

NOTES ON A NEW EDITION OF THE GREEK LYRIC FRAGMENTS

Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta vol. 1 published by O.U.P. in 1989 is the first part of my new recension of the fragments of early Greek lyric; an enterprise advertised elsewhere in this journal (1). In the article thus alluded to I outlined in general terms the considerations which rendered Page's *PMG* (2) somewhat unsatisfactory (to my view) in comparison with the standards set by other modern editions of fragmentary authors, in particular Pfeiffer's of the Callimachean fragments. In the present study I proceed to what I fear are often rather trivial details concerning differences of presentation that will be found to exist between my first volume (which comprises the remains of Alcman, Stesichorus and Ibycus) and the appropriate parts of *PMG* (and also such relevant books as Calame's edition of Alcman) (3). I will not be dealing with divergences over readings, conjectures or interpretation, which can be (or have been) treated elsewhere, but with rather more formal *minutiae* of editorial technique. Indeed (to try the reader's patience still further) some of the details will be purely negative and designed to explain the absence from my book of certain features which others might expect.

For instance, given the decision to include not only the fragments of early Greek lyric but also the *testimonia* relating to the life and art of the poets concerned, it seemed desirable besides to set at the head of the first volume a few pages (1-3) laying out the "*testimonia ad novem lyricos pertinentia*". The few relevant texts were already printed by H. Färber in his *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike* (4) which also provides valuable commentary. Be it noted, however, that one of these texts should be omitted: *An. Gr.* 3.1461 Bekker καὶ γνώρισμα μὲν λυρικῶν ποιητῶν τὸ πρὸς λύραν τὰ τούτων ᾄδεσθαι μέλη, ὡς τὰ τοῦ Πινδάρου καὶ Στησιχόρου καὶ Ἀνακρεόντος καὶ Ἀλκμᾶνος Ἀλκαίου Βακχυλίδου

(1) *Towards a new edition of the Greek lyric poets*, "Prometheus" 14, 1988, 193-8.

(2) Oxford 1962.

(3) Published in Rome 1983. See my review in "Gnomon" 58, 1986, 385 ff.

(4) Munich 1936.

Σιμωνίδου Ἰβύκου καὶ τὰ τῆς μουσικωτάτης Σαφφούς. This passage is formally similar to a number of others listing the canonical nine lyric poets of Greece, but transpires on investigation to be a sixteenth century forgery by Konstantinos Paleokappa (5). The first half of the text (down to and including the mention of Anacreon) is verbally almost identical to the lyric poets (and naming of three) which we find in Tzetzes *Proleg. ad Hes. Op.* also quoted by Färber (p. 20) and more recently edited by Colonna (6) (= my *T5).

The importance of choosing the best text of a *testimonium* is further emphasised by an instance from one of my *testimonia vitae* relating to Alcman (TA6, from the sub-section amassing the ancient evidence for and against Alcman's Lydian origin). This is the epigram by Alexander Aetolus A.P. 7.709 = Plut. *Moral.* 599E = Gow-Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams* 149 ff. = Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* p. 127. Because he does not consider the edition of this poem by Gow and Page, Calame (7) fails to mention Bentley's palmary emendation Κανδαύλεω (for Δασκύλεω) in the final line, which is approved not only by the two English editors but by V. Schmidt (8).

Moving on to the text of Alcman's fragments, one may begin by citing an instance where again the absence rather than the presence of a feature is to be desiderated. In fr. 35 as main sources for the two-word fragment κάλλα μελισδομέναι Page (9) cited *Et. Gen.* and *Et. Mag.* and then adds "fere eadem *An. Par.* 4.63.13 Cramer (cod. Paris. 2636)". But the worthlessness

(5) See the demonstration by Cohn, *Philol. Abhandlungen M. Hertz dargebracht* p. 130. It is not always easy to decide when to include or omit the evidence provided by a passage which is technically a forgery: take, for instance, Pseudo-Plutarch *Nob.* 2 (7.200 Bernard): ποσάκις παρὰ Σιμωνίδη, Πινδάρφ, Ἀλκαίφ, Ἰβύκφ, Στησιχόρφ ἡ εὐγένεια ἐν λόγῳ καὶ τιμῇ μέρει ἔστι; This is printed as T25 of Alcaeus in Campbell's Loeb translation; but περὶ εὐγενείας (*pro Nobilitate*) is (in the form we know) a decidedly late forgery (see Ziegler, *RE* 21.1 [1951] 812 ff. = pp. 76 of the separate printing) c. 15th cent. A.D. (!) and can hardly be said to convey any earth-shattering information about the poets in question.

(6) In "Bollettino del Comitato per la preparazione delle Edizioni Nazionali dei Classici Greci e Latini (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei)" 2, 1953, 27 ff. On the importance of this overlooked edition see West's commentary on Hesiod's *Works and Days* (Oxford 1976) p. 69 n. 5 (cf. my remarks in "CR" 29, 1979, 204).

(7) Sup. cit. (n. 3) p. 7.

(8) *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas* (Berlin 1968) p. 72 and. n. 103. On the other hand Ursinus' βακέλας for μακέλας in 1.2, set in the text by Gow-Page but only mentioned in the app. crit. by Calame, is assailed by Masson, "ZPE" 9, 1972, p. 101 n. 25, who defends the paradoxos.

(9) I maintain Page's numeration (cf. my *Praefatio* p. i and n. 2).

of this particular MS was amply exposed by Reitzenstein in his classic *Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika*, so that the note may be dispensed with (10). By contrast, a sin of omission is involved by such frequently bare references in Page as "An. Ox. 1.55.4 Cramer" (fr. 129) or "An. Ox. 1.190.19" (fr. 136). Merkelbach and West's *Fragmenta Hesiodica* which appeared five years later (11) illustrates the correct way to handle the matter: their fr. 309 from the same source is correctly labelled "Epimerism. alphab. in Hom., Anecd. Ox. i.148.23 Cramer" (12). Now that volume one of A. R. Dyck's edition of the *Epimerismi Homerici* has been published we can already replace such references as Page's "An. Par. 3.297.28 Cramer" (in fr. 171) with "Epimer. Hom. 1B.1a (1.62 Dyck)".

The relationship between the *Lexicon* of Harpocration and the *Suda* is another area where Page's app. crit. can be misleading as (for instance) at fr. 14, where a reference to Harpocrat. *Lex.* 1.151 Di(ndorf) is at once followed by the statement "fere eadem *Suda* 2.706 Adler (ubi 'Αλκαῖος pro 'Αλκμάν codd.)". In fact the *Suda* (like Photius' equivalent entry, not cited by Page) derives its information here from the epitome of Harpocration (derives thence also its confusion of Alcaeus and Alcman - an important fact for the editor of Alcman). Calame's app. crit. is again no clearer, and even Merkelbach and West, with notes such as (on Hes. fr. 225, where Harpocration is the main source) "cf. Sudam p. 521 (iii 355/6 Adler); ex eodem fonte Photius, *Lex.* p. 220 Porson" or (on fr. 150.17f.) "cf. ... et Harpocrat. Sudam Photium s.v." do not make the facts quite perspicuous. For that (as for so many refinements in the art of editing fragments) one must turn to Kassel-Austin's *Poetae Comici Graeci*, for instance, their app. crit. to Aristophanes fr. 332.11 (3.2.186).

At this point it is as well to stress that (like, regrettably enough, many other editors of fragments) I have not in *PMGF* set myself the task of editing each fragment *de novo* in the way attempted (and triumphantly achieved) by Kassel-Austin who, for instance, in certain cases (e.g. with comic fragments preserved by Athenaeus or Hesychius, authors not yet reliably edited) collate (via photographs) the original MSS. But even so, I think it will have emerged from the preceding details that there is plenty of scope for

(10) The reference is taken over by Calame in his edition (p. 142). Other places where Page needlessly cites this "evidence" include fr. 110 where the references to "An. Bekker 3.1294, 3.1404" and *An. Ox.* 4.415.30 Cramer (and 4.368.19) also in Calame (p. 124) may be omitted.

(11) So that there is no excuse for Calame's failure (in an edition published in 1983) to do anything more than repeat Page's omission.

(12) On this text see the Introduction to Dyck's new edition, vol. 1 (Berlin 1983), pp. 1 ff.

a scholar to improve on Page's presentation of MS evidence even if he fails to move beyond the scope of *PMG*'s second-hand reporting (13). Given the proliferation of excellent modern editions of many of the authors who preserve lyric fragments, and the increasing sophistication of editorial technique in collections of fragments, we may achieve a considerable advance over a book first published more than a quarter of a century ago.

St. John's College, Oxford

MALCOLM DAVIES

(13) An amusing triviality, not altogether without importance for the editor of Alcman, is the resilient misprint in the app. crit. of fr. 7 which has survived numerous reprintings: Σ Eur. *Tro.* 210 (2.353 Schwartz) is quoted for a detail connecting the Dioscuri with Therapnae: the poet's name is partially obliterated in MS A (ἀλκ....): what follows next in *PMG* is the statement "ἀλκμαίων α" which should be corrected to "α" (an apograph of A).