

ENRICO EMANUELE PRODI

*P.OXY.* 2448 (PI. FR. 215 SN.–M.) AND PINDAR'S *PROSODIA*

aus: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 185 (2013) 53–59

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



*P.Oxy.* 2448 (PI. FR. 215 Sn.–M.) AND PINDAR'S *PROSODIA*\*

I. *P.Oxy.* 2448: unrecognised fragments of Pindar's *Prosodia*?

*P.Oxy.* 2448 (MP<sup>3</sup> 1377), first published by Edgar Lobel, is securely identified as a book of Pindar by the coincidence of fr. 1.2f. with a Pindaric quotation in Σ *h Il.* 2.400 p. I 270 Erbse and Artem. 4.2 p. 243 Pack, and (probably) of fr. 1.6f. with one in *P.Oxy.* 2449 ll. 4f.<sup>1</sup> The three largest groups of fragments are now found as fr. 215(a)–(c) Sn(ell)–M(aehler), the two largest as G10–G11 Rutherford.<sup>2</sup> None of the ancient sources involved specifies the book from which the lines are taken, and no consensus on the subject has yet been reached by modern scholars. Lobel rightly noted that “[t]he invocation of Apollo in fr. 1 and the allusion to Delphi in fr. 2 (a) makes the *Paeans* a reasonable first hypothesis”, but dismissed it on the ground that it was hard to reconcile with fr. 1.4.<sup>3</sup> Giambattista D’Alessio also supported ascription to the *Paeans*, while Ian Rutherford professed himself undecided between *Paeans* and *Partheneia*, the latter being suggested somewhat by the image of combing maidenly tresses at fr. 215(a).6f. Sn.–M.<sup>4</sup>

A further possibility that has not been noted so far, but which is borne out by the reference to Apollo at fr. 215(a).9 and to Delphi at (b).9–12, is the *Prosodia*. A special association of the genre with Apollo and Artemis is remarked by Poll. 1.38 Bethe and underlies Procl. *Chr.* 41 Severyns *ap. Phot. Bibl.* 139 p. 320a.24f. Bekker. Pindar composed for the cult of (presumably) both deities two odes later included in the *Prosodia*, fr. 89a Sn.–M. and *Pae.* 12 = G1 Rutherford. Also connected to Apolline cult are the theoric *prosodia* ascribed by Pausanias to Eumelus of Corinth and Pronomus of Thebes (*PMG* 696, 767 in Paus. 4.4.1 *etc.*, 9.12.5) and the epigraphically attested *prosodia* of Amphicles of Rheneia and Cleochares and Limenius of Athens (*Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 662, 450, 698c = *CA* pp. 149–59). Of these *prosodia*, Cleochares’ and Limenius’ were composed for performance at Delphi, while the others are either certainly (Eumelus’, Pronomus’, Amphicles’) or probably (Pindar’s) related to a Delian cult.<sup>5</sup> At this point in the evidence, it is only fair to say that no conclusion can be drawn concerning the generic identity of the poem(s) preserved by *P.Oxy.* 2448: if the three books mentioned above are not already sufficient, one can easily add the *Hymns*, the first of which may have been to Apollo, and possibly the *Hyporchemata*, which several ancient sources likewise connect with Apollo.<sup>6</sup>

It is possible nonetheless to explore a new line of argument which favours the *Prosodia*, based on two points. First, D’Alessio’s insight that fr. 86 of *P.Oxy.* 2442 (*‘Pae.’* 22(h) = Z23–Z24 Rutherford) belongs to the *Prosodia*, and specifically contributes to the title and first line of the composition for the *Aeginetans to Aeacus* (formerly *Pae.* 6.123–83 = D6.123–83 Rutherford) and the end of the ode that precedes it. Second, the hitherto unremarked fact that the scanty remains of that ode-end are metrically compatible with fr. 215(a).3–7 Sn.–M.

\* I wish to thank Daniela Colomo, Bruno Currie, Jürgen Hammerstaedt, Dirk Obbink, and Chris Pelling for fruitful discussion and feedback; any remaining mistakes are, of course, my own.

<sup>1</sup> Lobel 1961c. A high-resolution image of the papyrus (and of *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86, discussed below) can be found at [www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/POxy/](http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/POxy/) as well as in the *editio princeps*, pl. XIV.

<sup>2</sup> Rutherford 2001: 387–92.

<sup>3</sup> Lobel 1961c: 131. What exactly in fr. 1.4 should tell against a *paean* is nowhere made explicit, and remains rather mysterious (see also Rutherford 2001: 391).

<sup>4</sup> D’Alessio 1991: 115; Rutherford 2001: 389, 391f., rightly pointing out that the tag διθυρα[μβῶδες] (so Lobel 1961c: 133; possibly διθυρα[μβικόν] or the respective adverbs, cp. Σ *Pi. P.* 4.371 p. II 147 Drachmann, Eust. in *Il.* 23.863 p. IV 852 van der Valk, *etc.*) applied to fr. 1.6f. by *P.Oxy.* 2449 l. 6 has no bearing on the classification of the song.

<sup>5</sup> On the connexions between Apollo and *prosodia* see Grandolini 1991: 128–30, D’Alessio 1997: 29f., 2009a: 145–8 (with 137–45 on the *prosodion* attributed to Eumelus), Rutherford 2003: 714.

<sup>6</sup> The case for this attractive reading of the first *Hymn* (fr. 29–32, 33a, 33c–34, 35b–c Sn.–M., on which see generally D’Alessio 2005) is laid out in D’Alessio 2007: 111–15, 2009b: 140–4; on the *hyporcheme* as a song to Apollo see Men. *Rhet.* p. 331 Spengel, Io. Sardanias in Aphth. *Prog.* 21 p. 119 Rabe, Luc. *Salt.* 16, with Rutherford 2001: 100f.

The case for the former was made in a nutshell in D'Alessio's revision of the papyrus evidence for Pindar's *Prosodia*.<sup>7</sup> Under the heading of *P.Oxy.* 2442 are gathered the remains of what was probably a set of matching rolls containing (at least) the *Hymns*, the *Paeans*, and the *Prosodia*;<sup>8</sup> unless coincidence with an otherwise known portion of text occurs, each of its fragments can in principle belong to any of these genres. At *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86.6 Lobel rightly recognised a title, indented to the right and double-spaced away from both the preceding and the following line; the supplement Αἰγινή[τα] is all but unavoidable.<sup>9</sup> As for the following line, the first of the new poem and last of the fragment, Lobel suggested integrating the legible ] . . . ακ[ ("more probably the apex of a triangular letter followed by the top of ι than a single ν") with *I.* 9.1 κλεινός, Αἰακίου λόγος.<sup>10</sup> Bruno Snell rightly turned down Lobel's hypothesis (the preceding lines are certainly not the end of *I.* 8), later to counter-propose identification with fr. 242 Sn.–M. (*incerti libri*) ἄ μὲν πόλις, Αἰακιδῶν.<sup>11</sup> Conversely, D'Alessio suggested reading the first two traces as a single μ so as to fit *Pae.* 6.123 ὄνομα κλύτα γὰρ ἐκ Δωριεῖ, which, as *P.Oxy.* 841 testifies, was also preserved in the first book of the *Prosodia* with the title Αἰγ[ινήτα]ς | εἰ]ς Αἰα[κό]ν.<sup>12</sup> Snell and D'Alessio's conjectures suit the traces equally well from the strictly palaeographical point of view (*pace* Lobel), but the latter's finds greater support in (i) the coincidence with an attested rather than a conjectural title,<sup>13</sup> (ii) the coincidence with a line independently attested as the opening line of an ode, (iii) the resulting indentation of the title by the space of just under three letters (instead of Snell's nine), which is the same figure as can be plausibly reconstructed for 'Pae.' 18 on fr. 7 of the same papyrus, and (iv) the connexion with a fragment known to belong to a genre independently attested among the fragments of *P.Oxy.* 2442.<sup>14</sup> None of these elements is decisive, but their accumulation carries considerable weight; while the classification of *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86 among the *Prosodia* is not proven beyond question, it must be regarded as comparatively likely on the present state of the evidence.

The starting-point for the next step is *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86.3. Although the line-beginnings are not preserved in the fragment, the position of the title and the restoration of l. 7 (if identical to *Pae.* 6.123) entail that at most three, and rather more probably two, letters are missing before the vowel whose accent survives on the left edge of the papyrus at l. 3. This creates a strong presupposition that the line is a *colon* of only three syllables, either a cretic or, conceivably, a lone anapaestic foot (compare *Dith.* 4(e).6 λογιῶν). Such three-syllable *cola* are exceedingly rare: in his Alexandrian colometry, extant Pindar has at most five, the others being *Dith.* 2.14 cὺν κλόνωι (thus also l. 32 ματέ[ρ –]), *Dith.* 4(e).6 quoted above, possibly *Dith.* 4.43 τρα]τόρωι,<sup>15</sup> and most importantly fr. 215(a).5 Sn.–M. ἔστι μοι in our *P.Oxy.* 2488. In the latter example, the *coronis* partly preserved beside l. 6 (and therefore presumably centred under l. 7, whose left edge is lost) strongly suggests that the *colon* in question is the last but two of an epode, or possibly a monostrophic

<sup>7</sup> D'Alessio 1997: 37 n. 92.

<sup>8</sup> See Lobel 1961a: 31 with D'Alessio 1997: 35–7, 40f. Johnson 2004: 26 alternatively suggests one anthological roll, but I cannot help feeling that too many different poems are represented in the extant fragments (now with the necessary addition of *P.Oxy.* 5039) to make this particularly likely. For sets of matching rolls of lyric see e.g. *P.Oxy.* 2430 (Simonides), *P.Lit.Lond.* 46 (Bacchylides), and presumably the *sillybos* *P.Ant.* 21 Πίνδαρος ὄλοσ.

<sup>9</sup> Lobel 1961a: 67. The fragment was originally published by Hunt 1922: 33 as a part of *P.Oxy.* 1787 (Sappho), almost immediately reassigned to Pindar by Lobel 1922: 290, and re-edited together with the rest of *P.Oxy.* 2442 by Lobel 1961a: 67.

<sup>10</sup> Lobel 1922: 290, quotation from 1961a: 67.

<sup>11</sup> Snell 1938: 438 and in Maehler 1975<sup>4</sup>: 66, 142.

<sup>12</sup> See Rutherford 1997: 3–8, D'Alessio 1997: 27. Since *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86.1–5 certainly do not contain *Pae.* 6.118–22, attribution of the title and first line to the version of *Pae.* 6.123–83 transmitted in the *Paeans* is ruled out.

<sup>13</sup> That fr. 242 Sn.–M. comes from an Aeginetan ode is perhaps probable, but not strictly necessary: compare e.g. *O.* 13.109, a passing reference to Aegina in an ode for a Corinthian.

<sup>14</sup> See D'Alessio 1997: 35–7.

<sup>15</sup> The left margin is lost and all supplements are conjectural (this one belongs to Snell 1964<sup>3</sup>: 78), but the alignment is quite certain: Lobel 1961b: 89.

stanza.<sup>16</sup> In *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86, as we have seen, this *colon* is the last but two of a poem, and therefore – again – either of an epode or of a monostrophic stanza.

Given the rarity of such *cola*, to find two in precisely the same position does raise the question of possible responsion. The context in *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86 is too mutilated to confirm this hypothesis to any acceptable degree, but at least it nowhere contradicts it:

Fr. 215(a).3–7 Sn.–M.:

δ’ αἰνεῖ δίκων ἀνδρῶν ἔκλαστος.	-- ∪ ----- ∪   --	– E ×
ἕαρον, ᾧ τάν, μή [[με]] κερτόμ[ει	-- ∪ ----- ∪ ∪ [ – ( ∪ – ?)	e – E ?
ἔστι μοι	-- ∪ ×	e
πατρίδ’ ἀρχαίαν κτενὶ Πιερίδ[ων	-- ∪ ----- ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ [ –	e – D
ὦ]στε χαίταν παρθένου ξανθ[α ∪ --	-- ∪ ----- ∪ -- [ – ∪ --	E – e –

At l. 4, Franco Ferrari’s ἕαρον fits the traces considerably better than Snell’s γόϊον, Lobel’s χάϊον, or Athanasios Kambylis’ δάιον.<sup>17</sup> The *longum* that Ferrari recognises above α actually straddles both epsilon and alpha, implying synizesis (amply attested for ἐάω, but not so far in Pindar). Further on in the line the scribe deleted με with two suprascript dots, but the deletion cannot be accepted without destroying the metre.<sup>18</sup> The complete structure of ll. 6f. can be garnered from the responding fr. 215(b).7f. (*P.Oxy.* 2448 fr. 2(a).7f. + 3(a).2f.), where the line-ends survive.<sup>19</sup>

*P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86.1–5:

. . ]αθανα[	] × × × [
. . . ]ερασε[	] ∪ × × [
. . ] ’λον	] ∪ ×
. . . ]εδοιc [	] ∪ – [
. . ]αθεισεν[	] × – × [

The sheer amount of undeterminable quantities in the above scheme shows well how tenuous the metrical link between *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86 and fr. 215(a) Sn.–M. remains. Nonetheless, at least compatibility is certain, and the identical reciprocal position of a rare *colon* and triad- (or stanza-) end does suggest something more than an interesting but ultimately indecisive coincidence.

If both these arguments are accepted, it follows that fr. 215(a)–(b) Sn.–M. come from the same song as *Pae.* 22(h).1–5, one included in the first book of Pindar’s *Prosodia*: a sketch of the proposed reconstruction can be found below. This would make *P.Oxy.* 2448 another manuscript – the fifth identified to date – of that book. At all events, the *Prosodia* must at least be added to the list of possible classifications of *P.Oxy.* 2448.

Sn.–M.	Lobel	Rutherford	proposed reconstruction
fr. 215(a)	<i>P.Oxy.</i> 2448 fr. 1	G10	either end of an epode (1–7) and beginning of a strophe (8–14) or end and beginning of two monostrophic stanzas; may have preceded or followed fr. 215(b)
fr. 215(b) col. i?	<i>P.Oxy.</i> 2448 fr. 2(a)–(b), 3(a)–(b)	G11	either end of an epode (1–8) and beginning of a strophe (9–19) or end and beginning of two monostrophic stanzas; may have preceded or followed fr. 215(a)

<sup>16</sup> “Not a normal coronis” according to Lobel 1961c: 132, but in that place it can hardly be anything else: for the admittedly rather anomalous shape compare e.g. the upper stroke of the one that marks the beginning of B. 18 on *P.Lit.Lond.* 46 col. 7.

<sup>17</sup> Ferrari 1992: 230f., Snell 1962: 6, Lobel *per litteras* cited *ibid.*, Kambylis 1966: 240f.

<sup>18</sup> Snell 1962: 6, Rutherford 2001: 388.

<sup>19</sup> Responsion argued by D’Alessio 1991: 114 after Snell 1964<sup>3</sup>: 135 (Rutherford 2001: 391 is sceptical); the right margin is not visible beside fr. 215(b).8, thus in theory leaving space for continuation, but the verse seems complete as it stands. The relationship between *P.Oxy.* 2448 fr. 2(a) and 3(a) was plausibly suggested by Lobel 1961c: 135f.

fr. 215(b) col. ii?	<i>P.Oxy.</i> 2448 frr. 2(c)–(d)	–	vertical mutual position and horizontal relation to ‘col. i’ established by Lobel; may have preceded or followed it; if the former, may come from the preceding poem
<i>Pae.</i> 22(h)	<i>P.Oxy.</i> 2442 fr. 86	Z23–Z24	end of the poem (1–5) and title and first line of <i>Pae.</i> 6.123–83 = D6.123–83 Rutherford (6f.)
fr. 215(c)	<i>P.Oxy.</i> 2448 fr. 7	–	metre broadly compatible with fr. 215(a)–(b); position unknown; may well come from a different poem
–	<i>P.Oxy.</i> 2448 frr. 1A, 4–6, 8–18	–	position unknown; probably remains of several compositions

## II. The internal organisation of Pindar’s *Prosodia*

Pindar’s *Prosodia* took up two books, on the testimony of *P.Oxy.* 2438 col. ii.36f., *Vita Pindari Ambrosiana* p. I 3 Drachmann, and by implication Σ Π<sup>4</sup> D6.124 p. 304 Rutherford and *P.Vindob. Gr.* inv. 39966 (*SB* XXIV 16328) *verso* col. i.5.<sup>20</sup> Their internal organisation is unknown: only very little can be gleaned of the criteria for the partition of the poems between the two books or the ordering of the poems within each. Σ D6.124 guarantees that *Pae.* 6.123–83 appeared in book 1; none of the few other ancient citations from the *Prosodia* (Porph. *Abst.* 3.16.5, Σ **VEΓΘMLh** *Ar. Eq.* 1264b Jones, Σ *Genev. II.* 23.361 p. I 218 Nicole + *An. Par.* III 292) specifies a book-number.

The papyri testify to the sequences ‘*Pae.*’ 14–15 = S3–S4 Rutherford (*P.Oxy.* 2441 fr. 1, 1792 fr. \*8), ‘*Pae.*’ 20–21 = S1–S2 Rutherford (*P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 32), and, if they are indeed *Prosodia*, ‘*Pae.*’ 17(b)–18 = S6–S7 Rutherford (*P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 7).<sup>21</sup> Before the text of Σ D6.124 was correctly integrated, Rutherford noted the sequence ‘*Pae.*’ 14–15, two odes seemingly concerned with heroes, and suggested that the first book “consisted of poems devoted to the gods, and the second of poems devoted to heroes”.<sup>22</sup> The subsequent discovery that *Pae.* 6.123–83 was addressed to Aeacus and included in book 1 apparently refuted this hypothesis, leaving no obvious replacement for it. On the arrangement of the poems within the books, D’Alessio noted the sequence ‘*Pae.*’ 20–21, where a poem probably for Heracles is followed by one quite certainly for Hera, and suggested an alphabetical arrangement (by first letter only) according to the deity addressed, either as the sole ordering criterion, or subordinated to one by commissioning community, consistently with the format of the titles of the *Prosodia*.<sup>23</sup> The placement of *Pae.* 6.123–83 in book 1 obviously suits both possibilities very nicely. An alphabetical order of the titles by a word other than the first, as an order only by deity would be, is somewhat puzzling, but cannot be discounted entirely; likewise, since the performers of ‘*Pae.*’ 14 and 17 as well as of 20–21 are not known with certainty, an alphabetical order by community cannot be either confirmed or refuted conclusively on the present evidence.<sup>24</sup> It must

<sup>20</sup> First published by Sijpesteijn and Worp 1974: 324–31; see now Puglia 1998, Otranto 2000: 9–15.

<sup>21</sup> A strong case for attribution to the *Prosodia* in D’Alessio 1997: 41f., 2004: 109f.

<sup>22</sup> Rutherford 1992: 68, 2001: 417f.

<sup>23</sup> D’Alessio 1997: 38, 2004: 114. For the frequent Hellenistic practice of alphabetical order by first letter only compare e.g. the list of Euripides’ tragedies on *P.Oxy.* 2456 and of various poets’ comedies on *P.Oxy.* 2659; see also the collected Euripidean *hypotheses* on *P.Oxy.* 2455 (Ὁρέκτης Οἰδίπου [col. iv], the T-sequence beginning with Τήμενος [viii] and ending with Τέννης [xiii], Φ beginning with Φρίξος α’ Φοῖνιξ [xvii–xviii] and ending with Φιλοκτήτης Φρίξος β’ Φοῖνισσαι [xix–xxi]), *P.Oxy.* 2457 (Ἀλκηστις Αἰόλος), and *PSI* 1286 (Ῥήκος Ῥαδαμάνθυς).

<sup>24</sup> D’Alessio 2004: 114–21 (see already 1997: 36 n. 87, 43 n. 124) makes an attractive case for performance of ‘*Pae.*’ 21 in an Argive statue-washing ritual, either that conducted by the priestesses Ἡρακίδες at the shrine of Hera Akraia (Agias et Dercylus fr. 4a Fowler = *FGrHist* 305F4, Hsch. η 757 Latte, *Et. M.* col. 1264 Gaisford) or that at the spring Kanathos near Nauplia (Paus. 2.38.2f.); largely on this ground he suggests an Argive context for ‘*Pae.*’ 20 too (*ibid.*). The hypothesis that ‘*Pae.*’ 21 was composed for Argos would receive strong further support if Psyche’s prayer to Argive Juno *prope ripas Inachi, qui te iam nuptam Tonantis et reginam dearum memorat* in *Apul. met.* 6.4 could be shown to refer specifically to the refrain

be noted that such an arrangement, if envisaged as continuous across the two books, with the first half of the sequence in book 1 and the rest in book 2, strongly suggests that *P.Oxy.* 1792 contains fragments of both books of the *Prosodia*, not only of the first: 'Pae.' 12 = G1 Rutherford (*P.Oxy.* 1792 fr. \*1), with all likelihood composed for the citizens of Naxos, is hardly an attractive candidate for inclusion in book 1, given the position of ν in the alphabet and the relative prominence of cities such as Aegina and Thebes in Pindar's work.<sup>25</sup>

If one or both of the arguments outlined above on *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86 and fr. 215 Sn.–M. are accepted, the matter can be pursued further. The hypothesis that the two fragments come from the same composition entails that fr. 215(a)–(b) Sn.–M. immediately preceded *Pae.* 6.123–5, titled Αἰγινή[τα]ῖς | εἰς Αἰα[κό]ν: if the speakers of the former are the citizens of Delphi, as suggested by D'Alessio (which is virtually certain in view of 215(b).9–12),<sup>26</sup> then an alphabetical order by community is certainly excluded, although one by deity remains possible if the title of fr. 215(a)–(b) was e.g. Δελοφῶς εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα. More importantly, however, an alphabetical order by community will prove to be difficult to square with the identification between *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86.6f. and the title and first line of *Pae.* 6.123–83 even if the rest of the argument outlined in section I. is rejected.

The title of *Pae.* 6.123–83 is identical to that of 'Pae.' 15: therefore, an alphabetical arrangement by community would lead us to expect to find both in one sequence of poems Αἰγινήταις εἰς Αἰακόν, whether one after the other or separated by one or more other compositions with the same title. But just as the title of 'Pae.' 15 on *P.Oxy.* 2441 fr. 1 was written out in full, so was that of *Pae.* 6.123–83 on *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86, if it is recognised there; at least Αἰγινή[τα]ῖς was certainly written. This constitutes a problem for an alphabetical order by community in so far as the practice of the ancient editions of 'choral lyric', now largely obscured by the tacit re-titling that modern editors see fit to introduce, seems never to have been to assign identical titles to consecutive compositions, but to use the shorthand τῶι ἀντῶι (τοῖς ἀντοῖς, etc.) instead when the need arose. The commentary to *I.* 4 preserved by *P.Oxy.* 2451 A fr. 2(a) is indeed titled τῶι ἀντῶι. *P.Oxy.* 2441 fr. 3 τοῖς ἀντοῖς, if it does belong with that manuscript (or to another manuscript of Pindar), offers another example.<sup>27</sup> The medieval transmission of the *Epinicians* is also quite consistent in this respect. In the case of *O.* 3, 5, and 11, only some later manuscripts add the name of the victor to the plain τῶι ἀντῶι of the earlier witnesses; for *P.* 5 readings are somewhat more varied, but always with τῶι ἀντῶι coming first;<sup>28</sup> *P.* 2 and 3 show greater variety, but τῶι ἀντῶι occurs in a majority of the manuscripts, and can plausibly be regarded as the original form of the heading.<sup>29</sup> Bacchylides shows the same tendency: odes 2, 4 (with the addition Πύθια, since 3 was [Ολύ]μπια), and 7 are all titled τῶι ἀντῶι.<sup>30</sup> No contrary example in either author appears to have been published to date. If this was indeed common prac-

of the ode (Zimmerman *et al.* 2004: 390 relate it to *Ov. fast.* 6.36, 37 instead), but both of the epicleses found in the Latin text are quite commonplace, and a specific reference is not wholly above doubt. Other performance contexts can be conjectured for both 'Pae.' 20 and 21, in *primis* the Herakleia at Thebes and the Daidala at Plataea respectively.

<sup>25</sup> By way of comparison, if one ordered the *Epinicians* alphabetically by homeland of the *laudandus*, a hypothetical Naxian victor would have to be added thirty-seven forty-sevenths of the way down the list. This total includes the Western Greek cities which so far have failed to turn up in Pindar's cult poetry, but their presence does not dramatically alter the count.

<sup>26</sup> D'Alessio 1991: 115; see also Ferrari 1992: 228f., Rutherford 2001: 391. In theory there could be a chance of Pindar speaking ll. 9–12 in *propria persona* as a particular guest of Delphi (on which see the ancient biographical tradition testified by *Vita Ambrosiana* p. I 2 and *Vita Metrica* 6–8 p. I 9 Drachmann, *Lib. Or.* 20.2 with such statements as *Pae.* 6.11), but the *topos* of the lack of horses at 12f. (on which see D'Alessio and Ferrari just cited) all but demands a native inhabitant as the speaker.

<sup>27</sup> Alessandro Pardini (*ap.* D'Alessio 1997: 38 n. 94) noted that the hand in which the title is written is different from that which wrote the title of 'Pae.' 15 on fr. 1; the same applies to the layout of the title and the shape of the accompanying *asteriskos*. In the absence of any stronger evidence for it, the ascription of fr. 3 to *P.Oxy.* 2441 should be regarded as doubtful. On the other hand, the *asteriskos* and, given the parallels listed here, the title itself still strongly suggest pertinence to a manuscript of 'choral lyric'.

<sup>28</sup> Mommsen 1864: 28, 39, 106, 208.

<sup>29</sup> Mommsen 1864: 147, 159, Schroeder 1900<sup>5</sup>: 63f.

<sup>30</sup> The title of B. 5, which should have fallen in the same category, is missing altogether from *P.Lit.Lond.* 46. In that manuscript, interestingly, the title τῶι ἀντῶι of B. 7, omitted by the first scribe like that of the preceding ode, appears to have been written by the second corrector (A<sup>3</sup>) over three abraded lines penned by the first (A<sup>2</sup>), which in Snell's opinion were the ode's

tice and the ascription of *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86 to the *Prosodia* is held to be correct, then it follows from their written-out titles that both ‘*Pae.*’ 15 and *Pae.* 6.123–83 opened a sequence Αἰγινήτατς εἰς Αἰακόν, or at least did not immediately follow a composition with the same notional title; and this contravenes the notion of one sequence for each commissioning community which the hypothesis of an alphabetical arrangement by community necessarily entails.

Thus, we are left with two routes. We may suppose that *Pae.* 6.123–83 and ‘*Pae.*’ 15 were placed in the first and second books of the *Prosodia* respectively, assuming again that *P.Oxy.* 1792 preserved fragments of both books, but each with a distinct alphabetical sequence. (However, one wonders why two odes for the same community and addressee should be so split if coincidence of precisely these data was an ordering criterion, however partial.) Otherwise, one must choose between identifying *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86 with the title and first line of *Pae.* 6.123–83 and supposing an alphabetical arrangement by community. An ordering by deity does not necessarily face the same problem, if the arrangement was flexible enough to allow e.g. εἰς Αἰακόν, εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα, εἰς Αἰακόν, but the slight oddity of an alphabetical order of the titles by a word other than the first remains intact.

As the identification of *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86 with the title and first line of *Pae.* 6.123–83 cannot ultimately be proved, to note its contradiction with an alphabetical arrangement by community brings us no closer to establishing which of the two, if either, is correct. The conclusion can only be that the internal organisation of the *Prosodia* is still, frustratingly, unknown. An alphabetic arrangement cannot be excluded, and remains a concrete possibility, but still lacks conclusive proof on the existing evidence. More importantly, maintaining that the *Prosodia* were ordered alphabetically by name of the commissioning community very probably precludes recognising the title and first line of *Pae.* 6.123–83 on *P.Oxy.* 2442 fr. 86.6f.

#### Bibliography

- D’Alessio, G. B. 1991: Osservazioni e paralipomeni ad una nuova edizione dei frammenti di Pindaro, *RFIC* CXIX, 91–117.
- 1997: Pindar’s *Prosodia* and the Classification of Pindaric Papyrus Fragments, *ZPE* CXVIII, 23–60.
- 2004: Argo e l’Argolide nei canti culturali di Pindaro, in P. Angeli Bernardini, *La città di Argo. Mito, storia, tradizioni poetiche*. Atti del convegno internazionale (Urbino, 13–15 giugno 2002), Roma, 107–25.
- 2005: Il primo *Inno* di Pindaro, in S. Grandolini (ed.), *Lirica e teatro in Grecia: il testo e la sua ricezione*. Atti del II incontro di studi (Perugia, 23–24 gennaio 2003), Napoli, 113–49.
- 2007: Per una ricostruzione del *Primo Inno* di Pindaro: la “Teogonia” tebana e la nascita di Apollo, *SemRom* X, 101–17.
- 2009a: Defining Local Identities in Greek Lyric Poetry, in R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (eds.), *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture. Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, Cambridge, 137–67.
- 2009b: Re-constructing Pindar’s *First Hymn*: the Theban “Theogony” and the Birth of Apollo, in L. Athanassaki, R. P. Martin, and J. F. Miller (eds.), *Apolline Politics and Poetics*, Athens, 129–47.
- Ferrari, F. 1992: Pindaro, fr. 215(a), 4, *Maia* NS XLIV, 227–31.
- Grandolini, S. 1991: Canto processionale e culto nell’antica Grecia, *AION(filol)* XIII, 125–40.
- Hunt, A. S. 1922: 1787. Sappho, Book IV, in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XV, 26–46.
- Johnson, W. A. 2004: *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Toronto.
- Kambylis, A. 1966: Bemerkungen zu Pind. Fr. 215(a), 4 (Snell), *Hermes* XCIV, 238–43.
- Lobel, E. 1922: Two Fragments of Papyrus, *BQR* III/36, 289f.
- 1961a: 2442. Pindar, Ὕμνοι, Παιᾶνec, ?other pieces, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XXVI, 31–78.
- 1961b: 2445. Pindar, *Dithyrambs* (?) (and other categories?), *ibid.* 86–101.
- 1961c: 2448. Pindar, Uncertain Category, *ibid.* 131–9.
- Maehler, H. 1975<sup>4</sup>: *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, II: *Fragmenta. Indices*, Leipzig.
- Mommsen, T. 1864: *Pindari carmina*, Berolini.
- Otranto, R. 2000: *Antiche liste di libri su papiro*, Roma.
- Puglia, E. 1998: Gli inventari librari di PVindob. Gr. 39966, *ZPE* CXXIII, 78–86.

full title (1934<sup>5</sup>: 11\*). If correct, this strengthens our point: A<sup>2</sup> had divined the title of 7 from the text itself (see Snell 1934<sup>5</sup>: 10\*) without concomitantly supplying that of 6; once A<sup>3</sup> took care of the latter, it became necessary to alter the former accordingly.



- Rutherford, I. 1992: Two Heroic *Prosodia*. A Study of Pindar, “*Paeans XIV–XV*”, *ZPE* XCII, 59–72.
- 1997: *For the Aeginetans to Aiakos a Prosodion*: an Unnoticed Title at Pindar, Paean 6, 123, and its Significance for the Poem, *ZPE* CXVIII, 1–21.
  - 2001: *Pindar's Paeans. A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*, Oxford.
  - 2003: The Prosodion. Approaches to a Lyric Genre, in F. Benedetti and S. Grandolini (eds.), *Studi di filologia e tradizione greca in memoria di Aristide Colonna*, Napoli, II 713–26.
- Schroeder, O. 1900<sup>5</sup>: *Pindari carmina*, Lipsiae/Berolini.
- Sijpesteijn, P. J. and Worp, K. A. 1974: Literary and Semi-literary Papyri from the Vienna Papyrus Collection, *CE* XLIX, 309–31.
- Snell, B. 1934<sup>5</sup>: *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*, Lipsiae.
- 1938: Identifikationen von Pindarbruchstücken, *Hermes* LXXIII, 424–39.
  - 1962: Pindars 8. Paian über die Tempel von Delphi, *Hermes* XC, 1–6.
  - 1964<sup>3</sup>: *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, II: *Fragmenta. Indices*, Lipsiae.
- Zimmerman, M. et al. 2004: *Apuleius Madaurensis. Metamorphoses*. Books IV 28–35, V and VI 1–24: *The Tale of Cupid and Psyche*. Text, introduction and commentary, Groningen.

Enrico Emanuele Prodi, Christ Church, Oxford OX1 1DP, United Kingdom  
enrico.prodi@chch.ox.ac.uk