

THEODORE F. BRUNNER

*P. AMST. I 24: A ROMANUS MELODUS PAPYRUS*

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 96 (1993) 185–189

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



### ***P. Amst. I 24: A Romanus Melodus Papyrus***

For the most part, our knowledge of the hymns of Romanus Melodus has depended upon medieval manuscripts; to date, only one papyrus, containing a portion of Hymn 8 stanza 6, has been found.<sup>1</sup> To this "most important witness"<sup>2</sup> we can now add a second papyrus, *P. Amst. I 24 recto* (= P. Amsterdam Inv. Nr. 198) containing portions of a Romanus Melodus hymn.

The editors<sup>3</sup> describe the piece as a "hellbrauner Papyrus, der an allen Seiten unregelmäßig abgebrochen ist"; the right and bottom margins are 3.5 cm. and 3 cm.+ respectively. Of unknown provenance, the papyrus contains many holes, dates from the VI/VII century, and is a page from a codex. With regard to its content, the editors see various traces of biblical sentiment,<sup>4</sup> though noting that *πανόθλιον* (line 10) "ist nicht biblisch." They also leave open the possibility "daß es sich um eine Klage handelt (vgl. Z. 11-12)." In fact, the front of *P. Amst. I 24* (→) contains portions of stanzas 6 and 8 of hymn 11 of Romanus Melodus.<sup>5</sup> The other side, naturally written by the same hand, contains very little text; most of it is margin. The little that survives has defied all efforts to match it with any text ascribed to Romanus.

The new text of Romanus varies substantially from the text known for this portion of hymn 11 only from manuscripts A (10-11 cent.) and P (11th cent.), mainly in lines 2, 4, 6-7, 8, and 11 (see below, notes to the reconstruction of the text). It seems to be significant that in lines 6-7 the text of A is also substantially different from that of P. Moreover, the papyrus omits stanza 7. Almost a century ago, this stanza had been suspected of being a later addition. To this problem I shall return at the end of this article. In lines 4 and 11 the papyrus may preserve the correct reading (against AP), but in other places the papyrus is clearly in error (in line 2 together with AP, but the mistake is insignificant), and particularly in the additions to the text in lines 2 and 6-7 as well as in the omission of a stanza in line 8. The scribe wrote the text continuously, not colometrically. Stanza 6 ends in line 8 with the refrain *κεχαριτωμένη*; stanza 8 begins in the same line, and it is the first colon of the new stanza that is omitted. Whether the beginning of the stanza was marked by a paragraphos is not known since the left margin is not extant. In lines 8 and 12 the end of cola is marked in the usual manner by a raised dot, but it is uncertain whether raised dots are meant to separate grammatical or metrical

---

<sup>1</sup> *MPEP* 1939, S. 68, pap. gr. Vind. 29 430 (recto). P. Maas, who published the piece in "Romanus auf Papyrus," *Byzantion* 14 (1939) 381, dates it "etwa saec. vi." Unless otherwise noted, the numeration of J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode: Hymnes*, vols. 1-4 (Paris 1965) is used in this paper.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. P. Maas and C.A. Trypanis, *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica: Cantica Genuina* (Oxford 1963) xxvii. This edition is henceforth referred to as M-T.

<sup>3</sup> R.P. Salomons, P.J. Sijpesteijn and K.A. Worp.

<sup>4</sup> For lines 3-5 they refer to Lucas' story of Jesus falling asleep in a boat on the lake when his disciples were frightened by a storm (8.22ff.)

<sup>5</sup> Hymn 11 Grosdidier = Hymn 2 M-T = Hymn 42 Krumbacher.

cola. The absence of a clearly marked colometry would have made the text vulnerable to additions and omissions.

There is not enough text extant to compare the papyrus to each of the two medieval manuscripts and to identify joint mistakes. The papyrus agrees with A in lines 4 (πνέει against πνεύσα) and 8 (δι' ἡμῶν against δι' ἐμοῦ, the reading preferred by modern editors), while it joins P in lines 5-6 (τὸν ἀύκληρόν against τῶν καυτήρων) and most likely in line 7 (ἐρριμένους θεωροῦσα, see note on the reconstruction). The just mentioned confirmation of A in line 8 may very well be correct.

In the following I transcribe the papyrus diplomatically, with a few corrections of the first editors' readings; the arrangement mirrors that of the papyrus closely in order to facilitate the calculation of the amount of text that is lost (cf. note 2 on reconstruction).

1	]ρ [ ] . . ]αγονος ]ξανθη-
4	κ]κιπνεει ]τοναυς ] νπροπο ] αςπλαγ
8	]μωμε·και διημων ] . .μηπαρ . . ης ]νηενγυγτους ]ονπαναθλιον
12	]ντα·δακρυαμου

1 ]ρ : ]ρι· *ed. pr.*; ρ is followed by a vertical which is ambiguous; η is one of the possible readings (see reconstruction).

3 ]ξανθη: thus read by L. Koenen on the plate in the first edition (I was unable to obtain a better photograph). After what *prima facie* looks like ε appears a vertical stroke that could well be the right vertical of η. The left part of this letter as well as the right part of θ is rubbed off. ]αγνε editors.

4 κ]κ̄ῑ: the horizontal stroke above the abbreviated word before ι]κ̄ is extant. ὁ κ(ύριο)ς Ἰ(ησοῦ)κ̄ *ed. pr.*

6 ] ν: the traces suit best ε (thus L. Koenen and T. Gagos). The following letters were read as προπο by the first editors, and this reading is perfectly possible. But a broad π instead of ετ is possible (see the reconstruction).

7 ] α: the first letter is most likely μ; extant is the typical curve that connects this letter with the following α. There is an additional dark spot seemingly in the shape of the middle stroke of ε. But the entire shape matches ε badly; what looks like a "middle stroke" most likely is not ink. Similar dark spots appear in other places of the plate as well. The paleographical observations are due to L. Koenen and T. Gagos; the former suspects ἡ]μ̄α. Be this as it may, it is certain that the papyrus cannot be read as εὐθέως, the word that appears here in P and A (see the reconstruction).

8 ]μω: the reading of the first letter is quite certain (thus Koenen); ] ω *ed. pr.*

9 ] . .μηπαρ . . ης: the traces of the letters which are represented by dots are insignificant. The *ed. pr.*'s γὰρ is quite possible.

We may now dare to reconstrue the text on the basis of the medieval transmission (A and P). I use a horizontal stroke to separate cola. At the beginning Eva is speaking, while Adam takes over at the beginning of the 8th stanza in line 8.

- 1 " τὰ ἀρχαῖα γὰρ πα]ρη[λ]θε  
 [ (ca. 10 lett.) καὶ νέα πάντα δείκνυσιν ὁ τῆς Μαρί]α]ς γόνος  
 [X(ριστό)ς. | τούτου τῆς νοτίδος ὁφράνθητι καὶ εὐθέως ἐ]ξάνθη-  
 4 [ρον, | ὡς στάχυς ὀρθώθητι· τὸ γὰρ ἔαρ σε ἔφθασεν, | ὁ κ(ύρι)ς]c Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς πνέει  
 [ὡς αὖρα γλυκερά· | τὸν καύωνα  $\hat{\omega}$  ἦς ( ? ) ἀποφυγῶν] τὸν αὐ-  
 [τηρὸν | δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι πρὸς Μαριάμ, |  $\dots$ ]εν πρὸ πο-  
 [δῶν (ca. 16 lett.) ἐρριμένους (?) θεωροῦσα | (?) ἡ]μᾶς σπλαγ-  
 8 [χνισθῆσεται ἢ κεχαριτωμένη." | "μήτερ ἄ]μωμε, | καὶ δι' ἡμῶν  
 [πᾶν τὸ γένος τοῖς ἴχνεσι σου πρόκειται]αι. | μὴ παρίδῃς  
 [τοὺς τεκόντας, | ἐπειδὴ τόκος ὁ σὸς ἀνεγέν]νησε νῦν τοὺς  
 [ἐν φθορᾷ· τὸν ἐν Ἄδῃ παλαιωθέντα με Ἄδᾶμ τ]ὸν πανάθλιον  
 12 [οἰκτεῖρησον, θύγατερ, τὸν πατέρα σου στένοντα· | <τὰ> δάκρυά μου  
 [βλέπουσα, σπλαγχνίσθητί μοι κτέ."

2 Μαρίας AP : Μαριάμ Trypanis *metri causa* 3 ὁφράνθητι A : πιάνητι P εὐθέως νῦν P  
 κ(ύρι)ς Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς : Ἰησοῦς Χριστός AP : Ἰησοῦς (—) <ὁ> Χριστός Trypanis *metri causa* πνέει A :  
 πνεύσας P 5 τὸν καύωνα AP : τὸ καῦκος Maas  $\hat{\omega}$  P : οὗ Maas ( $\hat{\omega}$  ἦς om. A) 5-6 τὸν  
 αὐ[τηρὸν P : τὸ αὐκτηρὸν Maas : τῶν καυτήρων A 6  $\dots$ ]εν : καὶ AP 6-7 αὐτῆς πρὸ τῶν πο-  
 δῶν ἐρριμένους θεωροῦσα P Grosdidier (ἐρριμένον Eustr.) : τῶν ἀχράντων αὐτῆς ποδῶν ἄψαι σὺν ἐμοὶ  
 νῦν καὶ εὐθέως A M-T 8 ἰδοὺ εἰμὶ (P : ἡμεῖς A) πρὸ ποδῶν σου, πάρθενε, μήτερ AP δι' ἡμῶν  
 A : δι' ἐμοῦ P Grosdidier M-T 9 πρόκειται P : πρόκειται A 10 τοὺς τεκόντας A : τὴν τε-  
 κοῦσαν P 11 τὸν ἐν A : καὶ τῷ P παλαιωθέντα με A : προκατασχεθέντα δι' P παν-  
 άθλιον : πρωτόπλαστον AP

2: By comparison with other lines we expect that 35-40 letters are lost before ]ας γόνος. The medieval transmission (AP) provides a text of 28 letters. Hence the papyrus must have had a longer text, which however would have violated the metrical structure. This could indicate that the text of the kontakion is interrupted by brief extraneous remarks, but this explanation would neither hold in lines 6-7 where the papyrus again presents a text longer than would suit the metrical structure, nor in line 8 where the papyrus seems to omit the first colon of the stanza.

4 ὁ κ(ύρι)ς Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς]c: ~ - ~ ~ -. Since Ἰ(ησοῦ)ς is preceded by another abbreviated *nomen sacrum* ending on c, the first editors' ὁ κ(ύρι)ς]c Ἰησοῦς is virtually certain. Bisyllabic κύριος is problematic (see J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de la poésie religieuse à Byzance* [Paris 1977] 132), but needed here; for bisyllabic Ἰησοῦς see M-T 516. AP have Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, which for metrical reasons was corrected by Trypanis to Ἰησοῦς (—) <ὁ> Χριστός. The reading of the papyrus may well be the original text which, in the transmission, was simplified to Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, thus creating another metrical irregularity.

6-7: (a) The length of the text broken off indicates that more text is missing than is extant in A or P (see above, on line 2); moreover, (b) the first letters extant in lines 6 and 7 point to a text at least partially different from the text of either A and P (see critical apparatus). In line 6  $\dots$ ]εν (see also note on the diplomatic text) may easily be ὄθ]εν, replacing the καὶ of AP. In 7 ]μᾶς leads easily to ἡ]μᾶς (see also note on the diplomatic text), which corresponds to 8 δι' ἡμῶν (Pap., A), 10 τεκόντας (A), and, here in 7, ἐρριμένους (P; for A's text see apparatus) which naturally connects with ἡ]μᾶς. The latter fact seems to indicate that the Pap. has essentially the same text as P. But, as stated, this text is too short. The papyrus may possibly have borrowed some

words from the tradition later emerging in A, e.g. τῶν ἀχράντων αὐτῆς, a colon, which however would not suit the metrical structure. In short, the text may have been something like:

6 ὄθ]εν πρὸ πο-  
 [δῶν {τῶν ἀχράντων} αὐτῆς | ἐρριμένους θεωροῦσα | νῦν ἡ]μᾶς πλαγ-  
 [χνιθίχεται | ἡ κεχαριτωμένη.

This reconstruction accepts for the first colon  $\cup\cup\cup - \cup -$  as variation of  $\cup\cup\cup \cup\cup\cup -$  (if the text of the papyrus can be taken seriously at this point); and for νῦν cf. A's ἄψαι σὺν ἐμοὶ νῦν.

On the other hand, while 6 ... ]εν is paleographically likely, καὶ τ]όν cannot be entirely ruled out; then ἐρριμένον (Eustr.) would follow, but ἡ]μᾶς would no longer make sense. — In sum, the available evidence is insufficient.

8 ἡ κεχαριτωμένη is the refrain at the end of stanza 6, which is immediately followed by stanza 8. But the scribe must have omitted even more. The refrain is a primary candidate for such an omission, but insufficient. Some 10 letters more should be missing. Adam is speaking to Mary. Most likely his first colon (ἰδοῦ εἰμι πρὸ ποδῶν σου) is omitted (see apparatus). The scribe may have taken ἡ κεχαριτωμένη as vocative and connected with the following παρθένε, μήτηρ ἄ]μωμε, despite the fact that the omitted text is required by the metrical structure. This renders the following καὶ pointless, but the scribe may have understood it as implying that "we are before you and, through us, all mankind." In any case, the resulting text is erroneous.

With ἰδοῦ εἰμι πρὸ ποδῶν σου being omitted, line 8 seems just possible, but most likely the next word, παρθένε, was omitted as well. For the omission of stanza 7 see below.

11 τ]ὸν πανάθλιον: this word is a metrical equivalent to AP's τὸν πρωτόπλακτον. In the context of this prayer, πανάθλιον is quite appropriate, and the word, while unbiblical (*ed. pr.*) is no stranger to the texts variously ascribed to Romanus Melodus, cf. Hymns 7.20. 3; 33.22. 1; 38.8. 1 (M-T); 71.18. 8; 76.14. 5 (the last two citations refer to P. Maas and C.A. Trypanis, *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica: Cantica Dubia* [Berlin 1970]). In short, the reading of the papyrus may reflect the original version of this hymn.

Finally we turn to the fact that stanza 7 is omitted in the papyrus. The omission occurs right in between a host of textual problems (see above, on lines 6-7 and 8). As K. Krumbacher recognized, the presence of stanza 7 in the medieval codices is owed to an amplification of the original text over the course of time. The ending of stanza 6 (ἀκολούθει μοι πρὸς Μαριάμ· — — πρὸ ποδῶν ἐρριμένους θεωροῦσα — — ἡ]μᾶς πλαγχνιθίχεται ἡ κεχαριτωμένη [see above, on lines 6-7]) provides a natural transition into stanza 8 (ἰδοῦ εἰμι πρὸ ποδῶν σου, παρθένε, μήτηρ ἄμωμε; only partly preserved in the text of the papyrus (see above, on line 8). Without stanza 7, the hymn's acrostic TOY ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΥ ΡΩΜΑΝΟΥ, as transmitted by A and P, is *prima facie* flawed; the alternative ΤΑΠΙΝΟΥ, however, is quite acceptable.<sup>6</sup> In any event, hymnal acrostics are well known to have little bearing upon text authenticity, or lack thereof. As M-T (xvii) note: "...the inclusion of the poet's name in the acrostic does not prove the genuineness of the poem, and genuine works have been claimed by lesser writers who falsified the acrostics." In any event, M-T consider

<sup>6</sup> In his comment on the beginning of stanza 7 of Hymn 34 (Grosdidier), Krumbacher notes that "Die Akrostichis wird wie regelmässig bei Romanos nach dem Prinzip der Antistoechie gebildet, nach dem ι auf gleicher Stufe steht wie ει" ("Die Akrostichis in der griechischen Kirchenpoesie," *Sitzungsberichte der philos.-philol. und der histor. Klasse der K. Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss.* [München 1898] ii. 209). Cf. also K.'s comment on the beginning of stanza 15 of Hymn 5 (Grosdidier): "Das überlieferte ὄκει darf nicht mit Pitra in οἰκεῖ geändert werden, denn bei der Bildung der Akrostichis berücksichtigt Romanos of nur die Aussprache, so daß z.B. ι statt ει steht" (228). K. considered the later addition of a strophe E to a hymn a distinct possibility; he thought it highly unlikely, however, "daß eine im Archetypus stehende Strophe für 'E' von einem späteren Bearbeiter oder Kopisten zur Erzielung der Kurzform ταπινοῦ weggelassen wurde" (653). For further discussion, cf. 653-655.

this hymn to be "genuine," i.e., among those "which 'on the whole' appear to come from the poet's own hand..." (xxv).<sup>7</sup> But this statement does not necessarily militate against the authenticity of stanza 7.

M-T also note that "the transmission [of the text of Romanos] is... 'contaminated'." that "no subdivision or grouping into families of manuscripts is possible," and that "the single Romanos papyrus [i.e., pap. gr. Vind. 29 430] shows that variants found in the codices are very old, many probably going back to the days of the poet himself" (xxvii f.). This very fact precludes a summary rejection of the text of *P. Amst. I 24*. But the text of the papyrus is a mixed blessing. Some of its readings are clearly wrong, but others deserve attention. This papyrus predates A and P, our other sources of Hymn 11, stanza 7+ 9, by as much as four or five centuries, and comes very close to Romanus' lifetime. It provides us with concrete evidence that—in terms of content, structure, and acrostic insignia—an early version of Hymn 11 differed significantly from the version known to us from the codices.<sup>8</sup>

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae  
University of California, Irvine

Theodore F. Brunner

---

<sup>7</sup> Since there is not sufficient congruence of text, the absence of stanza 7 does not imply that the papyrus reflects the anonymous modification of Hymn 11 (= 147 Krumbacher), which also lacks a stanza (in this case stanza 2). For a discussion of 147, cf. P. Maas, "Grammatische und metrische Umarbeitungen in der Überlieferung des Romanos," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 16 (1907) 586f.

<sup>8</sup> The Thesaurus Linguae Graecae data bank and computing facilities were used in the preparation of this article. I am most grateful for major contributions to this article provided by L. Koenen.