

Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici

ESTRATTO

Fabrizio Serra editore
Pisa · Roma

76



md · 76

Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici

RIVISTA SEMESTRALE

DIRETTORE: Gian Biagio Conte (*Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa*).

CONDIRETTORE: Rolando Ferri (*Università di Pisa*).

COMITATO SCIENTIFICO: Alessandro Barchiesi (*Università di Siena-Arezzo*), Luigi Battezzato (*Università del Piemonte Orientale*), Emanuele Berti (*Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa*), Maria Grazia Bonanno (*Università di Roma «Tor Vergata»*), Mario Citroni (*Università di Firenze*), Andrea Cucchiarelli («*Sapienza*» - *Università di Roma*), Mario De Nonno (*Università Roma 3*), James Diggle (*Queens' College, Cambridge*), Marco Fantuzzi (*Università di Macerata*), R. Elaine Fantham (*Princeton University*), Stefano Grazzini (*Università di Salerno*), Philip Hardie (*Trinity College, Cambridge*), Richard Hunter (*Trinity College, Cambridge*), Mario Labate (*Università di Firenze*), Glenn W. Most (*Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa*), Valentina Prospero (*Università di Sassari*), Michael Reeve (*University of Cambridge*), Gianpiero Rosati (*Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa*), Alessandro Schiesaro («*Sapienza*» - *Università di Roma*), Ernst A. Schmidt (*Universität Tübingen*), Richard Tarrant (*Harvard University*).

SEGRETARI DI REDAZIONE: Andrea Cucchiarelli («*Sapienza*» - *Università di Roma*), Maria Luisa Delvigo (*Università di Udine*).

Sede della redazione: Dipartimento di Filologia Classica, Università degli Studi di Pisa, I 56126 Pisa, Via Galvani 1, telefono +39 050 2215602, fax +39 050 2215621.

Si pregano gli autori, i cui articoli siano stati accettati, di inviare i dattiloscritti in forma definitiva e di attenersi rigorosamente alle norme grafiche e ai criteri di citazione elencati nelle ultime due pagine di ogni fascicolo della rivista.

DIRETTORE RESPONSABILE: Gian Biagio Conte (*Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa*).

★

«Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici» is an international peer-reviewed semiannual journal and it is indexed and abstracted in *Scopus* (Elsevier), in *Arts and Humanities Citation Index* and in *Current Contents/Arts & Humanities* (ISI Thomson - Reuters). It has been released in the *JSTOR Archive* as a part of the *Arts & Sciences VIII collection* and the eContent is archived with *Clockss* and *Portico*. ERIH: INT1. ANVUR: A.

Κόσμος ἐπέων.

Studi offerti a Franco Ferrari

A cura di Luigi Battezzato e Giovan Battista D'Alessio

© Copyright by Fabrizio Serra editore, Pisa · Roma.

Francesca Schironi

*Alcman's semi-choruses – in the text ... and beyond it**

THE famous Louvre papyrus preserving Alcman's first *partheneion* (*P.Louvre* E3320 = *P.Paris* 71) dates to the first century CE and derives from learned sources, as proven by the critical signs and the scholia with glosses, variant readings, and some sophisticated exegesis. The quotation of authorities such as Aristophanes, Aristarchus, and Pamphilus furthermore suggests an Alexandrian origin for many of these notes. In what follows I will focus on ll. 35-63 of the *partheneion*, the famous 'beauty contest' between Agido and Hagesichora to show how this papyrus offers important evidence for ancient scholarly practices in dealing with the extra-textual realities of choral performances.

MARGINALIA AND PARAGRAPHOI ON LL. 35-63

The new edition by Cornelia Römer¹ allows us to study this text with *marginalia* on a firmer basis; in particular, three scholia commenting on the choral performance are now legible:²

1. at l. 36: αἱ π(ρὸς) τῆ(ς) Ἀγιδουῶς ἄιδουσι(ν)
2. at ll. 43-44: ἐντεῦθεν α[ἰ] π(ρὸς) τῆς Ἀγησιχόρ(ας) | πάλιν [λέ]γουσιν
3. between ll. 48 and 49: αἱ π(ρὸς) τῆ(ς) Ἀγιδουῶς(ς) τοῦτ' ἄιδουσι(ν) | εἶτα αἱ π(ρὸς) τῆ(ς) Ἀγησιχόρ(ας)

Aside from these scholia, which suggest an amoebaeian exchange between 'the girls of Agido' and 'the girls of Hagesichora', we can rely on two additional elements: the *paragraphoi* added to some lines in *P.Louvre* and the text itself.³ At ll. 35-64 of

* I would like to thank Luigi Battezzato, Giambattista D'Alessio, Gabriel Nocchi Macedo, Monica Negri, and Doug Olson for their comments and helpful suggestions. Working on this piece revived fond memories of my time at the Scuola Normale, among the best of my life as a student. My gratitude goes to Franco Ferrari, who showed me a papyrus for the first time in my life and asked how I would supplement it. I had no idea of what to say, but since then I have been fascinated by those tiny scraps of ancient books.

¹ Römer 2013, pp. 106-127.

² Ibidem, pp. 114-117.

³ The presence of these scholia noticing a distinction between the followers of Agido and those of Hagesichora had already been noted by scholars such as Page 1951, pp. 12-13 (schol. VII and VIII), 48-49, and Rosenmeyer 1966, pp. 322-324; however,

the *partheneion* (= col. ii, 1-30), the following *paragraphoi* can be detected:

ll. 35-36 (?)¹: end of stanza

ll. 39-40

ll. 43-44

ll. 49-50: end of stanza

ll. 59-60

ll. 63-64: end of stanza

In addition to marking the end of stanzas, Hephaestion states that *paragraphoi* can also be markers of amoebaeon exchanges in choral lyric:

Τῇ δὲ παραγράφῳ ἦτοι κατὰ πρόσωπα ἀμοιβαῖα, ἐν τε τοῖς ἰαμβικοῖς καὶ τοῖς χορικοῖς, <ῆ> μεταξύ τῆς τε στροφῆς καὶ τῆς ἀντιστροφῆς.

(Hephaest. 75.5)

With the *paragraphos* [they mark] either the amoebaeon exchanges among characters, in the iambic or choral lyric poems, or the change from the strophe into the antistrophe.

The content of these lines, according to how the ancients understood them (as is clear from the *marginalia*), can explain how the scholia and the *paragraphoi* work together in the papyrus. Even if the first scholium is placed next to l. 36, it probably refers to l. 39, as ll. 36-39 (1st half) contain the *gnome*.² On the other hand, ll. 39 (2nd half)-59 can be interpreted as an amoebaeon exchange where two semi-choruses alternatively praise their own chorus leaders:³ Agido's chorus praises the brightness of Agido (ll. 39-43); then Hagesichora's chorus (ll. 43-49) says that Hagesichora does not allow them to praise Agido, as Hagesichora is outstanding like a prize-winning horse among herds. Here, Agido's chorus quickly intrudes to claim that in fact even Agido is a horse – a Venetic horse (ll. 50-51); but then Hagesichora's chorus (ll. 51-57) responds

they did not read the verbs *ἄιδουσιν*/*λέγουσιν* in the scholia, nor did they connect the *paragraphoi* in the text with the scholia, as Römer 2013, p. 116 finally does.

¹ Uncertain according to Page 1951, pp. 2 and 7, and absent according to Römer 2013, p. 115. The digital image of the papyrus shows a faint trace of what seems to be ink between ll. 35 and 36 (col. ii, 1-2), which might be compatible with a *paragraphos*. If so, some missing fibers and the fact that scholia referring to the previous column reach into the column at issue might have further confused the traces of the original *paragraphos*.

² Cf. Römer 2013, p. 116.

³ This division (but with a different solution for ll. 58-59) is suggested by Peron 1987, pp. 41-47, on the basis of the content of those lines (not on the scholia).

by praising Hagesichora's golden hair and silver face. Ll. 58-59 are debated among scholars, as the text (ἀ δὲ δευτέρα πεδ' Ἀγιδῶ τὸ φεῖδος / ἵππος Ἰβηνῶι Κολαξαῖος δραμήται) allows for two solutions, according to whether πεδ'(ἀ) is considered a preverb in tmesis with δραμήται (such that Agido is the subject of the verb: «the second in beauty [after Hagesichora], Agido, will run after [her], [like] a Colaxaeon horse against an Ibenian»)¹ or a preposition with the accusative Ἀγιδῶ (in which case Hagesichora becomes the subject of the verb, «the second in beauty after Agido, [Hagesichora], will run, [like] a Colaxaeon horse against an Ibenian»).² For the ancients, however, these lines seem to have been quite easy to understand, as the *paragraphoi* and the *marginalia* in the papyrus clearly consider these two lines to belong to the same block as ll. 51-57, and accordingly prefer the first solution. In addition, some clues to how the ancients understood this passage come from *P.Oxy.* 2389 (first century CE), whose fragments preserve the remainder of a commentary on some of Alcman's poems, including *partheneion* 1. Fr. 6, i, 1-5, refers to these lines and, if we follow Römer's suggestion,³ at ll. 2-3 we read: οὕτως ἢ Ἀγιδῶ πρὸ|[ς Ἀγησιχόραν δευ]τέρα κατὰ τὸ εἶδος, according to which the first solution is clearly preferred and no other syntactic alternative seems to be discussed. Whether or not we accept Römer's suggestion in *P.Oxy.* 2389, it seems that the scholars of *P.Louvre* understood the text in this way, so that ll. 51-59 are all praise of Hagesichora. At l. 60 the 'beauty contest' stops; these lines seem to be spoken by all the girls, who compare both Agido and Hagesichora to doves/Pleiades, as the ancients understood one of the difficult passages in this poem (the reference to the Pleiades carrying a ΦΑΡΟΣ). If so, one might think that the two semi-choruses reunited to sing in unison.

The *paragraphoi* and the scholia match this textual articulation quite well, as illustrated by the following reconstruction (where the parts sung by Agido's semi-chorus are wavy-underlined and those sung by Hagesichora's semi-chorus are bold-underlined):

¹ So Garzya 1954, pp. 51-52; Rosenmeyer 1966, p. 342; Calame 1983, p. 330.

² So Peron 1987, pp. 44-46; on the other hand, for Page 1951, pp. 50-51, 89-90, and Campbell 1987, pp. 69-71, the 'second in beauty after Agido' is not Hagesichora but another member of the chorus (but see Römer 2013, p. 24).

³ Römer 2013, pp. 22-24.

P.Louvre E3320, col. ii, 1-29¹

	Partheneion 1, 35-63 (PMGF)	Scholia
35	φέργα πάσον κακὰ μησαμένοι· — ἔστι τις σιῶν τίσις· ὁ δ' ὄλβιος, ὅστις εὐφρων ἀμέραν [δι]απλέκει ἄκλαυτος· ἐγὼν δ' αἰίδα	αἱ π(ρὸς) τῆ(ς) Ἀγιδουῆς αἰδοῦσ(ιν) ²
40	— Ἀγιδῶς τὸ φῶς ὄρω ἦ ἄτ' ἄλιον ὄνπερ ἄμιν Ἀγιδῶ μαρτύρεται φαίνην· ἐμέ δ' οὐτ' ἐπαινῆν — οὐτε μωμῆσθαι νιν ἅ κλεννὰ χοραγὸς	ἐντεῦθεν α[ι] π(ρὸς) τῆς Ἀγησιχόρ(ας) πάλιν [λέ]γουσιν
45	οὐδ' ἀμῶς ἐῆι· δοκεῖ γὰρ ἤμεν αὐτὰ ἐκπρεπῆς τῶς ὡπερ αἴτις ἐν βοτοῖς στάσειεν ἵππον παγὸν ἀεθλοφόρον <u>καναχάποδα</u> <u>ἡτῶν ὑποπετριδίων ὀνείρων†</u> .	αἱ π(ρὸς) τῆ(ς) Ἀγιδουῆ(ς) τοῦτ' αἰδοῦσιν εἶτα αἱ π(ρὸς) τῆ(ς) Ἀγησιχόρ(ας) ³
50	— ἦ οὐχ ὀφῆις· ὁ μὲν κέλις Ἐνετικός· ἅ δέ χαιτα τᾶς ἐμᾶς ἀνεψιᾶς Ἀγησιχόρας ἐπανθεῖ χρυσὸς [ὡ]ς ἀκήρατος·	
55	τό τ' ἀργύριον πρόσωπον· διαφάδαν τί τοι λέγω; Ἀγησιχόρα μὲν αὐτὰ· ἅ δέ δευτέρα πεδ' Ἀγιδῶ τὸ φεῖδος ἵππος Ἰβηνοῖ Κολαξαῖος δραμήται·	
60	— ταῖ Πεληάδες γὰρ ἄμιν Ἵρθρίαι φᾶρος φεροίσαις νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίαν ἄτε Σήριον ἄστρον ἀνηρομένα μάχονται·	

They suffered, since they planned evil deeds.
There is a vengeance from the gods:
This man is blessed, the one who cheerfully
Weaves the web of his life
Without weeping. But I sing of
The brightness of Agido: I see her
Like the sun, which
Agido summons
To shine on us; but to praise
Or fault her [i.e., Agido] our glorious
chorus-leader
Does not let me; for she seems to be

The (girls) on the side of Agido sing

From here the (girls) on the side
of Hagesichora speak in response

¹ I translate the text as understood by the ancients (on the basis of the scholia in *P.Louvre* and *P.Oxy.* 2389).

² At l. 36, but referring to l. 39.

³ Between ll. 48 and 49, but referring to l. 50 (Agido's chorus) and l. 51 (Hagesichora's chorus) because between ll. 49 and 58 a long scholium discussing dreams in poetry (cf. Römer 2013, pp. 118-119) takes up most of the space, pushing up the note.

Pre-eminent, just as if someone
Were to place a horse among grazing herds,
A strong, victorious, loud-hoofed horse The (girls) on the side of Agido sing
One of those seen in rock-sheltered dreams (?) these words and then those on the side
Don't you see? The race-horse of Hagesichora [speak]
Is Venetic; but the hair
Of my cousin
Hagesichora blooms
Like pure gold
And her silver face
– Why do I tell you openly?
This one here is Hagesichora
And the second in beauty, Agido,
Will run after [her] [like] a Colaxean horse against an Ibenian;
 For the Pleiades/Doves [i.e., Agido and Hagesichora], as we
 Carry a plow to Orthria,
 Through the ambrosial night like the star Sirius
 Rise and fight against us.

With this solution we simply need to assume 1. that our scribe missed a *paragraphos* below l. 51, which is not unlikely, especially since he had just written one two lines above, and 2. that no scholium was added at l. 60, when the two semi-choruses reunite. This note was perhaps felt to be unnecessary, because for someone who understood ll. 60-63 as sung by the entire chorus in praise of the two chorus leaders it was perfectly clear that at l. 60 «we» (= whole chorus) was in opposition to the «Doves» Agido and Hagesichora. According to this amoebaeon interpretation, Hagesichora's semi-chorus has many more lines than Agido's semi-chorus, but this might not have been a problem: Hagesichora was definitely the most beautiful in the understanding of the ancient commentator, and perhaps her beauty granted more 'voice' to her chorus.¹

The existence of semi-choruses has also been proposed in modern times,² but has been rejected by eminent scholars such as

¹ According to Peron 1987, pp. 49-53, the imbalance in lines spoken by the two semi-choruses is a question of personality: Hagesichora, the chorus leader, would be the artist, hence her 'lyric' attitude, while Agido would be a priestess, hence her 'laconic' utterances. For the ancients, however, it is more likely that this imbalance was justified from within the text by Hagesichora's superiority as stated in ll. 58-59 – in fact, her beauty is again underscored in the poem when she «wears out» (τείρει at l. 77) the girls of her chorus. This reading is present both in *P.Louvre* and in a lemma of *P.Oxy.* 2389, fr. 7 + 13, l. 11 (μ]ε τείρει[ει), against the proposed emendation τηρεῖ («Hagesichora guards me»), which is accepted for example by Garzya 1954, p. 62, and Hooker 1979, pp. 219-220; see Calame 1983, pp. 339-340.

² E.g., D'Errico 1957, pp. 23-35; Rosenmeyer 1966; Peron 1987, with further bibliography.

Page¹ and Calame.² Without entering into this debate, I am interested in exploring here how ancient scholars could have come up with such an idea and whether we have further evidence of performance notes indicating divisions of lyric poetry into semi-choruses. I will start from this latter question.

SEMI-CHORUSES IN PAPYRI

Normally (and not surprisingly) ancient discussions about changes of speakers are confined to dramatic texts.³ Similarly, dramatic papyri mark changes of speakers with letters denoting actors' roles (A, B, Γ, etc.) or characters' names.⁴ This practice is in fact also attested in some Homeric papyri that add the names of speakers throughout the poem.⁵ Another possibility for marking speaker changes is with *paragraphoi*, often used in dramatic texts (e.g., *P.Oxy.* 22, *P.Oxy.* 2654), but also in Homeric papyri (e.g., *P.Mich.* inv. 2810; *P.Berol.* inv. 7807). Sometimes *paragraphoi* and speaker indications can be combined, as in *P.Oxy.* 2458 (third century CE), containing a fragment from Euripides' *Cresphontes*, with letters indicating actor's roles (A and Γ) as well as *paragraphoi*.⁶ Finally, *eisthesis* and *ekthesis*, which usually mark a change in metrical pattern, sometimes can be used to mark an amoebaeon exchange (e.g., *P.Mich.* 3.140, where both the chorus and Oedipus speak in anapests, so the *eisthesis* only indicates the alternation of speakers).⁷

In purely lyric texts, however, there is not much evidence of editorial practices to signal changes of speaker. Three cases, though, show some similarity with the Alcman papyrus. The first is *P.Berol.* inv. 9771, dating to the third century BCE.⁸ This fragment belongs to an anthology of lyric excerpts and contains a lyric passage from Euripides' *Phaethon*.⁹ The portion preserved (the *parodos*) is purely lyric and does not involve any exchange with any character. Thus,

¹ Page 1951, pp. 48, 57-62.

² Calame 1977, II, pp. 130-132.

³ Cf. Nünlist 2009, pp. 338-343.

⁴ E.g., the papyri studied by Gammacurta 2006.

⁵ Cf. Azzarello 2008.

⁶ Cf. Gammacurta 2006, pp. 95-110.

⁷ Cf. Savignago 2008, pp. 72-73. On the use of *eistheseis* to mark amoebaeon exchanges, see *ibidem*, pp. 318-319. On speaker indications in papyri and mediaeval manuscripts of drama, see Lowe 1962.

⁸ I would like to thank Luigi Battezzato for signaling this text to me.

⁹ The identification of the play as well as supplements in the papyrus were made possible because portions of the text (including the *parodos*) are also transmitted in a palimpsest with the *Epistles* of Paul (P = *Paris*, gr. 107B). See Diggle 1970, pp. 33-34.

the performance context is comparable to the one of Alcman, as there is only the chorus speaking – unlike, for example, *P.Mich.* 3.140, mentioned above, in which the exchange involves the chorus and a character. The text of *P.Berol.* inv. 9771 is not written respecting colometry but as prose. The left margin of the papyrus is partly missing; however, where it is preserved (ll. 1-6 and 9-14), four *paragraphoi* (between ll. 4-5, 10-11, 12-13, 13-14) are clearly visible.¹ I present below the ‘prose’ layout of the papyrus, which corresponds to ll. 63-97 of the play, supplemented with and corrected on the basis of the text edited by Diggle.²

P.Berol. 9771

- 1 ἤδη μὲν ἀρτιφανῆς / Ἄω[ς] ἱ[ππεύει κατὰ γᾶν,] /
 ὑπὲρ δ' ἐμᾶς κεφαλᾶς / Πλειά[δων πέφευγε χορός], /
 μέλπει δὲ δένδρεσι λεπτ[ᾶν ἀηδῶν ἀρμ[ονίαν / ὀρθρευ-]
 ομένα γόοις / Ἴτυν Ἴτυν πολύθρηνον. // [σύριγγας δ']
 5 — οὐριβάται / κινουῖσιν ποιμνᾶν ἐλάται, / — [ἔγρονται]
 § δ' εἰς βοτάναν / ξανθᾶν π[ώλ]ων συζυ[γίαι· / ἤδη]
 [δ' εἰς ἔργα κυνα/γοὶ στ]είχουσι[ν θηροφόνου, / παγαῖς τ' ἐπ']
 [ἸΩκεανοῦ /] μ[ε]λιβόας [κύκνος ἀχεῖ. // ἄκατοι δ' ἀνάγον-]
 ται ὑπ' εἰρεσίαις [/ ἀνέμων τ' εὐαέσσιν ῥοθίοις, /] — ἀν[ὰ δ' ἰστία ναῦται]
 10 ἀειράμενοι / ἰαχοῦσιν [“Ἐπου, πό[τνι] αὔρα, / ἡμῖν ὑπ']
 — ἀκύμονι πομπᾶι / σιγῶντων ἀνέμων / [ποτὶ τέκνα]
 — τε/ καὶ φιλίας ἀλόχους.” / — σινδῶν δὲ π[ρότονον ἐπὶ μέ-]
 — σον πελάζει. // — τὰ μ[ε]ν οὖν ἐτέροισι μέριμνα πέ[λει, /]
 — κόσμον δ' ὕμεναί[ω]ν δεσποσύνω[ν / ἐμὲ καὶ]
 15 [τὸ δίκαι]ον ἄγει καὶ ἔρω[ς / ὕ]μνεῖν· — δμωσί[ν γὰρ]
 [ἀνάκτων / ε]ὐαμερίαι προσι[ο]ῦσαι / μολπᾶι θάρσ[ος ἄγουσ' /]
 [ἐπιχάρμα]τά τ'· — εἰ δὲ τύχα τι τέκοι / — βα[ρὺν βαρεῖα]
 [φόβον] ἔπεμψεν οἴκοις. // — ὀρίζεται δὲ τόδ[ε φάος]
 [γάμων] τέλει, / — τὸ δ[ὲ] ποτ' εὐχαῖ[ς ἐγὼ /] λισσο[μένα]

1 Ἄω[ς] Morel: Ἐώ[ς] pap: Ἐώ[ς] P ἱ[ππεύει: suppl. Wilamowitz

2 δ' ἐμᾶς Wilamowitz: δὲ ἐμᾶς pap.

3 δὲ s.l.

5 οὐριβάται P: ὀριβάται pap. κινουῖσιν P: κινουῖσι pap.

7 [δ' εἰς ἔργα κυνα/γοὶ στ]είχουσι[ν θηροφόνου: restored *exempli gratia* on the basis of Diggle's text; some unclear traces are visible in the papyrus; Austin suggested: ε[σ] ε[ργα] κυναγων

¹ Yet the latest edition by Pordomingo 2013, pp. 59-64 follows the *editio princeps* by Schubart and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1907, pp. 79-84, and so has only three *paragraphoi* (the last three), while the dash above l. 5 is considered as a *supra lineam* to correct ὀριβάται into οὐριβάται. However, the papyrus' digital image now available online unmistakably proves the presence of a *paragraphos* (which Diggle 1970, p. 102 already noticed, on the basis of Austin's inspection: cf. *ibidem*, p. 34).

² The text in the papyrus contains some mistakes and discrepancies compared to the text edited by Diggle 1970, which I have noted in the apparatus. Cf. Diggle 1970, pp. 98-115; Carrara 2009, pp. 110-113. Mine is not an edition of the papyrus but is simply a reconstruction to show how *paragraphoi* work in this *ekdosis*.

θ[ηροφόνου στ]είχουσι[ν. I cannot make much of the traces; yet στ]είχουσι[ν is definitely on the right hand-side of the column, so if θηροφόνου was in the original, it was indeed probably before στ]είχουσι[ν.

9 [/ ἀνέμων τ' εὐάεσσιν ῥοθίοις, /]: restored *exempli gratia* on the basis of Diggle's text; some traces are visible in the papyrus; Austin suggested: [α]ν[ε]μ[ω]ν c. 5] or [-]α[ν]εμ[ω]ν c. 4]; the latter solution is more likely in my view; yet reading: - [.]σ [.] c. 7] (after σ remnants of a stem with serif compatible with ι, π, τ) is also possible

10 λαχοῦσιν Diggle: ἀχοῦσιν Wilamowitz: ἀχέουσιν pap.

12-13 μέ]σον: μέ]σομ pap.

13 ἐτέρουσι μεριμνα πέ[λγει Diggle; ετερωνετε[...] pap., ἐτέρων ἐτέ[ροι]σι μέλει] suppl. Rubensohn

14 κόσμον δ' ὕμεναίων Hartung: κοσμεῖν ὕμεναίων δέ P, κοσμεῖν - ὕμεναί[ω]ν δέ pap. δεσποσύνω[ν P (post corr.); ἀεὶ δεσποσύνω[ν pap.

16 εὐαμερῖαι M. Schmidt: ε]ὶημέροι pap. : εὐαμέροι P (post corr.)

17 τ' Wilamowitz: τε pap. τέκοι P: τέκηι pap.

Already just appearing Dawn rides over the earth,
And above my head the chorus of the Pleiades has fled;
The nightingale sings her delicate harmony among the trees, awake
Before daybreak with her laments, [singing] the mournful 'Itys, Itys'. //
Those who drive flocks, walking the mountains, stir their pipes, and
Pairs of fair fillies rise to go to the pasture; already
Hunters who kill wild beats hurry to the deed; on the streams
Of Oceanus the sweet-singing swan sings. // Light vessels are led
Under the oars and the winds' favorable waves, and sailors, raising
The sails, cry loudly: "Escort us, breeze, our mistress,
On a calm voyage back home while the winds are still, towards our children
And dear wives"; and the sail comes close to the
Forestay's middle. // Those things are others' concern;
But both right and desire lead me to sing
A praise of my masters' wedding; for to servants
Their lords' happy times, when they come, bring confidence
And joy in their song, but if misfortune should bring something forth, it, heavy,
Sends heavy fear on the house. // This day is marked
For the fulfillment of a marriage which begging with prayers I long...

The papyrus, recently discussed by Martinelli,¹ has marks and *marginalia*. The meaning of the archaic-shaped *coronis* at l. 6 is uncertain. In the margin of l. 12 is what looks like an arc or a tilde; below, between ll. 13 and 14, only the upper traces of one or two letters/ sigla are visible before the papyrus breaks off. There are also dashes within the text; they might articulate the text, as they often coincide with pauses of sense and in most cases (in fact, all except the one at l. 15 and the first one at l. 17) they are placed before the end of the line (marked by a single slash in the text above).

The function of the four *paragraphoi*, on the other hand, is much clearer and corresponds to what we have seen in the Louvre papyrus. The first *paragraphos* (between ll. 4-5) signals the end of the strophe in l. 4 (marked by double slashes in the text). The *para-*

¹ Martinelli 2009, pp. 344-350.

graphos between ll. 13-14 has the same function, namely, it marks the end of strophe in l. 13. The ends of antistrophes are at l. 8 and at l. 18; however, the margins between ll. 8-9 and between ll. 18-19 are not preserved enough to tell whether a *paragraphos* was present there as well. We are then left with two *paragraphoi* between ll. 10-11 and 12-13. Clearly they do not have any metrical function, but rather seem to indicate a change of speaker. Ll. 10-12 contain direct speech (underlined in the text) by sailors within the *parodos*, which, in turn, is sung by the chorus of female slaves. These two *paragraphoi* thus indicate a change of speaking persona *within* a lyric passage, as already suggested by Battezzato.¹ In both papyri, thus, *paragraphoi* are used both to mark the end of sections within a lyric poem (strophes/antistrophes or stanzas) and to indicate changes of speakers within a lyric text (the ἀμοιβαῖα κατὰ πρόσωπα of Hephaestion), as is clear from the following two Tables:

Paragraphoi in *P.Berol.* 9771 and *P.Louvre* E 3320

P.Berol. 9771

<i>Paragraphos</i>	Meaning of the <i>paragraphos</i>	Content of the text
ll. 4-5	Strophe ends (at l. 4)	Chorus of female slaves
[missing margin]	Antistrophe ends (at l. 8)	Chorus of female slaves
ll. 10-11	Change of speaker (at l. 10) – and of performer?	Invocation to Breeze by the sailors
ll. 12-13	Change of speaker (at l. 12) – and of performer?	Chorus of female slaves
ll. 13-14	Strophe ends (at l. 13)	Chorus of female slaves
[missing margin]	Antistrophe ends (at l. 18)	Chorus of female slaves

P.Louvre E 3320

<i>Paragraphos</i>	Meaning of the <i>paragraphos</i>	Content of the text
ll. 35-36?	Stanza ends (at l. 35)	Gnome
ll. 39-40	Change of speaker: Agido's girls (at l. 39)	Praise of Agido (at ll. 39-43)
ll. 43-44	Change of speaker: Hagesichora's girls (at l. 43)	Praise of Hagesichora (at ll. 43-49)
ll. 49-50	Stanza ends (at l. 49) <i>and</i> change of speaker: Agido's girls (at l. 50)	Brief Praise of Agido (at ll. 50-51)
Missing	Change of speaker: Hagesichora's girls (at l. 51)	Praise of Hagesichora (at ll. 51-59)
ll. 59-60	Change of speaker: entire chorus (at l. 60)	Agido and Hagesichora as doves (at ll. 60-63)
ll. 63-64	Stanza ends (at l. 63)	Agido and Hagesichora as doves (at ll. 60-63)

Because the *Phaethon* is not preserved elsewhere (except in the scanty *Paris. gr.* 107B) and because of lack of legible *marginalia* or

¹ Cf. *ibidem*, p. 349. Martinelli herself (*ibidem*, p. 350), on the other hand, seems to suggest that these *paragraphoi* have a mostly metrical and rhythmical function.

marginalia with a clear meaning,¹ we do not know whether, in the original performance, this change of speaking persona was rendered by having the chorus split into two groups, one impersonating the ‘real’ chorus of female slaves and another one (a smaller group?) impersonating the sailors.²

While the case of *P.Berol.* 9771 does not necessarily imply the presence of semi-choruses, an amoebaean exchange among two semi-choruses and a character is clearly indicated in *P.Oxy.* 1370; this is, however, a later example, as the manuscript dates to the fifth century CE.³ It consists of nine fragments from a papyrus codex containing at least the *Medea* and the *Orestes*. While the short fragment of the *Medea* (fr. 1r) signals speaker changes with *paragraphoi*, the *Orestes* fragments add the characters’ names to the *paragraphoi* (e.g., Tyndareus at l. 470 in frs. 2-3r). For our purposes, fr. 9 fol. 1v is especially interesting. It covers ll. 1246-1265, which is an amoebaean exchange between Electra and the chorus. The characters are named the first time they appear on the page; *eisthesis* and, occasionally, *paragraphoi* (hardly visible in the digital image) indicate change of speaker:

P.Oxy. 1370, fr. 9, fol. 1v

	Ἥλ(έκτρα)	Μυκηνί[δες ὃ φίλιαι,] τά πρώτα [κατὰ Πελασγὸν ἔδος Ἀργείων.]
1250		^ο Χ ρ τίνα [θροεῖς αὐδάν, πότνια; παραμένει] γ[ά]ρ [ἔτι σοι τὰδ’ ἐν Δαναΐδᾶν πόλει.] — στῆθ’ [αἰ μὲν ὑμῶν τόνδ’ ἀμαξήρη τρίβον,] αἰ δ’ [ἐν]θ[άδ’ ἄλλον οἶμον ἐς φρουρὰν δόμων.] τ[ί] δέ με τόδε χρέος ἀπύεις;] ἔ[γινεπέ μοι, φίλα.]
1255		φόβο[ς] ἔχ[ει με μή τις ἐπὶ δώμασι] στα[θεις ἐπὶ φοίνιον αἶμα] πή[ματα πήμασιν ἐξεύρηι.] — [χωρεῖτ’, ἐπειγώμεσθ’· ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν τρίβον] [τόνδ’ ἐκφυλάξω τὸν πρὸς ἡλίου βολάς.]
1260	ἄλ]λο ἡμιχ(όριον)	καὶ μ[ὴν ἐγὼ τόνδ’, ὅς πρὸς ἐσπέραν φέρει.] — δ[όχμιά νυν κόρας διάφερ’ ὀμμάτων.] ἐ[κείθεν ἐνθάδ’ εἶτα παλινσκοπιάν.]
1265		ἔχομ[εν, ὡς θροεῖς.]

El.: O dear women of Mycenae

First in Argos, the home of the Pelasgians.

¹ Perhaps the *marginalia* at ll. 6, 12, and 13-14 might be connected with these changes of speakers, but I have not found any satisfactory solution for what they can mean.

² As suggested by Bers 1997, pp. 23-25, for similar cases of *oratio recta* in lyric passages of drama.

³ Cf. Savignago 2008, pp. 217-223; Carrara 2009, pp. 524-530.

Ch.: What are you saying, mistress? For this [honor] is still left
For you in the town of the Danaids.

El.: Position yourselves, some of you along this high-road,
The others on other road, to watch the palace.

Ch.: But why do you call me to this service?
Tell me, my dear.

El. I fear that someone at the house
Stationed for a bloody murder
May find trouble upon trouble.

Semi-Ch.: Let's go, quick; I will watch
Upon this road towards the east.

Semi-Ch.: And I upon this one, which leads towards the west.

El. Throw a glance sideways,
Here and there, in the opposite direction.

Ch.: We are positioned, as you tell us.

The text indicates the presence of a semi-chorus (at l. 1260) as distinct from the entire chorus (indicated by the vertical abbreviation Χορ, closer to the indented text at ll. 1248-1250); most likely another indication for the other ἡμιχόριον was placed in the margin of l. 1258, which is now lost. At l. 1265 the entire chorus speaks together again.¹

Lastly, another occurrence of a ἡμιχόριον is in *P.Mich.* inv. 5067a (fourth century CE), with reference to Aristophanes, *Ach.*, 494; this text too has indications of characters (Euripides, Dicaeopolis, chorus) as well as *paragraphoi*.²

Like *P.Oxy.* 1370 and *P.Mich.* inv. 5067a, *P.Louvre* uses both *paragraphoi* and 'speaker indications' to mark the amoebaeon exchange between two different groups of performers. Nevertheless, the commentator in *P.Louvre* does not speak of '(first/second/other) semi-chorus' as *P.Oxy.* 1370 and *P.Mich.* inv. 5067a do; neither does he speak of 'semi-chorus A' and 'semi-chorus B', which would suggest a performance note, similar to the actors' texts with letter-designations.³ Rather, he uses the name of the 'characters' in the poem, Agido and Hagesichora, which suggests that the *ekdosis* in the Louvre papyrus was less performance-oriented: here there are no semi-choruses, but only «the girls on the side of Agido» and «the girls on the side of Hagesichora», who speak to each other. This way of signaling the exchange is not like that of a dramatic

¹ On the division among speakers of ll. 1261-1265, see Savignago 2008, pp. 221-223, whom I followed. On this scene, cf. also Di Benedetto, Medda 1997, p. 244.

² See Renner 1981, pp. 1-7; Olson 2001, p. 17.

³ E.g., the already mentioned *P.Oxy.* 2458 as well as the other papyri studied by Gammacurta 2006, pp. 7-110.

text (where the chorus is labeled as «chorus») but is closer to non-dramatic texts, such as those Homeric papyri which have characters' names intermixed with the abbreviation πο(ιητής), 'poet', for narrative parts.¹ Of course, ancient scholars knew that choral lyric was performed by a chorus; yet our commentator's attitude is that of a reader who identifies speaking characters, not choral performers.

SEMI-CHORUSES WITHIN THE TEXT

The manuscripts analyzed above prove that the ancients did take an interest in choral performances and sometimes signaled changes of speakers within a lyric exchange. Even if we do not have any other evidence of semi-choruses in Pindar and other lyric poets, semi-choruses are also noted in lyric exchanges in dramatic scholia.² How did ancient scholars come up with such an articulation of lyric passages? The two Euripidean examples analyzed above are telling. In the *Phaethon parodos* the sailors' invocation is clearly introduced at l. 10 (ἰαχοῦσιν) and at l. 13 the housemaids dissociate themselves from the sailors' concern (τὰ μ[ε]ν οὖν ἑτέροισι μέριμνα πέ[λει]), and consequently the change of speaker is obvious from the text (whether or not it was sung by a different semi-chorus). Even clearer is the case of the *Orestes* papyrus. At ll. 1251-1252 Electra orders the chorus to divide themselves into two groups to keep watch from two opposite directions; at ll. 1258-1259 one speaker says that she will watch the road «towards the east» (πρὸς ἡλίου βολάς), while at l. 1260 another speaker claims that she will watch it «towards the west» (πρὸς ἐσπέραν). Hardly could we find a clearer indication of two semi-choruses who announce to the audience – or to the readers, in this case – that they are splitting and walking towards the two *eisodoi*.

Similar cases of semi-choruses deduced 'from the text' are found in dramatic scholia. For example, in the *Frogs* Aristarchus apparently supposed the chorus of the initiates to split into two semi-choruses, perhaps already at l. 354 to speak the anapestic tetrameters containing didactic and political advice to the audience (ll. 354-371). While the scholium reporting Aristarchus's opinion on this

¹ E.g., Bankes Homer (*PLit.Lond.* 28, second century CE).

² Cf. *P.Oxy.* 2741, ll. 120-121, 186-187, a *hypomnema* to Eupolis' *Marikas*; *Sch. Aristoph. Ach.* 564a, *Eq.* 589a.b, *Lys.* 321; *Sch. Aesch. Septem* 369-371, 372a, 888a, 890b, etc.; *Sch. Eur. Alc.* 77, *Or.* 1275, *Troad.* 166. On modern views on *dichoria*, see Rosenmeyer 1966, pp. 354-359.

line is corrupted, and so it is unclear what he thought,¹ another scholium testifies that it was debated whether or not the anapestic tetrameters were sung by a semi-chorus or by the entire chorus:

καὶ τί ἄρα σύννοιδεν ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος; δύναται δὲ καὶ ἐνσύζυγον εἶναι τὸ λεγόμενον, πολλαχοῦ δὲ μεμερίσθαι καὶ εἰς διχορείαν τὸ λοιπὸν ὥστε εἰς ἰβ' καὶ ἰβ' διαμεμερίσθαι.

(Sch. Aristoph. Ra. 354b)

And what does Aristarchus know? What is being said can also be in unison [i.e., sung by the entire chorus] and in many places [what is being said] [can] also be split further on into two semi-choruses, so to be divided into twelve and twelve [*choreutai*].

On the other hand, at l. 372 Aristarchus certainly thought of a semi-chorus who would exhort the initiates in lyric meters (ll. 372-382):

ἐντεῦθεν Ἀρίσταρχος ὑπενόησε μὴ ὅλου τοῦ χοροῦ εἶναι τὸ πρόσωπον.

(Sch. Aristoph. Ra. 372c)

From here on Aristarchus supposed that the speaking persona was not that of the entire chorus.

How did Aristarchus reach this conclusion? The scholia are scanty, just like the other scholia noticing the presence of semi-choruses in dramatic texts. We cannot exclude the possibility that he had access to antiquarian information about the performance of the *Frogs* – his teacher Aristophanes of Byzantium used records of Athenian performances derived from Peripatetic sources to compile his *hypotheseis* of dramatic texts² and Aristarchus might have used them. Yet another scholium preserving a reaction to Aristarchus' ideas should make us suspicious about his real knowledge of performance praxis of the *Frogs*:

τοῦτο οὐκ ἀξιόπιστον. πολλάκις γὰρ ἀλλήλοις οὕτω παρακελεύονται οἱ περὶ τὸν χορόν.

(Sch. Aristoph. Ra. 372d)

But this [i.e., Aristarchus' idea of semi-choruses] is not convincing. For often the members of the chorus exhort each other in this way [i.e., without being divided into two groups].³

¹ Sch. Aristoph. Ra. 354a Ἀρίσταρχος ἐπὶ τούτων λέγει τὸν χορὸν μεμερίσθαι ἴεις μερικὰ ἀνάπαιστα, ἄλλα δὲ ἄμειβεσθαι τὸν χορόν. According to Dover 1993, pp. 63-64, Aristarchus thought that ll. 354-371 were sung by a semi-chorus.

² Cf. Pfeiffer 1968, pp. 192-196.

³ Dover 1993, p. 64 reads τοῦτο δὲ ἀξιόπιστον, which of course changes completely the meaning of the scholium (which would agree with Aristarchus). However, in his

The comments of *Sch. Aristoph. Ra.* 354b and 372d suggesting different semi-choral divisions seem to imply that Aristarchus' conclusion was based only on a metrical analysis of the passage and on its content. In fact, the use of the verb ὑπονοεῖν, 'to guess', 'to suppose', in *Sch. Aristoph. Ra.* 372c for Aristarchus' opinion about the semi-chorus, may also imply that his statement was an 'educated guess' more than a secure piece of information. While this possibility cannot be proven, the examples of ancient editions of dramatic texts analyzed above suggest that performance notes such as the splitting of a chorus could often simply be deduced from the text itself. Yet there might be an exception: *P.Mich.* inv. 5067a. Here the indication of the presence of a semi-chorus does not seem derived from the text, as this passage from the *Acharnians* does not necessarily suggest the division of the chorus into two groups; nor does the meter reveal any change from the lines spoken by the entire chorus (ll. 489-493) to those supposedly spoken by the semi-chorus (ll. 494-496). The papyrus is relatively late (fourth century CE), but if this division derives from an Alexandrian edition, then we might speculate that ancient editors sometimes had external information on the original performance to be able to mark changes from a chorus to a semi-chorus. On the other hand, as Doug Olson has observed to me, the chorus does split at ll. 557-577, with one group (or speaker) advocating for Dicaeopolis, the other against him. Accordingly, our ancient editor might be anticipating this split at l. 494.

ALCMAN'S SEMI-CHORUSES BEYOND THE TEXT?

If even great Alexandrian scholars could dive into purely speculative conclusions about dramatic and lyric performances without any external evidence to corroborate their claims, the anonymous commentator of *P.Louvre* could certainly have derived the notion of the two semi-choruses in Alcman from the text itself. Indeed, for the 'beauty contest' in ll. 39-59, it does not take much imagination to think of two semi-choruses. This was even easier for Hellenistic scholars familiar with the amoebaeon poetry of Theocritus,

apparatus Chantry does not mention any variant, except that manuscripts have τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἀξιόπιστον, with a δέ connecting scholium d to scholium c (which he deleted). I follow Chantry's text.

where two 'poets' / herdsman often engage in song contests.¹ In addition, as highlighted in the text at p. 36, the continuous use of μέν and δέ in these lines suggests a division into two parties in dialogue with each other.

If ancient commentators assumed the presence of semi-choruses on the basis of the text itself, this would show how the Aristarchean principle 'to clarify Homer with Homer' could backfire if wrongly applied. While this is an excellent philological principle, it becomes risky when discussing extra-textual realities such as choral performances. If, thus, the idea of two semi-choruses in the Louvre papyrus (and elsewhere) arose on the basis of the content only, these *marginalia* and *paragraphoi* would be interesting from a cultural point of view but could not help us to reconstruct ancient lyric performances.

However, for this specific case of Alcman's *partheneion*, we might have some indication that it was not only a question of 'clarifying Alcman with Alcman'. Even if it is unlikely that ancient scholars took this information from contemporary performances (though Alcman's texts might still have been performed at Sparta in the third century BCE),² we can rely on some additional, external evidence for semi-choruses in Sparta:

καὶ ἡμιχόριον δὲ καὶ διχορία καὶ ἀντιχόρια. ἔοικε δὲ ταῦτόν εἶναι ταυτὶ τὰ τρία ὀνόματα· ὁπόταν γὰρ ὁ χορὸς εἰς δύο μέρη τμηθῆ, τὸ μὲν πρᾶγμα καλεῖται διχορία, ἑκατέρα δ' ἡ μοῖρα ἡμιχόριον, ἃ δ' ἀντάδουσιν, ἀντιχόρια. τριχορίαν δὲ Τύρταιος ἔστησε, τρεῖς Λακόνων χορούς, καθ' ἡλικίαν ἐκάστην, παιῖδας ἀνδρας γέροντας.

(Pollux 4.107, p. 233.4 Bethe)

Semi-chorus, *di-choria*, and *anti-choria*. It seems that these three names mean the same thing. For when the chorus is split into two parts, this event is called 'di-choria', while each part of it [is called] 'semi-chorus', and what they sing to each other [is called] 'anti-choria'. Tyrtaeus set out a 'tri-choria', [i.e.,] three choruses of Laconians, [divided] by age, children, adult men, and old men.

Writing his *Onomasticon* in the second century CE, Pollux used excellent sources, many of which belonged to the foremost Alexandrian scholarship (the lexica by Eratosthenes, Aristophanes of Byzantium, and Pamphilus). Though he does not mention Alcman

¹ Rosenmeyer 1966, pp. 325-332 even suggests a connection between Theocritus' amoebaeon poetry and the genre of *partheneia*.

² Cf. Carey 2011, pp. 354-356.

or Sparta explicitly when he speaks of *di-choria* and semi-choruses, he attributes triple choruses to Tyrtaeus, who lived in Sparta at roughly the same time as Alcman. Alcman is in fact mentioned in a note by Athenaeus that derives from Sosibius, the third-second century BCE authority on ancient Sparta who also wrote a work *On Alcman*. In his other work *On Sacrifices*, Sosibius claimed that the choruses performing *gymnopaïdiai* were trifold, one of boys, one of men, and one of old men, and they sung odes by Thaletas, Alcman, and Dionysodotus (*FGrHist* 595 F 5 = Athen. 15.678bc). Aside from the details concerning the Spartan *gymnopaïdiai*,¹ there is no reason to distrust Sosibius and Pollux, as least when they agree in claiming that at Sparta choruses could be divided into two or three groups.²

To conclude, our commentator might have ‘found’ his division into semi-choruses in the text itself; yet it cannot be disproven that he might in fact have had a solid basis upon which to claim this, derived from historical or antiquarian sources lost to us.³ In fact, another fragment in *P.Oxy.* 2389 (fr. 35, 16-18)⁴ may discuss Spartan semi-choruses. The poem commented on is unknown because no *lemmata* can be identified, but at ll. 17-18 the commentator mentions girls of Dyme who went to Pitane and did something with the girls there ([Δ]υμαιν[]κοντο ε[ις] τ(ήν) Πιτά[]ην συ. [τ]αῖς Πιτανάτισι). Whether or not we accept Barrett’s appealing supplement (π[ολ]λάκις δ(ὲ) / [Δ]υμαιν[ῶν] παρθένοι ἀφί]κοντο ε[ις] τ(ήν) Πιτά[]ην συ[]χορεύσουσαι τ]αῖς Πιτανάτισι),⁵ clearly the commentator speaks of two female groups belonging to two different areas of Sparta⁶ and meeting to do something together. If

¹ Cf. Bühler 1999, pp. 479-487. The *gymnopaïdiai* were in fact important initiation rituals for men at Sparta and have often been connected with Alcman’s *partheneia* (which, according to this theory, would have been the corresponding rituals for young women); see Calame 1977, I, pp. 350-357; Hinge 2006, pp. 282-290.

² As D’Alessio pointed out to me, Bühler 1999, p. 484 notices that the choral performances described by Sosibius seem to be very different from those described by Pollux.

³ The fact that Sosibius might have been describing performances of his own time (Carey 2011, pp. 455-456) does not mean that similar performances with ‘split choruses’ were not performed at Sparta in Alcman’s time. In fact, Pollux seems to assume that ‘split choruses’ did go back to Tyrtaeus’ (and Alcman’s) time.

⁴ Though this fragment may not belong to the same manuscript as the rest of *P.Oxy.* 2389. Cf. Römer 2013, pp. 12, 41.

⁵ Barrett 1961, p. 687.

⁶ While Pitane indicates an area of Sparta and Dyme is one of the Dorian tribes, in Hesychius they are both considered tribes of Sparta (Hsch. δ 2484, π 2382). The Dymainai reappear in *P.Oxy.* 2390, fr. 2, ii, 25. See Calame 1977, I, pp. 382-385.

the commentator speaks of two locally-based choruses who came together to sing (Barrett's συγ[χορεύσουσαι), this note may echo Pollux's and Sosibius' accounts of Spartan choruses.¹

CONCLUSIONS

The *marginalia* in the Louvre papyrus of Alcman offer unique evidence for editorial practices highlighting encoded generic performance details and, maybe, knowledge about particular performances of lyric poetry. While we have plenty of evidence for notation of changes of speakers from ancient editions of dramas and even Homer (names of characters, letters indicating actors' roles, *paragraphoi*, *ekthesis* / *eisthesis*), the evidence for lyric poetry is scanty. Yet the three papyri here analyzed of Euripides and Aristophanes suggest that ancient critics did articulate speaker changes in lyric poetry and marked them with *paragraphoi*. These papyri thus confirm what we read in Hephaestion about the function of *paragraphoi* in lyric poetry: they did not only mark the transition from strophe to antistrophe but also dialogues among characters. Whereas in the *Phaethon* papyrus the *paragraphoi* indicating the ἀμοιβαῖα κατὰ πρόσωπα might not necessarily indicate a change of performers, the Louvre papyrus and the papyri of the *Orestes* and the *Acharnians* also add marginal notes that seem to refer to the external reality of the performance. *P.Oxy.* 1370, fr. 9v, and *P.Mich.* inv. 5067a are the most performance-oriented, as they clearly speak of a 'semi-chorus'; the *marginalia* in *P.Louvre*, on the other hand, do not speak of semi-choruses but use the name of the 'characters' in the lyric exchange. Perhaps this is an indication that the scholars working on this edition considered the *partheneion* a text, to be read rather than performed – so instead of choruses dancing and singing, they conceived of characters speaking under the lead of the two girls mentioned in the poem.

Even with this reader-oriented attitude, the Alcman papyrus offers exceptional evidence, all the more so because it derives from learned sources, most likely connected with Alexandrian scholarship, as the names of Aristophanes and Aristarchus among the authorities quoted in the *marginalia* suggest. Scholia noticing semi-choruses or amoebaeon exchanges in lyric passages in dramatic

¹ *P.Louvre* has two other scholia probably dealing with the number of chorus members. Cf. Römer 2013, pp. 122-123, 125-127.

texts confirm that the Alexandrians took an interest in what we would now consider the ‘performance aspects’ of lyric poetry. Yet we need to be careful here. First, changes in speaking personae do not necessarily imply that such changes were rendered in the performance by a division of the chorus into groups; the *Phaethon* papyrus might indeed be one of these cases. Still, matching a change of speaking persona to a splitting of the chorus might have been an obvious choice and seems to have been the solution often adopted by the ancient critics, as scholia discussing semi-choruses in drama suggest. Finally, and closely connected to this point, there is the question of whether ancient scholars relied on external evidence (i.e., historical information about real performances) or whether they deduced the speakers in a lyric exchange from the text itself. If *P.Mich.* inv. 5067a offers inconclusive evidence, dramatic scholia as well as the papyri of Alcman’s *partheneion* and of Euripides’ *Phaethon* and *Orestes* all suggest that the placement of the *paragraphoi* and other markers for speaker changes could have been deduced from the text itself. The Alcman papyrus, however, allows for a more nuanced answer, and this is why it is important. As we have seen, the evidence from Pollux and Sosibius indicates that ‘real’ lyric performances in archaic Sparta might indeed have included semi-choruses. Thus we cannot exclude the possibility that ancient scholars could have also consulted an antiquarian source to back up their views about ancient semi-choruses when commenting on Alcman’s *partheneion*. Perhaps this came as a second step, as an afterthought, once amoebaeon exchanges had been ‘deduced’ from the text itself. But we should not censure the Hellenistic scholars for this. Even now, because of the lack of theatrical notes and of direct evidence for ancient performances, scholars of ancient drama use the very text of extant tragedies and comedies to reconstruct what happened onstage.¹ Furthermore, checking external sources to confirm and back up conclusions based only on internal evidence cannot be condemned *per se* – in fact, it is a rather common practice, one that modern scholars often embrace without qualms. Why, then, be so strict with our ancient colleagues? In the end, they were simply anticipating our own *modus operandi* when it comes to ancient performances.

University of Michigan

¹ E.g., most famously, Taplin 1977, 2003, and Di Benedetto, Medda 1997, who also discuss (*ibidem*, pp. 242-245) semi-choruses in tragedy.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Azzarello 2008: G. Azzarello, *Sprecherhinweise in homerischen Papyri*, in S. Lippert, M. Schentuleit (eds.), *Graeco-Roman Fayum - Texts and Archaeology. Proceedings of the Third International Fayum Symposium*, Wiesbaden, pp. 27-44.
- Barrett 1961: W. S. Barrett, review of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, xxiv, by E. Lobel et alii, «Gnomon» 33, pp. 682-692.
- Bers 1997: V. Bers, *Speech in speech*, Lanham (MD).
- Bühler 1999: W. Bühler, *Zenobii Athoi proverbia*, vol. 5 (II 41-108), Göttingen.
- Calame 1977: C. Calame, *Les chœurs de jeunes filles en Grèce archaïque*, 2 vols., Rome.
- Calame 1983: C. Calame, *Alcman: Introduction, texte critique, témoignages, traduction et commentaire*, Rome.
- Campbell 1987: D. A. Campbell, *Three Notes on Alcman 1 P. (= 3 Calame)*, «Quad. Urb. Cult. Class.» 26, pp. 67-72.
- Carey 2011: Ch. Carey, *Alcman: from Laconia to Alexandria*, in L. Athanassaki, E. Bowie (eds.), *Archaic and classical choral song: performance, politics and dissemination*, Berlin, pp. 437-460.
- Carrara 2009: P. Carrara, *Il testo di Euripide nell'antichità*, Firenze.
- D'Errico 1957: A. D'Errico, *Il Partenio di Alcmane*, «Ann. Fac. Lett. Nap.» 7, pp. 5-38.
- Di Benedetto, Medda 1997: V. Di Benedetto, E. Medda, *La tragedia sulla scena. La tragedia greca in quanto spettacolo teatrale*, Torino.
- Diggle 1970: J. Diggle, *Euripides, Phaethon*, Cambridge.
- Dover 1993: K. Dover, *Aristophanes, Frogs*, Oxford.
- Gammacurta 2006: T. Gammacurta, *Papyrologica scaenica*, Alessandria.
- Garzya 1954: A. Garzya, *Alcmane. I frammenti. Testo critico, traduzione, commentario*, Napoli.
- Hinge 2006: G. Hinge, *Die Sprache Alkmans*, Wiesbaden.
- Hooker 1979: J. T. Hooker, *The unity of Alcman's Partheneion*, «Rhein. Mus.» 122, pp. 211-221.
- Lowe 1962: J. C. B. Lowe, *The manuscript evidence for changes of speaker in Aristophanes*, «Bull. Inst. Class. Stud.» 9, pp. 27-42.
- Martinelli 2009: M. C. Martinelli, *Testi musicati, testi per la musica. Ipotesi su alcuni papiri lirici*, in Eadem (ed.), *La Musa dimenticata*, Pisa, pp. 317-354.
- Nünlist 2009: R. Nünlist, *The ancient critic at work*, Cambridge.
- Olson 2001: D. S. Olson, *Manuscript indications of change of speaker in Aristophanes' Acharnians*, «Ill. Class. Stud.» 26, pp. 1-36.
- Page 1951: D. L. Page, *Alcman, The Partheneion*, Oxford.
- Peron 1987: J. Peron, *Demi-chœurs chez Alcman: Parth. 1, v. 39-59*, «Grazer Beitr.» 14, pp. 35-53.

- Pfeiffer 1968: R. Pfeiffer, *History of classical scholarship*, Oxford.
- Pordomingo 2013: F. Pordomingo, *Antologías griegas de época helenística en papiro*, Firenze.
- Renner 1981: Th. Renner, *Two papyri of Aristophanes*, «Zeitschr. für Papyr. und Epigr.» 41, pp. 1-12.
- Römer 2013: C. Römer, *Alcman*, in *Commentaria et lexica Graeca in papyris reperta*, Pars I, 1.2.1, Berlin-Boston.
- Rosenmeyer 1966: Th. G. Rosenmeyer, *Alcman's Partheneion I reconsidered*, «Gr. Rom. Byz. Stud.» 7, pp. 321-359.
- Savignago 2008: L. Savignago, *Eisthesis. Il sistema dei margini nei papiri dei poeti tragici*, Alessandria.
- Schubart, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1907: W. Schubart, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Berliner Klassikertexte* Bd. 5.2, Berlin.
- Taplin 1977: O. Taplin, *The stagecraft of Aeschylus*, Oxford.
- Taplin 2003: O. Taplin, *Greek tragedy in action*, London².

COMPOSTO IN CARATTERE DANTE MONOTYPE DALLA
FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE, PISA · ROMA.

STAMPATO E RILEGATO NELLA
TIPOGRAFIA DI AGNANO, AGNANO PISANO (PISA).

★

Maggio 2016

(CZ 2 · FG 3)



© Copyright by Fabrizio Serra editore, Pisa · Roma.

A norma del codice civile italiano, è vietata la riproduzione, totale o parziale (compresi estratti, ecc.), di questa pubblicazione in qualsiasi forma e versione (comprese bozze, ecc.), originale o derivata, e con qualsiasi mezzo a stampa o internet (compresi siti web personali e istituzionali, *academia.edu*, ecc.), elettronico, digitale, meccanico, per mezzo di fotocopie, pdf, microfilm, film, scanner o altro, senza il permesso scritto della casa editrice.

Under Italian civil law this publication cannot be reproduced, wholly or in part (included offprints, etc.), in any form (included proofs, etc.), original or derived, or by any means: print, internet (included personal and institutional web sites, academia.edu, etc.), electronic, digital, mechanical, including photocopy, pdf, microfilm, film, scanner or any other medium, without permission in writing from the publisher.

© Copyright 2016 by Fabrizio Serra editore, Pisa · Roma.

Fabrizio Serra editore incorporates the imprints *Accademia editoriale, Edizioni dell'Ateneo, Fabrizio Serra editore, Giardini editori e stampatori in Pisa, Gruppo editoriale internazionale* and *Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali*.

Stampato in Italia · Printed in Italy.

*

Autorizzazione del Tribunale di Pisa n. 7/78 del 17.1.78.

ISSN 0392-6338

ISSN ELETTRONICO 1724-1693

*

I prezzi ufficiali di abbonamento cartaceo e/o *Online* sono consultabili presso il sito Internet della casa editrice www.libraweb.net.

Print and/or Online official subscription prices are available at Publisher's website www.libraweb.net.

Ogni comunicazione o richiesta relativa agli abbonamenti dovrà essere inviata a:

FABRIZIO SERRA EDITORE, Casella postale n. 1, Succursale n. 8, I 56123 Pisa, telefono +39 050 542332, fax +39 050 574888, fse@libraweb.net.

I pagamenti possono essere effettuati tramite versamento su c.c.p. n. 17154550 o tramite carta di credito (*Eurocard, Mastercard, Visa, American Express*).

Uffici di Pisa: Via Santa Bibbiana 28, I 56127 Pisa, fse@libraweb.net.

Uffici di Roma: Via Carlo Emanuele I 48, I 00185 Roma, fse.roma@libraweb.net.

*

www.libraweb.net

Sommario

Κόσμος ἐπέων. Studi offerti a Franco Ferrari

A cura di Luigi Battezzato e Giovan Battista D'Alessio

Luigi Battezzato, Giovan Battista D'Alessio, <i>Per Franco Ferrari, nel suo 70esimo compleanno</i>	11
Giuseppe Lentini, <i>La scena giudiziaria dello Scudo di Achille (Hom. Il. 18.497-508) e l'immaginario della giustizia nella Grecia arcaica</i>	15
Francesca Schironi, <i>Alcman's semi-choruses – in the text ... and beyond it</i>	33
Lucia Prauscello, <i>Sappho's book 4 and its metrical composition: the case of P.Oxy. 1787 reconsidered</i>	53
Carlo Pernigotti, <i>Compositore o performer? La natura dell'interpretazione musicale nelle testimonianze della musica greca antica di età arcaica</i>	73
Andrea Capra, <i>Rise and fall of a Parian shooting star: new perspectives on Evenus</i>	87
Mario Telò, <i>Mad Man: Epicharmus, Odysseus and the poetics of desertion</i>	105
Filippomaria Pontani, <i>Mothers with Child: on Eur. Med. 1271</i>	123
Luigi Battezzato, « <i>Shall I sing with the Delian maidens?</i> ». <i>Trojan and Greek identities in the songs of Euripides' Hecuba</i>	139
Marco Fassino, <i>Due brani lirici dell'Eretteo di Euripide nel P.Sorb. inv. 2328 (fr. 370 Kannicht = 17 Sonnino)</i>	157
Salvatore Lavecchia, <i>Poesia e cosmopoiesi. Sulle fonti della scrittura filosofica in Platone</i>	171
Francesca Maltomini, <i>La raccolta epigrammatica di P.Freib. I 4 (SH, 973): una rilettura</i>	185
Giovan Battista D'Alessio, <i>Didymaeon Songs (on SEG, 58.1301, 60.1150)</i>	197
Angela Longo, « <i>Senza far rumore</i> », <i>la tragedia nella teodicea: una ripresa di Euripide (Troiane 887-888) in filosofi platonici di età imperiale e tardoantica (Plutarco, Plotino, Proclo)</i>	213