

Dipsas too has been linked with ‘Ovid’ through her art, and Myers writes that ‘The *lena*’s shared status as erotic expert reveals her to be less an “other”, *altera*, than an alter-ego to elegy’s first-person narrator.’¹² Thus the focus on magical powers as the nexus of connections between Dipsas, Nape and the writing tablets forces the reader to wonder about the nature of the narrator’s *carmina* as well.¹³ If the educated Nape and Dipsas are connected in part through their witchy transformations and are connected through their art with the poet, then we are forced to wonder if the *carmina* produced by ‘Ovid’ (especially the one that appeared on the tablets of *Amores* 1.11 and 1.12), may not simply be a form of attempted persuasion but of persuasion *magic*.

University of Winnipeg

NATALIE J. SWAIN

n.swain@uwinnipeg.ca

doi:10.1017/S0009838823000095

DIDYMUS’ COMMENTARY ON PINDAR’S *PAEANS**

ABSTRACT

This article examines the citation of Didymus’ ‘first’ commentary on Pindar’s Paeans in Ammon. Diff. 231 Nickau. It argues that the commentary on the Paeans was the first volume in Didymus’ commentary to all of Pindar.

Keywords: Didymus; Ammonius; Pindar; *Paeans*; commentaries; bibliography

The beginning of the entry in the epitome of Herennius Philo ascribed to Ammonius on the difference between ‘Thebans’ and ‘Thebes-born’, along with its twin in the epitome of Herennius Philo which circulated as Herennius Philo (91 Palmieri), contains the only explicit quotation of Didymus’ commentary on Pindar’s *Paeans* (fr. 68 Braswell = °172 Coward–Prodi):¹

Θηβαῖοι καὶ Θηβαγενεῖς διαφέρουσιν, καθὼς Δίδυμος ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν παιάνων Πινδάρου φησίν. “καὶ τὸν τρίποδα ἀπὸ τούτου Θηβαγενεῖς πέμπουσιν τὸν χρύσειον εἰς Ἴσμήνιον πρῶτον”. (Ammon. *Diff.* 231 Nickau)

‘Thebans’ and ‘Theban-born’ are different, as Didymus says in the first commentary on Pindar’s *Paeans*: ‘and from there the Theban-born escort the golden tripod to the Ismenion first’.

¹² Myers (n. 6), 1.

¹³ *carmen* in Latin means both ‘a magical chant, spell, or incantation’ and ‘a song, poem, play’: OLD² s.v. *carmen* 1b and 2.

* I am grateful to Stefano Vecchiato and to *CQ*’s reader for their comments.

¹ Here and henceforth ‘Braswell’ = B.K. Braswell, *Didymos of Alexandria: Commentary on Pindar* (Basel, 2017²); ‘Coward–Prodi’ = T.R.P. Coward and E.E. Prodi, ‘A checklist of the testimonia and fragments of Didymus’, *BICS* 63 (2020), 95–120.

Readers have been perplexed by the expression ἐν ὑπομνήματι τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν παιάνων Πινδάρου.² What is ‘the first commentary on Pindar’s *Paeans*’? Did Didymus write multiple, different commentaries on the *Paeans*? Unlikely.³ Wilamowitz amended τῷ πρώτῳ to τοῦ πρώτου, ‘the commentary on the first of Pindar’s *Paeans*’.⁴ But the normal meaning of the expression—‘the first book of Pindar’s *Paeans*’—is precluded by the fact that the *Paeans* consisted of a single book,⁵ and the phrase cannot be made to mean ‘the first poem of Pindar’s *Paeans*’ instead.⁶ Eschewing Wilamowitz’s conjecture, several scholars have inferred a multi-volume commentary, of which Ammonius quotes the first book.⁷ To square the Greek with this interpretation, Filoni deleted ὑπομνήματι as an intrusive gloss explaining the referent of an original ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν παιάνων Πινδάρου, viz. the commentary rather than the *Paeans* themselves.⁸ Braswell argued instead for ‘ὑπομνήματα (treatises) on individual *Paeans*’, with the first dealing with the first *Paeon*.⁹

I shall make a different suggestion, starting from Didymus’ attested bibliographical praxis. The colophon of the Berlin roll of the Περὶ Δημοσθένους (*P.Berol.* inv. 9780 recto, fr. °281 Coward–Prodi) reads:

ΔΙΔΥΜΟΥ
ΠΕΡΙ ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΟΥΣ
ΚΗ
ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΚΩΝ Γ

Didymus’ work on Demosthenes, then, had both a continuous numeration of volumes across the entire work (of which this was Book 28) and separate titles for commentaries on individual speeches or groups of speeches (here the *Philippics*, of which this was

² The words τῷ πρώτῳ are not present in ‘Herennius Philo’: Δίδυμος ἐν Ὑπομνήματι τῶν παιάνων Πινδάρου φησίν, κτλ. I therefore leave him aside in the remainder of this article. On the relationship between ‘Ammonius’ and ‘Herennius Philo’, see K. Nickau, *Ammonius: De adfinium vocabulorum differentia* (Leipzig, 1966), xl–xliv; V. Palmieri, *Herennius Philo: De diversis verborum significationibus* (Naples, 1988), 49–70.

³ G.B. D’Alessio, ‘Pindar’s *Prosodia* and the classification of Pindaric papyrus fragments’, *ZPE* 118 (1997), 23–60, at 46; the suggestion came from S.L. Radt, *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* (Amsterdam, 1958), 5 n. 1.

⁴ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Pindaros* (Berlin, 1922), 185.

⁵ *Vita Ambrosiana* I, page 3 Drachmann; *P.Oxy.* 2438 col. ii (*FGrHistCont* IV/A 1132) 37. Wilamowitz wrongly stated that there were two: J. Irigoin, *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris, 1952), 37 n. 3.

⁶ A. Filoni, *Il peana di Pindaro per Dodona (fr. 57–60 M.)* (Milan, 2007), 75–6; E.E. Prodi, ‘Notes on Pindar’s *Dithyrambs*’, *MH* 78 (2021), 194–211, at 203–6.

⁷ G. Bona, *Pindaro: I Peani* (Cuneo, 1988), xxi; I. Rutherford, ‘*Et hominum et deorum ... laudes* (?)’: A hypothesis about the organisation of Pindar’s *Paeon*-book’, *ZPE* 107 (1995), 44–52, at 46 n. 10; I. Rutherford, *Pindar’s Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford, 2001), 356; A. Pardini in D’Alessio (n. 3), 46 n. 142 (with D’Alessio’s objection). A complex text like the *Paeans* may well have required more explanation than a single roll could contain, and a multi-volume commentary on a one-volume text is not unheard of: the *hypomnēma* to Eupolis’ *Marikas* in *P.Oxy.* 2741 was probably the second of two (?) volumes (W. Luppe, review of *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 26, in *Gnomon* 43 [1971], 113–23, at 119).

⁸ Filoni (n. 6), 74–5. Scholarly texts provide several examples of ‘in [title]’ used as shorthand for ‘in the commentary on [title]’: L. Käppel, ‘Pindar, *Pae.* fr. 67, 68, 69, 70 + *249b Sn.–M.’, *RhM* 135 (1992), 44–8. One clear example in Didymus: *P.Berol.* inv. 9780 col. xii.36–7 ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου δεδηλώκα[μ]ε[v]. But Filoni’s emendation may not be needed to yield his intended meaning: Braswell (n. 1), 258 n. 351.

⁹ Braswell (n. 1), 259.

Book 3).¹⁰ I submit that the same may have been true in our case: Didymus' commentary on Pindar had a continuous numeration running alongside the titles of the individual volumes, and the commentary on the *Paeans* was the first. Indeed, the only explicit citation of Didymus' commentary in the Pindaric scholia uses the plural, ἐν δὲ τοῖς Διδύμου ὑπομνήμασιν (schol. inscr. *Ol.* 5 Drachmann, fr. 7 Braswell = °110 Coward-Prodi): the scholiast's point of reference is the multi-volume commentary collectively, not the individual volume which included *Olympian* 5. We may imagine the colophon as:

ΔΙΔΥΜΟΥ
ΠΙΝΔΑΡΟΥ ΥΠΟΜΝΗΜΑ(TA)
Α
ΠΑΙΑΝΩΝ

A piece of circumstantial evidence can be called upon from the Pindaric scholia. Four times in the *Olympians* and in the *Pythians* a scholium cross-references a commentary on the *Paeans* with ἐν παιᾶσιν εἴρηται or the like (schol. *Ol.* 1.26g, 2.70d, *Pyth.* 6.5c, 12.44a Drachmann, fr. 69–72 Braswell).¹¹ In secondary literature, when εἴρηται and similar expressions do not refer to the commented author's words, they are often used for self-citation by the commentator, including by Didymus.¹² If in these cases, too, εἴρηται denotes self-citation, it follows that the anonymous writer had commented on the *Paeans* before he commented on the *Olympians* and the *Pythians*. It cannot be proved that he was Didymus, but the suggestion has some interest.¹³ Didymus is the most quoted source in the Pindaric scholia; indeed, the very note we started from is summarized, without Didymus' name, in a scholium to *Pythian* 11 (schol. *Pyth.* 11.5 Drachmann). The references in the four εἴρηται-scholia concern the kind of erudite matters that were the bread and butter of Didymus' commentaries, though they need not have been unique to him.

University College, London

ENRICO EMANUELE PRODI
e.prodi@ucl.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838823000058

¹⁰ I follow F. Leo, 'Didymos Περὶ Δημοσθένους', *NGG* 1904, 254–61, at 260. See M.T. Luzzatto, 'Commentare Demostene (le strategie dell'*hypomnema* nel Didimo di Berlino)', *BollClass* 22 (2012), 3–72, at 26–31. Leo parallels Ath. *Deipn.* 7.15 (281f) Ἀπολλόδοφος ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ Περὶ Σώφρονος τῶ εἰς τοὺς Ἀνδρείους μίμους; now see also *P.Oxy.* inv. 51 B 44/G(b)] οὐ Ἀ[ριστο-] φρασιῶν εἰς ὑπ[όμνημα], 'Commentary by -os on the plays of Aristophanes, vol. 6' (M. Caroli, *Il titolo iniziale nel rotolo librario greco-egizio* [Bari, 2007], 191–4).

¹¹ Käppel (n. 8); as he remarks, editors are wrong to regard them as citations of the *Paeans*.

¹² Käppel (n. 8), 46. Didymus: *P.Berol.* inv. 9780 col. vi.54–5 καθ'ἄπερ προέκκειται (referring to v.18–21), xii.41–2 εἴρηται μ(έν) ἡμῖν ἐντελῶς (probably referring to the commentary on the speech *On the Crown* cited at xii.36–7, see n. 8 above).

¹³ So already A. Boeckh, *Pindari opera quae supersunt*, II/1 (Leipzig, 1819), xvii–xviii; M. Schmidt, *Didymi Chalcenteri grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1854), 239–40. Sensibly, Braswell (n. 1), 261 n. 352 believes that they are 'very likely Didymos', but without corroborative evidence they should more properly be included as *dubia* '.