

THE  
OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI  
VOLUME LXXVI

EDITED WITH TRANSLATIONS AND NOTES BY  
D. COLOMO AND J. CHAPA

WITH CONTRIBUTIONS BY

J. BARTON	A. BENAÏSSA	A. E. BERNHARD
A. K. BOWMAN	H. ESSLER	E. W. HANDLEY
W. B. HENRY	A. KOENIG	M. KONSTANTINIDOU
F. MONTANARI	D. OBBINK	M. C. D. PAGANINI
M. PERALE	O. RANNER	D. W. RATHBONE
M. SALEMENOU	A. SCHATZMANN	S. SCHORN
G. S. SMITH	S. TREPANIER	B. H. WEAVER
	G. XENIS	

Graeco-Roman Memoirs, No. 97

PUBLISHED BY  
THE EGYPT EXPLORATION SOCIETY  
WITH THE SUPPORT OF  
THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES RESEARCH COUNCIL  
AND  
THE BRITISH ACADEMY  
2011

ναι πα]ρεπηται δε το ωφ[ελιμω  
 και λυε]ιτελουντωε ημιν[ εξειν  
 και τηι ]πολει και αυτ[ον αυτωι C  
 πωε γαρ ου ]εαν δε γ ο[ιμαι τ ανα  
 10 ντια τουτων ουτε τ]ηι πο[λει

5 η α with b (ἦ ἀ): ἦ ἀ B (obviously erroneous): ἦ T. Due to the absence of breathings and accents in the papyrus, it is impossible to determine to which of the two hands of B our reading corresponds. It is reasonable to assume that B's reading is a simple mistake, due either to its own scribe or to one of its ancestors' during the process of transcription into minuscule.

7 ημιν: ἡμᾶε MSS. Assuming that the word εξειν followed, the papyrus text confirms the doubts raised by Dobree and Ast against ἡμᾶε (Ast deleted it). The juncture λυειτελουντωε εξειν is a *hapax* here, but comparison with εχω + adverb in other cases shows that it must have the meaning 'to be useful'. ἡμᾶε cannot be linked directly with this construction, so it lacks a verb indicating judgement. Things do not become better, however, with the papyrus' reading ημιν, for it alters the balance of the whole sentence. It is not taken up later in 10 (= 146 c3) which clearly shows the duality of τῆ πόλει – αὐτῶ. So there are two possibilities: (a) in the papyrus ημιν was not followed by εξειν but another verb (expressing 'to act'?), or (b) ἡμᾶε is an old corruption (a marginal note dropped into the text?) that turns up in the medieval manuscript tradition. The papyrus could imply that ἡμᾶε existed earlier.

A mark over ν—tempting as it is to be seen as a critical sign introducing a variant reading or deleting an unsuitable one in such a troubling passage—is most probably a circumflex, the descending part of which is missing and mistakenly placed over ν instead of ι.

9–10 The text transmitted in the medieval tradition is slightly too long to fit in the available space.

A. SCHATZMAN

**5081.** PLATO, *CHARMIDES* 166 c, 167 a

31 4B.16/K(1–2)a

7.9 × 5.6 cm

Second/third century

Fragment of a papyrus roll containing remains of two columns; the back is blank. The first column contains the ends of 13 lines, the second beginnings of 9 lines. The width of a column can be estimated as 6 cm; it ranges from 17 to 22 letters a line. The reconstructed column height is 54 lines in 23.8 cm. The intercolumnium is 1.5 cm; no margins are preserved. Col. ii is sloping approximately 5° to the left. The lines look ascending. The whole dialogue as preserved by the medieval tradition would have covered 35 columns, of which our fragment gives parts of cols. xx and xxi, with 45 lines between the two preserved pieces.

The text is written along the fibres in the 'Severe Style', sloping to the right. γ once projects under the line (i 4), ρ never. There are two forms of the narrow ε, the lunated version in two strokes (i 12, ii 13) and the angular one (e.g. i 10), both with short middle stroke. Close parallels are XXII **2320** and XXIII **2361**.

The diacritical signs used are rough breathings of form 1 in *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> 11 (i 7 and 12), accents (acute at i 3, 4 and circumflex together with a rough breathing at i 12), apostrophe to separate words at i 5, high stop (i 3, 6) and low stop (i 10), paragraphi (ii 12, 13) indicating change of speaker, and line-filler (i 6). For the preserved part the division at line-ends is syllabic, and reconstruction suggests that it was also the case in col. ii. The spacing in ii 13 leads to the assumption that, in addition to the paragraphi, a blank of two letters was used to indicate change of speaker in the line. In i 13 this would also be possible. The scribe elides tacitly (ii 13 and maybe in ii 14), but *scriptio plena* also occurs (i 4 and i 5, perhaps also in i 13). No opportunity occurs to determine the presence of iota adscript.

The text is collated with images of B, T, and W, and supplemented from Burnet's OCT (1903). In the preserved parts there are only spelling variants, in the second column, however, there are two instances where spacing suggests that the papyrus had a shorter reading (ii 10, 11).

Col. i

· · · · ·  
 αυτης τ]αις [αλλαις το δ 166 c  
 ουκ εστιν] ουτως α[λλ αι μεν  
 αλλαι π]ασαι· ἀλλ[ου ειςιν ε  
 πιστημ]αι ξαυτων δέ ου η  
 5 δε μονη] των τε αλλων' ε  
 πιστημ]ων επισ[τημη' ε>  
 στι] και αυτη αυτης και  
 ταυτα] σε πολλου δει λεληθε  
 ναι αλ]λα γαρ οιμαι ο αρτι  
 10 ουκ εφ]εσθα ποιειν. τουτο  
 ποιεις ε]με γαρ επιχειρεις  
 ελεγχειν] ξασας περι ουδ ο λο  
 γος εστιν] οιον ην δ εγω ποι  
 [εις

Col. ii

· · · · ·  
 κ[αι οιεται ειπερ οιδεν και (167 A)  
 τ[ι αυτος οιεται μεν ειδεναι  
 οιδεν δ ου των δ αλλων  
 ουδ]εις και εστιν δη τουτο το  
 σωφ]ρονειν τε και σωφροσυ  
 10 νη κ[αι το εαυτον γιγνω  
 σκειν] το ειδεναι α τε οιδεν  
 αρα τα]υτα εστιν α λεγεις  
 εγω γ] εφ[η παλιw τουνw  
 ην δ]ε ε[γω

Col. i

1 τ]αις. The traces surviving could correspond either to *ταις* or *ἀλλαις*. Spacing suggests that *ταις* stood in this place of the line.

4 δέ. An acute accent would not be expected here, unless there was punctuation after *δε*. The mark, over *δ* rather than over *ε*, could be a correction in the form of an apostrophe marking that elision should be effected between *δε* and *ουκ*.

10 εφ]εσθα: εφ]εσθα MSS. The upper part of *ε* is clearly visible. An interchange between *ε* and *η* is common (see Gignac, *Grammar* i. 242-4).

Col. ii

6 τ[ι αυτος: Spacing seems to exclude the possibility that the papyrus could have read Bekker's conjecture αῦ, but αῦ τις (Buttmann) or αὐτός of BTW would fit the line.

10 There is not enough space for the transmitted text; εἰαυτὸν or αὐτὸν instead of εἰαυτὸν αὐτὸν would fit the line.

11 κκειν[. There is not enough space for the OCT text τὸ εἰδέναι ἃ τε οἶδεν καὶ ἃ μὴ οἶδεν. The first part of the clause, τὸ εἰδέναι ἃ τε οἶδεν, would fit the line. Omission by homoioteleuton conveniently explains the discrepancy in the papyrus: after having written the first οἶδεν, the scribe then mistook it for the second one and continued with ἀρα ταυτα, omitting καὶ ἃ μὴ οἶδεν.

14 δε ε[γω. Only part of an upper horizontal is preserved before the papyrus breaks off. It looks slightly curved and should therefore rather be ε than ρ.

H. ESSLER

**5082.** PLATO, *CHARMIDES* 172 C–D, 173 A–B

58/B(72) part

4.3 × 7.5 cm

Third century

A fragment of a papyrus roll containing parts of two consecutive columns of *Charmides*, with an intercolumnium of c.1.5 cm. The back is blank. The line length is 17–23 letters (5.8–6 cm), with c.50 lines per column (c.20 cm). The text lost before the first column would occupy c.31 columns, and the whole dialogue would need c.40 columns occupying 2.8–3 metres. There was then room for **5086** (*Laches*) in the same roll, which according to calculations would be contained in c.54 columns of approximately 4 metres, constituting thus a composite roll.

The hand is a flowing, medium-sized, undecorated specimen of the 'Formal Mixed' style, of the general type commonly referred to as the sloping oval. The contrast between broad and narrow letters is not particularly marked, although κ, μ, ν, and ω are always wide. ο is variable in size and spacing; λ has a curve that goes halfway down the line of writing, and the base of ω is almost flat. XXVII **2458**, assigned to the third century, is similar but more rapidly written. II **223** = *GLH* 21a of the early part of that century is also similar but considerably sloppier and more angular.

There are no breathings, accents, or punctuation except a misplaced forked paragraphus below ii 3. Correction in i 14 has been made by the main scribe. Some critical scrutiny has been accorded the text. There are critical signs in the margin of what would have been lines 12–13 in col. ii and an ancora mark, perhaps serving as a directional symbol to the misplaced forked paragraphus in the new section (col. ii 3–4).

The text has been collated with and supplemented from the edition of Burnet's OCT. This is the second papyrus of the *Charmides* to come to light. In so far as one can judge from so small a text, the papyrus sides twice with the united evidence of the direct tradition (BTW) as against that of the indirect tradition, mainly