

Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou
Of Golden Manes and Silvery Faces

Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes

Edited by
Franco Montanari and Antonios Rengakos

Scientific Committee
Alberto Bernabé · Margarethe Billerbeck · Claude Calame
Philip R. Hardie · Stephen J. Harrison · Stephen Hinds
Richard Hunter · Christina Kraus · Giuseppe Mastromarco
Gregory Nagy · Theodore D. Papanghelis · Giusto Picone
Kurt Raaflaub · Bernhard Zimmermann

Volume 16

De Gruyter

Of Golden Manes and Silvery Faces

The Partheneion 1 of Alcman

by
Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-029182-7
e-ISBN 978-3-11-029200-8
ISSN 1868-4785

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche
Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet
at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2012 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston

Logo: Christopher Schneider, Laufen
Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

There is nothing in this poem that has not been denied by somebody sometime.

Page, *Alcman, The Partheneion* (Oxford 1951), 97, n. 5

Let [this] reconstruction stand until a more convincing one is proposed.

A. J. Podlecki, *BMCR* 2009. 10. 59

Contents

Preface	IX
Commentary	
Text (<i>PMG</i>) and Commentary	3
The Numbers	102
Mode of Performance	112
‘ <i>A kind of little drama</i> ’	112
<i>Presentation</i>	119
<i>Ἰππάδα</i>	126
<i>Agido</i>	129
<i>θωστήρια</i>	131
<i>Reperformances?</i>	134
Text and Translation	
TEXT (proposed)	143
Scholia A	149
Scholia B	156
Translation	161
References	163
General Index	169
Plates	171

Preface

The solution to the enigma of Alcman's Partheneion 1¹ proposed in this study, apart from a number of new suggestions, borrows elements from proposals already made by other scholars, in different combinations and with different overall interpretations. Naturally, it depends on the text of the Louvre papyrus, an excellent 'copy made for a scholar for his personal use',² in the form of the *textus receptus* appearing in Page's *Poetae Melici Graeci* and the editions made thereafter. My preference in prefixing Page's *PMG* text at each item in the discussion that follows does not mean that I reject or spurn the modern editions of the Partheneion. It only means that in that edition I recognize the direct ancestor of all subsequent ones. With the exception of a number of new readings or proposals, both in the poem and in the scholia (Schol. A, those contained in the Louvre papyrus, and Schol. B of P.Oxy. 2389),³ my approach is mainly interpretative, as it attempts to trace, in an old-style text-centered close reading of the poem, a coherent thought throughout the text. To be more precise – truistic though it may sound –, my effort to interpret the puzzling poem was channelled more through the Greek text and less through large-scale notional concepts. I believe the admirable development of philological studies in the last half-century, conspicuous on at least a quantitative sense, would also greatly profit qualitatively if they had taken, in parallel with the interesting theoretical or rather ideological paths of interpretation, more empirical or technical roads of approach, such as palaeography and textual criticism, that are now progressively disdained.

1 Henceforth, simply Partheneion.

2 Turner 1987, 44 on no. 16. P. Louvre E. 3320/R56 (known as Papyrus Mariette), which is part of a papyrus roll found at Memphis (Sakkara) in 1855. [Pl. 2.] It is ascribed to the middle of the 1st century A.D. thanks to the similarity of the script with that of B.M. Pap. 131 (the *Ath. Pol.* papyrus), which is dated shortly after A.D. 78/9; see below n. 38; first published by Egger 1863.

3 A preliminary version of my edition of the Scholia was published in Tsanoglou 2006^a. Since then, new findings have overturned some of my previous proposals.

By this logic of approach, the scholia of the Louvre papyrus proved decidedly helpful, though reading and deciphering them was, admittedly, often difficult. The hardship lies in the wear and abrasion of the papyrus or of its writing, when the scribes used different ink, as well as in the peculiarity of the script, which is often very different from that of the poetic text, even when the hand belonged to the same scribe as that of the poem. Difficulties also arise due to the plethora of abbreviations, some of which appear for the first time. For reading the less legible parts of the papyrus, I could not avail of other technical facilities apart from a black and white photograph provided by the Musée du Louvre, for which I am thankful. No doubt, reading was facilitated by the digital techniques for regulating the size and the brightness contrast of the image. However, if I succeeded in reading something more than other most skilful palaeographers, many of whom were able to inspect the original, this must be ascribed to the longer time I devoted to this seemingly uninviting job – sometimes many days over a word or even a single letter.

It was impossible to work through the entire bibliography on the subject. It was certainly quite chaotic even to refer to all former proposals, or this study should have to spread over many more pages and, unfortunately, years. Apart from that, however, the reader may be surprised to notice the absence of discussion on or reference to some subjects that other scholars were greatly concerned with. Leaving aside the ignorance factor, there were two reasons for this: my dependence on new readings of the papyrus, which were naturally unknown to previous scholars who would not deserve to be unfairly criticized for that, and my inner disposition to avoiding polemics, an art in which I am absolutely unskilled. I am sincerely sorry that *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics & Dissemination*, ed. by Lucia Athanassaki and Ewen Bowie, came into my hands when this book had already been delivered to the publisher. General suggestions on the character of the poem as well as the mode and the occasion of its performance, will be set out at the end, following the discussion on the text. The study will conclude with the proposed new text and its translation.

An explanation ought to be given in advance as regards the reconstructed text. In order to make my proposals clearer, I sometimes have had to resort to *exempli gratia* restorations. This was especially marked in stanza γ' (V), the most mutilated stanza of the poem. Naturally, it was always explicitly stated that the restoration was presented by way of illustration. Being aware that some of the readers will not read anything more than the reconstructed text of Alcman, I thus included these pro-

visional restorations in this reconstruction and not only in the commentary. I recognize this is methodically improper, but the need of clarity prevailed over scholarly regulations.

I must admit that my aim was not to produce an edition of Alcman's Partheneion that would definitively replace the previous editions, whether commented or not. Each of these editions retains its special merits. For instance, one shall still need to use Calame for his ample apparatus criticus and interpretative comments, or Hutchinson for his fresh approach, as I have done myself during the preparation of this study. I shall be happy if my observations prove to add to their advantages. Regrettably, the large number of often boring technicalities that I was obliged to insert among interesting interpretation notes may deteriorate the readability of the book to some degree. I only hope that the new interpretation makes up for the dissatisfaction caused by the scholarly approach.

This book has had a solitary course, which possibly accounts for any shortcomings that may be detected in it. Still, my thanks are due to many people, a long anonymous list of colleagues and friends, for their valuable discussions and advices on several issues arising both from the edition and the commentary. I break this anonymity for only three persons: Daniel Jakob, for his continuous advice on various queries, from textual to bibliographical; George Parássoglou, for his assistance in palaeographical matters; and Antonios Rengakos for providing me with rare bibliographical items, otherwise inaccessible to me, but mainly for his constant encouragement towards the completion and publication of this book. Thanks are also due to the anonymous reader of the series 'Trends in Classics – Supplementary Volumes', who found this study worth publishing. Finally, I wish to extend my gratitude to the staff of Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. for their unstinted helpfulness at all stages in the production of this book.

Thessaloniki, April 2012

Kyriakos Tsantsanoglou

Commentary

Text (*PMG*) and Commentary

1-7] Πωλυδεύκης·
οὐκ ἐγὼ¹Ν Λύκαισον ἐν καμοῦσιν ἀλέγω
Ἐνα]ρσφόρον τε καὶ Σέβρον ποδώκη
]ν τε τὸν βιατὰν
5]· τε τὸν κορυστὰν
Εὐτείχη¹ τε φάνακτά τ' Ἀρήϊον
]ά τ' ἔξοχον ἡμίσιων·

Of the first column (1–34), only the right-hand part has survived. How much text preceded this column is still unknown, but the question is discussed later on. Some of the mutilated verses of the first column can be confidently completed, either with the help of the indirect tradition (e.g., line 2, from Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 11.15a) or by dependable conjecture. In this way, the left-hand margin of the column can be reconstructed with considerable precision, although it entails taking account of Maas's law, which is pronouncedly applied in the Louvre papyrus.¹ At line 1, the margin allows only about five letters before Πωλυδεύκης. The curious thing is that these five or so letters must accommodate the first four syllables of the hagesichorean: ×-υ-υ] Πωλυδεύκης. I can only think of something like -ήϊε Πωλυδεύκης, preceded by some preposition (άνήϊε, ἐξήϊε, κατήϊε *vel sim.*). Numerous attempts at restoring line 1 (see Calame's copious app. cr.) take account of the metre but not of the size of the lacuna. Depending on the part of the myth described, one might think of several choices, e.g., Polydeuces' hatching out of the egg together with Helen (ἐξήϊε); possibly, his return home from the exile (κατήϊε); or since the image implied is the conflict with the Hippocoontidae that ends with their killing mentioned in lines 22 ff., his attack on them together with Castor and Heracles (ἐπήϊε, ποτήϊε).

¹ Turner 1987, 5, 44. Thus, whereas the left-hand edge of the papyrus is more or less perpendicular, the missing text of line 1 must be approximately five letters long, but that of the last line of the column (34) approximately 15.

Before proceeding to a discussion of Alcman's mutilated verses, it might prove helpful to investigate the comments of Schol. A1² on line 2 (οὐκ ἐγὼ₁ν Λύκαισον ἐν καμοῦσιν ἀλέγω), which, with a few new readings and supplements, may perhaps become more intelligible [Pl. 3]:

ὅτι τοιαύτη ἡ
 διάν(οια)· τὸν Λύκαι-
 ον οὐ συνκατα-
 ριθμ(ῶ) τοῖς πρ(ότερον) ὑ(περ)βλη-
 5 [θεῖ]σι Δη[ρ]ιτίδαις.
 οὐ μῆ[ν] π(αρ)επο]ίησε
 τ(αὔτα)· οὐτ(ως) δ(ι)ε[νέγκοι ᾗ]ν
 λί(αν), εἰ ᾗζ[η]λῶ[τ]ως
 εἴποι οὐ μόνον
 10 τὸν Λύκαι(ον), ἀλλ᾽
 καὶ τοὺς λοιπούς,
 Δηριτίδας, οὓς ἐπ' ὁ-
 νόματος λέγει.

4 sq. πρ (monogrammatic) ὑβλη|[...]₁σι leg. Ts.; edd. alii alia legunt; πρ(ότερον) vel πρ(ίν), πρ(όσθεν), πρ(ο-) ὑ(περ)βλη|[θεῖ]σι Ts. || **5** δ[η][ρ]ιτίδαις leg. Ts., [Δηρι]τιδαις iam Diels dub., Ἰπποκω]ντίδαις Blass, edd. plurimi || **6** ουμ[edd., οὐ μῆ[ν] π(αρ)επο]ίησε vel μ(ετ)επο]ίησε Ts. || **7** τ̣ = ταῦτα vel τοῦτο leg. Ts.; ου^τ ᾗζ[...]. leg. Ts., οὐτ(ως) δ(ι)ε[νέγκοι ᾗ]ν Ts., του[...]. edd., τοῦ[τον εἰς ἀπώ]λειαν Diels || **8** λί(αν) leg. et expl. Ts., λειαν.... Blass, ἀπώ]λειαν Diels; εἰ ᾗζ[η]λῶ[τ]ως Ts. || **9** εἴποι leg. Ts., ειται Blass, ἔστ[α]ι Diels, ἔστα Page || **10** λυκαῖ sigla s.l. valde incerta || **12** οὓς <οὐκ> Pavese

At line 4, following a monogrammatic πρ, the letter before βλη|[θεῖ]σι is a Y with an extended right-hand prong, which is a sign of abbreviation. It must stand for ὑπέρ, since ὑπό is usually (but not in the read part of this papyrus) abbreviated as ὑ. ὑ is among the abbreviation forms of ὑπέρ; McNamee 1981, s.v. In the scholion *ad* 70–76.2, which comes from the same scribe A1, ὑπέρ (if correctly read) is abbreviated to υπ/. In any case, if the dative plural aorist participle is interpreting Alcman's καμοῦσιν, none of the several meanings of ὑποβάλλω -ομαι fits its senses, in con-

² Written in the same hand as the poetic text.

trast to ὑπερβάλλομαι, which means, just like κάμνω, ‘be overcome, be defeated’. Given that πρ usually stands for πρὸς, a phrase such as τοῖς πρ(ο)σ(περ)βληθεῖσι Δηριτίδαις should mean ‘among the surpassed, exceeded Deritidae’. προσυπερβάλλω occurs a few times, but only in the active voice and mainly in works of Philo Judaeus, as something like ‘surpass’, ‘exceed’, or sometimes ‘exaggerate’. However, πρ can also stand for πρότερον,³ and it would be better to think of τοῖς πρ(ότερον) ὑ(περ)-βλη[[θεῖ]σι],⁴ ‘the formerly overcome, defeated Deritidae’. At Δη[ρ]ι-, of delta the bottom right-hand part is clearly visible, of eta only a thick vertical, of rho practically nothing, and, lastly, a clearly detached iota with a forked bottom end. Lines 6–8 are marred by some holes in the papyrus. At 6, after ουμ, which has been read by all the editors, eta is very likely. After a lacuna of five letters,]ιησε is more dependable, with an unfamiliar character, much like /, which is visible after sigma; this is a letter which we shall meet several times hereafter and is decipherable as ε.⁵ I propose οὐ μὴ[ν π(αρ)επο]ίησε or μ(ετ)επο]ίησε, with the prepositions abbreviated to π̣ or μ̣. At 7, τ̣ with a marked tail at its low end must stand for τ(αὔτα); the same abbreviation occurs at the scholion *ad* 49 written by the Schol. A2. It is followed by ου with a superscript τ̣, which stands for οὔτως. The delta that follows has a leftward bending tail underneath, the combination being the abbreviation of διὰ (here δι- in composition); see Schol. A1 *ad* 70–76.2. The traces that follow, mostly in a narrow tongue of papyrus, clearly suggest an epsilon. After a lacuna, δ(ι)ε[is followed by the high part of a vertical, an iota, or the second vertical of nu. I propose οὔτ(ως) δ(ι)ε[νέγκοι ᾗ]ν, which offers a reasonable sense. At 8, I decipher λι as λί(αν),⁶ and read the rest as εἰ ᾗ[η]-λώ[τ]ως. At 9, I read εἴποι for the editors’ εἴται or ἔσται. The somewhat projecting to the left horizontal of π, which gave the editors the impression of τ, is a common feature of scribe A1, perhaps more visible in the

3 Monogrammatic π^ρ for πρ(ότερον) at *An. Lond.* 36.47; see McNamee 1981, s.v. Naturally, the same abbreviation may stand for πρίν, πρόσθεν, or προ- in composition, all of which are possible alternatives here.

4 At first sight, the sigma of]σι seems to be extraordinarily large. However, what looks like the upper end of sigma is actually the high tip of iota, which is a very tall letter. In the whole scholion, the scribe starts each line with large letters, but changes right away to small, at times even tiny ones.

5 It obviously derives from the upper part of the two-piece epsilon, usual in the cursive script of the first century A.D. The evolution process is clearly visible in the last epsilon of εἰρηκε, in the scholion *ad* 14.

6 For ου^τ (= οὔτως), see McNamee 1981 s.v.; λι (= λίαν) is not recorded.

poetic text than in the scholia. At the end, λέγει has its second ε in the unfamiliar form described above, but only in its mirror image, i.e., λ.

In the first part, the Scholiast interprets line 2 of the Partheneion as οὐκ ἐγὼ]ν Λύκαισον ἐν καμοῦσιν ἀλέγω, but in the second, he deals with a certain opinion, which claims that Alcman altered the mythological data. By stating that the poet does not count Lycaethus among the overpowered sons of Derites, he does not clarify whether or not the poet included Lycaethus among the Deritidae or among the overpowered Deritidae. This would mean that Lycaethus is a Deritides but, for some reason, has not been overpowered. That the reference to Deritidae instead of Hippocoontidae is not a mere slip of memory is clear from the end of the scholion, where it is stated that if the poet – along with Lycaethus – also named the rest of those in the list as Deritidae, this would be inappropriate and not commendable (ἄζηλώτως = ἄδοκίμως, Poll. 5.160), as it would constitute a great deviation from tradition (οὕτως διενέγκοι ἄν λίαν). In any case, as regards the equivocal interpretation, the Scholiast states that it does not constitute a falsification or a modification (οὐ μὴν παρεποίησε / μετεποίησε ταῦτα). Does this mean that the Scholiast considers Lycaethus as Hippocoontides, but believes that either Alcman or some commentator other than himself altered the mythological facts at this point? There is no need to supplement οὖς <οὐκ> ἐπ' ὀνόματος λέγει (Pavese). The clause οὖς ἐπ' ὀνόματος λέγει is added as an explicatory afterthought for clarifying τοὺς λοιπούς.

Where did these Deritidae come from? I do not believe that the poet would consciously transform, much less falsify, one of the principal myths of Sparta, even in a minor point as the parentage of an unimportant hero. It seems that the problem has arisen from a misunderstanding of the poetic text. Alcman says 'I do not count Lycaethus among the καμόντες', not 'among the καμόντες Deritidae'. Since the common legend (Ps.-Apollodorus 3.124) includes Lycaethus among the sons of Hippocoon killed by Heracles, a superficial interpretation would be that Alcman declares a personal deviation from the myth, which is an interpretation the Scholiast rejects. However, he or his source⁷ seems to understand καμοῦσιν

7 The scholion starts with ὅτι, which is a typical way of marking 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; possibly *ad* 59, 70–76), all written by scribe A1 (the scribe of Alcman's text) come from an existing commentary, possibly the same one in all ὅτι-scholia? Or does the Scholiast himself follow the scholarly habit? McNamee

not as ‘killed’ but as ‘overpowered’ (ὑπερβληθέντες). All this leads me to surmise that the misunderstanding arises from a former lost reference in the poem to Δηριτίδαι καμόντες, which the Scholiast associates with the καμοῦσιν of line 2, only noting that Alcman, unlike others (οὐκ ἐγών), does not include Lycaethus in the καμόντες, apparently, Deritidae. We cannot know just what came about with this single Deritides in the Scholiast’s mind; why he was left off in the alleged ‘previous overpowering’ and lived through only to later become part of those slain by Heracles in the latter’s Hippocoon campaign. What Alcman really meant by οὐκ ἐγών Λύκαισιν ἐν καμοῦσιν ἀλέγω is another story, and I shall state my opinion below. Did the Scholiast’s reference to τοῖς πρότερον ὑπερβληθεῖσι Δηριτίδαις come from his knowledge of Spartan prehistory or from the previous verses of the Partheneion? ‘Formerly overpowered’ may be said in relation to mythical time, earlier, that is, than the Dioscuri and the Hippocoontidae, or to the sequence of the story elements in Alcman’s poem or, quite possibly, to both. If any one of these options is true, this would be a real gain, since the reference to τοῖς πρὶν ὑπερβληθεῖσι Δηριτίδαις, together with the first surviving word of the Partheneion, Πωλυδεύκης, would be the only hints towards the contents of the column prior to col. i.

Who, then, are the Deritidae? The only mention of a Δηρείτης occurs in Pausanias, 7.18.5, in the genealogy of Patreus, after whom Achaean Patrai are supposedly named. Derites is the son of Harpalus or rather Argalus,⁸ who is a brother of Cynortas. Thus, Derites must be a first cousin of Oebalus, son of Cynortas. Derites’ sons, the Deritidae, should be second cousins of Tyndareos and Icarius (who are the legitimate sons of Oebalus and Gorgophone), as well as of Hippocoon, son of Oebalus and Bateia, and of Aphareus and Leucippus, sons of Gorgophone from her marriage to Perieres.⁹

2007, 158 ff., translates always: ‘(The sign is placed) because ...’, perhaps rightly, although lines 60 and 70–76 present no sign whatsoever.

8 In Pausanias, he appears as Ἀρπαλος in the genealogy of Patreus (7.18.5), but as Ἄργαλος twice in the account of the founding of Sparta (3.1.3). Ἄργαλος occurs also in Hsch. α 515 Ἀγίαιος· Ἄργαλος καλεῖται παρὰ Λάκωσιν ὁ Ἀμύκλαντος υἱός, where the lemma may possibly be emended to Αἰγαῖος Ἄργαλος from the old city of Αἰγαί in Achaia, which was deserted already in antiquity (Hdt. 1.145, Paus. 7.25, *al.*).

9 There are several versions of the Tyndaridae and the Hippocoontidae genealogy, but I can find no evidence for the version mentioned by Robbins 1994, 12 n. 32, indicating that Derites is a brother of Oebalus. If the evidence of Schol. Lyc. 1123 (κατὰ δὲ ἐτέρους Κυνόρτου καὶ Γοργοφόνης ὑπῆρχε Τυνδάρεως καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοί – Oebalus included?) is not baseless, then the Deritidae would be second