

P. A. HANSEN

DIOGENES THE CYNIC AT VENICE

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 82 (1990) 198–200

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn

DIOGENES THE CYNIC AT VENICE

εἶπέ, κύων, τίνος ἀνδρὸς ἐφεστῶς σῆμα φυλάσσεις; -
 τοῦ Κυνός. - ἀλλὰ τίς ἦν οὗτος ἀνὴρ ὁ Κύων; -
 Διογένης. - γένος εἶπέ. - Σινωπεύς. - ὃς πίθον ᾧκει; -
 καὶ μάλα· νῦν δὲ θανὼν ἀστέρας οἶκον ἔχει.

Helmut Häusle's *Sag mir, o Hund - wo der Hund begraben liegt* (Hildesheim 1989) centres its contribution to the interpretation of Greek funerary epigrams around AP 7.64 which purports to be the epitaph of Diogenes the Cynic. I have just reviewed the book for the *Classical Review*, where the reader can find my views on Häusle's interpretation. It is Häusle's merit to have drawn attention to the apparently completely forgotten evidence for the inscriptional nature of the epigram. The basic facts are of considerable interest and deserve more attention than they can be given in a review.



G. Wheler and I. Spon saw the epigram in Venice in 1675 'upon a Marble, under the *Basso-relievo* of a Dog' (Wheler, *A Journey into Greece* [1682] 444). Wheler p.445 has the above engraving (with errata p.[14]). Spon, *Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce, et du Levant* 3 (1678) 60f. gives the text in capital letters. S. Maffei, *Museum Veronense* (1749) p.lxviii gives the first four words plus a reference to the Anthology. Häusle on pp.9f. with note 46 substantially misinterprets the evidence because (1) he uses Spon's book only,

seemingly unaware of Wheler's book with the engraving; (2) he is unaware that the Corinthian alphabet had long since ceased to be generally used by the late fourth century; and (3) his ideas about forms and syntax need revision. Spon vol.3 pp.60f. has:

ΕΙΠΕ ΚΥΩΝ ΤΙΝΟΣ ΑΝΔΡΟΣ
 ΕΦΕΣΤΩΣ ΣΗΜΑ ΦΥΛΑΣΣΕΙΣ
 ΤΟΥ ΚΥΝΟΣ ΑΛΛΑ ΤΙΣ ΗΝ
 ΟΥΤΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ Ο ΚΥΩΝ
 ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΓΕΝΟΣ ΕΙΠΕ ΣΙ
 ΝΟΠΕΥΣ ΟΣ ΠΙΘΟΝ ΩΙΚΕΙ
 ΚΑΙ ΜΑΛΑ ΝΥΝ ΔΕ ΘΑΝΩΝ
 ΑΣΤΕΡΑΣ ΟΙΚΟΝ ΕΧΕΙ

Wheler's engraving p.445 (with the three corrections p.[14]) gives:

ΕΙΠΕ ΚΥΩΝ ΤΙΝΟΣ ΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΕΦΙΣΤΑΣ ΣΗΜΑ ΦΥΛΑΣΣΕΙΣ
 ΤΟΥ ΚΥΝΟΣ ΑΛΛΑ ΤΙΣ ΗΝ ΟΥΤΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ Ω ΚΥΩΝ
 ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗΣ ΓΕΝΟΣ ΕΙΠΕ ΣΙΝΟΠΕΥΣ ΟΣ ΠΙΘΟΝ ΩΙΚΕΙ
 ΚΑΙ ΜΑΛΛΑ ΝΥΝΔΕ ΘΑΝΩΝ ΑΣΤΕΡΑΣ ΟΙΚΟΝ ΕΧΕΙ

Spon (like Maffei) mentions the Anthology, Wheler does not. I have italicised the divergencies from the Anthology (*APL.*) in both texts. When one reaches ὁ κύων in v.2, the situation is odd: Spon has the correct text and the wrong translation ('ὁ chien'), and Wheler the wrong text and the right translation. ὦ and Σινοπεύς are probably simple misreadings of the stone, one corrected from the Anthology by Spon, the other not. ΜΑΛΛΑ is a careless partial correction of an error in the engraving. I imagine that Wheler's ἐφιστάς is a subconscious substitution of a more familiar form (Häusle's idea that Spon understood ἐφιστώς as ἐφιστός is unintelligible). κύων is interesting. It is found not only in both the above versions but also in Maffei and therefore has a good chance of being the form on the stone. Häusle thinks that this could conceivably weaken the case for a fourth century date of the stone. But κύων for κύον is also found in Archipp. 6, and nominatives instead of vocatives are not altogether rare in the fourth century (see the apparatus on *CEG* 2.530.1). I add that the text on the stone is unlikely to have been copied from a collection (*AP* and *APL.* agree over the reading κύον. The early editions all have κύον not κύων, with the sole exception of the third Aldine 1550 and the pirated reprint of it bearing the same year [which S.F.W.Hoffmann in his *Bibliographisches Lexicon* 1² (1838) 169 mistakenly calls a reprint of the second Aldine]).

Häusle considers the 'Steinbefund' 'gröblich missverstanden'. 'Es dürfte sich um eine rundplastische Darstellung eines Hundes und um den Inschriftenstein, der als Basis oder Kapitell gedient hat, gehandelt haben.' This assertion is based upon Diogenes Laertius 6.78 coupled with ignorance of the English book. The illustration is clearly somewhat stylised (e.g. the frame does not necessarily imply that the stone was a base [the form that the picture is given in the French translation of Wheler 1689 = 1723 is an aberration]), and the spaniel

ear of the otherwise quite convincing Greek dog can surely without qualms be attributed to Wheler or his draftsman/engraver), but together with the explicit 'under the *Basso-relievo* of a Dog' it leaves no doubt about what Wheler is indicating. D.L.'s κίονα καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶ λίθου Παρίου κύννα is not necessarily in contradiction with Wheler, since κίων can indicate all sorts of pillars, and reliefs on pillars are well attested (cf. e.g. *CEG* 2.743 and 744). But we must also bear in mind that D.L. is unlikely to have seen the monument he describes.

There is nothing strange in finding inscriptions from Greece at Venice or Verona (cf. e.g. *CEG* 1.178 and 2.521), and the content of the epigram gives no grounds for denying it a fourth century origin. Regarding v.1 and the structure of the entire epigram, Häusle very rightly compares (pp.23-7) the Thessalian fifth century epitaph *GVI* 1831 = *CEG* 1.120, and he thinks (p.32) that v.4 may have been known to Cercidas (D.L. 6.76f. = fr. 1 Powell), which seems quite likely. Häusle is inclined to accept the monument as authentic. Above, I hope to have strengthened his case, and I consider that denying authenticity might be a little eccentric. I therefore sadly note that this epigram should have been in *CEG* 2, as indeed it would have been if I had studied Jacobs or Dübner or Stadtmüller (or Wheler and Spon already used by me for *CEG* 2.767) with sufficient zeal. It is little consolation that it was ignored by Peek; that Gow & Page's interest limits itself to the one word 'fictitious' (*HE* 2 p.367); and that neither the Budé editors nor Beckby seem aware of the epigraphic evidence. It is a great shame that Häusle's book and my *CEG* 2 appeared at the same time. On the one hand, this deprived Häusle of the possibility of pointing out my oversight. On the other, I missed the opportunity of correcting it in time. The epigram will now - in due course - have to be *CEG* 3 no.? = 653a.