

SCHOLIA MINORA TO *ILIAD* 2.212-225, 272-295

CUL Plumley 3¹

6.8 x 13.8 cm

First/second century

Parts of two columns of a glossary (scholia minora) to the second book of the *Iliad* are extant along the fibres of CUL Plumley 3, a fragment of papyrus roll now housed in Cambridge University Library. The designation 'CUL Plumley' identifies Coptic and Greek papyri and parchment manuscripts found among the papers of Jack Martin Plumley (1910-1999), Egyptologist at Cambridge University, alongside the collection of Frederick William Green (1869-1949). A separate classification was given to these manuscripts as no evident connection with Green could be found, although it is probable that at least some of the items labelled as 'Plumley' belong to the Green collection.² Both the Green and the Plumley manuscripts entered Cambridge University Library in 2000 as a donation of Plumley's widow, Ursula Plumley. Details of provenance are not recorded for any of the items comprised; Sarah J. Clackson identified some of the Green papyri as coming from the monasteries of Apa Apollo at Deir el-Balayza and Bawit.³

The fragment belongs to the upper part of the roll; the upper margin is preserved to 2.2 cm, and the intercolumnium measures 1.1 cm at its narrowest point. The back was reused for a list of payments (unpublished). The piece has suffered considerable damage and is almost divided in two vertically; there is a repair with a small patch of papyrus of 1.6 x 1.2 cm to the top edge of the back, at 2.5 cm from the right margin of that side, which has slightly overlapped the edges of the two sides of the fragment. The overlap is visible in the photo at 3 cm from the left edge, at the end of lines i.1-12. The ends of lines i.1, 6-9, and 11-12 are displaced downwards by nearly the height of one line, and two strips, containing i.6 and i.11 respectively, remain partly folded.

¹ I am grateful to the curator of the collection, Catherine Ansgore, for permission to study and publish this piece, to Nikolaos Gonis for comments on drafts of this paper, and to Anna Johnson for the conservation of this papyrus fragment. I also wish to thank two anonymous *BASP* reviewers for their comments and suggestions. Remaining errors are of course my responsibility. The image of the papyrus is reproduced by the kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.

² This is suggested by the presence of some leaves from *La Bourse Egyptienne* of 28th May 1914 in one of the boxes where the items were kept, as some of the Green manuscripts were packed with sheets from the same newspaper. A separate box of papyri associated with Plumley was also found in the Faculty of Oriental Studies together with a letter from Green; three of the manuscripts were recognised by Sarah J. Clackson as clearly related to the Green collection (now CUL Green 7, 8 and 9), while the rest of the box received the classification 'Plumley' in the absence of other evidence. All the information about the recovery and the identification of the items in the Green and the Plumley collections is taken from Sarah J. Clackson's Report, 21/02/2001 (Manuscripts Department, Cambridge University Library).

³ In particular, provenance from Deir el-Balayza has been attributed to CUL Green 88, while the manuscripts connected with the Bawit Monastery of Apollo are CUL Green 1, 5, 6, published as P.Mon. Apollo 42, 56, 60; and CUL Green 2, 3, 4, 7, 8 and 86, published as P.Bawit Clackson 5 (= Green 2), 25 (= Green 3), 47 (= Green 4), 2 (= Green 7 side A), 3 (= Green 7 side B), 85 (= Green 8 side A), 10 (= Green 8 side B), 22 (= Green 86). Cf. S.J. Clackson, *Coptic and Greek texts relating to the Hermopolite Monastery of Apa Apollo* (Oxford 2000) 13.

The hand is a medium-sized example of Turner's 'informal round' style.⁴ Bilinearity is generally observed: only *rho*, *phi* and *psi* extend below the baseline. The descenders of these letters sometimes curve leftwards at the foot, while serifs frequently embellish the apices of *alpha*, *delta*, *eta*, *mu*, *nu*, *pi*, *tau* and *upsilon*. There is no contrast between thick and thin lines. Letters frequently touch each other, but ligatures are sporadic, and particularly occur in the sequence *epsilon-iota*. *Alpha* is written both in the looped and in the angular shape. Other notable letter forms are *epsilon* with a long cross-bar, *mu* with the curving middle touching the baseline, *omicron* generally of a smaller size, *upsilon* of the long-tailed type written in three strokes, *phi* with a slightly flattened loop, *omega* with mid-peak at full height. Comparable hands are found in e.g. P.Berol. 6926 (second half 1st c.), P.Fayûm 110 (94) and P.Oxy LXXIII 4956 (146/7); a date in the first or second century can be thus suggested for this piece.

Each entry begins a new line. Lemma and gloss are separated by a small blank space, not organized in separate columns, as is common for scholia minora; a gloss continuing from the previous line is slightly indented below its lemma (see ii.4, 10).⁵ Several lemmata receive two equivalent interpretations, the second one being preceded by καί (i.8, 9, 11). This practice is rarely attested elsewhere: parallels are found in e.g. P.Aphrod.Lit. II F° 3 ↓ 5, F° 6 ↓ 17, → 9, F° 9 ↓ 24, F° 13 ↓ 17; P.Stras. inv. 33 ix.4;⁶ P.Köln inv. 2281 iii.6;⁷ P.Sijp. 2 i.14-16, 17-18. In other papyri, when two synonymous glosses are supplied, they are simply juxtaposed or separated by ῥ; this is also the case in the D scholia and generally in the comparative lexicographical testimonies.⁸

The papyrus has no lectional signs. At i.6 the last three letters of a gloss reaching the margin of the column are written above the line, in a smaller size. The shapes of *nu* and *sigma* are different from the other examples in the text, and the ink is slightly darker: it may be either a correction by a second hand or an addition by the same hand in a faster, less careful style. Letters in the interlinear space are also visible above i.13 and ii.12; these seem written by the original scribe. The lemmata at ii.3 and ii.13 appear preceded by a curved stroke at full height, probably a deletion mark.⁹

What remains of the first column contains scholia to *Il.* 2.212-225; the second column preserves only the initial part of lines 272-295. The glosses on the lines

⁴ E.G. Turner, *Greek manuscripts of the ancient world*, 2nd ed. (*BICS Suppl.* 46) (London, 1987) 21.

⁵ The arrangement of the text in this papyrus is not uncommon and finds several parallels, see e.g. P.Amh. II 18; P.Amst. I 5; P.Ant. II 70; III 150; P.Oxy. LVI 3832; LXVII 4633 = J. Spooner, *Nine Homeric papyri from Oxyrhynchos* (Firenze 2002) 87-105; 4635 = *ibid.* 117-129; LXXV 5034; P.Sijp. 2. Most other papyri containing scholia minora, however, have lemmata and glosses arranged in two parallel columns: cf. L.M. Raffaelli, 'Repertorio dei papiri contenenti *scholia minora in Homerum*', *Ricerche di Filologia classica* 2 (Pisa 1984) 173-4.

⁶ A. Henrichs, 'Scholia Minora zu Homer I', *ZPE* 7 (1971) 119-148.

⁷ A. Henrichs, 'Scholia Minora zu Homer II', *ZPE* 7 (1971) 229-252.

⁸ For juxtaposition see e.g. P.Oxy. XLV 3238 Fr.1 i.7-8; P.Aphrod.Lit. II F° 3 → 6, F° 4 → 11, F° 6 ↓ 20, *passim*; P.Köln 2281 i.9, 19, iii.23 = Henrichs (n. 7); P.Amst. I 5.4, 8; P.Oslo II 12 i.7, 8 *passim*; cf. also P.Kell. III Gr. 95 Tab. I^v 18-21, 45-46, 48-49, *passim* (scholia to Isocrates, *Ad Demonicum*). For the use of ῥ see e.g. P.Mich. inv. 1588 i.16 = T. Renner, 'Three new Homeric on papyrus', *HSCP* 83 (1979), 311-337; P.Oxy. XLV 3238 iv.121.

⁹ For the practice of indicating deletion by enclosing the text in round brackets see Turner (n. 4) 16.

covered are less frequent than in overlapping papyri and not evenly distributed: apparently, the papyrus does not comment on 277-291. Probably there were other gaps in the lines glossed in the lost portion of the first column: the extant part of the column has 13 entries for 24 lines, while the Homeric text has 48 lines between the last lemma preserved in the first column and the first one in the second column. If the proportion between verses and entries observed in the extant section were maintained throughout the first column, there would be about 26 entries lost in the break. Since the 13 entries preserved occupy 19 lines, 26 calculated in the lost part should have extended to over 38 lines. If this were correct, the first column would have contained about 57 lines, with a height of ca. 31 cm (average letter height and interlinear space calculated at 0.3 and 0.25 cm respectively). Accordingly, since the lower margin in literary papyri is generally at least as broad as the upper, the height of the roll could not have been shorter than 35 cm.¹⁰ This figure, however, would not fit the average roll height of 25-33 cm calculated by Johnson for the Roman period.¹¹ It thus seems likely that a number of verses between *Il.* 2.225 and 272 received no comments.

Scholia minora to the lines covered in this fragment are also transmitted in P.Hamb. inv. 736v (*Il.* 2.61-222, 2nd c.);¹² P.Oxy LVI 3832 (*Il.* 2.201-218, 2nd c.); LXVII 4632 (*Il.* 2.214-227, 3rd c.);¹³ and 4633 (*Il.* 2.277-293, 307-318, 3rd c.).¹⁴ In most cases, however, overlap is in fact limited to the lemma. Glosses on φοξός, ψεδνή, λάχνη (219), νεμέσσηθεν (223), τέο δ' αὔτε (225) and the entries for lines 272-276 are preserved in this papyrus only. The Plumley fragment is of particular interest as it offers readings mostly not corresponding to those transmitted in other papyri, the D scholia, or other testimonies (grammarians, paraphrases, lexica). Where two glosses are offered for the same lemma, the first generally agrees with the majority of these sources, while the second is unparalleled; both glosses for ψεδνή (219) are attested in the glossographic tradition, although the second occurs less frequently, while neither of the glosses on νεμέσσηθεν (223) is found elsewhere. The second interpretation of φοξός (219) is remarkable as it has no parallel in the usual testimonies, but the full entry finds precise correspondence in Erotianus' Hippocratic glossary. The entry for ἔμμεναι (216) is also noteworthy, as the word is not glossed at this point in other papyri or in the D scholia. The lemmata in the papyrus generally agree with the readings in the Homeric text received, except for a banalisation at i.7 (συνοχωκοτεε), a nominative instead of an accusative at ii.3 (επεεβολος) and an itacistic mistake at ii.12, if correctly restored (απειθηεντα).¹⁵

¹⁰ W.A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto 2004) 134.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 141-143.

¹² Th. Vlachodimitris, 'Ein Glossar zu Ilias B 61-222', *ZPE* 11 (1973) 65-68.

¹³ Spooner (n. 5) 83-85.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 87-105. For a list of the papyri transmitting scholia minora published so far see 'Bibliography' in J. Landon, *The Scholia Minora in Homerum: an Alphabetical List*, Version 1.0 (November 2012) (Köln-Leuven 2012) (Trismegistos online publications 7: <http://www.trismegistos.org/dl.php?id=14>). The same work has been used for references to scholia minora supplied in the notes.

¹⁵ Misspellings and minor discrepancies between the lemmata and the readings in the Homeric text, including change of inflection, are commonly found in scholia minora: see J. Landon, 'Lexeis from the

Abbreviations and editions consulted:

- Ap. = A. Ludwich, 'Über die homerischen Glossen Apions', *Philologus* 74 (1917) 209-247; 75 (1918) 95-103; reprinted in K. Latte – H. Erbse, *Lexica graeca minora* (Hildesheim 1965) 287-334 [cited by page and line number as in reprint].
- Ap.Soph. = I. Bekker, *Apollonii sophistae lexicon homericum* (Berlin 1833) [cited by page and line number].
- D = H. van Thiel, *Scholia D in Iliadem. Proecdosis aucta et correctior 2014. Secundum codices manu scriptos* (Köln 2014) (Elektronische Schriftenreihe der Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek Köln, 7: <http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/5586/>).
- EGen = F. Lasserre – N. Livadaras, *Etymologicum magnum genuinum. Symeonis etymologicum una cum magna grammatica. Etymologicum magnum auctum*, vol. 1 (α – ὄμωσγέπωσ) (Rome 1976) [cited by entry number].
- EGud = E.L. de Stefani, *Etymologicum Gudianum*, vol. 1 (A – B); vol. 2 (B – Z) (Leipzig 1909-1920, repr. Amsterdam 1965) [cited by page and line number]; F.W. Sturz, *Etymologicum Graecae linguae Gudianum et alia grammaticorum scripta e codicibus manuscriptis nunc primum edita* (for ζειαί – ω) (Leipzig 1818, repr. Hildesheim 1973) [cited by column and line number].
- EM = T. Gaisford, *Etymologicum magnum* (Oxford 1848, repr. Amsterdam 1962) [cited by column and line number].
- Ep.Hom. = A.R. Dyck, *Epimerismi Homerici. Pars 2, Epimerismos continens qui ordine alphabetico traditi sunt; Lexicon 'Aimōdein' quod vocatur seu verius 'Etymologiai Diaphoroi'* (Berlin 1995) [cited by entry number].
- Eust. = M. van der Valk, *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes, vol. 1: praefationem et commentarios ad libros A – Δ complectens* (Leiden 1971) [cited by page and line number].
- Hsch. = K. Latte, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, vols. 1-2 (A – O) (Copenhagen 1953-1966); P.A. Hansen, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, vol. 3 (Π – Σ) (Berlin 2005); I.C. Cunningham – P.A. Hansen, *Hesychii Alexandrini lexicon*, vol. 4 (Σ – Ω) (Berlin 2009) [cited by entry number].
- Lex.Hom. = H. van Thiel, *Lexeis Homerikai* (Köln 2002) (<http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/1815/>) [cited by entry number].
- Orion = F.W. Sturz, *Orionis Thebani etymologicon* (Leipzig 1820, repr. Hildesheim 1973) [cited by column and line number].

Scholia Minora in Homerum', *ZPE* 124 (1999) 25-26; cf. J.-L. Fournet, *Hellénisme dans l'Égypte du VIe siècle: la bibliothèque et l'oeuvre de Dioscore d'Aphrodité*, 2 vols. (Cairo 1999) vol. 1, 101-103.

- PB = paraphrasis Bekkeri: I. Bekker, ‘Παράφρασις τῆς Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάδος’, in *Scholiorum in Homeri Iliadem appendix* (Berlin 1827) 651-811.
- Phot. = C. Theodoridis, *Photii patriarchae lexicon*, vol. 1 (A—Δ) (Berlin 1982); C. Theodoridis, *Photii patriarchae lexicon*, vol. 2 (E—M) (Berlin 1998); C. Theodoridis, *Photii patriarchae lexicon*, vol. 3 (N—Φ) (Berlin 2012) [cited by entry number].
- PW = paraphrasis Wassenberghi: E. Wassenbergh, *Homeri Iliadis liber I et II, cum paraphrasi graeca huc usque inedita, et Graecorum veterum commentariis magnam partem nunc primum in lucem prodeuntibus. Edidit notas in paraphrasin scholiorum emendatorum specimen et alia quaedam adjecit E. Wassenbergh* (Franecker 1783).
- Sch^{AbT} = H. Erbse, *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem (scholia vetera)*, vol. 1 (Berlin 1969)
- Sch.Gen. = J. Nicole, *Les scolies genevoises de l’Iliade*, vol. 1 (Geneva 1891, repr. Hildesheim 1966).
- Sch.Mosch. = J. Scherpezeelius, *Man. Moschopuli Byzantini scholia ad Homeri Iliados librum I et II adhuc inedita, cum notis et animadversionibus J. Scherpezeelii; accedit commentarius J. Camerarii* (Utrecht 1719).
- Sud. = A. Adler, *Suidae lexicon*, vols. 1-5 (Leipzig 1928-38) [cited by entry number].
- Syn. = I.C. Cunningham, *Synagoge: Ὁναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων. Texts of the original version and of MS.B* (Berlin 2003) [cited by entry number; Σ = *versio antiqua*; Σ’ = *versio codicis B*].
- h34 West = P.Hamb. inv. 736v (Mertens-Pack³ 1170.1)
- h36 West = P.Oxy LVI 3832 (Mertens-Pack³ 1170.4)
- hl33 West = P.Oxy. LXVII 4632 (Mertens-Pack³ 1170.41)
- h134 West = P.Oxy. LXVII 4633 (Mertens-Pack³ 1170.42)

Manuscript sigla, abbreviations and symbols used in the notes are reported as in the consulted editions. References to variant readings in the Homeric text are based on the apparatus in West’s edition.¹⁶

Col. i

	αμετρο]επης[<i>vac.</i>] . . . η[. .]αφα.	(212)
] ιεις απεραν . Ϛ	
	ακοςμα] αδιδακτα.	(213)
	εισαιτο] φανειη	(215)
5	εμμεν]αι ειναι	(216)
		voc
	φολκος]την οψιν διεστραμμε	(217)
	συνοχω]κοτες συμπεπτω-	(218)

¹⁶ M.L. West, *Homeri Ilias. Vol. 1, Rhapsodias I-XII continens* (Stuttgart 1998).

	κοτ]εσ και συνεχόμενοι	
	φοξοσ]οξυκεφα[λοσ] και	(219)
10	πρ]ομετωπο[σ]	
	ψεδνη]μαδαρα και αραια	(219)
	επενη]νοθε πα[] κταιλε	(219)
] .v. κτ[
] ...[] .	
	λαχνη τρι]χωσι[σ]	(219)
15	εκπαγλωσ ε]κπλη[κτικ]ωσ	(223)
	και σφ]οδρωσ	
	νεμεσσ]ηθεν ενεμεσ]ησαν	(223)
	και]ηγανακτησαν	
	τεο δ αυ]τε τουτου δη	(225)
20] ...[]	
]	
] .	
] .	
	— — — — —	

Col. ii

	εοργε[(272)
	κορυ[σσων	(273)
	επεσβολον[(275)
	λωγ[
5	λωβητηρα[(275)
	εσ]χ αγοραων. [(275)
	ου θην [(276)
	παλι]ν[αυτισ	(276)
	αγηνωρ[(276)
10	θαδησ[
	αμε[
	[vac.?]χα. [
	ανει]ηθεντα	(291)
	νεε[σθαι	(291)
	ειν[ατοσ	(295)
15	[
	. [
	. [
	. [
	. [
20	ε. [

Col. i

1 αμετρο]επηc[*vac.*] ...η[.]αcα.

The papyrus is heavily damaged at this point. A small break occurs immediately after the end of the lemma ἄμετροεπήc (212); a blank space separating the lemma from the gloss is expected. The top and bottom of a large semicircle open to the left is visible at the right of the lacuna, with the center stripped away. This is expected to be the first letter of the gloss; however, no letter seems compatible with the trace. It could not be the right-hand side of a round letter, such as *omicron*, as this would be too large and high, and would leave no space between the lemma and the gloss. On the basis of ii.3 and ii.13, it could be a round bracket indicating deletion of the lemma, assuming that another bracket corresponding to it preceded the lemma. This is followed by the lower part of an upright linked to a descending diagonal slightly curved leftwards: it may be the lower part of a *kappa* on the basis of the shape of *kappa* in καί at i.11, although the scribe curves the bottom diagonal in the opposite direction in every other example in the text. *Chi* is unlikely on the basis of the examples at i.8, 14 and ii.6. The letter is followed by the lower part of a stroke curving rightwards, touching the base of a circular stroke with a horizontal trace in the middle. It could be the tail of a narrow *alpha* (cf. e.g. the second *alpha* at i.2) linked to the base of *theta*, although there would be no trace of the loop at the left of the tail. The remains of the following letter are compatible with *eta*. A lacuna of the width of either one wide or two narrow letters follows, after which it is possible to read the sequence *alpha-sigma-alpha*. The reading καθη[. .]αcα. would find no correspondence in any of the glosses transmitted in the comparative testimonies on ἄμετροεπήc. If the semicircle following the lemma were correctly interpreted as a deletion mark, the reading could perhaps refer to a different lemma. It may be possible to suggest καθη[δρ]αc, a misspelling for καθέδραc, presumably part of the gloss on ἐρήτυθεν at the previous line (211), on the basis of D on ἐρήτυθεν at *Il.* 2.99: κατεῖχον ἕκαστος τὰc ἑαυτοῦ καθέδραc (also EM 373, 12: ἐρήτυθεν δὲ καθέδραc: ἀντὶ τοῦ κατεῖχον ἕκαστος τὰc ἑαυτῶν καθέδραc). The final *alpha*, however, would not be compatible with such a restoration. Note that the gloss on ἄμετροεπήc in h36 West is also apparently unattested elsewhere.

Scholia minora: h34 West α[μετροεπηc; h36 West αμετροε]πηc· [] εν . . . [] . . νων.|| D: ἄμετροεπήc: ἄμετροc ἐν τῷλέγειν (Γⁱ), | φλύαροc (Aⁱⁱ) ZYQXI || PB, PW: ὁ ἄμετροc ἐν τῷλέγειν || Sch^{bT} (ex.) 212d: ἄμετροεπήc: ... ἡμεῖc δὲ ἀπεραντολόγον τοῦτόν φαμεν ... || Hsch. a3619: *ἄμετροεπήc· φλύαροc b ἄμετροc ἐν τῷλέγειν Sb || Eust. 312, 11, 16: ἄμετροεπήc δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀπεραντολόγοc κατὰ τοὺc παλαιοὺc καὶ μὴ μέτρον εἰ δῶc λόγου ... τινὲc δὲ ἄμετροεπή λέγουcι τὸν ἐν τῷλέγειν ἄτακτον || Sch.Mosch.: ἄμετροεπήc: ἀπεραντολόγοc.

2] ιειϞ απεραν . Ϟ

The line opens with a blank space of the width of about one letter, suggesting that a short lemma has been lost at the left edge. The base of an upright is then visible below a small hole: *iota* seems the only possible restoration, as the lacuna would be too narrow for containing any other letter. The rest of the line is mostly clear. In απεραν . Ϟ the right vertical of *nu* is lost. On a semi-detached piece of papyrus, a short slightly diagonal line is then visible, followed by another diagonal stroke facing the opposite direction. These could be part of the same letter, namely *kappa*, *chi*, *lambda* or *alpha* with a very narrow loop (cf. the second *alpha* at i.11); none of these, however, would be compatible with the sequence απεραν-. It may be plausible to interpret the first slightly diagonal line as the base of an upright stroke, supposedly the vertical of a *tau*, followed by the left-hand side of a round letter, which could be *omicron*, *omega* or *epsilon*. The tiny piece on which these traces are written overlaps with the papyrus containing the end of the word. A small trace of ink is visible immediately below the fibres containing the supposed vertical of *tau*; this is probably from the right-hand side of the following letter, and appears as a short diagonal linked to a short horizontal. It could be the end of the top curve of *epsilon* touching the end of the cross-bar (cf. *epsilon* at i.10), or perhaps the end of the right curve of *omega* with a serif (cf. *omega* at i.16 and ii.5), or the joining extremities of *omicron* (cf. *omicron* at i.9). Final *sigma* is almost entirely visible. A possible restoration might be ιειϞ ἀπεράντωϞ, ‘endlessly hurling (words)’; this would have no parallel in the comparative testimonies, and there is no obvious lemma to which such a gloss could refer besides ἀμετροεπήϞ. ἀπεράντωϞ would be comparable with ἀπεραντολόγοϞ for ἀμετροεπήϞ in the scholia exegetica, Eustathius and Moschopoulos; cf. also Galenus, *Adversus ea quae a Juliano in Hippocratis aphorismos enuntiata sunt libellus*, ed. Kühn, vol. 18a, 253, 10-11:¹⁷ οὐδέν ἐστιν ἀπεραντολογώτερον τάνθρώπου. «Θερσίτης δ’ ἔτι μῦθος ἀμετροεπήϞ ἐκολύω» (Il. 2.212). Also Julius Pollux, *Onomasticon*, VI 146:¹⁸ εἶϞ δὲ τὸν πολλὰ οὐ μὴν κεκριμένα λέγοντα, ... ἀπέραντος ἀπεραντολόγοϞ, ... ἄμετροϞ ἀμετροεπήϞ.

3 (213) ἄκομα = ἀδίδακτα

The gloss ἀδίδακτα in the papyrus is not otherwise attested.

Scholia minora: h36 West ακομα·] αδια[τακτα || D: ἄκομα: ἀπρεπή (I'), ἄτακτα Z || Lex.Hom. ε254: ἄκομα: ἀδιάτακτα OU, | ἀπρεπή O, | ἄπρακτα U || PB: ῥήματα ... ἀπρεπή || PW: λόγουϞ ... ἀτάκτουϞ || Hsch. α2501: *ἄκομα· ἄτακτα vgn (AS) ἀπρεπή (AS) || Syn. Σ α260 (CD) = Σ' α710, Phot. α798, Sud. α933: ἄκομα· ἀπρεπή, ἄτακτα || EGen α352: ἄκομα· ἀπρεπή, ἄτακτα, μωρά B || EM 51, 22: ἄκομα: ἀπρεπή, ἄτακτα, μωρά, ἄδηλα || Eust. 312, 13-14: ἄκομα δέ, διότι μάτην καὶ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἤριζε τοῖ Ϟ βασιλεῦσι.

¹⁷ C.G. Kühn, *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, 20 vols. (Leipzig 1821-33, repr. Hildesheim 1965).

¹⁸ E. Bethe, *Pollucis onomasticon*, 2 vols. (= *Lexicographi Graeci* IX) (Leipzig 1900-1931) vol. 2, 39.

4 (215) εἴ ϗαιτο = φανείη

The reading offered in the papyrus also occurs in h36 West; other than there, it is found in the scholia exegetica only.

Scholia minora: h36 West εἴ ϗαιτο·] φανειη; hl33 West εἴ ϗαιτο[|| D: ... εἴ ϗαιτο ... : ... ὄν ἐνόμιζεν ... ZYQXIG; T^r ἐγίνωσκεν || PB: ὄν ἐνόμιζε || PW: φαίνοιτο || Sch^{bT} (ex.) 215b: εἴ ϗαιτο: φανείη, δόξειεν; Sch^{bT} (Ariston.) 215c: ... ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐδόκει ... || Hsch. ε1084: *εἴ ϗαιτο· δόξειεν AS ὁμοιοῖ το || Ep.Hom. ε57: εἴ ϗαιτο: †ἔδοξεν, ἐφάνη† ... O; cf. EGud 433, 10: εἴ ϗαιτο· ἔδοξεν, ἐφάνη

5 (215) ἔμμεναι = εἶ ναι

The lemma does not occur at this point in the overlapping papyri and in the D scholia. This might be due to the fact that the term was already discussed at a previous occurrence, for instance at *Il.* 1.117, 1.287 or 2.129. It is, however, worth observing that the D scholia offer the lemma at several different lines in the text.

Scholia minora: P.Oxy. XXIV 2405.160 (*Il.* 1.117): εμμεναι· ειναι. || D on 1.287: ἔμμεναι: εἶ ναι ... ZYQ; on 2.129 = 2.249: ἔμμεναι: εἶ ναι ZYQXⁱ; also on 2.783: ἔμμεναι: εἶ ναι, ὑπάρχειν ... ZYQ || Lex.Hom. ε317: ἔμμεναι: εἶ ναι, ὑπάρχειν OSU || PB, PW: εἶ ναι || Hsch. ε2374: *ἔμμεναι· καθέζεσθαι A εἶ ναι †ἔως αὐτοῦ AS ἢ ἐπίμμενε S || EGud 463, 5: ἔμμεναι: ... τὸ γὰρ ὑπάρχω σημαίνει ... || EM 335, 10: ἔμμεναι: ἀπὸ ἐνεστῶτος· (τὸ γὰρ εἶ ναι τὸ ὑπάρχειν σημαίνει·) εἰ μί

6 (217) φολκός = τὴν ὄψιν διετραμμένον

The top of the right vertical of *eta* and the apices of *nu* in τὴν appear linked through a thinner horizontal stroke, probably an accidental move with the pen. Two other examples of *nu* with the apices connected through a thin line occur at i.18. *Tau* and *rho* in διετραμμένον are not visible in the photo due to a fold in the final part of the strip; their presence has been ascertained during conservation work, as the fold could be temporarily opened.

The readings transmitted in the papyri differ from one another; *τραβός* in h36 West is the gloss generally reported in later sources. τὴν ὄψιν διετραμμένον in this fragment is also comparable to the reading in the D scholia and in the paraphrasis Bekkeri, but precise correspondence occurs in Eustathius only; see also on *Il.* 9.503:¹⁹ παραβλῶτας ... τουτέστι διετραμμένον τὴν ὄψιν; and on 12.310:²⁰ μυλλός δὲ ὀ διετραμμένον τὴν ὄψιν. A parallel reading is also offered in a scholion to Ar. *Thesm.* 846:²¹ τυφλός, διετραμμένον τὴν ὄψιν.

Scholia minora: h36 West φολκος·] τραβος; hl33 West φολκος· [---]ινους του[---] || D: φολκός: τὰς ὄψεις διάτροφος, ὃ ἐστιν | τραβός (A^{ti}) || PB: τὰς

¹⁹ M. van der Valk, *Eustathii archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes, vol.2: praefationem et commentarios ad libros E-I complectens* (Leiden 1976) 774, 10-11.

²⁰ M. van der Valk, *Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes, vol.3: praefationem et commentarios ad libros K-II complectens* (Leiden 1979) 398, 2.

²¹ R.F. Regtuit, *Scholia in Aristophanem. Pars III, Fasc. 2/3 continens Scholia in Aristophanis Thesmophoriazusas et Ecclesiazusas* (Groningen 2007) 49.

ὄψεις διάστροφος || PW: στραβός || Ap.Soph. 164, 17: φολκός. ... ἔστι δὲ οἷον φαολκός, ὃ τὰ φάη εἰ λκυκμένος, οἷον στραβός || Lex.Hom. φ82: φολκός: στραβός OSU || Sch^A (Ariston.) 217a: φολκός: ... ἔστι δὲ φολκός ὃ τὰ φάη εἰ λκυκμένος, ὃ ἔστιν ἐστραμμένος; Sch^{bT} (ex.) 217b: ... ἔστιν οὖν ἐφελκόμενος τὰ φάη ... || Sch.Gen.: φολκός] ὃ στραβός, οἷον φαολκός, ὃ τὰ φάη εἰ λκυκμένος || Hsch. φ730: *φολκός: στραβός (vg³A⁶Br²⁴³Σ). οἱ δὲ λιπόδερμον || Orion 159, 24: φολκός. παρὰ τὸ τὰ φάη παρέλκεσθαι, ὃ ἔστι ν ἐν τῇ συνηθείᾳ στραβός λεγόμενος || Ep.Hom. φ35: φολκός: παρὰ τὸ τὰ φάη εἰ λκυκμένα ἔχειν· εἰ λκυκμένον γὰρ λέγουσιν τὸν στραβόν O || Sud. φ565, Phot. φ253, Syn. Σ φ164: φολκός: στραβός ABC || EGud 555, 34: φολκός: ὃ στράβος, παρὰ τὸ τὰ φάη ἐλκυκμένα ἔχειν· ἐλκυκμένον γὰρ λέγεται τὸ στράβον || EM 798, 3: φολκός: παρὰ τὸ τὰ φάη παρέλκεσθαι || Eust. 314, 21-22, 30-33 and 315, 1: ἔστι δὲ φολκός μὲν ὃ στραβός, ὃ τὰ φάη, τουτέστι τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, μὴ ὀρθὰ ἔχων ἀλλὰ ἐστραμμένα καὶ παρελκυκμένα τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ὀρθότητος ... Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τὰ κατὰ τὸν στραβὸν οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ οὕτω φράζουσιν· οἱ μὲν, ὅτι βλεπεδαίμων ὃ διεστραμμένος τὰς ὄψεις ... ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι ἰλλός πλάγιος, διεστραμμένος, στραβός Cf. also Julius Pollux, *Onomasticon*, II 51:²² ὀφθαλμία. παραβλώψ, φολκός, διάστροφος, στρεβλός; Herodian, *Partitiones*, ed. Boissonade, 145, 4:²³ φολκός, ὃ στραβός.

7-8 (218) **συνοχωκότες** (l. **συνοχωκότε**) = **συμπεπτωκότες** καὶ **συνεχόμενοι**

The reading in the papyrus is probably a banalisation; **συνοχωκότε** occurs correctly in 841 West = P.Oxy. LXVII 4638²⁴, h133 West, tt (*testimonia auctorum antiquorum*), Ω;]τε also in h36 West; **συνεχωκότες** 3 West = P.Lond.Lit. 5; **συνοχωκότε** Hsch.

συμπεπτωκότες, restored in the papyrus, corresponds to the gloss generally offered at this point; **συνεχόμενοι** is unique to this glossary. On the spelling and etymology of the lemma (cf. **συνοχωκότε** in Hesychius) see P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*, 2nd ed. (Paris 2009) 1033 (on **συνοχωκότε**); LSI *Suppl.* (Oxford 1996) 287 (on **συνόχωκα**).

Scholia minora: h34 West **σ[υνοχωκοτε**; h36 West **συνοχωκο]τε· συνπεπτω[]κοτ[ε(σ)** || D: **συνοχωκότε: συμπεπτωκότες** (A^{ti}), **συνηγμένοι ZYQXIⁱ** (**συνπεπτωκότες Z, συμπεπτωκότε A[†]**) || PB, PW: **συμπεπτωκότες** || Sch^{bT} (ex.) 218b: **συνοχωκότε: ἀπὸ τοῦ συνοχωκός, ὃ ἔστι συμπεπτωκότες ...** || Hsch. c2675: **συνοχωκότε· ἐπισυμπεπτωκότες ...** || EGud 516, 14: **συνοχωκότες, συμπεπακότες** || EM 735, 46: **συνοχωκότε: συμπεπτωκότε, συνηγμένω** || Eust. 315, 20: **τὸ δὲ συνοχωκότε δηλοῖ μὲν τὸ συμπεπτωκότες.**

²² Bethe (n. 18) vol. 1, 98.

²³ J.F. Boissonade, *Herodiani partitiones* (London 1819, repr. Amsterdam 1963).

²⁴ Spooner (n. 5) 147-156.

9-10 (219) φοξός = ὄξυκέφαλος καὶ προμέτωπος

ὄξυκέφαλος in the papyrus is read in agreement with the D scholia and most of the other sources, while προμέτωπος is not found elsewhere in these testimonies; rather, the gloss occurs almost identically in Erotianus, *Vocum Hippocraticarum collectio*, ed. Nachmanson, 132, 11:²⁵ φοξοί· οἱ ὄξυκέφαλοι καὶ προμέτωποι. The use of the conjunction also in this parallel is noteworthy; double explications separated by καί are frequent throughout Erotianus' glossary. It seems remarkable that this parallel appears for the section of Homeric narration concerning the physiognomic description of Thersites: this may suggest that the glossator enriched the interpretations of the lemmata with materials from other glossographic works external to the Homeric tradition.

Scholia minora: hl33 West φοξοϛ || D: φοξός: ὄξυκέφαλος ΖΥQXA^ιΓΙ^ςΓΤ^ρ || Lex.Hom. φ70: φοξός: ὄξυκέφαλος OSU² || PB: ὄξυς ἦν τὴν κεφαλὴν || PW: ὄξυκέφαλος || Ap.Soph. 164, 19: φοξός: ... σημαίνει δὲ τὸν ὄξυκέφαλον || Sch^A (Er. Hom.) 219b: φοξός: φοξός εἴρηται ἀπὸ τῶν κεραμεικῶν ἀγγείων τῶν ἐν τῇ καμίνῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ φωτός ἀπωξυμένων ... ἔνιοι δὲ κυρίως τὸν ἐπὶ τὰ φάη, τουτέστι τὰ ὄμματα, ἀπωξυμένην ἔχοντα τὴν κεφαλὴν. †ἀμφοτέρων† τὸ πρότερον || Sch.Gen.: φοξός] ὁ ὄξυκέφαλος ... || Hsch. φ740: *φοξός· λιπόδερμος. ὄξυκέφαλος vgA¹Br²⁴⁶Σ || Orion 159, 12: φοξός. φάοξός τις ὤν, ἀπὸ μεταφορῶς τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ περὶ διεστραμμένων ὀστρακίων ἀγγείων ἐν τῷ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν τῇ καμίνῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ πυρός ἀποξυμένων. ἔνιοι δὲ κυρίως τὸν ἐπὶ τὰ φάη, τουτέστι τὰ ὄμματα, ἀποξυμένην ἔχοντα τὴν κεφαλὴν. ἄμεινον τὸ πρότερον O || Syn. Σ φ167 (ABC), Phot. φ257, Sud. φ577: φοξός: ὄξυκέφαλος || EGud 556, 43: φοξός, ὁ ὄξυκέφαλος ... καὶ ἄλλως· φοξός ὁ διεστραμμένος ἐν τῷ φάει || EM 798, 17: φοξός: ὄξυκέφαλος, ὁ διεστραμμένος τὰ φάη || Eust. 315, 27-30: φοξός δὲ κεφαλὴν λέγεται ὁ εἶς ὄξυ λήγουσαν ἔχων αὐτήν, λεγόμενος οὕτως ἢ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀξύτητος ἢ κατὰ τοὺς παλαιοὺς ἐξ ὁμοιότητος τῶν πυριρραγῶν ὀστράκων, ἅπερ φοξά λέγεται οἱ οὐεῖ τινα φλοξά. Cf. also Herodian, *Partitiones*, ed. Boissonade, 145, 4:²⁶ φοξός, ὁ ὄξυκέφαλος.

11 (219) ψεδνή = μαδαρά καὶ ἀραιά

The first three letters in ἀραιά are not visible in the photo due to a fold in the papyrus; the reading, however, has been confirmed during conservation work, as the strip was temporarily unfolded. The final part of the tail of the second alpha is visible near the base of *iota*, the reading of which is partly hindered by a damage in the papyrus.

The reading in the papyrus closely agrees with the D scholia, although the word order is inverted; μαδαρός is widely transmitted, while ἀραιός is less commonly attested; but cf. ἀραιόθριξ in Hesychius, Suda, Synagoge and Etymologicum Gudianum (ἀρεόθριξ).

²⁵ E. Nachmanson, *Erotiani vocum Hippocraticarum collectio cum fragmentis* (Göteborg 1918).

²⁶ Boissonade (n. 23).

Scholia minora: hl33 West ψεδνη[|| D: ψεδνή: ἄραιά μαδαρά. ZYQXA^{ti}T^{ri} || PB: ἄραιά || PW: λεπτή || Ap.Soph. 169, 19: ψεδνή ἄραιά, μαδαρά, οἷον ἄπεσιλωμένη || Lex.Hom. ψ7: ψεδνή δέ: †διεψευσμένη OSU || Hsch. ψ99: *ψεδνή ἡ θρίξ· ἢ ἄραιόθριξ A⁷. «ψεδνή δ' ἐπενήνοθε» μαδαρά ἐπήνθει g³A⁶ || Orion. 168, 4: ψεδνός ... ὁ μαδαρός ... || Ep.Hom. ψ1: ψεδνή: ... σημαίνει δὲ ψεδνός τὸν φαλακρόν GO || Syn. Σ ψ7: ψεδνός· ἄραιόθριξ, μαδαρός BC || Sud. ψ38: ψεδνή: ἄραιά. καὶ ψεδνός, ἄραιόθριξ, μαδαρός || EGud 573, 13: ψεδνή: ὀλίγη ... σημαίνει δὲ ψεδνός, τὸν φαλακρόν; cf. 573, 21: ψεδνός: μαδαρός, ἄρεόθριξ ... || EM 817, 51: ψεδνός: ἄραιός, μαδαρός· σημαίνει δὲ τὸν φαλακρόν καὶ ψιλὸν τὴν τρίχα || Eust. 316, 13: ἔστι δὲ ψεδνή μὲν ἢ λεπτή. See also Herodian, *Partitiones*, ed. Boissonade, 150, 10.²⁷ ψεδνός, ὁ μαδαρός.

12-13 (219) ἐπενήνοθε = πα[] κταιλε [-ca.6-] ¹ v. κτ[] ... [] .

The traces of ink surviving at 13 do not reach the end of the column, suggesting that the line was rather short; it seems thus probable that it contained the continuation of the gloss on ἐπενήνοθε. The breaks in the papyrus hinder the reading of the gloss. There is a lacuna of one letter at 12 after the sequence *pi-alpha*; part of the foot of an upright is then visible at the bottom of the line before *kappa*; this seems compatible with the hooked foot of *eta* at i.4. The sequence κταιλε is then clearly legible. 13 is almost entirely lost in lacuna. If it is to be read as part of the gloss, indentation and alignment with i.8 and 10 are assumed, and therefore a loss of about six letters can be calculated in the missing part. Only part of three or four nearly faded letters survives, split horizontally between two joining edges (the lower one is visible above the letters *chi* and *omega* at i.14). The first curved stroke on the left could be *epsilon*, or *sigma*, or perhaps *omicron*. The two following obliques facing opposite directions are probably part of the same letter, either *chi* or *upsilon*. This is followed by the top of an upright. A spot of ink is then visible at the end on the line, possibly the top of the last letter. The interlinear space between 12 and 13 contains writing: two traces are visible after the lacuna, the second one being perhaps compatible with *nu*. A blank space of the width of one letter follows, possibly as the ink has vanished; *kappa* and *tau* are clearly visible before the papyrus breaks off. What remains of the gloss contained in 12-13 and in the interlinear space seems not compatible with the reading in any other comparative testimony; possibly, πα[ρ]ηκται may be proposed at 12, although in this case a preposition such as ἀπό would be expected to follow. If word division is correct, the sequence *lambda-epsilon* at the end of the line might be part of λέγεται or λέγουσι.

Scholia minora: hl33 West επηννο[θε || D: ἐπενήνοθεν: ἐπήνθει (Iⁱ), ἐπέκειτο. ZYQXI. A^{ti} ἐβεβλαστήκει || PB: ἐπέκειτο || PW: ἐπεύκνωτο || Ap.Soph. 71, 11: ἐπενήνοθεν ἐπήν, ἐπέκειτο || Lex.Hom. ε557: ἐπενήνοθεν: ἄνωθεν, ἐπέκειτο OSU || Sch^T (ex.) 219d¹: ἐπενήνοθεν: ἀπὸ τοῦ θέω· ὑπερβιβασμός ἔθω ... ; Sch^A (Ep. Hom., ex.) 219d²: ἐπενήνοθε: ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθω ἐνέθω, ἦνοθα καὶ ἐπενήνοθα

²⁷ Boissonade (n. 23).

... ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ θέω ὑπερβιβασμοῦ ἔθω, ὡς ῥέω ἔρω· ἐν συνθέσει ἐνέθω, ἦνοθα καὶ Ἀπτικῶς ἐνήνοθα; Sch^b (ex.) 219d³: τὸ δὲ ἐπενήνοθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ θέω, ἐν ὑπερβιβασμοῦ ἔθω, ἀναδιπλασιασμοῦ ἐνέθω, ἦνοθα καὶ ἐνήνοθα || Hsch. ε4412: *ἐπενήνοθεν· ἐπήνθει AS. ἔπεστιν. ἐπήν || Orion 124, 11 ὀθόνη: παρὰ τὸ ὄθω τὸ δηλοῦν τὴν κίνησιν ... «ψεδνὴ δ' ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη» (*Il.* 2.219) ἐνόθω ἦνοθεν ἐνήνοθεν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκινεῖ το || Ep.Hom. ε58 = EGud 498, 5: ἐπενήνοθεν· ῥῆμα μέσου παρακειμένου οἱ μὲν, ὅτι τὸ θέμα ἐστὶ ν ἔθω ... καὶ οἱ Ἀπτικοὶ τὸ ε τοῦ παρακειμένου τρέπουσιν εἰς ο ... ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἄλλω· ἔστιν ὄθω, τὸ κινῶ... Ο || Sud. ε2057: ἐπενήνοθεν: ἐπήνθει, ἐπέκειτο || EM 354, 41: ἐπενήνοθε: κάλλιόν ἐστιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ὑπῆρχεν. ἔστι δὲ μέσοσ παρακειμένος· οἱ μὲν παρὰ τὸ ἔθω ... ἄλλω· ἐκ τοῦ ἔω, τὸ ὑπάρχω, γίνεται ἐέθω ... || Sch.Mosch.: ἐπενήνοθε: ἀπὸ τοῦ θέω ... μάλιστα δῆλον γίνεται ὅτι τὸ ἐπενήνοθεν τὸ ἐπέτρεχε δηλοῖ, οὐ τὸ ἐπήνθει || Eust. 316, 24-5 and 317, 1-3: τὸ δὲ ἐπενήνοθεν ... σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ἐπέθεε καὶ ἐπέτρεχεν ... τὸ θέω, τὸ τρέχω, ὑπερβιβασθὲν καὶ γενόμενον ἔθω πεποιήκε τὸ ἐπενήνοθεν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ χρόνου μέσου παρακειμένου; 317, 11-13: τινὲς δὲ ἐπενήνοθέ φασι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπεκινεῖ το ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄθω, τὸ κινῶ κατὰ κλίσιν ὁμοίαν μέσου παρακειμένου.

14 (219) λάχνη = τρίχωσις

The interpretation offered on this lemma is reflected in all testimonies.

Scholia minora: h34 West λ[αχνη; h133 West λαχνη[|| D (ZYQXA^{ti}), Lex.Hom. λ5 (OSU): λάχνη: τρίχωσις || PB, PW: τρίχωσις || Sch^T (ex.) 219e: λάχνη: πύκνωσις, παρὰ τὸ λα καὶ τὸν χ<ν>οῦν T || Hsch. λ455: λάχνη· δασει̅ α θρίξ· χαίτη· κόμη· ὕλη ... *ἔπρίχωσις (*Il.* 10.134) ASvgn. ἢ ἀφροῦς τῆς θαλάσσης vgr || Orion 95, 28, Ep.Hom. λ5 (GO), Syn. Σ λ42 (ABC), Phot. λ127, Sud. λ168, EGud 363, 45, EM 558, 18: λάχνη: τρίχωσις ... || Eust. 316, 19-22: λάχνη δὲ ἢ τρίχωσις. See also Julius Pollux, *Onomasticon*, II 22:²⁸ τὰ δὲ τῶν μερῶν ὀνόματα τρίχεσ, τρίχωσις ... λάχνη.

15-16 (223) ἐκπάγλωσ = ἐκπληκτικῶσ καὶ σφοδρῶσ

The left edge of the papyrus is damaged at this point. A short indentation is expected at 16, as this contains a gloss continuing from the previous line; on the basis of the restorations at i.8 and 10, it is possible to calculate a loss of about five letters at the beginning of 16. The first visible letter is partly lost in the lacuna: this appears as a curved stroke, presumably the right-hand side of a round letter; σφ]οδρωσ seems the only plausible restoration. On the basis of the readings at i.8, 9 and 11, the conjunction καὶ may be plausibly restored at the beginning of the line, assuming a loss of five and a half letters in the lacuna; if a different conjunction, such as ἦ or simple juxtaposition of the two interpretations were used, it would be necessary to assume that the indentation at 16 was greater than those at i.8 and 10.

ἐκπάγλωσ is not glossed at this point in h133 West. ἐκπληκτικῶσ is transmitted in most sources; σφοδρῶσ, restored in the papyrus, is unparalleled.

²⁸ Bethe (n. 18) vol. 1, 87.

Scholia minora: P.Schub. 2.7 (*Il.* 1.268): εκπα]γλωϷ· εκπληκτικ[ωϷ ... ; P.Stras. inv. 33 vii.8-9 (*Il.* 1.268): ε]κπαγλωϷ· εκ[π]ληκτικωϷ, εξ[ο]χωϷ; P.Amh. II 18 xv.200 (*Od.* 15.335): εκπαγλωϷ· υπεραγοντωϷ || D: ἐκπάγλωϷ: ἐκπληκτικῶϷ (Iⁱ), μεγάλωϷ. ZYQX; cf. on *Il.* 1.268: ἐκπάγλωϷ. ἐκπληκτικῶϷ. ὅ ἐστι, κατὰ κράτος αὐτοῦϷ ἐξαπώλεσαν ZYQI. A^{ti} ἐξόχωϷ καὶ φοβερῶϷ || PB: ἐκπληκτικῶϷ || PW: ἐξόχωϷ || Ap. 312, 17 (1.268): ἐκπάγλωϷ β' · ἰχυρῶϷ. φοβερῶϷ || Lex.Hom. ε224: ἐκπάγλωϷ: ἐκπληκτικῶϷ OSU || Sch^T (ex.) 222-3: <τῶ δ' ἄρ' Ἀχαιοί/> ἐκπάγλωϷ <κοτέοντο>: ὕβριστικῶϷ ... ; cf. Sch^T (ex.?) on *Il.* 2.357: ἐκπάγλωϷ: ὕβριστικῶϷ || Hsch. ε1570: ἐκπάγλωϷ· ἐκπληκτικῶϷ. ἘξόχωϷ s μεγάλωϷ, ἘθαυμαστῶϷ s ἔξοχα;

17-18 (223) νεμέσσηθεν = ἐνεμέσσησαν καὶ ἠγανάκτησαν

On the basis of the restorations at i.8 and 10 it is possible to calculate about three letters missing at 18; καὶ ἠγανακτῆσαν can be reasonably restored (cf. i.16).

The glosses in the papyrus differ from those attested elsewhere; the first one simply clarifies the lemma by offering the more familiar aorist active form. The verb ἠγανακτέω chosen for the second interpretation is unparalleled: the other testimonies unanimously use μέμφομαι.

Scholia minora: hl33 West ν]ε[μ]εσσ[η]θεν; cf. P.Oxy. XLIV 3160 ii.41 (*Od.* 2.64): νεμεσσηθηται· μεμψεωϷ αξιον ηγησεται (l. -τε) || D: νεμέσσηθεν: ἐμέμφοντο. ZYQX (U^mIⁱ μεμψάμενοι) || PB, PW: ἐμέμφοντο || Lex.Hom. ν17: νεμέσσηθεν δέ: ἐνέμψα<ν>το δέ OSU || Hsch. ν287: *νεμεσῶ μέμφομαι s || Syn. Σ ν42: νεμεσῶ: μέμφεται ABCD || EM 600, 34: νεμεσσητός: ... «νεμέσσηθέν τ' ἐνὶ θυμῶ» (*Il.* 2.223) ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμέμφοντο, Ἰλιάδος β' || Eust 318, 17-18: οἱ δὲ ὄμωϷ νεμεσῶι τῶϷτασιασση, τουτέστι δικαίωϷ ἐπιμέμφονται.

19 (225) τέο δ' αὔτε = τούτου δῆ

The reading τεο δ α]υ]τε in the lemma is restored with Aristarchos, 3 West, Ω; δῆ αὐτ' (Bekker) or δηϋτ' (Fick) was in Zenodotos, on the basis of Sch^T (Did.) 225b.

The lemma is not entered at this point in hl33 West. τούτου in the papyrus has no parallel in the comparative sources, which unanimously explain τέο with τίνοϷ.

Scholia minora: P.Hamb. III 200 ii.22 (*Od.* 4.463): [[το]]τεο: [[ο]]τιν[ο]Ϸ || D: τέο: τίνοϷ. ZYQXIⁱ || Ap.Soph. 151, 6: τέο τίνοϷ ... || PB: τίνοϷ δῆ || PW: τίνοϷ || Lex.Hom. τ76: τέο: τίνοϷ O²SU² || Sch^T (Did.) 225b: τέο δ' αὔτε: οὔτωϷ ἈρίσταρχοϷ. ΖηνόδοτοϷ δὲ διὰ τοῦ η || Hsch. τ488: τέο· τίνοϷ || Ep.Hom. τ8: τέο: ἔστι τίϷ τινόϷ ... GO || Sud. τ317: τέο: ἀντὶ τοῦ τίνοϷ || EGud 526, 3: τέο, τίνοϷ χάριν; ἔστι τίϷ τινόϷ || EM 752, 10: τέο καὶ τεόν: τὸ μὲν τέο ἀντὶ τοῦ τίνοϷ κεῖται

20-23 The tops of some letters are visible at 20, but these are too scant to allow identification of the lemma. An upright stroke at the end of the third line calculated in lacuna, on the edge of the break, could be compatible with either *iota* or the right-hand side of *nu*. The remains of the letter at the end of the fourth line,

immediately after the break, seem compatible with the right-hand side of *alpha* linked to *iota*, or perhaps with *nu*.

Col. ii

1 (272) εοργε[

ἔοργε(ν) is glossed in D on *Il.* 2.272; *Ap.Soph.* 70, 16; *Lex.Hom.* ε502; **Hsch.* ε4043; *Ep.Hom.* ε66; *EGud* 493, 1.

2 (273) κορυ[CCων

κορύCCων is glossed in D on *Il.* 2.273; *Sch^T* (ex.) 273b¹; *Hsch.* κ3721.

3-4 (275) επεCβολοC[---]λωγ[

Apparently, the papyrus has the lemma ἐπεCβόλοC inflected in the nominative instead of the accusative ἐπεCβόλον transmitted in manuscripts at this point: ἐπεCβόλοC is also glossed in Apollonius Sophistes, while the D scholia and the *Lexeis Homerikai* have ἐπεCβόλον.²⁹ The indentation at 4 indicates that the line contains the continuation of the gloss at 3; λωγ[surviving at 4 is compatible with τοῖC ἔπεC βάλλων in Apollonius Sophistes, Hesychius, *Etymologicum Gudianum* and *Etymologicum Magnum*, supposing that βάλλων was split between the lines. The lemma is preceded by a curved stroke, probably a cancellation mark: perhaps this may be due to the fact that the term had been glossed before λωβητῆρα, while λωβητῆρα precedes ἐπεCβόλον in the text transmitted.

D: ἐπεCβόλον: ἔπεCιν, ὃ ἐCτι λόγοιC, βάλλοντα (~I¹), λοιδορον ZYQX λοιδορωῶ Z || PB: τὸν ἔπεCιν (ὃ ἐCτι λόγοιC) βάλλοντα || PW: ἔπεCι βάλλοντα (ὃ ἐCτι τὸν ὑβριCτήν) || *Ap.Soph.* 71, 18: ἐπεCβόλοC: τοῖC ἔπεCι βάλλων, λοιδοροC || *Lex.Hom.* ε562: ἐπεCβόλον: τὸν τοῖC ἔπεCι, ὃ ἐCτι τοῖC λόγοιC, βάλλοντα καὶ ὑβρίζοντα OSU || *Sch^{bT}* (ex., *Hrd.*) 275b: <ἐπεCβόλον> ἔCχ' ἀγοράων: ὤC συνεχῶC αὐτοῦ παρρηCιαζομένου. | ἐπεCβόλον δὲ ὤC ἐγχεCπάλον (cf. *Il.* 2.131) bT ἦτοι τὸν ἔπεCι βάλλοντα τοῦC πολλοῦC b || *Hsch.* ε4450: ἐπεCβόλοC· λοιδοροC. πρόγλωCCOC. τοῖC ἔπεCι βάλλων || *Syn.* Σ ε616, *Phot.* ε1437, *Sud.* ε2079: ἐπεCβόλοC: λοιδορον, φλύαρον || *Ep.Hom.* ε70: ἐπεCβόλοC: ἐκ τοῦ ἔποC καὶ τοῦ βάλλειν ... || *EGud* 499, 3: ἐπεCβόλοC: ὁ φλύαροC (*d*¹) καὶ λοιδοροC (*d*²) ... || *EGud.* 499, 21, EM 355, 4: ἐπεCβόλοC: ὁ λοιδοροC, ὁ τοῖC ἔπεCι βάλλων || *EGud.* 499, 22: ἐπεCβόλοC: ὁ

²⁹ Cf. K. McNamee, *Sigla and select marginalia in Greek literary papyri* (Bruxelles 1992) 65-72 for marginal notes in literary papyri in which lemmata or glosses are inflected differently from the original text. McNamee observes that lemmata inflected in the nominative or accusative may be plausibly explained by assuming that the note was taken from commentaries in which the word occurred as the grammatical subject or object of discursive explanations; McNamee suggests that similar variations observed in the scholia minora may be explained in the same way.

φλύαρος καὶ λοίδορος, ὁ διὰ τῶν ἐπῶν λωβῶν, τουτέστιν ὑβρίζων, ἐπεκλύβος καὶ κατὰ ἐναλλαγὴν ἐπεεβόλος.

5 (275) λω[βητηρα

λωβητήρα is glossed in D on *Il.* 2.275; Lex.Hom. λ123; Sch^T (ex.) 275a; Hsch. λ1488; Syn. Σ λ173; Phot. λ499; Sud. λ723.

6 (275) εσχ αγοραων.[

Apostrophe to mark elision is not written. D gloss ἔσχεν and ἀγοράων separately on *Il.* 2.275. ἔσχε(ν) is also glossed in P.Mich. inv. 2720 Fol. 5v, 22 (*Il.* 5.300), Ap.Soph. 78, 5, and Lex.Hom. ε848; ἀγοράων in Lex.Hom. α58 and *Hsch. α719. Sch^{bT} (ex., Hrd.) 275b has <ἐπεεβόλον> ἔσχ' ἀγοράων (cf. note at ii.3-4 above).

7 (276) ου θην[

On account of the blank space following the reading, before the papyrus breaks off, the lemma should have been οὔ θήν only, glossed in Hsch. ο1613; οὔ θήν μιν is glossed in D on *Il.* 2.276; Lex.Hom. ο316; Ep.Hom. ο76; EGud 439, 46; EM 638, 16. Sch^T (ex., Ariston.) 276b¹ comments on οὔ θήν μιν πάλιν.

8 (276) παλ[ιν αυτις

αὔτις is restored in the lacuna on the basis of the entry in D on *Il.* 2.276; the expression is also glossed in Sch^A (Ariston.) 276a. πάλιν alone is glossed in Ap. 329, 13; Ap.Soph. 126, 26; Lex.Hom. π1; Hsch. π190; EGud 449, 46, 50; EM 648, 20.

9-10 (276) αγη[νωρ ---]|θαδης[

The indentation given to 10 indicates that the line contains part of the gloss continuing from 9; the reading θαδης[at 10 can be confidently restored as part of αὐθάδης, found in most comparative testimonies, assuming that the word was split between the lines.

D: ἀγήνωρ: αὐθάδης, ὑβριετής (=I¹), καὶ θρασύς ZYQX. | ὅτε δὲ δηλοῖ [καὶ Q] τὸν ἀνδρεῖον ZQ; cf. on I 398: ἀγήνωρ δὲ νῦν ὁ ἄγαν ἰ ἀνδρεῖος (=T^r), ὅτε δὲ ὁ αὐθάδης, καὶ ὑπερήφανος ZYQXI¹G (lemma 'ἀγήνωρ' pro δὲ QX) || Ap. 289, 19: Ἀγήνωρ γ' ὄνομα κύριον (*Il.* 4.467). καὶ τὸν ἀνδρεῖον (9.398). καὶ τὸν αὐθάδη (2.276). καὶ ὑπερήφανον (*Od.* 2.103) || Ap.Soph. 7, 16: ἀγήνωρ: ἦτοι ἄγαν ἀνδρεῖος, τῆς ἠγορέας ἐγκειμένης, ἢ ὅταν αὐθάδης καὶ ὑβριετής... || Lex.Hom. α35: ἀγήνωρ: αὐθάδης, ὑβριετής OSU, | ἢ ἄγαν ἀνδρεῖος U || Sch.Gen. on *Il.* 9.699: ἀγήνωρ] ἄγαν αὐθάδης καὶ ὑπερόπτης, ὑβριετής, ἢ ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὴν ἠγορέην ἢ τὴν ἀνδρείαν || Hsch. α491: *ἀγήνωρ· ὑπερήφανος vγΣ αὐθάδης vγAb ἀνδρεῖος .. nΣ καὶ ὄνομα κύριον .. wΣ || Ep.Hom. α72: ἀγήνωρ: παρὰ τὸ ἄγαν καὶ τὸ ἀνὴρ γίνεται ἀγάνωρ... PO.

11 αμε[

A small angular stroke, partly vanished, is visible in the upper part of the line, immediately before *alpha*; if not accidental, it might be a small added letter: cf. those written above i.6, i.13 and ii.12. If this were correct, the shape of the stroke would be compatible with either *gamma* or *tau*. The alignment on the left, corresponding to the one given to the lemmata in the column, would suggest a lemma rather than a gloss extending from the previous line. The text received and the variant readings transmitted at this point, however, do not offer any lemma compatible with the reading in the papyrus. It may be possible to hypothesise a mistake for ἄμα (281).³⁰ ἄμα is glossed in D on *Il.* 1.417, 1.495, 2.281, 13.729; Sch^A (Ep. Hom.) on *Il.* 1.251; Hsch. α3386; Phot. α1095; Ep.Hom. α74; EGud 102, 7; EM 75, 8.

[vac.?]χα[

The writing at this point is smaller than elsewhere, and distance from the preceding and the following line is very short: this indicates an interlinear addition. It could be either an addition or modification of 12 below it, or the continuation of a gloss from 11 above. A break in the fibres prevents us from ascertaining whether letters are missing before the sequence *chi-alpha*. There would be space for one or two letters. If it were a new lemma added between the lines, the sequence *chi-alpha* would be incompatible with any reading in the text transmitted.

12 (291) ανει[ηθεντα (l. ἄνηθέντα)

If the lemma is correctly restored, the papyrus has a banal itacistic mistake: cf. αν[[ε]]ἰηθέντα in 3 West;]ανειηθεν[in 689 West = P.Mich. inv. 3694. The reading ἄνηθέντα νέεσθαι is transmitted in Sch^{bT} (ex.) 291c-d, 854 West = Oxford, Sackler Library 97/135 (ined.), h134 West, tt, Z (= D scholia), Ω; ανιητη[in West 2 = P. Hawara (Bodl. Gr. class a.1 (P)). West prints †ἄνηθέντα νέεσθαι† and suggests ἄνιη τ' ἐνθάδε ἦσθαι in the apparatus; ἄνιη τ' ἔνθ' ἄνέχεσθαι is the emendation proposed by Freytag, reported by West. Besides h134 West, ἄνηθέντα is glossed in D on *Il.* 2.291; *Hsch. α5193; Sud. α2463.

13 (291) νεε[σθαι

A curved stroke at full height, nearly faded, precedes the lemma: it could be a deletion mark, as at ii.3. νέεσθαι is glossed in h134 West; P.Oxy. LXVII 4631.21 on *Il.* 2.84; Ap.Soph. 115, 4; Lex.Hom. v23; *Hsch. v200; Orion 112, 1; Syn. Σ c31; Phot. v85; Sud. v133. D gloss οἷ κὸν δὲ νέεσθαι on *Il.* 2.290.

14 (295) ειγ[ατοσ

εἴνατοσ is glossed in D on *Il.* 2.295; Lex.Hom. ε117; *Hsch. ε972; Ep.Hom. ε73; EGud 423, 7; EM 302, 1.

³⁰ See F.T. Gignac, *A grammar of the Greek papyri of the Roman and Byzantine periods. Vol. 1: Phonology* (Milan 1976) 280-282.

15-20 The horizontal fibres are lost at this point; it is possible to estimate a space of six lines missing before the papyrus breaks off. An upright survives at the beginning of 16, then a diagonal connected with the base of a vertical is visible at 17, plausibly *nu*. Part of a vertical line, gently curving at the foot, is extant on the baseline at 18, perhaps the left foot of *pi* or *eta*. 19 has an oblique compatible with either the left-hand side of *alpha* of the triangular shape or *lambda*; *epsilon* is recognisable at the beginning of 20, followed by an upright stroke, possibly *iota*.

Image:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B9EpUfjRstgeGNDWnh6Q0NJcEE/view?usp=sharing>

Caption: Cambridge University Library