

ARTEMIS, THE CALYDONIAN BOAR AND POPYRI

Giuseppe Giangrande

A textual analysis of the Hellenistic elegy contained in *Pap. Sorb. Inv. 2254* and *Pap. Brux. Inv. E. 8934* shows that the poem is a narrative piece on the Calydonian Boar, and not a series of ἀπαί.

Un análisis textual de la elegía helenística que contienen *Pap. Sorb. Inv. 2254* y *Pap. Brux. Inv. E. 8934* muestra que la poesía es una composición narrativa sobre el Jabalí de Calidón y no una serie de ἀπαί.

A. Cameron's words¹ concerning my explanation of a Hellenistic elegy on papyrus are so misleading and erroneous that I deem it necessary to refute him, in the plainest possible terms, so that even those who, like him, have no specialistic knowledge of Alexandrian poetry can easily comprehend the matter. He gives the readers to understand that I, in order to rebut Lloyd-Jones' hypothesis regarding the said elegy, invented so improbable an interpretation of the poem that only those whom he sarcastically calls my "loyal disciples" accepted my results, until Dr. M. Huys, who insofar as not being one of my loyal disciples had retained his independence of judgement, intervened in the discussion and, armed with a new papyrus, "proved" that Lloyd-Jones was "right" and I was wrong.

¹ *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton University Press 1995) 385.

None of Cameron's assertions is correct. To begin with, I did not excogitate a new explanation of the lines: I simply demonstrated², by means of original arguments which have hitherto proved irrefutable, that the *editor princeps* of the elegy, M. Papathomopoulos³, was right, whilst Lloyd-Jones, who had tried to contradict him in a very aggressive paper⁴, was wrong. For good measure, Cameron neglects to say that I, followed by my pupils⁵, was good last in accepting as valid Papathomopoulos' interpretation of the piece: his conclusions were unreservedly approved of, and loudly applauded, by such eminent students of Hellenistic poetry as C. Préaux⁶, I. Cazzaniga⁷ and J. Th. Kakridis⁸. All the above facts Cameron hides from the reader.

Secondly, it is to be noted that Huys, as Cameron strangely omits to say, is the *coryphaeus* of my "loyal disciples". Huys unequivocally quotes me as his methodological mentor at the very beginning of his commentary⁹; he eagerly follows and applies, throughout his useful monograph, my teaching about "arte allusiva", "oppositio in imitando", "Selbstvariation", etc., in order to illustrate the poet's style and adaptation of Homeric models. Huys accepts my explanations of the many difficult passages of Hermesianax I have thrown light upon, and systematically agrees with the many contributions in matters of *Sprachgebrauch*, metre and style which K. Alexander and I (in her valuable commentary quoted by me above, footnote 5) have made to the study of the elegy under discussion (Huys, *op. cit.* 10). Huys' Achilles heel is his imperfect knowledge of metre, but he may be forgiven: papyrologists, of whom he is one, are not always as conversant with the intricacies of Hellenistic versification as would be desirable. On p. 62 f. of his commentary Huys sees himself compelled to alter the text of the papyrus (line 9 of his edition, = line 10 Papathomopoulos) solely because he does not know how diaeresis was manipulated by Hellenistic poets: the text of the papyrus has been ably explained and defended by Alexander (*op. cit.* 138 ff.) on the basis of my research results¹⁰.

Now to the main problem, which Cameron has hopelessly failed to grasp: I shall here summarize the issue, because the reader will find all the details he might

² "The Sorbonne Papyrus, Meleager and the Calydonian Boar", *MPhL* 8 (1987) 111 ff.

³ "Un poème élégiaque inédit sur Méléagre et le sanglier de Calydon", *Rech. de Papyrologie* 2 (1962) 99 ff.

⁴ "Un nuovo frammento papiraceo dell'elegia ellenistica", *SIFC* 35 (1963) 205 ff.

⁵ M. A. Rossi, in *AC* 57 (1988) 311; K. Alexander, *A Stylistic Commentary on Phanocles and Related Texts* (Amsterdam 1988) 123 ff.

⁶ *CE* 38 (1963) 162 f.

⁷ *CE* 38 (1963) 274 ff.

⁸ *RPh* 38 (1964) 273 ff.

⁹ "Le poème élégiaque hellénistique P. Brux. Inv. E. 8934 et P. Sorbonn. Inv. 2254", *Pap. Brux. Graec.* II 22 (Bruxelles 1991) 37, n. 1.

¹⁰ On the diaeresis cf. the admirably focused exposition by my distinguished colleague M. A. F. Contreras in *Habis* 27 (1996) 334: Huys would greatly profit from reading what she has written.

need in Alexander's extremely clear commentary, which I have already quoted, p. 123 ff.

Papathomopoulos correctly understood that the person who speaks of the *sūn* is the goddess Artemis, who announces to Oeneus that she will send the Calydonian boar to punish him and the Aetolians. The key lines are 15-19 Papathomopoulos (= 14-18 Huys), which the *editor princeps*, using the much mutilated *Pap. Sorb. Inv.* 2254, supplemented, transcribed and translated as follows:

16 “Ἀντὶ δ’ ἐγὼ τῶν στίξω σὺν ἀργιόδοντα
 ἄγριον, ὃς Καλυδῶν ἔρχόμενος κάματο[ν
 Αἰτωλοῖσι π]όρησι”. Τό γ’ ἄρ φίλον ἔπλετ[ο κο]ύρηι.
 Βλάπτε μὲν ὕς καρπ]όν, σίνετο δὲ σταφυλάς,
 μῆλα δὲ καὶ φύλ]ακας θηρήτορας ἐξενά[ρι]ζεν.

[“Pour t'en châtier] j'aiguillonnerai un sanglier [sauvage] aux dents blanches, qui venant à Calydon accablera [les Étoliens”.] Voilà donc ce qui plut à la déesse vierge. [Le sanglier détruisait les moissons], saccageait les vignes et tuait [les troupeaux] et les gardes chasseurs.

Papathomopoulos rightly perceived that a full stop, marking the end of the speech uttered by Artemis, must be placed before the phrase τό γ' ἄρ φίλον ἔπλετ[ο κο]ύρηι, which phrase forms part of the poet's narration of events. On the other hand, Papathomopoulos incorrectly thought that στίξω, in line 15, must mean “j'aiguillonnerai”: since this meaning of the verb στίξω is not attested in Greek, Lloyd-Jones (*art. cit.* 211) hastily concluded that “la poesia non ha niente a che vedere con Artemide”. Lloyd-Jones observed that the verb στίξω, in Greek, can only mean “tatuare”, “marchiare”: not being able to understand why Artemis should “mark” the boar, Lloyd-Jones saw himself constrained to conclude that “la persona che parla minaccia di tatuare l'immagine del cinghiale sulla persona a cui essa si rivolge”. Lloyd-Jones conjectured that the speaker was not Artemis, but a man who had been wronged and who, in order to punish the wrongdoer, wanted to mark the latter with a tattoo representing the Calydonian boar. Why this “pena”, which Lloyd-Jones himself admitted to be “fuor del comune”? Because, Lloyd-Jones alleged, the Calydonian boar was one of the “oggetti che simboleggiavano il potere di Dike”, to be invoked by someone who had been wronged. I was able to refute Lloyd-Jones' assertions with ease. First of all, the verb στίξω, governing the accusative of an animal (here, the accusative *sūn*) means “mark”, “marchiare”, in order to establish the ownership of the animal concerned, and does not mean “tattoo a person with the image of an animal”. Secondly, there is no evidence that the Calydonian boar was regarded in antiquity as one of the “oggetti che simboleggiavano il potere di Dike”. I demonstrated that the words στίξω σὺν... ἄγριον (lines 15-16) in the sense “I shall mark a wild boar” fully confirm Papathomopoulos' interpretation of the elegy. We know that a god who wanted to

set loose an animal sacred to him took care to mark it, so that, if any mortal dared to kill it, the god would be able to recognize the dead animal as his property, as an animal sacred to him, and would consequently punish the impious killer. This motif is attested in Theocritus (cf. my *Scr. Min. Alex.* I, 188, and Alexander, *op. cit.* 152): the papyrus text under discussion offers a neat Hellenistic parallel to Theocritus. Artemis in plain Greek announces to Oeneus that she will mark (στίξω) the wild boar before sending it on its destructive mission: she warns Oeneus that she will mark the wild boar before setting it loose on the Aetolians, so that, if anybody dares to kill it, she will be able to identify the dead boar as the one sacred to her and she will inflict on the Aetolians an even harsher punishment than the one produced by the boar. This is in fact what happened, according to ancient sources (for details, cf. Alexander, *op. cit.* 153 ff.): Artemis did recognize the wild boar killed by Meleager as the one sacred to her, and punished the Aetolians very harshly indeed.

And now to Huys. He cannot refute my arguments: he readily admits (p. 10) that my explanation rests on Greek grammar, i. e. on the “sens attesté de στίξω”. That is to say, the verb στίξω “avec un animal comme objet direct” (p. 66: in this case, the “objet direct” is σύν in line 15 Paphom. = line 14 Huys) means “mark an animal in order to indicate its being owned by a person” (“marquer un animal comme sa propriété”: Huys, *ibid.*). However, after this laudable start, he gets into *textkritisch* trouble.

Huys, with the support of *Pap. Brux. Inv. E.* 8934, supplemented, edited and translated the lines under discussion as follows, taking them to be a speech addressed by a wronged man to the wrongdoer, as Lloyd-Jones had surmised:

- 14 αὐτὰρ ὑπὲρ [σ' ὀφρύ]ων στίξω σύν ἀργιόδοντα,
 15 ὅς ποτ' ἂν Ἄιτ[ω]λῶν ἐρχόμενος καμάτ[ους]
 16 Ἄρτέμιδος βουλήσι -τὸ γὰρ φίλον ἔπλετ[ο] κούρηι-
 17 σίνετο μὲν [σίτ]ον, σίνετο δὲ σταφυλάς,
 18 πολλοὺς δὲ σκ[ύλ]ακας θηρήτορας ἔξενά[ρι]ξεν.

“Puis je (te) tatouerais encore au-dessus (des sourcils) un sanglier aux dents blanches, celui qui jadis parcourait les fruits des labours des Étoliens par la volonté d' Artémis, car cela plaisait à la déesse vierge. Il détruisait les champs de blé, il détruisait les vignes, il tuait de nombreux chiens de chasse”.

The young Belgian scholar has made several mistakes in establishing the text and in punctuating it. First of all, he creates in his own fantasy the personal pronoun σε and forces it into line 14, in order to produce a parallel between line 4 (στίξω δ' ἐν κορυφῇ σε μέγαν καὶ ἀναιδέα λᾶαν)¹¹ and line 14, but the

¹¹ For the meaning of this line see below.

pronoun $\sigma\epsilon$ is impossible in line 14: as Luppe, quoted by Huys himself, has pointed out, the interposition of a personal pronoun such as $\sigma\epsilon$ is exclusively attested in implorations (“dans les serments et les adjurations”), but not in the opposite kind of address, i. e. not “dans les menaces”: the words uttered by the speaker in lines 14 ff. Huys are clearly a “menace”, certainly not an imploration. It follows therefore that the only possible supplementation is ὑπερθ’ ὄφρύων, as suggested by Luppe: consequently, the word ὄφρύων cannot but denote, in line 14, the brows of the boar (the noun ὄφρυς often refers to animals, cf. *Thees.*, s. v.). If anyone has been “trompé” by Greek grammar in explaining the sense of $\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ in line 14 Huys, it is not I, as Huys suggests, but patently Huys. Secondly, Huys states that he is unable to accept my “interprétation subtile” (as he kindly calls it, p. 66), because, according to him, “Artemis ne peut être le sujet qui parle” in the passage under discussion (Huys, p. 65). Huys’ assertion is contradicted by the text. The *paragraphos* between lines 13 and 14 Huys indicates that a new personage starts speaking in line 14: this personage can only be Artemis, as the text indicates. The punctuation adopted by Huys is faulty, insofar as the phrase τὸ γὰρ φίλον ἔπλετο κούρη would constitute as impossible tautology after the words Ἄρτεμιδος βουλήσι: “par la volonté d’Artemis, car cela plaisait à la déesse vierge” is in truth “une étrange redondance”, as the baffled Huys must admit. In reality, the “redondance” first created and then complained about by Huys does not exist, because the correct *Textgestaltung* of the lines is the following:

15 Ἄντάρ ὑπερθ’ ὄφρύων στίξω σὺν ἀργιόδοντα,
 ὅς ποτ’ ἄν’ Αἰτωλῶν ἐρχόμενος καμάτους
 Ἄρτεμιδος βουλήσι”. Τό γ’ ἄρ φίλον ἔπλετο κούρη.
 Σίνετο μὲν [σίτ]τον, σίνετο δὲ σταφυλάς,
 πολλοὺς δὲ σκύλακας θηρήτορας ἐξενάριξεν.

The goddess Artemis, who is speaking, alludes to herself in the third person singular, as gods and important personages often do in Greek poetry: that is to say, the words Ἄρτεμιδος βουλήσι uttered by Artemis mean “by my wishes”. In the phrase ὅς ποτ’ ... ἐρχόμενος, the participle ἐρχόμενος is a *participium pro verbo finito* (on this syntactical feature cf. Contreras, *loc. cit.*, 333: “un elegante homerismo”), the sense being “which will one day come to...”. After the words Ἄρτεμιδος βουλήσι we must place a full stop: as Papathomopoulos cleverly realized, the phrase τὸ γ’ ἄρ φίλον ἔπλετο κούρη forms part of the poet’s narration of the events, and Artemis’ speech ends immediately before the said full stop. The sense, in sum, is: “I shall mark above its brows a white-toothed wild boar, which one day will come to the fields of the Aetolians, by my will”. This is what the virgin goddess decreed. The boar destroyed the fields, destroyed the vineyards, and killed many hunting dogs”.

Conclusion: Papathomopoulos and Giangrande are right, whilst Lloyd-Jones and Huys are wrong. Of all this, Cameron has understood literally nothing.

I can now proceed further, and luminously demonstrate that the whole theory of ἀραΐ invented by Lloyd-Jones and zealously championed by Huys is totally unfounded. Lines 4 ff. Huys are addressed by Dike (mentioned in lines 1-3 Huys) to Oeneus; Artemis, in her turn (ἀὐτάρ, line 14 Huys), addresses her speech, which I have explained, to the same Oeneus. The critics have not understood line 4 Huys, which reads as follows:

στίξω δ' ἐν κορυφῇ σε μέγαν καὶ ἀναιδέα λᾶαν.

The meaning of the line cannot be “je te tatouerais sur la tête une pierre énorme” (so Huys), because, if we assume with Lloyd-Jones that the alleged tattooing is here in line 4 a form of punishment meant to be visible to the onlookers (cf. *Thes.*, s. v. στίξω: *sceleris alicuius deprehensi solebant notis inustis insigniri*) we must remember that the κορυφή could not possibly be used for the purpose of such a punishment, as Alexander has lucidly underlined (*op. cit.* 136 f. and 150)¹²: Herod. 5.35, invoked by Huys, proves Alexander’s point, because, as Herodotus emphasizes, the hair which grew again on the shaved κορυφή (“le crâne rasé”, Huys) of the slave rendered the tattoo invisible¹³.

Huys surmises that the alleged tattooing which he sees in line 4 must be “une pratique magique”, but there is no evidence that such a “pratique” existed in antiquity: tattooing was used as a form of punishment, to be seen by onlookers. Since Alexander is right, and since στίξω can, metaphorically, mean “hit”, τύπτω (*Thes.*, s. v. στίξω, 769 C) we are inescapably led to conclude that the sense of line 4 is “I shall hit you on the head with a big stone”. The internal accusative λᾶαν instead of the instrumental dative is a poetic construction: cf. e.g. Kühner-Gerth, I, 320, quoting Aesch. *Prom.* 905 θεῶν ἔρωσ ἄφικτον ὄμμα προσδράκοι με (cf. Eur. *Med.* 1040 προσδέρεκεσθέ μ' ὄμμασι), and Eur. *Tr.* 42 Κάσανδραν... γαμεί βιαίως σκότιον Ἀγαμέμνων λέχος. Cf. also Herod. 4.75 τὸ κατασχωρόμενον τοῦτο (accus.= instrumental dative) καταπλάσσονται πᾶν τὸ σῶμα, with Stein’s note *ad loc.* (see Kühner-Gerth I, 321). The construction στίξω δ' ἐν κορυφῇ σε, “I shall hit you on the head” (words uttered by the goddess Dike) is neatly paralleled by Soph. *Antig.* 1271 ἐν δ' ἐμῷ κάρᾳ θεὸς... με... ἔπαισεν (“traf auf’s Haupt”, cf. H. Ebeling, *Wörterb. zu Sophokles* [Leipzig 1869], s. v. παίω). It will be noted that Sophocles’ ἔπαισεν governs the internal accusative μέγα βάρος (adverbial, cf. L. Campbell, *Sophocles*, I [Oxford 1879] 559; liter. “employing great weight”), just as στίξω, in line 4, governs the internal accusative μέγαν λᾶαν (instrumental: “employing a great stone”). For the dimensions of the stone (μέγαν... λᾶαν) cf. my explanation (in *Scr. Min. Alex.* II, 141) of the enormous bed

¹² “Tattooing in order to punish somebody was carried out ‘sulla fronte’, as Lloyd-Jones has strangely forgotten”. Cf. especially Athen. 6.225 B, quoted in *Thes.*, s. v. στίξω, 769 B-C.

¹³ I owe this acute observation to Dr. Heather White.

mentioned by Hermesianax in line 55 of his elegy: Huys enthusiastically accepts the said explanation given by me (“un lit énorme... etymologie correctement expliquée”) in his analysis of Hermesianax’s elegy which concludes his monograph. We are appositely reminded by Dike, in lines 4 ff. Huys, of Sisyphus and Tantalus, because they were both guilty of disrespect towards the gods, exactly as Oeneus was. The different meanings of στίξω (metaphorical in line 4 Huys, non metaphorical in line 14 Huys) are an example of *Selbstvariation* (in this case, “falsa anaphora”) typical of the style of this elegy¹⁴.

Cameron’s blunders have one merit: they have prompted me to explain in a conclusive manner the important Hellenistic elegy which I have dealt with in this article.

Addenda. Miscellaneous observations:

- a) For the coupling of γε and ἄρ(α), correctly recognized by Papathomopoulos in line 17 (= 16 Huys), cf. e.g. J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles* (Oxford 1954²) 43.
- b) On gods and heroes alluding to themselves in the third person singular cf. e.g. Kühner-Gerth I, 88, Anmerkung 5.
- c) None other than Huys, in the “Conclusion” at the end of his monograph, confesses that the “pratique magique”, which he, when discussing line 4, peremptorily postulates (“sans doute”), because its existence would offer to him the only possible way to justify Lloyd-Jones’ claim that the tattoo of a man’s κορυφή is mentioned in the said line, did not exist in antiquity (“ne se rencontre pas”).
- d) In line 4, the “internal” accusative λᾶαν is provided “mit einem attributiven Adjektive” (i. e. μέγαν), the sense of στίξω σε... μέγαν λᾶαν being equivalent to στίξω σε μεγάλου λᾶος στίξιν (liter. “I shall strike you a big stone’s stroke”; on all this cf. Kühner-Gerth I, 320 and especially J. S. Lasso de la Vega, *Sintaxis Griega I* [Madrid 1968] 370: “*figura etymologica o no*”). Hitting someone on the head with a stone was a common way of killing the person concerned: cf. e.g. Antipho 132, §26 ἀπέθανεν... κἀγὼ λίθον αὐτῷ ἐνέβαλον· εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν, E. *Phoen.* 1157 f. λᾶαν ἐμβάλων κάρᾳ ἀμαξοπληθῆ (= μέγαν καὶ ἀναιδέα λᾶαν).
- e) The god who, as I have explained, says that he will hit Eurytion on his back in col. I, line 5 (νῶτον στίξω Εὐρυτίωνα: for the double accusative cf. Lasso de

¹⁴ The metaphorical sense of στίξω (=τύπτω) is probably colloquial: the employment of colloquial words, or meanings of words, is typical of Hellenistic elegy, as everybody knows. In col. I of *Pap. Brux. Inv. E.* 8934 the text is too mutilated to permit any convincing reconstruction. Huys tentatively proposes, in line 5, νῶτον στίξω μέγαν Εὐρυτίωνα: this phrase is likely to be uttered by a mythological character, and to mean “I shall hit the great Eurytion on his back”. What follows (lines 21-24) is in fact a description of how Eurytion was beaten up and killed by a god.

la Vega, *op. cit.* 371) is Heracles, who then proceeds to use his ῥόπαλον (col. I, line 21) in order to strike the Centaur: cf. the perfect syntactical and semantic parallel παίει ῥοπάλω με τὸ νῶτον (Arist. *Aves* 497); for στίζω= “beat someone on his back with a cudgel” cf. Aristoph. *Vesp.* 1295 f. τὸ νῶτον... στιζόμενος βακτηρία.

- f) Greek syntax suffices to prove that Huys and Lloyd-Jones are wrong. The type of syntactical “construction du verbe στίζω avec... le double accusatif” which Huys, in his vain attempt to salvage Lloyd-Jones’ hypothesis, invents and proposes for col. I, line 5, col. II, line 4 and col. II, line 14 is a figment of his imagination, non-existent in Greek: he invokes, in his commentary on col. I, line 5, Xenophon., *Anab.* 5.4.32, as “un seul exemple” paralleling and justifying such a figment, but the alleged “exemple” does not exist, because Huys has not understood that in Xenoph., *loc cit.*, the accusative τὰ νῶτα καὶ τὰ ἔμπροσθεν πάντα is governed by ποικίλους, not by ἔστιγμένους (cf. F. Vollbrecht, *Xenoph. Anab.* [Leipzig 1887], *ad loc.*, and P. Couvreur, *Xénophon, Anabase* [Paris 1929], *ad loc.*). Cameron, true to form, has understood none of this: he is clearly out of his depth in matters of textual and literary criticism.