

THE  
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI  
VOLUME LXXI

EDITED WITH TRANSLATIONS AND NOTES BY

R. HATZILAMBROU      P. J. PARSONS  
and  
J. CHAPA

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

A. BENAÏSSA      L. CAPPONI      N. GONIS      CHR. MÜLKE  
D. OBBINK      P. M. PINTO      F. SCHIRONI  
G. UCCIARDELLO      G. A. XENIS      J. YUAN  
and  
A. G. BERESFORD      M. P. POBJOY

Graeco-Roman Memoirs, No. 91

PUBLISHED FOR  
THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL  
BY THE  
EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY  
3 DOUGHTY MEWS, LONDON WC1N 2PG  
2007

(like that of Staphylus?) or from the normal 'cases' of rhetoric. Thus Libanius *Decl.* 6 *Μετὰ τὴν τῆς Τροίας ἄλωσιν καὶ τὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος τελευταίην Ὀρέστης ἀπεκτονῶς τὴν μητέρα ὡς ἀνδροφόνου κρίνεται φόνου.* Sopater *Rhet. RG VIII 261* Ἄχειρ ἀριστεὺς προσέταξε τῷ παιδὶ μοιχὸν ἀνελεῖν. ἀνείλεν ὁ παῖς καὶ κρίνεται φόνου.

καυτ. [: καὶ το[ιαύτη suggests itself. If so, the missing letters must have been heavily compressed to fit the line-end (cf. 7).

22-5 If Panionis proposes the theme, and Heroxenus improvises the speech that begins in 26, we must provide for a change of speaker. Three possibilities: (i) Panionis continues into 24, e.g. εἰ[πεῖ ὁ] | λόγος ὠδέ πως λέ[γει. ὁ δέ] | ἔλεγεν κτλ. Here λόγος would mean 'story', and the theme must relate to some well-known (mythical or historical) incident. (ii) Heroxenus intervenes in 22, e.g. 'καὶ το[ιαύτη] | ἐστὶν ἡ ὑπόθεσις', εἰ[φη, 'καὶ ὁ] | λόγος ὠδέ πως λε[γέσθω]. (iii) Heroxenus intervenes in 23, e.g. 'εἰ[φ] ἦς ὁ] | λόγος ὠδέ πως λε[γέσθω] | ἔλεγεν κτλ. In (ii) and (iii) λόγος would be the speech he is to make, and ὠδέ πως has its typical function of looking forward to introduce quoted words. But (ii) leaves no room for a connection with 25; neither allows a clear reference to Heroxenus as the new speaker.

25 πάνυ εὐθε. [. εὐθέω[ might suit (Plato *Phaed.* 63A): the practised declaimer does not need time to collect his thoughts, but plunges in with all speed. That would leave room for c.3-4 letters. If the speech began only with the next line (26 note), this introductory sentence continued for a further word, unless the line-end was left blank to mark (with the *paragraphos*) the new section.

26 ἦετο μὲν presumably began the 'speech'. For this use of μὲν see Denniston, *GP*<sup>2</sup> 383.

ου. [: οὐτ[ος or οὐτ[οσί acceptable, but equally οὐτ[ωσ. In any case, the singular subject should be the accused, and that supports the singular κρε[ῖν]ε[τ]αι in 22.

P. J. PARSONS

#### 4812. GLOSSARY (MORE OF XV 1802)

127/35-6

6.1 x 7.7 cm

Late second century  
Plates VIII-IX

Fragments from an alphabetical glossary written across the fibres of a papyrus roll. A history of Alexander (XV 1798) is written along the fibres on the other side, the original recto. A substantial portion of this glossary of Greek and foreign words was previously published by Hunt as XV 1802. Additional fragments were identified as part of the same manuscript by Lobel (some of which he joined with the already published ones), and these are published here for the first time. A transcript and notes prepared by Lobel have been used for the edition below (he did not transcribe fr. 26-8). All the fragments may be ascribed to the same manuscript on palaeographical grounds.

Of the new fragments, five join those already published by Hunt: one joins 1802 fr. 2; two join 1802 fr. 3 i and 1802 fr. 5; and two join 1802 fr. 6 and 1802 fr. 9. The adjoining fragments (old and new) are presented together here; the new fragments, joined to previously numbered fragments, compose ensembles that are designated as follows: fr. 2, fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5, and fr. 6 + 9. In addition to these, there are seventeen new fragments that do not seem to join either with one

another or with the old fragments. These have been assigned numbers following on from those of **1802** (i.e. from **1802** fr. 11). All the new fragments (including fr. 26–8) have the same text of the glossary on one side and the same text as the recto of **1802** on the other, but not enough on either side to give a clue to their placement. In **1802** lemmata (covering letters κ–μ) are set in *ekthesis* and a blank space divides each lemma from its explanation. The end of a lemma is preserved in fr. 13.2, but otherwise the new fragments offer no complete new lemmata. There are no clear indications that they cover letters other than κ–μ. The upper margin is preserved to a height of 1.8 cm. in fr. 6 + 9, 13, 26 and 28, matching the height of that preserved in **1802** fr. 3. Line-ends are preserved in fr. 2 (i 12) and fr. 26.

Written in an irregular semi-cursive that has affinities with the Severe style: see **1802** introd. and cf. V **842** (*GLH* 17b); P. Mich. inv. 3 (*GLH* 15c, and now *Greek Medical Papyri* i 2, where the verso document is redated from 190/1 as in *GLH* to 192/3). A date in the late second century is likely. As in **1802**, no accents or other diacriticals are in evidence; no punctuation (other than blank space separating explanation). Iota adscript always omitted (cf. fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.17; fr. 6 + 9.3); diaeresis often added to initial iota (e.g. fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.13). Final ν sometimes written as a horizontal stroke above the preceding letter (fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.12). Many iotacistic spellings: *πολειτεία* (fr. 2.4.8; fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.21); *Φοινείκης* (fr. 12a. 6). At least one possible spelling error: fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.12 (τ for δ?).

As in the previously published portions of **1802**, the entries in the new fragments give a lemma (usually a rare, dialectal, or foreign word) followed by an explanation or translation of it by a named scholarly authority, often citing works and book-numbers; the lemma, which always begins a line, is separated by a blank space from its explanation. It is sometimes difficult to tell whether a preserved blank space is that separating lemma from explanation (as it is, e.g., at fr. 13.2), or part of the blank line-end after the explanation has ended. In spite of the absence of complete new lemmata (which might have yielded e.g. new poetic quotations), the new fragments offer much learned material, exhibiting (as in **1802**) an interest in foreign, especially 'Eastern' words (*παρὰ Πέρσαις* fr. 6 + 9.13; *κατὰ Πέρσας* fr. 12a.9; *περὶ τοῦ κατὰ Ἀσίαν . . .* fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.10, 17–18; *περὶ Φοινίκης* fr. 12a.6; *Κυθικῶν* fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.1), together with constant appeal to authorities as sources of the explanations: Berossus' *Babyloniaka* (fr. 6 + 9.20; fr. 12a.9), Erastriatus (fr. 12a.7), Xenophon (fr. 6 + 9.21), and Dionysius of Utica (fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.13—possibly the same as the Dionysius quoted in **1802** fr. 3 ii 48), and perhaps Hegesander (fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.12, already quoted in **1802** fr. 3 iii 74). In fr. 2 i 4.8 and in fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.21 *πολιτεῖαι* are mentioned, probably from works on constitutions (perhaps by Aristotle, who was quoted in **1802** fr. 3 iii 60 for the *Constitution of Soli*).

fr. 2

col. i

col. ii

col. i

col. ii

	], νσε . . υ[ ] . [				], νσε . . υ[ ] . [		
	]λοπονιαν [	] . . [		φι]λοπονίαν [	] . . [		
	] ]	[		] ]	[		
	]νπολειτεια	λα[		]ν πολειτεία	λα[		
5	] . καντηνωρ	[		] . c Αντήνωρ	[		
	] ]	[		] ]	[		
	] ]	λα[		] ]	λα[		
	]αλωνπ . λειτειά' [	λα[	Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Θεσσ]	]αλῶν πορειτεία [	λα[		
	] . εκ[	. [		] . εκ[	. [		
10	] - τ[	. . . .		] - τ[	. . . .		
	]υ[			]υ[			

Col. i 1 ], ., remains of sloping upright and oblique, a possible . . υ[, foot of upright followed by another on the edge, in a space for one letter, then forward-sloping upright, suggesting left stem of ν (but μ not excluded) ] . [, speck at line-level 5 ], ., top of stroke sloping up from left to right (top right of a η ι ω ?) 9 ], ε, foot of oblique sloping down from left to right (a, a ?) followed by upright curved at top and bottom with traces of middle stroke, ε possible (but β ρ θ not excluded) 10 τ[, τ not excluded (but less likely)

Col. ii 2 ] . [, two sloping strokes on edge, compatible with λ a 9 . [, speck on edge

fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5

	]γ̄κυ[ . . . ]ων		ἐν - - - ] γ̄ Κυ[θικ]ῶν
	]νωναρχη[ . . . ]ητρ[ . ]		]νων ἀρχη[ . . . ]ητρ[ . ]
	]αποιονυτε[ . . ]υθουσια		]α ποιούντε[ c ἐ ]υθουσία-
	]εροιςμαρδοι . . [ . . ]ουνται	ζουσι? παρ' ἐτ]	έροις Μάρδοι κ[α]λούνται
5	] . λoιαντικλε[ . . . ]c		] . λoι Αντικλε[ίδη]c
	]ηπιαδησευ[ . . ] . π . [ . . ]α		Ἀσκλ]ηπιάδης ἐν [ . . ] . π . [ . . ]α
	] [ c.5 ]		] [ c.5 ]
	]οικουσινηρα . [ . . . . ]c		]οικουσιν ηρα . [ . . . . ]c
	] ]		] ]
10	]περιτουκαταασιανα		] περὶ τοῦ κατὰ Ἀσίαν α
	] ]		] ]
	]αντροσευνοπομνημασι		Ἠγής]αντρος ἐν ὑπομνήμασιν
	]διονυσιουσιτυκαιος		] Διονύσιος ὁ Ἰτυκαίος
	] ]		] ]
15	] ]		] ]

	]	]
	]εντωπεριτουκαταασι	] ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ κατὰ Ἀσί-
	]	αν ]
	]ονομασιων	]ονομασιῶν
20	]ε.	]ε.
	]...κηπολειτεια [	]...ικῆ πολειτεία [
	]ις [	]ις [
	]cωευρυχωρια[	]cω εὐρυχωρία [
	] [	] [
25	]ικηνατ[	]ικηνατ[
	] [	] [
	]ρθουπρ[...][	]ρθοι πρ[...][
	]ι.θ...[	]ι.θ...[

1 ]φ, lower part of bowl (ο not excluded) 2 ]., upright with traces of loop in the upper part (ρ? but also λ η μ possible) 4 ]ε, middle stroke joining ρ ... [.] , upright on the edge (ι, κ); after the gap part of oblique joining ο (α or λ) 5 ]., upright compatible with ι or η 6 ]., traces of horizontal π [., upright with middle stroke (η?) or ιτ rather than ιτ 8 ]., foot of sloping upright (ι? left stem of κ?) 20 ]ε., dot level with top of letters and horizontal underneath 21 ]... , letter-top on edge, upright (ι?), curved top of upper end of stroke descending to right (λ, γ?), top of upright (ι likely) 25 ]., speck at line-level 28 ]ι., top of circle (ε, c) θ... [., sloping horizontal, perhaps upper part of c or ε followed by high speck on edge

fr. 6 + 9

	]ουβασιλειῶ [	]ου βασιλέως [
	]ογικων [	]ογικων [
	]εντωτρωικω [	] ἐν τῷ Τρωϊκῷ [
	]δροσο...ιοχευς [	]δροσο...ιοχευς [
5	] [ ] [	] [ ] [
	]βλεφα[...].αραχ.[	] βλέφα[ρα] παρὰ Χα[λδαίοις?]
	]ανθις[...].οτανπλ[	]ανθις[...].οταν πλ[
	]...μοιχ[...].ον.[	]λοις μοιχ[...].ον.[
	]c [ ] [	]c [ ] [
10	]κατατηνλιβνην[	] κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην [
	]ενοιτρο...[ ]ωι.δι.[	]ενοιτρο...[ ]ωι.δι.[
	]ωγ [	]ωγ [
	]αραπε[...].ις...[	π]αρὰ Πέρ[ε]αις ἐπ[ὶ τοῦ
	] [ ] [	] [ ] [
15	] [ ] [	] [ ] [

	]διουφ.[. .]. [ ]	]διουφ.[. .]. [ ]
	] [ ]	] [ ]
	]μακεδων[ ]	] Μακεδων [ ]
	] .ιμ . . . [ ]	] .ιμ . . . [ ]
20	]ρ. σοεγ. βαβυλω[ ]	Βή]ρωσος ἐγ. Βαβυλω[νιακῶν
	] . ζξεν[. ] φωνενᾶ [ ]	] . ζ Ξεν[ο]φῶν ἐν ᾧ π[ερὶ
	]αδυ.[. .]. χουστθυρ[ ]	]α δύο [το]ίχους τεθυρ[ωμένουσ
	] . [ ] . . [ ]	] . [ ] . . [ ]

1 ] . , speck above line, possibly remnant of horizontal top (τ?) [ , trace of lower part of curve  
 4 . . . , curving left-hooked stroke below line (loop of λ?), abraded surface, followed by remains of horizontal top joining an upright on left (τ, τ?) 6 ] . αρα, remains of horizontal after the break (τ η π?), of λ only left part of loop and oblique [ , rather large bowl consistent with ο c ω, but λ not excluded 7 ] . , traces of a sloping upright (κ, η?) τ likely, but τ not excluded 8 ] . . . , two obliques (λ, x?), then faint traces of at least two or three letters, the last compatible with c [ ] . , upright slightly sloping to right suggesting ι or η if faint trace at mid-level is part of mid-stroke [ , small bowl or a curved bottom, as of λ λ μ? 9 ] . , ι or η 11 . . [ ] , faint traces, fibres missing ι, δ, speck of ink, possibly a letter 13 ε, [ ] , missing fibres and a gap, together space for two letters [ ] . ις, speck, then upright followed by round letter . . [ ] , faint remains of top and mid-stroke on abraded surface (ε?), then upright with long horizontal top on right, τ π τ possible 16 [ ] , upright (η ι κ η π?) [ ] , mere traces [ ] , part of tiny circle (ε?) 19 ] . ιμ, traces on abraded surface followed by upright suggesting ι . . . [ ] , traces of 2-3 letters, followed by blank space 20 ]ρ. , loop and lower part of upright εγ, trace of left part and middle stroke (η also possible), descending oblique and upright on right suggesting η, then below horizontal line marking numeral, horizontal top joining an upright, as of τ ζ τ 21 ] . , horizontal at mid-level touching upright suggesting η (or perhaps ει?) [ ] , sloping upright hooked to right: π? τ not excluded 22 [ ] , speck on edge at mid-level [ ] . , traces of a top horizontal, as τ π τ or serif on ι 23 ] . [ ] . . [ ] , traces of letter-tops

fr. 12a

	]ν [ . . ] [ ]	]ν [ . . ] [ ]
	]οινικωνκ. . . . c. . [ ]	Φ]οινικων κν. . . . σος [ ]
	] . . [ ] ] μνηνευεται υρου [ ]	] . . [ ] ] ρμνηνευεται πυροῦ [ ]
	] . αποτονπυρονενταυθατ υς [ ]	δ]α τὸ τὸν πυρὸν ἐνταῦθα τοῦς [ ]
5	]κακυποθη . υριζεινωε . . . αι [ ]	Φοίνι]κας ὑποθησαυρίζω ὡς Ἐστιαί- [ ]
	] περιφοινεικης [ ]	ος ἐν ] περι Φοινείκης [ ]
	]ωνεντοστιδιωντιωσσερας . ζτρα[ ]	]ων ἐντοστιδίων τι ὡς Ἐρασίτρα- [ ]
	]εντω [ . . ] τυτικω [ ]	τος] ἐν τῷ Ὀ[ψαρ]τυτικῷ [ ]
	]θαλασκακαταπερσαςβηρωσσο [ ]	] θάλασσα κατὰ Πέρσας . Βήρωσσος [ ]
10	]αβαβυλωνιακων [ ]	ἐν] ᾧ Βαβυλωνιακῶν [ ]
	]τουσταπροστηντροφην . [ ]	] τοὺς τὰ πρὸς τὴν τροφήν . . [ ]

]...β.ϵ[

]...β.ϵ[

fr. 12b

. . .  
 ] . ς [

fr. 12a

2 κ., read as *καί* by Lobel, but *ν* more likely than *αι* . . ., space for two or three letters on abraded surface . . . c. . ., specks of ink suggesting tiny loop (λ, ο?), followed by upright joining to rather flat top on right, ρ, π? (but c not excluded) 3 ] . . . [ , bottom right-hand arc of small circle suggesting ο, followed by foot of upright ] . . . [ , right part of tiny loop suggesting ρ (but ο not excluded) 4 ] . . . [ , upright and missing fibres (ρ, π?), then upright joining oblique at top, suggesting Υ (but κ not excluded) 5 ] . . . [ , upright joining horizontal at mid-level on left as of η, but also ι ligatured with the preceding letter possible 6 ] . . . [ , speck of ink suggesting tiny rounded letter (ο?); upright with speck of ink at left (top of Υ?); then top of circle, possibly c (ο not excluded) 7 ] κ., upright followed by two convergent obliques, κ very likely, but also two letters in ligature not excluded (λc?) 8 ] η . . . [ , lower left portion of circle (ο, c?), then foot of oblique suggesting tail of λ (but α or λ not excluded) 9 ] ε . . . [ , abraded surface, space for two or three letters with speck at line-level 10 ] ς c., space for one letter on abraded surface 11 ] ε, projecting mid-stroke 12 ] τ, horizontal top on edge 13 ] ο. [ , curved top on edge (ε, c?) 14 ] . . . [ , faint traces and dots 15 ] . . . [ , two dots at upper level, an oblique (α, λ?), a curved arm (top of Υ?) 16 ] . . . [ , dot on abraded surface

fr. 12b

This piece was joined to the major fragment (fr. 12a) by Lobel since the fibres in 12b indicate a position below the right-hand side of 12a. The interval between them cannot be determined.

1 ] . ς [ , top of vertical (1? right stem of η, π?) 2 ] . . . [ , foot of upright hooked up to the left, not *prima facie* η 3 ] ρ . . . [ , tiny loop (β, ρ?), then apex of triangular letter (α or λ), followed by upper left-hand arc of angular circle or sloping horizontal with loop underneath: ε ο c?

fr. 13

	] . κ και διηνε [	] . c και διηνεκ [
	] ςιος λιθ [	] ςιος λιθ [
	] οροδιοσεν̄π [	] δ' Ὀδδιος ἐν ᾱ π [ερί
	] οιαποτη [	] οί ἀπό τη̄ [c
5	] καιομηρο [	] και Ὀμηρο [c
	] ταιλασιωσ . [	] ταιλασιωσ . [
	] αντ [	] αντ [

1 ] . . . [ , on edge upright hooked to right with traces of a horizontal stroke on the left: η μ π?

or ι in ligature with the (lost) preceding letter (αι?) .[, below line foot of upright hooked to right  
 2 ]ς very likely, but perhaps κ not excluded 3 π[, upright with flat horizontal top on right; ρ  
 also possible 6 .[, high speck on edge, possibly letter in ligature with preceding ς, perhaps ζ,  
 represented by top cross-stroke

fr. 14

<p>· · ·          ] . [ ]καταμ[          ]ωτωενδι[          ]ωνπαναι[          ]ακρησινα[          5 ]αςκρητ[          ] . . ης [          ] . νοναι [          ] . [ ] . ερ[          · · ·</p>	<p>· · ·          ] . [ ]καταμ[          ]ωτω έν δι[          ]ων Παναί[τιος?          παρ]à Κρησιν α[          ]ας Κρητ[          ] . . ης [          ] . νοναι [          ] . [ ] . ερ[          · · ·</p>
--	--

1 ] . [, traces of two curving strokes, possibly the loop and the tail of λ τ, top and part of  
 stem 4 α[, loop and part of oblique (λ not excluded) 6 ] . . , dot at bottom-line with  
 horizontal top, compatible with ς, followed by upright with serif suggesting ι, or traces belong to one  
 letter, π most likely 7 ] . , upright on abraded surface descending below line 8 ] . [, dot  
 at line level ] . , top of an upright

fr. 15

· · ·  
 ] κ . [ .  
 ] . υκα[  
 · · ·

fr. 16

· · ·  
 ] . . . . [ .  
 ] υκεξ[  
 ] . . [ .  
 · · ·

fr. 17

· · ·  
 ] . κρησφ . [ .  
 ] νιερεις[  
 ] [ .  
 ] εκατιλ[  
 · · ·

fr. 18

· · ·  
 ] ανεις[  
 ] μαρδ[  
 ] ος[  
 ] [ . ] ζ . [ .  
 5 ] μ . [ . ] η[  
 · · ·

fr. 15

1 ] . [, beginning of stroke rising to right  
 top of υ

2 ] . , right-hand end of cross-stroke touching

fr. 16

1 ] . . . . [, upright below line (ι, ρ?), bottom of tiny circle at line level, horizontal joining upright  
 (middle stroke and right stem of η?), speck on edge 3 . . [, upper part of upright joining oblique  
 as of κ, γ, then speck of ink on edge

fr. 17

1 ] . , upright on edge: η or ι . [, slightly sloping upright on edge



fr. 18

4 . [ , upright with curved top on edge (τ ε? ο, c also possible) 5 . [ . ], top of upright, the left half of a second μ? λ or λ also possible η [ , the right-hand end of a cross-stroke touching upright at mid-level as η, but perhaps τ1, λ1 or the like

fr. 19

. . .  
]. π ο . [ .  
] τ ο υ . [ .  
] ε ω ρ γ υ . [ .  
. . .

. . . .  
]. π ο . [ .  
] τ ο υ . [ .  
γ ] ε ω ρ γ υ κ [ ὠ ν ?  
. . . .

fr. 20

. . . .  
]. [ . . ] . [ .  
]. [ . [ .  
] [ . [ .  
] [ . [ .  
5 ] ν γ γ ε ω ρ [ .  
]. α ι δ ι α ν [ .  
]. ι [ ] [ .  
] ε χ . [ .  
. . . .

. . . .  
] 4 [ . . ] . [ .  
]. [ . [ .  
] [ . [ .  
] [ . [ .  
] ν γ γ ε ω ρ [ γ υ κ ὠ ν  
]. α ι δ ι α ν [ .  
]. ι [ ] [ .  
] ε χ . [ .  
. . . .

fr. 19

1 ] . [ , foot of upright, slightly turning right (ι γ) 2 ] . [ , foot of sloping upright, as right leg of κ  
N λ? 3 ω, very similar to ο, missing fibres; for ω, cf. fr. 12a.5 and esp. fr. 20.6 4 ] . [ , oblique on edge as left leg of κ or N

fr. 20

1 ] . [ , triangular shape with rising oblique to the right 2 ] . [ , extremity of upright descending below line-level? 3 ] . [ , triangular shape like a flattened Δ 4 ] . [ , perhaps end of upper arm of κ 5 ] . [ , speck followed by top of upright 6 ] . [ , left part of a bowl: ο ω c? e less likely

fr. 21

. . . .  
]. α [ .  
] α ρ [ .  
] [ .  
] α ο . [ .  
. . . .

fr. 22

. . . .  
]. [ .  
] ρ . ο [ .  
]. ο ι α π α [ .  
]. c o . . [ .  
5 ] . ι [ .  
] α κ ω ν [ .  
]. [ .  
. . . .

fr. 23

. . . .  
]. . . [ .  
] ε ρ . [ .  
] η ρ . [ .  
] ν [ .  
. . . .

fr. 24

. . . .  
] ι δ ε [ .  
] ι υ μ [ .  
] ο ε θ [ .  
. . . .

fr. 21

1 ] . α [ , lower part of vertical joining to loop of λ 4 ] . [ , foot of upright descending below the line as ι or ρ

fr. 22

1 ] . [ , speck on edge      2 ] ρ . , at interval from ρ upper part of upright, perhaps trace to right of top, as ρ, ι      3 ] . , high slightly curved top, c likely, but ε not excluded      4 ] . , traces of large loop on abraded surface, λ Δ ω?      . . [ , two uprights with traces of ink at mid-level, as η or ι followed by an upright, as ρ π ι ρ      5 ] . , traces (perhaps of arc) on edge      7 ] . [ dot on edge

fr. 23

1 ] . . [ , faint traces of 2-3 letters, second with diagonal below the line (x?)      2 ] . [ , upright on edge with traces of horizontal top: ρ or π      3 ] . [ , left-hand part of rounded letter on edge with traces of horizontal stroke at mid-level, ε or ο

fr. 24

3 ] ο , remains of circle, but not joined at right, thus perhaps c not excluded      θ [ , circle cut by a horizontal or projecting middle stroke of preceding ε

fr. 25

fr. 26

fr. 27

fr. 28

. . .  
] πα . μ ε [ .  
] κα . ε ι [ .  
] . . . [ .  
. . .

] ω ν [ .  
] η ν [ .  
] . . . [ .  
] . ο ι [ .  
. . .

. . .  
] η μ α [ .      ] [ .  
] . θ [ .      ] . . [ .  
. . .

fr. 25

1 ] . , traces of rounded letter on abraded surface      2 ] . , foot of sloping upright on abraded surface followed by a hole, as left stem of λ, insufficient space for μ or ν      ι [ , upper part of upright ligatured to ε, as ι      3 ] . . [ , remnants of rounded letter, three verticals and other traces in space for at least three letters

fr. 26

4 ] . , dot above line (end of a horizontal top?) and sloping horizontal in ligature with bottom of ο, suggesting λ or λ, perhaps μ or c

fr. 27

2 ] . , triangular shape suggesting λ or λ

fr. 28

2 ] . , tiny loop suggesting ρ or β      . [ , part of circle, c not excluded

fr. 2 col. i

It is likely that this column began with lemmata in κν- or κω-, for the reasons given below on 8; the following column has lemmata starting with λα, and we seem to have a break in the text signalled here after line 5 or 6.

4 ] ν πολειτεία. To judge from **1802** fr. 3 iii 59-60 *Ἀριστοτέλ]λης ἐν τῇ Κολέων πολειτεία*, all of the instances of *πολειτεία* in the new fragments (2 i 4; 2 i 8; 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.21) are likely to be in the dative, forming part of a title introduced by ἐν, i.e. a citation of the source for the explanation

of the gloss, probably near the end of the entry (all these cases of *πολιτεία* occur at ends of lines). Between  $\xi\nu$  and *πολιτεία* we would expect a genitive plural of the people whose constitution was treated in the work, or an ethnic adjective ending in *-ικος*, i.e.  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  *-ικῆ* *πολιτεία*. Here  $\nu$  suggests the former, and supports the notion that (as in 8) we have a work by Aristotle cited here (see below, fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.21 n.); if by Aristotle (though see 8 n.), the list of candidates for the supplement of the name of the city is a long one (Aristotle was credited with ‘constitutions’ of at least 158 states: Diog. Laer. V 27.1; fr. 381–603 Rose).

5 *Ἀντήνωρ*: an antiquarian writer from Crete (FGrH 463) active in the 2nd century BC.

6–7 Blank as preserved. The first half of 6 might have concluded, well before line-end, the entry beginning in 5; line 7, however, must have been left blank, for the reasons explained below on line 8.

8 *Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τῇ Θεσσαλῶν πολιτεία* [A. Θεσσαλῶν (or Θετταλῶν) πολιτεία by Aristotle is mentioned by Athen. XI 499d and *schol.* Eur. *Rhes.* 311 (ii p. 334 Schwartz) = Aristotle fr. 498–9 Rose; a κοινή Θετταλῶν πολιτεία by Harpocration s.v. τετραρχία (fr. 487 Rose). Critias too wrote a work of the same title (Athen. XIV 663a, cf. XII 527b; Critias 88 B 31 DK). No doubt Aristotle is more likely to be cited as an authority, and fr. 499 has a special interest here: *θηλυκῶς λέγεσθαι φησιν ὑπὸ Θετταλῶν τῆν λάγυνον*, since it is commenting on the word *λάγυνος*, ‘flask’. Presumably the lemma *λάγυνος* stood at the beginning of the line; if so, it would be the first word in  $\lambda$ - in the glossary, preceded by a blank space (apparently left at the level of line 7) as marking the end of the letter  $\kappa$  and the beginning of  $\lambda$  (as proposed by J. J. Keaney, *ZPE* 37 (1980) 198).

fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5

1 *Κυ[θικ]ῶν*. For works on Scythians (a number of them known to have extended to at least three books) see generally FGrH III C pp. 927ff.

2–4 The lemma could be *Μαργιανοί* (so already Hunt): cf. Strabo 11.8.1 who mentions *Ἄμαρδοι* (other name of *Μάρδοι*; cf. Strabo 11.13.3), *Μαργιανοί* and *Κύθαι* as closely connected. The *Μαρδοί* were a population of the area of the Black Sea living on piracy: Steph. Byz. 432.15 *Μάρδοι*, *ἔθνος Ὑρκανῶν*. *Ἀπολλόδωρος* (FGrH 244 F 316) *Περὶ γῆς δευτέρω*. *ληστὰι δ’ οδοῖοι καὶ τοξόται*. The name *Μάρδοι* can perhaps be read also in fr. 18.2 (below). At 3–4 Hunt restored  $\xi$ ] *ϋθουσία* | [*ζουσι*, thinking that the *Μαργιανοί* (associated with the *Μαρδοί* by Strabo) might be connected with *μάργος*, ‘mad’ (cf. Hsch. μ 264).

5 ] *λοι Ἀντικλε[ίδη]ς*:  $\delta$ ] *ηλοί* possible; [*ιδη*] just about possible, though a tight squeeze, as Hunt notes. Anticleides, an Athenian historian who flourished in the early 3rd century BC, wrote a History of Alexander, *Deliaka*, and *Nostoi* (FGrH 140). At Athen. XI 473b he is credited with an *Ἐξηγητικόν*, probably by confusion with Autocleides (FGrH 353), who certainly wrote a work of that title explaining religious terms and usages. Presumably it is the same Autocleides who is cited in 1802 fr. 3 iii 62 (= FGrH 353 F6) for an explanation of *μιαετηρ* (i.e. *μιάετηρ*?). Since 3  $\xi$ ] *ϋθουσία*- might have a ritual reference, we could wonder whether *Ἀντι*- here is a mistake for *Ἀύτο*-. But in a damaged context this remains entirely speculative.

6 *Ἀσκληπιάδης ἐν*: suggested by Hunt, who wanted to restore  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  [ . ]  $\xi$ ] *πει[γρ]α* | [*μμάτων* and understand thus Asclepiades of Samos, epigrammatist of the 3rd century BC. But this reading is not only called into question by the difficulty of reading  $\iota$  after the  $\pi$  (a thick upright is joined at mid-height by a horizontal stroke, which would suggest  $\eta$  or  $\iota\tau$  rather than  $\iota\tau$ ), but there is no evidence for epigrams of Asclepiades in numbered books, and the reading is in any case excluded by the rules of syllable division. On the other hand, we know of many historians by this name: Asclepiades of Tragiolos, 4th century BC (FGrH 12); Asclepiades of Myrlea, 2nd/1st century BC (FGrH 697); Asclepiades of Cyprus (FGrH 752). There are also two physicians with this name: Asclepiades of Bithynia, 2nd/1st century, and Asclepiades the Younger, 1st/2nd century AD. Perhaps the best candidate, in keeping

with the historical and antiquarian interests of most of the authorities in the glossary, is Asclepiades of Myrlea, whose interest in foreign peoples was exemplified e.g. by his treatise on Bithynians.

8 *ηρα*. [. . . .]c. Hunt suggested *Ηρακ[λείδη]c*. If correct, he could be the same as the Heraclides author of a work entitled *ξένη φωνή* quoted in **1802** fr. 3 iii 66. But there are other possibilities (cf. *RE* XV s.v. Herakleides): e.g. the ethnographer Heraclides of Cymae (4th century BC), Heraclides the geographer (3rd cent. BC), Heraclides Lembus, grammarian and historian (2nd century BC).

10 ] *περὶ τοῦ κατὰ Ἀσίαν α*[: cf. 17 (same work?). A historical or ethnographic work about Asia, not identified elsewhere. There is a superficial similarity with Ctesias' *περὶ τῶν κατὰ Ἀσίαν φόρων* (FGrH 688 F 53-4).

12 ] *αντρος*. The only solution seems to read *Ἡγής[ανδρος]*, as suggested by Lobel; he was already quoted in fr. 3 iii 74 (see note) and the exchange between δ and τ is frequent in the Roman and Byzantine periods especially after ν: Gignac, *Grammar* i 76-7, 81.

13 *Διονύσιος ὁ Ὑτυκαῖος*: Dionysius of Utica (1st century BC) is mentioned by Athen. XIV 648e and *Scholía in Lucianum* 46, 3.6 Rabe as author of a *Γεωργικά*, a translation of the work on agriculture of the Carthaginian Mago, and by Steph. Byz. 342.3 as author of *Πιζοτομικά*, a herbal treatise.

21 ] . . . *ικῆ πολιτεία*: citation of a work on a constitution. Those ascribed to Aristotle are always cited as *ἐν [- -]ων πολιτεία*, i.e. with the genitive plural of the citizens (rather than with an ethnic adjective), which casts doubt on the supposition that a 'constitution' of Aristotle's is cited. Athenaeus, who always cites Aristotle's constitutions in this way, does use the adjective for the homonymous work by the Stoic Persaeus, pupil of Zenon (Athen. IV 140b, 140c-f) *Περσαῖος ἐν τῇ Λακωνικῇ πολιτεία*. *Suda* a 3254 speaks of *τῇ Περσικῇ πολιτεία*, which would suit the interest in Persian glosses elsewhere in this lexicon, but the reference is not in citation of a work, but rather to a 'man who is honoured according to (or by) the Persian constitution'. In any case, none of these suit the traces in the papyrus before the ending *-ικῆ* in **4812**: an upright (1?) and a stroke descending to right (λ, γ?).

27 ] *ρθοι*. Hunt suggested *Πά]ρθοι*.

Fr. 6 + 9

3 *ἐν τῷ Τρωϊκῷ*: a work on some aspect of Troy. A possible guess would be *τῷ Τρωϊκῷ διακόσμῳ*, i.e. a citation of the work on the disposition of the Trojan plain by Demetrius of Scepsis, known from Sch. Ap. Rh. 1.1165 *Δημήτριος ὁ Σκήψιος ἐν τῷ Τρωϊκῷ διακόσμῳ*. Another possibility is to read *ἐν τῷ Τρωϊκῷ καταλόγῳ* in reference to the catalogue of ships in *Il.* 2. Still other possibilities: *ἐν τῷ Τρωϊκῷ πολέμῳ*, in the Trojan war, *ἐν τῷ Τρωϊκῷ πεδίῳ*, in the Trojan plain, both common expressions, though perhaps less satisfactory here.

4 ] *δροσο . . . ιοχευς* [. Possible is ] *δροσ* (perhaps *Ἀλέξαν]δροσ*, but that is not the only possibility), then *ὄ*? But after that *ἠγιοχεύς* (suggesting an Homeric context) is ruled out by the traces; these, however, allow *Ἄγτιοχεύς*, which is what Hunt read. Allen suggested privately to Hunt *Ἀλέξαν]δροσ ὁ Ἄγτιοχεύς*, who he thought might have been cited in a lost work *Parthica* by Appian (cf. above on fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.27); but if this is correct, he is elsewhere unidentified.

6 ] *βλέφα[ρα] παρὰ Χα[λδαίους]*? If correct, we might suppose that the lemma was an Akkadian word for 'eyelids' or 'eyes'. This would be *īnu*, 'eye', which could be accommodated in the implied alphabetical order of the glossary. If the word is instead Iranian, the Iranian root for 'eyelids' is *mr-zng*, which in Persian becomes *mozhe*. It could become something like *μόζη* or similar when transcribed into Greek. This too would fit the alphabetical order.

8 ] . . . *μοιχ[ . . . ]ον* [. The sequence *μοιχ* seems to suggest that we are dealing with a derivative of the verb *μοιχάσμαι*, or *μοιχεύω*, 'commit adultery'; the gloss could thus be about something related to words for adultery or adulterer.

10 *κατὰ τὴν Λιβύην*: a citation of a work about Libya (cf. Asia in fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.10, 17), an explanation of a Libyan word, or part of an explanation having something to do with Libya.

13 π]αρά Πέρ[ε]αις ἐπ[ί] τοῦ. If the restoration is correct, the lemma was a Persian word ('found among Persians', 'in Persian', *παρά Πέρσαις*), and the explanation is of what the word is used for, i.e. means (ἐπί τοῦ + genitive; hence τοῦ, *exempli gratia*).

20 Βή]ρωκος ἐν ᾧ Βαβυλω[νιακῶν]: the first of the quotations of the *Babyloniaka* of Berossus (FGrH 680). The book number is not clear: horizontal top joining an upright could suit γ ζ ξ τ. For Berossus' *Babyloniaka* three books are attested, so the only possible reading would be γ, the third book.

21 ] .c Σε[ν]φῶν ἐν ᾧ π[ε]ρί. If the letter after the numeral is γ or π we must look for a work by Xenophon beginning with one of these letters; there are not many options, because among his works the only ones meeting this criterion are *περί ἵππικῆς* and *περί προσόδων* (the other title for *Ποροί*), but these works do not have more than one book. However it could be an alternative title in the form 'the work on χ' and in this case (with *περί* + gen.) it could be any of the works by Xenophon. Out of the main interest in Babylonian and Persian glosses of the lexicon, a quotation from the *Cyropaedia* (*περί τῆς Κύρου παιδείας*?) or perhaps from the *Anabasis* (*περί Ἀναβάσεως*?) seems the most likely hypothesis.

22 δὲ[ο] τοίχους τεθυρ[ω]μένους: 'two walls with doors'. The verb *θυρώ*, 'furnish with doors', is not common and is never used in connection with *τοίχος*. Probably we have part of the same entry as the previous one; therefore we may assume that the quotation of Xenophon goes together with it. An analysis of the works of Xenophon for the words *τοίχ-* and *θυρ-* has shown that, whereas there are not many attestations of *τοίχος* and derivatives, the word *θύρα* and derivatives is (perhaps not surprisingly) frequent, particularly in *Cyropaedia*, where it is often used of gates of cities; as such δὲ[ο] τοίχους *τεθυρ[ω]μένους* might paraphrase a description in that work of city-walls with gates built into them.

fr. 12a

3-6 These lines seem to be part of the same entry, discussing a Phoenician word probably meaning 'corn-store', as the explanation seems to suggest (ἐ]ρμηνεύεται πυροῦ | e.g. *θησαυρός* δ]ιὰ τὸ τὸν πυρὸν ἐνταῦθα τοὺς | [Φοίνι]κας ὑποθησαυρίζειν). The lemma itself cannot be determined with certainty. Lobel suggested *Πυραμίδες* from Steph. Byz. 540.14 ὠνομάσθησαν δὲ πυραμίδες ἀπὸ τῶν πυρῶν, οὗς ἐκεῖ συναγαγὼν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐνδειαν ἐποίησε δίτου κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον. However, it is hard to restore *Πυραμίδες* as a lemma for this entry; π would probably be too far from the rest of the preserved part of the glossary, where there is no evidence of lemmata beginning with letters after μ (but cf. entry in 9-10, lemma beginning with θ or ο?).

3 ἐ]ρμηνεύεται can mean not only 'explain', but also 'interpret foreign words', i.e. 'translate into Greek'; cf. Steph. Byz. 340.14 ὑπὸ δὲ Φωνικῶν Κέλλα ῥαφαθ δ ἐρμηνεύται ἰστος νεός. Here it introduces the explanation of the meaning of the word(s) in the lemma earlier in the line.

5 ὑποθησαυρίζειν: only here; the closest parallel is ἀποθησαυρίζειν in late writers.

5-6 ὡς Ἑστιαί] [ος ἐν] ᾧ περὶ Φονείκης. Among authors who wrote *Φωνικικά* at least one name begins with ε: Hestiaeus (FGrH 786), and that fits both the space and the traces.

Lobel noted that, if the supplements at the beginnings of ll. 5, 6, 8 are complete, the width of this column will have been considerably narrower than that of fr. 3 ii and iii. Unfortunately, apart from this poorly-preserved column and those in fr. 3, we do not have any other evidence of other columns; a variation in terms of width is not impossible but cannot be proved further.

7-8 ]ων ἐντοσιτιδίων τι ὡς Ἐρασίτρα] [τος] ἐν τῷ Ὀ[ψαρ]τυτικῷ: a new fragment of the Ὀψαρτυτικά of the physician Erasistratus (fr. 290 Garofalo; cf. Athen. VII 342a Ἐρασίτρατος ἐν Ὀψαρτυτικῷ, not in Garofalo).

9-10 ] θάλασσα κατὰ Πέρσας. Βήρωκος | [ἐν] ᾧ Βαβυλωνιακῶν. Paralleled at FGrH 680 F1 (b) ἄρχειν δὲ τούτων πάντων γυναῖκα ἢ ὄνομα Ὀμόρωκα· εἶναι δὲ τοῦτο Χαλδαῖστί μὲν †Θαλαθ, Ἑλληνιστί δὲ μεθερμηνεύεσθαι θάλασσα (from the first book of the *Babyloniaka*). The lemma is uncertain: perhaps Θαλαθ or Ὀμόρωκα (both consistent with the alphabetical order of the glossary). Θαλαθ

is a corruption of the Chaldaean Tiamat; the form used by Berossus, however, is disputed: possibly Thamte, which in Greek would be spelled as Θαμτε. Όμόρωκα, instead, was the name of a woman, who, according to Berossus, ruled over the first living beings.

fr. 13

The beginnings of three entries are visible (2, 4, 7), but lemmata are missing except for the ending -κιος in 2.

1 διηνεκ[; perhaps a derivative of διηνεκής.

2 ]κιος λιθ[. The lemma may be the name of a stone, as the beginning of the explanation (λιθ[) seems to suggest.

3 ] δ' Ρόδιος ἐν ᾗ περι[. The citation of the Rhodian authority pertains to the same entry as line 2. Any number of authorities who hailed from Rhodes who could be meant here. Strabo 14.2.13 lists ἄνδρες μνήμησ ἀξιοι who were Ρόδιοι or were described as such, e.g. Apollonius Rhodius, Panaetius (cf. infra fr. 14), Andronicus, Timachidas, and Callixenus; catalogued in B. Mygind, 'Intellectuals in Rhodes', in V. Gabrielsen et al. (edd.), *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture and Society* (Aarhus 1999) 247-93.

5 ] και Όμηρο[; introducing the only citation from Homer thus far in the glossary, which does not seem interested in explaining Homeric or poetic diction in general; all lemmata seem to be prosaic and technical rather than poetic words. Here, however, a rare Greek word, or a word from a particular dialect, or perhaps a foreign 'eastern' word was presumably explained by recourse to Homeric usage (cf. on 6). All the other preserved authorities quoted are historians or antiquarian writers. An exception would be Apollonius of Rhodes (if his name is to be restored in l. 2), but if so, he was probably invoked more as a source of the explanation than as literary attestation.

6 ]ταιλαιωσ[; [-ται λαοι ὡς looks possible, especially in the context of the citation of Homer in the previous line—not, however, a Homeric quotation; but then most of the citations of authorities in the explanations are not direct quotations, but conflation and paraphrases.

fr. 14

3 Παναί[τιος seems attractive, especially with a Rhodian source cited in fr. 13.3. However a reading ]ων πᾶν αι[ cannot be ruled out.

4-5 In the light of ]ακρησινα[ and ]ακρηστ[, the entry seems to have dealt with a Cretan gloss.

fr. 15

2 ] .υκα[. Among other possibilities, ]τυκα[ι- (Lobel) could be tried, i.e. Dionysius of Utica (above fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.13).

fr. 17

1 ] .κρησφ[; a Cretan gloss?

2 ]νιερεις[; perhaps ]νι ερεισ[, or, more likely ]ν ιερεις[.

fr. 18

2 ]μαρδ[; probably Μάρδοι (mentioned in fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.4) or a derivative.

3 ] ος[. The space marks the beginning of the explanation of the lemma.

5 ]μ[. [.]η: possibly the beginning of another entry, perhaps starting with μ. If this fragment contained words in μ, as appears from ll. 2 and 5, this scrap could have belonged to fr. 3 col. i. There is support for this view in the fact that the other side (front) of both displays tops of columns. Moreover Μάρδοι are mentioned in fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.4, which could suggest that this scrap belongs to one

of the lemmata or explanations in that column. However, it is not possible to join this fragment with fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.3-4 as proposed by Lobel, unless we suppose a gap between the two.

fr. 19

3 ]γεωργικ[ών? (proposed by Lobel) seems reasonable, i.e. a citation from a certain book of a work on agriculture; cf. the parallel expression in fr. 20.6. Another citation from the Sicilian Dionysius of Utica quoted in fr. 3 i + 2 new fr. + fr. 5.13? (according to *Scholia in Lucianum* 46, 3.7 Rabe his translation of the Carthaginian Mago's γεωργικά was in more than one book).

fr. 20

The handwriting appears slightly different in certain respects from that of the other fragments (cf. esp. λ and ω), but this may be due to a change of pen. The content however is in keeping with the glossary.

6 ]ν̄γεωρ[: perhaps ε]ν̄ γ̄ γεωρ[γικ-, i.e. the third book of a work dealing with agriculture. A similar work, or at least something connected with the root γεωργ-, is cited in fr. 19.

7 ] .αιδιαν[: possibly και δι' αυ[τό.

fr. 21

2 ]ᾱρ[: The first letter is a numeral, presumably a book number. For possible titles in ρ-, cf. (περι) ῥητορικῆς (τέχνης), Ῥωμαίων ἱστορία, Ῥωμαϊκῆς ἀρχαιολογίας, and the like.

fr. 25

2 ]καλεῖ[ται?

F. SCHIRONI