

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR PAPYROLOGIE UND EPIGRAPHIK

herausgegeben

von

Werner Eck, Helmut Engelmann, Dieter Hagedorn, Jürgen Hammerstaedt, Rudolf Kassel

Ludwig Koenen, Wolfgang Dieter Lebek, Reinhold Merkelbach und Cornelia Römer



BAND 154

2005

DR. RUDOLF HABELT GMBH · BONN

NOMINAL ACCIDENTS BY QUESTION AND ANSWER: TWO FRAGMENTS OF A ΤΕΧΝΗ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙΚΗ, ONE NEW*

For Wolfram Ax
on his 60th birthday

PSI inv. 505¹

A: 7.0 x 11.3 cm; B: 19 x 15.5 cm

Late first or early second century

Two hole-ridden and rubbed fragments, of unknown provenance, from a papyrus roll containing a τέχνη γραμματική written on the *recto* along the fibres. The larger of the two fragments (fr. B) was first published by V. di Benedetto in 1957² and re-edited by A. Wouters in 1979³. The smaller (fr. A) is new. The *verso* of both is blank. Fr. B preserves parts of two columns, separated by a space of 1.5–2.0 cm. The lower margin survives to 1.3 cm in one place and remains of the upper margin may also be preserved at the top⁴. Fr. A supplies portions from the beginnings of lines 2–20 of the first column of fr. B, ranging from a single trace to fourteen letters. A meagre stretch of intercolumniation survives at its top left. The amount of text missing between the two fragments varies somewhat from line to line. At the point they come closest (I 19), only one letter is lost. The new fragment in most cases confirms the supplements proposed by the two previous editors for the missing beginnings of lines 5–16 and 18 of the first column⁵, thereby making it certain that the lines held an average of around 46 letters⁶ and the column measured 18.5–19 cm across. If parts of the upper margin do in fact survive at the top, a column contained 22 lines and was roughly 13.5 cm in height. Whereas broad columns are typical of the layout adopted for technical literature, such low ones would be somewhat unusual. Attention has occasionally been drawn to the unevenness of the line-ends⁷, but an effort to obtain alignment on the right is in evidence. Devices employed to this end include word-division and the reduction of the size of the final

* We should like to express our deep gratitude to Isabella Andorlini, who competently answered several pages of taxing queries and offered valuable suggestions of her own. Rudolf Kassel and the members of his Kolloquium patiently listened to a preliminary version of this edition and gave us the benefit of their comments. Guido Bastianini granted permission to publish.

¹ Basic information in LDAB 4452 and MP³ 2152. The papyrus should perhaps be added to the number of “grammatical treatises” (nos. 358–78 on pp. 263–9) listed by Criatore (1996) in her Catalogue of school texts (see below p. 101).

² Di Benedetto (1957) 180–5 (No. IV) with Tav. III. Cf. also Di Benedetto (1958) 188 for a summary of the content of the papyrus.

³ Wouters (1979) 135–8 (No. 7).

⁴ At its greatest extent the unwritten area at the top reaches 0.6 cm without there being the least hint of traces from a foregoing line. The normal interval between the lines is around 0.4 cm. It is also possible to restore a continuous text from the bottom of the first to the top of the second column; see I 22–II 1n.

⁵ In I 13 and 15, however, the supplements of the two earlier editors were in part wide of the mark. In I 13 the new fragment has λεγόμενον (θήλεος λεγόμενον, δι]ατελλόμενον) where they restored καταλήγον (θήλεος καταλήγον, δι]ατελλόμενον) and in line 15 καθ' ἑκάτερον ([τὸ] καθ' ἑκάτερον τ[οῦ] ἄ]ρρε[voc] in place of their ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ ([τὸ ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄ]ρρε[voc]). In the first case, the number of letters is the same; in the second it is less by one. At the beginning of I 17, Di Benedetto and Wouters wisely did not attempt to guess at the second of the pair of examples cited for the ἐπίκοινων γένος (ἡ χελώνη), but they could have gone further in restoring the words immediately following that example (καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἄρ]ρηγ) on the basis of the parallel expression surviving in I 16 (καὶ [γὰρ] ἡ θήλεια).

⁶ This average is calculated on the basis of the 14 lines in I 5–18 that can be restored with certainty. The *diple obelismene*, which occurs in I 5, 11 and 17, is assigned the value of two letters in the calculation. The range in the number of letters to the line extends from a minimum of 41 letters in I 9 to a maximum of 50 letters in I 12, 15 and 16. It is clear from I 4 (*vacat*), however, that lines could be considerably shorter. As restored, II 1, with 37 letters, would also be under average.

⁷ Cf. Di Benedetto (1957) 180 (“la incertezza dei margini”) and Criatore (2001) 212 (“the irregular margins”).

letters in the line⁸. Since the text of the τέχνη is unknown, there is no way of estimating the original length of the roll. A *kollesis* running down the second column about three letters in from its beginning does, however, indicate that a constituent sheet measured at least 22 cm across, unless a join has been lost at the break between the two fragments. In that case the width of the *kollema* will have been 15 cm.

The text is written in a medium-sized, rounded, slightly backward-sloping, informal hand. Rough bilinearity is breached below by *rho* and *tau*, above and below by *iota*. Di Benedetto (1957) 180 assigned the script to the second half of the first century AD, without excluding the beginning of the second century, and in this he was followed by Wouters (1979) 135⁹. In favour of the earlier alternative, Di Benedetto adduced *P.Fay.* 110 (Plate V; Roberts [1956] Pl. 11b), dated to 94 AD, and, in support of the later, *P.Berol.* 6890 (*BGU* I 140 Taf. II; Schubart [1911] Tab. 22a), dated to 119 or shortly thereafter¹⁰. No-one will wish seriously to contest Di Benedetto's dating and apt comparisons. Both the general characteristics of the script, especially the tendency to curved lines and rounded angles, already drawn attention to by Roberts in his description of the hand of *P.Fay.* 110, point to the period suggested, and so do the forms of such letters as *alpha*, *epsilon*, *eta*, *mu*, *nu*, *pi* and *upsilon*. A possible further parallel, *P.Ryl.* III 457, assigned by the editor Roberts to the first half and by Montevecchi (1988) tav. 48 to the beginning of the second century, might incline one to the later end of the proposed chronological range¹¹.

Sparing use is made of lectional signs and marks of punctuation, all of which give the impression of deriving from the original hand. Two words are equipped with acute accents (I 17, 21), though in the first case the position of the accent is wrong¹². A short descending oblique, vaguely resembling a grave accent rather than a breathing in form, appears over the initial vowels of three words certainly (I 15, 18, 19) and perhaps over that of a fourth (I 14)¹³. Whether actually a grave accent or not, the sign in any case identifies the new word and thereby serves to assist in the articulation and understanding of the text. Four instances of the trema placed over *iota* or *upsilon* survive, two initial (I 14, II 10) and two medial (I 18, 19). Elision is effected, but not signalled, on the one occasion it can be tested (I 15). A middle point makes a single appearance (I 9). To judge by the only surviving case (II 1), letters used as numerals were overlined¹⁴. Overlining is also employed, in the discussion of the genders and numbers,

⁸ Words are certainly divided between the lines at I 2–3 (ἀνθρῶ[π-]), 6–7 (ἐνικῆς), 13–4 (ἀνθρώπος), 16–7 (λέγει[τ]αι) and II 8–9 (παρά[γ]ωγα). At the end of I 15, the last few letters of [ᾠρ]γενικῶς are written smaller than usual and so are those of ὄνομα at the end of the preceding line. The *diple obelismene* at the ends of I 3 and 5, in addition to performing its proper separatory function, seems to act as a filler. The apparent *vacat* at the end of I 4 may owe its existence to the writer's desire to reserve a single line (I 5) for the enumeration of the five genders.

⁹ Wouters assigns the papyrus to “ca. 100 AD” in the heading of his edition and proposes “a date at the end of the first or the beginning of the second century” in his introduction.

¹⁰ Wouters draws attention to the similarity of *gamma* and *pi* in *P.Fay.* 110 and of *epsilon*, *eta* and *upsilon* in *P.Berol.* 6890.

¹¹ The hand of *P.Oxy.* XLV 3233, assigned by the editor to the “late first or earlier second century”, though more formal and carefully executed, is also closely akin to that of *PSI* inv. 505.

¹² The accentuation of abstract words in -ωνη such as γονή, ἡδονή and καλλονή (cf. Chandler [1881] 41 § 140) may be at the root of the slip of χελονή for χελώνη.

¹³ The fact that two of the vowels so marked are aspirated (ῆ in I 14, ἐνικῶς in I 18), but two are not (ῆ in I 15, ᾠρθμ[ὸ]ς in I 19), is, in addition to form, a further reason against taking the sign as either a rough or smooth breathing. On the other hand, the fact that three of the four vowel-syllables in question are unaccented and one carries the grave in context would be in keeping with their interpretation as grave accents, since the practice of placing graves over unaccented syllables is attested in ancient manuscripts. It must be pointed out, however, that this practice seems to have been restricted mostly, if not entirely, to poetic texts. On accents in the papyri, see Turner (1987) 11 and most recently Probert (2003) 11–3 with references to earlier and forthcoming studies.

¹⁴ Numerals certainly occurred in I 4 and 18. In I 4, part of the letter presumably indicating the second of the two numerals written in the line (ἑ) is in fact preserved, but its top and with it the supralineation are lost. Numerals may also have been present in I 21 and II 9.

to highlight the definite article when referred to as a word and when cited as part of the examples (I 7, 11, 14, 21)¹⁵.

The *diple obelismene* occurs four times in the papyrus and performs its proper task of dividing the text into sections and subsections¹⁶: in I 3, it serves to separate the γένη from what precedes (whatever that is); in I 5, the definitions of the γένη from their enumeration; in I 11, the two additional γένη from the three standard ones (cf. I 4–5n.); in I 17, the ἀριθμοί from the γένη. In I 3 and 5, where it comes at the end of the line, it is horizontally extended and also seems to act as a filler. How systematically the sign was used is difficult to judge, since the boundaries between the sections on the individual *accidentia* and their subsections often fall in lacuna. Its absence between the enumeration and definitions of the ἀριθμοί in I 18 does, however, show that absolute consistency was not achieved. Considerations of line-length suggest that it was once perhaps present in I 22, after the treatment of the πτώσεις (cf. I 22–II 1n.), and possibly at the end of II 1, between the enumeration and definitions of the three σχήματα (cf. II 1n.). The position of the *diple obelismene* within the text rather than between the lines in the left-hand margin is unusual and *PSI* inv. 505 should be added to the list of the few known papyrus manuscripts displaying this phenomenon¹⁷.

Departures from standard orthography are infrequent and in any case belong to well-attested types. There is one case of the simplification of double *c* (I 6), one of the interchange of *o* and *ω* (I 17) and perhaps one also of the interchange of *α* and *ε* (I 11, but cf. I 6–11n.)¹⁸. An unassimilated form occurs once (II 10). It is interesting to observe in this connection that the writer consistently spells ἀρκενικός with -*pc*- on the one hand (I 6, 15), but ἄρρηγ with -*pp*- on the other (I 12, 15, 17; cf. I 5n.). Whether *iota mutum* was written cannot be determined on the basis of what remains, but the use of movable *nu* appears regular (I 8, 9, 11, 14, 18, 19, II 2). If the suggested addition Π(η)λείδ[ης] (II 9) is right¹⁹, this is the only mistake in the surviving text, apart from the erroneous accentuation of χελονή (I 17). The original hand made one correction, probably in the course of writing (I 5).

The two fragments come from the part of the τέχνη γραμματική²⁰ devoted to the παρεπόμενα (“accidents”) of the noun. Both the first and the last few lines of the surviving text are so badly damaged as to render hopeless attempts at restoration in these areas. In the first section that can be reconstructed with any degree of certainty (I 4–17), and which has derived most benefit from the discovery of the new fragment, the γένη of the noun are dealt with. The treatment of the γένη is followed by discussions of the ἀριθμοί (I 17–21) and apparently the πτώσεις (I 21–2). Although the identification of the section on the πτώσεις, proposed here for the first time, rests on the few letters and traces remaining in the last two lines of the first column, it is irresistibly tempting (cf. I 21–2n.). Remnants of the treatment of the

¹⁵ The definite article plays a decisive role at least in the theory of the γένη expounded in the papyrus. On several occasions, however, the writer seems inadvertently to have omitted the supralineation: I 13 (ὁ), 17 (ἡ), 20 (τὸ). In a number of other places (I 9, 11, 14, 16, 19), its expected presence can no longer be verified owing to damage and, in these cases, it has been restored in the transcript.

¹⁶ On the *diple obelismene*, see Turner (1987) 12–3 and Barbis (1988), 473–6, in partic. 475 (“lo scopo del segno è quello di indicare una divisione, chiara e netta all’interno del testo”). See now also the article by M. Stein, s.v. Kritische Zeichen (B.I.b.4.), to appear in a forthcoming volume (XXI) of the *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*.

¹⁷ We are aware of only two other cases (both in medical papyri) of the internal use of the *diple obelismene*. One is *P.Mil.Vogl.* I 15, where the sign appears inside the line to separate the question-and-answer units of this medical catechism (recto 17, 20, 26, 27, verso 15, 21); cf. also Moretti (1995) 22. The other is *P.Ryl.* III 530, where it is similarly used within the text to divide the individual medical aphorisms from each other (fr. a recto 4, 13, 19, verso 27, 30, fr. b verso 63).

¹⁸ For the simplification of double *c* (*cc* > *c*), cf. Gignac (1976) 158–9; for the interchange of *o* and *ω* (*ω* > *o*), cf. *ibid.* 276–7; for the interchange of *α* and *ε* (*α* > *ε*), cf. *ibid.* 192–3.

¹⁹ For the loss of an unaccented vowel before a liquid or nasal, cf. Gignac (1976) 307–8, and, in particular, for that of *η* between *π* and *λ*, cf. SB VI 9242b 5 (ἀπλιώτη for ἀπηλιώτην), quoted by Gignac in his list of examples.

²⁰ For the characteristics of this genre, see Wouters (1979) 33–45 and Ax (1982 [2000]) 97 [128–9]. Works of this class typically provide a definition of grammar, an exposition of the tasks of the grammarian and a structural analysis of the Greek language based primarily on the word-class system.

αἰδέματα, which perhaps began at the end of the last line of the first column, occupy at least the first seven lines of the second column. The final part of the discussion of the εἶδη was hitherto thought to survive in the first three lines of the first column, but new readings in the second column now suggest that the εἶδη, or at least the εἶδη παραγῶγων, were handled after the αἰδέματα in II 9 ff.

If this reconstruction is correct, the five *accidentia* of the noun were treated in the following order: γένη, ἀριθμοί, πτώσεις, αἰδέματα, εἶδη. Such an arrangement is new. On the one hand, it differs from that adopted in the Τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax (§ 12, GG I.1:24.6–7). There too the γένη come first, but they are then followed by the εἶδη, αἰδέματα, ἀριθμοί and πτώσεις in that succession. On the other hand, it is also different from the order in which Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian (and Romanus) are reported to have arranged them. These scholars, according to the Scholia to Dionysius Thrax and Choeroboscus, placed the εἶδη before the γένη, inverting the positions assigned to these two accidents in the Τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax²¹. Such differences with respect to the later tradition confirm that a fixed order for the treatment of the nominal accidents had yet to be established by the first century AD.

The grammatical theory in *PSI* inv. 505 is expounded by question and answer and the papyrus furnishes an early example of this manner of presentation²². The catechistic method proceeds in a descending scale from the higher to the lower levels of the overall system of classification. The individual sections in the papyrus are introduced by a question asking the number of the subclasses of the grammatical category concerned (πόσοι, -αι, -α). Further questions within the sections then elicit the definitions of each of the subclasses (τί ἐστιν). The order of the interrogative words and the category or subclass in question is deliberately reversed (e.g. ἀριθμοί πόσοι in I 17 and not πόσοι ἀριθμοί) so that each section or subsection begins with a clear indication of its subject. In *PSI* inv. 505, however, the question-and-answer procedure seems not to have been rigidly adhered to in all cases. The definition of the plural in the section on the numbers, unlike the definitions of the singular (I 18 ἐνικὸς τί ἐστιν) and the dual (I 19 δυϊκὸς [c] τί ἐστιν), is apparently not introduced by the expected interrogative, πληθυντικὸς τί ἐστιν (cf. I 17–21n.).

PSI inv. 505 is one of the earliest τέχνη γραμματικαί that has come down to us on papyrus and in this lies its especial importance²³. It allows, as few other direct witnesses do, a glimpse into word-class theory in the crucial stages of its development prior to Apollonius Dyscolus, active in the second century AD. Not surprisingly the papyrus manual differs in several respects from the later grammatical tradition. To begin with, a number of the illustrative examples are unique (cf. I 9 εὐνή, 11 πεδίο[ν], 17 χελώνη, II 3 λέων). Secondly, the definitions of two of the γένη, the κοινόν and ἐπίκοινον, are otherwise unattested (cf. I 11–7n.). This makes the loss of the definitions of the other *accidentia* the more regrettable, since they may well have contained new concepts and formulations. Finally, the order of succession in the treatment of the five nominal accidents as reconstructed seems to have diverged considerably from their arrangement elsewhere (cf. above and I 1–3n., 21–2n., II 7–9n., 9–11n.). In view of these differences, caution should be observed when calling upon the subsequent grammatical tradition as a basis for textual restoration.

²¹ Cf. *Sch. D. Thr.* (ΣΙ <Heliodori>), GG I.3:524.21: ἵκτεον ὅτι ὁ μὲν Διονύσιος τὰ γένη προτάττει τῶν εἰδῶν, ἐπειδὴ πεφύκασι τὰ εἶδη ὑποτάσσεται τοῖς γένεσιν· οἱ δὲ περὶ Ἡρωδιανὸν (cf. Hrd. Περὶ ὀνομάτων, fr. 1, GG III.2.2:612.4–5) καὶ Ἀπολλώνιον (Ap. Dysc. *Fragm.*, GG II.3:39.19–20) τὰ εἶδη τῶν γενῶν προτάσσουσιν and Choer. *Proleg.*, GG IV.1:108.13: οἱ δὲ περὶ Ἀπολλώνιον (Ap. Dysc. *Fragm.*, GG II.3:39.18–9) καὶ Ἡρωδιανὸν (Hrd. Περὶ ὀνομάτων, fr. 1, GG III.2.2:612, 4–5) καὶ Ῥωμανὸν τὰ εἶδη προτάσσουσιν τῶν γενῶν. Cf. also Prisc. *Inst.* II.22, GL II:57.8 (= Ap. Dysc. *Fragm.*, GG II.3:39.13): *accidunt igitur nomini quinque: species, genus, numerus, figura, casus*. On the so-called “Apollonian” arrangement and its origin, see Fehling (1956) 247, Wouters (1979) 181–2 with n. 41 and Lallot (1998) 130 n. 5.

²² On the ἐρωτήματα-structure in technical literature, see Wouters (1979) 41–3, 88–9; Ieraci Bio (1995) and Bussièrès (2004). For its mnemonic function in grammatical literature in particular, cf. Law (1996).

²³ *P.Yale* I 25 (No. 1 Wouters), *P.Heid.* I 197 (No. 6 Wouters), *P.Brook.* I (No. 8 Wouters), all dated to the first century AD, are, together with *PSI* inv. 505, our earliest surviving papyrus τέχνη. Add now the recently published *P.Schøyen* I 13.

Several features combine in betraying the person responsible for this text and the end it served. On the one hand, the informality of the handwriting and layout make it unlikely that the papyrus was a commercial product copied by a professional scribe. On the other, the presentation of grammatical theory by question and answer points unambiguously to the schoolroom. The relatively high level of the doctrine, however, and in particular the fullness of the definitions in the better preserved sections, point to a learned individual behind the composition. The bare listing of grammatical categories often characterizing other handbooks (e.g. *P.Ant.* II 68 [No. 15 Wouters] and to a certain degree also the *Τέχνη* attributed to Dionysius Thrax) stands in stark contrast to the detail of our papyrus *τέχνη* and only reinforces this impression. The most probable candidate for the owner would therefore seem to be a teacher, who wrote it, or had it written, for his own personal use as a scholar and instructor²⁴.

In republishing the old fragment together with the new, we have been able to improve the readings of the earlier editions in a number of places and as a consequence propose a somewhat different reconstruction of the text. We have also taken the opportunity to provide a rather more detailed commentary, in which an attempt is made to place this *τέχνη* in the wider context of the grammatical papyri and evaluate its content in the light of word-class theory transmitted elsewhere.

Text

Col. I

			Top (?)
1	[±35]...[...]
2	[±10] [±25]...[.] ἄνθρω-
3	[π-	±8] [±25]...c>—
4	[±8] εν[±10]...[...].̄ vacat?
5	ἀ[ρκενικόν, θηλυκόν, οὐδέτερο]ν, κοινόν, ἐπίκοινον. >—		
6	ἀρ[ενικόν τί ἐστιν; ὄνομα] οὐ προτά<c>εται ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνι-		
7	κῆς εὐθεΐας π[τώσεως ἄρθρο]ν τὸ δ̄, οἶον δ̄ Ὅμηρος. θηλυκόν		
8	τί ἐστιν; ὄνομα οὐ [προτά<c>εται] ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνικῆς εὐθεΐ[ας]		
9	πτώσεως ἄρθρ[ον τ]ὸ ῥ̄, [οἶον ῥ̄] εὐνή. οὐδέτερον τί ἐστιν;		
10	[ὄ]νομα οὐ προτά<c>εται ἐπ[ὶ τῆς] ἐνικῆς εὐθεΐας πτώσεως		
11	ἄρθρ[ον] τὸ τὸ, οἶον [τὸ] πεδίο[ν. >]- κοινόν τί ἐστιν; ὄνομα τὸ		
12	κατὰ [μὲ]ν πά<c>ας [τὰς πτώ]σεις ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρρενος καὶ τοῦ		
13	θήλεος λεγόμε[νον, δι]ατελλόμενον δὲ τοῖς ἄρθροις, οἶον ὁ ἄν-		
14	θρωπος, ῥ̄ ἄνθρωπ[ος, δ̄ ἵ]ππος, ῥ̄ ἵππος. [ἐπ<c>ί]κοινον τί ἐστιν; ὄνομα		
15	[τὸ] καθ' ἐκάτερον τ[οῦ ἄ]ρρε[νος κ]αὶ τοῦ θ[ή]λεος μόνον ῥ̄ [ἀρ]κενικῶς		
16	[ῥ̄] θηλυκῶς λεγόμε[νον,] οἶο[ν δ̄] ἄε[τός, καὶ [γὰρ] ῥ̄ θή]λεια ὁμο[ί]ως λέγε-		
17	[ται, ῥ̄ χελώνη, καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἄρ]ρηγ ὁμοίως καλεῖται. >— ἀριθμοὶ πό<c>οι;		
18	[γ̄·] ἐνικ[ός], δυϊκός, πλ[ηθ]υντικός. ἐνικὸς τί ἐστιν; ἀριθμὸς ὁ		
19	[...] [±7]ε[] οἶ[ον] ῥ̄ Ὅμηρος. δυϊκός [τ] τί ἐστιν; ἀριθμ[ὸς]		
20	[ὁ ±17]ον, [οἶο]ν τὸ Ὅμηρ[ω. πλ]ηθυντικὸς δὲ		
21	[ὁ ±20 οἶο]ν οἱ Ὅμ[ηροι. >— πτώ]σει<c> π[ό]οι; [ε̄·] εὐ-		
22	[θεΐα, γενική, δοτική, αἰτιατική, κλ]ητικ[ή]. >— <c>χήματα (?)		

Foot

²⁴ For the connections of this papyrus grammar with a scholastic milieu, cf. Di Benedetto (1957) 180, 182 and Criboire (2001) 212–3.



PSI inv. 505

Col. II

Top (?)

- 1 πόσα; γ· ἀπλο[ῶν, σύνθετον, παρασύνθετον. ἀπλοῶν]
- 2 τ[ί] ἐστιν; ὄνο[μα]
- 3 οἶον λέων, θ[εός (?)
- 4 ον . . ηχα . . [
- 5 παρασύνθε[τον τί ἐστιν; ὄνομα]
- 6 δε γτασι[
- 7 οἶον Ἑρακλείδ[ης
- 8 καὶ παρ[ά]γωγον π[±30? παρά-]
- 9 γωγα εἰς εἰ Π(η)λείδ[ης
- 10 συν[κ]ριτικόν, ὑ[περθετικόν ±20? παρώνυ-]
- 11 μόν, ῥηματι[κό]ν [
- 12 ων θ[
- 13 π [
- 14 α [
- 15 καια [
- 16 αδελ [
- 17 ν[. . . .] . . . [
- 18 Traces

11] . . . [, first, right-hand part of thin horizontal at letter-top level; second, vertical with junction at top, followed apparently by foot of a second vertical, π possible; third, lower left-hand arc of round letter, perhaps ο . . .] . . . , first, upper and lower arcs of round letter open to the right, ε or c; second, remains of oblique descending from left to right and joining vertical at foot, ν more likely than αἰ; third, faint traces, if not illusory, of round letter with crossbar **2**] . . . [, remains of round letter?] . . . [. . .] , first, upper arc of round letter; last, curving upright on edge of break, which might suit ν, but second and third apparently not οἰ **3** c, first and second, part of oblique descending from left and joining slightly bent upright in middle, αἰ or λἰ or possibly ν, unlikely υ; third, indeterminate remains of mangled letter; fourth, lower curve of round letter, ε rather than ο **4**] . . . , scattered specks ε̄, lower curve and start of crossbar After ε̄ no trace of writing though surface apparently intact **5** επι-κοινων, π corr. perhaps from c, only upper tip of ι, κο corr. perhaps from ν, second ο retraced or corr. from another (round) letter **6** αρ[ενικον, lower half **7** αρθρο]ν, only the lower tip of the second vertical **8** προτασσετ]αι, only end of tail **9** τ]ο, right-hand arc η, lower part of first and foot of second vertical ευνη· **10** επ[ι, only bottom of lower curve and tip of crossbar of ε **12** ομοιω, only lower left-hand arc επι, only ends of crossbar and right-hand junction **13** δε, minimal trace on edge of break τοις, only right-hand tip of crossbar **14** η? ἵππος, after ἵ apparently space (now in lacuna) greater than normal distance between letters; only part of the lower (?) arc of ο followed by the start of the upper curve of c **15** θ[η-λεο]c, left-hand projection of midstroke on edge of break η αρ]ενικως, end of cap **16** αε]τος, vestiges of crossbar on a single fibre γαρ, tip of descender ηθηλεια, foot of first vertical of η on lower limit of break, then top of θ on upper edge ομο[ι]ως, left-hand side of ο, two traces from either curve of ω, end of cap of c **17** χελονή γαρ, lower half of upright of γ, followed by tip of nose of α αρ]ρηγ, only lower half of second vertical ομοιω, lower extremity of ι, followed by remains of right-hand side of ω καλειται, only tail **18** ενικ[ο]c, topmost part of upper curve of ε, second upright of ν, scanty traces of c on right-hand edge of break δυϊκοc πλ[ηθ]υντικος, of ν, ι, κ and ο meagre remnants ενικος εστιν, part of upper arc of c, then right-hand half of crossbar of τ **19** οι[ο]ν, central oblique of ν, followed at interval by second upright ο, part of lower left-hand arc δυϊκοc, scanty traces of upper left-hand arc τι, right-hand half of crossbar αριθμ[ο]c **20**]cov, upper curve of c, upper half of ο, upper portions of first upright and oblique of ν Ομηρ[ω, upper half of first vertical of η, followed by part of upper arc from head of ρ πλ]ηθυντικος, junction of crossbar and second upright of η, only tip of upper left-hand branch of ν **21** όμ[η]ροι πτωσει]c, end of overhang running into crossbar of π π[ο]cαι, overhang of c, upper half of vertical of ι **21-2** ευ[θ]εια, cap of ε, then arms of υ **22** κλ]ητικη, junction of crossbar and second vertical

Π 4 ον ηχα [, between ν and η faint traces of one or rather two letters, after α hooked descender as of ι or ρ, then two uprights separated by a short interval and probably belonging to a single letter **5** παρὰ συνθε[τον, short segment from crossbar of π, part of loop of α, faint traces of head of ρ **6** υ, two minimal traces, the first level with the letter-tops, the second at mid-height, followed by lower half of left-hand vertical, perhaps beginning of diagonal and second vertical of ν **7** ηρακλειδ[ης, only foot **8** παρ[α]γωγον, left-hand side of π, tail of α, foot and bar of γ, left-hand arc and base of disfigured ω, only minimal traces from bottom of ο on lower edge of hole **9** π[ι], left-hand half **10** συν[κ]ριτικόν, right-hand branch of ν, apparently lower arc from head of ρ, only scanty traces of ο on edge of break **11** μόν, top of first leg of μ (on piece of papyrus to be shifted upwards and to the right) and top and curving foot of second, apparently most of left-hand vertical and oblique of ν, followed by upper part of right-hand vertical **12** ον, or perhaps μόν Third or fourth letter after ν, almost complete circle in upper half of line suiting ρ, ο or possibly even ε Before θ, left-hand tip and right-hand half of high horizontal **14** α, or perhaps κ

I 3]υρος B²⁵, πῦρ, π|υρός W **5** [ἀρρενικόν B, W **6** [ἀρρενικόν B, W **7** ἄρθρον] B, W **8** προτάσσεται]ι W **9** οὐ[δ]έτερον W **10** ἐπ[ι] B, W **12** [ὁ]μοίως W **13** [θήλεος καταλῆγον B, W δ[ὲ] τ[ο]ῖς B, W **14** ἡ ἱ[π]πος B (ἱ[π]πος W) **15** [τὸ ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄ]ρρε[ν]ος B, W θήλεος] B, W ἀρρενικῶς B, W **16** ἀετ[ό]ς B, W γὰρ ἡ] θήλειά B, γὰρ ἡ θήλεια W ὁμο[ί]ως B, W **17** καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἄρ[ρ]ην:]ρη B,]ρη[] W ὁμο[ί]ως B, W κ[α]λεῖται W **18** πληθ[υ]ν[τ]ικ[ό]ς B, W [ἐ]κ[τι]ν W **19** [ὁ] B, W δυϊκ[ό]ς τ[ι] B, W **20**]σον B, τὸ δι[κ]τ[ό]ν W Ὀμ[ή]ρω B, W πλ[η]θ[υ]ν[τ]ικ[ό]ς B, W **21** οἶον W — πτώσει]ς π[ό]δας; [ε]·] ἐν[θ]εῖα:] π[ι]·]σαν [B, W **22** κλ[η]τικ[η]·]ντικ[B, πληθ[υ]ν[τ]ικ[W

Π 4 ον ηχα [: ον[]ηχαι [B, W **5** π[α]ρὰ συνθε[τον B, W **7** Ἡ[ρ]ακλειδ[ης B, W **8** καὶ παρ[α]γωγον π[ι]· καὶ τ[ι]· εγ[]ντ[ι] B, καὶ []τ[ι]·]εγ[]ντ[ι] W **8–9** παρὰ]γωγα εἰς εἰ Π[η]λειδ[ης: γω[]αθιχειπλειδ[B, W **10** συν[κ]ριτικόν, ὑ[περ]θετικόν: συν[]ρικ[ό]ν υ[] B, W **10–1** παρών]μον, ῥηματ[ικό]ν: []οιον·ματ[B, W **13–8** edd. pr. non descriperunt

Translation

... anthrop- (man) ...

... 5: masculine, feminine, neuter, koinon, epikoinon. What is a masculine noun? A noun preceded in the nominative case singular by the article *ho* (the), for example *ho Homeros* (Homer). What is a feminine noun? A noun preceded in the nominative case singular by the article *he* (the), for example *he eune* (the bed). What is a neuter noun? A noun preceded in the nominative case singular by the article *to* (the), for example *to pedion* (the plain).

What is a koinon noun? A noun which in all the cases is used in the same form both for the male and the female, but (whose gender) is distinguished by the articles, for example *ho anthropos* (the man), *he anthropos* (the woman), *ho hippos* (the stallion), *he hippos* (the mare). What is an epikoinon noun? A noun which, whether referring to a male or a female, is used only with the masculine or the feminine article, for example *ho aetos* (eagle), since the female is also referred to with the same word, *he chelone* (tortoise), since the male too is thus called.

How many numbers are there? 3: singular, dual, plural. What is the singular number? The number which ... for example *ho Homeros* (Homer). What is the dual number? The number which ... for example *tô Homerô* (a pair of Homers). But the plural ... for example *hoi Homeroi* (Homers).

How many cases are there? 5: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative.

How many figures are there? 3: simple, compound and decompound. What is a simple noun? A noun ... for example *leon* (lion), *theos* (god). ... What is a decompound noun? A noun ... for example *Herakleides* (son of Herakles) ... and derivative ... derivatives in *ei*, *Peleides* (son of Peleus) ...

... comparative, superlative, ... denominative, deverbal ...

²⁵ The letters B and W refer respectively to the transcripts of Di Benedetto (1957) 183–4 and Wouters (1979) 136–7. Mere differences in the dotting of letters, and not in their actual presence or absence, are in general ignored.

Commentary

I 1–3. Di Benedetto (1957) 184 (comm. I 1–3) and Wouters (1979) 137 (comm. ll. 1–4) detected the final part of the section on the εἶδη in the meagre remains of these lines. Wouters recognized an example of the ὑποκοριστικὸν εἶδος (diminutive) in the letters at the end of I 2 (ἀνθρῶ)²⁶. At the end of I 3, Di Benedetto recovered an example of the παρώνυμον εἶδος (denominative) through his supplement, πῦρ πυρός²⁷. In support of Di Benedetto's restoration, Wouters pointed out that the παρώνυμον εἶδος immediately follows the ὑποκοριστικὸν εἶδος in the Τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax²⁸. Although neither editor says so explicitly, the fact that, according to our sources, Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian treated the εἶδη before the γένη (cf. p. 100) may have been a guiding consideration in their efforts to reconstruct these lines.

If Di Benedetto and Wouters are right in supposing that the εἶδη were the subject of this part of the text, the discussion of the εἶδη before the γένη in the treatment of the *accidentia* of the noun would be shown to antedate Apollonius Dyscolus and Herodian²⁹. *P.Heid.* I 198 (No. 12 Wouters), I 6–II 28, datable to the third century AD, proves that the same arrangement of the two παρεπόμενα continued to be adopted in manuals of the post-Apollonian period³⁰. On the other hand, the order of the nominal accidents in the Τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax, where the γένη are dealt with before the εἶδη, formed a distinct tradition. Expectedly, it is this disposition that turns up in *P.Amh.* II 21 (No. 14 Wouters), 22–4, written at the beginning of the fourth century AD³¹.

The reconstruction of these lines proposed by Di Benedetto and Wouters, however, encounters a barrier of obstacles. In the first place, it is doubtful whether the traces at the end of I 3 can actually be read as the sequence ὑπο, though these letters appear undotted in the two earlier editions. Secondly, even granting the correctness of the reading and the supplement based on it, πῦρ πυρός, the noun in question would be a very surprising choice of example, occurring a single time in *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:542.34 in illustration of a special type of denominative formation³². Thirdly, as Di Benedetto (1957) 184 (comm. I 1–3) himself pointed out, the παρώνυμον is followed by the ῥηματικὸν εἶδος in [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:29.3–4, whereas according to his reconstruction it would have to be the last of the εἶδη treated in *PSI* inv. 505. Inasmuch as the παρώνυμον and ῥηματικὸν εἶδος

²⁶ For diminutives of ἄνθρωπος as examples of the ὑποκοριστικὸν εἶδος, cf. [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:28.7 (ἀνθρωπίσκος); *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ), *GG* I.3:376.22 (ἀνθρώπιον); *Sch. D. Thr.* (Comm. Byz.), *GG* I.3:574.5 (ἀνθρωπάριον). The diminutive is defined in [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:28.6–7 as follows: ὑποκοριστικὸν δέ ἐστι τὸ μείωσιν τοῦ πρωτοτύπου ἀνυγκρίτως δηλοῦν, οἷον ἀνθρωπίσκος, λίθαξ, μειρακύλλιον. Cf. also Ap. *Dysc. Fragm.*, *GG* II.3:45.34–6; *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:226.13–228.3; (Σμ), *GG* I.3:374.31–376.24; (Σλ), *GG* I.3:538.8–540.2 and (Comm. Byz.), *GG* I.3:574.3–6. On these definitions, see Lallot (1998) 135 n. 14.

²⁷ In [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:29.1–2, the denominative is defined as follows: παρώνυμον δέ ἐστι τὸ παρ' ὀνόματι ποιηθέν, οἷον λέων, Τρύφων. Cf. also *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:377.6–7 (= Ap. *Dysc. Fragm.*, *GG* II.3:46.22–3): παρώνυμον δέ ἐστιν ὃ γέγονεν ἐξ ὀνόματος μηδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὑποπεπωκός. Further passages of relevance are *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:228.5–24; (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:376.25–377.14; (Σλ), *GG* I.3:540.3–543.1 and (Comm. Byz.), *GG* I.3:574.6–8. On the denominative, see Lallot (1998) 135–7 n. 15 and Matthaios (2004) 14.

²⁸ Cf. [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:25.7 and 28.6–29.2. The two *species* come likewise in the same order in *P.Harr.* 59 (No. 11 Wouters) recto, 1–10. Wouters (1979) 137 n. 6, however, supposes that πυρρός (“flame-coloured”) was meant for πυρός (“wheat”) in the papyrus on the ground that the former would stand in a closer semantic relation to the word πῦρ from whose genitive it is made to derive.

²⁹ Wouters (1979) 181–2 (comm. ll. 7 sqq.) regards the papyrus as evidence that Apollonius Dyscolus is not to be credited with the introduction of the order of the accidents he adopts.

³⁰ Cf. Wouters (1979) 181–2 (comm. ll. 7 sqq.).

³¹ Cf. Wouters (1979) 195 (comm. ll. 22–4). On the two systems used in arranging the nominal accidents, see Lallot (1998) 130 n. 5.

³² Di Benedetto (1957) 184 (comm. I 1–3) and Wouters (1979) 137 (comm. ll. 1–4) quote this passage in support of their reconstruction. This type of derivative is obtained not through the addition of a suffix but by means of *metaplasmus*, the nominative of the newly formed word being identical with the genitive of the noun from which it derives.

make up a conceptual whole³³, such an arrangement would seem problematic. Note that the *diple obelismene* at the end of line 3 and the surviving text in line 4, where the treatment of the γένη begins, put it beyond doubt that the section ended here. Fourthly, the sequence ἀνθρώ need not necessarily belong to a diminutive form of ἄνθρωπος at all, since the noun ἄνθρωπος is commonly cited as an example of other nominal categories. The Τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax uses ἄνθρωπος to illustrate appellatives (κοινῶς λεγόμενα), as opposed to proper names (ιδίως λεγόμενα)³⁴, in the definition of the word class ὄνομα. If the discussion of the nominal accidents began with the γένη in I 4, it is at least conceivable that the word fragment ἀνθρώ is part of the noun ἄνθρωπος adduced to exemplify the appellatives in the definition of the noun.

However, even supposing these lines belonged to a discussion of the εἶδη, the εἶδη discussed can only be the εἶδη κατὰ τὴν σημασίαν. The εἶδη κατὰ τὴν φωνήν were evidently treated in a later section, as new readings in II 10–1 reveal³⁵. Furthermore, if the letters at the end of I 2 do come from the noun ἄνθρωπος, a standard example of the προσηγορικὸν ὄνομα³⁶, the particular εἶδη κατὰ τὴν σημασίαν in question here must be proper nouns and appellatives.

I 4–5. Whereas the following lines can be supplemented with confidence, the first line of the section on the γένη is almost entirely lost and is also the most problematic from the theoretical point of view. Nevertheless, a combination of clues helps to determine its original content. First of all, the last letter of the line is very likely an *epsilon*. Since five *genera* are discussed in the next lines, it seems reasonable with the two earlier editors to take the letter as a numeral referring to these. A second important clue is the partly preserved *diple obelismene* in I 11. The sign does not mark the end of the section on the γένη, but rather serves to divide it into two distinct parts, the first dealing with the three main *genera* (ἄρσενικόν, θηλυκόν, οὐδέτερον), the second with two additional ones (κοινόν and ἐπίκοινον). Wouters (1979) 137–8 (comm. I. 5) was the first to connect the presence of the *diple* here with the ancient controversy over the number of the *genera* and thereby to substantiate Di Benedetto's hunch ([1957] 181–2 and 184 [comm. I 4]) that the author of the treatise made reference to the issue in I 4. Both scholars adduced *P.Amh.* II 21, 22–3 in support of their contention: τούτων τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐστὶν τρία <γένη>, κατὰ [δέ τινας] ἢ πέντε. To this passage Wouters added [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:24.8–25.2: γένη μὲν οὖν εἰσι τρία· ἄρσενικόν, θηλυκόν, οὐδέτερον. ἐνιοὶ δὲ προκτιθέασι τούτοις ἄλλα δύο, κοινόν τε καὶ ἐπίκοινον, κοινὸν μὲν οἶον ἵππος, κύων, ἐπίκοινον δὲ οἶον χελιδὼν, ἀετός. Supposing the author of *PSI* inv. 505 mentioned the two positions on the number of the *genera*, as seems quite likely, he will have done so in I 4 immediately after the introductory question. That question must therefore have stood at the very beginning of the line (for reasons of space) and not, as Di Benedetto (1957) 184 (comm. I 4) suggested, at the end of the line just before the numeral. The *diple*

³³ Unlike the other types of derivative nouns (the patronymic, the possessive, the comparative, the superlative and the diminutive), which owe their names to the basic semantic content of the derived word (on each of these types see [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* §12, *GG* I.1:25.6–28.7), the categories of the denominatives and deverbals are based on the part of speech to which the primary word belongs. Thus the denominative is defined as a word which is derived from a noun and the deverbal as a word derived from a verb; cf. [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* §12, *GG* I.1:29.1–4; *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:228.4–229.5; (Σμ), *GG* I.3:376.26–378.2; (Σι), *GG* I.3:540.2–543.16. On these εἶδη, see Steinhil (1890–91) II 248, Lallot (1998) 135–7, Vaahtera (1998) 54–5 and Matthaïos (2004) 14.

³⁴ See [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* §12, *GG* I.1:24.5. For the opposition between κοινῶς and ιδίως λεγόμενον, its philosophical background and connection with the distinction between proper names and appellatives, see Matthaïos (1999) 211–3.

³⁵ Ancient grammarians distinguished εἶδη κατὰ τὴν φωνήν and εἶδη κατὰ τὴν σημασίαν. Cf. *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σι), *GG* I.3:527.25–8 (= *Ap. Dysc. Fragm.*, *GG* II.3:39.22–6): τῶν δὲ ὀνομάτων τὰ μὲν εἰσι κατὰ τὴν φωνήν εἶδη, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν σημασίαν· καὶ τὰ μὲν κατὰ τὴν φωνήν πρωτότυπον καὶ παράγωγον, ὅπερ ὑποδιαίρεται εἰς πατρωνυμικὸν καὶ ἐξῆς, τὰ δὲ κατὰ σημασίαν κύριον, προσηγορικὸν καὶ ἐξῆς. Cf. also (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:385.16–8; (Σι <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:552.3–6 and 15–8. In the Τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax, the εἶδη κατὰ τὴν φωνήν and εἶδη κατὰ τὴν σημασίαν are treated in separate sections (§ 12, *GG* I.1:25.3–29.4 and 32.2–45.2 respectively). On the classification of the εἶδη of the noun, see Lallot (1998) 148–50 n. 25.

³⁶ Cf. *P.Yale* I 25 (No. 1 Wouters), I 13 and [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:34.1–2.

obelismene at the very end of the preceding line would lead us to expect it there in any case. Given this reconstruction of the content of I 4 and considering the available space and the two previously unknown letters contributed by the new fragment, an acceptable restoration of the wording at the beginning of the line might be [γένη πόσα:] γ̃. ἔν[τοι δὲ or perhaps even [γένη πόσα; οἱ] μὲν [γ̃ ...

Those among ancient grammarians opposed to granting the κοινὸν and ἐπίκοινον γένος the status of *genera* at all pointed out that these two categories possess no specific formal or semantic characteristics of their own to distinguish them from the other three genders³⁷. Since there are no more than three articles in the linguistic sphere³⁸ and no more than three natural genders in extralinguistic reality³⁹, no more than three grammatical *genera* could, in their view, come into question. The position of the author of this handbook on the matter, however, is not entirely clear. He certainly separated the two additional *genera* from the three standard ones by means of the *diple obelismene* in I 11 and showed at least an awareness of the issue in I 4, if our reconstruction of the line is correct. On the other hand, he goes on to define and exemplify all five *genera*. Though believing in the existence of only the masculine, feminine and neuter, he may nevertheless have included the other two γένη for the sake of completeness of treatment. The grammarian behind *P.Amh.* II 21 (No. 14 Wouters) expresses a preference for three *genera*, but also provides the κοινὸν and ἐπίκοινον with full definitions and examples. The Τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax likewise favours a three-genus system, but does not hesitate to list and illustrate the two additional γένη (§ 12, *GG* I.1:24.8–25.1–2).

Even if we are well informed about the development of the doctrine of grammatical *genus*⁴⁰, it is uncertain at exactly what point in time the status of the *genus commune* and *epicoenon* was first called into question. Apollonius Dyscolus appears to have taken a theory of three *genera* as his starting-point and to have regarded the κοινὸν γένος as a linguistic peculiarity rather than a distinct *genus* over and above them⁴¹. The ἐπίκοινον γένος he subsumed under it⁴². Both the Τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax and *P.Amh.* II 21 (No. 14 Wouters), of the early fourth-century AD, also prefer a system of three *genera*, as we have just seen, and *P.Ant.* II 68 (No. 15 Wouters) recto, i 33–6, likewise of the fourth-century AD, passes over the κοινὸν and ἐπίκοινον γένος in silence; cf. Wouters (1979) 202 (comm. 1. 33). But *PSI* inv. 505 now suggests that qualms about the five-genus system were already felt in the first century AD and thus provides our earliest evidence for their existence.

I 5. The spelling of the restoration ἄ[ρκενικόν is due to the fact that the term was almost certainly written with -pc-, and not -pp-, in its two other occurrences (I 6, 15). Admittedly, the crucial letter is

³⁷ Cf. *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ <Heliodori>) *GG* I.3:363.4–12: παράσχωμεν τοίνυν καὶ τῷ κοινῷ γένει καὶ τῷ ἐπικοίνῳ ἰδίους χαρακτήρας καὶ ἴδια ἄρθρα πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν καὶ διάκρισιν τῶν ἄλλων γενῶν, καὶ τότε δώμεν καὶ αὐτὰ γένη· εἰ δὲ οὐχ εὐρίσκομεν, τί μᾶτην πλῆθος γενῶν παρεικόμομεν τῇ τέχνῃ; καὶ χρὴ λέγειν ὄνομα κοινόν, ὄνομα ἐπικοινον, καὶ οὐ γένος κοινόν καὶ ἐπικοινον. Ὡς οὖν δέδεικται, οὐ δεχόμεθα τὰ γένη ταῦτα παρὰ τὸ ἀρκενικόν καὶ θηλυκόν καὶ οὐδέτερον, ἐπειδὴ οὔτε σημασίαν ἰδίαν ἔχουσιν οὔτε ἄρθρον ἴδιον· τὸ γὰρ σημαίνον αὐτῶν ἢ ἀρκενικόν ἢ θηλυκόν, καὶ ἢ φωνὴ αὐτῶν ἢ ἀρκενικὴ ἢ θηλυκὴ. Cf. also Choer. *Proleg.*, *GG* IV.1:107.34–5: ἐπειδὴ οὖν οὐδὲν ἔχουσιν ἴδιον, ἀλλὰ παραλαμβάνονται ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων γενῶν, οὐ δυνάμεθα ταῦτα λέγειν ἴδια γένη παρὰ τὸ ἀρκενικόν θηλυκόν οὐδέτερον, ἀλλ' οὔτε δὲ πᾶσιν εἶναι ἐγνωσμένα. Further passages of relevance are: Choer. *Canon.*, *GG* IV.2:101.7–13; Sophr. *Exc.*, *GG* IV.2:378.1–7. On the whole problem, see Wouters (1979) 195–6 (comm. II. 22–38) and Lallot (1998) 130–1 n. 6.

³⁸ *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σλ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:524.30–1 defines *genus* as χαρακτήρ λέξεων σημαίνων τὸ ἐν φωνῇ ἄρκεν ἢ θῆλυ ἢ οὐδέτερον and indicates in the definite article the distinctive feature of each of the three γένη (cf. I 6–11n).

³⁹ Strunk (1993) has succeeded in showing that, according to the ancient conception, the neuter also belongs to the realm of natural gender.

⁴⁰ On the history of the theory of the grammatical *genera* in the ancient scholarly tradition, see Callanan (1987) 35–6 and Matthaios (1999) 272–4. The first evidence for the creation of a *genus commune* comes from Aristarchus; cf. Matthaios (1999) 273–4. According to *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:357.16, Tryphon also distinguished a κοινὸν γένος (fr. 93 Velsen).

⁴¹ Cf. Ap. Dysc. *Fragm.*, *GG* II.3:59.9–20 (col. 2).

⁴² Cf. Schneider (1910) 59: “Ap[ollonius] non solum ea nomina κοινά appellat, quae quamquam una terminatione utuntur, tamen ὁ et ἡ articulis genera distinguunt, sed etiam ea quae unum articulum admittunt, sed duo genera significant, ut ἡ χελιδών, ὁ ἀετός. Ἐπικοίνως semel legitur coni. 253, 20 et est ‘universe’”.

damaged in both cases, but, in both, the traces point decisively to *c* rather than *p*. The two previous editors, who could not take account of the first occurrence, which is preserved in the new fragment, and did not notice the trace of the *c* in the second, supplemented the Attic form with -*pp*- throughout. The word for natural gender, however, is spelt ἄρρην, with double *p*, on the three occasions it occurs (I 12, 15, 17), and this may have dictated the editors' choice. Inconsistency in the spelling of these terms within the works of one and the same author is attested elsewhere in grammatical literature, and one spelling does not necessarily rule the other out. Apollonius Dyscolus, for example, uses ἄρρενικόν and ἄρρενικόν as well as ἄρρην and ἄρρην indifferently⁴³.

I 6–11. The enumeration of the five γένη is followed by a treatment of each γένος in turn, consisting of an introductory question, a definition and one or two examples. In the definitions, the name of the word class, ὄνομα, stands in place of the term for the accident or property in question, γένος, just as it does in the discussion of the σχήματα further on (cf. II 2). By contrast, the denomination of the accident ἀριθμός is maintained in the definitions of the *numeri* (I 18–21). This suggests that no particular theoretical importance should be attached to the substitution of word class for property in the definitions here.

The definitions of the masculine, feminine and neuter display the same structure:

Masculine =		article ὁ
Feminine =	a noun preceded in the nominative singular by the	article ἡ
Neuter =		article τό.

As the table makes clear, the article accompanying each noun constitutes the distinctive characteristic of each of the three *genera*. The definitions in the papyrus thus already reflect the common conception that grammatical gender, as opposed to natural gender, is recognizable by the σύνταξις τῶν ἄρθρων and εὐφωνία alone – that is, by exclusively linguistic features⁴⁴. Apollonius Dyscolus later took issue with this view, apparently a popular position at the time, in his treatise Περὶ γενῶν⁴⁵.

The definitions of these three *genera* in *PSI* inv. 505 find exact parallels in *P.Amh.* II 21 (No. 14 Wouters), 24–30⁴⁶. Comparable both in substance and wording are also those recorded in *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:362.3–7; (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:524.31–4 and (Comm. Byz.), *GG* I.3:572.28–33⁴⁷. *P.Ant.* II 68 (No. 15 Wouters) recto, I 33–6 and [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:24.8–25.2, on the other hand, merely list the names of the *genera*, providing neither definitions nor examples.

The late *P.Amh.* II 21 (No. 14 Wouters), 24–30, dated to the early fourth century AD, gives examples of the three main *genera*, all evidently chosen with a view to correlating grammatical and natural gender: masculine with male in ὁ Ἀρίσταρτος (*l.* Ἀρίσταρχος), feminine with female in ἡ Ἑλένη and neuter with “neuter” in τὸ παιδεῖον [*l.* παιδίον]⁴⁸. The author of *PSI* inv. 505, on the contrary, appears clearly not to have sought such a thoroughgoing correspondence. Whereas gramma-

⁴³ Cf. the *Index vocabulorum* in Schneider (1910) 179 s.vv. ἄρρενικός and ἄρρην and 184 s.v. γένος. For an example of the use of both spellings within the same line, cf. Ap. Dysc. *Synt.* III.98, *GG* II.2:355.2.

⁴⁴ Cf. *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν <Stephani>), *GG* I.3:218.12–6; (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:361.35–362.7; (Σλ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:524.30–1, 524.35–525.2 and (Σλ), *GG* I.3:525.6–18.

⁴⁵ Cf. Ap. Dysc. *Synt.* I.38, *GG* II.2:35.5–7: οὐ μετρίως δέ τινες ἐσφάλησαν ὑπολαμβάνοντες τὴν παράθεσιν τῶν ἄρθρων εἰς γένη διακρίνειν παρατίθεσθαι τοῖς ὀνόμασι. πρὸς οὐκ ἀντίρηται διὰ πλειόνων ἐν τῷ Περὶ γενῶν (= Ap. Dysc. *Fragm.*, *GG* II.3:59.38–41) and Ap. Dysc. *Synt.* I.41, *GG* II.2:36.16–37.11 (= Ap. Dysc. *Fragm.*, *GG* II.3:59.41–60.11). See Lallot (1997) II 30–1 n. 118 and Di Benedetto (1957) 181.

⁴⁶ Cf. Wouters (1979) 138 (comm. II. 6–17) and 195 (comm. II. 22–38). Cf. now also *P.Schøyen* I 13.7 and 7–10n.

⁴⁷ Cf. Wouters (1979) 195 (comm. II. 22–38).

⁴⁸ For the natural gender of neuter nouns, cf. *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σλ), *GG* I.3:539.31: τὸ οὐδέτερον πολλάκις κατὰ ἀμφοτέρων γενῶν, ὡς τὸ παιδίον.

tical and natural gender coincide in ὁ Ὀμηρος (I 7), the example given for the masculine, in ἡ εὐνή (I 9), the example given for the feminine, they manifestly do not. The example of the neuter, τὸ πεδίον (I 11), is less straightforward. If πεδίον is in fact meant, no attempt is made to correlate grammatical and natural gender, since, like εὐνή, the noun refers neither to a male nor a female nor a “neuter” as conceived by ancient grammarians (cf. n. 48). If, on the other hand, παιδίον is intended, both genders would correspond as in the case of ὁ Ὀμηρος, the natural neuter gender referring either to a male or a female according to the ancient conception. The noun παιδίον is the example cited for the neuter in *P.Amh.* II 21 (No. 14 Wouters), 30 and the phonetic interchange involved is in any case well-attested (see p. 99 n. 18 above). The absence of a systematic attempt to correlate grammatical and natural gender in the exemplifications of the three *genera* in *PSI* inv. 505 and the choice of unique examples (εὐνή, πεδίον?) should probably be put down to the handbook’s early date of composition.

I 11–7. In this section the two additional γένη, the κοινόν (I 11–4) and the ἐπίκοινον (I 14–7), are discussed. The definitions of the two *genera* given in the papyrus differ in their wording from those found in our other sources. *P.Amh.* II 21 (No. 14 Wouters), on the other hand, conspicuously accords with the Scholia to Dionysius Thrax both in definitions and examples⁴⁹.

Whereas each of the three main *genera* contains nouns referring either to male beings or female beings or beings or things that are neither male nor female, the κοινόν and ἐπίκοινον γένος accommodate nouns that refer at once to beings both male and female. The precise difference between the three main and the two additional *genera* therefore involves natural gender and natural gender alone. This emerges clearly from the definitions of the κοινόν and ἐπίκοινον γένος given in the papyrus and in particular from the expressions ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρρενος καὶ τοῦ θήλεος (I 12–3) and καθ’ ἐκάτερον τ[οῦ ἄρρε]νος καὶ τοῦ θ[ή]λεος (I 15). Unlike their derivatives ἄρρενικόν/ἄρρενικόν and θηλυκόν, used of grammatical gender, the words ἄρρεν and θήλυ refer to male or female creatures in extralinguistic reality.

If the difference between the three main and the two additional *genera* involves natural gender, the dividing line between each of the two additional *genera*, like that between each of the three main *genera*, is grammatical and depends on the form of the noun and the article and their combination. Nouns belonging to the *genus commune* are masculine in form, but can be constructed with either the masculine or the feminine article, according as they refer to a male or female entity. Nouns belonging to the *genus epicoenon*, by contrast, are either masculine or feminine in form and, if masculine, constructed with the masculine article, if feminine, constructed with the feminine article, but refer indifferently to both natural genders. The author of the papyrus τέχνη thus combines both the formal and semiotic aspects of the two *genera* in his definitions by indicating the interplay of the article and word form, on the one hand, and natural gender, on the other. The morphological and syntactical elements as features distinguishing the *genus commune* and the *genus epicoenon* are given greater prominence in the definitions transmitted by *P.Amh.* II 21 (No. 14 Wouters), 30–8 and the Scholia to Dionysius Thrax, where the object of extralinguistic reality is left out of consideration (cf. n. 49).

The examples chosen for the two additional γένη in *PSI* inv. 505 are all paralleled elsewhere in grammatical literature⁵⁰, with the exception of ἡ χελώνη (I 17). To illustrate feminine nouns belonging

⁴⁹ For the definition of the κοινόν γένος, cf. *P.Amh.* II 21, 30–4 with *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:218.18–20; (Σμ), *GG* I.3:363.19–20 and (Σλ), *GG* I.3:525.20–1. For the definition of the ἐπίκοινον γένος, cf. *P.Amh.* II 21, 34–8 with *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:218.22–24 and (Σλ), *GG* I.3:525.23–5. See also Wouters (1979) 195 (comm. II. 22–38). The κοινόν γένος, or rather ὄνομα, is moreover defined and exemplified in a marginal annotation in *BKT* IX 188 (*P.Berol.* 21282). A revision of the text of the scholium by R. Luiselli is to appear in the journal *Eikasmos*.

⁵⁰ For ὁ/ἡ ἄνθρωπος (I 13–4) as an example of the *genus commune*, cf. *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν <Stephani>), *GG* I.3:218.29; (Σμ), *GG* I.3:363.20–1. For ὁ/ἡ ἵππος (I 14), cf. [*D. Thr.*] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:25.2; *P.Amh.* II 21 (No. 14 Wouters), 32; *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:218.20; (Σλ), *GG* I.3:525.21. For ὁ ἀετός (I 16) as an example of the *genus epicoenon*, cf. [*D. Thr.*] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:25.2; *P.Amh.* II 21 (No. 14 Wouters), 38; *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν <Stephani>), *GG* I.3:219.7; (Σλ), *GG* I.3:525.28.

to the *genus epicoenon*, our sources cite instead ἡ περιτερά, ἡ κορώνη and especially ἡ χελιδών⁵¹. The close formal resemblance of χελώνη to χελιδών raises the possibility that χελώνη, if perhaps not actually to be considered a mistake for χελιδών, may at least have been suggested by it somewhere along the line. It should in any case be remembered that use is made of examples unattested elsewhere in the tradition on other occasions in this papyrus τέχνη (cf. above p. 100).

I 17–21. The *diple obelismene* towards the end of I 17 marks the beginning of the section on the *numeri*, which catechistically opens with the question ἀριθμοὶ πόσοι. There follow, in I 18, the numeral indicating the number of the ἀριθμοί, now lost in lacuna at the beginning of the line, and the enumeration of the three *genera* themselves.

Unlike the singular and the dual, the plural was not introduced by a question. The space available between the expression πληθυντικὸς δὲ in I 20 and the example in I 21 (οἶον οἱ Ὀμηροί) does not suffice for both opening interrogative and definition. The occurrence of the particle δέ immediately after πληθυντικὸς, however, makes it clear that the absence of the question is not merely due to scribal error. The particle seems rather intended to secure a contrast between the singular and the dual, on the one hand, and the plural, on the other. In all likelihood, the desired contrast consisted in the opposition of the indefiniteness of the plural, which can refer to any number of items greater than two, to the determinate nature of the singular and the dual, limited respectively to one and two.

P.Ant. II 68 (No. 15 Wouters) recto, I 37–40 merely lists the numbers. [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:30.5–31.1, gives a list and adds examples of each. But, as is clear from what remains, *PSI* inv. 505 went further still and also provided definitions. Parallels for the definitions of the numbers can be found in the Scholia to Dionysius Thrax and Choeroboscus: (1) *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:381.19: ἐνικὸς μὲν ὁ τὸ ἐν σημαίνων, οἶον ὁ Αἴας, δυϊκὸς δὲ ὁ τὰ δύο σημαίνων, οἶον τὸ Αἴαντε, πληθυντικὸς δὲ ὁ τὰ τρία ἢ καὶ πολλὰ σημαίνων, οἶον οἱ Αἴαντες; (2) Choer. *Prol.*, *GG* IV.1:109.20: ἐνικὸς μὲν ἔστιν ὁ ἐν τι σημαίνων, οἶον Αἴας· δυϊκὸς δὲ ὁ δύο σημαίνων, οἶον Αἴαντε· πληθυντικὸς δὲ ὁ τρεῖς ἢ πλείονας σημαίνων, οἶον Αἴαντες· ἀρχὴ γὰρ πλήθους ὁ τρεῖς ἀριθμὸς ἔστιν⁵².

Unfortunately, the state of preservation of the papyrus makes it impossible to determine the exact wording of the definitions of the three *numeri* given in the papyrus τέχνη. The examples, however, show that the definitions were based on the concept of the quantity referred to by each, the singular indicating one, the dual two and the plural three or more. At the same time, as pointed out above, a distinction seems also to have been drawn between the singular and dual as expressing a definite quantity, on the one hand, and the plural as expressing an indefinite quantity, on the other.

The article ὁ directly following ἀριθμὸς in I 18 would lead one to expect that the structure of the definitions of the three *numeri* in the papyrus was very close to that of the definitions in the parallels cited above from the Scholia to Dionysius Thrax and Choeroboscus. In the parallels, the article is accompanied by the participle σημαίνων and the participle has as its direct object an expression indicating the exact quantity referred to by each number. There are, however, serious reasons for doubting whether the same words were used in the papyrus as in the parallels and even whether the structure of the definitions in the papyrus was maintained in each case. In particular, the definitions of the singular and the dual given in the parallels seem too short for the space available in the papyrus, whereas the definitions of the plural appear too long. The exiguous surviving traces of the definitions in the papyrus are also either indeterminate or positively do not suit the wording of the parallels. The fact that the papyrus elsewhere gives definitions unattested in the sources only opens the door to the possibility here too. That would of course remove an obstacle to the supplement τὸ δις|cón, proposed by

⁵¹ For ἡ περιτερά, cf. *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν <Stephani>), *GG* I.3:219.6–7; (Σλ), *GG* I.3:525.28; for ἡ κορώνη, cf. *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν <Stephani>), *GG* I.3:219.7; for ἡ χελιδών, cf. [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:25.2; *P.Amh.* II 21 (No. 14 Wouters), 38; *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν <Stephani>), *GG* I.3:219.7.

⁵² On the development of the category ἀριθμὸς in the ancient grammatical tradition, the definitions of the individual numbers and the terminology used in discussing them, see Matthaios (1999) 278–83. For the view that the plural means three or more, cf. *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:229.32–230.2; (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:381.25–9; (Σλ), *GG* I.3:545.14–6.

Di Benedetto (1957) 185 (comm. I 18–22) and admitted by Wouters (with a question mark) to his text⁵³, but the surviving letters, read by both previous editors as certain, are in fact much less so and any supplement based on them must therefore be viewed with extreme caution.

The three *numeri* are illustrated in *PSI* inv. 505 using forms of the proper name "Ομηρος. So too in [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:30.5–31.1. The Scholia to Dionysius Thrax and Choeroboscus, quoted above, opt for Αἴας instead. The name "Ομηρος also appears in this papyrus as the example of the masculine gender (I 7).

I 21–2. Di Benedetto (1957) 185 (comm. I 18–22) and Wouters (1979) 138 (comm. l. 22), who recognized part of the term *πληθυντικός* in the few letters surviving in I 22, thought that the section on the *numeri* continued in these lines with a discussion of the *pluralia tantum*. In support of this idea, both editors adduced a passage from the *Τέχνη* attributed to Dionysius Thrax, where the enumeration of the ἀριθμοί is followed by a treatment of discrepancies between grammatical number and the actual number of persons or things referred to⁵⁴. Di Benedetto (1957) 181 and Wouters (1979) 138 (comm. ll. 23 sqq.) also both supposed that the section on the *εχήματα* came directly after the ἀριθμοί and Wouters further suggested that only a little text was missing between the last line of the first column and the first surviving line of the second. His ground for this was presumably the assumption that the treatment of the *numeri* in the papyrus concluded with a discussion of the *pluralia* and *singularia tantum*, as it does in the *Τέχνη* attributed to Dionysius Thrax. Unfortunately, the trace of the letter that both Di Benedetto and Wouters took as a certain *nu* in I 22 does not suit that letter at all well, so that the palaeographical basis of their proposed restoration *πληθυ]ντικ[* turns out to be far less solid than it might otherwise have been.

A completely different reconstruction of these lines is possible. Among other things, this reconstruction takes account of the letters and traces preserved in I 21, not exploited by the previous two editors. It is tempting to discern in the sequence read by Di Benedetto and Wouters as *π[]σαν* a section-opening interrogative, *π[ό]σαι*, instead. Since the other accidents of the noun are dealt with elsewhere in the papyrus, and since the interrogative is apparently feminine in gender, the section in question should be that on the *πτώσεις*. Some confirmation of this suspicion comes from the following line (I 22). Here the trace of the letter interpreted by Di Benedetto and Wouters as a *nu* better suits an *eta* and the resulting sequence *ητικ* occurs in the standard term for the vocative case, *κλητική*. It seems hardly coincidental therefore that the position of these four letters in the line would accord with the usual place reserved for the vocative in the list of the cases, the fifth and last one.

If these new readings and supplements hit the mark and the discussion of the *πτώσεις* fell within these two lines, the example of the plural in I 21 was followed by the *diple obelismene* and the question introducing the new section. The numeral indicating the number of cases came next and after it the enumeration of the five cases themselves. The numeral is now missing, but there would be room for it in the gap and the traces of the following and last two letters in I 21 would be consistent with the *epsilon* and *upsilon* of *εὐθεία*, a standard term for the nominative case⁵⁵. The enumeration of the *πτώσεις* continued in I 22 and ended with the vocative.

⁵³ This expression never occurs in the sources in reference to grammatical number. In its single occurrence in Ap. Dysc. *Synt.* IV.1, *GG* II.2:434.5–9, it is used in an entirely different connection and appears to mean "double".

⁵⁴ Cf. [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:31.1–4: εἰς δὲ τινες ἐνικοί χαρακτηρες καὶ κατὰ πολλῶν λεγόμενοι, οἷον δῆμος, χορός, ὄχλος· καὶ πληθυντικοὶ κατὰ ἐνικῶν τε καὶ δυϊκῶν, ἐνικῶν μὲν ὡς Ἀθῆναι, Θῆβαι, δυϊκῶν δὲ ὡς ἀμφότεροι. See also Ap. Dysc. *Fragm.*, *GG* II.3:60.37–61.4 (col. 1) and 60.28–61.4 (col. 2) as well as *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:230.3–19; (Σμ), *GG* I.3:381.19–382.35; (Σι <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:545.18–546.4. For the history, in the ancient scholarly tradition, of this problem of incongruence between form and meaning, cf. Lallot (1998) 139 n. 18 and Matthaios (1999) 282–3.

⁵⁵ Other terms for the nominative case, besides *εὐθεία*, are *ὀρθή* and *ὀνομαστική*. Cf. [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:31.6 and Matthaios (1999) 286 with n. 402. The fact that *εὐθεία* occurs elsewhere in the papyrus (I 7, 8, 10), and is the only term used by the author for the nominative, makes it likely that it stood here too.

The position of the treatment of the *πτώσεις* in the midst of sections on other accidents is noteworthy. In the Greek and Latin grammatical literature that has come down to us, the cases are always dealt with last⁵⁶. Yet it would be mistaken to expect an early manual to treat the accidents in exactly the same order as later handbooks. Even in the subsequent tradition, a certain degree of fluidity in their arrangement is in evidence, albeit not as regards the position of the cases specifically. Whereas the *ἀριθμοί* were discussed after the *σχήματα* in the *Τέχνη* attributed to Dionysius Thrax, in the Latin *Artes grammaticae* (and presumably in Apollonius Dyscolus) they were treated before them⁵⁷. And, as we have seen (cf. above p. 100), the relative order of treatments of the *γέννη* and the *εἶδη* was also a subject of debate in some circles. But, leaving aside the sequence of the *accidentia* as whole, it is important to observe that, in [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, GG I.1.24.6–7, the sections on the *ἀριθμοί* and the *πτώσεις* are arranged in the same order as in our papyrus *τέχνη* and that in both texts the *πτώσεις* are discussed immediately after the *ἀριθμοί*.

It is likely that the treatment of the *πτώσεις* came to an end directly after the enumeration of the five cases and that the cases were not defined. Our other surviving handbooks at least never give definitions of the individual cases, probably on account of the conceptual and theoretical difficulties involved. Sometimes alternative terms are provided for each of the cases in the discussion of the *πτώσεις*⁵⁸, but the rigid typology of the questions occurring in the other sections of this papyrus *τέχνη*, aimed at obtaining exclusively the enumeration and the definition of the grammatical categories discussed, would seem to rule that possibility out⁵⁹.

I 22–II 1. If the section on the *πτώσεις* consisted in the enumeration of the five cases alone, the discussion of the *σχήματα* must have begun at the end of I 22, the last line of the first column. In that case, the mention of the fifth and final *πτώσις*, the *κλητική*, was directly followed by the *diple obelismene* and the *diple obelismene* by the first word of the question opening the new section, *σχήματα*. With 41 letters (the *diple obelismene* counting as two), I 22 would fall at the lower end of the range of certainly established line-lengths (cf. n. 6).

Di Benedetto (1957) 185 (comm. II 1) and Wouters (1979) 138 (comm. II. 23 sqq.), who supposed that the treatment of the *ἀριθμοί* continued in I 22, were forced to assume that at least one entire line was lost at the top of the second column. But, if our reconstruction of I 22 is right and the first word of the question introducing the section on the *σχήματα* (the word *σχήματα* itself) was the last word of the first column, then the second word of that question (the interrogative *πόσα*), preserved at the beginning of II 1, was the first word of the original second column. From this it would follow that the unwritten space above II 1 belongs to the upper margin. Its depth, slightly greater than the normal interval between the other lines (see p. 97 and n. 4) and the total absence of traces of letters from a line above it also suggest that this is in fact the case.

II 1–7. What little remains of the section on the *σχήματα* is enough to show that each of the three *figurae* was defined and illustrated with an example or two. The *Τέχνη* attributed to Dionysius Thrax (§ 12, GG I.1:29.5–7) confines itself to examples and so does *P.Ant.* II 68 (No. 15 Wouters) verso, I 8–15⁶⁰. The first word of the definition of the *ἀπλοῦν σχῆμα* in II 2, *ὄνομα*, moreover, indicates that, as with the *genera*, the terms for the subclasses of the *figurae*, *ἀπλοῦν*, *κύνθετον* and *παρακύνθετον*, qualified the word class exhibiting the property (*ὄνομα*) rather than the property itself (*σχῆμα*).

⁵⁶ See above p. 100 and the references in n. 21.

⁵⁷ Cf. Prisc. *Inst.* II.22, GL II:57.8 (= Ap. Dysc. *Fragm.*, GG II.3:39.13). On the arrangement of the *accidentia* of the noun in the Latin grammarians, see Jeep (1893) 125.

⁵⁸ See [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, GG I.1:31.6–32.1; Ap. Dysc. *Fragm.*, GG II.3:65.22–67.42; Sch. D. Thr. (Σν), GG I.3:230.24–231.10; (Σμ), GG I.3:383.27–384.21. For the various terms used to designate the cases, cf. Lallot (1998) 144–8. *P.Ant.* II 68 (No. 15 Wouters) recto, I 41–6 just enumerates the five cases without mentioning alternative terms.

⁵⁹ Latin grammars with question-and-answer structure also confine themselves to the bare enumeration of the cases. Cf. e.g. Donat. *Ars minor*, GL IV:355.25–6.

⁶⁰ On the history of the grammatical category *σχῆμα*, see Matthaios (1999) 260–2 and (2004) 8–10 and 14–6.

As supplemented here and in the first two editions, II 1 is short, containing only 37 letters against an average of 46 in column I. Perhaps a *diple obelismene* was placed after the enumeration of the three *σχήματα*, as it was after the list of the five *γένη* in I 5. In the latter case, however, the sign occurs at line-end.

II 1–3. The *ἀπλοῦν σχῆμα* was treated in these lines and parts of the definition and examples survive. The words τ[ί] ἐστιν at the beginning of II 2 belong to the introductory question and prove that the discussion of at least this, and probably the other *figurae*, proceeded in accordance with the catechistic method.

So little of the definition of the *σχῆμα* is preserved in the papyrus that it would be foolhardy to attempt to restore its precise wording. The following definitions, given in the Scholia to Dionysius Thrax, may at least convey a rough idea of its content: (1) *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:378.6: καὶ ἀπλῶ μὲν ἐστὶν ὅσα μὴ πέφυκε διαιρεῖσθαι εἰς δύο ἢ καὶ πλείονας λέξεις ἰδίᾳ νοητάς; (2) (Σμ), *GG* I.3:379.32: ἀπλοῦν ἐστὶ τὸ ἐξ ἑνὸς μέρους λόγου ἡγουν μιᾶς λέξεως, οἷον θεός.

The *ἀπλοῦν ὄνομα* seems exceptionally to have been illustrated with two examples. The first (λέων) is intact, but only the initial letter of the second (θ) survives. Wouters hesitatingly restored θ[εός] in II 3, the example given in the second of the definitions just quoted. The noun λέων, on the other hand, never occurs in illustration of this *figura* in other grammatical literature and so joins the number of otherwise unattested examples cited by the author of this *τέχνη* (cf. p. 100 above).

II 3–4. The whole of the treatment of the *σύνθετον σχῆμα* is missing except for a few letters and traces at the beginning of II 4, but it will have consisted, on the usual pattern, of the introductory question, *σύνθετον τί ἐστιν*, the definition and one or more examples. It is once more impossible to recover the wording of the definition, but again its general content can be readily imagined from definitions provided in the Scholia to Dionysius Thrax: (1) *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:378.6: σύνθετα δὲ τὰ ἐκ δύο ἢ καὶ πλείονων λέξεων ἰδίᾳ νοητῶν συντεθειμένα, ἐν ἐνὶ τόνῳ καθ' ἑνὸς ὑποκειμένου λαμβανόμενα; (2) (Σμ), *GG* I.3:379.33: σύνθετον δὲ τὸ ἐκ δύο λέξεων ἢ καὶ πλείονων, οἷον φιλόθεος, χρυσολευκόλιθος. Since there would scarcely be enough room for the whole of the definition in II 3, it is likely that the letters and traces preserved in II 4 belonged to it and not to the exemplification. But the identity of some of those letters and the articulation of all remain uncertain. A word-break may fall between η and χ, and η may be taken as the disjunctive ἢ, but this is just one possibility. Assuming that they do come from the definition, there is space enough later in the line for the citation of at least one and at most two illustrative compounds. These, consisting of two or more words, tended to be quite long⁶¹.

II 5–7. The words *παρὰσύνθε[τον]* and *Ἡρακλείδ[ης]*, preserved in II 5 and 7 respectively, mark the beginning and approximate end of the treatment of the third *figura*. The first certainly belonged to the opening question (*παρὰσύνθε[τον τί ἐστιν]*); the second, as its formal characteristics and the preceding οἷον show, was cited as an example. The definition, which will have begun with *ὄνομα*, is entirely lost, but, as with those of the two preceding *σχήματα*, the Scholia to Dionysius Thrax help to form a notion of its content: (1) *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ), *GG* I.3:379.34: τὸ δὲ παρὰσύνθετον παρῆκται ἀπὸ συνθέτου· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παρὰσύνθετον καλεῖται; (2) (Σλ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:544.20: καὶ ἔστι παρὰσύνθετον τὸ ἀπὸ συνθέτου γεγόμενον, μὴ μέντοι προσλαβὼν ἑτέραν λέξιν, οἷον Ἀγαμέμνων, Ἀγαμεμνονίδης; (3) (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:379.14: παρὰσύνθετα δὲ ἐκεῖνά φαμεν τὰ ἀπὸ συνθέτων ὀνόματα εἰς ἐν τῶν προειρημένων ἐπτὰ εἰδῶν μεταπίπτοντα.

It is nevertheless not at all easy to make sense of the letters and traces surviving in II 6 and imagine how they might tie in with the definition. Is *δε* at line-beginning the particle *δέ* or is it part of another word? And, in the latter case, is it the start of a new word or the continuation of one divided between the

⁶¹ Cf. e.g. the two long compounds cited from *Ar. Ra.* 966 by *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:378.11–2: *καλπυγολογυπηνάδης* and *καρκασμοπιτυοκάμπτης*. Such examples from Greek comedy were favourites among Greek grammarians to illustrate compounds formed of more than two words.

lines? As for the following letters, one possibility might be to recognize in them a form of the word *τάσις*. A discussion of accentuation in connection with word composition would not be out of place in this context, as a passage from the *Περὶ συντάξεως* of Apollonius Dyscolus shows⁶². The same passage informs us that Apollonius Dyscolus also dealt with problems of accentuation in his monograph *Περὶ σχημάτων*⁶³.

The examples of the three *σχήματα* cited in the *Τέχνη* attributed to Dionysius Thrax (§ 12, *GG* I.1:29.6–7) make up a connected series of three, in which the second is built upon the first and the third upon the second: *Μέμνων*, *Ἀγαμέμνων*, *Ἀγαμεμνονίδης*⁶⁴. However, to judge by the examples surviving in the papyrus (*λέων*, *θ[εός]*?, *Ἡρακλείδης*), the author of this *τέχνη* appears to have selected nouns with no common morphological components.

The name *Ἡρακλείδης* is not cited elsewhere in illustration of the *παρακύνθετον ὄνομα*, but is used to exemplify a particular type of derivative within the category of patronymics⁶⁵.

II 7–11. New readings in II 8–11 afford a general idea of the content of these lines, but the precise structure of the text and its relation to what immediately precedes remain problematic. It is now apparent that derivative nouns were discussed and their *εἶδη* enumerated. A distinction between primary and derivative nouns (*πρωτότυπα* and *παράγωγα*) probably introduced the discussion in II 7–8, though to what extent the former were treated is uncertain (cf. II 7–9n.). Since the *παρακύνθετα* fall into the wider class of the *παράγωγα*, it seems reasonable to suppose that the foregoing subsection on the *παρακύνθετον ὄνομα* gave rise to the discussion of the derivatives. But whether a new section on the *εἶδη* actually began between the exemplification of the *παρακύνθετον ὄνομα* in II 7 and the enumeration of the *εἶδη παραγῶγων* in II 9–11 cannot be established with absolute certainty. An enumeration would in any case point to the beginning of a new section.

II 7–9. It is impossible to restore the missing parts of these lines with any confidence, because so much is lost and the little that survives does not seem to fit together easily. The section on the *εἶδη* in the *Τέχνη* attributed to Dionysius Thrax (§ 12, *GG* I.1:25.3–7), however, may provide some guidance to the reconstruction of the text of the papyrus in this area. There a distinction is first drawn between primary (*πρωτότυπα*) and derivative (*παράγωγα*) nouns and then the latter are broken down into seven classes (*εἶδη παραγῶγων*). The presence of *καὶ παρ[ά]γωγῶν* in II 8 and the likelihood of an enumeration of the *εἶδη παραγῶγων* in II 10–1 suggest that the author of our *τέχνη* proceeded along similar lines. If so, *πρωτότυπον* stood at the end of II 7, as the first of the pair of two main *εἶδη*, and the section on the *εἶδη* itself began after the exemplification of the *παρακύνθετον ὄνομα*. Assuming a second example of 10 letters or so after *Ἡρακλείδης*, the *diple obelismene*, the introductory question (*εἶδη πόσα*) and the letter representing the number two (*β*), the length of the line would be about average. It must be borne in mind, however, that the treatment of the *εἶδη* in the *Τέχνη* attributed to Dionysius Thrax reflects only one of several possible classifications in ancient grammatical theory (see n. 35 above).

There are, however, at least two serious obstacles to this reconstruction. The first is that there would hardly be enough room in II 8 for the definitions of the *πρωτότυπον* and *παράγωγῶν εἶδος*, even if the question-and-answer form was here exceptionally dispensed with. Secondly, the surviving text in II 9 does not contain even part of a definition, but seems to refer to a derivational type of patronymic. The first four letters of II 9, *γωγα*, seem at least clearly to be part of the term *παράγωγα* divided between the lines. The following sequence of letters may then most plausibly be articulated into the preposition *εἰς*, the letters *ει*, constituting the initial part of the suffix, and a word formed with this suffix. Supposing the writer omitted the first *eta* by mistake, that word was *Πηλείδης*, commonly cited in grammatical

⁶² Cf. *Synt.* IV.51, *GG* II.2:475.3–476.3. On this passage, see Lallot (1997) II 310–1 nn. 125 and 126.

⁶³ Cf. *Fragm.*, *GG* II.3:61.37–62.6.

⁶⁴ The same series of examples occurs in *P.Ant.* II 68 (No. 15 Wouters) verso, I 11–5.

⁶⁵ Cf. *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:221.26–7; (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:367.23–4.

literature as an example both of the patronymic in general and of one of its particular types⁶⁶. Such an articulation would fully accord with the ancient theory of derivation, which classified types of derivatives by suffix (κατάληξις) and further by the syllable preceding the suffix (παράληξις)⁶⁷. Like Ἡρακλείδης, Π(η)λείδης is a derivative and it is precisely this link between the two words that would speak against the beginning of a new section on the εἶδη in II 7 after the exemplification of the παρακύνθετον ὄνομα. Instead, II 7–9 may have added that an essential property of the παρακύνθετον ὄνομα, as opposed to the other two σχήματα, consisted in its being at the same time a derivative. In such a context a mention of the πρωτότυπον εἶδος would be out of place.

On the other hand, the link between the nouns Ἡρακλείδης and Π(η)λείδης might serve to provide a bridge from the treatment of the παρακύνθετον ὄνομα to a general discussion of derivatives and their εἶδη. In this case, the enumeration of the εἶδη in the following lines would be explicable and perhaps forms part of a separate section. The connection between the παρακύνθετα and παράγωγα is directly attested in *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:379.14–20 and (ΣΙ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:544.18–20, where the compounds are said to fall into the same seven εἶδη as all other derivatives.

II 9–11. Restoration of these lines is based on a new reading of the letters and traces in II 10. Here it is possible to identify a term for one of the εἶδη παραγῶγων, the συν[κ]ριτικόν, or comparative noun. Immediately thereafter an *upsilon* is visible on the edge of the break. In the list of the εἶδη παραγῶγων given in the Τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax (§ 12, *GG* I.1:25.6–7), the συγκριτικόν is directly followed by the ὑπερθετικόν, the term for the superlative. It therefore seems likely that the superlative came after the comparative in the papyrus too and that the two terms belong to an enumeration of the kinds of derivative. A term for a third kind of derivative can also perhaps be detected in the following line, ῥηματι[κό]ν, preceded perhaps by a reference to yet another kind, παρώνυμον. A new section may thus have begun in II 9 after Π(η)λείδης and the rest of the line contained the *diple obelismene*, the introductory question, a numeral indicating the number of the εἶδη and the first items of the enumeration. The order in which the kinds were listed may have been the same as in the Τέχνη attributed to Dionysius Thrax (§12, *GG* I.1:25.6–7): πατρωνυμικόν, κτητικόν, συγκριτικόν, ὑπερθετικόν, ὑποκοριστικόν, παρώνυμον, ῥηματικόν. But the arrangement of the surviving pairs, συν[κ]ριτικόν-ὑπερθετικόν and παρώνυμον-ῥηματι[κό]ν, which in any case logically belong together in this sequence, is no absolute guarantee.

II 11–8. If a new section on the εἶδη παραγῶγων began in II 9, the treatment of the individual kinds of derivative might have occupied these lines. The four letters at the beginning of II 16, αδελ, may belong to ἀδελφός, or a form of ἀδελφός, which occur in the discussion of the πατρωνυμικόν εἶδος in *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σμ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:365.32–366.2 and (ΣΙ <Heliodori>), *GG* I.3:531.22–31.

Works Cited

Editions of papyri are referred to by the abbreviations recommended in: Oates, J. W., et al. *Checklist of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets*, <<http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist.html>>, May, 2005.

Ax W. (1982). Aristarch und die “Grammatik”. *Glotta* 60: 96–109.

Ax W. (2000). *Lexis und Logos. Studien zur antiken Grammatik und Rhetorik*. Ed. F. Grewing. Stuttgart.

⁶⁶ As an example of the patronymic, Πηλείδης is cited in [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, I.1:25.9; *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:220.19; (Σμ), *GG* I.3:365.21; (ΣΙ), *GG* I.3:528.11; (Comm. Byz.), *GG* I.3:573.10. As an example of the type of patronymic in -(ει)δης, Πηλείδης occurs in *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:221.11; (Σμ), *GG* I.3:366.32; (Comm. Byz.), *GG* I.3:573.16.

⁶⁷ For the majority of the εἶδη παραγῶγων endings, or rather derivational suffixes, were distinguished which were considered characteristic of each class. These τύποι were further differentiated according to the syllable immediately preceding the suffix. For this classificatory system in the case of patronymics, cf. [D. Thr.] *Ars gramm.* § 12, *GG* I.1:26.1–5; *Sch. D. Thr.* (Σν), *GG* I.3:221.3–222.21; (Σμ), I.3:367.6–369.17. On the topic, see now Matthaïos (2004) 12–3.

- Barbis R. (1988). La diplè obelismene: precisazioni terminologiche e formali. In *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25-31 May 1986*. Ed. B. G. Mandilaras. Athens. II: 473–6.
- Bussi  res M.-P. (2004). Concluding Remarks. In *Erotapokriseis: Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context. Proceedings of the Utrecht Colloquium, 13-14 October 2003*. Edd. A. Volgers, C. Zamagni. Leuven. 181–9.
- Callanan C. K. (1987). *Die Sprachbeschreibung bei Aristophanes von Byzanz*. G  ttingen.
- Chandler H. W. (1881). *A Practical Introduction to Greek Accentuation*. Oxford.
- Cribiore R. (1996). *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta.
- Cribiore R. (2001). *Gymnastics of the Mind. Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton-Oxford.
- Di Benedetto V. (1957). Papiri inediti della raccolta fiorentina: IV. Frammento grammaticale. *ASNP* 26: 180–5.
- Di Benedetto V. (1958). Dionisio Trace e la Techne a lui attribuita. *ASNP* 27: 169–210.
- Fehling D. (1956). Varro und die grammatische Lehre von der Analogie und der Flexion. *Glotta* 35: 214–70.
- GG = *Grammatici Graeci*. Partes I–IV. Lipsiae 1867–1901.
- Gignac, F. T. (1976). *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Vol. I. Milano.
- GL = *Grammatici Latini ex recensione H. Keilii*. Voll. I–VIII. Lipsiae 1855–80.
- Ieraci Bio A.M. (1995). L'erotapokrisis nella letteratura medica. In *Esegesi, parafrasi e compilazione in et   tardoantica. Atti del Terzo Convegno dell'Associazione di Studi Tardoantichi*. Ed. C. Moreschini. Napoli. 187–207.
- Jeep L. (1893). *Zur Geschichte der Lehre von den Redetheilen bei den lateinischen Grammatikern*. Leipzig.
- Lallot J. (1997). *Apollonius Dyscole. De la construction (syntaxe)*. 2 voll. Paris.
- Lallot J. (1998). *La grammaire de Denys le Thrace*. 2     dition revue et augment  e. Paris.
- Law V. (1996). The Mnemonic Structure of Ancient Grammatical Doctrine. In *Ancient Grammar: Content and Context*. Edd. P. Swiggers, A. Wouters. Leuven-Paris. 37–52.
- LDAB = The Leuven Database of Ancient Books, <<http://ldab.arts.kuleuven.ac.be>>
- Mattha  os S. (1999). *Untersuchungen zur Grammatik Aristarchs: Texte und Interpretation zur Wortartenlehre*. G  ttingen.
- Mattha  os S. (2004). Die Wortbildungstheorie in der alexandrinischen Grammatik. *Beitr  ge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 14: 5–22.
- Montevocchi O. (1988). *La papirologia*. Ristampa riveduta e corretta con addenda a cura di S. Daris. Milano.
- Moretti A.F. (1995). Revisione di alcuni papiri greci letterari editi tra i *P.Mil.Vogl. AnalPap* 7: 19–30.
- MP³ = Base de donn  es exp  rimentale Mertens-Pack³ en ligne, <<http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/index.htm>>
- Probert P. (2003). *A New Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek*. London.
- Roberts C.H. (1956). *Greek Literary Hands. 350 B.C.-A.D. 400*. Oxford.
- Schneider R. (1910). *Librorum Apollonii deperditorum fragmenta*. In GG II.3.
- Schubart W. (1911). *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses*. Bonn  e-Oxoniae.
- Stein M. (Forthcoming). Kritische Zeichen. In *Reallexikon f  r Antike und Christentum*. Vol. XXI.
- Steinthal H. (1890–91). *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und R  mern mit besonderer R  cksicht auf die Logik*. 2 vols. Berlin.
- Strunk K. (1993). Neutrum: zum antiken Benennungsmotiv eines grammatischen Terminus. In *Sprachen und Schriften des antiken Mittelmeerraums. Festschrift f  r J  rgen Untermann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edd. F. Heidermanns, H. Rix, E. Seebold. Innsbruck. 455–63.
- Turner E.G. (1987). *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*. Second edition revised and enlarged. Ed. P. J. Parsons. London.
- Vaahtera J. (1998). *Derivation: Greek and Roman Views on Word Formation*. Turku.
- Wouters A. (1979). *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt. Contributions to the Study of the 'Ars Grammatica' in Antiquity*. Brussel.

INHALT

Armoni, Ch., PSI Com. 11: Ein seltenes Exemplar einer <i>Exomosie</i>	214
Bakola, E., Old Comedy Disguised as Satyr Play: A New Reading of Cratinus' <i>Dionysalexandros</i> (P. Oxy. 663)	46
Bennett, Chr., Arsinoe and Berenice at the Olympics	91
Bettarini, L., Note linguistiche alla nuova Saffo	33
Campanile, D., Sul ritorno in patria di Strabone	267
Cropp, M. – Fick, G., On the Date of the Extant <i>Hippolytus</i>	43
Dana, D., Sur quelques noms fantômes thraces et daces	293
Daniel, R. W. – Gronewald, M., Lyrischer Text (Sappho-Papyrus)	7
Delrieux, F., Les décrets d'Iasos en l'honneur d'étrangers au début de l'époque hellénistique. Notes sur un essai de classement	173
Drew-Bear, Th. – Scheid, J., La copie des <i>Res Gestae</i> d'Antioche de Pisidie	217
Eckerman, Chr., Τὸ βόλιμον in the Lease Inscriptions of the Klytidai	183
Engelmann, H., Archiereus und Lykiarch (zu TAM II 1, 175)	181
Esposito, E., P. Oxy. XVII 2087 e una citazione dal Περὶ δικαιοσύνης di Aristotele	79
Fick, G. – Cropp, M., On the Date of the Extant <i>Hippolytus</i>	43
Finglass, P. J., Erinys or Hundred-hander? Pindar, fr. 52i(a).19–21 Snell–Maehler = B3.25–7 Rutherford (<i>Paeon</i> 8a)	40
García-Dils de la Vega, S. – Sáez Fernández, P. – Ordóñez Agulla, S. – Saquete Chamizo, J. C., Hispania Baetica, provincia immunis	299
Garulli, V., Posidippo in <i>schol. Flor. Call. Aet.</i> fr. 1 Pf. (PSI XI 1219)	86
Gonis, N., Notes on Miscellaneous Documents II	203
Gonis, N., Stein's <i>Style Nouveau</i> and the Post-Consulates of Iustinus II and Tiberius II	211
Gronewald, M. – Daniel, R. W., Lyrischer Text (Sappho-Papyrus)	7
Guichard Romero, L. A., Sur les papyrus d'Achmîm 3 et 5	190
Hagedorn, D., Bemerkungen zu Urkunden	195
Hardie, A., Sappho, the Muses, and Life After Death	13
Jones, C. P., An Athenian Document Mentioning Julius Nicanor	161
Jordan, D., Notes on Verses in <i>Cyranides</i> , Book I	117
Kassel, R., Aus der Arbeit an den Poetae Comici Graeci	59
Kovács, P., Register zu Tituli Romani in Hungaria reperti. Supplementum	275
Lambert, S. D., Athenian State Laws and Decrees 352/1–322/1: II. Religious Regulations	125
Le Roux, P., Peregrini incolae	261
Lundon, J. – Matthaïos, S., Nominal Accidents by Question and Answer: Two Fragments of a Τέχνη Γραμματική, One New	97
Marquis, T. L., Letter from a Connoisseur of Ponies: P. CtYBR inv. 601	201
Matthaïos, S. – Lundon, J., Nominal Accidents by Question and Answer: Two Fragments of a Τέχνη Γραμματική, One New	97
Ordóñez Agulla, S. – Sáez Fernández, P. – Saquete Chamizo, J. C. – García-Dils de la Vega, S., Hispania Baetica, provincia immunis	299
Pernigotti, C., Menandro a simposio? P. Oxy. III 409 + XXXIII 2655 e P. Oxy. LIII 3705 riconsiderati	69

Sáez Fernández, P. – Ordóñez Agulla, S. – Saquete Chamizo, J. C. – García-Dils de la Vega, S., Hispania Baetica, provincia immunis	299
Saquete Chamizo, J. C. – Sáez Fernández, P. – Ordóñez Agulla, S. – García-Dils de la Vega, S., Hispania Baetica, provincia immunis	299
Scheid, J. – Drew-Bear, Th., La copie des <i>Res Gestae</i> d'Antioche de Pisidie	217
Speidel, M., Centurial Signs and the Battle Order of the Legions	286
Tchernetska, N., New Fragments of Hyperides from the Archimedes Palimpsest	1
Tomlin, R. S. O., The Prefect of the Misene Fleet in 218: A Note to <i>RMD</i> III 192	271
Zambito, L., La lastra di Modica (c.da Monte Margi). Una proposta di lettura	269
International Summer School in Coptic Papyrology	312