

The Classical Quarterly 70.2 822–826 © The Author(s), 2020. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

doi:10.1017/S0009838820000804

822

P.OXY. 2438 AND THE ORDER OF BOOKS IN ARISTOPHANES BYZANTIUS' EDITION OF PINDAR

Two well-known ancient witnesses report that Aristophanes of Byzantium was responsible for the arrangement of Pindar's poems into seventeen book-rolls according to lyric genres (dithyrambs, hymns, etc.). These witnesses form fr. 381 in the edition of Aristophanes' fragments by W.J. Slater (*Aristophanis Byzantii fragmenta* [Berlin and New York, 1986]):

Vit. Pind. P.Oxy. 2438.35–9 (*LDAB* 3724, *TM* 62542; late second/early third century A.D.)¹ δ]ιήρηται δὲ αὐτ[ο]ῦ τ]ῆ ποιήματα ὑπ' Ἀριστοφάν]ους εἰς βιβλία ιζ'· διθ[υ]ρ[ά]μ[μ]βων β' [προσοδῶ]ν β' παιάνων α' πα[ρ]θην[ε]ῖων γ' [ἐπινικίω]ν δ' ἐγκωμίων α' ἐν [ῶ] καὶ [σκ]όλ[ι]α ±4 ὕμνων α' ὑ[π]ορχημάτων α' θρ[ῆ]νων.

| nisi aliter ind., omnia suppl. Lobel | 2 Ἀριστοφάν]ους Lobel e *Vit. Pind. Vat.* (q.v.) | 3 ἐν [ῶ] καὶ [σκ]όλ[ι]α de Kreij : ἐν [ῶ] καὶ σκόλια πνα vel ἐν [ῶ] καὶ σκόλια ἐστ(ν) Gallo (1968, 73–4; 1969, 107) : ἐν [ῶ] καὶ [παροίγια D'Alessio (2000) | 4 α' post θρ[ῆ]νων con. edd., fort. recte; an θρ[- β'?

Vit. Pind. Vat. page 7.14–17 Dr.² ὁ δὲ ἐπινικίος οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ “Ἀριστον μὲν ὕδωρ” προτέτακται ὑπὸ Ἀριστοφάνους τοῦ συντάξαντος τὰ Πινδαρικά διὰ τὸ περιεχεῖν τοῦ ἀγώνος ἐγκώμιον καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ Πέλοπος, ὃς πρῶτος ἐν Ἡλίδι ἠγωνίατο.

A much-debated question is whether the order of the poems attested by the papyrus can be credited to Aristophanes, since an ordering principle is apparently not to be found in the list transmitted by it. Moreover, there are some disagreements with the list of Pindar's works transmitted by the *Vita Ambrosiana*, which is generally deemed the most authoritative catalogue of the poet's corpus, on account of its well-recognized criterion of classification: the poems are divided between those for gods (from *hymnoi*

¹ On the papyrus and its content, see M. de Kreij, ‘Anonymous, Pindar (1132)’, in *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* Part IV (2017), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_jciv_a1132>; this edition, based on a fresh collation, has been reproduced here. As de Kreij (this note) points out, ‘after inspection, cleaning, and conservation of the papyrus’, he has been able to revise some readings of the *editio princeps* and ‘to better establish the size of the lacunae’. Previous editions are E. Lobel, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 26 (Oxford, 1961) and I. Gallo, *Una nuova biografia di Pindaro (P. Oxy. 2438)*, (Salerno, 1968). In the critical apparatus ‘D'Alessio (2000)’ refers to G.B. D'Alessio, ‘Review of S. Schröder, *Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1999)’, in *BMC R* 2000.01.24; ‘Gallo (1969)’ refers to I. Gallo, ‘Gli σκόλια di Pindaro. Nota critica al catalogo pindarico del Papiro di Ossirinco XXVI, 2438’, *QUCC* 8 (1969), 105–12.

² The label *Vita Vaticana* has been introduced by Gallo instead of the traditional label, *Vita Thomana*, which is misleading, since the biography cannot be credited to Thomas Magister: it was already known to Eustathius, who not only quoted ample extracts from it in his *Introduction to Pindar* (25–38 Negri) but also ascribed it to ancient commentators (παλαιοί). The ascription to Thomas is based on a brief note by Demetrius Triclinius (E. Abel [ed.], *Scholia recentia in Pindari epinicia*, 1 [Budapest and Berlin, 1891], 31), who, however, only says that the text of the biography διορθώθη (‘was corrected’ or ‘was revised’; cf. *LBG* s.v.) by Thomas, not that it was compiled by him (γένος Πινδάρου διορθώθη δὲ παρὰ τοῦ σοφωτάτου Μαγίστρου). On the whole issue, see I. Gallo, ‘Eustazio commentatore di Pindaro’, *QUCC* 25 (1977), 43–51, at 50; M. Negri, *Pindaro ad Alessandria. Le edizioni e gli editori* (Brescia, 2004), 16 n. 3, 23 with n. 4.

to *hyporchēmata*) and those for men (from *enkōmia* to *epinikia*), and both of these categories of songs are arranged from the most general (respectively, the hymns and the *enkōmia*) to the most specific (the remaining genres).³ This catalogue has been thought to reproduce the order established by Aristophanes in his edition of Pindar.⁴

Here is a comparison between the two lists:⁵

<i>P.Oxy. 2438</i>	<i>Vita Ambrosiana</i>
(17 books)	(17 books)
<i>dithyramboi</i> (2)	<i>hymnoi</i> (1)
<i>prosodia</i> (2)	<i>paianes</i> (1)
<i>paianes</i> (1)	<i>dithyramboi</i> (2)
<i>partheneia</i> (3)	<i>prosodia</i> (2)
<i>epinikia</i> (4)	<i>partheneia</i> (2+1)
<i>enkōmia</i> (with <i>skolia</i>) (1)	<i>hyporchēmata</i> (2)
<i>hymnoi</i> (1)	<i>enkōmia</i> (1)
<i>hyporchēmata</i> (1)	<i>thrēnoi</i> (1)
<i>thrēnoi</i>	<i>epinikia</i> (4)
.....? (gap at lines 39–40)	

The total number of books (17) is the same in both lists, and the poetic genres are the same. Beside ordering, the other main divergence lies in the number of scrolls containing *hyporchēmata*: two in the *Vita Ambrosiana*, only one in *P.Oxy. 2438*. The papyrus list, as it stands, is one book short of the total number. It is impossible to establish with sufficient probability whether the figure α' after ὑπορχημάτων (line 3) is mistaken⁶ or whether a reference to the seventeenth book of the edition, corresponding to the second volume of *hyporchēmata*, is lost in the gap following the mention of *thrēnoi* (θρήνων α' ±37 | ±2]ων †νεικ[ολεγων† καπι[...]).⁸ None the less, two considerations favour the first possibility: in the string of letters following the gap, the expected figure α' is missing;

³ *Vit. Pind. Ambr.* page 3.6–9 Dr. γέγραφε δὲ βιβλία ἑπτακαίδεκα: ὕμνους, παιᾶνας, διθυράμβων β', προσοδίων β', παρθενείων β' φέρεται δὲ καὶ γ' ὃ ἐπιγράφεται κεχωρισμένον τῶν (Prodi: κεχωρισμένον τῶν Snell) παρθενείων ὑπορχημάτων β', ἐγκώμια, θρήνους, ἐπινίκων δ'. On this list, see E.E. Prodi, 'The list of Pindar's works in the *Vita Ambrosiana*', *RhM* 161 (2018), 236–7.

⁴ Since E. Hiller, 'Die antiken Verzeichnisse der pindarischen Dichtungen', *Hermes* 21 (1886), 357–71; but see already A. Boeckh, Πινδάρου τὰ σωζόμενα. *Pindari opera quae supersunt*, vol. 2/2 (Leipzig, 1821), 555–7.

⁵ I do not take into account either the list offered by Eust. *Intr. Pind.* 342, since it depends upon the *Vita Ambrosiana* (cf. Negri [n. 2], 216 with n. 1), or the lists provided by the *Vita metrica* and the *Vita Vaticana*, for they exhibit only a selection of the poems. As for the *Suda*'s list (π 1617 A.) and its peculiarities, see Gallo (n. 1 [1968]), 42–5. More generally, on the different lists, see Gallo (n. 1 [1968]), 27–45 and Gallo (n. 1 [1969]); W.H. Race, 'P.Oxy. 2438 and the order of Pindar's works', *RhM* 130 (1987), 407–10.

⁶ Cf. Gallo (n. 1 [1968]), 72–8. Corruptions in numerals are particularly frequent: see Iren. *Haer.* 5.30.1 and Jer. *Tract. Ps.* 77, with Z.J. Cole, *Numerals in Early Greek New Testament Manuscripts* (Leiden and Boston, 2017), 14–15; examples in C. Neri, *Erinna. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Bologna, 2003), 46–7 and 211. For the missing book, cf. Lobel (n. 1), 6.

⁷ As M. de Kreij informs me, after θρήνων α', 'Gallo believes about 6 letters are missing, but these are all wide letters, as is the number, so the column may have ended after the number; at most 3 letters could be added. It is clear that the right margin was not dead straight in any case (see 6 and 9)'.

⁸ Cf. Gallo (n. 1 [1968]), 77–8 and (n. 1 [1969]), 111–12, who favours the first possibility; de Kreij (n. 1), on the other hand, is disposed to the second possibility: 'the genitives plural in l. 40 strongly suggest this was the final entry in the list of Pindar's works'.

furthermore, it seems difficult to restore in the gap the name of a poetic genre traditionally associated with Pindar (including the five supplementary titles recorded by *Suda*).⁹ A third, hitherto neglected, possibility is that the figure following θρηῖνων could have been β' instead of α', but this would introduce a further disagreement between the two lists, which seem otherwise pretty similar: though this option cannot be completely discarded, it does not seem to be very appealing.

As for the differences of ordering, Race and Cameron concluded that there was not a fixed editorial arrangement in antiquity, and that the rolls containing Pindar's poems were to be freely rearranged by scholars.¹⁰ On the other hand, D'Alessio has pointed out that '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. 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.'¹¹ The same stance is held by Negri ([n. 2], 213–25), who explains the divergences between the two lists as a consequence of the different natures and aims of the scholarly works in which they are found. While *P. Oxy.* 2438 was probably part of a collection of biographies,¹² whose compiler was not interested in accurately reproducing the order of books established by Aristophanes of Byzantium, the *Vita Ambrosiana* was devised to introduce an edition of Pindar, and therefore the exact order of the book was relevant to its compiler. Other scholars, though accepting the existence of a single authoritative edition by Aristophanes, have also suggested that the different orders of books may reflect different arrangements proposed by ancient scholars: Arrighetti, for instance, traced back the papyrus' list to Didymus¹³ and that of the *Vita Ambrosiana* to Aristophanes, while Gallo ([n. 1 (1968)], 35, 41–2) took the opposite stance.¹⁴

It seems difficult to deny the existence of an authoritative edition in seventeen books, namely the edition provided by Aristophanes, with its own arrangement.¹⁵ Which of the transmitted lists reflects such an arrangement is not easy to ascertain, but the only list explicitly associated with the Alexandrian grammarian is the list provided by *P. Oxy.* 2438. The book order of this list is generally considered to lack a well-recognizable criterion, but is only apparently chaotic: upon closer scrutiny, it betrays a substantial bipartition between songs εἰς θεοῦς (lines 36–7: dithyrambs, *prosodia*, paeans,

⁹ Cf. *Suda* π 1617 A. ἔγραψε δὲ [*sc.* Πίνδαρος] ἐν βιβλίοις ἑξ' Ἀσπίδι διαλέκτω ταῦτα: Ὀλυμπιονίκας, Πυθιονίκας, προσόδια, παρθένια, ἐνθρονισμούς, βακχικά, δαφνηφορικά, παῖαντας, ὑπορχήματα, ὕμνους, διθυράμβους, σκόλια, ἐγκώμια, θρήνους, δρόματα τραγικά ἑξ'.

¹⁰ Cf. Race (n. 5); Alan Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, 1995), 110–11.

¹¹ G.B. D'Alessio, 'Pindar's *prosodia* and the classification of Pindaric papyrus fragments', *ZPE* 118 (1997), 23–60, at 52. For references to a seventeen-book edition in antiquity, cf. J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris, 1952), 37–8.

¹² Cf. Lobel (n. 1), 1; G. Arrighetti, 'La biografia di Pindaro del papiro di Ossirinco XXVI 2438', *SCO* 16 (1967), 129–48, at 129; Gallo (n. 1 [1968]), 17–18; De Kreij (n. 1), who also takes into account an alternative possibility, namely that *P. Oxy.* 2438 could be 'a (para)literary text concerning Pindar to which an excerpted *Life* was attached, perhaps written at a later time'.

¹³ Cf. Arrighetti (n. 12), 139–40, 144–5; also N. Natalucci, 'Il P. Oxy. 2438 e la tradizione biografica di Pindaro: una nuova proposta di lettura', *QUCC* 37 (1995), 57–88, at 87.

¹⁴ For the attribution of the book-arrangement attributed by *P. Oxy.* 2438 to Aristophanes, see also I. Cazzaniga, 'Due contributi filologici', *SCO* 19/20 (1970/1), 5–14, at 5; F. Lasserre, 'Review of B. Snell, H. Maehler, *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis. Pars II* (Leipzig, 1975)', *AC* 45 (1976), 660–1; L. Lehnus, *L'inno a Pan di Pindaro* (Milan, 1979), 81–3.

¹⁵ D'Alessio (n. 11), 51–5; T. Phillips, *Pindar's Library Performance Poetry and Material Texts* (Oxford, 2016), 55–60.

partheneia) and songs εις ἀνθρώπους (lines 37–9: *epinikia, enkōmia, thrēnoi*),¹⁶ with the only exceptions being *hymnoi* and *hyporchēmata* (lines 38–9), both of which are misplaced in the second group of songs. The misplacement, possibly owing to an oversight of the scribe, is, none the less, telling, for it involves two terms that begin with the same letter (υ-). Once these two genres are moved to the end of their category—that is, the songs εις θεούς—the resulting order turns out to conform to two clearly recognizable criteria: a hierarchical principle based on the recipients of the song (gods/men), and, within both of these groups, an alphabetic ordering extending no further than the first letter, as seems to have been customary in the Hellenistic period (διθύραμβοι, προσόδια, παιάνες, παρθένεια, ὕμνοι, ὑπορχήματα / ἐπινίκια, ἐγκώμια [with σκόλια], θρηῆνοι).¹⁷

These two criteria match those which were arguably used in Alexandrian editions of at least some melic poets. The hierarchical principle seems to govern Aristophanes' edition of the four books of Pindar's victory songs (viz. the hierarchy of both Panhellenic games and agonistic disciplines: first the chariot race, then the other equestrian competitions, followed by contact sports and foot races),¹⁸ while the alphabetic principle seems to be recognizable in the editions of Bacchylides (within the book of dithyrambs) and Sappho (as a subordinate criterion governing the arrangement of the poems within each thematic section),¹⁹ which are generally ascribed to Aristophanes.²⁰ Furthermore, the

¹⁶ As pointed out by Lehnu (n. 14), 82: 'l'aspetto polarizzato (odi divine dai ditirambi ai partenì, umane dagli epinici ai treni) prevale visibilmente su quello casuale'.

¹⁷ Cf. Arrighetti (n. 12), 139 for the possibility that the list betrays these two criteria. Arrighetti, however, assumed that the overarching criterion was the division between songs performed by a moving chorus and songs performed by a stationary chorus, and that both of these groups were subdivided into songs for gods and songs for men, arranged in alphabetical order. The problems entailed by this approach have been shown by Gallo ([n. 1 (1968)], 40 n. 39). On alphabetic ordering in Hellenistic scholarly works, see L.W. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Brussels, 1967), 29; J. Rusten, 'Dicaearchus and the tales from Euripides', *GRBS* 23 (1982), 357–67, at 363; K. Alpers, 'Review of L.W. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Brussels, 1967)', *Gnomon* 47 (1975), 113–17, at 113; E. Esposito, 'Fragments of Greek lexicography in the papyri', *TiC* 1 (2009), 255–97 (lexica displaying alphabetical arrangement, dating from the third/second century B.C.).

¹⁸ On this ordering principle, and others used by Aristophanes in arranging the victory songs, see Negri (n. 2), 152–74; N. Lowe, 'Epinikian eidography', in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (edd.), *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* (Oxford, 2007), 167–76, at 171–4.

¹⁹ On the alphabetical arrangement of songs within a book, see I. Rutherford, *Pindar's Paeans* (Oxford, 2001), 158–9 with nn., with reference to Sappho's and Bacchylides' Alexandrian editions. On Bacchylides' book of dithyrambs, cf. J. Irigoien, *Bacchylide. Dithyrambes – Épinicies – Fragments* (Paris, 1993), XXV–XXVI with n. 6. On Sappho's edition, see C. Neri, 'Il Brothers Poem e l'edizione alessandrina (in margine a P. Sapph. Obbink)', *Eikasmos* 26 (2015), 53–76, at 69–73, and C. Neri, 'Dolorosi, imprevisi tradimenti (Sapph. fr. 16A)?', *Eikasmos* 29 (2018), 39–54, at 48–51. On the basis of recent papyrus findings, Neri has proposed that the poems by Sappho had probably been arranged within each book of the Alexandrian edition according to two criteria: they were grouped into thematic sections, which were internally arranged according to an alphabetical order (it seems less probable that the alphabetical principle was followed throughout a whole book; for the problems raised by this hypothesis, suggested by E. Lobel, *Σαπφούς μέλη* [Oxford, 1925], XV, see Neri [this note (2018)], 48–9).

²⁰ In Sappho's case, the existence of an edition published by Aristophanes is strongly suggested by Heph. *Sign.* pages 73.11–74.14 Consbr. (test. 236 V. = Neri) and Apoll. *Dysc.* *GG* 2/2.443.8–12 (test. 236A Neri); cf. C. Neri, 'Immagini di Saffo', in C. Neri and F. Cinti, *Saffo. Poesie, frammenti e testimonianze* (Santarcangelo di Romagna, 2017), XXIV–XXVI. In Bacchylides' case, there is no evidence that Aristophanes was responsible for the standard edition of the poet, and it has been suggested that this could have been the work of Aristarchos (D'Alessio [n. 11], 54, on the basis of the testimony of *P.Oxy.* 2368 about Aristarchus' classification of Bacch. *Dith.* **23 M. among the dithyrambs; cf. schol. B ad loc. page 128.9–14 Maehler).

bipartite structure of Pindar's edition (songs εἰς θεοὺς and εἰς ἀνθρώπους) seems to be confirmed by the selected list of Pindaric poems given by Horace in *Carm.* 4.2.10–24 (the celebrated ode *Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari*),²¹ where only dithyrambs (10–12), hymns (13–16), *epinikia* (17–20) and *thrēnoi* (21–4) are mentioned, that is, two genres for each group, in both cases in alphabetical order.²² It is also 'very interesting that P.Oxy. 2438 [...] begins with the *dithyramboi* and ends with the *threnoi* exactly as Horace does' (Race [n. 5], 410). These agreements, taken together, suggest that the Roman poet may have had Aristophanes' edition in mind when he outlines the poetic work of his model.

Compared with the papyrus list, the list provided by the *Vita Ambrosiana* exhibits an order which seems to be more refined, as noted above. It is perhaps not irrelevant to acknowledge here the work of Didymus on lyric poetry—as, for example, Gallo ([n. 1 (1968)], 40–1) did—which is generally considered to be the basis for Proclus' classification (*Chrest.* 32–3 Severyns).²³ If so, the differences between the two lists could be explained as the result of different attempts to arrange Pindar's poems. There is evidence that the discussion on the classification of the odes continued after Aristophanes' edition, and that 'Didymos himself disagree[d] with the classification of *Nemean XI* among the *Nemeans*: it should not even have been inserted among the *Epinikia*. In this he was following Dionysios of Phaselis. He thought that *Nemean XI*, composed for the investment ceremony of Aristagoras as a πρῦτανις in Tenedos, was not a victory ode but a παρποϊνιον, a "drinking song"' (D'Alessio [n. 11], 54). As well as in the matter of individual poems, Didymus might have proposed some change of Aristophanes' arrangement in the ordering of poetic genres too.

University of Bologna

MARCO ERCOLES
marco.ercoles@unibo.it

²¹ Written in 16 or 15 B.C. (cf. E. Fraenkel, *Horace* [Oxford, 1957], 432–3).

²² Cf. Cazzaniga (n. 14), 5–8; Lehnus (n. 14), 81–3 with n. 102. I follow Lehnus in taking *Carm.* 4.2.13–16 as a reference to the hymns: compare the expression *seu deos regesque canit, deorum | sanguinem* with Heliod. in *schol. Lond. Dion. Thrax* 1, *GG* 1/3 451.6 Hilgard ὕμνος ἐστὶ ποίημα περιέχον θεῶν ἐγκώμια καὶ ἡρώων μετ' εὐχαριστίας. For the bipartition between songs for gods and songs for men, see already Pl. *Resp.* 10.607a (ὕμνους θεοῖς καὶ ἐγκώμια τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς).

²³ On the relationship between Didymus and Proclus, see A. Severyns, *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus*, vol. 2 (Liège and Paris, 1938), 114, who considers Proclus' classification a development of Didymus'; also R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship. From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), 184; L.E. Rossi, 'I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche', *BICS* 18 (1971), 69–94, at 74–5 with n. 20.