

## APOSTROPHE AND ΣΦΡΗΓΙΣ IN THE THEOGNIDEAN SYLLOGE

One of the characteristic features of elegiac verse in the *Theognidean Sylloge* is the large number of lines containing vocatives to Cynrus, the young man to whom Theognis addresses his instructional poetry in lines 19–30 of the *Sylloge*. These vocatives have some peculiar features. In the majority of verse groupings (which for convenience I shall refer to as poems<sup>1</sup>), the vocative is given without an accompanying verb or pronoun or pronominal adjective in the second person singular. Lines 337–40 are typical:

Ζεὺς μοι τῶν τε φίλων δοίη τίσιω, οἷ με φιλεῦσιν,  
τῶν τ' ἐχθρῶν μείζον Κύρνε δυνησόμενον.  
χοῦτως ἄν δοκέοιμι μετ' ἀνθρώπων θεὸς εἶναι,  
εἴ μ' ἀποτεισάμενον μοῖρα κίχῃ θανάτου.

The vocative *Κύρνε* is inserted in the second line, but the rest of the poem is in the first- and third-person, and Cynrus is not otherwise addressed. Cynrus plays no essential role in the poem, and the vocative could have been omitted without any loss of meaning.<sup>2</sup> This is true for most of the poems containing a vocative to Cynrus: 42 of 70 (60 per cent) lack any other form of second-person singular address.<sup>3</sup>

The reason this is odd is that, for vocatives of any other sort in the *Sylloge*, quite the opposite is true. Many of the poems in the *Sylloge* address other named people (Democles, Simonides, Timagoras), the poet's boy-friend (the *παῖ* of *Book 2*), wine, wealth, poverty, and an assortment of gods (Apollo, Artemis, Eros). Of the sixty poems containing a vocative of this sort, all but four have at least one second-person singular verb or pronoun or pronominal adjective<sup>4</sup>, and many have several.<sup>5</sup> Lines 753–6 are typical:

ταῦτα μαθὼν φίλ' ἑταῖρε δικαίως χρήματα ποιοῦ,  
σώφρονα θυμὸν ἔχων ἔκτος ἀτασθαλίας,  
αἰεὶ τῶνδ' ἐπέων μεμνημένος· εἰς δὲ τελευτὴν  
αἰνήσεις μύθῳ σώφροσι πευθόμενος.

<sup>1</sup> Verse divisions into groupings are taken from M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (Oxford, 1971). Divisions in some cases are controversial, and many groupings are likely to be fragments (see West at 173; E. Bowie, 'The *Theognidea*: a step towards a collection of fragments?', in G. W. Most [ed.], *Collecting Fragments = Fragmente sammeln* [Göttingen, 1997], 63–4). As I hope to make clear in the course of my article, none of this affects my principal conclusions.

<sup>2</sup> Indeed, through an understandable oversight D. E. Gerber, *Greek Elegiac Poetry* (Cambridge, MA, 1999), 223, does omit it in his translation.

<sup>3</sup> I have excluded from this total lines 159–60, since the infinitive is the equivalent of a second-person imperative. One might wish also to exclude four poems that contain a first-person plural verb or pronoun (lines 819–20, 833–6, 1133–4 and 1217–18), and one with a second-person plural pronoun (1103–4). None of the percentages I have given are significantly altered if repeated passages are removed from consideration.

<sup>4</sup> In lines 1257–8 (ὦ παῖ), a second-person verb is lacking but understood.

<sup>5</sup> The exceptions are lines 503–8 (to Onomacritus—I take ἄγ' in line 505 as adverbial), 667–82 (to Simonides), 1059–62 (to Timagoras), and 1135–50 (to a friend). Lines 667–82 have a first-person plural verb that may not refer specifically to the person named by the vocative. These lines were probably written by Euenos—see T. Hudson-Williams, *The Elegies of Theognis* (London, 1910), 34; and C. M. Bowra, 'Simonides in the Theognidea', *CR* 48 (1934), 2–4.

In addition to two second-person singular verbs, the first in the same line as the vocative, there are also four participles modifying the subject, the 'dear companion' not otherwise identified. Personal address assumes an important role in the structure of these verses, as it does in the overwhelming majority of the poems when the vocative is not *Κύρνε*.<sup>6</sup>

One possible explanation for this difference is that many of the vocatives to Cyrnus, which are numerous in two-line poems, occur in fragments formerly attached to other verses. One could, for example, connect lines 631–2,

ὦντινι μὴ θυμοῦ κρέσσων νόος, ἀλὲν ἐν ἄταις  
Κύρνε καὶ ἐν μεγάλαις κείται ἀμηχανίαις.

which have a vocative but no second-person verb, with lines 633–4 that immediately follow in the *Sylloge*,

βουλεύου δις καὶ τρίς, ὃ τοί κ' ἐπὶ τὸν νόον ἔλθῃ·  
ἀτηρὸς γάρ τοι λάβρος ἀνὴρ τελέθει.

which have a second-person verb but no vocative. This would make one poem with perfectly good sense, eliminating the anomaly.

Although some of the shorter poems are very likely to be fragments of other poems, this is not a satisfactory explanation of the disparity in the treatment of vocatives. In the poems that contain both a vocative and some other form of second-person singular address, the vocative and verb/pronoun/adjective are generally in the same distich<sup>7</sup> and often in the same line,<sup>8</sup> as in lines 753–6 above. Furthermore, many of the poems with vocatives not to Cyrnus are short: there are, for example, 11 with two lines and 28 with four. Of these thirty-nine poems, all but one have at least one second-person singular verb/pronoun/adjective explicit or understood, whereas of the fifty-five poems with four lines or less that contain a vocative to Cyrnus, only seventeen do so. Since there is no evident reason why poems containing *Κύρνε* would be more likely to be fragments than the other poems in the *Sylloge*, we are left with the anomaly that in most instances *Κύρνε* was inserted into a context lacking the more extensive second-person address of the sort usually found for other kinds of vocatives.

Why should this be so? One possible explanation is that poems containing *Κύρνε* were of two sorts, written by different poets. Those containing a second-person verb/pronoun/adjective in addition to the vocative might, for example, be supposed to be the authentic work of the poet Theognis, and the others might have been written by

<sup>6</sup> The vocative *Πολυπαῖδη* probably refers also to Cyrnus, but I have not included poems containing *Πολυπαῖδη* in my counts unless occurring together with *Κύρνε*. *Πολυπαῖδη* is found with *Κύρνε* in three poems (lines 19–30, 53–68, and 183–92) but by itself in five. In two of the five (lines 79–82 and 129–30), *Πολυπαῖδη* is accompanied by a second-person singular verb in the same line, but in the other three (lines 143–4, 541–2, and 1197–202), a second-person singular verb or pronoun or pronominal adjective is not present anywhere in the poem, the same proportion as in poems containing *Κύρνε*.

<sup>7</sup> 25/39 or 64 per cent of the vocatives in poems with *Κύρνε*, 57/64 or 89 per cent in the poems with other vocatives. I have included the two poems with the vocative *Πολυπαῖδη* that have second-person verbs (lines 79–82 and 129–30).

<sup>8</sup> 17/39 or 44 per cent of the vocatives in poems with *Κύρνε*, 49/63 or 78 per cent of the poems with other vocatives. Note that the poems with *Κύρνε* are in general less likely to have the verb/pronoun/adjective nearby in the same line or distich than poems with other sorts of vocatives.

a later writer who inserted the vocative in imitation. An explanation of this sort is unlikely, however, since poems containing *Kύρνε* and lacking a second-person verb/pronoun/adjective are nearly as numerous (12/24 or 50 per cent) in the poems of lines 19–254, which West<sup>9</sup> calls the ‘Florilegium Purum’, most of which is generally agreed to form a coherent work, perhaps largely of Theognis himself; and of lines 255–1022 (17/27 or 63 per cent), which West calls the ‘Excerpta Meliora’. Poems containing other sorts of vocatives are also found in all parts of the *Sylloge*, though they are less frequent in the Florilegium Purum than elsewhere. These poems are, however, so similar in style and subject matter to the *Kύρνε* poems that some relatively large number were almost certainly written by the same poet.

Another possibility is that Theognis actually wrote something that could fitly have been described by the phrase later used of the extant *Sylloge*, πρὸς Κύρνον τὸν αὐτοῦ ἐρώμενον γνωμολογίαν δι’ ἐλεγείων (*Suda* 2.692.13 Adler). Within this work Theognis placed the vocative *Kύρνε* perhaps in every poem,<sup>10</sup> even when Cynus was not otherwise addressed. Theognis might have done this as a matter of style, or perhaps out of affection for Cynus. Lines 239–40 say

θοίνης δὲ καὶ εἰλαπίνῃσι παρέσσημι  
ἐν πάσαις, πολλῶν κείμενος ἐν στόμασιν

One way to put Cynus ‘on the lips of many’ would be to put his name in every poem, even when no actual address to Cynus was otherwise intended.

The numerous occurrences of *Kύρνε* could also have been inserted to mark the poems in some way. Theognis says (in lines 19–23),

Κύρνε, σοφίζομένωι μὲν ἔμοι σφρηγὶς ἐπικείσθω  
τοῖσδ’ ἔπειν—λήσει δ’ οὐποτε κλεπτόμενα,  
οὐδέ τις ἀλλάξει κάκιον τοῦσθλοῦ παρεόντος,  
ὅδε δὲ πᾶς τις ἔρεϊ· ‘Θεύγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη  
τοῦ Μεγαρέως’.

The nature of this σφρηγὶς or ‘seal’ has been much debated.<sup>11</sup> The peculiar way in which *Kύρνε* is placed in many of the verses without additional second-person address supports the notion that *Kύρνε* marked the authorship of the poems. This possibility is often discounted,<sup>12</sup> in part because it is strange, as Woodbury put it, ‘that so thorough an attempt to protect literary copyright should have proved so

<sup>9</sup> M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin, 1974), 45.

<sup>10</sup> F. Jacoby, ‘Theognis’, *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse* 9 (1931), 90–180, at 157 (reprinted in H. J. Mette [ed.], *Kleine philologische Schriften Band I* [Berlin, 1961], 345–455, at 427); J. Carrière, *Theognis de Mégare* (Paris, 1948), 115; West (n. 9), at 41.

<sup>11</sup> R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion* (Giessen, 1893), 264–9; Hudson-Williams (n. 5), at 1–4; Carrière (n. 10), at 114–15; F. Jacoby (n. 10), at 112–23 (*Kleine philologische Schriften*, 371–86); J. Kroll, *Theognis-Interpretationen*, *Philologus*, Supplementband 29 (Leipzig, 1936), 48–87; L. Woodbury, ‘The seal of Theognis’, in M. E. White (ed.), *Studies in Honor of Gilbert Norwood* (Toronto, 1952), 20–41; B. A. van Groningen, *Theognis, le Premier Livre* (Amsterdam, 1966), 446–9; West (n. 9), 149–50; L. Pratt, ‘The seal of Theognis, writing, and oral poetry,’ *American Journal of Philology* 116 (1995), 171–84; L. Edmunds, ‘The seal of Theognis’, in L. Edmunds and R. W. Wallace (edd.), *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore, 1997), 29–48.

<sup>12</sup> See especially Kroll (n. 11), at 50–8; Woodbury (n. 11), at 22–3; West (n. 9), at 149–50, who observes that Theognis says ἐπικείσθω not ἐπικείται and argues that the usual understanding of this passage is mistaken.

signal a failure'.<sup>13</sup> But though much of the *Theognidean Sylloge* may be a hodge-podge of elegiac verse of multiple and often undetermined authorship, the only poems within the *Sylloge* that most will agree to be the genuine work of Theognis contain the vocative *Kύρνε*. Perhaps the seal wasn't such a failure after all.<sup>14</sup>

University of California, Los Angeles

GORDON L. FAIN

gfain@ucla.edu

doi: 10.1017/S0009838806000267

<sup>13</sup> Woodbury (n. 11), at 22.

<sup>14</sup> I am grateful to John Crook, Michael Haslam, and an anonymous referee for their comments on the manuscript.

## THE ΦΟΡΤΗΓΟΙ OF THEOGNIS 667–82

εἰ μὲν χρήματ' ἔχοιμι Σιμωνίδῃ, οἳά περ ἦδη,  
οὐκ ἂν ἀνιώμην τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσι συνών.  
νῦν δέ με γινώσκοντα παρέρχεται, εἰμὶ δ' ἄφωνος  
χρημοσύνηι, πολλῶν γνοῦς ἂν ἄμεινον ἔτι,  
οὐνεκα νῦν φερόμεσθα καθ' ἰστίᾳ λευκὰ βαλόντες  
Μηλίου ἐκ πόντου νύκτα διὰ δνοφερῇν,  
ἀντλεῖν δ' οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν, ὑπερβάλλει δὲ θάλασσα  
ἄμφοτέρων τοίχων. ἦ μάλα τις χαλεπῶς  
σώιζεται, οἷ' ἔρδουσι κυβερνήτην μὲν ἔπαιον  
ἔσθλόν, ὅτις φυλακὴν εἶχεν ἐπισταμένως·  
χρήματα δ' ἀρπάζουσι βίῃ, κόσμος δ' ἀπόλωλεν,  
δασμὸς δ' οὐκέτ' ἵσος γίνεται ἐς τὸ μέσον·  
φορτηγοὶ δ' ἄρχουσι, κακοὶ δ' ἀγαθῶν καθύπερθε.  
δαιμαίνω, μή πως ναῦν κατὰ κύμα πῆι.  
ταῦτά μοι ἦνιχθω κεκρυμμένα τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσιν·  
γινώσκοι δ' ἂν τις καὶ κακός, ἂν σοφὸς ᾖ.<sup>1</sup>

Although Benedetto Bravo has shown that etymological evidence supports the reading of *φορτηγοί* as 'traders' or 'merchants' at Theognis 679,<sup>2</sup> the Supplement to LSJ sets aside this translation in favour of 'porter' for this passage. In doing so, LSJ apparently adheres to the earlier argument of Thomas Hudson-Williams, who contends that '*φορτηγοί* probably denotes persons employed for menial services on board ship, "carriers of burdens," the lowest class of ships' servants, who have no knowledge of navigation'. According to his reading, a description of a ship in disorder would require those of the lowest rank on the ship, the menial labourers or porters, to have taken control from those of the highest rank, including the *κυβερνήτης* *ἔσθλός*.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Text from M. L. West, *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (Oxford, 1989<sup>2</sup>). I would like to thank Christopher Faraone for his advice on this note.

<sup>2</sup> B. Bravo, 'Une lettre sur plomb de Berezan: colonisation et modes de contact dans le Pont', *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 1 (1974), 111–87, and B. Bravo, 'Remarques sur les assises sociales, les formes d'organisation et la terminologie du commerce maritime à l'époque archaïque', *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 3 (1977), 1–59.

<sup>3</sup> T. Hudson-Williams, *The Elegies of Theognis* (London, 1910), ad 679.