

]ποντιων]ς κοιλαι δε πετρων
	μ]αζον ^ω ολεναις κοπτουσα]αδες μυκηδον εκροτο[υν
10]υς χορους οπου θεους εδαι]ενων ανοιξιας κολπον [
]] . ων θρηνωδον [. . .
]	25]ε χαλκεου φανταζε[. . .
]ς	ο]υς βροντης κτυπο[υς

1. α of]μονας has been corrected from ε.

7. πενθήρη στολήν occurs in Jo. Chrysost. t. 2, p. 624 c (ed. Par.).

10. The end of the verse may equally well be after οπου. εδαι suggests only ἔδαισεν : εδει cannot be read.

17. If the text is right αλευεται and ενθα form a crasis. The epic word ἀλεύεσθαι is not found in the tragedians, though ἀλέειν occurs in lyric passages.

24. θ in θρηνωδον is corrected apparently from χ.

865-870. PROSE FRAGMENTS.

Plate I (867).

The following six small prose fragments remain unidentified, and except in the case of 866 there is good reason for believing them to belong to works which are not extant. The first three seem to be historical, the fourth is perhaps from a commentary, the fifth is philosophical, and the sixth geographical.

865 consists of the beginnings of the last eight lines of a column, written in a medium-sized uncial hand of the third century. The fragment belongs to a description of a war in which Greeks were apparently fighting foreigners, and the leader of one of the armies was the illegitimate son of a person whose name probably ended in -ευσ (l. 5), this general being subsequently recalled, perhaps in consequence of an oracle (ll. 6-7). Ἰδρωῶς, presumably the town in Calabria, is mentioned in l. 3. A φρούριον of that name occurred in Book xxxix of Theopompus' *Philippica* (Fr. 210), which was concerned with Sicilian history, though whether the φρούριον was identical with Ἰδρωῶς in Calabria is not certain. Possibly our fragment too belongs to a lost work dealing with Sicilian history. Apart from the Theopompus passage, there seems to be no mention of Ἰδρωῶς in Greek historians before the Roman period.

866 contains a few letters from the first seven lines of a column. The script is a neat uncial of a distinctly early type, and may be ascribed with confidence to the first century. A mention of the Carthaginians in l. 5 suggests that this fragment also is historical, but the context is quite uncertain.

867 (Plate I) has six nearly complete lines from the top of a column, in

a rather large and handsome square uncial, resembling the hand of 661 (Part IV, Plate V). That papyrus (late second century) provides an exceptionally early example of the type of hand to which the great Biblical codices belong. The present specimen is probably somewhat later than 661, and is likely to have been written in the third century. Two kinds of stops (high and middle points) occur. An iota adscript has been inserted in one place by the original scribe. The fragment refers to the capture of Ephesus, and may belong to a historical work. For *προσβιάζεσθαι* with the dative, which occurs in l. 4, the only example quoted in the lexica is Diod. xx. 39.

868 consists of parts of twelve lines, apparently from the top of a column, written on the verso, the recto being blank except in one corner where there are one or two broken letters. The script is a medium-sized rather irregular uncial, probably of the first century. The nature of the fragment is very obscure; the second person singular occurs in ll. 5 and 9, but it is difficult to believe that the lines belong to a connected oration or dialogue, and we are disposed to regard the fragment as a piece of a commentary, the blank spaces after *αριστοις* and *ακουεις* in ll. 6 and 9 in that case marking the division between the text and the scholia; cf. 853. The rare word *ἀπόκαιμα* (l. 4) is not found in writers of the classical period.

869 contains the ends of twenty-two lines from the upper part of a column, written in a sloping uncial hand of probably the latter half of the third century. The subject is clearly of a philosophical character, and perhaps has reference to religion.

870 is part of a leaf from a papyrus codex containing a geographical work. The recto gives a list of tribes in Thrace, Macedonia, and Asia Minor, apparently in two columns, the successive names being numbered. Of the verso only a few letters from the ends of lines are preserved; the last seven lines also seem to be a list of names, but the upper portion of the page is different. Which side of the leaf came first is uncertain. The script is a good-sized oval uncial of the sixth or seventh century.

865. 8 x 6.3 cm.

866. 6 x 2.4 cm.

απολειπ[
 μνω διατ[. . .]υ[
 ὑπο Ὑδρου[ν]τος κελ[του στρα
 τευματος ηγειτο . [ε
 5 ως νοθος υιος υστ[ερον δε με

] πολις μου[
]αι πυθομε[ν
]οβαλουσι [
]ε καθολου [
 5 Κ]αρχηδονιο[

ταπεμπτος εγεν[ετο]ρεν εις πι .[
της κατα μαντεια[ν]ρεν[
μενων των Ελλη[νων

865. 3. The supposed λ after κε might be χ.

5. ως is probably the termination of the genitive of a proper name ending in -eus. The phrase μετάπεμπτος γίγνεσθαι occurs twice in Plutarch.

7. κατα μαντεια[ν: or καταμαντεια[ς, but this word is not known.

866. 2. πυθομέ[may be the end of a line.

867. 5.7 × 7.5 cm. Plate I.

ὑδωρ αυ[. . .] . . [η
νεγκεν επι θα[
λασσαν. κακ[ε]ιθ[εν
Εφεσω' προσεβι[α
5 σθη· τα δ αλλα γαρ
[υ]περμηκη προσ[.

868. 8.1 × 4.1 cm.

[εμε[.]οι τον ακρατον []
] και οτι θραυστης σ[]
]ς δου[λ]ων ημετερω[ν
]λοις αποκαυματα []
5]ς δικην τεισεις εμου []
]ον τοις αριστοις α[]
δια]κονειτωσαν πενι[]
]μενης γυναικες α[]
]μων ουκ ακουεις σ[]
10]αθη[.]ω τ[ρ]αχηλον []
]ισασε[]
]μινω[]

869. 13.8 × 6.1 cm.

] ὑπαρξεως διαπο . [.
] μη βλεπειν ναους τ[.
]ς και βωμους αφαγ[.
]ας ηλθον επι το διστ[.
5]ρον εστιν η ουκ ε . [. .
α]λλ ουχι ταυτα μεν . [.
]σης τοις λοιποισ απο[]
ρον
]υν δε ποτε τοις κα[]
]νουσιν θεοις απο
10]τα[[υ]]το των εκαστ
] νομιζομενοις ου
]μενος αυτοις παρασ
]τι τοις κατ αληθη
] αλλ ουχι τοια . . [. .
15]ς αναγκαστικο[.
]ν εις το προκειμε[]
νον] μεγα[σ]τα δε πασι[ν []
]εν αμα την παρα[]
]κατα φλυαρ[.
20]ι εις ανθρω[π
] . αντες οτι [. . . .
]λους νο[.

867. 1.] . . [η: the first letter is probably α, δ, κ, λ, or χ, while the vestiges of the second suggest γ, η, ι, π, or τ. It is not certain that a letter is lost at the end of the line.