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A BIBLIOLOGICAL NOTE ON P. OXY. 659
(PINDAR, PARTHENEIA)¹

P. Oxy. IV 659 (subsequently P. Lond. Lit. 44)² preserves the lower portion of five consecutive columns, as well as several smaller fragments, from a roll of Pindar’s Partheneia³. Two poems are represented, Partheneia 1-2 (frr. 94a-b Snell-Mae)³⁴. The back preserves an anthology of epigrams, P. Oxy. IV 662 (P. Lond. Lit 61)⁵; these will not detain us here, although the chief argument of this paper will impact the verso no less than the recto.

The hand is a poised, plump majuscule of the “epsilon-theta style”, fairly thick and tendentially bilinear⁶. On the basis of the handwriting, the

¹ I am grateful to Lucio Del Corso and Giuseppe Ucciardello for their valuable comments.
³ Pindar’s Partheneia consisted of three books, the last of which was known as κεχορισμένα τῶν παρθενείων: P. Oxy. 2438 col. II l. 37, Vita Pindari Ambrosiana p. 3.8-9 Drachmann. What the difference was is uncertain in the extreme; all that is known about the κεχορισμένα is that they included Pindar’s ‘hymn to Pan’ (frr. 95 and probably 96-100 Snell-Mae), see L. Lehnus, L’inno a Pan di Pindaro, («Testi e documenti per lo studio dell’antichità» 64), Milano 1979, esp. 69-71.
⁴ MP 1595, LDAB 2445, TM 61303. The three (?) epigrams by Amyntas preserved in col. II are now SH 42-44. No image of the verso appears to have been published to date.
⁵ A detailed description of the hand can be found in E. Turner, Greek Manu-
papyrus can be dated to the mid- or late first century BC. Letter-height is around 0.3 cm for a leading of 0.5 to 0.6 cm; interlinear spacing is somewhat irregular, and the lines themselves are often not terribly straight. Bilinearity is broken by ρ downward and by θ in both directions; the top of α and υ sometimes also projects slightly above the top line. The foot of ρ and θ extends to the left in an ostentatious hook, and a smaller serif to the left, level with the base line, can adorn the foot of practically any upright. As characteristic of this style, the cross-bar of Ǐ and ǒ is detached from the stem and «often contracts to a dot».

ů sometimes does not connect in the middle. «Ξ is in the form of a central vertical connecting upper and lower horizontals». The angled cup of ς reaches all the way up to the top line. The upper arms of χ turn downward, and the feet upward, at the end. All three accents are used, albeit very sparingly, as are rough breathings and signs of long quantity. Paragrapheis (not always placed correctly) mark the end of strophes, antistrophes, and epodes, κoroi the end of triads, and asteriskoi the end of poems (or at least of Partheneion 1). Stichometric letters, as usual, were written every hundred

---

6 Dated to «the latter half of the first century B.C.» by Grenfell and Hunt, p. 50; simply first century BC according to Turner, p. 50; mid-first century BC «o solo poco oltre» for Cavallo, p. 21 = Il calamo e il papiro, p. 115; G. Cavallo and H. Maehler, Hellenistic Bookhands, Berlin-New York 2008, p. 126, now hesitate between the late first century BC and the early first AD.

7 I use «leading» as defined by W.A. Johnson, Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus, Toronto-Buffalo-London 2004 (henceforth «Johnson»), p. XI: «the vertical distance from base line to base line».

8 Turner, p. 50.

9 Ibid.
lines. A few additions and corrections were made to the text, but no exe-
getical or critical annotations survive.

As the original editors noted, the original height of the columns of
writing can be tentatively calculated on the basis of the metrical scheme
of the second poem. Strophe, antistrophe, and epode of Partheneion 2 have
five lines each, resulting in 15 lines to a triad. Col. II ends with the last line
of a strophe, the surviving section of col. III starts with the fourth line of an
epode; col. III ends with the fourth line of a strophe, the surviving section
of col. IV starts with the third line of an epode. Therefore, «the number of
lines missing at the top of Cols. iii and iv must be either 8 or 23», depend-
ing on whether an entire additional triad was lost beyond the minimum
number of lines necessary to complete the scheme; «a larger figure is out
of the question»¹. Grenfell and Hunt made no definite choice between the
two figures, but found the lower to be «a satisfactory supposition» and
noted that it would result in columns «of from 28-29 lines» (the surviving
portion of coll. I and II has 20 lines, that of coll. III and IV has 21) for a
roll-height «of about 20 cm.»¹¹.

Among subsequent editors, only Maurice Bowra and Alexander Tu-
ryn opted for an eight-line lacuna¹². Otto Schroeder, Aimé Puech, Bru-
no Snell, Luigi Lehnus, and Herwig Maehler followed Grenfell and Hunt
in presenting the alternative between eight and twenty-three lines¹³. Eric
Turner cites P. Oxy. 659 alongside P. Egerton 1 (Herodas’ Mimes, also P.

¹ Grenfell and Hunt, p. 52.
¹¹ Ibid.
¹² Pindari carmina cum fragmentis recognovit brevique adnotatione critica in-
struxit M. Bowra, Oxonii [1935], not paginated; Pindari carmina cum fragmentis edidit
A. Turyń, Cracoviae MCMXLVIII, pp. 309-310. Both scholars lay out the ode with
verse-divisions of their own devising, but clearly assume that no additional triad is lost
in the lacunae.
¹³ Pindari carmina cum fragmentis selectis edidit O. Schroeder, Lipsiae MC-
MVIII, pp. 306-308, and subsequent re-editions; Pindare. V: Isthmiques et fragments,
texte établi et traduit par A. Puech, Paris 1952², p. 168 nt. 1; Pindari carmina cum frag-
mentis edidit B. Snell, Lipsiae MCMLIII, pp. 247-248, and subsequent re-editions;
Lehnus, pp. 62-63, 71-73, 87 nt. 14; Pindari carmina cum fragmentis edidit H. Ma-
ehler, II: Fragmenta. Indices, Lipsiae 1989, pp. 91-94. Rather bizarrely, Farnell (The
Works of Pindar translated, with literary and critical commentaries by L.R. Farnell,
III: The Text, London 1932, pp. 173-174) measures the lacuna in col. III as eight lines
and that in col. IV as either eight or 23.
Lond. Lit. 96)\textsuperscript{14} and P. Oxy. XXXIII 2654 (Menander’s Carchedonius)\textsuperscript{15} as evidence for his statement that «[i]n i B.C. and i and early ii A.D. rolls of relatively small height were in fashion for books of poetry.»\textsuperscript{16} Unfortunately, none of the scholars who favour the shorter column-height makes his reasoning explicit, and their choice does not seem to have gained common assent.

Nonetheless, doubt can be dispelled by means of a simple calculation. Already Grenfell and Hunt had recognized the stichometric $\gamma$ written in the left margin of col. IV next to its sixth surviving line, which accordingly (if the letter was correctly placed) must have been line 300 of the roll. By implication, the final line of that column was line 315 of the roll. Now, this fact is fully compatible with the hypothesis that the columns of P. Oxy. 659 were each 28 or 29 lines high, as would result from an eight-line lacuna at the top of coll. III and IV: col. IV, numbering 29 lines, will have been the eleventh column of the roll, preceded by six columns also of 29 lines (one of which being col. III) and four of 28, in an unknown order. On the contrary, the hypothesis that a whole additional triad has been lost at the top of each column cannot be squared with the stichometric letter in col. IV: no combination of any amount of columns numbering 43 or 44 lines each can give 315 lines as a result\textsuperscript{17}. Thus Grenfell and Hunt’s «satisfactory supposi-

\textsuperscript{14} MP\textsuperscript{i} 485+1877, LDAB 1160, TM 60050.

\textsuperscript{15} MP\textsuperscript{i} 1297.3, LDAB 2621, TM 61474.

\textsuperscript{16} Turner, p. 19; see also p. 50 and id., The Papyrologist at Work, (Greek Roman and Byzantine Monographs 6), Durham NC 1973, p. 11. However, his statement in the latter publication that our roll «is only 12.8 cm high» can be misleading: 12.8 cm is the height of the (mutilated) surviving fragment, not of the volume when entire. On the tendency towards relatively short column-heights in Ptolemaic papyri of verse see also Johnson, pp. 120-2, and the extensive analysis of third-century literary rolls in A. Blanchard, Les papyrus littéraires grecs extraits de cartonnages: études de bibliologie, in M. Maniaci and P.F. Munafò (eds.), Ancient and Medieval Book Materials and Techniques (Erice, 18-25 september 1992), (Studi e testi 357), Città del Vaticano 1993, I pp. 15-40 (henceforth «Blanchard»).

\textsuperscript{17} It is true that seven columns of 45 lines to the column would give the required 315 lines, but this necessitates the assumption that while coll. III and IV were 44 lines high (as they must have been on this hypothesis), the supposed five columns that preceded them were all taller, three numbering 45 lines and two 46: hardly an economical supposition, given the extant evidence. Note also that in the surviving portion of coll. I and II the lines are less, not more, cramped than in coll. III and IV (the bottom 20 lines measure 11.6, 11.4, 10.9, and 10.9 cm in height respectively), which suggests a lower rather than higher number of lines to a column.
tion» of an eight-line lacuna affecting a series of 28- or 29-line columns can be shown with considerable likelihood to be correct.

This conclusion also allows the bibliological data of the manuscript to be specified somewhat. Although line-spacing is not entirely regular even within individual columns, nonetheless one can estimate quite roughly the original height of coll. III and IV at around 16 cm\textsuperscript{18}. The lower margin is 1.8 cm at its extant widest (col. V). This makes it unlikely that the roll may have been less than 20 cm tall; one suspects that both margins may have been somewhat broader, and the roll consequently taller, perhaps close to Blanchard’s «Groupe C»\textsuperscript{19}. Column-to-column width is 12 cm between coll. I and II, 12.3 cm between coll. II and III, and 13 cm between coll. III and IV; the intercolumn, measured from the end of the longest extant line in a column to the left edge of the next, is 1.8 cm between coll. I and II, 1.7 cm between coll. II and III, and III and IV. Thus, the more stable of the two figures appears to be that of the intercolumn, suggesting that the position of each column was based on the width of the preceding one rather than on a fixed, recurring distance; but the loss of over a fourth of the height of each column makes the measurement of column-width and intercolumn highly uncertain\textsuperscript{20}.

Turner’s inference of a roll «of relatively small height»\textsuperscript{21} is therefore confirmed, although our manuscript is significantly taller than the slimmest examples of the kind, such as \textit{P. Egerton} 1 (roll-height 12 cm). Unlike this and even some slightly taller contemporary rolls of verse, such as \textit{PSI XV 1474} (Euripides’ \textit{Phrixus I}, 14.2 cm tall)\textsuperscript{22}, the columns of \textit{P. Oxy. 659} are taller than they are broad, with a proportion of roughly 4:3. Even the slightly earlier \textit{P. Oxy. XV 1790} (Ibycus)\textsuperscript{23}, which thanks to its handsome

\textsuperscript{18} The basic formula for calculating column-height is given by \textsc{Johnson}, p. 12. Given the slight irregularity of the script, I have also made calculations based on the leading extracted from a 20-line sample (see \textsc{Johnson}, p. 56); for the same reason, I only give a very approximate figure.

\textsuperscript{19} \textsc{Blanchard}, pp. 26, 32. On the difficulty of extrapolating the width of the upper margin from the lower see \textsc{Johnson}, pp. 130-134.

\textsuperscript{20} Compare \textsc{Johnson}, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{21} \textsc{Turner}, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{22} \textit{MP} 1703, \textit{LDAB} 3960, \textit{TM} 62772.

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{MP} 1237, \textit{LDAB} 2324, \textit{TM} 61292. Assigned to «the middle or latter half of the first century» by A.S. \textsc{Hunt} in \textit{The Oxyrhynchus Papyri} 15, 1922, pp. 73-84, at
upper and lower margins was around 20 cm tall, had a column-height (12 cm) that was only slightly greater than the column-to-column width that can be reconstructed between col. II and III (which almost touch each other at the top).\textsuperscript{24}

A final consideration can very speculatively be made. The argument presented in the preceding paragraphs shows that the first line of \textit{Partheneion} 2 was line 238 of the roll. Given the length of \textit{Partheneion} 2 itself (not known with exactitude, but no shorter than 120 lines and presumably not very much longer), one might venture the suggestion that the two poems that partly survive on \textit{P. Oxy.} 659 were the second and third of the volume; at any rate, they were not far from the beginning of the book. Lehnus persuasively argued that the notional title of \textit{Partheneion} 2 was (or at least began with) ΄Αγασκλέ̄ Θηβαίοι.\textsuperscript{25} There is also a possibility, although I cannot say a likelihood, that \textit{Partheneion} 1 may have been similarly titled Άιλλά̄azı̄ (or Άιλλά̄η̄, Atticized) Θηβαίοι. While the reason for the two poems to be grouped together may have been primarily genealogical, since Aeoladas and Agasicles were grandfather and grandson, the presence of one or indeed two titles beginning with Ά so near to the beginning of the book raises the question of a possible alphabetical ordering by title.

In the “canonical” Alexandrian editions of the choral lyricists, an alphabetical arrangement by title is only attested with certainty for Bacchylides’ \textit{Dithyrambs}, but has been suggested with varying degrees of probability also for (sections of) Pindar’s \textit{Paeans} and \textit{Prosodia} and Simonides’ \textit{Paeans} and \textit{Epinicians for equestrian victories}.\textsuperscript{27} An alphabetical order

\textsuperscript{24} On the proportion of column-height and column-width in rolls of verse see BLANCHARD, p. 35, and JOHNSON, pp. 129-130, 208-212.

\textsuperscript{25} LEHNUS, p. 78. A minimal trace of the first letter of the title might in fact be visible on the papyrus itself.

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis} edidit F. BLASS, Lipsiae 1898, p. V.

\textsuperscript{27} Pindar’s \textit{Paeans} (limited to Pae. 2-7): I. RUTHERFORD, \textit{Et hominum et deorum … laudes (?): a hypothesis about the organization of Pindar’s Paean-book}, \textit{ZPE} 107 (1995), pp. 44-52, at p. 49 nt. 24, and G.B. D’ALESSIO, \textit{Pindar’s Prosodia and the
A Bibliographical Note on *P. Oxy.* 659 (*Pindar, Partheneia*)

by first word of the text has been argued by Edgar Lobel for Sappho (with the usual exception of the first poem of the collection) and for Alcaeus by Carlo Gallavotti; Lobel’s insight has just recently been confirmed, at least in respect to book 1, by *P. GC.* inv. 105. I see no way of proving that some such arrangement was operative in Pindar’s *Partheneia* (or individual books of them) on the scanty evidence that survives to our day; indeed, there is no evidence that the book of the *Partheneia* represented by *P. Oxy.* 659 was the first. Nonetheless, as a pure hypothesis, an alphabetical ordering may be worth taking into consideration, pending confirmation or refutation by any future discovery.
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**ABSTRACT**

The article re-assesses the evidence for the original format of *P. Oxy.* IV 659, argues that its columns had 28 to 29 lines each, suggests that the two poems it preserves were the second and third of the book, and briefly entertains the possibility that Pindar’s *Partheneia* may have been ordered alphabetically by title.
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