

XVIII. Notes on Literary Papyri

MARK NAOUMIDES

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

1. *PRainer* 7 (= *Pack* 214)

This papyrus (s. iv–v A.D.) was first edited by C. Wessely in *Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde* 4 (1905) 111–13. Its text, written on both sides of the papyrus fragment, consists of a few glosses to Demosthenes' *In Midiam* arranged alphabetically.

The recto is occupied by an extensive quotation taken from Aristotle's *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* 53.1–6, cited obviously to explain the entry *διαιτητής*. Wessely indicated that the missing part of line 20 (a lacuna of *ca.* 28 letters)¹ contained something that is not found in our text of the *AP*, where immediately after the words *κελεύουσιν οἱ νόμοι* (i.e. the last words of line 19 in our papyrus) the words *ἔφεσις δέ ἐστι καὶ τούτοις* follow without any interval. Since this could have a bearing on the text of the Aristotelian treatise, I think it deserves some consideration.

The text of lines 15–20 in the papyrus (which were apparently the concluding lines of the quotation and the entry) is quite disturbed, if we compare it with the corresponding passage of our text of the *AP*, and is, indeed, misleading in places. For the convenience of the reader, I give here a transcription of the text of these lines as read and restored by Wessely and the corresponding lines from Aristotle:

A. THE TEXT OF *PRainer*

- . . . ὁ γὰρ νόμος· ἔάν τις μὴ
- 15 [γένηται τῆς ἡλικίας αὐτῷ καθη]κούσης² διαιτητῆς τῆς αὐτῷ
 [καθηκούσης ἄτιμον εἶναι κε]λεύει πλὴν ἐὰν τύχῃ ἀρχὴν
 [ἄρχων τινὰ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἐν]αυτῷ ἀποδημῶν οὐκ ἀτελεῖς
 [ἔστιν δὲ καὶ εἰσαγγέλλειν] εἰς τοὺς διαιτητὰς ἂν τις ἀδι-
 [κηθῇ καὶ καταγνώσιν ἀτ]μούς εἶναι κελεύουσιν οἱ νόμοι
- 20 [*ca.* 22 letters] ἔφεσις δέ³ ἐστι καὶ τούτοις.

¹ Not *ca.* 22 letters as Wessely estimated. The smaller figure would make the line shorter by six letters as compared with the average line.

² The dots above the letters apparently indicate that the word *καθηκούσης* was deleted by the scribe or some corrector of the papyrus.

³ Wessely read *εε* and marked the correct form *δε* as a correction. However, the *delta* is easily visible in the photograph of the papyrus, which I obtained from the

B. THE TEXT OF THE *Ath. Pol.*⁴

... ὁ γὰρ νόμος, ἂν τις μὴ
 γένηται διαιτητῆς τῆς ἡλικίας αὐτῷ καθηκούσης,
 ἄτιμον εἶναι κελεύει, πλὴν ἂν τύχῃ ἀρχὴν
 ἄρχων τι[ν] ἂ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ ἢ ἀποδημῶν· οὗτοι δ' ἀτελεῖς
 εἰσὶ μόνοι.
 ἔστιν δὲ καὶ εἰσαγγέλλειν εἰς τοὺς διαιτητάς, ἂν τις ἀδι-
 κηθῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ διαιτητοῦ κἂν τινος καταγνώσιν ἀτιμοῦσθαι κε-
 λεύουσιν οἱ νόμοι.
 ἔφεςσις δ' ἔστι καὶ τούτοις . . .

As is clear, the text of the *PRainer* has undergone several changes due either to omissions, which sometimes change the meaning of a whole sentence, or to transposition of words or, finally, to the substitution of one word for another. These differences are, to be sure, in conformity with the typical errors of the scribes; their frequency, however, may also suggest that the quotation did not originate from an authoritative MS. of the *AP*, but was either copied from the compiler's notebook or even cited from memory—a possibility which should not always be dismissed in reference to dictionaries.

In view of the above irregularities of the papyrus text, one would be inclined to think that the text of the last two lines has a somewhat different arrangement from the text of the *AP* and that the missing part of line 20 was originally occupied by some of the words of the known text. Indeed, some part of this text (the phrase ὑπὸ τοῦ διαιτητοῦ and the word τινος) was left out by C. Wessely, because it would have created an unusually long line, if it had been restored in its proper place. With the addition of the missing words, a rearrangement of the text, and other minor changes, we can obtain a text close, although not identical, to that of the *AP*, which would eliminate the strange lacuna:

[ἔστι δὲ καὶ εἰσαγγέλλειν] εἰς τοὺς διαιτη[τ]άς, ἂν τις ἀδι-
 [κηθῇ ὑπὸ τοῦ διαιτητοῦ καὶ ἀτί]μους εἶναι κελεύουσιν οἱ νόμοι
 20 [ἂν τινων ἀδικίαν καταγνώσιν] ἔφεςσις δὲ ἔστι [κ]αὶ [το]ύτοις

Oesterreichische Nationalbibliothek through the Library of the University of Illinois. In the restored text (see below), I have indicated the letters no longer visible on the papyrus.

⁴ The text is taken from H. Oppermann's newest edition (Stuttgart [Teubner] 1961). I have arranged the text in lines in such a way that the comparison with *PRainer* would be convenient.

The editor, though he pointed out the most outstanding parallels to the glosses of the verso, attempted no real restoration of the missing text. Indeed, to judge from his note on lines 9–10, he seems uncertain about the actual length of the lines. The close resemblance, however, of some of the glosses with the corresponding entries in Harpocration's *Lexicon* makes the restoration of some of the lines at least probable. A good example of such a restoration is offered by the text of lines 13–15, which Wessely read as follows:

. . . ἡγεμῶν συ[μμορίας
]ν ἔχων περιουσίαν Με[ι]δία τουτ[
 15]μμενος.

The name of Midias, however, in what appears to be a definition or explanation of the term ἡγεμῶν συμμορίας is completely out of place. Indeed, a close examination of the photograph of the papyrus reveals that the actual reading is κα[ι] δια instead of Με[ι]δία. With the new reading, the remnants of the above lines correspond so perfectly to the words used by Harpocration in his definition: . . . ἡγεμῶν ἐκαλεῖτο συμμορίας ὁ προέχων τῷ πλούτῳ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῶν ἄλλων ἡγεμονεύειν ἐπειλημμένος (page 145, 13–14 Dindorf), that no one would hesitate to supplement the missing part of lines 14–15 with Harpocration's words: κα[ι] διὰ τουτ[ο τῶν ἄλλων ἡγεμονεύειν ἐπειλη]μμένος. This would give the line from the beginning of the preserved text⁵ of line 14 to that of line 15 (i.e. one full line) a total of 51 letters, which is comparable to the average 50-letter line of the recto. This also establishes that the papyrus is a fragment of a leaf of a papyrus codex, a view also held by the first editor. Since the outside margin is still visible on the recto, the beginnings of the lines of the verso in the original papyrus should not have been much further to the left than the left side of the verso, and I am inclined to think that line 15 began with the word -ειλη]μμενος.

Having obtained the approximate length of the lines, we can proceed with the restoration of more lines with some confidence. Thus, we can restore the first part of the same gloss (i.e. lines 13–14) as follows:

ἡγεμῶν συ[μμορίας ἐκαλεῖτο ὁ μείζω τῶν
 ἄλλων]ν ἔχων περιουσίαν

⁵ For neither the beginnings nor the ends of the lines are preserved on the verso.

This is only a trifle different from Harpocration's text.

In the same way we can fill out line 15 again with Harpocration's text as follows:

θέ[μ]ενος τὰ ὀπλ[α] ἀντὶ [τοῦ περιθέμενος,⁶ ὀπλισάμενος

The same text also helps to restore lines 10–11:

πληρωτὰς ἔλεγο[ν τοὺς ἀποδιδόντας τοῖς ἡ-
τοι εἰ]πιλαχοῦσιν⁷ ἢ ἐωνημένοις τὸν ἔ[ρανον . . .

The close resemblance between the three glosses of the papyrus (especially as they stand together one after the other) and Harpocration indicates that most probably they originate from a source common also to Harpocration.

As for the quotation cited in the place of the lemma in lines 9–10 (from Demosthenes 21.184), it would require a line almost twice as long as the given one to be fully accommodated. Since this would be against all probability in our papyrus, it is necessary to suppose that either a part of it was left out by a careless scribe (through haplography, for example) or that it was abbreviated on purpose from the beginning by the compiler of the dictionary (or its source) on account of its length. The latter I consider as more probable and suggest the following supplement for the above lines:

ἐγὼ νομίζω πάντας ἀνθρ[ώπους ἐράνους φέρειν οὐχὶ μόνον ὦν
πληρ]ωταὶ γίνονται.

Such abbreviation would preserve the essence of the whole sentence and could have easily replaced it for the sake of brevity.

2. *PBodl.* (MS. Gr. Class. e 44) = *Pack* 953

This papyrus (s. I–II A.D.) was first published by E. W. B. Nicholson, *CR* 11 (1897) 390–93.⁸ It contains a fragment of the *Homeric Lexicon* of Apollonius the Sophist in a version considerably fuller than that of the unique MS. of the *Lexicon*. Unfortunately,

⁶ I omit καὶ which precedes ὀπλισάμενος in Harpocration to avoid a long line, although in the recto there are lines with as many as 60 letters.

⁷ Wessely read ἡτ[οι]οι λαχοῦσιν as in Harpocration. In the photograph, however, the first letter resembles a *pi* rather than an *omicron*. Therefore, I substituted ἐπιλαχοῦσι for λαχοῦσι.

⁸ Though not completely unknown, it seems that it has escaped the notice of some scholars who have dealt directly or indirectly with Apollonius; so, e.g., H. Gattiker, who in his dissertation (*Das Verhältnis des Homerlexikons des Apollonios Sophistes zu den*

the portion of the text preserved in the papyrus is too small and fragmentary to allow a complete restoration. Its importance, however, lies in that it confirms the theory (expressed already before its publication)⁹ that the text of Apollonius, as we have it, has been somewhat epitomized. It also allows a glimpse into some of the principles of its original composition, for it shows that the lexicographer most probably provided all his entries with at least one quotation each. This can be inferred from the fact that all the entries which are surely recognizable in our fragment have at least one quotation to illustrate their meaning, while in the MS. a large number of entries (among others, two with parallels in our papyrus) lack any quotation or reference at all.

This seems to have escaped the observation of the editor when he attempted to restore lines 5 and 6 (in his enumeration. They are respectively lines 3 and 4 in the fragment). As a result, he suggested the following supplements:

$$\begin{array}{c} [\epsilon\phi\epsilon\pi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon]_{\varsigma} \epsilon\pi[\epsilon\rho\chi\omicron\mu] \\ \rho \\ [\epsilon\nu\omicron\epsilon\phi]_{\theta}\alpha\sigma\theta[\eta\varsigma \epsilon\nu\omicron\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma] \end{array}$$

It is true that Nicholson did not suggest his supplements at random. The blank space between ς and $\epsilon\pi$ in line 5 could be considered as a pause separating the lemma from the explanation; and of all the glosses of the MS. version, $\epsilon\phi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\chi\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ would fit here best. Besides, the correction in line 6 seemed to him to betray a confusion by the copyist of the words $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\theta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma$.¹⁰ The supplements, however, besides ignoring the apparent rule of at least one quotation an entry, violate another principle to which our papyrus seems to adhere. According to this principle, which is also observed by almost all the alphabetical dictionaries found in papyri,¹¹ each new entry

Homerscholien [Zurich 1945] 7, states that "Das Lexikon selbst wird zwar durch die Funde nicht direct betroffen"; cf. also F. Martinazzoli, *Hapax legomenon, parte prima* (ii) *Il Lexicon Homericum di Apollonio Sofista* (Bari 1957) 21–22.

⁹ See A. Brosow, *Quomodo sit Apollonius Sophista ex Etym. Magno explendus atque emendandus* (Diss. Königsberg 1884) and L. Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE* 2 (1895) 135–36.

¹⁰ The photograph of the papyrus, however, which I obtained from the Bodleian through the Library of the University of Illinois, shows that the alleged *theta* is nothing but a crossed-out *omicron*. A similar method was used in another correction in line 15.

¹¹ There is only one exception: the *PRainer* 7, which has the arrangement of the lexica but resembles the scholia in almost all respects except the arrangement,

begins with a new line. It also violates the rules of syllabification. Such supplements could also be considered responsible for the view held by some scholars¹² that our papyrus does not contain the original text of the dictionary but a version already epitomized. For all the above reasons, these supplements should be discarded and replaced by others in which the above principles are observed. Since it is hardly possible to accommodate lemma, explanation, and quotation in a line averaging 20 or 21 letters, it is safe to assume that only one entry occupied both lines. Therefore, I suggest the following restoration:

[ἐφράσθη]ς ἐπ[έγνως ἐνόησας]
[ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἐφ]ράσθη[ς]
(*Od.* 19.485, 23.260)

In lines 7–9 of the same papyrus, the first editor suggested the following supplement:

[Εφυρους] τω με[ν αρ εκ Θρηι]
[κης Εφυρου]ς ο κομ[ψολογος]
[ποιητης] δια το υπ[εναντιον] . . .
(*Il.* 13.301)

The expression ὁ κομψολόγος ποιητής has not even a remote parallel in Apollonius, as far as I know, and seems too lofty for his simple and straightforward expression. Instead, I suggest that the above lines contained a reference to the grammarian Comanus,¹³ who is referred to five times in the preserved version of the *Lexicon*. That the comment (extending to line 16) dealt with Thrace is obvious from the fact that Ares' name appears in line 10, as well as from the quotation of lines 11–16 (*Od.* 8.360–62). This is also supported by the scholia on both passages quoted in the above lines (7–16). But the exact point made in these lines escapes my comprehension. It is possible (from line 11, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν Ὁ[δυσσεΐαι])¹⁴ that a question of the authenticity of the Homeric passage (*Il.* 13.301 ff.) had arisen and Apollonius

¹² Cf. J. Tolkiehn, *RE* 12 (1925) 2445, s.v. "Lexikographie." He does not give, however, any reasons for his view.

¹³ The spelling fluctuates between Κομανός and Κομανός. But only the former (which is also the spelling of the MS. of Apollonius) has been considered as correct; cf. W. Pape-G. E. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*³ (Braunschweig 1863) 1.690b. On Comanus, see Gudeman's article "Komanos" in *RE* 11 (1922) 1128–29.

¹⁴ The first editor read [καὶ τὰ ἄλλα καὶ ἐν Ὁ[δυσσεΐαι]] and translated it "both elsewhere and especially."

thought proper to defend the passage from which his entry had originated¹⁵ before he proceeded with the explanation proper.

In lines 16–19 the editor suggested the following supplements:

. . . οἱ δὲ Εφυροὶ [Φλε]
 [γναι τε βαρ]βαρων εθνη ω[ν]
 [ο ποιητης] φησιν [Ε]φυρου[ς]
 [μεν το]υς νυν Α[καρνανα]ς . . .

This is inconsistent with the text of the MS. of Apollonius, where we read: "Εφυροὶ δέ, Φλεγύαι, βάρβαρα ἔθνη. οἱ δὲ Ἐφύρους εἶναι τοὺς νῦν Ἀκαρνᾶνας etc. (page 316 Toll). Moreover, the blank space after the word ἔθνη in the papyrus (line 17) seems to indicate a stronger pause than a mere comma. Since it is, as a rule, used instead of a period or a colon, it should be considered as introducing a new sentence and, indeed, another view of the meaning of the word in question. That the two views, "Εφυροὶ = βαρβάρων ἔθνη and "Εφυροὶ = Ἀκαρνᾶνες, were not equivalent could not be mistaken by any ancient lexicographer. It is clear, therefore, that the lacuna between lines 17–18 contained the name of a grammarian who sponsored the second view, which name the epitomator also suppressed into the generic οἱ δέ. From all the grammarians cited by name elsewhere in the dictionary, only the name of Crates,¹⁶ I think, would fit the space provided. I suggest, therefore, as a probable supplement of the lines the following: ὡ[ς δὲ Κράτη]ς φησὶν Ἐφύρου[ς καλεῖ το]ὺς νῦν Α[καρνᾶνας] etc.

Lines 29–35 of the papyrus are devoted to the discussion of the meaning of the word ἐχεπευκές. The first part of the explanation is easily restored with the help of the known text of Apollonius. The last three lines are more fragmentary and have no equivalent in our MS. The editor suggested the following restoration:

[εχεπικρον] δητοι κατα δυναμιν
 [πικραν τη]ν επι χρ[ωι τ]ων
 35 [εν βελ]ξι φα[ρμακων]

He admitted, however, that he was not satisfied with his restoration and, indeed, nobody would be. First, after επιχρ (in line 34)

¹⁵ The word "Εφυροὶ, as a national name, occurs only once in the Homeric poems; also in Strabo (8.3.6), Pausanias (9.36.3), the lexicographers, and the scholiasts.

¹⁶ Crates' name occurs twice in Apollonius, s.v. ἄμμορον (page 113 Toll) and πλωτῆ (page 555). The final sigma is partly visible in the papyrus.

there are clear traces of a letter which, I think, was clearly an *iota* and not an *omega*.¹⁷ Secondly, the lacuna επιχρη[]ων is clearly larger than Nicholson indicated and could accommodate at least four letters. Finally, the expression ἐπὶ χρῶ τῶν ἐν βέλεσι φαρμάκων is not good Greek (to say the least) and hardly suitable to indicate the smearing over of the bows with poison. The scholia on *Od.* 1.262 describe the same thing as follows: ὅταν οὖν τὰ βέλη ἐν τῇ Ἰλιάδι κοινοτέρως πικρὰ καὶ πευκεδανὰ λέγῃ καὶ ἐχεπευκῇ πάντως διὰ τοῦ φαρμάκου κεχρῖσθαι ἀκουστέον (page 48, 27 Dindorf); and Eustathius, in a passage where, I think, he echoes Apollonius, writes: ἐχεπευκὲς ἦτοι ἐχέπικρον κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς· ἐχρίετο γάρ, φησι, τὰ βέλη πένκη . . . (page 1006, 68). It becomes, therefore, clear that the proper reading for these lines should be:

[ἐχέπικρον] δ' ἦτοι κατὰ δύναμιν
[πικρὰν τῶ]ν ἐπιχρη[ομένων]ων
[τοῖς βέλ]εσι φα[ρμάκων]

3. *PGraecVindob.* 31956

This papyrus (s. IX A.D.) was published as a posthumous work of Peter Sanz in the *Jahrbuch der oesterreichischen byzantinischen Gesellschaft* 4 (1955) 1–11 (with a table without pagination) under the title, “Ein Fragment eines neuen Kanon des Andreas von Kreta.” The editor considered the text of the papyrus as new and argued that it was the work of St. Andrew of Crete. His arguments were twofold: first, the external evidence; and secondly, certain stylistic features. In the first instance, he noticed that one of the *troparia* (stanzas) of the poem had already been used as an *heirmos*¹⁸ in a *tridion*¹⁹ by the said poet. Since Andrew has commonly been considered as the originator of the poetic genre known as “canon,”²⁰ naturally the *heirmos* used by him could

¹⁷ If this is what Nicholson meant when he wrote that “part of the second ω is visible” (392). The second *omega* is entirely visible beyond any doubt.

¹⁸ The term *heirmos* has been variously explained from Byzantine times onwards. In an article ‘Ὑμνογραφικὰ κείμενα εἰς τοὺς παπύρους (to be published in the next volume of the *Ἑπετηρίς Ἐταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 63[1963]), I have argued that its original meaning was *link* between the biblical odes and the *troparia* of the canon. Whatever the original meaning of the word, it is commonly used to indicate the rhythmical and musical model of the *troparia*.

¹⁹ *Tridion* is a composition similar to the “canon” but consisting of only three “odes” *versus* nine of the latter.

²⁰ I have criticized this view in the article mentioned above (note 18), where I have argued that the “canon” was known before Andrew.

not have been written by anybody else but him. In the second instance, Sanz pointed out in detail similarities in the expression between the text of the papyrus and various poems by Andrew.

Unfortunately, the text from which our fragment originated is not new. With the help of Miss Follieri's *Initia hymnorum*,²¹ I was able to identify it with the "canon" composed in honor of the Ἀσώματοι (celebrated on November 8) by John the Monk.²²

However, not all the stanzas found on the papyrus fragment are the work of John or an integral part of the same poem. According to the *Mēnaion*, the *heirmoi* of the "odes" have been borrowed from other "canons." Indeed, the *heirmos* of the eighth "ode" (*incipit* Τὸν ἐν ὅρει ἀγίῳ δοξασθέντα) is attributed by the *heirmologia*²³ to St. Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople and contemporary of both Andrew and John. As for the *heirmos* of the ninth "ode," it is also attributed to our John the Monk, but it belongs to another of his compositions.^{23a}

The custom of borrowing the *heirmoi* from previous compositions was quite common in Byzantine poetry. Indeed, of all the "canons" composed during the Byzantine period only a small percentage had their own original meter and music. The general practice, however, was merely to indicate the *heirmos* which had served as a model by citing the beginning words only. That this practice was quite old is proved by *PRylands* 466 (s. VII–VIII A.D.).²⁴

²¹ Henrica Follieri, *Initia hymnorum ecclesiae Graecae* (Vatican City 1960–62) 1–3 (Studi e Testi 211–13). The fourth volume is expected to appear soon. The immense usefulness of this laborious work is somewhat diminished by the fact that no reference is made to the already considerable number of papyri with hymnographical contents (such as the one under discussion).

²² This "canon" is the first of the two composed by the same John the Monk for the same feast and included in the *Mēnaion* (cf. *Μηναία τοῦ ὁλοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ* 2 [Rome 1892] 81 ff.). Their author is probably the renowned theologian of the Eastern Church, John of Damascus, who is often referred to simply as John the Monk; cf. S. Eustratiades (below, note 23), *passim*.

²³ Cf. S. Eustratiades, *Εἰρμολόγιον* (Chennevières-sur-Marne 1932) (Ἀγιορειτικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη 9) 225–26; add also *Hirmologium Athoum: Codex monasterii Hiberorum phototypice depictus*, curavit C. Höeg (Copenhagen 1938) (*Monumenta musicae Byzantinae* 2) fol. 135^r.

^{23a} *Op. cit.* (above, note 23) 220–21.

²⁴ See C. H. Roberts, *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester*, 3 (Manchester 1938) 28–35. I have discussed this papyrus in connection with the problem of the origin of the canon in my article already mentioned (above, note 18).

Sometimes the text of the borrowed *heirmos* may be given in full at the beginning of each "ode"; but in this case, it would be marked with quotation marks. More often we find the full text of the *heirmos* at the end of each "ode" marked as *καταβασία*²⁵ Even in the latter case, quotation marks were commonly used. The scribe of the papyrus, however, has incorporated the borrowed stanzas into the actual text of the "canon," apparently for the facility of the reader or singer.²⁶ This may also indicate a practice of a special area or period. The deviation from the usual, at any rate, explains why Sanz, who was himself quite familiar with the problems of Byzantine sacred literature, was misled and considered the *heirmoi* as part of the "canon."

As for the authorship of John the Monk, neither the stylistic reasons suggested by the first editor nor the external evidence as evaluated by him can be of a decisive character against the testimony of the *Ménaia*. Similarities in expression between the most different Byzantine hymnographers are quite common²⁷ and were due either to direct imitation or to repetition of certain formulas, some of which *indeed* go back (directly or indirectly) to the Biblical texts (canonical or apocryphal). Finally, the well-attested custom of borrowing the *heirmoi* from previous or contemporary hymnographers, together with the express testimony of the *heirmologia* that the stanza *Τὸν ἐν ὄρει ἀγίῳ δοξασθέντα* was composed by Germanus, more than counterbalance Sanz, arguments in favor of Andrew's authorship. Indeed, it is hardly probable that the famous Cretan archbishop had any connection at all with any part of the text preserved in our papyrus.²⁸

In spite of the above identification, *PVindobonensis* is not without some value: for two of the *troparia* preserved in it have no parallel in our liturgical books, as far as I know, and can be considered as new. This is the case of the *troparion* contained in lines 1-4

²⁵ For the term *καταβασία* see C. du Fresne du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Graecitatis* I (Lyon 1688) 606; E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Boston 1870) 426; and A. A. Papadopoulos, "Λειτουργικοί ὄροι," *Ἀθηνᾶ* 40 (1928) 79.

²⁶ In later times all the *heirmoi* were collected in special books (with musical notation) called *heirmologia*.

²⁷ For a good example, cf. K. Krumbacher, *Gesch. d. byz. Litt.*² (München 1897) 667.

²⁸ That Andrew could have borrowed an *heirmos* from John of Damascus in the *tridion* referred to by Sanz (whether it is an authentic poem or not) is not strange; cf. S. Eustratiades, *op. cit.* (above, note 23) i.

of the papyrus (*incipit* Ἀγνῶν ἐξ αἰμάτων), which is clearly a *theotokion*.²⁹ Since the *theotokia* were integral parts of the “odes” of the Byzantine “canons,” and the seventh “ode” of the “canon” under discussion lacks a *theotokion* in our *Ménaion*, there should not be any doubt that the above stanza was part of the original composition. Fortunately, it has been preserved in a fairly good condition and should be restored in its place by the future editors of the *Ménaia*.

The other new *troparion*, which is also a *theotokion*, is contained in lines 25–29 (*incipit* Τὴν παρθένον καὶ ἄχραντον μητέρα). Its genuineness, however, is not as evident as that of the former, because the eighth “ode” (to which it belongs) has another *theotokion* in both the *Ménaion* and the papyrus (*incipit* Ὡς ἐν πόλῳ παρειστήκεισαν τρόμῳ)—indeed, a very unusual case. The fact that the latter has been preserved in both the *Ménaion* and the papyrus seems to favor its genuineness against the former. On the other hand, it lacks the usual *ephymnion* (refrain), which is one of the links connecting the stanzas in such compositions.³⁰ Whatever the case is, both the stanzas under discussion appear to be nothing but a duplication, where the same idea (that the Virgin Mary gave birth to Him, Whom the angels cannot behold) is expressed from two slightly different points of view. To show this, I give here in transcription the two *troparia* side by side:

A	B
Τὴν παρθένον	Ὡς ἐν πόλῳ
καὶ ἄχραντον μητέρα	παρειστήκεισαν τρόμῳ
τὴν τεκοῦσαν	μυριάδες
τοῦ κόσμου τὸν σωτήρα	ἀγγέλων ἀρχαγγέλων
ὃν κατιδεῖν οὐ φέρουσιν ἀσώματοι,	τοῦτον ἀγκάλας φέρειν κατηξίωσαι
Κύριον, πάντες ὑμνεῖτε	τούτῳ, Θεοτόκε,
καὶ ὑπερυψοῦτε	πρέσβευε σωθῆναι
εἰς πάντα τοὺς αἰῶνας.	τοὺς σὲ δοξολογοῦντας.

The apparent similarity between the two may indicate that they were two different drafts of the same stanza by the same author,

²⁹ A *theotokion* is a hymn in honor of the *Theotokos* (Virgin Mary). As a rule, the last *troparion* of each “ode” of a “canon” is a *theotokion*.

³⁰ The refrain was common especially in the first, seventh and eighth “odes” of the canon and was a remnant of the old *hypopsalmata* of the Biblical odes or canticles; cf. my article (above, note 18).

or that the one was an imitation of the other, which was already in the ninth century attached to its model. The final solution probably lies in the MSS. I am inclined to think that since *troparion* B (above) follows A in the papyrus, and since it is also an imitation of the first stanza of the seventh "ode,"³¹ it is not the "genuine" one.

The identification of the papyrus text with that of the "canon" of John the Monk makes the restoration of the lacunae a routine task. There are, however, a few differences between the two texts which are not without some interest from the point of view of textual criticism. Thus, in line 7 our papyrus has *πυρός* against *πυρὶ* of the liturgical books.³² Either reading could be correct. In the same line the papyrus has preserved the metrically (and aesthetically) correct form *παρθένου* *versus* *ἁειπαρθένου* of most of the tradition. In line 12 the reading *ἄλλω* could have stood not for *ἄλλῳ* (as Sanz transcribed it) but for the *ἄλλως* of the *Mēnaion*, which seems closer to the spirit of the hymnography of the period. In line 14 *οὐρανίους* seems a mistake (on a false analogy of the preceding *χορείας*) and so is *ὁ τὸν* *versus* *οἱ τὸν* in the same line. In line 30 the papyrus agrees with the *Mēnaion* by preserving the correct form *πόλῳ* (sky, heaven) *versus* Sanz' correction *πώλῳ* (foal). In line 32 the reading of the papyrus *του[τον] ἀγκάλαις* (Sanz suggested *τοῦ [ταῖς] ἀγκάλαις*) is contrasted with *ἐν ταῖς ἀγκάλαις* of the *Mēnaion*. In lines 36–37 we read *τῆς κτίσεως*, which is far better than *καὶ Κύριον* of the *heirmologion*,³³ both because it rhymes with *φύσεως* of the preceding line and explains the point made there in a more vivid way: "Ὅρους παρῆλθες τῆς φύσεως* τὸν δημιουργὸν συλλαβοῦσα τῆς κτίσεως; it should, therefore, be readily adopted as the correct reading. In line 40, the papyrus presents what seems to be a

³¹ *Ὁ παρειστήκεισαν ἀπαύστως* λειτουργοῦσαι μυριάδες τῶν ἀγγέλων* τοῦ προσώπου ὁρᾶν* μὴ φέρουσαι τὴν θέαν,* Εὐλογητὸς εἰ, Κύριε,* ὁ θεός, ἀναβοῶσιν (page 86).

³² The stanza *Τὸν ἐν ὄρει ἁγίῳ δοξασθέντα* occurs on several occasions in the *Mēnaia* (above, note 22) 1.34 (on Sept. 2), 63 (on Sept. 5), 459 (on Oct. 18); vol. 2.269 (on Nov. 24); 4.94 (on March 15); also in the Tridion (*Τριώδιον κατανυκτικόν* [Athens, *Apostolikē Diakonia*, 1960]) 23, 62, and 158; also in Migne, *PG* 140.777, and in S. Eustratiades, *op. cit.* (above, note 23) 226. The text is not identical in all cases. The reading *πυρὶ* is common to all except the *Mēnaion* 2.269 and Migne, *PG*, where the reading *τόκον* has replaced the common reading. In the next instance (*παρθένου* *versus* *ἁειπαρθένου*), the *Mēnaia* in 1.459 and 4.94, as well as the *heirmologia*, agree with our papyrus against the rest.

³³ This *troparion*, although it has been used in several instances as an *heirmos*, is never given in full in the other liturgical books.

correction or alternative reading: *κενώσαντα* versus *ένώσαντα* of the *Ménaion*. But even if we accept the editor's correction *καινώσαντα*, the traditional reading is much more consistent with the meaning of the whole stanza and should be retained. Finally, in line 41, the papyrus omits the word *Χριστέ*, which in the *Ménaion* appears between *έπουρανίοις* and *έπίγεια*, and which is necessary both for metrical reasons and to explain the *σέ* at the beginning of the stanza.