



Supplementum Hellenisticum (=S.H.) 1025: Definitely Gregory of Nazianz

Author(s): Filippomaria Pontani and Francesca Schironi

Source: *Hermes*, 129. Bd., H. 3 (2001), pp. 439-440

Published by: Franz Steiner Verlag

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4477451>

Accessed: 03-04-2019 19:52 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Franz Steiner Verlag is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Hermes*

JSTOR

SUPPLEMENTUM HELLENISTICUM (= S.H.) 1025:
DEFINITELY GREGORY OF NAZIANZ

< > ὁ μὲν οὐτι τόσον τελέθει κακὸν ἔνδοθι μίμνον

Thus reads S.H. 1025, quoted by Epim. Hom. A 9C¹ (as well as by number of etymologica and scholia drawing from this source²) as an example of the pronominal use of the word ὅ.

The Hellenistic origin of this incomplete hexameter, postulated by SCHNEIDER³, was denied by NAUCK⁴, who identified the line as Greg. Naz., carm. II, I, 34, 111 (PG 37, 1315, 5):

νῦν δ' ὁ μὲν οὐτι τόσον τελέει κακὸν ἔνδοθι μίμνων.

The editors of S.H., otherwise very attentive to the list of *emendationes* to Schneider's "anonyma" given by PFEIFFER mainly on the basis of NAUCK⁵, seem to ignore this identification, since in their collection the fragment quoted by the Epimerismi is included amongst the *Frustula Adespota ex Auctoribus*, without any reference to Gregory. The only parallel we can trace for this editorial behaviour is S.H. 1095 πὰρ πυλεῶνα (quoted by Hsch. π 1005 SCHMIDT), where the editors, after mentioning NAUCK's detection of πὰρ πυλεῶνα in Greg. Naz., carm. I, 2, 2, 138 (P.G. 37, 589), apparently suppose that Hesychius might be quoting not from Gregory but from a lost Hellenistic source (from which Gregory himself would then have drawn the expression). This seems to us very unlikely⁶.

In the case of our fragment S.H. 1025, however, such a possibility is ruled out by the combination of the following factors:

a) the partial paraphrase of the line given by the epimerism (see above note 3) clearly indicates that the quoted line began with νῦν, just as it does in Gregory;

b) Orus, the 5th-century grammarian to whom our epimerism is ascribed, quotes in his grammatical notes, along with the traditional Homeric lines, almost exclusively passages from the New Testament and from other Christian texts, including Gregory himself⁷. In our case we can be

¹ Epimerismi Homerici, ed. A. R. DYCK, I, Berlin-New York 1983 (SGLG 5/1), p. 86, 40–60, esp. 51–59: Σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ὅ ἐξ: ἄρθρον 1) ὑποτακτικὸν καὶ 2) προστακτικόν [prob. προτακτικόν legendum] καὶ 3) ἀντὶ τοῦ οὗτος ἀντωνυμίαν τρίτου προσώπου ἀναφορικῆν·

ὁ γὰρ βασιλῆϊ (A 9)·

4) ἀντὶ τοῦ τοῦτο·

ὁ μὲν οὐτι τόσον τελέθει κακὸν ἔνδοθι μίμνον [DYCK says he «non invenit» this quotation (!)],
τουτέστι, νῦν δὲ τοῦτο μὲν ὑπάρχει κακόν· 5) ὁ ἀντὶ τοῦ ὅτι·

λεύσετε γὰρ τό γε πάντες, ὁ μοι γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλη (A 120)·

6) ἀντὶ τοῦ διό·

τοίου γὰρ καὶ πατρός, ὃ καὶ πεπνυμένα βάζεις (δ 206).

² An. Ox. I, p. 315, 5 and Et. Gud., p. 417, 15–16 STURZ (in both cases the editors print ὁ μὲν pro ὅ μὲν); EM, p. 614, 9 GAISFORD; sch. Pind. Ol. I, 32, 7 (ed. D. SEMITELOS, Πινδάρου σχόλια Πατριακά, Athina 1875; we are quoting from TLG # D CD-Rom). Unfortunately Choerob., Epim. in Psalm 9, 14 (ed. T. GAISFORD, Oxford 1842) is not accessible to us.

³ Callimachea, ed. O. SCHNEIDER, II, Lipsiae 1873, fragm. anon. 359 (p. 782): SCHNEIDER restored the line by filling in the missing first *longum* with νῦν, which was suggested to him by the partial paraphrase of the line given by the same epimerism: τουτέστι νῦν δὲ τοῦτο μὲν ὑπάρχει κακόν (p. 86, 56 DYCK).

⁴ A. NAUCK, Kritische Bemerkungen VII, in Mélanges gréco-romains tirés du Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Petersbourg, IV, St.-Petersbourg 1876, pp. 90–236: 186–187.

⁵ Callimachus, ed. R. PFEIFFER, I, Oxford 1949, p. 517 (Conspectus III).

⁶ NAUCK, Kritische..., pp. 184–185 shows that Gregory «dem Lexikon des Hesychius und anderen byzantinischen Grammatikern eine reiche Ausbeute zugeführt hat».

⁷ Epim. Hom. A 2B¹ (p. 72, 47–48 DYCK: quotes Greg. Naz., or. 38, 12, 31); A 4A² (p. 76, 43–44 DYCK: quotes LXX, Is. 53, 8 = Act. Ap. 8, 33); A 11B² (p. 90, 39–41 DYCK: quotes Ev. Io. 18, 31 and an unidentified fragment that sounds unmistakably Christian: ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου ἠτιμωμένος).

sure that the quotation of the line under discussion has been introduced by Orus in the context of a pre-existent note: in fact, the note about the meanings of ὄ occurs in almost identical form in Apollonius Sophista, where one finds all the Homeric examples given by Orus in our epimerism, but not the “Gregorian” line⁸;

c) the variant readings in Orus’ epimerism are to be regarded as changes made to the line by Orus himself in order to make it meet the need for an example of the pronominal use of ὄ⁹: such changes – even if they imply, as in our case, a total alteration of sense and syntax – will be no surprise to those who are familiar with this kind of grammatical works.

Thus being demonstrated beyond any reasonable doubt that the Epimerismi quote from Gregorius, there are in our opinion no grounds whatsoever for ascribing the line to an anonymous Hellenistic poet.

Pisa

FILIPPOMARIA PONTANI - FRANCESCA SCHIRONI

⁸ Ap. Soph., *Lex.* p. 118, 1–5 BEKKER: ὄ. προτακτικὸν ἄρθρον ἐνικῷ ἀρσενικοῦ καὶ ὑποτακτικὸν οὐδετέρου. ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ οὗτος ἀναφορικόν “ὄ γὰρ βασιλῆι χολωθεῖς.” [A 9] ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ τό “Πάτροκλον κλαίωμεν· ὄ γὰρ γέρας ἐστὶ θανόντων.” [Ψ 9, sic] ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ διό “τοῖο γὰρ καὶ πατρός, ὄ καὶ πεπνυμένα βάζεις.” [δ 206, sic] ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ὅτι “λεύσεται γὰρ τόγε πάντες, ὄ μοι γέρας ἔρχεται ἄλλη.” [A 120, sic]. It is interesting to observe that in Apollonius the pronominal use of ὄ (ἀντὶ τοῦ τό, whereas the epimerism introduces our line as an example of the use of ὄ ἀντὶ τοῦ τοῦτο) is illustrated by means of a Homeric example (Ψ 9).

⁹ It is particularly remarkable that the change affects here the very word discussed by Orus: in fact, what in Gregory’s line is a masculine article (ὁ, referring to the νόος mentioned in line 105) becomes a neuter pronoun (ὄ). As for τελέει, its transformation into the more difficult τελέθει may have been influenced by Orus’ familiarity with epic diction.