The Palau Ribes Papyrological Collection Rediscovered

(*P.PalauRib.Lit. 9 Re-Edited*)

Alberto Nodar

Forty years ago, in 1968, Sebastián Bartina published this Hesiod papyrus¹ in one of the first volumes of *Studia Papyrologica*, the journal that Josep O'Callaghan, creator of the Palau-Ribes collection, founded in 1962 to host and promote the papyrological studies in Catalonia and Spain. At the 25th International Congress of Papyrologists I had the pleasure of contributing a paper about the "rediscovery" of the Palau Ribes collection. The appearance of the re-edition of this papyrus, which I have been planning for some time, in the proceedings of the Congress is timely, for it offers a good example of the resumption of work on the Palau-Ribes material and the new dynamism we wish to inspire to papyrological studies in our country. In fact, the papyrus itself was among those proposed to the students in a recent summer seminar at the present location of the Palau-Ribes collection.² By re-editing the text, I do not intend to criticize the work of my predecessors, but to honor their memory by adding my contribution to their scientific efforts.

Hesiod, *Theogony* 862–872

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>P.PalauRib.Lit. 9</em></th>
<th>Plate I</th>
<th>4.7 x 7.2 cm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III AD (beginning)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The papyrus contains remains of 11 lines of writing belonging to a single column. The text runs along the fibers and was probably part of a roll. The back is blank, except for a seemingly accidental spot of ink with no definite shape. Only 1 cm of the upper margin has survived.

The handwriting is roughly bilinear, for letters do not sit regularly on the base-line and the long descenders of ρ, φ, i and u, protrude below the line. The mid-sized capitals are in general quite regularly spaced and, with the exception of the middle horizontals of ε and θ, they hardly ever touch each other. Slight variations in size and spacing, as well as the somehow narrow interlinear space, contribute to a general air of informality, although the hand is certainly experienced. It shares many characteristics of the Formal Mixed or Severe Style – following Turner-Parsons' terminology –³ such as the contrast between a set of broad letters (conspicuously η, μ, υ and ω) and smaller, narrow letters (typically ε, θ, ο and γ), and the angularity of shapes, especially noticeable in the case of the round letters: ε and γ with straight backs and upper parts drawn in a separate movement, lower loop of β with a triangular shape, pointed left-

---


² And thus I wish to thank my colleagues and friends present at that seminar, Cesar Hernández, Raquel Martín and Marco Antonio Santamaría, for their comments and reflections regarding this text.

hand elements of $\alpha$ and $\delta$, etc. However, the central parts of $\mu$ and $\nu$ and the right-hand oblique of $\alpha$ are curved. Shading is also characteristic of this style of writing: thin horizontal strokes contrast with thick vertical strokes, and oblique strokes ascending to the right are thinner than those descending to the right. Other feature often associated to the Formal Mixed style is the slant to the right, even if in our case this is not very conspicuous, and the overall impression is that of an upright writing.

Ornamentation is not frequent and is restricted to occasional ticks to the left at the foot of long descenders (e.g., $\iota$, $\rho$, $\upsilon$) and sometimes at the top of verticals (e.g., in $\eta$ or $\nu$). Likewise, the left-hand oblique of $\upsilon$ may present a similar tick at its top. The text is provided with accents: acute (ll. 862, 869, 871), grave (l. 869), and circumflex (ll. 863, 868), and has been corrected, apparently by a different hand (see commentary to ll. 863 and 867). The preserved portion of text presented no possible cases for elision in the original paradosis, but it was subsequently effected and marked by a second hand as a correction (l. 867). Line 865 provides the only place in the papyrus where the practice of the scribe regarding $\iota$ adscript can be safely ascertained: it is absent.

Classical exemplars of the Formal Mixed comparable to our manuscript are P.Berol. inv. 97664 (Plato, Laws), with a slight curvature in the diagonal of $\nu$, $\mu$ with rounded central elements and pointed left-hand parts of $\alpha$ and $\delta$. Long descenders also tend to protrude well below the line, as in our manuscript ($\rho$, $\upsilon$, $\phi$ and, here, $\tau$ more than $\iota$). The hand is, however, more formal than in our papyrus. P.Heid. inv. 17015 also compares well with our hand, but is still formal, even if in its general appearance more similar to our somehow thick, not stylized strokes (but modular contrast between narrow and small letters is more pronounced, see, for instance how $\omega$ is smaller and suspended high in the line). Both are assigned to the third century AD. P.Oxy. XXXIV 2699 (Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica),6 also assigned to the same date, shares the informal air with our script, although ductus and letter shapes, typical for the Formal Mixed style, are not particularly similar to ours. There are more similarities, however, with P.Oxy. LXVIII 4649 (Prose quoting Hesiod, Theogony 6–7): although the material is scanty for comparison of all letters, $\mu$ has the curved central elements, $\omega$ has the same height and width as the rest of the broad letters, and the triangular set of letters keep their angularity. Similarly, long verticals descend below line-level, but shading, slanting or any other kinds of ornaments are not very pronounced.7 Since this papyrus has also been assigned to the third century, I would rather suggest the beginning of this century as a probable date for our papyrus. Thus, rather than showing an early stage in the formation of the style, the unperfected appearance of the script shows the informality of the production.

Apart from l. 863 (see commentary), the text agrees with the manuscript tradition,8 but an orthographic mistake of a phonetic nature (l. 865), the character of the correction in l. 867, simplifying the text, and the error itself in l. 863 (very probably due to lack of attention) point, together with the already

---

5 Reproduced in Seider, op.cit. (above, n. 4) no. 36.
6 Ibid., no. 49.
7 For a similar appearance of another Hesiodic papyrus, compare P.Oxy. LXVIII 4641 (Works and Days 563–567), but the fragment is even smaller to allow comparison of individual letters. It has also been assigned to the third century.
8 For the purposes of collation I have used M.L. West, Hesiod Theogony (Oxford 1966). I have also considered A. Rzach, Hesiodi Carmina (Stuttgart-Leipzig) 19133 and F. Solmsen, R. Merkelbach and M.L. West, Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum, Fragmenta Selecta (Oxford 1990).
mentioned informal air in the execution, to a non-professional copy of the text and, at the same time, seem to exclude the possibility of a scholar’s private copy. However, the fact that the handwriting is an experienced one, and already able to attain the standards of a type such as the Formal Mixed, as well as the presence of accents seem to indicate that the text may have been copied by an advanced student, and probably then corrected by the teacher (who is not responsible, however, for the correction in l. 867; see commentary to the line).

Bartina also studied the relationship of our papyrus with the rest of the *Theogony* papyri in an article published one year after its *editio princeps*, following the appearance of many new Hesiod papyri. He identified four containing passages of the text partially overlapping with ours; I cite them here according to West's list:

Π5
P.Vindob. inv. G 19815; *MPER* 1.73–83, from the second half of the fourth century AD. Hesiod, *Theogony* 626–881; Works and Days 210–828; Shield 1–32, 350–470 (lac.)

Lines 871–872 are preserved in both papyri, but only partially, since Π5 contains only the line-ends, which are absent in our papyrus.

Π12
*PSI* IX 1086, assigned to the end of the second or beginning of the third century AD. Hesiod, *Theogony* 839–869. Differences from our text are registered in the commentary to this edition, even though they are not substantial.

Π13
Since our papyrus has not preserved this part of the lines, comparison between the text of the two papyri is not possible.

Π15
*P.Ant.* II 71; assigned to the fifth or sixth century AD. Hesiod, *Theogony* 825–853, 868–896; it contains scanty remains of the middle of lines, which prevent any coincidence with our text.

Since 1969 a new Hesiod papyrus has been published containing portions of text present in ours: *P.Oxy.* LXVIII 4657, edited in 2003 by P.J. Parsons, and assigned to the second century AD, transmits

---


11 “Ambos (both PLit. Palau Rib. 9 and PAnt 2.71) a su vez contienen reliquias mediales de los versos, tan reducidas que tampoco coinciden entre sí en ninguna letra, verso por verso,” Bartina, *op.cit.* (above, n. 9) 106.
Theogony 820–831, 859–865. A few letters of ll. 862–865 are present in both papyri, which do not show any textual divergence.\(^\text{12}\)

On palaeographical grounds or otherwise, the possibility that any of these papyri should belong together with our fragment is excluded. Furthermore, I have been unable to identify any other Hesiod papyri\(^\text{13}\) as belonging to the same roll as our fragment. The closest parallels found among other Hesiod papyri in palaeographical terms are the two small fragments mentioned in the description of the hand, but it is clear that they were not written by the same hand as ours.

I have discussed the presence of diacritical signs in papyri elsewhere,\(^\text{14}\) arguing that in many cases rather than performing a purely practical task in helping the reader articulate the text, they reflect the rich philological activity which goes back to Alexandrian scholarship. Nonetheless, it is also true that this philological activity partially finds its origin in the explanatory nature of the work of the γραμματικοί, whose function was to explain the literary text and whose work is so graphically reflected in lists of words, glossae or D-Scholia, in the case of Homer.\(^\text{15}\) In this respect, what we find in our papyrus is not so much traces of highly learned scholarship as traces of the work of a grammatikos, who, in the educative process, explains rare words, mythological characters, unusual forms and peculiar grammatical phenomena. Signs in the text may serve to mark such passages, which would then be explained in a separate commentary or word list, and accents may be used in precisely this way, regardless of the prosodic characteristics of the word in question. As a matter of fact, of all the known glossed words in ll. 862–872\(^\text{16}\) we only have two in the papyrus (θεσπεσίη, αἰζηνόν, ll. 862 and 863, respectively), and both carry an accent. Of course there are more instances of accents in the text, which I will try to account for in the commentary.

\[ \text{→ αυτὴν θεσπεσίη καὶ ετηκετό κασσίτερος ως} \]
\[ \text{τεχνὴ ὑπ ἀιζηνόν νῦ ὁ} \]
\[ \text{θαλάσσει πος σιδήρος ὁ περὶ κρατερωτάτους ἑστιν} \]

865 οὐρὶς εἰς ἄθησα ὁ ἄμυανοι πυρὶ κηλεὼ
τηκεται εν χθει δ[η ὡη Ηραίου παλαιοσίνων
ριψε δε μι[ν] θυμω[ν] ακαχων ες ταρταρου ευριν

---

12 See, however, commentary to line 863.
Unless otherwise stated, I provide West’s text in the lacunae, and will only discuss textual variants preserved on the papyrus. I have printed lectional signs only when present in the papyrus, and have omitted iota adscripts, following the scribe’s practice.

862 θεσπ[εσίη: The accent appears displaced to the right; this practice, not unusual in the papyri, has sometimes been attributed to rapid or inaccurate writing. The expression has been the object of an explanation: cf. Glossae in Θεογονία 862.1 ἀυτή θεσπεσίη. τῇ τοῦ πυρὸς ἀτμῷ Μα.

863 αἱ [ζη̣ω̣ν]: Our papyrus does not seem to agree with the manuscript tradition: ύπο τ ’ευτρήτου χοάνοιο, nor does it agree with the only papyrus which has preserved the text at this particular point, Π12 in West’s list: ύπο τ ευτρη[ ]. Peppmüller had suggested ἐν εὐτρήτως χοάνωι for stylistic reasons, but the remains of ink at this point do not confirm his proposal, for they are not consistent with ε, but o. Obviously, the scribe – or corrector – has perceived some problem at this point, as the superscription above the line, to the right of ω, shows. In this respect, attention should be drawn to the fact that this passage still seems troublesome to modern editors, and that P.Oxy. 4657 presents an iota mutum superscript after η. Though an error, as P.J. Parsons rightly observes, it may be further evidence of confusion at this point. In any case, I do not think, as Bartina and Übel interpreted, that the superscription is a sign for an abbreviation: (υπο) η. I rather see a ν, of which the second vertical has been almost completely lost in the lacuna. Its shape is somehow different from that in the main text; it looks, in fact, more similar to one of those characteristic of the Severe Style, without the curvature in the diagonal stroke it presents in the main text. I think it likely that the letter was written by a second hand, perhaps that of a teacher, already mastering this writing style in all its formality.

A hypothesis to explain the second half of the verse might be that our student, having completed the first half of the line (we have masculine caesura after αἱζη̣ον), started to copy the second half of the next one: δ’ περ κατερώτατος ἐστιν, after the feminine caesura: the traces following ο, namely the left-hand end of a high horizontal, are consistent with the high horizontal of π. This lack of attention might have

---

17 West, op.cit. (above, n. 8). I will also follow this edition and adopt West’s sigla when quoting readings from different manuscripts and papyri.

18 See B. Laum, "Alexandrinisches und byzantisches Akzentuationssystem," RhM 73 (1920–4) 28–30 and C.M. Mazzucchi, "Sul Sistema di Accentazione dei Testi Greci in Età Romana e Bizantina," Aegyptus 59 (1979) 148–149, regarding, above all, the study of grave accents, such as the one we have in our text in l. 869.

19 See West’s discussion of the passage, including Peppmüller’s suggestion, op.cit. (above, n. 8) 394–395.

20 Cf. Parson’s note at the edition of the line: "… some ancient scholars believed … that αἱζη̣ος should be written by analogy with the four-syllable αἱζη̣ος."

21 They also interpreted the sign on ω not as a circumflex accent, but as a mark of abbreviation, in this case for final ν in αἱζη̣ον(ν), cf. Bartina’s editio princeps and F. Übel, "Literarische Texte unter Ausschluss der christlichen," APF 22–23 (1974) 361.
been favored by the somehow parallel constructions used for both metals in the simile: κασσίτερος ...
τέχνη ὑπ’ αἰζηνών ... θαλφθεῖς: σίδηρος ... δαμαζόμενος ὑφ’ ἤραντου παλάμης, thus making possible the transposition at this point without ruining completely the sense. If this was the case, however, we cannot know whether the error was subsequently corrected, because the second half of the following line has also not been preserved.

For the circumflex accent in αἰ ἔνων’ ν’, the Glossae give an equivalent to the expression in the normal speech: Glossae in Theogoniam 863. 1 αἰζηνών. νέων BM v. Hesych. αἰζηνών. νέων τεχνημάτων (l. τεχνημόνων) M².

865 εὺ for ἐν is a common phonetic mistake. Bartina prints ν in his edition at this point, but the breadth of the letter, the fact that the oblique stroke does not touch the lower end of the second vertical, and that there seems to curve up when it joins it — even if not so clearly as in the other instance of μ we have in the text (l. 868) — make me think that we have a μ rather than a ν.

866 τηκέται εν: The papyrus does not support τήκεται δ’ ἐν, in νQ, or τήκετο δ’ ἐν in S, thus agreeing with the rest of MSS and Π12.

δην: The two strokes forming the left-hand vertex of δ do not join together; it is certainly not to be seen elsewhere in the papyrus for this letter or α, but I think the lower stroke would be too high in the line to regard it as an accent referring to γαια in next line.

867 αὶρ’ [αι’] ε’ τηκέτο: On the second α in ἀρα the augment of the verbal form has been added. The hand, which must also be responsible for the apostrophe after ρ above the line, is not the same as the one correcting the text at l. 863, to judge from the coarse strokes drawn touching the right-hand elements of α. Was this correction due to the student going through the text a second time? Rather than a variant, this should be regarded as a simplification of the text, in accordance with the school related production character of this papyrus (cf. introduction).

868 θυμών: The papyrus agrees with the rest of manuscripts against those in group a, offering θυμουν. The word is not glossed, nor is it the object of a scholium at this point. Maybe the accent was stressing the fact that there is a dative here, and not an accusative?

869 Τυφώνεος ἐστι: there does not seem to be a diacritical purpose for either accent, inasmuch as there seems to be no alternative articulation of the text. Maybe Τυφώνεος was glossed as a genitive in -εος, as opposed to the one in -εως, normal for this flexive type in Attic and the koine, or maybe it was glossed as the mythological character. The verse is quoted in a scholion regarding Theogonia 307, δεινον θ’ ὑβριστὴν τ’ ἄνομον θ’ ἐλικώπιδι κούρῃ, where doubt is expressed as to whether ἄνομος or ἄνεμος should be referred to Τυφώνεων in the previous line:

<ἀνεμων: > ἐάν μετὰ τοῦ <ο> γράφηται, ἄνομον ἀκουσόμεθα, ἐπεῖ τῇ τοῦ Διός ἀρχήν ἐπέθετο· ἐάν δὲ δία τοῦ <ε>, ἄνεμον, ἐπεὶ αἰ πνοαὶ τυφώνεις λέγονται, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸς λέγει (v. 869)

ἐκ [δὲ] Τυφώνεος ἐστ’ ἄνεμων μένος ύγρὸν ἄνεμων. Scholia Vetrica (R2WLZX)

---

22 It is not registered in West’s apparatus as a variant reading.

23 It is unlikely that the scribe might have wished to prevent the reader from placing the accent on the ο, thus reading the accusative form Τυφώ.
As for the grave accent, also placed one letter further to the right (see commentary to l. 862), it is
difficult to see what confusion could be caused by placing a high pitch on the second ε. The construction
εκ + gen. + ἐστὶ, however, might have been signaled with the accent characteristic to Hesiodic poetry. It
might be interesting to note at this point the following homeric scholion, on the *barytonesis* of the verbal
form in the same construction:

Scholion to *Iliad* 1. 63c <<ἐκ Διός ἐστιν: τὸ ἐστιν ἐγκλιτικὸν ἐστιν, εἰ μὴ ἀρχεται ἢ
προηγεῖται αὐτοῦ ἢ οὐ ἀπόφασις. b (BC) Ττ, attributed to Herodian.

870 Νοτ[ου: a (and S, according to the *apparatus criticus* in Solmsen, Merkelbach and West’s
edition of Hesiod’s works) present νότον τε, against the papyrus and the rest of MSS.

871 θεόφιν: The word does not appear in the *Scholia* or *Glossae* to Hesiod, but it does in the
Homeric Scholia (e.g. scholia to *Iliad* 14. 318 T³, ex., and to 17. 101b b(BCE3)Τ³, ex., etc.). The
accent is likely to be drawing the reader’s attention to this unusual form, rather than preventing confusion
by warning the reader against the *barytonesis* that the final syllable of θεός would experience in normal
circumstances; for, as a matter of fact, θεός in itself would be no form of the substantive.

---

24 Cf. West, *op.cit.* (above, n. 8) 330 on ll. 590–591.

25 I cite according to H. Erbse’s edition *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem.* 7 vols. (Berlin 1969–1988). See also, though
not so clearly suited to our case, the scholion to *Iliad* 6. 152a, also attributed to Herodian:

<<ἐστιν ἀπόροια λόγος: τὸ ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης συλλαβῆς ἔχει τὴν ὁδείαν, ἄτοι ἀρχηται, ἢ ἐστιν ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης
συλλαβῆς ἔχει τὴν ὁδείαν, οἷον "ὁ δὴ τετελεσμένον ἐστίν" (Σ 196. Σ 427. ε 90) (Λ).

26 <<θεόφιν: θεός ἢ θεός: τὸ γάρ ἵνας ὁμοίας ἀλληγορίας ἀπάλλαντος διότι συντάττεται.

27 <<ἐκ θεόφιν: ἐκ θεόν, περισσή οὐν ἢ ἔξ.

28 Even if we find an acute accent printed at this point in the volume edited by O’Callaghan, the note to the line draws the
attention to its strange shape; already Bartina in the *editio princeps* noted that from its lower end a short stroke seems to go to
the right, and printed accordingly a triangular sign on ο. I think, however, that the blobby shape of such a stroke may have
something to do with the fact that the accent touches the lower elements of ρ in the preceding line, and thus it might have been
caused accidentally.