

FILIPPOMARIA PONTANI – MARIA GIOVANNA SANDRI

A NEW MANUSCRIPT WITNESS OF CALLIMACHUS' *IAMBUS* 5, LL. 23–29

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 213 (2020) 23–27

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

A NEW MANUSCRIPT WITNESS OF CALLIMACHUS' *IAMBUS* 5, LL. 23–29*

This paper presents the first edition of a marginal note of ms. Par. gr. 2558, which contains the text of Callimachus' *Iambus* 5.23–29 (as known from PSI 1216) in a much fuller (if corrupt) form than the remaining extant indirect tradition.

1. According to the *Diegesis* (VII.20–24 Pf.) Callimachus' fifth iambus, an epodic poem in choliambic trimeters and iambic dimeters, was a benevolent satire (ἐν ἡθελίᾳ εὐνοίας) directed against a schoolteacher (an Apollonios or a Cleon) who “corrupted” (καταισχύονοντα) his pupils. The text of the poem, fragmentarily transmitted by PRyl 485, PSI 1216 and POxy 2171, is badly flaked and has been interpreted in different ways, particularly with respect to its meta-poetical meaning (the author's quarrel with Apollonius Rhodius)¹. A group of seven lines (ll. 23–29), relatively well preserved in PSI 1216 (2nd c. CE), also occurs in the indirect tradition as a paradigmatic example of allegory: in particular, the rhetorical treatises quoting this passage are two *On tropes* (Περὶ τρόπων), one ascribed to Trypho (“Trypho II” in West's terminology)² and one ascribed to Choeroboscus (more precisely, its *versio longior*)³. It should be stressed that, despite his admirable efforts, Pfeiffer (whose text has remained the basis for all subsequent editors and commentators) could rely only on old editions of these works (Spengel, Cramer, Walz), which offered a rather corrupt text of Callimachus' lines.

Par. gr. 2558 is one of the many manuscripts that have escaped the notice of modern editors of the Περὶ τρόπων, although it did attract the attention of palaeographers: this product of Italian Salento is in fact composed of two distinct books, the former (ff. 1^r–54^v, containing the Περὶ συντάξεως λόγου by Michael Syncellus, the Περὶ ἐγκλινομένων by Ioannes Charax and a grammatical work by Niphon ὁ μοναχός) commonly dated to the early 14th century⁴, the latter (ff. 55^r–167^v, containing a miscellany of grammatical works, introduced by the verses on orthography by Nicetas of Heraclea⁵) dated by André Jacob to the early 15th century, and attributed to the hand of the scribe Thomas of Otranto, known from the colophon of Vat. gr. 1870 (probably copied *ante* 1419)⁶. Written in a period of decadence of Greek culture in Salento, this

* Though the entire note has been conceived by both authors, § 2 has been written by M. G. Sandri, § 3 by F. Pontani. Our thanks to Luca Ruggeri (Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa) for his advice.

¹ The most recent edition is by E. Livrea, Callimachi Iambus V, *ZPE* 144 (2003), 51–58. See A. Kerkhecker, *Callimachus' Book of Iambi*, New York 1999, 123–146; B. Acosta-Hughes, *Polyeideia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 2002, 212–217 and 251–264; and for the metapoetic meaning E. Lelli, *Critica e polemiche letterarie nei Giambi di Callimaco*, Alessandria 2004, 110–122.

² See M. L. West, Tryphon *De tropis*, *CQ* 15.2 (1965), 230–248 (earlier editions: J. Fr. Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, III, Paris 1831, 270–284; J. A. Cramer, *Anecdota Barocciana, The Philological Museum* 2 (1833), 432–434; Chr. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, VIII, Lutetiae 1835, 761–778; L. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, III, Leipzig 1856, 215–226: since Cramer the treatise was edited under the name of the 12th-century grammarian Gregory of Corinth). Almost the same text of “Trypho II” also occurs in the two mss. of the *scholia Londinensia* to Dionysius Thrax (see A. Hilgard, *Grammatici Graeci*, I 3, Leipzig 1901, 457). Nothing of our interest appears in the other treatise *On tropes* attributed to Trypho, called by West “Trypho I” and edited by Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, III, 191–206.

³ Ed. Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, III, 244–256 (superseding Chr. Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, VIII, Lutetiae 1835, 799–820). As noticed by D. D. Resh, Toward a Byzantine Definition of Metaphrasis, *GRBS* 55 (2015), 754–787: 769–781, the text edited under the name of Choeroboscus is in fact an expanded redaction of the original version of Choeroboscus' treatise; the expansion must be dated some time between the 12th and the 13th century, *ante* 1280.

⁴ See D. Arnesano, *La minuscola «barocca». Scritture e libri in Terra d'Otranto nei secoli XIII e XIV*, Lecce 2008, no. 144 with bibliography.

⁵ See Th. Antonopoulou, The Orthographical Kanons of Nicetas of Heraclea, *JÖB* 53 (2003), 171–185: 173 and 176 n. 25.

⁶ A. Jacob, Un copiste du monastère de Casole: le hiéromoine Thomas, *RSBN* n.s. 26 (1989), 203–210, esp. 205–208. *RGK* III, 240 still date Thomas to the 13th century.

codex was probably produced at the request of a Western learned elite, like other manuscripts of the same age and provenance⁷.

The Parisinus never left Southern Italy, since we know (f. I^r) that it went through the hands of the “secretario” Antonello Petrucci, an important dignitary at the court of Naples and a remarkable bibliophile, who demonstrably collected other books from Salento, such as Par. gr. 1685 (Aesopus and Ps.-Callisthenes) and the geographical miscellany Par. gr. 1407, dated to 1428: the former was copied by the monk Nectarius of Casole, the same man who pens on the top margin of f. 68^r of our Parisinus a note καὶ ἐγὼ Νεκτάριος⁸. Together with most of Petrucci’s books, our Parisinus was brought to Paris by king Charles VIII after his short-lived conquest of Naples in 1495⁹, and has rested in the Bibliothèque Royale (then Nationale) ever since.

2. Par. gr. 2558 – and particularly its second part, written by Thomas perhaps with the help of other scribes – matters to us here because in ff. 160^r–163^v it contains, under the name of Trypho (f. 160^r: περὶ τρόπων Τρύφωνος), the original, so far still unpublished version of Choeroboscus’ Περὶ τρόπων. On f. 160^r l. 17 – 160^v l. 3 of the Parisinus, Choeroboscus’ section on ἀλληγορία¹⁰ is followed by an excerpt of the section on the same topic in the Περὶ τρόπων of “Trypho II” (here in italics):

ἀλληγορία ἐστὶ λέξις ἕτερόν τι λέγουσα καὶ ἑτέραν ἔννοιαν παριστῶσα, ὡς τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν τῇ Θεΐᾳ Γραφῇ, ἔνθα πρὸς τὸν ὄφιν ὁ Θεὸς φησι “ἐπικατάρατος σὺ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν” [LXX, Gen. 3.14]· ὁ γὰρ λόγος ὡς πρὸς τὸν ὄφιν ἐστὶ, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ διαβόλου ἀναλόγως [fort. ex ἀναλογικῶς corr.] παραλαμβανόμενος. τότε καταχρῶνται ὅλως τῇ ἀλληγορίᾳ, ὅταν δι’ εὐλάβειαν ἢ δι’ αἰσχύνην οὐ δύνωνται [δύνασται cod.] φανερώς ἀπαγγεῖλαι¹¹.

On the right margin of f. 160^v, next to the last lines of this paragraph, we find a note by a Greek (not Italian) hand otherwise unattested in the manuscript¹². The text of the scholium, which clearly refers to the allegory used δι’ εὐλάβειαν ἢ δι’ αἰσχύνην, runs as follows (punctuation and diacritics as in ms.; lacunae on the left margin are due to the unfortunate trimming of the folia perpetrated some time during the course of the manuscript’s history):

ὡς π(αρὰ) καλλιμάχῳ ἐν ἰ
[ἀ]μβοίς: τὸ πῦρ δ’ ἄ
[.]ῶν ἐκκάυσας ἄχρις οὔ
πολλῇ πρόσω κεχώρηκε
φλογί: ἀλλ’ ἀτρεμί

⁷ D. Arnesano, San Nicola di Casole e la cultura greca in Terra d’Otranto nel Quattrocento, in H. Houben (ed.), *La conquista turca*, Galatina 2008, 107–140 offers a splendid overview with *specimina*: see esp. 114 on Thomas and Nectarios, and 119–120 on later copyists such as Gioacchino of Casole, who fled the monastery under Turkish threat in 1481.

⁸ On Nectarius of Casole (not to be confused with his more illustrious 13th-century namesake) and his hand in mss. Par. gr. 2970, ff. 80–100, and Ambr. B 39 sup., ff. 54–61, see I. Aulisa – C. Schiano (eds.), *Dialogo di Papisco e Filone giudei con un monaco*, Bari 2005, 142–144.

⁹ See on this Ch. Astruc, Nota per i codici greci di Antonello Petrucci, in: T. De Marinis (ed.), *La biblioteca napoletana dei re d’Aragona. Supplemento, I: Testo*, Verona 1969, 217–250, and R. Ruggiero, “Homines talem scribendi qualem vivendi formulam tenent”. La biblioteca di Antonello Petrucci ‘secretario’ ribelle, in: C. Corfiati, M. de Nichilo (ed.), *Biblioteche nel Regno fra Tre e Cinquecento*, Lecce 2009, 171–192.

¹⁰ This is the text of the section as it occurs in the most ancient extant witness, the 10th-century ms. Par. Coisl. 120, f. 206^r, ll. 5–11: ἀλληγορία μὲν ἐστὶ λέξις ἕτερόν τι λέγουσα καὶ ἑτέραν ἔννοιαν (εὔν- cod.) παριστῶσα, ὡς τὸ εἰρημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὸν ὄφιν, “ἐπικατάρατος σὺ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν θηρίων” [LXX, Gen. 3.14]· ὁ γὰρ λόγος ὡς πρὸς τὸν ὄφιν ἐστίν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ διαβόλου αὐτὸν ἀλληγορικῶς ὄφιν ἐκλαμβάνομεν.

¹¹ Cfr. Tryph. II 1.1.3–4 West: τότε δὲ καταχρῶνται τῇ ἀλληγορίᾳ, ὅταν ἢ δι’ εὐλάβειαν ἢ δι’ αἰσχύνην οὐ δύνωνται φανερώς ἀπαγγεῖλαι.

¹² The very incomplete note on f. 163^v might possibly go back to the same hand. There are several other annotators in the codex, mostly adding marginal *notabilia* (e.g. f. 164^r), occasionally variant readings (e.g. f. 107^v), and even interlinear glosses in a Southern Italian dialect (e.g. f. 136^r). However, the hand of the scholium on f. 160^v is definitely an expert Greek hand, using abbreviations and ligatures in a manner that is not germane to what we know of the handwriting of Italian humanists.

ζει κήπιος τέφρην εἰ (εἰ ex οἱ correxit librarius)
 [.]ῆ κοιμίσων ἴσχε δὲ δρό
 μου μαργώντας ἵππους, μὴ
 δὲ δευτέραν κάμψης.
 μὴ τοι παρὰ νύσση δί
 φρον ἄξωσιν, ἐκ δὲ κύ (ἄξωσιν ex ἄγωσιν vel ἄγρωσιν ut vid. correxit librarius)
 μβαχος κυβιστήσης:-

This note, which according to a preliminary though necessarily incomplete survey of the witnesses of the two *Περὶ τρόπων* does not occur elsewhere either in the text or in the margins¹³, corresponds to ll. 23–29 of Callimachus' fifth *Iambus*, with the notable peculiarities that it is much more complete than the quotations in the witnesses of the indirect tradition (both Choeroboscus and “Trypho II” omit ll. 25–26 ἀλλ’ – κοίμησον, the former covering this bit with a generic καὶ πάλιν), and that to a notable extent it matches the readings of PSI 1216. It is hard to speculate what the (probably lost) source of this note might have been: the indication ἐν ἰάμβοις (altogether absent in Choeroboscus) and the fact that, as we have just seen, Par. gr. 2558 interpolates in the text of the ἀλληγορία section a sentence taken from “Trypho II” (in Trypho II this sentence, the one printed in italics above, precedes immediately the Callimachean quotation), might point to an original *versio aucta* of the “Trypho II” treatise; but some form of an older rhetorical handbook might also be considered¹⁴. It is at any rate very interesting, for the history of South Italian Hellenism, to observe that this lost source must have circulated in the Mezzogiorno as late as the 15th century, and must have gone through the hands of an unknown scholar specifically interested in the wording of Callimachus' fragment.

3. Be that as it may, it is time to compare the text of our note with that of Call. ia. 5 (fr. 195 Pf.), 23–29 as established by editors from Pfeiffer to Livrea: while our scholium mainly confirms the readings of the papyrus, it also presents some remarkable variants that deserve some discussion. The edition of the lines at issue (based on PSI 1216, with a revised apparatus criticus) runs as follows¹⁵:

τὸ πῆρ δὲ τῶνέκαυσας, ἄχρις οὐ πολλῆ
 πρόσω κεχώρηκεν φλογί,
 25 ἀλλ’ ἀτρεμίζει κήπι τὴν τέφρην οἴ[χ]γεί,
 κοιμίσων. ἴσχε δὲ δρόμου
 μαργώντας ἵππους, μηδὲ δευτέριην κάμψης
 μὴ τοι περὶ νύσση δίφρον
 ἄξωσιν, ἐκ δὲ κύμβαχος κυβιστήσης.

23 δὲ τῶνέκαυσας Pf.: δετόάνεκαυσας PSI: δὲ τ’ ἀνέκαυσας Choer.: ὅπερ (vel ὅτε) ἀνέκαυσας (vel ἐνέκαυσας) Tryph.: δ’ ἀ[.]ὼν ἐκκαύσας Par. 2558 || ἀχρισου PSI (ἄχρις οὐ Pf., ἄχρις εὐ olim Pf., Terzaghi, ἄχρι σευ Norsa/Vitelli): ἄχρις οὐ Par. 2558 et Choer. mss. aliquot: ἕως (vel ἔρος) οὐ Choer. cett. mss.: om. Tryph.

¹³ We count today 17 manuscripts of Trypho II (of which all have been examined) and 99 of Choeroboscus (59 examined, only 13 of which transmit the *versio longior* of the *Περὶ τρόπων*, the one carrying the Callimachean quotation, see above and below note 15). But figures are necessarily rough, given the complexity and the contamination of this tradition, where parts of different treatises on tropes are mixed and re-arranged together in countless different ways.

¹⁴ Perhaps the common source of the two extant *Περὶ τρόπων*: see E. Diehl, *De Callimachi librorum fati capita selecta, Acta Univ. Latviensis* 4.2, 1937, 305–476, 365: “dubitare non possumus quin omnia haec testimonia ad eundem librum rhetoricum redeant. Qui eum scripsit, Callimachi iambos ante oculos habebat.”

¹⁵ The apparatus criticus benefits from the collation of all the discovered witnesses of Trypho II (Pal. gr. 360; Vat. gr. 1751; Matr. 4613; Matr. 7211; Par. gr. 2008; Par. gr. 2551; Par. gr. 2929; Par. suppl. gr. 123; Laur. 87.10; Marc. gr. Z 512; Leid. BPG 67D; Leid. VGQ 20; Lond. Add. MS 5118; Oxon. Barocci 72 and 76; Prag. XXV.C.31. Marc. gr. Z 489 contains only the introduction of this treatise, so that it doesn't preserve our fragment) and all the witnesses of Coeroboscus' *versio longior* that we have discovered (Pal. gr. 40; Pal. gr. 356; Par. gr. 2495; Par. gr. 2758; Par. gr. 2929; Bologna BU 2638; Laur. 55.7; Laur. 55.14; Neap. II C 37; Taur. B IV 10; Vindob. philol. gr. 305; Vat. gr. 1405; Bodl. Auct. T.4.7). In the lack of complete collations, it is difficult to say whether the correct readings of mss. Laur. 87.10, Pal. gr. 40, Prag. XXV.C.31 and Pal. gr. 360 in ll. 24, 26, 27, 28, stem from a different branch of tradition or (as seems more likely) from conjectures.

- 24 κεχώρηκε(v) Par. 2558 Choer.: κέχρηκε (cum πολλήν ... φλόγα) Tryph. (praeter ms. Laur. 87.10 κεχώρηκε) || φλόγι PSI
 25 om. Choer. Tryph. || ἀτρεμίζε a.c. PSI || κηπιτην PSI, corr. Norsa/Vitelli: κηπὶ (scil. καὶ εἰ ἐπὶ) τὴν Pf.: κῆπιος Par. 2558 || οἰ[χ]νεῖ suppl. Norsa/Vitelli: οἰκεῖ sive οἰκει Parsons: εἰ[.]ῆ (ex οἰ[.]ῆ correxit librarius) Par. 2558
 26 κοίμησον PSI: κοιμίσων Par. 2558: om. Choer. Tryph. || δρόμον Tryph. (praeter mss. Pal. gr. 360 et Prag. XXV.C.31 δρόμου)
 27 μαργούντας ἵππους vel μαργούντος ἵππου Tryph. (μαργώντας ἵππους ms. Laur. 87.10 tantum), qui reliqua om. || μηδὲ: μὴ Choer: μὴ δὲ Par. 2558 || δευτέραν Par. 2558
 28 τοι: τι Choer. (praeter ms. Pal. gr. 40 τοι) || περί: παρά Par. 2558 Choer.
 29 ἄξωσιν: fort. ex ἄγωσιν (vel ἄρωσιν) correxit librarius Par. 2558

In the new witness we can overlook the normalised Attic form *δευτέραν* for *δευτέρην* in l. 27, the untenable participle *κοιμίσων* (for *κοίμησον* of the papyrus) in l. 26¹⁶, the wrong reading *ante correctionem* (perhaps) *ἄγωσιν* or *ἄρωσιν* in l. 29 (*ἄξωσιν*, aor. subj. from *ἄγνυμι*, is the only possible form in this passage), and the trivial confusion *περί* / *παρά* in l. 28. In three details, the Parisinus confirms the readings of the papyrus: l. 23 *ἄχρις* (also carried by some mss. of Choeroboscus), l. 24 *κεχώρηκε(v)* (against the wrong *κέχρηκε* in most of Trypho's mss.), l. 25 *ἀτρεμίζε* (against the papyrus' reading *ante correctionem* *ἀτρέμιζε*, an imperative still preferred by some modern exegetes¹⁷).

The first metaphor is the more problematic: in Pfeiffer's text, ll. 23–26 mean: “Das Feuer aber, das du entfacht hast, laß einschlafen, solange es noch nicht mit großer Flamme vorwärtsschreitet, sondern Ruhe hält und in Richtung Asche geht.”¹⁸ This reconstruction has been suspected for various reasons, mainly because it seems to imply that the fire has not yet properly spread¹⁹. While Pfeiffer's text remains the most likely, the text of our scholium may point to the existence (in the mind of the scholiast of the Parisinus, not in the realm of actual Callimachean exegesis) of a different syntactical construction.

In l. 23 the *ω* of *ὀ[.]ών* (the missing letter perished in the trimming of the outer margin of f. 160) might well be a remnant of the crasis *τὸνέκαυσας* posited by Pfeiffer: the scholium, however, read either *ἀγών* (a noun that makes no sense here) or *ὀδών* (but the breathing on the *alpha* is smooth, and this participle rings very odd on its own) or *ὀπών* “in your absence” (almost nonsensical here); *ἄκων* conflicts with the metre, although we have a non-metrical text in l. 26 *κοιμίσων*; it would perhaps be too bold to correct into something like *τὸ πῦρ δ' ἐκὼν*. More importantly, the aor. participle *ἐκκαύσας* has a long final *α*, which does not scan: one would need to correct *ἔκκαυσας*, a rather unlikely 2nd-person indicative without augment - *ἐκκαίω* is very appropriate to the idea of “stirring up” fire (both literally and metaphorically), but *ἀνακαίω* may imply a repetition, “to burn again”, much in keeping with l. 27 *δευτέρην*. Finally, the transmitted *οὐ* is definitely more common in combination with the conj. *ἄχρις*, and this would point to the actual, violent spreading of the fire rather than to its denial (*οὐ*).

In l. 25 the fire is said to “move towards the ash”, to “go over the ash” or more simply to “dwell in the ashes”, or “rest among the ashes”²⁰: as the conflicting translations show, the *iunctura* *ἐπὶ τὴν τέφρην οἰχνεῖ* lacks parallels and clarity, and has indeed even been suspected²¹. The scholium presents us with a new, interesting word, *ῆπιος*, which is semantically consistent with the context of taming or appeasing the fire. In the masculine (*κῆπιος τέφρην*) it can only refer to the addressee (*σύ*), but then the connecting *καὶ*

¹⁶ Confusion *η/ι* (through *iotacism*) and *ο/ω* is of course frequent in Byzantine manuscripts. The aorist of *κοιμίζω*, as of all the verbs of its kind, has short *ι*, despite the readings of a large part of the ms. tradition (*κοίμισον*) in Ξ 236 and Π 524.

¹⁷ According to G. Vitelli and M. Norsa (*Papiri greci e latini*, Firenze 1935, 124) the correction into *ἀτρεμίζε* in the papyrus is by a second hand.

¹⁸ M. Asper (ed.), *Kallimachos. Werke*, Darmstadt 2004, 229.

¹⁹ See a full discussion of earlier critics and conjectures in Kerkhecker (as in note 1), 134–136.

²⁰ The translations are by Asper, Clayman, Acosta-Hughes, and Lelli (“sulla cenere posa”) respectively.

²¹ The traces of the papyrus are very faint and controversial, though *οι* and *ει* are reasonably certain, and in between there seems to be room for two letters rather than one. Parsons' *οἰκεῖ* would imply a problematic construction with *ἐπὶ* + acc., though the scholar compares *ia. 4.54 ἐπὶ τὴν ὀδὸν κείμαι*.

would necessarily have to look forward to the imperative κοίμισσον in l. 26 – hence we would need to read ὀτρπέμζε “keep calm” (against the scholium itself, and in accordance with the papyrus *ante correctionem*); in this frame, the imperative κοίμισσον would lose its most obvious object, the fire, and probably get τέφρην instead (but can one “put out the ashes”?). Much depends on what we would make of the final word of the line: our scholium may have had one of εἰ [μ]ή (“if not”), εἴ[λ]η (“with the heat”, semantically pertinent, but the noun is very rare), εἰ [λ]ῆ (“if he wants”, a Doric form that seems very unlikely – who would be the subject?) or εἰ[κ]ῆ (“at random”), none of which looks particularly attractive – the corruption of οἴχνει or οἴκει into e.g. εἴκη (or οἴκη in the earlier reading) could be sufficiently explained by way of iotacism.

In sum, with all its corruptions the scholium may have intended something like: “You have lit up (willingly?) the fire, until it has spread forward with big flames; but keep quiet now, and with soothing spirit calm down the ashes.” Both text and sense are of course untenable, and Pfeiffer’s text should still be preferred; but, while the new witness does not yield much progress over the text as reconstructed from previously known sources, it does confirm part of what we know from the papyrus, and above all it attests that a fuller form of Callimachus’ quotation still circulated (most probably within a lost grammatical source) in the erudite *milieux* of Southern Italy as late as the early Quattrocento.

Filippomaria Pontani, Università “Ca’ Foscari”, Venezia
f.pontani@unive.it

Maria Giovanna Sandri, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa
giovanna.sandri@sns.it