

πολλ[ω restored with Ph LbA: πολλών Pg dett. The scribe does not maintain a justified margin, so space could accommodate either.

21 The tops of εἰ and the central stroke of μ are visible.

↓

1 αν might be read, though with great difficulty, at line beginning, and thus reconstruction to τα] ἀναλ[ωμα]τα το[υς φοβους might be possible.

2 c]υμβολας with LbA: κυμπλοκάς Phg.

3 Blank space before εἰτα marking the beginning of the new section.

τοθ with LbA: omitted Phg.

4 παιοντας: παιάνας MSS. The reading is nonsense, and thus most likely a scribal mistake made during the process of copying παιάνας.

5 δε τα with MSS: δε <ήττωμένων> τὰ Heeren (Priscian *qui uicti sunt*).

6 Blank space before εαν marking the beginning of a new sentence.

τοπ[ουc with Ph Lb dett. Priscian (*loca*): χρόνουc A.

8 τινα εκ with LbA: τινα και εκ Phg Priscian (*et*).

10 λογοθ with LbA Priscian (*rationem*): λόγου Phg.

11 There does not seem to be enough space for the reading of the mediaeval MSS, ἐκφράσεωc μάλιcτα μὲν αφήνεια και ἐνάργεια: δεῖ γὰρ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν. The obvious homoioteleuton between αφήνεια and ἐνάργεια may have caused an omission. But between 11 and 12 the scribe clearly copied ερ]μηνιαν. Even if και ἐνάργεια was lost, there is still not enough space for the transmitted text. Notably, there is an exiguous ink trace in the left margin that could be a pen stroke (see for example X **1232** fr. 1 col. ii 3; LXVIII **4660** col. ii 98) or an *ancora* (see XIII **1617** Fol. 1 recto 19) marking the problem (see K. McNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri* (1992) 11–13, 15–17).

11–12 [ερ]μηνιαν l. ἐρμηνείαν.

15 οφίλει l. οφείλει.

21 τὴν εκφραcιν] εἰc γ[υμναcμα ωc may be reconstructed here.

C. ITURRALDE

5280. THEMISTIUS VI 71D–72A, 72D–73A

93/Dec.23/I.1

6.3 × 7.3 cm

Fifth/sixth century
Plates VIII–IX

Fragment of a leaf from a papyrus codex with remains of 12 lines on ↓ and 14 on →. The average number of letters per line is 29, suggesting a column width of at least 12 cm. No margins survive. Approximately 32 lines are missing between ↓ and →. On the basis of these data, we can reconstruct a codex of c.44 lines per page. The written area was most likely around 12 × 25 cm. Assuming margins of at least 2–3 cm, the leaf would possibly fall within Turner's Group 5 or 6 (*Typology* 16–18).

The papyrus is written in a fast, medium-sized, sloping majuscule. Letter spacing is more or less regular, but letters often touch. The scribe achieves some chiaroscuro effect, although the contrast between thick horizontal and thin vertical and oblique strokes is not consistent. The script is roughly bilinear, except for the

descenders of ρ, φ, ζ, γ and the bottom bowl of β. There is some slight decoration in the tail of ζ and the tiny ornamental hook on the foot of φ. ρ has a rounded loop. β is tall and has a broad rounded base. The horizontals of ε and θ extend to the right. η is sometimes broad and has a high cross-bar. The uprights of μ have slightly curved feet, often touching the letter on the right, and the central element is deep. η is executed in three strokes, but in some cases its oblique and right-hand upright appear to be drawn in one movement; as a result, η sometimes resembles μ. γ occasionally appears in a V-shape with a smaller or bigger tail. ω is broad and well-rounded.

A *terminus post quem* for the codex is AD 364, when Themistius delivered this speech before the Emperor Valens; see R. Maisano, *Discorsi di Temistio* (1995) 108, and H. Leppin and W. Portmann, *Themistios: Staatsreden* (1998) 13–14, 113. Taking into consideration the date of the oration, the ink type, and the codex format, the hand is datable to either the fifth or sixth century. For comparable hands and letter shapes, cf. PSI II 126 (*GBEBP* 15b, assigned to the early fifth century), XV **1818** (*GBEBP* 23b = W. Lameere, *Aperçus de paléographie homérique* 148–74, assigned to the early sixth century), and **1817** (*GBEBP* 28a = Lameere, *Aperçus* 175–90, assigned to the mid sixth century).

There is an organic diaeresis in a ligatured form (↓ 7 ὕμιν), one instance of crasis (→ 3 ταυτον), and iotacistic spelling (↓ ιι). Iota adscript is written in most cases, with very few exceptions.

This is the first papyrus of Themistius' *Φιλάδελφοι ἢ περὶ φιλανθρωπίας* (VI) to be published. To date, the only other papyrus witness of Themistius is Pap. Brux. XIII 12 (= *MPER* N.S. 3 62), a codex of the late fourth or fifth century containing the end of an unknown speech and the beginning of *Πρεσβευτικὸς ὑπὲρ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ῥηθεις ἐν Ρώμῃ* (III). **5280** usually agrees with A, which preserves the most reliable tradition, and notably once with Ψ (*αοριστον* against *ακριτον*), whose variants Schenkl considered of little value (see H. Schenkl, *WS* 20 (1898) 239–43). The papyrus also offers two otherwise unattested variants: ↓ 2 *διαλ*] *εξεσθαι* (for *διαλέγεσθαι*); ↓ 7 *δε ὕμιν* (for *δὲ καὶ ὑμῖν*).

For reports of readings of the mediaeval manuscripts, and restoration of the text *exempli gratia*, I have relied on the Teubner of H. Schenkl and G. Downey, *Themistii Orationes quae supersunt* i (1965).

↓

εξῆ|γγητη]ν υπερ ω[ν εμελλε τωι βασιλει (71d)

διαλ]εξεσθαι εγω δε [ευξαιμην αν
τους α]παντας ανθρωπο[υς γενεσθαι (72a)

διακον]ους μοι και ερμην[εας του μελ
5 λοντος λ]ογου ουτω πεποιθα [μαλλον

τη διαν]οιαι των ρηθησομεν[ων η τοις ο
νομας]ι παντως δε υμιν [κριτεον τους λο
γους ου] τα ρηματα εξεταζ[οντας αλλα
την γνωμ]ην και μαλιστα γε τ[ων φιλο
10 σοφειν προσποιο]υμενων εχει [γαρ ουτως
ανωθεν ω βασ]ιλης ευνοια κα[ι συγγενεια
βασιλειαι προς] φιλο[σοφιαν] εστ[ι και επι

.

→

.
ονν κακως η] τρ[αγ]ωδια [και προς γε (72d)
ετι κακιον οτ]αν θεον λεγη την [τυραννι (73a)
δα και γαρ ο]υτως εις ταυτον πλημμελημα
περικτα]ται ο γαρ θεος ο τι περ [ακροτα
5 τον της σ]οφιας μαλλον δε αυ[τοσο
φια και εξ]ηγ τωι Ευριπιδη[ι αναβλε
ψαντι ει]ς τον ουρα[ν]ον κατα[μαθειν
και διδαχ]θηναι οτι μη τυραν[νιδος
c.3 ευδα]ιμονος βασιλεαs ευ[δαιμονα
10 εργα ου] προς εξουσιαν αορις[τον χρω
μενης τ]ηι της δυνα[μ]εωs πε[ριουσιαι
αλλα κα]τα τους νομου[ς τους εαυτης
διεξιου]σης [c.5]α αιω[να ουs αυτη
c.15 . . . [c.10

↓

2 διαλ]εξεσθαι: διαλέγεσθαι MSS. Although a new reading, the future infinitive is not surprising. With μέλλω either reading is grammatically sound.

εγω. Trace of supralinear ink over ε that looks like a possible grave accent, though not likely given the amount of surviving text and the lack of accents overall. Possibly accidental.

[αν] restored with AΘΥ: omitted Ψu.

3-4 [γενεσθαι] | [διακον]ουs μοι with AΨΥ: μοι γενέσθαι διακόνουs Θ.

4 ερμην]εαs restored with the correct reading in AΨΘΥ: έρμηνιάουs u.

7 παντως δε υμιν: πάντως δέ και ύμίν MSS. Although και can be taken as emphatic, it is not necessary, nor is it found with any other instance of πάντως δέ in Themistius: cf. *Or.* 11.148b 29; *in APb.* 5.1, 16, 24 Wallies; *in Ph.* 5.2, 80, 19 Schenkl.

υμιν: for ligatured diaeresis, cf. LXXIII 4933 introd. p. 10.

9-10 τ[ων φιλο]||[σοφειν] restored on grounds of space with Θ: τοὺς τῶν φιλοσοφῶν AΨ: τοὺς τῶν φιλοσόφων u. The reading of AΨ is preferable, but would create a rather long line. Pantin and

Petavius have suggested τῶν τῶ φιλοσόφῳ. For τῶν φιλοσοφεῖν προσποιουμένων, cf. Lucian *Nigr.* 24.3; D. C. 52.36.4.1; D. Chr. 49.12.8; Porph. *Plot.* 10.1.

10 [γαρ] restored on the basis of space with AΨΥ: δὲ γὰρ Θ.

11 βασιλεῖς l. βασιλεῖς with MSS. An iotacistic spelling is more likely than the Old Attic form of the plural vocative in -ῆς instead of -εῖς (on which see Kühner–Blass, *Grammatik* i 449 and Threatte, *Grammar* 239–47).

εὐνοια κα[ι κυγγενεια] restored with AΘΥ: εὐνοια καὶ εὐμένεια Ψυ. Space could accommodate either. Yet it would only take a somewhat cursive exemplar to remind one how palaeographically close *κυγγενεια* and *εὐμένεια* could be. Reading *εὐμένεια* is tautological.

→

3 ταυτον with AΨΘ: ταὐτὸ Υ.

5 τηc] restored with AΘΥ based on average line lengths: omitted Ψ.

6 και εξ]ην restored with AΘΥ: ἐξῆν δε Ψ.

8 οτι μη: the papyrus agrees with manuscript consensus and does not confirm modern corrections, namely Pantin's and Petau's <καὶ> ὅτι οὐ and Harduin's ὅτι οὐ.

8–9 The transmitted ὅτι μὴ τυραννίδος ἐστὶ τὰ ἐκεῖ ἀλλ' εὐδαίμονος βασιλείας does not fit the space. Presumably the papyrus omitted ἐστὶ τὰ ἐκεῖ. The resulting text, with only [αλλευδα] or [αλλαευδα] in lacuna, is still grammatical.

10–11 αορις[τον χρω][μενης] restored with Ψυ: ἄκριτον ἀποχρωμένης AΘΥ (Υ ἀποχρωμένοις). The ο would be an odd oblong shape, cf. e.g. the oblong ο in → 8; the remaining ink is definitely not κ. There is not enough space to accommodate the preverb ἀπο-. Harduin and Maisano accept Ψυ, while Dindorf preferred ἄκριτον ἀποχρωμένης.

13 [c.5]α: τὸν ἅπαντα MSS. The transmitted sequence is too long for the space, which can however accommodate ἅπαντα, without the article.

C. CHRYSANTHOU