

dieser Übereinstimmung schließen läßt, daß auch unser dem 7.—6. Jh. entstammendes Tongefäß der Aufbewahrung des Geldes gedient hat, dann ist man berechtigt, in *urna tita* eine volkstümliche Bezeichnung des Geldtopfes zu sehen. Dann hätte *tita* weder mit dem Bildwort ital. *tetta* noch mit dem Personennamen *Titus* (wohl) etruskischer Herkunft etwas zu tun, sondern es würde seinerseits als Onomatopoeikon („*Klimper-topf*“) ¹⁸⁾ zu lat. *tinnire*, *tintinnabulum* gehören. Ähnlich heißt ja auch heute im ital. Volksmund die Sparbüchse *dindarolo*, das Geld in der Kindersprache *dindo*, Wörter, die zu einer Schallnachahmung *din din* ¹⁹⁾ gehören.

Ist nun aber diese Annahme richtig, so können wir an Hand von *urna tita* in der Ceres-Inschrift *urnela [ti]tela* ergänzen, die spielerische Verkleinerung einer Wortverbindung, die vielleicht sonst zu banal, zu alltäglich geklungen hätte.

Korrekturzusatz: Herr Hofrat Vetter teilt mir mit Schreiben vom 19. 6. 58 einen beachtenswerten Vorschlag zur Ergänzung der ersten Zeile mit. Mit seiner frdl. Erlaubnis sei er hier wiedergegeben:

„Ich möchte am Anfang lesen ME[LC]TOM (oder ME[LQ]TOM) und sehe darin die Urform von lat. *multum*. Das Lautliche ist . . . in Ordnung; schwieriger ist das Bedeutungsgeschichtliche.

Es würde anzunehmen sein, daß der Begriff (wie ja so vieles andere) aus der Landwirtschaft stammt: ein „geklopftes“ Maß ist ein reichliches Maß einer Körnerfrucht und in der Ceres-Inschrift in der Verbindung mit *far* sicher noch in seiner ursprünglichen Bedeutung empfunden. Eine Prüfung der ältesten Belegstellen wäre jetzt nötig; vielleicht ergibt sich für die ältesten Belege eine gewisse Beschränkung des Sprachgebrauchs. Die Stelle aus Varro, ling. Lat. 5. 177 wird dabei zu berücksichtigen sein.“

Innsbruck

Johann Knobloch

A CYPRIAN EXHORTATION TO SOBRIETY

O. Hoffmann, *Die griechischen Dialekte* (Göttingen 1891 bis 98) I, 144; cf. I. H. Hall, *J. Amer. Or. Soc.* X (1880) pp. 209—11 and Plate IV; R. Meister, *Die griechischen Dialekte* (Göttingen 1882—89) II, 157—9; H. Collitz *SGDI* (Göttingen 1883—1915) no. 68; Bannier *BphW* (1917) coll. 1446—8.

18) Man würde an dt. *Klingelbeutel* denken, wenn dieser nicht nach dem Klingeln des unten angebrachten Glöckchens benannt wäre.

19) W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* ³, Heidelberg 1935, Nr. 2644 a: *dind* ‚hin- u. her bewegen‘ (zweifelloch ursprünglich Schallwort).

Hoffmann's interpretation is as follows; —

*ka-i-re-te / ka-ra-si-ti / va-na-xe / ka-po-ti /
 ve-po-me-ka / me-po-te-ve-i-se-se /
 te-o-i-se / po-ro-a-ta-na-to-i-se / e-re-ra-me-na /
 pa-ta-ko-ra-i-to-se /
 o-vo-ka-re-ti / e-pi-si-ta-i-se / a-to-ro-po / te-o-i /
 a-le-tu-ka-ke-re /
 te-o-i / ku-me-re-na-i / pa-ta / ta-a-to-ro-po-i /
 po-ro-ne-o-i / ka-i-re-te /*

χαίρετε. γράσθι, φάναξ κα(π) πῶθι. Γέπο(μ) μέγα· μέποτε
 Φείσεε

θεοῖς πόρῳ ἀθανάτοις ἐρεραμένα πά(ν)τ' ἀκοραίτῳς.
 οὐ γάρ τι ἐπίσταίς ἀ(ν)θροῦπῳ θεῶι, ἀλ(λ) ἔτυχ' ἃ χέρ
 θεῶι κυμερέναι πά(ν)τα τὰ ἄ(ν)θροῦποι φρονέῳι. χαίρετε.

„Iß und trink, o Herr. Ein großes Wort ist: Verlange niemals, ohne Rücksicht auf die unsterblichen Götter, alles das, was du wünschst, unverkürzt. Denn nicht der Mensch hat die Herrschaft über die Gottheit, sondern dem Gotte ward die Hand, alles das zu lenken, was die Menschen denken.“

The above text and translation are printed without comment by E. Schwyzer, *Dialectorum graecarum exempla . . . potiora* (Leipzig, 1923) p. 333, no. 685¹ (under the title „Specimina titulorum prorsus dubiae interpretationis“).

The lines are carved, according to Hall, „on a piece of soft stone . . . Above, near the center, is a sitting figure, 6 inches high, on a throne, with scepter and thunderbolt; Zeus, to all appearance. Above the back of the throne is a broken, winged figure, probably the eagle, but somewhat suggestive of a sphinx. To the left, behind the throne is a standing figure, 4 inches high; to the right, another standing figure, 6 inches high, with indications of another where the stone is worn and broken.“

Most of the difficulties of reading and interpretation have already been solved by the German scholars named above. The groups for which no satisfactory solution has yet been found are: *e-re-ra-me-na*, *pa-ta-ko-ra-i-to-se*, *e-pi-si-ta-i-se*, *a-to-ro-po*, and *ku-me-re-na-i*.

The obscurities of the Cyprian syllabary and dialect are in this text balanced by metrical requirements. The hexameter form determines the number of syllables and the length of each within quite narrow limits. Metrical crudities may of course be

expected to occur in a document of this kind, but they are only to be postulated and accepted as a last resort.

I propose the text and translation that follow in the hope that they may remove some of the outstanding problems. Hall's facsimile, which is the only one available to me, shows that, although most of the signs are quite legible, a few are not; and even among those that seem most clearly preserved there are some that have given rise to variant readings in the past. I have ventured to make four changes in l. 2, in three cases where the surface of the stone is obviously damaged and in one other where the confusion of two similar signs appears possible; I have also reverted to one of Hall's readings in l. 3, although Hoffmann and others discarded it. In other respects I adhere to the syllabic values quoted in Hoffmann's version.

χαίρετε. γραῶθι, Φάναξ, κὰς πῶθι. Φέπος μέγα μήποτε Φείσης.

θεοῖς περὶ ἀθανάτοις ἐγγραμμένα πάντ' ἀκρατήτως.

οὐ γὰρ [ἔτι] ἐπιστάτησ' Ἀτροπος θεῶι, ἀλλ' ἔτυχ' ἔ Κήρ

θεῶι κυμερῆναι πάντα τὰ ἀνθρωποι φρονέωι. χαίρετε.

Hail. Eat, my lord, and drink. Never utter (?) a boastful word.

By the immortal gods all things are hedged about insuperably.

For Fate did not obtain power over the god, but Death was given

To the god that he might keep in check all the thoughts of men. Farewell.

1. γραῶθι ... καὶ πῶθι, Neubauer. Cf. Hesychius s. v. γραῶ φάγέ, Κύπριοι; and see LSJ s. vv. γράω, γραῶσις etc. Φάναξ, cf. Schwyzer, *op. cit.* 680. 2, with note.

One might be tempted at first sight to suppose that Φάναξ referred to Zeus and that offerings of food and drink to the god were meant. But the second part of l. 1 is obviously addressed to a human being, and it is difficult to believe that there is a change of person between the two parts. So Φάναξ must be an earthly prince. In this case he may be a living prince, such as might be entertained in a *πρυτανεῖον* at public expense; then the verses may represent a general welcome to public guests of this type, exhorting them in the Greek style to enjoy themselves with decorum. On the other hand, the subsequent mention of Fate and Death might suggest that the prince is dead. In this case, however, the fact that he is not named, together with the

apparent uselessness of advising someone in the other world how to behave at a banquet are overwhelming difficulties. I therefore assume that the stone is addressed to a living prince, perhaps to an individual who was the ruler of the community concerned (and so did not need to be named) but perhaps to any one of a group of princes who were maintained in the public banqueting-hall.

κᾶς, Cyp. for καί. Final *s* is omitted also from the following word *Ἐέπος* (μέγα) and from Ἄτροπος (θεῶι). In all three cases there is a close rhythmical connection between the two words concerned.

Ἐέπος μέγα. Bannier compared Theognis 159 *μήποτε . . . ἀγορᾶσθαι Ἐέπος μέγα*. The prince (or princes) is warned against boasting under the influence of food and drink.

Ἐείσης, 2s. aor. act. subj. from *Ἐέλ-/Ἐί*, cf. Skt. *ve-/vy-*; see LSJ s. vv. *εἶσομαι* II, *ἔημι* (with etymological note). So Hoffmann, perhaps correctly. The active form of this stem with the inflection of the *s*-aorist appears to be unattested elsewhere in Greek. Possibly *Ἐείσης* is no more than a heteroclitite form of *εἰδῆς* (*οἶδα*). The occurrence of *φρονέωι* in l. 4 may be thought to indicate that thoughts rather than spoken words are in question; cf. the Homeric use of *ἄγρια, ἦπια, αἴσιμα, ἄρτια* etc. as object of *εἰδέναι*. In this case, however, *Ἐέπος* would be a curious object. (For the form, cf. Elean *Ἐειζῶς*.)

θεοῖς . . . ἀθανάτοις, dat. agentis with *ἐγγραμμένα*; see below. *περί*. Hall and most editors read *po-ro*, but Collitz has *pe-re*. The notion that *po-ro* could stand for *πόρ(ρ)ω* (with the Attic resolution of *rs* to *rr*) is untenable, and the resulting sense is far from impressive. Similarly, *πρό* gives poor sense, whether as a preposition or as an adverb or as a pre-verb in *imesi* with *ἐγγραμμένα* (or any other participle). Now, although in Hall's facsimile the *po* looks clear enough, the difference between Cyp. *po* and *pe* is slight and Collitz actually thought that *pe* was written here. The second syllable is obviously damaged and cannot be read with certainty. I suggest *περί*, to be taken in *imesi* with *ἐγγραμμένα*. The traces of the sign on the facsimile can be reconciled with Cyp. *ri*.

ἐγγραμμένα. The editors read *e-re-ra-me-na*, and this is certainly the spelling indicated by the facsimile. But metre then demands *ἐρερά(μ)μένα*, and it seems impossible

to interpret this as Greek. The passive participle of ἐράω (if it existed) would hardly fit the context; and that of ῥάπτω, with double reduplication (if that were possible), although it might seem to offer good sense in itself, sc. ‚devised‘, ‚contrived‘, would, with περί, give only the very late and rare compound περιρράπτω or, with πρό, the non-existent προρράπτω. But, while the second sign as drawn by Hall looks like Cypr. *re*, it would not be difficult to confuse *re* with Cypr. *ka* on a roughly inscribed and damaged stone; *re* looks like two chevrons, one above the other, and *ka* like one chevron over a capital T upside down. I believe that *e-ka-ra-me-na* may have been written here, sc. ἐγραμμένα. The compound περιγράφειν ‚circumscribe‘ is attested first in Herodotus and is used from his time on in a variety of contexts, with both literal and metaphorical connotations; see LSJ s. v. Reduplication of the stem of γράφειν by simple ἐ- is not unparalleled; cf. Cret. ἐγρατται etc., quoted in LSJ s.v. and in the grammars.

ἀκρατήτως. Here most editors have *pa-ta-ko-ra-i-to-se*; Collitz has *sa* for *i*. In fact only the top half of this sign is preserved and Hall's drawing suggests that it is as likely to be *te* as *i*; Collitz's *sa* is improbable. The sign transcribed *ko* is by no means a typical example of Cypr. *ko*, which is a fairly large sign consisting of two vertical strokes (curved slightly outwards from each other) with a cross-bar at the top. This is a small chevron with short straight lines, similar to those found in Cypr. *re* and *ka*. Here I conjecture that *ka* was written and that only the chevron at the top has survived. Admittedly, however, Hall does not show any abrasion at this point. Yet *ka* has the advantage of producing a good Greek adverb ἀκρατήτως, which is used by Aristotle and later writers in the sense of ‚unsubdued‘. In this text I fancy that it may mean ‚in a way that cannot be overcome‘. This at least fits the context. Hoffmann's ἀκοραίτως, the most plausible alternative so far put forward, is a linguistic fiction without any basis in Greek usage.

3. οὐ γάρ. The effect of γάρ in relation to the sentence beginning with ἀλλά is apparently proleptic: ‚although (or while) Atropos did not . . . , Death gave the god power to . . . “ It is because of the power to inflict Death that the gods, who

are not subject to this disability, are able to control men. But οὐκ ἄρ' is not impossible.

[ἔτι]. There can be no doubt that the mason inscribed here the equivalent of οὐ γὰρ ἔτι. But I feel sure that he was in error. I have found only one way of making οὐ γὰρ ἔτι scan, and that is with elision before a following word ἐψῖταις. But ἐψῖταις, although it might have been 'banqueters' (cf. ἐψία, ἐψιάομαι), does not exist; and I have found it impossible to reconcile it satisfactorily with the rest of the line or with the adjacent verses. The reading οὐ γὰρ τι, which some editors favour, cannot be made to scan at all. It seems to me that the mason spelled out οὐ γὰρ ἔτ(ι) by mistake, simply because it was a frequent opening for hexameters, and that he then added the following ἐπι-, which is correct, and ignored his error. Dittography of this kind is not uncommon in inscriptions of the classical period.

ἐπιστάτησ' Ἄτροπος. Although the editors read *e-pi-si-ta-i-se a-to-ro-po* and interpret these words as ἐπίσταίς ἀνθρώπου, 'supervision of man (subjective genitive) over god (ethic dative)', Hall's facsimile shows a plain *te*, not *i*, in the first word; and that is what Hall himself professes to see there. The current interpretation is dubious in grammar and sense and from the standpoint of scansion is impossible (it demands either οὐ γὰρ τι ἐ- or οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἐ- in the first foot). The change of medial σ to *h* in ἐπίστασις might be paralleled by φρονέωι in the next line, but this possibility can hardly affect the argument for or against ἐπίσταίς.

The reading of this part of the line is dictated by *a-to-ro-po*. Having in view *ta-a-to-ro-po-i* in the next line, which must be τὰ ἀνθρωποι, editors try to read ἀνθρωπος, ἀνθρωπον or ἀνθρώπου here. But this is only possible metrically if something like ἐπίσταίς or ἐψῖταις is read in the preceding group; and, as we have seen, these versions not only set aside Hall's *te* but are themselves improbable in metre or sense (or in both). In addition, the following reference to Κήρ and the power of god over man suggests that a straightforward statement concerning the immortality of gods may be required here. By reading Ἄτροπος, we obtain this kind of statement; and at the same time we make it easier to resolve the problems of scansion. Plainly Atropos, the Fate who cuts short human life, has no power over a god.

For the omission of final *s*, cf. *κὰς*, *Φέπος*, l. 1.

It is then possible to read *ἐπιστάτης(ε)*, supposing the stemvowel of *ἐπιστάτέω* to be lengthened *metri causa*. For *ἐπιστατέω* of supervising, controlling see LSJ s. v. 1; it has both literal and metaphorical uses. For the lengthened $\bar{\alpha}$ cf. Parmenides fr. 16.2 Diels-Kranz *παρίσταται* (perhaps also Empedocles fr. 108.2); also Theocritus 2.149 *ἔραται*, 1.78 *ἔρασαι* (perhaps also Sappho fr. 16.31—2 *ὄττω τις ἔραται*, although this is generally regarded as a subjunctive); and conceivably also *διαβάτης*, 'one who crosses', *διαβήτης*, 'divider', 'compass'; *ἐπιβάτης*, 'passenger', *ἐπιβήτης*, 'incomer'. The frequent alternation between $\sigma\bar{\alpha}$ - and $\sigma\acute{\alpha}$ -, $\beta\bar{\alpha}$ - and $\beta\acute{\alpha}$ -, $\varphi\bar{\alpha}$ - and $\varphi\acute{\alpha}$ -, in the paradigms of these verbstems might provide a sufficient excuse for a metrical experiment of this nature. *Ἐπιστάτης* (f., with Ionic *η*) is possible, but the following *ἔτυχε* suggests that an aorist is more appropriate here.

ἄ Κήρ. The German editors read *ἄ χῆρ*, but the metaphorical uses of *χείρ* seem not to extend to the kind of power wielded by a god over men. I had thought of *ἄ χρή*, but this seems irrelevant to the context. The simplest reading and the one most easily associated with the rest of ll. 2—4 is *ἄ Κήρ*. The personified figure of Death is common in the poets from Homer on, and Death is the chief instrument of Zeus in punishing those who speak boastfully, i. e. whose thoughts exceed the limits allowed to mortals on earth.

The use of the definite article is odd; it does not occur elsewhere in these verses. Both with adversative *ἀλλά* it is idiomatic enough.

θεῶι, Zeus, portrayed in the relief-sculpture above the inscription. Zeus is the god who both guards the laws of hospitality and punishes evildoers amongst men. So also *θεῶι*, l. 4.

4. *κυμερῆναι*. The syllabic signs appear to be quite certain. Accordingly there can be little doubt that *κυμερῆναι*, a by-form of *κυβερνᾶν*, was intended. Although *κυμερνάτας*, a variant on *κυβερνήτης*, is attested in an inscription from Lesbos (see LSJ s. v.), it is not easy to account for the loss of the stem-consonant *n* from *κυμερῆναι* here. The formula 'dissimilation of consonants' may be relevant but its actual

working is obscure in this case. One might also have looked for a verb with a somewhat stronger sense than ,govern', ,steer' in this context; Death is a more drastic remedy in the hands of Zeus than *κυμερῆναι* might seem to indicate. But the meaning and colour of this verb are at least in harmony with *περὶ . . . ἐγγραμμένα*. (Cf. Heraclitus fr. 41 D).

φρονέωϊ, sc. *φρονέωσι*, 3 pl. subj. in a relative clause without *ἄν* or *κε* — a construction that is rare enough after Homer. Hall read *po* instead of *ne* in this word; but the two signs can be confused without difficulty, and it is evident that Hall's own drawing of this sign could be a *ne*. In any case *προπόωϊ* does not seem to be possible.

The ending *-i*, with the postulated change of *-si* to *-hi*, seems to be certain also. The sign is damaged but enough remains of the top half to suggest *i* and to rule out most other signs except *a* or *e*. One might have hoped for *-me*, giving *φρονέωμε(ν)*; but this seems out of the question. (See above on *ἐπιστάτησε*, l. 3, for which *ἐπίσταίς* is read by the German editors).

The verses, as I have expounded them, must seem dull and unnecessarily lugubrious. An invitation to food and wine that is followed by a warning against loud talk and then by a reminder of the violent punishment which the gods may bring upon boastful men may be thought to lack conviction. But if we allow for a certain uncouthness of expression, thoughts of this kind will be recognised as typical of early Greek poetry. After all, we do not know the exact circumstances that led to the erection of this monument. If we did, its apparent grimness might be readily comprehensible. Accordingly doubts as to the propriety of the words and phrases should not cause the reader to turn away from what they seem in truth to mean.

The advantage of the foregoing interpretation is that it is coherent and intelligible throughout. It exerts no undue pressure on Greek accident or syntax, or on the meaning of Greek words; and it adheres to the rules of Greek prosody and metre. In a syllabic script, such as the Cyprian, coincidence of this kind is generally not without significance. I have cause to know this; for I have tested many possible forms and meanings in this text and have pursued the apparently promising interpretations that they held out, only to come up against a series of solid objections in each case. For this reason, while I realise

that a slight alteration in one word or another might still alter the aspect of the text substantially, I believe that the account I have given may in the main correspond to the ancient versifier's intention.

If I were required to comment on the authorship and date of the inscription, I would say that the lines might have been put together by someone acquainted with both early didactic poetry and moral philosophy about the end of the fourth century. It seems to me that l. 1 may have been traditional in its entirety, although, if *Φείσης* is connected with *οἶδα*, this may be a sign of inferior writing in the epic style. What follows is perhaps a pretentious elaboration of the simple theme of l. 1. The general cast of l. 2 and, in particular, the occurrence in it of *περιγράφειν* and *ἀκρατήτως* suggest to me the kind of verse that philosophers wrote from the fourth century onwards. Ll. 3—4, with their exaggerated fatalism, appear to be a remarkably bad example of the same thing. They are made up of phrases which may for the most part be traditional; but the scansion of *ἐπιστάτησε* looks as if it might be an imitation of earlier philosophical verse, while the definite article in l. 3, *ἡ*, is perhaps a sign that the writer was not master of the idiom which he had chosen to copy. Any date later than the fourth century would raise difficult questions regarding the currency of the syllabic script in the Hellenistic age.

If I were required to explain the meaning of the scene represented on the sculpture, I would say that the two figures facing the throne of Zeus might be legendary characters, such as Tantalus and Pelops, and that the figure behind the throne might be Ganymedes. The winged creature above the throne is perhaps simply an eagle; but, if Hall's suggestion that its head looks human is to be given any significance, then it might be an allegorical representation of Death (or conceivably *Diké*). Thus interpreted the scene might represent the condemnation by Zeus of a prince who had overstepped the mark.

But in general I should prefer to leave all questions of authorship, date and ultimate significance unanswered for the present.

Edinburgh

A. J. Beattie