

Myrtia, nº 12, 1997, pp. 9-24

The *Carmina Asisinatia* in the Light of Hellenistic Poetry

GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE
Classics Research Centre, Londres¹

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

First of all, I shall examine the epigram first published by M. Guarducci in *Atti Acc. Linc., Memorie Cl. Sc. Mor. St. Filos.* VIII, XXIII, fasc. 3, 1979, p. 276 f., and examined by S.M. Medaglia in *Accad. Lincei, Bollettino dei Classici*, II, 1981, p. 197 ff.

Prof. Guarducci edited the inscription as follows:

Ἴαμε ἀγαδύσποτμε, τί(ς) σοι φίλος ἢ τί(ς) σύναιμος;
ἄλκαρ ἀπολλυμένω Φοῖβος, ἰδοῦ, πόρε, παῖ

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 ἀγαδύσποτμε,

¹ Dirección para correspondencia: G. Giangrande, Little Ash House, Little Hadham Near Ware, Herts. SG11 2DB, (Inglaterra).

Copyright 1998: Servicio de Publicaciones e Intercambio Científico de la Universidad de Murcia, Murcia (España). ISSN: 0213-76-74. Aceptado: junio 1998.

postulated by Guarducci, is morphologically and metrically impossible; moreover, he rightly observed that the two τίς introduced into the line by Guarducci "guastano l'esametro"; therefore he suggested reading

"Ἴαμε ἄγα<ν> δύσποτμε, τί σοι φίλος ἢ τί σύναιμος
ἄλκαρ ἀπολλυμένω; Φοῖβος ἰδοῦ πόρε, παῖ

"O molto sventurato Iamo, quale soccorso un amico ti porta, o quale un parente, mentre stai per morire? Ecco é Febo 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 πόρε. Syllepsis is certainly possible in epigrams (cf. *Scr. Min. Alex.*, 111, p. 142, note 1), but Medaglia's proposal is untenable, because πόρε is an aorist, meaning "ti portó" (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 τί with a personal dative and ellipse of ἐστί, in the sense "what use is...to...?", is common in Greek (cf. e.g. Bernhardt, *Wiss. Syntax*, p. 90). Therefore, the sentence τί σοι φίλος ἢ τί σύναιμος; in the first line is best understood to mean "what use is friend or relation to you?". The words φίλος and σύναιμος are collective singulars (cf. English "friend or foe", etc.): for such syntactical use of singulars cf. Bernhardt, *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 Bernhardt, *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 ἀγαδύσποτμε 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 "necessitá" 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

"Ἴαμε, ἄγ' ἅ δύσποτμε, τί σοι φίλος ἢ τί σύναιμος;
ἄλκκαρ ἀπολλυμένω Φοῖβος, ἰδοῦ, πόρε, παῖ

As Prof. Guarducci has already noted, both in this epigram and in the epigram n° 8 (Guarducci, *art. cit.*, p. 283), the poet "si rivolge al protagonista della vicenda". In epigram n° 8, the poet says ἅ δύσερως; here, in the epigram under discussion, he says ἅ δύσποτμε. The adverbial ἄγε is placed after the beginning of the sentence, and is elided, exactly as in *Iliad* XIV, 314: νῶι δ' ἄγ' ἐν φιλότητι...

Both Guarducci and Medaglia print "Ἴαμε, in *scriptio plena*: the final ε 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 "Ἴαμ' ἄγ' ἅ. The parallelism with *Iliad* XIV, 314 is complete: in both lines ἄγε occupies the same *sedes*, is elided and is preceded by elision (respectively "Ἴαμ' and δ'). Adverbial ἄγε, 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. ἄγε p. 10, col. I - *alia structura utitur poëta* - quoting, *inter alia*, *Od.* XIX 24 ἀλλ' ἄγε, τίς...) Another case of *scriptio plena* occurs in epigram n° 3 (Guarducci, *art. cit.*, p. 274), line 2: κῆρα ἔριδος = κῆρ' ἔριδος.

The sense of the epigram is, in conclusion, the following: "O wretched Iamos ("Ἴαμε... ἅ δύσποτμε), come (ἄγε), 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 ἄγε 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 (τίς τοι ἔπειτα... *Od.*, *loc. cit.*; τί σοι φίλος, 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 (ἰδοῦ "behold") help provided by the child's father, Apollo, has just arrived (πόρε).

The two lines of the distich are separated from each other by

punctuation (i.e. by the question mark after *σύναιμος*) just as the two lines of epigram n° 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 n° 9 of the series edited by Guarducci. It is a poem on Narcissus:

καινόν, Ἐρωσ, καινὸν κραδίας ἄχος εἴκασας [.]ρσαι·
τῆς ιδίας ὄδ' ἄκων εἰκόνοσ ὑγρὸν ἐρᾶ

Guarducci supplemented (*art. cit.*, p. 284f.) [*ἄ*]ρσαι, 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 εἴκασας [*ῶ*]ρσαι 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 εἰκάζω, does not exist in Greek; the verb means "depict" or "infer from comparison". To boot, when the verb εἰκάζω governs an infinitive, such an infinitive is never "consecutivo-finale", as ὄρσαι would have to be according to Medaglia's interpretation. The verb εἰκάζω, followed by an infinitive, means, in Greek, "I suppose that..."

All the difficulties are eliminated if we read

καινόν, Ἐρωσ, καινὸν κραδίας ἄχοσ εἴκασασ ἔρσαι

The word ἔρσαι is the dative singular of ἔρσα. 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 ἔρσα. On the canon in question cf. e.g. Page, *Further Greek Epigr.*, p. 11, 113, 345 ("ἀδύ for ἠδύ is at variance with the dialect of the rest", just as ἔρσα 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 *ἔκασα*, meaning "you have depicted" is paralleled by *εἰκόνο*, "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 *ἔρση*, not *ἔρσα*, i.e. that the poet used the Ionic, and not the Doric form. On *ἔρση* meaning "water" cf. *LSJ*, s.v. and *Suppl. Hellenist.* 961, 5.

Guarducci interprets the second line of the epigram as follows: "costui, non volendo, ama l'acqua della propria imagine". In the Hellenistic and early Roman period, *α* 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. 989ff. and *The interpretation of Greek Epigrams*, *παρνασσός* 1991, p. 369ff., with all the relevant documentation): therefore it would be arbitrary to alter *ἄκων*, as Medaglia (*art. cit.* p. 211) suggests.

In any case, *ἄκοντος* (*α* short) is already in Euripides *Ion* 746, cf. *Thes.* s.v. *ἄκων*). On *ἀθητῶν* (*α* short) cf. Crimi, *Sic. Gymn.* 1972, 25, p. 15.

Medaglia thinks that "il verbo *ἐράω* richiede il genitivo" and that therefore *ὕγρον* is an adverb, meaning "languidamente". The interpretation proposed by Guarducci is correct, although she absurdly believes that "la costruzione di *ἐρῶν* 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. 1275ff.). Hellenistic poets often employed vulgarisms (cf. my paper "Problemi testuali nei poeti Alessandrini" in *La*

² Dichronous *α* is especially frequent, of course, in names: therefore Guarducci is correct in realizing (*art. cit.*, p. 285) that *Ὀνφάλην* is scanned, in epigram n° 10, as consisting of three long syllables. In epigram n° 10, that is, the name *Ὀνφάλην* does not have "prosodia cretica", as Medaglia (*art. cit.*, p. 212) believes. On dichronous *α* in names cf. e.g. my *Scr. Min. 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 ἐπιθυμέω (cf. G. Tibiletti, *Le Lettere private nei papiri greci*, Milano, 1979, p. 95) or ἐράω (cf. *Thes. s.v. ἐράω*, 1966, D, *cum accusativo*) were construed with the accusative instead of with the genitive (cf. Hatzidakis, *Einleitung*, p. 220f.): here, the poet has construed ἐρᾷ with the accusative ὑγρόν, the sense being "he, reluctantly, loves the water of his own image". Narcissus loves the water of his own image "reluctantly" (ἄκων), because love, as everybody knows, is a torment (ἄχος, line 1). Medaglia's proposal to the effect that ὑγρόν should be an adverb is untenable, not only because, as we have seen, the accusative ὑγρόν "water" governed by ἐρᾷ is grammatically correct, but also because ὑγρόν (cf. *Bollett. Class.* II, 1981, p. 211, note 42) means "in a languidly desirous manner" (cf. especially M. Brioso, *Anacreónticas*, p. 18, note 1), whereas Narcissus is looking "reluctantly" (ἄκων) at his watery image. To obviate this difficulty, Medaglia must alter ἄκων into ἄχων.

We shall now discuss epigram n° 7 in the series published by Guarducci (*art. cit.*, p. 280 ff.):

ποιμαίνει Πολύφημος αἰδῶν καὶ Γαλάτεια
κυρτὸν ὑπὲρ σειμοῦ νῶτον ἀγαλλομένη.

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 Propertio". 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 ἀγαλλομένη having the meaning ἀγάλλεται in line 2 of the epigram. We may conclude that Guarducci has correctly interpreted the text, i.e. has correctly understood that ἀγαλλομένη 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 σειμοῦ, in line 2) is typical of Hellenistic poetry.

Guarducci translates the words Γαλάτεια κυρτὸν ὑπὲρ σειμοῦ νῶτον as "Galatea sulla curva schiena del 'camuso'": she thinks that σειμοῦ (that is to say, σιμοῦ) is an epithet denoting a dolphin, because dolphins are called σιμοί in Arion's Hymn preserved in Aelian, *Hist. Anim.* XII, 45. In other words: she suggests that σιμοῦ, 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 σίμος", i.e. since the substantivized adjective σιμός (accented, of course σίμος, cf. Medaglia, *art. cit.*, p. 205, note 24, for the "regressione del accento") denoted "una specie di pesce", the epigrammatist cannot have used the substantivized adjective σιμοῦ (so Guarducci) or σίμου (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 κυρτὸν νῶτον in line 2: the "curvi dorsi" of the dolphins are a literary *topos* (cf. Arion's Hymn, line 14 κυρτοῖσι νῶτοις, 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 σίμος (or σιμός), 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 adjunct. et subst. apud Nicandr.*, 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 ἔλλοπες as an epithet to the noun ἰχθύς (ἔλλοπες ἰχθύς); Lycophron and Nicander used the substantivized adjective ἔλλοπες *pro* 'piscēs', even though the substantivized adjective ἔλλοπες had specialized to denote certain *piscium species* (Ritter, *loc. cit.*). In exactly the same manner, since Arion used the adjective σιμοί as an epithet to the noun δελφίνες, the author of the epigram we are discussing used the substantivized

adjective *σιμοῦ* ("il camuso", "the snub-nosed one") to designate a dolphin, even though the substantivized adjective *σίμος* had specialized to denote certain species of fish³.

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

βράγχιοι περὶ δὲ σὲ πλωτοὶ
 θῆρες χορεύουσι κύκλω,
 κούφοισι ποδῶν ῥίμμασιν
 ἐλάφρ' ἀναπαλλόμενοι, σιμοὶ
 φριξανχένης ὠκύδρομοι
 σκύλακες, φιλόμουσοι
 δελφίνες, ἔναλα θρέμματα
 κουρᾶν Νηρείδων θεᾶν,
 ἄς ἐγείνατ' Ἀμφιτρίτα·
 οἱ μ' εἰς Πέλοπος γὰν...

13

All the critics ("la lettura degli editori", so Medaglia, *art. cit.*, p. 204) agree that *σιμοί* is an epithet of *δελφίνες*. In conformity with Hymnal usage, the word *δελφίνες* is accompanied by several appositions (*θῆρες*, *σκύλακες*, *θρέμματα*) and each apposition, as well as the noun *δελφίνες*, is accompanied by epithets (*βράγχιοι*, *πλωτοί* qualify *θῆρες*; *σιμοί*, *φριξανχένης*, *ὠκύδρομοι* qualify *σκύλακες*; *ἔναλα* qualifies *θρέμματα*). The apposition *σκύλακες*, which means "whelps" (cf. *LSJ*, s.v. *σκύλαξ*, I, 2 quoting Eur. *Hipp.* 1276, already cited by Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets*, p. 209) and is parallel to *θρέμματα* "nurslings" is supplied, in conformity with

³ The substantivized adjective *σίμος* 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. Strömberg, *Studien zur Etymologie... der griech. Fischnamen*, Göteborg, 1943, p. 17, 126 ff. The substantivized adjective *σίμος* denoted several kinds of different fish: one, akin to the tunny, is mentioned by Artemid. II, 14, p. 132 Pack (cf. *Thes.*, s.v. *σιμός*, 258D: *thyngus*, as noted by Schneider); another was a fresh-water fish, found in the Nile and mentioned by Athen. VII. 312 B (cf. *Thes.*, *ibid.*); yet another fish called *σίμος*, and inhabiting sea-rocks and sand, is described in Oppian, *Hal.* I 168 ff. That these are different kinds of fish, all named *σίμος*, is clear: cf. Strömberg, *op.cit.*, p. 44 (the fish mentioned by Athenaeus is a fresh-water one, a "Nilfish", unlike the others, also called *σίμος*, which are sea-fishes).

Hymnal usage, with *Adjektivhäufung*⁴ (σιμοί, φριξανχένης, ώκύδρομοι): the same *Adjektivhäufung* occurs in lines 1ff. of the Hymn (ὑψιστε, πόντιε, χρυσοστράινε, γαιήοχε), and in line 4f., where θήρες has two epithets, namely βράγχιοι and πλωτοί. Incidentally, the epithet βράγχιοι, in Arion's line ("finny") is regularly formed from βράγχος "fin", and can certainly exist alongside the substantive βράγχιον⁵.

Medaglia (*art.cit.*, p. 203), in order to separate the dolphins from their epithet σιμοί in Arion's Hymn, would like, against all the "editori", to introduce a "struttura tricolore", and read σίμοι φριξανχένης, ώκύδρομοι σκύλακες, φιλόμουσοι δελφίνες: in this manner, he would introduce into the Hymn, besides the dolphins, two further kinds of fish, namely the σίμοι and the σκύλακες. 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: μάρτυρα τῆς τῶν δελφίνων φιλομουσίας, οἰονεὶ καὶ τούτοις ζῳάγρια ἐκτίνων ὁ Ἀρίων ἔγραψε.

The structure of the Hymn fully supports Aelian's statement: the words βράγχιοι...πλωτοὶ θήρες χορεύουσι κύκλω, κούφοισι ποδῶν ῥίμμασιν...ἀναπαλλόμενοι, φιλόμουσοι δελφίνες are all intended to celebrate the dolphins' 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 affinxit. delphinis quia saltare facit*" (Smyth, *ibid.*), and adds that they are fleet of foot (ώκύδρομοι) 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 μ' εἰς Πέλοπος...). 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 σίμοι and the

⁴ On the "Adjektivhäufung" in Arion himself and in Greek poetry cf. Medaglia, *art.cit.*, p. 202, note 20 ("cumulo di epiteti").

⁵ Cf. e.g. Chantraine, *La formation des noms...*, p. 56 f.; Risch, *Wortbildung der homer. Sprache*, p. 115, 41 a).

σκύλακες, Medaglia is compelled to state that πλωτοὶ θῆρες cannot "essere inteso" as an apposition to δελφίνες (*art.cit.*, p. 202, note 20), but such a statement is ungrounded: the πλωτοὶ θῆρες who χορεύουσι are, according to the well known ancient *topos*, the dolphins (cf. Smyth, *loc.cit.*, who quotes Anacreontic 55 Bergk= 57 Preisend., lines 23ff. δελφῖσι χορευταῖς...χορὸς ἰχθύων κυρτός, -where κυρτός by enallage, refers to the curved back of the dolphins, cf. κυρτὸν νῶτον in line 2 of the epigram we are analyzing-, and Eurip. *Hel.* 1454 καλλιχόρων δελφίνων). 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. 435f.

We may conclude. Guarducci's interpretation of the epigram is correct: we must only add that the employment of the participle ἀγαλλομένη having the function of the *verbum finitum* ἀγάλλεται, and the employment of the adjective σιμοῦ in the sense "il camuso" 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 Cyrillus (or Philoponus) says (*Lexica Graeca Minora, selegit* K. Latte, *disposuit* H. Erbse, Hildesheim, Olms Verlag, 1965, p. 370: σίμος (*sic*: σίμος) ἰχθύς: σιμὸς δὲ ἐπίθετον. 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 σιμοῦ in the epigram.

Finally, we shall analyze epigram n° 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 Τριτωνίδι λίμνη in line 1:

ἀνλοῦς οὖς ἔρειψε θεὰ Τριτωνίδι λίμνη
εὐρηκέν ποτε Φρύξ, κῆρα ἔριδος μεγάλης

The distich alludes to the story of Athena and Marsyas. The aorist ἔρειψε (i.e. ἔρριψε) in line 1 seems to show a connection of the epigram with Apollodorus, I 4, 2 ἀνλοῦς οὖς ἔρριπεν, as Guarducci notes: ἔρριψε occurs e.g. also in *A.P.* IX 5 17, 4 (ἔρριπεν λωτοῦς) -a poem on the same subject-, and in Melanippides fr. 2, 1 ff. Diehl; Τριτωνίδι in the same *sedes* as in line

1 of the epigram, occurs in *A.P.* IX 321, 5. Our epigrammatist competently uses literary stock material. The problem, according to Guarducci, is represented by the fact that the mention of the *Τριτωνίδι λίμνη* "é 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.ira* 6, states that Athena's face was reflected *ἐν ποταμῷ τινι*; Ovid (*Fasti* VI 655) calls the goddess *Tritonia*, and adds that the pipes reached "the turf of a river-bank" (*excipit abiectam caespite ripa suo*, *Fasti* VI 697ff.); Propertius II 30, 16f. connects (see my "Appendix") the pipes with the shallows of the Maeander (*tibia...vado Maeandri iacta*), which shallows are called *λίμνη* by Strabo XII 578 (cf. Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, commentary on lines 685f.); Antipater of Thessalonica (*Garl. Phil.* 681 ff. = *A.P.* IX 266) says that Marsyas was flayed alive *ἐπὶ Μαιάνδρω* (*A.P.* IX 266, 6). Melanippides (*loc.cit.*) merely says *ἔρριψεν...ἰερᾶς ἀπὸ χειρὸς*, without specifying where the goddess threw the pipes; Telestes (fr. 1 Diehl) talks of "mountain thickets" (*δρυμοῖς ὀρείοις*) 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 epigrammatist 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 Göttermahl, wo sie von den übrigen Göttern verspottet ist, nach dem Tritonsee".

This version of the story seems to be little known: the author of our epigram has, *more Alexandrino*, followed it instead of the better known versions⁶. Having analyzed the above epigrams according to the yardstick of

⁶ Cf. H. White, *Corolla Londin.*, vol. II, 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 *Τριτωνίς λίμνη* 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 *Τριτωνίς λίμνη*? 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 (n° 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 iacta natasti,
turpia cum faceret Palladis ora tumor.
non tamen immerito! Phrygias nunc ire per undas,
et petere Hyrcani litora nota maris,
spargere et alterna 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 (*Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV, Traiecti 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 iactata paludibus olim
tibia, foedatam quum reddidit umbra Minervam,*

where *Libycis paludibus* corresponds to the words *Τριτωνίδι λίμνη*

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 dans les Argonautiques*, Bordeaux, 1930, p. 262 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.

Burmannus 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 ἐπὶ Μαιάνδρῳ (Gow-Page, *Garl. Phil.*, 686) after Marsyas' death, to sail to him in Rome (*hic locus est in quo, tibia docta, sones*), 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" by 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), *vado Maeandri*: the dative *vado* is "dativo di direzione"⁷.

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 immerito*: *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 immerito*) 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 exclamatory question, which denotes "Unwillen und Betrübniß" (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 *te = tibiam*, cf. Hanslik's apparatus in his Teubner edition of Propertius: the subject cannot be *me = Propertium*, 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

⁷ On this type of dative, cf. Fedeli, *Properzio, Il primo libro delle elegie*, Firenze, 1981, p. 341, 355; Kühner-Stegmann I, p. 320; J.P. Postgate, *Selected Elegies of Propertius*, London, 1926, p. xcvi.

Propontis (the words *Phrygias undas* denote the *Propontis*, on whose southern coast there lies Phrygia) to the Caspian sea (*Hyrcaei litora nota maris*), i.e. to the remotest⁸ and most uncivilized⁹ 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 Periplus Maris Erythraei*, p. 240f.). The epithet *nota* 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 *Hyrcaei litora nota maris*, the *tibia* would be used *in praeliis* (cf. Burmannus, *op.cit.*, p., 446), i.e. in wars involving the belligerent and savage inhabitants of that region (Ὑρκανίους ἀπεχθέα δῆριν ἔχοντες Dion. Perieg. 699; ὑπὸ πόδα Κασπίων Πάρθοι νοιετούσιν ἀρήϊοι Dion. Perieg. 1039); Nilsson (Fedeli, *loc.cit.*) correctly sees in lines 21-22 an allusion to the battle *apud Carrhas*; significantly enough, there exists the variant *proelia*, 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 nota*) means (cf. *Oxf. Latin Dict.*, s.v., 1, a) "make for a place as the final destination, as the end of one's voyage" (e.g. Prop. III 11, 71 *sive petes portus, navita*; Ov. Tr. I 2, 82 *Sarmatis est tellus, quam mea vela petunt*), whereas the Argonauts never regarded, either on their way to Colchis or on their way back¹⁰, 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. Burmannus, *op.cit.*, p. 445).

⁹ Cf. e.g. already Forcellini, *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis*, Patavii 1805, s.v. *Hyrkania, 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 *natare* in the same line (*natasti*) 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 natasti* 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...natasti* 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 *Τριτωνίς λίμνη*, or he may have had in mind one of the rivers mentioned, as we have seen, by other authors (Plut. *De cohib.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 693 ff.), whereupon the *tibia* navigated up to the shore of the Maeander (*excipit abiectam caespite ripa suo*: *Fasti*, *loc.cit.*; *excipit* 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 *abiectam* both mean "thrown into the water". Of course it could well be that Ovid, *more*

Alexandrino (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 abiectam 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 30, 16):

hic locus est in quo, tibia docta, sones

Giuseppe Giangrande