

Prop. 3. 11. 49, . . . *cape, Roma, triumphum*, roughly corresponds to line 49 of Ovid's elegy. Propertius tells Rome to have her triumph, while Ovid is admitting his own position as a captive in Amor's triumph. A similar correspondence of ideas is found in the next line of each elegy where both poets plead for an untroubled life. Propertius asks this boon for Augustus, but Ovid asks it for himself. Even though the contrast between Prop. 3. 11. 49–50 and *Am.* 1. 2. 49–50 is less specific than that of the two distichs praising Caesar, Ovid, by

insinuating that Rome's triumph over Cleopatra is in some way analogous to Cupid's triumph over him, has transferred Propertius' serious idea to a much lighter context, exactly as he has done concerning Caesar in the following distich. This evidence from outside the Propertian text, then, provides the final and most conclusive proof of the validity of this transposition.

KATHLEEN BERMAN

HERBERT LEHMAN COLLEGE

AESCHYLUS' *MYRMIDONS* (FRAG. 224 METTE)

Τεύκρος δὲ τόξου χρώμενος φειδωλῖαι
ὑπὲρ τάφρου πηδῶντας ἔστησε <ν> Φρύγας.

Although Mette questioned¹ the inclusion of these lines from Trypho² among the list of fragments attributed to Aeschylus' *Myrmidons* and Nauck printed them as Fragment 569 *Adespota*,³ on the basis of papyrological, literary, and stylistic considerations, I am convinced that the lines belong to that play.

It is at least possible that the quotation can be used to restore one of the fragments of *POxy.* 2163.⁴ The first of these papyrus fragments⁵ can be attributed with certainty to the beginning of the *Myrmidons*.⁶ Since the other fragments are written in the same hand and were found with the first fragment, one may assume that they also belong to the play.⁷ I want to suggest that Trypho's quotation is a likely restoration for Frag. 6 of *POxy.* 2163⁸ and, therefore, comes from Aeschylus'

Myrmidons. The papyrus fragment is transcribed as follows:

1] . . [
2] πρ α . [
3] κ ρ ο [
4] ρ . [
I superimpose Frag. 224, Trypho's quotation, over lines 3–4 as follows:⁹

3 Τεύ]κρο[ς δὲ τόξου χρώμενος φειδωλῖαι
4 ὑπὲρ]ρ [τάφρου πηδῶντας ἔστησε <ν>
Φρύγας·

The position of the extant letters matches that of the quotation perfectly, and the three letters thus restored to the left of the two lines make the left margin of this fragment the same as that of Frag. 4, col. 2 (*POxy.* 2163).¹⁰

MAE SMETHURST

PITTSBURGH UNIVERSITY

1. H. J. Mette, *Die Fragmente der Tragödien des Aischylos* (Berlin, 1959), p. 78. All fragments mentioned will be numbered according to Mette.

2. Trypho *Περὶ τρόπων 5* (*Περὶ μεταλήψεως*), p. 195. 15, L. Spengel (1866).

3. *TGF*² (Leipzig, 1926), p. 952.

4. Mette, *op. cit.*, pp. 74 ff. The papyrus fragments are restored by E. Lobel, *Oxyrhynchos Papyri*, XVIII (1941), pp. 23 ff.

5. Frag. 213 (Mette).

6. Restored from schol. Aristoph. *Frogs* 992. Cf. Harp., s.vv. *Λέξεις ῥητορικαί*, p. 159, Bekker⁶ (1833).

7. Lobel, *op. cit.*, p. 23, warns that this is merely an assumption.

8. Frag. 218 (Mette).

9. Lobel, *op. cit.*, p. 25, n. 6, thinks that the left-hand side of a circular letter, e.g., Θ, can be seen after the ρ of line 4. It appears to me to be difficult to tell.

10. Frag. 216 (Mette).

ANYTE (*ANTH. PAL.* 7. 208)

Μνᾶμα τόδε φθιμένου μενεδαίου εἶσατο Δᾶμις
ἵππου, ἐπεὶ στέρνον τοῦδε δαφνοῖν Ἄρης
τύψε· μέλαν δὲ οἱ αἶμα ταλαυρίνου διὰ χρωτὸς
ζέσσει, ἐπὶ δ' ἄργαλέαν βῶλον ἔδευσε φόνῳ.

As transmitted, the above epigram by Anyte

on the horse of Damis (*Anth. Pal.* 7. 208; Gow-Page, *The Greek Anthology*, "Anyte" No. IX) makes no sense in line 4, as ἀργαλέαν βῶλον can hardly mean the "battlefield."

Various emendations have been suggested:

Jacobs proposed ἀυαλέαν, Mähly ἀζαλέαν, and Reitzenstein ἀρκαλέαν, instead of ἀργαλέαν—all seeking for an adjective meaning “dry”—whereas Meineke emended the passage into ἀργαλέω . . . φόνω and Stadtmüller into ἀργαλέα . . . φονᾶ. None of these, however, is satisfactory, as the contrast drawn does not seem likely to be between the *black* blood and the *dry* earth; nor does the word order ἐπὶ δ’ ἀργαλέω(-α) βῶλον ἔδευσε φόνω(-ᾶ) appear probable, since ἐπὶ belongs to the verb, and ἀργαλέω(-α) is so far away from φόνω(-ᾶ). Moreover, an adjective added to φόνω(-ᾶ), “the flow of blood,” would weaken the effect of the preceding: μέλαν δέ οἱ αἶμα ταλαυρίνου διὰ χρωτὸς ζέσσ’.

I should like to emend ἀργαλέαν βῶλον to ἀργεννὰν βῶλον, the *white* earth, in view of the

variae lectiones ἀργέαν and ἀργυρέαν found in the *Suda* for ἀργαλέαν (*s.v.* τάλαιος). The contrast is between the *black* blood and the *white*, chalky earth it stained, and the (Homeric) adjective ἀργεννός is used with αἶα by Oppian in *Hal.* 1. 795, though there it is the snow-covered earth (cf. also the ἀργῆς Κολωνός of Sophocles *OC* 670). It might also be worth adding that λευκός, the more frequently employed adjective synonymous with ἀργεννός, is used by Homer for the gray of dust (*Il.* 5. 503). So line 4 of Anyte’s epigram should read: ζέσσ’, ἐπὶ δ’ ἀργεννὰν βῶλον ἔδευσε φόνω.

C. A. TRYPANIS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

NOCHMAL THE WORD ANOYATON

In a recent note (*CP*, LXV [1970], 51) C. A. Trypanis suggests that the word ἀνούατον, “without ears,” in Theocritus *Epigram* 4. 3 should be emended to ἀνούτατον, “unscathed.” According to his logic, the epithet makes no sense when applied to the Priapus of the poem since, firstly, “the head and the phallus of the effigies of that god . . . were what the artists concentrated on,” and, secondly, an earless Priapus could not have heard the suppliant’s plea. He construes his proposed ἀνούτατον as either connected with the ἀρτιγλυφές of the preceding line or “as a compliment to the rustic artist, who did not damage the bark of the wood when carving it.” Although his first suggestion is attractive, his second is not acceptable; for how could any artist have carved a head with ears and yet have left the bark intact? My purpose here is to show that, in the light of Priapic iconography, ἀνούατον is quite appropriate and is consistent with the other adjectives applied to the idol in line three: ἀσκελές instead of τρισκελές and αὐτόφλοιον.

Priapus was the personified *membrum virile erectum*; it is therefore logical that the physical characteristics of the ithyphallus were incorporated into the iconography of the god. For example: the head of the phallus can be thought

of as bald, when erected and suffused with blood the phallus has a reddish tinge, and the orifice resembles a single eye. It is not by mere chance, then, that Priapus was often represented as bald¹ and red² and that the phallus was sometimes depicted in both art and literature as one-eyed.³ In the same way that the head was envisioned as bald and one-eyed, so could it well have been considered earless. Neither the poet nor the ancient reader would have encountered difficulties with the concept of an earless idol; for even when Priapus was represented by little more than a post in the ground, prayers were addressed to him. Besides, the god’s earlessness heightens the poignancy of the goatherd’s request.

Visually the ithyphallus consists of two main parts: the head and the shaft. Consequently, like the herm, Priapus in his most rudimentary form was presented as a head and torso. Jahn’s emendation of τρισκελές to ἀσκελές, then, makes excellent sense, and line three should read thus: ἀσκελές αὐτόφλοιον ἀνούατον, ἀλλὰ φάλητι. This gives an exact description of a primitive Priapus figure: it was a log set in the ground, therefore it had no legs; the top was rounded off to give the mere suggestion of a head, therefore it had no ears; and as only a

1. H. Herter, “De Priapo,” *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten*, XXIII (1932), 184.

2. Herter (*ibid.*, 172–74) gives other reasons for Priapus’

redness, but they do not affect the validity of my analysis.

3. P. Brandt (H. Licht), *Sittengeschichte Griechenlands* (Dresden, 1925), II, 30, and III, 200; Martial 9. 37. 9–10.