

TOWARDS A NEW EDITION OF THE FRAGMENTS OF GREEK LYRIC POETRY

"Audacia mea, qua fit, ut quindecim tantum annos postquam poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta tam accurate tamque eximie ediderunt Edgarus Lobel Dionysius Page, eorundem auctorum editionem proferam, eo consilio excusanda videtur, quod plura quam editores priores coacervavi subsidia et ad illustrandos textus et ad textuum vicissitudines cognoscendas utilia."

Eva-Maria Voigt's justification (1) of her edition of the fragments of Alcaeus and Sappho comes naturally to the mind of a scholar who has undertaken (at the request of the Oxford University Press) to replace not only Lobel and Page's *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (Oxford 1955) but also Page's *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962), and his *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis* (Oxford 1974, now out of print) (2). So considerable an expenditure of time, energy (and money) requires a detailed defence and explanation, especially in view of one reviewer's opinion (3) that *PMG* "is not likely to be superseded in any foreseeable future", and this I here attempt.

In the first place, important new papyrus fragments of Greek lyric poems have been published even during the relatively short space of time since the appearance of *SLG*. Most notably there is the poem preserved on Lille Papyrus 76, our longest extant fragment of Stesichorus (and one of the longest of any Greek lyric poet) (4). Less spectacularly there are also some interesting fragments of Alcman (5), a number of small remains which M.

(1) *Sappho et Alcaeus Fragmenta*, Amsterdam 1971, p. V.

(2) These volumes are henceforward acronymically referred to as *PLF*, *PMG*, and *SLG*. *PMG* was reviewed by Treu in "GGA" 216, 1964, 114 ff., and *SLG* by Führer in "GGA" 229, 1977, 1 ff.

(3) Lloyd-Jones, "CR" 14, 1964, 17.

(4) This has recently been re-edited with a commentary by J. Bremer in *Some Recently Found Greek Poems*, "Mnemos." Suppl. 99 (1987), 128 ff., a volume which also contains (*inter alia*) a new edition and commentary on Alcaeus' 'Cologne Epode'. See my review in "Gnomon" 61, 1989, forthcoming.

(5) P. Oxy. 3213 in particular.

L. West has convincingly assigned to Ibycus (6) and so on. These accessions to our knowledge (7) are undeniably important but do not in themselves, perhaps, justify a complete and full-blown edition, especially when that edition is to be in four volumes. There are, however, further considerations.

The second set of reasons for a new edition centres on the appearance, in the quarter of a century and more that has elapsed since the publication of *PLF* and *PMG*, of satisfactory texts of those authors who happen to preserve so many of the fragments of Greek lyric poetry. Even in 1962 Page was able to list (8) an impressive collection of editions unavailable to Bergk in the nineteenth century for his *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*: they include Wendel's scholia to Apollonius of Rhodes and Theocritus; Schwartz's scholia to Euripides; Drachmann's scholia to Pindar; Wachsmuth and Hense's Stobaeus, Adler's Suda, and the Teubner Plutarch. One could hardly expect the accessions from the twenty five years between *PMG* and the present quite to match those from the eighty-odd years between the final edition of *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* and 1962; yet in truth they are almost as remarkable. Pride of place should probably be given to Erbse's Iliad scholia (9), and then, not far behind, the Dutch edition of the scholia on Aristophanes; the various Greek grammarians (10) now appearing in the de Gruyter's series entitled *Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker* and Bühler's Zenobius; van der Valk's Eustathius, Rocha-Pereira's Pausanias. Only a few particularly copious providers of quotations remain in outstanding need of a new edition: one thinks first of Athenaeus and Strabo (11).

(6) P. Oxy. 3538: West, "ZPE" 57, 1984, 23 ff.

(7) There are also a few citational fragments which, for some reason, Page failed to include in *PMG* or *SLG*: see, for instance, *Paradox. Vat.* 33 p. 110 Keller (from Stesichorus' *Geryoneis* and drawn to our attention by R. Kassel in 1973 ["Rh. Mus." 116, p. 100 n. 14] and numerous scholars since). On this see now my remarks in "CQ" 38, 1988, 277 ff. Also P. Oxy. 1087.39 = Σ II. 7.76 (2.224.49f. Erbse) by Simonides (and inserted in the second edition of Diehl's *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* 2 [1942] as fr. 66^A). Not all the "übersehene Stücke" noted by Snell, "Philol." 96, 1944, 282 ff. = *Ges. Schr.* 68 ff. found their way into Page.

(8) *PMG* p. ix.

(9) Unfortunately lacking the D scholia: these are to be edited separately by N. G. Wilson. The (less important) Odyssean scholia are being edited by Dyck.

(10) Slater's edition of the fragments of Aristophanes of Byzantium (1986) is of particular usefulness in this context. The new *Photius Zavordensis* now in process of publication by Theodoridis is also important.

(11) On Athenaeus' need see, for instance, W. G. Arnott, "PCPS" 16, 1970, 3 f. It is good news that a new edition of Strabo is in the safe hands of S. L. Radt.

It must, however, be stressed that Page did not always exploit as fully as he might have, the editions at his disposal. An extreme and unrepresentative instance of this is to be found on p. 158 f. of *PMG* where, out of four successive fragments of Ibycus (311-314), as many as three are cited from outdated editions of the authors that quote them. Fr. 311 from Porphyrius' *comment(arium) in Ptolem(aei) harmon(ica)* is cited by the edition of John Wallis (12) (Savilian professor of geometry at Oxford from 1649 to 1703), published in 1699, instead of that by I. Düring (Göteborg 1932). Fr. 312 from the edition of Galen's *comment(arium) in Hippocr(at)is epidem(ias)* by Kühn (1821) instead of that in *Corp. Med. Graec.* vol. 5 by Wenkelbach and Pfaff (1940). Finally, one of the sources quoted for fr. 314 is "Phot. *lex.* ii 156 N. = p. 513 Porson" without any acknowledgement that this actually constitutes in its turn a fragment of Pausanias Atticista (edited by Erbse in *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika* ("Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin", phil.-hist. Kl. 1950, p. 208) (13). The publication of the invaluable *Canon of Greek Authors and Works*² (1986) edited by L. Berkowitz and K. A. Squitier makes it a great deal easier for today's epigoni to get right details such as these that had eluded greater minds. But Page's deficiency in this area, together with his strange reluctance to identify the relevant authors cited in the same context as a lyric fragment by their numbering in Jacoby's *Fragmente der frühgriechische Historiker*, is a further reason for a new edition of the Greek lyric fragments (14).

Of course a new editions of other such fragmentary authors have appeared since *PMG*: one thinks in particular of Merkelbach and West's *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967), of West's *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (two volumes: Oxford 1971 and 1972), of Lloyd-Jones and Parsons' *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (1983) and of the various volumes thus far to appear of *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* and *Poetae Comici Graeci*. To

(12) For a bibliography of this important mathematician see the *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* s.v. (14.146 ff.). He would surely have been surprised to learn that a work of his would still be cited in this way in the twentieth century!

(13) Two instances of fragmentary authors edited since *PMG* (both lurking within texts that quote Stesichorus) are Stes. fr. 265: Eust. *II.* 772.3 = Suetonius περὶ βλασφημιῶν p. 99 § 50 Taillardat (though cf. R. Browning, "CR" 20, 1970, 98) and fr. 266 = Eust. *Od.* 1441.16 = Philoxenus fr. 339^B Theodoridis. The failure of Page to exploit Erbse's edition of Pausanias and Aelius Dionysius is especially obvious in the fragments of Anacreon.

(14) It is also helpful to include cross-references to books that are not strictly speaking editions of fragments. For instance, on fr. 194 of Stesichorus, Page's *PMG* might have correlated the constituent parts with the Edelsteins' *Asclepius. A Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies* (Test. 69 ff.).

be able to quote these too is a great boon for the modern editor of lyric fragments. But over and above this the last three in particular raise an important point of principle, whose consideration brings us to what is probably the most significant defect of the editions of lyric fragments hitherto available.

Talking of *PLF* Lloyd-Jones (15) has observed: "By a kind of coquetry not uncommon among great scholars, Lobel had chosen to present the poems in a fashion whose austerity repels some readers; and it is possible to regret that Page took over this method". In similar vein, M. L. West (16) talks of the edition's "irritating features" and "gymnosophist tendencies" which combine to produce a book that sometimes seems "wilfully unhelpful". Reacting against the extremely slovenly and unscientific level of previous texts of Sappho and Alcaeus, Lobel perhaps went too far with the sort of rigorously scientific edition we find in Σάπφους Μέλῃ (Oxford 1925) and Ἀλκαίου Μέλῃ (Oxford 1927) and this has decisively left its mark upon *PLF* which is, in a sense, a sequel to Lobel's two earlier volumes. This was all the more regrettable because in the interim the first volume of Pfeiffer's *Callimachus* (Oxford 1949) had shown the world how a poet's fragments can still be edited in a scientific and rigorous manner that simultaneously affords the reader a great deal more help than Lobel saw fit to offer. The main source of aid in the case of the Callimachean fragments was, of course, the brief Latin commentary accompanying them. A precedent of sorts for this can already be found in Bethe's edition of fragments from the Trojan part of the Epic Cycle (17), but the real forerunner in this aspect of Pfeiffer's editorial technique was Bernard Wyss with his edition of the fragments of Antimachus (1936). This likewise anticipated the helpful accumulation of *testimonia* pertaining to the poet's life and art which Pfeiffer (18) annexed to the second and final volume of his *Callimachus* (Oxford 1951) pp. xcv ff. Though Page's *PMG* moved some

(15) "PBA" 65, 1979, 764 = *Blood for the Ghosts* 300 (from an obituary of Page). Cf. the same scholar's remarks in "CR" 19, 1969, 20 on the "somewhat forbidding appearance of the texts in *PLF*". Compare, for instance, B. B. Rees, *ib.* 99: "Papyrology, like music, is an art, not a science, in the last analysis, and its practitioners must not become so obsessed with their own reputation for scientific exactitude as to forget that those who profit most from their work expect it to be presented in a form which they can understand, and not as a cross between a Greek inscription and a fragment of Morse code".

(16) "CR" 27, 1977, 161 f. (from a review of Voigt's edition of Sappho and Alcaeus). Cf. already H. Fränkel, "GGA" 190, 1928, 259 ff. (on Lobel's original editions).

(17) Cf. my remarks in "NGG" 2, 1986, 92.

(18) The trail had been blazed here by the "Vitae Supplementa" and "Mantissa Testimoniorum de vita et arte Aeschyli" which Wilamowitz prefaced to his edition of Aeschylus (Berlin 1914), following his text of the γένος Αἰσχύλου.

distance from the austerity of *PLF* it did not follow Pfeiffer in either of these particulars and still remained closer to Lobel's prototype than to Pfeiffer's; and the same is true of, for instance, Merkelbach and West's *Fragmenta Hesiodica* or West's *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (19). Other ways in which Page could have extended greater help to his readers include clarification of a cited fragment's context: thus at Stes. fr. 230 (= Pausan. 9.11.2) which begins ἐπιδεικνύουσι δὲ Ἑρακλέους τῶν παίδων τῶν ἐκ Μεγάρων μνήμα κτλ. we need to insert "(scil. ἐν Θήβαις)" *vel sim.* after the initial verb if the reader is not to be left totally in the dark. Likewise with fr. 200 of the same poet (= Athen. 10.456F sq.) it is not good enough merely to write out ἀνακομίζοντος δ' αὐτοῖς τὸ ὕδωρ ὄνου ὃν ἐκάλουν Ἑπειὸν διὰ τὸ μυθολογεῖσθαι τοῦτο δρᾶν ἐκείνον κτλ., for who is going to guess or remember that αὐτοῖς refers to τοῖς χοροῖς τοῦ Σιμωνίδου unless the editor informs him?

In this and other respects, more recent editions of fragments (such as *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* or *Poetae Comici Graeci*) have set new standards. The question of just how many past conjectures to advertise when editing inevitably corrupt fragments is a ticklish one (20) but most critics would agree that *PLF* included far too few (21) and that *PMG* was not a great improvement in this respect. A middle road that avoids the excesses (22) of, for instance, Calame's recent edition of Alcman (where eight full pages of *apparatus criticus* are evoked by the First Partheneion alone) is surely not unattainable.

Given the additional space taken up by the above combination of new fragments, *testimonia vitae et artis*, and brief Latin commentary, the new edition will be in four volumes as follows:

- I: Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus;
- II: Anacreon, Simonides, Corinna;
- III: Poetae Minores et Adespota;
- IV: Sappho and Alcaeus.

(19) See my remarks in "JHS" 101, 1981, 167 f.

(20) See, for instance, the remarks of Lloyd-Jones in his review of Radt's Aeschylus fragments ("CR" 37, 1987, 143): "R. has chosen to record appreciably more of the conjectures made upon the fragments than some editors would have done, and he might have done well to spare the reader more of the absurdities of the Görschens, the Steffens and the Stoessls, not to mention Mette. But his doxographic method has great compensating advantages, for the reader has the various attempts made to solve each problem put before him, and can the more easily understand its nature".

(21) Cf. West, "Maia" 22, 1970, 311 on a conjecture in Sappho 31.10 "ignored (like many other good conjectures) by L-P".

(22) See my remarks in "Gnomon" 58, 1986, 385 ff.

The volumes will appear in this order with Sappho and Alcaeus designedly kept to the end because the high merits of Voigt's edition make a new text of them far less urgent. Vol. I (which will appear this year) will contain a skeleton commentary on Alcman (Calame's recent edition still leaves much to be done) and Ibycus. My commentary on Stesichorus will appear separately and (almost) simultaneously. As regards the second and third volumes, it should be noted that editions of Simonides and the Adespota in the hitherto uneven *Lyricorum Graecorum quae exstant* are promised, the first by Gentili, the second by G. Brussich (23).

St. John's College. Oxford

MALCOLM DAVIES

(23) See Calame's *Alcman*, p. xxxvi. On the importance of context for understanding a quoted fragment see now S. L. Radt's *The importance of the context* (1988), pp. 11 ff.