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ABSTRACT
A treatise on rhetorical tropes is attributed in manuscripts to the first-century grammarian Trypho: this article considers for the first time a fifteenth-century manuscript of this work (Leiden, BPG 74G), which turns out to be the only complete witness of its hitherto unknown original version; this version (very fragmentarily transmitted by a fifth-century papyrus scrap) is also partly found in another fifteenth-century manuscript now kept in Olomouc (M 79). Four interesting poetic fragments are quoted in this newly discovered, fuller version of Ps.-Trypho’s De Tropis: some lines from Callimachus’ fifth and fourth Iambi (23–9 and 90–2 respectively: a radically new light is shed by this new witness on the parallel papyrus fragments carrying Callimachus’ text), an epigram dubiously attributed to Simonides (FGE 44 Page, probably to be dated to the Hellenistic period: the text can be now restored to its complete form), and some enigmatic lines of “Hesiod”’s Wedding of Keys, which the new witness finally makes fully understandable.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Recentiores, non deteriores. This is the story of a hitherto neglected Greek manuscript of philosophical and rhetorical content, which was copied as late as the High Renaissance, and happens to be our only witness for a fuller version of four poetic fragments, on whose wording and meaning it casts an entirely new light.

M.L. West’s edition of the rhetorical treatise On Tropes ascribed in the manuscript tradition to the first-century grammarian Trypho1 was based on just eight out of the twenty-one extant medieval codices and on one papyrus (the fifth-century P.Vindob. 29332),2 which West, following an insight by Paul Maas,3 believed to carry the very
same work handed down by the medieval witnesses. A closer analysis of the entire manuscript tradition, carried out by M.G. Sandri for a new edition of the ancient Greek and Byzantine treatises on tropes, now reveals the special importance of MS Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek BPG 74 G (here Z), a codex from the collection of the eighteenth-century traveller Antonios Triphilis. This manuscript is familiar to students of ancient mathematics and philosophy as a witness of Aristotle’s Physics (fols. 67–144) and of Nicomachus of Gerasa’s Eisagoge (fols. 4–48, together with John Philoponus’ commentary on it, fols. 52–65); its last folia, however, have a different character, and include (Ps.-)Manuel Chrysoloras’s On Anomalous Verbs (fols. 150–7) and (Ps.-)Trypho’s On Tropes (fols. 145–9v). The scribes are not identified, but watermarks throughout the codex consistently point to the first decades of the sixteenth century.

The paths of the manuscript transmission of the texts Περὶ Τρόπων are very complicated; hence we shall leave to another occasion a more thorough consideration of the contribution made by this manuscript to our knowledge of the treatise ascribed to Trypho (‘Trypho II’). Here it will suffice to say that the Leidensis preserves the original form of this treatise, while the rest of the manuscript tradition, embracing twenty codices dated between the late thirteenth and the early eighteenth centuries, carries an epitomized (and sometimes adapted) version. The lost archetype of this shorter version (which itself gave rise to two different families) we shall call α.

As the lone witness of the fuller version of the Περὶ Τρόπων, the Leidensis is of paramount importance for the constitution of the text. In this paper, we shall focus exclusively on four out of five non-Homeric literary quotations appearing in Ps.-Trypho’s text: not only do these offer entirely new (and sound) readings for hotly debated poetical fragments of ‘Hesiod’, ‘Simonides’ and Callimachus, but comparison of the manuscript’s readings with papyri containing the same lines (whether the papyri transmit the original poetic works or, in one case, the text of Ps.-Trypho himself) guarantees that the new readings cannot derive from conjectural activity. We shall present each of the four relevant passages in the order of Ps.-Trypho’s treatise, with an apparatus criticus; we shall then discuss the impact of this new witness on the text of the fragments concerned.

6 The watermark of the section of interest in this paper is a Main type Briquet 10750 (Provence, 1529). A description of the manuscript and its contents can be found in K. de Meyier, Codices Bibliothecae Publicae Graeci (Leiden, 1965), 145–7, and particularly in P. Moraux (et al.), Aristotelis Graecus, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1976), 392–3 (available also at https://cagb-db.bbaw.de/handschriften/handschrift.qxl?id=37728). The proposed identification of the copyist of fols. 48–149v with the sixteenth-century scribe Michael Kontoleon (handwriting known from Par. gr. 1729; see RGK II.383) is very doubtful for the Aristotle and utterly impossible for the Ps.-Trypho section.
7 The fifth is Trag. Adesp. fr. 569 TrGF, quoted in Ps.-Trypho §4: in this fragment, both the Leidensis and MS Barocci 72 (one of the witnesses of Ps.-Trypho’s treatises not previously considered by the editors; it is a grammatical miscellany copied in Crete between the late fifteenth and the early sixteenth century: see H.O. Coxe, Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae pars prima [Oxford, 1853], 117–25 and P. Kraft, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung von Cornutus’ Theologia Graeca [Heidelberg, 1975], 14–19) carry the participle χρώμενος in the first line (already supplemented by West), which also occurs in the same quotation in the treatises by ‘Trypho I’ (195.16–17 Spengel) and Choerobuscus (247.29 Spengel). In Ps.-Trypho quotations from Homer, the main source of examples for rhetorical tropes throughout the treatise, are also generally fuller and more correct than in other extant witnesses.
2. ALLEGORY IN CALLIMACHUS' Iambi (5.23–9)

§1. Allegory is a figure of speech by which a certain thing is expressed in its actual meaning, but is also presented as something else. This is not said in its actual meaning. In fact, the discourse is not about fire or prudence or decency, but about the desire to make a second turn around the turning-post, and headfirst you fall. You have lit up the fire, before it has extinguished itself. Hold back from the race the raging horses, and don’t make a second turn lest they break your chariot around the turning-post, and headfirst you fall. These things, however, are not said in their proper sense. In fact, the discourse is not about fire or horse-races, but he uses an allegory, as if ashamed to declare openly what he wants to say.
This fragment has already been discussed in a recent essay after discovering that it is attested (in a much fuller form than in the known manuscripts of Ps.-Trypho and Choeroboscus) in the margins of MS Par. gr. 2558 (y). While we refer to that article for the discussion of the readings offered by the Parisinus, we emphasize here only a few textual aspects.

The contribution made by Ζ to the text of Ps.-Trypho is clear (lines 1, 3, 12, 13: the manuscript also admirably confirms conjectures by Walz and West). As for Callimachus’ fragment, the improvements on the text of α, mostly in accordance with the second-century papyrus P.S.I. 1216, are manifold and conspicuous (for example the very existence of lines 7 and 9–11 = Callim. 29; 25 and 17–29; the readings in line 8 = Callim. 26). Aside from orthographical issues (line 5 = Callim. 23 ἕχρις οὗ; line 7 = Callim. 25 καὶ ἑξίπτωσιν, without the crisis— but Ps.-Trypho must have had κηρτί, see y’s κήπω) and one word-order blunder (line 5 πρόσω πολλῆς), Ζ has faulty readings in line 5 = Callim. 23 δ’ ἐξοκουσάς, line 7 = Callim. 25 ἐπὶ ἄτρημοι, and line 11 = Callim. 29 κυβιστηθείσες (the former two metrically untenable). The issue of line 7 = Callim. 25 οἰκεῖον is more delicate, as the papyrus traces are uncertain, and the commonly accepted οἰκεῖον has been restored by Norsa and Vitelli from οι[ ] in the papyrus, while Par. gr. 2558 has ei[.]η (corrected from oi[ ]η): Parsons’s conjecture οἰκεῖον, though slightly problematic syntactically, should be carefully considered.

More importantly, the existence of Ζ now confirms that—as surmised in the aforementioned paper—the quotation in MS y does indeed derive from a lost manuscript witness carrying the fuller version of Ps.-Trypho’s treatise on tropes.

3. TRANSPPOSITION IN ‘SIMONIDES’ (FGE 44 PAGE = 105 S SIDER)

§5. Ἐπερραβότον ἐστὶν φράσις ἀνά μέσον τοῦ τῶν ἔξής ἔχουσα. γίνονται δὲ τὰ ὑπερβατὰ ἐν εἰδεσθε δύσιν, ἦτοι ἐν λέξει ἐν ἑν λόγῳ. [...] ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ ἐν συλλαβάσις ὑπερβατὰ πεποίηκασιν, ως καὶ Σιμωνίδης ἐν ἑπταγράμμασιν.

Ἐρμήν τόνδ’ ἀνέθηκε Δήμητρος Ὀρθάδου κεν ἐν προθύρους Δήμης στηθή τε καὶ μάθε τρος, Ζα ((Sim.) FGE 44 Page = 105 S Sider)

Ἀλλάσσει προσυπερβιβάσεις τοῦ τε ἀνέθηκεν καὶ τοῦ “Δήμητρος” τὴν τελευταίαν συλλαβήν. τὸ ἄρα ἔξης ὤντος ἐποδιδῆτα: Ἐρμήν τόνδ’ ἀνέθηκεν Δήμητρος Ὀρθάδου’ ἐν προθύρους Δήμητρος στηθή τε καὶ μάθε. ΠΖ

MSS Tryphonis: Π = P.Vindob. 29332 (lacunosa); Ζ = Leidensis BPG 74G; α = consensus codicum praeter Ζ

1 τι τῶν Ζ et Marc. gr. 512: τῶν (vel tā vel tā) α
2 ἦτοι ἐν λέξει ἐν λόγῳ Ζ: εἶτε ἐν λέξει, εἶτε ἐν λόγῳ (fere idem coniecerat West) Marc. gr. 512: ἢ ἐν λόγῳ, ἢ ἐν λέξει Barocc. 72: εἶτε ἐν λέξει nec plurα α
4–5 Ἐρμήν τόνδ’ ... μάθε τρος post Headlam (qui usque ad προθύρους κοπτερεατ) scripsimus: Ἐρμήν τόνδ’ ὁ σύνεθθη Βαρουφακίου, ὁρθία δ’ οὐκ ἐν προθύρους· Δήμητρος στηθή τε καὶ μάθε Ζ: Ἐρμήν τόνδ’ ἀνέθηκε Δήμητρος, ὁρθία δ’ οὐκ ἐν προθύρους, ἀντι τοῦ οὐκ ὁρθία δ’ α: Ἐρμήν τόνδ’ ἀνέθηκε Σύρος Δήμητρος, οὐκ εὐ’ ὁρθία δ’ οὐ Δήμητρ’ ἐπετεῖν ἐν προθύρους Βαρουφακίου
6–8 ἀλλ’ ὀποῖος προσυπερβιβάσεις τοῦ τε ἀνέθηκεν καὶ τῆς Δήμητρος τὴν τελευταίαν συλλαβήν τοῦ γὰρ ἔξης οὕτως ἀποδιδότα: [Ἐρμήν τόνδ’ ἀνέθηκεν Δήμητρος Ὀρθάδου’ ἐν προθύρους Δήμητρος στηθή τε καὶ μάθε Π; e MS Ζ lacunas supplereavimus (et ἀλλ’ ἐπετεῖν ἐν προθύρους Βαρουφακίου)]

Transposition is an expression that presents in the midst some parts of what should follow. Transpositions arise in two forms, either in a word or in a phrase. [...] Some have made transpositions also in syllables, as Simonides in his epigrams:

Demetrios, son of Orthiades, dedicat—this herm—ed in the entrance of the temple of Deme—stand still and learn—ter!

transposing the last syllable of anéthēken and Dēmētēr elsewhere. In fact, the sequence must be understood this way: ‘Demetrios the son of Orthiades has dedicated [anéthēken] this herm in the entrance of the temple of Demeter [Dēmētros]: stand still and learn!’

This section on hyperbaton is of the utmost importance for the tradition of Ps.-Trypho’s treatise, since the verbatim overlap with the Leidensis now confirms beyond any reasonable doubt that the fifth-century Vienna papyrus is indeed, as Paul Maas had understood, a witness of the very same treatise handed down in the medieval codices. The final part of the paragraph, carrying the exegesis of the epigram, is preserved only in the papyrus and in the Leidensis, which rules out the possibility that the scribe of the codex (or his model) could have restored it by way of conjecture.

As for the wording of the lines of ‘Simonides’, MS Z now yields the actual quotation from the epigram, not only its paraphrase in ‘regular’ Greek prose (after τὸ γὰρ ἔξης ὀὔτως ἀποδίδοται, which was the only partly readable section in the Vienna papyrus. The reference to the transposition of the τελευταία συλλαβή proves that the hyperbaton here at stake did involve syllables, and that Headlam9 was therefore on the right path in assuming that the key feature of the first line, however normalized in the manuscript transmission, was the splitting of ἀνέθη—κεν; accordingly, we assume, the second transposition must concern the splitting of Δήμη—τρος.

This is at least how Ps.-Trypho appears to present matters. Some may assume (with Page) a deeper corruption,10 and others may even believe that these lines were made up ad hoc by some grammarian.11 However, we believe that the authenticity of such an unusual wordplay (where tmesis occurs both times at the caesura and projects the last syllable at line-end, with a subtle game of symmetry) should be seriously considered: ‘Simonidean’ virtuoso pieces are attested (see, for example, FGE 684–5 = CEG 430 with the notorious enjambement Αριστω- | γειτων), and precise parallels for similar mots fragmentés, though absent from the corpus of extant Greek lyric, can be found in archaic Latin poetry.12 While the corpus of ‘Simonidean’ epigrams offers a limited

10 It is tempting to surmise that ὄρθως δ’ οὐ κεν might conceal a reference to the ὀρθάξειν of the herm’s phallus (see Sider [n. *], ad loc.), but the easiest interpretation of the evidence is a genitive of the masculine name ὄρθιάξην (attested in the famous late fourth-century inscription from Tenos IG XII 5.2 872 = CIG II 2338: J. Game, Actes de vente dans le monde grec [Lyon, 2008], 133 [§21]).  
11 This is S. Timpanaro’s suggestion for Ennius’ bold tmesis in ‘Per una nuova edizione critica di Ennio’, SIFC 22 (1947), 179–207, at 196–8 (but he later changed his mind: see next n.).  
12 Particularly Ennius, fr. 609 Vahlen saxo cere comminuit brum and 610 Massili portabant iuuenes ad litora tanas (= fr. spur. 5–6 Skutsch, already evoked by W.G. Headlam in the 1898 article (see n. 9 above) and then in his ‘Notes on the Greek lyric poets’, CR 14 [1900], 5–14, at 9). These lines were deemed spurious by O. Skutsch (on the basis of S. Timpanaro, who, however, later changed his mind: Contributi di filologia greca e latina [Firenze, 2005], 232–3) and by several later scholars, but see J. Zetzel, ‘Ennian experiments’, AJPh 95 (1974), 137–40, who offered a number of possible
number of votive pieces, and while the link between Hermès and Demeter (or Demeter’s shrine) is unclear (a pun can easily be imagined with the donor’s name), one may assume that the wit in the distich could lie precisely in the bold transposition of syllables (a hyperbaton not imposed on the poet by metrical constrictions with the proper names involved). Thus the final exhortation to ‘stay still and learn’ apparently proceeds from a careful study of the conventions of Greek sepulchral epigrams, urging the passer-by to avoid superficiality, and to pause and pay attention to the stylistic peculiarity for which this epigram stands out, if he wants to learn the names of the donor and the goddess.

4. MOCK-MODESTY IN CALLIMACHUS’ IAMBI (4.90–2)

§17. Αστείομος δὲ ἔστι φράσις διὰ τῶν ἐναντίων τὸ κρείττων ἡθικός ἐμφανίουσα, ὡς εἰ τις πλοῦσις ὄν πένης εἶναι λέγει, καὶ τὸ τεχνίτης ἀτεχνὸς, καὶ τὸ ἄγαθος φαύλος, αὐθεντικός ὡς παρά Καλλιμάχῳ ἐν Ἰάμβοις τὰ ὑπὸ τῆς ἔλαιας λεγόμενα. Οὔθ’ οἱ θύται φορεῦσιν, οὔθ’ ἐπὶ φλεῖς ἔστηκα: μὴ με κερτομεῖτε τὴν φαύλην. Οὔθ’ ἐν Ιαμβοὺς τὰ ὑπὸ τῆς ἔλαιας λεγόμενα: Οὔθ’ ἐπὶ φλεῖς ἔστηκα: μὴ με κερτομεῖτε τὴν φαύλην. Οὔθ’ ἐπὶ φλεῖς ἔστηκα: μὴ με κερτομεῖτε τὴν φαύλην. Οὔθ’ ἐπὶ φλεῖς ἔστηκα: μὴ με κερτομεῖτε τὴν φαύλην.

Mock-modesty [asteismos] is an expression that gracefully shows what is better through the style of the ancients (in these fragments the tmesis has simply been omitted in all witnesses except the Leidensis Z). Some define the valuable mediocre: as in the words of the olive in Callimachus

Mock-modesty [asteismos] is an expression that gracefully shows what is better through the style of the ancients (in these fragments the tmesis has simply been omitted in all witnesses except the Leidensis Z).

Greek antecedents for both tmesis and apocope, although none as blunt as ours (indeed, M. Fruyt, ‘Mots fragmentés chez Ennius’, Glotta 69 [1991], 243–6 argued that in these fragments the tmesis follows an etymological criterion, for cere-brum and Massili-tanas were word-segmentations mirroring the ancients’ own perception of the structure of those words); see also H. Prinzen, Ennii im Urteil der Antike (Stuttgart, 1998), 307–8.

and a second manuscript, an Olomucensis that, like the Leidensis, has not yet been collated and that we shall call U, which otherwise largely agrees with the rest of the tradition (ω, see above §0).14 In the parallel section on asteismos of the other treatise Περὶ Τρόπων ascribed to Trypho (‘Trypho I’, page 206.16 Sp.),15 we do find a reference to a Callimachean line (fr. 93b Schneider = lamb. 4, fr. 194.13 Pf. †ἐγὼ φαύλη πάντων τῶν δένδρων εἰμὶ†), which despite its evidently corrupt form has been inserted by Pfeiffer (followed by all subsequent editors) in the large lacuna after line 12 of the fourth lambus.

Callimachus’ fourth lambus revolves around the controversy between an olive and a laurel.16 The first of the three lines quoted in MSS ZU most probably represents a more correct form of the same line as quoted in the Περὶ Τρόπων ascribed to ‘Trypho I’ (†ἐγὼ φαύλη πάντων τῶν δένδρων εἰμὶ†, which we think must be a paraphrase of the original verse): despite the absence of any reference to ‘all the trees’ in the line of ZU, and despite the seemingly ‘poetic’ use of the positive φαύλη used for the superlative φευλωτάτη, it is unlikely that the olive should resort to such an asteismos twice in the same iambus, in virtually the same terms;17 indeed, one of the witnesses of Trypho I’s treatise, the important MS Marc. gr. 512,18 carries this quotation as ἐγὼ δὲ φαύλη τέ εἰμι, which is precisely the incipit of the line as it features in Trypho II’s fuller version.19 The new find thus suggests that what is quoted by Ps.-Trypho (both I and II) as an outstanding example of mock-modesty is not a claim made by the olive in its opening speech, of which so little is extant,20 but rather the concluding outburst of the long tirade (lines 46–92) by which the olive rebuts the laurel’s arrogant speech (lines 18–43).

This state of affairs is supported by manuscript evidence from across the centuries. Lines 90–2 of fr. 194 appear in current editions in the following form:

14 The MS Olomouc, Vedecká Knihovna, M 79, written by the well-known Spartan scribe Demetrios Trivolis, active in Greece and at Rome, in the second half of the fifteenth century (RGK I.103: identification by E. Gamillscheg apud A. Guida, ‘Nuovi testimoni di Longo e di Achille Tazio’, Prometheus 7 [1981], 1–10), is more grammatical in nature, since it contains (after a first codicological unit preserving some works attributed to Hesiod) the De Passionibus Dictionum attributed to Trypho (fol. 137–138v), the De Encliticis by Johannes Charax (fol. 138v–141), our Ps.-Trypho’s De Trois (fol. 141–143v) followed by Gregory of Corinth’s De Dialectis (fol. 144–145v), and John Philoponus’ Collectio Vocum (fol. 157–159v). This codex has been copied using two different antigraphs, one carrying the epitomized version of the ω-group and one carrying the versio plenior found in Z, so that for the first six chapters of the Περὶ Τρόπων U carries the epitomized version, while for chapters 7–19 (chapters 20–6 are missing since the manuscript is mutilated at the end) it preserves the versio plenior: this is precisely the reason why only U helps us in the constitutio of this fragment.


16 The fullest discussion can be found in A. Kerkhecker, Callimachus’ Book of Iambi (Oxford, 1999), 85–115.

17 Repetition, however, does occur in the laurel’s speech, e.g. at the opening of lines 18, 28 and 37 ὃς γενόμενος ἠλαίαι.

18 Fols. 64–6 (but the treatise is preserved only in its final part, 201.12–206.22 Sp.). This codex also contains Trypho II’s Περὶ Τρόπων (fols. 53v–58v).

19 The only varia lectio being τέ instead of τ. The manuscript tradition of Trypho I’s treatise has not yet been investigated exhaustively, but on the basis of preliminary collations we believe that MS Marc. gr. 512 might be the only witness of a peculiar branch of the tradition.

20 Hence (despite the arguments brought by Kerkhecker [n. 16], 88–9) what is now line 13—though of course not necessarily the idea it carries—should probably be removed from its place.
This is fully compatible with the lines as quoted by the Leidensis and the Olomucensis, apart from the trivial oscillation between οὐτ᾽ and οὔδ᾽ in line 91. Indeed, as Pfeiffer had seen, these lines represent an echo of the boastful claims of the laurel about her omnipresence in cult and ritual, in lines 24–5 (τίς δ᾽ οίκος οὔπερ οὐκ ἐγὼ παρὰ φλιῆ | τίς δ᾽ οὐ με μάντες ἢ τίς οὐ θύτες ἔλκει). In her long reply, the olive introduces the dialogue between two crows (lines 64–80), who take on the task of comparing the respective merits of both competing trees.

It has been argued by some scholars that lines 90–2, which conclude the olive’s speech (line 93 begins ὅς εἶτε), are not spoken by the olive but belong to the dialogue between the crows; this is now disproved by the new evidence, which indicates that the olive’s speech ended on a note of ironical self-deprecation or mock-modesty. It is unlikely that the olive resumed her speech immediately after line 80 or (as Fraser argued) after line 84, since line 87 καλλίνικος ἡλαίη must still be pronounced by the crows. The fragmentary nature of lines 83–9 prevents us from drawing a firm conclusion on this point, but it is likely that lines 88–9 contained the first part of the reasoning picked up in line 90 ἐγὼ δὲ—perhaps an exhortation to the crows to honour or praise other trees (the pear-tree, line 88 τὴν ἀγχυν, or a better tree, line 89 τὴν πλέον τιν’) as opposed to the olive’s own modesty.

There are at least two interesting features in the lines thus recovered: first, the verb κερτομέω (nowhere else in Callimachus), which inscribes the complex relationship between the olive and the crows in the frame of a sophisticated literary game.

Second, the repetition of the adjective φαύλη: first (line 90) in a sort of parodic echo

21 In line 90 we read surely μικοντεκμιον, not ὅμικοντεκ (the second vertical stroke of the first -μ- is clearly visible, and so is the second -μ-, albeit partly lost in a hole; the -α- of μάντεις, on the contrary, cannot be read); in line 92 τομείτε is very easy to read, whereas scanty traces remain of the first two letters of τίν; as for φαύλη, we can detect beyond doubt a cup-shaped υ and, on the left under its arch, a smallish α; of the λ, only the upper stroke is visible.

22 On these lines, see Kerkhecker (n. 16), 91–2.

23 From Gallavotti to D’Alessio and Kerkhecker ([n. 16], 101–2 and 107–8, who makes the fullest argument and refers to earlier literature); it is taken for granted by B. Acosta-Hughes, Polyideia (Berkeley – Los Angeles – London, 2002), 203.

24 One of the main arguments for not ascribing these lines to the olive was that they included the word δάφνη, which the olive never speaks elsewhere in the iambus (Kerkhecker [n. 16], 107–8). But δάφνη, as we have seen, should not be read in line 92.

25 This seems to be implied by D.L. Clayman, Callimachus’ Iambi (Leiden, 1980), 25–6.

26 True enough, after the olive’s aside in lines 81–2, at least lines 83–4 must still be spoken by the crows, for the form of the question faithfully reproduces that of line 79 τε τί γὰρ.

27 Some tentative hints on these lines are provided by Kerkhecker (n. 16), 108, who believes that they should represent a reply, in reverse order, to the arguments laid out by the laurel in her first speech (but according to Kerkhecker, as we have seen, the lines are spoken by the crows).

of the laurel’s proud statements at line-beginning in line 37 ἵρῃ γάρ εἶμι and line 39 ἄγνη γάρ εἶμι;²⁹ then (line 92) as the concluding word of the entire speech. It may be argued that this anaphora matches that of ἀδόξη in the laurel’s arrogant words at lines 26–7;³⁰ but, more importantly, the place of honour thus attributed to the adjective strengthens Lelli’s claim that it represents here an allusion to the particular kind of olive known as φαυλία, while also carrying a stylistic and aesthetic overtone, with reference to the Aristotelian terminology (Poet. 1448a with the opposition between the φαύλον and the σπούδασιον).³¹ If the parallel between this iambus and the conversation between lady Elegy and lady Tragedy in Ov. Am. 3.1 holds true,³² then Ovid’s incipit in line 41 (sum leuis, et mecum leuis est, mea cura, Cupido), where Elegy speaks with a similar attitude of understatement and apparent self-depreciation (only to rebound later),³³ might well be reminiscent of ἔγῳ δὲ φαυλή τ’ εἰμί, with a characteristic shift from the ‘humble’ to the ‘tenuous’, from the φαύλον to the λεπτόν.

5. RIDDLE IN ‘HESIOD’ S WEDDING OF KEYX (FR. 266A.8–11 M.–W. = 204A.8–11 MOST)

§23. Αἰνήμα δὲ ἐστὶ φράσις διάνοιαν ἀποκεκρυμμένην καὶ σημανόμενον ἀσύνετον πειραμένη ποιείν, ὡς ἔχει παρ᾽ Ἡσιόδο τὰ περὶ τῆς κύλικας λεγόμενα: αΖ

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δαιτὸς μὲν ἐστὶς ἐξ ἐρὸν ἐντὸς ὁ θόντος ἐπὶ στομά χερσίν ἐγγόντο αΖΗς

ἀζαλὲν τε καὶ ὀπαλέν ταῦτα σφιντέρισε τέκεσσι τεθνάσιν. ΖΗς

(ας. fr. 266a.8–11 M.–W. = 204a.8–11 Most)

οἴνου γάρ μητέρα μητρὸς λέγει τῆς κύλικας, ἤτοι ἐστὶ τὸ ἀνέκαθεν ἢ γῆ, ἤτοι καὶ τῆς ἀμπέλου μητίν προσφερομένην ὁ δὲ φησὶ Ζ ἀζαλὲν τε καὶ ὀπαλέν ἐπεὶ δοκεῖ πρῶτον ἵπταιεθαίτα, εἰτα ὀπάσαθαι, σφιντέρισε τέκεσσι, τοῖς εὐαυτεῖς τέκνοις, λέγει δὲ τοῖς ξύλοις. τὸ δὲ τεθνᾶσι, καθὸ δοκεῖ ἐκ τῆς ὑλῆς ἐκκεκόρθια. αΖ

MSS Tryphonis: Z = Leidensis BPG 74G; α = consensus codicum praeter Z

ll. 3–6 frustula in Hes. Ceycis Nuptiis praebet etiam Ης = P. Oxy. 2495, fr. 37

1 διάνοιαν ἀποκεκρυμμένην α: ἀποκεκρυμμένη Ζ. τὸ (sed τὸ delevimus) σημανόμενον ἀσύνετον (ἀσύν.iam coniecerat Finckh) Ζ: σύνθετον α.

2 ὡς ἔχει παρ᾽ Ἡσιόδο τὰ καὶ τὰ παρ᾽ Ἡσιόδο α μηδέ ποτ’ ὀινοχῶν τιθέμεν κρητήρῳ ύπερθέν [Hes. Op. 744] post λεγόμεναι alicui codices familiae α praebent

3 ἐξ ἐρὸν ἐντὸ (p.c.) tantum in fine versus praebet Ης εἰσὶς Ζ et Marc. gr. 512, Laur. 87.10: θίσις vel τεθείσις α (praeter Marc. et Laur.)

dialogs is current since as early as Od. 8.153, but its meaning in Homer is hotly debated: M. Clarke, ‘Heartcutting talk: Homeric kertomoe and related words’, CQ 51 (2001), 329–38.

This is the ordering suggested by Maas, while the papyrus (followed by Pfeiffer) has the two similar incipits following one another in lines 39–40: on the philological problem, see Kerckhefer (n. 16), 94–5.

On which Acosta-Hughes (n. 23), 200.

See E. Lelli, Critica e polemiche letterarie nei Giambi di Callimaco (Alessandria, 2004), 65–6 and more broadly 47–82 for his complex and ingenious metapoetic reading of the entire fourth iambus—an approach largely discarded in recent scholarship.


The reference to the φαίλη in Callimachus might be consciously reversed by Elegy’s insistence on the limen (cf. line 50 liminis adstricti sollicitare fidem).
The riddle is an expression that attempts to conceal a given concept and make a certain meaning unintelligible, as is the case with the words in Hesiod about the wine-cup:

- after they had driven away the desire of an equal banquet,
- they brought to the mouth with their hands the mother of wine’s mother,
- dried and baked through its own children

The Wedding of Keyx is one of the ‘minor’ works attached to Hesiod’s name, of which just a handful of fragments remain: its very nature—an autonomous poem or a section of the Catalogue of Women!—has been hotly debated, with the former hypothesis being now more widely accepted. It probably narrated Heracles’ disembarkation from the Argo at Aphetae on the Pagasaean Gulf and then his unexpected participation in the wedding ceremony of Keyx and Aeolus’ daughter Alcyone at Trachis. In particular, fr. 37 of the second-century P.Oxy. 2495 (fr. 266a M.–W.) has been considered by scholars a witness of this work, because it displays a hexameter-end τρίποδάς τε τεθνάναι, which seems to match what Athenaeus says (Deipn. 2.49a; see also Poll. Onom. 6.83 = fr. 266b M.–W.) about the use of the word ‘tripod’ for ‘table’ in the Hesiodic Wedding of Keyx.

Now, lines 8–11 of the same papyrus fragment, though badly flaked, yield a narrative segment that has been convincingly supplemented through the quotation from Hesiod attested in Ps.-Trypho’s On Tropes. The Leidensis (Z) now comes to heal the remaining gaps in both Ps.-Trypho’s known text and the papyrus, particularly with respect to two points: in line 9 (our line 4), where it guarantees οἴνου (which no scholar had conjectured from the manuscripts’ οίον οὗ—the papyrus is lacunose here) and ἐπὶ στόμα χερσίν (all scholars had accepted Lobel’s παισίν, and supplemented accordingly); and in the entire line 10 (our line 5), which had already been brilliantly restored by West (and partly by Finckh) on the basis of Ps.-Trypho’s subsequent prose.

---


35 This correct reading is also shared by the late thirteenth-century MS Marc. gr. 512.

36 West had conjectured for line 9 δὴ τότε μητέρα μητρὸς ἐφ᾽ σὺν παισίν ἄγοντο, Merkelbach καὶ τότε μητέρα μητρὸς ἐφ᾽ ἐπὶ παισίν ἄγοντο.
paraphrase. West had understood that the corruption in Ps.-Trypho’s text depended on a *saut du même au même* from one ἀξολένη (that of the text) to the other (that of the subsequent prose explanation). It is possible that this very mistake prompted the insertion of Hes. *Op.* 744, which is not in the Leidensis and was probably added in the archetype of one of the two branches of the α-group in order to compensate for the deficiency of the poetic quotation.

However, lacking a wider context for Ps.-Trypho’s quotation, West elaborated a totally different explanation for the riddle, assuming:

– that περὶ τοῦ κόλληκος in Ps.-Trypho’s introduction is corrupt (or else refers exclusively to Hes. *Op.* 744): hence the conjectures περὶ τοῦ ἀκύλου (Merkelbach) and παρὰ τοῦ Κήκοκος (West himself);

– that the ‘mother’s mother’ is the acorn (mother of the oak), and that the solution of the riddle is the Pelasgians (the children of the oaks, according to Stat. *Theb.* 4.275–81 and other sources), who ‘gathered acorns to die dried and roasted by (for, with) her children’;

– that this riddle was proposed by Heracles at the wedding banquet, in the frame of a sympotic contest.

The explanation now available in the Leidensis tells however a different (and more simple) story: it makes clear that the ‘mother of wine’s mother’ is indeed—in an ingenious pun—the wine-cup made of clay, that is, of cooked earth, earth being the mother of the vineyard (an idea too obvious to require any parallel), and the vineyard being in its turn the mother of wine.40 Along this train of thought, the σφέτερα τέκεα are the wood logs (ξύλα) used for lighting up the fire, which are themselves offspring of the earth (possessive σφέτερα refers to the earth, as the dative is an agent or instrument to the adjectives ἀξολένη καὶ ὀπταλένη),40 but have died upon being chopped away from the trees.41 In his *Table Talks* (730E–F) Plutarch tells us

37 M. Della Bona, ‘Gare simposiali di enigmi e indovinelli’, *OUCC* 104 (2013), 169–82, at 179–80 tries to save the reference to this line as an ἄνινγη κατ᾽ ὀμοιον (sic), but her explanation looks somewhat strained.

38 M.L. West, ‘Hesiodea’, *CQ* 11 (1961), 130–45, at 143–4 (subsumed in the argument made by Merkelbach–West [n. 34], 311–12); Zonas of Sardis in *Anth. Pal.* 9.312 does not support West’s view (the oak is mother of the acorn, not vice versa), and ἐκκεκόφθαι would be a bit odd for a fruit like the acorn (much more appropriate for wood logs). West’s explanation (which has bearings on the accommodation of fr. 268 M.–W. on the Fatherless ἀπάτωροι) is inherited by all modern scholarship, including G.B. D’Alessio, ‘Ordered from the *Catalogue*: Pindar, Bacchylides, and Hesiodic genealogical poetry’, in R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge, 2005), 217–38, at 233 n. 65 (an essential overview of the possible reminiscences of the *Wedding of Keyx* in later poetry); S. Beta, *Il labirinto della parola* (Turin, 2016), 64–6; and I. Konstantakos, ‘Ἄιος, ἀνίνγα, μυθόγραφος, ἄσπος Ἀμφιλόχης Μιτρησίδης Τόμος Κ. Συνοδινόι* (Ioannina, 2020), 251–89. On riddle contests at banquets, see Beta (this note), 44–62; Della Bona (n. 37); S. Monda, ‘Gli indovinelli letterari antichi come testimoniazione di contesti ludici e agonali’, *Enthymema* 23 (2019), 390–400; A. Potamiti, ‘Playing at riddles in Greek’, *GRBS* 55 (2015), 133–53.


40 That the dative might go with ὀπταλένη was already envisaged by Merkelbach–West (n. 34), 312, though discarded by them as hardly compatible with their overall interpretation of the lines.

41 τεθνήσαν in the Leidensis would be untenable as an indicative, but could make sense as a dative plural to be taken with τέκεσσι, in the sense of τεθνήσαν, along the doctrine of e.g. *EM* 523.53 Gaisford.
that in the *Marriage of Keyx* (which he regards as interpolated into Hesiod’s corpus by some later poet) there is a riddle alluding to the fact that the fire eats ‘the wood from which it was lit, which was its father and mother’ (fr. 267 M.–W.):42 it is hard to imagine that this quotation had nothing to do with the lost poetic context of our fragment,43 but specifically what remains of these lines presents the wood rather as an offspring of the earth than as a parent of fire.44

Ps.-Trypho’s interpretation of the Hesiodic *ainigma* may be wrong, but we believe that it is methodically wiser to start by taking it seriously. We therefore consider it likely that the narrative inaugurated by these lines (αὐτότρ πέτει) did not belong to Heracles’ intervention (a rather complicated insertion of a narrative-within-a-narrative) but rather to (Ps.-)Hesiod’s own voice,45 and that the banquet here described is indeed that of Keyx’s wedding feast, whose participants simply started drinking wine once they had finished eating.46 It is true that there are a number of cases in which riddles are used at ἀγόνες during symposia, but there is no evidence in sources that this should happen in our case; quite the contrary, the references in Plutarch, Athenaeus and Ps.-Trypho, taken at face value, support the idea that the δόξις here implied is precisely that of Keyx. Furthermore, the description of a wine-cup by way of a complex periphrasis is perfectly in keeping with the riddles and *kenningar* known from Hesiod’s poems, such as φερέοικος for ‘snail’ (Op. 571) or the famous periphrastic description of the octopus’ wintry habits ὄν νόστεος ὄν πόδα τένδει | ἐν τ’ ἀπτόρῳ οἴκῳ καὶ ἰθεοὶ λευκαλέοις (Op. 524–5):47 this has little bearing on the issue of authenticity (indeed, it might be a good example of how some characters of Hesiod’s poetry are picked up and developed in later stages of the epic tradition), but might help better frame a certain use of *ainigmata* in the context of narrative and sapiential poetry.48

We leave to other scholars any further speculation on the consequences of this new find on the structure of the *Wedding of Keyx*, starting from the problematic presence

---


43 Indeed, following Th. Bergk (*Kleine philologische Schriften*, vol. 2 [Halle, 1886], 746, 752), A. Rzach grouped both Ps.-Trypho’s quotation and Plutarch’s as fr. 168 of his edition, though of course he had no knowledge of the papyrus.

44 Conclusive arguments against Rzach’s solution have been brought by West (n. 38), 143; indeed, μητέρα κἀ πατέρα in Plutarch’s text might well be a quotation from a different line. See, however, Merkelbach–West (n. 34), 313 n. 40.

45 This was, in view of the ‘Pelasgian’ theory, by West (n. 38), 144–5. Merkelbach–West (n. 34), 307 added the argument that line 4 of *P.Oxy.* 2495 fr. 37 ends σωσα (‘not likely to be anything but ἐσωσα or a compound’), but the first σ is uncertain, and the letters are also perfectly compatible with a feminine present participle from a verb in -αο. That σωτέρ πέπει should be taken as the formulaic introduction to the symposium, rather than as Heracles’ words, had been already surmised by Della Bona (n. 37), 179.

46 This was denied, on the ground that ‘no one starts eating at the same time as he finishes’ (but it is drinking, not eating, that is at stake here), by West (n. 38), 145.


at the end of line 11 (in P.Oxy. 2495) of the words νιφετήν τε καὶ ὄμβρον (suppl. West)—they could indeed refer to the people comfortably sitting around a fireplace while the weather outside is wintry.  

49 In this direction also Merkelbach–West (n. 34), 313.