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**P.Fay. 141 descr. (*Il.* 1.273–362)**

[P.Fay. 141 descr.](https://papyri.info/dclp/60315) (TM 60315; LDAB 1436; MP3 596) was unearthed by Said Achmet at Kom Aushim on 3 January 1896, towards the end of the first phase of Bernard P. Grenfell and David G. Hogarth’s pioneering excavations for the Egypt Exploration Fund (EEF).[[1]](#footnote-1) Hogarth’s daybook records the discovery as follows: “In chamber next (E.) of plastered room Said Achmet found fragments of Homer. Abdullah just S. of pylon, nothing. Mahmud to W. of him a red vase… All these at floor level.”[[2]](#footnote-2) The plastered room which provides the reference point is described in previous daybook entries as a chamber to the southeast of the temple, full of wood, twigs, and remains of mats,[[3]](#footnote-3) where “two oatmeal boxes full” of papyrus scraps had previously been discovered.[[4]](#footnote-4) In his daybook, Hogarth elsewhere remarks upon that room’s rough frescoes and “large remains of roof.”[[5]](#footnote-5) Homer was not the last of the papyri found in this part of the temple precinct; in the final days of the season, there emerged “a few more inscribed sherds + bits of pap.”[[6]](#footnote-6) as well as “a tax-receipt + a good deal of Byzantine pap. fragments.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

A collation of Hogarth’s notes, the plan of the temple precinct he published (Figure 1), and the plan of the precinct subsequently produced by the University of Michigan excavations (Figure 2) indicates that the structure which yielded the *Iliad* papyrus was the *deipneterion*, whose lintel bore an inscription from the reign of Vespasian identifying it as such.[[8]](#footnote-8) That doorway is labelled ‘Gate of Vespasian’ in Figure 1: in the nomenclature of the Michigan dig, the *deipneterion* is T4.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Figure 1: Hogarth’s Plan of the Temple Precinct (P.Fay. Plate II)

Figure 2: Precinct of Temple of Pnepheros and Petesouchos, Level E (Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan)

Figure 3: The east facade of the temple with gateway T3, forecourt T2 and the entrance to T4 (Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan, neg. no. 5.3311)

Figure 4: Dec. 31 1929. Stone gateway to T4. View looking south. (Kelsey Museum of Archaeology, University of Michigan, neg. no. 5.3399)

That Hogarth’s daybook does not immediately describe the structure as a *deipneterion* is no obstacle to this conclusion; the dedicatory inscription is badly damaged, especially in the third and fourth lines where the structure’s function is mentioned.[[10]](#footnote-10) Only later in the 1895/6 season, evidently, was it fully analyzed.[[11]](#footnote-11) To the *deipneterion*’s immediate west lay a chamber that was indeed notable for the plaster on its wall. When the University of Michigan excavations returned to the South Temple precinct in 1929, they designated this chamber T7, and recorded that one of its niches preserved no less than eighteen layers of plaster.[[12]](#footnote-12) Given the decades-long interval following the conclusion of Grenfell and Hogarth’s 1895/6 season, during which time the structure was not backfilled but remained exposed to the elements, the plaster’s preservation is remarkable.

Grenfell and Hunt described the papyrus’ hand as a “good-sized round uncial”, and we may more accurately categorize it as a formal round of the rounded majuscule (or ‘Roman uncial’) type. Decent parallels are [P.Oxy. 8 1090](https://papyri.info/dclp/60054) (late I) and especially [P.Oxy. 5 844](https://papyri.info/dclp/61330) (mid I–mid II; see Figure 6).[[13]](#footnote-13) To a lesser extent, classic second-century examples of rounded majuscule such as [P.Oxy. 1 20](https://papyri.info/dclp/60507) or the famous Hawara Homer ([TM 60571](https://papyri.info/dclp/60571)) are also appropriate. The Karanis papyrus shares with the latter three parallels an elegant variation in the thickness of penstrokes. As in the parallel rolls, serifs adorn the bases of upright strokes on the Karanis papyrus, but the spacing of both its lines and especially the letters within them is somewhat compact. The letters’ ratio of width-to-height (i.e., their ‘modulus’) is also less uniformly square: alpha, lambda, and delta are somewhat upright and narrow. Of particular note is the ductus of epsilon, whose upper arm curves around clockwise to the point of touching the rightmost edge of the elevated middle arm, forming an eyelet and thereby hazarding confusion with theta. The script is on the whole less refined than classic examples of rounded majuscule and therefore probably earlier: Grenfell and Hunt assigned it to the first or second century, which we would revise slightly to the *late* first or second century.

Figure 5: P.Fay. 141 descr.

Figure 6: P.Oxy. 5 844 (MS Gr SM6162a. Houghton Library, Harvard University)

The papyrus survives in ca. 20 fragments preserving two partial columns from a roll of *Iliad* 1.[[14]](#footnote-14) Each of the extant columns almost certainly preserved forty-five lines of text: only a trio of lines from the vulgate are wholly lacunose, none of which are omitted in the mss. tradition. On the assumption that previous columns contained a similar number of lines, and allowing for the occasional omission or addition of lines, these were evidently the seventh and eighth columns of the roll: they begin with *Il.* 1.273 and 1.318, respectively. Apart from a single orthographic variant in the first extant line – μυ for μεo – the text is unremarkable. There are no scribal diacriticals, punctuation, or paratextual additions except for a possible scribal apostrophe in vii.5. With a single exception at the end of vii.22, iota adscript is written. Supplements to the text are drawn from the Teubner edition.[[15]](#footnote-15)

After it was described by Grenfell and Hunt, the papyrus was returned to Cairo by the EEF, along with a great many others from both its Fayum season as well as the first three volumes of Oxyrhynchus papyri.[[16]](#footnote-16) It was inventoried as P.Cair.Cat. (= CG) 10217, but was subsequently transferred to the Antiquities Museum of the Bibliotheca Alexandrina, where it now has the serial number 0520.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| P.Fay. 141 descr. (= CG 10217)  Bibliotheca Alexandrina Antiquities Museum Serial 0520 | 14.4 × 13.3 | Late I – II |
| [ipap.csad.ox.ac.uk](http://ipap.csad.ox.ac.uk/4DLink4/4DACTION/IPAPwebquery?vPub=P.Fay.&vVol=&vNum=141) |  | Karanis |
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<S=.grc

<D=.vii.column<=

1. [καὶ μ]έν <:μεο|reg|μυ:> β̣ο̣υλέ̣ων ξύ[νιεν πείθοντό τε μύθωι·]

2. [ἀλλὰ πίθεσθ]ε̣ κ̣[α]ὶ̣ ὔμμες, ἐ[πεὶ πείθεσθαι ἄμεινον·]

3. [μήτε σὺ τόνδ’ ἀ]γ̣αθός π̣ε̣ρ̣ [ἐὼν ἀποαίρεο κούρην,]

4. [ἀλλ’ ἔα, ὥς οἱ πρ]ῶ̣τ̣[α δ]όσ̣αν γέ̣[ρας υἷες Ἀχαιῶν·]

5. [μήτε σὺ] <:[Πηλεί]δ’\*apostrophe?\* ἤθελ’|alt|[Πηλεί]δη θέλ’:> ἐριζέ̣[μεναι βασιλῆϊ]

6. [ἀντιβίην, ἐπεὶ ο]ὔ ποθ’ ὁμοί[ης ἔμμορε τιμῆς]

7. [σκηπτοῦχος βασ]ιλεύς, ὧι τε [Ζεὺς κῦδος ἔδ]ω̣κ̣ε̣ν.

8. [εἰ δὲ σὺ καρτερός] ἐ̣σσι, θεὰ δέ [σε γείνατο μήτη]ρ̣,

9. [ἀλλ’ ὅδε φέρτερ]ό̣ς̣ ἐ̣σ̣τ̣[ιν], ἐ̣π̣ε̣[ὶ] π̣λ̣ε[ό]ν̣[εσ]σ̣ιν ἀ̣[νά]σ̣σ̣ε̣ι̣.

10. [Ἀτρείδη, σὺ δὲ] παῦε τεὸν μένος· αὐ̣[τ]ὰρ ἐγώ̣ γ̣ε

11. [λίσσομ’ Ἀχιλλ]ῆ̣ϊ μεθέμεν χόλον, ὃς μ̣έγα π[ᾶ]σ̣ιν

12. [ἕρκος Ἀχαιοῖσιν] π̣έ̣λ̣εται πολέμοιο κ̣[α]κ̣οῖο.

13. [τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβ]ό̣μενος προσέφη κρ[ε]ί̣ων Ἀ̣γαμέμν̣[ων·]

14. [ναὶ δὴ ταῦτά γε π]ά̣ντα, γέρον, κατὰ [μοῖ]ρ̣αν ἔειπ̣ες·

15. [ἀλλ’ ὅδ’ ἀνὴρ ἐθέλει περ]ὶ̣ π̣ά̣ν̣[των ἔμ]μ̣εναι̣ [ἄ]λ̣λων,

16. [πάντων μὲν κρατέειν ἐθέλ]ε̣[ι], π̣[άντεσσι δ’ ἀνά]σ̣σ̣[ε]ι̣ν̣,

17. [πᾶσι δὲ σημαίνειν, ἅ τ]ι̣ν’ οὐ πε̣ί̣[σ]εσ̣[θαι] ὀ̣ΐ[ω].

18. [εἰ δέ μιν αἰχμητὴν] ἔ̣θεσαν θεο̣ὶ [αἰὲν] ἐ̣όντες

19. [τούνεκά οἱ προθέο]υ̣σιν ὀνείδ[εα μ]υ̣θ̣ήσασ̣θ̣[αι;]

20. [τὸν δ’ ἄρ’ ὑποβλήδη]ν̣ ἠμείβετο [δῖος] Ἀχιλλ̣εύς·

21. [ἦ γάρ κεν δειλός τε] κ̣α̣ὶ οὐτιδανὸ̣[ς κα]λ̣εοίμ̣[ην,]

22. [εἰ δὴ σοὶ πᾶν ἔρ]γ̣[ο]ν ὑ̣πείξομαι̣ ὅ̣[ττί κε]ν εἴπῃς.

23. [ἄλλοισιν δὴ τα]ῦ̣τ’ ἐπιτ̣έλλεο, μὴ̣ [γὰρ ἐ]μ̣οί γε

24. [σήμαιν’· οὐ γὰρ ἐ]γώ γ’ ἔ̣τι σοὶ πείσ[εσθα]ι̣ ὀ̣ΐ̣ω.

25. [ἄλλο δέ τοι ἐρέ]ω, σὺ δ̣’ ἐ̣νὶ φρεσὶ βά̣[λλ]εο̣ σῆισι·

26. [χερσὶ μὲν οὔ τ]ο̣ι ἔγ̣ω̣γ̣ε μαχέσσομ[αι] ε̣ἵ̣ν̣ε̣κ̣α κούρης,

27. [οὔτε σοὶ οὔτέ τωι ἄλ]λ̣ωι, ἐπεί μ’ ἀφ[έλεσθέ γε] δ̣όντες·

28. [τῶν δ’ ἄλλων ἅ μοί ἐ]σ̣τ̣ι θοῆι παρὰ νηῒ μ̣ε̣λ̣α̣ίνηι,

29. [τῶν οὐκ ἄν τι φέροι]ς̣ ἀνελὼν ἀέκοντ̣ος ἐμεῖο.

30. [εἰ δ’ ἄγε μὴν πείρησαι ἵ]ν̣α γ̣νώωσι καὶ ο̣ἵδε·

31. [αἶψά τοι αἷμα κελαινὸν] ἐρωήσει περὶ δ̣[ο]υ̣ρί.

32. [ὣς τώ γ’ ἀντιβίοισι μαχ]εσσαμ̣ένω ἐπέ̣ε̣[σσιν]

33. [ἀνστήτην, λῦσαν δ’ ἀγορὴ]ν̣ παρ[ὰ] νηυσὶν̣ Ἀχαιῶν.

34. [Πηλεΐδης μὲν ἐπὶ κλισί]α̣ς καὶ̣ νῆας ἐΐ̣σ̣α̣[ς]

35. [ἤϊε σύν τε Μενοιτιάδηι καὶ] ο̣[ἷ]ς̣ ἑτάροισιν·

36. [Ἀτρείδης δ’ ἄρα νῆα θοὴν ἅλαδε προέρυ]σ̣σ̣ε̣ν,

37. [ἐν δ’ ἐρέτας ἔκρινεν ἐείκοσιν, ἐς δ’ ἑκατ]όμβην

38. lost.1lin

39. [εἷσεν ἄγων· ἐν δ’ ἀρχὸς ἔβη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύ]ς̣.

40. [οἳ μὲν ἔπειτ’ ἀναβάντες ἐπέπλεον ὑγρὰ κέλευ]θ̣α̣,

41. [λαοὺς δ’ Ἀτρείδης ἀπολυμαίνε]σ̣θ̣α̣[ι ἄνωγεν.]

42. [οἳ δ’ ἀπελυμαίνοντο καὶ εἰς] ἅ̣λα λύματ’ ἔ[βα]λλον,

43. [ἔρδον δ’ Ἀπόλλωνι τεληέσσ]α̣ς ἑκατόμβ[ας]

44. [ταύρων ἠδ’ αἰγῶν παρὰ θῖν’ ἁ]λ̣ὸς ἀτρυγέ̣[τ]ο̣ι̣[ο·]

45. [κνίση δ’ οὐρανὸν ἷκεν ἑλισσ]ομένη πε̣[ρὶ] κ̣απνῶι.

=>=D>

<D=.viii.column<=

1. ὣς ο̣[ἳ μὲν τὰ πένοντο κατὰ στρατόν· οὐδ’ Ἀγαμέμνων]

2. λ̣ῆγ’ [ἔριδος, τὴν πρῶτον ἐπηπείλησ’ Ἀχιλῆϊ,]

3. ἀλλ’ ὅ̣ [γε Ταλθύβιόν τε καὶ Εὐρυβάτην προσέειπεν,]

4. τ̣ώ̣ ο̣[ἱ ἔσαν κήρυκε καὶ ὀτρηρὼ θεράποντε·]

5. lost.1lin

6. χειρὸ̣[ς ἑλόντ’ ἀγέμεν Βρισηΐδα καλλιπάρηον.]

7. εἰ δέ κ̣[ε μὴ δώησιν, ἐγὼ δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕλωμαι]

8. ἐλθ̣ὼ̣ν̣ [σὺν πλεόνεσσι, τό οἱ καὶ ῥίγιον ἔσται.]

9. ὣ[ς εἰπὼν προΐει, κρατερὸν δ’ ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλεν.]

10. τὼ̣ [δ’ ἀέκοντε βάτην παρὰ θῖν’ ἁλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο,]

11. Μ̣[υρμιδόνων δ’ ἐπί τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας ἱκέσθην.]

12. τ̣ὸ̣ν̣ δ̣’ ε̣[ὗρον παρά τε κλισίηι καὶ νηῒ μελαίνηι]

13. ἥμενο̣[ν· οὐδ’ ἄρα τώ γε ἰδὼν γήθησεν Ἀχιλλεύς.]

14. τὼ μὲν̣ [ταρβήσαντε καὶ αἰδομένω βασιλῆα]

15. στήτη[ν, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ’ ἐρέοντο·]

16. αὐτὰρ ὃ̣ [ἔγνω ἧισιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φώνησέν τε·]

17. χαί̣ρ̣ε̣τ̣ε̣ [κήρυκες, Διὸς ἄγγελοι ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν,]

18. ἆσσον ἴ̣τ̣’· [οὔ τί μοι ὔμμες ἐπαίτιοι, ἀλλ’ Ἀγαμέμνων,]

19. ὃ σφῶϊ π̣[ροΐει Βρισηΐδος εἵνεκα κούρης.]

20. ἀλλ̣’ ἄ̣γ̣ε̣, δ̣[ιογενὲς Πατρόκλεις, ἔξαγε κούρην]

21. lost.1lin

22. π̣ρ̣[ός τε θεῶν μακάρων πρός τε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων]

23. καὶ πρ̣ὸ̣[ς] τ̣ο̣ῦ βασι[λῆος ἀπηνέος, εἴ ποτε δὴ αὖτε]

24. χρειὼ̣ [ἐ]μ̣ε̣ῖ̣ο̣ γ̣έ̣ν̣η̣τ̣[αι ἀεικέα λοιγὸν ἀμῦναι]

25. τ̣οῖ̣[ς ἄλλ]οις. ἦ γ̣ὰρ̣ ὅ γ̣’ ὀ̣λ̣[οιῆισι φρεσὶ θυίει,]

26. ο[ὐδέ τι] ο̣ἶδε [ν]ο̣ῆ̣σ̣α̣ι̣ [ἅμα πρόσσω καὶ ὀπίσσω,]

27. ὅπ̣π̣ως οἱ παρὰ νηυ̣[σὶ σόοι μαχεοίατ’ Ἀχαιοί.]

28. ὣς̣ [φ]άτο, Πάτροκλος [δὲ φίλωι ἐπεπείθεθ’ ἑταίρωι,]

29. ἐκ δ̣’ ἄγαγε κλισίης Βρ̣[ισηΐδα καλλιπάρηον,]

30. [δῶκ]ε̣ [δ’ ἄγειν. τὼ δ’ αὖτις ἴτην παρὰ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν,]

31. [ἣ δ’ ἀέκο]υ̣σ’ ἅμα τ̣ο̣ῖ̣σ̣ι̣ [γυνὴ κίεν. αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς]

32. [δακρύσ]ας ἑτάρων ἄ[φαρ ἕζετο νόσφι λιασθείς]

33. [θῖν’ ἔφ’ ἁ]λὸς πολιῆς, [ὁρόων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον·]

34. [πολλὰ δ]ὲ̣ μητρὶ φίληι̣ [ἠρήσατο χεῖρας ὀρεγνύς·]

35. [μῆτερ, ἐ]πεί μ’ ἔ̣τ̣ε̣κέ̣ς̣ [γε μινυνθάδιόν περ ἐόντα,]

36. [τιμήν π]έρ μοι ὄφελλ[εν Ὀλύμπιος ἐγγυαλίξαι]

37. [Ζεὺς ὑ]ψιβρεμέτης· [νῦν δ’ οὐδέ με τυτθὸν ἔτισεν.]

38. [ἦ γάρ μ’ Ἀτ]ρείδης ε̣ὐ̣ρ̣ὺ̣ [κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων]

39. [ἠτίμη]σεν̣, ἑ̣λ̣ὼ̣[ν γὰρ ἔχει γέρας αὐτὸς ἀπούρας.]

40. ὣ̣[ς] φά̣τ̣[ο δά]κ̣ρ̣υ̣ χ̣[έων, τοῦ δ’ ἔκλυε πότνια μήτηρ]

41. ἡ̣[μένη] ἐ̣ν̣ β̣έ̣νθε̣σ̣[σιν ἁλὸς παρὰ πατρὶ γέροντι.]

42. [κα]ρ̣π̣α̣λ̣ί̣μ̣ως δ’ ἀ̣νέδ̣[υ πολιῆς ἁλὸς ἠΰτ’ ὀμίχλη,]

43. κα̣ί̣ ῥα πάροιθ’ αὐτοῖο κ̣[αθέζετο δάκρυ χέοντος,]

44. χειρί τέ μ̣ιν κατέρεξ[εν, ἔπος τ’ ἔφατ’ ἔκ τ’ ὀνόμαζε·]

45. τέκνον, τ̣ί κλαίεις; τί δ[έ σε φρένας ἵκετο πένθος;]

=>=D>
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**P.Vindob. G 19768 (*Il*. 8.436–461)**

On the handwritten inventory card Carl Wessely made for the catalogue in Vienna, [P.Vindob. G 19768](https://papyri.info/dclp/60326) (= TM 60326; LDAB 1447; MP3 832) is described as follows: “Papyrus. Stammt aus den Funden Grenfells in Karanis, wurde 1896 von Wessely um je 1 £ Sterling (und einen Band Corpus Papyrorum Raineri I) für jedes Fragment gekauft, hierauf der erzherzoglichen Sammlung geschenkt. Unciale Schrift”.[[17]](#footnote-17) It is not immediately clear which *Funde* yielded the fragment. Given the date, one thinks immediately of the recently concluded 1895/6 EEF excavations at Kom Aushim (discussed above), but it would have been uncharacteristic of Grenfell to distribute papyri that were not from his personal collection. Unless Wessely’s inventory records an inference on his part as opposed to the provenance supplied by Grenfell,[[18]](#footnote-18) I assume rather that Grenfell acquired this papyrus on another occasion – either on his 1894 survey of the Fayum or during the April 1896 visit he paid to the site with Arthur S. Hunt, prior to their departure from Egypt at season’s end.[[19]](#footnote-19) The only evidence that the papyrus might have derived from the EEF excavations at Karanis is Hogarth’s passing reference in an article for *The Times* to the “many scraps of Homer” they found there, which is incongruent with the fact that P.Fay.141 descr. is the only Homeric papyrus from Karanis published in *Fayum Towns and their Papyri*.[[20]](#footnote-20) As part of the same 1896 Grenfell lot, Wessely purchased for the Vienna collection additional fragments of Homer at the same price.[[21]](#footnote-21)

Palaeography indicates that this papyrus originates in the same roll of *Iliad* 8 as [P.Grenf. 1 2 + P.Flor. 2 109](https://papyri.info/dclp/60326), whose hand we date, with Gallazzi, to the first century CE.[[22]](#footnote-22) Grenfell noted the archaic form of his fragment’s zeta but assigned a date in the first or second century, while Comparetti posited a range between that of the Herculaneum papyri and the first half of the second century.[[23]](#footnote-23) An excellent parallel which also features the archaic zeta and which justifies a somewhat earlier assigned date is [PSI 15 1478](https://papyri.info/dclp/59199) (mid I BCE–mid I CE; see Figure 8).[[24]](#footnote-24) Like [P.Fay. 141 descr.](https://papyri.info/dclp/60315), the Vienna papyrus’ script can be classified as an early example of what would become the rounded majuscule or ‘Roman uncial’ type.[[25]](#footnote-25) Several palaeographical peculiarities (including the broad horizontals of epsilon, theta, and alpha, the arms of kappa that do not touch the letter’s hasta, and the diagonal of nu that begins above and beyond its left hasta) are all shared by the various fragments. Hypsilon is written in two straight diagonal strokes, like the lower-case letter ‘y’ in English. Gallazzi argued that the bookroll included both *Iliad* 7 and 8,[[26]](#footnote-26) to which point we would add only that the testimony of the Vienna papyrus, whose column ends with *Il.* 8.461, indicates that most of the ten columns separating it from the Oxford and Florence fragments contained thirty-three instead of thirty-four lines (barring further omissions). The testimony of Vienna’s inventory card is sufficient grounds for locating all of the fragments in Karanis.

Figure 7: P.Vindob. G 19768 (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Papyrussammlung)

Figure 8: PSI 15 1478 (Florence, Istituto Papirologico ‘G. Vitelli’)

The various fragments constituting this roll are all ‘early’ acquisitions. The Oxford portion (P.Grenf. 1 2) is among the earliest of Grenfell’s purchases after arriving in Egypt – Hogarth probably saw it in the spring of 1894[[27]](#footnote-27) – while the Florentine papyrus (P.Flor. 2 109) was bought in 1903.[[28]](#footnote-28) As was previously noted, Wessely purchased the Vienna fragment edited here directly from Grenfell in 1896. It is admittedly curious that different fragments from this palaeographically distinct roll passed through Grenfell’s hands on separate occasions, but that conclusion appears inescapable. The alternative hypothesis, that they were acquired together during Grenfell’s 1894 survey of Kom Aushim, requires that Grenfell either failed to connect (and publish) them immediately or somehow misplaced a fragment, only to rediscover it years later. Neither alternative seems particularly likely. It is preferable, then, to suppose that they were distinct acquisitions. Grenfell failed to recall a familiar hand for the simple reason that he was reading vast numbers of papyri in these years; yet another fragment of Homer was less likely to catch anything more than his passing attention, a supposition consistent with his willingness to part with it without first publishing the text, which was otherwise his typical practice.

The Vienna fragment is notable for a few textual peculiarities. In line 10, the scribe assimilated the final vowel of οὐδέ τι to οὐδέ τε, and (more unusually), appears to have written [οὕ]θω in line 12, whose false aspiration violates Grassman’s law. Although Gignac notes the frequent interchange of theta and tau in the papyri, a sigma typically precedes;[[29]](#footnote-29) his examples of false aspiration in composition, meanwhile, all involve prepositional prefixes.[[30]](#footnote-30) The only parallel known to us is [P.Lond. 3 991](https://papyri.info/ddbdp/p.lond;3;991).22, where οὕθως is perhaps explained as a slip in anticipation of ὀρθῶς, which follows in the formula. Here, [οὕ]θω may similarly be attributed to the influence of τίφθ’, which immediately precedes. Iota adscript is written in line 8, as elsewhere in the roll’s other fragments. Like [P.Sorb. 1 3](https://papyri.info/dclp/60725) and P.Mich. inv. 5694d ([TM 66091](https://papyri.info/dclp/66091)), the papyrus omits *Il.* 8.458. No scribal accents or punctuation can be discerned, which is consistent with the testimony of the roll’s other fragments, which preserve a mere trio of diaireseis. Supplements to the text are drawn from the Teubner edition.[[31]](#footnote-31)
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1. [.?].6[.?]

2. [μίγδ’] ἄ̣λλοισ̣[ι θεοῖσι, φίλον τετιημέναι ἦτορ.]

3. [Ζεὺς δ]ὲ̣ πατὴ[ρ Ἴδηθεν ἐΰτροχον ἅρμα καὶ ἵππους]

4. [Οὔλυμ]π̣όνδ’ ἐδ[ίωκε, θεῶν δ’ ἐξίκετο θώκους.]

5. [τῶι δ]ὲ̣ καὶ ἵππ[ους μὲν λῦσε κλυτὸς Ἐννοσίγαιος,]

6. [ἅρματ]α δ’ ἂμ β[ωμοῖσι τίθει, κατὰ λῖτα πετάσσας.]

7. [αὐτὸς] δ̣ὲ χρύσε[ιον ἐπὶ θρόνον εὐρύοπα Ζεύς]

8. [ἕζετ]ο̣, τῶι δ’ ὑπ̣[ὸ ποσσὶ μέγας πελεμίζετ’ Ὄλυμπος.]

9. [αἳ δ’ οἶ]α̣ι Διὸς ἀμ[φὶς Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη]

10. [ἥσθην,] ο̣ὐδέ <:τέ=pap.|ed|τί=mss.:> μ̣[ιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ’ ἐρέοντο.]

11. [αὐτὰρ ὃ] ἔ̣γνω ἧ[ισιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φώνησέν τε·]

12. [τίφθ’] <:[οὕ]θω=pap.|ed|οὕτω=mss.:> τετ[ίησθον, Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη;]

13. [οὐ μέν] θην κάμ̣[ετόν γε μάχηι ἔνι κυδιανείρηι]

14. [ὀλλῦσ]α̣ι̣ Τ̣ρῶα̣[ς, τοῖσιν κότον αἰνὸν ἔθεσθε.]

15. [πάντ]ω̣ς, ο̣ἷ̣[ο]ν̣ [ἐμόν γε μένος καὶ χεῖρες ἄαπτοι,]

16. [οὐκ ἄν] με τ̣ρέ[ψειαν, ὅσοι θεοί εἰσ’ ἐν Ὀλύμπωι.]

17. [σφῶϊν] δὲ πρίν πε̣[ρ τρόμος ἔλλαβε φαίδιμα γυῖα,]

18. [πρὶν πό]λεμόν τ<ε> ἰδ̣[εῖν πολέμοιό τε μέρμερα ἔργα.]

19. [ὧδε γὰρ] ἐξερέω, τ̣[ὸ δέ κεν τετελεσμένον ἦεν·]

20. [οὐκ ἂν ἐ]φ’ ὑμετ̣έ̣ρ̣[ων ὀχέων πληγέντε κεραυνῶι]

21. [ἂψ ἐς Ὄλ]υ̣μπον ἵ̣κ̣[εσθον, ἵν’ ἀθανάτων ἕδος ἐστίν.]

22. [ὣς ἔφαθ’·] α̣ἳ̣ δ̣’ ἐ̣π̣έ̣[μυξαν Ἀθηναίη τε καὶ Ἥρη.]

23. [ἤτοι Ἀθ]ηνα̣ίη ἀ[κέων ἦν οὐδέ τι εἶπεν,]

24. [σκυζομ]ένη Δι̣ὶ̣ π̣[ατρί, χόλος δέ μιν ἄγριος ἥιρει·]

25. [.?].2[.?]

25. lost.?lin

=>
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**P.Vindob. G 19791+ 19794 (*Il.* 10.41–57, 10.76–100, 10.103–112)**

In addition to the previous item (G 19768), Wessely also acquired further fragments of Homer from Grenfell in July 1896.[[32]](#footnote-32) They derive from a single roll ([TM 60366](https://papyri.info/dclp/60366); LDAB 1487; MP3 853), but were inventoried separately as P.Vindob. G 19791 and G 19794. The latter item consists of eight individual fragments. Their text is written against the fibers in a bilinear script which aspires to the Alexandrian majuscule.[[33]](#footnote-33) Particularly distinctive is the alpha in two strokes, with an elaborately capped diagonal that tends to bow gently as the penstroke descends toward the baseline. The letter’s oblong belly is drawn separately at the midpoint of that diagonal. Some letters – especially alpha, delta, lambda, mu, nu, pi, tau, and chi – are notably wider than they are tall. Reasonable palaeographical parallels are [P.Lond.Lit. 8](https://papyri.info/dclp/60678) (II–III), [P.Oxy. 50 3527](https://papyri.info/dclp/59986) (early III), [P.Ryl. 3 527v](https://papyri.info/dclp/64102) (III). Oellacher’s assessment – “Die Schrift des Homertextes ist unausgeglichen und ungemein zaghaft, also ein Schülerelaborat”[[34]](#footnote-34) – is unduly harsh: the verses are simply stacked quite closely atop one another and, in places, wavy, as though the notional lines containing them were not strictly ruled.

The fragments’ obverse preserves documents whose primary hand is a cursive characteristic of the second or third centuries, written with the fibers. A kollesis is visible to the left of the text on G 19791. Blank space on either side of that kollesis is suggestive of margins, and that these were originally separate sheets, pasted together into a composite roll which was subsequently reused to receive the text of *Iliad* 10 on its verso. The appearance of a subscription in a second, unpracticed hand at the bottom of the principal column of G 19794 is consistent with this inference, but we note that no such kollesis is discernible to the left of that column. The obverse texts are in any event helpful for establishing a date: although only traces of the first line of G 19794 survive, its legible portion begins τῷ καὶ Ἁρποκρ̣[ατί]ω̣νι σ̣τ̣ρ̣(ατηγῷ) Ἀρσι(νοίτου) | Θ̣ε̣μίστ(ου) καὶ Πολέμω(νος) μερίδων [Μᾶρ]|κος Αὐρήλιος Θέων ἀπάτωρ [μη]|τρὸς Θεανοῦτος ἀπὸ κώμης Πτολ̣[ε]|μ̣αίδος Μελ̣ισσουργ̣ῶν τῆς Πολέμω|νος μερίδος. ὀ[μνύω] τ̣ὴ̣ν Μάρ̣κ̣ου̣ Αὐρηλίου | Σεου̣ήρου Ἀν[τωνί]ν̣ου Παρ̣θ̣ικο[ῦ] | μεγ[ί]σ̣του Βρε̣[ταννι]κ̣οῦ μεγίστου.[[35]](#footnote-35) The strategos to whom this oath was addressed is Calpurnius Isidorus alias Harpocration, who held office in the Arsinoite between 214–216.[[36]](#footnote-36) The ‘twenty-fourth year’ [κδ (ἔτος)] mentioned in G 19791.7 allows for further precision, and is moreover reassuringly compatible with the testimony of G 19794: the twenty-fourth year of Caracalla’s reign was 215/216. The Homer text written against the fibers may therefore be dated to the third century, post 216.

G 19794 survives in eight individual fragments that were reassembled into a single column of text: both the upper and the lower margin are visible. Portions of 35 lines survive, and only two lines from the mss. tradition (*Il.* 10.101–102) are entirely lost:[[37]](#footnote-37) fully reconstructed, in other words, the column plausibly contained 37 lines. Assuming that the roll in question contained only *Iliad* 10, G 19791 preserves its second column, and the fragments of G 19794 its third. At the time the papyrus was glazed and imaged, the placement of two small fragments of G 19794 had not been definitively established, but our closer analysis – confirmed by the ÖNB – has established their position. The first, upside down in the picture, contains a few letters of *Il*. 10.88–91. Its right edge does not in fact preserve a margin (as it might appear); instead, the ink there has been abraded. The other small fragment contains letters from the beginnings of *Il.* 10.87–91. The text includes occasional orthographical variants, corrections, scribal punctuation, and apostrophes (noted below), but is otherwise unremarkable. Supplements are drawn from the Teubner edition.[[38]](#footnote-38)

Figure 9: P.Vindob. G 19791 + 19794 verso (Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Papyrussammlung)
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1. [νύκτα δι’ ἀμβροσίη]ν· μάλα τις θ̣ρ̣[ασυκάρδιος ἔσται.]

2. [τὸν δ’ ἀπαμειβόμε]ν̣ος προσέφη κρε̣[ίων Ἀγαμέμνων·]

3. [χρεὼ βουλῆς ἐμὲ κ]α̣ὶ σέ, διοτρεφὲς ὦ [Μ]ε̣ν[έλαε,]

4. [κερδαλέης, ἥ τίς κ]ε̣ν ἐρύσσεται ἠδὲ [σα]ώ̣σ[ει]

5. [Ἀργείους καὶ νῆα]ς, ἐπεὶ Διὸς ἐτράπ̣ετο̣ φ[ρήν.]

6. [Ἑκτορέοις ἄρα μ]ᾶ̣λλον ἐπὶ φρένα θῆχ’\*apostrophe\* ἱερ[οῖσιν.]

7. [οὐ γάρ πω ἰδόμ]η̣ν, οὐδ’ ἔκλυον αὐδήσαν̣[τος,]

8. [ἄνδρ’ <#ἕνα=1#> τοσσά]δ̣ε μέρμερ’ <:ἐπ’|subst|απ:> ἤματι μη̣[τίσασθαι,]

9. [ὅσσ’ Ἕκτωρ ἔρρεξε] δ̣ιίφι̣λ̣ος υἷας Ἀχαιῶν\*middot\*

10. [αὔτως, οὔτε θεᾶς] υἱὸς φίλος οὔτε θεοῖο.\*middot\*

11. [ἔργα δ’ ἔρεξ’ ὅσα φη]μὶ μελησ̣έμεν <:Ἀργείοισι|reg|Ἀργίοισι:>

12. [δηθά τε καὶ δολι]χ̣όν· <:τόσα|subst|τ.1σα:> γὰρ κα̣κ̣ὰ μήσατ’ [Ἀχαιούς.]

13. [ἀλλ’ ἴθι νῦν Αἴαντ]α̣ καὶ Ἰδομενῆ̣α̣ κ̣ά̣λ̣ε̣σ̣[σον]

14. [ῥίμφα θέων παρὰ] νῆας· ἐγὼ δ̣’ ἐπὶ Ν̣έ̣σ̣τορα [δῖον]

15. [εἶμι καὶ ὀτρυνέω] ἀνστήμεναι, αἴ κ̣’ ἐθέληι[σιν]

16. [ἐλθεῖν ἐς φυλάκ]ων ἱερὸν τέλος ἠ̣δ̣’ ἐ̣πιτ[εῖλαι.]

17. [κείνου γάρ κε μάλι]σ̣τ̣α̣ π̣[ιθο]ί̣ατ[ο· τοῖο γὰρ υἱὸς]

=>=D>=D>
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1. [ἀσ]π̣ὶς καὶ <#δύο=2#> δ̣[ο]ῦ̣ρ̣ε φαεινή τ̣[ε τρυ]φ̣ά̣λ̣ε̣ι̣α̣·

2. [π]ὰρ δὲ ζωστὴρ κεῖτο παναί[ολος, ὧι] ῥ̣’ ὁ̣ γεραιός

3. [ζ]ώ̣ννυθ’, ὅτ’ ἐς̣ πόλεμον φθ[εισήνο]ρ̣[α] <:θωρή[σσοιτο]|reg|θωρί[σσοιτο]:>

4. [λ]α̣ὸν ἄγων, ἐπε̣ὶ̣ οὐ μὲν̣ ἐπέ[τρεπε γ]ή̣ρ̣α[ϊ λυγρῶι.]

5. [ὀρ]θωθεὶς δ’ ἄ[ρ]’ ἐπ’ ἀγκῶνος, [κεφαλ]ὴ̣ν ἐ[παείρας,]

6. [Ἀτ]ρείδην πρ̣οσέει̣πε καὶ ἐ̣[ξερεε]ί̣[ν]ετ[ο μύθωι·]

7. [τί]ς δ’ οὗτος κατ̣ὰ̣ νῆ̣ας ἀνὰ σ̣[τρατ]ὸν ἔρχ̣[εαι οἶος]

8. [νύ]κ̣τα δι’ ὀρ[φναίη]ν, ὅτε θ’ εὕ̣[δουσι] β̣ροτ̣[οὶ ἄλλοι,]

9. [ἠέ] τ̣ιν’ οὐρήω[ν διζ]ή̣μενο[ς, ἤ τιν’ ἑ]ταί[ρων;]

10. [φθέ]γγεο, μηδ’\*apostrophe\* [ἀκέω]ν ἐπ’ ἔ[μ’ ἔρ]χ̣ε̣[ο. τ]ί̣πτ[ε δέ σε χρεώ;]

11. [τὸ]ν̣ δ’ ἠμείβ̣ε̣[τ’ ἔπε]ιτα ἄ[ναξ ἀ]ν̣δ̣ρ̣ῶν [Ἀγαμέμνων·]

12. [ὦ Νέ]σ̣τ̣ο[ρ] Νηλ[ηϊάδη, μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν,]

13. [γνώσε]α̣ι Ἀτ[ρείδη]ν̣ Ἀγ[αμέμνονα, τὸν περὶ πάντων]

14. [Ζεὺς ἐνέ]ηκε [πόνοισ]ι δι[αμπερές, εἰς ὅ κ’ ἀϋτμή]

15. [ἐν στήθ]ε̣σσι̣ [μένηι] καί μ[οι φίλα γούνατ’ ὀρώρηι.]

16. [πλάζομαι ὧ]δ̣’, [ἐπεὶ οὔ] μ̣ο̣ι [ἐ]π’ ὄ̣μ̣[μασι νήδυμος ὕπνος]

17. [ἱζάνει, ἀλλὰ μέλει πό]λεμος̣ κ̣αὶ [κήδε’ Ἀχαιῶν.]

18. [αἰνῶς γὰρ Δαναῶν] π̣ερ̣[ι]δ[ε]ίδ[ια, οὐδέ μοι ἦτορ]

19. [ἔμπεδον, ἀλλ’ ἀλαλ]ύ̣κ̣τημ̣α̣ι̣, κ̣[ραδίη δέ μοι ἔξω]

20. [στηθέων ἐκθρώισκει,] τ̣ρ̣ομ̣έ̣[ει δ’ ὑπὸ φαίδιμα γυῖα.]

21. [ἀλλ’ εἴ τι δραίνεις, ἐπεὶ] ο̣ὐδ[ὲ σέ γ’ ὕπνος ἱκάνει,]

22. [δεῦρ’ ἐς τοὺς φύλακας] κ̣ατ̣[αβείομεν, ὄφρα ἴδωμεν,]

23. [μὴ τοὶ μὲν καμάτωι ἀδ]η̣κ̣ό̣[τες ἠδὲ καὶ ὕπνωι]

24. [κοιμήσωνται, ἀτὰρ φ]υλα̣[κῆς ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθωνται·]

25. [δυσμενέες δ’ ἄνδρες σ]χεδ[ὸν εἵαται, οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν,]

26. lost.2lin

28. [Ἀτρείδη] κ̣ύ̣[διστε, ἄν]α̣ξ̣ ἀ̣ν̣[δρ]ῶ̣[ν Ἀγάμεμνον,]

29. [οὔ θην Ἕκτο]ρ̣ι̣ [πάντα] ν̣ο̣[ήμ]α̣τ̣α̣ μ̣η̣[τίετα Ζεύς]

30. [ἐκτελέει, ὅσ]α̣ π̣ο[ύ] νυ̣ν̣ [ἐ]έ̣λ̣π̣ε̣ται· ἀ[λλά μιν οἴω]

31. [κήδεσι μοχ]θ̣ή̣[σειν] καὶ πλ[ε<ί>]ο[σ]ι̣ν, εἴ κε̣[ν Ἀχιλλεύς]

32. [ἐκ χόλου ἀργα]λ̣έ̣οιο μετ̣ασ[τ]ρ̣έψ̣η̣[ι] φί̣[λον ἦτορ.]

33. [σοὶ δὲ μάλ’ ἕ]ψ̣ομ’ ἐγώ· προ̣[τὶ] δ’ αὖ καὶ ἐ[γείρομεν ἄλλους,]

34. [ἠμὲν Τυδείδ]η̣ν̣ δ̣ουρ̣ι̣κ̣λ̣υ̣τ̣ὸν̣ <:ἠ[δ’]|reg|εἰ[δ’]:> Ὀδ̣υ̣[σῆα]

35. [ἠδ’ Αἴαντα ταχ]ὺ̣ν καὶ Φυ̣[λ]έ̣ο̣ς ἄλκι[μον υἱόν.]

36. [ἀλλ’ εἴ τις καὶ] το̣ύσδε μετο̣ι̣χόμε[ν]ο̣ς [καλέσειεν,]

37. [ἀντίθεόν τ’ Αἴ]α̣ντα καὶ Ἰδομ̣ε̣[ν]ῆ̣α̣ ἄ̣ν[ακτα·]

=>=D>=D>
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2. Daybook for 3 January 1896 ([P452](https://archive-cat.magd.ox.ac.uk/records/MCA/P/452)/ARC/3/3). Cf. the slight chronological discrepancy recorded in David G. Hogarth to Laura V. Hogarth, 4 January 1896: “But all know it’s papyrus we want. Today a bit of Homer rewarded us. Yesterday it was a bit of some attic orator.” [P452](https://archive-cat.magd.ox.ac.uk/records/MCA/P/452)/PER/2/2/2. Cf. [Hogarth and Grenfell 1895–6](https://papyri.info/biblio/96072): 16 and P.Cair.Cat. 10217 descr., which specifies the date and acquisition as “1896 (Hogarth-Grenfell).” [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Daybook for 1 January 1896 ([P452](https://archive-cat.magd.ox.ac.uk/records/MCA/P/452)/ARC/3/3). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Daybook for 27 December 1895 ([P452](https://archive-cat.magd.ox.ac.uk/records/MCA/P/452)/ARC/3/3). Cf. Daybook for 29 December 1895 ([P452](https://archive-cat.magd.ox.ac.uk/records/MCA/P/452)/ARC/3/3): “Put two onto papyrus chamber, but nothing more found, + evidently only in top rubbish.” [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Daybook for 2 January 1896 ([P452](https://archive-cat.magd.ox.ac.uk/records/MCA/P/452)/ARC/3/3). Cf. the entry for 28 February 1896, which refers back to these frescoes in describing a house on the north side of the *kôm*: “One chamber had rude fresco of Christ with two bulls supporting, + two female? saints below. very bad art + colour, + rather like the frescoes near entrance of Temple. Must try tracing them tomorrow. Little or no ‘avsh’ in these chambers + no pap. so useless to continue.” [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Daybook for 27 February 1896 ([P452](https://archive-cat.magd.ox.ac.uk/records/MCA/P/452)/ARC/3/3). [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
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8. The inscription is [I.Fayoum 87](https://www.trismegistos.org/text/41652). Early entries in Hogarth’s daybook refer to the Vespasianic Gate (as does P.Fay.: Plate II): the inscription’s date was evidently legible, even though text otherwise proved a challenge. The daybook entry for 29 December 1895, for example, includes the remark “Squeezed Vespasian erasure” ([P452](https://archive-cat.magd.ox.ac.uk/records/MCA/P/452)/ARC/3/3). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
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