

M. A. JOYAL

P. OXY. 3722: TWO OBSERVATIONS ON THE ANACREON COMMENTARY

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 81 (1990) 103–104

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



## P.OXY. 3722: TWO OBSERVATIONS ON THE ANACREON COMMENTARY

As H.Maehler has remarked in editing this commentary on Anacreon, "the gain, as far as new lines or works of Anacreon are concerned, is very modest."<sup>1</sup> Perhaps I may nevertheless offer two brief notes.

1) The representation by Anacreon of Eros as an oppressive impulse may be detected in two of the certain lemmata: 3722.1.26 Ἔρως κακέ, τρύγησ.[ or Ἔρως κάκ' ἐτρύγησ "e.g., ἄνθη), cf. AP 12.256 (Meleager)" (Maehler, 4); less positively 3722.2.1 θεράπων ἔμηνεν, if the θεράπων be identified as Ἔρως (Maehler, 5).<sup>2</sup> Such descriptions are hardly unexpected, but may be added to the already existing stock of similar instances in Anacreon's poetry.<sup>3</sup>

On 3722.3.6-7 ]αττα τύραννα Professor Maehler comments: "if τύραννα (n. plur.) paraphrases the preceding word, this cannot have been δυν]άττα (voc.); possibly ἀπέλ]αττα 'unapproachable' (Simon. 29B.?), or βι]αττά 'violent, if the scholion continued with something like ὁ λόγο[σ δὲ νοεῖ καὶ ἄ]νομα. (Dr. Leofranc Holford-Strevens suspects a scribal error for τύραννε.)" The reason for excluding τύραννα from consideration as a lemma is the space between it and ]αττα (separation and dicolon are used in this papyrus to distinguish lemmata from commentary [Maehler, 1]). But to judge from the photograph which the editors reproduce in Plate I, the space is not very marked, the less so if the a preceding τύραννα has lost part of a tail.<sup>4</sup> However this may be, if τύραννα is a paraphrase it is, I think, a rather curious one; in an exegetical context we should expect instead the much more common τυραννικά.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, if it were the case that the adjective τύραννα is a lemma, it would antedate our earliest extant occurrence of the word ([Aesch.] PV 761) by perhaps 75 years or more. Better to follow Dr. Holford Strevens and understand the vocative τύραννε (τύραννα by assimilation with the ending of the preceding word).

This clears the way for a limited degree of interpretation. If we can trust that τύραννε is not a lemma, it must be explained (to account for the vocative) as paraphrase, thereby removing any obstacle from the restoration of δυν]άττα (vel sim.) in line 6. This word will

<sup>1</sup> The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, LIV, edd. R.A.Coles, H.Maehler, P.J.Parsons (London, 1987) 1 (hereafter "Maehler"); see also M.L.West, ZPE 75 (1988) 1-2.

<sup>2</sup> For μαίνομαι in an erotic context in Anacreon, cf. 359.2 PMG, 428.2 PMG, P.Oxy. 3695.18.7 (with Haslam's note on line 1).

<sup>3</sup> See my forthcoming article "Anacreon fr. 449 (PMG)" in Hermes 118 (1990) (especially n.8).

<sup>4</sup> The space is not as distinct as those in, e.g., fr. 1.25,2.4, cited by Maehler, 1.

<sup>5</sup> Again, if τύραννα is a paraphrase, the two supplements proposed by Professor Maehler must come into question. Perhaps βιαττά is the more plausible, especially if something along the lines of the supplement ὁ λόγο[σ δὲ νοεῖ καὶ ἄ]νομα did in fact follow. But for the rare βιαττά is it not more likely that we would find as a paraphrase or gloss simply βίαα?

then, no doubt, represent the addressee of the verb μ]έμφεται in the previous line. The remains of this particular fragment are too exiguous for us to be at all certain about the nature of the complaint in 5 or the identity of the putative δυνάκτης in 6. However, since in the article cited above (n.3) I have argued for Anacreon's use of the metaphor of the erotic tyrant in fr. 449 PMG (132 Gentili), in a context which likely expressed a degree of invective,<sup>6</sup> I would suggest (with due caution) that here as well, in a papyrus that seems uniformly concerned with things erotic and symptomatic in Anacreon's poetry (cf. Maehler, 1), we have a reference to a similar kind of despot (in which case this passage may be classified also with note 1) above); cf. esp. Anacreontea fr. 1.4-5 West (= 505d PMG) ὄδε [sc. Ἔρωσ] καὶ θεῶν δυνάκτης, / ὄδε καὶ βροτοὺς δαμάζει; also Anacreontea 15.7-10 West, with the discussion of these lines in my op.cit. (n.3 above). But I doubt that here Eros himself could be δυνάκτης; for while the poet may of course address the god directly (cf. fr. 1.26 in note 1 above), it would be very unusual for him to speak of the "criticisms" (n.b. μ]έμφεται) of Eros. It seems that we have to do instead with a human erotic tyrant. The hint of discord implied by μ]έμφεται in line 5 encourages me to consider the possibility that the commentary is here discussing the same poem as that to which the meagre fr. 449 alone bears witness.<sup>7</sup>

ADDENDUM: Professor H.Maehler has very kindly inspected P.Oxy. 3722.3 at my request and informs me that my suspicions about the loss of part of a tail of the final α of ]αττα in line 6 are unfounded. He also reaffirms his initial judgement that ]αττα is the end of a lemma. My argument in 2) above is, however, substantially unaffected.

Memorial University of Newfoundland

M.A.Joyal

---

<sup>6</sup> See especially my op.cit. (n.3 above) n.9.

<sup>7</sup> For a discussion of the erotic tyrant metaphor before Anacreon (Archilochus 23.20 West [= P.Oxy. 2310 fr. 1]), see M.L.West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin, 1974) 119-20; A.Pippin Burnett, *Three Archaic Poets: Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho* (Cambridge, Mass., 1983) 72-6 (with references in 74 n.58); against their interpretations of this line in the Archilochus fragment see now S.R.Slings in J.M.Bremer, A.Maria van Erp Taalman Kip, S.R.Slings, *Some Recently Found Greek Poems* (Leiden, 1987) 5-6 (cf. also West, CR n.s. 39 [1989] 10; M.Davies, *Gnomon* 61 [1989] 99). On the post-Anacreontic use of the motifs of lover as tyrant, or love as tyrant or tyranny, see my op.cit. (n.3 above) nn.7 and 12.