HOMERIC BEGINNINGS IN THE 'TATTOO ELEGY'*

THE 'TATTOO ELEGY'

The text given here is based on the edition of Huys (see below), updated in the light of more recent scholarship.[1] I have standardized spelling in one respect, which is that I have not followed the papyrus' doubling of initial consonants which lengthen the previous open syllable (thus I have given ὑπὸ λαπά[ρ]ην for the papyrus' ὑπολλαπα[ρ]ην). Supplements to the Sorbonne fragment rendered redundant by the Brussels papyrus have been omitted. For further information (especially papyrological), the reader is referred to Huys's edition.

Supplements etc. are referred to as follows:

P: M. Papathomopoulos, 'Un poème élégiaque inédit sur Meleagre et le sanglier de Calydon', *Recherches de Papyrologie* 2 (1962), 99–111 [*editio princeps* of the Sorbonne papyrus].

H: M. Huys, *Papyri Bruxellenses Graecae* II.22, *Le poème élégiaque Hellénistique P.Brux.inv.E.8934 et P.Sorb.inv.2254*, Brussels, 1991 [*editio princeps* of the Brussels papyrus].

A: K. Alexander, *A Stylistic Commentary on Phanocles and Related Texts* (Amsterdam, 1988) [Not a commentary on Phanocles and 'related texts', but on Phanocles and the Sorbonne papyrus of the tattoo elegy].

B&H: J. Maarten Bremer and M. Huys, 'Some remarks on the new edition of the "Tattoo Poem" (= P.Brux.inv.E.8934 + P.Sorb.inv.2254)', *ZPE* 92 (1992), 118–20.

B&Ll-J: H. Lloyd-Jones and J. W. B. Barns, 'Un nuovo frammento papiraceo dell' elegia Ellenistica', *SIFC* 35 (1963), 205–27, translated into English in *Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion and Miscellanea: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford, 1990), 196–215.

G: G. Giangrande, 'A Hellenistic pentameter', in id., *Studies in Classical Philology* (Amsterdam, 1992), 39–48.

Hu: G. O. Hutchinson, review of Huys (above), *CR* 42 (1992), 483–4.

L: W. Luppe, recorded in Huys (above).

[1] See now H. Lloyd-Jones, *Supplementum Supplementi Hellenistici* (Berlin and New York, 2005), no. 970 (p. 114), where the post-Huys text is given with a bibliography.

Ll-J: H. Lloyd-Jones, 'Again the Tattoo Elegy', *ZPE* 101 (1994), 4–7.

M: H. Maehler, review of Huys (above), *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 54 (1997), 369–74.

Pa: P. Parsons, recorded in Huys (above).

S: S. R. Slings, 'Hermesianax and the Tattoo Elegy', *ZPE* 98 (1993), 29–35.

col. 1

[two lines of illegible traces]

$$\begin{array}{lr}
].\pi.[...].\mu\nu\ \text{σονται}\ \text{ἀοιδαί} & 3 \\
].[\ ].\ [.\ ].\quad \text{ς}\ \text{τε}\ \text{πυρὶ}\ \phi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\text{ομαι} & \\
]\nu\hat{\omega}\text{τον}\ \sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\xi\omega\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\text{αν}\ \text{Εὐρυτ}\ [\omega]\nu\text{α} & 5 \\
\text{Ν}]\epsilon\phi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\varsigma\ \upsilon\quad \nu\ \grave{α}\tau\rho\epsilon\sigma\text{τοβίην} & \\
\text{'Αμφιτρυωνι]άδαο}\ \delta\underset{\cdot}{α}\ \zeta\acute{ο}\mu\epsilon\text{νον}\ \grave{υ}\pi\grave{ο}\ \chi\epsilon\rho\sigma\acute{ι}\nu & \\
]\kappa\ .\tau\text{ος}\ \tau\epsilon\ \mu\nu\eta\sigma\tau\acute{ε}υ\epsilon\tau\text{ο}\ \text{κούρην} & \\
\grave{α}\nu\theta]\rho\quad \pi\text{ων}\ \grave{α}\zeta\acute{ό}\mu\epsilon\text{νος}\ \nu\acute{ε}\mu\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu & \\
]\underset{\cdot}{α}\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\iota\nu\grave{ο}\nu\ \chi\acute{ο}\lambda\text{ον},\ \ddot{ο}\varsigma\ \tau'\grave{ε}\pi\grave{ι}\ \delta\epsilon\iota\lambda[.]. & 10 \\
].\ \text{ον}\ \delta\rho\iota\mu\ \underset{\cdot}{\nu}\ [\grave{α}\epsilon\grave{ι}]\ \tau\acute{ι}\theta\epsilon\tau\text{αι} & \\
]\ \tau\acute{ι}\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omega\ .\sigma\ .\ \text{ο}\ .\text{οι}\cdot\ \ddot{η}\ \gamma\grave{α}\rho\ \ddot{ο}\ \gamma'\text{ο}\ \delta\grave{ε}\nu & \\
]\ \pi[.]..... \kappa\text{ακῆς}\ \ddot{υ}\beta\rho\text{ιος} & \\
]...\epsilon\ [\tau]\rho\ \pi\text{οδα}\ \mu\acute{ε}\gamma\text{αν}..... & \\
].\ \phi\text{ο}..[.]\underset{\cdot}{\iota}\varsigma\ \kappa\rho\text{ατὸς}\ \ddot{υ}\pi\epsilon[\rho]\ \lambda\text{ας}\ \text{ου} & 15 \\
]\ \epsilon\iota\ \mu\acute{ε}\sigma\sigma\text{ον}\ \delta'\epsilon\grave{ι}\varsigma\ \sigma\tau\hat{\eta}\theta[\text{ο}]\varsigma\ \ddot{ε}\rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu & \\
]\ \nu\ \grave{α}\nu\acute{ε}\rho\text{ος}\ \text{ουδεμ}\ \text{αν} & \\
]\ \epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon\ \beta\acute{ε}\lambda\text{ος}\ \text{Τρ}\underset{\cdot}{\iota}\tau\text{ων}\ \varsigma\ \text{'Αθήνη} & \\
]\ \tau\text{ου}\ \phi\epsilon\iota\delta\text{ομ}\ \text{νη}\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{α}\lambda\omega\varsigma & \\
\grave{ε}\tau]\ \rho\eta\iota\ \mu\grave{ε}\nu\ \grave{υ}\pi'\grave{α}\sigma\phi\acute{α}\rho\underset{\cdot}{α}\gamma\text{ον}\ \lambda\acute{α}\beta\epsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{ι}, & 20 \\
\tau\hat{\eta}\iota\ \delta'\ \grave{ε}\tau\acute{ε}\rho\eta\iota\ \rho]\acute{ο}\pi\text{αλον}\ \sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\grave{ο}\nu\ \grave{α}\underset{\cdot}{\nu}\underset{\cdot}{α}\sigma\chi\acute{ο}\mu\epsilon\text{νος} & \\
]\ \kappa\rho\acute{ο}\tau\text{αφον}\ \sigma\acute{υ}\underset{\cdot}{\nu}\ [\tau'\text{ὸ}]\sigma\tau\acute{ε}α\ \pi\acute{α}\nu\tau\text{α}\ \ddot{α}\rho\underset{\cdot}{α}\xi\epsilon\nu & \\
]\ \nu\omega\nu\ \ddot{ε}\kappa\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu\ [\grave{ε}\gamma]\underset{\cdot}{κ}\ \phi\text{αλος} & \\
]\ \pi\lambda\acute{η}\gamma\eta\nu\ \psi\upsilon\chi\hat{\omega}\ [\delta']\underset{\cdot}{α}\underset{\cdot}{\nu}\underset{\cdot}{α}\ \grave{η}\acute{ε}\rho\underset{\cdot}{α}\ \underset{\cdot}{\delta}\ \nu\epsilon &
\end{array}$$

col. 1

5]νῶτον (an νώτοις ?), πρῶτά σ'ἐπὶ ν]νῶτον e.g. H.; Εὐρυτ [ω]να: primum υ ex ι correctum.   6 ἀτρεστοβίην corr. Pa., ατᵖεστρόβιην MS   7 δα ζόμενον corr. H., . . . ζομενου MS; βιαζομένο<ιϲ> ὑπὸ χερσίν M.; post hunc versum lacuna.   8 ὅς τε vel ἀέ]κοντός τε e.g. H. (quod dubitavit M.), ὅϲτε βίαιος ἄ]κλητός τε L.   9 ἀζόμενος corr. H., οζομενος MS   10 οὔτε θεῶν δείσ]ας Pa.; Διὸς δείσ]ας Hu.   10–11 δειλ[ῶ]ι / ὑβριστῆι πόλε]μον vel δειλ[οῖ]ς / ὑβρισταῖς πότ]μον e.g. H., δειλ[ὸν / ὑβρισταῖς πόλε]μον δριμὺς Pa.   13 ὕβριος supra ιω suprascr. ιο   14]..ε [τ]ρ ποδα (an ..τε[τ]ράποδα ?) H.   16.Ἡρακ]λεῖ Pa.   17 καί κεν ἴδοις φυλακὴ]ν Pa.; ἐλπίζων ἀλκή]ν ἀνέρος οὐδεμίαν B&H.; de ἐλπόμενος ἀλκή]ν cog. B&H.   18 ἀλλ' ἐν χερσὶν ἔθηκε e.g. H., εἰ τότε μὴ παρέθηκε Pa., ἀλλ' ἄλιόν οἱ ἔθηκε Hu.   19 init. αὐ]τοῦ vel βιό]του e.g. H.; ἀνδρὸς τηλυγέ]του Ll.-J.; fin. fortasse corruptum (sic Hu.)   20 init. Ἡρακλέης Pa.   22 Κενταύρου] Pa.; πλῆξέ τε] κρόταφον σύν [τ' ὀ]στέα πάντα ἄραξεν B&H.   23 ῥι]νῶν Pa.; ἔκπεσεν corr. H. εκπεσσεν MS

col. 2

$$\begin{array}{l}
\mu\epsilon\acute{ι}\delta\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ [\delta]\grave{ε}\ \Delta\acute{ι}\kappa\eta\ \pi\text{αρθένος}\ \grave{α}\theta\acute{α}\nu\underset{\cdot}{α}[\text{τος}], \\
\ddot{η}\tau\epsilon\ \grave{α}\nu\text{απεπταμένοις}\ \grave{α}\tau\epsilon\nu\grave{ε}\varsigma\ \beta\lambda\ \pi\epsilon[\iota\ \grave{ο}\phi\theta\text{αλμοῖσιν}], \\
\grave{ε}\nu\ \delta\grave{ε}\ \Delta\iota\grave{ο}\varsigma\ \text{Κρ}[\text{ο}]\nu\acute{ι}\delta\epsilon\omega\ \sigma\tau\acute{η}\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu\ \grave{ε}\delta\rho\iota\acute{α}[\epsilon\iota].
\end{array}$$

paragraphus

στίξω δ'ἐν κορυφῆι σε μέγαν καὶ ἀναιδέα λᾶαν,
　　　　　ὅς τε καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδεω κρατὸς ὑπερκρέμεται　　　　　5
Ταντάλωι ἀξυνέτου γλώσσης χάριν· ἦ μέγ' ἐκείνωι
　　　　　πῆμα καὶ εἰν Ἀΐδεω δώμασιν ἐστρέφετο.
ἦ μὲν δὴ καὶ θεοῖσιν ὁμέστιος ἀθανάτοισιν,
　　　　　ἦεν καὶ Ζηνὸς παῖς νεφεληγερέος,
καὶ πλούτωι καὶ παισὶ μέγας καὶ τίμιος αὔτως.　　　　　10
　　　　　ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὣς γλώσσηι δοὺς χάριν ἀξυνέτως
ποινὴν ἐξήλυξε· σὺ δ' ἔλπεαι ἔκφεύξεσθαι;
　　　　　μήπω τοῦτο [θ]εοῖς ἀνδάνοι ἀθανάτοι[ς].

paragraphus

αὐτὰρ ὑπέρ σ' ὀφρύων στίξω σὺν ἀργιόδοντα,
　　　　　ὅς ποτ' ἀν' Αἰτ[ω]λῶν ἐρχόμενος καμάτ[ους]　　　　　15
Ἀρτέμιδος βουλῆισι—τὸ γὰρ φίλον ἔπλετ[ο] κούρηι—
　　　　　σίνετο μὲν [σῖτ]ον, σίνετο δὲ σταφυλάς,
πολλοὺς δὲ σκ[ύλ]ακας θηρήτορας ἐξενά[ρι]ξεν,
　　　　　πρίν γ' ὅτε οἱ μελίην πῆξεν ὑπὸ λαπά[ρ]ην
Οἰνεΐδης Μελέαγρος· ὁ γὰρ θηρέστατος ἦεν　　　　　20
　　　　　πολλῶν ἡρώων σὺν τότ' ἀθροισαμένων.
ἤλυθε μὲν Θησεὺς Πιτθηΐδος, ἤλυθε δ' Αἴθων,
　　　　　ἤλυθε δ' Ἀγκαῖος σὺμ μεγάλωι πελέκει,
ἦλθον δὲ Λήδης κοῦροι καὶ Ζηνὸς ἄνακτος.

col. 2

1 ἀθάνα[τος P.　2 βλέπε[ι ὀφθαλμοῖσιν B&Ll-J.　3 ἑδριά[ει P.　6 ἐκείνωι vel ἐκεῖνος H.　9 παῖς corr. B&Ll-J.: παισι MS; παῖσι malunt A, G (vix recte).　10 παισί: primum ι suprascr. (πᾶσι plerique)　11 ἀλλ' οὐδ' H.: αλλουσδ MS; ἀξυνέτως: σ ex ι correctum P. et A.; ι ex σ correctum B&Ll-J.　12 ἐκφεύξεσθαι iam corr. P., εχφευ σασθαι MS　14 ὑπέρ σ' ὀφρύων vel ὕπερθ' ὀφρύων H., ὕπερθ' malit Ll-J.　15 καμάτ[ους] vel κάματ[ον] H.　16 ἔπλετ[ο] κούρηι P.　17 σίνετο μὲν σῖτ]ον iam B&Ll-J.　18 σκύλ]ακας iam P.; ἐξενά[ρι]ξεν iam B& Ll-J. (ἐξενά[ρι]ζεν P.)　19 οἱ Luppe ('an δὴ ?' H.)　20 de θηρεύτατος cogitavit S., sed non corrigere uoluit; ἦεν iam corr. P., ειεν MS　21 -σαμένων: α ex ο correctum　22 Αἴθων H. (αἴθων P.): ω ex inc.litt. correctum　23 Ἀγκ]αῖος iam P.: supra ντ suprascr. γκ　24 ἦλθον καὶ Λή]δης suppl. omnes ante P.Brux.; nunc fortasse corrigendum.

col. 3

```
                     [
      [
                     [
      [
                     [                              5
   .[
                     ...[
  ạ..[
                     βημ.[
  ..σγ.[                                            10
                     ...[
  ...  [
                     οξ.[
  πε..[
                     πε.[                           15
  φọ.[
                     πολ[
```

paragraphus

στίξ[ω

          οἷσι π[

η..[20

          τ.[

.. [

          ..[

[

col. 3

9 βήμεναι e.g. H.   18 στίξ[ω P.

It is now widely understood that this poem, preserved in *P. Brux.*inv.E.8934 and *P.Sorb.*inv.2254[2], consisted of a catalogue of mythological scenes which the narrator intends or threatens to tattoo onto the body of an adversary, who is most likely an erotic rival.[3] It should therefore be seen in the context of curse poetry, Ἀραί.

The *outré* subject matter, catalogue form and style have been seen to suggest a Hellenistic date, but the willingness to use unaltered or scarcely altered Homeric vocabulary suggests a date before the period of Callimachus, so that scholars have dated the poem to the first part of the third century B.C.E.[4] That the first punishment scene is that of the centaur Eurytion has been seen to suggest Hermesianax as the author, because Pausanias records that this centaur was treated by Hermesianax (Paus. 7.18.1 = Hermesianax fr. 9 Powell).[5]

[2] M. Huys, *Papyri Bruxellenses Graecae II.22, Le poème élégiaque Hellénistique P.Brux. inv.E.8934 et P.Sorb.inv.2254* (Brussels, 1991).

[3] This interpretation was first proposed by Lloyd-Jones and Barns before the discovery of the Brussels fragment (H. Lloyd-Jones and J. W. B. Barns, 'Un nuovo frammento papiraceo dell' elegia ellenistica', *SIFC* 35 (1963), 205–27; English translation in H. Lloyd-Jones, *Greek Comedy, Hellenistic Literature, Greek Religion and Miscellanea: The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford 1990), 196–215). It has been vigorously opposed by Giangrande (G. Giangrande, 'The Sorbonne Papyrus, Meleager and the Calydonian Boar', *MPhL* 8 (1987), 111–18, and 'A Hellenistic pentameter', in id., *Studies in Classical Philology* (Amsterdam, 1992), 39–48, apparently written before the Brussels fragment was made public) and his pupil Alexander (K. Alexander, *A Stylistic Commentary on Phanocles and Related Texts* (Amsterdam, 1988): not a commentary on Phanocles and 'related texts' but on Phanocles and the Sorbonne papyrus of the 'tattoo elegy'). The discovery of the new fragment constitutes an excellent example of an ingenious proposal being verified by the discovery of further evidence, and Giangrande now seems to be the only scholar who refuses to accept it ('Artemis, the Calydonian Boar and Papyri', *Habis* 29 (1998), 69–76: but his argument is extremely unpersuasive, though rich in *odium philologicum*). The phrase ὥς τε πυρὶ φλέγομαι (col. i.4) most likely implies an erotic context; cf. Huys (n. 2), ad loc.

[4] Lloyd-Jones and Barns (n. 3), seeing Phanocles as most similar of the early Hellenistic elegists; Huys (n. 2), 77ff., arguing for Hermesianax (see below). The papyrus has been dated palaeographically to the middle or the latter part of the second century B.C.E. On more complex use of Homeric vocabulary and phrasing in the later Hellenistic period, see now (e.g.) M. Fantuzzi, ' "Homeric" formularity in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes', in T. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos (edd.), *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden, 2001), 171–92 and M. Fantuzzi and R. Hunter, *Muse e modelli:la poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto* (Rome, 2002), 359–80.

[5] Huys (n. 2), 77ff. His argument was challenged by S. R. Slings, 'Hermesianax and the Tattoo Elegy', *ZPE* 98 (1993), 29–37, largely on the basis of metrical statistics. However, the sample sizes are small and surely do not justify any sort of certainty. Also, Slings does not sufficiently consider the possible impact of generic differences between poems (cf. his own data for Theocritus 15, and M. van Raalte, 'Greek elegiac verse rhythm', *Glotta* 66 (1988), 145–78 at 158 [and see his tables]

TATTOOS IN ANTIQUITY

Tattooing seems to have been practised by the Greeks primarily as a punishment for slaves and prisoners of war.[6] Decorative tattooing was seen as a manifestation of exotic, barbarian otherness, as in the longest surviving fragment of Phanocles (fr. 1 Powell), and other examples collected by C. P. Jones.[7]

Seen in this context, the notion of a poem in a broadly Homeric style, in which the narrator threatens his rival in love that he will tattoo him with a variety of scenes from (Greek) mythology, suggests a striking combination of Greek and non-Greek, and of 'high' themes with a context of 'low' life. The potentially elevated and serious nature of the heroic stories jars with the context of the thwarted lover taking revenge and with the idea of tattooing, associated in the Greek mind either with foreigners or with punishment of lowly persons or both. In this context, I propose to examine one part of the poem in more detail, to illustrate how the poet plays on these contrasts. In particular, I propose to demonstrate that, at the beginning of his description of the hunt for the Calydonian Boar, the poet creates repeated reminiscences of the beginnings of the Homeric poems: this enhances, I believe, the contrast between the elevated nature of the subject matter and the circumstances in which it is being described.

THE CALYDONIAN BOAR

The third image to be tattooed on to the body of the narrator's adversary (col. ii.14ff.) will be of one of the most famous paradeigmatic tales of the *Iliad*: the hunt for the Calydonian boar (*Il.* 9.529ff.). Of the three tattooed images which survive, this is the only one to be taken from Homer.[8] The poet emphasizes the Homeric status of the story with some pointed reminiscences. Most powerful is the use of the epithet ἀργιόδοντα (col. ii.14) of the boar, in the same final *sedes* as at *Il.* 9.539.[9] The reader may note here that there is an interesting contrast to be drawn with the introduction of the tattooist's previous subject at col. ii.4: μέγαν καὶ ἀναιδέα λᾶαν / clearly echoes *Od.* 11.598 (λᾶας ἀναιδής /), but with the difference that the Homeric line refers to the punishment of Sisyphus rather than that of Tantalus. In both instances the

---

on the differences between Callimachus' elegiacs in different genres, and between Theocritus' epic and bucolic hexameters); on all of this cf. H. Lloyd-Jones, 'Again the Tattoo Elegy', *ZPE* 101 (1994), 4–7.

[6] Cf. C. P. Jones, 'Stigma: tattooing and branding in Graeco-Roman antiquity', *JRS* 77 (1987), 137–55, esp. 146–50, and id., 'Stigma and tattoo', in J. Caplan (ed.), *Written on the Body: The Tattoo in European and American History* (Princeton, 2000), 1–16.

[7] Cf. Jones (n. 6), 144–6; Phanocles reveals the Greek attitude to tattooing by supposing that the origin of the Thracian custom was to do with punishment (ibid., 145). Lloyd-Jones (n. 1) tentatively raised the possibility that the papyrus elegy might be another part of the same poem as Phanocles fr. 1 Powell, but this strikes me as extremely unlikely, even discounting the possibility that the poem is by Hermesianax; Stobaeus surely quotes an entire item from Phanocles' catalogue of Ἔρωτες, as can be seen from its 3+4+4+3 couplet structure and neat final *aetion* (so that one Ἔρως must have been much shorter than one Callimachean *aetion*; cf. M. Marcovich, 'Phanocles ap. Stob. 2.20.47', *AJPh* 100 (1979), 360–6).

[8] Tantalus' sufferings are related in *Od.* 11.582ff., but Odysseus' account is of water and food disappearing out of reach, not of the stone above his head. Eurytion in this poem is not the same centaur as the Eurytion mentioned at *Od.* 21.295ff.: Huys (n. 2), 40.

[9] One suspects that a poet of Callimachus' generation would not have passed up a chance to use the Homeric *hapax* χλούνην (a word of uncertain meaning); cf. B. Hainsworth (ed.), *The Iliad: A Commentary*, Vol. 3, *Books 9–12* (Cambridge, 1993), on *Il.* 9.540 and Callimachus *h.*3.150 (the same word reapplied to κάπρον).

introduction of subject matter by the verb στίζω is followed by a clear Homeric reminiscence at the end of the line, but at ii.14, where the poet is using a story narrated in Homer, the reminiscence is to a Homeric source text for the same story, whereas at ii.4, where the subject matter is not Homeric, he takes a Homeric phrase and reapplies it to a new context.

Furthermore, θηρήτορας (col. ii.18) seems like an echo of the same word at *Il.* 9.544 (a Homeric *hapax legomenon*). Less specifically, the use of πολλοὺς at col. ii.18 and πολλῶν at col. ii.21 may recall the large number of parts of πολύς in Phoenix' account (*Il.* 9.540, 541, 544, 546, 547, 552).

I would argue, however, that these lines do not contain strong reminiscences only of the Iliadic passage from which the story is taken. The portion of the second column containing the beginning of our poet's description of the boar and the hunt for it resembles in structure and in specific phrasing the beginning of a Homeric epic, in a way in which the description of the other (un-Homeric) scenes does not. The basic structure of col. ii.14–24 is of a *proem* which introduces the main characters and tells some of what happens in the narrative (col. ii.14–20a), followed by a short 'bridge passage' (col. ii.20b–21) and then a briefly expressed catalogue of heroes (col. ii.22–4, and possibly more, since the third column is lacking entirely here, and never preserves more than a few letters). At this point, as the reader encounters a proem section followed by a catalogue, and is given clear cues to think of the Homeric source text for the story concerned, the sequence proem–catalogue has an epic resonance.

I now look at these lines in detail, attempting first to demonstrate that certain features in the text encourage the reader to use the beginnings of the Homeric epics as intertexts, and then to explore some of the consequences of doing so (col. ii.14–24):

> αὐτὰρ ὑπέρ σ' ὀφρύων στίζω σῦν ἀργιόδοντα,
>   ὅς ποτ' ἀν' Αἰτ[ω]λῶν ἐρχόμενος καμάτ[ους]
> Ἀρτέμιδος βουλῆισι—τὸ γὰρ φίλον ἔπλετ[ο] κούρηι—
>   σίνετο μὲν [σῖτ]ον, σίνετο δὲ σταφυλάς,
> πολλοὺς δὲ σκ[ύλ]ακας θηρήτορας ἐξενά[ρι]ξεν,
>   πρίν γ' ὅτε οἱ μελίην πῆξεν ὑπὸ λαπά[ρ]ην
> Οἰνεΐδης Μελέαγρος· ὁ γὰρ θηρέστατος ἦεν
>   πολλῶν ἡρώων σὺν τότ' ἀθροισαμένων.
> ἤλυθε μὲν Θησεὺς Πιτθηΐδος, ἤλυθε δ' Αἴθων,
>   ἤλυθε δ' Ἀγκαῖος σὺμ μεγάλωι πελέκει,
> ἦλθον δὲ Λήδης κοῦροι καὶ Ζηνὸς ἄνακτος.

Verse 16, Ἀρτέμιδος βουλῆισι—τὸ γὰρ φίλον ἔπλετ[ο] κούρηι—seems to recall the verse in the *Iliad* which appears to provide a divine driving force for the action of that poem (*Il.* 1.5): οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι, Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή. While there is little close reminiscence of vocabulary, except in the use of the key word βουλή, the similarities of structure and of sound (especially at the main caesura and at line end), in combination with the position within the poem and the similarity of sense, seem to me to indicate an echo of the Homeric line. It may be in order to emphasize the Homeric source that the poet has expanded Ἀρτέμιδος βουλῆισι with the otherwise somewhat redundant τὸ γὰρ φίλον ἔπλετ[ο] κούρηι.[10] The position within the proem seems similar when the reader reaches this point: the subject matter is introduced, it becomes the grammatical subject of a relative clause, and then the action is attributed to the βουλή of a deity, just as, in the *Iliad* proem, the μῆνις of Achilles is introduced

---

[10] Although the chatty aside is not in itself surprising. The phrase is a variation of the common Homeric φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῶι; cf. Huys (n. 2), ad loc.

as the subject matter, it becomes the grammatical subject of a relative clause (ἥ μυρί᾽ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε᾽ ἔθηκε κτλ.), and the action of the poem is then mysteriously attributed to the Διὸς βουλή.

Another cue seems to be present in col. ii.18. This verse, while it certainly recalls Il. 9.544 in the use of the Homeric hapax θηρήτορας (as noted above), also provides a clear echo of Il. 1.3: πολλὰς δ᾽ ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν. Again, the echoes of sense and verse structure are reinforced by the structure of the sentence. The subject matter is introduced, becomes the grammatical subject of a relative clause, and the deaths caused by the subject matter are presented in a line which recalls the equivalent line in the Iliad proem. It is also particularly sophisticated: at the beginning of the treatment of the Calydonian Boar, the poet recalls the beginning of the Iliad as a whole at the same time as recalling Homer's treatment of the same story.

Thus sensitized to Homeric references, and especially references to the Homeric proems, we may examine the Calydonian Boar section as a whole with these in mind, and consider what happens if we read the text with the Homeric proems beside us. The first line introduces the main subject of what is to follow—the boar—as the object of a verb, with an adjective attached. We may compare Μῆνιν . . . οὐλομένην (Il. 1.1) and Ἄνδρα . . . πολύτροπον (Od. 1.1) but we should also note the important difference that the action of the speaker (the tattooing) is placed before the subject matter, where in both Homeric poems the subject matter is first word. Furthermore, rather than commanding or asking a Muse or Muses, the narrator of this poem takes all responsibility for himself with the first-person στίξω, a verb to do with the visual domain rather than the spoken word. The difference thus emphasizes (a) the ecphrastic nature of what follows and (b) the aggressive presence of the narrator, by contrast with the self-effacing Homer.[11] The contrast with the allusion present in the introduction to the Tantalus passage has been mentioned above, and serves to emphasize the Homeric status of the Meleager story, by contrast with the other (non-Homeric) scenes which the narrator will tattoo.

Again as in the prologues to both Homeric poems, a relative clause follows introduced by ὅς (as in Od. 1.1, ἥ in Il. 1.2). As in Il. 1.2ff., the relative clause describes the damage caused by the thing which is the subject matter of the poem. The sequence of clauses is different from that in the Homeric poems, with the verb delayed until two verses later (col. ii.17), after the parenthetical verse 16 which I discussed above. Col. ii.17 does not recall any of the material in the Homeric proems, although perhaps the double structure was suggested by κύνεσσιν / οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι (Il. 1.4–5)[12] or the multiple combinations of two items in Od. 1.3–5. Then follows the very clear reminiscence of Il. 1.3 which I discussed above (col. ii.18).

Col. ii.19 is less closely related to the beginnings of the Homeric poems. The Iliad proem focuses not on the end to which the action is directed but on its beginning (except for the phrase Διὸς δ᾽ ἐτελείετο βουλή, which is much vaguer and does not provide information about the actual events of the plot) with the phrase ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα κτλ.; the Odyssey does look forward to the end of the poem (Od. 1.5–6):

---

[11] The first person will have seemed un-Homeric rather than un-epic, as the poets of the epic cycle were willing to present themselves in the first person: Ἴλιον ἀείδω καὶ Δαρδανίην εὔπωλον (Ilias parua fr.1.1 Davies = fr.28.1 Bernabé).

[12] This point holds regardless of the controversy concerning the reading πᾶσι versus δαῖτα in Il. 1.5, and the connection seems not to be sufficiently precise to shed light on that problem, for which see J. Latacz, R. Nünlist and M. Stoevesandt, Homers Ilias: Gesamtkommentar (Munich, 2003), vol. 1, fasc. 2,19–20.

ἀρνύμενος ἥν τε ψυχὴν καὶ νόστον ἑταίρων.
ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὥς ἑτάρους ἐρρύσατο, ἱέμενός περ·

Here the poet refers to what Odysseus does indeed accomplish (and what he fails to accomplish) during the course of the poem. While there is no strong verbal echo, there may be a slight reminiscence in terms of sense (both the *Odyssey* proem and the passage in the elegy have sufferings expressed in a line beginning with a form of πολύς, followed by a glance forward to what was achieved and the point at which the sufferings stopped). The reminiscence is not strong, but it operates in a context where the reader is already sensitized to expect one.

More explicit reminiscence of the proems of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* may be detected in col. ii.20–1, where again the poet combines reminiscence of Homeric proems and of the Meleager episode in *Il.* 9:

ὁ γὰρ θηρέστατος ἦεν
πολλῶν ἡρώων σὺν τότ' ἀθροισαμένων

Huys ad loc. does not provide any parallel for πολλῶν ἡρώων in this position (though ἡρώων is common in the equivalent hexameter *sedes*). He comments that the adjective 'en faisant écho au πολλούς de la 1.18, renforce le parallélisme entre hommes et animaux'.[13] In addition, I would suggest, the poet has in mind *Od.* 1.3 / πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων as well as the enjambed / ἡρώων of *Il.* 1.4. It also seems likely that he may have had in mind κλέα ἀνδρῶν / ἡρώων at *Il.* 9.524–5, where Phoenix introduces the story of Meleager.[14] Again, both the Iliadic source of the Meleager story and the beginnings of the Homeric poems seem to operate as intertexts for the tattoo elegy.

THE LENGTH OF THE SECTION

Unfortunately, we do not know at what length the boar hunt was described. The account of Eurytion must have taken up twenty-four lines (allowing for only one pentameter to have been lost after col. i.7); that of Tantalus ten. If the description of the hunt continued until col. iii.17 (where a paragraphus is followed by στίξ[ω), then it would have taken up twenty-eight lines. However, the upper part of the third column is totally lost, so there may well have been a change of section earlier on. Obviously, the scribe might not have marked every change of section anyway.[15] Huys

[13] Of course, the echo of *Il.* 1.3 in v. 18 also reinforces the parallelism between men and animals.

[14] The most 'conventional' expression with which to fill the first half of the pentameter would have been / ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, as at *Od.* 4.268, 11.629, 14.97, 24.25, and at Hes. *Op.* 159, *Scutum* 19 (= fr.195 M.-W. u.19), fr. 204 M.-W. u.119 and possibly fr. 200 M.-W. u.9 (πάντων Wilamowitz, ἀνδρῶν Kretschmer); the word ἡρώων in the same *sedes* at *Il.* 18.56 and 18.437 (both in the formula / ἔξοχον ἡρώων) and at *Od.* 7.44, 8.242, 11.329 and fr. 200 M.-W. (see above). The most common formula with ἡρώων in the *Iliad* is ἀνδρῶν / ἡρώων, which occurs at 5.747, 8.391, 9.525, but only once in the *Odyssey* (1.101). The gen. pl. ἡρώων does not occur elsewhere in extant elegy as represented in the *TLG*; however, it should probably be restored at Simonides 11.14W (the Plataea elegy; in the same *sedes* as here).

[15] He need not have been especially careful; there is a certain *lacuna* after col. i.7, and there are minor errors at col. i.23, col. ii.9 (the MS reading is aggressively but unpersuasively defended by Alexander [n. 3] and by Giangrande [n. 3, 1992]), 11, 12, 20. If one agreed with Slings (n. 5) that the poet uses initial liquid to make position too much, one might consider ἦλθον καὶ Λήδης (the reading of all scholars before the discovery of the Brussels fr.) at ii.24 (an easy corruption with δέ

would like the section on the hunt to be fairly short, in order to make the first item in the catalogue longest, as in Hermesianax fr.7 Powell.[16] If, as he suggests, the description of the hunt might have been wrapped up within the first five lines of the third column, then the large amount of material recalling the proems to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* would be especially striking and incongruous. In any case, one feels that it would help to judge the effect of the echoes described above if one knew at what length the hunt was described.

CONCLUSIONS

I believe that I have demonstrated that the poet does not only use a generally Homeric vocabulary and style in the lines discussed, but that in addition to reminiscences of his Homeric source in the speech of Phoenix in *Iliad* 9 he also employs a number of reminiscences of the proems to the Homeric poems, especially the *Iliad*. This would appear to be a way of giving a sense of grandeur and elevation to his description of the mythological *exemplum*. But at the same time, there is a lack of 'fit'. The reader still remembers that what is being described is what is to be tattooed on to the poet's personal enemy, probably as a consequence of erotic rivalry, and this scarcely corresponds in theme to the loftiness and importance of the two epics. I would suggest that the poet's reminiscences of the epic proems create a (characteristically Hellenistic) sense of irony, and that the narrator undermines himself by implicitly comparing the subject matter of his tattooing to the works of the greatest poet. This piquancy enhances the more basic mismatch between the 'high' mythological themes of the ecphraseis and the rather less elevated circumstances and means of their being depicted which I suggested at the beginning of this article.[17] One might compare the beginning of Callimachus fr. 67 Pf., where the implicit analogy between Acontius and Odysseus is witty and ironic because we can see that the story which Callimachus tells is in no respect analogous to the *Odyssey* in elevation or significance.[18]

   It has been made clear above that I think that the poet's combination of reminiscences of Homeric material from different places displays a fair amount of sophistication (perhaps especially, I would suggest, in the combination of echoes of

---

twice in the two previous lines and a delta immediately above where the scribe was reading); if one were as worried as Slings by θηρέστατος at ii.20, one might consider his θηρεύτατος, which he dismisses as 'correcting the author himself' (Slings (n. 5), 25, n. 16).

   [16] Huys (n. 2), 80–1.

   [17] Possibly the poet's partiality for μέγας and cognates (Huys [n. 2], 41), which might seem rather banal on a first reading, contributes to this ironic flavour; the poet's emphasis on the 'bigness' of the characters and situations of the myths to which he refers reminds the reader that these things are imagined as being tattooed on a much smaller scale. This mismatch emphasizes the more general mismatch between the myths and the imagined situation of the poem.

   [18] An equivalent to Callimachus' reference to scholarly controversy over the text does not seem to be present in the tattoo elegy. Alan Griffiths points out to me that this mismatch between erotic themes and mythological *exempla* is also commonplace in Propertius; nevertheless, I would not categorize this poem with the other (probably) Hellenistic elegiac fragments discussed and related to Roman elegy by B. L. Butrica, 'Hellenistic erotic elegy: the evidence of the papyri', *Proceedings of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 9 (1996), 297–322, since (if the context here is indeed erotic) there does not seem to be the same degree of correspondence between the mythological material and the 'real-world' context as Butrica argues for (Tantalus' punishments and the hunt for the Calydonian boar had nothing to do with Eros; cf. Herwig Maehler's review of Huys (n. 2) in *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 54 (1997), 371, where he indeed argues from this that we should not see an erotic context at all).

Il. 1.3 and 9.544 presented in col. ii.18). Slings in particular has taken a very negative view of the quality of the poem,[19] regarding the echo of *Od.* 11.598 at col. ii.4 as unsubtle, and condemning the repetition between col. ii.6 and 11. Personally, I find the very close repetition of εἰν ᾿Αΐδεω between col .ii.5 and 7 more troubling, especially given the additional aural and structural similarities between col. ii.3 ἐν δὲ Διὸς Κρ[ο]νίδεω στήθεσιν ἑδριά[ει] and 7 πῆμα καὶ εἰν ᾿Αΐδεω δώμασιν ἐστρέφετο. At any rate it must be conceded that these judgements are somewhat subjective.[20] Moreover, a degree of roughness of style may be considered appropriate to the angry nature of a curse poem; one does not do well to complain that the poem is not as smooth as a catalogue of poet's love affairs like Hermesianax fr. 7 Powell or an elegant aetiological treatment of the death of Orpheus like Phanocles fr. 1 Powell. Nor should one judge this poet as if he were trying to imitate the probably later Callimachus.[21]

Perhaps this discussion of the poet's allusive play on the beginning of the Homeric poems allows us to see him as rather more sophisticated than had previously been apparent.

University College London   RICHARD RAWLES

richard.rawles@ucl.ac.uk

---

[19] Slings (n. 5), 34–5.
[20] Cf. Lloyd-Jones (n. 5).
[21] As Slings (n. 5), 35 appears to do; cf. Lloyd-Jones (n. 5).