

XXVIII. The Papyrus of the *Lexicon* of Harpocraton

MARK NAOUMIDES

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

This small papyrus of unknown provenance¹ was first edited by C. H. Roberts in the third volume of the *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester* (Manchester, 1938, pages 168–70 and plate 9) under number 532. Although small in size and rather poorly preserved, the papyrus is of some importance for the history of the text of Harpocraton's *Lexicon*.²

The papyrus has been ascribed to the late second or early third century A.D. on the basis of the writing. It is, therefore, almost contemporary with the author of the dictionary³ and over a thousand years older than the oldest manuscript of Harpocraton. The text of the fragment corresponds to that of the so-called "fuller version" of the dictionary.⁴ The text of the papyrus, however, is of a quality superior to that of the MSS. For not only are the faulty readings of the individual MSS. absent in the papyrus, but it also furnishes three excellent readings (two already conjectured by scholars) which have no parallels in any of our MSS.

¹ E. G. Turner, however, has suggested as quite probable that the papyrus came ultimately from Oxyrhynchus; cf. *JEA* 38 (1952) 92 and note 5.

² A thorough study and evaluation of the MSS. as well as a systematic history of the text of Harpocraton are still lacking. Wentzel's work on the subject was never published; a summary of it was given by H. Schultz, *RE* 7 (1912) 2412–13, s.v. "Harpokration." The most valuable contribution so far has been made by G. Kalkoff, "De codicibus epitomes Harpocratoneae," *Dissertationes philologicae Halenses* 8 (1887), 141–91 (and separately, Halis Saxonum, 1886).

³ Cf. Roberts, *Catalogue* 168. For recent evidence for Harpocraton's dates from the papyri, see E. G. Turner (above, note 1) 91–92, and B. Hemmerdinger, "Les papyrus et la datation d'Harpocraton," *REG* 72 (1959) 107–9.

⁴ Harpocraton's *Lexicon* has come down to us in two versions, independent of each other, one of which is usually referred to as the fuller version, while the other is clearly an epitome of the work. Besides, there are excerpts of glosses originating from the fuller version. While the fuller version has been preserved only in a number of late MSS., which all originated probably from one MS. written in the thirteenth or fourteenth century, the epitome was made as early as the ninth century, as is proved by the fact that it was used extensively by Photius and the *Suda Lexicon* through the *Συναγωγή λέξεων χρησίμων* (cf. Schultz and Kalkoff, above, note 2).

The fragment contains the lower parts of two consecutive columns. The text of Column I originally contained in the fragment can be restored fully and with safety, since a substantial part of the text is readable, and the lacunae are easily filled with the assistance of the text of our MSS. The restoration of Column II, however, presents some difficulties; for only the beginnings of the lines (with a maximum of four letters a line) have been preserved, while some of the lines have disappeared completely. This column was restored by the first editor as follows:⁵

	Κεβρ[ηνα Δημοσθενος εν τω]	(21 letters)
15	κατα ⁶ Α[ριστοκρατους πολιν εστι]	(26 „)
	της Τ[ρωαδος Κεβρην Κυμαι]	(21 „)
	ων [αποικια ως φησιν Εφορος]	(22 „)
	εν ε[
	κε.[
20	προ[
	πε[
	τους [
	Κεγχ[ρεων Δημοσθενος εν τη]	(22 letters)
	[προς Πανταυετον παραγραφη]	(24 „)
25	[καπειτ επεισε τους οικετας]	(23 „)
	[τους εμους καθεζεσθαι εις τον]	(25 „)
	[Κεγχρεωνα αντι του εις το καθαρι]	(27 „)
	σ[τηριον κτλ.]	

Roberts suggested that lines 19–22 contained the passage of the historian Ephorus referred to in line 18. This view has been adopted by A. Körte (*Arch. Pap.* 14 [1941] 136) and B. Snell (*Gnomon* 15 [1939] 543) in their reviews of the edition.⁷

The above restoration, however, is not as probable as it first appears. Indeed, the first editor was not entirely satisfied with his supplement of line 27 (a line which would be too long in comparison with the average 22-letter line) and suggested that perhaps in lines 25–26 we should read *τους εμους οικετας* (a

⁵ The supplements suggested reproduce Dindorf's text (*Harpocrationis Lexicon in decem oratores Atticos*, [Oxford 1853]). In parentheses I give the totals of letters for each line.

⁶ As is clear from the photograph of the papyrus (cf. Roberts, plate 9), only one alpha can be read, and even that is not completely preserved. Considering the unusual length of this line, one would prefer to read *κατ' Ἀριστοκράτους* as in Dindorf.

⁷ Snell has even suggested that *Κεβ[ρην]* (in line 19) "ist nach der Tafel sicher . . . zu lesen." The traces of the third letter, however, are too meager and uncertain to be considered as decisively pointing to a beta or excluding a gamma.

variant of MS. N of Harpocration) instead of τοὺς οἰκέτας τοὺς ἐμούς. This would shorten the whole passage and thus remove the difficulty with which the editor was concerned, but it is hardly a satisfactory solution; for the suggested reading is only an isolated variant of one of the *deteriores* and is opposed to the unanimous testimony of all the other MSS. of the fuller version as well as of those of the epitome, and to the reading in the *Suda Lexicon* (indebted here to the epitome) and in the text of Demosthenes which Harpocration here quotes.

One could also question the editor's acceptance (in line 24) of the reading παραγραφῇ of the Aldina⁸ as a genuine one against the testimony of all our MSS. (including again those of the epitome as well as Photius' dictionary and the *Suda Lexicon*), which all read γραφῇ.

Finally, a careful measurement of the space between lines 23 and 28 shows that not four but only three lines could have been accommodated there originally. Roberts seems to have derived his estimate from a rough correspondence between the lines of the two columns. As is clear, however, from the photograph of the papyrus, the lines of the two columns are not on a level. Thus, line 22 clearly corresponds neither to line 7 nor line 8 but to the space between them, and so does line 23 in comparison with lines 8 and 9; and as appears from the traces of a letter at the beginning of the next-to-the-last line, this was also true for the remaining lines of Column II.⁹

Attempting a readjustment of the text in lines 23 to the end to fit a basic line of twenty-two letters, I hit upon the following arrangement:

	Κεγχρεών. Δημοσθένης ἐν τῇ	(22 letters)
	πρὸς Πανταίνετον γραφῇ καὶ	(22 „)
25	πειτ' ἔπεισε τοὺς οἰκέτας	(21 „)
	τοὺς ἐμούς καθέζεσθαι κτλ.	

A single look at the above lines is sufficient to show that their beginnings coincide completely with those of lines 19–22. If then

⁸ This reading is probably a conjecture, according to Dindorf (above, note 5), s.v. He, however, has introduced it into his text as the genuine reading.

⁹ The same can be seen also in other papyri containing lexica, e.g. in the papyrus of Apollonius, edited by E. W. Nicholson (*CR* 11 [1897] 390–93); in *PRain.* 7, edited by C. Wessely (*Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde* 4 [1905] 111–13), twenty lines of the recto correspond to only eighteen of the verso.

we place the beginning of the entry at line 19 and continue with the wording of Harpocration exactly as it is in the MSS., we arrive at the following restoration, closing the entry with what is now seen to be line 27 (instead of 28). With this restoration the strange and unexplained sign in the margin near the sigma of the last line can be interpreted as marking either the end of the entry or the reference.¹⁰

	Κεγ[χρεών. Δημοσθένης ἐν τῇ]	(22 letters)
20	πρὸ[ς Πανταίνετον γραφῇ κᾶ-]	(22 „)
	πε[ιτ' ἔπεισε τοὺς οἰκέτας]	(21 „)
	τοὺς [ἐμὸνς καθέζεσθαι εἰς τὸν]	(25 „)
	κεγχ[ρεῶνα ἀντὶ τοῦ εἰς τὸ]	(21 „)
	[καθαριστήριον ὅπου τὴν ἐκ]	(22 „)
25	[τῶν μετὰλλων κέγχρον διέψυ-]	(23 „)
	χ[ον ὡς ὑποσημαίνει Θεόφρα-]	(22 „)
	σ[τος ἐν τῷ περὶ μετὰλλων]	(end of entry)

If this restoration is accepted, the supposed quotation of Ephorus disappears from the papyrus.¹¹ This has some bearing on the more general question of whether our MSS. of Harpocration (of the so-called fuller version) contained an already abbreviated version of the original dictionary.¹² For the papyrus now proves to contain nothing more than the MSS. at this point and deprives the sponsors of epitomization of what would be a strong point in favor of their theory. It is true that the papyrus covers only four entries, for none of which was there any evidence

¹⁰ Use of various signs to mark a reference, a quotation, or simply the end of an entry are common in papyri containing dictionaries; e.g. *POxy.* 1801, 1803 and *PBerol.* 9780.

¹¹ The fact that with this restoration line 18 is left with only three letters cannot damage this theory, unless the quotation was so short as to be contained in the missing part of the line. Short lines at the conclusion of an entry are very common in papyri containing alphabetical dictionaries. Besides, it is always possible that the original dictionary contained the title of Ephorus' work and that the line read ἐν ἐ[τῶν Ἱστοριῶν. Such a reference to Ephorus' work is not without a parallel in Harpocration; cf. Dindorf (above, note 5) s.v. ἀρχαῖως.

¹² The evidence that such abbreviation possibly took place consists of a number of references as well as four glosses which appear in the epitome (especially the MS. D) but are missing from the text of the fuller version. Occasionally also the entries of the epitome offer slightly more extended explanations than the corresponding parts of the fuller version. C. Boysen (*De Harpocratonis Lexici fontibus*, Diss. Kiliae, 1876) suggested that these additions were mere interpolations and criticized Dindorf for having accepted them in the text as genuine. Kalkoff (above, note 2), however, sharply defended their genuineness, and his arguments have generally been accepted.

that they were epitomized. The consistency, however, in the agreement between our fragment and the MSS., as it appears in the order of the glosses and in the identity (even in details) of the explanations, seems to favor the view that the alleged epitomization of the fuller version—if it, indeed, took place—was limited and casual rather than intentional and systematic throughout the work, as, e.g., in the actual epitome of the *Lexicon*.

On the other hand, the existence of the *additamenta* in the MSS. of the epitome (even if we consider them as genuine) does not necessarily imply a full-scale epitomization of the fuller version. The dictionaries were not copied with the same accuracy as the texts of the classical authors; and discrepancies between the various MSS. of a dictionary, such as omissions of references and even of a few glosses as well as occasional abbreviations of the explanations, are not uncommon. Therefore, the omissions of the *additamenta* by our MSS. of the fuller version should be viewed as discrepancies due to a negligent scribe rather than to an epitomator. The negative testimony of our papyrus, as restored and evaluated above, corroborates this view and makes it possible for us to consider the dictionary, as we have it, not very different from the original work of Harpocration.*

* The material for this article is essentially taken from Chapter VI of my unpublished dissertation, *Greek Lexicography in the Papyri* (Urbana [Ill.] 1961), written under the direction of Prof. John L. Heller.