## Myrtia, nº 13, 1998, pp. 225-230

## NOTES ON PALLADAS

## HEATHER WHITE Classics Research Centre, Londres<sup>1</sup>

Ι

A.P. 9, 395:

"ὡς οὐδὲν γλύκιον ἦς πατρίδος," εἶπεν 'Οδυσσεύς·
ἐν γὰρ τοῖς Κίρκης ἔκχυτον οὐκ ἔφαγεν,
οὖ μόνον εἰ καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρώσκοντ' ἐνόησεν,
εἶπεν αν οἰμώζειν καὶ δέκα Πηνελόπαις.

line 1 'Οδυσσεύς Grotius : "Ομηρος mss.

Translation by Paton (*The Greek Anthology*, Loeb edition, vol. 3, p. 219):

Odysseus said "nothing is sweeter than a man's fatherland", for in Circe's isle he never ate cheesecake. If he had seen even the smoke curling up from that, he would have sent ten Penelopes to the deuce.

The phrase  $\dot{\omega}_{\zeta}$  οὐδὲν γλύκιον ἦς πατρίδος is uttered by Odysseus at Od. 9, 34, and Grotius, followed by all editors, changed the ms. reading Ομηρος, in line 1, into Οδυσσεύς, in order to make line 1 congruent with the mention of Circe (line 2) and Penelope (line 4). However,

Dirección para correspondencia: H. White. 30 C, Bethune Road, London N 16 58D (England). *Copyrigth 1999:* Secretariado de Publicaciones. Universidad de Murcia (España). ISSN: 0213-76-74.

Grotius' alteration creates a difficulty which scholars have not been able to solve. Why on earth should Odysseus be seduced by a cake to the point of forgetting his wife Penelope?

In reality, the epigram is very witty: the reading " $O\mu\eta\rho\sigma\varsigma$ , in line 1, is sound, and constitutes the *pointe* of the poem. To begin with, the statement " $\dot{\omega}\varsigma$   $\dot{\sigma}\dot{\sigma}\dot{\delta}\dot{\epsilon}\nu$   $\gamma\lambda\dot{\nu}\kappa\iota\sigma\nu$   $\dot{\eta}\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\dot{\iota}\delta\sigma\varsigma$ " was put into the mouth of Odysseus by Homer, who was of course the author of the line:  $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$ , in line 1, refers to the fact that the statement was pronounced by Homer himself, not by the character into whose mouth Homer put it. The verb  $\epsilon\dot{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$  is normally used with reference to statements made by Homer<sup>2</sup>. The epigram, therefore, concerns what was said by Homer, not what was said by Odysseus<sup>3</sup>.

Palladas is alluding to the fact that Homer was connected with cunnilingus. Cf. A.P. XI 218:

Χοίριλος 'Αντιμάχου πολὺ λείπεται· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πᾶσιν Χοίριλον Εὐφορίων εἶχε διὰ στόματος, καὶ κατάγλωσσ' ἐπόει τὰ ποιήματα, καὶ τὰ Φιλητᾶ ἀτρεκέως ἤδει· καὶ γὰρ 'Ομηρικὸς ἦν.

Translation by Paton:

Choerilus is far inferior to Antimachus, but on all occasions Euphorion would ever talk of Choerilus and made his poems full of glosses, and knew those of Philetas well, for he was indeed a follower of Homer.

Paton explained that Euphorion is said to be a "real thighman" because "he always and everywhere had a woman's sow in his mouth."<sup>4</sup>. Accordingly, Palladas means that if Homer had practised cunnilingus with Circe, he would not have cared at all for Penelope. It should also be noted that "cake" was often used as a euphemism for "pudenda"

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Cf. for example, A.P. IX 636,  $1 \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \nu$  "Ounpox" (same sedes as in Palladas' line).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Cf. A.D. SKIADAS, Homer im griech. Epigramm, Athens, 1965, p. 153 ff., for Palladas.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>On  $\dot{\delta}\mu\eta\rho\iota\kappa\dot{\delta}\varsigma$  meaning "practising cunnilingus, as Homer did", and  $\dot{\delta}\mu\eta\rho\dot{\iota}\zeta\omega$  meaning "practise cunnilingus, as Homer did", cf. Thes., s.v.  $\dot{\delta}\mu\eta\rho\dot{\iota}\zeta\omega$ .

muliebria"<sup>5</sup>. Moreover, the noun  $\kappa \alpha \pi \nu \delta \varsigma$  ("smoke") was also used in obscene contexts<sup>6</sup>.

The ancient reader would know that Homer was said to be in love with Penelope (cf. Hermesianax, frag. VII, lines 29-30)<sup>7</sup>, and that Circe was said to be a prostitute, cf. A.P. X 50:

τὴν Κίρκην οὕ φημι, καθὼς εἴρηκεν "Ομηρος, ἀντ' ἀνδρῶν ποιεῖν ἢ σύας ἡὲ λύκους τοὺς αὐτὴ προσιόντας εταίρα δ' οὖσα πανοῦργος, τοὺς δελεασθέντας πτωχοτάτους ἐποίει τῶν δ' ἀνθρωπείων ἀποσυλήσασα λογισμῶν, εἶτ' ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων μηδὲν ἔχοντας ἔτι ἔτρεφεν ἔνδον ἔχουσα δίκην ζώων ἀλογίστων. ἔμφρων δ' ῶν 'Οδυσεύς, τὴν νεότητα φυγών, οὐχ Ἑρμοῦ, φύσεως δ' ἰδίας ἐμφύντα λογισμὸν εἶχε γοητείας φάρμακον ἀντίπαλον. 10

Translation by Paton (op. cit., vol. 4, p. 29):

I deny that Circe, as Homer says, changed those who visited her from men into pigs or wolves. No! she was a cunning courtesan, and made them who took her bait poorest of the poor. Stripping them of their human sense, she now, when they could gain nothing for themselves, reared them in her house like senseless animals. But Ulysses, having his wits about him and avoiding the folly of youth, possessed a counter-charm to enchantment, his own nature, not Hermes, emplanting reason in him.

Note that Palladas is the author of the epigram which states that Circe was a prostitute. Conclusion: A.P. 9, 395 is a beautiful example of epigrammatic obscenity.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Cf. J. HENDERSON, The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy, New Haven-London, 1975, p. 144.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Cf. J. HENDERSON, op. cit., p. 143.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Cf. G. GIANGRANDE, Scripta Minora Alexandrina, II, Amsterdam, 1981, p. 403 and IV, 1985, p. 521. For Ithaca being the  $\pi\alpha\tau\rho$ iς of Homer cf. A.P. XIV 102, 2 and A.D. SKIADAS, op. cit., p. 24

5

II

A.P. 6, 60:

ἀντὶ βοός χρυσέου τ' ἀναθήματος "Ισιδι τούσδε θήκατο τοὺς λιπαροὺς Παμφίλιον πλοκάμους ἡ δὲ θεὸς τούτοις γάνυται πλέον, ἤπερ 'Απόλλων χρυσῷ, ὃν ἐκ Λυδῶν Κροῖσος ἔπεμψε θεῷ.

Translation by Paton (The Greek Anthology, Loeb edition, vol.

I, p. 331):

Pamphile, in place of an ox and a golden offering, dedicated to Isis these glossy locks; and the goldess takes more pleasure in them than Apollo in the gold that Croesus sent him from Lydia.

This epigram concerns a dedication that was made by a *hetaera* named Pamphilion to the goddess Isis. Palladas composed A.P. 6, 61 on the same theme:

ἄ ξυρὸν οὐράνιον, ξυρὸν ὅλβιον, ῷ πλοκαμίδας κειραμένη πλεκτὰς ἄνθετο Παμφίλιον, οὕ σέ τις ἀνθρώπων χαλκεύσατο· πὰρ δὲ καμίνω Ἡφαίστου, χρυσέην σφῦραν ἀειραμένη ἡ λιπαροκρήδεμνος, ἴν' εἴπωμεν καθ' Όμηρον, χερσί σε ταῖς ἰδίαις ἐξεπόνησε Χάρις.

Translation by Paton:

O heavenly razor, happy razor with which Pamphile shore her plaited tresses to dedicate them. It was no human smith that wrought thee, but beside the forge of Hephaestus the bright-snooded Grace (to use Homer's words) took up the golden hammer and fashioned thee with her own hands.

In a discusion of these two epigrams, Alan Cameron<sup>8</sup> stated that he was puzzled by the language which the poet used in A.P. 6, 61. He argued that A.P. 6, 61 seems to be a parody of A.P. 6, 60. I would like to point out that epigrams on the same theme were often placed together in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>"Notes on Palladas", CQ 1965, pp. 215-225 (p. 216 f.).

Greek anthologies<sup>9</sup>. Cameron has, moreover, failed to understand that in A.P. 6, 61 Palladas describes the razor which cut Pamphilion's hair as  $oip\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota o\nu$  ("heavenly") because he is alluding to the fact that Aphrodite was known as  $Oip\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota o\nu$  ("LSJ  $s.\nu$ . II. It should also be noted that Palladas is alluding in lines 5-6 to Iliad 18, 382  $X\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota \varsigma$   $\lambda\iota\pi\alpha\rho\sigma\kappa\rho\acute{\eta}\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\sigma\varsigma$ . Thus A.P. 6, 61 does not parody A.P. 6, 60. Both epigrams deal with the theme of a dedication to Isis by a hetaera. However, A.P. 6, 61 treats the theme more extensively, by alluding to Aphrodite  $Oip\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\acute{\alpha}^{11}$  and to a passage from Homer. In A.P. 6, 60, on the other hand, Palladas alludes to the topos of the mercenary nature of Aphrodite  $\dot{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\alpha$  by mentioning dedications of golden offerings. For this literary topos, cf. MPhL 4, p. 192 ff. I need hardly add that the adjective  $oip\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota o\nu$ , in A.P. 6, 61, line 1, is used in enallage: for such types of enallage, where the noun to which the epithet refers is "unterdrückt", cf. G. Giangrande 12.

III

A.P. 9, 528:

(είς τὸν οἰκον Μαρίνης)

χριστιανοὶ γεγαῶτες 'Ολύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες ἐνθάδε ναιετάουσιν ἀπήμονες οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτοὺς χώνη φόλλιν ἄγουσα φερέσβιον ἐν πυρὶ θήσει.

Translation by Paton (The Greek Anthology, Loeb edition, vol.

3, p. 295):

(On the House of Marina)

The inhabitants of Olympus, having become Christians, live here undisturbed; for here they shall not be put on the fire in the melting-pot that produces necessary small change.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup>Cf. G. GIANGRANDE, "Two Epigrams on Papyrus", MPhL 2, 1977, p. 147 ff.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup>Cameron also argued (*op. cit.*, p. 217) that Palladas wrote A.P. 6, 85 as a parody of A.P. 6, 86. Once again Cameron is mistaken. It is clear from the *lemma* that Eutolmius Scholasticus wrote A.P. 6, 86 as a parody of Palladas' poem.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup>For an obscene pun involving the noun  $oi\rho\alpha\nu\delta\varsigma$ , cf. A.P. 5, 105, line 4 and A.P. 11, 328, line 9.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup>"Studi sul testo e sulla lingua di Corippo", SicGymn 43, 1990, p. 145.

230 H. White

This epigram concerns statues of heathen gods which are not going to be melted down by Christians. Instead they are going to be kept. Most commentators, as e.g. Paton, take  $\phi\delta\lambda\lambda\iota\nu$  to be a small coin: cf. e.g. Waltz and Soury in their Budé edition (Anthologie Grecque, Paris 1974). However, this interpretation, lately followed by Cameron<sup>13</sup>, is impossible, because the epithet  $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\iota o\nu$  cannot possibly mean, in Greek, that the coin was used "in purchases and transactions of everyday life" (so Cameron): the epithet  $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\iota o\nu$ , in Greek, means "life-giving" (examples in Thes. Gr. Ling., s.v. and in Peek, Lexikon zu den Dionysiaka des Nonnos).

That  $\phi \delta \lambda \lambda \iota \zeta$  here means "bellows", as indicated in LSJ<sup>14</sup>, is proved by the fact that the melting pot  $(\chi \acute{\omega} \nu \eta)$  and the bellows are always mentioned together (cf. Iliad 18, 468 ff., Apollonius Rhodius, Arg. 3, 1299 and Nonnus, Dion. 43, 405). Moreover,  $\phi \epsilon \rho \acute{\epsilon} \sigma \beta \iota \circ \zeta$  is connected with breathing  $(\mathring{\alpha} \sigma \theta \mu \alpha)$  in Tryphiod. 483,  $\pi \nu \epsilon \mathring{\nu} \mu \alpha$  in Orphic Lith. 300); the  $\mathring{\alpha} \sigma \theta \mu \alpha$  of the bellows is mentioned explicitly by Nonnus (loc. cit.).

Palladas has here achieved a neat *pointe*: the  $\phi$ όλλις is normally  $\phi$ ερέσ $\beta$ ιος because it produces "living" or "life-like" works of art (i.e. bronze statues: cf. A.P. 16, 87, line 1:  $\tau$ έχνης 15  $\pi$ νρσὸν ὅπασσα  $\phi$ ερέσ $\beta$ ιον). Here, the  $\phi$ όλλις that normally produces works of art will not ( $o\dot{\nu}$ δέ) destroy such works of art, i.e. the bronze statues of the gods, which will be kept. One could, of course, explain  $\phi$ ερέσ $\beta$ ιον in the sense "giving life (scil. to the fire)": cf. A.P. 6, 101, 2 where the bellows are called  $\pi$ νριτρόφονς.

**Heather White** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup>Cf. CQ 15, 1965, p. 223, note 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup>Cf. also Sophocles, Lex. Byz., s.v., who quotes Jacobs, Animadv. vol. XIII, p. 661.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup>The word  $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \chi \nu \eta$  denotes, of course, the art of the worker in bronze statues, for the  $\chi \dot{\omega} \nu \eta$  producing "life-like" statues with the help of the fire, cf. G. GIANGRANDE, "The Interpretation of Greek Epigrams", Παρνασσός 33, 1991, p. 383 ff.