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In 1968 six larger fragments of a papyrus roll containing on the recto (the verso being uninscribed) parts of chapters 17 to 21, 23 and 24 of Book III of Achilles Tatius' novel Leucippe and Cleitophon were identified among the Cologne papyri (P.Koln inv. 901) and published by Albert Henrichs. These fragments had been bought from a dealer in the mid 1950's. From a different dealer in 1955 the noted archaeologist David M. Robinson acquired a group of some 200 quite small literary fragments in a dozen hands. Half of these were written in a distinct informal bookhand (P.Rob. inv. 35), which a search of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae instantly revealed to derive from the same chapters of Achilles Tatius as the Cologne fragments. On seeing photographs of the Robinson fragments, Ludwig Koenen at once recognized the hand to be the same as that of the Cologne, of which no photographs had been published. Clearly the two sets came from the same roll. As is the case for most literary papyri, its provenience is unknown. But certain of the other fragments mixed in the same lot clearly came from the Thebaid, possibly Panopolis.

Again by the aid of the machine readable TLG text, it was relatively easy to align the Robinson fragments on the computer screen so as to determine their relation to one another, and thus to assemble the numerous small pieces into thirty substantial fragments. These larger groupings proved in turn to fill many of the gaps between the Cologne fragments, and so to provide an almost continuous running text of Book III chapters 17


through 25 ($\Pi^4$).\(^3\) The Robinson fragments supplement all but ten of the 80 broken lines preserved on the Cologne fragments and contribute 103 additional lines for a combined total of 183. Few of the lines are complete, however, and of some only a few internal letters survive. Altogether the combined fragments preserve fifty per cent of the original text of these chapters, twenty per cent supplied by the Cologne fragments and thirty per cent by the Robinson. Through the good offices of Reinhold Merkelbach it has been arranged that the Cologne fragments are placed on indefinite loan to the Duke University Library, where they have been rejoined and photographed (Plates 1-4).

As joined together the combined Robinson and Cologne fragments constitute a substantial part of the last five columns of Book III, and possibly also of the roll since the fifth column is distinctly narrower and shorter than its four predecessors. In depth of column, cols. i, iii and iv have 44 lines each, col. ii only 42; but the surviving fragment of col. v preserves the middle of its first nine lines, and Book III could have been completed in five more lines for a total of fourteen, not counting a probable colophon. In length of line, cols. i, ii and iv average 48 letters, col. iii 51 letters, but col. v only 41. Possibly the scribe saw that he was about to run out of space at the end of his roll. It is also possible, however, that estimating that the remainder of Book III would not require a column of full width, he may have narrowed col. v to conserve space and may have continued thereafter with Book IV.

Since the lower margin of col. i is preserved (1.6 cm.) and the full upper margins of cols. ii and iv (1.7 cm.; the frayed upper margin of col. iii measures 1.0 cm.), the height of the roll can be calculated as 29.1 cm.—tall but within normal limits. The average written width of cols. i–iv is 10.5 cm., and intercolumnar margins vary from 1.5 to 2.1 cm. The average width of these columns including an adjoining intercolumnar margin is thus 12

---

\(^3\) The sigla $\Pi^1$, $\Pi^2$, and $\Pi^3$ are those assigned by E. Vilborg in his critical edition, *Achilles Tatius, Leucippe and Clitophon* (Stockholm 1955). The sigla $\Pi^4$–$\Pi^7$ were designated by J. N. O'Sullivan in his *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius* (= *Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte* 18 [Berlin/New York 1980]). Though his $\Pi^4$ signifies only the Cologne fragments, I extend the siglum to include the Robinson fragments as well. When he compiled his lexicon he could not yet know that $\Pi^1$ and his $\Pi^6$ derived from the same roll (see infra).
cm. At an average 433 words per column one may estimate that the entire vulgate text of Book III would comprise thirteen such columns and would therefore fill a roll 1.55 meters in length,\(^4\) only a fraction of the usual roll-length ranging from 7 to 10 meters (23 to 33 feet).\(^5\) At the same ratio if the roll contained the first three books together it would have measured about 5 m. (16.7 feet), still short of the length of an average roll. The whole of the novel, on the other hand, would have occupied about 100 columns or a roll of 12 m. (40 feet), rather beyond ordinary size; or two such rolls of, respectively, 6.5 m. (21 feet) and 5.75 m. (19 feet), each somewhat shorter than average.

The joined Robinson and Cologne papyrus constitutes the most extensive ancient text of Achilles Tatius yet found, and one of the two earliest copies. To its rapid informal quasi-literary hand sloping slightly to the right and admitting frequent ligatures I have found no close parallels among either literary papyri or documents. The more formal features somewhat resemble the hand of the final columns of the Vatican Favorinus (\textit{P.Marm. I} = M. Norsa, \textit{Scrittura letteraria graeca} pl. 13, or C. H. Roberts, \textit{Greek Literary Hands} pl. 18b–c), dated to the late II or early III century, presumably before A.D. 215. The cursive letter-forms and ligatures are near \textit{BGU I} 356 (= W. Schubart, \textit{Griechische Palaeographie} Abb. 48), dated A.D. 213, and in some cases near \textit{P.Wisc. I} 5 pl. II, dated A.D. 186. I should therefore assign the papyrus to the early III century.\(^6\) Slightly earlier still, perhaps, is \textit{P.Mil.Vogl. III} 1244 (\(\Pi^3\)), a small fragment of a papyrus codex having parts of lines from Book VI chapters 14–17, which A. Vogliano (with Schubart’s approval) assigned to the II century;\(^7\) but the compression of its hand sloping to the right and its codex form suggest a later date just before or after A.D. 200. In any case, to the Milan codex leaf, now

\(^4\) The calculations in this paragraph are based on a computer word-count of the eight books of Achilles Tatius in Vilborg’s edition recorded by TLG: I, 5175 words; II, 7287; III, 5577; IV, 4670; V, 6503; VI, 4160: VII, 3940; VIII, 6128; total, 43440.

\(^5\) W. Schubart, \textit{Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern}\(^3\) (Heidelberg 1961) 52f.

\(^6\) Henrichs, citing the Favorinus but also adducing Schubart Abb. 52 (\textit{P.Ryl. II} 117, A.D. 269), which seems to me not so close as Abb. 48, and Abb. 90 (\textit{Iliad} 14, \textit{P.Berl. inv. 11910}), a literary hand of a rather different style, suggested a date of the end of the III century.

reinforced by the Robinson-Cologne roll, belongs the distinction of compelling a reassignment of Achilles Tatius from the V or VI century to a date no later than the middle of the II.

Four other papyri of Achilles Tatius have come to light, all later. The first to be recognized was *P. Oxy. X* 1250 (II') from a papyrus roll of the III (Schubart) or IV (Grenfell and Hunt) century, containing part of Book II chapters 2-3 and 7-9, to which now may be added *P. Oxy. LVI* 3837 (II') from the same roll, a fragment of Book VIII chapters 6-7. *P. Schub. 30* (II'), apparently lost, was a fragment of a papyrus codex dated to the III century, bearing lines from Book II chapters 2 and 14, now known only from Schubart's collation. *P. Oxy. VII* 1014 (II') from a IV-century roll, published originally as an unattributed historical fragment, was subsequently recognized by M. Gronewald to be a fragment of Book IV chapter 14. Now in the most recent volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* P. J. Parsons has published parts of three columns from a second roll (*P. Oxy. LVI* 3836, II) of Book III chapters 21-23 dated to the IV century, which though fragmentary overlaps an appreciable stretch of the text covered by the Robinson-Cologne papyrus. The papyri of Achilles Tatius now outnumber those of any other work of this genre, three from rolls, three from codices, and all from the late second through the fourth centuries.

Our scribe, despite the informality of his hand, wrote with commendable care. In only three instances was he guilty of uncorrected orthographical errors: χρησιμον at ii 5 (marked by a corrector with a slash in left margin), μηχανηματος at iii 30 and ροδοςις at iv 37 (in lines of which the left margin is not preserved); and one probable error (παρ' for γαρ at i 20) which may confirm a lucky emendation. For dative singular endings of first- and second-declension forms (though never internally) he writes *iota*-adscript correctly in 25 cases, omitting it in only four. He regularly writes a trema over initial *iota* and *upsilon* and the apostrophe as divider to separate double or cognate consonants (i 26, 30; ii 14; iii 1, 16, 41; iv 12, 30, 33, 43). Only once (ii 30) does he write -σσ- (with the codices) for Attic -ττ-. In the only two cases of short lines where the right margin is preserved (50 of 183 lines) he writes a space filler (ii 2, 4).

---

8 *Ein verkannter Papyrus des Achilleus Tatios,* ZPE 22 (1976) 14–17.
Insignificant orthographic alternatives and phonetically equivalent spellings are fairly frequent: there are eight instances of iotacism (i 19; ii 41; iii 6,9,19; iv 15,22,44), two of -ε- for -αε- (i 9; iv 6 with Π 5). Seven times ηu-movable is followed by a consonant (i 15,19; ii 1,32; iii 9,26; iv 4 with Π 5). Twice adjacent consonants are not assimilated (i 27, ii 2). Once the scribe writes scriptio plena where the codices show crasis (i 32), once he elides where the codices do not (i 44). All such deviations are common in the papyri and of course do not qualify as either errors or variants.

The text has received the attention of a corrector, but in what cases he is the original scribe or a diorthotes is difficult to determine. In the five instances where interlinear variants are written, three of the scribe's unique original readings point to the probably correct text (ii 4,11,27); in the other two (ii 12, iv 42) the corrector offers a better choice as reflected in the mediaeval codices (see commentary ad locc.). Beside three of these lines there is no marginal slash; at the remaining two the left margin is lost. In two cases the scribe, apparently, entered a variant reading above the line without further marks (ii 4,11). In two other cases (ii 12,27) the corrector encloses the variant between dots, in the prior instance offering the reading of all the codices, in the latter recording a false variant found in no other source. In the fifth case (iv 42) the scribe's unique and conceivably right syllable has been stricken through and surmounted by the vulgate reading but in the wrong case. In addition to the instance of error mentioned above (at ii 5), a corrector has marked with a marginal slash two lines containing a gap in the scribe's text: in the first case (ii 29) a space of about 9 letters is crossed by a horizontal stroke extending a preceding final sigma, though here the codices show no loss; the second (iii 5), where a gap of about 12 letters is left unfilled, is discussed below and in the commentary.

As usual, the text of Π 4 does not align itself with any one or any family of the mediaeval codices, for the earliest of these (W, Vat. Gr. 1349) is dated XII-century, and their hypothesized archetypes would have been copied some six centuries later than the papyrus. Generally the text of one or more of the

---

9 For a list of these and their assigned sigla (drawn from the edition of Ebbe Vilborg [Stockholm 1955] xv–xxxii) see infra at the beginning of the commentary.
codices agrees with that of the papyrus but none predominately so.\(^{10}\) In 63 cases not counting transpositions or obvious errors, however, no codex has preserved the reading of \(\Pi^4\), and in at least 41 of these the papyrus may well have the sounder text. In eight cases \(\Pi^4\) confirms an editor's conjecture (Commelini in *ed.pr.* at iii 32; Castiglione at i 20; Cobet at ii 4, iv 3 and iv 22; Wifstrand at ii 26; Hercher at iii 28; Jacobs at iii 42). Several times \(\Pi^4\) has an Attic form (ii 26, iii 1,6,7,8,16) or construction (ii 4, iv 1,39) where the vulgate substitutes a late or trivialized equivalent; at i 23, iii 19,27, iv 7,18,20 the papyrus has a rarer classical word, the codices a commoner and weaker. There are fourteen instances of transposed word order, for at least some of which the papyrus seems more classical.

In nine lines \(\Pi^4\) shows a longer lacuna than the vulgate text can fill: either a word or two had dropped out or, less likely, the scribe of \(\Pi^4\) had skipped a short space as at ii 29. The lines in question are i 12,24,25,37,44, iii 15 and iv 28–30. Conversely, in five lines (i 10,23,28 twice, iii 7 and iv 33) the lacunae appear too short to hold the received text. A larger omission occurs at ii 13–14, where the codices seem to have padded the text unnecessarily. From the supplements in the following transcription I have omitted as superfluous short words not required by the context. Otherwise, where context and lacuna space permit, the supplements generally retain the vulgate text of the Vilborg edition. Noteworthy exceptions occur at iii 24–25 (22.1) where editors print both the competing phrases καλὸς ὁ κίνδυνος (α\(\Phi\) and probably \(\Pi^4\)) and γλυκὺς ὁ θάνατος (β), though no manuscript has more than one; and at iii 14 (21.5), where the agreement of \(\Pi^4\) and \(\Pi^5\) in κάτεσιν confirms Henrichs' restoration of ἀναβαίνειν against the codices.

But the most striking contributions of the papyrus are those where it has a quite different text extending through two or three lines. One of these (iii 4–6, at 21.3), mentioned above, is a passage clearly corrupt in the codices, for which editors have

---

\(^{10}\) Where family \(\alpha\) stands alone, there are three agreements with \(\Pi^4\); family \(\beta\) alone, seven agreements; F (family φ) alone, none. Where families \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) agree against F, there are five agreements with \(\Pi^4\); but where family \(\alpha\) and F agree against \(\beta\), there are eleven; family \(\beta\), F, and \(\Pi^4\) agree only once against \(\alpha\). W and F together against both \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) share three readings with \(\Pi^4\). If later alignments are ignored, the family \(\alpha\) codices preserve 20 readings of \(\Pi^4\), family \(\beta\) 14, F 15. Once Commelini's *editio princeps* uniquely preserves a \(\Pi^4\) variant.
suggested a variety of unsatisfactory solutions. Unfortunately our scribe has interrupted his text with a space of some twelve letters, presumably because he could not read or did not trust his antegraph. In any case the incomplete text of \( \Pi^4 \) is nearer the truth than are the codices, and from it a persuasive emendation may emerge. The other notable cases are at \( \text{ii} 10-11 \) (20.1) where the papyrus' \( \delta \varepsilon \sigma o i n \alpha \) and distribution of verbs and participles give the better text; at \( \text{iii} 27-28 \) (22.2) where the codices have abbreviated and trivialized the text; at \( \text{iii} 32-34 \) (22.3) where \( \Pi^4 \) agrees with neither the codices nor \( \Pi^5 \); at \( \text{iv} 8-9 \) (23.3) where the first of three parallel cola was lost in the codices' archetype but may be confidently restored from \( \Pi^4 \); and at \( \text{iv} 18-21 \) (24.1) where the text of \( \Pi^4 \) is more graphic and doubtless right. In the second and third of these passages lacunae impede a restoration, but in all of them the papyrus promises a sounder, more precise and vivid text than the vulgate.

For the first time we have a rare opportunity to collate two ancient copies of a significant amount of text. While \( \Pi^4 \) and \( \Pi^5 \) agree with each other and with all the mediaeval manuscripts nineteen times, once (\( \text{iii} 20 \)) they agree with \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) against \( F \), twice they share insignificant orthographical features (\( \eta u m o v a b l e \) before consonant, \( -\varepsilon - \) for \( -\alpha - \)) against all codices, and only once do they agree in a right reading (\( \kappa \alpha t e \sigma i n \) at \( \text{iii} 14 \)) against all codices. \( \Pi^4 \) opposes \( \Pi^5 \) nine times: once \( \Pi^4 \) agrees with the codices against \( \Pi^5 \) (\( \text{iii} 22 \)); once (at \( \text{iv} 6 \)) \( \Pi^4 \) agrees with \( \beta \) (though transposed) where \( \Pi^5 \) agrees with \( \alpha \) and \( F \); once \( \Pi^4 \) has \( \kappa \alpha i \) (\( \text{iv} 5 \)) where \( \Pi^5 \) with \( \alpha \) and \( F \) have \( \delta \varepsilon \) and \( \beta \) is asyndetic; and once \( \Pi^4 \) reads \( \delta \eta \) (\( \text{iv} 7 \)), \( \Pi^5 \) reads \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \omega \nu \), and the codices simply \( \omega \nu \). Four times \( \Pi^4 \) stands alone against \( \Pi^5 \) and the codices (\( \text{iii} 15,20, \text{iv} 1, \) and \( \text{iv} 3 \) confirming a Cobet conjecture), in all of which \( \Pi^4 \) is probably right. In only one passage (22.3) does each of the three sources have a markedly different text from one another. The codices, in some disarray, have lost a few words here, and \( \Pi^4 \) (at \( \text{iii} 32-34 \)) and \( \Pi^5 \) (at col. ii lines 12-16) are both too lacunose to provide a solution or help for each other. In any case it is clear that the two papyri, while occasionally differing from each other, are closer to the author's original than the archetype of the codices. Of the two, \( \Pi^4 \) more often has the sounder text. Altogether, where variants occur its style is more precise, clearer and more classical than that of the vulgate.

For details of these variants the reader is referred not only to the line-by-line commentary following the text but also to
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Henrichs' excellent notes on that portion of Π₄ available to him in 1968 (n.1 supra) and Parson's on Π₅ in The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LVI (1989) pp.64–66.

TEXT

P.Rob. inv. 35 + P.Köln inv. 901 [= Π₄]
(The text of P.Köln is underlined, that of P.Rob. is not.)

[ἐγὼ δὲ ἀνδρας ἰδὼν] 3.17.2

col. i

1 [έκ παραλόγου ζώντας καὶ φίλους οὕτε περιεπτυξάμην [οὕτε]
[ἐξεξπλάγην ὑπ' ἡδονής τοσοῦτον ἡ λύπη τής συμφορᾶς μὲ]
[ἐξεκώφησε. λαμβάνοντα δή μου τῆς] δεξιᾶς καὶ ἀφαιρεῖ[θα]ια 3
[ἐπεχείρουν τὸ ξίφος. ἐγὼ δέ, Πρὸς θεῶν.] μή μοι φθονήσῃ τεθανά-
5 [τοῦ καλοῦ, ἐφη, μᾶλλον δὲ φαρμάκου τῶν] καμιῶν· οὐδὲ [γ]ἀρ
ζῆν ἐτι
[δύναμαι, καὶ ἕαν νῦν με βιάσησθε, τῆς Ἀ]ευκίππης [οὗ]τος ἀνήρ-
[μένης. τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ἀφαιρήσεσθε μ]ου τὸ ξίφος, τ]οῦ δὲ τῆς ἐμῆς 4
[λύπης ξίφος ἔνδον καταπεπήγα καὶ τ]έμεινε κατ' ὀλίγον τὴν ψυ-
[χὴν. ἀθανάτω ἀφαγη ἀποθήκης] με βουλεύθαι ἀεὶ; λέγει
10 [Μενέλαος. Άλλ' εἰ διὰ τοῦτο θέλεις ἄπολθανείν, ὡρα σοι τὸ ξίφος]
[ἐπισχεῖν. Λευκίππη δὲ σοι ἀναβιώσεται. βλέψας ο[ὐ]ν πρ[ὸς] ζ αὐτ[ῶν],
["Ετι μου καταγελάς, ἐφην, ἐπὶ τ]ηλικούτω] κακῶι; εὖ
[γε, Μενέλαε, ξενίου μέμνησας Διός.] ὡ δὲ κρούσας τὴν σορὸν,
["Επεῖ τοινύν ἀπιστεί Κλειτοφῶν.] ἐφ[η]! μοι, Λευκίππη, μορτ-
15 [ρον εἰ ζής. ἕαν δὲ εἰ]πε καὶ δις μου καὶ τρις ἐπάταξεν τὴν
[σορὸν, καὶ κάτωθι φῶν]ής ἀκούσα καὶ πάνυ λεπτῆς, τρόμος
[ὁν εὐθὺς ἴσχε με καὶ πρ]ὸς τὸν Μενέλαο[ν] ἀπέβλεπον, μέγαν
[ἐναι δοκῶ. δὲ ἢ]νι]μον ἕμα τὴν σορὸν καὶ ἡ Λευκίππη
cάτω-
20 [θεν ἀνέβα]ινεν, φ[ο][β][ερ]ον θέαμα, ὡ θεοί, κ[αὶ] φρεικο-
[δέστα]ιον.] 6
25 [ἐπι-]
[pεσόνσα δὲ] περιπλέκεται μοι καὶ συνεφ[υ]μεν καὶ ἀμφο
κ[ατεπε]-
[σομεν. Μό]λις οὖν ἀναζωπυρήσας λέγω [πρ]ὸς τὸν Μενέλ[αον].] 7
P. Rob. inv. 35 + P. Köln inv. 901, columns i and ii

(reduced to 55%)
PLATE 2  WILLIS

P. Rob. inv. 35 +
P. Köln inv. 901

col. iii

P. ROB. INV. 35 + P. Köln INV. 901, COLUMN iii
(reduced to 64%)
P. ROB. INV. 35 + P. KÖLN INV. 901, COLUMN IV
(reduced to 64%)
PLATE 4

WILLIS

P. Rob. inv. 35e

P. Rob. inv. 35 + P. Köln inv. 901, column v

(actual size)
WILLIAM H. WILLIS

18.1

[Οὐκ]

[ἐρεῖς μοι τῇ ταύτῃ; οὐχὶ Λευκίππης ππην βλέπω; [οὐ κρατῶ καὶ ἁ[κο]ῶν
[λαλούσης; ἡ ὁν χθές ἑθεασάμην, τί]να ἕν; ἥ γάρ] ्

18.2

[ἡ ταυτα άλλ' ἑδοὺ καὶ φίλημα ἀληθινὸν καὶ ζῶν]ν ἑκείνῳ τε

18.3

[κύππης γυν. Ἄλλαν νῦν μὲν, ὁ Μενέλαος ἥφη, καὶ] τὰ

18.4

[ἀπολήψει καὶ τὰ στέρνα σ]υνή[σεται, καὶ αὐτὴν ἄτρωτον

18.5

[ἐπικάλυψαι τὸ πρόσωπον; καλὸ γ]άρ τη[ν Ἐκάτην ἐπὶ τὸ] ἔργον.

18.6

[δὲ πιστεύσας ἐνεκαλυψάμην]ν. ὅ δὲ ἀ[ρχεται τερατεύ]σθαι καὶ

18.7

[γον τινὰ καταλέγειν. ἄμ]μα λέγουν περ[ιαρέ]ὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ γαστρὶ

18.8


18.9

[λέγει δὲ μοι, Ἀποκ]άλυψαι, καὶ ἐ[γὼ μόλις καὶ φοβούμε]νος

18.10

[ἀληθῶς

18.11

[ἀπὸ ὅμη]ν τὴν Ἐκάτην παρεῖναι[ι], ὦμος δ' οὐν ἀπέστη[σα]σα τῶν

18.12

[ὁφαλ-]

18.13

[μῶν τὰς χεῖρας κ]αὶ ὀλόκληρον Λευκί[ππην ὁρῶν. ἔτι μᾶλλον]

18.14

[οὐν]

18.15

[ἐκπλαγεῖς ἐδεό]μην Μενελάοις λέγ[χον, Ἡ ὀμίτατε Μενέλαε, εἰ]

18.16

[διάκο]-

18.17

[νός τις εἰ θεόν, δ]έσομαι σου ποί γής ε]μι καὶ τί ποτε ταύτα]

18.18

[ὁρῶν; καὶ ἡ Λευκίππη]ν, Παυόσαι, ἔφη, Μενέλαις[ες, δ]εδιώκομεν[ος]

18.19

[ἀυτόν. λέγει δὲ πῶς τῶν ληστῶν ἤπατησας, λέγει οὖν ὁ]

18.20

[Μενέ[λα]ς]-

18.21

[ος. Οἰδᾶς ὡς Αἰγάπη]τιος εἰμὶ τὸ γένος; φθανὼ γὰρ σοι τοῦτο εἰπὼν

18.22

[ἐπὶ τῆς νεός, ἥν οὐν] μοι τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν κεφαλῶν περὶ ταύτην

18.23

[τὴν κόμην καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῆς γνώριμοι]ν. ἔπει[ι οὖν τῇ]

18.24

[ναυα]-

18.25

[γίαι περιπέπεσομεν, εἰ]τα[ε με προσε[ρ]ψε τὸ κύμα τοι[ς τῆς Αἰγά]-

18.26

[πτου παραλίοις, λαμβ[α]νομαι μετ[ά Σιατυρου προ[δ]ς τῶν ταύτων]

18.27

[παραφυλαττό]ντων λῆς[τῶν] ὡς δὲ ἔγομαι π[ρὸς τῶν]

18.28

[λήσταρ]
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col. ii

1 [xo]v. τοστι με τον ληστιν τινες γνωρίσαν[τες λύουσι]\ιν μου τα δεσμα θαρρειν τε ἐκέλευνοι και συντονειν [αυτοις], ός ἢν ει- γειον, ἔξατούμει δι και τον Σάτυρον ὡς ἐμὸν οἰκέτην, οἱ δὲ.

3 'Αλλ' ὀ-

4 πος, ἔφεσαν, ἐπείδειξεναι ἠμιν πρῶτον τολμηρόν τι σαυτοι, κάν γ/ τούτω χρήσιμον ἱγονοι κόρην καταβδ[αι] και καθήκου τὸ ληστήριον και τοῦ μὴν ἡπατος ἀπογεύσασθαι[α], τὸ δὲ λαν- πὸν σῶμα σορῷ παραδόντας ἀναχωρεῖν, ός ἢν τὸ τῶν ἐναντί- 
ων στρατόπεδον ὑπερβάλλοι τῆς θυσίας τὸν τόπον. λέγε δὴ τὰ ἐπί- λοιπα. Σάτυρο- ὃ σὸς γὰρ ἐντεύθεν λόγος, καὶ ὁ Σάτυρος λέγει-

20.1

5 δὲ ἐβαδίζομεν ἐπὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον ἐκλαίοιν, ὁ δὲ δέσποινα, καὶ ὁ[δ]υ-

2 ἱς/ Λευκίππης πυθόμενος και δεόμενος Μενελ[ά]- 

3 συνήρησεν. ἐτύχομεν τῇ [προτέραι τῆς θύσιας ἡμέρᾳ καθ[εζό]- 

4 μενοι τῇ θαλάττῃ περί τοῦ[των σκοπού[ν]τες. τῶν δὲ ληστῶν 

5 τινὲς νἀν ἱδόντες ἄγνοιαν πλανηθέοιο, ἄρμησαν ἐπὶ αὐτὴν.


[ἐλαυ]μέν 

3 νειν εἰς τούπισω· ὡς δὲ φθέ[νου]σιν αὐτοῦς οἱ λησταί 

καταλαβόν] 

4 τες, πρὸς ἀμυναν τρέπονται, καὶ γὰρ της ἐν [αὐτοις τῶν τὰ] 

'Ομηροῦ τοι σ[τ]όματι δεικνύοντας ἐν τοῖς [θεάτροις δὲν ἐπὶ]

τῆς νέως τῆς Ὀμηρίκην σκεύην ὁπλισάμενος ἐν ὡς τούτος και 

τ[ι]ους ἀλμα' αὐτῶν οὐτω σκευᾶσας ἐπεχ[εριουν μάχεσθαι. πρὸς δὲ 

[μὲν αὐ]τοῦ πρῶτως ἐπελθόντας καὶ μ[άλα ἐρρομένως] 

ἀντετάξατιηντο] πλειόνων δὲ ἐπιπλευσάσθ[ων σκαφῶν ληστρι]- 

[κώ]ν καταδύουσι τὴν ναῦν καὶ τοὺς ἄν[δρας ἐμπέσοντας] 

20 [ά]νήρουν. λανθάνει δὴ κίστη της ἐκτραπ[είας τοῦ ναυαγίω] 

4 καὶ καθ' ἡμᾶς τοῦ ῥώ[οι ρόπρω-/ κοιμθείσα καὶ] ἥν ο Μενέ-

5 λαος ἄναι]- 

[πε]ί[ται, καὶ ἀναχωρήσας ποι παρόντος ἀ[μα κάμοδ (προσεδόκα γάρ τι] 

[σπ]ουδαίον ἐνδον εἶναι] ἀνοίγει τῆν κιστήν, καὶ ὀρῶμεν 

χλαμύδα]
καὶ ἐξήραζον, τὴν μὲν κόψην ἔχον τὸ μήκος ὡς οὖν παλαιότερον

30 τὸ σάρων, τὸν δὲ σίδηρον ἐπὶ [τῇ κόψῃ βραχύτατον,

δακτύλων]

ὦσιν οὐ πλεῖό τρίῳ. ὡς δὲ ἄνελόμενος τὸ ξίφος ὁ Μενέλαος

ἐλα] -

θεν μεταστρέψας κατὰ τὸ τοῦ σίδηρου μέρος, τὸ μικρὸν ἐκεῖ-

νο ξίφος ὄσπερ [άπο χρήσευμο] τῆς κόψης ὡς οὖν κατατρέξῃ τοσοῦ-

τον εἰχὲν ἡ κόψη τὸ μέγεθος. [ὡς δὲ ἀνέστρεψας εἰς τοῦμ]παλίν,

αὖθις ὁ σίδηρος εἰς[σω κ]ατεδύετο. [τούτωι δ'] ἄρα ὡς εἰκὼς ὁ

κακ] ὁδαίμων


Λέγω [ὑμῖν] πρὸς [τὸν] Μενέλαον, Θ[έου ἡμῖν, ἃν θέλῃς νῦν

χ]ρηστός

[γενεῦθαι, συναγωνίσεται. δυν]ηθε[όμεθα γὰρ καὶ] τὴν κόρ[ὴν

ἑοῦσαι]

[kαὶ τοὺς ληστὰς λαθεῖν, ἀκούσον δὲ ποιῶ τρόπ]ων· δέρμ[α

προβάτου].

21.1

[λαβόντες ὡς ὅτι βαδινώτατον συνράψωμεν εἰς σχῆμα β]αλαντίον,

[μέ]-

[τρον ὡς σαντρός ἀνθρωπίνης, εἰτα ἐμπλήσαστες θ]ηρίων

σπ[λάγ]-

[χνων καὶ αὖματος τὴν πλαστὴν ταύτην γαστέρα] ράψωμεν, [ὡς

μή]

col. iii

1 ἕν[α]ν] τὰ σπλάγχνα διαπίπτοι, καὶ ἐνσκευάσσαντες[ς τῇ κόρη]

tούτοι[ν τὸν τρόπον καὶ στολὴν ἐξωθήν περιβαλλόμενες μίτραις]

te κα[ὶ ξ]ώμασιν ἐνδεδεμένην τὴν σκευὴν ταυτὴν [ἐπικρύψαμεν.]

4 π[άντ]ως δὲ καὶ ὁ χρησιμός ἡμῖν εἰς τὸ λαθεῖν χρήσιμος[ς· ὁ μὲν

γάρ]

/ αὐτὴν ε ῥατα μενε στολὴ διὰ ταύτην ἀνάτμη[θηναί μέσης]

λέγει. ὥρας δὲ τούτῳ τὸ ξίφος ἃς ἔχει μηχανής· ἄν γὰρ ἔριζη τις

ἐπὶ τινος]

5 σώματος φεύγει πρὸς τὴν κόψην ὡσπερ εἰς κολεόν· κα[ὶ οἱ μὲν

δοκοῦσι βε]-

βαπτίζοι τὸν σίδηρον κατὰ τὸ σώματος· ὃ δὲ εἰς τὸν χραμ[ὸν

τῆς]

κόψης ἀνέθεσαν, μόνην δὲ καταλάιπει τὴν αἰχμήν, ὃ[σον τὴν πλα]-

στὴν γαστέρα ταύτη[ν]υ τεμείν καὶ τὴν κόψην ἐν χρό τοῦ

σφαξ[ιομέ].
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νο[υ τ]υχείν· καὶ [ἀποσπάσῃ] της τῶν σίδηρων ἐκ τοῦ τραύματος[ς, κατά]·
πε[ί π]άλιν ἐκ τοῦ [χειραμοῦ τὸ] ἐξίφος ὀσον τῆς κόπτης
ἀνακο[ωπίζει].
ταύ τ[ὸ μετέωρον καὶ τὸν αὐ]τὸν τρόπον τοὺς ὀρῶντας ἀπατ[舭ι·
δοκεῖ]
γὰρ τ[ὸσοφότον ἀναβαίνειν ε']κ τῆς σφαγῆς· ὃσον κάτεισιν ἐκ τῆς[ς]
μυχ[ανῆς· τούτων ὄν ὡτ]ῶς γενομένων οὐκ ἐν ἰδοιεν όι]
λησ[ται]
τὴν [τέχνην· τὰ π]ερὶ δέρματα[α ἀποκεκρύβεται τὰ τε
σπλάγχνα την]·
[σφαγῆ προπηθήσεται, ἀ]περ [ἡ]μεῖς ἢξελ[όγισες ἐπὶ τοῖς β]ωμῶι
θόσο]-
[μεν. καὶ τὸ ἐντεύθεν]ν οὐκέτι προσίσασιν οἱ λησταὶ τοῦ σώματι,[ατι,
ἀλλ']
[eἰς τὴν σορὼν καταθήσοπ]μεν· ἀκήκας δὴ τοῦ ληστάρχου μεῖκ[ραὶ
πρόσθεν]
[εἰπόντος, δεῖν τι τολμ]ηρότατον ἐπιδείξασθαι πρὸς αὐτ[ός· ὡ]στε]
[ἐστὶ σοι προσέλθει]ν αὐτῷ καὶ ὑποσχάσθαι ταύτην τὴν
ε[πιδείξιν]·
[ταῦτα λέγων ἔ]δε[ι]μυν Δία Ξένιον καλὸν καὶ κοινῆς
[ἀναμμηνή]-
[σκο[ν καὶ χρηστής τ]ραπέζ[ης καὶ κοινῆς ναυά[γιας· ὁ δὲ χρηστός
οὐσίς,] 22.1
[Mέγα μὲν, ἐφι, τὸ ἔρ]γον ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ φίλου κἂν ἀποθανεῖν κα[λὸς
ὅ]
[κίνδυνος. Νομίζω δ]ῆ, ἐφιν, ζῆν καὶ Κλειτ[όφωντα· ἢ [ἀγα κόρη
πυθό]-]
[μένωι μοι καταλιπεῖν αὐ]τὸν εἰπὲν παρὰ τοῖς ἐαλωκόσι τ[ῶν
ληστῶν δε]-
[δεμένων· .... τὸν λήστα]χον πάντας διεκπαίδευσι ζόντας τ[]
[ο]στε ἀ]ποκείσθησαί σοι παρ’ αὐτῶι χάρις καὶ
[μα] 2
[ἐλεήσαι κόρην ἀθλίαν ἐκ τοσοῦτοι] κακοῦ. ταῦτα λέγων πείθω,
[καὶ συν]-
3
[ἐπραξὲν ἡ Τύχη. ἔγω μὲν οὖν περὶ τ]ὴν τοῦ μυχαν(ή[μ]ι]ατος ἦν
σκε[υήν]
[ἐρτι δὲ Μενελάου μέλλοντος τοῖς] λησταῖς περὶ τῆς θυσίας
[λέγειν.]
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[the Λευκίππε]πτην ἐμὸν διεστότην, τοῦτον ἐκ π[άντων κατέσχεν ἧ]
[θαλαττα]ς. ἔνα[ς] μὴ τὴν ὑπερήν [μόνον ἀπολέσῃ, ἄλλα καὶ τὴν]
[τοι[άθη]. ὁ] [θαλα]τ[α] τα ἀγνώμων, ἐφθ[ό]νεος [ἡμ[ίν ἀλοκλήρου]]
[τοῦ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας οὖν δράματος[ς]. ἀπεί[ρ]ν τοῦ εἰς τὸ στρα-
[τόπεδον κ]οινὴ καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς [τῆς ἡμῆς εἰς] ὑπ[αρξ]εῖντες]
[τὸ λοιπὸν] τῆς νυκτὸς διετρείψαμεν· [καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα οὐκ ἔλαβε]
[τοὺς πολλοὺς, ἀμ[ὰ] δὲ ἐφ τοῦ στρατηγῶι τὸν Μενέλαον
ἀγω]
[καὶ τὸ πῶν καταλέγω. ο ὤ δὲ συνήδετο καὶ τὸν Μενέλαον
ποιεῖ]-
[τα] [φίλον, καὶ] πυνθάνεται πόση τις εἰ[ὴν δύ[ναμις τοὺς ἕναν]-
[μη] [ἀν[δρὸ]ν ἀπ' ο[ν]θ[έ]νων καὶ πολὺ συνερρυκ[ε]ναι
μο[ς] ὣς εἰναι περὶ μυ[ρίους. λέγει οὖν ὁ στρατηγός, 'Αλλ' ἡ[μίν 2]
ἀφί[ξ]όν-
Δέλτ[ὰ]
καὶ τὴν Ἡλίου πόλιν τεταγμέ[νων ἐ]πὶ τοῖς βαρβάροις. καὶ ἀμα
[λέ]-

[γον]το[ς αὐ[τὸ] παῖς εἰστ[έ]χει τ[ις], λέγον ἀπὸ τοῦ Δέλτα
πρόδρομ[ον]
[ρὼν δι]ατριβέ[ν] [τοὺς διαχιλίοις· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ βαρβάρους[ς]
[τοὺς κατατρέχοντας] πεπαδ[σ]θαι, μελλούσης δὲ ἢκειν [τῆς]
[δυνάμεως τὸν ὄριν κ]αὶ τοῖς ἑρέθην ἐπιδεδημη[σα],]
[σέροντα τοῦ πατρὸς]
[τὴν ταφὴν]· ἀνάγκη δὴ πᾶσ[α τὴν]
[ἐξοδον ἐπισχεῖν τοσοῦτον ἡμερά[ν]. Καὶ τὶς ὄρνις οὗτος [ὁμιλο]-
[τα] [τοσαυτής, ἐφ[
[φ]ν, τιμὴς ἥξισται; πο[ὶ]αν δὲ καὶ κομίζει τα[φήν;]
[Φοι]-
[νις τὸ μὲν ὄνομα, τὸ δὲ γένος Αἰθίω[ν], μέγεθος κατὰ τα[
[να. ἤ] τῆι]
[χροιά τῶς ἐν κάλλει δεύτερος. κ]εκέρασται μὲν τὰ πτ[ερά]
χρυσάοι]

[καὶ πο]ρο[ύραι, αὐ[χ ε] δὲ τὸν Ἡλίου δ]εποτήν, καὶ ἢ κ[εφαλὴ]
μαρτ]υρι]-
[τοῦ κύκλου στέφανος εἰκόν. κυ][άνεός ἐστιν, ρόδο[ς] ἐμφερή[ς,]
ἐδει]-

με].
COMMENTARY

In the following notes the text of Π⁴ is collated with codices cited in the Vilborg edition as follows:

Family α:

W (Vaticanus gr. 1349), XII cent.
M (Marcianus gr. 409), XIII cent. (or earlier?)
A (Anglicanus 16 D.xviii), XVI cent. (copied from M)
D (Vaticanus gr. 914), XIV cent. (excerpts)

Family β:

V (Vaticanus gr. 114), XIII cent.
R (Vaticanus gr. 1348), XVI cent.
E (Ambrosianus gr. 394), XV(I) cent.
ε = R and E when in agreement
G (Marcianus gr. 607), XV cent.

Family φ:

F (Laurentianus conv.soppr. 627), XIII cent.
col. i [17.2–19.2]

1. καὶ del. Cobet

2. ἡ τῆς συμφορᾶς Π⁴: λύπη με τῆς συμφορᾶς codd.: με om. G. Π⁴ has room for με at the end of the line, which would be short without it.

3. ἐξεκώφησε Hemsterhuis: ἐξεκώφισε codd.: ἐξεκώφωσε Salmasius

3–4. καὶ ἀφαιρεῖ[σθα]ι [ἐπεχείρουν τὸ ξίφος or τὸ ξίφος ἐπεχείρουν Π⁴: καὶ τὸ ξίφος ἐπεχείρουν ἀφαιρεῖθαι G: καὶ ἐπεχείρουν ἀφαιρεῖθαι τὸ ξίφος rell., Vilborg

4–5. θανάτου καλοῦ rell.: τοῦ καλοῦ F

5. The lacuna of line 4 will not accommodate the text of the codices, while that of line 5 requires a short additional word. I have therefore transposed ἐφην from its position in line 4 after θεῶν in the codices to line 5 after καλοῦ.

6. καὶ ἐὰν script.plen. Π⁴?: κἀν codd. Even so the received text lacks 4–5 letters of filling the lacuna; I therefore insert τῆς before Λευκίππης. || βιάζεσθε G: βιάσησθε rell.

7–8. τὸ δὲ τῆς ἐμῆς λύπης ξίφος om. M

8. καταστέησε G: καταστέησε rell.

8–9. τ]έμνει κατ’ ὀλίγον τὴν ψυ[χήν Π⁴ recte: τὴν ψυχὴν om. codd. omn.: τεμεί μετ’ ὀλίγον Schmidt

9. ἄρ’ ante ἀθανάτω Nabers || βούλεσθαι ἀεὶ Π⁴: βούλεσθε codd. No doubt -αι for -ε, phonetically equivalent; I take ἀεὶ to modify ἀποθησκεῖν.

10. οὐν ὁ Μενέλαος codd. Since the lacuna is 3–4 letters too short for the received text, I omit οὖν ὁ as the least essential words.

11. σοὶ ἀναβιώσεται M R: σοι νῦν ἀναβιώσεται rell. The lacuna will scarcely accommodate νῦν. || πρὸς Π⁴α F: εἰς β || The final letter visible in the line is tau, which would entail a highly unusual word division. But to its lower right a small triangle of surface is lost, possibly (though doubtfully) enough to have accommodated ov; or the scribe may have neglected to complete the final syllable in a line already full.

12. The lacuna requires a space or word of about 5–6 letters not preserved in the codices, possibly an adjective modifying μου: cf. Cruceius' translation (1554), “tantis (confictatum) malis irrdes.”

13. A short line; perhaps a word of 3–5 letters in the lacuna was lost.
14. ἀπιστεῖς F : ἀπιστεῖ rell. || ἔφις[η] μοι Π 4 : ἔφη σῦ μοι codd. The small second lacuna has no space for σῦ; it might have been written above the line or in the first lacuna just before ἔφη.
15. μοι Π 4 : του codd. || τρῖς VE F : τρεῖς αG || ἑπάταξεν Π 4 : ἑπάταξε codd.
16. κάτωθεν φωνῆς ἀκούω καὶ πάνω Π 4 : κάτωθεν ἀκούω φωνῆς πάνω codd.
17. εἴκε G : ἵσχε rell. || ἀπεβλέπον Π 4 α : ἀπεβλέπον F : ἠβλέπον β
18–19. ἦνοιγεν (μου add. ᾽W) καὶ ἀνέβαινε Β ε mediiis omissis: ἀνέβατι)νεν Π 4 alone, which otherwise supports the β tradition.
19. φρεικωδέστα[ Π 4 : φρικωδέστατον codd.
20. παρ’ αὐτῆς ἡ γαστήρ ἄπασα Π 4 : αὐτῆς ἡ γαστήρ πάσα codd. : ἡ γαστήρ αὐτῆς πάσα F : (γὰρ) αὐτῆς Castiglioni, apparently supported by the papyrus’ error παρ’ ἐντέρω G: ἐντέρω rell.
22. βλέπο Π 4 : ὡρῶ codd. || Λευκίππην κρατῶ; ταύτης οὖκ (?) ὡρὸ transp. G || ante οὗ κρατῶ hab. α F ταύτην, β ταύτης : om. Π 4 || οὗ post καὶ add. ᾽M
24. Spacing of the fragments requires a word of ca 4 letters between γὰρ and ἐκείνα. ἐνύπνια here, though apparently too long, would provide more idiomatic word order, but its transposition would require a word of similar length in line 25.
25. ταύτα ἐνύπνια codd. For the lacuna of Π 4, see the preceding note.
25–26. ξῶν ἐκείνο τε Λευκ[κίπης Π 4 : ζῶν ως κάκεινο το τῆς Λευκίπης β, τῆς om. αF. The τε of the papyrus and apparent omission of ως make the awkward text of the codices even more difficult. One must suppose either an error or a substantially different text in the preceding and following lacunae. The papyrus’ ΤΕΛΕΥ may be part of τελευτᾶω or a derivative, in antithesis to ζῶν.
26. Ἄλλα νῦν μὲν ὁ Μενέλαος ἔφη ᾽M : μὲν om. rell. The length of the lacuna requires at least μὲν, preferably an even longer supplement.
27. στέρνα α β : στέρεα Φ || τυφ[ Π4 : συμφόρεται codd. || καὶ ἀτρωτον δυνεί codd. Both the sense and the lacuna require supplement, for which I suggest αὐτὴν preceding ἀτρωτον.

28. ἀναφαίνω post δυνεί add. G || ἀλλ' ἐπικάλυψαι σου τὸ πρόσοπον codd. Since the lacuna requires a shorter text, I omit ἀλλ' and σου as least essential.

29. ταίῳ συντρόποι codd. : ταίῳ συντρόποι Hercher, for which the lacuna allows no room. γὰρ post ταίῳ G || τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ γαστρὶ μαγ' [γανεύματα Π4 recte : τὰ μαγανεύματα τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ γαστρὶ codd.

30. την αντε Λευκίκηνν add. codd. : om. Π4

31. τού ἀντε Μενελάου VG

32. δὲ β : om. α F : τε Hercher || καὶ ε[γ]ω Π4 : καγω codd. || The codices’ text is too long for the second lacuna; I therefore omit μὲν after μόλις.

33. ἀπέστησα codd. : ἀπέσπασα Mehler

34. τὴν αντε Λευκίκηνν add. codd. : om. Π4

35. τοῦ ἀντε Μενελάου VG

36. θεόν G Vmg Rmg : om. cett. || ποί Π4 α V ε F : τΗ G : ποῦ Jacobs || τῇ ποτε α F : τΙ β : τίνα ποτὲ Cobet || At the right margin the papyrus preserves two elongated strokes not characteristic of a letter in this hand; possibly it is an irregular extension of a final sigma. The lacuna would accommodate an additional word not preserved in the codices.

37. λέγε δὲ α F : ἀλλ' ἡδή λέγε β || λέγει οὖν ὁ Μενέ[λαος Π4 : ὁ οὖν Μενέλαος λέγει codd.

38. τοῦτο Π4 : ταῦτα codd.

39. σὺν μοὶ Π4 refl. : μοι οὖν F

40. κώμην refl. : πόλιν V || οὖν refl. : γοῦν G

41-42. ναυαγία refl. : ναυμαχία E

42. περιπετέσσαμεν β F : περιπέτεσσαμεν α || προσέρρυψε codd. : προσε[...]ε Π4, presumably failing to double the rho || τῆς om. G

43. τοῦ Σατύρου refl. : τοῦ om. Π4 GF || ταύτην codd. : ταῦτη Jacobs

44. The traditional text lacks 5–8 letters of filling the lacuna required to account for the vertical alignment of the syllables surviving from lines 43 and 44. Vilborg (comm. ad loc.) suggested τὴν κώμην or τὴν χώραν only to reject them, but one of these probably stood here. || παραφυλαττόντων W F : παραφυλασσόντων M : φυλασσόντων β || δ' Π4 : δὲ codd. || ἀγομαι Π4, cett. : ἔρχομαι F
col. ii [19.2–21.2]

2. συνπονεῖν Π⁴: συμπονεῖν codd.
3. δὴ om. VE || εἰμὸν οἰκέτην Π⁴: οἰκέτην om. codd.
3–4. ὅπως Π⁴, Cobet: ὁμως codd. The papyrus thus vindicates the conjecture of Cobet, who proposed also to read ἐπιδείξεις in line 4, the Attic construction (independent ὅπως + fut. indic.) equivalent to an imperative (Smyth 2213), as at 6.4.2.23 and 6.13.3.1. But the scribe of Π⁴ uniquely wrote ἐπιδείξειν, above the final syllable of which the same hand (apparently) wrote the alternative ending -ατ, whether as aorist active infinitive (so WF) or aorist middle imperative (so M). Presumably the latter interpretation gave rise to the ἐπιδείξον of the β family. With the early loss of the future tense, the now useless ὅπως was 'corrected' to ὁμως as all the codices attest.

4. ἔφασαν αGF : ἔφηςαν V e || ἐπιδείξειν Π⁴ a.c., \α\ / p.c. : ἐπιδείξεις Cobet: ἐπίδειξαι M : ἐπιδείξαι WF : ἐπιδείξαν β || τρόπον τολμηρόν τι σαυτοῦ Π⁴: σεαυτόν (σαυτῶν F) τολμηρόν τρότον codd.

5. Lacunam post τούτου conj. Cobet || κρήσιμον Π⁴ vitiose: κρησμὸν codd. || καθαραι Π⁴, rell. : καθηραι GF. A slanting stroke in the left margin marks the line as containing the error κρησμ(υ)ον. Cf. ii 29 and iii 5 and notes ad locc.

6. καὶ om. W

7. σορῷ om. β || ἀναχωρεῖν Π⁴ rell. : ἀναχωρῆσαι F

8. ὑπερβάλλου Π⁴WF: ὑπερβάλη MVR : ὑπερβάλη E G || τὸν τόπον Π⁴ A : τὸν τρόπον α F : ὁ τρόπος β : τὸ ἄτοπον Jacobs

9. ὁ σὸς γὰρ ἐντεύθεν λόγος Π⁴ : σὸς γὰρ ἐντεύθεν ὁ λόγος codd.

10. δὲ Π⁴, codd. : δὴ Richards || ἐβαδίζομεν Π⁴ recte: βιαζόμενος codd. || ἔκλαιον Π⁴WF : (καὶ) ἔκλαιον Koenen (ap. Henrichs) : ἔκλαιον M β || δέσποινα Π⁴: δέσποτα codd. Satyros here addresses not Clitophon but Leucippe, who is not only present but it is she who has requested this long edification. Hence here addresses not Clitophon but Leucippe, who is not only present but it is she who has requested this long account for Clitophon's edification.


tween dots immediately above the *omega*; cf. line 26 *infra* and note.

13. **προτέρα** α : **προτεραία** β F, Vilborg. The length of lacuna supports the reading of the α group.

13–14. καθ[εξε]μενοι τήν θαλαττήν περί τού[των σκοπούν]τες Π4 : καθεζομενοι πρός τήν θαλάττην (θαλάσση β) λυπούμενοι καὶ περὶ τοῦτων σκοποῦντες α F. Here the codices appear to have padded the text.

15. **ιδοντες** Π4 || πλανηθείσαιν rell. : πλέουσαν F || *ἐπ* cett. : ἐς F

16. νεώς Π4, α F : νηδός β

17. φθά[νου]σιν αύτούς Π4 : αύτούς om. codd.

18–20. ἢν ποστ αὐτοῖς add. codd. || τὰ Ἄμηρου cett. : τὰ τοῦ Ὄμηρου Μ || τῶι στόματι Π4, codd. : secl. Mitscherlich : τῶι σχήματι Berger || [ca 6] τῆς νεώς Π4, om. codd. Accepting the codices’ ἢν after αὐτοῖς in line 18, Cobet added ὅν after Ὄμηρην to rationalize the two apparently paratactic but asyndetic clauses. As it stands, the received text is ungrammatical. Before τῆς νεώς one should expect *ἐπι* ἢ. To fill the lacuna and rectify the grammar, I suggest ὅν following θεατρος (without punctuation), replacing the codices’ ἢν (line 18) and obviating the need for Cobet’s *οὖν*.


22. πρῶτος EG : πρῶτος rell.

25. τις ἐκτραπέσαις Π4 : ἐκτραπεσία τις codd. || τῶι ναυαγών [Π4], codd., to be construed with ἐκτραπεσία, not with κοµιοθεία as by some editors. The lacuna does not afford room for Wifstrand’s insertion of *ἐν* before τῶι ναυαγών.

26. καὶ καθ’ ἤµᾶς Π4, confirming Wifstrand’s addition of καὶ, which all codices omit. || τῶι ἰῶι suppl. vel emend. supra lineam ἀπόρρω. Π4 : τῶι ἰῶι β : τῶι ἰῶι α : τῶι ἰεθρῶρῳ Ἄνθρωπος : lacuna 7 litt. F. Π4 alone offers the Attic contracted form ἰῶι for Ionic ἰῶι ‘flow, tide’. As at line 12 supra, immediately above τῶι ἰῶι apparently the same hand writes ἀπόρρω without expunging or striking through the words below (contrast the ‘correction’ in iv line 42, where the corrector, probably a second hand, strikes through the rejected syllable and writes its replacement above without dots). It is probable, therefore, that the scribe uses the dots to signify an alternative reading drawn from another manuscript. Palaeographically similar, ἀπόρρω might be a false emendation advanced by a scribe who failed to recognize τῶι ἰῶι. In any case, it is unique. || κοµι-
σθείω μα Π⁴, codd. : κυσθείσα G || KA[ om. codd. The lacuna affords room for a word or short phrase beginning κα- which is not preserved in the received text. Appropriate sense would be provided by either of two phrases used by the author, κατὰ τυχὴν (2.7.3.2, 21.4.1, 31.4.1; 5.15.1.1) and κατὰ δαιμόνια (3.22.3.4 and 5.2.1.1), although either would yield an excessively long line. Professor Henrichs persuasively suggests κατηρίως, 'opportunistly'; though not appearing elsewhere in Tatius, it occurs at Chariton 1.14.8.1 and Heliodorus 1.32.2.5.

27. παρόντος ἁμα καμοῦ cett. : παρόντος ἐμοῦ F
28. τὴν cett. : τὸ F
29. A slanting stroke extends into the left margin, apparently to mark the vacant space of 9 letters across which the scribe has extended the top stroke of the sigma of ξίφος (cf. line 5 supra and esp. col. iii line 5 infra); no erasure or cancellation of an earlier text is apparent, nor do the codices record any alternative reading here. || ἡχόν παλαιστῶν MVEF : ἡχόν παλ. W G : ἀνά παλ. ἀνά R : ὅσον Hirschig || The length of the lacuna indicates the loss of up to 10 letters before παλαιστῶν, preserved in no codex. ὅσον alone would seem too short: perhaps, e.g., τὸ μήκος ὅσον (or ὅσην), as I have printed.

30. τεσσάρων Π¹, codd. Only here does Π¹ show -σσ- instead of Attic -ττ-. || βραχύτατον cett. : τραχύτατον M
31. ὅσον cett. : ὅσω W. Π¹ could have had either. || οὐ Π¹, cett. : οὐ πείσα W || οὐ πλείσα del. Hercher
31–32. ἐλαθὲν Π¹ : ἐλαθὲ codd.
32. κατὰ W F : καὶ cett. || τοῦ om. Β
32–33. τὸ μικρὸν ἔκεινο ξίφος cett. : om. Ν
33–34. τοσοῦτον ὅσον ἔχεν codd. : τοσοῦτον ἔχεν Π¹. Evidently Π¹ inverted the order of the correlatives, since without ὅσον the lacuna of line 33 would be ca 4 letters short. The word order assumed for Π¹ is more Attic, that of the codices more colloquial.

34. τοῦμαλιν cett. : τὸ ἐμαλίν F
35. καταδύτο Π¹, codd. : καταδύται M || Since the received text is too long for the second lacuna, possibly the papyrus omitted either ἀρα or ὡς εἰκός.
37. νῦν Β : om. cett. In the lacuna Π¹ has room for νῦν.
38. συναγωνίσεται cett. : συναγωνίσασθαι G : συναγωνιεῖται Cobet
40. The vertical alignment of the surviving fragment suggests that $\Pi^4$ may have omitted the codices' οὕτω $\parallel$ ραδινώτατον cett. : ραδινώτερον $\parallel$ For συμράψουμεν see infrạ on line 42. $\parallel$ σχῆμα cett. : χῶμα $\parallel$ The first lacuna appears to be 3–5 letters too short to hold the received text.

41. θηρίων $\Pi^4$ : θηρείων codd.

42. δάψωμεν $\Pi^4$ : δάψωμεν codd. Having the future indicative here instead of the codices' hortatory subjunctive, $\Pi^4$ probably had also συμράψουμεν in line 40 and ἐπικρύψουμεν at the end of the sentence. $\parallel$ The first lacuna seems to afford space for an additional short word.

col. iii [21.2–23.1]

1. ραίο[ν] $\Pi^4$ : ραδίαν $\parallel$ διασπειρός $\parallel$ διεκπετεῖον $\parallel$ διεκπετεῖον $\parallel$ τῇ κόρῃ $\parallel$ α $\parallel$ τῇ κόρῃ $\beta$

2. τόν $\parallel$ om. $F$

3. ξώμασιν $\Pi^4\beta$ : ξώσμασιν $\parallel$ ἐνδεδεμένη $\Pi^4\varepsilon G$ : ἐνδεδεμένη $\parallel$ Hercher $\parallel$ For [ἐπικρύψουμεν] instead of the codices' ἐπικρύψουμεν see supra note on col. ii line 42.

4–6. ὁ σίδηρος γὰρ ἀυτὴν ἐσταλμένην διὰ ταύτης (-της $\parallel$ F) ἀνα­τιμηθήναι μέσην (μέσον $F$) τής ἔσθητος λέγει ὁ χρησμός codd. : ὁ χρησμός γὰρ --- λέγει anon. ap. Schaefer (Θ?) : [ ? ] $\parallel$ / ἀυτὴν ε vacat ca 12 μενη στολή διὰ ταύτην ἀνατιμη[- ? ] λέγει $\Pi^4$. The text of the codices is corrupt, differently also that of the papyrus, for (as Henrichs noted) line 5 is marked in the left margin with the sign /; cf. note on col. ii line 29 supra. In any case, $\Pi^4$'s στολή obviates a need for the codices' τῆς ἔσθητος (for which the lacuna affords insufficient space), and the papyrus might be in part emended to read [ὁ μὲν γὰρ] αὐτὴν ἐ[σταλ]μένη(ν) στολὴ διὰ ταύτης(ς) ἀνατιμή[θη] μέσην[α] λέγει. Although the scribe usually writes iota-adscript in dat.sing., he omits the iota at line 10 and col. iv lines 7, 15 and 16. Thus ταύτης(ς) would refer to στολή, on which the codices' τῆς ἔσθητος is a gloss. For the codices' meaningless ὁ σίδηρος, T. W. Lumb (CQ 14 [1920] 148) proposed the palaeographically ingenious ποδήρει accepted by Vilborg. Hercher proposed ὀλοκλήρως accepted by some editors. But Jacobs reports the variants (mentioned above) found in Schaefer's copy of the ed.princ. (now lost) which are assumed to have come from the lost Codex Thuanus (Θ), for which see Vilborg I p. xxi. Either
may have had the same text here as Π4 or the Schaefer marginalia are astute emendations. The sentence may have begun ὃ χρησμὸς γὰρ, or alternatively, may have begun simply ὃ μὲν γὰρ (resuming the subject of the preceding sentence), and σίδηρος may have been intruded by a later copyist who did not perceive the referent. By this episode is fulfilled Panthea’s dream at 2.23.5, where μέσην ἀνατεμείν τῇ μαχαίρᾳ τὴν γαστέρα anticipates the present passage and may offer further clues for its restoration.


7. κολεόν Π4 : κουλεόν codd. The papyrus has the Attic form, codices the Ionic. || The lacuna has no room for the codices’ ὀρῶντας preceding δοκοῦσι.

8. βεβαπτίσθαι Π4 : βεβαπτίζοσθαί codd. While erroneous omission of –ζε– is possible, the scribe of Π4 (and the author) may well have written the Attic and more precise βεβαπτίσθαι, which the archetype of the codices then trivialized.


10. γαστέρα ταύτην Π4 : ταύτην om. codd. || τεμεῖν Π4 β : τεμόν α F

11. τις Π4, cett. : om. G

11–12. καταρρεῖ codd. The scribe of Π4 sometimes writes single ρθο for double (cf. col. i line 42).

12. ἄνακο[ Π4, ]ακουφ. [ Π5 : ἄνακουφίζεται codd. From this point to col. iv line 8 the fragments of P.Oxy. LVI 3836 (Π1) overlap those of Π4; all surviving readings of Π5 are cited hereinafter.

13. Ἰρον καὶ τὸν [ Π5 || τρόπον τούς ὀρῶντας Π4, codd., ]ν τοὺς ὀρῶν Π5


16. ἀποκεκρύψεται Π·4 ἀποκεκρυπται codd.

17. προσπήδησεται β̣ (προσ- Ṛ) ἀποπεδήσεται α F  ili om. M

17–18. θύσομεν A G θήσομεν M V e F θήσωμεν W ili τ o Jacobs: τότε codd.: desunt MG

18. ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς codd.: ἡμεῖς om. Π·4. In the second lacuna there is no room for ἡμεῖς.


19. καταθήσομεν cett.: καταθήσομεν W ili ἀκήκοα δὴ Π·4 ἀκήκοα codd.: ili οὖκ ante ἀκήκοας add. G ili μεικρὸν ρι codd.

20. δεῦτε cett.: δεῖ G ili τι om. M ili τολμηρότατον Π·4 τολμηρόν codd.: Ἰάλ [Π·5], with lacuna apparently too small for the superlative ili επιδείξασθαι Π·4, cett., ἔξασθαι Π·5 επιδείξαστες F ili

20–21. ὡστε ἐστι codd., ἐστε ἐστι [Π·5]


22. ταύτα Π·5, codd. ili ἐδεόμενα Δία codd., ἐμὴ Δία Π·4 ili ἡν Με[νελάου Δία Ξέ]νιον κα[ Π·5]

22–23. [ca 8–12 ili ca 10–14 τ]ραπέζης καὶ κοινῆς Π·4 ἀναμμηνήσκων καὶ κοινῆς codd.: ili Τραπέζης om. F ἀναμμηνήσκων τραπέζης καὶ χρηστῆς καὶ κοινῆς cett. The first lacuna of line 23 no doubt held καὶ χρηστῆς, which the codices have transposed to follow τραπέζης, giving rise to confusion and conjecture. I should reconstruct: κοινῆς [ἀναμμηνήσκων καὶ χρηστῆς τραπέζης καὶ κοινῆς ναναγίας.

24–25. ἀποθανεῖν Π·4 ἀποθανεῖν δεήση (δεήσει Μ) codd.: ili καὶ ἀποθανεῖν δεήση vel δεή Xcn. Eph. 2.7.5, 4.5.3 ili καλὸς ὁ κύνδυνος Α F ἡλυκῦς ὁ θάνατος β̣ ili ambo retinent codd.: ili Here in the lacunae of lines 24–25 there was clearly a different text. There seems to be no proper place for the δεήση omitted after ἀποθανεῖν: either it ili δεή̣ stood at the end of line 24 after καλὸς ili or it was omitted altogether either by error or by the rare construction ili (cf. Soph. El. 1483) wherein an obvious subjunctive introduced by καὶ is omitted (Smyth 1766. b). If the following κα[ began the phrase καλὸς ὁ κύνδυνος as attested by the α codices and F, the line remains ca 4–7 letters short at the right margin and line 25 3–4 letters short at the left, but insufficient room is given for the rival phrase ἡλυκῦς ὁ θάνατος. If κα[ introduced some different word, there would be space for either phrase but not for both. For καλὸς with κύνδυνος there are
many parallels, from the *locus classicus* at Plato *Phaedo* 114D6 onward to Heliod. 7.1.1 and Charit. 1.1.4, 1.10.6, 5.3.1; for γλυκός with θάνατος only Ach.Tat. 2.26.3 and Anth.Gr. 14.36.2, so far as I can ascertain. If, however, an original καλός ὁ θάνατος (which one would expect) gave rise to an amplification, there are even more parallels, including Ach. Tat. 3.17.3 and 6.2.10. I find no occurrence of γλυκός with κινδύνος. After καλός there would be room for δή or the missing δεήση, but its position there would be awkward and unparalleled.


25–26. πυθομένῳ cett. : πειθομένῳ F

26. εἰπε ante καταλιπεῖν transp. F || παρὰ Π4, cett. : περὶ V

27–28. Here Π4 had a radically different text from the codices’ amplification of the context, οὐ δὲ τῶν λῃστῶν πρὸς τὸν λῃσταρχὸν ἐκφυγόντες ἔλεγον (πρὸς F) (μὲν E) πάντας (μὲν VRG) τοὺς ὑπ’ αὐτῶν εἰλημένοις τὴν εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον μάχην ἐκπεφυγέναι—a loose style not characteristic of Tatius, and not consistent with 3.13.7. To fill the lacunae one might consider, e.g., [.... τὸν λῃστα]ρχον, πάντας διεκπαίδαις ζώντας τ[οὺς] δεσμώτας ἐις τὸ στρατόπεδον. ὡστε ἂ]ποκείσε-ται σοι, which would satisfy the required sense and fill the lacunae, “the bandit-chief, that all the captives without loss of life had broken through to (the safety of) the army camp”; I cannot guess what governed λῃσταρχον, and it is of course fruitless to supplement lacunae so large. I take διεκπαίδαις as infinitive continuing the *oratio obliqua* of the preceding clause; in Josephus, Pausanias, and Philostratus the verb is intransitive, in Appian and Plutarch transitive. It is a relatively rare word (cf. its synonym διακόστομεν at 3.13.5) not occurring elsewhere in the romances and apparently unfamiliar to the scribe of the codices’ archetype.


29. ἔλεησαι codd. : ἔρύσῃ Jacobs

29–30. The few letters surviving at the margins of Π5 accord with the vulgate text (ed. n. *ad loc.*).

30. οὖν cett. : om. V || περὶ β : παρὰ α F || μηχανήματος codd. : μηχανήματος Π4. Anticipatory omission of -τιμ- is one of the
few certain errors of the scribe of Π⁴. || σκευὴν cett.: παρασκευὴν G

31. μέλλοντος cett.: λέγοντος F

32–34. The vulgate text of these lines condenses that documented in the fragments of Π⁴ and Π⁵, which in turn evidently differed from each other.

32. κατὰ δαίμονα codd., in lac. Π⁴: ίαμονα δ[ Π⁵ || Νόμος ἡμῖν ἔστιν α F : ἡμῖν V ε : Νόμος [ημ][ι][ν] Π⁴ : Νόμος ἡν G : in lac. Π⁵

32–33. ἕφη τοὺς πρωτομύστας Commelini ed.pr. (from C?), ἕφη τοῖς πρῳ Π⁴, where the editor thinks the crossbar of τ extends too far left for π to be read: πον vice τοὺς α : ἕφη, πρωτομύστας cett.: transp. G


34–35. παρασκευάζεσθαι πρός codd.: ]εσθαι π[ Π⁵, in lac. Π⁴

35. θυσίαν· δεήσει codd.: ]ιαν δεήσει[ Π⁵, ]ιαν [ Π⁴ || καὶ τὸν σοῦ οἰκέτην codd., καὶ τὸν σοῦ οἰκέτην[ Π⁴, οἰκέτης[ Π⁵

36. μάλα cett.: μάλιστα G. By lacuna space Π⁴ and Π⁵ support μάλα. || οὕτος α F : οὕτως β || προθυμησόμεθα cett.: προθυμη-θοσόμεθα M F : σομέθα Π⁴, ]θυ[ Π⁵

37. οὐμῶν cett.: οὐμῶν F : οὐμῶν G || ημῖς cett.: ιμῶς VR || αὐτοῦς om. F || δὲ post αὐτοὺς add. W

38. ἀρμοδίως α F : ἀρμοδίους β || οὐμῶν β : om. α F. Vertical alignment with the preceding line leaves a space for ca 5–7 letters additional in the lacuna to the left: apparently Π⁴ had [...] οὐμῶν α'] τῶν, reflecting ημῖς αὐτοὺς of the preceding sentence.

39. στέλλομεν cett.: μέλλομεν F || προειρημένον Π⁴, cett.: εἰρη-μένον G

40. ἔαυτοὺς cett.: αὐτοὺς W F

41–42. θάτ’τον ὁ ὑπνος [αὐτὴν Π⁴, θαττον αὐτὴν ὁ ὑπνος α F
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42. el codd.: ἧν Hercher || τι Cobet : τς codd. || ἰμὺν εμποδόν P4, Jacobs : ἰμὼν ἐκποδόν codd.

43. τὸ cett. : om. F || αὐτὴν P4, cett. : τὴν κόρην M

44. βωμὸν· καὶ codd., μονὲν καὶ P5 || οἴδας α F : εἴδες β, ἰδὲς P5 || οὖν cett. : γούν G || ἥκουσα παντοδαπὸς codd., ηυ[σὰ] παντοδ[α] P5

col. iv [23.1-25.5]


1-2. πρὸς τὸν Μενέλαον codd., π[ ca 7 M]evela[ P5, in lac. P4


7-8. ταχὺ γὰρ ἐφθόνησε μοι codd. : ταχ[υ] γὰρ ἐφθόνησεν μ[οι P5, which breaks off here ] οὐ P4

8. τις post δαίμων add. codd.

8-9. τ[ό]λν δι[ [ἐμὲ ca 5 || ca 5 ἀποδε] δημηκότα P4, om. codd. The lacuna doubtless began with ἐμὲ, making explicit the reason for its repetition in line 9 and the codices' omission of
the phrase by haplography; Henrichs' supplement appears to be confirmed by the added Robinson fragment.

9. ἐμὲ Π⁴, cett. : ἐμὸν β

10. δεύτερον post Λευκίππην add. F || ἐκ π[άντων Π⁴, rell. : om. β

11. θάλασσα codd. || μόνον α : μόνην β F


13. σοῦ Π⁴, cett. : τοῦ G : om. F

14. σκηνῆς [τῆς ἐμῆς εἰ] Π⁴ : σκηνῆς εἰςω παρελθόντες τῆς ἐμῆς transp. codd. To fill the lacuna at the right margin, Π⁴ must have read σκηνῆς τῆς ἐμῆς εἰςω παρελθόντες.

15. διετρίψαμεν Π⁴ : διετρίψαμεν codd.

16. ἔω τῶι στρατηγῷ τῶι Π⁴ : ἔω ἅγω (προσάγω Jacobs) τῶν Μενέλαον τῷ στρατηγῷ transp. codd. The papyrus must have had τῶν Μενέλαον ἅγω in the right-hand lacuna.

17. [καὶ τὸ Π] ἂν καταλέγω Π⁴ : καὶ πάντα λέγω α F : καὶ (om. G) ἄπαντα λέγω β

18. καὶ] πυνθάνεται πόσῃ τις εἰ ἀνάδυσις Π⁴ : πυνθάνεται δὲ πόσῃ (πῶς ἡ Ἡ) δύναμις ἐστὶ codd. In Π⁴ πυνθάνεται must have been introduced by καὶ or ἐπείτα δὲ vel sim., and εἰ here (optative after historical present) was replaced by the codices' ἐστι : “And (then) he enquired how large a force the enemy had.”

20–21. συνεργηκέναι μύσ[ος ὅ]ς Π⁴ : συνηθροίσθαι ληστήριον codd. For the vivid and uncommon phrase “a great abomination has streamed together” the codices substitute the weak “a great robber-camp has collected.”

22. ἀυτα[....]τερον Π⁴ : ἀυταὶ πέντε codd. : (αἱ) ante πέντε suppl. Cobet. Apparently αὐτα[ί εἰσι]ν αἱ without a number: “we have these thousands adequate against those twenty.” || χειλιάδες Π⁴ : χιλιάδες codd.

23. οὐδέκα Π⁴, cett. : οὐποὶ Μ || ἔτεροι δισχίλιοι πρὸς τούτοις Π⁴ : πρὸς τούτοις ἐτεροί δισχίλιοι transp. codd.

24. Ἡλίου πόλιν G : Ἡλιούπολιν cett. After Ἡλίου Π⁴ shows a slight space, like the space this scribe often leaves between words.

28. τοῦς del. Cobet \(\|\) κατατρέχοντας cett. \(\|\) κατέχοντας G

28–30. Vertical alignment indicates either that 5–7 letters are lost from the first lacunae of each of these lines, possibly leaving an open square of ca 2 cm. inset from the left margin or (so as not to interrupt phrases) within the column, as shown. It is hard to imagine that each of the lines lost some word of the same length at the same relative position. Perhaps the papyrus had a fault which the scribe had to avoid; or perhaps he left space for a small drawing of the Phoenix, for ancient copies of romances were sometimes illustrated (cf. K. Weitzmann, Ancient Book Illumination [Cambridge (Mass.) 1972] 52 and fig. 38a), though I know no parallels either for an original hole in a literary roll or for a single small vignette inset in such a text.

30. τὴν ταφὴν cett. : τάφον V \(\|\) ΑΝΑΓ’ΚΗΔΗΠΑΣΙ \(\|\) Π 4 : ἀνάγκη (aut ἀνάγκαι?) δ’ ἦσαν codd. : ἀνάγκαι δ’ ἦσαν ed.pr., Hirschig : ἡνογκάσθησαν Goettling : ἀνάγκη(ν) δὲ πᾶσα(ν) Jacobs : ἀνάγκην δ’ εἶναι Hercher : ἀνάγκη δέσσαν Lumb : ἀνάγκη δ’ ἦν Vilborg. Among these only Jacobs comes close to the original reading of Π\(^4\) : did he find it in Schaefer’s notes from cod. Θ (see note on col. iii line 2)? The ΔΗ of Π\(^4\) might be interpreted δή, δ’ ἦ, or δ’ ἦ, though a verb is not required here.

30–31. τὴν ἐξοδον ἐπισχεῖν τοσοῦτων ἡμερῶν cett. : τοσοῦτων ἐπισχεῖν τὴν ἐξοδον ἡμερῶν M

31. τίς ὅρνις Π\(^4\), WF : τίς ὅ ὅρνις cett. \(\|\) ὅστις cett. : ὅς G

32. ἐφην ante τοσαύτης F, post τιμῆς G \(\|\) κομίζει Π\(^4\), cett. : κολάζει G

33. Φοίνιξ μὲν ὁ ὅρνις ὅνομα codd. For this the first lacuna is too short; the suggested restoration better balances the following τὸ δὲ γένος Αἴθωψ and preserves the chiasmus. The codices’ ὁ ὅρνις is probably a gloss.

33–34. τῇ χροίᾳ cett. : τὴν χροῖαν MG

34. ἐν κάλλει del. Hercher. The length of the lacuna requires these words. \(\|\) μὲν τὰ \(\|\) Π\(^4\), cett. : μὲν γὰρ τὰ D

36. ἐστεφάνωσε Π\(^4\), codd. : ἐστεφάνωσε Jacobs \(\|\) ἐφυγῆς codd. (Eustath.) : ἐφυγῆς Wifstrand : ἐφυγῆς Cobet

37. ΡΟΔΟΣ Π\(^4\) vitiose : ρόδοις codd.

37–38. ρόδοις --- codd.

39. αὐτόν \(\|\) : αὐτὸν codd. The scribe of Π\(^4\) evidently understood αὐτόν as dir. obj. of μερίζονται, ζωῆν and τελευτήν as acc. of respect, while the codices take these nouns as dir. obj.
limited by the gen. αὐτοῦ : “The Ethiopians have possession of him in his life, the Egyptians in his death,” cf. LSJ s.v. μέρις Π.1.

41. αὐτῷ β : αὐτῳ αF

42. βόλον codd. : βόλος corr. e βωμῶν Π⁴. While βόλον is more graphic and doubtless the right reading, βωμῶν in the sense ‘tomb’ is at least possible. Unlike the variants recorded between dots at col. ii lines 12 and 26, the syllable -μῶν is cancelled, and above it an apparently different hand has written -λος, nom. for acc.

44. γεῖνεται Π⁴ : γίνεται codd. || τῷ νεκρῷ cett. : τῶν νεκρῶν F || δὲ cett. : γὰρ V

col. v [25.5–6]

1. καὶ εἰς codd. : καὶ κλείσας Hercher : κλείσας τε Jacobs : κλείσας Castiglioni : καὶ βύσας Hirschig || γῆνω codd. : συμφρνίνω Jacobs. Averaging 39 letters, the lines of col. v are some 20% shorter than those of the preceding columns. The probable length of the second lacuna would accommodate the text of the codices better than that of the emenders.

3. The received text gives a line 3–4 letters shorter than average. Perhaps ἀλλοίων for ἂλλων?

4. δορυφόρων G : δορυφόρων cett. || ὁ δρυνὶς Π⁴, cett. : ὁ om. V

5. πλανᾶται αF, prob. Π⁴ : πλανᾶ β || (ζητῶν) vel (προσιπτάμενος) post πλανᾶται Richards. The papyrus has no room for either.


7. προπόλους cett., prob. Π⁴ : προπόλους G

[10–17]. The rest of the received text of Book 3 would have occupied five additional lines, not including a colophon.
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