

ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΟΥ Γ. ΜΑΝΔΗΛΑΡΑ  
Βοηθοῦ Γ' "Εδρας Λατινικῆς Φιλολογίας

THE SPEECH "ON THE PEACE" OF ISOCRATES  
FROM THE BRITISH MUSEUM PAPYRUS 132<sup>1</sup>

Among the papyri of Isocrates (50 in number) the British Museum papyrus 132 deserves first place because of its date (first century A.D.), its length (1850 lines), and the literary importance of its readings.

This papyrus contains the greater part of the speech "On the Peace" (from § 13 up to the end, § 145). A collation of it was attempted by Kenyon,<sup>2</sup> who showed that in 54 passages the papyrus supports the vulgate reading and in 123 it agrees with that of the Urbinas. From these results he formed the opinion, which he expressed also in his *Palaeography*<sup>3</sup> that "of the two well-marked families into which the vellum MSS. of Isocrates are divided" (i. e. the Urbinas on the one hand and the vulgate on the other) "neither is exclusively to be trusted, and that the formation of these families does not go back to classical, or even to early Christian, times", as this papyrus in all probability dates from the first century A.D. Kenyon's collation is indeed very limited (Bell calls it "provisional") because Kenyon did not inspect all the fragments of the papyrus, while he relied on the critical apparatus of Benseler and Blass's edition of Isocrates, which has a sketchy critical apparatus presenting the variants between Γ and Λ mainly, the latter stated as *vulg(ata)*. Kenyon's

1. This article was delivered in the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists at Oxford on the 30th of July 1974. It contains the main points of my work 'Ο περὶ εἰρήνης λόγος τοῦ Ἰσοκράτους ἐκ τοῦ παπύρου τοῦ Βρετανικοῦ Μουσείου, submitted to the University of Athens for the degree of the 'Υφηγητής, and published by the "Institute of Books M. Kardamitsa" (1975).

2. F. G. Kenyon, *Classical Texts from the Papyri in the British Museum*, London 1891.

3. F. G. Kenyon, *The Palaeography of Greek Papyri*, Oxford 1897, p. 96.

serious omission was that he overlooked on the papyrus, and Bell did not seem to have paid any attention to this omission.

Bell, on the other hand, assisted by the detailed work of Drerup on the transmission of the text of Isocrates,<sup>1</sup> proceeded to a diplomatic transcription of the whole papyrus roll.<sup>2</sup> He indicated the emendations of the correctors in the foot-notes, but he based his transcription on the text of the second corrector; he proved that only one scribe had been hired for the copying of the text. This point of view was also the result of the investigation of Drerup, who, relying at first on Kenyon's assessment, spoke of two scribes in his dissertation on the codices of Isocrates.<sup>3</sup>

Bell did not fill the gaps of the papyrus, rightly I think, because the irregular dimensions of the letters and the changeable space between them do not make it possible for us to calculate accurately the number of the letters missing. Occasionally however, he did so, where the lacuna is short and the reading certain.

The papyrus text presents characteristics which enable us to realize that the scribe did not possess a profound knowledge of classical literature. He falls into various mistakes connected as a rule with phonetics, e.g. iotaism, confusion of ε and αι, or of ο and ω, or of ν and ου. He avoids assimilation of ν before the guttural and labial sounds, he uses the verbal stem γιν- instead of γιγν-, and the Koine form οὐ-θεὶς instead of οὐδεὶς. He also uses the Hellenistic form αἰεὶ for ἀεί. Many of the spelling mistakes have been put right by the second corrector. The deviations from the classical form of the language show that the scribe had been influenced by the language of his period. It would be dogmatic, however, to insist that the scribe of the papyrus is entirely responsible for these deviations; it is likely that some of them occurred in the exemplar, but in any case the correctors (including the scribe of the papyrus) make an effort to remedy the copy from mistakes of this kind.

The scribe, on the other hand, confuses letters in many cases. This could not have happened if the exemplar had been sufficiently legible to permit the scribe an accurate transcription. The confused letters are ones which look alike in a cursive writing, and that means that the exemplar was written in a sursive hand dating from the early first century A.D., not long

1. E. Drerup, "De codicis Isocrateorum auctoritate," *Leipziger Studien*, xvii (1894), pp. 1-163.

2. H. I. Bell, "The British Museum Papyrus of Isocrates," *Journ. Phil.* xxx (1907), pp. 1-83.

3. See Drerup, *De codis*, p. 94.

before the time of the copying. Note that this century, as well as the previous one, are characterized by an instability in the shape of the letters, as this period is an age of transmission of forms from one shape to another<sup>1</sup>. Moreover the peculiar shape of H from about A.D. 50 to about A.D. 160 could easily be confused with that of Y;<sup>2</sup> such a confusion, however, is unknown in the text of the papyrus; which leads to the conclusion that the papyrus text had been transcribed before A.D. 50. Now, the fact that a literary text was written in a non-literary hand (I refer to the text of the exemplar) should not surprise us, because this is not a unique case; there are examples of literary texts written in a cursive writing,<sup>3</sup> and vice versa of non-literary texts written in a literary hand.<sup>4</sup>

Moreover our case reflects the so-called "private method of circulating literature".<sup>5</sup> It seems reasonable to think that a papyrus roll was lent to be transcribed privately. This speech "On the Peace" was then copied in a cursive hand (the exemplar of the papyrus) because of unknown reasons (it could be lack of time, or lack of ability of the scribe), and from this copy the text of the papyrus was then transcribed (or perhaps rewritten) in a literary hand by a scribe who did his job very defectively, so that the owner of the papyrus was obliged to ask another person (or two) to correct the copied text.

Some of the readings in the papyrus text are incoherent. E. g. H N O Y-Θ E Σ I A N: ἦν οὐθεὶς ἀν P<sup>2</sup>, O I O Ψ O Y Θ Y N: οἴδεν P<sup>2</sup>, etc. Many of them have been corrected properly by the second corrector. This kind of error points to visual copying, and especially a silent visual copying.<sup>6</sup> Mistakes due to haplography and omission of letters as well

1. See Kenyon, Pal., p. 41.

2. See Kenyon, Pal., p. 44.

3. Cf. the papyrus of Aleman (E. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World*, Oxford 1971, pl. 16, p. 44) dating from the middle of the first century A. D. (see Kenyon, Pal., p. 82), P. Lit. Lond. 131 (end of first century A.D.) containing Aristotle's 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία and written in a cursive hand for the most part, P. Lit. Lond. 98 (second century A.D.) containing part of Hyperides 'Επιτάφιος (see Turner, *Gr. Manuscripts*, p. 1).

4. Cf. P. Lond. 44 (161 B.C.): petition, P. Lond. 141 (A.D. 88): cession of land, P. Lond. 154 (end of first century A.D.): petition, etc.

5. See Kenyon, Pal., pp. 91-92.

6. It is possible to have phonetic errors for the that the scribe pronounced aloud the text which he copied, as if he was dictating to himself. This thesis was supported by Balogh in his article "Voces Paginarum," *Philologus* lxxxii (1972), pp. 84-109, 202-240. T. C. Skeat discussed it in his paper delivered to the British Academy under

as to dittography and addition of letters lead in this direction too.

Taken all together the scribal errors in the papyrus text declare the poor education of the scribe, and prove that the text was produced by a silent reading of the exemplar on the part of the scribe. We should notice at this point that there are more than twice as many omissions as additions; this fact conveys the haste of the copying.

After these introductory remarks I would like to proceed to a general comparison between the papyrus text and that of the later MSS. with reference to certain points.

First - hiatus. It has been stated by ancient as well as modern scholars that Isocrates used every possible way of avoiding hiatus. In the scholia e. g. of Maximus Planudes to Hermogenes (V, p. 469, 8) and in Joannes Siceliota (VI, p. 156, 19) is stated that Isocrates declares in his work on "Art" δεῖ δὲ ἐν τῇ μὲν λέξει τὰ φωνήεντα μὴ συμπίπτειν. χωλὸν γάρ τὸ τοιόνδε.<sup>1</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus says more specifically that he had not found a single instance of hiatus in the whole speech of "Areopagiticus." Nevertheless there are some instances of hiatus in this speech as transmitted by Γ (in the codices of the Α group there are even more). The speech "On the Peace" on the other hand (composed by the orator at the same time as Areopagiticus) as it appears in the papyrus (and obviously in the exemplar, roughly contemporary with Dionysius) presents 17 instances of hiatus, about half of which have disappeared in the later MSS. by means of elision, aphaeresis, crasis, change of word order, or addition of the movable -v and -ç. Out of these cases of hiatus 6 appear in Α and 2 in Γ.

From this situation there arises the question: why all these instances of hiatus in the papyrus text? And another question furthermore: Is the papyrus text corrupt in these cases, or can it be considered authentic?

---

the title 'The Use of Dictation in Ancient Book Production,' *Proceedings of the B. A.* xlii (1952), pp. 181 ff. A criticism of this point of view was expressed by Knox (B. M. W.) in his work "Silent reading in Antiquity," *G. R. B. S.* ix (1968), pp. 421-435. In the case of the papyrus of Isocrates the scribe copied the text silently without doubt; otherwise we cannot explain readings which give no sense, the error of which could be perceived easily by the scribe, if he read the text loudly.

1. See G. E. Benseler, *De hiatu in oratoribus Atticis et historicis Graecis*, Freiberg 1841 (detailed but dogmatic, based on the transmission of the text of Isocrates by Γ). See also R. C. Jebb, *The Attic Orators*, Glasgow 1875, i, pp. 66-67, and the chapter "Meidung des Hiatus" in F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, Leipzig 1887-1893, ii, pp. 140 ff., as well as Reeve's article "Hiatus in the Greek Novelists," *C. Q.* xxi (1971), pp. 514-536, where bibliography.

To give a reasonable answer to these questions we must examine the cases where a word order which presents a hiatus in the papyrus is changed in the later MSS. to make the hiatus disappear.

After having examined all the passages where the word order differs from that of the vellum MSS. I have found that out of 27 (in all) 18 seem to be authentic; 4 of the authentic readings present a hiatus; they are considered genuine because they agree in the main with the personal style of Isocrates and the structural figures which he uses in a strict way. We cannot accept that the author broke the rule only in cases of hiatus, because there is not even a single instance of his breaking the rule where there is no case of hiatus. If such a thing was attempted by Isocrates himself we would expect to find no instance of hiatus in his compositions. Moreover how can we explain that someone in the time between Isocrates and the papyrus changed the word order to create thus a hiatus? On the other hand there is no reason for such a transposition of words in the papyrus text to have happened at the time of the copying. A good example is that in which a rough breathing is involved. E.g. the papyrus has  $\tau\bar{\omega}\nu\ \pi\acute{\lambda}\varepsilon\omega\nu\ \alpha\acute{\nu}\tau\bar{\varphi}\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\nu}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  while the vellum MSS. have  $\alpha\acute{\nu}\tau\bar{\varphi}\ \tau\bar{\omega}\nu\ \pi\acute{\lambda}\varepsilon\omega\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\nu}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$  (§ 24). In fact there is no case of hiatus in the word order transmitted by the papyrus, because the rough breathing was pronounced in the times of Isocrates,<sup>1</sup> consequently if a vowel bearing rough breathing was followed by a vowel did not create a real hiatus. In later times, however, when the rough breathing disappeared, such a word order could be taken as presenting a hiatus, and was changed accordingly.

Let us see another example:  $\tau\bar{\omega}\nu\ \mu\acute{\nu}\epsilon\ \acute{\nu}\kappa\acute{\nu}\ \tau\bar{\omega}\nu\ \alpha\acute{\nu}\tau\bar{\varphi}\ \kappa\acute{\nu}\tau\acute{\nu}\iota\pi\epsilon\nu\ P$ :  $\tau\bar{\omega}\nu\ \mu\acute{\nu}\epsilon\ \acute{\nu}\kappa\acute{\nu}\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{\nu}\tau\bar{\omega}\ \tau\bar{\omega}\nu\ \alpha\acute{\nu}\tau\bar{\varphi}\ \kappa\acute{\nu}\tau\acute{\nu}\iota\pi\epsilon\nu$  codd. (§ 126). The position of the reflexive pronoun is stable in the text of Isocrates. That is, it always appears the structural figure: article + noun + article (repetition) + reflexive pronoun. This figure is broken in the above passage to avoid hiatus obviously. It is questionable whe-

1. Aristotle in his essay *Topica et sophistici elenchi* (177b) referring to the words  $\delta\rho\varsigma$  and  $\delta\rho\varsigma$  writes:  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda'\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \mu\acute{\nu}\epsilon\ \tau\bar{\omega}\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\nu}\rho\acute{\nu}\mu\acute{\nu}\epsilon\ \nu\varsigma\ \tau\bar{\omega}\ \alpha\acute{\nu}\tau\bar{\omega}\ (\tau\bar{\omega})\ \delta\acute{\nu}\nu\mu\acute{\nu}\alpha$ ,  $\delta\tau\bar{\omega}\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau\bar{\omega}\nu\ \alpha\acute{\nu}\tau\bar{\omega}\ \sigma\tau\bar{\omega}\chi\acute{\nu}\iota\omega\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\nu}\rho\acute{\nu}\mu\acute{\nu}\epsilon\ \nu\ \eta\ \kappa\acute{\nu}\ \acute{\omega}\sigma\acute{\nu}\tau\bar{\omega}\varsigma$  ( $\kappa\acute{\nu}\kappa\acute{\nu}\ \delta'$ ,  $\eta\delta\eta\ \pi\acute{\nu}\rho\acute{\nu}\sigma\eta\mu\acute{\nu}\ \pi\acute{\nu}\iota\o\acute{\nu}\eta\tau\bar{\omega}\varsigma$ ),  $\tau\bar{\omega}\ \delta\acute{\nu}\ \phi\theta\acute{\nu}\gamma\acute{\nu}\mu\acute{\nu}\epsilon\ \nu\ \eta\ \tau\bar{\omega}\tau\bar{\omega}\varsigma$ . From this statement we understand that these two words were written in the same manner (notwithstanding that a symbol was used to indicate the breathing) but were pronounced differently. There are some indications that the rough breathing was pronounced even in Hellenistic times: see F. Blass - W. J. Purton, *Pronunciation of Ancient Greek*, Cambridge 1890, p. 93 and W. S. Allen, *Vox Graeca*, Cambridge 1968, p. 50.

ther Isocrates himself attempted such a transposition of words to avoid hiatus. If he did it here, why he did not avoid hiatus entirely in his work? and why a later scribe would be responsible for such a transposition a words? or why this case of hiatus escaped the attention of the second corrector who, let us notice it, consulted an extra MS. when he checked the papyrus text? A research on these cases of hiatus created by the word order given in the papyrus made me to conclude that these cases must be considered genuine. Isocrates, above all, was a stylist of first class, who built up his sentences on stereotyped patterns. He concentrated his attention on the form of the sentence neglecting, if necessary or even on purpose, cases of hiatus created by his standards. Consequently the word order in these cases was changed later by an educated scribe, or during an edition of the text of Isocrates in Byzantine times, the editor of which was eager to remove any instance of hiatus from the text of Isocrates.

In 246 passages (14 of which involve word order) the papyrus text stands in agreement with the whole corpus of the MSS. against solitary codices or the text transmitted in *Antidosis* or by Dionysius. This fact creates confidence in the papyrus text, and it shows at the same time that Dionysius had followed a tradition coming from another source.

On the other hand there are 227 passages (33 of which involve word order) in which the papyrus supports the readings of the *Urbinas*, and 96 (8 of which involve word order) in which it agrees with those of the vulgate codices. It is of some value to note here the numerical superiority of the *Urbinas* readings, but more important is the fact that the papyrus text represents the tradition of both families.

The individual variations of the papyrus are numerous (181 in number). Many of them are simply scribal errors which escaped the corrector's attention.

There remain 80 cases which discriminate the papyrus from the rest of the MSS. Some of the (12 in number) arise from readings being wholly or partly in lacunas, especially at the beginning of the papyrus roll, where the papyrus is irreparably damaged. To fill up the gaps is usually uncertain (and undesirable), especially if the lacunas happen to be at the end of the lines.

There are however lacunas which can be filled by a reading different than its parallel in the Byzantine MSS. Often the length and the shape of the lacuna as well as the situation of the papyrus there exclude any interference of the scribe in the space between the lines or in the margins. There are 4 cases of this category in the papyrus.

Another category consists of readings connected with topics of palaeography. Let us see one example: In the passage: *καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους τοὺς ἡμετέρους αὐτῶν ἰδίαι λυμαῖνόμεθα καὶ δασμολογοῦμεν, ἵνα τοῖς ἀπάντων ἀνθρώποις κοινοῖς ἐχθροῖς τὸν μισθὸν ἐκπορίζωμεν* (§ 46) the dative *ἰδίαι* presents some questionable variations. It is quoted by Dionysius and thence accepted by Benseler and Mathieu. The latter makes the following comment: "Il y a dans le texte (assuré à la fois par la citation de Denys d' Halicarnass, Dé m. 17, et par le papyrus du British Museum) une antithèse (qui a échappé à la tradition manuscrite) entre les exactions dont suffre chaque cité (*ἰδίᾳ*) et le danger général (*ἀπάντων ... κοινοῖς*) que sont les mercenaires." Sauppe suggested *ἰδίους* on the basis of the senseless reading *δι' οὓς* (Γ<sup>2</sup> Εε). The codices Θ and λ have the reading *δ' οὓς* which reflects an effort to restore the reading *ἰδίᾳ*. The various readings in the codices and the effort of modern scholars to cure the passage betray the fact that the text here is corrupt. On the ground that there is a confusion between the reading *ἰδίαι* and *βιαῖ* in the papyrus, due to the similarity of the letters ΙΔ and Β I think that here Isocrates wrote *βιαῖ λυμαῖνόμεθα...* My conjecture is confirmed by the parallel passage (§ 29) *ἢν ... βιαζώμεθα τὰς πόλεις συντάξεις διδόναι*.

It is observed that in a number of passages the codices omit readings preserved by the papyrus, and vice versa the papyrus in some other cases omits words which appear in the Byzantine MSS. In both cases this happens as a rule with the words *καὶ* and *μέν*.

Another chapter of investigation consists of readings referring to the use of the same verb but in a different tense. The interchange of tenses is often attested in the vellum MSS. not only in the text of Isocrates but also in the text of other writers. It is due to the development of the verbal system in which the tenses lost their strict and regular function they possessed during the classical period. In our case the papyrus favours the aorist which seems to be the correct verbal form. Let us see one example: In § 143 we read: *οἱ μὴ τολμῶντες ἐν ταῖς μάχαις ἀποθνήσκειν ἀτιμότεροι γίγνονται τῶν τὰς τάξεις λιπόντων* (codd.) *καὶ τὰς ἀσπίδας ἀποβαλόντων* (ἀποβαλόντων codd.). The reading of the papyrus is also preserved by the codices ΠΘλ, and that reduces the possibilities of a scribal error. The question must be examined in relation to parallel passages. Isocrates in his second letter (§ 6) writes: *ἀσπίδας ἀποβαλεῖν*. Here the use of the aorist is clearly justified by the context. In the lyric poetry in general

we find the expression  $\dot{\alpha}\sigma\pi\dot{\iota}\delta\alpha$   $\dot{\phi}\dot{\iota}\psi\alpha\iota$  or  $\dot{\alpha}\pi\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\mathfrak{v}$ , thence the compound word  $\dot{\phi}\dot{\iota}\psi\alpha\sigma\pi\iota\mathfrak{c}$ ; that is from the aorist stem. The same is valid for the expression  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\mathfrak{v}$   $\lambda\iota\pi\epsilon\iota\mathfrak{v}$ . Cf. Pl. Ap. 28e:  $\lambda\acute{\iota}\pi\mathfrak{o}\mu\mathfrak{i}\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\mathfrak{v}$ , Dem, XIII, 14:  $\lambda\iota\pi\epsilon\iota\mathfrak{v}$   $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$  ...  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\mathfrak{v}$ , Dem. XV, 32:  $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\lambda\iota\pi\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{n}\tau\alpha$   $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$  ...  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\mathfrak{v}$ , Aeschin. III, 159:  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\iota\mathfrak{v}$   $\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\pi\epsilon\mathfrak{v}$ , etc., thence the compound word  $\lambda\iota\pi\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\kappa\tau\eta\mathfrak{c}$ ; that is from the aorist stem. Moreover the act itself of "throwing away the shield" and "deserting the line in the battle" is characterized by the "momentary aspect." All these confirm the reading transmitted in the papyrus.

In some other cases neither the papyrus nor the codices seem to have preserve the right reading. E.g. in § 116 the papyrus reads:  $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\mathfrak{v}$   $\kappa\mathfrak{a}\iota$   $\Lambda\alpha\kappa\epsilon\delta\alpha\iota\mu\mathfrak{o}\nu\mathfrak{i}\omega\mathfrak{v}$   $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\dot{\eta}\mathfrak{v}$ , while the codices omit the word  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\dot{\eta}\mathfrak{v}$ . The absence of this word gives an entirely different meaning to the passage. It means that the writer is not talking about  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\dot{\eta}\mathfrak{v}$  (this word cannot be omitted from the text), but about  $\pi\acute{\o}\lambda\iota\mathfrak{v}$  (this word can be omitted) as it appears from the previous phrase  $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\pi\acute{\o}\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\tau\mathfrak{o}\mathfrak{u}\tau\omega$ . But, on the other hand, the orator seems to have in mind the  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\dot{\eta}\mathfrak{v}$  (cf.  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\dot{\eta}\mathfrak{v}$   $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\dot{\alpha}$   $\theta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\alpha\mathfrak{v}$  and  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\xi\alpha\iota$   $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\mathcal{E}\acute{\alpha}\lambda\dot{\eta}\mathfrak{v}\omega\mathfrak{v}$  in the same paragraph). The use of the word  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\dot{\eta}\mathfrak{v}$  in this passage aims to raise any ambiguity in the speech. The phrase however does not correspond to the structure which Isocrates would use:  $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\Lambda\alpha\kappa\epsilon\delta\alpha\iota\mu\mathfrak{o}\nu\mathfrak{i}\omega\mathfrak{v}$   $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\dot{\eta}\mathfrak{v}$ . It is likely that the papyrus has preserved the noun  $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\dot{\eta}\mathfrak{v}$  and the codices the article  $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$ , the authentic reading being  $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\mathfrak{v}$   $\kappa\mathfrak{a}\iota$   $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\Lambda\alpha\kappa\epsilon\delta\alpha\iota\mu\mathfrak{o}\nu\mathfrak{i}\omega\mathfrak{v}$   $\dot{\alpha}\rho\chi\dot{\eta}\mathfrak{v}$  (cf. also Phil. 104). Let us cite another instance:  $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\beta\dot{\iota}\dot{\alpha}$   $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\tau\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{r}\alpha\mathfrak{v}\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{d}\alpha\mathfrak{c}$   $\kappa\mathfrak{a}\iota$   $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\pi\acute{\o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\mathfrak{c}$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{n}\tau\omega\mathfrak{v}$  (§ 143):  $\kappa\mathfrak{a}\iota$   $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\pi\acute{\o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\mathfrak{c}$  om. codd. As a matter of fact those who hold despotic power hold the cities too; so the phrase  $\kappa\mathfrak{a}\iota$   $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\pi\acute{\o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\mathfrak{c}$  in the papyrus is superfluous. In the same speech the orator uses the phrase  $\tau\mathfrak{o}\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{c}$   $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\tau\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{r}\alpha\mathfrak{v}\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{d}\alpha\mathfrak{c}$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{n}\tau\alpha\mathfrak{c}$  (§ 89), both passages being connected in sense. Here the word  $\beta\dot{\iota}\dot{\alpha}$  is omitted, rightly because those who hold despotic power hold it "by force." So we have two phrases equal in sense: (a)  $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\tau\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{r}\alpha\mathfrak{v}\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{d}\alpha\mathfrak{c}$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{n}\tau\omega\mathfrak{v}$  and (b)  $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\beta\dot{\iota}\dot{\alpha}$   $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\pi\acute{\o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\mathfrak{c}$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{n}\tau\omega\mathfrak{v}$ . The latter phrase is supported by the passage (§ 17):  $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\dot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\alpha\tau\mathfrak{r}\alpha\mathfrak{c}$   $\pi\acute{\o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\mathfrak{c}$   $\beta\dot{\iota}\dot{\alpha}$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{n}\tau\omega\mathfrak{v}$ . It is likely that the text had at first  $\tau\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{v}$   $\beta\dot{\iota}\dot{\alpha}$   $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\pi\acute{\o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\mathfrak{c}$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{n}\tau\omega\mathfrak{v}$  and  $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\tau\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{r}\alpha\mathfrak{v}\mathfrak{n}\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{d}\alpha\mathfrak{c}$  was written later as an interpretation to  $\beta\dot{\iota}\dot{\alpha}$   $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\pi\acute{\o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\mathfrak{c}$  to be inserted in the text by a scribe. The words  $\kappa\mathfrak{a}\iota$   $\tau\dot{\alpha}\mathfrak{c}$   $\pi\acute{\o}\lambda\epsilon\iota\mathfrak{c}$  was omitted in the codices because it was incopatable to the sense, but the word  $\beta\dot{\iota}\dot{\alpha}$  remained though it was incopatable too.

Another topic of consideration is the fact the papyrus text in 36 cases (6 of which involve word order) stands apart from the later MSS. which in these cases are deviated. It is obvious that a number of these readings deserves a place in the critical apparatus, and it is worth observing that this situation betrays the fact that the text of Isocrates underwent a further corruption in Byzantine times.

Examining the emendations of the first corrector, who happened to be the scribe of the papyrus himself, we observe that all refer to scribal errors which seem to have attracted the corrector's attention at the time of the transcription of the text. It is also clear that this corrector had only the exemplar in front of his eyes as there are no variants pointing in any way in another direction.

Considering now the corrections of the second corrector we notice that he concerned himself at first with the restoration of the text with regard to scribal errors (i. e. he corrected letters confused by the copyist, he erased superfluous letters, or he added letters or words omitted by the scribe. He also corrected spelling mistakes due to *iota cism* for the most part. He arranged thus the text in 293(!) cases (not to include corrections which probably came out of his hand) in agreement with the whole corpus of the MSS. 34 of these cases are worthy of note, as they betray the corrector's knowledge of classical literature. There are moreover 33 instances in which this corrector has altered the reading of the papyrus to that of the Urbinas, and 9 to that of the vulgate. This situation leads to the reasonable thought that he consulted a MS. kindred with the Urbinas family, but not yet distinguished from that of the vulgate.

An examination of the readings of the second corrector in comparison with the codices on the one hand and with the papyrus text on the other gives the following data: The second corrector agrees with the codices in 11 readings, while he differs from them in 18. Moreover he agrees with  $\Gamma$  in 13 cases, and with  $\Lambda$  in 5. In 9 cases he differs from the papyrus text being different from the codices, and in 41 he differs from the papyrus text being the same with the codices. Thus:

$P^2 = \text{codd.}$	$P^2 \neq \text{codd.}$	$P^2 = \Gamma$	$P^2 = \Lambda$	$P^2 : P \neq \text{codd.}$	$P^2 : P = \text{codd.}$
11	18	13	5	9	41

With reference to the third corrector the situation is rather obscure. He corrected the text in 14 cases between the lines 664 and 1303 inclusive. But why not in the other parts of the papyrus? If he had revised the text, he should have started from the beginning. On the other hand the second

corrector could not have left these passages uncorrected, given that he has been present in adjacent lines. More specifically, line 1231 was left blank by the original scribe and was filled up by the corrector. But it is reasonable to accept that the second corrector found this line filled, when he read the papyrus text. Considering also the fact that the corrections ascribed to the third corrector resemble essentially and in form those of the first corrector (the scribe) we must not exclude the possibility of the identity between the first and the third correctors.

In conclusion, the papyrus text shows that the transmission of the text of Isocrates is in general trustworthy. In some however the papyrus give better readings which can be proved to be authentic. It also gives us the occasion to dispute the position of modern scholars who do not accept hiatus in the text of Isocrates, to revise our outlook towards the "best" MS. (i. e.  $\Gamma$ ), and examine readings which had not been suspected because of the agreement between all codices.

The fact that there are authentic readings in the papyrus does not presuppose its superiority to the Byzantine MSS. Each case must be considered individually.

The papyrus sometimes gives a better solution to a difficult passage, where any attempt of modern scholars has been proved unsatisfactory; it offers in general new criteria on which a future edition of the text of Isocrates may rely with confidence.