«Prometheus» 48, 2022, 86-95

A NOTE ON AN EPIGRAM OF MELEAGER (*AP* 7.79.5-6)

AP 7.79 by Meleager (Gow-Page, *HE* CXXI) is a fictitious epitaph for Heraclitus of Ephesus structured as a dialogue between the philosopher himself, speaking from the tomb, and an anonymous passerby. The poem takes its cue from the antisocial reputation attributed to the philosopher by Diogenes Laertius (9.1-3)[1]. Here is the text of the epigram according to Beckby's second edition of the *Greek Anthology*[2], slightly modified at the beginning:

Ὤνθρωπ'[3], Ἡράκλειτος ἐγὼ σοφὰ μοῦνος ἀνευρὼν
φαμί. – "Τὰ δ' ἐς πάτραν κρέσσονα καὶ σοφίης." –
Λὰξ γὰρ καὶ τοκεῶνας, ἰὼ ξένε, δύσφρονας ἄνδρας,
ὑλάκτευν. – "Λαμπρὰ θρεψαμένοισι χάρις." –
Οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμεῦ; – "Μὴ τρηχύς." – Ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ
τρηχύτερον. – "Πάτρας χαῖρε σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου."

"Man, I am Heraclitus, the only one who found wisdom,
I declare it." – "Yes, but the duty towards the fatherland matters more than even wisdom."
– "I trod underfoot, oh stranger, even my parents, evil people,
by barking at them." – "How grateful to those who raised you!"
– "Why don't you get out of my way?" – "Don't be so harsh!" – "For soon you too will hear
something harsher." – "Greetings to you from your fatherland, Ephesus[4]."

Editors have puzzled over the poem mainly for the controversial allocation of the last lines to their respective speakers. In this paper I will focus on the assignment of speakers in the last couplet of the poem, for which I will offer my own interpretation on the basis of a distribution of the lines which has never been suggested so far by editors and scholars. I argue that

[1] For a general analysis of Meleager's epigram see K. J. Gutzwiller, *Style and Dialect in Meleager's Heraclitus Epigram*, in E. Sistakou and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Dialect, Diction, and Style in Greek Literary and Inscribed Epigram*, Berlin-Boston 2016, 253-268, who focuses on the literary aspects of the poem in order to show how the interaction between diction, style and dialect reflect Heraclitus' philosophy and style as presented in the biographical tradition. Cf. also F. Cairns, *Hellenistic Epigram: Contexts of Exploration*, Cambridge 2016, 432-435.

[2] H. Beckby, *Anthologia Graeca*, München 1967-1968², ii.58.

[3] The Ionic (psilotic) form is the reading transmitted in the Heid. Pal. gr. 23 (mid-tenth century) – the famous manuscript preserving the so-called *Palatine Anthology* (the poem is omitted in the *Planudean Anthology*, compiled by the monk Maximus Planudes in 1299 or 1301). The Attic form (ὤνθρωφ') is a correction by J. J. Reiske, *Anthologiae Graecae a Constantino Cephala conditae libri tres*, Lipsiae 1754, 72 (ep. DLX), accepted by later editors. On the superiority of the former see now K. J. Gutzwiller, *Poetic Meaning, Place, and Dialect in the Epigrams of Meleager*, in R. L. Hunter, A. Rengakos, E. Sistakou (eds.), *Hellenistic Studies at a Crossroads: Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts*, Berlin-Boston 2014, 92-93.

[4] The translation is my own.

the segment Μὴ τρηχύς, ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ / τρηχύτερον (lines 5-6) should be kept together and attributed to the passerby, whereas the final words Πάτρας χαῖρε σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου belong to Heraclitus and mean "Greetings to you from the fatherland Ephesus", that is, "our common fatherland Ephesus". For at this very last stage the reader finally discovers what the *pointe* of the poem is: both the philosopher and the passerby are from Ephesus, thus the passerby's hostile tone towards Heraclitus finds its justification, as the latter was often mistreated and blamed by his compatriots for his antisocial and abusive attitude. After the threat of the passerby (lines 5-6), Heraclitus' χαῖρε (line 6) sounds nice, polite and submissive to all appearances, but the fact that the philosopher makes his greeting come from Ephesus, flags up his detachment and disinterest, as well as disguises ironically his hope of getting rid of the passerby: in other words, actually that χαῖρε here is not conveying greetings after all, but it means essentially "get away from here". In this way the final words of the poem (Πάτρας χαῖρε σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου), uttered by Heraclitus, can be reconnected with the passerby's objection to the philosopher's focus on wisdom at line 2, when the interlocutor had stated that matters concerning one's fatherland are more important than wisdom, a patent criticism to Heraclitus' neglect for serving in government.

In the opening words the deceased philosopher addresses a passerby to give, in epitaphic form, his name and the reason for his fame. After Heraclitus' proud statement that he was the one and only to have found wisdom (lines 1-2), the reply that there are more important values than wisdom (line 2) cannot belong to anyone else but the passerby[5]. Therefore, the foreigner replies, accepting Heraclitus' claim to be a famed philosopher, but openly criticising his lack of interest in participating in the governing of Ephesus and accusing him of attacking his parents. The allusion here is probably to the fact that, when the philosopher was asked by the Ephesians to be their lawmaker, he declined the offer by adducing as excuse their inadequate constitution and preferred to go play knuckelbones with children, saying that "it is better to do this than engage in civil life with you" (κρεῖττον τοῦτο ποιεῖν ἢ μεθ' ὑμῶν πολιτεύεσθαι, D. L. 9.3; cf. Luc. *vit. auct.* 14).

The second couplet, *pace* Lloyd-Jones[6], clearly falls within two parts: first we have Heraclitus' claim to have attacked even his parents as δύσφρονας (by leaving it understood that just as he attacked his parents, he clearly was able to show an abusive behaviour against the citizens of

[5] Cf. M. L. West, *An epigram on Heraclitus (A.P. vii. 79 = Meleager 121 [4654] Gow-Page)*, "CR" 17, 1967, 127.

[6] H. Lloyd-Jones, *Again Meleager's Epigram on Heraclitus*, "CR" 18, 1968, 21.

Ephesus and the people in general, too); without denying 'barking' at his parents, he also admits simultaneously and indirectly to criticising other men, considered as foolish as his parents. Afterwards, the passerby makes the ironic remark that the philosopher does not show gratitude towards those who raised him[7].

The poem belongs to a well-established tradition of epitaphs dedicated to misanthropes, of which the most famous is the series dedicated to Timon[8]. This epigrammatic subcategory involves conventionally and notoriously antisocial characters such as the poets Archilochus and Hipponax[9] and Heraclitus himself. The main feature of these epitaphs is that the dead misanthrope always shows an abusive behaviour towards the passerby by refusing to identify himself, to greet his interlocutor or dialogue with him, thus reversing one of the most typical literary conventions of Greek epigrams, especially epitaphs. One may add to this tradition a further group of poems containing curses and threats against tomb desecrators[10]. Within this subgenre of funerary epigrams for misanthropes, Heraclitus' hostile attitude towards his parents finds a counterpart in Theodorid. *AP* 7.479.6 (Gow-Page, *HE* XVI), where the (deceased) philosopher is said to bark against the people. It is likely that in our poem, as well as in that by Theodoridas, the metaphor of the dog applied to Heraclitus reverses a metaphor used by Heraclitus himself in fr. 97 DK κύνες γ ἀρ καταβαῦζουσιν ὧν ἂν μὴ γινώσκωσι: in this passage he displays a scornful behaviour, which clearly emerges through all of his extant work, towards the masses, who are described as a pack of "dogs" (κύνες) barking (καταβαῦζουσιν) against the unknown (ὧν ἂν μὴ γινώσκωσι). In Leon. *AP* 7.408.3 (Gow-Page, *HE* LVIII), Hipponax as well is said to bark insults against those who gave birth to him. In these passages the mention of Heraclitus' and Hipponax's parents respectively is not specifically confirmed by the biographical tradition, which does not represent them as abusive towards their parents: it likely expresses a hyperbolic concept of aggressiveness, which does not spare anyone and never ceases[11]. Therefore, the accusation, directed to Heraclitus,

[7] For the irony on the lack of χάρις in Meleager see *AP* 12.137.5 (Gow-Page, *HE* CXVIII).

[8] Cf. M. Fantuzzi, *Epigram*, in M. Fantuzzi and R. L. Hunter, *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge 2004, 302-306.

[9] Cf. R. M. Rosen, *The Hellenistic Epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax*, in P. Bing and J. S. Bruss, *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram. Down to Philip*, Leiden-Boston 2007, 459-476.

[10] Cf. L. Floridi, *The Epigrams of Gregory of Nazianzus Against Tomb Desecrators and Their Epigraphic Background*, "Mnemosyne" 66, 2013, 55-81.

[11] One may compare the similar image of the poet-wasp, applied not only to Hipponax, but also to another invective poet, Archilochus, in Gaet. *AP* 7.71.6 (Page, *FGE* IV). In Call. fr. 380 Pf. the images of the wasp and the dog are both referred again to Archilochus.

of treating his parents abusively seems to stem from the Ionian tradition of iambic poetry, just like the philosopher's neglect for political affairs highlighted at line 2 was a well-established and anchored theme in his biography, too. This *topos* of Heraclitus' disinterest in political life, on which our poem is built, is the key to appreciate the *pointe* in the last couplet arranged as I suggest.

Coming to the last couplet, after a quick exchange at line 5 betweeen Heraclitus (Οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμεῦ;) and then the passerby (Μὴ τρηχύς), like Beckby[12], other editors[13] already identify the change of speaker from the latter to the former after τρηχύς: yet it seems irrelevant, if not contradictory, for the philosopher to threaten the unknown passerby with the drastic and abrupt rudeness of οὐκ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ;, which sounds conclusive, at least in the moment. Moreover, splitting the sequence Μὴ τρηχύς, ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ / τρηχύτερον into Μὴ τρηχύς (passerby) and Ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ / τρηχύτερον (Heraclitus) is not acceptable because it is evident that it is an only statement consisting of a main clause and a causal subordinate which must be uttered by the same character (the passerby, in my opinion). While Dübner[14] and Stadtmüller[15] attribute the final words χαῖρε σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου to the passerby (and attach πάτρας to the previous section, then assigning it to Heraclitus)[16], Gow and Page[17], who adopt the same arrangement as Paton[18], consider σὺ δ' desperate:

– Οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμεῦ; – Μὴ τρηχύς. – Ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ 5
τρηχύτερον πάτρας. – Χαῖρε. – †Σὺ δ'† ἐξ Ἐφέσου.

Apart from the position of δέ at line 6, in general they believe there is no remedy at all, as the text they print is "most disagreeable"[19]; particularly the

[12] Beckby (n. 2), ii.58. P. Waltz, *Anthologie grecque. Première partie*: *Anthologie Palatine*, Paris 1960, iv.91, prints exactly the same arrangement of the last couplet as Beckby.

[13] Dübner in F. Dübner - E. Cougny, *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et appendice nova epigrammatum veterum ex libris et marmoribus ductorum*, Paris 1864-1890, i.289; H. Stadtmüller, *Anthologia Graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea*, Leipzig 1894-1906, ii.56; W. R. Paton, *The Greek Anthology*, Cambridge MA-London 1916-1918, ii.48. A. S. F. Gow - D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*, Cambridge 1965, i.249; D. L. Page, *Epigrammata Graeca*, Oxford 1975, 286 (ep. CXXI).

[14] Dübner (n. 13), i.289.

[15] Stadtmüller (n. 13), ii.56.

[16] – Οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμεῦ; – Μὴ τρηχύς. – Ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ 5
τρηχύτερον πάτρας. – Χαῖρε σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου.

[17] Gow and Page (n. 13), i.249; cf. also Page (n. 13), 286.

[18] Paton (n. 13), ii.48: "– Be off! – Don't be rough. – Because you may soon hear something rougher than my people heard from me. – Farewell. – And you get out of Ephesus." Particularly "And you get out of Ephesus" cannot be tolerated as the rendering of the elliptic Σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου.

[19] Gow and Page (n. 13), ii.672, *ad loc*.

sense of Σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου is puzzling, whether it means "Greetings/Farewell to you from Ephesus" or "You are from Ephesus". In addition, the two editors think that the alternatives χαῖρε σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου or χαῖρε σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου (uttered by the passerby) cannot be tolerated in the renderings "Farewell to you from Ephesus" and "Hail, you (the man) from Ephesus", unless δ' is emended into γ'.

Those editors who instead more correctly keep together the words Μὴ τρηχύς, ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ / τρηχύτερον, take further stands that can be grouped in four main approaches, listed below:

a) Pontani[20] brings the passerby's speech to an end with πάτρας (...τρηχύτερον πάτρας); then we have the common greeting χαῖρε assigned to Heraclitus and, finally, the passerby passes on greetings from the city of Ephesus to her illustrious, yet late, citizen:

– Οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμεῦ; – Μὴ τρηχύς, ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ
τρηχύτερον πάτρας. – Χαῖρε. – Σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου[21].

Pontani believes that with his threat, the passerby means the exile; then, according to the editor's interpretation, Heraclitus pays his farewell, to which the passerby replies with a wishful greeting that good luck comes from his fatherland, which is odd because actually Ephesus has always mistreated and hated him[22]. This abrupt change of tone is surprising, so the greetings from Ephesus cannot be other than sarcastic (although Pontani does not clarify his point of view on this): his compatriots are glad to have gotten rid of Heraclitus, who continues to be so abusive even in his death. The main criticism to move to this reconstruction is that to send Heraclitus off into exile is an awkward threat, given that the philosopher is dead, even if we think that the Ephesians do not want to have even his dead body buried there. For we cannot argue from the poem where Heraclitus' body is thought to be. Apart from this, this distribution is also problematic because of πάτρας: first of all, which fatherland is here implied, the passerby's or Heraclitus' one? Since it would sound rather inconsistent that the anonymous passerby refers to his own, equally unknown, fatherland, thus it must be

[20] F. M. Pontani, *Antologia Palatina*, Turin 1979-1981, ii.46.

[21] "– Vattene. – Niente durezze! Ché avrai dalla patria più dure nuove. – Salute! – Altrettanto, e da Efeso."

[22] Pontani (n. 20), ii.506: "Uno straniero rimprovera al filosofo Eraclito di Efeso, del quale riconosce la vantata sapienza, un atteggiamento irriguardoso verso la patria e i parenti. Il filosofo si giustifica affermando d'avere abbaiato contro i suoi perché malvagi; spazientito dall'ironico commento dello straniero, lo scaccia. Ma lo straniero lo invita a deporre la durezza, facendogli intravvedere dure misure (l'esilio) che la patria prenderà a suo riguardo. Allora il filosofo formula un addio augurale e lo straniero lo ricambia: tocchi anche a Eraclito la buona sorte, e gli venga dalla sua patria".

Heraclitus' one, that is, Ephesus. Yet, as it stands, the word is confusing: it would be better to attach it to Ἐφέσου.

b) In the arrangement proposed by Lloyd-Jones[23] the section μὴ τρηχύς-χαῖρε (...τρηχύτερον πάτρας. χαῖρε.) is attributed to the passerby, so that the last words closing the poem (σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου) are given to Heraclitus:

– οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμεῦ; – μὴ τρηχύς, ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ 5
τρηχύτερον πάτρας. χαῖρε – σὺδ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου.

Lloyd-Jones thinks that by stating the stranger's place of origin, the philosopher implies that being an Ephesian makes happiness impossible. Moreover, the scholar makes also Heraclitus supply the reader with an explanation of the passerby's hostile tone, thus indicating that the main point of the epigram lies in its suggestion that all that negativity about Heraclitus derives from the malice of the Ephesians. This explanation is charming and certainly Lloyd-Jones is right by pointing out that the passerby is from Ephesus, too. However, that polite χαῖρε following immediately the threat sounds abruptly mismatched if uttered by the passerby, unless it is reckoned as sarcastic. Like in Pontani's arrangement, the main issue with this division of the lines is that it is affected by similar difficulties and discrepancies concerning πάτρας, which once again remains pending and is deprived of an unequivocal and necessary reference within the last couplet.

c) West[24], resuming a distribution of lines which had been previously adopted by Boissonade[25] and Meineke[26], ascribes the passerby the entire section μὴ τρηχύς-Ἐφέσου:

– οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμεῦ; – μὴ τρηχύς, ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ 5
τρηχύτερον πάτρας. χαῖρε. σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου.

Both Boissonade and Meineke consider ironic the passerby's greeting. West believes that the epigram implies that Heraclitus is exiled because of his misanthropy. This is possible, although it is odd and a bit tautological that the passerby reminds the philosopher about his place of origin; also, the distribution of speech provided is unlikely. For as such, the sequence μὴ τρηχύς-Ἐφέσου seems a rather long, unbroken sentence, whereas σὺ δ' at line 6 after σύ in the previous verse (line 5) clearly and unequivocally suggests a change of speaker. Besides (and especially), this arrangement does

[23] Lloyd-Jones (n. 6), 21.

[24] West (n. 5), 127-128: "– Be off! – Do not be rough, for you in your turn may hear some rough tidings, from your fatherland. Farewell: but remember that you are from Ephesus."

[25] J. F. Boissonade, *Eunapii Sardiani Vitae Sophistarum et Fragmenta Historiarum*, Amstelodami 1822, i.241-242: "Tum abit viator, Heraclitum non sine ironia salvere et gaudere jubens".

[26] A. Meineke, *Delectus poetarum Anthologiae Graecae*, Berolini 1842, 172-173.

not allow Heraclitus any room for a final reply, as would be expected from so peculiar a protagonist of the epigram.

d) Moving away from the options presented above, Jacobs[27] (and, previously, Graefe, with a slight alteration, though)[28] had correctly isolated the phrase Πάτρας χαῖρε σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου[29]:

– οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμεῦ; μὴ τρηχύς, ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ 5
τρηχύτερον – πάτρας χαῖρε σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου.

Jacobs does not clarify his interpretation, but conjectures an unnecessary *lacuna* before the last couplet, attributing the segment πάτρας χαῖρε σὺ δ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου to the passerby and assigning Heraclitus the long section οὐκ ἀπ'-τρηχύτερον. However, the diction of the second and the third couplet does not make the reader think that there is something missing between the second and the last distich, for it is a matter of linking what the passerby observes at line 2 and what it implies in the last two lines. Moreover, ascribing the philosopher the whole segment οὐκ ἀπ'-τρηχύτερον seems pointless because, as I have already stated above, the impolite οὐκ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ; unambiguously marks the end of a speech and, simultaneously, a certain change of speaker.

Taking my cue from Jacobs's (and Graefe's) proposal, I too believe that the final section πάτρας-Ἐφέσου should be considered as an independent sentence[30], but I ascribe it to Heraclitus instead. It is true that the position of the particle δέ, bothering Graefe as well as Gow and Page, is a bit awkward, but such a postponement is not at all impossible[31]. Therefore, I suggest that

[27] F. Jacobs *Anthologia Graeca ad fidem codicis olim Palatini, nunc Parisini ex apographo Gothano edita*, Lipsiae 1813-1817, iii.235-6, *ad loc*.

[28] F. Graefe, *Meleagri Gadareni Epigrammata*, Lipsiae 1811, 136, *ad loc*. (ep. CXVIII), considers the position of δέ problematic ("perversa particulae δέ positio"), so he suggests:

οὐκ ἀπ' ἐμεῦ; μὴ τρηχύς, ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ 5
τρηχύτερον – πάτρας χαῖρε σὺ δ' OR γ' ἐξ Ἐφέσου.

[29] Graefe (n. 28), 39 (ep. CXVIII), does not specify clearly his chosen arrangement for the previous segment of text, before πάτρας. Neither Reiske (n. 3), 72 (ep. DLX), does show clearly the distribution of lines 5-6 between the two speakers through editorial expedients in the text or in his notes, so it is impossible to understand his position.

[30] So did Beckby (n. 2), ii.58, and Waltz (n. 12), iv.91, who assign the line to the passerby.

[31] Cf. e.g. Leon. *AP* 5.206.5 = Gow-Page, *HE* XLIII ἡ φίλερως Σατύρη δὲ τὸν ἕσπερον οἰνοποτήρων, Mnasalc. *AP* 6.268.2 = Gow-Page, *HE* II τοῦτο σὺ δ' εὐθήρου, Anon. *AP* 7.169.5 = Page, *FGE* LXVIII εὐνέτις ἦν δὲ Χάρητος, Anon. *AP* 9.366.8 Ἔγγύην φεύγειν' δὲ Θαλῆς Μιλήσιος ηὔδα, Euen. *AP* 9.602.5 = Gow-Page, *GPh* IV νυμφίος ἐκ νύμφης δὲ κικλήσκομαι, *AP* 11.49.3 = Gow-Page, *GPh* VI χαίρει κιρνάμενος δὲ τρισὶν Νύμφαισι τέταρτος, Adae. *AP* 9.300.5 = Gow-Page, *GPh* VII συλήσας κεφαλῆς δὲ διπλοῦν, Bianor *AP* 10.22.3 = Gow-Page, *GPh* XVIII τὸν ἐκ χέρσου δὲ φύλαξαι, Autom. *AP* 12.34.5 = Gow-Page, *GPh* XI

the last two lines should be distributed between the two speakers as follows:

– Οὐκ ἀπ᾽ ἐμεῦ; – "Μὴ τρηχύς, ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ 5
τρηχύτερον." – Πάτρας χαῖρε σὺ δ᾽ ἐξ Ἐφέσου.

"Won't you get out of my way?" – "Don't be so harsh, for soon you too will hear something harsher." – "Greetings to you from (our) fatherland, Ephesus[32]."

According to the attribution of the lines proposed above, after the break on his parents (lines 3-4) and the passerby's ironic remark closing line 4, the disgruntled philosopher rudely sends away his hostile interlocutor (line 5 οὐκ᾽ ἀπ᾽ ἐμεῦ;), who then replies by exhorting the philosopher not to be τρηχύς: he too is able to reply in a harsh way, τρηχύτερον actually ("harsher")[33]. After this, in the last line of the epigram (line 6), Heraclitus sends greetings from Ephesus, which could seem unexpected: yet the moment represents a sort of *agnitio*, because it is only then that the philosopher appreciates that his supposedly 'foreign' interlocutor must be an Ephesian like him[34], one of those citizens he despised like his allegedly δύσφρονας parents. Therefore, on the part of Heraclitus sending greetings to the passerby from Ephesus, *their* own motherland and place of origin, is a way to unmask his own fellow citizen, if not friendly, in a sort of "I know who you are!" moment. At the same time, once the passerby's place of origin is acknowledged, his aggressive manners are explained, too: like his compatriots, he is hostile to Heraclitus because of the philosopher's abusive and antisocial behaviour and

ἐγὼ παίζων δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν, Phil. *AP* 9.85.5 = Gow-Page, *GPh* XXXIX ἤγαγεν εἰς λιμένας δὲ καὶ ἔσπειρεν δὶς ὁ πρέσβυς, *AP* 9.247.3 = Gow-Page, *GPh* XLIV λουσαμένη Βρομίῳ δ᾽ ἔστην πάλιν, Strat. *AP* 11.117.7 = °101 Floridi ἵππον ἀπὸ σπιθαμῆς δὲ μόλις βλέπει, *AP* 12.8.5 = 8 Floridi μᾶλλον τῶν καλύκων δ᾽ ἐρυθαίνετο καὶ κατακύψας, *AP* 12.205.2 = 46 Floridi πρὸς τὸ θέλειν δ᾽ οὐκ ἀμύητα γελᾷ, D. L. *AP* 7.112.2 θαυμάζω τοῦτο μάλιστα δ᾽ ἐγώ, *AP* 7.122.3 ἵνα μὴ τούτους δὲ πατήσῃ, Greg. Naz. *AP* 8.173.3 ὃς βήματα δ᾽ ἡμὶν ἐγείρει, Jul. Aegypt. *AP* 7.587.3 οὐχ ὡς ναυηγὸς δὲ βυθῷ θάνες, Anon. *AP* 15.19.2 μετὰ τὴν φθορὰν δὲ τοῦ γάμου τῆς ἁρπαγῆς, Anon. *APl* 386.5 τὸ νεῦμα χεὶρ μένει δέ. For the position and the postponement of δέ see in general J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*, Oxford 1954, 185-189.

[32] The translation is my own.

[33] For a comparable situation one may adduce lines 704-705 from Euripides' *Alcestis*, where Pheres, offended by Admetus, ends his *rhesis* with the words εἰ δ᾽ ἡμᾶς κακῶς / ἐρεῖς, ἀκούσῃ πολλὰ κοὐ ψευδῆ κακά ("if you tell me bad things, you will have to hear many likewise, and true ones, too"). The translation is my own.

[34] Cf. Gutzwiller (n. 1), 265, who shares the take that both speakers are Ephesians: in order to support this position, she argues that the Ionic elements in the poem direct towards that conclusion (and that is why she convincingly shows that ὤνθρωπ᾽ at the beginning of the poem is the correct textual choice). However, one should note that the vocative ἄνθρωπ᾽/ ὤνθρωφ᾽, which is frequent in epigrammatic contexts, often shows textual fluctuations: cf. L. Floridi, *Lucillio. Epigrammi*, Berlin-Boston 2014, 555-556, on Lucill. °°134.1 = *AP* 9.573.1 ὤνθρωφ᾽; F. Condello, *Sulla posizione del* Par. Gr. *2739 (D) nello stemma codicum dei Theognidea*, "IncTs" 18, 2018-2019, 72 and n. 238.

his disinterest in politics during his lifetime, for which he was often blamed[35]. He recognises his compatriot and reveals him to the reader as one of those who hated him. One may infer that Heraclitus, facing the passerby's sharp reaction, displays a compliant attitude and addresses him with a kind greeting (χαῖρε). Yet his politeness is only apparent: for the philosopher, in the hope of getting rid of the stranger, does not send his own greetings, but ironically from his fatherland, in order to highlight his detachment and disinterest, as well as to hide his intolerance. In general, this behaviour recalls that of Timon in *AP* 7.320.3-4 (Gow-Page, *HE* VIII) by Hegesippus[36], where the dead even accepts to be insulted by the passerby, as long as the latter goes beyond his tomb and leaves him in peace.

By making the passerby express the threat, Meleager is clearly and quite originally varying the pattern of the epitaphs for misanthropes refusing to engage kindly with the passersby and attacking him, with the passerby keeping a polite attitude throughout: for here not only does Heraclitus attack the passerby, but also the passerby, without pulling himself together as usually expected, replies to Heraclitus as a misanthrope with a counter-attack. However innovative and rare this variation of the common motif would appear, it could be paralleled by two epigrams belonging to the epigrammatic series on the Spartan mother, *AP* 7.433.5-8 (Gow-Page, *HE* VI) by Tymnes and *AP* 7.531.7-8 (Gow-Page, *GPh* XXIII) by Antipater of Thessalonica, although the situation narrated in them is not absolutely identical: for in these poems the woman (acting as an aggressive passerby and replacing his role), after receiving her son back from the battlefield still alive, curses and threatens him, proclaiming that he is not her child or a true Laconian while stabbing him to death for having fled his place in battle and, thus, dishonouring his fatherland. More in general, one may object that threatening someone who passed away is odd because technically the dead are not liable to suffer any harm or enjoy any pleasure any longer. However, in the Underworld the deceased are believed to be still suffering the pains or enjoying the pleasures of lifetime: in Book 7 of the *Greek Anthology* this

[35] The ending of the poem likely plays on the topical reputation of abusive moral criticism attributed to Ephesus. For example in Call. *Ia*. 13, perhaps recalled in this context as well, Callimachus in the shoes of an iambic poet resists to his insisting critic that as such (as a iambographer, therefore as an invective poet practising abusive and aggressive verse) he should "go to Ephesus" (fr. 203.12-14 and 64-66), a suitable location acknowledged as the motherland of abusive criticism.

[36] Τίμων μισάνθρωπος ἐνοικέω. ἀλλὰ πάρελθε
οἰμώζειν εἴπας πολλά, πάρελθε μόνον.
"There I, Timon the misanthrope, dwell. But do move on,
even wishing me greatly to go to rack and ruin, as long as you move on!"
(The translation is my own).

theme is exploited particularly in epitaphs for shipwrecked men who, being buried on the shore, continue to be tormented by the sea even after death; it can also be found in a series of epitaphs for Anacreon pictured as though in the Underworld he was still enjoying the joys of love and the symposium[37]. The motif is especially used in epitaphs for misanthropes as well, where these antisocial characters are represented as still moved by the same disappointment and hatred feelings towards mankind as during lifetime. According to this pattern, in our poem Heraclitus as a misanthrope consistently continues to be so abusive even in his death and deserves to be told off, like his malitious citizens used to do when he was still alive.

Such a division of speech, which has a lot to offer to our understanding of the poem and makes the *pointe* of the last couplet stand out more neatly, not only provides crucial clues to the proper interpretation of the epigram, but also supports the characterisation Meleager gives to the famed philosopher as an abuser misanthrope and as a neglectful citizen who does not want to engage with the political life of his fatherland, then reproducing a well-attested pattern in the biographical sources. Specifically, the distribution of lines in the final couplet as suggested above has the merit of freeing the text from any major ambiguity due to the opaque presence of πάτρας, which then, once attached to Ἐφέσου, improves the general rendering and appears completely justified by revealing to be a clear reference to Ephesus and not to any unknown place from which the passerby is supposed to come. At the same time, by assigning once and for all χαῖρε to Heraclitus, the text is released from a superfluous and odd mutual exchange of greetings between the passerby and the philosopher, which is unclear whether it should be taken as ironic or not otherwise. Last but not least, the distribution of the lines I present here removes the ambiguous elliptic σὺ δ’ ἐξ Ἐφέσου, which has raised so much confusion among the editors because of its debated meaning.

Newcastle University ARIANNA GULLO

ABSTRACT:
This paper concerns the last couplet of an epitaph by Meleager for Heraclitus of Ephesus (*AP* 7.79.5-6), arranged as a dialogue between the deceased and a passerby. It argues that the segment Μὴ τρηχύς, ἐπεὶ τάχα καὶ σύ τι πεύσῃ / τρηχύτερον should be taken together and attributed to the passerby, whereas the final words Πάτρας χαῖρε σὺ δ’ ἐξ Ἐφέσου should be assigned to Heraclitus.
KEYWORDS:
Epigram, Epitaph, *Greek Anthology*, Meleager, Heraclitus, Passerby.

[37] *AP* 7.23-33.