

M.J. APTHORP

SOME NEGLECTED PAPYRUS EVIDENCE AGAINST THE AUTHENTICITY OF
ILIAD 16.381

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 81 (1990) 1–7

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

Some Neglected Papyrus Evidence Against the Authenticity of *Iliad* 16.381

I print *Iliad* 16. 377-83:

Πάτροκλος δ', ἧ πλείστον ὀρινόμενον ἴδε λαόν,
 τῆ ρ' ἔχ' ὀμοκλήσας· ὑπὸ δ' ἄξοσι φῶτες ἔπιπτον
 πρηνέες ἐξ ὀχέων, δίφροι δ' ἀνακυμβαλίαζον.
 380 ἀντικρὺ δ' ἄρα τάφρον ὑπέρθορον ὠκέες ἵπποι
 382 πρόσσω ἴεμενοι, ἐπὶ δ' Ἑκτορι κέκλετο θυμός·
 ἴετο γὰρ βαλέειν· τὸν δ' ἔκφερον ὠκέες ἵπποι.

381 ἄμβροτοι, οὓς Πηληϊθεοὶ δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα (= *Il.* 16. 867) hab. codd. nonnulli.

Line 381 is omitted by most of our minuscule MSS. Most scholars regard it as an interpolation,¹ but some defend it,² while others simply take its authenticity for granted.³ In view of the disagreement about its status it is important to try to discover what the earliest surviving witnesses can tell us about the question. As it turns out, there are three papyri⁴ covering this part of the text, and all three omit line 381. However, this fact has never before been accurately stated, even though the last of these papyri to be published appeared as long ago as 1939. Through a bizarre series of blunders, silences and unfortunate coincidences scholarship has conspired to conceal and understate the true extent of the papyrus evidence against the line.

Let us consider each of the three papyri in the order of their publication.

(1) Pap. 9,⁵ the “Syriac Palimpsest”, Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 17210 (saec. vi p.C.), was lavishly published by transcription as long ago as 1851, and its omission of *Il.* 16. 381 was clearly recorded by its editor both in his transcription and in his collation.⁶ Although he inadvertently left this line-omission (and a few others) out of his “list of the omissions” on p. xviii of his Intro-

¹ See e.g. G.M. Bolling, *The External Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Oxford 1925) p. 20, with his list of editors who reject the line. To these one could add, from the 19th century, Ameis-Hentze, Faesi-Franke and (in his school edition) D.B. Monro, and from the 20th century P. Von der Mühl, *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias* (Basle 1952) p. 247 and M.M. Willcock (ed.), *The Iliad of Homer* Vol. II (London 1984) pp. 63 and 249.

² E.g. A. Pierron in his edition (Paris 1869) ad loc.; H. van Thiel, *Iliaden und Ilias* (Basle 1982) pp. 396-7. Note also that the line is included, unbracketed, in the texts of T.W. Allen (O.C.T. [with D.B. Monro] 2nd ed. 1908, 3rd ed. 1920; *editio maior* Oxford 1931) and P. Mazon (Paris 1937-8, 5th ed. of Vol. III [revised] 1961).

³ E.g. E. Delebecque, *Le Cheval dans l'Iliade* (Paris 1951) pp. 17, 77-8, 106, followed by J.R. Wilson, *Phoenix* 28 (1974) p. 385 n. 1 with p. 389 n. 11.

⁴ In accordance with a long-standing convention in Homeric papyrology I include in the term “papyri” uncials written on parchment.

⁵ I give first, for each papyrus, its number in the Allen-Collart-Mette list of Homeric papyri, for bibliographical details of which see my *Manuscript Evidence for Interpolation in Homer* (Heidelberg 1980) p. xi.

⁶ W. Cureton (ed.), *Fragments of the Iliad of Homer from a Syriac Palimpsest* (London 1851) pp. 36, 122.

duction, this oversight did not mislead his contemporaries, who accurately reported the line-omission in their own discussions of the Palimpsest,⁷ and the reading is also accurately reported in most of the 20th-century scholarly editions of the *Iliad*.⁸ But it is the *only* papyrus omission of this line to have been properly reported, the *only* one to be widely known. For example, the 1961 edition of Mazon's Budé text⁹ still records only this one papyrus omission, and when K. Reinhardt in the same year reports that the line "fehlt in ... einem der Papyri"¹⁰ he too is presumably thinking of the Syriac Palimpsest.

(2) Pap. 60, or "P. Morgan" (Pack₂ 870, saec. iii-iv p.C.), was published by description and collation in 1912.¹¹ It is a papyrus codex with numbered pages containing Books 11 to 16 of the *Iliad*. Plaumann's description (with collation) of pages 111 and 112, which fall within Book 16, reads in part as follows:

S. 111. 336-381. Durch 3 aneinandergesetzte Bruchstücke wird die Seite in der Längenausdehnung annähernd vollständig, bleibt aber in der Breite sehr defekt. ... Geringe Reste noch von 380. Das Übrige ist ganz weggebrochen. Var. nicht zu entscheiden. - 381 KEKAYTO.

S.112. 382-429(?). 383 BEAEEIN ...¹²

As G.M. Bolling, to his credit, pointed out in 1916,¹³ something has obviously gone badly wrong with the collation here. According to Plaumann¹⁴ the last line of p. 111 is 381; and yet he cites for this line a variant, κεκλυτο, which obviously belongs to line 382, not 381. Bolling argued that "The mistake could easily arise from the use of an edition in which 381 was relegated to the footnotes" and concluded that line 381 "must be omitted by the P. Morgan, although the editors do not state the fact". However, Bolling's over-confident conclusion was premature: it was a possible but not a necessary conclusion from the evidence available to him. His theory that the editors of the papyrus used an edition of the *Iliad* which omitted 381 from its text was not supported by the fact that Plaumann tells us (p. 1211) that his collation was based on the second edition (1908) of the Monro-Allen O.C.T., which *includes* 381 in its text (unbracketed). Only an inspection of the papyrus itself (or a photograph) would reveal whether Bolling's guess was right. (I use the word "guess" advisedly: his elevation of his surmise to the status of knowledge¹⁵ was illegitimate, and in

⁷ J. Classen, *Philologus* 7 (1852) p. 184; "B.S." at *RhM* N.F. 8 (1853) p. 475, where he silently augments Cureton's list while purporting merely to reproduce it; K.W. Kayser, *Philologus* 10 (1855) p. 147.

⁸ Allen's editions (above, n. 2) are exceptions, but that is because he lists only the MSS. which *contain* the line.

⁹ Above, n. 2 ad fin.

¹⁰ *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* (Göttingen 1961) p. 199 n. 12.

¹¹ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and G. Plaumann, "Iliaspapyrus P. Morgan", *Sitzb. Berl. Akad.* 1912 pp. 1198-1219. The introduction (pp. 1198-1202) is by Wilamowitz, the detailed description and collation (pp. 1202-19) by Plaumann.

¹² Op. cit. (above, n. 11) p. 1219.

¹³ *AJPh* 37 (1916) p. 19.

¹⁴ According to Wilamowitz, alleges Bolling, but the collation was done by Plaumann, not Wilamowitz: see above, n. 11.

¹⁵ "must be omitted", just cited; similar wording loc. cit. above, n. 1, and *Ilias Atheniensium* (Lancaster, Pa., 1950) ad loc.

the circumstances it is no reproach to Mazon or Reinhardt¹⁶ that they did not list this papyrus as omitting line 381.)

I am indebted to the Pierpont Morgan Library in New York, where the papyrus is held, for the photographs I have obtained of the surviving fragments of pages 109-12 of the codex, = Morgan G. 202, glass pane 54, recto and verso. The first point that emerges from the photographs is that Plaumann's collation misrepresents the division of the text between pages. Line 380 is the last line on p. 111; it reads ἀντικ[ρυ; and there is sufficient blank space extant below this line, and the surface is well enough preserved at this point, to show that no further line of the text was ever written below 380 on this page. The reading κεκλυτο, which Plaumann assigns to line 381 at the foot of p. 111, actually occurs in line 382 at the top of p. 112. This line reads:

προσσω̄ ἱεμ[ενο]ῑ ε[πι δ̄ Εκτορ]ῑ κεκλυτο̄ θυμ[ος̄

Above this line the top margin is preserved only in a fragmentary state; but that 382 was the first line written by the scribe on this page is strongly suggested by one fact and conclusively proved by another. First, the strong suggestion: one notes that line 382 was written at the same level on the verso (↓ and left-hand page in the codex) as line 336 on the preceding recto of the same leaf (→ and right-hand page), and 336 was certainly the first line on *its* page, as is clear both from my photograph of this page and from the fact that part of line 335 is extant at the foot of the previous page with an ample blank margin below it, as my photograph of that page reveals. Next, the conclusive proof: above parts of line 382, especially above the letters κεκλ, the top margin is both tall enough and sufficiently well preserved to reveal the blank space that one expects above the first line of a page: if 381 had been present, it would have left traces of writing above κεκλ; but no such traces are visible.

But the photographs still left me with a slight problem. Above the letters οθυ of κεκλυτο̄ θυμ[ος̄ in 382 there are some rather puzzling marks which look much more like dirt than like writing, but a nagging doubt remained. In the light of what I have said above I did not see how this could possibly be part of line 381, whatever else it might conceivably be (e.g. a correction of something in 382?), but it still seemed desirable to check my impression that the marks were probably not writing at all by an inspection of the original papyrus, and at my request Professor Roger S. Bagnall of Columbia University very generously agreed to undertake such an inspection. He has kindly allowed me to quote his findings, which I now do virtually in full:

Apart from the area in question [i.e. the marks above οθυ in 382 - M.J.A.], the surface is adequately preserved above line 382 over the IK and ΚΑ of ΙΚΕΚΛΥΤΟ, and it is quite clean. Over ΥΤ the surface is lost. Further to the left ... some of the surface is preserved. In that area, only a diaeresis over the initial iota of ΙΕΜΕΝΟΙ is visible. In sum, were there to have been a line 381 the normal spacing of lines would have left traces of it above 382 in places where the papyrus is preserved; and there are no such traces. A priori, therefore, I would not expect the dark traces at the right to be a part of line 381, whatever else they may be.

The questionable area is not well-preserved. Not all of the vertical (i.e. top on this side) fibers are there; all of the traces, however, are on these vertical fibers.

The traces are too close to line 382 for normal line spacing. Their quality and color does not seem to match that of the writing, particularly in density. The one exception is the dot over Υ; but it may be seen under magnification to be 3-dimensional, unlike the writing. The larger patch above that dot and slightly to its right is definitely dirt or discoloration.

¹⁶ Above, notes 9 and 10.

About the rest it is not possible for me to be absolutely certain, but it does not appear to be ink.

The papyrus has other stray dark markings around its surface, quite apart from areas of discoloration These may be ink, but if so they are stray marks.

In sum, I conclude that the totality of the traces about which you asked is either dirt or stray ink marks, in no case part of line 381 and almost certainly not any deliberate writing.

The conclusion, then, is clear, simple and certain. At the foot of p. 111 the scribe wrote line 380. This was the last line he wrote on this page. He then wrote line 382 at the top of p. 112. His text did not include line 381.

Bolling's surmise, then, has turned out to be correct; but henceforth statements about this line such as "om. P Morgan"¹⁷ can be based not on mere surmise but on a careful examination of the papyrus.

(3) Pap. 370, P. Rainer III. 4 (inv. 30485) (Pack₂ 933, saec. v p.C.), was published by description in 1939. It is a fragment of a single leaf of a papyrus codex. Its editor, H. Oellacher, describes its contents as follows: "Auf Recto lassen sich noch Reste von 19 Zeilen, Ilias Π 331-349 (erste Vershälften), auf Verso von 18 Zeilen, Π 372-390 (letzte Vershälften) erfassen." His exiguous collation mentions only one variant, the phonetic κε for και in line 376. But if the verso contains "18 Zeilen, Π 372-390", this can only be true if line 381 (or some other line) is absent, though Oellacher makes no explicit mention of any such omission. He does not tell us with what edition he has collated the papyrus; if with A. Ludwich's,¹⁸ which omits 381, the absence of any reference to the omission becomes understandable, but if with Allen's Oxford text,¹⁹ which contains the line (unbracketed), his lack of comment on this point is puzzling. In any case, his failure to clarify the matter is unfortunate. One might have expected Bolling's pupil S.T. Vandersall, who in 1942 aimed to catalogue all the significant line-omissions in Homeric papyri published since 1932,²⁰ to notice the possible implications of Oellacher's description for the status of *Il.*16. 381, but that he did not do so is probably due to yet another blunder in this comedy of errors: when listing the contents of this papyrus he gave them as merely "Π 331-49" (i.e. the contents of Oellacher's "Recto"), completely omitting any mention of the contents of the verso (lines 372-90).²¹ Once again I hoped I would be able to clear the matter up by inspecting photographs of the papyrus, and I am very grateful to Dr. H. Harrauer of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek for kindly providing me with such photographs. The photograph of the verso (↓) reveals clearly that the scribe did not include line 381 in his text; I transcribe lines 379 ff.:

379 πρηνεες εξ οχεων διφροι] δ ανακυμβαλι[αζον²²

380 αντικρυ δ αρα ταφρον υπερθ]ορον [ω]κεε[ς ιπποι

382 προσσω ιεμενοι επι δ Εκτορι κεκ]λετο θυ[μος

Thus the Rainer papyrus definitely omits line 381 - a fact which has never before been explicitly stated.

Thus three papyri bear witness to the text at this point, and all three testify against line 381.

¹⁷ Bolling, loc. cit. above, n. 1.

¹⁸ Leipzig 1902-7.

¹⁹ Above, n. 2.

²⁰ "Line Omissions in Homeric Papyri Since 1932", *CPh* 37 (1942) pp. 299-306.

²¹ Op. cit. (above, n. 20) p. 302.

²² An interesting fact not reported by Oellacher is worth noting in passing - that this papyrus here joins the very small but very select group of MSS. to read the unaugmented and Aristarchean ἀνακυμβαλίαζον (cet. ἀνεκ-).

The impression that the line is a late-comer to the text is reinforced by the minuscule MSS. It is omitted by both our 10th-century MSS., A and D; by four of our five 11th-century MSS.; by six of the seven 12th-century MSS. extant at this point of the text; and by the vast majority of the MSS. both from the 13th and from the 14th century. It is only when we get to the 15th century that we find a majority vote for this interloper - and even then the majority is a slim one. Even the *editio princeps* of 1488 omits the line.²³

Eustathius (saec. xii) does quote and comment on the line²⁴ (1064. 55-6), but there is no mention of it in any of the scholia.

Is there no evidence at all of the presence of the line in the text before the 11th century? One other papyrus deserves consideration in this connection, Pap. 501, P. Mil. Vogl. III. 114 (saec. i p.C.), containing *Il.* 16. 452-500. This papyrus has the stichometric mark $\bar{\epsilon}$ (= 500) opposite *Il.* 16. 500. E.G. Turner calls this stichometry "exact",²⁵ but this begs an important question: it is exact only if the papyrus included line 381 - and for this part of the text the papyrus is not extant. Very often stichometry in Homeric papyri is demonstrably inexact; both understatements and overstatements occur, but since scribes were paid by the line, and the primary purpose of stichometry was to work out what they were owed, there was a financial incentive for them to err on the side of overstatement rather than understatement, and overstatement seems in fact to be the more frequent kind of error.²⁶ Hence the stichometric $\bar{\epsilon}$ opposite line 500 is entirely compatible with an actual total of only 499 lines; it is very far indeed from proving that this text included line 381. And indeed, with the line absent from all five extant papyri and MSS. from the third to the tenth century p.C., we would not expect to find it in a papyrus as early as the first century p.C.

In any case, the external evidence against the line is strong enough to prove that it was absent from the edition of Aristarchus, on which our MSS. and vulgate post-Aristarchean papyri depend for their *numerus versuum*. There is no evidence that the line goes back ultimately to pre-Aristarchean times, but if it does (which I regard as unlikely) Aristarchus would not have omitted it from his edition unless it was absent from the vast majority of his MSS., in which case it would almost certainly be spurious.²⁷

Moreover, the external evidence against the line is supported by the internal evidence. At this point Patroclus's chariot is drawn by three horses, the immortal Xanthus and Balius and, as παρήγορος or outrigger, the very mortal Pegasus (*Il.* 16. 145-54). Homer himself stresses this contrast between mortality and immortality, saying of Pegasus ὄς καὶ θνητὸς ἐὼν ἔπεθ' ἵπποις ἀθανάτοισι (154). This contrast is important to Homer, because in a memorable scene the mortal Pegasus will soon be killed by Sarpedon's spear (16. 466-76).²⁸ It is therefore intrinsically unlikely that Homer would blur this important distinction by inaccurately referring to all three

²³ This analysis is based mainly on the information in Allen's *editio maior* (above, n. 2) but takes account of the redating of some MSS. by recent scholarship. Where the date assigned to a MS. spans two centuries (e.g. saec. xii-xiii) I have placed it in the earlier century.

²⁴ So, rightly, Ludwich in his edition (above, n. 18) ad loc.; the statement by Kayser (above, n. 7) that Eustathius *omits* the line is erroneous.

²⁵ *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford 1971) p. 19 n. 2.

²⁶ See K. Ohly, *Stichometrische Untersuchungen* (Leipzig 1928) pp. 86-92 (esp. 91-2), 105-9, cf. pp. 31-44.

²⁷ For the argument of this paragraph see my *MS. Evidence* (above, n. 5), esp. Chs. I, III and IV.

²⁸ See also Wilson, loc. cit. (above, n. 3) p. 386: "the death of Pegasus among the immortal horses prefigures Patroclus' own death in the immortal armour."

horses as immortal (ἄμβροτοι) at line 381.²⁹ Further, Homer is rapid, said Matthew Arnold, rightly, and here the rapid movement of the horses and the sense of urgency that inspires both them and Patroclus (380, 382-3) are better reflected in the rapid text of the early MSS., the text which does not interrupt the eager forward rush of the horses with an inaccurate note on their provenance (381).

But, it may be (and has been³⁰) objected, do we not need line 381 to tell us (1) *whose* horses the ὠκέες ἵπποι of 380 are - i.e. that they are Patroclus's and not the Trojans' - and (2) *how* these horses (miraculously?) manage to jump over the ditch, drawing a chariot with two men in it? Let us consider each of these points in turn.

(1) It is true that there is an ambiguity about the identity of the ὠκέες ἵπποι when we get to the end of 380 and have not yet read what follows, but thus far the ambiguity exists in *both* texts (i.e. with or without 381) - and it is then immediately *removed* in both texts, whether we next read 381 or 382: πρόσσω ἴμενοι (382) most naturally suggests the forward, aggressive movement of attack - hence Patroclus's horses - as opposed to the shortly preceding ἄψορρον προτὶ ἄστυ (376) in the context of the Trojan horses' headlong retreat,³¹ and this interpretation is immediately confirmed by the anti-Hector sentiment of the rest of 382. Of course 381 is even more explicit, but, as we have just seen, it is less accurate. And if there *is* a little vagueness in the way Patroclus's horses are identified, this is quite in keeping with the impressionistic and elliptical style of the whole passage 364-93 with its many problems³² - in fact we need look no further for a parallel than the highly elliptical ἐπὶ δ' Ἴκτορι κέκλετο θυμός in 382.³³

²⁹ Cf. J.U. Faesi and F.R. Franke (edd.), *Homers Iliade* Band III (6th ed. Berlin 1886) ad loc.: "hier wäre [der Vers] nicht einmal ganz passend, weil noch Pedasos, das sterbliche Ross, dabei ist." Delebecque (above, n. 3) also comments on the inaccuracy (pp. 17, 106), but it never seems to enter his head that the line may be interpolated; he does not even mention its weak attestation.

³⁰ By Pierron (above, n. 2) ad loc.

³¹ Cf. Reinhardt, loc. cit. (above, n. 10): "πρόσσω ἴμενοι kann nur von dem verfolgenden Gespann gesagt sein." In all three of its other occurrences in Homer the expression πρόσ(σ)ω ἴμαι is strongly aggressive: *Il.* 12. 274, 13. 291, 15. 543. For the aggressive use of πρόσσω without ἴμαι see *Il.* 11. 572, 16. 265, 17. 598, 734.

³² See esp. the edition of W. Leaf (2nd ed. London 1900-02) ad loc.

³³ J. van Leeuwen in his edition (Leiden 1912-13) omits line 381 from his text and argues that the leap of line 380 is that of the fleeing *Trojan* horses, freed from their overturned chariots "*diffRACTO iugo*". If this interpretation of 380 happens to be right, then of course 381 becomes impossible. But although I share van Leeuwen's belief that 381 is interpolated, I doubt whether his interpretation of 380 is right, for the following reasons: (1) the point I have just made about πρόσσω ἴμενοι; (2) a transition from the *Trojan* horses to *Patroclus* in the middle of line 382, but with no explicit mention of Patroclus, would be very harsh; (3) there is no explicit mention here of a break in the yoke - or, rather, pole - of any chariot such as would set the horses free - contrast 16. 371, 6. 40; (4) the *hapax* ἀνακυμβαλίαζον does not necessarily mean or imply "overturned": perhaps more likely is the interpretation "clattered along", "bounced noisily along" [being empty], which is supported by *Il.* 15. 453 κείν' ὄχεα κροτέοντες, cited by Willcock (above, n. 1), and 11. 160 κείν' ὄχεα κροτάλιζον, cited by Faesi-Franke (above, n. 29): the latter passage is especially significant since, as B. Fenik has pointed out, the Trojan retreats of 11. 148 ff. and 16. 372 ff. have much in common with each other: *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* Heft 21 (Wiesbaden 1968) pp. 85, 198-9; (5) van Leeuwen balks at the impossibility of such a jump by horses drawing a manned chariot - but if one of these horses, Xanthus, can later miraculously speak with human voice (19. 404-18) this lesser miracle (if indeed it is meant to be a miracle at all) should not surprise us too much (on this see further below in my text); and (6) Schol. T, though apparently ignorant of line 381, nevertheless has no hesitation in assuming that the horses of 380 are those of Patroclus.

(2) Now either (a) Homer regards the horses' leap over the ditch (380) as miraculous;³⁴ or (b) he regards it as impressive but not miraculous. In either case, line 381 is not needed:

(a) If he regards the leap as miraculous, he has already given more than adequate preparation for it in the recent and detailed account of the divine pedigree and immortal status of Xanthus and Balius (16. 145-54), and his audience are unlikely to have forgotten these memorable details after a mere 226 lines.

But (b) it is not certain that Homer regards the leap as miraculous. Hector boasts that his horses will "easily jump the ditch" (*Il.* 8. 179). Later he finds that actually the ditch is "not easy to jump" (12. 53-4, Homer *in propria persona*). But "not easy" is not the same as "impossible (short of a miracle)". Of course in real life such a jump *would* be impossible, but in Homer "there may be an underlying confusion with horse-riding"³⁵ in such matters, and if so Homer may not regard the leap as miraculous; in which case there is of course even less need for line 381.

However, either Question (1) or Question (2) above (or both) - i.e. (1) "Whose horses are they?", (2) "How do they manage to jump the ditch?" - will presumably have provided the motive for the interpolation.³⁶

Thus line 381 can be classed with those fairly numerous post-Aristarchean interpolations in the Homeric poems which "show a feeble effort to improve the text - to fill out a construction, complete an idea, or show just who is meant ..."³⁷ And like most of the post-Aristarchean interpolations in the *Iliad* it has been lifted verbatim from elsewhere within the *Iliad* itself (*Il.* 16. 381 = 867).³⁸

To summarize and conclude: line 381 is not necessary to the sense; it interrupts the flow of the narrative; and it is inaccurate. But this internal evidence against the line carries less weight than the overwhelming external evidence against it, which is now augmented by two more papyrus omissions than were previously generally known.³⁹

University of Queensland

M.J. Apthorp

³⁴ This is the usual interpretation: so A. Jacob, *Ueber die Entstehung der Ilias und der Odyssee* (Berlin 1856) p. 300; Pierron (above, n. 2) ad loc.; Delebecque (above, n. 3) p. 106; Willcock (above, n. 1) ad loc.

³⁵ Willcock (above, n. 1) ad loc.; emphasis mine; but he still regards the leap as "miraculous".

³⁶ The former is the motive assigned by Leaf (above, n. 32), Von der Mühl (above, n. 1) and Willcock (above, n. 1).

³⁷ Bolling, *Evidence* (above, n. 1) p. 15; cf. pp. 14, 16-30.

³⁸ See Bolling, *Evidence* (above, n. 1) pp. 14-23.

³⁹ I should like to thank my colleagues Dr. J.E.G. Whitehorne and Mr. M. Dyson, the former for his invaluable help on matters papyrological and the latter for discussing the interpretation of this passage with me.