

MARC HUYS

P. OXY. 61.4099: A COMBINATION OF MYTHOGRAPHIC LISTS WITH
SENTENCES OF THE SEVEN WISE MEN

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 113 (1996) 205–212

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

P. OXY. 61.4099: A COMBINATION OF MYTHOGRAPHIC LISTS WITH
SENTENCES OF THE SEVEN WISE MEN

I offer here a re-edition of P. Oxy. 61. 4099, as the editor, R.L. Fowler¹, having rightly identified the contents of the first part of the papyrus fragment as mythological, has left the second part (from col I. 13 onwards) unexplained. Although his vague comments “catalogue apparently gives over to narrative at i 14. Poetic citations may be lurking in i 19 and 24” give evidence of his justified misgivings, he did not notice that the second part contains a series of two word sentences of the ‘Seven Wise Men’, comparable to Stobaios’ long quotation from the Τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν ὑποθήκαι attributed to a certain Sosiades (Stob. 3.1. 173 W.-H.). Similar series of sentences are known from several medieval gnomologic manuscripts, as well as from ancient inscriptions, and some testimonies have been found recently on papyrus and ostrakon². As a consequence of L. Robert’s fascinating discovery of a column base in Ai-Khanoum (Afghanistan) from about 300 B.C., bearing an inscription explicitly presented as an exact copy of the original text of the sentences in Delphi³, we now know with certainty that a version of these ‘Sentences of the Seven Wise Men’ was once inscribed on a column in the famous temple of Apollo. Thus our papyrus fragment is particularly interesting for two reasons: first it is a new piece of evidence of the complex tradition of an important text of popular moralizing, and second, it combines this with mythical genealogy, thus revealing the miscellaneous nature of the text, which seems to come from an encyclopedic manual in the vein of the *Fabulae* attributed to Hyginus.

For this re-edition, I have profited from the generous help of Dr. Revel Coles, who sent me an enlarged picture of the papyrus and did some checkings for me on the original. He also confirmed that the back of the papyrus is blank, a detail not specified by Fowler. The papyrus consists of two pieces, one (a) containing the beginnings of the ten first lines of a column, the other (b) containing the line-endings of a greater portion of the same column and only the first letters of some fifteen lines of the subsequent column. Fowler dated the large and round handwriting to the first century B.C. or the first century A.D. and called it ‘wobbly, as if written by an old man’. The shape of the letters is sometimes irregular indeed (compare e.g. the end-epsilon in ll. 17 and 18, the eta in Αἴγλη in ll. 6 and 12), which may point to an origin in the school milieu⁴. I believe that the date should not be set earlier than the first century A.D.: the spelling τοιμα instead of τιμα (col. I, 15 and 28) may be an indication of that⁵.

¹ R.L. Fowler, *Mythographic Texts, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 61 (1995), p. 55-58.

² On the manuscript tradition, see W. Bühler, *Zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung der Sprüche der sieben Weise* (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 1989/1), Göttingen, 1989; M. Tziatzi-Papagianni, *Die Sprüche der sieben Weisen. Zwei byzantinische Sammlungen: Einleitung, Text, Testimonien und Kommentar* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 51), Stuttgart und Leipzig, 1994. The latter study also contains the best introduction to the epigraphical and papyrological evidence. For the non-specialist a good survey of the different sources and what we can learn from them is given by A.N. Oikonomides, *Records of "The Commandments of the Seven Wise Men" in the 3rd c. B.C.*, CB 63 (1987), p. 67-73, and a good discussion of the historical and cultural meaning of these sentences can be found in J. Defradas, *Les thèmes de la propagande Delphique* (Collection d’ études anciennes), Paris, 1972², p. 268 ff.

³ Cf. L. Robert, *De Delphes à l’Oxus. Inscriptions grecques nouvelles de la Bactriane*, CRAI 1968, p. 416-457. See also A.K. Narain, *On the Foundation and Chronology of Ai-Khanum: a Greek-Bactrian City, India and the Ancient World*, ed. G. Pollet (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta, 25), Leuven, 1987, p. 115-130, who proposes a somewhat later date for the inscription.

⁴ Although the hand is not as clumsy as P. Oxy. 3. 425 (= Pack² 1927), used as an example of a school papyrus by E.G. Turner, *Greek Papyri. An Introduction*, Oxford, 1968, p. 89; E.G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, (BICS Suppl. 46), London, 1987, p. 32 nr. 5.

⁵ On this phenomenon see E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, I.1, Berlin, 1970², p. 90-91; F.T. Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Milano, 1976, p. 272. On the

Before giving a new transcription of the text with a line-by-line commentary, I list the known versions of the sentences of the ‘Seven Wise Men’ to facilitate comparison with the present collection. Only the collections of two-word sentences of the Sosiades-type, i.e. attributed to the ‘Seven Wise Men’ in general, are included. Apart from these, Stob. 3.1.172 contains seven lists of maxims attributed to each of the Seven, allegedly edited by Demetrios of Phaleron. This Demetrios-type is also attested in different versions in medieval gnomologia, often connected with the Sosiades-type, but sometimes separately. A particular category of manuscripts, finally, inserts sentences currently belonging to the Sosiades-type among those attributed to a specific name: this category is represented by the last four items of the list and is probably due to secondary contamination in Byzantine times. I take almost all the abbreviations in bold type, also used below in the commentary on the text, from the book of Tziatzi-Papagianni. The items between brackets indicate texts that are too fragmentary to permit an assignment to one of these categories or a comparison with our papyrus.

Inscriptions:

- [- IG XII 3, 1020, Thera, IV a. Chr., remains of 4 sentences]: cf. Oikonomides, 1987, p. 72.
- Milet.** - SIG³ 1268, Miletupolis, III a. Chr., 56 sentences, of which 28 also occur literally in Sos. and some 7 in a similar formulation: cf. H. Diels, *Delphicorum praeceptorum titulus Miletopolitanus*, SIG³, III, 1920 [= SIG⁴, Hildesheim, 1960], p. 392-397; E. Schwertheim, *Die Inschriften von Kyzikos und Umgebung*, II. *Miletupolis* (Inschriften griech. Städte aus Kleinasien, 26), Bonn, 1983, nr. 2, p. 3-5, Abb. 5; Oikonomides, 1987, p. 71-72.
- A.K.** Ai-Khanoum, III a. Chr., 5 concluding sentences and fragments of two other sentences, all corresponding with Sos.

Papyri and Ostraca:

- P. Ath.** - P. Univ. Athen. 2782, I-II A.D., 8 sentences of which 7 also occur in Sos.: cf. A.N. Oikonomides, *The Lost Delphic Inscription with the Commandments of the Seven and P.Univ.Athen. 2782*, ZPE 37 (1980), p. 179-183; Oikonomides, 1987, p. 70-71.
- OMM** - OMM inv. nr. 779, Narmouthis, II-III A.D., 7 alphabetically ordered sentences, of which 4 correspond with Sos.: cf. R. Pintaudi, P.J. Sijpesteijn, *Ostraka di contenuto scolastico provenienti da Narmuthis*, ZPE 76 (1989), p. 85-92.
[- OMM inv. nr. 1197, Narmouthis, II-III A.D., 3 sentences]

Medieval Manuscripts:

- Sos.** Stobaios 3.1.173 W.-H., 147 sentences: cf. *Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium*, ed. O. Hense, Berolini, 1894, p.125-128.
- Stob. Rec. Barb.** (Stobaei recensio Barberiniana) - Barb. Gr. 4 (and 2 other mss.), 14th century, 153 sentences, of which 141 also occur in Sos.: cf. Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 11-21, 448-450.
- Laur.** (Recensio Laurentiana) - Laur. 60, 4 (and 11 other mss.), 15th century, 93 sentences in the same order as in Par.₂: cf. F. Schultz, *Die Sprüche der Delphischen Säule*, Philologus 24 (1866), p. 193-226; Bühler, p. 9, 29; Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 116-125.
- Par.2** (Recensio Parisina) - Parisinus Gr. 1639 (P), 14th century, 109 sentences; Vaticanus Gr. 743 (V), 14th century, 137 sentences; Atheniensis Bibl. Nationalis Gr. 1070 (A), 14th century, 124 sentences (and 7 other mss.): cf. *Anecdota Graeca ex codicibus regiis*, ed. J.F. Boissonade, I, Parisiis, 1829, p. 141-143; A. Delatte, *Les sentences des sept sages du manuscrit d’Athènes 1070*, Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati, 1, Milano, 1951, p. 15-18; Bühler, p. 7; Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 15-25, 61-115, 257-336.

other hand, the spelling γειν- instead of γiv- was already common in the Hellenistic period: cf. Mayser, p. 67 (γειν-), Gignac, p. 190-191 (ει).

- Rhed.** - Codex Vrat. Rhedigeranus gr. 12, f. 138^r-138^v, 1491, 106 sentences; this collection shows striking resemblances with Milet. and A.K.: cf. Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 7-10, 447-448.
- Mon.** (Recensio Monacensis): - Monacensis Gr. 507 (M₁), 14th-15th century; Monacensis Gr. 495 (M₂), 14th-15th century (and 4 other mss.), 191 sentences, all attributed to each of the Seven Wise Men. The sentences belong to the Demetrios-type as well as to the Sosiades-type, apart from a number borrowed from other sources: cf. Bühler, p. 11-20; Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 337-434.
- Vat.** Vaticanus Gr. 717, 14th century, 94 sentences, for the most part of the Sosiades-type, but all attributed to one of the Seven individually (and 2 other mss.): cf. *Ioannis Stobaei Florilegium*, IV, rec. A. Meineke, Lipsiae, 1857, p. 296-298; Bühler, p. 8; Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 33-43. Very similar, but containing only 78 sentences, is the redaction of Vaticanus Gr. 1144, 14th century (and 7 other mss.). A separate manuscript, which shows characteristics of both these redactions, is Monacensis Gr. 318, 14th century (second half), 82 sentences.
- Vat. 1056** Vaticanus Gr. 1056, 14th century, 41 sentences, for the most part of the Sosiades-type, but all attributed to one of the Seven individually. This redaction is only represented by one manuscript and shows some similarities with the redactions of Vat. 717 and 1144, but stands apart by the inclusion of otherwise unknown sentences: cf. Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 42-43.
- Ald.** First edited by Aldus Manutius in 1495 on the basis of an unknown manuscript, but recovered by Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 43-53 from 12 mss., 147 sentences attributed to each of the Seven, of which 52, all under the name of Periander, belong to the Sosiades-type and are taken from Par.₂: cf. *Fragmenta Philosophorum Graecorum*, I, ed. F.G.A. Mullachius, Parisiis, 1928, p. 215-216.

Text

I

II

- | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--|
| | (a) | (b) | |
| | |] | |
| | τωνε [Αἰγία]λεὺς Ἀδράστου | | |
| | Θέρ]σανδρος Πολυλνείκους Ἀλκμέων Ἀμφια- | | |
| | ράου] Σθένελος Κ[απανεώς Θ]ηξμέλης Παρ- | | |
| | θενο]παίου Δ[ιομήδης Τυδέ]ως Μοῖραι | | |
| 5 | Κλω]θὼ Λάχεσι[ς Ἄτροπος Ὠ]ραὶ Εὐνομίη Δίκη | | |
| | Εἰρήνη Χάριτες Ε[ὐφορσύνη] Αἴγλη{ι} Νύμφ[αι | | |
| |]ηπαναγο [Σειρήνες Θ]ελξιπέια | | |
| |]νις ευφρα [Γοργόνε]ς Σθενὼ Μέ- | | |
| | δουσα Εὐρυάλη Τ[ιτανίδες] Τηθὺς Θέμις Μνη- | | |
| 10 | μοσύνη Φ[ο]ίβ[η] Εὐμενίδες Ἀλλη- | | |
| | κτὼ Μέγαιρα Τεισιφόνη] Ἄρπυιαι Ἀέλλω Ὠκυ- | | |
| | πέτη | Ἐσ]περίδες Αἴγλη Ἐρύθεια | |
| | |]α [ἐ]ν Δελφοῖς ἀν [| |
| | |]... | |
| 15 |]αν τ{o}ίμα | | |
| | φίλοι]ς βοήθει | | |
| |]ε[ι]ας ἔχου | | |
| | σοφ]ίαν ζήλου | | |

	μη]δένα		
20	δίκ]αία		
	γ]{ε}ίνου		
	φίλοις ε]ύνόει		.[
] ἄρμοτε		.[
] ἄρεσκε		.[
25] φεῦγε		.[
	εὔχου δ]υνατά	5	δ[
	κ]αίρια		η[
] τ{ο}ίμα		δ[
30]...ξ		.[
] .	10	.[
] .		.[
			σ[
			.[
			ε[
		15	τ φ[
]τ[
] .[
] .[

Commentary

(for col. I, ll. 1-12, I only add some comments to the notes of Fowler, for col. II, where all readings are doubtful, I also refer to Fowler)

col. I

- Fowler's Ἐπίγο]νοι τῶν ἐπ[τὰ Αἰγία]λεὺς is very doubtful. It may be true that the letters spread out slightly in this first line, but the supplement τὰ Αἰγία (with two iotas) is obviously too short, corresponding with 11 letters in the following line. One might add υἱοί or παῖδες after ἐπτά (cf. Apollod.3.7.2 [80]: οἱ τῶν ἀπολομένων παῖδες, κληθέντες ἐπίγονοι; D.S.4.66.1: οἱ δὲ τούτων παῖδες, ἐπίγονοι ὀνομασθέντες). Also in Ἐπίγο]νοι the vertical of the iota would be unusually remote from the vertical of the subsequent tau. Perhaps then:] οἱ τῶν ἐπ[τὰ υἱοί.
- C. Bursian, *Emendationes Hyginianae*, Iena, 1874, p. 7 corrected Hyg., *F.* 71.2 'Thesimenes' to 'Tlesimenes' on the basis of Paus.3.12.9: Τλησιμένην δὲ Παρθενοπαίου τοῦ Μελανίωνος ἀδελφόν, οἱ δὲ παῖδα εἶναι λέγουσιν, a correction accepted in the editions of H. Rose (see below n. 8) and K. Marshall (*Hygini Fabulae*, [Teubner] Stuttgartiae et Lipsiae, 1993). The new evidence of this papyrus leads Fowler to reject this and to emend both Hyginus and the papyrus to 'Theximenes'. At any rate, the papyrus proves that the occurrence of this name in *F.* 71 is not due to an interpolation derived from a marginal comment, as was suggested by E. Bethe, *Thebanische Heldenlieder. Untersuchungen über die Epen des Thebanisch-argivischen Sagenkreises*, Leipzig, 1891, p. 111-2 (see also A. Modrzejewski, *Thesimenes*, RE VIA 1, 1936, col. 14-5).
- On the names of the Moirai, the Horai and the Graces, treated successively as three triads, see Apollod. 1.3.1.1-2 [13]: ἐκ μὲν οὖν Θέμιδος τῆς Οὐρανοῦ γεννᾶ θυγατέρας ὥρας, Εἰρήνην Εὐνομίαν Δίκην, μοίρας, Κλωθῶ Λάψαιαν Ἄτροπον, ... , ἐξ Εὐρυνόμης δὲ τῆς Ὀκεανοῦ χάριτας, Ἀγλαΐην Εὐφροσύνην Θάλειαν. This ultimately goes back to Hes., *Th.* 901-909, where the order is also Horai-Moirai-Graces. For the Horai, see also D.S. 5.73, Hyg., *F.* 183. 4: Eunomia ... Dice ... Irene, which originally would have been written consecutively according to C. Bursian, *Ex Hygini genealogiis excerpta*, Turici, 1868, p. 9.
Νύμφ[αι is not the only possible restoration, as 'Nympe' is one of the Horae according to Hyg., *F.* 183.4. But the text of Hyginus is uncertain (see also Bursian, *Ex Hygini ...*, p. 9), and Νύμφ[η, since it follows on the names of the Graces, would imply a disordered sequence of names here.
- Fowler reads Ἐρσ]η Πάνδρος[ος, but the rho is very suspect and in fact seems to be a gamma (the vertical of a tau would have been more to the right: Coles), and the last visible letter looks more like an epsilon or theta than a sigma (Coles). So, Fowler's reading, apart from being too short at the beginning of the line, implies a correction of at least the rho. Yet Herse and Pandrosos are not wholly unexpected here. The peculiarity that only these two Kekropids would be

given under the heading 'Nymphs' might have something to do with their traditional close association with the Horai and Graces just named: cf. J.H. Krause, *Die Musen, Grazien, Horen und Nymphen*, Halle, 1871, p. 113-114; C. Robert, *De Gratiis Atticis*, *Commentationes Philologicae in honorem Theodori Mommseni scripserunt amici*, Berlin, 1877, p. 143-150. The problem is that the reading]ηπαναγοθ[does not permit a sensible restoration, so that we have to suppose an otherwise unknown name of a Nymph beginning with Παναγο-.

Fowler rightly referred to Antimachos fr. 95 Wyss (now fr. 140 Matthews) for Aigle as the mother of the Charites. But she is called Ἀγλαΐη in Cornut., *De nat. deorum* 14, which points to the interchangeability of the two names.

8-9. The names of the three Gorgons are also given in Hyg., *Praef.* 9.

10. Fowler's question whether there is room for a non-Hesiodic Titaness after his own supplement Θεία Ῥεία should be answered, I think, with the name of Διώνη: cf. Apollod. 1.1.1.3 [2], Proklos in Pl., *Tim.* 297a, schol. Hes., *Th.* 17, and Hyg., *Praef.* 3.

10-11. Cf. Hyg., *Praef.* 3: Alecto Megaera Tisiphone; Apollod. 1.1.4.5 [3]: Ἀληκτώ Τισιφώνη Μέγαيرا. Both Ἀληκτώ and Ἀλληκτώ are attested, but the latter seems to have been used metri causa in Orph., *Hymni* 69.2 and Luc., *Podagra* 6; in schol. E., *Or.*, 37 besides Ἀλληκτώ one reads Ἀληκτώ in mss. A and T.

12. On the names of the Hesperides, see Krause, p. 145 n.2. Possibly only two of them were named here - in that case the following section on the sentences would start at the beginning of a line. But it remains possible that, as Fowler suggests, Arethousa and Hesperia were added in l. 13a.

13. Compare with the epigram accompanying the list of sentences in the inscription in Aí-Khanoum: ἀνδρῶν τοι σοφὰ ταῦτα παλαιότερων ἀνάκει[τα]ι, ῥήματα ἀριγνῶτων Πυθοῖ ἐν ἠγαθέα, and with the introductory formulae preceding the collection of maxims in several mss.: Athen. Graec. 1070: Ῥῆσι δὲ καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐπιγεγραμμένα ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς κίονος τάδε; Rhed.: Τὰ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἀναγεγραμμένα πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων εὐκοσμίαν; Laur. 60, 4: Τῶν ἐπὶ τὰ σοφῶν παραγγέλματα, ἅτινα εὐρέθησαν κεκολαμμένα ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς κίονος. See for other parallels Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 257. The tradition that the Seven Wise Men of Greece had come together in Delphi and had sentences inscribed on the temple of Apollo is first attested in Plato, *Prot.* 343 b. This gathering in Delphi is also referred to in Plu., *Sol.* 4.1, Paus. 10.24.1, Diog. 1.4: cf. Barkowski, *Sieben Weise*, RE IIIA1, 1927, 2251-3.

The last letter but one seems to have a horizontal at the bottom and therefore looks like a delta, but α or λ cannot be excluded. Of the last letter a high horizontal stroke is visible, probably γ, π, ρ or τ. Possible restorations are τ]ἄ [ἐ]ν Δελφοῖς ἀναγ[ε]γραμμένα or παραγγέλματα (ἀποφθέγματα, ῥήματα) τῶν ἐπ]ἄ [ἐ]ν Δελφοῖς ἀνδρ[ῶ]ν, but one expects σοφῶν, and I prefer the former alternative because of its shortness.

14. Possibly the beginning of this line, the shortest of the whole column, continued the introductory phrase of the previous line. Then, probably, one sentence followed, in contrast with the following lines which all contained two sentences. The last letter was certainly round, the preceding traces look like a somewhat compressed sigma, but may also be interpreted as the oblique strokes of a kappa. In the former case,]ισθ[ι], which would permit the sentence σαυτὸν ἴσθι, is not attractive, because the traces of the first letter do not look like a iota, and the surface of the papyrus does not favour the hypothesis that a letter has vanished at the end (Coles). More suitable is σχολῆν εἰ διατίθ]εσο, known from Mon. Chilo (3) (cf. D.L. 1.69: καὶ σχολῆν εἰ διατίθεσθαι). However, the identification of the penultimate letter as a kappa yields the following possibilities: δόξαν δί]ωκε, attested in Sos. (22), Par.₂ (11), Laur. (11), Milet. (I 11), Ald. Thales (8) and Vat. Thales (8), or εὐκλειαν δί]ωκε, attested in Par.₂ (75), ὁμόνοταν δί]ωκε, attested in Sos. (107), Par.₂ (91), Laur. (68), and νεώτερον δίδασκε, attested in Sos. (127), Par.₂ (125) and Laur. (87).

15. Two sentences are possible here: πρόνοι]αν τ[ο]ίμα, attested in Sos. (18), Par.₂ (27), Laur. (27), Milet. (I 7), Rhed. (30) and Vat. Periander (1), and ἐστίαν τοίμα, attested in Sos. (13), Par.₂ (7) and Laur. (7). One is tempted to prefer the former sentence here, because of its presence in the oldest text, viz. the inscription of Miletupolis, and in Rhed., a manuscript representing an old tradition.

16. φίλοι]ς βοήθει is also attested in Sos. (15), Milet. (I 1), Rhed. (28) and among the Solon-sentences in Mon. (42), Vat. (3) and Ald. (3).

17. Three restorations are possible: παιδ]ε[ί]ας ἔχου, attested in Milet. (I 10) and Rhed. (31), ἀληθείας ἔχου, attested in Par.₂ (9), Laur. (9), Rhed. (8), Ald. Periander (9), or εὐσεβείας ἔχου, attested in Par.₂ (29), Laur. (29) and Ald. Periander (15).

18. σοφ]ίαν ζήλου is attested in Sos. (23), Par.₂ (30), Laur. (30), Rhed. (32).

19. Ψέγε μη]δένα, attested in Rhed. (33) or ὑφορῶ μηδένα, attested in Sos. (56), Par.₂ (66), Vat. Chilo (10). Ὑπερόρα μηδένα, attested in Rhed. (24), is perhaps somewhat long, but not impossible when the first sentence of the same line is shorter than the corresponding sentences above and below.

20. Πρᾶσσε (or πρᾶττε) τὰ ἴ]δια, attested in Rhed. (34), πρᾶσσε δίκαια, attested in Sos. (27), Par.₂ (13), Laur. (13), Milet. (I 13), or Πρᾶσσε (or κρῖνε) δίκαια, attested in Sos. (84).

21. Εὐγνώμων γ]ί]νους, attested in Sos. (106), Par.₂ (89) and Rhed. (37), εὐφημος γείνου, attested in Milet. (I 23), Rhed. (36), φίλος γείνου, attested in Par.₂ (20), Laur. (20), φιλόσοφος γείνου, attested in Sos. (48) and A.K., or κοινὸς γείνου, attested in Sos. (32), Par.₂ (16), Laur. (16) and Milet. (I 19). Εὐπροσήγορος γείνου, attested in Sos. (97), Par.₂ (85), Milet. (II 5), Ald. Periander (34), and ὁμοιος σεαυτῶ γείνου, attested in Vat. Thales (2), are probably too long, but cannot be ruled out.

22. Φίλοις εἰβόνοι, attested in Sos. (28), Par.₂ (14), Laur. (14), Rhed. (35), Milet. (I 15) and Vat. Pittacus (1). Of the letter preceding νοει only a high spot to right remains, which may belong to an upsilon. A sigma may be excluded (Coles), so that the sentence ἀκούσας νόει in Sos. (7), Par.₂ (5), Laur. (5) offers no valid alternative here.
23. Πάσιν ἀρμόζου is attested in Sos. (43), Par.₂ (19), Laur. (19), but an alternative sentence with the active imperative, πεινῶν or πεινῶν ἄρμोजε, figures in the mss. M^{dA} of Sos.: see the *apparatus criticus* in *Ioannis Stobaei Florilegium*, I, rec. A. Meineke, Lipsiae, 1855, p. XII and in the edition of O. Hense, Berolini, 1894, p.126. Since the active is certainly possible (cf. LSJ II 2: "to suit, be adapted for"), I guess that here the active form is the older one, and that the medium resulted from a secondary development, just as in the sentence in the following line. In Hellenistic Greek the normal form of the verb was ἀρμόζω instead of the Attic ἀρμόττω: cf. E. Maysner, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, I.2, Berlin, 1938, p. 118-119. Probably the copyist meant the Attic form here, but omitted a tau.
24. Καλοῖς] ἄρεσκε is attested in Rhed. (52). But alternative reconstructions cannot be excluded: we find πλήθει ἄρεσκε in Stob.Rec.Barb. (148), Par.₂ (37), Laur. (37), Ald. Chilo (7) (but the mss. V and P of Par.₂ have ἀρέσκου), πλήθει μὴ ἄρεσκε in Vat. Chilo (7), πᾶσιν ἄρεσκε as Periander (1) among the Demetrios-sentences in the *Recensio Parisina*.
25. Ἐγγύην] φεῦγε, attested in Sos. (69), Par.₂ (39), Rhed. (53), Mon. Sol. (37) or δάντια φεῦγε, attested in OMM (4), which may be an adaptation in view of an alphabetical classification. Other possibilities are ἀπέχθειαν φεῦγε, attested in Milet. (II 28) and Rhed. (44), ἄδικα φεῦγε, attested in Milet. (I 3) and Rhed. (9), τὸ καλὸν μὴ φεῦγε, attested in Rhed. (13), αἰσχύνην φεῦγε, attested in Par.₂ (49), Laur. (48), Ald. Periander (25), δίκην φεῦγε, attested in Vat. Pittacus (4), πλεονεξίαν φεῦγε, attested in Vat. Cleobulus (6) or οἰνοφυλίαν φεῦγε, attested in Vat. Cleobulus (9).
26. Εὔχου δ] ἄδύνατά: is attested in Sos. (52), Par.₂ (44), Laur. (43), Rhed. (54). Compare with μὴ ἐπιθύμει ἀδύνατων, attributed to Chilo: cf. Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 184-185, 280.
27. I have not been able to find a sentence of the Sosiades-type ending on]αίρια, but ἀποκρίνου καίρια is attested in Vat. 1056 as Periander (4), and λάλει καίρια can be found among the sentences of the Demetrios-type in Stob. 3.1.172, Bias (11). However, a comparable sentence does belong to the normal tradition of the Sosiades-sentences, viz. ἀποκρίνου ἐν καίρω, attested in Sos. (98), Par.₂ (59), Laur. (57), Milet. (II 6), Rhed. (65) and Ald. Periander (26). This may be an indication that the two word-sentence ἀποκρίνου καίρια or λάλει καίρια originally belonged to the short maxims inscribed on the Delphic temple and later collected by Sosiades and that the two types influenced each other at an early stage. If ἀποκρίνου κ]αίρια is the correct restoration here, the surprise uttered by Tziatzi-Papagianni at the great number of Demetrios-sentences, including the present one, in Vat. 1056, can be put in perspective, although I admit that I cannot explain why this manuscript, which remains unedited, would offer this ancient reading.
28.]τ{ο}ίμα: of the first letter a high spot seems to remain, of the second letter the right part of a loop. Apart from either of the two sentences I have quoted at l. 15, there are some other possibilities: εὐεργέτας] τ{ο}ίμα attested in Par.₂ (68), Rhed. (56) and Ald. Periander (31) (Sos. 59 has εὐεργεσίας τίμα), ἀγαθοῦς τοίμα attested in Sos. (65), Par.₂ (46), Laur. (45), Rhed. (21) and Ald. Periander (23), and γονεῖς τοίμα, attested in Rhed. (3).
29. All the traces are difficult to interpret, except for those of the last letter, which is very probably a sigma. The first letter is completely obscure, of the second there remains the apex of α, δ or λ, and the third is a round letter (ο or ε) (Coles). This yields as the most plausible sentences χάριν ἀπ]όδοος, attested in Par.₂ (32), Laur. (32), Milet. (I 14), Ald. Periander (18), λαβὼν ἀπόδοος attested in Rhed. (55) and ὁ μέλλεις δός, attested in Sos. (58) and Par.₂ (67).

Col. II

It is questionable whether this column still contained sentences of the 'Seven Wise Men'. At any rate, l. 15, where the most probable reading is τῖφυ] (Τῖφυ]ς Coles), shows no correspondence with any of the known sentences. Since ll. 4-15 seem to have been written in eisthesis, they may have formed a separate section of this miscellaneous papyrus, e.g. a quotation from a classical author.

Some Conclusions

Just as for similar papyri with mythographic catalogues (e.g. P. Stras. WG 332, P. Vindob. Gr. 26737, P. Med. Inv. 123, P.Oxy. 4097⁶), it is impossible to determine the exact relationship between this papyrus text and the *Fabulae* of Hyginus, although some similarities suggest a relationship between the present catalogues and the *Fabulae*, which sets both of them apart from other mythographic texts. Fowler already noticed the striking parallelism as to the names of the 'Epigonoι' and their succession: Hyginus, *F.* 71 has the names of only five 'Epigonoι' (six in the 'Fragmentum Niebuhrianum'), but the order of the list is the same and it includes Thesimenes, a name unknown in all other catalogues of 'Epigonoι'. Further correspondences between our papyrus and Hyginus extend to the names of the

⁶ Published by J. Schwartz, *Une source papyrologique d'Hygin le mythographe*, Studi in onore di A. Calderini e R. Paribeni II, Milano, 1956, p. 151-156; P.J. Sijpesteijn, K.A. Worp, *Literary and Semi-literary Papyri. 4. Mythological Fragment*, CE 49 (1974), p. 317-324; S. Daris, *P. Med. inv. 123*, (American Studies in Papyrology, 7 = Proceedings of the XII Int. Congr. of Pap.), Toronto, 1970, p. 97-102; R.L. Fowler, *Mythographic Texts*, P.Oxy. LXI (1995), p.46-54.

Horai (*F.* 183. 4), Moirai (*Praef.* 1), Gorgons (*Praef.* 9.), Titanesses (*Praef.* 3) and Eumenides (*Praef.* 3), but these are shared by other texts.

The most striking correspondence, however, with the *Fabulae* is the combination of genealogical lists with the sentences of the ‘Seven Wise Men’. In *F.* 221 one finds a short enumeration of the name, the place of birth and the principal maxim of each of the ‘Seven Wise Men’. This fits in a separate, widespread tradition represented in some later Latin texts as well as in many Greek medieval manuscripts, and to be distinguished from the collections of both the Sosiades- and the Demetrios-type⁷. Rose considered *F.* 221, like many other elements of the *Fabulae*, an addition by later epitomators even from the fifth or sixth century A.D.⁸. However, on the basis of our present papyrus, one wonders whether these sentences or an older, more extensive version belonging to the Sosiades-type, could not have been part of the original *Fabulae* or at least of an early stage of the work. Perhaps the manual was destined from the beginning for use in schools, and contained also some non-mythological texts to be memorized by the pupils, or else was quickly interpolated with these elements⁹. From the discoveries of fragments of school papyri during the last decades, we know that their nature was often miscellaneous and that genealogical or mythographic material could be combined with collections of sentences by Diogenes, Menander or others¹⁰. A simple example is 2731 Pack², wooden tablets dated to the 3rd or 4th century A.D., containing a maxim in iambic trimeters and a mythological account on Agamemnon and Iphigeneia¹¹. Our present papyrus clearly fits in this tradition, but I prefer not to speculate on the exact nature of the present text - the term ‘school papyri’ indeed covers a wide variety of texts, either written by pupils by way of exercise or by teachers¹². At any rate our papyrus may have been one particular excerpt of a manual in the vein of the *Fabulae* adapted to classroom practice.

As to the sentences of the Seven Sages transmitted in this papyrus, since most of them cannot be identified with certainty, there seems at first glance to be insufficient evidence to establish a specific connection with one of the multiple traditions of these sentences. Moreover, one can easily imagine that, in contrast with A.K., which was explicitly meant to be an exact copy of the original maxims of the Delphic temple, a selection was made here in view of its use at school. Yet it is tempting to descry some special relationship with Rhed., starting from the following certain or presumed correspondences:

1.15b ~ Rhed. 30,	1.22b ~ Rhed. 35 (certain),
1.16b ~ Rhed. 28 (certain),	
1.17b ~ Rhed. 31,	1.24b ~ Rhed. 52,
1.18b ~ Rhed. 32 (certain),	1.25b ~ Rhed. 53,
1.19b ~ Rhed. 33,	1.26b ~ Rhed. 54 (certain),
1.20b ~ Rhed. 34,	1.28b ~ Rhed. 56,
1.21b ~ Rhed. 36 (or 37),	1.29b ~ Rhed. 55.

⁷ See Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 435-46.

⁸ *Hygini Fabulae*, rec. H.I. Rose, Lugduni Batavorum, 1933, p. XV, 145.

⁹ Doubts at Rose’s theory of the late epitomators were recently uttered by A.B.Breen, *The Fabulae of Hyginus Reappraised: a Reconsideration of the Content and Compilation of the Work*, diss., Univ. of Illinois, 1991, p. 11-12, although he did not call into question the secondary nature of the non-mythological elements which he surveyed on p. 60-61.

¹⁰ They also show the great continuity of the education system in Antiquity. But the use of sentences seems to have considerably increased, if one compares the early Hellenistic evidence with that of the Roman period: cf. H.-I. Marrou, *Histoire de l’éducation dans l’Antiquité*. 1. *Le monde grec*, Paris, 1948, p. 232.

¹¹ Cf. W. Fröhner, *Annales de la Société Française de Numismatique et d’Archéologie* 3 (1868), p. LXVIII-IX. See the list of school papyri in G. Zalateo, *Papiri Scolastici*, *Aegyptus* 41 (1961), p. 160-235 nr. 189; J. Debut, *Les documents scolaires*, *ZPE* 63 (1986), p. 251-278, nr. 132, 370. In this list one easily finds other school documents of mythological or / and gnomic nature, esp. under the headings I (4) f: “listes thématiques: mythologie”, I (5) e: “copies et dictées: sentences”, I (6) a: “chries”, b: “anthologies gnomiques”, III (2): “exercices littéraires: paraphrases mythologiques”.

¹² On the problem of defining and delimiting the category ‘school papyri’ see: S.M. Weems, *Greek Grammatical Papyri. The School Texts*, diss., Univ. of Missouri - Columbia, 1981, p. 6-19.

Between l.22 and 24 the scribe of the papyrus or his model has probably omitted a section of the original sentences. Theoretically the copyist of Rhed. may also have added a group of sentences from another source. However, the parallelism between the present papyrus and both sections of Rhed. is remarkable in that the succession in Rhed. excludes any correspondence with the first sentence of each line of the papyrus (ll. 15a, 16a, 17a, etc.). But the same peculiarity appears from a comparison of Milet. with Rhed., already made by Tziatzi-Papagianni, who had recognized the worth of Rhed. as witness of an old and independent tradition¹³. Among the 33 common maxims I especially note the following correspondences:

Milet. I 3 ~ Rhed. 9	Milet. I 4 ~ Rhed. 29
Milet. I 5 ~ Rhed. 10	Milet. I 7 ~ Rhed. 30
Milet. I 9 ~ Rhed. 11	
Milet. I 11 (δόξαν δίωκε)	Milet. II 4 ~ Rhed. 64
~ Rhed. 12 (δόξαν μίσει) ¹⁴	Milet. II 6 ~ Rhed. 65
	Milet. II 8 ~ Rhed. 66
Milet. I 22 ~ Rhed. 16	Milet. II 11 ~ Rhed. 67
Milet. I 24 ~ Rhed. 17	Milet. II 13 ~ Rhed. 68
	Milet. II 15 ~ Rhed. 69
Milet. I 1 ~ Rhed. 28	Milet. II 17 ~ Rhed. 70

Such an error would not be unique in the textual transmission of the sentences of the Sosiades-type: W. Bühler managed to reconstruct the lost three-column model from which the Mon. gr. 318, a manuscript depending on Vat., derives: the text had to be read in horizontal rows, but the copyist read it vertically, in three successive columns¹⁵. Likewise, in the case of the correspondences Milet. I 1 ~ Rhed. 28, Milet. I 4 ~ Rhed. 29, Milet. I 7 ~ Rhed. 30, the model of Rhed. seems to have been written in horizontal rows of three sentences each, misinterpreted by the copyist as three vertical columns. All the other correspondences just quoted between Milet. and Rhed. point to a two-column model, misread in an analogous way. This hypothetical reconstruction of the activity of the scribe of Rhed. automatically explains the apparent omission in this manuscript of the first sentence of each line of our papyrus. However, some irregularities in the order of the maxims, such as l.15b ~ Rhed. 30, l.16b ~ Rhed. 28, l.21b ~ Rhed. 36 (or 37), l.22b ~ Rhed. 35, l.28b ~ Rhed. 56, l.29b ~ Rhed. 55, are not accounted for by such a reconstruction. The same observation applies to some correspondences between Milet. and Rhed., which were therefore omitted in the list above: Milet. II 22 ~ Rhed. 72, Milet. II 23 ~ Rhed. 73, Milet. II 27 ~ Rhed. 74, Milet. II 28 ~ Rhed. 44, and Milet. II 29 ~ Rhed. 43. This should warn against a too simplistic reconstruction, which does not take into account the lost evidence of intermediary stages. We may feel certain that at some point of the textual transmission the error of the vertical misreading produced a text now to be found in Rhed., and that our papyrus, in addition to Milet., is an important witness of the text of the ancient model of Rhed. But the exact relationship of the papyrus and of Milet. to this model is unclear: there may have been many intermediate stages, and the scribes themselves of both these texts may have omitted sentences or changed their sequence.

¹³ Cf. Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 9: "Auffällig ist die Verwandtschaft des jungen Codex Rhed. mit der alten Inschrift von Miletupolis. Der Cod. Rhed. überliefert nämlich 33 Sprüche dieser Inschrift meistens als Gruppen in derselben Reihenfolge oft im Gegensatz zum Sos., z. B. ... Außerdem ist ... der Überschuß von Sprüchen in der Inschrift von Miletupolis im Vergleich mit Sos. und Par.₂ mit einer Ausnahme im Cod. Rhed. wortwörtlich belegt."

¹⁴ This is very probably one of the Christian adaptations by the copyist of Rhed. or his model, of which Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 10 lists some other examples.

¹⁵ Bühler, p.25-27; Tziatzi-Papagianni, p. 39.