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To date, only one papyrus fragment of Theognis (or, the so-called Theognidea) has ever been published, that in E. Lobel’s edition of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vol. XXIII (1956), no. 2380. The 2nd to 3rd century A. D. fragment, which preserves portions of Elegiae I, 254-278, soon ignited a long and heated debate on the date and composition of the Theognidean sylloge. J. Carrière, who produced the 1948 Budé edition of Theognis (revised in 1975), first realized thirty years ago that the papyrus fragment provided real proof of the bona fide antiquity of the manuscript tradition of the Theognidea. A. Peretti, on the other hand, who had argued before the papyrus’ discovery that the text of the Theognidea represents a late gnomic anthology, found nothing in the new fragment to modify his views. Despite the fact that the papyrus gives us a sequence of the Theognidea exactly as it occurs in our mediaeval witnesses, Peretti continued to hold to his position, prolonging the scholarly exchange into the next decade. Others, at arm’s length from the temperature of the debate, have tended to

1= Pack² 1497; see also, M. Gronewald, “Theognis 255 und Pap. Oxy. 2380,” ZPE 19 (1975), 178f. on this papyrus. I exclude, with others, the relative unimportance of the few citations of the Theognidea that occur in the context of gnomic anthologies. At least two ostraca with portions of the Theognidea are published, but they represent school exercises and include gnomic sentences gleaned from various authors: 1) P. Berol. 12319 (3rd cent. A.D.), ed. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Sitzungsberichte der Preußischer Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin, 1918), p. 742f. (= Pack² 1567, “Anthology”), is a collection of 12 γνῶμαι from various poets of which only the seventh contains Theognidea 25-26; and 2) P. Berol. 12310 (= Pack² 1498/1697), ed. P. Viereck, “Drei Ostraka des Berliner Museums,” Raccolta di scritti in onore di Giacomo Lombroso (1844-1925) (Milan, 1925), p. 254f., which contains in lines 1-10 Theognidea, 435, 434, 436-438, followed by a citation from an unidentified Comic fragment, lines 11-14 (= CGFP 317); see further, Maróti, note 5 below.


3A. Peretti has argued in his Teognide nella tradizione gnomologica (Studi Classici e Orientali 4; Pisa, 1953) that the Theognidea represents a gnomic anthology assembled as late as the 9th century A.D., after the manner of a Stobaeus or Orion. Then, in the first of two articles rebutting Carrière, Peretti emphasized the brevity of the Theognis papyrus, judging it as simply a sequence of γνῶμαι similar to that which eventually became the 9th-century Theognidean anthology: A. Peretti, “A proposito del papiro di Teognide,” Maia 19 (1967), 113-153 (further, note 4, below).

side with Carrière in recognizing the importance of the papyrus for establishing the early date of the sylloge.²

P. Berol. 21220, first edited more than twenty years ago by H. Maehler as an unidentified fragment of hexameters or elegies,⁶ can now be securely assigned to the Theognidea, lines 917-933, thus presenting us with our second Theognis fragment. The papyrus (H. 10.5 cm.; W. 3.0 cm.) is described in the editio princeps as written on the verso of a documentary text in a clean, round book-hand of the 2nd century A.D., comparable to the Xenophon papyrus, P. Berol. 21108. The text given below represents Maehler’s readings, largely unchanged.

[ alla prin ekteleseai katethi domon Aiðios [epos]
[ χρήματα δ’ ανθρώπων ουππύρχον ελα[βεν]
[ οετ’ εις ακαίρα ποιεῖν καὶ μη δομ[έν οι κ[’ έθελη τίς]

920 (5)
[ ειδον δ’ ἄλλον ος η γαστρι χαριζομενον [vac.]
[ χρήματα μεν διετριβεν εφηδ]υραγοι φ[ρενα τερψας]
[ πτωχευει δε φιλον παντας οπ]ου τιν’ ιδ[η]
[ ουτω δημοκλείς κατο χρήματ] εριστον [απαντον]
[ την δαπανην θεσθαι και μελ]ετην εχ[εμεν]

925 (10)
[ ουτε γαρ αν προκαμον ἄλλωι κ[αμον [μεταδοι[ης]
[ ουτ’ αν πτωχευον δουλοσιν]ην τελεοις [vac.]

---

²M. L. West, Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus (Berlin & New York, 1974), states on Peretti’s conclusion: “he tries to show that excerpt sequences reflect the subject-headings of gnomologists, and that our sylloge was put together after Stobaeus’s time from gnomologies like his — a conclusion hard hit by the papyrus” (p. 54). Similarly, H. Rahn, in Gnomon 36 (1964), p. 562 (rev. of D. Young, Theognis,” [Leipzig, 1961]) expresses justifiable enthusiasm over the papyrus; see, further, E. Maróti, “Zum römerzeitlichen Weiterleben des Theognis,” Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 15 (1967), 153-158 (who also sees an allusion to Theognis, 245-6 on a 2nd-3rd century inscription from Oenoanda); B. A. van Groningen, Theognis. Le premier livre (Amsterdam, 1966), p. 99. But even prior to P. Oxy. 2380’s discovery, scholars seemed uncomfortable with Peretti’s overall thesis of a late date for the sylloge; for even if the present form of the Theognidean sylloge resembles a sometimes thematically arranged gnomic collection, there is little reason not to accept a final redaction for the corpus in the 4th century B. C.; see, for example, M. L. West, Studies, pp. 55-59; idem, Iambi et Elegi Graeci, vol. I (Oxford, 1989²), p. 172 (s. VII-V); and the reviews of Peretti by F. Lasserre, L’Antiquité Classique 23 (1954), p. 461, G. M. Kirkwood, Classical Philology 52 (1957), p. 42, and others.

⁶H. Maehler, “Neue Hexameter-Fragmente auf Papyrus,” ZPE 6 (1970), 152-170, Nr. 4 (Taf. VIIk), pp. 163-165. I would like to thank W. Brashear of the Ägyptisches Museum for allowing me to republish this text before its appearance in an upcoming volume of Berlin papyri. The article also benefited greatly from discussion with R. Merkelbach, R. Kassel, M. Gronewald, and K. Maresch, particularly on the new interpretation of line 6.
[οὐδ’ ἐι γῆρας ἰκονο τὰ χρηματα] παντ’ απο[δραη]τ
[ἐν δὲ τοιωδε γενει χρηματατ χριστον ε[χειν]
[ην μεν γαρ πλουτεις πολλοι φιλοι: ην δε πενηαι]
930 (15) [ παυροι κουκεθ’ ὁμως σου] τος ανηρ[ αγαθος]
[---]ται vac.
(16) [φειδεσθαι μεν αμεινον ἐπ]ει ουδε θ’ αποκλαειει
[ουδεις ην μη οραι χρηματα] λειπομ[ενα]
[παυροις ανθρωπων αρετη και καλλο]ς ο[πηδει]

(920) 5 ενος: Maehler’s pointed letter can now be identified as a trace of an e. The long lateral stroke of the w indicates the end of the pentameter, rather than merely the ending of a word (so Maehler).
(921) 6 ψαγω: Nearly all Mss. read ψαγω (on the papyrus’ alternative reading, see discussion below).
(922) 7 The trace of ink near the top of the t can now be said to represent an apostrophe, for την ὀηπη.
(924) 9 The pointed χ was printed as pointed λ in the editio princeps, with χ given as an alternative.
(925) 10 The papyrus’ κάματον is supported by nearly all Mss. and is found in the editions of Young (1961) and Carrière (1975). West’s edition (1989) follows Ven. Marc. 317, which reads καμάτω.
(928) 13 The trace(s) in front of αριστον were interpreted by Maehler as possibly χ or υ. Following the text of Theognis, the horizontal of a τ, and possibly an α, can be read. Though an apostrophe is perhaps expected, the traces do not bear this out.
(930) 15 The right horizontal of a τ now joins to the o.
(930/1) 15/16 [---]ται: As noted in the editio princeps, these traces of an added word (in the same hand but with smaller letters) were written between lines 15-16 — evidently a correction or gloss; but if a correction, it does not seem to connect anywhere with the text of line 931. It should be noted that the tinier letters were written above the syllables επ]ει ουδε, which are in syncephonesis (synizesis). M. Gronewald proposes, e.g., the restoration ηπ]αγ]θια, or more properly ηπαγ]θια, since the vowels in synizesis are to be pronounced together without syllabic loss represented in the spelling (= συναλιφη; note M. L. West, Greek Metre [Oxford, 1982], p. 200, s.v. for the distinction). Interlinear corrections are also found on the Theognis fragment of P. Oxy. 2380, and one of the lines (Theognis, 255), as noted by M. Gronewald, ZPE 19 (1975), 178f., has shifted far to the right, perhaps to allow room for a title.

The fragment, in general, appears to follow the established text of Theognis, with the exception of verse 921 (line 6), where nearly all manuscripts read as follows:
χρηματα μὲν διέτριπεν, ἕρη δ’ ἑπάγονο ϕρένα τέρψας.
The papyrus, on the other hand, has ὑψαγοι φ. To propose that the ϕ is a variant for π and, moreover, that an iota-adscript has been falsely inserted at the end, assigns too little credit to our scribe. The papyrus reading suggests, rather, that ὑψαγοι
preserves a genuine dative noun or adjective and, hence, a potentially important variant. A glance at the syllables at *Theognidea* 921 immediately in front of ὑπάγω shows that ΕΦΗΔΥΦΑΓΩΙ must have stood on the papyrus; however, the letters are not to be interpreted with all modern editions as ἔφη δ’ ὑφάγωι (sic, leg. ὑπάγω), but rather as ἔφ’ ἥδυφάγωι:

χρήματα μὲν διέτριψεν, ἐφ’ ἥδυφάγωι φρένα τέρπας.

That is, the man has squandered all his money with an appetite for fine-dining.\(^7\) An adjective ἥδυφαγός (or ἥδυφασος) has not been previously attested in Greek, though compounds in —φάγος (nearly always paroxytone), are numerous; here, however, ἥδυφαγωι — the substantival adjective — can carry either the paroxytone or proparoxytone accent.\(^8\) A derivative adjective, transliterated into Latin, is attested in the title of Ennius’ gastronomic treatise, *Hedyphagetica*.\(^9\)

Support for the new reading is also found in the 15th-century Ms. K (Venetus Marcianus 317), which has articulated the usual ἔφη δ’ ὑπάγω as ἔφ’ ἥδυτάγω (see app. crit. in J. Sitzler, *Theognidis Reliquiae*, Heidelberg, 1880, p. 112). The codex’s word-separation and articulation is apparently echoing an older manuscript reading that, like our papyrus centuries earlier, contained diacritical readings; hence, the *varia lectio* of K seems to preserve a remnant of *P. Berol. 21220*’s ἐφ’ ἥδυφάγῳ.\(^10\) Furthermore, the papyrus’ new reading smooths out the overall sense of lines 920-922:

\(^7\)The use of ἐπί + dative of eating and drinking (= “with”) is amply attested in Greek (LSJ, s.v., [B] I.1.e). Furthermore, the phrase τέρπειν (φρένα) + dative, “to delight the mind/soul (in something)” is common in poetry; cf., e.g., Il. 9.186: τὸν δ’ ἐφ’ ὕφαν τερπομένων φόρμιττι λήγει (cf. LSJ, s.v. τέρπει, II.2, also with ἐπί + dat.: [Eurip.], *Rhes.* 194; further, LSJ, s.v. φρήν I. 2, for for the noun used of bodily appetites).

\(^8\)If paroxytone (i.e., with active sense) then ἥδυφαγός, -όν, means “eating sweet (food)”; the substantival, τὸ ἥδυφάγον, “the eating of sweet food” (delicacies, etc.) — the equivalent of a conceivable ἥδυφάγια. If proparoxytone (passive), τὸ ἥδυφαγον would mean (food) “eaten sweet”, or, adverbially, (food) “sweetly or pleasurably eaten” (cf. LSJ, s.v. ἡδύς, I: “pleasant to the taste”) — i.e., the specific dainties that are eaten (hence, “sweet cuisine”, or “delicacies”). P. Kretschmer & E. Locker, *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache* (2nd Aufl.; Göttingen, 1963), p. 378f., lists four columns of compounds in —φάγος, of which only one, ὀμοφάγος (“eating raw flesh”), also occurs proparoxytone (ἄφοφαγος, “eaten raw”): Eurip. *Fr.* 472, 12, ὀμοφάγους δαίτας τέλεσας (“codd. perh. rightly,” so LSJ, s.v.; τοὺς ὀμοφάγους Bergk [ed. Nauck]); see, further, C. A. Lobeck, *Sophoclis Ajax* (Berlin, 1866), p. 190, on ὀμοφάγος (ref. R. Kassel); for the sense of our passage, cf. also ἀδηφάγος, “gluttonous”, and perhaps ὠμοφάγος, ὦ, “gourmet”, etc.

\(^9\)Apuleius, *Apol.* 39: Ο. Εnnius Hedyphagetica scrisit, of which Apuleius cites eleven verses (I owe this reference to M. Gronewald). The title, of course, is simply Greek ἥδυφαγητικά, τά, which, though nowhere else attested, represents a clear derivative of the simpler adjectival ἥδυφαγός.

\(^{10}\)It is not inconceivable that a manuscript like K (Ven. Marc. 317, formerly 522) could preserve readings that reach beyond the limits of our present textual stemma. Ms. K, though copied from the damaged 14th-century Ms. O (Vaticanus gr. 915), must have used an independent witness. On the various Mss. of the *Theognidea*, see Douglas C. C. Young, "A Codicological Inventory of Theognis Manuscripts," *Scriptorium* 7 (1953), 3-36.
I saw another man who, in so gratifying his stomach,
Squandered his money, having delighted his appetite on sweet-cuisine,
Then begged alms of all his friends, wherever he might see any.

The new text with ἐφ᾽ ἡδυφάγων φρένα τέρψας sustains the previous ὃς ἦ γαστρὶ χαριζόμενος with a firm underpinning; the older reading with the imagined dialogue (ἐφη δ᾽) not only disrupted the smooth μὲν ... δὲ construction of lines 921-922, it produced the troublesome ἐφη δ᾽ ὑπάγω φρένα τέρψας, with its dangling intransitive verb.¹¹ Now that text, with the spendthrift’s interlocution about departing, vanishes in light of the papyrus’ innovative ἐφ᾽ ἡδυφάγων.

P. Berol. 21220 follows the sequence of, and represents another early witness to, the medieval text tradition of the Theognidea.¹² As our second papyrus witness, we now possess all the more proof that the Theognidean sylloge does not represent a late antique gnomic anthology. In addition, the papyrus’ new reading of verse 921 suggests the opening of potential inroads into the reconstruction of the sylloge’s difficult textual history, for apart from Ven. Marc. 317 the new reading is not directly supported by the medieval manuscript tradition that we have and, thus, indicates a dependence upon a superior Vorlage.
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ZPE 98 (1993) 76: CORRIGENDUM


¹¹For example, Radermacher (ed. Young, app. crit., ad loc.) proposed reading ὑπαγέ ὃ, φρένα τέρψας. Many commentaries, from Bekker’s 1815 edition on, have felt the need to explain the particular nuance of ὑπάγω here.

¹²The papyrus preserves a section of text that contains a long epigram to Democles on money and thrift (903-930) — verses that have been judged as part of the later (i.e., 4th cent. B.C.) formation of the sylloge. The text then spills over into a maxim on the same theme (931-932) and gives the first line of a section on virtue and beauty (933-938). On the style, vocabulary, and date of lines 903-930 see, for example, E. Harrison, Studies in Theognis (Cambridge, 1902), pp. 311-314; B. A. van Groningen, Theognis. Le premier Livre (Amsterdam, 1966), pp. 344-352; further, Q. Cataudella, “Theognidea, 903-930,” RHM 99 (1956), 40-46; J. Carrière, “Note sur Théognis,” Euphrosyne 1 (1957), 203-205 (on Democles being the same man mentioned in Anaxandridas [= Kassel-Austin, PCG II, fr. 35]).