

ENRICO MEDDA

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF LYSIAS, *AGAINST HIPPOTHESES*
(P. Oxy. 1606)

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 129 (2000) 21–28

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF LYSIAS, *AGAINST HIPPOThERSES*
(P. Oxy. 1606)*

The fragmentary speeches transmitted only on papyri are a part of Lysias' production that has received little attention from scholars. There is still a lot of work to be done on them, especially on textual problems. Among the papyri of Lysias, P. Oxy. XIII 1606 is certainly the one for which a critical revision and an up-to-date edition of the text are most needed.¹

The manuscript contains fragments of at least four previously unknown orations (the speech *Against Hippotherses*, a speech directed against a certain Theomnestus and another two – or, more probably, three or four – speeches). In spite of their importance for our knowledge of Lysias, the text the reader finds in the three existing editions of these fragments (Grenfell and Hunt 1919, Gernet and Bizos 1926 [1989⁵] and Albinì 1955) is often unreliable, because it does not correspond to the actual condition of the papyrus. After the admirable reconstruction of the speeches made by Grenfell and Hunt in the *editio princeps*, in fact, the physical arrangement of the fragments changed considerably around 1925, as a result of Edgar Lobel's work. Lobel managed to place correctly a certain number of fragments and published his findings in two short notes that appeared in the «Bodleian Quarterly Record», but were totally neglected by scholars, including the editors of the fragments of Lysias.² Direct examination of the papyrus would have revealed the situation, but neither Gernet and Bizos 1926 nor Albinì 1955 based their editions on a new collation of the manuscript: they just reprinted the text of Grenfell and Hunt 1919 with slight conjectural modifications and occasional misunderstandings.³

Lobel's intervention considerably reduced the number of independent fragments (there were 155 of them in the *editio princeps*). Owing to this fact, in future editions of Lysias a change in the numbering (both of the fragments and lines of the text) will be needed.⁴ Furthermore, Lobel's joins offer a certain amount of new readings, so that in several passages Grenfell and Hunt's transcription is by now out of date and their restoration of the text is no longer acceptable.

I shall leave a thorough discussion of P. Oxy. 1606 for another occasion. In these pages my analysis is confined to three passages of the speech *Against Hippotherses* where I propose some new readings and supplements to the text.

* These notes are part of a general re-examination of the papyrus fragments of Lysias that I have undertaken in order to prepare a new edition of these texts. My transcriptions from P. Oxy. 1606 are based on inspection of the original that I saw in July 1999. I had previously worked on excellent photographs supplied by the Bodleian Library in Oxford (where the manuscript is kept as Ms. Gr. Class. B. 19 (P)/1–3). I am grateful to Professor C. Carey for reading these pages and discussing problems in the text of P. Oxy. 1606 with me. He advanced some interesting suggestions and kindly allowed me to see a provisional draft of the relevant sections of his edition of Lysias, to appear in the OCT series. I was pleased to see that the supplement [ἄκριτον] in fr. 1, l. 8 occurred independently to both of us. I am also indebted to L. Battezzato for helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

¹ The papyrus was found in January 1906 and first published by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt in 1919. The *editio princeps* will be quoted here as the work of both scholars, though the continued absence from Oxford on military duties during the war prevented Hunt to take active part in the preparation of the XIII volume of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (he only revised some of the papyri and the proofs).

² Cf. Lobel 1926 and 1929. Lobel made the new joins while preparing the manuscript for mounting, after it had been assigned to the Bodleian Library. As far as I know, Sakurai 1995 (esp. p. 177 n. 2) is the first study on P. Oxy. 1606 that takes into account Lobel's articles. Note however that the entry τόκος in the ninth edition of LSJ (1940) registers Lobel's supplement τ[όκο]ν νυνὶ φρονεῖ in fr. 6+80+104, ll. 194–195.

³ See Medda 1995, 564–65.

⁴ I shall adopt a new numbering in my forthcoming edition of the text. For the sake of clarity, however, I prefer to maintain here the numbering of Grenfell and Hunt 1919.

Fr. 1, ll. 7–13:

]ξέφυ[.]ν..[
]...[.]ναυτ[.]υ[
]απέκτεινανκαιτηγ[
]αφείλοντο και[10
]γενπειραιειωι[χ].[
]ουκατελθωνα.[
]εθαινυνιδεεπε[

The sentence in ll. 7–10 was thus reconstructed by Grenfell and Hunt:⁵

ἐ]ξέφυ[γε]ν, τὸ[ν δὲ ἀ-
]δελφ[ὸ]ν αὐτ[ο]ῦ [Πολέμαρχον
] ἀπέκτειναν καὶ τὴν [οὐσί-
 α]ν ἀφείλοντο 10

The editors pointed out in the commentary that «Πολέμαρχον is rather long for the lacuna, but seems necessary».⁶ Taking into account this difficulty, A. Messina proposed to supply the shorter [ἐκείνοι] (*scil.* the Thirty), in order to clarify the change from the singular [ἐ]ξέφυ[γε]ν (whose subject is surely Lysias) to the plural ἀπέκτειναν.⁷ However, the Thirty were most probably mentioned in the lost lines before l. 7 and the subject of ἀπέκτειναν can be easily understood.

I would prefer to supply here an additional detail about the circumstances of Polemarchos' death. The text could have included a reference to the fact that he was put to death without trial, a point on which Lysias insists in the well-known narration of XII 17: Πολεμάρχῳ δὲ παρήγγειλαν οἱ τριάκοντα τοῦτ' ἐκείνων εἰθισμένον παράγγελμα, πίνειν κώνειον, πρὶν τὴν αἰτίαν εἰπεῖν δι' ἣντινα ἔμελλεν ἀποθανεῖσθαι· οὕτω πολλοῦ ἔδεγχε κριθῆναι καὶ ἀπολογῆσθαι.

I propose to write:

τὸ[ν δὲ ἀ-]
 δελφ[ὸ]ν αὐτ[ο]ῦ [ἄκριτον]⁸
 ἀπέκτειναν.

Similar expressions can be found in other passages where Lysias highlights the violent and illegal character of the actions taken by the oligarchic government of the Thirty: cf. XII 36 ὁμολογοῦσιν ἐκόντες πολλοὺς τῶν πολιτῶν ἀκρίτους ἀποκτινύναι, XII 82 καὶ οὗτοι μὲν τοὺς οὐδὲν ἀδικοῦντας ἀκρίτους ἀπέκτειναν and XII 83 ἱκανὴν ἂν τοῦ φόνου δίκην λάβοιμεν, ὧν οὗτοι πατέρας καὶ υἱεὶς καὶ ἀδελφοὺς ἀκρίτους ἀπέκτειναν;⁹

⁵ Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 52 (their text is accepted by Gernet and Bizos 1926 and Albini 1955). The reading δελφ[at l. 8 is very uncertain. The first visible letter is very damaged (perhaps δ, but κ, λ or α cannot be excluded); the second trace could be the lower part of ε or c. After a lacuna, I see part of a horizontal stroke followed by an inclined vertical trace under the line: the latter could perhaps be interpreted as the lowest part of φ.

⁶ Cf. Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 68. Grenfell and Hunt's proposal was based on XII 17 and on the passage of pseudo-Plutarchus which deals with the confiscation of Lysias' properties and the death of his brother (*Dec. or. vit.* 835 E ἀφαρθεῖς τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Πολέμαρχον). Though a connection between P. Oxy. 1606, fr. 1, ll. 7 ff. and the biography seems likely, I do not consider the presence of Polemarchos' name strictly necessary in l. 8. The arrest of the two brothers was probably narrated in the lost lines that preceded l. 7, and we may guess that the name of Polemarchos was mentioned there.

⁷ Messina 1950, 64.

⁸ Another possible (though less attractive) supplement is the rare adverb ἀκριτί, whose only occurrence in classical Greek is Lysias fr. 88, 3 T. ἀκριτὶ ἀποθνήσκειν.

⁹ See also, in different contexts, [VI] 54, XIX 7, XXV 26.

The reconstruction of ll. 10–13 is more difficult. The starting point for Grenfell and Hunt's restoration was the reading $\omega\chi\text{.}$ at the end of l. 11:

καὶ [ἔως 10
 μὲ]ν ἐν Πειραιεῖ ὄχ[ε]το ἡ-
 ξί]ου κατελθὼν ἀπ[ο]φέ-
 ρ]εσθαι.

I agree with the first editors that ἐν Πειραιεῖ refers to the time spent by Lysias at the Piraeus together with Thrasybulus and the democratic exiles who were preparing the final attack against the Thirty.¹⁰ However, the verb ὄχ[ε]το cannot be right in a sentence that describes the stay of the orator at the Piraeus;¹¹ furthermore, ἐν Πειραιεῖ ὄχ[ε]το is not the kind of phrase that we would expect for an exile returning to the Piraeus.¹²

Lipsius tried to solve the problem by emending the text of the papyrus, and proposed to write ὄκε[ι]. The syntax of the phrase is improved by this change, but its meaning still remains unsatisfying. Lysias had a house at the Piraeus and had been living there for years before the onset of the oligarchy. It seems improbable that he could use a phrase like «until he lived at the Piraeus» meaning to refer only to the short time he spent there with the exiles in 403.¹³

Neither Grenfell and Hunt nor Lipsius had doubts about the reading $\omega\chi\text{.}$ at l. 11.¹⁴ However, careful examination of the traces of ink on the papyrus leads, in my opinion, to a different reconstruction of the passage. Besides the two oblique strokes intersecting each other to form the χ of $\omega\chi\text{.}$, two small traces can be seen – one on the left and one on the right of the letter – that are probably the surviving extremities of a third oblique inclined line, slightly rising towards the right and crossing the other two. All the three strokes are damaged in their central part. It seems then that the scribe crossed out the χ in order to delete it. There is also another sign that he intended to delete the letter: a small trace of ink above the χ (a dot, or what survives of a very short horizontal line?) that looks like a shorter form of the lines used elsewhere by the scribe to indicate deletion (see fr. 1, l. 16; fr. 6, col. II, l. 202; fr. 6 col. III, l. 230). Perhaps the scribe decided to add a second stroke over the letter because he thought that the small horizontal line above it was not enough. The slightly anomalous character of this deletion in comparison with the other might depend on the circumstance that only one letter was involved.

So, my transcription of l. 11 is as follows:

¹⁰ Cf. Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 69. The fragments of the speech *Against Hippothereses* have thrown new light on this part of Lysias' biography. Before the publication of P. Oxy. 1606 the presence of the orator at the Piraeus could be inferred from XII 53 ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ ἦλθομεν, but it was not certain that Lysias included himself in the plural first person ἦλθομεν.

¹¹ This was first noted by Lipsius 1920, 2 n. 2. The translations of Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 66 «while he was away at the Piraeus», Collart 1919, 50 «tandis que Lysias était au Pirée», and Gernet and Bizos 1926 «tant qu'il fut au Pirée» strain the meaning of the verb, because they neglect the notion of movement that is implied in it; and even if the construction of ἐν with the dative could be explained by giving it the meaning recorded in LSJ s.v. ἐν I 8 («implying both *motion to* and subsequent *position in* a place»), the imperfect would nevertheless be out of place. I did not manage to find convincing parallels in classical Greek for the meaning of οἴχομαι with the dative that would be required here (we cannot find support in the late verses of *Epigr.* 1280, 3 Peek, II–III century A.D., ὄχετο δ' ἐν νεκύεσσι λιπὼν πατρὶ πένθος ἄληκτον, where attention is focused on the departure of the dead to the underworld).

¹² We find elsewhere ἐλθεῖν or κατελθεῖν εἰς Πειραιᾶ (cf. XII 53, 97; XVI 4; XXXI 8 and 9); at XXXI 8 the phrase εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ συνελέγοντο describes the gathering of the exiles. At XIII 90, when the accuser mentions the alleged presence of Agoratus at the Piraeus in the headquarters of the democrats, the verb he uses is the simple εἶναι (the two passages are quoted below).

¹³ Albini's translation «finché rimase al Pireo» slightly strains the meaning of the verb. For the evidence that Lysias lived at the Piraeus before the onset of the oligarchy see Blass 1887, 347; Dover 1968, 30.

¹⁴ As far as I can see, only Koerte 1924, 157 n. 2, who accepted Lipsius' ὄκε[ι], showed a bit of uncertainty about the reading of l. 11: «so Lipsius sicher richtig für das überlieferte (?) ὄχε[το]».

]νενηπειραιεωι[χ].[

The trace of the last damaged letter is probably to be interpreted as ε. With this new reading, I propose to supply the imperfect ᾤε[το], which restores a verb («he thought», «he believed») that seems necessary in the sentence.¹⁵

At this stage, what we need is another verb that describes the stay of Lysias at the Piraeus; it must also be part of a temporal clause, in order to supply an antecedent for νυνὶ δὲ of l. 13. At l. 10–11 Grenfell and Hunt supplied [ἔως μὲν] (a parallel for this can be found at XXXII 9). [ὅτε μὲν] is also possible, in my opinion: it occurs in combination with νῦν δέ at XXIV 8 (cf. Isocr. XX 40, Dem. XXXIV 44), and is also used at XII 26 (with ἐπειδή) and XXXIV 11. The verb can be inserted (provided that it is very short) at the beginning of l. 11, before the words ἐν Πειραιεῖ: I suggest the imperfect ἦν, used twice by Lysias at XIII 90 with reference to the alleged presence of Agoratus at the Piraeus (εἰ μὲν οὖν οὗτος μὲν ἐν ἄστει ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν Πειραιεῖ ἦμεν and οὗτος ἐν Πειραιεῖ ἦν).

This is my reconstruction of ll. 10–11:

καὶ [ὅτε (vel ἔως) μὲν
ἦν]¹⁶ ἐν Πειραιεῖ ᾤ[χ]ε[το]

My supplements require 20 letters for l. 10; this is a perfectly suitable number in view of the fact that the lines of the papyrus range from 15 to 22 letters. We may also observe that l. 9, if Grenfell and Hunt's supplement τὴν [οὐσί-/α]ν is right, had four more letters after the last visible one. Since καὶ at l. 10 ends under the τ of τὴν, it is well possible to find room for 6 letters – two of them narrow – after it.

At ll. 12–13 we must supply an infinitive governed by ᾤε[το], whose first letter was surely α, while the second can be read as ι or ν (perhaps also μ; π or γ are less likely). Grenfell and Hunt wrote ἀπ[οφέρ]εσθαι («to get it back») in the text, but in the commentary they suggested ἀν[ακομίζ]εσθαι, which better fits the traces of the second letter and was preferred by Lipsius.¹⁷ This verb does not occur elsewhere in Lysias, but its meaning can be easily explained as an extension of the simple κομίζεσθαι, «to get back». ¹⁸ However, it is not easy to explain why the compound verb should have been preferred only in this passage; moreover, Grenfell and Hunt's κ[ομίζε]σθαι is a very likely supplement at ll. 16–17, and a repetition of the same verb is not attractive. In view of the lack of more convincing supplements, I have made up my mind to accept ἀν[ακομίζ]εσθαι *dubitanter*.¹⁹

¹⁵ Grenfell and Hunt 1919 placed this verb at ll. 11–12. Their proposal [ἦ-/ξί]ου was accepted by Lipsius 1920, 2 n. 2; Koerte 1924, 157; Gernet and Bizos 1926; Ferckel 1937, 66 n. 405 (whose transcription of the beginning of l. 12 as]ξίτου is inaccurate); Messina 1950, 64; Albinì 1955.

¹⁶ For ὅτε μὲν ἦν cf. ὅτε μὲν ἦν νεώτερος at Plato *Sophist.* 243 b 7 and Isocr. *Antid.* 15. The validity of the two parallels is not undermined by the fact that in both places ἦν is copula.

¹⁷ Cf. Lipsius 1920, 2 n. 2. Ἀποφέρεισθαι can sometimes mean «to bring back» things or persons (cf. LSJ *s.v.*, II), but it does not seem the right word in a phrase that concerns Lysias' whole property. For other meanings of the verb in the *corpus Lysiacum* cf. XII 18 (where it refers to the transport of Polemarchos' body); XVI 6 («make a list»); XXX 5 (λόγον ἀποφέρειν, «render an account»).

¹⁸ Cf. *Against Hippotherses* fr. 2, l. 43; III 25; XXIX 6, and above all XXIX 14 τὰ ὑμέτερά αὐτῶν κομιεῖσθε. See also LSJ *s.v.* ἀνακομίζεσθαι II («bring back», «recover»).

¹⁹ A verb meaning «to get back» at l. 13 is necessary, in my opinion, to restore the opposition between ll. 10–13 and ll. 14–17 (the intransitive αἰ[τιάσ]εσθαι, supplied by Messina 1950, 64, is not attractive). I have considered ἀν[ακτῆ]εσθαι, though I do not have much confidence in it. The verb does not occur in the orators, with the exception of [Dem.] LXVI 51 (ἐκ τοῦ τὴν σὴν φύσιν ἐπαινεῖν ἀνακτῆεσθαι σε προσδοκῶν). It is used by Aesch. *Choeph.* 237, *Soph.* fr. 358 R. (= Hesych. α 4857 Latte ἀνέκτημαι ἀνείληφα), Herodot. I 50, 61; III 73; VI 83; Xen. *Cyrop.* I 3, 9, 2; I 11, 2, 8; VII 5, 55, 6. In these authors, however, the verb has objects like «power» or «kingdom», or refers to persons; at Aesch. *Choeph.* 237 ἄλκη πεποισθῶς δῶμ' ἀνακτῆρη πατρὸς the object is a house, but it is clear that Agamemnon's palace is mentioned primarily as a symbol of the power that Orestes will recover after his vengeance.

The infinitive did not have an expressed object in Grenfell and Hunt's reconstruction; but now that their [ῆξι]ου at ll. 11–12 is no longer necessary, there is room to supply one. The supplement must end with the letters ου, and considering that at the beginning of l. 16 we find the words τὰ ἑαυτοῦ clearly deleted by the scribe, it seems reasonable to think that the deletion concerned two words that had been repeated in the text by mistake. It is possible that τὰ ἑαυτοῦ was first written in the correct position at ll. 11–12 and then written again and deleted at l. 16.²⁰ If this hypothesis is right, the passage can be restored thus:

καὶ [ὅτε μὲν
ῆ]ν ἐν Πειραιεῖ ᾧε[το τὰ ἑαυ-
τοῦ κατελθὼν ἀν[ακομί-
ζ]εσθαι.

L. 11 would be rather long if spelled with the *scriptio plena* [τὰ ἑαυτ]οῦ. It would have included 22 letters plus the deleted χ. This length would still be acceptable, but it is possible to leave a letter out writing [τὰ αὐτ]οῦ. The form αὐτοῦ is found in fr. 6 col. II, l. 177.²¹

Fr. 6 col. II, ll. 203–207:

μεταμελη[.]νο[
ατηνηλικι[.]ν[
ωνγεγενημεγ[205
φαντειτουςπολλ[
θαυμασειργα[.]

Grenfell and Hunt supplied:

ο[ὑδὲ δι-]
ὰ τὴν ἡλικί[α]ν β[ελτί-]
ων γεγενημέν[οσ κυκο-] 205
φαντεῖ τοὺς πολλ[οὺς με-]
θ' ἃ ὑμᾶς εἰργά[α]το

and guessed that the last word of l. 207 was κακά.²² The first part of this reconstruction (until l. 205) is good and can be accepted. The defendant is reminding the jurors that Hippotherses, after his youthful anti-democratic adventure at Dekeleia, has not mended his ways with age. The present [κυκο]φαντεῖ seems certain too, since the context requires an opposition between the past and the present.

Far less satisfying, in my opinion, are Grenfell and Hunt's supplements at ll. 205–206. [κυκο]φαντεῖ τοὺς πολλ[οὺς] («he slanders the democracy», in Grenfell and Hunt's translation),²³ is an unusual expression which lacks convincing parallels and can hardly describe Hippotherses' behaviour before

²⁰ According to Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 69, τὰ ἑαυτοῦ could have been added in the margin of ll. 12–13. Messina 1950, 60 suggests the transposition of τὰ ἑαυτοῦ before κατελθὼν, in connection with a reconstruction of the passage based on the supplement αἰ[τή-/c]εσθαι at ll. 12–13 (at l. 16 Messina replaces the transposed text with the words τὰ φανερά).

²¹ C. Carey suggested to me the shorter form [τὰ αὐτοῦ] as a supplement for this line. He regards my reading and restoration of l. 11 as possible, and proposes e.g. [τότε / μὲ]ν ἐν Πειραιεῖ ᾧε[το τὰ αὐ-/ε]οῦ κτλ.

²² Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 54–55, 71.

²³ Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 67. See also the translations of Gernet and Bizos 1926 («il calomnie la démocratie après ce qu'il vous a fait»), Albin 1955 («si mette anche, dopo i bei servizi che vi ha reso, a calunniare la democrazia»), Collart 1919, 54 («il diffame le régime démocratique»).

and during the trial.²⁴ As for [με]θ' ἃ ὑμᾶς εἰργά[σ]α[το] at ll. 206–207, such a conclusion would spoil in my opinion the rhetorical construction of the period, that creates an ascending climax culminating in the present actions of the accuser ([κυκο]φαντεῖ, ll. 205–206). A further addition recalling Hippotherses' past wrongdoings again would be quite out of place here.²⁵

Moreover, the transcription εἰργα[.]α[given by Grenfell and Hunt at l. 207 is far from certain. The interpretation of the traces at the end of the line is particularly difficult, since the letter has almost completely disappeared. What I can see is the upper part of a vertical stroke and a very small oblique trace of ink on the right of it. I have come to the conclusion that the left vertical stroke is not enough inclined to allow an interpretation of the letter as α or λ. In my opinion the traces are more likely to be what survives of μ (the upper part of the left vertical stroke and the beginning of the middle curve).²⁶ I cautiously propose for l. 207 the transcription:

θαυμασχειργα[.]μ[

It seems to me probable that in ll. 205–207 the sentence ended with a specific reference to the accusation of Hippotherses against Lysias. That very accusation is presented to the jurors as the evidence of the unchanged anti-democratic feelings and untrustworthy nature of the accuser. Hippotherses does not hesitate to slander citizens like Lysias, who have been loyal to the democracy and do not deserve to be wronged so badly. I think that ll. 206–207 should be restored as follows:

[κυκο-]
φαντεῖ τοὺς πολλ[ὰ ἀγα-]
θὰ ὑμᾶς εἰργα[σ]μ[ένους].

The expression πολλ[ὰ ἀγα]θὰ ὑμᾶς εἰργα[σ]μ[ένους] is well supported by XXI 11 τοσαῦτα ἀγαθὰ εἰργασμένος τὴν πόλιν and XXV 28 οἱ . . . πλείεστα ὑμᾶς ἀγαθὰ εἰργασμένοι. The article that precedes the participle εἰργα[σ]μ[ένους] is justified by the intention of Lysias to present himself as part of a category of people to which the jurors should be thankful. Good parallels are offered by Isocr. XXII 7 οὗτος δὲ καὶ τοὺς οὐδὲν ἡδίκηκότας τολμᾷ κυκοφαντεῖν and Dem. *Phil.* III 56 τοὺς τὰ βέλτιστα λέγοντας κυκοφαντοῦντες.

This reconstruction provides a suitable conclusion to the comparison between Lysias and Hippotherses that the speaker is drawing in order to make it easier for the jurors to decide which of the two «is better for our city» (cf. fr. 6, col I, ll. 135 ff.). Ll. 205–206 complete and close the argument that begins at ll. 181 ff.: νῦν δ' ἀνάγκη περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγειν· ὑπὸ τοιούτου γὰρ φεύγει τὴν δίκ[η]ν, ὅς . . . κτλ. Lysias' merits must be recalled, because his accuser is a man of doubtful repute, a traitor who dared to fight against his country. A citizen of this sort, a friend of the Spartans who never repented of his errors, is now slandering those who have brought great advantages to the democracy, like Lysias

²⁴ At XIII 76 Lysias says that Agoratus ἐκυκοφάντει πολλοὺς ὡς Ἀθηναῖος τοῦνομα ἐπιγραφόμενος: in that passage πολλοὺς is not preceded by the article, and the meaning is that Agoratus «slandered a lot of citizens». In the *Against Hippotherses*, however, τοὺς πολλοὺς could not be equivalent to «a lot of democratic citizens»: it should have its normal political meaning (the «democratic party» or the «democratic government»), and this would be a very unusual object for the verb κυκοφαντεῖν. In the Attic orators, when the verb is transitive, its object is either people who find themselves falsely accused (cf. Lys. XXIV 2; Antiph. VI 43; Isocr. XIV 6, XVIII 7; Dem. XXI 116, XXXIX 25) or specific categories of citizens, as Isocr. XXII 7, Dem. *Phil.* III 56, LVIII 2.

²⁵ In his translation of the passage Collart 1919, 54 (perhaps reacting to this difficulty) prints a semicolon after «le régime démocratique», and has a new period starting with μεθ' («il diffame le régime démocratique; après ce qu'il a fait contre vous . . .»). However, a connective is needed at the beginning of the new sentence, and the καὶ of l. 207 is a better starting point for it.

²⁶ A comparison with the first μ of l. 196 may be useful.

(note also that the beginning of the sentence εἶτα τ[οιοῦτος]²⁷ ὢν πολίτης... at ll. 201 ff. echoes ὑπὸ τοιοῦτου γὰρ φεύγει τὴν δίκην of ll. 183–84).

The new supplement requires 18 letters at both l. 205 (17 if we prefer the elided form πόλλ' ἀγα-) and l. 206. This is perfectly consistent with the average line length in the papyrus.

Fr. 6, col. III, rr. 216–19:

.[]παρα 216
 του[]βαν[
 εργ[].ην μεγα
 στ[]κοτα. δεο >

Grenfell and Hunt suggested this restoration for the scanty remnants of these lines:

Λ[υσίαν δὲ χάριν] παρὰ[216
 τοῦ [δήμου ἀπολαμ]βάν[ειν <εὐ->
 εργ[εσίαν] τὴν μεγί-
 στ[ὴν πεποη]κότα

Their reconstruction is perhaps acceptable for l. 216 and for the first part of l. 217. At ll. 217–218 the supplement ἀπολαμ]βάν[ειν <εὐ->]/εργ[εσίαν is too long for the space available at the end of l. 217. The letters βαν seem to be very near to the end of the column, and the omission of <εὐ> postulated by Grenfell and Hunt is an extreme solution. We may also observe that the supplement [<εὐ->]/εργ[εσίαν] is too short for the lacuna at l. 218, that is likely to have contained 8–9 letters.²⁸

Though the lines are badly damaged, it is possible to guess the general sense of the passage: in the final peroration, the speaker reminds the jurors that Lysias' merits deserve the gratitude of the democracy. In this context, the superlative μεγιστ[²⁹ recalls expressions like XXV 17 μεγίστην ἡγοῦμαι περὶ ἑμαυτοῦ τῆ δημοκρατία πίτιν δεδωκέναι or XVIII 19 ταύτην ὑμῖν οἴονται διδόναι πίτιν τῆς αὐτῶν εὐνοίας (for πίτις . . . μεγίστη see also XIX 32). I propose to write:

ἔργ[οις πίτιν] τὴν μεγί-
 στ[ὴν δεδω]κότα

«(Lysias) . . . who has given by his deeds the greatest proof of loyalty». At l. 218 it is also possible to supply the singular ἔργ[ω].³⁰

It could be objected that at XVIII 19 the meaning of the substantive πίτις is explained by the genitive τῆς αὐτῶν εὐνοίας and at XXV 17 by the complement περὶ ἑμαυτοῦ, while neither at l. 218

²⁷ Lipsius' supplement τ[οιοῦτος] (Lipsius 1920, 3 n. 1) is far better than τ[έλεος] (Grenfell and Hunt 1919) or τ[ίμιος] (Gernet and Bizos 1926). These other are unconvincing both for reasons of space and because a mention of the juridic state of Hippotherses as a citizen is less appropriate here than a reference to his unsatisfying moral standard. For τοιοῦτος . . . πολίτης see XIV 1 τοιοῦτον γὰρ πολίτην ἑαυτὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς παρέσχεν, XXI 15 τοὺς ἄλλους εἶναι τοιοῦτους πολίτας, and also XIV 47, XXI 25.

²⁸ Cf. Grenfell and Hunt 1919, 71. The hypothesis of an omission is approved by Collart 1919, 54, Gernet and Bizos 1926, Messina 1950, 64, Albin 1955. I shall discuss elsewhere the reconstruction of ll. 216–217.

²⁹ The reading γι at the end of l. 218 is not certain, but is anyway the most probable. As for the beginning of the line, a trace of a vertical stroke survives after the letters ερ, most probably γ (π, κ, ι are also possible).

³⁰ C. Carey kindly informed me that the singular ἔργ[ω] has been independently conjectured by Harvey. This supplement was one of a number of suggestions that emerged during a seminar series on the text of Lysias which Prof. Carey held in 1998 at the Institute of Classical Studies in London. He accepts it and proposes to supply ἔργ[ω εὐνοίαν] τὴν μεγί-/[στην δεδηλω]κότα. The mention of Lysias' εὐνοία towards the democratic party would be appropriate here, and ἔργω would reinforce its effect (εὐνοία is qualified by μέγας in Dem. XXV 64 and *Epist.* II 20). I am less persuaded by the expression εὐνοίαν . . . δεδηλωκότα, since Lysias uses elsewhere εὐνοίαν ἐπιδείξασθαι (XII 52; XVIII 4). Moreover, I do not find convincing parallels for the phrase εὐνοίαν δηλοῦν with the meaning that would be required here.

nor at l. 219 is there room in the papyrus for a similar addition. However, in Lysias the single word πίστις means «proof of loyalty» at XII 27 οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἐν τοῖς μετοίκοις πίστιν παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐλάμβανον, XXV 13 ὡς ταύτην παρ' ἡμῶν πίστιν εἰληφότης. A very close parallel for my restoration can be found at XII 77, where Lysias says that the unfortunate Theramenes was put to death by the Thirty πολλὰς πίστει αὐτοῖς ἔργῳ δεδωκόσ. We find all the three crucial words: the accusative πίστεις, the dative ἔργῳ and a form of the verb διδόναι.

My supplement adds only six letters (four of which are wide) to l. 219, giving a total of 15 in the line. Lines of 15/16 letters are found in the papyrus at fr. 6 col. II, ll. 181 and 197 (15); fr. 2 col. I, ll. 39 and 41 (16). Furthermore, there is a blank space after the desinence]κοτα and the line is closed by the sign >, used by the scribe to fill up shorter lines. It would be attractive to add an [ύμῖν] or [ἡμῖν] before δεδωκότα, restoring a longer line with 21 letters: I do not believe, however, that the lacuna between στ[and]κοτα is large enough to contain all the 10 letters needed.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albini 1955 Lisia, *I Discorsi*, Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione e note a cura di U. Albini, Firenze 1955.
- Blass 1887 F. Blass, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, Leipzig 1887² (Hildesheim 1962).
- Collart 1919 P. Collart, Les papyrus d'Oxyrhynchos. A propos du tome XIII, *Revue de Philologie* 43 (1919) 49–54.
- Dover 1968 K. J. Dover, *Lysias and the Corpus Lysiacum*, Berkeley–Los Angeles 1968.
- Ferckel 1937 F. Ferckel, *Lysias und Athen. (Des Redners politische Stellung zum Gaststaat)*, Würzburg 1937.
- Gernet and Bizos 1926 Lysias, *Discours*, t. II (*XVI–XXXIV et fragments*), texte établi et traduit par L. Gernet et M. Bizos, Paris 1926 (1989⁵).
- Grenfell and Hunt 1919 *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. XIII, edited by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, London 1919, 48–73 (and Plate II).
- Koerte 1924 A. Koerte, Literarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 7 (1924) 156–58.
- Lipsius 1920 J. H. Lipsius, Lysias' Rede gegen Hippotherses und das attische Metoikenrecht, *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, Bd. 71 (1919), H. 9, Leipzig 1920, 1–12.
- Lobel 1926 E. Lobel, *Bodleian Quarterly Record*, 4 (1923–1925), Oxford 1926, 47–48.
- Lobel 1929 E. Lobel, Some Lysias, *Bodleian Quarterly Record*, 5 (1926–1928), Oxford 1929, 303–304.
- Medda 1995 Lisia. *Orazioni XVI–XXXIV e frammenti*, con introduzione, traduzione e note di E. Medda, Milano 1995.
- Messina 1950 A. Messina, Di alcuni frammenti delle orazioni di Lisia, *Emerita* 18 (1950) 46–69.
- Sakurai 1995 M. Sakurai, A New Reading in POxy 1606 (Lysias, 'Against Hippotherses'), *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 109 (1995) 177–80.
- Thalheim 1913 Lysias. *Orationes*, edidit Th. Thalheim, maior editio altera correctior, Lipsiae 1913.