

## THE NUMBER OF BOOKS OF IAMBlichus' *BABYLONIACA* (ON PHOTIUS *BIBL.* 94, 78B 3)

Photius' summary of Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca* in his *Bibliotheca* (ch. 94)<sup>1</sup> ends with the triumph of Rhodanes over Garmos, king of Babylon: Rhodanes recovered his beloved Sinonis and became king of the Babylonians, as a swallow had foretold (*Bibl.* 94, 78a 39 - 78b 3 Henry)<sup>2</sup>. Then Photius concludes chapter 94 with these words: ἐν οἷς ὁ ις' λόγος, "with these facts book 16 ends".

Photius' words do not arouse suspicion in themselves, but they become problematic if one takes into account Suidas' entry on Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca*: ἔστι δὲ Ῥοδάνου καὶ Σινωνίδος ἔρως ἐν βιβλίοις λθ' (*Lex.* ι 26 Adler), "it is the love story of Rhodanes and Sinonis, in 39 books".

The disagreement between Photius and Suidas on the number of books (16 and 39 books respectively) actually poses a problem, and not merely a textual one. Modern scholars have given various answers but no unanimous conclusion has been reached on this issue. Roughly speaking, two explanations have been suggested<sup>3</sup>:

i) the number of books could be corrupt in the manuscript tradition – a flaw usually ascribed to the text of Suidas' *Lexicon*<sup>4</sup>;

ii) there was in circulation another edition of *Babyloniaca* with a different text division in *logoi*, or an abbreviated or a partial one<sup>5</sup>.

Yet the Photian phrase ἐν οἷς ὁ ις' λόγος can be explained otherwise: it may indicate not the end of the *Babyloniaca*, but only a turning-point in the

<sup>1</sup> Iamblichus' novel survives in the summary by Photius, in fragments scattered throughout Suidas' *Lexicon*, and in excerpts from medieval and humanistic manuscripts. For a synoptic edition of these texts (summary, fragments and excerpts), see Habrich 1960; for Photius' summary see Henry 1960, 34-48; texts and translations are in Stephens-Winkler 1995, 179-245.

<sup>2</sup> Ῥοδάνης δὲ καὶ νικᾷ καὶ τὴν Σινωνίδα ἀπολαμβάνει, καὶ βασιλεύει Βαβυλωνίων. Καὶ τοῦτο χελιδὼν προμηνύει· ταύτην γάρ, ὅτε παρὴν Γάρμος καὶ συνεξέπεμπε Ῥοδάνην, ἀετὸς ἐδίωκε καὶ ἰκτῖνος· ἀλλὰ τὸν μὲν ἀετὸν ἐξέφυγεν, ὁ δὲ ἰκτῖνος ταύτην ἤρπασεν. "Rhodanes in fact wins the battle and recovers Sinonis and becomes king of Babylonians. This had been prophesied by a swallow: for in the presence of Garmos, when he was sending Rhodanes off to the war, an eagle and a kite were chasing the swallow. She eluded the eagle but the kite caught up with her." (transl. Stephens-Winkler).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Brioso Sánchez-Crespo Güemes 1982, 387 note 3, 441 note 114.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Di Gregorio 1964, 9; Stephens-Winkler 1995, 180. It should be noted that Angelo Mai claimed to have read the book number λε' (35) instead of λθ' (39) in a Vatican manuscript of Suidas: vd. Mai 1827, 348 note 2.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Croiset-Croiset 1928, 790-791, note 3; Henry 1960, 207 (supplementary note to page 48, line 5).

novel, so the numeral ις' would indicate a partial account of Photius' reading, and not Iamblichus' novel as a whole. This explanation seems the most realistic one<sup>6</sup>, but it is not commonly accepted in modern studies of Iamblichus: the widespread view is that Photius' summary in ch. 94 of the *Bibliotheca* covers the novel as a whole, although there is absolutely no evidence for that.

In order to argue that ch. 94 is incomplete and that Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca* were not originally only 16 books in length, we need to broaden our approach and inquire into certain literary, codicological, and textual features of this chapter:

i) firstly, although Photius' summary ends with the reunion of the pair of lovers, there is no convincing reason to believe that Iamblichus' novel would end at this point – as many scholars have stated in the wake of Erwin Rohde's important contribution on Iamblichus' novel<sup>7</sup>, followed by René Henry in his edition of Photius, amongst many others<sup>8</sup>. Reunions and separations of the pair, in fact, occur more than once in the complex plot of the ancient novels<sup>9</sup>, but, most of all, we don't really know how Photius epitomized Iamblichus' novel (in ch. 73, for example, Photius treats Heliodorus's intricate plot as if it was a linear narrative).

ii) a second element is the lack of biographical information or literary details on the author and his work at the end of this chapter, as we find, instead, with Heliodorus (*Bibl.* 73, 51b 38-41), and especially with Antonius Diogenes (*Bibl.* 166, 111b 32 - 112a 12). Even though biographical information, included in the novel itself, is epitomized in ch. 94, 75b 20-34, and each chapter of Photius' *Bibliotheca* has a different structure and features and any comparison may seem arbitrary<sup>10</sup>, it is nevertheless important to point out this deficiency at the end of this chapter;

iii) a third aspect, generally overlooked in modern studies, concerns the earliest and most important extant manuscript of the *Bibliotheca*, the Marcianus Gr. 450 (A), recently ascribed to the last decade of the 9th

<sup>6</sup> Thus Morgan 1998, 3327. Schneider–Menzel 1948, 77 suggested that there were later books which Photius did not read and argued also for serial publication, the different character of the novel in its sections being due to the use of different models.

<sup>7</sup> Rohde 1960, 364 note 2.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *supra* note 4.

<sup>9</sup> See Heliodorus 7.7.7 f., for example, with the recognition scene in which Charicleia and Theagenes are finally reunited: the story appears to move swiftly towards a happy ending, but the pair will face other misfortunes and a short-lived separation (8.6.2 f.). It should be incidentally noted here that Heliodorus seems to draw upon Iamblichus' novel as a model: see Borgogno 1979, 153-156.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Nogara 1985, 12.

century (in other words, while Photius was probably still alive)<sup>11</sup>. The end of ch. 94 is anomalous in **A**: for some reason this chapter ends a little below the middle of the first column of fol. 76v and the remaining part of the folio is left blank.<sup>12</sup> Similar anomalies – viz. *lacunae* and blank spaces – do occur elsewhere in **A**: for example, at the end of ch. 63 on Procopius' *De bellis*, at the end of ch. 219 on Oribasius' works, and at the end of ch. 239 on Proclus<sup>13</sup>. In these chapters blank spaces may suggest that Photius' text was left interrupted and then incomplete<sup>14</sup>. It is hard to get a sense of the exact reason for these blank spaces left by the scribe, but these features of **A** are too significant to be overlooked – the answers given so far do not explain every aspect of this question<sup>15</sup>, as it can be seen in the light of a preliminary codicological survey of this manuscript<sup>16</sup>.

iv) finally, a further observation about Photius' closing words. The expression ἐν οἷς (καὶ) ὁ (number) λόγος, if not matched by any verb or noun pointing to a conclusion (viz. τελειώω, συμπεραίνω, συναπαρτίζω, τέλος etc.)<sup>17</sup>, occurs in the *Bibliotheca* as a standard formula describing the

<sup>11</sup> See Cavallo 1999, and Canfora 1999.

<sup>12</sup> The Marcianus Gr. 451 (**M**), the other main manuscript of Photius' *Bibliotheca* (last decade of the 12th century), does not show at this point the broad white space of **A**, but only the usual short *vacuum* marking the transitions from one chapter to another of the *Bibliotheca* (fol. 58v). At the end of this chapter **M** reads ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ ἕξ καὶ δέκατος λόγος.

<sup>13</sup> As regards the end of ch. 63, Claudio Bevegni and Nigel Wilson noted that “qui entrambi i principali manoscritti del testo foziano presentano una lacuna; lo spazio bianco potrebbe indurci a credere che Fozio avesse l'intenzione, se il tempo glielo avesse permesso, di completare il riassunto” (Wilson–Bevegni 1992, 103 note 1; same remark in Wilson 1994, 52 note 13). On the incompleteness of ch. 219 see Ronconi 2012, 263. As for ch. 239, Photius' words are contradictory: at the beginning of the chapter, Photius refers to Proclus' work as “in four books”, but at the end as “in two books”. Scholars have given different interpretations: cf. Severyns 1938, 258–260. It is also worth noting that a corrector of **M** deleted the last words of ch. 239 (ἐν τούτοις) perhaps in order to solve this contradiction in terms: on this topic, see Severyns 1968, 401–405. Cf. Treadgold 1980a, 79–80, and Treadgold 1980b, 59 (ad p. 166).

<sup>14</sup> On blanks and *lacunae* in **A** and **M** see Hägg 1976, 40–41; for codicological remarks on this topic, see Ronconi 2012, 258 note 36, 263; for interesting remarks on the relation between the *lacunae* and Photius' authorship, see Nogara 1975, 215–218.

<sup>15</sup> In Henry's opinion, the scribe “évite de commencer un chapitre à la fin d'un cahier et il laisse de grands blancs là où le parchemin présente quelque défaut” (Henry 1959, XXIX).

<sup>16</sup> Ronconi 2012, 258 note 36.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *Bibl.* 62, 21b 7–8 ἐν οἷς αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ δύο συμπεραιούνται λόγοι (this phrase marks the end of Praxagora's work); 92, 72b 39 ἐν οἷς καὶ τοῦ δεκάτου λόγου τὸ τέλος (the last book of Arrian's work); 99, 85b 35–36 ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ ὄγδοος τελειοῦται λόγος (the last of the eight books of Herodian's work); 221, 180b 3–4 ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ ἰδ' συμπεραίνεται λόγος. κατὰ δὲ τὸν ιε' διαλαμβάνει λόγον... (transition from the fourteenth to the fifteenth book of Aetius' work). In 223, 210a 37–40, the phrase points to the transition from the second to the third book of

transition from one *logos* to another in the case of works in more than one book, or in a partial account: *Bibl.* 65, 30a 3 (ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ τέταρτος λόγος. ὁ δὲ πέμπτος διέξεισιν...), 30b 8 (ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ πέμπτος λόγος. ὁ δὲ ἕκτος λόγος περιέχει...), 31a 5 (ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ ἕκτος λόγος. ὁ δὲ ἑβδομος λόγος διαλαμβάνει...); 72, 37a 25 (ἐν οἷς ὁ ἐνδέκατος Κτησίῳ λόγος τοῦ Κνιδίου. ἄρχεται δὲ ὁ δωδέκατος...); 92, 72a 24 (ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ θ' λόγος. ὁ δὲ δέκατος διαλαμβάνει...); 120, 94a 1 (ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ πρῶτος λόγος. ὁ δὲ δεῦτερος ἀνατροπὴν περιέχει...); 161, 103a 41 (ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡ δευτέρα βίβλος τῶν συλλογῶν. ὁ δὲ τρίτος λόγος συλλέγεται...); 221, 180a 14 (τοῦτο μὲν καὶ ὁ γ' λόγος. ἐν δὲ τῷ ιδ' περί τε τῶν ἐν ἔδρᾳ φιλοπονεῖται...); 223, 212a 3 (ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ τρίτος λόγος. ἐν δὲ τῷ δ' μὲν λόγῳ, λ' δὲ δ' κεφαλαίῳ...).

On these bases, it is now possible to argue more convincingly that Photius' summary of Iamblichus's novel is not complete: it ends with book 16, but the *Babyloniaca* did indeed continue. The portent of the swallow, with which Photius concludes his summary, does not refer to the end of the novel: it was a turning-point in the plot, and – in Morgan's opinion – it may be that Photius omitted it from his summary and only realised its importance afterwards with an explanatory back-reference<sup>18</sup>. Therefore, the number 39 recorded by Suidas' *Lexicon*, which draws extensively from Iamblichus<sup>19</sup>, is not an error and is by no means anomalous<sup>20</sup>. So a future critical edition of Photius' *Bibliotheca* should pay close attention to these textual and

Diodoros of Tarsus' Κατὰ εἰμαρμένης “in eight books and fifty-three chapters”: ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ δεῦτερος αὐτῷ συναπαρτίζεται λόγος καὶ τὰ δέκα κεφάλαια, τελευτήσαντα μὲν εἰς τὸ κ', ἀρχὴν δὲ τὸ ι' ποιησάμενα, “at this point his second book with its ten chapters comes to an end – chapters beginning with number 10 and ending with number 20” (transl. Wilson). There is only one (apparent) exception: in 80, 59a 1-3, the phrase ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡ πρώτη τῆς ἱστορίας δεκάλογος. ἄρχεται δὲ ἡ δευτέρα ὥδε... points to the transition from the first to the second decade of books of Olympiodoros' historical work – not from one book to another.

<sup>18</sup> Morgan 1998, 3327.

<sup>19</sup> See Habrich 1960. Another relevant case in which Photius disagrees with Suidas on the number of books concerns the Κεστοί of Iulius Africanus: the 9th cent. Byzantine chronicler and ecclesiastic George Syncellus speaks of an ἐννεάβιβλος (*Ecloga chron.* 439, 18 Mosshammer), Photius knows of Iulius Africanus' work ἐν λόγοις ... ιδ' (*Bibl.* 34, 7a 8), and Suidas ἐν βιβλίῳς κδ' (α 4647). Even if it is not possible to exclude the existence of earlier or partial editions of the Κεστοί (cf. Wallraff-Scardino-Mecella-Guignard 2012, XIX and 31 note 15), Suida's testimony is the most credible considering that the third century Papyrus Oxy. 412 preserves the subscription to the 18th book and that “Africanus himself apparently ascribed a special significance to the number 24” (*ibidem*, XIX-XX).

<sup>20</sup> It should be noted here that 39 is not a strange number (so Whitmarsh 2005, 600): for instance, Chrysippus' *Quaestiones logicae* included 39 books; Sextus Pomponius, a contemporary of Gaius (II AD), is the author of a legal commentary in 39 books *ad Quintum Mucium*; P. Iuventius Celsus (II AD) wrote legal commentaries in 39 books entitled *Digesta*.

codicological features of **A** and should at least provide information about the *status* of the final part of ch. 94.<sup>21</sup>

If the *Babyloniaca* really continued after book 16, the question arises of why Photius decided to end his summary right here. In the light of the actual gap in **A**, it is conceivable that this situation (blank spaces at the end of certain chapters) may be traceable back to Photius himself<sup>22</sup>, and to the conditions in which he left his working materials (σχεδάρια), and then to his entourage that put together those σχεδάρια<sup>23</sup>. However, it is impossible to tell whether this interruption is due to private circumstances (exile)<sup>24</sup>, simple personal choice (the length of the *Babyloniaca* possibly strained his patience)<sup>25</sup>, or the availability of texts (lost books)<sup>26</sup>. It is likely in this case, as at other points in the *Bibliotheca* where a blank space follows the end of a chapter, that the scribe who copied this chapter (scribe B)<sup>27</sup> was not able at that time to find the rest of Photius' account of the *Babyloniaca*, arguably left incomplete.

Furthermore, it should be noted that Photius' σχεδάρια on Iamblichus are likely to have been much more tangled than one might suppose: in the right margin of fol. 72r of **A** (where Photius summarizes the autobiographical

<sup>21</sup> The sign of *lacuna* at the end of this chapter was recommended by Treadgold 1980b, 54 (*ad* vol. II, p. 48).

<sup>22</sup> Nogara 1975, 216-218, previously ascribed blank spaces and *lacunae* to Photius himself.

<sup>23</sup> On the composition of the *Bibliotheca* and Photius' σχεδάρια cf. Canfora 1998a; Canfora 1998b; Canfora 2002, 81-83.

<sup>24</sup> For the most recent examinations of Photius' first exile, and a closer dating of his *Bibliotheca*, see Ronconi 2013; Ronconi 2014, 117-119.

<sup>25</sup> A few pages earlier Photius seems to want to move more quickly in the summary: 78a 10 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὧδε προῦβαινε... "while these events were in progress..." (as remarked by Henry 1960, 46 note 2: "à partir de cet endroit, on sent dans le sommaire une certaine hâte de l'auteur d'arriver à la fin"); cf. also 78a 24 ἀλλ' ὕστερον ταῦτα... "but that happened later", and 78a 29 ἐν ᾧ δὲ ταῦτα ἐπράττετο... "while these events happened..."

<sup>26</sup> Habrich 1960, 70 (*ad* fr. 92), thinks that Photius' copy could have been missing something from the beginning, but it should be remarked that Photius usually indicates instances of incomplete readings (due to lack of time or – sometimes temporary – difficulties in finding books): cf. for instance *Bibl.* 35, 7a 33 (Photius reads only a part of Philip of Side's work); 40, 8b 24-25 (he finds other λόγοι of Philostorgius' work ἐν ἄλλῳ βιβλίῳ); 41, 9a 17 (he cannot read John Diacrinomenos' work as a whole); 58, 17b 22 (he has not yet read some of Arrian's works); 97, 83b 35 and 84a 34-35 (he can read only a part of Phlegon of Tralles' *Olympiades*); 176, 120a 8-14 (remarks on the preservation of Theopompus' λόγοι ἱστορικοί); 187, 144a 32 (remarks on the rarity of Nicomachus of Gerasa's *Arithmetical Theology*); 224, 240a 9-11 (Photius cannot read some books of Memnon's work); 228, 245a 28-29 (he can read only some βιβλίου of Ephraim of Theoupolis' work). Cf. Canfora 1995, 48-49.

<sup>27</sup> Cavallo 1999, 158-159.

digression in the novel), the same scribe who wrote the text<sup>28</sup> added an extensive scholion containing information about Iamblichus<sup>29</sup>. In Schamp's opinion, "à première vue, on ne doit pas se tromper de beaucoup en supposant que la scholie a pour auteur un de ces érudits que produisirent à la fin du IX<sup>e</sup> siècle l'ardeur intellectuelle et l'exemple stimulant du cercle groupé autour du futur patriarche" [viz. Photius]<sup>30</sup>. If this is how things are, and ms. A is really an assembly work of "matériaux photiens originels"<sup>31</sup>, it can be stated all the more confidently that Photius' *σχεδάρια* on Iamblichus in ch. 94 were a work still in progress and the summary of the *Babyloniaca* was not complete.

University of Bari

NUNZIO BIANCHI

### Bibliographical References

- A. Borgogno, *Antonio Diogene e le trame dei romanzi greci*, "Prometheus" 5, 1979, 137-156  
 M. Brioso Sánchez - E. Crespo Güemes, Longo, *Dafnis y Cloe; Aquiles Tacio. Leucipa y Clitofonte; Jámblico. Babiloniacas (resumen de Focio y fragmentos)*, Madrid 1982  
 L. Canfora, *Libri e biblioteche*, in G. Cambiano - L. Canfora - D. Lanza (edd.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, II. *La ricezione e l'attualizzazione del testo*, Roma 1995, 11-93  
 L. Canfora, *Il 'reading circle' intorno a Fozio*, "Byzantion" 68, 1998, 222-223  
 L. Canfora, *Le 'cercle des lecteurs' autour de Photius: une source contemporaine*, "REByz" 56, 1998, 269-273  
 L. Canfora, *Postilla*, "QS" 49, 1999, 175-177  
 L. Canfora, *Il copista come autore*, Palermo 2002  
 G. Cavallo, *Per le mani e la datazione del codice Ven. Mar. gr. 450*, "QS" 49, 1999, 157-174  
 A. Croiset - M. Croiset, *Histoire de la littérature grecque*, V, Paris 1928  
 L. Di Gregorio, *Sulla biografia di Giamblico e la fortuna del suo romanzo attraverso i secoli*, "Aevum" 38, 1964, 1-13  
 E. Habrich, *Iamblichi Babyloniacorum reliquiae*, Lipsiae 1960  
 T. Hägg, review of Henry's edition of Photius' *Bibliotheca* (voll. I-VII, Paris 1959-1974), "GGA" 228, 1976, 32-60  
 R. Henry, *Photius. Bibliothèque*, I. *Codices 1-83*, Paris 1959  
 R. Henry, *Photius. Bibliothèque*, II. *Codices 84-185*, Paris 1960  
 A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio a Vaticanis codicibus*, II, Romae 1827  
 J. R. Morgan, *On the Fringes of the Canon: Work on the Fragments of Ancient Greek Fiction 1936-1994*, in ANRW, II.34.4, Berlin-New York 1998, 3293-3390

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Severyns 1938, 17, and Henry 1959, xxix.

<sup>29</sup> See the critical edition of this scholium in Habrich 1960, 2 (a less correct transcription is provided by Henry 1960, 40 note 1); transl. in Stephens-Winkler 1995, 181.

<sup>30</sup> Schamp 1987, 221.

<sup>31</sup> Ronconi 2012, 272.

- A. Nogara, *Note sulla composizione e la struttura della Biblioteca di Fozio, patriarca di Costantinopoli. I*, "Aevum" 49, 1975, 213-242
- A. Nogara, *Note sulla composizione e la struttura della Biblioteca di Fozio. II*, "RSBS" 5, 1985, 11-57
- E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Darmstadt 1960 (= Leipzig 1914<sup>3</sup>)
- F. Ronconi, *La Bibliothèque de Photius et le Marc. gr. 450. Recherches préliminaires*, "S&T" 10, 2012, 249-278
- F. Ronconi, *The Patriarch and the Assyrians: New Evidences for the Date of Photios' Library*, "S&T" 11, 2013, 387-395
- F. Ronconi, *L'autunno du Patriarche. Photios, la Bibliothèque et le Venezia, Bibl. Naz. Marc. Gr. 450*, in J. Signes Codoñer - I. Pérez Mertín (eds.), *Textual Transmission in Byzantium: Between Textual Criticism and Quellenforschung*, Turnhout 2014, 95-132
- J. Schamp, *Photios historien des lettres. La Bibliothèque et ses notices biographiques*, Genève 1987
- U. Schneider-Menzel, *Jamblichos' "Babylonische Geschichten"*, in F. Altheim, *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum*, I, Halle/Saale 1948, 48-92
- A. Severyns, *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus*, Première partie. *Le codex 239 de Photius*, Paris 1938
- A. Severyns, *Mea culpa*, "AC" 37, 1968, 399-405
- S. A. Stephens - J. J. Winkler, *Ancient Greek Novels. The Fragments*, Princeton 1995
- W. T. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius*, Washington 1980
- W. T. Treadgold, *The Recent Completed Edition of the Bibliotheca of Photius*, "Byzantino-slavica" 41, 1980, 50-61
- M. Wallraff - C. Scardino - L. Mecella - Ch. Guignard, *Iulius Africanus, Cesti. The Extant Fragments*, Berlin-Boston 2012
- N. G. Wilson, *Photius. The Bibliotheca. A selection translated with notes*, London 1994
- N. Wilson - C. Bevegni, *Fozio. Biblioteca*, Milano 1992
- T. Whitmarsh, *The Greek Novel: Titles and Genre*, "AJPh" 126, 2005, 587-611

## ABSTRACT:

The aim of this paper is to reconsider the final words of chapter 94 in Photius' *Bibliotheca* on Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca* (ἐν οἷς ὁ ις' λόγος, "with these facts book 16 ends"). Literary, codicological, and textual evidence concur to prove that Photius' summary of Iamblichus' novel is actually incomplete and his words do not refer to the *Babyloniaca* as a whole.

## KEYWORDS:

Iamblichus, *Babyloniaca*, Photius, *Bibliotheca* ch. 94.