

Zeitschrift: Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique
Herausgeber: Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'Antiquité classique
Band: 14 (1968)

Artikel: Sympotic literature and epigram
Autor: Giangrande, Giuseppe
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660852>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 19.01.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

III

GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE

Sympotic Literature and Epigram

SYMPOTIC LITERATURE AND EPIGRAM¹

When Professor Dihle kindly invited me to take part in these *Entretiens* and we agreed that I should deal with the subject which forms the title of my contribution, it was understood that my task would be neither to re-examine Reitzenstein's theory nor to write a chapter of literary pre-history: what I had to do was rather to analyse concretely the sympotic *Leitmotive* as they developed in Greek literature before the Alexandrian period, and then to try and follow them up in their employment by the epigrammatists, with special regard to the Alexandrians.

This task I shall now try to fulfil. First of all, an introductory observation is necessary. Although Reitzenstein's thesis is, of course, not accepted nowadays², the fact that

¹ When epigrams are quoted, a simple figure refers to the verse-numbering in Gow-Page.

² None other than Reitzenstein himself came to admit, a few years after the publication of his *Epigramm und Skolion* (Giessen 1893), that his contention had been "übertreibend durchgeführt" (*RE*, s.v. Epigramm, col. 73; published 1907). Cf. now CARRIÈRE, *Théognis de Mégare, Etude sur le Recueil élégiaque attribué à ce poète*, Paris 1948, p. 146 ff., for Reitzenstein's exaggerated contentions. He went so far as to maintain (*Epigr. u. Sk.*, p. 75) that "Theognis selbst hat sein Buch für die Gelage bestimmt", and that (*ibid.*, p. 102) "Asklepiades, Kallimachos und Alkaios verwendeten das Epigramm im wesentlichen zur dichterischen Unterhaltung beim Gelage"; even fictitious epitaphs were regarded by him (*ibid.*, p. 119) as "zu den Scherzen für das Gelage verwendet". The Achilles' heel of Reitzenstein's theory was his underestimating the extent to which Alexandrian poetry is ultimately "Buchpoesie" (*RE*, s.v. Epigramm, col. 81, 43 ff.). Whether the type of sympotic epigram, that is, the kind of epigram whose theme is "Symposiastisches und Erotisches" is to be imagined as actually "beim Gelage vorgetragen" or whether the sympotic situation as utilized by the poet only exists in the poet's fantasy, the epigram being pure "Buchpoesie", is a problem that modern critics (cf. LESKY, *Gr. Lit.*², p. 790) wisely leave open. Fortunately the problem is ultimately irrelevant, because, whereas Reitzenstein was chiefly interested in demonstrating the existence of "Gelagebräuche" (*Epigr. u. Sk.*, p. 1 ff.) and the "weit verbreiteten Gebrauch, Epigramme bei Gelagen vorzutragen"

sympotic elements flowed into the Alexandrian genre *Epigram* is established and commonly acknowledged. However, in this connection an inaccurate notion still exists, and I shall try to rectify it. One tends to believe that the Alexandrian epigrammatists appropriated almost mechanically, as it were, the various sympotic motifs which had developed in literature. Just to quote a couple of current tools of our trade: Beckby, in his *Einführung* (which remains the best introduction to epigrammatic poetry available: cf. Keydell, *RAC*, s.v. *Epigramm*, 540) writes: "Wein und Liebe sind die Hauptquellen, aus denen die Alexandriner ihre Themen schöpfen. Das Skolion, die eigentliche Gelagepoesie, war im vierten Jahrhundert verklungen. Jetzt nimmt die neue Schule die Stoffe dieser Dichtung in die Epigrammatik herüber und erweitert dadurch den Motivkreis des Epigramms um eine ganze poetische Gattung" ¹: we can therefore speak of "die Aufnahme von Gelagepoesie und Liebe" into the epigrammatic genre. Lesky, in his turn, writes: "das gesprochene Epigramm" (*scil.* of the sympotic type) "trat an die Stelle des gesungenen Skolions früherer Zeit" ².

(*ibid.*, p. 153), we are concerned with the development of the literary motifs themselves, not with their sociological background, just as e.g. Copley has studied the penetration of the genre *paraclausithyron* into the Epigram, and the development of *paraclausithyron* motifs within the Epigram, from a purely literary point of view, leaving aside the question whether the *komos* alluded to by the epigrammatists was to be taken by the reader as an objective background or was merely evoked by the fantasy of the poet (COPLEY, *Exclusus Amator, Philol. Monographs published by the Amer. Philol. Assoc.*, XVII, Baltimore 1956). Indeed, the question holds true for Theognis himself: on the problem "réalité ou... fiction", "scène véritable ou scène imaginaire" in Theognis' banqueting scenes cf. CARRIÈRE's judicious remarks (*op. cit.*, p. 149 f.). I personally think that most of the Hellenistic epigrams are pure "Buchpoesie", in which the poet allusively "finge di trovarsi presente a un convito" (PASQUALI, *Orazio Lirico*, p. 509).

¹ *Anthologia Graeca*, I² (München, Heimeran), p. 31 f.

² *Gesch. d. griech. Liter.*², p. 790.

Such a notion needs sharper focusing. Alexandrian epigrammatists, with their typical abhorrence of the popular and the general, significantly avoided the more common sympotic *Leitmotive*, and chose the less popular ones ; or, when they employed a popular sympotic *Leitmotive*, they did so only to utilize it as a foil for an original point. Nothing was more alien from the Alexandrian taste than plain, uncomplicated *Schwärmerei* for such popular and banal sympotic themes as e.g. "Wein, Weib und Gesang".

We shall look at the manipulation of sympotic motifs by Alexandrian epigrammatists later ; first we must try to identify the motifs themselves as they came into being before the Alexandrians. We know that there existed what Lesky (*op. cit.*, p. 193) aptly calls a "Trinkkultur", which found its literary expression in poems which were "sung or recited" (Hudson-Williams, *The Elegies of Theognis*, London 1910, p. 28)¹ "beim Männergelage". Our first problem will now be : what *Leitmotive* emerged and developed within the framework of this sympotic literature ?² The sources of such sympotic literature are represented for us by Theognis, the Attic *skolia*, Alcaeus and Anacreon.

Theognis

First of all, let us rapidly survey the *corpus Theognideum*³. Theognis' work has been dissected, amputated and re-

¹ There seems to be little doubt that they were sung, cf. Theogn. 939 ff., 943 ff., and 237 ff.

² Certain aspects of our problem have been very well analysed by B. LIER, *Ad topica carminum amatoriorum symbolae*, Prgr. Gymn. Stettin 1914, and P. KÄGI, *Nachwirkungen der älteren griech. Elegie in den Epigr. der Anthol.*, Diss. Zürich 1917. Neither of these excellent works concentrates, however, on sympotic literature or the Alexandrians ; table manners are studied in the useful survey by K. BIELOHLAWEK (*Gastmahl- und Symposionslehren bei griech. Dichtern*, in *Wien. Stud.* 1940, LVIII, p. 11 ff.).

³ Cf. CARRIÈRE, *op. cit.*, p. 145 ff., on the "poèmes de table".

arranged in innumerable ways by scholars¹. It is, in the final analysis, a collection of “poèmes moraux”, to use Carrière’s words². The origins of this conglomerate do not concern us: for our purpose, we shall consider the corpus as a store of motifs.

The poet has composed such “poèmes moraux”, as he says himself (19-28: *σοί ... ὑποθήσομαι*, line 27) to instruct his pupil Cygnos³. This type of *ὑποθήκαι* is to a very large extent political (the *ἀστοί* appear, significantly enough, in the preamble, line 24 ff.; the affairs of the *πόλις* and the *ἀστοί* are frequently mentioned by the poet, as a glance at Young’s Index in the Teubner edition will show).

The morality preached by the poet is unashamedly utilitarian, i.e. Theognis wants to teach how to righteously derive personal advantage within the political world of the *πόλις*. This aim can be achieved by mixing with the right people and exercising prudence in the choice of one’s counsellors and confidants when one has to deal with a *χρῆμα σπουδαῖον* (63 ff.). It is easy to find company for banqueting purposes, but not easy to find suitable company for discussing serious matters (115 f., 643 f.). All this has been too well analysed by Andreæ⁴, Hoffmann⁵ and Carrière to need any further elucidation here: what is pertinent to our task is to note that, alongside the serious, one might say businesslike ex-

¹ The copious literature up to 1910 is usefully discussed by HUDSON-WILLIAMS, *op. cit.*, Introd. p. 12 ff.; recent literature (Adrados, Carrière, Peretti, Young) is surveyed by LESKY, *op. cit.*, p. 193-96.

² THEOGNIS, *Poèmes Elégiaques* (in the Budé Series, Paris 1948), Introd., p. 7. From now on I shall quote this work as “*Poèmes*”, and the previously mentioned monograph as “*Etude*”.

³ Cf. REITZENSTEIN, *Epigr. u. Sk.* p. 79 f.

⁴ *Die Ethik bei Theognis*, Diss. Erlangen 1921.

⁵ *Die ethische Terminologie bei Homer, Hesiod und den alten Elegikern u. Jambo-graphen*, Diss. Tübingen 1914.

hortations of ethico-political content, one finds¹ not seldom a “profession de foi hédoniste”². One typical example is the passage 1007 ff., where, characteristically enough, the same verb ὑποθήσομαι, used for political exhortations at 27 ff., occurs again. Owing to its composite origin, the Theognidean corpus is full of contradictory statements³: however, such hedonistic professions could hardly surprise us, because they do not clash, in themselves, with the conception that Theognis had of ἀρετή: although he vaguely says (e.g. 147 ff.) that πᾶσ' ἀρετή consists in δικαιοσύνῃ, nevertheless it is clear that his idea of ἀρετή is not “faite d'abnégation et de sacrifice” (Carrière, *Poèmes*, p. 116): he simply thunders against πλούτεῖν ἀδίκως (146 ff.), but πλούτεῖν in itself, by righteous means (cf. 197 ff. χρῆμα ... σὺν δίκῃ) is a perfectly desirable aim, indeed the whole object of his poem is to teach Cyrnos how to make good (1074 κρεῖσσόν τοι σοφίη καὶ μεγάλης ἀρετῆς)⁴. Attaining one's desire is the sweetest possible thing (255-56). The aim of πλούτεῖν ἀδόλως, it is interesting to see, re-appears later in sympotic literature, in the Attic *skolion* 7 Page (= *PMG* 890; on the motif, cf. Carrière, *Poèmes*, p. 104, n. 2). This particular conception of ἀρετή, acquisitive and hedonistic in its aims, is the primeval soup out of which sympotic Leitmotive sprang to life. We shall watch its birth more closely below under C.

¹ Cf. CARRIÈRE, *Etude*, p. 145: “à côté des poèmes sérieux” one is astonished to discover “les poèmes de table”.

² CARRIÈRE, *Poèmes*, p. 73.

³ Instructive examples of “krasse Widersprüchlichkeit der Gedanken” are shown by LESKY, *op. cit.*, p. 194. One might add that certain contradictions could be imputed to the poet himself: poets, more so than philosophers, are often prey to contradictory moods.

⁴ HOFFMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 146-148, concludes that “die Scheidung von ἀρετή und Reichtum” is very much blurred in Theognis. Cf. REITZENSTEIN, *Epigr. u. Sk.*, p. 77 ff.

Which are the sympotic *Leitmotive* identifiable in the corpus?

(A) To begin with, Theognis' position towards wine is explicitly ambivalent: cf. 211-12, 509-510, 837-40, 873-76. This attitude is not new in literature, and can be traced back to Homer himself, who calls wine ἐύφρων (*Il.* III, 246), ἐυήνωρ (*Od.* IV, 622), ἀνδρὶ κεκμηῶτι μένος μέγα (*Il.* VI, 261: cf. *A.P.* XI, 61), but knows that wine can be deleterious (*Od.* XI, 61): many a person, in Homer, is δαμασσάμενος φρένας οἴνῳ (*Od.* IX, 454), βεβαρηότα φρένας οἴνῳ (*Od.* XIX, 122): οἰνοβαρής at *Il.* I, 225 is used as "ein starkes Schimpfwort" (Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, p. 33). It was an excessive amount of wine that acted as an aphrodisiac in the case of the Centaurs, *Od.* XXI, 295: this is the earliest literary example of the motif coupling wine with love, and it is interesting to see that it is alluded to in Alcaeus 24 ff., = *A.P.* XI, 12, *A.P.* XI, 1 and Callim. 1233 ff., = *A.P.* VII, 725 (cf. *Hermes* 1963, p. 154 ff.; we shall return to these epigrams later). Hesiod had observed (*Erga* 584-93) that in summer οἶνος is ἄριστος, and had expressed the desirability of πινέμεν οἶνον ἐν σκιῇ ἔζόμενον, but was careful enough to recommend "a very weak mixture" of wine and water (cf. Paley *ad* 596). As a result of this ambivalent power of wine, Theognis, one of whose *Leitmotive* is the Solonian μηδὲν ἄγαν (151-52; 335 ff.; 401 ff., cf. Carrière, *Poèmes*, p. 107¹; 693-94) exhorts us to use wine in moderation, not ὑπὲρ μέτρον (498).

(B) The more instructive passages relating to the theme of moderation² are: 413-14: being drunk, one is

¹ Cf. also 219 f., with CARRIÈRE's note *ad loc.*, and REITZENSTEIN, *Epigr. u. Sk.*, p. 65, n. 2.

² On the theme μηδὲν ἄγαν in general cf. KÄGI, *op. cit.*, p. 65 f.; for banquets cf. BIELOHLAWEK, *art. cit.*, p. 23.

inclined to use δεινὸν ἔπος (= Hom., *Od.* VIII, 408) against one's companions, because one loses one's self-control.

467-496 : this Attic elegy, of uncertain paternity (Carrière, *Poèmes*, p. 110 f.) is an "exhortation à la sobriété". Lines 477 ff. are particularly interesting : too many toasts, says the poet, make one "déparler" (Carrière), whereas the symposium must be οὐκ ἄχαρι (496). By way of anticipation, I may already indicate that these motifs reappear in Alexandrian epigrams : Callimachus 1103 ff. = *A.P.* XII, 134, as we shall see, utilizes the theme of the three toasts (*Theogn.* 487-491), whilst Posidippus adapts the theme of the κύαθος οὐκ ἄχαρις at 3086 ff. = *A.P.* XII, 168.

541 ff. : the allusion to the ὕβρις of the Centaurs refers to their excess in drinking : what Κενταύρους ὅλεσεν was wine. The tone of the exhortation is serious, and the motif itself must have been traditional, because we find it already in Homer ; Callimachus, as I have already said, jocularly employs this theme for one of his epigrams.

627-28 : important variation. A drunkard is an object of shame (499-508), but one must adapt oneself to the situation and, if everybody else is drunk, one must follow suit¹. This motif can be understood if put in relationship with 33 ff. and 309-312, where the poet recommends Cygnos to adapt himself to the mood of the party, and become καρτερός at the door (cf. also line 480). It occurs again at *skol.* 19 Page.

837-44 : drunkenness is an evil, not in itself, but from a utilitarian point of view, because it places whoever is drunk in a position of inferiority towards his enemies and

¹ Cf. KÄGI, *op. cit.*, p. 58, who mentions the late re-appearance of this motif in the *Anthology* (*A.P.* XI, 429).

rivals: one is no longer $\gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\eta\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$ $\omega\bar{\delta}\epsilon$ $\nu\bar{\delta}\varsigma$ (480). It will be observed that the main reason why drinking was regarded as dangerous was that it loosened one's tongue. At the political *symposia* which Theognis is describing, political affairs were discussed, and the danger represented by a $\mu\bar{n}\bar{h}\mu\omega\bar{n}$ $\sigma\bar{u}\mu\bar{p}\bar{o}\bar{t}\eta\varsigma$ (*PMG* 1002) was great; in Alexandrian times the structure of the $\pi\bar{o}\bar{l}\bar{i}\varsigma$ was gone and political power lay now in the hands of Hellenistic sovereigns: the only secrets which might escape from the mouth of a banqueting man could be secrets of love, and the theme of "wine loosening one's tongue" was accordingly adapted, as we shall see.

(C) The *Leitmotiv* of pleasure in drinking is quite common in Theognis.

533 f.: here it occurs at its most elemental, $\chi\bar{a}\bar{i}\bar{\rho}\omega$... $\pi\bar{i}\bar{n}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}$... $\lambda\bar{u}\bar{r}\bar{\eta}\bar{\nu}$, $\kappa\bar{\tau}\bar{\lambda}$. (*Wein und Gesang*, without *Weib*).

757 ff. This is regarded as a sort of "préambule" to a series of convivial poems (Carrière, *Poèmes*, p. 119). Whatever we may think of this, we can consider the passage as typical of this kind of skoliastic literature, in which the political element is blended with the purely convivial one. There is first of all an invocation to the gods—we shall meet this ingredient again when touching upon the Attic *skolia*—who are invoked to protect the $\pi\bar{o}\bar{l}\bar{i}\varsigma$ against the Medes (764), and then there is the sympotic exhortation proper, $\pi\bar{i}\bar{n}\bar{\omega}\bar{\mu}\bar{\epsilon}\nu$... $\tau\bar{e}\bar{r}\bar{p}\bar{o}\bar{m}\bar{e}\bar{n}\bar{\omega}\bar{\nu}$, $\kappa\bar{\tau}\bar{\lambda}$. This exhortation favours the passage from the political theme to the purely private one, that is from worries about the Medes to the thought of private enjoyment over the cups, the exhortation to enjoy life before $\gamma\bar{h}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\varsigma$ spoils everything (to the specific motif of $\gamma\bar{h}\bar{\rho}\bar{\alpha}\varsigma$ we shall return soon). By way of anticipation we may already observe that one would expect the "Jonisch-Alexandrinische Schule" of epigrammatic poetry, with its inclination to

private¹ "Verinnerlichung" and "Philosophie des Egoismus" (Beckby, *op. cit.*, p. 30) to have readily accepted and copiously exploited this motif, i.e. the exhortation² to drink and enjoy life before old age arrives, but it was not so: the motif was too general and too popular to appeal to the Alexandrians, who, on the whole, shunned it in their epigrams³ or used it as a foil for a point⁴.

879 ff.: the theme of wine as a remover of sorrows was popular and wide-spread (the *Anacreon tea*, for instance, have 3 variants of the motif ὅταν πίω τὸν οἶνον: 43, 46, 48, Bgk). Once more, we may observe that this motif, precisely for its popular nature and its lack of specificity, was shunned by the Alexandrians⁵.

939: this passage is notable because it mentions a κῶμος (cf. also 886 and 1045 ff.)

1039-42. The motif indicated at 1039-40 (cf. Hudson-Williams *ad loc.*) is also present in Hesiod and Alcaeus. The

¹ The background of political *engagement* which is always present in sympotic literature (Theognis, *skolia*, Alcaeus) could of course hardly be expected to survive in the Alexandrian epigram. Theognis rejects the pleasures of drinking for political reasons at 825 ff., (i.e. for his own exile, which his "amour de la patrie" makes painful, cf. CARRIÈRE, *Poèmes*, p. 122), and professes himself able to enjoy banquets rather than wars *only if* the πόλις is not threatened (885 f.).

² I might as well note now that the hortatory tone is one of the traditional ingredients of sympotic poetry: cf. (I am quoting at random) Theogn. 763 (πίνωμεν), 989 (πίνε), 1042 (πίνωμεν), 1047 (πίνοντες τερπώμεθα), 1043 (εῦδωμεν); Hedylus 1853 (πίνωμεν), Leonidas 2384 = VII, 452,2 (πίνωμεν), Asclepiades 880 ff. = XII, 50 (πίνε, πίνωμεν). For such "Aufforderungen" cf. KÄGI *op. cit.*, p. 8.

³ KÄGI, *op. cit.*, p. 9 f. can only quote one Alexandrian epigram (Asclepiades 816 ff. = A.P. V, 85; cf. PLATO, *epigr.* 2), which we shall mention again later.

⁴ Leonidas' humorous point 2383 f. = A.P. VII, 452 (mentioned by KÄGI, *op. cit.*, p. 10) and Asclepiades' epigram 880 ff. = A.P. XII, 50 (cf. KÄGI, *ibid.*) will be discussed later.

⁵ Cf. KÄGI, *op. cit.*, p. 57, who overlooks the neat adaptation of a motif by Meleager at 4598 ff. = XII, 49 (we shall examine this epigram later).

motif of the drinking companion who has "le vin triste" (1041-42) seems, on the other hand, to appear for the first time. What is the reason for the companion's sadness? Since Theognis elsewhere recommends never to hurt the feelings of one's fellow drinkers who are in distress (1217-18; cf. Carrière, *Etude*, p. 146), it may be that the worries at which the poet would allow us to laugh are *peines d'amour*, i.e. worries of a not too serious nature¹. Whether or not this interpretation is valid for the Theognidean passage 1040-41, it is however certain that the "vin triste" reveals "peines d'amour"—and not political worries—in the Alexandrian epigram, as we shall see². Within the utilitarian framework of Theognis' *Weltanschauung* a *symposion* was an activity not only pleasant, and therefore desirable, in itself, but also useful. It is a *κέρδος* to be invited, if one can profit from the conversation (563 ff.; cf. also 33 ff.; the same motif in Attic *skolion* 897 *PMG*). 'Ανδρός ... οἶνος ἔδειξε νόον (500; cf. Hudson-Williams, *op. cit.* p. 197): therefore, (309 ff.) one can profit from this. Theognis thought in terms of political secrets (cf. Carrière, *Poèmes*, p. 5 on the poet living, "ombrageux et vindicatif", in an atmosphere of political rivalries); for the Alexandrians, the secrets to be evinced from one's companions and to be smiled at were the harmless ones of love.

1047 f. : ephemeral nature of human things, with exhortation to enjoy oneself (*πίνοντες τερπώμεθα*).

(D) The ephemeral nature of man's existence leads us to another *Leitmotiv*, the praise of youth and the abhorrence of old age. This motif goes back to Homer, who often gives

¹ Cf. however, Archil. fr. 9 D *κήδεα* ... *στονόεντα* ... *ἀστῶν* ... *θαλίη* ..., and fr. 13 D with Reitzenstein's observations, *Epigr. u. Sk.*, p. 49.

² Cf. also Hor., *Od.* I, 27, with Pasquali's observations on the treatment of the theme by Callimachus and Asclepiades (*Orazio Lirico*, p. 514 ff.).

γῆρας the epithet λυγρόν, and who said (*Hymn. Ap.* 190 f.) that mortals οὐδὲ δύνανται εὔρέμεναι ... γήραος ἀλκαρ. The theme was, of course, very popular, and continued in Elegiac poetry (e.g. *Mimn.* 1 D, 2 D, 5 D, ἀργαλέον γῆρας) : once more, we have here a motif which was so popular, elemental and wide-spread that the Alexandrians avoided touching it in their epigrams, as a rule.

The more relevant passages in *Theognis* are 567 ff., 877 ff., again 1070 a-b, 983 ff., = 1305 ff., 1007 ff., 1017-1022, which coincides with *Mimn.* 5 D, 1063 ff. (lovemaking and banqueting are possible and enjoyable when young), 1119 ff., 1191-94.

(E) Against the pleasures of banqueting and lovemaking, there appears the motif of poverty : 173-82, 267 ff., 351 ff., 525 ff., 649 ff. Poverty and old age are combined at 173-74; cf. 1122 ἥβη καὶ πλούτῳ. This motif contradicts another, also present in *Theognis*, the "Ablehnung des Reichtums" (Kägi, *op. cit.* 58 f.). Such motifs were, however, a "Gemeinplatz" (Kägi, *ibid.*), and in any case difficult to apply to erotic situations : it is therefore not astonishing to see that they are not frequent in Alexandrian epigrams : Callimachus for instance used the motif of poverty at 1071 ff. = XII, 148, but with an ironic twist, as we shall see.

We have thus rapidly surveyed *Theognis*, the oldest and richest store of sympotic *Leitmotive*¹, we have tried to see

¹ The motifs contained in *Theognis*' Book II may be considered (cf. LESKY, *op. cit.*, p. 193) as ingredients of *Gelagepoesie* which were originally scattered all over the *corpus Theognideum* and were subsequently concentrated into Book II, but the amount of Alexandrian interpolations cannot exactly be gauged. It is therefore safest to leave Book II outside the scope of this investigation. Points of contact with Hellenistic poetry are, of course, very numerous: e.g. 1231 σχέτλι' Ἐρως = *Ap. Rh.* IV, 445, *A.P.* V, 57 = Gow-Page 4075; 1249 simile of boy likened to a horse = *Callim. A.P.* XII, 149 = Gow-Page 1087 ff. (for the motif, cf. in particular KÄGI, *op. cit.*, p. 51);

how these emerged — the transition from political rejoicing to private jollification was an easy step at banquets celebrated by men whose idea of ἀρετή was acquisitive and affluent — and we have identified the main themes.

*Attic Skolia*¹

If we now turn to the Attic *skolia*, we find, not surprisingly, the same motifs as in Theognis, but our gleanings of sympotic motifs capable of development in the Alexandrian epigram is more meagre. The reason is that these *skolia* were, to use Bowra's words², "decorous and public-minded", and they tended to have "militant and patriotic associations". We find in them the same hymns to the Gods as in Theognis (*skolia* 1-4 correspond to the first four Hymns contained in the Theognidean *corpus*, as has been shown by Reitzenstein)³; we find in them "the aristocratic doctrine, familiar from Theognis"⁴.

However, there are a few *skolia* which have no political significance, and in these the motifs of private sympotic enjoyment appear.

(A) Exhortations to drink (or eat) and be merry.
Sk. 19, whose wording πῖνε, κτλ.⁵ echoes Theogn. 313 f. (cf. also Theogn. 877 f. ἥβα, κτλ. : Reitzenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 20)

1257 ff. tirade against παῖς πολύπλαγτος = γυναικα περίδρομον Theogn. 581 ff., and = Callim. XII, 43, Gow-Page 1041 ff.; 1299 ff. = Callim. XII, 149, Gow-Page 1087 ff.

¹ Numbering according to Page in *PMG*.

² *Greek Lyric Poetry*, Oxford 1961², p. 373, 388.

³ Cf. CARRIÈRE, *Poèmes*, p. 92; BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 375, n. 7.

⁴ BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 376 f. E.g. *sk.* 14 = Theogn. 31 f., 105; the same tendency to suspect enemies lurking everywhere, as in Theognis, appears in *sk.* 20.

⁵ On the hortatory formula πῖνε πῖνε in Simonides *PMG* 512 cf. BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 315.

and at the same time is “an imitation of Anacreon” (Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets, ad loc.*, p. 484). *Sk.* 23 contains the exhortation $\epsilon\gamma\chi\epsilon\iota$, which (cf. *Theogn.* 487) is repeated by Callimachus (1063 ff. = XII, 51), Meleager (4222 = V, 136 and 4228 = V, 137) and, later, by Marcus Argentarius (V, 110).

Sk. 30 contains the exhortation $\phi\epsilon\delta\eta$, which reappears, as we shall see, in Asclepiades: the exhortation is to $\epsilon\rho\tilde{\alpha}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\epsilon\iota\omega$.

(B) Expression of a wish, introduced by the formula $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\theta\epsilon$: *skolia* 17 and 18. This motif (cf. also Reitzenstein, *Epigr. u. Sk.*, p. 93) has been fully dealt with by Lier (*op. cit.*, p. 51-54) and therefore I need not dilate on it. One point, however, I should like to make: the motif was clearly of popular origin, and in this respect it is significant that, amongst Hellenistic epigrammatists, the only poet who is certain to have utilized it was the all-receptive Meleager (4432 ff. = *A.P.* XII, 52 and 4186 ff. = V, 174)¹. In the latter epigram, Meleager used the hackneyed theme in order to obtain a neat “reversal” of motif (“ $\Upsilon\pi\nu\omega\varsigma$ becomes $\ddot{\alpha}\pi\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ²: the emphatic position of the epithet is significant); in the former Meleager has, once more, inverted the motif: he would like to *carry* the loved person, rather than *be carried* or *worn* (which was the usual motif: cf. e.g. Anacreontic 22, 8 $\ddot{\alpha}\pi\omega\varsigma\ \dot{\alpha}\epsilon\iota\ \phi\omega\tilde{\eta}\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon$). Meleager, we may conclude, uses old motifs in order to achieve neat “Umkehrungen”. I take this opportunity of observing that the motif dealt with by Lier *loc. cit.* is applied to cups by later epigrammatists, starting with Meleager 4182 ff. (= V, 171; cf. Gow-Page *ad loc.*; add *A.P.* V, 266).

¹ *A.P.* XII, 142 (= Gow-Page 3250 ff.) is $\dot{\omega}\varsigma\ \dot{\alpha}\pi\alpha\tilde{\nu}\varsigma$, cf. Gow-PAGE, *ad loc.*; *A.P.* V, 83 and 84, which Reitzenstein *loc. cit.* considers as “sicher alte Epigramme” are rightly regarded as not Hellenistic by Gow-Page.

² On Meleager’s *acumen* cf. Wernicke’s observations (*Thes.*, s.v. $\ddot{\alpha}\pi\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, 1832 A).

(C) Couplets with a point. *Skolia* 21 and 22 show "pungent wit", as Bowra says (*op. cit.*, p. 382). It may be added that the witticism is achieved by means of a point, exactly as happens in the case of epigrams. *Sk.* 21 is taken to be the parody of a Dorian rustic (cf. Smyth, *op. cit.*, *ad loc.*, p. 485) who clumsily quotes a proverb, in order to justify his own desires; in *sk.* 22, the second line gives the point, by explaining the apparently illogical comparison indicated in the first line. These are typical epigrammatic structures: in epigrams the point often serves to explain an apparent illogicality that precedes, and proverbs are utilized by the epigrammatists in order to obtain humorous effects¹. The structural analogy existing between *skolia* and epigrams, from the point of view of the function given to the points² or the proverb, is worth stressing.

Alcaeus

In the case of Alcaeus, the task of analysing the sympotic *Leitmotive* present in his poetic production is easy, because already the ancient critics separated the Συμποτικά, Ἐρωτικά and Σκόλια from the Πολεμικά and Στασιωτικά.

Alcaeus was "overfond of war" (Smyth, *op. cit.*, p. 223), but he was no less fond of drinking: indeed, as all the critics from Athenaeus (X, 430) downwards have observed, for him any pretext was good enough to justify a drinking party. His drinking songs were, as is well known, "almost extemporey"³, that is, "Gelegenheitsdichtung", just as is the case with much of epigrammatic poetry. We would expect his poetry, therefore, to share many a motif with Alexandrian epigrams, and yet this is not so. The reason is to be found in

¹ Cf. v. PRITTWITZ-GAFFRON, *Das Sprichwort im griech. Epigramm*, Diss. Giessen 1912.

² Cf., as an example of apparently illogical nonsense explained by a declaration that follows, *A.P.* XII, 171 (1515 ff.), analysed in *Class. Rev.* 1967, p. 22.

³ BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

the poet's personality: "he is not subtle, nor even very imaginative", and "treats a drinking-party with the same energetic attention with which he treats politics"¹: his approach "is direct and immediate and realistic"², and, as an inevitable consequence, his utterances on wine and banquets have an elemental, uncomplicated and conventional—if robust³—tone. Exhortations to drink occur in fragm. 401 *a* LP ($\chiαῖρε καὶ πῶ$) and 401 *b* LP ($\deltaεῦρο σύμπωθι$); another exhortation occurs at 346 LP ($\piώνωμεν ... ἔγχεε...$), which contains the conventional motif of wine as a remover of worries; at 338 LP the excuse for drinking is the cold, whilst at 347 LP it is the heat (the motif is imitated from Hesiod). Whereas, however, Hesiod had recommended a "weak mixture", as we have seen, the impetuous Alcaeus recommends a mixture which is "a good deal stronger than normally" (Bowra, p. 158): this detail of the mixture, as we can follow it in its development in sympotic literature, is not without relevance to epigrams, as we shall see. At 38 LP we find the traditional motif of ephemeral youth; at 332 and 335 LP we read that $\muεθύσθην$ is good, for opposite reasons (Bowra, *op. cit.*, p. 157). The motif *in vino veritas* occurs at 333 LP and 366 LP. These two fragments are apophthegmatic utterances of the type which we have already seen in Theognis' $\gammaνῶμαι$ and in the Attic *skolia*⁴: their nature is sententious and conventional rather than imaginative. The ideal *symposion*, says Alcaeus with no breath-taking flight of imagination, is a mixture of loving and drinking (368 LP). The poet's character—robust, but

¹ BOWRA, *ibid.*, p. 157.

² BOWRA, *ibid.*, p. 150.

³ BOWRA (*op. cit.*, p. 160) rightly speaks of "the imperative temper of a drinking song". In Alcaeus' uncomplicated psychology, the exhortation to drink, under a plausible pretext, was all there was to a poem.

⁴ Cf. G. S. FARRELL, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, p. 322; BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 160, n. 4 and 161, n. 1.

uncomplicated, unimaginative and lacking in sense of humour —had very little in common with the Alexandrians¹: it is significant that the only notable echo of the motifs used by Alcaeus (fr. 346 LP) occurs in Asclepiades 880 ff. = XII, 50², an epigram which we shall examine later, and where the reference is made to Alcaeus in order to obtain a humorous point.

Anacreon

It is with Anacreon that the “Verinnerlichung” of sympotic *Leitmotive*, to the exclusion of political or moralistic implications, asserted itself. The ancients knew this only too well: they wondered whether he had lived *libidinosior an ebriosior* (Sen., *Ep.* 88; cf. *A.P.* IX, 239, 3-4). “He had little interest in war or politics”³. In the *symposia*, attended as they were by male aristocrats, there was much singing about war and politics⁴, but the poet gives us his unequivocal *manifesto* (cf. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 50) in fr. 56 Gent. This *manifesto* agrees, in its negative part, with Xenophanes’ (fr. 1 D.), who had proscribed στάσιας σφεδανάς from the *symposion*⁵. What Anacreon liked was indicated by him in fr. 23 Gent.: he wanted to συνηβᾶν, as does the author of Skol. 19 (cf. Theogn. 877, ὥβα); he did not care about wars (49 Gent.; cf. Bowra, *op. cit.*, p. 271). His interest was, as Smyth appositely says, in “Wein, Weib und Gesang”⁶.

¹ Cf. Bowra, *op. cit.*, p. 164, who notices the contrast between Alcaeus and the poets “of the Alexandrian age”, but unfortunately does not seem to be familiar with the essential features and the spirit of Alexandrian poetry.

² Cf. SMYTH, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

³ BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

⁴ BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 304.

⁵ Cf. LAVAGNINI, *Aglaia*, Torino 1954, p. 58: “E’ la descrizione di un simposio, ma di un simposio di saggi, quindi... in contrasto polemico coll’uso corrente”; cf. also BUCHHOLZ, *Anthol.*, I, p. 40 ff. and especially Hudson-Williams’ commentary *ad loc.*

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 47, = fr. 93 Gent., 373 *PMG*.

We find in his production Hymns which closely resemble the ones preserved in Theognis and in the Attic *skolia*, i.e. invocations addressed to a god for protection. Fr. 1 Gent. is “a personal prayer”¹, “a hymn, perhaps of the kletic class”², an “*inno cletico*”³, but it is significant that he, in a certain sense, adapted this genre to his personal amatory aims: in the Hymn 14 Gent. Dionysus, the god of wine, is invoked in a “*carme simposiaco che diviene personale negli ultimi versi*”⁴, and from ἥμιν (line 7) the poet passes to ἐμόν in line 10.

Let us now examine certain *Leitmotive* of his poetry. The motif of old age appears, but it is now coupled with a humorous element of *Selbstironie*: the poet “*klagt über das eigene Alter*”⁵. Fr. 36 Gent. is a description of himself as an old man, which has so far been misunderstood. Here is the text:

Πολιοὶ μὲν ἥμιν ἥδη
 κρόταφοι κάρη τε λευκόν,
 χαρίεσσα δ' οὐκέτ' ἥβη
 πάρα, γηράλεοι δ' ὀδόντες.
 γλυκεροῦ δ' οὐκέτι πολλὸς
 βιότου χρόνος λέλειπται.
 διὰ ταῦτ' ἀνασταλύζω
 θαμὰ Ταρταρον δεδοικώς:
 'Αίδεω γάρ ἐστι δεινὸς
 μυχός, ἀργαλέη δ' ἐς αὐτὸν
 κάτοδος· καὶ γὰρ ἐτοῖμον
 καταβάντι μὴ ἀναβῆναι.

¹ BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 273.

² SMYTH, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

³ GENTILI, *Anacreonte*, Roma 1958, p. xxii.

⁴ LAVAGNINI, *op. cit.*, p. 166. Cf. in particular Gentili, *op. cit.*, p. XXI f., who aptly compares Sappho's Hymn to Aphrodite: this, too, was a *κλητικὸς ὕμνος* which has a “*contenuto tutto personale*” (Lavagnini, *op. cit.*, p. 114).

⁵ LESKY, *op. cit.*, p. 202. For the motif cf. PHILODEMUS *A.P.* XI, 30, and v. PRITTWITZ-GAFFRON, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

The poem seems at first a dull and pointless complaint about old age, but then culminates in a very humorous twist at the end : the poet, in spite of his old age, is still fully *idoneus puellis*¹, and indeed complains because, once one has died, one cannot *make love* any more : Anacreon has cleverly employed, at the close of his poem, the usual opposition between *καταβαίνειν* and *ἀναβαίνειν* (cf. *Thes.*, s.v. *καταβαίνω*, for examples) in order to obtain a very witty effect based on the meaning of *ἀναβῆναι* (for his final *ἀναβῆναι*, cf. Moeris, 3 *ἀναβῆναι τὴν γυναικα 'Αττικοί*, and *Thes.*, s.v. *ἀναβαίνω*, 304 B-C). The poet has used what was a current, trivial motif (cf. Tribukait, *De Proverbiis... ap. Bucolicos...*, Diss. Königsberg 1889, p. 36, on the “*Orci fores*”; Callim. 1189 = *A.P.* VII, 524, 3 *ἄνοδοι*, and Peek *GV* 1905, 19-23; for *κάτοδος*, cf. e.g. *A.P.* XI, 23, 3), transforming it into an extremely witty climactic point which places the preceding lines in an entirely new light². The humorous ambiguity in

¹ The conclusion of the poem is prepared by the pointed *πολλός* in line 5. For an analysis of the structure cf. note below.

² My interpretation of the poem is confirmed by the unanimous biographical tradition, according to which Anacreon retained his amatory powers throughout his life (cf. e.g. *Sud.*, s.v. *Ἀνακρέων*: *βίος δὲ ἦν αὐτῷ πρὸς ἔρωτας παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν, κτλ.* and *A.P.* IX, 239, 3 f. *πρέσβυς ... σὺν ἴμέροις, A.P.* VII, 23, 7 f. *πάντα διαπλώσας ... σὺν ἔρωτι βίον*). Cf. in particular *A.P.* VII, 25, 5-8, a passage which seems directly inspired by the fragment that I have explained :

μοῦνον δ' εἰν 'Αχέροντι βαρύνεται, οὐχ ὅτι λείπων
ἡέλιον Λήθης ἐνθάδ' ἔκυρσε δόμων,
ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸν χαρίεντα μετ' ἡιθέοισι Μεγιστέα
καὶ τὸν Σμερδίεω Θρῆκα λέλοιπε πόθον.

Cf. also Anacreontic 6 Bgk., where the *γυναικες* tease the poet, but he replies that *τῷ γέροντι μᾶλλον πρέπει τὸ τερπνὸν παιζειν*, *ὅσῳ πέλας τὰ Μοίρης* (*παιζειν*, of course, is explained by Anacreontic 50 Bgk. *παιζειν μετὰ χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης*). In order to be properly savoured, Anacreon's poem must be carefully read within the framework of sympotic literature. He is alluding to the motif that one must, as long as one can, *ἔρῶν καὶ κατεσθίειν* (*skol.* 30), a motif which lasts until late (*A.P.* XI, 38, 5 *πῖνε καὶ ἔσθιε*, in a banquet, as indicated by *περίκεισο ἄνθεα*; the banquet implies bed-companions, cf. *A.P.* XI, 28, 4 *ἄλοχον*, XI, 34, 3 *διψάδα πόρνην*, and XI, 39, 1 for one such *γυνή*). Anacreon does admit that he cannot eat easily any longer

the use of a key-word (here, *ἀναβῆναι*) by the poet is, it must be noted, a literary feature which became common in the Alexandrian age: structurally, too, the technique of the "surprise point" at the *end* of the poem is the same as in the epigrams. For a close parallel, from the point of view of ambiguity in diction, cf. *CR* 1967, p. 22 on the use of *ἔμβατεῖν* at 2063 = VII, 657, 2. Similarly, fr. 13 Gent. has

(*γηράλεοι δ' ὁδόντες*), but he does say that he is *still* (*οὐκέτι πολλός*) able to enjoy *γλυκερὸς βίοτος*: his *βίος* is not yet *ἄτερ χρυσῆς Αφροδίτης*, he is not yet *ἀτίμαστος γυναιξίν*, as Mimnermus would put it. Anacreon is very careful not to make an admission like the ones we read e.g. at *A.P.* XII, 240 or XI, 30, and is preparing the ground for his surprise ending, at the end of the poem.

He finds the descent to Hades *ἀργαλέη* because (*καὶ γάρ*) it will be no longer possible for him to make love down there: *καὶ γάρ* does not mean "and more" (Edmonds), but explains the *only* reason why Anacreon really finds Hades *δεινός* and the descent *ἀργαλέη*: on *καὶ γάρ* explaining a preceding *γάρ* cf. DENNISTON, *Gr. Part.*², p. 108. The adjective *έτοιμος*, used with the infinitive *ἀναβῆναι*, means "sure to come, certain, inevitable" (cf. L.S.J., s.v. I, 2), exactly as in Eur. *H.F.* 86 ("verum et certum est me non redire", Mehlhorn, followed by Buchholz, *Anthol.* II, 2 p. 27, and Smyth *ad loc.*, p. 293); for "μὴ with *ἀναβῆναι*" (SMYTH, *loc. cit.*) cf. Soph., *El.* 1078 μὴ *βλέπειν*. Anacreon has cleverly utilized the motif of the "one regret" of the dead for the one thing that he (or she) misses and is no longer available in Hades: this motif appears, as we have said, at *A.P.*, VII, 25, 5-8, precisely in reference to Anacreon; we shall see later that the motif of the "one regret" was humorously applied, by Alexandrian epigrammatists, to the bibulous, if not amatory, desires of ladies in the nether world. In conclusion: once we become aware—as the ancient Greek speakers were!—of the meaning that the verb *ἀναβῆναι* could have in Greek, and of the "one regret" - motif commonly applied, in Greek sepulchral literature, to the dead in the nether world, the poem of Anacreon recovers for us moderns the witty and specific meaning that was of course not lost on the ancient reader. It is a pointed piece, very much like an epigram in spirit, technique and structure. The critics so far had interpreted Anacreon's poem as an expression of resigned acceptance, very much out of character with his unabating amatory inclinations ("old age was bad enough, but what came after it might be worse", BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 306): now we have realized that old age does not trouble the poet at all, as his pointed *πολλός* indicates: only what comes after it worries him! The "build-up" technique of the poem is worth noticing: first of all our suspicions are aroused by the strategically placed *πολλός*, and the point arrives at the very end, with *ἀναβῆναι*. Anacreon really "enjoyed himself to the last" (BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 307).

a very felicitous twist at the end, in true epigrammatic style. Here is the text :

Σφαίρη δηῦτέ με πορφυρέη
 βάλλων χρυσοκόμης Ἔρως
 νήνι ποικιλοσαμβάλω
 συμπαίζειν προκαλεῖται.
 ή δ', ἔστιν γάρ ἀπ' εύκτίτου
 Λέσβου, τὴν μὲν ἐμὴν κόμην,
 λευκὴ γάρ, καταμέμφεται,
 πρὸς δ' ἄλλην τινὰ χάσκει.

One would think that the poet is rejected by the girl because his hair is white (*ἐμὴν κόμην* ... *λευκὴ* = *πολιοὶ κρόταφοι* fr. 36 Gent.) but we discover that matters stand differently. The girl, a Lesbian, prefers, as *fellatrix*, not the poet's greying *κόμη*, not the cephalic hair, but another *κόμη*, the *κόμη* of his *αἰδοῖον*, the poet's pubic hair¹. The point, as in the epigrams, comes at the *end* of the poem : the poet, we may infer, is not too old to love, he is still *idoneus puellis*². The situation in fr. 83-84 Gent., = 378-379 *PMG*, if the two fragments belong to the same poem, is far from clear in its details. Smyth (*op. cit.*, p. 291) thinks that "the poet, having been scorned by a beautiful boy, flies aloft to Olympus to demand satisfaction of Eros, but Eros refuses to listen to his aged petitioner"³ : or, rather, is Eros going to be

¹ My learned friend, B. Gentili, has drawn my attention to the paper by Wigodsky in *Class. Phil.* 1962, p. 109.

² For the motif of pretended impotence cf. Hor., *Od.* III, 26 (an ode which has an "impostatura ellenistica" and is of Anacreontean inspiration, Pasquali, *op. cit.* p. 501). Horace pretends at first to be no longer *idoneus*, but at the end he turns the tables and we discover that it is rather Chloe (the green one !) who is *arrogans*, and does not want to love him (cf. *Od.* I, 23, 11-12 *tandem tempestiva viro*). On this Ode and its "surprise ending" cf. Copley *op. cit.*, p. 56. The same motif as in Anacreon and Horace occurs in Alcman (cf. Interpretationen griechischer Meliker, in *Rh. Mus.*, forthcoming).

³ Cf. also Bowra, *op. cit.*, p. 305, whose interpretation is accepted by Gentili (cf. his apparatus on fr. 84).

punished (cf. Schefold, *Prop. Kunstgesch.* I, fig. 236)? However that may be, all the critics seem to agree that the fragment contains a large dose of *Selbstironie*; perhaps the poet smiles at himself as a middle-aged lover in fr. 77 Gent¹. There are, of course, traditional motifs in Anacreon's poetry. In fr. 4 Gent. the poet "proclaims his belief in the Mean"²; we have already seen that the $\mu\eta\delta\grave{\epsilon}\nu$ $\grave{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\nu$ motif was at home in sympotic poetry. Fr. 33 Gent. is an "invito a bere" (Lavagnini, *op. cit.*, p. 173) in the hortatory tone ($\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$) usual in sympotic literature: in evident contrast with the request made by Alcaeus (fr. 346 LP $\kappa\epsilon\sigma\eta\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\check{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\nu\sigma$), the poet insists on a weaker, more civilized mixture ($\delta\epsilon\kappa'$... $\check{\nu}\delta\alpha\tau\sigma\varsigma$, ... $\pi\epsilon\eta\tau\epsilon\delta'$ $\sigma\check{\nu}\sigma\sigma\sigma$). Specific mention of such details (cf. also fr. 30 Gent.)³ was becoming, as we have already observed, a traditional motif in sympotic literature.

The intimate connection between wine-drinking and love-making is obvious in fr. 38 Gent.:

Φέρ' $\check{\nu}\delta\omega\sigma$, φέρ' $\sigma\check{\nu}\sigma\sigma\sigma$, $\check{\omega}$ $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}$,
φέρε δ' $\grave{\alpha}\nu\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\sigma\eta\tau\alpha\varsigma$ $\check{\eta}\mu\tilde{\iota}\nu$
στεφάνου ς , $\check{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\kappa\sigma$, $\check{\omega}\varsigma$ $\mu\check{\eta}$
πρὸς "Ερωτα πυκταλίζω.

This fragment needs detailed discussion. First of all, we must put out of the way an interpretation considered by Farnell (*op. cit.*, p. 352), according to which wine is seen by the poet as a "refuge from Eros" (cf. also Lavagnini, *op. cit.*, p. 173 "rimedio all' amore", i.e. *against* love). To consider wine as an antidote to love-making would be contrary to the unanimous opinion held by the ancient

¹ Fr. 74 Gent. apparently does not, however, depict Anacreon as an unsuccessful middle-aged womaniser, cf. Gentili *ad loc.*

² BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 291.

³ Cf. BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 276.

Greeks: wine, if drunk in the proper way (i.e. with water at a banquet, as Anacreon wants to do), was always regarded from Homer downwards as an erotic stimulant. We have already seen what happened to the bibulous Centaurs according to Homer: Euripides, *Bacch.* 773, tells us that οἴνου... μηκέτ' ὄντος οὐκ ἔστιν Κύπρις¹; Copley (*op. cit.*, p. 6) has shown that he, who sings a *paraclausithyron*, is generally "a lover who has been at a symposion" and is "warm with wine", such as the amorous Cyclops who was πλέως οἴνου (Eur. *Cycl.* 503): Anacreon himself (93 Gent.) is inclined to amorous activities (χωμάζων) after drinking a whole οἴνου κάδον. The motif, of course, is utilized in Hellenistic epigrams, as we shall see. As Gentili rightly observes (*op. cit.*, p. 202), "l'amore si associa spesso nell'arte di Anacreonte all'allegrezza del convito". It may therefore be concluded that the interpretation in question is a non-starter.

The choice between the variants ὡς μή and ὡς δή is, however, difficult². The recent editors (Gentili, Page) prefer ὡς δή: in this case we would have to see in the passage a tone of "Selbstironie" on the part of the poet: "il poeta cerca la lotta quasi certo di vincere l'avversario o almeno di resistergli" (Gentili, *op. cit.*, p. 202); the δή would be "ironical" (Smyth, *op. cit.*, p. 295), because Eros was ἀνίκατος μάχαν (Soph., *Ant.* 781) and Anacreon himself knows that the god δαμάζει everybody (37 Gent., cf. Smyth, *op. cit.*, p. 297, fr. xxv). If we accept this interpretation, we may see it supported by *A.P.* XI, 63: wine gives "Zechermut" (cf. Beckby *ad loc.*), and, just as Macedonius is ready, when drunk, to fight the invincible Giants, so Anacreon would proclaim himself ready to fight an invincible god.

¹ SCHOTT, *Posidippi epigrammata*, Diss. Berlin 1905, p. 64.

² Unfortunately fr. 65 Gent. = 346, 4 *PMG*, which contains the same ingredients as fr. 38 Gent. (ἐπυκτάλιζον, φέροι οἴνον φέροι ... ὕδωρ, etc.) is so confused that it cannot help us at all (Page, *ad loc.*, thinks that we may have business with "duo carmina"; cf. BOWRA, *op. cit.*, 293).

But why should Anacreon profess himself ready to πυκταλίζειν Eros? If he is at a banquet¹, surely he is there to make love—whether on the premises, or in the course of the κῶμος that will follow the banquet, does not matter to us—exactly as happens in fr. 93 Gent. : Farnell, *op. cit.*, p. 352, is right in observing that, if the poet wants to take part in a banquet, he is evidently in a mood to greet Eros as a conqueror, he will do his best to welcome Eros, and will not try to fight the god: such a Lapalissian truth will be confirmed, as we shall see, by sympotic tradition.

At Soph., *Trach.* 441 f. we read:

Ἐρωτι μέν νυν ὅστις ἀντανίσταται
πύκτης ὅπως ἐς χεῖρας, οὐ καλῶς φρονεῖ.

It is obvious that the two passages are connected, but their relationship has remained unclear. Jebb, who would like to read ως δή in Anacreon, is compelled to gloss over the contradiction that would thus arise between the two statements: according to him, “the resemblance is only verbal”, because “the reveller does not wish to *resist* Love, but to *make trial* of his might”. But the resemblance can hardly be purely verbal: either Sophocles is echoing Anacreon’s passage, or both poets are, independently of each other, alluding to the same proverbial saying; πυκταλίζω does not mean “make trial”, but “fight”, and we have just seen with Farnell that the poet cannot wish to fight Eros, but must rather be all too eager to welcome him. Banqueting does not imply offering the slightest resistance to Eros, in Anacreon: on the contrary, “l’amore si associa spesso nell’arte di Anacreonte all’allegrezza del convito”, as I have just said. On the other hand, Smyth *ad loc.* (p. 295) thinks that Sophocles’ passage supports the reading ως μή in Anacreon’s text: Anacreon, that is, refuses to be a fool, wants

¹ As shown by his request for wine, water and garlands (on the three garlands cf. Athen. XV, 671 e).

to καλῶς φρονεῖν, and therefore receives Eros, instead of fighting him. But why the specific mention of wine, and the final ὡς? This would imply the grotesque suggestion that Anacreon is normally a fool, and when sober wastes his time in fighting the invincible god, the δεινότατος θέων, δυνάστης θεῶν, πάντων δυσμαχώτατος θεῶν¹: we know, instead, that Anacreon, when he has his wits about him, wisely flees such an invincible adversary, instead of challenging him to a fight or welcoming him (fr. 35 Gent., also 65, 4 Gent.). And — fundamental difficulty — how could Anacreon καλῶς φρονεῖν by drinking? Only when sober is one “capable of reasoning” (cf. Gow-Page, *Introd.* to Posidipp. VII).

In order to understand Anacreon's passage we must remember that there were four main τόποι regarding Eros. (I) The god must be fled (Lier, *op. cit.*, p. 17, § 7: Anacreon does this, as I have just said, at 35 Gent.); (II) “*Amori resistentes operam perdunt*” (cf. Lier, *op. cit.*, 18, § 8: this is the τόπος utilized by Sophocles in the passage of the *Trachiniae*); (III) ἐρωμανεῖν is opposed to λογίζεσθαι (cf. Lier, *op. cit.*, p. 16-17; Anacreon's conception of love fits within this τόπος: ἐρᾶν is μαίνεσθαι, 46 Gent.); (IV) Τόπος Nr. III became typical of sympotic literature by the insertion of the motif according to which wine renders one no longer sober, no longer *compos sui*, thereby inducing ἐρωτικὴ μανία and inability to resist the assaults of Eros (cf. Lier, *op. cit.*, p. 25 f. § 14). At 3078 ff. the point is that “so long as Posidippus is sober Reason is always arrayed against the assault” (Gow-Page *ad loc.*); cf. also 3668 ff. = XII, 115, 4092 ff. = XII, 117 (where the lack of λογισμός in one who is οἰνοβαρής and willing to accept Eros is stressed), 4098 ff. = XII, 119; cf. also Rufinus, V, 93, and v. Prittwitz-Gaffron, *op. cit.*, p. 48 f.

The above sympotic passages prove *ad abundantiam* that the genuine reading in Anacreon is ὡς μή: Anacreon wants

¹ Cf. BRUCHMANN, *Epitheta deorum*, s.v. Eros, for attestations.

to say that when he is drunk, no longer sober, no longer able to καλῶς φρονεῖν because of his drunkenness, he is prepared to welcome Love, that *tormenting* master¹.

Whether Sophocles reversed the motif as present in Anacreon (the point in his passage is that whoever is in a sober state of mind, *compos sui*, knows better than to fight the god), or whether both poets have differently utilized a proverbial saying, is impossible to ascertain. It is interesting to note in this connection that both motifs, Anacreon's and Sophocles', are coupled in Plut. *Amat.* 759 *b*, where the author, no doubt reflecting earlier texts (cf. Copley, *op. cit.* p. 21 f.), states that the ἐρωτικὴ μανία conquers both νήφοντες and πίνοντες.

The variant reading ὡς δή arose because the copyists could not understand Anacreon's elegant implication: since wine is traditionally coupled with bellicosity (from Homer's allusion to the Centaurs' ὕβρις down to Macedonius' epigram on his own "Zechermut") there ading ὡς δή came into being.

Anacreon's readiness (as his *final* ὡς shows) to deprive himself of his λογισμός by drinking in order to welcome love testifies to a keen sense of *Selbstironie* which the poet applies to his own feelings: in this, he is the harbinger of the Alexandrians².

¹ This point is very important. Anacreon's attitude to love coincides with Posidippus' and Meleager's: the poet's way of thinking is already Hellenistic. Love, to him and the Alexandrians, is a torment (cf. *Hermes* 1968, p. 172, on Asclepiades τρωθεῖς; on love being a fire, a wound, etc. cf. Gow's *Index* to Theocritus, s.v. Love; cf. also LIER, *op. cit.*, p. 31 c); yet the torment is γλυκύπικρος and the lover is willing to give up Reason in order to be tormented (cf. *Eranos* 1967, p. 43 f.). Posidippus himself tells us why he, in his sober state, was "arrayed for the assault" of love: Eros is a *torturer*, cf. 3074 ff.

² At 46 Gent. he is ready to smile at his own inconsistency in love affairs: he does not take himself and his feelings too seriously. Cf. FARRELL, *op. cit.*, p. 348: "he lives for love and wine, but is never carried away by either passion". Such an inclination never to dramatize one's own feelings is not infrequent in the Alexandrians: on Callimachus smiling at his own "fickleness" in his affections cf. Gow-Page *ad* 1035 ff. = XII, 102, and v. PRITTWITZ-

Copley (*op. cit.*, p. 14) has already analysed the traces of *κῶμος* in Alcaeus and Anacreon. It is now interesting to see that Anacreon shows a reversal of motif at 45 Gent.:

κού μοκλὸν ἐν θύρῃσι διέγῃσιν βαλῶν
ἥσυχος καθεύδει

The technique of “reversal”, “Umkehrung” was destined to become a typically Alexandrian literary feature: Anacreon is a forerunner of the Alexandrians. The essential point of the *κῶμος* was that the night revellers should insistently demand admission (cf. e.g. Alc. 374 LP), try to burst the double door open (*θύρῃσι δικλῆσι* = Asclepiades 860 ff., *A.P.* V, 145; *δικλίδας* V, 256) and to break the *μοχλός* (e.g. Theocr. II, 127 ff.), or to burn the door (*A.P.* XII, 252). Opposition was sometimes offered by the *θυρωρός* (*A.P.* V, 30, 3; V, 4, 4; V, 294, 5; Luc. *Dial. Mer.* XII, 3), and indeed a *θυρωρός* appears in Anacreon, at fr. 27 Gent., which no doubt describes the stage at which breaking in is attempted. Anacreon 45 Gent. is iambic, i.e. “Spottpoesie”: the poet is satirizing a boy who, because now too old, is no longer visited by lovers, although he leaves—hopefully but in vain—his door unbolted. The hopes of the boy against whom Anacreon directs his “sarcasme impitoyable” (cf. Waltz, *Anthol.*, Livre V, Introd., p. 16) are the same as those of the boy at *A.P.* XII, 36: the “Vergeltung”-motif (cf. Kägi, *op. cit.*, p. 19-30, where it is fully treated) is the most usual theme in Book XII of the *Anthology*, and we

GAFFRON, *op. cit.*, p. 22. Cf. *A.P.* XII, 200 and 203. Callimachus smiles at his being betrayed by Lysanies, as I have shown in *Eranos* 1968, forthcoming. Kägi (*op. cit.*, p. 40 f.) shows that the motif is also attested in Theognis' book II (1369 ff.; as for 1091-94, “rien ne prouve qu'il s'agisse d'une amitié libertine”, CARRIÈRE, *Poèmes*, p. 77, n. 3; for later developments cf. LIER, *op. cit.*, § 22). Cf. BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 284: “when Anacreon comes to his own emotions, he is not going to make too grand a parade of them”. It remains for us to add that such an attitude places Anacreon much nearer to the Alexandrians than to the lyric poets such as Sappho or Alcaeus.

may conclude that Anacreon's poem is the earliest example of it¹.

To sum up: both in spirit and in technique², Anacreon shows a notable affinity with Alexandrian epigrammatists.

Epigram

We have so far observed how far certain sympotic *Leitmotive* developed in Greek literature before the Alexandrian period, and we have seen how, of the two conflicting elements present in the sympotic genre, i.e. the serious-political and convivial-erotic, the latter ended by prevailing with Anacreon. In particular we have noted that Anacreon shows a notable *Wahlverwandtschaft* with the Alexandrians, in that certain ingredients of Hellenistic poetry, *Selbstironie* and the technique of motif-reversal or pointed "surprise ending" are already present in his poetry. By way of anticipation, we have already noticed *obiter* how the more popular motifs of sympotic literature were, as a rule, avoided by the Alexandrian epigrammatists.

We shall now try to see how the main themes of sympotic literature were utilized by the epigrammatists. The Alexandrians were, of course, perfectly aware of their continuing, in their epigrams, a sympotic literary tradition, witness Callimachus 1185 f. = VII, 415, and Leonidas 2020 ff., = VII, 440, 7 ff: this has already been emphasized by Reitzenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 87 f. What I shall try to do now is to follow the utilization of certain given motifs at the hands of various poets.

¹ Cf. PASQUALI, *op. cit.*, p. 420, on Anacreon's "canzone a dispetto".

² It will be noted that the poet achieves his point by strategically placed key-words (we have examined πολλός-ἀναβῆναι, χάσκει, μὴ πυκταλίζω; cf. BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 294, 296 and also p. 285, on the poet's "skilful placing" of "pointed" words). The equestrian metaphor which concludes 36 Gent. is paralleled by the metaphor which concludes 78 Gent.: on such metaphors cf. now Gow-Page, *Introd.* to 832 ff., and *ad* 1486 ("horse-races", = 78, 4 Gent. δρόμου).

Avoir le vin triste

We might as well begin with this, which is perhaps the most famous of the erotic motifs in sympotic literature. We have already seen that the *topoi* to the effect that drinking makes you sad and makes you tell the truth were already known in sympotic tradition. A telling example of how these two themes were coupled and adapted by the Alexandrians is offered by *A.P.* XII, 135 and 134 (= 894 ff., 1103 ff.):

Οἶνος ἔρωτος ἔλεγχος· ἔραν ἀρνεύμενον ἡμῖν
ἥτασαν αἱ πολλαὶ Νικαγόρην προπόσεις·
καὶ γὰρ ἐδάκρυσεν καὶ ἐνύστασε καὶ τι κατηφές
ἔβλεπε, χῶ σφιγχθεὶς οὐκ ἔμενε στέφανος.

"Ελκος ἔχων ὁ ξεῖνος ἐλάνθανεν· ως ἀνιηρὸν
πνεῦμα διὰ στηθέων — εἴδες; — ἀνηγάγετο,
τὸ τρίτον ἦνίκ' ἔπινε, τὰ δὲ ρόδα φυλλοβολεῦντα
τῶνδρὸς ἀπὸ στομάτων πάντ' ἐγένοντο χαμαί.
ὢπτηται μέγα δή τι· μὰ δαίμονας, οὐκ ἀπὸ ρύσμου
εἰκάζω, φωρὸς δ' ἵχνια φώρῳ ἔμαθον.

The two epigrams are evidently related to each other: this has long been known¹, but so far their respective points have not been clarified. These consist both in the fact that Asclepiades and Callimachus have chosen different stages of the *symposion* as the moment when the person described betrays his *peine d'amour*. Asclepiades begins in the apophthegmatic style (οἶνος ἔρωτος ἔλεγχος) which we have seen to be not infrequent² in sympotic literature: this sententious *ouverture*, in which the apophthegm has been adapted to an

¹ Cf. REITZENSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 159 f.; PASQUALI, *op. cit.*, p. 514 ff. offers a particularly acute commentary.

² REITZENSTEIN, *loc. cit.*

erotic theme¹, gives a “sympotic” tone to the poem. It was customary at banquets to first give three toasts to the gods, and then to start the toasts of a more personal nature, the erotic προπόσεις; we have already seen that this motif is established in *Theognis*. The whole point of Asclepiades’ epigram is the fact that Nicagoras is so much in love that he has drunk too many toasts to his beloved², and that his drunken state—he nodded, ἐνύστασε³, because such toasts were given with pure wine—is now betraying his *peine d’amour*, a *peine* which he has been trying to hide (ἐρῶν ἀρνεύμενον). Callimachus, whose epigram is evidently modelled on Asclepiades’ (cf. Gow-Page on *Asclep.* xviii and v. Prittowitz-Gaffron, *op. cit.*, p. 20 f.) has inverted the theme: the protagonist has a hidden wound, which causes him to be in a fever⁴, but his fever (= his love) is so great that no sooner has he finished drinking the three introductory toasts than the wine betrays him. In other words: his feelings are so overwhelming that merely three cups suffice to bring them into the open. Asclepiades has, in conclusion, used the motif of πολλὰς σπονδάς (*Theogn.* 489 ff.), Callimachus the motif

¹ KÄGI, *op. cit.*, p. 54; KNAUER, *op. cit.*, p. 12; at XI, 232 the motif is “nicht erotisch gewendet”, cf. KÄGI, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

² Knauer, who is not familiar with such sympotic traditions, writes: “vielleicht liegt in dem αἱ πολλαὶ eine gewisse Absichtlichkeit seitens des Zutrinkenden” (*op. cit.*, p. 12). In reality, Nicagoras’ infatuation as shown by his enthusiastically repeating the love-toasts is the whole point of the poem! Meleager drinks πάλιν, πάλιν καὶ πάλιν a toast to his beloved, with ἀκρητος wine, at 4222 f. (= V, 136). Cf. Callim. 1063 = XII, 51 ἔγγει καὶ πάλιν εἰπέ.

³ Cf. the commentators on Plat. *Symp.* 238 c-d: whoever νυστάζει at a symposium incurs ἐωλοκρασία.

⁴ On love as a hidden wound cf. LIER, *op. cit.*, p. 31 f.; ἀπὸ ὁσμοῦ is, of course, a medical term (cf. LUCK, *GGA* 1967, p. 58): in pre-Lister days, the only defence on which the body could count against an infection caused by a wound was a fever; on ὁθυμός cf. the *Index* to Galen in Kühn’s edition, s.v. *Rhythmus* and *Pulsus*; cf. GALEN, IV, p. 149 Kühn: μία αἰτία τῆς μεταβολῆς τῶν σφυγμῶν ἔστιν αὔξησίς τε καὶ μείωσις τῆς ἐμφύτου θερμότητος.

of the three¹ introductory *σπονδαί* (Theogn. 486 ff.) in order to say the same thing in a different, indeed opposite² way: either *too many* love-toasts after the first three ritual ones, or *not even one* love-toast at all, but only the first three libations, betray the love of the protagonists. Unless we place these two epigrams within the framework of sympotic tradition, they cannot be understood properly and their respective points completely elude us: the difficulties which have so far prevented us from understanding them (cf. Gow-Page on 1105, who tentatively wonder whether the third libation might have had some special relevance for the protagonist) disappear when we recognize that the two poets have used specific sympotic details in order to achieve each his own point. The motif of the "vin triste" enables us to understand Asclepiades 870 ff. = V, 167, which I have examined in *Hermes* 1968, p. 171 ff.:

Γετὸς ἦν καὶ νὺξ καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἄλγος ἔρωτι
οἶνος, καὶ Βορέης ψυχρός, ἐγὼ δὲ μόνος.
ἀλλ' ὁ καλὸς Μόσχος πλέον ἵσχυεν. « Καὶ σὺ γὰρ οὔτως
ἥλυθες, οὐδὲ θύρην πρὸς μίαν ἡσυχάσας ».
Τῆδε τοσοῦτ' ἐβόησα βεβρεγμένος. "Αχρι τίνος, Ζεῦ;
Ζεῦ φίλε, σίγησον· καύτὸς ἐρᾶν ἔμαθες.

¹ Cf. especially Gow-Page on 1105.

² I may conclude that "l'idée générale" (HAUVETTE, *REG* 1907, p. 339) has been utilized by the two poets in order to achieve two opposite points. There are, of course, other pointed variations, which I shall study in detail in my forthcoming *Studies in Hellenistic Epigram*: Nicagoras nods (the aorist ἐνύστασε is patently punctiliar!) so that his garland falls, whereas Callimachus, with his *στομάτων*, is playing with ἀφυλλον *στόμα* and alluding to the ὑποθυμίς, which his neighbour has under "ses narines" (Dar.-Saglio, s.v. *Corona*, p. 1527; Athen. XV, 671 e) and upon which he is "breathing or sighing heavily" (Gow-Page, on 1103). With an unbelievable lack of perceptiveness all the critics have made a bee-line for the *lectio facilior* *στεφάνων*! Both enamoured banqueters have nodded: one has dropped his head-garland, the other is sighing heavily into the ὑποθυμίς which is in front of his mouth.

In my interpretation published in *Hermes* I think I have clarified the crucial point of the epigram, that is, I have shown that the text of lines 3-4 is sound, and that it represents a typical reversal of motifs on the part of the poet: instead of crying for admission, as was usual in the genre, Asclepiades shouts that he does not really care about being shut out: he pretends to be engaged in a *κῶμος*, and not to have come straight to the house on whose threshold he now is. The poet has, once more, "trasformato con la sua consueta eleganza" (cf. Pasquali, *op. cit.*, p. 423) a traditional motif: instead of despair and pleading, he expresses pretended nonchalance. Of course such a fabricated attitude is only intended for the ears of the person Asclepiades loves, because he confesses his real feelings to Zeus: the poet, like Zeus, *ἐρα*, and it is for love that he is enduring the rain and the cold on the threshold.

This is, I think, the crucial point of the epigram; I now take this opportunity of clarifying certain details that I was not able to solve in my *Hermes* paper. Asclepiades' *paraclausithyron* depicts, as is customary in all epigrams of this type, a situation that the reader must reconstruct from the hints that the poet gives him. The situation, as indicated from the context, is the following: Asclepiades is now at the door (*ἐγὼ δὲ μόνος ... τῆδε*), in the rain and exposed to the cold¹ exactly as is the case with his epigram 1006 ff. = V, 189; (cf. also 866 ff., = V, 164, where, however, no mention is made of the weather). Before signifying to the readers that he is now alone at the door, the poet recalls what has happened: it was a rainy and windy night, and the poet was *πλέως οἴνου* (cf. Eur. *Cycl.* 503): he left the banquet, and has come to visit his beloved. He is now standing alone (*μόνος*) on the threshold, *τῆδε*, because the boy has not admitted him. *Τὸ τρίτον* is, I think, the correct reading, restored (or preserved?)

¹ The cold coupled with the drinking of wine is a motif already found in Alcaeus 338 LP, as we saw: for a *paraclausithyron*, cf. "Callim." 1327 ff. = V, 23.

in one of the “*apographa*”: it has been unjustly suspected by all the critics, including me. Gow-Page note *ad loc.* that τὸ τρίτον “would increase the already grave suspicion of οἶνος”, because, as Knauer puts it, “die Zahlenangabe τὸ τρίτον kann nur abschliessend gedacht werden, nicht wenn noch ein 4. Übel kommt”. But both οἶνος and ἄλγος are unassailable: those who are acquainted with sympotic motifs and with the *paraclausithyron*-epigrams will immediately realize that οἶνος is the last thing we could possibly suspect: wine is the essential feature in the genre, as Copley has abundantly shown; as I have indicated in my *Hermes* article, love, to the Alexandrians, is *topically* synonymous with *dolor*, pain: Asclepiades himself is τρωθείς at 1008 = V, 189, 3; cf. e.g. 3062 ff. = V, 211: ἄλγος. If οἶνος and ἄλγος are therefore untouchable, we may only test the reading τὸ τρίτον. Now, the expressions τέτρατον ἄλγος (IX, 390, 3) and δεύτερον ἄλγος (IX, 274, 4), in which ἄλγος, as in our epigram, means “*causa doloris*” (cf. *Thes.*, s.v. ἄλγος, 1409 B; “was Schmerz bereitet”, Knauer *ad loc.*) would *prima facie* support the reading τὸ τρίτον ἄλγος¹. There is a passage in Oppian, *Hal.* I, 255, where τὸ τρίτον is used precisely as in Asclepiades’ epigram, i.e. in an enumeration of four items, without τὸ πρῶτον, δεύτερον or τέταρτον being specified². The wording in Oppian and the expressions in two epigrams just quoted would seem to fully support the reading τὸ τρίτον in Asclepiades’ line: the copyist of P tended to omit monosyllables (cf. Preisendanz, *Praef.*, p. LXI), and therefore the restoration of τὸ as we find it in the *apographon*

¹ Rain and the cold (Βορέης ψυχρός) are clearly “*causae doloris*” for someone who is in love and feels compelled to brave the elements: but why should night be classified as another such *causa*? The answer is in 854 ff. = V, 64, where σκότος denotes the darkness with which Zeus torments Asclepiades, who will nevertheless κωμάζειν.

² Oppian is following earlier models, cf. Ap. Rh. III, 516 τρίτος, in an enumeration of several people (no other ordinal adjective is specified).

presents no problems ; for the scansion, cf. Ouvré, *op. cit.*, p. 94, who quotes Asclepiades 961 = IX, 63, 4 $\tau\delta\ \xi\nu\nu\o\nu$.

So far, the readers know that the poet is $\mu\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu$, standing in front of the door, and they know the circumstances in which he has come (on a stormy night, and $\pi\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu$ $\o\nu\nu\nu$) : this technique, whereby the “ walk through the streets ” up to the door of the loved person is allusively recalled by the poet, is customary in the genre (cf. Copley, *op. cit.*, p. 13, 14, 16). Afterwards, in line 3, the poet tells us of his vain struggle to gain admission. The difficulties as to the identity of $\delta\ \kappa\nu\nu\nu\delta\ M\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu$ (*cf.* in particular Stadtmüller *ad loc.* and Gow-Page *ad loc.*) are, I believe, solved by the fact that the poet uses the descriptive imperfect ¹ $\iota\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu$: the tense denotes that a protracted resistance ² was offered, which ended by prevailing over the poet’s insistence: $\delta\ \kappa\nu\nu\nu\delta\ M\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu$ must therefore be the beautiful boy loved by Asclepiades³, the boy who, as is traditional in the *paraclausithyron*, has been offering a staunch and so far successful resistance. Having seen that his entreaties have failed, the poet has just had recourse to his final weapon : he has pretended to believe that there is a rival inside, and that therefore the boy has been unfaithful. Asclepiades has pretended to shout the words “ *Kai\ \sigma\nu\ \gamma\nu\nu\ o\nu\nu\tau\nu\nu\c\nu\, \kappa\nu\nu\lambda.* ”, which I have already explained in my *Hermes* paper⁴, to his non-existent rival inside, but of course what he has shouted is meant to be heard by the boy who is behind the door (*cf.* Callimachus,

¹ For Asclepiades’ *usus* cf. OUVRÉ, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

² On Asclepiades’ usage of images from “ dem Gebiet der Kriegsführung ” cf. KNAUER, *op. cit.*, p. 45 ; cf. also MEINEKE, *Anal. Alex.*, p. 266, for $\lambda\nu\nu\nu\nu\nu$.

³ The identity of Moschus is conclusively proved by one decisive point : there cannot be a rival inside, otherwise Asclepiades would not stay hopefully $\tau\nu\nu\delta\epsilon$, and would go, like Posidippus 3066 ff. = V, 213.

⁴ On the “ $\gamma\nu\nu\delta$ in exclamacione ” cf. OUVRÉ, *Quae fuerint dicendi genus ratioque metrica apud Asclepiaden, Posidippum, Hedylum*, Diss. Paris 1894, p. 65. On elliptical $\gamma\nu\nu\delta$, explaining an *implied* statement, cf. also SCHOTT, *op. cit.*, p. 24; FRAENKEL, *De Sim. Rhod.*, Diss. Göttingen 1915, p. 79 and GOW, *Theocritus*. Index, s.v. $\gamma\nu\nu\delta$, elliptical.

1079 = XII, 118, 5, ἐβόησα: the words shouted are meant to be heard by Archinus). By shouting Καὶ σὺ γὰρ οὗτως, κτλ. Asclepiades has used a double weapon: on the one hand he has excited the jealousy of the boy who is inside (the motif of jealousy I have already indicated in my *Hermes* paper) by pretending that he is engaged in a κῶμος, i.e. going from one boy's house to another's, and on the other he has accused the boy of unfaithfulness. Either of these two motivations, or indeed both, should suffice to make the παιδικά change his mind and open the door: Asclepiades, who has, in his well constructed epigram, introduced the readers "near the end of the *paraclausithyron* incident" (cf. Copley, *op. cit.*, p. 16, for similar cases) is now waiting τῇδε, on the threshold, hoping that the door will be opened: in the meantime he asks Zeus to stop raining, so that he may not be further soaked. At 1006 ff. = V, 189 Asclepiades describes the end of the *paraclausithyron* incident, with himself still hopefully waiting outside the door, in the rain; at 866 ff. = V, 164 the readers find themselves once more at the end of the incident, and the poet offers a variation: he seems to be inclined to go away, because the φιλεξαπάτις has betrayed him, and hopes that the situation may be reversed; at 860 ff. = V, 145 we encounter another variation of the "end of the incident" - motif: the poet actually goes away, instead of traditionally waiting and crying¹; the epigram we have now examined presents yet another variation: the poet, at the end of the *paraclausithyron* incident, has tried his final weapon and his waiting to see its effects, standing and speaking on the threshold, τῇδε (τῇδε = αὔτοῦ, παρὰ δικλίσι ταῖσδε 860, = V, 145, 1).

The interpretation which I have outlined here, on the basis of the results I had already obtained in my *Hermes*

¹ In the genre, the poet as a rule "lies down in the doorway, there to remain until morning" (COPLEY, *op. cit.*, p. 1); for the exception represented by V, 145 cf. COPLEY, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

paper, accounts for $\tau\tilde{\eta}\delta\epsilon$, which so far had puzzled the critics, and shows that the epigram has been, as usual, very skilfully constructed by Asclepiades¹.

Wine and Love-making

We have already seen that the aphrodisiac power of wine was firmly established as a literary motif, since Homeric times. Hellenistic poets produce ingenious variations on this motif, playing upon the more or less great ability that one has to carry one's liquor. Callimachus at 1075 ff. = XII, 118 uses common motifs, "sentiments which are a commonplace" (Gow-Page on 1077), but he manages to achieve an unexpected climactic effect :

Εἰ μὲν ἔκών, 'Αρχῖν', ἐπεκώμασα μυρία μέμφου,
 εἰ δ' ἄκων ἥκω τὴν προπέτειαν ἔα.
 ἄκρητος καὶ ἔρως μ' ἡνάγκασαν, ὃν δ' μὲν αὐτῶν
 εἴλκεν, δ' δ' οὐκ εἴα τὴν προπέτειαν ἔᾶν·
 ἐλθὼν οὐκ ἐβόησα τίς ἡ τίνος ἀλλ' ἐφίλησα
 τὴν φλιήν. εἰ τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἀδίκημ' ἀδικέω.

After the introduction, in which the reader is misled to believe that the poet is apologizing for having done heaven knows what wild act of violence, under the influence of wine², we find, as a surprise ending, that the poet has merely indulged in a harmless sentimental gesture, which is the *opposite* of violent³. Prop. I, 3, 9-13 varies Callimachus' motif.

¹ It will be noted that my explanation of the text enables us to reconstruct exactly the situation indicated by COBLEY, *op. cit.*, p. 2, who, however, adopts a text violently altered and fails to understand the meaning of the words "Καὶ σὺ γὰρ οὔτως, κτλ" shouted by the poet.

² This is what traditionally happened in the course of the *κῶμος*, cf. COBLEY, p. 13, 25, etc. Gow-PAGE ad 1076, 1078 speak of "temerity".

³ COBLEY (*op. cit.*, p. 16) has partly seen this point, but he fails to recognize that this is one more case of the "reversal" technique: the anticlimactic effect is produced by the explicit *reversal* of the motif of violence as established in the genre. On such thematic reversals in the epigrammatic genre cf. PASQUALI, *op. cit.*, especially p. 479, 483, 501 ff. (on a "scherzo" by Posidippus), etc.

The motif “sine Baccho Venus friget” was the natural counterpart of the theme stressing the erotic powers of wine: Antipater at IX, 305 issues such a warning (cf. Dübner *ad loc.*): the poet, having drunk water, sleeps the wrong sleep:

“Τύδατος ἀκρήτου κεκορημένῳ ἄγχι παραστὰς
χθιζόν ἐμοὶ λεχέων Βάκχος ἔλεξε τάδε:
«Εὔδεις ἀξιον ὑπνον ἀπεχθομένων Ἀφροδίτη·
εἰπέ μοι, ὃ νήφων, πεύθεαι Ἰππολύτου;
τάρβει, μή τι πάθης ἐναλίγκιον.» Ὡς δὲ μὲν εἰπὼν
ῳχετ’, ἐμοὶ δ’ ἀπὸ τῆς οὐκέτι τερπνὸν ὕδωρ.

The opposite motif is, nevertheless, also true: if one drinks too much, one goes into a comatose state, and becomes impotent. This is what Euenos in fact says at XI, 49:

Βάκχου μέτρον ἄριστον, δὲ μὴ πολὺ μήδ’ ἐλάχιστον·
ἔστι γάρ ἡ λύπης αἴτιος ἡ μανίης.
χαίρει κιρνάμενος δὲ τρισὶν Νύμφαισι τέταρτος·
τῆμος καὶ θαλάμοις ἔστιν ἔτοιμότατος·
εἰ δὲ πολὺς πνεύσειεν, ἀπέστραπται μὲν Ἔρωτας,
βαπτίζει δὲν πνῷ, γείτονι τοῦ θανάτου.

This motif is ultimately already Alexandrian. We have already seen that Nicagoras, having drunk too much neat wine, ἐνύστασε; an important variation on this theme is found in Asclepiades 880 ff. = XII, 50:

Πῖν’, Ἀσκληπιάδη· τί τὰ δάκρυα ταῦτα; τί πάσχεις;
οὐ σὲ μόνον χαλεπὴ Κύπρις ἐληῖσατο,
οὐδὲ ἐπὶ σοὶ μούνῳ κατεθήκατο τόξα καὶ ιοὺς
πικρὸς Ἔρωτς· τί ζῶν ἐν σποδιῇ τίθεσαι;
πίνωμεν Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα· δάκτυλος ἀώς·
ἢ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχνον ἴδεῖν μένομεν;
πιομένου γάρ Ἔρωτς· μετά τοι χρόνον οὐκέτι πουλύν,
σχέτλιε, τὴν μακρὰν νύκταν ἀναπαυσόμεθα.

Meleager 4598 ff. = XII, 49 ($\zeta\omega\rho\pi\otimes\tau\iota$ = $\zeta\omega\rho\grave{\omega}\pi\mu\alpha$) follows Asclepiades, not without adding his own variation on the theme.

The *congetto* added by Meleager is that pure wine, instead of water, is used to extinguish a fire, the φλόγα φιλόπαιδα¹.

Asclepiades' poem contains such a great number of sympotic motifs that it has been called by Knauer a "Gelage-elegie" (*op. cit.*, p. 13). There are exhortations ($\pi\iota\nu\epsilon$, $\pi\iota\nu\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$), the *vulgaris consolandi formula* (Jacobs) οὐ σοὶ μούνῳ, κτλ., the final *locus communis* about the μακρὸν νύκτα. I need not dilate on such motifs in themselves, because Knauer has already done so, nor shall I analyse the effective use of paronomasy, already illustrated by Knauer (*op. cit.*, p. 43): what I shall do is to explain the epigram, which so far has not been understood. To begin with, the reading κατεθήκατο in line 3 is sound: the verb κατατίθημι is used here *contraria significione, de armis induendis*, as in Q. Sm. XII, 304 (cf. *Thes.*, s.v. κατατίθημι, 1269 D)². The tendency to use words *contraria significione* is typically Alexandrian, and is the lexical equivalent of the reversal of themes which we have already repeatedly mentioned. Precisely because κατατίθεσθαι means "usually 'lay down'" (cf. Gow-Page, *ad loc.*) the unusual³ meaning *de armis induendis* has been chosen by Asclepiades. Secondly, the words πιομένου γὰρ "Ερως in line 7 are perfectly sound, and patently mean

¹ Page observes *ad loc.* that Meleager has used "the old and common motif 'drown your sorrows in drink' without variation". On the contrary: Meleager has created the new *conceitto* that I have indicated. Both Asclepiades and Meleager have made "the old and common motif" specifically erotic: wine, the traditional "Sorgenbrecher" (KÄGI, *op. cit.*, p. 57) now drowns the "peines d'amour".

² Quintus is thinking of the armour, that the hero puts ὡμοισι; Asclepiades is thinking of the τόξα being carried ἐπὶ νώτων (cf. Meleager 4442, = A.P. XII, 78, 1).

³ Cf. *Class. Rev.* 1967, p. 130 on the use of *ἰκέτης* by Meleager.

“ ‘Ερως se livre à qui boira”, i.e. “ if you will drink, like us, you will triumph over your love-pangs ”. For the construction *πιομένου γάρ* “Ερως (ἔστι) cf. Kühner-Gerth I, p. 372 (cf. e.g. Soph., *O.T.* 917 ἔστι τοῦ λέγοντος); for the absence of the article cf. Kühner-Gerth I, p. 608, Ouvré, *op. cit.* p. 54 (Asclep. 812, 862), and for the ellipsis of *ἔστι*, the most common feature of Asclepiades’ style, cf. Knauer, *op. cit.*, p. 37 (cf. e.g. 900 = XII, 153, 3 οὐδ’ ὁ μελιχρός ’Ερως ἀεὶ γλυκύς). Asclepiades is fond of military metaphors: here he wants to say that Eros, who as a rule *λητίζεται*, is subjugated by the drinker. Meleager, it is most interesting to see, echoes such themes: at 4098 ff. = XII, 119 the motif of the lover who “ submits ”, “ is taken captive ” and yet, thanks to wine, resumes his fight against Eros has been well analysed by Page. Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα, we may conclude, is indicated by Asclepiades to be an antidote against love-pangs¹. The statement is a pointed and specific² *congetto*³: the poet has neatly inverted the motif present in Eur., *Bacch.* 773 οἴνου δὲ

¹ The structure of the epigram is that of a dialogue between the *συμπόται* and Asclepiades: cf. WILAMOWITZ, *Hell. Dicht.*, II, p. 112 f., BECKBY and DÜBNER *ad loc.* Hedylus, in an epigram which is thematically connected with Asclepiades’ (KNAUER, *op. cit.*, p. 13 f.), inverts the order of the exhortation: first comes the plural *πίνωμεν*, and then the singular *παῖς*. KNAUER, *loc. cit.*, considers Asclepiades’ epigram to be at the outset a monologue with “Selbstanrede”, evolving into a dialogue.

² My interpretation clarifies the function of the particle *γάρ* in the phrase *πιομένου γάρ* “Ερως: it serves to explain the previous exhortation *πίνωμεν*, κτλ.; cf. SCHOTT, *Posidipp. epigr.*, p. 24.

³ ’Ελητίσατο means, in Asclepiades’ epigram, “ carried captive ” (Gow-Page, following Knauer *ad loc.*; cf. MEINEKE, *Anal. Alex.*, p. 266); Posidippus *inverts* Asclepiades’ motif at 3080 = XII, 120, 3: it is the poet that is subjugated (ἔκδοτον) by Eros, when he has drunk; Meleager plays with the same motifs (δήσας 4101 = XII, 119, 4: Page’s introduction to this epigram is excellent). That in spite of this copious “Motivik” Asclepiades’ words *πιομένου γάρ* “Ερως should have remained unexplained to this day is a source of stunned amazement to me.

μηκέτ' ὄντος οὐκ ἔστιν Κύπρις¹. Ζωροποτεῖν², then (which weakens the drinkers at XI, 25, 4) acts as an antidote: “the poet is recommended to drown the sorrows of love in wine”, observe Gow-Page in their introduction to this epigram, and it only remains for us to add that this motif is new in literature: Meleager and Euenus will repeat it. Wine, which in another of Asclepiades' epigrams, as we have seen, makes Nicagoras drowsy, is here described as making the flames of love drowsy, too.

What must now be observed is that this statement made by Asclepiades (through the mouths of the personages speaking in his epigram) was promptly seized by Hedylus³, who made, as we shall see, an unflattering comparison between Asclepiades' and Socles' sexual prowess and robustness. We shall examine Hedylus' epigram separately later, but we must now quote the first two lines of it (1857 ff.):

Ἐξ ἡοῦς εἰς νύκτα καὶ ἐκ νυκτὸς πάλι Σωκλῆς
εἰς ἡοῦν πίνει τετραχόισι κάδοις.

These two lines show that Hedylus' epigram, in which, as we shall see, Asclepiades' statement as to the sedative effect of wine on amatory capacities is mocked, was written in explicit reference not only to the theme of Asclepiades' epigram, but indeed to its wording: the phrase ἐξ ἡοῦς εἰς

¹ Cf. also Alcman 58 *PMG* Ἀφροδίτα οὐκ ἔστι, “Aphrodite is at the moment not present”, where, however, Ἀφροδίτα refers to the goddess, and not, metaphorically, to the presence of love. REITZENSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 90, n. 2. fails to see the point made by Asclepiades.

² Drinking *neat* wine was not the natural Greek way, it was unusual, and regarded as barbaric, cf. Anacreon *PMG* 356, Plat., *Leges* I, 637 e; ζωροπόται οἶνοι is a derogatory term in Manetho IV, 300; at Hedylus 1843 ζωροπόται is a jocular “Schimpfwort”, in the tradition of sympotic ribaldry (the term is used by one drinker addressing his fellow-topers). Cf. BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 158, on the “precise proportions of wine and water” in Alcaeus.

³ On Hedylus' relationship to Asclepiades cf. KNAUER, *op. cit.*, p. 70 f.

νύκτα καὶ ἐκ νυκτὸς πάλι εἰς ἥοῦν corresponds to, and will now help us to explain, Asclepiades' words « δάκτυλος ἀώς· ἦ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχνον ἵδεῖν μένομεν; », which so far have puzzled the critics.

Every ancient reader will have immediately recognized that Asclepiades is alluding to Alcaeus' words πώνωμεγ· τί τὰ λύχν' ὀμμένομεν; δάκτυλος ἀμέρα (cf. Gow-Page on 884 f.; on Alcaeus' "excuse" cf. Bowra, *op. cit.* p. 157; the discussion in Farnell, *Greek Lyric Poetry* p. 320 is the best): but why the pointed change of ἀμέρα into ἀώς?¹ The word ἀώς perplexes the reader at first. This is one more example of Asclepiades' skilful "delayed effect" technique: only when we have finished reading the epigram can we understand the humorous point². The situation described in line 5 πίνωμεν Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα· δάκτυλος ἀώς, as clarified by the words ἦ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχνον ἵδεῖν μένομεν; and by their corresponding echo in Hedylus ἐξ ἥοῦς εἰς νύκτα καὶ ἐκ νυκτὸς πάλι Σωκλῆς εἰς ἥοῦν πίνει, is the following: Asclepiades' companions are very bibulous; they have been drinking from the previous evening up to the dawn that is now breaking (ἀώς), they have been drinking, as Homer would put it, παννύχιοι μέσφ' ἥοῦς ἡριγενείης (Il. VIII, 508: before the σέλας of the day covers the οὐρανόν), or, to be more exact, παννύχιοι καὶ ἡῶ (Od. II, 434), i.e. during the night and throughout ἡῶς, which latter means τὴν ὁρθινὴν ὥραν τὴν μεταξὺ νυκτὸς καὶ ἡλίου ἀνατολῆς (*schol. EBQ ad loc.*). Asclepiades' companions, that is, are anxious to make good use of the tail end of dawn that is still left, before

¹ The use of Doric forms such as ἀώς and κοιμιστάν is also an intentional allusion to Alcaeus, as KNAUER (*op. cit.*, p. 59) correctly emphasizes. Cf. also KNAUER *op. cit.*, p. 67, and, for the allusive technique, PASQUALI, *op. cit.*, p. 504 (Posidippus and Horace alluding to Alcman and Sappho).

² Cf. KNAUER, *op. cit.*, p. 25, for another epigram: "jetzt erst erfasst der Leser die Bedeutung des Wortes voll". For the technique of *fulmen in clausula*, cf. also WEINREICH, *Wien. Stud.* 1941, LIX, p. 69.

sunrise brings the nocturnal banquet to its end, and, in their eagerness to prolong their banquet until the last possible moment, they jocularly twist, indeed reverse, Alcaeus' saying δάκτυλος ἀμέρα “there is but a finger's breadth of *day* left” into “there is but a finger's breadth of *dawn* left”, i.e. soon it will be daylight and the banquet will have to come to an end. For people who, like them, *noctem de die faciunt*, dawn is the equivalent of δεῖλη, *tempus vespertinum sub occasum solis* (cf. *Thes.* s. v.), which precedes the arrival of full nocturnal σκότος¹. After having urged Asclepiades to drink before the banquet is brought to an end by the arrival of full daylight, ἡλίου ἀνατολή, the poet's companions ask him: are we perhaps staying on here, i.e. at the banquet, until we see again the lamps that will put us to bed?²

¹ In other words (cf. Callim. 260, 55 Pf.) Alcaeus uses as an excuse the δεῖελος (= “evening”) that precedes the νύξ, Asclepiades the ἀώς that precedes the ἔνδιος: ἀώς does not form part of, but only precedes, the day that will follow it, as is clear from e.g. *Od.* V, 390. To be more precise: Alcaeus uses the expression δάκτυλος ἀμέρα as an “apology for an early commencement of the drinking bout” (FARNELL, *loc. cit.*: Farnell is right, because “*partem solidi demere de die*” was “contrario al buon costume antico”, cf. Tescari on Hor. *Od.* I, 1-20): he implies that the δεῖελος is already part of the night, when one is allowed to drink (cf. *A.P.* XI, 46 δεῖλης ... ὅρθρος); Asclepiades' companions, who have reversed the normal way of life as ζωροπόται εἰλαπινουργοί, ἡματα νύκτας ἄγοντες (Manetho IV, 300) are interested in the opposite end of the night, and argue that ἀώς is still part of the night.

² WILAMOWITZ (*Hell. Dicht.* II, p. 113), who, not without perplexity, tries to force the meaning “Abendröte” into Asclepiades' ἀώς (which of course means here, as “je sonst”, “Morgenröte”!) is consequently compelled to understand λύχνον as “lamps that will conduct the revellers home to bed” (Gow-PAGE on *κοιμιστάν*, line 884), but this unusual meaning (torches were used for walking in the street) is not necessary, as my interpretation shows. For the *nomen agentis* *κοιμιστάν* cf. Asclep. 832 = V, 203, 1 ἵππαστήρ. Ludwig is right in saying (*Gnomon* 1966, p. 23) that “der Gedankengang und die Alkaiosnachahmung (Fr. 347 LP) sprechen jedoch dafür, dass von den Lampen die Rede ist, die am Abend angezündet werden”: our utilization of Hedylus' lines solves all the problems, and enables us to conclude that Asclepiades' “arte allusiva” is, as is the case with all the Alexandrians, crystal clear—provided, that is, we can pin-point the allusions, by invoking the Goddess *Kombinationsgabe*.

The word *πάλι*, “again”, clearly denotes the fact that the lamps used so far (cf. Callim. 260, 65 Pf. ἐωθινὰ λύχνα = δάκτυλος ἀώς!) for the nocturnal banquet are going to be extinguished when the daylight has arrived, and will be lighted *once more* when night falls *again*¹. Asclepiades’ friends conclude very pointedly, by stressing that the long night, *μακρὰν νύκτα*, will inevitably come: for the moment, the implication is, Asclepiades had better make good use of what short time is left of the night which has been spent in banqueting.

We may thus conclude: what at first seems a conglomerate of *loci communes* reveals itself to be, upon closer examination, a skilfully constructed poem: Alcaeus’ *dictum* has been conceptually reversed², and the motif of *τὴν μακρὰν νύκτα*—hackneyed and trite in itself—which often closes, with conventional lack of originality, innumerable epigrams (cf. Knauer, *op. cit. ad loc.*) acquires in its employment by Asclepiades, who opposes it to the shortness of the convivial

¹ Ἡ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχνον ἵδεῖν μένομεν; means, ironically, “sollen wir wieder bis Nacht warten?”. WILAMOWITZ *loc. cit.* sees the grammatical meaning of the sentence, but strains it (“Mitternacht” is not in the text). In ἢ μένομεν; (cf. the deliberative subjunctive ἢ μείνω ἐν Βακχιάδι; *Pap. Fay.* 137, 2 f., quoted in MOULTON-MILLIGAN, *Vocab. Gr. Test.*, s.v. ἢ) the indicative is ironic and “das Gegenwärtige leise tadelnd” (BLASS-DEBR., *Gr. neutest. Griech.*¹¹, § 366, 4; in this case, Asclepiades is being mildly reproached). Same ironic indicatives XI, 134. Hedylus, as we shall see, goes out of his way to emphasize that precisely this kind of thing—drinking *ἐξ ἡοῦς εἰς νύκτα καὶ ἐκ νυκτὸς πάλι ... εἰς ἡοῦν*—can be done, indeed can be done without having one’s amatory faculties impaired.

² Such a reversal is natural in “the voluptuaries *qui officia lucis noctisque perverterint*” (FOURNEAUX on Tac., *Ann.* XVI, 8; cf. especially Manetho IV, 300 ff. ζωροπότας οὖνο, ... εἰλαπινούργούς, κτλ.; also WACKERNAGEL, *Vorles.* II, p. 67), but the concept was in itself already at hand: in fact we read δρώει οὐρανόθεν νύξ, (*Od.* V, 294), δείελος ... δύων (*Il.* XXI, 232), indeed Asclepiades himself says νύξ δύνει at 1006 (= V, 189; I shall deal with this last passage in a forthcoming paper).

night still left¹ to himself and his companions for their enjoyment, a felicitous originality².

Poverty

The motif of poverty, as we have seen, can be subdivided into two themes, complaints about impecuniousness or eulogy of frugal life. Late epigrammatists, as a rule, take a bitter view of poverty (e.g. XI, 302; XI, 303; X, 63; X, 66; IX, 394; IX, 149; X, 51). Alexandrian epigrammatists are not ashamed to acknowledge their poverty, indeed are proud of it. How far this is genuine autobiography, we do not know, but it is interesting to see that, after the statuesque attitude towards one's own "Dichterberuf" as typified by Pindar in the classical age, Alexandrian poets, in their dislike for pomposity, return to a preclassical theme, attested in Theognis. Leonidas 2167 ff. (= VII, 736) reflects the same "Preis des genügsamen Lebens" as in Theognis (Kägi, *op. cit.* p. 58); the "sympotic" inspiration of Leonidas 2167 ff. is confirmed by the fact that this epigram, as the commentators know, is clearly related to Leonidas 2014 ff. (VII, 440), which contains explicit convivial elements. Leonidas 2435 (= VII, 740; imitated by Palladas IX, 172b, X, 60 πλούτεῖς, κτλ.) echoes the sentiments expressed by Theognis 725 ff. (cf. Gow-Page *ad loc.*). The Theognidean οὐκ ἔραμαι πλούτεῖν οὐδ' εὔχομαι, κτλ. (1155) reappears, in a slightly modified form, at X, 113. In a more humorous and less serious mood, Leonidas smiles at his own poverty

¹ If the party which forms the background of Asclepiades' epigram took place in winter μακρῶν τῶν νυκτῶν οὐσῶν (Plat., *Symp.* 238 c, νύξ μακρή Asclep. 1006 = V, 189, 1) Asclepiades' point would be even more elegant. This is very probable, because most sympotic epigrams, like Asclepiades 1006 f., have as a background long and cold winter nights.

² The more *trite* the motif utilized in order to obtain a *novel* point, the more elegant the epigram: this was a fundamental canon of Alexandrian epigrammatists; for an epigram by Meleager cf. *Mus. Helv.* 1968, p. 52 f. Cf. below, Addendum, p. 173.

2191 ff. = VI, 302; for the motif, cf. Headlam on Her. VI, 32. Callimachus, too, is not ashamed of being poor; unlike Leonidas, he applies the theme to erotic situations¹. His epigram 1047 ff. = XII, 150, with a praise of hunger as an antidote for *la maladie d'amour* I have analysed elsewhere (*Hermes* 1963, p. 151²); we shall examine here his other epigram related to the poverty theme, 1071 ff. = XII, 148:

Οἶδ' ὅτι μεν πλούτου κενεαὶ χέρες, ἀλλά, Μένιππε,
μὴ λέγε πρὸς Χαρίτων τούμὸν ὄνειρον ἐμοί.
ἀλγέω τὴν διὰ παντὸς ἔπος τόδε πικρὸν ἀκόνων.³
ναί, φίλε, τῶν παρὰ σεῦ τοῦτ' ἀνεραστότατον.

The theme was treated later more or less lamely (1523 ff. = XII, 42; V, 113; XI, 320; XII, 44; XII, 212); Callimachus' witty point has so far eluded the critics. The poet begins apologetically, indeed disarmingly admits that the complaints made by Menippus are founded (*τούμὸν ὄνειρον ἐμοί*: cf. v. Prittowitz-Gaffron, *op. cit.* p. 18 f.); he even seems to seek commisera-

¹ Leonidas remained, in this respect, "auf nichterotischem Gebiet", (KÄGI, *op. cit.* p. 36 f.). Cf. below, Addendum, p. 173.

² Cf. also the good note by WALTZ on *A. P.* V, 113 (112).

³ This line needs a brief commentary. The construction of *ἀλγέω* with the participle of a *verbum audiendi* is usual (Herod. III, 50, Aesch. *Pers.* 844, Soph. *Phil.* 86). In view of *κατὰ πᾶν* *ἥλγηκα* at 3648 (= XII, 90, 3) and Synesius' *πάντα λυπεῖ* (cf. *Thes.*, s.v. *πᾶς*, 570 C), given the connection between *κατὰ πᾶν* and *διὰ παντός* (*Thes.*, s.v. *πᾶς*, 576 B) one cannot but agree with Gow-Page in referring *τὴν διὰ παντός* to the verb *ἀλγέω* (it may be added that *διὰ παντός* is not only current in Plato and Thucydides, but also usual in papyri, cf. PREISIGKE, *Wört.*, s.v. *πᾶς*, 3). Callimachus, in sum, *ἀλγεῖ* endlessly at hearing Menippus' words. Why? The reason for his infinite pain is given at the end of the epigram, whose witty point we shall analyse. The exact meaning of *τὴν διὰ παντός* is unclear (cf. Bos, *Ellipses*, ed. Schäfer, p. 218: "epideictic", cf. BERNHARDY, *Wiss. Syntax*, Berlin 1829, p. 191): the presence of the article *τὴν* seems to indicate that we must understand *ἥλγησιν* (cf. KÜHNER-GERTH II, p. 558, on Herod. I, 109 and III, 119; this would be confirmed by Callimachus 1312 = *A. P.* XI, 362, 2: cf. LAPP, *De Callimachi tropis...*, Diss. Bonn 1965, p. 66, on the "figura etymologica" in this epigram).

tion for his own grief ($\alpha\lambda\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega$), but then comes the annihilating point, in which he accuses the $\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\varsigma$ of being mercenary-minded: “of all the statements coming from you, this is ‘the most $\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\sigma\tau\varsigma$ ’”. Is the adjective active (as everyone has so far believed) or passive? One must pay attention to the explicit invocation of the Graces as well as to the emphatic positions of $\text{M}\acute{\epsilon}\nu\text{i}\pi\pi\epsilon$, $\pi\alpha\rho\grave{\alpha} \sigma\epsilon\tilde{\nu}$ and $\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\sigma\tau\varsigma\tau\alpha\tau\varsigma$: the boy has the same name as that Menippus who flourished precisely at the same time as Callimachus, that notorious Menippus who preached the “Lob des einfachen Lebens” but was venal and mercenary-minded to the point of practising usury: for this, “der Hellenismus verachtet ihn”¹. Callimachus, playing on the homonymy (as we shall see, he does the same with the name Acheloos at 1063 ff. = XII, 51, and Rhianus obtained a beautiful joke on the basis of the name Hippocrates at 3246 ff.: these are “etymologische Spielereien” on personal names which are traditional from Homer down to Nonnus² in Greek literature) pointedly tells the mercenary-minded boy that he already is, or is on the way to becoming, another Menippus. Menippus of Gadara (Diog. L., *loc. cit.*) was $\alpha\tau\eta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\varsigma\alpha\varsigma$ $\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\tilde{\alpha}\nu\tilde{\omega}\nu$ $\bar{\nu}\pi\grave{\delta}$ $\varphi\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha\rho\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, and the boy Menippus is like the $\text{A}\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\lambda\acute{\eta}$ satirized by Marcus Argentarius at V, 63 (cf. Waltz *ad loc.*). In conclusion: the adjective $\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\sigma\tau\varsigma\tau\alpha\tau\varsigma$ is not active, does not mean “not loving”, “cruel” (towards the poet: cf. Hauvette, *REG* 1907 p. 348), as one might be inclined to take it at first, given the apparently *larmoyant* structure of the epigram (cf. e.g. LSJ, s.v.; “de tout ce qui me vient de toi, ami, c'est ce qui sent le moins l'amour” Cahen;

¹ Cf. GIGON, *Lex. d. alten Welt*, s.v. Menippos von Gadara. Menippus preached “die Nichtigkeit aller irdischen Güter”, in Cynical fashion, but his “anrüchige Geldgeschäfte” are reported by Diogenes Laertios VI, 2, 20 (= VI, 99 ff.) (*RE*, s.v. Menippos, 888, 52 ff., 891, 22 ff.)

² Cf. LUDWICH, *Beitr. zu Nonnos*, Königsberg 1873, Sach- u. Wortregister, s.v. Nonnos, etymologische Spielerein.

“ of all I have had from thee this is the most unloverlike ” Mair) : instead of ending with such a moaning and pointless note, the poet, through alluding to Menippus of Gadara —his universally “ verachtet ” contemporary ! —and cleverly placing the relevant words in emphatic positions (Μένιππε, παρὰ σεῦ, ἀνεραστότατον) concludes with an unexpected piece of biting irony : what the boy Menippus is doing, by asking for money, is the “ most unbecoming ” ¹ thing *he* ² could possibly do (unbecoming to himself, of course), because his behaviour cannot but invite a comparison with his homonymous—and notorious—usurer. Instead of a moaning line, a devastating note of sarcasm concludes the epigram. ’Ανεραστότατον is passive, = *inamabilis, invisus* (cf. *Thes.*, s.v., ἀνέραστος and Jacobs’ Index, s.v.). Once more, the technique of “ delayed effect ” is superbly utilized : once we have realized that ἀνεραστότατον does not mean “ *inumano* ” (i.e. cruel against the poet ; Veniero *ad loc.*), but rather “ *unbecoming, degrading* ” (for the mercenary Menippus), the conclusion throws a new light on the preceding lines : the tone is not *larmoyant*, but in reality ironically contemptuous : ἀλγέω does not mean that the poet is pained by Menippus’ reminding him that he is poor, but means that he is pained in his commiseration towards Menippus, at seeing the boy degrade himself, lowering himself to the level of the usurer Menippus.

¹ This is why the poet invokes the Χάριτες in line 2 : the fact that they are not “ die Göttinnen der Liebe ” and yet are mentioned by Callimachus puzzled (and misled) Wilamowitz (cf. BUM, *Die Epigr. des Kallim.*, Diss. Wien 1940, p. 43). My interpretation of the epigram fully accounts for the circumstance that the Χάριτες are invoked, indeed this fact confirms my interpretation of the poem : Menippus is invited not to disgrace himself for the sake of the Graces. Callimachus obtains an ironic point on the basis of the *Eigenname* Μένιππος : for such a technique cf. LAPP, *De Callimachi tropis et figuris*, Diss. Bonn 1965, p. 33 (“ *nominis ironia* ”). Cf. also GOW-PAGE, *Introd.* to 1453 ff.

² The emphatic words παρὰ σεῦ mean, in sum, “ coming from you, a person so inauspiciously named Μένιππος ”.

Such a self-degradation hurts the poet and, of course, the Χάριτες, for the sake of whom the boy should stop disgracing himself.

Youth and Love

The themes of youth being short, and the need to enjoy life¹ before it is too late, were in themselves banal² and in any case already exploited to the full³, by the time Alexandrian epigrammatists were writing. Utterances on the brevity of life were, therefore, avoided by them, as a rule, and occur mostly in late epigrams (V, 12, 39, 118; IX, 118; also V, 74). The epigram V, 112, by Philodemus, with its traditional ingredients ἐμάνην, κεκώμακα, πολιὴ ἀντὶ μελαίνης θρίξ) echoes Anacreontic and perhaps Meleagrian⁴ motifs (the motif of white hair mixing with black is first attested in Anacr. 36 Gent.).

The only Alexandrian epigram on the theme of youth being ephemeral from the point of view of lovemaking is Asclepiades 816 ff. = V, 85, which echoes Plato V, 80. Neither epigram seems to me to go beyond stating the obvious⁵; they may be considered as forlorn attempts to

¹ The pure theme of the vanity of human possessions and the worthlessness of life—without any exhortation to enjoy oneself—is, of course, already present in early Elegy (KÄGI, *op. cit.* p. 58 ff.). Such motifs were used by Callimachus and Leonidas in their epitaphs (cf. KÄGI, *op. cit.* p. 61 ff.: Callimachus 1241 ff. = VII, 519; Leonidas 2435-2458, = VII, 740, VII, 472), but I am naturally not dealing with them.

² Cf. WALTZ, *op. cit.*, p. 15, with note 4.

³ KNAUER, *op. cit.* p. 69 (“das Motiv war in der Volkspoesie zuhause”).

⁴ Cf. KAIBEL, *Philodemi epigrammata*, Greifswald 1885, p. 20 f.

⁵ The analysis by KNAUER (*op. cit.*, p. 12) is good, but his verdict incorrect: the “verfängliches Thema” has nothing to do with the fact that the poem has little “poetischer Reiz”; the epigram is dull because the theme was in itself platitudinous.

treat a “materia” which was “sorda a risponder”, and which was therefore wisely avoided by the Hellenistic epigrammatists¹.

THE SYMPOSION²

Theognis had not failed to give instructions to Cygnos on how to behave at the symposium; Xenophanes had polemically given specific “Vorschriften” (Reitzenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 50) on the subject; Anacreon seems to have been a stickler for perfection in details concerning the ritual of banqueting (Bowra, *op. cit.*, p. 276), and so was Alcaeus (Bowra, *op. cit.* p. 158). Such themes, i.e. directions dealing with the symposium, were developed by the epigrammatists. We have already observed that Alexandrian epigrammatists were aware of their continuing a literary sympotic tradition. The fashion of literary banquets, i.e. banquets at which epigrams and poems were recited, must have got out of hand, because in post-Alexandrian times we find what we might call the theme of the “anti-literary symposium”: the most explicit is Lucilius, at XI, 10, who gives us his δειπναρίου νόμον:

Τὸν τοῦ δειπναρίου νόμον οἴδατε· σήμερον ὑμᾶς,
Αὔλε, καλῶ καινοῖς δόγμασι συμποσίου.
οὐ μελοποιὸς ἐρεῖ κατακείμενος, οὔτε παρέξεις
οὐθ' ἔξεις αὐτὸς πράγματα γραμματικά.

¹ The theme of the fading of boys’ charms (not the fading of youth) is a separate motif, which, as we have seen, already occurs in Anacreon: I am not treating it because KÄGI, *op. cit.*, p. 19 ff. has done so exhaustively. “Callimachus” 1327 ff. (= V, 23), which ends with the trite allusion to the πολιή is in all probability by Rufinus: in any case, it is significant that the πολιή-motif, “frequently treated” by later epigrammatists (LUCK, *Class. Quart.* 1956, p. 229) is not a commonplace of Hellenistic epigrammatic poetry, as I have said.

² BIELOHLAWEK (*art. cit.*) is particularly useful on this point.

The epigram is very dexterous, because the first two lines lead us to expect that the poet will issue a *Trinkkomment*, however novel the *Komment* may be, i.e. we expect that the instructions will be on how to drink¹, instead of which the last two lines contain a ban on poetry recital. Such recitals, which had been “obligatorisch” (cf. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 10, 39, 47, for such “Rezitationen”) are again attacked by Lucilius at XI, 137: after the three ritual toasts—a motif which we have already come across—instead of further drinks he is tormented by poems being recited; at XI, 134, he complains about the excruciating habit of “Aufnehmen” (cf. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* p. 29); there is even worse: at XI, 394 (on the authorship, cf. Beckby *ad loc.*) the poor guests are not even offered the minimum of the three traditional toasts. Cf. also XI, 140. The same Lucilius blames his guest for not having kept to the terms of the invitation at XI, 11: the theme of the invitation is already present in Alc. 71 LP (cf. Bowra, *op. cit.* p. 163: in both cases, the guest is addressed by the poet as host). The theme of an invitation to an intellectual banquet occurs in Philodemus at XI, 44 (cf. Kaibel, *op. cit.* p. 23 ff.): it reappears in Catullus and Horace (cf. Kroll on Cat. 13). I should like to note that the ultimate model is Alexandrian: the theme of a modest dinner in intellectual company (as in Philodemus) occurs in Nicaenetus 2703 ff., where the dinner, according to the typical Hellenistic taste for bucolic surroundings as opposed to urban environment, must take place in the countryside. We shall return to Nicaenetus’ epigram in connection with the “antisympotic motif” which we shall mention later.

Criticism of the order of serving appears in a late epigram, XI, 9 (the point of the poem residing in the utilization of two proverbs).

¹ On the νόμοι συμποτικοί concerning “das Benehmen beim Mahl” cf. BIELOHlawek, *art. cit.*, p. 14, 30.

A particularly notable theme is the “shopping list”¹. Influence of mime and comedy is probable (cf. Gow-Page on 920), but we must not forget that Alcaeus and Anacreon had issued shopping instructions to slaves (cf. Knauer, *op. cit.* p. 21, 67): Knauer has persuasively shown the influence of sympotic literature upon the epigrams in this respect. Hellenistic poets, as usual, employed this traditional theme in order to obtain a point. The point in Asclepiades 920 ff., = V, 181 lies in the password, the *σημεῖον*², strategically placed by the poet at the end of the epigram: the host was a powerful lover, who had possessed the girl five times running (cf. Knauer, *op. cit.* p. 23); the point in Asclepiades 932 ff. = V, 185 is that the most important ingredient, as it were, is left with apparent nonchalance (*ταχέως ἐν παρόδῳ* 937) to the very end (cf. Knauer, *op. cit.* p. 22, and Ouvré, *op. cit.* p. 81); in Posidippus 3094 ff. = V, 183 the point is that the host is giving a super banquet, with gallons of wine, which begins exceedingly early (the words *τρόχαζε*, *ώρας γὰρ πέμπτης* are strategically placed, as a point, at the end of the poem; cf. Gow-Page p. 489, and Ouvré, *op. cit.* p. 81): the host does not seek excuses, as Alcaeus had to do, in his less permissive, if more heroic, age.

A witty variation on the theme of the shopping list is in Rhianus 3246

“Ημισυ³ μὲν πίσσης κωνίτιδος, ήμισυ δ' οἴνου,
 'Αρχῖν', ἀτρεκέως ήδε λάγυνος ἔχει,
 λεπτοτέρης δ' οὐκ οἶδ' ἐρίφου κρέα· πλὴν δ' γε πέμψας
 αἰνεῖσθαι πάντων ἀξιος 'Ιπποκράτης.

¹ Cf. the lemmatist on *A. P.* V, 181: *τοῦτο οὐκ ἐρωτικόν, ἀλλὰ καπηλικόν.*

² On the *σημεῖον* cf. *A. P.* V, 213, and SCHOTT, *op. cit.* p. 54 f.

³ The *exordium* is poetic *Gemeingut*: cf. *A. P.* IX, 256, XII, 73, IX, 137.

Incredible though it may seem, the crystal-clear point of this epigram has not been understood so far.

The structure of the poem is very skilful and the point felicitously arrives at the climactic end. The poet, speaking in the first person as the master who sent the slave to the market, complains about the bad quality of the provisions which he has been sent by the grocer. The wine, he says in jocular exaggeration, is half wine and half pitch, and the chops¹ are “small” (or “skinny”): *λεπτός* can mean either, cf. Gow-Page *ad loc.*). As a point, the poet adds: but I should not be astonished at all this (on *πλήν* cf. Gow-Page *ad loc.*,) seeing that the one who sent the groceries (the participial construction *δέ πέμψας* is overtly emphatic) is called Hippocrates. The grocer’s name, coming as it does at the end of the poem, explains everything, as a witty point: pitched wine had been recommended for medical purposes by no less a clinical authority than Hippocrates himself², and “light”, non-fat meat was also recommended by doctors for dieting purposes³. The poet implies that the wine and the meat which the grocer rejoicing in the name Hippocrates has sent are fit not for enjoyment at table, but only for medicinal or dieting purposes⁴.

¹ On the plural *ἐρίφους κρέα* = chops, *carnis portiones* cf. *Thes.* s.v. *κρέας* 1937 B.

² Cf. Gow-PAGE on 3246.

³ On *λεπταὶ δίαιται* in general cf. Hippocr., *Aph.* I, 4 (cf. LSJ, s.v. *λεπτός*, 9). For Galenus, cf. the Index in Kühn’s edition (vol. XX, p. 124, s.v. *caro boedina*): kid meat was recommended by doctors to patients, cf. Gal. VI, 774 Kühn. Cf. in particular, for Hippocrates, LITTRÉ, *Table Alphab.*, s.v. Chevreau (vol. X, p. 524): *κρέα ἐρίφου* were prescribed to patients by doctors (VI, 252 Littré) because such meat was very “light”; on *τὰ ἐρίφεια κρέα* being amongst the “lightest” cf. LITTRÉ VI, 546. Meat was regarded by doctors as a very important part of medical diets: cf. LITTRÉ, *Table Alphab.*, s.v. *viande* (vol. X, p. 841; “viandes légères” are discussed at VI, p. 263 LITTRÉ).

⁴ If the ancient Greeks actually drank *retsinato* (on the question cf. Gow-PAGE *ad loc.*), then the meaning is that too much pitch has been put in (by mistake

Finally, under this heading we may observe the “anti-sympotic” theme. Theognis, as we have seen, had exhorted Cyrnos to be his banqueting companions, but to “become serious again” at the door, when returning to the law of the jungle which dominated the political life of the polis: human nature does not change, because Automedon, at XI, 46, offers bitter considerations on this very point. The atmosphere of the banquet was, that is, false. Theognis had exhorted Cyrnos to drink when the others drank, regardless of his own inclinations: against such “*joie factice*” (Carrière, *Etude*, p. 145) Honestus explicitly proclaims at XI, 45 that drinking must be *αὐτοθελής*, not imposed by the *ἀνάγκη* of the banqueting etiquette and closes, rather lamely and unoriginally, with a celebration of the *μέτρον* (cf. Kägi, *op. cit.* p. 57). Cf. XI, 429, another late epigram which (cf. Beckby *ad loc.*) refers to Theognis 627 ff.: the protagonist is stupid because he does not become drunk like the other banqueters: this shows that the *ἀνάγκη* against which Honestus complains was still felt as a social obli-

or in order to hide the vinegary taste of wine that was “off”? The ancients were no less fussy than we are about the bouquet of wine: they wanted the wine to be *ἄδολος*: cf. PREISIGKE, *Wört. Pap.*, s.v.) by the dealer; if they did not, the meaning is that the wine had become, as it were, “corked”, i. e. its bouquet had been ruined by the pitch with which the vase had been sealed (cf. Theocr. VII, 147) or lined. The situation is probably the same as in Posidippus 3094 ff., = V, 183, where (cf. Gow-PAGE *ad loc.*) the master seems to complain to the slave about the swindling propensities of the wine-seller. The motif reappears in a late epigram, IX, 229: the poor owner of a bottle *ἐμῆς πενίης*, line 3) buys wine on draught (line 1; from the *κάπηλος*; he does not fill the bottle at home, “chez lui, au tonneau”, as Waltz observes): the owner of the bottle hopes to receive from the dealer good wine, not mixed with water and *ἄφθορος*. In Rhianus’ point, the verb *αἰνεῖσθαι* governs *πάντων*, as has been explained by MEINEKE, *Anal. Alex.*, *ad loc.* (p. 211; cf. also Gow-PAGE *ad loc.*): it remains to be added that *αἰνεῖσθαι* is, of course, ironic: interesting examples of irony in epigrams obtained through allusion to personal names are indicated in LAPP, *op. cit.*, p. 33 (‘Ακέσων *ab Aesculapio precatus*, etc.), as we have already observed when examining the epigram directed against the boy called Menippus.

gation. The most emphatic example of this anti-sympotic motif is Philodemus XI, 34 :

Λευκοῖνους πάλι δὴ καὶ ψάλματα καὶ πάλι Χίους
 οἴνους καὶ πάλι δὴ σμύρναν ἔχειν Συρίην
 καὶ πάλι κωμάζειν καὶ ἔχειν πάλι διψάδα πόρνην
 οὐκ ἐθέλω· μισῶ ταῦτα τὰ πρὸς μανίην.
 ἀλλά με ναρκίσσοις ἀναδήσατε καὶ πλαγιαύλων
 γεύσατε καὶ κροκίνοις χρίσατε γυῖα μύροις
 καὶ Μιτυληναίω τὸν πνεύμονα τέγξατε Βάκχῳ
 καὶ συζεύξατέ μοι φωλάδα παρθενικήν.

The poem is very well constructed : up to the end of line 3 we think that it is an exhortation, with infinitives which are either imperatival (cf. Anacr. 357, 11 *PMG*, where δέχεσθαι is probably = δεχέσθω, cf. Page *ad loc.* and Buchholz, *op. cit.*, I⁴, p. 33 ; cf. also Alcaeus 362 LP ἀνήτω, περθέτω, χευάτω) or to be followed by χρή (as e.g. in Xenophanes' Symposium, I, 13 D. : cf. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* p. 50 ; also Bielohlawek, *art. cit.* p. 19, 23, etc.). Then comes the unexpected οὐκ ἐθέλω, at the beginning of line 4. After this anticlimax, there follow the real orders expressed by imperatives (in sympotic tradition). Kaibel's interpretation (*op. cit.* p. XVI) to which I refer the reader for details is fundamentally correct (the poet is bored with banquets and ἐταῖραι, and wants to get married to a παρθένος¹) although neither he nor any other critic seems to have understood the point². This "anti-sympotic" movement,

¹ Cf. *A. P.* IX, 130, 2 παρθένος οὐ μεθύω. Similar anti-sympotic motif in Macedonius, *A.P.* XI, 39 (on the motif of the *fellatrix* cf. KROLL, *Catull*⁴, p. 300 f.).

² After much indulging in debauchery, the poet sees himself as a παρθένος ἀνήρ, i.e. "vir qui uxorem *juvenculam* et virginem duxit" (*Thes.*, s.v. παρθένειος, 507 c.) Unless we are familiar with the *topical* praise of male pre-matrimonial virginity (cf. LATTIMORE, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana 1962, p. 193) Philodemus' *Selbstironie* cannot be savoured. Cf. below, Addendum, p. 173.

fully developed, as we have just seen, in post-Alexandrian times, cannot, of course, be found in the epoch when it was fashionable to οἶνω καίρια συγγελάσαι, but it is interesting to see that an “Ansatz” is already present in Nicaenetus, 2703 ff., whose epigram we have already mentioned :

Οὐκ ἐθέλω, Φιλόθηρε, κατὰ πτόλιν ἀλλὰ παρ' Ἡρῷ
 δαίνυσθαι Ζεφύρου πνεύμασι τερπόμενος.
 ἀρκεῖ μοι λιτή μὲν ὑπὸ πλευροῖσι χάμευνα,
 ἐγγύθι γάρ προμάλου δέμνιον ἐνδαπίης
 καὶ λύγος, ἀρχαῖον Κάρων στέφος. ἀλλὰ φερέσθω
 οἶνος καὶ Μουσέων ἡ χαρίεσσα λύρη,
 θυμῆρες πίνοντες ὅπως Διὸς εὐκλέα νύμφην
 μέλπωμεν, νήσου δεσπότιν ἡμετέρης.

The tone is symptomatically hortatory (e.g. φερέσθω οἶνος = φέρ' ὕδωρ, φέρ' οἶνον Anacr. 38 Gent. ; ἀνήτω χεινάτω Alc. 362 LP; the poet—whose οὐκ ἐθέλω may well have inspired Philodemus’ choice of words οὐκ ἐθέλω· μισῶ, κτλ. insists (ἀρκεῖ ... λιτή, κτλ.) on frugality; the poet dislikes *Persicos apparatus* and requests a plain celebration: the bucolic setting is—this is a very important point—synonymous with simplicity and frugality: instead of the *nexae philyra coronae* he wants a modest garland of λύγος¹, like a peasant of old (cf. Athen. XV, 672 A οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ... ἀγροίκων, κτλ.).

¹ My comparison of this epigram with Hor. *Od.* I, 38 would show that the λύγος mentioned by Nicaenetus (ἀρχαῖον Κάρων στέφος) denotes what the poet wants in order to garland himself in archaic simplicity, instead of using new-fangled στέφη of a more recent and more luxurious age. Cf. TESCARO on Hor. *Od.* I, 26, 15 f. and I, 38, 3-4. The connection between Nicaenetus’ epigram and Horace’s *Od.* I, 38 seems to have escaped most commentators, including Kiessling-Heinze, who (*ad* I, 38) emphasize Horace’s rejection of “Tafelluxus” for his potion, and his choice of a plain garland. Anacreon (cf. 19, 30, 38, 104 Gent.) and Alcaeus (48, 296b8 LP) were fussy about garlands (cf. BOWRA, *op. cit.*, p. 276): cf. also Jacobs’ Index, s.v. στέφανος. The garland was a necessary item till late, cf. *A. P.* XI, 38, 5-6, Philodemus regards it as necessary at XI, 35, 5 and requests one at XI, 34, 5.

Love toast

The appropriate mixing of wine and water, a motif which goes back to Hesiod, was used by epigrammatists, as we have already seen, in order to obtain points within an erotic context: Asclepiades sought relief from $\chi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\pi\eta\;K\acute{u}p\acute{o}ri\acute{s}$ and $\pi\iota\chi\varrho\delta\acute{s}$ "Ερω\ς in Βάκχου ζωρ\δ\acute{o}n πόμ\alpha, whilst Euenos and Antipater obtained opposite and yet converging points on the motif of the sleep produced by wine and by water. The motif of wine and water having to be mixed lasted, of course, until late (cf. IX, 587); Meleager, a past master at obtaining points, extracted a novel *congetto* at 4706 ff. = IX, 331 by superimposing the topical opposition of water and wine on to the topical contrast of fire and water (the technique of double *congetto* is nothing unheard of in his poetry).

Not only the general motif of water and wine being mixed came to be used in erotic contexts, but in particular this *topos* was applied to the specific feature of the love-toast. The love-toast was given with pure, undiluted wine; Meleager promptly utilized this circumstance in order to obtain a novel *congetto* at 4222 ff. = V, 136

"Εγχει καὶ πάλιν εἰπέ, πάλιν πάλιν, 'Ηλιοδώρας·
εἰπέ, σὺν ἀκρήτῳ τὸ γλυκὺ μίσγ' ὄνομα.
καί μοι τὸν βρεχθέντα μύροις καὶ χθιζόν ἔόντα
μναμόσυνον κείνας ἀμφιτίθει στέφανον.
δακρύει φιλέραστον, ἵδού, ῥόδον, οὔνεκα κείναν
ἄλλοθι κού κόλποις ἡμετέροις ἐσορᾶ.

The wine, $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\rho\eta\tau\acute{o}s$, must be mixed ($\mu\acute{i}\sigma\gamma\acute{e}$) not with water, but, appropriately enough, with the name of the beloved to whom the poet is drinking his love toasts (the poet also managed to squeeze into the lines the motif of the beloved person being missed by the person who is drinking, a

motif we have already seen). The same *conceitto* occurs in another variation by Meleager, 4228 ff. = V, 137: οὗνομ' ἐν ἀκρήτῳ συγκεράσας πίομαι. The archetype of such *conceitti* relating to the love-toast is Callimachus 1063 ff. = XII, 51:

"Ἐγγει καὶ πάλιν εἰπὲ «Διοκλέος»· οὐδ' Ἀχελῷος
κείνου τῶν ιερῶν αἰσθάνεται κυάθων
καλὸς δὲ παῖς, Ἀχελῷε, λίην καλός, εἰ δέ τις οὐχὶ¹
φησίν, ἐπισταίμην μοῦνος ἐγὼ τὰ καλά.

The point relating to the name Ἀχελῷος has been correctly understood by Beckby *ad loc.* (cf. V, 110: ἔγγει, λάτρι, = ἔγγει ..., Ἀχελῷε¹); the concluding point of the poem has not been fully understood yet. The implication of the words is clear, provided we are familiar with certain literary motifs to which the poet is alluding. If someone should state that the boy is ugly, Callimachus hopes (the optative ἐπισταίμην is significant in this respect) that such a statement will be believed: the poet will not be so stupid as to contradict it, which would be tantamount to attracting his rivals' attention to the beauty of the boy, and wishes that he may be the only one to know that the boy is beautiful (or the only one to "understand beauty", which boils down to the same thing, in the context). The ever-threatening danger represented by rivals is a *Leitmotiv* in the Anthology (cf. *Rev. Et. Gr.* 1968, p. 50 ff.). Callimachus is, of course, making the statement καλός... λίην καλός orally to his slave, confidentially, not advertising the boy's beauty in written *graffiti* of the καλός -type. The poet's implication has been perfectly understood by the author of 3762 ff. = XII, 130, where the desirability of avoiding public confutations becomes explicit.

¹ Add *A.P.* XI, 24, where the pun is on the slave-name Helikon. The hortatory formula ἔγγει occurs in *skol.* 906 *PMG*: ἔγγει καὶ ..., διάκονε, κτλ.

We can examine Callimachus' epigram more closely. With his *μοῦνος ἐγώ*, the poet has reversed¹ a negative motif, which goes back to Theognis 696

τῶν δὲ καλῶν οὔτι σὺ μοῦνος ἐρᾶς

(τὰ καλά² means here “physical appâts”: cf. Carrière, *Poèmes*, *ad loc.*, and Reitzenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 160, n. 1): cf. also, for the thought in the negative form, Asclepiades 882 f. = XII, 50, 2 f., well illustrated by Gow-Page *ad loc.*

The wish expressed by Callimachus to be “the only one in the know” is found in Tib. IV, 13, 3 ff.: *tu mihi sola places* (= καλός, λίην καλός) ... *utinam posses uni mibi bella videri! displiceas aliis* (= εἰ δέ τις οὐχὶ φησίν), *sic ego tutus ero; nil opus invidia est...* : *qui sapit* (= ἐπισταίμην), *in tacito gaudeat ille sinu.* Callimachus and Tibullus (whoever the Greek model of the latter may have been) have adapted to the erotic sphere the motif of monopoly of knowledge, which is not infrequent in Greek literature: it is ultimately a Theognidean theme (772: the poet blames those who, out of jealousy towards others, keep their knowledge of precious things to themselves: it is obvious that Callimachus and Tibullus have reversed the motif; cf. also Eur., *Med.*, 400 f.); for Callimachus' wording *ἐπισταίμην* ... *ἐγώ* cf. Soph., *Trach.* 582 *ἐπισταίμην* *ἐγώ*.

The theme of love toasts having to be drunk undiluted is treated by Posidippus 3086 ff. = *A. P.* XII, 168. I have already dealt with this epigram in *Rhein. Mus.* 1963, p. 260 ff.,

¹ He liked to reverse such themes, as is well known: cf. 1087 = XII, 149, where the proverb *κοινὸς Ἐρμῆς* is reversed into *ἐμὸς Ἐρμῆς* (Gow-Page realize that *ἐμός* is “emphatic and predicate”, and merely fail to draw the conclusion: the proverb has been pointedly reversed). Cf. also Callim. 1069 f. = XII, 230, 3 *καὶ σὺ ποτ’ ἡράσθης*, where Callimachus uses “positiv” a notion normally used in the negative (REITZENSTEIN, *op. cit.* p. 190).

² For *ἐπίσταμαι* governing neuter plurals cf. Theogn. 652, also 224; *PMG* 449.

where it is explained, and therefore I shall not repeat myself here¹. We shall rather examine Hedylus, 1831 ff. = V, 199

Οἶνος καὶ προπόσεις κατεκοίμισαν Ἀγλαονίκην
 αἱ δολίαι, καὶ ἔρως ἥδὺς ὁ Νικαγόρεω,
 ἡς πάρα Κύπριδι ταῦτα μύροις ἔτι πάντα μυδῶντα
 κεῖνται, παρθενίων ὑγρὰ λάφυρα πόθων,
 σάνδαλα καὶ μαλακαὶ μαστῶν ἐκδύματα μίτραι
 ὕπνου καὶ σκυλμῶν τῶν τοτε μαρτύρια.

The point of this epigram has not yet been understood. As usual, an analysis of its structure will help us. The poet has successfully followed a climactic “build-up” technique, which finds its witty explanation at the end. Οἶνος καὶ προπόσεις are traditional ingredients, which we have already come across (cf. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* p. 91 f.); κατεκοίμισαν is ambiguous: what kind of sleep has the poet in mind? There are various types of ὕπνος, as we have seen: did Aglaonike sleep the ἄξιος ὕπνος of *A. P.* IX, 305, 3, the ὕπνος ἀπεχθομένων Ἀφροδίτη? Evidently not, because

¹ In addition to what I said the following points might be mentioned: (a) the allusion to Theognidean motifs is stronger than I thought: cf., alongside Theogn. 496, also Theogn. 478 and 840; (b) the metaphoric usage of νήφοντ' οἰνωθέντα (referred to the cup) is typically Posidippian: cf. OUVRÉ, *op. cit.*, p. 82, on such metaphors; at 3145 “matutina vocantur pocula quod ea Charaxus et Doricha mane exhauriunt”; οἰνωθέντα οἶκον is metaphorically said of a house at *A.P.* VII, 444, the metaphor indicating that the house was occupied by drunken people (in Posidippus the cup which is μεστός is οἰνωθεῖς because it is seen as the bottle at *A.P.* V, 135, which μεθύει and νήφει like its owner); (c) for the “Anrede an die Eroten”, cf. KNAUER, *op. cit.*, p. 4 f.; (d) for the substantive κύαθος to be understood, cf. GOW-PAGE ad 3092 (“the meaning appears to be that he wants each of the ... κύαθοι to be brimmers”); (e) the opposition of such participles as νήφων and οἰνωθεῖς was topical (cf. Theogn. 627 f., *Thes.*, s.v. νήφω, 1506 D; cf. also Asclepiades 1017 = *A.P.* IX, 752, 4); for asyndetical usage of participles expressing “einen Gegensatz” cf. KÜHNER-GERTH II, p. 103 f.; for contrasted participles expressing “two possible contingencies” cf. also BOLLING, *The Participle in Apollonius Rhod.*, in *Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, Baltimore 1902, p. 455. Cf. below, Addendum, p. 173.

οἶνος and ἔρως are specified. Was hers, then, the ὑπνος caused by too much wine, when one is practically dead and unable to do anything but lie in a coma, the ὑπνος which is γείτων τοῦ θανάτου (*A.P.* XI, 49)? Has she, with οἶνος, drowned her ἔρως-sorrows?¹ The verb κατακοιμίζω is deliberately vague, because it means "lull to sleep" (e.g. Plato, *Leg.* 790 *d*, κατακοιμίζειν τὰ δυσυπνοῦντα τῶν παιδίων: Aglaonike may well be visualized as a girl reluctant to go to sleep), or "mollify", = ἐξαπατάω, καταπραῦνω (attestations in *Thes.*, s.v.); the wine, we may think, acted as a κατακοιμιστής (an office reserved for eunuchs, as would appear from *Diod.* XI, 69). The wine, then, acting as a κατακοιμιστής, put Aglaonike to bed. Was she *alone* in bed? It is crucial to remember that there are, as we know from "Callimachus" 1327 ff. (= V, 23), various ways of ὑπνοῦν, κοιμᾶσθαι and κοιμίζειν²: cf. *A.P.* V, 120, 4 εὔδομεν ὡς εὔδειν τοῖς φιλέουσι θέμις; and παρὰ τῇ νέᾳ καθεύδειν Aristoph., *Ecc.* 938 (sympotic context, cf. Copley *op. cit.* p. 7). The adjective *αἱ δολίαι*, emphatically following³, arouses our suspicions. The young girl's offerings increase our misgivings, when mention is made of symbols of παρθενίων πόθων being now given away to Cypris, and finally the mention of σκυλμῶν, immediately following ὑπνου, clarifies everything: only when mention is made of σκυλμῶν μαρτύρια do we understand what type of sleeping we have to do with, in other words, we realize that the girl had been induced to sleep for the first time with a man by the effect

¹ This is what Asclepiades' companions recommended, as we have seen; for the theme cf. Meleager 4598 ff. = XII, 49; for κοιμίζω in the sense of "quenching" desire, πόθος, ἔρως, cf. 4052 = V, 212, 3 and 3191 = V, 215, 1 f.

² Such ambiguities are based on the meaning indicated in LSJ, s.v. κοιμάω, II, 4. It is important to recall that the τόπος of a girl sleeping *alone* was common (cf. SMYTH, *op. cit.*, on Sappho XIX, 4, p. 243). Cf. 4372 = V, 184, 3 and 4378 ff. = V, 191; also 3066 f. = V, 213, 1-2.

³ Variation: *A.P.* VII, 221, 4; cf. 3055 = V, 134, 2.

of the wine she had drunk. The threadbare motif of φείδη παρθενίης (*skol.* 913, 2 *PMG*, and Asclepiades 816 = V. 85, cf. Knauer, *op. cit.* p. 12 f.) is here treated with unsurpassed skill in obtaining a climactic effect¹. It is significant of the Hellenistic interest in women that the theme of sleep being connected with wine should here be applied not to a man (those who νυστάζουσιν because of wine-bibbing are, in literary texts, men, as a rule) but, by a reversal of motif, to a girl: a similar reversal of an established motif occurs in the *Fragmentum Grenfellianum*, another Alexandrian text, where the person singing the *paraclausithyron* is a girl. The choice of the term σκυλμῶν is very much pointed: cf. *Tebt. Pap.* 790, 11 (2nd cent. b. C.): μέθ' ὕβρεως καὶ σκυλμοῦ, 41, 7 (with the editors' note ad loc.), also *Ptolem. Tetrab.* IV, 206 μερίμνας τε καὶ σκυλμούς ἔμποιεῖ τῷ σώματι, *Artemid.* II, 30 φροντίδας καὶ σκυλμούς: a man who drinks gets rid of μερίμναι and φροντίδες (cf. Kägi, *op. cit.*, p. 57; *Anacreontica* 43, 46, 48 Bgk.), whereas a girl who takes οἶνος does attract σκυλμούς.

The Bibulous Women

What happened to Aglaonike leads us to examine the *topos* of the bibulous woman. Such a theme is frequent

¹ The verb κατακοιμίζω is, we understand at the end of Hedylus' epigram, used ironically, precisely as is the case with "Callimachus'" usage of κοιμίζω in the above quoted epigram (cf. LAPP, *op. cit.*, p. 33). On Hedylus' irony cf. OUVRÉ, *op. cit.*, p. 84 (where, however, the epigram under discussion is not understood). Hedylus has jocularly reversed a well established motif, the epigram written "pro victoria parta" (cf. KÜHN, *Topica epigrammatum dedicatoriorum graecorum*, Diss. Breslau 1906, p. 59): the μαρτύρια dedicated by the girl commemorate her *defeat* (cf. *GV* 2043, 4 μάρτυρες ... ἀρετᾶς τρόπαια, and Eur., *Tr.* 646 ἀρετᾶς λάφυρα); it may be added that the poet maliciously implies that the girl was, after all, willing to be defeated: on the felicitous *oxymoron* λάφυρα πόθων cf. JACOBS, *Animadv.* VII = I, 2, p. 331 f. (several similar cases in WALTZ, *De Antip. Sid.*, Diss. Burdigalae 1906, p. 47 f., where the technique of the employment of *oxymoron* in epigrams is discussed).

in Hellenistic epigrams. Various factors have contributed to its emergence. Epitaphs on ἔταῖραι who attended συμπόσια (e.g. VII, 217, 218, 221, 222, 223, 403; cf. V, 46) helped to introduce the character of the bibulous woman into epigrammatic poetry; the character was in any case (cf. Gow-Page, p. 68 and 261) already established in literature before Alexandrian times. The social position of women had changed: they had come nearer and nearer social equality with men. Traces of this social development can be found¹ even in Epic: as I have shown (*Cl. Q.* 1968, p. 55) Apollonius' heroines do not hesitate to use ὦ with the vocative, a familiar mode of address which of course no reserved Homeric heroine such as Penelope or Andromache would have dared to employ. The literary type of the οἰνοπότις² was in any case already present in sympotic literature, witness Anacr. 136 Gent. (οἰνοπότης, also attested in Anacreon, 57 Gent., appears in Callimachus fr. 69, 2 Pf. and at *A. P.* VII, 28, 2, an epitaph for Anacreon, as Gentili rightly indicates *ad loc.*; cf. also 1325, = VII, 454). Most of the epigrams on *buveuses* are interesting more as a mirror of social attitudes than as expressions of clever points, but there are exceptions. Hedylus' epigram 1837 ff. contains a witty point in line 3, which I have restored and explained in *CR* 1967, p. 22; the epigram is a typical social mirror in that it shows explicitly why the lady was felt to be remarkable: she could outdrink men (διαπινομένη ἀνδράσι), and could consume 18 pints (for a male counterpart cf. the late epigram XI, 57: it contains usual hortatory formulae, πῖνε καὶ ζῆθι; cf. XI, 56 πῖνε καὶ εὔφραίνου). In their epitaphs, the epigrammatists tend to imply that bibulosity does not

¹ Cf. ZIEGLER, Kallimachos und die Frauen, *Die Antike* 1937, p. 20 ff.; BRINGMANN, *Die Frau im ptolem.-kaiserl. Aegypten*, Diss. Bonn 1939.

² Cf. WEBSTER, *Hellenistic Poetry and Art*, London 1964, Plate IX b, for a photograph of the famous statue.

make one die prematurely: at the same time, the motif of emulation with men, as far as the drinking capacity is concerned, occurs again and again. At 356 ff., = VII, 303, the bibulous lady died *πολιή*: the epithet is emphatically put at the beginning of the piece. Even dead, she longs for the glass: the poet has utilized here the motif of the "one desire" of the dead, as Gow-Page notes on 360, a motif which Anacreon very humorously employed, as we have seen (cf. Gow-Page on 2390). The same motif occurs at 2385 ff., = VII, 455, where Leonidas repeats the theme, in metrical variation. A similar motif is found at VII, 329: at VII, 384, the dead lady longs for a *πίθος* to contemplate. The epigram 362 ff. = VII, 423 may be a serious epitaph or a joke (cf. Gow-Page ad 362). More interesting is Dioscorides' epigram 1647 ff., = VII, 456, whose humour nobody has understood:

Τὴν τίτθην Ἱέρων Σειληνίδα, τὴν δὲ πίνοι
ζωρὸν ὑπ' οὐδὲ μιῆς θλιβομένην κύλικος,
ἀγρῶν ἐντὸς ἔθηκεν οὐδὲ φιλάκρητος ἐκείνη
καὶ φθιμένη ληνῶν γείτονα τύμβον ἔχοι.

The separation *οὐδὲ μιῆς* (cf. 1638, = *A.P.* VII, 484, 2) is crucial to the understanding of the epigram: *οὐδὲ μιῆς*, as at 1638 (and 873, = *A.P.* V, 167, 4 *οὐδὲ ... μίαν*) implies, as usual, the notion "not even *one* out of *many*" (i.e. not even one out of all the many cups that she drank: cf. Kühner-Gerth II, p. 567, k).

Prostitutes drank *ἄκρητον* (cf. *A.P.* VII, 223, 4): and yet, when the respectable nurse drank *neat* wine (*ζωρόν*), "not even one" of the many cups she drank "oppressed" her with the consciousness of having done the wrong thing. *Θλιβομένην* "grieved" is a jocular exaggeration (for the meaning, cf. especially Moulton-Milligan, *Vocab. N. Test.*, and Preisigke, *Wört. Pap.* s.v. *θλίβω*; the meaning "in *Bedrängnis geraten*" is

frequent with passive participles ; the negative *litotes* has a humorous effect) : drinking ζωρόν was *not* the done thing (as we have seen, ζωροπόται was a “*Schimpfwort*”), but the lady evidently was not troubled even one bit by social scruples. Πίνοι and ζωρόν are not by chance put in an emphatic position. Ἡ φιλάκρητος ἐκείνη is also emphatic : ζωροποτεῖν was a masculine activity (cf. also ζωροπότης) and φιλάκρητος is usually applied to men (cf. Gow-Page on 786 ; the lexica show that the epithet was used of Bacchus, the Corybants, Anacreon, etc.) : the epigrammatist wants to insist that the lady’s drinking capacity was not inferior to a man’s. The final point is witty : ληνός, as I have shown elsewhere (*Antiq. Class.* 1968, forthcoming), denoted, in Hellenistic times “the place where the wine was kept”¹. At 786 ff., = VII, 457 the motif appears in variation : the tomb is lying near the threshing floor where the grapes were left to ripen before being put into the vat. Since must² did not stay in the wine-press, but directly percolated from it—as it was produced by treading—into the *lacus* or *dolia*, ληνοί³, it would appear that we have here an attestation of the meaning ληνός = πίθος, which appears in Theocr. XIV, 16, and which I have already discussed in the above quoted article. The lady fell into a large πίθος, *dolium*, whose lid she had lifted, and was drowned like Piasos (Strab., XIII, 621 : *RE*, s.v. *Dolium* 1286, 32 ff.) : on the lids of such *dolia* cf. *RE*, s.v. *Dolium*, 1286, 10 ff. ; Smith, *Dict. Ant.*³, s.v. *Vinum*, 964 (*opercula*) ; Dar.-Saglio, s.v. *Dolium*, fig. 2493). The epithet Κυκλωπείην stresses, of course, the enormous drinking capacity of the deceased. At XI, 409,

¹ The motif survived down to the mediaeval songs of clerici : “*si je meurs ie veux qu’on m’enterre dans la cave où ’y a du bon vin*”.

² Must, it is interesting to know, was the drink of “elderly women” (SMITH, *Dict. Ant.*³ s.v. *Vinum*, 964-965, on *lora*, *passum*, and *RE*, s.v. *Mustum*, 913, 8 ff.).

³ Cf. SMITH, *Dict. Ant.*³, s.v. *Vinum*, *Torcular*, *Torcularium*.

the huge amount of pure wine drunk by Σειληνίς (26 litres in four gulps, cf. BECKBY *ad loc.*) caused her to die:

Τετράκις ἀμφορέως περὶ χείλεσι χείλεα θεῖσα
 Σειληνὶς πάσας ἐξεφόρησε τρύγας.
 εὐχαῖτα Διόνυσε, σὲ δ' ὕδασιν οὐκ ἐμίηνεν·
 ἀλλ' οὗτος πρώτης ἦλθες ἀπ' οἰνοπέδης
 τοῖόν σε προύπινεν ἀφειδεές, ἄγγος ἔχουσα
 εἰσότε καὶ νεκύων ἦλθεν ἐπὶ ψάμαθον.

We do not know whether she died old or young ; the point, which so far has eluded the critics, lies in the final ἄγγος ἔχουσα. She died with the ἄγγος in her hand : the ἄγγος, of course, was full of wine. We know from line 1 that she drank directly from the amphora : why does the poet use ἄγγος? Because the phrase ἄγγος ἔχουσα suggested to a Greek reader the idea of a woman who went to fetch such harmless liquids as water or milk. Cf. e.g. *PMG* 56, 3 χρύσιον ἄγγος ἔχοισα ; Eur. *El.* 55 ἄγγος ... φέρουσα πηγὰς ποταμίας, κτλ. ; at *Theocr.* XIII, 39 ἄγγος ἔχων implies ὕδωρ ἐπιδόρπιον οἰσῶν, as Rumpel notes (*Lex. Theocr.*, s.v.). That is why the poet has used ἄγγος (which in itself can denote any kind of vase : cf. *Thes.*, s.v.)¹.

Drunkenness

If bibulous women can be indulgently treated by the epigrammatists, what about drunkenness in itself? In later

¹ A similar joke is in (Callimachus?) 1325 f., = VII, 454 (προποθεῖσα = προύπινεν XI, 409, 5 "drink up", as used by Anacreon, cf. LSJ, s.v. ; the point in the joke is probably that it is the κύλιξ which goes ἔχουσα, rather than being carried as one would expect : in other words, Callimachus seems to have reversed a phrase which was "common and suitable", cf. Gow-PAGE *ad loc.*).

times, epigrams show a moralistic attitude. "Diogenes Laertius" at VII, 104 blames Arkesilaos not because he drank himself to death ($\tauοσοῦτον ἀκρηγτον ἔσπασας$), but explicitly because drunkenness is a crime against the Muses.

The same motif appears at XI, 343 (late; Palladas?) where what "Diogenes Laertius" meant is made clearer, *remota metaphora*: the poet who has taken to the bottle is no longer able to write poetry: too much drinking sends him to sleep (the motif, as we have seen, is not new in epigrammatic poetry) and he cannot any more attend to the Muses, whose friendship he has now lost. Such a serious view is taken of confirmed alcoholics; occasional drunkenness is, of course, smiled at: cf. XII, 199, where Strato jocularly echoes a motif which is moralistically employed by Theognis 503-508, and XI, 26, where a *jeu de mots* reminiscent of the φέρουσα reversed by Callimachus at 1325 f. occurs: $\pi\alpha\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha\iota$, in the final line, means "I am carried away", the pun being on the fact that if it were the wine to be $\pi\alpha\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\varsigma$, the participle would mean "served", cf. LSJ., s.v.

Epigrammatists do not take a serious view of drunkenness, as is shown by the epitaphs they wrote. Leonidas (or Theocritus) 3426 ff. = VII, 660 makes the implicit point that it is not dangerous in the least to get drunk at home: the mortal dangers are outdoors, and a similar alibi for excusing the wine is later used by Antipater (VII, 398): the dead was $\mu\epsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$, but what killed him was his imprudence in going out in such a state, and on a rainy night at that. Similarly, the god Dionysos is partially excused at VII, 533, by apportioning half of the blame to $Z\acute{\epsilon}\nu\varsigma \acute{\nu}\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota\o\varsigma$: at IX, 82 the real culprit is indicated as being the sea, ($\mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon} \dots \acute{\delta}\lambda\acute{\o}\eta\pi\acute{\i}\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu\epsilon \theta\alpha\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\eta$), whereby "Ιακχος is automatically exonerated; at VII, 625, what ὤλεσε the man returning from a banquet was the ὕδωρ of the sea, not the wine that he had copiously ($\pi\epsilon\varrho\i\sigma\sigma\o\varsigma$) drunk, and that caused him to vomit after dinner. Such epitaphs try, jocularly, to dismiss the

charge of drunkenness that one might tend to make against the dead man¹.

One Hellenistic epigrammatist, Hedylus, explicitly associates copious drinking of wine with poetic creativity, in two epigrams, 1853-1856 and 1857-1862. Here are the texts :

Πίνωμεν, καὶ γάρ τι νέον, καὶ γάρ τι παρ' οἶνον
εῦροιμεν λεπτὸν καὶ τι μελιχρὸν ἔπος.
'Αλλὰ κάδοις Χίου με κατάβρεχε καὶ λέγε « παῖςε
'Ηδύλε »· μισῶ ζῆν ἐς κενὸν οὐ μεθύων.
'Εξ ἡοῦς εἰς νύκτα καὶ ἐκ νυκτὸς πάλι Σωκλῆς
εἰς ἡοῦν πίνει τετραχόοισι κάδοις,
εἴτ' ἐξαίφνης που τυχὸν οἴχεται· ἀλλὰ παρ' οἶνον
Σικελίδεω παῖςει πουλὺ μελιχρότερον,
ἔστι δὲ δὴ πουλὺ στιβαρώτερος· ὃς δ' ἐπιλάμπει
ἡ χάρις ὥστε, φίλε², καὶ γράφε καὶ μέθυε.

The sympotic hortatory tone is obvious (*πίνωμεν* : cf. also *Theogn. 763, 1042* cf. Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* p. 89 ff.); the

¹ The *topos* of going home in a drunken state—with the inevitable dangers attending—is attested in sympotic poetry : cf. *Anacr. 107* Gent., where the editor quotes *Theognis*, following Schmid. Cf. also BIELOHlawek, *art. cit.*, p. 24 f.

² As I shall indicate later, Jacobs' conjecture φίλει will be made all the more relevant and attractive by my interpretation of this epigram. However, given the facts that Hellenistic poets search for rarities, that Posidippus lengthens vocatives in -α “ vi caesurae semiquinariae ” (OUVRÉ, *op. cit.*, p. 90), that Hedylus is, in matters of prosody, “ multo audacior ” than Posidippus (OUVRÉ, *op. cit.* p. 89) and that a modern re-appraisal of the problem does not exist yet (I only know Fr. T. FRIEDEMANN, *Dissertatio de media syllaba pentametri*, published in Fr. SPITZNER's *De Versu Graecorum Heroico*, Leipzig 1816, p. 269 ff.; cf. now YOUNG's *Index* in his edition of *Theognis*, s.v. *Metrica, Syllaba brevis producta*) I am inclined not to interfere with the *lectio tradita*, until we learn more about facts that have been “ hinwegkonjiziert ” as a consequence of Hermann's dogmatic approach. Cf., for the moment, KOSTER, *Traité de métrique grecque*, Leiden 1966⁴, p. 81, n. 2 (e.g. *A.P. XI*, 431, 2; X, 44, 4). Cf. below, Addendum, p. 173.

motif $\pi\alpha\rho'$ οῖνον ... $\pi\alpha\iota\zeta\epsilon$ and $\pi\alpha\rho'$ οῖνον $\pi\alpha\iota\zeta\epsilon i$ closely corresponds to Callimachus 1185-86 = VII, 415 οῖνω καίρια συγγελάσαι; the jocular exaggerations κάδοις κατάβρεχε and τετραχόισι κάδοις also belong to sympotic tradition, because we have seen that Anacreon, in similarly facetious exaggeration, professes to have drunk a whole κάδον οῖνου, after which he is inclined to sing to the lyre, in company of a girl at the banquet. The poet Socles, who is exhorted to $\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon i\upsilon$ and $\mu\epsilon\theta\acute{\nu}\epsilon i\upsilon$, is obviously seen as behaving in the same sympotic tradition as Anacreon; another poet, too, Alcaeus, had proclaimed that $\mu\epsilon\theta\acute{\nu}\sigma\theta\eta\eta$ was a good thing for himself, as we have seen, and Anacreon confessed to being drunk in fr. 107 Gent. The question relating to the exact meaning of στιβαρώτερος (πουλὺ στιβαρώτερος = οὐκ δλίγον στιβαρώτερος *Od.* VIII, 187) will be soon clarified, but one fact is obvious: getting drunk is, for Hedylus, conducive to literary productivity. Exactly the same motif appears in another Hellenistic epigram of uncertain paternity, 2711 ff. = XIII, 29

Οῖνός τοι χαρίεντι πέλει ταχὺς ἵππος ἀοιδῶ
 ὖδωρ δὲ πίνων οὐδὲν ἀν τέκοις σοφόν.
 τοῦτ' ἔλεγεν, Διόνυσε, καὶ ἔπνεεν οὐχ ἐνὸς ἀσκοῦ
 Κρατῖνος ἀλλὰ παντὸς ὡδώδει πίθου.
 τοιγάρ οὐπὸ στεφάνοις δόμος ἔβρυεν εἶχε δὲ κισσῶ
 μέτωπον ὥσπερ καὶ σὺ κεκροκωμένον.¹

There is no doubt that the poet is praising excess in drinking: ἀσκός was as a rule the *uter caprinus* (cf. *Thes.*, s.v.), a comparatively small container (cf. e.g. ἀσκὸν ἔνδος μοι *Eur. Cycl.*

¹ For my text cf. GABATHULER, *Hellen. Epigr. auf Dichter*, Diss. Basel 1937, p. 15. Δόμος is clearly *lectio difficilior*; οὐπὸ στεφάνοις can be left untouched as being a Hellenistic periphrasis for the dative (cf. LSJ, s.v. οὐπό, B 4); there is no “unschöner Subjektwechsel” because μέτωπον means here the “front”, of the house. Cf. below, Addendum, p. 174.

510, quoted by Copley *op. cit.* p. 6: hence the specifications ἀσκὸν μέγαν *Od.* IX, 212, ἀσκὸν βοὸς ἐννεάροιο *Od.* X, 19): he has drunk not one single ἀσκός, but indeed one whole πῖθος, namely, the equivalent of several ἀσκοί. The ἀσκοί were used to transport the wine, which was poured into them from the *dolia*, πῖθοι (cf. Smith, *Dict. Antiq.*³, p. 965): this explains the association here. It was to the influence of wine that Cratinus owed his numerous literary victories. The polemical tone is explicit: the authority of an old poet, Cratinus, is invoked, and the proof of the validity of the statement is given by relying on the factual number of Cratinus' victories. The literary terminology of these pieces is rather loose, or at least is not sufficiently clear for us, but certain points are obvious: by writing παρ' οἶνον, one achieves a λεπτός and μελιχρός style, one is χαρίεις (χαρίεντι ἀοιδῷ 2711; χάρις 1862). Λεπτότης was a quality aspired to by Callimachus and the Alexandrians (cf. Gow-Page on 1299, and especially Skiadas, *Homer im griech. Epigr.*, p. 116, with literature; add Jacques, *REA* 1960, p. 48 ff.)¹. Why, then, the disconcerting στιβαρώτερος in Hedylus' epigram? The presence of the adjective has troubled the critics: Gow-Page observe that “τὸ στιβαρόν is not a quality very naturally associated with τὸ μελιχρόν”, and Reitzenstein (*op. cit.* p. 89) must admit that Asclepiades, too, aimed at achieving a “kräftig” style (*op. cit.* p. 89, n. 2.). For these reasons, στιβαρώτερος cannot but mean “physically robust, able to carry his liquor well”: but why

¹ For the polemic that Antipater conducted against the ὑδροπόται, I refer the reader to SKIADAS, *loc. cit.*, where the details bearing on the question are indicated. The relevant epigrams are XI, 20, 23, 24, 31; IX, 406 is ascribed to Antipater by Rubensohn, who relates it to IX, 305 on the one hand, and to XI, 20, 23, 24, 31 on the other. Not everything is clear: one cannot easily understand, for instance, why Callimachus is not mentioned at *A.P.* XI, 24 (cf. REITZENSTEIN in *Festschrift Reitzenstein* p. 55, n. 1). Antipater used symptotic motifs: at XI, 31 he makes a pointed allusion to the proverb μισῶ μνήμονα συμπότην, which occurs at *PMG* 1002.

should Socles *οὐχεσθαι*¹, in that case? The difficulties caused by the presence of *στιβαρώτερος* are coupled with those presented by the words *οὐχεται*: “it is hard to see what this should mean”, say Gow-Page *ad loc.* In reality, the two apparent difficulties are connected: they are no difficulties at all, but two details that explain each other and that reveal the epigram in question to be a very felicitous and humorous poem. By examining the epigram within the context of sympotic literature we understand what the poet is driving at. *Στιβαρός*, “robust”, “vigorous”, perplexes us at first, because this quality of style cannot be reconciled with the *λεπτότης*: nor can the perplexed reader reconcile *στιβαρώτερος* “able to carry his liquor better” with the fact that Socles *οὐχεται*, as Hedylus has just said. But the point of the epigram becomes clear—it is a typical case of humorous “delayed effect”. After drinking for a long time at a banquet, the vigorous Socles *οὐχεται*, in order to *κωμάζειν* and make love: this is, for him, the natural conclusion of banquets: it was an established sympotic motif that either “cortei giocondi di giovani usciti allora allora dal banchetto con le vene gonfie di vino e di desiderio” (Pasquali, *op. cit.*, p. 420 f.) should go around in search of love, or that each young man should go “alone” (Copley, *op. cit.*, p. 1 ff.) on the prowl. For the latter situation, which applies to Socles, cf. 3794 ff. = XII, 116 and 4092 ff. = XII, 117, Callimachus 1075 ff. = XII, 118 *ἄκρητος καὶ ἔρως μ' ἡνάγκασαν*, κτλ., and also 3668 ff. = XII, 115. Socles, who is more vigorous than Asclepiades, has by now “le vene gonfie” not only “di vino”, but also “di desiderio”, and therefore *οὐχεται*. The reader, bearing in mind the established sympotic motif of the departure from a banquet

¹ BECKBY (*op. cit.*, I², p. 35, n. 2) and GULICK (Athenaeus, Loeb edition, vol. V, p. 87, n.e) correctly understand that *στιβαρώτερος* means that Socles “can carry his liquor better” than Asclepiades, but cannot solve the problem presented by the addition *οὐχεται*. Cf. below, Addendum, p. 174.

when one has drunk "einen über den Durst" (cf. Gentili on *Anacr.* fr. 107, quoting Schmid), is at first puzzled: could it be that Socles has gone because he is drunk? But has the poet not said that Socles "can carry his liquor better"? Then comes the poet's witty explanation of the *real* reason why Socles ¹ οἴχεται ².

What Hedylus wants to ironically say is that Asclepiades is less vigorous than Socles, because the former had himself admitted that ζωροποτεῖν, instead of exciting sexual desires (as happened to Callimachus, Meleager, and, we now see, Socles—all of whom went out in search of love activities after drinking ἀκρηγτος), extinguished them (πίνωμεν Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα ... πιομένου γὰρ Ἔρως). In other words: Asclepiades, says Hedylus, was less vigorous than Socles, because he did not carry his wine well, and drinking put him into a state of torpor. Στιβαρός, therefore, is a witty allusion to physical ³, not stylistical, vigour: we have thus explained

¹ Hedylus is, in conclusion, ably playing with established sympotic motifs. The penny drops only if we keep them present to our mind.

² The situation depicted by Hedylus is best illustrated by the final scene in Plato's *Symposion*. Here, towards the end of the banquet, before the sun rises, those who are ἀδύνατοι πίνειν (cf. 176 c) go home (οἴχεσθαι ἀπιόντας, cf. οἴχεται, said of Socles; cf. 198 c), whereas those who, like Socrates, are not ἀδύνατοι πίνειν (cf. 223 c), remain and go on drinking; at the same time, κωμασταί on the prowl break in. Finally, the banquet is terminated ἥδη ἡμέρας γιγνομένης (223 d; cf. Xen., *An.* II, 2, 3 ἥλιου ἥδη δύντος). Socles οἴχεται, and those who remain behind may ask themselves whether he οἴχεται like the Platonic ἀδύνατοι πίνειν, but Hedylus wittily eliminates such a suspicion: Socles οἴχεται at dawn, before the sun rises, because he has gone on his own private κῶμος like the κωμασταί who break in towards the end of Platon's symposium: he is robust, and if he goes it is therefore not because he is ἀδύνατος πίνειν, but rather because he is δυνατὸς κωμάζειν, unlike Asclepiades who was "ein schwacher Zecher" (cf. BECKBY, *loc. cit.*)

³ On στιβαρός = *robustus, validus*, cf. *Thes.*, s.v. 762, C-D; Socles was στιβαρός τὸ σῶμα (cf. Jos. Fl. *Bell. Jud.* VI, 2, 8, Arist., *Thesm.* 639 στιβαρά τις καὶ καρτερά; the meaning of στιβαρός = *robustus* in the physical sense was already recognized to be present in Hedylus' epigram in *Thes.*, *loc. cit.*). The point achieved by Hedylus is all the wittier, as στιβαρός happened to be a technical term relating to style (cf. GOW-PAGE on 1861): the reader of the

both the presence of *στιβαρώτερος* in the poem and the words *οὐχεται*, *κτλ.* Incidentally, the emendation proposed by Jacobs and Kaibel becomes now anything but "irrelevant" (cf. Gow-Page on 1862): *φίλει* might be restored alongside the other two imperatives (but I have already explained why it is far more advisable to leave the *lectio tradita* alone). The banal theme "Wein, Weib und Gesang" was transformed by Hedylus into a neat, specific pointed and well constructed epigram¹. *Τυχόν "womöglich"* is delightful: it implies that Socles leaves the banquet only when it has been possible for him to date a girl previously: he is shrewd enough never to go to a girl's house *ἄκλητος* (cf. Asclepiades 866 ff. = V, 164). The conclusion of the poem (*ώς ἐπιλάμπει*, *κτλ.*) is now perspicuous, and the *oratio* no longer *hiat* (cf. Jacobs, *loc. cit.*): *ώς* is emphatic, andt he sentence means: it is in this way (i.e. through the stimulation of wine, with its attending amatory *Nebeneffekt*) that Socles' *χαρίεις* poetry is produced (*ἐπιλάμπει* = "erscheint, zeigt sich, leuchtet heran": cf. Passow, *Wört.* s.v., 1), so that (*ώστε*) it must be hoped that the poet will continue to write *and* drink.

epigram, knowing that Alexandrian poets appreciated *λεπτότης* and *μελιχρότης*, but disliked *παχύτης* (cf. Gow-PAGE on 1299 ff.) is at first disoriented in finding the expression *παιζει πουλὺ μελιχρότερον* followed by the incongruous *στιβαρώτερος*, which he at first refers to the style of Socles, only to be made to realize, through a delayed effect of humour, that *στιβαρώτερος* refers to physical prowess. Examined at close quarters, the choice of words appears very clever: Hedylus says *παιζει μελιχρότερον*, but *ἔστι στιβαρώτερος* (for the *Wortstellung*, cf. Asclep. 944 = VII, 11, 3). Epigrammatists, incidentally, are particularly touchy on the subject of amatory prowess (cf. XII, 232 and 240, also XII, 11, XI, 30; we have already marvelled at the *σημεῖον* used by Asclepiades at 930 f., = V, 181, 12 f.).

¹ To the "delayed effect" which I have analysed there corresponds a skilful structure: *ἀλλά* has the "assentient" meaning (cf. DENNISTON, *Gr. Part.*², p. 16 ff., and RUMPEL, *Lex. Theocr.* s.v., 2). The sense is: Socles, who obviously likes drinking, suddenly leaves the banquet: but then, but of course (*ἀλλά*) the reason is obvious: he is a skilful poet like Asclepiades, yet (*ἔστι δὲ δή*) he is much more vigorous than Asclepiades, and must therefore go out in order to indulge in amorous activities. Cf. below, Addendum, p. 174.

Wine-drinking Kills

The theme, as was already observed, is ultimately based upon a proverbial saying which goes as far back as Homer. Of course, the warning was not taken seriously by Alexandrian epigrammatists, who explicitly employed the Homeric motif in order to obtain pungent effects. Callimachus' epigram 1233 ff. = VII, 725 I have already interpreted in *Hermes* 1963, p. 154 ff., and I need not repeat myself here: the epigram, with its humorous implications, is a delightful piece of "arte allusiva"¹; Alcaeus, in two epigrams (18 ff., 24 ff. = IX, 519 and XI, 12) used the motif of wine being a killer in order to attack Philip's poisoning activities; Leonidas, using this theme at 2092 ff. = VII, 422, created a joke on Peisistratus' drinking propensities; Callimachus 1325 f. (= VII, 454) obtains a *jeu de mots* which we have already mentioned. Later, one occasionally encounters jokes on this theme: Nicarchus II at XI, 1 plays on the double meaning of the verbal form $\alpha\pi\omega\lambda\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu$ ("killed", or "lost"). At XI, 61 Macedonius, who had been ordered to abstain from wine by his doctor, confutes him on Homer's authority. The epigram is not without interest: the poet, constructing his epigram on the theme of doctors' incompetence (cf. Beckby *ad loc.*, who quotes Leo Philosophus; cf. Hedylus 1887 ff. = XI, 123, for the motif of inexpert doctors, and Anacreontic 8, 14 f. Bgk. for the motif of $\nu\ddot{\nu}\sigma\sigma\zeta$) has reversed the usual mode of quoting Homer: one generally cited the Homeric passage stating that wine kills (cf. Gow-Page on 24), whereas Macedonius is able to adduce Homer as an authority who proclaims exactly the opposite. Post-Alexandrian poets came to accept the point that wine-drinking kills, but they did so in a good spirit: Diogenes Laertius, as we have already seen, blames

¹ For the proverb, cf. v. PRITTWITZ-GAFFRON, *op. cit.* p. 16.

Arkesilaos not for having drunk himself to death, but only for having wronged the Muses ; at XI, 23 Antipater wittily suggests (not omitting the sympotic exhortation $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$) that he prefers to go to Hades on horseback rather than on foot, cleverly connecting the saying of Cratinus with what must have been a common proverb (X, 112: cf. Beckby *ad loc.*).

“ *Wein, Weib und Gesang* ”

A theme of this kind was too popular and too “ unspecific ” to appeal to Alexandrian epigrammatists in its crude form. We have just seen how Hedylus refines the raw material represented by the plain sympotic exhortation $\mu\acute{e}\theta\nu\epsilon$ into a very sharp diamond of a point. The motif, in its general theme, hardly occurs in Hellenistic epigrams, Posidippus 3054 ff. = V, 134:

Κεκροπί, $\delta\acute{\alpha}\iota\pi\epsilon$, $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\gamma\nu\pi\epsilon$, $\pi\o\lambda\acute{\u}δ\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\o$ ν $\acute{\i}\kappa\mu\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha$ Βάκχου,
 $\delta\acute{\alpha}\iota\pi\epsilon$ · $\delta\rho\iota\sigma\acute{\i}\zeta\acute{\e}\sigma\theta\omega$ $\sigma\mu\beta\o\lambda\iota\kappa\heta$ $\pi\acute{\r}\o\pi\o\sigma\i\zeta$ ·
 $\sigma\i\gamma\acute{\a}\sigma\theta\omega$ Ζήνων, δ $\sigma\o\phi\delta\acute{\o}$ $\kappa\acute{\u}\kappa\nu\o\zeta$, $\acute{\a}$ $\tau\epsilon$ Κλεάνθους
 Μοῦσα, $\mu\acute{e}\lambda\o\i$ δ' $\hbar\mu\i\pi\epsilon$ δ γλυκύπικρος "Ερως

opens along orthodox sympotic lines (one will note the hortatory tone insisted upon : $\delta\acute{\alpha}\iota\pi\epsilon$, $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\gamma\nu\pi\epsilon$, $\delta\rho\iota\sigma\acute{\i}\zeta\acute{\e}\sigma\theta\omega$ ¹ ; the sympotic ambiance is explicit : $\sigma\mu\beta\o\lambda\i\kappa\heta$ $\pi\acute{\r}\o\pi\o\sigma\i\zeta$).

Schott (*op. cit.* p. 44) stresses that the epigram, clearly of a “ genus convivale ”, must date from the poet’s student days. The point, in any case, consists in a clever reversal of motif : it was a natural, established convention to include the Muses as a suitable company in convivial poetry, because banquets were marked by drinking and the singing of poetry (cf. e.g. Nicaen. 2708 $\varphi\acute{\e}\rho\acute{\e}\sigma\theta\omega$ $\o\i\pi\o\zeta$ $\kappa\acute{\a}\i$ Μούσεων ... $\mu\acute{e}\lambda\pi\o\mu\epsilon\nu$;

¹ The metaphoric usage $\delta\rho\iota\sigma\acute{\i}\zeta\omega$ applied to wine recalls the metaphor employed by Hedylus at 1855 $\kappa\acute{\a}\t\beta\o\pi\epsilon\chi\heta$, $\kappa\acute{\a}\i$.

οἰνοποτάζων ... Μούσεων, κτλ., Anacr. 56, 1-3 Gent.), whereas here one Muse is excluded. The irony is jocular as it is subtle : Cleanthes' Muse was too serious, because he was primarily a philosopher, and his poetry was anything but that type of literature to be enjoyed by the light-hearted participants in a banquet : the *μέλος* they want to hear is purely erotic in tone, and so Cleanthes' ponderous poetry¹ is not wanted. Posidippus, who must be presumed to have the highest respect for his revered master's philosophy, has a very irreverent opinion of the latter's fervid and well-meaning, but unremittingly wearisome and hopelessly humourless poetry, poetry which was singularly out of touch with Hellenistic literary taste—I venture to say that whoever has read Cleanthes' lines, and compared them with Callimachus' Hymns, will hardly fail to agree with Posidippus².

¹ Posidippus' jocular irony can only be understood if we consider the epigram within the framework of sympotic traditions : his joke has eluded Gow-Page, who think of Cleanthes' "inspired teaching" and suggest that Posidippus "presumably intends to include all his works then published". Cf. SCHOTT, *op. cit.* p. 45, rightly : "haec vox ex poeticis Cleanthis studiis originem dicit neque verisimile est eam hoc quidem loco de philosophia dici". REITZENSTEIN, *op. cit.* p. 75, n. 3, who thinks that Cleanthes' Hymn to Zeus was meant to be "beim Gelage gesungen", can hardly be right ; what Posidippus implies is simply that Cleanthes' poetry was not of the type suitable for banqueting and singing purposes. Even Pasquali, who had an uncommonly fine ear for catching humorous "rovesciamenti" of motifs (e.g. *op. cit.* p. 423, 479, 483) and who has done so much to establish the concept of "arte allusiva" whose *raison d'être* is "richiamare in mente ai lettori colti" certain established motifs (*op. cit.* p. 504) misses Posidippus' point (*op. cit.* p. 614 f.) : as I have tried to show, "la grazia" of this epigram does not consist "solo in espressioni audaci e in giuochi di parole", but in a very facetious aside at Posidippus' teacher, very much in the "irriverente" spirit typical of the "periodo alessandrino", to use Pasquali's own words, *op. cit.* p. 619). Honestus (XI, 32) used a motif reminiscent of Posidippus' point (Βάκχος brings the φιλοπαίγμων nature of the Μούση into the open).

² The ground for the aside at the *μέλος* of Cleanthes' Muse has been prepared by the poet through his mention of Zenon as σοφὸς κύκνος. This, as SCHOTT *loc. cit.* has seen, means "extremely old philosopher" : Zenon—who in effect died at the age of ninety eight—is compared to a swan, who *sings* when

The Muses, one of whom had been so disrespectfully rejected (cf. *PMG* 796, 5) by Posidippus, conventionally reappear at the banquet in later epigrams, e.g. X, 18.

Leonidas, too, gives us an exhortation to enjoy ourselves, but, in typically Alexandrian fashion, does it obliquely, by implication. At 2383 f. = VII, 452 we read :

Μνήμης Εύβούλοιο σαόφρονος, ὃ παριόντες,
πίνωμεν· κοινὸς πᾶσι λιμὴν Ἀίδης.

This couplet is as witty as it is skilfully structured : as we have had occasion to observe more than once, the word-arrangement often contributes to "building up" the climactic point, in Hellenistic epigrams. Μνήμης was a traditional beginning of real epitaphs (cf. Peek, *Verz. d. Gedicht-Anf.*, s.v. Μνήμης). From such an *ouverture* up to the end of the line the reader is misled to believe that he has business with a serious, real epitaph : the personal name of the dead accompanied by the epithet σαόφρων is a traditional feature, and the address to the passers-by ὃ παριόντες is only too common as a sepulchral formula. Then comes, in an emphatic position at the beginning of the second line, the unexpected and perplexing πίνωμεν : this is an orthodox sympotic formula, which reveals the genitive μνήμης to be a *genitivus honoris*, Genitiv des Libierens (cf. Ouvré, *op. cit.* p. 57; *A.P.* XII, 51, 1, XII, 168, 1, etc.; cf. *KG* II, p. 376). Such a genitive, in quite impeccable sympotic style, and therefore apposite as a companion to

near his death. Posidippus was probably thinking of the topical comparison of the philosopher Socrates with a swan, cf. THOMPSON, *Gr. Birds*, p. 181; at the same time, the witty idea of Zenon "singing" was prompted by the circumstance that, from Theognis down to Nicaenetus 2703 ff. (Μουσέων λύρη ... μέλπωμεν) the habit of singing songs at *symposia* remained firmly established. Needless to say, Posidippus' epigram, which was composed during his student days, was only meant for private circulation amongst his fellow students.

the conventional sympotic formula *πίνωμεν*, is nevertheless incongruous, because it refers to a dead person, instead of to a living one. Leonidas is utilizing the fact that often "Grabinschriften schliessen mit der Aufforderung zum frohen Lebensgenuss" (Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* p. 149¹), but the *Aufforderung* is disconcerting here: Gow-Page observe, perplexed, that they "know no example of a toast to a dead man". But this is precisely the humorous point of the epigram. The explanation is supplied by the poet himself, with the concluding words *κοινὸς πᾶσι λιμὴν Ἀίδης*², which neatly round off the poem. In order to understand the poet's humour we must be familiar with contemporary *Sprachgebrauch* as reflected by Leonidas' choice of the epithet *σαόφρων*. The epitaph, as we have seen, invites passers-by not "zum Lebensgenuss" in general terms, but pointedly to drink toasts to the memory of the dead. What kind of person was he? The toast must be drunk not to the health of a *living*, ribald, merry and bibulous *συμπότης*, or in honour of a loose-living mistress, as was customary, but—another example of humorous reversal of themes—in honour of a *dead* man who had been *σαόφρων*. Now the adjective *σαόφρων* denotes, on epitaphs, the virtues of sexual continence and teetotalism, and was therefore, in Hellenistic times, reserved for dead ladies (cf. Skiadas, 'Επὶ τύμβῳ, Athens 1967 p. 74 ff.³). What the poet ironically implies is that Eubulos, for all his unmanly virtue *σαοφροσύνη*, did not escape the fate common to us all, virtuous and unvirtuous ones: much better it is therefore not to live like him, but to drink, with

¹ Cf. now LATTIMORE, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs*, Urbana 1962, p. 256 ff., especially p. 260 ff. : cf. e.g. PEEK, *GV* 1219.

² This was, in itself, a trite motif (cf. LATTIMORE, *op. cit.* § 71) which the poet cleverly utilizes in order to obtain a novel point.

³ Cf. Wyss, *Die Wörter auf -σύνη*, Diss. Zürich, 1954, p. 66-67. A useful history of the word *σωφροσύνη* is in Sturz, *Lex. Xenoph.*, s.v.

all the amatory implications¹ that wine-drinking automatically suggests².

The incongruity between the virtue stressed in the epitaph, *σωφροσύνη*, and the ribald exhortation given by the poet, constitutes the point of the epigram³, which has so far defied the grasp of the critics⁴. The final explana-

¹ Cf. e.g. Philodemus, XI, 34, 3 *κωμάζειν ... ἔχειν διψάδα πόρνην*, VII, 223, etc.

² *Σωφροσύνη*, as sexual continence, was traditionally connected with teetotalism, cf. *A.P.* IX, 132, and IX, 305. My interpretation of Leonidas' jocular epitaph is confirmed by Leonidas himself, cf. 2319 f. = VI, 305, 7-8, where *λαθροσύνη* and *σωφροσύνη* are opposed to each other.

³ *GV* 1227 (of the 6th century, when *σωφροσύνη* was still used in epitaphs for men, cf. SKIADAS, *op. cit.* p. 33) best illustrates, as a foil, the humorous incongruity of Leonidas' epigram:

'Αντιλόχο ποτὶ σὲμ' ἀγαθῷ καὶ σόφρονος ἀνδρὸς
[δάκρυ κ]άταρξον, ἐπεὶ καὶ σὲ μένει θάνατος.'

(for the text, cf. SKIADAS, *loc. cit.*).

In view of the common fate awaiting them, passers-by are invited to cry. Leonidas asks himself, having in mind such epitaphs: what is the point of being virtuous and abstinent? Rather than invite the passers-by to cry, he invites them to be incontinent.

⁴ Reitzenstein came nearest to the solution, but he failed to see the humorous contrast between the Hellenistic usage of *σώφρων* on real epitaphs (for *ladies*!) and the jocular use made of it by the poet. Cf. *GV* 1490 (on a woman, *σῆς ἀρετῆς μνημεῖα ... σώφρων, κτλ.*). Whether Leonidas' *πίνωμεν* is only allusively sympotic, i.e. the poet wants to convey to his readers an exhortation of distinctly sympotic flavour, or whether the epigram was actually extemporized at a banquet, as Reitzenstein believes, is immaterial. I personally think that the first hypothesis is correct, because exhortations in the subjunctive given by "unbestimmte Personen" (SEELBACH, *Die Epigr. des Mnas. u.d. Theodor.*, p. 29; examples: *ἰδώμεθα* 995 a = *A.P.* 68; *ἰδώμεθα* 2803 = IX, 332; *στῶμεν* 2659 = IX, 333) are not rare on "Aufschriften", as Reitzenstein himself knows (*op. cit.* p. 141) and in particular because the living often speak in the first person plural on epitaphs (cf. 1193 = VII, 17, 1; 1214 = VII, 518, 4; 1245-1249 = VII, 271; 2092 = VII, 422, 1; Leonidas, subjunctive *στοχασώμεθα* = *πίνωμεν*, VII, 376, 1). We need not imagine, therefore, the poet actually extemporizing at a banquet: the choice of such a traditional sympotic formula as *πίνωμεν*, a choice so incongruous to an epitaph, constitutes the humour of this piece of *Buchpoesie*. Gow-Page observe, on Leonidas' epigram (2383): "for *πίνωμεν* cf. Asclepiades 884, where the cause for merry-making is however different". Precisely in this difference consists the point of Leonidas' epigram!

tion¹ neatly concludes a skilfully balanced poem, supplying to the readers the explanation for the poet's sympotic exhortation *πίνωμεν*, an exhortation which at first leaves them puzzled. If we now put Leonidas' epigram, with its elegant and witty implications, alongside a traditional "Zweizeiler" like *GV* 1219, where the same idea implied by Leonidas is explicitly and crudely stated, we shall at once perceive what elegant use of commonplace themes the Alexandrians were capable of making, even within the narrow limit of a couple of lines.

After Hellenistic times, the theme, which we have seen was sparingly employed by the Alexandrians, and always in order to obtain a specific point, makes a come-back into the epigrammatic genre. Straton offers the motif in its explicit form without any implied witticism: XI, 19 (καὶ πίνε [sic] ... καὶ ἔρα ... πυκασώμεθα καὶ μαρίσωμεν: the traditional hortatory tone is obvious); Antiphanes² wants (X, 100), ψαλμός, ἔρως, προπόσεις, because soon πολιὸν γῆρας, the χειμῶν γῆρας βαρύς will arrive, accompanied by impotence (cf. XI, 30, XII, 240): nothing more trite could possibly be preached. The influence of *Grabpoesie*³ becomes now notable. The times of Palladas and Agathias were inclined not to pointed, light-hearted witticisms, but rather to wry and pessimistic considerations on the inevitability of death.

¹ It will be noted that the final explanation κοινὸς πᾶσι λιμὴν Ἀίδης, which, *fulmen in clausula*, throws full light on the incongruous relation between the apparently compunctious Μνήμης σαόφρονος and the ribald *πίνωμεν*, so that the ironic nature of σαόφρονος is thrown into relief, is in itself, as was already noted, a threadbare motif: once more, a novel point is obtained by means of a trite *locus communis*. One will observe that Gow-Page, like Reitzenstein, skirt the correct interpretation of the epigram: "let all of us who pass the memorial of the good (or perhaps 'sober') Eubulus make merry since all his σωφροσύνη has not saved him from the common fate". What has prevented them from understanding Leonidas' point was their overlooking the *Hellenistic* meaning of the adjective σαόφρονος.

² Cf. KÄGI, *op. cit.* p. 12, for XI, 168.

³ Cf. KÄGI, *op. cit.* p. 14.

A.P. XI, 8 repeats the theme of the "one regret" which we have already seen (οὐχ δὲ θανῶν πίεται), at the same time echoing *Theogn.* 1191 and *GV* 1363 (cf. Beckby, *ad loc.*). Palladas, at XI, 62, exhorts us to drink and love—trying to forget the thought of death (a significant pointer to the *Stimmung* of those days (cf. Beckby *ad loc.*, who quotes *GV* 1589); the same thought of death being inevitable occurs at XI, 23, which we have already examined; XI, 25 adapts *Theognis* 1012 to the theme of death being inevitable (μοιριδίη μελέτη): the author wakes up a fellow toper who has fallen asleep at a nocturnal drinking party (an echo of the "nodding theme" which we have already encountered: but, whereas Callimachus and Asclepiades smilingly use the theme for erotic situations, the autor of XI, 25 sombrely reminds his companion that death will come, as a *long, long* sleep, πολὺς, πολὺς); XI, 56 is probably by Palladas (cf. Beckby, *ad loc.*): it starts with the traditional formula πῖνε and ends with the thought of death; XI, 28 begins with the motif of death being inevitable, and ends by saying that even philosophers are mortal; XI, 38 uses once more the traditional exhortations (πῖνε ... καὶ ἔσθιε καὶ περίκεισο ἀνθεα), but, whereas in Anacreon such preparations led to jollification, now the conclusion of the poem is, once more, the theme of death being imminent (ἐξαπίνης).

Wine drowning Worries

This motif, as we have already observed, was too general and too popular to be liked by the Alexandrians. The epigrams where it appears are late: X, 118, XI, 55 and VII, 339 contain the typical pessimistic considerations of the time (influence of *Grabpoesie* is probable: cf. Lattimore, *op. cit.*, p. 256-265). Macedonius, at XI, 63 (in his epigram on the "Zechermut" which we have already mentioned in another context) touches on the theme in question:

wine removes despondency caused by $\pi\epsilon\nu\eta$. Paulus Silentiarius, at XI, 60, using the conventional hortatory form ($\mu\acute{e}\theta\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}\ \beta\acute{o}\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \check{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\omega$) proclaims his intention to remove $\varphi\varrho\sigma\tau\iota\delta\alpha$ by drinking rather than eating, and the same theme occurs in Macedonius at XI, 59: (the *skolion* 913 *PMG* exhorts to $\dot{\epsilon}\rho\tilde{\alpha}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\dot{\iota}\ \kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\theta\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$, but Anacreon 93 Gent. had taught that wine was more conducive to amatory activities than food). These late epigrams have an air of forced joviality, and one searches in vain for a point that might redeem them: they are rather rhetorical compositions *di maniera* (Jacobs aptly recalls that the theme is also attested in Nonnus, *Dionys.* XII, 211).

I might as well conclude now. The *Ertrag* of my survey is, I venture to think, threefold. First of all, I have endeavoured to briefly outline a chapter of literary history, which I hope may prove not entirely useless to future researchers: like Copley, I have surveyed the development of a literary genre, the sympotic, which, just like the *paraclausithyron*, finds its expression in various literary shapes (*Theognidea*, *skolia*, *epigrams*), yet preserves throughout the centuries certain clearly defined features. Secondly, I have tried to show, beyond the commonly accepted generalization about "die Aufnahme von Gelagepoesie" into the epigrammatic genre, how selectively the Alexandrians made their choice of motifs, and how pointedly they used them in their epigrams; thirdly, I have attempted to demonstrate that a good many poems (epigrams, Anacreon) cannot be understood and enjoyed unless we place them within the literary framework of sympotic poetry:

Sie sprechen eine Sprache,
Die ist so reich, so schön ;
Doch keiner der Philologen
Kann diese Sprache verstehn.

ADDENDUM

P. 135, n. 2 : The readers who have followed my argument will note that Bergk's restoration of *πάλι* at Hedylus 1857 is confirmed by Asclepiades' words. But, even if we were to read *Πασισωκλῆς*, I need hardly add that the absence of *πάλι* in Hedylus' words would not alter in the least the *Sachverhalt* as I have brought it to light : the presence of *πάλι* is crucial only in Asclepiades' words, where it demonstrates that *ἀώς* cannot be "a synonym of *ἡμέρα*", as Gow-PAGE (*ad* 884) propound.

P. 136, n. 1 : On Leonidas "philosophy" the best has been written by HANSEN, *De Leonida Tarentino*, Diss. Leipzig 1914, p. 20 ff. G. LOMBARDO-RADICE's paper in *Maia* 1965, p. 141 ff. "non pretende contribuire all' approfondimento storico-filologico della poesia di Leonida" (p. 141), and therefore need not be read.

P. 145, n. 2 : The poem is skilfully constructed: the reader wonders what difference there is between the banquet described in lines 1-4 and the banquet described in lines 5 ff. (so do very perplexedly Gow-PAGE, *The Garland of Philip*, p. 390 ff., who have not seen the point) until the final point, line 8, clarifies that the banquet wanted by the poet is a *nuptial* one. The features of nuptial banquets (garland worn by bridegroom, *Flötenbegleitung*, etc.) were misleadingly similar to those of the disreputable banquets which Philodemus wanted to stop attending. The sexually much experienced Philodemus is belatedly complying with the requirements of "Greek opinion of Hellenistic, and especially of Roman times" (LATTIMORE, *loc. cit.* n. 156) which expected of a man that he should marry young and *ἀθιγῆς*. This epigram is analysed by me in detail in my already quoted forthcoming *Studies in Hellenistic Epigram*.

P. 150, n. 1 : SKIADAS (*Rh. Mus.* 1966, p. 187 ff.) has unaccountably not understood A.P. V, 135, 5 f., nor is he familiar with the *Hellenistic* motif of the poet being in love with the Muses : Posidippus' epigram is analysed by me in detail in "Interpretationen hellenistischer Dichter" (*Hermes* forthcoming).

P. 158, n. 2 : Friedemann blindly followed Hermann's dogmatic pronouncement, but what Gow says about another Hermannian dogma is no less true in our case : "the exceptions were collected and emended by Hermann, but they are too numerous for emendation to be plausible" (*Theocritus*, vol. II, p. 294).

P. 159, n. 1 : Indeed the *metaphorical* sense of *μέτωπον* seems to be the *usual* one in the *Anthology*; cf. VII, 465, 1-2 *μέτωπον* ... *στέφανοι*; IX, 114, 1;

IX, 679, 4 and IX, 710, 3. The *Sprachgebrauch* of the *Anthology*, in other words, vindicates the *lectio difficilior*: an yet nobody so far had seen this fundamental point.

P. 161, n. 1: Cf. also JACOBS, *Animadv.* I, 2 (= VII), p. 328: "difficile fuerit divinare, quo Pasisocles bene potus abire sit solitus".

P. 163, n. 1: The point lies in the final $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\epsilon$, which explains the previous $\mathfrak{o}\acute{\chi}\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$: $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\epsilon$ implies that Socles will leave the banquet in order to $\kappa\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota$, cf. 3794 = XII, 116 $\kappa\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\omega\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$, $\kappa\tau\lambda\ldots$ and 3668 ff. = XII, 115 $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\upsilon\omega\ldots\kappa\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\iota$. The pointed implication (*fulmen in clausula*) renders the notion represented by the imperative $\varphi\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\iota$ unnecessary. Hedylus' biting point is aimed at Asclepiades, whose sexual weakness Hedylus derides. To this end, Hedylus has seized upon an unfortunate implication contained in Asclepiades' own words at 880 ff. = XII, 50.

DISCUSSION

M. Luck: Ich möchte zu drei typischen Motiven der symposiastischen Epigramme etwas bemerken :

1) zur *shopping list* : es scheint mir, dass das Motiv, so wie es im Epigramm erscheint, stark von der Mittleren und Neueren Komödie geprägt ist.

2) Es gibt eine Reihe von Hetärenepigrammen, hauptsächlich bei Athenaios (der sie vielleicht aus Meleager hat; die byzantinischen Editoren der *Anthologie* haben nur ganz wenige aufgenommen) ; wie ich gesagt habe, darf man das in der älteren Elegie nicht erwarten ; jene Symposien waren offenbar exklusive Männergelage.

3) Das Thema *Wein und Dichtung* wäre noch interessant. Hedylos sagt (bei Athen. XI, 473a) « beim Wein spiele ich viel lieblicher als Asklepiades ». In der Kaiserzeit kommt dazu die Polemik gegen die Wassertrinker (*A.P.* 11, 20 usw.), die ja auch gegen literarische Gegner gerichtet ist.

M. Raubitschek : Die symposiastischen Distichen gehören mit den Grabepigrammen und den Weiheepigrammen zusammen und stellen einen weiteren Bereich des rezitierten elegischen Gedichtes dar, das überall dort verwendet wurde, wo Gruppen von Männern zusammen kamen, am Grabe, am Heiligtum und beim Gelage. Ein frühes Beispiel so eines symposiastischen Gedichtes könnte das Epigramm sein, das auf dem Nestorbecher steht und das sich nur dadurch von einem « Epigramm » des Theognis unterscheidet, dass es aus zwei Hexametern besteht und nicht aus einem Distichon.

M. Pfohl : In das Studium der symposiastischen Elemente müssen auch eine Reihe von Inschriftgruppen einbezogen werden: die päderastischen Ephebeninschriften, Vaseninschriften (« Freue dich

und heirate nicht! — O, was sagst du da? »), Grabepigramme, die das « Gerede » vom Weiterleben und die verschiedenen Ausdrucksweisen für die « Welten des Jenseits » ironisieren und zum Lebensgenuss, oft in drastischer Form, auffordern (Sardanapal).

M. Gentili : Per Anacreonte 13, 7/8 Gent. vorrei segnalare l'interpretazione, che a me sembra persuasiva, di M. Wigodsky (*Class. Phil.* 62, 1962, 109) : $\chi\acute{a}\sigma\kappa\omega$ in senso erotico come in Aristofane (*Vesp.* 1345-50) in un'analoga situazione simposiale. E' perciò sicura la lezione trádita $\pi\varrho\delta\varsigma\ \delta'\ \ddot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\varsigma\ \tau\iota\eta\acute{a} = \pi\varrho\delta\varsigma\ \delta'\ \ddot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\varsigma\ \tau\iota\eta\acute{a}\kappa\acute{a}\mu\eta\varsigma$, cioè una « chioma » nera in contrapposizione alla « chioma » bianca del poeta ($\lambda\acute{e}\u03b9\kappa\acute{h}\ \gamma\acute{a}\rho$). L'interpretazione è coerente con l'invito al $\sigma\mu\pi\alpha\acute{h}\varsigma\iota\eta$ e con la menzione che la ragazza è di Lesbo. Non trovo inadeguato in Anacreonte l'uso di $\chi\acute{a}\sigma\kappa\omega$ in senso erotico. Questa pretesa castigatezza nel linguaggio dei poeti lirici è sempre più smentita dalle recenti scoperte papiracee. Basti pensare a $\ddot{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\beta\varsigma\iota\eta$ in Saffo, a $\pi\acute{o}\rho\eta\eta$ in Alceo, a $\pi\alpha\eta\delta\sigma\iota\alpha$, $\mu\alpha\eta\acute{o}\kappa\eta\pi\varsigma$, $\lambda\acute{e}\omega\phi\acute{r}\o\varsigma$ in Anacreonte. Quanto poi alla pratica amorosa delle etere di Lesbo rinvio all'esauriente indagine del Wilamowitz (*Sappho und Simonides*) che precisa il significato dei termini $\lambda\acute{e}\sigma\beta\iota\acute{a}\varsigma$ e $\tau\phi\iota\beta\acute{a}\varsigma$.

M. Labarbe : L'interprétation de $\chi\acute{a}\sigma\kappa\omega$ signalée par M. Gentili, pour le trait final du petit poème d'Anacréon (13 G = 5 D²), me paraît inacceptable. A la différence d'Archiloque, Anacréon n'est guère porté sur le mot cru. $\chi\acute{a}\sigma\kappa\omega$ est un synonyme de $\chi\acute{a}\iota\eta\omega$, forme récente, avec, probablement en plus, une nuance inchoative : alors que le poète se croyait invité au jeu de l'amour ($\sigma\mu\pi\alpha\acute{h}\varsigma\iota\eta$), la fille le dédaigne et se met à *bayer* (d'admiration) $\pi\varrho\delta\varsigma\ \ddot{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\varsigma\ \tau\iota\eta\acute{a}$ (non pas seulement $\kappa\acute{a}\mu\eta\varsigma$, comme serait tenté de le croire l'auditeur ou le lecteur trop candide, mais $\nu\tilde{\eta}\eta\iota\eta$ (*puellam*), comme le suggèrent les indications précédentes sur l'origine lesbienne — d'une part $\dot{\alpha}\pi'\ \varepsilon\acute{u}\kappa\pi\acute{t}\iota\eta\varsigma\ \Lambda\acute{e}\sigma\beta\varsigma\iota\eta$ et, d'autre part, $\pi\acute{o}\iota\kappa\iota\lambda\o\sigma\alpha\mu\beta\acute{a}\lambda\omega$, au lieu de la forme ionienne attendue, $\pi\acute{o}\iota\kappa\iota\lambda\o\sigma\alpha\eta\delta\acute{a}\lambda\omega$). $\chi\acute{a}\sigma\kappa\iota\eta$, avec la malicieuse équivoque contenue dans le complément circonstanciel, exprime la décou-

rageante volte-face de la fille au moment où Anacréon allait lui conter fleurette, et non point une habitude perverse qu'il l'accuserait d'avoir. Χάσκει correspond à μέμφεται (cf. μέν... δέ...) et ne vaut que pour la situation actuellement vécue.

En ce qui regarde εὔκτιτον, renouvellement de l'épithète homérique ἐὔκτιμένη employée pour Lesbos (*Il.* IX, 129; mais cf. II, 592, où ἐὔκτιτος apparaît déjà, à côté d'un autre nom), il faut sans doute y voir une allusion ironique à la complaisance avec laquelle la fille se glorifiait d'avoir pour patrie une île aussi remarquable.

