

# Notes on *P.Oxy. XXXII 2636* (Commentary to Pindar?)

Enrico Emanuele Prodi

University of Oxford, UK

**Abstract** This paper re-examines an anonymous commentary to two anonymous lyric texts (possibly by Pindar) preserved by *P.Oxy. XXXII 2636*. It offers a fresh critical text and apparatus, followed by exegetical notes on several passages. Parallels from Pindaric praise poetry allow a richer reconstruction of the original contents.

**Keywords** Papyrology. Oxyrhynchus. Commentary. Lyric Poetry. Pindar. Ibycus.

*P.Oxy. XXXII 2636* is a single fragment of a commentary (*hypomnema*) on two pieces of ‘choral’ lyric.<sup>1</sup> Immediately overshadowed by its larger, more attention-grabbing neighbour *P.Oxy. XXXII 2637* (probably a commentary to Ibycus, *PMGF S220-257*)<sup>2</sup> and excluded from all lyric corpora to date, it has enjoyed relatively limited scholarly attention. After its publication by Edgar Lobel it has been the topic of a few sentences in Bruno Snell’s review of the *editio princeps*, a short

---

This chapter’s first public appearance was in June 2014 in Warsaw, at the conference *Fragments, Holes, and Wholes: Reconstructing the Ancient World in Theory and Practice*, where Willy also spoke. I am honoured to be able to offer it to him on this occasion. I have benefitted from comments and criticisms by various friends and colleagues: Lidia Di Giuseppe, Massimo Giuseppetti, Claudio Meliaddò, Stefano Vecchiato, and especially Marco Perale, who was the respondent in Warsaw, and Henry Spelman, who carefully read a draft of this paper.

**1** MP<sup>3</sup> 1949.2, *LDAB* 4819, *TM* 63610. *Ed. pr.* Lobel 1967; image in pl. XIII and at <http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/POxy/>. I have inspected the original in Oxford’s Sackler Library.

**2** So identified by Page 1970, 93-4; further arguments Barron 1984, 17, 19-21. Treu 1968-69 had argued for Simonides.



Edizioni  
Ca' Foscari

**Antichistica 31 | Filologia e letteratura 4**

e-ISSN 2610-9344 | ISSN 2610-8828

ISBN [ebook] 978-88-6969-548-3 | ISBN [print] 978-88-6969-549-0

**Peer review | Open access**

Submitted 2021-05-17 | Accepted 2021-06-23 | Published 2021-12-16

© 2021 | Creative Commons 4.0 Attribution alone

**DOI 10.30687/978-88-6969-548-3/010**

185

notice by Fritz Uebel, a re-edition and commentary by Giuseppe Ucciardello, and Federico Condello's review of the volume containing Ucciardello's chapter.<sup>3</sup> Even cursory mentions are few and far between.<sup>4</sup> Although Lobel's terse notes and Ucciardello's thorough reassessment have laid a solid foundation, there is space overhead to build a better understanding of certain parts which have remained obscure. Such is the aim of the present paper. To this end, after a brief introduction I give my own critical text of the papyrus, based on my inspection of the original, followed by notes on selected passages, complementing earlier discussions.

The papyrus has been dated on palaeographical grounds to the second (Lobel) or more probably first century AD (Ucciardello).<sup>5</sup> Two columns of text are partly visible on the front; the back is stained but not written. Like many papyrus commentaries, and perhaps more than most, it is clearly a working copy, not a professionally made book. The script is small, irregular, and cramped: the space between two consecutive baselines (to the extent that one can even speak of a baseline) is in the region of 4 mm, and the intercolumn (which is similarly uneven) measures 1 cm at its widest. Several letters are cursorily formed, especially in the lower part of col. ii, where the writing is obviously faster. There are a few abbreviations (i.3, 10; ii.11, 14, 22) and a shorthand / = ἐκρί (i.20, ii.26). Lemmata are indented into the margin by the width of about one letter (ii.4-5, 9, 16) and spaces of one to three letter-widths deputise for punctuation.<sup>6</sup> The width of col. ii can be estimated from the nearly certain supplements at ii.9 and 13, but this is no more than a rough guide to line length, as the very uneven right edge of col. i shows.

In the lower part of col. ii the copyist left several sizeable blank spaces: at lines 20, 21 (seemingly a whole line), 24, 27 (perhaps a whole line), and 28. Furthermore, lines 23 and 24 are spaced further apart than the others – but not enough that an additional line could be written between them. Lobel hypothesised “that the copyist's exemplar was in some way defective and that the gaps were left to be filled in when an opportunity offered”;<sup>7</sup> Ucciardello, that the spaces were left deliberately to allow for subsequent additions.<sup>8</sup> A third, perhaps better option is that the copyist may have curtailed some lem-

---

<sup>3</sup> Snell 1968, 121; Uebel 1976, 232-3; Ucciardello 2001; Condello 2002, 395-7.

<sup>4</sup> Cannatà Fera 2003, 196 fn. 20; Henry 2005, 114; Ucciardello 2005, 22 and fn. 4; Ucciardello 2007, 9 fn. 43.

<sup>5</sup> Lobel 1967, 133; Ucciardello 2011, 89-91. For an in-depth analysis of the palaeography of the fragment see Ucciardello 2001, 88-92.

<sup>6</sup> Blank spaces in papyrus commentaries: Del Fabbro 1979, 89.

<sup>7</sup> Lobel 1967, 137.

<sup>8</sup> Ucciardello 2001, 91-2 fn. 25.

mata for the sake of speed, only writing as much as was necessary to make them recognisable, and failed to fill them in later. What is omitted at line 20 seems to be the first part of a lemma, given ἕως,<sup>9</sup> and the other blanks seem too short to accommodate the kind of extended explanation favoured by our commentator.

Col. ii clearly contains the end of the commentary to one poem, marked by a rudimentary *koronis*, and, after an empty space, the beginning of another. It seems likely, although it cannot be proved, that the commentary in the upper part of col. ii is the continuation of that in col. i; how much text is missing between them cannot be estimated. That the object of the commentary in both cases is a poetic text, and more specifically the kind of poetry that we have come to call 'choral lyric', is at once apparent from their diction and tallies with what can be gleaned of their content: respectively praise poetry (let us call it Poem A) and a hymn of some sort (Poem B).<sup>10</sup> The opening of Poem B, describing an epiphany of a god – probably Apollo – may have been a model for that of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*.<sup>11</sup>

The author of two poems remains unknown. Lobel identified in the quoted extracts several elements that suggest Pindar; Ucciardello has argued for Ibycus.<sup>12</sup> The limited length of this article precludes an extended discussion, but there is a great deal here that sounds just like Pindar, and very little that does not, even accounting for how much less Ibycus we have than Pindar. On the other hand, there exist two problems: the name of the honorand of Poem A, Pigres, which is Karian not Greek (although it is also attested in Greece, however sparsely),<sup>13</sup> and the juxtaposition of a poem praising a man with a cult song (but there is a Pindaric *comparandum*, *P.Oxy. IV 659: Partheneia*, fr. 94a-b Maehler).<sup>14</sup> If I may state my opinion without argument for the time being, I find the case for Pindar to be fairly strong, and perhaps strengthened by some of the interpretations presented in the coming pages. If this were Ibycus, his role in the emergence of the

**9** Lobel 1967, 137 suggests that ἕως τοῦ Ἰστρου may be geographical ("as far as the Istros") rather than textual ("[from X] until Ἰστρου"). Yet ἕως certainly has the textual sense at ii.9-10, and the alternative creates more problems than it solves.

**10** Lobel 1967, 133; see also Ucciardello 2001, 94-102.

**11** See already Lobel 1967, 136; Ucciardello 2001, 99.

**12** Lobel 1967, 133; Ucciardello 2001, 102-14; see also Condello 2002, 396-7 (*non liquet*; suggesting Simonides as a provocation, 400 fn. 8).

**13** Ucciardello 2001, 105-6.

**14** It may not be without relevance that nocturnal rites involving Apollo, rare as they are, tend to be associated with choruses of women: cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 11.1-10 (fictional, and its relation to Theban cult and to the ode's own performance is debated: see Finglass 2007, 27-32, *contra* Bernardini in Gentili et al. 1995, 296; Sevieri 1997), Eur. *Hel.* 1469-1477 (a corrupt passage, but there is a clear reference to κόμοις Ἰακίνθου νύχιον ἐκ εὐφροσύνας in which Helen participates; see Kannicht 1969, 1: 383-4). See D'Alessio 2000, 253-4, 259, who compellingly makes a similar argument for Pind. fr. \*333 Maehler.

commonplaces of Greek praise poetry would become much more pronounced than has yet been recognised.

In my text, following common practice, I use **bold** to mark out quotations of the poetic text. Distinguishing lemma and comment is a speculative endeavour, one made more challenging by the scantiness of the surviving text and by the scribe's erratic use of blank spaces, which he deploys to separate *kommata* within the commentary (e.g. ii.12, 14) no less than to separate the commentary from the poet's text. Moreover, the commentator often repeats excerpts from the poetic texts within his comments (e.g. ii.9-15), so not every item in bold is, strictly speaking, a lemma. Textual choices, other than the most obvious, that are not attributed to a named scholar in the apparatus belong to the *editor princeps*.<sup>15</sup>

col. i

*margo*

	διέστ[α]λται μὲν πρὸς τὸ..[	
	διέστ[α]λται δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὸ ε...[	
	] διὰ δὲ τοῦ μέρου(ε) τ...[	
	] ησαε ᾗ δὲ τὸν Πίγηρητα...	
	] ν ἐποίησα καταε.	5
μια-	ο] ὑ ψευδῶς αὐτὸν ἐγκ[ω-	
	] <b>ΞΙΟΝ ΦΕΡΟΙ ΚΕΝ</b> · ο..[	
τοῦ	ψε]υδῶς τὰς ἀρετὰς α[ὑ-	
	] ιτο εἰς αὐτὸν α[. ] ν	
	] ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐγκωμίοις αὐτοῦ	10
	] ων καὶ οὐκ εὐτυχίε.	
	] <b>ΕΚΚΕ</b> · τοῦτο ἅμα μὲν	
	] ι λέγει, ἅμα δ' εἰς τοὺς δια	
	] ουμένου τοῦ Πίγηρητος	
	] <b>· C ΚΑΠΤΟΝ</b> · του	15
	] οισ αὐτὸν τὸν Πί-	
γηρητα	] <b>π] ἄσαν ὁδὸν</b> · καὶ	
	] ..[.] εὐφραينو.[	
	] οι τοῖς ἄνθεσι.[	
	] ηε, τουτ(έστι) τοῖς ὕμν[οις	20
	] ηε γλυκυφω[ν-	
	] λ' ἐγκωμια[	
	] ...[	
	...	

<sup>15</sup> In the commentary to Poem B in col. ii my line-numbers match Lobel's not Ucdiardello's, who calculates a space of two lines rather than one between the two texts.

**1** τὸ Ucciardello || **3** τη dub. Lobel : ταιν[ι- Ucciardello: “una forma di tema ἀιν-”  
Condello : τὸν possis || **4** προσφω]γησας Snell : ἐπαι]νησας Perale || **5** κατατ[,  
κατὰ ττ[ dub. Ucciardello : ση-, στ- malim || **6** ο]ὐ ψευδῶς Lobel : ] ἀψευδῶς dub.  
Ucciardello || **7** θεῖον e.g. Ucciardello | οὔτο(ς), οὔτ(ω) possis || **8** (οὐ) ψε]υδῶς  
dub. Lobel : ἀψε]υδῶς dub. Ucciardello || **8-9** α]ὐ]του Perale || **9** αὐτὸν Ucciardello :  
“εἰς αἰσχρὸν apparently intended” perperam Lobel || **10** αὐτοῦ dispexi :  
αὐτο Lobel : αὐτό Ucciardello || **11** κακοδαίμων vel πολυπήμων Condello || **12**  
ἔσκε Snell : “εἴτ]εσκε, φάν]εσκε simm. vel ]εσ κε possis” Ucciardello | “incertum  
utrum ἄμα ἢ ἀμᾶ scribendum” Ucciardello || **13** ]ωι possis | δια-τ]βάλλοντα  
e.g. || **14** ἐπαι]γουμένου Meliadò || **15** Δ]ιός dub. Lobel | “σκαπτον is multifar-  
iously ambiguous: σκάπτον, σκάπτόν, σκάπτόν as well as σκάπτον” Lobel |  
τοῦ[ττο suppleverim, praeunte Ucciardello || **17** π]ᾶσαν ὁδόν dub. Ucciardello :  
]ασ ἄν’ ὁδόν possis || **18** εὐφραινον[ Ucciardello || **21** Πίγ]ρησ dub. Lobel :  
μελιγα]θής Snell, obl. Ucciardello : ἄδυε]πής Condello | γλυκύφω]νος Snell ||  
**22** ]ταξε[ Ucciardello

col. ii

*margo*

. [ . ] κεκρατ[  
.. [ . ] τ. ω[. ] ελα [ . ] .. ] με.. [ ]  
δ[ιὰ] τοῦ τελευταίου συνίστησιν τ[ ]  
οὔ παραμνήσκειται λέγων **αλκ** [ ]  
**[π]έμπω χάριν**· οὔτος γὰρ εἰς ὃν τείν[ει] [ . ] [ ] 5  
προν λόγον > **οὔτως τυχόντα δα**[ ]  
. [ . ] **ιραν ἐταίρωι λῆιας δατεῖς**[θ-

**πολλὰ μὲν δὴ cὺν χοροῖς. ὦραι δὲ cὺν ἐσπερίαι**  
ἕως τοῦ **ἀπύων**· οὐκ ἂν λέγοι νῦν τ[ὸ] **κλάγ-** 10  
ξεν ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἐπισπάστρου οἶον [ ]  
ἐσφόφης[ε]ν ἢ θύρα, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ δ[ ]  
ἰσοδυνα[με]ῖν τὸ **κλάγξεν** τῶι κλά[γξαι] ἐποίη-  
σε καθ’ ὃ[ν] τρό[πον] ὑπακούσαιμεν ἂν τ[ ]  
τοσ· **ᾠ[ρα]ι** γὰρ **cὺν ἐσπερίαι** ἐσφόφ[ησε] (ν) 15  
**χειμῶ[νι φρίσσο]ντι βλαβεῖς**· πάλιν το[ ]  
ουτ[ ] [ ] νοητέον τὸ **φρίσσο**[ντι ἰσοδυνα-  
μεῖν τῶι φρί]σσειν ποιοῦντι· καὶ [ ]  
Πίγ]δαρος καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ π[ ]  
] ἕως τοῦ **Ἰστρου** [ ] 20  
] [ ]  
] c Ἄρτεμιδ( ) φωνήν.. [ ]  
] . . . ] καλεῖ Ἰστρου στ . . [ ]  
] . . ] δα [ ] δια . . ] μο [ ]  
] . . ] αὐ κατὰ τὸ κύρ]ιον 25  
] ις σκῆπτρον [ ]

] αδιοϰ  
]. [

...

**1** “de κρατέω vel κεράννυμι cogitaveris e.g”. Ucciardello : ]κε κρατ[, ] κε κρατ[ possis || **3** δ[ιὰ] dispexi | τοῦ Ucciardello || **4** οὔ̃ dispexi : ϰι Ucciardello | ἀλλκ[ Ucciardello : Ἀλλκ[μάνναϰ νιῶ̃ Di Giuseppe : Ἀλλκ[αῖ̃δαι Vecchiato : ἀλλκ[ιμ- Perale || **5** “ὄν τειν[ο]ν[τ-, τείν[ε]ι [, ὄντιν[α] (ει pro ι exaratum?)” Ucciardello || **6** πον vel τὸν ut vid. | utrum υ (edd.) an > ambiguum || **7** χ[ρή] possis | ] μοῖραν dub. Lobel, obl. Ucciardello | δατεῖϰ[θαι dub. Ucciardello || **12** δ[οκεῖ γάρ Lobel : δ[ῆλον γάρ possis, vel δ[ῆλόν / (= ἔστιν) || **13** κλά[γξαι Lobel : κλά[ζειν possis || **14-15** τ[ινος κρούσαν]τοϰ Lobel : an τ[ούτου εἰσιόν]τοϰ, ἐλθόν]τοϰ ? || **15** fin. ἡ θύρα Ucciardello : τὴν θύραν, ὁ θεός, sim. malim || **17** οὐ τὸ [ρίγοῦντ] ι e.g. Ucciardello | fin. supplevi || **17-18** “a comment of the tenor τὸ φρίσσοντι δύναται ἀντὶ τοῦ φρίσσειν ποιούντι” Lobel : vel ἰσοδυνα|μεῖ τῶι Ucciardello : -μεῖν malim || **19** π[οιηταῖ] vel π[ολλοί] Lobel || **22** Ἀρτέμιδ(οϰ) Ucciardello || **23** οὔ̃τ]ωϰ Vecchiato | ϰτῶμ[α(-) Condello : ϰτῆφρα[ Meliadiò || **24** διὰ κῶμου]ϰ e.g. Ucciardello : βῶμοῦ]ϰ possis || **25** κύρ[ιον] Condello

## 1 Poem A: Praising Pigres

Poem A is concerned with an individual called Pigres (i.4, 13, probably 16-17, quite possibly also 21). We must be dealing with a praise poem, an inference strengthened by ἐγκωμίωιϰ at i.10 and a likely part of ἐγκωμιάζω at i.6-7. ἐπαι]νήςϰαϰ (Perale) is a possibility at i.4 and ἐπαι]νοῦμένου (Meliadiò) is attractive at i.14. As Ucciardello remarks, τὰϰ ἀρετάϰ (i.8) is also telling.<sup>16</sup> The passage glossed in col. i (the length of which is unknown: commentators did not pore over every sentence, and this papyrus may not preserve the complete text of the commentary) must have included some self-reference on the part of the *persona loquens*. The smoking gun is the first person ἐποίηϰα at i.5, which must come from a paraphrase of the text; ὕμν[οιϰ (i.20) and γλυκυφω]ν- (i.21) are also suggestive. The interplay of first and third person at i.4-6 suggests that the poet was talking about this Pigres without addressing him, at least in this part of the poem. This allows (but does not require) him to be the subject of the third-person verbs quoted at i.7, 12.

**i.1-2** The identical ending and the similar context suggest a repeated occurrence of the same form at the beginning of these two lines. The first half of the verb is missing, but there is little doubt that Lo-

<sup>16</sup> Ucciardello 2001, 94-5.

bel was right to guess διέσταλται.<sup>17</sup> διατέλλω it is, then. In a context such as ours, the verb can have one of two meanings: ‘distinguish’ or ‘punctuate’. Lobel argued for the first: “In the sense of ‘punctuate’ διατέλλειν and equivalent words and phrases are construed with an assortment of prepositions, ἐπί, ἐν, εἰς, κατά, μετά, μέχρι, or with none at all, but not, that I have observed, with πρός”.<sup>18</sup> The very variety of prepositions speaks against the assumption that πρός is just the one that cannot be so used, but there is a weightier argument: as far as I can tell, the sense ‘punctuate’ is never expressed by the perfect tense. In a grammatical context, διέσταλται is a technical term for a distinction in sense. Condello is right that the occurrence in two consecutive lines may rather suggest diverging opinions on how to punctuate the passage,<sup>19</sup> but while *differentiae uerborum* commonly consist of pairs, triplets are attested too (Ammon. *Diff.* 3, 92, 113 (+) Nickau; cf. schol. *Il.* 24.229a Erbse).

The commentator, then, may be pointing out that the sense of a certain word in the text is different from another and also from a third (with the usual τό introducing the quotation). It may be a clarification of the meaning of one word or phrase, forestalling a misunderstanding based on ambiguity (e.g. schol. *Il.* 1.214a1, 2.605, 5.479b (+) Erbse) or flawed synonymy (e.g. schol. *Il.* 2.819 *ap. P.Oxy.* VIII 1086, 115), but equally it could be a non-obvious difference in meaning between the several words used by the poet, implicitly forestalling a charge of redundancy against him (e.g. Ammon. *Diff.* 451 Nickau (on Thuc. 1.44.1); schol. *Il.* 4.540, 8.340b, 13.288a (+) Erbse; schol. Aeschin. 3.311a Dilts).<sup>20</sup>

**i.4-7** The speaker discusses his own role in praising Pigres.<sup>21</sup> ἐποίησα – a verb not hitherto attested in ‘choral’ lyric – must be the commentator’s paraphrase of a different expression used by the poet. Lobel suggests ἔθηκα, comparing schol. Pind. *Ol.* 7.10a-b, 8.21 Drachmann;<sup>22</sup> at least one alternative comes to mind that has a similar range of meanings and is sometimes glossed with the same verb, viz. ἔτευξα (cf. schol. *Od.* 1.277c1 Pontani; schol. Aesch. *Sept.* 835b

**17** Lobel 1967, 135. Condello 2002, 395 remarks that “non sarebbe da escludere nemmeno l’antonimo συνέσταλται”, without specifying what sense of the verb would suit our context.

**18** Lobel 1967, 135.

**19** Condello 2002, 395.

**20** So Ucciardello 2001, 92, who marks ε... [ as a lemma.

**21** Condello 2002, 396-7 cautions that the person praised need not be Pigres. He is right to the extent that the identification is not certain: the occurrences of ἐπαινέω with reference to Pigres at i.4, 14 are conjectural, and indeed they stem from the assumption that he is the *laudandus*. Still, the repeated occurrence of the name – and of no other discernible name – in a patently encomiastic context makes such a supposition attractive.

**22** Lobel 1967, 135.

Smith; schol. Soph. *Phil.* 1189 Papageorgius; etc.). Ucciardello suggests that the referent is poetic composition, citing Pind. *Ol.* 3.8 ἐπέων τε θέειν with schol. 14a Drachmann τὴν ποίησιν ἐπέων θέειν εἶπεν,<sup>23</sup> but the verb may just as well be used in the sense ‘make’ ‘cause to be’, as in the two examples cited by Lobel, with Pigres as the object and an accusative in ἴν as its predicative complement. Nor can we be certain of a word-for-word correspondence between text and paraphrase: scholia often gloss one verb with a periphrasis involving a form of ποιέω (e.g. schol. *Od.* 4.582a Pontani στήσα ~ σταθῆναι ἐποίησα; schol. *Ar. Eq.* 774 Jones ἀπέδειξα ~ φανερά ἐποίησα; schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.139c ἀγάλλων ~ ποιῶν ἀγάλλεσθαι, 7.15 ἰλάσκομαι ~ ἰλαροὺς ποιῶ; and ii.13-14, 17-18 in this very papyrus).

The poet could be claiming that, by praising (ἐπαίησας i.4) Pigres, he has made him - famous, honoured, enviable...? - with his song, and in the same breath denying that he has praised him untruthfully. Pindar time and again asserts the truthfulness of his praise (*Ol.* 2.92, 6.89-90, *Nem.* 7.63, etc.) and the assertion occasionally takes a negative formulation (*Ol.* 4.17-18 οὐ ψεύδει τέγξω λόγον, 13.50-52 γαρύων [...] οὐ ψεύσομ', *Nem.* 1.18 οὐ ψεύδει βαλῶν, etc.); the same is true of Bacchylides (8.20-21, 9.85, 11.26-27, etc.).<sup>24</sup> ἐγκ[ω- at the end of i.6 must be a reference to praise poetry; the adverb ψευδῶς suggests the verb rather than the noun. We are probably still with the commentator as he paraphrases the passage: the adjective ἐγκώμιον in a generic sense first occurs in Pindar (*Hes. Op.* 344, from κώμη rather than κῶμος, is irrelevant), but the verb ἐγκωμιάζω is not recorded before Herodotus (5.5.5) and it is an unlikely candidate for a lyric passage. The truthfulness of praise, however expressed, is also the topic of i.8. What the relation is between that passage and this one is uncertain; ἰ. εἶον φέροι κεν must belong to the poet's words, but it may have been a quotation (cf. ii.4-5, 7, 13, 15) rather than a new lemma.

**i.5** If I am right that the line ends here, the rules of syllabification require that the letter following c be a vowel, and the traces suggest a short upright: η, ι? The phrase κατὰ σημασίαν (‘semantically’) occurs often in the grammarians, but I am not sure of its relevance to this passage.

**i.7** Of the first letter, a trace at the bottom left and one at the top right, suggesting c but compatible with much else too. The next letter had a rounded shape. What might the anonymous subject ‘carry’? Something ‘divine’, θεῖον (Ucciardello), perhaps related to the poet's song (cf. the Homeric formula θεῖος ἀοιδός and the ‘divine dancing-place’ of *Od.* 8.264)? The ‘prize of honour’, πρεῖςβεῖον (*Il.*

**23** Ucciardello 2001, 95 fn. 29.

**24** As so often, the repertory of motifs in Pavese 1997 is invaluable.



8.289  $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\eta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ , cf. Hsch.  $\pi$  3247 Hansen, schol. *Il.* 8.289 Erbse, etc.), or conversely ‘the last prize’,  $\lambda\omicron\iota\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$  (*Il.* 23.785  $\lambda\omicron\iota\iota\sigma\theta\eta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$  ἔκφερ’ ἄεθλον), evidently in a negative formulation? Pindar often uses the active of  $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$  in this way, see Slater s.v. The ‘last prize’ would resonate with the negativity of i.8  $\psi\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma$  and i.11  $\omicron\kappa\ \epsilon\upsilon\tau\upsilon\chi\eta\sigma$  (see also i.10 n., i.12-14 n.). After the quotation, the traces suggest  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron(c)$  or  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$  with the last letter in suspension, cf. ii.11  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron(\tilde{\upsilon})$ .

**i.10** I believe I can see a trace of a raised  $\upsilon$  above the  $\omicron$ , cf. ii.11. Given  $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$ , it seems that we are dealing with something being said ‘with reference to his songs of praise’, or even ‘against’ them (*LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v. B.I.1.c), rather than ‘in’ them, which would call for  $\epsilon\nu$ . The genitive  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$  can just as easily be objective (praise of Pigres) as subjective (the poet’s praise).

**i.12-14** “(The poet) says this to ... and at the same time towards the ...” The correlation ἅμα μὲν ... ἅμα δέ ... is well attested in prose since the fifth century (Hdt. 4.75, 8.113 (+); Thuc. 2.20.4, 3.115.4 (+); Antiph. 1.16; etc.).<sup>25</sup> The commentator’s use of  $\epsilon\iota\sigma$  in place of a second dative may suggest that the  $\delta\iota\alpha$ -, unlike  $\lambda\omicron\iota$ -, were an intended target of the poet’s statement without being directly addressed. The idea of *parlare a suocera perché nuora intenda* (to use an Italian idiom) crops up occasionally in the Pindar scholia: there is the bizarre case of schol. *Pyth.* 1.1a Drachmann, which takes the allocution to the “golden lyre” as a reminder to Hieron of the remuneration he had promised the poet; in schol. *Nem.* 4.60b Drachmann the poet is said to be taking a dig at Simonides while addressing himself ( $\delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\ \text{C}\mu\omega\nu\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\nu$ , cf. ii.3-5 n.).

Who are the  $\delta\iota\alpha$ ? One possibility, given the content of the preceding lines, is  $\delta\iota\alpha\lbracket\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\alpha\varsigma$ , ‘slanderers’. The commentator may have inferred from the poet’s ostensible self-defence (i.6, 8) that his truthfulness had been called into question. Similarly, the scholia disentangle the string of maxims about slander, deceit, flattery, and straight talk at Pind. *Pyth.* 2.73-88 by proffering an autobiographical interpretation involving Pindar having been slandered before his patron Hieron because of his closeness to a rival dynasty and therefore exculpating himself (schol. 132b, 142c, g Drachmann; cf. 132c-f, which detect a disparaging allusion to Bacchylides at vv. 72-73).<sup>26</sup> Otherwise, as Claudio Meliaddò suggests to me, the slanderers may have targeted Pigres, whom the poet defends. (In a praise poem the difference between these two things need not be very clear-cut.)

**i.17** If Ucciardello’s  $\pi\acute{\iota}\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu\ \omicron\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu$  hits the mark, we are reminded of the trope whereby countless roads, and/or roads everywhere, are

<sup>25</sup> Condello 2002, 396; Ucciardello 2001, 95-6, had spoken of “un lemma finora sfuggito all’identificazione”.

<sup>26</sup> See Bitto 2012, 69-70.

open to the poet's praise (Pind. *Nem.* 6.45-46 πλατεῖαι παντόθεν λογιόειν ἐντὶ πρόσοδοι to praise Aegina, *Isthm.* 4.1-3 ἔστι μοι [...] μυρία πανταῖ κέλευθος [...] ὑμετέρας ἀρετὰς ὕμνωι διώκειν, 6.22-23 μυρία δ' ἔργων καλῶν τέττανθ' ἐκατόμπεδοι ἐν σχερῶι κέλευθοι from the Nile's springs to the Hyperboreans; Bacchyl. 5.31-33 καὶ ἔμοι μυρία πάντα κέλευθος | ὑμετέραν ἀρετάν | ὑμνεῖν).<sup>27</sup> Perhaps closest to our passage is *Pae.* 4.6 κατὰ πάσαν ὁδόν, in a fragmentary but clearly metapoetic context;<sup>28</sup> cf. *Nem.* 5.2-3, where the song is told to travel ἐπὶ πάσας ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτωι.

**i.18-20** In the Pindar scholia *τουτέστι* often introduces, not an immediate explanation of the text, but a further elucidation of something already explained, when the commentator first paraphrases the poet's words on a literal level and then explains the referent of an image, or the like: e.g. *Ol.* 1.20i Drachmann "ἀώτῳι" δὲ τῆς ὠιδῆς ἄνθει, *τουτέστιν* ἐν ταῖς ὠιδαῖς, 2.107 "κατὰ γᾶς" ὑπὸ γῆς, *τουτέστι* καθ' Ἄιδου, 8.28a-b ἐν τῇ Αἰγίνῃ ἀκκεῖται ἡ Θέμις ἡ τοῦ Ξενίου Διὸς πάρεδρος· *τουτέστι* φιλόξενοί εἰσιν, etc. The article *τοῖς* also suggests locating ἄνθει in the commentator's paraphrase, whether or not the same form was also used by the poet; the commentator then goes on to note that these 'flowers' stand for songs, ὕμνοις. The image is of a very common sort: beside *Ol.* 1.15 μουσικᾶς ἐν ἀώτῳι just quoted, see *Ol.* 6.105 ἐμῶν [...] ὕμνων [...] εὐτερπέεσ ἄνθος, 9.48-49 ἄνθεα [...] ὕμνων | νεωτέρων, *Pyth.* 10.53 ἐγκωμίων [...] ἄωτος ὕμνων (+); Bacchyl. 15.8-9 παρηόνων | ἄνθεα, fr. 4.63 Maehler μελιγλώσσων ἀοιδᾶν ἄνθεα.

**ii.3-5** "At the end he introduces [...] whom he mentions in passing by saying 'I send *charis* (to?) Alk...' (αλκ[ - - | π]έμπω χάριν): for he is the one to whom (the poet) alludes". For *τείνω* εἰς + accusative used in this sense cf. schol. Pind. *Ol.* 2.173f, 8.30c, 13.32b Drachmann, etc.; with a person as the target of the allusion, schol. *Nem.* 3.143, 4.60b, 11.55 Drachmann, etc. I have not found other examples of *διὰ τοῦ τελευταίου* with the adjective used substantively (τῶν ἐπέων, Gal. *Comp. med.* XIII p. 273 Kühn; *κτίχου*, Origen. in *Ps.* 150.3-5 II p. 363 Pitra), but what else can it mean?

The third letter of the quotation at ii.4 is likely to be κ, which suggests one of the several man's names that begins with Alk- (Peralé; the masculine gender is guaranteed by οὔτοσ in the next line). Yet there is no certainty that αλκ[ represents our man's actual name, especially because *τείνω* εἰς normally denotes an oblique allusion, not an explicit mention. One could think of Ἀλκ[αῖδα (Vecchiato) or indeed of Ἀλκ[μῆνας υἱὼι (Di Giuseppe), which would about fill the remaining space to the right. (If that line of thought is correct, it may become relevant that τὸ[ν Ἡρακλῆ would fill the end of ii.3.) But the

<sup>27</sup> See Pavese 1997, 280.

<sup>28</sup> See Sitzler 1911, 699.

reference need not have been to a hero: an ordinary human being could have been the son of somebody called Alk[; he may have been qualified as ἄλκιμος (Perale); or his own name may have been ennobled with periphrastic ἄλκά, a variation on the Homeric βία (cf. Pind. *Nem.* 3.38 χαλκότοξον Ἀμαζόνων [...] ἄλκάν, *Isthm.* 4.35b Αἴαντος ἄλκάν φοίνιον, cf. *Pae.* 21.9 ἄλκάν Ἀχελώϊου) – a remarkable but perhaps not impossible way to refer to a contemporary mortal.

In any case, it seems that towards the end of the poem the poet introduced a further character with a passing reference. This practice is most readily associated with the praise of an athlete's trainer at the end of an epinician (Pind. *Nem.* 4, 5, 6; *Isthm.* 4, 5), but there are other, perhaps more relevant examples: Pind. *Pyth.* 10.69-72 (the *laudandus'* brothers), *Nem.* 5.41-54 (two relatives of the *laudandus* as well as his trainer), *Isthm.* 6.66-75 (father), Bacchyl. 13.221-231 (father), and perhaps Pind. *Pyth.* 11.59-64 (Iolaos and the Dioscuri, with an intriguing emphasis on being ὑμνητόν).

**ii.6** The first letter of the line resembles π more than it does τ. The reading προν, however, leaves what seems to be a small speck of ink unaccounted for on the right. If that is illusory and προν stands, it raises the prospect of τὸν λοιπὸν λόγον “the rest of his discourse”, with τείνω used transitively. The collocation τείνω τὸν λόγον is uncommon (normally it is the λόγος, if not the author or some such, that τείνει, intransitively, in some direction), but cf. Pl. *Phd.* 63a (εἰς ἐε); schol. Thom. Pind. *Ol.* 5.48-57 Abel (πρὸς τὸν Δία).

After λόγον, all editors read υ: wrong, clearly, but not deleted by the scribe. Yet it does not look quite like his other υs, and one wonders whether it might be something different. It looks like a *diple* (>), which however is a marginal sign. A first-century BC *hypomnema* to Book 2 of the *Iliad*, P.Oxy. VIII 1086, incorporates the *diple* in the commentary to introduce some lemmata, whose explanation then begins τὸ σημεῖον (οἱ ἢ διπλῆ) ὅτι (27, 54, 97, 114; lost in lacuna at 82, 107, perhaps 11).<sup>29</sup> We cannot be sure on internal grounds whether οὔτως κτλ. are prose or the beginning of the poetic quotation that takes up the next line, but there is certainly no explanation after it, which excludes a lemma. The verse may rather have been a quotation made to support the commentator's earlier point (see ii.7 n.), but in that case the *diple* is problematic. A series of marginal *diploi* is used to mark lemmata in a second-century AD *hypomnema* to the *Theaetetus*, P.Berol. inv. 9782, and (doubled) the Stesichorean quotation in P.Oxy. XVII 2102 of the *Phaedrus*, col. ii.21-25 (243a-b: PMGF 102 = fr. 91a Finglass), also from the second century AD; the sign would go on to become a mark of scriptural quotations in manuscripts with Chris-

<sup>29</sup> Hunt 1911, 78; see also Lundon 1997, 20-2. Compare the *obeloi* prefixed to vv. 791-3, 795 at col. ii.61-63, followed by ἀθετεῖ τούτους Ἀρίσταρχος ὅτι κτλ.

tian content.<sup>30</sup> Yet our scribe uses indentation, not a *diple*, to mark lemmata; the seemingly non-lemmatic quotation at ii.4-5 is likewise indented, not introduced by a *diple*; and the sign in our papyrus is not marginal anyway. I still suspect that we are dealing with a *diple* marking the beginning of the quotation, rather than with a stray υ, but my case falls short of proof.

ii.7 In such close proximity to ἐταίρωι and to a part of δατέομαι – probably the present infinitive δατεῖσθαι (Ucciardello) – the likeliest articulation is λαῖαc ‘booty’, cf. Pind. *Ol.* 10.44 λαῖαν (Ahrens’ correction for the mss’ λαίαν). Given the Doric form, these words must be a poetic quotation. Since no explanation follows, it was probably quoted by the commentator in support of the point made in the preceding section. “On the basis of the certain letters I should have guessed μοῖραν ἐταίρωι λάιαc δατεῖσθ-, but λα would have been written with an inordinately elongated α and I do not think the present appearance of the ink could have resulted from μο however damaged” (Lobel); “[μο]ῖραν vestigiis non convenit” (Ucciardello).<sup>31</sup> I would not put inordinate elongation past our scribe, and perhaps μο can be made out after all (for the diminutive ο cf. for instance the two at i.7). At any rate I am unable to propose a better reading: the traces allow [βλ]ᾶβαc, but how to construe it?

If Lobel reads rightly, the poet may have introduced a further character at the end of the poem (see ii.3-5 *n.*) by paralleling the situation where a companion who shared in a heroic deed receives a share of the booty afterwards: similarly, perhaps, this character may have deserved a share of the poet’s praise, or of his gratitude (the two likeliest sense of ii.5 χάριν in this context: Slater s.v. 1.b.I, c.II). Henry Spelman reminds me of a parallel passage in Pind. *Ol.* 10.16-19:

πύκταc  
δ’ ἐν Ὀλυμπιάδι νικῶν Ἴλαι φερέτω χάριν  
Ἀγησιδάμοc, ὥc Ἀχιλεῖ Πάτροκλοc.

I observe that the traces of the first letter and the width of the lacuna to follow are compatible (though no more than that) with χ[ρή], and that the resulting construction could easily be made to cohere with οὔτωc τυχόντα in the previous line, perhaps to be taken in the sense “one who has attained such good fortune” (Slater s.v. “τυγχάνω” b).

<sup>30</sup> See McGurk 1961, esp. 3-5 (but most of the papyrological *diplai* he cites are not really *diplai* but *diplai obelismenai*, a different sign with a different function); Turner-Parsons, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup>, 14-15 and fn. 76.

<sup>31</sup> Lobel 1967, 136; Ucciardello 2001, 94.

## 2 Poem B: The God at the Door

Poem B, which opened with a (?self-)reference to choruses (i.9), describes in seemingly vivid detail the epiphany of a god (ii.12): probably Apollo, given the references to the Istros (ii.20, 23) and to Artemis (ii.22).<sup>32</sup> His arrival has caused the door-latch to make a noise (ii.10-15), which is perhaps what alerts the *persona loquens* to his presence. The occasion might have been the god's return from the land of the Hyperboreans, as suggested by the wintry cold (ii.16-19) and, again, by the northerly river Istros.<sup>33</sup> A divine epiphany manifested by a supernatural intervention on a door (most frequently its spontaneous opening) is well attested in Greek literature.<sup>34</sup> A particularly close parallel is the celebrated 'mimetic' opening of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*,<sup>35</sup> even though the details are (predictably) hard to match with precision:

Οἶον ὁ τῶπόλλωνος ἐεείατο δάφνινος ὄρπηξ,  
οἷα δ' ὄλον τὸ μέλαθρον· ἐκάς ἐκάς ὅστις ἀλιτρος.  
καὶ δὴ πού τὰ θύρετρα καλῶι ποδι Φοῖβος ἀράσσει·  
οὐχ ὀράσαι; ἐπένευεν ὁ Δῆλιος ἡδύ τι φοῖνιξ  
ἔξαπίνη, ὁ δὲ κύκνος ἐν ἡέρι καλὸν αἰίδει. 5  
αὐτοὶ νῦν κατοχῆς ἀνακλίνασθε πυλάων,  
αὐταὶ δὲ κληῖδες· ὁ γὰρ θεὸς οὐκέτι μακρῆν·  
οἱ δὲ νέοι μολπήν τε καὶ ἐς χορὸν ἐντύνασθε.

"There survives no earlier example of such a mimetic presentation of an epiphany ritual", claimed Frederick Williams.<sup>36</sup> Yet Poem B is just such an example, and indeed, on the evidence of the small amount of text that survives, it may well have been Callimachus' model.

**ii.10-14** "Here (the poet) is not saying ... κλάγξεν of the ἐπίσπαστρον itself, as (if one said) 'the door made a noise', but of the god. (One must understand) that 'sounded' (κλάγξεν) is equivalent to 'caused to sound'. In other words: the subject of κλάγξεν is not the ἐπίσπαστρον but the god, and the verb is used transitively in a causative sense. If the pericope indicated at ii.9-10 comprised a single sentence, it may follow that it was also the god who 'called' (ii.10 ἀπύων). ἐπί in the

<sup>32</sup> Lobel 1967, 133.

<sup>33</sup> Snell 1968, after Lobel 1967, 137; a fuller discussion in Ucciardello 2001, 100-2.

<sup>34</sup> Weinreich 1929, 207-98; McKay 1967.

<sup>35</sup> Lobel 1967, 136; Ucciardello 2001, 99. On the opening of *Ap.* see Pasquali 1913, 148, 150-1, 153; Weinreich 1929, 229-36; Friedländer 1931, 35-6; and the commentary by Williams 1978, 15-23. On *Ap.* as "mimetische Gedicht" see also Albert 1988, 66-72; on the broader question of Callimachean hymnic mimesis, Harder 1992; on the *persona loquens* in *Ap.*, Petrovic 2012.

<sup>36</sup> Williams 1978, 15.

sense ‘referring to’ is common currency in the scholiastic jargon, as is the ‘irrational’ ἄν + optative (which we probably also find at ii.14, see *n.*).<sup>37</sup> Transitive κλάζω is attested both in lyric (Pind. *Pyth.* 4.23 ἔκλαγξε βροντάν, fr. 169a.34 Maehler πικρο[τά]τ[αν] κλάγεν ἄγγε[λία] γ; Bacchyl. 18.3-4 ἔκλαγε χαλκοκώδων | κάλπιδε πολεμῆϊαν αἰοιδάν) and elsewhere (one example for all: Aesch. *Ag.* 48 κλάζοντες Ἄρη), but in all those cases the accusative is more an internal object of the verb than a separate thing which the subject causes to resound.

It seems unlikely that so prosaic a word as ἐπίσπαστρον – a metal ring affixed to the door which doubled as knocker and handle<sup>38</sup> – was used in a cult song; its synonym ρόπτρον may be a better candidate, occurring as it does in Euripides (*Ion* 1612; also *Hipp.* 1172, in a different sense). In either case, a neuter noun may have facilitated the confusion between object and subject which the commentator apparently seeks to forestall. In so doing the commentator cites as a parallel a set phrase from New Comedy, ἐψόφη[ε]ν ἡ θύρα, whose several permutations are used when a character perceives another character’s impending entrance from the creak of the stage building’s door.<sup>39</sup> Perplexing though it was to previous editors, this parallel is remarkably suitable in terms of narrative context, of construction (since the verb can be either used intransitively, with the door as subject, or transitively, with the door as object), and of meaning, since ψόφος occurs as a gloss for κλαγγή elsewhere (*Apion Gloss. Hom.* D316, p. 243 Ludwich κλαγγή· ψόφος. ἢ φωνὴ ἄχημος).

**ii.14-15** The supplementation of these lines hinges on three uncertainties: (i) the meaning of ὑπακούω, (ii) the supplementation of τ[ - - ]τος, and (iii) the construction of the latter relative to the former. For (i) we have three options: (a) ‘infer’, ‘supply’ something unstated (the ordinary sense of the verb in scholia and similar texts); (b) ‘listen’, ‘heed’; or, more specifically, (c) ‘answer’ the door (*LSJ*<sup>9</sup> s.v. II.1). (b) seems out of place. Between the other two, Lobel inclined for (c): “Though I cannot follow the logic, the likeliest guess based on what remains seems to be καθ’ ὃν τρόπον ὑπακούοιμεν ἄν τινος κρούσαντος, ‘as we should answer the door when someone knocked’, or something not very far from this. Taking ὑπακούσαι- in the sense most commonly found in commentaries, ‘understand, supply (the sense)’, I can make no progress”. The problem is precisely “the logic”, or rather its absence: what has his reconstruction to do with the

<sup>37</sup> Dickey 2007, 116 (confusion in the use of moods and of ἄν), 118 (ἐπι).

<sup>38</sup> Lobel 1967, 136.

<sup>39</sup> Ucciardello 2001, 100 and fn. 52. On the correct interpretation of this comic trope (where the verb is normally present or perfect, never aorist, and more frequently transitive than intransitive) see Bader 1971; further reflections on its significance in Melandri 2007.

sense of what precedes? So we may have to go back to the ordinary scholiastic meaning after all.

Lobel correctly intuited (ii) that ]τοϰ is the end of a participle, of which τ[ is the subject, and (iii) that together they make a genitive absolute. But, with ‘scholiastic’ ὑπακούω, the conditional construction he envisages is out of the question; ἄν + optative will have to be of the ‘irrational’ kind already at ii.10 (see *n.*). ‘Scholiastic’ ὑπακούω takes the accusative of the word to be inferred, often with τό by way of inverted commas, so here too the phrase beckons to be taken as a quotation of sorts: “as we would supply ‘when ...’/‘because...’”. So who is doing what? Lobel’s τ[ινος is possible, but so is τ[οῦ θεοῦ or (better) τ[ούτου, referring to “the god” mentioned at ii.12. As for the action, Lobel surmises that the subject could be knocking; but if one hears the knock of a knocker, it is not a noteworthy inference that someone must be knocking. Rather, the parallel with the comic situation of ἐψόφη[ε]ν ἡ θύρα (see ii.10-14 *n.*) may suggest that the inference being made is that of the god’s arrival (ἐλθόν]τοϰ?) or perhaps entrance (εἰσιόν]τοϰ?). Yet at least some ancient readers thought that those comic passages indicated an intentional knocking to warn passers-by of one’s impending exit from the stage building,<sup>40</sup> and this may be the interpretation that our commentator had in mind.

**ii.15** The commentator does not argue it explicitly, at least in the text as transmitted by this fragment, but his paraphrase makes clear that he understands the poet’s δέ as equivalent to γάρ. The concept of ὁ δε ἀντὶ τοῦ γάρ is widespread among ancient grammarians:<sup>41</sup> schol. *Il.* 1.123-124, 200, 2.122b (+) Erbse; schol. Hes. *Theog.* 713a Di Gregorio; schol. Pind. *Ol.* 2.106a, 4.34b-c, 6.4b-c (+) Drachmann; etc. The omission of the explanation may be a further hint that our papyrus is only a selection from a longer work (see already the prosaic ἐπίπαστρον at ii.10-14 *n.*). It seems, then, that the god’s auditory epiphany was construed as the grounds for something: perhaps for the speaker’s realisation of the god’s arrival, or for the need to celebrate “much, with choruses” with which the poem opened (i.9), cf. Pind. fr. 94b.1-3 Maehler:

⊃ ♂ - ∪ ∪ ]χρυσοπ[επλ ♂ - ∪ ∪ -  
... ]δωμ[... ]λέχητ[... ]μῆ [ - ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪  
ἦκε]ι γὰρ ὁ [Λοξ]ίας,

and especially Call. *Ap.* 1-16, as already mentioned. But we do not know how selective our commentator and our scribe were, so the distance from the quoted *incipit* may have been considerable.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>40</sup> Evidence in Bader 1971, 37 and fn. 4.

<sup>41</sup> And not only: see Denniston, *GP*<sup>2</sup> s.v. “δέ” I.C.1.i.

<sup>42</sup> So Condello 2002, 396, *contra* Ucciardello 2001, 99.

**ii.16-19** Again (πάλιν) an example of the same usage as we found in κλάγξεν.<sup>43</sup> Now it is φρίσσω's turn to be used to mean 'cause to shiver'; Lobel aptly parallels schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 4.144 Drachmann "φρίσσοντασ ὄμβρουσ" οὐκ αὐτοὺσ φρίσσοντασ, ἀλλὰ φρίσσειν ποιοῦντασ.<sup>44</sup> For the reconstruction of the poetic quotation, I am less sceptical than he about his own suggestion χειμῶ[νι φρίσσο]γτι βλαβείς. As he admits, φρίσσο]γτι is unavoidable, and the letters would not have to be very squeezed together for the entire supplement to fit in the lacuna. Our scribe's hand is hardly a regular one, and some letters can vary significantly in width, ν being one of them. Causative φρίσσω is a Pindaric hobby-horse: beside *Pyth.* 4.81 φρίσσοντασ ὄμβρουσ there is fr. 94b.17-18 χειμῶνοσ κθένει | φρίσσων βορέασ and perhaps *Nem.* 10.74 μιν [...] ἄσθματι φρίσσοντασ πνοάσ.<sup>45</sup> If this is Apollo returning from the land of the Hyperboreans, as the context suggests, he will *not* have been "harmed by the winter that makes one shiver";<sup>46</sup> the negative was irrelevant to the commentator's point, and therefore omitted. Presumably the construction ascribed to "Pindar and also other poets" (or "many others") is the transitive use of a normally intransitive verb, rather than of φρίσσω specifically.<sup>47</sup>

**ii.23** Ucciardello suggests διὰ κώμου]c, which is attractive. Alternatively, διὰ βωμό]c: our increasingly rushed scribe had already used the very similar cursive β at ii.16, and altars would not be out of place in a devotional song.

## Bibliography

- Albert, W. (1988). *Das mimetische Gedicht in der Antike. Geschichte und Typologie von den Anfängen bis in die augusteische Zeit.* Frankfurt am Main.
- Bader, B. (1971). "The Ψόφος of the House-Door in Greek New Comedy". *Antichthon*, 5, 35-48.
- Barron, J.P. (1984). "Ibycus: Gorgias and Other Poems". *BICS*, 31, 13-24.
- Bitto, G. (2012). *Lyrik als Philologie: zur Rezeption hellenistischer Pindarkommen-tierung in den Oden des Horaz, mit einer rhetorisch-literarkritischen Analyse der Pindarscholien.* Rahden.
- Cannatà Fera, M. (2003). "Pindaro in Trifiodoro". Benedetti, F.; Grandolini, S. (a cura di), *Studi in memoria di Aristide Colonna*, vol. 1. Napoli, 193-8.

<sup>43</sup> Lobel 1967, 137; Ucciardello 2001, 100.

<sup>44</sup> Lobel 1967, 136-7.

<sup>45</sup> Lobel 1967, 137; Henry 2005, 114 (but in *Nem.* 10 πνοάσ could also be accusative of respect).

<sup>46</sup> For the dative of the agent with a passive participle see Hummel 1993, 130.

<sup>47</sup> Ucciardello 2001, 100. Differently Lobel 1967, 137.



- Condello, F. (2002). Review of *I lirici greci: forme della comunicazione e storia del testo = Atti dell'incontro di studi* (Messina, 5-6 novembre 1999). A cura di M. Cannatà Fera e G.B. D'Alessio. Messina: Di.Sc.A.M, 2001. *Eikasmos*, 13, 390-401.
- D'Alessio, G.B. (2000). "Tra gli dèi ad Apollo, e tra gli uomini ad Echecrate": P. Louvre E 7734+7733 (Pind. fr. dub. 333 S.-M.)". Cannatà Fera, M.; Grandolini, S. (a cura di), *Poesia e religione in Grecia. Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera*, vol. 1. Napoli, 233-62.
- Del Fabbro, M. (1979). "Il commentario nella tradizione papiracea". *StudPap*, 18(2), 69-132.
- Dickey, E. (2007). *Ancient Greek Scholarship. A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. New York.
- Friedländer, P. (1931). "Vorklassisch und Nachklassisch". Jaeger, W. (Hrsg.), *Das Problem des Klassischen und die Antike = Acht Vorträge gehalten auf der Fachtagung der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft zu Naumburg 1930*. Leipzig; Berlin, 33-46.
- Gentili, B.; Bernardini, P.A.; Cingano, E.; Giannini, P. (1995). *Pindaro. Le Pitiche*. Milano.
- Harder, M.A. (1992). "Insubstantial Voices: Some Observations on the Hymns of Callimachus". *CQ*, 42(2), 384-94.
- Henry, W.B. (2005). *Pindar's Nemean. A Selection*. München; Leipzig.
- Hummel, P. (1993). *La syntaxe de Pindare*. Louvain; Paris.
- Hunt, A.S. (1911). "1086. Scholia on Iliad ii". *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 8, 77-99.
- Kannicht, R. (1969). *Euripides. Helena*. 2 Bde. Heidelberg.
- Lobel, E. (1967). "2636. Commentary on Choral Lyric". *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, 32, 133-7.
- Lundon, J. (1997). *Per una nuova edizione del POxy 1086* [tesi di dottorato]. Università degli Studi di Salerno.
- McGurk, P. (1961). "Citation Marks in Early Latin Manuscripts (with a List of Citation Marks in Manuscripts Earlier than A.D. 800 in English and Irish Libraries)". *Scriptorium*, 15(1), 3-13.
- McKay, K.J. (1967). "Door Magic and the Epiphany Hymn". *CQ*, 17(2), 184-94.
- Melandri, E. (2007). "Il 'rumore' della porta all'uscita di un personaggio: sviluppo e valenza drammatica di uno stereotipo menandro". Pretagostini, R.; Dettori, E. (a cura di), *La cultura letteraria ellenistica. Persistenza, innovazione, trasmissione = Atti del convegno COFIN 2003* (Università di Roma "Tor Vergata", 19-21 settembre 2005). Roma, 3-24.
- Page, D. (1970). "Fragments of Greek Lyrical Poetry: P. Oxy. 2637". *PCPhS*, 16, 91-6.
- Pasquali, G. (1913). *Quaestiones Callimacheae*. Göttingae.
- Pavese, C.O. (1997). *I temi e i motivi della lirica corale ellenica*. Pisa; Roma.
- Petrovic, I. (2012). "Callimachus and Contemporary Religion: The Hymn to Apollo". Harder, A.; Regtuit, R.F.; Wakker, G.C. (eds), *Gods and Religion in Hellenistic Poetry*. Groningen, 281-306.
- Sevieri, R. (1997). "Un canto sul far della sera. Autoreferenzialità e mimesi culturale nella Pitica XI di Pindaro per Trasideo di Tebe". *Aevum(Ant)*, 10, 83-100.
- Sitzler, J. (1911). "Zum vierten Pään Pindars". *Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie*, 28(25), 698-702.
- Snell, B. (1968). Review of Lobel 1967. *Gnomon*, 40(2), 116-23.
- Treu, M. (1968-69). "Sizilische Mythologie bei Simonides (P. Ox. 2637)". *Kokalos*, 14-15, 428-38.

- Ucciardello, G. (2001). "POxy. XXXII 2636: commentario a Pindaro o a Ibico?". Cannatà Fera, M.; D'Alessio, G.B. (a cura di), *I lirici greci: forme della comunicazione e storia del testo = Atti dell'incontro di studi* (Messina, 5-6 novembre 1999). Messina, 87-116.
- Ucciardello, G. (2005). "Sulla tradizione del testo di Ibico". Grandolini, S. (a cura di), *Lirica e teatro in Grecia. Il testo e la sua ricezione = Atti del II Incontro di Studi* (Perugia, 23-24 gennaio 2003). Napoli, 21-88.
- Ucciardello, G. (2007). "A Single Scribe in P. Oxy. IV 660 + P. Oxy. XXIII 2623 + PSI inv. 1907 (Choral Lyric: Simonides?)". *ZPE*, 160, 4-14.
- Uebel, F. (1976). "Literarische Texte unter Ausschluss der Christlichen". *APF*, 24-25, 191-251.
- Weinreich, O. (1929). "Türoffnung im Wunder-, Prodigien- und Zauberglauben der Antike, des Judentums und Christentums". *Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft*, 5, 200-464. Reprinted in *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*, Darmstadt, 1968, 38-298.
- Williams, F. (1978). *Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo. A Commentary*. Oxford.