

GIOVAN BATTISTA D'ALESSIO

PINDAR'S *PROSODIA* AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF PINDARIC PAPYRUS
FRAGMENTS

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 118 (1997) 23–60

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

PINDAR'S *PROSODIA* AND THE CLASSIFICATION OF PINDARIC PAPYRUS FRAGMENTS*

I. The attribution of Pindaric papyrus fragments

Judging from current editions, the two books of Pindar's *Prosodia* seem to be by far the most scantily represented among the 17 books in which his work was divided by ancient editors.¹ In the Teubner edition (the only critical edition taking account of the bulk of papyrus fragments published in 1961, and of the few scraps subsequently known) the *Prosodia* occupy less than two pages, which compares rather poorly with the second worst represented category, the *Hyporchemata*, where five pages are the remains of one or two books,² not to say of the *Dithyrambos* (14 pages from two books), the *Threnoi* (9 pages from a single book) or of the apparently massively represented *Paeans* (57 pages from a single book!). Together with the single book of the *Encomia* (whose indirect tradition is better represented) the *Prosodia* are the only category to which Snell and Maehler attribute no papyrus fragment.³

The distribution of the fragments among the different books of Pindar's works, apart from the few cases where we have explicit evidence that a quotation or a poem came from one or other book, rests, unavoidably, on a certain degree of speculation. Since the 18th century (and in some cases earlier) many fragments, known thanks to indirect tradition, have been conjecturally attributed to different genres on different grounds: in the recent Teubner edition this fact is signalled by an asterisk, preceding the conjecturally assigned fragment, while two asterisks indicate a fragment whose attribution to Pindar is conjectural too.

After the beginning of this century the new papyrological discoveries have offered new problems, since in many cases, where no attributed ancient quotation comes to help, it is difficult to decide from which book the different scraps, often rather badly preserved, came. Moreover, even when part of a new papyrus text coincides with an attributed ancient quotation, or with an already attributed papyrus text, the solution might not be so easy. Papyrus fragments are normally grouped according to the appearance of the handwriting, and it was possible that the same scribe wrote more than one book of a single author, or even more than a single author. In a few cases, as for P. Oxy. 841, the famous London *Paeans*-papyrus, it is possible to reconstruct a significant portion of the book, and it is reasonable to infer that its

* Thanks are due, in the very first place, to Ian Rutherford, for letting me know the results of his own research on *paean* VI triad III, and for his generosity in discussing the whole subject: without his precious collaboration this paper would not have been written in this form and at this time; to Revel Coles for providing reproductions of the Oxford papyri, and for his patient assistance during my work on them in the Ashmolean Museum; to Alessandro Pardini for letting me read a copy of the proofs of his forthcoming book, quoted below in the bibliography, and for useful comments on an earlier draft of this paper; to Prof. Maria Cannatà Fera for useful suggestions and information; to Prof. M. Manfredi, Dr. I. Andorlini (Istituto Papirologico Vitelli, Florence) and Dr. M. S. Funghi (Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa), for providing me with reproductions of the relevant parts of P. Oxy. 841 *recto*. This paper has been the object of presentations at the University of Reading (Prof. J. Adams), at the University of Rome "La Sapienza" (Prof. L. E. Rossi), at the Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa (Prof. F. Ferrari), at the University of Urbino (Proff. F. Perusino, B. Gentili): my gratitude goes to all the inviters, to the audiences, and to their contribution to the discussion. The first of the two visits to Oxford and London necessary for the completion of this work (July, 1996) was funded by the Italian CNR, the second (November, 1996), partly, by the MURST 60% funds of the University of Messina.

¹ Cf. below, Appendix.

² Two books: *vita Ambrosiana*; one book: P. Oxy. 2438, 39 (if the gap in l. 38 has to do with the fact that the κκόλια had been included among the ἐγκώμια, the number of the *Hyporchemata* books might be mistaken since the total has to be 17 anyway: cf. Gallo, 1968, 72–78). On the divergent list in *Suid. s. v. Πίνδαρος* see E. Hiller, "Die antiken Verzeichnisse der pindarischen Dichtungen", *Hermes* 21 (1886), 357–371 (misreported in Irigoin, 1952, 37).

³ One or more books of Pindar's *Prosodia* are mentioned in P. Vindob. Gr. Inv. No. 39966 (I A. D.) col. i l. 4, a list of literary texts, probably a library catalogue: cf. P. J. Sijpesteijn – K. A. Worp, *Chronique d'Égypte* 49 (1974), 324–331.

remains all come from a single book of the ancient edition: in many other cases the situation is much more uncertain.

Snell's policy seems to have been to attribute almost any poem present in a papyrus which contained *also paeans* to the book of the *Paeans*, unless some explicit evidence to the contrary was available. Consequently, he attributed to this category the bulk of the fragments of P. Oxy. 2442, a II–III century papyrus published in 1961, which certainly contained *Paeans* already known from P. Oxy. 841, as well as the *Hymns*, the *Pythian odes*, and other fragments of uncertain attribution.

In Snell's editions, *Paeans* I–VI, VII,⁴ VIIIb, VIIIc, VIId, VIII, VIIIa, IX, X (a), (b) are all attested in the London papyrus, P. Oxy. 841, and there is no serious doubt that they are all paeans. *Paeon* VIIa precedes *paeon* VIIIb in two papyri: though not attested in P. Oxy. 841 it certainly belongs to the same Pindaric book. Under VIIIb are printed 6 separate scraps from a papyrus which offers, in another fragment, the beginning of *paeon* VIII (it is not clear that it was preceded by the end of *paeon* VIId). The title preserved in fr. (a) l. 5 has the word *παιόν* in it: this implies that the poem was indeed a paeon, but makes it somewhat doubtful that all poems in this papyrus were paeans.⁵ These are the only poems known from papyri which we can consider to have certainly been in the Alexandrian book of Pindar's *Paeans*. *XVI too (part of a prayer to Apollo,⁶ followed by a *Du-Stil* aretology of the god, preserved in P. Oxy. 2440, whose other two fragments preserve parts of *paeans* VIIa+VIIIb and VIII) is almost certainly a *paeon*: the asterisk, this time, seems due to excessive caution. *Paeans* XII–XXII, and all the papyrus scraps grouped under *paeon* XXII (c–k) should have been preceded by an asterisk in the edition, though in fact only XIII–XVII and XX–XXI are.⁷

The attribution of all this material to the *Paeans* was by no means unavoidable. Apart from the fact that the total number of all these poems might possibly exceed that of the poems contained in the single book of Pindar's *Paeans*, significant doubts about the classification of many of the fragments had been raised as early as their *editio princeps*. Nevertheless their classification as *Paeans* in the authoritative Teubner edition has not been without consequences, and has led many scholars to treat some of them as *Paeans* with few, if any, qualifications.⁸

The aim of the following pages is to show that XII–XV, XX–XXI, XXII (k) are most probably *Prosodia*; XVII–XVIII are *Prosodia* or, possibly, *Hymns*, while XIX and XXII (a–b) have some chance of being *Paeans*. For the sake of completeness I shall also briefly discuss the cases of fr. 140a and 140b (which should be treated together with the other fragments from P. Oxy. 2242), and the classification of the *tripodephorika* (fr. 57–60, 66; partly represented in the same papyrus).

⁴ Of the separate scraps printed *after* paeon VII (a–f), five come from the Florentine codex which offers, in other fragments, parts of *paeans* VI and VII, the sixth, (f), comes from P. Oxy. 1792, and, as we shall see, is probably not from a paeon.

⁵ The remains of the title in VIII in this same papyrus seem to be compatible with the usual kind. A possible solution might be supplementing e.g. *προοδιακός* παιάν εις [(cf. below § IIIa.ii), rather than *προοδιον ἢ* παιάν (so I. C. Rutherford, *ZPE* 86 (1991), 8; cf. D'Alessio, 1991, 102).

⁶ V. 2 may be integrated e.g. as *Παιά]ν ἄναξ Ἄπολλον*.

⁷ The fact that XVIII has no asterisk must be due to a misprint, since *XVII and XVIII are consecutive poems in the same fragment of P. Oxy. 2442, and should, of course, be treated in the same way. Cf. D'Alessio, 1991, 103.

⁸ So e.g. Käppel, 1992, whenever he deals with the doubtful poems; G. Bona, *Pindaro. I Peani*, [Cuneo] 1988, does not take side on XIII–XV, thinks that XVIII is very probably a paeon, does not mention the problem at all on XX–XXI; Grandolini, 1988, in the most recent and useful treatment of the *prosodion* as a literary genre, makes no mention of *XIV–XV (probably *Prosodia* already according to Lobel, 1961).

II. P. Oxy. 1792: A papyrus of Pindar's *Prosodia*

IIa. P. Oxy. 1792

When P. Oxy. 1792 was first published by A. S. Hunt in 1922⁹ it was attributed to Pindar, on grounds of style, vocabulary and content. Since the only fragment of a certain extension (fr. 1) describes the performance of a Naxian festival in Delos and tells of the birth of the twin gods in the island, its attribution to the *paean*s seemed a not unreasonable possibility, though it by no means won general acceptance.¹⁰ Hunt had noted a certain overlap between the text of fr. 16 of this papyrus, and that of *pae.* VI 134 f. (known from P. Oxy. 841), but thought this might have been only a coincidence. After a new collation of the scrap, Snell argued that fr. 16 was actually part of the same text, though with a different colometry, and drew the conclusion that fr. 1, as well as fr. 6 (which overlaps with the content of a further papyrus, P. Berol. 13411a), must be part of the *Paeans* (they are now *paean*s XII and *XIII).¹¹

In 1961 E. Lobel was able to join many of the fragments published by Hunt with each other, or with unpublished fragments of the same papyrus, and published quite a few new scraps of the roll.¹² Snell's intuition was corroborated by Lobel's identification of fr. 60, which he joined to a new fragment, and numbered **15**, with *pae.* VI 128–131, again with a different colometry. On the other hand, Lobel was able to identify further overlaps with new papyri. Frs. 24, 55, 83 (?), 84,1 (??) overlap with P. Oxy. 2442 fr. 32 col. ii, while fr. 32 and fr. 139 overlap with P. Oxy. 2442 fr. 32 col. i 6–10 and 16–19, "which may be *Paeans* though poems of other categories are found written by the same hand". They are now part of *paean*s XX and XXI, whose classification was, according to Lobel, doubtful,¹³ and which are duly printed with an asterisk in Snell's edition.¹⁴ It is to be remarked that, as far as we can tell, there is no colometrical divergence between the two papyri in *these* poems.

A further overlap noted by Lobel was between P. Oxy. 1792 fr. **8** (and 69?) and P. Oxy. 2441 fr. 1 col. ii 12–19 (and 21 f.?). The two poems involved are the asterisked *paean*s XIV and XV in Snell's edition. In discussing these poems Lobel was in fact inclined to think that they were not *paean*s on the ground that XV was addressed to Aiakos, and not to Apollo and/or Artemis, as one would expect in a *paean*, and that the title Αἰγινήταις εἰς Αἰακόν did not match the usual form of *paean* titles where the place of performance, but not any addressed hero is mentioned. Lobel mentioned the possibility that the two pieces might have been classed among the *Hymns*, the *Hyporchemata* or, more probably, the *Prosodia*.¹⁵ He thought, nevertheless, that the form of the title (with εἰς Αἰακόν rather than εἰς Αἰάκειον) might be more suited to a hymn than to a *prosodion*, and decided to leave the case open.¹⁶ In these poems too there is no colometrical divergence between the two papyri.

Snell, updating his edition in 1964, did not explicitly mention nor discuss Lobel's alternative classifications of *XIV, *XV, *XX and *XXI. In the apparatus to *XIII (present both in P. Oxy. 1792 and in

⁹ Hunt, 1922, 86–98. Hunt dated it to the first half of the second century; Ferrari, 1991b, 762 f., comparing P. Oxy. 216, argues that it should be rather dated to the middle of the first century.

¹⁰ Cf. Wilamowitz, 1922, 518: "daß es Paeanen waren, glaube ich nicht".

¹¹ Snell, 1938, 431 f.

¹² Lobel, 1961, 13–25, with Plates XIX–XX. Hunt's numeration went up to 68, Lobel's up to 138. The fragments produced by joining fragments already published by Hunt with other fragments were numbered with bold numbers. A few fragments ended up in Berlin and have been published by H. Maehler, *ZPE* 3 (1968), 97, and in the 1975 Teubner edition (*pae.* 22 (k)); a further Oxford scrap, numbered fr. 139, overlapping with P. Oxy. 2442 fr. 32 col. i 16–19, has been published in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XXXVII, London, 1971, 104.

¹³ Lobel, 1961, 51.

¹⁴ No doubt is reported by L. Käppel–R. Kannicht, "Noch einmal zur Frage 'Dithyrambos oder Paian?' im Bakchylideskommentar P. Oxy. 23.2368", *ZPE* 73 (1988), 23, and Käppel, 1992, 61, 66, 78: see D'Alessio, 1994, 63, and below, § IIIc.

¹⁵ Lobel, 1961, 29: they are treated as if they were *paean*s, without any discussion, by Käppel, 1992, 54, 61: cf. below, § IIIc.

¹⁶ The two poems are treated as probably *Prosodia* also by Rutherford, 1992, 68, who adds the third book of the *Partheneia* as a possibility. For further details see below, § IIIc.

Pap. Berol. 13411), however, he warned the reader about the uncertainty of the actual classification of the poem as a *paean*: “constat enim nunc P. Oxy. 1792 non modo paeanas continere” (though this is slightly contradictory with the fact that *all* poems preserved in this papyrus are classed among the *paeans* in his edition, and only occasionally do they have an asterisk: cf. XII and XXII (k)).

In fact, it is very dubious if any of the poems preserved in P. Oxy. 1792 (with the obvious exception of the fragments overlapping with *pae. VI*) might have been part of the Alexandrian book of Pindar's *Paeans*. Apart from XII, none of them seems to deal with either Apollo or Artemis: XIII mentions a hero, Poseidon (?), Pallas and possibly other Olympian gods; XIV was performed in a *theoria* involving a hero or a heroine; XV reenacts a mythical episode featuring Aiakos, Poseidon, Nereus and Zeus, and possibly accompanied a mimetic *hieros gamos*; XX deals with Heracles; XXI is addressed to Hera. There is evidence that, for Pindar, a distinctive feature of the *paean* was its being addressed to Apollo and/or Artemis (fr. 128c, 1 f. S.–M.). This feature is present in most of the ancient descriptions of the *paean* as a literary genre: ancient scholars were aware that later authors addressed *paeans* to gods other than Apollo and Artemis, to heroes, or even to human beings, but there is no doubt that, in their opinion, the twin gods were the proper addressees in such songs.

As a matter of fact we do possess the rest of at least 12 (but probably even more) poems which should be almost certainly attributed to the Alexandrian book of the *Paeans* (P. Oxy. 841 + overlapping papyri), all dealing with Apollo, and a few other Apolline candidates are provided by other papyri (P. Oxy. 2442 + P. Yale 18: frr. 140a, 140b S.–M.; P. Oxy. 2448: fr. 215 S.–M.). There is some evidence, moreover, that two more poems represented in P. Oxy. 2442, XXII (a+b) and fr. 97a = fr.*59 S.–M., may belong to the *Paeans*.¹⁷ It is improbable that the *Paeans* book was much longer than the longest among the *Epinikia* books: the *Olympian odes*, if we count the number of the poems (14, and 1562 *cola*), or the *Pythian Odes*, if we count the number of the *cola* (12 poems, but 1983 *cola*, mainly due to the unusual length of *Pyth. IV*).¹⁸ The excessive number of fragments attributed to the *Paeans* becomes evident judging from the number of pages which they occupy in the latest Teubner edition: their 57 pages outnumber not only those of the *Olympian Odes* (49), but even those of the *Pythian Odes* (53). The comparison is even more telling if one keeps in mind that the 57 pages are made up by *fragmentary* poems: the space occupied by the *complete* poems would have been far greater.

Summing up: (a) there would scarcely be space for adding all P. Oxy. 1792 poems to the book of the *Paeans*; (b) most of its poems do not seem to fit such a classification at all.

In absence of any fresh evidence, and due to our scarce knowledge of how Pindar's *Hymns* and *Prosodia* had been arranged in the Alexandrian edition, a reasonable policy would have been to assume that P. Oxy. 1792 were fragments of at least two rolls, one of the *Paeans* (to which only frr. 16 and 15, identified with *pae. VI* 128–131 and 134 f., could be attributed with some certainty) and another of unidentified poems, possibly *Hymns* or *Prosodia*, represented by the bulk of the remaining fragments (**pae. XIII–XV, XX–XXI*). The classification of <*>*pae. XII* should have been left uncertain, since on one hand it is not unconceivable that some of the *Hymns* were addressed to Apollo or Artemis (see below IIIa.iii), while on the other hand, as we shall see, many ancient *Prosodia* were sung in honour of the Delian gods.

The overlap with P. Oxy. 2442 might in fact have favoured the classification of these poems among the *Hymns*, since the scribe who wrote this papyrus certainly did write a roll of *Hymns* (fr. 1 = fr. 33a, 33d S.–M.), as well as the *Paeans* and the *Pythian Odes*.¹⁹ Lobel had, however, argued, from the form

¹⁷ Cf. below, §§ Va.ii and Vb.

¹⁸ Cf. Irigoin, 1952, 40 f.

¹⁹ Funghi–Messeri, 1992, have recently argued that the same scribe wrote (apart from Sappho, P. Oxy. 1787, for which see Lobel, 1961, 31) also P. Oxy. 2443 (Alcman), 1788 (Alcaeus), 1604 and 2445 (Pindar, *Dithyrambs*), 2446 (Pindar, *Hyporchemata*). In any case the texts grouped by Lobel under P. Oxy. 2442 (belonging to group A in Funghi–Messeri, 1992, 46 f.) are in a different format (i.e. dimensions of the letters and spacing between the lines) compared to 1604, 1788, 2445, 2446 (group B in Funghi–Messeri, 1992, 48–50), so that there is no real danger of confusing fragments of the *Dithyrambs* and of the *Hyporchemata* with fragments from any of the books represented in 2442. According to Lobel it is impossible to attribute different fragments to different rolls on the base of variations of the script, as he had observed “considerable variation within relatively short intervals” in the fragments preserving the *Pythian Odes*. I have not been able to verify this since he never published these fragments, and they are not to be found in the collection in the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford

of the title of **pae*. XVIII (on which see below, § Va.i), the possible presence, among the P. Oxy. 2442 fragments, of a fourth book; and, since in a marginal scholion to the left of fr. 94,4 the word *προσόδιον* can be read, he inferred that the fragments included also a further book, of *Prosodia*. This last argument has a very limited value, and may actually be used to show that fr. 94 did *not* belong to a *Prosodia* book, since the generic title of the book was not normally repeated as a separate heading for its single poems.²⁰

IIb. A new piece of evidence: The scholion to *pae*. VI 124

A fresh piece of evidence, provided by a new reading in the scholia to *pae*. VI 124 in P. Oxy. 841, offers a decisive solution to the problem. The beginning of triad III of that poem had, as it seems, a title of its own, read by I. Rutherford as *Αἰγ[ινήτα]ις / [εἰ]ς Αἰακόν / προσόδιον*, and was accompanied, to its right (v. 124), by a marginal scholion, which I would supplement as follows:

ἐν τῷ α̅ [τ]ῶν προσοδί[ων] φέρεται.

The letters underlined belong to a previously unplaced fragment of P. Oxy. 841, fr. 108, wrongly printed by Grenfell and Hunt among the fragments of section C of the text. Its hand certainly belongs to sections A–B, and is well compatible with the scholion to v. 124 (which, in my opinion, looks as if it has been written by the same hand as the main text). The placement of this fragment is put beyond doubt by its general appearance and dimensions, by the fact that traces further down match very well with the remains of a cursive scholion to v. 125, and by its recto, which perfectly fills a gap in two proper names of the census list in column AR5, 13–14 of *pae*. VI's recto.²¹ The traces of the numeral are tiny, and amount to the lower part of a left-hand round letter: this is compatible with alpha (often traced with a rounded belly by the scribe of A–B), and rules out beta.

We now know, therefore, that *pae*. VI triad III had a separate tradition in the first book of the *Prosodia*: this squares very well with the fact that the only certainly 'paeanic' fragments from P. Oxy. 1792 all belong to that triad. Both of them show a remarkable colometric divergence when compared with the text of the London and Florence papyri, though, in the other poems, there is no such substantial colometrical divergence between our papyrus and P. Oxy. 2441, 2442 and P. Berol. 13411+21239. The case of *paean* VI is the only one in Pindar in which the same poem has been arranged in two radically different ways. The colometrical difference does not depend on a peculiarity of this papyrus, nor is it likely to be due to mere chance. A possible explanation is that *pae*. VI triad III (*alias* the *Prosodion for the Aeginetans in honour of Aiakos*) and *pae*. VI as a whole had been divided into cola prior to their assignment to different books in Aristophanes' edition (cf. below, Appendix).

The other important consequence is that we may now assume that the P. Oxy. 1792 poems do not come from the *Paeans* and some other unidentified book, but that at least most of them, if not all, belong to the *Prosodia*. This allows, for the first time, an attempting to assess this 'literary genre' starting not from ancient or late ancient definitions, nor from quotations of a few lines, but from substantial fragments of Pindar's poems attributed to it in the Alexandrian edition.

at the moment. They might possibly have provided useful information about lengths of columns (we can now work out only the length of a single column, in the *Paeans* roll) and other lay-out problems.

²⁰ Anyway the note was certainly *not* a title, which in this papyrus occupies a line between the poems, and is not written on the left margin: it might indicate some discussion about classification of a poem, or some part of it (as in the case of *pae*. VI triad III), but this cannot imply that the scrap came from a book of *Prosodia*.

²¹ For a fuller account of this supplement, and of the supplements previously proposed, cf. Rutherford, 1997. The idea that fr. 108 might have been relevant to the new reading of the title had also occurred independently to I. Rutherford, who, however, did not think, at a first stage, that it may have been correctly placed as here reconstructed.

III. A survey of the poems preserved in P. Oxy. 1792

IIIa.i. XII and the *prosodia* for Apollo and Artemis, at Delos and Delphi

A possible clue to the performance of *paean* <*>XII is provided by ll. 4–7. The ‘poet’ wishes that some unidentified goddess or personification (possibly Delos/Asteria) “may pluck the flowers of such celebration with songs” and goes on to describe how “often from [Na]xos a sacrifice/sacrifices of well-fed flocks c[omes/come], in company of the Graces,²² to the cliff of mount Kynthos” (in Delos). It has often been assumed, in my opinion quite reasonably, that XII itself was performed in such a circumstance.²³ This would be, therefore, the song accompanying a *theoria* sent by the Naxians to Delos.²⁴ On these occasions, it was usual to accompany the sacred mission with the singing of a *prosodion*. According to Paus. IV 4,1 already in the 8th cent. B. C. the poet Eumelos of Corinth had written an *αἶσμα προσόδιον* for the Messenians who τότε τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι ἐς Δῆλον θυσίαν καὶ ἀνδρῶν χορὸν ἀποπέλ- λουσι.²⁵ A similar poem for the inhabitants of Chalcis was written in the 4th cent. by the Theban musician Pronomos (*ibid.* IX 12,6). A Delian inscription dated 165/4 B. C mentions the honours granted by the Athenian cleruchs to the poet Amphicles of Rhenaia for writing a *προσόδιον* in which he had celebrated Athens and sung τοὺς . . . θεοὺς τὴν νῆσον κατέχοντας, just as Pindar’s poem deals with the birth of Leto’s twin children in Delos.²⁶ It seems, therefore, quite reasonable that this poem might have been included in the *Prosodia* books by Aristophanes.

Another P. Oxy. 1792 fragment (fr. 11 Lobel = *pae.* XII (a) S.–M.) might come from a poem with similar features (though there is no way of showing that it may be part of the same one). It mentions the twin children of Leto (l. 4), and, in three fragmentary lines, the words *πρόσοδον* (?),²⁷ *χορὸν*, *χάριν* (?)²⁸ and *πέμπει* occur in suggestive proximity (ll. 9–12).

²² That is, the sacrifice was accompanied by music and songs: so, correctly, Wilamowitz, 1922, 518: cf. also G. B. D’Alessio, *ZPE* 92 (1992), 82. Χαρίτεσσι μύγδαν cannot mean “for all the Graces”, as Hunt *ad loc.* and R. Pfeiffer, “The Image of the Delian Apollo”, *The Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute*, 25 (1952), 29 = *Ausgewählte Schriften*, München 1960, 68 n. 36, believe. The dative should go with μύγδαν, as an equivalent of σύν: cf. LSJ, *s. v.* μύγδην and the *Revised Supplement*, Oxford, 1996, *s. v.*; the construction with the dative seems to be attested only in Orph. fr. 223,5, but μύγδα, μύγα (in Pindar, *Pyth.* IV, 113) and μυγάδην (in Nic. *Al.* 349) are normally construed with the dative. This last form (twice in Nicander) is simply a variant of μύγδην, present as *varia lectio*: cf. C. A. Lobeck, *Pathologia Graeci Sermonis Elementa*, I, Regimontii Bor. 1853, 408 and G. Lingenberg, *Quaestiones Nicandreae*, Diss. Halle 1865, 32.

²³ Though, it must be said, one cannot rule out the possibility that the poem was actually performed in the Delion in Naxos.

²⁴ For the abundant evidence on the cultic links between the two islands, cf. e.g. Gallet de Santerre, *Délos primitive et archaïque*, Paris 1958, 289–296, R. Herbst in *RE* XVI (1935), col. 2086, Call. fr. 67.5 f. Pf., Ph. Bruneau, *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l’époque hellénistique et à l’époque impériale*, Paris 1970, 113. For the Cyclades in general: Thuc. III 104, 3, Call. *hym. in Del.* 278 ff., Strab. X 5,2.

²⁵ Cf. Grandolini, 1988, 29–32. The problem of the poem’s actual date is immaterial for our purpose.

²⁶ Cf. *BCH* 10 (1886), 35 f.; 13 (1889), 244 = *SIG*³ 662; F. Durrbach, *Choix d’inscriptions de Délos*, Paris 1921, 121–125.

²⁷ This articulation has never been explicitly proposed, as far as I know, but is certainly likelier than e.g. *πρὸς ὀδόν*. *πρόσοδος* is a common term to indicate a religious procession to a sacred venue, accompanied by songs and culminating in a sacrifice: cf. LSJ, *s. v.* 3, and plenty of occurrences in inscriptions. There is little doubt that the term *προσόδιον* derivates from it (cf. Ar. *Av.* 853 and scholia *ad loc.*, Heliodoros in sch. Lond. [Dion. Thr.], 451, 17 f. Hilgard [from Didymos?]). The indication of the width of the gap at the left edge of the fragment, as calculated by Snell in the Teubner edition, seems somewhat doubtful to me: if l. 4 started with Λατοῖδαι, there is no space for a further letter before λτ in l. 9 (the alignment is correct in Lobel’s transcript); on the other hand it is very unlikely that l. 8 started with λεινο, and, if we have to supplement something to its left (Snell’s κλεινο being the most reasonable solution), the alignment with l. 9 would demand wider supplements there too (the same applies, to a lesser degree, to l. 4 also), and there is no satisfactory alignment if we are to suppose that we are so close to the beginning of the line. The only reason for believing so is the presence of a trace under the first two letters of l. 8, which may be interpreted as a *paragraphos*. The only other preserved *paragraphos* in this papyrus, however, is not wider than a single letter: while in this case it would be three letters wide. We have to take into serious account the possibility that the trace under l. 8 does not belong to a *paragraphos*, but to some interlinear sign.

²⁸ Cf. Ar. *Av.* 855 *χάριτος ἔνεκα*, in a context mentioning *prosodia* and sacrifice.

One of the few *prosodia* fragments by Pindar known from indirect tradition (fr. 89a S.–M.) preserves the beginning of a dactylo-epitrite poem celebrating Leto and Artemis (θεῶν ἕκαστον ἐλάττειραν; it is possible that Apollo was mentioned later on). Fr. 51,3 from P. Oxy. 1792 (not in S.–M.) reads]προσόδι]: the coincidence with the mention of Artemis as Λατοῦς ἱπποσόα θυγάτηρ in *Ol.* III 26 had been signalled already by Lobel in Hunt's *editio princeps*. The fragment may come from a further Delian (?) *prosodion*.²⁹

A peculiar connexion between the twin gods and the *prosodion* appears in its definition in the *Onomasticon* of Pollux (I 38): ὠίδαὶ εἰς θεοὺς κοινῶς μὲν παιᾶνες [delendum?³⁰] ὕμνοι, ἰδίως δὲ Ἀρτέμιδος οὐπιγγος, Ἀπόλλωνος ὁ παιᾶν, ἀμφοτέρων προσόδια. This definition cannot be taken as excluding the possibility that *prosodia* were addressed to any other god or hero: it is rather a consequence of the fact that most songs accompanying *theoriai* to Delos (as possibly elsewhere) would address both twin gods (and often their mother too: cf. fr. 89a S.–M.; according to the Delian inscription Amphikles, in his *prosodion*, had sung τοὺς . . . θεοὺς τὴν νῆσον κατέχοντας).

The processional song must have played an important role in Delphi as well. Our direct evidence for this (all epigraphical) is not earlier than Hellenistic time. Indirect evidence for the 5th cent. is, however, provided by *Ar. Av.* 851–857, where the chorus of the Birds enthusiastically joins Peisetairos' πομπή, and agree to προσόδια μεγάλα κερνὰ προσιέναι θεοῖσιν, accompanying a sacrifice. In this context, they exhort each other to raise the Πυθιάς βοά.³¹ This strongly suggests that such songs were felt as characteristic of the Delphian cult, and may imply that the Apolline epiphthegma (if that was meant with Πυθιάς βοά) may not have been out of a place in a *prosodion*.³²

In the list of the participants in the Delphian Soteria in 234 B. C. two [ποιητ]αὶ προσόδιων are mentioned (the Athenian Diopieithes and the Megarian Diphilos).³³ In an inscription dated ca. 230–220³⁴ the Athenian poet Kleochares is granted honours and privileges by the Delphians for having written τῷ θεῷ ποθόδιόν τε καὶ παιᾶνα καὶ ὕμνον, ὅπως αἰδῶντι οἱ παῖδες τῆς θυσίας τῶν Θεοξενίων. The actual poems are lost, but a later inscription preserves a poem composed by the Athenian Limenios, to be performed in Delphi, in the 128 B. C. Theoxenia.³⁵ The heading describes the poem as [πα]ιδῶν . . . καὶ προσόδιον εἰς τὸν θεόν.³⁶ The poem itself is clearly divided into two parts. The first (1–33) is in cretics and soluted cretics (paeons): it consists in an invocation to the Muses that they may sing Apollo (1–4); an *Er-Stil* narration of the god's birth and of his arrival from Delos to Attica (5–21); an address to the god, that he may come to Delphi (21–23); a *Du-Stil* narration of his first arrival to Delphi and of his protection of the sanctuary (23–33). The second part (33–40), separated by a

²⁹ For the importance of this song in the cult of Artemis also elsewhere, cf. the contest for the performance of a *prosodion* in the Artemisia of Eretria in *IG XII*, no. 9, 189, 13 (= F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacrées des cités grecques*, Paris 1969, 92, 13, IV B. C.).

³⁰ It is stated, in some sources, that the paeon had evolved into a song addressed to gods other than Apollo and Artemis, so as to be appropriate to any god (cf. e.g. *Proc. Chrest.* § 41, 320a 21 f.) and even to heroes (Serv. ad Verg. *Aen.* X 738): the text may reflect this opinion, but the asyndetic series where paeans and hymns follow each other without qualification, and the fact that the term παιᾶν occurs later in the same sentence as a song addressed specifically to Apollo, might suggest that the word has been added at a later stage by somebody acquainted with the possible wider meaning of the word.

³¹ S. Grandolini, "In margine ad *Aristoph. Av.* 851–857", *Giornale Italiano di Filologia*, 38,2 (1986), 263 f. argues that this is an early case of confusion between the two genres. The scholia ad loc. inform us that part of these words is adapted from Soph. *Peleus* (fr. 489 Radt), though it is not easy to work out the exact amount of the borrowing: certainly not the whole sentence (προβάτιόν τι θύειν sounds very unlikely in Sophoclean lyrics, and a few scholars think that the repetition of ἴτω should be rather Aristophanic).

³² Cf. N. Dunbar, *Aristophanes. Birds*, Edited with Introduction and Commentary, Oxford 1995, 506 f.

³³ *SIG*³ 489, 14 f.

³⁴ *SIG*³ 450: cf. *SEG XXXII* (1982) 540.

³⁵ *SIG*³ 698A and C, Bélis, 1988; Ead., 1992.

³⁶ A possible similar integration in the heading of Athenaios' contemporary poem had been proposed by Moens, who thought that it may have been similarly divided (its final part is very fragmentary): cf. Bélis, 1992, 53 f., who rejects it.

paragraphos, is in aeolic metre: it is a prayer to Apollo, Artemis and Leto, that they may protect Athens, Delphi, Dionysos' technitai and Rome's power. The heading seems to suggest that the first part is a paeon, while the second a prosodion. The internal reasons to consider part one a paeon are: a) the Apolline content; b) the fact that the god is called Παιήονα in l. 19 (the refrain in l. 17 is entirely integrated); c) possibly the metre, if the resolved cretics, known as *paeons*, were felt appropriate to a *paeon*.³⁷ On the other hand there is no internal reason to consider the second part as a *prosodion*. Its *prosodiac* features must therefore have been *extra-textual*: it was a *prosodion* because it was performed as such. One would probably expect a *prosodion* to be performed in a procession *before* reaching the temple, and, therefore, *before* the *paeon*. In fact we know too little about the actual performances of these poems:³⁸ it is not unconceivable that there was a performance of the *paeon* by the Technitai, followed by a procession in which the short aeolic strophe was repeated *ad libitum* until it reached the altar.³⁹

IIIa.ii. The προκοδιακοὶ παιᾶνες and the internal order of the *Paeans* book

It is easy to see from these examples that overlaps between *paeans* and *prosodia* were rather common. In his definition of lyric 'genres' Proclus (§ 41, in Phot. *Bibl.* 320a, 20 ff.) says that some people confused *prosodia* and *paeans* using the latter for the former (καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ τὰ προκοδιά τινες παιᾶνας λέγουσιν).⁴⁰ It must have been fairly common that the same poem presented features characteristic of both 'genres', making things difficult for anyone who wished to distribute such kind of poems into books. An obvious possibility was to give priority to one of the genres, qualifying it with an adjective as προκοδιακός. This certainly happened in the case of Pindar. The ancient authority for the scholia to *Isth.* I Inscr. b knew a προκοδιακὸς παιᾶν Κείοις εἰς Δῆλον, which must have very probably been the same as *paeon* IV of current editions.⁴¹ Whoever inserted this poem among the paeans (probably Aristophanes, perhaps following some predecessor) must have thought that the paeanic features were in this case more significant than the 'processional' ones. Among the P. Oxy. 841 *paeans*, II and IV–VII present processional features (III is too badly preserved to draw any conclusion from it),⁴² while there is no such feature in the remains of VIIb, VIII, VIIIa, IX.⁴³ The heading of VII in the Florentine papyrus seems to be Θηβαίοις εἰς---/προκοδιῖ, which might well be supplemented as

³⁷ This connection does not hold true for all paeans, not even for most of them, but was probably felt as such in Delphi in this period: cf. Käppel, 1992, 75 f. The *paeon* by Athenaios is entirely in cretics/paeons.

³⁸ On the performance of Limenios' poem cf. Bélis, 1988, 213–218; Ead., 1992, 139–142, 146 f. and n. 42 (on the *prosodion*).

³⁹ Another possibility, which I would consider on the whole less likely, must however be mentioned (it seems implied by R. Muth, *RE* XXIII 1 (1951), s. v. "prosodion", 860, 51 f., who quotes this as one of the cases of catachresis later criticized by Proclus). The words παιᾶν καὶ προκοδιὸν might be felt as a hendiadys indicating a paeon with processional features, the same kind of poem that the ancient grammarians would have defined, as we shall see, a προκοδιακὸς παιᾶν. Demochares (75 F 2 *FgrHist*, in Ath. VI 253bc) tells how the Athenians honoured Demetrios Poliorketes as a god, εἰς αὐτὸν . . . παιᾶνας καὶ προκοδία αἰδοντες, but this need not refer to one kind of poem rather than to two (προκοδία καὶ παιᾶνες are quoted, after the παρθένεια, as examples of the use of Dorian harmony in [Plut.] *de mus.* 17, 1136e = Aristoxenos fr. 82 Wehrli). The inscription in honour of Kleochares, quoted above, mentions ποθοδιὸν τε καὶ παιᾶνα καὶ ὕμνον, and it seems very unlikely to me that the three terms may refer to a single poem. More importantly, the obvious bipartition of the poem itself suggests that the usual interpretation of the heading is the correct one.

⁴⁰ Cf. I. Rutherford, "Apollo's Other Genre: Proclus on ΝΟΜΟΣ and His Source" *CP* 90 (1995), 359.

⁴¹ The initial verses, though very fragmentary, seem compatible with this hypothesis, mentioning Delos in l. 12, a road in l. 6, and Artemis in l. 1. Against the notion that a triadic structure is not compatible with a processional performance (e.g. Käppel, 1992, 99 n. 41) cf. D'Alessio, 1994, 64.

⁴² Cf. *pae.* II 3–5; for IV cf. n. 41 above; V 44–48 (ἐνθα . . . δέξαθε) and the possible integrations to v. 6 proposed by me in *ZPE* 92 (1992), 82 f.; VI 5 (με δέξα), 182 f. (δέξ'), VII 10–12 (μου . . . ἰόντι τηλανγέ' ἄγ κορυφᾶν).

⁴³ Only the end of I is preserved and there is no explicit indication that it was processional. The image of Eniautos and Horai arriving to Thebes and bringing a sacrificial meal to the god might, however, suggest that the poem itself was performed during a procession too (cf. also Wilamowitz, 1922, 186).

προσοδικαίος.⁴⁴ It is therefore an attractive possibility that, toward the end of the book of the *Paeans*, the προσοδικαί ones had been grouped together.⁴⁵

A possible objection might be that in P. Oxy. 841 fr. 134 an uncial note to the right of l. 7 (= *pae.* X (b) 7 S.–M.), but possibly referring to the text at *its right*, reads Θηβαίους προσ|. If this is a title (as nobody seems to have supposed), and if it is to be integrated as προσοδικαίος, the idea that the προσοδικαί were grouped together would collapse, since the fragment belongs to section D of the papyrus, and must probably have preceded not only section A (where the supposed προσοδικαί are), but also section B, and, possibly, section C: a homogeneous grouping would have included almost the whole book! It is, however, possible a) that the marginal note is not a title (and in fact it seems to be too close to the text on its left to be a title); b) that it has to be integrated in a different way. At the present state of our knowledge the idea that the *processional paeans* were all grouped together seems therefore an attractive possibility to me.

IIIa.iii. Teneros, the Ptoion and Aulis: another Apolline *prosodion*?

One very small fragment from P. Oxy. 1792 may be probably connected to an Apolline sanctuary: it is fr. 47, 1–2 (the two last lines of a poem = *pae.* VII (f) S.–M.), where the words |ριαινα| and |ενπτωιω| can be read. In the first line the word is most probably an epithet of Poseidon, Ὀρκο|τρίαινα or Ὀρκο|τρίαινα; the second line certainly refers to the Ptoion, a well-known oracular site in Boeotia. Some Pindaric fragments, quoted by Strabo in succession,⁴⁶ deal: a) with the foundation of sacred groves by Apollo (fr. 51a S.–M.); b) with the fact that the hero Teneros, son of Apollo and Melia, was prophet in the Ptoion (fr. 51b S.–M.),⁴⁷ and c) with his giving the name of “Teneric plain” to a nearby territory. Teneros, best known as a prophet in the Theban oracle of Apollo Ismenios, had been highly honoured by Poseidon (ὁ πόντιος Ὀρκο|τρίαινα: *pae.* IX 47 f.). Only the first fragment is actually attributed to Pindar, without mention of any particular book. The second one is introduced by the words ὁ αὐτὸς ποιητής: though a quotation from Alcaeus separates the two, there is little doubt that quotations 2 and 3 are not from Alcaeus, but from Pindar. Compatibility of metre and content suggests that they come from the same poem.

According to the scholia to Paus. IX 23,6, Pindar had narrated the genealogy of the hero Ptoios from Apollo and Zeuxippe, Athamas’ daughter, ἐν ὕμνοισι (fr. 51c S.–M.): on this ground in the Teubner edition the three fragments quoted by Strabo (none of them with an asterisk)⁴⁸ are attributed to a *hymn* εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα Πτωίων.⁴⁹ However, since Strabo makes no mention of the hero Ptoios in this context, it is rather doubtful that the son of Zeuxippe played any part in the poem he was quoting from. Ptoios’ genealogy, referred to by the scholia to Pausanias, may well be part of a different poem (a *hymn*, this time).⁵⁰

Pindar had certainly sung Teneros in the *Paeans*. In *pae.* IX, where he is linked with the Ismenion and with some site on the Euripos (see below), the story of his career as a hero and a prophet is interrupted by a break in the papyrus, and he was

⁴⁴ Cf. D’Alessio, in D’Alessio–Ferrari, 1988, 169 n. 29.

⁴⁵ One may toy with the idea that arrangement was by a rough alphabetical order, on the base of the performance place: Abdera (II), ? (III), Delos (IV–V), Pytho (VI), Ptoion (VII). But this is far from certain, since it would imply that II was the first of the series (I being certainly a Theban poem). A similar idea has been proposed by I. C. Rutherford, “*Et Hominum et Deorum . . . Laudes* (?): A Hypothesis about the Organisation of Pindar’s *Paeon*-Book”, *ZPE* 107 (1995), 44–52, who thinks, however, that the group includes not the processional paeans, but paeans where heroic figures occupy a prominent position, and envisages the possible alphabetical order somewhat differently (Abdera, Delos, Delphi, Thebes).

⁴⁶ His source in the preceding chapters, probably up to at least the first Pindaric quotation, is Apollodoros, περὶ τῶν νεῶν καταλόγου: discussion, and doubts on the source of the other two quotations, in R. S. Wagman, “Le citazioni pindariche in Strab. IX, 2, 33–34”, *Athenaeum* n. s. 64 (1986), 111–126.

⁴⁷ The quotation is more complete in Herodian. *de orth.* in R. Reitzenstein, *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika*, Leipzig 1897, 305, 16: καὶ ποτε τὸν τρικάρανον Πτωίου κευθμῶνα κατέχεθε κοῦ|; the last fragmentary word, omitted by Strabo, was integrated as κοῦ|ρα by Reitzenstein, on the assumption that the subject was Ptoios’ mother, Zeuxippe. Strabo’s wording, however, (προφήτης τοῦ μαντείου κατὰ τὸ Πτωίων ὄρος (sc. Teneros), ὃ φησιν εἶναι τρικόρυφον ὁ αὐτὸς ποιητής· καὶ ποτε . . . κατέχεθε. καὶ τὸν Τήνερον καλεῖ ναοπόλον . . . ὀμοκλέα) strongly suggests that the subject of the sentence is Teneros. Snell’s integration, κοῦ|ρος has therefore far better chances (if, of course, referred to Teneros, and not to Ptoios: in the text Snell assumes Ptoios as the subject, but the doubt expressed in his apparatus is certainly justified; this seems to me likelier than the alternative according to which the κοῦ|ρος would be Apollo: cf. A. Schachter, *Cults of Boiotia*, I, *BICS* Suppl. 38.1, 1981, 57, and Wilamowitz, 1894, 247, who, without knowing the Herodianos’ text, thought that Apollon was the subject of κατέχεθε).

⁴⁸ Cf. D’Alessio, 1991, 96.

⁴⁹ The arrangement of Wilamowitz, 1894, 246–248, followed also by Schroeder and Turyn.

⁵⁰ It may of course be argued that P. Oxy. 1792 does not preserve only *Prosodia*, but also *Hymns*, so that we may attribute fr. 51 a–d S.–M. and P. Oxy. 1792 fr. 47 (and possibly 49) to the same poem. I think, however, that the scholion to Pausanias would be too slender evidence for this hypothesis. The Ptoion was one of the most important venues for the Apolline cult in 5th cent. Boeotia, and it would not be surprising if Pindar had written more than one poem dealing with it.

celebrated in *paē*. VII too (it is not clear whether as a prophet in the Ismenion or in the Ptoion). Neither *paēan*, for metrical reasons, can accommodate the dactylo-epitrite of the three fragments quoted by Strabo, but it is conceivable that they may belong to the same poem represented in P. Oxy. 1792 fr. 47.⁵¹ It would therefore be more prudent to leave fr. 51a, b and d among the *incerti generis*, with a probable ascription to the *Prosodia*, or to the *Hymns*.

A further fragment from P. Oxy. 1792 may be connected with Teneros. In fr. 49,2 (not in S.–M.) the name Αὐλίδη (Hunt) is a very likely articulation. A link between Teneros, Poseidon and Aulis is suggested by the remains of *paē*. IX, where, after the verses narrating how Poseidon had honoured Teneros and had moved toward the Euripos, P. Oxy. 841 is bafflingly broken. In an unplaced fragment from the same section of that papyrus (fr. 139, not printed in S.–M.) a marginal scholion mentions somebody giving oracles to the people of Aulis: Grenfell and Hunt have argued that this may refer to some missing portion of Teneros' story.⁵² The hypothesis that P. Oxy. 1792 fr. 49 comes from the same poem which ended in fr. 47 of the same papyrus is worth suggesting.

IIIb. XIII (and P. Berol. 13411+21239)

**Paean* XIII is represented by three large fragments (a–c; in a and b the column is preserved at its full height, 25 lines) and seven further smaller scraps (d–k) of a 3rd cent. A. D. roll preserved in Berlin.⁵³ One scrap of P. Oxy. 1792, fr. 6 has three beginnings of lines (υμ| / θα| / πο|) which have been identified by Snell with vv. 8–10 of fr. (a) of the Berlin papyrus. The identification may be right, but some doubt remains.⁵⁴

The three major fragments are in dactylo-epitrites. Snell tried to work out the possible responsions: [1] between (a) 1–5 and (a) 20–25; [2] between (a) 6–10, and (b) 1–5; [3] between (b) 1–5 and (b) 20–24; he noticed, moreover, a remarkable similarity [4] between (a) 6–10, (b) 1–5, (b) 15–19 and (c) 1–5.⁵⁵

Snell's reconstruction is probably right as far as [1] is concerned,⁵⁶ so that it is reasonable to assume that the *paraphros* after (a) 10 signals division between strophe and antistrophe.⁵⁷ On the basis of [2] he argued that (a) and (b) were part of two consecutive columns, and arranged (a) and (b) in this sequence, but his reasons do not seem to be compelling: [2] may be right, but is based, in fact, only on the circumstance that the third line in the sequence is shorter than the other ones; in the only case in which the rhythm can be actually checked we find that (b) 2 ends with a iambic or trochaic rhythm (| – ~ – x – ~ –), while in (a) 7, in a portion which cannot be too distant from the end of the line, the rhythm is *prima facie* dactylic (| – ~ ~ ?), or, if iambic, the sequence entails a solution. This cannot rule out responsion, but certainly does not support it.

Snell himself noticed that [3] and [2] were mutually contradictory. They would imply that the poem was not triadic, which is unlikely with a strophe 20 lines long. A monostrophic structure would imply responsion between (a) 11–25 and (b) 6–20, but in the few cases where the verse-end in (a) is preserved, the comparison shows them not to be compatible: (a) 16 short vs. (b) 11 long; (a) 17 ending – ~ ~ – x vs. (b) 12 ending – ~ ~ ; (a) 22 long vs. (b) 17 short; the strophe (b) 6–24 would be divided into 19 lines vs. the 20 lines of (a) 11– (b) 6. It must be added that if [3] alone is correct (b) cannot come from the same poem as (a). [4] is based only on a general resemblance in the verse-lengths, which cannot (and did not mean to) prove anything.

Summing up, there is no proof of responsion between the three major fragments. Apart from the possible ascription of fr. 51 a, b, d to the *Prosodia* (cf. above), there was at least another *prosodion* in

⁵¹ The scanty remains of fr. 47 and 49 are compatible with dactylo-epitrites, as, possibly, with almost any kind of metre for that matter.

⁵² Cf. G.-H., 1908, 109. A possible further connection between Aulis, Poseidon, oracles and (perhaps) the Ptoion, may be suggested by a tantalizing fragment of Corinna, fr. 654 col. iii *PMG*: an unidentified prophet in an oracle (identified by some with the Ptoion) tells the story of his predecessors: they include a certain Euonymos (later known as father of Aulis: Steph. Byz. s. v. Αὐλίς; sch. D. II. II 496), and his successor, Hyrieus, son of Poseidon. Cf. Schachter, 1981, 61–64. There is no other mention of Aulis in the extant or fragmentary works of Pindar.

⁵³ P. Berol. 13411 (first published by Zuntz, 1935, 282–296; cf. also Snell, 1940, 185–191, and the editions of Bowra, Turyn and Snell) and 21239, first published, as fr. (k) in the 1989 Teubner edition by H. Maehler. Fr. b, c, d in G. Cavallo, *Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica*, Firenze 1967, II, Tav. 24.

⁵⁴ Cf. Snell, 1938, 431 f. Snell argued that it is statistically unlikely that a sequence with those three beginnings may have occurred more than once in the corpus of the three possible candidates for the Berlin papyrus (Pindar, Simonides and Bacchylides). He may be right, since *cola* starting with υμ–, υλ– or υα– are rare in the rest of the preserved Pindar, but the overlap is very scanty indeed. It must, moreover, be stressed that in P. Oxy. 1792 fr. 6 there is no trace of the expected *paraphros* under v. 10.

⁵⁵ [3] is implied in the integration of | ~ – at the end of (b) 5 in his edition too.

⁵⁶ Cf. also Ferrari, 1991, 386.

⁵⁷ With a monostrophic structure, according to the usage attested in P. Oxy. 841, we would expect the *paraphros* to be accompanied by a *coronis*, but this may not have been the normal way of signalling this feature.

dactylo-epitrites (fr. 89a). It cannot therefore be taken for granted that these fragments are part of the same poem, though this is by no means unlikely.

Even the three best preserved of these fragments give little or no clue about their possible classification: (b) is part of a mythical narration (with a direct speech: 6?); (c) has a narration involving unidentified female figures (2), and a typically feminine ritual cry (ὄλολυγαῖς, 4);⁵⁸ vv. 9–14 provide the *aition* of either a rite or a *paradoxon*, or both (9: καὶ νῦν τέρας; 14 μνᾶμ' ἔτι τοῦ[το e.g. μένει: cf. XXI 21 f. ἔτι/ τοῦτ.ν?);⁵⁹ connected in some way with water and wine (“not grape [. . .] nor Acheloius”, vv. 10 f., with the articulation suggested by Lobel in Snell’s apparatus). It seems that some divine action in the past is seen as providing the background for something in the present, maybe even actually present during the performance (though τοῦτο, even if right, does not necessarily imply this). In fr. (a) too there seems to be a link between a present rite and a mythical, or simply remote, antecedent. There is mention of an altar for a hero (1); the sea (4, possibly a reference to Poseidon: so Zuntz); Pallas (5); hymns and celebrations (8); nymphs (12, probably plural genitive; but ‘brides’ or ‘bride’ cannot be ruled out). The adjective θυιαίγιδ’ in 13 (as articulated by Lobel) is a *hapax legomenon*: its first member (θυι-) might suggest a connection with Dionysos, who has something to do with the second member of the epithet too, since he was sometime venerated as Μελαναίγης.⁶⁰ The union of the two elements, however, does not square very well with the features of this god. They seem to be linked, more naturally, still to Athena.⁶¹ The following verses (14–20) describe a dance performed by women (not necessarily the nymphs mentioned in v. 12), their hair crowned with myrtle and wearing purple wool:⁶² the performance seems to take place in the past (ἔγειρον v. 17).⁶³ The dance was probably linked to a sacrificial meal (v. 21: ἐν δαυτί τε . . . μακάριον, as in *Isth.* II 39, and fr. 70a, 12 ἐν δαυμόνων . . . θοῖναι,⁶⁴ or μάκαριε/ας). At v. 21 ἔνθεν may have provided the connection with the actual performance of the poem, while καμάντορι in v. 24 might refer to Zeus, θεῶν κημάντορι πάντων.⁶⁵

⁵⁸ It may also simply indicate a wailing cry (so e.g. W. J. Slater, *A Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin 1969, s. v.), but in this context the ritual meaning (cf. L. Deubner, *Ololyge und Verwandtes*, in *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1941.1, 16) seems more appropriate.

⁵⁹ This is close to the way of introducing *aitia* with εἰκέτι νῦν *et similia*, typical in Hellenistic poetry (cf. Phanocles 1, 27 Powell, *Call. Dian.* 77, 220 (just ἔτι), A. R. I 1061, II 717, 850, 1214, III 203, IV 480, 534, 599, 1153, and (with ἐξέτι κείνου/ κείθι) *Call. Ap.* 47, 104, *Del.* 275, A. R. IV 430; cf. G. Zanker, *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry*, London-Sydney-Wolfeboro, 1987, 128 n. 11), but cf. already *hy. hom. Merc.* 125 (ὡς ἔτι νῦν), *Pind. Ol.* X 78, T. Fuhrer, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos*, Basel/Kassel 1992, 115 n. 431.

⁶⁰ E.g. in the Athenian Apatouria (where he was associated in the cult with Athena and Zeus), and in Hermione (Paus. II 35,1); cf. *RE* V 1 (1903), 1031, s. v. “Dionysos”. For his cult at Melainai and Eleutherai, where it was connected (as it happened for other Dionysiac cults) to the healing of the king’s daughters from the madness caused by the god himself, cf. Schachter, 1981, 175; Hollis ad *Call. Hecale* fr. 84–85. It is worth remarking that Zuntz thought that the myth narrated in (b) and (c) dealt with the healing of the Proitides, though, I am afraid, it may refer to almost everything else. I should add that, in my opinion, there is absolutely nothing in the text connecting (a) either with the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (Zuntz), or with the one of Niobe (Snell, cl. fr. 64 Schroeder, from the *Paeans*, on which see below, § Va.ii).

⁶¹ Shaking the *aigis* belongs mostly to her and to Zeus (sometimes to Apollo; cf. Ferrari, 1991, 387), and θύω is quite often used to describe storms and heroes in battle. Most compound epithets ending in -αίγης belong to Athena: cf. κυάναίγης, χρύσαίγης and the very close πελέμαίγης.

⁶² For the myrtle (whose widespread use was not limited to any particular cult) cf. M. Blech, *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*, Berlin-New York 1982, 318–321 (its Dionysiac connotation is probably overestimated by Ferrari, 1991, 387; cf. Blech, *cit.*, 212 [*aition* for the lack of myrtle in Dionysiac cult]; *Ar. Ran.* 329 seems to be specifically connected with Eleusis and Iakchos, rather than, generically, with Dionysos). For the use of purple wool: J. Pley, *De lanae in antiquorum ritibus usu*, Giessen 1911, 35–48, 70–77.

⁶³ Ferrari, 1991, 389, mentions the possibility that the verb may be an aorist imperative, but the subject is likely to be still the women of vv. 14–16.

⁶⁴ As supplemented by F. Ferrari, *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, s. III 84 (1991), 3, cf. *E. Ba.* 383.

⁶⁵ [Hes.] *Scut.* 56 and fr. 5,2 M.-W., *h. hom. Mer.* 367.

These scanty remains do not allow any substantial hypothesis about the actual performance context and possible classification of the poem(s). One thing seems however reasonably certain: the remains do not present *any* paeanic feature. No mention of Apollo, no *epiphthegma*, no paeanic situation. The poem of fr. (a) was probably connected with a rite in honour of Athena or Dionysos. It seems very unlikely that it was a *paean*.

There is nothing in the text suggesting a classification of these fragments as *prosodia*, but there is nothing incompatible with it. Its possible attribution to this book must, at the moment, rest on the papyrological evidence, and, more exactly, on the assumptions (a) that P. Oxy. 1792 fr. 6 really offers part of the same text as the Berlin papyrus (cf. n. 54), and (b) that P. Oxy. 1792 does not represent more than one book of Pindar's works (cf. § IIIe). At the present state of our knowledge their classification as *Prosodia* is likelier than any other alternative possibility.⁶⁶

IIIc. XIV and XV (and P. Oxy. 2441)

The last 15 lines of XIV and the first 10 of XV are partly preserved in P. Oxy. 2441, fr. 1 col. ii.⁶⁷ Parts of the last 4 lines of XIV and of the first 4 of XV appear also in P. Oxy. 1792 fr. 8 (fr. 69 may preserve a scrap of XV 21 f.).

The classification of these two poems as *προκόδια* had already been considered more than a mere possibility by E. Lobel in the *editio princeps* (on 2441 fr. 1 col. ii 13f f.).⁶⁸ He argued that the “close relationship between the *προκόδιον* and the *paean* . . . might account for their turning up together on fragments written in the same hand [*i.e.* in 1792]”, and that “a mission to a sacred place, which is the occasion of the first of our pieces, and the procession to a temple (or the like), such as is described in the second, might suitably be accompanied by a processional (or, to be more exact, ‘accessional’) song”. He remarked, however, that “the form of the title, εἰς Αἰακόν (not Αἰάκειον . . .), indicated rather a hymn”, and did not rule out the possibility that the poems were *Hyporchemata*. As a consequence of the new attribution of P. Oxy 1792 to Pindar's *Prosodia*, Lobel's first argument turns out to be irrelevant, while the possibility of Αἰγινήταε εἰς Αἰακόν as a title for a *προκόδιον* has been put beyond doubt by the decipherment of the title of *pae. VI triad III* in P. Oxy. 841. Considerations based on internal grounds (Lobel's second argument) square very well with this classification.

Of the first poem only the end is preserved. It seems to mention the occasion of the performance, while praising the poet's capability of reaching a public wider than the one actually present at the festival. The poem seems to provide a “reward consisting in good fame” (31 εὐδοξίαε ἐπίχειρα). The Muse “sweetly murmurs in the rites of (. . .) a speech of pleasant words” (32–34), but she “will remind of the sacred mission (θεαρία) for the hero/heroine even somebody who lives far away” (35–37).⁶⁹ A

⁶⁶ I. C. Rutherford–J. A. D. Irvine, “The Race in the Athenian Oschophoria and an Oschophoricon by Pindar”, *ZPE* 72 (1988), 50 f. tentatively argue for an identification of the occasion with the Oschophoria, but they themselves admit that it seems that Pindar's *Oschophorica* (if they were more than one) were grouped at the end of the *Isthmian Odes*. The actual connection with the Oschophoria seems somewhat vague: the hero is not necessarily Theseus, and Athena and Dionysos might have been mentioned together in a variety of occasions (cf. e.g. *Ol.* II 26, fr. 70b 17). Ferrari, 1991, 387 f. stresses the Dionysiac elements in (a), but warns that the poem was not, for this reason, necessarily a *dithyramb*. It may have been a *prosodion* for some cult involving (*inter alios?*) Dionysos.

⁶⁷ Part of XIV is represented in the badly mutilated col. i. Fr. 2 of the same papyrus provides a further unplaced scrap, and fr. 3 preserves a title, τοῖς αὐτοῖς.

⁶⁸ Cf. also Rutherford, 1992, 68, and n. 16, above.

⁶⁹ For a survey of the possible different interpretations of these lines cf. Lobel, 1961, 28, Rutherford, 1992, 60 f., Ferrari, 1992, 150–152. The construction accepted above is the one preferred by Lobel, Rutherford and Ferrari (Snell in his apparatus suggests a different and, in my opinion, less convincing approach). Under this interpretation, these verse show a certain similarity to Sappho, fr. 147 V.: μνάσεσθαί τινα φα<ι>μι ἄλλ' ἕτερον ἄμμεων.

final gnomic cluster seems still to focus on the self-praise of the poet and his skill (apparently compared with gold put to test with the Lydian βάκανος).⁷⁰

The actual features of the festival still elude us. The sacred mission (ἡρωΐδος θεαρίας) seems to be in honour of a hero (or rather a heroine?);⁷¹ we may compare the heroic πομπαί in honour of Neoptolemos in *Nem.* VII 46 and the grand pentaeteric *theoria* of the Ainianes for the same hero in Delphi imaginatively described by Heliodoros (II 34-III 6). Anyway, as Lobel already saw, a *theoria* is a very appropriate occasion for a processional song. A more precise clue on the rite involved was probably provided in the fragmentary words]μων τελευταῖς. Snell's supplement [κώ]μων τελευταῖς is not particularly attractive; much more appealing for the context (ὀαρίζει, τερπνῶν ἐπέων) and for its parallels (e.g. *Pyth.* IX 66 [τερπνῶν γάμου . . . τελευτῶν], *Ae. Suppl.* 1050)⁷² is Ferrari's [γά]μων τελευταῖς. This would imply a sacred mission, involving a hero/heroine, and a sacred marriage. It is probably no coincidence that the same features (or, at least, some of them) may be recognized in the following poem too.⁷³

There is no need to dwell at excessive length on XV after Rutherford's recent and detailed discussion.⁷⁴ It is, most remarkably, a reenactment at the present time (1 τῶιδ' ἐν ἄματι τερπνῶι) of a mythic event. This features Poseidon's immortal mares (bringing somebody or something), Aiak[os] (more probably than one of his descendants, since the poem was in his honour), Nereus, Zeus, and a banquet of gods. The event seems to take place at an anniversary (at the completion of a yearly cycle).⁷⁵ Many particulars are still obscure, though it seems rather probable that Aiakos was admitted at a meal in company of the gods, possibly on the occasion of his marriage with a minor goddess. The event was reenacted during the festival, while the song described, at the same time, myth and ritual performance. This might have involved bringing in procession statues of the hero and of the gods,⁷⁶ but we cannot rule out the possibility that the rite was performed by human beings impersonating mythical characters.⁷⁷ The verbs imply a movement (1 ἄγοντ'; 2 ἔπεται; 5 μολλοῦσι?; 9 ἔρχεται): there is little doubt that the song accompanied a procession.

III. XX and XXI (and P. Oxy. 2442)

Parts of these two poems are known to us thanks to fr. 32 (two consecutive columns) of P. Oxy. 2442, *i.e.* a fragment belonging to a group of rolls written in the same hand and format, which included (at least) Pindar's *Hymns*, *Paeans* and *Pythian Odes*.⁷⁸ Very small portions of the same texts are preserved in P. Oxy. 1792 (fr. 31 = XX 6–10; fr. 139 = XX 16–19; fr. 24 = refrain of XXI + beginning of a verse not preserved in P. Oxy. 2442; fr. 55 = refrain of XXI; fr. 83 = refrain of XXI?; fr. 84 = end of XXI and beginning of next poem?⁷⁹).

⁷⁰ Cf. M. Cannatà Fera, "Pindaro e la pietra di paragone", in *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata*, Milano 1995, 413–422.

⁷¹ Ferrari, 1992, 151, argues that ἡρωΐδος is not an adjective but a noun.

⁷² More parallels in Ferrari, 1992, 151 f.

⁷³ Cf. already D'Alessio ap. Ferrari, 1992, 152. A sort of *hieros gamos* may be envisaged for XXI too (cf. below § III d).

⁷⁴ Rutherford, 1992, 62–72.

⁷⁵ For this meaning of ἐνιαυτῶι cf. the passages and the bibliography collected in G. B. D'Alessio, *Callimaco. Inni, epigrammi, frammenti*, Milano 1996, 502 n. 5.

⁷⁶ Rutherford, 1992, 69–72, provides a useful collection of material for this kind of rite. A. Klinz, *Ἱερὸς γάμος. Quaestiones selectae ad sacras nuptias Graecorum religionis et poeseos pertinentes*, Diss. inaug. Halle 1933, is of very limited utility.

⁷⁷ F. Back, *De Graecorum caerimoniis in quibus homines deorum vice fungebantur*, Diss. Berolini, 1883, is probably still the best treatment on the subject.

⁷⁸ Cf. above § II a and n. 19.

⁷⁹ If this fragment contains the last refrain of the ode (as Lobel had tentatively supposed) the interlinear asterisk which follows it should occupy the position of the fourth letter from the beginning of the line, whereas in fr. 8, where another asterisk

Their classification was considered doubtful already by Lobel,⁸⁰ but, in spite of the asterisks in the Teubner edition, nobody seems to have dealt with the issue.⁸¹

XX, as it stands, offers no clue for the identification of its occasion (see below, § Va.i, on XVIII, for further speculations). The preserved text is a mythical narration about baby Heracles strangling the snakes sent by Hera, very similar to the same story sung in *Nem.* I. It might have been told on many occasions: we cannot infer from it anything about the classification of the poem.

XXI, on the other hand, was certainly connected to a festival in honour of Hera, invoked in a refrain at the end of each metrical section (ἰὴ ἰὲ βασιλείαν Ὀλυμπίων/ νύμφαν ἀριτόποσιν).⁸² At lines 9 f. the text mentions “this sacred little spring”: unless this was part of the speech of some character, one should assume that the song was performed in sight of the spring itself. Ll. 13–18 preserve fragmentary statements in the future tense regarding the city (15 ἄττει), the sailors and the city again (17 πόλις). The adjective ἀένναος at l. 14 (literally “everflowing”, but also, more generically, “perennial”) may be linked to the mention of the spring. It is possible that the future statements belong to a prophecy uttered by some character. It is perhaps more likely that they express a sort of ‘comparison’ (cf. also ὡς after ἀένναος in l. 14) between the flowing of the spring (and/or some ritual performance connected with it) and the future prosperity of the city. A good parallel is provided by Callimachos’ *Hymn to Demeter* 120–127 (*mimesis* of a processional hymn), where the speaker compares some features of the rite with corresponding favourable events which will affect the city.⁸³

We know of many Greek rituals about statues of goddesses brought in procession to a river, a spring, or the sea, washed, and then brought back to their temple.⁸⁴ Hera’s cult quite often involves sacred springs or rivers: close to the Argive Heraion the ὕδωρ Ἐλευθέριον played an important part in purification rites and secret sacrifices (Paus. II 17,1);⁸⁵ in Hera’s most famous island, Samos, the river Imbrasos was also called Parthenios (“as she was raised there when she was still virgin”);⁸⁶ in Nauplia there was a spring called Kanathos, “where the Argives say that every year Hera is washed and becomes virgin” (Paus. II 38,2);⁸⁷ the river Asopos played some role in the Boiotian Daidala (Paus. IX 3, Plut. fr. 157 Sandbach).⁸⁸ In some of these cases a statue of the goddess was carried in procession and washed, either before or after a hierogamic ritual, recovering her virginity. It seems very likely that a song

isk is preserved, it corresponds to the position of the tenth letter. It is possible, of course, that the position of the asterisk was not always the same, or that more than a single asterisk occupied the line separating two poems (cf. PSI 1181, where an interlinear title is preceded and followed by an asterisk; in P. Oxy. 1792, however, there is no trace of interlinear title), but the identification must be regarded with scepticism.

⁸⁰ Lobel, 1961, 51, remarked that the overlap with P. Oxy. 1792 did not imply that the poems were necessarily *paean*s, but did not address the question either in the introduction or in the commentary.

⁸¹ G. Bona (n. 8 above) and Käppel (nn. 8 and 14) treat them as *paean*s without any discussion (for a criticism of this position see D’Alessio, 1994, 63).

⁸² The metrical structure is not clear: P. Oxy. 2442 has a coronis, after 4, and two *paragraphoi*, after 12 and 20. The two metrical sections fully preserved (5–12 and 13–20) have the same length and end with an identical two-line refrain, which appears also at the end of the section followed by the *coronis* (whose length is unknown), as also, probably, at the end of every metrical section. Apart from the refrain itself, the responsion among the preserved remains of the sections is not clear. It is possible that: a) the poem was triadic, and ‘inexact responsions’ between 5–10 and 13–18 (strophe/antistrophe) are due to differences in the ‘aeolic base’, while 1–4 and 21 ff. are parts of epodes; b) that the poem was monostrophic (with a considerable amount of ‘inexact responsions’); c) that it was formed by sections 8 lines long, ending with the same refrain, but without proper responsion. Only a) is compatible with the metrical signs in the papyrus.

⁸³ For this kind of ‘magical comparison’ cf. Fraenkel ad Ae. Ag. 1602.

⁸⁴ Cf. Rutherford, 1992, 69–71 (without mention of this poem).

⁸⁵ For evidence on Hera’s sacred λουτρά in Argos cf. Hesychius, s. v. Ἡρακίδεα.

⁸⁶ sch. A. Rh. I 187; Call. fr. 599 Pf., Euph. fr. 431 SH. A. M. Cirio, *BPEC* s. III 2 (1981), 136–142.

⁸⁷ If the occasion of Pindar’s poem is to be found among these cases (but it may well be otherwise unattested), the mention of the sailors in l. 16 and of a “spring” rather than of a river in l. 10 makes Nauplia (under Argive patronage) the best candidate.

⁸⁸ Cf. R. Ginouvès, *Balaneutikè*, Paris 1962, 288–290.

accompanying such a procession would have been classified among the *Prosodia*. It is perhaps no coincidence that another two poems from P. Oxy. 1792 (XIV and XV) might involve some sort of hierogamic procession.

Neither XX nor XXI are likely to have been classified among the *Paeans*. According to his own definition of the ‘genre’ (fr. 128c, 1 f.: “the seasonal songs of paeon in honour of gold-distaff Leto’s children”), it is very unlikely that Pindar himself would have considered XXI a *paeon*. The papyrological evidence (their presence in P. Oxy. 1792) leads to the provisional conclusion that these poems were included in one of the *Prosodia* books: as far as we can see from the content of XXI this seems to be a pretty reasonable classification.

One implication of this is that for the Alexandrian scholar responsible for the arrangement of Pindar’s poems attested in our papyri (probably Aristophanes of Byzantium) the presence of the epiphthegma ἰὴ ἰέ was not a compelling reason to classify a poem among the *Paeans*. It is probable that Callimachos would have been of a different opinion, as the well known discussion on Bacchylides’ (?) *Cassandra* in P. Oxy. 2368 testifies:⁸⁹ according to Aristarchos the poem was a dithyramb, because it contained Cassandra’s story (i.e. because it was entirely or mainly narrative); therefore he gave it the title *Cassandra*.⁹⁰ Callimachos was mistaken in classifying the poem as a *paeon* as he did not understand that the refrain was common also to the dithyrambs (i.e. that it occurred also in the dithyrambs: I doubt that this may imply that, according to Aristarchos, or to the source of this note, the epiphthegma was confined to paeans and dithyrambs *only*). The same opinion was held by Dionysios of Phaselis.⁹¹

IIIe. Some provisional conclusion. On the arrangement of the poems in P. Oxy. 1792 P. Oxy. 1792 is, unfortunately, preserved almost entirely in tiny fragments. Apart from XII, it is possible to evaluate the poems it contained only when some other papyrus succours. With the help of P. Berol. 13411+21239, P. Oxy. 2441 and 2442 it is possible to have a glimpse of at least four or five more poems (XIII?, XIV–XV, XX–XXI), and a further poem must have been triad III of *paeon* VI (*alias* the *Prosodion for the Aeginetans in honour of Aiakos*).⁹² This means that we have a more or less vague idea of at least six or seven poems probably included in this book. It is possible that some of the unidentified scraps from this papyrus belong to lost portions of these poems, or of some poem known thanks to other papyri (a few cases shall be examined below, § V), or not known otherwise (as in the case of the possible poem for the Ptoion, if it does not coincide with fr. 51 a, b, d S.–M.). There is no overlap with quotations known from indirect tradition (which, anyway, for the *Prosodia* are exceedingly scanty, cf. § IV), but the reasons to consider the poems of this papyrus as part of a book of the *Prosodia* are, in my opinion, quite strong:

i) it preserves apparently only triad III of *paeon* VI, with a colometry strongly divergent from the one attested in papyri known to contain only *Paeans*. In all other cases of overlaps between P. Oxy. 1792 and other papyri, colometrical divergences are practically absent. Since we now know that triad III

⁸⁹ Cf. Käppel, 1992, Test. 3 (296 f.), and 38–42, with bibliography in n. 19, and add I. C. Rutherford, *Eos* 79 (1991), 10–12, T. Fuhrer, *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos*, Basel/Kassel 1992, 36–38. Käppel does not seem to be aware that the classification of XXI as a *paeon* is in itself based on doubtful (probably mistaken) grounds (cf. nn. 8 and 14 above). In the discussion of the hellenistic *paeans* in honour of mortal addressees in Ath. XV 696a–697b (= Hermippos fr. 48 Wehrli = Käppel Test. 7) it seems probable that with τὸ παιανικὸν ἐπίφθεγμα is meant not merely the cry ἰὴ ἰέ but a refrain containing the word παιάν or the like as well (cf., in the same passage, τὸ ἰὴ παιάν ἐπίφθεγμα).

⁹⁰ In l. 13 f. Lupre’s ἐπιγράφει δ’αὐτήν/ καὶ Καλλιάνδραν makes poor sense: read ἐπιγράφει δ’αὐτήν/ διὸ Καλλιάνδραν? Lupre’s alternative explanation for the dissension between Callimachos and Aristarchos (*ZPE* 69 (1987), 9–12) has been effectively challenged by R. Kannicht and L. Käppel, *ZPE* 73 (1988), 19–24.

⁹¹ On this papyrus see also below, Appendix § d.

⁹² Since we now know that P. Oxy. 2442 did contain also *Prosodia* it is worth mentioning the possibility that its fr. 86 l. 6 might preserve the title of *pae.* VI triad III in *Prosodiis* (Αἰγινῆ[τα]ς εἰς Αἰακόν), and that in line 7 ὄνομα κλύτα would not be an impossible reading.

was transmitted also among the *Prosodia*, it is very likely that we have an exemplar of this book, representing a different (textual and) colometrical tradition (cf. below Appendix, for further details);

ii) apart from XII (which is, however, well compatible with a classification as a *prosodion*), there is no other poem which may suggest classification as a *paeon* on grounds of content;

iii) if all of them were *paeans* the total number of these poems, added to the ones known thanks to other papyri, would probably exceed the capacity of a single book in Pindar's ancient edition (cf. above, § II);

iv) there are internal grounds in some fragments (*pae.* XII (a), XIV, XV, XXI) that make likely their performance during some sort of procession;

v) there is nothing, in the other poems, which tells *against* this classification.

At the state of present knowledge a few questions must be left unanswered. Do the fragments of P. Oxy. 1792 belong to a single book of the *Prosodia* or to both of them? Do they belong only to the *Prosodia*, or do they represent also some other category of Pindar's poems?

We have no evidence for answering the first question. As for the second question, one cannot, of course, rule out the possibility that the P. Oxy. 1792 fragments come also from books other than the *Prosodia*, but I think that there is no evidence that any of its poems may not have been accommodated among the *Prosodia*, while for many of them the classification as *Prosodia* seems the most probable on internal grounds. Barring new evidence to the contrary, it should therefore be assumed that P. Oxy. 1792 is likely to contain remains of the *Prosodia* only.

Of the seven 'readable' torsos, we have: XII, one poem for the Naxians (?) to be performed in Delos (?) in honour of Apollo and Artemis (some further possible Apolline poems are dealt with in §§ IIIa.i and IIIa.iii); XV and *paeon* VI triad III, two poems for the Aeginetans in honour of Aiakos; XXI, a poem for the Argives (??) in honour of Hera; XX, a poem in honour of Heracles (?) for the Argives or the Thebans (??); XIII, a poem in honour of a hero and Athena or Dionysos (and other gods?); XIV, a poem for an unknown hero or heroine to be performed in a venue other than the (unknown) patrons' main town (since it is part of a θεορία). If all these poems were accommodated in a single book, the criterium for dividing the *Prosodia* in two books remains unclear.⁹³ The internal arrangement is known only for the succession of XIV–XV and XX–XXI. In the first case it is remarkable that both poems are in honour of heroes and *might* involve hierogamic rituals. This latter feature might be shared by XXI, but its relative collocation to XIV–XV is unknown. From the title τοῖς αὐτοῖς in P. Oxy. 2441 fr. 3 one might infer that poems for the same patrons were (at least sometimes) consecutive.⁹⁴ It is possible, for instance, that XX and XXI were both for the Argives, but this is far from certain.⁹⁵ Alternatively (or in addition?), for XX–XXI, a roughly alphabetical order of the addressed heroes/gods may be envisaged (Heracles [?]/ Hera).

The criteria for assigning the poems to the *Prosodia*, as far as and when they can be ascertained, seem to have focused on the internal evidence for a processional performance, grouping together odes with typologically similar occasions. When a processional poem presented some distinctive feature connecting it with some clearly recognizable 'genre', its 'prosodiac' features seem to have played a subordinated role in the classification, as in the case of the προσοδιακοὶ παιᾶνες. In some cases,

⁹³ One should, in this case, give up the idea that one book was for the *prosodia* in honour of gods, the other for the ones in honour of heroes (Rutherford, 1992, 68).

⁹⁴ In this case e.g. *paeon* VI triad III might have followed XV. Part of its content too may be read as a *hieròs gamos* (I owe this point to I. Rutherford). But cf. also the discussion of P. Oxy. 2442 fr. 86 above, n. 92. It must be kept in mind, however, as A. Pardini reminds me, that the title in P. Oxy. 2441 fr. 3 is not written in the same hand as the other title preserved in this papyrus.

⁹⁵ For Heracles in an Argive context cf. e.g. *Nem.* X 13–18 and the discussion of XVIII below (§ Va.i) (but a Theban patronage would have even better chances); on XXI cf. above n. 87.

however, external information on the poem's performance may have been available, as it possibly was for *paean* VI triad III, if it really was ever performed as a separate *prosodion*.⁹⁶

It is normally assumed that Alexandrian scholars had completely lost touch with the reality of public performance of lyric poetry, and with its occasions and classification.⁹⁷ One has, however, to keep in mind that choral *prosodia* were composed, performed with musical accompaniment, sung and danced in Delphi, Delos and elsewhere not only until the late Hellenistic age, but well into imperial time, as we learn, *inter alia*, from epigraphical evidence.⁹⁸ In some of the rare instances in which we have access to the actual text, as in the case of Limenios discussed above (§ IIIa.i), it turns out that the classification of a poem as a *prosodion* might depend on extra-textual features, and that it was recorded in the heading of the poem in the inscription. It seems unconceivable to me that the scholars who arranged Pindar's poems were not aware of the contemporary practice, and of the possible extra-textual features implicit in the classification of a poem as a *prosodion*, and it is by no means impossible that some of Pindar's poems were preserved in inscriptions giving some sort of information about mode and occasion of the performance.

IV. The *Prosodia*-fragments in the Teubner edition

Few as the fragments collected among the *Prosodia* in the Teubner edition are, the number of the fragments known thanks to the indirect tradition should nevertheless suffer a further diminution. Pausanias II 30,3 attests that Pindar wrote an ἄνθρα for the Aiginetans in honour of the local goddess Aphaia (fr. *89b). J. G. Schneider, in the first separate edition of Pindar's fragments, assigned this song to the *Prosodia*, without any cogent reason.⁹⁹ Some decades later A. Böckh argued that the beginning of this song was to be identified with the beginning of a *prosodion* by Pindar preserved in the scholia to Aristoph. *Eq.* 1264 (fr. 89a: cf. above, § IIIa.i), where Leto and Artemis are celebrated.¹⁰⁰ The only reason to do so was that in some later sources Aphaia was connected with the Cretan nymph Britomartis/ Dictynna, who had cultic links with Artemis.¹⁰¹ In the 5th cent., however, Aphaia seems to have been the object of an independent cult, and was perhaps rather linked to Athena.¹⁰² Even if we accept a cultic link with Artemis, there would be no particular reason to think that 89a led to the celebration of Aphaia, rather than of Artemis and her brother themselves. There is no evidence for the classification of fr. 89b, which should therefore be relegated among the *Incerti libri fragmenta*.¹⁰³

The case of fr. 92 and 93 is somewhat more complex, but there is little doubt, in my opinion, that they should go among the *Incerti libri* too. Porphyrios, *de abst.* III 16, reports the story that, when the gods fled from Typho's attack, they transformed themselves into animals, as narrated by Pindar, in the *Prosodia* (fr. 91). The story is otherwise known from sources

⁹⁶ Cf. Rutherford, 1997.

⁹⁷ This is the basic assumption of, e.g., A. E. Harvey, "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry", *CQ* n.s. 5 (1955), 157–175, as of most modern scholars (more recently: T. Gelzer, "Die Alexandriner und die griechischen Lyriker", *AAntHung* 30 (1982–1984), 134 f.: "Sie hatten keine Chöre, sangen und tanzten nicht. Die Praxis der Aufführung war für sie zum Gegenstand antiquarischer Forschung geworden").

⁹⁸ Cf. Grandolini, 1988, 37–40, 43–48: cf. in particular the Delphian and Delian inscriptions mentioned above (§ IIIa.i), Philo, *de vit. contempl.* 80, II, p. 484 and 84, II, p. 485, on the *prosodia* (and other choral songs in Greek language and metre), performed and danced by a Jewish religious community in Fayûm; the preserved catalogues of the winners in the Museia at Thespieae mention a ποιητής προκοδίου Βάκχιος Βακχίου Ἀθηναῖος (*IG* VII 1759, 9 f.: I B. C.) and a ποιητής προκοδίου Εὐμάρων Ἀλεξάνδρου Θεεπιεύς (*IG* VII 1773,6: II A. D.).

⁹⁹ Schneider, 1776, 32.

¹⁰⁰ Böckh, 1821, 588.

¹⁰¹ Cf. e.g. *Kleine Pauly*, II, Stuttgart 1967, s. v. "Diktynna", col. 28, ll. 31–34, 39 f. In this Böckh was influenced by C. [O.] Müller, *Aegineticorum liber*, Berlin 1817, 163–70.

¹⁰² Cf. A. Furtwängler, *Aegina, Das Heiligtum der Aphaia*, München, 1906, 1–9, 470 ff., 500, *Rheinisches Museum* 56 (1901), 252 ff., *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-philologischen und historischen Klasse der k. b. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München*, 1901, 376 (for the separation of the two fragments). The two fragments were separated again by O. Schroeder in his revision of the *editio maior*, *Pindari carmina*, Leipzig 1923, 550 (he had followed Böckh in the first edition, Leipzig, 1900): cf. also U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Lesefrüchte CLV", *Hermes* 54 (1919), 54 f. (= *Kl. Schr.* IV 292 f.).

¹⁰³ Cf. Wilamowitz, 1922, 274.

depending, *inter alia*, on Nicander's *Heteroioumena*, but it may well have been Pindaric.¹⁰⁴ The following sentence, in Porphyrios' text, is more difficult: ἐραεθέντα δὲ Παισιφάης Δία γενέσθαι (sc. Πίνδαρος ἐν προσοδίῳ ἐποίησεν?) <νῦν add. Abresch> μὲν ταῦρον, νῦν δὲ ἀετὸν καὶ κύκνον. If the text is sound, this version of the story is not otherwise attested, since Zeus' metamorphoses into bull, eagle and swan are connected to different love-stories of the god. Bergk's brilliant conjecture, substituting δὲ φαει for δὲ Παισιφάης, would solve the problem, while at the same time eliminating Pindar as the authority for the statement. The text is almost certainly corrupt, but it is theoretically possible to think of different solutions, e.g. the mere deletion of the noun Παισιφάης, as an intrusive gloss, or its substitution with φαει. In this case the story would still be Pindaric, though, it must be said, it is difficult to envisage a narration where the poet might have accumulated so many discreditable metamorphoses of the god.¹⁰⁵ Snell compared the sequence of Porphyrios' statements with fr. 169b, 1 and 8, where the words . (.)εὐγὸνί (φ)εὐγὸν(τεσ?) and πασιφί (Παισιφ(α-?)) can be read. This fragment is preserved in P. Flor. inv. 557 col. ii, a papyrus containing lyric verses in 'Doric' dialect (note κωριδί in l. 10) and was printed in Snell's first editions as fr. 344 among the *Fragmenta dubia*. It has been reclassified as fr. 169a and 169b (among the *Incertorum librorum*) in the 1975 revision of Snell's edition by H. Maehler, after his identification of col. i 4–8 with fr. 169a, 29–33. This identification is, however, probably mistaken, and the fragment should go back in the *Dubia* section.¹⁰⁶ Anyway, the general context of fr. 169b, mentioning between the two verses quoted above a Letoides (3), a bow (4), the sun (5), does not lend particular support to a reconstruction based on Porphyrios' passage. Moreover, for both lines different articulations are conceivable. Though it is not possible to reach certainty on this subject, the relevance of Porphyrios' second statement to Pindar's *Prosodia* should be regarded as very doubtful.

92 and 93 are two dactylo-epitrites fragments quoted by Strabo, XIII 4,6 in an excursus on the collocation of Typho in Cilicia, in Pithecoussa and in Sicily. Strabo's first quotation is *Pyth.* I 17–19, followed by fr. 92 and 93. The three quotations are connected by a simple καὶ πάλιν and they would have perhaps been attributed to the same poem, had *Pyth.* I not been preserved in its entirety: this should warn us on the uncertainty of the attribution of the other two fragments to a single poem. A. Böckh saw a possible link between these two quotations and fr. 91; he preferred, however, attributing them to a *skolion* for Hieron of Aitna.¹⁰⁷ The attribution to the *Prosodia* was favoured by Bergk, followed by most editors in this century. There is no serious reason for this choice. According to fr. 92 Typho is imprisoned under mount Aitna, while fr. 93 tells how it was Zeus alone, without the other gods, who vanquished the monster, ἐν Ἀρίμοις (cf. *Il.* II 783, wherever Pindar may have thought that this place was). It is easy to see that there is no particular similarity with the event as reported by Porphyrios. Only in the *Victory Odes*, Pindar mentions Typho thrice (*Ol.* IV 7, *Pyth.* I 16, VIII 16): it is rather probable that he dealt with the monster more than once in the other thirteen books of his works.

V. Some poems of uncertain 'genre' in P. Oxy. 2442

Once we know that the fragments from P. Oxy. 2442 overlapping with P. Oxy. 1792 belonged to one of the *Prosodia* book (former *paeans* XX–XXI), the question arises whether some other fragments from this same papyrus may be attributed to the *Prosodia*. The problem is complicated by the fact that P. Oxy. 2442 corresponds to at least four books of Pindar's works: *Pythian Odes*, *Paeans*, *Hymns*, *Prosodia*.¹⁰⁸ Fr. 94 was regarded by Lobel as an indication of the presence of *Prosodia* among these

¹⁰⁴ Antoninus Liberalis, 28, from the fourth book of Nicander's *Heteroioumena* (fr. 59 Schneider) and other later sources. J. G. Griffiths, *Hermes* 88 (1960), 374–376, argues that this *interpretatio graeca* of an Egyptian myth would not be unconceivable in the 5th cent. For Pindar's interest in Egyptian religion cf. fr. 201, and L. Lehnus, *L'inno a Pan di Pindaro*, Milano 1979, 192–202 (and 200 with n. 50 on fr. 91).

¹⁰⁵ The only editor, prior to Snell, who thought that both statements might go back to Pindar was Christ.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. V. Bartoletti ap. C. Pavese, *HSPH* 72 (1967), 77 n. 80, L. Lehnus, *Paideia* 31 (1976), 197, Ferrari, 1991, 405 f., C. O. Pavese, *HSPH* 95 (1993), 143 f.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Böckh, 1821, 589, 618. Strabo's fragments had been attributed to the *skolion* for Hiero already by Schneider, 1776, 10 f. The reasons for attributing these fragments to the *skolion* may be: a) the mention of Aitna in fr. 92, and the use of Typho's story in *Pyth.* I (for Hiero); b) the metrical compatibility with fr. 125–126 (from a *skolion* to Hiero, in dactylo-epitrites), though there is no link in their content; c) the fact that [Julianus], *epist.* 180 Bidez-Cumont, reports as told by Pindar ἐν ἐπινικίῳ the story of the struggle between the monster Typho (described as ἑκατοντακέφαλος) and Zeus, who overcomes him ἐνὶ βλήματι, stressing the fact that it was Zeus alone who faced him. Böckh thought that this could not refer to *Pyth.* I, where in fact some details are missing (ἐνὶ βλήματι and the monomachy-motif), and thought that it may have come from a κώλιον where also a victory was celebrated. Since in fr. 93 Typho is πεντηκοντοκέφαλος, Schneider assumes that Strabo's text is not sound, and Böckh accepts Hermann's emendation in ἑκατοντακάρανον (elsewhere, as in all of his three occurrences in the *Victory Odes*, Typho has hundred heads). It is however more likely that [Julianus] is referring to the episode described in *Pyth.* I, possibly conflating it with another (Pindaric?) account: this latter *may* be represented by fr. 93.

¹⁰⁸ The same scribe seems to have written, in a slightly different format, also at least one book of the *Dithyrambs* (P. Oxy. 1604+2445) and one of the *Hyporchemata* (P. Oxy. 2446). Cf. above § II.a and n. 19.

fragments.¹⁰⁹ But (as we have already seen above, § II and n. 20) the evidence provided by this scrap is ambiguous. Most of the poems represented in this papyrus are classed among the *Paeans* in the Teubner edition (apart from fr. 1, unambiguously attributed to the *Hymn to Zeus* = fr. 33a and d S.–M., and from fr. 97, confined to the *Incertorum librorum fragmenta* = fr. 140a–b S.–M.): they are **Paeans* XVII, XVIII, XIX, XXII, fr. 59–60 S.–M. It seems however that some of these poems have little chance of having actually been part of the *Paeans* (anyway less chance than e.g. fr. 140a–b would have).

Va. The case of XVII–XVIII, XXII, 140a–b

i. XVII–XVIII

Fr. 7 preserves parts of the last 6 lines of a poem (XVII S.–M.; if fr. 6 is to be located above this piece, 9 further fragmentary lines are gained to this poem), followed by the title, Ἀργείοισι . . . [. . .] Ἠλεκτροῦ, and 10 fragmentary lines of the following poem (XVIII S.–M.). According to Lobel the appurtenance of these poems to the *Paeans* (“which might be suggested by the occurrence of *παιηόνων* at the end of” XVII) was ruled out by the form of the title in XVIII.¹¹⁰ The form of the title is textually uncertain. Lobel thought that Ἠλεκτροῦ was part of a genitive, preceded by a noun. Snell supplemented as εἰς τὰς Ἠλεκτροῦνος e.g. *Θυρία* vel *ἑορτάς*,¹¹¹ though this would not have parallels in Pindar’s extant titles. Another possibility would be e.g. εἰς τοῦ Ἠλεκτροῦνος παῖδας vel Ἠλεκτροῦνιδας, which would correspond to the kind of title of the *Prosodia* (XV, and of *pae.* VI triad III in P. Oxy. 841: dative (patrons) + εἰς + noun of addressed hero), of the *Hymns*, and of other ‘genres’ (for the first e.g. fr. 37 S.–M. and Bacchylides fr. 1B, Lasus fr. 702 *PMG*: εἰς + noun of addressed god; for other instances cf. e.g. Pind. fr. 89b, 95). The preserved titles for the *Paeans*, on the other hand, seem to be of the form “dative (patrons) + εἰς + place of performance” (IV; VI; VII; VIIb; VIII; Simonides 519 fr. 35, 12 *PMG*): the addressee is never indicated with the εἰς + noun formula, probably as the explicit or implicit addressee was assumed to be always Apollo.

It was possible, of course, that the actual addressee at the beginning of a paean was not the god himself (Pytho: VI; Delphian prophets: VIII; Charites (?): III; Abderos: II), but there are signals that all these poems were performed in ceremonies in honour of Apollo. Even in the case of II, where the address to Abderos must have had important cultic implication, the performance had the temple of Apollo Derenos in its route and the celebration did certainly involve Apollo (cf. not only 5, but also 96–102, and, probably, the part of text preceding these verses in the gap): in the refrain it is certainly with Apollo, not with Abderos, that Παιάν is to be identified. I very much doubt that the title of this poem might have been Ἀβδηρίταις εἰς Ἀβδηρον. In the case of XVIII, however, there seems to be no evidence that the ritual occasion had anything to do with Apollo. The place of performance was probably mentioned at the beginning of the poem: Ἐν Τυνδαριδᾶν ἱερῷ / [τεμένει πεφυτευμένον ἄλκος. This must have been one of the two temples of the Dioscuroi in Argos: either the urban one described by Paus. II 22, 5, in whose area gymnastic contests were held, and where a recently discovered inscription mentions a τέμενος,¹¹² or, perhaps, the extra-urban one, on a detour from the road to Lerna (*ibid.* 36, 6). It is possible that in this τέμενος some rite was performed in honour of Elektryon and/or his sons.

There is nothing, therefore, either in the title or in what we can infer on the occasion from the text itself, suggesting that this poem might have been a *paeian*. The only theoretical reason for doing so would be the presence of the word *παιηόνων* in line -3 of the preceding poem in an uncertain context. But, of course, the mere mention of *paeians* in a poem cannot be taken to imply that the poem itself was a *paeian*: cf. eg. the case of fr. 128c 2, and of Bacchylides’ *dithyramb* XVI 8.

Among the books attested in P. Oxy. 2442 the *Hymns* and the *Prosodia* seem to be the best candidates for the classification of XVIII. At the state of present knowledge we do not know of any *hymn* by

¹⁰⁹ Lobel, 1961, 31: this was his only clue, since he did not consider the possibility that fr. 32 (=XX–XXI) might have contained *Prosodia*. Cf. also n. 92 above.

¹¹⁰ Lobel, 1961, 36. It is curious (and probably due to a persistent misprint) that in the Teubner edition XVII is preceded by an asterisk, but XVIII is not.

¹¹¹ In spite of the indication of the letters in the gap in both Lobel and Snell, Snell’s integration is not *longior spatio*.

¹¹² Cf. *IG* IV 561, 564, 566; *SEG* XXVI (1976–1977) n. 428.

Pindar addressed to a hero rather than to a god,¹¹³ while there are some *prosodia* addressed to heroes (two to Aiakos; one, perhaps, to Heracles; one to some unknown hero or heroine, XIV; cf. also the mention of a hero in XIII (a) 1). XVI–XVII should therefore be classed as *E Prosodiis vel Hymnis*.¹¹⁴

Elektryon and his male offspring are rather shadowy characters in myth, and there is almost no mention of them in what we know of Argive cults. A late hellenistic inscription from Argos recently (and only partly) published, however, provides interesting evidence for Elektryon's importance in the region. It is an honorary decree for an unidentified individual who, *inter alia*, had forced the illegal users of the ἱερά καὶ δαμοσία χώρα to give it back τῷ τε Ἴηραι καὶ τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ καὶ Πυθαεῖ καὶ Ἀληκτρύωνι.¹¹⁵ The last mentioned (with the slight spelling mistake η/ε) must be Elektryon. His cultic importance in Argos and its *chora*, previously unattested, must have been considerable also in the 5th cent., as the request to Pindar of writing a poem in his honour should show.

Most of his sons are known only for having been killed by Taphian pirates who raided Elektryon's cattle: the Hesiodic *Catalogue* mentions nine of them, born by Lysidike, Pelops' daughter (fr. 193, 10–17 M. W., cf. also fr. 135, 6–11 M. W.).¹¹⁶ Amphitryon, betrothed to Elektryon's daughter, Alcmena, promised that he would take revenge for this slaughter before having intercourse with her. According to the scholiast to A. Rh. I 747 (who attributes the story to the *Aspis*) Elektryon had been killed on the same occasion, while, in most other accounts (including the text of the *Aspis* itself, vv. 11 f. and 80–82), he was later killed by Amphitryon. In the *Aspis* Amphitryon killed Elektryon χωσάμενος περὶ βουσίην, whereas later sources (starting from Pherekydes 3 F 13 *FgrHist?*) regarded the killing as accidental. After the event, anyway, Amphitryon and Alcmena emigrated to Thebes, from where the hero attacked and overcame the Taphians (before his coming back, Zeus, disguised under Amphitryon's features, visited Alcmena and fathered Heracles).

It seems that the preserved text might have told some part of the story. The sequence might have been as follows: the grove in the τέμενος of the Dioskouroi in Argos provides poets with subject for songs; a short survey of Argive mythological exploits¹¹⁷ (mentioning the Trojan expedition, with [Δ]αρδανία in v. 7), leads to the story of Amphitryon's arrival in Thebes (v. 8), and, with a 'flash-back', to the raid of the Teleboai (vv. 9 ff.).¹¹⁸

Since in almost all sources this story is a sort of prelude to the more famous one of the begetting of Heracles, and since the subject of XX (preserved in the same papyrus) is the first exploit of the infant Heracles, it would be tempting to see in XVIII the beginning of XX.¹¹⁹ In this case XVII–XVIII should be considered *Prosodia* since, as we saw above, XX must belong to that book.

There are, however, some difficulties with this hypothesis, though not all of them have the same weight.

a) metre: the first 10 *cola* of XVIII present all a dactylic rhythm, with just one sequence of three shorts syllables at v. 8,¹²⁰ and none with a single short. The metre of XX shows a remarkably higher number of sequences with single or triple shorts (6, 7, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19). XX 6–19 cannot therefore be in responsion with any verse of XVII 1–10. One cannot, however, rule out the possibility that XX 6–19 represent an epode. In this case, since epodes are not normally longer than the strophes of the

¹¹³ Cf., however, schol. Iond.(A E) [Dion. Thrac.] 451,6 Hlg.: ὕμνος ἐστὶ ποίημα περιέχον θεῶν ἐγκόμια καὶ ἠρώων μετ' εὐχαριστίας (going back to Didymos?).

¹¹⁴ It might be argued that the mention of paeans (as at the end of XVI) would be likelier in a *prosodion* than in a *hymn*, because of the great affinity between the two 'genres' (cf. above § IIIa.i). In the absence of the context, however, it would be safer not to give too much weight to this argument.

¹¹⁵ In C. Kritzas, "Aspects de la vie d'Argos au V^e siècle avant J. C.", in *Polydipsion Argos, BCH Suppl. XXII*, Paris 1992, 237–239 (cf. also *SEG XLI* (1991), n. 282), who argues that the names mentioned belonged to the "Grandes Divinités de l'Argolide" (as opposed to the principal gods of the city itself; strictly speaking, however, there is no reason to believe that in the Argolis Heracles and Alektryon were regarded as gods rather than heroes).

¹¹⁶ For later variants on his sons and wives cf. *RE V*, 2317 f., (1905). The tomb of another son, Likymnios, killed by Heracles' son Tlepolemos, was still indicated in Argos at Pausanias' time (II 22,8).

¹¹⁷ Cf. the longer catalogue in *Nem.* X 1–18 (cf., moreover, vv. 2 f. φλέγεται δ'ἀρεταίς/ μυρίαίς [sc. Δαναοῦ πόλις . . .] Ἄργος] with vv. 4 f. from this poem: ἀμφὶ πόλιν φλέγεται (?) / . . .]ν ὕμνων κέλας and v. 19' Ἀργεῖον . . . τέμενος with vv. 1–2 here, in a similar context).

¹¹⁸ This is more or less what already Lobel and Snell had envisaged.

¹¹⁹ The same hypothesis is independently formulated by Rutherford, and, I understand, will appear in his forthcoming book on Pindar's *Paeans*.

¹²⁰ It might be avoided by reading οἶά instead of οἶά but, in a fragmentary context, the interpretation of the lectional signs in a normally accurate papyrus should not be doubted.

same poem, a single triad must have been not less than 40 lines long (which is not impossible), and the epode must have comported a marked rhythmical variation.

b) the appearance of the papyrus: the two fragments (fr. 7 = XVII–XVIII and fr. 32 = XX–XXI) look very different in colour and state of preservation. This may be due to chance (cf. e.g. fr. 22 and 29, both from *pae.* VIII), but certainly does not support the identification.

c) the writing presents some difference too (most noticeably in the hupsilon, which in fr. 7 has a curious, sinuous vertical stroke, and in the alpha, almost always of the angular type in fr. 7, while in fr. 32 the left-hand side is more often a loop). The scribe of these rolls does show “considerable variation within relatively short intervals”,¹²¹ and two different forms of a letter may occur even in the same word.¹²² The difference in the general appearance in this case, however, seems due not only to this, but also to the fact that in fr. 7 the strokes are thinner than in fr. 32: this should imply that fr. 7 has been written with a newly sharpened calamos, while in fr. 32 the point of the pen is broader. I would not feel so confident as to rule out the possibility that such variation may have taken place within the same poem (i.e. at an interval of just one column, or even none), but do not think it very likely.¹²³

In conclusion, the identification of the two poems has some attractiveness on grounds of content, but should be considered rather dubious as far as other reasons are concerned.¹²⁴

ii. XXII (a+b): fragments of the *paean* on Niobe’s wedding?

The fragments grouped under *Paean* XXII (without asterisk!) in the Teubner edition are, in fact, a somewhat heterogeneous bunch. They cannot, obviously, belong to one single poem since at least two beginnings are preserved (in (c) 6 and in (h) 7). Most of them belong to P. Oxy. 2442, but for (k) which is a Berlin fragment of the same hand as P. Oxy. 1792, and should, consequently, go with the other fragments of this papyrus, among the *Prosodia*. Most of the fragments are too small to make any hypothesis about them (on the possibility that (h) may preserve the beginning of *paean* VI triad III among the *Prosodia*, see n. 92). (b) is the only one which offers a roughly comprehensible context. It seems to be part of a mythical narration, mentioning nuptial gifts (? : 1 ἔδ' ἰωλῶν Snell), a wedding song (4 ὕμνεαίωι), the Olympos (6), Kronios Pelops, and somebody hearing something (7: αἰών), the heaven (8), death (10), a banquet (15] . νεῖμ' ἐρανιτράϊε Snell), and somebody’s portal (16 πρόθυρον ἔόν Lobel). The story is uncertain: the only probable inference is that it deals with a wedding and with Pelops. There is no internal clue for the ‘generic’ classification of the poem. In this case, however, it is possible that evidence from the indirect tradition may succour us. We know that Πίνδαρος ἐν παιάειν ἐπὶ τοῖς Νιόβης γάμοις φησὶ Λύδιον ἀρμονίαν πρῶτον διδαχθῆναι ([Plut.] *de mus.* 15, 1136c = Pind. fr. 64 Schroeder; cf. Aristoxenos fr. 80 Wehrli).¹²⁵ This fragment has disappeared as such from the more recent Teubner editions, since Snell thought it was relevant for the interpretation of **pae.* XIII (which I now attribute to the *Prosodia*), without any particularly cogent reason, as we saw. Its relevance for our fragment may be suggested:

a) by the mention of wedding and nuptial songs;¹²⁶

¹²¹ Lobel, 1961, 31.

¹²² Cf. Funghi–Messeri, 1992, 47 n. 19, for the variations of hupsilon in fr. 32, n. 20 for the alphas in fr. 7.

¹²³ A reverse order would be, of course, perfectly acceptable, since the pen might have been sharpened in between.

¹²⁴ It might be added, however, that a succession of XVIII+XX and XXI might provide an attractive sequence: Ἀργείοις . . . [. . .] Ἡλεκτρῶν, followed by, e.g. τοῖς αὐτοῖς εἰς Ἴθραν, i.e. identity of patrons and alphabetical order of addressees.

¹²⁵ This might be supplemented with Paus. IX 5,7 (not attributed to Pindar) where Amphion (Niobe’s Theban husband) learns the Lydian harmony from the Lydians thanks to his connection through marriage with Tantalos (κατὰ κῆδος τὸ Ταντάλου). Heracleides Ponticos (Ath. XIV 625e = fr. 163 Wehrli) attributes the importation of the Lydian harmony to the Lydians and the Phrygians who followed Pelops in the Peloponnese, quoting Telestes 810 *PMG* as evidence.

¹²⁶ Also ποικίλον in v. 2 might refer to music: cf., *inter alia*, *Nem.* VIII 15 Λυδῖαν μίτραν καναχηδὰ πεποικιλμέναν for the possible link with the Lydian harmony.

b) by the mention of Pelops, Niobe's brother, the other famous son of Tantalos. Apart from the genealogical link, there is no literary evidence for a connection of the two characters in myth. And yet there must have been one. There are, in 4th cent. Apulian red-figured vases, some raffigurations of Niobe enshrined in a funerary naiskos, in the process of becoming a grieving stone, surrounded by gods and, among other characters, members of her family. In three of them Pelops too is present, clearly recognizable thanks to his characteristic iconography, and to labels with his name (in two vases he is accompanied by his wife Hippodameia).¹²⁷ It has been recently suggested by M. Schmidt that an Apulian red-figured lekythos by the Darius painter (340–330 B.C.) represents Niobe's wedding.¹²⁸ The upper register, according to this hypothesis, would represent, *inter alios*, Amphion tuning his lyre, Niobe, Tantalos, Aphrodite, Eros and a Moira; in the inferior register Schmidt recognizes Pelops and Hippodameia, close to a chariot guided by Eros, and other characters. Schmidt's own opinion is that the two registers are not meant to be read as describing an event taking place at the same time: the inferior one may represent the prelude to Pelops' flight with Hippodameia. It seems to me that the vases with Pelops and the grieving Niobe and the lekythos with the marriage scene, possibly representing both sister and brother, might suggest that Pelops' presence at Niobe's wedding would not have been out of place in Pindar's *paean*.

c) by the presence of a scholion, very difficult to read, at the bottom of the column (not transcribed in the Teubner edition), where some form of the word ἄρμονία occurs twice, in a context suggesting discussion about invention (cf. l. 2] ἄρμονία πρότερον [, and l. 3, end, εὔρηται).¹²⁹

This is not enough to reach certainty, but surely makes XXII (b) a very attractive candidate for the *Paeans*.¹³⁰

iii. fr. 140a–b (and XIX): more possible *Paeans*?

Fr. 97 from P. Oxy. 2442 preserves five verse-ends overlapping with P. Oxy. 408 (now P. Yale 18)¹³¹ fr. (a) col. i 12–15 = fr. 140a 12–15 S.–M.¹³² This implies that fr. 140a, 1–72 was preserved in one of the rolls of P. Oxy. 2442. The same should apply to fr. 140a, 73–80+ fr. 140b, preserved in fragment (b) from P. Oxy. 408 = P. Yale 18. Grenfell and Hunt, followed by Snell, tentatively suggested that it comes from the inferior part of the same column as fr. (a) col. ii. Even if this is not proved, it is nevertheless almost certain that fr. 140a and 140b belonged to the same book of Pindar's works.

Strangely enough, Snell, after printing all P. Oxy. 2442 fragments among the *paean*s, chose to leave fr. 140a–b among the *Incertorum librorum fragmenta*. Strictly speaking, this latter choice was correct, as P. Oxy. 2442 preserves at least also *Hymns* and *Prosodia*. Nevertheless, it seems to me that these two poems have better chance of actually being *paean*s than many other P. Oxy. 2442 fragments labelled as such by Snell.

Fr. 140a was part of a poem consisting of one or more very long triads (the strophe alone counts 20 *cola*). The closest parallels for this are to be found among the *paean*s (VI, VIIb), though fr. 70b (a *dithyramb*) has a strophe 18 *cola* long. The preserved portion is a mythical narration about Heracles in Paros.¹³³ Attacking a local impious king, Heracles obeys to the order of Delian Apollo (vv. 55–59): the story leads to an invocation to Apollo, who is reminded of the cult in his honour and of his father, Zeus, established by Heracles in Paros. The textual condition of the address is uncertain, but it is not unlikely

¹²⁷ Cf. M. Schmidt s. v. "Niobe", in *LIMC* VI 1, Zürich-München 1992, 908–914, with numbers 18–20.

¹²⁸ Cf. M. Schmidt, "Lydische Harmonie", in *Εὔμουςία. Ceramic and Iconographic Studies in Honour of A. Cambitoglou*, ed. by J. P. Descoeudres, Sydney 1990, 221–226, with Plate 42. Cf. also A. D. Trendall, A. Cambitoglou, *Second Supplement to the Red-figured Vases of Apulia*, Part I (*BICS* Suppl. 60, 1991), 18/70a. M. Schmidt has no reference to Pindar's **paean* XXII, which would have perhaps lent further support to her interpretation of the vase.

¹²⁹ The mention of a work of Ἀρτέμιων ?] ἐν Λυδίακοις in a marginal note on the etymology of Κρόνιος (v. 7) is very uncertain (cf. Lobel, 1961, 58), but the use of this source might perhaps be relevant for the identification of the note at the bottom of the column as a scholion on *Lydian* harmony.

¹³⁰ In v. 15] . νεῖμ' ἐρανιεύσας might refer either to the nuptial banquet or to another episode of Tantalos' mythical career, when he ἀλίκεσσι κυμπόταις/ νέκταρ ἀμβροσίαν τε/ δῶκεν, οἷσιν ἄφθιτον/ θέν νιν (sc. οἱ ἄθάνατοι; *Ol.* I 61–64). In this case vv. 9–16, introduced by τὸν ποτε, may be part of a chronological digression on Tantalos (and Pelops?). The *paean* probably narrated also of the death of Niobe's sons and daughters: cf. *fr. 65 S.–M. (in the apparatus to **pae.* XIII).

¹³¹ J. F. Oates, A. E. Samuel, C. Bradford Welles, *Yale Papyri in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library*, I, New Haven and Toronto, 1967, 37 f.

¹³² Cf. Lobel, 1961, 72.

¹³³ For an interpretation, with some new readings, cf. Ferrari, 1990, 230–232.

that it refers to a present celebration of the god in the island, possibly in the local Delion.¹³⁴ In this case the poem would have been written for the Parians in honour of Apollo. Snell thought that P. Oxy. 2442 fr. 16, 3a (= *pae.* XIX S.–M.) might have been the title of this poem (Παρίσιος ἶ), which is not unlikely, since we do not know of any other poem of Pindar written for the Parians.

Fr. 140b¹³⁵ starts with the mention of Xenocritos, a 6th cent. poet from Locroi Epizephyrioi, inventor of a particular harmony and, as it seems, the composer of a *paeon* in honour of Apollo and of some other god. The *persona loquens* in Pindar's poem is apparently stimulated to a sort of competition with Xenocritos' musical achievement. There is no general agreement on the classification of fr. 140b, though it has often been considered a *paeon*.¹³⁶ It seems indeed that there are grounds to regard both poems as *paeans* since the first one was almost certainly in honour of Apollo, while the second one seems to be composed in emulation of a famous ancient *paeon*.

Vb. The classification of the *tripodephorika*

Frr. *57 (indirect tradition), fr.*59 (= P. Oxy. 2442 frr. 96A+95), and, perhaps, fr. *60 (indirect tradition) S.–M., seem to belong to a poem in honour of Zeus of Dodona. Fr. 58 (quoted as Πίνδαρος παϊῶτιν) is a story about the origin of the priestess of the oracle at Dodona called 'dove'. If it comes from the same poem, as it seems likely, this must have been a *paeon*.¹³⁷

A 'genre' of songs accompanying the tripodephoria to Dodona is mentioned in sch. lond. (A E) [Dion. Thrac.] 450, 19 Hlg., in Proclus' *Chrestomathia* (§§ 79–86, in Phot. *Bibl.* 321b 33 ff.),¹³⁸ and in Ephoros 70 F 119 *FgrHist* (the last two providing also the aitiology for the rite). Judging from the mention of tripods in fr.*59, 11, it seems probable that Pindar's poem belonged to a *tripodephorikon* to Dodona. It may seem strange that a poem in honour of Zeus was classed among the *paeans*. An obvious reason might have been the fact that the *tripodephoria* moved from the temple of Apollo Ismenios in Thebes, and that the tripod itself had been kept in that shrine, "unde aptior *paeans* denominatio, quoniam Ismenius tripod ab Apolline non alienus":¹³⁹ the celebration might have involved Apollo as well as Zeus.

One cannot, of course, rule out the possibility that fr. 58 may refer to some *en passant* mention of Dodona's 'dove' in a *paeon*, and that the poem for Zeus of Dodona was a *hymn* or a *prosodion*.¹⁴⁰

There is however some further, however slight, evidence that a *paeon* of Pindar dealt with the tripodephoria. It is provided by Ammon. *de diff. verb.* 231 Nickau: Θηβαῖοι καὶ Θηβαγενεῖς διαφέρουσιν, καθὼς Δίδυμος ἐν ὑπομνήματι ἴτῳ πρώτῳ ἰ τῶν παϊῶνων Πινδάρου φησὶν (= p. 238 Schmidt) καὶ τὸν τρίποδα ἀπὸ τούτου Θηβαγενεῖς πέμπουσιν τὸν χρύσειον εἰς Ἰσιμῆιον ἴπρωτον ἴ. τίς δ' ἐστὶ διαφορὰ Θηβαγενῶν πρὸς Θηβαίους; Εφωρος ἐν τῇ δευτέρῃ (70 F 21

¹³⁴ Cf. Ferrari, 1990, 231 f.

¹³⁵ Cf. M. G. Fileni, *Senocrito di Locri e Pindaro (fr. 140b Sn. Maehl.)*, Roma [1987], Ferrari, 1990, 232–234 (with further bibliography), W. J. Henderson "Pindar Fr. 140b Snell-Maehler: the Chariot and the Dolphin", *Hermes* 120 (1992), 148–158.

¹³⁶ Cf. Fileni (above n. 135), 52–53. For the identification with a *paeon* cf. e.g. H. W. Garrod, "Simonidea", *CQ* 16 (1922), 121; M. Gigante in *Locri Epizefiri*, Atti del XVI convegno sulla Magna Grecia, Napoli 1977, 626. With Ferrari's attractive reconstruction Xenocritos' poem would not be compared to a *paeon*: it would be actually described as such. Other proposals for classification: *partheneion* (rejected by Gigante, *loc. cit.*): but the two texts offer no evidence for performance by a female chorus, and fr. 140b 13 has a masculine participle referring to the first person; no remains of *partheneia* have been identified in P. Oxy. 2442; *hyporchema* (Wilamowitz, 1922, 321, 500; Fileni): this is compatible with the elaborate description of the musical accompaniment in fr. 140b (though there is nothing in fr. 140a suggesting an elaborate dancing-performance); it must be kept in mind, however, that in P. Oxy. 2446 we do have some *Hyporchemata* fragments written in the same hand as P. Oxy. 2442 (cf. above, n. 19), but they are in a different format (smaller letter format and interlinear space), and in this respect fr. 97 goes with the rest of 2442, not with 2446. There is nothing suggesting a possible classification among the *Prosodia*. The *Hymns* seem a less promising guess than the *Paeans*. It is very unlikely that they may have been *Dithyrambos*, as Irigoin, 1952, 90 thought ("assez probable": possibly a mere slip for *Paeans*).

¹³⁷ Cf. Lobel, 1961, 71 for a concise and clear exposition of the problems related to this poem and its classification. Fr. *60 too may be relevant, but it would be more prudent to leave fr. *60 (a)-(b) S.–M. (= P. Oxy. 2442 frr. 105 and 107), attributed to this poem in Snell's edition, out of the discussion. The only reason for the attribution of (a) seems to be the mention of Zeus in v. 5, but it mentions Poseidon as well (whose role in Dodona is not otherwise attested): a mention of the two gods might have occurred in many contexts, since the fragment may belong to the *Paeans*, the *Hymns* or the *Prosodia*. The same applies to (b), where the only clue seems to be the integration of χρῆς|τήριον in col. i 12 (Erbse): this may well be right, but might apply to any oracular shrine (col. ii 14 mentions the Delian epithet Κυνθίωι).

¹³⁸ Commentary in Severyns, 1938, 232–243.

¹³⁹ Boeckh, 1821, 571.

¹⁴⁰ From fr. 58 one might equally have inferred that the address to Zeus-Ammon in fr. 36, classed among the *Hymns* on the slender evidence of Paus. IX 16,1, was part of a *paeon*.

FgrHist) φησίν.¹⁴¹ The expression ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν παιάνων Πινδάρου should literally mean “in the first Commentary on the *Paeans* of Pindar”, implying that Didymos wrote many Commentaries on the *Paeans*, which seems somewhat unlikely.¹⁴² Wilamowitz corrects it in τοῦ πρώτου, implying that the quotation comes from Didymos’ Commentary to the first poem in the book of Pindar’s *Paeans*.¹⁴³ It cannot be ruled out, however, that the corruption may be of a different type, or deeper.¹⁴⁴

Didymos’ fragment refers to a different tripodophoria, the one in which the Θηβαγενεῖς carried a golden tripod to the temple of Apollo Ismenios in Thebes. Wilamowitz, prior to the publication of fr. *59, thought that Pindar had in fact composed a song not for the tripodophoria to Dodona, but for the one to the Ismenion, and that this song was the first in the book of the *Paeans*.¹⁴⁵ There is, however, no evidence that there were *tripodephorika* written for the Ismenion, rather than for Dodona: the existence of such a poem, implied by the title of fr. 66 as integrated in the Teubner edition, should be regarded as very doubtful. In fact fr. 66 simply implies that Didymos had mentioned the rite in his commentary. The reasons for his doing so may have been various: a simple mention of the golden tripods preserved in the Ismenion may have been enough, as it happens for the words χρυσέων ἐς ἄδυτον τριπόδων/ θησαυρόν . . . Ἰσμηνιον in *Pyth.* XI 4 ff., where the scholia ad loc. explain: τριπόδων εἶπε θησαυρόν τὸν Ἰσμηνιον διὰ τὸ αὐτῷ πολλοὺς ἀνακεῖσθαι τρίποδας· οἱ γὰρ Θηβαγενεῖς ἐτριποδοφόρουν ἐκεῖσε. And yet *Pyth.* XI is no *tripodephorikon*. The only reasonable conclusion is that the Ismenion and its tripods (and, possibly, a tripodophoria) were mentioned in the poem commented upon by Didymos: this may well have been the *tripodephorikon* to Dodona, if it was indeed classed among the *paeans*.¹⁴⁶

Appendix

Some remarks on the colometry and on the arrangement into books in the ancient editions of Pindar

The new evidence for the double status of *paeon* VI triad III raises some interesting questions about the history of Pindar’s text in the Alexandrian period. The two main problems involved are that of its colometry and that of the attribution of the various poems to different books. Both problems have been brilliantly dealt with, some forty years ago, in Irigoin’s splendid *Histoire du text de Pindare*, to which the following pages are in profound debt. A fresh scrutiny of the new and old evidence will not, however, be out of place.

a. Double colometries in the *Victory Odes*?

As it is well known, P. Oxy. 1792 frs. **15** and 16 offer a text of *pae.* VI triad III with a colometrical layout remarkably different from the one found in P. Oxy. 841 and PSI 147 (two *Paeans* papyri). Before trying to assess the implication of the difference, it may be useful to stress that:

a) the colometry of Pindar’s poems, as we can reconstruct it from the papyri, the scholia metrica and the medieval manuscript tradition, is almost completely uniform. In the very few cases where some difference is found, it is clear that we are dealing not with two *really different colometries*, but with

¹⁴¹ It is very likely that Ephoros’ authority was adduced by Didymos himself: on his liking for the historians cf. Irigoin, 1952, 71.

¹⁴² So S. L. Radt, *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian*, Amsterdam 1958, 5 n. 1. A. Pardini suggests to me the possibility that Didymos’ Commentary may have been divided into more than one book, but I am not sure that the transmitted text may easily have been understood as meaning “in the first volume of Didymos’ Commentary on Pindar’s *Paeans*”.

¹⁴³ Wilamowitz, 1922, 185. Since there was just one book of *Paeans* the, perhaps more natural, interpretation “Commentary to the first book of *Paeans*” is ruled out. For this kind of indication cf. the discussion in L. Lehnus, “Una glossa pindarica in Corinna di Tanagra”, *Rendiconti dell’Istituto Lombardo*, 107 (1973), 397–400.

¹⁴⁴ A marginal scholion in P. Oxy. 2442 fr. 97 (= fr. 140a 12 ff., perhaps a *paeon*) reads Δίδυμο(ς) δ(ε) followed by a Π crossed by a P. The explanation of this siglum is uncertain: πρὸς (often), or πρότερος/πρώτος (cf. McNamee, 1981, 80 f.). It is not impossible that this was the work referred to by ‘Ammonios’.

¹⁴⁵ Wilamowitz, 1922, 185 f., followed in Jacoby’s commentary to 70 F 21 *FgrHist*; the criticism in Severyns, 1938, 242 f. is partly impaired by the fact that he thought that Wilamowitz had actually identified the *tripodephorikon* with *our paeon* I, but is justified on other grounds.

¹⁴⁶ A form of the adjective Ἰσμηνιος occurs in *pae.* VIIc (a) 7, but this fragment (from the B section of P. Oxy. 841) is unlikely to belong to the first poem of the book.

minor variations of the same colometrical division. There is no substantial evidence, apart from the case under discussion, for the existence of ancient concurrent colometries;

b) in all other cases where we can compare P. Oxy. 1792 with an overlapping papyrus, there is no such colometrical divergence.

The first point may be verified only for the *Epinicia*, the *Paeans* and the *Prosodia*, since there is no case of overlap in the remains of the other books.

For the *Epinicia* the colometrical division attested in the papyri (from the late hellenistic to the imperial period) basically corresponds to the pre-Böckhian *vulgata*, reconstructed from the metrical scholia (going back to the II A. D.?)¹⁴⁷ and, with occasional divergences due to a longer manuscript tradition, from the layout in the byzantine *paradosis*.

A careful and updated assessment of the colometry in the papyri, after Irigoin's discussion, is recently due to A. Tessier, who has taken into account also some new papyri unknown to Irigoin.¹⁴⁸ In his conclusions, Tessier argues that there are deviations, sometimes marked ones, between most papyri and the *vulgata*. In my opinion, however, his own analysis of the data suggests that the presence of such divergences is only a marginal phenomenon, in a practically uniform tradition.

If we take out of account the late P. Oxy. 1614 (V–VI A. D.), practically useless, as it is so full of singular mistakes that very often passages in responsion do not match with each other at all, we can compare the two data for a total of about 180 *cola* attested in the other 8 papyri examined by Tessier: to these we should add P. Ryl. III 500,¹⁴⁹ and a new Florentine papyrus codex with parts of *Nem.* I (IV A. D.), to be published by R. Pintaudi and M. Cannatà Fera (with colometry coinciding with the one implied in the scholia metrica), reaching a total amount of more than 200 *cola*. According to Tessier's own assessment of the data, the division into *cola* corresponds (or might correspond, in case of lacunose texts) to the *vulgata* in all cases but 7.

I do not think, however, that P. Oxy. 2439 fr. 1 col. ii (= *Isth.* VIII 36–38), where the papyrus divides

υ|
π .|
χε|
στ|,

implies a colometrical divergence.¹⁵⁰ The division corresponds to the one of the only medieval manuscript preserving this part of the ode, D (Laur. 32,52):

υῖὸν εἰσιδέτω θανόντ' ἐν
πολέμῳ, Ἀρεῖ
χεῖρας ἐναλίγκιον
στεροπαῖσι τ' ἄκμᾶν ποδῶν.

There are some problems, since it is not clear whether the letter after π in the papyrus might have been an omicron,¹⁵¹ and, if the text was different, there is no way to make any comparison. The coincidence between the verse-beginnings, however, is unlikely to be casual. The second *colon* is explained in the metrical scholia as a ἰωνικὸν ἀπ' ἐλάσσονος <δίμετρον Irigoin> βραχυκατάληκτον and in most of the passages in responsion D, where the text seems to be sound, has a sequence ~ ~ - - ~ -. For the sequence πολέμῳ, Ἀρεῖ this scansion would be certainly awkward by modern criteria, but, perhaps, not unconceivable for the ancient practice, as attested in the metrical scholia. Hermann restored a

¹⁴⁷ Irigoin, 1952, 104 f.; Id., 1958, 35, but without any decisive argument for the date.

¹⁴⁸ Irigoin, 1952, 86–88, 115–118; Id., 1958, 19; Tessier, 1995, 35–50.

¹⁴⁹ *Ol.* XIII 110–113 (6 *cola*), with no divergence from pre-Böckhian colometry (M. Gronewald, *ZPE* 86 (1991), 2).

¹⁵⁰ *Contra* Tessier, 1995, 38 f.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Lobel, 1961, 8: “two dots level with the top of the letters”. L. Battezzato suggests to me that the papyrus may have read πτιολέμῳ.

smoother correspondence by inverting Ἄρει and χεῖρας and this has been accepted by modern editors, with a different stichometry, and with the addition of τ' after Ἄρει (Böckh). It seems that both the papyrus and D represent the same corrupted text, but one cannot assume that the author of the metrical scholia was using a different text, with a different division.¹⁵²

The 23 *cola*, as reconstructed in the *proekdosis* and in the editio princeps of PSI 1277, offered many divergences: after Tessier's revision¹⁵³ only the case of *Ol.* VII 6–7 is left. This implies an overlap between strophe and antistrophe and must be a singular error: it may involve, moreover, a textual difference. It cannot be considered a serious attempt to produce a concurrent colometry.

The same must be said for *Ol.* X 3–4 in P. Tebt. 684, where the strophe *may* have a divergent division, but antistrophe goes with the *vulgata*.

Of the other four cases, two are in P. Laur. 133, where *Pyth.* IV 122–123 are not divided as in the *vulgata* (but vv. 119–121 seem to correspond to it, according to Tessier's reconstruction): the divergence may involve the displacement of a single word between two short *cola*: the *vulgata* has ἄν περὶ ψυχᾶν ἐπεὶ γάθηεν ἔξαιρετον, while the papyrus might have had ἄν περὶ ψυχᾶν ἐπεὶ γάθηεν/ἔξαιρετον.¹⁵⁴ The gap at the beginning of the next *colon* seems to be ample enough to accommodate the *vulgata* sequence [γόνον ἰδὼν κάλλιπτον ἀνδρῶν].¹⁵⁵

The last case (*Nem.* VI 26 in P. Berol. 16367), though involving a single syllable (avoiding, moreover, a word-overlap), might, nonetheless, be more relevant to the issue, since, according to Tessier's reconstruction, it would match with the division in the passage in responsion (v. 33) in this same papyrus. Judging from the photographic reproduction, however, it seems that at v. 33 the gap is not wide enough for ἀγερώχων (Müller), nor for ἀ-/γερώχων (Tessier, corresponding to the division of v. 26 in the papyrus), but only for ἀγε-/ρώχων,¹⁵⁶ which corresponds to the division transmitted in the metrical scholia: the division of v. 26 is simply due to the avoidance of word-overlap, and has no particular meaning. In the other 17 *cola* attested in this papyrus (the most ancient with the *Epinicia*: I B. C.), the division coincides with the *vulgata*.

This means that the amount of the possibly significant divergences between the colometry in the papyri and the *vulgata* is less than 2%, and does not ever seem to be the product of *intentional* change. Our evidence shows that there was a standard colometry for Pindar's *Epinicia*, attested in the late hellenistic and imperial papyri, in the metrical scholia and in the medieval *paradosis*. Divergences are attested in a minor percentage and normally involve very few *cola*, with only slight differences, often of a single syllable.

b. Double colometries in the other books?

As far as the real *Paeans* are concerned, we cannot compare the papyri with any other kind of tradition. It is, however, not uncommon to find portions of the same text preserved in different papyri: these portions involve more or less 100 *cola*.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵² In *Isth.* VIII 8–9 the papyrus goes with the metrical scholia (where the twentieth *colon* is a δακτυλικὸν πενθημιμερὲς) against the ms. division (as reflected e.g. in Heyne's edition) where the first syllable of the *colon* is attributed to the preceding line (avoiding word-overlap in the first strophe).

¹⁵³ I have not seen any reproduction of the papyrus myself.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. H. Maehler, *APF* 32 (1986), 81.

¹⁵⁵ Judging from R. Pintaudi, *Dai papiri della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana (PLaur. IV)*, Firenze 1983, Plate XCVIII, ον is not aligned with the iota of ἐπὶ in the penultimate line (thus Tessier) but with the letters γα: the letters to the left would be 15 in the first case, 16 in the second, which is well tolerable.

¹⁵⁶ I owe this point to A. Pardini.

¹⁵⁷ The exact number is not easy to define, since in some cases comparison is partly conjectural (where neither verse ends nor beginnings are preserved), doubtful, or impossible (when the overlap between the two papyri is too meagre): in about 80 cases it is, however, possible to assess the case with a fair amount of approximation.

Pae. VI 61–70, 104–111, 125–156, 175–176, 179–183, *pae.* VII 1–3, 7, 9–12 are attested both in P. Oxy. 841 and PSI 147: in all these *cola* the two papyri show only a single minor divergence, at *pae.* VI 138, involving a single syllable, with word-overlap.¹⁵⁸

The last three verses of *pae.* VIIa and *pae.* VIIIb 1–10 are preserved both in P. Oxy. 2440 and 2442. The former has only their beginnings, the latter only their ends: a comparison is not strictly possible, but it seems rather probable that they presented the same colometrical layout.

Pae. VIIIb 9–20 are attested in P. Oxy. 841 and 2442, with the same identical colometry.¹⁵⁹

Pae. VIII 1 is present, with identical colometry, in P. Oxy. 841, 2442 and 3822. P. Oxy. 841 and 3822 coincide also for vv. 2–3. Vv. 64–66 are present, with the same verse-division, in P. Oxy. 2440 and 1790. This latter coincides in the colometry of vv. 67–69, 72–75, 79–80 with both P. Oxy. 841 and 2442, and with 2442 for vv. 76–77 and 81–82 (where 841 is lost).

The comparison involves 6 papyri: there is no substantial case of divergence.

A further comparison (with full coincidence in the verse ends) may be made between P. Yale 18 and P. Oxy. 2442, for fr. 140a, 12–14, probably from a *paean*.

We may conclude that the papyri of the *Paeans* represent all, with very minor singular deviations,¹⁶⁰ the same colometrical layout of Pindar's text.

The same seems to be true for the *Prosodia*: P. Oxy. 1792, leaving apart the case of *pae.* VI triad III, overlaps with three different papyri in five different poems. In all these cases there is identity of colometry.

The beginnings of XIII 8–10 coincide with P. Berol. 13411.¹⁶¹

XIV 12–15 and XV 1–4 present the same colometry both in P. Oxy. 1792 and 2441; a possible coincidence, with the same alignment is to be found also for vv. 7–8, if Lobel's identification of P. Oxy. 1792 fr. 69 with these verses is correct.

XX 6–10 and 16–19 present the same alignment in P. Oxy. 1792 and 2442, and the refrain of XXI is divided in the same way in both papyri.

From this we may draw the following conclusions: a) P. Oxy. 1792 is not isolated in its colometrical layout, apart from the fragments overlapping with *pae.* VI triad III; b) our papyri attest that there was a standard colometry also for the *Prosodia*.

c. The case of *pae.* VI triad III and the *Prosodion to Aiakos for the Aeginetans*

The case of the double colometry of *paean* VI triad III seems therefore to be without parallels in the whole attested Pindaric tradition.

P. Oxy. fr. 16 and 15 present portions of *pae.* VI 128–131 and 134–137 with a division remarkably different from the one found in the *Paeans* papyri.

Fr. 16 (vv. 134–137) reads:

] vacat
]αωπου[
]εψατοπ[.¹⁶²

¹⁵⁸ The case of the division of vv. 125 f. in the Florentine papyrus is uncertain: at v. 125 ([λα-]/νιο]υ according to the editors) the gap seems in fact wide enough for λανιο]υ, as in the London papyrus, but in the following verse ου]νε]κλεν is probably too short. On the other hand it is difficult to envisage an alternative division, and in a passage in responsion (vv. 64–66) the layout in the two papyri is identical.

¹⁵⁹ For the possible omission of one line in P. Oxy. 2442 cf. Lobel, 1961, 12.

¹⁶⁰ Such deviations are attested even within the same papyrus, where two passages in responsion are sometime divided with occasional slight differences (cf. Ferrari, 1991b, 759 n. 6; B. Gentili, in *SIFC* s. III 10 (1992) (= *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Antichità Classica della F.I.E.C.*, Pisa 24-30 agosto 1989), 772): this has no implication for the existence of concurrent colometrical traditions.

¹⁶¹ But there may be some doubts that they represent the same text: cf. above, § IIIb, and n. 54.

¹⁶² Of next line only part of a *gravis*, under the space between ε and ψ, is preserved.

This is incompatible with the layout found in both other papyri:

cὸν ἐγγυάλιξεν ὄλβον
 εὐρύο[πα] Κρόνου παῖς· ὕδατι δ' ἐπ' Ἀc[ω-]
 ποῦ π[οτ' ἀ]πὸ προθύρων βαθύκολ-
 πον ἀ[νε]ρέψατο παρθένον.

The text of the London and of the Florentine papyri is metrically defective, when compared to the passages in responsion: instead of the dactylic sequence ὕδατι we need a trochaic sequence, and an extra syllable, reading ὕδατεcci, was restored by the first editors; even if another solution is accepted, it is generally agreed that the original text was one syllable longer. We do not know, of course, the reading of P. Oxy. 1792, and this makes any attempt at reconstructing its layout particularly uncertain. If it really represents a completely different tradition of the text, it is not unconceivable that it did not share the reading ὕδατι with the other two papyri. On the other hand, if a different reading had been known, we would expect to find some trace of it in the margin of the London papyrus, which, for this *paean*, preserves a wealthy crop of *variae lectiones* and ancient conjectures: we do find some fragmentary notes to the right of these verses, but they do not seem to be dealing with textual matters.

Snell, who has been the first to attempt a colometrical reconstruction of the fragment, thought that the Oxford papyrus had the reading with an extra syllable, and that the divergence with the other two papyri might have been caused by the avoidance of the word-overlap in Ἀcω/ποῦ, and by the fusion of the two consecutive *cola* into a single one:

εὐρύο[πα] Κρόνου παῖς· ὕδατεcci δ' ἐπ' Ἀcωποῦ
 π[οτ' ἀ]πὸ προθύρων βαθύκολπον ἀνερέψατο παρθένον.¹⁶³

So far, the divergence might have been explained by a fairly simple mechanical error. This is, however, by no means the only way of reconstructing the text. A slightly different solution has been envisaged by Radt, who, on the assumption that the Oxford papyrus had the same reading as the other two, attributed to the first *colon* the last syllable of the preceding one too. Neither Snell nor Radt tried to find some rational principle behind their reconstruction of the papyrus' lay-out, but, if Snell's colometry had the attractiveness of providing a simple explanation for the divergence, Radt's one has not even this advantage. Anyway, the fact that also fr. 15 presents a divergent colometrical division (unknown to both Snell and Radt at the time of their reconstructions) rather suggests that the cause of the difference is not to be sought in a simple mechanical mistake.

Recently Alessandro Pardini, after a careful assessment of the ancient and modern colometries of these verses, has argued that the layout of P. Oxy. 1792 fr. 16 is to be reconstructed as follows:

εὐρύοπα Κρόνου
 παῖς· ὕδατεcci δ' ἐπ' Ἀcωποῦ π[οτ' ἀ]πὸ προθύρων
 βαθύκολπον ἀ[νε]ρέψατο παρθένον . . .¹⁶⁴

This is an attractive solution, with verse-ends coinciding with word-ends also in all the other attested passages, avoiding the hiatus between ὑψικόμωι and Ἐλέναι in v. 93, and providing a comprehensible colometry. I would not rule out that it may be the correct reconstruction.¹⁶⁵ But: a) the number of the other possible articulations is too high, and the margin of variation in the script too wide, to rule out that any other of them is palaeographically possible; b) it is far from certain that P. Oxy. 1792 did not offer the same text as the other two papyri, reading ὕδατι; c) if P. Oxy. 1792 preserved only triad III, the hiatus in triad II might not have been influential in establishing the colometry; anyway, this kind of hiatus would have been unobjectionable for the ancient colometrical practice. This solution is more

¹⁶³ Snell, 1938, 431.

¹⁶⁴ Pardini, forthcoming, § 4.3.

¹⁶⁵ It corresponds to the one adopted in Turyn's edition, followed by B. Gentili, "Trittico pindarico", *QUCC* n. s. 2 (1979), 16–18.

sensible than the ones by Snell and Radt, but it seems that, without any line-end or beginning preserved, and with the textual problem in v. 134, the question cannot be settled with any certainty.

The situation is not different for fr. 15 (vv. 128–131), which reads:

]|ναξομ[
]|ποθεν[
]|γαρετ[.

In the other papyri the text is divided into four *cola*:

οὔνεκεν οὐ̄ ce παιηόνων
ἄδορπον εὐνάξομεν, ἀλλ' αἰοιδᾶν
ρόθια δεκομένα κατερεῖς,
πόθεν ἔλαβες ναυπρύτανιν
δαίμονα καὶ τὰν θεμίξενον ἀρετάν.

In this case it is particularly clear that the divergence cannot be due to some simple mistake, but must be based on a completely different layout of the text. Here too, unfortunately, the state of the text prevents us from reconstructing the colometry with any certainty. Pardini, the only scholar who has attempted any reconstruction, argues for the following division:

ἄδορπον εὐνάξομεν, ἀλλ' αἰοιδᾶν ρόθια δεκομέ-
να κατερεῖς, πόθεν ἔλαβες ναυπρύτανιν δαίμονα καὶ
τὰν θεμίξενον ἀρετάν.¹⁶⁶

This may well be right, but, at the state of our knowledge, it is not possible to rule out other articulations. I do not think we have enough evidence in order to reconstruct the colometry in the Oxford papyrus (and even less to assess its value when compared to the one in the London and in the Florence papyri). It certainly entailed longer *cola*, but its criteria still elude use.¹⁶⁷

It will be enough for our purpose, anyway, to conclude that the divergence between the two colometries did not involve only matters of detail. The comparison between the two traditions shows that in the seven comparable *cola* there is no identical division, and that the divergence is far more serious than the ones occasionally found among other papyri. One cannot explain this with the hypothesis that P. Oxy. 1792 was the work of a scribe who did not care for a correct colometrical division, since in other five poems its colometrical division coincides with the one found in the other papyri. The only possible explanation is that the text has been divided into two different ways in the two different branches of its tradition.

d. The role of Aristophanes: the arrangement into books

We are used to thinking that the same scholar, Aristophanes of Byzantium, has been responsible for both (a) the colometry¹⁶⁸ and (b) the arrangement of Pindar's odes into the 17 books in the ancient

¹⁶⁶ Pardini, forthcoming, § 4.2: he interprets the sequence as 2cho ^2cho (ba cho)/ cho cho cho cho/ pher//.

¹⁶⁷ One may toy with the idea that the tendential avoidance of word-overlap was one of the criteria for ancient colometry and that the word-divisions served as a guide-line (cf. e.g. Irigoin, 1958, 22). A not too unsatisfactory reconstruction of fr. 15 would be obtained dividing at οὔνεκεν οὐ̄/ . . . αἰοιδᾶν/ . . . ναυπρύτανιν/ (with 19, 21, 21 letters in the gap at the left: moving οὐ̄ into the next line would produce a less satisfactory alignment: I would rule out the other two alternatives: ce/ . . . ρόθια/ . . . δαίμονα/ = 17, 18, 15 letters; παιηόνων/ . . . δεκομένα/ . . . καὶ τὰν = 9, 8, 8 letters). This may provide a comprehensible metrical sequence with 1 = ba ia hipp (or δ ia aristoph), and 2 (coinciding with verse 5 in the modern period-division) = 4 cho (split into two dimetra in the London/Florence colometry). Problems would arise in the line preceding the first preserved one (let us call it line 0) if one takes into account the first two triads (the antistrophe in triad III cannot be checked): there would be word-overlap between lines 0 and 1 at least in v. 87; internal hiatus, after Ἀφροδίτα, at v. 2 (*colon*'s end according to the division in the London papyrus, and signal of period's end according to post-Böckhian criteria and modern editors), and the short final syllable of οὔνεκεν would correspond to a long one in v. 85; this is not necessarily a problem, since that element might have been regarded as an ἄλογος (and shortened in hiatus at v. 2), interpreting the final sequence of line 0 as 2 tro cho; the hiatus, anyway, may have been simply neglected (even more so, if, as it seems, this colometry was applied to triad III only).

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Wilamowitz, 1889, 141 f., Irigoin, 1952, 44 ff., Pfeiffer, 1968, 185–189.

vulgata:¹⁶⁹ is it really conceivable that he accepted the same text into two different books devising for it *two* different colometries? Before trying to explore the various possible explanations for this, it may be safer to assess the evidence we have for points (a) and (b).

The evidence for (b) is to be found in Pindar's *vita Thomana* and in P. Oxy. 2438, 35–36. In this latter text the name of the scholar responsible for the division in 17 books is partly in a gap, but the integration ὑπ' Ἀριστοφάνου (Lobel) is almost beyond doubt, since there is no other name of a scholar known to have contributed to Pindar's text suitable for the preserved letters, and since we know that Aristophanes did deal with Pindar's text. According to the *vita Thomana* it was him, who arranged τὰ Πινδαρικά, and was responsible for the internal order of the *Olympian Odes*, having chosen our *Olympian* I as the first of the book.¹⁷⁰ Hellenistic and later quotations and papyri seem all to reflect the 17 books division present in the *vita Ambrosiana* and this must be due to the existence of a single authoritative edition.¹⁷¹ The attribution of what is practically the same list in P. Oxy. 2438 to [Aristophan]es confirms that it was his work in this field which had set the standard followed by subsequent scholars, scribes and book publishers.¹⁷²

It is not to be doubted, however, that Aristophanes' edition did follow, at least in some features, the outlines of previous classifications.

Timaios is reported to have regarded *Pyth.* II as a sacrificial ode (θυσιαστική, sc. ὠδή, or θυσιαστήριος, sc. ὕμνος), and *Nem.* I as an *Olympian* (*FgrHist* 566 F 141–142). This latter opinion is clearly wrong, and may be explained by the fact that he was quoting the beginning of the ode (where the Alpheos is mentioned), without remembering the following verses, which unambiguously refer to Nemea.¹⁷³ The definition of *Pyth.* II is likelier to be only a vague way of referring to a song, whose function was unclear to him, in the context of some historical narration, rather than a real attempt to classify it. He clearly had access to some, if not all, of Pindar's Sicilian odes, but, if we are to judge from these two cases, it seems unlikely that they were arranged in some rational way. Some work must have been done by Zenodotos, but it is only with Callimachos, some decades younger than Timaios, that we meet traces of such an arrangement.

In his Πίνακες (fr. 450 Pf. = *sch. Pyth.* II *inscr.*) *Pythian* II was classed among the *Nemean Odes*. This implies, in the first place, that in Callimachos' catalogue Pindar's *Victory Odes* were already divided according to the venue of the victory celebrated, while the ones by Simonides were divided according to the event (fr. 441 Pf.).¹⁷⁴ This may find a plausible explanation if we suppose that a larger number of victories among Simonides' odes had not been won at the Panhellenic festivals. With too many venues, a classification by place might have been awkward. However this may be, the different

¹⁶⁹ Cf. e.g. Wilamowitz, 1889, 138 ff., Irigoin, 1952, 35–50, Pfeiffer, 1968, 183 f.

¹⁷⁰ *Vita Thomana* (I 7, 14 f. Drachm.): [Ol. I] προτέτακται ὑπὸ Ἀριστοφάνου τοῦ συντάξαντος τὰ Πινδαρικά; P. Oxy. 2438, 35–36 δὴν ἰσχυρίζεται δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς τὰ ποιήματα ὑπὸ Ἀριστοφάνου εἰς βιβλία τζ κτλ. (cf. Gallo, 1968, 35–45): both are fr. 381 in Slater, 1986.

¹⁷¹ Irigoin, 1952, 37 f.

¹⁷² The scepticism of Slater, 1986, 145 f., is, in my opinion, not justified: one can hardly attribute the whole arrangement of Pindar's *vulgata* into 17 books to “a book publisher, rather than to a scholar”, since it involved taking side on a high number of controversial cases, while avoiding, as much as possible, omissions and unnecessary double editions. It was by no means an easy task. Whoever arranged the edition, he was authoritative enough to be followed by all (or at least almost all) subsequent scribes and “book publishers”. The fact that Aristophanes' opinion on the classification of *Pyth.* II is not quoted in the scholia is hardly relevant: an inference *ex silentio* from the scholia has a very limited value. For a more sensible account of the task involved in this kind of editorial classification cf. L. E. Rossi, “I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche”, *BICS* 18 (1971), 80–83.

¹⁷³ Some ancient scholar, perhaps Didymos, in *sch. Nem.* I 25a Dr., tried to guess at the reasons of his mistake: this may imply that Timaios himself did not state his reasons for such a classification.

¹⁷⁴ It has been assumed that such arrangement for Simonides was even older than Callimachos (cf. T. Bergk, *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*, Pars III, Leipzig 1867³, 1115, in his note to fr. 5; Wilamowitz, 1900, 37, and *Sappho und Simonides*, Berlin 1913, 154 n. 1), but this is not necessarily true.

arrangement was preserved in the editions circulating in later times, and Simonides' victory odes, unlike those of Pindar and Bacchylides, continued to be quoted as ἐν πεντάθλοις or ἐκ τῶν τεθρίππων (PMG 508 and 512).¹⁷⁵

Callimachos' classification of *Pythian* II among the *Nemean Odes*, moreover, probably already implies the collocation of some of Pindar's poems composed for the minor festivals at the end of that group (διὸ κερχωρικμέναι φέρονται: *sch. Nem. IX inscr.*), since there is no link with Nemea in its text.¹⁷⁶

Its collocation after *Pythian* I seems to overrule the classification strictly imposed by the available evidence, in order to produce a homogeneous sequence of three odes for Hieron. This, even if the status of II and III was doubtful, makes better reading than segregating them at the end of the collection. A similarly practical attitude underlies the displacement of *Olympian* I, which, according to the criteria adopted for the internal arrangement in the four books, should have followed *Olympians* II and III, but προτέτακται ὑπὸ Ἀριστοφάνους τοῦ συντάξαντος τὰ Πινδαρικά διὰ τὸ περιέχειν τοῦ ἀγῶνος ἐγκώμιον καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ Πέλοπος ὃς πρῶτος ἐν Ἡλίδι ἠγωνίσατο.¹⁷⁷

The scholia to *Pyth.* II do not report Aristophanes' position on the issue, but say that the ode was a *Pythian Ode* according to Apollonios ὁ εἰδογράφος, the Classifier. He was Aristophanes' successor, or, more probably, his predecessor, at the Direction of the Library, and, according to *Et. gen.*, had classified the odes (whose is left unclear), according to their harmony, a criterium not apparently followed in the edition of any poet.¹⁷⁸ It is possible that the notice is inaccurate, and that his contribution to the arrangement of the lyric poets was more influential. But it seems unlikely that the general arrangement of Pindar's work goes back to him rather than to Aristophanes:¹⁷⁹ some (even most) of his classifications may have been followed by Aristophanes (if one accepts that this latter was his successor in the Library); or, if the reverse order is assumed, Apollonios may simply have endorsed his predecessor's arrangement in the classification of *Pythian* II.

P. Oxy. 2368 gives evidence that Aristarchos dealt with problems of classification for the text of Bacchylides (if he was indeed, as it is very likely, the author of the *Cassandra*: cf. above, § III d). It is not clear who was responsible for the standard edition of Bacchylides' works. We have no evidence that

¹⁷⁵ The evidence provided by the title in P. Oxy. 2431 fr. 1 a (Simonides?) is ambiguous: the word order κέλητι τοῖς Αἰατίου πασίην differs from the normal one found for Pindar and Bacchylides, but the omission of the venue is difficult to explain (cf. E. Lobel in *The Oxyrhynchos Papyri*, Part XXV, London 1959, 89). The heading κέλητι might have introduced a subsection in the section ἵπποις (τεθρίπποις being another one) and our fragment, from the top of a column, might be the first of the subsection (arranged by the alphabetical order of the patrons?): this would explain the presence of the, otherwise superfluous, qualification κέλητι. Anyway, we would expect the venue too to be indicated: it is possible that the indication Πυθιονίκαις or Πύθια has been omitted by mistake. An alternative explanation might involve a slightly different articulation: sections arranged by general name of events, such as ἵπποις; first subsections arranged by venues; further articulations according to more precise event (B. Gentili, *RCCM* 2 (1960), 116). In this case too one may suppose, as I have argued above, that our piece was the first of a subsection.

¹⁷⁶ O. Schroeder, *Pindari carmina*, Leipzig 1900, 63, Irigoin, 1958, 33.

¹⁷⁷ *Vita Thomana* (I 7, 14 ff. Drachm.). Cf. Irigoin, 1952, 43 f. for the internal order followed in the *Victory Odes* (the fact that its first articulation is by the events and its second one by the status of the patrons had escaped Wilamowitz, 1889, 139 n. 27).

¹⁷⁸ The evidence for the positions of Apollonios of Rhodes and of Apollonios the Classifier in the list of the Librarians is very confused: Pfeiffer, 1968, 141 f., 154, 172 n. 2, 184 and n. 6, 210, argues for the sequence Zenodotos- A. of Rhodes- Eratosthenes- Aristophanes- A. the Classifier- Aristarchos: cf. also P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, Oxford 1972, I 232 f., 461, II 490, 666 f.; H. Herter, "Zur Lebensgeschichte des Apollonios von Rhodos", *RhM* 91 (1942), 314–319, and E. Eichgrün, *Kallimachos und Apollonios Rhodios*, Diss. Berlin, 1961, 16–18 and 24–31 (after a conjecture of Rostagni), argue for inserting A. the Classifier between Eratosthenes and Aristophanes: cf. also R. Blum, *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnis bei den Griechen*, Frankfurt am Main 1977, 184–187.

¹⁷⁹ So Wilamowitz, 1922, 108 (followed by H. Färber, *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike*, München 1936, 19, who believes that this Apollonios was Aristophanes' predecessor, and not his follower): this was in contradiction with Wilamowitz's own previous position, as he had attributed the standard edition, and the division into books, of the text of the nine lyric poets (and of Pindar in particular) to Aristophanes (Wilamowitz, 1889, 138 ff.; 1900, 17, 20, 42–44).

Aristophanes arranged his poems, and it is not unconceivable that this was the work of Aristarchos. It may be argued, of course, that Aristophanes did publish an edition of Bacchylides, but that, since no commentary by him was available, it was more convenient to quote Aristarchos' opinion. In this case we would not be in a position to infer whether Aristophanes' position was that of Callimachos, or that of Aristarchos. Judging from the classification of such poems as Bacchylides XVII and of fr. 60–61 (if they are by Bacchylides, as I believe they are) in papyri circulating in later times, where poems of the same kind were classed among the *Dithyrambs* and did have a title, their arrangement seems to have followed Aristarchos' opinion. The use of ἐπιγράφει for the *Cassandra* seems to imply that the poem had no such title before Aristarchos,¹⁸⁰ and this may mean that it was not classed among the *Dithyrambs* before. The evidence is, admittedly, not decisive (the *Cassandra* may not have been part of Bacchylides' edition; the analogy with XVII and fr. 60 may be misleading; ἐπιγράφει may imply that Aristarchos was responsible only for the title, and not for the classification too, which may be anterior to him; or that he was expressing his agreement to somebody else, responsible for both title and classification), but it strongly suggests, at least to me, that the arrangement of the standard edition of Bacchylides was the work of Aristarchos, rather than that of Aristophanes. There is no evidence that Aristarchos dealt with such problems for the text of Pindar: if he did alter the classification of some of his poems, this did not have a strong impact on current editions, since their arrangement continued to be attributed to Aristophanes.

Discussion on the classification of Pindar's odes went on after Aristophanes' edition, of course, and it is sometime reported in the scholia,¹⁸¹ but it is very doubtful that this had any influence on the actual arrangement of the books in circulation. Didymos himself disagrees with the classification of *Nemean XI* among the *Nemean*: it should not even have been inserted among the *Epinicia*. In this he was following Dionysios of Phaselis.¹⁸² He thought that *Nemean XI*, composed for the investment ceremony of Aristagoras as a πρῦτανις in Tenedos, was not a victory ode, but a παροίνιον, a "drinking song".¹⁸³ This category overlaps with that of the κόλια,¹⁸⁴ which in Aristophanes' edition seem to have been included in the book of the *Encomia*.¹⁸⁵ Dionysios may have wished to join the poem to fr. 123, written, as *Nem. XI*, for a boy of Tenedos, and assumed to have been an ἐγκώμιον in Aristophanes' edition, but quite possibly regarded as a παροίνιον too by Dionysios. The name of Theoxenos' father in fr. 123, 15 is Ἀγησίλας (Ἄ- ms), while in *Nem. XI* 11 Aristagoras' father is called Ἀρκεσίλας according to one

¹⁸⁰ E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XXIII, London 1956, 54, thought that Aristarchos' criticism might have been an "obiter dictum", but cf. H. Lloyd-Jones, *CR* n. s. 8 (1958), 19.

¹⁸¹ Cf., above all, the *inscriptio* to *Pyth. II*: according to Ammonios and Callistratos (the former a pupil of Aristarchos the latter of Aristophanes') *Pyth. II* was an *Olympian ode*; according to Dionysios of Phaselis, who inserted a desperate conjecture in the text, it celebrated a Panathenaic victory.

¹⁸² Dionysios' date is uncertain. If P. Oxy. 2368, quoted above, § III d, means that Dionysios agreed with Aristarchos' criticism of Callimachos, he must have been later than Aristarchos, and, since his περί ποιητῶν is quoted as an authority in the *Vita* of Nicander, any date earlier than the 2nd cent. B. C. is ruled out (if Nicander's date under Attalos III in the *Vita* goes back to him, he must have lived still later, but the actual chronology of Nicander, or of the Nicanders, is too thorny a problem and the question must be left open). Anyway he cannot have been later than Didymos. A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics*, Princeton 1996, 206 f. (without mentioning P. Oxy 2368), dates the Phaselites after Aristodemos, one of Aristarchos' pupils, on the ground that he is quoted after Aristodemos and Leptines in *sch. Ol. X* 55a: but it is far from certain that the Dionysios quoted there is the Phaselites (cf. Drachmann's index, and Irigoien, 1952, 60, who identify him with Dionysios the son of Charmides quoted in *sch. Nem. VII* 35a; H. T. Deas, "The Scholia Vetera to Pindar", *HSPH* 42 (1931), 17, identifies him with the Sidonian quoted ad *Pyth. I* 172), and the order by which the scholia quote a series of scholars is not necessarily always a chronological one.

¹⁸³ Cf. the mention of λοιβαί in v. 6, and that of music, song and τράπεζαι in vv. 8 f. Bergk's conjecture, παρθένια, printed in the text of the scholia by Drachmann, should not have been taken into serious consideration.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. B. A. van Groningen, *Pindar au banquet*, Leyde 1960, 14.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Gallo, 1968, 72–78.

ms. (D), and to the scholia, Ἀγησίλαος according to the other ms. (B).¹⁸⁶ This cannot have been a coincidence. Dionysios was not above introducing conjectures in Pindar's text in order to produce a better foundation to his classification. In *Pyth.* II 3 he changed the words ἀπὸ Θηβῶν into ἀπ' Ἀθηνῶν, and classified the ode as a Panathenaic. It is not impossible that in *Nem.* XI too the reading in B goes back to some lost scholia reporting a conjecture by Dionysios.

Dionysios' suggestion about the classification on *Nem.* XI was by no means unreasonable. But neither was it its classification among the *Victory odes*, due to the central role given to the victory-theme in vv. 13–29 (the same ground may have favoured also the classification of *Pyth.* III, which, according to stricter rules, might have gone among the ἐγκώμια too). The responsible of the present arrangement (Aristophanes, or one of his predecessors) put together poems of uncertain category in a flexible, but very sensible way: reaching a definitive solution would have been impossible. It is anyway more than doubtful that Dionysios did produce an edition of Pindar with a book of παροίνια. Didymos, who agreed with him, was commenting upon an edition where the poem was included among the *Nemean odes*, and did not venture to move it from its position. The same can be said of Dionysios' desperate attempt to make a Panathenaic ode of *Pyth.* II. He might have dealt with these issues, and with the problem of the classification of the *Cassandra* (cf. above, § III d), in a scholarly treatise, possibly his περὶ ποιητῶν:¹⁸⁷ it is very unlikely that his work was meant to have much practical use for strictly ecdotic purposes.

Summing up:

i. there is no doubt that the standard arrangement of Pindar's works (as of the other lyric poets) must be due to some authoritative model;

ii. such evidence as we have suggests that, at least for Pindar, this arrangement was linked to the name of Aristophanes;

iii. some of the features of the arrangement of the standard edition were as old as Callimachos (but possibly unknown to Timaios): Callimachos' own classification, however, does not coincide with the later standard one; if Apollonios the Classifier was Aristophanes' predecessor in the Library, his work might well have influenced Aristophanes;

iv. the existence of a standard arrangement did not prevent further discussion on the issue, though there is no evidence that anybody ever actually produced an edition of Pindar with an alternative arrangement.

e. The role of Aristophanes: the colometry

The evidence for Aristophanes' responsibility for the colometry of Pindar is a bit weaker. It is certain that Aristophanes did work on a text of Pindar divided into *cola*, as his athetesis of *Ol.* II 27a shows. The scholia ad loc. (48c) inform us: τὸ κῶλον τοῦτο ἀθετεῖ Ἀριστοφάνης. περιπτεύειν γὰρ φησι πρὸς ἀντιτρόφους (cf. 48f: ὄθεν καὶ ὀβελίσκος αὐτῷ παράκειται. πᾶσαι γὰρ εἰσι δεκατεσσάρων κῶλων, αὕτη δὲ μόνη δεκάπεντε εὐρίσκεται ἔχουσα).¹⁸⁸ This strongly suggests, even if does

¹⁸⁶ Only the first reading produces an exact correspondence with the passages in responsion, but this has been allowed in Pindar by some modern scholars too. C. Gaspar, *Essai de chronologie Pindarique*, Bruxelles 1900, 171, and P. Maas, "Die neuen Responsionsfreiheiten bei Pindar und Bakchylides", *Jahresberichte des Philologischen Vereins*, 39 (1913), 297 n. 3, 301 (followed by Wilamowitz, 1922, 430 n. 1) changed it into Ἀγεσίλαον ('A-, Gaspar, as in the ms.), a form attested in Hellenistic poetry (after Callimachos, *hy.* V 130): *contra* O. Schroeder, *Pindari carmina*, Leipzig 1923, 498 (addendum to 15, § 8), who accepts the free responsion; cf. also E. Schwyzler, *RhM* 79 (1930), 105 f.

¹⁸⁷ Irigoin, 1952, 65 f.

¹⁸⁸ Nr. 380 A in Slater, 1986, 145. This, together with the information about the arrangement into books, strongly suggests that Aristophanes *edited* rather than merely *catalogued* Pindar's poems (*contra* Slater, 1986, 145). I do not take into account his possible mention as an authority for *variae lectiones* ad *pae.* II 75, VI 89, 181 in P. Oxy. 841 (cf. e.g. Pfeiffer, 1968, 185, and Slater, 1986, 148), as the sigla usually taken to stand for his name are likelier to indicate Aristonikos: cf. MacNamee, 1981, 10 and n. 14, D'Alessio in D'Alessio-Ferrari, 1988, 169 n. 28.

not necessarily imply,¹⁸⁹ that he was the first one who divided the text of this ode into *cola*. The other well-known passages connecting Aristophanes with the invention of colometry (D. H. *de comp. verb.* 156 and 221), are, in fact, somewhat vague: Dionysios says that he is presenting a text divided according to rhetorical articulation not following the *cola* οἷς Ἀριστοφάνης ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τι μετρικῶν διεκόμηνε τὰς ὠιδὰς (in the other passage it is Ἀριστοφάνης ἢ ἄλλος τις who divided the texts into *cola*). This implies only that Aristophanes was the first name that occurred to one's mind when talking about colometry, not that he actually invented it. He must certainly have been responsible for a good deal of work in this field, but this does not mean that he was the first one to divide *all* the texts into *cola*.¹⁹⁰ There is, moreover, some slight (and controversial) evidence, that the division into *cola* may be attested in papyri or inscriptions earlier than Aristophanes' activity.¹⁹¹

The evidence does not necessarily imply that Aristophanes was the *first* one to elaborate a colometric division for the lyric poets, but suggests that his work was particularly influential. Since all our papyri and later manuscripts seem to derive from a standard colometry, with very minor or singular divergences, they must reflect the colometry of a single authoritative edition. It is reasonable to think that it was the one by Aristophanes. Later discussion about Pindar's colometry (which has left no trace) does not seem to have significantly impinged on the *lay-out* of the books in circulation.

f. Some possible solutions

Our evidence for the double classification of *pae*. VI triad III depends on the scholion to *pae*. VI 124 (φέρεται ἐν τῷ ᾱ τῶν προκοδίων, cf. above, § II.b). The sentence must have as its subject the whole triad: any further qualification would otherwise have been indispensable for a minimal level of comprehension by any reader. Its wording, with φέρεται, without any qualification, again, implies that the poem was *not* found among the *Prosodia*, Book I, in *some* copies, but that it was *transmitted in that place in the standard circulating editions*.¹⁹²

It may be argued, of course, that the text transmitted among the *Prosodia* was not *identical* with the one transmitted among the *Paeans*. This may be true, in my opinion, only as far as minor textual divergences are concerned. The two scraps preserved in P. Oxy. 1792 have a different colometry, but

¹⁸⁹ It has been suggested, not very convincingly in my opinion, that his predecessors *may* have noticed the extra-*colon* as well, deciding that the principle of respension was not strong enough to eliminate a transmitted line: cf. Tessier, 1995, 24 f. and n. 39. Aristophanes himself did not expunge the line, but simply marked it with an *obeliskos*.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Slater, 1986, 145, Tessier, 1995, 1–34. For some recent defense of ancient colometry, tracing it back earlier than the Alexandrian scholarship, cf. T. Fleming – E. C. Kopff, “Colometry of Greek Lyric Verses in Tragic Texts”, in *SIFC* s. III 10 (1992) (= *Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Antichità Classica della F.I.E.C.*, Pisa 24–30 agosto 1989), 761 f., B. Gentili, *ibid.*, 771–773, T. Fleming, “The *Versus* in Greek Metrics and Music”, *QUCC* n. s. 52 (1996), 123–131.

¹⁹¹ The evidence is collected by Tessier, 1995, 14–17, cf. also Pardini, forthcoming, §§ 1.2 and 2.1. Pardini, § 1.2 and § 3, also argues that some divergences in the colometry of some ‘dactylo-anapaests’ poems in P. Oxy. 3876 (Stesichoros?) and 2617, 2359 (Stesichoros) and the circumstance that *Nem.* XI is divided into *cola* longer than the other dactylo-epitrite odes by Pindar show that the work must have been done at different times and according to different criteria.

¹⁹² The only possible parallel known to me is that of Alcman fr. 3 *PMGF* (P. Oxy. 2387), where a marginal scholion above the beginning of a poem says: παρεγγρά(φεται) ἐν [τοῖς ἀντιγρά(φους) αὐτῆ/ κἀν (τῷ) <suppl. Lobel>] πέμπτοι καὶ ἐν ἐκείνοι/ ἐν μὲν τῷ <suppl. Lobel> Ἀρ(ις)το(ν)ί(κου) περιεγέγρα(πτο) ἐν δὲ τῷ Πτολ(εμαίου)/ ἀπερ(ί)γρα(πτος) ἦν. This should mean that in the exemplars used by the scribe (i.e. those attributed to Aristonikos and to Ptolemaios) the poem was wrongly inserted also in the fifth book, where it was bracketed (i.e. marked for expunction) by Aristonikos, while it was not by Ptolemaios. The wording, and, perhaps, the substance, is, however, slightly different from our case: in that case the scribe expresses a judgment on the *erroneous* nature of its insertion into the fifth book in its mss exemplars (and not necessarily in the standard edition), in ours it is simply stated that it is transmitted in the first book of the *Prosodia*; furthermore, there a whole poem is repeated, while in Pindar what might be taken as a part of a poem appears with a different function elsewhere. In Alcman we seem to have a simple problem of classification, in Pindar the problem of classification seems to have arisen from a problem of transmission. We do not know who did arrange Alcman's poems and are in no position to decide whether the repetition was in his intention, or if we are dealing with the results of a later attempt to modify the arrangement.

offer no textual variant. Some minimal change may have been convenient, since Ὀνομακλύτα γάρ¹⁹³ ἐcc̄t would hardly be suitable as the beginning of a poem: the first verse of *Pyth.* IV (κόμμερον μὲν)¹⁹⁴ would provide a good parallel for a start with, e.g., Ὀνομακλύτα μὲν (not followed by any balancing sentence). Anyway, the two texts must have been almost identical, if the preserved scholion to v. 124 and the presence of the title in P. Oxy. 841 have not to be completely devoid of sense. I would also regard unlikely the hypothesis that, in the *Prosodia*, triad III did not form a complete poem in itself: as it stands now it is almost self-sufficient (apart, maybe, from the particle in its first verse). Its start, with an address to a personified place, is of a kind normally found at the beginning of poems.¹⁹⁵ The prayer at its end¹⁹⁶ makes it difficult to think of any continuation after it.

Another point which requires some comment is the status of “triad III” in the book of the *Paeans*. The presence of an asterisk and of a new title should strictly imply that *pae.* VI 123 was judged to be the start of a new poem. On the other hand, the fact that the title seems to define this poem as a *prosodion* makes it unlikely that it was meant to be its *original* title in its collocation among the *Paeans*: it is well possible that somebody repeated here the title that this poem bore in the first book of the *Prosodia*. It is not possible, therefore, to rule out either possibility.

One has to explain, now, how the same text came to be included into two different places of Pindar’s edition. It is not to be doubted that the ultimate arrangement of all the 17 books must be due to a single scholar (it is immaterial, for our purpose, to know whether he worked by himself, or supervised the work being done also by further collaborators). The controversial cases were so numerous and complex that, if the work had not been conducted with coherent criteria, the amount of poems included in more than one book (as the risk of omitting some poem) would have certainly been much higher. The hypothesis of a later addition by some other scholar would not explain the lack of qualification in our scholion, which implies that the addition was adopted in the circulating text, and that the double classification had become the standard one. This hypothesis would imply moving the formation of the standard edition a further stage down, but would leave the same questions unanswered.¹⁹⁷

I would envisage three possible explanations for its double tradition in ancient current editions:

(A) Division of a single poem in two poems: *paeon* VI triads I–III were transmitted as a single poem. A scholar has found that triad III was in apparent contradiction with the fact that the rest of the poem seems to be addressed to a Delphian patronage, and has imagined that the address to Aegina was better suited for an initial position. He thought, therefore, that triad III must have been an independent poem, composed for the Aeginetans. This, however, might possibly have involved intentional change in

¹⁹³ The reading of P. Oxy. 841 is not clear here: γάρ ἐcc̄t, conjectured by Radt as the original reading in the quotation of this passage in *schol.* T Hom. II. XXII 51, and advocated now by Rutherford, 1997, is closer to what can be actually read in the papyrus than the γ’ ἐνεcc̄t read by G. H. and by all other editors. I would not rule out the possibility that the situation of the papyrus may be explained as an attempt to correct an original γάρ by partly erasing it. The alternative reading, with γε, would be undoubtedly *easier* for an incipit, as γε, of course, is not a connecting particle. I doubt, however, that it may actually have been used at the beginning of a poem, and know of no comparable case in lyric poetry. J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1954², 116 and 127, correctly states that “it tends to come near the beginning of the first sentence of a speech”, and that “emphatic γε gravitates to the opening of sentence and speech”, but in most cases the first sentence of those speeches is itself an answer to a preceding remark by some other speaker, and not really a fresh start.

¹⁹⁴ Cf. Braswell ad loc.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. H. Meyer, *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*, Diss. Köln 1933, 57 f. The rule, however, is not quite as binding as he argues: cf. A. Kambylis, “Anredeformen bei Pindar”, in *Χάρκις Κ. Βουμβέρη*, Ἀθήναι 1964, 164 f. and n. 5, the passages quoted in Snell-Maehler’s apparatus to Bacchylides I 13 ff., and add Pind. fr. 33c S.–M. (where χάριε makes, however, some difference). Note that the title and the beginning of a poem in fr. 86, 6 f. of P. Oxy. 2442 (which did include also the *Prosodia*) may be read as Αἰγινί[τα]ις εἰς Αἰακόν followed by ὀνομακλύτα (above, n. 92).

¹⁹⁶ For its text cf. D’Alessio–Ferrari, 1988.

¹⁹⁷ Anyway, if somebody thought that it was necessary to add *pae.* VI triad III among the *Prosodia*, without deleting it from the *Paeans*, why might this idea not have occurred to the scholar who arranged Pindar’s works in the first place?

the text of its first line, and would not explain the different colometry,¹⁹⁸ nor its double tradition and its classification among the *Prosodia*.

The strongest argument in favour of a pre-Alexandrian transmission of “triad III” as a *prosodion* is that the text appears to refer to itself as a *paean* (v. 127) and ends with an address to Παιών (v. 182). It seems very unlikely to me that a scholar working on the *text* of a 3 triads poem *only*, may have decided to separate its last triad and to classify it as a *prosodion*, rather than as another *paean*. This is, in my opinion, better understood with the existence of some sort of extra-textual information. Since we know that in later Delphic Theoxenia it was possible that a single poem was made up by a first section performed as a *paean* and a second one performed as a *prosodion* (cf. above, §§ IIIa.i, for Limenios’ case, IIIe, for the acquaintance of later generations with the performance of *prosodia*), it is not unconvivable that it was some information of this sort which led to the classification of this text as a *prosodion*.

(B) Conflation of two different poems into *pae*. VI: the scholar who arranged the standard edition (Aristophanes), or one of his predecessors, found *paean* VI triads I–II and “triad III” transmitted in an independent way. In this case (unless one assumes that Aristophanes divided the two texts into *cola* at different stages, with different results, which I would find extremely unlikely), at least one of the two poems must have been divided into *cola* already before the standard edition. At a further stage he made “triad III” follow triads I–II of *Paeon* VI, changing its lay-out¹⁹⁹ and, maybe, its first verse.

This is particularly unlikely, given the high number of Alexandrian textual variants found also in triad III of this poem: some of them occur in passages in responsion, involving at least triads II and III, and possibly also triad I.²⁰⁰ Its tradition must have been fairly rich, and discussion on it might have involved Zenodotos too.²⁰¹ Moreover, the idea that the Alexandrian editor may have altered the first verse of the *prosodion* (as opposed to proposing only a conjecture in a commentary) in order to link it to the *paean* lacks verisimilitude.

(C) Previous double tradition: the two texts (*paean* VI triads I–III and the *prosodion*) had an older separate tradition (possibly as old as the 5th cent., and maybe going back to Pindar’s time). Whoever arranged the standard collection of Pindar’s works (let us call him Aristophanes) quite correctly chose to include both of them in his edition.

There is no doubt that “triad III” was closely linked to triads I–II: the metre is identical, the content has a clear, if subtle, connection, the sequence *paean+prosodion* is paralleled elsewhere in the Delphic Theoxenia. I find it very unlikely that the two texts were “published” in this sequence for the first time in the Alexandrian edition, and suspect that this situation may go back to the 5th. cent., possibly to Pindar himself. Triads I–III as they stand make, in my opinion, much better reading than I–II by themselves. The abrupt end of triad II is rather awkward, and, in the *paean*, a final prayer is needed. The transition from the story of Neoptolemos’ death to the splendid address to Aigina makes a sharp contrast, and a grand effect. This may not be Pindar’s *first* version of the *paean*,²⁰² and a slightly

¹⁹⁸ One might suppose that this happened because the scholar who divided the poem did not agree with its current colometry, but in this case he would have probably changed the colometry of the *paean* too.

¹⁹⁹ It is worth noting that of the three cases where, in this *paean*, the ancient colometry overlooks signals of period-end (vv. 95, 138 and 175 [on which cf. Ferrari in D’Alessio–Ferrari, 1988, 171]), two (138 and 175) occur in “triad III” (I owe this point to A. Pardini).

²⁰⁰ The texts of ep. II 119 f. (as attested in P. Oxy. 841) and of ep. III 180 f. (as attested in both P. Oxy. 841 and P. S. I. 147) have an identical metrical structure but are one syllable shorter than the text of ep. I 58 f. (as attested in P. Oxy. 841): in both cases marginal variants provide the extra-syllable, and in the first case the variant is accompanied by the siglum ζ^η. Cf. the whole discussion in D’Alessio–Ferrari, 1988.

²⁰¹ It is possible, though not certain, that Zenodotos was quoted as an authority for variants in the scholia to vv. 55, 59, 118, 119, 183: cf. F. Ferrari, “La sigla ζ^η/ζ nei papiri pindarici”, *SCO* 42 (1992), 273–276 (against the identification).

²⁰² Cf. L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, I, London 1930, 313.

different version of triad III might have circulated by itself, as a *prosodion*, even in Pindar's time. But the joining of I–II to III seems to me clearly the work of the Theban poet, not of a later scholar.

This would allow various hypotheses in order to explain the difference in their colometry. It is possible (1) that Aristophanes found both texts already divided into *cola*. This may have happened at an earlier stage of their separate transmission, either (1a) as a consequence of different metrical criteria of two different ancient scholars²⁰³ or (1b) because the musical notation which accompanied the texts (not necessarily the original one)²⁰⁴ suggested a different rhythmical articulation (in this case they might have been colometrized in different ways by the same person, even by Aristophanes himself). In both cases he would have decided to include both the received texts, and their different colometries, in his edition. (2) Aristophanes is not responsible for the colometry of all of Pindar's books: he divided the poems among the books, but different collaborators were responsible for their colometrical layout. This would imply that there was no proper supervision, and is hardly compatible with good sense. (3) The different colometry of P. Oxy. 1792 is due to an isolated attempt of a later scholar (who, anyway, did not alter the colometry of the other poems of the book).

Of the three possible explanations, I find (C) the most satisfactory (but not, therefore, necessarily true). If (C) is correct, among the hypotheses for the difference in the colometry, (1) seems to be the most reasonable, (2) and (3) far less convincing. None of the possibilities, however, can be ruled out at the present state of our knowledge.

Bibliographical abbreviations

- Bélis, 1988: A. Bélis, "A proposito degli *inni delfici ad Apollo*", in B. Gentili – R. Pretagostini, *La Musica in Grecia*, Bari 1988, 205–218
- Bélis, 1992: A. Bélis, *Corpus des Inscriptions de Delphes*, tome III, *Les hymnes à Apollon*, Paris 1992
- Böckh, 1821: A. Böckh, *Pindari opera quae supersunt*, II 2, Leipzig 1821
- D'Alessio, 1991: G. B. D'Alessio, review of *Pindarus. Pars II. Fragmenta. Indices*, ed. H. Maehler, Leipzig 1989, in *RFIC* 119 (1991), 91–117
- D'Alessio, 1994: review of Käppel, 1992, in *CR* n. s. 44 (1994), 63–5
- D'Alessio–Ferrari, 1988: G. B. D'Alessio – F. Ferrari, "Pindaro, *Peana* 6, 175–183: una ricostruzione", *SCO* 38 (1988), 159–179
- Ferrari, 1990: F. Ferrari, "Restauri testuali a P. Yale 18", *Maia* 42 (1990), 229–234
- Ferrari, 1991: F. Ferrari, "Tre papiri pindarici", *RFIC* 119 (1991), 385–407
- Ferrari, 1991b: F. Ferrari, "Errori e divergenze di colometria nei papiri pindarici", *ASNP* s. III 21 (1991), 757–763
- Ferrari, 1992: F. Ferrari, "Per il testo dei *Peani* di Pindaro", *Materiali e Discussioni* 28 (1992), 143–152
- Funghi–Messeri, 1992: M. S. Funghi – G. Messeri Savorelli, "Lo 'scriba di Pindaro' e le biblioteche di Ossirinco", *SCO* 42 (1992), 43–62
- Grandolini, 1988: S. Grandolini, "Osservazioni sul prosodio", *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università degli Studi di Perugia*, XXV, n. s. XI (1987/1988), 1, Studi Classici, 29–52
- Gallo, 1968: I. Gallo, *Una nuova biografia di Pindaro (P. Oxy. 2438)*, Salerno 1968
- G.-H., 1908: B. P. Grenfell – A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part V, London 1908
- Hunt, 1922: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XV, edited with Translations and Notes by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, London 1922
- Irigoin, 1952: J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare*, Paris 1952

²⁰³ If the reconstruction of vv. 134 ff. in P. Oxy. 1792 by A. Pardini discussed above (Appendix § c) is correct, it has to be stressed that the lay-out in this papyrus would make verse-end coincide with word-end in all attested passages (and, if applied to str. II, would avoid a hiatus *within* the line); the lay-out of the London and Florence papyri, on the other hand, seems to follow the criterium "di ridurre ad unità omoritmica, olodattilica, i vv. 9–11", while disregarding word-ends and hiatus (B. Gentili, "Trittico pindarico", *QUCC* n.s. 2 (1979), 17).

²⁰⁴ On the highly controversial point, whether the music might have been of some help for the ancient colometry, cf. Fleming–Kopff (above, n. 190), and Tessier, 1995, 20–22. The possibility of such an interpretation of our case has been strongly advocated to me by Dr. L. Lomiento (private communication).

- Irigoin, 1958: J. Irigoin, *Les scholies métriques de Pindare*, Paris 1958
- Käppel, 1992: L. Käppel, *Paian. Studien zur Geschichte einer Gattung*, Berlin-New York 1992
- Lobel, 1961: *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part XXVI, Edited with Notes by E. Lobel, London 1961
- McNamee, 1981: K. McNamee, *Abbreviations in Greek Literary Papyri and Ostraka*, Ann Arbor 1981 (*BASP* Suppl. 3)
- Pardini, forthcoming: A. Pardini, *Colometrie e tradizioni dei lirici. Ricerche su Stesicoro, Alceo, Pindaro*
- Pfeiffer, 1968: R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, <I>, Oxford 1968
- Rutherford, 1992: I. C. Rutherford, "Two Heroic *Prosodia*. A Study of Pindar, 'Paeans XIV–XV'", *ZPE* 92 (1992), 59–72
- Rutherford, 1997: I. C. Rutherford, "For the Aeginetans To Aiakos a *Prosodion*: An Unnoticed Title at Pindar, *Paeon* 6, 123, and its Significance for the Poem", *ZPE* 118 (1997) 1–21
- Schneider, 1776: J. G. Schneider, *Carminum Pindaricorum Fragmenta*, Argentorati 1776
- Severyns, 1938: A. Severyns, *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus*, Première partie, *Le Codex 239 de Photius*, Tome II, Liège-Paris 1938
- Slater, 1986: *Aristophanis Byzantii Fragmenta*, ed. W. J. Slater, Berlin-New York 1986
- Snell, 1938: B. Snell, "Identifikationen von Pindarbruchstücken", *Hermes* 73 (1938), 424–439
- Snell, 1940: B. Snell, "Drei Berliner Papyri mit Stücken alter Chorlyrik", *Hermes* 75 (1940), 185–191
- Tessier, 1995: A. Tessier, *Tradizione metrica di Pindaro*, Padova 1995
- Wilamowitz, 1889: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie*, Berlin 1889 (reprint: Berlin 1907)
- Wilamowitz, 1894: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, "Pausanias-Scholien", *Hermes* 29 (1894), 246–248
- Wilamowitz, 1900: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Lyriker*, Berlin 1900 (*Abhandlungen der königl. Gesellsch. der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Philologisch-historische Klasse, N. F. IV 3)
- Wilamowitz, 1922: U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros*, Berlin 1922
- Zuntz, 1935: G. Zuntz, "De Pap. Berol. 13411", *Aegyptus* 13 (1935), 282–296