

NOTES

Lucian *Timon* 4: another case of σκηπτόν/σκήπτρον?

Lucian's *Timon* accuses Zeus of negligence: even his statue at Olympia has not punished the temple-robbers who despoiled it, although it had a δεκάπηχυν κεραυνὸν ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ (*Tim.* 4). But according to Lucian's contemporary Pausanias (v 11.1), the Zeus at Olympia possessed no such weapon; it held a Nike in the right hand, a sceptre in the left. A. M. Harmon (*LCL* Lucian ii 331) notes that since Pausanias' testimony is confirmed by numismatic evidence,¹ Lucian must be wrong and 'the error is odd in so good an observer'. In fact Lucian could be rather careless over such details; but in this case we can hope to account for his mistake. While he must have seen the Zeus at Olympia at some stage, the statue was also an obvious subject for rhetorical ephrasid and literary elaboration: one thinks of Dio Chrysostom's *Olympicus* (*Or.* xii); and Lucian may well have been as bookish in his approach to works of art as he was in so many 'cultural' subjects.² In this case the error would easily have arisen if he had read, misread, or misremembered an accusative of σκηπτός ('thunderbolt') for σκήπτρον ('sceptre') in a previous written source; he would then only have had to supply a synonym κεραυνός for the wrong object. The fact that the thunderbolt is in the wrong hand would then have followed easily from the initial error: one does not hurl thunderbolts with the left hand! The obvious risk of confusion between σκηπτόν and σκήπτρον is illustrated by the problem at Plutarch, *de Alex. fort.* ii (*Mor.* 338b), where Clearchus becomes tyrant of Heraclea, takes to carrying a σκήπτρον—and calls his son Κεραυνός. The Teubner editor³ rightly adopts Valckenaer's σκηπτόν for MSS σκήπτρον: a tyrant sufficiently uninhibited to call his son Thunder would also be uninhibited enough to carry a replica of a bolt.

GRAHAM ANDERSON

Keynes College,
University of Kent at Canterbury

¹ See Frazer's *Pausanias* (London 1895) iii 532, fig. 72.

² See J. Bompair, *Lucien écrivain, Imitation et création* (Paris 1958) 707–34.

³ W. Nachstädt, *Moralia* ii (1935, repr. 1971). This emendation is unnecessarily challenged by S. M. Burstein, 'Sceptre or Thunderbolt: Plutarch, *Moralia* 338b', *Calif.SCA* vii (1974) 89–92. Burstein rightly pays attention to the context, and notes that 'all but one of (Plutarch's) other examples seem to involve an unjustified claim to divinity or divine power'. But the context also offers close parallels to the carrying of a bolt. Clitus sinks three or four triremes, takes the title Poseidon—and carries a trident, parallel to the bolt of Zeus and clearly a symbol of destructive power rather than kingship (338a). Lysimachus, with similar arrogance, boasts that he touches heaven with his spear: the Byzantine ambassador tells him not to puncture it with the point (338a–b)—again a symbol of aggressive arrogance, and Clearchus is entitled to the same.

Rufinus, *AP* v 60

παρθένος ἀργυρόπεζος ἐλούετο, χρύσεια μαζῶν
χρωτὶ γαλακτοπαγεῖ μῆλα διανομένη·
πυγαὶ δ' ἀλλήλαις περιηγέες εἰλίσσονται
ῥδατος ὑγροτέρῳ χρωτὶ σαλευόμεναι
τὸν δ' ὑπεροιδάινοντα κατέσκεπε πεπταμένη χεῖρ
οὐχ ὄλον Εὐρώταν ἀλλ' ὄσον ἡδύνατο.

An interesting poem, though not without its difficulties. Eurotas in the last line has traditionally been regarded as an obscene synonym for the female genitals. Sir Denys Page, however, challenged this in his recent edition of Rufinus.¹ Other matters of language and style are also worth discussing for the light that they may throw on the techniques of a late Greek epigrammatist.² Hence the following analysis takes the form of a commentary.

The subject of the poem is a girl bathing. Page claims that it has no parallel in the Anthology. That overlooks the adumbration of this same theme by Antiphilus (*AP* v 307)—instructive, in that it describes Leda bathing in the Eurotas.

Otherwise, Rufinus doubtless intended his readers to think of such mythological sequences as the Artemis/Acetaon episode. The Ovidian version (*Met.* iii 181 f.) exhibits the motif of concealment of the *pudenda*. Most relevant is the description of Semele bathing in Nonnus (vii 237 f.), where the phrase παρθένον ἀργυρόπεζαν is strikingly similar to Rufinus' opening words. The Nonnan treatment offers a variant of the motif of concealment: Zeus, with modest eyes, averts his gaze from Semele's αἰδοῖα.

1. ἀργυρόπεζος. Only here in this form, according to Page. In fact, it occurs in Pollux ii 192, as an epithet of Thetis, which suggests that it co-existed with the Homeric formula in the poetic tradition (cf. *Il.* i 538, *Od.* xxiv 92, and elsewhere). Girls and goddesses regularly have silvery limbs in poets of the Anthology.³ But it seems most likely that Rufinus here has Thetis in mind; elsewhere⁴ he ascribes silver feet to her.

χρύσεια. Page translates as 'shining', regarding this usage as uncommon outside Rufinus.⁵ But it may be more effective to translate it literally. The girl has silver feet and golden breasts—quite a metallurgical miscellany! Along with this consider

2. γαλακτοπαγεῖ. The suffix has no force, Page claims, adducing *AP* xii 204, where that might be the case.⁶ But Rufinus surely has in mind Theoc. xi 20, where Polyphemus apostrophises Galatea as λευκοτέρα πακτᾶς ποτιδεῖν.⁷ The full force of the epithet adds to the overall humour of Rufinus' description of the girl's body.

3. Page rightly takes ἀλλήλαις as a dative of competition, defending it against the abysmal conjectures advanced by earlier critics. Rufinus *AP* v 36 (on girls in a

¹ *The Epigrams of Rufinus* (Cambridge 1978) 91–2.

² Page makes out a convincing case for a late date. See one or two additional remarks below in support. For completeness' sake, it may be noticed that Page was unaware of J. M. Dryall, *The Poems of Rufinus* (Ottawa 1974), in which (7) it is asserted without argument that Rufinus was 'an Ionian of the second century before Christ'.

³ E.g. v 255 (silver knee); v 272 (silver neck); xii 72 (silver shoulders).

⁴ *AP* v 48; cf. v 90 (also by Rufinus) for Thetis' distinctive feet.

⁵ Page claims the usage for *AP* v 27 and v 48, both serious poems; also for *AP* xii 93 (Rhianus).

⁶ Though not necessarily so, since Strato's poem is a light-hearted comment on traditional epithets and poetic formulae.

⁷ The full meaning is emphasised in Ovid's imitation (*Met.* xiii 796): *mollior et cygni plumis et lacte coacto*; cf. Theoc. xi 20–6. The Theocritean flavour may be enhanced by recollecting that Polyphemus is there in the role of a komast, with the sea-shore as his mistress's threshold; cf. F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry* (Edinburgh 1972) 145.

beauty contest) provides a reasonable parallel: ἤρισαν ἀλλήλαις. Furthermore, there may be a word-play on the expression πρὸς πυγὴν ἄλλεσθαι,⁸ a notion perhaps reinforced by the presence of σαλευόμεναι in the next line.

4. ὕγροτέρῳ χρωτὶ. 'Another loose dative, presumably with σαλευόμεναι.' Page may be too cautious here. Rufinus *AP* v 35 discloses the parallel *τροφερῷ χρωτὶ σαλευομένη*. The line under discussion is compared by Page to one in *AP* ix 709 (Philip) describing a statue of the Eurotas. Coincidence of language and theme is seen by Page as just that. Yet it is at least possible that Rufinus re-worked the language and theme of a serious epigram for the purpose of humour, if not actual parody.

5. ὑπεροδαίνοντα. Only here, according to Page and LSJ. In fact, Gregory of Nyssa twice uses the verb, once metaphorically of the human heart.⁹ Such a provenance might imply that the word is a late one, thus lending some small support to Page's dating of Rufinus.

Page adduces *ὑπεροδαίνω* from Lucian: it actually occurs in *Amores* 53, in some eyes pseudo-Lucian. The context is of interest and relevance: swelling nipples in a pederastic sequence. One can add that the verb is glossed by Pollux viii 79.¹⁰

This concordance with the *Amores* is striking, for the latter piece furnishes an account of the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles containing the gesture described in Rufinus' poem: πάν δὲ τὸ κάλλος αὐτῆς ἀκάλυπτον οὐδεμιᾶς ἐσθῆτος ἀμπεχούσης γεγύμνωται, πλὴν ὅσα τῆ ἑτέρα χεῖρι τὴν αἰδῶ λεληθότως ἐπικρύπτει. (*Am.* 13).

κατέσκεπε. Page cites *AP* v 294 (Agathias) and vi 250 (Antiphilus) for this verb, adding that it is quite common in prose of the early imperial period. Both references are false: Agathias has the simple verb, Antiphilus the different compound *περισκέπω*. And LSJ offers only the Rufinus passage and a fragment of Musonius in Stobaeus. What the reader needs to know is that the verb occurs twice in Nonnus (ii 110; xi 494), in both cases of concealment of the breasts.

πεπταμένη χεῖρ. Page does not comment on this. But the phrase may be crucial to an appreciation of Rufinus' comic use of language and motifs, and to the Eurotas conceit. Verb and noun were used together of swimming, from Homer to Nonnus.¹¹ In addition, the verb and its cognates occur in revelatory contexts, some comporting a sexual *double-entendre*, namely the motif of exposure of the female genitals.¹²

The Suda,¹³ citing the last two lines, adduces this poem for the use of Eurotas as an obscene synonym for the female genitals. Jacobs discerned a pun on one who is *nimio Veneris usu εὐρυτώσης*; Dübner, Waltz, and Becky concur. For Page, the expression is 'unintelligible', the point 'wholly obscure'. Taking *parthenos* in its literal sense, he rejects the bawdy connection with *εὐρυτιά* or *εὐρύς* as inappropriate.¹⁴

However, a glance at LSJ confirms that *parthenos* was

⁸ *Ar. Lys.* 82; cf. *Ath.* xii 554c for competitions in pygal beauty between girls.

⁹ Migne, *PG* xlv 676b; xlvi 609b.

¹⁰ Notice also *ὑπεροδαίνω* in Galen (xix 71 Kühn).

¹¹ *Homer Od.* v 374; *Nonn.* x 169–70.

¹² *AP* ix 86 (Antiphilus) and *Opp.* *Cyn.* iii 414. For the employment of swimming in a sexual sense, cf. J. J. Henderson, *The Maculate Muse* (Yale 1975) 161–6. Conceivably there is also a hint of female masturbation in Rufinus' lines (cf. Henderson 221–2).

¹³ *E* 3709 (Adler); cf. *Eustath. Od.* 1478. 39.

¹⁴ A referee pointed out that despite scholarly usage the verb *εὐρυτιά* is unknown to LSJ.

regularly applied to girls who were not virgin. To their examples¹⁵ one may add *AP* xii 7, where Strato employs the noun in a register of the sexual amenities offered by girls and boys.

Page makes some play with the fact that the Suda cites this use of Eurotas only from the present poem. True, one might readily agree that the locution was not common; the muddled state of the Suda's notice possibly attests to that.¹⁶ But the fact that only one example is given does not imply that only one *could* be given. There are countless items in the Suda illustrated by a single reference.

Acknowledging Ovid's very pertinent *ipsa Venus pubem, quotiens velamina ponit, [protegitur] laeva semireducta manu* (*AA* ii 613–14), Page suggests a distinction between *pubes* and *pudenda*: it is the former which a girl tries to hide, and a play on Eurotas will only work in respect of the latter. However, *pubes* is a flexible term, readily interchangeable with *pudenda*.¹⁷

The vagina is commonly described in terms of its width (cf. comedy's *εὐρύπρωκτος*). Hence a pun on *εὐρύς* would be quite in keeping. Another motif present is that of a girl's accidental or deliberate exposure of her sex thanks to scanty clothing or none at all. This has been amply demonstrated by Giangrande,¹⁸ with particular reference to *AP* xii 161 (Asclepiades). In the manner of most of his poetic brethren, Rufinus is playing with, and expanding upon, the *Motivik* of erotic epigram.

Rufinus may or may not have been the first, or only, writer to employ Eurotas in this way. That is not the chief issue, albeit evidence of originality, however small, is always welcome in a late author. What Page and other commentators have ignored is the technique whereby proper names were used to indicate the female parts, essentially a device of Old Comedy,¹⁹ but also of Rufinus himself: elsewhere (*AP* v 36), he uses the name Meriones for *pudenda*.²⁰ Also pertinent is the constant use of geographical and topographical terms in indecent *double-entendre*.²¹

Conscious exploitation of comic devices would suit Rufinus. The poem is primarily humorous, its author (as Waltz calls him) an *ironiste*. It may be that Rufinus jokily selected the Eurotas, apart from its etymological appropriateness,²² because of its handy associations with myth

¹⁵ *Il.* ii 514; *Pind. P.* iii 34; *Soph. Trach.* 1219; *Ar. Nub.* 530 (with Dover's n.).

¹⁶ Having asserted that the reference is to the male organ, the lexicographer subjoins a quotation from *AP* vii 531 (not 551, as Adler) by Antipater on the subject of Thermopylae, where the Eurotas is mentioned but undeniably without obscene allusion.

¹⁷ For a clear instance, see *Apul. Met.* ix 12; cf. *Verg. Aen.* iii 427; *Ov. Am.* iii 12. 21.

¹⁸ 'Hellenistische Epigramme', *Eranos* lxx (1967) 38–9, reproduced in *L'Epigramme Grecque* (Geneva 1967) 344–5. One item of substance can be added to the discussion of *AP* xii 161 by both Giangrande and Gow–Page. The imperfect *ἐφαυε* is used of the girl's revelation. Gow–Page found this tense 'disconcerting'; Giangrande defends it as 'descriptive'. In fact, the identical tense and phrase (*ἐφαυε μηρών*) occur in the *Oeneus* of the tragedian Chaereon (*Ath.* xiii 608b). The context is of girls exposing their charms through torn and scanty clothing. Similarity of theme and language suggests a common poetic tradition.

¹⁹ A register of such names (in some cases used of the anus) is furnished by Hsch. s.v. 'Aristodemos'. Cf. Henderson (n. 12) 147–8 for refs.

²⁰ Where Page (unlike other edd.) is surely wrong in printing it with a small *m*.

²¹ The Melian Gulf, for instance, is applied to the anus, the Isthmos to the vagina; cf. Henderson (n. 12) 135–6, 149, and *passim* (at 135 n. 142, he adduces the names Rhodope and Rhodocleia from a poem of Rufinus, *AP* v 36, as examples of obscene word-play).

²² Another factor may well be the common use of water as symbol and scenery in erotic poetry; cf. C. P. Segal, *Landscape in Ovid's Metamorphoses*, *Hermes Einzels.* xxiii (Wiesbaden 1969) 23–33.

and beauty. Sparta was the city with the loveliest women;²³ and the Eurotas had been the venue for Leda and the swan.²⁴

BARRY BALDWIN

University of Calgary

²³ *Od.* xiii 412; cf. the discussion in *Ath.* xiii 566a.

²⁴ See *AP* v 307 (Antiphilus) on a picture of this episode.

Artemis Eukleia and Euripides' *Hippolytus**

In connection with a temple of Artemis Eukleia at Plataea, Plutarch tells us that Eukleia was commonly identified with Artemis: τὴν δ' Εὐκλειαν οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ καὶ καλοῦσι καὶ νομίζουσιν Ἄρτεμιν (*Plut. Arist.* 20.6). His testimony is supported by Pausanias, who mentions a temple of Artemis Eukleia at Thebes (*Paus.* ix 17.1). Plutarch goes on to tell us that the cult of Eukleia was widespread, at the same time giving us a glimpse of its followers: βωμὸς γὰρ αὐτῆ καὶ ἄγαλμα κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀγορὰν ἴδρυται, καὶ προθύουσιν αἱ τε γαμοῦμαι καὶ οἱ γαμοῦντες (*Plut. ibid.*). He has himself already mentioned Eukleia's temple at Plataea and we may add the festival of Eukleia at Corinth reported by Xenophon.¹ More important perhaps for the present discussion, Pausanias mentions a temple of Eukleia situated in the agora at Athens:² ἔτι δὲ ἀπατέρω ναὸς Εὐκλείας, ἀνάθημα καὶ τοῦτο ἀπὸ Μῆδων, οἱ τῆς χώρας Μαραθῶνι ἔσχον. φρονήσαι δὲ Ἀθηναίους ἐπὶ τῇ νίκῃ ταύτῃ μάλιστα εἰκάζω (*Paus.* i 14.5). Moreover, an Athenian tragedian could refer to the link between Artemis and Eukleia and expect to be understood, as did Sophocles:

πρώτῳ σε κεκλόμενος, θύγατερ Διός, ἄμβροτ' Ἀθάνᾳ,
γαιόχομόν τ' ἀδελφεᾶν
Ἄρτεμιν, ἢ κυκλόεντ' ἀγορᾶς θρόνον εὐκλεία θάσσει
(*Soph. O.T.* 159–61).

In Euripides' *Hippolytus* Artemis' role is fundamental, despite the fact that she appears on stage in person only for a short time. Her brief epiphany at the end of the play matches and balances that of Aphrodite, who delivers the prologue; within the play, framed by these two powers, their struggle—or part of it—is acted out.³

At the same time the idea of *eukleia* bulks large: we find *εὐκλεῆς* (47, 489), *εὐκλεεῖς* (423, 687), *εὐκλεᾶ* (717) and *ὑπ'εὐκλείας* (1299); cf. *δυσκλεᾶ* (405) and *ἀκλεῆς* (1028). Phaedra is depicted as preoccupied with her own *eukleia* (489, 687), upon which—as she sees it—depends that of her sons (423, 717). It is her desire to die with *eukleia* that leads her to cast the blame for her death upon Hippolytus. Euripides indicates this at the critical juncture, when Phaedra decides upon her final course of action:

σὺ δ' οὐκ ἀνέσχου· τοιγὰρ οὐκέτ' εὐκλεεῖς
θανοῦμεθ'. ἀλλὰ δεῖ με δὴ καινῶν λόγων
(687–8; cf. 502)

* This note owes much to the generous help of Mrs P. E. Easterling and G. A. Mizen. The responsibility is my own, of course.

¹ *Plut. Arist.* 20.5; *Xen. Hell.* iv 4.2; cf. L. R. Farnell *The Cults of the Greek States* (Oxford 1896) ii 575 n. 66.

² Cf. J. G. Frazer *Pausanias's Description of Greece* (London 1898) ii 124.

³ Cf. W. S. Barrett (ed.) *Euripides' Hippolytus* (Oxford 1964) 263 ad 545–64. I cite Barrett's text throughout. On the goddesses as a frame cf. R. P. Winnington-Ingram, 'Hippolytus: A Study in Causation' in *Euripide: Entr. sur l'Ant. Class.* vi (Fond. Hardt 1960) 172.

and again: *εὐρημα δὴ τι τῆσδε συμφορᾶς ἔχω
ᾧσ' εὐκλεᾶ μὲν παισὶ προσθεῖναι βίον
αὐτῆ τ' ὄνασθαι πρὸς τὰ νῦν πεπτωκότα.*

(716–18; cf. 764–75)

Just before, at 713–14, the Chorus swears by *Artemis* that it will not divulge what it knows. This mention of *Artemis* and the stress on *eukleia* at this vital turning-point allow us to make the connection, if we will—a connection which an Athenian audience might make, as we have seen.

Phaedra's death leads to the death of Hippolytus, upon which *Artemis* appears (1283 ff.) and explains the truth of the matter to Theseus (1296 ff.): she says that she has come to give this explanation so that Hippolytus may die with *eukleia* (ὡς ὑπ'εὐκλείας θάνῃ, 1299), as he duly does (1462–6). The idea of *eukleia* is thus of central importance⁴ to the play as it progresses and unfolds to give depth to Aphrodite's prophetic statement in the prologue:

ἢ δ' εὐκλεῆς μὲν ἀλλ' ὄμως ἀπόλλυται
Φαίδρα.
(47–8)

Does the potential identification of *Artemis* and *Eukleia* add anything to our appreciation of the *Hippolytus* beyond the possibility that the idea of *Artemis Eukleia* may be lurking rather aimlessly behind the drama? It may do. We have seen that Euripides portrays Phaedra as preoccupied with *eukleia*. But this is a particular characteristic of *Artemis*. In a sense, therefore, Phaedra can be said to be preoccupied with *Artemis*. Her preoccupation with *Artemis* must recall that of Hippolytus. *Both* characters can thus be seen as preoccupied with her, although we must immediately allow the objection that they are preoccupied in different ways and to differing degrees. Nevertheless the parallelism, however we may choose to mitigate it, is there.

Further, with this manifestation of Phaedra's preoccupation with *Artemis* we may link the language used by her earlier at 208 ff., when, in a frenzy inspired by Aphrodite, she longs to go hunting—the particular pursuit of *Artemis* and her devotee Hippolytus; indeed, in this frenzy Phaedra explicitly invokes *Artemis* (228 ff.). We find the same interrelationship of Aphrodite and *Artemis* when we see *Artemis* in her capacity as *Eukleia*: under the influence of Aphrodite, Phaedra is made to insist upon her *eukleia*—the particular attribute of *Artemis*. The intimate association of *Artemis* and *Eukleia* can now be fitted into the larger pattern of complexities wherein the spheres of Aphrodite and *Artemis* tend to merge, for all their mutual opposition, to form a whole:⁵ to worship one and ignore the other is to make too clear-cut a distinction. This is Hippolytus' mistake.⁶

We may perhaps go a little further. Plutarch tells us that prospective brides and bridegrooms sacrificed to *Artemis Eukleia*.⁷ This is particularly apposite in this play in which

⁴ On the central importance of *eukleia* in this play cf. B. M. W. Knox, 'The Hippolytus of Euripides', *YCS* xiii (1952) 17–18; also Winnington-Ingram (n. 3) 177, 179–81, 184; B. D. Frischer, "'Concordia Discors' and Characterisation in Euripides' Hippolytus', *GRBS* xi (1970) 85–100; C. P. Segal, 'Shame and Purity in Euripides' *Hippolytus*', *Hermes* xcvi (1970) 278–99.

⁵ So C. P. Segal, 'The Tragedy of the Hippolytus: the Waters of Ocean and the Untouched Meadow', *HSCP* lxx (1965) 159; cf. Winnington-Ingram (n. 3) 172; B. D. Frischer (n. 4).

⁶ Cf. Segal (n. 5) 123–5.

⁷ *Plut. Arist.* 20.6 (cited above); cf. L. R. Farnell (n. 1) ii 568 n. 45, 575 n. 66.