

## FIFTEEN HELLENISTIC EPIGRAMS

IN the following pages I shall interpret epigrams which so far have outwitted the critics. For the sake of brevity, I assume the reader to have looked up the reassessment of the relevant problem as given in Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.* or *Garl. of Phil.*, before proceeding to read what I have written.

1. First of all, let us examine a piece by Nicias, *A.P.* VII, 200 (=Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.* 2767 ff.):

Οὐκέτι δὴ τανύφυλλον ὑπὸ πλάκα κλωνὸς ἐλιχθεῖς  
 τέρψομ' ἀπὸ ῥαδινῶν φθόγγων ἰεῖς πτερύγων.  
 χεῖρα γὰρ εἰς ἀραιὰν παιδὸς πέσον ὅς με λαθραίως  
 μάρψεν ἐπὶ χλωρῶν ἔζομενον πετάλων.

I have already removed<sup>1</sup> one difficulty concerning this poem, by pointing out that the phrase *χεῖρα ἀραιάν* (in line 3), which baffled the commentators (*cf.* e.g. Gow-Page *ad loc.*; for 'the correption of -αι-' *cf.* also Koster, *Traité de métr.*,<sup>3</sup> p. 35, n. 1) is an elegant instance of the typically Hellenistic technique of allusion to Homer. Just as Anyte, by using the epithet *ῥαδινάν* with reference to the beach in *A.P.* VII, 251, 6 (=Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.* 712 ff.), neatly indicates<sup>2</sup> that she sides with those scholars who took Homer's *ῥαδινός* to mean *ἐπιμήκης*, 'long' (*cf. schol. B on Il. XXIII, 583: ῥαδινήν = ἐπιμήκη*),<sup>3</sup> so Nicias' *χεῖρα ἀραιάν* is a pointed allusion to Homer's *χεῖρα ἀραιήν* (*Il. V, 425*). In Homer's line, the adjective *ἀραιήν* means 'light and without strength' (*cf. Ebeling, Lex. Hom., s.v. ἀραιός: ἀραιήν. ἀσθενή καὶ λεπτήν*), and Nicias has reproduced, in his epigram, the phrase *χεῖρα ἀραιήν* with the same meaning as in Homer. The point made by Nicias is that the hand of the child who has caught the insect alive without squashing it<sup>4</sup> was 'light and without strength': the great elegance of Nicias' point resides in the fact that *ἀραιήν* could, in the opinion of certain ancient grammarians, also mean 'destructive' (*ἐπιβλαβή: cf. Ebeling, loc. cit.*), and there was real danger that a child's hand, owing to his eagerness to catch an insect, could prove precisely 'destructive', by inexpertly squashing the insect instead of nimbly catching it alive. In fact, this is just what happened to the insect squashed by a child's hand in *A.P.* VII, 201 (*Class. Rev., loc. cit.*).

I want now to remove the other obstacle offered by Nicias' poem. The participle *ἐλιχθεῖς* has defeated the ingenuity of scholars: in desperation, Dilthey proposed *ἐλυσθεῖς*, a conjecture which Gow-Page (*ad loc.*) reluctantly feel obliged to accept: they admit that *ἐλυσθεῖς* is 'hardly secure', but they 'can attach no meaning to *ἐλιχθεῖς* of a cicada or grasshopper'. Ancient epigrammatists were extremely accurate in describing animals (*cf.* e.g. *Class. Rev.* 1967, p. 21, on Anyte's description of the viper): here, *ἐλιχθεῖς* is a very apposite allusion to the *cicada flexuosa* (Keller, *Antike Tierwelt*, II, p. 405). We have thus killed two birds with one stone: we have established that *ἐλιχθεῖς* 'curled up' (*cf. Ap. Rh. Arg. III, 655; Peek, Lex. Nonn., s.v. ἐλίσσω, C*) is a perfectly appropriate epithet in that it refers to the *cicada flexuosa*, and we have ascertained that the insect described by Nicias is in fact a cicada, not a grasshopper.

2. Now to a jewel of Hellenistic obscenity, an epigram by Leonidas, which has perplexed the critics. First of all, the text (*A.P.* IX, 563, =Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.* 2579 ff.):

<sup>1</sup> *Class. Rev.* 1967, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately, the poet's elegance was lost on the critics: for instance, Gow-Page (*ad loc.*) go as far as to say that the epithet *ῥαδινήν* 'may be corrupt'!

<sup>3</sup> On all this *cf.* 'L'epigramma ellenistico', in *Introd. alla Cultura Classica*, Milano 1972, p. 127.

<sup>4</sup> The insect is 'not dead, but captive': so, correctly, Gow-Page in their introduction to the epigram.

Τὸν φιλοπωριστὴν Δημόκριτον ἦν που ἐφεύρης,  
 ὠνθρωπ', ἄγγελον τοῦτο τὸ κοῦφον ἔπος,  
 ὡς ἡ λευκοόπωρος ἐγὼ καὶ ἐφώριος ἤδη  
 κείνω συκοφορῶ τὰς ἀπύρους ἀκόλους.  
 Σπευσάτω—οὐκ ὀχυρὴν γὰρ ἔχω στάσιν—εἴπερ ὀπώρη  
 ἀκρήτου χρῆζει δρέψαι ἀπ' ἀκρεμόνος.

The only scholars who have understood that the epigram is obscene are Stadtmüller and Buchheit (cf. *Rh. Mus.* 1960, p. 210 ff.). Since, however, Buchheit's interpretation of Leonidas' key words is fanciful (he takes ἄκολος to mean 'Gebäck in obszönen Formen', whereas the plural ἄκολοι means, as we shall see, 'bread-crumbs', and he thinks that ἄπυρος means 'neu') I shall analyse the piece in detail. The epigram is described by Gow-Page as an 'invitation to a fruit-lover from a fig tree whose fruit is ripe': the editors add that this is 'an odd subject': furthermore, they recognise that the epigram opens jocularly, 'like a parody' of serious epitaphs in which the dead man invites the passer-by to report his death to his parents.

Now, Gow has already been once before unnecessarily mystified by figs, because he forgot what ἰσχάς and σῦκον mean metaphorically in Greek (cf. *Class. Rev.* 1965, p. 279, and Kannicht in *Gnomon* 1966, p. 554). Once again, Gow is faced with metaphorical figs, as I shall endeavour to demonstrate in detail. The epigram is a humorous one, to be read as a veiled invitation put by Theocritus into the mouth of a girl: Leonidas purports that the girl wishes a man (Democritus) to make love to her. In Hellenistic times, as I have often underlined, the roles of the sexes were often reversed: instead of the man, a girl takes the initiative in the *Fragmentum Grenfellianum* (cf. *Entr. Hardt.* XIV, p. 152), and the same happens in Leonidas' epigram (for amatory epigrams spoken by a woman who is desirous of being made love to cf. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, vol. II, p. 378). The real meaning of the epigram is progressively unveiled by the poet. We do not know who the Democritus mentioned in the poem is, but we do know that the pointed epithet φιλοπωριστής, coined by the epigrammatist, alludes to the man's propensity to enjoy σῦκα: cf. Pl. *Leg.* 844E, σῦκα ὀπωρίζειν, Diog. Laert. VI, 61 ἀπὸ συκῆς ὀπώριζε. The epithet, conspicuously placed at the beginning of the epigram, has the reader puzzled: this is typical of the 'delayed effect technique' which I have illustrated in *Entr. Hardt, loc. cit.*, pp. 161, 167, etc. Just what kind of figs does Democritus like to enjoy? The fig-bearer in question is λευκοόπωρος: a variety of real figs actually became white when ripe (cf. Gow-Page, *ad loc.*), but we must also remember that a lady ἀνανδρος πολὺὰ παρθενεύεται (Eur. *Hel.* 283); the fig-bearer is ἐφώριος, 'in season' (Gow-Page, *ad loc.*): we must not forget that ὄρα refers to ladies who are ripe for erotic activities (Her. I, 10 ἐς γάμου ὄρη ἀπικέσθαι; cf. also γάμων ἔχειν ὄραν, Dion. Hal. V, 32, εἰς ἀνδρὸς ὄραν ἦκουσα, Plat. *Criti.* 113 D; cf. also the common phrase ἄωρος πρὸς γάμον) and that ὄριος was commonly said not only of fruits, but also of girls who were in 'aetate nubili' (Thes. s.v. ὄριος: a κόρη is said to be γάμω ὄριος in *A.P.* VII, 188 and in *A.P.* XI, 70 we find Παφίη ὄριος). The ambiguity of the poem continues: συκοφορῶ can certainly be said of a tree carrying real figs, but a lady also carries her σῦκον. The ambiguity begins to dissolve when we reach the words συκοφορῶ τὰς ἀπύρους ἀκόλους. The phrase, instead of being 'very awkwardly expressed', as Gow-Page declare *ad loc.*, is very dexterously employed by Leonidas in order to reveal to us that we are not faced with real figs. The plural ἄκολοι means (cf. Thes., s.v., quoting the lexicographer Pausanias as adduced by Eustathius, *Comm. Odys.* 1817, 44) ὑπερόπτων ἄρτων θραύσματα, i.e. 'crumbs of overcooked bread':<sup>5</sup> the sentence means literally (for the syntactical type of the metaphor cf. Wifstrand,

<sup>5</sup> Eust. 1817, 44 ψώθια . . . ὑπερόπτων ἄρτων θραύσματα = Pollux VII, 23 ψωθία ὑπεροπτόμενα. Leonidas' ἀκόλους ('overcooked') and ἀπύρους (liter. 'non

coctus', cf. Thes., s.v.) constitute a beautiful oxymoron. For a similar erotic metaphor involving ἄπυρος cf. Luc., *Dial. Deor.* XIX, 1 (ἀκυρος δός). That

*Eranos* XLIV, 1946, p. 244 ff., and also below, note 7) either 'I carry figs which are those breadcrumbs overcooked without the flame of the fire', or 'I carry a fig which is, consists in, those breadcrumbs overcooked without the flame of the fire'. The article *τάς* underlines that we are faced with a special kind of overcooked breadcrumbs, namely those which are overcooked without the flame of the fire (*ἀπίρους*). Does *συκοφορῶ* mean, in its context, 'I carry figs which are . . .', or 'I carry a fig which is . . .'? The accusative *ἀκόλους*, which is patently one of those 'Objekte, die den Ausdruck noch metaphorischer machen' (Wifstrand, *art. cit.*, p. 245), makes it clear that *συκοφορῶ* means 'I carry a fig'. Real figs and real breadcrumbs could certainly in no way be 'overcooked' without a real fire: on the other hand, a lady's metaphorical *σῦκον* can certainly be 'overcooked' by burning love-desire, which proverbially 'cooks' (*cf.* Gow on Theocr. VII, 55 and Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.*, ad line 1107, for this topical use of *ὀπτᾶω*). The metaphorical fig in question, in so far as being described as 'overcooked' by burning love-desire, has thus revealed its real nature: the girl is talking about her own *σῦκον* = *rudenda muliebria*.<sup>6</sup> Why should the girl's *σῦκον* be described as *ἄκολοι*?<sup>7</sup> Because, according to a proverb related by Suidas (*ἀκόλω τὰ χεῖλη, οὐ σῦκω βῦσαι*) the exhortation to eat *ἄκολοι* (*ἀκόλω* is a collective singular, as we shall presently see) as opposed to the *σῦκον* was addressed to those who were expected to act unhesitatingly and manfully (*παρεγγυᾶ ὁ λόγος ἐρρωμένως χρῆσθαι τοῖς πράγμασιν*). The full significance of the words in line 4 becomes obvious when we reach line 5: Democritus is exhorted (by means of the imperative *σπευσάτω*) to act unhesitatingly (*σπευσάτω*) and manfully (as made clear by the words *εἴπερ ὀπώρην ἀκρήτου χρήζει δρέψαι ἀπ' ἀκρεμόνος*, which we shall now explain). The girl's allusion to the proverb reported by Suidas is exceedingly felicitous: according to the proverb, in order to act manfully one had to help oneself *not* to the fig, but to the *ἄκολοι* (*ἀκόλω* is evidently a collective singular, because the man stuffs his mouth full with them, *ἀκόλω βῦσαι*; such singulars are common 'bei stofflichen Begriffen', *cf.* Kühner-Gerth I, p. 13, and are *de rigueur* in proverbs); Democritus, however, need not worry at all about the possibility of his appearing to act not manfully if he helps himself to *her* *σῦκον*, because the latter *is* *ἄκολοι*.

Now we understand the rest: *στάσιν*, which has puzzled Gow-Page and most critics, becomes clear as soon as we remember that *στάσις*, meaning 'situation', can well refer to human beings: the metaphorical fig-bearer is in an awkward situation, in that she is not 'out of reach of plunderers' (so Gow-Page): a rival of Democritus<sup>8</sup> will plunder the 'fig-

Leonidas should have used *ἀκόλους*, an acceptance otherwise preserved by a lexicographer (Pausanias) is typical of the epigrammatists' diction: *cf.* e.g. *Quad. Urbin.* 1973, p. 19 f., 29; words or acceptations attested in the epigrammatists and otherwise only in lexicographers such as Hesychius are legion (*cf.* e.g. *REG* 1972, p. 62, n. 2).

<sup>6</sup> For similar metaphors, in the mouth of a female speaker (as is the case with the speaker in Leonidas' epigram) *cf.* Herond. VI, 97 *λαμάντει* (where the subject is Metro's *ὄς*, as I have indicated in *Class. Rev.* 1974, p. 35); the lady in Leonidas' epigram is 'cooked' by the same *πολὸν πῦρ καίμενον* mentioned by the girl in *Fragm. Grenf.*, line 15 f. (*cf.* line 24, *κατακάομαι*).

<sup>7</sup> In Leonidas' sentence ('I carry a fig which is those *ἄκολοι* . . .') and in similar sentences studied by Wifstrand (*loc. cit.*: e.g. *A.P.* V, 151, 4 *σαρκοφαγεῖτε μέλη* 'eat flesh which is my limbs', *Pol.* I, 89, 1 *σαρκοφαγεῖ ἀνθρώπους* 'it eats flesh which is men', Philo, *De Migr. Abr.* 144 *ἀχθοφορῆσαι πόνους* 'carry

a burden which consists in labours') the accusative governed by the compound verb in *-έω* can be in the plural in that it is a predicate. *Cf.* *A.P.* V, 20, 3-4 (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 2400 ff.), where *ἡ δὲ πέπειρος/ἔς Κύπριδος θαλάμου ὄρια καλλοσύνη* means (*cf.* Waltz, *ad loc.*) 'ripe beauty (*ἡ δὲ πέπειρος καλλοσύνη*) is fruits of season (*ὄρια* is predicate to *ἡ πέπειρος καλλοσύνη*; on *τὰ ὄρια* = 'fruits of season' *cf.* Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.*, on line 1987) for Aphrodite's bed'. In Leonidas *A.P.* IX, 329, 4, = Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.* 1987 *ὄρια δωροφορεῖ* is exactly parallel to *συκοφορῶ ἀκόλους* (i.e. is an example of the construction studied by Wifstrand, *loc. cit.* and not known to Gow-Page), and means 'carries a present which is, consists in, the fruits of the season'. The plural *ἀκόλους*, which Buchheit (*art. cit.*, p. 213 f.) has difficulty in explaining, is obviously part of Leonidas' metaphor: only the plural *ἄκολοι* meant 'crumbs of overcooked bread'.

<sup>8</sup> On the 'thème du rival' in Hellenistic epigrams *cf.* *Rev. Et. Gr.* 1968, p. 51, n. 3.

bearer', unless Democritus makes haste and plunders her first. 'Ὀπώρη (line 6) means in Greek 'ripe virginity' (L.S.J., s.v., III), δρέψαι refers to a girl being enjoyed, e.g. in *A.P.* VII, 218, 7–8, and I need hardly remind the reader of Sappho's μαλοδροπήες, who forgot to pick the apple from ἄκρω ἐπ' ὕσδω just as Democritus risks failing to pick the fig from the branch (δρέψαι ἀπ' ἀκρεμώνος), unless he acts now. The epithet ἀκρήτου has puzzled many eminent scholars (cf. my own remarks in *Rhein. Mus.* 1959, p. 374 f.). In the light of two factors we can now solve the problem. First of all, we have established that the fig and the ὀπώρη Leonidas is talking about are metaphorical, and that ὀπώρην means here 'ripe virginity'. Secondly: virginity, in ladies, was topically described by means of vinous metaphors (i.e. by means of adjectives compounded of privative ἀ- and the verbal adjective of a verb of 'mixing'): on such employment of ἄχραντος and ἀκήρατος cf. my observations in *Class. Rev.* 1967, p. 22.<sup>9</sup> The very word which has bewildered the commentators demonstrates that our interpretation of the epigram is correct, i.e. that the fig is a metaphorical one: the allegedly real fig belongs to an allegedly real ἀκρεμών which is ἀκρητος: *remota metaphora*, the *puerula muliebria* offered to Democritus belong to a girl who is still ἀκρητος, *virgo intacta*.

Note that the key to the whole puzzle is given by the poet where it traditionally must be, i.e. at the end of the epigram: ἀκρήτου, the witty point of the piece, is in the final line.<sup>10</sup> We are now in a position to understand and enjoy Leonidas' satirical epigram. It is a typical specimen of the 'sarcasmes impitoyables' which the Greek epigrammatists had for ladies who were no longer young (cf. Waltz, *Anthologie Grecque*, Tome II, Livre V, Paris 1928, p. 16, with note 4). The motifs employed by Leonidas are strongly reminiscent of those present in Sappho, *fr.* 105 a-b Lobel-Page. The girl satirised by Leonidas has been forgotten on the ἀκρεμών, and still hopes that Democritus will δρέψαι her σῦκον, as the girl described by Sappho was in fact 'plucked' from her branch, if only late (*fr.* 105a). However, the girl ridiculed by Leonidas is, by her own admission, white-haired (λευκοόπωρος): she is evidently one of those girls who are 'past it', and yet try to palm off their old age as appetising maturity, ὀπώρη (cf. Waltz, *op. cit.*, p. 16, with note 5: e.g. *A.P.* V, 204, 271). The fact that she is white-haired indicates that the girl's hopes are vain, and that she is condemned to the 'despised condition of the unwedded girl', which is the theme of Sappho *r.* 105b (cf. Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets*, p. 249): the πολυή is notoriously the νέμεσις πόθου (*A.P.* V, 273, 7) and the θριξ πολυή is διαλυσιφίλος (*A.P.* V, 21, 2–3). The magnificent irony of κοῦφον ἔπος (in line 2) is now apparent: the adjective κοῦφον is doubtless meant by the girl to signify 'geringfügig, kurz' (Geffcken, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*, p. 94), 'non molestum ferenti, pauca verba' (Dübner, *ad loc.*; on κοῦφος = 'leicht, von der Leistung', cf. Preisigke, *Wört. Pap.*, s.v.), but we know that she, being white-haired, does not have a chance of attracting

<sup>9</sup> Cf. also *A.P.* IX, 229, 5 f. (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 1427 ff.), where ἄμικτος is referred to a bottle containing pure wine and to a virgin bride. At Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.* 1839, since the μίτρη was traditionally called ἄχραντος, ἀκήρατος, Hedylus jocularly refers to the μίτρη of a bibulous girl the epithet ζωρή, which is a synonym of ἄχραντος, ἀκήρατος and which at the same time denounces the girl's propensity to drunkenness: a beautiful case of humorous metalepsis (Hedylus' ζωραῖς μίτρησι is a poetic plural, cf. μίτρας in *A.P.* IX, 602, 8 = Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 2317).

<sup>10</sup> It is in character with Leonidas that the obscene humour of his epigram is based—until the final *dénouement*—on ambiguity: for his 'jocularly ambiguous' ποιμένες αἴγας κεδείρους ἐμβατέοντες οἷς in

*A.P.* VII, 657 (a mordant aside at the ποιμένες being notoriously μηλοβάται) cf. *Class. Rev.* 1967, p. 22. Leonidas' humorous and ambiguous epigram is entirely based on traditional ingredients. The reader thinks at first that he is faced with a speaking fig-tree: speaking trees are common in the epigrammatic genre (cf. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, vol. II, p. 103); vegetable metaphors applied to ladies (such as ὀπώρη in Leonidas' epigram) are usual in epigrams (cf. *A.P.* V, 20); parody of sepulchral poetry (we have already noted that Leonidas' epigram opens as a parody of serious epitaphs) is not unknown to epigrammatists (cf. e.g. Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.*, vol. II, p. 639: both Meleager's and Leonidas' parodies of sepulchral poetry are obscene).

Democritus, so that her phrase *κουφον ἔπος* turns out to mean 'ungroundedly optimistic words' (cf. *A.P.* VII, 630, 4 = Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 806), '*dictum temerariae confidentiae*', '*illud verbum fiduciae plenum*' (Jacobs, *Animadv.*, II 1 = VIII, p. 236, II 2 = IX, p. 68).

3. We shall now interpret an epigram by Archias, *A.P.* X, 10 (Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, 3766 ff.):

Πᾶνά με τόνδ' ἱερῆς ἐπὶ δισσάδος αἰγιαλίτης,  
 Πᾶνα τὸν εὐόρμων τῆδ' ἔφορον λιμένων  
 οἱ γριπῆες ἔθεντο· μέλω δ' ἐγὼ ἄλλοτε κύρτοις,  
 ἄλλοτε δ' αἰγιαλοῦ τοῦδε σαγηνοβόλοις.  
 ἀλλὰ παράπλει, ξεῖνε, σέθεν δ' ἐγὼ οὐνεκα ταύτης  
 εὐπλοῖτης πέμψω πρηνὸν ὄπισθε νότον.

The difficulties offered by the text are all concentrated in line 1. The reading *τόνδ' ἱερῆς* is perfectly sound, as already recognised by Dübner and others: the adjective *ἱερός* here means 'humidus', not 'holy', which latter sense would of course be inappropriate here (as Gow-Page observe *ad loc.*). The adjective *ἱερός* was said by ancient grammarians to be capable of meaning 'humidus' (cf. *Thes.*, s.v. *ἱερός*, 544C), and Archias is here parading his grammatical knowledge, as was expected of every epigrammatist. The demonstrative *τόνδε* (line 1) neatly corresponds to *τῆδε* (in line 2).

Let us now throw light on the rest of line 1. Substantivised adjectival formations in *-ás* (as e.g. *λίσσάς*, *scil.* *πέτρῃ*, feminine of *λίσσός*; *λευκάς*, *scil.* *πέτρῃ*, feminine of *λευκός*; cf. *χοιράς*, *scil.* *πέτρῃ*, often used by epigrammatists) are very common in later epic and epigrammatic poetry.<sup>11</sup> *Δισσός* 'double' can denote in Greek one object which consists, or is visualised as consisting, of two halves, and in fact the adjective occurs in such a meaning in two epigrams (*A.P.* IX, 337, 2 = Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.* 2144: *δισσὸν ὄρος*, of one mountain consisting of two halves, i.e. of two summits between which there lies a valley; *A.P.* IX, 326, 1 = Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.* 1978, *πέτρης δισσης*, of a rock cleaved into two halves, with water gushing out of the cleft). In both cases, the adjective *δισσός* has been arbitrarily altered into *λίσσός* (*λίσσὸν ὄρος*, *πέτρης λίσσης*: cf. Geffcken, *Leonidas von Tarent*, p. 88). A breakwater is a stone wall consisting of two halves (*χηλαί*): none other than Archias describes a statue of Priapus standing on the breakwater in *A.P.* X, 8 (= Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 3758 f.). It follows that *ἱερῆς* (= 'humid') and *δισσάδος* (*scil.* *πέτρῃς*, = 'stone wall consisting of two parts') are a perfectly suitable description of a breakwater, and it would be unwarranted to alter either word. It must now be remembered that epigrammatists are particularly fond of *cumulatio*, whereby two or more epithets are referred to one substantive.<sup>12</sup> At the same time, we should not forget that in later epic poetry feminine adjectival forms in *-ίτις* tended to be replaced by feminines in *-ίτη* (cf. e.g. Lobeck, *Paral.* p. 459): Archias who always tries to be original in the formation of his words<sup>13</sup> has used the feminine *αἰγιαλίτη* instead of *αἰγιαλίτις*. Conclusion: the line is perfectly sound, and *ἱερῆς ἐπὶ δισσάδος αἰγιαλίτης* means 'on the humid (*ἱερῆς*) stone wall consisting of two

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Rebmann, *Die Sprachl. Neuer. in den Kyneg. Oppians*, p. 134 ff.

<sup>12</sup> For Archias cf. Reinach, *De Archia poeta*, p. 38 ff. Cf. *Quad. Urbin.* 1973, p. 11; the most common form of *cumulatio* is of two epithets, cf. e.g. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, lines 366, 380, 621 f., etc.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Reinach, *op. cit.*, p. 39. It must be remembered that epigrammatists, in their constant search for the new, eagerly employed motion in order to obtain new adjectival forms. The motion *-ής* / *-ος*

(cf. *Quad. Urbin.* 1973, p. 97, n. 41) gives birth e.g. to *βαρύπενθος*, *βαθύκλειος*, arbitrarily altered in Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, 2819, 3013. At *A.P.* IX, 551, 4 (= Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 841 ff.: for this epigram cf. *Quad. Urbin.* 1973, p. 19 ff.) the adjective *τεναγίτων*, I should like now to add, is not to be altered into *τεναγίτων*: the form *τεναγίτων* is the result of motion (for this type of motion cf. *Quad. Urbin.* 1973, p. 77) and a feminine (cf. e.g. the feminine *αἰμύλον* in *Garl. Phil.* 1874).

parts (δισσάδος) on the shore (αἰγιαλίτης): both epithets *ιερή* and *αἰγιαλίτη* refer to the substantive *δισσάς*, which denotes the breakwater on which the statue of Pan is standing.<sup>14</sup>

4. We shall now explain an epigram by Bianor, *A.P.* IX, 272 = Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 1701 ff.

Καρφαλέος δάψει Φοῖβου λάτρης εὔτε γυναικός  
 εἶδεν ὑπὲρ τύμβου κρωσσίων ὄμβροδόκην,  
 κλάγξεν ὑπὲρ χείλους, ἀλλ' οὐ γένυς ἤπτετο βυσοῦ·  
 Φοῖβε, σὺ δ' εἰς τέχνην ὄρνιν ἐκαιρομάνεις·  
 χερμάδα δὲ †ψαλμῶν σφαῖρον†, ποτόν ἄρπαγι χεῖλει  
 ἔφθανε μαιμάσσων †λαοτίτακτον† ὕδωρ.

*Ὀμβροδόκην*, as was correctly seen by Waltz, needs no alteration: it is an apposed noun, the sense being 'the bird saw a pitcher, a rainholder'. Nouns in *-δόκη* continued to be created by the epigrammatists (*cf.* Buck-Petersen, *Rev. Index*, 679), and the use of apposed nouns is frequent in the Hellenistic poetic language.<sup>15</sup> The closest parallel I can think of is *Ap. Rh. Arg.* I, 1194, where the noun *οἰστοδόκην* is apposed to *φαρέτρην* (the reading *οἰστοδόκον*, unaccountably preferred by Ardizzoni, is an evident trivialisation).

As regards line 5, Jacobs (*Delectus Epigr.*, p. 390) has offered the most probable restoration: since the story is about a 'corvum per sitim lapides congerentem' (Plin., *N.H.* X, 125), since *χερμάς* can be a collective singular (*cf.* Thes., s.v. *χερμάς*; *cf.* also LSJ, s.v. *λίθος*, II, 2), and since *σφαιρώ*, used of a multitude of objects of the same kind, can mean 'bring together, collect',<sup>16</sup> he proposed *χερμάδα δὲ ψάμμων σφαιρῶν* ('lapillis arenae, glareae, collectis et stipatis'); *χερμάς* denotes in fact 'pebble of the sea-shore', and *ψάμμων* is genitive of appurtenance: 'pebbles of the sea-shore'.<sup>17</sup>

The surface of the water in the pitcher could not be reached by the bird's beak ('*attingi non posset*', Plin., *loc. cit.*); by dropping stones into the pitcher the bird caused the level of the water to rise, so that he could reach it. *Ἐφθανε*, in line 6, has unnecessarily disconcerted the critics; the word means 'reached': *φθάνω* + accus., in the sense 'reach', 'get at', is attested in the Anthology (*A. Pl.* 384, 3, *A.P.* VII, 183, 2 = *Garl. Phil.* 2583), indeed in none other than Bianor himself (*A.P.* IX, 252, 5 = *Garl. Phil.* 1695; *A.P.* IX, 278, 6 = *Garl. Phil.* 1718, passive).

Since the *cumulatio* of two epithets referring to the same substantive is quite common in epigrams, *ποτόν* and *†λαοτίτακτον†* as epithets to *ὑδωρ* offer no difficulty, as far as their being two in number is concerned. The epithet *ποτόν* is perfectly clear: what about *λαοτίτακτον*?

<sup>14</sup> The statue, that is, is standing at some point on one of the two halves of the breakwater, which latter is regarded by the poet as one single wall made up of two parts. The reader who is familiar with the 'common theme' of Priapus and Pan standing on the breakwater (*cf.* Gow-Page, in their introduction to Archias XXVII) will instantly recognise, and admire, the words *ιερῆς ἐπὶ δισσάδος αἰγιαλίτης* ('humid stone-wall consisting of two parts, on the shore') as Archias' ingenious description of the breakwater, a description typical of Archias' '*inventio*', achieved '*in aenigmatis modum*' (on this trait of Archias' style *cf.* Reinach, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-40; the epigrams *A.P.* X, 7 and 8 were indeed recognised to be a case of 'Selbstvariation' in Archias, as shown by the fact that they follow one another in the Anthology). I have already noted that supplying one noun (*δισσάς*) with two epithets (*ιερή* and *αἰγιαλίτη*) is a char-

acteristic feature of epigrammatic art.

<sup>15</sup> *Cf.* e.g. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, on lines 2601 or 3846.

<sup>16</sup> *Cf.* Philost., *H.E.* Migne 65, 589B, *Damasc. Pr.* 400: it must be remembered that epigrammatists often used words in meanings which are for us otherwise attested in late prose (*cf.* below, note 22).

<sup>17</sup> I need hardly add that Jacobs' emendation is palaeographically impeccable: confusion between *λλ* and *λμ*, *-ων* and *-ον* (abbreviated as supralinear ~ and \) is common in the minuscule, and it is well known that most corruptions in the Anthology are reading errors presupposing 'an exemplar in minuscule' (*cf.* e.g. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, on line 1163). On genitive of appurtenance in epigrammatic poetry *cf.* *Quad. Urbin.* 1973, p. 21; *αἰγιαλοῦ* is genitive of appurtenance in *A.P.* X, 10, 4 = *Garl. Phil.* 3769.

We have now reached the most important word of the epigram, the very point, the epithet *λαοτίτακτον*. The volume of the water was expanded by the stones; *τιταινώ* means 'expand'; compound adjectives in *-αντος* from verbs in *-αίνω* were very eagerly coined by epigrammatists (cf. e.g. *εὔξαντος, οἰνοπέπαντος, ἀλίρραντος, ἀποίμαντος, μυρόρραντος*: Buck-Petersen, *op. cit.*, p. 500); confusion between capital *ν* (i.e. N) and *κ* (i.e. IC) is very common (cf. Bast, *Comm. Pal.*, p. 726),<sup>18</sup> so that it remains for us to read *λαοτίταντον*, 'expanded by the stones'. Conclusion: the sense is: 'he brought together pebbles of the beach, and could reach (*ἔφθανε*) with his eager beak the drinking water (*ποτόν ὕδωρ*) which had been expanded by the pebbles (*λαοτίταντον*)'. *-τίταντος* is of course formed regularly: the verb is not a reduplicated form like e.g. *βιβρώσκω*, and its stem was *τιταν-*, as shown by the aorist *ἐτίτηνα*.

5. We shall now elucidate an epigram by Flaccus, *A.P.* VII, 542 = Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, 3813 ff.:

Ἐβρου χειμερίοις ἀταλὸς κρυμοῖσι δεθέντος  
 κοῦρος ὀλισθηροῖς ποσσὶν ἔθραυσε πάγον·  
 τοῦ παρασυρομένοιο περιρραγὲς ἀχρὲν ἔκοψεν  
 θηγαλέον ποταμοῦ Βιστονίου τρύφος.  
 καὶ τὸ μὲν ἠρπάζθη δίναις μέρος, ἡ δὲ τεκοῦσα  
 λειφθὲν ὑπερθε τάφου μόνον ἔθηκε κάρα,  
 μυρμένη δὲ τάλαινα "τέκος, τέκος" εἶπε "τὸ μὲν σου  
 πυρκαϊή, τὸ δέ σου πικρὸν ἔθαιψεν ὕδωρ.

The epitaph deals with the theme of a boy decapitated by river-ice. This proved indeed a peculiar way of dying: it was fashionable in such cases for the poet to derive the point from the unusual type of death suffered by the deceased.<sup>19</sup> Reiske changed *τάφου* into *τάφω*: his conjecture is singularly inapposite, because the word *τάφω* comes to be 'awkwardly placed inside the coherent phrase *λειφθὲν ὑπερθε μόνον*' (Gow-Page, *ad loc.*): yet all the critics have accepted this proposal. Reiske's conjecture destroys the very point of the epigram. *Ἐθηκε*, in line 6, means 'buried': the verb *τίθημι* alone (without the addition of *τάφω* or *τύμβω*) commonly has the meaning 'to bury' (cf. LSJ, s.v. *τίθημι*, A, II, 11). *Ἐπερθε τάφου* means 'above the tomb';<sup>20</sup> the literal sense of line 6 is 'she buried his head, which alone had been left above the tomb'. The point, i.e. the final line of the epigram, explains the deliberately puzzling phrase *ὑπερθε τάφου*: the head had been left above the water, and the water constituted the tomb of the unfortunate boy (*ἔθαιψεν ὕδωρ*; on this motif cf. *A.P.* VII, 382, 5 *τύμβευε καθ' ὕδατος*). *Ἐθηκε* ('buried') and *πυρκαϊή* ('pyre') indicate that the boy's mother followed the usual practice, whereby the remains of the body which was burnt on the pyre (in this case the head alone) were put into an urn which was then buried (cf. e.g. Smith, *Dict. Antiq.*,<sup>3</sup> s.v. *Funus*, p. 887). It follows that *ἔθαιψεν*, which the critics could not make out (cf. e.g. Gow-Page *ad loc.*), is perfectly appropriate, indeed constitutes the final dénouement of the preceding riddle *ὑπερθε τάφου*.

6. Now to a neat epigram by Bianor which has been misunderstood by the critics: *A.P.* X, 22, = Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 1745 ff.:

Μῆ πόδα γυμνὸν ἔρεσσε δι' ὑλάεσσαν ἀταρπὸν  
 Αἰγύπτου: χαροπῶν φεῦγε διέξ ὀφίων,

<sup>18</sup> It is interesting to see that Bast, *loc. cit.*, quotes an example of confusion between *-αντα* and *-ακτα*, analogous to the confusion between *-αντον* and *-ακτον* indicated by me.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. e.g. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, *Index*, s.v. 'Death, caused by . . .'; Fohlen, *Les circonstances de la mort*

*dans les épitaphes grecques métriques, Mélanges Magnien*, Toulouse 1949, p. 29 ff.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *ὑπερθε τάφου* *A.P.* IX, 117, 2 (= Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 3828; also by Flaccus); *ὑπὲρ τύμβου* *A.P.* IX, 272, 2 (= Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 1702).

ἀγρευῖ δουνακοδίφα, τὸν ἐκ χέρσου δὲ φύλαξαι  
 ἰόν, ὁ τοξεύειν ὄρνιν ἐπειγόμενος.

The epithet *ύλάεσσαν* is typical of the epigrammatic genre, yet has been suspected by editors. Jacobs changed it to *ύλσεσσαν*, and Gow-Page (*ad loc.*), though retaining it in the text, observe that ‘mud’ is likelier than ‘woods in Egypt’. The adjective is in order, both from the point of view of its form as well as of its meaning. As regards the form, the intrusion of isolated Dorisms into an Ionic text was regarded, as is well known, as a compulsory ingredient of epigrammatic poetry.<sup>21</sup> As to the sense, it is well known that Hellenistic poets, especially epigrammatists, liked to employ words in meanings which pertain to prose rather than to poetry.<sup>22</sup> In *Urk. Ptol.* 70, 9 (second century B.C.), *ύλη* means precisely ‘mud’, not ‘wood’. The meaning is also recorded by Photius, *Lex.*: *ύλην* = τὸ καθίζον . . . τοῦ ὕδατος. True to the epigrammatists’ tendency to employ words in their *rarer* meaning,<sup>23</sup> Bianor may well have derived his adjective *ύλάεις* from *ύλη* in the sense ‘mud’. On the other hand, *ύλη* in Egypt means not ‘forest’, but ‘shrubbery’, ‘Gesträuch’ (material in M. Schnebel, *Die Landwirtschaft im hellenist. Ägypten*, München 1925, p. 20: my learned friend W. E. H. Cockle has drawn my attention to this factor), so that Bianor, who is describing a hunter amongst the reeds (*δουνακοδίφα*) may well have used *ύλάεις* in the sense ‘through the shrubbery’, in pointed allusion to Theocritus’ *τρίβω ὑλήεντι* (XXV, 228) and Antimachus’ *ύλήεντα πλόον* (*fr.* 109 Wyss: *cf.* LSJ, s.v. *ύλήεις*, 1).

7. An epigram by Crinagoras, *A.P.* IX, 560 (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 1961 ff.) reads as follows:

Ῥιγηλὴ πασῶν ἔνοσι χθονός, εἴτε σε πόντου  
 εἴτ’ ἀνέμων ἔρρει ρεύμα τινασσόμενον,  
 οἰκία μοι ρύε νεοτευχέα. δαίμα γὰρ οὔπω  
 ἄλλο τόσον γαίης εἶδ’ ἐλελιζομένης.

The mss. reading *ἔρρει* has been arbitrarily changed into *αἶρει* by Chardon, whom all the editors (Beckby, Gow-Page, Rubensohn, Dübner) follow. In reality the text is perfectly sound: *ἔρρει* means here ‘goes’ (exactly as in *A.P.* XI, 39, 1 =Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 2544; *ἔρρων* means ‘proceeding’, ‘moving’ in *A.P.* VII, 506, 5 [Leonidas]); the accusative *σε* is governed by *τινασσόμενον*. The participle *τινασσόμενον* is of course middle and transitive (=‘shaking’): *cf.* Thes. s.v. *τινάσσω* 214 C–D, for attestations. The sense is ‘whether it be the ocean’s or the wind’s flow that goes, shaking you’. The ocean and the wind are visualised as a flow (*ρεύμα*) which goes, moves (*ἔρρει*). *Ἔνοσις* means ‘quassatio’ and *τινάσσομαι* means ‘quatio’ (Thes., s.v.): *σε* (i.e. *ἔνοσι*) *τινασσόμενον* means ‘quassationem quatiens’, i.e. ‘producing a shake’, a beautiful example of *figura etymologica* (*cf.* Lobeck, *Paral.* II, p. 501 ff., espec. 509–10; for Hellenistic poetry *cf.* Lapp, *De Callim. tropis et figuris*, p. 65 ff.; Ouvré, *Quae fuerint dicendi genus et ratio metrica apud Asclep.*, p. 60).

The same Chardon changed *εἶδα* into *οἶδα*, and his suggestion has been adopted by all editors, including Rubensohn. Once again Chardon’s alteration is unwarranted: the form *εἶδα* is by origin a vulgarism (*cf.* Blass-Debrunner, *Gramm. neutest. Griech.*, §81) which

<sup>21</sup> I have underlined this point in my review of Gow-Page, *The Garland of Philip*, forthcoming in *Class. Rev.* The form *χατταίεις* occurs in *A.P.* VI, 234, 1 =Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 2256.

<sup>22</sup> Often such prosaic meanings are attested for us in late prose. *Cf.* e.g. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, on lines 26, 475, 749, etc.; a particularly instructive example in Theocritus XIV, 15 f. (*ληρός* = *πιθος*) I

have indicated in *Antiq. Class.* 1968, p. 506, n. 37. Formulae of *ἀποπομπή* and *ἐπιπομπή* ‘attestate in epoca imperiale’ already occur in Leonidas, as was shown by Weinreich (*cf.* Gigante, *L’edera di Leonida*, p. 50).

<sup>23</sup> I.e. to employ the ‘unique and bold’ (Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, vol. II, p. 242), the ‘very rare’ (*ibid.*, pp. 139, 175).

is also attested in late Epic<sup>24</sup> (Orph. *Arg.* 118: cf. Dottin, *Les Argon. d'Orphée*, p. CXVI). We are no more justified in removing *εἶδα* from Crinagoras' epigram than we would be in removing the vulgarisms *ὄφελον*, *ὄφελε* from Hellenistic epigrams (cf. Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.*, on lines 20 and 1245: such vulgarisms, admitted into the epigrams, reappear in late epic: the adverb *ὄφελον*, for instance, is a vulgarism attested both in Alcaeus, *Hell. Epigr.* 20 and in Orph. *Argon.* 1159).

8. Another epigram by Crinagoras, *A.P.* IX, 284 (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 1981 ff.) badly needs elucidating, because it has been massacred by the critics:

Οἶους ἀνθ' οἶων οἰκήτορας, ὦ ἐλεωνή,  
 εὖραο· φεῦ μεγάλης Ἑλλάδος ἀμμορίη.  
 αὐτίκα καὶ γαίη χθαμαλωτέρη εἶθε, Κόρινθε,  
 κεῖσθαι καὶ Λιβυκῆς ψάμμον ἐρημοτέρη,  
 ἢ τοίοις διὰ πᾶσα παλιμπρήτοισι δεθεῖσα  
 θλίβειν ἀρχαίων ὄστέα Βακχιαδῶν.

The text of line 3 has caused great difficulties to the commentators (cf. lastly Gow-Page, *ad loc.*): yet it is perfectly sound. The sense is 'O Corinth, I would have you lie as soil (*γαίη*) both (*καὶ . . . καὶ*) more low and more deserted than Libya (*χθαμαλωτέρη . . . ἐρημοτέρη*) rather than be . . .'. *Χθαμαλή γαίη* means *mere, flat, non-built-up soil*, as opposed to built-up land, i.e. to land occupied by edifices erected thereupon.<sup>25</sup> The motif is the same as in an epigram by Alpheus, *A.P.* IX, 101, 1–2 (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 3560 f.): the edifices of Mycenae exist no more, and their ruins are 'not much higher than their plains' (*οὐ πολλῶ γ' αἰπύτεραι πεδίων*).<sup>26</sup> In the same way, Corinth has been destroyed, and reduced to *γαίη*, just as Mycenae was reduced to *πεδία*. Crinagoras skilfully develops Alpheus' theme: he says that Corinth is *γαίη* even lower (*χθαμαλωτέρη*) than Libya. Why? Because Corinth was destroyed *ab imis fundamentis*, *ἐκ βάθρων* as none other than Alpheus says of Troy (*A.P.* IX, 97, 2 =Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 3554 f.). Libya was proverbially a sandy desert (*ἐρημος*) and low, flat, non-mountainous land (*χθαμαλή Αἴγυπτος* Theocr. XVII, 79: in Hellenistic times, *Λιβύη* denotes the part of Egypt which is on the west bank of the Nile: cf. e.g. LSJ, s.v. *Λιβύη*; cf. *A.P.* IX, 235; on *Λιβύη* being *mere*, non-built-up *ψάμμος* and *κόνις* cf. *A.P.* XII, 145 and XVI, 52 *τῆν Λίβυσσαν . . . κόνιν*, proverbial): the area where Corinth had stood now shows the hollows caused by the destruction of the edifices *ἐκ βάθρων* and is therefore even lower than flat Libya. To conclude: Crinagoras has skilfully produced an elegant variation on themes attested in Alpheus. The participle *διὰ . . . δεθεῖσα* should not be altered: *διαδέω* means 'put in chain' (of a slave, in *Ox. Pap.* 1423, 9):<sup>27</sup> Crinagoras

<sup>24</sup> On Crinagoras' employment of epic forms cf. Rubensohn, *Crinagoras*, p. 24. Epigrammatists, as is well known, often employ forms which are attested in later epic: e.g. Antiphilus' *πολύτμητος* (*A.P.* XI, 66, 1 =Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 1095) occurs again only in Oppian, Philip's *ἀρτίφυτος* (*A.P.* IV, 2, 14 =Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 2641) reappears in Nonnus; Antipater's *κάθετος* ('fishing-line', *A.P.* VII, 637, 2 =Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 402) is found in Oppian, and Flaccus' *παντοπαθής* (*A.P.* V, 5, 4 =Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 3799) occurs in Manetho; the form *ἐκρυφεν* is attested in *A.P.* VII, 700, 1 (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 2148) and again in Quintus and Nonnus; *κητοφόνος* occurs in *A.P.* VI, 38, 3 (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 2694) and elsewhere only in Oppian; *χρεμέθω* (*A.P.* IX, 295, 3 =Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 1721) reappears

only in Oppian; *χλανόω* (*A.P.* IX, 293, 2 =Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 2960) is found elsewhere only in Nonnus.

<sup>25</sup> On this meaning of *χθαμαλός* cf. below, note 35. Just as Crinagoras says that Corinth, razed to ground, is *γαίη*, so Barboukallos states that Berytos, razed to the ground by an earthquake, is *mere κόνις*, i.e. flat soil (*A.P.* IX, 425, 4: *κόνις* is, in epigrams, a common synonym of *γαίη*, cf. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* on line 2391; *κόνις* is *χθαμαλή*, cf. *A.P.* VII, 629, 1).

<sup>26</sup> No 'higher than the levels on which they were built' (Gow-Page, *ad loc.*).

<sup>27</sup> Fourth century A.D.: once more, a meaning attested in an epigrammatist re-emerges in late prose. Cf. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, on line 1052 (*ἐναντολόγει*).

neatly conveys, by a beautiful *oxymoron*, the notion that it is better for Corinth to have been destroyed than to be put in chains by, of all people, slaves: *παλιμπρήτοις* is, of course, a dative of agent, exactly as e.g. in *A.P.* IX, 72, 6 (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 614).

9. Antipater of Thessalonica writes in *A.P.* VII, 252 (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 375 f.):

Οἶδ' Ἀΐδαν στέρξαντες ἐνύπνιον οὐχ ἄπερ ἄλλοι  
στάλαν ἄλλ' Ἀρετὰν ἀντ' ἀρετᾶς ἔλαχον.

Gow-Page write *ad loc.*: 'ἐνύπνιον is plainly unintelligible, and Casaubon's ἐνόπλιον much preferable to Stadtmüller's ἐνώπιον accepted by Waltz and Beckby'. In reality, the critics have deprived the poet of his elegance: Ἀΐδαν στέρξαντες ἐνύπνιον means 'having welcomed, liked, Hades who is seen in one's sleep', i.e. having died willingly for the sake of the fatherland. For the theme of death spontaneously sought for the sake of the fatherland cf. *A.P.* IX, 293, 1 (αὐτοδαίκτον, wrongly suspected by Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, on line 2958: the point is that Leonidas, instead of taking to flight, voluntarily engaged in a battle which meant certain death for him; the point made by αὐτοδαίκτον at *A.P.* IX, 293, 1 is an allusion to a common *topos*: on αὐτοδαίκτος of a warrior who engaged in a battle which could only mean death for him cf. Nonn., *Dionys.* XVII, 274; the *topos* of such an αὐτοφόνος ἀγνηορή is employed by Opp. *Hal.* II, 322, *Cyn.* II, 480; because of his ignorance of the *topos* under discussion Livrea, *At. e Roma* 1971, p. 144, calls αὐτοδαίκτον at *A.P.* IX, 293, 1 'incomprendibile!'); death was topically a *sleep*, cf. Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.*, pp. 196, 280, 458, 501), and Hades could therefore only be seen by those who had descended to Hades, in that they were in the sleep of death. The words are very elegantly chosen: Ἀΐδης was traditionally hated, whereas here the poet says στέρξαντες; Ἀΐδης was taken to mean 'invisible' (cf. *Thes.*, s.v. Ἀΐδης, quoting ancient authorities): Antipater adroitly makes the point that Ἀΐδης is in fact seen in the sleep of death. In sum: Antipater has achieved two elegant *oxymora*,<sup>28</sup> by referring στέρξαντες to traditionally hateful Hades, and by saying that Hades, 'invisible' though he is, is in fact *seen* by the dead. The couplet is typical of Antipater's art: within two lines, he has achieved a remarkable feat of 'arte allusiva':<sup>29</sup> he has alluded to the current etymology of Ἀΐδης as well as to the *topos* whereby death was equated with sleep, and, for good measure, has thrown in two *oxymora*.

10. Antipater of Thessalonica describes how a child was killed by bees in *A.P.* IX, 302 (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 453 ff.):

Τὸ βρέφος Ἐρμῶνακτα διεχρήσασθε, μέλισσαι,  
φεῦ κύνες, ἐρπηστήν κηρία μαιόμενον,  
πολλάκι δ' ἐξ ὑμέων ἐψισμένον ὠλέσατ', αἰαῖ,  
κέντροις. οἱ δ' ὀφίων φωλεὰ μεμφόμεθα·  
πείθεο Λυσιδίκη καὶ Ἀμύντορι μηδὲ μελίσσας  
αἰνέειν· κάκειναις πικρὸν ἔνεστι μέλι.

Gow-Page observe (*ad loc.*) 'if μέλι of the mss. is retained, the phrasing is intolerably clumsy, for snakes have no honey, bitter or otherwise, and though ἔνεστι is suitable of a snake's venom it is not so of a bee's honey, which is gathered from without'. For this reason, the critics accept Jacobs' βέλος. The text is in reality sound: we are faced with the employment of καί with personal pronouns as studied by Wifstrand in *Årsbok Vetensk. Soc. Lund* 1934, p. 12 ff. The sense is: 'they, too, have something bitter, which in their case, as opposed

<sup>28</sup> On *oxymora* cf. Waltz, *Antip.*, p. 47 f.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. 'Gli epigrammi alessandrini come arte allusiva', in

*Quad. Urbin.* 1973, p. 7 ff., for a methodological treatment of this literary feature.

to snakes, happens to be honey'. The bees' honey is metaphorically called *πικρόν* in the sense indicated in LSJ, s.v. *πικρός*, III, 1 ('of what yields pain instead of expected pleasure'). *Ἔνεστι* is perfectly suited to the bees' honey, because the poet is thinking of the honey which is kept by the bees *inside* their proboscis (*A.P.* V, 32, 3 = Gow-Page *Garl. Phil.* 1309). In line 4, the reading *οἱ δ'* is perfectly sound: *οἱ δέ* is used with the first-person verb, a construction which is of Homeric origin (cf. *Il.* XIX, 324 f.). For such employment of the pronoun cf. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 863; the pronoun *αἱ δέ* is used with the second-person verb in *A.P.* IX, 548, 4 = Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 1742, an epigram which is probably modelled on Antipater's (cf. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, vol. II, p. 74). The sense is: 'we caution against the lairs of snakes; be taught by Lysidice and Amyntor not to praise bees either: in them, too, lies something bitter, in their case honey'. The asyndetic structure of lines 4–6 in the epigram under discussion and the change of person (*μεμφόμεθα/πείθεο*) are typical of late Hellenistic epigrams (cf. e.g. *Quad. Urbin.* 1973, p. 24; cf. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, on line 863 f.; in *Garl. Phil.* 3404 the 'change from third to second person', which Gow-Page find 'rough', is characteristic of the late Hellenistic epigrammatists' style).

11. At *A.P.* IX, 417 (= Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 459 ff.) Antipater of Thessalonica offers a witty epigram on the death of a dog:

Θηρευτήν Λάμπωνα Μίδου κύνα δίψα κατέκτα  
καίπερ ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς πολλὰ πονησάμενον,  
ποσσί γὰρ ὤρυσσεν νοτερόν πέδον, ἀλλὰ τὸ νωθές  
πίδακος ἐκ τυφλῆς οὐκ ἐτάχυνεν ὕδωρ.  
πίπτε δ' ἀπαυδήσας, αἱ δ' ἔβλυσαν πάρα Νύμφαι·  
Λάμπωνι κταμένων μῆνιν ἔθεσθ' ἐλάφων.

Lines 5 and 6 contain the point which has been spoiled by the critics. The Nymphs traditionally make the water spring out of the soil (cf. lastly *Eranos*, 1973, p. 68 ff.). Therefore, *αἱ δ' ἔβλυσαν πάρα Νύμφαι* means 'and the Nymphs spurted it<sup>30</sup> out' (*ἔβλυσαν πάρα* is *παρέβλυσαν* in *tnesis inversa*: *tnesis inversa* is common in Hellenistic poetry, cf. *Class. Rev.* 1973, p. 8 and *Quad. Urbin.* 1973, p. 22). In Hellenistic epigrams, the poet not seldom abruptly addresses a given person (cf. e.g. *Quad. Urbin.* 1973, p. 24, n. 17 and p. 28). The final line is addressed by Antipater directly to the Nymphs; the sentence is introduced asyndetically (*asyndeta* are very common in epigrams). The line is either a question ('did you charge to Lampon's account your anger for the deer he had killed?') like e.g. *A. Pl.* 103, 5 *ἄχθη γυμνωθεῖς ὄπλων σέο*; or it is a non-interrogative sentence ('you evidently charged to Lampon's account your anger for the deer he had killed').

12. Let us now examine an epigram by Erucius, *A.P.* VI, 255 = Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 2224 ff.:

Τοῦτο Σάων τὸ δίπαχυν κόλον κέρας Ὠμβρακιώτας  
βουμολγὸς ταύρου κλάσσειν ἀτιμαγέλου,  
ὀππότῃ μιν κνημούς τε κατὰ λασίους τε χαράδρας  
ἐξ ὀρέων<sup>31</sup> ποταμοῦ φράσσατ' ἐπ' αἴονι

<sup>30</sup> The object of *ἔβλυσαν πάρα* is *ὕδωρ*, mentioned in the previous line. *Παραβλύζω* is otherwise attested in late prose: for such cases (frequent in epigrammatic poetry) cf. e.g. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, on lines 2719 (*ζοφάω*), 1052 (*ναυτολογέω*).

<sup>31</sup> The correction suggested by Hecker (*ἐξ ἐρέων*) is singularly elegant, but in view of the excessive love

of epigrammatists for 'partiziplose Konstruktionen' (cf. lastly *Quad. Urbin.* 1973, p. 31) I hesitate to alter the mss. reading *ἐξ ὀρέων*: if the reading is correct, the sense is 'when he espied the animal (as he roamed) down ridges and bushy ravines (which proceed) down from mountains, whilst it was cooling its hooves and flanks on a river bank'.

ψυχόμενον χηλὰς τε καὶ ἰξύας· αὐτὰρ ὁ βούτεω  
 ἀντίος ἐκ παγέων ἴεθ', ὁ δὲ ῥοπάλω  
 γυρὸν ἀπεκράνιξε βοὸς κέρας, ἐκ δέ μιν αὐτᾶς  
 ἀχράδος εὐμύκῳ πᾶξε παρὰ κλισίᾳ.

The epithet *αὐτᾶς* has presented difficulties: cf. Gow-Page *ad loc.*, who propose *αἰπᾶς*, whilst Reiske, approved by Meineke, wrote *αὔας*. In reality the epithet *αὐτᾶς* is the opposite of 'meaningless here', as Gow-Page write. It is well known that, especially in the countryside where Saon lived, the object of the dedication was either placed on an altar which was erected under a tree (cf. e.g. Gow, *Theocr.*, Plate XIII; βωμοί were often placed in an ἄσλος, cf. e.g. *Hymn. Ap.* 384, Hes. *Scut.* 70, Ap. Rh. IV, 1715)<sup>32</sup> or affixed to a tree which was *solitary*, i.e. accompanied neither by an altar nor by other trees such as grow in an ἄσλος or *τέμενος* (cf. Kühn, *Top. epigr. dedic.* p. 21 ff.). Epigrammatists were in the habit of underlining whether the dedication was affixed to a solitary tree or placed on an altar (Kühn, *ibid.*). Now, *αὐτός* means 'alone, by itself' (cf. LSJ, s.v. *αὐτός* I, 3): Erucius' *αὐτᾶς* stresses that the horn has been fastened to a tree which stands alone, by itself, which is solitary. I need hardly add that *αὐτός* in the meaning 'alone' is common in epigrammatic poetry (cf. Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.*, vol. II, p. 138; *Garl. Phil.*, on line 2612).<sup>33</sup>

**13.** We shall now put matters right concerning an epigram by Archias, *A.P.* IX, 343 = Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 3738 ff.:

Αὐταῖς σὺν κίχλαισιν ὑπὲρ φραγμοῖο διωχθείς  
 κόσσυφος ἠερίης κόλπον ἔδω νεφέλης,  
 καὶ τὰς μὲν συνοχηδὸν ἀνέκδρομος ὤχμασε θᾶμιγξ,  
 τὸν δὲ μόνον πλεκτῶν ἀθλι μεθῆκε λίνων.  
 ἶρὸν ἀοιδόπων ἔτυμον γένος· ἦ ἄρα πολλήν  
 καὶ κωφαὶ πτανῶν φροντίδ' ἔχουσι πάγαι.

What has hitherto caused difficulty is the pronoun *αὐταῖς* in line 1. It is well known that the construction *αὐταῖς σὺν* is emphatic, and of Homeric origin, as Dübner observes (*ad loc.*: 'αὐταῖς σὺν . . . , majore vi, ut *una cum*, jam ap. Hom.'), but why should Archias have used this emphatic construction within the context of his poem? Brunck, followed by Jacobs (*Animadv.* II, 1 = VIII, p. 263), declared that there was no place for the emphatic pronoun *αὐταῖς* in the epigram ('αὐταῖς . . . nihil significat'), and changed it to *διτταῖς* (accepted by D'Arcy Thompson, *Gloss. of Gr. Birds*, Hildesheim 1966, p. 175). Gow-Page (*ad loc.*), following Jacobs' footsteps, branded *αὐταῖς* as 'meaningless' in its context, and changed it into *αὐτός*. In reality, the pronoun *αὐταῖς* is the very *clou* of the epigram: the poem, instead of being 'an inferior version of the theme' treated by Antipater and Paulus Silentiarius, as Gow-Page (*ad loc.*) regrettably state, is by far the cleverest and wittiest

<sup>32</sup> No doubt because the shade afforded by trees protected the celebrants from the fierce southern European sun, which scorches and glares. In *Anacr.* LVII, 14 ff. Bergk *δέμας χυθεῖσαν σκιερῶν ὑπερθε φύλλων* means 'who has spread her body on a bed of leaves protected by the shade', as I have explained in detail in 'On the Text of the *Anacreontea*', forthcoming in *Quad. Urbin.*

<sup>33</sup> On the meaning under discussion of the adjective *αὐτός* cf. Gow-Page, *Hell. Epigr.*, on line 2459 = *A.P.* VII, 731, 1). I take this opportunity of explaining *αὐτῷ* in *A.P.* VII, 731, 1, which has been misunderstood by Gow-Page. The old man who

speaks in the epigram means that until recently he was able to obtain *firm* support (*στηρίζομαι*) from his legs (*πόδεσσι Il.* XXI, 241 f.) combined with his stick, i.e. his legs were still firm enough to offer reliable support if aided by the stick, but now his legs have become so weak that his stick *alone*, without his legs which had hitherto been the companions of the stick in creating firm support, can afford him any of the firm support he needs.

<sup>34</sup> This type of 'Weglassung' of the personal pronoun (in this case Weglassung of the dative *αὐτῷ*, 'him') is of course 'sehr gewöhnlich' (Kühner-Gerth, II, p. 562), especially in epigrams.

variation. The phrase *αὐταῖς σὺν κίχλαισι* means 'in one, together with the thrushes' (cf. LSJ, s.v. *αὐτός* I, 5), 'gesamt mit' (cf. Kühner-Gerth I, p. 433): the pronoun *αὐταῖς* serves to emphasise, as distinct from the plain *σύν*, the 'Begriff der Gemeinschaft', i.e. the fact that the blackbird was mixed 'in one' with the thrushes. The emphatic *αὐταῖς* prepares the point which follows in the final couplet: although the net had captured the blackbird *indiscriminately* mixed with the thrushes, nevertheless it proved a not insensate net, because it knew how to *discriminate* between the thrushes and the blackbird which was mixed with them. In other words: the pronoun *αὐταῖς* is very felicitously employed by Archias, as the neat preparation of the point which follows in the final line. Just as the perplexing phrase *ὑπερθε τάφου* in *A.P.* VII, 542, 6 dexterously prepares the point which ensues in the final line 8, so the presence of *αὐταῖς* at the very beginning of the epigram perplexes the reader, only to be elegantly clarified by the final couplet, where the discriminating powers of the net are suitably celebrated. Conclusion: *αὐταῖς*, which the critics wanted to destroy, is, of all things, an essential part of the point.

14. At *A.P.* VII, 629 (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 493 ff.) we read:

Ἡ χθαμαλήν ὑπέδυσ ὁ τόσος κόνιν; εἰς σέ τις ἀθρῶν,  
 Σώκρατες, Ἑλλήνων μέμφεται ἀκρισίην.  
 νηλέες, οἳ τὸν ἄριστον ἀπώλεσαν οὐδὲν ἐν Ἄιδου  
 δόντες· τοιοῦτοι πολλὰκι Κεκροπίδαι.

The mss. reading *οὐδὲν ἐν Ἄιδου* has been altered to *οὐδὲ ἐν αἰδοῖ* by Brunck, whose alteration is 'generally accepted' (cf. Gow-Page *ad loc.*). The text is in reality sound: the alteration proposed destroys the very point of the epigram. The words *οὐδὲν ἐν Ἄιδου δόντες*, which mean 'allowing him nothing after death',<sup>34</sup> indicate that Socrates received no tomb after his death, and therefore was covered only by *χθαμαλή κόνιν*, instead of being granted a *τάφος* and a *στήλη*, as the Greek custom required (cf. e.g. *A.P.* VII, 554). The adjective *χθαμαλή* here, as we have already seen to be the case with *A.P.* IX, 284, 3, denotes *flat soil* (*κόνιν*) on which nothing has been erected:<sup>35</sup> the choice of the adjective is very pointed, because in Hellenistic and Roman times it was fashionable to erect *tall* tombs: cf. *Hermes* 1968, p. 177, on such 'tours tombales': cf. also *A.P.* VIII, 177, 178, 182, 185, 186, 202, 203, 206, etc. For the motif, cf. also *A.P.* VII, 655 (Leonidas). Antipater's testimony to the effect that Socrates received no tomb after his death is not contradicted by Diog. Laert. II, 43: this latter author says that the Athenians dedicated to Socrates a *statue* (which was placed *ἐν τῷ πομπείῳ*), but not a *τάφος*.

15. Finally, we shall examine *A.P.* VII, 531 (=Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.* 201 ff.):

Αὐτά τοι τρέσσαντι παρὰ χρέος ὥπασεν ἄδαν  
 βαψαμένα κοίλων ἐντὸς ἄρη λαγόνων  
 μάτηρ ἃ σ' ἔτεκεν, Δαμάτριε, φᾶ δέ, σίδαρον  
 παιδὸς ἐοῦ φύρδαν μεστὸν ἔχουσα φόνου,  
 ἀφριόεν κонаβηδὸν ἐπιπρίουσα γένειον,  
 δερκομένα λοξαῖς οἶα Λάκαινα κόραις,  
 "Λεῖπε τὸν Εὐρώταν· ἴθι Τάρταρον. ἀνίκα δειλῶν  
 οἶσθα φυγὰν τελέθεις οὔτ' ἐμὸς οὔτε Λάκων".

Gow-Page observe (*ad loc.*) that line 5 gives an 'impressionistic' but inaccurate picture, in that *κοναβηδόν* is 'not consistent with the rest of the line'. In reality, the picture is perfectly

<sup>35</sup> On *χθαμαλός* = 'terrae aequalis', 'complanatus', *ισόπεδον τῆ πεδιάδι* cf. Thes., s.v. *χθαμαλός*.

accurate. *Γένειον*, as I have shown in *Eranos* 1970, p. 88 ff., means 'jaw', in particular 'lower jaw': the line therefore means not 'with foaming lips and gnashing teeth', as Gow-Page render it, but 'gnashing (*ἐπιπρίουσα*) noisily (*κοναβηδόν*) her foam-covered (*ἀφριόεν*) lower jaw (*γένειον*): the lower jaw is moved up and down, so that it clashes with the upper one, producing a gnashing sound. The picture drawn by the poet is, in sum, very precise in all its details.<sup>36</sup>

*Birkbeck College*  
*University of London*

GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE

<sup>36</sup> Gow-Page (*ad loc.*) note that the poet has used *ἄρη* (line 2) as a synonym of *σίδαρον* (line 3). It may be added that the employment of synonyms is frequent in Hellenistic poetry (cf. *Class. Rev.* 1971, p. 355): the feature reached its greatest development

in Nonnus (*Class. Rev.*, *loc. cit.*; Wifstrand, *Von Kallim. zu Nonn.*, p. 154, n. 1). In *A.P.* IX, 343 (= *Garl. Phil.* 3738 ff.) Archias uses the three synonyms *νεφέλη*, *θῶμυγξ* and *πάγη*. Cf. Ouvré, *Méléagre*, p. 178.