

Pylon 3 (2023)
ISSN: 2751-4722

Scholia minora to Iliad 1.1–12: P.Berol. 5014 Revisited

Julia Lougovaya

Heidelberg: Propylaeum, 2023



Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48631/pylon.2023.3.98180>

Textvorlage

Zitierhinweis

J. Lougovaya, “*Scholia minora* to Iliad 1.1–12: P.Berol. 5014 Revisited,”
Pylon 3 (2023). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.48631/pylon.2023.3.98180>.

- §1 [P.Berol. inv. 5014](#) (TM 61036) is a page from a papyrus codex dated to the 5th c. and containing *scholia minora* to the first lines of the Iliad. The side inscribed along the fibers preserves glossary entries to Iliad A 1–6 and the side inscribed against the fibers covers verses A 8–12. In the *editio princeps* of 1887, Ulrich Wilcken produced a diplomatic transcription of the papyrus. In 2007, Franco Montanari published an updated edition on the Aristarchus website ([Scholia Minora in Homerum](#), December 19, 2007). Two years later, Davide Muratore [\(Muratore 2009\)](#) produced an article with several further improvements to the text.
- §2 From high-quality digital images in the Berliner Papyrusdatenbank I was able to decipher more of the text and to propose a few changes to the existing transcriptions. While studying the papyrus I made use of ImageJ, a free image processing program designed for enhancing images, alongside a plugin called DStretch.¹ DStretch allows one to optimize the legibility of writing by manually filtering and adjusting color channels, as well as by changing brightness, contrast etc. An example of such transformations can be seen on Figures 1–2.

¹ For DStretch, see <https://www.dstretch.com/index.html>; for its use in helping read ancient inscriptions, cf. [Bülow-Jacobsen 2021](#): 76–77. To obtain the program, a donation of at least 50 dollars is now required. One can also consider using a somewhat similar, though more automatic, image enhancer called Hierax, which is freely available at <https://d-scribes.philhist.unibas.ch/en/hierax-enhancer/>.




Figure 1: → side of P.Berol. inv. 5014 processed with DStretch (lab ac)



Figure 2: ↓ side of P.Berol. inv. 5014 processed with DStretch (lab_ac)

- §3 *Scholia minora* on the same or some of the same lines as those in the Berlin papyrus are attested by five other papyri, tabulated here in chronological order and with indication of the extent of the preserved commentaries:

Reference	TM number	Date	Provenance	Glossed verses of A
☞ P.Mich. inv. 1588	☞ 60341	1st–2nd c.	unknown	1–9 ²
☞ P.Oslo 2 12	☞ 60545	2nd c.	Theadelphia	5–24 ³
☞ P.Oxy. 44 3207	☞ 60893	3rd c.	Oxyrhynchus	4–18
☞ P.IFAO inv. 105	☞ 60777	3rd c.	unknown	10–12 ⁴
☞ P.Achm. 2	☞ 60959	3rd–4th c.	Panopolis	1–21 ⁵

- §4 The page of the codex is broken on top and at bottom. At the top, on the side with the fibers (→), the page must have had entries for μῆνιν and ἄειδε, with only a speck of ink from the definition of the latter visible in l. 1. The lost bottom of this page, along with the lost top of the page inscribed against the fibers (↓) must have contained glosses to Ἀτρεΐδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς / τίς τάρ σφωε (A 7–8). Since the writer tends to comment on each and every word of the text, on which see more below, the missing part of the papyrus likely had no fewer than six entries, if τίς τάρ σφωε was treated as one lemma (cf. P.Mich. inv. 1588 col. 2.15, *schol. DA* 8⁶), and possibly had more, if it was split between entries.
- §5 The lost part of the pages aside, the Berlin glossary encompasses 47 entries; for comparison, the part of the glossary in P.Achm. 2 covering the same amount of text of the Iliad comprises only 17 entries.⁷ This difference reflects the fact that the two papyri represent two poles among the preserved papyrological *scholia minora* to the beginning of the Iliad, with P.Achm. 2 being most selective⁸ and P.Berol. 5014 being most plentiful. P.Mich. inv. 1588, P.Oslo 2 12 and P.Oxy. 44 3027 are closer in their coverage to P.Berol. 5014 than P.Achm. 2, but none appears to follow the text as closely as the Berlin papyrus does. The intention of the writer of the latter seems to have been to produce a glossary to the continuous text of Homer, connectives included, so much so that it was once suggested that the papyrus contained a prose rendition of the epic.⁹ It must have been in the quest for completeness of the commented text that such words as Ἀχιλλῆος (*l.* Ἀχιλῆος), ψυχάς, θεῶν and μάχεσθαι, which are not glossed in other papyri, have been supplied with explanations, even if in two cases it amounted to nothing more than adding an article to the word (thus, τὰς ψυχάς and [τῶν] θεῶν). In light of this completeness, it is surprising that the writer does not explain Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν (A 3) and ὁ γὰρ ἦλθε (A 12).¹⁰ It is thus likely that at least the first omission was unintentional, while the second was possibly so as well, cf. ↓ 19n.
- §6 Textual changes proposed here mainly concern the first five lines of the definition column on the ↓ side of the papyrus, which, with the exception of one line, had not been deciphered before. Nevertheless, the entire extant text of the papyrus is printed. It is based on Montanari's edition and takes into account Wilcken's *editio princeps* and Muratore's suggestions. Note that the numbering of lines on → differs from previous editions.

² The readings and line numbers of this papyrus are cited after Montanari's edition (March 14, 2007) available on the Aristarchus website at ☞ <http://www.aristarchus.unige.net/Scholia/it-IT/Database/PapyDetail/2>.

³ In citing this papyrus I follow the reedition by ☞ Valeria Fontanella 2021, whose text, with app. crit., is also available on the Aristarchus website at ☞ <http://www.aristarchus.unige.net/Scholia/it-IT/Database/PapyDetail/42>.

⁴ Only the lemmata are preserved in this papyrus.

⁵ A black-and-white photo of this papyrus is available at ☞ <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b11000137n/f10.item>.


⁶ Here and in the commentaries, *schol. D* are cited after ☞ van Thiel 2014.

⁷ This is the number of entries in P.Achm. 2 from θεά to ἀρητῆρα.

⁸ Notably, P.Achm. 2 does not give definitions to any of the proper names with the sole exception of explaining the location of mount Olympus (l. 32–34) in the gloss to Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες (A 18).

⁹ ☞ Erman and Krebs 1899: 232.

¹⁰ ☞ Erman and Krebs 1899: 232 comment on the first omission, but not the second.



© SMB Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung, Foto: Sandra SteiB

Figure 4: P.Berol. inv. 5014 ↓ (c) Staatliche Museen zu Berlin – Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung. Photo: Sandra SteiB, P. 5014

→

		[-ca.?-] [-ca.?-]	A 1
	θ[εά]	[μο]ῦσα	
	Ἰη[λη]ιά[δεω]	[τῶ] παιδὶ τοῦ Πηλέως	
5	Ἀχιλλῆος	τοῦ Ἀχιλλέος	A 2
	οὔλομένην	ὀλεθρίαν	
	ἧ	ἧτις	
	μυρία	πολλά	
	Ἀχαιοῖς	τοῖς Ἑλλησι	
	ἄλκεια	κακά	
10	[ἔθη]κεν	ἐποίησεν	
	[πο]λλὰς	πλείστας δέ	A 3
	[ἰφ]θίμους	ἰσχυράς	
	ψυχάς	τὰς ψυχάς	
	ἥρώων	τῶν ἡμιθέων ἀνδρῶν	A 4
15	αὐτοὺς δέ	τὰ δὲ σώματα αὐτῶν	
	ἐλώρια	ἐλκίσματα σπαράγματα	
	τεῦχε	ἐποίει	
	κύνεσι	τοῖς κυσί	
20	οἰωνοῖσι δὲ πᾶσι	καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς σ[αρκ]ωφάκοις	A 5
		ὠρνέοις λεγ[-5-6-] -1-2- [-ca.?-]	
	Διὸς δέ	ἡ δὲ τοῦ Διό[ς]	
	ἐτελείετο	ἐτελειοῦτο	
	βουλή	ἡ γνώμη	
	ἐξ οὗ δῆ	ἄφ' οὗ δῆ χρό[νου]	A 6
25	τὰ πρῶτα	τὴν ἀρχήν	
	διαστήτῃ[ν]	διέστη[σαν]	
	ἐρῖσάντ[ε]	[-ca.?-]	

↓

	θεῶν	[τῶν] θεῶν	A 8
	ἔριδι	φ[ι]λονίκ[ί]α	
	ξυνέηκε	[σύν]έβαλ[ε]	
5	μάχεσθαι	[π]ολεμῆ[σαι]	A 9
	Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός	ὁ Ἀπό[λλων]	
	ὁ γάρ	οὕτως γὰρ[ρ]	
	βασιλῆι	[τῶ] βασίλ[ει]	
	χωλωθείς	[ὀργι]σθείς	
	νοῦσον	λιμικὴν νόσον	A 10
10	ἀνὰ στρατόν	ἀνὰ τὸ στράτευμα	
	ᾤρσεν	ἐνέβαλεν	
	καϊκὴν	κακωτικήν	
	ὀλέκοντο δέ	ἀπόλυντο δέ	
	[λ']αοὶ	οἱ ὄχλοι	
15	οὐνέκα	τιότι	A 11
	τὸν Χρύσιν	τὸν ἱερ<έ>α Χρύσι[ν]	
	[ἦτί]μνησεν	ἀτίμως ἀπέ<πε>μψεν	
	[ἀρητ]ῆρα	τὸν ἱερέα	

20	[Ἄτρ]είδης [θ]οάς [ἐ]πὶ νῆας [Ἀχ]αίων	ὁ τοῦ Ἀτρείως παῖς ταχεΐας ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς [τῶ]ν Ἑλλήνων	A 12
----	--	--	------

→.1] [Muratore, *om.* Wilcken, Montanari →.2 θ[*legi* →.4 Ἰ. Ἀχιλλῆος Ἰ. Ἀχιλλέως →.9 Ἰ. ἄλγεα →.11 [πολ]λάς Montanari →.16 Ἰ. ἐλκύσματα →.18 Ἰ. κύνεσσι →.19 Ἰ. οἰωνοῖσί τε σ[αρκ]ωφάκοις, Ἰ. σαρκοφάγοις Muratore, σ[αρκ]ωφάγοις [ς] Montanari, σ[αρκω]φά[γ]οις [ς] Wilcken →.20 Ἰ. ὀρνέοις λεγ[ομένοις] Wilcken, λεγ[ομένοις] [] () [*an* κ[Montanari, λέγ[ει γυ]ψί, κ[όραξι] Muratore →.27 [ἐ]ρίσαντ[ε] Muratore,]... () [Montanari, *om.* Wilcken ↓.1 [τῶν] θεῶν *om.* *al.* ↓.2 [φ]ύλονεικ[ί]α Muratore, *om.* Montanari, Wilcken ↓.3 [συν]έβαλ[ε] *om.* *al.* ↓.4 [π]ολεμῆ[σαι] *legi*, μ[- ca.?-] Montanari, *om.* Wilcken ↓.5 υἱός· ὁ Ἀπόλλων *legi*, υἱός [*ve*/υ[ί]ός [Muratore, υ[ί]ός Montanari, *om.* Wilcken ↓.6 Ἰ. οὔτος γ[άρ] Montanari ↓.8 Ἰ. χολωθεῖς ↓.9 Ἰ. λοιμικὴν ↓.13 Ἰ. ἀπώλυντο ↓.15 Ἰ. διότι ↓.16 Ἰ. Χρύσην Ἰ. Χρύση[ν]

→

- §7 2 θ[εά]. The lower loop of the theta is visible. The same definition occurs also in the other two papyri preserving glosses to this verse, P.Mich. inv. 1588 col.1.4a and P.Achm. 2.20.
- §8 3 Πη[λη]ιά[δεω· τῶ] παιδὶ τοῦ Πηλέως. The omega of the ending of Πηληιάδεω may have suggested to the writer that the word is in the dative. P.Mich. inv. 1588 col. 1.5 explains Πηληιδέω· Πηλέως υἱοῦ, ἡπατρωνυμικῶς, λέγει δὲ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως.
- §9 4 Ἀχιλλῆος (Ἰ. Ἀχιλλῆος)· τοῦ Ἀχιλλέος (Ἰ. Ἀχιλλέως). The name is not commented on in the other two papyri. Here, the gloss was probably meant to explain the Ionic ending, while the addition of the article could perhaps be for emphasis, although the writer has a propensity for adding the article in the definitions, cf. a similar case in ↓ 7: βασιλῆι· [τ]ῷ βασιλεῖ[ι].
- §10 5 The same in P.Mich. inv. 1588 col.1.7 and P.Achm. 2.20–21, as well as *schol. DA* 2.
- §11 6–7 ἦ is not glossed in P.Mich. inv. 1588, but cf. *schol. DA* 2 ἦ· ἦτις ὀργή. P.Achm. 2.21 runs together ἦ μυρί· ἦτις πολλά.
- §12 8–12 Same words are glossed similarly in P.Mich. inv. 1588 col. 1.9–13, whereas P.Achm. 2 omits Ἀχαιοῖς, ἄλγεα and πολλάς.
- §13 13 ψυχάς· τὰς ψυχάς. An apparently unique ‘clarification’, if it may be called so, perhaps with the article conceived of as possessive, or simply owed to the writer’s propensity for using the article whenever possible, cf. → 4n.
- §14 The writer must have inadvertently skipped the end of A 3, Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν, for it is unlikely that the omission was intentional, as he comments on virtually every word. Both terms are glossed in P.Mich. inv. 1588 col.1.15–16 and *schol. DA* 3, whereas their absence in P.Achmim is probably due to the more selective character of that glossary.
- §15 14 Cf. *schol. DA* 4, ἡρώων· τῶν ποτὲ ἡμιθέων ἀνδρῶν. P.Mich. inv. 1588 col. 1.16 has () μήτε ἀνθρώπων, with the writer probably unintentionally leaving out the beginning of the definition when copying.

- §16 **15–18** Same words are commented on in a similar way in P.Mich. inv. 1588 col. 1.17–20, with ἐλώρια· ἐλέ{σ}ματα ἢ ἐλκίσματα also in P.Oxy. 44 3207 Front, 1. P.Achm. 2 omits commenting on τεύχε and κύνεσσιν.
- §17 **19–20** The Berlin papyrus generally avoids lemmata consisting of more than one word, particles and prepositional clauses excluded, but this is the first exception (the other is ↓ 5). The wording of the clarification is, unfortunately, not entirely clear. P.Oxy. 44 3207 Front, 2, and P.Achm. 2.24–25 have οἰωνοῖσι· (τοῖς) σαρκοφάγοις ὀρνέοις, while the partially preserved explanation in P.Oslo 2 12. col. 1.1–2 features ὀρνέοις and τοῖς γυψί. In P.Mich. 1588 col. 2.3–4, οἰωνοῖσι and πᾶσι are commented on separately with the clarification for the first lost.
- §18 In the Berlin papyrus, the reading σ[αρκ]οφάγοις, suggested by ☞ **Muratore 2009**: 24, is very convincing as the upper vertical visible after the alpha of φα is not compatible with gamma. His proposed restoration ὀρνέοις λέγ[ει γυ]ψί, κ[όραξι], however, seems problematic mainly because of the space it requires. Restoring κ[όραξι] entails that five letters were written beyond the current break of the papyrus, whereas writing in lines 14 and 16, with the letters decreasing in size on the far right, suggests that the last words there are written close to the right-hand edge of the sheet. Thus, it seems that only one, possibly two letters, but not five, could have fit after what is taken to be kappa in line 20. I wonder if the traces might be compatible with a xi, thus λέγ[ει κόρα]ξι[ι], or with upsilon and psi, thus λέγ[ει τοῖς γ]υψ[ί]. I cannot, however, see enough to make a decision.
- §19 **21–23** P.Mich. inv. 1588 col. 2.5–6 has the exact same definition except that it glosses the entire clause, Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή, whereas the Berlin papyrus splits it into three entries. P.Oslo 2 12 appears to omit commenting on ἐτελείετο, whereas P.Oxy. 44 3207 Front, 4 only comments on this verb. P.Achm. 2 skips the clause altogether.
- §20 **24–26** Similar in all papyri except P.Achm. 2, which does not comment on any of these.
- §21 **26** ἐρίσαντ[ε]. The ink is much fainter than elsewhere but most of the letters are discernible. The word is glossed in all four other papyri that preserve notes to this verse (the gloss stands out of order in P.Oxy. 44 3207 Front, 3).
- ↓
- §22 **1–5** Parts of the words in lines 1–5 of the definition column are relatively well discernible, and zooming in and applying color filters brings out some letters even more, as can be seen in the examples in Figure 2.
- §23 **1** [τῶν] θεῶν. The letters θεῶν seem quite clear, while their position indicates that about three letters preceded the word, which renders the proposed supplement all but certain (for the use of the article, cf. → 4n, 13n). It is conceivable that one of the faint verticals to the left of theta belongs to the nu, but I find it difficult to distinguish possible ink from darkened vertical fibers of the papyrus. The word is not commented upon in other papyri.
- §24 **2** φ[ι]λονικ[ία]. ☞ **Muratore 2009**: 24–25 reads [φ]ιλονικ[ία], but the sequence νικ appears to be more compatible with the traces on the papyrus than νεικ since there are two relatively clear, tall verticals following nu, which would fit the verticals of iota and kappa. The same definition is found in P.Mich. inv. 1588 col. 2.16, P.Oxy. 44 3207 Front, 12. The entry is likely lost in P.Oslo 2 2, and the word was not commented upon in P.Achm. 2.
- §25 **3** [συν]έβαλ[ε]. The beta and the epsilon preceding it are very visible and traces of alpha and lambda can be discerned. For this definition, cf. [ξυνέηκε· συν]έβαλεν in P.Oxy. 44 3207 Front, 13, and

- ξυνέηκε· ξυνέβαλε in P.Achm. 2.26, as well as *schol.* D A 8. The clarification is lost in P.Mich. inv. 1588 col. 2.17 and the entire entry is thought to have been in the damaged part of P.Oslo 2 12.
- §26 4 [π]ολεμή[σαι]. The epsilon is legible even without enhancing, and starting from it one can work out lambda and omicron to the left, and mu and eta to the right of it. The lambda and right-hand side of omicron must have created the impression of a mu, which Montanari recorded, although not without hesitation. The word is not explained in the three papyri preserving glosses to A 8, nor did it likely appear in P.Oslo 2 12, in which the part of commentaries to A 8 is lost, but see ☞ Fontanella 2021: 40 and *ed.pr.* for the probable supplements. Nor is μάχεσθαι glossed in *schol.* D A 8, but cf. *schol.* D A 151, μάχεσθαι· πολεμήσαι.
- §27 5 υἱός· ὁ Ἀπό[λλων]. Pi and omicron of Ἀπόλλων are legible on the photo, and then going left from it one can work out the letters υιοσφα. The same entry appears in all papyrological witnesses but P.Achm. 2, which avoids commenting on proper names.
- §28 6–18 The same words are glossed the same way or similarly in P.Oslo 2 2 col. 1.16–col. 2.11 (for col. 2.9, see ☞ Fontanella 2021: 42–43) and P.Oxy. 44 3207 Front, 15–Back, 6. P.Achm. 2 leaves out ὁ γάρ, βασιλῆι, ἀνὰ στρατόν, κακὴν, λαοί and τὸν Χρύσην, while P.IFAO inv. 105 1–6, which overlaps with P.Berol. inv. 5014 ↓ 11–18, leaves out κακὴν and τὸν Χρύσην.
- §29 19 Ἀτρείδης. The word is glossed in P.Oxy. 44 3207 Back, 5 (the definition is lost), and P.IFAO inv. 105 7–8 (Ἀγαμέμνων), but not in P.Oslo 2 12 and P.Achm. 2.
- §30 The papyrus omits ὁ γὰρ ἦλθε (of A 12, Ἀτρείδης· ὁ γὰρ ἦλθε θοάς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν), which is also not explained in P.Oxy. 44 3207 and P.Achm. 2, while P.Oslo 2 12 col. 2.12–13, contains glosses to ὁ γὰρ· οὗτος [γ]άρ and ἦλθε· παρεγένετο. Since the Berlin papyrus tends to comment on each and every word in the Homeric text, it seems likelier that the writer overlooked to copy or to produce the two lines than that he left them out intentionally, cf. his omitting a comment on Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν of A 3. Yet, it is not impossible that he now started to exercise judgement over which words to comment on and left the ‘trivial’ ὁ γὰρ ἦλθε out.
- §31 20–22 Our writer is back to commenting on each and every word. The same gloss on θοάς is found in P.Oxy. 44 3207 Back, 6, and P.Oslo 2 12. col. 2.14, the latter papyrus also glosses νῆας· ναῦς, πλοῖα in the following line. No other papyrus contains a definition for Ἀχαιῶν.

Bibliography

- ☞ Bülow-Jacobsen, A. (2020) “Photography of Papyri and Ostraca,” in C. Caputo and J. Lougovaya (eds), *Using Ostraca in the Ancient World. New Discoveries and Methodologies* (Materiale Textkulturen, 32). Berlin/Boston: 59–86.
- ☞ Erman, A. and Krebs, F. (1899) *Aus den Papyrus der Königlichen Museen. Berlin.*
- ☞ Fontanella, V. (2021) “Neuedition von P.Oslo II 12: ὀνομαστικὸν Ὀμήρου?” ZPE 217: 37–52.
- ☞ Muratore, D. (2009) “A proposito di alcuni papiri berlinesi con Scholia Minora all’Iliade,” APF 55: 21–31.
- ☞ van Thiel, H. (2014) *Scholia D in Iliadem. Proecdosis aucta et correctior 2014. Secundum codices manu scriptos.* Köln.

✉ **Wilcken, U. (1887)** “Die Achmîm-Papyri in der Bibliothèque Nationale zu Paris,” Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: 807–820. Reprinted in U. Wilcken (1970), Berliner Akademieschriften zur Alten Geschichte und Papyruskunde (1883–1942). Teil 1: 1883–1931. Leipzig: 105–118.

Lougovaya, Julia

GND: ✉ <https://d-nb.info/gnd/1058244469>

ORCID: ✉ <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8099-5930>

Institute for Papyrology, Heidelberg

lougovaya@uni-heidelberg.de