

A Planudean Edition of Pindar? The Evidence of *Parisinus gr.* 2403

Almut Fries

THE QUESTION whether Maximus Planudes (ca. 1255–1305) prepared an edition of Pindar’s *Epinician Odes* has been debated since Irigoín ascribed to him the so-called ‘Paris recension’, represented by the late-13th- and early-14th-century manuscripts *Par.gr.* 2774 (C), *Ambr.* E 103 sup. (N), *Leid. Voss.gr.* Q 4 B (O), *Vat.gr.* 915 (Ø), and *Par.gr.* 2403 (V).¹ Prima facie it is likely that Planudes edited or at least worked on Pindar. The *Epinicians* (especially the *Olympians* and *Pythians*) were a mainstay of the Byzantine higher school-syllabus, Planudes was the leading scholar of classical literature of his time, and his two most distinguished students and/or associates, Manuel Moschopoulos (born ca. 1265) and Demetrius Triclinius (ca. 1280–1335), produced influential annotated editions of the *Olympians* and all four books of *Epinicians* respectively.²

Irigoín’s theory was accepted outright by Hunger, whereas

¹ Detailed descriptions of these codices are provided by J. Irigoín, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris 1952) 257–266. None of them preserves a complete text of Pindar. V and C go furthest, breaking off at *Nem.* 6.44 and *Pyth.* 5.51 respectively. NOØ contain only (part of) the *Olympians*, with changing family allegiances in N and O (see n.26 below). The mutilation goes back to the common source (ζ) of the ‘Paris recension’ and two collections of Pindaric *gnōmai*, one found in Ø (fol. 47^r), the other in *Barb.gr.* 4 (fols. 56^r–64^v). See Irigoín 247–248 with nn.5, 6.

² On the evidence for an association between Planudes and Triclinius see N. G. Wilson, “Planudes and Triclinius,” *GRBS* 19 (1978) 389–394 and “Miscellanea Palaeographica,” *GRBS* 22 (1981) 395–397.

Wilson remained sceptical, though not unsympathetic.³ However, it was severely criticised by Günther with the following three arguments:⁴

- a) The text of CNOØV shows no signs of systematic philological and metrical revision.
- b) Many correct readings in the *Olympians* are paralleled in the codex *Ambr. C 222 inf. (A)*, the only extant representative of a separate strand of transmission, and thus likely to be genuine paradosis.⁵
- c) There is no evidence in the form of a commentary that Planudes worked on Pindar in depth.

While none of these arguments can be dismissed, they do not preclude the possibility that Pindar was studied by Planudes and his circle in a more informal or preliminary manner.⁶ It has been thought that Planudes oversaw the production of *Vat. gr.* 915 (Ø), which embeds its small portion of Pindar (*Ol.* 2.43–7.29) within a large collection of poetic works commonly read in Byzantine schools.⁷ Further, and perhaps more secure, evidence for Planudes' involvement with Pindar comes from *Par. gr.* 2403 (V).

The manuscript, written on oriental paper, was dated by

³ H. Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* II (Munich 1978) 68–69; N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (Baltimore 1983) 238.

⁴ H.-C. Günther, *Ein neuer metrischer Traktat und das Studium der pindarischen Metrik in der Philologie der Paläologenzeit* (Leiden 1998) 64–67.

⁵ Cf. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* 238. Irigoien (*Histoire* 244, 251–252) recognises the influence of A on the 'Planudean edition', which he attributes to its model, that is ζ (cf. n.1 above) or one of its descendants. In addition, however, some of the readings he quotes as metrical corrections of Planudes (*Histoire* 249–251) also occur in A: e.g. *Ol.* 4.21 ἄπερ [καί] Κλυμένοιο παῖδα, 7.12 παμφόνοισί τ' ἐν ἔντεσιν ἀύλων (ἐν om. codd. pler.). These could still be independent conjectures, but the bulk of the evidence suggests paradosis.

⁶ On the possibility that Planudes did not live to produce a complete edition of Pindar see 713 below.

⁷ Homer, Hesiod, Lycophron, Dionysius Periegetes, Theocritus. Only the dramatists are conspicuously absent. On the possible connection with Planudes see Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* 236–237.

Irigoin to the end of the 13th century, without any supporting explanation.⁸ Like Ø, it contains several works that belonged to the Byzantine higher school-curriculum: Aratus *Phaenomena*, Lycophron, Nicander *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca*, Pindar *Olympians*, *Pythians*, and *Nemeans* 1.1–6.44,⁹ and nearly the entire *Odyssey* (1.1–24.309). In addition, there are an anonymous work on cosmography, Proclus' *Outline of Astronomical Theories*, John Tzetzes' verse-treatise on the genres of poetry, and various small pieces added by different hands.¹⁰

The text of Pindar (fols. 116^r–172^r) is of a composite nature. The *Olympians* and *Pythian* 1 are copied from *Vindob.suppl.gr.* 64 (Vi). This book, which Irigoin named 'manuscript of Germanos' after an otherwise unknown scholar mentioned in a small set of scholia written by the main scribe,¹¹ is a palimpsest where Pindar stands on top of a 10th-century *sticherarion*. Dated to ca. 1260–1280, Vi bears marks of having been intended for educational purposes, such as careful orthography, extensive punctuation, and annotation. It thus testifies to the value attached to higher education in the period of restoration which followed the return of the Imperial court from exile in 1261.¹² The manuscript is now mutilated, breaking off after *Pyth.* 5.55.

The remaining Pindar odes in V come from an exemplar related to the 'Paris recension', that is, the supposed edition of

⁸ Irigoin, *Histoire* 265: "Le manuscrit V est à peu près contemporain du manuscrit C; faute d'éléments de datations précis, je dirai: fin du XIII^e siècle."

⁹ On the absence of the remaining *Nemeans* and the *Isthmians* in the 'Paris recension' see n.1 above. In addition, V has a lacuna between *Nem.* 4.68 and 6.33, owing to the loss of two folios in that codex (Irigoin, *Histoire* 265).

¹⁰ See Irigoin, *Histoire* 264.

¹¹ Irigoin, *Histoire* 217.

¹² Cf. A. Fries, "For Use in Schools. Prosodical Marks in Two Pre-Palaeologan Manuscripts of Pindar," *GRBS* 57 (2017) 745–770, at 766–767 (with n.53 for other contemporary 'inverse palimpsests' of classical school authors). Images of Vi can be consulted at <https://www.onb.ac.at/digitaler-lesesaal> or via <https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/71527/>.

Planudes. The text is close to C, but since this is the only other extant member of the family which attests more than the *Olympians* (see n.1 above), the observation is of little evidential value.¹³ However, the two parts of the Pindar text show clear, if limited, signs of scribal contamination, stronger perhaps in the direction from the ‘Paris recension’ to Vi, and some of the interventions may even point to one or more external sources (see n.30 below). I provide select evidence and further explanation in the Appendix, expanding on the very sparse data given by Irigoín.

The educational background of V’s exemplar in the *Olympians* and *Pythian* 1 and the relatively small, but visible, philological effort expended on the composite text point to a learned milieu like Planudes’ circle, but do not substantiate this particular connection. A stronger hint comes from the presence of three cosmographic or astronomical works in V. Triclinius attests to Planudes’ interest in astronomy, and a Planudean autograph of Cleomedes’ *Κυκλική θεωρία* and Aratus’ *Phaenomena* (both used as astronomical textbooks in Byzantium) has been identified in the codex *Edinburgh, Advocates Library* 18.7.15.¹⁴ But by far the clearest indication that V originated in the environs of Planudes is provided by its script.

The hand of V’s principal scribe resembles those of manu-

¹³ Cf. Irigoín, *Histoire* 266.

¹⁴ Triclinius’ comment, which describes Planudes’ substitution of factually incorrect lines in Aratus with verses of his own, is found in two 15th-century codices of Aratus: *Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barocc.* 109 (fol. 167^r) and *London, BM Add.* 11886 (fol. 26^r). The slightly differing text of both manuscripts can be consulted in J. Martin, *Scholia in Aratum vetera* (Stuttgart 1974) XXX–XXXI. The veracity of the note has been confirmed by Planudes’ treatment of Aratus *Phaen.* 481–496, 501–506, and 515–524 in the Edinburgh codex. See I. C. Cunningham, “Greek Manuscripts in the National Library of Scotland,” *Scriptorium* 24 (1970) 360–371, at 367–368, and A. Turyn, *Dated Greek Manuscripts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in the Libraries of Great Britain* (Washington 1980) 57–59 with pl. 41–42; cf. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* 232.

scripts known to have been produced in Planudes' circle. It is defined by the following characteristics:¹⁵

- a) large circular letters (e.g. β, ο, σ, υ, φ, ω, and the ligatures for ερ or ος),
- b) the frequent use of oversized uncial γ and minuscule δ and τ, all with extended and slightly curly horizontal strokes,
- c) a long wave for the abbreviation of -ων.

All three of these features appear in Planudes' own script, albeit to a much lesser degree, as can be seen, for example, in *Marc. gr.* 481, the partial autograph of the *Planudean Anthology*.¹⁶ The best individual parallel for V is the hand of scribe G of *Ambr. C* 126 inf.¹⁷ This codex of ca. 1295–1296 contains Plutarch's *Moralia* 1–69 “in the order and text recension of the so-called Corpus Planudeum.”¹⁸ It was written by ten scribes (A–K), including Planudes himself (B), and provides “a significant illustration of the variety of scholarly scripts from the Planudean milieu.”¹⁹ Even more spectacular examples of the large τ are exhibited by its scribes A and C.²⁰ It is also worth pointing to scribe B in *Marc. gr.* 481 of the *Planudean Anthology* (fols. 16^r.5–19^r, 20^r–22^r.11, 22^r.17–23^v).²¹

¹⁵ Digital images of V are available at <https://gallica.bnf.fr/> or via <https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/52035/>.

¹⁶ See A. Turyn, *Dated Greek Manuscripts of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries in the Libraries of Italy* (Urbana 1972) II pl. 71 (fol. 55^v). Planudes wrote most of this manuscript, but two other scribes were involved. For the (possible) distribution see E. Mioni, *Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum. Codices graeci manuscripti* II (Rome 1985) 276. Digital images of the entire codex are accessible via <http://www.internetculturale.it/it/41/collezioni/29635/> or <https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/69952/>.

¹⁷ Turyn, *Dated Greek Manuscripts ... Italy* II pl. 65; cf. <https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notices/cote/42458/>. There are no digital images publicly available yet.

¹⁸ Turyn, *Dated Greek Manuscripts ... Italy* I 81.

¹⁹ Turyn, *Dated Greek Manuscripts ... Italy* I 84.

²⁰ See Turyn, *Dated Greek Manuscripts ... Italy* II pl. 59, 61.

²¹ See Turyn, *Dated Greek Manuscripts ... Italy* II pl. 73 (fol. 22^v), and n.16

Planudes' students and amanuenses clearly imitated and exaggerated the flourishes of their master's hand, and the scribe of V seems to have been one of them. In that case it nevertheless remains possible that V was produced independently of Planudes by a scholar-scribe who was trained by him before moving elsewhere.²² But we would still have to account for the astronomical bias of the codex as, presumably, the legacy of his former teacher. On the whole therefore it seems preferable to assume that V stems from the Planudean circle.

These considerations do not prove that the second part of the Pindar text in V (and its relatives CNOØ) represents a 'proper' edition by Planudes. Günther's arguments, especially the one about the absence of a commentary, remain serious objections. But they corroborate our prima-facie assumption that Pindar was studied in the Planudean milieu. Perhaps Planudes was prevented by illness and/or his premature death around 1305 from completing a full edition of the *Epinicians*, and what we see in the 'Paris recension' is the remains of his preliminary work.²³ One may compare the case of Eustathius, whose *Proem to Pindar* survives, while the commentary it was intended to accompany appears, for whatever reason, never to have been realised.

Further support for this theory may come from the very fact that V has a composite text. Irigoin suggested that the reason why the *Olympians* and *Pythian* 1 were copied from V1 was that this manuscript offered metrical scholia from *Olympian* 2 to *Pythian* 1, "whereas the 'Planudean edition' [my inverted com-

above for the link to digital images. N. G. Wilson ("Maximus Planudes, the Codex Laurentianus 60.8 and Other Aristidean Manuscripts," *REG* 122 [2009] 253–261, at 255) recognised the same hand in the main text of *Laur.* 60.8, which contains Aelius Aristides. For images of this codex see <http://opac.bmlonline.it/Home.htm> (via 'Manoscritti') or <https://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/notice/fonds/1418/>.

²² Wilson (*GRBS* 19 [1978] 393) envisages this possibility for the principal scribe of *Laur.* 32.2 and cites the Planudes student John Zarides as a probable example of such movement.

²³ I owe this suggestion to Nigel Wilson.

mas] omits them.”²⁴ It is unclear whether Irigoin considered this ‘omission’ intentional or unintentional, but the former seems unlikely, given that Planudes made (basic) metrical corrections in other poetic texts and that both Moschopoulos and Triclinius did the same extensively for Pindar. But if the common ancestor of the manuscript family had failed to transmit the metrical scholia, their partial acquisition from another source would have been of interest to Planudes and his students. In *Ambr.* E 103 sup. (N) the metrical scholia to *Olympians* 3–12 were likewise added from a different source.²⁵

The question whether Planudes worked on Pindar and, more specifically, curated the ‘Paris recension’ must inevitably remain open. But the fact that two members of this family, *Vat. gr.* 915 (Ø) and *Par. gr.* 2403 (V), can independently be connected with him tips the scales somewhat in favour of Irigoin’s hypothesis.

APPENDIX

The mutual influence of V and Vi upon each other

Irigoin (266) observed that the two recensions of the Pindar text that have been joined in V exercised “a slight influence” upon each other. This ‘contamination’ was largely carried out by the main scribe in the process of copying; only occasionally have readings from the respective other source been added as corrections by the first or a second hand. Irigoin quotes three examples from the part of V that was copied from Vi (*Ol.* 1–*Pyth.* 1) and three from that which belongs to the ‘Paris recension’ (*Pyth.* 2–*Nem.* 6.44). Nearly all the changes, one of which is a genuine improvement (*Ol.* 7.62 ἀὐξ[αν]ομένων), the others *Verschlimmbesserungen* (*Ol.* 1.75 ἔειπε : εἶπε, 10.57 ἄρ’ : ἄρα, *Pyth.* 2.14 εὐα<ν>χέα, 44 ὀνομάξε : ὀνομάζε, 3.45 πόρε<ν>), reflect metrical considerations and suffice to prove that the intervention was intentional.

²⁴ Irigoin, *Histoire* 265: “La répartition du texte ... a probablement été établie en fonction des scholies métriques qui, dans le manuscrit de Germanos, vont de la seconde *Olympique* à la première *Pythique*, alors que l’édition planudéenne les omet.”

²⁵ Irigoin, *Histoire* 257.

However, further investigation seemed in order. Since Vi is mutilated after *Pyth.* 5.55 (see 710 above), the evidence had to be collected from *Olympian* 1 to *Pythian* 4. I collated *Pythians* 2–4 (510 verses) for the part copied from the ‘Paris recension’, and *Olympians* 1, 6, 7, 13, and *Pythian* 1 (531 verses) for the part copied from Vi. This selection was intended not only to expand on Irigoín and to match approximately the combined number of verses in *Pythians* 2–4, but also to reflect the widest possible spread of attestation in the manuscripts of the ‘Paris recension’.²⁶

These collations have revealed a broader range of philological activity in V. We see simple corrections (e.g. *Ol.* 6.82, 7.37, *Pyth.* 4.245), the introduction or removal of dialect forms (e.g. *Pyth.* 1.8, 92, 4.232), and even independent intervention, presumably again for metrical reasons (*Ol.* 6.5). Yet the changes remain intermittent, of variable quality, and occasionally internally inconsistent,²⁷ while a large number of opportunities for correction have been missed (e.g. *Ol.* 1.112 κρατερώτατον VVi : κρατερώτατον CN cett. recte; *Pyth.* 4.41 λυσιπόνοισι VC : λυσιπόνοις Vi cett. recte). It also appears that popular odes like *Olympian* 1 and *Pythian* 1 attracted more extensive intervention and that the portion of V that was copied from Vi was more heavily interfered with than that which stems from the ‘Paris recension’. This may suggest an editorial bias towards the ‘Paris recension’ (cf. 711 above), although one has to keep in mind that the scope for comparison in the second part of V is limited by the mutilation of Vi and the fact that much of the available evidence consists of *Pythian* 4, which because of its enormous length was presumably less commonly read.

The tables below first list the (final intended) reading of V, regardless of whether it is correct, followed by that of Vi. Wherever possible, the quotation of other manuscript sigla, adapted from the

²⁶ *Olympian* 1 is attested in CN (O here belongs to the ‘Laurentian family’), *Olympians* 6 and 7 in CNOØ (N up to *Ol.* 7.64, O from *Ol.* 6.76 to 7.64, Ø up to *Ol.* 7.29), *Olympian* 13 in CNO, *Pythian* 1 only in C (cf. n.1 above). For details of the varying family associations of NOØ see A. Turyn, *Pindari camina cum fragmentis* (Oxford 1952) x.

²⁷ See below for the introduction of the Aeolic ending -αῖς to the masculine aorist active participle in *Pyth.* 1.92 as opposed to its removal in *Ol.* 1.60 and *Pyth.* 4.232 (and apparently also 230).

apparatuses of Turyn and of Gentili et al.,²⁸ has been kept to the minimum.

1. The influence of the 'Paris recension' on the text copied from Vi

Olympian 1

- 23 βασιλῆα V cett. recte : βασιλέα Vi (+ H $\ddot{\iota}$)
 23–24 κλέος / εὐάνορι^{os} Λυδοῦ VC^{pc}N (+ AHL) : κλέος / ἐν εὐάνορι
 Λυδοῦ Vi^{ac} u.v. (+ $\acute{\alpha}$ BE) recte
 26 ποσειδῶν VCN (+ B $\ddot{\iota}$) : ποσειδῶν Vi cett. fere recte (-άν)
 41 γαννυμήδης VCN (+ codd. pler.) : γάνυ- Vi (+ AB) recte
 60 κλέσας VCN (+ A $\acute{\alpha}$ HL^{ac}) : κλέσας Vi u.v. (+ A γ ^oE $\ddot{\iota}$ L^{pc}) recte
 75 ἔειπε VCN : εἶπε Vi cett. recte
 82 κέ VN (+ ABL^{pc}) recte : καί Vi (+ C¹E : δὲ C²H)²⁹

Olympian 6

- 5 τε βωμῶ V^{pc} : βωμῶ τε V^{ac} cett. recte
 29 ποσειδάωνι VCN \emptyset (+ L) : ποσειδάωνι Vi cett. recte
 82 λιγυρᾶς V et fere cett. recte : λυγερᾶς Vi

Olympian 7

- 37 ὑπερμάκει V cett. recte : ὑπερβάκει Vi
 44 προμάθεος V codd. pler. recte : προμαθέως Vi (+ ABO)
 74 λίνδον τ' V et fere cett. recte : λύδον τ' Vi φρένες V cett. recte :
 φρένας Vi
 94 ἐν δὲ V cett. recte : δὲ om. Vi (+ O)

Olympian 13

- 52 προσπόλοις VCNO^{pc} (+ F^s) : προπόλοις Vi cett. recte
 95 ἐξηκοντάδι δ' VC^{ac} : ἐξηκοντάκι δ' Vi cett. : ἐξηκοντάκις
 Mommsen recte

Pythian 1

- 8 γλεφάρων VC (+ codd. pler.) recte : βλεφάρων Vi (+ C^s)
 26 ιδέσθαι V (+ F^gG γ ^oH γ ^o) : πυθέσθαι Vi codd. pler. : προσιδέσθαι
 CE γ ^o recte³⁰

²⁸ Turyn, *Pindari cammina*; B. Gentili, C. Catenacci, P. Giannini, and E. Lomiento, *Pindaro. Le Olimpiche* (Milan 2013); B. Gentili, P. Angeli Bernardini, E. Cingano, and P. Giannini, *Pindaro. Le Pitiche* (Milan 1995).

²⁹ While this variant is metrically relevant, the distribution of readings in the 'Paris recension' (CN), and especially the correction δὲ in C², suggest that κέ in V may be a lucky itacistic slip.

³⁰ The fact that none of the other codices which attest the reading of V belong to the 'Paris recension' may indicate that the scribe had further

85 οἰκτιρομῶ VC (+ codd. pler.) recte : οἰκτιρῶν Vi (+ Å)
 92 πετάσαις V^{pc}C : πετάσας V^{ac} cett.³¹

2. The influence of Vi on the text of the ‘Paris recension’

Pythian 2

65 ἱπποσόοισιν V^sVi : ἱπποσόοισιν V cett. recte
 88 τηρέωντι VVi (+ G) recte : τηρέοντι cett.

Pythian 3

6 τέκνον ἀνωδυνίας V²Vi (+ BH^{γθ}) : τέκτον’ ἀνωδυνίας V¹C (+
 ÅEG²) : τέκτονα νωδυνίας G¹H Tricl. recte
 52 περιάπτων VVi cett. : περάπτων EHC recte
 114 γινώσκομεν VVi (+ GH) : γινώσκομεν C cett. recte

Pythian 4

232 ῥίψας V^{pc}Vi codd. pler. : ῥίψαις V^{ac}C (+ BG) recte³²
 245 πεντηκόντερον VVi (+ EG) recte : πεντηκόντορον C (+ BH) et
 fere cett.³³

July, 2020

The Queen’s College
 Oxford OX1 4AW
 United Kingdom
 almut.fries@classics.ox.ac.uk

sources at his disposal (711 above). However, since in *Pythian 1* C is the only extant member of the Paris family, we cannot be certain of that proposition.

³¹ This participle is metrically and semantically superfluous and was rightly excised by Callierges. Given the general absence of dialect glosses in Pindar, the majority reading πετάσαις is probably original and Aeolic πετάσας due to what Irigoin called *contre-normalisation* (i.e. the introduction of dialect forms during transmission as opposed to their elimination). C is particularly faithful in preserving -αις.

³² The same ‘correction’ is found in *Pyth. 4.230* (τελέσ(σ)ας V^{pc} codd. pler. : -αις V^{ac} (+ CB) recte), but it is impossible to verify the reading in Vi from the digital images (cf. n.12) as the word is hidden in the gutter margin.

³³ This article is a ‘spin-off’ from my forthcoming edition, with introduction and commentary, of *Pythian 1*. I am grateful to Nigel Wilson for his initial suggestion to find parallels for the script of V, for reading the first version of this piece, and for supplying me with several references from his own library at a time when the public ones were closed. I also thank the anonymous referee for *GRBS* for pointing out ways to improve the evidential value of the Appendix.