## AN AESCHYLEAN PROBLEM

## HEATHER WHITE -GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE

In Aesch. Suppl. 28 2f. we read:

Κύπριος χαρακτήρ τ' ἐν γυναικείους τύποις εἰκὼς πέπληκται τεκτόνων πρός ἀρσένων.

The much debated problem presented by these two lines has been extensively discussed in recent publications.<sup>1</sup> None of the ingenious hypotheses suggested in the above quoted  $\Pi \varrho \alpha \varkappa \tau \iota \varkappa \dot{\alpha}$  seems satisfactory.<sup>2</sup> The solution to the *vexata quaestio* is, we believe, simple. Whilst, as everybody who has-read Jaxt knows, the complexion of Greek girls was a mixture of white and pink, the Danaids (cf. Tucker *ad loc.*) were not "black", but "dusky", i.e. light brown, like the  $\Lambda \iota \beta \upsilon \sigma \tau \iota \varkappa \dot{\alpha}$  yuvaĩ $\varkappa \epsilon_{\zeta}$  mentioned in lines 279f. and the Amazons (line 287), who were notorious for their sun-tan, acquired by living in the open air.

We can enter the way leading to the elucidation of the enigma by

Πρακτικά του Δευτέρου Διεθνοῦς Κυπρολογικοῦ Συνεδρίου". Τόμος Α, Λευκωσία 1985, Πρακτικὰ τοῦ Β΄ Τοπικοῦ Συνεδρίου ἀργολικῶν Σπουδῶν, Παράρτημα 14. ἀΑθῆναι 1989.

<sup>2.</sup> It is impossible to read (with Hatziioannou)  $\chi \dot{\upsilon} \pi \varrho_{1005}$ , "made of copper", because this adjective, attested in *Pap. Gr. Mag.* I,  $\varrho.130$ , is borrowed from late Latin (*cyprius* =  $\chi \dot{\upsilon} \pi \varrho_{1005}$ ); it is unwarranted to alter (with Hetzistefanou)  $\chi \dot{\upsilon} \pi \varrho_{1035}$  into  $\chi \alpha \dot{\iota} \pi \varrho \dot{\upsilon}_5$  because the particle  $\tau \varepsilon$  in line 282 does not permit such a textual change; the hypothesis of an interpolation (suggested by Johansen and Whittle) has not convinced anybody, as far as we know; if as all the critics seem to agree, it were true that K $\dot{\upsilon} \pi \varrho_{1055} \chi \alpha \varrho \alpha \varkappa \tau \dot{\eta} \varrho_{1055}$  refers to the inhabitants of Cyprus, one could not maintain (with Hatzistyllis) that Pelasgos refers only to the skin-colour of the Danaids and not to that of the Cypriots. The old hypothesis favoured by Paley (*ad loc.*) is not tenable, because Pelasgos explicitly uses the word K $\dot{\upsilon} \pi \varrho_{1055}$ , and cannot therefore refer to a settlement of "Ethiopians" in Cyprus instead of to the Cypriots who inhabited the island.

recalling that the famous fellow-king of Pelasgos, the Cypriot King Pygmalion, had sculpted a beautiful ivory statue of a girl, of which he became enamoured. Ivory is at first white *(niveum sculpsit-ebur*, Ov. *Metam.* X 243ff.), but it becomes light brown with the passage of time (cf. Mart. IV 62, VII 13, VIII 28; Sil. Ital. XII 229; Prop. IV 7, 82 *pallet ebur*). The word  $\chi\alpha \rho\alpha \varkappa \tau \eta \rho$  can mean "facial appearance", "aspect", and  $\tau \upsilon \pi \sigma \varsigma$  can signify "a figure in statuary", "statue" (on all this cf. Paley and Tucker *ad loc.*; Thes., s.v.  $\chi\alpha \rho \alpha \varkappa \tau \eta \rho$  and.  $\tau \upsilon \pi \sigma \varsigma$ ). It is agreed that Pelasgos uses a "metaphor" based on such meanings<sup>3</sup> (cf.Tucker *ad loc*).

The upshot of all this is that the sense of the words uttered by Pelasgos is literally "and a Cyprian ( $\varkappa \upsilon \pi \varrho \iota \circ \varsigma$  is used in *enallage adjectivi*, insofar as the statue and its face were created by the Cyprian sculptor Pygmalion) facial appearance ( $\chi \alpha \varrho \alpha \varkappa \tau \eta \varrho$ ) like yours ( $\epsilon \iota \varkappa \omega \varsigma^4$ : that is to say, light brown) has been chiselled ( $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \varkappa \tau \alpha \iota$ ) into female statues ( $\epsilon \varkappa$  $\gamma \upsilon \varkappa \alpha \iota \varkappa \epsilon ( \circ \varsigma \tau \upsilon \tau \sigma \iota \varsigma \varsigma)$  by male sculptors ( $\tau \epsilon \varkappa \tau \circ \upsilon \upsilon \tau \sigma \rho \circ \varsigma$  d $\varrho \sigma \epsilon \prime \omega \upsilon \iota$ : i.e., by the Cypriot King Pygmalion)". King Pelasgos, delicately alluding to his colleague Pygmalion's well-known but abnormal love, uses the *pluralis poeticus*  $\tau \upsilon \pi \sigma \iota \varsigma$  and  $\tau \epsilon \varkappa \tau \circ \upsilon \upsilon \upsilon^5$  in reference respectively to the statue created by Pygmalion and to Pygmalion; the pointed words d $\varrho \sigma \epsilon \cdot \upsilon \upsilon \upsilon$  and  $\gamma \upsilon \varkappa \iota \varkappa \iota \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \iota \varsigma$  overtly refer to the famous erotic story of the *one* amorous male sculptor Pygmalion who fell in love with the *one* statue of a female. The perfect  $\pi \epsilon \pi \lambda \eta \varkappa \tau \alpha \iota$  indicates that Pygmalion had sculpted the statue a while before Pelasgos speaks, and was still in possession of

<sup>3.</sup> The meaning of  $\chi\alpha\varrho\alpha\varkappa\tau\eta\varrho$  = "impress stamped on the unmarked metal form by thecoiner", and of  $\tau \upsilon \pi \sigma \varsigma$  = "unmarked metal form" (cf. Tucker and Paley, *ad loc.*) can hardly be at the basis of Pelasgos's metaphor, because  $\gamma \upsilon \varkappa \varkappa \varkappa \iota \sigma \iota \varsigma$  can certainly denote the statue of a female, but cannot designate metal coins struck by the coiner. Moreover,  $\tau \varkappa \varkappa \iota \sigma \omega$  can mean "sculptor" in Greek, but cannot signify "coiner": this difficulty did not escape Tucker, as is evident from his note on p. 32 (those who struck the die with a hammer did not create any "important works of art", because the design of the coins was not of their making: they were called  $\chi \alpha \varrho \alpha \varkappa \tau \eta \varrho \epsilon \varsigma$ , i.e. "strikers", not  $\tau \varkappa \varkappa \tau \upsilon \varkappa \varsigma \varsigma$ .

<sup>4.</sup> After previously stating (lines 279-80) that the Danaids' faces are "dark complexioned," "light brown" as those of the Libyan women, Pelasgos employs εἰκώς in the sense "like your just mentioned faces": such absolute use of εἰκώς to denote similarity to something just mentioned is perfectly normal in Greek (as well - as in other languages, cf. e. g, Engl. "similar").

<sup>5.</sup> Cf. Eur. Alc. 348 f. σοφη δε χειρί τεκτόνων δέμας το σον / είκασθέν.

it, by which time the statue had become light brown in colour (Pelasgos had either seen the light brown statue on a visit to his fellow -king Pygmalion, or heard (cf.  $\dot{\alpha}\varkappa o\dot{\omega}\omega\nu$  1. 284) that it had become light brown owing to the passage of time). The verb  $\pi \acute{\epsilon}\pi\lambda\eta\varkappa\tau\alpha\iota$  (liter. "has been struck, hit") is as Tucker has understood (he translates "has been stamped"), used in the so-called "resultativ" sense (cf. Schwyzer, *Griech. Gramm.* II, p.74) and means, therefore "has been produced by hitting" (i.e. by chiselling).

Conclusion: *enallage adjectivi*, although lamentably unknown to many would-be classical scholars (cf. H.White, *Myrtia* 2000, XV, p.56), is extremely common in Greek Tragedy, as e.g. Paley, Lewis Campbell and Breitenbach (with his excellent bibliography) have emphasized:  $K \acute{n} \varrho_{105} \sigma_{2}$  as used by Aeschylus in *Suppl*. 282 is a perfectly normal case in point. The skin-colour of the inhabitants of Cyprus has absolutely nothing to do with the passage in question. We hope to have conclusivsly illustrated Aeschylus' words<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>6.</sup> A few minor details. The anapaest at the beginning of line 282 does not surprise editors and critics (Paley, Tucker, Murray, Page, West, Mazon, etc.) because the said feature occurs in Tragedy, especially with *Eigennamen* such as Κύποιος is. Our explanation of lines 282f. entails the solution of the problem which the perfect tense πέπληπται presented to scholars (cf. Tucker *ad loc.;* Mazon, in his Budé edition, evasively transforais the perfect into the present "frappent"). The opposition between γυναικείοις and ἀρσένων, which would be nonsensical if referred to bronze coinage, proves contextually and grammatically apposite in the light of our demonstration. The mediaeval scholiast, who knew nothing about *enallage adjectivi* and Pygmalion, suggested (cf. Tucker *ad loc.*) that γυναικείοις τύποις meant "uterus", but this is contredicted by the perfect tense (πέπληπται cannot mean "frappent" as Mazon translates it). In line 284, ἀχούων could well be a "*participium pro verbo finito*".