

DEIRDRE DIONYSIA VON DORNUM – MICHAEL W. HASLAM

FISHING FOR PHAEDO

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 89 (1991) 1–14

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

FISHING FOR PHAEDO

In view of the textual excellence of the 2nd-cent. *Phaedo* manuscript P.Oxy. XVIII 2181, published by Colin Roberts in 1941, and as a warm-up to dealing with another *Phaedo* papyrus, since published as P.Oxy. LII 3676, Haslam thought it might be worth while to place the unusually large number of fragments left unplaced in ed.pr., an easier task today than fifty years ago. Most of them were amenable enough (provisional identifications were quite readily made for 30 of the 34), but the limits to what could be done on the basis of the printed transcripts were reached all too soon. More recently a photograph was obtained, and this not only enables the secure identification of fragments that Roberts transcribed but also reveals the existence of some 70-odd pieces which he left untranscribed.¹ Several of the latter have now been placed by von Dornum.²

Since Haslam's initial work we have learnt of two other efforts to place the fragments transcribed but unplaced by Roberts. In the Papyrology Rooms at the Ashmolean Museum is kept a letter to the editors of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* from Prof. Reinhold Rau of Tübingen, dated 31 August 1963, in which identifications were tendered for 24 of them; the photograph verifies all but two. More recently a team at Pisa, using the *TLG*, independently placed 19.³

It should be stressed that we have worked only from a photograph, not from the actual papyrus. With the papyrus itself undoubtedly more could be done, more easily and more securely. P.Oxy. 2181 can fairly claim to be our best manuscript of the *Phaedo*: its textual evidence merits recovery.⁴

We divide our treatment into three parts: A. Recovered text; B. Textual notabilia; C. Textual significance.

¹ Thanks go to Prof. Luci Berkowitz for lending us a photograph kindly provided by Dr R.A.Coles and for passing on from Dr Coles the information about Prof. Rau's earlier work, reported below. Roberts referred to the unplaced fragments in his introduction to P.Oxy. 2181 but claimed to give transcripts of "all those containing more than two or three letters"; in fact the untranscribed residue proves to contain many such pieces.

² We take joint responsibility for the textual data given in this article; for textual judgments the primary responsibility is Haslam's.

³ Stefania Fortuna, Remo Bindi, and Andrea Bozzi, *Studi classici e orientali* 37 (1987) 191-203. Unlike Rau, they had a photograph as well as the *TLG*, and their relatively poor success is surprising. Rau had successfully identified seven fragments that the Pisa team does not (frr. 52, 54, 55, 63, 65, 72, 84), the Pisa team identifies only three that had defeated Rau (frr. 77, 80, 81). Our own placements were made partly without the *TLG*, partly with; most of the smaller fragments were placed with the help of an Ibycus, ideal for such purposes; thanks go to Prof. Theodore F.Brunner for facilitating our use of the machines at Irvine.

⁴ In view of the extent and the quality of the manuscript, it is surprising that it has been neglected so. It receives passing mention in A.Carlini's *Studi sulla tradizione antica e medievale del Fedone* (Rome 1972). A proper edition of it is needed.

A. Recovered text

First, a check-list of the locations of the fragments transcribed but unplaced in ed.pr.

Fr.51	?(apparently not 83d)
Fr.52	84c
Fr.53	116d
Fr.54	79ab
Fr.55	84a
Fr.56	83d-84a
Fr.57	83d
Fr.58	79e-80a
Fr.59	101d
Fr.60	80b
Fr.61	105a
Fr.62	85b
Fr.63	83cd
Fr.64	102ab
Fr.65	102ab
Fr.66	99de
Fr.67	99e-100a
Fr.68	104cd
Fr.69	108cd
Fr.70	104de
Fr.71	101c
Fr.72	79e-80a
Fr.73	83d
Fr.74	107d
Fr.75	83d
Fr.76	103de
Fr.77	106e
Fr.78	117bc
Fr.79	107de
Fr.80	108c
Fr.81	102a
Fr.82	? (perhaps 93a; transcript unverifiable on photo.)
Fr.83	93d
Fr.84	104d

For these, we give below only enough of the text to make the location clear, and to amend the printed transcripts. We see no need to catalogue the first editor's misreadings, still less to

castigate them (1940 was no ordinary year), but it is at once instructive and comforting to observe such text-book cases as πo read as τω (fr.79.3), as well as less familiar confusions such as ει read as αυ (fr.64.2).⁵

Of the pieces not transcribed in ed.pr. which we have placed, we give a provisional transcript, based on the photograph.

77a

Fr.<113>⁶

- - -

]αι την τ[ε 77a1 (all line references are to Burnet's OCT)

]την ους[ιαν

- - -

From the same column as fr.3-5.

79ab

Fr.54.1 τ[from κατατ(α)αυτα (79a10), 2 η]μ[ων, 3 εφ[η, 4 ει]ν[αι, 5 γε δ[ηλον, 6 ου]χ? (79b8).

79e-80a

Frr.58 & 72, joining each other and fr.7 to give (fr.58.1 + fr.72.1 + fr.7.7) 1 επ]ειδ[α
ε]ν τ[ωι (79e8: we read fr.7.7 as]γ ε]ν τ[, the first three letters split with fr.72.1), 2
δου]λευειν κ[αι, 3 αρ]χειν και δ[ε]σποζειν, 4 δ]οκει ομ[οιον, 5 θνητ]ωι : η ου
δ[οκει, 6 ηγεμον]ευειν π[εφ-, 7 δουλ]ευειν[: , 8 δ]η ω κω[κρατες.

80b

Fr. 60 evidently represents 80b5-10, but its legibility is only partial. Of line 3 ου]τωc can be made out, of line 4 διαλυ]εcθαι. In line 2 ωc is clear, and we presume the text was ω φιλε κεβηc ωc ουχ ουτωc εχει, though we cannot verify what stood fore and aft; cf. section **B** below.

⁵ This should serve against undue reliance on printed transcripts. Transcripts can be wrong, as those who transcribe are only too well aware, and this is something that has to be taken into account when performing computer searches. Something else that has to be taken into account is the possibility of textual variation (without which possibility, indeed, papyri would have little value). These are both obvious points, but often neglected in practice. If a computer search shows no match for a given collocation of letters, it does not follow that the fragment does not belong to the work in question.

⁶ Angle-brackets designate fragments not transcribed (and accordingly not numbered) in ed.pr. The fragment-numbers are simply what we assigned for working purposes.

83b-84a

Seven fragments combining: fr.63 (83b9-d7) + fr.73 (d1-6) + fr.75 (d4-8) + fr.57 (d8-10) + fr.56 (d9-84a2) + fr.<86> (83e1-3) + fr.55 (84a2-8). According to our reconstruction of the physical make-up of the roll they will all come from the column intervening between the column represented by fr.9-14 and that represented by fr.15-16 (+ fr.52 & 62). For clarity's sake we give a transcript of the combined fragments.

63.1	- - -] . []οιο[v]αλ[λ εσ]τιν· το[υτο	83c1
63.5	c]ωκρατε[c αναγκα]ζεταια[μα]ηγειθ[α[ι ενεργεσ]ατον[δ]εμαλ[ιςτα	
73.1+63.10	ουκου]νεγ[τουτωιτωιπ]αθ[ε]ιμ[αλιςτα c]ωματ[οc	83d1
73.3+75.1+63.12	η]λονεχ[ουσαπ]ροσ]η[λοι]α[υτην]π[ροσ περον]αικα[ιποιε]ις]ωματ[οειδη	
75.3+63.14	τ]οcω[μ]αφ]η:εκ[τοι]cαυτο[ις]α]ι[ρειν	
57.1+75.5 ⁷]καιομ[οτρο-	
57.2+56.1	κα]θαρω[ς]εις[αιδου? ωστ]εταχ[υ	
<86>.1+56.3]καιω[ς]περ]cπειρομε]νηεμ[φουεσθαι αμοιρο]εινα[ιτησ]τουθ]ειουτε]κ[αι]cυν]ουσιαc:αληθε]ς]τατα[τοι]νυ]νενε[κα κ]αιανδ[ρειοι δη]ταεγ[ωγε	83e1
56.5		84a1
55.1+56.9	. [] . [μ]εν[ν]ηc[τη[v	

⁷ No photo of fr.57. Fr.75.5 is illegible, but apparently gives letter-tops of fr.57.1.

55.5 τειν[
 νηç[
 μεν[
 καιτ[ο

84c

Fr.52.1 ηρ[ετο (84c5-7), 2 ενδε]ιωç, 3 αντι]λαβ[αç, 4 ε[ι μεν. From the same column as fr.15-16 (+ fr.62).

85b

Fr.62.1 Presumably ειν]α[ι [(85b5), 2 χειρο]ν[; 4 is]αλλα το[υτου. In 3, where Roberts gives]ουδε .. ι[, we expect the transmitted ουδε δυσθυμοτερον, and Fortuna transcribes ουδε δυ[accordingly; but the traces do not seem compatible. The final trace (Roberts' ι, Fortuna's υ) is a shortish descender, broken at the top, suggesting ι but not excluding ρ or υ. What preceded is mostly lost in a hole: traces at letter-foot level, and an apparent upright at the right, close to the descender; hardly δ. A variant, then? Hardly α.υτ[ων (different word order). We have considered α.θ.υ[μοτερον, but that would be cramped. The fragment's last line (5, not column foot) will come from the same line as fr. 16.1.

86c-d

Fr.<146>

	- - -		
] τοι[ç φθογοιç		86c6
] τα δε [λειψανα		
]ν πα[ραμενειν		
]πηι: ο[ρα		d1
5]αν τ[ιç αξιοι		
	- - -		

From the same column as fr.17, towards foot. Fr.18 is from the lower part of the following columns, then two columns are unrepresented.

93d

Fr.83.2 ψυχη]ç ειν[αι (93d2), 4 ε]τερα[ç, 5 ?]τη[ν (93d6). Above fr.20. The next three columns are unrepresented.

107d-e

Fr.74(d2-7) + fr.79(d7-e1), + fr.40.

Fr.74-3 -τ]α εϋθυ[ς (d5)

Fr.79.1 + fr.74.5 perhaps -π]ερ [ζω]γτ[α (d7). Fr.79.2 + fr.40.1 το]πον· [οι] δει etc., fr.79.3 + fr.40.2 αιδ]ου πορε[υεθαι] μετ[α, fr.79.4 + 40.3 -τετ]ακτ[α[ι του]c etc.

107d is represented also by P.Oxy. 3676.

108c-d

Fr.<97>(c2-7) + fr.80(c6-8) + fr.69(c8-d3).

Fr.<97>

- - -
] μετ[ριωc 108c2
] ηγεμ[ονων
]ι τοπ[ον
] της γ[ηc το]ποι· και α[υτη (fr.80.1)
] υπο [των] περι γηc [
 - - -

Fr.80 and fr.69 appear to join to give (fr.80.3 + fr.69.1) πεπε]ιζμαι : κ[αι (108c8-d1).
 Fr.69 continues 2 ωκρ]ατες: π[ερι, 3 μ]εντοι τα[υτα (108d2-3).

109b-c

Fr.<127>

- - -
]αθ]αρ[ωι 109b7
]δη α[ιθερα
]ειωφ[c1
]αι ξυ[ρρειν
 - - -

In line 3 ειωθ]οτων is hardly to be read, but the placement of the scrap seems sufficiently assured to justify its inclusion here. It will belong directly above fr.43.

112e

Fr.<107>

- - -
]τερο]ιc [112e2
]α μεν ου[v
] [. [
 - - -

116d

Fr.53 apparently represents either 91c3-5 (without εὐλαβούμενοι, as **b**, cf. n.9 below) or 116d3-5. From the photo we cannot tell which, but Dr Coles has examined the original and reports for line 3 that τοῦ[is very likely and that τοῦ[is excluded. Thus 91c5 τοῦ[εντρον is excluded, and the text is evidently 116d: 1 πρ[ος, 2 ἀμ[α (perhaps with rough breathing above the mu), 3 τοῦ[.

117bc

Fr.78.1 οὐδὲν [(b8) 2 εὐ]χρηθ[αί, etc. Line beginnings: paragraphus beneath line 1. One line will be wholly lost between fr.78.5 and fr.50.

B. Textual notabilia

Here we isolate textually significant places in the newly placed fragments, i.e., for the most part, places where the papyrus' contribution extends beyond confirming the antiquity of the mediievally transmitted text by showing significant discrepancy with at least part of the paradosis. For medieval variants we depend on Vicaire's Budé (1983), but we do not always repeat the entirety of the information given there. We coin **b** to designate BCD; T is T (now securely dated to the mid-10th cent.: Boter, *Mnemos.* 39,1986,102-11); Vicaire's W "family," comprising WPSV, is not at all clearly delineated (cf. Carlini, *Studi sulla tradizione*, 169-95), and the only respectable course meanwhile is to cite the individual manuscripts as appropriate. There is some textual overlap with remnants of other ancient mss of the dialogue (a list is given by Vicaire p. xciv, to which now add P.Oxy. XLII 3676); we do not note disagreements with the most important of these, a "wild" early Ptolemaic papyrus (Pack² 1388, Burnet's and Robin's *Ars.*, Vicaire's Π²). Nor do we waste space noting the papyrus' failure to share individual manuscripts' aberrations such as T's omission at 103d9-11, which would be noteworthy only if the papyrus coincided. In cases of reported variants where the papyrus' erstwhile evidence is now quite beyond reach, e.g. in lacunae where space calculations give no clue, we are generally silent. We do not include orthographica and the like, though in a manuscript of such care and consistency such things merit attention.⁸ We incorporate a few notes on the previously identified pieces, supplementary or corrective to Roberts' or Vicaire's, but do not systematically rework information given in ed.pr.

77b8 The papyrus correctly has ἀπα]λλαττη[with codd. (ἀπαλλάττηται), not ἀπ]αλλατη as in ed.pr.

⁸ Note e.g. πεμπάς not πεμπτάς at 104a8, ἔργμοῦ (ἐργ[) not εἶργμοῦ at 82e3, καόμενον not καίόμενον at 115e2; consistently ἔστιν not ἔστι; αὐτοῦ 101c9, d1, ἑαυτοῦ 103e3, 104a2. The manuscript is altogether an admirably professional job of work, its meritoriousness indicated by its lectional apparatus — an economical but consistently and accurately applied system of punctuation, meticulous marking of speaker change, proper use of iota adscript, discriminating application of breathings and accents.

77c1 If Roberts' Cιμ]μια[and ωc]περ[are right for fr.5.1 and 2, there must be some textual discrepancy, for more than what is transmitted (ο Κεβηc. φαίνεται γαρ) must have intervened. But]μια[, to go by the photograph, may well be wrong: perhaps] εϋ λ[εγειc, which would remove the anomaly.

77c3 Here the problem is more serious, and textual discrepancy must be recognized. Fr.5 has 4] ην ημ[ων, 5] . ετι [. More text must have intervened than is mediievally transmitted (ημων η ψυχη, δει/δειν δε προcαποδειξαι οτι/ετι). But the transmitted text gives no impression of being defective. One could postulate e.g. the addition of και τουτο, or some scribal dittography, by a parableptic leap e.g. to δει in the previous line. There appears to be a speck of ink at letter-top level before ετι[, suitable for]ι or a high stop. As to the transmitted variants: (i) there is no telling whether the papyrus had δει or T's δειν; (ii) ετι[is clear, but not what preceded or followed it. The preferred reading is **b**'s ὅτι καὶ: ἔτι εἰ T WP: εἰ καὶ V. (Vicaire's report tacitly contradicts Burnet's, which implies καὶ as present in all the codd.) The papyrus did not have **b**'s reading, but did not necessarily have TWP's either: might ὅτι ἔτι be worth contemplating (with or without καὶ)? What follows is on the short side too; perhaps η ψυχη was written?

77c5 The papyrus affords no basis for choosing between ε[χειν and ε[ξειν (fr.5.6).

80b6 (fr.60.2) ωc with T and the indirect tradition (Euseb., Stob.) not η (ἦ vel ἦ rell.) or ηι (ἦ Schanz, probb.edd.).

b8 (fr.60.3) Space requirements would not be well satisfied if the papyrus had τουτων after εχοντων as Stobaeus.

82a4-5 If the lineation of fr.9-11 and fr.12-14 as given in ed.pr. is correct, some textual discrepancy must be inferred; but we presume it is not. (There is no reason to think that fr.9-11.8 has line-end at προτε-.)

c1 (fr.12-14.16) αλ[λ]ωι η with T WVB² Iambl.Stob.: ἀλλ' ἦ **b** P, probb.edd.

82d2 (fr.12-14.25) Considerations of space indicate that εφη will have been absent (as in **b**), and possibly ω κεβηc too.

εκει]νοιc is an error of ed.pr., taken over by Vicaire. The photograph clearly shows -οι with codd.

83c3 (fr.63.4) ἐcτι (εc]τιν pap.) om. WPV.

d1-2 (fr.73.1-2) Considerations of space suggest that the papyrus probably did not have the article with cωματοc, reported for WPVB².

d8 (fr.57.1 + fr.75.5) We would guess but from the photo cannot confirm that the papyrus had ομοτροποc τε και ομοτροφοc as **b** T Iambl.

d9 (fr.57.2 + fr.56.1) We would have expected μηδεποτε ειc αιδου καθαρωc αφικεcθαι, i.e. word order as **b** T Iambl., but on the photo α]φικ[εcθαι looks an intolerably forced reading for fr.56.1, whereas]ειc[suits the traces well. The only word order that seems consistent with space and traces is μηδεποτε αφικεcθαι κα]θαρω[c] ειc [αιδου, otherwise unattested.

85b6 (fr.62.2) Neither χειρον (codd. & Stob.) nor χειρονα is excluded.

Considerations of space do not favour Stobaeus' αὐτοῦ after δεσπότου.

b7 (fr.62.3) The papyrus appears to have had something other than δυσθυμοτερον: see section A above.

d7 (fr.17.17) επειδη και: the και is a subsequent addition, written above the line with a thinner pen, perhaps by the hand that added the marginal annotation ού(τωσ) Θέ(ων) (?) in fr.19. The papyrus' primary text was επειδη προς εμαυτον, and the added και may be evidence of collation.

87c5-6 (fr.18.15f.) Roberts noted that the space between ολιγοχρονωτερον and κκ]οπει was insufficient to include all the transmitted text, and suggested that the papyrus was without ω κυμια; but that does not solve the problem, for the resultant text still seems too long for the space, by very roughly about 10 letters. We see no obvious explanation, neither mechanical loss in the papyrus nor interpolation in the tradition. The received text seems sound; we would guess some inadvertent omission in the papyrus (conceivably ουμα ω κυμια, though that still leaves a little more than one would estimate), which may or may not have been made good (the margin is missing). It should be added that Roberts' line divisions appear to be purely exempli gratia.

92d4 (fr.19.28) The papyrus' punctuation (μα]λλα·) implies εἰάν τις αὐτοῦς μὴ φυλάττηται εἰ μάλα, ἐξαπατῶσιν. This seems to us clearly right, against the conventionally accepted ... φυλάττηται, εἰ μάλα ἐξαπατῶσιν.

93d4 (fr.83.4) Evidently αρμονιαν (om.Stob.) and αρμονιασ (secl. Schmidt) were both present.

94a2 (fr.20.9f.) Roberts supplements without the transmitted εστιν, presumably on grounds of the limited amount of space available, though he provides no note. We suspect that in copying ειπερ αρμονια εστιν: αρμονια the scribe's eye skipped from one αρμονια to the next, resulting in ειπερ αρμονια. That well suits the space.

99a7 (fr.22.8f.) Requirements of space are well satisfied if αληθη αν λεγοι was absent, as in T; with it, the text is much too long. See section C below.

e6 (fr.67.2) Apparently ωι (with T & Stob.) rather than ωσ.

100a1 & 3 (fr.23.4f. + fr.67.3f., fr.23.5f.) It is not clear whether or not τοις was present (as before λόγοις in **b** and before ἔργοις in **b** Stob.); considerations of space favour presence in the former place but not in the latter, but not definitively in either case. (The articles are defended by R.Renehan, *GRBS* 22,1981,374f., without reference to the papyrus.)

a6 (fr.92.4) περὶ present: om. WPV.

b9 (fr.24-7.5) Roberts correctly recorded the papyrus as having no article with ψυχη (αθανατο]ν ψυχη[seems beyond doubt), though he mistakenly thought the same was true of BW. Burnet had printed [ή] ψυχή, reporting "ή om. pr. T." Vicaire prints ή ψυχή, with nothing, not even the papyrus' reading, in the apparatus.

c3 (fr.24-7.7) On the photograph it looks very much as if the papyrus had the transmitted $\epsilon\zeta\eta\varsigma \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\]\omicron\iota\varsigma$, not $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma \epsilon\zeta\]\eta\varsigma$ as ed.pr., which would be new.

d1 (fr.24-7.14f.) Rightly noting that after $\sigma\tau\iota\omicron\]\upsilon\nu$ the estimated amount of space available would not be filled by $\eta \chi\rho\omega\mu\alpha \epsilon\upsilon\alpha\nu\theta\epsilon\varsigma \epsilon\chi\omicron\nu \eta \varsigma\]\chi\eta\mu\alpha$ (**b**, probb. edd.), Roberts suggested $\eta\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota \chi\rho. \epsilon\upsilon. \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota \eta \varsigma\chi.$ Vicaire reports $\eta\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$ (rather than $\eta\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$) in the prior position for B² T WPV Philop. and in the latter position for WPV; $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu$ is not reported. We may be virtually certain that the papyrus had $\eta\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$ in the prior position; it may well have had it in the latter position too. (Vicaire has no warrant for reporting the papyrus' reading as $\eta\ \varsigma\chi\eta\mu\alpha.$) Whether it had $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ there is no knowing, but we admit to finding $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$ very attractive; if $\eta\ \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota \dots \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu$ arose by contamination with a **b**-text, as seems tempting to suppose, there is no reason to postulate such contamination in the papyrus.

d6 (fr.24-7.20) The "confirmation" of the conjectured $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma\alpha\gamma\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$, dependent as it is on the placement of an isolated scrap, cannot be regarded as secure.

101d3 (fr.59.2) The antiquity of $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\iota\tau\omicron$ is demonstrated.

e4 (fr.29.14) Vicaire's report of $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon \epsilon\iota\varsigma$ for the papyrus should be deleted; the papyrus is in lacuna.

103d8 (fr.76.2) The speck is suitable for $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\]\iota$ (T WV), not for $\alpha\upsilon\tau\]\omicron$ (**b**); it would also suit $-\varsigma\epsilon\iota\]\nu$.

104a1 Ed.pr. transcribes $\omicron\pi\epsilon\rho \pi\epsilon\]\rho\iota\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ (fr.31 ii 9), but the photograph seems to show $\omicron\pi\epsilon\rho \tau\omicron \]\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\tau\omicron\nu$, as codd.

a7 (fr.34.3) $\omicron\pi\epsilon\rho$ with codd., not the conjectured $\omicron\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho$.

104d2 (fr.68.3) The papyrus' text is beyond recovery.

d3 (fr.68.4) There is no telling what followed $\alpha\upsilon\]\tau\omega\iota$. The medieval tradition offers three different word orders. Considerations of space tell against $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\iota \alpha\epsilon\iota \tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (**b**) for the papyrus, and in favor of $\alpha\epsilon\iota \tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\iota$ (WPV), without excluding $\alpha\epsilon\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\iota \tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (implied by T).

105b5-7 (fr.36-7.4f.) Space limitations seem decisive against the variant ($\eta\nu \dots$) $\alpha\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\iota\varsigma\iota\nu$ ($\dots \alpha\lambda\lambda\eta\nu$) recorded in W, perhaps not quite decisive against T's ($\omega\iota \dots$) $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega\iota$.

107d4 (fr.74.2) Considerations of space indicate definitely that the papyrus' word order was not $\mu\epsilon\gamma\iota\varsigma\tau\alpha \lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, as **b**, but $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \mu\epsilon\gamma\iota\varsigma\tau\alpha$, with T WPSV Iambl. Stob.

108c5 (fr.97.3) To go by the length and straightness of the remaining hasta, the papyrus' text was $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma\tau\eta\iota$ (T W) rather than $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\varsigma\tau\eta$ (**b** PSV Stob.). P.Oxy. 3676 is in lacuna here.

109c1 (fr.127.3) If this scrap is rightly placed, as we think it must be, what we read as $\]\epsilon\iota\omega\]\epsilon$ represents the beginning of $\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\acute{\omicron}\tau\omega\nu \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$, unanimously transmitted by both the direct and the indirect tradition (Eus. and Stob.) but suspected or deleted by some editors. Perhaps the theta was just oddly made. At all events the papyrus testifies to the phrase's presence.

115b2 (fr.47.4). Since the papyrus has only]λειε there is no telling whether it had επιτελλειε, adopted by edd. from Coislin.155, or επιτελλειε with T (and S); the latter seems likelier. Not -ει or -ηι as the other mss, at all events. Vicaire omits the papyrus testimony.

117c7 (fr.50.2) Apparently εμου βι]αι γε και αυ[του, though the photo does not quite exclude εμο]υ γε και αυ[του βιαι (as ed.pr. lemma in note ad loc., inconsistently with transcript). The former would give a previously unattested word order (έμοῦ γε βία καὶ αὐτοῦ **b** T [test. Vicaire, otherwise Burnet], έμοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ γε βία B²), the latter is what presumably underlies W's έμοῦ τε καὶ αὐτοῦ βία (βία deferred still further in W²PSV). Vicaire's Π⁸ is a mistake for Π³, the present papyrus.

C. Textual significance

The paucity of readings altogether unattested in the medieval manuscripts suggests that those manuscripts' collective catchment of the range of readings current in the Roman period is relatively good. Naturally it is not total, and since F is not among the manuscripts of the *Phaedo*, the medieval tradition is all the poorer. But P.Oxy. 2181 contains a lower proportion of readings that escaped the medieval net than P.Oxy. 3676, of similar date. ψυχή without article at 100b9, whether in fact new or not, we take to be unquestionably right, despite Vicaire; cf. 105e4, 6, 106e2, where the medieval tradition itself is divided, and *Phdr.* 246b5-6; as with other authors (e.g. Thucydides, cf. P.Oxy. LVII 3885 fr.3 ↓ 18n.), one wonders how many other definite articles have infiltrated the tradition. We think some doubt must attach to the apparent confirmation of the conjectured προαγορευομένη at 100d6, but if the placement of the scrap in question is verified, the reading must surely be accepted. Beyond these there are the apparent new versions of the phrases at 117c7 and 83d9, more mundanely the repeated preposition at 99a1, the absence (a.c.) of καὶ from 85d7, a difference of word order at 100c3 (if the ed.pr. transcript is right), and readings beyond secure recovery at 77c3 and 92b4. The discrepancies evidenced at 87c6 and 94a2 we take to be cases of inadvertent omission, though when the actual text is lost in lacuna it is difficult to be sure. The papyrus' punctuation at 92d4 (we have not checked the later manuscripts) is in our view a distinct improvement on the text as generally read. (For the position of εὖ μάλα cf. e.g. 116e4, *Rep.* 411c4-5.) ἔχει for the ungrammatical ἔχον at 100d1 would be welcome if it were actually there, instead of merely hypothesised. At 92a7 the papyrus' correct δόξαι (δο]ξ[αι, space definitive) is given also by Stobaeus, but otherwise only by T² (δόξαιεν T, δοξάσαι **b** WPV). On the other hand it is no surprise to find that some error common to the entire medieval tradition is shared by the papyrus: most signally απιτων at 87c1 (ἀπιτοίη edd., inescapably). The presence of suspected interpolations (e.g. at 76e1-2, 93d4, 101d3-5, 109c1) is no argument for their authenticity. At 77e6 the papyrus joins all but WV in the erroneous πειρωμεθαπειθειν for πειρωμεταπειθειν.

T's as well as **b**'s access to ancient tradition is amply confirmed. The notion of an archetype is hardly tenable, and the principle of editorial eclecticism is abundantly justified. The papyrus evidently joined T in "omitting" ἀληθῆ ἂν λέγοι at 99a7. Editors retain the clause, but it seems to us an indubitable interpolation, added to mend the ellipsis; suppression of the apodosis (sc. "all well and good") is vindicated by *Rep.* 575d and *Prot.* 325d (cf. Kühner-Gerth II.2 §577.4d, Herwerden *Mnemos.* 19 [1891] 338f.).⁹ It may be that elimination of prejudice in favour of **b** still has some way to go. The papyrus increases **b**'s isolation in editorially preferred but not manifestly right readings at e.g. 77c3, 86a4, 100d1, 101d2, 107d4. The ill-defined W "family" appears to have less independent value, but some; the papyrus agrees with WPV against **b**T at 85c9 (δυσελεγχωτατον vs. δυσεξ-). Two further readings in this section are particularly noteworthy. At 85d2 the received text is δύναιτο; the papyrus' δύνονται (δυνατ[]) is reported by Vicaire for C and V, both manuscripts not used by Burnet (cf. Carlini, *Studi sulla tradizione*, 151-5, 192-5). In the next sentence, at 85d7, the received text is δοκεῖ; but the papyrus' ἐδόκει (εδ[]), represented by the W line of the medieval tradition (WPV B²D), is surely right (*utrum in alterum*, and εἶπον).

What we have in sum, then, is an "open" tradition fairly stable in its contours from Roman times to medieval, its range of fluctuation well evidenced though not fully captured by its medieval representatives. A certain amount of normalization of syntax and word order is evident in the medieval tradition, aggravated by editorial choices. As a concrete example of a second-century manuscript of the dialogue, the papyrus has direct and indirect contribution to make to the establishment of the Platonic text. It is useful in revealing the existence of a few hitherto unknown readings, some of them at least arguably true, and in lending its authority to particular readings (true and false alike) attested either by the whole of the medieval tradition or in one or another constituent of it, thereby providing a firm sounding-board for notions about the history of the tradition. Its usefulness is limited by its fragmentary condition and by the fact that like any other manuscript it is a single instantiation of the text, so that even if it were complete, we would still need the later manuscripts, which collectively give greater variety and accordingly greater potential access to the original text than is available in any single witness, medieval or ancient.

Los Angeles

Deirdre Dionysia von Dornum
Michael W.Haslam

⁹ Another construction-easing interpolation, *pace* Burnet and subsequent editors, is εὐλαβούμενοι at 91c3, "omitted" by **b**. Its addition is much easier to account for than its loss. The extremity of modern editors' reluctance to recognize interpolation is illustrated by Vicaire's retention even of γίγνεται at 100d8, absent from the papyrus as well as from B WPV.