ISOCRATES BILINGUIS BEROLINENSIS

In the new publication by G. Ioannidou, *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Literary Papyri in Berlin* (Mainz 1996 = Berliner Klassiker Texte, IX), 186-87, one finds under # 149 (cf. ibidem, pl. 64), 'Bilingual Text', an edition of two fragments (belonging to a dark-brown papyrus codex from the 4th century A.D., from Hermupolis); each fragment is inscribed on the recto and the verso with (1°) a column of text in Greek and (2°) a column of text in Latin. Obviously the Latin is a translation of the Greek text. The editor of the fragments does not state whether she has attempted to identify this text.

While consulting the volume for other purposes we noticed by accident the slightly deviant way of separating *κατα* from *λογαδην* in # 149, Fr. I ↓, l. 4; here one might as well print one word, *καταλογαδην*, and this word (cf. LSJ s.v.) reminded us of a passage in our recent edition of the 4th-century Isocrates codex from Kellis/Ismant el-Kharab (Dakhleh Oasis,

Egypt¹). We identify the passages concerned as parts of [Isocr.] *Ad Demonicum*, §§ 47 and 48, and *Ad Nicoclem*, §§ 7 and 8. For the sake of convenience we present the transcript of the *ed. princ.*²), followed by some comments of our own. If (as seems likely to us) in the complete original codex the text of the *Ad Demonicum* preceded the text of the *Ad Nicoclem*, one should invert the position of the fragments numbered in the *ed. princ.* as '1' (H. 6.5 × W. 18.2 cm) and '2' (H. 9.5 × W. 15.7 cm). In order, however, to remain more close to the *ed. princ.* we decided not to invert the position of these fragments and to invert only the position of the recto and the verso of fragment 1. As to the handwriting practised in the Greek and the Latin columns, we have not been able to convince ourselves that two different hands should be distinguished; likewise, however, we are not certain that they are identical: therefore, we restrict ourselves to a *'non liquet'*.

Fr. 1 Verso:

Col. I	Col. II
1 [lost]	[...].capitulum[
2 [lost]	conspectum
3 γ]αρ[]	multa enim
4 κ]αι των εμμετρων	et modulorum
5]ποιηματων·	carminum
6]και των κατα λογαδην	et profetiarum
margin	margin

Fr. 1 Verso = Isocr. *Ad Nicoclem* § 7 (p. 118.18–19 Drerup). We supply in col. I.3 [πολλα γ]αρ], take in I.6 καταλογαδην as one word (cf. above), and read in col. II.1 'd[i]f[i]c[i]le a prin[cipio]', corresponding with a lemma '[χαλεπον απο της αρχης]' lost in col. I.1; in col. II.2 the supinum (?) 'conspectum' (see below) seems to correspond with a lemma '[συνιδειν]' lost in col. I. It should be noticed that—like Ψ [= the Kellis Isocrates codex], ll. 37–38, P¹, A, P^{corr.}, N—the Berlin papyrus has εμμετρων ποιηματων against μετὰ μέτρον ποιημάτων in Γ, cf. Worp–Rijksbaron, *op. cit.* [fn. 1], 185.

Fr. 1 Recto:

Col. I	Col. II
1 ..[	[lost]
2 α.[...].[.....[	[lost]
3 ωφελησειεν·	[
4 και τους τας δυναστειας	etm..[
5 εχοντας·	habentes
6 και τους ὑπ αυτοις ὄντας·	et subiectos
	n .?
7]τοις μεν γαρ αν τας αρχας	mañ ill.ş qui deminiť[
margin	margin

7:]γ?

Fr. 1 Recto = Isocr. *Ad Nicoclem* § 8 (p. 118.25 - 119.1 Drerup). One should supply now in col. I.1 the word προτρεψειεν, but most of this is lost (we have not been able to identify the preserved traces). The lemma in col. I.2 may be read as ‘αμ[φ]ο[τε]ρως αν’. In col. II.3 we cannot read the preserved traces as ‘προδε[ss]et’, though this verb is the most plausible candidate. In col. II.4 we read ‘et pot[e]nt[i]a[s]’ (or read ‘-[i]a[m]’?) as the translation of the Greek lemma ‘και τους τας δυναστειας’. In col. II.7 one should read the translation as ‘nam (initial ‘n-’ in superscript as a correction for ‘m-’) illis quidem init[ia]’, i.e. the translator has committed here a mistranslation of αρχας, which should be taken as ‘magistracies’. We note that again this papyrus shares a reading with P¹, Λ, Π, Ν, viz. ωφελησειεν against ονησειεν in Γ, cf. Worp-Rijksbaron, *op. cit.* [fn. 1], 186.

Fr. 2 Recto:

Col. I	Col. II

1]ηρ·[	
2]ρωτη·	[]tiores
3]οσαγ	[]...
4]α...προτερον	et [...].. quidem prius
5]. blank	[...]..t
6]....θ...εν·	[...]..o.tri[c]t.vimus
7]δ..ε	[...]..m
8	[...]..orem
margin	margin

Fr. 2 Recto = [Isocr.] *Ad Demonicum* § 47. On the basis of Fr. 2 Verso (see below) we assumed that the rather mutilated Fr. 2 Recto would contain a passage from the *Ad Demonicum* as well. This assumption proved correct and we are able now to give a more coherent transcript of the text. We think that instead of a long vertical line before each entry in col. II in the *ed. princ.* the initial letters of each entry are preserved (we should like to stress that we have made our transcript only on the basis of the plate [pl. 64] of the papyrus and that a check of the original text may necessitate a few modifications):

Fr. 2 Recto, revised text:

Col. I	Col. II

1]ηρ·[	[lost]
2 [και βεβ]ωτερας·	c[er]tiores or: e[t cer]tiores?
3 [αποδιδ]ωσιν· Trace?	r[ed]dit
4 [και εκε]ι μεν προτερον	et i[ll]i[c] quidem prius
5 [ησθεντε]ς blank	g[au]de[n]tes or: g[au]de[n]t[es]
6 [υστερον] ελπηθημεν·	p[oste]a contri[c]stavimus
7 [ενταυθ]α δε	h[ic] au]tem
8 [μετα τας] λυ[πας]	p[ost do]lorem
margin	margin
2 βεβαιωτερας	

In col. I.1 the reading cannot be correct; we expect here part of the adjective εἰλικρινεῖς, but we have not succeeded in identifying the preserved ink traces; the adjective might have been translated as 'sinceras' or 'integras'. In col. II.6 the scribe apparently wrote originally 'contric-', but corrected this into 'contris-' by writing a cursive -s- over the -c-. We note that this papyrus—with Ψ l. 261, P⁶, Λ, Π, Σ, Υ—in col. I.6 has ἐλυπηθῆμεν against ἐλυπήθησαν in Γ; cf. Worp-Rijksbaron, *op. cit.* [fn. 1], 178.

Fr. 2 Verso:

Col. I

Col. II

1]..ουτ[	]..e.[
2 τοιαυτην	t]alēm
3 πεποινηται	facerent
4 την ὑποθεσιν·	cont[r]aversiā[m
5 τοις δε σπουδαι[οι]ς	industriis au[tem
6 ου[κ]χ οιον τ[ὸ]ν[.] της	impo[ss]ibile.[
7 αμελειν·	necle[g]e.r.e[
8 ἡ πολλου. εχει[	[a]ut multum[
margin	margin

Fr. 2 Verso = [Isocr.] *Ad Demonicum* § 48 (p. 114.15–115.1 Drerup). We notice that in col. I.1 the reading '].ουτ[' may be corrected into 'γα]ρ του β[ιου]', corresponding in col. II with a translation 'enim vitae' or 'vitae enim' (we cannot read the preserved traces with confidence). In col. I.6 we think one should read in the second half of the line τ[αι]ε τη[ς] αρε[της] (to be translated as 'virtutem'?). In col. II.2 we prefer printing '[t]alēm', in col. II.3 we read 'facerunt' as an error for 'fecerunt', and in col. II.7 we prefer reading 'necle[g]e.r.e['. Finally, we note that the papyrus—with Ψ l. 267, P¹⁷, Λ, Π, Σ, Υ—has in col. I.8 αμελειν η πολλους against ἀμελειν διὰ τὸ πολλούς in P⁶, Γ, Ζ, and Syrus, cf. Worp-Rijksbaron, *op. cit.*, 178.

This translation of the Greek text of Isocrates into Latin presents a complete novelty: we do not know of any previous publication of a papyrus with a translation of a Greek pagan literary work into Latin (translations, on the other hand, of Latin classical authors like Virgil and Cicero into Greek are well-known; for a fragment of a Greek/Latin Bible text cf. J. v. Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* [Paris 1976] # 523/1208 = PSI XIII 1306). For further information on this subject we refer the reader to the full study by B. Rochette, *Le latin dans le monde grec. Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et des lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain* (Bruxelles 1997; = Collection Latomus, 233). On the basis of Rochette's second chapter, 'Le latin dans l'enseignement' (pp. 165–210), we tend to believe that the papyrus was used in the curriculum of an 'elementary' school; perhaps for children, but far more likely for adults³).

It will be noticed that the Latin text clearly aims at presenting a *verbum de verbo*-translation, which also seeks to preserve the word classes and the syntax of the original⁴).

We give here a few comments on some of the translations:

Fr. 1 Verso, col. II

l. 2, *conspectum*: if this is meant to render 'συνιδεῖν', the form is puzzling. Above we suggested that it might be a supinum. It may be objected, of course, that the presence of such an obsolete form (and use) in an elementary translation is rather strange. It is also the wrong supinum, for with an adjective like *difficilis* a supinum in *-u* is expected. Perhaps *conspectum* was preceded by a preposition, e.g. *ad* (lost in the lacuna at the end of l. 1?). Be that as it may, *con-spectum* rather than *con-spicere* may have been chosen to serve as a 'perfect' equivalent of the aorist 'συν-ιδεῖν'.

ll. 4-5, *modulorum carminum*: the combination of *carmen* with some form of *modulor* was a rather common one, cf. (e.g.) *Ov. Met.* 13,341, *Sen. Ben.* 4,6,5, *Mart.* 13,77,1. The translation *modulatus* for ἔμμετρος may have been a standard one; it is found in G. Goetz-G. Gundermann, *Glossae latinograecae et graecolatinae* (Lipsiae 1888; = Corp.Glos.Lat.II), 296.

l. 6, *profetiarum*: in the Isocrates text τῶν καταλογάδην is followed by συγγραμμάτων⁵); this combination is a common expression for 'prose'. 'Profetiarum' is, then, a very strange translation of the Greek; in fact, the normal Latin translation of καταλογάδην seems to have been *prosa*⁶). We venture to think that somehow (in some hands, Latin 's' and 'f' may look much similar, sometimes) a form of *pros-* (perhaps *prosarum*, followed by *con-scriptionum*?⁷)) got mixed up with *profetia*, a word from the Christian vocabulary. See also below, *contristavimus*.

Fr. 2 Recto, col. II

l. 6, *contristavimus*: the choice of the verb *contristo*, rather than (e.g.) *doleo* or *maereo*, may betray Christian influence. In fact, in the New Testament Gk. λυπῶ is, with the exception of *Ev.Marc.* 10,22,1, always translated by *contristo*, cf. (e.g.) *Ev.Matt.* 14,9,1 (λυπηθεὶς *contristatus*), 18,31,1, *Ev.Joh.* 21,17,2 (ἐλυπήθη *contristatus* est), 2 *Ep.Cor.* 2,5,1 (ἐελύπηκεν *contristavit*)⁸). The intransitive/'passive' use of active *contristavimus* must be considered a mistake.

Fr. 2 Verso, col. II

l. 4, *contraversiam*: at first sight the choice of this word to render ὑπόθεσιν seems odd. Actually, it is not found in the Greek-Latin glossaries. Interestingly, however, the *Glossae latinograecae* (Goetz-Gundermann, 115) have '*controversia* ἀμφισβητήσις· υπόθεσις'. Cf. LSJ s.v. ὑπόθεσις, II.2, *case at law, lawsuit*. We should add that eventually the Latin translation *is* odd, for in the context ὑπόθεσις means 'foundation'; an interpretation of ὑπόθεσιν as a law-term does not make sense.

In view of the *modus operandi* of the translator we have the distinct impression that he consulted a glossary which was a predecessor of one of the Medieval glossaries (for such ancient glossaries cf. J. Kramer, *Glossaria bilin-gua in Papyris et Membranis Reperta* (Bonn 1983; = Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, 30).

1) For this codex see our *The Kellis Isocrates Codex* (Oxford 1997). On pp. 49 ff. we list the various sigla for the relevant medieval Mss and ancient papyri of Isocrates.

2) We have slightly adapted the alignment of the text of the *ed. princ.* in order to better illustrate the complete parallelism between the respective columns.—By way of experiment we have split up the text of the *Ad Nicoclem* between the last preserved words of § 7, τῶν καταλογαδῶν (cf. Fr. 1 Verso), and the first preserved words of § 8, προτρεψεῖεν (cf. Fr. 1 Recto, col. I.1n.) into single line elements; we arrive at approx. 27 lines missing between τῶν καταλογαδῶν and προτρεψεῖεν, hence we calculate that the original codex contained approx. 34 lines. As the height of 6 lines in the fragment as preserved is approx. 4.5 cm, 34 lines should equal approx. 25.5 cm. Adding margins of 2 cm each at both the bottom (preserved) and the top of the leaf (lost) we arrive at a codex leaf with a total height of approx. 29.5 cm. A similar attempt of ours to split up the text of the *Ad Demonicum* between § 47, ἐνταῦθα δὲ μετὰ τὰς λύπας, and § 48, τοῦ βίου τοιαύτην πεποιήνται τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, seems to confirm this approximation.

3) “Il ne faut pas se méprendre sur le sens de l’adjectif «élémentaire». L’enseignement ainsi qualifié ne s’adresse pas à des enfants, mais bien à des adultes.” (Rochette, *op. cit.*, 177 n. 44). Cf. also R. Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Atlanta 1997), 30: “... these texts (i.e. Latin texts used to learn Latin) are all written by experienced hands and show that students at an advanced level studied Latin as a second or third language”.

4) Cf. for this procedure S. Brock, *Aspects of translation technique in Antiquity*, GRBS 20 (1979), 69–87.

5) Ψ has συνταγμάτων, which probably should be rejected; cf. Worp–Rijksbaron, *op. cit.* [fn. 1], 186.

6) Cf. Goetz–Gundermann, *Glossae...*, 341.

7) For this (rather rare) *terminus technicus* for ‘treatise’ cf., e.g., Vit. 5,1,2; cf. further the Thes. Ling. Lat. s.v.

8) Cf. also Goetz–Gundermann, *Glossae...*, 363: λυπω *contristo*. An advantage of *contristo* over *doleo* / *maereo* was that this verb, just like λυπῶ, had both active and passive forms.