

CORRECTIONS TO THE LATEST MAEHLER'S EDITIONS
OF BACCHYLIDES

by

ANNA SZCZEPANIAK

ABSTRACT: The author lists some misprints found in the latest Maehler's editions of Bacchylides and adds a brief note on the problem of accenting words standing before an enclitic where either the enclitic or the word before an enclitic allows of synizesis.

As the title informs, this not a review of Bacchylides' editions by MAEHLER (2003: *Bacchylides. Carmina cum fragmentis* and 2004: *Bacchylides. A Selection*). My aim is just to list some misprints I have found in the editions discussed.¹ A few of the misprints have been previously noted by GERBER (2006), some others, overlooked by me and GERBER, have been pointed to me by Jerzy Danielewicz. The footnotes indicate who is the original author of the correction.

Lack of an accent: 1.123 M. 2003 for [πο]λιν read [πό]λιν; 5.22–23 M. 2003 for ὀρνιχες read ὄρνιχες;² 5.80 M. 2003, 2004 for στα̃θι τ' read στα̃θί τ'; 7.11 M. 2003 for Λαχω]να read Λάχω]να; 8.22–23 M. 2003 for Ἐλλανας read Ἐλλανας; 11.119–120 M. 2003, 2004 for †προγονοι read †πρόγονοι; 13.132 M. 2003 for χε[ρσον read χέ[ρσον;³ 15.56 M. 2003 for πιαι̃δες] νιν read πιαι̃δές] νιν; 17.36–37 M. 2003, 2004 for χρυσεόν τέ οι read χρύσεόν τέ οι;⁴ 17.53 M. 2003, 2004 for ει̃ πέρ με read εῖ πέρ με; 17.81 M. 2003, 2004 for ὦς εῖπε read ὦς εῖπε; 24.12 M. 2003 for ὀλβος read ὄλβος; fr. 22 + 4.61–62

¹ For MAEHLER 2004 I give only corrections to the text of Bacchylides' odes (3–6, 11, 15–20, fr. 22 + 4, fr. 11 + 12, fr. 20A–20D) though there are also various mistakes in the commentary, e.g. on p. 119 (ad 5.75) (φ)ιόν 'violet' should be corrected to (φ)ιον; on p. 123 (ad 5.141) in ὠκύμορον an upsilon is missing (ὠκύμορον).

² The misprint noted first by GERBER 2006: 290.

³ The misprint indicated by Danielewicz.

⁴ The misprint noted first by GERBER 2006: 290.

M. 2003, 2004 for εἰρηνα read εἰρήνα; fr. 20B.17 M. 2003 for ὦ π[α]ἰ read ὦ π[α]ῖ;⁵ fr. 20D.10 M. 2003, 2004 for θῆκέν τε νιν read θῆκέν τέ νιν.

Wrong accent: 5.112 M. 2003, 2004 for στάσαμεθ' read στασάμεθ'; 5.161 M. 2003, 2004 for μήδ' read μηδ'; 8.24 M. 2003 for ἀνήρ τε read ἀνήρ τε; 9.20 M. 2003 for Πολυνεικεί read Πολυνείκει;⁶ 9.90 M. 2003 for [δνοφοῖσιν read [δνόφοισιν;⁷ 11.114 M. 2003, 2004 for ἵππότηρον read ἵπποτρόφον; 15.59 M. 2003, 2004 for θόως readθοῶς; 16.1 M. 2003 for ἐπεῖ read ἐπέι;⁸ 17.29 M. 2003 for εἰ καὶ σε read εἰ καί σε;⁹ 17.71 M. 2003, 2004 for θυμαρμένον read θυμάρμενον; 17.78 M. 2003 for δέ τοι read δέ τοι; 18.4 M. 2003 for αἰοιδὰν read αἰοιδάν; 23.6 M. 2003 for ἐπεῖ δέ read ἐπέι δέ;¹⁰ 24.7 M. 2003 for γάρ τις read γάρ τις; 26.14 M. 2003 for δ' ἐπεῖ read δ' ἐπέι;¹¹ fr. 14 + 57.4 M. 2003 for παγκρατῆς τ' read παγκρατῆς τ'; fr. 20B.6 M. 2003, 2004 for γλύκει' read γλυκεῖ'; fr. 25.4 M. 2003 for δυαῖ read δυαῖ.¹²

Incorrect space: 5.62 M. 2004 for Ἐχ ἰδνας read Ἐχίδνας; fr. 22 + 4.64 M. 2004 for βω ἰμῶν read βωιμῶν; fr. 22 + 4.70 M. 2004 for πέλιονται read πέλιονται; fr. 20B.1 M. 2004 for φυλάσ [σων read φυλάσ[σων.

Other misprints: 3.35 M. 2004 for θῆ[γ]ατράσι read θῆ[γ]ατράσι; app. cr. ad 3.77 M. 2004 for ἐκαβόλος read ἐκαβόλος; 5.31 M. 2003 for πάντᾱ read πάντᾱι; app. cr. ad 7.13–18 M. 2003 for fr. 8 K. read fr. 12 K.; 9.82 M. 2003 for Νέ]μέᾱι read Νε]μέᾱι; 11.12 M. 2003 for εὐφρονσύναι read εὐφροσύναι;¹³ 11.38 M. 2004 for χρυσαλάλατος read χρυσαλάκατος; 11, ep. 12–14 M. 2004 (metrical scheme) for – D – D E – ||| read D – D E – |||; 13.57 M. 2003 for ιδρώεντ read ιδρώέντ;¹⁴ 13.209 M. 2003 for αἰδῆς read αἰδῆς;¹⁵ 15.51 M. 2003, 2004 for ὑψ[ιμέδων ὀ]ς read ὑψιμέδων ὀ]ς; 15.53 M. 2003, 2004 for [μέσ]ωι read [μέσ]ωι; 16.10 M. 2003 for Πύθι' Ἀπολλον read Πύθι' Ἀπολλον;¹⁶ 16.15 M. 2004 for Ἄμφιτρώνιάδαν read Ἄμφιτρωνιάδαν; 16.30 M. 2004 for τάλα[α]ν' read τάλα[α]ν'; 17, str. 13 M. 2004 (metrical scheme) for ∪ – – ∪ – ∪

⁵ The misprint noted first by GERBER 2006: 290.

⁶ The misprint noted first by GERBER 2006: 290.

⁷ The misprint indicated by Danielewicz.

⁸ The misprint noted first by GERBER 2006: 290. I would be inclined to put a grave accent here rather than an acute. An acute, however, seems to be in accordance with MAEHLER's editorial practice. Cf. below.

⁹ The misprint noted first by GERBER 2006: 290.

¹⁰ The misprint noted by GERBER 2006: 290.

¹¹ The misprint noted first by GERBER 2006: 290.

¹² The misprint noted first by GERBER 2006: 290.

¹³ The misprint indicated by Danielewicz.

¹⁴ The misprint indicated by Danielewicz.

¹⁵ The misprint indicated by Danielewicz.

¹⁶ The misprint indicated by Danielewicz.

read $\cup - - \cup - \cup -$; 17, ep. 4 M. 2004 (metrical scheme) for $- \cup \cup \cup$ (...) read $- \cup \cup \cup$ (...); 17.129 M. 2003, 2004 for ἐρατᾶι read ἐρατᾶι; 19.47 M. 2004 for ἐπταπύλοισ[ι read ἐπταπύλοισ[ι; fr. 22 + 4.66 M. 2003, 2004 for εὐ]μάλιων read εὐ]μάλιων; fr. 20B.6 M. 2004 for ἰ γλύκει' ἀνάγκα read ἰγλυκεῖ' ἀνάγκα; fr. 20B.7 M. 2003 for θάλπησι θυμὸν read θάλπησι θυμὸν; fr. 20B.8 M. 2004 for ἐλπῖς δ<ι>αιθύσση φρένας read ἐλπῖς δ<ι>αιθύσση φρένας; fr. 20B.14 M. 2003 for πυροφῖοροι read πυροφῖοροι.

I suppose that Δεινομένεος κ' (4.13) M. 2003 should also be considered as mistaken since MAEHLER seems to follow SNELL in accenting such cases¹⁷ but in all of SNELL's editions we find Δεινομένεος κ'. The problem is particularly interesting. Editors cannot agree as to whether a proparoxytone word in which the last two vowels are slurred together (synizesis) should acquire an acute accent before an enclitic. The practice of accenting in such cases changes not only from editor to editor but also from one instance to another within the text of the same editor. Let me illustrate this by four cases I have found within Bacchylides' corpus:¹⁸

4.13 M.:¹⁹ Δεινομένεος κ' TACCONE 1907, MAEHLER 2003; Δεινομένεος κ' KENYON 1897, JURENKA 1898, BLASS 1898, JEBB 1905, BLASS, SUESS 1912, FESTA 1916, EDMONDS 1927, SNELL (1934, 1949, 1958, 1961), SNELL, MAEHLER 1970, MAEHLER (1982, 2004), CAMPBELL 1992, IRIGOIN 1993.

11.15 M.:²⁰ ἰλέωι [ν]ιυ KENYON 1897, JEBB 1905, TACCONE 1907; ἰλέωι [ν]ιυ JURENKA 1898, BLASS (1898, 1899, 1904), BLASS, SUESS 1912, FESTA 1916, SNELL (1934, 1949, 1958, 1961), SNELL, MAEHLER 1970, MAEHLER (1982, 2003, 2004), CAMPBELL 1992, IRIGOIN 1993.

fr. 22 + 4.71–72 M.: ἔγχεα τε, ξίφεα τ' SNELL (1934, 1949, 1958, 1961), SNELL, MAEHLER 1970, CAMPBELL 1992, IRIGOIN 1993, MAEHLER (1997, 2003, 2004); ἔγχεά τε, ξίφεά τ' NEUE 1822, BERGK (1843, 1853, 1867, 1882), KENYON 1897, EDMONDS 1927; ἔγχεά τε, ξίφεα τ' BLASS (1898, 1899, 1904), JEBB 1905, TACCONE 1907, BLASS, SUESS 1912, FESTA 1916.

The same problem occurs elsewhere e.g. in Pind. *Isth.* 5.33 S.-M. (Πολυδεύκεος τ' MANUTIUS 1513, BRUBACCHIUS 1542, BENEDICTUS 1620, SNELL, MAEHLER 1987 and most editions but Πολυδεύκεος τ' e.g. CHRIST 1882, SANDYS 1978) or Aesch. *Ag.* 1586²¹ (πόλεωός τε e.g. DINDORF 1873, SCHNEIDEWIN, HENSE 1883 (v. 1545), ENGER, PLÜSS 1895 (v. 1558), DENNISTON, PAGE 1989, SMYTH 1999 but πόλεωός τε e.g. WEIL 1884, HEADLAM, PEARSON 1910, MAZON 1961, WEST 1990, SOMMERSTEIN

¹⁷ Though see the next footnote.

¹⁸ One more case is found in SNELL's supplement to fr. 20C.14: ἠίθεσι θ' (so written in SNELL 1934, 1949, 1958, 1961). MAEHLER (1997, 2003, 2004), who incorporates the conjecture to the main text, writes ἠίθεσι θ'.

¹⁹ In BLASS 1899 and 1904 an error of accenting Δεινομένεος despite deleting κ'.

²⁰ In EDMONDS 1927 an apparently mistaken form ἰλέωι.

²¹ Indicated to me by Danielewicz.

2008). I do not find any example of a disyllabic enclitic following a proparoxytone word suffering synizesis of final vowels,²² nevertheless, the practice chosen, if consistent, should cover both this case²³ (if an example were found) and disyllabic enclitics coming after a paroxytone word suffering synizesis as well as disyllabic enclitics allowing of synizesis and following a paroxytone word. The last case would apply to non-emphasised oblique personal pronouns only. Thus, e.g. Archil. 106.4 ὄφρα σέο²⁴ (WEST 1998, GERBER 1999), Eurip. *Phoen.* 419 Οἰνέω^ς φασιν or Eurip. *Rhes.* 479 ἀριστέα^ς φασιν would be in accordance with Δεινομένε^{ος} κ', ἔγχεα τε etc.; if, however, Δεινομένε^{ός} κ' etc. then ὄφρα σέο (DIEHL 1952), Οἰνέω^ς φασίν (most, if not all, editions), ἀριστέα^ς φασίν (most editions unless ἀριστή^{ης}).

Several minor mistakes in MAEHLER 2003 are connected with the text layout.²⁵ MAEHLER retains SNELL's practice in exhibiting the inner metrical organization of the poems by means of indentations and changes in the accentuation of the last syllable of a period. A grave accent at the end of a line and an indentation in the following line supposedly mark lines constituting a period. A pause seems to be indicated by an acute accent and the lack of an indentation in the following line (cf. e.g. the text layout of *Ep.* 3 SNELL and SNELL, MAEHLER: grave accents in lines 31, 49 (str. 3) and 11, 53 (ep. 3) etc. but an acute in 85 (str. 1)). Conceivably, however, the indentations or the lack thereof illustrate not only the pauses confirmed by hiatus, *anceps iuxta anceps* or *brevis in longo*, but also the alleged ones (not indicated in metrical schemes; cf. e.g. the use of indentations in 11, str. 5–12 where such pauses would occur in str. 7, 8, 11). If I understand the method of presenting the text properly, the following inconsistencies should be corrected:

Wrong accent: 3.85 M. 2003, 2004: μέν read μέν; 5.138 M. 2003: ἔμοι read ἔμοι; 16.1 M. 2004: ἐπεὶ read ἐπέι;²⁶ 17.93 M. 2003, 2004: ἐπεὶ read ἐπέι.

Lack of an indentation:²⁷ M. 2003: 1.12, 112; 2.10; 3.40; 5.17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 50, 54, 105, 158; 8.9, 13, 15; 10.8, 32; 11.44, 58, 70; 13.8, 12, 40, 41; 16.16; 17.95, 96, 98; 18.22; fr. 22 + 4.22; fr. 20C.28, 34.

Incorrect indentation: M. 2003: 9.56, 57, 66, 74, 98, 100; 10.2, 6, 22, 26; 15.9; fr. 20A.22; fr. 20C.35; fr. 24.4.

²² My inquiry, though, has not covered the whole extant corpus.

²³ In which, if the practice were Δεινομένε^{ος} κ', ἔγχεα τε etc., a proparoxytone word would not acquire an additional acute and a disyllabic enclitic would be accented.

²⁴ If synizesis and not a resolution of a longum.

²⁵ The same applies to MAEHLER 2004. I will not, however, discuss (except for the accents) the mistakes occurring there as it is often difficult to decide whether a line begins with an indentation or not (cf. e.g. 5.12, 27).

²⁶ And no indentation in 16.14.

²⁷ I also include lines where only metrical scheme occurs (cf. MAEHLER's practice e.g. in fr. 20A. 2–3).

In 4.4 ~ 14 an indentation should occur either in both lines or in none (as in 2004; in 2003 an indentation in 4 but not in 14). If indentations, then υῖόν in 13 (if not υῖόν as in 2004). In 16.25–26 (ep. 1–2) either indentation in 26 or ἐπεὶ in 25. In fr. 1 either πυκινάων or an indentation in the second line. In fr. 22 + 4, ep. 4 an indentation should be either in both responding lines (24, 54) or in none.

University of Silesia in Katowice

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BENEDICTUS 1620: J. BENEDICTUS (ed.), Πινδάρου περίοδος: *Pindari Olympia, Pythia, Nemea, Isthmia*, Saumurii 1620.
- BERGK 1843: T. BERGK (ed.), *Poetae lyriici Graeci*, Lipsiae 1843.
- 1853: *Poetae lyriici Graeci*, editio altera auctior et emendatior, Lipsiae 1853.
- 1867: *Poetae lyriici Graeci*, tertiis curis pars 3, Lipsiae 1867.
- 1882: *Poetae lyriici Graeci*, editionis quartae vol. 3, Lipsiae 1882.
- BLASS 1898: F. BLASS (ed.), *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*, Lipsiae 1898.
- 1899: *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*, editio altera, Lipsiae 1899.
- 1904: *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*, editio tertia, Lipsiae 1904.
- BLASS, SUESS 1912: F. BLASS, G. SUESS (eds.), *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*, editio quarta, Lipsiae 1912.
- BRUBACCHIUS 1542: P. BRUBACCHIUS (ed.), Πινδάρου Ὀλύμπια, Πύθια, Νέμεα, Ἴσθμια. Μετὰ ἐξηγήσεως παλαιᾶς πάνυ ὠφελίμου καὶ σχολίων ὁμοίων, Francoforti 1542.
- CAMPBELL 1992: D.A. CAMPBELL (ed.), *Greek Lyric*, vol. 4, Cambridge (Mass.)–London 1992.
- CHRIST 1882: W. CHRIST (ed.), *Pindari carmina cum deperditorum fragmentis selectis*, Lipsiae 1882.
- DENNISTON, PAGE 1989: J.D. DENNISTON, D. PAGE (eds.), *Aeschylus, Agamemnon*, Oxford 1989 (1957).
- DIEHL 1952: E. DIEHL (ed.), *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*, fasc. 3, editio tertia, Lipsiae 1952 (repr. 1954).
- DINDORF 1873: G. DINDORF (ed.), *Aeschyli tragoediae*, editio quinta correctior, Lipsiae 1873.
- EDMONDS 1927: J.M. EDMONDS (ed.), *Lyra Graeca*, vol. 3, London–New York 1927.
- ENGER, PLÜSS 1895: R. ENGER, T. PLÜSS (eds.), *Aeschylos, Agamemnon*, Leipzig 1895.
- FESTA 1916: N. FESTA (ed.), *Le odi e i frammenti di Bacchilide*, Firenze 1916.
- GERBER 1999: D.E. GERBER (ed.), *Greek Iambic Poetry from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*, Cambridge (Mass.)–London 1999.
- 2006: Rec. 1) H. Maehler (ed.), *Bacchylides, Carmina cum fragmentis, editio undecima, Monachii–Lipsiae 2003*, 2) H. Maehler, *Bacchylides, a Selection, Cambridge 2004*, ExClass 10, 2006, 290–291.
- HEADLAM, PEARSON 1910: W. HEADLAM, A.C. PEARSON (eds.), *Agamemnon of Aeschylus*, with verse translation, introduction and notes, Cambridge 1910.
- IRIGOIN 1993: J. IRIGOIN (ed.), *Bacchylide. Dithyrambes–Épiniques–Fragments*, Paris 1993.
- JEBB 1905: R.C. JEBB (ed.), *Bacchylides, The Poems and Fragments*, Cambridge 1905.
- JURENKA 1898: H. JURENKA (ed.), *Die neugefundenen Lieder des Bakchylides*, Wien 1898.
- KENYON 1897: F.G. KENYON (ed.), *The Poems of Bacchylides*, Oxford 1897.
- MAEHLER 1982: H. MAEHLER (ed.), *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*, 1. Teil: *Die Siegeslieder*, Leiden 1982.
- 1997: *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*, 2. Teil: *Die Dithyramben und Fragmente*, Leiden 1997.
- 2003: *Bacchylides. Carmina cum fragmentis*, editio undecima, Monachii–Lipsiae 2003.

- 2004: *Bacchylides. A Selection*, Cambridge 2004.
- MANUTIUS 1513: A.P. MANUTIUS (ed.), Πινδάρου Ὀλύμπια, Πύθια, Νέμεα, Ἴσθμια. Καλλιμάχου ὕμνοι, οἱ εὕρισκόμενοι. Διονυσίου περιήγησις. Λυκόφρονος ἀλεξάνδρα²⁸, τὸ σκοτεινὸν ποίημα, Venetiis 1513.
- MAZON 1961: P. MAZON (ed.), *Eschyle*, vol. 2, septième édition revue et corrigée, Paris 1961.
- NEUE 1822: Ch.F. NEUE (ed.), *Bacchylidis Cei fragmenta*, Berolini 1822.
- SANDYS 1978: J. SANDYS (ed.), *The Odes of Pindar*, Cambridge (Mass.)–London 1978 (¹1915).
- SCHNEIDEWIN, HENSE 1883: F.W. SCHNEIDEWIN, O. HENSE (eds.), *Aischylos, Agamemnon*, zweite Auflage, Berlin 1883.
- SMYTH 1999: H.W. SMYTH (ed.), *Aeschylus*, with an English translation, vol. 2, Cambridge (Mass.)–London 1999 (¹1926).
- SNELL 1934: B. SNELL (ed.), *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*, editio quinta, Lipsiae 1934.
- 1949: *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*, editio sexta, Lipsiae 1949.
- 1958: *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*, editio septima, Lipsiae 1958.
- 1961: *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*, editio octava, Lipsiae 1961.
- Note: there was no ninth Teubner edition of Bacchylides.
- SNELL, MAEHLER 1970: B. SNELL, H. MAEHLER (eds.), *Bacchylidis carmina cum fragmentis*, editio decima, Leipzig 1970.
- 1987: *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*, pars 1, editio octava, Leipzig 1987.
- SOMMERSTEIN 2008: A.H. SOMMERSTEIN (ed.), *Aeschylus*, vol. 2: *Oresteia*, Cambridge (Mass.)–London 2008.
- TACCONE 1907: A. TACCONE (ed.), *Bacchilide. Epinici, Ditirambi e Frammenti*, Torino 1907.
- WEIL 1884: H. WEIL (ed.), *Aeschyli tragoediae*, Lipsiae 1884.
- WEST 1990: M.L. WEST (ed.), *Aeschyli tragoediae cum incerti poetae 'Prometheo'*, Stuttgart 1990.
- 1998: *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, vol. 1, editio altera, Oxonii 1998.

²⁸ I retain the lower case letter in the Greek title of Lycophron's work. The Latin version of it begins in MANUTIUS with the upper case letter.