

TERESA MORGAN

SOME LOST FRAGMENTS OF HYPERIDES

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 123 (1998) 75–77

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

SOME LOST FRAGMENTS OF HYPERIDES

Some fragments of a famous papyrus of Hyperides have turned up in a collection in the library of St. John's College, Cambridge. Two of the three largest have had a chequered history in published editions, and it may be useful to future editors to know where they are; the third appears not to have been published, and I transcribe it here (cf. Tafel II).¹

The fragments are stuck onto large pieces of card together with an assortment of other papyrus fragments in several languages. The collection belonged to Churchill Babington, Fellow of St. John's College 1846-8 and Honorary Fellow 1880-89. He labelled the three largest Hyperides fragments 1-3 and two of them were published as Bb II and III by Blass in the Teubner edition of 1869. Blass placed them both in the Oration against Demosthenes:

Bb III ὕ]πὸ το[ῦ ψη-]
 φίσματος [ήλωκέ-]
 ναι σε αὐτόμ[ατον, οὐ-]
 κ ἐποίησαν
 γενομέν ———
 * * *
 π
 πα
 το ἐτ
 ρ
 ρε

Bb II μ εϋπ ε
 [σ]θαί εὐεργετήματ[α·]
 οὐ γὰρ τὴν ἑτέρων
 [π]ατριίδα εἶ π[ο]ιεῖν
 [αὐ]τοῦς, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἑαυ-
 [τῶν, ο]ὐδὲ μ..... ε²

Blass identified a further fragment, Bb IV, with part of column XXXVI of the Oration against Demosthenes, but of that fragment only a scatter of almost illegible half-letters now survives, and the conjecture is impossible to confirm.

The papyrus from which these fragments come is a fine bookhand production of the first century BCE or CE, containing Hyperides' speeches *Against Demosthenes*, *For Lycophron* and *For Euxenippus*.³ Large fragments of *Demosthenes* and *Lycophron* were acquired by A. C. Harris in Thebes in 1847

¹ Prof. Eric Handley surprised and delighted me by telling me of the existence of these fragments, and his comments on an earlier draft of this article were invaluable. The fragments are published by kind permission of the Master and Fellows of St. John's College, to whom I should like to record my thanks for three very happy years spent as a member of the Fellowship.

² There is a margin at the left hand side; the pieces are broken on all other sides. Blass's reconstruction in his 1881 edition, reproduced here, has been generally accepted by other editors.

³ P.Lond. inv. 108+115 = P.Lit. Lond. 132, C. H. Roberts, *Greek Literary Hands* (Oxford, 1956) no. 13b. He dates it to the first half of the second century CE, noting a considerable history of controversy over the date. Babington had put it as

and parts of *Lycophron* and *Euxenippus* by Joseph Arden in Thebes in 1848. Both made immediate facsimile editions of their finds. Babington knew both men, doubtless through the Royal Society of Antiquaries where they first showed the texts, and quickly interested himself in them, helping Arden with his edition and making a second edition of Harris' *Demosthenes* in 1850. None of these editions, however, includes Babington's fragments (though they include others as small), and it is a puzzle how and when these came into Babington's possession. They are more likely to come from among the fragments purchased by Harris than those of Arden, since Harris's collection included fragments of *Demosthenes*. The file in which Babington's fragments have been preserved, however, is labelled, in a late nineteenth or early twentieth century hand (not Babington's) as 'Papyri from Thebes: Joseph Arden 1847'. Babington himself merely notes that the fragments 'come from the same papyrus as that edited by Mr. Harris and Mr. Arden'.

Bb II and III appear in Blass's 1869 edition as unplaced fragments 13 and 14 of the speech against Demosthenes. As a former editor of both parts of the papyrus, Babington was a natural person for Blass to consult in making his edition; Blass must also have communicated with Arden and Harris, who were still in possession of their fragments. Evidently Babington had never seen his pieces attached to larger portions of text and could not tell Blass where they came from; rediscovering the fragments, therefore, regrettably does not help us to decide whether they are rightly placed by Blass. In Teubner's second edition (1881), Blass moved Bb III to the end of *Dem.* col. 28, fr. 8, noting that it seems to make sense there, and Bb II to the end of col. 29, fr. 8, noting that no better place could be found for it.

At this point, knowledge of the whereabouts of Babington's fragments was lost. Babington died in 1889; Harris and Arden had already donated their papyri to the British Museum in 1872 and 1879 respectively. When F. G. Kenyon made his 1907 edition of Hyperides for Oxford University Press, he worked only from the British Museum fragments, and Babington's fragments appear neither in his edition nor in subsequent Oxford Classical Texts. Other editors have mainly followed Blass, though there has been some renumbering of fragments and columns over the years; their inclusion of Bb II and III, however, has been a matter of faith.

Though small, the fragments are well-preserved on good quality papyrus, only slightly brown with age. The ink is still very dark and readings fairly clear. Bb I-III are accompanied by several tiny fragments of one or two letters, none of which appears to belong to them. I cannot improve on Blass's readings of Bb II and III, and it is disappointing not to be able to strengthen the case for the fragments' position, but at least future editors will know where to look at them.

The other sizeable fragment in Babington's scrapbook, Bb I, must also have been known to Blass, but for some reason he did not publish it. It has never seen the light of day, but since other small fragments have been successfully fitted in to the speeches over the years, it is worth transcribing it here.

Bb I]	τ[
] ρηται	α[
]σ	ι[
]	βαι . [
5]ν	ριτη[
]	νεισ[
]	σι [
]	εμ[
].	εμ [

early as 150 BCE; A. C. Milne (*Catalogue of Literary Papyri in the British Museum*, London, 1927 p. 99) at c.100 CE, describing it as a 'rounded, rather elegant uncial hand'. Pack² 1233 notes the the existence of some other scattered small pieces, but not these.

10]	ταφη[
]	μοιχε[
]	ομηθ[
]	[.] [.] εφ[

This is the top of a column. The intercolumnar space in the second line is 1.8cm, slightly less than the average 2cm. As it goes down the page, the beginning of the column drifts to the left by 0.5cm in 13 lines. This is noticeably less than the average leftwards drift elsewhere in the papyrus, and affords our best chance of placing the fragment. It cannot be fitted anywhere in the *Euxenippus* or *Lycophron* (despite the tempting reading μοιχε- in line 11): the drift is too small and there is no likely-looking lacuna. It must therefore come from the *Demosthenes*. Three of Harris's fragments - 9, 10 and 13 - show a similar drift, and all of these come from a sheet, or sheets, of a particularly pale and fine-grained papyrus, distinctive even among the good average quality of sheets in this roll. The papyrus of Bb III is very similar, despite being differently stored for 150 years, so it seems likely that this fragment came from the same part of the text as Harris's fragments 9, 10 and 13. I have made no further progress in placing it, but a future editor may perhaps do so.

Newnham College, Cambridge, CB3 9DF
U.K.

Teresa Morgan



Frr. Bb I–V of Hyperides *Demosthenes* from the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge, by Kind Permission of the Master and Fellows of St. John's College; T. Morgan, pp. 75–77