

THE LIST OF PINDAR'S WORKS IN THE *VITA AMBROSIANA*

In all the most recent Teubner editions of Pindar, from Snell's first to Maehler's latest,¹ the list of Pindar's work transmitted by the *Vita Ambrosiana*, l 3 Drachmann reads as follows:²

γέγραφε δὲ βιβλία ἑπτακαίδεκα· ὕμνους, παιᾶνας, διθυράμβων β', προσοδίων β', παρθενείων β'· φέρεται δὲ καὶ γ' ὃ ἐπιγράφεται κεχωρισμένον τῶν παρθενείων· ὑπορχημάτων β', ἐγκώμια, θρήνους, ἐπινίκων δ'.

Ambrosianus C 222 inf. (A) || προσοδίων A^{ac} | παρθενείων β'· φέρεται δὲ καὶ γ' Boeckh : φέρεται δὲ καὶ παρθενίων β' καὶ γ' A | ἐπιγράφεται Boeckh : ἐπιγράφει A | κεχωρισμένον τῶν παρθενείων Snell : κεχωρισμένων παρθενίων A

Boeckh's emendations require no discussion.³ Snell's, however, does. He must be right that A's text is unsound, as the three other sources that give *Partheneia* book 3 a title call it "Separate from the *Partheneia*", not "Separate *Partheneia*":⁴ schol. ap. P.Oxy. XXVI 2438 ἐπιγρ(άφεται) (Lobel, Gallo) τὰ κεχωρισμ(έν)α τ(ῶν) π[αρθε]νείων (Lobel),⁵ schol. BDEGQ Pind. Pyth. 139a, ll 81 Drachmann ἐν τοῖς κεχωρισμένοις (κεχρημένοις E) τῶν παρθενείων (παρθένων codd. : Schneider, Bergk), schol. KEAG Theocr. 2.10b, 271 Wendel ἐν τοῖς κεχωρισμένοις τῶν παρθενείων.⁶ But as well as showing the correct syntactical relation between participle and noun, these sources also indicate that the title of book 3 was in the plural: "Poems" – not "Book" – "separate from the *Partheneia*". This comes as no surprise: each of the other books into which Pindar's poetry was arranged presented itself as a plurality of poems of a kind or another – *Hymns*, *Paeans*, etc. Snell's singular, then, is inapposite. One may toy with κεχωρισμένων τῶν παρθενείων, but the genitive is odd in

¹ Pindari carmina cum fragmentis ed. B. Snell, Leipzig 1953, 191; Pindarus, ll: Fragmenta. Indices post B. Snell ed. H. Maehler, Leipzig 1989, 1.

² The apparatus is based on that given by Drachmann.

³ Schneidewin claimed that the first of these was unnecessary, suggesting "Sufficiebat στιγμή post β' posita" (Eustathii prooemium commentariorum Pindaricorum ed. F.W. Schneidewin, Göttingae 1837, 25). I am unpersuaded: this use of φέρεται would be odd, and likewise the expression β' καὶ γ'.

⁴ On this still rather mysterious book (frr. 95–*100, 104 Snell–Maehler) see L. Lehnus, L'inno a Pan di Pindaro, Milano 1979, 69–85, with bibl.

⁵ MP³ 1351.1, ed. pr. E. Lobel, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri XXVI (1961) 6 n. 1, now in K. McNamee, Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt, s.l. 2007, 305. There is no material or logical connection with P.Oxy. 2438 (MP³ 1351), as Lobel recognised ("a stray scrap of papyrus which I cannot attach to any text"); M.S. Funghi and G. Messeri Savorelli, Considerazioni paleografiche e papirologiche su P.Oxy. 2438a, SCO 41 (1991) 101–4, after L. Porciani, Note critiche a P.Oxy. 2438a, ibid. 95–100, connect it with P.Oxy. LXXV 5039 (MP³ 1355.21).

⁶ In the second and third of these examples the genitive, if taken as partitive, could conceivably be just a periphrastic rendering of A's κεχωρισμένα παρθένεια, but this cannot be true of the first example, where the likely reference to titling suggests that the title is quoted verbatim. I owe both of these points to the kindness of Prof. Dr. Stephan Schröder, who no longer maintains his earlier defence of the transmitted text (*Geschichte und Theorie der Gattung Paian*, Stuttgart–Leipzig 1999, 137 n. 1).

the absence of a numeral, all the more so with ἐπιγράφεται. In keeping with the other single-book titles in the list, the solution that imposes itself is κεχωρισμένα τῶν παρθενείων.