been driven by Artemis ... or (less probably) by Ares ... You would not otherwise ...'. I follow Lobeck in removing the usual query.—Here too I abstain from colometric discussion.

5 There may be a comparable 'mantic' connection of thought between Ταυροκόλα (with a fancied 'bull' etymology) and θοτίς in A. 172-5.

6 With powerful dramatic irony in the diametrically wrong conjecture, since we know that the deity responsible is in fact (antithetically) Aphrodite.

7 For Artemis-Hecate, see Friis Johansen and Whittle on A. Su. 676, also West on Ag. 140-1 in his Studies in Aeschylus (Stuttgart 1990), 177f. The name Dikynna is usually associated with δικτύον 'net', variously for hunting and fishing (both aspects relevant to the Britomartis myth, and the latter relevant here for the potency δίνω έν νερίσσις οὖμοις). But she is likely also, or even primarily, to have been a mountain goddess, with a name cognate with the holy mountain Dicte (Dikti) in East Crete.

8 The verb φοιτάω makes a striking re-appearance as the concluding word of the ode at 169 (... καὶ θεότις φοιτάω). So far from causing madness, there the 'visitation' of Artemis is explicitly remedial of ἀφοσοῦν (164). In contrast to Aphrodite (cf. n. 5 above) Artemis is indeed a paradigm of ἀφοσοῦν.

9 τρύγεισθαι like τίχερθαι can come close to middle force, cf. Med. 159, μὴ λέων τάκου, Hcl. 1286 τρύγουσα καυτήν. For the sense 'pinea', cf. Ar. Pax 989. But τρύγεισθαι is properly passive ('to be worn out by'), etc.

10) This would be unusual. As Dr Rijksebaron has pointed out to me, ὁδε typically refers to a pre-existing situation rather than to words in the speaker's preceding sentence. I am grateful for his citations which include (in questions) PV 581ff. τί ποτέ μ', ὅν Κρόνει παύ ... παράκοπον ὁδε τέρειν; and S. El. 123ff. ὃ παῖ ... τίν' ἀδει γάτας ὁδε ἄκορετον οἰνωνεῖν; also Ant. 752, OT 1435, Phil. 730, OC 1717, E. Ba. 1036; and (in other types of sentence) S. Aj. 427, 440, El. 232, 1274, 1275, Ant. 919, Phil. 1132, OC 1714, E. Su. 285, Hec. 1269. Pho. 1060.

11) Dr Rijksebaron aptly draws my attention to the observations concerning ὁδε etc. in Kühner-Gerth i. 644.

ISOCRATES BILINGUIS BEROLINENSIS

In the new publication by G. Ioannidou, Catalogue of Greek and Latin Literary Papyri in Berlin (Mainz 1996 = Berliner Klassiker Texte, IX), 186-87, one finds under # 149 (cf. ibidem, pl. 64), 'Bilingual Text', an edition of two fragments (belonging to a dark-brown papyrus codex from the 4th century A.D., from Hermopolis); each fragment is inscribed on the recto and the verso with (1') a column of text in Greek and (2') a column of text in Latin. Obviously the Latin is a translation of the Greek text. The editor of the fragments does not state whether she has attempted to identify this text.

While consulting the volume for other purposes we noticed by accidence the slightly deviant way of separating κατα from λογοθνη in # 149, Fr. I ↓, l. 4; here one might as well print one word, καταλογοθνη, and this word (cf. LSR s.v.) reminded us of a passage in our recent edition of the 4th-century Isocrates codex from Kellis/Ismant el-Kharab (Dakhleh Oasis, © Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden 1998 Memesyne, Vol. LI, Fasc. 6
Egypt(1)). We identify the passages concerned as parts of [Isocr.] Ad Demonicum, §§ 47 and 48, and Ad Nicolem, §§ 7 and 8. For the sake of convenience we present the transcript of the ed. princ.(2), followed by some comments of our own. If (as seems likely to us) in the complete original codex the text of the Ad Demonicum preceded the text of the Ad Nicolem, one should invert the position of the fragments numbered in the ed. princ. as ‘1’ (H. 6.5 × W. 18.2 cm) and ‘2’ (H. 9.5 × W. 15.7 cm). In order, however, to remain more close to the ed. princ. we decided not to invert the position of these fragments and to invert only the position of the recto and the verso of fragment 1. As to the handwriting practised in the Greek and the Latin columns, we have not been able to convince ourselves that two different hands should be distinguished; likewise, however, we are not certain that they are identical: therefore, we restrict ourselves to a ‘non liquet’.

Fr. 1 Verso:
Col. I

Col. II

1 [lost]  
2 [lost]  
3 γαρ [ ]  
4 καὶ τὸν εἰμετέρων  
5 ἡμετέρων·  
6 ἧκε τὸν κατὰ λογικὴν  
margin  

[lost]  
conspicuum  
multa enim  
et modulatorum  
carminum  
et profetiarum  
margin

Fr. 1 Verso = Isocr. Ad Nicolem § 7 (p. 118.18–19 Drerup). We supply in col. I.3 [πόλλα γαρ], take in I.6 καταλογικὴν as one word (cf. above), and read in col. I.1 ‘[δίδομεν ἐπὶ]μικρὸι’, corresponding with a lemma ‘Τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ αὐτὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς’ lost in col. I.1; in col. II.2 the supinum (?) ‘conspicuum’ (see below) seems to correspond with a lemma ‘[συνιδεῖν]’ lost in col. I. It should be noticed that—like Ψ [= the Kellis Isocrates codex], II. 37-38, P1, Λ, Pcorr., N—the Berlin papyrus has εἰμετέρων ποιημάτων against μετὰ μέτρου ποιημάτων in Γ, cf. Worp–Rijksbaron, op. cit. [fn. 1], 185.

Fr. 1 Recto:
Col. I

Col. II

1 [lost]  
2 [lost]  
3 σφαλησιεύν·  
4 καὶ τοὺς τὰς δύναστειας  
5 εὐχοντας·  
6 καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ αὐτοῖς ὀντας·  
7 τοὺς μὲν γαρ οὖν τὰς αρχὰς  
margin  

[lost]  
[lost]  
[...][  
habentes  
et subiectos  
man ill. qui deminit[  
margin

7:γ?
Fr. 1 Recto = Isocr. Ad Nicoclem § 8 (p. 118.25 - 119.1 Drerup). One should supply now in col. I.1 the word προτηρεύειν, but most of this is lost (we have not been able to identify the preserved traces). The lemma in col. I.2 may be read as ‘αὐθηνατος ὁ τεργασίας’. In col. II.3 we cannot read the preserved traces as ‘προδέσσετ’, though this verb is the most plausible candidate. In col. II.4 we read ‘ετ[τ][ε]ν[α][�][ς]’ (or read ‘ετ[τ][ε][ς][μ]’?) as the translation of the Greek lemma ‘καὶ τὸς τῶς δυναστέας’. In col. II.7 one should read the translation as ‘τὸν’ (initial ‘n’ - in superscript as a correction for ‘m-’) illis quidem init[ia]’, i.e. the translator has committed here a mistranslation of ἀρχάς, which should be taken as ‘magistracies’. We note that again this papyrus shares a reading with P1, Λ, Π, N, viz. οφελήσειν against ὁνήσειν in Γ, cf. Worp–Rijksbaron, op. cit. [fn. 1], 186.

Fr. 2 Recto:
Col. I Col. II

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[η ηρ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[ρωτ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[σσ̣σ̣σ̣</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[μ...προτερ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.[blank]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[....θ...εν]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>δ...ε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>margin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fr. 2 Recto = [Isocr.] Ad Démonicum § 47. On the basis of Fr. 2 Verso (see below) we assumed that the rather mutilated Fr. 2 Recto would contain a passage from the Ad Démonicum as well. This assumption proved correct and we are able now to give a more coherent transcript of the text. We think that instead of a long vertical line before each entry in col. II in the ed. prin. the initial letters of each entry are preserved (we should like to stress that we have made our transcript only on the basis of the plate [pl. 64] of the papyrus and that a check of the original text may necessitate a few modifications):

Fr. 2 Recto, revised text:
Col. I Col. II

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[ηρ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[καὶ βεβ[ε]σσετας]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>[αποδίδωσιν] Trace?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>[καὶ εκ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>[ηςθεντες] blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>[προτερος]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>[ενταμθε] δε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>[μετα τας] λγ[πας]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>margin</td>
<td>margin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 [βεβαστερας]
In col. 1.1 the reading cannot be correct; we expect here part of the adjective εἰλακρινείς, but we have not succeeded in identifying the preserved ink traces; the adjective might have been translated as 'sinceras' or 'integrae'. In col. II.6 the scribe apparently wrote originally 'contric-', but corrected this into 'contris-' by writing a cursive -s- over the -c-. We note that this papyrus—with Ψ l. 261, P6, Λ, Π, Σ, Y—in col. I.6 has ἐλυπηθήσεν against ἐλυπηθήσαν in Γ; cf. Worp–Rijksbaron, op. cit. [fn. 1], 178.

Fr. 2 Verso:
Col. I
Col. II

| 1 | ἔος | t]α[λ[έ]m |
| 2 | θανάτον | facerent |
| 3 | παραγιντα | cont[r]aversia[m |
| 4 | τὸν ἔρω[θε]σιν | industriis au[tem |
| 5 | τοὺς δὲ σπουδαῖοι | ε[ ]τὸς |
| 6 | οὐ[κ]χ ο[ν]τὸν [δια]...τὴς | impo[ss]ible,|
| 7 | ομα[λείν] | necle[g]e[re] |
| 8 | ἡ πολύνοις | [a]μ[μ]λυτυμ[ ] |
| margin | margin |

Fr. 2 Verso = [Isocr. ] Ad Demonicum § 48 (p. 114.15–115.1 Drerup). We notice that in col. I.1 the reading 'ἔος' may be corrected into 'γαρ τού [διου]', corresponding in col. II with a translation 'enim vitae' or 'vitae enim' (we cannot read the preserved traces with confidence). In col. I.6 we think one should read in the second half of the line τὸ[ν] τὴς ἁρπης τὴς (to be translated as 'υριτιμε')?. In col. II.2 we prefer printing 't]a]l[m]', in col. II.3 we read 'facerunt' as an error for 'fecerunt', and in col. II.7 we prefer reading 'necle[g]e[re]'. Finally, we note that the papyrus—with Ψ l. 267, P17, Λ, Π, Σ, Y—has in col. I.8 ομαλεῖν η πολύνοις against ομαλεῖν διὰ τὸ πολύνοις in P6, Γ, Z, and Σyrsus, cf. Worp–Rijksbaron, op. cit., 178.

This translation of the Greek text of Isocrates into Latin presents a complete novelty: we do not know of any previous publication of a papyrus with a translation of a Greek pagan literary work into Latin (translations, on the other hand, of Latin classical authors like Virgil and Cicero into Greek are well-known; for a fragment of a Greek/Latin Bible text cf. J. v. Haelst, Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens [Paris 1976] # 523/1208 = PSI XIII 1306). For further information on this subject we refer the reader to the full study by B. Rochette, Le latin dans le monde grec. Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain (Bruxelles 1997; = Collection Latomus, 233). On the basis of Rochette’s second chapter, ‘Le latin dans l’enseignement’ (pp. 165-210), we tend to believe that the papyrus was used in the curriculum of an ‘elementary’ school; perhaps for children, but far more likely for adults3).

It will be noticed that the Latin text clearly aims at presenting a verbum de verbo-translation, which also seeks to preserve the word classes and the syntax of the original4).
We give here a few comments on some of the translations:

Fr. 1 Verso, col. II

l. 2, *conspectum*: if this is meant to render ‘συνιδεῖν’, the form is puzzling. Above we suggested that it might be a supinum. It may be objected, of course, that the presence of such an obsolete form (and use) in an elementary translation is rather strange. It is also the wrong supinum, for with an adjective like *difficilis* a supinum in -i is expected. Perhaps *conspectum* was preceded by a preposition, e.g. *ad* (lost in the lacuna at the end of l. 1?). Be that as it may, *con-spectum* rather than *con-spicere* may have been chosen to serve as a ‘perfect’ equivalent of the aorist ‘συν-ιδεῖν’.

ll. 4-5, *modulatorum carmium*: the combination of *carmen* with some form of *modulor* was a rather common one, cf. (e.g.) Ov. *Met.* 13.341, Sen. *Bref.* 4.6.5, Mart. 13.77.1. The translation *modulatus* for ἔμπετρος may have been a standard one; it is found in G. Goetz–G. Gundermann, *Glossae latinograecae et graecolatinae* (Lipsiae 1888; = Corp.Glos.Lat.II), 296.

l. 6, *profetiarum*: in the Isocrates text τῶν καταλογάδην is followed by *συγκρομμᾶτων*; this combination is a common expression for ‘prose’. *'Profetiarum* is, then, a very strange translation of the Greek; in fact, the normal Latin translation of *καταλογάδην* seems to have been *prosa*.

We venture to think that somehow (in some hands, Latin ‘s’ and ‘f’ may look much similar, sometimes) a form of *pros* (perhaps *prosaurum*, followed by *conscriptum?*) got mixed up with *profetia*, a word from the Christian vocabulary. See also below, *contristavimus*.

Fr. 2 Recto, col. II

l. 6, *contristavimus*: the choice of the verb *contristo*, rather than (e.g.) *doleo* or *maero*, may betray Christian influence. In fact, in the New Testament Gk. ἀπόφασις is, with the exception of Ev. *Marc.* 10.22.1, always translated by *contristo*, cf. (e.g.) Ev. *Matt.* 14.9,1 (ἀκαταλαβής *contristatus*), 18.31,1, Ev. *Joh.* 21.17,2 (ἐλευθερία *contristatus est*), 2 Ep. *Cor.* 2.5,1 (ἀκατάλαβος *contristavit*). The intransitive/‘passive’ use of active *contristavimus* must be considered a mistake.

Fr. 2 Verso, col. II

l. 4, *contraversiam*: at first sight the choice of this word to render ὑπόθεσιν seems odd. Actually, it is not found in the Greek-Latin glossaries. Interestingly, however, the *Glossae latinograecae* (Goetz–Gundermann, 115) have ‘controversia αμφισβητησις: ὑπόθεσις’. Cf. LSJ s.v. *ὑπόθεσις*, II.2, *case at law, lawsuit*. We should add that eventually the Latin translation is odd, for in the context ὑπόθεσις means ‘foundation’; an interpretation of ὑπόθεσιν as a law-term does not make sense.

In view of the *modus operandi* of the translator we have the distinct impression that he consulted a glossary which was a predecessor of one of the Medieval glossaries (for such ancient glossaries cf. J. Kramer, *Glossaria bilingua in Patrycis et Membranis Reperta* (Bonn 1983; = Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 30).
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1) For this codex see our *The Kellis Isocrates Codex* (Oxford 1997). On pp. 49 ff. we list the various sigla for the relevant medieval Mss and ancient papyri of Isocrates.

2) We have slightly adapted the alignment of the text of the *ed. princ.* in order to better illustrate the complete parallelism between the respective columns.—By way of experiment we have split up the text of the *Ad Nicoclem* between the last preserved words of § 7, τὸν καταλογικῶν (cf. Fr. 1 Verso), and the first preserved words of § 8, προτρεπεῖν (cf. Fr. 1 Recto, col. I.1 n.) into single line elements; we arrive at approx. 27 lines missing between τὸν καταλογικῶν and προτρεπεῖν, hence we calculate that the original codex contained approx. 34 lines. As the height of 6 lines in the fragment as preserved is approx. 4.5 cm, 34 lines should equal approx. 25.5 cm. Adding margins of 2 cm each at both the bottom (preserved) and the top of the leaf (lost) we arrive at a codex leaf with a total height of approx. 29.5 cm. A similar attempt of ours to split up the text of the *Ad Demonicum* between § 47, ἐντολὴ δὲ μετὰ τῶν λυπῶν, and § 48, τοῦ βιού τουλάχιστον περιοίνηται τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, seems to confirm this approximation.

3) “Il ne faut pas se méprendre sur le sens de l’adjectif «élémentaire»: L’enseignement ainsi qualifié ne s’adresse pas à des enfants, mais bien à des adultes.” (Rochette, *op. cit.*, 177 n. 44). Cf. also R. Criquiore, *Writing, Teachers and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Atlanta 1997), 30: “... these texts (i.e. Latin texts used to learn Latin) are all written by experienced hands and show that students at an advanced level studied Latin as a second or third language”.


5) Ψ has συνταχύταιν, which probably should be rejected; cf. Worpswede–Rijksbaron, *op. cit.* [fn. 1], 186.


7) For this (rather rare) *terminus technicus* for ‘treatise’ cf., e.g., Vitr. 5,1,2; cf. further the Thes. Ling. Lat. s.v.

8) Cf. also Goetz–Gundermann, *Glossae..., 363: λυπω contristo. An advantage of contristo over doleo / maereo was that this verb, just like λυπᾶσθαι, had both active and passive forms.

**MART. 14.211: CAPUT VERVECINUM**

mollia Phrixei securisti colla mariti.
hoc meruit tunicam qui tibi, saeve, dedit?

Professor Michael Winterbottom suggests to me that “*Phrixei ... mariti* is Juvenalian bathos, like the swimming Ithacan” (10.257: *cuī fās est Ithacum lūgere natantem*); but it contains also, I think, a measure of Martian irony. As I should have appreciated in my commentary ad loc. (London 1996), the *vervex* is a wether and so it is in fact incapable of being a *maritus*. The effect of this word at the line-end is enhanced by the counterbalancing and contrasting *mollia*, a word with effeminate connotations, and *securisti, seco* being applicable to castration; cf. e.g. Mart. 5.41.2-3: *et concubino mollior"