation. In the west, it would seem, the current copper coins of the day were popularly called denarii... Denarius seems to be synonymous with nummus. In 445 the rate of exchange between the solidus and the nummus was stabilized at 1 : 7 000 - 1 : 7 200.". Thus if the quarter solidus in our document were not paid in gold, then it would have been paid for with about 1 750 nummi.

³ - 4) The problem with the price here is the strange symbol after vo(). It has been suggested that it is in fact £(60); in this case the quarter solidus could be considered a scribal fee or something of the kind. However, if we compare the only other axle price of vaguely similar date, we find this must be wrong: P. Oxy. XVI 1911 (an account

¹op. cit. p.212.
from the Apion archive, 557 AD) gives the price of two axles (col.vii, 1.160 and 1.163) as νο(μισμα) απ(αρα)ε, that is, one solidus less 5 siliquae = 19 keratia. The most plausible explanation is that the scribe wrote zeta initially, but corrected it by writing the second numeral (stigma) above. If we interpret the price here as 6 1/4 solidi, we have a price of 12 1/2 keratia per axle. This represents much less of a wild variation than 5 solidi per axle; but even the difference between 12 1/2 and 19 keratia is noteworthy — perhaps a lower price was agreed in our document because of the bulk order. Of course, the price difference is real and not the result of inflation as the value of the solidus remained constant through the centuries.

Unfortunately, not enough axle prices are extant to calculate whether there was any real increase or decrease in the price of axles. We have pointed out that they were charged by the cubit, though this may not always have been the case; we also cannot tell whether an axle was intended for a saqqiyah or a shadouf, and rates between the two types may have varied. The only other extant axle price (apart from SB XVI 12382 mentioned above, which gives a price of 90 drachmas for a 9 1/2 cubit axle) is P. Princ. III 174 (farm account, ca. 260 AD) from Hermopolis, which gives the price of an axle of unspecified length as 260 drachmas. Even taking possible length variation into account, this represents a huge increase attributable to the rampant inflation: "For the next fifty years [after Caracalla] the Antoninianus, which from the middle of the century completely superseded the denarius, went from bad to worse until [under Gallienus, 260 - 268] it contained less than 5 percent silver, as well as being substantially reduced in weight." The price increase is nearly 189%; unfortunately, we cannot calculate the inflation rate as we do not know how many years elapsed between the two documents, and we would also require several prices between those two points as the rate of inflation would not have remained constant.

4) The addition is presumably in the hand of Abraamios himself, confirming that he has received the money; underneath he added a note that this copy should be

1See Jones, op. cit., p.206 - 207, where he discusses the gold prices of wheat and pork.
2Jones, op. cit., p.196.
returned to Petros. One should perhaps supplement thus: 

\[ \text{σεσεμισωμαι υπερ ήμης αξονων δωδεκα...} \] 

It remains to work out how the symbol after nomismatia came about. We would suggest that the lower part (\(\xi\)) was meant as an abbreviation sign for nomismatia (in which case the raised omicron is not to be regarded as the abbreviation, but merely a scribal tendency) and that the upper part, the figure stigma (\(\zeta\)) was somehow written over it.

5) The date is expressed in Oxyrhynchite eras, a full discussion of which is contained in Bagnall and Worp\(^1\). At first the two numbers given after the symbol (\(\varepsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\)) in dating formulae involving Oxyrhynchite eras were the regnal years of Constantinus I and III. After the death of Iulianus, the numbers given were the regnal yeras of Constantinus II and Iulianus. The latest document dated in this manner SB VI 8987 of 644 - 645 AD. Bagnall and Worp also discuss in great detail the different meanings and changing systems associated with the word \(\varepsilon\omicron\nu\delta\omicron\kappa\tau\omicron\nu\). Though the indication was really a fiscal term and its dates were actually adjusted at one point so that the harvest period might fall entirely within the indication, the fiscal usage became secondary at Oxyrhynchos\(^2\): "From the start of the use of indictional dating clauses of documents...scribes constantly used a year running from Thoth 1 to Mesore, epagomenai 5, i.e. the traditional Egyptian civil year. It was on the basis of this year that the Oxyrhynchite eras, which were locally more important that the indication for dating purposes, were reckoned, and the indication was equated to the era years. The scribes of the Oxyrhynchite thus separated the chronological sense of the indication from the fiscal, for in the Oxyrhynchite also taxes and crops are consistently reckoned on the basis of the date of the praedelegatio 1 May...The date was calculated according to the Thoth indication, the crops and taxes according to the May one." Our document poses no problems as the predicted indication number for the year as dated by the Oxyrhynchite eras, is correct. The date here is the third of phamenoth (= 27th February).

\(^1\)"Chronological Systems in Byzantine Egypt", chp.6 "The Oxyrhynchite Eras".
\(^2\)Bagnall and Worp, op. cit., chp.4.
Introduction

What can be deduced from an archaeological artefact? If we found, for example, a bronze fibula in a grave - what would that tell us about the occupant of the grave? We would not even be able to conclude that the occupant had used it: it may have had symbolic value, been a grave-offering etc. Of course with comparative evidence (fibulae found in different contexts, different periods) we are able to make reasonable deductions concerning fibulae that we would not be able to make with the original object alone. The deduction of knowledge from papyri suffers from similar problems: should we be projecting the constructs we derive from papyri onto papyri? The more evidence we have, the surer we can be, but the more errors in our own thinking we have to correct. At first glance, the private letter may seem to be spared this problem since it is an expression of personal relationships rather than socio-economic realities.

Yet the contents of personal letters from Graeco-Roman Egypt are often mundane and trivial, as in our letter, or obscure, since they concern personal matters of whose precedents we are ignorant. A letter may well have been sent from one illiterate person to another; some of the intended meaning may have been obscured by the scribe, or may have been obscured by the person that read it to the receiver. Koskenniemi has made an excellent study of the motivation and (somewhat formulaic) phraseology of papyrus letters\(^1\). There are many examples of letters asking that a letter be written, expressing amazement that a letter has not been written and consequent concern for the health of the recipient\(^2\). Then, as now, one of the functions of letters was simply to maintain relationships between two people that were apart\(^3\):"Eine beträchtliche Menge von

---

\(^1\)"Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des Griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.".
\(^2\)Koskenniemi, op. cit., p.64 - 75.
\(^3\)See Koskenniemi, section V, "Der Brief als Mittel zur Pflege persönlicher Beziehungen".
Familienbriefen ist auch ohne deutlich erkennbare äussere Ursache geschrieben worden...In den vorchristlichen Jahrhunderten treffen wir derartige Briefe zur Pflege der Verbindung gar nicht an...Erst mit dem 2. Jahrh. beginnen die eigentlichen »Verbindungsbriefe« von der Art, wie sie dann bis zum 4. Jahrh. in Gebrauch blieben. Am zahlreichsten vertreten ist diese Gattung in den Papyri des 3. Jahrh. aus dem es auch sonst so viele Privatbriefe gibt...Der Gesamteindruck, den die Familienbriefe auf den modernen Leser machen, ist vor allem der, daß sie formelhaft und monoton sind, daß aus ihnen nur eine schwach entwickelte Phantasie spricht...Doch ist es nicht unsere Aufgabe zu kritisieren, sondern zu beschreiben und das rechte Verständnis zu bemühen."

The papyrus is large and complete apart from some holes, mainly in the unwritten part of the papyrus, and measures 35.1cm x 18.2cm. The main body of the text is well set out, as are the greeting and valedictory formulae. Where possible, the scribe has added a long horizontal flourish at the end of the line. The ends of similar flourishes can be seen on the left-hand side of the papyrus: presumably the local scribe wrote many such letters at the end of a roll and cut them off as and when each one was finished. Despite the clearly well practised format, the script is somewhat cursive, resulting in some strange letters and some whose identity has to be deduced rather then deciphered. Especially cursive is κυριας in line 6.

Note also the beta in line 3 (velopment) and the very long downward strokes of iota and, occasionally, rho; yet in line 3 we see a very carefully formed, bipartite omicron. The writer was obviously capable of writing well, but here he was in a hurry. Similar hands may be found in the Heroneinos archive (e.g. P. Flor. II 199 of 259 AD); similar too is P. Vindob. Gr. 2331 (= C.P.R. I 32, Seider I 43), dated 218 AD. Since, as we have seen, the flood of family letters began in the second century AD, but composite valedictory formulae do not become usual until the third century (see note to lines 10 - 12), we may place this papyrus in the first half of the third century AD.
To my father Loukios, son of Serenos, scribe to the strategos of Hermopolis.

Sarapion to his father Loukios [many] greetings! I am worried, not having received a letter from you for many days. For, on account of my habit of continually asking after you and my lady mother, it happens that I am now worried about my lady mother, having heard nothing. I send you many greetings - little Loukios, Apia, Loukion and all
of you/us. I pray you are in good health my lord father, prospering your whole life with all your household. Epeiph 17.

Commentary

2) There are traces of letters at the edges of the hole before the word χαίρειν, which suggest πόλα rather than πλείστα. Letters with identical opening formulae (i.e. A to B with relationship specified, πόλα χαίρειν) are B.G.U. I 38 (first century B.C.), P. Giss. 19 (second century AD), P. Oxy. XIV 1769 (third century AD) etc.

3) The initial case usage is slightly surprising, one might have expected an accusative. A certain amount of laxity is apparent in the uses of the various cases and their denotations of time: Mayser¹ says:"Für den im Spät- und Neugriechischen häufigen und bald geläufigen Gebrauch des Akkusatives zur Bezeichnung eines Zeitpunkts (an Stelle des Datives) fehlen in den ptolemaischen Papyri sichere Beispiele." Likewise, on the temporal use of the dative, Mayser says²: "Auf die Frage wann? bezeichnet der bloße Dativ den genauen Zeitpunkt einer Begebenheit (Datum), dagegen ev c. dat. eine Zeitdauer, einen Zeitraum, in dessen Verlauf etwas geschieht". Although the dative here certainly implies "for many days now" it might have an iterative sense: "on many days I have worried..." The last word of the line is clearly γραμματα; however, as the word is cursively written, we seem to lack one stroke, the two μι's being written thus: μμ.

3) The construction of the second sentence is somewhat complicated: it runs from συνεβη (line 4) to μητερα (line 7); δια...μητρος must be taken in parenthesis and the pronoun μι must be understood as the subject of the infinitive μετωριζεθαι, agreeing with πυθομενον.

συνεβη: Koskenniemi points out that the use of the tenses in letters departs often from what we regard as the norm³: "Der Aorist ist von den Tempora dasjenige, das

¹,²,³ p.330ff.
"
zweifellos am häufigsten speziell dem Briefstil angepasst erscheint". 
He lists three peculiarly epistolary uses of the aorist:"(a) Für das Schreiben eines Briefes, wenn man es als ein einmaliges Ereignis betrachtet und der Situation keine besondere Beachtung schenkt; (b) Für das Absenden von Personen oder Waren zusammen mit dem Brief; (c) Zur Bezeichnung eines psychischen Vorgangs, der der Anlass für das Schreiben des Briefes ist, wird allgemein der Aorist des betreffenden Verbums sentiendi gebraucht, mit dem ein Verb im Infinitive verbunden wird, das "schreiben" oder "grüssen" oder etwas ähnliches bedeutet..." Clearly (c) is the most relevant to us here. Elsewhere Koskenniemi³ points out that the writer frequently justifies his motivation for writing a letter and that the tense used is usually the aorist: e.g. B.G.U. II 451 (first - second century AD): eυροντεσ ουν τον αναπλεοντα...αναγκειον εσχαμεν δι[ε]πιστολησ σε απασεσθαι; P. Oxy. VI 933 (second AD): τυχων [τ]ου προς σ[ε] γεινομενο[ν] ηδίστα σε ασπαζομαι...

6) κυριας A very general polite form of address. Zilliacus² says:"Als allgemeine respektvolle Anrede tritt seit dem II Jahrh. n. Chr. das substantivische κυριος, κυρια...Die allerersten Ansätze lassen sich jedoch bereits im I Jahrh. n. Chr. beobachten. Seit dem II Jahrh. wird es aber häufig gebraucht und zwar für Eltern...Als Epithet oder Anredeform für Familienangehörige ist κυριος nur auf Eltern bezogen...Als Bezeichnung für Minderjährige kommt es zwar nur vereinzelt vor..."

7) μετεωρίζεσθαι. μετεωρίζω means "I raise up" and in the passive "I am raised up, I am elevated". Liddell and Scott translate once as to "unsettle" a man's mind (Polybius 5.70), which fits the sense excellently here. The word occurs only six times in the papyri; one of those occurrences is P. Oxy. VI 904 (fifth century) a petition to a praeses in which a certain Flavius complains about the treatment he has been subjected to during the course of his work. The original meaning of μετεωρίζω occurs here, as he is strung up with ropes and beaten: "...καθ'εκασθην ημεραν μετεωρίζομεν σχοινιοι και πληγαι κατακοπτομενοι..." The other five occurrences of the word all occur in private letters

¹ op. cit. p.77.
² "Untersuchungen zu den abstrakten Anredeformen und Höflichkeiten im Griechischen", p.34.
whose dates range from the first to the third century AD; the word always appears in the passive and in all cases has the meaning "I am anxious": SB XII 10927 (30 B.C. - 14 AD) - διο αξιω | γραφειν μοι πυκνοτερον ως μετεωριζομενωι και σφαλλοντι τη διανοια περι τε | τη σωτηρια σου...; SB XIV 12143 (41 - 54 AD) - ...μεχρι του | σοι παραγανοιαι επι πολλα μετεωριζομαι ωθε ανω; P. Warr. 13 (= P. Lugd. Bat. I 13, second century) - λειαν μετεωριζομενοσ ξενιζομαι ανη το κυριε μου...; P. Oxy. XIV 1679 (second century, covering letter for dispatch of goods) - ωστε, μη μετεωριζου, καλασ διαγομεν; the closest parallel perhaps is P. Mich. VIII 488 - γραφω και συ {for σοι} μοι ουδεμιαν αντιφωνησιν επεμψας {for επεμψεσ} γινωσκων οτι μετεωριζομαι εαν μη μοι πυκνοτερα γραφησ|τα κατα σε...

Liddell and Scott suggest that the translation "I am anxious" is also suitable for Luke 12.29, and we would agree. Delebecque notes in his edition of Luke: "Le verbe μετεωριζομαι porte la marque personelle de Luc hellénistique, d’abord parce qu’il n’a pas d’autre exemple dans le N.T....ensuite parce que dans la septante il s’applique uniquement, avec les mots de la famille, à l’arrogance, laquelle n’a rien à voir ici...le verbe ainsi que l’adjectif μετεωρος se dit au propre ou au figuré de la personne ou de la chose qui s’écarte de la terre pour s’élever dans les nuages ou s’avancer en haute mer...l’idée n’est donc pas celle de l’inquiétude...elle est plutôt celle de l’agitation inutile...et davantage encore de l’instabilité..." Thus Delebecque comes to a similar conclusion from a different route. However, we feel that Luke may have intended the sense "to be anxious" in this passage, though it would be a colloquialism - perhaps used to deliberate effect.

The supplement <με> suggested in the note to line 1 as necessary to construe this sentence correctly, could have dropped out by haplography at the start of this line, i.e. <με> μετεωριζομαι.

7) την κυριαν μου μητερα: accusative of respect.

8) Λουκιος ο μικρος: presumably the grandson of Sarapion’s father.

9) The name Λουκιον is unattested, though we do find Λυκιονος in SB I 1026. Απια is well attested.
Although οἱ ἡμῶν πάντες must mean "all our family", it is possible that οἱ ὑμῶν πάντες ("all of you") was intended; for examples of ν > η in the papyri, see Gignac I, p. 262. The final nu of ημῶν seems to have disappeared almost completely in the scribe's haste.

10 - 12) The three lines of the closing formula feature elements all well attested elsewhere. Koskenniemi comments as follows: "Wir haben...die ursprüngliche, bekanntlich gemeingriechische Wunschformel ερρωσό (bzw ερρωσθε) und daneben das im Ton etwas feierlichere ευτυχεί (seit dem Anfang des 2. Jahrh. n. Chr. auch ευτυχεί) zu denen sich im 1. Jahrh. n. Chr. das ein wenig umfangreichere ερρωσθαί σε ευχωμασ gesellt...Man kann die Klausel ausser durch eine adverbiale Zeitbestimmung wie διὰ παντός, διὰ ὅλου βίου, εἰς μακροῦς αἴωνας o.ä. vor allem durch ein Partizip wie ευτυχών, εἰ πράσσων, εὐκοπῶν oder ἕγαιῶν erweitern. Diese wechselnden Zusätze, die übrigens vor dem 3. Jahrh. n. Chr. sehr selten sind, hatten offenbar den Zweck, den Gehalt der Klausel zu unterstreichen und blosse Formelhaftigkeit zu vermeiden...Im 2. Jahrh. n. Chr. wird es üblich, in die Klausel eine Apostrophierung des Adressaten aufzunehmen, etwa ᾧ ἀδελφε, πάτερ, τέκνον oder κύριε μου...Bemerkenswert sind ferner die Zusätze, die kollektiven Charakter etwa πανοικησαί (πανοικία, πανοικεί), σὺν τὸι σάσι, μετὰ τῶν σῶν πάντων oder μεθ’ ὅν βουλη, denen wir vom 2. Jahrh. n. Chr. an häufig begegneten..."

Ibycus provides about thirty parallels for the combination of ρωννυμι and ευτυχω in valedictory formulae; the closest are P. Berl. Zill. 11 (third century) - ερρωσθ(αί σε) εὐχωμαι πανοικις διά παντός | ευτυχουντα; P. Princ. III 185 (162 AD) - ερρωσθαί εὐχωμα | ευτυχουντα πανοικεί; P. Strassb. IV 253 (third century) - ερρωσθαί σε [ε]υχωμα(αί) κυριε μου αδ[ελ]φε | ευτυχουντα διά βιου.

The various forms of πανοικεί are not perhaps all as common as Koskenniemi might suggest. πανοικία is rare in the papyri - in fact it only seems to occur in the expression σὺν πανοικία in B.G.U. VIII 1835 (51 - 50 B.C.) and the editor notes a parallel in another (unpublished) Berlin papyrus. As this may be construed as an elliptical form of σὺν τῇ πανοικία, we are inclined to disagree with

1op. cit., p. 151.
Döllstädt's restoration πανοικισματικαί at B.G.U. II 450 line 26; his defence is that "der Schreiber steht stilistisch und orthographisch hoch genug, daß man ihm die Kenntnis der Form πανοικισματικαί zutrauen kann." Yet he goes on to remark: "Indes ist zu bemerken, daß es nicht nur Ungebildete sind, die πανοικισματικαί schreiben, denn diese Wort findet sich auch in der gebildeten Sprache des Lukas..." πανοικισματικαί occurs twice in the papyri (P.S.I. XIII 1335 and SB XII 10801, both third century); this is a variant on πανοικισματικαί for which there are eight parallels: P. Lond. IV 479, P. Flor. II 273 (though this appears as πανοικισματικαί), P. Tebt. II 418, P. Oxy. XIV 1664, P. Oxy. XXXIV 2726, P. Oxy. Hels. 42, P. Oslo II 59 and SB XIV 1166.

In the letters on papyrus, the form πανοικισματικαί is by far the commonest. Döllstädt says: "Späterhin dominieren die wirklichen Adverbia [πανοικισματικαί, πανοικισματικαί] (schon ihrer Kürze wegen) mehr und mehr. Das NT kennt nur πανοικισματικαί." πανοικισματικαί was deemed appropriate in many types of letters, e.g. P. Abinn. 28 (a formal complaint, 342 - 351 AD), P. Oxy. XLII 3084 (a business note informing of the arrival of the prefect), P. Sarap. 90 (private letter) and P.S.I. XIV 1415 (second - third century, "biglietto di saluti").

Note on Address on Exterior

The recipient's name is written against the direction of the fibres. The expression Λουκιων πατρι Σέρενου is slightly unusual. Presumably it does not mean "to Loukios, father of Serenos" but "to Loukios, (son of) Serenos, my father". In a letter, Dr. Marie Drew-Bear writes: "...le patronyme ne devrait-il pas suivre Λουκιων? On peut sans doute l'expliquer par le fait que le scripteur a d'abord écrit "à Loukios mon père" puis a ajouté les précisions nécessaires qui individualisent le destinataire de la lettre pour qu'elle parvienne sans problèmes."

The expression that follows is very interesting: γραμμ(ατε) στρ(ατηγου) [Ε]μυσολ(εωσ) - "scribe to the strategos of Hermopolis". This and similar posts are only attested in

2 Note on the various forms, re. P. Oxy. XIV 1664, line 3.
a few other papyri: P. Oxy. III 602, a letter from Dionysios to Herakleides, γραμματευος στρατηγου Οασεός Θηβαιδος, second century; P. Oxy. XIV 1663, a letter of recommendation addressed to Κλεωνι γραμματει στρατηγου Οξυρυγχιου; possibly P. Fay. 23a where there is the expression υνι ων γρ(αμματεωσ) βασιλικου Δισγησ could be supplemented either υνι ων γρ(αμματεωσ) βασιλικου <γραμματεωσ> ("scribe to the royal scribe") or understand εισαγωγευο from above: υνι ων γρ(αμματεωσ) βασιλικου <εισαγωγεω>; B.G.U. III 981, a contract in which a certain Ptolemaios agrees to act as γραμματευος to Χαιρημων, 78 AD; P. Oxy. XLII 3062, a private letter addressed to Αρχελαωι γραμματει Θεονο(σ) στρατηγου | Πανος(ολιτου), first century; P. Wisc. II 73, a letter addressed to Ηφαιστωνι γραμματη Φιλονεικου στρατηγου Οξυρυγχιου, second century; SB XIV 12143, a business letter, which has εα([ν] δ[οι] | [πεμψ]ον αυτα τω Σαραπι(ων) | [γρα]μματει {for γραμματεωσ} του στρατηγου. The only instance where the expression occurs in the plural is SB XIV 11394 ("Fragment eines Prozessprotokolls", second century) where lines 6 - 7 read: [-- -]γραμματεις ειναι των στρατηγων ?ω μηδε [ε - - -] | [-- βασι - ?εκ]ων μηδε τως υπ[ηρ]εστας[ - - -]. Dr. Coles informs us that the start of line 7 may be read ἔδικων, and several compounds in -δικος could be restored. If this is the correct reading, then the document would be exclusively concerned with lesser officials in public office.

There seem to have been several types of lesser officials. Biedermann¹ names several types known to be in the office of the basilikos grammateus: ἐπιστατης, ἀντιγραφευς, εισαγελευς, βοηθος, ὁ παρα το βασιλικου γραμματεως among others. Lewis² discusses such officials briefly:"Once he entered upon his office, the liturgist was free to make his own arrangements for carrying out the prescribed duties...In many documents, activities of liturgists are performed by assistants who identify themselves as βοηθος, γραμματευς, κατακολουθον, ἑπερέπτης, κειριστης. In most instances there is nothing to indicate whether the assistant was liturgic, but it seems likely that most of them were hired by the liturgists themselves. The impression is perhaps

¹"Der ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΟΣ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΕΥΣ", chp. 4, "Untergebene".
conditioned in part by the unambiguous evidence of a number of extant contracts in which liturgists employ substitutes to take over their liturgic duties completely..."1

Tait2 provides evidence to show that the strategos and basilikos grammateus were appointed to nomes of which they were not native (see, for example, B.G.U. III 981, where Chairemon, a citizen of Alexandria becomes royal scribe of Diospolis Parva). Like Apion, royal scribe of the Letopolite nome, but native of Oxyrhynchos (P. Oxy. X 1219), our Loukios seems to have brought his documents home with him at the end of his appointment - the only alternative explanation for a letter found in Oxyrhynchos but meant for Hermopolis would be that it was never sent in the first place. There are examples of officials of one nome owning land in another, e.g. P. Oxy. X 1257, which records a strategos of the Tanites owning land in the Oxyrhynchite. The interesting fact that arises from this letter is that Loukios must have taken his family with him, leaving Sarapion in Oxyrhynchos, possibly to administer the family land in his absence.

DOCUMENT 5 - P. Oxy. 70/44(c)
LETTER TO A STRATEGOS - Mid-second Century
Plate 19

Introduction

This fragment, 10.4cm at its widest and 12.5cm tall, was the 26th document of a tomos synkollesimos. We cannot tell whether it is the original or a copy - though there are annotations in a more cursive script in the upper margin (1.6cm at its widest), the script is not necessarily by a different hand from that of the main text. It is the start of a letter from one unattested strategos to another unattested strategos; since the Antaiopolite and Thinite nomes were not contiguous, one wonders whether these two men

2 "The Strategi and Royal Scribes in the Roman Period", JEA 8 (1922).
knew each other - perhaps from Oxyrhynchos (the home town of at least one of the strategoi concerned, who had taken his papers with him on completion of his office - cf. commentary to previous letter from Sarapion to his father Loukios in Hermopolis). The absence of the nomen Aurelius in either name suggests a date before 212 AD, and the content (see later in introduction) would suggest a date in the middle of the second century.

The only Oxyrhynchite Philadelphos or Athenodoros of that period who might be the same as the ones mentioned here is an Αὐρελίου Φιλάδελφος και Τουρβών Ηρακλείου Απολλοδόρος, one of the bouleutai in P. Oxy. L 3559, dated to after September 27th 150 AD, and, incidentally, coming from the same parcel. The scribe uses one iota adscript (line 4), but otherwise omits it. Some letters occur in both formal and cursive forms - cf. the kappas of κραστώς and κληρώσαι (lines 7 and 8) or the epsilons of επιστολασ and επιμελητών (lines 6 and 11). Sometimes the letters stand quite separate from each other, sometimes they touch, and occasionally there is a true ligature (e.g. αλλών in line 9).

The contents of the letter are most tantalising. Philadelphos informs Athenodoros that he has written two letters to the epistrategos of the Thebaid, the first concerning the appointment by lot of "those completing the allotted time" and the second concerning the epimeletai (also "completing the allotted time"...). Here the papyrus breaks off. It cannot be established whether (a) the epistrategos replied and the strategos of the Antaiopolite is merely passing on copies of the epistrategos' letters, which would make our fragment simply a covering letter, or (b) the strategos of the Antaiopolite has written to the epistrategos and, receiving no reply, has written to another strategos for information. If (a) is the case, then it is interesting to see information being disseminated in this way. A very similar document is P. Oslo III 82 (assigned to the third century). This is a letter from the strategos of the Arsinoite nome to the strategos of the Oxyrhynchite nome; here too, information seems to be being sent from nome to nome (1.7: προλαβων επιστελλω σοι, φιλατε | γραμματα απο νομου εισ νομου...). The editor's note is of relevance here: "προλαβων etc. seems to imply that the strategos of the
Oxyrhynchite has been the first to receive the circular (?) in question. But it remains obscure why such an order should be sent "from one nome to another" instead of being copied out at the central bureau and thereupon forwarded simultaneously to the different officials interested in the matter". If (b) is the case, then Philadelphos strikes one as relatively inexperienced to be requesting such procedural information from a colleague. (a) seems more likely, though we have no more evidence to show how such a system of information distribution would have worked.

There are very few extant letters from one strategos to another; they cover a wide range of topics. P. Gen. II 103 (147 AD) is the reply of the strategos of the Aphroditopolite nome to the strategos of the Herakleides meris in the Arsinoite nome, stating which of two men owning land in his nome is more suitable to exercise guardianship over a fatherless child resident in the Arsinoite nome. P. Oxy. IX 1189 (ca. 116 AD) is a letter from the strategos of the Herakleopolite nome to that of the Oxyrhynchite concerning a γραφή of property confiscated from Jews as a result of the Jewish uprising. P. Oxy. XII 1422 (ca. 128 AD) is a letter to an Oxyrhynchite strategos from another, concerning the arrest of an individual to be found in the writer's nome. SB XVI 12696 (140 AD) is a "Weiterleitung einer Petition in einer Rechtssache unbekannter Natur", another covering letter.²

Correspondence between strategoi and epistrategoi is more common: P. Laur. III 59 (third century - instructions from the epistrategos of the Hepta Nomia to a strategos that πράκτορες and στολογοι submit detailed reports), P. Oxy. L 3569 (282 AD) and SB XIV 11647 (280 - 281 AD, both covering letters from strategoi to epistrategoi for documents arriving separately), P.S.I. XII 1248 (235 AD - an oath by two men sent by the Oxyrhynchite strategos on the orders of the epistrategos that the men they were sent to look for had

escaped the Oxyrhynchite nome), SB XVI 12504 (135 - 136 AD, a "πρόγραμμα über die liturgische Überwachung des Biersteuereinzugs" where the strategos acts on the instructions of the epistrategos), cf. P. Oxy. XLII 3025. Of course there are several examples of legal matters being referred to the epistrategos.1

The evidence concerning the kleros procedure has been admirably collected and analysed by Lewis2 and Thomas3 and it is appropriate here to quote some of the latter’s conclusions: "[The kleros] procedure is well documented in the papyri and its general working is clear: the scribe (of the village or the metropolis) drew up a list of names of persons eligible for the liturgy in question and sent these names to the strategos; he in turn passed on the names to higher authority for selection by lot of the appropriate number of persons to fill the posts. Normally and probably invariably, the scribes submitted exactly twice as many names as there were vacancies to fill. The higher authority was usually the epistrategos..." The only officials definitely appointed in this way were the πρακτόρες and στολογοι. The attestations of appointment of these officials fall within a very short space of time, and even if one includes those officials probably appointed in this way, only in "atypical circumstances"4 - the βιβλιοφύλακες, γραμματεῖς πόλεως, διέρασις δημοσίου πυροῦ, ἀμφόδογραμματεὺς, ὑπηρετὰ to the strategoi and κωμογραμματεὺς - the time span is 131 AD to 229 - 230 AD.5 Thomas suggests that the kleros procedure was a degenerate form of an originally more meaningful selection (cf. SB VI 9050 of 90 AD and P.Oxy. XLII 3025 of 118 AD). Unfortunately, in our

---

3op. cit. p.69ff.
4Lewis, op. cit., p.343.
5Thomas includes the διέρασις δημοσίου πυροῦ with officials known to be regularly appointed by lot. For other officials possibly appointed by the kleros procedure, see Thomas, op. cit., p.77ff., and the discussion of P. Oxy. XLII 3025.
case, the officials are not specified, though the language would suggest that it was those regularly appointed in this way.

Unfortunately the words qualifying επιμελητῶν are also lost. Though there was an official known simply as the ἐπιμελητῆς (who, among other things, dealt with απογραφὰ of property¹, the επιμελητῆς comes in many varieties, not only as a tax collector, but also as procurator for the annona etc. (e.g. P. Cairo Isid. 44, P. Charite 15 (= S.P.P. XX 95)). One could supplement the lacuna in various ways - perhaps simply κατὰ τοῦ νομοῦ, though P. Amh. II 64 is probably the most useful parallel, dating to 107 AD. These are two documents relating to the public baths of the city of Hermopolis; the first is a "report of a decision of the prefect Vibius Maximus concerning the manner in which the cost of the renovation of the baths should be defrayed"; the second is a copy of a letter from Vibius Maximus' successor, to the strategos, "requesting the latter to submit a fresh list of persons qualified to serve as superintendents (ἐπιμελητῶν) of the baths, if the complaint made by one of the present holders of the office, that his assicatés were incapable, was true..." One assumes that the prefect would not have been regularly concerned with the appointment of bath superintendents in the metropoleis and that this was an exceptional case because of the circumstances. Unfortunately it is not clear whether the list of persons to be sent was to exceed the number of posts available to facilitate a meaningful selection or simply an appropriate number of people for the prefect to rubber-stamp. In our papyrus, we assume that if the epimeletai are bath-attendants, then they are not being selected by lot, but that there is some other problem regarding the appointment of new men to the posts. The officials in question may be being appointed by lot - the phrasing of the letter does not preclude that - and thus the papyrus may be evidence for the appointment by lot of another type of official; but without a sure supplement in line 11, we cannot be sure.

Thomas does suggest that other officials were appointed by the epistrategos\(^1\) - he cites *P. Oxy. XLII 3025*, a letter from an epistrategos περὶ καταστασεως πραγματικων. Thomas interprets πραγματικοι in the widest possible sense, as in *P. Giss. 58* of 116 AD, a list of liturgical officials coming to the end of their service where the editor notes "[Die Urkunde hat] die Form einer öffentlichen Bekanntmachung (πρόγραμμα) des Strategen...[Die Liturgen] werden πραγματικοι genannt. Das Wort bezeichnet in seiner umfassenden Bedeutung Staatsbeamte..." Thomas says:"...it is striking that several of [the pragmatikoi] are known to have been appointed by the epistrategos later in the century (by the kleros procedure) and that none of them is known not to have been appointed by him...[lines 12 - 15 do] not suggest that the role of the epistrategos was limited to applying mechanically the kleros procedure to names already selected by others."

Why did Philadelphos feel it necessary to write twice? This could imply that the selection procedure was different - the first group appointed by lot, the second perhaps by meaningful selection (possibly under exceptional circumstances, though the phraseology of the letter would suggest that it was a regular occurrence). Of course, the epimeletai may also have been appointed by lot, in which case it would be hard to find a reason for Philadelphos' writing twice.

Text

. κολ(λημα) με

κς-

Φιλαδελφος στρ(ατηγοσ) Αντα[ιο]πολ(ιτου)
Αντωνιωι Αθηνοδρωροι

στρ(ατηγοι) Θιντου τω(ι) φιλτατω(ι) χαιρ(ειν)
επιστολας β γραφεισας υπ' εμου
τω(ι) κρατιστω(ι) επιστρατηγω(ι)
την μεν περι του κληρωσαι

\(^1\)op. cit., p.77.
Translation

Philadelphos, strategos of the Antaiopolite, to Antonios Athenodoros, strategos of the Thinite, greetings! (The) two letters written by me to the most powerful epistrategos, one concerning the appointment by lot to replace those completing their allotted time, the other concerning the epimeletai [...] likewise completing their allotted time...

Commentary

1) After the remains of the first letter, there are four consecutive letters, the first with a short line over it. The second of these four letters is possibly an alpha (cf. the alpha of αλλων in line 9). However, it might also be read a tiny omicron followed by a raised lambda, and one could supplement κολλημα (μ) i.e. kollema number 45. This would present enormous difficulties, as the next line already contains a number; yet we would adduce the evidence of P. Hawara 2441 and P. Oslo III 141. The former has, on the recto, line 4: τομ(ος) Ἰη και κολλημα γ χ(αρτης) νη; the latter has in line 1: χαρτης θ, which the editor interprets as "10th kollema (?), 9th chartes". κολλημα is usually thought to be translated "sheet", i.e. the number of that document within the roll. To translate χαρτης one would have to assume that a kollema was the sum of all documents collected on one particular matter, and that chartes thus meant the sheet or page number within that group.

1Published by J.G. Milne, "The Hawara Papyri", APF 5 (1913).
5) φιλαπω. Though used at all levels of letter writing, in formal circumstances, it was only used between equals.


9) The expression is not common, but there is a striking parallel in P. Giss 58 (col.i, lines 4 - 5):...πελήμνη[
ο][φ][ν][η][ν][ά][σ][η][ε][γ][ν].

10) The expression ωρίσθενα χρονον seems to be unparalleled.

12) Only traces of the omicron and iota remain.

14) The first two letters of this line are very unclear: the first would appear to be an alpha or lambda, but there is a horizontal stroke adjoining the top of the first letter; there also seem to be two dots on either side of the vertical descender of the second letter, thus: 푡.

VERSO

On the verso of the papyrus is the address, given simply as "to Antonius Athenodorus". It is written in the same direction as the fibres, the papyrus having been turned through 90°. Antonius is written without iota adscript, but Athenodorus is.

αυτοινω αθη[ν]ωνω
Introduction

This small document is extremely interesting and raises many possibilities. It consists of one column of writing against the direction of the fibres; the papyrus measures 4.9cm x 22.3cm; the upper margin measures 1.4cm, the lower 7.4cm. We are plunged in medias res and therefore should posit at least one (similarly narrow) column before the one we have, which would have extended the whole height of the papyrus. This slightly unorthodox arrangement of the text may perhaps be attributed to the presence of a kollesis over which the scribe did not want to write. Dr Coles has kindly checked through the remaining unpublished papyri from the same parcel, and the first column was not found.

Below the text proper are some traces - possibly administrative markings; all that is definite is one horizontal stroke followed by two oblique ones, thus: \( / \). There are also oblique strokes in the upper margin on the left. As these marks would probably have been in the middle of the upper margin of the original document, they could be the numeration of the document within a roll. There are abbreviations (lines 5, 9, 12 etc.) and two interlinear additions (between lines 6 and 7 and lines 15 and 16). It is not easy to establish under precisely what circumstances the document was written. It could be a summary of a petition, kept for the record, or the record of someone's declaration. A comparable document in this case would be \textit{P. Wisc. II 48}, assigned to the second century, a "draft or corrected version of a document" and thus perhaps the record of proceedings before an official. \textit{P. Wisc. II 48} also concerns the plaintiff's maltreatment by soldiers. It could be a declaration on oath - cf. \textit{B.G.U, XI 2085} of 119 AD, a declaration by the presbuteroi of Κερκεσούχα Ὀροῦσ that they do not have reeds (which would have been used for weapons) growing on their lands. This refers to a measure brought in by the prefect Rutilius Lupus, which forbade the provision of weapons following the Jewish uprising of 115 and 117 AD.
In our case, the declaration would have been made for the declarant to free himself of suspicion of being involved in some criminal situation (a brawl? simple theft of the jars of wine?).

Syntactically speaking, the document begins in mid-sentence, with the jars of wine as the subject of the perfect passive infinitives in lines 7 and 13; the sentence does not finish until line 16. Understood from the beginning of the document must be some phrase like "I swear that...", "I make this declaration...". The script is fairly legible: there are few genuine ligatures (e.g. for λε, l.13 or μελ for μελ in line 2) and the hand's cursiveness is restricted to individual letter forms: pi ( yat), kappa (ω), rho (e), epsilon (σ) and phi (ϕ). The hand may be assigned to the end of the second century.

The fragment documents the misbehaviour of some soldiers who broke into the plaintiff's house and took (and presumably drank) sixteen jars of wine; they left a further eight in the cellar when they found that the wine in them had turned sour. A brawl may have developed and the soldier's commanding officer seen what had happened (lines 18 - 20). It may be that the declarant did not wish to be held responsible for the wine that he was supposed to provide for the soldiers (see lines 21 - 23, end of introduction and note to line 2). That the wine may well have been meant for the soldiers anyway may be deduced from the lack of demand for restitution, as in other petitions concerning thefts.

Lack of discipline and misbehaviour were quite common in the Roman world. Macmullen cites several examples; just one from his list would be this one from the Scriptores Historiae Augustae: "nam cum Antiochiam venisset ac milites lavacris muliebribus et deliciis uacarent, eique nuntiatum esset, omnes eos comprehendi iussit et in uincula conici". More specifically, soldiers were frequently guilty of extortion. The soldiers were provided for through the

---

1See most recently on this subject, A. Lukaszewicz, "Petition Concerning Theft", JJP 19 (1983).
3op. cit., p.84, notes 27 and 28.
4Severus Alexander 53,2.
military annona (see below) and for individual requisitions, a διπλή appears to have been necessary; section nine of book seven of the Theodosian code in fact consists of four edicts (dated 340, 340, 393 and 416 AD) concerning extortion. We take the opportunity to adduce some other relevant papyrological and epigraphic evidence: P. Oxy. II 240 of 37 AD (a declaration by a village scribe denying any knowledge of extortion by a certain soldier and his agents in the villages for which the scribe acted); P.S.I. V 446 of 133 or 137 AD (a decree by the prefect Petronius Mamertius, "diretto contro il frequente abuso di requisizionti illegali da parte di soldati viaggianti in Egitto" - soldiers are reminded that they require a διπλή for authorisation); Dittenberger's Or. Gr. II 665 of 48 AD "in pylone primo templi magni quod est in oppido Girgeh Oasis magnae", a decree made by the prefect Gnaeus Vergilius after examples of extortion had been brought to his attention (1.21ff.): "...διο κελευθο τους | διοδευοντας δια των νομων στρατιωτας και ιππεις και | στατορας και εκατοναρχας και χειλιαρχους και τους (λοι)πους απαντας μηδεν λαμβανειν μηδε αναρευειν ει μη | τινεσ εμα διπλωματα ενουσια..."; P. Lon. III 1171 (verso) c (p.107) of 42 AD (a "proclamation by the prefect Lucius Aemilius Rectus for the protection of the natives from unauthorised violence and forced labour or extortion" - "...μηδεν εξεσω αναρευειν τους επι της χωρασ | μηδε εφοδια η αλλο τι δωρεαν αντειν ανευ του παρεμθου [u] διπλωματος λαμ[β]ανειν..."). The phraseology of these last two decrees is remarkably similar to that of P.S.I. V 446 of several decades later. An example of such extortion has even made its made into literature: the "Golden Ass" of Apuleius (IX,40) describes the maltreatment of a native by a soldier following the enforced acquisition of the former's donkey. This is discussed by Millar1.

The various requirements of soldiers either stationed or travelling through Egypt are discussed by Lesquier2 and Mitchell, who has made a particular study of transport3. These requirements were collected in two ways - either through the annona (an annual tax in kind, occasionally

2"L'Armée Romaine d'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien", Cairo 1918, chp. 8, "Les Fournitures Militaires".
3"Requisitioned Transport in the Roman Empire - a New Inscription from Pisidia", JRS 66 (1976).
commuted into a money payment) and requisitions. Macmullen lists the documents giving evidence of requisitions\(^1\), three examples of which are B.G.U. VII 1612 of the third century ("Quittung eines Centurio über Zwangslieferung von Palmfasern"), P. Oxy. I 60 of 323 AD (a letter from the strategos to the president of the town council of Oxyrhynchos notifying the fact that a supply of meat had been sent to Nikopolis, in accordance with the orders of the prefect, for the troops stationed there) and P.S.I. V 465 of 265 AD, a contract concerning provision of skins ("l'indicazione υπέρ της μητροπολίας...suppone forse un obbligo della città di Oxyrhynchos per la fornitura delle pelli di cui si tratta"). Wallace\(^2\) considers the annona militaris a "further obligation in kind", though his statement that οἶνος and οἶχος (cf. P. Tebt. II 403) only were required for the annona and that other items were requisitioned is incorrect: at least one document includes oil in the annona (P. Mich. XII 650 of 293 AD which is a receipt for money paid εἰς τὴν οἰνοῦ καὶ ελαίου). Another document shows that sometimes wine was requisitioned (P. Oxy. XLVI 3290 of 258 - 260 AD, an "application...from an known person...who requests payment for wine supplied by him to provision troops serving, apparently, under the direct a/ command of the prefect"). On requisitions, see also P. Oxy. VIII 1115 (requisition of bread) and P. Oxy. IX 1194 (report concerning arrears of (annona) supplies ordered for the use of the troops accompanying the prefect). As antecedents for the annona, Lesquier\(^3\) cites various documents from the first and second centuries relating to the visits of emperors and prefects:"Si insuffisantes que soient ces sources, elles donnent une préface intéressante à l'étude des fournitures proprement militaires: liturges collecteurs du nome et commissions liturgiques des métropoles se retrouvent au IIe et IIIe siècle pour les céréales et les autres vivres de l'armée".

\(^1\)op. cit., p. 86.
\(^2\)"Taxation in Egypt...", Oxford 1938.
\(^3\)op. cit., p. 350 - 351.
The practice of commuting tax payments into money was known as *adaeratio*. Septimius Severus pronounced against this practice; lines 41 - 44 of the *Apokrimata* are as follows: "Διοσκόρ[ο]φωρ Ἑλλησπόντου και Πεισι Ομηρός | και αλλοίς | αργυρίον αντι πυρου καταβάλλων υμα | καλύπτομεν". The editors see the decision as a ploy to maintain the artificial value of the silver denarius: "If, on the other hand, the government could maintain the fictitious which it had set upon its silver surrency, at a rate higher than its acceptance value on the open market, the financial advantage to the administration of its insistence upon payments *in natura* would be obvious." Of course it could be simply that the government realised they could not set a value on the denarius, and then buy the foodstuffs it required with the small amount of money they would receive if payments in kind were commuted into money payments.

Lesquier goes on to demonstrate that deliveries were sometimes made directly to the troops; he also describes the system whereby the *annona* was usually collected. Papyri concerning the mechanics of distribution are *P. Reinach I* 56, *B.G.U. III 974*, *P. Köln III 139*, *P. Panop. Beatty 1 & 2*, and *P. Lon. III 959*. It may be that the items delivered directly to the soldiers were those that had been requisitioned; perhaps the items went via a central supply office (where normal supplies would have come from) - we have papyri documenting soldiers' rations: *P. Oxy. XVI 2046* and 1920; cf. also Fink receipts numbers 78 - 81.

We have deliberately outlined the *annona*. Our declarant, as said above, does not demand restitution - merely requests that he not be held responsible (see note to

---

1 Cf W.O. II 1264 (but cf. BL), *P. Oxy. XII 1573*, *P. Cair. Isid. 34*, (published in Byzantion 17 (1944 - 5) = SB VI 9044), *P. Cair. Isid. 35*, *P. Mich XII 650*. All these receipts specifically concern the wine *annona*. Sometimes the wine had to be transported elsewhere - see SB XIV 11549 and *P. Oxy. XLIII 3111.*

2 "Apokrimata - Decisions of Septimius Severus on Legal Matters" by W.L. Westermann and A.A. Schiller, New York 1954.

3 *op. cit.*, p.354ff.

4 See also D. v.Berchem "L'Annone Militaire dans l'Empire Romain au III Siècle" = Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France, tome 80.


1.22). We wish to suggest that the wine was his, but in fact intended for the soldiers billeted in his house; the soldiers seem to have taken their due prematurely or all at once; maybe they did not provide authorisation. If the fragment does concern a specific requisition of wine, then our declarant was probably a well-to-do citizen: he already has soldiers billeted in his house, and he has excess wine stored away. The declarant would have wanted to make it clear that he no longer had any wine to give them, in case the subsequent demands were made upon his resources.

One of the most difficult aspects of this document is its possible historical context: who were the soldiers in question and what were they doing in Oxyrhynchus? A clue may lie in the word στρατευματος (line 11), which is rare in the papyri. It usually means expedition, sometimes associated with a military campaign: C.I.G. III 5127B (an inscription concerning Ptolemy III’s expedition into Asia); B.G.U. VII 1564 (an order for wares to be delivered to the στρατευματα εν Καππαδοκια]; P. Oxy. XLIII 3091 (an undertaking by a liturgist to convey barley to Alexandria for the troops of Caracalla in Syria — εις Συριαν ερωι | στρατευματι); Wilcken Chrest. 245 (a document concerning Caracalla’s journey to Egypt and the requisition of camels — ...τοις γραφεσιν υπο Ουαλεριω Νατου...εις τας εν Συρια κυριακας υπηρεσιας των γενναιοτατων στρατευματων...); SB VI 9528; W.O. I 5954 (a receipt for money given for oil — ...υπερ πυρηνης | έλαιου των ενταυθα στρατευματων[ν] | δραχμασ...); P.Oxy. XLV 3243 (a report to the prefect concerning supplies: the writer has to send details of how much is left in the granaries and how much has already been sent εις τε τροφας κτηνων[ν] των εν Θηβαιδι στρατευματων).1

If the στρατευμα referred to here is indeed to be associated with a military campaign, then it might be that against the Boukoloi, a desert tribe whowere wont to make unwelcome incursions into Greek towns2 around 172 AD3. If the στρατευμα referred to is the visit of an emperor, there

---

1The only other occurrence of the word in the papyri is P.S.I. XIV 1444, reworked by J. Rea CE 47 (1972), “P.S.I. XIV 1444 and Philip the Arabian”. It is not directly relevant to our purposes here.


3Note that the account of the Boukoloi has been dismissed as fictitious by J. Winkler (in JHS 100 (1980) p.175ff.) who cites literary precedents for the structure and vocabulary of the anecdote in Cassius Dio.
are several possibilities - Marcus Antoninus with Commodus Antoninus in 175 AD\textsuperscript{1}, Pescennius Niger\textsuperscript{2} and, of course, Septimius Severus. Birley, in his study of Septimius Severus says:\textsuperscript{3} "[Egypt] had supported his rival Niger...There had been active discontent there during the reign of Commodus...the HA and Dio both attest Septimius' fascination with Egypt". We also know that Septimius did go as far south as Aswan.\textsuperscript{4}

There is another possibility: Daris\textsuperscript{5} and Fink\textsuperscript{6} list several papyri that record - incidentally - small troop movements. Such small groups would have been entitled to lodgings (see note to line 8): P. Oxy. VII 1022, P. Mich. VIII 468 and P. Oxy. XIV 1666 (= Daris numbers 4, 7 and 8) all detail the transfer of groups of new recruits - cf. P. Dur. 121 and P. Mich. VIII 454 (= Fink numbers 29 and 30); Fink numbers 63 and 64 document troop losses, movements and transfers. The soldiers in our document were perhaps simply just such a small group of soldiers being transferred.

---

\textsuperscript{1}Scripторes Historiae Augustae, chp.26. It is not known how far they went.
\textsuperscript{2}Scripторes Historiae Augustae, chp. 7.
\textsuperscript{4}The word δυνάμεις is used almost synonymously with στρατηγόι it seems: O.G.I.S. 90, C.I.G. III 4836 (= SB I 1604), B.G.U. IV 1190, C.I.G. III 4860, SB I 3448 etc. Cf. also P. Thmouis 1, col.xcix, which mentions a στρατηγοί δύναμις sent to deal with incursions by the Νεικωνάγαι identified in the introduction with the Βουκόλοι.
\textsuperscript{5}Documenti per la Storia dell'Esercito Romano in Egitto*, Milan 1964.
\textsuperscript{6}op. cit. supra.
στρατιωτών του  
στρατευμάτων  
κεραμία  
και ετε-ρα απολειφθαι  
υπάντων ανα- 
κ[ε]καλύμ[με]ν[α  
κερά(μια) η  
οξικότα. οπερ  
φανερον ποιου- 
μαι ο και σοι  
δηλον εγενετο  
παροντων αυτων.  
προσ το μηδενα  
ζητεισθαι [[προς]]  
προσ με  
5 προκ 9 α 15 - 16 κερα~

Translation

[I declare that...] the (jars) stored at my house and registered as excess up to the present day in the cellar of the above-mentioned dwelling, in which we live were stolen (today ?) by the soldiers of the expedition billeted in the same house - 16 jars: the others were left by them when they uncovered them and found them to be sour wine/to have gone off (8 jars). I wish to clarify this with you, which will have been apparent when they were present. [I make this declaration so that] no-one will come after me.

Commentary

1) The traces between the initial delta and the tau are very difficult to decipher. After the delta there are the remains of a vertical stroke (iota, rho?); what follows could be the top of lambda or delta, followed by an alpha: διδα or διλα. No obvious restoration comes to mind. It is extremely tempting to try to read δηλω, which would make the document self-contained and grammatically complete; however, we do not feel that the traces would justify such a reading.
αποκείμενα "in store". This meaning is quite common in the papyri: P. Abinn.19, P. Ham. III 52, P. Mich. XI 260, P. Mil. Vogl. IV 249, P. Oxy. VI 921, P. Oxy. X 1286, P. Oxy. XIV 1631, P. Oxy. XXXVI 2778, P. Oxy. XLV 3243, P. Yale I 83 and O. Leid. 354 (= SB X 10365). The closest parallel is of very similar date (190 AD) and subject (a petition concerning the theft of barley, asking that an enquiry be held and restitution made):...εἰσελθοντα[ς] εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν διὰ ταύτης βεβασταχεῖν αἵπτων ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αποκείμενον μονας | κρίθης αρτάβας δεκα... (P. Oxy.I, 69)

2) The supplement λοιπογραφοῦσα is fairly certain, and one need only supply καὶ to give good sense. λοιπογραφῶ is used of items left over after taxes had been paid, and "carried forward".

4 - 5) καταγγείλων A cellar is characteristic of a larger house. Husson¹ says the following:"Dans les descriptions de maisons des époques romaine et byzantine on trouve des mentions de caves. Généralement il s'agit de maisons urbaines spacieuses...[See P. Lon. III 1164 (p.160), P. Lips. 17, P. Oxy. I 75, P. Oxy. VIII 1105, P. S.I. X 1112, P. Oxy. XIV 1634 and P. Lon. V 1874]...La fonction de la cave lorsqu'elle est indiquée est de servir de magasin d'entrepôt et de débarras. On y trouve des ustensiles divers en cuivre, en étain et en bois, des pièces de lin non encore teintes, des jarres de vin..." See P. Oxy. XVI 1896 line 21 of 577 AD.

6) οἰκομεν The word has been stretched to fill the line. The interlinear addition should perhaps be supplemented τῇ εὐς(σω(σμ) ημ(ραι) - one can see possibly the vertical of the tau. At least one, if not both of these words would have had to have been abbreviated.

7) The bottom right-hand corner of chi has been rubbed off and what follows seems to be traces of a ligature between chi and theta, and then the bottom half of the theta. What appear to be two dots over the upsilon of υμο are in fact the ends of the verticals of the interlinear addition above it.

Soldiers and public officials had access to accommodation by the requisitioning of parts of people's houses. See Daremberg and Saglio\(^1\), s.v. hospitium militare for the legal rulings on billeting as they appear in the Theodosian code and a detailed list of exemptions. Presumably, as with transport etc., written authorisation was required. The permanently stationed soldiers eventually put up permanent quarters for themselves\(^2\) and there appear to have been quarters for soldiers in Oxyrhynchos\(^3\). Temporary billeting was a separate matter\(^4\) and may have been required under special circumstances - as with troop movements or visits from high places, e.g. SB I 3924.

Only two documents (apart from those concerned with the settling of soldiers in the Fayûm in the Ptolemaic period) seem to contain direct references to billeting: P. Rein. I 17 (109 B.C.) is a petition concerning theft by brigands who broke into a house; the missing items are listed at the bottom - the last is given as τῶν νυξενωθετῶν ματιῶν, which the BL (vol. 1) revises to τῶν [ἐπὶ]ξενωθετῶν ματιῶν. However, the cloaks may simply have belonged to guests. The other document (P. Oxy. L 3581) is a petition by an Aurelia Attiaena concerning the behaviour of her husband Paul; his misdeeds do not only concern her: "...αλλά καὶ στρατιωτῶν ἐπιξενωθετῶν τω<ι> οἰκω<ι> μοι ἀπεσυλήσεν αυτοὺς καὶ ἀνεχωρήσεν..." The word used here is a hapax, but is presumed to mean "billeted". Other occurrences of the word in the papyri are all in the meaning "to be a guest abroad" (e.g. P.S.I. III 206, P. Oxy. XX 2273 and 2275 etc.) Our fragment is thus the only papyrological attestation of this word in this sense published thus far for the Roman period.

9) τῆς α(υης) οικίας This may imply that several houses were being used for billeting.

12) The line over the numeral 16 seems to have been very long, its central portion becoming rubbed - there is no other explanation for the stroke over the και.

---

\(^1\)"Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines" Paris 1877.
\(^2\)See Macmullen, op. cit., p.79 - 80.
\(^3\)Macmullen, p.80, note 16, cf. P. Oxy. II 247.
\(^4\)See Macmullen, p.77 - 78.
14) ανακαλυμενα The soldiers would have had to open the jars to establish what was inside. There are some traces over the initial upsilon of line 14 - either a rough breathing or diaeresis.

16) οξιςω is a rare word generally and in the papyri is only to be found restored at P. Ant. I 42 (line 19, 542 AD), an acknowledgement of indebtedness. Aurelius Peionous says, having borrowed 12 1/2 jars of wine, that he will pay for them at harvest time. If any of the wine he gives in return turns out to be αποινησμος οξιςω he will replace it. It is not clear whether the jars contained οξις (sour wine) which formed a regular part of the annona, or whether it was simply wine that had gone sour.

22) The word προς at the end of the line has been deleted - dittography. The central stroke of epsilon has been extended to fill the remaining space. The phraseology here is somewhat compressed. Parallels are as follows: P. Oxy. XLIII 3104 of 228 AD - the doorkeepers of the treasury office in the city (in which there would have been a prison) report the death of a tax-farmer being held in custody; the report finishes ...διο επιδιομεν το βιβλιδιον φανερον ποιουν τεσ αυτο τουτο προς το | ειδεναι μη πως υστερον επιζητηθη...; P. Oxy. I 69 (190 AD, a complaint of robbery): "...οπερ αυτην φανερον πεποιηκεναι τω της κωμης αρχοντων και τω τοις αλλοις δημοσιοις. οθεν κατα το αναγκαιον επιδιοις τουτο βιβλιδειον αξιω, επιτρεπαι αικηθηναι..."; SB VI 9203 (222 - 235 AD, "Rechtserhaltende Anzeige beim Centurio"): "[Διο] επιδιωμι αυτο τουτο | [φα]νερον ποιων προς το | [μεν]ιν μοι τον λογον προς | [τουσ φανησωςενους αιτιους..."; SB VI 9387 (second - third century, private letter): "...φανερον ουν | σοι εποιησαι τουτο, ιν' ο βουλαμει περι τουτου αντιφωνησιο...". For the construction προς plus infinitive, cf. C.P.R. V 11 (deacon's work contract): "...προς] το απαραβλητον με ειναι της επειξ[κοπης σου..." and P. Col. You. II 72 (281 AD, sale of house and land): "...προ[σ] το α[πο] νυν | [σε κυριευειν...]"
This most interesting receipt fits into a well attested but not much studied aspect of Ptolemaic and Roman administration. It is more or less complete and is 9.5cm wide and 18.9cm at its highest point. The text leaves no margin on the right-hand side, but there is a margin of approximately 2cm on the left.

The starting point for this document is an article by Michurski\(^1\), where he distinguishes between advances of seed-corn (σπέρματα) and loans of seed-corn (σπέρματα δάνεια). Michurski was the first to make this distinction clear. Land-leases of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods make it clear whether the land is to be leased αὐξ ἀξισπέρμη or ἀξισπερμί. P. Amh. II 61 (163 B.C., an order for payment of corn) reflects the normality of the procedure (τὰ καθηκόντα σπέρματα). The advances of seed-corn were returned either without any interest, or, more commonly, with interest of 50%. Michurski comments thus on this return with interest\(^2\): "Nous voyons ici encore une fois, par le système des avances aux semaines, que le seul but auquel tendaient les autorités représentant l'intérêt de la couche sociale dominante de l'Égypte ptolémaïque et romaine, était d'assurer, aussi dans ce cas, les revenues les plus mirifiques. Les fermiers étaient obligés de se plier à ces dures conditions sauf dans le cas, où il s'agissait d'une terre peu fertile ou quand le nombre de candidats était restreint." An example of a certificate of an advance of seed-corn is P. Oxy. Hels. 24.

The process of loaning seed-corn began with a request by the farmer in question. A precedent to the Roman examples is P. Cairo Zen. 59414, a letter from Damis to Zenon requesting fifty artabas of garlic for seed, promising to repay half as much again out of the new crop. Michurski\(^3\) comments on the requests thus: "Ces demandes déposées chez le

---

\(^2\) op. cit., p.112.
\(^3\) op. cit., p.113.
strate [P. Lille 50, B.G.U. VIII 1861] par les fermiers royaux [SB V 8755] et par les clérouques-catoeques [SB V 8756] (il s'agit surtout des petits fermiers qui empruntent de quelques dizaines d'artabes) révèlent l'existence d'un formulaire comprenant les deux parties. Dans la première le pétitionnaire formule le désir de recevoir le prêt de semences, δανεια εις σπερματα dans l'année courante; dans la seconde il s'engage par serment à ensemencer la terre, rendre la dette à la nouvelle récolte, y rester attaché pendant toute la durée, où sa présence serait nécessaire et à ne pas profiter du droit d'asile [P. Tebt. I 210]“. From the Roman period, seven applications are extant: P. Hamb. I 19, P. Oxy. VII 1031, S.P. XX 34, P. Flor. I 21, P. Col. You. I 22, P. Col. You. I 26 and P. Oxy. XLIX 3474. What is interesting is that the only two extant Oxyrhynchite receipts (P. Oxy. X 1262 and our fragment) follow the same pattern as for the applications, whereas the Arsinoite receipts follow a different pattern. The structure of these documents has been analysed by the editor of P. Col. You. I 26 and is summarised here below.

ADRESSEES

P. Col. You. I 22 (Oxyrhynchos, 88 AD) - Titus Flavius Herkleides, strategos.
P. Col. You. I 26 - (Apollonopolis, 156 AD) - Pantanymos.
P. Oxy. VII 1031 (228 AD) - Aurelios Demetrios, archiereus, and Dioskoros, agoranomos, both bouleutai and chosen υπο της κρατιστης βουλης επι αναδοσεως σπερματων του ενεστωτος εις ετους ανω τοπαρχια. S.P. XX 34 (Herakleopolite, 232 AD) - Aurelios Achilleus, strategos.
P. Flor. I 21 (Arsinoite, 229 AD) - Aurelios Korakion (κοσα) and Herakleides (αρχικ) chosen υπο της κρατιστης βουλης επι τη λιμνασμον και πεδινων κατασπορας και τη<σ> των σπερματων διανοσεως, though cf. BL I, p.36.
P. Oxy. X 1262 (197 AD) - Loukretios Neilos, strategos, and Seronos, basilikos grammateus, through Epimachos, ex-gymnasiarch and Demetrios, ex-exegete, chosen επι παραληψεως και παραδοσεως σπερματων χωρουντων εις πην του ενεστης ετους κατασποραν. P. Oxy. 1B.38/D(a) ? + ? [both ?] bouleutai chosen επι κατασποραν και αναδοσεως σπερματων εις ανω τοπαρχιαν.
Note the wide variety of officials addressed. This variety may suggest a certain flexibility in the system. It would seem that up to the end of the second century, the requests were transmitted from local officials to the strategos (see P. Tebt. II 341 of 140 AD); the strategos and basilikos grammateus instructed the local sitologoi, authorising payment of the seed (see below). Although a commission seems to have come into existence in the third century to deal with this aspect of the administration, we still find the farmer of S.P. XX 34 addressing his request directly to the strategos, and P. Hamb. I 19, which predates our document by only a year, is addressed to the basilikos grammateus, whereas ours is addressed to the commission. The same commission issues the certificate of an advance of seed-corn, P. Oxy. Hels. 24 (217 AD); there the commission consists of Aurelios Ptolemaios, ex-kosmetes and bouleutes, and "those chosen with him επί κατασφορας [και αναδόσεως σερματων] του ενεστωτος β (ετους)". The make-up of the commission may also be seen in P. Lund. VI 8 & 9, letters from the πρακτορεις στικων to the commission: Aurelios Horion, ex-archiereus and ex-eutheniarch, bouleutes chosen επι κατασφορας σερματων τοπαρχιασ). Note that the composition and number of members in the commission varies even within a few years in one place (Oxyrhynchos).1

NUMBER OF APPLICANTS; NUMBER OF AROURAI; NUMBER OF ARTABAI; TYPE OF LAND; NUMBER OF KLEROI P. Col. You. I 22 1; 3; 3; στεσαν βεβρεμμενη βασιλικην γην και αλλων ειδων; 1. P. Col. You. I 26 11+; 5 1/16; 5 1/48; βασιλικη γη ουκ ελασσων β (αρτ.); 11. P. Oxy. XLIX 3474 1; 17; 17; βασιλικη γη; several. P. Hamb. I 19 1; 13 1/4; 10; βασιλικη γη; ? P. Oxy. VII 1031 1; 30; 30; δημοσια γη ουκ ελασσων διαρταβου; 2. S.P. XX 34 1; 50; 50; βασιλικη γη ουκ ελασσων β αρταβων τελουσα; several. P. Flor. I 21 several (college of presbuteroi through two); 136; 136; ?; not specified. P. Oxy. X 1262 1; ?; ?; ?; ?. P. Oxy. 1B.38/D(a) 1; 8 1/16; 8 1/16; δημοσια/βασιλικη γη; 3+. It will be seen that the type of applicant also varies. The usual rate was one artaba per aroura - see B.G.U. II 512 and

---

Wilcken Ostraca I, p.777. Note P. Tebt. II 341 of 140 - 141 AD - this application was passed to the basilikos grammateus via the komogrammateus, and the rates implied there are 1 1/2 artabas for βασιλική γη and 1 1/4 artabas προσδούγη. Tax rates were given sometimes, but not always. The editor of P. Col. You. I 26 suggests that the tax rate was included to demonstrate that the land was of sufficient quality to justify a loan of seed. However, the rate given there is very low (see below, note to lines 15 - 21) and would seem to suggest that the land was comparatively infertile. N.B. The amount of land involved in P. Col. You. I 26 is 13 1/4 arourai and not 34 arourai, as specified by the editor!

**PHRASING OF REQUEST** P. Col. You. I 22 χρητίζει εις <σ>περματα δάνεια P. Col. You. I 26 επιπροσδεμεθα σπερματα δανεια P. Oxy. XLIX 3474 αιτουμαι παραμετρηηθαι παρ’υμων εις σπερματα δανεια P. Hamb. I 19 and P. Oxy. VII 1031 αιτουμαι επισταληναι σπερματα δανεια S.P. XX 34 αιτουμαι σπερματα δανεια P. Flor. I 21 αιτουμεθα επισταληναι... σπερματα PHRASING OF RECEIPT FORMULA P. Oxy. X 1262 παρειλθα αν parameptrimai par’umin spermata danai P. Oxy. 1B.38/D(a) παρελαβον και parameptrimai tais aitheiasa upo mou eis spermata danex The restoration of P. Flor. I 21 (lines 9 - 10) should presumably be as follows, on analogy with S.P. XX 34: αιτουμεθα επισταληναι εις δανεια| σπερματα | τη επ’αγαθοισ γενομε ηνατασπορα| του ενεστω(τοι)... Note that in one case (P. Amh. II 61), the seed applied for is two years old, i.e. the seed is not always that of the preceding year, as suggested by the editor of P. Col. You. I 26.

**REPAYMENT DETAILS** P. Col. You. I 22 εν νεων μετρησον αμα [τοιοι] της γης δημοσιοισ with oath. P. Col. You. I 26 τας ισοσ γενημ(ατων) αμα τοιο της γης εκφοριοισ συν τοιο προσπαραγραφομενοισ πασι P. Oxy. XLIX 3474 εκ νεων αποδοσων συν τοιο επομενοισ αμα τοιο της γης τελεμασι with oath and guarantor P. Hamb. I 19 and P. Oxy. VII 1031 εν νεων αποδοσων τας ισοσ συν τοιο επομενοισ αμα τοιο της <γης>...γνησιοισ τελεμασι with oath S.P. XX 34 (text not given) P. Flor. I 21 εισενεγκουμεν ειν πρωτου αμα τοιο της κωμης δημοσιοισ πασι P. Oxy. X 1262 (in lacuna) P. Oxy. 1B.38/D(a) τας ισοσ συν τοιο επομενοισ αμα τοιο της γης δημοσιοισ τελεμασαν with guarantor and oath. The repayment clause usually followed a promise by the farmer to plant the land "honestly" ("υγιως και πιστωσ"). There is an important phrase in P. Oxy. XLIX 3474: the application is made κατα τα δοξαντο(α) Αιμιλλιω
This would seem to indicate that extraordinary circumstances were required to make a seed-corn application - a low Nile flood, for example.

P. Vindob. Tan. 11 stands in a group by itself. It is from the Herakleopolite nome and dates to 241 - 242 AD; it is a copy of two receipts sent by the corn commission to the strategos and the basilikos grammateus. Presumably the commission then issued the received corn to the applicants. This would seem to be a procedural variant, since in the Oxyrhynchite nome the corn was issued directly to the applicant. Perhaps special circumstances obtained here.

There is a further group of receipts, mainly from Karanis, and nearly all dating from 158 - 159 AD, which follow a different, much shorter pattern. The resolution of the abbreviations in these receipts is discussed by Viereck, in the introductions to P. Aberd. 49 and P. Goth. 2 and has been treated in as definitive a manner as possible by Gundel. Unfortunately, Gundel does not consider Michurski's article, where all these receipts and others are divided into those for advances of seed-corn and those for loans.

If seed-corn applications had been a regular occurrence, then one might have expected more such documents to have survived. The fact that the applications also demonstrate a variety of phraseology would suggest that the procedure was not common. Finally, on the subject of applications, we should like to quote Michurski's discussion of the repayments: "Il convient de remarquer que la clause du contrat de prêt concernant la quantité supplémentaire devant être rendue n'est pas interprétée d'une façon unanime par les papyrologues. Cette quantité est désignée dans les

---

1The receipts are in "Quittungen über Lieferung von Saatkorn" (Viereck, Hermes 30 (1895) - these are from the Fayûm and are of various dates); "Short Texts from Karanis" (O.M. Pearl, Aeg 33 (1953), numbers 6 - 11, mostly 214 AD); P. Cairo Goodspeed 16 - 24 (all from Karanis and all dating to 158 - 159 AD, bar no.17 of 214 AD); P. Aberd. 49 (Karanis, 158 - 159 AD); P. Goth. 2 (Karanis 153 - 154 AD); P. Chicago Goodspeed (= Studies in Classical Philology (Chicago) III (1902), reprinted as Sammelbuch, Beiheft 2, all Karanis 158 - 159 AD); P. Fay. 80 (141 - 142 AD); B.G.U. I 104 & 105 (Karanis, 158 - 159 AD).
2op. cit. in nota supra.
4op. cit. supra, p.126ff. See especially p.127 notes 185 and 186.
5op. cit. p.115.
documents par le terme général suivi de mots comme une conséquence du prêt ou par le terme suivi d'ajout, lorsqu'il s'agit du prêt planifié. P. M. Meyer, dans son commentaire au P. Hamb. I 19 suggère l'interprétation des mots par le principe du nulo. M. Kalen, dans son commentaire au P. Berl. Leihg. 1 (p.74ss), rejette l'interprétation de la word comme étant une augmentation du prêt lui-même, tandis que M. Johnson la considère comme une sorte d'escompte déduisant les 50% de supplément à l'avance, au moment même de la réception du prêt. En partageant cette opinion, nous tendons à supposer que le terme επομένα pourrait être interprété de la même façon..."

Orders for payment fall into four groups. The first group contains one document, P. Amh. II 61, the only payment order from the Ptolemaic period. It is in fact a letter stating that the komogrammateus would have sufficient corn [i.e. to issue to those who had made applications] if he were left with the 200 artabai he had, and received another 133 1/3 artabai from the agents of the sitologos. The letter is countersigned by two officials - presumably the agents of the sitologos, and this forms the order for payment. A related document is P. Petrie III 88, a list of σπερμάτα δάνεια giving the amount of croton seed issued to the owners or farmers of certain kleroi.

The second group are all Arsinoite. P. Lon. II 256 d & e (p.95ff.) are two of a group of five corn-related documents from the Arsinoite nome:"It appears that, in order to set the στολός in motion for the distribution of seed-corn to the cultivators, two kinds of authorisation were necessary; first that of the officials of the nome, the strategus and the βασιλικός γραμματεύς and then that of the local officials of the district. The former authorisation is contained in [e], the latter in d..." The recipients are δημοσιοι γεωργοι, and their land is described as βασιλικην και ιεραν και επεραν γνη. Most interesting are the four local officials, whose titles are ηγουμένος, τοπαρχης, κωμογραμματεύς and γραμματευς γεωργων. Note that the authorisation probably came to the sitologoi from the nome officials via the local officials, rather than coming separately, cf. P. Giss. I 45 (Hadrianic): an official writes to the strategos Apollonios requesting that he send to either the komogrammateus or his
SCRIBE ἐπεὶ διὰ τοῦτο ὑπερτὶ [θεν]ται τίνες τας χειρογραφιὰς | [προε]σθαὶ, i.e. the farmers are refusing to sign receipts until they have seen the higher authorisation. The requirement of a receipt on issue is also found in the London document.

P. Vindob. Tan. 9 dates from the following year and features the same sitologos (Akousilaos) as the London document. Columns ii and iii are practically identical to P. Lon. II 256 d, except that here the order is issued by the ἤγουμενος and γραμματεὺς γεωργῶν only. The remains of the previous column, lines 6 - 7 read: Τριφῶν Ἀπολλώνιου κωμογραμματεὺς ἐπθυκὸλογιθήκα τῇ προ[ο]κε[ί]μενη ανα[δόσῃ], which should be translated "I agree to this distribution". The editors suggest that Kenyon's supplement in the London document (ἡγουμένος ἱεραρχῶν) as well as that of the BL (I, p.250: ἤγουμεν[ος κωμης]) are unlikely: "...zweifelsohne müssen wir ihn als den Vorsitzer des Kollegiums der πρεσβυτεροί τῶν δημοσίων γεωργῶν betrachten." This is perhaps confirmed by P. Flor. I 21 where the application is made by two presbuteroi on behalf of the whole college - the ἤγουμενος and γραμματεὺς? We would have, in that case, a throw-back, since the Florentine document is much later and from the Oxyrhynchite nome, but we still see the same officials involved, though at a different stage in the process.

The last document in this group is SB X 10614 of 167 - 168 AD. In it the strategos of the Arsinoite orders the sitologoi of Theadelphia, to make the payments, on his authorisation and that of the basilikos grammateus, specified by the basilikos grammateus ω[ι]πι τῶν σπερματῶν διακρίσεως διαφερεῖ. The payments are to be made to the δημοσίως γεωργίος ...αιτησαμενοις δια Αχίλλη Κρονιωνος και Πετευτος Πετευτος των β πρεσβυτερῶν... The two presbuteroi seem to apply directly to the strategos and basilikos grammateus. Since in the earlier document (P. Vindob. Tan 9) the toparchos and komogrammateus are involved (- were they responsible for the διακρίσεως τῶν σπερμάτων at that date?) it is hard to imagine where a commission might have fitted in to the process. Note that even in the Florentine document, the "commission" does not have the same title as that normally associated with the Oxyrhynchite nome, and indeed, the application and issue procedure implied there is different from that implied in any of the other Oxyrhynchite documents: we would suggest
that though P. Flor. I 21 was found in Oxyrhynchos, it was brought back there from the by one of the officials involved in the process, who was performing duties outside the nome. Thus we feel that the restoration αναδοσια in the early Arsinoite document cannot refer to a commission in the Oxyrhynchite sense.

The third group of payment orders are all Oxyrhynchite. The terminology of these payment orders is fixed and the phraseology is very similar in parts to that of the Oxyrhynchite applications and receipts detailed above. P. Köln III 137 (88 AD) represents a slight irregularity in that in addition to the strategos and the basilikos grammateus, another official (in lacuna) gives the authorisation for payment; the editor suggests that it might be the commission. The sowing has to be overseen, and the officials responsible in the Cologne fragment are the topogrammateus and the komogrammateus. P. Oxy. XVIII 2185 (92 AD) has the same terminology as the other orders for payment, but in fact seems to be a payment order for an advance rather than a loan of sed-corn; the officials responsible there for overseeing the sowing are [κ]αι [των προκεχιρισμου(εων) (contrast the list of officials responsible in SB X 10614, from the Arsinoite nome: αιγαλοφυλακος και κατασπορων οντων και χωματεπιμελητων και των αλλων των ειωθών. The two other Oxyrhynchite orders are P. Oxy. VII 1024 (129 AD) and P. Oxy. XLI 2956 (of 148 - 149 AD), which are very similar to each other in terminology.

The fourth group are two Herakleopolite payment orders from 49 - 48 B.C. Despite their date they are surprisingly similar to the Oxyrhynchite orders: SB V 8755 and SB V 8756.

Michurski also discusses the orders, though the evidence available to him at the time was considerably less than the evidence available to us now. He also usefully gathers all the other related documents - lists of grain to be issued etc. It would seem that the commission only

---

1P. Lille 5 (260 - 259 B.C.) and P. Lon. III 1215 (p.121) are not to be considered here as they seem to be orders for payments of advances rather than loans of seed-corn.


3op. cit., p.121ff.

4op. cit. p.118ff.
functioned in extraordinary circumstances, and indeed, perhaps only in the Oxyrhynchite nome (if our suggestions concerning P. Flor. I 21 and P. Vindob. Tan. 9 are correct). The Oxyrhynchite documents all fall within a span of thirty years; this may either be because of a series of bad floods in the area, or, as has been suggested, because the regulations controlling land in the Oxyrhynchite, were all changing at around this time\(^1\).

\[^1\]This suggestion was made by Dr. Rowlandson, from a general impression she has formed after studying very many land-related documents from the Oxyrhynchite nome.
το προκεχρισμένων καὶ εν νε- 25
ών ἀποδόσω τασ [1]σασ συν τοις
ἐπομενοίς αμα τοις τὴ γης δη-
μοσίοις τελεσμα[σ]υν του ενεστω-
tος μετ(ρου) ἡμιαρταβίῳ <τ> μετ(ρησεί) τη<τ> κέλευ-
σθιν<ι> ύπο την πρώτη[ν μετ(ρησιν)]. παρεσχον
de εμαυτου ενυγνητ[ν εις τουτο]
Αυρηλιον Αχιλλιωγ[α] (patronym)
tου και Βερενικια[νου παροντα και
ευδοκουντα κα[λ]ι ομνω την τυχην
Μ[αρκο]ν Αυρηλιο[υ Σεουηρου Αλεξανδρου
[(ετους)ξ] αυτοκ[ρατορος.... etc.

Translation

To...and Ai[ ]...bouleutai of the city of Oxyrhynchos, appointed to oversee the sowing and distribution of seed for the upper toparchy for the current [6th year]. From Aurelius [ ]anos Asklas, whose mother is Demes from the village of Monimou. I have received and had measured out for me the (artabai) requested by me as a loan of seed-corn from the produce of the past 5th year for the sowing of the current 6th year for the demosiac (land) which I farm around the village of Monimou: formerly of Ammonia (daughter of?) Sara( ), of the kleroi of Epikouros son of Koikos and other kleroi of royal land taxed at 2 + 1/2 + 1/10 artabai to the aroura, 2 1/2 arourai; and land formerly of Maximus Theon, 1/2 + 1/16 arourai; and land formerly of the heirs of Ploutos, one aroura; and of land [formerly] of Septimius Aurelius Similis and of 8 arourai of another kleros of royal land taxed at 3 + 1/10 artabai, a total of four arourai; which gives a (grand) total of 8 + 1/16 arourai, 8 + 1/16 artabai, which I shall clean of barley and darnel and sow properly and honestly into the ground under the supervision of those appointed to do this; and I shall repay the same and the rest incurred, together with the taxes on the land for the present year, by the
public half-artaba measure according to the measurement ordered with the first payments into the public granary. I have provided as guarantor for myself [of this] Aurelius Achillion, son of [ ], also known as Berenikianos, who is present and assenting; and I swear by the fortune of Marcus Aurelius [Severus Alexander], our lord Caesar, [that I have not lied. In the sixth year] of the emperor...

Commentary

1) The name of the second commissioner cannot be established with certainty. After the initial Αι there are two letters, divided in the middle by a break in the upper layer of papyrus; the two letters could be μ. or possibly λω.

2) After Ωξ there is a small mark, possibly of abbreviation; the restoration would thus be τησ Ωξ(υργχειτων) (πολ(εωσ)?) rather than τησ Ωξ|υργχειτων (πολ(εωσ)?).

3) Various supplements are possible, depending on whether the scribe included πολ(εωσ) or not; the other functions the men had performed in the past might have been included, though no obvious jobs that both might have done come to mind, unless both had at one time been gymnasiarchs. Before αιρεθαι[σιν] there are the remains of one letter, possibly sigma, so one could simply suggest πολεωσ αμφότεροι for line 3. Parallels for the commissioners’ being bouleutai are P. Oxy. VII 1031 and P. Lund VI 8 & 9.

5) P. Oxy. VII 1031 is also concerns the upper toparchy.

8) The letter before the lacuna is possibly eta, though it appears to be quite smudged. A fragment of papyrus in the lacuna bears the remains of two letters. There is a horizontal stroke over the alpha of απα after the lacuna, perhaps indicating an abbreviation, or being the lengthened upper stroke of a sigma; if the latter is the case, then one could restore Δημητριός, which is quite rare, but paralleled at P. Oxy. III 503 (line 2).

11) The initial sigma of σπερματα also has to be supplied at P. Oxy. VII 1031 and P. Col. You. I 22.
15) Throughout, we have expanded the abbreviation σ as (προτερον), cf. B.G.U. IX 1893 - 1896 etc. Neither Ammonaria nor Epikouros (following line) are attested for klorei; indeed, the name Ammonaria is only attested one other time, in P. Lugd.-Bat. II 7, line 19. This document dates from the same year as ours, but comes from the Herakleopolite nome, so hardly the same person (especially as there she is the mother of a slave!).

16) Σαρ(α]) could be expanded in several ways, though one wonders if it is in fact the patronymic - Σαρ(α)(πωνος) vel sim. Κοικο would also present problems; κοιξ means doum-palm, but is only attested in the papyri in the sense of "basket" (P. Oslo III 159, P. Oxy. XVIII 2190, P. Wash. I 30, SB VI 9210, SB XVI 12594 & 12695, O. Amst. 30). In P. Laur. II 24 (= SB XVI 12498, "Fragment einer Liturgienbenennung") we have Νυμος κοικας. Youtie discusses this papyrus and gives the hapax the meaning "basket weaver". We could then regard this as a genitive in error (i.e. of Epikouros, the basket-maker), or a local Egyptian name, derived from κοιξ (cf. πζ-νρ, "the carob tree"). The simplest solution, however, would be to interpret it as the genitive of Koikos, a hitherto unattested proper name. The letters before Επικουρου are very difficult to interpret, though excellent sense is obtained if we interpret them as εκ πων. The epsilon would be the only really doubtful letter - it does not look like any of the other versions of the letter epsilon used by this scribe.

19) We feel that after και, (προτερον) should be added to give perfect sense.

20) We can suggest no plausible supplement for the patronym here, that also accounts for the horizontal stroke visible over the lacuna

21) After the numeral 8 there is a symbol which looks like an extended stigma (>). It resembles a "total" sign but must refer to the subtotal of land from the kleros

---

2"New and Rare Words in P. Laur. II 24", ZPE 35 (1979). The papyrus is also discussed by Sijpesteijn in "List of Nominations to Liturgies" in Miscellanea Papyrologica (= Papyrologica Florentina 7).
3Ranke, "Personennamen der Ägypter", p.104, no.24. We are grateful to Dominic Montserrat for this piece of information!
of royal land (i.e. "of eight arourai from another kleros (or even: from other kleroi) taxed at 3 + 1/10 artabai, a total of four arourai")

We are proceeding on the assumption here that all the land mentioned is royal land being farmed by Aurelius (i.e. the ownership of the kleroi had passed from the owners to the state, perhaps through confiscation or since the owners had died intestate). One also has to assume that the tax rate of 2 + 1/2 + 1/16 applies to the land previously of Maximus and the heirs of Ploutos. It would be tempting to think that some of the land was private - one would not then have to supply (προτερον) in line 19; if some were private then it would be that previously of Ammonaria (from the land of Epikouros), that of Maximus and that of the heirs of Ploutos, since these are the plots for which no tax rate is specified. However, the document specifically states that the land is δημοσιαν and the only possible parallel for an application for private land would be the early P. Col. You. I 22, though one would have to assume it was included in the expression βασιλικην γην και αλλων ειδων.

For an excellent discussion of the tax rates on royal land, see the article by Rowlandson1. Though Aurelius describes his land as δημοσια the rates are given for βασιλικη: the two are not mutually exclusive2.

30) We feel the supplement υπο την πρωτην μεταρασιου is justified, as the cross-stroke of the raised tau is visible. The expression is found only twice elsewhere - P. Oxy. I 101 (a land-lease of 142 AD) and P. Upp. Frid. 5 (261 AD) where the editor comments: "i.e. as soon as the earliest payments into the public granary were possible..." Payments were usually made in Pharmouthi and Pachon: see note to P. Upp. Frid. 5, col. i, 1.16 - 17. The top of the sigma of παρεσχον is also visible.

30 - 31) For the supplement παρεσχον | δε εμαυτου...[παροντα και] ευθυκολντα, cf. P. Oxy. XII 1552 (214 AD), P. Oxy. VI 972 (223 AD), P. Oxy. XXXVI 2764 (277 AD), P. Oxy. XLIII 3127 (332 AD), P. Oxy. XLIII 3132 (237 AD), P. Oxy. LI 3605 (215 AD) and SB VIII 10204 (210 - 211 AD). All of these are undertakings on oath. The provenance of the

---
2See Wilcken Grundzüge, I, p.288, "Die ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ und die ΔΗΜΟΣΙΑ ΓΗ".
last document cited is given as unknown, but could well be Oxyrhynchos, as this is the only nome to produce this expression. We have suggested ἐπὶ τοῦτο for the lacuna in line 30 - cf. P. Oxy. LI 3605, line 9, also P. Oxy. XII 1553 line 8, τοῦτον χαριν). The final upsilon of ἐπὶ τοῦτον was written over another letter, almost certainly a sigma.

35) Σευνηρίου Ἀλεξανδροῦ would presumably have been abbreviated in some way.

DOCUMENT 8 - P. Oxy. 5 1B.33/Lb
PETITION TO AN EKDIKOS - Fifth - Sixth Century
Plate 22

Introduction

This petition to an attested ekdikos is closely allied to a group of Oxyrhychite papyri, P. Oxy. XVI 1876 - 1887, dating from the period 427 - 539 AD. The clear formal hand of our papyrus, however, has parallels in Seider I,50 (= P. S.I. XII 1265) of 426 or 441 AD and Seider I,54 (= P. Amh. II 148) of 487 AD. Our hand is extravagant in the upward thrust of its epsilons and sigmas; tau appears once in a very cursive form ( - line 9) and the omega is formed by two strokes thus: ω. The text has no subscription and appears to have been discarded already in antiquity1. The original width and height of the papyrus seem to be preserved in places, and they are, respectively, 14cm and 22.9cm.

The libellus procedure is outlined by Taubenschlag2: "[Libelli-proceedings] started with a postulatio simplex, addressed by the plaintiff to the office of the court that the copy of his bill of complaint be served upon the defendant by an executor negotii. The postulatio was read and examined by the court. The court

---

1Our thanks go to Dr. Cockle for the unenviable task of disentangling the fibres of this papyrus, which had to be relaxed twice before being put under glass.

issued a decree that the minutes of the proceedings in court in which the libellus was recorded, be communicated to the defendant to be officially summoned either to settle or to defend his case, and should he choose the latter, to appear before the court. The introduction of the proceedings with other jurisdictional officials, such as defensor and municipal proximi takes place by libelloi." The name of the defendant is lost, as is some of the text of lines 6 and 7 (and possibly 8), but the sense is clear, as is the fact that the petition is to do with debt. The papyrus presents some interesting and uncommon phraseology.

Text

Φλαουίων τού αἰδεσιμοῦ επαρχικοῦ καὶ λογίατος τοῦ τῆς Οξύρυνχων παρὰ Παλατίνου πρεσβυτεροῦ ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς Ἰ. [. . .] τὴς ὁρμομενοῦ εἰς ταυτής τῆς πολέως ἐπόφιλον μοί 5 ἑρων χρεοῦσα ακολουθῶσα γραμματίου π. . . . (.) ὑπὸ μνησθεὶς παρ ἐμοὶ τὰ δικαία πρὸς ἐμὲ θεσθαι ὅλης ἀνεχεται. τοῦτον χαρίν τον τὸν λιβελλὸν 10 ἑπιδίδομαι τῇ ση παίδευσι αξιῶν κελευσαι τοῦτον παραστηναι καὶ συνελαυνεσθαι πρὸς εὐγνωμόσυνην λογιωτάτη 15 εκδίκει κυρίε Translation

To Flavius Menas the respected, of the office of the prefect, most eloquent ekdikos of the (city of the) Oxyrhynchites, from Palatinos the priest, from the same (city). I[ . . . ]tis, coming from the same city and owing me (the sum ?) of a debt according to an agreement...called on by me, refuses to deliver the correct monies; wherefore I
submit this libellus to your erudite self, thinking it fit that you should order him to be summoned and compelled to pay up, most eloquent lord ekdikos.

Commentary

1) Flavius Menas is attested in P.S.I. VIII 872 which is assigned to the sixth century by its editors, somewhat later than the date we have suggested here. An earlier stage in his career is perhaps given by P. Oxy. XXIV 2419 (assigned to the sixth century), where a certain Menas is described as συμμαχος της εκδικιας and δημοσιος ταβο<υ>λαριος. For assistants to the ekdikos, cf. SB I 6000, where there is a βοηθος της εκδικιας.

The title αιδεσμω<ν> is only mentioned fleetingly by Zilliacus1: "αιδεσμωτατος dessen ältester Beleg in P.S.I. II 246 (V, Jahrh.) zu finden ist, kommt selten vor, αιδεσμος seit dem VI Jahrh. dagegen oft." Re, επαρχικος, the editor of P.S.I. VIII 872 says: "Ad ogni modo, επαρχικος vorrà indicare un funzionario della επαρχικη ταξις..." Cf. P. Ant. III 194, line 3, note. Instances of the title are comparatively rare, and apart from the P.S.I. document cited, the only other instance of the title's being given to an ekdikos is P. Oxy. XIX 2237. The title λογωτατος is well attested, and used of the ekdikos at P. Oxy. VI 902, P. Oxy. XVI 1884 - 1886, P. Rain. Cent. 81 and P. Wash. Univ. I 10.2

The ekdikos has been briefly discussed by Lallemand3 and most fully by Rees4, who usefully collects the previous literature together. It is appropriate here to repeat some of his conclusions: "[The defensor civitatis] was an office created in the second half of the fourth century of our era to provide the imperial government with a means of protecting the poorer classes against the depredations of

4"The Defensor Civitatis in Egypt", JJP 6 (1952).
the rich and powerful, which, despite its acquisition of increased administrative and judicial powers, was to fall far short of original expectations as to have become by Justinian’s time a mere tool of the fiscal authority and a monument to municipal decadence...[under Justinian] his powers under the civil law were increased and he was invested with the right to pronounce a verdict and inflict a penalty in minor criminal cases, his general powers of administration were confirmed...he found himself increasingly beneath the supervision of the bishops and clergy, and his office, the duration of which was now limited to two years, became a munus to which all the more important citizens became liable in rotation."

3) Παλατίνος is quite a rare name in the papyri, and those occurrences are limited to the fifth and sixth century.

πρεσβύτερον Palatinos could have been a priest, rather than just an "elder". Constantine had made it legal for the church to hold property. Bowman1 says: "Although it is hardly possible to draw up a balance sheet, the total income of Christian foundations will certainly have more than sufficed for the construction and upkeep of buildings and the payment of salaries to the clergy, who were generally by no means averse to self-enrichment."

4) The name of the debtor is partly lost and we can find no suitable supplement.


7 - 8) Over the initial upsilon are three dots, the first seemingly part of a squiggle, thus: \iota\. We can find no explanation for the dots other than to suggest that they constitute a rough breathing and diaeresis. Parallels for the construction may be found at P. Muench. IIIi 128 (line 9), P. Oxy. I 125 (line 17), P. Oxy. XVI 1877 (line 6) and P. Oxy. XVI 1886 (line 10).

8 - 9) All that can be read at the end of line 8 is \ικαία. The restoration given would work well for the space available, but the expression τὰ δικαία πρὸς εμὲ θεσθαί seems to be unparalleled, and for that reason must remain suspect. We

---

1"Egypt after the Pharaohs", Oxford 1990, p.197.
have translated "to deliver the correct monies", since Preisigke lists δικαιος as meaning "correct" when applied to amounts of money.

9) ουχ ανεχεται See P. Rain. Cent. 81 (line 7, note): "Negiertes ανεχεσθαι + Infinitive "sich nicht entschließen können, sich weigern" findet sich in dieser Zeit häufig." To the examples cited there add P. Köln V 240 (line 6).

11) παιδευσι A reference to the ekdikos' supposed erudition. Parallels for the word used of the ekdikos are P. Oxy. XVI 1883, 1884, 1886, P.S.I. VIII 872 and S.P. XX 129.

13 - 14) ευγνωμοσυνην. This word only seems to occur at SB I 5357 (line 14); SB VIII 9770\(^1\) where line 6 reads ...αχρει τελεία ευγνωμοσυνην παντος του χρεους - the original editor comments: "ευγνωμοσυνη = αποδοσις Rückzahlung; in dieser Bedeutung m.W. singulär, doch vgl. ευγνωμονειν, "zurückzahlen" in P. Amh. II 142 [line 17]..."; P. Cairo. Masp. III 67279 where despite the context, the original meaning of "courtesy, prudence" seems to be retained; P. Oxy. XVI 1876 (line 8), 1877 (lines 6 - 8) and 1883 (line 5); P. Vindob. Worp. 13 (lines 15 - 16) where the editor notes: "ευγνωμοσυνη kommt auch in P. Flor. III 377 vor, mit der Bedeutung "ein pünktliches Einhalten seiner finanziellen Verpflichtungen"; cf. P. Oxy. XVI 1883 (lines 8 - 9): "το | ευγνωμον μοι ποιειν".

\(^1\)Originally published by Gerstinger in "Byzantinische Vertragsurkunden" JJP 13 (1961).
This is a receipt for the price of oil from three oil-sellers, addressed to the prytane. It raises several interesting points and measures 23.6cm x 11.5cm. Bowman discusses the role played by the boule in the administration of public buildings and the upkeep of amenities:\textsuperscript{1} "It is clear that the boule passed resolutions to authorise the work and that it controlled the city fund from which the payment was made. The place of the prytanis in the procedure as the chief executive of the boule is quite clear... the evidence shows that the boulai in the third century enjoyed complete autonomy in directing business of this kind, taking decisions on what work was to be done and supervising the execution of the work and the financial details..."

The oil paid for here is specified as being that for the public baths. This important feature of everyday life is attested from several sources: two inscriptions from Argos (I.G. IV 597 and 606) honour two men who, as well as gaining victory in the games, "Provided oil in the gymnasia and baths for slaves and free men from dawn to dusk." In S.P. V 57 - 64 (= Corpus Papyrorum Hermopolitanorum I) we have a collection of documents addressed to the boule by the ελαιοχυτες who had been appointed by the epistrategos to report any lack of oil - a remarkable appointment by the central and not the local government. Some extraordinary situation may well have obtained. In P. Oxy. XII 1413 (270 - 275 AD) we have the proceedings of the boule, in which it is discussed which gymnasiarchs are responsible for the provision of oil for gymnasiaal purposes on which days of the month; for a gymnasiarch "unstinting in his provision of unguents", see P. Oxy. III 473.

\textsuperscript{1} The Town Councils of Roman Egypt\textsuperscript{,} Toronto 1971, pp. 87 - 90. 
According to Bowman¹, there was a radical shift of power between the third and fourth centuries: "The prytanis and boule no longer exercise autonomous supervision of the administration of public works. Permission to undertake public works is, in some cases at least, obtained from the prefect or authorised by him, and the financial administration is in the hands of the logistes...". However, we can see from our document that in the fourth century, the boule was still responsible for organising the supply of oil for the public baths; perhaps responsibility for works passed to the central government but every-day administration still fell to the boule. To make our document fit the system as implied in P. Oxy. XII 1413, we would have to assume that the prytanis in office paid for the oil for the whole month (out of the city fund?) and that the gymnasiarchs refunded him for the individual days for which they were financially responsible for the supply. That at least some of the expense of running the public baths was recouped from the public is indicated by P. Mich. XI 619 (a household account of 182 AD) which itemises (col. ii, lines 14 - 15, cf. 1.19) an obol paid for the public baths, and another half obol for entry to the hot bath.

The papyrus contrasts sharply with P. Oxy. I 84 of 316 AD. Here the guild of iron and copper workers acknowledge the receipt of six talents of silver (the price of one hundred pounds of wrought iron) through their monthly president - to the logistes. It is noteworthy that the logistes pays for the iron here, yet the prytane pays for the oil in our document. Perhaps our prytane had already been authorised by the central government to pay for the oil out of public funds; alternatively, the iron may have been intended for some specific project, but the supply of oil to the baths was an on-going item of expenditure left to the boule.

Text

υπατειας Φλαουιου [Δαλ]ματιον αδελφου

¹op. cit., p.90.
In the consulship of Flavius Dalmatius, brother of our emperor Constantinus Augustus and of Domitius Zenophilus, viri clarissimi, phaophi 4.

To Aurelius Ploution, son of Eudaimon, ex-gymnasiarch, ex-bouleutes of the bright, nay, most bright city of the Oxyrhynchites, prytane in office, Aurelius Neilos, son of Didymus and Aurelius Ere[ ] son of Thonios and (Aurelius) Theodorus, oil merchants of the same city (send greetings), meniarchs for thoth, send greetings.

We have had from you the full price for the oil which we have provided to the administration of the municipal baths of the thermae for the whole of the same month of
thoth of the current 28th, 18th and 10th year and we require (?) to have nothing else in addition. This declaration is valid and we, having been asked, have given our agreement.

We, Aurelius Nilos, Aurelius Ere[ ] and (Aurelius) Theodorus have had the price of the whole of the month of thoth and have given our agreement. I, Aurelius Amoitas, son of [ ]anos, have written on their behalf, since they are illiterate.

Commentary

1) αδικλάφου Flavius Dalmatius the half-brother of the emperor Constantine (see R.E. IV, p.1043, no.3). The only other document from the same year is P. Oxy. XIV 1716, where the consular details are expressed in the same way. Iulius Constantinus, another half-brother of Constantine, was consul two years later, and is attested in P.S.I. VI 706, P. Oxy. X 1265, P. Oxy. IX 1206 and P. Oxy. XII 1470; his name is restored at P. Würzb. 15 and P. Neph. 31.

The first two words of line 1 appear to be written in slightly smaller heavier letters than the rest of the text before the subscription.

4) The pi, rho and omega are very rubbed. The date here is the 1st of October.

5) Aurelius Ploution, Neilos, Theodorus and do not appear to be attested elsewhere.

9) The papyrological evidence for oil merchants has been succinctly collected by Harrauer1, who summarises their job: "Unmittelbar mit dem Gewerbe haben die amtliche Preisfestsetzung, an die Händler gerichtete Bezahlungen und im besonderen Zahlungsaufträge zu tun. Ihre Geschäfte reichen aber weiter: für einen Sack, für Eier, für Gerste, Weizen ergeben Zahlungen an Ölhandler; einer erwirbt gebrauchte Leitung, ein anderer zahlt seine Miete. Ihre Merktsteuer beträgt in Oxyrhynchilos im Jahre 172 n. Chr. 6 Drachmen. Aus zwei Stellen lernen wir Ölhandler als Pächter der ἐλαική-Steuer kennen. Sie scheinen ihre Abgabe für die vestis militaris zu entrichten. Als Steuerpflichtige sehen

wir sie...über zwei Zeugnisse verfügen wir bisher, die

' έλασσωλάρι im Zusammenhang mit dem Ölschmuggel zeigen...In
beiden Fällen entdeckte der Öländler illegales Öl bei
Privatpersonen..." Cf. "Repertorio di Nomi di Mestieri", L.

10) The last three extant letters should be alpha, iota

and sigma; but though the there are traces, these are not
immediately compatible with those letters. Of the several
occurrences of the meniarch in the papyri, most are from
Oxyrhynchos, dating to the first half of the fourth century.
There are only a few from outside this time span and from
outside Oxyrhynchos. Possibly the earliest occurrence is
the Theban ostracon O. Tait. II 1986, assigned to the second
or third century; the editor there simply says:"Le mot
désigne les présidents mensuels des corporations".
Meniarchs feature in account rolls from the Petaus archive
from Ptolemais Hormou - P. Petaus 37, col.i, 1.4 and col.ii,
1.22, of 184 - 187 AD; they are also to be found in SB XIV
11593 from the Hermopolite nome 1. Finally there is a
possible instance in P. Prag. Varcl. 6 (= SB VI 9409), an
accounts roll from the Heroneinos archive, where payments
are made νπερ μηνιαρχεσα (no.3, line 121 and 141). The
editor comments:"Hiermit ist angedeutet auf welche Weise die
Frage der Aufsicht über die freien Arbeiter auf einem
ägyptischen Landgute gelöst wurde: an der Spitze jeder
Gruppe der Arbeiter...stand ein Vordermann, μηνιαρχης, der
gewiß für die Ordnung und gewissenhafte Leistung der Arbeit
verantwortlich war; für seine Dienste wurde diese Vordermann
nach dem Zeugnisse dieses Papyrus mit 10 Brotstücken und 2
Kotylen pro Monat belohnt..." None of these
non-Oxyrhynchite occurrences is helpful in forming an idea
of the functions and duties of the meniarch - certainly in
the last papyrus cited, he is nothing more than an overseer.

In the Oxyrhynchite occurrences the meniarchs act on
behalf of their guilds in several different capacities,
which we take the opportunity here to outline. Apart from
P. Oxy. VIII 1139, which is simply assigned to the fourth
century, the earliest occurrence is P. Oxy. LIV 3730 (308 -
312 AD) and the latest P. Harr. II 216 (343 AD), a period of

only thirty-five years. Men acting in the same capacities as those in other documents where the executives are specified as being meniarchs, also appear in documents where they are not given the title meniarch, e.g. P.S.I. III 202, where Artemidorus and Eulogios must be meniarchs.

P. Harr. I 73 (338 AD) is a declaration made through meniarchs by an Oxyrhynchite guild to the logistes of the city, assessing the value of goods in stock at the end of the month; meniarchs feature on the verso of the same document (P. Harr. I 160, early fourth century), but their role there is not clear. In P. Harr. II 216, the guild of tow-handlers present, through their five meniarchs, the names of five people suited to the performance of an unidentified liturgy. P. Oxy. VIII 1130 (fourth century) is an order from the logistes to the meniarch of the guild of vegetable-sellers to issue the exceptor with a ration of vegetables; P. Oxy. I 53 (316 AD) is a report to the logistes through the meniarch of the carpenters' guild about a tree that might be used for repairing the public baths; P. Oxy. I 84 has been mentioned in the introduction above; P. Oxy. XXXI 2579 (313 AD) is a receipt for επικεφαλαίας signed by a meniarch, instead of the more usual systates: "It seems from this that some of the contributions were made by the guild, which then recovered the money from its members"; in P. Oxy. XLIII 3126 (328 AD) a man who has bought a share in a house and is barred from it by the two women owners of the rest of the property, petitions the prefect and sends a letter to the logistes asking that the matter be sorted out - he asks that the logistes send τούς των οικοδόμων μηνιαρχας ινδώσα; P. Oxy. XLIIV 3195 (331 AD) is a report on the condition of certain property; in P. Oxy. XLV 2161 (324 AD) the four meniarchs provide recruits on behalf of the signatories, who acknowledge liability for the expense in this contract; a meniarch seems to repay his loan in P. Oxy. LIV 3730. Finally, the meniarchs are responsible for making the price declarations P. Oxy. LIV 3734, 3740, 3743, 3752, 3753, 3765 - for further literature on this type of document see P. Oxy. LIV 3731, introduction.

One would like to be able to associate the rise of the meniarch with the appearance of the curator civitatis at the start of the fourth century, but the non-Oxyrhynchite
occurrences (and the possible restoration of the title at P.S.I. V 456, dating to 276 - 282 AD) would militate against this.

11) The expression μηνιαρχ(α) προς is not paralleled elsewhere.

12) πληρη See Gignac II, p.138ff., esp. no.3 (p.139): "[With πληρης] there is an occasional lack of agreement, especially with the neuter used for the feminine." cf. P. Oxy. XVII 2125 and P. Oxy. XIV 1697.

ου παρεσαχομεν ελαιου The relative falls in the genitive, by attraction (= την τιμην του ελαιου ο παρεσχομεν).

13 - 14) The βαλανεια are the baths proper of a whole recreational establishment (thermai), cf. Seneca's Dialogus 9.9.7: "Apud desiodissimos ergo videbis quicquid orationum historiarumque est, tecto tenus exstructa loculamenta; iam enim inter balnearia et thermas bibliotheca quoque ut necessarium domus ornamentum expolitur." Petrie's excavations1 were not of great extent and did not uncover any baths. P. Oxy. I 43 (verso 295 AD) is a list of guards or watchmen who were distributed over the chief streets and public buildings of Oxyrhynchos, and it lists in addition to the thermae (col.iii, 1.10) two balaneia (col.iii, 1.24 and col.iv, 1.24). Clearly the number of thermae and balaneia would have varied over the years, but there were certainly Trajanic/Hadrianic baths (P. Oxy. I 54 and P. Oxy. VI 896) and Antonine ones (P. Oxy. XVII 2128, late second century).

There are not many papyri in which the balaneia are distinguished from the thermae - P. Oxy. I 53 (316 AD) is a report by a meniarch on a tree the meniarch had been sent to inspect, with a view to its being used to repair the bath of the thermae; P. Oxy. III 473 (138 - 160 AD) is a resolution to honour a gymnasiarch who, among other things, has restored the baths and "the greater thermae"; P. Oxy. VI 896 appears to be very closely connected with P. Oxy. I 53, and concerns the repair of the bath of the thermae; P. Oxy. XXXI 2569 is the resignation of a liturgist γενομε[ο]υ μισθωτον ανειμ·ηςως υδατων πολειτικων θερμων βαλανεων; P. Oxy. XLV 3265 (= P. Col. You. II 81, 326 AD) also concerns repairs of the bath of the thermae; finally, P. Univ. Genova I 22 (345 AD) gives an αμφοθεν θερμων β[αλα]νιο[ν, otherwise unattested.

1"Tombs of the Courtiers and Oxyrhynchos", London 1925.
Other papyri concerning the various baths and aspects of their administration at Oxyrhynchus are: P. Oxy. VI 892, P. Oxy. VIII 1104, P. Oxy. X 1252, P. Oxy. XII 1430, 1436, 1499, P. Oxy. XVI 1889, 2040, P. Oxy. XVII 2127, 2128, P. Oxy. XXXIV 2718, P. Oxy. XXXVI 2780, P. Oxy. XLIII 3088, P. Oxy. XLIV 3173 (cf. B.G.U. IV 1130), P. Oxy. XLIV 3176, 3185, P. Oxy. L. 3566.¹

The phrase θερμῶν δημοσίων πολιτικῶν βαλανεῖων has no exact parallel anywhere, though P. Oxy. XXXI 2569 is very close.

15 - 16) 28th year of Constantinus, 18th year of Constantinus II, 10th year of Constantius. The function of the double slash mark in line 16 is unclear to us; the symbol used after the year numerals, more usually met meaning "year", here must simply be an ordinative. The word πληρη in line 12 is superfluous - in receipts, the word is often put right at the end to emphasise the fact that the amount has been paid in full (cf. B.G.U. XI 2038, P. Strassb. III 132, P. Princ. II 37, P. Cairo Isid. 41 (col. vi, 1.63), SB V 7624, 7679 and SB VIII 9833 ("ομολογούμενα πεσεχτικαι παιρα σου τον [φιδρον...]/...του εν]εσωτης ει (ετουο) και ιδ (ετουο) και ζ (ετουο) πληρη...")

16 - 17) This clause does not seem to have any parallel and presents problems of interpretation; the last word is followed by an abbreviation sign, thus: προσδέ. The restoration προσδε(ομεθα) is our own. For the last word of the previous line it is tempting to read αλ[ο]λον; though such a neuter form would be unattested, it would have parallels with varying neuter terminations of τουςυνος and τουντος (see Gignac II, p.175). One might be tempted to interpret προσδε as προσδε(οικατε) (cf. P. Vindob. Sijpesteijn 18 (= P. Lugd.-Bat. XI)). Youtie, however, corrected Sijpesteijn’s interpretation²; for this supplement to hold, εξειν would have to be considered exegeetical. Another explanation for the last word of 1.16 would be to read αληλον (for αλληλων), which would fit well, since it would recognise not only that the oil merchants have delivered the goods, but that they have received the money too.

17 - 18) This "Stipulations-Klausel" has been the subject of much debate in the past. The arguments are most fully presented by Dieter Simon, though see also the important discussions by de Visscher and Pringsheim. De Visscher wished to see in it a corruption of the Roman clause "stipulatus spoondit": "En présence d'une relation aussi constamment et formellement marquée avec l'autorité attribuée au document écrit (κυριον, κυρια) il semble qu'une méprise eût difficilement dû se produire sur la portée véritable de notre clause. Dès 1900, Gradenwitz en ramenait le sens à celui de notre formule moderne "lu et approuvé" ("vorgelesen und genehmigt") et s'il eut le tort, croyons-nous, d'y reconnaître malgré tout, une extension ou généralisation de la stipulation romaine, aucune interprétation ne correspond plus exactement au rôle et à la place qui lui sont assignés dans les actes." It must be said that the clause is used more often in the Greek papyri than circumstances of the Roman law would seem to have allowed; Maehler has suggested that its widespread use was a result of growing illiteracy in the later Roman period: the documents had to be read out, the declarant asked if it corresponded to his intentions, and his consent obtained.

22) πληρής is sometimes used indeclinably in the papyri: cf. Gignac reference above, note to line 12.

24) The incorrect grammar of the last word, and the omission of a syllable two lines above, leads one to believe that Aurelius Amoitas is not very literate himself.
INDICES

In the first index, the number after the Homeric word glossed is that of the fragment of scholia minora; in the following indices, the numbers refer to document and line numbers (as numerated in this edition).

HOMERIC WORDS GLOSSED

Square brackets indicate that the lemma, but no gloss, is preserved.

A

ἀγέληφι 7
ἀγερόχων 9
ἀγλάον 6 + ![4]
ἀγρομένησι 7
ἀγχιάλον 8
ἀδινάων 2
ἅ 7
ἀίζηλον 5
ἀπύτιον 8
ἀρείτω 1
ἀρίσσειν 1
[ἀίχηστος] 3
[ἀλγεα] 1
ἀλίς 2
ἀμφισεντάτο 4 + 5
ἀμφιαχυάν 4 + 5
ἀνδρείφοντι 9
ἀνέω 5
ἀνήκεν 2
ἀνθεμύσει 7
ἀνιθθέντα 4
ἀνύγει 4
ἀπεβήσατο 1
ἀποπτάμενος 2
ἀργείφοντι 2
ἀρησαλέντα 9
αρίζηλον 4
[ἀρπηκτος] 7
[ἀρχοῦς] 7
ἀσχαλάσαι 4
Αὔλις 5 + 6
ἀφελοντο 8

B

βοτρυδόν 2
βουληφόρον 1
βουπράσιον 8

Γ

γε (see ὁ γε)
[γελοιόν] 3
γλαφυρῆς 2

Δ

δαφοῖνος 4 + 5
δεδηεί 2
diaktoρωι 2
dουρίκλυτος 8 + 9

Ε

εργεί 8
ειαρινοῖσιν 2
εἴδομένη 4
[εἴσατο] 3
eis ὁ κεν 5
ἐκπερσαντί 4
ἐλεαιρεῖ 1
ἐλεγχιστον 4
ἐλελιξάμενος 4 + 5
ἐνυαλίωι 9
ἐνυψιόν 2
[εξαιρετοι] 3
ἐπαιξας 4
ἐπεισοδ 8
ἐπεσεσέοντο 2
ἐπενήνοθε] 3
ἐπιτετράφαταί 1,
ἐπιφασσάιατο 4
ἐρώμεν 6
ἐρεισάμενος 2
ἐρήτυειν 2
ἐρήτευθεν 2
ἐρείζεμεναι] 3
'ἐσπετε 7
"ἐστε 7
'ἐστιχώντο 2
[έσεα] 6
'ἐστεῖλατο 9
ἐυτ'άν 1
ἐφηνε 4 + 5
ἐώικει 2

Η

ηγείροντο 2
ηγερέθοντο 5 + 6
ηγησάσθην 8
ηγήτορες 2
ηπόνος 2
ημαθόντος 2
ηματι 1
ηρτύνετο 2

Θ

θέμεναι 4
θέμις 2
θεσείδ' 8
θήσειν 1

Ι

ιαχον 5
ιδμεν 7
ιέναι 2
κάμε 2
[κεκληγώς] 3
κηδεταί 1
κιθαριστῶν 8
κλέος 5
κοναβῆσαν 5
κονάβιζε 7
[kοτεόντο] 3
κρατερὰς 2

λᾶν 5
λαοί 1
[λάχνη] 3
λιγυφθογγοισίν 2

μέγα 1
μέδοντες 2
μελίφων 1
μεμήλεν 1
μετηύδα 2
μῆδετο 1
μιλτοπάρηιοι 8
μίμνετε 5
[μνησαι] 7
[μυθήσομαι] 7
ναιταώσας 9
νέεσθαι 2 + 4
[νεικε] 3
[νεικειεσκε] 3
[νεμέσηθεν] 3
νηπιας 1
νοσφιζομεθα 2

Ξ

ξύνες 1

Ο

ο γε 1
ολυπιας 4
όμαδος 2
[ονείδα] 3
ονειδειοις 4
[ονομήνω] 7
[οξέα] 3
[όου] 6
όρουσεν 4 + 5
όσα 2
οτρύνουσα 2
[όψιμον] 6
όψιτελεστον 5 + [6]

Π

πέλωρα 5
πεποτήσαται 2
πετάλοις 4 + 5
πλατανίστωι 4 + 5 + [6]
[πλεία] 3
πλήθυς 4
πληξιπωι 2
ποιμένι λαῶν 2
ποιμηνιὸν 7
πολυκλήσσι 2
Πριάμου πόλιν 1
προκαθίζοντων 7
[πτολεμιέμον] 6
πτολίπορθος 4
πυκινήν 2

Σ

σήμα 4
Σκαμάνδριον 7
σκηπτούχοι 2
σμαραγδέ 7
σμερδαλέος 4 + 5
σταθμόν 7
στείχοντες 4
στεναχιζόντα 2
στέρνον 7
στοναχάς 1
στρούθοι 4
συνοχωκότε 3
σχοινατε 2

Τ

tετρήχει 2
tετριγώτας 4
tόσσα 1
tρίχα 9

Υ

υπαιξας (see ἐπαίξας)
[ὑπερθεν] 3
ὑπέσταν 4
ὑποπεπτηστές 4 + 5
ὑποσχεσίν 4
ὑσμίνας 1
ὑστατοι 4
Φ

φολκός 3
[φοξός] 3
φώς δὲ 4

Ψ

[ψεδνή] 3

Ω

ἐρημί 7

PROPER NAMES

A

Ἀθηνοδώρος 5,4
Ἀι.[ 7,1
Ἀμοῖς 1,1 & 25; 9,24
Ἄμμοναρία 7,14
...]άνος 7,7
Ἀντωνίος 5,4
Ἀπια 4,8
Αὐρηλίος 7,7 & 19 & 32; 9,5 & 8 & 24
Ἀχιλλιων 7,32

B

Βερενικιάνος 7,33

Δ

Διδυμός 9,8
Διογένης 1,2
Διονυσίος 1,1
Δημήτης? 7,8
...[δρων 7,20
Επικουρος 7,15
Ερε[ 9,8 & 20
Ερμογενης 2,2
Ευδαιμων 9,5
Ευτυχης 1,4

Θεσπιδος 9,9
Θεων 7,18
Θωνιας 9,9

Ισαρους 1,3

Κοικος 7,15

Λουκιος 4,1 & 8
Λουκιον 4,8

Μαξιμος 7,17
Μηνας 8,1
Μουσαιος 3,1

Νιλος 9,8 & 20

Παλαινος 8,3
Παυλος 2,2
GENERAL INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

A

αγόνιον 4,4
αδελφός 9,1
αἰρεω 7,3
αἰρηθ 7,22
αἰτεω 7,10
ακολουθως 8,6
άλλος 5,9
αμα 7,27
αναγραφω 1,5 & 9
αναδοσις 7,4
ανακαλυπτω 6,14
ανεχομαι 8,9
αντι 5,9
αξιος 3,4
αξιω 1,9; 8,11
αξιων 3,2 & 4
απεχω 9,11 & 21
απεω 1,2; 4,3; 7,10 & 22; 8,3
αποδιδωμι 7,26
αποκειμαι 6,1
απολειπω 6,13
αποχη 9,17
ασπαζομαι 4,8
αυτος 8,3

Β

βαλανειον 9,14
βαλλω 3,3
βασιλικος 7,17 (?) & 20
βασταζω 6,8
βιος 4,12

Γ

γαρ 4,4
γενημα 7,12
γεωργω 7,14
γη 2,4; 7,23 & 27
γεγονω 6,19
γραμματα 4,3; 9,24
γραμματειον 8,7
γραφω 5,6; 9,23

Δ

dανειον 7,11
δε 5,10; 7,31
δηλος 6,19
δημοσιος 2,4; 7,14 & 27; 9,13
dia 4,4 & 10
dierchomai 7,12
dikaios 8,8
dio 1,8
doulos 1,4

E
gynhtēs 7,31
eis 1,10; 3,3; 6,3; 7,14 & 23 & 24
ek 7,25
eλαιον 9,4 & 21
eμου 5,6; 8,8
ev 6,4 & 6
eνιστημι 6,3; 7,6 & 13 & 28; 9,15
eντυχω 2,3
eπακολουθεω 7,24
eπερωτασ 9,17 & 22
epi 1,6; 7,3
eπιδιδωμι 1,8 & 26; 8,10
eπιξενουμαι 6,8
eπιστολη 5,6
eπιστυλιον 3,3
eπομαι 7,27
eποφειλω 8,5
eti 1,7
eteros 6,2
eυγνωμοσυνη 8,14
eυδοκεω 7,34
eυτυχεω 4,11
eυχομαι 4,10
eχω 1,27; 9,17

Z
ζητεω 6,22
Η

ημερα 4,3; 6,4
ημων 4,9; 9,2

Θ

θερμαι 9,13

Ι

ισος 1,28; 7,26

Κ

καθηκει 1,11
καταγαιον 6,4
κατασπορα 7,4 & 13
κατατιθμι 7,22
κελευω 7,29; 8,12
κεραμιον 6,12
κληρονομος 7,18 & 19
κληρος 7,17 & 20
κληρω 5,8
κοκκολογω 7,22
κρατιστος 5,10
κυριος 4,6 & 7 & 10; 9,17

Λ

λαμβανω 4,3
λαμπρος 9,6
λαμπροτατος 9,6
λιβελλος 8,10
λοιπογραφω 6,2

Μ

μεν 5,8
μετεωριζομαι 4,7
μετρησις 7,29
μηδεις 6,21; 9,16
μηδεν 4,6
μην 9,15 & 21
μητρο 1,2; 4,6 & 7; 7,8
μικρος 4,8
μοι 6,3; 8,5
μονος 3,4
μου 1,4; 4,6 & 7; 7,11

N

νεος 7,25
νυν 4,6

O

οδε 8,10
οιδα 9,24
οικεω 6,6 & 9
οικα 6,5
ομνω 1,12; 7,34
ομοιος 1,11
ομοιος 5,12
ομολογεω 9,18 & 22
οξιζω 6,16
ορμασομαι 8,4
ουκ 8,9

Π

παιδευσις 8,11
παλαι 1,7
παρα 1,1; 3,2; 6,3; 7,7; 8,3 & 8; 9,11 & 14
πανοικ(e)ι 4,12
παραλαμβανω 7,9
παραμετρεω 7,10
παρεμι 6,20
παρεχω 3,2; 7,30; 9,12
παριστημι 8,2
πατηρ 4,1 & 10
πεμπω 2,2
περι 2,4; 4,5; 5,8; 7,14
πιστως 7,23
πληρης 9,12 & 16 & 22
πληρω 5,9 & 12
ποιεω 6,17
πολιτικος 9,14
πολυς 4,3 & 8
προαστιον 3,3
προκειμαι 6,5
προς 6,21 & 23; 8,9 & 13; 9,11
προχειριζω 7,25
πρωτος 7,30
πυνθανομαι 4,5 & 6
πυρος 7,12
πωμαριον 3,3

P
ρωνυμι 4,10

Σ
σε 4,10
σημειομαι 3,4
σοι 6,18
σος 8,10
σου 4,3 & 5
σπερμα 7,5 & 11
συν 7,26
στρατευμα 6,11
στρατιωτης 6,10
συμβαινει 4,4
συνελαυνω 8,13
συνεχως 4,5
συνηθεια 4,4

Τ
ταξις 1,11
tελ(ειος) 1,5
tελεσμα 7,28
tελευταω 1,7
τιθημι 8,9
τιμη 3,2; 9,12 & 21
τυχη 1,17; 7,34

υγιως 7,23
υμας 4,8
υπερ 3,2; 9,24
υπηρεσια 9,13
υπο 5,6; 6,8 & 14; 7,11 & 30
υπομναω 8,8
υπομνημα 1,8

φανερος 6,17
φιλτατος 5,5

χαιρειν 3,1; 4,2; 5,5; 9,10 & 11
χαριν 8,10
χρεος 8,6
χρονος 5,10

ψευδομαι 1,18; 7,36

ως 1,11

CONSULS

Δομιτιος Ξενοφιλος 9,3
Φλασιως Δαλματιος 9,2
EMPERORS

Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Caesar 1,13 - 15
Lucius Aurelius Commodus Caesar 1,15 - 16
(titulature continues in lines 21 - 24)
Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander 7,35 - 37
Constantine 9,2
Vocabulary to Iliad II c.50-105
Oxyrhynchus Parcel 51. Box 4 B 18/H(1-3)a 1
GLOSSARY TO ILIAD II 214 ff.
Oxyrhynchus Parcel 19, Box 23, 82/K (a)
VOCABULARY TO I LIAD II c.300-320
Oxythynchus Parcel 70/39(a)
COMMENTARY ON ILIAD II
Oxyrhynchus Parcel 19. Box 23. 81/C (f)
GLOSSARY TO ILIAD II c. 480
Oxyrhynchus Parcel 68. Box 63. 17/J (1-3) f1
GLOSSARY TO ILIAD II c. 645
Oxyrhynchus Parcel 49. Box 5 B. 100/ H (1-2)
HOMER: Iliad Book II
Col. I 43-64  Col. II 80-125
Coryphæus Parch 15, Fasc. 2 R. 40/F(3)
HOMER: Iliad Book II

(m. 2) 405–407  (m. 1) 408–414
Oxyrhynchus Parcel 38, Box 3B.79/E (1-2)
ORDER TO ARREST
Oxyrhynchus Parcel 24. Box 3 B75/E (a)
DOCUMENT ON AXLES
Oxyrhynchus Parcel 30. Box 48.38/B (2-3)
LETTER OF SARAPION TO HIS FATHER.
RECEIPT FOR SEED CORN
Oxyrhynchus Parcel 5, Box 1B, 38/D(a)
PETITION TO AN ΕΚΔΙΚΟΣ

Oxyrhynchus Parcel 5. Box 11.33/1 (f)
RECEIPT FOR THE PRICE OF OIL

Oxyrhynchus Parcel 69/21(a)
ERRATA

The following observations and corrections are the result of my viva voce examination on Tuesday 4th March, 1991, and this list has been drawn up in accordance with the regulations of London University. As with the thesis itself, information from this document may only be used in publication with the written consent of the author.

p. 8  SIFIC = Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica.


p. 62  Though the papyrus edited here is almost certainly of second century date, Apollonios Sophistes' dates fall in the second half of the first century and not the first half of the second century, as stated.

p. 74  Professor Montanari suggested that the occurrence of θημι in the lemmata column could be a copying error.

(line 4) Professor Montanari pointed out that the supplement could well have been longer and suggested διαμοιζόσσα διεγγυρτόδιαμοιζόσσα διεγγυρτό - cf. D.

(line 19) ἐπιστήμη could much more plausibly be restored as ἐπιστήμη[είς] and would thus be part of the explanation as to why Pelops was called πλησίως; cf. D.

p. 93  text, column 1, lines 20-21. A better reading would be στειχωνunfinished] μενοραγένος

p. 94  text, column 2, line 18. The reading of the lemmata column is wrong. It should be:- ηλιαμενος, haplography for ηλειαμενος.

p. 106  Text. The incorrect final nu in line 5 recurs in line 19; the incorrect double consonant in line 10 recurs in line 17.

p. 113  Text, recto. A better supplement, which would account for the space in line 2 would be:-

Aυλις ὑ τη ταύτης τιμος
πολις

p. 114  Text, recto. A closer examination of the text of line 1 gives the possible reading ἴαθς, which gives the more plausible supplement -
The Homeric reading cited from An. Ox. IV, 318, 1 is also found in some manuscripts; cf. Allen, appendix.

One very important point concerning fragments 8 and 9 is, that despite their intrinsic lack of interest, they are the first scholia minora to be edited from the Catalogue of Ships.

Though it was thought that marginal scholia minora/glosses were comparatively rare, Montanari informs me that those working on the new edition of Pack have found that, on re-examination of papyri of the text of Homer several do in fact contain marginal and interlinear glosses, mention of which was omitted in Pack².

**DOCUMENTARY PAPYRI**

Dr. Rowlandson was not convinced by the arguments in favour of the axles' being intended for a shadouf rather than a saqqiyah and said that the question should remain open.

Though the papyrus has been correctly read, the translation of line 2 is wrong. It should read: "Give to Abraamios the agent for the price of eleven axles of twelve cubits length..." This does not tally with figures given in line 4.

To the commentary on line 2 should be added a remark that the figures do not tally within the papyrus. However, it seems more plausible that the axles in question are twelve in number and eleven cubits in length and not vice versa.

The vast fluctuation of commodity prices is in fact quite common and an increase of 6½ keratia should not be a source of surprise.

Dr. Rowlandson wondered whether the family listed in line 8 - 9 was in fact with Sarapion, with little Loukios being his son, Apia his wife and so on; this would mean that we would not have to understand ημαν for ημαν in line 9, but that the form σαπαζωκαν would be incorrect - a result of a scribal tendency always to end letters in this way? A further possibility is to imagine that Sarapion is Σαπαζωκαν ο και Λουκιος - the translation would then run something as follows: "I, little Luke, send many greetings, as do [my wife ?] Apia, [my son?] Loukion and all of us."

Unfortunately, since the submission of this thesis, the latest volume
of the Oxyrhynchus papyri has appeared, containing eight seed-corn documents, which would have to be taken account of in a rewrite of the introduction. None of the conclusions drawn in P. Oxy. LVII contradict what is given here.

p.244 Commentary, line 10, second line: delete "and sigma".

Further information and copies of the more obscure items in the bibliography to part I may be obtained from myself.

Dr. Joseph Spooner,
c/o 22, Murray Road,
Wimbledon,
London,
SW19 4PB.

The examiners were as follows:–

Internal –

Dr. Jane Rowlandson,
Department of Classics,
Birkbeck College,
Gower Street,
London.

External –

Professor Franco Montanari,
Dipartimento di Filologia Classica,
(Universita di Pisa)
Via Galvani 1,
I - 56100,
ITALY.