

MISZELLEN

THE LIST OF PINDAR'S WORKS
IN THE *VITA AMBROSIANA*

Keywords: Pindar, Partheneia, Vita Ambrosiana

In all the most recent Teubner editions of Pindar, from Snell's first to Maehler's latest,¹ the list of Pindar's work transmitted by the Vita Ambrosiana I 3 Drachmann reads as follows:²

γέγραφε δὲ βιβλία ἑπτακαίδεκα ὕμνους, παιᾶνας, διθυράμβων β', προσοδίων β', παρθενείων β'. φέρεται δὲ καὶ γ' ὃ ἐπιγράφεται κεχωρισμένον τῶν παρθενείων ὑπορχημάτων β', ἐγκώμια, θρήνουσ, ἐπινίκων δ'.

Ambrosianus C 222 inf. (A) || προσοδίων A^{ac} | παρθενίων β'. φέρεται δὲ καὶ γ' Boeckh : φέρεται δὲ καὶ παρθενίων β' καὶ γ' A | ἐπιγράφεται Boeckh : ἐπιγράφει A | κεχωρισμένον τῶν παρθενείων Snell : κεχωρισμένων παρθενίων A

Boeckh's emendations require no discussion.³ Snell's, however, does. He must be right that A's text is unsound, as the three other sources that give *Partheneia* book 3 a title call it "Separate from the *Partheneia*", not "Separate *Partheneia*":⁴ schol. ap. P.Oxy. XXVI 2438 ἐπιγρ(άφεται) (Lobel, Gallo) τὰ κεχωρισμ(έν)α τ(ῶν) π[αρθε]νείων (Lobel),⁵ schol. BDEGQ Pind. Pyth. 139a, II 81 Drachmann ἐν τοῖς

1) Pindari carmina cum fragmentis ed. B. Snell, Leipzig¹ 1953, 191; Pindarus, II: Fragmenta. Indices post B. Snell ed. H. Maehler, Leipzig⁸ 1989, 1.

2) The apparatus is based on that given by Drachmann.

3) Schneidewin claimed that the first of these was unnecessary, suggesting "Sufficiebat στιγμή post β' posita" (Eustathii prooemium commentariorum Pindaricorum ed. F. W. Schneidewin, Göttingae 1837, 25). I am unpersuaded: this use of φέρεται would be odd, and likewise the expression β' καὶ γ'.

4) On this still mysterious book (fr. 95–*100, 104 Snell / Maehler) see L. Lehnus, L'inno a Pan di Pindaro, Milano 1979, 69–85, with bibl.

5) MP³ 1351.1, ed. pr. E. Lobel, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXVI (1961) 6 n. 1, now in K. McNamee, Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt, s.l. 2007, 305. There is no material or logical connection with P.Oxy. 2438 (MP³ 1351), as Lobel recognised ("a stray scrap of papyrus which I cannot attach to any text"); M. S. Funghi / G. Messeri Savorelli, Considerazioni paleografiche e papirologiche su P.Oxy. 2438a, SCO 41 (1991) 101–4, after L. Porciani, Note critiche a P.Oxy. 2438a, ibid. 95–100, connect it with P.Oxy. LXXV 5039 (MP³ 1355.21).

κεχωρισμένοις (κεχρησμένοις E) τῶν παρθενείων (παρθένων codd. : -ίων Schneider, -είων Bergk), schol. KEAG Theocr. 2.10b, 271 Wendel ἐν τοῖς κεχωρισμένοις τῶν παρθενείων.⁶ But as well as showing the correct syntactical relation between participle and noun, these sources also indicate that the title of book 3 was in the plural: “Poems” – not “Book” – “separate from the *Partheneia*”. This comes as no surprise: each of the other books into which Pindar’s poetry was arranged presented itself as a plurality of poems of a kind or another – *Hymns*, *Paeans*, etc. Snell’s singular, then, is inapposite. One may toy with κεχωρισμέν(ων) τῶν παρθενείων, but the genitive is odd in the absence of a numeral, all the more so with ἐπιγράφεται. In keeping with the other single-book titles in the list, the solution that imposes itself is κεχωρισμέν(α) τῶν παρθενείων.

Venice

Enrico Emanuele Prodi

6) In the second and third of these examples, the genitive, if taken as participle, could conceivably be just a periphrastic rendering of A’s κεχωρισμένα παρθένεα; but this cannot be true of the first example, where the likely reference to titling suggests that the title is quoted verbatim. I owe both of these points to the kindness of Prof. Dr. Stephan Schröder, who no longer maintains his earlier defence of the transmitted text (*Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian*, Stuttgart / Leipzig 1999, 137 n. 1).