

## POSIDIPPUS 122 (AUSTIN–BASTIANINI): COMPOSITION AND STRUCTURE

*Maria N. Kazanskaya*

Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Science,  
9, Tuchkov pereulok, St. Petersburg, 199053, Russian Federation; subura@mail.ru

Posidippus' epigram on Doricha, a hetaera from Naucratis and the lover of Sappho's brother Charaxus, is usually interpreted as a variation of the poetic topos that opposes the mortality of physical beauty and the immortality of poetry: Doricha herself is gone, but her name lives in Sappho's verses. However, this reading of the poem clashes with other sources that state plainly that Sappho's reaction to Charaxus' love affair was highly negative (Hdt. 2, 135; Athen. 13, 596b). Following an examination of textological problems and of the poem's structure, the article proposes a different interpretation. It is shown that Posidippus emphasizes the part played by the city of Naucratis to preserve Doricha's memory against the working of time and Sappho's influential disapproval, while his own epigram, engraved on a real or imaginary monument for the courtesan, will help to re-establish Doricha's rightful fame.

*Keywords:* Posidippus, Sappho, Doricha, Rhodopis, Charaxus, Athenaeus, Hellenistic epigram, reception of archaic lyric poetry.

At the end of book 13 of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*, the conversation of the banqueters turns to the discussion of renowned hetaerae of old. In his catalogue of beauties whose charms are abundantly illustrated by anecdotes, literary references and quotations, Myrtilus mentions Doricha, a courtesan who lived in Naucratis and who had for some time been the lover of Sappho's brother Charaxus (Athen. 13, 596b). Myrtilus summarizes what is known of this affair and of Sappho's reaction to it from Herodotus (2, 135), correcting his source in points of detail, and completes his account with Posidippus' epigram on the famous beauty:

Δωρίχα, ὄστέα μὲν σὰ πάλαι κόνις ἦν ὃ τε δεσμός  
χαίτης ἢ τε μύρων ἔκπνοος ἀμπεχόνη,  
ἦι ποτε τὸν χαρίεντα περιστέλλουσα Χάραξον  
σύγχρους ὀρθρινῶν ἦψαο κισσυβίων.  
Σαπφῶναι δὲ μένουσι φίλης ἔτι καὶ μενέουσιν  
ῶιδης αἰ λευκαὶ φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες  
οὔνομα σὸν μακαριστόν, ὃ Ναύκρατις ὧδε φυλάξει  
ἔστ' ἂν ἦι Νείλου ναῦς ἐφ' ἄλός πελάγη  
(Posidipp. 122 Austin-Bastianini)<sup>1</sup>.

1 σὰ πάλαι Casaubon σ' ἀπαλὰ A : κόνις ἦν ὃ τε δεσμός Austin (κόνις Jacobs, ὃ τε Meineke, δεσμός Casaubon) κοιμήσατο δεσμῶν A 3 ἦι Jacobs ἦ A 7 μακαριστόν Musurus μακάριστον A 8 ἔστ' ἂν ἦι Dindorf εσταν ειηνειλου A ἐφ' ἄλός Meineke ἔφαλος A : πελάγη Meineke γεγανη A.

<sup>1</sup> I quote the text as it appears in C. Austin's and G. Bastianini's authoritative edition of Posidippus. The text presents a set of problems which will be discussed below.

This eight-line poem, clearly meant to be read as an inscription on a real or imaginary monument for the famous courtesan<sup>2</sup>, is one of the best studied pieces in Posidippus' corpus. It has drawn attention both as a testimony on the complex story of Sappho's relationship with her brother, but also for literary reasons — it is regularly quoted as an illustration of the Hellenistic poets' approach to their predecessors among lyric poets of the archaic period<sup>3</sup>. Despite a set of textological problems that the epigram presents (in particular, the uncertain reading of the first verse, and the question concerning the syntactic structure of the third and fourth distiches), scholars have shown unanimity in interpreting its general sense. The poem is usually understood as a variation on the idea of the immortalizing power of poetry: as Lidov puts it, “Whatever the difficulties of the reading in the first couplet, the motif, or topos, is clear enough: the body is gone, but the fame will live on the page”<sup>4</sup>.

If no other testimony of Sappho's attitude to her brother's affair with the Naucratic courtesan survived but this poem, this would indeed be the natural way to understand Posidippus' thought: the expression φίλη ᾠδῆ in particular seems to imply goodwill on Sappho's part<sup>5</sup>. However, both Athenaeus and Herodotus state clearly that Sappho disapproved of the affair<sup>6</sup>, and Sappho's only fragment in which the name Δωρίχα appears is negative<sup>7</sup>. Consequently, if her poem (or poems) did indeed contribute to the courtesan's lasting fame, it could hardly have been done in a complimentary manner. There have, of course, been attempts to explain this as irony<sup>8</sup>, or, more subtly, as a reflection on the ambiguous nature of literary fame<sup>9</sup>, but in both cases Posidippus' aim in reworking the poetic topos is difficult to understand: the result seems to be complimentary neither to Doricha (the epigram would then state that despite her charms, she is only remembered

<sup>2</sup> See Gabathuler 1937, 51–52; Gow, Page 1965, II, 498; Angiò 1999, 154. The poem is sometimes also qualified as an epitaph: see Krevans 2005, 86, who notes that it “could join the numerous other epigrams for women in \*ἐπιτύμβια” of the P. Mil. VIII 309; similarly, Zanetto *et al.* 2008, 203; Casanova 2002, 134. I am not convinced by Kayachev 2016, who postulates an inscription on a cenotaph.

<sup>3</sup> For example, Gutzwiller 2007, 45; Acosta-Hughes 2010, 2–3; Acosta-Hughes, Barbantani 2007, 439.

<sup>4</sup> Lidov 2002, 222–223; cf. Klooster 2011, 28–29; Kayachev 2016, 421.

<sup>5</sup> See, in particular, Gow, Page 1965, II, 498.

<sup>6</sup> Χάραξος δὲ ὡς λυσάμενος Ῥοδῶνιν ἀπενόστησε ἐς Μυτιλήνην, ἐν μέλει Σαπφῶ πολλὰ κατεκερτόμησέ μιν (Hdt. 2, 135); ἐνδόξους δὲ ἑταίρας καὶ ἐπὶ κάλλει διαφερούσας ἤνεγκεν καὶ ἡ Ναύκρατις· Δωρίχαν τε, ἦν ἡ καλὴ Σαπφῶ ἐρωμένην γενομένην Χαράξου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτῆς κατ' ἐμπορίαν εἰς τὴν Ναύκρατιν ἀπαίροντος διὰ τῆς ποιήσεως διαβάλλει ὡς πολλὰ τοῦ Χαράξου νοσοφισαμένην (Athen. 13, 596b).

<sup>7</sup> Sapph. fr. 15, 9–12 Voigt: Κύ[πρι κα[ί σ]ε πι[κροτ..]αν ἐπεύρο[ι / μῆ]δὲ καυχάσ[α]ιτο τόδε ἐννέ[ποισα / Δ]ωρίχα τὸ δεύ[τε]ρον ὡς ποθε[ί / ]ερον ἦλθε. Even if the first letter of Doricha's name in v. 11 is missing, the reconstruction is accepted by the absolute majority of scholars; the appearance of the name in Sapph. fr. 7, 1 Voigt is less assured. The courtesan's name does not appear in other poems, but Sappho does speak of Charaxus' return from Naucratis in the newly found *Brothers poem* published by D. Obbink 2014, 37–40, as well as of a sea-travel of her brother (also, no doubt, Charaxus) in the *Nereid ode* (Sapph. fr. 5). On Sappho's poems regarding Charaxus' love affair, see Page 1955, 48–51; Obbink 2014, 33–35; Ferrari 2014, 9–11.

<sup>8</sup> Wilamowitz 1913, 19–20 n. 1: „Sehr geschickt und auf wissende Leser berechnet ist es, daß er so aussieht, als hätte Sappho die Liebe ihres Bruders gefeiert, die sie gescholten hatte“; cf. Yatromanolakis 2007, 327. This point of view is opposed by Lidov 2002, 223 n. 46 who points out that such “heavy-handed irony” that makes “words mean their opposite as a source of humour”, is not typical of Posidippus.

<sup>9</sup> Thus Klooster 2011, 29: “The *pointe* of the epigram is therefore that immortality can only be achieved by (becoming the subject of) poetry, no matter how powerful charm may be — and no matter what this poetry precisely states”; cf. Bing 2009, 262; Acosta-Hughes, Barbantani 2007, 439; Ferrari 2014, 9. Zanetto *et al.* 2008, 204 combine the two explanations: “Forse Posidippo, in un epigramma di per sé splendido, ricco di malinconia (vv. 1–2), sensualità (vv. 3–4) e orizzonti (v. 8), volle ironizzare implicitamente su questo errore; ma solo chi sia a conoscenza dei versi di Saffo contro Dorica può apprezzare l'ironia e riflettere più profondamente sul problema della fama letteraria”.

because of Sappho's mention in a very negative context), nor, strictly speaking, to Sappho (who sought to express her disapproval, but ended up immortalizing the girl who caught her brother's fancy). The other drawback to this interpretation is the statement that Naucratis will "guard Doricha's name" in v. 7 (Ναύκρατις ὧδε φυλάξει), a formulation which seems to contradict the idea that the memory of the courtesan depended solely on Sappho. An explanation has been invented for this point as well: the ship described in v. 8 as passing though Naucratis, ἔστ' ἂν ἦι Νείλου ναῦς ἐφ' ἄλως πελάγη, might be carrying papyri, and among them Sappho's songs, which will guarantee the preservation of the hetaera's name<sup>10</sup>. Despite the subtleness of this explanation, it finds little support in Posidippus' text: no element in the epigram brings out explicitly the association between Sappho's poems and Naucratis as a center of trade, and the expression οὐνομα φυλάσσειν seems a strange choice, if the poet spoke of the dissemination of manuscripts throughout the Mediterranean.

I would like to suggest that it is possible to construe the logic of the Posidippus' epigram differently, in a way that reconciles the poem with other sources on Charaxus' love affair and accounts for the mention of Naucratis in the last distich. However, textual problems have to be examined first.

The opening verse is the most problematic line of the poem. The reading of its second half in the codex Marcianus (A), σ' ἀπαλὰ κοιμήσατο δεσμῶν, is impossible to construe. Numerous corrections have been proposed from early on. Casaubon elegantly emended σ' ἀπαλά into σὰ πάλαι which eliminates the problematic expression ἀπαλά ὅστέα, 'tender bones', and emphasizes the remoteness of the scene described in vv. 1–4, but the rest of the line, which he corrected into κοσμήσατο δεσμός, is less convincing<sup>11</sup>. Jacobs, building on the first of Casaubon's emendations, proposed to divide the verb κοιμήσατο, turning its first half into a noun, πάλαι κόνις, and this reconstruction has been accepted by many later editors, although the end of the verse still needs serious modification; ὃ τε was proposed by Meineke, who also transformed the preceding words into σὰ πάλαι κεκόνισθ'. As a result, the beginning of the poem has a variety of readings: Δωρίχα, ὅστέα μὲν σὰ πάλαι κοιμήσατο, δεσμῶν / χαίτης... (Dindorf 1827, 1327); Δωρίχα, ὅστέα μὲν σὰ πάλαι κόνιν, ἔσσατο δ' ἔσμος / χαίτης... (Kaibel 1890, 314)<sup>12</sup>; Δωρίχα, ὅστέα μὲν σὰ πάλαι κεκόνισθ', ὃ τε δεσμός / χαίτης... (Meineke 1859, 80)<sup>13</sup>; Δωρίχα, ὅστέα μὲν σὰ πάλαι κόνις ἢδ' ἀναδεσμός... (Wilamowitz 1913, 20, accepted by Acosta-Hughes 2003, 42–43, albeit with a certain regret for κοιμήσατο<sup>14</sup>); Δωρίχα, ὅστέα μὲν σ' ἀπαλῆς κοσμήσ' ἀπόδεσμα

<sup>10</sup> The papyri trade as the link between Sappho and Naucratis was first suggested in a passing remark by P.A. Rosenmeyer 1997, 132; it has since been endorsed by Bing 2009, 262–263; Yatromanolakis 2007, 327 n. 184; Klooster 2011, 29 n. 48; Acosta-Hughes 2003, 45; Kayachev 2016, 423.

<sup>11</sup> To explain the resulting turn of phrase Casaubon imagined the following funerary rite: "prius quam defunctam comburerent, crinem secuerant, et postea in urnam ubi assevatae reliquiae, coniecerant cum unguentis" (Casaubonus 1664, 880).

<sup>12</sup> Kaibel is further obliged to gloss the proposed correction of Posidippus' text in his *apparatus criticus*: "ὅστέα σὰ καὶ ἔσμος χαίτης καὶ ἀμπεχόνη: ἔσαντο et κόνιν verba ἀπὸ κοινοῦ posita"; for criticism, see Schott 1905, 36.

<sup>13</sup> Meineke's conjecture κεκόνισθ' strays from the reading of Athenaeus' ms.; besides, the verb seems to be used of 'getting sprinkled with dust', not of 'turning to dust'. In a later discussion of Athenaeus' passage (Meineke 1867, 281), he also proposed a simpler variant, κόνις ἔσθ' ὃ τε δεσμός, which reappears in Zanetto *et al.* 2008, 72.

<sup>14</sup> 'Doricha, your bones are long dust, as well as the band of your hair...' Schott's and Mackail's editions are close, but diverge with regard to the last word: while Schott 1905, 36 read ... ἢδ' ἀναδέσμη, while Mackail

/ χαίτης... (Edmonds 1922, 148, followed by Gulick 1937, 214)<sup>15</sup>; Δωρίχα, ὅστέα μὲν σὰ πάλαι κόνις ἦν ὁ τε δεσμός / χαίτης... (Austin, Bastianini 2002, 159, followed by Olson 2011, 12; Klooster 2011, 28)<sup>16</sup>. Although these corrections try to stay as close as possible to the ms. reading of the opening verse<sup>17</sup>, none seems to have a definite advantage over the others, and in this case we would sympathise with those editors and scholars who choose to leave the text as found in ms. A: Δωρίχα, ὅστέα μὲν †σ' ἀπαλὰ κοιμήσατο δεσμῶν† / χαίτης...<sup>18</sup>

The rest of the poem, although the manuscript has to be corrected in several instances, is much more consensual from the point of view of textual variants<sup>19</sup>. There does exist, however, a problem of articulation of the third and fourth distiches, and its solution has a direct influence on the structure and thought of the epigram. Most of the older editions placed a full stop after the expression φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες, so that the second half of the poem consists of two distinct sentences:

Σαπφῶναι δὲ μένουσι φίλης ἔτι καὶ μενέουσι  
ὠιδῆς αἱ λευκαὶ φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες.  
οὐνομα σὸν μακαριστόν, ὃ Ναύκρατις ὤδε φυλάξει  
ἔστ' ἄν ἴηι Νείλου ναῦς ἐφ' ἄλός πελάγη<sup>20</sup>.

This had been the prevailing articulation of the passage, until Austin and Bastianini in their edition chose the interpretation that had been proposed in 1597 by one of the first editors of Athenaeus, Jacques Daléchamps: the four verses were considered a single sentence and οὐνομα σὸν μακαριστόν taken to be a direct object of the participle φθεγγόμεναι. In works following 2002 this has become the prevailing reading<sup>21</sup>. Curiously, the change in the articulation has not been extensively argued. Austin and Bastianini note in their apparatus criticus “vulgo post σελίδες interpungitur: distinctionem amoverit J. Dalecampius

1911, 176 preferred ἡδ' ἀπόδεσμος... The prefixed ἀπόδεσμος was first proposed by Jacobs, but already Meineke 1867, 281 noted that the noun was only used of girdles (“sed ἀπόδεσμος nisi de fascia pectorali non dicitur”; cf. Gow, Page 1965, II, 497).

<sup>15</sup> ‘Doricha, your bones were adorned by a band for your soft hair...’ Although the adjective ἀπαλός goes much more naturally with the noun χαίτη, the text, resulting from these corrections, does not seem to make much sense.

<sup>16</sup> ‘Doricha, your bones were dust long ago, and the ribbon of your hair...’ Cf. Zanetto *et al.* 2008, 72, who replace the imperfect form ἦν by present tense (as already suggested by Meineke, see above, n. 13).

<sup>17</sup> The corrections of the v.1 proposed by Scheidweiler 1958, 94–95, and, very tentatively, by Angiò 1999, 151, are not as close to the ms. and did not find their way into editions.

<sup>18</sup> Gow and Page 1965, I, 171; Page 1975, 1650–1657; Campbell 1990, 16; Fernández-Galiano 1987, 114, 116; Lidov 2002, 222; Yatromanolakis 2007, 326.

<sup>19</sup> Among these, we can note Meineke’s correction of the last word (γεγανη in the ms.) into the adjective πελάγη (Meineke 1867, 281), accepted by the majority of editors (Jacobs’ τενάγη is retained by Dindorf, Edmonds and Gulick; Dobraeus’ ἔη Νείλου ναῦς ἔφαλος στεγανή, mentioned by Meineke, *loc.cit.*, gives little sense). Dindorf’s correction of the ms. reading εἴη into ἴηι is doubtless correct and accepted by all subsequent editors. The ms. reading ἔφαλος was separated into noun and preposition, ἐφ’ ἄλός, by Meineke, which is better both from the point of view of usage (ἔφαλος is usually applied to territories or cities by the sea — e.g. *Il.* 2, 538 and 584; *Soph. Aj.* 190), and style (if πελάγη is accepted, a second adjective without conjunction would be awkward).

<sup>20</sup> Thus, Kaibel 1890, 314; Meineke 1859, 80; Gow, Page 1965, I, 171; Page 1975, I, 1654–1657; Campbell 1990, 16; Edmonds 1922, 148; Gulick 1937, 214. It is accepted by Wilamowitz 1913, 19 n. 1; Angiò 1999, 151, 153; Yatromanolakis 2007, 327. This division was followed by Acosta-Hughes 2003, 42, but abandoned in his later book, Acosta-Hughes 2010, 3.

<sup>21</sup> See text as quoted in the beginning of the article.

[...] ('candidae tabulae, personantes beatissimum nomen tuum', cfr. Call. fr. 92 Pf.), and Zanetto *et al.*, 2008, 205 add a fairly subjective consideration concerning the epigram's structure: "è più suggestivo pensare che i vv. 5–8 costituiscano un solo periodo, corrispondente a quello dei primi quattro versi". But there seem to be several reasons to prefer a full stop after the third distich.

The first reason concerns the use of φθέγγομαι. Austin's translation of φθεγγόμεναι... οὔνομα as "celebrating your name"<sup>22</sup> is not impossible: the meaning "sing or celebrate one aloud" is distinguished by the *LSJ*<sup>23</sup>, and the verb can be used with a direct object. It is manifest, however, that the intransitive use prevails (cf. the expression λύρην... φθεγξαμένην] used of Arsinoe's "resounding" lyre in Posidip. 37, 1–2), and that the verb, regularly chosen in order to emphasize the physical aspect of human voice, never completely loses its connection with φθόγγος<sup>24</sup>. Thus, even when φθέγγομαι is accompanied by a direct object, it means to "announce/pronounce" or "articulate". In fact, the closest example to Austin and Bastianini's interpretation of Posidippus' passage occurs in Callimachus' epigram on Theaetetus: ἄλλων μὲν κήρυκες ἐπὶ βραχὺν οὔνομα καιρὸν / φθέγγονται, κείνου δ' Ἑλλάς ἀεὶ σοφίην (Call. *Ep.* 7, 3–4). However, in this antithesis of short-lived and real glory the choice of φθέγγομαι was due to the subject of the first part of the phrase, κήρυκες, whereas the verb was retained as predicate for the second part of the phrase only by extension; in other words, the parallel structure of the sentence allowed to use φθέγγομαι in an untypical context ([φθέγγεται] Ἑλλάς ἀεὶ σοφίην). In Posidippus' passage nothing suggests similar extension, and the expression φθεγγόμεναι... οὔνομα would thus mean "uttering" or "voicing your name", which is much milder than the sense of praise or celebration postulated by the editors.

On the other hand, the verbal adjective μακαριστός shows a distinct tendency to be used either as a vocative (Theocr. 7, 83) or as a predicative in nominal phrases, especially as it regularly appeared in the context of *makarismos*. The *Greek Anthology* presents several parallels for this kind of usage (cf. especially δᾶμος ἀεὶ μακαριστός... — *A. P.* 7, 748, 7; δένδρον ἐγὼ μακαριστόν... — *A. P.* 9, 661, 1)<sup>25</sup>, and it is probable that Posidippus' readers would expect οὔνομα σὸν μακαριστόν to form an independent clause.

Second, the oxymoron φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες placed at the end of the distich seems to be derived from a formulaic pentameter ending that occurs in a set of epigrams where a voice is unexpectedly acquired by an inanimate object or comes from an unexpected

<sup>22</sup> See Austin, Bastianini 2002, 159; cf. the Italian translation "fare risuonare" (Austin, Bastianini 2002, 159; Zanetto *et al.* 2008, 73). Olson's translation of φθέγγομαι as "proclaim" is closer to the verb's usage (Olson 2011, 13).

<sup>23</sup> See *LSJ*, s.v. φθέγγομαι, III.c. acc. pers.: "sing or celebrate one aloud, P. O. 1, 36; also tell of, recount θεῶν ἔργα Xenoph. 12.1".

<sup>24</sup> B. A. van Groningen 1966, 108 (*ad* Theogn. 266): "[φθέγγομαι] signifie donc plutôt 'se faire entendre, proférer un son' [...] que s'exprimer en paroles claires et compréhensibles"; cf. Fournier 1946, 46–47. This phonetic aspect of the use of φθέγγομαι is felt even in the examples listed by the *LSJ* (see n. 23). In Pindar φθέγγομαι can introduce an accusative and infinitive construction, as in *N.* 5, 52, but in that case the expression διδοὶ φωνάν in the preceding verses (vv. 50–51) brings out the nuance "to resound"; similarly, in *O.* 1, 36–40 Pindar addressing Pelops promises to raise his voice in his defence, νιὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ' ἀντία προτέρων φθέγγομαι... ἀρπάσαι... (*O.* 1, 36, 40; cf. Gildersleeve 1885, 132, *ad loc.*: 'touching thee I will utter what wars with earlier bards'). Finally, in Xenophanes' criticism of Homer and Hesiod, ὡς πλεῖστ' ἐφθέγγαντο θεῶν ἀθεμίτια ἔργα (fr. 11, 1), φθέγγομαι is used as a verb whose nuclear semantics denote meaningless noise as opposed to meaningful speech.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *A. P.* 7, 383; 12, 217. It is especially noted that μακαριστός is principally used of the dead (Hunter 1999, 177; Acosta-Hughes 2003, 43).

speaker<sup>26</sup>. Thus in the anonymous epigram on a jug, it is said to “make a (gurgling) sound through its narrow mouth” (στεινῷ φθεγγομένη στόματι, *A. P.* 5. 135); Antiphilus speaks of the water clock sounding the hour twelve times a day, ἀγλώσσω φθεγγομένον στόματι (*A. P.* 7, 641); in the anonymous funerary epigram, the stella speaks of the dead whose grave it marks, ξεστὰ δὲ πέτρα καθύπερθε ἀγορεύει / τὸν νεκὺν, ἀφθόγγω φθεγγομένα στόματι (*A. P. App., ep. sep.* 166)<sup>27</sup>; the anonymous epigram on Erinna presents her as just acquiring her poetic, “swan-like”, voice, ἄρτι δὲ κυκνεῖω φθεγγομένην στόματι (*A. P.* 7, 12)<sup>28</sup>; Simias points out the locust’s surprisingly pleasant song, τερπνὰ δι’ ἀγλώσσου φθεγγομένα στόματος (*A. P.* 7, 193); and Pantocles’ victories are presented as announced by Zeus himself, τρεῖς δ’ ἔτι καὶ Ζεὺς οἶδεν Ὀλύμπιος ὡς ἐτύμας [τοι / εἰπεῖν ἐξ ἰ]εροῦ [φθ]εγγόμενος στόματος... (*Anth. P. App., ep. ded.* 291, 5–6)<sup>29</sup>. These passages show remarkable similarity in their wording, but also in the paradoxical turn of thought (note the frequency of negative epithets qualifying στόμα), which points to a common source. The expression appears for the first time in the *Theognidea* in the riddle on the lyre (or on the cockle-shell, as Athenaeus, probably erroneously, explained)<sup>30</sup>:

ἦδη γάρ με κέκληκε θαλάσσιος οἴκαδε νεκρός,  
τεθνηκῶς ζῶφ φθεγγομένος στόματι (*Theogn.* 1229–1230).

It is, of course, tempting to think that it was ultimately from this γῶφος that the formulaic verse ending used by later poets was directly or indirectly derived<sup>31</sup>. In any case, it should be noted that in the listed passages the participle φθεγγόμενος is used at the end of the sentence or colon, and does not have a direct object designating the content of the utterance (if it needs to be specified, another *verbum dicendi* will be used as the main verb of the sentence)<sup>32</sup>.

Posidippus’ φθεγγομένοι σελίδες seems to be drawing on the same tradition, not only because of its placement in the verse, but also from the way he makes the white columns preserve Sappho’s voice as if she were alive. It thus seems better from the point of view of semantics and of poetic usage to understand the participle φθεγγόμενοι as intransitive, and to retain a full stop after the third distich, as printed by earlier editors.

We may now turn to the structure of Posidippus’ epigram. The poem consists of four distichs: the first two constitute a single period introduced by the particle μέν and focalizing on Doricha’s charms and lifestyle of life (the distich describing her nights with Charaxus is marked by δέ); the third distich is introduced by a second δέ and centers on the enduring nature of Sappho’s poetry; the last distich is marked by an asyndeton,

<sup>26</sup> On the motif of impossible speakers, popular in Hellenistic poetry, see Hutchinson 1988, 71–72.

<sup>27</sup> Merkelbach, Stauber 1998, 528 (*ad* 05/01/41 Smyrna) note the closeness of this passage with Simias’ epigram (*A.P.* 7, 193, see below).

<sup>28</sup> See Zelchenko 1997, 248.

<sup>29</sup> We did not include Antipater’s epigram (*A.P.* 6, 10) in this list. Although it also ends with φθεγγομένου στόματος the text is severely corrupted (see Gow, Page 1968, I, 36; II, 50–51 who postulate either a lacuna or a displacement of the last line of the poem by a verse that did not belong to it at all).

<sup>30</sup> Athen. 10, 457 b. Athenaeus’ explanation is accepted by Ohlert 1912, 130–131. For a convincing alternative interpretation of this riddle as referring to the lyre, see Zelchenko 1997, 242–244.

<sup>31</sup> Thus, Kägi 1917, 80; Zelchenko 1997, 248 n. 35 adds that the fact that indirect cases of the word στόμα are well adapted for the pentameter ending must have contributed to the expression’s popularity.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. κέκληκε in *Theogn.* 1229–1230; εἰπεῖν in *A.P. App., ep. ded.* 291, 5–6; ἀγορεύει in *A. P. App., ep. sep.* 166.

and emphasizes Naucratis as a preserver of Doricha's fame. Traditionally, the poem has been divided into two equal parts: "Doricha, you are gone" (vv. 1–4), "but Sappho's song remains" (vv. 5–8)<sup>33</sup>. I should like to suggest, however, that it would be better, both from the point of view of style and sense, to understand the two clauses introduced by the particles μέν... and the second δέ... as listing two hindrances to an adequate perception of Doricha, and take the last distich, opposed to the sentence that occupies the first six verses by the asyndeton, as a positive solution to the conundrum. In other words, Posidippus' thought progresses in the following manner: "Doricha is gone"<sup>34</sup>; "what remains is Sappho's poem" (uncomplimentary to the girl and all the more dangerous since Sappho's song is as a general rule, φίλη); however, "Doricha's name is hallowed, and Naucratis will keep it thus". The last distich would then contain the point of the epigram, emphasizing Naucratis' importance in preserving Doricha's good name and implying that Posidippus' own epigram, inscribed on a monument for the girl, will contribute to it. The promise is reinforced by a pun on the city's name (Ναύκρατις ὧδε φυλάξει ἔστ' ἂν ἦ... ναῦς...): the city will preserve Doricha's name as long as it remains worthy of its own<sup>35</sup>.

Naturally, the evocation of Sappho's poetry plays an important part in the poem: Posidippus' epigram is above all a response to her, although instead of simply paying a compliment to the great poetess, Posidippus elegantly emulates her. The Doricha epigram carries a set of recognizably Sapphic traits: the mention of the hetaera's clothing (the head dress, whatever the exact wording of the first verse; the fragrant cloak<sup>36</sup>) is reminiscent of Sappho's attention to the apparel of the girls she sings of<sup>37</sup>. The sensual description of the moment shared by the lovers just before dawn is also has Sapphic overtones<sup>38</sup>. Posidippus even engages in a wordplay known from Sappho's poetry: the expression χαρίεντα... Χάραξον (elegantly rendered by Klooster 2011, 28 as "charming Charaxus") finds a close

<sup>33</sup> For example, Zanetto *et al.* 2008, 204: 'L'epigramma appare diviso in due ampi periodi, di quattro versi ciascuno. Al loro inizio (v. 1 e v. 5) compaiono subito i nomi delle due donne, segno della volontà del poeta di sottolineare l'importanza del nome". It should be noted that the division 1–4 and 5–8 is postulated both by editors who place a full stop after φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες and those who do not.

<sup>34</sup> Posidippus may have intended an association with the proverb ἅπανθ' ὅμοια καὶ Ῥοδῶπις ἢ καλή. This proverb is known from the lexicographers (*Suda*, α 2897, cf. π 191; Phot. *Lex.* α 2248; see also Bachmann 1828, 111, 15; Phryn. *Praep. soph.* fr. 233), who explained it in two ways: either that "all mortals are equal before death" (σημαίνει, ὅτι ταῖς τύχαις ὁμοίως ὑποπεπτῶκασιν οἱ θνητοί, *Suda*, α 2897; Phot., *Lex.* α 2248), or that "the difference between Rhodopis and other, less expensive, hetaerae is not radical" (τοὺς οὖν πολὺ ἀπολέσαντας ἀργύριον, τὸ διάφορον τῆς μίξεως πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας γυναικάς συνορῶντας, ἐπιφωνεῖν τὸ λεγόμενον, *Suda*, π 191 = *com. adesp.* fr. 579 Kassel). Lidon 2002, 229 n. 61 suggests that the second interpretation was the original, appearing in Attic comedy, and that later it was "bowdlerized", in order to make "the proverb obviously Delphic in tone". However, if ἅπανθ' ὅμοια καὶ Ῥοδῶπις ἢ καλή did appear in a comedy, it would seem as natural (if not more natural) for a comic poet to transform an existing philosophic maxim on the transience of life and the equality of all living things in the face of death into a discussion on the quality/price ratio of hetaerae.

<sup>35</sup> The wordplay on Ναύκρατις and ναῦς has been pointed out in particular by Bing 2005, 263.

<sup>36</sup> It has recently been shown that μύρων ἔκπνοος ἀμπεχόνη, often translated as "perfume-breathing shawl", must denote a much larger cloth (see di Benedetto 2004); compare also the fragment of a red-figure vase (Louvre G 99) dating from ca. 525–500 B. C. showing two lovers wrapped in a cloak (for details, see McNeil 2005, 8).

<sup>37</sup> See, in particular, Sapph. fr. 98 a, b Voigt where Sappho describes different headdresses and deplures having no headband to give to Cleis; cf. fr. 39, 100, 101 Voigt. In fr. 22, 13–14 the Gongyla's attire is mentioned as that which first attracted Abanthis (ἀ γὰρ κατάγωγος αὔτα[ς] σ' / ἐπτόαισ' ἴδοισαν), and in fr. 57, 3 a girl is derided for not knowing how to dress elegantly (οὐκ ἐπισταμένα τὰ βράκε' ἔλκην ἐπὶ τῶν σφύρων).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Acosta-Hughes 2003, 44.

equivalent in Sappho's wish in the *Nereid-ode* that Charaxus become "a joy" for his dear ones, καὶ φίλοισι Φοῖσι χάραν γένεσθαι (fr. 5, 6 Voigt), which, as C. M. Bowra pointed out, amounted to exhorting Charaxus to live up to his own name<sup>39</sup>. Thus, in vv. 1–4 Posidippus describes Doricha's and Charaxus' affair in terms Sappho herself would have used, had the latter not been her brother. Sappho's own poetry in vv. 5–6 is characterized as φίλη... ᾠδή. The epithet φίλη is problematic, in view of Sappho's negative reaction to Charaxus' love affair, but the noun ᾠδή can be used of poetry in general, and the plural λευκαὶ φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες seems to point to a poetry-book rather than a single poem<sup>40</sup>. We would argue then that the expression φίλη ᾠδή should be understood as "lovely song", i. e. generally loved and admired by Sappho's readers. Posidippus particularly emphasizes φίλη by a strong hyperbaton, highlighting the fact that in Doricha's case, the enduring popularity of Sappho's poetry was yet another obstacle to preserving a just memory of the courtesan's charms.

From the point of view of structure, the proposed division of epigram 122 into two unequal parts, one long sentence describing the setbacks to a just appreciation of Doricha (vv. 1–6) and one shorter phrase offering the solution (vv. 7–8), gains support from observation of Posidippus' compositional technique: of the twelve eight-verse poems in the Posidippian corpus (i. e. the "Old Posidippus" and the "New Posidippus"), by far the most frequent division is three stanza, followed by one stanza which concludes the poem, while other structures are much less represented<sup>41</sup>. While statistics cannot be considered as positive proof with regard to the epigram on Doricha, the poet's general compositional tendencies (the "intonations" characteristic of his poetic voice) deserve to be taken into account.

More importantly still, this interpretation of the epigram is easier to reconcile with what is known about Charaxus' love affair with the Naucratic courtesan from other sources, and in particular, with Athenaeus, the context in which Posidippus' epigram is cited. Athenaeus mentions two sources for his account of Doricha — Herodotus, whose account he summarizes and challenges with regard to the identification of Doricha with Rhodopis<sup>42</sup>, and Posidippus whose poem he quotes<sup>43</sup>. Athenaeus manifestly compares his

<sup>39</sup> Bowra 1934; on Sapphic connotations of the epithet χαρίεις, see Acosta-Hughes 2010, 13.

<sup>40</sup> The surprising choice of φίλη is noted by Gow, Page 1965, II, 498 who state that in this context ᾠδή can only refer to Sappho's poem on Doricha. Scheidweiler 1958, 95 suggested altering its form, so as to transform it into a vocative: φίλη σ' (this unnecessary emendation is not retained by editors). Angiò's suggestion that φίλη might allude to love as the main subject of Sappho's poetry seems excessively complicated and finds no parallels: "potrebbe trattarsi di un riferimento alla "poesia d'amore", tema predominante nella poetessa di Lesbo, proprio per questo particolarmente cara alla maggior parte dei poeti alessandrini" (Angiò 1999, 153).

<sup>41</sup> Of the fourteen poems in Posidippus' corpus that comprise eight verses (Posid. 8; 15; 33; 36; 37; 39; 56; 57; 62; 95; 121; 122; 140), nine have the "3 + 1 distich" structure; of the remaining poems, epigrams 33 and 128 are divided "2 + 1 + 1"; 62, despite textological problems, has the structure "1 + 3"; 121 consists of a single period, so that syntactical units do not coincide with verse-ends. For the structure of the Doricha epigram, Posidippus 140 is especially important as a parallel: in this poem the first three stanza consist of a list of toasts for lovers and poets, while the last stanza stands apart, and this detachment is marked by the same kind of asyndeton as we find in the epigram on Doricha.

<sup>42</sup> The identification of Charaxus' beloved with the courtesan Rhodopis known for her donations to Delphi and from other stories appears in Herodotus (2, 134–135), who does not mention the name Doricha at all; seeing the scarcity of sources, his identification is in general accepted by scholars. While the double name cannot be explained with certainty, it is usually assumed that Δωρίχα was the girl's real name, while Ῥοδῶπις was the name she used in her profession (thus, Page 1955, 55; Lloyd 1986, 86; Boardman 1994, 142 n. 13).

<sup>43</sup> Athenaeus also evoked Cratinus' mention of the ox-spits dedicated by Rhodopis at Delphi (ὄν μέμηται Κρατῖνος διὰ τούτων... Athen. 13, 596b; the quotation is lost). From the point of view of

sources, balancing them against each other, and also doubtless against Sappho's poem(s) on Charaxus' affair<sup>44</sup>. Among these, Posidippus' epigram is clearly the central piece, quoted in its entirety and presented as a portrait of the girl, at once complimentary and faithful to the original. As Sappho's poetry did not present the girl in a positive light, Athenaeus found a fortunate alternative in Posidippus' epigram with its admiring evocation of the love affair and its subtle imitation of Sappho's poetics. For Athenaeus himself Posidippus' epigram had the supplementary advantage of giving credit to his native city for its part in preserving the Doricha's renown.

To conclude, Posidippus' epigram on Doricha does engage with the themes of the transience of beauty and the immortality of poetry, but the relationship between these motives is not as straightforward as has usually been assumed. In this precise case, Sappho failed to do justice to the charms of the woman her brother fell in love with, and Posidippus mentions her poetry as one of the hindrances to Doricha's deserved lustre, together with the fact that the courtesan has been dead for so long. The epigram elegantly corrects this injustice by describing in an unmistakably Sapphic manner a moment of their romance, and offers a positive solution to the problem: Naucratis, the city where Doricha lived and where a monument with Posidippus' epigram will now stand, will preserve her good name, as long as it is worthy of its own name.

## References

- Acosta-Hughes, B. Alexandrian Posidippus: On Rereading the GP Epigrams in Light of P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309, in: B. Acosta-Hughes et al. (eds.) *Labourled in Papyrus Leaves. Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309), Cambridge Ma., 2003, 42–56.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*. Princeton, Oxford, Princeton UP, 2010.
- Acosta-Hughes, B. Barbantani, S. Inscribing Lyric, in: P. Bing, J. S. Bruss (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, Leiden, Boston, Brill, 2007, 429–57.
- Angiò, F. Posidippo di Pella, l'ep. XVII Gow–Page e l'Αἰθιοπία. *MH*, 1999, 56, 150–158.
- Austin, C. Bastianini, G. (eds.) *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*. Milano, Edizioni universitarie di lettere economia diritto, 2002.
- Bachmann, L. (ed.) *Anecdota Graeca e codd. mss. Bibl. Reg. Parisin.* Vol. I. Lipsiae, J. H. Hinrichs, 1828.
- Benedetto, V. di. Il falso scialle di Dorica. *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale*, 2004, 2, 315–318.
- Bing, P. The Politics and Poetics of Geography in the Milan Posidippus, Section One: On Stones (AB 1–20), in: K. Gutzwiller (ed.) *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 2005, 119–140.
- Bing, P. *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2009.
- Boardman, J. Settlement for Trade and Land in North Africa: Problems of Identity, in: G. R. Tsatskheladze, F. de Angelis (eds.) *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation: Essays Dedicated to Sir John Boardman*, Oxford, Oxford University Committee for Archeology, 1994, 137–149.
- Bowra, C. M. Two Notes on Sappho. *CR* 1934, 48, 126.
- Cambell, D. A. *Greek Lyric*. Vol. 1: *Sappho and Alcaeus*. Cambridge Ma., Harvard University Press, London, W. Heinemann, 1999.
- Casanova, A. Tra vecchio Posidippo e nuovo, in: G. Bastianini, A. Casanova (eds.), *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo: Atti del convegno internazionale di studi (Firenze, 13–14 giugno 2002)*, Firenze, G. Vitelli, 2002, 129–142.

Athenaeus' argumentation, this reference has no bearing on the story of Charaxus' affair with the courtesan, as it concerned Rhodopis, and not Doricha, who, as Athenaeus insists, were two different women.

<sup>44</sup> It is not likely that Athenaeus, himself a proud native of Naucratis, would have missed Sappho's poem on one of the city's most renowned women. On the role of Naucratis in Athenaeus' *œuvre*, see Thompson 2000, 81–82; Jacob 2013, 9–11.

- Casaubonus, I. *Animadversionum in Athenaei Dipnosophistas libri quindecim*, Lugduni, Sumptibus Huguetan, Ravaud, 1664. 998 col.
- Dindorf, W. (ed.) *Athenaeus*, vol. 3. Lipsiae, Libraria Weidmannia, G. Reimer, 1827.
- Edmonds, J. M. (ed.), *Lyra Graeca, Being the Remains of All the Greek Lyric Poets from Eumelus to Timotheus Excluding Pindar*. Vol. 1: *Terpander, Alcman, Sappho and Alcaeus*, London, William Heinemann, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1922.
- Fernández-Galiano, E. (ed.), *Posidipo de Pela*, Madrid, C.S.I.C., Instituto de Filología, 1987.
- Ferrari, F. Sappho and her Brothers, and Other Passages from the First Book. *ZPE*, 2014, 192, 1–19.
- Fournier, H. Formules homériques de référence avec verbe « dire ». *RPh*, 1946, 20, 29–68.
- Gabathuler, M. *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter*, Diss. Basel, St. Gallen, 1937.
- Gildersleeve, B. L. (ed.) *Pindar. The Olympian and Pythian Odes*, London, Macmillan and Co., 1885.
- Gow, A. S. F. Page, D. L. (eds.) *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. Vol. 1–2. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Gow, A. S. F. Page, D. L. (eds.) *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*. Vol. 1–2. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1968.
- Groningen, B. A. van (ed.) *Théognis : le premier livre édité avec un commentaire*, Amsterdam, N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1966.
- Gulick, C. B. (ed.) *Athenaeus, The Deipnosophists*. Vol. 6. Cambridge Ma., London, Harvard University Press, 1937.
- Gutzwiller, K. *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*, Malden Ma., Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Hunter, R. L. (ed.) *Theocritus. Idylls, A Selection: 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Hutchinson, G. O. *Hellenistic Poetry*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Hutchinson, G. O. *Talking Books: Readings in Hellenistic and Roman Books of Poetry*, Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Jacob, Chr. *The Web of Athenaeus*, transl. by A. Papaconstantinou, Washington D.C., Center for Hellenic Studies, 2013.
- Kägi, P. *Nachwirkungen der älteren griechischen Elegien in den Epigrammen der Anthologie*, Inaugural-Dissertation, Zürich, Leemann, 1917.
- Kaibel, G. (ed.), *Athenaei Naucraticae Deipnosophistarum libri XV*, vol. III: *Libri XI–XV et indices*. Lipsiae, B. G. Teubner, 1890.
- Kayachev, B. A. Epitafija Dorikhe (Posidipp, XVII Gow — Page), *Indoeuropeiskoe iazykoznanie i klassicheskaia filologija*, 2016, 20 [Kayachev, B. A. Doricha's Epitaph (Posidippus, XVII Gow–Page), *Indo-European Linguistics and Classical Philology*, 2016, 20] (in print) (in Russian).
- Klooster, J. *Poetry as Window and Mirror: Positioning the Poet in Hellenistic Poetry*. Leiden, Boston, Brill, 2011.
- Krevans, N. The Editor's Toolbox: Strategies for Selection and Presentation in the Milan Epigram Papyrus, in: K. Gutzwiller (ed.) *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*, Oxford, New York, Oxford University Press, 2005, 81–96.
- Lidov, J. B. Sappho, Herodotus, and the *Hetaira*. *CPh*, 2002, 97, 203–237.
- Mackail, J. W. (ed.), *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*. New York, Bombay, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1911.
- McNeil, L. Bridal Cloths, Cover-Ups, and Kharis: The 'Carpet Scene' in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*. *G & R*, 2005, 52, 1–17.
- Meineke, A. (ed.) *Athenaei Deipnosophistae*. Vol. 3. Lipsiae, B. G. Teubner, 1859.
- Meineke, A. *Athenaei Deipnosophistae*, Vol. 4, *analecta critica continens*, Lipsiae, B. G. Teubner, 1867.
- Merkelbach, R. Stauber, J. (ed.) *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, Bd. 1: *Die Westküste Kleinasiens von Knidos bis Ilion*, Stuttgart, Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1998.
- Obbink, D. Two New Poems by Sappho, *ZPE*, 2014, 189, 32–49.
- Ohlert, K. *Rätsel und Rätselspiele der alten Griechen*, Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1912.
- Olson, S. D. (ed.) *Athenaeus: The Learned Banqueters*. Vol. VII: Books 13.594b–14. Cambridge Ma., London, Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Page, D. L. (ed.) *Epigrammata Graeca*, Oxonii, E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1975.
- Page, D. L. *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955.
- Rosenmeyer, P. A. Her Master's Voice: Sappho's Dialogue with Homer. *MD*, 1997, 39, 123–149.

- Scheidweiler, F. Zwei Epigramme. *RhM*, 1958, 101, 91–95.
- Schott, P. (ed.) *Posidippi Epigrammata*. Diss. Berlinensis, 1905.
- Thompson, D. Athenaeus in His Aegyptian Context, in: D. Braund, J. Wilkins (ed.), *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, Exeter, University of Exeter Press, 2000, 77–84.
- Voigt, E.-M. *Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta*, Amsterdam, Athenaeum — Polak & van Gennepe, 1971.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von *Sappho und Simonides. Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker*. Berlin, Weidmann, 1913.
- Yatromanolakis, D. 2007. *Sappho in the Making: The Early Reception*. Washington DC, Center for Hellenic Studies, London, Harvard University Press, 2007.
- Zanetto, G. et al. (ed.), *Posidippo : Epigrammi*, traduzione e note a cura di S. Pozzi, F. Rampichini. Milano, Mondadori, 2008.
- Zelchenko, V. Theogn. 1229–1230. *Hyperboreus*, 1997, 3(2), 237–250.

**For citation:** Kazanskaya M. N. Posidippus 122: composition and structure. *Philologia Classica* 2016, 11(1), 31–41. DOI: 10.21638/11701/spbu20.2016.103

## ПОСИДИПП, ЭПИГР. 122: КОМПОЗИЦИЯ И СТРУКТУРА

Мария Николаевна Казанская

Обычно считается, что Посидипп в эпиграмме, посвященной Дорихе, гетере из Навкратиса, в число поклонников которой входил брат Сапфо Харакс, обыгрывает ставшее топосом противопоставление бренности красоты бессмертию поэзии: Дориха умерла, но ее имя живет в стихах Сапфо. Однако такое толкование плохо сочетается с сообщениями других источников о весьма негативной реакции Сапфо на увлечение брата (Hdt. 2, 135; Athen. 13, 596b). Рассмотрение текстологических проблем, а также структуры эпиграммы, позволяет предложить иную интерпретацию: город Навкратис предстает истинным хранителем памяти о своей знаменитой горожанке, вопреки действию времени и влиятельному мнению Сапфо; эпиграмма же Посидиппа, написанная для памятник гетере (не обязательно реального), в свою очередь будет способствовать доброй славе Дорихи.

*Ключевые слова:* Посидипп, Сапфо, Дориха, Родопис, Харакс, Афиней, эллинистическая эпиграмма, рецепция архаической лирики.

Received: 18.04.2016

Final version received: 20.05.2016