

THE SCHOLIA ON ALCMAN'S *PARTHENEION*

Professor Cornelia Römer, Direktorin der Papyrussammlung und Papyrusmuseum of the Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek at Vienna, kindly informed me that, in the frame of a programme for publishing the annotated Greek literary papyri, she has taken up the edition of the scholia on Alcman.¹ In an attempt to offer yet another interpretation of Alcman's Partheneion, I had done the same thing, starting already in the year 2002. Therefore, I thought it fair to present, at least, my text of the scholia in a prepublication form, expecting a preliminary judgement, which might lead to utilizing its merits and rejecting its demerits in the definite editions to come, both Professor Römer's and mine.

It must be stated in advance that the writing of the scholia in the Louvre papyrus (E. 3320/R56, i A.D.; scholia A), mostly by the same hand that wrote the poetic text (A1), but also by two more contemporary hands (A2, A3), is necessarily squeezed in the intercolumnar spaces of the papyrus or in its upper or lower margins, thus having a distinct cursive character and making extensive use of abbreviations. All these characteristics, together with the physical wearing out of the papyrus, render the reading, at some points, extremely difficult. The scholia are regularly written to the right of the poetic text they are annotating, except for two long ones that are accommodated in the upper and lower margin of the third column, and one or two that start in the intercolumnar area and continue in interlinear spaces.² The scholia of P. Oxy. 2389 (i A.D.; scholia B), actually a continuous commentary, are fragmented, but present no serious reading difficulties.³

The last edition of the scholia on the Partheneion by G. O. Hutchinson⁴

1. *Commentaria et Lexica Graeca in Papyris Reperta (CLGP)*, edd. Guido Bastianini, Michael Haslam, Herwig Maehler, Franco Montanari, Cornelia Römer. The first volume has already appeared: Pars I, *Commentaria et Lexica in auctores*. 1.1 Aeschines - Alcaeus. München - Leipzig 2004.

2. First published by E. Egger, *Mémoires d'histoire ancienne et de philologie*, Paris 1863, pp. 159-175.

3. First published by E. Lobel, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 24 (other texts edited by C. H. Roberts, E. G. Turner, J. W. B. Barns), London, Egypt Exploration Society, 1957.

4. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*, OUP 2001, 8 ff.

was perhaps too cautious. The editor notes (p. 3) concerning the Louvre papyrus: “*ipsam contuli papyrus; scholia tamen eius, quae et ante et post ex imaginibus contuli, tum conferre non potui: tam tenacibus uinculis me retinuit tertia columna.*” On the contrary, I believe that not only the third column, but the whole of the poetic text and its interpretation could be greatly improved by a careful edition of the scholia. Truly, some of the new readings, even when the Scholiast’s view need not be adopted, open new paths for approaching the riddle of the Partheneion. When such was the case, and only then, I added a comment, long or short, on the scholion. Naturally, this is not a commentated edition of the Alcmanic scholia. The detailed and more extensive utilization of the scholia in the interpretation of the poem will appear in due time. Some of the critical signs used in the papyrus must come from the hand of A2, a scholiast who attempted, among other things, to apportion the singing of the poem’s verses to different singers. These critical signs, all written to the left of the poetic text, mainly paragraphoi and diplai unrelated to the usual division of stanzas, will also be specified.

I availed myself of a photograph of P. Louvre placed at my disposal by the Département des Antiquités Égyptiennes of the Palais du Louvre, to whom I am indebted. Concerning P. Oxy. 2389, I used the excellent reproductions at the end of vol. 24 of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*.

Scholia A

ad 2	ὄτι τοιαύτη ἦ διάν(οια)· τὸν Λύκαι- ον οὐ συνκατα- ριθμ(ῶ) τοῖς προ(ιν) ὑ(περ)βλη-
5	[θεῖ]σι Δη[ρ]ιτίδαις. οὐ μάτ[ην ἐπο]ίησε ταῦτα οὐ(δ) ἔς[φαλτα]! λί(αν), εἰ ἄζ[η]μίω[ς] εἶποι οὐ μόνον
10	τὸν Λύκαι(ον), ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς λοιπούς, Δηριτίδαις, οὐ[ς] ἐπ’ ὀ- νόματος λέγει.

(manu 1) 4 sq. π^ρο’ βλη[...]_ς (π^ρ monogrammatice) pap.; προ(ιν) vel προ(όσθεν), προ(ότερον), προ(ο-) ὑ(περ)βλη[θεῖ]σι leg. et suppl. Ts. || 5 [Δηρι]τίδαις dub. Diels, Δη[ρ]ιτίδαις leg. Ts., Ἰπποκώ]ντιδαις Blass || 6 ουμ edd., rell. leg. et suppl. Ts.; c’ (= -ce) pap. || 7 τ` (= ταῦτα) et οὐ` (= οὐδ(έ)) pap., expl. Ts. | ¹ς[...]_ς pap.,

leg. et suppl. Ts. || 8 λειαν..... Blass, (ἀπώ)λειαν Diels; λ'ειαζ[.]μω[leg. Ts.; sup.]μω[scriptum est]δο[.]ς, quod ἀ]δό[λω]ς supplendum esse coni. Ts. || 9 ειται Blass, ἔστ[α]ι Diels, ἔσται Page, εἴποι Ts. || 10 Λύκαι(ον) : abbreviatio s.l. incerta || 12 οὖς (οὐκ) Pavese || 13 λέγ(ων) Diels

Reading and sense are more or less clear in lines 1-5 and 9-13, but 6-8 are marred by some holes in the papyrus. In the first part, the Scholiast is interpreting line 2 of the *Partheneion*, οὐκ ἐγὼ]ν Λύκαισον ἐν καμοῦσιν ἀλέγω, but in the second, he is offering excuses for Alcman's mythological error. "He didn't write these verses idly nor is his error too great, if with no harm (and no fraud) he calls not only Lycaeus, but the rest as well, whom he calls by name, Deritidae." He seems to understand Alcman's καμοῦσιν not as 'killed' but as 'overcome', and explains the verse as excluding Lycaethus from the group of the sons of Derites and not of the sons of Hippocoon, as hitherto believed. Actually, though apologizing on his account, he believes that Alcman committed an error in designating Lycaethus as a Deritides, and pleads lack of intent, fraud, and harm in extenuation of the error. Actually, by designating as Deritidae all those in the name-list of lines 3-12, some of whom were famous Hippocoontidae, he is mitigating the error and proving Alcman's innocence. πρ, written monogrammatically, must stand for πρῖν or πρότερον, πρόσθεν, προ-. 'Formerly' is no doubt in relation not only to mythical time, former, that is, than the Dioscuri and the Hippocoontidae, but also to the sequence of the story elements in Alcman's poem. This is a real gain, since the reference to τοῖς πρῖν ὑπερβληθεῖσι Δηριτίδαις together with the first word of the *Partheneion*, Πωλυδεύκης, are the only hints towards the contents of the column prior to col. i. There is no need to supplement οὖς (οὐκ) ἐπ' ὀνόματος λέγει (Pavese). The word-order is εἰ εἴποι οὐ μόνον τὸν Λύκαισον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς λοιπούς, Δηριτίδας. The Scholiast adds οὖς ἐπ' ὀνόματος λέγει as an afterthought for clarifying τοὺς λοιπούς.

υ'βλη[...]ει may, of course, also be restored as ὑποβληθεῖσι, especially since the scribe A1 abbreviates ὑπέρ as υπ' in the scholion *ad* 70-76, 2. If, however, the dative plural aorist participle is interpreting καμοῦσιν, none of the several meanings of ὑποβάλλω -ομαι fits its senses, in contrast to ὑπερβάλλομαι, which means, just like κάμνω, 'be overcome, be defeated'.

There is no place for Δηριτίδης or anything similar to qualify Lycaethus in the poem, and the only specification accompanying him is that the singer does not count him among the καμόντες. The Scholiast certainly knew Lycaethus and the others named in the list as sons of Hippocoon killed by Heracles, in the same way as they are known to us from Ps.-Apollodorus and other sources. The error may stem from the fact that the Scholiast, not finding any mention of Hippocoontidae in the text prior to the list, identified

Alcman's *καμώντες* with the only brothers apparently mentioned as 'overcome' in the previous text, and no doubt expressly designated as Deritidae. The fact that the Scholiast, in order to render *καμώντες*, employs the rare form *ὑπερβληθέντες*, 'surpassed, defeated' (cf. Ps.-Plato *Alc.* 1, 103b 5, Aristid. *Panath.* 161.32, al.), and not 'slain', possibly shows that no killings were related in the story of the Deritidae.

Of course, the Scholiast was wrong in imputing to Alcman justified ignorance. What the poet meant by "I do not count Lycaethus among the dead", as well as the lineage of Derites and the Deritidae, their place in the prehistory of the Spartan royalty, but, especially, their place in Alcman's Partheneion will be discussed elsewhere. Further, since the Scholiast claims that Alcman's text implies that the brothers listed in lines 3-12 are Deritidae just like Lycaethus, it is necessary that the opening of Alcman's line 3 was οὐδ' Ἐνα]ρσφόρον (Canini) and not ἀλλ' Ἐνα]ρσφόρον (Blass).

The scholion starts with ὅτι, a usual way to mark the excerpts taken from another work in a compilation, whether a chronicle or a commentary. Does this mean that all scholia starting with ὅτι in the Louvre papyrus (*ad* 2, 14, 49, 60, 83; cf. *ad* 59), all written by scribe A1, come from an existing commentary, possibly the same one in all ὅτι-scholia? Some abbreviations, as explained here (οὐ' for οὐδ' and λ' for λίαν), though obvious, are unparalleled.⁵ Interesting is the use of λ for ε, not only here but several more times in the scholia.

ad 6	Φερεκύ(δης) (fr. 172 A Fowler) ἔνα τ(ῶν) Ἰπποκωντιδ(ῶν) Ἄρηϊτον. μήπο- τ' οὐν κ(αὶ) ὤδε σὺν τῶι ε̄
5	δεῖ γρ(άφειν) ἢ τ(όν) Ἄρηϊτον ὁ Ἄλκμ(άν) Ἄρηϊον; Χῖ.

(manu 2) 1 ἔνα Egger, ἐν α' dub. Bergk, alii || 2 τ' (= τῶν) Ἰπποκωντιδ pap. || 4 μηπο|τ' οὐν κ' ὠδε pap. || 5 γρ^o monogrammatice pap. | τ' (= τόν) pap. | αρηϊτον leg. Calame || 6 in fine scholii X¹ dispexit Ts.

^I
X, written between this and the previous scholion, is difficult to decide to which of the two it belongs. Its position, however, at the very end of the scholion *ad* 6 and its cant speak for the present one. Apparently, it must be a

5. At least, not recorded in K. McNamee, *Abbreviations in Greek Literary Papyri and Ostraka* [BASP, Suppl. 3], Chico 1981.

mark repeated from the now lost left margin of the Partheneion's line 6. Why the × sign is repeated at the end of the scholion and why it is topped with a vertical, I cannot say. Possibly, the vertical is an iota, forming the word χῖ, i.e. the name of the critical sign × (Diog. Laert. 3.66; cf. χιάζειν; χιάζεται ὁ στίχος), used to attract attention to a scholarly issue of the text, and repeatedly occurring in the Louvre papyrus. The possibility that we might be dealing with the abbreviation of the name of a grammarian (Χ(αίρ)ι(δος)? see scholion *ad* 95) is rather weak.

ad 14 ὅτι τὸν Πόρον εἴρηκε τὸν ἀϋτὸν
τῶ(ι) ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἡσιόδο(υ) μεμυθολογη-
μένωι Χάει (*Th.* 116).

(manu 1) 1 εἰρηκῶ pap. || 2 ὑπο τοῦ ησιοδῶ pap.

ad 32 Ἄριστο(φάνης) Ἄϊδας (fr. 384A Slater)· Πάμφιλο(ς)
Ἄϊδας.

(manu 1) 1 αἰδᾶς pap. || 2 αἰδας pap.

ad 36 αἰ π(αρὰ) τῆ(ι) Ἄγιδοι - τ(αὔτα) δ' εὔφρονα.

(manu 2) πῑ et οι-τ' pap.; τ' (= ταὔτα; v. sch. *ad* 2, 7 et *ad* 49,1); ἀ[ρ]χ[ῆ] τ(ῶν) Ἄγιδου[ς] [ἐπαίνων] Blass, αἰ π(ρὸς) τῆ(ς) Ἄγιδου[ς] Page, alii alia

It is not clear whether the Scholiast A2 implies two semichoruses, one led by Agido the other led by Hagesichora (see below A2 *ad* 43 and 49) or two groups of supporters. Obviously, the short dash is no more than a dividing punctuation mark. The neuter plural must refer to the words sung by the girls on Agido's side, which are amusing and cheerful. Actually, the bantering part of the Partheneion starts from this stanza (36-49). A prose word might be more appropriate, but the Scholiast is employing εὔφρονα deliberately, alluding to 37 ὅστις εὔφρων.

ad 37 Ἄρι(σταρ)χ(ος) ὄ[δ'].

(manu 1)

ad 43 ἐντεῦ(θεν) ἀντ() []() τῆ(ι) Ἄγησιχόρ(αι)
παρα[στ]ατοῦσι.

(manu 2) 1 εντεῦ et αντ' pap., coniuncta ἐντεῦθεν Page, separavit Ts.; e.g. ἀντ(ι-λέγ(ουσι)) vel ἀντ(ᾶδ(ουσι)) |]' : e.g. ἀπ[ι](ερ) (π' = περ) | ἀγησιχοῶ pap. || 2

-οῦσι pap., παρα[στ]ατοῦσι Ts., παρα[βάλλει] vel παρα[βάλλουσι] Diels, παρα[κο-
λου]θοῦσι Marzullo

ἐντεῦθεν: From line 43 onward. Both ἀντιλέγουσιν (or ἀντάδουσιν) and αἴπερ are completely speculative, but are well reflecting the expected sense. The change of singer is also indicated by a dipole obelismene after line 43, most likely by Scholiast A2.

ad 49 αἰ π(αρά) τῆ(ι) Ἀγιδοῖ τ(αῦτα), οὔτ(ως) λεγόμενα·
εἶτα αἰ π(αρά) τῆ(ι) Ἀγησιχόρ(αι).

(manu 2) 1 π`τῆαγιδοῖ pap.; π(ρὸς) τ(ῆς) Ἀγιδο(ῦς) Diels, π(αρά) τ(ῆ) Ἀγιδο(ῖ) (τῆ(ι) Ἀγιδοῖ Ts.) Rosenmeyer | τ`ουτS pap.; τ(αῦτα) οὔτ(ως) Ts. | λ^εγόμενα^α pap. || 2 εἶτα legit Calame | αιπτῆαγχιχ^ο pap.; π(ρὸς) τ(ῆς) Ἀγησιχόρ(ας) Page, π(αρά) τ(ῆ) Ἀγησιχόρ(αι) Rosenmeyer

The suggestion of Scholiast A2 that the girls on the side of Agido sing a single verse (49), apparently interrupting the group of Hagesichora, before the latter take up the singing again, casts a different light on the numerous theories about the delivery of the song. οὔτως λεγόμενα, ‘merely spoken’ (*LSJ* s. οὔτως IV), apparently ‘not sung’. Just as in the scholion *ad* 36 the Scholiast A2 characterized the style of the verses as ‘allegro’, here he describes the delivery mode of the short interruption as ‘parlando’. ουτS is not recorded in McNamee (note 5 above), but see the marginal scholion in *BKT* v 2 (Corinna) ii 43 (ουτS). A high stroke looking like an acute after 2 αἰ is only the tail of the previous line’s τ`. An identical tail is visible at the scholion *ad* 2, 7 τ(αῦτα) by A1, but not at the scholion *ad* 36 τ(αῦτα) by A2. The necessary grave upon 2 π seems to be missing.

ad 49 ×

(manu?)

The sign may have been written to attract attention either to the peculiar use of ὑποπετριδίων ὄνειρων or to the change of singer indicated in the scholion or to both.

ad 49 ὅτι τὰ θαυμα-
στὰ κ(αὶ) τερατώδη οἱ
ποιηταὶ εἰώθα(σι) τοῖς
ὄνειροις προσάπτειν κ(αὶ)
5 {κ(αὶ)} ὁμοιοῦν διὰ τὸ φαίνεσθαι
κατὰ τὸν ὄνειρον τοιαῦτα.
ὑποπετριδι(α) εἴρηκε ὡς

ὑπὸ πέτρα(ι) οἰκοῦντα
 ἐν ἀ. ἀλέω(ι) τόπω(ι). παραγρά(φει)
 10 δὲ Ὀμ(ήρου) ἔπ(η), ὡς ἐν τῆ(ι) Ὀδυσσεΐαι
 (24.11-12).
 ‘πὰρ δ’ ἴσαν Ὀκεανοῖο ῥοὰς
 κ(αί) Λευκά-
 δα πέτρην, ἣδὲ παρ’ ἠελίοιο πύλας κ(αί) δῆμο(ν)
 ὀνειρών’.

(manu 1) 4-5 κ(αί) bis scriptum legit Blass (τε | κ(αί) volebat?), παρομοιοῦν Page (alt. κ(αί) ut παρ legens); ομοιοῦν^ν pap.; aliquid erat scriptum infra ομοιοῦν^ν || 9 ἀ. ἀλέω(ι) legit Ts. (λ^ω pap.); inter ἀζαλέωι et ἀαλέωι fluct. Ts., ἀδῆ[λω]ι Blass, Bergk || 10 Ὀμ(ήρου) ἔπ(η) legit Ts. (ομ^π pap.), Ὀμ(ηρι)χ(ά) Hutchinson, Ὀμ(ηρον) Diels, alii alia || 13 παρ pap.^{pc}, ημαρ (?) pap.^{ac}

At 9 ἐν ἀ. ἀλέω(ι) τόπω(ι), I cannot choose between ἀζαλέωι and ἀαλέωι. The reading is closer to the second, but what looks like an upsilon has a distinct wavy bottom horizontal like that of zeta. Perhaps a correction of υ to ζ? At any rate, though both are almost synonymous poetic words, known to the Scholiast from his scholarly learning, ἀζαλέωι is more appropriately used for a dry rocky land.

ad 59 τ(αῦτ)α γένη ἐστὶν κῶν ἴππων [.]
 E[ι]βην
 ἀμ. [.]μικρ. [
 5 σάζει Ἄγ[ιδῶ Λ]υδίαι
 τῆν

(manu 1) 1 τ'α, ut videtur, = τ(αῦτ)α; ante 1 sq. ὄ[τι ταῦ]τ(α) Blass | inter ἐστὶν et κῶν lacuna non scripta c. 5 literarum; ἐξωτ[ικῶν] Diels, Σκυθ[ικῶν] Bergk; Ἄσιατικῶν volebat? || 3 non est [Λ]υδικῶ. || 4 ἐξ[ι]σάζει dub. Ts. (an ἰσάζει vel ἐξ[ι]σάζει?), σ correctum (e τ?), ὄνο[μά]ζει Blass, alii alia; non est εἰ[σ]άζει | αγ[ι] potius quam αγ[η] | Λ]υδίαι, i.e. dat. adiectivi, Ts.

Blass's ὄ[τι ταῦ]τ(α) is impossible, because what is read ο is written above the long horizontal stroke that marks the end of the previous scholion *ad* 49. The Scholiast not only leaves the scholion unfinished (he probably intended to continue with Hagesichora: τῆν δὲ κτλ.), but also writes some words imperfectly (κῶν, E[ι]βην) and wipes out others.

ad 59 ×

(manu 1)

The sign probably refers to the scholion on the breeds of the horses. A paragraphus after 59 (by A2?) may indicate a change of singer.

ad 61 αριστο

(manu 1) super φᾶρος; αροτο omnes

φαρος is written in the text with a circumflex and an acute above alpha. This is then one of the numerous cases of wavering on the part of the scribe as to orthography, usually followed by a relevant scholion; cf. 32 Ἄιδας - Ἄιδας, 41 and 89 ἄμιν - ἄμιν, 95 νᾶι - νᾶι. Apparently, the circumflex was the appropriate accent for the meaning ‘cloth, cloak’, and the acute for the meaning ‘plough’. The metre does not help, since alpha falls in the anceps position of the trochees. So, the problem is mainly limited to the meaning. The scribe, no doubt, did not intend to write super lineam only the name of the grammarian who proposed φᾶρος, i.e. Aristophanes, but a comprehensive scholion about the spellings and the relevant meanings. But when he started writing it, the sigma of αριστο fell upon the already written acute, thus producing a sign looking like omikron – whence the false reading αροτο (actually, αριστο). He saw that, if he continued writing the scholion between the lines (as he does elsewhere, with much longer scholia), he would stumble again on the grave and the acute of φερόσαις. So, he interrupted the writing, put a chi in the margin, and wrote the full scholion under the column; see next scholion.

ad 60-61 Ἄριστο(φάνης)
 Ὅρθιαι φᾶρος· Σωσιφάνης ἄροτρον : ὅτι
 τὴν [Ἀγν]δὼ καὶ Ἀγησιχόραν περιστραῖς εἰκάζουσι.

(manu 1, in marg. inf. columnae ii) 1 Ἄριστο(φάνης) leg. Turner, ἄρ[ο]τρο(ν) Page, alii || 2 Ἄριστο(φάνης) - ὅτι interpunxit Hutchinson | Σωσιφάνης pro Σωσίβιος scriptum? || 3]δὼ : ζω pap. | ἱκαζουσι leg. Blass, sed vestigia super ι signum diaereseos non sunt

Page 1951, p. 10, concerning the Scholia A: “Where so many [sc. commentators] are named, it is remarkable that there is no mention of Sosibius, the most celebrated authority on Alcman and on Laconian customs.” Primarily here, in a question of Laconian ceremonial practices, one should expect the evidence to come from Sosibius’ Περὶ τῶν ἐν Λακεδαιμόνι θυσίων and not from an unknown work of an Alexandrian Pleiad tragedian. Then, possibly, a slip of pen, Σωσι-φάνης for Σωσί-βιος, influenced by Ἄριστο(φάνης) mentioned right before?

ad 61 ×

(manu 1)

The sign probably refers to the previous scholion.

ad 62 / (?)

(manu ?)

If a sign, it may refer to σίριον.

post 62 ÷ (?)

(manu ?)

Uncertain shape and meaning.

ad 63 × (?)

(manu ?)

Uncertain if a sign.

ad 70-76 ἰ παῖδας δ[ηλοῖ] δ(ιὰ) π(αῖδων) ἦ : Ἰππαδάεις ἰβ' (εἰσὶν) αἰ παῖδ[εις, ὧν ἰ ἔλαττ(ον) ἦ ἰε' ἔτη, κ(αὶ) αἰ ὠιδῶν αὐτῶν κ'· κ(αὶ) δ(ιὰ) τ(ὰς) β' ὑπ(έρ) ἰε' δ' ἔχ(ουσι) : M[ἐν ν... διδασκάλω(ι) στάση(ι) σὺν κ', οἱ μὲν(ουσι) αἰ γ' : κ(αὶ) .[δ.. ἀντ(ι) τ[ο]ῦ κ' τ(όν) ἀριθμ(όν) τ(ῶν) ἰβ' πρῶτος πρ(ο)τίθησι : οὐδὲ τὰ Ναν[νῶς

5 ὠ...π... : Ἀρέτα οὐδὲ Συλακίς : κ(αὶ) Κλησισηρό[α : οὐκ Ἀσταφίς ...ρικ(), Φίλυλλα μ() κ(αὶ) Δαμαρέτα κ(αὶ) Ἰανθεμίς.

(manu 1, in marg. sup. columnae iii) 1 ἰ pap. | δ`πζ η : ἰππαδαῖς ἰβ' pap. | // (= εἰσὶν) pap. | αἰ παῖδ[εις, ὧν ἰ ἔλαττ(ον) ἦ leg. et suppl. Ts. || 2 ἰε' ἔτη pap. | κ'αι pap. | κ'δ τ· β' υπ' ἰε' δεχ' pap.; δ) (= διά), υπ' (= ὑπέρ), εχ' (= ἔχουσι?) | M[: nomen chori magistrae in casu dativo latet || 3 διδασκάλω(ι) Ts., -λος Diels | συνκοιμεν)αιγ':κ' pap. | .[: nomen chori magistri latet ('Αλκμάν?) || 4 δ'Υ an τ incertum (δ(ιὰ) τ(αῦτα)?) | usque ad κ (ic Page) leg. et suppl. Ts. | αντ[.]η pap. | τ'αριθμ' ἰβ' πρῶτος Page recte, nisi quod primum τ' (= τόν), alterum τ` (= τῶν) |

π^ρτιθησι : leg. Ts. || 5 ..γγ... Calame, $\overline{\omega\mu\mu\gamma\alpha\iota\alpha\pi}$... : valde incerte leg. Ts. | οὐδὲ leg. Ts., linea verticalis (ι?) sup. ο in pap. | θ super c (sc. Θυλακίς) pap. | κ'κ'λεης. pap. || 6 οὐκ dub. Ts. (κ' pap.; sed v. 5 κ'λεης.) | ...ρικ` pap., ὑστέρικ(εν) valde dub. Ts. | μ` pap. (= μόνον? sed alibi μ` = μετά)

A large portion of the text is effaced, leaving only faint traces. There is also extensive use of abbreviations. It seems that the six lines contain a miscellany of scholia. Separate scholia, but also the sentences they consist of, are divided by dicola.

Line 1 starts with a number, as shown by the top horizontal dash. Nothing is visible before τ̄. However, nothing can precede τ̄ in numerical notation but hundreds and thousands. παῖδας has left only faint traces, but is very likely. Following δ[ηλοῦ], comes a difficult combination of abbreviations and numbers. Since δ and π, quite un-Greekly, follow each other, the first must necessarily either be a number or belong to an abbreviation. The accent beside δ, which would determine the word abbreviated (δ' = δέ, δ` = διά), is practically invisible, but διά gives sense. πζ represents παι, which, combined with διά and some uncertain traces, may be integrated as παίδων. η, without a visible top dash, looks very much like κ, because of a low split in the papyrus, but is more or less certain. διὰ παίδων η' must refer to the eight girls listed in lines 70-76 of the Partheneion. The number ten, which must refer to the actual number of the girls performing, will come again in the scholion *ad* 98. "The poet reveals ten girls by eight girls".

After a dicolon, there follows a masculine plural dative ending, -άδαις, connected with a different now piece of information, namely that the number of the girls was twelve. The reading, though hard, is quite reliable. The two contiguous pis are written with their tops the first curved and the second straight-lined (∩Π). Both forms are legitimate, since they are frequently used in the papyrus, both in the text and in the scholia. The scribe writes in the same manner, two consecutive pis with a different form each, in line 59 of the Partheneion (I∩ΠΙΟC). If the reading is right, one would expect the name to stand for the chorus of the Partheneion. Names of animals denoting religious groups are not uncommon: ἄρκτοι at Brauron, μέλισσαι at Delphi and elsewhere, πέλειαι or πελειάδες at Dodona, et al. But Ἰππάδαι, unlike ἵπποι, not only has the ending of a genos name (like, say, Ἀγιάδαι or Σκοπάδαι), but is also definitely masculine. If a genos name, it would be the first, as far as I know, occurrence of that family, and it would be difficult to guess even the name of the family's progenitor.⁶ On the other hand, it would

6. Ἰππάδης (CIG 4682, 134 B.C., Alexandria) and ηπ(π)ιάδαις (SEG 11.638.4, c. 500 B.C., Laconia) are personal, not family names.

be curious if a *genos*, in Sparta or elsewhere, had a chorus of their own. It was usually the tribes that competed with each other in choral performances, and there is reliable evidence for Doric tribal choruses, whereas Ἴππάδαι is obviously not a tribe name.

In any case, it seems that the choruses might be named after the role or the personae given to the choreuts in particular choral performances. Hesychius records such a term at υ 15, Ὑαλκάδαι· χορὸς παίδων. Λάκωνες. M. Schmidt gives a number of possible parallels, but none seems to resemble the Laconian word. Given that, by folk-etymology, ἀλκυών was usually pronounced with a rough breathing, I would propose a transposal of the initial *upsilon*, quite possible in Hesychius. Ἀλκυάδαι would be a chorus of alcyons, just as Ἴππάδαι would be a chorus of horses. Both look like *genos* names and are masculine. One of the most famous fragments of Alcman, *PMG* fr. 26, likens the chorus-girls to a flock of alcyons accompanied by an aged he-alcyon, a *kerylos*, apparently the male chorus-master, possibly Alcman himself:

οὐ μ' ἔτι, παρσενικαὶ μελιγάρυες ἰαρόφωνοι,
 γυῖα φέρον δύνονται· βάλε δὴ βάλε κηρύλος εἶην,
 ὅς τ' ἐπὶ κύματος ἄνθος ἄμ' ἀλκυόνεσσι ποτήται
 νηδεὲς ἦτορ ἔχων, ἀλιπόρφυρος ἰαρός ὄρνις.

The usual explanation for the dactylic hexameters is that the fragment constitutes a proem to a *partheneion*. C. M. Bowra presumed that the fragment speaks of chorus-girls portraying alcyons literally, not figuratively.⁷ He did not associate his suggestion with Hesychius' Ὑαλκάδαι. Many scholars believe that *ταὶ πεληάδες* at line 60 of the *Partheneion* is also the appellation of a chorus rival to the one singing. However it be, *πεληάδες* is feminine plural.

It was Bowra⁸ too who, without knowing of the name Ἴππάδαι, had stressed the importance of the copious references to horses in the *Partheneion*, where the girls and their leaders are, earnestly or lightly, compared to equines in recurring similes (lines 45-59, 92-93). He had also associated these references to terms significant in Laconian religion, such as *πῶλοι* and *Λευκιπίδες*, identifying both terms, in the sense 'priestesses of Dionysus', with the chorus-girls. He also finds affinities between the horse imagery and the worship of Helen and the Dioscuri. The latter are no doubt a consecrated

7. *GLP*² p. 24; cf. L. B. Lawler, *CJ* 37 (1942) 351-361.

8. *CQ* 28 (1934) 35-44.

pair of young horsemen whose origin appears in the Indo-European (Vedic) pair *Aśvin* (Sanskrit *aśvas* = ἵππος).⁹

Both Ἰππᾶδαι and Ἀλκυάδαι are, however, masculine nouns, though the relevant choruses are feminine. How can this fact be explained? It is likely that the Laconian ἀγωγὴ is involved in the naming. The division of the children in ἴλαι, ‘congregations’, ἀγέλαι, ‘flocks’, and/or βοῦαι, ‘herds of cattle’, obviously suggests animal groups, much like the ‘cubs’ or the ‘wolf cubs’, the ‘beavers’, the ‘bears’, the ‘bobcats’, the ‘lions’ of modern boy scouts. It seems that the βοῦαι were organized in age-groups, with each βούα headed by a βουαγός. This structure apparently concerns boys, not girls. But a couple of Hesychius articles extends this arrangement to girls as well: β 959 βούπρωρον· ... οἱ δὲ τὴν ἠβῶσαν ἢ βουάρχη· ... A singing girl in the Partheneion refers to Hagesichora as her cousin (52 τᾶς ἐμᾶς ἀνεψιάς), whereas another is discouraging a chorus-leader from providing herself with chorus-girls from someone else’s group or company (73 ἐς Αἰνησιμβρότας ἐνθοῖσα). This recalls Hesychius’ article κ 971 κάσιοι· οἱ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀγέλης ἀδελφοὶ τε καὶ ἀνεψιοί. καὶ ἐπὶ θηλειῶν οὕτως ἔλεγον Λάκωνες. Finally, we do not know whether Pindar, while referring to Λάκαινα μὲν παρθένων ἀγέλα (fr. 112 Snell-Maehler), is using the last word as a technical term or just for the group dancing the πυρρίχη, which is ὑπορχηματικὴ ὄρχησις ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν (Ath. 14.631c from Aristocles). If then young girls were also organized in agelai and bouai with adolescent leaders, and lived together in close relationship forming a sort of family connection, they might well have genos-like names. And separate agelai or bouai that provided the members of particular choruses might well be named after the specific animals. On such an organization cf. also below Alcman. Scholia B, fr. 7 (a)+13 and 7 (b), and Theocr. 18.22-24 with K. Kuiper, *Mnemosyne* 49 (1921), 231.

Genos or genos-like names had naturally masculine endings. We cannot exclude, however, the possibility that males were also involved in the chorus. Plutarch, *Lyc.* 14.4-6, states that young girls in Sparta performed πρὸς τισιν ἱεροῖς [...] τῶν νέων παρόντων καὶ θεωμένων. The girls addressed the young men of the audience uttering jibes or praises at them. This does not mean that the girls performed in front of the general public. If they were to praise or to mock same-aged boys according to each one’s personal characteristics,

9. E. Robbins, *CQ* NS 44 (1991) 7-16, esp. 13-14, with older literature. Note also the (folk-etymological) distortion of the name of Polydeuces in Alcman: Πωλυδεύκης (fr. 1 (Parth.) 1, fr. 2); Robbins, n. 39. Let me add, concerning the Dioscuri, that their survival is found in Saints George and Demetrius, who are worshipped in common as a mounted pair of young warriors in several Eastern Christian provinces.

as Plutarch notes, they must have been familiar to each other through spending time with them. The relationship might be still closer if some of the children were relatives, siblings or cousins, as stated in Hesychius' article. Apart from fr. 26, where the participation of a male person is implied, Alcman offers further evidence of boy-choragoi leading or accompanying female choruses.¹⁰ In the Louvre Partheneion, there are some indications for a mixed chorus, with the boys singing, in whole or in part, the section of the poem that spoke of fights and killings, though the Scholiast, as far as I can follow his arguments, does not seem to share such a view. It seems then that the agela or boua that provided the members of the Partheneion chorus might be mixed, thus named, as is regular in such collective appellations, in the masculine plural.

At the end of line 1, it is not easy to choose between αἱ παῖδες, αἱ παρ[θένοι, and αἱ παῖσαι, but an indistinct high trace of ink may belong only to ι, thus making the first of the three the likeliest choice. The rest is supplemented thanks to the simple arithmetic of the next line. The epsilon of ἔτη is written ϛ, the mirror image of ϛ found several times in the scholia. What "and their (sc. of the ten girls) odes are twenty" means is problematic. If ὠδαί means, however, not 'songs' but 'singings' (*LSJ* s.v. II), it might mean that each of the ten girls sang twice, whether separate stanzas or half-stanzas or even shorter cues or combinations of them. And, since their singings are counted separately, they must not have been continuous. The singings would have been twenty, had it not been for the two remaining girls, because of whom the chorus has four more singings, again two singings each. These two are older than fifteen, and must, apparently, be the semichorus-leaders.¹¹ The age-limit of fifteen is, obviously, related to the Spartan education system, of whose 'classes' we possess some knowledge, though all evidence about age divisions (μικχιζόμενοι, πρατοπάμπαιδες, ἀτροπάμπαιδες, μελλείρηνες, εἴρηνες) refers to boys.¹² However it may be, just as a boua was headed by a παῖς (Hsch. β 867 βουαγόρ· ἀγελάρχης· ὁ τῆς ἀγέλης ἄρχων παῖς. Λάκωνες), so an ἡβῶσα might also lead a boua (Hsch. β 959 βούπρωρον· ... οἱ δὲ τὴν ἡβῶσαν ἢ βουάρχην). It is very likely that heading a boua is identified with heading a chorus or a semichorus. Twenty-four singings do not presuppose twelve stanzas for the Partheneion, since the singers need not sing

10. Mainly fr. 10 (b).

11. On choruses that consisted at the same time of minor and major members, cf. fr. 38: ὄσσαι δὲ παῖδες ἀμέων ἐντί, τὸν κιθαριστὰν αἰνέοντι, "those of us who are little girls, praise the lyre-player." See, however, the next paper in the present issue.

12. U. Kahrstedt, *Griech. Staatsrecht* vol. 1, 1922, 342 ff. To Kahrstedt's evidence add Λέξεις Ἡροδότου in H. Stein, *Herodotus*, vol. 2, Berlin 1871, p. 465.

two half-stanzas each, but any two metrical units, large or small. Nor can the number of the singings determine the number of the stanzas of the Partheneion, which many scholars believe was ten.

The sources of the Scholiast's knowledge on this issue must be diverse. The name of Ἰππάδαι may come from an explicit reference to the identity of the chorus, a self-presentation at the lost opening of the poem. The facts about the number of singings may depend on his own calculations. But the details about the number of the girls and their age must come from some extra-textual piece of information, possibly Sosibius. From the last source may also come the explanation of the seeming paradox of employing less singers for twenty or twenty-four singings: M[, while serving as choir-mistress with twenty choreuts, was abandoned by all but three girls. ἐν γ..., at line 3, must conceal the ceremony where this event had taken place. ἐν νέαις, might denote the organized Spartan girls, especially in the girls race at Dromos: Hsch. ν 170 νέαι· ἀγωνισάμεναι γυναῖκες τὸν ἱερὸν δρόμον, and cf. ε 2823 ἐνδριώνας (ἐν δριώνας, ἐν Δριώνας correxerunt)· δρόμος παρθένων ἐν Λακεδαίμονι. However, with the exception of the first three letters, nothing else is visible. The definite article (αἱ γ') possibly indicates that the three girls who remained had a special role, known to the Scholiast, and were distinguished from the others. Apparently, 'the three' were the chorus-leader and the two semichorus-leaders, who, unlike the rank-and-file members of the chorus, might be appointed in advance and not subject to replacement. They must have been also older than fifteen. The accident of M[led an unknown male person (Alcman?) to diminish the number and establish the twelve-member choruses. It appears as if the Scholiast considers the twelve choreuts as canonical. The numbers ten and eight must have, as it seems, a different explanation depending upon the specific occasion of the Partheneion or upon poetic reasoning. The eta of στάση(ι) is uncertain, looking much like alpha. If ττααα, it would be surprising to have either a Doric form (στάσα(ι)) in an annotatory text, even if about Spartan issues, or a nominative (στᾶσα) that is causing problems of construction. At the opening of line 4 δ(ιὰ) τ(αὔτα), though not easily recognizable, is likely.

Reading is extremely difficult after οὐδὲ τὰ Ναν[νῶς. The first word of line 5 does not seem to be κόμαι, and its first letter looks like an omega with a dash above it. It would be strange if this were a number (800). Much likelier is that the Scholiast is speaking about the letter ω, which is found only in the dialectal genitive Ναννῶς instead of the Ionic-Attic Ναννοῦς. But I cannot make out anything else. The comment following has to do with the puzzle of the name-list of lines 70-76, but I am unable to understand the solution proposed, especially the mention of the first three names, Ἄρετα

οὐδὲ Συλακίς: καὶ Κλησισηῖρα. At line 6, I cannot make out the word/s between Ἀσταφίς and Φίλυλλα. The best I can guess is ὑστέρικ(εν), of ὑστερίζω ‘lag behind, be inferior’. In that case, the Scholiast would seem to interpret Alcman’s Ἀσταφίς τέ μοι γένοιτο by “Astaphis has not been unsuccessful” and καὶ ποτιγλέποι Φίλυλλα Δαμαρέτα τ’ ἐρατά τε *Φιανθεμῖς* by “only Phil., Dam., and Ianth. are (sc. unsuccessful)”. That would mean that Astaphis has passed the audition, so she may join the choir (μοι γένοιτο), but the rest have not, so they should stay as spectators (καὶ ποτιγλέποι). The reading is, however, so uncertain that any suggestion is bound to be highly speculative. The iota (?) on top of the omicron of 5 οὐδέ, if correctly read, is inscrutable to me.

ad 79 ἄν(τι) αὐτοῦ.

(manu 3) α^v pap., quod etiam ἄν(τι τοῦ) significare possit; McNamee (supra n. 5), s.v.

ad 80 στασιάζει.

(manu 3) legit Ts.; alt. α angulatum; Στασικλεῖ Page cum schol. praeced. conjungens, Στασικλῆς Calame

Page connects the scholion with the one *ad* 79, ἄν(τι) αὐτοῦ, written also by A3, but their layout in the margin of the papyrus makes it clear that they are two distinct scholia. The reading Στασικλεῖ not only assigns an interpretation to a hitherto unheard-of grammarian, but also, inexplicably, presents his name in the dative. To remedy this paradox Calame published Στασικλῆς (Στασικλ... Hutchinson). I believe I can read στασιάζει, with the second α written in its old angular form of the cursive, usually employed in abbreviations. A similar alpha was written by A1 in the schol. *ad* 2, 3, *κ*Αταριθμ(ῶ), and *ad* 70-76, 5, *κ*λΑκic. For στασιάζει, which, in my view, interprets Alcman’s 80 *παρμένει*, in the sense “stands fast” or “stands her ground”, “does not give way before (Agido)”, cf. Schol. Ar. *Eq.* 590 (from the antode of the first parabasis: Νίκην, ἥ χορικῶν ἐστὶν ἐταῖρα | τοῖς τ’ ἐχθροῖσι μεθ’ ἡμῶν στασιάζει) τοῖς τ’ ἐχθροῖσι] τοῖς ἀντιπάλαις, τοῖς ἀνταγωνισταῖς. ‘στασιάζει’ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ πρὸς φιλονεικίαν διαφέρεται. The arrogant choragos maintains stubbornly her position in the controversy with Agido, “she is at odds with her”.

ad 80 παρ...

(manu 1) fortasse deleta

Apparently an interpretation of *παρμένει* by Scholiast A1, deleted and substituted by A3's *στασιάζει*.

ad 81 θωστήρια· έορτ[ή

(manu 1) supplevit Blass

ad 83 ὅτι τὸ ἄνα ἄνυσις.

(manu 1)

ad 83 ×

(manu 1)

The sign probably refers to the previous scholion.

ad 87 ÷ (?)

(manu ?)

Uncertain sign. Since there is no scholion *ad* 87 to which it might refer, it may indicate a change of singer, possibly after *γλαύξ*. If so, the sign should be attributed to A2.

ad 88 ἄρέσκειν ἐπιθυμῶ.

(manu 1)

ad 95 ἐ]ν νᾶϊ νᾶϊ Χαίριδ[(ος)

(manu 1) νᾶϊ νᾶϊ χαίριδ[leg. Ts., ἐ]ν νᾶϊ· [ἐν] νᾶι Ἄρι[στοφάνης Diels | Ἄρι[στοφάνης Blass, hoc vel Ἄρι[στοταρχος Page; an [ὁ] Χαίριδ(ος) ?

νᾶϊ is written in Alcman's text in the papyrus with a grave and a circumflex on *α*, probably both accents written by the same hand. This is a conflation of two different accentuations, which become clear in the present scholion, usually published as *νᾶϊ νᾶι αρι*. Diels had already published *ἐ]ν νᾶϊ· [ἐν] νᾶι Ἄρι[στοφάνης*, but there is neither trace nor space for the second *ἐν*. The longum sign over the second *α* is joined with the circumflex, which covers both *α* and *ι*, the second having no diaeresis. This gave the impression to many scholars, including Page (also *LSJ* s. *ναῦς*), that the second form is a monosyllabic *νᾶι*. If so, however, the longum sign would be redundant, and it cannot be claimed that the grammarian was metrically so

ignorant as to cover a trochaic foot (–υ) with a longum (–). The grammarian was neither Aristophanes (Blass, Diels) nor Aristarchus (Page), but, if I read well, Chaeris, an Aristarchean grammarian, whose interests included accentuation:¹³ fr. 5 Berndt θῶων ~ -ωῶν, 7 στρουθός ~ -θός; add ῥΩπος, Apollonii τοῦ Χαίριδος fr. 4 Berndt. The first example (fr. 5, from Schol. Hom. *Il.* 13.103) may have something to do with the ‘Doric’ accent, since it is related to the accentuation of monosyllables like πάντων and παίδων (Dor. παντῶν, παιδῶν). The two forms must have been νᾶϊ and νᾶϊ̄. The formulation of the scholion does not make absolutely clear which of the two forms was proposed by Chaeris, but the second is likelier. I do not know why the editors prefer the Aeolic νᾶϊ to the Doric νᾶϊ̄.

ad 98

: ἐν δέκα:

ταῦτ' οὐ ψευδ(ος) εἴρηκε,
ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ τὸν

5 χορὸν ὅτε μὲν ἐ[ξ] ἰα' παρθένων ὅτε δὲ ἐκ ἰ' φη(σίν) οὔν
τὴν χορηγὸν ἐπαινεῖν ἀντὶ ἰα' αἰδεῖν ἰ' ἐξῆν γὰρ ἀ[ν-]
ἀριθμον εἰπεῖν τ(ὸν) χορὸν, εἴπερ οὐκ ἐβούλετο τὸν ἀριθμ[ὸν] τῶν
παρθένων ----- ντωιμ[.]τ[.]
ἀλλὰ Ἰολυμπι...ι.ι.α...θμοι ----- ςαιδ[
10 ιβ' ἐξῆν.

(manu 1) 1 : ενδέκα pap.; accentum dispexit Ts.; ενδεκα edd. || 2 ταῦτ' οὐ ψευδ^ο legit Ts. || 5 χορο' pap. | φῆ pap. || 6 ἐπαινεῖν legit Ts. || 6 sq. ἀ[ν]ἀριθμον Merkelbach || 7 τ(ὸν) χορὸν leg. et suppl. Ts. || 8 ἐν τῶι μ[ε]τὰξ[ύ] ? an ντωιμ? || 9 ἀλλ' αἰ an ἀλλὰι? ἀλλὰι, Ἰολυμπίους θεοῖς ἰσάριθμοι dub. Ts. || 9 sq. ςαιδ[| ιβ' ἐξῆν omnia in litura || 10 ιβ' legit Ts., ιβ' edd.; post ἐξῆν nihil erat scriptum

Line 1 consists of the lemma, the dicolon at its start serving as a reference mark. The accent above the second epsilon, slightly effaced but certain, shows that the scribe was interested to distinguish between ἐνδεκα and ἐνδέκα, before discussing the second, which he considers Alcman's true reading. This is not the place to discuss the impact of this reading on the poem's interpretation, but it can be claimed in advance that the whole picture of the occasion, which the *Partheneion* and its performance are placed in, is considerably changed. Line 2, οὐ ψευδός, stresses that the unconventional number of the choreuts is not a fiction invented by Alcman, but a fact occasionally observed. At 6, following τὴν χορηγόν, an infinitive depending on φησίν is necessary. I discern faintly but certainly εἰπα. Campbell publishes

13. R. Berndt, *Charetis Chaeridisque fragmenta*, Progr. Königsberg 1902.

ἐπαυγῶν (Page, hypothetically), and translates “so he says (in praise of) the chorus-leader that etc.”, which is incomprehensible. ἐπαινεῖν would, however, yield perfect sense: “therefore he says that the chorus-leader assented to the singing of ten instead of eleven”. Merkelbach’s 6-7 ἀνάριθμον is satisfactory. I read or guess at 7 τ(ὸν) χορόν, which integrates the sense. 8-9 ἐ]ν τῶι μ[ε]ταξ[ὶ] | ἄλλαι Ὀλυμπίως θεοῖς ἰσάριθμοι is possible but far from certain. From 9 ραῖδ[to the end, the text seems to be written upon erased words. The reference to a number of choreuts at 10 is ιβ’, not ιθ’, as usually published. There is no text after ἐξῆν.

ad 98 ×

(manu I)

Reference mark to the previous scholion.

ad versum quendam carminis sequentis ×

(manu ?, in column iv)

Scholion B

(P. Oxy. 2389, frs. 6, 7, 8, 13)

fr. 6 (a) + (c) + (b)
col. i

] ὡς ἵππος Κολαξαῖος
 ὕστερεῖ τοῦ Ἰβηνοῦ,] οὕτως ἡ Ἀγιδῶ προ-
 ἔχει Ἀγησιχόρας, ἡ δευ]τέρᾳ κατὰ τὸ εἶδος
 οὔσα, ὡς] ἵππος Κολ[αξαῖος πρὸ]ς Ἰβηνόν
 5 ἐστι. Κολ]αξαίου δὲ []...ο
 Ἰβ]ηνοῦ. πε[ρὶ δὲ τοῦ γένο]υς τῶν
 ἵππω]ν Ἀρίσταρχος ο[ὕτως ἱστορ]εῖ· ἀμ-
 φότερ]α ταῦτα γένη ἵπ[πων Ἀσιατι]κά· λέ-
 γουσι] δὲ ἀμφοτέρω[ν διαπρε]πόντων
 10 προφ]έρειν τὸν Ἰβην[όν· Κράτης δὲ] τοὺς
 Ἰβην]οὺς φησιν τῆς Λ[υδίας ἔθνος εἶ]ναι·
 ἀπὸ τ]ούτου δὲ βούλετ[αι δεῖξαι ὅτι] Λυ-
 δὸς ἦν] ὁ Ἀλκμάν· Σω[σίβιος δὲ τὸ τ]ῶν
 Ἰβηνῶ]ν ἔθνος ἀποφ[αίνεται τῆι Συ]ρί-
 15 αι παρά]κεισθαι προσα[γόμενος .]δο-

... μ]άρτυν. περι δὲ τῶ[ν Κολαξαί]ων
 Εὐδοξο]ς ὁ Κν[ίδι]ος δια[c. 8]νεα[
]...ο]ς γρ[c. 9]δε[
 περι] τὸν Πόντον τούτο]υς
 desunt 5 vv.

25

]..
]δε
]ια
]κι

.....

scholium ad Parthenii vv. 58-59 || 1 ὡς Page || 2-5 omnia e.g. suppl. Ts., praeter 3 δευ]τέρα et 4 Κολ[αξαί]ος πρὸ]ς Lobel || 5]...: ωι sscr. || 6-10 omnia suppl. Lobel, praeter 8 f. Ἀσιατι]κά: λέ[γουσι] Page et διαπρε]πόντων Barrett || 10-13 Κράτης δὲ et δεῖ]ξαι (συμβάλλειν Page, spatio longius) suppl. Ts., rell. Barrett post Lobel, qui sensum indicavit || 13-14 Σω[σίβιος δὲ τὸ τ]ῶν Ἰβη]νῶ]ν Lobel || 14-15 ἀποφ[αίνεται] (ἀποφ[αίνει Lobel) τῆ] Συ]ρί]αι παρὰ]κεισθαι Ts.; de Συ]ρί]αι, sc. Κοίλη] Συρία, v. St.Byz. s. Ἰβαῖ]οι et Ἰώνη; de παρὰ]κεισθαι cf. e.g. St. Byz. s. Λιβυστῖ]νοι, Σαννί]γαι, Σιθηνοῖ] || 15-16 προσα[γόμενος Lobel;]δω pap., cum o sscr., i.e. in δο correctum; μ]άρτυν Lobel || 16 τῶ[ν Κολαξαί]ων Barrett post Lobel; Εὐδοξο]ς ὁ Κν[ίδι]ος Lobel; δια[σαφεῖ Diehl || 19 ποντον pap.^{Pc}, τοπον pap.^{ac} ([το]πον'τον'), τὸν Πόντον τούτο]υς vel τούτω]ν Barrett probabiler; περι Diehl || 26 [η] sscr. super ε

Admittedly, much is supplemented *exempli gratia*. The opening sentence seems to present a true statement in a logically inverted formulation, but this is a deceptive impression. The Scholiast is merely following the construction of the *Partheneion* (Ἴππος Ἰβη]νῶ]ι Κολαξαῖ]ος δραμῆ]ται). What is inverted is the demonstrative part of the correlative expression: οὕτω]ς ἢ Ἀγιδῶ] προέ]χει Ἀγησιχό]ρας for οὕτω]ς ἢ Ἀγησιχό]ρα ὑστερεῖ Ἀγιδοῦ]ς. The reason is that the Scholiast intended to describe Hagesichora in a relative clause, so that her name should necessarily be placed in the last position of the principal clause. The sense of lines 1-5, which has been greatly distorted by Page and other scholars, is now, I believe, clear. At 10 I supplement, perhaps too boldly, Κράτης δὲ, since it is known that it was this grammarian who supported Alcman's Lydian origin; see test. 1 and cf. 2-9, esp. 7, Campbell. Based mainly on the parallels from Stephanus Byzantius, both informatory and stylistic, I propose 14-15 τῆ] Συ]ρί]αι παρὰ]κεισθαι. In Stephanus, the Ibians are identified with the Ἰαονῖ]ται (Ἰβαῖ]οι, οἱ καὶ Ἰβη]νοί: ἔθνος Κελτι-κῆ]ς. Ἰβη]νοὶ δ' εἰσὶ καὶ Λυδίας, οἱ καὶ Ἰαονῖ]ται λέγονται). And Ἰωνῖ]ται were a people, supposedly named after Io and tracing their origin from Argos, who lived in the area of the mouth of Orontes, near late Antiocheia (mod. Antakya

in Southern Turkey); cf. St. Byz. Ἰώνη· οὕτως ἐκαλεῖτο ἡ Ἀντιόχεια ἢ παρὰ Δάφνην, ἣν ὠίκησαν Ἀργεῖοι. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Ἰωνίτης κτλ. A confusion of Ἰώνη and Ἰόνιον πέλαγος with Gaza (St. Byz. Ἰόνιον πέλαγος, Hdn. Gr. 3.1.337.8 L., Eust. Comm. in Dion. Perieg. 92.11) will not occupy us at present. The supplement of [..ρι] in the Schol. B is obvious, since the area is really close to Syria. There is no need to connect etymologically Ἰβηνοί with Ἰαονῖται and certainly not with the Ionians; Page '51, p. 90 n. 1. It is noteworthy that, in the Schol. B, Sosibius appears to disagree with another grammarian, probably Crates, who considers the Ibenians an ἔθνος of Lydia. This might mean that Sosibius does not consider the area that is close to Syria as part of Lydia. Stephanus or his sources combine the two views, considering the Ibenians an ἔθνος of Lydia and identifying them with a people living close to Syria. In any case, even though the southern borders of the Lydian kingdom in the time of Alcman are indeterminate, Alcman nowhere speaks of a Lydian breed, but may well imply a breed used by the Lydians.

col. ii

ἄμιν Ὀιρθρίαι φᾶρος φεροῖσαις νύκτα δι'
 ἀμβροσία·ν ἄτε Σίριον ἄστρον ἀνειρομέναι
 μάχοντα·ι
 εἰρημέν[
 5 τὴν Ἀγιδῶ [πλεο-
 αὐταῖς Ὀρ[θρίαι Ἄ-
 δὲ τοῦτο λ[
 νάκις εἶσα[
 —
 ταρνίδες .[
 10 [φέ-
 αδ... .[
 χοντα·ι τὰς [δὲ Πλειάδας Πελειάδας φη-
 σίν, καθάπερ [καὶ Πίνδαρος καλεῖ ἰδρεῖ-
 ἄν γε Πελειάδων μὴ τηλόθεν Ὠαρίωνα
 15 νεῖσθαι· ἐὰν [δὲ πέλειαι ὤσι, δύναται καὶ
 οὕτως ἀκοῦσα·ι ἢ τε Ἀγησιχό-
 ρα καὶ ἡ Ἀγιδῶ .[
 ουσαι, τὸ τοῦ Σιρί[ου
 μαχόμεναι πε[
 20 Πλειάδων τὸ α[φέ-
 γὰρ ὡς πελει[άδες
 ρουσιν. πα[.] .[

25 'νύκτι, α δι' ἀμβροσίαν ἄτε σίριον ἄστρον ἀυει-
 ροιμέναι μίχαχο[νται.] ἔνταῦθα δοκεῖ ἐλλεί-
 πειν τι· εἶναι γὰρ [τὸ κῶλον 'νύκτα δι' ἀμβρο-
 σίαν' ἀντίστροφο[ν τῶι 'ἀεθλοφόρον κανα-
 χάποδα', ὥστε ἡ λ[έξις β' βραχειῶν δοκεῖ ἐλ-
 λείπειν· τιμῶν[
]ν ἄστρον ἄτε Σίριον κατὰ
 30 λόγον τοιοῦτον [
 ἡμᾶς περὶ τῆς [
 ..] εὔνου ἄστρου
 ..] ἀπο[

scholium ad Parthenii vv. 60-63 || 1-3 Lobel || 6 ὀρθρίας Lobel, ὀρθρίας
 Davison, Ὄρθρια Ts. || 7-8 πλεο|νάκεις Lobel || 8 / in marg. sin. pap.; εἰς α[
 vel εἰσα[|| 8-9 Ἄ|ταρνίδες Lobel; an modo Ταρνίδες? || 11 ἀδι|αμβρο[(sc.
 νύκτι)|α δι' ἀμβροσίαν ἀυειρόμεναι μίχαχο[νται] dub. Page, ἀδι|αμβρο[Calame; ambo
 negat Hutchinson recte || 12-15 Lobel, praeter 13 καλεῖ Ts. ex Ath. 11.490f
 || 15 e.g. suppl. Ts. || 16 Lobel || 17 καιγι pap.^{ac}, καιη pap.^{pc}; ασιδω pap.,
 corr. Lobel || 18 Σίρι|ου ἄστρον Lobel, an Σίρι|ου ἄστρου δυσμενές coll. 32?
 || 19-20 an τῶν Πλειάδων τὸ α[ίσιον coll. 32? || 21 πελει|άδες Lobel, Πε-
 λει|άδες Hutchinson || 21-22 φέ|ρουσιν suppl. Ts. || 24 φασὶ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ἄνω
 ἐλλείπειν τι e.g. Page, ἔνταῦθα δοκεῖ ἐλλείπειν τι e.g. Ts. || 25 πειντι· pap.;
 supra πε alt. manu scr. ου; vide infra; τὸ κῶλον e.g. Ts., rell. Lobel || 26 αντι-
 τουτω[pap.^{ac}, ἀντίστροφο[pap.^{pc} (στροφο[supra τουτω scripto); τῶι Lobel; solum
 κανα|χάποδα suppl. Lobel, ἀεθλοφόρον κανα|χάποδα Ts. post Page || 27 e.g.
 Ts.; scholiasta vehementer errat, quia νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίαν ad παγὸν ἀεθλοφόρον
 respondet, non ad ἀεθλοφόρον κανα|χάποδα; errorem scriba posterior indicavit, qui
 v. 25 οὐ sscr. || 28 λειπειν· τιμῶν[pap., λείπειν τι μῶν [(quod alia supplementa in
 v. 27 postularet), λείπειν· τιμῶν[, λείπειν· τί; μῶν [? || 28-29 Σίρι|[[ο]ν? emenda-
 tiones tentat scholiasta || 29 κατὰ Lobel || 32 εὔνου ἄστρου leg. et suppl. Ts.

Lines 4-22 are too fragmentary, but seem to discuss the sense of πεληγά-
 δες, whether Pleiads or pigeons. The mention of Ἄ|ταρνίδες at 8-9 is
 mysterious, but I strongly doubt that it may refer to women of Atarneus, the
 Lydian-Mysian town in Asia Minor opposite Lesbos. The same ethnicon, in
 the singular Ἄταρνίδα, appears in Alcman's gravely mutilated fr. 10 (a) 15
 = test. 9 Campbell. One might conjecture that the word is a poetic adjective
 for 'Sardian', since, according to the Homeric Scholia, the Lydian city
 Τάρνη, mentioned in the *Iliad* 5.44, is ἡ νῦν καλουμένη Σάρδις. Plin. *HN*
 5.110 mentions *Tarne* as a river fountain on Tmolus, on whose slopes Sardis
 was situated. For the initial alpha see Steph. Byz. s. Ἄπαισός: ... ὡς ἄρ'
 Ἄταρνα πόλις καὶ Τάρνα. Ὅμηρος ὄς ἐκ Τάρνης ἐριβόλακος'. Yet, line

9 may well be read Ταρνίδες. In fr. 10 (a) the discussion is actually about the place of Alcman's origin, whether Sparta or Sardis. Concerning the first, Alcman's reference to nightingales he heard by the stream of Eurotas (6 ff.) and its rich pastures (εὐνομώ[τατον, rather than 'best-governed') is adduced as evidence for his Laconic origin. Then comes 15 Ἀταρνίδα possibly in a quotation presented as evidence for the Lydian origin. I would supplement 14 ff.

με-]
 ταλλᾶν τὰν τρ[ίβον εἰς]
 15 Ἀταρνίδ' ἀέν[αον παγάν'.]
 ἐν γὰρ τούτο[ις εἰώθει]
 γράφειν τὰ π[οιήματα]
 Ἀλκμάν, ὃς [

14 με]|ταλλᾶν suppl. Ts. (dorice -λλῆν debebat); τὰν τρ[ίβον εἰς suppl. Ts. || 15 suppl. Ts., -ίδα ἐν[Page || 16 τούτο[ις suppl. Page; num supplendum τούτοις (τούς τόποις)?; εἰώθει suppl. Ts. || 17 π[οιήματα suppl. Ts. || Ἀλκμάν, ὃς (vel ὄσ[περ) Ts., Ἀλκμάνος Page

“... to inquire the path to the ever-flowing Atarnian fountain”. Yet, it is impossible to propose with any confidence what (A)ταρνίδες qualified in Schol. B. Just speculatively, I should guess that, if in 10 (a) Ἀταρνίδα κράναν or παγάν stands in contraposition with Εὐρώτα ῥοαῖσι, the plural (A)ταρνίδες, in a passage where the question is about the meaning of πελειάδες, might qualify Sardian doves. Only that, if this is true, this reference to doves would not imply initiation into poetry as with the Eurotan nightingales. Doves are not poetic birds, and Herodotus, 2.57, attests that the reference to their chirping was employed for ‘speaking barbarian, therefore unintelligibly’. They are, however, erotic birds, and Alcman, ὦν ἐρωτικὸς πάνυ εὐρετῆς γέγονε τῶν ἐρωτικῶν μελῶν (Suda, Alcman. test. 1 Campbell). Would it be too extravagant to suppose that the reference to the two birds in the discussion about Alcman's origin may allude to the barbarophone erotic poet who turned into a Greek lyric poet?

The dubiously proposed supplements at 16 ff. (ἦ τε Ἀγῆσιχό]ρα καὶ ἡ Ἀγιδῶ [+15]|ουσαι, τὸ τοῦ Σιρι[ου ἄστρου δυσμενές] | μαχόμεναι πε[c. 15 τῶν] | Πλειάδων τὸ α[ίσιον), admittedly extremely speculative, depend on the reading 32 εὔνου ἄστρ[ου and on the assumption that T. G. Rosenmeyer's remarks (GRBS 7, 1966, 321-359, esp. 343 and n. 81), that Sirius had ominous and uncomplimentary connotations, were anticipated by the Schol. B.

fr. 7 (a)+13

col. iii

.
],[
] Φίλυλλα Δαμαρέ-
 τα τ' ἔρατά τε Ἰανθεμίδης · καθ' ὑπόθεσιν ταῦ-
 τ[α· αἱ γὰρ παρθένοι ἐν τῇι τ]ῆς Αἰνησιμβρό-
 5 τα[ς συναγελαζόμεναι] βού[αι

fort. columnae iii vv. 15 sqq.: 'Fr. 7 (a) col. i + (b) no doubt formed part of the column following fr. 6 (c) col. ii. I believe that (a) may be located opposite fr. 6 ii 15 [per errorem, 25 impressum] seqq. (c) is shown by the vertical fibres to have been in the same column as fr. 7 (a) col. ii. I am fairly confident that it stood above this, possibly opposite fr. 6 ii 7 seqq., though at such an interval identification of the cross-fibres can be no more than a speculation' Lobel || scholium ad Parthenii vv. 73-77 || e.g. suppl. Ts. || 3-4 ταύ|τ[ην Lobel

It was not noticed that the Scholiast refers to the well-known rhetorical figure καθ' ὑπόθεσιν; Hermog. *Id.* 1.11.250, al. In other words, the visit to Aenesimbrotas's and the request for other girls to take part in the chorus never took place, but was also never supposed to take place; it was mentioned hypothetically by the poet only for emphasizing the efficiency of the existing chorus. 4-5 are supplemented *exempli gratia*. For the supplement βού[αι, though highly speculative, cf. Hsch. β 959 βούπρωρον· ... οἱ δὲ τὴν ἡβῶσαν ἢ βουάρχηγν· ... quoted above on Scholia A, *ad* 70-76, and the discussion made there. See also the next item.

Fr. 7 (b)

.
],[
 ἴ]γα βλέπηι .[
 τὰς λ]οιπὰς παρθ[ένους ἰ]ἀλλ' Ἄγη-
 σιχό]ρα με τ]εῖρει
 5], ἀλλ' Ἄγησιχ]όρα με τεῖρει. οὐ

γὰρ] ἅ καλλίσφυρος Ἄγησιχόρα πάρ' αὐτεῖ·
 ο]ὕχ ὡς νῦν μὴ παρού[σης ἐμνημόνευσε
 τ]ῆς Ἄγησιχόρας, ἀλλ' ἐ]πει δεῖξαι βούλε-
 ται ὅτι ἐὰν ἔσω τῆ[ς Αἰνησιμβρότας βούας
 10 ἔλ]θης οὐδεμίαν [τοιαύτην ἐκεῖ δυνήσῃ
 εὐ]ρεῖν πα[ρθ]ένο[ν· ἀλλὰ Ἄγησιχό-
 ρα μ]ε τεῖρει

fort. columnae iii vv. 21 vel 22 sqq. || scholium ad Parthenii vv. 75-79 || 2 dub. suppl. Lobel || 3-6 Lobel | 6 versus in ecthesi ut lemma scriptus || 7-11 sensum intellexit Lobel || 7 ο]ὐχ et παρού[σης Page post Lobel; ἐμνημόνευσε Ts. post Barrett μέμνηται, μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων dub. Page || 8 ἀλλὰ [λέγειν βούλε|ται dub. Page, ἀλλ' ἐ[πεὶ δεῖξαι βούλε|ται Ts. || 9 εἰ[.]τη[legit Lobel, εἰ[ς] τῆ[ς Αἰνησιμβρότας suppl. Page, εἶ[σ]ω τῆ[ς Αἰνησ. Barrett, negavit Hutchinson; at potius non ι sed c legendum est, cum linea recta scriptum (vide 8 τ]ῆC), tum ἔσω τῆ[ς Αἰνησιμβρότας οἰκίας vel βούας, vel ἐς [τ]ὸ τῆ[ς Αἰνησιμβρότας δῶμα || 10-11 suppl. Page post Lobel || 12 εὐ]ρεῖν πα[ρθ]ένο[ν Lobel; ἀλλὰ μόνη Ἀγησιχό|ρα pergīt Page

Fr. 7 (c)

col. iv

. .
κα[
τε.[
με[
—
εχ[
. .

fort. columnae iv vv. 6-9

(a)

. .
εἰσχ[
—
ταδο.[
.[
. .

columnae iv fort. vv. 15-17 || 1 an εἰβ[?] || 2 versus in ecthesi ut lemma scriptus, quamquam ταδο in Parthenio superstiti non invenitur

fr. 8

. .
]μεν..[
]ὦ θεοί, δέ[ξασθε
. . . .

fort. scholium paraphrasticum ad Parthenii vv. 80-83 || e.g. παρα]μένει[καὶ τὰ θωστήρια ἐπαινεῖ. ἀλλά,] ὦ θεοί, δέ[ξασθε τὰς εὐχὰς κτλ.