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Summary: In this essay the author examines epigrams 1, 9, 7 and 3 published by M. Guarducci and discusses some controversial passages.


Prof. Guarducci edited the inscription as follows:

*Iomos infelicissimo, quale amico hai, o quale consanguineo? Difesa a te morente Febo, ecco, dette, o fanciullo*.

She interpreted the poem in this sense: "O Iamos infelicissimo, quale amico hai, o quale consanguineo? Difesa a te morente Febo, ecco, dette, o fanciullo". Prof. Medaglia correctly noted that the adjective *μακροδοξίας*,
postulated by Guarducci, is morphologically and metrically impossible; moreover, he rightly observed that the two riq introduced into the line by Guarducci "guastano l'esametro"; therefore he suggested reading

"Ioam ανα <ν> δίστορι, τι σοι δίλος δι σύντομος
θάνορ ἐπολλιομένης; θάνος ίδιον τύρα, ταί"

"O molto sventurato lamo, quale soccorso ti porta, o quale un parente, mentre stai per morire? Ecco Efebo che te lo porta, o fanciullo".

Medaglia, that is, supposes that we are faced with a case of syllepsis, whereby the verb "ti porta" must be supplied, in the first sentence, from the second one, which contains such a verb, namely πάρε. Syllepsis is certainly possible in epigrams (cf. Scr. Min. Alex., 111, p. 142, note 1), but Medaglia's proposal is untenable, because πάρε is an aorist, meaning "ti port6" (not "te lo porta"). If Phoebus has already brought help to Iamos, the poet cannot ask the latter "quale soccorso un amico ti porta?". The construction involving τι with a personal dative and ellipse of ἐνυρ, in the sense "what use is...to...?", is common in Greek (cf. e.g. Bernhardy, Wiss. Syntax, p. 90). Therefore, the sentence τι σοι φίλος δι σύντομος; in the first line is best understood to mean "what use is friend or relation to you?". The words φίλος and σύντομος are collective singulars (cf. English "friend or foe", etc.): for such syntactical use of singulars cf. Bernhardy, Wiss. Syntax., p. 58, quoting e.g. Aristoph. Eccles. 1146. There is, to sum up, no need to "ipotizzare" any "struttura sintattica", as Medaglia suggests (art. cit., p. 198, note 11): the syntactical construction indicated by Bernhardy, op. cit., p. 90, does exist, and line 1 of the epigram we are discussing is one example of it.

Now to the second problem. Since αγαδιστομία is impossible, Medaglia introduces into the line the adverb ἄγαν, which is absent in the inscription; the inscription is devoid of any spelling error, as are most of the others, and therefore one hesitates to force ἄγαν into the line.

Medaglia himself confesses to being compelled by a metrical "necessità" to intrude ἄγαν into the line (art. cit., p. 198). There is, in reality, no need to tamper with the hexameter, which is impeccably modelled on Homeric patterns.

I think the epigram can be explained without difficulty, and fully in keeping with grammar as well as epigrammatic style if we read
As Prof. Guarducci has already noted, both in this epigram and in the epigram no 8 (Guarducci, art. cit., p. 283), the poet "si rivolge al protagonista della vicenda". In epigram no 8, the poet says ιαπε...; here, in the epigram under discussion, he says ιαπε... The adverbial ιαπε is placed after the beginning of the sentence, and is elided, exactly as in Iliad XIV, 314: νοά β' ιαπε... ιαπε...

Both Guarducci and Medaglia print ιαπε, in scriptio plena: the final E of the name is of course meant by the writer of the graffito to be elided (on scriptio plena cf. my Studies in Classical Philology, Part I, p. 48), i.e. we are meant to read ιαπ' ιαπε... The parallelism with Iliad XIV, 314 is complete: in both lines ιαπε occupies the same sedes, is elided and is preceded by elision (respectively 'ιαπ' and δ'). Adverbial ιαπε, in the epigram under discussion, is followed not by an imperative, but by an interrogative sentence: this type of construction is Homeric (cf. Ebeling, Lex. Homer., s.v. ιαπε p. 10, col. 1 - alia structura utitur poeta- quoting, inter alia, Od. XIX 24, ὅλα οὐδεὶς, τίς... Another case of scriptio plena occurs in epigram no 3 (Guarducci, art. cit., p. 274), line 2: ιαπε χιλος = χιῳ ιαπες.

The sense of the epigram is, in conclusion, the following: "O wretched Iamos (ιαπε...δ' δοσθώμε), come (ιαπε), what use are friends or blood relations to you? Look, as you are on the verge of death Phoebus has brought help to you, child". The poet alludes to the story of Iamos, according to which the child was not helped by anybody until his father, Apollo, came to his rescue. Note that ιαπε is used, in our epigram, in the same manner as it is employed in Od. XIX, 24: it means "come", and it is followed by an interrogative sentence (τις τις έλευθε...Οδ., loc.cit., ήια χιλος; in our epigram) which expects a negative reply: in Od., loc.cit., the expected reply is that nobody will fetch a light for the person to whom the question is addressed, whilst in our epigram the expected reply is that no friend or relation will help Iamos. Then comes, unexpectedly, a positive reply: Telemachus, replying to the nurse, says that a person will fetch the light for him (Od. XIX. 27f.) and the poet, replying to the question which he has asked in line 1 of the epigram, says that, to his astonishment (ιπε) help provided by the child's father, Apollo, has just arrived (τίς). The two lines of the distich are separated from each other by...
punctuation (i.e. by the question mark after ζήναιμαι) just as the two lines of epigram no 9 in the same series (Guarducci, art. cit., p. 284ff.), where there is a high point at the end of the hexameter.

We shall now examine epigram no 9 of the series edited by Guarducci. It is a poem on Narcissus:

καίνον, Ἠρως, καίνον κραδίας ἤχως εἰκόνας [. . . χάσαν.

Guarducci supplemented (art. cit., p. 284f.) ἡλέκτρα, and understood "un nuovo dolore del cuore immaginasti di costruire": Medaglia (art. cit., p. 210 f.) has shown that the proposal made by Guarducci is untenable; for his part, he suggests reading εἰκόνας ἡλέκτρας which he renders "un nuovo tormento dell'animo immaginasti, o Amore, un nuovo tormento, da suscitare". But the meaning "forgiare", which he would like to give to εἰκόνις, does not exist in Greek; the verb means "depict" or "infer from comparison". To boot, when the verb εἰκόνις governs an infinitive, such an infinitive is never "consecutive-final", as ἡλέκτρα would have to be according to Medaglia's interpretation. The verb εἰκόνας, followed by an infinitive, means, in Greek, "I suppose that..."

All the difficulties are eliminated if we read

καίνον, Ἠρως, καίνον κραδίας ἤχως εἰκόνας ἤρως

The word ἤρως is the dative singular of ἄρως. As is well known, a literary canon prescribed that Doric forms should be inserted into an epigram written in Attic, and the author of the epigram we are examining has complied with this canon, by using the Doric form ἤρως. On the canon in question cf. e.g. Page, Further Greek Epigr., p. 11, 113, 345 ("ἀδός for ἁδό is at variance with the dialect of the rest"); just as ἤρως is here at variance with the dialect of the rest of the epigram we are discussing, 109, 63, 490, 429 (a "Doric form" which appears in "an Ionic epigram"), 275, 430, 440, 450, etc., for such types of dialect mixture, and Index, s.v. Dialect. On Hellenistic epigrams being written in a "deliberate mixture of dialects" and showing the "intrusion" of "aberrant" dialect forms, cf. my observations in Scrip. Min. Alex. III, p. 176.

The sense of this very elegant epigram is, therefore, the following: "O
Love, you have depicted a new torment of the soul by means of water": the image of Narcissus, produced by the water, torments Narcissus. Note that δεινονήθει, meaning "you have depicted" is paralleled by εικόνα, "depicted image" in line 2: such etymological games are common in Hellenistic epigrams.

I should like to add that, to judge from the facsimile of the graffito as reproduced by Guarducci (art.cit., p. 285), the penultimate letter of the hexameter could be either A or H: if it is an H, then we would have to conclude that the poet wrote έικόνα, not εικόνα, i.e. that the poet used the Ionic, and not the Doric form. On ἐικόνα meaning "water" cf. LSJ, s.v. and Suppl. Hellenist. 961, 5. Guarducci interprets the second line of the epigram as follows: "costui, non volendo, arna l'acqua della propria imagine". In the Hellenistic and early Roman period, a was treated as dichronous by poets2, (cf. L'isocronia vocalica come fenomeno prosodico alessandrino, in Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca. Festschrift Gentili, Roma, 1993, p. 96ff, and The interpretation of Greek Epigrams, ?rapvaau~ 1991, p. 369ff., with all the relevant documentation): therefore it would be arbitrary to alter έικόνα, as Medaglia (art.cit.p. 211) suggests.


Medaglia thinks that "il verbo ἐικόνα richiede il genitivo" and that therefore ἐικόνα is an adverb, meaning "languidamente". The interpretation proposed by Guarducci is correct, although she absurdly believes that "la costruzione di ἐικόνα con l'accusativo" is a "latinismo", i.e. a syntactical error made by the poet, whom she contends to be Roman, and not Greek (cf. now Medaglia, Accad. Lincei. Bollett. dei Classici, VIII, 1987, p. 40, 43, 60). In reality, the poet is Greek, not Roman, because he cannot be Propertius or Blaesus, as Guarducci opined (cf. my demonstration in Studi...in onore di G. Monaco, III, Palermo, 1991, p. 127ff.). Hellenistic poets often employed vulgarisms (cf. my paper "Problemi testuali nei poeti Alessandrini" in La

---

2 Dichronous a is especially frequent, of course, in names: therefore Guarducci is correct in realizing (art. cit., p. 285) that 'Οθέλλος is scanned, in epigram no 10, as consisting of three long syllables. In epigram no 10, that is, the name 'Οθέλλος does not have "prosodia cretica", as Medaglia (art. cit., p. 212) believes. On dichronous a in names cf. e.g. my Scr.Nin. Alex. III, p. 40.
critica testuale greco-latina, oggi: metodi e problemi, Roma, 1981, p. 384-389), which are otherwise attested in later Greek (cf. Scr.Min.Alex. I, p. 264, note 22; p. 265, note 27 etc.). In later Greek, verbs like ἵππησαι (cf. G. Tibiletti, Le Lettere private nei papiri greci, Milano, 1979, p. 95) or ἱππα (cf. Thees. s.v. ἱππα, 1966, D, cum accusativo) were construed with the accusative instead of with the genitive (cf. Hatziadakis, Einleitung, p. 220f.): here, the poet has construed ἵππα with the accusative ἵππα, the sense being "he, reluctantly, loves the water of his own image". Narcissus loves the water of his own image "reluctantly" (δοξα), because love, as everybody knows, is a torment (δοξα, line 1). Medaglia’s proposal to the effect that ἵππα should be an adverb is untenable, not only because, as we have seen, the accusative ἵππα "water" governed by ἵππα is grammatically correct, but also because ἵππα (cf. Bollett. Class. 11, 1981, p. 211, note 42) means "in a languidly desirous manner" (cf. especially M. Brioso, Anacreonticas, p. 18, note 1), whereas Narcissus is looking "reluctantly" (δοξα) at his watery image. To obviate this difficulty, Medaglia must alter δοξα into δοξα.

We shall now discuss epigram no 7 in the series published by Guarducci (art. cit., p. 280 ff.):

σομαίνει Πολύφημος ἄλως καὶ Γαλάσταις
κηρύττε οὗτοι σεμίδο νότον ἀγαλλιάζει.

Medaglia rightly calls Guarducci to task, because she thought that the "participio" having "valore di indicativo", in line 2, was "un uso che si trova attestato nell’età augustea, e...nelle elegie di Properzio". Such a statement by Guarducci is irrelevant: as I have underlined in Studies in Classical Philology, Part I, p. 7ff., the use of the participium pro indicativo is a stylistic feature attested in Greek poetry from Homer down to Musaeus, and found in Hellenistic epigrams: there is, therefore, nothing abnormal in the use of ἀγαλλιάζει having the meaning ἀγαλλιάζει in line 2 of the epigram. We may conclude that Guarducci has correctly interpreted the text, i.e. has correctly understood that ἀγαλλιάζει is a participium pro indicativo, without realizing that such a type of participle is a syntactical feature common in Greek hexametric and epigrammatic poetry. We shall now see a parallel case, where Guarducci has correctly understood the text, without realizing that the feature she is faced with (the employment of ἀγαλλιάζει, in line 2) is typical of Hellenistic poetry.
Guarducci translates the words Ἕλκατεια κυρθῶν ἕκελα σμοῦ κτένεν as "Galatea sulla curva schiena del 'camuso'": she thinks that σμοῦ (that is to say, σμοῦ) is an epithet denoting a dolphin, because dolphins are called σμοῦ in Arion’s Hymn preserved in Aelian, Hist. Anim. XII, 45. In other words: she suggests that σμοῦ, in the epigram, is a substantivized adjective, denoting the dolphin on whose back Galatea is riding. Medaglia (art. cit., p. 205) has objected that, since there existed "un pesce denominato σμοῦ", i.e. since the substantivized adjective σμοῦ (accented, of course σμοῦ, cf. Medaglia, art. cit., p. 205, note 20, for the "regressione del accento") denoted "una specie di pesce", the epigrammatist cannot have used the substantivized adjective σμοῦ (sc. Guarducci) or σμοῦ (so Medaglia), in line 2, in order to designate another fish, i.e. a dolphin.

The problem can be very clearly stated. On the one hand, there is no doubt that the fish mentioned by the epigrammatist is a dolphin. As Guarducci underlined, and as Medaglia must concede (his art., p. 208) "Galatea si accompagna tradizionalmente al delfino"; moreover, the epigram under discussion, as Guarducci stressed, is written under a painting which represents Polyphemus and Galatea, together with "un delfino, il cui dorso sinuoso" is described by the words κυρθῶν κτένεν in line 2: the "curvi dorsi" of the dolphins are a literary topos (cf. Arion’s Hymn, line 14 κυρθῶν κτένεν, quoted by Guarducci, art. cit., p. 282). If, in conclusion, the fish depicted in the painting is beyond doubt a dolphin, how can the epigrammatist describe it by means of the substantivized adjective σμοῦ (or σμοῦ), which had specialized in Greek to denote "una specie di pesce" (Medaglia, art. cit., p. 205) different from the dolphin?

The solution to the problem is given by Hellenistic style. In Hellenistic times, poets used as substantives (i.e., as substantivized adjectives) adjectives which previous poets had employed as epithets to nouns: cf. in particular Ritter, De adject. et subst. ad Nican., p. 24, note 5, quoting the fundamental paper by Schneider. Such a substantivized use of adjectives by Hellenistic poets was indulged in even when the adjective in point had specialized to denote, as a substantivized adjective, a zoological species. For instance, Hesiod used the adjective ἄλλοκες as an epithet to the noun ἄλοκος (ἄλλοκες ἄλοκος). Lycophron and Nicander used the substantivized adjective ἄλλοκες pro 'piscis', even though the substantivized adjective ἄλλοκες had specialized to denote certain piscium species (Ritter, loc. cit.). In exactly the same manner, since Arion used the adjective ἄλοκος as an epithet to the noun ἄλοκος, the author of the epigram we are discussing used the substantivized
adjective αἰπος ("il caruso", "the snub-nosed one") to designate a dolphin, even though the substantivized adjective αἰμος had specialized to denote certain species of fish.

In the Hymn by Arion, the epithet οἰπως is applied by the poet to the dolphins:

All the critics ("la lettura degli editori", so Medaglia, *Art. cit.*, p. 204) agree that αἰμος is an epithet of δελασίες. In conformity with Hymnical usage, the word δελασίες is accompanied by several appositions (θηρια, σκυλια, θψίματα) and each apposition, as well as the noun δελασίες, is accompanied by epithets (βράχοια, πλωτοι qualifying θηρια; αἰμος, φαζανητες, ωσίωροι qualifying σκυλια; έναλα qualifying θψίματα). The apposition σκυλια, which means "whelps" (cf. *LSJ*, s.v. *σκυλες*, 1, 2 quoting Eur. *Hipp.* 1276, already cited by Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets*, p. 209) and is parallel to θψίματα "nurslings" is supplied, in conformity with

3 The substantivized adjective αἰμος did not denote "un pesce", one single kind of fish, as Medaglia appears to believe. It is well known that the same name can, in Greek, denote different kinds of fish, and, conversely, that the same kind of fish can be denoted, in Greek, by different names: on all this, cf. R. Steineberg, *Studien zur Etymologie...der griech. Fischnamen*, Göteborg, 1943, p. 17, 126 ff. The substantivized adjective αἰμος denoted several kinds of different fish: one, akin to the tunny, is mentioned by Aristot. *N. 14*, p. 132 Pack (cf. *Thea. s.v. αἰμος*, 258D: *θυμος*, as noted by Schneider); another was a fresh-water fish, found in the Nile and mentioned by Athen. *VII. 312 B* (cf. *Z'hes. ibid.*); yet another fish called αἰμος, and inhabiting sea-rocks and sand, is described in Oppian, *Nat. 1 168 ff*. That these are different kinds of fish, all named αἰμος, is clear; cf. Steineberg, *op. cit.*, p. 44 (the fish mentioned by Athenaeus is a fresh-water one, a "Nilfish", unlike the others, also called αἰμος, which are sea-fishers).
Hymnal usage, with Adjektivhauung2 (ομοι, φοινικίσσες, ωκόδομην): the same Adjektivhauung occurs in lines 11f. of the Hymn (άγαστη, πόντη, χανοστράται, γαστρακά), and in line 11f., where θέμαν has two epithets, namely βραγχάκων and φλωτάν. Incidentally, the epithet βραγχάκων, in Arion’s line (“δίπλα”) is regularly formed from βραγχός “throat”, and can certainly exist alongside the substantive βραγχός3.

Medaglia (art. cit., p. 203), in order to separate the dolphins from their epithet ομοι in Arion’s Hymn, would like, against all the “editori”, to introduce a “struttura tricolica”, and read ομοι φοινικίσσες, ωκόδομην σκύλαξις, φιλόμοιος δελφίνις: in this manner, he would introduce into the Hymn, besides the dolphin, two further kinds of fish, namely the ομοι and the σκύλαξις. Medaglia’s proposal is untenable, because, apart from the fact that a kind of fish called σκύλαξ did not exist (as he admits, art. cit., p. 206), the “testimonianza di Eliano”, as he concedes (art. cit., p. 203, note 21), refutes Medaglia, who is, moreover, refuted by the structure of the Hymn itself. Aelian says that Arion wrote his Hymn in order to celebrate the dolphins, and no other kinds of fish. Aelian writes (II 45) that Arion celebrates the dolphins first of all for being lovers of music, and then for having saved his life: μαρτύρις τῆς τῶν δελφίνων φιλομοιούσης, ὁμεί καὶ τοιοῦτος μαρτύριον εκτίμων ὁ Ἀριον ἐγράφανε.

The structure of the Hymn fully supports Aelian’s statement: the words βραγχάκων...φοινικίσσα θερείας κίελη, κούφιοι τοιῶν ρύμους...λανταλλάμως, φιλόμοιος δελφίνις are all intended to celebrate the dolphin’s ability to dance to the tune of music; the mention of the dolphins’ speed (cf. Smyth, loc. cit.) also forms an integral part of Arion’s praise of the dolphins as good dancers: Arion ‘pedes affixit...delphinos quis salutare factis’ (Smyth, ibid.), and adds that they are fleet of foot (ωκόδομης) because dancers had to have speedy feet, cf. e.g. Nonn. Dionys. 45, 273 ff., etc.) After having celebrated the dolphins as lovers of music and dance, Arion proceeds to thank them for having saved his life (οἱ πετ...). There is, therefore, no room in the Hymn for the intrusion of any kind of fish other than the dolphins. In order to intrude the ομοι and the


3 Cfr. e.g. Chantraine, La formation des noms..., p. 56 f.; Kretsch, Wortbildung der homer. Sprache, p. 115, 41 f.).
a~fiXa~eq, Medaglia is compelled to state that πλωτοι θήρες cannot "essere inteso" as an apposition to δελφινες (art.cit., p. 202, note 20), but such a statement is ungrounded: the πλωτοι θήρες who χορέουσιν are, according to the well known ancient topos, the dolphins (cf. Smyth, loc.cit., who quotes Anacreontic 55 Bergk= 57 Preisend., lines 23ff. δελφια φορεταια…χορος, -where χορος by enallage, refers to the curved back of the dolphins, cf. ναρυθνη κοτοι in line 2 of the epigram we are analyzing-, and Eurip. Hel. 1454 καλλιέροις δελφινας). The fish who dance are the dolphins, from the beginning of Arion's Hymn throughout it up to its end: cf. Scr.Min.Alex. IV, p. 4355.

We may conclude. Guarducci's interpretation of the epigram is correct: we must only add that the employment of the participle ἀγγοιλομήνη having the function of the verbum finitum ἄγγολλην, and the employment of the adjective ομός in the sense "il camusso" in order to designate the dolphin, are two features of Hellenistic poetry which Guarducci has failed to recognize.

One final detail: the "regressione dell' accento" (Medaglia, art.cit., p. 205, note 24) occurs in cases where an adjective, used substantivally, had specialized so as to become the name of a species; therefore Cyrilillus (or Philoponus) says (Lexica Graeca Minorata, selegit K. Latte, disposuit H. Erbse, Hildesheim, Olms Verlag, 1965, p. 370: ομός (sic: ομός) ἱχθύς: ομός δὲ επώθετο. In the case of substantivized adjectives used by poets in the manner described by Ritter, loc.cit., it is not clear whether such a "regressione" occurred, and I therefore follow Guarducci in reading ομός in the epigram.

Finally, we shall analyze epigram no 3 in the series edited by Guarducci (art.cit., p. 274 ff.). This poem does not contain any textual or interpretative problems, other than the mention of Ταύρων λίμην in line 1:

οὐλός αὐς ἐρώτε θύα Ταῦρων λίμην
eρόεν τοτε Φρε, κήρα έκεδος μεγάλης

The distich alludes to the story of Athena and Marsyas. The aorist ἐρώτε (i.e ἐρώτη) in line 1 seems to show a connection of the epigram with Apollodorus, I 4, 2 οὐλός αὐς ἐρώτη, as Guarducci notes: ξαφνί occurs e.g. also in A.P. IX 5 17, 4 (ἐρώτην λυττοί) -a poem on the same subject-, and in Melanippides fr. 2, 1 ff. Diehl; Ταύρων in the same sedes as in line
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1 of the epigram, occurs in A.P. IX 331, 5. Our epigrammatics competently uses literary stock material. The problem, according to Guarducci, is represented by the fact that the mention of the Τητωνώς λύρα is "in contrasto" with the rest of mythographical tradition. In reality, as we shall see, there is no "contrasto". There were many versions of the legend concerning where Athena threw the pipes which were found by Marsyas: the material is collected in RE, s.v. Marsyas (XIV, 1990ff.) and—in greater detail—in Roscher, s.v. Marsyas, 2440ff. Hyginus Fab. 165 says that Athena in Idam silvam ad fontem venit; the proverb tibias ad fontem (quoted by Bömer, in his commentary on Fasti VI 694) agrees with this version. Plutarch, Coh., t.r. 6, states that Athena's face was reflected in ποταμῶν ὕδωρ; Ovid (Fasti VI 655) calls the goddess Tritonia, and adds that the pipes reached "the turf of a river-bank" (exspectavit caestpite tita, Fasti VI 673ff.); Properti II 30, 16f. connects (see my "Appendix") the pipes with the shallows of the Maeander (tibias ...vado Maenandri iacta), which shallows are called λύρα by Strabo XII 578 (cf. Gow-Page, Garl. Phil., commentary on lines 685ff.); Antipater of Thessalonica (Garl. Phil. 681 ff. = A.P. IX 266) says that Marsyas was flayed alive εἰς Μαρσύας (A.P. IX 266, 6). Melanippides (loc.cit.) merely says ἡρμήν...Λυρίως ὤμοι χειρός, without specifying where the goddess threw the pipes; Telesines (fr. 1 Diehl) talks of "mountain thickets" (δρυμάς ιδωνικ) which wording corresponds to Hyginus, Fab. 165, in Idam silvam. However, the distich says nothing which is "in contrasto" with mythological tradition: according to one version of the story, which our epigrammatisist evidently follows and which is attested in Myth. Vat. I 125, II 115, III 10, 7, and in Fulgentius III 9 (as quoted in Roscher, loc.cit., 2441, 27ff.): "geht Athena vom Götterschmaul, wo sie von den übrigen Göttern verspottet ist, nach dem Tritonseen".

This version of the story seems to be little known: the author of our epigram has, more Alexandrinus, followed it instead of the better known versions. Having analyzed the above epigrams according to the yardstick of 

---

5 Cf. H. White, Corolla Min., vol. III, 1982, p. 200, note 19: "we know that Hellenistic poets always preferred to mention obscure and rarer versions of a given myth". Both the Mythographus Vaticanus and Fulgentius specify that the version according to which the goddess threw the pipes into the Τητωνώς λύρα is attested in several sources, which of these sources the author of the epigram under discussion drew upon is impossible to say. How could Marsyas find the pipes, if the goddess had thrown them into the Τητωνώς λύρα? The only possible explanation is that the pipes suffered a fate analogous to that of Orpheus' lyre. The lyre was
Hellenistic poetry, we can conclude that they are grammatically and stylistically impeccable. I hope that my observations, rectifying Professor Guarducci's scholarly pioneer work and Professor Medaglia's learned investigations, will be a welcome contribution to the understanding of these poems.

Appendix

The epigram which we have last explained (no. 3 in the series published by M. Guarducci) enables us to throw light on the much debated lines in Prop. II 30, 16ff.

hic locus est in quo, tibia docta, sones,
quae non iure vado Maeandri natasti,
turpia cum faceret Palladis ora tamar,
non tamen immitteri! Phrygiis nunc ire per undas,
et petere Hyrcani litora noua maris,
spargere et altera communes caede Penates,
et ferre ad patrios praemia dira Lares!

For the details, I refer the reader to the apparatus in Fedeli's Teubner edition of Propertius. To what Fedeli has argued I should like to add the following. Burmannus (Properti Elegiarum Libri IV, Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1780, p. 449) has underlined that Claudian, Eutrop. II 255 follows what we now know is the same version of the legend which is attested in the epigram under discussion:

hic cecidit Libycis lactata paludibus olim
tibia, fondatam quam reddidit umbra Minervam,

where Libycis paludibus corresponds to the words Τητανωίδα Νιψα

thrown into the Thracian sea, and was carried away by a sea-current until it reached Lesbos (all this is narrated by Phanocles). The "lac Triton" according to ancient geographers (Delage, La géographie des Argonautiques, Bordeaux, 1930, p. 267 ff.), communicated with the sea, so that the pipes were carried away by sea-currents from the "lac Triton" to the shallows of the Maeander (vado Maeandri Prop. II 30, 16), where Marsyas found them.
which we read in the epigram.

Burmann notes that Claudian's *iactata* is parallel to Propertius' *iacta*. The problem, which so far nobody has been able to solve, is simply stated: how could Propertius expect the *tibia*, which is not a ship, to be capable of sailing from the Maeander to him, in Rome? The answer to the problem is obvious. The poet invites the *tibia* (*docta*, as symbol of poetry), which lies *ex Mueandri* (Gow-Page, Gril. Phil., 686) after Marsyas' death, to sail to him in Rome (*hic locus est in quo, tibia docta, sonet*), evidently sailing up the Tiber. He then explains (the relative sentence *quae...natasti* is explanatory) why the *tibia* can well sail to Rome: the *tibia* has proved capable of sailing because, after it was *iacta* (*iactata*, Claud., *loc.cit.*), i.e. 'thrown away' into Athena into whatever sheet of water Propertius believes she hurled it, it sailed (*natasti*) from there to the shallows of the Maeander (like a ship: cf. Prop. II 14, 29-30), *velo Mueandri*: the dative *natasti* is "dativo di direzione*. Since the *tibia* has, therefore, proved capable of navigating, Propertius invites it to sail to Rome, the centre of civilization and literature. He then adds that, if the *tibia* will sail to him, he deserves it (*non tamen immetto: tamen* is used as indicated in Georges, Wörterbuch s.v. *tamen*, II, the sense being that, although Propertius' invitation to the *tibia* may seem presumptuous, nevertheless he, as a competent poet, as the Romanus Callimachus, deserves being granted his request by the *tibia*). Then Propertius, in order to bring into relief his claim that it is just (*non immetto*) that the *tibia*, insofar as *docta* (i.e. capable of producing, with the poet, learned Elegiac verse), should sail from the Maeander to him in Rome, asks the *tibia* an explanatory question, which denotes "Unwillen und Betrübnis" (Kühner-Stegmann, I, p. 719ff.: the sense is "wie ist es denkbar, dass...") and as such expects a negative reply, i.e. Propertius asks the *tibia* whether it would prefer the (subject of the infinitives *ire, petere, spargere* and *ferre* is *tibiam*, cf. Hanslik's apparatus in his Teubner edition of Propertius: the subject cannot be *me* = Propertius, as Cairns, followed by Fedeli, contends, because the navigating is done by the *tibia*, not by Propertius) to sail not to Rome, the centre of the civilized world, in order to be used by Propertius for the production of exalted and divinely inspired poetry, but, through the...
Propontis (the words Phrygias undas denote the Propontis, on whose southern coast there lies Phrygia) to the Caspian sea (Hyrcania litora notae maris), i.e. to the remotest and most uncivilized part of the world. The tibia could reach the Caspian Sea from the Propontis, because, as I have underlined, the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea were believed by the ancients to be joined with each other (cf. L. Casson, The Perithous Maris Erythraiota, p. 240ff.). The epithet notae means "notorious" (cf. Oxford Latin Dict., s.v. notus 7), because the area was notorious for being inhabited by savage and war-like peoples. In that notorious part of the world, i.e. on the Hyrcania litora notae maris, the tibia would be used in praesulis (cf. Burmamns, op.cit., p. 446), i.e. in wars involving the belligerent and savage inhabitants of that region ("Υπερώνοι τήν πόλειν σημειούσαν ἀσέχθη δήμο εὔποτες Dion. Perieg. 699; C. Nöde Kosm. Πάρος νοικώνοιν ἂρδεα Dion. Perieg. 1039); Nilsson (Fedeli, loc.cit.) correctly sees in lines 21-22 an allusion to the battle apud Carrhae; significantly enough, there exists the variant praesilia, in line 22. Cairns' first hypothesis, to the effect that lines 19-20 are an allusion to the Argonauts' expedition, is devoid of any foundation, because peto with the accusative of a place (in this case, litora notae) means (cf. Ox Latin Dict., s.v., 1, a) "make for a place as the final destination, as the end of one's voyage" (e.g. Prop. Ill 11, 71 sive petes portus, navista; Ov. Tr. 1 2, 82 Sarmatis est tellus, quam mea vela petunt), whereas the Argonauts never regarded, either on their way to Colchis or on their way back, the shores of the Caspian Sea the final destination of their voyage. The opposition is emphatically (hic locus est) between the locus, in quo the tibia should rightly settle (i.e. Rome, the centre of the pax Romana) and the place in which the tibia would wrongly settle, if the tibia made for it (i.e. the war-torn shores of the Caspian Sea); it follows that Cairns' second hypothesis, which concerns lines 21-22 and which is predicated on his first hypothesis, is untenable: lines 21-22 cannot be an allusion to Thebana illa (cf. Fedeli's apparatus), as Cairns, followed by

---

8 The Caspian Sea was even more remote than the Black Sea, sinus Oceani remotissimus (cf. Burmanns, op. cit., p. 445).

9 Cf. e.g. already Forcellini, Lexicon Tauriae Lurionaris, Patavii 1805, s.v. Hyrcania, Hyrcanus.

10 For the details concerning the route followed by the Argonauts, cf. e.g. Delage, op.cit., p. 181 ff., with map on page 191 and Vian, Les Argonautiques Orphiques, Paris, 1987, p. 28-45.
Fedeli, suggests, and can only refer to the bloody military activities in which the tibia would be involved if it sailed to the Caspian region, inhabited by warriors, instead of accompanying (sones) the unmartial elegiac verse produced, in Rome, by Propertius. The opposition between war and elegiac poetry is canonic, cf. Scr. Min. Alex. IV, p. 518.

We may conclude. The context clearly shows that, in line 17 vado is a dative denoting the relevant "Bestimmungsort", i.e. "dativo di direzione", and that the verb natura in the same line (nastasi) means "sail, navigate like a ship, so as to reach a landfall" (in this case, the landfall is the vadum Maeandri). In other words, quae vado Maeandri iacta nastasi means "you, who sailed like a ship so as to reach the shallows of the Maeander" (the meaning is not, therefore, "you, who drifted, floated aimlessly, in the shallows of the Maeander"). If the tibia had not proved to be capable of navigating so as to reach a certain destination, "Bestimmungsort", both the explanatory nature of the relative sentence quae...nastasi and Propertius' invitation to the tibia to the effect that it should sail from the Maeander to him in Rome instead of to the Caspian Sea could not be accounted for.

Propertius, like Ovid, "non precisa" into which sheet of water Athena threw the tibia (cf. Guarducci, art. cit., p. 275); he only says iacta. He may have followed the tradition according to which Athena hurled the tibia into the Maeandri, or he may have had in mind one of the rivers mentioned, as we have seen, by other authors (Plut. De coh. ira 6; Hyginus, Fab. 165; Ovid, Ars amat. III 506, in amne):

From such a sheet of water the tibia as Propertius states, sailed to the shallows of the Maeander. (for nato of a ship in the sense "sail", "proceed", cf. Verg. Aen. IV 398; Prop. III 22, 13, etc.); the tibia got stuck in the shallows of the Maeander (vado Maeandri) like a ship at the end of its navigation (cf. Prop. II 14, 29-30). If Ovid refers to a version of the legend, whereby Athena threw the tibia into the water of the Maeander (in amne, Ars Amat. III 506: cf. Brandt, ad loc.; liquidis undis, Fasti VI 69 ff.), whereupon the tibia navigated up to the shore of the Maeander (excipiit abiec tam caespite ripa suo: Fasti, loc cit.; excipi means here "fished out of the water", cf. Lewis-Short, Lat. Dict., s.v. excipio, I, A), Propertius may be alluding to the same version: if this is so, Propertius invites the tibia, because it has shown its navigational expertise by reaching the shore of the Maeander, to sail on from the Maeander to him in Rome and not to the shores of the Caspian Sea. Note that Propertius' iacta and Ovid's abiec tam both mean "thrown into the water". Of course it could well be that Ovid, more
Alexandrinus (cf. especially H. White, *Studies in Theocritus and Other Hellenistic Poets*, p. 68) only mentions the two salient points of the legend concerning the *tibia*, i.e. the moment when Athena threw the *tibia* into a river other than the Maeander (*in amne, Ars Amat.* III 506), and the moment when the *tibia*, after reaching the sea, sailed up to the bank of the Maeander (*Fasti, loc. cit.*: *excipit abjectam caespite ripa suo*), where Marsyas found it. What is certain is that, as Burmannus notes (*op. cit.*, p. 448f.) we are faced with an elegant example of what we call today *oppositio in imitando*: in Ovid Athena, addressing the *tibia*, tells it to go away from the place where she is (*Ars Amat.* III 505):

"I procul hinc", dixit, "non es mihi, tibia, tantum"

whereas Propertius, addressing the same *tibia*, tells it (note the subjunctive *sones*, which corresponds to the imperative *i* used by Athena) to come to the place where he is (*Prop*. II 50, 16):

*hic locus est in quo, tibia docta, sonae*
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