

MARTIN L. WEST

THE BERLIN CORINNA

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 113 (1996) 22–23

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

THE BERLIN CORINNA

On a recent visit to Berlin I took the opportunity to re-examine the famous papyrus of Corinna, P. Berol. 13284 (Pack² 251), originally published by Schubart and Wilamowitz in *BKT* v(2). I should like to express my thanks to Dr. Günter Poethke of the Ägyptisches Museum and Papyrussammlung and to his colleague Frau Dr. Müller for their cooperation. It is a delightful thing to read a neatly-written papyrus containing real digammas.

The papyrus comes from Hermoupolis and is dated to the second century. For a description and full transcript I refer to D. L. Page, *Corinna* (Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies Supplementary Paper no. 6, London 1953), 9–17. The text is no. 654 in his *Poetae Melici Graeci* of 1962. Since then the papyrus has been inspected, at least in part, by J. Ebert (*ZPE* 30, 1978, 5–12, with a photograph of col. i in Taf. 1). In what follows I note the places where my readings diverge even trivially from those in Page 1953, and comment as appropriate.

Col. i 5]αρῶντ'ορειῶν 6] ιφῶλονορνι The spot above ρ seems to me not to be ink. 9] . . . 10]νεθλᾱ· 11 marg. χιῶνα But Wilamowitz's τῖνα is possible. 12]π[. . .]κώ·ει 13]ψανδαθι[. . .]αζ Over δα I see ζα (not an acute accent) and over ι, ε This is a significant re-reading, because the alleged accent implied accusative δάθιον agreeing with βρέφος and excluded the dative δαθίοι agreeing with ἄντροι (Page, 18; Bolling, *AJP* 77, 1956, 283). As the application of ζάθεος to persons is not found before Philodamus Scarpheus, I included this among the linguistic arguments for dating Corinna to the Hellenistic period (*CQ* 20, 1970, 284); it must now be discarded as evidence. 15]υλομέιταο 16]ανικά ρεια 17]άλαντ[]θανατων[. . .] 18 . . .]λε 19 μῶρη with suprascript ους above ῶρ 21]υφίαν χρῶν with suprascript υ 22] φαίνᾶ· with ει above ί 23 πλιοναζ δ'[[εθ]]λεκιθήρων[·] with ει above (πλ)ι and εῖ above εθ 25]νᾶούεᾶ·ερα[τ]ανῶς 26 Dotted φ 27 . . .]διᾶτώ or]αράτώ Compatible with Ebert's [δὲ κ]άρα τῶ γ', except that I saw the accent on the omega as an acute, like previous editors, though I confess I did not look carefully at this particular detail. The descender after ῶ could belong to a tau among other things. 29 The kappa needs no dot. 30 Something over the final ε, but I am not sure what: ἔ? ἔ? ἔ? The number of letters lost at the beginnings of lines 32–35 is greater by one than shown in Page; cf. Ebert, 10–11. 32 The omicron dotted; the elision-mark before it probably imaginary. 33 The psi dotted. 34 There is something over μου, but I am not sure it is a breve (which would be problematic if the word is supplemented μου[ρι]άδεcci). At end perhaps λάυς· 35]επ[. . .]νεγ[. . .] . [.] 36]βρορίαζ[.] The (doubtful) trace at the end is a low speck, level with the foot of the rho. The letters oc should be aligned under ν(εγ). 37 Perhaps room for two letters in the gap. 39]πᾶζ[. . .] or]πῖζτ[. . .] The π should be aligned under ςμ 40]ζόρουσεν (ε from ι) 41]α 45 Perhaps a high point between ν and τ Schol.: presumably εζ εαρ[46]νῖονταζάζα[47]αρεορῖν·εῖ[] ο: or ζ 48]αδι[ο]μνα[50 For the letter after νῆ upsilon is suggested, but it would be abnormally made. 51]ῦκκαλε[or δε[53 (below πρ):] [

Col. ii 1][[ε]]ῖ 3] . υ 4 οδ? Not wide enough for ῶ I endorse Page's note 'post ῶδ, fort αρ, sed αῖρ sive αφ spatio melius accommodatum' 7 κροϋ[9 τ'α[11 The marginal device printed by Page seems to me to be nothing but random ink. The following paragraphos and marginal tick should be combined as a dipole with two small hook-shaped marks in the angle. 13 μῶ[or μῶ[fin.,]ῶν[14]νεπῶ[15 Perhaps δι[(Wil.)]μελι with ει above ι 16 ῥ[(i.e. an illegible trace after ν ῖ, not a stop).]υδιον 19] . υστιαζ 21]ι . . .]ιαν 22]ν The ends of 22–25 all very uncertain. 26]εγνομον 28]πων (not τῖων, I think) 29 Not]φαζ, I think 31 μετ'ᾶ[32 εμπε[33 Nothing above η? 38 ποδι[]τεῖρ, ει corrected from η by a second hand. 40]ζτινεχῶν· 41]εζ 42 λδ[or λε[48 and 51, the points in the margin should be shown close up to the initial letters. 49 ῶ[

Col. iii 13 Perhaps πατέι[25 τ'ἄγγιρω 28]κρατερ[ω]ν 29 πέτ[35 The final punctuation point at mid height. 36 The final high point doubtful. 37 πῆσπ[40]ν 42 κ[44 marg. εικε[45] φ The three-line scholium belongs next to 46 47]περάγγειτ· 49 The mark over the last letter of δεξιας is not ink.

Col. iv 11 τεῶγ[15 Before ταω[a short horizontal line representing the paragraphos due after this verse. 17 δώσ[(scarcely ω[) 19 σουι[, the o perhaps inserted. 20 τεινλαυς[23 φᾶδομή (rightly Croenert) 24 The initial letter is represented by the merest specks, and the papyrus is abraded above the following alpha. The space perhaps favours κιδ- (Maas) over φιδ- (Croenert). 27 νεκ[28 εκφ[.]υςτ[29 κτεργωτ'α[30 καμει[31 κίθηρ[32 ητίω[33 πλειά[34 μείδε[35 ζουντ[41 κηκίθ[43 δ'αγετ'ω[47 τῶν . . .] 48 θανο . . [49 παρνε[(no accent).

Fragmenta incerti loci: 1. 1 .] ρε[1. 2 δημογ[1. 4, the ογ very doubtful. 2.4 I cannot see the epsilon at all. 3.1]ουν· The three lines of the scholium are bunched round this line-ending. In the first line I read]ελαιονπα[There is a gap after αινα 4.1 The reading very uncertain. 4.4 The phi has departed. 4.6 The last letter very uncertain; not rho, sooner gamma or pi.