

**X.—Two Literary Papyri from Karanis**I. Isocrates, *Πρὸς Δημόνικον* 33–34II. Demosthenes, *Κατ' Ἀριστοκράτους* 166–72

ELINOR MULLETT HUSSELMAN

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The excavations conducted by the University of Michigan in Egypt over a period of ten years at Kom Aushîm, the site of ancient Karanis, yielded many papyri. Although most of them are fragmentary and many are too small for identification, there remain a goodly number that are reasonably complete and of considerable interest.<sup>1</sup>

This material has been inventoried under some two thousand numbers, but, because there are so many small and relatively unimportant pieces, papyri from one location in the dig are as a general rule kept together under a single inventory number. It would not be an exaggeration to estimate that there are at least five thousand separate documents represented by these two thousand numbers. Of all these fragments only one hundred and forty can be classified with a fair degree of certainty as literary, either from the text, or, when the fragments are very small, on the basis of the hand. This is a very small proportion, but perhaps not much smaller than we should expect.<sup>2</sup>

Most of the literary fragments remain unidentified, and indeed the majority are so small as to make eventual identification unlikely. Some are sufficiently extensive for us to determine the character of the contents, although they have not been recognized as previously known works. There are, for example, two fragments from paraphrases of the *Iliad*, a fragment from a Homeric

<sup>1</sup> Sixty-five papyri have been published by H. C. Youtie and O. M. Pearl in *Papyri and Ostraca from Karanis* (Michigan Papyri VI, Ann Arbor, 1944). Several others have appeared in various journals.

<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to make a comparable estimate of the proportion of literary to documentary papyri elsewhere. Of the 2207 published Oxyrhynchus papyri, 536, or nearly twenty-five per cent, are literary, whereas the literary papyri form less than three per cent of the Karanis papyri at Michigan. But much Karanis material is to be found in other institutions, and all of it would have to be taken into consideration, before we could form any definite conclusions as to the extent of literary interests in that village.

glossary, not that of Apollonius, some extensive fragments from two or three grammatical treatises, two scraps that appear to be historical, one that may be from a dramatic work, and four from works on the borderline of literature dealing with magic and astrology.

Only fourteen fragments have been identified, and, as is to be expected, ten of them are Homeric.<sup>3</sup> Of the Homeric fragments eight are from the *Iliad* and two from the *Odyssey*, so that here also the usual proportion between the two poems is maintained. There are two fragments from rolls that contained the *Works and Days* of Hesiod, with the *Theogony* written on the verso of one. And finally there are two fragments that have been identified as belonging to the works of the Attic orators.

It is these last two that are presented here. Although they are not extensive and introduce no textual innovations, they have a certain value because they are among the earliest witnesses to the texts of these authors.<sup>4</sup>

# I

The first is a small fragment, measuring  $6.5 \times 11.6$  cm., of the *Πρὸς Δημόνικον*, traditionally ascribed to Isocrates, and generally accepted as authentic. It was found at Karanis during the excavations of 1928/29, and bears the inventory number 5299. The text consists of ten lines, only three of which are complete, from one column of a roll, and it includes the end of § 33 and the beginning of § 34 of the speech.

The hand is a rather large and well-formed uncial, with finials, not strongly marked, on some of the letters. Its general character accords well with hands generally attributed to the late first or early second century A.D.<sup>5</sup> There is no punctuation, nor are there any diacritical marks. The final *ν* is once indicated by a horizontal stroke above the preceding letter (τῶν in line 8). There are from

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the list of literary papyri published by C. H. Oldfather, *The Greek Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt* (University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History 9, Madison, 1923). The evidence is summed up by F. G. Kenyon in *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 1932) 31-34.

<sup>4</sup> Of the nine papyri of the *Πρὸς Δημόνικον* of Isocrates that have been published, three have been dated in the second century, two in the third, three in the fourth, and one in the fifth-sixth. One of the fragments of the *Κατ' Ἀριστοκράτους* of Demosthenes is dated in the second century, the other three in the third.

<sup>5</sup> The hand may be compared with those on Plate IX of Medea Norsa, *La scrittura letteraria greca dal secolo IV a.C. all' VIII d.C.* (Firenze, 1939).

19 to 23 letters in a line, and the width of the column is about 8.5 cm. It is of course impossible to make any estimate of the original size of the manuscript from such a small fragment.

Isocrates was one of the more popular authors of antiquity, although he ranked far below Homer and Demosthenes, and of his works the *Πρὸς Δημόνικον* is the most frequently found among the papyri.<sup>6</sup> Six papyri are listed by Oldfather, and three others may be added to his list:<sup>7</sup> *P. Ross. Georg.* 1.16, a folio from a fourth century codex; *P. Lond. Inv.* 230 (Milne, *Catalogue*, 255), a school text in a third- or fourth-century hand for use either for reading or as a shorthand exercise; and a fragment in the Lund University library,<sup>8</sup> containing the lower half of two columns in a third-century hand.

The only papyrus that contains §§ 33–34 is P. Berl. 8935, written at the beginning of the second century on the verso of BGU 3.781, a long inventory of the late first century A.D. It contains §§ 18–52 and was used by Drerup in his edition of the orations of Isocrates. Drerup's text<sup>9</sup> was used for the collation of the Michigan fragment.

[λογοῖς ἐλυπησαν τοῦτ]ων τοῖς  
 [εργοῖς τὴν τ]ιμωριαν ἐδω  
 σαν οὖς εἰαν βουλευεῖ ποιήσας  
 θαι φίλους ἀγαθὸν τι λέγε πε  
 5 ρι αὐτῶν ἀρχὴ γὰρ φιλίας μὲν  
 [επ]αι[ν]ος ε[χ]θρας δὲ ψόγος  
 § 34 [βουλευομεν]ος παραδειγματα  
 [ποιου τα π]αρεληλυθοτα τῶ  
 [μελλοντων το] γὰρ ἀφανες  
 10 [ἐκ τοῦ φανεροῦ ταχι]στ[ὴν ε]  
 [χει

1. τοῦτ]ων: τοῦτ<sup>ων</sup> P. Berl., τούτῳ Δς, τούτοις T.

2–3. ἐδωσαν: read ἔδοσαν.

<sup>6</sup> In Oldfather's list, *op. cit.* (see note 3) 41, six of the eighteen papyri of Isocrates are from the *Πρὸς Δημόνικον*.

<sup>7</sup> The writer has been fortunate in being able to supplement Oldfather's list by the as yet unpublished bibliography of literary papyri compiled by Roger A. Pack of the University of Michigan.

<sup>8</sup> Published by A. Wifstrand in the *Årsberättelse* of the Humanistiska Vetenskaps-samfundet i Lund (1934–35) 57–58.

<sup>9</sup> *Isocratis Opera Omnia* recensuit Engelbertus Drerup (Lipsiae, 1906). Drerup's symbols have been used in the critical notes.

3. *εαν βουλει*: *εάν* P. Berl., T; *βούλει* T; *ἄν βούλη* most manuscripts and Drerup.

4-5. *περὶ αὐτῶν*: omitted in P. Berl. The Michigan papyrus omits the phrase *πρὸς τοὺς ἀπαγγελοῦντας*, which follows in the manuscripts and Drerup.

7. *παραδείγματα*: read *παραδείγματα*.

## II

There were also found in the excavations at Karanis in the season of 1928/29 five papyrus fragments belonging to a single manuscript, to which has been given the inventory number 5472. Four of the fragments have been fitted together, so that there are two fairly good-sized pieces, one  $9 \times 10.5$  cm. and the other  $16.3 \times 9.3$  cm., with a piece about 9.5 cm. wide missing between them. The text consists of parts of four consecutive columns from a roll that contained the twenty-third oration of Demosthenes, *Κατ' Ἀριστοκράτους*. There are fourteen complete lines and remnants of three others in Column I, only two or three letters from Column II, the ends of twenty-three lines in Column III, and the beginnings of thirty-four lines in Column IV. The text covered is §§ 166-172.

The hand is a small, neat uncial, lacking the finials of the Isocrates papyrus, and the manuscript is probably to be dated in the second century A.D.<sup>10</sup> The scribe sometimes uses a diaeresis (either one or two dots) over an initial *ν*, and frequently indicates the final *ν* at the end of a line by a bar above the preceding letter. Punctuation consists of a single point, sometimes on the line, sometimes above it, and in one instance apparently in a middle position; there seems to be no distinction in the use of these positions.

The number of letters in a line varies from 14-20, with an average of 17. Between Columns I and III 824 letters, or 48-49 lines, are lost. Hence Columns I and II together consisted of 65-66 lines, or 32-33 lines to a column. If the two complete letters and the two mutilated letters, which are the sole remnants of Column II, are correctly placed in the text, there are 377 letters, or 22 lines, lost between Columns I and II, and 414 letters, or 24-25 lines, lost between Columns II and III. Since six lines are lost at the begin-

<sup>10</sup> The hand is very close to that of the fragment of Thucydides at Lund, also published by Wifstrand, *op. cit.* (see note 8) 54-56. Of a similar character is the hand of the Aeschylus fragments *P. Oxy.* 18.2159-64, 2178-9.

ning of Column II, Column I apparently had 33 lines originally and Column II probably 32. Between the last line remaining on Column III and the first line of Column IV, 193 letters, 11–12 lines, are lost, which would give Column III 35–36 lines. Thirty-four lines remain in Column IV; it may be complete, but since the lower margin is broken away, we cannot be sure that it did not contain one or two more lines. The estimate of the number of lines to a column given above is only approximate, since in the papyrus letters and words have been inserted between the lines, and words and phrases have been both added and omitted.

The original length of the roll can also only be roughly estimated. The entire oration in Butcher's edition contains about 1750 lines, and the four columns on the papyrus correspond to 50 of these lines. If the same proportion held throughout the roll, the complete text would have required about 140 columns. Column I, the only one of which the width is preserved, is 5 cm. wide, and the intercolumnar space, where it can be determined, varies from a little less to a little more than 3 cm. If the entire oration was contained in one roll, the roll must have been slightly over eleven meters long. According to Schubart<sup>11</sup> the length of the papyrus roll seldom exceeds 7–10 meters. It is unlikely that two rolls would be used for an oration of this length; it is more probable either that the roll slightly exceeded the normal length, or that the writing may have been compressed at the end of the manuscript.

Column IV, which is nearly, if not completely, preserved, is 14 cm. high, with an upper margin of 2 cm. Judging from other papyri we should expect the lower margin to exceed the upper,<sup>12</sup> and it may well have been 4 cm. Hence the roll was probably in the neighborhood of 20 cm. in height.

Demosthenes ranks second to Homer, although far below him, in the number of papyri that have come down to us.<sup>13</sup> The oration against Aristocrates was not, however, one of the more popular speeches. Oldfather lists only two fragments; in addition to these there is a fragment of a leaf from a codex of the third century, containing §§ 79–80, 82–83, in Vienna,<sup>14</sup> and a fragmentary column

<sup>11</sup> W. Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*<sup>2</sup> (Berlin and Leipzig, 1921) 52–53.

<sup>12</sup> The lower margin does not always exceed the upper. For example in the Demosthenes papyrus, Brit. Mus. Inv. 133, published by Kenyon in *Classical Texts from Papyri in the British Museum* (London, 1891), the upper margin is the wider.

<sup>13</sup> Oldfather, *op. cit.* (see note 3) 11–14.

<sup>14</sup> P. Rain. (N.S.) 1.9.

from a roll of the second century, containing §§ 51–54, in the Michigan collection.<sup>15</sup> There is also an interesting fragment in Berlin<sup>16</sup> from a codex of the fourth–fifth century, containing a lexicon to the oration.

The text itself offers little of importance. Although a few corrections have been made by the scribe, the omissions and transpositions of words in the text, that are unsupported by other manuscript evidence, suggest that it was not carefully revised after it was written. In Column I, line 15, the papyrus has the reading ὑπὸ τούτου, rejected, but without manuscript authority, by Butcher, Blass, and Benseler. In Column IV, lines 24–26, the reading τῶν λο[γων ἐν] τῷ δήμῳ [ρήθέντων πο]λλῶν may be more than an accidental inversion of words on the part of the scribe. Also in line 33 of the same column, the agreement of the papyrus with Parisinus 2934 (S) in reading ἐψηφίσασθε instead of ψηφίσεσθε is of interest. The text, which follows, has been collated with the edition of Butcher.<sup>17</sup>

### Fragment 1

#### Column I

- των δ' ἡν μέστη καὶ κατὰ  
 § 167 ποντιστῶν· ἐνταυθα  
 ἐλθόντων μὲν ὑμῶν  
 καὶ πολιορκούντων πο  
 5 ρευθεὶς διὰ Χερωννῆ  
 σου πασης τῆς ὑμετέρας. ὕ  
 μιν μὲν προσεβαλλεῖ·  
 ἐβοηθεῖ δὲ τοῖς λησταῖς  
 καὶ καταποντισταῖς· καὶ  
 10 πρότερον τὸν ὕμετε  
 ρον στρατηγὸν ἐπισε  
 καὶ ἠναγκασέ μὴ τα βέλ  
 τιστα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν μὴ  
 πρᾶττειν ἢ αὐτοῖς ὕπο  
 15 [τ]ούτου ἐπει[σ]θῆν ὡ[ν]  
 [ω]μολο[γη]κ[ε]ῖ καὶ ὑπέ[ρ]  
 [σχ]ῆτο τι [πρα]ξαὶ καὶ

Sixteen lines are lost.

<sup>15</sup> *P. Mich.* 3.142.

<sup>16</sup> *BKT* 1 (1904) 77–82.

<sup>17</sup> Demosthenis *Orationes* recognovit S. H. Butcher (Oxonii, 1903–1931). Butcher's symbols have been used in the critical notes.

1. ην: the ν is inserted above the line.
3. ελθοντων μεν: δ' ἐλθόντων Butcher. υμων: read ἡμῶν.
4. πολιορκουντων: Butcher adds τούτους.
- 5-6. Χερωνήσου: read Χερρονήσου.
6. της: inserted above the line.
- 6-7. ὕμν: read ἡμῖν.
10. προτερον: Butcher adds προσκαθήμενος.
11. επισε: read ἔπεισε.
- 12-13. βελτιστα: βέλτισθ' Butcher.
13. μη: this superfluous negative does not appear in other manuscripts.
14. η: inserted above the line. αυτο. s: a blurred spot of ink between the ο and s may be the trace of a letter that has been deleted by the scribe.
15. επει[σ]θην: ἐπέισθη Butcher. Butcher follows Benseler in deleting ὑπὸ τούτου. Blass also deletes ἐπέισθη.

## Column II

Six lines are lost.

τω [στρατηγω συμβαν]  
τω[ν δηπου μαρτυρες]

Twenty-four to twenty-five lines are lost.

## Fragment 2

## Column III

- [γνους οτι σωθ]ησεται  
[προς Κερσοβλ]επτη  
[αν αχθη παραδιδω]σι Καρ  
[διανοις τοις υμε]τεροις  
5 [εχθροις κακειν]ο[ι λα]  
[βοντες και αυτο]ν και  
[τον υιον αναγαγ]οντες  
[εις το πελαγος εν] πλοι  
[ω τον μεν υιον] αἴξω  
10 [φαξαν εκεινον] ὃ ἐπι  
[δοντα το]ν υιον αποσφατ  
[τομενο]ν κατεποντι  
§ 170 [σαν τω]ν δε Θραικων  
[απαντω]ν χαλεπως ε  
15 [νεγκον]των ἐπι του  
[τοις και] συστραφεντῶ  
[του τε Β]ηρισαδου και

- [του Αμα]δοκου ιδων  
 [τον κα]ϊρον τουτον  
 20 [Αθηνοδωρος συμ]μαχίαν  
 [ποιησαμενος προς] του  
 [τους οιος ην πολε]μειῖ  
 [εν φοβω δε κατασταν]τος

Eleven to twelve lines are lost.

12-13. κατεποντι[σαν]: the ν is inserted above the line.

22. πολε]μειῖ: the second ι is a slip.

#### Column IV

- πολεμον τ[ουτον κα]  
 τεστησατε κ[αι τω μεν]  
 Αθηνοδωρ[ω συνεβη]  
 διαφειναι τ[ην δυνα]  
 5 μιν χρημα[τ ουκ εχον]  
 τι ουδ αφορ[μην τω πο]  
 λεμω· τω δ[ε Χαβρια]  
 μιαν ναυν [εχοντι μο]  
 νην εκπλ[ειν τι ποι]  
 10 ει παλιν ο Χ[αριδημος]  
 ουτος· ας μ[εν ωμοσε]  
 προς τον [Αθηνοδωρον]  
 συνθηκας [εξαρνος γιγ]  
 νεται και τ[ον Κερσο]  
 15 βλεπτην [αρνεισθαι]  
 πειθει· γρ[αφει δ ετε]  
 ρας προς τ[ον Χαβριαν]  
 ετι των π[ρος Κηφισο]  
 δοτον δει[νοτερας ου]  
 20 κ εχων δ ε[κεινος οι]  
 μαι δυναμ[ιν στεργειν]  
 ηναγκαζε[το τουτοις]  
 § 172 ακ[ου]σαντε[s δ υμεις]  
 ταυτα των λο[γων εν]  
 25 τω δημω [ρηθεντων]  
 [πο]λλων κα[ι των συν]  
 [θη]κων ανα[γνωσθειςων]  
 [ουτ]ε την Χα[βριου δοξαν]



- [αισχυ]ν[θεντες ουτε]  
 30 [τω]ν συναγ[ορευοντων]  
 [ουδ]εναν απ[εχειροτο]  
 [νησ]ατε παλιν τας [συν]  
 [θηκ]ας και εψ[ηφισασθε]  
 [ψηφ]ισμα Γλ[αυκωνος]

5-6. εχοντι: Butcher adds παρ' ὑμῶν.

7. τω δε Χαβρια: τῷ Χαβρίᾳ δέ Butcher.

10-11. ο Χ[αριδημος] ουτος: οὗτος ὁ Χαρίδημος Butcher.

24-26. των λογων εν τω] δημω [ρηθεντων πο]λλων: ἐν τῷ δήμῳ λόγων  
 ῥηθέντων πολλῶν Butcher.

31. [ουδ]εναν: the final ν is a slip.

32. απ[εχειροτονησ]ατε: Butcher adds καὶ ταύτας.

33. εψηφισασθε: so S, although the α has been erased by a later hand. ψηφίζεσθε A, Butcher.