

FRANCO FERRARI – FILIPPOMARIA PONTANI

ALCAEUS' GRANDFATHERS: A NOTE ON FR. 6, LL. 17–20 V

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 113 (1996) 1–4

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

ALCAEUS' GRANDFATHERS: A NOTE ON FR. 6, LL. 17–20 V

Lines 17–20 of Alcaeus' fr. 6 V (= 6 LP) run as follows in Voigt's edition¹:

17	ἔοντε[]	ἄπ	πατέρω[ν
	τῶν	εφ[]	αμμο	ς
	ἔοικε[]	ων	ταχίαν [
20	τά[]	ν	ητορεν [

In order to enhance our understanding of this stanza, we shall deal with some palaeographic and philologic issues. We assume that Lobel's arrangement of POxy 2166 (e) 4 as belonging to the right-hand side of our fragment, is right². Although we cannot be certain, writing, colour and fibres of the small papyrus scrap point in this direction.

L. 17 ἔοντες at the beginning must refer to the τόκηες mentioned in l. 14, who are apparently – if we accept Hunt's excellent integration οἷ at the beginning of l. 15 – also the subject of the sentence covering the last two lines of the stanza³.

Lobel's apparatus suggests that the first letter after the lacuna might be either a K or a Λ. In fact, the tiny, N-W oriented stroke just before the foot of A's left diagonal, can only belong either to a K or to a Λ or – though less likely – to a X, since the scanty space above it appears to be blank (A, which is also theoretically possible, can be ruled out because a succession of two alphas in this papyrus, which does not use *scriptio plena*, is impossible).

Of course, reading Λ (or X) would imply admitting before ἄπ either an elided neuter plural (-λα, -χα) or an elided third person of a past indicative (-λε, -χε: imperfect, aorist or perfect), which are both highly improbable given the structure of the line (ἔοντες can hardly be left on its own, isolated at the beginning), or else the conjunction ἀλλά(α), which is also very unlikely for the same reason (between ἔοντες and ἀλλά there would be left one long syllable only, and no predicate of ἔοντες can reasonably fit in this space). As a result, preference should be accorded to the reading K, following the path traced by Gallavotti⁴, who brilliantly conjectured κἄπ πατέρων μάθος: this solution has the advantage of both respecting the palaeographic aspect of the papyrus and of using for the *constitutio textus* (with the simple addition of a κ, that could have easily gone lost at some stage of the textual tradition) the quotation from Alcaeus in Herodianus II 941 Lentz, which reads ἀππατέρων μάθος, and is generally interpreted as ἄπ πατέρων μάθος⁵.

Now, if we are to read this passage the way Gallavotti did, one very important consequence to be drawn is the elimination of one out of the two instances of the apocope of the preposition ἄπυ in the

¹ *Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta*, ed. E.-M. Voigt, Amsterdam 1971, p. 180.

² *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XVIII, London 1941, p. 45, where Lobel however tones down the strength of his proposal by beginning the sentence with “perhaps”.

³ M. G. Bonanno, Alcae. fr. 6, 12–15 V., in *Museum Criticum* 8–9, 1973–74, pp. 135–137 (137 n. 10), accepts Hunt's οἷ but maintains – on the ground of an otherwise plausible comparison with Hdt. VII 53, 1 – that ἔοντες in l. 17 refers «alle imprese compiute dai padri per rendere presumibilmente “grande” e “degnà” la città». Yet Bonanno does not indicate which masculine noun in the nominative case ἔοντες should agree with, nor how this noun should fit in ll. 15–16; her argument is therefore far from being decisive.

⁴ See C. Gallavotti, *Saffo e Alceo*, Napoli 1956–1957², vol. II, pp. 54–55.

⁵ In this form it has been used even as a motto: it appears in great evidence on the front cover of the first edition of G. Pasquali's *Pagine stravaganti di un filologo*, published by G. Carabba, Lanciano 1933, as well as on that of other volumes of the same series («Biblioteca di cultura classica») directed by B. Lavagnini.

Lesbian dialect⁶. Furthermore, considering that the other one (ἀπ[π]εμπε in Sappho fr. 27 V = LP, l. 10) is not only the fruit of a rather easy integration – if the reading of the first π is indeed correct –, but quite certainly the echo of an unparalleled Homeric use of the same verb (cp., as Hamm points out, ο 83 ἀπέμψει), we can conclude that, as one would expect since ἄπυ is not oxyton, no real instance of apocope of this preposition is attested in the Lesbian dialect. On the other hand, the apocope and assimilation of κάτ – for this is the regular form of the preposition in Aeolic – before π is fairly well attested and easily explicable⁷.

As for the meaning of κάπ πατέρων μάθος, the main point is of course the sense to be given to the rare noun μάθος: a quick survey on the TLG CD-Rom enables us to single out four real occurrences of the word (leaving out scholia, an insignificant fragment of Aristophanes and our own case). By far the most famous is Aesch. *Agam.* 177 (τῷ πάθει μάθος), where the meaning is akin to that of μάθησις, i.e. “the act of learning”; Empedocles, fr. 17, 14 D.–K. gives μάθη γάρ τοι φρένας αὖξει, where μάθη obviously means “doctrines”; finally, two instances in Hippocr., *De mul. aff.* VI 9 (ἦν γὰρ ἐλάσσονα ἢ πλέονα ἡμέρας τοῦ μάθεος φοιτέτη) and LXI 26 (καὶ ἐπὶ πλέονα τοῦ μάθεος φάγη) approach μάθος to the meaning of “custom, habit”. In our fragment the meaning of the word is probably closer to the latter examples (and, to a lesser extent, to Empedocles’) than to the Aeschylean use, and we might therefore translate “according to their fathers’ habits” (i.e. “to the habits they had learnt from their fathers”).

Finally, the two-syllable lacuna after ἔοντες must be covered by a predicate of the form — x beginning with a vowel. Gallavotti’s ἔσλοι, though perhaps too easily drawn from l. 13, is still a good solution; an alternative could be ἄνδρες, taken in the same sense as in l. 12 (“vir”).

L. 18 Edmonds’ τῶν σφῶν, supported by a similar line-incipit in Sappho, fr. 32 V = LP, l. 2 (τὰ σφῶ δοῖσαι)⁸, is quite certain and fits in remarkably well with the syntax of the fragment, since it specifies which πατέρες are involved (not Alcaeus’, but his parents’) and emphasizes the notion of the same μάθος – the same “values” one would say – tracing back from each generation to the one before. In this case, a strong pause is needed after σφῶν, and the following reference to “ἄμμος θυμῶς”⁹ must be necessarily κατ’ ἀντίφρασιν, if, as we think, the poem’s «paränetischer Charakter» is to be maintained and if the «Appell an die gemeinsame Herkunft» of the ἔταιροι is to be strengthened through the stimulus of a negative appreciation of their bravery compared to their fathers’, in view of the exhortation to a rapid recovery that probably covered the following stanza (ἀλλ[.] – quite surely ἀλλ(ά) – in l. 21 is a hint in this direction)¹⁰. For this reason, the connection between the sentence ἔοντες - σφῶν and the following is best identified, rather than in Diehl’s ὅτ’ or in Gallavotti’s τὰδ’, in an easy ὁ δ’, where δέ has the role of mildly but univocally marking the aforesaid antiphrasis.

As for the end of the line, any attempt to fill in the lacuna would result in a more or less wild guess. Still, if our reconstruction is right, we can tell that this place should be occupied by a noun in the dative governed by ἔουκε in the following line.

⁶ See E.-M. Hamm, *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios*, Berlin 1958², p. 111 § 195 c).

⁷ See Hamm, *Grammatik*, p. 41 § 85 and p. 110 § 195 a) and also A. M. Bowie, *The poetic dialect of Sappho and Alcaeus*, Salem (N.H.) 1981, pp. 108–109.

⁸ Cp. also Sappho, fr. 103a V, col. II l. 6 τῶν σφῶν (about the accent of the article see Hamm, *Grammatik*, p. 44 § 91 b2 and p. 108 § 191).

⁹ The remains of a diagonal before the first M of ἄμμος (theoretically A or Λ, but the latter is of course ruled out by the following consonants) and the circumflex accent on the Y make the reading ἄμμος θυμῶς quite certain.

¹⁰ For an analysis of the social and political meaning of this fragment, see W. Rösler, *Dichter und Gruppe*, München 1980, pp. 126–134, on our stanza especially 132–134. About the use of the first person plural together with the second (μνάσθητε l. 11) cp. Rösler, *ibidem*, pp. 37–38 and W. Barner, *Neuere Alkaios-Papyri aus Oxyrhynchos*, Hildesheim 1967, p. 33 n. 6. In fact, ἄμμος θυμῶς is rather “unser Mut” (Rösler, *ibidem*, p. 133 n. 55) than “mein Herz”, as M. Treu, *Alkaios*, München 1963², p. 42 freely translates.

L. 19 A major problem is the reading of the second letter of this line: despite the silence of Voigt's apparatus, both Hunt in his *editio princeps* of POxy 1789¹¹, and Diehl in his first edition of the fragment¹², read ECIKE and suggested either to conjecture an unheard εἰκυκε (Hunt) or to integrate ἐκίκετο (Hunt and Diehl). It was then Diehl himself, as far as we know, who changed his mind and printed ἔουκε in his second edition¹³. Closer inspection of the good photographic reproduction of the papyrus kindly sent to us by Dr. Revel Coles, shows a letter that is very similar to a C in its shape and that was drawn in two clearly distinguishable curved strokes; yet, at the end of the second stroke (i.e. at the lower foot of the letter) there are traces of a third upward stroke, which however does not reach the top end of the letter, possibly because of a damaged fibre running across it (on the same fibre some ink has been effaced from the middle of the following I). *Tertium non datur*: either we have here an original C corrected into O or we must suppose that the upward stroke is a mere blot of ink. Relying on Lobel's authority and considering that to read C would imply accepting ἐκίκετο (or actually ἐκίκετ'), *hapax legomenon* aorist of a most scarcely attested verb ἐκικνέομαι, that could hardly suit our context and would on the contrary throw serious doubt on Lobel's arrangement of the right-hand fragment, we cautiously accept the former, which has also the advantage of giving a more perspicuous text.

The reading of Ω and especially of N before ταχήαν is itself very uncertain¹⁴, because the surface of the papyrus is very damaged and it is hard to make out any proper letter out of a few isolated dots. However, if we assume that this ΩN is the ending of the genitive plural qualified by ταχήαν, we might infer that this genitive was governed by the lost dative (possibly an abstract noun) at the end of l. 18, and that a comparison was thus established between the θύμος of Alcaeus and his friends and [the timidity of?] some fast female animal (ταχήαν).

L. 20 The line began with a relative pronoun (ταῖς according to Hamm) referring to the noun in the genitive plural in the line before. Again, it is an idle exercise to try and fill in the rest of the lacuna from ταῖς(ι) to] νητορεν, which evidently covers, *spatii ratione*, five syllables (~ --), not two as one could infer from Diehl's bad integration¹⁵.

As for the string νητορεν, given that the remains of the first letter show a curved left side that can undoubtedly belong to an O, and that the fourth letter is quite certainly a T (the space is too narrow for Ξ or Ζ, also theoretically possible, while Υ is ruled out by the vowels that would surround it), we cannot but detect in it the word ἦτορ¹⁶, to which the preceding word, ending in -ον, could well be an adjective. In this case, the letters εν should belong to a bisyllabic word ending both the line and the stanza. This word must be ἔνδον, an adverb indicating the seat of the ἦτορ, and – what is most important – itself, like ἦτορ in Page's words, «a loan from Epic vocabulary»¹⁷: cp. δ 467 μινύθει δέ μοι ἔνδοθεν ἦτορ, the formulaic clause ἔνδοθι θυμός (β 315 and τ 377, in both cases preceded by a dative [μοι] and a verb [ἀέξεται / ὀρίνεται]; see also θ 577), and more passages where ἔνδον, ἔνδοθι or ἔνδοθεν are variously related to νόος, κραδίη or the like¹⁸.

¹¹ *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XV, London 1922, pp. 64–65 (text) and 71 (notes).

¹² E. Diehl, *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, vol. I, Lipsiae 1925, fr. 120 (p. 440).

¹³ E. Diehl, *Lyrice Graeci redivivi*, in *Rheinisches Museum* 92, 1944, pp. 1–26 (25).

¹⁴ The remains on the left, though very difficult to decipher, do recall the shape of an Ω, while those on the right might suggest the shape of a narrow N with some kind of strange serif at the foot of the left vertical; although the latter reading is not very satisfactory, no other turns out to be more persuasive.

¹⁵ Diehl, *Lyrice Graeci redivivi*, p. 25: ταῖς' ἔκλον ἦτορ ἐνε[στ' ὀρέσθαι].

¹⁶ For the not insurmountable phonetic problems posed by this word, nowhere else attested in the Lesbian poets, see Hamm, *Grammatik*, p. 28 § 57 and p. 90 § 175.

¹⁷ See D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*, Oxford 1955, p. 184.

¹⁸ Although Alcaic stanzas ending with a bisyllabic metrical word are not very frequent (the only other example we can find is fr. 328 V = LP καί τις ἐπ' ἐχατίαιεν οἴκεις), the general syntactic tempo of these lines as we have reconstructed them fits in well with the description of the "Strophenbau" of the Alcaic stanza given by D. Korzeniewski, *Griechische Metrik*, Darmstadt 1968, pp. 135–137: the decasyllable plays here the role of an «epexegetische Ergänzung», and the third and fourth lines actually give an impression of "Auflösung der Spannung".

