Durham University

Durham E-Theses

The Greek epigram at Alexandria

Mohamed Mahmoud El Salamoni

How to cite:

El Salamoni, Mohamed Mahmoud (1954) The Greek epigram at Alexandria. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/8440/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

THE GREEK EPIGRAM AT ALEXANDRIA

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM

B Y

MOHAMED MAHMOUD EL SALAMONI

F O R T H E

DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1954

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

CONTENTS

Chapter I. Introductory Note on the literary movement and characteristics of the Alexandrian Period. pp. 1 - 188

Chapter II. The Greek epigram before the Alexandrians. pp. 189 - 276

Chapter III. The Alexandrian epigram: its characteristics and themes. pp. 277 - 393

Chapter IV. Callimachus of Cyrene and Leonidas of Tarentum, the representative of the two schools: 'The Ionic and the Doric,' and the masters of the Alexandrian Epigram. pp. 394 - 654

Chapter V. The further contribution to the Alexandrian Epigram and the completion of its themes made by Poseidippus, Hedylus and Alcaeus of Messene. pp. 655 - 807

Chapter VI. The conclusion. pp. 808 - 819

Appendices. (1) Callimachus' Librarianship, (2) The literary meaning of 'κυκλικός' in Callimachus' A.P. XII, 43, l.I. pp. 820 - 833

Bibliography. pp. 834 - 843

N.B. The notes on Chapters I, II, III, & VI are to be found at the end of each chapter. Those on Chapters IV & V follow my account of each epigrammatist.

GUIDE TO THE NOTES

1. Notes on Chapter I. (1-283) pp. 143-188.

2. Notes on Chapter II. (1-135) pp. 248-276.

3. Notes on Chapter III (1-262) pp. 366-393.

4. Notes on Chapter IV: I Callimachus, (1-151) pp.463-494.
   II Leonidas, (152-418) pp. 616-654.

5. Notes on Chapter V: A. Poseidippus (1-102) pp. 702-723.
   B. Hedylus (103-150) pp. 750-756.
   C. Alcaeus (151-246) pp. 791-807.

6. Notes on Chapter VI: (1-22) pp. 816-819.

N.B. A mistake has been made in the numbering of the pages, which was discovered too late for it to be rectified. Page 574 follows on from page 572 - there is no page omitted, and page 573 does not exist.

C H A P T E R I

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

ON

THE LITERARY MOVEMENT AND CHARACTERISTICS

OF

THE ALEXANDRIAN PERIOD.

CHAPTER I

1. The Alexandrian Period defined. pp. 1 - 10

2. Alexandria as the literary centre. pp. 10 - 20

3. Alexandrian Scholarship. pp. 20 - 28

4. The Alexandrians' attitude towards Classical poets. pp. 28 - 51

5. The literary quarrel. pp. 51 - 72

6. The literary characteristics of the period. pp. 72 -142

Greek epigram, which we are to consider, belongs - in its best specimens - to a period of Greek literature generally called the 'Alexandrian'. To understand this particular genre fully involves a study of the period during which the epigram, as a finished type, flourished; we have to consider its general characteristics and the poets' tendencies, judging from what survives from their writings. These share with the epigram the distinctive character of this period. Moreover, almost all the Alexandrian poets tried their hands at writing epigrams.

1. THE ALEXANDRIAN PERIOD DEFINED:

Before going into any detail concerning the characteristics of the period, I shall concern myself, first of all with clarifying its dates. It is, so it seems to me, inexactly dated and vaguely dealt with. I shall begin by summarizing what is generally understood by 'Alexandrian' and then give my own views.

Scholars differ about the length of the period to which the term 'Alexandrian' may be applied and the exact date which marks its beginning. To some the period begins with the death of Alexander the Great (323 B.C.) at Babylon and is ended with the annexation of Syria by the Roman Republic in 65 B.C.[1] To others it dawned with the establishment of the power of the

Diadochi - about 300 B.C. till the final conquest of their monarchies by the Roman Empire - i.e. till the beginning of the period of the Emperors (27 B.C.).[2] But its duration is generally held to be of little more than two and a half centuries. Then from the literary point of view, the period is generally understood to include the literary out-put of many centres of greater or less poetical activity during this period of time— such centres as Greece proper, Asia Minor and the adjacent islands including Cos and Rhodes, Magna Graecia (or Southern Italy), Sicily, Crete and the courts in Macedonia, Pergamum, Syria and Alexandria.

The reason why the poetical out-put of this period is called 'Alexandrian' is given by Professor Knaack. To quote his very words: "To call this period 'Alexandrian' is justified by the fact that, owing to the interest and sympathy of the Ptolemaic royal dynasty with the cultural ideas of its time, Alexandria became the dominating centre for art and science."[3] This survey cannot, however, be complete without mentioning the comparatively new tendency for substituting the term 'Hellenistic' for 'Alexandrian'. In Professor Knaack's opinion, the term 'Helenistic' is parallel to 'Alexandrian'. He says - " The wider designation

'Hellenistic period' (recently more common) does not lose its justification"[4]... Again, Professor Legrand enthusiastically supports it. "Si, dans le domaine de l'histoire générale, l'appellation de période alexandrine, appliquee aux trois derniers siècles avant notre ère, peut sembler abusive et doit céder la place à une autre appellation plus large - celle d'hellenistique, - dans le domaine de l'histoire litéraire elle est parfaitement justifiée"[5].

Having illustrated so far what is mainly intended by the 'Hellenistic period'[6] or the 'Alexandrian period', I would like to give my own views. The prevailing conceptions on this question are, in my opinion, open to argument. The term 'Alexandrian' as an alternative name to the period beginning with 323 or even with 300 B.C. is supported by neither historical nor literary foundations. To use the term as a recognition of what Alexexandria contributed to poetical activity later on is misleading and should be avoided. I feel strongly that it should be applied to a certain period beginning with a new date and including, as well as the types of poetry written actually within the walls of Alexandria under the new circumstances and the new patronage, the types also which were written outside Alexandria, but

show signs of Alexandrian influence or of sharing a common characteristic with the indigenous Alexandrian out-put. To my mind, it begins with the first years of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (about 282 B.C.). In this way the term which is called after Alexandria itself has its due weight and a precise meaning. This helps us to speak freely but accurately of the different poetic genres cultivated in the course of the Alexandrian period, beginning with 282 B.C. and ending with the year 31 B.C. Such a new conception of the limitation of the period may not be easily welcomed by the scholars who used either 323 or 300 as the dawn of the Alexandrian period or by many others. It is not difficult, however, to support this view.. When we speak of Alexandrian poetry we all agree that it is a studied and elaborated poetry, and a consequence of a connection established between poetry and learning, distinguished by eager exploration of every field of knowledge; in a word, a production of savants who are masters of form and innovators in poetic material. But do we not have in mind, in speaking of all this poetry, the city of Alexandria itself, or more precisely, its Library and Museum, the literary and scientific institution, the headquarters which presented every kind of information, and directed

and controlled this re-birth of Greek literature? If so - and this can hardly be disputed - this poetry with such characteristics could have flourished and come into fashion only in the hands of an organized school like that which existed at Alexandria, whose members were, more or less, influenced by those scholars of the Library and Museum. The library was founded between 300-290 B.C.[7] and the museum between 290-284 B.C.[8] during the reign of Ptolemy I Soter, the head of the Ptolemaic royal dynasty of Egypt. But it is almost certain that it was only at the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus that the Library and the Museum were fully available[9] and that the scholars began to set themselves to work. From that time onwards Alexandria became the mistress of the literary or more precisely of the poetic movement.

On the other hand, to call this period 'Hellenistic' is as dangerous as to call the whole period 'Alexandrian'. How could it be called Hellenistic at a time when the earlier Alexandrian poets tried and almost succeeded in giving their production new features which were not known either to their ancient predecessors or even to their immediate precursors? The literary quarrel between Callimachus and his school and Apollonius

Rhodius and those who shared with him the archaic tendency; - in other words, the struggle between the innovators and the quasi-conservatives - shows how Callimachus strove to break with the classical forms and to avoid some of the distinguishing features of those pioneers - from the fifth century downwards, and to establish a new poetic school at Alexandria. The victory of Callimachus over his antagonists established the foundation of the new Alexandrian school of poetry, whose main object was to break with the classical forms and even with the way of treatment practised by their immediate precursors. All that the new school cared for was to create short poems, characterised by neat and careful workmanship. This was almost achieved by the early great masters of the period, who intentionally and enthusiastically tried to develop a personality of their school in contrast to that of the great predecessors. Moreover, the poets of the period, or most of them, were not as those of olden times drawing their inspiration freely from the Muses, but their inspiration was always reined by the canons laid down by the early masters of the period who were the authoritative scholars of the Library and Museum. Such poetry, therefore, cultivated at Alexandria with these typical features

and under the control of the poets of the Library and Museum should not be any more called 'Hellenistic'. The exact name for it would properly be 'Alexandrian'. This is not all; for this same term 'Alexandrian' - with the suggested dates - is to be applied also to the poetic production of the time in other centres. It is not disputed at all that the Alexandrian poets used to exercise their influence on their contemporaries outside Alexandria, and even after that on the literature of the Augustan age in Rome. The comparative facilities of communications between the different literary centres and the production of papyrus at Alexandria itself, especially in the factory-workshop of the Library itself, helped the Alexandrian poetic production to be widely circulated in these centres. Again, some poets of these centres must have chanced to live in, or simply pass by, Alexandria. Professor Legrand refers to this very likely event when he speaks of the relation of the poets of the third century with Alexandria. "There were very few who were not at some time of their life under the patronage of the Ptolemies, or who did not for a time live in or at least visit Alexandria"[10]. The familiarity of the poets of other centres with the Alexandrian poetry and again the Alexandrians' familiarity of the

poetic activity outside Alexandria is well known. Callimachus imitated in some of his epigrams Asclepiades of Samos, who may never have come to Alexandria. Euphorion of Chalcis in Euboea and the librarian of the Library at Antioch was accused of plagiarism of both Callimachus and Apollonius Rhodius. Again, Aratus' Phaenomena, which was written in Pella, was recommended by Callimachus, the literary critic of the age. All these - and they are only a few examples - show what relation existed between the different centres and Alexandria. She revealed herself, from the beginning, as the mistress of the poetic art, whose scholar poets were generally, if not wholly, used as models. They are also the critics and arbiters whose judgement used to be acknowledged and have its due weight. Professor Körte's words to this effect are important and true ".....the small and exclusive circle of Alexandrian literati became the decisive factor in the success of a poet. Even those who visited the metropolis on the Nile only in passing, or not at all, found themselves under the spell of the literary criticism there prevailing, a criticism which, to say the least, had to be reckoned with. Thus, the circle of the Alexandrians' imprinted its stamp on the whole of Greek poetry". 10a All

these factors which gave Alexandria the lead entitled her to the term 'Alexandrian' in its wider sense which is to be applied to the Alexandrian poetry composed in and outside Alexandria from 282-31 B.C. To call this period 'Ptolemaic'[11] is as dangerous as to describe it 'Hellenistic'. The first diminishes and restricts her own contributions to the Greek literature and the second, because of its generalization, begrudges Alexandria an honour to which she is deservedly entitled. The term 'Alexandrian' is a convenient one and should put an end decisively to that newly coined term 'Hellenistic', which cannot be taken precisely or scientifically, from the point of the poetic activity and the different characteristic features, as a name for the whole period, nor for the particular period during which Alexandria was the chief, if not the only home of the Muses.

It is time now for the scholars to reconsider this subject and try to overcome the ambiguity caused by regarding the term 'Alexandrian' as equivalent to that of 'Hellenistic'. It cannot, in any way, cover all the period, although it covers most of the Hellenistic period and marks new defined tendencies easily distinguished from those of the classical times and even from

those of the pré-Alexandrian period. Moreover, it is most dangerous to let the term 'Alexandrian' bear two senses: a larger sense and a more restricted sense. It cannot naturally indicate more than one defined period which begins with the first years of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, not before him.

In order to clarify the term 'Hellenistic'[12] as applied, only to the whole period, I am tempted to suggest that it would be advisable to divide it into two subdivisions: the first beginning with 323 B.C. and ends about 282 B.C. This is to be called the "Hellenistic period I" or "The Pre-Alexandrian Period".[13] The second beginning about 282 B.C. and ends about 31 B.C. is to be called the "Alexandrian Period" or the "Hellenistic Period II."[14]

Finally I am glad to state that all the scholars to whom I disclosed my views on the subject of defining the period have agreed that this question needs to be reconsidered.[15] I do not pretend that I have considered it in a scientific way. I have touched it but slightly, for it does not fall within the scope of my thesis. I hope, however, I shall give it special attention in future when I finish with my present work.

2. ALEXANDRIA AS THE LITERARY CENTRE:

How did Alexandria become a dominating centre of

art and become entitled to give her name to the period? It is such a long story that I shall concern myself only with the chief factors, dealing with her as a literary centre. Alexandria developed rapidly, fortunate in her founder and blessed in her rulers of the Ptolemaic dynasty, especially in the first three kings. Her growth was due to her energetic rulers and to her wonderful situation as a meeting place of the three continents: Europe, Asia and Africa. She became an outstanding commercial centre of the world. She must have been a fair and attractive place. Although we have no detailed description of this city in the third century B.C., yet it is not difficult to form an idea of what it was like at the time.[16] How could those ambitious rulers who were fond of the pomp and themselves almost prodigally generous, and who were backed by the big resources of Egypt, fail to embellish the city which was the seat of their throne, wonderfully planned by the gifted architect, Deinocrates, made as its founder wished and still bearing his name. From the beginning this city revealed itself as a hospitable host welcoming races from different parts of the world and became a second home for all the people. And from the beginning, too, it showed itself as a place of

gaiety such as Paris of today and its society high and low, from the king and his retinue to the ordinary man, enjoyed themselves to the full and knew and practised even the basest kind of enjoyments.[17] But like Paris, also, it was the place of hard work which contributed to more than one field of knowledge. So it happened that this new but ambitious city chose to continue Athens's legacy, when the latter's Muses had been hushed, and became the new home of the Muses and held the torch during the whole Alexandrian period. It was in many ways a good second to Athens, that illuminating centre which, after she had successfully sustained and canalised the best efforts of Hellenic genius and culture, had to bow her head down to her conqueror, the illiterate Macedon, and lost for ever that freedom which inspired her distinguished tragedians and comedians. It was due to her powerful kings and their interest in literature that Alexandria was able to manage so well. Literary interest is shown by almost all the members of the Ptolemaic dynasty. To mention a few examples, Ptolemy I Soter wrote a history of Alexander, had his son, Philadelphus, taught by Philetas, the Coan poet. Ptolemy IV, Philopator (221-203 B.C.) not only wrote a tragedy,[18] but also honoured the memory of Homer,

for whom he built a magnificent temple. Even Ptolemy VII Euergetes II (Physcon) (145-116) under whose reign of terror the scholars were expelled, was a most learned man; he occupied himself with grammatical studies, geography and ethnology. It was under the first of these kings that Alexandria began to welcome the distinguished learned men of the Hellenic world and he was happy to surround himself with such an intellectual court of poets and philosophers. The generosity of the king attracted these and the comparatively safe and wealthy city induced them to leave their birth places which were, more or less, suffering from war or its results. In this way Greek literature was introduced to Alexandria. As a literary centre, Alexandria was not like Athens or even like the un-literary Sparta attracting literary figures. She was a new city and had no literary tradition whatever and had to build her literary movement on the shoulders of mercenary Literati. A list of some of the famous literary figures who came to Alexandria and contributed to the formation of the Alexandrian literature shows the variety of their origins. From Cos, a reputed literary centre, came Philetas. From Cyrene, further along the African coast, came Callimachus, most typical of all Alexandrian writers, and Eratosthenes,

scholar and poet, as well as the most gifted geographer of antiquity. From Syracuse in the west came Theocritus, one of the foremost poets of the age. From Chalcis, in central Greece, came Lycophron, whose obscurity is falsely taken as a characteristic of the Alexandrian poetic school. Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus of Samothrace were also among many who had Alexandria as a permanent residence. In short, according to the established policy of the Ptolemaic Kings, Alexandria was frequented during the whole period by almost all the literary figures of the Hellenic world. Strangely enough, the only poet who was born in Egypt was the epic poet Apollonius, who is known by the surname Rhodius because he lived for some years in Rhodes and was not 'Alexandrian' in the literary sense. One must, however, remember that the Ptolemies were not the only rulers whose interest in literature showed itself in attracting the scholars and the poets to their capital. Other rulers showed an interest in literature too and tried to surround themselves with poets and learned men. Antigonus II Gonatas, the King of Macedon (276-239 B.C.) was, himself, a philosopher and gathered about him philosophers and historians and entertained Aratus, among other poets,

at his court in Pella. Attalids in Pergamum were also notable patrons of literature, philosophy and arts: Attalus I (269-197 B.C.) called numerous scholars to his court and was himself a writer; Eumenes II (197-159 B.C.) tried to bring the Library of Pergamum to the standard of her Alexandrian elder rival; Attalus II (159-138 B.C.) was also a lover of arts and genuinely interested in literature. As to the Seleuci, less interest in literature is shown by them. To draw a conclusion from what I have just stated about these literary activities and the influence of the royal patronage in these court-centres, it is clear from the dates of these kings that the first two Ptolemies were pioneers and that Alexandria is therefore a model. It is also not disputed that what the others contributed to the Alexandrian literature is much less than the contribution of Alexandria. The writers in these centres, unlike those in Alexandria, have no followers and therefore their writings had no lasting effect.

There are still other centres which, unlike these court centres, had a literary tradition long before the conquests of Alexander the Great. These, scattered from one end to the other of the Mediterranean, were still producing their best literary work; Athens, whose

development of tragedy and later on the comedy, history and oratory made her the indisputable literary centre of Greece, ceased to be what she was after the battle of Chaeronea in 338 B.C.; but she did not utterly die, owing to the literary and philosophic activity of Menander and Theophrastus. The real homes of Greek literature, however, were to be found outside Greece itself; in Sicily, in Magna Graecia, in the islands of of the Aegean. It is particularly in the islands of Sicily, Cos, Samos, Rhodes and on the coast of Asia Minor that the literary movement, after Alexander's conquests, clearly shows signs of vigorous local activity. It is from these centres that Alexandria succeeded in attracting some writers, who imported with them some literary conventions and laid the first rudiments of a new literature in the city itself, where they were pursued and developed in the works of the first Alexandrian masters of the new school and became known and had weight and dominant influence outside it.

It is now time to try to deal with the activity of Alexandria in the literary sphere in a comparatively detailed way. This city, in the land of a people, whom the Greeks before Alexander used to call 'barbarians', holds the torch, the dazzling light of which eclipsed

other centres. The literary movement in this city revealed itself from the beginning to be academic in nature. It began with the preservation of the old heritage, the classical Greek literature, and it was within the Library and the Museum that this valuable enterprise was carried on. These two foundations, as I said before, were begun by Soter and organized and completed by Philadelphus. They stood in the Brucheion or the Royal Greek-Macedonian quarter. We know nothing of their exact site. The description of Strabo does not help very much in fixing the place.[19] The library, one can say, was the biggest library of the ancient times and one which has no rival in its own time. It owed its greatness to the great zeal of the first three Ptolemaic kings, who, begrudged no expense in purchasing books from all over the world. The policy of acquiring all the best works of the classical period taken by Ptolemy I Soter, partly inspired by the versatile and influential Peripatetic, Demetrius of Phalerum, resulted in the collection of two hundred thousand rolls by the same king and his adviser.[20] Ptolemy II Philadelphus, who showed himself as good as his great father, continued to pursue the policy of his father and augmented the number of books. We are told by Athenaeus that he

purchased the valuable library of Aristotle from Neleus, Theophrastus' heir, and also books from Athens and Rhodes and transferred them all to his beautiful capital, Alexandria.[21] A scholiast[22] in the Plautine M.S. gave us a statement of the number of books already stored in the Library in the reign of this king: "in the Palace library,[23] four hundred thousand mixed volumes and ninety thousand single volumes and digests, according to Callimachus,[24] a man of the court and Royal Librarian, who also wrote the titles for the several volumes".[25] This vast library, as it is clear from this scholium, was catalogued by Callimachus, the dominating figure of the Alexandrian school of poetry and a savant possessed of a rare combination of critical and creative talent. This most industrious and unwearied bibliographer made a compilation, Πίνακες, in no less than one hundred and twenty rolls.[26] It was of singular importance, because a man like Callimachus could not have written a mere list of titles and authors in the manner of the library catalogue of to-day. He reveals himself always as an academic and encyclopaedist and his catalogue differed accordingly. It contained all the necessary and helpful information, such as a short biographical sketch of the principal authors and a critical

note concerning such matters as the authenticity of the book. 'It was divided into eight classes: (i) Dramatists (ii) Epic and Lyric poets (iii) Legislators (iv) Philosophers (v) Historians (vi) Orators (vii) Rhetoricians (viii) Miscellaneous writers'.[27] This gigantic accomplishment, the first Greek literary history, which was lost[28] together with all Callimachus' prose works, is in itself a credit to the greatness of the Alexandrian Library and to its influence on the new literary revolution not only in Alexandria itself but far and wide outside it.

The second foundation, the Museum, is by far the most important and illustrious achievement of the Ptolemies. It was founded by Ptolemy I Soter and made accessible to scholars by his son, Philadelphus. This institution in Strabo's description - and it is a meagre one - is part of the royal palaces; it has a public walk, an Exedra with seats, and a large house, in which is the common mess-hall of the men of learning who share it with the Museum.[29] Vitruvius described the 'exedrae' as spacious within three porticoes with seats, where philosophers, rhetoricians and all others who take delight in studies can engage in disputation.[30] Such a description convinces me that the plan of this Museum

was drawn under the inspiration of Demetrius of Phalerum who was a pupil of Theophrastus and would have been familiar with the latter's school. But, although, it was founded on the pattern of Plato's Academy[31] or Aristotle's Lyceum,[32] yet it must have surpassed these models in structure and magnificence. This institution housed about one hundred research scholars drawn from all the parts of the Hellenic world. They received a generous stipend from the king, to whom they were attached and they formed a sort of entourage to their benefactor who used to join in many of their discussions. They had a society of their own and were interested in themselves only. They did not care what went on in the city, where they always lived as foreigners. Their time was divided between hard work and leisure, especially at the symposia, where they could enjoy themselves with puns and repartees, epigrams, and Attic salt.

3. ALEXANDRIAN SCHOLARSHIP:

The importance of the Library and the Museum is manifest in what the Librarians and the members of the Museum have contributed. To these untiring scholars, humanity owes the preservation of the Greek literature of the golden age. This movement first began in the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, when the scholarly

critics directed their researches towards the works which were already collected. These were arranged, their texts criticised, and explained whenever an obscure allusion or reference needed explanation or comment. This task was carried out on a scientific basis never known before.[33] Such careful studies undertaken by men of wide knowledge created useful sciences, such as grammar, prosody, lexicography, mythology and archaeology. The first of these scholars, who drew the masterpieces from the old sources and preserved them in a readable state, is Zenodotus of Ephesus, the first official librarian.[34] This scholar[35] arranged the epics in order, his assistant, Alexander of Aetoia the tragedies, and Lycophron of Chalcis the comedies.[36] Of Zenodotus' works, we know that he compiled a Homeric Glossary (Γλῶσσαι). He wrote, also, a compilation of foreign expressions 'Λέξεις Ἐθνικαί'. He was the first to edit the Homeric poems, the Iliad and Odyssey and to divide them into twenty-four books. He also produced recensions of Hesiod's Theogony, Anacreon and Pindar. Callimachus' amazing productivity, versatility and wide knowledge give him justifiable claim to be mentioned after Zenodotus. He is an author and commentator rather than an editor. According to Suidas, Callimachus wrote more than eight hundred poetic

and prose works.[37] What survive among his poetic books, whether complete or fragmentary, are few in number. His prose works are all lost and we have only some titles.[38] Besides his Pinakes, I will enumerate some of these prose works which were mentioned by Suidas or known from other sources. I will concern myself only with those which are linguistic and encyclopaedic in their contents. These, undoubtedly, give us an idea of the writer and at the same time shed a light, not only on the writing of Callimachus and his own school, but also reveal not a few of the characteristics of Alexandrian poetry as a whole. Among other books he wrote Πίναξ τῶν Δημοκρίτου γλωσσῶν καὶ συνταγμάτων , Table of the Expressions and Constructions of Democritus; Ὑπομνήματα ἱστορικά ,[39] historical memoranda; Μηνῶν προσηγορίαι κατὰ ἔθνος καὶ πόλεις , Local month-names; Κτίσεις νήσων καὶ πόλεων καὶ μετονομασίαι, Foundations of Islands and cities and changes of name; Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ποταμῶν , On the Rivers of the World; Θαυμάτων τῶν εἰς ἅπασαν τὴν γῆν κατὰ τόπους συναγωγή, Collection of marvels in all the earth according to localities; Περὶ μετονομασίας ἰχθύων, περὶ ἀνέμων; περὶ ὀρνέων ; Ἐθνικαὶ Ὀνομασίαι ,[41] National Designations, On the Nymphs;[42] Customs of

Barbarians.[43]

Eratosthenes of Cyrene, the pupil of Callimachus and the librarian under the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes, was the most versatile scholar of his time. He was the first to assume the title of φιλόλογος at Alexandria and he deserved it.[44] He tried his hand at many sciences: Mathematics, astronomy, geography, chronology, philosophy and literary history. Of his literary works, the most important one was a treatise in at least twelve books on the Old Attic Comedy, περὶ τῆς ἀρχαίας κωμῳδίας. In this work he did not follow the chronological order but contented himself with discussing questions of authorship, the dates of the plays, textual criticism, language and subject matter. He corrected his predecessors Lycophron and Callimachus who had already written treatises on the same subject.[45] His investigations in this field proved to be a valuable contribution; for Aristophanes of Byzantium used it in editing his comic poets and also Didymus depended on it in compiling his lexicon of comedy, Λέξεις κωμικαί. He wrote, also, καταστερισμοί, a work which treated the constellations and their mythology. In his χρονογραφίαι, he was the first to try to fix the dates of political and

literary history on a scientific basis. He compiled a list of Olympic victors. And, finally his Γεωγραφικά, in its systematic and scientific manner, was the first the world had ever seen and revealed the many-sided Scholarship of its author.

With Aristophanes of Byzantium we are dealing with a different type of scholar; for he was not, as his predecessors, a poet-scholar but a learned scholar of special zeal in pure scholarship. Aristophanes spent a long time of his life within the walls of the Museum and the Library, before he became the chief Librarian at the age of sixty-two. He was a pupil of the greatest scholars of his age : Zenodotus, Callimachus and Eratosthenes, but he surpassed all his teachers in his systematic studies and critical acumen. He wrote linguistic, literary, textual and scientific researches. Outstanding among his other works and by far the most important is the edition of the Iliad and Odyssey which is an advance on the work of Zenodotus and Rhianus. in order to go on with his textual criticism safely, he invented symbols, everyone of which has a certain meaning.[46] He edited, also, Hesiod's Theogony, Alcaeus and Anacreon. He was the first to produce a collected edition of Pindar and arranged his poems in

seventeen books. He probably edited Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides and wrote introductions to these tragedians and also to Aristophanes.[47] He divided the works of Plato in trilogies, though his grouping of these did not prove satisfactory and was later abandoned. He tried his hand at lexicography. The most important among his lexicographical works was his λέξεις (or Γλῶσσαι) which must have included a series of important studies. He composed a grammatical treatise περὶ ἀναλογίας in which he tried to define the rules of Greek declension. He was the inventor of the marks of accent with which he preserved the correct pronunciation, already corrupted by the non-Greek speaking people. Finally, he corrected and supplemented Callimachus' Pinakes, which had inspired him - and Aristarchus after him - to produce selected lists of the best classical poets. Such lists were with all probability the basis for the Alexandrian Canon.

Turning to Aristarchus of Samothrace, one of Aristophanes' pupils, we deal with a scholar in whom the critical school at Alexandria reached its summit. He was eulogized and honoured by ancient writers, Greek and Roman. His name is met with in Athenaeus as 'The most eminent grammarian, Ἀριστάρχος ὁ γραμματικώτατος'[48]

Panaetius, the philosopher of Rhodes used to call him 'the diviner, μάντις, because he so easily divined the meaning of the poetic lines.[49] He is considered by Cicero[50] and Horace[51] as a typical critic.

Aristarchus was appointed a head of the Library C.153 B.C. and he was the last of the great scholars who occupied this post and he was deservedly entitled to it. He wrote as many books[52] as the prodigiously productive Callimachus did, but he excelled all his predecessors in his scientific and methodical scholarship which shows its many-sidedness in the wide range of his researches : grammatical, etymological, orthographical, literary and textual criticism. His greatest feat acknowledged by the ancient, as well as by the modern scholars is his critical recensions of the texts of Homer. In editing Homer, he was more cautious than his predecessors, Zenodutus, Rhianus, Aristophanes. His wide knowledge of grammar, his careful study of the Homeric vocabulary, his regard for the best manuscripts, helped him in reaching a goal never attained before him. In his study of the texts, he used symbols, which differ from those of Zenodotus and Aristophanes, to denote his various judgements and conclusions.[53] He edited, also, Hesiod, Archilochus, Alcaeus, Anacreon

and Pindar. He wrote commentaries, ὑπομνήματα, on these poets[54] as well as on Aeschylus, Sophocles, Ion, Aristophanes and Herodotus.

And again he wrote critical treatises, συγγράμματα; some of these dealt with particular themes of the Iliad and the Odyssey, e.g. The naval camp of the Greeks; others are directed against scholars who are concerned with Homeric study. Thus he wrote a brochure against Philetas[55] of Cos, attcking his miscellaneous Glosses, Ἄτακτοι Γλῶσσαι, the lexicon, explaining rare words drawn from Homer. He wrote another one against the Chorizontes, especially Xenon,[56] one of the earliest representatives of this sect.

With this consummate critic, the subject on the activity of the golden age of Alexandrian scholarship should be ended. The account - and this is not a place to treat of scholarship scientifically and accurately - is very brief, but it fulfils the purpose intended of giving an idea of what was going on in both the Library and the Museum and of the contributions of the first Librarians and the research men of the Museum to the classical literature. They undoubtedly succeeded in preserving the greater part of the old heritage. If we are able to-day to read the tragedies of Aeschylus, the

comedies of Aristophanes, the epinician odes of Pindar and the histories of Herodotus, etc., etc., we are greatly indebted to them. Were it not for these scholars, these works would already have been lost and fallen into oblivion. The task of editing, as we have already seen, created and formulated for the first time literary criticism, bibliography, grammar, commentaries glossaries; all that had its effect on making the Greek language in a generally intelligible condition. These great achievements are always referred to with admiration towards the Ptolemies and those scholars who worked so hard under their patronage. Who can deny those devoted research students or begrudge them his full estimation? Satirists are always exceptional creatures; their satiric bee must have a sting to plant in its victims. So it happened that these hard working men came under the lash of Timon of Phlius, the caustic philosopher. This writer of 'Silloi' poked fun at them and humourously depicted them thus "Many pedantic (bookish) cloisterlings are fed in populous Egypt as they carry on endless fights in the Muses' bird cage".[57]

4. THE ALEXANDRIANS' ATTITUDE TOWARDS CLASSICAL POETS:

We must now consider the very remarkable attitude of the Alexandrians towards their classical predecessors,

the true makers of their own types. We have seen how the Alexandrians took great pains in preserving in book form, classifying, cataloguing and annotating the different works of those earlier masters, whose strong creative faculty shaped among other types the great epic, lyric, tragedy and comedy. This movement of establishing and elucidating the texts which took place in the great Alexandrian Library, made them thoroughly familiar with the ancient culture and specially with the poetic types from Homer to Menander.

Although they affected a pious cult of most of the classical period, the Alexandrian poets - and many of them were scholars - differed in their opinions about many of their predecessors and their attitude is marked by admiration, preference and criticism. The study of such tendencies is not without profit as it sheds a light on the characteristics of Alexandrian poetry and the literary views of the poets themselves.

To concern myself first of all with the poets' attitude towards the ancient writers, the name of Homer comes at the top of the list owing to his priority of time and his special position in the poetic production of Greece. The Alexandrians are unsurpassed in their studies of Homer. The textual and literary criticism

of Zenodotus and Aristarchus together with his several treatises on Homeric questions which remained unique, prove clearly that they honour him as the greatest of poets. But inspite of this traditional respect, there are many signs which show that he is admired and studied rather than imitated. In my opinion they thought that it was merely a waste of time to try to write an epic in the manner of Homer. Such an idea can be supported by what has been said by the poets of the period. Theocritus, for example, thought that rivalry with Homer is in vain. So says indignantly one of the characters in his seventh Idyll "So I hate those birds of the Muses that cackled in vain rivalry with Homer".[58] In the same way Euphorion, the composer of epyllia and epics, expressed the same thing when he said that one ought not to try to be like Homer.[59] This feeling of inferiority was not all; there are still some other reasons for shunning the Homeric epics; these were repeated again and again by some of the eminent figures of the period. Notwithstanding this fact, there were not few who were ambitious to try their hands at composing lengthy mythological epics, and did their best to follow in the steps of the great master. The most brilliant of these is Apollonius of Rhodes - and more

correctly of Alexandria -, the author of the 'Argonautica', a work which met with vehement opposition from Callimachus and his school and caused a wordy war between the author and his previous teacher.[60]

Hesiod, our second ancient epic figure, was, in my opinion, more fortunate with the Alexandrians than Homer. The fact that his poems, both didactic and mythological, fascinated them, is not difficult to see. In fact the eulogy of the aged poet of Ascra which can be met with in what have luckily been preserved from the poetry of this period go far beyond what one might expect. Hermesianax calls him πασῆς ἤρανον ἱστορίης[61] 'the friend of all knowledge'. Asclepiades, the most eminent epigrammatist, heaps praise on him.[62] In coining his eulogy, he played artfully and rhetorically with what Hesiod himself said in the Prooimion to his Theogony.[63] Callimachus paid this poet a due tribute when he congratulated his friend, Aratus, for his 'Phaenomena', which has, as Callimachus says, the rhythm and the manner of Hesiod. I quote this epigram:

Ἡσιόδου τό τ' ἄεισμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος· οὐ τὸν ἀοιδῶν
ἔσχατον, ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον
τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο· χαίρετε λεπταὶ
ῥῆσιες, Ἀρήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης.[64]

'The subject of the song and the manner are Hesiod's; but the poet of Soli took to himself the impress, not of that worst of Poets, but, I venture to say, of the most honeyed part of his epic lines. Hail! delicate expressions, the fruit of Aratus' sleepless nights'.[65] As Aratus' Phaenomena is in spirit and tone a didactic poem, Callimachus intentionally chose the author of the 'Works and Days'.[66] But, although Hesiod is eulogized in a rather obscure way, the poem is a compliment paid to Aratus, who seemed to have an outstanding place among his contemporaries, rather than a criticism. It is worth noting that two eminent scholars, Dilthey and Couat, think that Callimachus preferred, in this poem, Hesiod to Homer.[67] Callimachus, who thinks of Homer so highly as a type of his own, above rivalry, imitation and criticism, could not have expressed his preference and depreciation so openly even in such far-fetched allusions. In any case, if there is any shade of preference in the minds of Callimachus' contemporaries, this is related much more to the subject-matter than to the poets. It is Hesiod's didactic elements and his learned mythological treatment which are preferred to the more easy and direct heroic myths of Homer. This is why Hesiod was most popular among the Alexandrians

and much used as a model by the poets. But which of his works were most appreciated? This is very important, as it shows the literary taste of the time. They very much admired and imitated his 'Catalogues of women' and Eoiae with their artless sagas, especially in the first period, when the interest in the subject-matter was prevailing. Hermesianax, in his Leontion imitated them fairly closely, and he was particularly under the spell of the Ἠοῖαι in the third book of the same Leontion, in which he enumerates the names of the women beloved by the great poets. Asclepiades seems to have been attracted by all Hesiod's works.[68] As for Callimachus, he prefers the 'Works and Days', Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι ; for he holds it to be τὸ μελιχρότατον τῶν ἐπέων '.[69] Still the Theogony, Θεογονία may have attracted Callimachus' attention. A passage of twelve lines which form the end of the Aitia[70] - a didactic poem in elegiac couplets - shows, in spite of its deplorably corrupted state, that Callimachus was thinking then of the Prooimion of that work. This piece reveals itself as a happy reminisence of Hesiod and shows at the same time with what mastery did Callimachus use his model.[71] Again, it is the Prooimion that gave Callimachus the idea of making gods and goddesses take

the lead as narrators instead of himself in his Aitia. In the course of his Phaenomena, Aratus, a true Alexandrian poet, for although he may have not seen Alexandria, he shares with the Alexandrian poets all their characteristics and poetic virtues and vices - tells the story of the ages of mankind which is merely a reminiscence of the old poet.[72] To Hesiod the Alexandrians look at least as a teacher who always instructs and whose 'Works and Days' are considered by them as the ideal model of any didactic poetry which, together with science, appeals to their scholarly taste and was everywhere found, more or less, in the poetic types of the period. Again, the Alexandrians looked to both Homer and Hesiod for inspiration and mythological material. They were never tired of drawing from them their mythological themes; but, strictly speaking, these were not their only or their favourite sources. Now the attitude towards myth is a peculiar one. What they favour now is not the well-known myths but the most obscure ones. There would be no surprise then, if they turned their eyes to some-one else. It was Antimachus, the eminent poet of the school of Colophon, famous for its excessive mannerism of archaism. This poet of the fifth century was glorified by unreserved praise by not

a few of the Alexandrian poets who consider him the founder of their school. It seems to me that of all Antimachus' works, the Lyde, fascinates the Alexandrians most. This elegaic work - in three books - called after the name of his beloved, is narrative in character or 'a sort of epic in elegiac verse' as Couat very intelligently called it,[73] has all that delights the Alexandrians. It abounds in legends of every kind, either borrowed without change or worked out by his alert hand, prolific imagination and vast erudition. Its subject, which deals with lovers and the enumeration of the great misfortunes caused by love, appeals to them and this is the same subject they treat after the pattern of their great master. No wonder, then, if some of the eminent poets of the age celebrate the work of Antimachus. Asclepiades, in one of his literary epigrams paid it his due homage. It is, in his opinion, 'a joint work of the Muses and Antimachus' τὸ ξυνὸν Μουσῶν γράμμα καὶ Ἀντιμάχου.'[74] Poseidippus, Asclepiades' friend and pupil, mentions it in one of his Scolion-like epigrams[75] side by side with Mimnermus' Nanno.[76] This admirer of the two collections was not blind to the fact that they are different in spirit and we owe to him this sound criticism on their

composers: Mimnermus is the lovers' friend while Antimachus is sober.[77] Antipater of Sidon, a poet of the later Alexandrian period has carried his praise too far.[78] In an epigram which shows every sign of rhetorical influence, no wonder in that, as he is from Sidon, and rich in its figures of speech, Antipater first praised Antimachus and his verses as a whole, then compared Antimachus with Homer. In order to make this comparison effective and valid, he held a comparison between Zeus and Poseidon. In one of his fragments which by a stroke of good fortune escaped oblivion, Callimachus gives us his own impression of Antimachus' Lyde. It is, as he saw it "a dull and unpolished piece of writing" Λύδη καὶ παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν".[79] Although this statement is very brief, yet Callimachus, the alert critic, succeeded in giving his judgement on the Lyde from two points of view: its subject matter and how it is treated and also its style and by so doing he gave us his own impression on Antimachus and his writings. Why Callimachus considers the Lyde dull is not difficult to imagine. The fragments of the expedition of the Argonauts, which reveals his way of treating this subject in detail, may possibly justify the assumption that he has dealt with the other myths and sagas[80] in the same manner. If so - and this is

what can be understood from παχυ γραμμα-, according to Callimachus' own practice and views, it was likely to be an annoyance to him. This dullness, as a matter of fact, results from the traditional characteristics which the cyclic poems knew a long time ago: long and minute accounts ab ovo, the hackneyed episodes, the use of epithets and formulas etc. Antimachus, whose Thebais as a cyclic poem, must have all the virtues and vices of this sort of poetry, cannot be appreciated in any way or even liked by Callimachus, whose ideas about the cyclic poems[81] and poets[82] we have already met with. Callimachus, himself, always reveals in the style and in the content of his works how the epic themes of the myths and sagas should be treated, and I should like to make it clear that Callimachus has no dislike of nor any prejudice against the treatment of mythological themes, but his way is to try to explore and treat some untouched themes which are not difficult to find; to shun the most familiar themes which had been dealt with so many times; to stick to moderation in narration and to avoid epic-like compositions; to seek originality in the treatment by making variations, interpretations or even contaminations. These are what Callimachus demands of the poets who try their hands at mythological subjects.[83]

They can show how big is the difference and how great is the contrast between what Callimachus holds forth and what was practised by the old Cyclic-poets and their imitators in the Alexandrian period [84] and before it. [85]

So much for the dullness resulting from his treatment of the mythology. Let us turn to the stylistic defects to which the phrase 'γράμμα οὐ τορόν' refers. To Callimachus, who is considered - in spite of his learning - refined, elegant, alert in high finish and careful workmanship, the Lyde must be regarded as turgid, heavy and unpolished. This is due, perhaps, to Antimachus' use of 'glosses', neologisms, obscure periphrases and the display of recondite learning, all of which can be met with in nearly all the writings of this period, including the writings of Callimachus himself. Notwithstanding Callimachus' and his followers' dislikes, Antimachus, whose verses were once liked and asked for by Plato, [86] had among the majority of the Alexandrian poets, warm partisans, who considered him the father of the narrative elegy which they liked and practised on the pattern of his Lyde. Hermesianax draws inspiration from it. His method of enumeration used in his Leontion is taken from it, as well as from

Hesiod as I said before. Apollonius in his Argonautica may have possibly copied Antimachus,[87] or at least has consulted the former's account along with other models and made use of some points. This is not difficult to believe. This is what the scholar poets of Alexandria practised. They take bits from here and bits from there and piece them together and in so doing, they consider themselves original. It is now clear that Antimachus has a bitter opponent in Callimachus. Finally I am inclined to refer to an argumentative resemblance between Antimachus and his opponent Callimachus. The latter's minute recording of Artemis's titles and cults in his Hymn of this goddess recalls what Antimachus practised in his hexametric poem on Artemis.[88] Is this a mere reminiscence of the former poet? It seems to me that it is not impossible, for there must be something in Antimachus' poems capable of attracting Callimachus' attention.

Let us now pass on from the old epic and epic-like poets to deal with some masters of the other types who inspired the Alexandrians and exerted their influence on their writings. Mimnermus of Colophon, the talented elegiac poet, was exceptionally admired by the two opponent schools at Alexandria, the erudite and the elegant. If Antimachus had among the Alexandrians warm partisans who exalted his erudition, Mimnermus

had also his admirers who were still thinking of the old elegy and especially of the amatory elegy developed by Mimnermus himself. But it may be said that he has fostered the longings of those who are enamoured of narrative elegy whether mythological or historical. His Nanno, an amatory poem or a collection of different poems called after the name of a certain flute-girl, whom the poet is said to have loved [89] - seems to have dealt with mythological and historical topics, e.g., the mythology of Tithonus (stob. Fl. 33); the tale of the laborious Sun and his magic bowl (Ath. 469 f); the story of the foundation of Colophon (strabo, 14,633); and finally, according to Pausanias, he wrote on the battle between the Smyrnaeans and Gyges (ix.29.4) etc. But compared with the Lyde - which can be considered as a development of the Nanno in Antimachus' own way - the Nanno touched the mythological and historical themes very lightly. In the light of the few fragments which have reached us, I can say that Mimnermus, unlike Antimachus, has no idea of displaying any kind of learning and that such tales occured to him when his pen flows with the poet's emotions. But this work, in whose honour Poseidippus drank a toast, was not liked by Callimachus who prefers Mimnermus' short poems to it. In his famous

passage in which he complains about, and attacks his enemies, who denied his ability of composing a long poem, he made a contrast between Mimnermus' two books: the one which contains the short poems and the other which is entitled Nanno: "I know well, see, that I am one of few lines; but the corn of Demeter far surpasses the huge oak. But of the two books, it is the short poems and not the long poem of 'the woman' that taught (us) how sweet he is.[90] The Alexandrian poets, however, who used the elegiac couplets for composing lengthy narrative elegy void of the subjective element of the older elegy and in jotting down short ones - the epigram - in which the poet is always subjective, must have looked to Antimachus for learning and to Mimnermus, whose elegies are an echo of the joys and sorrows of life, for sentiment. Moreover, he must have been the favourite of the Alexandrian epigrammatists since he is the first hedonist of literature who praised unashamedly sensual love and the free enjoyment of life. His lines on Aphrodite must have been taken by them as their motto: 'But what life would be, what joy, without golden Aphrodite? May I die when I no more care for secret love and gentle gifts and the bed, whither are the flowers of youth, pleasant alike to man and woman.'[91]

The iambic poets have also their admirers among the Alexandrians who show a certain interest in reviving satirical iambic - the iambic and choliambic - with success and used it in satirizing and criticizing contemporary morals and in attacking their personal enemies. They were inspired in this particular field by both Archilochus and Hipponax, the two vigorous satirists of the classical times. Archilochus, the first to use the iambic and to direct it against his personal enemies was considered the perfector - if not the inventor - of this particular metre. His sonorous iambics and his terrible invective against Lycambes and his daughters[92] have found among the Alexandrians a warm follower in Alcaeus of Messene, whose lost lampoons must have echoed the first known poet of hate. Alcaeus' epigrams on Philip V, King of Macedon, the earliest examples of invective, are forged in Archilochus' way.[93] Callimachus, on the other hand, was not a keen follower of Archilochus. In his 'Iambics', Callimachus avoided the ferocity and bitterness of Archilochus; but elsewhere we see him deriving his inspiration from this scorpion - like iambographer. Callimachus' elegiac lines[94] directed against those who slight his ability are in fact a reminiscence of the Archilochean style.[95] Does this not

show Callimachus' opinion and appreciation - although a modest one - of the art of Archilochus, an art which one cannot avoid when he defends himself? But it can be that Callimachus attacked Archilochus severely. This is true, but Callimachus' assault was made against Archilochus, the hymnographer not the iambographer. This is quite clear from the words of the only fragment of Callimachus in which there is any mention of Archilochus: "τοῦ <τε> μεθυπλήγος φοιμίον Ἀρχιλόχου."[96] "The hymn of wine-smitten Archilochus". How could Callimachus disparage the originator of the satirical iambics?

Our second iambographer, Hipponax, was more popular with the Alexandrians than his master, whom he took as a model at least in giving full vent to his hatreds. They preferred him to Archilochus; his fidelity in description and his concise vigour of style attracted the attention of some, while his colloquial verses fascinated some others. But for all, his σκάζων - the scazon - seemed to be more appropriate than the Archilochean iambic trimeter. All the Alexandrian poets who tried their hands at composing satire took this innovator[97] as their model. So did Callimachus, Herodes and others. As for Herodes, he proclaims openly that he follows

Hipponax as his model:

ἐπὶ] κλέος νὰι Μοῦσαν ἤ μ' ἔπεα κ[λήσει
μ]έγ' ἐξ ἰάμβων, ἤ με δευτέρη γν[ώμη
ἐ] (μοῖ)ς μεθ' Ἱππώνακτα τὸν πάλαι [κεῖνον
(τ)ὰ κύλλ' ἀείδειν Βουπάλους ἐπι<θ>ύσει. 98

Callimachus, however, paid Hipponax even a greater homage. This is obvious from the first lines of his "Iambics" which seem to be a collection. These lines which are a kind of brief prologue run thus:

Ἀκούσαθ' Ἱππώνακτος [ο]ὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἥκω
ἐκ τῶν ὄκου βοῦν κολλύ[βου π]ιπρήσκουσιν,
φέρων ἴαμβον οὐ μάχην [ἀείδ]οντα
[τὴν Βουπ[άλ]ειον, [κα]ινά ... [..... ἄ]νθρωπος
[-] ειν 99

Here in putting these introductory verses into the mouth of Hipponax, he very well acknowledges that he is a follower of that poet of Ephesus under whose patronage the collection appeared. But in what way can Hipponax be considered as a patron of Callimachus? Let us examine these lines which are of great help in defining the relationship between the model and the imitator.

100

In mentioning 'Bupalus', Callimachus points out the Characteristics of Hipponax' scurrilous and most abusive

choliambs, the personal expression of the poet's own envy and wrath. It is not Hipponax in this character in whose steps Callimachus follows: what he prefers is 'Hipponax redivivus' who has got rid of his old obscenity and abuse. This is enough to show us that Callimachus did not estimate Hipponax,[101] the lampoonist, but the innovator of the scazon whom he took as a model. This is confirmed by his lines in which he advises those who wish to write choliamb to look for light from Ephesus.[102] What remain of Callimachus' Iambi show the great difference between the Old Hipponax and Callimachus' Hipponax redivivus; he is less bitter, quite mild and even humorous and these characteristics can be taken as a feature of the Alexandrian iambic-compositions in general. But it can be said also that Callimachus, who avoided Hipponax' style in his 'Iambi', was inspired either by him or by Archilochus in his attacks cast in other metres against his literary opponents. We have seen a few examples and are going to meet others when I deal with the quarrel between Callimachus and Apollonius, the famous war of the opponent schools: the elegant and the erudite.

Finally, I must mention in passing that Hipponax, the inventor of 'parody'[103] or at least the practitioner[104]

of this literary device, inspired the moralizing preachers, the satirists and the diatribe poets who used his scazon in their writings.[105] I feel I should not go into a detailed treatment on the influence that Hipponax exerted on these writers, because their compositions show no sign of the characteristics of the literature patronized at Alexandria, and even more they contrast sharply with the writings of the poets attached to the court and Museum.

Turning to the old masters of lyric poetry, it can be said that Sappho, Alcaeus and Anacreon have inspired the Alexandrians and were used as models in almost all the types the latter cultivated. As regards the lyric metres, the Alexandrians were not keen to use them. In fact, the lyric poetry died out almost completely before the third century. Both the choral with its different types and the monodic were seldom used and what is extant from the Alexandrian poetry especially in the third century show that the Alexandrian poets cared more for those lyrical ideas and conventions of the monodic lyrists and expressed them in their own way and in metres never known as lyrical such as the hexameter and the elegaic.[106] Theocritus and Callimachus seem to be the only ones among the early Alexandrian poets who

tried to compose lyrical poems in lyrical metres. I hope we will change our minds when Oxyrhynchus,[107] the most productive site in Egypt, especially for literary papyri, or some other site yields some new specimens. As I am here dealing only with the models, I will concern myself with Theocritus. This prolific and versatile poet composed some lyrical idylls which show how he was indebted to those old masters. Idyll XII - The Beloved - was written in the dialect of the Ionian lyrists. In Idylls XXIX and XXX - The Aeolic Love Poems - he reveals himself as an admirer of the Aeolic school of lyrics. He introduces the XXIXth Idyll with a quotation from Alcaeus "Οἶνος, ὦ φίλε παῖ, καὶ ἀλάθεα."[108] It is written in the fourteen syllable Sapphic pentameter. The XXXth idyll is written in the greater Asclepiad. There remains the XXVIII idyll - the Distaff - this poem which was presented with a gift of a carved ivory distaff to the wife of the poet's friend, Nicias, the poet-physician, is a specimen of occasional poems which became fashionable in this period. It is composed in the Asclepiad metre. In these last three idylls written in Aeolic dialect, Theocritus acknowledges his indebtedness to either Sappho or Alcaeus. Anacreon attracted the Alexandrians even more. His works which were edited by

Aristarchus can be considered as a sign of estimation. His lyrics which are mostly monodic meet the taste of the Alexandrian society especially those which are light in character and concerned with pleasure, the love of boys and girls and those songs which were sung over the wine-cups. His more playful conception of the God of love captivated the Alexandrian poets and they continued to develop it exceedingly. This will be fully treated later while I deal with amatory epigrams and the epigrammatists' conceptions and the different pictures, attributes and epithets they gave to Eros. Moreover, I am not going to speak at present of the debt the Alexandrians owe to Anacreon as a model and inspirer. But I will concern myself with one particular case in which Apollonius of Rhodes in his Argonautica is believed to have been inspired by and imitated Anacreon. Professor Couat[109] says that the dramatic scene which describes how Eros enters stealthily the palace of Aectes and how he hurls the dart with both his hands at Medea and himself flashes back again from the high-roofed hall, laughing aloud,[110] is modelled upon this old master and that the Alexandrian epic poet has taken the idea and even the expression from Anacreon's lines which run as follows:

ταχύει δὲ, καί με τυπτει
μέσον ἦπαρ ὥσπερ οἰστρος·
ἀνὰ δ' ἅλλεται καχάζων·
Ἔνε' δ' εἶπε, 'συγχάρηθι
κέρας ἀβλαβὲς μὲν <ἦν> μοι,
σὺ δὲ καρδίην πονήσεις'. 111

Although Professor Couat says that the imitation does incontestably exist, I am inclined to disagree with him. The use of the bow and arrows, with which Eros attacks his victims, in this alleged model and the Alexandrian copy, induce me to say that such an imitation never existed at all. The bow and the arrows as attributes to the god of Love were, so far as we know, utterly unknown to Anacreon. The first poet who is known to have equipped Eros with such weapons is Euripides.[112] Moreover, a minute examination of the two passages led me to the conclusion that Apollonius' passage is itself the model for the most childish piece which is wrongly attributed to Anacreon. The only picture of Eros elsewhere in Anacreon represents him not as an archer but as a smith, who smites his victim with a hammer and souses him in a chill stream.[113] The passage which in Couat's opinion is the model does not occur in Anacreon's

works extant in quotations, but it exists in the collection known by the name 'Anacreontea' which is generally recognised to be spurious by modern scholars[114] and belongs to the later period of the Alexandrian period. Or according to Mr. Edmonds investigations and critical study of the poems of this collection, 'Style and matter preclude an earlier date for any poem than 150, or at most 200 B.C.'[115] All this confirms my point of view and permits me to conclude that Apollonius was by no means inspired by Anacreon, but he himself was taken as a model by a later imitator whose copy is inferior to the original.

In fact, the Alexandrians drew their inspiration more from the old masters of Aeolic lyric and the Ionic elegy than from the masters of the other types. Nothwithstanding their disinclination of using much of the lyrical metres, their different types have many reminiscences of the lyrical elements of the monodic. Many a passage in Theocritus' Idylls and in Callimachus Hymns, although the composers did not employ the traditional lyrical metres, provides what are, in spirit, good specimens of lyrical poetry. Take for example the prologue of Callimachus' Hymn II, to Apollo;[116] this passage with its agitation and excited address is one of the best and most lyrical pieces which can be ranked as a good second

to classical ones. In their subjective love, they are - as is expected - far inferior to the classical lyrists and elegists; this is due not actually to their inefficiency to express their feelings but rather to their liking for demonstration of virtuosity or tour de force. Yet there are some whose compositions can smack of the simplicity, spontaniety and rapture of the old masters.[117]

These few examples can in some way shed some light on the Alexandrians' attitude towards the great makers of old poetry. They show, also, how the Alexandrians used to draw inspiration from most of them and how they followed in their steps and imitated their works. The same examples show, also, how it was mainly to the past that they looked for models and material. The fourth or fifth century, the period of Athens' literary supremecy, did not attract them so much as the earlier masters whom as scholars they edited with so much enthusiasm and care.

5. THE LITERARY QUARREL:

The Alexandrians revealed themselves, as it has been already illustrated in the foregoing account, not of one heart in their attitude towards their classical predecessors. This attitude took different forms. A particular poet of the past was a favourite to some,

but disliked by some others. So, also, the poetical types, such as the epic, were favoured and cultivated by some, but avoided and even attacked by others. Although all the Alexandrians were dependent on the ancient poets for themes and materials, yet their relations with them were not always the same. Some were lavish in their imitations, a few were reasonable and contented themselves with adaptations and a few showed signs of innovations. Thus it was inevitable for the early masters of the Alexandrian school to occupy themselves - and most of them are critics, scholar-poets or lovers of originality - with such questions: To what extent should they draw inspirations from the old masters? On whom ought they to model their types? To what extent might the old forms be retained and revived? In what way could these forms be adapted or changed and refined to suit the age? Such questions were answered differently. Hence two different views or rather tendencies began to show themselves at Alexandria. The one appears in those poets who content themselves generally with the material bequeathed from the ancients and strive to create a new poetry woven on an Alexandrian loom. These I call the adaptors or rather innovators. The other view was held by those who tried to continue

the old tradition by composing certain types of poetry, following in the steps of the old masters, adopting their devices and even imitating them lavishly, but who showed at the same time some signs of the characteristics of the time. These, whose poems form a strange blend of the old and the new, I call the quasi-conservatives.[118] Between these two rival schools controversy was always going on, and it tended often to become violent. However painful to both sides, we owe to the opponent poets literary views and pronouncements which shed light on their manner of criticism and contribute to the science of 'literary criticism'. This controversy between the innovators and the quasi-conservatives was carried on for some time by Callimachus, the mouthpiece and head of the new school, and Apollonius, whose Argonautica made him a representative of the other school. This 'Argonautica' treats of one of the oldest Greek sagas - the story of Jason and Medea and of the journey of the Argonauts to Kolchis and their return home - and consists of five thousand eight hundred and fifty five lines in four books. This work met with a vehement opposition from Callimachus and his school and this ended in a quarrel which, as far as I know, was the first literary quarrel ever fought between

literary men themselves.[119] The two opponents took from their writings a vehicle for attacks, replies and counter-attacks. Callimachus' attacks can be met with in an epilogue of one of his hymns, in the prologue of his Aetia, in scattered fragments and some of his epigrams which began for the first time at Alexandria to comment on literary works and ridicule and attack poets of different tendencies. The polemical writings of Apollonius, on the other hand are not much. They are only a passage in his poem and a single epigram.

The vigour of the duel between these two poets has led some scholars to think that it was not a mere difference of literary views and tastes, but it was rather some sort of personal enmity and they took different directions in explaining the real cause of this hostility. Some assume that Callimachus was jealous of Apollonius and his rising eminence as a literary figure. Others - and they are the majority - believe that Callimachus' jealousy owes its existence to the fact that his younger pupil was the chief librarian at the time when he was only a cataloguer, a rank which is possibly lower than that of Apollonius who might have been - so they think - his teacher's superior.[120] To my thinking the source of their mutual discord issues from their literary difference of

opinions. It was the stubbornness of the teacher and and the disobedience, or rather the defiance, of his pupil that led to such a quarrel which is - I am certain - a purely literary one. I am going to deal with this quarrel in a rather general or impersonal way by keeping Callimachus and Apollonius in the background and by concerning myself chiefly with their literary dicta. I was tempted to do so for two reasons. First of all it is impossible to give a complete story of their hostility, because we are unfortunately short of material sufficient to help us in pursuing the attacks and counter-attacks in their due chronological order.[121] Secondly, as I am concerned to a great extent with the characteristics of Alexandrian poetry in general, I found it more profitable to emphasise the literary principles and theories, or rather dogmas, which exchanged their dominant influence on the poetic production of this period. Callimachus' literary principles which he has naturally dictated to his pupils within the walls of the Library and Museum and after Apollonius' first recital of his Argonautica, can be illustrated and summed up in that piece which our poet composed in his old age and which - as the scholars agree - forms the prologue of his Aetia.[122] To my mind, this passage is

the best literary testimony written by a poet on himself. It throws much light, not only on Callimachus' tendencies and technique already practised long before, but also guide to the very points which were a direct cause for the quarrel. His way in charging his antagonists and defending himself is rather unique. To those who accuse him of inability of composing a well constructed poem in many thousands of verses,[123] he says that he denounces the idea of writing any epic at all,[124] and advises them to judge the poetry by the measure of art and not by the Persian land measure.[125] Again he replied to those who belittle him as a poet of short poems, that it is the little poems that made Mimnermus a sweet poet. His preference of the short poems to the longer ones is alertly illustrated. He writes short poems in obedience to the words of Apollo, who says to him that offerings must be weighty and those of poetry should be light.[126] Apollo advised him to write on new themes - to frequent the roads that are not driven upon by chariots,[127] to denounce lavish imitation - to take heed not to drive his chariot in the tracks of another -[128] and finally to be original - to follow his own road, and even it be quite narrow.[129] These are in the main Callimachus' literary ideals,[130] according to which the

has said this clearly, some one says, "He is another's".[133] Now it is not easy to apply Callimachus' conception of "τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν"[134] precisely to Apollonius' Argonautica, simply because the present version, which we have, is not the original version attacked by Callimachus. But it is clear that the latter did not deride him because he chose a theme from the saga, because he himself drew on the same source. He, too, wrote on the Argonauts in his Aetia. From the statements: "and I do not take pleasure in a road that carries many people this way and that. I loathe, too, the wandering about beloved and I do not drink from a fountain. I abhor all public things," we are to infer Callimachus' hatred of Apollonius' treatment of the theme.[135] The first version must have shown the very same signs of the trivial epic poems which Callimachus detests. Although the present version does not abound in Homeric formulas and its author seems mild in his imitation of Homer and not breaking with Alexandrian conventions or rather the characteristics of Alexandrian school of poetry, this does not prevent us from assuming that Callimachus attacked the first version as having all the vices of the banal epic writers to whose pretentious banality and ambitious commonplaceness I have

referred to in more than one place. Again Apollonius is scoffed at as a writer of a theme which has been treated many times before him[136] and is already known by all. In this he is a mere slavish imitator who is unable to go his own way and produce a new theme which would credit him with originality. Such poetical ideals are not new to us. We have already met them in the feigned list of Apollo's advices. Such an epigram which wounded the youthful dignity, or rather vanity, of Apollonius could not be left unanswered. There is a single epigram in the Palatine Anthology which could be taken as a counter-reply. 'Callimachus, the rubbish, the fribble, the wooden head! The originator who wrote the Aetia - Origins?[137] This is a polemical epigram of the first rank. If Callimachus dared to attack his Argonautica humorously and subtly, he must avenge himself and his work openly and vehemently. He was very likely of Alexandrian descent, for he showed in this very short epigram, which is over-loaded with savage vollies of insult, the typical temperament of the Alexandrians of to-day. It can be inferred from these audacious attributes given to his former teacher that Callimachus was a writer of useless and trifling works which are void of sense, warmth and passion. In such an epigram,

'αἴτιος' must be taken as a pun; Callimachus is also the culprit, since the 'αἴτια' in Apollonius' opinion seems to be nothing but dull commentaries on different sagas. In this, Apollonius shows that he has no sense of aesthetic taste. How can he ignore the romantic story of Acontius and Cydippe? Is it not a part of the Aetia? Or how can he underrate the charming and exotic piece on the 'Bath of Pallas'? These are only few examples. Again, he must have been ungrateful to the poet of whose poems he made use.[138] Anyhow, I cannot hold this epigram as a criticism but simply a rash and childish lampoon at which Callimachus must have had many a good laugh. He, however, did not spare his pupil. In the epilogue[139] of the hymn of Apollo, which was manifestly added afterwards, Callimachus is thought to have carried on his subtle attacks against Apollonius. The lines are worthly of quoting and translating: 'Envy spoke secretly in the ear of Apollo, "I do not admire the bard who does not sing as Pontus[140] (the ancestor of Telchines=Apollonius)". Apollo spurned Envy with his foot and spoke thus: " The stream of the Assyrian river(Euphrates) is great, but it carries much filth of earth and much rubbish on its waters. And the Melissae (Demeter's priestesses) do not carry to Deo(Demeter)

water of every stream, but it is the trickling spring, pure, and undefiled that springs from the holy fountain, that supremely pure element". Φθόνος in this passage, as it is generally assumed, represents Apollonius. When Callimachus addressed the Τελχῖνες in the invective elegiac piece, he meant to attack all his opponents, but here he concerns himself with attacking his enemy No.1, [141] Apollo, whom Callimachus, as we have seen took as his poetic Muse or rather patron, exclusively prefers the short poems to long epics. Here I ought to draw attention to the fact that Callimachus has no prejudice against the great epics of Homer, whose successors fell short of reproducing his epic manner because it was beyond their powers. Callimachus was convinced that Homer cannot be rivaled nor imitated. Professor Mahaffy's judgement on Homer may in some way express Callimachus' belief. "Homer was the Bible of the Greeks, to most of them verbally inspired, and containing all kinds of perfect wisdom. But to imitate him would, on that very account, have been absurd as to imitate the old sacred books of any nation". [142] Theocritus apparently supports Callimachus when his Lycidas said: "Even as I hate the builder who is striving to make his house high as the peak of Mount Oromedon, so hate I also the birds

of the Muses (the poets) who crow in a fruitless rivalry against the Chian nightingale".[143] Anyhow, it is Homer's imitators and their cheap, superfluous and muddled treatment of the Homeric traditional material that gave Callimachus and his supporters the notion not to try any epic at all, nor to spare those who venture to approach it. As to Apollonius' epic in particular, it is in Callimachus' opinion, a dull, uninspired and as great as the Assyrian river which abounds in filth and rubbish. The contrast between the " Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος " and " ὀλίγη λιβάς " is important, for it reveals the two clashing tendencies of the Alexandrian school. Here the Argonautica is considered a long and tedious work. Anyhow, it is the great epic of the Alexandrian period. Compared with the authentic epics of Homer, it is less than one third of the Iliad and one half of the Odyssey; but still, according to Callimachus' famous dictum, " μέγα βιβλίον μέγα κακόν ",[144] it must be considered a very long work. Callimachus, by his own practice, remained faithful to his saying all his life and used to call always for poetical compositions which are more brief and less ambitious. He was convinced that the day of long epics passed and it is the part of the

Alexandrian School to cultivate exclusively short poems, which conform with the poets' tendency towards touching more than one poetic type and occupying themselves with further researches. In keeping, however, to short poems, so it seems to Callimachus, there is much hope in neat and careful workmanship which he prefers to all other qualities. He praised the Phaenomena of Aratus, simply because it is the fruit of sleepless nights:" Χαίρετε, λεπταὶ / ἠήσιες, Ἀρήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης"[145]. Apollonius could have not kept silent. It is generally inferred from a certain piece in the third book of the Argonautica,[146] which some hold to be a second edition insertion,[147] that Apollonius avenged himself by a counter-reply against what was said of him in the above mentioned epilogue. It is not unlikely that this last known weapon was discharged from Rhodes, where he had taken refuge many years ago. The words which are put in the mouth of a crow, κορώνη, Hera's messenger, run thus: "What an ignoble seer is this, who has not the wit to conceive what the children know, because how could a girl not say a sweet or lovely word to the youth when other strangers attend him. Begone, wicked seer, witless one; one you neither Cypris nor the gentle Loves breathe kindly". This passage which is of

polemical nature and stands out of the context[148] induces us to take it for granted as written against Callimachus. It contains nothing in addition to what Apollonius expressed in his mentioned epigram.

That this battle was furiously fought by these two opponents, is shown clearly by the fact that Callimachus was forced to write a whole book, to which he gave the title Ibis, against Apollonius. Suidas refers to this work and his mention of his names adds weight to his document. Suidas says ' Ἶβις ἔστι δὲ ποίημα ἐπιτετηδευμένον εἰς ἀσάφειαν καὶ λοιδορίαν εἴς τινα Ἶβιν γενόμενον ἐχθρὸν Καλλιμάχου, ἦν δὲ οὗτος Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ γράψας τὰ Ἀργοναυτικά '. Scholars have taken different directions[149] in explaining what Callimachus meant by Ibis and what relations exist between this bird and Apollonius. As this poem is concerned with a literary question,[150] I quite agree with Professor Couat that the Ibis, the bird consecrated to Hermes, the god of thieves, is the nearest and most possible explanation conforming with what is assumed from Callimachus' attacks concerning lavish imitation and even plagiarism. These must have been noticeable in Apollonius' first edition. A youth whose age did not enable him to digest what he read and who still needed the versatility of

mature age must have been dependent on his models. If this is not clear enough in our present edition,[151] it is because the Argonautica which we have belongs to the old age of the poet. This edition was never seen by Callimachus who was already dead. One is tempted here to ask who is not accused of imitation or rather plagiarism among the poets of the Alexandrian period. Callimachus himself cannot be aquitted. Professor Barber in his article on 'The Lock of Berenice : Callimachus and Catullus', speaks of Callimachus as a plagiarist: 'Another ground for confidence is afforded by the fact that Callimachus was eminently a plagiarist. Again and again in his extant works he borrows words and phrases from earlier Greek writers and puts them in a new setting.[152] His greatest debt is naturally to Homer...' After this inevitable digression, I can return to speak of the Ibis. Of Callimachus' Ibis, we have no trace; it is completely lost. But some passages in Ovid's poem of the same name - a satirical poem of six hundred and forty four verses - can give us an idea of what it was like. Ovid says that Callimachus' Ibis was a small book, exiguus libellus.[153] In the first pages of his Ibis, Ovid speaks of such relations between his poem and those of Archilochus and particularly Callimachus. His words on

Callimachus should be discussed, since there are some important informations about Callimachus' Ibis: "Now, in such way as Battiades - Callimachus - curses his enemy Ibis, so do I curse you and your family. And like him, I will enshroud my verses in vague tales, although I am not used to follow this style. I shall be said to have imitated in my Ibis his ambiguity, forgetful of my custom and judgement. And since I do not reveal yet to those who ask me, who you are, bear you meanwhile the name of Ibis '.[154] In the faint light of these lines, it is not difficult to assume the nature of Callimachus' work. Callimachus must have been very cruel in his attacks; he, so it seems, did not deride his antagonist as he used to in his pieces wittily and humorously, but charged him as a lampoonist and in the Archilochean way, or rather that of Hipponax' from which he kept himself away in his iambics. His enigmatic tales were intentionally worked out, since he wished his poem to be only conceived by his and Apollonius' close friends, whose learning helped to make such riddles within their grasp. But are we to infer from 'Now, in such way as Battiades curses his enemy Ibis, so I curse you and yours' that Ovid is a close imitator or rather an adaptor? I doubt it, and am glad to realize that scholars began

lately to reject such tendencies. There is nothing in Ovid's Ibis which smacks of Callimachus' way of attack. If I am right - this is my impression after I read Ovid's Ibis - Ovid in this poem is no more than an upset declaimer, who shows his familiarity with mythology which he displays in his Fasti. As the theme in Callimachus' Ibis is a literary one, he must have confined himself only to such tales which treat of contests of any kind, such as that of Marsyas and Apollo and dealt with them in his special way as he did in his hymns, his Aetia, his Hecale etc. Hence, it may be inferred that Ovid only used the name and drew some inspiration from Callimachus. Finally, the thing which should not be doubted is that the Ibis was a cruel charge against Apollonius and that it was very likely the last insult directed to him.

It is worth mentioning here that Callimachus tried his hand at writing an epic. Is it not surprising to see him approaching the very thing which he disliked and attacked all his life? There must have been something which moved him to practise what he condemns. Here the scholiast on the Hymn of Apollo, l. 106 - "οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει", put in the mouth of ὁ Φθόνος, Envy, gives the reason:

'By these words he rebukes those who jeered at him as not being able to write a great poem-epic-, on account of which he was forced to write Hecale![155] I, myself, hesitate to take the words of the scholiast for granted, for the amount of the fragments of the Hecale show that this work is an epyllion rather than an epic. There may be another reason which is not difficult to prove. As this poem belongs to the last days of Callimachus, one is tempted to think that our poet, after he spent the most part of his literary life struggling against the tendency of reviving epic in the Homeric manner and the superfluity of the epic treatment, he thought at last to give an example of the kind of epic, or still better, of epyllion which could be reckoned as a novelty and known as Alexandrian. In so doing, he gave a lesson[156] rather than a proof of his ability. Callimachus' choice of the theme and the way he treats his subject confirm such assumption. The subject of this work is the victory over the bull of Marathon by the demi-god Theseus, who was hospitably entertained by a poor old woman called Hecale. Here Callimachus is dealing with one of the well-known exploits of Theseus. This choice of this particular incident from the legends of Theseus, where an ordinary resourceless creature takes a positive part in the plot,

is a typical Alexandrian one. The Alexandrian poets, especially the epigrammatists, have shown more emphatically their interest and sympathy with low classes. This is obvious in their numerous dedicatory inscriptions originated by Leonidas of Tarentum and continued by his imitators and successors. Again to choose a minor exploit, compared with his expedition against the Minotaur, is conforming with Callimachus' own practice. He is always fond of exploring unknown myths or legends and especially the local ones[157] where he allows himself some liberty in loosing the reins of his fanciful faculties in such a way that the legend becomes rather Callimachean. Thus the choice of such , and a rather uncared for legend, by Callimachus who, as we have already seen, dislikes the famous legends which had been in the mouth of every poet who treated Greek legends, is not strange. The scholars felt sorry for the loss of this specimen of epic devised and produced by the Alexandrian school as a typical Alexandrian production which stands in sheer contrast to the epics tried by others. Fortunately the rather considerable amount of fragments brought to the light of the day now and then and compiled and studied with comprehensive efforts,[158] now put us in a fairly good position to speak on the merits of this work. I am not entitled in a general account to go into detailed treatment of it

(I have not tried to deal with the Argonautica for the same reason), but, as it is of novel nature, one may point out the chief characteristics very briefly. First of all there is originality in the treatment of the story, for unlike his predecessors, who, when they wrote an epic on Heracles, for example, crowded their works with inexhaustible narrations of all his exploits. Callimachus who is aware of such tedious way of narration departed from this convention and confines himself to one single exploit and not very famous one. Again, when he chose this incident in which that old poor woman happened to be a part of it, he gave the heroic epic a quite new meaning. In fact, he meant to engage the interest of the reader with the hospitality of Hecale towards the tired and hungry Theseus, which showed itself in the supper which she prepared for him and her tales about herself. Her fears for him from the bull have nothing to do with mythology but they are real human touches.[159] In so doing, Callimachus succeeded in letting actual life and the daily-life, too, manifest themselves in this poem. In the Hecale (as in his hymns and generally all his poetic works) Callimachus revealed himself as a master of telling a story with artistic ease and charm.

There is no doubt that the Hecale met with warm

approval even from the antagonists and acquired for him new firends. Unfortunately we have no evidence of Callimachus' contemporaries to this effect, but an epigram of a later epigrammatist can be held as an echo of the earlier poets' idea about the Hecale. Crinagoras of the Augustan age presented a copy of the Hecale to M. Claudius Marcellus, the nephew of Augustus, because it is, in the dedicator's opinion, a work delicately executed. The epigrammatist's appreciation runs thus: "This delicately finished (elaborate) poem is Callimachus', for on it, indeed, he let out every reef of the Muses. He sings of the hut of hospitable Hecale, and all the toils which Marathon put on Theseus' shoulders. His young strength of hands may it be yours to win, Marcellus, and equal praise of renowned life.[160] Apollonius, himself, appreciated the work of his enemy. This assumption is justified by the fact that he was indebted to Callimachus' Hecale of which he made use.[161] He must have used the Hecale in his last edition which belongs to his old age after his return to Alexandria and Callimachus' death. Is this an acknowlegement on the part of Apollonius of his master's supremecy?

After the success of the Hecale, Callimachus must have finally breathed freely. There were, so it seemed

to him, no vollies of invective any more.[162] His enemy was already in Rhodes and would not dare to return to Alexandria after his master's positive victory; the outsiders kept silent and held their peace. His position as arbiter literarum which was for a long time contested, now became well established and his school, which had been furiously attacked, was acknowledged as the distinguished school of Alexandrian poetry, (at least in Callimachus' life-time.).

This was the literary quarrel which exercised Alexandrian scholars for a long time. It can be generally called the quarrel of the "small book" and the "big book" - the clash between those who clung rashly to the old tradition and those who tried to break with it and strove after creating something new by means of wise and free adaptations.[163]

6. THE LITERARY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PERIOD:

After this consideration of the literary quarrel, the whole poetic activity of the period can be conveniently treated. Alexandrian poetry forms one of the poetical activities which belong to that period begun by the conquests of Alexander the Great and continued for some centuries by his successors, the Diadochi, and their descendants. Alexandrian poetry was just born some fifty

years after Alexander's early death. It was not yet existing when some of Alexander's generals, led by personal ambition and thirst for power, occupied themselves in deadly conflicts, intrigues and murder for more than twenty years, till at last they were obliged to unite against Antigonus, surnamed the one-eyed, and defeated him in a battle at Ipsus in Asia Minor in 301 B.C. The ambition of holding Alexander's vast empire by one man died at last with Antigonus. All seemed - at least after this battle - content with splitting the empire into separate portions and establishing themselves each as a despot in his own alloted kingdom. This solution did not stop war in future, for everyone of the new kings and their successors used to find alleged reasons for making war with one or more of his rival kings. It is worth mentioning that Ptolemy I Soter, did not take any apparent or effective part in the struggles of his colleagues. With the shrewdness of a distinguished statesman he preferred to keep the peace and went on, uninterrupted, with his schemes towards improving the conditions of his satrapy. And so in his life-time Alexandria became the greatest commercial city in the world and an attractive and safe refuge to those who wished to avoid the disturbances at their homes and seek some other peaceful

place. There is no wonder then if Alexandria became from the time of Ptolemy I Soter onwards a second home to strangers coming from any place whatever, especially men of letters, invited or uninvited, who frequented Alexandria even before the Library and the Museum were available for researches. With the same ambition and energy as his father, Ptolemy II Philadelphus carried on what his father successfully began and after a few years of his reign, there existed a literary activity at Alexandria which came to exercise a strong influence upon all literary production of its own time. This was so from about the middle of the third century B.C. onwards. This literary activity, however, though it stood above literary achievement between classical and Alexandrian times, is by no means entitled to vie with the classical activity itself. It is far behind it and yet it is the only one among all the post-classical centres of literary activity that is worthy to be ranked a good second to its unreached and unchallenged mistress of letters. This special position allows me in this account of the characteristics of Alexandrian poetry to make comparison and contrast between the general tendencies of the Alexandrians and their predecessors.

The Alexandrian period is, from the point of view

of poetic production, not of the same standard or level. It depended almost entirely, as is known, on the royal zeal and encouragement, and it so happened that the golden age falls within the reign of the first Ptolemies, Philadelphus and Euergetes, from about 280 to 221: a period of about fifty years. The years which precede this flowering period are merely a preparation for it and those which follow it are but a sequel to it. The whole period can be roughly subdivided into two: the first comprises Callimachus, his school and their opponents; the second is that of the Epigoni, the successors of the great masters. These were generally imitators of the work of their predecessors and inferior to them.

As I concern myself only with the poetical types closely related to epigram, I pass now to mention the characteristics of the poetical output of this age as represented in the various genres cultivated by the Alexandrians.

As the Alexandrian literature was a consequence of the study of the classical heritage and of familiarity with it in all its course from Homer to Menander, it is not surprising that the poets of Alexandria or of other places under her spell tried their hands at all sorts of compositions known and practised in the classical

times. They were also aware of the genres cultivated by figures like Philetas of Cos and his pupils, their immediate pioneers and masters of learned poetry in the manner of the scholar-poet, Antimachus of Colophon, a little more than a century before them. The different poetic genres generally favoured and practised to a greater or less extent by the Alexandrian school are : Narrative elegy, Idyll (literary mimes, rural and urban), Epyllion, Epic (historical or mythological and didactic), Hymn, Iambus, Lyric and Epigram. As to epic or rather lengthy compositions, there were some who favoured it and some who were against it. Callimachus, who tried to give the Alexandrian school of poetry a distinct personality, denounced the idea of writing lengthy poems and called for the composition of short poems more expressive of the genius of the age and highly polished. It cannot be said that Callimachus was against the treatment of heroic themes, he only wished that compositions of this sort should be short in order that the writer may be able to correct, revise, finish and keep to the new metric devices. In other words, such poems, if short, could be written in faultless technique of verse. What he recommended was the treatment of any subject-matter in the narrow frame of elegies and epyllia and

after the manner of Erinna's Distaff, Ἠλακάτα. In this Distaff, a poem of three hundred lines, Erinna commemerated, simply and yet artisticly, her affection for Baucis, her friend from early childhood and her grief at two occasions: the separation caused by Baucis' marriage and her death shortly after marriage. The surviving fragments of this poem or epyllion (for it is only three hundred lines) are quite sufficient to show that its composer was a poetess of high promise. I share Professor Wilamowitz's[164] surprise that a girl, seventeen years old, the native of a little island, Telos, which belonged to Rhodes, writes in her native language about the middle of the fourth century[165] a poem which was epoch-making. This poetess was highly estimated by the Alexandrians, and her poetry was well appreciated by them. Asclepiades, an immediate pre-Alexandrian epigrammatist, wrote an epigram which was inscribed on a volume of her poems. By putting the words in Erinna's mouth, Asclepiades tried to give the poetess her due appreciation: "This is the sweet work of Erinna, not great in size as being that of a maiden of nineteen, but greater in power than that of many others. If death had not come early to me, who would have had so great a name?"[166] The fact that this epigram was taken as a pattern in the course of the

Alexandrian period by earlier and later epigrammatists[167] shows the Alexandrians' attitude towards Erinna and her poems; which seem to be no more than the Ἀλακάτα and a number of epigrams, three of which are preserved in the Anthology.[168] Her Ἀλακάτα proper was the theme of a laudatory epigram written by an anonymous writer who seemed very interested in it and its young authoress. To his mind, she is equal to Homer and not inferior to Sappho. The lines of this epigram run thus: "This is the Lesbian honeycomb of Erinna, and if it is small, it is all mixed with honey from the Muses. Her three hundred lines are equal to Homer, though she was a girl of nineteen years - a maid who at once in fear of her mother sat by her distaff and stood at her loom as a bond servant in the service of the Muses. As much as Sappho surpasses Erinna in lyrics, so much does Erinna excel Sappho in hexameters."[169] Although Callimachus' extant poems do not mention even the name of Erinna, yet he was a great admirer of her. Antiphanes, a later epigrammatist, referred to this. In a lampooning epigram directed against Callimachus and his pupils, this poet addressed them in these words, "ἐπ' Ἠείνῃ δὲ κομῶντες".[170] No wonder if Erinna won an exceptionally distinguished praise of the new school under the patronage of Callimachus. Her

Distaff has certain characteristics which meet their taste and conform with many of the characteristics of the period: it is short - in other words an Epyllion which is preferred to epic - it is composed in hexameter, an unusual or rather new medium for expressing personal feeling and grief. Such tendency towards composing poems in other media is favoured and practised by them. In their hands, the hexameter and elegiac couplet were used for themes of lyrical flavour. The traditional conventions for writing a certain theme in an appropriate or rather fixed metre are by now and on purpose thrown in the air. Again its language which is a combination of Doric with Aeolic, harmonizes with the method they follow in their compositions. Callimachus and Theocritus used to mix two dialects or even more. Being a mixture of realism and romance, the Distaff must have attracted them the more. The Alexandrian poets favoured realism, and romanticism owes its existence to some of them such as Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes. There remain still some obvious characteristics which are worth mentioning: the simplicity, sincerity, tenderness and elegance. But few are the poets of this period who cared for such features; for the chief concern of the majority is for the elaborated, the learned, and the feigned

sentimental. Theocritus' familiarity with Erinna's Distaff is obvious and his reminiscences of the poetess is above dispute. His Idyll 1, the lament of Daphnis, shares with the Distaff certain important features. Like the distaff, the Idyll is written in hexameters and, as far as language is concerned, it is a combination of Doric and Aeolic. The only difference between the two is the Erinna's Distaff, the lament for Baucis, is real, personal and natural, while the lament for Daphnis is literary and not void of artificial devices such as the refrains used by the Alexandrian poet. Of the reminiscences in particular, I will only refer to some. The word, δαγύς[171], probably a Thessalian word, which Erinna used when she recalled the childhood with its dolls, is not found in any Greek poetry except in Theocritus.[172] Erinna's conception of Mormo as a bogey who frightens the children can be met with in Theocritus and in Callimachus, too.[173] Her 'ἴχνια κεῖται θέρμ' ἔτι' can be traced in Theocritus, although the theme he dealt with is different from Erinna's. Her Distaff was known to Virgil; for he also played with the same expression when he spoke of the love of Dido.[174] All these considerations together with her priority to the Alexandrian period induce me to say that Erinna was not only admired

by the new Alexandrian school of poetry to which Theocritus, himself, belongs, but was also used as a pre-Alexandrian model. These reminiscences of the poetess which I have already stated, can to a great extent justify my assumption. She may have been introduced to the Alexandrians through Theocritus who acquired and read her book in Cos, where he met Phelitas and Asclepiades.

After this inevitable digression, the characteristics can be dealt with. 'Literature', according to Professor Gillies' definition, 'is the child of the human mind but its creative force is the human relation to the material world.'[175] Such definition is quite sound when it is applied to the literature of this period. Alexandrian literature, although an offspring of the classical one, differs very much from the production of earlier Greece. The child was born in times and under conditions which were different from those of her mother. The world, after Alexander's conquests which brought West and East into contact and on a large scale never known before, became such that Hellenism was to assume a modified form. In fact, important changes had taken place in spirit as a consequence of these conquests, and according to the new conceptions, social, philosophical and intellectual, which were manifest in the kingdoms

established by Alexander's successors. It is an utterly new world with new views. The city-state, as an entirely independent unit, proud in her own institutions, laws, ways of her citizens' life, her dialect and her gods, was regarded as an old fashioned system. It gave place to that of an indivisible world, inhabited by a united people. The old tribal society which had a claim on her own members to devote themselves to her welfare is now transformed into a cosmopolitan society which has no claim whatever to its member's good will and his good offices. According to the philosophic principles of the age, he is recognized as an individual free from any obligation and liable to have the free choice of doing whatever he likes as long as he acts as a civilized man; in other words he acquired a full αὐτάρκεια. He is not obliged to stick to his birth-place unless he wishes, and so many used to leave their own towns for any place they wished. In this way they became mere inhabitants who had no idea of patriotism or self-devotion or self-sacrifice. Released from the old authority of the city-state, people were free to worship any god they wished, whether Greek or Oriental or a combination of the two. And there were those who disbelieved in gods at all. Furthermore, religion seemed to these rationalists merely

an artificial invention of the human mind. These considerations of the new world with its people can to a certain extent help us to form an idea of what Alexandria was like. This Egyptian Metropolis - and so also the other capitals and the big towns all over Alexander's shattered empire - was a true cosmopolitan city, crowded with multitudes of all races coming from different parts of the world, with different languages and customs and whose interests were variously related to trade and commerce. To these we must add not a small number of the chosen and distinguished practitioners of literary and scientific researches whom the new Alexandrian home of the Muses attracted. This city, although there is no similarity between her and cities like Athens for example, was Greek in its plan, buildings and atmosphere. It was a Greek city on Egyptian land. The Greeks, or more precisely the Greek-Macedonians, occupied its distinguished quarter, The Brucheion or Royal Greek-Macedonian quarter, while the Egyptians had to be content with their modest native quarter, the original Rhakotis; they were less fortunate even than those who came from Asia to live in their own city, but in the course of time they were acknowledged as an important portion of the inhabitants of the city and their

influence began to be felt. This sketchy picture of Alexandria, as a new example of artificial cities, and its society - mere inhabitants -, high and low with their individual tendencies and social characteristics, when compared with the old city-state and its own citizens, as we have already seen, gives us a preliminary hint of what kind of poetry was cultivated at Alexandria and in what way it differed from that of the classical period.

Alexandrian poetry as a part of a cosmopolitan culture had its own features which differed vitally and sharply from those of the production of earlier Greece. Although Alexandrian poetry was in theory and practice a continuation of the earlier one, yet there is a spacious and deep gap separating the one from the other. The new poetry, although it still concerned itself with themes excusively Greek in subject matter, drawn from Greek sources - for although most of it was composed in Egyptian Alexandria, yet there was almost nothing which touched any Egyptian traditional topic - yet it was void of the pure essence and flavour of the old poetry. It was not a direct inspiration drawn from the city-state with its native spiritual heritage and it lost for ever the spiritual relation to religion and

and its deep-rooted myths. It is to the city-state and religion that classical poetry owed its excellency and spontaneity. These are the main factors which separate the Alexandrian poetry from the classical and they are in the main the fundamental facts that made the work of the classical poet different from the Alexandrian in spirit, style and workmanship.

Here, I think, that a comparison and contrast between the productions of the two periods is needed.[176] They will help us to understand better the particular characteristics of the latter. The old poetic genres are original. They are the creation of the poets of genius, every one of whom was the first to shape his particular genre: the new are simply copies lavishly imitated or alertly adapted. The Alexandrian poets took liberty in making use of models composed by their predecessors, the most ancient, as well as the most recent. The ancient poet was generally a writer of one principal genre. Homer is known as an epic poet, Sappho as a lyric poetess, Sophocles and Euripides as tragedians, Aristophanes as a comedian and so on. The Alexandrians on the other hand are generally composers of a number of genres and almost all composed epigrams or used to throw them off occasionally. Callimachus, for instance, composed elegies, hymns, iambi,

songs, epyllia and epigrams. Theocritus wrote country and urban mimes, epyllia, hymns, Aeolic songs and epigrams. So did the others either successfully or otherwise. Again, the Alexandrian poet can be at the same time a philosopher, a critic, a grammarian or even a scientist. This distinctive feature can be met with in many poets of the Alexandrian school, such as Callimachus, Eratosthenes and others. In fact, the greatest poets of Alexandria were at the same time learned men. The old poets were in most cases original citizens of their city-states, while the Alexandrians were, with the exception of Apollonius Rhodius, foreigners to the city of Alexandria - or to a big city or any capital of other kingdoms - to which they came, if not invited by the king or an influential patron, to make use of the Museum and the Library or to seek royal patronage as Theocritus did. These different positions are not without positive effects upon the poetic production. The former - the poets who were subjective in their themes are excluded - used in their poems to reveal their greatest interest in the traditions and conventions of their own city-states from which they drew their inspirations. How glad and happy they were when they conveyed them to their countrymen so as to elevate their spirits and also to charm them. Their patriotism to their city-states and their devotion to their religions and cults seemed to be

stronger than their self-love, for they used to sacrifice their liberty and betray their own ideas in deference to the will of the city-states of which they were singers and interpreters. In consecrating their art to their city-states, they revealed their self-denial or rather their self-devotion to their father-land and regarded art as 'art for the city's sake' - a conception which was hardly welcomed after their own day. The Alexandrians on the other hand had no sense of patriotism towards the city - Alexandria or any other capital - which was to them no more than a comfortable place of residence and a literary centre. They lack the patriotic stimulus and so they felt that they could not sing sua sponte her prosperity, her ambitions, her rivalry with the neighbouring kingdoms. Their attitude towards the people of the city was almost indifferent. They did not try to sympathise with them or cherish their hopes in their poetic productions. Moreover, they did not mix with the inhabitants, many of whom did not take any notice of them. A queer community or society, indeed, which seemed to have no idea of the tendency towards brotherhood emphasized by the contemporary philosophical schools. But, although, they ceased to be panegyrists of the city, they were eulogists of kings and their

entourages whose patronages they had already acquired or were still anxiously looking for. We have some fulsome pieces of flattery written by these poets in which they extolled to the skies the luxury of their palaces and parks, the splendour of their festivals and the glory of their military exploits and the like.[177] In this they broke with the traditional practice of the old poets and reduced the dignity of their predecessors who were prophet-like bards, teachers and philosophers long before philosophy began to reveal itself as more competent to exercise their function. These eulogies whatever our judgement may be on them marks that freedom which the poets of this period used to have in the choice of theme and its treatment. The poets used to write for their own personal end and what pleased them personally above all. Thus the poetic productions of this period generally justify the fact that the Alexandrian poet tended in his poems to express his own feelings and emotions or his ambitions by displaying his learning; and he used poetic devices so as to be highly estimated as an inspired and versatile poet. This was, to his mind, the only goal which should be attained. The chief types of the old poetry were in touch with life and composed for the body of fellow-citizens who were enabled to

enjoy them and interested in listening to them in word and song. They used to throng around the rhapsode to hear some lays of divine Homer and to attend the religious festivals or national games where choral songs were performed. Again, in the theatre of Dionysus, the tragedians and the comedians used to instruct and entertain them. At Alexandria, on the other hand, nothing of this kind took place, for the Alexandrians did not write generally for the public. The genres they cultivated (with the exception of some mimes and epigrams) were in no sense popular. They were written only for an intellectual elite; in other words, they were learned exercises, circulated among a clique of scholar poets of the court and the representatives of the Library and Museum and the educated who attached themselves to such circle. Again, unlike the old poetry which was generally written to be sung, the Alexandrian verses were intended for recitation almost exclusively in a narrower circle, the members of which were capable of solving the far-fetched allusions prevailing in the compositions of this period. Between the poets and the public, so it seems, there was a kind of indifference. The public did not understand them and they did not care to be understood; in short, when the Alexandrian poets chose

to turn away from themes connected more or less with the state, concerned themselves with other subjects which meet with their own tastes and used every bit of their talent, to have them neat and polished, the art of poetry distinguished itself as an "art for art's sake", a quite new conception which is purely Alexandrian. Again, if the scholar poets shunned any contact with public audience, their books and pamphlets which they published in abundance for the first time in this period, must have found among the cultured outside their own clique, considerable numbers of zealous readers. The fact that their books made their way into the hands of such readers is justified by the discoveries of books or scattered leaves in private houses and tombs in some cities and even villages of Egypt.[178] To these readers the poetic production of the period was looked upon as an art of mere enjoyment and from their particular point of view, poetry became an "art for amusement's sake".

So much of these apparent differences which mark the changing conditions under the influences of which the classical poet appeared to have a function and tendencies different from those of the Alexandrian. These are not unhelpful in comprehending the special characteristics of the Alexandrian poetry itself. These, however,

can be still understood more in the light of some contemporary factors which were either favourable in many respects to the poetic production or contributed to its development. The establishment of royal libraries, abounding in books, (old and new), on all the known subjects, first at Alexandria and then at Pergamum, by the zealous and ambitious kings offered the greatest facilities to these poets whose first aim was either to imitate or adapt and who began for the first time to use reference books in their research-like poems, directed and put their stamp on the poetic production of this period. It was in this period the circulation of books flourished at Alexandria, presumably through the great Library. There is no wonder that Egypt was the first to contribute to the publication of books. Its endless supplies of papyrus render it more efficient than other places. Professor Barber refers to this in these words, "Further the mechanical production of 'books' " - more correctly papyrus-rolls - "had been rendered easier and cheaper by the opening up of Egypt and its inexhaustible supply of papyrus to Greek industry and commercial enterprise".[179] New places of the world became already known. The Persian Gulf was explored by Nearchus, one of Alexander's commanders, who circumnavigated the coast from the Indus

to the Tigris and wrote a chronicle of his explorations. Megasthenes wrote, also, a work on India, Ἰνδικά. Strabo and Arrian used Nearchus. Arrian also used Megasthenes. Pytheas, a Greek navigator of Messalia, explored the Atlantic and North Sea and described some places as Britain and its people. These explorers' accounts of new parts of the world, far and wide, undoubtedly widened the scope of the peoples' knowledge. These accounts, however, were used by the poets of this period. If Callimachus really meant by Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος,[180] to refer to Euphrates, it is most probable that he used Nearchus' account. Again, the accounts might have induced the poets to choose themes connected with journeys and led them to concern themselves occasionally with the people and their different customs. This is obvious in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius. This period is distinguished for a striking advance in scientific researches, especially in the spheres of geometry, astronomy, mechanics and geography. At the top of the exponent scientists stood the names of Euclides of Alexandria, Archimedes of Syracuse, who studied at Alexandria and Eratosthenes of Cyrene. In this period the man of letters was frequently or almost always distinguished in several sciences.

Eratosthenes, a poet who tried his hand at short epics and elegy, was at the same time, critic, astronomer, mathematician and geographer. Callimachus, his teacher, a real poet who wrote in several poetic genres, quenched his scholarly zeal by writing scientific treatises such as 'On Birds', 'On the rivers of the World', 'Foundations of Islands and Cities and changes of name', etc. These examples do not let us wonder why the poets of this period attempted to introduce science into poetry nor how the technique and vocabulary of science were permeated in their works both intentionally and unintentionally. It must be borne in mind that they were not necessarily experts and that the majority used to repeat only what the specialists had said. Astronomy seems to have been a favourite theme to the Alexandrians. Aratus' Phaenomena[181] is nothing but a versified work on astronomy. It can also be met with occasionally in the works of Callimachus, especially in his elegy on the 'Lock of Berenice'[182] or in Theocritus and even Apollonius of Rhodes.[183] Geographical questions were not missing in Callimachus and Apollonius of Rhodes too. Euphorion's epics were also too cumbered with geography. Patronage, especially the royal, to which Alexandrian poetry owed much for its existence and flourishing, inspired those

mercenary poets, who could not do without it, to introduce a new poetic theme which could be rightly called the courtly-poetry, a strange combination of flattery and gallantry. The flattery of the king (and even the queen) seemed from the beginning of the Ptolemaic dynasty to be indispensable and this is the most dangerous and despicable feature of literature under patronage. From the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus at least, the poets chose to keep silence concerning the weaknesses of the king's character. This was not without reason. They saw already the sad end of their colleague, Sotades, when he abused Philadelphus for repudiating his first wife, Arsinoë I, daughter of Lysimachus and for marrying his full sister Arsinoë II[184] and how great a price Sotades paid for his tactless frankness. In fact, Sotades was too bold or rather too rash to address the king in such words " Εἰς οὐχ ὁσίης τευμαλιὴν τὸ κέντρον ἀθεῖς "[185]. How did he not realize that such scurrilous abuse must not be directed to a king belonging to a dynasty which traced its descent, like Alexander, from Heracles and the kings of which ruled Egypt as successors of the deified Pharaos? It is true that the marriage of a brother and sister practised only in Macedonia and Hellenized Macedonian kingdoms, was considered incentuous and

and abominable in the eyes of the Greeks;[186] but notwithstanding this counter-attitude towards such marriage, it was celebrated by other poets like Callimachus and Theocritus. Callimachus said of it " Ἀρσινόης, ὦ ξεῖνε, γάμον κατὰ βάλλομ' ἀείδειν ".[187] Although this line (and this is what survived) bears nothing important, yet its words give the impression that Callimachus is not only going to defend it but also to applaud it as a divine thing practised long ago by the Father of the Olympian gods. The loss of this poem is deplorable indeed; for to my mind, it is one of Callimachus' poems which smack of erudition and aetiology. Theocritus, on the other hand, dealt with this royal wedlock in his 'Panegyric of Ptolemy' very successfully. To him it is a happy reminiscence of the holy wedlock of Zeus and his sister Rhea.[188] These two poets seemed to have understood what Sotades was blind to; that Ptolemy is the kind of person who rewards flattery but punishes frankness. Thus they went on playing the part of flatterers of this king openly and boldly. Callimachus' IInd Hymn to Apollo with all its description of the attributes of the god which are in fact intended to apply to Philadelphus is a masterpiece of subtle but excessive flattery. Theocritus' tedious eulogy of the same king is slightly different in

treatment, for Theocritus took pains to eulogize all the members of the royal family: Philadelphus' father, mother and his sister and wife. One cannot read the character and traits of Philadelphus on which the poet laid stress without feeling Theocritus' abominable exaggeration.[189] This poet, as it is obvious from his writings, was unwilling to miss the opportunity of complimenting this king and the royal court. This can be further seen at the end of 'The Love of Cynisca'[190] and in the course of 'The women at the Adonis Festival'.[191] Traces of similar bits of flattery can be met with more or less in other poets' poems.[192] Women of the royal family and those attached to the court such as the mistresses of the king revealed themselves worthy of flattery and compliments. They used to exert their influence in the Ptolemaic court and some of them often ruled in the name of the king. No wonder then if poets did not miss the opportunity of gratifying their vanity and, as women, they could but welcome it with all their hearts. Callimachus' elegy 'Lock of Berenice'[193] which he composed for Berenice, Ptolemy III Euergetes' wife, whose favour he sought to gain, is worth mentioning, for it is perhaps the most far-fetched effort of court flattery in existence[194] and gives certain features of the elegy

cultivated by Callimachus and his school. This elegy which is a gallant poetic production glorifies Canon's gallant invention and shows Callimachus' art of courtly homage at its zenith. The young queen must have been happy to hear herself spoken of as stout-hearted from young girlhood, to hear of her brave deed,[195] to read of her emotions when parting from her husband depicted in so clever and dramatic expressions. The sorrow of the 'lock' for missing her lady's head and its anxious wish to become the queen's lock once more, must have enchanted her and given her the utmost pleasure. From the stylistic point of view, this elegy is a happy example of Alexandrian poetry where astronomy was introduced into poetry without an intentional display of erudition at all. The expressions are by no means heavy, they flow spontaneously and smoothly. Finally, in letting the 'lock' speak from the beginning to the end, Callimachus introduced into the elegy a particular device of the dedicatory epigram (and so also the sepulchral) in which the dedicated offering used to speak. This instance of the influence of epigram on other types ought to be acknowledged. In one of his epigrams, Callimachus seemed to strive for establishing his position with the new régime. To the Graces-Charites - who were traditionally

three in number, Berenice should be added to make them four. This epigram is worth quoting : 'The Graces are four, for beside those three, one has been fashoined lately and is yet bathed in perfume, blessed Berenice, happy among all, without whom even the Graces are not Graces.'[196] With this bold epigram and its most tactful 'point' it would be hard, so it seems to me, to flatter more. Such courtly flattery was necessary for those foreign poets who used to look earnestly for the liberality of those kings who fostered it. If we know that Ptolemy III Euergetes had an official flatterer called Callicrates,[197] we are then in a position to sympathize with the poets rather than blame them.

We turn now to deal with the typical characteristics of the school revealed in the works of its first masters: Callimachus, the typical and prolific Alexandrian poet, Theocritus, the most charming pastoral singer, Apollonius of Rhodes, the first romantic poet, etc. It is not disputed that their literary types best illustrate the general features of the Alexandrian school which owes to them its existence and the influence it exerted far and wide. In undertaking my present study, which is far from being a literary history, I am not expected to follow the chronological order of the poets nor to

concern myself with their different works nor to deal with the various literary types in a systematic way. All this is beyond the limits of my subject. I will only occupy myself with picking out any characteristics met with in whatever type was cultivated in this period.

It would be helpful, so it seems to me, to approach these characteristics by bringing the Library and the Museum and their readers - not necessarily the research students - into focus. A snap-shot or rather snapshots taken within the precinct of these two magnificent foundations, rich in the possession of all known texts and works of learning in every department of knowledge, are of great help for a full understanding at least of the literary tendencies of this period. My mind's eye can see in these snaps an activity worthy of attentive investigation. The library is very busy. Works are enthusiastically consulted and made use of. Here is a reader who occupies himself with some compilations of ancient myths or local legends. Another finds an earnest pleasure in inspecting some tables of glosses. A third is attentively scanning some verses of an ancient poet and taking notes. A fourth, who seems to be rather anxious to pursue a certain point about a special people or a particular country or even city, is lost among the geographical

treatises and the explorers' accounts. A fifth, sixth etc., are attentively pursuing some various works on Astronomy, medicine or encyclopaedic topics on different themes and so forth. This picture brings us near the characteristics of the poetic productions; for these readers with their different occupations can meet in one person - the Alexandrian poet - who strives to introduce into his compositions instances of scientific aid. Very few are the poets who escape this new way of writing. Here it is clear that poets did not write spontaneously but with much labour. It is a literature of study in which the poets were no more inspired by the Muses, but in fact by the Museum or the home of the Muses. We still have some other snaps to be inspected. As the poet now writes to please himself and to satiate his personal ambition for acquiring a distinguished place in the circle of Literati in whose hand his composition is destined either to success or failure. I can see the learned members of this clique in the 'Exedra' lecturing and discussing, walking in the 'Peripatos' or sitting in the shade of the trees speaking of certain urgent questions and commenting on some up-to-date novelties in the choice and treatment of a subject-matter. Their talks again in the dining-hall after dinner or at Symposia were light and

far from being considered scientific discourse; and yet one must admit that these scholars used to have particular jokes of their own which are generally connected more or less with their scholarly career. I can imagine them occupying themselves with some trifling questions; such as "How many times does such and such a word occur in Homer?" "Is Nausicâa an example of an innocent virgin or could she be taken simply as a hetaera?" They can break into laughter simply because one of them utters a commonplace phrase or refers to a well known or hackneyed myth. A more subtle and enigmatic phrase or an obscure myth or rather legend will give them the utmost joy and offers every one of them the opportunity of displaying his learning. I hope it is now clear, in the light of these pictures, what kind of characteristics we could expect in poetic productions cultivated by poets who are generally scholar poets. These poets discovered from the beginning that they were not the peers of their predecessors in spontaneity and easy workmanship and, ambitious as they were, began to hide their inferiority by giving the old types some new shades and adapting them to new needs and new points of view. Again, from the point of view of treatment, they originated new devices which are obvious in their compositions. In this they succeeded

to create a poetry which is their own and could be called after them.

Now I can enumerate some of the chief features of this Alexandrian poetic school. Erudition is the most conspicuous feature in the productions of the period. The early poets occupied themselves, as it was said before, with the study of different sciences: geography, astronomy, antiquities, mythology, grammar, prosody, metre, etc. The result of these studies constantly appeared in their productions and those of their pupils and imitators. As a consequence of this taste for sciences, erudition prevailed so excessively that the poems could hardly be understood except by scholars to whom, before any one else, the poems were written and addressed, being full of recondite learning. Almost all of them share the passion for excessive erudition, even Theocritus, who is thought to be least bound by his colleagues' conventional rules of form and style did not escape it completely.[198] Alexandrian elegies and epics especially are erudite compilations of every sort of learning. The best example is Callimachus' Aetia. Here Callimachus is quite as much scholar as poet. It is an encyclopaidic elegy abounding in aetiological researches of festivals, games, customs, foundation of cities, etc. In the hands of this poet elegy dealt with themes didactic in essence. It was not

by mistake that he chose the elegiac couplet instead of the hexameter. It was a mere Alexandrian convention. In an age where old lines separating nations, races and classes faded, one should expect a similar thing with the poetic types. Metres were no more taken as vehicles for particular themes as these poets' predecessors used to do. Apollonius' Argonautica is another example of the work of a savant and antiquarian. It is a pedantic display of learning of a laborious apprentice and scholar. In fact the story of the Argonaut's voyage is a compilation of material drawn from various books and woven together industriously and skilfully. The fact that Apollonius showed the same excessive passion for erudition and especially aetiology can be again justified by some titles of a number of epyllia treating of the local legends connected with the foundation of certain cities as Naucratis, Cannus, Rhodes and Alexandria.[199] The poets' learned instincts can be further shown in dealing with the myths and sagas. Unlike their predecessors who used to select from the traditional store of mythology what were chiefly concerned with their state religion, the Alexandrians were free in their choice since they were comparatively released from all religious obligations. Towards 'Myth' and 'Legend', all the Alexandrians had in

common one characteristic, namely avoidance of the hackneyed. To the ambitious and industrious, the old myth or legend is looked upon as a raw material which could be shaped according to his own taste or as obsolete and antiquated and needing to be rehandled and modified to suit his own ends. Their earlier masters, Callimachus and his contemporaries, were only interested in what was obscure, untouched and neglected. They handled these with learning and considerable technical skill and sometimes with attractive touches. We have already seen how Callimachus treated a rather obscure myth of Theseus in his Hecale and how he reduced it to a story which is not alien to real life. The documentary character of acquiring their mythological material from special works on the subject can be justified by the words of Callimachus 'ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀείδω'.[200] And as scholars or under the influence of scholars, they avoided any details which could be known to their colleagues or to the advanced readers. So they contented themselves with short allusions. This is obvious in Apollonius' Argonautica. Professor Körte says, 'We do not know how Jason receives the bidding, or how he enlists comrades for the adventure; nay, even the special task, the winning of the Golden Fleece is not deemed by the poet worth further

mention than the three words of the proem.'[201] This specific tendency is intensified in Callimachus' works, which contain not a few obscure mythological allusions. But the worst examples we have of this kind are found in Lycophron's Alexandra, a tragic monologue abounding in enigmatic mythological and historical material. According to Suidas, it is ' τὸ σκοτεινὸν ποίημα '.[202] Euphorion, a composer of epyllia and epics on mythological subjects shared with Lycophron the ill-fame of the difficulty of his mythological references. But it must be said in passing that these poets could not be taken as authorized representatives of the whole poetic school, for their defects are rather personal.

Alexandrian poets seemed to have an excessive interest in local legends. They preferred them to the myths which, as a matter of fact, became worn-out in the hands of the old epic poets. These legends, which are combinations of local history and mythology in prose, existed already in the places which had given them birth. They were in their eyes an undiscovered treasure for a new subject matter which could add, as they wished, to their originality, since they were the first to deal with them in poetry and gave them a romantic touch. The material derived from these local legends, so it seems to

Professor Barber,[203] were usually treated in either the epyllia or narrative elegies. We have no satisfactory example of an Alexandrian epyllion to warrant this conjecture. As regards the narrative elegy on the other hand, we have in the love story of Cydippe and Acontius which is treated by Callimachus in his Aetia and taken from a tale of the annals of Ceos,[204] a possible proof. Depending on the 'Ἐρωτικὰ παθήματα' a prose outline of love stories written by Parthenius, an Alexandrian elegist of the first century B.C., these stories were usually narratives of amorous adventures of unhappy love either between two mortals or between a mortal and a god or goddess.[205] Here gods-and it is a typical Alexandrian practice- lost much of their old dignity. They were no more considered as super-human who presided over mankind and punished the evil-doers. Religion had by now no weight on these poets. Under the influence of the Epicureans and Stoics, the cultured gave themselves to rationalism. And to the poets, in particular, mythology and mythological gods became a field of a refined game of phantasy. Zeus, the father of the gods, became a naughty seeker of love-affairs.[206] Theocritus also deemed Eros to be cruel.[207] Apollonius Rhodius spoke of the same god, who occupied the thoughts of the poets and artists

of this period, as a wild and wilful child whom even the gods feared.[208] This impious or rather playful treatment of gods is by no means new. Gods suffered much long before at the hands of the masters of comedy. But if the Alexandrians were not the originators, they were at least unique in developing it with a change of emphasis. The Alexandrian Society, as those in other capitals, became more sensual than those rather decent societies of olden times, owing to increased luxury and the mingling of nationalities with their imported customs and vices. Here the poets, who share with their society what is proper and what is improper, are its true mouthpieces. It is a society which had not the least dislike whatever of prostitution.[209] Hetairae and paramours moved freely and enjoyed every enjoyment of night-life. Two pictures in Theocritus[210] would be sufficient at present to give us an idea of what girls and men were like and how the two sexes behaved.[211] The second example showed us how the beloved met the lover as a maid and returned home a woman.[212] These pictures show us clearly how poetry kept pace with the morals of a society to which Aphrodite or Eros was no more οὐράνιος but exclusively πάνδημος. Outside the erotic sphere, where gods were playfully treated, we see them

subject to a new treatment never attempted before. Due to the flowering of scientific researches of this period, people began to use their eyes and brains more and more and there existed a tendency towards rationalism and realism. The Alexandrian poets who introduced scientific ideas and used technical words in their poems, became realists. They began to concern themselves with portraying things which really exist. In so doing they avoided any flights of imagination and kept close to the ground. This tendency towards realism shows itself clearly in the treatment of the superhuman Homeric and Hesiodic gods, who, without intentional humiliation or disdain, were reduced to the status of mankind. They became more human in their deeds and emotions. They shared with human beings their good qualities and failures. We have many interesting and striking portrayals of these deities in almost all the poetic types of this period especially elegy, hymns, idylls and epics. Hephaestus used to go early to his work-shop as an ordinary and paid-worker.[213] Cypris is depicted as a typical Eastern middle-class wife, even inferior, if we are to compare her with those of to-day. She is a good house-keeper who can manage on her own without needing a help-maid either to look after her or

her house. She dresses her long hair with a golden comb without the help of a private-maid.[214] Callimachus in the fifth Hymn refers to the pains Cypris takes in taking care of her hair, for she took the shining bronze and often altered and again altered the same lock.[215] Comparing her with Pallas, the latter is rather mild; for she is only content with anointing herself with some olive unguents.[216] This comparison is interesting; it is held between a married lady and an unmarried maid. It shows that the families had at that time a kind of conventional principles which were more or less followed. It can be assumed also that, as far as the making-up question is concerned, virgins were not allowed to have the same liberty as the married ladies. I saw in my childhood and early youth a parallel to this convention, which appears to me to be a typical Eastern convention. Again Cypris takes interest in family-life-responsibilities; for she makes her husband's bed herself.[217] As a mother, Cypris had her own troubles. Her only son, Eros, does not obey her. He is naughty and a rascal. In a very fascinating passage, Apollonius disclosed to our eyes a picture of Cypris and her heavenly guests, Hera and Athena: As soon as her guests begged her to order her 'boy' to

charm the Colchian princess with love for Jason, she began to complain of her son's conduct and behaviour.[218] No human mother could have complained more bitterly. Bogies which were used as an instrument for frightening disobedient children and for re-establishing the paternal prestige among people[219] were sought for the gods' children. Callimachus, as we have already seen used it to pacify the disobedient daughter of Ocean.[220]

The tendency of the age towards realism reached its climax in the treatment of the individual man and the current manners of society. The poets took the greatest interest in dealing with familiar incidents of every day life depicted with realistic and faithful vein. These few pictures of the deities I have already given, in which they played a role of human beings typical to men and women moving in the Alexandrian society is but an aspect of this new excessive passion for realism. If elegy, humns and epic introduced us indirectly to this society, it is in the Idylls of Theocritus, the mimes of Herodas and the epigram that the interest in social phenomena becomes more noticeable. In the first place, it was Theocritus who gave realistic scenes from shepherd and town life. His poem 'The women at the Adonis-Festival'[221] is the most brilliant

extant specimen of Alexandrian realism.[222] The poem is full of many and various pictures. Here Alexandria is described; people, especially women, were dealt with; and their behaviours and customs were faithfully and artistically delineated. Wives are expressing themselves naturally.[223] Proxinoa complains of her husband. She does not feel ashamed to call this wretched husband bad names in the presence of her baby. Although her friend Gorgo seemed wiser,[224] yet is unwilling to miss this golden opportunity of complaining also of her husband.[225] Proxinoa's inhuman treatment of her maid-servant is dramatically displayed.[226] The friends talk about Proxinoa's gown, its style, price and the manner in which it is made up is marvellously expressed. It is the kind of conversation in which women of every age and country are interested.[227] The crowd in the streets of Alexandria and the bustle at the royal palace gate were keenly observed and graphically described. The next master of realism and photographer of society is Herodas,[228] the mimographer and imitator of Theocritus. But this genuine realist is of different type. He is more akin to Menander than to Theocritus. His interest lies generally in the seamy side of the contemporary life, of which he earnestly took notice and alertly

pictured. In one of his mimes,[229] he gives us a picture of a schoolmaster, a complaining mother and a naughty son, who destroys things and takes no heed of his lesson. Having been besought by the mother to beat her son, our respectable pedagogue undertook his favourite job gladly and thrashed the boy cruelly. This is a realistic picture which I have known in reality in my childhood. In another[230] he introduces us to an unpleasant scene of an old and rich woman, who treats with sadistic cruelty her slave and at the same time her paramour, who she suspects to be unfaithful to her. His other mimes treat similar themes, some of which are rather obscene.

Realism can be still seen in the passion of the poets of this period for art and their admiration and appreciation of works of the different kinds of fine arts. A few examples[231] suffice to show the aesthetic sense of these poets. Looking at the draperies, hung between the pillars in the great hall of the royal palace, Theocritus, with an artist's eye deems their embroideries to be almost divinely made.[232] The passion for art is obvious in Herodas. One of his mimes deals exclusively with two principal sorts of fine art: sculpture and painting. The setting of this mime is

Cos in the sanctuary of Asclepius, god of medicine. Two women are seen in the temple with a cock in hand to be dedicated to the deity. On gaining a sight of the temple-statues, they were exceedingly enchanted and began to express their admiration and personal appreciation of special statues in the manner of experts or amateurs in a gallery of works of art. What appealed to their artistic taste were the statues carved by Praxiteles' sons Cephisodotus and Timarchus, on the altar of the Asclepieum[233] and the 'Sacrifice' of Apelles of Ephesus.[234] One is tempted to think that Herodas was an admirer of his contemporary artists whom he preferred to their predecessors. But it is ridiculous to put into the mouth of these two humble women who admittedly have not this high understanding of art, his aesthetic pronouncements. It is not however a personal shortcoming. All the poets of this period share with him the tendency to show their learning whatever the character delineated may be.

Their attitude towards nature is surprisingly manifest. Traces of the poets' feeling for nature, appreciation or rather adoration of natural scenes, are not few in the poetic productions of the period. One meets them in elegy, epics and above all in the idyllic

pastoral poems where charming landscapes are marvellously portrayed and the epigram in the small cadre of which nature is depicted in vignettes. Again if poets did not describe nature directly they used to touch it in metaphoric pictures. Their method of dealing with nature and natural phenomena, so it seems to me, is basically realistic. They are not necessarily dreamers but realists whose pens graphically depict what their eyes really see; in other words, they approach nature generally, through scientific observation. Sometimes their metaphors drawn from nature are in some ways not poetic at all. One example from the Argonautica shows this scientific bent. When Apollonius described Medea's feelings and fear about Jason's fight with the bulls, he compared her trembling heart to a sunbeam reflected from moving water in a vessel.[235] Such comparison is purely Alexandrian. In some other passages in the Argonautica, Apollonius proves that he can be simpler and rather more spontaneous. After he gave Jason's speech which captivated Medea, he speaks of her warm heart as melting away like the dew melts away round roses when warmed by the morning light.[236] At the end of this period Meleager, a lover of flowers wrote a 'spring song' which is lyric in tone and shows the poet's

excessive idolisation of nature with its smiling flowers and laughing meadows.[237] It is Theocritus however who is singled out from the Alexandrian poets as the prolific singer of nature. Professor Körte goes further and considered him as standing alone among the Greek poets.[238] His bucolic or pastoral idylls - the rural mimes - go far to justify the claim that in his feeling for nature, his love for it and his wide knowledge of natural phenomena, he cannot be surpassed or even rivalled. Although he followed in the steps of his fellow-countryman Sophron, he is universally considered the originator of pastoral poetry. If this is true - and it is not far from truth - we are then dealing with a new type which is purely Alexandrian. The most striking fact about Theocritus' pastorals is that they are realistic and that the characters depicted by the poet exist in reality. Unlike his contemporary poets he composed these poems from personal experience not from books and compilations. Being a native of Sicily, the country of the most beautiful and charming landscapes and the land of shepherds, goatherds and cowherds, he was able to get in touch with nature and to know country life at first hand. Again the truth prevailing in his poems, the freshness of the

treatment and the excessive interest the poet showed in his characters gave his songs a subjective colour akin to that of the epigram of the period which hardly exist with intense emphasis outside these two types. What delights Theocritus most is the sights and sounds connected with the country and country life. Thus his ever watchful eyes and sharp ears delight in the humming of the bee, the cooling shade of the trees, the murmur of fountains and the sound of falling water, the grasshopper or cicada chirping in the sun, the twittering of birds and the hens flapping their wings. These are the favourite sights and sounds of his characters who admire their country and their country life. Many of his similes are likewise rural characteristics: animals, trees, fruits, productions of the farm etc. The beloved Galatea is in Polyphemus' eyes whiter than pressed milk, tenderer than the lamb, more playful than the calf, more plump than a shiny unripe grape.[239] Sometimes he turns from his limited world and draws some pictures from the sea. Simaetha, who was cruelly abandoned by her boy-friend, contrasts her restless longing of her heart with the quiet of the sea and calmness of the wind.[240] Apart from mythological figures whom he, compared with his contemporaries, depicted rather

mildly and reservedly, his other characters are most human in word and deed. They are both good and bad. They are so honestly and strikingly described in their rustic environment that a complete picture of the small society of shepherds and husbandmen is marvellously attained. Their songs in which they sing their own joys, are but glorifications of nature, their trade, their cattles and their beloved. All this is well represented in the 'Second country singing Match'.[241]

I pass now to deal with the love theme which came in this period into fashion and was industriously treated by all the poets whether they are in love or not. It is the favourite and common theme of elegy, epic, epyllia, idyll and above all of the epigram. At the beginning of the period some elegiac poets composed collections of love poems. Alexander Aetolus wrote the Apollo, love-stories with unhappy endings. Hermesianax' Leontion in three books deals with the same subject. Athenaeus preserved a catalogue of lover poets and some philosophers. Phanocles wrote Erotes, a catalogue poem dealing with the love of gods and heroes for fair boys. These, as they seem, are of objectively erotic content. In fact no poem of any considerable length which smacks of subjective love has reached us. Such poems may

never have existed. The poets might have contented themselves by expressing the joys or pangs of love in shorter elegy or epigram.[242] Notwithstanding this, it is strikingly conspicuous that there existed among the first masters of the school a vigorous tendency to describe very precisely the state of mind and heart of the heroes and heroines in their treatment of amorous adventures, if not for the first time, at least with a change of emphasis. Some of them succeeded in handling their themes to such an extent that the poems seemed to have a subjective tone. The minute descriptions of the souls of the lovers, their fears, hopes and despairs, which were dealt with in a rather detailed and progressive way - all of which was meant to win over the reader or listener - gave rise to what we call now 'Romanticism'. It is in the elegy of Callimachus, the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius and in the love idylls and epyllia that 'romanticism' first saw the light of the day. Romantic elements and treatment is obvious in Callimachus' Cydippe and Aeontius,[243] the first romantic elegy of ancient world. Signs of romantic handling are not missing in the 'Lock of Berenice'. Apollonius' third book of the Argonautica is but a sentimental and romantic modern novel.

Apollonius' Medea is original in creation and treatment. She contrasts sharply with the Medea of Euripides. She is no more a hard-hearted sorceress but an innocent and feeble virgin who absolutely surrendered to the powers of love. This story of Medea's falling in love with Jason is a wonderful psychological study of a woman's heart, the analysis of which is full of delicacy, power and brilliancy. The whole theme is absolutely original and stands unique among all Greek romantic love stories written in either poetry or prose. To illustrate this, I give an example of the mastery of Apollonius in dissecting of Medea's emotions. It is night and nature is calm. There is no barking of dogs through the city, no sound of men's voices. All went to bed and silence prevailed everywhere. In this quiet atmosphere, Medea alone is wakeful. What a contrast! A fierce struggle between her love for Jason and her dutiful love for her father is now taking place in her tender breast. In this sleepless agony she has to choose between saving Jason from the jaws of the dreadful bulls or otherwise. But how can she lose him? This is the most difficult question for an inexperienced girl whom Eros shot unaware with his darts. Clashing thoughts come to her mind which she studies restlessly. At times she decides to give him the charms to work a spell on the bulls,

then she hesitates from fear of her father. She goes on for a time thinking and thinking till at last Love for Jason triumphantly induced her to provide him with the charm.[244] Such is what Apollonius pursued in the story of Medea and Jason. Theocritus showed the same romantic note in his idylls and epyllia. His charming descriptions of nature and the delicate delineation of his lovers contributed much to the creation of romanticism in this period. He was the first to subject the beauties of nature to the power of the beloved. The beloved's presence gives nature life and charm, while her absence makes its overwhelming sights and their associations dull and dead.[245] His Simaetha, the girl of the Spell, is an excellent short romance. Here reality is mingled with fancy and their combination is exceptionally striking. It is the story which can be told in any place and in every age; but for the few mythological allusions, the story seems to me modern in treatment. Simaetha's love for Delphis is real. It comes through the eyes not through the traditional agency of Eros and his shafts. How wonderfully this wretched lover told her story to Σελήνη in a romantic scene bathed in the pale light of the moon. She told the goddess everything about her tragic position as one

whom her lover made no wife and left to her shame no maid. Theocritus' realism and art are obvious when he described her soon after she was smitten in her heart. It is so real and minute that one could not help sympathizing with her: colour went from her cheek, she is in bed, love stricken invalid for ten days and nights, she is pale as the boxwood, her hair begins to fall and she is nothing but skin and bone. The thing which strikes me most, is Simaetha's visits to the charmer or witch to have a spell put on Delphis to make him love her. These charmers surprisingly enough are to be found particularly at Alexandria even to-day; they are visited by girls of all nationalities whose love has been unrequited. I know a Greek girl who spends all her living on spells.[246] It can be said now that the Alexandrians originated romanticism and handed it down to posterity to develop it in its own way.

It is now time to finish this chapter by a rough study of the style and metre. The language in which these scholar poets used to compose their poems is, on set purpose, different from the current language in this period, κοινὴ διάλεκτος. This cosmopolitan language which is drawn mainly from Attic seems to them not the right medium for scholarly expression. It is

not subtle, not pure and above all is written by persons of non-Hellenic or at least mixed descent at whose hands it suffered much and lost all peculiarities of a literary language. It seems to me that there are still other reasons for avoiding the ordinary spoken language. Their eagerness for reaching some degree of the excellence of the classical poetic genres made them stick generally to the old literary dialects, the peculiarities of which were disclosed to their eyes through the hard work of classifying and revising the old poetic types. Again their tendency to write for a certain class of people - their own circle of savants and the highly cultured - kept them away from expressing themselves in the language of the man in the street. Professor Page's witty statement about these poets is fairly sound: 'common speech is abhorrent to them and "to be understood by the vulgar" seems accounted a disgrace'.[247] From the dialectical point of view, there are signs sufficient enough to disclose those poets' tendency and practice of using whatever dialect was traditionally correct for the form they imitated or adapted. Apollonius, for example, used in his epic work, the Argonautica, the traditional dialect of Homer, the epic - a mixture of Aeolic with Ionic. Theocritus in his love-poems used

the Aeolic dialect in the manner of the Lesbian Alcaeus and Sappho.[248] In his 'Book of Iambi', Callimachus adopted Hipponax' dialect, the Ionic - the Ionic popular dialect - it was not an easy job for a poet, Dorian by descent, to write in this particular dialect. In Professor Körte's opinion, 'This is not the language which was spoken in the streets of Miletus and Ephesus in the time of Callimachus, but, as we learn from Ionic inscriptions, a dialect which for a long time had been obsolete, a language therefore which the Dorian Callimachus learned out of books'.[249] In fact, like Callimachus, other poets had to learn the dialects they chose as a medium for their compositions. Fortunately, as scholars, they had the patience and energy to tackle any difficulty so long as they were interested in their compositions. Again due to the ever growing tendency towards realism, the poets chose to write for special reasons in dialects other than the traditional media for certain genres as we have already seen. Although Theocritus of Syracuse and Callimachus of Cyrene tried their hands at other dialects than their own native dialect, the Doric, yet they used the Doric whenever they thought more of the country or the place in which or for which they wrote and also in giving a vivid and

real picture of the characters delineated. Thus the rural and urban idylls of Theocritus which were written either in Sicily or Cos were written in Doric. The fifth Hymn of Callimachus, The Bath of Pallas,[250] which was written in Doric for a festival held at Argos.[251] Theocritus' idyll, XV 'The Women at the Adonis-Festival', the characters of which are Syracusians, the poet did not concern himself with the fact that the piece was set at Alexandria, but thought much of his Syracusian characters whom he wished to introduce to the city with their native dialect. This undoubtedly gave a dramatic effect to the subject. What kind of Doric did Theocritus and Callimachus use? Is it their native dialect? The question is not easy to answer with certainty. The inscriptions of both Sicily and Cyrene do not help us much. Professor Legrand thinks that it may be a literary language.[252] Herodas used to write his mimes in Doric when the setting took place in a dorian land; otherwise he uses the Ionic dialect. Moreover the conventional practice of the Alexandrians both in language and metre is to break the traditional bonds and to free themselves from restrictions so as to claim for originality and novelty. In this way their poems exhibit a mixture of two or even more dialects. Whatever

might be the modern criticism on this peculiarity carried out boldly and without reserve, it was intentionally meant for displaying their adroitness in dialects and for giving a certain flavour to their expressions. This practice was not altogether new; the Attic dramatists gave a doric colour to their own language. One could not consider a poet like Theocritus erroneous when he introduced doric forms in many of his epyllia. He must have thought to water down the traditional dialect of the gods and heroes with another dialect; the Dorian, in order to reduce it to the ordinary standard. This explanation, which may seem strange, conforms with the way the Alexandrians followed in treating the gods in general. This tendency of combining dialects can be traced still in the epics and epyllia written in this period. Although the composers of these two genres kept to the Homeric vocabulary, they were not strict in confining themselves to the vocabulary of their master and model. Apollonius whose Argonautica is meant to be an imitation of Homer did not escape the use of words drawn from non-Homeric sources. Aratus, an editor of Homer's Odyssey and imitator of Hesiod showed in his Phaenomena the same practice. Again Rhianus, who published a Homeric

edition, can be considered, more than any Alexandrian epic writer, in using old words in the new epic, revealed himself in his Messeniaca, an epic rich in myth, history and geography, audacious in introducing new vocabulary in his poem. These scholar poets were not only fond of archaic and dialectical words, but they had a peculiar liking for rare words which they used to meet in their studies or consult in glosses. The writings of Callimachus, and above all, of Lycophron, Euphorion and Nicander are full of these curious words. Glosses were available at that time. Just before the period begins Philitas of Cos, the tutor of Ptolemy Philadelphus and a grammarian and poet at the same time, collected and explained words - drawn especially from epic - which were seldom used.[253] This compilation, so it seems, was purposely made for helping those who were not familiar with archaic words. Callimachus too might have tried the same thing. As far as the archaic and rare words or glosses are concerned, Lycophron and Euphorion had the worst reputation among their contemporaries. The latter was harshly attacked by Crates the grammarian in a mischievous epigram. He says:-

καὶ κατάγλωσσ' ἐπόει τὰ ποιήματα, καὶ τὰ Φιλητᾶ
ἀτρεκέως ἤδει· καὶ γὰρ Ὁμηρικὸς ἦν.[254]

'..... and made his poems full of glosses[255] (in rare or far-fetched language) and knew those of Philetas well, for he was also a follower of Homer'. The excessive passion of the Alexandrians for creation and innovation can be seen in their artificial vocabulary. It is an inevitable consequence of the pedantry and affectation of these poets with whom simplicity should be thrown to the winds. I will give some examples to illustrate their technique. There was a tendency towards lengthening or modifying or even shortening the word which was used long ago such as ψαλάσσω[256] for ψάλλω, ταρμύσσω[257] for ταρβέω, τάρροθος[258] for ἐπιτάρροθος. Formation of compound words formed from a combination of a preposition and the word governing it as παριστίδιος[259] were common. But the majority of compounds were intended to give a description with emphasized effect more realistic and picturesque. These are formed from a noun and adjective such as: μελαμψήφις[260], applied to stream running on black pebbles and κυάνοφρυς[261], applied to a young girl with dark-brow. Sometimes the compound is but a paraphrase or a worked out reference to a man or woman practising certain trade, as for example, ἐρυσίχθων[262], applied to the ox which in reality tears up the earth or δικτυβόλος, a synonym to a fisherman who casts the

net.[263] In forming their compounds, these learned poets went beyond what is reasonable. Lycophron's phrase 'τριέσπερος λέων' gives us a typical but not usual enigma. Who could realize that it alludes to Heracles unless he knows the legend of Zeus and Alcmene and their son Heracles who was begotten in three nights. Callimachus did the same thing but he is more intelligible though still obscure. He thought that such epithets συοκτόνος and λεοντάγχης can refer to Heracles who could easily be understood. Their liking of long words which we have already seen in forming compound words is most conspicuous in such words used by Cercidas: ῥυπακιβδοτόκων, συαπλουτοσύναι and πιμελοσαρκοφαγεῖν.[264] Their vocabulary is copious and varied. They invented new words and owing to their scientific bent increased the technical terms.

From the stylistic point of view, Alexandrian poetic compositions had their own peculiarities. I have already referred to them in more than one place and I shall therefore rather add to what I said before than repeat myself here. In a general account on the stylistic characteristics of the poetic school at Alexandria, one is obliged to deal only with the common features which, in their generalization, cannot give an exact or

minute picture of those personal peculiarities of the members who formed the school during the whole period. Anyhow the fact that all follow more or less set and well established principles which were either originated or imitated, helps us in speaking of the chief stylistic workmanship favoured by the mounting tide of the new taste. Faithful to their scholarly bent, these poets used to display in their compositions all manners of learned studies. Such is conspicous in the language which is a strange blend of archaism and neologism which becomes shocking in the poems of Lycophron and Euphorion who deliberately strove after enigmatic expressions by using obsolete words and coining curious new words too. Again these compositions are more or less heavy owing to the accumulations of proper names which encumber the statements: names of cities, mythological heroes, geographical, ethnical and patronymical names are not infrequent especially in the epics, elegies and hymns. Incapable of continuing the spontaniety and straightforward manner of the old poets who generally expressed themselves unaffectedly and in whose simplicity lies every sort of charm, these poets strove after devising any artificial aid for drawing the attention and striking the feeling. Such aids which are rhetorical in essence

were already at hand. Some generations before them, Gorgias introduced into prose rhetorical and artificial devices and the Athenians were most excited and impressed by his speech full of antithesis, parallelism and assonance.[265] Hegesias of Magnesia in the middle of the third century B.C., to whom the full development of the Asiatic style is commonly attributed, not only showed in his writings the same devices taught by Gorgias but also carried them out excessively.[266] He is responsible in giving 'rise to an artificial style which depended for its effects on epigrams, strained metaphors, false antitheses, over elaborated rhythms and the like.'[267] It was inevitable that such prosaic and rhetorical devices meant for excitement could not enter the realm of poetry in a period the poets of which took the greatest pains to introduce into their poems every kind of exciting spices. The tendency to bring into use such aids can be understood from what Neoptolemus of Parium (third century B.C.) stated in his 'Poetics'. He required for the more elaborate poems such qualities as splendour, harmony, gravity.[268] Andromenides,[269] whose date cannot be fixed, went further. According to his views "what was most becoming in poets was the careful elaboration of speech, their task being not to say what

others say, but rather to speak as no others can, and to work out for themselves a clear utterance, making use of the rhythms, the sounds, and the happy sequences (ἁρμονίαι) of the Muses".[270] In the light of the sophistic teachings - the influence of which may seem to some scholars doubtful - the asiatic style movement - a contemporary influence which was undoubtedly at work - and the poetic pronouncements of these critics who could be considered as successors of Plato or Aristotle, together with the influence of Antimachus and his school and Philetas, the immediate pioneer of the school, the poetic style and workmanship is best understood. The poems of the time are full of all sorts of rhetorical devices and artifices; figures of speech were frequently used especially in epigram. The metaphor and the simile especially seemed more natural to these poems than to the rest. One meets in the epics, especially in the Argonautica, the idylls of Theocritus, the hymns of Callimachus many exquisite similes and metaphors. The poems of the earlier period were not void of such artifices. Homer's Iliad and Odyssey give much more exciting metaphoric descriptions, but neither he nor the other poets seemed always keen to make use of metaphors in their descriptions. They could be plain

straightforward ones. The Alexandrians, on the other hand seem to me more fond of such artifices. They were to their thinking a favourite medium for displaying their learning and they conform with their taste of giving realistic, romantic and sometimes scientific descriptions. Their compositions moreover are rich in delicate and curious conceits, abound in antitheses, assonance, and other ornamental devices. They took the greatest pains in their writings. Apollonius, for instance, spent all his life in writing and revising and improving his Argonautica. So did the others. They are not altogether inspired poets but hard-working poetasters. This is justified by Philetas' πολλὰ μογήσας[271] and Callimachus' Ἀρήτου σύντονος ἀγρυπνίης.[272] The hard-working poets spent their time not without profit. The best works of the period show how the poets made great efforts to reach a high standard in their writings and they succeeded in reaching their goal. Their endeavour to write in a fine or rather over-fine style is apparent everywhere and justifies what Professor Couat says about their interest for form and the refinement of style: "To their thinking, a man's life did not seem to have been ill spent, if it had been devoted to writing polished verse, to searching

for striking epithets and to inventing striking alliterations".[273] Due to their unwearied workmanship, their poems - and I am here speaking of the best - are overflowing with elegant, beautiful, effective and selected expressions, exquisite and charming descriptions, all of which make certain that the Alexandrians are masters of form. This excellence of form which was carried to the highest point in the best works, had its beauty. But there is a big difference between a virgin and natural beauty and an artificial one, a result of labour and polish. Here lies the sheer contrast between the classical poetry and the Alexandrian. The latter reminds me of a garden full of pretty distractions: it abounds in flowers of every kind decked with varied colours and redolent with fragrance. These flowers, once imported from far and wide were evidently planted and kept by gardeners of the greatest skill. The garden moreover attracts the eye by many evidences of artistic workmanship,-paths covered with mosaics of dazzling hue, and breathing statues of marble or rare Egyptian stone. It is a garden such as graced the palaces of the Ptolemies and their courtiers in the Brucheion or the Royal Greek Macedonian quarter. To the lover of the classical meadow with only its wild, natural beauty and

the scent and colour of the flowers scattered through it, the artificial garden with its embelishments man-made, appears lifeless and dull. This allegorical picture occurs to me whenever I read some passages from the two periods, the classical and the Alexandrian.

Metre and metrical technique need only one or two words. In this particular sphere the Alexandrians revealed themselves simpler than their ancesstors both in their choice of metres and in using them. They showed but feeble enthusiasm for the rather complicated lyric media. Their favourite metres in which the majority of their poems were written, are the hexameter, the elegiac and to a certain extent the iambic. The preference for these metres as vehicles to express the various themes cultivated by the Alexandrians is not without significance. Unlike the classical bards, the Alexandrian did not compose - so it seems - poems to be sung. The new tendency favoured more the reading or the recitation of poems. These metres which adapt themselves very well to recitation suit the new taste. I have already referred to the Alexandrians' tendency towards mixing styles and kinds of poetry and that it was due to their practice that the rigid rules of the past concerning the application of a particular metre

to a special theme was almost thrown into the air. The poets did not trouble themselves any more with the separating lines which once existed among the different genres. This new motion widened the range of certain metres which began in their hands to be used for purposes often far different from those to which they were traditionally confined. This can be easily justified by the use of two metres: the epic hexameter and the elegiac couplet. I will concern myself with these two metric forms; for most of the surviving remains of this period were composed in them. Again the elegiac must need a special care, since it is almost the only medium used by the Alexandrian epigrammatists.

According to the Alexandrian practice, the hexameter acquired some new colours. Although it continued to be the metre of epic compositions such as the Argonautica, it was dexterously used for shorter epics, ἐπύλλια, and hymns. It may seem from the first sight that there is no innovation made by the Alexandrians in writing these themes in this particular metre and that they simply continued the traditional conventions. But anyone who studies the characteristics of these genres carefully has not the least hesitation to acknowledge that it is certainly an innovation. The epic in the

hands of Apollonius and others, the epyllia in the hands of Callimachus, Theocritus and others, and finally the hymns written by Callimachus and Theocritus,all these differ in treatment, as we have already seen, from those composed in classical times. They acquired new features such as romantic accomplishment, adventures of love, analyses of sentiments, the descriptions of the pangs of heart, the realistic delineation of every-day life and so on. To the hexameter, the grand and dignified metre, these poems with such characteristics are quite new. How many a passage in Callimachus' and Theocritus' hymns and pastoral poems at least are pure lyrics written in hexameters. Professor Barber's clever notice is worth quoting: 'It is significant that Theocritus modernizes Pindar and Stesichorus by re-writing their lyric compositions in hexameters'.[274]

The elegiac couplet was in fact the Alexandrians' favourite. It was applied in their hands to a great variety of subject matter. In the first place it continued to be the vehicle of the elegy handed down to them from earlier times especially the Ionian which attracted them more: that subjective elegy of Mimnerus, for example, in which he glorifies love and praises the enjoyment of life or the narrative one originated also

by Mimnermus and Antimachus after him. The best Alexandrian example of the latter is Callimachus' Aetia which is in reality epic material written in elegiac form. Again it could be used as a medium for writing hymns. So did Callimachus in the hymn of the 'Bath of Pallas'. Moreover it could rival the iambus in expressing personal satire as did Callimachus in the prologue to the Aetia. It could be adapted for triumphal ode as Callimachus' ἐπινίκιον εἰς Σωσίβιον[275] which is, as Professor Couat states, a reduction into elegiac form of the Pindaric odes.[276] Finally, the ancient and lyrical Scolia and the drinking songs, as we shall see later, were very successfully written in elegiac couplet.

In their metrical handling and masterful technical accomplishment, the Alexandrians are hardly surpassed. With the same unwearied workmanship they showed in the linguistic and stylistic field, they handled metres with utmost care on strictly scientific methods. The metres in their hands, began to acquire certain features sometimes unkown before and diligently imitated and pursued after them. Due to gradual refinement, they became polished, elegant and smooth. The care they took in the arrangement of words in the lines produced

in the hands of poets like Callimachus a happy combination of sense and sound. Again the assonance which they strove to produce by the same symmetrical order of words was meant, so it seems to me, to replace the music which, as a rule, used to accompany the classical poems. In so doing the poems became musical in themselves without any outer aid. These characteristics are most noticeable in the elegiac couplet. The Alexandrians took great pains in developing this metre to such an extent that it owed much to their technical mastery. I will give some examples to show how elegiac couplet, especially the pentameter, developed a new strength in the third century. The attempt to achieve harmony, melody, variety of tones and force is most manifest in the way the Alexandrians usually followed in the learned construction of the pentameter. A few examples which I picked at random illustrate some of the achievements of this new metrical workmanship. The most noticeable practice adopted in Alexandrian versification is the assonance especially in the two halves or hemistichs of the pentameter. Here are some instances:

'Ὀρφεύς, / πάντοίους ‖ δ' ἐξάνεπεισε θεούς 277
[καὶ Βέρ]ενίκειος ‖ καλὸς ἐγὼ πλόκαμος, 278

The order of words in the lines is studied and practised with the greatest care but not without elaboration. In the case of qualified nouns, the position of the noun and its adjective varied. The adjective is put at the end of the first hemistich and the noun at the beginning of the second. Again the adjective and the noun are put at the beginning of the two hemistichs. But the most common favourite effect is that of an adjective at the end of the first hemistich and its corresponding noun at the end of the second. This gives a sort of balance to the two hemistichs:

'Αργιόπην μαλακοῦ // πνεῦμα λαβὰν βιότου. 279

The position of the nouns in relation to the genitives that depend on them was elaborately treated, but the common practice is that the genitive precedes its noun. Sometimes the genitive ends the first hemistich and its noun - in any other case - is put at the end of the second:

Βάκχου καὶ λωτοῦ // πιστότατον τάμιήν 280

Sometimes the genitive comes at the end of the first hemistich and its noun begins the second:

καὶ δεινὴ μυθῶν // κῆδος ἔχουσ', ἀρετή 281

The Alexandrians' fondness of long words is revealed in the close of pentameters; but the use of a

word of three syllables predominates. Finally they were careful to end the couplets with important words such as a noun or a verb. These are some of many devices they intentionally practised in their elegiac couplets, all of which show how they treated this metre in a rather scientific or artificial way.

With this modest survey on metre and versification, the account on the characteristics of the Alexandrian school comes to an end. These characteristics are well summarized by Professor Robinson Elis: 'Precision in form and metre, refinement in diction, a learning often degenerating into pedantry and obscurity, a resolute avoidance of everything commonplace in subject, sentiment or allusion'.[282]

Finally although this is not the place for giving a judgement on the poets with whose works I dealt rather superficially, yet, seeing opinions still differ very widely about their literary personality and mastery, I have some claim to give them a due and impartial judgement. It is not always wise to compare them with their inimitable and unrivalled predecessors and draw a conclusion that they are far inferior to them. Our criticism, it seems to me, will be fair and worthwhile, if we concentrate our thoughts on what they achieved and

the influence they exerted on those who succeeded them. In this way we shall accord them their proper place, be it good or bad. Notwithstanding their vices and shortcomings, I admire the sincerity and devotion to their art which they showed in their perfection of the stylistic and metrical accomplishments. If they are imitators and adaptors, they are good artists who were able to put to good use the inventions made by their famous predecessors. They showed signs of originality. Romanticism and adventurous love owed their existence to them. Literary epic and pastoral idylls are Alexandrian in spirit and essence. Had not Callimachus and Euphorion (one should also add the name Philetas although he is not Alexandrian), written elegies, the long-lived Roman elegy would have not reached its high standard. This is not all; the literature of the West owes to the Alexandrians more than it does to the Classical poets. If so, why do we hesitate to give the poets of the Alexandrian period[283] their due place as inspirers, no less than their predecessors, of world-literature.

In closing a long and dull preface, some apology for its length and dullness is necessary. But it is manifest that it is wholly impossible to comprehend the

Alexandrian epigram unless we have a clear notion of the characteristics of the poets who are almost epigrammatists and contributed to the development of the genre.

NOTES ON CHAPTER I

1. J. W. Mackail, Lectures on Greek Poetry, p. 192.
2. Knaack, P.W. vol. I. p. 1399.
3. Professor Knaack, op. cit., p. 1399.
4. Professor Knaack, op. cit., p. 1399.
5. PH. - E Legrand, La Poésie Alexandrine, p. 14.
6. 'Hellenistic' is a newly coined term. The great historian Johann Droysen the author of 'Geschichte des Hellenismus', (vol. I, 1836 and vol. II, 1843) was its originator.
7. George Heinrich Klippel, Ueber das alexandrinische Museum, Gottingen, 1938, p. 66, quoted in Parsons (Ed. Alex.) The Alexandrian Library, p. 89.
8. Klippel, op. cit, p. 87 quoted in Parsons 'The Alexandrian Library', p. 90.
9. Couat (Alexandrian Poetry under the first three Ptolemies, London, 1931) p. 11.
10. PH. E. Legrand, La Poesie Alexandrine, p. 14.
10a. The Hellenistic Poetry (tr. by J. Hammer and M. Hadas New York, 1939) p. 91.
11. Kingsley (Alexandria and her Schools, Cambridge, 1854, p. 39.) calls it 'The literary Ptolemaic Era'.
12. It is too late - so it seems to me - to get rid of this newly coined name which is only suitable for historical researches on the period from after the death of Alexander to the final

subjection of his successors' empire. The term can adapt itself as a name of the literary production of the whole period only when it is subdivided and given particular names for each part.

13. It may be called also 'The Period of the Diadochi or the Transitional Period'.

14. It may be also termed 'The Period of the Epigoni'.

15. Professor Skemp of Durham University, Professor Gundert and Professor Nesselhauf of Freiburg University and Professor Herter of Bonn University. Professor Herter's views on the term 'Alexandrian' need some further discussions. In his letter to me (dated 19,9,1952) he states the following:"In (1) a more accurate sense, the beginning of the Alexandrian period of poetry can be fixed first of all for the time, when Alexandria assumed the leading position, that is under Philadelphus. In (2) a more general sense "Alexandrian" is taken for 'Hellenistic', that is starting with the period of Alexander the Great. (3) The real problem is to find out, if poets like Philetas had already developed the characteristics of the poetry during the reign

of Philadelphus or if their work is a transition".
In his first statement (marked 1) Professor Herter agrees with my present views. In his statement (marked 2) he is still harping on the same chord as the scholars to whom I referred in the foregoing pages. Here I cannot agree with him at all. As for statement (marked 3), I hesitate to consider Philetas Alexandrian simply because he came to Alexandria in his fifties. He was already dead before Philadelphus became the King of Egypt. It is true that what reached us from his poetry - fifty disconnected lines belonging to poems of different kinds (Couat, op. cit. p.72) - show signs of the distinguishing features of the Alexandrian poetry, but, as the majority of his writings were written in Cos where he acted as the head of the Coan school of poetry, I would consider him only as a representative of Cos, a literary centre which exerted, like other centres, as Samos for instance, some influence on the Alexandrian school. The Alexandrian poetry begins with Callimachus and Theocritus and their followers whose poetic productions have given the Alexandrian school of

poetry its special characteristics.

16. Theocr. Idyll XV.

17. This will be fully treated later.

18. According to Aelian (Var. Hist. XIII.22) he built a temple which was adorned with a seated statue of the poet, surrounded by emblems of the cities which claimed his birth.

19. Strabo, Geography, XVII, I. 8. C. 793-794.

20. Couat, op. cit, p.11 cf. Josephus: Jewish Antiquities, Book XII-2-I.

21. Deipnosophistae, I, 3. b.

22. For the original text of Plautine Scholium (A fragment);see a plate facing p.106 in Parsons (op. cit.)-See also pp.106-121.

23. There is another library, a smaller branch, established in the Serapeum, in the original Rhakotis or the Egyptian native quarter. This library contained, as the same Scholiast states, 42,800 volumes. These books were either less important than those in the big one or duplicates. This library contained also the workshop where the papyrus were made and manuscripts were copied (Couat, Op. Cit. p.20).

24. For the librarianship of Callimachus, see Appendix I.

25. Ritschel, Die alexandrinischen Bibliotheken, Breslau, 1838, pp.3-4 (quoted from Parsons, op. cit. p.18). The same number is mentioned by Johannes Tzetzes' Prolegomena to Aristophanes (Kaibel, Comicorum Gr. Frag, Berlin 1899, p.18 ff.)

26. Suidas: 'Πίνακες τῶν ἐν πάσῃ παιδείᾳ διαλαμψάντων καὶ ὧν συνέγραψαν ἐν βιβλίοις κ' καὶ ρ'.

27. John Edwin Sandys, A history of Classical scholarship, vol. I, p.123.

28. Aristophanes of Byzantium wrote a catalogue of the Library (Ath. 336E) and also a work on the 'Πίνακες' of Callimachus (Ath. 408 F.)

29. 17. I.8. C.794.

30. De Architectura, 5. 11. 2.

31. Diogenes Laert. IV. 3. 19.

32. Ibid. V.2. 51 et seq.

33. The examination of the texts was carried out according to the following processes: διόρθωσις, ἀνάγνωσις, τέχνη, ἐξήγησις and κρίσις.

34. Suidas. s.v. Ζηνόδοτος.

35. I shall content myself with some examples of the first originator of the scholarly movement. Moreover in dealing with these scholars and their

works, I do not mean to give a history of scholarship but to show only what influence the works of these scholars have on the literature of the period.

36 Scholium II of Tzetzes on Greek Comedy: §19 in Studemund's article in Philologus, 46(1888) p.10, ἱστέον ὅτι Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Αἰτωλὸς καὶ Λυκόφρων ὁ Χαλκιδεὺς ὑπὸ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου πεοτραπέντες τὰς σκηνικὰς διώρθωσαν βίβλους. Λυκόφρων μὲν τὰς τῆς κωμῳδίας, Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ τὰς τῆς τραγῳδίας.; ib § 21 τὰς δέ γε σκηνικὰς Ἀλέξανδρός τε.... καὶ Λυκόφρων διωρθώσαντο. τὰς δέ γε ποιητικὰς Ζηνόδοτος πρῶτον καὶ ὕστερον Ἀρίσταρχος διωρθώσαντο. (Quoted in Sandys, op. cit., p.119).

37 The number is not exaggerated, if we consider that some of the works are mere pamphlets.

38 I am for the moment dealing with his prose works, or those which were presumably in prose.

39 Not in Suidas; see A. W. Mair, Callimachus and Lycophron, (L.C.L.) p.13

40 Athenaeus mentions this treatise slightly differently as 'περὶ ὀρνίθων'. IX,388,d.

41 Athen. 329 A (=fr. 38. Schneider); Not in Suidas; Mair, op. cit. p.13.

42. Not in Suidas; Mair, op. cit. p.13.

43. Not in Suidas; Mair, op. cit. p.13.

44. Sandys, op. cit. p.5.

45. Lycophron wrote a treatise on Comedy in at least eleven books: Callimachus wrote also πίναξ καὶ ἀναγραφὴ τῶν κατὰ χρόνους καὶ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένων διδασκάλων, Table and register of dramatic poets, chronologically, from the earliest times. This treatise which was mentioned by Suidas seems to be a part of his πίνακες.

46. Sandys, op. cit. p. 127.

47. 'These have survived in an abridged forms in the Arguments (ὑποθέσεις) prefixed to their plays'. (Sandys. op. cit. p.129.)

48. XV. 671 f.

49. Ath. XIV. c and d.

50. Att. I. 14. 3.

51. Ars Poetica. 450.

52. 800 books, Suidas, s.v. Ἀριστοφάνης; many of these must be mere pamphlets.

53. See Sandys. op. cit. 132 etc.

54. Except Alcaeus and Archilochus.

55. πρὸς Φιλήταν (Didym. zu Il. I, 97, II, 798, XXIV, 110) cf. Cohn (PW. vol. II,p.863, s.v.Aristarchus)

56. πρὸς τὸ Ξενώνος παράδοξον (Didym. zu Il. XII. 435 gegen die chorizonten gerichtet). Cohn (op. cit., p.863).

57. Ath. I, 22 D:

πολλοὶ μὲν βόσκονται ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πολυφύλῳ βιβλιακὰ χαρακῖται ἀπείριτα θηριόωντες Μουσέων ἐν ταλάρῳ.

This may have been written against Zenodotus the earliest editor of Homer. This is what I gather from Diog. Laert. ix. 113.

58. Idyll, vii, 47-8.

59. Fr. lxii, Meineke; quoted in Couat's op. cit. note 3, p. 518

60. This will be dealt with under'The literary quarrel at Alexandria'.

61. 5, 22.

62. A.P. IX. 64. (MS Palatinus, Ascepiades or Archias).

63. ll. 1-6.

64. A.P. IX. 507. (Mair, 29; Wil. 27; Cahen, 28; also Arati Vita (West. p. 54.)

65. ἀπομάττειν in Plato Tim. 50 e is translated by Cornford 'take impressions of' (shapes in some soft substance). The middle rather than the passive seems to be implied in Aristotle Eth.Nic.

1172a, 13, where the accusative object of the verb is lost in the οἷς with ἀρέσκονται. Thus here probably the middle with the accusative means "allowed himself to take the impress of". So ἐκμάσσεται ἴχνη (κονίᾳ) in Theocritus XVII, 122. Even so, however, ἀπεμάξατο is difficult and the possible sense of 'levelling off for oneself' of a measure of meal (e.g. Theocritus, XV, 95) cannot be excluded.

66. It is universally believed that Callimachus refers to Hesiod's 'Works and Days', 383 ff.

67. The style of this epigram is either affected or inaccurate. Such an inaccuracy misled some commentators who formed a different idea which never entered Callimachus' head. Dilthey (De Callim. Cydip. p. 11) thinks that Callimachus in this epigram preferred Hesiod to Homer. In order to justify such a view he substituted θέσφατον for ἔσχατον (1.2.) and maintains that the former signifies Homer. Although this word is used by Homer (Od. VII, 143 etc.), this does not justify the idea that it signifies Homer and so I do not see that this audacious conjecture is a plausible one. Abiding on the same thought,

Dilthey (op. cit, p.9) thinks that these lines (Callim. Strabo XIV, p.638) ll 3-4:

..... Ὁμήρειον δὲ καλεῦμαι
γράμμα· Κρεωφύλῳ, Ζεῦ φίλε, τοῦτο μέγα.

which form the point of an epigram on the cyclic poet, Creophylus, the author of the 'Capture of Oechalia', are directed against Homer himself. This is far from truth. Callimachus meant by this ironical ending to rail at Creophylus. Callimachus' hatred of the cyclic poets is well known: (Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν - A.P. XII. 43, 1-1). On this point, see Appendix II. Couat also believes the same thing although his way is different. In his own words: (op. cit., Note 2, pp. 521-522): 'It seems to me that the words οὐ τὸν ἀοιδῶν ἔσχατον make quite good sense, if in them we see a figure of speech, an understatement. Their meaning is: Aratus imitated the greatest of poets (Hesiod), but I fear that he has not been very successful'. This explanation again is not convincing since the meaning given does not conform with the Greek text. The truth is then that Callimachus pays a friendly tribute to Aratus for some

reason which is difficult to define. Leonidas of Tarentum did the same (A.P. IX. 25).

68. A.P. IX. 64, 7-8.

69. A.P. IX. 207, 2-3; On no authority Couat (op. cit. p.96.) changes the phrase to ' τὸν μελιχρότατον τῶν ἐπέων', 'the sweetest of all poets'. Callimachus, as it is clear from all readings which agree at the neuter accusative 'τό' referring to the poem not the poet, alludes to one of the poet's works (i.e. the 'Works and Days' as I said before).

70. Callimachus and Others (Mair, L.C.L) p.319.

71. For another instance which proves Callimachus' originality (like manner) in using his model, cf. Works and Days, 225 et seq, 240 et seq with Hymn iii, 124 et seq.

72. Cf. Hesiod's 'Works and Days', 106 et seq with Aratus' Phaenomena, 105 et seq.

73. Op. cit. p.67.

74. A.P.IX. 63, 4.

75. A.P.IX. 168.

76. An elegiac collection called after the poet's beloved.

77. A.P.IX. 168, 1-2.

78. A.P. vii. 409, by error committed by scribe C, this epigram was attributed to Antipater of Thessalonica.

79. Schol. Dion. Perieg. ap. Schneid. Callim. 74B.

80. Such as the mysteries of Demeter, the adventures of Bellerophon, the flight of the Thessalians into Asia in pursuit of Triopas and the legend of Oedipus.

81. A.P. XII. 43.

82. Strabo. XIV, 638; Mair, 7; Wil. 6; Cahen 6.

83. I am here only summing up his views, with which I will deal in detail in my account on the 'Literary quarrel'.

84. Euphorion and Rhianus.

85. Peisander, the author of Heraclea and Panyasis, the composer of another Heraclea.

86. So says Heraclides Ponticus (Procl. In Ti, I.90. Diehl) and (O. Voss. fr.91).

87. The scholiast speaks of a resemblance between Antimachus and Apollonius in their account of the Golden Fleece in this phrase συμφώνως Ἀντιμάχῳ (Apollonius, Arg. Schol. IV, 156, ed. Kiel (quoted from Couat, p.309. N.2).

88. Professor Barber refers to such resemblance thus "The Artemis, if the first part of P Milan 17 contains excerpts from this poem, was written in hexameters and its careful recording of the goddess's titles and cults recalls the Hymn to Artemis of Callimachus" (v.s. Antimachus, Oxf. Class. Dict.)

89. Cf. Hermesianax, ap. Ath. 597 f, Strabo, 643.

90. Ox. Pap. 2079, ll. 9-12. Edmond's Elegy and Iambus, vol. I. P.84:

[ἦν ἔξοι]δ' [ἄ]ρ' ἐὼν [ὁλ]ιγόστιχος ἀλλὰ καθέλ[κει]
[δρῶν πο]λὺ τὴν μακρὴν ὄμπνια Θεσμοφόρο[ς,]
[τοῖν δὲ] δυοῖν Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκὺς αἰ κατὰ λεπτὸν
[ὧδε μέν,] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή....'

91. Stob. Fl. 63.16. π. Ἀφροδίτης Μιμνέρμου, ll 1-5; Edmond's Elegy and Iambus, vol. I. p.88.

τίς δὲ βίος, τί δὲ τερπνὸν ἄτερ χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης;
τεθναίην ὅτε μοι μηκέτι ταῦτα μέλοι,
κρυπταδίη φιλότης καὶ μείλιχα δῶρα καὶ εὐνή,
οἷ' ἥβης ἄνθεα γίγνεται ἀρπαλέα
ἀνδράσιν ἠδὲ γυναιξίν· - - - - - - - - - - -

92. Frags 94,95 and 143. But these fragments are void of the vigorous abuse which we expect. The scholiast on Horace, Epod. VI,13. told us that

Lycambes was so bitterly attacked with abusive verses that he committed suicide. There is nothing in the fragments that justify that fact that Neobule or her sister or sisters committed suicide also. The epigrammatists (one Alexandrian - Dioscorides and some later ones) took up the theme, Lycambes' daughters, and treated the chastity of the maidens in sort of literary exercises or epideictic epitaphs: A.P. VII, 69, 70, 71, 351, 352.

93. A.P. IX. 518, 519, XI, 12, especially IX.519.

94. This treatment of a theme which is essentially iambic, in the form of elegy is one of Callimachus' masterful metric devices. It is also through him and the first exponent poets of the Alexandrian period, the practice of mingling poetic style became a fashion, i.e. to use a metre in expressing a particular theme never practised in the classical period.

95. Ox. Pap. 2079 (restored by Hunt - Lobel). These introductory lines may shed a light on this elegiac invective:-

1 [νῦν δὲ τ]ὸ μὲν Πελχῖνες* ἐπιτρύζουσι ἀ[λκές]
2 νήϊδες οἱ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι,

. . . . . .
7 [φημὶ δ]ὲ καὶ Τ[ελ]χῖσιν ἐγὼ τόδε· Φῦλον ἄ[ϊδρις]
8 [μοῦνον ἐὸν τήκ[ειν] ἦπαρ ἐπισταμένοις.(1-2 and7-8)

"But now mean Telchines - charlatans - who are no friends of the Muse murmur (against me)... And to the Telchines I say this: "You ignorant tribe, who are only skilled in wasting away your own liver,...."

* Telchines was Callimachus' name for his literary opponents in general.

96. fr. 223. This fragment cannot refer to Archilochus' satires at all as Couat (op. cit., p.521-522) says. The word 'προοίμιον' means a prelude, a hymn or short poem s.v. (Liddel and Scott). As Archilochus tried his hand at composing hymns (frags. 119, 120 Diehl), one of these must be the object of Callimachus' unfavourable criticism.

97. The scazon is more like an innovation than invention. It is only a slight variation of the iambic trimeter in the last foot where a spondee or a trochee takes place of the ordinary iambus.

98. Mime VIII, 76-79; A. D. Knox, Theophrastus Characters etc. p. 168.

99. Oxyrhynch. Papyr. 1011. Fol. 2 verso (in Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vii 1910, p.31 ff. ed. by

A. S. Hunt); Callimachus and others by G. R. Mair, p.272.

100. This Bupalos may have been Hipponax' rival in the love of a certain Arete. He is a butt of vehement and coarse attacks; (cf. frs. I, 13,15,20 , Diehl).

101. In contrast to Callimachus, cf. Horace: Epistles I, XIX, 23-25:

.....Parios ego primus iambos
Ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus
Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben.

(Yet he threatens to be like Archilochus or Hipponax if necessary, Epode VI.)

102. Callimachus' Iambi, ibid, Fol. 6. verso, Mair, p.288

Ἔφεσον ὅθεν πὰρ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλλοντες
τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ μαθὼς ἐναύονται.

103. Ath. 698 B.

104. There is among his fragments, one in which he made a fun at a certain Eurymedontiades the glutton (Knox' fr. 89). In this fragment composed in hexameters, the poet parodied some of Homer's expressions. The fragment runs thus:

Μοῦσά μοι Εὐρυμεδοντιάδεω τὴν πάγχυ τὸ χάρυβδιν
τὴν ἐγγαστριμάχαιραν, ὅς ἐσθίει οὐ κατὰ κόσμον,[a]

ἔνθεφ' ὅπως ψηφῖδι κακ(ὴ) κακὸν οἶτον ὄληται b
βουλῇ δημοσίῃ παρὰ θὶν' ἁλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο. c

a - Il. VIII. 179 etc.

b - Il. III . 417 etc.

c - Il. I. 316 etc.

105. See Barber, The Hellenistic Age, p.68 et seq; see also Couat, op. cit., p.603 et seq.

106. For Callimachus' lyrics which came to us in a very lamentably deteriorated state, see R. Pfeiffer's Callimachus, vol I, pp. 216-225. One of these (228 - I Fg. 1) comes from a funeral ode for Arsonoë who died in 270 B.C. This poem is also one of the many sorts of poems written for special occasions.

107. Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab conquest, by Idris Bell, pp 17-18.

108. Alcaeus, 126, 1, Edmonds' Lyr. Gr. I, p.398

109. Op. cit. p.325 N.1.

110. Apollonius' Argonautica III. 275-286.

111. Anacreontea, 33, 27-30 (Edmonds' Elegy and Iambus, II, p.62.

112. '...., Bei Euripides zuerst finden wir Eros wirklich mit dem Bogen ausgestattet, zunächst

wieder das poetische Bild für die: ἐπεί μ' ἔρως ἔτρωσεν, Hipp. 392, dann aber V.531 ff. Eros das Zeuskind, das der Aphrodite Geschoss entsendet; auf des Eros unentrinnbaren Bogen wird auch Eurip. Med. 530 f. angespielt. vgl. auch Iph. Aul. 548 f δίδυμα τόξα spannt Eros ὁ χρυσοκόμας dann es gibt zweierlei Liebe, usw'. Stengel, PW. vol. VI, p.494. But it is fair to add that Euripides was inspired by Aeschylus in giving Eros such attributes: Aeschyl. Prom. 649 f. Ζεὺς γὰρ ἱμέρου βέλει πρὸς σοῦ τέθαλπται.

113. Anacreon, 48 (Edmonds' Lyra Graeac, vol. II p.163)

114. Mahaffy. Greek Life and Thought, p.255.

115. Edmonds, op. cit. p.6.

116. ll. 1-8.

117. As the epigrammatists, Asclepiades, Theocritus, Callimachus, Meleager and others.

118. To call them mere 'conservatives' as sone scholars used to do, is rather inaccurate and does not conform with the nature of their writings, in which they old and the new meet. This is obvious in Apollonius' Argonautica and others as I show immediately.

119. One can hardly say that such passages of Pindar as

Ol. ii. 83-86 amount to a standing literary quarrel between Pindar and his rivals. There was, no doubt, personal animosity at the Court of Hiero.

120. Alfred Körte (Hellenistic Poetry, translated by Jacob Hammer and Moses Hadas, New York, 1929) p.177; E. A. Barber, Oxf. Class. Dict. S.V. Apollonius Rhodius; etc. My opinion, on the other hand is quite different; for I do not think that their posts in the Great Library at Alexandria have anything to do with their differences. On this question, See Appendix I. pp. 820 - 826.

121. Concerning this quarrel, Professor Mahaffy (Greek Life and Thought, p.267) enthusiastically refers the reader to Couat (op. cit. pp.523-542). To some extent Professor Mahaffy is right; for Couat was one of the few who took pains to give a connected account of this quarrel. To my thinking, however, he was unsuccessful. He began his account (p.523) in these words: "The complete story of the literary quarrel is unrolled before our eyes with sufficiently great probability". In the course of his treatment, he added: "Unfortunately too many documents have

been lost to make it easy or even possible to follow the course of the quarrel" (p.532) and his conclusion on this question runs thus: "Such then is the story of the quarrel between Apollonius and Callimachus. I have given its main incidents, without, however, being able to state with certainty in what order they followed one another" (p.541).

122. Oxyrh. Pap. No. 2079. I have used the reconstructed text of Professor Emile Cahen, Callimaque et son Oeuvre Poétique, (Paris, 1929), pp.646-647.

123. ll 3-5 :

[εἴνεκε]ν οὐχ ἕν ἄεισμα διηνεκές, ἠ βασιλ[
[....]ας, ἐν πολλαῖς ἤνυσα χιλιάσιν
[....]....ους ἥρωας, ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τοὔθεν ἑλ[ίσσω...

124. ll. 19-20.

[μηδ' ἀπ' ἐμεῦ διφᾶτε μέγα ψοφέο]υσαν ἀοιδήν
[τίκτεσθαι βρονταῖον δ' οὐκ ἐμόν, ἀλλ]ὰ Διός.

125. ll. 17-18.

[Ἄλλετε, Βασκανίης ὀλὸν γένος] αὖθι δὲ τέχνῃ
[κρίνετε μὴ σχοίνῳ Περσίδι τὴν σοφίην,

126. ll. 22-24.

....., Ἄπ[ό]λλων εἶπεν ὅ μοι Λύκιος
[«ἦ δεόν α]ἰεί, ἀοιδέ, τὸ μὲν θέος ὅττι πάχιστον
[ἄμμιφέρε]ιν μοῦσαν δ' ὦ γαθέ, λεπταλέην.

127. ll. 25-26.

[πρὸς δὲ σε] καὶ τοῦδ' ὤνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἄμαξαι
[τὰ στείβε]ιν, ...

128. ll. 26-27.

....., ἑτέρων (δ)' ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὁμά
[διφρον ἐλ]ᾶν .....

129. ll. 27-28.

.....ἀλλὰ κελεύθους
[σπεῦδ' ἰδί]ας, εἰ καὶ στεινοτέρην ἐλάσεις.»

130. These principles which are coined, as we have seen, in a variety of subtle and clever images are repeated now and then. In their expressions, as we shall see immediately, they reveal their composer's moods and illustrate the occasions which dictated them.

131. Professor Knaack, alexandrinische Litteratur, PW, vol. I. p.1402.

132. This surmise is very probable, because it is always the conquered not his conqueror who starts with vengence.

133. A.P. XII. 43 (Mair XXX; Wilamowitz, 28):-

Ἐχθαίρω τὸ παίγμα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ
χαίρω τίς πολλοὺς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε φέρει·

μισῶ καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον, οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης
πίνω· σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια.
Λυσανίη, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός· ἀλλὰ πρὶν εἰπεῖν
τοῦτο σαφῶς Ἤχώ, φησί τις "ἄλλος ἔχει."

I adopted Mair's punctuation after Ἤχώ in the last line. It gives it the point which Callimachus wishes to express.

134. On its meaning together with a historical account, see Appendix II.

135. It must not be forgotten that the present version of the Argonuatica, is a result of some revisions and much correction. This makes it very difficult to decide the dispute or rather speak of it with certainty.

136. 'The tale of the Argonauts had been told often before in verse and prose, and many authors' names are given in the Scholia to Apollonius, but their works have perished. The best known earlier account that we have is that in Pindar's fourth Pythian ode, from which Apollonius has taken many details (Seaton, R.C. Apoll. Rh. The Argon., p.X)'.

137. A.P.XI, 275:

Καλλίμαχος τὸ κάθαρμα, τὸ παίγνιον, ὁ ξύλινος νοῦς.
αἴτιος ὁ γράψας Αἴτια Καλλίμαχος.

'De auctore igitur minime constat; Apollonio Rhodio abiudicavit Bernhardy, Griech·Lit-Gesch. III^{3}, p.303, cf. Wil. GGN 1893, p.746 et Hell. Dicht. II.96 sq. reddidit Apollonio Rhodio sine iusta causa M. Pohlenz, GGN, 1929, p.153 sq. (Professor Pfeiffer [Callimachus, II, Oxford, 1953) p.XCIX]). Is it, however, reasonable to deny that Apollonius may have written one epigram once on this theme?

138. 'Time and again he is called the pupil of Callimachus; his work exhibits indubitably the influence of Callimachus in metre, language and many details (Alfred Körte, op. cit. p.177). Professor Pfeiffer referred in his book (Callimachus, vol.II. Oxford, 1953 to Apollonius' use of Callimachus: 'In primis nunc id (de quo nemo unquam dubitare debuit) constat Apollonium Rhodium non solum Hecalam, sed etiam Aetia passim imitatum esse' this statement is followed By some examples, cf. pp.XLI-XLII. Callimachus' works which escaped Apollonius' notice are

referred to also by Professor Pfeiffer: 'Moneo neque Comae Berenices neque Invectivae in Telchinas neque Hymni II certa vestigea apud Apllonium inveniri posse' (p.XLII).

139. Hymn II, To Apollo. ll 105-112:-

ὁ Φθόνος Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπ' οὔατα λάθριος εἶπεν
"οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει."[106]
τὸν Φθόνον ὠπόλλων ποδί τ' ἤλασεν ὧδέ τ' ἔειπεν·
"Ἀσσυρίου ποταμοῖο μέγας ῥόος, ἀλλὰ τὰ πολλὰ
λύματα γῆς καὶ πολλὸν ἐφ' ὕδατι συρφετὸν ἕλκει.
Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι Μέλισσαι,
ἀλλ' ἥτις καθαρή τε καὶ ἀχραάντοιο ἀνέρπει
πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον."

140. The translation of πόντος by 'sea' is attacked by Professor Rose who says ('I cannot admire that bard who sings not even as much as Pontus'.). This at first sight would seem to mean 'as much as the sea' which is pure nonsense, the sea being proverbially noisy and 'not even' therefore meaningless. It requires a meaning, however, when we recollect that Pontos is, by one account, the father of the spiteful Telchines, and that Telchines was Callimachus' name for his literary opponents in general, op. cit. p.325.) · Professor

Rose owes this idea to Professor Barber who says 'It is even possible that the mysterious πόντος of l. 106 is to be explained by reference to the ancestory of the Telchines, for Tzetzes (Theog. 81 sqq. cited by Roscher s.v. Telchinen, p.238) asserts that they were the sons of Γῆ καὶ Πόντος. Was Apollonius pilloried as the father of the Βάσκανοι? (Class. Rev. XLVI, 1932, p.163-164). I am tempted to follow such opinion, although it seems far-fetched and disputed. Anyhow it suits the context.

141. This will be revealed immediately.

142. Mahaffy, op. cit. p.265.

143. Idyll VII, 45-48:

ὥς μοι καὶ τέκτων μέγ' ἀπέχθεται, ὅστις ἐρευνᾷ
ἶσον ὄρευς κορυφᾷ τελέσαι δόμον Ὠρομέδοντος,
καὶ Μοισᾶν ὄρνιχες ὅσοι ποτὶ Χῖον ἀηδὼ
ἀντία κακκύξοντες ἐτώσια μοχθίξοντι.

144. Fr. 359 Schneider; Ath. III. 72. A: "Ὅτι Καλλίμαχος ὁ γραμματικὸς τὸ μέγα βιβλίον ἴσον ἔλεγεν εἶναι τῷ μεγάλῳ κακῷ."

145. A.P. IX. 507, ll. 3-4.

146. l. 932 ff.

147. Mair (A. W.) Callimachus etc. p.5.

148. Seaton, op. cit. p.viii.

149. Couat (op. cit. pp.536-538) discussed all the known explanations. None of them convinced me personally.

150. Op. cit., p.538.

151. For Apollonius' imitations from Homer, Callimachus and Antimachus, see Merkel Proleg. p.xxxvii (quoted in Couat, op. cit. N.1. pp.538-539).

152. Greek Poetry and Life, p.344.

153. Ovid's Ibis, l. 449.

154. op. cit., ll. 55-62.

Nunc quo Battiades inimicum devovet Ibin,
Hoc ego devoveo teque tuosque modo.
Utque ille, historiis involvam carmina caecis:
Non soleam quamvis hoc genus ipse sequi.
Illius ambages imitatus in Ibide dicar
Oblitus moris indiciique mei
Et quoniam, qui sis, nondum quaerentibus edo,
Ibidis interea tu quoque nomen habe; ...

155. Schol. Callim. Hymn. Apoll. 106 : ἐγκαλεῖ διὰ τούτων τοὺς σκώπτοντας αὐτὸν μὴ δύνασθαι ποῆσαι μέγα ποίημα ὅθεν ἠναγκάσθη ποιῆσαι τὴν Ἑκάλην.

156. Professor Couat thinks "The Hecale was not a defence, but a protest" (op, cit. p.408).

157 Callimachus may have drawn his information from Philochrus (fourth century B.C.) the most famous of the atthidographers. (See fr. 109 and Jacoby (Atthis, The local chronicles of Ancient Athens, Oxford, 1949) p. 128. A passage in Plutarch (Life of Theseus, XIV) may reveal Callimachus' dependence on Philochorus. In this passage Plutarch speaks of Theseus' fight with the Marathonian bull and his relation with the hospitable Hecale. At the end of the passage Plutarch mentions Philochorus as a source of a special point. Moreover Naeke and Schneider (quoted in Couat, op. cit. p. 381) think that Plutarch borrowed this account from Callimachus, a view which is rejected by Couat for several reasons which he mentions in pp. 381-382. In his conclusion, Couat says "In the Life of Theseus there occur five quotations from Philochorus and two from Demo (another atthidographer who flourished (300 B.C.)....It is natural that from among all these chroniclers he should have recourse to Philochorus, whose works on the fabled antiquities of Attica were quite indispensable for him.

Therefore, even if Plutarch had in mind the poem by Callimachus, he may none the less, well have resorted to Philochorus by preference for the exact information and the critical remarks about the legend of Hecale which necessarily must have been found in that author's writings. That was the source for the passage with which I am dealing" (op. cit. p.382). If we deduce anything from this quotation, we come to the conclusion that Philochorus was the most reliable source for this Attic legend. If so, - and it is almost certain - Callimachus could hardly have used another Atthidographer. But, according to his practice, he might have adapted the legend and given it a new and sensational shape. Moreover it is likely that Plutarch used Callimachus' Epyllion among other sources without citing it, as he did with the others.

158. See Professor Pfeiffer's Callimachus, vol. I. pp. 226-303.

159. One might compare the 'humanising'treatment of Polyphemus in Theocritus, Idyll VI.

160. A.P. IX, 545:

Καλλιμάχου τὸ τορεῶτον ἔπος τόδε· δὴ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ
ὠνὴρ τοὺς Μουσέων πάντας ἔσεσε κάλους.
ἀείδει δ' Ἑκάλης τε φιλοξείνοιο καλιὴν
καὶ Θησεῖ Μαραθῶν οὓς ἐπέθηκε πόνους,
τοῦ σοὶ καὶ νεαρὸν χειρῶν σθένος εἴη ἀρέσθαι,
Μάρκελλε, κλεινοῦ τ' αἶνον ἴσον βιότου.

161. 'The Hecale became an extraordinary favourite. In the Argonauts of Apollonius, which is but little later in date, its influence is noticeable'. (Alfred Körte op. cit. p.156); "Of the few lines of the Argonautica that appear to be imitations of Callimachus, almost all are borrowed from the Hecale,...." (Couat, op. cit. p.538) and see also the list by Professor Mair (Callimachus etc p.23).

162. There is no trace of any invective against Callimachus and his school written by his contemporaries besides those of Apollonius; but as it may be rightly inferred from the epigrams of later epigrammatists, there must have been some which were lost. It can be said with sufficient probability that the cruel charges of Antipater of Thessalonica (A.P. XI. 20), Philippus of Thessalonica (A.P. XI. 321) etc. are simply literary

exercises repeating what was said one day at Alexandria within the years of the quarrel. There is no rashness in assuming this. The fact that the later epigrammatists' epigrams were almost copies of some previous models is well attested.

163. If Callimachus meant by "ἀλλὰ κελεύθους/ [σ]πεῦδ' ἰδί]ας ἐ καὶ στεινοτέρην ἐλάσεις . Oxyr. papy. No. 2079. ll. 27-28" "Follow your own road, and even it be quite narrow" originality, and for sure he did, one must not take seriously. He is quite convinced that no Alexandrian poet can be regarded as original. Some other words can take its place: "wise imitation", 'free adaptation' or the like.

164. Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos, 1924, p.108.

165. Professor's Wilamowitz' date is based on the authority of Eusebius who placed it in Oly. 106-7 (356-352 B.C.) This seems to be the only reasonable one in ancient authorities. Suidas' statements on Erinna (s.v. Ἤρινν α) are inconsistent and also unhelpful. He is uncertain of what he states especially about her birth-place and date;

her birth-place is Tenos or Lesbos or Telos or Rhodes. He makes her a contemporary of Sappho "Ἦν δὲ ἑταίρα Σαπφοῦς, καὶ ὁμήχρονος". Anyhow his statements on her 'Distaff' "ποίημα δέ ἐστιν Αἰολικῇ καὶ Δωρίδι διαλέκτῳ ἐπῶν" and that on her death "τελευτᾷ δὲ παρθένος ἐννεακαιδεκέτις" are useful but well known a long time before him. Professor Bowra in two most illuminating articles on Erinna (New Chapters in the history of Greek literature, iii, Series, Oxford, 1933, pp.180-185 and Greek Poetry and Life, Oxford 1936, pp.325-342) of which I gratefully made use, wished to consider Erinna as an Alexandrian poetess. He says 'Though the evidence is scanty, it looks as if her short period of poetic activity took place in the first quarter of the third century' (New Chapters, p.184). Then he changes his mind three years later and considers her a forerunner of this period, he says 'if she did not herself belong to the Alexandrian Age, she was at least its forerunner - in her language, her metre, her choice of subject'. (Gr. Poetry and Life, pp. 341-342) This view of Professor Bowra is taken on the ground that there is similarity between

her and Theocritus. This is true, but this similarity I have taken to be merely reminiscences in him, as I state in the following pages. Again the simplicity of the Ἄλακάτα of which Professor Bowra is aware (Gr. Poetry and Life pp.337-338) cannot be the work of the Alexandrian School. Erinna is far simpler and more natural than Theocritus who is considered as free from the affectations and the other stylistic vices of his contemporaries. I am not in a weak position in stating that Erinna belongs to the fourth century (and probably to its middle). Almost all the scholars are of the same mind: cf, Crusius PW. vol. VI, p.455, R. Reitzenstein, Epig. und Skolion, p.143 and others.

166. A.P. VII, 11. the natural place of this epigram would be the ninth book.

167. A.P.VII.12 Anonymous; VII, 13 Leonidas or Meleager (Leonidae tantum apud Plan. tribuitur; Leonidae tribuunt plerique commentatores, Meleagro vero Hecker, Stadt müller. Wifstrand (Anthologie Grecque, Anthologie Palatine, par Pierre Waltz, Tome IV, p.62.)), VII. 713 by Antipater of Sidon. The last epigram is not sepulchral in

spirit.

168. A.P. VI. 353; VII, 710 and 713. Meleager's Stephanos must have included some more to justify Meleager's γλυκὺν Ἠρίννης παρθενόχρωτα κρόκον (A.P. IV, 11. 50-51).

169. A.P.IX.190. This anonymous epigram is attributed variously to Callimachus (Benndorf) Antipater of Sidon (Stadtmüller), Meleager (Wilamowitz):

Λέσβιον Ἠρίννης τόδε κηρίον· εἰ δέ τι μικρόν,
ἀλλ' ὅλον ἐκ Μουσέων κηρυάμενον μέλιτι.
οἱ δὲ τριηκόσιοι ταύτης στίχοι ἶσοι Ὁμήρῳ,
τῆς καὶ παρθενικῆς ἐννεακαιδεκέτεος·
ἣ καὶ ἐπ' ἠλακάτῃ μητρὸς φόβῳ, ἣ καὶ ἐφ' ἱστῷ
ἱστήκει Μουσέων λάτρις ἐφαπτομένη
Σαπφὼ δ' Ἠρίννης ὅσσον μελέεσσιν ἀμείνων,
Ἠρίννα Σαπφοῦς τόσσον ἐν ἑξαμέτροις.

In the last lines, where a kind of comparison between Erinna and Sappho is made, the poet seems to be dilettante and a careless critic. To make comparison on a metric basis is wrong. Sappho, made little use of hexameter only in some poems in her seventh book and Erinna's extant poems are not composed in lyrical metres. This poet could have made use of the common subject: the

intimate personal feelings towards their friends as a basis for comparison; for although Erinna treated a lyrical subject in other media than lyric, she expressed herself spontaneously like Sappho. Thus I am disinclined to attribute this epigram at least to Callimachus or Meleager. These two especially revealed themselves dexterous literary critics.

170. A.P. XI. 322. l. 3.

171. cf. Voss. Virg. Ecl. 8.73. (Liddell and Scott.) eighth ed.

172. II, 110.

173. cf. Erinna's Distaff. 25-27.

αἰ μικραῖς τ[όκα νῶϊν ὅσον] φόβον ἄγαγε Μο[ρμ]ώ,
τᾶ]α ἐν μὲν κο[ρυφαῖ μεγάλ' ὤατα ποσσὶ δ' ἐφοίτη
τέ]τρασιν· ἐκ δ' [ἑτέρας ἑτέραν] μετεβάλλετ' ὀπωπάν.

with Theocrit. XV.40.

αὐκ ἀξῶ τὸ τέκνον, μορμὼ δάκνει ἵππος.

and Callim. Hym. Artem. 70-1.

αὐτίκα τὴν κούρην μορμύσσεται, ἢ δὲ τεκοῦσης
δύσεται ἔσω κάλπιδος θερμέης ἐπὶ φάεσι χεῖρας.

By using 'μορύσσομαι' instead of Μορμώ, Callimachus wished, as he always did, to deviate from both Erinna and Theocritus.

174. cf. Erinna's Distaff 19-20

ταῦτά μοι ἐν καρδίαι καὶ νῦν γοερᾶι ἴχνια κεῖται θέρμ' ἔτι·

with Theocrit. XVII. 121-2

..... ὡς ἔτι θερμὰ κονία

στειβομένα καθύπερθε ποδῶν ἐκμάσσεται ἴχνη,...

and Vergil, Aen. IV. 23 'veteris vestigia flammae'.

175. Apollonius Rhodius, Argonautica III, Cambridge, 1928, p.xiv.

176. I must apologize for generalization which, I am quite sure, is very dangerous; but it is inevitable here, as I am only touching on the characteristics in a rather general way.

177. I shall deal with such poems later on.

178. M. Rostovtzeff, A History of the Ancient World (trans, from Russian by J. D. Duff, Oxford, 1925) vol. I. p.388. These discoveries include a considerable part of the classical and pre-Alexandrian literature which owe their existence to a great extent to the care of the scholars of Alexandria.

179. The Hellenistic Age (Cambridge, 1923) pp.32-33

180. Hymn Apol. 1. 108.

181. I take the liberty to consider the Phaenomena as an Alexandrian work; notwithstanding the fact that it was written in Macedonia at the demand of Antigonas Gonatas, Aratus was a friend of Theocritus. The latter dedicated Idyll VI to him. This dedication of this particular love-poem to Aratus the author of the Phaenomena is attested by the fact that Aratus tried his hands at amatory epigrams (cf. A.P. XII, 129). He also mentioned him several times in the seventh Idyll (l. 97-119. 122). The fact that this Idyll was written at Cos may with probability suggest that Aratus belonged once to the school of Philetas of which Theocritus was a member. Callimachus would not have praised his Phaenomena - A.P. IX. 507 - unless he knew him and unless Aratus' work met his taste. Some scholars, however, consider Aratus as a corresponding member of the school of Alexandria (Müller and Donaldson, History of the Literature of Ancient Greece) vol. II. p.428. Again the fact that Aratus, the first to use verse as a vehicle for scientific subjects, found in Nicander of Colophon some decades later, a successor outside Macedon, confirms the assumption

that Aratus belonged to the Alexandrian school. Nicander wrote two didactic poems: the Theriaca, which treats of remedies against bites of poisonous beasts, and the Alexipharmaca, which treats of remedies against food poisoning. These have been recently edited by Gow and Scholfield.

182. XIII. 25.

183. Argon. III. 226, 745, 957 etc.

184. Athen. XIV. p.620 F et seq.

185. Powell, Collectanea Alexandrina, p.238.

186. Bury, the Hellenistic Age (Cambridge 1923), p.11.

187. Fr. 55 (196) (Mair 'Callimachus' etc) p.323.

188. Idyl. XVII. 128-134. If these poets took interest in Egyptian mythology, which they never showed, Osiris and Isis, his sister and wife should have been mentioned.

189. Idyll. XVII.

190. Idyll. XIV.

191. Idyll. XV.

192. Such as Lycophron '...yet he is credited with the cleverness of writing an anagram which interpreted Ptolemy, as sweet as honey and Arsinoë, as violet' (Parsons. op. cit. p.140); Herodes paid a rather passing compliment in his first mime, 'The Bawd

or Matchmaker', ll. 27 et seq.

193. The bare facts of this occasional elegy can be summarized as follows:- Shortly after Euergites' marriage to his cousin Berenice, he set out for Syria to punish the murderers of his sister. His young wife vowed to the gods for his safe return a lock of her hair, which, on his return was dedicated to the gods. Unfortunately it mysteriously disappeared and Conon, the court astronomer paid the queen due homage by pretending that it was transformed into a new constellation among the fixed stars in heaven. This elegy did not reach us, as many of Callimachus' works, complete, and our knowledge of it was once derived mainly from Catullus' poem LXVI, which he acknowledges to be a translation from Callimachus (Catull.LXV, 15-16). Recent discoveries proved that Catullus was rather free in his translation. Professor Barber, who closely studied the two texts (The Lock of Berenice: Callimachus and Catullus, Greek Poetry and Life, pp.343-363), says "But that Catullus is no very sure guide was made sufficiently plain by the publication of 44-64 in 1929..... Nevertheless, though Catullus often found himself

compelled to depart a long way from his original, there is plenty of evidence that he was trying to reproduce not only the general gist, but also the peculiarities of phrase and structure which characterized the poem of Callimachus" (op. cit. p.344)

194. Müller and Donaldson, op. cit. vol. II p.432.

195. He is most probably referring to the assassination she arranged for her former betrothed, Demetrius the Fair, son of the Macedonian King Demetrius Poliocretes; Demetrius the Fair was killed in her mother's arms, with whom she had entered upon a liaison.

196. A.P. V. 146:

τέσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες· ποτὶ γὰρ μία τᾶις τρισὶ κείνας
ἄρτι ποτεπλάσθη, κἤτι μύραισι νοτεῖ·
εὐαίων ἐν πᾶσιν ἀρίζαλος Βερενίκα,
ἃς ἄτερ οὐδ' αὐταὶ καὶ Χάριτες Χάριτες.

197. Athen. VI. p.251.

198. Mythological erudition is noticeable in the last stanzas of the third poem, The Serenade. Is it not ridiculous that a simple shepherd utters such learned tales? This in itself shows that this serenade, like other poets' works, was only

written for people of high cultural standard.

199. Oxf. Class. Dict. s.v. Apollonius Rhodius.

200. Fr. 125 (442); Mair's Callimachus etc, p.345.

201. Op. cit. p.180.

202. s.v. Λυκόφρων.

203. Barber, op. cit. p.53.

204. Couat, op. cit. p.606 "Cos" must be a misprint for "Ceos".

205. There is some evidence for us to believe that Parthenius made use of Alexandrian poets like Apollonius Rhodius and Euphorion; see Professor Barber, op. cit. p.48.

206. Theocr. Idyl. VIII. 59-60:

..... ὦ πάτερ ὦ Ζεῦ,
οὐ μόνος ἠράσθην καὶ τὺ γυναικοφίλας.

207. Idyl. III. 1. 15. νῦν ἔγνων τὸν Ἔρωτα βαρὺς θεός.

208. Argon. III. 91-159.

209. This is illustrated in the amatory epigrams written by a big number of epigrammatists in this period.

210. Idylls II. The Spell, and XXVII, The Lovers' Talk.

211. Although the girl, Simaetha of Idyll II is Coan and Idyll XXVII is not urban, as it deals with shepherds' love, yet, being written by an Alexandrian poet whose experience and thorough

familiarity with Alexandria, justifies the fact that he has Alexandria's courtesans and its bon-vivants in mind when he wrote these two poems the characters of which appear to me urban-like ones.

212. idem (XXVII) 65:
παρθένος ἔνθα βέβηκα, γυνὴ δ' εἰς οἶκον ἀφέρπω.

213. Argon. III. 40-43.

214. Argon. III. 45-47. The 'golden comb' suits the epic grandeur. cf. the following note where Callimachus was content with a bronze toilet-article.

215. Hymn V, 'On the Bath of Pallas', 21-22; Cypris in both Apollonius and Callimachus is more reserved than Praximoa who cannot do without 'rouge' 'φῦκος,' (Theocr. XV. 16)

216. ibidem 25-26.

217. Argon. III, 40.

218. ibidem, 90-99.

219. Theocr. XV. 40.

220. Hymn. Artemis, 70-1.

221. Idyll, XV.

222. I chose this particular Idyll also for two reasons: first it is abounding in pictures and secondly

because its setting is Alexandria.

223. ibidem 8-10.

224. ibidem 11-13.

225. ibidem 18-20; but she is a concientious wife, for she realizes at the end of the festival that she must get back to prepare the dinner meal for her husband. (ibidem, 147-148).

226. ibidem, 29-32.

227. I shall return to Alexandrian realism once more in my account on the Alexandrian epigram and the epigram and the epigrammatists who were interested in the lower classes, such as Leonidas of Tarentum and his imitators. Cf. Chapter IV, pp. 549 sqq.

228. Cf. VI with Theocr. XV; cf. Rose, op. cit., p.339, note 33.

229. III. The Schoolmaster.

230. V. A Jealous Lady.

231. This is illustrated by many epigrams written on fine arts in this period.

232. XV, 78-83.

233. IV, 23 sq.

234. ibidem 73 sq.

235. III. 755-760.

236. ibidem, iii. 1019-21.

237. A.P. IX. 363; it is a hexametric piece of 23 lines. I cannot regard it an epigram at all. It is a lyric poem written in other media in the manner of the early masters of the period.

238. Op. cit. p.301.

239. XI, 19-21.

240. Idyll, II, 38-39.

241. Idyll, VIII.

242. Examples will be fully illustrated in my account on the epigrammatists who tried this particular theme.

243. a part of the Aetia.

244. III, 744-801.

245. VIII, the songs of Menalcas and Daphnis, 41-48.

246. I wonder if this magic custom came down from the Greeks of the third century B.C. I know from experience that the contemporary Greeks are superstitious, and that many of the superstitions prevailing at Alexandria originated from them.

247. Couat, op. cit. p.viii.

248. Idylls, XXVIII, XXIX and XXX.

249. Op. cit. p.122.

250. Hymn VI, To Demeter, was composed in Doric. There must be some reason for its being written in that

dialect which is not clear to us.

251. As to its destination, Susemihl holds that it was written to the order of the Argives for a festival of Pallas in that city. That is the view also of F. Spiro "Prolog und Epilog in Lykophrons Alexandra", Hermes xxiii (1888) p.194 ff; quoted in Mair's Callimachus etc., p.30.

252. Op. cit. p.116.

253. Cf. Athen. 383 B.

254. A.P. XI, 218, 3-4.

255. There may be an improper pun in κατάγλωσσος (κατα-γλωττιζω means 'to kiss wantonly by joining mouths and tongues'). But I believe that the grammarian is thinking first of all of the language not of what Euphorion's works contain.

256. Lyco. 139.

257. Lyco. 1177.

258. Lyco. 360, 400 etc.

259. A.P. VII. 726. 5 (Leonidas of Tarentum).

260. Callim. Hymns. III, 101 and IV, 76.

261. Theoc. Idylls III, 18 and XVII, 53.

262. Strabo ap. Ath. 382 E.

263. A.P. VI. 105.

264. Meliambs, II, 10; II, 15 and IV, 5.

265. E. E. Sikes, The Greek View of poetry, p.34.

266. Gillies; op. cit. p.xxvii.

267. Atkins, Literary Criticism in Antiquity, vol I, p. 167.

268. Atkins, op. cit. p.175.

269. 'As it seems he was an author of a book on hunting 'κυνηγετικά'; cf. Hesych. s. Ἐνοδία. Ἄρτεμις καὶ κυνηγετικά, ὡς Ἀνδρομενίδης (where, however, Kuester writes κυνηγετική according to Etym. Magn. 344, 42). We do not know anything else about it' (M. Wellmann. PW. vol. Suppl. I. p.80).

270. Atkins, op. cit. p.175.

271. Stobaeus, Floril, vol III, p. 109, l.3.

272. A.P. IX 507.

273. Couat, op. cit. p.545.

274. op. cit. p.52.

275. ἐπινίκιον ἐλεγειακὸν εἰς Σωσίβιον Ath, IV. p.144C.

276. op. cit. 559.

277. Hermesianax, Λεόντιον, Lib. III. 8. So also 6, 18, 22, 24, 30, 34, 36, 42, 56, 64, 68, 74, 80, 84, 92. See Powell's Collectanea Alexandrina, pp.98-100.

278. Callimachus, The Lock of Berenice, 62. See Cahen,

Callimaque et son Œuvre Poétique, p.644.

279. Hermesianax, 14. so also 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 18, 22, 24, 30, 32, 34, 36, 42, 44, 52, 58, 64, 68, 72, 74, 78, 80, 84, 92, 94, See Powell, op. cit. pp.98-100.

280. Hermesianax. 70.

281. Hermesianax. 82.

282. R. C. Seaton, Apollonius Rhodius, p.ix.

283. I am here thinking only of the first masters of the school with whom I almost concerned myself in this account. They are, it is true, dominating in all the period and taken as models. If some of their types which they cultivated did not survive them, the epigram continued and flourished during all the period and even after it came to an end. These earlier poets, were always followed by later poets as the acknowledged epigrammatists.

C H A P T E R II

T H E G R E E K E P I G R A M

B E F O R E T H E A L E X A N D R I A N S

- - oOo - -

The Alexandrian epigram, like any other poetic genre cultivated by the Alexandrians, was handed down from the old masters who originated these various poetic types and bequeathed them to the coming generations to serve as models, and to be either copied or adapted by poets who were usually inferior to them. These types - with the exception of 'Epigram' - were grown up and mature long before the Alexandrians handled them. No one among the Alexandrian poets had the least intention, as we have already seen, of rivalling their masters, but all without exception tried their best to reach the standard of their models, and this was difficult or even impossible for some of them. Compared with its related types, the epigram never reached the age of maturity in classical times in the way that epic, lyric and elegy did. And although it is older than tragedy and comedy, yet it stands far behind them in perfection or rather in fertility. The reasons for this are not difficult to find out. Epigramma, when it first saw the light of the sun, was in intention and practice something far from being considered as literary, and it took it long to put on any literary garb. However, one is not far from the truth in saying that the classical poets did not give their hearts to this odd branch of

literature as they did to other poetic productions. Had not the Persian Wars broken out the epigram would have remained a comparatively dull and sterile thing. Again, had not Simonides the Cean, fired with patriotism, touched it with his masterful and versatile genius, it would have reached the hands of the Alexandrians in a much lower and more deplorable state. Fortunately it became something in the hands of Simonides and his immediate successors. But notwithstanding the development attained at the hands of the Classical poets, the epigram had better fortune with the Alexandrians whose originality - which is disputed as far as other types are concerned - in this particular genre is far from being disputed. In fact the Classical period left the epigram half way along its journey of progressive development, and the Alexandrians, as we shall see, completed the other half successfully. It is in this field that the Alexandrians are interesting to study, for they are no longer imitators but to a great extent originators.

The relation between the Alexandrian epigram and the classical is exactly the same as that of a parent and his offspring. The parent has his own traits and his offspring has his own individual features as well

as his family likeness. It is advisable therefore, before dealing with the particular features of the offspring-epigram, to try to pass lightly over the characteristics of the parent-epigram. In this way the family likeness and unlikeness will be discernible and above all the work of the Alexandrian poets will be judged with greater justice.

In making a study of the epigram at Alexandria that will lead to full understanding of its peculiarities, certain questions about the earlier epigramma[1] should be treated with a special stress, such as:- When did epigram become a distinct branch of literature? What are the different themes that were attempted by the classical poets? Was the epideictic sepulchral epigram the first among the epideictic themes, and when was it composed? Such questions are not easy to answer; for the extant remains are scanty and many epigrams which were attributed to some earlier poets are mere forgery. Here I shall allow myself to conjecture and discuss the scholars' views in the light of common sense.

Epigramma (ἐπίγραμμα) as its etymology indicates is originally anything that is inscribed. To inscribe a brief phrase on stones, metals or the like was the

custom of the Greeks at a very early period of their history. This occurred on the tombs, on different objects dedicated to divinities, on monuments such as those erected to commemorate heroic deeds, the statues of distinguished persons, especially victors in public games, and occasionally signposts. The most widespread and familiar in all Greek areas are those inscribed on tombs and votive offerings. In this way the epigramma or inscription in its earliest usage was connected with the cemeteries and the temples of the gods. In other words it fell almost entirely under two heads: Sepulchral ἐπιτύμβια and dedicatory ἀναθηματικά. These are the chief specimens, the energetic development of which gave the epigramma an artistic form and this entitled it to be finally recognized as a literary type.

The oldest epigramma, sepulchral and dedicatory, showed certain characteristics from the point of view of the information they contained, the metrical vehicle and their style. Of the informative content, it is understood that epigramma was in practice considered as an explanatory note - call it label - which must give the necessary information, simply and plainly expressed, of the dead or the offering dedicated to a certain divinity, god or goddess. The earliest epigramma of

the seventh and the sixth centuries collected from many places in the peninsula proper and areas either in the east or west showed a great variety in their informative contents. In this they reveal the local tendencies, taste and workmanship. As far as sepulchral epigrammata[2] are concerned, some epitaphs bear the name of the dead and his father, as for instance:-

Στάλα Ξενφάρεος τοῦ Μηείξιος εἰμ' ἐπὶ τύμωι.[3]

'I am the gravestone (column) of Xenvares, son of Meixis, upon his grave'. The dead may be paid a certain tribute by mentioning a certain high quality of his, such as:

Χαιρεδήμου τόδε σῆμα πατὴρ ἔστη[σε θ]ανόντος[4]
Ἀνφιχάρ(η)ς ἀγαθὸν παῖδα ὀλοφυρόμενο[ς].[5]
Φαίδιμος ἐποίει.

'This tomb of Chaeredemus, his father Amphichares erected, mourning his brave son'. Others contain only the name of the deceased with the cause of death, such as the following:

Δφειγία τόδε [σῶμα], τὸν ὤλεσε πόντος ἀναι[δής].[6]

'This is the tomb of Dveinias, whom the ruthless sea destroyed'. Or that one in elegaic metre:-

Προκλείδας τόδε σῶμα κεκλήσεται ἐγγὺς ὁδοῖο
ὃς περὶ τὰς αὑτῶ γᾶς θάνε βαρνάμενος.[7]

'This tomb near the road will be called Procleidas', who died fighting for his own land'. I am inclined to add to these an unusual epitaph which seems to me to be the only one of its sort in classical times. Here the dead ends the epitaph with an imprecation upon the violator of his tomb:-

Σῆμα τόξ' Ἰδαμενεὺς ποιήσα, ἵνα κλέος εἴη·
Ζεὺ(δ) δὲ νιν ὅστις πημαίνοι λευγάλη θείη. [8]

'This tomb I, Idameneus, have made to keep my memory alive. May Zeus entirely bring into misery the one who causes it any harm'. The importance of this epigramma is that it became common from the third century on, in Lycia and after that in other parts of Asia Minor and the Mediterranean.[9] There is still another epigram which had a claim to be mentioned. It is, as it seems, the oldest type involving dialogue which flourished and developed in the Alexandrian period:

Καλλίας Αἰγίθ(θ)οιο· τὺ δ' οὐ πρὸς [σ', ὦ] παροδῶτα. [10]

'(This is the tomb of) Callias, son of Aegithus, but may you, passer-by, fare well!' - These are the prevailing specimens of epitaphs which the areas, although extended and rather free from definite conventions, provide. Turning to the dedicatory epigrammata, it is almost a common feature that they contain the

name of the dedicator and that of the divinity approached. Often we find the verb of dedication, for instance:-

Σιμίων μ' ἀνέθ<η>κε Ποτειδάϝων [ι Ϝάν]ακτι. [11]

'Simeon dedicated me to Lord Poseidon'.

In some others the dedicator asks the divinity for requital for the gift offered, for example:-

Μάντικλός μ' ἀνέθεικε Ϝεκαβόλοι ἀργυροτόξοι
τᾶς δεκάτας. τὺ δὲ Φοῖβε δίδοι χαρίϜεττάν ἀμοι[βάν]. [12]

'Manticlus dedicated me, a produce of the tenth (tithe) to the Far-shooter of the silver bow. Do thou, O Phoebus, give a kind return'. The dedicator may only express a wish, for instance:-

Νικόμαχός μ' ἐπόει
χαῖρε Ϝάνακς Ἡράκλες· ὁ τοι κεραμεύς μ' ἀνέθηκε
δὸς δέ Ϝ' ἐν ἀνθρώποις δόξαν ἔχειν ἀ(γ)αθ<ά>ν. [13]

'Nicomachus made me

Hail, Lord Heracles; the potter dedicated me; grant him to have good reputation among men'. Or he may merely wish for the acceptance of his ex-voto by the divinity; an example to this is the following:-

Εὐξάμενός με Φίλων δεκάταν ἀνέθηκε Λύκειον [14]
αὑτοῦ καὶ παίδων· τὺ δὲ δέξαι, Φοῖβε Ἄπολλον.

'Having vowed a tithe, Philo dedicated me as a

Lycian ex-voto from himself and his children: do thou receive it, Phoebus Apollo'.

These oldest epigrammata were written either in verse or in prose.[15] Outside Ionia, those which belong to the earliest times were without doubt composed in verse because prose was not yet invented and even after the invention of prose, it was not yet considered as a form of literary expression and so verse continued to be the vehicle because an inscription in verse is more easily remembered than any written in prose.

It is impossible to know exactly at what time metrical epigrammata began. It is probable that they were very ancient, but it is chiefly at the end of the sixth century and during the fifth that they spread widely and that this particular period produced the masterpieces of this metrical genre. The oldest epigrammata were composed in three metres: the hexameter, the metre of epic, the elegiac distichs, the medium of the Ionian elegy and the iambic trimeter.[16] Their composers - and they were not necessarily poets[17] - were free in using any metre they wished. This tendency was in time restricted in using almost one metre for the many centuries to come, the elegaic couplet. Of these metres, the hexameter seems to be the first in use. It was not

intentionally chosen as a vehicle for epigramma, but it happened that it was extant and long used by Homer. Here I wish to draw the attention to the fact that the first composers of the earliest hexametric epigrammata were not - at least the majority of them - poets, as I said before; and so they were content only, as is to be expected, with making use of the Homeric achievement both in metre and style.[18] The same thing can be said in respect of the other two metres, the elegiac and the trimeter. These were used in the same way, not because they are convenient vehicles for the composition of epigramma, but because they already existed. Again their dependence on the poets, elegists and lyrists, confirms the fact that these epigrammata or at least most of them were composed by those who were not poets but who knew by heart the works of the known poets. Miss Cragg can be said to share this view with me, when she says: 'When the custom arose in inscribing such poems upon stone, those who could not or would not employ the services of professional poets, turned poets themselves - they wrote indocti doctique - and the results are what might be expected'.[19] At any rate the earliest epigramma in its simplicity and brevity, seemed to need no extraordinary talent or masterful technique and their

compositions are within the power of an average amateur who can put some phrases and formulas in a metrical form. This, if I am right, will help us in understanding more and more the earliest epitaphs and dedicatory inscriptions before, strictly speaking, they were almost entirely composed by poets and began to acquire the poetic features. To return to hexametric epigramma, it is supposed that the most ancient composed in epic metre is that on Midas, the King of Phrygia 738-696 B.C. It is composed of four hexameter lines which runs thus:

χαλκῆ παρθένος εἰμὶ, Μίδα δ' ἐπὶ σήματι κεῖμαι.
ἔστ' ἂν ὕδωρ τε νάῃ, καὶ δένδρεα μακρὰ τεθήλῃ,
αὐτοῦ τῆδε μένουσα πολυκλαύτῳ ἐπὶ τύμβῳ,
ἀγγελέω παριοῦσι, Μίδας ὅτι τῆδε τέθαπται.

'I am a brazen maiden, and lie on Midas' grave. So long as water flows and tall trees shoot out their leaves, abiding here in this way upon the tomb of many tears, I shall tell those who pass by me that Midas is buried here'. It is after all different from the real hexametric epigramma I mentioned before.

Of the Iambic epigramma, a word or two could be said. Iambic was not used much and comes into view suddenly in the middle of the seventh century B.C. as a

vehicle of personal satire.[21] At the first sight one is astonished to see a metre, fundamentally satiric in practice, used in sepulchral and dedicatory epigramma. This use came into fashion simply, because, as I have just said, the tendency favoured the use of existing metres without taking much heed to the nature of the themes expressed by them. But one can say that it was used on purpose when the name of the dead or his father and that of the dedicator could not be cast in a different kind of metre. The following epitaph is an example where the proper name appears as the obvious reason for adopting the iambic metre:[22]

[λοι]μῶι θανούσης εἰμὶ [σῆ]μα Μυρ(ρ)ίνης.[23]

'I am the gravestone of Myrrina who died of the plague'. This metre, whatever the motive for using it may have been, revealed itself as a convenient vehicle for the composition of epigramma. Here is an example of an epitaph distinguished by simplicity and straightforwardness. It is free from any poetic colour and uses elision, prodelision and crasis correctly:-

Τόδ' Ἀρχίου 'στι σῆμα κἀδελφῆς φίλης·
Εὐκοσμίδης δὲ τοῦτ' ἐποίησεν καλόν·
στήλην δ' ἐπ' αὐτῶι θῆκε Φαίδιμο(ς) σοφός.[24]

'This is the monument of Archias and his beloved sister,

Eucosmides made it to be beautiful, and the clever Phaedimus put the slab over it'.

This is enough for the hexametric and iambic epigrammata, which are far fewer in number than those cast in elegiac couplets of which I am due to speak now. As far as epigramma and manuscript-epigram are concerned, the elegiac metre is their favoured vehicle for many centuries from the eighth century B.C. to about the tenth century A.D. Thus a word on this particular metre is needed espceially because it is the most popular with the Alexandrians and almost the only medium of the Alexandrian epigram. From the point of view of metrical structure, the elegiac verse is a variation upon the heroic hexameter;[25] in other words it came into being as an offshoot of the epic hexameter. In this case it must have been invented and employed after the hexameter and before the trimeter. It is thought that this metre was the invention of the Greek colonists of the eastern coast of the Aegean.[26] But who was its originator? Such question is fundamental for the study of epigram and its development. Again there are other questions which should be treated with special stress in order to throw a light on its nature, usage etc. Many questions concerning this metre are not easy to

answer and some of them are rather impossible to answer with certainty. We do not know for sure about its inventor. Horace many centuries ago asked the same question and reached no conclusion: 'Yet who was the inventor to put forth brief elegiacs, grammarians still dispute and the case has yet to be settled'. Horace was also obscure when he spoke of the first themes expressed by it. He said 'Verses joined unequally - hexameters and pentameters - contained first complainings, afterwards also the sentiment that has possession of the thing prayed for'.[28] What he meant by 'querimonia' and 'voti sententia compos' are not clear at all and I think we cannot usefully discuss them here. At any rate the first appearance of the elegiac couplets took place in the seventh century B.C. associated with the names of Callinus and Archilochus.[29] If Professors Blakeway and Hauvette are right, Archilochus could be regarded as the inventor or at least the first of whom we have any fragments of the oldest elegy. With regard to the themes cast in the elegiac couplets in the hands of Archilochus and the early elegists such as Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus, Solon, Theognis and Simonides, the elegiacs were, generally speaking, a vehicle of leisured poets writing for their own satisfaction, where they used to

talk about their personal emotions, sufferings and love. Such are the themes of the Ionian elegy in the hands of Archilochus and Mimnermus. They were also used from the beginning both in Greece itself and in the Aegean circles as a medium of a military cry exhorting the warriors to defend their homelands against invaders or simply as a feasting song sung in accompaniment of the flute in camps. Tyrtaeus and Archilochus were the first composers of these two military themes. In them again the poets used to speak of their experiences rather earnestly and express their thoughts and sometimes preach and give ethical lessons. This is what Thegonis of Megara, one of the gnomic poets used to do in his elegies to his young friend Kyrnus. Finally the elegiacs were used in Solon's hands for the expression of his own opinions on personal and political matters. In short the elegy up till the end of the fifth century was an expression of individual feelings: an echo of love affairs, joys and sorrows connected with misfortune in life-time, heroic exhortation to military valour, didactic or gnomic aids to the conduct of life socially and politically. In all these themes the personal note is always obvious. If these were the topic-themes of the early elegy and we must remember

that what reached us of the early elegiac output is incomplete and rather corrupted and sometimes apocryphal, how did it happen that the earliest epigrammata were composed in elegiac couplet? Here the scholars, and especially in recent years[30] occupied themselves with this question: Had the inscriptional epitaph a direct connection with the ἐπικήδειον the dirge which was sung actually over the dead body or the θρῆνος the song sung in memory of the dead? The one says yes, others say no. The question is not easy to answer with certainty, since we had no extant specimen of dirges in elegiac belonging for sure to the seventh century. Professor Friedländer makes good efforts in connecting ἔλεγος with lament or mourning. In order to convince us of the alleged fact that the use of the elegiacs for epitaphs originated from the elegies of mourning, he made an intelligent but unconvincing combination of the elegy of mourning and the ἐλεγεῖον on the tombstones. His statement is worth quoting. He says: 'One may ask whether there was not a direct connection between the elegy of mourning and the elegeion on the tombstones. We know far too little about the sepulchral rites of the Greeks to settle this question. But one should for a moment bring together three facts: that elegos meant

lament, that the elegy was recited to the accompaniment of the flute, and that the Sirens mourning and playing upon a flute are a familiar symbol on Greek sepulchres. It is not impossible, then, that - say,in the seventh century - elegies of mourning were sung to the flute at or after the burials of the great, and that the elegiac epitaph mirrored such a custom'.[31] This conception that the ἔλεγος is a lament is a later one and as it is clear, Professor Friedländer depends on Euripides.[32] This question is above bargaining or compromise. We must not forget that we are not certain about the origin of ἔλεγος and its derivation - if it is actually a Greek word - from the exclamation ἐ ἐ λεγειν[33] was not coined by the seventh century but by the fifth. It is in Euripides' hands and later writers, that ἔλεγος became a synonym of θρῆνος.[34] But the fact that Euripides' Andromache's Lament[35] in elegiacs has no traceable literary ancestor in the poems of the early elegists,[36] help us in assuming without much hesitation that the early elegiac epitaphs did not originate from threnody at all; in other words elegiacs were never used in the seventh century to convey a lament in the broad sense of the word. This can be easily proved by examples of early elegiac epitaphs where the grief, if

expressed, is firmly restrained; it is pathos rather than sorrow or pity. Here is a monument set up by a father to his son. There is no trace of written expressions of lament:

[Ἀριστίων Π]άριος [μ' ἐποίησεν].
Σῆμα πατὴρ Κλεόβουλος ἀποφθιμένωι Ξενοφάντωι
θῆκε τόδ' ἀντ' ἀρετῆς ἠδὲ σαοφροσύνης.[37]

'Father Cleobulus set up this monument to the dead Xenophantus, in honour of his valour and prudence'. In the following epitaph the buried virgin speaks. Her words stir sympathy, although grief is not expressed:

Σῆμα Φρασικλείας· κούρη κεκλήσομαι αἰεί
ἀντὶ γάμου παρὰ θεῶν τοῦτο λαχοῦσ' ὄνομα.
Ἀριστίων Πάρι[ος μ' ἐπ]ο[η]σε.[38]

'The tomb of Phrasicleia: maiden shall I be called always, a name I have obtained by the will of the gods in place of marriage

Aristion of Paros made me'.

Here is another epitaph where the dead asks only for pity. The lines run thus:[39]

Ἄνθρωπε, ὃς (σ)τείχεις καθ' ὁδὸν φρασὶν ἄλ(λ)α μενοινῶν,
στῆθι καὶ οἰκτίρον σῆμα Θρασώνος ἰδών.[40]

'Man, as you walk along the road, meditating in your mind on other desires, seeing the tomb of Thrason,

stop and pity (him)'. The following epitaph with which I end these illustrative examples is really an interesting one:

[Εἴτ' ἀστός τις ἀνὴρ εἴτε ξένος ἄλ(λ)οθεν ἐλθών
Τέτ(τ)ιχον οἰκτίρας ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν παρίτω
ἐν πολέμωι φθίμενον, νεαρὰν ἥβην ὀλέσαντα·
ταῦτ' ἀποδυράμενοι νεῖσθε ἐπὶ πρᾶγμ' ἀγαθόν.[41]

'Let everyone, whether townsman or stranger from abroad, who pass by, pity Tettichus, a brave man who died in battle and wasted his tender youth; lamenting this, proceed to good task'. This is one of the first elegiac epitaphs ever written, so it seems to me, to order by a professional poet. Its contents and the artistic and poetic treatment justify my conjecture. Here the dead distinguishes between two kinds of 'passer-by'; his country-men and strangers from abroad. In this the dead expects lament from all. The story of his death is alertly told and his characterisations are purposely disclosed. And finally the dead, undoubtedly under the influence of gnomic elegy, does not forget to give an admonition to those who move upon earth. Incidentally the second line of this epitaph is found in the last line of a later epitaph belonging to the fifth century or even later. This may indicate that

the former inspired the latter or that both made use of a certain model of which we know nothing.[42] I think that these examples which, as it is obvious, display but very moderate pathos, are sufficient to indicate that the ἐλεγεῖον was not used in the early sepulchral epigramma just because it is a vehicle for the expression of lament; and I quite agree with Professor Bowra who bravely contradicts Professor Friedländer and others[43] when he states that the oldest types of elegiac verse have little or nothing to do with lamentation.[44] But I still hold to my own views which I have already expressed. Here I should like to emphasize them again. These views or rather conjectures, I must say, depend on mere common sense no more. The more I think over the early epigramma with connection to hexameter, iambic trimeter and elegiac couplets, the more I am convinced with the assumption that the early inscriptions, which are not poetry in the full meaning of the word, but nothing more than informative labels in poetry written either by average amateurs or paid professional poetasters, kept pace with their period and in consequence of this, they were composed in the metric form à la mode without having the least idea of the convenience of the metrical medium to the theme or not. Thus the

epigrammata were composed at first in hexameter at the end of the heroic age when it was the only recognized metrical form. Then when the elegiac and the iambic trimeter appeared as vehicles for new types other than the epic and used by poets everywhere in Ionia and Greece itself, the hexameter, generally speaking,[45] gave way to the two new media. Let us concern ourselves here with the elegiac couplets.[46] The elegiacs in which military and convivial themes were already cast began to appear on epitaphs (and also in connection with offerings) simply because the metre came into fashion. How could it not be tried? From now onward they were used, though they were never the only metre in use. This is my own idea. It may be strange, but it is not unreasonable at all.

The big number of the inscriptional epigrams (so also of the epigrams which were never inscribed) composed in elegiacs compared with the minority of those composed in other media, can in itself show that the elegiacs were considered more suitable than the others in conveying the pathos, affection and grief of the nearest relatives of the dead. Notwithstanding the fact that from the earliest times poetic inscriptions were freely put in the mouth of the grave (sometimes in

the mouth of the dead himself) and votive offerings, these epigrammata, sepulchral and dedicatory, are a personal expression of those who erect the tomb or dedicate the votive offering. In this the elegiacs which had already revealed themselves as a device for personal expression, gave the epitaph the subjective tone in comparison with the objective of the hexametric one. This can be illustrated by examples. The following are two epigrammata of the sixth century B.C. The first is in hexameter while the second in elegiac couplet. Here is the first:

Πραξιτέλει τόδε μνᾶμα Fίσων ποιFησε θανό[ντι],
[τ]οῦτο δ' ἑταῖροι σᾶμα χέαν βαρέα στενάχοντες
Fέργων ἀντ' ἀγ[α]θῶν κἠπάμερον ἐξετέλεσ(σ)α[ν].[47]

'To Praxiteles Vison made this monument, and his companions, mourning grieviously, heaped up this tomb; it took them one day'.

The second runs thus:

Παι[δὸ]ς [ἐπ]οφθιμένοιο Κ[λεοί]του τοῦ Μενεσαίχμου
μνῆμ' ἐσορῶν οἴκτιρ', ὡς καλὸς ὢν ἔθανε.[48]

'As you behold the monument of Cleoitos, the dead child of Menesaechmus, mourn how beautiful he was, yet died.' In these two epitaphs, the metres can speak of themselves and show their particular characteristics.

The first is crammed with informative element and all are concerned with the monument and those who took part in getting it ready for the dead. If Vison is not the father of Praxtiles - and I doubt it - the dead is only introduced by his own name; and finally, although excessive mourning is expressed, the writer is objective. The second, on the other hand is different in tone. The lament asked for, is very moderate compared with that of the first, yet as a whole, the epitaph stirs the heart of the reader. Beauty as an alleged reason for grief should not be understood, so I feel, by the meanings of the words; it is only a way of singing with much sorrow the beauty of a dear son who died young. Here the subjective note is most obvious.

These examples, and many others like them, show that the elegiac couplet was discovered from the very beginning of its use, to be more competent, and suitable for epigramma than the hexameter, simply because it can interpret with much ease and sincerity the personal feelings and emotions which the mourners wish to express. In this, the epitaph became a true record. No wonder then, if it was recognized to be the vehicle par excellence for epigramma and after that for the written epigram. If at least some epigrams which have reached us

under the names of the Lyrists Sappho and Anacreon are really authentic,[49] here one could have said that elegiac couplets were from the beginning taken for granted by the poets as the artistic and poetic epigrammatic vehicle. This became more and more evident when the epigrammatic genre came into the full course of its development. The variety of themes composed in this metre in the hands of the Alexandrians - and it was their favourite - justifies Professor Mackail's words: 'a metre which would refuse nothing, which could rise to the occasion and sink with it'.[50] In short, it is the medium of the classical elegy[51] to which the Alexandrian epigram owed much especially with respect to themes and the reminiscences of the early elegists which can be met with in the Alexandrians' epigrams, many of which are elegies in a small cadre. If this is so, the elegiac metre could be taken as a direct link between the early elegy (especially the Ionic which found good admirers in the Alexandrians) and the Alexandrian epigram itself.

Now I can turn to speak generally of the style of the early epigramma. In this account I will concern myself only with the most distinct stylistic features and particulars which distinguish the early epigramma

up to the beginning of our period.

As to the dialect of these epigrammata, nothing could be said with certainty owing to the deplorable scarcity of inscriptions found in different areas. In one case we are fairly able to have to a certain extent a clear idea. It is with the Attic epigrammata, of which we have a great number. These are for the most part of a blend of Ionic and Epic but words of other dialects might have certainly crept into them. In an Attic epigaph which I have already mentioned, we meet φεασίν the unusual dative plural of φείη which, is thought to be Boeotian.[52] As to the dialect of other areas on the other hand, there is no hope of reaching satisfactory and fruitful conclusions, since there is no other source to rely upon. It is true that there exist epigrams preserved both on stone and MSS.; but these are few in number and some show that they were altered on papyrus, in other words they were not an accurate reproduction of the inscriptions on the stone.[53] More often these, especially the epigramma of the Persian Wars, were expanded by later epigrammatists.[54] Unprovided by necessary material testimonies, the scholars who were and are still groping in darkness used to content themselves with approaching this vexed

subject on a rather conjectural basis. Since Miss Cragg reviewed the Scholars' views, I allow myself to draw from her source these views. I shall state them first and then give my own judgement however poor it may be. According to Miss Cragg's account,[55] Fick[56] claims that we find in inscriptions only such forms as belong to the language of the author or of those for whom the verses were composed.[57] Von Mess on the other hand holds that the forms drawn from various dialects may, for different reasons, appear in the same epigram.[58] To Wilamowitz's mind that the dialect is either native or 'die internationale Form des elegisch - epischen Dialects'.[59] Wagner admits the appearance of words of various dialects in one epigram. To his mind this could be explained by the fact that words and phrases were drawn from various types of literature and also by the fact that the poets who composed them used to speak different dialects.[60] Reitzenstein's opinion, which Miss Cragg thinks the best compared with other views is 'the dialect is essentially epichoric, if the dead is buried abroad, the dialect is the one of his home-land. Yet the influence of the epic and the lyric operated now and then the dialectic form'.[61] This is a rather general opinion and does not help much. A more recent view is

that of Palmer who holds that 'the earliest inscriptional epigrams were written in the local dialects, so that even the Ionian Simonides composed the epigrams he wrote for Doric cities in a conventional Doric. ....'The poets of this genre drew largely on Homeric material in composing their hexameters, but the oldest epigrams exhibit fewest traces of this influence. It is noteworthy that even such borrowings assume a native guise: thus Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι appears in a Corinthian epigram Ποτειδάϝωνι Ϝάνακτι [62]'. As far as these different views are concerned, I feel that there is in the foregoing views some truth which does not allow me to under-rate every one as a whole but rather to agree with most of them, if not wholly, at least partly; in other words my method is selective. In the first place one must bear in mind that the archaic epigramma were written either by ordinary persons or professional poets. Those which were composed by ordinary persons must have been generally in local dialects; but they might have included epic forms. These were made known by the rhapsodes and the brevity of the epigramma could make the job of piecing a phrase or two to form the inscription not so hard. Those which were composed by poets on the other hand must have distinguished

themselves with some particular features, stylistic and poetic, but these could not have avoided the local dialects of the areas in which they took place. It is not difficult to prove this. The fact that these epigrammata, sepulchral and dedicatory, were in the main purposely intended to serve practical purposes gives an idea on the dialectic question in general. How could the epigramma serve its end, if it was not readable and well understood by the passer-by who was, if not exclusively, the countryman of the dead man? If so, the local dialect, whatever it may be, could not fail to have been represented. If we admit that the ancient Greeks preferred brief epitaphs, for instance, to longer ones, they must have reasons for such convention. Beside lapidary difficulties, they were aware that long epitaphs were less likely to be read by the passer-by who was always presumed to be weary. This wish could not be further attained if the inscription was not written in an intelligible dialect. Again the professional poet who used to write to order must have known what he ought to do. As a cultured person who was equally inspired by the Muses and by other poets, old and contemporary, he is understood to master all the dialects of the poetic types: epic, lyric and elegy;

in other words Epic, Doric, Ionic and Aeolic. He must have a background of the other local dialects which enabled him to write something which meets the expectations of the relatives of the dead man or the dedicators themselves for whom the verses were exclusively composed. Here I disagree with Professor Fick who holds, as we have already seen, that inscriptions include forms that belong to the language of the author. It is true sometimes that the language of the poet may have by chance appeared in the inscription with that of the orderer; but this cannot be explained by saying that the poet uses his language intentionally simply because he writes for others not for himself. Thus when the poets use their own dialects, they may even so make occasional use of another dialect for some reason or other as, for example, for metrical convenience. I am therefore, convinced that the local dialect was given the first place in the archaic epigramma and that the other dialects, if used, appeared occasionally and on set purpose. All that I should like to emphasize is one thing which is far from being regarded as a scientific investigation: although we have not enough inscriptional material at our command to help us in reaching positive conclusions, it is not unreasonable to hold that preference

was given to local dialects and other dialects in which literary types were written. These cannot be avoided but on the contrary they were always sought when the inscription belongs to upper-class people. In this I agree exclusively with Professor Palmer and partly with Professor Von Mess. I have nothing against Professor Reitzenstein's account except his generalization. Although his chief concern was about the dialect of the dead man who is buried abroad, yet I understand from his sentence 'Der Dialekt ist im wesentlichen epichorisch' and especially from the adverbial phrase 'im wesentlichen' that he assumes, as I do, that the dialect of the dead man who is buried in his native land, is primarily that of his home-land not that of the poet who composes the epitaph.[63]

The adoption by the early epigramma of the vocabulary drawn almost from the known literary types which, it is known, display a variety of dialects, is very interesting. It throws to a certain extent a light on the dialectical forms which crept into the epigrammata and heralds, so it seems to me, the growing and gradual development of this non-literary type into a distinct literary genre which survived the others for many centuries.

It was inevitable for the epigramma, whether written by mere amateurs of poetry or by professional poets - and the latter are anonymous as I have often mentioned - to approach the known poetic genres for inspiration: it ever needs a certain grandeur and some poetic colour drawn from epic and lacks the emotional sentiments mirrored in elegy or lyric poetry. This is obvious from words and phrases drawn especially from epic and elegy in the sixth and fifth centuries and to certain extent from tragedy in the fifth and fourth centuries. Since it is of course impossible to enter here into a full and detailed account about the vocabulary of the epigramma drawn from other types, I will content myself with a small selection of examples which belong to the classical period from the seventh to the fourth centuries[64] and could throw a light, although a faint one, on the debt these inscriptions owe to epic, elegy and other genres. Of the epigrammata of the seventh century we have a very few and these were naturally adorned with Homeric vocabulary and enriched with Homeric decorations. Here is a dedicatory inscription, probably from Thebes:

Μάντικλός μ' ἀνέθεικε Fεκαβόλοι ἀργυροτόξοι
τᾶς δεκάτας. τὺ δὲ Φοῖβε δίδοι χαρείFεταν ἀμοι[βάν].[65]

Here the author made use of the epical epithet ἀργυρότοξος of Apollo (cf. Il. I. 37 and XXIV,56). For 'δίδοι χαρείϝεττα ν ἄμοι [βαν]' cf 'δίδου χαρίεσσαν ἄμοι βῆν, Od. III.58'. If we pass to the epigramma of the sixth century we notice that the epic is still exerting the utmost influence; but we meet some words used in lyric poetry only; i.e. not used in epic.[66] Again we find in this century the influence of elegy operating either by the use of words from old elegiac poets or phrases conveying personal feelings and tender expressions of sorrows. As the influence of epic is overwhelming, I will here give one example. It is a sepulchral epigramma from Corcyra. It is by far the best example which show how epic or rather Homer is inspired and at work. It runs thus:-

Σᾶμα τὸ δ' Ἀρνιάδα χαροπὸς τόνδ' ὤλεσεν Ἄρης
βαρνάμενον παρὰ νωσὶν ἐπ' Ἀράθθοιο ϝοϝαῖσι,
πολλὸν ἀριστεύοντα κατὰ στονόϝεσ(σ)αν ἀϝυτάν.[67]

'This is the tomb of Arniadas, bright-eyed Ares destroyed him while he was fighting by the ships at the streams of Arathus, being the bravest amid the groans and shouts of War'. Here are the Homeric parallels: In the first line: cf. ὤλεσεν Ἄρης with ὤλεσεν ἀλκήν, Il. XVI.753; In the second, cf. βαρνάμενον παρὰ νωσὶν

with μαρνάμενον περὶ ἄστυ , Il. VI.256 and παλὰ νηυσί Il. XIII,123 cf. also ἐπ' Ἀραθθοιο ϝοFαῖσι with ποταμοῖο ϝοῆισι Il. XVI,669 and ἐπ' Ὠκεανοῖο ϝοάων Il. III,5. In the third line cf. ἀριστεύοντα with παῦσεν ἀριστεύοντα Il. XI,506; στονόϝεσ(σ)αν ἀϝυτάν with στονάεσσαν ἀὔτήν Od. XI.383. The 'χοροπός' of the first line which was used by Homer as an epithet for wild animals (cf. χαροποὶ τελέοντες, Od. XI,611) is adopted for Ares. This leads me to think that it is composed by a poet who is able to colour the Homeric epic with the local dialect. In the next few epigrammata, the influence of elegy or rather the old elegists is manifest. In this epigramma from the latter part of the sixth century B.C., we find that the author was inspired by Theognis:

[Εὐάνδρω]ι τόδε σ[ῆ]μα μήτηρ ἐπέθηκε θανόντι 68
Φανοκρίτη παιδὶ χαριξομένη.

'To (Euandros) his mother, Phanocrite, erected this monument as a token of affection for her dead child'.[69] Cf. παιδὶ χαριξομένη of the second line with Theognis' παιδὶ χαριζόμενος l.774. Here one may add that the tone of affection with which the epigramma smacks is a pure elegiac influence. The next epigram is very interesting from many points of view. It is a

sepulchral epigramma from Eretria; it runs thus:-

Πλειστίας.

Σπάρτα μὲν πατρίς ἐστιν, ἐν εὐρυχόροισι Ἀθήναις
ἐθρέφθη, θανάτου δὲ ἐνθάδε μοῖρ' ἔσχε.

Pleistias

'Sparta is my native land; I was brought up in spacious Athens, and the lot of death befell me here'. As a real inscription of the sixth century, it displays much that lead to the understanding of the epigramma in this particular period. From the form point of view, we see here for the first time, as far as I know, the name of the dead man written extra metrum. From the language point of view, it shows a blend of different dialects: Σπάρτα and Ἀθήναι are Doric while εὐρυχόροισι is epic. We meet it in Homer as an epithet of great cities, cf. ναῖεν δ' ὅ γ' ἐν εὐρυχόρῳ Σικυῶνι, Il. XXIII,299. The aorist passive ἐθρέφθη is curious, although it is from the Doric τρέφω, but still it is different from the usual aorist, ἐτράφην. One is tempted to take it as a careless form which was in fashion at Sparta at that time. Professor Friedlander considers it as vulgarism of spelling.[71] The second aorist ἔσχε from κιχάνω is rather puzzling also and what I said of ἐθρέφθη can be repeated here. Its

dependence on elegy is shown by this formula ' θανάτου δὲ ἐνθάδε μοῖρ' ἔσχε '. which echoes the formula much beloved by the old elegists. It is Callinus' μοῖρα κίχεν θανάτου [72] which was used after him by Tyrtaeus, Mimnermus [73] and Solon. It remains to say that this epigramma is one of those which belong to dead men who were buried in a foreign land. Although the dead was buried in Eretria in Ionic Euboea, his epitaph was written, with the exception of words from other dialects, in Doric, a sign which shows in some way that a warm relation exists between the dead and his native country. [74]

Turning to the fifth century, we are dealing with most brilliant period of epigrammatic production. Here the epigram, due to the Persian wars and the master of the genre, Simonides of Ceos, developed into a precious gem which attracts us by its harmonizing combination of splendour of expression, simplicity and nobility of thought. Concerning the chief literary influence on epigrammata, epic and elegy were still operative. Tragedy began to show itself in the epigrammata of the period. Here an example, although short, can display such influences:

[ἐνθάδ' Ἀ]νάξανδρο[ς ἀ]γὴ[ρ δ]οκιμώτατος ἀστῶν
κε[ῖτ]αι ἀμώμητο[ν τ]έρμα λα[χ]ὼν θανάτου.[75]

'Here Anaxander, most notable of the townsmen, lies, having won blameless goal of death.' Here we have two epic words: ἀμώμητον cf. πουλυδάμαντος ἀμωμήτοιο Il. XII, 109 and τέρμα cf. Il. XXIII, 309. Ἀμώμητον is also used by the old elegists, namely by Archilochus, cf. 6.2. drawn naturally from epic, since the elegiac, as Prof. Bowra says, at its very beginning was dignified with rich vocabulary of Homer.[76] Τέρμα[77] was used by the elegist, namely Simonides cf. τέρμα βιότου; so also by the tragedians: Aesch. Fr 299; Soph. O.T, 1530; Eur. Alc. 643. Ἀστῶν is taken from Archilochus, 7.1. And finally the formula ἀνὴρ δοκιμώτατος ἀστῶν has parallels, though slightly different, in tragedy. In Sophocles O.T. 775 f, we have ἀνὴρ ἀστῶν μέγιστος and in Euripides, suppl. 277 we have ὦ δοκιμώτατος ἑλλάδι.

In the fourth century, the epigrammata, compared with those of the previous centuries, show almost no sign of epic influence which, almost dying out, gave way to other influences. We can safely say that they continued to be under the influence of tragedy; and the rhetoric cherished in this period began to be more or less manifest. The influence exerted by tragedy usually

appears in the use of words, phrases which were for the most part, paraphrased or simply inspired. Here is an example:

Ὦ Χρό]νε, παντοίων θνητο[ῖς πανεπίσκοπε δαίμων,
ἄγγελ]ος ἡμετέρων πᾶσ[ι γενοῦ παθέων·
[ὡς ἱερὰν σώζειν περιώμενοι Ἑλλάδα χώραν
Βοιωτῶν κλεινοῖς θνήσκομεν ἐν δαπέδοις] 78

'O Cronos (Time) all-surveying all that befalls mortals, announce our misfortune to all; how striving to save the holy land of Hellas, we fell in the glorious Boeotian field.' cf. Kaibel's 1.I: Χρόνε παντόων ...πανεπίσκοπε δαίμων with Soph. O.T.1213. ὁ πάνθ' ὁρῶν χρόνος and Fr. 280. ὁ πάνθ' ὁρῶν καὶ πάντ' ἀκούων παντ' ἀναπτύσσει χρόνος Again cf. Kaibel's 1.4: κοινὸν φερεφόνης πᾶσιν ἔχας θάλαμον with Soph. *AJ*.1192 τὸν πολυκοινον Ἅιδαν or Eur. Suppl. 797 καινὸν ἐς Ἅιδην κατα βᾶσα. There are other examples still, which show the influence of tragedy especially on the sepulchral epigramma, but I feel these examples are sufficient. It is only natural that sepulchral epigrammata draw from or are inspired by tragedy which is a mine for expressions of emotions of pity, grief and affection.

This foregoing short survey on the influence of

other departments of poetry on epigram reveals but one feature of the archaic epigramma. There are still other important features to be recorded. These I leave for the moment and shall deal with them in the course of my treatment on the Alexandrian epigram, sepulchral and dedicatory, whenever the need arises for stating reminiscences or holding comparisons and contrasts with the old models.

The second important point to deal with is the development of the epigramma into a distinct branch. Such point has a special importance for the study of the Alexandrian epigram, as it defines the real epigrammatic heritage bequeathed to the Alexandrian epigrammatists and in this way the achievement of the latter in this particular field will be manifest. This survey on the development concerns all the questions I raised before, namely the following: When did the epigram become a distinct branch of literature? What are the different themes that were attempted by the classical poets? Was the epideictic epigram, basing itself upon the sepulchral, ever composed in this period and when? The fact that the early epigramma as a kind of monumental and memorial inscription underwent stages of development in the classical period itself and

assumed new themes is not a matter of dispute. Due to the active and ingenious talent of the early poets, especially the elegists and the lyric bards; epigramma was not long confined within its previous narrow limit as inscriptions on tombs or on votive offerings, but in the course of time it enjoyed a wide process of evolution, and was extended in such a way that it included gradually new themes which were never intended for mere inscriptions.

It is noticeable that the epigramma showed by the end of the sixth and the beginning of the fifth centuries signs of poetical style - drawn from epic, elegy and lyric poetry - which was, it is quite true, never attained afterwards as far as conciseness and simplicity of diction are concerned. Again the first half of thefifth century can be considered the climax of what had been endeavoured before to raise these non-literary informative inscriptions to a poetic standard. It is in these few decades during which the Persian Wars were taking place that epigramma began to be more and more connected with the national cause. By now, it does not convey what a small family wished to express for its dead quite personally, but it was intended to contain the expression of the bigger family which

records with pride the death of the defenders of liberty. Here the individual sinks out of prominence. Again if grief is to be mentioned, it is the grief of the state, rarely of individuals. Death which was deplored in the sixth century and in the fourth is considered now a noble thing. Two sepulchral epigrammata by Simonides of Ceos, the most famous poet of this period, will justify what I mentioned before. These are among the most beautiful and delicate ones which were composed to commemorate the heroism of the Greek warriors who fell in the Persian wars. The first is a memorial set up at Thermopylae as an epitaph for the Spartans who fell in this battle. With complete simplicity and ease of workmanship he put in the Spartan warriors' mouth this faultless sentence:

Ὦ ξεῖν' ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε
κείμεθα τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι [79]

'Stranger, tell the Spartans that we lie here obedient to their word.' These eleven words are very expressive. Nothing which is worthy to be said, is missing. The second which was set up probably on the Spartans who died at Plataea:

Ἄσβεστον κλέος οἵδε φίλης περὶ πατρίδι θέντες
κυάνεον θανάτου ἀμφεβάλοντο νέφος·

οὐδὲ τεθνᾶσι θανόντες, ἐπεὶ σφ' ἀρετὴ καθύπερθεν
κυδαίνουσ' ἀνάγει δώματος ἐξ Ἀίδεω. 80

'These men having crowned their own country with a glory not to be quenched, put on the dark cloud of death; and having died, yet they are not dead, for their valour honoured them and led them up from the house of Hades'. This epigramma, whether written by Simonides or by another, has the characteristics of the fifth century. The antithesis in οὐδὲ τεθνᾶσι θανόντες and the metaphor κυάνεον θανάτου..... νέφος show the influence of rhetoric which appeared in the epigramma of the fifth century and became in fashion in the fourth. These two epigrams, especially the second, show how the epigramma in this period assumed the qualities and characteristics of poetry. Does this mean that it could be entitled to be regarded as a distinct branch of poetry from this century? To my mind epigramma, as a poetic form compared with other poetic types, seems to have existed already from the second
81
half of the sixth century and reached its zenith in the first half of the fifth, when the dark days of the Persian Wars offered it the last chance of acquiring all the styles of poetry: the dignified expressions of the epic and the subjective tone of elegy and lyric.

The next question to deal with is how and when the epigramma, already showing poetical qualities, developed to a literary epigram and thus became a distinct branch of literature treating beside the sepulchral and dedicatory themes, new ones. The question is not easy to answer with any certainty; for the Greek Anthology as the chief source of these themes - including undoubtedly a part of a whole - cannot help us in speaking accurately. Moreover the attributions of epigrammata and epigrams to the old poets for many reasons proved false, as the scribes of the Anthology were possessed by a desire to assign every poem to too early a date. Prof. Körte's statement, in which he rejects the testimony of such collections expresses the idea of the majority, if not all, of scholars. He says: "But in the collections the majority gradually acquired the names of famous poets. Because Simonides had in fact composed several epigrams during the period of the struggle for liberty, all good epigrams of the Persian Wars passed current as Simonidean. If an epigram came from Lesbos, Alcaeus or Sappho must have been the author; if it was from Paros, Archilochus wrote it. These remarks apply to many pieces in Meleager's Garland which are ostensibly from the hands of old lyric poets.[82]

Miss Cragg is, as far as I know, the only one who advises us to give the MSS. at least an unprejudiced hearing.[83] Again she contends against Professor Reitzenstein because he underates them in these words: "It is, in my opinion, unmethodical to require in the case of this kind of pseudo-tradition, to demand even the proof of spuriousness."[84] Again there is no evidence from the classical period itself which throws a light on the development of epigramma into a literary genre. If we trace the term in the light of what is preserved in the different works of the classical period we find that it implies exclusively a mere inscription. Thus Herodotus, the father of history, was the first, to use the term. The reader comes upon it in some places of this historian's works. When he quotes in his fifth book verses carved on offerings at Thebes written in Cadmean letters, he introduced the first tripod thus: ἓν μὲν δὴ εἷς τῶν τρίποδων ἐπίγραμμα ἔχει.[85] Thucidides, on speaking on the altar which Peisistratus, the son of Hippias, dedicated to the twelve gods in the Agora during his archonship and extended after him by the people of Athens, used the term in the same way as Herodotus: καὶ τῷ μὲν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ προσοικοδομήσας ὕστερον ὁ δῆμος Ἀθηναίων μεῖζον μῆκος ἤφανισε τοῦ ἐπιγράμματος.[86] Ἐπίγραμμα

in this case is a dedicatory one. In another passage he mentioned it as an epitaph when he spoke on the monument of Archedice the daughter of Hippias in Lampsacus: καὶ αὐτῆς σῆμα ἐν Λαμψάκῳ ἐστιν ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον τόδε.[87] From these quotations of both Herodotus and Thucydides, we can form an opinion on the meaning of the word. It means simply an inscription, sepulchral or dedicatory. There is nothing, however in these non-literary citations to indicate that the two historians thought of a literary type. I am therefore astonished at the conculsions reached by Prof. Mackail who stated 'for there is proof that in Herodotus the word is on the point of acquiring its literary sense'.[88] But I am inclined to think that the two historians were not ignorant of it as a literary type although these quotations do not indicate this; for as they are only historians dealing with historical facts, they had not the opportunity of giving us other kinds of epigrams attributed to their original authors. And so I disagree with Prof. Reitzenstein[89] who thinks that, because Herodotus and Thucydides quoted epigrams without giving the names of the authors, epigram was considered in their days as an inscriptional document only not a work of poetry. Outside the historic works, the term still applies to inscriptions. In Plato's Phaedrus, as we

have already seen, it was associated with that inscriptional epitaph thought to be carved on Midas of Phrygia.[90] So also in Plato's Hipparchus, it is connected with inscriptions carved on Hermae or signposts erected by Hipparchus, the son of Peisistratus on the roads halfway between the town and the country demes. Two inscriptions are preserved in Plato.[91] The first runs thus:-

μνῆμα τόδ' Ἱππάρχου· στεῖχε δίκαια φρονῶν.

'This is a monument of Hipparchus: go your way with upright thoughts.' The second is as follows:-

μνῆμα τόδ' Ἱππάρχου· μὴ φίλον ἐξαπάτα.

'This is the monument of Hipparchus: deceive not your friend.' There is no doubt about the attribution of these two inscriptions to Hipparchus. This is confirmed from the following one by the same tyrant:-

[Ἐν μέσ(σ)ωι Κεφαλῆς τε καὶ ἄστεος ἀγλαὸς Ἑρμῆς
[μνῆμα τόδ' Ἱππάρχου -υυ -υυ-].[92]

'Halfway between Cephale and the town (here stands) glorious Hermes. This is a monument of Hipparchus...' The study of these two inscriptions written before 514 B.C. is important. The statements 'στεῖχε δίκαια φρονῶν and μὴ φίλον ἐξαπάτα, if they mean anything. they are paraenetic in tone. In this they mark the influence of the gnomic elegy which already appeared in

the inscriptional epitaphs some time ago. This reminiscence of elegy, i.e. the ethical admonition is one of the first signs of the development of epigramma into admonitory epigram which in time replaces the admonitory and reflective banquet-elegy just before the Alexandrian period and long after its end.[93] To return to our point, we are compelled to admit, in the faint light of the historical and literary documents which have reached us, that the classical age meant by epigramma, an inscription on votive offerings, tombstones and occasionally on signposts.[94] Suidas, many centuries after Herodotus, Thucydides and Plato, still confines the definition to the inscriptional. In his words epigram is ' πάντα τὰ ἐπιγραφόμενά τισι, κἂν μὴ ἐν μέτροις εἰρημένα ἐπιγράμματα λέγεται '.[95] All this renders the task of modern scholars very hard and leads to controversial discussion which could not be taken for granted as convincing conclusions. As far as the question of the development is concerned, scholars have two different tendencies: The first are extremely sceptical and the second are less sceptical or rather unprejudiced. Miss Cragg represents the second sect. In her opinion, literary epigram already appeared in the sixth century.[96] She thinks that satiric epigrams

began to appear in this century and were followed in the fifth by gnomic, epideictic, erotic, convivial and narrative ones.[97] The conclusions she strives to reach seem very weak and could by easily partly and wholly rejected.[98] In inserting fragments from Theognis and others, she ventures a dangerous and misleading results. First of all she admits that detached lines - in the case of Theognis - or merely remmants of longer elegies - in the case of others - could by taken as epigrams. I wonder how she gives herself this freedom. In this she acknowledges that the epigram is a part of an elegy. No one, who has the least idea of the epigram can agree with her; for the epigramma is but one unit and composed on set purpose for one occasion. Again she should be remindful of Prof. Mackail's golden precept. 'In such cases respice auctoris animum is a safe rule, what was not written as an epigram is not an epigram.'[99] Moreover her unprejudiced acceptance of the literary tradition - attribution without discrimination,[100] reveals itself in her choice of the fragments. The dates also have no weight with her. The pieces taken from the collection attached to the name of Theognis cannot be assigned to the sixth or fifth century as the poems included in the collection are written by different

poets between about 700 B.C. and 460 B.C.[101] or rather 400 B.C.[102] Finally it can be said that she deals with elegy in general rather than epigram.[103] The first headed by Reitzenstein on the other hand are disinclined to acknowledge the existence of any literary epigrams in the sixth or the fifth centuries. The reasons why they are reluctant are given in the following, "To give the date of single steps of this development approximately is very difficult with the present state of extant poems, because epigrams written as an art-form and composed in great number by certain poets are available only since the time of Alexander; the collection of Simonides' poems[104] are very much interpolated; other collections of earlier times are undoubtedly falsified?[105] Again he insists that the literary development of epigram could not be attained before epigrammata were collected in book-epigram[106] and that up to the middle of the fourth century there are neither collections of epigrams nor a poet composing epigrams in the narrow sense of the word except Plato whose collection is not reliable.[107] Finally he agrees with Professor Keil that epigram was raised to a kind of poetry in the fourth century.[108]

It is obvious from these clashing views that the

question of the literary development of the inscriptional epigram seems to be a riddle hard to solve. In my opinion however the two sides went so far in their militating views and that there is a solution, if not certain, not far from truth. As I am dealing with the classical epigram as a bridge leading me to the Alexandrian, I will allow myself occasionally to ignore the author and deal with the epigrams. If I am convinced of their composition in any century before our period I will treat them as if composed by anonymous poets. In my thesis the classical themes count more than the poet. In order to acknowledge any literary development of the epigram, one should look forward to the Alexandrian period and also backward to the ancient times in which the different poetic productions flourished and the epigramma came into fashion. Looking forward to the Alexandrian period, I can say beforehand that the Alexandrian epigrammatists were familiar with epigram in the hands of their predecessors as a genre which already acquired poetic colour and had themes of its own beside the inscriptional ones. The fact that the Alexandrian epigrammatists had in their hands collections of epigrams at least of Simonides and perhaps of Plato cannot be doubted. These epigrams

composed by Simonides and Plato - and I am aware that epigrams written by other hands were interpolated in their collections and falsely attributed to them - show signs of development of the epigram and variety of themes which were imitated and adapted by the Alexandrians as we will see later on.[109] The most important question now is how the epigram acquired themes more or less far from the tomb and temple. This can be answered if we approach the epigramma in connection with the poetic themes cultivated at a time when it was confined to its narrow sphere and composed to order by the poets from the sixth century onwards: These are the elegy and lyric. Of the elegiac themes, I mention only those which are supposed to have taken place at the symposia. These were composed approximately from the middle of the sixth century: the sympotic songs sung over the wine were composed by such poets as Archilochus, Mimnermus and Ion of Chios. The gnome was written by Phocylides of Miletus and Theognis. The poems of Theognis (whether composed by himself or by him and others) which were definitely used at banquets as he himself tells us,[110] are gnomic, erotic, abusive and praise or blame wine.[111] There are still two themes of elegy worthy of mentioning: the γρῖφος and the

παίγνιον which were favourite subjects at the banquet in the fifth century. The γρῖφος is the riddle or problem put in jest[112] while the παίγνιον is the sportive effusion which has a counterpart in the nugae or ineptiae of Catullus. The lyric also contributed to the banquet with its scolia: the more outspoken drinking songs of Alcaeus and Anacreon and serious ones which reached us in an anonymous collection through Athenaeus. These, Athenaeus himself calls σκόλια Ἀττικά[113]. This collection or some of its poems belong to the end of the sixth century; in other words it may be attributed to the period from Solon to Aeschylus.[114] This collection, small as it is - for it contains only twenty-five songs written in lyrical metre with the exception of poem XXIII on a certain Cedon[115] which is in elegiac couplet - contains a variety of themes different in character and taste.[116]

These short types of elegy and lyric, which, as I have said, played a great part at the classical symposia, are undoubtedly the nucleus of the Alexandrian epideictic epigrams which were recited either at the Alexandrian symposia or in other occasions and lead us to try to trace the beginnings of epideictic epigrams during the classical period. By so doing, the date of

the literary development will be manifest, since the first step towards such development would be naturally the creation of a feigned epigram from a real epigramma. This too will disclose any poetic influence which rendered the development possible. Before I plunge into discussion, I should like to make it clear from the beginning that I use 'epideictic'[117] as an indication of epigrams which have the characteristics and form of a real inscription yet they were never intended for inscription at all. Let us begin with an epitaph which Athenaeus mentions as a real epitaph standing on the tomb of Timocreon of Rhodes the lyric and elegiac poet.

πολλὰ πιὼν καὶ πολλὰ φαγών, καὶ πολλὰ κάκ' εἰπὼν
ἀνθρώπους, κεῖμαι Τιμοκρέων Ῥόδιος.[118]

'(Here) I lie, Timocreon of Rhodes, after drinking much and eating much and speaking much ill of men.' As far as inscriptional form is concerned, this couplet has the characteristics of epigramma: the dead is speaking, his name is mentioned and both death and burial are referred to in κεῖμαι[119]. But could it be taken as a real epitaph? I do not think so and I consider the testimony of Athenaeus a misleading one. How could a dead man write such words about himself or how could his family honour his memory thus? It is then an inscription like epigram written by a witty poet just

to please himself and others who disliked Timocreon or for any other purpose except the tomb. The jesting note or rather the humourous biting of this couplet led scholars to give it different names and it is called γρῖφος or παίγνιον or even σκολιόν[120]; in other words it is any of these types which disguised the form of inscription. I am not ready to agree with them all. To my mind - and I have a strong feeling - this couplet, although sportive in spirit, is still in close connection with epigramma in such a way that it would be more correct to call it an epideictic epigram developed from the epigramma under the influence of elegy or rather strictly the elegiac types: παίγνιον and γρῖφος. If we call it a παίγνιον or γρῖφος cast in an inscriptional form it is absolutely far from truth for we ignore the fact that epigramma was transformed into a literary type by elegy, the influence of which on epigram was manifest in the centuries to come and also hesitate to acknowledge an early date for the flowering of epigram as a literary type. This couplet I hold to be the first epideictic epigram we have - as far as the extant epigrammatic relics provide - and at the same time it marks the beginning of a long stage of development. If so, I should go on to fix the date at which

it was produced. The Palatine MS. attributes it to Simonides; but scholars show different tendencies about such attribution.[121] But I think there is much reason in assigning it to an early date; it is simple, void from any artificiality and straightforward. This becomes more clear if we compare it with the following couplet which is undoubtedly an imitation of it or a kind of parody:-

βαιὰ φαγὼν καὶ βαιὰ πιὼν καὶ πολλὰ νοσήσας
ἔφυ μέν, ἀλλ' ἔθανον· ἔρρετε πάντες ὅμοῦ.

'After eating little and drinking little and suffering much sickness I lasted long, but finally I died. A curse on you all!" This latter couplet as a copy is without doubt inferior to its model in many respects. Nothing in it shows any relation to a real inscription. Again the last statement ἔρρετε πάντες ὅμοῦ betrays the bad behaviour of its composer. I have the impression that it was written long after its model. To return to the first couplet, I have no hesitation to attribute it to Simonides. It is worthy of him and his bad relation with Timocreon justifies this attribution.[123] Such enmity is stated by Suidas. He was at enmity with the lyric poet Simonides, and also with Themostocles,[124] of whom he composed a censure in the form of a song.

He wrote among other things a comedy directed against the same Themistocles and the lyrist Simonides. Again if Simonides was a composer of epigramma, he is also a writer of παίγνια and it is not seemly to deny him the jeu d'esprit when he plays with the inscription when the occasion inspired him. Thus I can say now that the literary development of epigram took place in the form of 'epideictic' in the first half of the fifth century in the hands of Simonides, the versatile poet and the father of epigrem and the model of the epigrammatists of the successive centuries. I am willing also to share Prof. Preger's opinion when he says 'absurda est corum sententia, qui omnino quinto saeculo derisoria epigrammata scripta esse negant'.[125] It remains to say that the γρῖφος, in the strict sense of the word, contributed also to the development of the epideictic epigram in the course of the fifth century. Neoptolemus of Parium (3rd century B.C.) said in his book 'On epigrams' περὶ ἐπιγραμμάτων, that the following epigrams was inscribed on the tomb of the sophist Thrasymachus in Chalcedon:-

τοὔνομα θῆτα ῥῶ ἄλφα σὰν ὖ μῦ ἄλφα χεῖ οὖ σαν.
πατρὶς Χαλκηδών· ἡ δὲ τέχνη σοφίη.[126]

'My name is theta, rho, alpha, sigma, upsilon, mu,

alpha, chi, omicron, sigma; my native city Chacedon, my profession wisdom'. Here I am convinced forcibly in spite of Neoptolemus' statement that this epitaph is but an epideictic epigram tinged by a graphic colour. I hope that these two epigrams, which are specimen of the new offshoot of epigram, a consequence of the fusion of the inscription with elegy, are entitled to prove that Prof. Reitzenstein went very far when he held that epideictic epigrams could not have been composed till inscriptions from stones were collected to be edited in a book.[127] Anyhow he had no reason to stick to this opinion as long as he admitted that the γρῖφος exerted an influence on the true epigram at the end of the fifth century.[128] It is under this present form however that epigram made itself one of the recognisable types of the sympotic songs which were either sung or recited at the banquet. From that time onward for many centuries it flourished and developed, in other words it was extended to cover occasional short poems - mostly in elegiac metre - expressing the mood or the idea of the poet.

As far as epideictic epigram is concerned, one is not far from truth when he says that, in spite of the many doubts and difficulties of the authenticity of

of epigrams attributed to Simonides, Plato and others, it was developed long before the Alexandrian period and some new themes had already shown themselves in the course of the period between the first half of the fifth century and the beginning of the Alexandrian period. The fact that Meleager included in his 'Stephanos' epigrams[129] which could never have been inscribed on stone justifies our believing - what is probable in itself - that the Alexandrians found and made use of the classical themes. Some few examples are given for illustration.[130] It is almost believed that imaginary epitaphs on animals were first composed by Anyte at the verge of the Alexandrian period. Her epigrams however have a remote ancestor in the following epigram on a certain hound called Lycas:-

ἦ σεῦ φθιμένας λεύκ' ὀστέα τῷδ' ἐνὶ τύμβῳ
ἴσκω ἔτι τρομέειν θῆρας, ἄγρωσσα Λυκᾶς.
τὰν δ' ἀρετὰν οἶδεν μέγα Πήλιον ἄ τ' ἀρίδηλος
Ὄσσα, Κιθαιρῶνός τ' οἰονόμοι σκοπιαί.[131]

'I think surely, huntress Lycas, your dead white bones in this tomb still frighten the wild beasts; your valour is well-known to great Pelion and far-seen Ossa and the sheep feeding peaks of Cithaeron.' This epigram is attributed to Simonides on the authority of

Pollux. It is well known that Simonides went about 514 to Thessaly and was the guest of the Scopads, the Thessalian princes. Thus I do not see why it should not be attributed to Simonides. Is it not reasonable that he feels obliged to please his patrons by composing a commemoration of their beloved dog? Anyhow the style, the pathos, workmanship and the familiarity with the mountain landscape, all justify the attribution to Simonides. The next is a nice epigram on an aged ox worn out with labour composed by Addaeus of Macedon:-

Αὔλακι καὶ γήρᾳ τετρυμένον ἐργατίνην βοῦν
Ἄλκων οὐ φονίην ἤγαγε πρὸς κοπίδα,
αἰδεσθεὶς ἔργων· ὁ δέ που βαθέῃ ἐνὶ ποίῃ
μυκηθμοῖς ἀρότρου τέρπετ' ἐλευθερίῃ. 132

'Alcon did not lead to the bloody chopper his working ox worn out by the furrow and old age, because he reverenced it for its service, and somewhere in the deep grass it rejoices its liberty from the plough by bellowings.' This epigram, which reveals the Greeks' attitude towards animals, cannot be held as dedicatory at all. It is simply an epideictic one which has no traces whatever of the attributes of the dedicatory inscription. 133 I regard it an occasional poem composed out of sympathy felt either by the poet or the owner of the

ox.

Love-epigrams were composed in classical times as a type of the sympotic elegy. They show their existence in the second book of Theognis; but it is thought to have developed in intensity and intimacy by Plato. The following is a delicate epigram on Agathon:-[134]

Τὴν ψυχήν, Ἀγάθωνα φιλῶν, ἐπὶ χείλεσιν ἔσχον·
ἦλθε γὰρ ἡ τλήμων ὡς διαβησομένη.[135]

'As I was kissing Agathon, I held fast my soul on my lips. Poor soul. She came hoping to cross over.'

These few instances show how epideictic epigram really existed in the classical period and therefore there is no reason to suppose that the Alexandrian epideictic one sprang into being full grown. If epigram in its development was influenced by lyric and especially by elegy, a fact which could not be denied, this certainly happened at the hands of the versatile classical poets. Its development in the classical period is not a matter of dispute at all, in spite of the lack of the reliable and authentic material. In short the classical epigram as a literary type advanced several steps in the course of development and reached the utmost point of it at the hands of the Alexandrians.

With these recollections of the classical epigramma

and epigram we can turn to the study of the Alexandrian. I am aware of the fact that my study of the epigram of this period - the classical - was incomplete and that there are some other facts to be recorded. There is still, however, a chance for filling the gaps whenever the occasion calls for plunging into comparisons, contrasts or reminiscences.

NOTES ON CHAPTER II

1. In order to be clear and exact, I shall from the beginning distinguish between the inscriptional epigram and the one which was never chiselled on stone. The first, I allow myself to call epigramma (pl. epigrammata), the second, epigram.

2. The works referred to are Kaibel, G. (Epigrammata Graeca ex Lapidibus Conlecta, Berlin, 1878), Friedländer (Paul) and Hoffleit (Herbert, B) (Epigrammata, Greek inscriptions in verse from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars, University of California Press, 1948) and Geffcken (Johannes) (Griechische Epigramme, Heidelberg 1916).

3. From Corcyra, Ca. 600 B.C. No. 1, Fried; 181, Kaibel. τύμ ωι = Kaibel, τύμ [β] ωι.

4. From Athens, Ca. 550 B.C. No. 62 Fried;

5. Here we notice the artist's name who made the stone is written. Names of artists can be met with not infrequently; the author's name on the other hand was never inscribed and this makes it generally very difficult to attribute any of the oldest epigrammata, which are a matter of unceasing dispute among scholars, to the earliest well-known poets. Thus A.P. vi 133 is attributed in the Anthology to Archilochus. This is

due to the fact that this epigram was copied in antiquity from an actual dedication in the temple of Hera (perhaps at Paros) cf. Friedländer, op. cit. p. 102, No. 104; see also Körte, op. cit. p. 356.

6. From Corinth, Ca. 600 B.C. No. 2. Fried; 463a Kaibel; 52 Geffcken.

7. Acarnania, probably Anactorium, VIth century B.C. No. 64, Fried; 182, Kaibel. Fried's αὐτῶ = Kaibel αὑτοῦ.

8. Camirus, in Rhodes. VIth rather than VIIth century, No. 33 Fried.; 17, Geffcken who thinks the epigramma is of the middle of the seventh century. Fried's λειώλη is to be preferred to λειόλη (Geffcken). See L.S.J. sub voce λεώς or λείως.

9. Fried. op. cit. p. 36.

10. Haliartos. Ca. 500 Geffcken; No. 5 Fried; No. 90 Geffcken.

11. Corinth, Not after the middle of VIth century, No. 11a Fried.

12. Probably Thebes. Ca. 700 B.C. No. 35, Fried.

13. Lucania, vicinity of Metapontum and Heraclea, VIth century B.C. probably not very late. No. 111 Fried.

14. Delphi, end of VIth century B.C. (Fried and Geff.). No. 41 Fried, 27.

15. 'Only Ionia makes rather an exception; it was there that the Ionians preferred prose in the VIth century because they already knew how to write it.' Thus says Prof. Wilamowitz (op. cit., vol. I pp. 123-124). Prof. Croiset, on the other hand has a quite strange idea; he says that the majority of the inscriptions were written in prose, but if the dead was a great personage or if the offering was of some value, prose gave way to verse (Histoire de la littérature Grecque, Tome 2, p. 166, troisième edition). But we have no epigrammata which certainly go back beyond the time of the heroic hexameter, and thus we have no real means of judging this.

16. There are still some other complicated metrical media, but these are few in number and unimportant.

17. 'aber wer Grab - oder Weihe - E(pigramme) als Dichtungsart einmal von einem bestimmen Poeten erfunden sein läßt, zeigt nur, daß er alte Epigramme überhaupt nicht kennt oder nicht zu emfinden versteht' (Reitzenstein, P.W. vol. VI. p. 78).

18. I shall illustrate this in my account of the style of the early epigrammata. See infra, p. 211 sqq.

19. Miss Cragg (Florence Alden) (A study of the Greek epigram before 300 B.C., Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences vol. XLVI NO. 1 - September, 1910) pp. 12-13.

20. A.P.VII.153. It is found also in Diog. Laert. I 89(90) and Plato, Phaedrus, 264. It is attributed either to Cleobulus of Lindos (6th century B.C.) one of the seven sages or to Homer. For a full discussion, see Piére Waltz, op. cit. Tome IV, page 41, Note, 1. and page 119, note 1. It is clear from Plato's statement in the dialogue between Socrates and Phaedrus that the inscription, although familiar, cannot be taken for sure as being really carved on the tomb of this Midas the Phrygian: καὶ εὑρήσεις τοῦ ἐπιγράμματος οὐδὲν διαφέροντα, ὃ Μίδᾳ τῷ Φρυγί φασί τινες ἐπιγεγράφθαι. Thus in spite of the old tradition which is by the way inconsistent, I am disinclined to consider it one of the earliest metrical epitaphs. I cannot say that it was written by Plato himself as some scholars think. (Piere Waltz ibid), but some time before him. It would appear that something like it but

referring to a marble monument could be criticised by Simonides (Bergk, P. L. G. pars III, p. 414 No. 57 (10) = Edmonds, Lyr. Graec., vol. II, p. 296, No. 31). But the piece, however, is not concise and contains more than what is needed. Its first line can be very well considered as a complete epigramma in the manner of the first specimen of Sepulchral inscription. This is enough for the time being and I hope that sometime I will be able to make a more detailed study of this epigram and discuss fully the different conflicting views of modern scholars.

21. In the hands of Archilochus or Hipponax.

22. So says Prof. F. D. Allen (On Greek Versification in Inscriptions. Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, vol. 4. pp. 37-204. Boston, 1,888) p. 44 quoted in Friedländer's Epigrammata, p. 158.

23. Attica. Countryside, deme Cephalae, No. 170 (Fried); 48, Geffcken, who assigns it to the sixth century. His reading of this epigramma is different in some words. It runs thus:-

[Λαι]μαῖ θανόσης εἶμι [σε]μα Μυρ(ρ)ίνες.

24. Attica Mesogeia. Ca. 550 B.C. No. 169 Fried.

25. Hardie, Res Metrica, p. 49.

26. Mackail, Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology, London, 1890. p. 5.

27. quis tamen exiguos elegos emiserit auctor,
grammatici certant et adhuc sub iudice lis est
(Ars. Poetica, ll. 77-78).

28. versibus impariter iunctis querimonia primum,
post etiam inclusa est voti sententia compos;
(Ars. Poetica, ll. 75-76).
Professor A. S. Wilkins, ad loc. takes 'voti sententia compos' to refer to dedicatory epigrams in fulfilment of a vow. He may take it to mean 'the expression which embodies a vow'.

29. Hardie, op. cit. p. 49. But who was the first of these poets to use it? Prof. Blakeway discussed the date of Archilochus with great ability and fullness (Greek Poetry and Life, pp. 34-55). He reached the conclusion that Archilochus lived between 740-730 B.C. to before c 670-c 660 B.C. (pp. 53-54) and that his floruit: 688-685 B.C. Again Prof. Hauvette, speaking of Callinus says 'Le poète Callinos était dans Éphèse, excitant ses con-citoyens à la lutte, dans le temps de l'invasion cimmérienne: depuis longtemps,

selon nous, Archiloque avait fait usage du vers élégiaque pour chanter les joies ou les peines de sa vie aventureuse'. (Archiloque, Sa vie et ses Poesies, Paris, 1905, p. 40). It is known that the Cimmerians attacked Ephesus about 650B.C. This invasion is announced by Callinus (Fr. 3. Diehl)

νῦν δ' ἐπὶ Κιμμερίων στρατὸς ἔρχεται ὀβριμοεργῶν

30. See, for example, Friedländer, op. cit. pp. 65 (especially note 1) seq.

31. op. cit. p. 66.

32. op. cit. p. 65. See Prof. Page's views in his article 'The elegiacs in Euripides' Andromache, Greek Poetry and Life', pp. 206-208.

33. Eurip. I.T. 146.

34. Cf. Horace, A.P. 75-6 to which I have already referred; Ovid's 'flebilis Elegeia' (Am. iii.9. 3) and others.

35. Il. 103-116. The Andromache which may not have been performed at Athens belongs to the end of the Archidamian War.

36. Page, op. cit. p. 214.

37. Athens; No. 71 Fried; No. 43 Geffcken. The latter assigns it to the sixth century. His text is in the older alphabet thus:-

Σῆμα πατρὸς Κλέβολος ἀποφθιμένοι Χοσνοφάντοι
θῆκε τόδ' ἀντ' ἀρετῆς ἔδε σαοφροσύνες.

38. Attica. Deme Myrrhinus; No. 80 Fried; No. 49 Gef. According to Geffcken, it belongs to the middle of the sixth century.

39. φρασίν as a dative plural of φρήν was used later by Pindar but since this epigramma belongs to the sixth century, it is assumed by Miss Cragg (op. cit. p. 41) that it came from Boeotia. She says 'In order to explain the form φρασίν a form found elsewhere only in Pindar, v. Hess (Quaestiones de epigrammate Attico, Diss. Bonn 1898, p. 21) conjectures that the phrase φρασίν ἄλλα μενοινῶν was common in Boeotia and thus crept into the inscriptions of the adjoining country. It is, however, unlikely that the contracted form μενοινῶν was common in Boeotia in the sixth century (see Ahrens, De Graecae linguae Dialectis, Goettingen, 1839, I, 201) and it is more probable that we have in φρασίν another evidence of the influence of lyric poetry, unless indeed, it may be also Attic.'

40. Athens. Near the Dipylon; No. 83 Fried; 41 Geffcken who assigns it to the sixth century.

41. Attica; No. 135 Fried; 47 Geffcken. It belongs to the middle of the sixth century.

42. cf. Fried., 135 (Gef. 47) l. 2:-

τέ(τ)ιχον οἰκτίρας ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν παρίτω.

with Fried., 137, from the vicinity of Pharsalus (Gef. 93) l. 4:-

[πᾶς δὲ κα]τοικτίρας ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν παρίτω.

43. Müller and Donaldson, op. cit. vol. I p. 169.

44. Early Greek Elegists, p. 5.

45. It does not disappear altogether. The Palatine MS. preserves many epigrams in hexameters. cf. book VII, 3, 53, 93, 153, 158, 313, 325, 343, 363, 621, 672, 673, 678, 680, 689, 691, 746 and 747.

46. I have already dealt with the iambic trimeter, see supra p. 198 sq.

47. Troezen; No. 29 Fried; 58 Geffcken who assigns it to the VIth century.

48. Athens, No. 81 Fried; 1 add. Kaibel who assigns it to the VIth century.

49. But this is, as Prof. Reitzenstein thinks, quite uncertain. Cf. P W. vol. VI, 80, s.v. Epigramm.

50. Op. cit. p. 6.

51. Either erotic or gnomic; but lyric also exerted influence upon it especially the drinking songs

(σκόλια) of Alcaeus, Anacreon and others. All this will be treated later.

52. See note 39.

53. These are some examples; the words on the stones with their altered parallels are underlined:-

A. 1. Cf. Kaibel, 758:-

πρὶν μὲν Καλλιτέλης ἱδρύσατο [τόνδε δ' ἐκείνου
ἔ]γ[γ]ονοι ἑστήσα[ν]θ', οἷς χάριν ἀντιδίδου.

2. with A. P. VI. 138 which is falsely attributed to Anacreon:

πρὶν μὲν Καλλιτέλης μ' ἱδρυσατο τόνδε δ' ἐκείνου
ἔκγονοι ἑστασαν θ' οἷς χάριν ἀντιδίδου.

'μ' in (A. P. VI. 138) line 1 is not found in the inscription.

B. 1. cf. Kaibel, 751:-

τόνδε Πόρης] ἀνέθηκε Πολυμνήστου φίλο[ς υἱός,
εὐξάμενος δεκάτην Παλλάδι Τριτογενεῖ.
Κυδωνι[ά]τ[η]ς κρησίλας εἰργάσσατο.

2. with A. P. XIII, 13: Anonymous.

Τόνδε Πυρῆς ἀνέθηκε Πολυμνήστου φίλος υἱός,
εὐξάμενος δεκάτην Παλλάδι Τριτογενεῖ.
Κυδωνιάτας κρησίλας εἰργάξατο.

In (1) the words underlined are Ionic while those in (2) are Doric. This epigram is one of those in which the poet (and it must be written by a poet) took liberty in the use of metre. It is cast in Hexameter followed by a pentameter and then an iambic trimeter. There is another thing which attracted my attention. The statement which tells the name of the maker of the object which was written before extra metrum in prose is cast here in metre. The choice of the iambic here can be explained by the fact that this metre is the nearest to prose and also for metrical necessities as the word κυδωνιάτας, for instance, does not suit any other metre.

C. cf. Cragg 83 =AM (= Mittheilungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts, athenische Altheilung) 22. p. 53 and Tab. 9; Bergk, Simonides, 97; quoted in Wilamowitz, Sappho Und Simonides, (Berlin. 1913) pp. 192-193.

(1) ὦ ξένε εὔυδρ]ον ποκ' ἐναίομες ἄστυ Φοίνθο
νῦν δ' ἄμε Αἰά]ντος [νᾶσος ἔχει Σαλαμίς.

(2) With Bergk, Simonides, 96.

Ὦ ξεῖν' εὔυδρον ποτ' ἐναίομεν ἄστυ Κοίνθου,
νῦν δ' ἄμ' Αἴαντος νᾶσος ἔχει Σαλαμίς.

In (1) one notices the doric form of παρ' ἑναλίοις the existence of Koppa in Φοίνθο. The 'O' as an ending of a genitive is very striking (Wilamowitz, op. cit, p. 192). Elision is not cared for. In (2) on the other hand, Attic forms replaced the Doric ones and elision was carried out.

This epigramma is an epitaph on the Corinthians who were buried at Salamis. It is attributed by Dio Chrysostom (Or. LXXVII. 18.) to Simonides but is rejected by Hauvette (Epigrammes de Simonide, Paris, 1896) p. 77 where he says after a test of dialect :' il n'y a pas là un indice qui permette de se prononcer sur l'authenticité de la pièce.'

54. To the epigramma of the foregoing note another couplet was added which was never inscribed. Cf. Bergk. Simonides, 96 :

ἐνθάδε Φοινίσσας νήσου καὶ Πέρσας ἐλόντες
καὶ Μήδους ἱερὰν Ἑλλάδα ἐυσάμεθα.

This example shows how the archaic epigramme suffered from expansions worked out by later forgers.

55. See the discussion of this subject of dialects in Miss Cragg, op. cit. pp. 40-45.

56. Die Homerische Ilias, Goettingen, 1886 pp. v ff.

57. Kirchhoff (Hermes 5, pp. 56 ff) agrees with him so far as the Attic epigram is concerned.

58. Questiones de Epigrammate Attico et Tragoedia Antiquiore Dialecticae, Bonn, 1898.

59. Hermes 20; pp. 69 ff.

60. Quaestiones de Epigrammatis Graecis, Leipzig 1883.

61. 'Der Dialekt ist im wesentlichen epichorisch; wenn der Tote im Ausland begraben ist, der seiner Heimat. Doch hat die Einwirkung des Epos oder der Lyrik ab und an auch die dialekische Form beeinflußt' (PW. νοΙ. νι (S.v epigramm), pp. 78-79.)

62. Oxf. Class. Dictionary. s. v. Greek Dialects, 13. epigram, p. 272.

63. Prof. Reitzenstein must have come across some specimens written fundamentally in local dialect, as for example:-

Στάλα Ξενφάρεος τοῦ Μηλέξιος εἰμ' ἐπὶ τύμωι

(Corcyra, Ca. 600 B.C. = No. 1, Fried.)

Here the Dialect of Corcyra, the Doric, is represented by στάλα and τύμωι , as Prof. Friedlander thinks (op. cit. p. 9) is a Corcyrean form. The influence of epic is obvious in ἐπὶ τύμωι cf. ἐπὶ τύμβῳ Ἴλου Δαρδανίδαο (II, XI. ll. 370-341).

64. Here I am only dealing with inscriptions and dealing with them as written by anonymous authors.

65. No. 35. It has already been translated.

66. Melos, the middle of the VIth century, No. 114 Fried. = 740 Kaibel = 19 Geff.:-

Παῖ Διός, Ἔκφαντος δέξαι τόδ' ἀμενφὲς ἄγαλμα·
σοὶ γὰρ ἐπευχόμενος τοῦτ' ἐτέλεσσε Γεόφων.

'O son of Zeus, receive from 'Ecphantus this flawless gift;(for) Crophon vowed and made it for you'. The word ἀμενφές (ἀμεμφής,ές) is only used by Pind. Olym. 6. 78; Aesch. Pers. 168, Supp. 581.

67. Corcyra, VIth cent. No. 25 Fried = 180 Kaibel = 54 Geff.

68. Erythrae, No. 63, Fried. It is clear of course, from the unmetrical importation of μήτηρ and the incomplete pentameter that the composer is using poetic 'tags' without any sense of metre.

69. The literal meaning of ' θανόντι..... παιδὶ χαρι ξομένη ' is 'to please or gratify her dead child'. This does not seem to interpret a mother's feeling very well and so I made use of Prof. Friedländer's translation.

70. No. 77 Fried = IG. XII, 9, 286.

71. Op. cit. p. 82. But it is not a half-Doric spelling of the form ἐθρέφθην found in Epic and Hesiod, Theogony, l. 198. The absence of 'ν' in the first person is notable.

72. Edmonds, Elegy and Iambus, vol. 1. p. 46. 1, 15.

73. Op. cit, Tyrtaeus. p. 66, 6,7,5:- 'μοῖρα κίχαι θανάτου'; Mimnermus; p. 96, ll. 2:- 'μοῖρα κίχοι θανάτου'; Solon, p. 136, 20-21, 4:- 'μοῖρα κίχοι θανάτου'. The spelling ἔχιχε seems individual in our epigram.

74. This conforms with Prof. Reitzenstein's point of view on dialect which I have already mentioned.

75. Apollonia on the Black Sea; 78. Fried. Note the form ἀστῶν before κεῖται, there being no break in sense.

76. Op. cit. p. 13.

77. Cf. the following epigrammata in Kaibel 113. 4, 237, and 856.

78. 27 Kaibel; Ad Olympieum = A. P. VII. 245, τοῦ αὐτοῦ (= Caetulicus). Both Kaibel and Waltz reject the attribution to Caetulicus. This epitaph which is probably on the Greeks who fell at the battle of Chaeronea (B.C. 338) was thought to be written between 350 and 300. The Anthology is not consistent with the inscription twice:- l. 1:-

'δαίμων' Kaibel; 'δαῖμον' A.P. and l. 3:- 'χώραν' Kaibel; 'χώρην' A.P. The last inconsistency is one of dialect.

79. A.P. VII. 249. It is universally attributed to Simonides.

80. A.P. VII. 251; Bergk, Simonides' 99; Edmonds, 126.

81. Miss Cragg (op. cit. p. 38) thinks that epigramma, due to frequent repetition of formulas and imitation of one epigram to another, was early - before the period assigned by me - considered as a distinct branch of literature. The list she gives as a justification to her idea is very poor in respect of the influence upon epigramma of both the seventh and sixth centuries. The only example she was able to give as an illustration is:-

Cf.-(Seventh and sixth centuries), Cragg, 1 = CIA I, 463 = K. 1 = H.2:-

οἰκτίρας ἄνδρ' ἀγαθὸν παρίτω.

with (Fifth century). Cragg 90 = 1 G A 325 = H. 55 Pharsalus:- '[Κα]τοικτίρας ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν παρίτω.'

The examples belonging to the fifth century onward in her list show more instances of imitations and so justify what I have said.

82. Op. cit. p. 356.

83. Op. cit. p. 11.

84. PW. vol. VI. s.v. Epigramm, p. 80:- ' Es ist meines Erachtens unmethodisch, bei dieser Art Pseudo-tradition auch nur den Beweis der Unechtheit zu verlagen'. Here Prof. Reitzenstein also refers to the collections or the relics of the old poets as Archilochus, Sappho, Anacreon, Simonides, Bacchilides, Plato and others.

85. V, 59. cf. also VII, 228.

86. VI, 54.

87. VI, 59.

88. Op. cit. p. 1.

89. Op. cit. p. 116.

90. Although the authenticity of the dialogue is generally doubted (See P. Friedländer, Platon, vol. II pp. 117 ff.), it is pre-Alexandrian. Literary questions treated in it seems anyhow to depend on responsible tradition (e.g. about Homeric recitation) and even if they are not entirely certain, there is always a shade of truth in them.

91. Hipparchus, 228d.

92. No. 149, Attica, Fried. op. cit, p. 139. Its date

is before 514 B.C. the year of Hipparchus' death.

93. Cf. A.P. VII. 420 by Diotimus of Athens, one generation before Leonidas. For the borrowings of this poet from Theognis, see Reitzenstein, op. cit. p. 171A.

94. I still believe that the literary epigram existed in the lifetime of Herodotus. I will discuss this immediately and prove that sepulchral epigrams which were not carved on tombstones were composed by Simonides. Again if we do not meet any epigram of a literary type in the works I have already mentioned, this can mean that the writers had not the chance of giving us a non-inscriptional epigram. This can be further proved by the fact that Meleager. the first compiler of a collection on all subjects, inscriptional, and non-inscriptional used in his proem to his collection, Στέφανος, such words as ἀοιδή, ὕμνος, μέλισμα, ἔλεγος (cf. A.P. IV, 1) as names to the different short pieces included in his collection and he never used the word ἐπίγραμμα. Philippus, the second compiler more than a century after Meleager, did not call the short pieces incorporated in his collection as epigrams

but ὀλιγοστιχία (cf. A.P. IV, 2, 1. 6). The term anyho. did not occur in the Anthology until the Roman period, cf. A.P. IX, 342, by Parmenion. This poet had the honour to introduce the term ἐπίγραμμα as a well-known literary genre. This epigram is of special importance as it conveys ideas concerning the length of the epigram. All this convinces me that literary epigram existed in the classical period but was not sufficiently fixed to have a defining name. It is admitted however that a thing must precede its name and that it must be sufficiently developed before admitting a definition and name.

95. S.v. 'Ἐπίγραμμα'. I wonder how Suidas of the tenth century A.D. gives that definition when Athenaeus eight centuries before him connected it with conviviality. In Hedylus (Athen. XI, 473a), Nicaenetus (Id XV. 673b), Poseidippus (Id X, 415B), the name is given to convivial poems and the meaning which the word assumed in the time of Athenaeus himself departs from the inscriptional type (e.g. Athen. II, 39c; III 125c; IV. 162a; XIII, 604 f.). Miss Cragg thinks that it is probable that Athenaeus quotes the poet's

poems by the titles, 'ἐπιγράμματα' which their authors gave them (op. cit. p. 6-7).

96. To call any epigram or an elegy written during both the classical and Alexandrian times 'satiric' is a bold description. The epigrammatists of these two periods did not try to compose satirical epigrams at all. What they tried up to the close of the Alexandrian is some occasional epigrams possessed of humour, irony or parody. These were to them an inseparable entertainment at the Symposia. In addition to these they were occasionally involved in writing lampoons. There is a big difference between these and 'satire' in the Roman sense. Satirical epigram (influenced chiefly by satire) are developed in the hands of Martial not before him. But although I am aware of the inaccuracy of the description. I use it loosely in the manner of scholars treating these themes. This use conforms with the definition given in the Oxford dictionary which is modern.

97. Op. cit. p. 19.

98. Ibid. p. 28.

99. Op. cit. p. 3.

100. She says also ' where the reputed author of an

epigram is mentioned it is merely for purposes of citation. and is not meant as an assertion of the correctness of the attribution, (Op. cit. p. 45). As this statement is the final lines of her article, I take it as an apology which is too late.

101. Bowra, Anc. Gr. Lit. p. 63.

102. Reitzenstein, op. cit. p. 81.

103. I must confess that she did very well in other points and I am indebted to her especially in regard to the many reference books and authors she used and discussed. although I disagree with her deductions.

104. Of the Simonidean collection of epigrams, Reitzenstein thinks it belongs to the time of Isocrates, i.e. the fourth century (op. cit. p116)

105. Reitzenstein, op. cit. p. 105.

106. PW. VI, p. 81.

107. Op. cit. p. 121.

108. PW. VI, p. 79.

109. This will be traced in the special account of the Alexandrian epigrammatists.

110. ll. 239-243.

111. According to Eustathius' definition of the 'σκόλια' that they are ' τὰ μὲν σκωπτικά, τὰ δὲ πρὸς

ἔρωτα, πολλὰ δὲ καὶ σπουδαῖα (Ad Odyss. vii p. 1574.14.) quoted in Harrison's Studies in Theognis. p. 130 (Cambridge, 1902), the poems of Archilochus, Mimnermus, Theognis are

112. So says Clearchus of Soli; cf. Athenaeus, X, 440.

113. XV. 694-695f.

114. Bowra, Gr. Lyr. Poetry (Oxford, 1936) p. 402.

115. ἔγχει καὶ Κήδωνι, διάκονε, μηδ' ἐπιλήθου, εἰ χρὴ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν οἰνοχοεῖν.

'Pour in wine for Cedon too, waiter, if we should pour wine for brave men'. Nothing could be said with certainty about Cedon. If we trust the statement of Aristotle 'Const. Ath. 20 ἔτι δὲ πρότερον τῶν Ἀλκμεωνιδῶν Κήδων ἐπέθετο τοῖς τυράννοις διὸ καὶ ἦδον καὶ εἰς τοῦτον ἐν τοῖς σκολίοις.', he must be an enemy of the Peisistratids before the Alcmaeonids. This poem is important (1) as being almost certainly sixth-century (11) as being a complete unit and not an extract from an elegiac poem.

116. Its contents which conform with the definition given by Eustathius to which I have already referred, could be subdivided according to their

themes. The first four are addresses to various gods and goddesses. Poems VIth, VIIth, VIIIth, IXth, XXth, and XXVth are gnomic and give more or less advice and counsels useful for the conduct of life. Songs XVth and XVIth are eulogies of Homeric heroes. Poems X to XII are praises to Harmodius and Aristogeiton who freed Athens by killing the tyrant Hipparchus. Poems IVth and Vth deal with the Persian Wars. Verses XVII, XVIII, XXI and XXII are mere sportive wishes and jeux d'esprit. Poem XXIV was composed in honour of the men who fought on the side of the Alcmaeonids against Hippias. Finally poem XIX is a pure drinking song in the manner of Anacreon. As far as these topics are concerned, they are concerned with actual events, personal philosophy and genuine liking for entertainment. Such are the topics which were welcomed by the gathering at the symposium which played an intimate part in the life of the Greeks in general and the Athenians in particular.

117. 'epideictic' denotes still other specimens of epigrams. It is in practice during the course of the centuries to come especially from the

Alexandrian period one of the following types which are more or less derived from the inscriptional epitaphs and dedications: epitaphs or commemorative pieces on celebrated dead personages of the past or on mythical heroes, epitaphs on dead animals, dedications of modest and perishable offerings. It may be also a piece of jest or parody; a descriptive piece of nature, art, comment on striking event actual or imaginary, a moral sentence and criticism. These latter types are simply literary exercises intended to display the skill of the poet and in this way they are not always safe from rhetorical declamation and artificiality. These reveal no reminiscences of the real inscription, a consequence of long stages of development.

118. A.P. VII. 348.

119. Cf. Fridländer, op. cit. p. 81. No. 76 (Vth century B.C.), see also Kaibel, No. 22.

120. It is called 'γρῖφος' by Reitzenstein (op. cit. p. 119), 'παίγνιον' by Bergk (Poetae Melici, pars III, p. 505) and 'σκόλιον' by Bowra (Gr. Lyr. Poetry, p. 380).

121. Among those who attribute it to Simonides are:

Kirchhoff (quoted in Waltz's op. cit. tome. IV. p. 202) and Hauvette (op. cit. p. 143). Reitzenstein on the other hand thinks that this inscription can only have been preserved in oral tradition and thus has come into the collection of Simonides (Ep. U. Sk. p. 119).

122. A.P. VII. 349, Anonymous.

123. S.V. Τιμοκρεών.

124. Plutarch, 'Life of Themistocles', 21.

125. quoted in Reitzenstein's Ep. U. Sk. p. 119.

126. Athen., X. 454. f.

127. Op. cit. p. 104.

128. Op. cit. p. 119.

129. In his proem (A. P. IV. 1) Meleager calls the poems in his collection 'ἀοιδή (l.1) ὕμνος (l.7) μέλισμα (l. 55) and ἔλεγος (l 36). Here one should lay stress on 'μέλισμα' and 'ἔλεγος' since the epigram is in fact from the beginning and in the long run an offshoot of lyric and elegy as I said before.

130. As it is impossible to trace the development in time with any certainty, I content myself only with giving any example which I believe to be composed before the Alexandrian period. Of the attribution, I will point out whether it is

authentic or apocryphal. Otherwise I will consider them as composed by anonymous; for it is the theme that matters more to one who is only dealing with the classical epigram rather in a passing way.

131. Bergk (op. cit. pars III, p. 476) No. 130 (183). Pollux (5.47) introduces this epigram in the following words:- 'ἔνδοξον δὲ καὶ Λυκάδα τὴν Θεσταλὴν Σιμωνίδης ἐποίησε, γράψας τοὐτὶ τὸ ἐπίγραμμα ἐπὶ ᾧ τάφῳ τῆς κυνός'. It is considered authentic by Prof. Hauvette (op. cit. pp. 49-50). It was already known to Anyte:- Cf. line 4 with Anyte's A.P. XVI. 291. l. 2:- 'δῶρον ὑπὸ σκοπιᾶς Θεύδοτος οἰνόμος'. This epigram reveals the Greeks' love of animals. This love may have originated from Pythagoras who believes in the transmigration of souls and the fundamental kinship of man with beasts. As far as dogs are concerned, Pythagoras is ridiculed by Xenophanes, a contemporary of Simonides:-

καί ποτέ μιν στυφελιζομένου σκύλακος παριόντα
φασὶν ἐποικτεῖραι, καὶ τόδε φάσθαι ἔπος·
"παῦσαι, μηδὲ ῥάπιζ', ἐπεὶ φίλου ἀνέρος ἐστὶ
ψυχή, τὴν ἔγνων, φθεγξαμένης ἀΐων."

(Edmonds, Elegy and Iambus, vol. I, Diog. Laert.

8.8. 20; A. P. VII. 120; but this is not an epigram. It is a part of an elegy).

'They say that once he passed by when a dog was maltreated, and pitying it spoke this word, "Stop and beat it not; since the soul is that of a friend; I know it, for I heard it speak.'

132. A.P. VI. 228. Plan. VI. 48.

133. The fact that this epigram is included in the VIth Book of the Anthology led Prof. Waltz to consider it as a real inscription. He says. "Cette piece etait peut-etre destinee a accompagner l'image d'un boeuf, peinte, sculptée ou modelée, et consacrée en ex-voto dans un temple.' (op. cit. Tome III p. 119. Note 1). I disagree with him, for, if it is real, it should preserve the traditional form of the inscription and secondly such undertaking was not known to the Greeks of the classical period. In fact such a theory rather reveals the weakness of the case which is being argued.

134. Of Agathon, Prof. Edmonds states the following, 'As A. was born 20 years before Plato, this poem seems to have been written, like the Dialogues, by Plato personating Socrates' (op. cit. II p. 7 Note 2).

135. Bergk. Plato 1 = A.P.V. 78 = Edmonds (op. cit.II) p. 7. On the authority of Gell. N.A.XIX 11, Macrob. Sat. II 2. Diog. Laert. III, 32. Schmidt attributes it to Anacreon (Bergk. ib.III p. 299). There is a tendency, almost universal, among the scholars to consider any epigram attributed to Plato to be apocryphal. Fava (Gli epigrammi di Platone) denies that any of them belong to Plato or even to the fourth century at all (quoted in Cragg's op. cit. p. 34). Reitzenst in holds almost the same idea:-"..... from this follows that these poems were forged in Alexandrian times, after the time of Dioscorides. If we assume that the poems were written in the Alexandrian period, nothing is strange in them, but everything would be strange in them if we assign them to Plato's time".(Ep. U. Sk. pp. 181 ff.).Of amatory epigrams in particular, it is generally thought that it would be disgraceful to the great philosopher if we attribute to him such epigrams (Bergk. ib. p.298) I admit that out of his thirty epigrams there are some which were written after his time, but those written about the philosopher's contemporaries must be authentic (Knaack, quoted in Waltz,

op cit. tome I p. XII. N.1). In my opinion this epigram should be considered authentic. Agathon is a contemporary of Plato and the beloved of Socrates, and it is worthy of being recited at a banquet. Nothing in it disgraces the poet. To judge such poem according to our Christian or Mohammedan principles or teachings is not a scholarly way of judgement. Love among men and boys was considered graceful not only in the classical period but also in all the periods of the Greek culture. The lover can speak about it, so too the beloved. In short he, who has the least idea of Plato's Symposium with its out-spoken talks (e.g. the praise of Socrates by Alcibiades which is for the modern an indecent and disgrafeful confession of the beloved, Symp. 215 ff) would not hesitate to attribute this poem to Plato.

C H A P T E R III.

THE ALEXANDRIAN EPIGRAM:

ITS CHARACTERISTICS AND THEMES.

Epigram in the Alexandrian period became for the first time an independent department of poetry and held a place among the poetic types cultivated in this period not inferior to that of elegy, epic and idylls. We have seen how the classical poets endeavoured to develop it into a kind of literary type and how it actually acquired some features which entitled it to that effect. Thus it can be said with certainty that the inventive classical poets paved the way and it remained for the Alexandrians to touch it with their diligent fancies and workmanship and bring it to the last stage of development. The reason why it progressed in the hands of the Alexandrians are not far-fetched. The fondness of the Alexandrians for epigram is beyond doubt or dispute. It was the hobby not only of men of letters but also of learned scholars and even physicians. It was composed by gifted poets some of whom, as far as we know, wrote only epigrams, and also by pedantic litterati. All of them found in it the handy or the simple medium of the expression of what is personal. They confided to it their moods and feelings and thus it conveyed their love, their gaiety, sorrow and their grief for the departed. It was the vehicle of displaying their wit, humour, light jest and invective. It

was sometimes the cherished medium or weapon for attacking an antogonist. Anywhere it is met with warm welcome. It can be recited in the literary circles, particularly in the halls of the Museum, in dinner parties at the banquet where gifted poets improvise and cap each other's efforts and in social and night clubs. Such love of epigram can be shown by the comparatively large number of epigrams which Meleager preserved, though they are much less than what was written in this period. Again epigram compared with other poetic types cultivated in this period like epics, idylls, elegies and hymns is less sustained and easy and displays much of their skilful artifices in a happy manner. As far as the Alexandrian artificiality is concerned, the epigram shows the same vices dominating the other poetic types, but its small body saved it from longer allegorical pictures and far-fetched similes which are met with in their longer themes. "It is," as Professor Wilamowitz notices, "the epigrams of all Hellenistic poetry - or the Alexandrian poetry - that give us the purest and easiest pleasure."[1] This is perfectly true; for the Alexandrian epigrams, even those written by learned poets like Callimachus reveal themselves to be generally undefiled with mannerism and mostly realistic in tone. This is due to the sheer contrast

between epigram and other longer poetic types. The latter are objective and mere adaptations of the classical forms, the scope of which began to be changed, expanded and given some dazzling stylistic colours. In these no originality in the strict sense of the word was attained and originality was, as I have already pointed out, anything but intelligent adaptation. The former on the other hand is generally subjective and the undisputed type which gave the Alexandrians the opportunity of being original and innovators in such a way that they became almost the classical model for later epigrammatists. In their hands the scope of epigram was widened and new themes never known in the classical period were composed in plenty. Such themes in their veriety reveal the characteristics, tendencies and the way the Alexandrians pursue in their compositions. These themes are a consequence of the fondness of what is real, romantic and sentimental, the love of description, comment, jest and trifling; pedantic; erudite and sometimes fantastic demonstrations. Again they are a result of the fusion of the literary forms like lyric and elegy especially the Ionic one. This fusion was to a certain extent noticeable in the classical period but it progressed further in this

period the poets of which broke the barriers existing among poetic types and mingled the one form with the other and in this way elegy transformed the epic and the epic on the other hand was influenced by elegy into which it introduces a new vein of personal feeling. With epigram in particular, their function was to create rather than to mix. Thus the Alexandrian epigram was intended to absorb the functions of other types and this marked the final stage of development. Three types contributed to it and there is no shadow of doubt about this especially with themes which are not related to the inscriptional ones. Thus under the influence of Ionic elegy it echoed the intimate personal feeling: the individual hopes, fears, sorrows and love. To elegy in general it owed the gnomic and didactic element. Lyric and especially the Aeolic lyric exerted an undoubted influence in the domain of wine and love songs, the favourites of the revellers at the banquet. The Attic scolia played also a part in the development. The influence of iambic can be traced in the invective epigrams tried by Alcaeus of Messene. Again the comedy also in the hands of Menander (himself following themes closer to Euripides than to Aristophanes) contributed to the development of the vulgar amatory epigrams on courtesans. Bucolic poetry also has still a claim to

to be mentioned as taking a part in the development. In a word the Alexandrian epigram made use of many of the known poetic types, classical and Alexandrian, and had in fact exhausted all its sources.[2] One however is not far from truth to say that several themes which belong to certain forms written in either elegiac or in some other metres were intentionally and happily cast by them in the brief and memorial cadre of the poetic inscription.

This general introduction brings us to the discussion of the themes attempted by the Alexandrian epigrammatists. These themes reveal not only the range of development but also disclose the different literary influences which took part and led to the final stage of this development. As far as the themes are concerned, there were two quite discernible tendencies at work just before the Alexandrian period began: the one is called the Doric and the other the Ionic. These distinguished two schools of epigrammatists; the one opposes the other but the two exchanged influence on each other. These two schools continued to exist in the Alexandrian time and we have in Leonidas of Tarentum a distinguished representative of the Dorian School, while Callimachus represents the Ionic School.

The horizon of the Doric School, which is rather conservative, is limited. It contented itself with developing the inscriptions, sepulchral and dedicatory and adheres more closely to the traditional epigramma. Its main interest shows itself in the treatment of the simple life of ordinary people: artisans, peasants, shepherds, hunters and fishermen. Its epigrams which are full of descriptions of nature are closely related to the bucolic poetry especially with regard to the singing of rustic life. Its language is chiefly the Doric[3] and its relation to lyric poetry is manifest; for, although it is objective, yet it is sentimental. Many of its characteristics seem to have originated from the Peloponnesian School established by Anyte of Tegea and her imitators like Mnasalces.[4] The Ionic school on the other hand, as a lineal descendant of the Ionian elegy from which it derived its subjects, concerns itself with social questions, serious and light and thus it is comparatively richer and more attractive. It developed the gnomic epigram which are akin to the 'γνῶμαι δι' ἐλεγείας'[5] of Theognis or Theognis' collection and those on wine, women and boys. Its epigrammatists tried their hands at epigrams of riddle, jest and mockery and in this way they supplied the Alexandrian 'banquet'

with the most attractive material. The school took interest in literary questions and in art. The epigrammatists are generally witty and avoid all lyrical splendour. Nature does not appeal to them and it is described only when the poet suffers from rain or cold. It can be said that the epigrammatists of the Ionic School are the real developers of the literary epigram in its wide range and that it is in their hands that the traditional term 'epigramma' was used for almost any occasional short poem in elegiac, without any necessary connection with inscriptions.

In the enumeration of the themes, the sepulchral and dedicatory epigrams come on the top of the list simply because they are the first traditional themes connected with the term. The two schools developed these two themes in great numbers during the whole period. Are these epigrams attributed to the Alexandrian epigrammatists to be taken as real or simply as epideictic? Or were some real and some fictitious? Scholars went different ways in their views. Reitzenstein believes that everything in this period is not genuine but epideictic.[6] To his mind all the epigrams are book-epigrams, i.e. poems which are essentially intended for the book or for the recitation

and he is not sure if they were inscribed here and there on stone and were composed for certain occasion or if the persons mentioned in them really lived.[7] In another place he attacked those who tried to prove that the Alexandrian epigrams are true inscriptions and accused them of having done much harm.[8] Finally he asserts that the book-epigram or the epideictic succeeded elegy and took its place at the banquet and under this impression his book 'Epigramm und Skolion' was written. Professor Wilamowitz disagrees with him in many points. Grappling with this question, he seems more cautious and deliberate. He holds that epigram should be regarded as genuine until its falsification is revealed. Thus he says '.....but I should like to declare right from the beginning that I hold the indications of the epigrams to be true until it is proved that the poet invents the persons or borrows them.'[9] He is also against Reitzenstein's generalization of the use of epigram at the banquet, for he thinks that if this prove true with poets like Asclepiades and Callimachus, it cannot be universally admitted, because how should this presumed society in which Asclepiades and Callimachus moved exist everywhere, even for Leonidas of Tarentum and Anyte of Tegea?[10] Again he is most intolerant of Reitzenstein's

conviction that all that was written in this period is unreal and considers this movement as fatal: 'Und verhangsnisvoll wird es, dass er wirkliche Verwendung der hellenistichen Gedichte gar nicht gelten lasst.'[11] Here the clashing views concerning the nature - whether real or epideictic - and the use of the Alexandrian sepulchral and dedicatory show that the question is not yet settled and that there is room for a further discussion. To my mind Reitzenstein's opinions and investigations are without doubt intelligent and most useful but they appear at the same time the outcome of one-sided outlook. His insistence on regarding the epigram as a poetic medium of mirth blinded him about other possible facts involved in it. Professor Wilamowitz's criticism has its weight, but it is far from being considered as a final study of the question. As for my views, I am fully convinced that there exist among the sepulchral and dedicatory epigrams attributed to the Alexandrian epigrammatists real inscriptions as well as literary exercises which were composed for other purposes other than the practical use.

Beginning with the real inscriptions, I have no doubt that the MS. Palatinus contains a number of real inscriptions composed by the Alexandrian epigrammatists

who used to write to order in the same way as their predecessors. These inscriptions were almost all of them taken, as it is known, from Meleager's Stephanus. The latter draws its contents from different sources: private collections edited by the epigrammatists such as that of the 'Ἐπιγράμματα' of Callimachus, Leonidas of Tarentum and Antipater of Sidon and others; anthologies, i. e. those in which several epigrammatists' poems were edited in common such as the disputed collection including the epigrams of Asclepiades, Hedylus and Poseidippus.[12] The existence of such collections could not be doubted. The imitation of the earlier Alexandrians by later ones before the compilation of Meleager's Stephanus testifies this. Meleager is thought also to draw epigrams, especially the inscriptional ones, from the works of the Periegetae such as Polemon on the geographer.[13] I am going to select some examples from two of the earlier epigrammatists who are universally considered as the representatives of the Alexandrian period: Callimachus, who actually lived at Alexandria, represents the Ionian School and Leonidas of Tarentum, who, it is certain, never lived at Alexandria but is considered Alexandrian on the grounds that he had intimate relationship with the poets of the

Coan School who contributed to the Alexandrian poetry such as Theocritus, and because he either imitated the Alexandrian epigrammatists or was imitated by them. He represents the Dorian School. But on what grounds could the epigram be held as real? I hold it to be real if it conforms to the traditional and conventional practice, but I must be ready to give some allowances since the period with which we are concerned has its own characteristics which differ in spirit and style from the classical period. At any rate I believe that a real inscription, sepulchral or dedicatory should be rather short and must contain the necessary informations, which were pursued and handed down from a generation to generation in the classical period. I have already given some examples both sepulchral and dedicatory but I think it is advisable to summarize their essential features again. As far as the sepulchral inscriptions are concerned, the tomb or the dead is to address the passers-by. The epitaphs must bear at least the name of the dead (it would be still better, if the name of the father and the native land are mentioned). The dead must be contemporary with the epigrammatists; i.e. he should not be a great personality of the past. If there are some other facts to be mentioned about the

dead - and this is almost always the case - these must be clothed in expressions which suit and harmonize with the dignity of death and the seriousness of the occasion. As to the dedicatory inscriptions, the name of the dedicator is to be mentioned. There must be a verb of dedication or any other verb which gives the notion of dedication. The ex-voto is usually mentioned unless it is a statue. The god or goddess to whom the ex-voto is dedicated is generally named. The ex-voto must be imperishable articles and finally the language in which the epigram is written must be decent and reveal the sincerity and the dutifulness of the dedicator.[14] These, it seems to me, the criteria which one ought to bear in mind in distinguishing the real inscription from the epideictic one. Beginning with the epitaph, I select three epitaphs from Callimachus:

Οἵτινες Ἀλείοιο παρέρπετε σῆμα Κίμωνος
ἴστε τὸν Ἱππαίου παῖδα παρερχόμενοι.[15]

"You who pass by the tomb of the monument of Cimon of Elis, know that it is Hippaeus' son whom you are passing by." Such epitaph, so it seems to me has all the virtues of classical epigramma: the passers-by are addressed. The word "tomb" is mentioned, so also the name of the dead,

his father and his native town. From the point of view of style, it is very simple, straightforward and terse. The word σάμα which is doric convinces me of the fact that it was composed to order. Anyhow Callimachus did not use the doric dialect much in his epigrams.[16] The second epigram gives also a dignified specimen of epitaphs:

Τᾶδε Σάων ὁ Δίκωνος Ἀκάνθιος ἱερὸν ὕπνον
κοιμᾶται· θνάσκειν μὴ λέγε τοὺς ἀγαθούς[17]

"Here Saon, son of Dicon of Acanthus, sleeps the holy sleep. Say not that the good dies." Here the name of the dead, his father and his native town are mentioned. The tomb is referred to by τᾶδε and the death by 'ἱερὸν ὕπνον κοιμᾶται'. The end reminds us of the moral formulae used long ago. From the dialectic point of view, there are three doric words: τᾶδε, κοιμᾶται and θνάσκειν which indicate with probability that it was written to order. This third epigram is worth mentioning.

Δωδεκέτη τὸν παῖδα πατὴρ ἀπέθηκε Φίλιππος
ἐν θαλάμοις, τὴν πολλὴν ἐλπίδα, Νικοτέλην.[18]

'Here Philippus laid his twelve-year- old son, Nicoteles, his great hope'. This epigram is one of the few tender epitaphs I have ever met in the Anthology and I consider it to be a real epitaph: 'ἐνθάδε' stands for the tomb; the name of the dead as well as his father are mentioned and the whole expression gives the notion of reality. Professor Reitzenstein is not prepared to regard the two latter epigrams as real epitaphs inscribed on stone: '... it cannot be inferred that VII, 453 and 451 must have been inscribed on stone, only because the old formula was ennobled by a short addition. They are lyrical poems of a short form; their effect would be the same even if the persons were invented, which is after all possible at all times'.[19] It is not strange that he refuses to regard them as real; for his opinion on Alexandrian epigram is well known. But the fact that he has nothing against their form as epitaphs leads me to ask why a real epitaph could not be lyrical in tone if the occasion demands it. How could he deny that the untimely death of a boy and the deplorable bereavement of his miserable father could have touched the poet? The simplicity of the couplet harmonizes with the idea that the names are real. If they were invented, the epigram should have been longer and

rather steeped in sentimentality and artificiality. Leonidas of Tarentum, a poor poet and wanderer, is universally known as a composer of real sepulchral and dedicatory epigrams ordered by poor people and specially by guilds of tradesmen. Here is an epitaph on a certain fisherman called Theris:

Θῆριν τὸν τριγέροντα, τὸν εὐάγρων ἀπὸ κύρτων
ζῶντα, τὸν αἰθυίης πλείονα νηξάμενον,
ἰχθυσιληϊστῆρα, σαγηνέα, χηραμοδύτην,
οὐχὶ πολυσκάλμου πλώτορα ναυτιλίης,
ἔμπης οὔτ' Ἀρκτοῦρος ἀπώλεσεν, οὔτε καταιγὶς
ἦλασε τὰς πολλὰς τῶν ἐτέων δεκάδας·
ἀλλ' ἔθαν' ἐν καλύβῃ σχοινίτιδι, λύχνος ὁπαῖα,
τῷ μακρῷ σβεσθεὶς ἐν χρόνῳ αὐτόματος.
σῆμα δὲ τοῦτ' οὐ παῖδες ἐφήρμοσαν, οὐδ' ὁμόλεκτρος,
ἀλλὰ συνεργατίνης ἰχθυβόλων θίασος.

'Theris, the very old man who got his living from his lucky weels, who swam more than a gull, the ravager of fishes, the scine-hauler, the creeper in the holes in the rocks, the sailor on a ship with a single pair of oars, nevertheless neither Arcturus (i.e. the season of Arcturus' setting, September) destroyed him nor did any hurricane drive to death throughout his many decades, but he died in his reed hut, going out like a lamp of

his own will owing to the length of years. This tomb neither his children nor his wife did provide, but it is the guild of his fellow fishermen who set it up.' In this epigram we have a new type of epitaphs which are typical of Leonidas of Tarentum. All the particulars of a real epitaph are present. The name of the dead is mentioned; the tomb, those who erected it, the death and its cause are stated, but according to Leonidas' way, much stress was put on the profession of the dead. Thus we have in this epitaph a biographical survey crammed with different activities of a distinguished fisherman which were cleverly enumerated. It is obvious that it is long for an inscription; but the assumption that it was ordered by the guild, the members of which seized the opportunity of exalting their trade even indirectly justifies the fact that it is a genuine epitaph. The poet could not have been able to mention the guild and exclude the mere thought that the family of the dead took no part in the erection of the tomb unless he meant to state facts. If so the guild could not have ordered it unless it was intended for practical use. It may be inferred from the use of the Ionic 'σῆμα' (line 9) instead of the Doric 'σᾶμα' that the epitaph belongs to non-Doric descendant, otherwise the

poet could have used his own dialect, the Doric especially because the syllable quantity in both is the same. It is clear however that the poor dead was honoured by so long an epigram simply because it is the guild that paid the expences. Finally I would like to point out that such an epitaph - and many like it - could not reach us at all; for the cemeteries of fishermen naturally were by the sea-coast and so they were threatened by natural phenomena especially wind and moisture of the soil. Here is another epitaph written by Leonidas[21] to order for the tomb of a nurse called Clita. In two couplets the nurse was paid deserved homage:

Ὁ μικκὸς τόδ' ἔτευξε τᾷ Θρᾳΐσσᾳ
Μήδειος τὸ μνᾶμ' ἐπὶ τᾷ ὁδῷ κἠπέγραψε Κλείτας.
ἐξεῖ τὰν χάριν ἃ γυνὰ ἀντ' ἐκείνων
ὢν τὸν κῶρον ἔθρεψε. τί μάν; ἔτι χρησίμα καλεῖται.[22]

'Little Medeus made this tomb by the wayside for a Thracian woman and inscribed it with the name of Clita. The woman will have her reward for rearing up the boy. Why? She is still called "useful" '. This is one of the inscriptions on slaves which came into fashion in the Alexandrian period. The assumption that the epigram is a genuine epitaph cannot be doubted. It is a

sincere expression of gratitude from the family of the boy for one who reared up their child. Nothing in it is extraordinary to count it an epideictic poem. From the point of view of form, the epigram contains the name of the dead, the name of the constructor of the tomb. The place of the tomb is indicated. Turning to dedicatory inscriptions, I choose one composed by Callimachus accompanying a lamp dedicated to the Egyptian god Serapis whose cult was introduced by the first Ptolemies and perhaps by Ptolemy Soter himself:

Τῷ με κανωπίτᾳ Καλλίστιον εἴκοσι μύξαις
πλούσιον, ἀ Κριτίου λύχνιον ἔθηκε θεῷ,
εὐξαμένα περὶ παίδος Ἀπελλίδος· ἐς δ' ἐμὰ φέγγη
ἀθρήσας φήσεις· "Ἔσπερε, πῶς ἔπεσες;"[23]

'To the god of Canopus, Serapis, did Callistion, daughter of Critias, dedicate me, the lamp rich in twenty nozzles, having made the vow for her child Apellis. Looking on my light you will say, "Hesperus - the evening star - how did you fall on the earth.' This is an epigram worthy of being inscribed on a tablet. The occasion is serious and the ex-voto seems suitable for fulfilling the vow. The name of the dedicator, the epithet of the god and the article dedicated are mentioned. The statement: 'Ἔσπερε, πῶς ἔπεσες' is

not a mere exaggeration; it simply shows that the poet was inspired by an extraordinary lamp of twenty wicks.[24] The next is an inscription on a statue of a girl dedicated to the goddess Isis:

Ἰναχίης ἔστηκεν ἐν Ἴσιδος ἡ Θάλεω παῖς
Αἰσχυλίς, Εἰρήνης μητρὸς ὑποσχεσίῃ.[25]

'Aeschylis, the daughter of Thales, in fulfilment of the vow of her mother Irene, stands in the temple of Isis, daughter of Ianachus.'[26] The brevity of the inscription and the simplicity of the composition leave no doubt in regarding it a real inscription carved on the statue of Aeschylis. From Leonidas of Tarentum I choose the following epigram in which some shields were dedicated to Itonian Athene by Pyrrhus king of Epirus:

τοὺς θυρεοὺς ὁ Μολοσσὸς Ἰτωνίδι δῶρον Ἀθάνᾳ
Πύρρος ἀπὸ θρασέων ἐκρέμασεν Γαλατᾶν,
πάντα τὸν Ἀντιγόνου καθελὼν στρατὸν· οὐ μέγα θαῦμα.
αἰχμηταὶ καὶ νῦν καὶ πάρος Αἰακίδαι[27]

'The Molossian Pyrrhus hang here the shields, taken from the bold spirited Gauls as a gift to Itonian Athene after destroying the whole army of Antigonus. It is no great wonder![28] Now, as of old, the sons of Aeacus are warriors.' This epigram refers to the defeat of

Antigonus II (surnamed Gonatas) and his Galatian mercenaries at the hands of the formidable Pyrrhus in 274 B.C.[29] The fact that this inscription was found on a stone in Iton in Thessaly[30] gives me no chance of further comment. Of Leonidas' dedicatory inscriptions, I quote the following. Ambrosia who was saved from bitter pangs of labour dedicates some of her things to Eileithyia (Hera or Artemis):-

Ἐκ τάκου, Εἰλείθυια, πικρὰν ὠδῖνα φυγοῦσα
Ἀμβροσίη κλεινῶν θήκατ' σοι πρὸ ποδῶν
δέσμα κόμας καὶ πέπλον, ἐφ' ᾧ δεκάτῳ ἐνὶ μηνὶ
δισσὸν ἀπὸ ζώνης κὠμ' ἐλόχευσε τέκνων.[31]

'Having escaped the bitter pangs of labour of child-birth, Ambrosia, Ilithyia, laid at your glorious feet, her hair-bands and her robe, because in the tenth month she brought forth the double fruit which she bore under her girdle (the double fruit of her womb).' The contents of the epigram show that it was composed for a practical use i.e. for an inscription accompanying the hair-bands and the robe. The name of the dedicator and that of the goddess are given. The reason for the dedication are also mentioned. There is nothing sportive or particular to lead us to consider it epideictic at all. The occasion of childbirth and the ex-voto offered to

the goddesses who preside over the safety of mothers seems always serious, real and cherished during all the Greek world.

I hope that these few epigrams selected from those of the early masters of the period whose epigrams were taken as models by later epigrammatists are sufficient to prove that there is among the epigrams of the Anthology as well as the other sources a number of real sepulchral and dedicatory inscriptions. These examples show that Professor Reitzenstein's assumption that the Alexandrian epigrams - namely the sepulchral and dedicatory - are only literary exercises for books is not correct at all. There is no doubt that the majority of what reached us from the epigrams of this period are epideictic and composed for some other purposes; but it is not true at all that all are of that nature as I have already proved. Generalization is always dangerous. What we should do to settle this question reasonably is to examine every epigram - sepulchral or dedicatory - on a stylistic basis and then decide whether the epigram is real or epideictic. The difference between the real and epideictic is not difficult to see. Let us take an example from Callimachus to show what difference does exist between the real and unreal epitaphs:

Σύντομος ἦν ὁ ξεῖνος· ὃ καὶ στίχος· οὐ μακρὰ λέξω·
"Θῆρις Ἀριστα[ί]νου, Κρὴς" ἔπ' ἐμοὶ δόλιχος.[32]

'The stranger was short; so the line. Though I will not tell a long tale: "Theris son of Aristaeus, a Cretan", is long for me'. If we compare this epitaph with those of Callimachus I have already dealt with, we shall not hesitate to consider the latter epideictic. As to its contents, it cannot be taken as real epitaph. There is no mention of the tomb nor a mere allusion to it. The air of the couplet is undoubtedly sportive and thus it is a book-epigram as well as a Scolion-like poem recited at the table. Such epigram makes it clear that Professor Reitzenstein opens his eyes only on the epideictic and took no heed of those which can be considered as real. The shortness of material testimony and the doubt or rather the uncertainty of the names of the dead or the dedicator do not justify the rash conclusion that all that was written in the Alexandrian period was only for the book. The best way then is to approach the question with commonsense and without any prejudice.

In the light of these examples we safely reach the conclusion that the Alexandrian epigrammatists tried

their hands at the composition of real inscriptions, sepulchral and dedicatory and that the Palatine Anthology includes a number of them. If Meleager did not copy them directly from the stones, or from the works of the Periegetae like Crateros and Polemon, who copied poetical inscriptions from stone, he might have possibly taken them from the epigrammatists' own collections. Some inscriptions written to order by the epigrammatists and actually inscribed on stones and dedicatory tablets could have been included by the epigrammatists themselves in their own collections for some reason or other such as the preservation of their masterpieces. These, I admit, are few in number compared with the other literary themes at which the epigrammatists tried their hands.

We pass now to discuss the different themes which were an outcome of the epigrammatic activity during this period or more precisely during its golden age which took place almost at its beginning for nearly a score of decades. The study of these themes is in fact a study of the development of the Greek epigram in the hands of the Alexandrians. This epigrammatic development is the fruit of the epigrammatists' practice of borrowing and adapting themes belonging to other poetic

types and recasting them in the narrow frame of the epigram. Add to this the new tendencies of the poets, to which I referred in my account of the characteristics of the period.[33] As a result of all this, the epigram became a vehicle touching on anything that could be briefly expressed. Thus the medley of the themes is great and rather unlimited.

To begin with the enumeration of these themes, we are especially concerned with the epideictic epigram or the literary exercises derived from the traditional themes, the sepulchral and the dedicatory as well as the themes which have no connection with inscriptions. To the first group belong the epideictic sepulchral and dedicatory epigrams which are simply a playing with the traditional form either seriously or sportively. The second group show a variety of topics which the epigrammatists used to handle freely and spontaneously. These themes are as follows: the amatory and the symposiac, the literary, the aesthetic, the admonitory, the flattering, the humorous and the invective. These two distinctive groups of themes will be thoroughly discussed and clearly illustrated in my account on the Alexandrian epigrammatists[34] whom I consider the originators of the epigrammatic genre in this period and

who, if we take them together, have widened the scope of its subjects, each of them in his own way,[35] and in whose hands the epigrammatic genre came into the full course of its development. This study of the themes is then an attempt to understand the epigrammatists' initiatives and to trace their following up of these initiatives.

To begin with the themes derived directly from the inscriptional epigramma, the epideictic sepulchral and dedicatory epigrams throw a light on the tendencies of the Alexandrians and their way of adapting certain poetic types used by their predecessors and became rather obsolete by then. Of the sepulchral, we have much reason to believe that epigram acquired the features of the scolion and the griphus and like them became an item cherished at the symposia of the savant banqueters. The first specimen shows itself in the epigrams on 'heroes', Greek and Trojan, who died in the Trojan Wars. These are, it is very likely, the offspring of both the Attic scolion[36] sung or recited at the symposia and the griphos where the banqueters used to compete in capping in turn the names of these heroes.[37] There is some evidence to prove this in the epigrams of Asclepiades and his friend and pupil, Poseidippus where the first composed two epigrams on Greek heroes while

the second two on Trojans. Unfortunately, we have only one complete epigram on Ajax (A.P. VII, 145) and the others are referred to in quotations or in the comment of a scholium. Of the other epigram by Asclepiades, there is a quotation in Etymologicum Magnum - 'Σπληδόνα τ' ἀγαθέην' - cited from Asclepiades to show that Aspedon in Boeotia was also called simply Spledon. This tag may have come from an epigram on Ascalaphos or his brother Ialmenos, the leaders of the contingent from Aspledon and Orchomenos at Troy.[38] Of Poseidippus' two epigrams one is on a Trojan hero whose name, by a mistake, is Berisos.[39] This epigram is referred to by Aristarchus[40] as being included in the collection called the 'Σωρός'.[41] The fact that there is no such person among the Trojan leaders called Berisos, leads us to think that such an epigram is a griphos capped at a symposium and that Poseidippus being at a loss for a Trojan leader's name beginning with 'B', got out of this difficulty by coining a name formed from a verb, a particle and the actual name of a bastard son of Priam. Poseidippus also wrote a griphos epigram on Pandaros, son of Lycaon, who owed his skill with the bow to Apollo himself.[42] This epigram may have appeared also in the 'Σωρός'. These examples from Asclepiades and Poseidippus confirm that the epigram replaced the

scolion and the griphos and the epideictic sepulchral epigram, as is clear from Asclepiades' extant epitaph on Ajax (A.P. VII, 145), became a favourite theme and an item recited at the gatherings of the Literati where pompous laudation of these ancient heroes were improvised at the banquet in the same way as Asclepiades and Poseidippus did. Such appreciative epigrams - and they are mostly cast in epitaph-form - reveal the improvisators' admiration of Homer and the Homeric gallant characters. The Palatine MS. preserves some epigrams many of which are composed by anonymous poets.[44] These are on Hector,[45] Ajax,[46] Nestor,[47] Ajax and Hector,[48] Achilles and Patroclus[49] and on Priam.[50]

Epideictic epitaphs on distinguished literary figures, poets and thinkers were a speciality of the Alexandrians. Hardly any poet or philosopher of any merit, old or contemporary, was not paid a due tribute. Moreover this theme was almost composed by every epigrammatist not only during this period but also long after it ends. Some of them however wrote more than one on one poet. It is not surprising that the Alexandrians indulged themselves in expressing their attitudes especially to their predecessors, since in this period the works of these eminent poets were

edited, annotated and elucidated. These appreciative epitaphs, although they comment on the works of these poets and contain all kind of epithets which were so carefully chosen as to express what they thought appropriate to the spirit of the poet, are not and far from being a criticism in the full sense of the word. Many of them are mere repetition of the characteristics of the poets and the nature of their works. The list of these are so numerous that I am bound to content myself with mentioning only those on the most famous figures composed by some distinguished epigrammatists. These are the classical poets that were honoured by laudatory epitaphs: Homer, Hesiod, Orpheus, Thespis, Sappho, Alcman, Archilochus, Hipponax, Anacreon, Sophocles, Aeschylus, Aristophanes and Pindar.[51] Moreover other literary figures including the Alexandrians have their complimentary epitaphs too: Antimachus, Erinna, Heracleitus, Tellen, Machon, Euphorion and Philaenis.[52] Epideictic epitaphs written by the poets themselves for their own tombs came into fashion in this period. Nossis of Locri, an immediate pioneer of the Alexandrian school may have been taken as a model; for she is the first, as far as we know, to write an epitaph for her tomb.[53] Of this kind we have some written by three

eminent epigrammatists of this period: Callimachus, Leonidas of Tarentum and Meleager.[54] In their beautiful epitaphs, they gave us a biographical outline of their lives, expressed their hopes and inflated their ego as versatile poets. The epitaphs written during this period on thinkers (philosophers and sages) are comparatively few in number especially if they are compared with those written after the end of this period.[55] These are on Pittacus, Diogenes; Zeno and Heraclitus of Ephesus.[56]

A different kind of epideictic epitaph is worth mentioning. These are the epitaphs written on animals. The Greeks like the Europeans of the present day, especially the British,[57] are lovers of animals. This is most obvious from the epitaphs belonging to the periods preceding the Alexandrian period especially those written by Anyte and her school,[58] whose interest in epitaphs on animals makes them the originators of this theme. The Alexandrians therefore followed in their steps, showing at the same time a mastery in their treatment. We have accordingly some written on different animals: Locusts, a mare, a dog, a swallow, a leveret and an ant.[59]

We pass now to deal with the usual sepulchral

epigrams which were written on the poets' contemporaries high and low. These are, as I said before, either real or epideictic. As far as the epideictic epigrams are concerned, they owe the style of their composition to the real deaths of real people and so they are literary development of actual inscriptions written to order by the same poet, who thus had the chance to express himself more freely than in the brief inscription itself. These sepulchral epigrams touch on the members of the Alexandrian society and whatever postion they had. In this they showed more than those of the classical period, a democratic tendency towards the dead. Among the many sincere and passionate epitaphs that attract our eyes in this period,[60] are the following: first come those whicharo connected with family. Epitaphs on women who died on giving birth to a child are full of pathos which arouses our sympathy.[61] So also epigrams on lads and lasses in childhood, some of whom died in deplorable accidents,[62] became now into fashion.[63] Maidens who died before marriage or on the very day of their marriage were honoured by touching epitaphs and threnodes.[64] For the first time in the history of epitaphs, slaves and especially nurses are recognised as members of the family and are entitled to have

epitaphs on their tombs.[65] Happy people, who died at an advanced age, have some gay epitaphs.[66]

Epitaphs on wretched shipwrecked sailors and sea-farers are not few. This is only natural with the Greeks-a sea-faring people who profited and suffered from traversing the Mediterranean for fishing and trade. Thus these epigrams give us a true tale of the sea and of sea-farers, a story which is by no means cheerful. It is not astonishing then if we meet in these poems cries and sheer complaints from the unkind sea and the horrible and inhospitable winds especially when the ship-wrecked bodies are either tossed by the waves or wholly or partly eaten by the sea-monsters. Of these epitaphs and threnode,[67] I mention only a small list. Connected with these are the cenotaph-epitaphs composed for tombs empty of the corpses of the dead.[68] Both of these classes are numerous.

Epitaphs on warriors who died in battle-field are a favourite theme of some epigrammatists of the period, as for instance, Damagetus, Theodoridas, Dioscorides and Alcaeus of Messene.[69] In their treatment, these poets reveal their own political tendencies and so they contrast with Simonides who was in his epigrams inspired by national patriotism.[70] In this way the epigram becomes

a vehicle for political controversies and party-propaganda.

The sepulchral epigram is not always an epitaph; it may be a threnode or commiseration. We have a big number of these threnodes which are reminiscent of the old threnodic elegy; they deal with persons who died in their prime or were drowned at sea or whose death was a result of some accident.[71] Along with these there are some commemorative tributes glorifying the skill of the departed as musician, actor, dancer or navigator.[72] It can be also a tribute to a companion or friend.[73]

The sepulchral epigram may be a story of ill-fated death which some epigrammatists took pains to record in a dramatic way, as, for example, the story of a certain fisherman who was a victim of a fish; for after he lifted it from the sea, it slipped from his fingers and went wriggling down his narrow gullet and caused his destruction; or of the sailor who, on diving to loosen the anchor, was half eaten by a great monster of the sea, or of that unfortunate one who leapt from a high wall to Hades because he read a treatise of Plato on the soul; or of the very old man who ended his life by drinking poison.[74] These epigrams, striking as they are, could have been composed for the book or for

recital at the banquet.

Sepulchral epigrams gave the poets a chance for indulging themselves in expressing their own philosophical ideas (which are naturally only commonplace) and their reflections about life and death. Here the dead man utters an advice or admonition to the passer-by and even to mankind. We have seen some classical epigrams where the dead give some kind of advice to the passer-by or wish him good luck; but such practice was widened and emphasized in the Alexandrian time especially at the hands of Leonidas of Tarentum, who is deservedly considered as the representative of this kind of epigram in which an advice or admonition is put into the mouth of the dead as a preacher. This admonitory sepulchral epigram both classical and Alexandrian is reminiscent of the old gnomic and reflective elegies which were sung at the banquet. Since it was an offspring of these, it must have been recited at the symposia as Professor Reitzenstein asserts.[75] Leonidas' epigrams, although many of them were cast in an epitaph form, conform with his (i.e. Professor Reitzenstein's) deduction. I will give some instances of Leonidas of Tarentum:[76] in one of his epigrams, a certain rich deceased person denounces the idea of possessing much

property, herds and flocks while his own tomb occupies a little share of his vast lands. In another the deceased, whose death may have been caused by excessive drink, advises the passer-by not to go out drunk on a winter night. In a third the dead speaks of the vanity of erecting rich and useless monuments. The next deals with the emptiness of life and the vain hopes of man, and advises us to be humble and be content with the simple life. In another the dead considers death a great relief from the storms of life.[77] It may be a sympathetic comment on some tombs in a bad condition. Thus the dead man in one of Leonidas' epigrams is very worried because a new road was opened where his tomb stands and caused destruction to his skeleton. In another, the tomb is by the road and ever scraped by the axle and wheel of the travellers' coaches.[78] These two epigrams reveal the poet's sympathy and deep concern for those dead persons whose bodies, or what is left of them, were exposed and seen by the passers-by. They cannot be taken as epitaphs, although they were cast in an epitaph-form, but this form was used to give stronger effect to the poet's sympathy.

Some of the sepulchral epigrams - most of them epitaphs- are humorous in tone. These are mere jokes

flavoured with caustic wit, irony and sarcasm, usually cynical; but they have nothing to do with satire at all, though the scholars wish to call them satire.[79] The few instances we have in this period conform with my assumption. All of them are jeux d'esprit or light and sportive comments void of malice. According to their particular nature and motif, they are entertaining items improvised at the symposia to rouse laughter; in other words, they were composed under the spell of wine to stimulate the banqueters during the drinking round and add to their jolly and merry mood caused by intoxication. Such humorous epitaphs originated from the fusion of the inscription with the elegeion sung at the banquet[80] some generations before the beginning of the Alexandrian period. We have already seen an example by Simonides on Timocreon[81] which reveals the fact that guests of an intellectually higher level invented and practised this special kind of epitaph that conforms with their literary taste and caprice. As regards the source or sources from which these jests are drawn, the influence of comedy may have been at work; but it is more correct to say that the sense of humour is a personal gift. There are epigrammatists who are endowed with humour and subtle wit while others are not gifted.

The humorous epitaphs of the Alexandrian period, which are comparatively few, deal mostly with tipplers whose death was caused by excessive drink. In an epitaph involved in dialogue, Callimachus gives us a subtle remark on a soaker: Someone asks his dead friend of the cause of his death and the latter answers that it is the unhappy wine to blame. Here the questioner is both subtle and caustic; for he not only anticipates the cause of death but also emphasized the fact that his friend was the victim of heavy drink. This is attained by referring to the Centaur, Eurytion, who ruined himself by drinking too much.[82] The next epigram by Leonidas is a narrative epitaph about a wine bibbing and boozing old woman. In order to give his fun a dramatic effect, he brought into the scene an Attic cup standing on the tomb of this boozer and then he alludes to the distress the dead suffers beneath the earth - a distress which, he asserts, is by no means caused by leaving a family behind her but because the cup is empty.[83] This humorous climax gives the epigram a point similar to those achieved by later epigrammatists especially in the hands of Martial. Dioscorides' epitaph of a nurse who was never tired of drinking untempered wine, was laid to rest by her master in his fields so that she should even dead and buried, be near to the vats.[84] Beside

these epitaphs on drunkards, two humorous ones dealing with different subjects have a claim to be mentioned, because of their pawky humour. The two are by Callimachus' pen.[85] In the first he states that the epitaph is brief because the dead man is short. Such epitaphs as this could be nothing but a joke passed on a dead man who is known by all to be very short. The other[86] is rather cynical and reveals Callimachus' scepticism or even his denial of the existence of gods and his disapproval of the current religious beliefs. Thus a conversation took place between the poet and the dead. The poet asks the dead man some critical questions about the life after death, the return or resurrection and the god presiding over the deceased. The answers he received from the dead, are the poet's own views. The fact that such questions are still puzzling many to-day, especially those whose faith is not strong, and offer still a chance for conversation, sometimes argumentative, whenever a party of cultured people takes place, makes it clear that this epitaph was composed for the symposia reflecting some views of the highly cultured men. Along with these two epigrams which I call epitaphs involving a defence of the dead, are worth mentioning. They are by Dioscorides. In the

first[87] the daughters of Lycambes upon whom and their family Archilochus poured a flood of horrible reproach and evil report, are defending themselves from under the tomb. In the other[88] Philaenis, a Samian poetess to whom an obscene book was attributed, tries very hard to clear her name from the dishonour caused by assigning these wanton verses to her. The warmth of her defence is very effective.

These are the different subjects treated in the Alexandrian sepulchral epigram. As far as the examples enumerated are concerned, they illustrate a variety of themes and disclose the epigrammatists' tendencies and caprices; for they deal with death and the dead either seriously or sportively. They touch on a real society, high and low, and smack with real sentiments, fears, complaints and even hopes. In addition to the inscriptional epitaphs, they are literary reproductions or extensions of genuine epitaphs.

Our next theme is the dedicatory. Dedicatory epigrams are as important as the sepulchral and even more. They bring us nearer to the living society, whose members vary according to their age, class, trade, calling and hobby, but all have to approach some superhuman power as an aid for reaching their goal. In this

the dedicatory epigram discloses unseparable connection between the mortals and the immortals who were their benefactors, protectors and saviours. These deities have their characteristics and sphere of power and the one is approached for one particular occasion, the other for another. As for the motives and the occasions for the dedications, they are manifold: thanksgiving for deliverance from sickness, from the sea, and from all sorts of calamities and crises of human life - for victory in war, for good luck and success. They also commemorate a happy occasion taking place in the family life, victories in games and contests, financial profit and increase of crop etc. etc. The ex-votos offered varied according to the deity and the offerer. These are the subject of the dedicatory epigram long before the Alexandrian period and long after its end; for ex-votos are usually accompanied with an inscription which is simply a bare record of the gift dedicated. The Alexandrian dedicatory inscription compared with the classical one is far superior, elaborate and possessed of all poetic embellishments. Their characteristics are best illustrated by Professor Mackail in these words: 'But it is hardly till the Alexandrian period that the dedication has elaborate pains bestowed upon

it simply for the feeling and expression as a form of poetry; and it is to this period that the mass of the best prayers and dedications belong.'[89]

In their wide range and different tones, the Alexandrian dedicatory epigrams, whether inscriptional or literary, are quite interesting. They display all sort of expression neatly and alertly achieved. Like the sepulchral, they are either serious containing admonitory advice and practical philosophic lessons and reflective turns of thought or sportive comments for entertainment. The two eminent epigrammatists that contributed to this special field are Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum, whose influence, especially that of the latter, showed itself clearly and strongly in the epigrams of their contemporaries and successors.

To begin to enumerate the themes, we take first the dedications which commemorate some happy events belonging to Domestic life. In thanks for cures, the Egyptian gods, Sarapis and Isis are offered different offerings: a lamp rich in twenty wicks to the first and a statue of the child cured to the second.[90] The birth of a child, which is a happy event, has due offerings[91] to the goddesses presiding over childbirth: Ilithyia and Artemis.[92] Marriage and successful family-life are

motives for dedications. Thus a maiden who has bidden farewell to her knuckle-bones, dedicates to Artemis her abundant curly hair and her snood with a prayer that the goddess may kindly grant her both a husband and children.[93] A lady already married, blessed in her wedlock and children, dedicates her statue to Cypris Urania as a thanksgiving to the goddess for her grace.[94] Childdren have their opportunity to dedicate to different deities such as Apollo, Hermes and sometimes the Nymphs. The occasions are the first cut of hair, the time of puberty and also for undefined circumstances. The exvotos dedicated are usually hair or dolls.[95] The epigrams commemorating these happy events often contain prayers that the child might live till his old age and lead a good and successful life.[96]

We pass now to deal with votive epigrams on dedications consecrated by certain types. The first are the warriors. The theme was tried long before the Alexandrian period begins. We have some nice pieces attributed to Simonides, Anyte and others.[97] Such themes originated from the many wars which the Greek fought against his fellow Greeks or against foreign enemy. In these epigrams, either in the classical period or during the Alexandrian era warriors used to consecrate

to different deities - not in fact to Ares, the god of war, or rather of warlike frenzy[98] - some of their arms as a tithe or commemoration of victory, but retired soldiers who have been tired from long wars and place their old and war-worn in the temple of some deities just to take a rest after a long time of struggle. The epigrams describing these are at all times possessed of fresh colours, self-glorification of all sorts and polemical attitudes which rob the offering of its pious simplicity. Among the best specimens preserved from our period are those composed by Callimachus, Leonidas of Tarentum[99], Mnasalces, Tymnes and Antipater of Sidon. The dedicators in these epigrams offer the deity (Serapis, Athene, Phoebus and Artemis) bows, shields, woven coats of mail, axes, spears, a trumpet that once poured forth the bloody notes of war in battle and the sweet tune of peace. These dedications refer to real wars which were continually fought in the Hellenistic period; some of them can be identified: Menoetas, who dedicates his bow to Serapis[100] took part in an expedition against Cyrene; Hagon's epigram in which he dedicates to Athene eight shields, eight helmets, eight woven coats of mail and as many blood-stained axes, the spoils of the Lucanians, refers to the wars which have taken place between the

Tarentines and the Lucanians.[101] Pyrrhus' epgram in which he dedicates some shields, spoils of the Gauls, refers to the battle fought between him and Antigonus.[102]

Victory in games and different contests is a motive for dedications. The gifts offered are generally the prize awarded to the victors. We have quite a few number in the Anthology. Of the epigrams composed for the athletes we have three.[103] The first on a bronze image of Clitomachus (see Pausanias, Vi, 15) who won three contests at the Isthmus. We do not know if this image was dedicated or not; for according to Rouse, some athlete Statues were votive and some are not.[104] In the second[105] Charmus, after winning the Isthmian race offers to Posiedon his whip, curry-comb and the other trappings of his horses. According to traditional custom, the athlete, like the victorious warrior, might consecrate the implements of his game.[106] The third is a pompous piece which may be a description of a statue of Nicophon who won the mens' boxing contest in the Olympian games.[107] Of the other contesters, the first is on Damomences, the Choregeus, who dedicates a tripod to Dionysus togehter with a picture of the god to celebrate the occasion of a victory with his chorus of men.[108] Here it is understood that Damomenes dedicates

the prize he was actually given, for according to the traditional custom the tripods were awarded for the best tribal chorus at the Dionysia.[109] The second on an actor, Agoranax, the Rhodian, who dedicates a comic mask for his victory in the theatre.[110] The last one in this series deals with a contest of beauty. Contests of beauty were known to the Greeks of the classical times. According to Athenaeus' Cypselus instituted a contest of feminine beauty where his own wife Herodice won the prize.[111] In an epigram of the anthology, a victorious maiden, Niconoe, having won the contest offers as trophies for her victory, her snood, the purple vest, the Laconian robes, the gold piping for the tunic, the fawn-skin and golden jug to Priapus.[112]

Another specimen of dedicatory epigrams are those which belong to the world of workers of different trades and callings. In these epigrams the different professions of humble people are given an attention never known before. Their great number marks a revolution in acknowledging the status of the low people as a class not to be underrated but on the contrary cherished and sung of. The enumeration of the tools and implements and the exquisite epithets given to them show the

interest of the Alexandrians not only in the crafts themselves but also in the individuals who practise them. This theme is quite an innovation. Leonidas of Tarentum instituted it, stimulated his contemporaries to try it and inspired his immediate and later successors to exercise it with much zeal. This concern for the poor class may have been due to the current philosophic teaching of the time which gave much attention to the poor especially the Cynic sect. Cercidas of Megalopolis, though a member of the wealthy class, made himself in his poems the mouthpiece of the poor. It may be an outcome of Alexander's conquests which introduced some sort of social reforms and some correction of the old political views. It is therefore conceivable that such people began to occupy a better place and their trades to be sung of. As Leonidas of Tarentum is the originator and instigator of this particular theme, I would like to discuss and illustrate it in my account of his dedicatory epigrams[113] and concern myself here with a list of the dedications consecrated by the members of each craft under the name of their composers who belong to the period. I begin with the weavers; these are women or maids who work very hard for livelihood. The theme was tried only by Leonidas of Tarentum and his

follower and imitator Antipater of Sidon. In their votive epigrams these women-weavers consecrate their instruments and sometimes pieces of their work to Athene their patroness and also to Artemis. The motives of their dedication are to beg the deity to help or when they wish to change their manner of living. Thus three working women Bitto, Antianira and Bitie dedicate a piece of woven work which the three vied in making, to Artemis, the fairest of the daughters of Zeus.[114] The poor daughters of Lycomedes offer, as a tithe of their work, the laborious spindle, the weaving comb, the spools and the heavy weaving blade to Athene with the hope that she would fill their hands and make them rich in meal.[115] Bitto dedicated to Athene her melodious loom, comb, the implement of the work that was her scanty livelihood; for she decided to enter into the service of Aphrodite which is more profitable.[116] Fishermen, on retiring from their hard and dangerous trade consecrate[117] their implements generally to Poseidon. Diophantus, an aged fisherman dedicates to the god of the sea, Poseidon, a long list of the relics of his old calling: his hook, his long poles, his line, his creels, the weel, the trident and the two oars of his boat.[118] A certain fisherman, Dionysus, dedicates a shell he found

cast ashore to the Nymphs of the grotto. A group of fishermen dedicate to the gods of a vast rib of a thousand-footed scolopendra which was cast ashore.[119] Carpenters, on ceasing from their calling dedicate their tools to Pallas Athene, the patroness of urban arts and handicrafts. Thus Theris, the cunning worker, dedicates to Pallas his instruments: the straight cubit-rule, the stiff saw with curved handle, his bright axe, the plane and the revolving gimlet.[120] The list of another carpenter, Leontichus, is rather longer. To the same goddess he dedicates the following tools: the grooved file, the plane, rapid devourer of wood, the line and the ochre-box, the hammer that strikes with both ends, the rule stained with ochre, the drill-bow and rasp, and the heavy axe with its handle, the revolving augers and quick gimlets, four screw-drivers and the double-edged adze.[121] The enumeration of these tools and the minute and attractive description of every piece reveal Leonidas' unrivalled mastery and his great interest in crafts and craftsmen. I wonder if the second of these epigrams, the longish one, was written for a practical purpose as an inscription accompanying all these instruments. To take it as a literary and extended reproduction of a real inscription seems to be more

reasonable.

The rural people have their own dedications. The huntsmen and fowlers in woodland approach their deities: Pan the lord of the mountains and forests, Artemis Agrotera, Hermes and Heracles, for help, in thanks for a good catch and on ceasing from their callings. The offerings dedicated are tools, such as spears, staffs, clubs, hunting-cudgels, bows, quivers, leashes, dog-collars etc. These are brought in the local shrines or under trees. Or a part of the catch: heads, horns and skin generally hung upon plane or wild pear-trees. Thus Sosippus the fowler suffering the feebleness of old age dedicates to Hermes the trap, the nets, his quiver and so on.[122] Polyaenus, the boar-hunter, dedicates to Pan a club, a bow, a quiver, a dog-collar and the boar's feet, gifts of thanks for his success in boar-hunting.[123] This theme was tried by epigrammatists who were either under the influence of the Doric school or particularly followers of Leonidas of Tarentum.[124] In like manner husbandmen (farmers and gardeners) pay their devoirs to the deities of the country life: Pan, Demeter, Bacchus, Artemis, the Nymphs etc. The offering dedicated is as tithe or first fruit of husbandry, orcharding or shepherding; the motive may be thanksgiving or for

acquiring the favours of the deity. These offerings are generally crops of the farms, fruits of the orchard, flowers of the garden or victims from the pasture. Here are some examples: Timodemus places in the temple of Demeter unnamed gifts, a tithe of his gains in fulfilment of a vow.[125] Philetis dedicates to the heroine - Nymphs of the Libyans (see Apoll. Rhod. IV, 1308 ff) some consecrated sheaves and fresh garlands of straw, the full tithe of his threshing.[126] Old Biton dedicates to Pan, a newly born kid, to Bacchus a branch of ivy, and to the Nymphs, the varied bloom of blood-red rose in full flower, in return for much milk, grapes and water.[127] Shepherds and herdsmen have some motives for dedicating offerings to the deities, Pan and Artemis. As they and their herds are exposed in the solitude to dangers of every kind, storms, thunders, savage animals etc., they approach their deity either in thanks for escaping some dangers or commemorating a victory over beasts which haunt the pastures and threaten them and their herds. So some goat-herdsmen, who were saved from a lion, dedicate to Pan, the god of the mountain peaks, a picture on a thick-stemmed oak of what befell them.[128] Eualces, the Cretan, slew, while shepherding his flocks at night, a beast which caused havoc on the flock, the cattle-pen and the herdsmen and hung it on a pine.[129]

Glaucon and Corydon, the cattlemen slaughtered a horned steer for the pastoral god Pan and fixed by a long nail to the plane-tree its horns, twelve palms long.[130] These last specimens of epigrams on fowlers, hunters, husbandmen and shepherds show clearly the love of the epigrammatists of rural life. It is to them a refuge so desirable and a change from the great cities with their bustle and noise and pursuit of gain. Their appeal to nature which is obvious, is made through the deities of the hillside, the plain, the pasture, the meadow and the garden, in the persons of Pan, Heracles, Hermes, Priapus, Demeter, Bacchus and the Nymphs as we have already seen.

This intuition of natural beauty reinforcing and reinforced by their devotion to nature appears with much emphasis in a group of Idyllic or pastoral epigrams which are either loosely related to inscriptions or have nothing to do with inscriptions but all are literary exercises inspired by Anyte's epigrams[131] or Theocritus' Idylls. We are not sure whether the classical epigrammatists had the same devotion for nature. Miss Gragg is inclined to believe that they were far behind. To quote her words: 'In epigrams earlier than 300B.C., we have almost nothing of that half-reverential,

half-intimate affection for nature which is part of the
132
charm of so much of later work. This view gives the credit to the Alexandrians and their immediate pioneers who exclusively belong to the Dorian school. The group of the pastoral epigrams to which I am referring immediately could make an attractive sound film representing ' the country and country life.' There pass before our mind's eye stretched and ever green pastures dotted with bubbling fountains gushing with pure and cold water to quench the thirsty way-farer, trees laiden with fruit, under the leafy shade of which he can have a rest and relax his fatigued limbs. It is the realm of the nightingales pouring forth their winning song far and wide and of the blackbirds with their shrill song. Here too the cicada, perched in the high trees and warm in the midsummer heat, makes music for the way-farer without payment. The sweet-scented flowers and roses with their varied and captivating colours are scattered here and there. This is the place where the kids run, jump and enjoy themselves - not without danger, for the wolf is always after them. The people are busy. The farmers grow their crops, the gardeners their flowers, vines etc. and the shepherds tend their flocks up and down where they pursue water and fodder and have time to play on

their pipes. It is the realm of Pan and other rural deities who exercise their traditional powers and extend willingly the kind hand of help. All these pictures are given so minutely that they disclose clearly their authors' conscious appreciation of the charms of nature. Among the many pieces, which attracted me most, are those by Theocritus, Leonidas of Tarentum, Hasalces, Antipater of Sidon and Meleager.[133] In these epigrams the epigrammatists' attitude towards nature can be summarized as follows: sympathetic interest in flowers, plants and animal life, warm humanity towards the country-people and the deep love of fairy land with its dancing nymphs, comfortable surroundings, savage beauty and primitive amusements.

This account can be conveniently ended by some courtesans' votive offerings. The social position of hetaerae (ἑταῖραι, a delicate name for πόρναι) who sold themselves for money, was held higher in the Greeks' estimation. They were considered as priestesses of venal love in the service of Aphrodite who presides over love-affairs whether legal or illegal. Their profession is acknowledged by the state and by religious traditions. This is attested by some evidences: When the Persians invaded Greece, the courtesans of Corinth

went to the temple of Aphrodite and prayed for the safety of Greece. After the enemy were driven back the people dedicated a picture of the women in the same place.[134] Gods other than Aphrodite did not refuse their offerings. The Courtesan Rhodopis sent a tithe of her earnings to Delphi in the form of iron bars.[135] Two little pots of gold were offered at Delos by Cleino, a courtesan in the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus.[136] According to Polybius, the same girl, who was Philadelphus' cupbearer, was honoured by many images set up in Alexandria wearing only a tunic and holding a drinking horn in her hand.[137] These instances make it clear that courtesans had not an unimportant position in the Greek private life and are entitled to the same right as citizens to approach the deities and offer them gifts for some reason or other. The motive for the dedications is not always stated but in such cases, it is fairly reasonable to assume that they owe their occasions to a lawful marriage or the old age which robs them of their beauty. The offerings the courtesans dedicated generally to Aphrodite,[138] their patroness and president of the guild, are, among other articles, garlands, locks of hair, girdles, snoods, bands, veils, cloaks, anklets, mirrors, torches, combs, fans, sandals, shoes, statues, goblets etc. The VIth book of the Anthology contains some few

specimens from this period: Simon offered to Aphrodite - the occasion is not stated - her own portrait, her breast-band and a torch.[139] Calliclea, her wish having been granted, dedicates to Cypris the silver statuette of love, bosom-band, her bronze mirror, box-wood comb etc.[140] Another, Parmenis, leaves her fan to Aphrodite, a tithe from her bed.[141] Three girls, Menecratis, Phemoe and Praxo, all free-born courtesans, dedicate to Aphrodite shoes, a cloak and a goblet, because each one of them had a husband.[142]

Before leaving this account of the dedicatory epigrams, I should like to refer to the fact that strangely enough illiterate people in Egypt and in the East generally carry out the practice of dedicating offerings to some deceased persons who are held, through tradition, to have supernatural powers to help those in danger, to grant luck and prosperity, to cure diseases, to give barren women children, to offer a maiden a husband, to increase crops and herds and so on. The burial-halls (sometimes a mosque or a church) are frequented by supplicants, usually villagers, who dedicate to these dead persons offerings of every kind such as candles, lamps, models of boats and sometimes even money; sometimes they sacrifice a ram or bull or a cow

and distribute it, raw or cooked, among the poor in the name of the superhuman departed. The occasion of these offerings is either thanksgiving for some object attained, a fulfilment of a vow or simply a kind of tithe. As this practice did not originate in either the Mohamedan or the Christian religion nor develop from the Ancient Egyptians' religious rites, it is then a reminiscence of the Greek tradition practised on the Egyptian soil in this period under discussion in the temples of Serapis and Isis.[145] The same thing takes place in modern Italy where some churches at Florence or Padua, receive offerings on the same ancient pagan principle. To quote Symonds "A fashionable church in modern Italy - the Annunziata at Florence, for example, or St. Anthony at Padua - is not more crowded with pictures of people saved from accidents, with silver hearts and waxen limbs, with ribands and artificial flowers, with rosaries and precious stones, and with innumerable objects that only tell their tale of bygone vows to the votary who hung them there, than we the temples of our lady of Love in Cneidos or Corinth".[144] This is again a direct heritage of both Greek and Roman traditions.

In addition to these epigrams, which, to a certain extent and in most cases retain the seriousness of real

inscriptions, there is a great number of epigrams half-serious or totally sportive, fanciful and humorous. According to this particular feature, these epigrams are meant to be published in books or improvised and recited at the gay symposia. Among such epigrams I select some which are possessed of salient wit and clever turn of thought. In one of his humorous epigrams Callimachus very cunningly sports with the gods. Asclepius is reminded of the fact that the tablet accompanying the votive offering bears a witness in case the god forgets and claims again for the fulfilment of the vow Akeson made for his wife Demodice.[145] Leonidas tried some jokes with gods too. In a fanciful epigram on a herm along the side of the road which had the face of Hermes on the one side and that of Heracles on the other, he envisaged them as unfriendly partners, for the offering: the pears and the grapes are swallowed by Heracles and poor Hermes is left nothing. This is the complaint of Hermes to the votaries. The climax of this complaint is revealed in the concluding lines in a form of instruction: 'Let whoever brings us anything serve it separately to each of us and not to both, saying, "This is for thee Heracles," and again, "This is for Hermes." So he might make up our quarrel.'[146] Another epigram of Leonidas about Ares is full of

caustic humour and dramatic effects. The god is furious, his whole face reddens with shame and the sweat gushing from his forehead bedews his breast. The reason of his agony is that somebody whom he does not know, hung on the walls of his temple some unwelcome gifts: unbruised helmets, polished shields unstained by blood and unbroken spears. These offerings, as the god himself indignantly puts it, are ornaments for a lady's bower, or a banqueting-hall or a court or a bridal chamber.'[147] Types did not escape the epigrammatists' fun. The priests of Rhea were a theme for jokes.[148] A long-haired priest of Rhea, who rests now from his frenzy, dedicates his tambourines, his scourge armed with bones, his noisy brazen cymbals and his scented lock of hair to the solemn Mother, Rhea or Cybele. Another type is a cynic follower. The goddess Famine hung on a tamarisk bush the filthy spoils of dirty Sochares: his hard and untanned goat-skin, his walking stick, his polluted oil-flask, his dog-skin purse without a copper in it, and his hat.[149] Gluttons are also ridiculed. Cephalas, the Dorian, the gourmand dedicates to Gluttony and Voracity his kitchen utensils: the enormous Larissean boiling cauldrons, the pots and the wide-gaping cup etc. The epigram ends in a funny prayer; for the goddesses are besought to receive these evil gifts of an evil-giver,

and never grant him temperance.[150] Meleager dedicates to Cypris the playful lamp that is initiated in her night festival.[151] Such are some of the sportive epigrams, which, although they were cast in a dedicatory form, are related to the scolion or the paegnion in spirit and like the latter they were made to entertain at the banquet.

We pass now to the second group of epigrams which did not originate from the inscription but were generally acknowledged to be epigrams. Aristarchus calls the poetic productions of Poseidippus epigrams.[152] As the majority of Poseidippus' poems deal with themes other than inscriptional epigrams, epigram seems in this period to have acquired a broader meaning. In fact, however, we do not know why a poem which is not related to inscription was given the title of epigram. No reason was given by ancient authorities and the modern scholars are disinclined to tackle this question. Although any deduction or conjecture will not be easily welcome, I would not like to pass by it silently. To my mind there is a clue. The fact that the Alexandrians or more strictly the pioneers of the Alexandrians such as Philetas or Asclepiades were fond of the Ionic elegy, the vehicle of the poetry of love and mirth, is well

known. This they cultivated with zeal and widened its scope by adding to the old themes new ones. But, in dealing with their themes, they preferred to be concise, and thus they shortened the body of the old elegy so that it acquired not only the brevity of the inscription, but also like it the tendency to deal with one point only. The metric medium of this poetry is generally the elegiac. Thus it can be said that the old elegy was reduced at this period to the length of the inscription and was therefore entitled to be called after it.[153] The same thing happens with old scolion composed by Alcaeus and Anacreon and also the anonymous Attic scolia. These were recast into another metric medium, i.e. the elegiac couplet, and thus became 'epigram' in form. This is confirmed by the fact that one of Hedylus' poems, written in elegiac couplet and having all the properties of a scolion, a drinking song, is called by Athenaeus, an epigram.[154]

After this digression I return to the themes of the second group. The first is the amatory. The epigram of love is almost an Alexandrian contribution. It may be true that Plato has tried his hand at amatory epigram; but it is certain that Asclepiades is the undisputed exponent of this genre and the first to sing of love with a new accent which revealed itself in

avoiding any flight of imagination and describing real and familiar love affair which takes place between men and women and men and boys in everyday life with much freedom. This spirit of freedom which created new adventures of love and love affairs owed much to the conquests of Alexander. These helped the West to contact with the East and meet in a city like Alexandria or any other flourishing centre and thus customs, virtues and vices imported from every locality became in time a common feature of the new communities. As far as love and love-treatment are concerned, it is not difficult to imagine what reaction this mixture of people has on these themes. Add to this the growing luxurious and licentious life which most of the people of this period, high or low, led. I have already referred to this in the 1st. Chapter and will have more chance to illustrate it in my accounts of Callimachus, Poseidippus and Hedylus. All these factors contributed to the new revolutionary movement of treating love and dealing with lovers and their beloved, girls and boys. Speaking first of the epigrams which touch on the relation between men and women and the emotions arising from them, I say in passing that this theme was always a favourite theme to the Greek poets long before the Alexandrians.

Homer in the Iliad and the Odyssey, the lyrical poets of the seventh and sixth centuries glorified softer emotions and sentiments, sincere and serene. In Attic Tragedy, Euripides, is the first to make love the basic motif in a series of his tragedies in which he explored every phase of love, high and low - from the faithful love of Alcestis to the free or lawless love of Phaedra and Stheneboea. In Comedy on the other hand especially the comedy of manners in the hands of Menander, the last Attic and at the same time the first hellenistic poet, love has so degenerated that it hardly deserves its name. It is involved in intrigues, seduction of a willing girl or the violation of the unwilling and although it smacks of real characters moving in the society of his own day, it is the cheap love of courtesans and whores. In elegy and especially the Ionic elegy which is sympotic in nature, love is treated rather freely and licentiously. Mimnermus, as I have already said, is the father of this special erotic elegy. It is deplorably true that we have only few fragments of this poet, yet one of them can throw a light on his approach to love: 'But what life would there be, what joy, without golden Aphrodite? May I die when I be no more concerned with secret love and

suasive gifts and the bed, such things as are the very flowers of youth, pleasant alike to man and woman. And when dolorous Age cometh ..... ill cares do wear and wear his heart, he hath no more the joy of looking on the sunlight, to children he is hateful, to women contemptible, so grievous hath God made Age.'[155] This piece, in which triviality is blended with commonsense, gaiety with fears and sympathy, is a subjective expression of one who really enjoys himself and makes the best of his time before old age comes and puts an end to his youthful and frivolous adventures of love. In fact the love for which the poet calls is the secret love connected with bed, his Aphrodite is presumably earthly or Pandemus and the beloved are more likely hetaerae. Which of these classical expressions and treatment of love attracted the Alexandrians most? In its tone and contents the amatory epigram of this period is more concerned with the vulgar love connected with the characters moving in Menander's plays and possessed of the same outspokenness which this poet used in the treatment of the unfaithful love of the courtesans and their paramours. Thus it can be said that Menander was inspired by the Alexandrian epigrammatists; but I must say that the characters depicted by Menander were still

moving in the Hellenistic world far and wide and so Menander's influence is not too strong. He only bequeathed them the theme and they advanced it inspired by their own society. The old elegy, especially the erotic, attracted the Alexandrians too. Its influence on the amatory epigram of this period is so obvious that the latter could be regarded as an offspring of the former and an intermediate between this old Greek elegy and the Roman elegy. It owes to the old erotic elegy some manifest features: the subjective expression of the poet's own emotions, which takes the form of vain longings and regrets, the ecstasy or frenzy of passion and the free expression of sensual love. These features can be met with in the epigrams of the period with some stress laid on female and male beauty, problems arising between the lovers and the beloved, and the playful approach to some gods like Zeus and Eros. Such characteristics are Alexandrian in theme and tone. Of the other features, these must be noted: the sheer outspokenness of illicit sexual and homosexual relations, the blending of reality with romanticism for the first time in the history of the poetry of love, the sincerity of expression although sometimes pedantry, artificiality, excessive use of rhetorical devices, fanciful situations

and sentimentality mark some epigrams, as, for instance, a big number of Meleager's poems - an outcome of the fusion of the Greek spirit with the Eastern passion at the end of our period.

Turning to deal with the enumeration of the themes, we find that almost all of the amatory epigrams of this period are addressed to courtesans or to young boys. These mirror not only the moral weakness of the poets but throw also a light on the degenerated society of this period. I will refrain from any criticism, for we must bear in mind that prostitution of both girls and boys was acknowledged and licenced by the Greeks from the beginning of their recorded history and that the confession of sensuality or its manifestations in life is unchecked by the laws of the different city-states or the hypocritical condemnation of public opinion. If the Alexandrians enjoyed excessive liberty of expression, they were only depicting the growing liking of luxurious and licentious life prevailing in this period. Not few are the cities that were noted for their luxury revealed in pompous public celebrations, or their dinner or drinking parties.[156] So also are the cities notorious for their licentiousness, as centres of prostitutes of both sexes and of night-life with

its noisy and voluptuous festivities.[157] It is this new world including many nations both Western and Eastern which collaborated in developing the lascivious life of the Greeks by giving it some new and varied colours and introduced new conceptions and expressions. Such an international or cosmopolitan world not only provided the epigrammatists with material but also drifted them into the wilderness of forbidden love and sensual pleasures. Thus with a subjective accent and under varied moods, the poets of this period developed many themes, most of them not known before. The first touches on the attitude of the lovers towards Love himself. In the Alexandrian epigram, Eros has his characteristics as regards his appearance and conduct: he is a beautiful lad having wings on his back and a bow and arrows in his hands or in his quiver.[158] He occasionally has winged shoes.[159] As for his conduct, he is sometimes a wild wilful lad or a gentle and playful child, who is feared even by the gods and mightier than the gods of Olympus. Meleager has much to do with the god who gave him pleasures and caused him upsets and worries. He, more than any epigrammatist in this period and even after it, approached this god playfully[160] and sometimes ridiculously, cf. A.P. V. 178 in which

he wished to sell him in auction. The epithets given to this god in this period are varied and throw a light on the changeable mood of the poets. Most of these epithets were invented by Meleager. Dioscorides (A.P. XII. 37, 1.2) calls him 'ὁ βροτολοιγὸς Ἔρως' 'Love, the murderer of men.' Meleager used the same epithet (A.P. V. 180, 1,1). Poseidippus (A.P.V. 134, 1,4) calls him 'ὁ γλυκύπικρος Ἔρως' [161] 'the bitter-sweet'. Meleager surpasses all in his fantastic epithets such as, for instance, Love the delicate-sandalled, the sweet-teared, the ball-player, the helmsman and so on.[162] According to these epithets, the god is treated differently: he can provide a delightful talk at the banquet[163] or be a cause of hatred[164] or complaint.[165] He is implored to have mercy upon his wretched victims;[166] but he can be challenged and attacked strongly.[167] The epigrams convey also signs of deplorable weakness on the part of the lovers who are either unable to avoid love or sympathize with their poor souls.[168] At times the poets, being tired of love and their hearts worn out, tried very hard to get rid of Love's painful spell. So Callimachus gave a prescription for curing love (love of boys). The ingredients of this effective medicine is learning and hunger.[169] Poseidippus found out that the spell of Love can be shunned through abstaining from drink.[170]

This is rather a shield than a remedy. Meleager too thinks that drink gives a temporary relief to the unhappy lover.[171] Concerning the beloved, a girl or a boy, these, as I have already said, are mostly professional prostitutes who sell their bodies for money. If so - and this is true - we are not to expect the epigrams of the period to bear any sign of genuine and spiritual love on the part of the lover or the beloved. Speaking first of the girls, many epigrams introduce us to what sort of girls the poets of the period as well as the periods to come, speak of in different tones and accents. They are not different from those who, especially in time of war, carry out their quasi-professional trade in big towns and harbours. Here is a girl that asks her lover to take it easy and not be jealous. This was cynically expressed by Asclepiades in an allegorical picture. His captivating Hermione wore, so he says, a zone of many colours bearing letters of gold "Love me and be not sore at heart if I am another's."[172] Another is a wandering prostitute who roams about the street to catch a passer-by, a practice most noticeable in Paris at present. An epigram composed by Philodemus,[173] is involved in an outspoken conversation between a street-walker and a passer-by, a business

like bargain for love affair. These girls used to do their best to attract people. One curious practice needs mentioning. The word 'ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΕΙ,' that is 'follow me', was found nailed on the sole of a shoe, so that while the girl walks along, the word is impressed on the ground of the street, and the passer-by can have no doubt as to her trade.[174] There are also street-walkers from the other sex. A woman-pursuer treading in the steps of a lovely girl, was checked by the nurse accompanying her. He was treated badly by the nurse and he has to defend himself by alleging that he is only gazing at the maiden's sweet form, which is quite permissible.[175] Lovers in this period, as at any time, have their views in regard to the beloved. If they are attracted by courtesans, they at times detest these public girls and prefer to them innocent virgins who know not Cypris yet.[176] But it is the courtesans that inspired the poets of the period. These poets' epigrams, as it is expected, are either cheerful and full of exaltation or grim, full of criticism, blame and even attacks; but all echo the sound of illicit love with its pleasures and complications. They glorify the beauty of the female bosom. The Greeks' delight in the charms of the body is reflected in the literature and art;[177] but the amatory epigrams of this period paid more homage to this effect

more than any poetic genre. Dioscorides is one of the foremost epigrammatists whose delight in women's captivating beauty is most noticeable. In one of his epigrams he gives a fascinating enumeration of some beauties in his girl: the rosy prattling lips, soul-melting portals of the ambrosial mouth, the eyes that flash under thick eyebrows, the nets and traps of the heart, the milky paps well-mated, full of charm, fairly formed, more delightful than any flower.[178] Philodemus is another epigrammatist who sings the charms of women even their private parts.[179] In the ecstacy of longing he cries

'O feet, O legs, O thighs ...O flanks, O shoulders, O breasts, O slender neck, O arms, O eyes, O accomplished movement, O admirable kisses, O exclamations that excite!'[180]

Extravagant eulogy of the beloved is a special topic of Meleager. No girl was lavishly praised in the Anthology as his Heliodora or Zenophila.[181] In a graceful language decked with all kinds of rhetorical embellishments, the air of which is heavy with scent of flowers: violet, myrtle, narcissus, lilies etc., the beauty of these lucky girls is extolled and the poet's passion flows so tenderly that we think that his love is really genuine. Meleager, like the other epigrammatists, cannot be a genuine lover; for he is inconsistent in his

love, a love which is aroused by sensual beauty. This he sought and found it in some other girls.[182] He can love five girls at the same time: Timo, Heliodora, Demo, Anticlea and Dorothea.[183] Parties were arranged for the beloved and toasts were drunk in their name.[185] Along with these favourable epigrams there are quite a large number composed against the beloved. Inconstancy of these courtesans is quite natural. It shows itself in breaking promises or forswearing a vow.[186] But the lover too may not keep to his word.[187] Akin to these there are serenades or paraclausithyrons,[188] songs sung by lovers shut out before the door of the stubborn or cold-hearted beloved. These usually contain complaints, excuses and even threats.[189] The epigram may be also a kind of ultimatum full of threats.[190] It may also be a report by a detective lover who, in spite of his beloved's crafty tricks, discovers her false love.[191] Sometimes it is only a piece of pure flattery as, for example, Callimachus' epigram on Berenice, where she becomes a fourth 'Grace'.[192] And finally the amatory epigram conveys fun and mockery which arouse laughter. Not many epigrammatists in this period tried amatory-humorous epigrams, but the small number which survive are full of wit and lascivious fancies. Philodemus, more than any epigrammatist mastered this subject but

his expressions are too bold and outspoken. This is generally due to his stay in Rome where he was initiated to the special ways of the Romans in regard to free entertainment and expression. In one of his epigrams, he pokes fun at an old courtesan by advertising her charms which, in spite of old age, are still present: her hair is still dark, the marble cones of her bosom stand firm upheld by no encircling band, her skin without a wrinkle, distils fascination and ten thousand graces. After this charming description, he asks the lovers to try this beauty, unmindful of her decades.[193] In a maritime setting, Medylus gives a funny story of three mariners who were caught by three greedy courtesans who stripped off their clothes and left worse than the ship-wrecked.[194] Meleager gives us a picture of a retiring courtesan whom he compared with an old corsair. The joke is elaborately acheived by the comparison of the different parts of the courtesans with the worn-out parts of the ship.[195] These are the themes of the Alexandrian amatory epigram. In their variety and workmanship, they show how far this topic was developed in a way never known before and never advanced afterwards.[196]

The many epigrams which deal with the love of boys

must next be noticed, but it is fortunately not necessary to give a detailed treatment of them, since the several themes are virtually identical with those of the love of the courtesans. There are rather more epigrams dealing with obscene matters, and the enthusiastic glorification of the parts of the body including the private parts, is carried - if possible - even further in their case.[197] However, as there is no essential difference between the amatory treatment of boys and of girls, what has been already said about the latter can suffice.

Passing to the convivial epigram, we deal with not a specified theme but with a group of themes which for some reason or another are suitable topics for the symposium. The most characteristic feature of these epigrams which connect them with the symposium, as dinner-party poems, is their exciting and light tone. Among the themes that provide a welcome item for entertainment at the symposium of the intellectual persons in their jolly and merry mood in the company of the gift of Bacchus are the amatory epigrams on girls and boys which excite by a blend of reality and playful fancy; the personal confessions, the subtle critical remarks passed on some companion, the sly detective

investigations etc.; the epideictic sepulchral epigrams on the heroes and on the poets of the past; and finally the humorous ones on certain types of the departed. All these provide the banquet with entertaining stuff; so also do the epideictic dedicatory epigrams possessed of humour or admonition. Thus it can be said that any poem (in the form of inscriptions or in keeping with their brevity) developing from the Ionic elegy, the Lyric scolion of wine and love, the sportive paegnion and the griphos - in fact all the entertaining poems at the ancient symposium may be described as 'convivial'. We have already met a quite large number of this sort in the foregoing pages and we will meet them illustrated in my accounts of the epigrammatists. In addition to these, I will give instances of those epigrams which the MS. Palatinus calls 'συμποτικά' and 'σκωπτικά'. These, for convenience and exact illustration, can be subdivided into three different classes: light, humorous and invective. The first class speaks of youth, wine, pleasures of the moment and include trifling phantasy and fancy. The second comprises the witty and humorous remarks - sometimes cynical in tone - on some curious or repulsive people. And the third contains those invective epigrams in which the poet attacks with some brutality and malice. These different classes can be

referred to in an Attic scolion which at the same time discloses what was going on in the old symposia: 'Drink with me, sport with me, love with me, wear wreaths with me, rage with me when I am raging, be sober when I am sober.'[198] Although this piece may have been composed for a special occasion, yet it throws a light on the conventional topics and practices: drink and revel songs, sportive comments of any kind, philosophical and sober conversations and hot arguments. Of the epigrams of the first class I will concern myself here with the chief theme:[199] the purely light and unreflective songs on wine and pleasures. They were inspired as were the old Ionic elegy and scolion, by wine, the gift of Bacchus. In the manner of Himmermus, Asclepiades, who first made epigram a counterpart of old elegy embittered by the pains caused by cruel Cypris and bitter Love, calls for quaffing unmixed drink of Bacchus and urges himself and his companions not to miss any chance for merry-making before it is too late.[200] Poseidippus asks the Attic jug, the dewy rain of Bacchus, to shower and refresh the merry company and to talk of Love, a better topic than philosophy.[201] Hedylus went further than his comrades; he wishes to be soaked in jars of chian; for he cannot write his playful verses without wine and he hates to live for nothing and not being drunk.[202]

Meleager calls for drinking strong wine; for a cup full of the vine-juice drives out the abhorred pain from the heart of an unhappy lover.[203] Antipater of Sidon insists on drink, although the men learned in the stars say that he is short-lived.[204] Philodemus, although he is already thirty-seven, still cares for the speaking music of the lyre and for revelling and in his insatiate heart the fire is alive.[205] Bacchus, as the god of wine, cannot be passed silently. In a rhetorical and fantastic epigram, Meleager favours the wine diluted with water, because, when his mother, Semele was consumed by the lightning after he was born, the Nymphs washed him and so he was united with them.[206] In another epigram, he calls Bacchus traitor and faithless and blames him for disclosing the lover's secrets.[207] In their drinking-bouts, the banqueters were used to drink the toast of a favourite. Thus in one of his epigrams, Poseidippus drinks the toast of some old poets: Homer, Hesiod, Mimnermus, Antimachus and others.[208] In the same way Meleager asks the cup-bearer, on ladling the wine into the cup, to pronounce the name of his beloved Heliodora.[209] Preparation for parties, dinners or drinking bouts with their sportive description and their long list of the purchased food-stuff and drinks are also typical

convivial epigrams. In two mime-like epigrams, Asclepiades, inviting his beloveds, sends his friend to the market to do some shopping for a jovial meal.[210] Again the presence of the cup-bearer may loosen the reins of the poet's galloping fancy. This is most noticeable in the epigrams on boys. Thus Helicon, the name of a cup-bearer, inspired Antipater of Sidon to improvise a poem in which he connects the cup-bearer's name with that of the Boeotian Helicon and contrasts between the springs of Helicon and the wine served by the cup-bearer, Helicon. The latter, causing less care, is much preferable to the waters of the former.[211] These poets under the spell of wine show different moods and tendencies which they reveal frankly. They either wish to continue enjoying their youthful pleasures even in their old age or to put an end to so frivolous a life they used to lead most lasciviously. Philodemus expressed these two points of view in two epigrams, with which I end this class. In the first - and it is partly obscene - he blames old age, in the manner of Mimnermus, for making him incapable of pursuing the joys of the bed.[212] In the second[213] he is more sober and reasonable; for he expresses his hatred for the garland, the lyre, the Chian wine, the Syrian myrrh, the revelling and

the whores. All these, he says, lead to madness. What he longs for now, after a most tiring life full of ups and downs, is an innocent virgin who loves her nest. There is a practical lesson in this epigram worthy to be remembered.

These are the chief topics inspired by the wine. They echo the human weaknesses extolled in song and attacked sometimes. As human expressions, they attract us by their candidness, although their immorality may not appeal to the modern taste dominated by religious teachings.[214]

The second class comprises the humorous epigrams which deal more or less with types, as, for instance, gourmands and drunkards. As this theme was chiefly cultivated by Poseidippus and Hedylus, it will be fully discussed along with them in the V. th chapter. Again the invective theme, especially the political, which belongs to the third class, is tried by Alcaeus of Messene exclusively and will therefore be treated in detail on my account of this epigrammatist in the course of the Vth chapter.

Works of plastic art are a favourite theme of the epigram of this period. We have already seen how the Alexandrians took a special interest in pieces of art

of every kind.[215] This is most noticeable in the poetic works of the period. But it is the epigram more than the rest of the poetic genres that reflects the aesthetic taste of the period best. The theme was tried shortly before the Alexandrian period begins by Anyte of Tegea and Nossis of Locris, The Planudean and Palatine MSS. preserve some beautiful epigrams on statues and pictures.[216] But the Alexandrians, as usual, developed it in their own way so successfully that they became the acknowledged models of the later epigrammatists. These epigrams which are either serious or sportive, are by no means pieces of aesthetic criticism. They are far from being so. They only convey some personal admiration or appreciation. Many of them are mere literary exercises full of every kind of rhetorical devices: dialogues, questions, phantastic plays of fancy etc. I will give some instances: Eros, who was treated playfully in the literature of this period, is a favourite theme of art. So the epigrammatists give us a number of statues of this god; some of them naturally exist only in the poets' imaginations. The statue of 'Eros Bound' is treated by Alcaeus of Messene and Antipater of Sidon.[217] Other postures of the god are the 'Love Asleep'[218] and 'Love Ploughing.'[219] Finally Antipater of Sidon speaks of both the statue of

Eros at Thespiae and that of Cnidian Aphrodite by Praxiteles in high praise; but not without some touch of his fantastic imagination; for the two deities of love, as he thinks, can set fire to the stone.[220] Priapus whose statue stood almost in every garden as a guard is another favourite theme composed in this period.[221] The epigrams are nicely achieved but with some obscenity which was carried beyond the limit by the later epigrammatists. Of the other deities and mythological figures, there is one on the statue of Pan,[222] one on Heracles fighting with the Nemean Lion,[223] and on Marsyas.[224] Statues of influential personalities, a king or a queen, and various distinguished figures such as poets, athletes etc., are likewise commented on. Poseidippus wrote a nice epigram on the statue of Alexander of Macedon carved by Lysippus. He too paid a tribute to queen Berenice when he saw a statue of Cypris and was at a loss as to which the beautiful statue belongs.[225] Of the statues on poets which may or may not have existed, Theocritus gave us two complimentary descriptive epigrams, one on the statue of Pisander of Camirus, the first among poets of old time that told the famous labours of Heracles and the other on Epicharmus, the inventor of comedy.[226] Speaking of the poets, Anacreon was differently treated; his statues, whether they

existed or not, were spoken of in a playful language marred by indecency.[227] This sort of treatment suggest that such epigrams were recited at the symposium to arouse laughter. We have quite a large number of epigrams dealing with the statues of deities which are mere trifling songs improvised at the table.[228] Among the pieces of fine art which met with hot enthusiasm in this period and the successive periods is the bronze cow wrought by the hands of Myron. It was dealt with thirty-six times as a literary exercise on the model of Leonidas of Tarentum. Among the poets who showed interest in it are: Leonidas,[229] Dioscorides[230] and Antipater of Sidon.[231] We end this group with an epigram composed by Poseidippus on the statue of Time by Lysippus. The epigram is elaborately achieved; for it is involved in a dialogue between the inspector and the statue and so the characteristics of this piece of art are dramatically revealed.[232]

Pictures were also described in the epigrams of this period, which are few in comparison with those on statues. Two pictures at least interested the epigrammatists: that of Niobe[233] and Aphrodite Anadyomene of Apelles.[234] In addition to these topics, public buildings especially temples and shrines and different artistic

articles which furnished the later epigrammatists of the Christian era with congenial subjects, did not pass unnoticed by the poets of this period whose interest in real life is unquestionable. Although a small number of epigrams describing these buildings is extant, yet they mark the first attempt made in this period which in time stimulated the interest of the epigrammatists of later periods. Of the public buildings, we have an exquisite description of the Pharus of Alexandria built by the architect Sostratus of Cnidos. It is one of Poseidippus' attractive epigrams.[235] Shrines of a deity or deified personality are also described or admired. Limasalces asks his comrades to stand on the beach to gaze at the sanctuary of Cypris of the Sea.[236] Poseidippus also celebrates the foundation of the shrine erected by the admiral Callicrates to Arsinoë II sister and wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphus.[237] Of the description of some artistic article we have one specimen by Hedylus. It is a graphical description of a rhyton in the temple of Arsinoë.[238] These are generally the themes tried by the epigram of this period. Many of the epigrams which I have already enumerated will be fully illustrated and discussed in my accounts of the epigrammatists.[239]

Turning to the epigrams on literary criticism, we

deal with an important and manifold theme. In fact I have already touched on this question in two places: in the Ist chapter where I dealt with the literary quarrel which took place in the beginning of the period between Callimachus, the head of the new school and his antagonists,[240] secondly in the earlier part of this chapter when I dealt with epideictic sepulchral epigrams in the form of homages paid to the distinguished literary figures of the past. It only remains for me to give now distinct lists of the different topics which reveal the Alexandrian literary criticism in general. These topics are as follows: (i) Literary views, (ii)appreciative criticism of the earlier and contemporary poets. (iii) unfavourable criticism of contemporary poets, (iv) Criticism of books. Beginning with epigrams on the literary views expressed in this period, there is hardly anyone that gave his heart to this topic more than Callimachus of Cyrene. We have already seen in more than one place in this thesis how he strives very hard in almost all his poetic productions to denounce certain poetic themes and to call earnestly for the development of others. So few epigrams can refer to his literary pronouncements: hating to follow in the step of ancient poets without

attempting innovation, he praised a certain Theaetetus, perhaps a dramatic poet, because he worked on new lines.[241] Detesting longish poems, perhaps the epic, he reminds a certain Dionysus that a successful poet is a man of few words.[242] But it is the trite stories which are known to everybody that he hates more. These trite stories are the cyclic poems tried by mediocre poets who used to repeat in a tiresome way what was said before.[243] Turning to the second topic, we have some epigrams in praise of poets, ancient and modern. In addition to the epideictic sepulchral inscriptions written on some of the distinguished poets of the past which are of the nature of delicate and appreciative criticism or a hearty tribute to their ancient models and masters, there are still more cast in short poems other than the inscription. Among those highly praised are Homer, Sappho, Pisander (Peisander) Epicharmus, Hipponax and Anacreon.[244] The language of the epigrams on Hipponax and Anacreon are sportive in tone but the expressions used are appropiate to the bitter language of the former and the revelling ecstasy of the latter. Again of the contemporary poets we have some few but pleasant epigrams. One of these is written by Callimachus on his friend Heracleitus of Halicarnassus, the elegiac poet and the author of a book called the 'Nightingales'. This epigram is

universally known as a sincere tribute paid for a friend whose remembrance and poetic muse are exquisitely commemorated.[245] Hedylus paid a similar friendly homage to a certain Socles - whom we do not know - whose playful verses are even preferable to those of Asclepiades himself.[246] If so it is most deplorable that his verses were lost. Finally Theodoridas eulogizes Euphorion as an exquisite writer of verse.[247] The third topic deals with unfavourable criticism of poets belonging to our period. Hasalces is attacked of plagiarism and dependence on Simonides and underrated as loud-voiced but empty poet.[248] Apollonius of Rhodes attacked Callimachus in an epigram which I consider the first lampoon in the history of literary criticism. He calls his teacher "Wooden-head".[249] The literary differences of the attacked and his attacker was developed so bitterly that such an invective epigram is most expected. Euphorion who was praised by Theodoridas, as we have already seen, is attacked by Crates because he fills his poems with glosses, a feature most noticeable in the poetic productions of the period.[250] Finally Lycophron who is notorious for his obscurity, is jeered at because his Cassandra is a store of recondite learning. The last topic is the criticism of books. Epigrams on books are

quite a new theme. It was first tried by Asclepiades. The Palatine MS. preserves two instances by this poet; the first[251] is a high praise of Erinna's volume of her poems and the second[252] is on the 'Lyde' of Antimachus, which is to the poet's mind a joint work of the Muses and Antimachus. Erinna's verses were also highly appreciated by Antipater of Sidon.[253] Antimachus's Lyde is overestimated by Poseidippus who drinks a toast to it.[254] Antipater of Sidon praises without the specification of the work, the sturdy verse of tireless Antimachus.[254a] In appreciation of Mimnermus' Nanno, Poseidippus drinks the toast of this book.[255] The 'phaenomena' of Aratus was twice eulogized by Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum. In Callimachus' opinion, it is a monument of Aratus' sleepless nights and the delicate phrases of it are enchanting.[256] Leonidas praised it in a rather fantastic way; for, after he stated that it is a great task at which Aratus toiled, he concluded with these words: 'Let us count him second to Zeus, in that he made the stars brighter.'[257] It is clear from the contents of these epigrams that criticism is not carried out on a scientific basis. They are only appreciative notes of an ancient poet's work or a complimentary tribute to a contemporary author. The art of reviewing

books is, strictly speaking, a modern practice.

The next topic is the flattering epigram. This theme, which is purely Alexandrian, came into being as a result of circumstances in this period. The kings in every place, because of the rivalry among themselves, began to have the mania of hearing the luxury of their palaces, the splendour of their festivals, the magnificence of their public buildings and the glory of their exploits highly extolled in songs. In fact they attracted the poets and offered some of them their patronage. The queens too, especially of Egypt, who played an important part in the politics of the time were also of the same mind and even more. Again the poets, resourceless and ambitious, welcomed the offered patronage and some of them tried very hard to get it. In this way flattery became a topic for the first time in this period. It is to be found in almost all the poetic productions of the period. I have already spoken of the flattering theme in my 1st chapter where I gave instances from Callimachus, Theocritus and others, in idylls, hymns, elegy, mimes etc. of tedious eulogies of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. As far as flattery is concerned, it was impossible for epigram, which became a gallant poetic genre in this period, not to be given

to flattery as well. In fact, as a vehicle for compliment, eulogy and flattery, epigram seems to be a better medium than any, owing to its brevity, light tone and fanciful turns of thought. The instances preserved in the Palatine MS. and Athenaeus, the only available sources, are comparatively few, but they are enough to reveal some epigrammatists' speciality in this particular field. The first [258] is by Poseidippus and it is on the statue of Alexander the Great made by Lysippus, the sculptor of Sicyon. The ending of this epigram is interesting: "No longer do we blame the Persians: cattle may be pardoned for flying before a lion." This is an indirect but subtle flattering tribute to the Ptolemaic dynasty whose royal members were proud to link themselves with the royal house of Macedonia especially with Alexander. Add to this the fact that Ptolemy Soter took part in the battles against Persia and the East in general. But the most slavish and fantastic flattering epigrams ever written in this period are those written on Berenice, presumably the wife of Ptolemy III Euergetes. The first , which is composed by Callimachus, is beyond the limit of any eulogy; for he made the number of the Graces four instead of three by adding Berenice to them - and then added that without Berenice not even the Graces are Graces. [259] Berenice, it seems, must have

been thrilled to death by so hyperbolic a compliment. In the second Poseidippus pays a similar tribute in a different way. In front of a statue of Cypris (presumably a beautiful piece of art) which fascinated him, he began to wonder if it is of Berenice.[260] In addition to these, there are some descriptive epigrams on some public buildings and artistic pieces of art in which the poets took the liberty to pay a homage in passing to Ptolemy Philadelphus and his wife Arsinoe.[261]

These are the themes tried by the Alexandrian epigrammatists through the whole period. Their large number shows how the Alexandrians added some new topics to those handed down to them by their predecessors which proved to be too restricted. Moreover the fact that the post-Alexandrians did not add new themes gives the credit to the Alexandrians as the masters of the genre at whose hands the ancient epigram reached the age of maturity.

In their variety of subject, they comprise all human expressions, serious and light, and treat with a touching limpidity and sweetness of the joys and fears and hopes and sorrows that are common to all humanity. Finally they introduce us to the actual life, the dreams, the thoughts, the practices, good or bad, of a

bygone civilization of the Hellenistic cosmopolitan world when the East mingled with the West and produced new expressions and ideas.

Finally in regard to the art of the epigrammatic composition and the methods used to embellish the expressions, the epigrammatists are of two schools; the one prefers the plain style and the other the grand one with excessive use of rhetorical devices. As the first school is represented by Callimachus and the second by Leonidas of Tarentum, this subject will be fully dis- 262
cussed and illustrated in my account of these two poets, whose epigrams reflect the characteristics of the Alexandrian epigram in general. Although, however, the two schools have their differences, there are common characteristics that prevail in the epigrammatic composition of the period. These are: the use of dialogue, enumerations, play on words and mythology.

NOTES ON CHAPTER III.

1. Op. cit. vol. I. p. 119.
2. This will be fully dealt with immediately in the next account of the themes.
3. Conventional and with Epic colour.
4. An enthusiatic imitator of Simonides, cf. A.P. VI. 9. (Mnasalces) and A.P. VI. 2. (Simonides). He is accused by Theodorides for imitating Simonides slavishly (A.P. XIII, 21).
5. The Alexandrian poets knew and used Theognis, Reitzenstein, op. cit. (Ep. U. Sk.) Note 2, p.55
6. Ep. U. Sk. Chapter III. He reiterates this view in this chapter. Prof. Wilamowitz refers to this "... und Reitzenstein hat behauptet, daß in der Periode, die uns beschäftigt, alles nur Schein wäre (op. cit. vol. I. p. 120).
7. P.W. VI. p. 81.
8. P.W. VI. p. 83.
9. Op. cit. vol. I. p. 121.
10. Ib. p. 120.
11. Ib. p. 120.
12. It is not well established that this collection stands for the Σωροί quoted by Aristarchos - Reitzen.,

p. 100) to which I shall refer in my account on Poseidippus. See Chapter V, p. 658 sqq.

13. Hecker (quoted in Radinger's Meleagros Von Gadara, p. 99) thinks that Meleager, like Crateros and Polemon, travelled around to copy poetical inscriptions from stones. Nothing in Meleager's nature expressed in his epigrams justifies such idea. I do not see why he did not make use of these Periegeses which were ready at hand. It is expected that in such second hand sources the authorship is generally doubted, since the poets did not write their names in the poems themselves or extra metrum. In this one should be cautious and deal with every inscription in the light of the characteristics of the epigrammatist together with some other stylistic features.

14. There remains some other characteristics which I intent to mention in connection with the study of the examples; and as the Alexandrians play always with classical conventions and methods, I shall refer to this when a new method or phase occurs.

15. A.P. VII. 523.

16. "Parmi les epigrammes de Callimague celle qui sont en dorien ne forment q'un petit groupe. Il ya dans le nombre une dédicace, une funéraire; probablement, les personnes pour qui elles furent écrites se servaient communement du dorien. Les autres sont des pieces d'un accent personnel..." (Ph. - E Legrand, op. cit. p. 117.) cf also Chapter IV, pp. 47-45 note 59.

17. A.P. VII. 451.

18. A.P. VII. 453.

19. P.W. vol. VI, p. 82.

20. A.P. VII. 295.

21. Palatinus MS attributes it to Leonidas, τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Modern scholars such as Geffcken and Vacobs reject this attribution. Legrand and Wilamowitz assign it to Theocritus. The fondness of Theocritus of using unusual metres (cf. A.P. VII, 664; IX 598, 599, 600, XIII, 3) suggests that this epigram (written in the Phalaecian hendecasyllable followed by an Archilochian) is possibly composed by Theocritus. The epigrams of Theocritus however are a matter of futile discussion and dispute (see Theocritus, A.S. Gow,

vol. II, pp. 524 ff). The conclusion Gow reached (ibid, p. 527): 'the fact however remains that if anyone chooses either to defend or to condemn the whole series (1-22 which attributed to Theocritus) he cannot be convincingly refuted,' shows that the attribution is not easy.

22. A.P. VII. 663.

23. A.P. VI. 148.

24. This could be dedicated at present in Egypt to some public burial-halls of the deceased who are held to have supernatural powers. See further on this pp. 330-331.

25. A.P. VI. 150.

26. Isis here is identified with Io, daughter of Inachus, elsewhere the Egyptian goddess answers to the Greek Demeter, Hdt., II, 41, 59 & 156.

27. A.P. VI. 130.

28. This means that Pyrrhus considers himself as a descendant of Aeacus, the grand father of Achilles.

29. M. Cary, (A history of the Greek world, second edition, London, 1951) pp. 127-128. See also Paus. I. 13, 2; Plut. Pyrrhus, chapter 26, 3-8.

30. 169 Geffcken? = Plut. Pyrrh. 26 = Diod. XXII. 11 = A.P. VI. 130 (τοῦ αὐτοῦ <Λεωνίδου>. See further, Chapter IV, p. 617, note 153.

31. A.P. VI. = Geff. 45

32. A.P. VII, 447 = Wilam. XI.

33. Chapter I

34. Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum (Chapter IV); Poseidippus, Hedylus and Alcaeus of Messene (Chapter V).

35. It is in fact inevitable to speak on certain themes in dealing with these epigrammatists, simply because they are their exponents: The sepulchral and the dedicatory, for instance, are appropriately treated with Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum; the amatory and the sympotic with Callimachus, Poseidippus and Hedylus, the humorous also with these two, and the invective with Alcaeus of Messene. A full consideration of such themes is therefore to be obtained where the themes of every epigrammatist are discussed.

36. See Athenaeus, XV, 695, c (Attic Scolia, 15, on Ajax, and 16, on Ajax and Telamon.

37. According to Clearchus (ap. Athen., X, 457c.f.) the ancients used to occupy themselves at the symposia in competing among themselves by mentioning the name of each leader against Troy or each leader among the Trojans beginning with a

given letter. This competitive game is a griphos.

38. Cf. Iliad, II, ll. 511-512. See also Reitzenstein (Ep. U. Skol.) p. 95.

39. This 'name' is undoubtedly an intentional or unintentional misreading of a Homeric line: ' αὐτὰρ ὁ βῆ ῥ' Ἴσον τε καὶ Ἄντιφον ἐξεναρίξων', (Iliad, XI, l. 101). It is a combination of three words 'βῆ ῥ' Ἴσον' 'Isus was driving the chariot.'

40. A scholiast's note on Iliad, XI, l. 101: 'μὴ ἐμφερεσθαι δὲ φησιν ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος νῦν ἐν τοῖς Ποσειδίππου ἐπιγράμμασι τὸν Βήρισον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ Σωρῷ εὑρεῖν.

41. For the 'Σωρός', see Poseidippus (chapter V) p. 568 sqq.

42. Cf. Iliad, II, ll, 824-827. See also on 'Pandaros,' in Steph. Byzant. s.v. 'Ζέλεια'.

43. In fact the majority of the epigrammatic themes are, as we will see in the course of the treatment of other themes, suitable items of entertainment at the symposia.

44. The style of these epitaphs is most probably Alexandrian. This becomes clear if we compare them with some epigrams of the IXth book of the Palatine Anthology where the anonymous epigrammatists' epigrams - and they surely belong to a

later period - are mere declamatory exercises: cf. IX. 457 (on Achilles) in which the poet deals with the following questions: What would Achilles say if Agamemnon were killed? etc.

45. A.P. VII. 137, 152. composed by anonymous poets.

46. A.P. VII. 146 (Antipater of Sidon); 149, 150 (anonymous.)

47. A.P. VII. 144 (anonymous)

48. A.P. VII 151 (anonymous)

49. A.P. VII. 142, 143 (anonymous).

50. A.P. VII. 136. (Antipater of Sidon?)

51. On Homer, A.P. VII. 1, 5 (Alcaeus of Messene), 2,6 (Antipater of Sidon); on Hesiod, A.P. VII,54 (Mnasalces); 55 (Alcaeus of Messene); Orpheus, A.P. VII, 8 (Damagetus), 8 (Antipater of Sidon); Thespis, A.P. VII,410 (Dioscorides); Sappho, A.P. VII, 15 (Antipater of Sidon), 407,(Dioscorides); Alcman, A.P. VII, 709 (Alexander of Aetolia); Hipponax, VII, 408 (Leonidas of Tarentum); 536(Alcaeus of Messene); Anacreon, A.P. VII, 31 (Dioscorides); 23, 26, 27, 29,30,(Antipater of Sidon); Sophocles, A.P. VII, 37 (Dioscorides); Aeschylus, A.P. VII, 411(Dioscorides), 40 (Diodorus, Aristophanes,A.P. VII, 38 (Diodorus) and Pindar A.P. VII, 35 (Leonidas of Tarentum), 34 (Antipater of Sidon).

52. On Antimachus, A.P. VII. 409(Antipater of Sidon); Erinna, A.P. VII, 11(Asclepiades) 13(Meleager), 713(Antipater of Sidon); Heracleitus, A.P. VII. 80(Callimachus); Tellen, A.P. VII, 719 (Leonidas of Tarentum), Machon, A.P. VII, 708(Dioscorides), Euphorion, A.P. VII, 406(Theodoridas), Antipater of Sidon, A.P. VII, 428, (Meleager) and Philaenis, VII, 450(Dioscorides).

53. A.P. VII. 718.

54. On Callimachus, A.P. VII, 415, 525; Leonidas of Tarentum, A.P. VII. 715 and Meleager, A.P. VII, 417, 418, 419 and 421.

55. This theme seems to be a speciality of later periods. Diogenes Laertius who belongs to the first half of the third century A.D., practised it more than anyone else. Cf. A.P. VII, 106, (on Epicurus); 107(on Aristotle); 108, 109(on Plato), 110, (on Theophrastus); 118(on Zeno); 120, 121, 122 on Xenophanes, etc. etc.

56. On Pittacus, A.P. VII, 89 - not sepulchral - (Callimachus); Diogenes, A.P. VII, 69(Leonidas of Tarentum), 65(Antipater of Sidon); Zeno, A.P. VII, 117(Zenodotus) and Heraclitus of Ephesus, A.P. VII, 79, (Meleager).

57. They will speak affectionately to or of their dogs

and horses, more than they will do concerning their friends and family.

58. Cf. Simonides (on a dog), 130 (185), Bergk (op. cit, pars III, p. 476); Anyte (A.P. VII, 190) on a locust or cicada; 202, on a cock devoured by a fox; 208, on a tomb built for war-horse and 215, on a dolphin.

59. On locusts: A.P. VII, 198(Leonidas of Tarentum), 192, 194(Mnasalces), 197(Phaennus); on a mare, 212(Mnasalces); on a dog, 211(Tymnes); on a swallow, 210(Antipater of Sidon), on an ant, 209(Antipater of Sidon) and on a leveret, 198 (Meleager). On these epitaphs on pets, see G. Herrlinger (Totenklage um Tier in der antiken Dichtung, Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1930).

60. The variety of the sepulchral epigrams - epitaphs, threnodes, and friendly tributes - will be illustrated and fully discussed in the IVth chapter in my account on Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum who remain unrivalled in this particular theme.

61. A.P.VII 163(Leonidas of Tarentum), 166(Dioscorides), 528(Theodoridas), 465(Heracleitus), 464(Antipater of Sidon).

62. Cf. A.P. VII. 170(Poseidippus); 632(Leonidas of Tarentum) and 303, (Antipater of Sidon).

63. Cf. VII. 453, 517(Callimachus), 463,662(Leonidas of Tarentum) 488(Mnasalces), 497(Damagetus), 527(Theodoridas), 537(Phanias), 468(Meleager) and 467(Antipater of Sidon).

64. A.P. VII, 488, 491(Mnasalces), 182(Meleager), and 711 (Antipater of Sidon).

65. Cf. A.P. VII. 663(Leonidas of Tarentum), 453 (Callimachus), 162, 456(Dioscorides) and 632 (Diodorus).

66. Cf. A.P. VII, 728(Callimachus), 729(Leonidas of Tarentum) etc.

67. A.P. VII, 264, 266, 273, 283, 503, 504, 506, 652, 654 (Leonidas of Tarentum), 271, 272, 277 (Callimachus), 267(Poseidippus), VII, 65 (Euphorion), 282(Theodoridas), 497(Damagetus), 495(Alcaeus of Messene), 287, 288, 498(Antipater of Sidon) and 404(Zonas of Sardes.)

68. Cf. A.P. VII, 272(Callimachus), 273, 652, 654 (Leonidas of Tarentum), 497(Damagetus).

69. Cf. A.P. VII, 435, 526(Nicander of Colophon), 242(Mnasalces), 299, 434(Dioscorides), 231, 432, 438, 540, 541(Damagetus) 529(Theodoridas), 247

(Alcaeus of Messene) and 246(Antipater of Sidon).

70. For the political theme see my account on Alcaeus of Messene, Chapter V. Cf. also Ph. E. Legrand, Événement du temps, politique ou militaire (Rev. Étud. Anc. 1901) p. 185 ff.

71. Cf. A.P. VII, 517, 519(Callimachus), 466, 662, 665 (Leonidas of Tarentum), 488(Mnasalces), 464 (Dioscorides), 735(Damagetus), 527, 722, 732, 735, 738(Theodoridas), 495(Alcaeus of Messene) 468, 479(Meleager) and 467, 745(Antipater of Sidon).

72. Cf. A.P. VII. 448(Leonidas of Tarentum), 485 (Dioscorides), 412,(Alcaeus of Messene) 498, 625 (Antipater of Sidon).

73. A.P. VII, 440(Leonidas of Tarentum), 355(Damagetus).

74. Cf. A.P. VII, 504, 506(Leonidas of Tarentum) 471 (Callimachus), 470(Meleager).

75. Ep. U. Skol. p. 157.

76. These will be fully discussed in my account on Leonidas' epigrams, Chapter IV.

77. Cf. A.P. VII, 470, 660, 655, 472, 472B; cf. also 736, 648,(Leonidas of Tarentum). Leonidas is generally the only practioner of this sort of admonitory sepulchral epigram.

78. A.P. VII. 480, 478(Leonidas of Tarentum).

79. Among others, cf. Waltz (op. cit. vol. IV) p. 33 ff.

80. Reitzenstein, Ep. U. Skol., p. 103.

81. Cf; A.P. VII, 348(Simonides) and its copy, or a parody of it, 349(Anonymous). See also my discussion, Chapter II pp. 239-242.

82. A.P. VII, 725; cf also 454 which is rather a scolion than an epitaph.

83. A.P. VII. 455. This epigram was imitated by Antipater of Sidon(A.P. VII. 353). A.P. VII. 660(Leonidas) treats the same theme.

84. A.P. VII, 456.

85. A.P. VII, 447.

86. A.P. VII, 524.

87. A.P. VII, 351.

88. A.P. VII. 450.

89. Op. cit, pp. 44-45.

90. Cf. A.P. VI, 148, 150(Callimachus); It is strange enough that Asceplius, the god of healing and medicine was not approached in this period. Asclepius, however, was mentioned by Callimachus in a sportive epigram (A.P. VI, 147) and Theocritus concerned himself with a statue of the god, made from perfumed cedar-wood, standing in the house of the physician Nicias of Miletus,

the intimate friend of the poet.

91. The gifts dedicated are: head-bands, robes, zones, frocks, etc.

92. Cf. A.P. VI, 146(Callimachus), 200, 202(Leonidas of Tarentum) etc.

93. A.P. VI, 276(Antipater of Sidon) cf. also 206, 208, 209, 281(Leonidas of Tarentum).

94. A.P. VI, 340(Theocritus).

95. Hair is also vowed in time of peril and offered in gratitude. Orestes sheared off his hair when he came to his senses (Paus. viii, 34.3). Berenice vowed and paid her hair for Ptolemy III Euergetes' safety in War (Catull. Coma Berenices). A sailor offers his hair to the sea-gods (A.P. VI 164 Lucian). It is worth mentioning that St. Paul sheared off his hair at Cenchrea in fulfilment of a vow (Acts of the Apostles, xviii, 18): "And Paul after this tarried there (Corinth) yet a good while, and then took leave of the brethren, and sailed thence into Syria and with him Priscilla and Aquila, having shorn his head in Cenchrea: for he had a vow". This, however, was a Jewish (Nazarite) vow: cf. Numbers vi, 18).

96. 'Maidens before marriage, originally at puberty, were accustomed to dedicate along with their

hair, the dolls and other toys of their past childhood, on the same principle as the warrior dedicates his worn-out arms or the workman his tools.' (Rouse, Greek Votive Offerings, Cambridge, 1902, p. 249). Cf. Hair; A.P. VI. 278(Rhianus), 279(Euphorion), 155, 156(Theodoridas), 277 (Damagetus); dolls: 209(Leonidas of Tarentum) etc.

97. Cf. A.P. VI, 2(Simonides?), 122(Hegesippus) 123 (Anyte) etc.

98. The very few epigrams in which Ares was approached are humorous in tone; cf. A.P. IX, 322(Leonidas of Tarentum). This epigram was imitated by Antipater of Sidon, IX, 323 and Meleager VI, 163.

99. Cf. A.P. XIII. 7(Callimachus); VI.129, 130, 131 (Leonidas of Tarentum), 9, 125, 128, 264 (Mnasalces), 46, 159 - the second is a variation of the first - (Antipater of Sidon).

100. A.P. XIII. 7(Callimachus).

101. A.P. VI. 129; cf. also 131(Leonidas of Tarentum).

102. P.P. VI. 130(Leonidas of Tarentum).

103. A.P. IX. 588(Alcaeus of Messene).

104. Op. cit. p. 168.

105. A.P. VI. 346(Philodemus?).

106. Rouse, op. cit. p. 160.

107. A.P. VI. 256(Antipater of Sidon).

108. A.P. VI. 339(Theocritus).

109. Rouse, op. cit. p. 156.

110. A.P. VI. 311(Callimachus); the tone of the epigram is humorous.

111. Op. cit. XIII, 609F.

112. A.P. VI. 292(Hedylus).

113. See Chapter IV, pp. 549 199.

114. A.P. VI. 286(Leonidas of Tarentum).

115. A.P. VI. 288, cf. also 289(Leonidas of Tarentum).

116. A.P. VI. 47(Antipater of Sidon). This epigram seems to be sportive. Cf. also 160, 174, 287 by the same poet. The last (i.e. 287) is a copy of Leonidas' 286;

117. Very few sepulchral epigrams on fishermen are preserved in the Anthology in this period; cf. A.P. VII, 295, 504(Leonidas of Tarentum).

118. A.P. VI. 4(Leonidas of Tarentum).

119. A.P. VI, 224, 222(Theodorides); the last, it seems, is imitated by Antipater of Sidon, cf. 223.

120. A.P. VI. 204(Leonidas of Tarentum).

121. A.P. VI. 205(Leonidas of Tarentum) cf. VI. 103 (Philippus) which is a copy of this epigram.

122. A.P. VI. 296(Leonidas of Tarentum) Cf. also 93 (Antipater of Sidon).

123. A.P. VI. 34(Rhianus).

124. For further examples, cf. A.P. VI. 35, 188(Leonidas or Tarentum), 268(Mnasalces), 96, 255(Erycius), 93, 109, 111(Antipater of Sidon).

125. A.P. XIII. 25(Callimachus).

126. A.P. VI. 225(Nicaenetus).

127. A.P. VI. 154(Leonidas of Tarentum).

128. A.P. VI. 221(Leonidas of Tarentum).

129. A.P. VI. 262(Leonidas of Tarentum). Cf. also 157 (Theodoridas).

130. A.P. VI, 96(Erycius).

131. Cf. A.P. IX, 313, 314; XVI, 228, 231, Anyte; as far as we know is the first epigrammatist who described nature; see Reitzenstein(Ep. u. Skol) p. 123 ff.

132. Op. cit, p. 27.

133. A.P. VI, 336; IX, 432, 433, 437(Theocritus); VI, 120; IX, 99, 318, 326, 337, 563; XVI, 230 (Leonidas of Tarentum); IX, 324(Mnasalces); IX, 76; XVI, 305(Antipater of Sidon); IX, 331 and especially 363 - the song of Spring (Meleager).

134. Theopompus and Timaeus, ap. Ath. XIII, 573.

135. Herod. II, 135; Plut. De Pyth. Or. 14.

136. Rouse, op. cit. p. 93.

137. Ap. Ath. XIII. 576 f.

138. A courtesan from Sparta dedicated her own image to Athene (Polemon, ap. Ath. XIII. 574D).

139. A.P. XIII. 24(Callimachus).

140. A.P. VI. 211(Leonidas of Tarentum).

141. A.P. VI. 290(Dioscorides).

142. A.P. VI. 208(Antipater of Sidon).

143. Cf. Serapis: A.P. VI, 148; XIII, 7(Callimachus). Isis: A.P. VI. 60(Palladas), 231(Philippus).

144. John Addington Symonds (Studies of the Greek Poets, vol. II, London 1893 p. 290.

145. A.P. VI. 147.

146. A.P. IX. 316.

147. A.P. IX. 322. the epigram was imitated by Antipater of Sidon, IX, 323 and Meleager, VI, 183.

148. A.P. 218(Alcaeus of Mytilene), 220(Dioscorides) and 219(Antipater of Sidon). These are all imitations of Leonidas' 221, with a change of the personel or characters. These are in Leonidas' model shepherds, but in his imitators' copies, priests of Rhea or Cybele.

149. A.P. VI. 298(Leonidas of Tarentum).

150. A.P. VI. 305(Leonidas of Tarentum).

151. A.P. VI. 162. See also A.P. V. 199(Hedylus, and 202,(Poseidippus). The last two epigrams are inspired from Asclepiades' 203; 206(Leonidas

of Tarentum).

152. Cf. the scholiast's note on Iliad XI, 101. It will be discussed in my account of the Soros; see Chapter V. P. 658 sqq.

153. Perhaps similarity in theme at first to the sepulchral epitaph encouraged the borrowing of the word epigram (=inscription) for a wider use. We use the term 'Lapidary' of Style.

154. XI, 473.

155. This I quote in J.M. Edmonds, Elegy and Iambus, vol. I, pp. 89-91. I have already given the text in my Ist. Chapter p. 155, note. 91.

156. Among these cities are: Alexandria (Cf. Athen. V, 196-203, VII, 276 etc.), Canopus (Canobus) in the Nile Delta (Strabo, XVII, I, 15-16ff.), Corinth (Athen., IV, 137, VII, 281), Samos (Athen., XII, 525-526, 541), Cyprus (Athen. XII, 531d.e, 542c), Syracuse (Athen., XII, 527c-e), Miletus (Athen., 523-524), Colophon (Athen. XII, 526), the cities of Syria (Athen., 527e.f), Naucratis (Athen., IV, 149, d ff.) etc.

157. Among these localities are Macedonia (Athen. IV, 167), Rhodes (Athen. VIII, 552b). The places famous for prostitution are Corinth (Athen. XII, 527e, 535c, XIII, 559), Cyprus (Athen. XII, 516b)

Miletus (Athen. XIII, 572) Naucratis (Athen. XIII 596b.c); and Crete was notorious for paederasty (Athen. XI, 782c, XIII, 601c, 602f).

158. A.P. XII. 75(Asclepiades), 76, 78(Meleager), 77(Poseidippus).

159. A.P. V. 179(Meleager).

160. Cf. A.P. V, 176, 177, 179, 180.

161. Cf. also Meleager A.P. XII. 109, 154. These instances disclose Meleager's debt to his predecessors. It is only natural for a compiler and poet at the same time to make use of the poems he includes in his anthology.

162. A.P. XII, 158, l. 2, 167, l. 2; XII, 157, ll. 1-2. 47, 1-2. etc. etc.

163. A.P. V. 134(Poseidippus),

164. A.P. V. 10(Alcaeus of Messene), 177(Meleager).

165. A.P. V. 48(Meleager).

166. A.P. V. 215(Meleager).

167. A.P. V. 188(Leonidas of Tarentum), XII, 45 (Poseidippus), V. 57(Meleager).

168. A.P. V. 211(Poseidippus), V. 212(Meleager), XII, 80(Meleager).

169. A.P. XII. 150.

170. A.P. XII. 120.

171. A.P. XII. 49.

172. A.P. V. 158(Asclepiades).

173. A.P. V. 106.

174. Cf. Daremberg - Saglio and also Licht, op. cit. p. 383.

175. A.P. V. 106 (Diotimus of Miletus).

176. Cf. A.P. V. 175, 184(Meleager), XII, 173(Philodemus). See also XII, 43, 102(Callimachus). The last two epigrams deal with boys or male prostitution.

177. Examples of the appreciation of female charms can be met with in classical poets: the eyes: Sophocles (Antigone, 795), Euripides (Hippolytus, 525), Aeschylus(Agam. 714; Supplices, 973) etc. the cheeks: Sophocles (Antig, 783), Phrynichus (frag. 8. Athen, XIII, 603e); the mouth: Simonides (frag. 72, Athen. XIII, 604b). etc.

178. A.P. V. 56.

179. I shall not deal with epigrams that mention private parts nor with the outspoken ones. For the first cf. A.P. V. 54, 55(Dioscorides) 208(Meleager) etc; for the second, cf. A.P. V. 4, 120, 306(Philodemus) etc. Obscene epigrams are generally composed in this period by Euphorion, Rhianus, Dioscorides and Meleager.

180. A.P. V. 132 Cf also 131, 13. In fact the glorification of women's beauty is a speciality of Rufinus (belonging to the Byzantine period) A.P.V 14, 48, 60, 70, 76, 94 etc.

181. On Heliodora, Meleager composed 15 epigrams: A.P. V. 24, 136, 137, 141, 143, 147, 148, 155, 157, 163, 165, 166, 214, 215; XII, 147. On Zenophila he wrote 12 epigrams: 139, 140, 144, 149, 151, 152, 171, 174, 177, 178, 195, 196.

182. Cf. Timarion (A.P. V. 96), Tryphera (154), Asclepias (156), Demo (160, 172, 173), Lycaenis (187), Scylla (190) Callistion (192) etc. etc.

183. A.P. V 198.

184. A.P. V. 183 (Poseidippus), 185 (Asclepiades).

185. A.P. V. 136, 137 (Meleager).

186. A.P. V. 150 (Asclepiades), 52 (Dioscorides), 175 (Meleager).

187. A.P. V. 6(Callimachus).

188. Cf. Alfred Körte, op. cit., p. 293: "The so-called paraclausithyron, is an old form of folk lyric. Traces of it are to be found in Alcaeus, Aristophanes uses it in a comedy,....."

189 A.P.V. 64 (Asclepiades), 213 (Poseidippus), 23 (Callimachus) etc.

190 A.P.V. 107 (Philodemus), 184 (Meleager).

191. A.P.V. 186 (Poseidippus), 137 (Meleager).

192. A.P.V. 146.

193. A.P.V. 13; cf also 115, 121, 126.

194. A.P.V. 161.

195. A.P.V. 204, cf also 161.

196. This is an important theme tried in this period by a number of epigrammatists whose names I mention graded according to their productions: Meleager, Callimachus, Rhianus, Dioscorides, Alcaeus of Messene and Phanias. As to the love of boys, which was a national practice among the Greeks from the oldest times, I will not commit myself to discussing the question whether they were the originators of homosexuality or not. It is a difficult question and at the same time beyond my subject. But I would like to refer to the fact that ancient authorities are inconsistent: Herodotus (I, 135; apud Athen., XIII, 603a) says that the Persians learned the use of boys from the Greeks. Again according to Athenaeus (XIII, 602f) Timaeus says that the practice of paederasty came to Greece from the Cretans first. In the face of such uncertain information, I feel that such abnormal defect could have been favoured and practised simultaneously in any

ancient community, Eastern or Western, whenever and wherever there is an impulse. These epigrams, however, are written by poets, who belong to both East and West, and show that this vice was common.

197. Typical examples are: A.P. XII, 37 (Dioscorides), 93 (Rhianus), 30 (Alcaeus of Messene), 63, 94, 95 (Meleager). Cf also these epigrams that are milder in tone: A.P. XII, 38, 58, 121 (Rhianus), 31 (Phanias), 35, 54, 92, 101, 122, 133, 159 (Meleager) etc.

198. No. 19, Athen. XV, 695d:-

σύν μοι πῖνε, συνήβα, συνέρα, συστεφανηφόρει,
σύν μοι μαινομένῳ μαίνεο, σὺν σώφρονι σωφρόνει.

199. I have already alluded to other light epigrams in the foregoing pages.

200. A.P. XII. 50.

201. A.P. V. 134.

202. Ap. Athen. XI, 472f, 473a.

203. A.P. XII. 49.

204. A.P. XI. 23.

205. A.P. XI, 41.

206. A.P. IX, 331.

207. A.P. XII. 119.

208. A.P. XII. 168.

209. A.P. V. 136; cf also 137.

210. A.P. V. 181, 185; cf also 183 (Poseidippus); XI, 35 (Philodemus) etc.

211. A.P. XI. 24.

212. A.P. XI. 30.

213. A.P. XI, 34.

214. Concerning these convivial topics teaming with love and wine, they have a counterpart in modern Egyptian poetry and strictly speaking, in the Alexandrian poetry; for modern Alexandria is noted for a certain kind of poetry, light and lascivious (called Mawali and Zagal, written in colloquial Arabic) which is generally Alexandrian. The poets who write these verses are exclusively Alexandrian born and bred. What strikes me more is the fact that these Alexandrian poets have a club of their own called the 'Nadua' (an Arabic equivalent to ('Symposium') where they meet by night to talk and improvise sportive verses on whatever topic they fancy, especially on love, wine, politics etc. Their verses are notorious for their unbridled freedom of expressions. I wonder if this modern poetry of the 'Nadua' has any connection with the convivial epigram at the symposium; in other words, is this Alexandrian

poetry a reminiscent of the Alexandrian convivial epigram? I will give special care to this question in the near future. At the moment I would like to say that there is a possibility because of the following factors: Modern Alexandria shows more than any city in Egypt some Greek signs - the belief in magic, fondness of wine and night-life etc. The kind of poetry to which I have already referred is typically Alexandrian and the '<u>Nadua</u>'of the poets are not, as far as I know, to be found outside Alexandria.

215. Chapter I.

216. A.P. XVI. 231, on a statue of Pan (Anyte); VI. 353, 354; IX, 604, 605, on faultless pictures of some ladies and girls (Nossis).

217. A.P. XVI. 196, 197.

218. A.P. XVI. 212 (Alpheius of Mitylene).

219. A.P. XVI. 200 (Moschus).

220. A.P. XVI. 187.

221. A.P. XVI, 236, 261 (Leonidas of Tarentum), 237 (Tymnes), 242 (Erycius). The last epigram is very obscene.

222. A.P. XVI. 226 (Alcaeus of Messene).

223. A.P. XVI. 95 (Damagetus).

224. A.P. XVI. 8 (Alcaeus of Messene).

225. A.P. XVI. 119, 68.

226. A.P. IX. 598, 600.

227. Cf. A.P. IX, 599 (Theocritus), XVI, 306, 307 (Leonidas of Tarentum).

228. Cf. On Love: A.P. IX. 179; XVI. 206 (Leonidas of Tarentum); XII, 56, 57 (Meleager). On unarmed Cypris at Sparta, IX. 320 (Leonidas of Tarentum). On Virtue defeated by insane Joy, Athen., IV, 163. a.b (Mnasalces of Sicyon). On Pan, Hercules and Hermes, A.P. XVI. 234 (Philodemus) etc.

229. A.P. IX, 719.

230. A.P. IX. 734.

231. A.P. IX. 720, 721, 722, 723, 724 and 728.

232. A.P. XVI, 275.

233. A.P. XVI. 132 (Theodoridas); 133 (Antipater of Sidon), 134 (Meleager).

234. A.P. IX, 182 (Leonidas of Tarentum) 178 (Antipater of Sidon).

235. Paulus Schott (Poseidippi Epigrammata, Berlin, 1908), No. 1.

236. A.P. IX. 333. cf. also, 143 (Antipater of Sidon).

237. Schott, No. 2. Cf. also Schott, No. 3; Athen. VII, 318d., on the same shrine.

238. Athen., XI, 497 d.e.

239. Cf. Chapters IV and V.

240. Cf. Chapter I, pp. 51-72.

241. A.P. IX. 565.

242. A.P. IX. 566.

243. A.P. XII, 43; Cf. Strabo, XIV, 658, Nil. 6. Against Creophylus, the author of 'The taking of Oichalia'. See further Appendix II where I treated 'The cyclic poems' in detail.

244. Homer: A.P. IX, 24 (Leonidas of Tarentum), 97 (Alpheius of Mitylene); Sappho: 66(Antipater of Sidon); Pisander: 598 (Theocritus); Epicharmus: 600 (Theocritus); Hipponax: XIII.3 (Theocritus); Anacreon: A.P. XVI, 306, 307 (Leonidas of Tarentum), IX, 599 (Theocritus), VII, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30 (Antipater of Sidon), 31 (Dioscorides) etc.

245. A.P. VII. 80.

246. Athen. XI, 473, a.b.

247. A.P. VII. 406.

248. A.P. XIII. 21 (Theodoridas).

249. A.P. XI. 275.

250. A.P. XI. 218.

251. A.P. VII. 11; although the epigram is included in the seventh book of the Palatine MS., it is not sepulchral.

252. A.P. IX. 63. Callimachus' opinion on it is

unfavourable (cf. Schneider, fr. 47B).

253. A.P.VII. 713.

254. A.P.XII. 168.

254a. A.P.VII. 409.

255. A.P.XII. 168.

256. A.P.IX. 507.

257. A.P.IX. 25.

258. A.P.XVI. 119.

259. A.P. V. 146.

260. A.P.XVI. 68.

261. Cf. Supra, the epigrams on Pharus, the shrine of Arsinoë II and the rhyton in the shrine of that queen.

262. Chapter IV.

C H A P T E R IV

CALLIMACHUS OF CYRENE

&

LEONIDAS OF TARENTUM

THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE TWO SCHOOLS

THE IONIC & DORIC, AND THE MASTERS

OF

THE ALEXANDRIAN EPIGRAM

In this chapter I shall take into consideration two eminent epigrammatists. Callimachus of Cyrene and and Leonidas of Tarentum, whom I consider Alexandrians. These wrote, roughly speaking, at the beginning of the Alexandrain period, a period which ends in the first century B.C. In this period, which covers about 250 years, Alexandria was so distinguished a centre of literary movement that the whole period could be called without dispute after her name. The part she played in the development of the various poetic departments was, as we have already seen, a remarkable achievement, but it is in the epigrammatic development that her contribution seems to be greatest.

As far as epigram is concerned, Alexandria, because of her distinguished position and other facilities, became the headquarters or the centre of this particular genre. The new centre succeeded at the hands of her earlier epigrammatists to make good use of all that was already attempted along the long course of development, whether in the classical times or in that period which comes between the latter and our era. This intermediate period is distinguished by some centres which occupied themselves with cultivating the genre in their own way and according to their own tastes.

Such are the Peloponnesian School with its illustrious figure, Anyte of Tegea; that of Magna Graecia, the representative of which is Nossis of Locri and at last the schools of Cos and Samos, the poets of which, such as Philetas and Asclepiades, are mere singers of love and paegnion-like trifles. The influence of the epigrammatists belonging to those schools on the Alexandrian epigram is manifest. They are taken as models by many an epigrammatist and their themes were either imitated or varied. Sometimes the Alexandrian copy surpasses the model, as it happens often with Callimachus; but with the second-rate epigrammatists the copy looks inferior to the model. Although these epigrammatists do not belong to our period - and many of them flourished at the beginning of the third century, i.e., a few years before the date of the real Alexandrian period - it is impossible to ignore them when a comparison rises or reminiscence does occur.

Let us now try to trace the contribution of Alexandria proper achieved at the hands of these Alexandrian epigrammatists whom I regard as the most efficient exponents of the epigrammatic genre. Alexandrian epigrammatists, in my judgement are those who lived at Alexandria either permanently or even for

a short interval and also those who might not have seen Alexandria at all but show, at the same time, some familiarity with the epigrammatic movement at Alexandria. Such familiarity shows itself in sheer imitation or mere competition in handling the same theme such as Leonidas of Tarentum at the beginning of our period and Meleager, the distinguished representative of the Syrian School, at its end. So much said, it is time to begin the study of the eminent contributors to the genre:-

I. Callimachus of Cyrene

The first epigrammatist to begin with is Callimachus. This is due to several factors: first of all, he was a resident of Alexandria for the greater part of his life and secondly because he is the true founder of the poetic School at Alexandria. No-one allows himself to deny the remarkable part which Callimachus played in creating the Alexandrain poetic school and in devising the characteristic principles which gave the school an independent personality. It is true that he is somewhat younger than Leonidas of Tarentum and Theocritus of Syracuse who belong to the same school; but they hardly have a claim to be mentioned before him for the same reasons which give him

the lead as the head of the school although it was disputed for sometime.

Callimachus'[1] literary career as a poet of promise commenced with his composition of the 'Hymn to Zeus' which was written sometime between 280 and 275[2]. This hymn, written by a young man at about the age of thirty, attracted the attention of the King, Ptolemy II Philadephus; and it was sooner or later that Callimachus gained the royal patronage, became a poet laureate, and had the chance of becoming a leading figure; but he may have not reached the zenith of his reputation before year 264[3].. As far as Alexandrian poetic school is concerned, I believe that the hymn to Zeus is the first extant piece which is typically Alexandrian in theme, spirit and workmanship, and so the years 280-275 B.C. could be taken as the beginning of both Callimachus' poetical career and at the sametime that of our poetic era. Callimachus may have written epigrams before that date, but it is in the longer poetic genres that the characteristics of the school are most manifest.

We have at least sixty-one undisputed epigrams[4] of Callimachus' pen. This number, great as it is, undoubtedly forms a part of a greater number which were lost

like the most part of Callimachus' work whether in prose or verse. This number in any case demonstrates that Callimachus had the time to compose epigrams on serious occasions and to enjoy himself and make good use of his gifts of pawky humour with which he was so remarkably endowed. Anyhow the extant epigrams are enough to reveal much of their author's spirit, workmanship, and the part he played in developing the genre and widening its range. As Meleager used to make use of private collections, I should like first to discuss the question of Callimachus' collection or collections of epigrams before dealing with the epigrams themselves. As far as the Alexandrian epigram is concerned, there is no doubt that Meleager was the main source of the MS. Palatinus. If so, he must have at hand collections of different poets.[5] In his proem to his Stephanus, Meleager revealed the utmost familiarity with the Alexandrian epigrammatists. This is shown by the way he pursued in describing each of them in term of flowers. Professor Cuvré believes that at least Callimachus, Asclepiades, Poseidippus, Hedylus, Nicaenetus, Moero, and probably Dioscorides had their private collections.[6] Again Meleager's imitations of the Alexandrian eminent epigrammatists add weight to

this assumption. But we do not know either the nature of these collections or whether they were published by the epigrammatists themselves or that their epigrams were simply collected after their death independently or in anthologies sometime before year 80 B.C., the approximate date when Meleager compiled his Stephanus. In the case of Callimachus, one is rather certain that the poet who cared for editing the verses of the classical poets could hardly have failed to deal otherwise with his own. There are still evidences which confirm this assumption: Callimachus' epigrams were commented on by Archibius[7] soon after the poet's death[8] and paraphrased in iambic lines by Marianus[9] who flourished in the reign of Anastasius in the sixth century A.D.[10] Although it is agreed that Callimachus must have published his epigrams, yet we do not know anything about the nature of the collection - or collections - and its contents. The title also is not decisive. Tradition leaves much for conjecture, deduction, and dispute. As far as the title is concerned, there is some ground for supposing that Callimachus' collection was called Ἐπιγράμματα. We have already noticed that Suidas used this title in his account on Ἀρχίβιος and Μαριανός. Again the quotations of some fragmentary epigrams by various writers right from the

first century are always accompanied with the phrase ἐν Ἐπιγράμμασιν[11]. It is supposed that there is another collection concerned exclusively with literary views and criticism on poets or writers like Archilochus, Antimachus and others. This collection is entitled γραφῆων. Nothing can be said of this collection with any certainty.[12] A distich on Archilochus led Schneider[13] to think that it is one of a series of poems belonging to this particular collection which the critic of Alexandria composed at different occasions. Schneider observes also that many of the poems of this collection were quoted by later grammarians as a part of the "Ἐπιγράμματα" such as the piece on the Lyde of Antimachus.[14] Professor Herter in his very useful and extensive article on Callimachus dealt with the topic of γραφεων rather cautiously. He shunned giving his own views and contented himself with illustrating others' conjectures and assumptions.[15] Wilamowitz refers to it in passing as one of the empty titles (leeren Titel) and an ambiguous one.[16] Such are the principal informations about the disputed γραφῆων. Unhelpful as they seem for any decisive conclusion, they could provide some help for a new idea on the existence of this work and its contents. I shall

grapple with the question and hope to reach some kind of conclusion. The fact that the meaning of the title is vague led the modern scholars to have different views about its form and contents. In Susemihl's opinion, it is 'portraits of poets' (Dichter-portrate)[17]; according to Cahen, it is a collection of 'epigrammes satirico-litteraires'. Herter considers it 'Ein Gedicht literarhistorichen Inhalts war das γραφεῖον.'[18] The meaning of the word in the Alexandrian period as a "register-office" and the like (cf. Preisigke, Wörterbuch, III, p. 104) may throw a certain light on Callimachus' γραφεῖον and define its nature. Callimachus' position in the Museum as a head of the catalogue-department and his place in the earlier days of the Alexandrian period as a literary arbiter possessed with all the literary attainments on a high level leads us to think with some reason that the word γραφεῖον was skilfully taken by our poet from the ordinary usage and applied to a special literary purpose. One, who is acquainted with the enigmatic and much-disputed title of the 'Ibis', ought not to be surprised at this title at all. As the question is still open to further conjectures and assumptions, I think that the title suggests that the γραφεῖον must

have been an independent collection which consists of various poems, not one poem as Professor Herter says; for whatever be the disputed contents which come under this title, the critic must have dealt with variety of literary questions and comments on literary figures both ancient and contemporary which eventually took place at different intervals. A scholar like Callimachus whose interest in literary criticism cannot be disputed, might have included in his γραφεῖον all the literary pronouncements and his various views on poets, whether in the form of eulogy or deprecation, which he used to issue, from time to time, from his department in the Museum. The assumption that the γραφεῖον includes only 'portraits of poets' as some scholars believe does not appeal to me at all, because, if this be the case, Callimachus, would have not cared for preserving his other literary pronouncements and views, which I doubt very much. In addition to the fragmentary pieces - which are in fact fragmentary epigrams - collected by Schneider, as I have already said,[19] on poets and other writers, we have a certain number dealing with poets and with his own literary views preserved in good condition in the MS. Palatinus and in other sources[20]. These I do not hesitate to

regard as a part of the original γραφεῖον. The fact that these epigrams were known by Cephalas may with all probability justify my assumption that Meleager had at hand either one collection of Callimachus with the title Ἐπιγράμματα which should be in this case divided into sections, of which the γραφεῖον is one, or that Meleager had two different collections, a general one with the title Ἐπιγράμματα and one dealing with the literary topics with the title γραφεῖον. Although the fact that later grammarians' quotations of similar poems, as for instance the line about the Lyde of Antimachus, were taken from the collection of the ἐπιγράμματα may lead to the assumption that Callimachus later included in the general collection pieces which had once been published in the γραφεῖον, yet I am inclined to think that Callimachus could have belittled such a collection in this way. If something of the kind happened it must have been attempted by some other person and probably after the time of Meleager. These are my conjectures on this difficult question. If they are not decisive, I hope that they are not altogether unreasonable.

Let us now turn to the study of the epigrams. In an account on the epigrammatists, I think the best way

to be pursued is to try to study their epigrams in series on a theme-basis. In so doing the epigrammatists' characteristics and their contribution will be manifest. According to this practice, Callimachus' epigrams fall generally into two main divisions which could be divided into sub-divisions: the inscriptional, sepulchral and votive (both the real and the epideictic) and the topic epigrams which have nothing to do with inscriptions at all, such as the erotic, the moral, the literary and the occasional in the form of a tribute or homage to one of the royal family. Callimachus' epigrams are introduced to us in an exquisite description by Meleager:-

. . . . . ἠδύ τε μύρτον/Καλλιμάχου, στυφελοῦ μεστὸν ἀεὶ μέλιτος [21] ' and the sweet myrtle of Callimachus ever full of harsh honey'. This statement reveals the admiration of Meleager and throws a light on the characteristics of some of Callimachus' epigrams: the concisness, the simplicity of the artifice, and finally the dry and pungent flavour which is not missing here and there in his epigrams. In this metaphorical description, Meleager, it seems to me, was thinking only of the erotic epigrams; for it is in these that the sweetness is not without

sourness. The lover in Callimachus' epigrams is generally uneasy owing to his distrust of the beloved and thus his comments are rather bitter. Of the implicity of Callimachus which could be understood of 'sweetness', I have no doubt, especially when he is compared with Leonidas of Tarentum; but as many epigrams reached us in a rather deplorable condition owing to lacunae and mistakes committed by scribes, they are in fact enigmas which are impossible to translate accurately and correctly inspite of the numerous conjectures attempted by diligent scholars.

Of the first division, i.e. the inscriptional, I will begin with the sepulchral. These are generally of three kinds: real epitaphs, mere παίγνια or sportive epigrams, and those which maintain the seriousness of the epitaphs but do not possess the essential particulars which a real tomb would need as the name of the dead, his parentage and his native-land. These are simply a lament of the deceased, a touching remembrace or a cry of sorrow upon untimely death. Of the first kind, the real epitaphs, I have already said that there existed among the sepulchral epigrams, genuine epitaphs which have the traditional characteristics of the classical epitaphs. Some examples which I have already

given were partly drawn from the epigrams of Callimachus himself. It is true that Callimachus' real epitaphs, which reached us, are fewer in number than those sepulchral ones written for other purposes and for the book. This led Professor Herter to think that Callimachus' epigrams were mostly written for the book and ricitation[22]. It is worth while to refer here to his doubts concerning the genuine epitaph written by Callimachus and other epigrammatists belonging to this period. He says: 'it has to remain doubtful in many cases, whether it was occasionally also inscribed on stone, and whether it was written for a special occasion, or whether the persons mentioned really lived'[23]. Such views and doubts of Professor Herter are but an echo of a sound heard long ago from Reitzenstein and his school and their followers. Professor Herter's statement, however, does not show that he denies altogether that there are among Callimachus' sepulchral epigrams some which have the characteristics of real epigrams. If so our ignorance of the names of the dead should not lead us to reject them as real epitaphs inscribed on the tombs. It is not practical to take the 'stone' as the only evidence of real epitaphs. Did all the tomb-stones survive to our time? In short if

we lack material testimonies, we have still to study the epigrams by the help of the different criteria. I have already mentioned but a sound understanding and common sense are of great importance for giving a final judgement whether for or against. Let us take an example from Callimachus and see how the criteria work. It is a sepulchral epigram on a certain Erasixenus the wine-bibber:-

Τὸν βαθὺν οἰνοπότην Ἐρασίξενον ἡ δὶς ἑφεξῆς
ἀκρήτου προπόσις ὤλεσ' ἔχουσα κύλιξ. [24]

'The cup of unmixed wine drained to the health of a friend twice straight off ruined Erasixenus the deep drinker'. As far as the criteria are concerned this epigram could not be held as a real epitaph at all. The tomb or even any reference to it is not mentioned. The name of the dead is not accompanied by those of his parentage or even his native-land. The cause of the death is not a decent one. I am astonished that Professor Cahen holds it to be real epitaph. It is in my opinion a παίγνιον and an unattractive one. The poet is just poking fun at a certain banqueter-companion whose fondness of wine and especially the neat or undiluted wine must have surprised or shocked all; for according to the general custom wine is seldom

drunk neat but mixed with water to the proportion of one to three. Let us take another example. It is on a certain Menecrates who died from giving himself to wine:-

α. Αἶνιε, καὶ σὺ γὰρ ὧδε, Μενέκρατες, οὐκ ἐπὶ πουλὺ
ἧσθα· τί σε, ξείνων λῶστε, κατειργάσατο;
ἦ ἑᾶ τὸ καὶ Κένταυρον ἰβ'. Ὄμοι πεπρωμένος ὕπνος
ἦλθεν, ὁ δὲ τλήμων οἶνος ἔχει πρόφασιν.

'A. "Menecrates of Aenus, you were not here for long - what, best of friends, caused your death? Was it that which caused the centaur's?" B. "The destined sleep came to me, but the wretched wine has the blame." '

Here the name of the dead and his native land are mentioned, the cause of death is disclosed. In its dialogue form, it reminds us of some classical patterns, but the dialogue here is carried in a rather artificial and subtle way. Could we regard it, as Professor Cahen did, as a real epitaph? Although the particulars of a real epitaph are carefully followed, yet I do not think it is an epitaph at all. It is too literary for a tomb. The reference to the mythological intoxicated centaur, Eurytion, is not within the reach of the ordinary passer-by. It is then, undoubtedly a παίγνιον by which the poet makes a jest of the

Thracians who were known to be deep-drinkers. This could be inferred from the poet's choice of Aenus, a Thracian city famous for its good wine. These two examples in which I decidedly have views different from Professor Cahen, make it clear that it is not difficult to distinguish the real epitaph from the epideictic. It is especially on the suggested criteria and the use of common sense that we should depend in deciding whether a sepulchral epigram of Callimachus or of any other epigrammatist is a genuine epitaph or a false one.

Returning to the discussion of the disputed real epitaphs which are regarded as book-epigrams by some of the German scholars, I am inclined to believe that it is more reasonable to say that Callimachus composed both epitaphs for the stone and sepulchral epigrams for the book, than to say that he concerned himself only with the second sort; for there are, as we have seen, a number among Callimachus' epigrams which compare with the best classical epitaphs. But how did such epitaphs written for the tomb appear in Callimachus' collection 'Επιγράμματα', if they were ever drawn from it? It is not unreasonable that the poet himself selected out of those epitaphs which he wrote to order or to his

28

friends a certain number which he thought to have a certain claim (such as matchless brevity and so forth) to be included in a circulated collection. It will take me a long time to concern myself with some selections of real epitaphs, so I will end my account with a rather disputed epitaph. It is written for a certain good nurse called Aeschra:

Τὴν Φρυγίην Αἴσχρην ἀγαθὸν γάλα, πᾶσιν ἐν ἐσθλοῖς
Μίκκος καὶ ζωὴν οὖσαν ἐγηροκόμει,
καὶ φθιμένην ἀνέθηκεν, ἐπεσσομένοισιν ὁρᾶσθαι
ἣ γερὴ ὗς μαστῶν ὡς ἀπέχει χάριτας. [29]

'Phrygian Aeschra, his good nurse, so long as she lived, Miccus cared for in her old age with all good things, and when she died he erected her statue for future generations to see how the old woman received due thanks for her nursing breasts.' Here we have the name of the dead together with that of her country. This is, I think, enough, since the dead is only a slave. The verb 'ἀνέθηκεν' suggests the death and tomb. The reason for erecting the statue of the dead justifies the fact that it is a real epitaph although it may look unusual and too literary, for there are signs of artificiality and erudition in more than one place: ἀγαθὸν γάλα, the good milk, is not an ordinary

phrase to refer to a once living nurse, ἐγηροκόμει is a reminiscence of Hesiod, cf. γηροκόμοιο, Theog. l. 605, φθιμένην is Homeric and the expression ἑπεσσομένοισιν ἀρᾶσθαι reminds of Herodotus' καὶ ἑπεσσομένων ἀνθρώπων, VI, 77. From stylistic point of view, these literary peculiarities are not a guarantee for holding it to be a real epitaph; but although Professor Cahen hesitates to consider it as written for the tomb, I have not the slightest doubt that it is not a real epitaph but also a new Alexandrian type. I then take these erudite features as pro and not contra the assumption that it is ordered by Niccus to his nurse out of sheer gratitude. This is not difficult to prove; for since it is such as is ordered by a high-class person for a humble dependent, it is only natural that the deeds of the giver are exalted and expressed in a special tone. Again the fact that there is something exciting in a pure literary sepulchral epigram, especially in the hands of Callimachus, adds some weight to my views.

We can turn now to the παίγνια - sepulchral epigrams. Inscriptions were composed for purposes other than the tomb already in the classical period.[30] It is not then surprising that such practice continues in the

Alexandrian period, but what strikes me is that they widened its scope and introduced themes which were entirely unknown before them. Of these themes I begin with the παίγνια on purpose; for it is the παίγνια that develop from the real epitaph and yet show striking difference with them especially in spirit and tone. Here is an epitaph composed by Callimachus for his own tomb:-

Βαττιάδεω παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδας, εὖ μὲν ἀοιδὴν
εἰδότος, εὖ δ' οἴνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι.[31]

'It is the tomb of Battus' son that you are passing - one who could sing well and laugh well at the right time over the wine.' This epigram is a happy example to begin with; for it is the first fictitious epitaph, as far as we know, written by an epigrammatist for himself, a practice which was pursued after him by poets such as Leonidas of Tarentum, and Meleager. Very subtly Callimachus, Battus's son, introduces us to his poetic productions, the earnest and the gay. The ἀοιδή refers to his numerous poems he wrote on certain serious occasions such as his hymns, his elegies etc. This οἴνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι undoubtedly alludes to those little songs included in his ἐπιγράμματα - collection, especially those which were presumably

written for the tomb and those accompanying the ex-votos such as the Scolion-like erotic and drinking epigrams[32] and the παίγνιον - like epigrams in which the poet records the flights of his sportive fancies on whatever theme may be, including naturally the inscriptional epigram. These series of epigrams, as originated from the σκόλιον and παίγνιον, replaced the former at the banquet and formed entertaining articles favoured especially by a particular class of banqueters endowed with literary attainments. The influence of these entertaining types exerted upon the Alexandrian epigram - and the same thing could be said of the classical - was fortunately discovered and wonderfully dealt with by Professor Reitzenstein.[33] As far as book-epigram is concerned - with the exclusion of those epigrams which are written for the tomb or for accompanying an ex-voto[34] - I do not only agree with him but also feel quite thrilled by the sound conclusions he reached:[35] namely that the fictitious inscriptional epigram for the 'book' flourished tremendously in this period for sheer recitation, either within or outside the symposium. I am inclined to add to this that they were also read privately by readers everywhere. Of the παίγνια proper, I am going to give some examples. My

comments on them, if there are any, will be very brief since the difference between the real and the epideictic is not difficult to grasp. The following is an epigram on Timon[36] the Athenian, known as a misanthrope:-

α. Τίμων (οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἐσσί), τί τοι, σκότος ἢ φάος, ἐχθρόν;
β. Τὸ σκότος· ὑμέων γὰρ πλείονες εἰν Ἀΐδῃ.[37]

'Timon (for you are no more), which is hateful to you, darkness or light? "The Darkness, for there are more of you in Hades." ' In this epigram we have a quite clever example of a fictitious inscription used as a joke at the banquet. As far as its form is concerned, it shows the closest relation to a real inscription. The dialogue, which is very simple and direct is achieved with utmost mastery. Finally the 'point' compared with those of other epigrams on the same person[38] is more subtle and vivid. The next is an epitaph on a certain Timarchus who may be the philosopher[39] who was a native of Alexandria. It runs thus:-

Ἤν δίξῃ Τίμαρχον ἐν Ἄϊδος, ὄφρα πύθῃαι
ἤ τι περὶ ψυχῆς, ἢ πάλι πῶς ἔσεαι,
δίξεσθαι φυλῆς Πτολεμαΐδος, υἱέα πατρὸς
Παυσανίου· δήεις δ' αὐτὸν ἐν εὐσεβέων.[40]

'If you would seek Timarchus in the house of Hades to

enquire anything about the soul or about how it shall be with you hereafter, seek Pausanias' son of the tribe Ptolemais and you shall find him in the abode of the pious'. This epigram which is undoubtedly epideictic, is one of a series of three epigrams in which Callimachus touches the philosophic theories or rather conceptions with his usual light irony. The two others are worth mentioning. The second is on a certain Cleombrotus[41] who committed suicide. The reason for that is ironically given:

Εἶπας "ἥλιε, χαῖρε" Κλεόμβροτος ὡμβρακιώτης
ἅλατ' ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ τείχεος εἰς Ἀίδαν,
ἄξιον οὐδὲν ἰδὼν θανάτου κακόν, ἀλλὰ Πλάτωνος
τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς γράμμ' ἀναλεξάμενος[42].

'Farewell, O Sun, said Cleombrotus of Ambracia and leapt from a high wall to Hades. No evil he had seen worthy of death, but he had read one treatise of Plato: that 'On the Soul'.'[43]. Here Callimachus leaves the cause of the suicide to the end to form an ingenious point conveying his or others' disbelief in the immortality of the 'Soul'. Such 'point' reminds me of many of Martial's epigrams in which he used to end in an unexpected point[44] to which the foregoing lines do not actually lead. The third is even much

more fascinating, although its final line remains a riddle for the lovers of Callimachus. It is on a Charidas of Cyrene.

α. Ἦ ῥ' ὑπὸ σοι. Χαρίδας ἀναπαύεται; β. Εἰ τὸν Ἀρίμμα
τοῦ Κυρηναίου παῖδα λέγεις, ὑπ' ἐμοί.
α. Ὦ Χαρίδα, τί τὰ νέρθε; γ. Πολὺς σκότος. α. Αἰ δ' ἄνοδοι τί;
γ. Ψεῦδος. α. Ὁ δὲ Πλούτων; γ. Μῦθος. α. Ἀπωλόμεθα.
γ. Οὗτος ἐμὸς λόγος ὑμμιν ἀληθινός· εἰ δὲ τὸν ἡδὺν
Βούλει, πελλαίου βοῦς μέγας ἐν Ἀίδῃ. 45

'A. "Does Charidas verily rest under you?" B. "If you mean the son of Arimmas of Cyrene, under me." A. "O Charidas, what are things like below?" C. "Very dark." A. "And what of return?" C. "A lie." A. "And Pluto?" C. "A myth." A. "We are undone." C. "This is my true reply to you, but if you wish a pleasant tale, a large ox in Hades costs but a coin of Pella." 46

The dialogue here is a Callimichean innovation. In epigrams of this kind involving in dialogue, the dialogue usually takes place between the passer-by and either the tomb or the dead man. Here the passer-by first addresses the tomb and then the dead himself. This polite way may be explained, though I am not sure,

by the fact that Charidas was an etiquette-lover. The conversation now took place between the poet and the dead. The questions of the living regarding conditions in the hereafter are quite amusing. In just a few lines, Callimachus as usual, was able to make fun at myths, philosophical speculations and popular beliefs. There is no doubt that these three epitaphs are epideictic and specifically παίγνια.

We can turn to another sort of epitaphs written for mere display of mastery of device and style or with the idea of surpassing a similar theme. The following is an epitaph on a certain Astacides the Cretan:-[47]

Ἀστακίδην τὸν Κῆτα, τὸν αἰπόλον, ἥρπασε Νύμφη
ἐξ ὄρεος· καὶ νῦν ἱερὸς Ἀστακίδης.
οὐκέτι Δικταίῃσιν ὑπὸ δρυσίν, οὐκέτι Δάφνιν
ποιμένες, Ἀστακίδην δ' αἰὲν ἀείσομεθα.[48]

'Astacides, the Cretan, the goat-herd, a nymph carried off from the mountain and now Astacides is holy. No more beneath the oaks of Dicte, no more of Daphnis shall we shepherds sing, but always of Astacides.' Here the poet, under the influence of Peloponnesian School or Doric School, gives us an example of a bucolic epigram dealing with nature and the life of shepherds. The repetition of the dead's name, which is

to be found in every line gives the epigram vividness and assures that Callimachus pays a tribute to a contemporary bucolic poet who may have been his friend. The next inscription of a cenotaph of the ship-wrecked Critias buried (or not) in a foreign land:

Κύζικον ἦν ἔλθῃς, ὀλίγος πόνος Ἱππακὸν εὑρεῖν
καὶ Δίδυμην· ἀφανὴς οὔτε γὰρ ἡ γενεή.
καὶ σφιν ἀνιηρὸν μὲν ἐρεῖς ἔπος, ἔμπα δὲ λέξαι
τοῦθ', ὅτι τὸν κείνων ὧδ' ἐπέχω Κριτίην.[49]

'If you go to Cyzicus, it will be small trouble to find Hippacus and Didyme; for the family is by no means obscure. And a painful message you will tell them, yet by all events tell them this, that I hold here their Critias.' This epigram is a copy, the model of which was written by Asclepiades.[50] It is thus one of those themes which Callimachus used to take from other epigrammatists, old or contemporary with the idea of revealing his own mastery.[51] Here is Asclepiades' epigram:-

Ὦ παρ' ἐμὸν στείχων κενὸν ἠρίον. εἶπον, ὁδῖτα,
εἰς Χίον εὖτ' ἂν ἵκῃ, πατρὶ Μελησαγόρῃ,
ὡς ἐμὲ μὲν καὶ νῆα καὶ ἐμπορίην κακὸς Εὖρος
ὤλεσεν, Εὐίππου δ' αὐτὸ λέλαπτ' ὄνομα.[52]

'O wayfarer who passes by my empty tomb, when you come

to Chios tell my father Melesagoras that the East wind destroyed me, my ship and my merchandise, and nothing but the name of Euippus is left.' I will first deal with the second, i.e. the model. The dead is addressing the traveller. But how can the dead speak if he is not in the tomb? He told his sad story and wished it to be reported to his father in Chios. The final line 'Εὐίππου δ' αὐτὼ λέλειπτ' ὄνομα' does not sound reasonable if uttered by the dead himself. It would have been more effective if it was uttered by the empty tomb. I have to add that there is no point whatever in devising an empty tomb for one who died far from home. It would be more natural if it was erected in his native land. In Callimachus' epitaph on the other hand, it is the tomb that speaks. It does not mention the story of death as Asclepiades does, but it can be easily inferred from 'ἀνιηρὸν ἔπος'. The name of the dead, his father and his native land are mentioned. The name of the mother is added perhaps to give the epitaph some effect, but this was not usual in Greek epitaphs before Callimachus. Finally the statement 'ἐπέχω Κειτιήν' is a successful ending and it seems that the poet intends by it to correct his model. It is clear now that Callimachus' epitaph surpasses

that of Asclepiades in the treatment and effect. This motif was treated with variations by many epigrammatists but Callimachus' epitaph was never excelled.[53] I end this series with a cenotaph on a certain Lycus of Naxos, whose tomb, out of the dead's sheer and hard experience, offers an advice to the sailors which is gnomic in tome:-

Νάξιος οὐκ ἐπὶ γῆς ἔθανεν Λύκος ἀλλ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ
ναῦν ἅμα καὶ ψυχὴν εἶδεν ἀπολλυμένην,
ἔμπορος Αἰγίνηθεν ὅτ' ἔπλεε· χὠ μὲν ἐν ὑγρῇ
νεκρός· ἐγὼ δ' ἄλλως οὔνομα τύμβος ἔχων,
κηρύσσω παντάληθες ἔπος τόδε· "Φεῦγε θαλάσσῃ
συμμίσγειν Ἐριφων, ναυτίλε, δυομένων".[54]

'Lycus of Naxos died not on land, but in the sea, he saw his ship and his life perish together, when he sailed as a merchant from Aegina. And he is in the sea, a corpse; and, I his tomb, that holds only his name, proclaim this quite true word "Shun to communicate with the sea, Sailor, when the Kids are setting.'[55]

We come now to those pieces which could be regarded as short pieces of elegy written occasionally on the death of a friend or untimely death of young children which excites the poet's personal emotions. To this series belong also the poems in which the poet shares

others' mourning. All these motifs are full of tenderness and genuine pathos. The poem, Callimachus wrote on the death of Heracleitus, a poet of Halicarnassus, has the grace of movement and a tenderness of pathos that are unsurpassed:- [56]

Εἶπέ τις Ἡράκλειτε, τεὸν μόρον, ἐς δὲ με δάκρυ
ἤγαγεν, ἐμνήσθην δ' ὁσσάκις ἀμφότεροι
ἡλίων ἐν λέσχῃ κατεδύσαμεν· ἀλλὰ σὺ μέν που,
ξεῖν' Ἁλικαρνησεῦ, τετράπαλαι σποδιή.
αἱ δὲ τεαὶ ζώουσιν ἀηδόνες, ἧσιν ὁ πάντων [57]
ἁρπακτὴς Ἀΐδης οὐκ ἐπὶ χεῖρα βαλεῖ.

'One told me, Heracleitus, of your death and it moved me to tears, when I remembered how often we two in conversation put the sun to rest. And you, my Halicarnassian friend, are somewhere ashes long and long ago, but your 'Nightingales' live still, on which Hades, snatcher of all things, will not lay his hand.' Nothing could be more sincere, delicate and touching than this hearty tribute to the memory of a friend and distingued poet. One is so sorry that this highly appreciated 'Nightingales' - presumably a collection of elegies - disappeared entirely. The following is one of those epigrams in which our poet expresses his sympathy for others who might be his friends or neighbours. Thus the sudden death of a

certain Charmis touches the very heart of the poet:-

Δαίμονα τίς δ' εὖ οἶδε τὸν αὔριον, ἀνίκα καὶ σέ,
Χάρμι, τὸν ὀφθαλμοῖς χθιζὸν ἐν ἡμετέροις,
τᾷ ἑτέρᾳ κλαύσαντες ἐθάπτομεν, οὐδὲν ἐκείνου
εἶδε πατὴρ Διοφῶν χεῖρ' ἀνιαρότερον.[58]

'Who knows well to-morrow's fate? When even you, Charmis, who was yesterday in our eyes, we bewailed and laid in the grave next day. Your father Diophon has seen nothing more grievious than that.' The poet's sentiment interpreted in simple and direct language rings very true. The opening words 'Δαίμονα τίς δ' εὖ οἶδε τὸν αὔριον, one of the reasons of mankind's eternal anxiety, is alertly chosen for the occasion. Again I gather from the dialect, the Doric, the poet choose for the poem that the father of the dead is both Cyrenean and a closest friend of Callimachus. The five epigrams[59] which Callimachus wrote in this dialect, suggest that the poet sticks to the Doric dialect on purpose. Again it is one of those epigrams which are lyrical in tone. The next is also a short elegy which has nothing to do with epitaphs. It is simply a lamentable story of a miserable father who lost his two children in one day, an incident which moves the whole city of Cyrene:

Ἠῶι Μελάνιππον ἐθάπτομεν, ἠελίου δὲ
δυομένου Βασιλὼ κάτθανε παρθενικὴ
αὐτοχερί· ξώειν γάρ, ἀδελφεὸν ἐν πυρὶ θεῖσα,
οὐκ ἔτλη· δίδυμον δ' οἶκος ἐσεῖδε κακόν.
πατρὸς Ἀριστίπποιο· κατήφησεν δὲ Κυρήνη
πᾶσα, τὸν εὔτεκνον χῆρον ἰδοῦσα δόμον.

'At dawn we buried Melanippus, and at sunset the maiden Basilo died by her own hand; for after laying her brother on the pyre, she could not endure to live; and the house of their father Aristippus witnessed a double woe, and all Cyrene stood with downcast eyes, seeing the house bereft of its lovely children.' Although this incident is so deplorable, yet the poet does not show the usual personal feeling.[61] The sorrow which he expresses is that which is felt by all the city. Here one can safely say that the poet wrote this epigram under the inspiration of so unusual catastrophe and also with the intention of paying a tribute to Aristippus who seems to be of some rank and importance in the city. It can be added that this epigram was written in Cyrene itself before the young poet immigrated to Alexandria.

It is time now to deal with Callimachus' dedicatory epigrams. Like the sepulchral epigrams, they are either

real or epideictic. I have already some examples of real ones.[62] To these I am going to add some others, the form and seriousness of which leave no shade of doubt about their use for practical purposes. The first is a distich inscribed on a statue dedicated by Phileratis to Artemis:

Ἄρτεμι, τόν τοὶ τόδ' ἄγαλμα[63] Φιλήρατις εἵσατο τῇδε·
ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν δέξαι, πότνια, τὴν δὲ σάω.[64]

'Artemis, to you Phileratis set up this statue here. Accept it, sovereign Lady, and keep her safe.' The fact that the name of the dedicator is not accompanied by that of his father and his native country do not prove against its practical use since we have already some real classical inscriptional epigrams in which the poets ignore any additional information beyond the name of the dedicator.[65] Again the epigram is so simple and serious that an assumption that it is a mere seems to be quite ridiculous. The second epigram was composed to accompany a horn bow and quiver dedicated to Serapis by Menoetas of Lyctus:

Ὁ Λύκτιος Μενοίτας τὰ τόξα ταῦτ' ἐπειπὼν
ἔθηκε· "Πῆ, κέρας τοι δίδωμι καὶ φαρέτρην,
Σάραπι· τοὺς δ' ὀϊστοὺς ἔχουσιν Ἑσπερῖται."[66]

'Menoetas of Lyctus dedicated this bow with these words:

'Here, Serapis, I give you the horn and quiver, but the men of Hesperis have the arrows.' This epigram forms one of a series, in which our poet turned away from the customary elegiac distich and employed lyric measures.[67] As far as form is concerned, this epigram makes a good example of real dedicatory one: The name of the dedicator, that of his native town, the god and the article dedicated are all mentioned. Even more, the people who suffered from the arrows are also mentioned. The last words which are alertly expressed should not be taken for mere boasting. Mnasalces of the deme Plataeae in Sicyon tried the same theme. His epigram runs thus:

Σοὶ μὲν καμπύλα τόξα, καὶ ἰοχέαιρα φαρέτρη,
δῶρα παρὰ Προμάχου, Φοῖβε, τάδε κρέμαται·
ἰοὺς δὲ πτερόεντας ἀνὰ κλόνον ἄνδρες ἔχουσιν[68]
ἐν κραδίαις, ὀλοὰ ξείνια δυσμενέων.[69]

'These hang as gifts from Promachus to thee, Phoebus, his crooked bow and quiver that delights in arrows; but his winged shafts, the deadly gifts he sent his enemies, are in the hearts of men on the field of battle.' - Callimachus' epigram undoubtedly surpasses that of Mnasalces in both form and treatment. In Mnasalces' epigram, the name of the enemies which is

important in a trophy-dedicatory epigram is missing. The absence of the native country of the dedicator weakens the name Πρόμαχος which could stand for a 'fighter.' Again while Callimachus' epigram makes a good example of a real inscription, that of Mnasalces is a mere literary exercise. I wonder which of these two epigrams is the model and which is the copy.[70] Of the fictitious dedicatory epigrams, we have a quite interesting number. These for one reason or another could not have been used for practical purposes. In the following epigram a bronze cock tells a story of the dedication:

"Φησὶν ὅ με στήσας Εὐαίνετος (οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
γιγνώσκω) νίκης ἀντί με τῆς ἰδίης
ἀγκεῖσθαι χάλκεον ἀλέκτορα Τυνδαρίδῃσι·
πιστεύω Φαίδρου παῖδ' Φιλοξενίδεω."[71]

' "Euaenetus, who set me up, says (for I do not know) that I, the bronze cock, am dedicated to the Tyndaridae in return for his own victory. I believe the son of Phaedrus son of Philoxenus." ' That this epigram is a mere joke or rather ridicule is understood from the uncertainty of the cock about the Euaenetus' victory just at the beginning, then its trust - and it is a feigned one - in the dedicator's words at the end. I gather from this apparent contradiction that the victory

is disputed or even a sheer lie. The mentioning of the name of the grandfather, which is unusual, adds some flavour to the jest. The second epigram, a dedicatory one involving in dialogue, is an interesting one and shows novelty in workmanship:

α. Τίν με, λεοντάγχ' ὦνα συοκτόνε, φήγινον ὄξον
β. Θῆκε τίς; α. Ἀρχῖνος. β. Ποῖος; α. Ὁ Κρής. β. Δέχομαι. 72.

'A. To you, O Lord, throttler of the Lion, Slayer of the Boar, I, a branch of oak, was dedicated. B. By whom? A. Archinus. B. Which? A. The Cretan. B. I accept.' Here the poet's Muse puts on the erudite cloak; for instead of giving the name of the God Heracles, he refers to him with two epithets of which one, who knows the labours of this god, is familiar: the strangling of the Nemean Lion and the slaying of the Erymanthian Boar. As to the dialogue, it is true that the dedicated article was made to speak already in the classical period, but the dialogue between it and the god is a new practice. This is undoubtedly an imitation of the sepulchral epigram in which the dialogue usually takes place between the tomb and the passer-by. There is no doubt that this epigram is fictitious or a literary exercise; for the epithet

of the god could not traditionally replace the deity,[73] the temple of the god is not mentioned and furthermore 'Archinus'[74] which occurs in a paignion amatory epigram, as a name of a boy with whom the poet was in love may be a pseudo-name used by the poet in the composition of unreal and light epigrams. The third epigram, as it is clear of its contents, is satirical in tone:-

πῆς Ἀγοράνακτος με λέγε, ξένε, κωμικὸν ὄντως
ἀγκεῖσθαι νίκης μάρτυρα τοῦ Ῥοδίου
Πάμφιλον, οὐ μὲν ἔρωτι δεδαγμένον, ἥμισυ δ' ὀπτῇ
ἰσχάδι καὶ λύχνοις Ἴσιδος εἰδόμενον.[75]

'Say, stranger, that I am set up as a truly comic witness of the victory of Agoranax of Rhodes -. the mask of Pamphilus,[76] not bitten with love, but half of me like roasted fig[77] and the colour of Isis' lamps.' Here the mask, the dedicated article, also speaks; but the epigram is far from being considered real inscription. The god to whom the mask is dedicated is not mentioned. Although it is not difficult to assume that he is Bacchus, yet the name of the god is not left for assumption. Again the mask does not honour his dedicator; for it is attacked as being badly made and ugly to look at. In this it fails to represent the face of Pamphilus, the young lover. No description could be

worse than giving a metaphoric picture of a face of a young man wrinkled like a roast fig and black or brownish as the terracotta-lamps. If this mask is such, how could Agoranax sho admittedly used it in playing the part of Pamphilus be acknowledged as victorious by Callimachus. Thus it is rash to assume that the butt of the satire is the actor in the first place. The fourth epigram in this series is a mere joke on a god with whom the poet sports rather irreverently:

Τὸ χρέος ὡς ἀπέχεις, Ἀσκληπιέ, τὸ περὶ γυναικὸς
Δημοδίκης Ἀκέσων ὤφελεν εὐξάμενος,
γιγνώσκειν· ἢν δ' ἆρα λάθῃ καὶ μισθὸν ἀπαιτῇς,[78]
φησὶ παρέξεσθαι μαρτυρίην ὁ πίναξ.[79]

'Know, Asclepius, that you have received the debt which Aceson owed you by the vow he made for his wife Demodice. But if you forget and demand the charge, the tablet says it will bear witness.' Is this not a strange offering dedicated to the god of medicine? The poet is dealing with him as if he does with one whom he does not trust. The next epigram is a mere literary exercise with a bucolic tone:-

Κυνθιάδες, θαρσεῖτε· τὰ γὰρ τοῦ κρητὸς ἔχεμμα
κεῖται ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ τόξα πρὸ Ἀρτέμιδι,
οἷς ὑμέων ἐκένωσεν ὄρος μέγα· νῦν δὲ πέπαυται,

αἶγες, ἐπεὶ σπονδὰς ἡ θεὸς εἰρύσατο. [80]

'O goats of Cynthus, be of good cheer; for the bow of Cretan Echemmas is laid up in Ortygia in the temple of Artemis, that bow with which he made the great mountain empty of you. But now he rests, O goats, since the goddess has made him consent to a truce.' Although all informations required in a real dedicatory inscription are not missing, the tone is a mixture of erudition and display of his cleverness of treatment. Cynthus is described as ὄρος μέγα [81]. Delos is given the old name Ortygia which the poet mentions rather on purpose; for Cynthus could refer to it very well. Stranger or rather novel is the reason why the hunter Echemmas dedicates his bow which was for long a menace for the goats of the mountain to Artemis. It is not old age and fatigue that caused him to hang his bow in the temple of the virgin huntress as his trade-colleagues used to according to Leonidas of Tarentum and his imitators, but as a result of a truce ordained by the goddess. Such point which is unexpected gives the notion that the epigram is but a παίγνιον composed under the influence of the Doric School headed by Anyte. Again owing to Wilamowitz's idea that no one could hunt in Cynthus,[82] there should be no doubt that it is a mere

intelligent παίγνων . Finally I end this series with an epigram in which Callimachus parodies votive epigrams in general use for sailors or sea-merchants who escape shipwreck. Here is the epigram which skilfully played with the practical and traditional theme:

Τὴν ἁλίην Εὔδημος, ἀφ' ἧς ἅλα λιτὸν ἐπέσθων
χειμῶνας μεγάλους ἐξέφυγεν δανέων
θῆκε θεοῖς Σαμοθρᾳξι, λέγων ὅτι τήνδε, κατ' εὐχήν,
ὦ μεγάλοι, σωθεὶς ἐξ ἁλὸς ὧδ' ἔθετο.[83]

'Eudemus dedicated to the Samosthracian gods - Cabiri - his salt-cellar, out of which, by eating plain salt, he escaped great storms of debts, saying, according to my vow, O great gods, saved by salt,[84] I dedicate this here.' This epigram is the masterpiece among Callimachus' imaginary votive offerings. The joke he makes is attained in a series of puns based on the double meaning of ἅλς as meaning either 'salt' or 'sea'. The gods invoked are well chosen as the Cabiri are regarded as the protectors from the dangers of the sea and also other dangers.[85]

With these examples of Callimachus' sepulchral and dedicatory inscriptions, real and imaginary I have to turn to study his erotic epigrams or παίγνια of the symposium. Erotic trifles are few in number. The

MS. Palatinus preserves only fourteen epigrams: two on women and twelve on boys. But it is understood from Meleager's statement which I have already quoted, that many of Callimachus' epigrams on women were lost. The myrtle, the symbolic description which Meleager gave to Callimachus' effusions, was one of the most favourite blossoms of Aphrodite.[86] Whatever the number of his epigrams may be, Callimachus is our first master of erotic epigrams in the Alexandrian style. Such epigrams which escaped oblivion show that the diligent scholar and the writer of longer elegies which narrate among other things legendary stories of lovers, had the time and bent to cultivate, second to Asclepiades, in gem-like elegies the erotic epigram, the unreserved echo of man's love affairs whether joyful or baneful. Whether recited at the symposium or published in books, Callimachus' amatory epigrams deal either with his own love or others' love affairs. In the first case he revives the classical subjective treatment in the hands of the old lyric and elegiac poets; in the second he discloses one of the important features of the social life at Alexandria the inhabitant of which, young and old, men and women were experts in the art of loving.

Of the two epigrams on the love of women, the first, it seems, deals with the poet's own love for a girl. This piece is a skilful serenade or paraclausithyron reduced to the frame of epigram. In it the poet complains from the hard heartedness before the door of the beloved Conopion:

Οὕτως ὑπνώσαις, Κωνώπιον, ὡς ἐμὲ ποιεῖς
κοιμᾶσθαι ψυχροῖς τοίσδε παρὰ προθύροις·
οὕτως ὑπνώσαις, ἀδικωτάτη, ὡς τὸν ἐραστὴν
κοιμίξεις· ἐλέου δ' οὐδ' ὄναρ ἠντίασας.
γείτονες οἰκτείρουσι· σὺ δ' οὐδ' ὄναρ· ἡ πολιὴ δὲ
αὐτίκ' ἀναμνήσει ταῦτά σε πάντα κόμη.

'So may you sleep, Conopion, as you make me sleep by these cold porches, so may you sleep, O most cruel, as you make your lover lie; but you have not met with a shadow of pity. The neighbours take pity on me, but you not a shadow. But the grey hair will presently remind you of all this.' In this epigram the condition of an unrequited lover is stated or described very vividly with utmost simplicity. The fact that hetaerae stand, on a much higher level and occupy a far more important position in Greek private life long before the Alexandrian period and long after it, can be understood from this epigram and many others in which the

hetaera could, from her good will, open her door to the lover or refuse to admit him. The social position of such hetaerae at Alexandria is a distinguished one. Polybius tells us that the most beautiful houses in Alexandria were called after the name of those hetaerae and that there were many portraits of some of them in the Alexandrian temples, such as that of Cleino, the cup-bearer of Ptolemy II, Philadelphus.[90] One should not be surprised therefore if the lover could pass hopelessly in front of his beloved's door or wait for her arrival rather desperately in his own home.[91] Without artifices or affectation,[92] the complaint flows smoothly and artlessly and the repetition of such expressions as Σ' οὐδ' ὄναρ gives the epigram that echo of real serenades. In the menace at the end of the epigram which is the climax of the lover's outrage, the poet was only content with reminding his hard-hearted beloved of grey hair, the usherer of old age where traces of physical beauty decay and vanish.[93] The next epigram does not belong to our poet as a lover. It is a jesting comment on the instability of lovers who usually exchange vows destined to be forgotten and transgressed by the one or the other:

Ὤμοσε Καλλίγνωτος Ἰωνίδι, μή ποτε κείνης

ἔξειν μήτε φίλον κρέσσονα μήτε φίλην.
ὤμοσεν· ἀλλὰ λέγουσιν ἀληθέα, τοὺς ἐν ἔρωτι
ὅρκους μὴ δύνειν οὔατ' ἐς ἀθανάτων.
νῦν δ' ὁ μὲν ἀρσενικῷ θέρεται πυρί· τῆς δὲ ταλαίνης
νύμφης, ὡς Μεγαρέων, οὐ λόγος οὐδ' ἀριθμός.[94]

'Callignotus swore to Ionis that he would never have a friend, male or female, dearer than her. He swore, but it is true what they say, that lovers' oaths do not enter the ears of the immortals. Now he is glowing with fire for a male, and of the poor girl, as of the Megarians, there is neither word nor reckoning.'[95] The names Καλλίγνωτος (possessed of well-known beauty?) and Ἰωνίς (an Ionian woman) could easily testify that Callimachus states a general fact about lovers and has not any particular persons in mind. Again there is no subjective element in this epigram and the poet simply tells the story of an unfortunate beloved.[96]

To turn to the epigrams written on boys, the comparative large number of these led some scholars such as Körte to think that 'in Callimachus' own amatory experiences handsome lads played a larger rôle than did girls'.[97] Such judgement which is based on the number of epigrams preserved in the MS. Palatinus seems to me not correct, since Callimachus' epigrams in Meleager's words,

as it has been already stated, are connected with Aphrodite who is more concerned with the love of men to women than with that of men to boys. Thus if we trust Meleager's words, it is safe therefore to assume that nearly all the amatory epigrams together with the elegies on women are lost. Such assumption is not altogether rash; for how could Callimachus be the master and the model of Propertius and Ovidius,[98] if he did not compose amatory epigrams in the manner of the older subjective elegy? All this makes it certain that the epigrams on boys are by no means more than those on girls. In his epigrams on paedophilia proper in spite of their small number, Callimachus is revealed to have concerned himself with what is expected from a lover who speaks of his joy and disappointment in his beloved. He too gratifies, complains, reproaches and even threatens. In some of his epigrams he pokes fun at some lovers whose love is unrequited. In both the epigrams which he wrote on himself - for at least some of the epigrams in which he speaks in the first person belong to himself - and those on others: his friends or fellow-banqueters, he is rather prudent, decent and free from that obscenity which is found in the composition of some of the epigrammatists of the period.

I am going now to give some examples where his characteristics to which I roughly referred will become clear. The first epigram is very interesting, since it defines the poet's attitude towards boys. Thus under the spell of φιλοπαις νοσος[99], Callimachus declares that it is the fleeing boy whom he pursues with some toil, that attracts him most. The epigram runs thus:-

Ὠγρευτής, Ἐπίκυδες, ἐν οὔρεσι πάντα λαγωὸν
διφᾷ, καὶ πάσης ἴχνια δορκαλίδος,
στίβῃ καὶ νιφετῷ κεχρημένος. ἢν δέ τις εἴπῃ,
"τῆ, τόδε βέβληται θηρίον," οὐκ ἔλαβεν.
χοὐμὸς ἔρως τοιόσδε· τὰ μὲν φεύγοντα διώκειν[100]
οἶδε, τὰ δ' ἐν μέσσῳ κείμενα παρπέταται.[101]

'The hunter on the hills, Epicydes, seeks after every hare and the tracks of every gazelle, subjected by frost and snow. But if one says "Lo! This is a beast lying shot", he takes it not. Even such is my love; it knows how to pursue what flees from it, but what lies in the common ground it flies past.'[102] In this epigram we have an allegorical picture bucolic in essence: We have the hunter, the mountains and the games chased. The poet was successful in choosing the hare and the gazelle as they are well-known as fleeing game. That the hunter is not fond of an easy game which lies ready

in his way is an alert allusion to the public boys who are wont to attract men for money. These were available in every place and in any time during the Greek world from the classical period to its end. These are naturally much cheaper and of lower standard than those companions who are rather reserved and capable of offering ideal pleasure to the soul as well. These, so it seems, are in the poet's mind when he composed this epigram. It is also a sly attack against those who are content with male prostitutes or rather the beloved who are in circulation.[103] In this case the epigram is a blade with two edges. In the next epigram the poet puts his words into deed; for he begins to chase his game, an obstinate lad. The task is not an easy one, but the hunter is not unsuccessful to hit the target:

"Ληφθήσῃ, περίφευγε, Μενέκρατες" εἶπα Πανήμου[104]
εἰκάδι, καὶ Λώου τῇ[104]– τίνι; τῇ δεκάτῃ
ἦλθεν ὁ βοῦς ὑπ' ἄροτρον ἑκούσιος[105]· εὖγ' ἐμὸς Ἑρμᾶς
εὖγ' ἐμός· οὐ παρὰ τὰς εἴκοσι μεμφόμεθα.[106]

' "You will be caught, flee from me, Menecrates", I said on the twentieth of June, and in July - on what day? the tenth, the ox came to the plough of his own accord. Well done, my Hermes! well done, my own! With the

twenty days delay I find no fault'. Here our poet reveals himself only attracted by the unusual and the difficult. Although it must have taken him a long time to carry out his devices, the poet, after his success, forgot all about his patience and efforts. This could be understood from '[107] ὁ βοῦς ὑπ' ἄροτρον ἑκούσιος.' The following is a very nice and intelligent apology: the lover, so he pretends, does not approach the door of the beloved of his own accord; but he is compelled to come with strong wine and love. What an excuse!

Εἰ μὲν ἑκών, Ἄρχιν', ἐπεκώμασα, μυρία μέμφου·
[108] ἢν δ' ἀέκων ἦκω, τὴν προπέτειαν ὄρα·
ἄκρητος καὶ ἔρως μ' ἠνάγκασαν· ὧν ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν
εἷλκεν, ὁ δ' οὐκ εἴα σώφρονα θυμὸν ἔχειν.
ἐλθὼν δ' οὐκ ἐβόησα, τίς ἢ τίνος ἀλλ' ἐφίλησα
[109] τὴν φλιήν· εἰ τοῦτ' ἔστ' ἀδίκημ' ἀδικῶ.

'If I come to thee in revel, Archinus, of my free will, blame me ten thousand times, but if I am here against my will, consider the vehemence for my coming. Unmixed wine and love compelled me; one of them dragged me and the other allowed me not to be sober-minded. But when I came, I did not shout who I was or whose, but I kissed the door-post. If that be wrong, I have done wrong.' This epigram, as its contents show, is full of

extraordinary tenderness and warmth that is not surpassed by any other epigrammatist even though he is Asclepiades or Meleager. The weakness and rashness, the characteristics of lovers, are most noticeable and give the notion of a real sentiment. But I wonder how the lover accompanied by a party of revellers did not shout his name or that of his beloved. It is worth-mentioning that this epigram was found engraved on a wall in a house on the Esquiline in Rome.[110] How could the beloved reject the lover whose two final lines are as sweet as anything?[111] The next is of some special interest, as it may be one of those in which the poet speaks about his personal experiences of love affair. If so, it reveals our poet as a poor lover who is disgusted to hear it from his beloved. This must belong to the time when he was an ordinary school teacher at Eleusis:

Οἶδ' ὅτι μου πλούτου κενεὰ[112] χέρες· ἀλλά, Μένιππε,
μή λέγε, πρὸς Χαρίτων, τοὔμον ὄνειρον ἐμοί·[113]
ἀλγέω τὴν διὰ παντὸς ἔπος τόδε πικρὸν ἀκούων·
ναί, φίλε, τῶν παρὰ σοῦ τοῦτ' ἀνιαρότατον.[114]

'I know that my hands are empty of wealth, but, by the Graces, Menippus, tell not, my own dream to me. I am pained to hear continually these bitter words. Yes, my dear, of all I have had from you this is the most

unloving thing.' This beloved seems to be greedy and looks for the money or the presents expected from his lover. Those boys who were fond of gain are attacked by the poets who complains of the greediness of boys.[115] But love of boys, in spite of this complaint seems to be dominating and the lover is unwillingly subdued. Thus in the next epigram he loses half of his soul and is afraid that it escapes to where the lads are:

Ἡμισύ μευ ψυχῆς ἔτι τὸ πνέον, ἡμισυ δ' οὐκ οἶδ'
εἴτ' Ἔρος εἴτ' Ἀΐδης ἥρπασε πλὴν ἀφανές.
ἦ ἐά τιν' ἐς παίδων πάλιν ἴσχετο; καὶ μὲν ἄπειπον
πολλάκι· "Τὴν δρῆστιν μὴ ὑποδέχεσθε, νέοι."
οὗ τις συνδιφήσων· ἐκεῖσε γὰρ ἡ λιθολεύστος[116]
κείνη καὶ δύσερως οἶδ' ὅτι που στρέφεται.[117]

'Half of my soul still lives, but half I know not whether Love or Death seized on it; only it is vanished. Has it gone again to one of the lads? And yet I told them often "O youth, receive not the runaway". There help me, some one, to search; for I know it is somewhere there that the lovesick one, worthy to die by stoning, is loitering.' This epigram, though nice and quite dramatic does not necessarily express much of the poet's sentiments or longing for boys. It is only a far-fetched imitation of an epigram by Asclepiades[118] in

which the latter in a sigh of a complaint beseeches Loves - Ἔρωτες[119] - to secure to him what remains of his soul or make him utterly into ashes and cinders. In his imitation, Callimachus is not worried at all, but quietly asks about its destination which he anticipates with some threatening words. The tone of Callimachus' epigram shows that he merely plays mockingly with his model. With the following epigram I end my selection of these pieces which have more or less subjective tone and could be taken as testimonies of our poet's experience of love of boys. The poet discovered at last a charm against paederasty and had the opportunity of challenging the 'Little boy'. What kind of charm could this be! :-

Ὡς ἀγαθὰν Πολύφαμος ἀνεύρατο τὰν ἐπαοιδὰν
τὰν ἐραμένω καὶ Γᾶν, οὐκ ἀμαθὴς ὁ Κύκλωψ.
αἱ Μοῖσαι τὸν Ἔρωτα κατισχναίνοντι, φίλιππε·
ἦ πανακὲς πάντων φάρμακον ἁ σοφία.
τοῦτο, δοκέω, χἀ λιμὸς ἔχει μόνον ἐς τὰ πονηρὰ
τὠγαθόν, ἐκκόπτει τὰν φιλόπαιδα νόσον.
ἔσθ' ἁμῖν χἀκάστοτ' (A) ἀφειδέα πρὸς τὸν Ἔρωτα (B)
τοῦτ' εἶπαι "κείρευ τὰ πτερά, παιδάρεων
οὐδ' ὅσον ἀτταράγον σε δεδοίκαμες". αἱ γὰρ ἐπῳδαὶ
οἶκοι τῶ χαλεπῶ τραύματος ἀμφότεραι.[120]

'How excellent was the charm that Polyphemus discovered for the lover. By Earth, the Cyclops was not fool. The Muses, O philippus, reduce the symptoms of Love. Surely learning is all healing remedy for every ill. Hunger too, I think, has this good and this alone in regard to evil; it makes an end of the disease of love for boys. I have this utterance (word) against the remorseless Love at all time: "have your wings cut, little boy. I fear you not a tiny bit"; for these is at home both the charms for your severe wound.' As far as the subjective epigrams are concerned, this epigram reveals much of the poet's weakness and of his common sense as well. The fact that he concerns himself with the discovery of a remedy against love suggests that he becomes fed up with the homosexual love. The recipe he prescribed with its two ingredients: learning and hunger are most effective. It is by confiding oneself to work that one has no time to spare for the pleasures and displeasures of love. Hunger too is operative. It is an effective remedy against love or rather the love making. One of the advices of our Prophet to those who are financially unable to get married is to fast. The three opening lines speaks of the Muses as a factor reducing the troubles of Love.

This is not his own opinion but it is suggested by Theocritus[121] who believes that the Muses' utterance, a song sung by the Cyclops Polyphemus for his unsubdued beloved, the nymph Galatea, could have the power to dress the wound which the shaft of the mighty Cyprian goddess plants in Polyphemus' heart. This allusion to this special remedy discovered by Theocritus is very interesting; for it shows that the poets in this period, especially at its beginning, used to take interest in exchanging, discussing and correcting each other's views on certain topical points.

With these I pass on to those epigrams which are, in essence, tone and practice, worthy of the banquet where they were sung for some reason or other as mere aids to gaiety. Most of these are neat trifling improvisations inspired on the spot by the ecstasy and the indulgence in merry-making. All of which are true lineal descendants of the old convivial poetry whether it be the Ionic elegy or the Anacreontic song or the Attic Scolia, which were, especially the first two, concerned principally with wine and love. At the banquet the lover is glad to drink the toast of his beloved Diocles whose beauty is worth drinking unmixed wine:

Ἔγχει, καὶ πάλιν εἰπέ, Διοκλέος οὐδ' Ἀχελῷος
κείνου τῶν ἱερῶν αἰσθάνεται κυάθων·
καλὸς ὁ παῖς, Ἀχελῶε, λίην καλός· εἰ δέ τις οὐχὶ
φησίν— ἐπισταίμην μοῦνος ἐγὼ τὰ καλά.[122]

'Fill the cup and say again "To Diocles", nor does Achelous know of his sacred cups. Beautiful is the boy, Achelous, and very fair; and if any denies it, may I be the only one to know what beauty is.' The opening lines of this epigram were imitated twice by Meleager.[123] The formula of the toast is followed in both the model copy by the announcement that the wine served is unmixed. Meleager is straightforward in calling it ἄκρητος while Callimachus expressed it in a roundabout way of expression; for instead of naming the sort of wine, he gives an erudite allusion to it: 'οὐδ' Ἀχελῷος κείνου τῶν ἱερῶν αἰσθάνεται κυάθων. As Ἀχελῷος which is a name for several rivers, is used by later poets to indicate generally water, the meaning is not obscure. Bentley followed by Schneider was successful to interpret the whole statement by: nulla aqua vino illo miscenda est.[124] This suits the idea of the poet very well. Ἀχελῷος of the third line is difficult to understand. Professor Paton confesses to failing to understand the reference to it.[125] Other commentators passed by it almost

in silence. As the word is used in the vocative case, one is not wrong to assume that Callimachus is addressing one of his fellow-banqueters on whom he bestows the fictitious name Achelous for some reason or other which was understood by all at the banquet as a joke or an innuendo. I myself believe that the person addressed by that name is jeered at because he was at that moment drinking the ordinary or the usual wine mixed with water. In the second epigram the lover is desperately uncertain of the beloved's attitude towards him. As this crucifies him, he approaches Zeus, once upon a time a lover like him, and entreats him rather excitably to be on his side:

Τὸν τὸ καλὸν μελανεῦντα Θεόκριτον, εἰ μὲν ἐμ' ἔχθει,
τετράκι μισοίης· εἰ δὲ φιλεῖ, φιλέοις·
ναίχι πρὸς εὐχαίτεω Τανυμήδεος, οὐράνιε Ζεῦ,
καὶ σύ ποτ' ἠράσθης. οὐκέτι μακρὰ λέγω.[126][127]

'If Theocritus, the beautifully brown, hate me, may you hate him, Zeus, four times as much; but if he loves me, love him. Yea, at the enkindling of Ganymede of the fair hair, O Zeus in heaven, you too were once in love. I say no more.' The air of this epigram is but an obvious joking reference to the love affairs of Zeus, who once carried away the beautiful Trojan royal boy,

Ganymede, to his heaven, so that he might, as his page, offer him the cup filled with nectar and, as his favourite share his bed with him. Such trifling stories about gods' and goddesses' love-affairs became a favourite topic in the literary productions of the period.[128] Thus such trifles must have a certain prestige among the learned banqueters. The third epigram is inspired by wine and the beauty of a boy who is presumably present at the banquet. The lover is afraid of a playful boy's allure:

Ἔστι τι, νὴ τὸν Πᾶνα, κεκρυμμένον, ἔστι τι τούτῃ,
νὴ μὰ Διώνυσον, πῦρ ὑπὸ τῇ σποδιῇ·
οὐ θαρσέω· μὴ δή με περίπλεκε· πολλάκι λήθει
τοῖχον ὑποτρώγων ἡσύχιος ποταμός.
τῷ καὶ νῦν δείδοικα, Μενέξενε, μή με παρείσδυς[129]
οὗτος ὁ σιγέρπης εἰς τὸν ἔρωτα βάλῃ.

'There is something hidden, by Pan, there is, yes, by Dionysus, some hidden fire beneath these ashes. I have no confidence in myself. Embrace me not. Often the quiet river secretly eats away a wall from below. Therefore now too I fear, Menexenus, lest the crawler slip in and cast me in love.' How gallant the poet is in this most lascivious piece. Is he really ashamed of his weakness? Or does he shun the boy's embrace? I doubt

it. The allegorical picture of the ruined wall under the calm river is a successful counterpart of what Love does with hearts. The gods invoked are well chosen. They are the most reckless among the gods. Pan, that queer god with fantastic appearance, with goat's feet, two horns and a long beard, was always in love and practically no nymph had any rest from him. Dionysus too, that beautiful youth with womanish look whose power of sweet desire and jovial inebriety are well-known, is a great lover. His love adventures are so numerous that they formed a long epic written by Nonnus known as the Dionysiaca. I end these banqueting songs with two epigrams which I call detective. In them the poet tries to discover what does worry his fellow-revellers very alertly and with much fun. In the first the poet asks a certain Cleonicus who enters the banquet looking so miserable and in so bad a state of health, the reason for all this; but before he receives any answer, he discovers what ruins his friend:

130

Θεσσαλικὲ Κλεόνικε τάλαν, τάλαν· οὐ μὰ τὸν ὀξὺν
ἥλιον, οὐκ ἔγνων σχέτλιε, ποῦ γέγονας;
ὀστέα σοι καὶ μοῦνον ἔτι τείχεος. ἦ ἐά σε δαίμων
οὐμὸς ἔχει, χαλεπῇ δ' ἥντεο θευμορίῃ;
ἔγνων· Εὐξίθεός σε συνήρπασε· καὶ σὺ γὰρ ἐλθὼν

τὸν καλόν, ὦ μοχθηρέ, ἔβλεπες ἀμφοτέροις.[131]

'Cleonicus of Thessaly, poor wretch! poor wretch! nay by the scorching sun I knew you not. Where, poor wretch, have you been? You are nothing but bones and hair.[132] Has the evil spirit taken hold of you as me, and have you met with a hard stroke from heaven? I know it. Euxitheus caught you too; for when you came here, you rascal, you were gazing upon the fair one with both your eyes.' The detective here has a special interest in his job; for he is also a lover and admirer of Euxitheus. This is why he addresses his rival so craftly, so sarcastically and rather derisively. Moreover the fact that it is highly possible that two or even more banqueters could love one boy at the same time gives the notion that such epigrams represent a theme which was in fashion at the banquet where the rivals express themselves each in his own way. In the second epigram the poet is a mere spectator who is aware of what goes on around him. This inquisitive spectator discovered something peculiar about a certain guest and began to ask his neighbour if he noticed anything about the fellow; but the guest's third cup gave the answer which the poet already anticipated. What is it?:

Ἕλκος ἔχων ὁ ξεῖνος ἐλάνθανεν· ὡς ἀνιηρὸν
πνεῦμα διὰ στηθέων εἶδες, ἀνηγάγετο,
τὸ τρίτον ἤνικ' ἔπινε· τὰ δὲ ῥόδα φυλλοβολοῦντα
τῶνδρος ἀπὸ στεφάνων πάντ' ἐγένοντο χαμαί.
ὤπτηται μέγα δή τι μὰ δαίμονας, οὐκ ἀπὸ οἴνου
εἰκάζω· φωρὸς δ' ἴχνια φὼρ ἔμαθον. [133]

'Our guest had a wound and we did not know it; did you not notice how painful a sigh he raised from his breast when he drank the third cup? And the roses, shedding their petals fell from the man's wreaths all upon the ground. He is badly burnt; by the gods, I guess not without reason - a thief myself, I know a thief's foot-prints.' Asclepiades expressed such a theme before Callimachus which suggests that Callimachus' epigram is a copy of Asclepiades' model. I am going to give Asclepiades' epigram:

Οἶνος ἔρωτος ἔλεγχος· ἐρᾶν ἀρνεύμενον ἡμῖν
ἤτασαν αἱ πολλαὶ Νικαγόρην προπόσεις.
καὶ γὰρ ἐδάκρυσεν καὶ ἐλύγξατε, καὶ τι κατηφὲς [134]
ἔβλεπε, χὠ σφιγχθεὶς οὐκ ἔμενε στέφανος. [135]

'Wine is a proof of love. The many toasts convicted Nicagoras who denied to us that he was in love. For truly he shed tears and had a hiccup, and looked with downcast eyes and the wreath bound tight on his head did

not remain on his forehead.' To begin with the model, Asclepiades opens his epigram with a general idea (οἶνος ἔρωτος ἔλεγχος), then he states Nicagoras' denial of an unhappy love and how much drinking convicts the liar. At last his love is revealed by some signs testifying the love-sickness. The general tone of the epigram is rather dull; the scene does not excite the attention of the reader and the poet fails to attain a real fun of his friend. Callimachus, who undoubtedly has the epigram in mind varies the theme, makes it vivid and gives it a dramatic touch by telling his observations to his neighbour and calling him to witness their truth. The picture of the roses shedding their petals and falling on the ground from the guest's wreaths is more graphic and life-like than that of Asclepiades. Moreover Callimachus introduces something new by referring to Eros's burning shafts: 'ὤπτηται μέγα δήτι.' Again the transition to the first person through a pointed proverb gives the epigram a happy end. Finally it is obvious that he excells his model's motif without sacrificing the simplicity appropriate to such detective trifles. In nearly all the epigrams into which he draws the motifs from Asclepiades as well from others, Callimachus does not reveal himself as a slavish imitator

who tries to express in his own words the thoughts of others, but he is wont to take pains in proving and even deviating from his model. Again, as far as the imitative epigrams in general are concerned, Callimachus' way of making use of a certain model, so it seems to me, is something like that: he selects the motif which appeals to him most, studies it carefully and diligently and after discovering some weak points or some gaps which should be logically filled, he usually develops the theme, on a new line of his own. In many cases, on a rhetorical basis, he heightens the motif by dexterous points. In this way Callimachus' copies surpass their models.

Having discussed all Callimachus' erotic epigrams preserved in the MS. Palatinus - and these are all that reached us - we are now in a fairly good position to form an opinion on our poet as an erotic epigrammatist. Professor Cahen[136] regards him as a creator or originator along with Asclepiades of the erotic epigram. To my mind, however, there is much exaggeration in this; for although he excells Asclepiades' models, yet this is not sufficient to lead us to the assumption that he is an initiator of erotic theme or even a match for Asclepiades in any case. There is a big difference between the

Muses of the two epigrammatists. That of Asclepiades is too lyrical while that of Callimachus is at its best still academic. Asclepiades' Muse is inventive, that of Callimachus is analytical. Again as far as the god of love is concerned, it is Asclepiades, not Callimachus, that gave him the different attributes and descriptions which became familiar in this period and long after its end. Finally he is the gifted master who introduces the glorification of the senses, in other words the smiling sensuousness,[137] one of the obvious features of the Alexandrian erotic epigram.

However this may be, Callimachus is our first Alexandrian erotic epigrammatist whose style is marked at one time by a frigidity of good scholarship but at another warms into the fire of passionate poetry. Like Asclepiades he has his admirers and imitators from the beginning of the period till the latest Byzantian period.

Callimachus' remaining epigrams are of a literary character. In these he generally reveals his own views, appreciates some original works written by his contemporaries or attacks others' tendencies towards slavish imitations etc. These I have already dealt with in my account of the 'literary quarrel at

318
Alexandria.

Callimachus' epigrams with their different themes, many of which I have already discussed, could easily throw a light on their composer's workmanship. As far as real epitaphs are concerned, the most complete perfection of the form, the fineness of pathos and the deep and restrained feeling, make Callimachus second only to Simonides. His imaginary or epideictic epigrams, especially the serious ones, have always the particulars usually needed in a real epitaph that it is difficult to say with certainty whether the inscription is real or fictitious. The playful sepulchral epigrams at the banquet are very interesting. They are not mere trifles but full of intelligent criticism or sly innuendoes. Some of them are full of signs of academic learning, a special concern with the intellectual movement old and contemporary. Those on himself - and these are among the first of their kind in the
139
history of the Greek epigram - are true records of the poet's hopes and self-confidence. They reveal at the same time his bitter complaints of those who envy him. What was said of the epitaphs, real and epideictic, could be like-wise repeated in regard to the dedicatory inscriptions real and fictitious. The real have all the virtues of the classical models; and the fictitious are happy play with the form in a masterful way. His inscriptions on the

unreal ex-voto, the bronze cock dedicated by Euaenetus
140
or the tragic mask dedicated by Simos son of Miccus are exceptionally fascinating. The first is an unsurpassed academic jest and the other is an erudite and intended enigmatic exercise or γρῖφος in tone and essence. As a poet of love, especially the love of boys, Callimachus does not seem to be inspired like Asclepiades for instance but he is undoubtedly his superior in the perfection of form. He is so endowed with a psychological and logical intellect that his love stories or others' are more realistic and it is in this that he surpasses all love-epigrammatists. As far as the glorification of the love of boys is concerned, I am not going to blame our poet for indulging in such a subject which terribly shocks the moderns; it is the task of the literary historian to deal with the poet's effusions rather impartially and without any prejudice of any kind whether reasonable or fanatic provided that what we do abhor to-day was well accepted by almost all the peoples of the past. It is worth mentioning however that Callimachus, compared with epigrammatists like Euphorion, Rhianus, Dioscorides, Meleager and Straton, whose Muse was more reckless and obscene, is most decent and prudent. His literary epigrams are remarkable examples written by one who is most interested in his

profession as a man of letters. They contain much of his literary pronouncements, tendencies and criticism of poets, old and contemporary, which are scattered in his other poems. All of which suggest that Callimachus was deservedly considered an arbiter literarum not only at Alexandria but also of the then-Greek world. As a critic, he weighs his words and tries to express his own ideas and fights for them. In this he is different from his contemporaries such as Asclepiades and Leonidas and the other epigrammatists of the Alexandrian period who originated and practised with some vigour the composition of literary criticism of old poets and writers in the form of epideictic epitaphs. These, being generally slavish praise, could not have any weight as pieces of sound criticism. They are in fact no more than literary exercises. No wonder then if Callimachus did not try this sort of epitaph.

As far as the workmanship, form and style of Callimachus' epigrams are concerned, they have their own characteristics. In them the epigrammatist is not to a great extent learned or erudite. He is rather simple and plain. He cherished the compact brevity which is so traditionally characteristic of the classical epigram. He added to the conciseness of expression some new features which became the main characteristics of

the developed epigram from his day onwards: elegant wit, sly humour, vivid and ingenious turns of thought, stylistic tricks, clever points and dramatic way of expression. Vividness is always attained, as the various examples have already shown, through certain devices: now it is a dialogue, a dramatic device with which the poet tries to attract the ears of the hearer. We have already seen some examples in which the passer-by speaks to the tomb and the dead to the passer-by, or the article dedicated talks to the god, or even the lover threatens the beloved.[141] Effect could be achieved through a comparison. We have already seen how a lover who is only interested in a special kind of selected boys is likened to a typical hunter who is wont to pursue the fleeing beasts and overlooks the already shot ones.[142] Playing on words or making puns is also a favourite device of Callimachus. It best reveals the poet's fondness of witty tricks. The dedicatory epigram on Eudemus who eats salt to get rid of debts is full of a series of plays on words.[143] Bentley's intelligent comment on it is very interesting: 'Ingeniosissimum epigramma est, cuius acumen positum in ambigua vi vocum ἁλίην, ἅλα, ἁλός, similitudine verborum ἐπέσθων et ἐπελθών, et nominum δανεών et ἀνέμων. Totum

parodia est."[144] Sly humour is a familiar device with Callimachus. In his epigram on Theocritus, the beautifully brown boy, the poet, after invoking Zeus to behave with the beloved in the same way in which he treats his lover and reminding him of his love of the fair-haired Ganymedes, ends his address to the celestial god in these sly and humourous words ' οὐκέτι μακρὰ λέγω '. Such concluding words weak, as it would seem, is to my mind more convincing and expressive as it takes aim and hits the mark. Proverbs or proverbial expressions are often used by Callimachus for approving and intensifying the poet's confessions, views and assumptions. Thus in the very beautiful detective epigram, in which he surpasses Asclepiades' model, on that guest who tries to hide his love-wounds, the poet, after enumerating some incidents which he holds as signs of consuming love, announces his certainty by 'φωρὸς δ' ἦγγια φὼς ἔμαθον'.[146] Again by attaching the proverb to the first person - ἔμαθον - the poet emphasizes the effect of the hitting of the target. By such ending, the poet, it seems is careful to give a pointed character to his epigram. But as a real 'point' in the manner of the Latin epigram especially that of Martial, it is definitely not. As far as 'point' is concerned,

Callimachus like many of the Alexandrian epigrammatists did not care very much for developing such device.[147] But there are some epigrammatists, as we will see, who made use of it from time to time. Thus it could be safely said that such practice was at this period rather individual than general. The point however was not considered something which contributes to the poet's versatility and efficiency.

Finally Callimachus' dialect, use of metre and style need not delay us here. I have already discussed them rather generally before.[148] As far as his epigrams are concerned and from the point of view of the dialects he used, Callimachus used the epic or the Homeric, the Ionic and the Doric forms. In this he followed in the steps of the classical epigrammatists. We have already seen that the old epigramma was inspired by Homer, the Ionic elegists and the Doric lyric poets. In the Alexandrian period proper, the epigram revealed itself as an offspring of elegy and lyric and thus the use of Ionic and Doric dealects could be held as reminiscent of these two literary genres. Callimachus however kept in some of his epigrams to Doric, as I have stated on set purpose. Again in making use of all the known literary dialects, Callimachus was not exceptional,

since there was a tendency among the Alexandrian poets to intermix between the dialects either for poetical conveniences or for some other reasons such as a display of their learning. As to style or diction, Callimachus the epigrammatist is different from Callimachus the learned poet. In his epigrams, Callimachus took off his erudite gown and expressed himself with natural ease. His constructions which do not suffer from the rhetorical devices and the figures of speech are accordingly plain and simple. As regards erudition and obscurity, there are some few examples which do not count very much. These instances however exclusively occur in the dinner-party epigrams and must have been easily understood and appreciated by the banqueters all of whom were men of letters. Callimachus, the many-sided scholar and poet is so endowed with aesthetic literary taste that he knows when he sticks to erudition and when he avoids it. My general impression of the style of the epigrams in general is that it is faultless, light and lively.

Finally an impartial judgement on Callimachus as an epigrammatist could be reached, if we bear in mind two factors: first his contribution to the development of the genre and to widening its scope; secondly his

influence on contemporary and later epigrammatists. As to the first, he continued the traditional themes successfully and developed in his own way the work of the pioneers of the Alexandrian school and especially of the Ionian School of which Asclepiades was a leader. It is in the hands of the head of this school that epigram became a flexible medium of personal and more or less social expression. Like Asclepiades, Callimachus wrote epigrams on love and wine in which he used to gratify, attack and complain of the beloved. But he has his own contributions; for he is the originator of some new themes; he made the epigram a vehicle for paying homage to influential personalities like a king or queen. Thus the descriptive dedicatory epigram[149] on a certain shell presented to the goddess of the temple at Zephyrium - a promontory between Alexandria and the Canopic mouth of the Nile - is but a homage paid both to Ptolemy II Philadelphus and to his wife Arsinoë II who was worshipped as Arsinoë Aphrodite.[150] In another he considered Berenice, the wife of Ptolemy III as a fourth Grace.[151] It is also in his hands that epigram became a sharp weapon of literary rivalry, a medium for the expression of different views in literature and as far as poets are concerned, it became an autobiographical testimony; for

the epigrammatist in his fictitious epitaphs entrusts his epigrams with his fears, complaints and hopes for immortality. In them too he plays the part of a self-critic. As to the influence he exerted on other epigrammatists, instances where he is imitated or inspired are not few. Among his imitators are such great epigrammatists as Leonidas of Tarentum and Meleager.

Thus we are justified to say that Callimachus occupies an outstanding place as an epigrammatist. In reality he is not only the master of the Alexandrian epigram but also one of the greatest makers of epigram in general.

NOTES ON CHAPTER IV

I. Callimachus (1-151) pp. 463-494

1. For his official position at Alexandria, see Appendix. I. PP. 820-826.
2. Couat, op. cit. p. 246.
3. Aulus Gellius, N.A, xvii, 21.
4. The MS. Palatinus attributes to Callimachus 63 epigrams. To this number two are added: one is taken from Athenaeus VII. 318 (= Mairs' VI) and the other from Strabo XIV, 628 (= Mairs' VII). Five others are ascribed to him on more or less doubtful authority. The inconsistency of the Anthology gave the modern scholars a chance to differ among themselves. Thus according to Professor Müller (op. cit. vol. II, p. 432) they are 76 in number and these, as he says were commented on by Archibius soon after the poet's death, and paraphrased in iambic lines by Marianus, who flourished in the reign of Anastasius; Couat, 64; Mair, 64; Jacobs, 64, Körte, 63; Cahen, 63; Andre Hauvette, 61 and Wilamowitz 61. The last kept the numbers of Meineke (I-LXIII) but rejected III (= A.P. VII,

318, an imaginary inscription on Timon, the cynic, which is preserved in the Palatinus MS under the head τοῦ αὐτοῦ . I quite agree with him since Callimachus wrote another one on the same person (A.P. VII. 317) · Callimachus, however, was not fond of variations like Leonidas of Tarentum for example. He rejected also, A.P. VII. 454 which is anonymous in Athenaeus, X, 436e. The two epigrams, V (= Athenaeus. VII. 318) and VI (= Strab. XIV. 638) did not appear at all in his collection. The first is on a nautilus shell dedicated to Arsinoë Aphrodite of Zephyrium and the second is about the poem called 'The Taking of Oichalia' (Οἰχαλίας Ἅλωσις) composed by Creophylus of Samos. If I am entitled to give my opinion on the authenticity of Callimachus' epigrams, I agree with Professor Wilamowitz with some reserve. I do not see why the epigram on the Samian Creophylus is to be rejected. It is about cyclic poems and Callimachus' opinion on this kind of poetry is well-known. I am inclined however to reject A.P. VII. 89 (Diog. Laert. I. 79 f). As far as the form and length of Callimachus' epigrams are concerned, this poem of eight couplets

could not be taken as epigram especially by Callimachus whose epigrams are always short and compact. It may be one of Callimachus' admonitory elegies which was not included in his collection of epigrams. It is not anyhow written in the style of his epigrams which are rather simple and plain.

5. '....; haben doch die Forschungen der letzten Jahrzehnte, eines Reitzenstein, Radingers, Wifstrands zu der richtigen Erkenntis gehührt, dass dem Gadarener schon Kleinere Liederkränze vorgelegen haben' (Geffcken, PW, vol. XV. p. 482).

6. Méléagre de Gadara (1894), p. 70; Wilamowitz (Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachus, Band I. pp. 135 and 140) admits that Nossis and Leonidas (of Tarentum) had equally collections of their own; Geffcken (Studien von griechischen Epigramm (Neue Jahrb. f.d. Klass. Altertum XXXIX, 1917, p. 88 sq.) attributes to Anyte, Theodoridas and Alcaeus of Messene (quoted in Pierre Waltz, op. cit. Tom. I. p. X).

7. Suidas. s.v. Ἀρχίβιος, Ἀπολλωνίου, γραμματικός· Τῶν Καλλιμάχου Ἐπιγραμμάτων ἐξήγησιν.

8. Archibius, as Professor Cahen believes, lived in the

first century.

9. Suidas. S.V. Μαριανὸς, Ἔγραψε... Μετάφρασιν Καλλιμάχου Ἑκάλης, Ὑμνων καὶ τῶν Αἰτίων καὶ τῶν Ἐπιγραμμάτων ἐν ἰάμβοις.

10. Müller and Donaldson, op. cit. vol. II, p. 432.

11. Such as the fragmentary epigram No. 1, on Cronus (= a nickname of Diodorus of Jasos, a philosopher of the Megaric school) mentioned by Diog. Laert., ii, 111; also the fragments, 72, 77, 74 ab and 75 (quoted in Cahen (Callimaque et son Oeuvre Poétique) Note, 2, p. 206.

12. Fr. 37a:

Εἴλκυσε δὲ δριμύν τε χόλον ὀξύ τε κέντρον
σφηκός· ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων ἰὸν ἔχει στόματος.

'The piercing rage of the dog, the sharp sting of the wasp, he (Archilochus) usurped and from both he had the poison on his mouth.' The following note (Cahen, Callimaque, Les Origines etc. Paris, 1948, p. 145), confirms that this piece belongs to the Γραφεῖον. Fragmentum reponimus ut apud Schneider exstat (fr. 37 a), ex grammatico quodam ap. Keil, Anal, grammat., p. 5 et alliis, qui omnes Callimachum citant 'ἐν τῷ γραφείῳ'.

13. Callimachea (Teubner, Leipzig, 1873), vol II, pp 166-168; quoted in Amedée Hauvette (Les epigrammes

de Callimaque, Étude Critique et Littéraire, Revue des Études Grecques, Tome XX, 1907), p. 304.

14. Fr. 74 B: Λύδη καὶ παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν 'The Lyde is a dull writing and not clear;' Cahen 'Callimaque, Les Origines, etc. p.109) says 'Le mot connu de Callimaque sur la Lyde d' Antimaque de Colophion est egalement cite avec la mention! ἐν ἐπιγράμμασιν.'

15. PW. Suppl. V. p.430. This account is, as far as I know, the most recent literary survey on Callimachus.

16. Op. cit. vol. I, page 217, Note 2.

17. Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur, I, p.356.

18. Herter (PW. Suppl. V, p.430).

19. Vol. II, p.220 ff.

20. I dealt with these in Chapter I.

21. The Stephanus, A.P.IV, 1, 11, 21-22.

22. PW. s.v. Kallimachus; suppl. v. p.431.

23. ibid. pp.431-432.

24. A.P. VII. 454 (τοῦ αὐτοῦ = Callimachus) = Athen. X, p.436 e (Anonymous) = Cahen, 36 attributed to Callimachus, rejected by Wilamowitz, Mair, Jacobs and Pfeiffer (Callimachus, vol. II) p.90.

25. A.P. VII. 725; Wilamowitz 61; Cahen, 61; Pfeiffer LXI (62).

26. He is referring to the Centaur Eurytion (Hom. Od. XXI. 295.)

27. Op. cit. p. 218: Il n'y a donc pas d'impossibilité que les ep. 36 (= VII. 454) et 61 (= VII. 725) de Callimaque soient des inscription "vraies".

28. A.P. VII, 451, 453, and 523.

29. A.P. VII. 458; W. 50. C. 50. Pf. L (51).

30. Even Professor Reitzenstein sho looks to the epigrams of the classical period with great suspicion admits that it cannot be denied that during the fourth century, the inscription appeared frequently among banquet-songs. (Ep. U. Skol. p. 119).

31. A.P. VII. 415; W. C & Pf. 35.

32. Professor Herter believes that ' οἶνω καὶρία συγγελάσαι ' which stands for παίγνια refers chiefly to Callimachus' erotic epigrams (op. cit. p. 433). This is rather a loose conception, since erotic epigrams are the decendants of the drinking-songs or the Scolia of Alcaeus and Anacreon cast in the Alexandrian especial mould. If some of them look as παίγνιον, this can be

only explained by the fact that the scolion was developed at the hands of the Alexandrians in essence as in metre which became entirely elegiac.

33. This is discussed in detail in his book (Ep. u. skol.) especially in the third chapter.

34. Real epitaphs and dedicatory epigrams could very well be included under 'ἀοιδή' mentioned by Callimachus in the epigram under discussion.

35. Op. cit. chapter III pp. 87 ff.

36. Timon forms a favourite theme for the epigrammatists. We have eight epigrams in the Anthology: A.P. VII, 313-320. It is probable he was the first to deal with this theme. Although Timon lived in the fifth century B.C., his misanthropy was not ridiculed before the Alexandrian period. This shows the Alexandrians' caprice for trifles.

37. A.P. VII. 317. W. 4; C. 4; Pf. IV (5).

38. A.P. VII. 318 on the same is attributed by all authorities to Callimachus with the exception of Wilamowitz. The name of Timon does not occur at all. Although it could be taken as a γρῖφος or a sort of αἴνιγμα, yet I quite agree with the latter since it does not show any sign of Callimachus' striking and pungent style.

39. Diog. Laert. VI. 95.

40. A.P. VII. 520; W. 10; C. 10, Pf. X (12).

41. He is a pupil of Plato. He was in Aegina at the time of Socrates' death, Plato, Phaedo 590. His suicide was well-known in antiquity; Cf. Lucian (Philopatr. i) refers to the ' τὸ τοῦ Κλεομβότου πήδημα.

42. A.P. VII. 471, sext. Emp. Adv. math. p. 690, schol. Dion. Thrac. p. 160 etc. Cf. 354, by Agathias Scholiastious. W. 23; C. 23; Pf. XXIII (25).

43. This work is 'Phaedo' which deals with the nature of death and the question of the immortality of the soul. It is also known by the sub-title 'on the soul (Phaedo, p. 363a). The attribution to Plato is disputed.

44. This epigram seems to me to have exerted some influence on Martial who regards Callimachus as a master of epigram (IV, 23, l. 4). This could be realized from this epigram in which Martial attacks the physicians:-

"Lotus nobiscum est, hilaris cenavit, et idem
inventus mane est mortuus Andragoras.
tam subitae mortis causam, Faustine, requiris?
in somnis medicum viderat Hermocraton (VI, 53)"

It is expected that Martial, the father of the

satiric epigram, could have improved on his model.

45. A.P. VII. 524. W. 13; C. 13; Pf. XIII (15).

46. This coin must be of a very small value. This is inferred from another passage of Callimachus himself (Iambi, Oxyrhynch. Papyr. 1011(in Oxyrhynchus Papyri, vii, 1910, p. 31)):-
'Ακούσαθ' Ἱππώνακτος [σ]ὺ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἥκω
ἐκ τῶν ὅκου βοῦν κολλύ[βου π]ιπρήσκουσιν,....
Professor Jacobs (quoted in Couat, op. cit. p. 196. Note 4) surmises that the word πελλαῖον signifies an unknown coin that was current at Pella in Macedonia, and of very small value. But why does the βοῦς μέγας cost only so low a price? All the explanations and surmises given by scholars are not convincing. (Cf. Conat, ibid and Mair, Callimachus etc., pp. 148 - 149, note a). Although the statement is so difficult to understand, I will try to add to the different surmises a new one; but I am not sure of it. I think that the fact that the price of the ox upon earth anywhere and in any epoch, ancient or modern, could not be so low like that and that this sepulchral epigram is imaginative and sportive, could lead to such not unreasonable conjecture. Callimachus,

it seems to me, is either ridiculing a great philosopher of his own time belonging to the Academy or poking fun at Zeus himself. This can be understood from the adjective μέγας and from the underrating hint about Pluto (l. 4.). Zeus is the brother of Hades and as gods, the first is the deity of heaven and the second is the god of the underworld; and it is well-known that Zeus disguises himself in the form of a bull in his love-affairs. Thus in this sportive epigram written for the banquet, Callimachus the rationalist may have expressed his disbelief and contempt of either philosophy or religion. This was a topic-theme of the banquet-epigram in the Alexandrian period.

47. Professor Reitzenstein (op. cit. p. 255, Note 1) states that Astacides must not necessarily have been either Dosiades or Lycidas (Leonidas of Tarentum) and that the name may have been invented to offer the poet an opportunity for a new play with the form of the epitaph and to pay a compliment to a certain Cretan poet.

48. A.P. VII. 518. W. 22; C. 22; Pf. XXII (24).

49. A.P. VII. 521; W. 12; C. 12; Pf. XII (14).

50. A.P. VII. 500; No scholar has any doubt about the

fact that Callimachus used this epigram (See Hauvette, op. cit. p. 322 and Reitzenstein, op. cit. p. 160-161). There is still a further evidence which vouches for such assumption: cf. Asclepiades (VII. 500), l. 4.

....., Εὐίππου δ' αὐτὸ λέλειπτ' ὄνομα.

With Callimachus, VII, 271, ll 3-4:

.. ..ἀντὶ δ' ἐκείνου

οὔνομα καὶ κενεὸν σῆμα παρερχόμεθα.

51. Cf. Callimachus, A.P. VII. 271 with Simonides, AP. VII, 496.

52. A.P. VII. 500.

53. Cf. A.P. VII. 499, 502, 631, 540, 544, 569, 589, 694, and 718.

54. A.P. VII, 272; W. 18; C. 18. Pf. XVIII (20).

55. Ἔριφοι, οἱ = Haedi = Two stars the rising and setting of which are frequently accompanied with violent storms (cf. Aratus, Phaen. 156 sq. Their setting takes place sometime in December.

56. Nothing sure is known about Heracleitus. Diog. Laert. (IX. 17) speaks of three elegiac poets of the same name and city: τρίτος ἐλεγειάς ποιητὴς Ἁλικαρνασσεύς, εἰς ὃν Καλλίμαχος πεποίηκεν οὕτως after which the epigram follows. Strabo (XIV, 656) mentions Ἡράκλειτος ὁ ποιητὴς ὁ

Καλλιμάχου ἑταῖρος. Meleager did not mention him in his proem; but there preserved in the Anthology under the name of Heracleitus (the city is not mentioned) an epigram (VII, 465 imitated by Antipater of Sidon, VII, 464). If this epigram, which is extremely beautiful and touching, in his, Callimachus' words on the 'Nightingales' are fully justified.

57. A.P. VII. 80, Diog. Laert. i. 79 f.

58. A.P. VII. 519; W. 14; C. 14. Pf. XIV (16).

59. A.P. V. 146. On the statue of Berenice

" " VI, 148. On a lamp rich in twenty wicks dedicated to serapis.

A.P. VII. 519. On Charmis who died suddenly.

" " XI, 362. On Orestos, but quite personal in feeling.

A.P. XII, 150. The poet seems to speak on personal love. Here he does not take the subject jokingly as always.

The examination of these epigrams written in Doric by a poet who uses more than one dialect in one epigram led me to think that Callimachus uses the Doric, his own native dialect, on purpose, on two occasions: the first, because the

person to whom or on whom the epigram is written belong to Doric-speaking area such as V. 146 and perhaps VI, 148. The second when he expresses his own feeling either commenting on personal experience or sympathizing with someone whom he knew well such as XI, 362, XII, 150 and VII, 519. Here the native dialect would be the only vehicle for genuine and spontaneous expression.

60. A.P. VII. 517; W. 20; C. 20; Pf. XX (22).

61. Here one must not expect the Doric dialect, although the epigram was written on Cyreneans, simply because Callimachus does not describe his own feeling and Aristippus was not his friend.

62. A.P. VI, 148 and 150.

63. Cf. Ἄρτεμί σοί τόδε ἄγαλμα, the beginning of an inscriptional epigram probably from Delos or Paros, Ca. 500 B.C? or VIth Century, 110. Friedländer, op. cit. p. 106.

64. A.P. VI, 347; W. 33, C. 35, Pf. XXXIII (35).

65. Such as that of Melos, long before the Persian Wars, No 114, Friedländer, op. cit. p. 110.

66. A.P. XXII. 7; W. 37; C. 37; Pf, XXXVII (38). It is composed in the comic tetrameter.

67. The other instances are: XXII, 24, 25 and VII 728.

68. A reminiscence of Archilochus, frag. 7 Bergk: "ξεί-νια δυσμενέσιν λυγρὰ χαριζόμενοι ".

69. A.P. VI. 9.

70. This similarity of the theme suggests the following deductions: Firstly, one of them may have been the model for the other. Secondly the two may have used a common model by a third epigrammatist. Neither deduction is decisive in solving the question. The fact that we do not know the exact date of Mnasalces makes it impossible to decide whether Callimachus' epigram is the model or the copy. Of Mnasalces' date, scholars have two different views: Reitzenstein (Ep. U. Skol. pp. 127 - 128) puts him in the early period(of the early period)of the Alexandrian school. In this he makes him at least a contemporary of Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum. Again he takes Callimachus' epigram (A.P. XIII. 7) as a copy of (A.P. VI. 9) composed by Mnasalces (ibid), and he considers Leonidas' epigram, A.P. VII. 198, (id. p. 148) as a copy of one of Mnasalces' epigrams but he does not say which (it may be A.P. VII. 192 treating the same theme, the death of a locust). Other scholars put him towards the

middle of the third century. (Waltz, op. cit. Tom. III, p. 189; Geffcken, PW. vol. XV. p. 2247; Wilamowitz, op. cit. vol. I, p. 138). Sesemihl (op. cit. vol. II, p. 540) states that he is a contemporary of Euphorion who, according to Suidas was born in 276B.C. (idem, vol. I. p. 393 and 394, note, 97). According to Professor Barber (Oxford Class. Dictionary) Euphorion is an immediate successor of Callimachus and even of Apollonius Rhodius: 'The papyrus fragments reveal him as a barefaced plagiarist of his immediate predecessors, Callimachus and Apollonius Rhodius'. If these scholars are right, it is obvious that Mnasalces wrote after Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum and could not be therefore their model.

To go on to discuss the second deduction, it seems the more reasonable one to me, though the evidence is not decisive. Both Callimachus and Mnasalces' theme may have originated from an epigram composed by a third epigrammatist. There is an epigram preserved in the Palatine MS. under the name of Simonides (A.P. VI. 2) treating the same theme. The attribution of this epigram to Simonides is

disputed: (cf. Waltz, ad loc., Plan. VI. 144, Sim. 143 Bergk, Simonidi recte, abiudicat Kaibel, ei vindicat Hauvette, Nossidis esse suspicatur Stadtmüller, Mnasalcae tribuit Boas). In spite of these different views, it is not unreasonable to say that this epigram whether authentic or apocryphal, was included in a collection, real or pseudo-Simonidean and that it was available to the two epigrammatists. This is justified by the fact that Mnasalces was an enthusiastic imitator of Simonides (cf. A.P. XIII. 21, a polemical epigram composed by Theodoridas of Syracuse in which Mnasalces was derided for his plagiarism and dependence on Simonides). If so, both Callimachus and Mnasalces could have taken the theme directly from Simonides' collection. Such deduction seems to me more reasonable. As to the similar themes composed by both Leonidas of Tarentum and Mnasalces, there is no need of any discussion, for the two belong to one school, the Doric, and they imitate equally Anyte of Tegea, the head of their school.

There seems no real reason to reject the view that Callimachus and Mnasalces had a common model.

71. A.P. VI. 149; W. 56; C. 56; Pf. LVI (57).

72. A.P. VI. 351. W. 34; C. 34; Pf. XXXIV (36).

73. Cf. 35 (Friedländer, op. cit. p. 38), probably Thebes, Ca:700 B.C.:

Μάντικλός μ' ἀνέθεκε Ϝεκαβόλοι ἀργυροτόξοι
τᾶς δεκάτας· τὺ δὲ Φοῖβε δίδοι χαρίϜεττιν ἀμοι[βάν].

Here we notice that although the epithet underlined refers very well to Phoebus (Apollo), yet the poet found it necessary to mention the name of the deity. This could easily induce us to reject the attribution of the following epigram to Amacreon or to any classical poet: (A.P. VI. 137 (τοῦ αὐτοῦ, i.e. Ἀνακρεόντος).

Πέφρεων, ἀργυρότοξε, δίδου χάριν Αἰσχύλου υἱῷ
Ναυκράτει εὐχωλὰς τάσδ' ὑποδεξάμενος.

Just because the poet uses only the epithet of the god. Such practice is then an Alexandrian one.

74. A.P. XII, 118; W. 42; C. 42; Pf. XLII (43).

75. A.P. VI, 311; W. 49; C. 49; Pf. XLIX (50).

76. The reference here is to the hero of a comedy called Ἑκύρα by Apollodorus of Carystus, a new comedy poet who is a contemporary of Callimachus.

77. Lamps made of terracotta shaped in the form of

statuettes of Isis.

78. The text is corrupted in the third line. I adopt however the underlined amendation of Stadtmüller.

79. A.P. VI. 147; W. 54; C. 54; Pf. LIV (55).

80. A.P. VI. 121; W. 62; C. 62; Pf. LXII (63).

81. Cf. μακρὸν ὄρος, the Homeric Hymn 'To Delian Apollo', l. 17.

82. Quoted in Amedee Hauvette, op. cit. p. 330 'Nous répondons ici aux scrupules que manifeste Wilamowitz au subjet du texte κυνθιάδες θαρσᾶτε .... dans sa dernière edition (1907) corruption; in Cyntho nemo venari peterat (Ep. LXII, V. 1).'

83. A.P. VI, 301 (There are different readings of the underlined words in line 4: ὦ λαοί, Cahen, ὦ ἅλιοι Waltz and ὦ μεγάλοι Wilamowitz. I adopt the last reading which appeals more to my mind); W. 47; C. 47; Pf. XLVII (48).

84. or 'from salt'; either of them are more convincing than 'from sea'.

85. Cf. VI. 245, where the dedicator, saved from a stormy voyage, both fulfilled his vow after he escaped death and then prayed the deity to save him from another danger: poverty from his door.

86. Lucian, Amores, 12. In his description of

Aphrodite's temple at Cnidus on the Coast of Asia Minor, Lucian says '..... The floor of the vestibule was not, as elsewhere, laid out with dead, smooth stone slabs, but - as was quite natural in the temple of Aphrodite - completely planted with living trees and shrubs, which with their magnificent leaves and flowers combined to form a luxuriant foliage, spreading in rare fragrance to a distance. Especially the myrtle, rich in fruits, made a show in the temple of its mistress in profuse abundance (quoted in Hans licht, Sexual life in Ancient Greece (London, sixth edition, 1952) pp 199 - 200.

87. A.P. V. 23; W. 63; C. 63; Pf.

88. 'Conopion' which is a greek name for 'mosquito', Κωνώπιον, led Professor M. Spiro to regard this epigram as a mere literary exercise (quoted in Hauvette, op. cit. pp 340 - 341). The simplicity and directness of the epigram induce me to take it as real. I assume that 'Conopion' is a nick-name substituted for the proper name of the girl, who is undoubtedly a hetaera (Lemma 1: εἰς Κωνώπιον τὴν ἑταίρην). Callimachus is no exception in giving a nickname to the hetaera. This

practice was carried out long before him. Eubulus, the middle comedy poet wrote a comedy called Klepsydra, 'water-clock' (C.A.F., II, 181). This is a nickname given to the hetaera Metiche. The reason why Metiche was called Klepysdra by her friends is the following 'she was so called because she manifested her favours exactly "according to the clock", that is until it was emptied' (Hans Licht, op. cit. p.343). But why does Callimachus bestow upon his companion such a queer nickname? Nothing could be said with certainty but if I am allowed to explain it according to our practice at present, she must be slim, noisy and nimble.

89. There are three sorts of prostitutes used to practise the making of love throughout the Greek world: the πόρναι, who carry out their trade in brothels, the ἑταῖραι and the girls to whom prostitution is a secondary trade. These used to roam about in the streets of the cities especially in harbours, cf. A.P. V. 101. Of these the ἑταῖραι are the most distinguished and respectable. Although the majority could be bought for money and presents, many of them could be regarded as life-companions or girl-friends

(not exactly in the modern practice and sense); since they used to complain of their unfaithful lovers who leave them for other girls or for unknown reasons. Lucian tells us (Dialogues of Courtesands, IV) of a girl who asked for the aid of a witch in order to recall, by her spells, the unfaithful lover and patch the pieces of broken love together. Cf. also Athenaeus' XIII Book which is full of many stories of the priestesses of Aphrodite, the goddess of love, the heavenly and the earthly or the sensual.

90. The Histories, XIV, 11.

91. Cf Asclepiades' epigrams: A.P. V. 7, 150 etc.

92. Cf Asclepiades' A.P. V. 145. Although Asclepiades' style is known to be very simple and void of the artificialities of the Alexandrians, yet this very epigram compared with Callimachus' is full of affectations which marred it as a real complaint. As far as plain style is concerned, Asclepiades' A.P. V. 164 could match with the present epigram

93. Later epigrammatists used to express Callimachus' threat by enumerating a series of defects that accompany old age; cf Rufinus - A.P. V. 21. 28

and 92 - In V. 21, Rufinus reminds his girl of the wrinkles, the grey hairs, the shrivelled body and the mouth lacking all its former charms.

94. A.P. V. 6; W. 25; C. 25; Pf. XXV (27).

95. The concluding words are a reminiscence or an allusion to the Delphian oracle given to the Megarians by the Pythian priestess. It is thought that the Megarians inquired of the Delphian god what grade of dignity they held among the Greeks. The answer of Apollo was by no means favourable, for after he enumerated some various people whom he preferred to them, he closed his oracle in these words:

ὑμεῖς δ', ὦ Μεγαρεῖς, οὐδὲ τρίτοι, οὐδὲ τέταρτοι
οὐδὲ δυωδέκατοι, οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ, οὔτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ

(A.P. XIV, 73, ll 7-8; for the whole oracle, see ll. 1-6).

96. Professor Reitzenstein (op. cit., p. 162) thinks that Callimachus depends in this epigram on the first couplet of Asclepiades' A.P. XII. 153, a complaint of a girl, and that he extends the theme. This is Asclepiades' couplet in question:

Πρόσθε μοι Ἀσκληπιάδης ἐθλίβετο· νῦν δὲ τὰ λοιπὰ
οὐδ' ὅσσον παίξων εἰς ἐμ' ἐπιστρέφεται.

'Formely Archeades used to rub his shoulders against me, but now, not even in play does he turn to look at me, the unhappy one.' I do not see any similarity between Callimachus' couplet and that of Asclepiades whether in word or in theme. Asclepiades' couplet deals with a forsaken girl while that of Callimachus announces an oath still valid.

97. Op. cit, p. 386.

98. Knaack, (PW. vol, I. pp 1402 - 1403) s.v. Alexandrinische Litteratur.

99. A.P. XII. 150. l. 6.

100. κέχαρημένος Bentley. I myself prefer the first reading, since χέχαρμαι gives a better meaning than χαίρω. τῇ (l. 4) is a Homeric reminiscence.

101. A.P. XII. 102; W. 31. C. 31; Pf. XXXI (33).

102. This epigram was paraphrased by Horace, Sat. i, 2, 105 ff. Ovid also expressed the same idea, cf. Amor. ii, 9, 9 and ii. 19, 35.

103. A.P. XII, 43, ll. 4-5.

μισῶ καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρώμενον, οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης
πίνω· σὺν κλαίνῳ πάντα τὰ δημόσια.

Notwithstanding the paederastic tone of this epigram especially at its end, the epigram in

fact stands for a testimony of Callimachus' literary views, namely his dislike of common-place stories. Thus I dealt with the whole epigram while discussing the poet's own views on literary questions. (see. Chapter I, pp. 26-72 passim)

104. According to Professor A. W. Mair (Callimachus and Lycophron, p. 169): 'In the Alexandrian calendar in the time of the Ptolemies Panemos = June, Lows = July approximately.' These months belong to the Macedonian Calendar which became well-known in the East after Alexander's conquests.

105. Cf. Theog, 371 - 372:

Μή μ' ἀέκοντα λίην κεντῶν ὑπ' ἄμαξαν ἔλαυνε
εἰς φιλότητα βίῃ, Κύρνε, προσελκόμενος...

Callimachus' third line may remind of Theognis' 371, as Reitzenstein thinks (Ep. U. Skol. p. 70) provided that Callimachus is always cautious and independent in making use of the reminiscences of older poets.

106. A.P. XII. 149; W. 45; C. 45; Pf XLV (46).

107. O. Schneider (quoted in Hauvette, op. cit. 247 - 348) thinks that the proverbial statement is "proverbium de rebus prospere evenientibus non nostra industria sed sponte sua et ut fert

natura". I disagree with him; for the epigram will be pointless if the beloved surrenders from his free will. The possessive 'ἑμός' before 'Ἑρμῆς' - the giver of good luck - which is unusual, could be held as a sign of joy for achieving his work. Again it could be assumed from the appointed period which was prolonged that the question was a matter of efforts than mere good luck.

108. The poet, it seems, jests at the technical and philosophical language of the Stoics.

109. A.P. XII. 118; W. 42; C. 42; Pf. XLII (43). For l. 6. cf Propert. II, 30. 24.

Hoc si crimen erit, crimen Amoris erit.

and some other general reminiscences: cf. Propert i, 3, 13; Ovid, Amor. i. 6. 33 and 59.

110. Kaibel, Ep. Gr. e. Lap. conlect. III, p. 502.

111. They are quoted by Plutarch, De cohib. ira, 5.

112. A short syllable is required.

113. Proverbial of what one knows too well; cf. A.P.VI. 310, l. 6 by Callimachus himself.

114. A.P. XII. 148. W. 32; C. 32; Pf. XXXII (34).

115. Straton, A.P. XII. 212.

116. 'οὐκισα δίφησαν' which is given in the MS. Palatinus,

has no sense at all. Again some word is lost as the scanning proves. Thus I adopt Professor Mair's reading which does very well.

117. A.P.XII. 73.

118. A.P.XII. 166, especially the first two lines:-
τοῦθ' ὅ τί μοι λοιπὸν ψυχῆς, ὅ τι δή ποτ', Ἔρωτες,
τοῦτό γ' ἔχειν πρὸς θεῶν ἡσυχίην ἄφατε.

119. Here and elsewhere (cf. XII. 46,l. 2), Asclepiades is not content with a single Eros. There is however some reason for the plurality of the god which gives stronger emphasis to his power. Moreover as far as Eros is concerned, it is to Asclepiades generally more than anyone else that the Alexandrians owe much in regard to the attributes they give to the playful child and the many pictures they depict which acquired popularity during the period and long after its end in both poetry and plastic art.

120. A.P.XII. 150 (it is indeed deplorable that this epigram which is one of the most important, reached us corrupted in the seventh line (cf. the words underlined, A & B). Of A, the text in the MS Palatinus is ' ἔσθ' ἁμῖν + χάκασ τας', but it has no sense at all. Several readings were

suggested (see Couat, op. cit. Note, 1, pp 188 - 189) and none of them convinced me, since they weaken or rather nullify the stress which Callimachus lays on the two remedies for love: ἁ σοφίὰ and ὁ λιμός . Wilamowitz's reading is very convincing and thus I adopt it. It avoids all the complications accompnaying other conjectures. Of B. there is in the MS Palatinus a full-stop which Cahen rejects. I fully agreed with him, since the full-stop makes the progress of the idea impossible. These are the major difficulties; there are some minor ones which I intentionally overlooked as they are merely dialectical variations. The doric dialect is well represented); W. 46. C. 46. Pf. XLVI (47).

121. Idyl. XI.

122. A.P. XII. 51; W. 29; C. 29; Pf. XXIX (31).

123. A.P. V. 136 and 137.

124. Hauvette, op. cit. p. 346.

125. Op. cit. vol. IV, ad loc, p. 305.

126. A.P. XII. 230; W. 52; C. 52; Pf LII (53).

127. Professor Mair (op. cit., note c, pp. 174 - 175) identifies this Theocritus with the famous poet. This assumption is based on the artiful use by

Callimachus of some of Theocritean phrases (Cf. Theocr. τὸ κάλον, iii, 3 and 18 with Callimachus, ibid, 1; Theocr. VIII, 59 - 60 with Callimachus, ibid 3 - 4). Such reminiscences or echoes could not in themselves justify such opinion. Again we do not know with certainty whether Theocritus is younger or older than Callimachus. It is believed, however, that Theocritus is older than Callimachus. Professor Cow (Theocr. (Cambridge, 1950) p. XXVI) believes that Theocritus' birth-date was about 320 B.C., Couat (op. cit. p. 60) reached a calculated conclusion that Theocritus was born between 320 - 315, while Callimachus' birth-date, as Couat believes, was between 310 - 305. Professor Mair himself put the birth of Callimachus in 310 B.C. All this renders Mair's assumption impossible. It must be remembered that the beloved is generally eighteen years old.

128. Cf. Theocritus, Idyl. VIII, 59 - 60:
ὦ πάτερ, ὦ Ζεῦ, οὐ μόνος ἠράσθην· καὶ τὸ γυναικο φίλας . & Asclepiades, A.P. V. 167, 5 - 6:
"Ἄχει τίνος, Ζεῦ; Ζεῦ φίλε, σίγησον κωτὸς ἐὰν ἔμαθες ."

129. A.P. XII. 139. ὁ σιγέπης which is underlined is the correction suggested by Bentley in place of

ὁ τσειγαρχης given by the MS Palatinus which has no sense at all.

130. Cf. Longus, II, 39.

131. A.P. XII, 71; W. 30; C. 30; Pf. XXX (32).

132. Cf. Theocr. Idyl II, ll. 89-90: αὐτὰ δὲ λοιπὰ / ὅστι' ἔτ' ἦς καὶ δέλμα. Are these not the traces which love leaves on lovers?

133. A.P. XII. 134; W. 43; C. 43; Pf. XLIII (44).

134. The reading of the MS Palatinus, ἐνύστασε is not acceptable since 'καὶ τι κατηφὲς ἔβλεπε immediately after it repeats its meaning. I adopt Reitzenstein's correction because it has more sense and correspond with Callimachus' 'ὡς ἀνιηρὸν πνεῦμα διὰ στηθέων ..... ἀνηγαγέτω'.

135. A.P. XII. 135.

136. Op. cit. pp. 326 sqq: Professor E. A. Barber (Class. Rev. XLVI, 1932, p. 164) thinks that this is hardly convincing and adds 'and in any case one misses a discussion of Plato's epigrams in this connection'. It is true; for as far as erotic epigrams are concerned, Plato, inspite of the doubts about the authenticity of most of his epigrams, is the first originator of this particular genre as I have already stated. There

is however a great difference between Plato's and Asclepiades's treatment. Plato is true and personal while Asclepiades is rather sentimental. It is said with truth that Asclepiades' art does not penetrate into the uttermost depth of the soul, but he does express with delightful truth and simplicity the various moods of a highly cultivated and pleasure-loving society' (Professor Körte, op. cit. pp. 369 - 370).

137. Cf. for example, A.P. V. 85.

138. See Chapter I.

139. Nossis could be considered as the first who originated this practice, cf. A.P. VII, 718.

140. This epigram is one of Callimachus' pieces in which he deals with works of art. For other instances, cf. A.P. V. 146; VI, 149, 150, 310, 311, 347; VII, 458 and IX, 336. Epigrams on plastic art or works of art became familiar in the Alexandrian period. It was first introduced by Nossis and Anyte just before our period began. Cf. Otto Benndorfius, Anthological Graecae Epigrammatis quae ad Artes spectant (Lipsiae, CIↃIↃCCCLXII) pp. 4-5. Where the author says 'Ante Alexandri igitur tempora epigrammata demonstrativa nulla

fuere. Quantum quidem ex eis quae diem tulerunt intellegitur Nossis Anytaque poetriae primae ita videntur lusisse, ut epigrammatis etiam artis opera celebrarent.'

141. Cf. A.P. VII. 447, 522, 524 and 525; VI, 351; XII, 149.

142. Cf. A.P. XII. 102.

143. A.P. VI. 301.

144. Quoted in Couat, op. cit. Note 5, p. 197.

145. 'τοὐμὸν ὄνειρον ἐμοί .' Cf. VI, 310 l. 6 & XII, 148, l. 2.

146. A.P. XII. 134, l. 6.

147. The two apparent and stressed points which Callimachus achieved successfully and on set purpose are those of the two epigrams: A.P. V. 145 (146) and A.P. VII. 524.

148. All these topics were dealt with, with real appreciation and much learning by the Scholars especially by Professor Emile Cahen, Callimaque et son Œuvre poétique.

149. Athen. vii, 318. This epigram is held to be Callimachean by Cahen (V), but rejected by Wilamowitz. If this epigram is really composed by Callimachus, it is an imitation of Anyte: cf. A.P. VII. 215.

150 Strabo, 800.

151 A.P. V. 146; W. 51; C. 51; Pf. LI (52).

II. LEONIDAS OF TARENTUM

Our second figure is Leonidas of Tarentum, who seems to have composed only epigrams. Leonidas is one of the greatest Greek epigrammatists. His importance is justified by many factors. As the greatest representative of the Peloponnesian-doric School, second only to Anyte of Tegea, he introduced to the Alexandrian epigram the idyllic theme, the pasteral, which depicts the country life and scenery. As an epigrammatist, his influence on epigrammatic poetry, in regard to themes, workmanship, stylistic characteristics and his general wanton fancy, is more enduring than that of Callimachus or any other distinguished epigrammatist. This can be easily detected in the epigrams of both the Alexandrian period up to the Byzantine period. In fact he was the most favourite model of later epigrammatists who took pleasure in using his themes for variations or imitating him in a more or less fantastic way. Again he is the originator of that particular species of dedicatory epigrams written for humble people of modest callings such as shepherds, hunters, fishermen, carpenters, spinning and weaving women offering their tools to the gods and godesses. The astonishing thing with these

epigrams is that they are overloaded with instruments of many trades enumerated so ingeniously that one wonders how he can be acquainted with different trades or professions. In fact these tools-ex votos are Leonidas's most favourite themes. In short, nobody, as Professor Reitzenstein says, influenced the epigrammatic poetry more than he did.[152]

Leonidas is the author of about one hundred epigrams.[153] In his output, Leonidas like Peloponnesian-doric School confines himself to the form of inscriptions and very seldom deviates from it. His Muse used to play with this traditional form all the time. Thus the poet continued to cultivate the two inscriptional epigrams, the sepulchral and the dedicatory and took from it a vehicle for expressing his own views, reflections and admonitions, all of which belong to the commonplace philosophy. He tried every known theme except the sympotic and the erotic. This innovation of the Ionic school under the leadership of Asclepiades does not attract him as it does the rest of the Alexandrians. Of the erotic theme proper, it is astonishing that the Palatinus MS. preserves for him a single amatory epigram, A.P.V. 188 (187 Stadtmüller) which I am inclined to quote just to show its nature

and characteristics:

Οὐκ ἀδικέω τὸν Ἔρωτα. γλυκύς, μαρτύρομαι αὐτὴν
Κύπριν· βέβλημαι δ' ἐκ δολίου κέρκος,
καὶ τὰς τερφοῦμαι· θερμὸν δ' ἐπὶ θερμῷ ἰάλλει
ἄτρακτον, λωφᾷ δ' οὐδ' ὅσον ἰοβολῶν.
λὰξ θνητὸς τὸν ἀλιτρὸν ἐγώ, κεἰ πτηνὸς ὁ δαίμων,
τίσομαι· ἐγκλήμων δ' ἔσσομ' ἀλεξόμενος; 154.

'I do not wrong Love. I am gentle, I call Cyris to witness; but I was shot from a treacherous bow and I am all burnt to ashes. He sends forth one burning arrow after another and not for a moment ceases from shooting. And I, a mortal, shall avenge myself on the sinful, even if the god be winged. Shall I be censorious for defending myself?!

As Leonidas speaks in the first person, it is probable that the epigram is personal. The lover here is different from the lovers depicted in the Alexandrian Ionic amatory epigram. He does not find any pleasure in his complaint about the gods as Asclepiades and Callimachus did. His challenge to the god of love is rather silly and childish. My own impression of this epigram is that its author is not a genuine lover of the Alexandrian type and has no gift or inclination to the sensual love predominant at

that time. It is astonishing that the style of this poem is rather simple and plain and differs from that of Leonidas's other epigrams; for bold coinages, compounds, and accumulations of epithets are altogether missing. The absence of these characteristics led Professor Reitzenstein to think that the epigram was not written by Leonidas.[155] I still see that it was composed by him and if it does not conform with his way of writing, this could be due to the fact that he may have tried to express himself in others' style and did not succeed and then gave up the idea of composing any more amatory epigrams.

To speak of the other various themes tried by Leonidas, the inscriptional, sepulchral and dedicatory come first. The majority of his epigrams purport to be inscriptions; for it is the form of sepulchral epitaphs and votive inscriptions that gave our poet a mould to cast poetical description or reflection dealing with all sorts and conditions of men, especially the low class people. With regard to this inscriptional theme, which is his favourite, the question of the nature of these epigrams arises, and we have to consider whether a rather chaotic class of epigrams are real or simply epideictic. As far as the nature of the Alexandrian

inscriptional epigram in general are concerned. I have already warned against the generalization which led Reitzenstein and his followers to think that Alexandrian epigram was rather exclusively written for publication or for any other purpose than the tomb or the dedicatory offering. Moreover, I proved that some epigrams of Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum which are preserved in the M.S. Palatinus have all the characteristics of real inscriptions. I will not repeat myself here, but I should like to draw the attention to the fact that the best way to be followed to reach any conclusion about the reality or fictitiousness of an inscriptional epigram is in the application of the inscriptional criteria which I have already stated. Let us take an example from Leonidas' epigrams and decide whether it is real or fictitious. The epigram is on a certain Aristocrates. It runs thus:-

Ἠείον, οἷον νυκτὶ καταφθιμένοιο καλύπτεις
ὀστέον, οἰγν, γαῖ', ἀμφέχανες κεφαλήν,
πολλὸν μὲν ξανθαῖσιν ἀρεσκομένου χαρίτεσσι,
πολλοῦ δ' ἐν μνήμῃ πᾶσιν Ἀριστοκράτεως·
ἤδει Ἀριστοκράτης καὶ μείλιχα δημολογῆσαι,
στρεβλὴν οὐκ ὀφρύν ἐσθλὸς ἐφελκόμενος·
ἤδει καὶ Βάκχοιο παρὰ κρητῆρος ἀδῆειν.[156]

ἰθοῦναι κείνην εὐκύλικα λαλιήν.
ἥδει καὶ ξείνοισι καὶ ἐνδήμοισι προσηνέα[157]
ἔδδειν· γαῖ' ἑρατή, τῶιον ἔχεις φθίμενον.

'O tomb, what a man was he, the dead whose bones you hide in the deep darkness of the night, O earth, what a head you have engulfed! Very pleasing was Aristocrates to the golden-haired graces; much is his memory treasured by all. Aristocrates knew how to talk properly and sweetly, without a frown, and over the wine he knew how to guide well the convivial talk without strife; and well he knew how to offer kindness to strangers and compatriots. Such, beloved earth, is the dead you hold? - This is indeed one of the most pleasant epigrams written by Leonidas. It is full of sincerity and genuineness of feeling, and in spite of some stylistic pecularities, epithets and repetitions, the words flow spontaneously. But what kind of sepulchral epigram is it? Could it have been inscribed on a tomb? Geffcken who, like Reitzenstein, believes that Leonidas' inscriptions were written for books, astonishingly thinks that it might have stood on a tomb.[158] In my opinion, such an epigram was never inscribed on a tomb. According to the inscriptional criteria, every requirement of a real inscription is

missing. The name of the father and the native land are not mentioned. The tomb is given information of the dead man it holds which is unusual. It is in fact, a dirge uttered by the poet on passing by or visiting a tomb of a friend and it was composed for the book. It reminds me of that dirge Callimachus composed on his friend Heracleitus of Halicarnassus[159] and it is at the same time a copy and variation of the fictitious epitaph written by Callimachus for his tomb[160] in which Callimachus was able to tell much in a couplet only. In his imitations, as we will see immediately, Leonidas used to enlarge and enrich the themes and patterns which he took from other epigrammatists. If my views on this epigram are correct, I am going to apply these criteria since they seem to me to give a basis for a sound judgement.

There is no doubt that there are real inscriptions among Leonidas' epigrams, sepulchral and dedicatory. Reitzenstein, after a long discussion almost against the possibility of the existence of real inscriptions composed by Leonidas,[161] ended his account in this contradictory statement: 'Do not understand me wrongly; I do not deny that some poems of Leonidas' collection were really destined for the stone.'[162] This conclusion

which makes obvious the shortcomings of his theory, agrees with my conclusion, which is justified again and again by the great number of inscriptions composed by Leonidas for low-class people: workers, fishermen, hunters, shepherds, weavers etc., whose death he celebrated in touching epigrams and whose tools he enumerated and elaborately described. It is true that t he majority of the epigrams which reached us by the hand of Leonidas on these humble men are not real; but could it be ever believed that our poet was only possessed by a mania for the composition of mere literary epigrams in the manner of Theocritus Idylls? This is by no means convincing; for these epideictic inscriptional epigrams, indulging occasionally in fancies, are variations of some real inscriptions written by Leonidas himself. I am sure that some of the latter are preserved in the MS. Patlatinus and they form but a scanty relic of what was lost for not being preserved in his collection inspected and used by Meleager. In this I consider his literary epigrams are an undisputed evidence for Leonidas' practice of composing
163
real inscriptions, sepulchral and dedicatory, to the order of these miserable creatures whom he had to know and mix with during his wandering life. This special life is also a proof justifying such assumption

The wretched Leonidas was obliged to leave Tarentum[164] after he failed to stop the invasion by the Romans of his birthplace, which he endeavoured to defend through the unfruitful help of the warlike kings of Epirus. Afterwards he had to live as a vagrant, wandering up and down the Hellenistic lands of the eastern Mediterranean. The poet himself, mentioned his wandering life and his deplorable poverty.[165] Again as far as Leonidas' poetic activities are concerned, he is only known by his epigrams and he is only an epigrammatist. What could a wandering poor epigrammatist do to earn his living unless he substituted by writing epitaphs and dedications for small fees? All these facts lead to a reasonable and plausible conclusion that our poet used to compose inscriptions for practical use.

It is time now to study the themes tried by our poet. The first one to begin with is the inscriptional real and fictitious. In his inscriptional epigrams, - both real and fictitous - sepulchral and dedicatory, Leonidas was concerned with different groupes of people on whom he wrote with noticeable freedom in regard to form, expression and treatment. Moreover, he played with the form and gave it various colours. Thus a sepulchral or dedicatory epigram became in his

hands not infrequently a gem-like Idyll or a minute reflective or admonitory elegy etc. So we must proceed to some attempt to subdivide them and threat them under different headings in accordance with the groups of people and also with the themes he treated besides. In so doing, I think, Leonidas' inscriptional epigrams can be understood better and their characteristics would be more discernible. This method, however, has one big disadvantage, for the other real inscriptions will not be studied independently and successively. Anyhow, they will be pointed out whenever we meet them.

We begin with the sepulchral epigrams. They can be subdivided under the following headings. Inscriptions connected with the family, sea-faring people, sailors and merchants, hunters and fishermen, workers, various characters, poets etc, old and contemporary, reflective and admonitory, and bucolic.

In his family- sepulchral epigrams, Leonidas touched on themes more or less connected with family life; the death of a wife in childbirth, a favourite theme of the Greek epigram; the death of the only son, the catastrophe of a father who lost all his children and died from sorrow; the bachelor, who, on his death, realized that he should have married and have had

children[167] or the death of poets endeared by the members of the family. Such themes, as we will see, were treated with so great a freedom, that they reveal the characteristics of Leonidas' variety of sepulchral epigrams. Let us quote some of them. The first is an epitaph on a certain Praxo who died in childbirth. In this epitaph, Leonidas made use of the form of dialogue:

α. Τίς τίνος εἶσα, γύναι, Παρίην ὑπὸ κίονα κεῖσαι;
β. Πρηξὼ Καλλιτέλευς. α. Καὶ ποδαπή; β. Σαμίη.
α. Τίς δέ σε καὶ κτερέϊξε; β. Θεόκριτος, ᾧ με γονῆες
ἐξέδοσαν. α. Θνήσκεις δ' ἐκ τίνος; β. Ἐκ τοκετοῦ.
α. Εἶσα πόσων ἐτέων; β. Δύο κεἴκοσιν. α. Ἦ ἔα γ' ἄτεκνος;
β. Οὐκ, ἀλλὰ τριετῆ Καλλιτέλην ἔλιπον.
α. Ζώοι σοι κεῖνός γε, καὶ ἐς βαθὺ γῆρας ἵκοιτο.
β. Καὶ σοί, ξεῖνε, πόροι πάντα Τύχη[168] τὰ καλά.[169]

A. "Who are you, who your father, lady lying under the pillar of Parian marble?" B. "Prexo, daughter of Calliteles." A. "And your country?" B. "Samos." A. "Who buried you with due honour?" B. "Theocritus, to whom my parents gave me in marriage." A. "And how did you die?" B. "In childbirth." A. "How old?" B. "Twenty-two." A. "Childless then?" B. "No! but I left behind my three year old Calliteles." A. "May he, of yours live and reach an advanced old age."

B. "And to you stranger, may Fortune give all good things?" - This epigram is a perfect specimen of epitaphs in dialogue form. The questions of the stranger and the answers of the dead young lady are wonderfully achieved. The compliments exchanged at its end are full of genuine sympathy and by no means superfluous. Its style is plain, simple and direct. Nothing required in an epitaph is missing and nothing unnecessary is added. Moreover, the poet succeeded in portraying the affection existing between the new married couples and the good financial position of the husband. The last can be understood from the allusion to the 'Parian Marble' and the absence of any worry on the part of the dead about her three year old son. So much so, can this epigram be a real epitaph? To my mind, it is not only a mere real epitaph but also a good model for epitaphs in general. Again as far as the requirements of real epitaphs are concerned, they are all present and vividly illustrated. The name of the dead, that of the father, the husband and the native country are mentioned. Full informations of the dead such as the age, the cause of death and her place as a mother are stated. The person who erected the monument is referred to with some stress. Finally it is the dead herself that speaks to the

passer-by. Thus by virtue of style and contents, the epitaph, which is void of fanciful exaggerations noticeable in the poet's literary epigrams, could be safely held as real. The fact that this epitaph was specially liked by the later epigrammatists can be seen in the variations tried by Antipater of Sidon, Amyntas and Archias who used the same names given by their pattern.[170] In the second the poet deals with a family catastrophe. An old mother bewails her only son Anticles, a youth eighteen years old:

Ἆ δείλ' Ἀντίκλεις, δειλὴ δ' ἐγὼ ἣ τὸν ἐν ἥβης
ἀκμῇ καὶ μοῦνον παῖδα πορωσαμένη,
ὀκτωκαιδεκέτης ὃς ἀπώλεο, τέκνον ἐγὼ δὲ
ὀρφάνιον κλαίω γῆρας ὀδυρομένη.
βαίην εἰς Ἀΐδος σκιερὸν δόμον· οὔτε μοι ἠὼς
ἡδεῖ' οὔτ' ἀκτὶς ὠκέος ἠελίου.[171]
ἆ δείλ' Ἀντίκλεις, μεμορημένε πένθεος αἴης
ἰητῆρ', ἐξωῆς ἔκ με κομισσάμενος.[172]

'Ah unhappy Anticles and I the wretched who have laid on the pyre my only son in the bloom of his age! At eighteen you perished, my child, and I weep and bewail my desolate old age. Would I go to the shadowy abode of Hades! Nor down nor the beam of the swift sun are sweet to me. Ah unhappy Anticles, would you, who

suffered your doom, be healer of my mourning by carrying me away from life? - This epigram, far from being held as an inscription, is a pure elegy, in other words, it is a dramatic but genuine threnode successfuly put in the mouth of an unlucky mother breft of all her hopes. 'Ἆ δείλ' Ἀντίκλεια' in line seven forms a kind of refrain and its repetition in lines one and seven gives the piece a womanish tone, desperate and rather impatient. The third epigram is on four daughters who died in childbirth and their father who died of sorrow for them:

Αὗτα Τιμόκλει', αὗτα Φιλώ, αὗτα Ἀριστώ,
αὗτα Τιμαιθώ, παῖδες Ἀριστοδίκου,
πᾶσαι ὑπ' ὠδῖνος πεφονευμέναι· αἳ δ' ἐπὶ τοῦτο
σῶμα πατὴρ στάσας κάτθαν' Ἀριστόδικος.[173]

'This is Timoclea, this is Philo, this is Aristo, this is Timaetho, the daughters of Aristodicus, all are victims of childbirth. Their father Aristodicus died after erecting this tomb for them.' - I quote this epigram as an example illustrating Leonidas' fondness of searching and stating singular and horrible situations. Here we have four dead daughters, who died one after the other by the same cause for death and a dead father who died of sorrow (what about the mother?) The death of the father, as it seems, forms the climax of the situation, but such death is far from truth, for

sorrow may lead to madness not to death. This piece I can not take for an epitaph at all as it does not conform with the inscriptional criteria. It is simply a sympathizing comment on a wretched father who lost all his children. The fourth epigram is a fictitious epitaph on a grasshopper endeared by a certain Philaenis:

Εἰ καὶ μικρὸς ἰδεῖν καὶ ἐπ' οὔδεος, ὦ παροδῖτα,
λᾶας ὁ τυμβίτης ἄμμιν ἐπικρέμαται,
αἰνοίης, ὤνθρωπε, Φιλαινίδα· τὴν γὰρ ἀοιδὸν
ἀκρίδα, τὴν εὔσαν τὸ πρὶν ἀκανθοβάτιν,
διπλοῦς ἐς λυκάβαντας ἐφίλατο τὴν καλαμῖτιν,
καὶ τρέφεθ' ὑπνιδίῳ χηραμένη παταγῷ.[174]
καί μ' οὐδὲ φθιμένην ἀπανήνατο· τοῦτο δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν
τὼλίγον ὤρθωσεν σᾶμα πολυστρεφίης.[175]

'Wayfarer, though the tombstone that rests on my grave seems small and almost on the ground, would you, Surrah, speak of Philaenis in praise. For being her tuneful grasshopper, that used to walk before among thorns and the dweller among corn-stalks, she loved and cherished for two years because I made melodious noise. And even when I was dead she cast me not away, but set up this little tomb in return for my varied talent.' - As far as the epigrammatic themes are concerned, this epigram is a genuine bucolic one, for it deals with the locust,

the tuneful songster, the nimble leaper upon thorns and the dweller amid the corn-stalks, but as it spent two years looked after and cherished by a lover of animals as an endeared pet, it has a claim to be dealt with under our present family-topic. Epideictic epitaphs on animals were composed long before Leonidas by Simonides and Addaeus in the classical period and by the Peloponnesian School chiefly by Anyte and her followers, Mnasalces, Nicias, Simmias and Phaennus.[176] So under the influence of Anyte and her admirers Leonidas introduced this theme to the Alexandrian epigram. The pattern Leonidas used is undoubtedly that of Anyte. According to his practice, he enlarged the theme rather elaborately in such a way that the copy becomes inferior to the model.[177] Passing to the sepulchral epigrams on sea-faring people, sailors and merchants, we have a quite sufficient number which reveals much about those victims who were exposed to different perils: pirates, hurricanes etc. Graphical descriptions of their doom sometimes real and simple, sometimes fanciful and elaborated, but all throw a light on the Hellenistic Greeks whose life and professions are connected with the sea right from the dawn of their historical times. To illustrate Leonidas' art on this particular theme, I

am going to give some quotations and comment on some others. The following is an epitaph in a dialogue form on a certain Phinto whose death was caused by a furious September gale:

α. Ἀρχαίης ὦ θινὸς ἐπεστηλωμένον ἄχθος,
εἴποις ὄντιν' ἔχεις, ἢ τίνος, ἢ ποδαπόν.
Β Φίντων' Ἑρμιονῆα Βαθυκλέος, ὃν πολὺ κῦμα
ὤλεσεν, Ἀρκτούρου λαίλαπι χρησάμενον.[178]

'A. "O burden set up on the ancient beach, would you tell me whom you hold, whose son and from what country?"
B. "Phinto the son of Bathycles of Hermione,[179] whom a great wave killed possessed of by the furious storm of Arcturus, i.e. a September gale."' - This is undoubtedly a real epitaph. All particulars needed for a real epitaph are present; the name of the dead, that of his father and the dead's birth-place are given. The cause of death is also mentioned. The dialogue between the passer-by and the tomb-stone - the content of the inscribed stone - covers all the needed information plainly, tersely and simply. The simplicity of style, which is not always cherished by Leonidas, adds some weight to this assumption. The epigram intended for a cenotaph, a favourite theme of the Alexandrians was also tried by Leonidas. These are preserved in the

M. S. Palatinus.[180] The first is on a certain Callaescharus who was drowned in the middle of the Libyan Sea; the cause of his death and the state of the dead's corpse are touchingly and elaborately described:

Εὖρόν με τεῖχεα καὶ αὐτήεσσα κατ' αἰγιαλοῦ,
καὶ νύξ, καὶ δνοφερῆς κύματα πανδυσίης
ἔβλαψ' Ὠρείωνος· ἀπώλισθον δὲ βίοιο
Καλλαισχρος, Λιβυκοῦ μέσσα θέων πελάγεος.
κἀγὼ μὲν πόντῳ δινεύμενος, ἰχθύσι κῦμα,
οἶχημαι· ψεύστης δ' οὗτος ἔπεστι λίθος.[181]

'The rough and sudden squall of the south-east wind, and the night and the waves destroyed me at the dark setting of Orion and I, Callaeschrus, glided out of life when I sailed the middle of the Libyan deep. I myself have sunken whirled in the sea, a prey to fishes, and this stone on my grave is a liar.' - This epitaph is obviously fictitious and has nothing to do with a real tomb. I take it as a poem composed on a theme frequent in the contemporary life: the death of sailors who sail anywhere and never return. In spite of the praenomen given to the sailor, he is a mere anonymous type. The facts given about his death and corpse utterly eaten by fishes are real but the epitaph is not.[182] Another cenotaph-poem is worth quoting. It is on Timolytus, a

merchant who was thrown into the sea by the Cretan pirates:

Αἰὲὶ λῃσταὶ καὶ ἁλιφθόροι, οὐδὲ δίκαιοι
Κρῆτες· τίς Κρητῶν οἶδε δικαιοσύνην;
ὡς καὶ ἐμὲ πλώοντα σὺν οὐκ εὐπιονιφόρτῳ
Κρηταιεῖς ὦσαν Τιμόλυτον καθ' ἁλός,
δείλαιον· κήγὼ μὲν ἁλιξόοις λαρίδεσσι
κέκλαυμαι, τύμβῳ δ' οὐχ ὑπὸ Τιμόλυτος.[183]

'The Cretans are always robbers and pirates, and never just; who ever knew of the justice of the Cretans? Thus the Cretans threw me, wetched Timolytus, into the sea when I was sailing with no very rich cargo. I am bewailed by the sea-gulls, and under the tomb there is no Timolytus.' ÷ This again cannot be held as an epitaph. It simply states a fact about the death of a merchant at the hands of the Cretan pirates[184] of whom Hellenistic Crete was famous. The next epigram deals with a strange case which happened to a certain diver, Tharsys by name, who was half eaten by a sea monster and half buried on a beach far from his country:

κήν γῇ καὶ πόντῳ κεκεύμεθα· τοῦτο περισσὸν
ἐκ Μοιρέων Θάρσυς Χαιρίδου ἠνύσατο.
ἦ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀγκύλης ἔνοχον βάρος εἰς ἅλα δύνων,
Ἰόνιόν θ' ὑγρὸν κῦμα κατεχόμενος,

τὴν μὲν ἔσωσ', αὐτὸς δὲ μεταίτροπος ἐκ βυθοῦ ἔλκων
ἤδη καὶ ναύτας χεῖρας ὀρεγνύμενος,
ἐβρώθην· τοῖόν μοι ἐπ' ἄγκιον εὐρὺ μέγα κῆτος
ἦλθεν, ἀπέβροξεν δ' ἄχρις ἐπ' ὀμφαλίου.
ἥμισυ μὲν ναῦται, ψυχρὸν βάρος, ἐξ ἁλὸς ἡμῶν
ἤραντ', ἥμισυ δὲ πρίστις ἀνεκλάσατο·
ἠόνι δ' ἐν ταύτῃ κακὰ λείψανα Θάρσυος, ὦνερ,
ἔκρυψαν· πάτρην δ' οὐ πάλιν ἱκόμεθα. 185

'I am buried both on land and sea. This is the uncommon lot Tharsys, son of Charmides, got from the Fates. Plunging into the waters and descending into the Ionian sea I saved the anchor which was stuck fast, but as I was returning from the depth and already stretching forth my hands to the sailors, I was eaten; so wild and great a sea-monster rushed upon me and bit me off as far as the navel. And a half of me, a cold burden, the sailors lifted up from the sea, but the shark - or a large fish of whale spieces - broke off the other half. On this beach, good sir, they bried the vile remains of Tharsys and I never came back to my country.' - This rather longish epitaph cannot be held as real; for although the name of the dead and that of his father are mentioned, the country and the place where the

dead is buried are not given. Again from the point of view of the style, it is full of repetitions, superfluous expressions. All this reveals its nature as a literary epigram. It is in fact a dirge, narrative in tone, dealing with a curious but certainly not fictitious kind of death handled artistically by a poet who knows how to play with the feelings of his readers. In putting the story in the mouth of the dead himself, he gave the story so vivid and graphic effect. The remaining epigrams on this particular theme are simply literary exercises expressing the hopes of those shipwrecked people such as that in which the poet told us that the dead Promachus was luckily buried in his own country by the hands of his own people,[186] or the complaints from the dead's fellow-sailors who used to moor their ships by his tomb,[187] or the warning against sailing in a time of storm.[188] Finally in a non-sepulchral epigram the poet draws the attention of the sailors to the right time of sailing. This admonition is put in the mouth of Priapus, the guardian of the harbour,[189] whose cult was popular in the Hellenistic period and especially at Alexandria:

Ὁ πλόος ὡραῖος· καὶ γὰρ λαλαγεῦσα χελιδὼν
ἤδη μέμβλωκεν, χὠ χαρίεις Ζέφυρος·

λειμῶνες δ' ἀνθεῦσι, σεσίγηκεν δὲ θάλασσα
κύμασι καὶ τεηχεῖ πνεύματι βρασσομένη.
ἀγκύρας ἀνέλοιο, καὶ ἐκλύσαιο γύαια,
ναυτίλε, καὶ πλώοις πᾶσαν ἐφεὶς ὀθόνην.
ταῦθ' ὁ Πρίηπος ἐγὼν ἐπιτέλλομαι ὁ λιμενίτας,
ὤνθρωφ', ὡς πλώοις πᾶσαν ἐπ' ἐμπορίην. [190]

'It is the fit season for sailing; for already the chirping swallow has come, and the pleasant Zephyr, and the meadows bloom and the sea boiling with waves and rough winds sunk to silence. Take up the anchor and loose hawsers, sailor, and sail loosing every stitch of canvas. This, O man, I Priapus, the presiding god of the harbour, bid, that you sail for all kinds of merchandise.' - In this epigram the poet mixes two themes, the admonitory with the bucolic. One wonders what interest the sailors had in meadows with their blooming roses, lilies and narcissus. Anyhow it shows the influence of the Peloponnesian School. Professor Oeffcken thinks[191] that Anyte is the model. If so I assume that Leonidas took great liberty in varying the theme and prolonging it. The fact that this epigram was admired and imitated, gives it a special position among Leonidas' beautiful epigrams; for it was quoted

by Cicero to Attieus.[192] Again it was widely imitated and varied by many epigrammatists of different periods.[193] Passing to sepulchral epigrams written for fishermen[194] I quote the following which was composed for a certain Parmis, an alpha angler in catching different sorts of fish whose death was caused by a rather uncommon and most striking accident:

Πάρμις ὁ Καλλιγνώτου ἐπακταῖος καλαμεύτης,
ἄκρεος καὶ κίχλης καὶ σπάρου ἰχθυβολεύς,
καὶ λάβρου πέρκης δελεάρπαγος, ὅσσα τε κοίλας
σήραγγας πέτρας τ' ἐμβυθίους νέμεται,
ἄγρης ἐκ πρώτης ποτ' ἰουλίδα πετρήεσσαν
δακνάξων, ὁλοὴν ἐξ ἁλὸς ἁρπάμενος,
ἔφθιτ'· ὁλισθηρὴ γὰρ ὑπ' ἐκ χερὸς ἀΐξασα
ὤχετ' ἐπὶ στεινὸν παλλομένη φάρυγα
χὠ μὲν μηρίνθων καὶ δούνακος ἀγκίστρεων τε
ἐγγὺς ἀπὸ πνοιὴν ἧκε κυλινδόμενος,
νήματ' ἀναπλήσας ἐπιμοίρια· τοῦ δὲ θανόντος
Γείπων ὁ γρυπεὺς τοῦτον ἔχωσε τάφον.[195]

'Parmis, Callignotus' son, the shore-fisher, an excellent angler of wrasse and scaros and the perch, the greedy seizer of the bait and all fish that inhabit the crevices and the hollow rocks at the bottom of the sea. Parmis perished one day while biting a rock-dwelling

iulis, a destructive fish which he lifted up from the sea, from his first catch, for the slippery thing slithered from his fingers and went wriggling down his narrow gullet. And he breathed his last, rolling over in agony, beside his lines, rod and hooks, fulfilling the doom spun for him by the Fates; and for his death, Cripo, the fisherman, built this tomb.' - In this epigram which is but a dirge in the form of a laborious narrative our poet deals once more with unusual but possible kind of death. It is clear from the epigram that Parmis' death is caused by suffocation, as a result of swallowing a certain fish, but how the fish reaches and rests in the dead's gullet seems to me unclear. The poet says first that Parmis met his death by biting a fish, then he adds that the fish slipped from his fingers. The first statement means that the fish was already held in the dead's teeth; here the second statement is out of place. From an analogous accident, I personally inspected twenty-years ago in a fishers' lake-village in which an excellent young fisher died by suffocation due to the swallowing of a fish, the proceedings of Parmis' death could be plausibly detected. In this village, fishermen used in the summer-time to catch fish by their hands from hollows near the shore, and

that young fisher who was so clever at catching was known all over the place to have been accustomed to hold fish in his teeth in order to have his hands free for another catch. In this way his death was caused by his inability to hold the fish in his teeth. Thus I assume that Parmis' biting is in a way an attempt to hold the fish in his teeth to free his hands.[196] This conforms with his cleverness in his job to which the poet alluded in the first two conplets. Such death which could be considered by the dead's fellow-fishermen as a heroic deed, justified the fact that the dead had a tomb built for him by one of his colleagues. The enumeration of the names of fishes and the fishing tools shows Leonidas' interest in the humble trades which will be more obvious in his dedicatory epigrams.

Of the sepulchral epigrams written on workers we have only one. It is a short elegy on an old and industrious lady, Platthis who used to spend her day and night in the company of her spindle and distaff:

Ἑσπέρων κήρων ἀπώσατο πολλάκις ὕπνον
ἡ γρῆυς πενίης Πλατθὶς ἀμυνομένη·
καί τι πρὸς ἠλακάτην καὶ τὸν συνέριθον ἄτρακτον
ἤεισεν, πολιοῦ γήραος ἀγχίθυρος,

Κάτι παριστίδιος δινευμένη ἄχρις ἐπ' ἠοῦς
κεῖνον Ἀθηναίης σὺν χαίρεσιν δόλιχον,
ἢ εἰκυῖ εἰκυοῦ περὶ γούνατος ἄρκιον ἰστῷ
χαρὶ στεροργύλλουσ' ἰμερόεσσα κερκίν.
ὀγδωκονταέτις δ' Ἀχερούσιον ηὔγασεν ὕδωρ
ἡ καλὴ καλῶς Πλατθὶς ὑφηναμένη. [197]

'Her evening and morning sleep old Platthis often drove away, in order to keep poverty away, and near the door of gray old age she used to sing something to her distaff and her toil-mate spindle. Still at the loom until the dawn she span round together with the Oraces that long task of Athene, or the charming lady, span with her old and shaking hand on her wrinkled knee the thread sufficient for the loom. At the age of eighty, comely Platthis who wove so well set her eyes on the waters of Acheron.' - This epigram shows the art of Leonidas at its best; he touched the career of an old and poor weaver so tenderly and graphicly that one cannot help admiring and sympathizing with her. In this he is worthy to called the 'poet of the poor' whose interest in them and their jobs surpasses that of any contemporary poet.[198] To my surprise, both Reitzenstein and Oeffcken[199] think that this short elegy is a

reminiscence of Callimachus' Hecale. To my mind this is unlikely to be true; for Leonidas in his epigrams on low-class people deals with types of real persons who move in society, while Callimachus' Hecale is a fictitious character. I have still the impression that it is Leonidas that introduced this theme to the Alexandrian poets, Callimachus and Theocritus and that the three developed it each in his own way. Thus Platthis, as a type of hired labourer, gives a good example for workers in all places and in all periods. In spite of her old age, she works hard and enjoys her job which she does quite happily, quietly and accurately.

We pass now to deal with some sepulchral themes which are purely epideictic; in other words, epigrams which all scholars agree to have been composed for some other object than the tomb. As far as these epigrams are concerned, it does not matter very much if they were recited at the banquet as Professor Reitzenstein thinks or merely published in books. The first theme deals with some characters whose personal characteristics stimulated the poet's pen. The Palatinus M S. preserves six of these.[200] [201] All but one are merely παίγνια or sportive occasional poems. To quote some examples, I begin with that griphos-like

dirge on a certain Pisistratus, a wine-drinker whose death was caused by Chian Wine:

Πί στοχασώμεθά σου, Πεισίστρατε, χῖον ἰδόντες
γλυπτὸν ὑπὲρ τύμβου κείμενον ἀστραγάλον;
ἦ ἐά γε μὴ ὅτι Χῖος; ἔοικε γάρ· ἦ ἐ' ὅτι παίκτας
ἤσθά τις, οὐ λίην δ', ὦ 'γαθέ, πλειστοβόλος;
ἦ τὰ μὲν οὐδὲ σύνεγγυς, ἐν ἀκρήτῳ δὲ κατέσβης
Χίῳ; ναὶ δοκέω, τῷδε προσηγγίσαμεν.[202]

'What shall we guess about you, Pisistratus, when we see a Chian die carved on your tomb? Would it be true that you were a Chian? This seems likely. Or would it be true that you were a gambler and not a right well lucky one,[203] my good friend? Or are our conjectures far from truth, and was your life's light put out by unmixed Chian wine? Aye, I think now we solved the riddle.' - This symbol of the chian die on the fictitious tomb could not have existed except in the fancy of the poet.[204] Thus this griphos-like poem marks one of the inventions of Leonidas which became a favourite subject of the later epigrammatists such as Alcaeus of Mitylene,[205] Antipater of Sidon[206] and Meleager.[207] In his sportive epigrams, Leonidas tried to make fun at a drunkard type, a drinker of neat Chian wine, and instead of attacking his butt directly, he created a riddle, the solution of which gave him a chance for

doubling and trippling his fun. This could have been recited very well at the symposia. The second epigram deals with a drunkard also, but from the other sex. It is on a certain Maronis, a singular type of drinker. Let us see how the mocking fancy of the poet did with this old lady:

Μαρωνὶς ἡ φίλοινος, ἡ πίθων σποδός,
ἐνταῦθα κεῖται γῆ ὑς, ἧς ὑπὲρ τάφου
γνωστὸν πρόκειται πᾶσιν Ἀττικὴ κύλιξ.
στένει δὲ καὶ γᾶς νέρθεν, οὐχ ὑπὲρ τέκνων,
οὐδ' ἀνδρός, οὓς λέλοιπεν ἐνδεεῖς βίου·
ἓν δ' ἀντὶ πάντων, οὕνεχ' ἡ κύλιξ κενή. [208]

[209]
'Old Maronis, the wine lover, the jar-drier, lies here and on her tomb, as a thing well-known to all, stands an Attic cup. She moans beneath the earth not for her husband and her children whom she left in indigence, but for one thing only, that the cup is empty.' - This funny Maronis is not without sisters in the Anthology: Silenis, Aristomache, Myrtas and Ampelis are women-drinkers, but none of them surpass the most charming Maronis who inspired the later epigrammatists all of whom failed to reach Leonidas' level. The only piece which could match with the pattern is that of Antipater, of Sidon who followed the whole motif exactly and even

used the same name.[211] Leonidas' epigram, which is genuine παίγνια[212] became therefore, either a pattern or a precedent for a topic-subject tried in the Alexandrian period and long after its sunsets. The epigram is plain and direct and happily ends in a clever point like those of Martial, the master of pointed epigrams, to which the foregoing lines led quite easily and spontaneously. With the next epigram I conclude this small series. It is on Timon of Athens,[213] the traditional and typical misanthrope:

Τὴν ἐπ' ἐμεῦ στήλην παραμείβεο, μήτε με χαίρειν
εἰπών, μηθ' ὅστις, μή τινος ἐξετάσας·
ἢ μὴ τὴν ἀνύσις τελέσας ὁδόν· ἢν δὲ παρέλθῃς
σιγῇ, μηδ' οὕτως ἢν ἀνύσις τελέσαις.[214]

'Pass by my monument, neither greeting me nor searching out who I am and whose son. Or may you not reach the end of your journey which you are making, and if you pass by silently, not even so may you reach the end of your journey.' - It is strange enough that Leonidas did not mention the name of Timon in this epigram. Could it be that he thought and tried to make the content of the epigram lead to the recognition of the person concerned.[215] If it is the case, it is, as Oeffcken[216] and Hauvette think, a variation of Callimachus' epigram

on the same person;[217] but the model, compact and more dramatic surpasses the copy.

Next come the sepulchral epigrams which our poet on the literary figures of the past especially the poets. This theme already existed before Leonidas, at the hands of Nossis and Asclepiades, but it may be through him that the Alexandrian and later epigrammatists tried their hands at it with ardour. As far as the form of a real epitaph is concerned, nothing among Leonidas' poems on poets-and they are naturally epideictic- could be a close imitation of a genuine inscription.[218] They are, as I see them, either appreciative tributes or displays of critical views known long before as outstanding characteristics of some of the poets concerned such as Hipponax; but they are not specific pieces of leterary criticism like those written by Callimachus for example.[219] In these he paid various tributes to Alcman,[220] Pindar, Erinna[221] and a certain Tellen, a composer of comic songs, of whose comic productions we know nothing. On Hipponax and Diogenes[223] of Sinope, he only intensified all that was known about them. Here are some quotations. The following is on Pindar who celebrated in his odes the athletic victories of both fellow-countrymen and foreigner:

Ἄρμενος ἦν ξείνοισιν ἀνὴρ ὅδε καὶ φίλος ἄστοις,
Πίνδαρος, εὐφώνων Πιερίδων πρόπολος.[224]

'Gentle in his ways to strangers and dear to his own countrymen, was this man, Pindar, the servant of the sweet-voiced Pierides (Muses).' - Thus in a single couplet, Pindar was paid a genuine tribute which he deserves. This epigram makes it clear that Leonidas was both admirer of Pindar and a good reader of his works. The latter can still be inferred from the phrase ' εὐφώνων Πιερίδων'[225] used by Pindar himself. The first line is a variant formula used by the poet himself[226] and imitated after him in later real inscriptions.[227] The second epigram on Erinna, the favourite of the Alexandrian School; is a nice piece of art:

Παρθενικὰν νεάοιδον ἐν ὑμνοπόλοισι μέλισσαν
Ἠερίνναν, Μουσῶν ἄνθεα δρεπτομένην,
Ἅιδας εἰς ὑμέναιον ἀνάρπασεν· ἡ δ' ἅ τόδ' ἔμφρων
εἶπ' ἐτύμως ἁ παῖς· Βάσκανος ἐσσ', Ἅιδα.[228]

'Erinna, the maiden honey-bee, the new singer among the masters of song, Hades raped to be his bride when she was gathering the flowers of the Muses. The prudent child said the following with truth: "You are a jealous god, Hades."' - In the first line the poet was able to

tell a lot about Erinna: her young age, her tenderness as a poetess and her outstanding position as a writer of poetry of a fresh and original charm among the masters of song. Her untimely death is given a dramatic effect by liking her with Persephone. Finally the point of the whole epigram which is a quotation from Erinna herself,[229] is a striking one. It is probable that Leonidas made use of Asclepiades' A.P.VII. II on Erinna as Geffcken states.[230] The third is an interesting epigram on Diogenes of Sinope, the great Cynic philosopher.[231] The cynic dead, as if in an interview with Charon, asks for a place in the boat and declares what he has with him:

Ἄϊδεω λυπηρὲ διηκόνε, τοῦτ' Ἀχέροντος
ὕδωρ ὃς πλώεις πορθμίδι κυανέῃ,
δέξαι μ', εἰ καί σοι μέγα βρίθεται ὀκρυόεσσα
βᾶρις ἀποφθιμένων, τὸν κύνα Διογένην.
ὄλπη μοι καὶ πήρη ἐφόλκια, καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν
ἔσθος, χὠ φθιμένους ναυστολέων ὀβολός.
πάνθ' ὅσα κήρ ξωοῖς ἐπεπάμεθα, ταῦτα παρ' Ἅιδαν
ἔρχομ' ἔχων· λείπω δ' οὐδὲν ὑπ' ἠελίῳ.[232]

'Gloomy-faced minister of Hades, you, who are traversing the water of Acheron in your dark boat, receive me, Diogenes the dog, even though your disgusting boat is

heavy with the spirits of the dead. I had a flask, and a wallet, and my old cloak, and the obol that pays the passage of the departed. All that I possessed in my life-time I had with me as I go to Hades and I do not leave anything behind me beneath the sun.' - In this epigram Leonidas portrays Diogenes as a real cynic who makes propaganda for simplicity and denounces all possessions. But I am afraid we are not sure if Leonidas is an admirer of Diogenes or not. This doubt, it seems to me, is due to the fact that the poet makes Diogenes speak in the first person. In this case the poet is rather objective.[233] This is not the case with Leonidas' followers who made use of the motif. Diogenes, who became a favourite theme, was either openly eulogized[234] or mocked at.[235] In many of his sepulchral and dedicatory epigrams, Leonidas seems to express himself in a way similar to that of the cynics. Thus in that epigram in which he warns the mice that they will not find anything available in his poor house and advises them to be off to other houses, he utters a cynical maxim: 'αὐτάρκης ὁ πρέσβυς ἔχων ἅλα καὶ δύο κρῖμνα.'[236] In another he goes on with his preachings on genuine consolation over poverty (A.P.VII,736), the contentedness of a very simple life: εἴης ἐν λιτῇ κεκλιμένος βιοτῇ (A.P. VII, 742, I. 14)

He also underrates riches and especially vast possessions and pleads that they are unprofitable after death as the dead only occupies but a little share of his vast lands (A.P. VII.740) and attacks those who are keen to erect pompous tombs just to please themselves and acquire a false posthumous fame (A.P.VII. 655). All these pronouncements and reflections are cynical in tone. On the other hand we see him poking fun at a member of the sect, Sochares, the typical cynic, for his primitive, untidy and dirty things which he carries with him: the hard untanned goat-skin wallet, the stick, the oil-flask which is never scraped clean, a dog-skin purse which does not hold a copper etc. (A.P. VI 298. cf. 293). Could this epigram be taken as a proof that Leonidas makes fun of Diogenes' followers? I do not think so; it may be an attack on the extremest type of the sect. These persons continued to be a butt in the Latin epigram especially in the hands of Martial.[237] In all the epigrams, as we have seen, Leonidas does not attempt to attack any principle pertaining to the school represented by Diogenes. But in spite of this he cannot be regarded a devoted admirer nor follower of cynicism. I may go further and say that by nature he is an enemy of poverty. This can be inferred from a nice dedicatory

epigram in which he reveals himself not happy with it at all:

Λαθρίη, ἐκ πλανίου ταύτην χάριν ἔκ τε πενέστεω
κήξ ὀλιγησιπύου δέξο Λεωνίδεω,
ψαιστά τε πιήεντα καὶ εὐθήσαυρον ἐλαίην,
καὶ τῶυτο χλωρὸν σῦκον ἀποκρέδιων,
κεὐοίνου σταφυλῆς ἔχ' ἀποσπάδα πεντάρραγον,
πότνια, καὶ σπονδὴν τήνδ' ὑποπυθμίδιων.
ἦν δέ μέ γ', ὡς ἐκ νούσου ἀνειρύσω, ὧδε καὶ ἐχθρῆς
ἐκ πενίης ῥύσῃ, δέξο χιμαιρο θύτην. [238]

[239]

'Lathrian goddess, accept this gift from Leonidas the wanderer, the poor man with little corn: rich barley-cakes, well-stored olives and this green fig plucked from the tree. Have, too, lady, these five grapes-bunch from a vine branch abounding in wine, and this libation of the dregs of the cup. But if, as you saved me from sickness, so you rid me of hateful poverty, then you will receive a sacrifice of a kid.' - In this epigram abounding in compounds and epithets, Leonidas announces his hatred of poverty so clearly that it would be rather rash to regard him an enthusiastic admirer or supporter.[240] His philosophical views, which are rather commonplace, are the outcome of a mixture of popular philosophy of the time and hard personal experience of

life and this is why he complains sometimes from the same thing he overpraises at some other time. Hipponax, the satiric poet, is figured in a rather sportive epigram which touches his characteristics very well.

Ἀτρέμα τὸν τύμβον παραμείβε, μὴ τὸν ἐν ὕπνῳ
πικρὸν ἐγείρητε σφῆκ' ἀναπαυόμενον.
ἄρτι γὰρ Ἱππώνακτος ὁ καὶ τίκτοντα βαΐξας[241]
ἄρτι κεκοίμηται θυμὸς ἐν ἡσυχίῃ.
ἀλλὰ πρόμη θήσασθε· τὰ γὰρ πεπυρωμένα κείνου
ῥήματα πημαίνειν οἶδε καὶ ἐν Ἀΐδῃ.[242]

'Pass gently by the tomb, lest you awake the savage wasp that lie asleep; for the spirit of Hipponax, that snarled even at his father, has only just now been laid to rest. Take care, then; for his verses know how to do mischief even in Hades.' - Leonidas successfully alludes to the bitter and violent invectives against the people against whom Hipponax directed his poisoned shafts. In stating this fact in a general way and including at the same time the poet's father, Leonidas exaggerated Hipponax's notorious Muse. Anyhow, this Ionic satirist became a familiar figure, probably through Callimachus, in the Alexandrian period and found a special favour as a theme favourite to many epigrammatists who imitated or variated Leonidas'

model.[243] Of the same type is another non-sepulchral epigram on Anacreon which is worth quoting. This epigram is a playful comment on the poems of the famous poet of wine and love songs:

Ἴδ' ὡς ὁ πρέσβυς ἐκ μέθας Ἀνακρέων
ὑπεσκέλισται, καὶ τὸ λῶπος ἕλκεται
ἐσάχει γυίων· τῶν δὲ βλαυτίων τὸν μὲν
ὅμως φυλάσσει, θάτερον δ' ἀπώλεσεν.
μελίσδεται δὲ τὰν χέλυν διακρέκων
ἤτοι Βάθυλλον, ἢ καλὸν Μεγιστέα.
φύλασσε, Βάκχε, τὸν γέροντα, μὴ πέσῃ.[244]

'Look how old Anacreon stumbles from drunkenness and the mantle falls down to his feet. For all that he keeps one of his slippers on, but has lost the other. Striking the strings of his lyre, he sings either Bathyllus or beautiful Megisteus.[245] Save the old man, Bacchus, from falling.' - In the first place, this epigram cannot be a mere inscription meant to be carved on a statue of the poet. The statue, it seems to me, exists only in the poet's imagination. In this it is in a way a personified picture in words. Although Leonidas did not try his hands at amatory and sympotic poems, he did not forget to pay a tribute, though sportive, to the originator of the light Alexandrian epigram

favoured by the pupils and imitators of Asclepiades. Thus it is not surprising then that the MS.Palatinus preserves about a dozen epideictic epitaphs on him, the majority of which are high appreciation of his art and exalting admiration of that bard[246] whose life, as Antipater of Sidon thinks, was poured out as an offering[247] to the Muses, Bacchus and Love. It is probable that Antipater made use of Leonidas' motif or at least drew inspiration from it and it is this time that he excelled his pattern; this is due to the similes and the allegorical pictures which he used. This subject on poets could now be happily ended with two appreciative notes on two poets: Homer the divine bard of the far past and Aratus, the contemporary poet and the author of the astronomical poem, Phaenomena. On the first he wrote a short but most exquisite epigram which can introduce itself best:

Ἄστρα μὲν ἠμαύρωσε καὶ ἱερὰ κύκλα σελήνης
ἄξονα δινήσας ἔμπυρος ἠέλιος·
ὑμνοπόλους δ' ἀγεληδὸν ἀπημάλδυνεν Ὅμηρος,
λαμπρότατον Μουσῶν φέγγος ἀνασχόμενος.[248]

'As the burning sun, rolling his axled chariot, dimmed the stars and the holy circle of the moon, so Homer, holding up the brightest torch of the Muses, brought to naught all the flock of singers! - It is not

strange that Leonidas pays so high a tribute to Homer; for many epigrammatists of this period and of other later epochs held the father of song in great honour.[249] Leonidas' epigram is worthy of the chapter in the M.S. Palatinus, the longest section, which contains the epideictic epigrams, ἐπιγράμματα ἐπιδεικτικά;[250] for Leonidas gave a typical display of verse-craft. Here the poet, enchanted by the excellence of Homer, likens him to the burning sun. As the sun outshines all glittering planets, so Homer surpasses all the masters of song. The allegorical picture given is very well devised.[251] The next is a slavish eulogy of Aratus whom the poet counts second to Zeus:

Τέκμαρ τόδ' Ἀρήτοιο δαήμονος, ὅς ποτε λεπτῇ
φροντίδι δηναιοὺς ἀστέρας ἐφράσατο,
ἀπλανέας τ' ἄμφω καὶ ἀλήμονας οἷσιν ἐναργὴς
εἱλόμενος κύκλοις οὐρανὸς ἐνδέδεται.
αἰνείσθω δὲ καμὼν ἔργον μέγα, καὶ Διὸς εἶναι
δεύτερος, ὅστις ἔθηκ' ἄστρα φαεινότερα.[252]

'This is the treatise of learned Aratus, who explored by his subtle mind the long-lived stars, both the fixed and the wandering, with which the bright revolving heaven is bound. Let all men praise him for the great task at which he toiled; let us count second to Zeus

that man who made the stars brighter.' - In this epigram in which the author's work is the epigrammatist's apparent concern, Leonidas may have drawn the motif from both Asclepiades[254] and Callimachus;[255] but unlike them he concentrated on the eulogy of the author rather than the work itself and so he revealed himself as a mere eulogist rather than a critic. This is clear from the exaggerated compliment at the end. Since both Callimachus and Leonidas wrote about this Phaenomena and both refer to the hard work with which Aratus produced his poem,[256] the question arises: Whose epigram served as a model to the other? I have already given the priority to Callimachus;[257] but more important is the fact that nothing in Leonidas' epigrams on poets shows any sign of scientific criticism such as that of Callimachus.[258] How then could we give him the lead? Again Callimachus' piece on the Phaenomena is a scientific review: he speaks of its model and touches on its style and rhythm; and knowing that Aratus' main object is versifying a previous prose treatise by Eudoxus of Cnidus, he did not give the author any credit of originality as Leonidas did. All this assures us that Callimachus is the unsurpassed model.

We come now to the class of reflective and admonitory

pieces moulded into sepulchral epigrams. These primarily touch on questions connected with the burial not the buried, but generally discuss questions of life and death, inspired after all by the experiences of the wandering and needy life of the poet. In this the sepulchral compact epigram replaces and performs the function of the longer elegy of the past in which the classical poets used to entrust their views, dreams, fears, hopes and despair, and used it also as a vehicle of preaching and admonition. In the same way, we see Leonidas discussing social questions and commenting on accidents which might have attracted his eyes and moved his heart. To begin with epigrams still related to sepulchres, tombs in bad condition is one of Leonidas' concerns. These are more or less connected with his job as a composer of epitaphs. The following is a complaint and petition put into the mouth of a wretched dead whose tomb was damaged by making a new road and whose bones were uncovered:

Ἤδη μευ τετρίπται ὑπεκκεκαλυμμένον ὀστεῦν
ἐρημονίῃ τ', ὦνερ, πλὰξ ἐπικεκλιμένη·
ἤδη καὶ σκώληκες ὑπὲκ σορροῦ ἀϊγάξονται
ἡμετέρης· τὸ πλέον γῆν ἐπιεννύμεθα;
ἦ γὰρ τὴν οἴπω περιν ἰτὴν ὁδὸν ἑτμήξαντο

ἄνθρωποι, κατ' ἐμῆς νισσόμενοι κεφαλῆς.
ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἐγγαίων, Ἀΐδωνέος Ἑρμείά τε
καὶ Νυκτός, τούτης ἔκτοσθ' ἴτ' ἀτραπιτοῦ.[259]

'Already, Surrah, my uncovered bones and the slab that lies on my tomb are crushed; already the worms are looking out of my coffin. What avails it to clothe ourselves with earth? For people, travelling over my head, have cut a road unpassable before. But by the infernal gods, Pluto, Hermes and Night, keep away from this path.' - Keeping with the traditional convention of epitaphs where the dead addresses the passers-by from his tomb, Leonidas gives a dramatic effect to his epigram which is far from being considered an epitaph.[260] In this epigram, Leonidas deals with a real case which he must have seen by his eyes in a visit to a cemetery. Everyone of us must stop and meditate awhile on it.[261] The next epigram is an epitaph written by Leonidas for his tomb:

πολλὸν ἀπ' Ἰταλίης κεῖμαι χθονός, ἔκ τε Τάραντος
πάτρης· τοῦτο δέ μοι πικρότερον θανάτου.
τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἄβιος βιός· ἀλλά με Μοῦσαι
ἔστερξαν, λυγρῶν δ' ἀντὶ μελιχρὸν ἔχω.

οὔνομα δ' οὐκ ἤμυσε Λεωνίδου· αὐτά με δῶρα
κηρύσσει Μουσέων πάντας ἐπ' ἠελίους.[262]

'A great way from the Italian land I lie, far from my native-country Tarentum, and this is bitterer to me than death. Such is the intolerable life of wanderers; but the Muses loved me, and instead of pains, I enjoy some sweetness. The name of Leonidas has not sunk into oblivion, but the same gifts of the Muses proclaim it till every sun be set.' - This epigram is not an epitaph[263] as Greffecken who rejects it in his edition, thinks. The fact that the dead is speaking is not the only factor which entilles it to be. Other essential factors are missing. It is in my opinion a short reflective elegy commemorating a passing feeling of the poet in his old age: the deplorable despair of seeing his native-country no more, then a joyful hope, as a substitution, of an assured and eternal fame of a great poet beloved by the Muses. If we understand this epigram in this way, there will be no reason for rejecting it and we have the right to do so, since it conveys a rather subjective element which is so rare in Leonidas' epigrams. In this particular field Leonidas did not forget to satirize the vanity of riches represented in pompous and heavy monuments and called for simple

and ordinary burials. So he successfully put his views into the mouth of a dead whose name and that of his father are given:

Ἀρκεῖ μοι χάνης μικρὴ κόνις· ἡ δὲ περισσὴ
ἄλλον ἐπιθλίβοι πλούσια κεκλιμένον
στήλη, τὸ σκληρὸν νεκρῶν βάρος· εἰ δέ με θανόντα
γνώσονται, Ἀλκάνδρῳ τοῦτο τί Καλλιτέλεως;[264]

'A little dust of the earth suffices me, and may a rich and exessive monument, a weight harsh for the dead to suffer, press and crush some other man. What is that to Alcander, son of Calliteles, if people know that I am dead?' - This view on the emptiness and meaninglessness of pompous monuments is very sound. What gain does the dead acquire if his monument is magnificent and strong, but will not add anything favourable to his credit, even if it stands the passing of long years? I myself, when I pass by an extraordinary tomb highly embellished and decorated, sympathize with its erectors for their weakness and shallow conception of the eternity of what they construct.[265] More general and expressive is this epigram in which the poet finds no point in excessive riches and vast possessions so long as the rich, when dead, will only occupy a very tiny piece of his vast land:

Αὔτα ἐπὶ Κρήθωνος ἐγὼ λίθος, οὔνομα κεἰνου
δηλοῦσα· Κρήθων δ' ἐν χθονίοις σποδιά·
ὁ πρὶν καὶ Γύγῃ παριστεύμενος ὄλβον, ὁ τὸ πρὶν
βουπάμων, ὁ πρὶν πλούσιος αἰπολίοις,
ὁ πρίν – τί πλείω μυθεῦμαι; ὁ πᾶσι μακαρτός,
φεῦ, γαίης ὅσσης ὅσσον ἔχει μόριον. [266]

'I am the stone that covers Gretho and makes known his name, but Gretho is dust below. He who once vied with [267] Gyges in wealth, who was once rich in cattle and herds of goats, who was - why do I say more? He who was enviable by all. Alas, what a small piece of his vast lands is his!' - This view of the poet is not new. It belongs to the popular moralizing philosophy which can be very easily uttered even by the illiterate ones who happened to listen to the wandering philosophers, especially the Cynics, who used to lecture the crowd in the street, but the interesting thing about it is that this commonplace note is uttered by the stone covering the corpse of the rich man. In so doing Leonidas gave the saying a persuasive effect. Death itself comes within the reflective scope of Leonidas. The poet did not shrink from it and no epigram of his bears any witness that he has any rebellion against it or just a feeling of bitterness of it. On the contrary he deemed

death a refuge after a troublesome life full of many worries and annoyances. Was he not wise? The following epigram reveals the attitude towards it. It is a very nice iambic piece assuring that the way to Hades is very easy:

Εὔθυμος ὢν ἔλεσσε τὴν ἐπ' Ἄϊδος
ἀταρπὸν ἕρπων· οὐ γάρ ἐστι δύσβατος
οὐδ' ἐσκληνὸς οὐδ' ἐνίπλεος πλάνης,
ἰθεῖα δ' ἥ μάλιστα καὶ κατακλινὴς
ἅπασα, κἠκ μεμυκότων δδεύεται. 268

'Push on with good cheer and tread the path to Hades; for it is not hard to go, not uneven, not full of tricks and turns, but straight as straight can be and sloping all the way, and is crossed with one's eyes shut.' - No poet, to my knowledge, spoke about death in these terms. Like a voyage-agency, he gives an attractive picture of the future unavoidable trip. Without making use of any mythological aid he expressed himself very plainly and spontaneously. Such sincerity of expressions leads me to think that the poet wrote it while he was suffering something and thought that the only safe refuge from his misfortunes was death which seemed to be the easiest way. This assumption becomes clear in the following epigram in which a dead man adomishes those who are

suffering in life to make haste to Hades:

χειμέρων ξωὴν ὑπάλυεο, νεῖο δ' ἐς ὅρμον,
ὡς κἠγὼ Φείδων ὁ Κρίτου εἰς ἀΐδην. 269

'Avoid the stormy life and hurry to the haven, to Hades, as I, Pheidon the son of Critas, did.' - Here Hades, i.e. the second world, is regarded a peaceful and comfortable place. But is it so for both good and bad spirits? It seems that Leonidas did not think of the life after death and only preferred death which is hated by all 270 to miserable life. The following epigram is purely admonitory. The poet addresses himself and advises content with a simple life:

Μὴ φθείρευ, ὤνθρωπε, περιπλάνιον βίον ἕλκων,
ἄλλην ἐξ ἄλλης εἰς χθόν' ἁλινδόμενος,
μὴ φθείρευ, κἄν εἴ σε περιστέψαιτο καλιὴ
ἣν θάλποι μικκὸν πῦρ ἀνακαιόμενον,
εἰ καί σοι λιτή τε καὶ οὐκ εὐάλφιτος εἴη
φύστη ἐνὶ χρωνῇ μασσομένη παλάμαις,
ἢ καί σοι γλήχων, ἢ καὶ θύμον, ἢ καὶ ὁ πικρὸς
ἁδυμιγὴς εἴη χόνδρος ἐποψίδιος. 271

'Waste not yourself, O man, leading a wandering life, rolled from one land to another. Vex not yourself if a hut would cover you, a hut which a kindled little fire warms, if you have a frugal cake of no fine meal kneaded

by your hands in a kneading dough, if you have mint or thyme or even coarse salt not unsweetened to be eaten with bread.' - This epigram has nothing to do with death. It may have been incorporated in the VII th book of the MS. Palatinus by mistake. It is clear that Leonidas compares his restless life with that of a happy and settled peasant who is content with his wooden hut and his modest meals. But whether the poet expresses his own wish or simply glorifies the simple life of poor peasants, is hard to know with certainty. In any way the epigram is very interesting, for it introduces us to a meal favoured by the poor peasants where salt is mixed with sweet.[272] Our Egyptian poor peasants have a similar cheap but favourite dish consisting of sour milk or curd mixed with sugar-cane-honey. In such mixture, I was told, neither salt nor honey predoninates but every one is discernible in taste. I end this selection of these reflective and admonitory epigrams in a most curious one in which the dead advises his passers-by to enjoy their time with drinking before they share with him the abode of Hades:

[273] μεμνῆσθ' Εὐβούλου σώφρονος, ὦ παριόντες.
[274] πίνωμεν· κοινὸς πᾶσι λιμὴν Ἀίδης.

'Remember temperate Eubulus, you passers-by. Let us

drink. Hades is a common haven to all of us.' - This is admittedly a παίγνιον of the same nature as those sung at the banquet. But it is not an ordinary one; for the exhortative πίνωμεν of the pure drinking-song is used for the first time in a pure sepulchral epigram. Professor Reitzenstein is right in assuming that it was modelled after a pattern by Ascepiades (A.P.XII. 50)[275] It may be also a sheer variation of the Attic Scolion in which the banqueters call for a toast for Cedon.[276] The statement 'κοινὸς πᾶσι λιμὴν Ἀΐδης' was made use of in later real epitaphs.[277]

Among the sepulchral epigrams there is a single but very nice piece of poetry on a dead shepherd whose fondness of his career is reflected in his requests to his fellow-shepherds and countrymen to remind him always of the scenes, sounds and undertakings he was familiar with:

ποιμένες, οἳ ταύτην ὄρεος ἐάχιν οἰοπολεῖτε
αἶγας κευέεσσι βοτεύοντες ὀΐς,
κλειταγόρη, πρὸς τῆς, ὀλίγην χάριν, ἀλλὰ προσηνῆ
τίνοιτε, χθονίης εἵνεκα Φερσεφόνης·
βληχήσαιντ' ὄϊές μοι, ἐπ' ἀξέστοισι δὲ παιμὴν
πέτρης συρίξοι πρηέα βοσκομένοις·
εἴαρι δὲ πρώτῳ λειμώνιον ἄνθος ἀμέρσας

- Χωρίτης στεφέτω τύμβον ἐμὸν στεφάνῳ,
καὶ τις ἀπ' εὐάρνοιο καταχραίνοι τὸ γάλακτι
οἰός, ἀμολγαῖον μαστὸν ἀνασχόμενος,
κρηπῖδ' ὑγραίνων ἐπιτύμβιον εἰσὶ θανόντων
εἰσὶν ἀμοιβαῖαι κἀν φθιμένοις χάριτες.[278]

'Shepherds, who roam the mountain ridge feeding your goats and fleecy sheep, I beg you, in the name of Earth, to render Cleitagoras, a little kindness, but a pleasant one, for the sake of Persephone of the netherworld. May the sheep bleat to me and the shepherds seated on the unhewn rock pipe soft tunes to them as they pasture, and may the villager in early spring pluck meadow flowers and adorn my tomb with a garland. And may anyone bedew it with milk from a ewe, a mother of many lambs, holding her udder up and wetting the edge of the tomb. It is the part of the dead, it is the exchange of favours even among the departed.' - It is a quite interesting piece of bucolics full of all the fascinating pictures belonging to this special world of the shepherds tending their goats and fleecy sheep. Here we can hear the sheep bleating and the shepherd piping. Here also the meadows are crowned with early spring-wreaths. And above all there is the ewe whose udder is

full of milk. Add to this the favourite places especially the unhewned rocks where the shepherds pass their days. All these attractive pictures are happily described by our poet. Such pictures are inspired by Anyte[279] and her followers; but the dramatic method, by which he expresses the wish that the tomb enjoys the bucolic life forever, is certainly his.

We pass now to the second traditional inscriptions, the dedicatory. These also were written to commemorate or celebrate different occasions. They were ordered by people of various status and callings. Again, like the sepulchral, they are either real or epideictic and show similar characteristics we have already met before in Leonidas. The first to begin with are those connected with private or family life. These dedications of offerings, real or imaginary, are offered to the divine powers for happy events which take place to the different members of the family. Thus Ambrosia, saved from the bitter pangs of labour and giving birth of twins returns her thanks for this happy event by offering Ilithyia her head-bands and her robe.[280] Another lady, Atthis, having given birth to a live child dedicated to Leto's daughter, Artemis, some of her clothes:

Εὐθύσανον ζώνην τοι ὁμοῦ καὶ τόνδε κιθῶνα
Ἄτθις παρθενίων θῆκεν ὑπερθε θυρέων.
ἐκ τόκου ὦ Λητοῖ, βαρυνομένης ὅτε τηνδὲ
ζωὸν ἀπ' ὠδίνων λύσαο τῆσδε βρέφος.[281]

'Atthis hung over thy maidenly portals, O daughter of Leto, her well-fringed zone and this her short frock, when you delivered her burdened womb of a live child.' - This is, as I see it, a real inscription. Although the mere name of the dedicator is given, it is enough in a dedicatory epigram provided that people have nothing to do with it; for the two persons concerned are the dedicator and the deity. The name of the goddess is mentioned and the offerings suitable for the offerer and the offered are enumerated. Again the reason why the ex-voto is given, is generally plainly stated. Nothing more than what is needed is mentioned and this in itself an evidence that this inscription is not a literary exercise. In other epigrams the poet touches on other family events. Here a young lad, Philocles, makes an offering to Hermes of the childish things which he was then laying aside: his noiseless ball, his lively boxwood rattle, his knuckle-bones and his spinning-top.[282] In another a poor mother offers a poorly

painted picture of her son Micythus to Bacchus and prays the deity to exalt him inspite of the trumpery gift which simple poverty can offer.[283] The next and the last is an interesting epigram. It is a mother's prayer for her daughter Aristodice, addressed to Cybele, for making the little maiden grow, prosper and enjoy a happy marriage:

Δίνδυμα καὶ Φρυγίης πυρικαέος ἀμφιπολεῦσα
πρῶνας, τὴν μικρήν, μῆτερ, Ἀριστοδίκην,
κούρην Σαλήνης, παμπότνια, κεἰς ὑμέναιον
κεἰς γάμον ἀνδρύνοις, πείρατα κουροσύνας·
ἀνθ' ὧν σοι κατὰ πολλὰ προνηΐα καὶ παρὰ βωμῷ
παρθενικὴν ἐτίναξ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα κόμην.[284]

'Great mother, who guardest Dindymus and the hills of Burnt Phrygia, would you bring little Aristodice, Silene's daughter, up to a ripe age and marriage, the due end of the girlhood. For this, she, many a time in your courts and before your altar, tossed in dancing this way and that her virgin hair.' - This epigram it seems, was not composed for a dedicatory inscription; for there is no material votive offering dedicated to the goddess. It will be rash to assume that dancing in the festivals of the deity replaces a dedicatory ex-voto. It is therefore, a complimentary tribute to the mother,

who, like every mother, looks forward for a happy life for her daughter.

Next come the dedicatory epigrams written for or about low people; hunters, fishermen, workers in various crafts, with whom Leonidas had a great deal to do. Just as the youth made an offering of the things of his childhood, so the worn-out hunter, fishermen, etc. devote to some deity the impliments which they could no longer use. Thus Sosippus, the hunter who was compelled by his old age to relieve himself from his calling, dedicates his hunting instruments to Hermes:

Ἑρμείῃ Σώσιππος, ἐπεὶ παρενήξατο τὸ πλεῦν
ἥβης, ἐκ γήρως δ' ἀδρανίῃ δέδεται.

'Sosippus gives to Hermes, now that he swam past the greater part of his strength and was fettered by the weakness of old age, his relentless trap, his reed that springs up and catches, his hunting nets, his crooked stick that flings at hares, his quiver, this flute pierced for the quail and the well-woven net for throwing over water-birds.' - In the first place we notice

that the verb of dedication is omitted but it can be understood from the case of Ἑρμείῃ. As far as hunting implements are concerned, this epigram abounds in a great number which the poet enumerates with special care and qualifies with exalting descriptions. Here a question about the enumeration of tools arises. Is Leonidas the inventor of this particular style of dedicatory epigram, in which the implements in general of some trade or profession are enumerated? Professor Reitzenstein thinks that dedications of tools existed long before Leonidas.[286] He depends on a fragment by Lycophronides, the lyric poet, who made his lovesick goatherd say:

τόδ' ἀνατίθημί σοι ἑόδον
καλὸν ἀνάθεμα καὶ πέδιλα καὶ κυνέαν
καὶ τὰν θηροφόνον λογχίδ', ἐπεί μοι νόος ἄλλᾳ κέχυται
ἐπὶ τὰν Χάρισι φίλαν παῖδα καὶ καλάν.[287]

'This rose I dedicate to you, a beautiful offering, and my sandals and cap and the game-slaying javelin; for my thoughts stream elsewhere, to the maid dear to the Graces and the beautiful one.' - It is true that this fragment contains an offering of three articles, but its influence on Leonidas is naturally inferior to his enthusiasm for these low-class people whose professions

and instruments mean much to him and we will not be far from truth if we assume that Leonidas, who draws his inspiration from actual life and careers, was the originator and the great practitioner of this style of epigrams known after him. But are they only mere literary exercises never meant for any inscription? I will not risk the attempt of giving a general opinion as Professor Reitzenstein does.[288] Every epigram should be treated independently. Thus to return to our epigram in which Sosippus dedicates his tools to Hermes. I have no doubt that it is an epideictic one. This can be shown by the absence of the word 'temple' or its substitutes. As some of these offerings are hung in or outside the temple, the mention of the place is essential. Again the gifts are so numerous and would occupy a spacious place if they are actually carried into the temple. This epigram will serve its purpose very well, if it is taken as a piece of eulogy of a previous career of a retired person who is still proud of his tools which he used for a long time. Of the same sort is the following epigram in which the fisherman Diophantus dedicates his tools to the patron of his craft:

Εὐκαπὲς ἄγκιστρον, καὶ δούρατα δουλιχόεντα,
χώρμην, καὶ τὰς ἰχθυδόκους σπυρίδας,

καὶ τοῦτον νηκτοῖσιν ἐπιχθύσι τεχνασθέντα
κύρτον, ἁλιπλάγκτων εὕρεμα δικτυβόλων
τηχόν τε τριόδοντα, Ποσειδαώνιον ἔγχος,
καὶ τοὺς ἐξ ἀκάτων διχθαδίους ἐρέτας,
ὁ γριπεὺς Διόφαντος ἀνάκτορι θήκατο τέχνας,
ὡς θέμις, ἀρχαίας λείψανα τεχνοσύνας.

'Diophantus the fisherman, as it is established by custom, dedicates to the patron of his craft the relics of his old calling: the hook easily swallowed, the long poles, the line, the baskets that hold fish, this crafty weel for trapping fishes, device of sea-faring fishermen the sharp trident, weapon of Poseidon, and the two oars of his boat.' - Here Diophantus the fisherman dedicates also a number of his instruments which the poet enumerates and qualifies some of them with attractive descriptions. The absence of the name of the deity makes it clear that the epigram is not inscriptional. This deity, if we have to guess his name, is Pan or Hermes. What was said about the previous epigram can be repeated here. The next is about an offering of three nets dedicated to Pan by three brothers: the first is a fowler, the second is a hunter and the third is a fisherman:

Οἱ τρισσοί τοι ταῦτα τὰ δίκτυα θῆκαν ὅμαιμοι,
ἀγρότα Πάν, ἄλλης ἄλλος ἀπ' ἀγρεσίης·
ὧν ἀπὸ μὲν πτηνῶν Πίγρης τάδε, ταῦτα δὲ Δᾶμις
τετραπόδων, Κλείτωρ δ' ὁ τρίτος εἰναλίων.
ἀνθ' ὧν τῷ μὲν πέμπε δι' ἠέρος εὔστοχον ἄγρην,
τῷ δὲ διὰ δρυμῶν, τῷ δὲ δι' ἰόνων. 292

'The three brothers dedicated these nets to you, huntsman, Pan, each from a different chase: Pigres these from fowls, Damis these from beasts and Clitor, the third, from the denizens of the sea. In return for which send them successful game, to the first through the air, to the second through the woods and to the third through the sea-shore.' - One wonders if these three brothers of different careers are real persons. I should think that this epigram is a fanciful one where three crafts are well represented. The piece has a special importance, for it shows that nets in antiquity were often used not only in fowling and fishing but also in hunting 293 hares and other game. Moreover this epigram used to have a special charm and popularity; for later epigrammatists, whose dates stretch over many centuries, either imitated it or varied and all of them used the 294 same names given by Leonidas. Again this epigram

was found engraved on a wall of a house at Pompeii beside a picture depicting the offering of the three men, the fowler, the hunter and the fisherman.[295] This selection can be conveniently ended with an epigram in which Pan, the patron of hunters and fowlers, declares his willingness for help:

Εὐάγρει, λαγόβηλα, καὶ εἰ πετεεινὰ διώκων
ἱξευτὴς ἥκεις τοῦθ' ὑπὸ δισσὸν ὄρος,
κἀμὲ τὸν ὑληωρὸν ἀπὸ κρημνοῦο βόασον
Πᾶνα· συναγρεύω καὶ κυσὶ καὶ καλάμοις.[296]

'Have good sport, you, hare-hunter, and you, fowler, if you come to the foot of this two-peaked mountain in pursuit of winged game. Call on me, Pan, the wood-god from the rock, for I join both the hounds in chase and help the limed reeds to capture.' - Under the influence of Anyte,[297] Leonidas lets Pan speak to the hunters.[298] In this he strengthens and defines the function and the characteristics of the deity concerned. The style is extremely simple and attractive; and the bucolic tone is highly and happily executed.

Leonidas' fondness of giving long lists of instruments described by words and composite epithets becomes clearer in his dedicatory epigrams for workers such as carpenters, weavers and even courtesans. It seems that

he was not only full of love for workers but also had a mania for the instruments themselves. This is most obvious in the following epigram in which a certain old carpenter, Leontichus, dedicated his tools to Athene:

Τέκτονος ἅμενα ταῦτα Λεοντίχου, αἵ τε χαρακταὶ
ἶναι, καὶ κάλων αἱ ταχιναὶ βορέες,
στάθμαι καὶ μιλτεῖαι, καὶ αἱ σχεδὸν ἀμφιπλῆγες
σφῦραι, καὶ μίλτῳ φυρόμενοι κανόνες,
αἵ τ' ἀρίδες, ξυστήρ τε, καὶ ἑστελεωμένος οὗτος
ἐμβριθής, τέχνας ὁ πρύτανις, πέλεκυς,
τρύπανά τ' εὐδίνητα, καὶ ὠκήεντα τέρετρα,
καὶ γόμφων οὗτοι τοὶ πίσυρες τορέες,
ἀμφί ξουν τε σκέπαρνον· ἃ δὴ χαριεργῷ Ἀθάνᾳ
ὠνὴρ ἐκ τέχνας θήκατο παυόμενος. [299]

'These are the tools of the carpenter Leontichus, the toothed file, the plane, swift devourer of logs, the line and ochre-vessel, and close to them is the hammer that strikes with both sides, the rule smeared with ochre, the drill-bow, the rasp and this heavy axe fitted with a haft, the prince of the craft, the revolving augers and the quick gimlets and these four screw-drivers and the polishing all round adze - these, on ceasing from his calling, he dedicated to Athene who gives grace to work.' - This epigram, more than anyone else

by Leonidas is crammed with implements described with abundance of epithets. The poet is not content with enumerating a list of single articles, but some of them are put in the indefinite plural. This shows that the epigram is a mere literary exercise, for it is impossible that a complete shop with repeated pieces is transferred to the temple of Athene. One wonders how Leonidas was able to include such a long list. This gives the impression that he was a connoisseur or an expert who had a special interest in what he enumerated. This can be further proved by such intensive and attractive epithets given to the plane 'κάλων οἱ ταχινοὶ βορέες', the axe, πέλεκυς· 'τέχνας ὁ πρυτανις' etc. This epigram was imitated by Philippus who used the same name of Leonidas' carpenter.[300] The artificiality in the copy is most obvious.

Some of Leonidas' dedicatory epigrams touch wamanish crafts, such as weaving. Thus we meet in his epigrams paid workers who do weaving for their livelihood or those who practise it as a hobby. These dedicate either their implements or the fruit of their hard work to such goddesses as Athene or Artemis. In one epigram[301] four daughters of a certain Lycomedes, Atheno, Melitea, Phinto and Glenis offer to Athene their

laborious spindle, the weaving comb, the round spools and the heavy weaving-blade with a prayer to give them a good return: to fill their hands and make them rich in meal.. This prayer indicates that the girls are very poor and that they practise weaving to earn their living. If so, as the text of the epigram show, why do they offer the instruments which they still require? It is thought[302] that they are only specimens of the real implements which they have bought to leave in the temple of the goddess[303]. The second epigram is on weavers of different kind; for they dedicate their implements just because they intend to give up the labours of Athene, the patroness of their craft:

Αὐτονόμα, Μελίτεια, Βοΐσκιον, αἱ φιλολάδεω
καὶ Νικοῦς κρῆσσαι τρεῖς ξένε, θυγατέρες,
ἃ μὲν τὸν μιτόεργον ἀειδίνητον ἄτρακτον,
ἃ δὲ τὸν ὀρφνίταν εἰροκόμον τάλαρον,
ἃ δ' ἅμα τὰν πέπλων εὐάτειον ἐργάτιν, ἱστῶν
κερκίδα, τὰν λεχέων Πανελόπας φύλακα,
δῶρον Ἀθαναίᾳ παντίτιδι[304] τῷδ' ἐνὶ ναῷ
θῆκαν Ἀθαναίας παυσάμεναι καμάτων.[305]

'Autonoma, Melite and Boïscion, the three Gretan daughters of Philolaides and Nico, dedicated in this temple,

O stranger, as a gift to Athene, the Weaver, on ceasing from the labours of Athene, one the thread-making ever revolving spindle, one the wool-basket that loves the night and one the weaving-comb of the loom, the industrious weaver of the robe, the watcher of the bed of Penelope.' - Here we have three sisters whose country, father and mother are given. The implements dedicated are not many and can occupy a place in the temple of the goddess who is mentioned also by name. All this give some weight to the assumption that the epigram is a real inscription. As far as the style and workmanship are concerned, the epigram is not simple or plain. The implements are given artificial epithets. The address 'ξένε' is uncommon in a dedicatory epigram and it is certainly a reminiscence of epitaphs. Of the reason of the dedication nothing could be said with certainty. Why did the three sisters give up their job simultaneiously? It could not be a question of old age and the loss of strength; for old women could continue to weave.[306] It could be that the three sisters are young and that they decide to give up the hard manual work of Athene and take up instead the service of Aphrodite. In other words they prefer the most exciting and attractive life of the hetairae. Such hypothesis may be

confirmed by an epigram of Antipater of Sidon about a certain Bitto, a widow in her fortieth year, who dedicated her melodious loom-comb to Athene because she was taking to the works of Cypris in spite of her rather advanced age.[307] The next epigram is about three girls who collaborated and vied in making a nice robe for Artemis:

Τῆς πέξης τὰ μὲν ἄκρα τὰ δεξιὰ μέχρι παλαιστῆς
καὶ σπιθαμῆς οὔλης Βίττιον εἰργάσατο·
θατέρα δ' Ἀντιάνειρα προσήρμοσε· τὸν δὲ μεταξὺ
Μαίανδρον καὶ τὰς παρθενικὰς Βιτίη.
κουρᾶν καλλίστη Διός, Ἄρτεμι, τοῦτο τὸ νήμα
πρὸς ψυχῆς θείης, τὴν τριπόνητον ἔριν.[308]

'The right end of the border of the robe, measuring a palm and a whole span is the part Bittion worked. The other extremity was fitted to by Antianira, while Bitie worked the maids and the Meander in the middle. Artemis, fairest of the daughters of Zeus, would you cherish from all your heart this piece of work of the three striving each against each.' - These three girls, it seems are not working weavers. They just please themselves by offering a piece of their work to Artemis. The reason for the dedication is not mentioned and although the attempt to discover it is rather fruitless, it can be

inferred from the vase-like picture of the dancing girls and the crooked stream of winding Maeander[309] that their intention was to provide a distinguished piece of art. This leads me to think that the epigram is an epideictic one. And it may have been inspired by a real ex-voto accompanied by its inscription which the poet inspected in the temple of Artemis.

With the next epigrams we pay farewell to the hard working class and move to the world of demi-monde whose art of allurement with which they attract lovers is no hard job provided that they are intelligent and endowed with powers of amusement and hilarity. The first epigram is about two old musician-sisters who, because they advanced in age, dedicated some musical instruments to the Muses: Melo her swift-lipped flute with its box-wood case and Satyra her pipe, the evening companion of banqueters and her sweet whistler.[310] The second is more interesting. Calliclea, the hetaira, dedicates some of her beauty-aid articles to Cypris:

τὸν ἀργυροῦν Ἔρωτα, καὶ περίσφυρον
πέξαν, τὸ πορφυρεῦν τε Λεσβίδος κόμης
ἕλιγμα, καὶ μηλοῦχον ὑαλόχροα,
τὸ χάλκεόν τ' ἔσοπτρον, ἠδὲ τὸν πλατὺν
τειχῶν παγηνευτῆρα, πύξινον κτένα,

ὧν ἤθελεν τυχοῦσα, γνησία Κύπρι,
ἐν σαῖς τίθησι Καλλίκλεια πατράσιν. [311]

'Calliclea, having got her heart's desire, dedicates in your inner chamber, true Cyris, the silver Love, the fringed gown that reaches her ankles, the purple lock of her Lesbian hair, the glass-coloured bosom-band, the bronze mirror and this broad box-wood comb that drags and gathers her tresses.' - We have here a list of the courtesans' professional belongings: the silver statuette of Eros the inducer of earthly love and a collection of beauty-aid articles described as usual by fascinating epithets. But what wish had been granted to Calliclea? It may be that she gave up prostitution to honourable wedlock. Cypris is the deity presiding over both heavenly and earthly love.

We pass now to the dedicatory epigrams dealing with war and war-spoil. This theme is not new. It is the earliest we know and perhaps almost as old as the worship of gods whether as a trophy upon the battle-field or in a temple. [312] Three of Leonidas' epigrams on historical events are preserved. The first celebrates the victory of Pyrrhus over Antigonus and his mixed force of Gauls and Macedonians (274). The arms of the

Gauls he offered to Athena Itonia at her temple between Pherae and Larissa.[313] The other two are about some victories over the Lucanians who in the fourth century were the chief enemy of the Tarentines, Leonidas' countrymen. I am quoting them. The first is an individual dedication of some arms of offence and defence offered by a certain Hagnon to Coryphasian Athene:-

Ὀκτὼ τοι θυρεούς, ὀκτὼ κράνη, ὀκτὼ ὑφαντοὺς
θώρηκας, τόσσας θ' αἱμαλέας κοπίδας,
ταῦτ' ἀπὸ Λευκανῶν Κορυφασίᾳ ἔντε' Ἀθάνᾳ
Ἅγνων Εὐάνθεος θῆκ' ὁ βιαιομάχας.[314]

'Eight shields, eight helmets, eight woven breast plates and as many blood-stained choppers (axes), these are the arms won from the Lucanians that Hagnon, son of Euanthes, the violent fighter dedicated to Coryphasian Athene.' - Hagnon is apparently a soldier who took part in a battle against the Lucanians.[315] As a warrior who takes a share of the enemy's spoil, he dedicates a part of it to Athene as a sign of thanksgiving or so. Although the self-glorification is obvious in this epigram, it seems to me to be real inscription. The name of the dedicator together with that of his father are given. He may have been a mercenery from Greece itself. This can be likely inferred from Κορυφασία, the

epithet of Athene who was worshipped among other places, in Coryphasium, a promontory on the South coast of Messenia. The second is of a different kind, for the name of the dedicator is not given:

Αἵδ' ἀπὸ Λευκανῶν θυρεάσπιδες, οἱ δὲ χαλινοὶ
στοιχηδόν, ξεσταί τ' ἀμφίβολοι κάμακες
δέδμηνται ποθέουσι δ' ὅμως ἵππους τε καὶ ἄνδρας,
Παλλάδι τοὺς δ' ὁ μέλας ἀμφέχανεν θάνατος. [316]

'These great shields won from the Lucanians and the bridles in a row, and the polished double-pointed spears are laid down here to Pallas, missing their horses and their men, but them black death has swallowed up.' - This epigram gives the impression that these arms, a cavalry-spoil, are an offering dedicated by an anonymous leader or a regiment. But although it deals with real event, its style especially the second couplet revealed its nature as an epideictic exercise celebrating a certain defeat of the Tarentines' hostile neighbours. The next epigram has a special interest. It deals with an offering dedicated to Pan by a certain Cretan, a hunter and a soldier at the same time, in order that the god might help him in chase and give him supremecy over his enemy:

Ὁ κρὴς Θηρίμαχος τὰ λαγωβόλα Πανὶ Λυκαίῳ
ταῦτα πρὸς Ἀρκαδικοὺς ἐκρέμασε σκοπέλους.

ἀλλὰ σὺ Θηριμάχῳ δώρων χάριν, ἀγρότα δαῖμον,
χεῖρα κατευθύνοις τοξότιν ἐν πολέμῳ,
ἔν τε συναγκείαισι παρίστασο δεξιτερὴ οἱ,
πρῶτα διδοὺς ἄγρης πρῶτα καὶ ἀντιπάλων. 317

'Therimachus the Cretan hung these hare-staves to Lycaean Pan on the Arcadian high rock. But would you, country god, in return for his gifts, guide aright his hand, the archeress in battle and in the glens stand beside him on his right hand, giving him supremacy in the chase and mastery over his adversaries.' - Therimachus, it seems, is a mercenery soldier employed or hired by any city-state in Arcadia and spending his leisure time in hunting. The offering is very modest but Pan is used to humble gifts. It is likely that the epigram is a literary exercise treating of two themes, bucolic and war. The last epigram of this selection is a quite interesting one, but extremely fanciful and sportive piece. Ares, the traditional god of war or rather of warlike frenzy, asks grimly and scornfully about that person who hung on the walls of his temple unpleasant arms: unbruised helmets and shields unstained with blood:

Οὐκ ἐμὰ ταῦτα λάφυρα· τίς ὃ θρίγκοισιν ἀνάψας
Ἄρηος ταύταν τὰν ἄχαριν χάριτα;
ἄθλαστοι μὲν κῶνοι, ἀνάιμακτοι δὲ γαναῦσαι
ἀσπίδες, ἄκλαστοι δ' αἰ κλαδαραὶ κάμακες.
αἰδοῖ πάντα πρόσωπ' ἐρυθαίνομαι, ἐκ δὲ μετώπου
ἰδρὼς πιδύων στῆθος ἐπισταλάει·
παστάδα τις τοιοῖσδε καὶ ἀνδρειῶνα καὶ αὐλὰν
κοσμείτω καὶ τὸν νυμφίδιον θάλαμον·
Ἄρευς δ' αἱματόεντα διωξίπποιο λάφυρα
νηὸν κοσμοίη· τοῖς γὰρ ἀρεσκόμεθα. 318

'These spoils are not mine. Who hung this unpleasant offering on the wall of Ares? The helmets are undinted of blows, the polished shields unstained by blood, and unbroken are the frail spears. My whole face reddens with shame and the sweat, gushing from my forehead, drops over my breast. Let such things adorn a woman's chamber, a banqueting-hall, a court and a bridal chamber. But may the blood-stained spoils of horse-driving deck the temple of Ares; for in those I take delight.' - This epigram is a typical παίγνιον. The poet's Muse takes great liberty in letting the god become too rhetorical. He questions, argues, compares and contrasts. Again according to the Alexandrian practice, the god is becoming a human being feeling shame and sweating. This

fanciful epigram did not escape the imitation by two great poets: Antipater of Sidon and Meleager.[319] As it happens with Leonidas' fanciful epigrams, these imitators' play of fancy is rather more wanton than their model. Themselves given to rhetoric, they play with the theme in a showy way and surpass Leonidas. This confirms the idea that the Alexandrian epigram, in regard of the development of themes and the establishment of form, is exclusively the work of the earlier Alexandrians and I can add that this poetic genre owes much in its development to the genious of a few epigrammatists such as Callimachus and Leonidas who were able to make use of their predecessors' achievements with versatality and masterful hand and were at the same time not unpossessed of originality. Thus although Antipater of Sidon and Meleager are the most distinguished epigrammatists at the end of the Alexandrian period, they are no more than imitators and triflers.

We come now to the most fascinating dedicatory epigrams connected with husbandry, orcharding and shepherding, in other words the dedications cast in the bucolic mould. The beauty of these epigrams is due to the pastoral pictures depicted in them and to the real information given about the husbandry career and

the kind of relation existing between the countrymen and their gods who presided over their labours. Here we meet certain gods who enter very closely into these people's life and behave like good neighbours giving and receiving. The most important are Pan, the helper in the hunt and the trust guardian of the flocks,[320] Hermes the luck bringer and the special guardian of the flocks. Moreover these countrymens' eyes were also turned to the nymphs who give water to a thirsty land and a tired wayfarer, Artemis, the goddess of wild life, Bacchus, the god of fertility and vegetation, especially the vines, and Priapus, the god of gardens and herds. These we will meet in Leonidas' epigrams offered the first-fruits, whether in the form of tithe or for the fulfilment of a vow or in thanks of good harvest or so. I am going to give some quotations. The first describes an offering by Neoptolemus of the race of Aeacus to three deities, Pan, Hermes and the Nymphs:

Αὐλιὰ καὶ Νυμφέων ἱερὸς πάγος, αἵ θ' ὑπὸ πέτρῃ
πίδακες, ἥ θ' ὑδασιν γειτονέουσα πίτυς,
καὶ σὺ τετρεγλώχιν, μηλοσπόε, Μαιάδος ἕρμᾶ,
ὅς τε τὸν αἰγιβότην Πάνα κατέχεις σκόπελον,
ἵλαοι τὰ φαιστὰ τό τε σκύφος ἔμπλεον οἴνης[321]
δέξασθ', Αἰακίδεω δῶρα Νεοπτολέμου.

'Caves and holy hill of the Nymphs and the Springs

under the rock, you pine that stand on the edge of water and you square Hermes,[322] son of Maia, protector of the sheep, and you Pan who rule the peak where the goats pasture, graciously receive the cakes and the cup full of wine, the gifts of Neoptolemus of Aeacus' race.' - This epigram transfers us from a great city with its bustle and noise and pursuit of gain to nature represented by caves, hills, streams full of cold water, the leafy shades of the trees. The offering is a product of the land. The deities are given their proper functions and attributes. The Nymphs' associations, the caves and springs, are intentionally mentioned. Neoptolemus, the votary's name is quite important; he is a prince of the Epiriot royal house and a King of Epirus from 302-1 to 297B.C.[323] Thus it can be said that this is one of the earliest of his extant epigrams. It shows also that Leonidas was connected with this king as he was afterwards with Pyrrhus. But could this epigram be taken as an inscriptional one? There is a tendency towards holding it to be.[324] I myself believe it to be only a nice literary exercise. The absence of the cause or occasion of the dedication is rather strange; if the votary is a king.[325] The bucolic tone of the epigram, the pastoral deities and the kind of

offering: cakes and wine,[326] all do not suggest any real inscriptional dedication by a king. This epigram suits very much a countryman or a shepherd. Concerning the cup of wine in particular, I wonder where it took place. The different deities concerned have no common shrines at all. Kings, it is obvious, dedicate more valuable offerings in the temples and shrines. This in itself may reject any assumption of taking the epigram as real inscription. As far as temples and shrines are concerned Pan, Hermes and the Nymphs possessed but few.[327] All this testify that this epigram is nothing but an epideictic bucolic poem. This epigram is imitated by Crinagoras and according to the practice of later epigrammatists, he enlarged it and added some picturesque details. He also played with the epithets and attributes of deities. It is worth mentioning that Crinagoras used his model correctly, for the dedicator is a hunter dedicating the spoils of swift chase of a deer.[328] The next epigram deals with an offering given by a certain old Biton to three deities to propitiate their favour in increasing his rural wealth. It runs thus:-

Ἀγρεονόμῳ τάδε Πανὶ καὶ ὠὸς τῇ Λυαίῳ
πρέσβυς καὶ Νύμφαις Ἀρκὰς ἔθηκε Βίτων·

- Πανὶ μὲν ἀρτίτοκον χίμαρον συμπαίστορα μητρός,
Κισσοῦ δὲ Βρομίῳ κλῶνα πολυπλανέος·
Νύμφαις δὲ σκιερῆς εὐποίκιλον ἄνθος ὀπώρης,
φύλλα τε πεπταμένων αἱματόεντα ῥόδων.
ἀνθ' ὧν εὐύδρειον, Νύμφαι, δόμον ἀμφιέπουσαι
αὔξετε, Πὰν γλαγερόν, Βάκχε πολυστάφυλον. 329

'Old Biton the Arcadian dedicated the following things to rural Pan, and Bacchus the reveller, and the Nymphs, to Pan a newly born kid, play-fellow of its mother, to Bacchus a branch of far-roaming ivy, to the Nymphs the varied flowers of shady Autumn and the blood-red unfolded bloom of roses. In return for which make the old man's house. - Ye Nymphs abounding in water, you Pan, full of milk, and you Bacchus, rich of grapes.' - Here again the offering is dedicated to three deities, Pan, Bacchus and the Nymphs. The gift offered to every deity is appropriate and worth giving. Each deity is besought to give help according to his own specified power-sphere. But the symmetrical prayer which makes the epigram three in one leads to a degenerated mannerism. As I said about the previous epigram, this epigram is only epideictic bucolic exercise. And one is not far from truth if he considers dedicatory epigrams to more than one deity could not have existed except in the imagination of

the poet.[330] The epigram is imitated by Sabinus Grammaticus, a later epigrammatist, who uses the same name given by Leonidas. Sabinus' epigram, strange enough, is simpler and plainer than that of Leonidas.[331] The bucolic tone of the next epigram is more apparent. A certain wayfarer called Aristocles dedicated to the Nymphs a cup after he quenched his thirst:

πέτρης ἐκ διοσῆς ψυχρὸν κατεπάλμενον ὕδωρ,
χαίρετε, καὶ Νυμφέων ποιμενικὰ ξόανα,
πίστραί τε κρηνέων, καὶ ἐν ὕδασι κόσμια τοῦτα
ὑμέων, ὦ κοῦραι, μυρία τεγγόμενα,
χαίρετ'. Ἀριστοκλῆς δ' ὁδοιπόρος, ὥπερ ἀπαύστου
δίψαν βαψάμενος τοῦτο δίδωμι γέρας.[332]

'Hail, you cold stream that leap down from the cleft rock and ye shepherds' make images of the Nymphs![333] Hail, ye, drinking troughs and these your countless dolls, ye maidens of the spring, that are drenched in its waters! And I Aristocles, the wayfarer, give you this gift which I dipped in your stream and quenched my thirst.' - Every word in this epigram speaks of its bucolic nature; cold stream gushing from the rocks and the Nymphs, the maiden of the spring, lie drenched in its water. The picture is so neat and charming that it is not difficult to define its nature as an epideictic exercise inspired

by Anyte,[334] the head of the Peloponnesian School from which our poet usedto draw inspiration. Although Leonidas' epigram is a copy of Anyte's model, he did not follow closely his model but on the contrary he deviated from it and a careful study of his epigram and her's leads to the conclusion that Leonidas surpasses Anyte in both the treatment of the theme and in the graphic illustration of the beauty of nature. The following epigram is a strange dedication the votaries of which are unnamed goat-herds. Having by good fortune escaped the attack of a lion, they offered to Pan a painted picture to tell what happened to them:

Χειμερίην διὰ νύκτα, χαλαξήεντά τε συρμὸν
καὶ νιφετῶν φεύγων καὶ κρυόεντα πάγον,
μουνολέων, καὶ δὴ κεκακωμένος ἀθρόα γυῖα,
ἦλθε φιλοκρήμνων αὐλιν ἐς αἰγινόμων.
οἱ δ' οὐκ ἀμφ' αἰγῶν μεμελημένοι, ἀλλὰ περὶ σφέων,
εἵατο Σωτῆρα Ζῆν' ἐπικεκλόμενοι·
λεῖμα δὲ θὴρ μείνας, θὴρ νύκτιος, οὔτε τιν' ἀνδρῶν
οὔτε βοτῶν βλάψας, ὤχετ' ἀπαυλόσυνος.
οἱ δὲ πάθης ἔργον τόδ' ἐϋγραφὲς ἀκρολοφίτᾳ
Πανὶ παρ' εὐπρεμνῳ τᾷδ' ἀνέθεντο δρυΐ. 335

'Through the wintery night and the driving of hail and escaping from the snowstorm and the chilling frost, a

solitary lion and indeed afflicted in all its limbs, came to the hut of the goat-herds who love the steep rockS. And the men, not anxious for their goats, but for themselves, sat and called on Zeus the saviour. But the beast, the beast of the night, waiting till the storm was over, went away from the hut and hurt neither the men nor the beasts. To Pan, the mountaineer, they dedicated on this oak with good stem, this well-painted piece of work (picture) of what happened to them.' - This epigram is nothing but a story told about an uncommon lion whose friendly disposition towards his victims is rather incredible. But did such lion ever exist? The epigram does not refer to any place on earth and we do not know any place in the Greek world haunted by lions except Cyrenaica. The exceptional behaviour of this lion however, suggests that the lion exists only in the poet's imagination. Thus the epigram belongs to the fanciful group, παίγνια. This can be very easily inferred from the imitations tried by later poets.[336] The copies are really fantastic and nothing but dull rhetorical exercises full of epithets, dramatic situations and grim jokes on Cybele's eunuchs. Their lions are not friendly like that of their model, but aggressive. I end this selection with the next

epigram on an offering dedicated by a certain Teleso, a hunter or shepherd to Pan:-

Τοῦτο χιμαιροβάτᾳ Τελέσων αἰγώνυχι Πανὶ
τὼ σκύλος ἀγρείας τείνε κατὰ πλατάνου·
καὶ τὰν ἐρυθρόκρανον ἐϋστοέθυγγα κορύναν,
ἅ πάρος ἀμφιπόους ἐστυφέλιξε λύκους,
γαυλούς τε γλαγοπῆγας, ἀγωγαιόν τε κυνάγχαν,
καὶ τὰν εὐρίνων λαμπετέδαν σκυλάκων. [337]

'This skin did Teleso stretch on the woodland plane-tree, to goat-hoofed Pan, the goat mounter, and the crook-headed club taken from a good trunk which formerly treated roughly the red-eyed wolves, the curdling milk-pails and the leash (that control the hound) and the collar of the keen scented hound.' - This is a further example of epigrams crammed with several offerings. The skin of a killed animal, a staff, the cheese-pails (and why are they plural?) and a leash and a collar of the dog. The skin stretching on the plane-tree is perhaps that of a wolf. This may be inferred from a variant[338] by Zonas and confirmed by the fact that wolves are the chief emeny of the shepherds and their sheep. Epithets used are not few and the epigram books to be simply a literary exercise. Its copy by Zonas[339] is simpler in style and could match and even

surpass its model. He contended himself with two offerings, the skin and the staff and the prayer that Pan helps the hunter to hunt with success is missing in the model. These are some examples of dedicatory epigrams imbued with gay bucolic colours which reveal Leonidas' love of nature and his concern with those who work on land or pasture their sheep on the slopes of hills and mountains.

The poet's fondness of nature was still illustrated in some epigrams which have nothing to do with the dead and the gods, in other words with epitaphs and dedications. Here the cicada can tell a story about the music he makes with which he entertains the wayfarer without payment:-

Οὐ μόνον ὑψηλοῖς ἐπὶ δένδρεσιν οἶδα καθίζων
ἀείδειν, ξαθερεῖ καύματι θαλπόμενος,
πρόκιος ἀνθρώποισι κελευθίτησιν ἀοιδός,
θηλείης ἔρσης ἱκμάδα γευόμενος·
ἀλλὰ καὶ εὐπήληκος Ἀθηναίης ἐπὶ δουρὶ
τὸν τέττιγ' ὄψει μ', ὦνερ, ἐφεζόμενον.
ὅσσον γὰρ Μούσαις ἐστέργμεθα, τόσσον Ἀθήνῃ
ἐξ ἡμέων· ἡ γὰρ παρθένος αὐλοθετεῖ. 340

'Not only do I know how to sing sitting on the high trees, warm in the midsummer heat, making music for the

wayfaring people freely, and tasting delicate dew, but you will see me, Sir, too, the cicada, sitting on the spear of Athene, with beautiful helmet. For as much as I am dear to the Muses, I love Athene; for she, the maiden, is the maker of the flute.' - Here we have the cicada speaking in person about all he likes and practises: to be on the top of high trees, to enjoy warm sunny days and the tiny drops of dew. He is self-conceited in his chirping with which he is proud to entertain the wayfarers freely. Is it not too fanciful to speak about animals as if they are real singers looking for gain? It is the rhetorical style which Leonidas likes and practises. This epigram, however, does not only give us this bucolic picture but it exhibits a piece of art, an image of the same cicada set on the spear of Athene, the inventor of the first flute.[341] Thus as a singer, the cicada connected himself with both the Muses and Athene. The epigram, it is obvious, is a blend of two themes, bucolic and art and the lifelike description of the cicada in its environment made the dead image more vigorous. Another bucolic example is the following epigram in which a voice guides the tired traveller to a better stream where he can quench his thirst. It runs thus:

Μὴ σύ γ' ἐπ' οἰονόμοιο περίπλεον ἰλύος ὧδε
τοῦτο χαραδραίης θερμόν, ὁδῖτα, πίῃς·
ἀλλὰ μολὼν μάλα τοῦθον ὑπὲρ δαμαλήβοτον ἄκρην
ταύτην, ἔνθα κεῖνα ποιμενίῃ πίτυϊ
εὑρήσεις κελαρύζον ἐϋκρήνου διὰ πέτρης
νᾶμα, βορειαίης ψυχρότερον νιφάδος. 342

'Traveller, drink not here in the solitude this warm water over-full of mud from a mountain torrent, but going a little further over the mountain top where young cattle are gazing, you will find by the shepherds' pine a fountain bubbling through the well-watered rock colder than snow from the north.' - This epigram, especially in its second part, is something like a signpost bearing an informative statement to guide people to a real spring. The statement could be one like that 'Go over the mountain-peak where you could find a fountain abounding in cold water under a high pine-tree'. But the contrast held between the hot and muddy water of the first and the cold water of the second shows Leonidas' elaborate treatment of the theme. But who is the guide who shows the way of the fountain to the wayfarer? He must be Pan who is associated with fountains, as we have seen, either alone or accompanied

with Nymphs. This epigram can show the influence of Anyte on Leonidas,[343] but Anyte is plainer and more attractive. In her epigrams, Pan has to be also understood. This selection can be now ended by two fanciful epigrams in which trees deal with some personal questions of their own. The first conveys a complaint from a vine against a he-goat who used to nibble her branches:

Ἴξαλος εὐπώγων αἰγὸς πόσις ἔν ποθ' ἁλωῇ
οἴνης τοὺς ἁπαλοὺς πάντας ἔδαψε κλάδους.
τῇ δ' ἔπος ἐκ γαίης τόσον ἄπυε· Κεῖρε, κάκιστε,
γναθμοῖς ἠμέτερον κλῆμα τὸ καρποφόρον·
εἶξα γὰρ ἔμπεδος οὖσα πάλιν γλυκὺ νέκταρ ἀνήσει,
ὅσσον ἐπισπεῖσαί σοι, τράγε, θυομένῳ.[344]

'The she-goat's nimble, well-beared husband once in an orchard nibbled the tender leaves of a vine. The vine spoke thus to him from the ground. "Cut, worst beast, with your jaws, my fruitful branch, my stem being steadfast, will again send forth ample sweet nectar as a libation for you, goat, when you are sacrificed"'. - This epigram fanciful as it seems, records everyday complaints arising from the spoiling of crops at the hands of the sheep and the like: but instead of putting the complaint in the gardener's mouth, our poet under the influence of rhetoric, gave the tree a human

personification and enabled it to express its fears and axiety and even challenge and threaten. It is by this literary and rhetorical device that the epigram is possessed of an unusual charm. The epithet given to the he-goat as 'the well-beared husband' gives the notion that the epigram is a παίγνιον. This epigram cannot escape imitation.[345] It was a model used by Evenus of Ascalon whose epigram, a couplet only, is very plain and devoid of any rhetorical devices. The pentemeter is taken wholly from Leonidas.[346] It is worth mentioning that Evenus' epigram was found inscribed in a house at Pompeii and beside it a picture depicting the story of the vine and the he-goat.[347] The second deals with a strange message sent by a fig-tree to a lover of fruits. Let us see the contents of a hospitable message of a kind-hearted tree:

Τὸν φιλοπωριστὴν Δημόκριτον ἤν που ἐφεύρῃς,
ὦνθρωπ', ἄγγελον τοῦτο τὸ κοῦφον ἔπος,
ὡς ἡ λευκοόπωρος ἐγὼ καὶ ἐφώριος ἤδη
κείνῳ συκοφορῶ τὰς ἀπύρους ἀκόλους·
σπευσάτω, οὐκ ὀχυρὴν γὰρ ἔχω στάσιν, εἴπερ ὀπώρην
ἀβλήτου χείρεσι δρέψαι ἀπ' ἀκρεμόνος.[348]

'If you find anywhere Democritus, the lover of autumn fruits, give him, Sir, this light message: that, the

white-fig-tree already mature, bear for him morsels that want no fire.[349] Let him hasten, for my position is unstable, if he would like to pluck the fruit from the still unstoned branches.'[350] - This epigram cannot be anything but a παίγνιον ; but the message sent by the tree implies a real situation. The poet must have seen a real tree laden with its ripe figs, and so Democritus, a fictitious person, could be the poet himself. The tree, as in the previous example, speaks in the first person. The message it gives is up to the point as it advises the person concerned to make haste and warns him of delay.

In his bucolic epigrams, Leonidas, as his contemporaries, shows especial concern with nature represented not in landscapes but in comfortable surroundings, the gardens, the meadows, the peaks of mountains, the slopes of hills, forest-gells, the streams, the shade and flowers. These charming pictures, as we have already seen, are set in a framework of mythological symbolism which embodied the spirit of nature in the form of god, Pan, Hermes, Dionysus or a nymph. Leonidas had also a special interest in animal and plant life.

The last sort of the dedicatory epigrams are those in which Leonidas treates of characters, especially

those persons who are possessed of some peculiar tendencies and practices. Here the dedicatory epigram keeps more or less the traditional form, yet turns towards derision or satire or even lampoon. We have already seen some examples belonging to sepulchral epigrams. The first epigram is an attack against a greedy person called Cephalas, who dedicates some kitchen-articles to the deities Gluttony and Greed:

Λαβροσύνᾳ τάδε δῶρα φιλευχύλῳ τε Λαφυγμῷ
θήκατο †δεισόξου Δωριέος Κεφαλά. 351
τὼς Λαρισσαίως βουγάστορας ἑψητῆρας,
καὶ χύτρεως, καὶ εὐρυχαδῆ, κύλικα,
καὶ τὰν εὐχάλκωτον ἐϋγναμπτόν τε κρεάγραν,
καὶ κνῆστιν, καὶ τὰν ἐτνοδόνον τορύναν
Λαβροσύνα, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα κακοῦ κακὰ δωρητῆος
δεξαμένα, νεύσαις μή ποκα σωφροσύναν. 352

'To Gluttony and Greed, the deities fond of dainties, the following gifts of Cephalas, the Dorian, who venerates these goddesses, are dedicated: The Larissian boiling pans of monstrous belly, the pots and the wide-mouthed cup, the well-wrought bent flesh-hook, the cheese-scraper and the spoon to stir the bowl of soup. Gluttony, receiving these base gifts from a base giver, would you never grant him self-control', - According to

Leonidas' practice, the epigram contains not a small number of cooking-utensils. These are not enumerated to glorify a trade or profession but simply to emphasize or rather exaggerate 'Cephalas' greediness. The personification of Gluttony and Greed is partly a literary convention and partly a rhetorical device. The epigram as its contents show is παίγνιον in character. In this Leonidas is no exception to his contemporaries, Callimachus, Poseidippus, Hedylus and others. So it is either for the banquet or the book. This does not make any difference as long as our poet made use of the dedicatory inscriptions for other themes and contributed with other epigrammatists, hand in hand, for the development of the Alexandrian epigram as we know it now. In Athenaeus (X.412F) a poet called Dorious has an epigram composed on a certain Milon, a man with enormous appetite. Could this mean that Alexandrian epigram did not escape satire? If so, it laid, together with other genres like the Greek diatribe, the foundation of the satiric epigram in the hands of Martial. Of the same sort is the following epigram on a certain cynic called Sochares whose belongings are dedicated to Cypris by his beloved:

Ὁ σκήπων καὶ ταῦτα τὰ βλαύτια, πότνια Κύπρι,
ἄγκειται κυνικοῦ σκῦλ' ἀπὸ Σωχάρεος,

- ὅλπη τε ἐυπόεσσα, πολυτρήτου τε πήρας
λείψανον, ἀρχαίης πλησθόμενον σοφίης·
σοὶ δὲ Ῥόδων ὁ καλός, τὸν πάνσοφον ἡνίκα πρέσβυν
ἥρπευσεν, στεπτοῖς θῆκατ' ἐπὶ προθύροις. 353

'The staff and these slippers hang here, Queen Cypris, the spoils won from Sochares the cynic; the filthy oil-flask too, and the remains of a wallet all in holes, full of ancient wisdom. Handsome Rhodon dedicated them to you on your garlanded portals, when he caught the all-wise old man.' - The poet as usual is pleasing himself by enumerating all the belongings of a cynic extremist. The epithets given to the wallet are alertly coined. In a παίγνιον like this, such prossessions should be listed. The τὰ βλαυτία, which are a kind of slippers worn by fops is intentionally used, for 354
Leonidas attacks Sochares not only as a filthy cynic but also as a lover of boys. Leonidas' Muse is undoubtedly too much sportive. How could such person be approached by a beautiful boy? Nothing in him attracts the boy. Neither his appearance nor his pocket has any power to induce. However, whatever be our judgement of the treatment of a pederastic theme, which the poet never tried in the same style of the rest of the

Alexandrians, there is no doubt that this epigram is an attempt to this end although he tried the pederastic theme under the guise of the inscriptional form.

These are some specimens of Leonidas' sepulchral and dedicatory epigrams.[355] They are as we have already seen either real or epideictic. The latter in particular show a variety of subjects treated in manifold ways due to the subject and the fancy of the poet.

We pass now to the epigrams dealing with images and statues, a theme which has no connection with the inscriptional epigram. In some of them Leonidas shows real appreciation for works of art; in others he is not an art-connoisseur or a virtuoso but a mere commentator playing with mythology and tradition. These are nothing more than epideictic exercises embued with all manner of rhetorical devices; and some of them are composed for mere sport. To illustrate Leonidas' aestheticism and artistic treatment, I will quote some examples. The first, which is by far the most attractive of the whole group, is about Aphrodite Anadyomene wringing from her hair the water of the sea from which she has just risen. This is the most famous portrait painted by Apelles of Colophon[356] the greatest painter of antiquity:

– Τὰν ἐκφυγοῦσαν ματρὸς ἐκ κόλπων, ἔτι
ἀφρῷ τε μορμύρουσαν, εὐλεχῆ Κύπριν
ἰδὼν Ἀπελλῆς, κάλλος ἱμερώτατον,
οὐ γραπτόν, ἀλλ' ἔμψυχον ἐξεμάξατο.
εὖ μὲν γὰρ ἄκρας χερσὶν ἐκθλίβει κόμας,
εὖ δ' ὀμμάτων γαλήνος ἐκλάμπει πόθος,
καὶ μαζὸς ἀκμῆς ἄγγελος, κυδωνιᾷ·
αὐτὰ δ' Ἀθάνα καὶ Διὸς συνευνέτις
φάσουσιν· "Ὦ Ζεῦ, λειπόμεσθα τῇ κρίσει." 357

'Apelles having seen Cypris who brings wedded happiness, just escaping from her mother's bosom and still wet with foam, drew her, most delightsome beauty, not copied but alive, for she subtly wrings out her hair with her finger-tips, beautifully calm love shines in her eyes, and the breast, the herald of her prime, is swelling like a quince. Athena herself and the consort of Zeus will say, "O Zeus, we are left behind in judgement.' - Apelles' portrait must deserve this fascinating description of Leonidas and one feels sorry for the loss of such a piece of art. But Leonidas is not giving a mere description, ἔκφρασις, but an elaborate one versed in rhetorical mould. This is obvious from the use of epithets: Cypris is 'the giver of marriage blessings

and her breast is the herald of her prime.' The picture given to the goddess wringing out her hair with her fingers and to her eyes shining with love is vivid and lifelike. The metaphor likening the goddess' breast to the quince is an attractive one. It appeals to the senses of the Alexandrians, who in art and literature celebrate and glorify the beauty of the different parts of the body and whose love arouses through the eye and thus it is sensuous longing. At last the poet indulges himself in the most rhetorical climax. Cypris' beauty worsted the charms of both Athena and Hera. Thus they uneasily told Zeus this bitter fact. Apelles' picture became a favourite of later epigrammatists[358] whose caprice for rhetorical effect is beyond what is reasonable. They, it seems, were not dealing with the picture itself but copying Leonidas' epigram. This is obvious in Antipater of Sidon's epigram. The next epigram is on the Statue of Love by Praxiteles:-

Ⓗ εὐπιέες τὸν Ἔρωτα μόνον θεὸν ἐκ Κυθερείης
ἄξοντ', οὐχ ἑτέρου γλαπτὸν ἀπ' ἀρχετύπου,
ἀλλ' ὃν Πραξιτέλης ἔγνω θεόν· ὃν περὶ Φρύνῃ
δερκόμενος, σφετέρων λύτρον ἔδωκε πόθων.[359]

'The Thespians venerate Eros, the son of Cytherea, alone among gods, and not one copied from any other pattern,

but that whom Praxiteles knew. The one whom he saw in Phryne and gave him to her as the ransom of his heart-ache.' - This epigram, strictly speaking, does not deal with the statue from the point of view of art, it gives a mere explanatory account about the seat of the worship of Eros and how Praxiteles, the great sculptor of antiquity, was inspired in carving it by the beauty of his mistress the courtesan Phryne,[360] to whom he gave it as a ransome for his affection.[361] There is preserved in the M. S. Palatinus under the name of Praxiteles[362] an epigram treating the same theme. The epigram could be a copy by a later epigrammatist imitated from Leonidas. This statue attracted the later epigrammatists who plied their most fantastic fancies in composing variants just to please themselves.[363] In another epigram on Eros, the god is fashioned from frankincense to be burned and suffer the fire in which he himself melts the hearts of lovers. The epigram is a grim and rhetorical exercise and shows a weak play of fancy.[364] The bronze-cast cow by Myron, the Greek sculptor of the Vth century attracted the attention of Leonidas. Let us see how he does make the cow introduce herself as a piece of life-like art:

Οὐκ ἔπλασέν με Μύρων, ἐψεύσατο· βοσκομέναν δὲ
ἐξ ἀγέλας ἐλάσας, δῆσε βάσει λιθίνῳ.[365]

'Myron did not mould me; he was a liar; but having driven me from the herd when I was feeding, he bound me to the stone base.' - Here according to Leonidas practice, Leonidas makes the cow or rather the heifer speak of itself and this naturally gives emphasis to his slavish eulogy of Myron. The cow is not an ordinary speaker but one who knows the secrets of rhetoric, al way of expression. She argues that Myron did not mould her and that she is not cast in bronze . The picture illustrating how Myron drove her while pasturing with the herd is dramatic and may be a reminiscence of the myth of the rape of Persephone by Pluto. This picture led the poet to a queer point; for how could a live cow be fixed on a stone base? This is, however, the natural climax of what was uttered before. Myron's cow or Leonidas' epigram became a favourite theme for later epigrammatists who like Leonidas - and many of them are mere triflers - dealt with it in a rather fantastic manner.[366] In the following two epigrams, Leonidas is not exactly dealing with statues as pieces of art but he only makes jokes about certain attributes of some gods and the way they behave. The first one is on Priapus,

the god of gardens. The god, set up on a wall of a garden speaks to the thieves with an air of challenge:

Αὐτοῦ ἐφ' αἱμασιαῖσι τὸν ἀγρυπνοῦντα Πρίηπον
ἔστησεν λαχάνων Δεινομένης φύλακα.
ἀλλ' ὡς ἐντέταμαι, φώρ, ἔμβλεπε. Τοῦτο δ', ἐρωτᾷς,
τῶν ὀλίγων λαχάνων εἵνεκα; Τῶν ὀλίγων.

'Here on the wall did Dinomenes set me up, wakeful Priapus, the guard of his greens. But look thief, how excited I am. And is this, you ask, for the sake of a few greens? Yes for the sake of these few.' - Here the statue of the Phallic god, Priapus, is taking care of the greens of a garden to keep away thieves, birds and to avert the evil eye.[368] There is nothing peculiar about his erect membrum virile. It was common and familiar to all in such a way that no one looked to it in the same way as we do to-day. But the gross joke Leonidas aimed at is the use of that shameful part of the body for threatening. Still the kind of threat is not too indecent compared with another one composed by Leonidas himself which is really obscene;[369] but it is not so obscene as that by Philippus.[370] Priapus became a favourite theme of later epigrammatists who were more- or less indecent in their treatment.[371] The next epi-

of Heracles which upsets his fellow-guardian Hermes:-

Ὦ τάνδε στείχοντες ἀταρπιτόν, αἴτε ποτ' ἀγρούς
δαμόθεν, αἴτ' ἀπ' ἀγρῶν νεῖσθε ποτ' ἀκρόπολιν,
ἄμμες δρεῶν φύλακες, δισσοὶ θεοί, ὧν ὁ μέν, Ἑρμᾶς,
οἷον ὁρῇς μ', οὗτος δ' ἕτερος, Ἡρακλέης·
ἄμφω μὲν θνατοῖς εὐάκοοι, ἀλλὰ ποθ' αὐτούς—
αἰ ξύνα παραθῇς ἀχράδας, ἐγκέκαφεν·
ναὶ μὰν ὡσαύτως τοὺς βότρυας, αἴτε πέλονται
ὦρῖμοι, αἴτε χύδαν ὄμφακες, εὐτρέπικεν.
μίσεω τὰν μετοχάν, οὐδ' ἦ δομαι· ἀλλ' ὁ φέρων τι,
ἄμφις, μὴ κοινᾷ, τοῖς δυσὶ παρτιθέτω,
καὶ λεγέτω· "πὶν τοῦθ', Ἡράκλεες·" ἄλλοτε, "Τοῦτο
Ἑρμᾷ·" καὶ λύοι τὰν ἕριν ἀμφοτέρων. 372

'O, you who pass along this road, whether you are going from town to the fields or coming to the city from the fields, we two gods are the guardians of the boundary. The one, as you see me is Hermes and this other is Heracles. We both are gracious to mortals but to each 373
we are not so. If you provide some wild pears to both of us (in common), he gulps them down unchewed. Yes and indeed, likewise grapes, whether they are ripe or utterly sour, he wins over. I hate sharing and take no pleasure in it. Let whoever brings us anything serve it separately, not in common saying "This is for you Heracles," and again "This is for Hermes." And he

might assuage our contention.' - The epigram deals with the hermae which were popular in antiquity. The most familiar kind was the square stones with a head of Hermes, the god of those who use the roads, set up by the road-side. Here we have an extraordinary herm composed of two faces, one of Hermes and the other of Heracles,[374] which may have existed merely in the poet's imagination. Anyhow, the epigram is not concerned with any piece of art at all. The poet's object was to make use of this herm just as a prop for developing a sportive theme on two gods who are supposed to have their share of the offerings given to them in common. Heracles, one of the two partners, who caused Hermes' complaint, was successfully chosen, since that god is traditionally known as a gourmand, who greatly enjoyed during his lifetime the pleasures of the table.[375] The way Hermes pursues in introducing his case, in illustrating his colleague's greed by examples and in requesting or rather petitionning the dedicators to be exact and precise in offering their gifts separately brings these gods nearer to human behaviour and shortcomings: selfishness, mania for possession and ill-will which usually show themselves in partnership. This partnership is not always just as the poet bluntly puts it. This is,

I think, the climax of Leonidas' trifling Muse which was undoubtedly recited from a book by cultured banqueters at the table with its joyful atmosphere.[376] I am really surprised that such fanciful piece escaped the notice of Leonidas' imitators who are particularly fond of this kind of trifling epigrams.

Our tour - and it is fairly long - is at end. The examples I selected from this epigrammatist's epigrams are sufficient to throw a light on both his understanding and workmanship of epigram. In his hand, it is obvious, the epigram is half way between the traditional practical epigram and the Alexandrian trifling one, for he clings more than the Alexandrians to the sepulchral and dedicatory specimens and casts in their limited frame whatever theme he wishes to. In this he progressed what was occasionally and individually tried by the classical epigrammatists and the immediate precursors of the Alexandrian period. Thus beside some real epitaphs and dedicatory inscription, he treated in their frame other themes which have nothing to do with inscriptions and in this way he progressed beyond previous attempts and made some innovations and contributed to the development of Alexandrian epigram as we know it. In him, and the early masters of this genre, the epigrammatic

seed imported from everywhere, was planted in a new soil and climate and due to local devices, it yielded a different crop rich in blooms of different forms and colour. The themes cast in this incriptional form, are as we have seen, a dirge, a short comedy, a satire, a didactic or philosophical poem. Again it can be a piece of encomium of those humble people whose crafts and instruments he took pleasure in extolling. It is not difficult to find out the literary genres which exerted their influence on his epigrams and those of the Alexandrian epigrammatists in general: the elegy especially the admonitory, the scolion, the paignion, the griphos, the idyll and even the mime. It is not difficult also to assume that his epigrams, originated from such entertaining genres, were used at the table or read in books for amusement. In additoin to these, we have some epigrams in which the poet deviates from the original form of the inscriptional epigram with its real or fictitious requirements to short pieces of poetry, generally in elegiac metre, which came already into fashion in the fourth century at the hands of the Peloponnesian School under the leadership of Anyte. Thus under the influence of this school, a Doric one, and its representative, Leonidas wrote such Idyllic epigrams on the exquisite

descriptions of pastoral sceneries which reveal his devotion to nature with its attractive pastures, its bubbling springs and the fairy life of the dieties haunting the landscapes. Under the same influence of Anyte together with Nossis[377] he tried the description of the works of plastic art especially the statues and images of gods, goddesses and animals. Compared with other Alexandrian epigrammatists, especially Callimachus, it could be said that Leonidas tried his hand at every theme with the exception of the flattering and the amatory. But he distinguished himself over his contemporaries as the epigrammatist of the poor whose different careers on sea and land were glorified in his sepulchral epigrams and tools extolled in his dedicatory ones.

We end this subject by a short account on the style of Leonidas and the characteristics of his epigrams. I have already touched on this question in my comments on each epigram I quoted and it remains to deal with it in a rather general way. To begin with the lanquage or rather the dialects used by our poet, Leonidas' principally uses the Doric, the dialect of his native-country, Tarentum, a colony founded by Sparta. However, he mixes with it some other dialects such as the epic, a reminiscence of Homer, with whom he was most familiar,

and the Ionic. In this he kept pace with the Alexandrian practice of intermixing different dialects in their compositions and also revealing the influences of literary genres as the lyric, tragedy, dithyramb etc.[378] It is not the dialects that Leonidas used which matter very much and concern us as the sort of vocabulary prevailing in his epigrams. It seems to me that the chief characteristic of our poet shows itself in the way he followed in dealing with vocabulary. If the chief characteristic of the Greek, as of the German for example,[379] is that it is a language of mainly long words and especially long compound ones, Leonidas did not only keep with this linguistic feature but he also went beyond the limit in such a way that he seemed to be fond of it excessively. Such sort of words are not few; for one can meet them practically in nearly all his epigrams especially the epideictic ones. To quote some examples just at random, these are some specimens of compound adjectives: φιλοεργός, ον; φιλόλιχνος, ον; φίλοινος, ον; πολύτλητος, ον; πολυστάφυλος, ον; πολυκαής, ές; ολιγηστι πους, ον then the exessive combination of εὖ with adjectives which shows some traces of colloquial speech:[380] εὖ παίκλος, ον; εὔιδρος, ον; εὔστοχος, ον; εὔαγρος, ον; εὐγλαμπτος, ον; εὐκαμπής, ές; εὐαυγής, ές; εὔφημος, ον; εὐκρότκλος, ον; εὐθησαυρος, ον; εὔοινος, ον; εὔφωνος, ον;

εὐάλφιτος, ον; εὐκί'ων, ον and εὐδόκιμος, ον. These are few examples, but his fondness of such combinations is obvious nearly in every epigram. To these some other compounds can be mentioned such as ποτιθύμιος, ον; ἀποδειπνίδιος, ον; περισφύρος, ον; ἀειδίνητος, ον; ἀποκράδιος, ον and ὑποπυθμίδιος, α, ον. Among these compounds there are his own coinage. As far as his coinage is concerned, it can be truly said that Leonidas enriched the Greek vocabulary by coining new words which became after him a common property for the later poets especially Oppian, the author of a didactic poem in five books in hexameters entitled 'Halieutica, On fish and fishes.' who adopted many of them[381] Such new coinages, Professor Reitzenstein believes, were intentionally invented for lyrical splendour.[382] Of these coinages, which attracted Leonidas' imitators, I shall mention some: ἰχθυσιλήιστης, ὁ; χηραμοδύτης, ὁ; πλώτωρ, ὁ; σχοινῖτις, ἡ; αἰγιβότης, ὁ; αἰγώνυξ, ὁ, ἡ; χιμαιροβάτης, ὁ; κελευθίτης, ὁ; δαιδαλόχαρ, ὁ, ἡ; χιμαιροθύτης, ὁ; ἁλιφθόρος, ὁ; ἀκανθοβάτης, ὁ; ἀλιτοφροσύνη, ἡ; φιλοπωριστής, ὁ; and so on. In addition to these mouns we have a great amount of adjectives as for example: φιλοκερήμνος, ον; εὐπί'ων, ον; ἁλίπλαγκτος, ον; εὐθύσανος, ον; ὑαλό-

χρεους, ουν; ἀειδύητος, ον; εὐάλφιτος, ον ; ἐποψίδωος, ον ; ἀδυμιγής, ές; ἴτος, ή, όν ; πλειστοβόλος, ον; ὀρφάνιος, ον; ὀλιγοχρόνιος, ον; δυσβίοτος, ον ; ἐπεσχαρεως, ον ; πολύσκαλαμος, ον; εὐκυλικος, η, ον ; διώξιππος, ον; εὐγλαγής, ές ; λευκοόπωρος, ον . He likewise coined verbs as for example γελοιομελέω ; δυσκωφέω ; καταχραίνομαι ; συναγρεύω; συκοφορέω; κοδωνιάω. Many fo the nouns and adjectives just mentioned are used as mere epitheta ornantia. In fact Leonidas' epigrams are abound in accumulations of these epithets. And it is thought that he was influenced by the dithyramb[383] especially of Philoxenus, the author or a poem called δεῖπνον , banquet, which describes a feast in full dithyrambic language pompous and affected.[384] Whatever be the influence exerted on Leonidas, his cleverness in coining such epithets is beyond the reach of any poet except Homer whom he took as a pattern in a rather independent way; for if Homer coined his epithets within the frame of a heroic circle, Leonidas coined them largely as attributes to humble people and mean tools; but he carried out the Homeric convention of giving the deities appropriate epithets in accordance to his own taste and the general conception of his age. This can be

illustrated by some examples. According to Homer's method, Leonidas used to accompany every deity by an appropriate epithet. Thus Pan is given the epithet χιμαιροβάτης and αἰγώνυξ, Priapus λιμένιτας, Minerva or Athena χαριεσσάς and πανίτας Aphrodite or Cypris λαθεσίη and εὐλεχής. The epithets associated with the working classes, their career and tools are so numerous and expressive that they reveal the poet's profound interest in ordinary lives and careers of the humble people. The list is a long one and I have to content myself with some examples: The epithet εὐστρόφου is given to a hunter's club because the latter is made of good trunk, εὐρύχαδης is given to a cup because it is wide-mouthed; μολπῆτις is given to a spindle because its sound and movement remind of a girl singing and dancing. The heavy axe of a carpenter is the πρύτανις τέχνας; πολύπτερτας is appropriately a sarcastic epithet of a queer cynic's wallet. How subtly the flute is given that expressive and life-like epithet ταχυ-χείλης, just because the girl-musician's lips run rapidly over it, and finally πτερήεις which he associates with a certain kind of fish, the ἰούλις, dwelling among the rocks in a Homeric reminiscence, but the epithet in Homer is given to rocky countries. Another characteristic which

is also most obvious in Leonidas' epigrams is his tendency towards altering the usual form of a great nunber of words which were long used before his time; but such alterations were achieved, as Professor Reitzenstein and Geffcken pointed out, in accordance with the Aristotelian rules.[386] Such tendency for alterations could be, it seems, an outcome of personal liking for long words[387] or to a certain extent for metric requirements. I cannot see any other reason. Such are the following words: εὐχάλκωτος, ον for ἐύχαλκος, ον; δουλιχόεις for δολιχός; πυξίνεος for πύξινος; ὠκήεις for ὠκύς; ὀρφάνιος for ὀρφανός; εὐλεχής, ές for εὔκηλος, ον; συνεργατίνης for συνεργάτης, ὁ; τεχνοσύνη for τέχνη; κελευθίτης for ὁδίτης, ὁ; εὐαστῆρ, ὁ for εὐαστής; συμπαστωρ, ὁ for συμπαστής; ἐσχαρεών, ὁ for ἐσχάρα, ἡ; ἀτραπιτός for ἀτραπός. The same thing happens with verbs as for instance: γειτονέω for γειτνιάω; δημολογέω for δημόομαι. Before I end this subject on Leonidas' vocabulary, two points should be dealt with just in passing. The first about his colloquialism; in other words his use of words belonging to familiar speech. The question is not easy to deal with because we do not know with certainty the sort of vocabulary spoken by people everywhere; yet it is not difficult

to assume that Leonidas mixed with the elevated poetic language words used every day. Some of his coinages which are new to the formal language of poetry must have been taken from the colloquial speech. This is testified by the fact that the poet almost entirely lived in the environment of lower classes and used to celebrate their careers and their tools. It is not difficult to assume that those people had a sort of language of their own and it would delight them most if some of the words which they use creep in their poet's epigrams. This seems to be the case.[388] Finally apart from some words which reached us in an imperfect manner, Leonidas' vocabulary is within our reach; for the poet, unlike his contemporaries, was not fond of any γλῶσσαι,[389] simply because his interest is to depict the ordinary life. Dealing with his style, Leonidas could not be regarded as a plain poet, although many of his short epigrams are extremely simple. It is the longer epigrams that reveal his style best. They are highly elaborate, crammed with long compound words and strange technical terms and full of high-sounding epithets. Professor Reitzenstein has rightly defined Leonidas' style thus: 'It appears to me that none of the epigrammatists of the older times possessed a language equally splendid,

selected or rather mannered and that afterwards only those who were his pupils reached or surpassed him.[390] It is obvious everywhere that Leonidas revealed himself as a most careful writer who knows how to arrange the words possessed of all elaborate artistry of language in his sentences to add new charm to his themes and it is in this way that his artificiality is fascinating. Not seldom all kinds of rhetorical devices are employed naturally with a view to increasing or specialising the effect. Besides the ordinary figures of speech: the similes, the metaphors, the allegories, the comparisons, the antitheses, Leonidas' epigrams abound in other graphic devices such as apostrophe, personification, sarcasm, hyperboles, climax in the form of a 'point', alliteration, repetition or anaphora, exclamation, dialogue, questions, Aposiopesis etc. In this Leonidas revealed himself to be the most rhetorical poet belonging to the early years of the Alexandrian period. No poet can compete with him through the whole period, except those later epigrammatists such as Antipater of Sidon, Meleager and Philodemus whose style became popular and magniloquent, sonorous and bombastic in its effects and whose epigrams are crammed with all kinds of rhetorical spices. I have already illustrated some of these devices in my comments on the differenct epigrams and it remains to give some examples of the others. The griphos-like

epigram on the cause of the death of Pisistratus - a fictitious person - gave our poet a chance of using the rhetorical questions.[391] The use of dialogue can be illustrated by that epitaph on Praxo who died in her prime leaving a husband and a baby behind. It is a story in symmetrical dialogue very well achieved.[392] It is worth mentioning that the use of this rhetorical device is almost absolutely Leonidas' invention[393] and that he exerted a special influence on later epigrammatists who were attracted by its graphic and impressive character.[394] Another device which Leonidas uses excessively is the anaphora, the repetition of a word or phrase in successive clauses. Thus proper names are repeated for emphasis: Μηλώ is repeated twice (A.P.V. 206 ll. 1&3); Κλεώνων (A.P.Vl, 226 ll. 1&4); Λαβεσσόνα (A.P.Vl. 305,ll. 1&7); Κρῆτες, Κρητῶν and Κρηταιεῖς (A.P.Vll,654,ll. 2&4); Τιμόλυτος (A.P.Vll, 654,ll. 4&6). The last example is a good example for emphasis; for the name of the dead is put at the end of the epigram. A word or two or a phrase is repeated and many of them are just repeated at the beginning of the line. Their place would creat a kind of symmetry: τίς (A.P.Vll, 163,ll. 1&3); ἄλλο τι (Vll, 408,ll. 3&4); αὐτά repeated four times (A.P.Vll, 463,ll 1&2); ἤδει is repeated

three times at the beginning of the line (A.P.VII.440, ll. 5,7&9); εὖ (A.P.XVI, 182, ll. 5&6); εἶπε (A.P.IX, 320. ll. 1&4); ἤδη (A.P.VII, 480, ll 1&3). We have also quite a number of two words or more and phrases: καὶ τὸν are repeated three times (A.P.VI, 305, ll 45&6); καὶ τι (A.P.VII, 726, ll. 3&5); ὃ πεῖν are repeated four times (A.P.VII, 740, ll. 3&5); μὴ φθείρεω (A.P.VII, 736, ll. 1&3) εἰ καὶ σοι (A.P.VII, 736, ll. 5&7). These examples which are only a part of a whole show how Leonidas has a special care for constructing his sentences. Alliteration is another device to embellish the flowing of the words in the successive clauses. It provides a rhythm which has its own effect. The examples are so many that I have to content myself with some illustrations: Μηλὰ μὲν Μούσας (A.P.V. 206, l. 3); δούρατα δουλιχόεντα (A.P.VI, 4, l. 1); τειοσοί τοι ταῦτα τὰ (A.P.VI. 1 3, l. I) and ἄλλης ἄλλος ἀπ' ἀγρεσίης (A.P. VI. 13, l. 2); τίς τίνος, κίονα κεῖσαι & ἐκ τίνος ἐκ τοκεοῦ (A.P.VII, 163, ll 1&4); τετρηχυῖα θάλασσα, (A.P. VII, 283, l. I); θῆρεν τὸν τριγέροντα, τὸν (A.P. VII. 295, l. I); ἀσπίδες, ἄκλαστοι & κλαδαραὶ κάμακες (A. P. IX. 322, 4); καὶ κυσὶ καὶ καλάμοις (A. P. IX. 337, l. 4) etc. The rhetorical figure, aposiopesis, the sudden breaking of a sentence caused

by a repetition of a word or phrase for emphasis (or modesty) is not missing in some of his epigrams. Thus τάν is repeated three times (cf. A.P. VII, 19, l.If and 295, l.I f); πολλὸν ... πολλοῦ (A.P. VII, 440, l. 3ff); ἤδη (A.P. VII. 440, ll. 5, 7 & 9) is repeated three times at the beginning of the distiches; ἁ δεῖλ' Ἀντίκλεια (A.P. VII, 466, ll. I & 7). To these Leonidas' inclination for achieving symmetry in some of his epigrams should be added. This method divides the epigram into parts every one of which is concerned with a certain fact in such a way that the whole theme becomes a compound unit comprising different facts well arranged and carefully balanced. The best example that illustrates such device can be found in that epigram in which the three brothers: Pigres, the fowler, Damis the hunter, and Clito the fisherman, everyone of whom dedicates to the huntsman Pan some catch in return of which the god is besought to extend to them a helpful hand. The epigram is divided into three distinct parts and so also their petitions which are mentioned one after the other.[395] Another example is a bucolic epigram in which Biton dedicates some offerings to three deities, Pan, Bacchus and the Nymphs in return for abundance of milk, grapes and water.[396] The symmetrical construction is clearly shown in the choice of the kind of offering fitting every deity. The help

requested from each is in harmony with the realm of the deity's power. The symmetry is highly executed in such a way that one feels that the theme degenerates into unpleasant mannerism.[397] Another phase of symmetry - a rather general one - achieved by Leonidas shows itself in the arrangement of the different facts which constitute his themes in order to emphasize them and attract the reader's attention. So in that epigram in which Hagon, son of Euanthes, dedicates some arms taken as spoil from the Lucanians, we see Leonidas arranging the factors in his theme thus: he begins with the booty which is enumerated in two lines. The third line contains the name of the defeated enemy and that of the goddess-Athena-to whom the offerings are dedicated; The fourth line was left for the name and attributes of the dedicator.[398] One can see from this arrangement what occupies the poet's mind. It is the defeat of the Lucanians, the hostile neighbours of the Tarentines. In order to emphasize their defeat, he begins with the arms; because they could prepare the ears for hearing the name of the defeated which follows immediately. Keeping the name of the dedicator to the end, he admittedly wished to emphasize it. Another example shows how Leonidas varies his way of arrangement according to the nature of the theme.

So in that epigram in which a Cretan Therimachus, a soldier and hunter, dedicates to Pan an offering in return of the god's favours, the theme is divided into two parts quite independent. The first two lines comprise a complete dedicatory epigram: The name of the dedicator, his native country understood from the adjective Κρῆς are given; so also the offering, the god, and the place of dedication. Lines three to six deal with prayers: in lines three and four, the god is besought to extend his help to Therimachus, as a soldier, in battle while line five, as a hunter. Line six deals with the two prayers together.[399] Exclamation is one of the rhetorical devices used by Leonidas especially in his sepulchral epigram. It is known that exclamation expresses some strong emotion without describing it in set words. In a threnode on a certain Anticles who died at the age of eighteen, his mother's heavy bereavement found expression in that phrase: ὦ δείλα Ἀντίκλεις repeated twice.[400] No other device could have expressed the mother's sorrow better.[401] Some of Leonidas' epigrams reveals the poet's liking for pointed ending. This is a kind of climax in the form of a point to which the rest of the preceding lines lead. In that epigram in which Leonidas sportingly warns the mice that they will

not find any eatable stuff in his own hut, he ended it with offering an advice that the mice should hasten to other houses where they will find plenty of food available to them. Such an advice is a natural extention to the warnings and therefore, it is a decisive point for which the preceding lines prepare.[402] The next epigram has a rather advanced point in the manner of Martial, the progenitor of the satiric and pointed epigram. The epigram is on a certain old Maronis, the jar-drier on whose tomb stands an Attic cup. After introducing her and her tomb, Leonidas gives the reason why she laments in her tomb. It is not because she left a dear family behind but because the cup on her tomb is empty. Such point which corrects some other surmises conforms with the description given to Maronis but the poet made it more impressive when he puts aside any other reason.[403] The last rhetorical device used by Leonidas is the personification, a figure consists in ascribing life and any property of life to things inanimate. According to this figure the tomb of the dead speaks.[404] The animal in the form of an image speaks as well.[405]

Of Leonidas' metric characteristics I have very little to say.[406] All his epigrams, with the exception of five pieces,[407] are composed in elegiac couplets.

As far as his metric mastery is concerned, it could be said that he managed very well. The position of the words in the lines was carefully chosen and the words flow quite spontaneously, although the task was not easy in the presence of the accumulated epithets, the names of tools and their different attributes. But he succeeded in managing very well by coining new and longer form for words already in use for a long period and also by using compounds and long names. In the formation of the pentrameter-line, he definitely shuns a monosyllabic word at its end. He may have followed Callimachus in this respect, but more probably the two poets followed a common convention.

Before paying our poet farewell, a final judgement on his work as a whole and from all points of view should be attempted on a rather general line. Of any ancient criticism we have none but Meleager's description of his epigrams. The Garland of Meleager mentions 'the rich ivy-clusters of Leonidas' 'εν δε Λεωνιδεω θαλερους κισσοιο κομας βοτρυς'[408] This symbolic description is by no means within the reach of modern critics. Professor Mackail interpreted this phrase as follows 'and the phrase well describes the diffuseness and slight-want of firmness and colour in his otherwise graceful

409
style. I agree with Professor Machail's criticism but I feel at the same time that it is a personal opinion of his rather than an interpretation of Meleager's symbolic phrase. Or he might have thought of modern ivy. No one is able to know for sure what kind of ivy Meleager meant. Is it that plant which grows in Greece itself or in the East where Meleager spent his life? Theophrastus spoke of the ivy and described it but, as far as his account on the subject is concerned, he seems to me to have been thinking of that kind which grows in
410
Greece itself. If we rely on Theophrastus' account, the plant seemed to have the following characteristics: the plant is in the form of shrubs or independent trees, but usually parasitic; with many roots tangled together and do not run very deep. It is generally rough and wild and of two kinds, black and white with fruits either sweet or extremely bitter and finally the plant is flowery and the flowers are closely attached to the fruit. If these are the general characteristics of the ivy family, we can see to a certain extent why Meleager likened Leonidas' epigrams to ivy. If we are to speak on the style of his epigrams in a metaphorical language, we cannot help using some of the characteristic descriptive phrases of this plant. In fact the style of his

epigrams answers to most of the natural phenomenas of the ivy. Like its roots, his sentences are involved in unmatched accumulation of compound words, epithets, names of tools of different crafts on land and sea. If they have any beauty, it is a wild beauty with which the poetic diction is not familiar. How could the tools of a carpenter enumerated from the beginning of the epigram to its end form a poetic piece, yet it has its own beauty due to its novelty. The rhetorical devices and his other methods give his poems a glittering colour which never fades and it is in this that they resemble the evergreen ivy. Again it seems that Meleager had in mind the tree-like ivy not the shrub. This is justified by the unique length of his epigrams which are longer than they used to be in the earlier periods and even in his own day. Again it is clear from Meleager's phrase that the rich clusters crowned by their flowers are not belonging to the bitter kind but it could hardly be sweet unless the MS. Palatinus omitted some of Leonidas' epigrams which are entilled to such description. Finally like the ivy, wild and exuberantly plentiful, Leonidas' epigrams show that their composer is not particular about keeping with the poetic rules, at least not like the true Alexandrians

such as Callimachus, the most finished poet; and this is emphasized by his interest in varying the themes and the many repetitions which can be met with in most of his epigrams. If these are really the general characteristics of this climing plant, Meleager's phrase gives a thorough aesthetic and sound criticism , the outcome of a serious study. Such are the general stylistic characteristics of Leonidas. To what extent do they harmonize with the typical features of the Alexandrian school represented in its early masters? It is almost apparent that Leonidas' epigrams show in many respects, as we have already seen, peculiarities of his time, an unavoidable result of his familiarity of the first masters of the period like, for instance, Callimachus whom Leonidas imitated or varied some of his themes; but for his other stylistic innovations, he could be considered in his own day as a poetical type of his own; although he soon became for the immediate and successive generations up to the Byzantian period an Alexandrian model.

Finally as an epigrammatist, Leonidas is certainly one of the formost figures of the Greek epigram in general and the Alexandrian in particular and deserves our estimation in full, for he did not only emphasize the language of the old epigram but also he showed

unique mastery in handling his themes. Professor Reitzenstein has good reason to say that nobody influenced the whole epigrammatic genre more than he did.[411] What strikes me in him most is the way he followed in imitating Anyte and her school. In making use of his models, he is never a slavish imitator who merely copies, but on contrary he used to enlarge, enrich and make considerable alterations in all the themes and patterns tried both by his predecessors and contemporaries. Again his imitations contributed to the building, nourishing and maintaining the Alexandrian epigram; in other words he grafted it with new seeds and transfused fresh blood extracted from the body of the Doric Peloponnesian epigram into it. This is one of the factors that made the Alexandrian epigram more compatible and vigorous in exerting an undisputed influence on future generations. Secondly as a model, Leonidas was popular. His motifs and technique, as we have already seen, found a certain grace in the eyes of innumerable dilettante. In this way, his influence on epigrammatic genre was more enduring than that of the early masters of Alexandrian epigram. Professor Korte thinks that Leonidas's popularity is due to the fact that our poet is a virtuoso in the use of language and because of this he could be imitated much more easily than could

Asclepiades or Callimachus.[412] This is partly true, but to my mind, it is his devices and his fanciful situations[413] that attracted them more. This can be testified by the skits which Lucillius, Λουκίλλιος, an epigrammatist of Nero's time and whose epigrams are almost all exaggerated jokes, composed as parodies to some of Leonidas' epigrams. Leonidas' A.P.VI. 13 on the three brothers who dedicate to Pan some offerings caught by their nets was parodied by Lucillius (A.P.VI. 17)[414] in a rather licentious language where the three brothers are replaced by three courtesans, Pan by Cypria. I have already given the names of his imitators[415] together with some instances and I will not repeat myself here. I simply content myself with tracing and defining his influence which was not as it is expected, of the same power or level; for sometimes it reaches its zenith and at other times it wanes. His influence in the third century could be traced in Rhianus and Dioscorides, in the second and the first it is noticeable in Antipater of Sidon, Archias and Meleager; from then up till the sixth century A.D. his influence was of no significance, for Palladas of Alexandria in the fourth century A.D. quite ignored him. There is, however, no surprise in this in so far as Palladas in his epigrams was a mere satirist in the manner of Juvenal and Leonidas' themes could by no

means attract him. But Leonidas' influence reached its high point under the reign of Justinian, A.D. 527 - 65. At that time Greek poetry began to revive once more for a few decades after three hundred years of complete silence.[416] It is then that Leonidas' motives and style found some fresh and vigorous interest at the hands of some distinguished epigrammatists like Julianus, Prefect of Egypt and Paulus Silentarius. Another side of Leonidas' influence and popularity could be justified by the fact that later inscriptions inscribed on stones made use of him. Kaibel preserves some instances: cf. Kaibel, 247 with Leonidas' A.PVII. 163.[417] and 298 with A.P.VII, 740, 11 1-2 etc.[418]

Such is Leonidas, one of the few masters of the Greek epigram in general and the Alexandrian epigram in particular. In his versatile hands the Alexandrian epigram touching on most diverse subjects had successfully adopted every conceivable mood and had exhausted all its resources. His art, themes, and even his characters, though not always attractive, out-lived him for many centuries up to the very time when the epigrammatic fountain ceased to flow.

NOTES ON CHAPTER IV

II. Leonidas of Tarentum (152-418) pp. 616-654

152 Ep. u. Skol. p. 144.

153 The number of Leonidas' epigrams cannot be fixed with certainty. This is due to the confusion between him and his namesake, Julius Leonidas of Alexandria who lived in the reign of Nero (A.D. 54 - 68) and also to the fact that a number such as VII. 662, 663, 664 etc., are attributed to him in the Palatinus MS. and in other manuscripts given among the epigrams of Theocritus. The acknowledged number according to Geffcken (Leonidas von Tarent, Leipzig, Teubner, 1896) the authority on Leonidas, is 98 (79 in the Palatinus MS. and 1 in Stobaeus, Flor. IV. 52 28, Wachsmith - Hense, vol. V, p.1081). To these I am inclined to add two which are attributed to Leonidas in the Palatinus MS. VII, 715 and VI, 130 and rejected by Geffcken. Epigram VII, 715 which is an epitaph written by the poet for his tomb, is rejected by Geffcken simply because it states that Leonidas lies buried far away from Italy, a thing which cannot be foretold by the living Leonidas. This reason could count if this epitaph is considered real. But nothing in it indicates that it is composed for a tomb. It

is simply a fictitious epitaph like those composed by Callimachus (A.P.VII,415 cf. VII,525) and Meleager (VII,416,419&421) to express self-appreciation and longing for immortality. To return to Leonidas' epigram, his sorrow for not being buried in Italy is simply a reflection of homesickness felt by the living Leonidas, the wretched wanderer who was perhaps prevented from returning to his birth place. If we take it this way, the epigram must have been written by Leonidas himself. If not, who can express the poet's own sorrows better than he can? As to epigram VI,130, a votive epigram on the spoils dedicated by Pyrrhus of Epirus to Athena Itonis after a victory over Antigonus Gonatas and his Galatian mercenaries, probably that recorded under B.C. 274, is rejected by Geffcken on the ground that in this very year Leonidas wrote an eulogy on the Phaenomena of Aratus (A.P.IX.25) which seems to have been published at the court of Antigonus and at his instigation between 276 - 274 (Mair, Aratus, P. 263) and so Leonidas, Geffcken thinks, cannot have written such votive inscription to celebrate Pyrrhus' victory in 274

over Antigonus, the patron of Aratos. This assumption is very weak and not convincing at all. If he wrote an epigram to eulogize Aratus' Phaenomena for some reason or other - for the relation between Leonidas and Aratos cannot be defined with certainty - he also composed, out of gratitude, that disputed dedicatory epigram to the Epirot who once took up with enthusiasm the role of champion and helped, though unsucessfully, the Tarentines against Rome. Who told us that the two poems were written in the same year i.e. 274. Even if we admit that this happened, a year is so long that seeming contradictory events can take place. Anyhow to connect Aratos with his patron is not reasonable at all. This is justified by the fact that Callimachus, whose patron, Prolemy Philadelphus, was hostile to Antigonus and gave support to Pyrrhus' invasion of Macedonia (M.Cary A history of the Greek World, London, 1951, p. 132) wrote also a eulogy on the Phanomena (A.P.IX.507, Wilamewitz and Cahen, 27). We should be more accurate if we do not assign both the epigram of Callimachus and Leonidas to a fixed day and bear in mind that

Leonidas' epigram was written later than that of Callimachus. Geffcken himself (P.W. vol. XII, p. 2026) admits that Leonidas made use of Callimachus' epigram especially of the hint of the laborious work the main characteristic of Aratos' work. I am fully convinced, therefore, that the epigram VI. 130 is by Leonidas' pen. cf. my note on this very epigram, p. 617.

154 A.P.V. 188.

155 Op. cit. p. 153; this assumption could be easily refuted since there are not few instances where the poet expresses himself plainly such as A.P. VII, 163.

156 Lines 6 and 7 do not appear in the MS. Palatinus, but are found in Planudes. Prof. Paton thinks that they are not genuine and that they are supplied by Planudes himself. Geffcken on the other hand believes them to be genuine(=Leonidas).

157 A.P. VII. 440; Geffcken, 43.

158 s.v. Leonidas von Tarent, PW. vol. XII, p. 2027.

159 A.P. VII. 80.

160 A.P. VII. 415.

161 Ep. U. Skol. pp. 144-151.

162 Op. cit. p. 151; but he never mentioned a single

real inscription. Is this not astonishing?

163 I will give further examples immediately.

164 Professor Ph.-E. Legrand (Revue des Études Grecques 1894, pp. 192-195) tried to prove that Leonidas (Lycidas) was a Cretan by birth and a Tarentine only by adoption. Against this theory, we have an undisputed epigram (A.P. VII, 654-G.5) written by Leonidas in which he not only underrates the Cretans but also attacks them without reserve:-

Αἰὲ λῃῖσταὶ καὶ ἀλιφθόροι, οὐδὲ δίκαιοι
Κῆτες τὶς Κητῶν οἶδε δικαιοσύνην;

This, then, seems unlikely to proceed even from an exiled Cretan and forcible ejection from Crete is not suggested by Legrand.

165 Cf. A.P. VII. 715; VI, 300, 302; also VII, 654.

166 Professor Edwyn Bevan (The Poems of Leonidas of Tarentum Oxford, 1931) tried many years before to divide them under different headings, but, although he successfully achieved his aim, his headings are rather general for a study. For an Anthology they are quite suitable.

167 A.P. VII, 648.

168 As far as I know, this is the first time for Τύχη, as a goddess, to be invoked. This marks the greatest prominence to which this deity came in Hellenistic and Roman times.

169 A.P. VII. 163. G. II; for another epigram in a

dialogue form see A.P. VII. 503. G.10.

170 Antipater of Sidon, A.P. VII, 164. This is found on a stone in Phrygia (Kaibel, 248). That of Amyntas, an unknown author who may have lived in the second century B.C., is preserved in Oxyrrhynchus Papyrus, vol. IV, No. 662. That of Archias (A.P. VII. 165) is ascribed by the MS. Palatinus either to Antipater of Sidon or to Archias, τοῦ αὐτοῦ, οἱ δὲ Ἀρχίου

171 ὠκέος ἠελίου is a reminiscence of Mimnermus' fr. 11.5.

172 A.P. VII. 466; A.P. VII. 467 by Antipater of Sidon may be a variation of it; but it is rather a free copy.

173. A.P. VII. 463=G.13.

174 Line 6 is inconsistent in all manuscripts; in MS. Palatinus is 'καὶ θετ' ἐφ' ὑμνιδίῳ χηραμένην πατάγῳ'; in Plamud; the text is 'κάτθετ' ἐφ-υπνιδίων χηραμένην πατάγῳ' I adopt the reading of Professor Edwyn Bevan (op. cit. p. 83) on the authoritative corrections and emenadations of W. Headlam and Schneider.

175 A.P. VII, 198; G.51.

176 For epigrams on animals either before the

Alexandrian period, or outside Alexandria:cf. Simonides, 130 (185), Bergk (op cit. par III, p. 476 (on a dog); A.P.IX.30 3 (on a dog) by Addaeus; VII, 202 (on a cock devoured by a fox) VII.208 (on a tomb erected for a war-horse) by Anyte; VII,193 (on a locust); VII,203 (on a patridge) by Simmias;Vii,192 (on a locust) cf. VII.194, by Mnasalces; VII, 200 (on a bird); IX 564 (on a bee by Nicias & VII.197 (on a locust) by Phaennus.

177 Cf. Anyte's A.P.VII.190. Reitzenstein (op.cit p. 148) thinks that Leonidas' epigram was modelled after Mnasalces but he did not give the number of the epigram. Anyhow the two epigrams composed by Mnasalces on locusts (VII.192 & 194) have no resemblance whatever to that of Leonidas. Anyte's epigram on the other hand reveals itself as the model from the first sight. The resemblance between the two, the model and the copy, misled the scribe who assigned it either to Anyte or to Leonidas (ΑΝΥΤΗΣ οἱ δὲ ΛΕΩΝΙΔΟΥ); See also note 70.

178 A.P.VII,503; G.10.

179 The harbour of Argolis.

180. A.P.VII, 273, 652 and 654.

181. A.P.VII, 273; G.6.

182. Leonidas may have made use of Callimachus' cenotaph poem: (A.P.VII, 273) and developed it in his own way. Anyhow Leonidas, as imitator, is difficult to catch.

183. A.P.VII. 654; G.5.

184. For the other underrating descriptions of the Cretans, Leonidas is probably playing with the proverbial saying attributed to Epimenides quoted by St. Paul, ep. Tit. i. 12 "... ....the Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle bellies". Cf. Callimachus, Hymn to Zeus, ll. 8-9. This universal conception of the Cretans is not justified by any historical factors and I think that, because they are not of a Greek origin, they are underrated and attacked by the Greeks.

185. A.P.VII. 506; G. 87.

186. A.P.VII. 665; G. 9.

187. A.P.VII. 266; G. 7.

188. A.P.VII. 264; G. 8.

189. We do not know anything about Priapus' undertaking as a god of the harbour. Such task is

not assigned to him elsewhere. Professor Wilamowitz (op. cit. vol. II. p. 108) is right in assuming that Leonidas had in mind a certain harbour where Priapus had a certain prestige.

190 A.P. XI, G. 50.

191 cf. A.P. IX. 144. cf. PW. vol XII, p. 2024.

192 cf. Ad Attic. IX, 7, 5: X, 2, 1; IX. 18. 3.

193 cf. A.P. X.2 (Antipater of Sidon); 4 (Marcus Argentarius); 5(Thiyllus); 6(Satyrus); 14 (Agathias Scholasticus); 15(Paulus Silentarius & 16(Theaetetus Scholasticus)

194 Two are preserved by the MS. Palstinus: A.P. VII. 295 on the old fisherman, Theris, which I have already given as an example of a real epitaph and 564 which I am quoting.

195 A.P. VII. 504; G. 86.

196 The epigrammatist Apollonides (1st century A.D.) wrote an epigram on a similar accident which happened to the fisherman Menestratus (A.P. VII. 702). But it is difficult to assume whether the epigram is a mere imitation or a commemoration of an uncommon death which took place in the poet's life-time. Unlike imitated epigrams, its is shorter, simpler and non-sepulchral.

197 A.P. VII. 726; G. 76.

198 Op. cit., p. 148.

199 P.W. vol. XII. p. 2026.

200 A.P. VII. 316 (G. 39) 422 (G. 35); 440 (G. 43); 448 (G. 36); 449 (G. 37) & 455 (G. 34).

201 A.P. VII. 440; G. 43; it is a dirge composed for a certain Aristocrates, a distinguished personality of society. I have already rendered this epigram and commented on it.

202 A.P. VII. 422; G. 35.

203 For the χῶς ἀστράγαλος is considered the worst cast of the dice.

204 Reitzenstein (op. cit., pp. 148-149) says that the pure griphos is transformed to the form of a dirge; it is in fact not a dirge but a παίγνιον where the sportive tone is prevailing.

205 A.P. VII. 429.

206 A.P. VII. 423, 424, 425, 426 & 427.

207 A.P. VII. 428.

208 A.P. VII. 455; G. 34. This is one of a group of poems composed in iambic trimeter. These are A.P. VI. 211, VII. 648, XVI, 182, 307, Stobaeus, Fl. 1209 = G. 96.

209 Maronis here does not necessarily mean a name of

a particular person. It may be a type-name. This can be inferred from the fact that Maron, is a name traditionally associated with wine. It is Maron, the son of Evanthes, who gave Odysseus the wine which he made Polyphemus drunk (od. IX 197 ff)

210 Silenis (VII. 456 by Dioscorides); Aristomache (VII. 384 by Marcus Argentarius); Myrtas (VII 329, Anonymous) and Ampelis (VII. 457 by Aristo)

211 A.P.VII. 353.

212 It is in Reitzenstein's opinion (op. cit. p. 150) a dirge; I understand the dirge to be something serious and so I do not agree with him..

213 The name is not given by Leonidas; but Lemmal: 'εἰς τὸν κῶτον ὁμοίως' which refers to Lemmal, (VII. 315): 'εἰς Τίμωνα τὸν μισάνθρωπον ἐν Ἀθήναις and the content of the epigram itself (A.P.VII. 316) are sufficient evidence.

214 A.P.VII. 316; G. 39.

215 PW. vol. XII, p. 2026 cf. Geffcken's Leonidas von Tarent, p. 76. n 1.

216 Rev. Etud. Grec., 1907, p. 309.

217 A.P.VII. 317.

218 With the exception, cf. A.P.VII. 719, G. 23; 19, G. 25.

219 A.P. VII, 19; G. 25.

220 A.P. VII, 35; G. 22.

221 A.P. VII, 13; G. 24.

222 A.P. VII, 402; G. 40.

223 A.P. VII, 67; G.94.

224 A.P. VII, 35; G. 22.

225 Isthmian I 64.

226 Cf. VII, 44. ll 9-10 : ἤδει καὶ ξείνοισι καὶ ἐνδημοισι πεφυγέα ἔρδειν.

227 Kaibel (op. cit. p. 520) No. 228b, line 5 : ἀσ]τοῖς καὶ ξείνοισι πεφυγέας. This, however, is one of many examples in which the influence of early Alexandrian epigrammatists' literary exercises is obvious on later inscribed epitaphs.

228 A.P. VII. 13, G. 24.

229 Cf. A.P. VII. 712, l.3; this is one of two nice epigrams Erinna wrote on her girl-friend Baucis. The other is VII. 710. This quotation and the inconsistency of the MS. Palatinus which assigns the epigram either to Leonidas or Meleager led some commentators such as Hecker, Stadtmüller and Wifstrand to attribute it to Meleager. Hecker (Waltz, op. cit; vol. IV, p. 62, Note 2) thinks that Erinna's epigram, as an

inscription in the island of Telos where Baucis was buried, could not have been known to Leonidas. In his opinion, it is composed by Meleager who made a voyage to collect inscriptions from tombs in different places and introduced them in his Garland. I myself do not agree with him for two reasons: first the epigram of Erinna is not an inscriptional epitaph (the second on the same person VII, 710 could be); it is a dirge which could be read in books. Secondly we have not the least idea of a journey made by Meleager for fetching inscriptions from their places. To return to the inconsistency of the M.S. Palatinus, I think that the epigram was attributed to Meleager simply because Meleager's VII 182, on a certain Clearista whose death is almost like that of Baucis, treats the same motif expressed in Erinna's VII. 217: but mere imitations is not a sufficient reason for attributing the epigram to Meleager. Thus I quite agree with Geffcken who rightly assigns the epigram to Leonidas.

230 P/W. vol. XII, p. 2026

231 We do not know whether he or Antisthenes is the

is the founder of the Cynic sect.

232 A.P.VII. 67; G. 94

233 Cf. also A.P.VII, 68. by Archias who imitates Leonidas very closely.

234 Cf. A.P.VII, 63 (Anonymous); 64 (Anonymous) and 65 (Antipater of Sidon)

235 Cf. A.P.VII. 66 (Honestus) and 116 (Diogenes Laertius)

236 A.P.VI, 302, l. 6.

237 Cf. IV, 53,8; Martial mocks the person who, by his long and dirty beard and threadbare cloak, pretends to be cynic. Such a person in the eyes of Martial is no more than a dog. non est hic cynicus, cosme,: quid ergo? canis.

238 A.P.VI. 300; G. 90.

239 The epithet Lathria for a goddess is not found elsewhere. But we know through two variations that Aphrodite is meant. cf. VI. 190 (by Gaetulicus) and VI. 191 (by Cornelius Longus). The two poets made much use of the model and kept Leonidas' name. Waltz (op. cit. vol. III, p. 150, notes 1&3) states the Lathria is an epithet of Artemis in the different regions of the Peloponnese and that the two imitators were

mistaken in attributing it to Aphrodite. Against this is the attribution of this epithet to Cypris by Eubulus, cf. L & S, VIIIth edition, s.v. λαθραῖος

240 So I cannot agree with Professor Edwyn Bevan (op. cit. p. XXV) who exalts the admirations of Leonidas for Diogenes thus "he evidently felt a strong admiration for Diogenes on account of his freedom from worldly incumbrances." Geffcken (P.W. vol. XII, p. 2023) and B. Hansen (De Leonida Tarentino, 1914, pp. 20, 22, 23 & 24). I, on the other hand, do not think that Leonidas is either an admirer or a follower of cynicism since he does not speak directly in favour of it.

241 The phrase underlined is variably given by the different texts: ὁ καὶ τοκέων εἶα βαΰξας P; ὁ καὶ τοκέων ἔο βαΰξας Plan.; ὁ κερτομέοντα βαΰξας Stadtmüller; ὁ καὶ τοκεῶνε βαΰξας W. Headlam which is followed by Paton & ὁ καὶ τίκτοντα βαΰξας Viscount Harberton (Meleager and the other poets etc, London, 1895). I adopt the last reading since it gives the same meaning suggested by all the different texts with the exception of Stadtmuller's reading and because the accusative is the proper construction with βαΰξω.

242 A.P.VII. 408; G. 40

243 Cf. A.P.VII 536 (Alcaeus, probably the Messenian) 405 (Philippus) XIII, 3 (Theocritus) and probably 71 on Archilochus (Gaetulicus). On the imitation of Theocritus, Hansen says 'hoc in carmine interpretando Leonidae ep. VII, 408 adhibendum esse vir doctissimus Jacobs iam adnotavit (De Leonida, p. 15)

244 A.P.XVI, 307; G. 28; cf. 306; G. 42. a variant by the same poet.

245 Bathyllus and Megisteus are the youths beloved by Anacreon.

246 Cf. in particular those of Antipater of Sidon (A.P.VII, 23,26, 27, 29&30) and Dioscorides (VII, 31); others are mere jokes like those composed by Julianus, Prefect of Egypt (A.P.VII. 32 and 33)

247 A.P.VII. 27, 11 9±10.

248 A.P.IX. 24; G. 21.

249 Seven nice epideictic epitaphs were composed for his fictitious tomb. Among the best are A.P.VII 1. (Alcaeus of Messene); 2&6 (Antipater of Sidon and 4 (Paulus Silentarius). In the IXth book of

MS. Palatinus, Ἐπιγράμματα ἐπιδεικτικά, the epigrammatists expressed the same respect and appreciation, cf. IX, 97 (Alpheius of Mitylene); 192 (Antiphilus of Byzantium); 575 (Philippus) & 385 (Stephanus the Grammarian). The last epigram consists of twenty-four lines where every book of the Iliad is reviewed.

250 Professor Paton calls them 'The declamatory and descriptive epigrams'. I agree with Professor E. Bevan (op. cit. pp. XXI-XXII) that Professor Paton was not successful in translating the Greek title in this way. The best rendering of the title is given by Professor Mackail (op. cit. p. 27) 'poetical exercises or show-pieces.' This conforms with the original meaning of ἐπίδειξις, a display. In such epigrams, the poets used to give forth into the air verses just to show what they could do as artists in verse.

251 I have the impression that this celestial picture was inspired by Aratus' Phaenomena which the poet eulogized as we will see immediately.

252 A.P. IX, 25, G. 44.

253 The Phaenomena, a work which must have achieved immediate fame; for it was praised by two

contemporary epigrammatists, Callimachus, A.P. IX. 507 & Leonidas, A.P. IX. 25. It is inferred from Cicero's passage (De Or. I. 69) that it enjoyed a great reputation among the Greeks and the Romans. Latin translations of it were made by Varro of Atex, Cicero, Germanicus and Avienus. Even in Christian times, it was well-known and admittedly appreciated. St. Paul (Acts XVII, 28) quoted it: Cf. 'For me are also his offsprings with Phaen. l. 5: τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος εἰμέν.'

254 Cf. A.P. VII. 11, On Erinna's poems & A.P. IX. 63, on Antimachus' Lyde. Asclepiades, as Geffcken thinks (PW. vol. XII, 2026) was the first to write epigrams on books.

255 A.P. IX. 507.

256 Cf. Callimachus' A.P. IX, 507, l. 4: 'Ἀλήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης' with Leonidas' A.P. Ix. 25 l. 5: αἰνείσθω δὲ καμὼν ἔργον μέγα.'

257 See the note on the number of Leonidas' epigram, pp. 616-619.

258 Geffcken (PW. vol. XII. p. 2026) confirms the influence of Callimachus' epigram on that of Leonidas, while B. Hansen (Op. cit. pp. 14-15) disagrees with him.

259 A.P.VII, 480; G. 32.

260 For further occasions where the dead addresses the passer-by, see also Leonidas' VII, 472, 13, 656,1.

261 Cf. also on the same subject A.P.VII, 478, where Leonidas, as a passer-by laments the misfortune of another dead man whose mean tomb and monument was over scraped by the axle and wheel of the traveller's coach.

262 A.P.VII. 715 (not in Geffcken). I have already given my reasons on the authenticity of this epigram. See the note on the number of Leonidas' epigrams, PP. 616-619.

263 Cf. PW. vol. XII, p. 2023. Anyhow, he (eodem loco) made use of it as a source for Leonidas' life without a single argument. I am sorry to say that Waltz (op. cit. vol. VII, p. 157 note 2) still repeats the very words of Geffcken in 1941.

264 A.P.VII. 655; G. 16.

265 I hope people always bear in mind that Cheops the Egyptian King of the fourth dynasy, who built the great pyramid for his tomb, did not make use of it long, as his mummy was robbed shortly

after his death.

266 A.P.VII. 740, G. 17

267 King of Lydia whose riches are proverbial in antiquity. cf. A.P.VII. 709, l.6

268 Stobaeus, Flor. IV. 52. 28 (Wachsmuth - Hense, vol. v, p. 1081. G. 96). This is one of the rare iambic epigrams.

269 A.P.VII. 472 bis, G. 89. This couplet is found in the M.S. Palatinus between lines 6&7 of A.P.VII. 472, but the corrector regarded it independent.

270 Cf. A.P.VII, 472, ll. 5-6

μικρὴ σεω ξωὴ τε θλιμμένη· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὴ·
ἡδεῖ' ἀλλ' ἐλθοῦ στυγνοτέρη θανάτου·

I must confess that I do not put much weight on the poets' views on questions like life and death; for what they once approve, they disapprove again.

271 A.P.VII. 736, G. 93

272 ἄλες ἡ δυσμενές, Athen. IX. 366 b

273 Pan et Vat. μνήμης Br. μνήμην.

274 A.P.VII. 452; G. 15

275 EP. U. Skol. p. 149

276 Scolion, 23, Athen. 695, e:

Ἔγχει καὶ κήδωνι, διάκονε, μηδ' ἐπιλήθου,
εἰ χρὴ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν οἰνοχοεῖν.

277 Kaibel, op. cit., 256, l. 10: πουνὸς ἐπεὶ θνατοῖς ὁ πλόος εἰς φθιμένους . (Salamine Cypriorum Vogue. Rev. archéol. 1866, I, 437. Lebas VII. 2761, I fere p. Chr. n. saec.)

278 A.P.VII. 657, G. 59

279 Geffcken, PW. vol. XII, p, 2024

280 A.P.VI, 200, G. 45. I have already rendered and commented on .

281 A.P.VI. 202, G. 46

282 A.P.VI. 309, G. 79

283 A.P.VI. 355; G. 68

284 A.P.VI. 281, G. 38

285 A.P.VI . 296; G. 81

286 PW. vol VI. p. 87; Cf. Geffcken, PW. vol XII, p. 2025.

287 P.L. G. III, 634; Diehl II, 157; Athen. XV, 670 e.

288 Op. cit. p. 149

289 A.P.VI. 4; G. 84

290 Cf. VI, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, etc.,

291 Cf. VI, 5 etc.,

292 A.P.VI. 13, G. 73

293 Alfred Körte, op. cit., p. 396.

294 Nine poets treated the same theme: Cf. A.P. VI. 11 12, 14, 15, 16, and 179-187. Among them are Antipater of Sidon (A.P. VI. 14) and Archias who wrote four epigrams (A.P. VI, 16, 179-181) on the same theme. Antipater of Sidon and Archias, Leonidas' imitators, are as usual very close to their pattern (Cf. VI, 14 & 16)

295 Cf. Kaibel, op. cit. 1104. But nothing exists of the three couplets except five scattered letters and six ones in line 6. We owe to Dilthey's shrewdness the identification of the Leonidean text.

296 A.P. IX. 337; G. 58.

297 Cf. A.P. IX. 313 & XVI, 228.

298 Cf. also A.P. IX, 316, X, 1 & XVI, 230.

299 A.P. VI, 205; G. 83; Cf. also 204, where the tools of Theris, the carpenter, are dedicated to Pallas. The shortness of this epigram - for it is of two couplets - and its comparative simplicity give the impression that it is probably a real incription.

300 A.P. VI. 103.

301 Antipater of Sidon uses this name. Cf. VI. 276, l.6.

302 Edwyn Bevan, Op. cit, p. 105.

303 A.P. VI. 288; G. 75. The epigram is corrupted in

two places (ll. 6&7); VI, 39 (Archias) and 174 (Antipater of Sidon) may be variants of this epigram.

304 Πανάτδι, Stadtmüller, ad. loc.

305 A.P.VI, 289, G. 78

306 A.P.VII, 726

307 A.P.VI. 47. This epigram ends in a clever point put into the mouth of Bitto herself: 'ὤφελες γὰρ κρεῖσσον ἐμοῦ τὸ θέλειν'.

308 A.P.VI. 286, G. 74

309 Cf. A.P.VI. 287 by Antipater of Sidon who imitated Leonidas very closely, but whose picture of the girls and the Maeander is more picturesque than his model.

310 A.P.V. 206, G. 77 the epigram is half dedicatory and half amatory.

311 A.P.VI. 211. G. 41

312 Cf. William Henry Denham Rouse (Greek votive offerings, Cambridge, 1902), pp. 101, 109 & 366

313 A.P.VI. 130. I have already rendered this epigram and commented on it. This epigram is rejected by Geffcken.

314 A.P.VI. 129, G. 1

315 Nothing could be stated with certainty about the battle and the year of the action. It may have

been fought under the leadership of Pyrrhus, who helped the Tarentines in their wars against the Lucanians and the Romans. Geffcken thinks this epigram and slo VI, 131 were composed before year 281 in which the Tarentines and Lucanians allied themselves against Rome. (cf. PW. vol. XII, p. 2023)

316 A.P.VI. 131, G. 2

317 A.P.VI. 188, G. 71

318 A.P.IX. 322. G. 18

319 A.P. IX, 323 & VI. 163

320 Paus. VIII. 28.8

321 A.P.VI. 334, G. 53

322 The Herm, a mere stock of stone, having generally a human head carved at the top.

323 He was killed by his cousin Pyrrhus who became Neoptolemus' joint King in 297 B.C. cf. Pierre Jouguet, Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East (London, 1928) pp. 157 & 163.

324 Cf. Geffcken (PW. vol XII, p 2027) has no objection to the fact that it might have stood on a real stone.

325 Sometimes the cause of dedication is missing in

real inscriptions, but the cause is not difficult to guess.

326 Wine should be dedicated to Bacchus; but it happened at that time that people did not keep the traditional practice and offerings, which used to be offered to certain gods, were given to others.

327 As far as the number of temples and shrines of the different gods and goddesses are concerned, statistics are given by G. B. Hussey. A. J. A. VI, 59 ff. (quoted in Rouse, op. cit. p. 48 Note 2). The order is: Apollo, Artemis, Athena, Zeus, Aphrodite Demeter, Dionysus, Asclepius, Poseidon, Hera, Cybele, Heracles, Eileithyia, Dioscuri: after which Tyche, Hermes, Pan, the Maid, Ares, Pluto, the Fates and Ge come together. The rest are rare.' But it is worth mentioning that Pan who was less honoured by temples and shrines, used to receive more didications than any other deity. This is attested by the sixth book of the Anthology. Professor Rouse gives a statistic account (op. cit. p. 48 Note 1). 'Thirty-four in all to Pan; as against Athena 27, Artemis 26, Aphrodite 23, Apollo 21, Hermes and Dionysus 16 each, Priapus, Demeter, Cybele,

10, Zeus, Poseidon, and the Nymphs alone 9, the Muses 7, Hera, Heracles 5, Asclepius, Ares 3, the others two or one.'

328 A.P.VI. 253

329 A.P.VI. 154; G. 72

330 Waltz, op. cit, Tome III, P. 88 Note 3 .

331 A.P.VI. 158

332 A.P.IX. 326; G. 54

333 For the practice of putting small images called Κόρκι or κορόκόσμια at the edge of the running water as offerings to the Nymphs. Cf. Schol. to Clem. Alex. Protrep. IV. 58 (Vol. I p. 314 Stählin) (quoted in Edwyn Bevan, p. 105)

334 A.P. XVI, 291

335 A.P.VI. 221; G. 65

336 Cf. A.P.VI. 217 (Simonides, 179). This epigram could not have been written by Simonides. The cult of Cybele, the Asiatic goddess, was introduced into Greece towards the end of the fifth century and was unpopular before the Alexandrian period. So the term Γάλλος, one of the eunuch priests of that goddess, is in itself a sufficient reason for rejecting its attribution to Simonides. Its composer, it is

clear, was undoubtedly later in time than Leonidas. This can be testified by the treatment of the theme; for although he changed it and deviated from it, Leonidas' models still prevail and dominate. Other epigrams are; A.P. VI. 218 (Alcaeus), 219 (Antipator of Sidon) 220 (Dioscorides) and 237 (Antistius). As far as all these copies are concerned, they deal with the Lion in connection with a priest of Cybele and not with Lionidas' goat-herds. This leads me to think that the imitators imitated Leonidas' first imitator who could be Dioscorides or that epigram A.P. VI. 217, the attribution of which is rejected by all, is also composed by Leonidas himself as Bergk thinks (of. Waltz, op. cit. Tome 111, p. 112, the Apparatus criticus on this epigram). In either cases the theme is Leonidas'.

337 A.P. VI. 35, G. 80.

338 A.P. Vl. 106, l. 2.

339 A.P. VI. 106.

340 A.P. VI. 120; G. 52.

341 An allusion to a Boeotian Myth. cf. Pindar's XIIth Pythian ode.

342 A.P. XVI, 250, G. 56.

343 A.P.IX. 313 & XVI. 228

344 A.P.IX. 99; G. 61

345 A.P.IX. 75

346 Cf. Leonidas' A.P.IX. 99, l.6 with Evenus' A.P.IX. 75, 1, 2.

347 Kaibel, op. cit. p. 499, No. 1106. In dextra pictura parte caper vitem adrodit, ad sinstram idem caper versus aram vi protrudiur, cuius caput homo aliquis uva expressa vino inspergit.

348 A.P.IX. 563; G. 62.

349 i.e. which needs no cooking like food, or baking like bread.

350 i.e. before children stone them and misuse their fruits.

351 The MS. Palatinus gives instead δεισό'ξου This is not found in dictionaries. Meinike, however depending on Suidas' δεῖσα' knownonly in his lexicon, accepts it and gives it the meaning. 'smelling of ordure.' Waltz's conjecture 'δεισιθέου' attracts me more. Κεφαλά' also causes an unsurmountable difficulty and is generally avoided by all translators. There is

anyhow a possibility of translating it, if we take it as a proper name, Cephalas. Δωριέος in this case would be an adjective in the genitive case agreeing with Κεφαλᾶ and the meaning of the first couplet will be as follows: 'To Gluttony and Greed, the deities fond of dainties, the following gifts of Cephalas the Dorian, who venerates these goddesses, are dedicated.'

352 A.P. VI. 305; G. 89.

353 A.P. VI. 293; G.33.

354 In another epigram (A.P. VI. 298; G. 88) the same Sochares' belongings are dedicated by Famine, to no deity.

355 The proportion of the real to the fictitious is low; but this should not let us doubt that Leonidas composed many scores of them and that they either escaped the notice of the compilers - be it Meleager or Cephalas or Planudes and others - or did not concern them as the epideictic did. As far as the MS. Palatinus is concerned, this can be proved by the fact that the IXth book which deals with epideictic themes, is the longest book of this compilation.

356 He belongs to the IVth century B.C. and might

have died some years before Leonidas' birth.

357 A.P.XVI. 182; G. 29.

358 A.P.XVI. 178 (Antipater of Sidon), 179 (Archias), 180 (Democritus), and 181 (Julianus, Prefect of Egypt).

359 A.P.XVI. 206; G. 26

360 She was the most beautiful, the most famous, but also the most dangerous of all the hatairae in Athens. Cf. Athen. XIII, 558C & 59Cf.

361 But she dedicated it to the temple of Eros in her native place Thespiae and so the inhabitants of the city, in gratitude for her offering, asked Praxiteles to execute a statue of her decorated with gold. This was set at Delphi among the statues of Kings (Athen. XIII, 591b).

362 A.P.XVI. 204; but I am inclined to reject the attribution to Praxiteles on the ground that the style is Alexandrian. It is nothing but a trifling literary exercise.

363 Cf. A.P.XVI. 203 (by Julianus, Prefect of Egypt who was wrong to think that the statue is made of bronze. cf. l. 4) 205 & VI. 260 (by Tullius Geminus).

364 A.P.IX. 179; G. 30.

365 A.P.IX. 719; G. 27

366 The IXth Book of the Anthology contains thirty-six epigrams on the same theme - the largest number to deal with one subject; 13 by anonymous epigrammatists (713, 714, 721, 725, 726, 727, 729, 731, 733, 735, 736, 737, & 741); 8 by Julianus Pref. of Egypt (738, 739 & 793 - 798) 6 by Antipater of Sidon (720, 721, 722, 723, 724 728); 2 by Anacreon (715 & 716). These should be regarded as composed by Anonymous since Anacreon lived long before Myron); 2 by Evenus (717 & 718); 1 by each of the following; Dioscorides (734); Philippus (742); Marcus Argentarius (732); Demetrius of Bithynia (730) and Gemius (740). The best among these epigrams are those written by Antipater of Sidon and Julianus. But all without exception, took it as exercises in rhetorical parade.

367 A.P.XVI, 236; G. 49.

368 The scarecrow, the figure of a man hung with old clothes set up in fields to keep birds away, which we see at present everywhere whether in the East or West countries, could be regarded as a continuation of the old practice with a

different outlook and practical purpose. This figure is still used in Egypt to avert the evil eye. If an ordinary person has a house built for him, he usually puts this figure, fantastically dressed in rags with many colours in such a way that it attracts the eye of the passer-by and in this way the building escapes his notice and his evil eye. Thus Priapus is still in existence with a new shape and conception.

369 Cf. A.P.XVI, 261.

370 A.P.XVI, 240.

371 Nine epigrams were written on the Statue of Priapus and his functions: XVI, 86 & 260 by anonymous epigrammatists, 242 by Erycius; 237 by Tymnes, 239 by Apollonides; 243 by Antistius; 240 by Philippus; 241 by Marcus Argentarius who imitates Philippus; and finally 238 by Lucian. It is worth mentioning that obscene treatment connected with Priapus reached its climax at the hands of the Romans in the Augustan period in some little verses compiled in a collection known as the Priapeia printed for the first time as an appendix to the edition of Virgil (Some of the verses are thought to have been

composed by distinguished poets like Tibullus, Ovid, Petronius and even Catullus). These verses usually describe very openly how th god with his gigantic phallus punishes the thieves of gardens in some gross way. These verses could be imitations of Leonidas and the Alexandrian epigrammatists, but according to Roman sensuality, these poets surpassed their models by their lewd jests and coarse jokes.

372 A.P.IX. 316; G. 57.

373 The phrase 'ἀλλὰ ποθ' αὑτούς' seems to mean 'but towards themselves (i.e. each other) they are not aimiable (V. L and S. sub ποτί). The complaint of Hermes emphasized the contrast existing between their good will to mankind and the unjust attitude of a god towards his colleague.

374 It could be inferred from the picture of this head with two faces belonging[1] to different gods that Leonidas was familiar with herms with two faces of Hermes. (I myself did not meet any like those, although it is not unlikely that the god of roads could have two faces if the herm is set up as a cross-road sign). Such a particular herm could have inspired Leonidas

who replaces one of Hermes' faces by that of Heracles, a god, who, as far as I know, has nothing whatever to do with roads at all.

375 Heracleides of Ponticus, quoted in Licht, op. cit., p. 10.

376 The last two epigrams could be regarded as bucolic themes. The first deals with a garden and the offerings dedicated in the second are the products of gardens. But the presence of the statues gives both epigrams their occasion.

377 Benndorfius, De Anth. Graec. Epig., pp. 4-5.

378 Reitzenstein, op. cit., pp. 145-146.

379 Such as 'die Hochwasser Katastrophe.'

380 Reitzenstein, op. cit. p. 147, Note 1.

381 Op. cit. p. 147.

382 Op. cit. p. 146 (note 1.)

383 Reitzenstein, op. cit. p. 145.

384 Athen. IV, 146 f. cf. also Reitzenstein (Ep. U. Skol.) p. 146 note 1.

385 Such as Αὐλίς, πυθών, καλυδών, II, 496, 519 etc.,

386 Op. cit. pp. 146 - 147 & PW. XII. p. 2029.

387 This is not quite the case; for there are some altered words which as far as syllabic quantity are concerned, are shorter than the usual words,

as for example αἰμωπός,όν, for αἰματωπός,όν; μακαρῶς,ή,όν for μακαριστός,ή,όν; ὠμιβίτης for ἐπιτύμβιος etc. But the number of such words are inferior to the others.

388 Professor Reitzenstein (op. cit.) refers to the fact that lots of mean words can be found in his lines which do not occur in poetry elsewhere (p. 145), the strange combination of εὖ with adjectives (p. 147) and such words as σαγηνεύς & καταιγίς which seem to him to be taken from colloquial speech. (p. 147).

389 Professor Reitzenstein op. cit, p. 147; a thorough examination of Leonidas' vocabulary justifies Reitzenstein's conclusion.

390 Op. cit. p. 145.

391 A.P.VII, 422.

392 A.P.VII. 163. cf. 503

393 Callimachus tried this rhetorical figure, cf. VII. 504 & 725. But it could be said that Callimachus was either influenced by Leonidas or was simply under the spell of rhetoric, of which he occasionally makes use to achieve effect. I understand from the epigrams of later poets that it is Leonidas' influence that is obvious

and predominant; Cf. A.P.VII, 164 by Antipater of Sidon & 165 a Variant by the same poet or Archias, with Leonidas' VII, 163.

394 Among epigrams in dialogue form composed by later epigrammatists are the following: A.P.VII, 164 by Antipater of Sidon; 165, by the same or Archias; 424, 426 by Antipater of Sidon; 37 by Dioscorides; 79 & 470 by Meleager; 307 by Paulus Silentarius; 379 by Antiphilus of Byzantium; 548 by Leonidas of Alexandria, 552 by Agathias Scholasticus; 576, 590, 603, 33 by Julianus, Prefect of Egypt; and 679 by Saint Sophronus the Patriarch etc. These examples show how Leonidas' example was flourishing long even through the Christian period.

395 A.P.VI, 13.

396 A.P.VI. 154.

397 See also A.P.VI, 286, 289 etc.

398 A.P.VI. 129; an epigram of four lines, The repetition of ὁ κτώ three times in l. l. conforms with Leonidas' practice.

399 For further examples, Cf. A.P.VI, 120, 286, 289, 296; VII, 295, 652, 657 and IX, 24 and 332.

400 A.P.VII, 466, ll. 1 & 7.

401 For further examples, Cf. A.P.VII, 440. 503 etc.,

402 A.P.VI. 302

403 A.P.VII. 455; for other examples, Cf. VI, 289, 298 300 etc.,

404 Cf. A.P.VII, 719, 740 & 264, 480, 596, 657 & 731.

405 Cf. A.P.VI. 120; I did not find any inanimate offering speak-.

406 Nothing could be added to the most valuable treatment of metric by J. Geffcken, Jahrb, F. Philol. Suppl. XXIII (1896) p. 140 ff & B. Hansen, de L. Tarento (1914) p. 25ff.

407 A.P.VI. 211; VII, 648; XVI, 182, 307 & Stobaeus, Flor. IV. 52, 28 (Wachsmuth-Hense, vol. V. p. 1081)

408 A.P.IV, l. 15.

409 Op. cit. p. 293.

410 'Enquiry Into Plants.' According to Theophrastus, the ivy is a shrubby plant (I, III, 3) and evergreen (I. II. 4). All ivies have numerous close roots, which are tangled together woody and stout and do not run very deep; but this is specially true of the black kind and of the roughest and wildest forms of the white. This form, also more than the others, grows stout and becomes tree-like, and in fact becomes itself an independent ivy.

tree, though in general it likesand seeks to be against another tree, and is, as it were, parasitic (III. XVIII. 9-10). Its flower is closely attached to the whole fruit (I. XIII. 4). There are considerable differences in the fruit, both in the white and the black kind;it is in some cases rather sweet, in others extremely bitter (III. XVIII. 10). Of its distribution in the east, Theophrastus added. 'Thus they say that ivy does not grow in Asia in the parts of Syria which are five days journey from the sea;..... but elsewhere in Asia it is said to grow only in Media, for that country seems in a way to surround and join on to the Euxine Sea.' (IV. IV. 1-2). These are all the facts Theophrastus mentions about the ivy. They are so loose and incomplete that they are not of much help.

411 Op. cit. p. 148.

412 Op. cit, p. 396.

413 Such as A.P.VI. 13, 221, 263; IX, 99, 563 etc.,

414 The M S. Palatinus attribtes it to Lucian, but Stadtmüller and others assigned it to Lucillius. It is certainly worthy of the latter. For further examples, see A.P.VI. 164, 166 & XI, 194.

415 Professor Geffcken dealt fully with them. See, op. cit. pp. 146 ff.

416 Mackail, op. cit. p. 308.

417 Op. cit. p. 94: 'I vel II p. Ch. n. saeculi. Poeta ante oculos habuit Leonidae (fortasse Tarentini) epigramma A.P. VII. 163.

418 Op. cit. p. 113-114. l. 4 aperta imitatio versiculi Leonidae (Tarentini) A.P.VII. 740; 11, 1-2.

C H A P T E R V

THE FURTHER CONTRIBUTION TO THE ALEXANDRIAN EPIGRAM AND THE COMPLETION OF ITS THEMES MADE BY: POSEIDIPPUS, HEDYLUS AND ALCAEUS OF MESSENE.

With Callimachus and Leonidas, the one the representative of the Ionic school and the other, the successor of the Peloponnesian or the Doric school, it could be said that the Alexandrian epigram is almost revealed to us from all points of view. As far as the themes and the methods practised in the composition of the epigram are concerned, these two great epigrammatists, due to their many-sided mastery and the comparatively large number of their extant epigrams with their varied subject-matter, exhausted the epigrammatic themes either as imitators or innovators. We are not too far from truth to say that these epigrammatists' effusions were repeatedly but unsteadily imitated by their successors, who used to reproduce these poets' themes and give them new personal stylistic touches. In so doing nothing exciting compared with the models of the early Alexandrian period was achieved, and these remained with few exceptions inferior to their models or masters. Yet as far as themes are concerned, it remains still to deal with a number of epigrammatists who deserve some further attention. These epigrammatists I propose to call "types"[1] for they favoured certain distinct themes and emphasized them with such

care and enthusiasm that they became typical representatives or perhaps progenitors of the Alexandrian epigram on the themes in question.

The first to begin with is Poseidippus and after him Hedylus. These epigrammatists have a special importance for the study of the Alexandrian epigram; for being Asclepiades' comrades or pupils, they introduced to it the erotic and sympotic themes in the Asclepiadean manner,[2] an offspring of the Ionic elegy with its light topics of love and wine. Apart from that they originated the mocking epigrams, deriding some of the odd characters such as heavy drinkers and gluttons, whom they met in society or more precisely in banquets.

A. Posiedippus.

Of Poseidippus' life some few informations could be mentioned. According to a fortunate discovery of an inscription,[3] he is from Pella, the Macedonian metropolis and achieved so remarkable a reputation by the year 280 B.C. that the Aetolians publicly honoured him. This may be due to the fact that he composed some votive epigrams exalting their victory over the Gauls.[4] These are the bare facts about the poet's life. He might have studied philosophy in Athens in his youth under Zeno, the founder of the Stoic school. This can be

inferred from two epigrams in which he repeatedly boasts of his philosophical knowledge.[5] A third sympotic epigram in which he lightly pokes fun at Zeno and his successor Cleanthes may lead to the assumption that he was a pupil of the first and a follower of the other. He must have travelled a lot in the Mediterranian, and spent some time in Samos or Cos. His dependance on Asclepiades among other things to which I shall refer soon[6] and the similarity between the two poets' themes testifies[7] the fact that they moved in the same society. Among the places which he visited or inhabited (we do not know how long) is Alexandria itself. This is proved by some epigrams which reached us from other sources than the MS Palatinus. Thus in one epigram he commemorated and described the light-house, Pharos, erected in 282-281 B.C. on the island of Pharos.[8] In two epigrams he paid homage to King Ptolemy II Philadelphus' wife, Arsinoë II celebrating her shrine erected at Cape Zephyrium between Alexandria and Canopus.[9] We do not know when he was born nor when he died. Paulus Schott thinks without giving any proof that he lived from about 300 to 255 B.C.[10] Professor Wilamowitz gives 280 B.C. as his floruit. This is all about Poseidippus life. The information is meagre and generally

conjectural. This is the case with many minor epigrammatists of whom we know absolutely nothing from external sources nor even from internal evidence which is deplorably missing.

As a poet, Poseidippus is generally known as epigrammatist[11] but he might also have written epic poetry.[12] His epigrams which are all literary were collected in a collection called Σωρός or the Heap. This collection is considered by Reitzenstein as the earliest of which we have any record. We got to know it from one source: A scholiast's note on Iliad, XI, 101 reads as follows:- μὴ ἐμφέρεσθαι δὲ φησιν ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος νῦν ἐν τοῖς Ποσειδίππου ἐπιγράμμασι τὸν Βήρισον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ Σωρῷ εὑρεῖν. This statement, as it is, is a mine of information, but at the same time it gives an ample opportunity for deductions and even conjectures. Thus in the first place the mention of the Berisos poem[13] which was not included among the epigrams of Poseidippus and which belonged once to the Σωρός makes it clear that our poet published two different collections: firstly the Σωρός and secondly a collection without title or with one which we do not know. The second, it is understood, must have been a kind of revised or standard edition in which the poet corrected or omitted

some epigrams which were found in the so-called Σωρός. Secondly this same passage gives the notion that the Σωρός is Poseidippus' own collection. Concerning this title which means 'Heap' or 'Quantity', there is no clue to why it is so called and an attempt to give an explanation to it is based not on facts but on surmise and conjectures. If so I have to give myself that liberty which the scholars took before me and to discuss their views. The nearest explanation of this title is that the book or collection must have included so many epigrams dealing with a multitude of themes. In Reitzenstein's opinion this Σωρός included the epigrams of Poseidippus, Hedylus together with those of Asclepiades their master and model in at least in the erotic and sympotic epigrams. In this he is the only scholar who holds this much disputed view[14]. Here the title rises from the collection of the joint epigrams of the three poets. Schott who followed Reitzenstein referred to this: 'addo in ipso nomine "Σωρός" aliquid incompositi inesse; carmina igitur aut non eiusdem generis aut non eiusdem auctoris esse videntur'[15]. Reitzenstein's hypothesis is based on some forced deductions which are not to be easily or readily accepted: The similarity existing in the three poets' epigrams,

especially between Asclepiades and Posiedippus, in the treatment of the same themes and even in the choice of the same name for some of their characters of which he gives some examples;[16] the confusion which is obvious in both the Palatine and the Planudean MSS, in attributing one epigram either to the one or the other;[17] the position of the epigrams of the three poets which generally follow in successive series;[18] the way in which their names were mentioned by Meleager and his criticism of their epigrams as wild flowers growing in the field and sown by the hands of no gardener;[19] all these are the basic factors which led Reitzenstein to the supposition that the epigrams of the three poets appeared in one edition - the Σωρός[20] without the authors' names. As far as this conclusion is concerned, I cannot agree with him.[21] The similarity, if it means anything, only points out that the three poets knew and possibly met[22] each other and that both Poseidippus and Hedylus imitated and paraphrased Asclepiades' epigrams; but such imitation or dependence on Asclepiades cannot in any way justify any assumption of a joint edition. This becomes clear if we remember that Callimachus imitated Asclepiades, as we have already seen, and did so at any rate as much as Hedylus did. Thus imitation and

paraphrase of Asclepiades is not to be taken as evidence at all. Again the confusion or rather the uncertainty of Meleager in assigning an epigram to either Asclepiades or to anyone of the two is not so convincing a proof for establishing this conjecture about him; for if the

was actually edited by the poets themselves it would naturally contain their names. Had the treatment of different or of similar themes, been by the two or the three poets in the way of competition with one another, this would not have happened without the mention of their authors' names; for they would have not wished to have these omitted. Moreover it is not wise to follow Reitzenstein and think that Meleager availed himself of this collection by adding to the different epigrams lemmata based on their position and their style.[23] It is unbelievable that the task of assigning the epigrams to their supposed authors could be achieved on a merely stylistic basis, for the same epigrammatist can write in either plain style or elevated. Again the imitator can put on the guise of his model very successfully especially in short pieces. It is important in this connection to notice that the Palatine Anthology did not include many of both Poseidippus' and Hedylus' epigrams, and had these escaped the notice of Athenaeus, we would have

missed much. The fact that Athenaeus, who lived long after Meleager, mentioned these epigrams proves that both Athenaeus and Meleager used different editions in this way: Athenaeus either used two different editions of both Poseidippus and Hedylus or quoted from some works which dealt with drinkers and gourmands who played a great part in his work, the Deipnosophistai; Meleager on the other hand in all probability used a kind of Anthology selected from private collections belonging to the three poets by a certain later compiler prior to himself. This compiler or anthologist, (as is clear from the alternative attributions in the case of a number of epigrams) must have been careless or unqualified for this kind of thing. Such conjectural argument is reinforced by the successive series of epigrams belonging to Asclepiades and to one or other of his colleagues and also by Meleager's way of mentioning the three poets beside each other.

This argument, although it lacks exact material evidences, leads me to the conclusion that the Σωρός is exclusively the first private collection of Poseidippus, that he published another collection or more than one, and that both Asclepiades and Hedylus edited likewise private collections; furthermore that an anthology from

the three poets' collections was made some time before Meleager's time.

To come at last to Poseidippus' epigrams, we have at most twenty-nine epigrams extant under his name, some of which are doubtful.[24] In his epigrams, he treated such themes as erotic, reflective, satiric, sympotic, descriptive and sepulchral. These extant epigrams as a whole are of an epideictic nature and their connection with inscriptional epigram cannot be felt. Even his sepulchral ones which were preserved in the Palatine Anthology (A.P. VII, 267 and 170 attributed either to Poseidippus, or Callimachus and the attribution of which to Poseidippus is rejected by P. Schott and to both by Stadtmüller) have nothing of the requirements of a real epitaph. Again the fact that there are no dedicatory epigrams, real or even epideictic, throws a certain light on the nature of Poseidippus' epigram and on the school to which he belongs, a school headed by Asclepiades.[25] Although Asclepiades, the first and most gifted representative of the Ionic school could not, because of my chronological views, be considered by me as an Alexandrian epigrammatist, nevertheless as an immediate precursor, his special position is evident as the pattern not only of Poseidippus and Hedylus alike

in their two particular themes, the erotic and sympotic, but also of amatory and sympotic epigrammatists such as Callimachus, Rhianus, Dioscorides and Meleager. Their imitations in these genres are, in a way, the introduction of Asclepiades' characteristic epigrammatic art into the Alexandrian epigram. I am not concerned with him here because of his art in general, but because Poseidippus and Hedylus could not be fully understood without a passing remark on the innovations executed at the hand of that inspirer of the poetry of love. Epigram with Asclepiades is the chief vehicle of love and its forbidden joys, the cheerful enjoyment of reckless life, naked sensuality, the glorification of the victorious power of physical beauty, sensual experiences and feverish longings. His epigrams have a world of their own, a world where the gospel of Hedone dominates. Its people are flute-players, dancers and similar ladies of the demi-monde who have never failed in their effect upon the sensuality of man. Boys' love plays a great part in the epigrams of Asclepiades either about himself or his comrades who, not free from the servitude of sensuality, used to pay homage to love and sexual intercourse. This world, though it seems to go easy, has its own tensions. The courtesans and the prostitute-

boys have, as it is to be expected, no thought of faithfulness and so the lovers were used to complain of their too accomodating beloved ones and also to threaten them for their inconstancy. The god of love, Eros, was always invoked for help, but he was also approached with some playful threats. Again it is through Asclepiades that this ancient cosmogonic deity lost his dignity. He is generally shown as a playful pretty child, a little winged archer, capricious, mischievous and delighting in shooting not only helpless creatures but gods as well. These erotic themes with their varied subjects are by far Asclepiades' favourites.[26] Such themes are, as far as the authentic amatory epigrams incorporated in the Palatine Anthology are concerned, have no epigrammatic analogy belonging to the classical times. As an epigrammatist of love it is difficult to say that Asclepiades is the first. Tradition speaks of Plato. Whatever be the recent views concerning the doubtful authenticity of his epigrams, some of them are generally accepted as his.[27] Although we have to be cautious in assigning any epigram to him, Plato is the first erotic epigrammatist of distinction, but concerning his influence on the Alexandrian epigram he had practically none. The contents or rather the nature of

the erotic epigram in this period which generally offers an experience or thought clothed in playful or lustful expressions speak against this. It has however the closest relations with the epigrams of Asclepiades, the originator of the trifling and unabashed erotic song. He is then exclusively the father of the Alexandrian erotic epigram and the pattern and inspirer of erotic epigrammatists in this period and long after its eclipse.

Asclepiades' erotic themes which are an a matter of fact an intruder to the epigrammatic genre is the continuation of the same fusion of the different poetic genres especially those sung at the symposia and inscription which is vaguely traced in Plato's epigrams and clearly in Asclepiades'. This fusion was dealt with very diligently and masterfully by Professor Reizenstein.[28] The conclusions reached, which are quite convincing and confirmed by examples, prove that Asclepiades drew from and patterned his themes on the old convivial poetry - the Ionic elegy, the Anacreontic song, and the Attic scolia the concern of which is principally with wine and love.[29] Such adaptation is well summed up by Professor Gilbert Arthur Highet thus: 'Asclepiades epigrams distil the quintessence of the

love elegy and drinking song into the inscriptional form of the epigram.[30] It is in this clever adaptation that Asclepiades' importance in the development of Alexandrian epigram is manifest. Due to his versatile talent and masterful and free hand, epigram became a flexible medium of subjective expression and a vehicle for pastime recording what went on in social gatherings where lovers and revellers used to enjoy elegant leisure. His stamp which he put on the Alexandrian epigram is more enduring than that of Leonidas, although the latter is luckier in having a large number of imitators.

Originating from the Ionic elegy and Scolia sung at the symposia, drinking parties, Asclepiades' and his pupils', Poseidippus and Hedylus, erotic and sympotic (and to these the humorous epigrams of the latter together with Asclepiades' and Poseidippus' epigrams on the heroes of Greece and Troy are to be added) must have been, as Rrofessor Reitzenstein intelligently pointed out,[31] sung and recited at the symposia. Internal evidences to support such views are provided by many examples.[32] These light, sportive and trifling themes which were cherished by literary circles in Greek localities far and wide shows that luxurious way of life

which predominated in the Greek world after the conquest of Alexander and the foundation of new kingdoms everywhere. As far as these themes are concerned, they are not new in subject but they are of a different tone. There is in them that freedom in expression which was not practised before even at the hands of Euripides or Menander. In this the themes kept pace with the society formed from intermixed population with different customs and traits. The fashionable vehicle for these themes was the elegiac metre in the form of a short elegy or a literary epigram. This phenomenon can be explained by the fact that epigram absorbed the sympotic poetic types and developed in such a way that it became a game of entertainment as well as a medium for practical use. I have already suggested that such development took place at the hands of Simonides and Plato. But it is in the hands of Asclepiades that this development is most obvious. And it is through him that the Alexandrian epigram in the hands of his friends and pupils, Poseidippus, Hedylus and the sportive epigrammatists, such as Rhianus, Dioscorides, Meleager and others, achieved a far wider scope.

After this long digression which, it seems, cannot be avoided in a study of the Alexandrian epigram in

general and those of Poseidippus and Hedylus in particular, I pass now to discuss Poseidippus chief themes. The first and most important is the erotic paegnion - like epigrams. These not only exceed his epigrams on his other themes in number but also throw a sufficient light on his personality and art. In his erotic epigrams Poseidippus is, to our knowledge, the first Alexandrian example who popularized this theme which became the favourite of many epigrammatists, contemporary, and later. Poseidippus' erotic epigrams are varied in their nature. These form an epitome of the poet's concern with Love, love affairs and the joys of life. Of Love (or Loves) proper, the poet reveals the human weakness, audacity and persistence: he complains, challenges, threatens and insists on love at any price. His views on love can be grasped from his poems on Courtesans whose love, in no way spiritual, and behaviours are well illustrated. The love prevailing in these poems is, to the mind of the lover and beloved, a mere answer to sensual calling. It is a light love which is free from heart-ache, self-devotion and is in fact full of the basest tricks.

To begin with the poet's concern with Love and longing for love, I quote some examples which are

typical of the period from the beginning to the end. Here is a touching complaint of Love:

Τὸν Μουσῶν τέττιγα πόθος δήσας ἐπ' ἀκάνθαις
κομίξειν ἐθέλει, πῦρ ὑπὸ πλευρὰ βαλών.
ἡ δὲ πρὶν ἐν βίβοις πεπονημένη ἄλλ' ἀθερίξει
ψυχή, ἀνιηρῷ δαίμονι μεμφομένη. [33]

'Love, binding fast the Muses' cicada on thorns, would put it to sleep there, throwing fire under its sides. But the Soul, worn out of old among books, makes light of other pains, blaming the grievous god'. - This epigram[34] seems to be a confession which is either personal depicting the poet's own feelings towards Love from whose attacks he suffers or somebody's else whose devotion to books and learning did not save him from Love's pains. The use of πόθος instead of ἔρως may well define the kind of love which is not altogether spiritual. The metaphor formed by using cicada for the Soul and the allegory of the soul scorched by the flame of Love's torches are very interesting. The latter may be the origin of one of the favourite allegories of sculptors and painters which appeared in the paintings at Pompeii.[35] In the following epigram the poet is rather a challenger; he will avoid the god's darts by abstaining from drink:

Εὔοπλῶ, καὶ πρὸς σὲ μαχήσομαι, οὐδ' ἀπεροῦμαι
θνητὸς ἐών· σὺ δ' Ἔρως, μηκέτι μοι πρόσαγε.
ἢν με λάβῃς μεθύοντ', ἄπαγ' ἔκδοτον· ἄχρι δὲ νήφω,
τὸν παρατεξάμενον πρὸς σὲ λογισμὸν ἔχω. [36]

'I am well equipped, and will fight with you and not give up, though I am a mortal. And you, Love, approach me no more. If you find me drunk, carry me off, but as long as I drink no wine, I have reason to stand in battle array against you'. - The relation between wine and love in this epigram decides the nature of the poet's love and the sort of girl or a boy he has in mind. It is a short-lived love that is aroused on the spot by wine and aluring gestures of the courtesans - a love which is typical of the Greeks who made sensuality the basis of life. This epigram is cleverly imitated by Rufinus,[37] a Byzantine epigrammatist whose thirty-nine amatory epigrams in the Palatine Anthology are of some merit. In the third epigram the poet, most confident of his will, makes a rather firm and unconditioned threat:

Ναὶ ναὶ βάλλετ', Ἔρωτες· ἐγὼ σκοπὸς εἰς ἅμα πολλοὺς
κεῖμαι· μὴ φείσησθ', ἄφρονες· ἢν γὰρ ἐμὲ
νικήσητ', ὀνομαστοὶ ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἔσεσθε
τοξόται, ὡς μεγάλης δεσπόται ἰοδόκης. [38]

'Yea, yea, ye Loves, shoot. I alone stand a target for many a dart at once. Spare me not silly creatures; for if you conquer me, you will be famous among the immortals as archers and masters of a mighty quiver'. - Here the poet is not only defying the unavoidable assaults of Loves but asks also rather contemptuously for an immediate action against his determined soul. All this is expressed in a concise and straightforward way. This epigram moreover is one of many evidences that show Poseidippus' dependence on Asclepiades. The opening words 'Ναὶ ναὶ, βάλλετ' Ἔρωτες is taken directly from Asclepiades.[39] The plurality of Love is a direct reminiscence of Asclepiades also.[40] The subject of this epigram resembles Asclepiades' epigram to which I have already referred (A.P. XII. 166) but while Asclepiades is delicate and graceful and showing traces of the lover's weakness undisputed submission and humiliating petition, Poseidippus treats the same idea with rather aggressive and vigorous language. So 'Loves' in his eyes are no more than horrible and personal enemies. As far as love is concerned, the poetical charm which is most obvious in the pattern, is wanting in the copy. The changing attitude of the poet towards Love and love affairs showed itself manifestly in this last epigram.

After such bitter complaints, challenges and threats, we find him welcoming new pains from Aphrodite and not tired from trying love after love:

Δάκρυα καὶ κῶμοι, τί μ' ἐγείρετε, πρὶν πόδας ἆραι
ἐκ πυρός, εἰς ἑτέρην Κύπριδος ἀνθρακιήν;
λήγω δ' οὔποτ' ἔρωτος· ἀεί δέ μοι ἐξ Ἀφροδίτης
ἄλγος ὁ μὴ κάμνων καινὸν ἄγει τι πόθος. [41]

'Tears and revels, why do you incite me before I walk out of the flame into another of Cypris' fires? Never do I cease from love, and tireless desire brings me always some new pain from Aphrodite'. - This epigram shows more than others the nature of the poet's love. It is nightly amour under the compulsion of wine which is accompanied occasionally by tears and generally by revelry. Moreover it is incited by the beauty of female bosoms of the obliging girls who know how to meet the most intimate desires of men and how to snare them unceasingly by their charms, natural and artificial. This is why the poet decides not to cease, for it is something above his power.

To turn to the beloved, they are, as it seems, all courtesans. These epigrams show the poet's familiarity with all about them. The first is very interesting as it throws a light on the Hetaerae's profession and

their attitude towards their lovers who are generally no more than customers. It is a prayer by a certain Callistion to Aphrodite:

Ἄ Κύπρον, ἄ τε Κύθηρα, καὶ ἃ Μίλητον ἐποιχνεῖς,
καὶ καλὸν Συρίης ἱπποκρότου δάπεδον,
ἔλθοις ἵλαος Καλλιστιῴ, ἣ τὸν ἐραστὴν
οὐδέ ποτ' οἰκείων ὦσεν ἀπὸ προθύρων. 42

'Goddess, who haunt Cyprus, Cythera and Miletus and the fair plain of Syria that sounds with the trap of horses, come graciously to Callistion who never forced away a lover from her door'. - The goddess addressed in this epigram is Aphrodite Pandemos or more precisely Aphrodite Porne,[43] Aphrodite the Prostitute, the goddess who presides over the prostitutes' occupation and favours free love and its purchasable joys. Cythera, Cyprus and Syria are well chosen by the poet. The first two are regarded as the oldest seats of Aphrodite's cult. Syria too represents one of the localities of Semitic civilization where the worship of Aphrodite probably originated. The end of the epigram where Callistion declares that she never repulsed a lover from her doors gives the clue to the fact that she practises prostitution for a living and as far as the prices asked by the hetairae are concerned, she is not greedy

and easy to please.[44] This Callistion may have been known by Hedylus, since he used her name in one of his epigrams.[45] In the second epigram the poet touches one of the prostitutes' many falsifications. It is the disloyalty and feigned love, a rather common phenomena of the whole class and a means for keeping as many lovers as possible and extorting as much money as they can get from them. The poet is fully aware of Philaenis' untrue love:

Μή με δόκει πιθανοῖς ἀπατᾶν δάκρυσσι, Φιλαινί·
οἶδα· φιλεῖς γὰρ ὅλως οὐδένα μεῖξον ἐμοῦ,
τοῦτον ὅσον παρ' ἐμοὶ κέκλισαι χρόνον· εἰ δ' ἕτερός σε
εἶχε, φιλεῖν ἂν ἔφης μεῖξον ἐκεῖνον ἐμοῦ.[46]

'Don't think to deceive me, Philaenis, with your persuasive tears. I know; you love absolutely no one more than me, as long as you are lying beside me; but if another possesses you, you would say you loved him more than me'. - If the hetaerae behave according to a set policy, the motto of which is 'The more lovers the better', the poet through long experience, knows that what Philaenis used to say is not genuine. Thus he frankly and rather bluntly speaks to her in an aggressive way which indicates that Philaenis is to him a sort of a girl friend. This can be affirmed by an

epigram by Asclepiades, which is thought to be the model for Poseidippus:

Ἑρμιόνη πιθανῇ ποτ' ἐγὼ συνέπαιξον, ἐχούσῃ
ζωνίον ἐξ ἀνθέων ποικίλον, ὦ Παφίη,
χρύσεα γράμματ' ἔχον· διὰ δ' ἐγέγραπτο, "Φίλα με
καὶ μὴ λυποῦ, ἤν τις ἄλλη μ' ἕτερος." [47]

'I played once with captivating Hermione wearing, O Paphian Goddess, a zone of many colours with letters of gold; all around it was written, "Love me and be not vexed if another possess me'. - In the first place it seems that Poseidippus made use of this epigram, cf. 'εἰ δ' ἕτερός σε εἴχε' (ll. 3 and 4) with Asclepiades' 'ἤν τις ἄλλη μ' ἕτερος' (l.4). Secondly the theme is the same, although it is differently treated. It is in the treatment that the personality of each poet is revealed. Asclepiades' imaginative picture of the inscribed zone is set in an ironical tone but illustrates very truly the real behaviour of those who gave themselves to prostitution. By letting the warning for the lover not to be jealous come from the hetaira he accepts the situation as it should be. By so doing he achieved a pleasant jest and a serene remark on the habitual faithlessness of the courtesans which is taken as granted by those who pay them nightly visits.

Poseidippus on the other hand touches the courtesans' faithlessness more gloomily, seriously and directly. The conclusion he reached, it seems, are the result of long investigation and the früits of detection and this is why he is intolerable, less delicate and graceful than Asclepiades. In the next epigram Poseidippus gives us a particular scene of courtesans' inner life and treatment of their admirers. These may be either engaged or occasionally unwilling to entertain the idea of admitting any longing lover into their houses:

Πυθιάς, εἰ μὲν ἔχει τιν', ἀπέρχομαι· εἰ δὲ καθεύδει
ὧδε μόνη, μικρόν, πρὸς Διός, ἔσκαλέσαις.
εἰπὲ δὲ σημεῖον, μεθύων ὅτι καὶ διὰ κλωπῶν
ἦλθον, Ἔρωτι θρασεῖ χρώμενος ἡγεμόνι. [48]

'If Pythias is with anyone, I am off, but if she sleeps alone, for God's sake, call me in for a little, and say for a token that drunk and through thieves, I came possessed of venturous Love for my guide'. - Here the lover is rather impatient and possessed of no dignity or self-confidence. This means that the courtesan, for some reason or other is not quite within his reach. She may be above the ordinary standard as it seems that the poet sends her a message through her maid or the like. Here again Poseidippus touches a theme treated

by Asclepiades;[49] but the situation is a bit different in both poets since Asclepiades' beloved did not admit him to her house although he was not uninvited. And so while Asclepiades is hot-headed and vexed, Poseidippus is more calm and submissive. It is noteworthy that Asclepiades, Poseidippus and probably Hedylus used the name 'Pythias' in their epigrams. This may indicate that they either moved for a time in the same society or that the two pupils of Asclepiades made use of the names used by their master.[50] In the next epigram which is dedicatory in form, Poseidippus speaks of a nightly love-competition held between two courtesans, Plango and Philaenis in which Plango was victorious. I quote it intentionally to show how the poet took great interest in the harlots of his day:

Πορφυρέην μάστιγα, καὶ ἡνία σιγαλόεντα
πλαγγὼν εὐίππων θῆκεν ἐπὶ προθύρων,
νικήσασα κέλητι Φιλαινίδα τὴν πολύχαρμον,
ἐσπερινῶν πώλων ἄρτι φυασσομένων.
Κύπρι φίλη, σὺ δὲ τῇδε πόροις νημερτέα νίκης
δόξαν, ἀειμνήστων τήνδε τιθεῖσα χάριν.[51]

'Plango dedicated on the portals decorated with horses,[52] her purple whip and glittering reins after winning as a jockey her race with Philaenis,[53] her very ardent rival

when the horses of the evening had just begun to neigh. Dear Cyrpis, give her unerring glory for her victory, confering upon her this ever-to-be-remembered favour'. In order to draw the attention to the sexual activities of Plango and Philaenis and especially to the first of them, the poet throws himself in the arms of rhetoric by giving us an allegorical picture of a race-course where jockeys, horses, whips and reins accompanied by their attractive epithets are represented. The piece is a parody of votive epigrams where the athletes celebrate their victories in horse races.[54] Asclepiades indulged in a picture nearly like this[55] but he was more successful than Poseidippus, who naturally imitated it with some diversion. The last epigram in this series deals with a hetaira who lived long ago in Naucratis. She is the beautiful Doricha, the beloved of Charaxus, Sappho's brother. It is in a form of a sepulchral commemorative epigram of some length:

Δωρίχα, ὀστέα μέν σ' ἀπαλῆς κοσμησ' ἀπὸ δέσμα
χαίτης ἥ τε μύρων ἔκπνοος ἀμπεχόνη,
ἥ ποτε τὸν χαρίεντα περισ τέλλουσα χάραξον
σύγχρους ὀρθρινῶν ἥψαο κισσυβίων.
Σαπφῶι δὲ μένουσι φίλης ἔτι καὶ μενέουσιν
ὠδῆς αἱ λευκαὶ φθεγγόμεναι σελίδες.

οὔνομά σον μακαριστόν, ὦ Ναύκρατις ὧδε φυλάξει
ἔστ' ἂν ἴῃ Νείλου ναῦς ἔφαλος τενάγη. [56]

'Doricha, your bones are adorned with a band for your soft tresses and with the perfume-breathing shawl in which you used to wrap up the handsome Charaxus, and enjoy flesh to flesh the morning cup; yet the white speaking pages of Sappho's lovely song abides and ever will.' Blessed your name, which Naucratis thus will preserve so long as sea-going ships sail up the shallows of the Nile'. - Although Doricha is not a contemporary hetaira, this epigram has its own importance and charm. It transfers us back for some centuries and introduces to us one of the hetairae belonging to the classical period who were generally dignified and looked on with due respect.[57] Dealing with the first part of the epigram (the first two couplets), the bones adorned with the hair-band and the spice-breathing shawl have in the back-ground a woman of distinguished beauty:[58] dainty tresses and an ever inviting female bosom breathing with attractive oriental perfumes which the lover used to enjoy all night breast to breast. She must have then ensnared Charaxus who used to lavish upon her great sums of money from his trade of wine between Mytelene and Naucratis, the Greek emporium of the Egyptian Delta.

Such love was not approved by Charaxus' sister, Sappho, who denounced Doricha in her poetry for having robbed him of a lot of money.[59] In the second part, the poet pays a nice tribute to unrivalled Sappho. He holds in great reverence and appreciation the imperishable art of Sappho which, despite unfriendly allusions to Doricha, immortalized the blessed name of the courtesan of Naucratis. This is at least an epigram in which Posiedippus showed singular originality and charm in depicting a love scene and paying a friendly tribute to an outstanding poetess of the past.

Of his sympotic epigrams which are a medley of love and wine songs we have only a few, but they are still worth quoting; for they throw a light on the Alexandrian epigram and its association with the symposia. In one of his epigrams to which I have already referred,[60] we visualize Poseidippus ready for drink and enjoying the occasion of remembering those occupying his thoughts. So he drinks to three different classes, mortal and immortal, which have more or less connection with 'love': first to literary figures, Mimnermus, Antimachus (and their love-poems, the Nanno and Lyde), Hesiod and Homer. Then comes his beloved and everyone who ever chanced to love. Lastly he drinks to the divinities: the Muses,

Mnemosyne, Cypris and the Loves. In his choice, Poseidippus reveals himself as a lover of love and love-treatment, and wine to him is a means only for glorifying love. This is most obvious in the next epigram where he understands that wine is the appropriate medium for conversing of Love, the bitter-sweet:

κεκροπὶ ῥαῖνε λάγυνε πολύδροσον ἱκμάδα Βάκχου,
ῥαῖνε· δροσιζέσθω συμβολικὴ πρόποσις.
σιγάσθω Ζήνων ὁ σοφὸς κύκνος ἄ τε Κλεάνθους
μοῦσα· μέλοι δ' ἡμῖν ὁ γλυκύπικρος ἔρως. 61

'Sprinkle on us, O Attic jug, the very dewy showers of Bacchus; sprinkle it and let the merry party we have planned be refreshed. Let Zeno, the learned swan, be kept silent and Cleanthes' Muse, and let the bitter-sweet Love be a care to us'. - Here one sees a party, a member of which looks forward for the merry effect of wine which, in spite of the philosophic teaching of Zeno and Cleanthes, is excessively cherished for inspiring talks on Love, a topic which is to him preferable to the eloquence of the first and the poetic works - the Hymn to Zeus - of the other. It is worth mentioning that Poseidippus was thoughtful of Sappho once more, for γλυκύπικρος ἔρως at the end of the epigram is a reminiscence of the great poetess. 62 The next epigram is

a more typical piece for and about the symposium. It deals with a preparation for a drinking bout for four friends just before noon. The tone of the epigram is rather light, sportive and can arouse the laughter of drunk companions:

Τέσσαρες οἱ πίνοντες· ἑρωμένη ἔρχεθ' ἑκάστῳ.
ὀκτὼ γινομένοις ἓν χίον οὐχ ἱκανόν.
παιδάριον, βαδίσας πρὸς Ἀρίστιον, εἰπὲ τὸ πρῶτον
ἡμιδεὲς πέμψαι· χοῦς γὰρ ἄπεισι δύο
ἀσφαλέως· οἶμαι δ' ὅτι καὶ πλεόν· ἀλλὰ τεόχαξε·
ὥρας γὰρ πέμπτης πάντες ἀθροιζόμεθα.

'We are four drinkers and each brings his mistress; for eight companions as we are, one jar of Chian wine is not sufficient. Go, my lad, to Aristus and tell him, the first he sent was half-full; it is nearly twelve pints short certainly. I think even more. But go quickly, for we all meet at five (about 11 a.m.)' - It is extremely difficult to grasp exactly what was going on in the host's head. But it is rather improbable that he foresees that the original measure of the Chian wine jar will not be sufficient for his guests, even if they are heavy on drink. It is more likely that he draws the attraction sportively to the fact that they are champions in drink. This could be assumed from the

claim that the jar was not full due to the dishonesty of the wine merchant who cannot rob his customer of twelve pints i.e. half the quantity. This exagerated robbed quantity is in itself a proof that the poet is only joking. This joke might have been appreciated by those who knew the wine merchant, Aristus in the same way as a bar-man is ridiculed by his customers nowadays. This epigram is a companion piece to two epigrams[65] of Asclepiades which describe the preparation for a banquet. In his two epigrams Asclepiades prepares for an evening meal followed by a drinking bout.[66] So there is in them an enumeration of various delicacies. The tone of these pieces is in the nature of mime especially (A.P. V. 181) where the humourous dramatic dialogue gives it a nice effect. Again their connection with love gives them a charm which is altogether wanting in Poseidippus' poem, the tone of which is entirely materialistic.

The epigrams on the love of boys are few in number also and none of them touches practically on the experience of nightly amours with young men or boys. These, as I have already shown, deal exclusively with Love himself and the poet's complaints, challenges and threats.[67] To these two extra epigrams which are

doubtfully attributed to Poseidippus can be added. The first is rather an audacious confession of a lover whose heart is exclusively inflamed by the love of boys:

Οὔ μοι θῆλυς ἔρως ἐγκάρδιος, ἀλλά με πορσοὶ
ἄρσενες ἀσβέστῳ θῆκαν ὑπ' ἀνθρακιῇ·
πλειότερον τόδε θάλπος· ὅσον δυνατώτερος ἄρσην
θηλυτέρης, τόσσον χὠ πόθος ὀξύτερος. 68

'The love for women does not appeal to my heart, but male brands put me under unquenchable coals of fire. Greater is this heat; by as much as a man is stronger than a woman, by so much is this desire sharper'. - To my mind such liking for boys is not only personal but also harmonizes with the general attitude of the Greeks for boys who are repeatedly preferred to women. The second epigram treats of a lively description of a beautiful boy who is likened to Eros himself with his attributes repeated again and again in this period:

Εἰ καθύπερθε λάβοις χρύσεα πτερά, καὶ σευ ἀπ' ὤμων
τείνοιτ' ἀργυρέων ἰοδόκος φαρέτρη,
καὶ σταίης παρ' Ἔρωτα φίλ' ἄγλαον, οὐ μὰ τὸν Ἑρμῆν,
οὐδ' αὐτὴ Κύπρις γνώσεται ὃν τέτοκεν. 69

'If you were to carry wings above, and on your silvery shoulders were hung a quiver holding arrows, and you were to stand, dear, beside splendid Love, nay, by

Hermes; would Cypris herself know which is her son?'. - This epigram could be understood better if it is compared with two epigrams dealing with the same theme: one by Asclepiades (A.P. XII. 75) and the other by Meleager (A.P. XII. 76). The first runs as follows:

Εἰ πτερά σοι προσέκειτο, καὶ ἐν χερὶ τόξα καὶ ἰοί,
οὐκ ἂν Ἔρως ἐγράφη Κύπριδος, ἀλλὰ σύ παῖς.[70]

'If you had wings on your back and a bow and arrows in your hand, not Love but you would be described as the son of Cypris'. The second runs thus:

Εἰ μὴ τόξον Ἔρωτος, μηδὲ πτερά, μηδὲ φαρέτραν,
μηδὲ πυριβλήτους εἶχε πόθων ἀκίδας,
οὐκ, αὐτὸν τὸν πτανὸν ἐπόμνυμαι, οὔποτ' ἂν ἔγνως
ἐκ μορφᾶς τίς ἔφυ Ζωΐλος ἢ τίς Ἔρως.[71]

'If Love had neither bow, nor wings, nor quiver, nor the barbed arrows of desire striking with fire, never, I swear by the winged god himself, would be able to decide from their form which is Zoilus and which is Love'. - These epigrams are of a paramount importance; for they throw a light on the workmanship and style of these great epigrammatists of amatory epigram. To begin with Asclepiades' epigram which is undoubtedly the model for both Poseidippus and Meleager, it shows[72] its author's great affection for boys and special

interest in the god of love. How plainly and simply Asclepiades eugolized the beauty of the unnamed beloved who is, in the poet's eyes as beautiful as Eros, the most handsome boy. Such beauty is emphasized by the fact that if the beloved possesses the different arms of Eros, he will be taken for the son of Aphrodite. Such plain and direct description of the beloved and the enumeration of Eros' arms without any pompous epithets speak not only of the general simplicity of Asclepiades but also of the nature of his poem which is undoubtedly an improvisation at the symposium. The poet seems to have been thrilled by the beauty of a boy who may have been the cup bearer at the table to whom he addressed extempore on the spot. Poseidippus, on the other hand followed Asclepiades' footsteps in treating the same theme; but according to his own practice, he dealt with it at somewhat greater length and embellished the Asclepiadean picture by adding some new colours for heightening the motif. Thus the wings are golden, the god's shoulders are silvery and the quiver is full of arrows. Again in order to emphasize the similarity between the boy and the god he devised a fanciful and rather ridiculous point: the boy is the god's peer in such a way that Cypris herself will not be able

to know the genuine Eros. It is obvious that the simplicity of Asclepiades' epigram is more effective. At last Meleager treated the same motive in quite a different way based on a careful study of the two epigrams. Instead of furnishing Zoilus, his beloved, with Eros' arms, he stripped the latter from his known attributes. In this he changed the position of the two sides and treated the theme from the negative aspect.[73] Although his deviation from his model or models adds to his originality, yet the whole theme loses the spontaneity of a jolly theme and becomes dull. The metaphoric phrase 'περιβλήτους...πόθων ἀκίδας' reveals Meleager's fanciful treatment of Eros, the destructive god, who naughtily plies his arrows and torches against miserable souls and hearts.[74] I must say that Asclepiades' epigram, plain, simple, brief and direct, serves its purpose very well and that its copies for all their apparent splendour and clever thoughts are far inferior to it.

In addition to the amatory theme, Posidippus tried his hand at descriptive theme, a topical subject favoured by the Alexandrians from the very beginning of the period. The epigrams on works of art are preserved in the Planudean MS. (Book XVI of the Anthologia Graeca). One is on a statue of Cypris; the second is on the

statue of Alexander of Macedon by Lysippus and the third is on the statue of Time by Lysippus also.[75] Of these I will quote the epigram on the Statue of Cypris; for it touches on a royal personality belonging to the Ptolemaic dynasty:

Κύπριδος ἅδ' εἰκών· φέρ' ἰδώμεθα μὴ Βερενίκας
διστάζω ποτέρᾳ φῇ τις ὁμοιοτέραν.[76]

'This is the statue of Cypris. Come, let us see if it be not Berenice's. I am in doubt of which one should say it is more like'. - This epigram, it seems, is not composed for simply appreciating a piece of art. It is rather a homage paid to Berenice, who is, as the poet puts it, as beautiful as the goddess of love herself. The epigram is then a madrigal or a piece of flattery in the manner of Callimachus, his contemporary. But who is this Berenice? It is in fact difficult to identify. She may be Berenice I wife of Ptolemy Soter I, and the mother of Arsinoe II and Ptolemy II Philadelphus or Berenice II, the daughter of King Magas of Cyrene and the wife of Ptolemy III Euergetes. If the epigram is Poseidippus', it could be on either of them but if it is Asclepiades', it must have been composed on Berenice I.[77] Whoever Berenice she may be, the poet enthusiastically or slavishly exalted the beauty of the queen in a

dramatic way. His words are so expressive that one can vigilize a scene graphically and vividly depicted. First of all he draws the attention to similarity which existed between the beautiful statue of the goddess and the handsome visage of the queen. Then he expresses his doubt as to which of the two the statue actually belongs. This is the climax; for there is no better way by which the poet could flatter a queen. This picture, carefully worked out is typical of Poseidippus whenever he imitates the generally plain, simple and straightforward Asclepiades. More important than these statuary epigrams are his descriptive and commemorative poems on two famous buildings at or near Alexandria: the lighthouse on Pharos and the shrine of Arisonë at Cape Zephyrium. The epigram on the Pharos runs thus:

Ἑλλήνων σωτῆρα, Φάρου σκοπόν, ὦ ἄνα Πρωτεῦ
Σώστρατος ἔστησεν Δεξιφάνου[s] Κνίδιος.
οὐ γὰρ ἐν Αἰγύπτωι σκοπαὶ οὔρεά θ' οἷ' ἐπὶ νήσων,
ἀλλὰ χαμαὶ χηλὴ ναύλοχος ἐκτέταται.
τοῦ χάριν εὐθεῖάν τε καὶ ὄρθιον αἰθέρα τέμνων
πύργος ὅ[δ'] ἀπλάτων φαίνετ' ἀπὸ σταδίων
ἤματι παννύχιος δὲ θ[ἐ]ω[ν]σ[ὺ]ν κύματι ναύτης
ὄψεται ἐκ κορυφῆς πῦρ μέγα καιόμενον,
καὶ κεν ἐπ' αὐτὸ δράμοι Ταύρου κέρας οὐδ' ἂν ἁμάρτοι

σωτῆρος Πρωτεῦ, Ζην[ὸ]ς [ὁ] τῆδε πλεόων.[78]

'Lord Proteus, the saviour of Hellenes, Sostratus son of Dexiphanes, the Cnidian, built this watchman of Pharos. For in Egypt there is no mountain-peaks as in the islands; but low lies the break-water offering a safe anchorage. Therefore this tower, cleaving the sky straight and upright, shines in the daytime from countless stades; and the sailor who runs all night long with the waves will see a great fire blazing from its summit. And he may run even to the Bull's Horn[79] and yet not miss Zeus the saviour, O Proteus, who sails this way'. - This epigram is of paramount importance as it certifies that Poseidippus came to Alexandria and was familiar with her society and famous buildings such as this Alexandrian Pharos[80] built about 300-280 B.C. by the architect Sostratus of Cnidos[81] for the safety of sailors. In this poem, Poseidippus concerns himself only with the function and importance of the lighthouse. This together with the mention of the constructor justifies the assumption that it was written to the order of Sostratus himself, who gave the poet the necessary particulars. The dedication of the Pharos to Proteus, a minor sea-god inferior to Poseidon, is quite interesting; for according to Homer[82], the island of Pharos is the haunt

of this old and Egyptian seer who owes allegiance to Poseidon and knows the sea in all its depths. In the next he celebrates the foundation of the shrine erected by the admiral Callicrates to Arsinoë II sister and wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphus:

μέσσον ἐγὼ Φαρίης ἀκτῆς στόματος τε Κανώπου
ἐν περιφαινομένωι κύματι χῶρον ἔχω
τήνδε πολυρρήνου Λιβύης ἀνεμώδεα χηλὴν
τὴν ἀνατεινομένην εἰς ἰταλὸν ζέφυρον.
ἔνθα με Καλλικράτης ἱδρύσατο καὶ βασιλίσσης
ἱερὸν Ἀρσινόης Κύπριδος ὠνόμασεν.
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν Ζεφυρῖτιν ἀκουομένην Ἀφροδίτην
Ἑλλήνων ἁγναὶ βαίνετε θυγατέρες,
οἵ θ' ἁλὸς ἐργάται ἄνδρες· ὁ γὰρ ναύαρχος ἔτευξεν
τοὔθ' ἱερὸν παντὸς κύματος εὐλίμενον. 83

'Midway between the beach of Pharos and the mouth of Canopus, I have my place amid shining waters, this windy breakwater of Lybia rich in sheep, stretching towards the Western wind from Italy. Here Callicrates set up me and called me the temple of queen Arsinoë-Aphrodite. Chaste daughters of the Hellenes, come to her that shall be called Zephyritis Aphrodite, come men who work on the sea. Our admiral made this temple a fair harbour from all waters'. - This is one of two

epigrams[84] on the shrine of Arsinoë II, a queen, who appears to have been one of the greatest administrative women who ever lived and had all conceivable honours. In her energy, political foresight and utter unscrupulousness[85] the gods made her to match the men of her time. The title 'Zephyritis Aphrodite' refers to the place where the shrine was erected - the promontory of Zephyrium between Alexandria and the Canopic mouth of the Nile - and to two functions of the deified queen parallel to those of Aphrodite, the goddess who looks after the other sex and directs their sentiments whether high or low, decent or indecent, and who is the guardian of sea-farers.[86] In this the queen is paid the greatest homage especially because the poet meant Aphrodite Urania. This is clear from line 8. To give the epigram a dramatic effect he makes the temple speak in the first person. The poem may have been written also to the order of Callicrates himself after the queen's death about 270 B.C. From the stylistic point of view, as Reitzenstein notices, the epigram is composed in a rather gorgeous language of the true inscriptions.[87]

The last theme at which Poseidippus tried his hand is the humerous one directed against gluttons. Two epigrams are preserved by Athenaeus. The first is on a

certain Athlete, Theagenes from Thasos, who devoured a bull alone:

Καὶ περὶ συνθεσίης ἔφαγόν ποτε Μηόνιον βοῦν·
πάτρη γὰρ Βεώμην οὐκ ἂν ἔπεσχε Θάσος
Θευγένει ὅσσα φαγὼν ἔτ' ἐπήτεον· εἵνεκα τούτου
χάλκεος ἑστήκω χεῖρα προισχόμενος. 88

'And for a wager I once ate a Maeonian (Lydian) ox; for my native land Thasus could not have offered a meal to Theagenes. Whatever I ate, I used to ask for more. For this reason I stand in bronze holding forth my hand'. - This epigram touches on a well-known feature of the Greek athletes right from the classical times who, according to Athenaeus' quotations, had no moderation in regard to food and were really shocking devotees, to gluttony and voracity. 89 Theagetes then, is one of the tribe of Athletes, who was able to eat an ox in competition and was not content with anything given to him. The poet seems to deal with facts in speaking about this abnormal creature. These facts are told quite simply and plainly; but, because they are put in the mouth of the glutton himself, they have a remarkable effect. Such effect reaches its climax in the way the poet followed in interpreting the posture of the outstretched hand in Theagenes' statue as a sign of asking

for more. Here the Statue of the athlete both inspired the poet and helped him in achieving a 'point' which heightened his motif. In the second epigram the poet deals with a glutton called Phyromachos whose greediness and bad looking aroused the poet's lampooning comment:

Φυρόμαχον τὸν πάντα φαγεῖν βορόν, οἷα κορώνην
παννυχικήν, αὐτὴ ἑωγὰς ἔχει κάπετος
χλαίνης ἐν τρύχει Πελληνίδος, ἀλλὰ σὺ τούτου
καὶ χρῖε στήλην, Ἀττικέ, καὶ στεφάνου,
εἴ ποτε σοι προκύων συνεκώμασεν. ἦλθε δ' ὁμωρὰ
βλέμμας ἐκ πελίων νωδὸς ἐπισκυνίων,
ὁ τριχιδιφθερίας, μονολήκυθος· ἐκ γὰρ ἀγώνων
τῶν τότε ληναίην ἦλθ' ὑπὸ Καλλιόπην. 90

'Phyromachos, as devouring at eating everything as a sea-crow through the long night, is now contained within this ragged trench in the worn out rag of a Pellenian cloak. But anoint, Atticus, his grave-stone and crown it with a wreath, if ever that flatterer revelled with you. And he came toothless with black looks from out of black eyebrows, clad in a hairy leather smock and carrying his oil-flask himself, for after formerly contests, he came under the dominion of Calliope, the Muse of the tomb'. - In this epigram the poet ridicules another type of gluttons: the parasites or flatterers

who frequent the rich hosts' banquets. Thus this parasite who used to infest the parties with his unseemly manners and ugly and poor appearance passed to the other world in no better state than he used to be in on earth. All this is so pictorially depicted that the person looks funny. From the stylistic point of view, this epigram seems to me the most obscure and erudite.[91] From the linguistic point of view, Poseidippus shows a liking for using unusual and long compound words in the manner of Leonidas of Tarentum such as 'τριχιδιφθερίας' and 'μονολήκυθος' in line 7. Finally the humour or the jest in this epigram, if there is any, is rather grim. In addition to these Athenaeus refers, in the course of his discourse on gluttonous trumpeters, to a third one the text of which is missing. It is on a certain woman called Aglaïs, the daughter of Megacles the trumpeter of Alexandria. This woman would eat twelve pounds of meat, four pints of wheat bread and would drink a pitcher of wine (nearly three quarts).[92] These three epigrams (the first on an athlete, the second on a parasite and the third on a female trumpeter) may with some truth lead to the assumption that Poseidippus (and also Hedylus) wrote convivial and humorous epigrams on different types of gluttons belonging to different

métiers. If this is true, Lucilius, Nicarchus who lived in the time of Nero and who may have written in Alexandria itself[93] were not the originators of this particular genre but only talented successors; for under the influence of Latin Satire, these together with their contemporary Leonidas of Alexandria developed the genre and widened its scope by multiplying the types ridiculed such as the gluttons, the lazy barbers, the slow runners, the disfigured Athletes, ignorant doctors, misers etc. It is noticeable that Meleager included in his Stephanus but a very few of these mocking epigrams composed by the earlier Alexandrians as Poseidippus and Hedylus for instance. The fact that Meleager was not keen to include this kind of epigrams in his Garland can be confirmed by the preservation of some of Poseidippus' and Hedylus' epigrams in Athenaeus. Then it is highly probable that the later epigrammatists belonging to Nero's period onward imitated or were at least stimulated by the innovation of their predecessors.[94] Anyhow Professor Reitzenstein believes that the existence of such poems is proved by the imitation of the younger poets in Rome who are however superior to their models in daring and malice.[95] To return to Poseidippus' epigrams on gluttons, I whould like to

define them in accordance with my own view. Satiric they are not. Satiric epigrams whether in Greek or Latin did not in fact exist before Martial many of whose epigrams were composed in accordance with the function of Satire - a pure Roman contribution - and with the help of its many devices and methods: humour, dramatic qualities such as dialogue, irony, and pungent wit. These are generally the elements required for ridiculing the vices of degenerate persons. Although satire was Roman in origin, these elements are taken from Greek sources: Humour and dramatic elements mark the influence of Greek comedy, while irony and pungent wit are reminiscences of the Greek διατριβή[96]. Thus the Roman satire reminds me of a dish prepared by a clever cook to meet the taste of his countrymen, but that the spicy ingredients which give it the flavour are not produced at home, but imported from elsewhere. The dish however will be known after the place where it was prepared. Although these ingredients or rather the methods of which the Roman satire made use, appeared occasionally in epigrams right from the fifth century B.C., these epigrams of both the pre-Alexandrian and the Alexandrian periods should not be called after satire, satiric; for according to the ancients' conception of Satire, these

are not.[97] They are merely convivial or mocking and humorous epigrams. In other words they are 'paignia' meant for entertaining or refreshing the banqueters sitting in festive mood. But it is these jests at the banquets that contributed together with satire to the formation and development of the post-Alexandrian satiric epigram especially in the hands of Lucilius and after him Martial.[98] Poseidippus' epigram therefore cannot be called satiric. They are only paignia recited at the banquet or edited in books. Like his amatory epigram, his humorous epigrams deviate from the inscriptional form. This conforms with the practice of the Ionic School in contrast with that of the Doric School represented by Leonidas of Tarentum whose humorous epigrams are, as we have already seen, cast in the inscriptional mould. Thus as a representative of the Ionic school and as a colleague and pupil of Asclepiades, Poseidippus' epigrams, amatory and humorous, are the direct offspring of the Ionic elegy.

These are the themes of Poseidippus' epigrams: love-affairs, descriptions of gay banquets, celebration of statuary arts, topical complimentary eulogies, humorous comments on gourmands and epideictic exercises on Trojan Warriors. His amatory and sympotic epigrams

are particularly interesting for the study of pleasure-making of the Alexandrian and the companion societies of the third century especially in connection with the night life of pleasure-makers: the banquets and the banqueters among their cups of wine and the women entertaining them and playing with their hearts. These may as well accept into their houses or refuse their lovers whose interest in them shows itself only in the admiration of their bodies and in the longing for sexual relief.

In his epigrams, Poseidippus reveals himself as a whole as a master of language and style.[99] His fondness of the 'grand' epic style shows itself in the use of many Homeric words and in trying all kinds of rhetorical devices which made his epigrams more ornate than those of his master. But he is more graceful than Hedylus. His relationship with Asclepiades is not always the case of an imitator. His 'personnel' is quite noticeable in his independent way of treating themes tried by Asclepiades;for, as we have already seen, he used to deviate from his model by achieving something different. He simply takes up the theme and alters it according to his own way.

Professor Körte summed up the characteristics of

both Asclepiades and Poseidippus and the latter's workmanship in these most convincing words: 'On the whole, Poseidippus is poorer than Asclepiades in inventiveness, coarser in tone, and not so concise or apt in expression. But the robust vigour renders him attractive, and he towers head and shoulder above the imitators who were nourished for centuries on the legacy of this generation of poets'.[100] Ouvré holds him diligent and careful in his composition: 'Levis est atque venustus Asclepiades, diligens attentusque Poseidippus'.[101]

Finally as far as the themes of the Alexandrian epigram are concerned, Poseidippus contributed in widening its range and enriched it with new subjects: the topical comments, and the humorous or the convivial. And to take him all in all, Schott's final criticism is worth quoting: 'Quae si collegerimus, videbitur Poseidippus poeta fortasse non indignus, quem amemus, homo certe dignus quem diligamus'.[102]

NOTES ON CHAPTER V.

A

Poseidippus: from 1 to 102 (pp. 702-723)

1. In this study of the 'types' - Poseidippus, Hedylus and Alcaeus - I am only concerned with 'themes'. Style, language and the like will be dealt with just in passing whenever there is a need for stylistic and linguistic comments.

2. Besides Poseidippus and Hedylus, Asclepiades' influence on Alexandrian epigram could be traced in Callimachus, as we have already seen and in many others such as Rhianus, Dioscorides, Meleager and others. To the Alexandrians and the epigrammatists of both the Roman and Byzantian periods, he was the Ionic model in the same way as Leonidas was the Doric pattern.

3. Wilamowitz, op. cit, vol. I, p.148: 'Ganz in seinen Bahnen wandelt Poseidippus, von dem wir durch eine Inschrift von Thermon erfahren haben, dass er um 280 als Epigrammendichter sich die ältolische Proxenie verdient hat und aus Pella stammte[1] (1 Weinreich Herm. LIII, 437). cf also Körte, op. cit. p. 370. Schott's conjecture

about the birth-place of Poseidippus (Posidippi Epigrammata, Berlin, 1905, p.113): 'Posidippus igitur in una aut prope unam ex maris Aegaei insulis non procul a Mileto natus esse videtur' is by now antiquated and should be avoidèd.

4. Körte, op. cit. p.370. also Wilamowitz, cf. the previous note.

5. A.P. V. 134; Schott 8; Jacobs XI.

6. This will be dealt with when Poseidippus' epigrams are discussed.

7. Professor Körte (op. cit. p.371) thinks that Poseidippus' close relationship with Asclepiades must fall between 280-270 B.C. at latest; and probably it came much earlier. I think that such conjecture is hard to believe, since there is nothing in the poets' epigrams that gives a clue to the exact time at which their friendship developed.

8. Among other sources, Schott, No. 1.

9. Among other sources, Schott, Nos. 2 and 3.

10. Op. cit. p.114. The date of his death is not exact; since the epigram A.P XVI, 68 on a statue of Berenice the wife of Ptolemy III Euergetes, which the Manuscript attributes either to

Asclepiades or Poseidippus must have been written about 246, the year in which Euergetes succeeded to the throne of Egypt. Again this epigram should be assigned exclusively to Poseidippus, because he is younger than Asclepiades and more connected with Alexandria which may have not been visited by Asclepiades whose chance of flattering the Queen of Egypt is incredible. As far as the dates given by Schott are concerned, he seems to me inadequate and unconvincing. The dates given by him however should be considered as antiquated. Cf. (pp.111-113) where he refers to the education of Poseidippus by Zeno and Cleanthes, he defines the period from about 280-276 B.C. In fact Poseidippus could not have been a pupil of Cleanthes in 276 since the latter succeeded Zeno as a head of the Stoic school in 263 at which time Poseidippus should have been in Alexandria and already commemorated the erection of the Pharos.

11. Schol. Apoll. Rh. I. 1289 (cf. Susemihl, op. cit. vol. II. p.525 note 36).

12. Athenaeus (XI, 491C quotes a line from Poseidippus, Αἰσωπία (Manuscript A. Ἀσωπίαι) and quoting an

epigram on Doricha, a courtesan from Naucratis and girl friend of Sappho's brother, Charaxus, Athenaeus says that Poseidippus mentioned her often in his Αἰσωπεία (Αἰθιοπίαι Manuscr. A). According to the reading of Manuscript A, it seems that Poseidippus wrote two epics but such a question is a matter of doubt. Cf. Kaibel who says in his index, p. 656 (Susemihl, op. cit. p. 532, note 62): "unum carmen fuisse sive Αἰθιοπίδα sive Ἀσωπίδα vix mihi dubium".

13. For the explanation of this name and Poseidippus' practice of improvising poems on the Trojan heroes, see Chapter III p....

14. Pierre Waltz (op. cit. Tom. I, p.XL Note 2): Reitzenstein supposait que les vers d'Asclepiade, d'Hedylos et de Posidippe avaient été publiés ainsi, en un seul volume; mais Ouvre, Knaack et Stradtmüller ont aisément demontré l'invraisemblance de cette hypothèse.

15. Op. cit. p.108.

16. Op. cit. pp.96-97 etc.

17. Op. cit. pp.97 and 101.

18. Sternbach, Appendix Anthologia Planudea, p.81; cf. Reitzenstein, op. cit. p.100.

19. A.P. IV, 1, ll. 45-46.
ἐν δὲ Ποσειδίππου τε καὶ Ἡδύλου, ἄγρι' ἀρούρης,
Σικελιδεὼ τ' ἀνέμοις ἄνθεα φυόμενα.

20. Op. cit. p.101.

21. This will be illustrated immediately when I deal with the erotic and sympotic epigrams of both Poseidippus and Hedylus.

22. Hedylus' acquaintance with Asclepiades is attested by Athenaeus. According to the latter (VII,297a) Hedylus may be a compatriot of Asclepiades Ἡδύλος δ' ὁ Σάμιος ἢ Ἀθηναῖος '. Again in another passage (Ath. XI, 473a) Hedylus calls Asclepiades by his known nick-name Sicelidas. On the other hand Hedylus' acquaintance or friendship with Poseidippus is rather certain; for the two must have met in Alexandria. Like Poseidippus he concerns himself with Arsinoë's temple. cf. Ath. XI,497d.e. where he described the rhyton in her temple. Owing to the facilities of communication by sea in those days and the cosmopolitan spirit prevailing then as a result to Alexander's conquests, one is not far from truth to assume that these poets and many others in their period used to meet each other anywhere in their limited

world for such occasions as religious festivals, holiday-trips and the like. Cf. Theocr. Idyl.VII

23. Op. cit. p.101.

24. The number of Poseidippus' epigrams is inconsistent. According to Reitzenstein (Ep. U. Skol. p.97) they are twenty; Couat (op. cit. p.179) 22; Mackail (op. cit. p.295) 25 and Schott (op. cit.) 29. These differences arise from the inconsistency of the Palatine MS. itself together with the various views on the epigrams which have double headings, i.e. those which are attributed to either Poseidippus or some other epigrammatists, especially Asclepiades. Of these six have double titles (Poseidippus or Asclepiades: A.P. V. 194, 202, 209; XII, 77; XVI, 68. Others are VII. 170 (Poseidippus or Callimachus); IX. 259 Poseidippus or Plato, the comic poet). Even in the case of the epigrams with the title, Poseidippus (A.P.V. 134, 183, 186, 211, 213; VII, 267; XII, 45, 98, 120, 131, 168; XVI, 119, 275), there is a tendency to reject some as XVI,119 and 275 (cf. Susemihl, op. cit. vol. II. p.532, note 68). Thus Schott was right when he divided Poseidippus' epigrams into two classes: genuine and doubtful.

As far as the authenticity of the epigrams are concerned, I consider the following preserved in different sources as genuine: the two epigrams celebrating the erection of the Lighthouse at Pharos and the foundation of the shrine of Arsinoë, the wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (for their source, see note 78. pp. 719-20. The four epigrams preserved by Athenaeus: cf. VII. 318d, X, 412e, 414e and XIII, 596c. Eleven epigrams preserved in the Palatine MS.: A.P. V, 134, 183, 185, 211, 213; VII, 267; XII, 45, 98, 120, 131, 168, all of which are accepted by Schott. To these I add the following six which are considered doubtful by him and disputed by other scholars (On my views, see my apparatus criticus ad loc.): A.P.V. 202; XII, 17, 77; XVI, 68, 119 and 275. The total number will be therefore 23.

25. Among Asclepiades' epigrams there is only one dedicatory (A.P. VI. 308) and his sepulchral which are not many (VII, 11, 145, 217, 284, 500, XIII, 23 etc) are epideictic in nature. Professor Körte (op. cit. p.359) holds the same views when he says 'It is indeed very probable that Asclepiades like Callimachus, composed to order actual

inscriptions for graves and votive offerings, but among the extant poems there is none for which original inscription on stone to be assumed'.

26 The erotic epigrams of Asclepiades form the majority of his work; for we have about 31 erotic epigrams out of about 40.

27 Even Reitzenstein whose views on the collection of Platolis well known, believes (P.W. vol. VI, p.90) that the following amatory epigrams (A.P.V. 78, 79 and perhaps 80) are genuine. The first about the poet's soul that is slipping to his beloved Agathon, is full of a rather elevated pathos. The third about the throw of an apple to the beloved Xanthippe, as a symbol of love and longing is a covered obscenity and is, in my opinion, written by him or by an Alexandrian poet. The second in which the theme of the third poem is treated in a naked sensual way, reminds me of one of Asclepiades' (A.P.V. 85) most indecent and really filthy epigrams. This I cannot attribute to Plato but to a later epigrammatist who might have used Asclepiades with some originality. Moreover C. M. Bowra 'Plato's epigram on Dion's

death', (Problems in Greek Poetry, Oxford, 1953, p. 128) is not against the attribution of the epigram on Agathon (A.P.V. 78) to Plato, while A. E. Taylor (Plato, the man and his Work, p. 554) rejects it.

28. Ep. U. Skol. p. 103 ff and P.W. (vol. VI, p. 69 ff) s.v. Epigramm.

29. Cf. Asclepiades, A.P. XII. 50 with Alcaeus' frag. 41. (Bergk = 163, Edmonds' Lyra Graeca, vol. I. p. 420); Asclepiades A.P.V. 85 with Scol. 30, Bergk 4; Asclepiades, A.P. XII, 153 with Alcaeus, frag. 59 (Bergk = 86 Edmonds, op. cit. vol. I, p. 376 etc. See Reitzenstein, P.W. vol II. s.v. Asclepiades, pp. 1625-1626; Susemihl, Litt. Gesch. vol II p. 526, note 37. Here one can add Asclepiades' admiration for Antimachus (A.P. IX. 63) and also Poseidippus' for both Mimnermus and Antimachus (A.P. XII, 168).

30. Oxf. Class. Dict. s.v. Asclepiades.

31. Ep. U. Skol. pp. 91-92 et alia loca.

32. Cf. Asclepiades (A.P. XII. 135); Callimachus (A.P. XII. 134, an imitation of Asclepiades); Hedylus (A.P. V. 199) etc.

33. A.P. XII. 98: Schott, 15, Jacobs. IX.

34. Professor Reitzenstein (Ep. U. Skol, pp.92-93) thinks that it is a satirical poem on an erodite poet who is inflamed by Eros. To my mind, there is no sign of satire in it. The name of the satirized person, real or fictitious, is missing and so there is no point in considering it satirical.

35. Couat, op. cit. p.187.

36. A.P.XII. 120; Schott, 16; Jacobs II.

37. A.P.V. 93.

38. A.P.XII. 45; Schott, 14; Jacobs I.

39. A.P.XII. 166, l. 5.

40. A.P.XII. 166, l. 5, 46, l. 2 etc. The notion of a duality or plurality in Eros is known long before Asclepiades; cf. Pindar, Athen, XIII, 574; Euripides, fr. 550; Plato, Phaedrus, 266 A (See R. G. Bury, The Symposium of Plato, (Cambridge, 1932) p.31. But it is through Asclepiades and his imitators of the Alexandrian period that the impulse to multiply Eros became most noticeable. In this way Eros is given stronger emphasis to his power.

41. A.P.V. 211; Schott, 11, Jacobs VIII. In the last line I adopt the reading of Paton: 'μὴ κάμνων'

instead of that of the MS. μὴ κείνων. Paton's suggestion gives better sense.

42. A.P.XII. 131, Schott, 17, Jacobs III.

43. There are many temple prostitution of Aphrodite Porne in many places. There is one in Abydos (Ath. xiii, 572e); one in Cyprus, (Herodotus, i, 199); one in Corinth (Ath. xiii, 573c; Strabo, viii, 378) etc.

44. There are some indications about the prices asked by the prostitutes in the Anthology by later epigrammatists. (cf. A.P.V. 109 by Antipater of Thessalonica, 125, by Bassus). The first epigram gives a standard price, a drachma and the second two obols. These prices are so low, that it is more reasonable to regard these epigrams as mere trifles.

45. Cf. Athen. XI, 486b.

46. A.P.V. 186; Schott, 10; Jacobs IV.

47. A.P.V. 158.

48. A.P.V.213; Schott, 12; Jacobs, V.

49. A.P.V. 164.

50. Asclepiades (A.P.V. 164); Poseidippus (A.P.V. 212) and Hedylus (A.P.V. 159). The last epigram is attributed to Simonides in the Palatine MS.

Such attribution is absolutely wrong and rejected by all. It can be attributed to either Hedylus or Asclepiades, since the name Pythias occurs in A.P.V.164 composed by Asclepiades and the name Boidion (a name of a flute-player occurs in A.P. V. 161) which is either attributed to Hedylus or Asclepiades.

51. A.P.V. 202; Schott, 25 Dubious; not in Jacobs'. The tradition is uncertain about the author who is either Poseiduppus or Asclepiades. Reitzenstein (Ep. U. Skol. pp.96-97) is inclined, for linguistic and stylistic features, to attribute it to Poseidippus. I quite agree with him on this point. It is also more reasonable to think that Asclepiades' A.P.V. 203 was a kind of a model to Poseidippus' epigram than to take it as a repeat of the rhetorical picture of horse-riding.

52. Plango, as a celebrated courtesan from Miletus who was of extraordinary beauty and of many tricks, is mentioned by Athenaeus: XIII, 558b; 567e and 594b.

53. Paton's translation of '

' by 'on the portals of the equestrian god' is not convincing. Hecker's interpretation

on the other hand (quoted in Waltz, op. cit. vol. II, p.91, note 5) is more reasonable. To his mind these portals belong to the temple at Zephyrium of Arsinoë the wife of Ptolemy II Philadelphus who was deified after her death under the name of Aphrodite-Arsinoë (cf. Callimachus, ep. 5 = Athen, VII. 318. B.C. and Poseidippus, id. loc. 318D) and might have been decorated by sculptural images of horses or heads of horses. If so these courtesans were exercising their profession at Alexandria itself.

54. A.P. VI, 135, 246 etc.

55. A.P. V. 203.

56. Athen. XIII, 596, c and d; Schott 6; Jacobs XX.

57. In practice the ἑταίρα , a female companion was to be distinguished from πόρνη , a harlot; but in the Alexandrian period and later times, the barrier between the two representatives of the two different classes was gradually broken and as a result of this 'ἑταίρα ' was used for both.

58. Cf. Athen. XIII, 596 b and c.

59. Ath. XIII, 596, b and c. We possess two poems of Sappho on a papyrus, unfortunately not well preserved, which refer to this incident and Sappho's

indignation. Cf. P.L.G. 4, frag. 138; Diehl. fragg. 25, 26; Edmonds, Lyra Graeca, vol. I, pp. 204-206. and Oxyrh. Pap. i. 10ff., X.20.ff.

60. A.P.XII. 168; Schott., 18; Jacobs X.

61. A.P.V. 134; Schott, 8; Jacobs XI.

62. Heph. 46 [π. Αἰολικοῦ ἔπους cf. Edmonds, Lyra Graeca, vol. I. No. 81, p.238.

63. A.P.V. 183; Schott. 9; Jacobs, XII.

64. We do not know the capacity of the Chian jar in question; but it must be about 24 English pints. This is assumed from the epigram itself; for the poet says that the jar is half-full because it is δύο χοῦς short. As the χοῦς equals a Roman congius and the latter equals 6 English pints, this brings half the jar to 12 pints and the whole jar to 24 pints. This amount of wine, either pure or diluted with water (1 wine to 3 water according to the Greek practice) is quite sufficient for the eight companions and even more than they really need.

65. A.P.V. 181 and 185.

66. Among other things, the poet orders wine (A.P.V. 181) and six rose-wreaths (A.P.V. 185).

67. Cf. A.P.XII, 98, 45 and 120.

68. A.P.XII. 17 ἄδηλον ; Schott, 29 Dub; not in Jacobs. Sternbach (Vatic 240 and Barbar. 123) found the Lemma Asclepiades or Poseidippus (cf. Susemihl. op. cit. p.531 and note 222 in the same work. If it is written by either of them, I take Poseidippus for the author. Its language is dry and its style shows most the nature of Poseidippus which is different from Asclepiades when the two treat one theme. If it is composed by neither of them, it has the tone of early Alexandrian epigram for it has not the reserved features of the classical epigram nor the naked sensual character of some of the Alexandrian and post-Alexandrian epigrammatists.

69. A.P.XII, 77 (Asclep. or Poseidip.); Schott, 27 Dub; Jacobs, (3), attributes to Asclepiades; Susemihl (op. cit. p.530, Note 60) is inclined to attribute it to Poseidippus on the ground that it is a copy of Asclepiades' A.P.XII, 75. Reitzenstein (Ep. U. Skol. p.96) assigns it to Poseidippus without giving any reason. As for me, I think that this epigram belongs to Poseidippus. Its style, as I will show immediately, testifies the attribution to Poseidippus

exclusively.

70. A.P.XII. 75.

71. A.P.XII. 76.

72. His love for boys is shown in his epigram on Amyntas (A.P.V. 145). There is hardly an epigram in the Palatine Manuscript which reaches the strong sentiment felt by the poet to his beloved. It is in fact a very sentimental kind of paraclausithyron full of humiliation, complaints and tears. The poet never felt the same agony of love in any epigram written on women. Can this mean that his affection for lads is deeper than for girls?

73. See also A.P.XII, 78. The poet treats the same theme with a different and fanciful point. So the original theme became a literary exercise to Meleager.

74. Cf. A.P.XII. 80, 82 etc.

75. These are respectively as follows: Anthologia Graeca XVI, 68 under the name of either Asclepiades or Poseidippus (Schott., 22 Dub; Jacobs, attributes it to Asclepiades under No. 32), 119, Poseidippus only (Schott, 22 Dub; Jacobs, 14) and 275, Poseidippus only (Schott, 23 Dub; Jacobs 13).

Susemihl (op. cit. p.532, note 68) thinks that they are probably not genuine. I do not see why some scholars doubt about the attribution of XVI, 119 and 275 which are preserved only under the name of Poseidippus: XVI, 119, on the statue of Alexander of Macedon, is a companion piece to a poem by Asclepiades XVI, 120 preserved in the Codex under the name of either Archelaus or Asclepiades, the authorship of which was with justice assigned to Asclepiades by Reitzenstein (Ep. U. Skol. p.97). We are not wrong to say that such theme could not be treated twice by the same poet. In any way a comparison between the two epigrams asserts that each epigram was composed by a different hand. XVI. 275 has the stylistic characteristics of Poseidippus: the clever but forced thoughts prevailing in his epigrams, is most obvious.

76. A.P.XVI. 68: See the foregoing note. Although Wilamowitz (Hellenist. Dicht. vol I, p.216, Note 1) is not able to choose between Asclepiades and Poseidippus (Es trägt die Uberschrift Ἀσκληπιάδου οἱ δὲ Ποσειδίππου; keins ist glaublich) and all the modern scholars are inclined to

assign it to Asclepiades, I believe that the poem is more likely Poseidippus'. The treatment which I will discuss immediately in my comment on the epigram, is more akin to the manner prevailing in Poseidippus' epigrams. Again the fact that Poseidippus came to Alexandria which is asserted by the epigrams written on the Pharos and the shrine of Arsinoë give some weight to my suggestions. These show to a certain extent Poseidippus' interest in Egypt and the Egyptian royal family, a thing which is entirely missing in Asclepiades' extant epigrams. These are the factors which led me to such conclusion.

77. Schott (Posidippi Epigrammata, pp.96-98) who attributes the epigram to Asclepiades, believes that it refers to Berenice, wife of Ptolemy III Euergetes. Wilamowitz on the other hand (op. cit, vol I, p.216, Note 1) suggests that the poem may refer to Berenice the mistress of Ptolemy I. (.... vollends auf die alte Königin Berenike I).

78. For this epigram and the following one I used the texts of Professor D. L. Page (Greek Literary

Papyri, vol I - L.C.L - pp. 446-448); cf. also Ed. pr. Weil, Un papyrus inédit: nouveaux fragments d'Euripide et d'autres poètes grecs: Monuments Grecs publiés par l'association pour l'encouragement des études grecques en France, N.8, 1879, p.28 with Plate. See Hiller von Gaertringen, Histor, Griech, Epigr. no. 92, p.38, no. 95, p.40 and literature quoted there; Schott, Poseidippi Epigrammata no. 1, 2; Powel-Barber, New Chapters, i, 107; Reitzenstein Epigramm und Skolion, pp. 163-164; Blass. Rh. Mus. 35, 1880, 90.

79 A narrow and dangerous channel leading to the port of Alexandria. cf. Pliny, N.H. V. 31 (128).

80 According to Eusebius (Chron. ad Olymp. 124, 1) it was built in the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, but according to Suidas, at the beginning of the reign of Pyrrhus (299 B.C.) i.e., in the time of Ptolemy I Soter.

81 Strabo, 17, 1.6.

82. Od. IV. 285 ff; it is an account of Menelaus' approach to Proteus who helped him to return safely to his native land and gave him the latest news of his friends. One may refer in passing to the fact that Homer, as it is clear from this

book, was fully acquainted with Egypt and that the Greeks of his time had had an interest and some kind of contact with it.

83. Schott, 2. See note

84. The other is quoted by Athenaeus, VII, 318D. Schott, 3. Jacobs XXI.

85. Cf. C. H. Macurdy Johns (Hellenistic Queens, Hopkins, Oxf., 1932) p.130.

86. Paus. i. 1.3; and according to Rouse (op. cit. p.121, note 4), a dedication to Ἀφροδίτη Εὐπολοία has been found at the Peiraeus C I A, ii, 1206. He also states that Aphrodite appears as guardian of sea-farers in later times.

87. Ep. U. Skol. pp.163-164.

88. Athen. X. 412, e, Schott, 4, Jacobs XV. The beginning of the epigram is missing. On this epigram together with those preserved by Athenaeus, I followed the emendations suggested by different scholars accepted by Professor C. B. Gulick (Athenaeus, the Deipnosophists, Loeb edition).

89. Athen. X 412e ff.

90. Athen. X 414e; Schott, 5, Jacobs XVII.

91. The connection of Calliope with the 'tomb' is most peculiar. I confess that I was not able to find

out any mythological information which justifies the fact that this Muse - mostly associated with epic poetry - has anything to do with death, unless, of course, the epic is thought to tell of the deaths of warriors in battle.

92. X, 415 a and b.

93. Cf. Paton (The Greek Anthology, vol. IV, p.67): 'There is plenty of evidence that Nicarchus wrote in Alexandria, and I think the same may be true of Lucilius (See A.P. XI, 212)'.

93a. These are: A.P. XI, 195 and 363 by Dioscorides; 218 by Crates; 223 by Meleager and 362 by Callimachus.

94. Thus Lucilius used the theme on gluttons handed down to him by Poseidippus and Hedylus; cf. A.P. XI, 205, 206, 207 and 208. cf. also 209 by Ammianus of the second century A.D.

95. Ep. U. Skol., p.93, note 1.

96. These are not exclusively the only sources to which the Roman Satire was indebted.

97. So I do not agree with Miss Cragg (op. cit. pp. 18-19) in calling the epigrams of Demodocus of the fifth century - if they are real epigrams and from his pen - (A.P. XI, 235-238) satiric. They

are nothing else but lampoons. I am not ready, as I said before, to regard them as epigrams. They are occasional and sportive short elegies marking the competition between the different localities. The fact that they are not inscriptional in form leads me to reject them as epigrams; for the few themes that marked the evolution of epigram in the classical period, as we have seen, were connected with the inscriptional epigram or were in reality sportive display of actual inscription; cf. Simonides' humorous epigram on Timocreon of Rhodes (A.P.VII, 348) which approaches in form inscriptions of the tomb.

98. Professor Reitzenstein (op. cit. p.92) partly holds the same opinion.

99. On language and style see H. Ouvré (Quae fuerint dicendi genus ratioque metrica apud Asclepiaden, Posidippum, Hedylum, Paris, 1894) pp.38-52 and 76-86.

100. Op. cit. p.376.

101. Op. cit. p.52.

102. Op. cit. p.177.

B. HEDYLUS

Hedylus is our second 'type'. He is the third of the poets whom Meleager grouped together in the proem of his Stephanus-Asclepiades, Poseidippus and Hedylus.[103] Of his life we have only scanty and doubtful informations. According to Athenaeus - and he is the only source - he is either Samian or Athenian. His mother is Hedyle, the poetess and the composer of an epyllion entitled Scylla, the sea-monster whom Glaucus, the sea-god vainly wooed. Thus it could be said that Hedylus belongs to a family devoted to the Muses; for Hedyle's mother, Moschine, was also an Attic poetess of iambic verse.[104] It is highly probable that Hedylus visited some localities in the eastern Mediterranean basin and, like Poseidippus, came to and lived at Alexandria for some time. This is attested, among other evidences, by his epigram in which he mentions and describes a rhyton in the temple of Arsinoë at Zephyrium.[105] His friendship with Asclepiades who may have been his compatriot, is rather certain. In an epigram in which he eulogizes a certain poet, Socles by name,[106] he mentions Asclepiades by his nick-name Sicelidas.[107] He may have also formed a certain relation with Callimachus but it is not clear whether it was friendly or hostile.[108] As he was contemporary with

Asclepiades and Poseidippus, he must have known quite a number of the eminent literary figures of his own day whether at Alexandria or outside it. Of his birth day we know nothing, but there is much reason in assuming that his floruit falls in about 270 B.C. i.e. during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. This is attested by a complimentary reference to Glauce the Chian poetess[109] who belongs to the same period and is undoubtedly identical with the poetess mentioned by Theocritus.[110] The epigram on the rhyton exhibited in the temple of Arsinoe refers to the same period. Ctesibius the engineer[111] who invented it must have lived during Philadelphus' reign. This could be assumed from the contents of the epigram itself which, it is highly probable, was written to order by Ctesibius himself. It may also be a complimentary tribute from the poet to Ctesibius or a flattering homage to the royal family. If this approximate date of his floruit is right, Hedylus must have been a younger friend of Asclepiades, just as Poseidippus was and nearly of the same age of the latter or only slightly older or younger than him.

As a literary figure Hedylus is generally known as an epigrammatist. Athenaeus, the only authority, connects him with epigram, as for instance " '

τοῖς ἐπιγράμμασιν οἱ τωσὶ λεγων[112]." Moreover he seems to have tried his hand at other types. The words of Athenaeus 'Ἡδύλος δ' ὁ Σάμιος ἢ Ἀθηναῖος Μελικέρτου φησὶν ἐρασθέντα τὸν Γλαῦκον ἑαυτὸν ῥῖψαι εἰς τὴν θάλατταν[113].' may suggest that Hedylus, following the example of his mother wrote an epyllion on the sea-god Glaucos.[114] He may also or may not have written longer elegies. Strabo quotes the beginning of an elegy, but he is not sure if it is composed by Hedylus or by someone else " εἴ"θ' Ἡδύλος ἐστίν, εἴ"θ' ὅστισοῦν[115]." Thus such work remains uncertain.

Here we are only concerned with Hedylus as an epigrammatist. His extant epigrams - some are preserved in the Palatinus MS and several others are quoted by Athenaeus[116] - are quite few; but, as far as the themes are concerned, they exhibit a wide range and are of paramount importance for the study of the development of the Alexandrian epigram which became trivial in the hands of Asclepiades, Poseidippus, Hedylus and their imitators. Before discussing Hedylus' epigrammatic themes, I should like to clarify this poet's relation with Asclepiades. It is in a way that relation which exists between a teacher and his pupil. So like Poseidippus - although his dependence and imitation of Asclepiades, as his

epigrams show, are by far less noticeable than Poseidippus - he shows signs of familiarity with Asclepiades' epigrams which means that Hedylus was influenced by the great master. Thus he uses in some of his epigrams the same names used by Asclepiades, as for instance Pythias (A.P. V, 159 by Simonides and 164 Asclepiades)[117]; Niconoe = Nico (A.P. VI. 292 Hedylus and A.P. V. 150 and 164); Nicagoras (A.P. V. 199 Hedylus and A.P. XII. 135 Asclepiades); Cleophon (A.P. V. 161 Hedylus or Asclepiades and V. 153 Asclepiades)[118]. We can add to this the fact that his poem on Nicagoras (A.P. V. 199) is a continuation of Asclepiades' poem on the same person (A.P. XII. 135)[119] and that A.P. V. 159 and 161 are either attributed to Hedylus or Asclepiades. These factors are reasonably sufficient to allow us to assume that Hedylus was a personal friend of Asclepiades, that he moved with him for some time in the same society or societies and that he could be regarded as a pupil of the Samian. These however, as I believe, could not be taken as an evidence that Hedylus' epigrams were included in the Σωρός[120] as Professor Reitzenstein suggests. The truth is that the Σωρός is a personal collection of Poseidippus and that Asclepiades and Hedylus had their own collections with or without titles[121].

We pass now to discuss the themes of his epigrams.

In his choice of his themes and in the way in which he treats them he is fairly different from Asclepiades or even Poseidippus. Thus in the light of his extant epigrams - and these being scanty, may be misleading - Hedylus reveals himself as a minor imitator of Asclepiades. Compared with Poseidippus and even with later epigrammatists like Meleager, Philodemus, Marcus Argentarius and others, Hedylus is so mild that he could be regarded as an independent type with quite a new range and field and it is in this that I regard him an originator and contributor to the Alexandrian epigrammatic genre. This becomes obvious in an attempt to illustrate his themes. These could be cassified into three main groups: (i) jokes sometimes bitter, frigid and coarse against courtesans, drunkards and gourmands of both sexes; (ii) glorification of wine and (iii) occasional topics. Hedylus' epigrams - and none of them belongs to inscriptions, sepulchral or dedicatory, which, although not much, tried by Asclepiades and Poseidippus - are repeatedly called by Athenaeus [122] ἐπιγράμματα and included in Meleager's Stephanus together with those of his colleagues. To call the poems with such themes, especially the convivial and the derisory, which are anything else but παίγνια, epigrams is very important; for it discloses the nature of

the Alexandrian epigram and the tendencies and practice of the early epigrammatists of this period in whose hands epigram became almost sportive and trifling in the manner of the παίγνιον. This connection between epigram and παίγνιον is confirmed by Hedylus himself. On two occasions he refers to the nature of both his verses and those of Asclepiades thus: "παῖξε, Ἡδύλε"[123] and ".....ἀλλὰ πάρ' οἶνον/ Σικελίδεω παίξειπολὺ μελιχρότερον."[124]. Such definition affirms that the masters of the Ionic school and their imitators understood and practised epigram on a new line which is Alexandrian in spirit. It is not now disputed that Hedylus' epigrams, the majority of which are either convivial or derisive, were recited at the symposia where sportive verses on wine, a reminiscence of the sympotic ἐλεγεῖα, and the sportive squibs on peculiar individuals in the manner of the old and middle comedy, add to the merriment of the light-hearted banqueters under the spell or ecstacy of Bacchus.

To deal with his themes, I will begin with the epigrams of mockery. Some of these are directed against Courtesans. Here Hedylus shows his own interest which is quite different from that of his colleagues; for unlike them, none of his epigrams speaks of personal

experiences, there is no complaint of the courtesans' infidelity and inconstancy, there is no invocation for help to Eros nor Aphrodite (Cypris), and finally he shows no interest in the naughty god of Love nor of his burning darts and his tyranical power over the hearts of mortals and immortals. He only contended himself with scrawling some subtle hints about their practice and inner career. In this he plays the role of a humorous reporter of Punch for instance. Thus in two epigrams he refers to them as gold-diggers. The first one is on Boidion and Pythias, who, on retiring from their calling, dedicated their zones and pictures to Cypris:

Βοίδιον ἠὐλητρὶς καὶ Πυθιάς, αἵ ποτ' ἔρασταί,
σοί, Κύπρι, τὰς ζώνας τάς τε γραφὰς ἔθεσαν.
ἔμπορε καὶ φορτηγέ, τὸ σὸν βαλλάντιον οἶδεν
καὶ πόθεν αἱ ζῶναι καὶ πόθεν οἱ πίνακες. 125

'Boidion, the flute-girl and Pythias, who were once upon a time lovely, dedicated to you, Cypris, these zones and pictures. Merchant and skipper, your purse knows whence their zones and whence their pictures.' - This epigram touches on an important point of the night-life-girls, their profession and the profits they gain from practising it. As for these girls, they must have acquired a lot; for they, as the epigram suggests, used

to carry their job in one of the harbours frequented by seamen who eventually squander their money wastefully on them. This poem is somewhat dedicatory in form, yet it is far from being so. It is only used as a device for achieving his aim of forming his ridicule with two edges: the grabbing nature of the prostitutes and the sheer foolishness of the seamen. Finally two witty expressions in the epigram are worthy of pointing out: 'αἰ ποτ' ἐραστάι' and 'τὸ σὸν βαλλάντιον οἴδεν.' They are really subtle and witty. The general tone and spirit of the epigram reminds me of Martial's nugae and ineptiae. The second epigram, in which Hedylus derides also the courtesans' covetous avarice is most expressive and elaborate: Euphro, Thais and Boidion were to the seamen worse than shipwreck:

Εὐφρὼ καὶ Θαὶς καὶ Βοίδιον, αἱ Διομήδους
γραῖαι, ναυκλήρων ἑλκάδες εἰκόσοροι,
Ἄγιν καὶ Κλεοφῶντα καὶ Ἀντάγορην, ἕν' ἑκάστη,
γυμνούς, ναυηγῶν ἥσσονας, ἐξέβαλον.
ἀλλὰ σὺν αὐταῖς νῆσοι τὰ λῃστρικὰ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης
φεύγετε· Σειρήνων δ' ἐστὶ γαῖα θεώτερα.[126] [127]

'Euphro, Thais and Boidion, the old women (or the Graiae), the twenty-oared trading vessels of ship-captains, have thrown ashore, one each, naked and worse off than shipwrecked sailors, Agis, Cleophon and Antagoras. But

fly, you and your ships, from Aphrodite's pirate-vessels; they are worse foes than the Sirens.' - This epigram in its tiny cadre gives an interesting and complete story with a plot and a lesson. It tells how three unlucky seamen whom three old avaricious whores turned out of their doors after having robbed of their belongings and even their clothes and left in a state much worse than that of a shipwreck. The alligorical maritime picture in which the epigram is cast, although rhetorical in essence and elaborate in tone, yet harmonizes with the particular trade of the victims and the metaphorical phrase 'τὰ λῃστρικὰ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης[128] who must have carried their profession in a harbour like that of Alexandria, samos or Corinthus. Again the metaphor τὰ λῃστρικὰ, pirate-vessels, expresses vividly the idea of these prostitutes' avarice. So also the concluding words "Σειρήνων αἴδε γὰρ ἐχθρότεραι" which form the climactic point of the epigram reveal graphically their crafty way of attracting their unlucky customers. Fimally the use of mythological figures, as a means for effect, is almost a common feature of the epigrammatists of this period. The third epigram is of a different type marked by some obscenity. Here the poet subtly hints to an illicit sexual relation between

a certain Nicagoras and Aglaonicé, the hetaira:

Οἶνος καὶ προπόσεις κατεκοίμισαν Ἀγλαονίκην
αἱ δόλιαι, καὶ ἔρως ἡδὺς ὁ Νικαγόρεω,
ἧς πάρα Κύπριδι ταῦτα μύροις ἔτι πάντα μυδῶντα
κεῖνται, παρθενίων ὑγρὰ λάφυρα πόθων,
σάνδαλα, καὶ μαλακαί, μαστῶν ἐνδύματα, μίτραι,
ὕπνου καὶ σκυλμῶν τῶν τότε μαρτύρια. [129]

'Wine and treacherous drinks and sweet love of Nicagoras lulled Aglaonice' to sleep; and here are dedicated to Cypris these wet spoils of her maiden love still all dripping with perfume, her sandals and her soft breast-band, witnesses of her sleep and the violence taking place then.' - Under the disguise of dedicatory inscription the poet passes an allusive remark on Nicagoras who may be the same person referred to by Asclepiades in a witty epigram.[130] Here Hedylus gives us a hinting note of another intimate scene laying in the background which could be easily understood from the contents of the epigram. I feel I must refrain from mentioning other particulars; but as far as the humorous nature of the poem is concerned, I believe that the poet succeeded in ridiculing Nicagoras in a rather open but subtle way.

We pass now to deal with the epigrams ridiculing drunkards and gourmands. It is highly probable that

such a theme is a speciality of Hedylus and that he wrote more epigrams on them especially on gluttons than Poseidippus did; for although there are some few odd ones extant, yet he must have written scores of them. This is inferred from Athenaeus' words: "Ἡδύλος δ' ἐν ἐπιγράμμασιν ὀψοφάγους καταλέγων[131]." The first to begin with is an epigram on Callistion, a dipso-maniac courtesan who defeated men in a drinking competition and celebrated her victory by a dedication to Aphrodite:

ἡ διαπινομένη Καλλίστιον ἀνδράσι, θαῦμα
καὐ φευδές, νῆστις τρεῖς χόας ἐξέπιεν·
ἧς τόδε σοί, Παφίη, ξωρεῖς μύρρησι θυωθὲν
κεῖται πορφυρέης λέσβιον ἐξ ὑέλου.
ἣν σὺ σάου πάντως, ὡς καὶ πάλι τῶν ἀπ' ἐκείνης
σοὶ τοίχοι γλυκερῶν σῦλα φέρωσι πόθων.[132]

'Callistion, she who challenged men in the drinking contest - and no false marvel - drank up twelve pints (six quarts) on an empty stomach. It is her lesbion filled with the sweet smell of pure balsam and made of glittering glass, that is here dedicated to you, Paphian goddess. Would you by all means keep her, that once again your walls may carry the spoils of sweet desires originating from her." - As usual the epigram is

cast in a dedicatory mould for mere playing at random with the inscriptional form. As far as its contents are concerned, this comprises three equal parts. The first couplet deals with Callistion's excessive ability of drinking too much and her victory in a competition with men. The second mentions the nicely made vessel filled with sweet-smelling ointment dedicated to Aphrodite, the patroness of prostitutes presumably as a thanksgiving to the goddess for winning the contest. Finally in the third and last couplet the goddess is asked to keep Callistion in return for further ex-votoes acquired from her profession as a prostitute. Although however the epigram is well balanced, the concluding words for all their humorous character missed all connection with the opening of the epigram which forms its essential part. Had he substituted Bacchus for Aphrodite and ended it with a prayer lightly coined, together with a jesting hint to Callistion's dipsomania, the joke could have attained the natural climax. The joke therefore does not depend on verbal humour but on the bare striking information given. Of the epigrams on gourmands, Athenaeus preserved three, two of which are regretably incomplete. I will quote two of them. The first is on a certain Agis, a parasite and gourmand at the same time:

ἐφθὸς ὁ Κάλλιχθυς· νῦν ἔμβαλε τὴν βαλανάγραν,
ἔλθῃ μὴ πρωτεὺς Ἆγις ὁ τῶν λοπάδων·
γινέσθω ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ καὶ ὃ βούλεται, ἀλλ' ἀπόκλεισον.

ἥξει γὰρ τοιαῦτα μεταπλασθεὶς τυχὸν ὡς Ζεὺς
χρυσορόης ἐπὶ τὴν δ' Ἀκρισίου λοπάδα. [133]

The beauty-fish is done, now put the key in the lock, lest Agis, that Proteus of pans may get in. He can turn himself into water and fire and anything he likes; well lock him out... For he will shape himself into such forms and come, even as Zeus descending in a shower of gold to attack this pan of Arcisius.' - This epigram is undoubtedly entertaining. Although a line and perhaps more is missing, it still, as a piece of mockery, can rouse laughter. Here we have in Agis a parasite who can hardly be avoided owing to his ability and rare tricks in pushing himself to share others' tables. This is expressed in an attractive and graphical way. By likening him to Proteus, the well-known deity who has the power to take all manner of shapes, the poet succeeded in hitting his butt. Finally the epigram in its present text is only a ridicule of Agis the parasite but of him as a glutton there is none. Such a ridicule could have been achieved in the missing

line or lines. The kind of fish - the beauty-fish - chosen by the poet must refer to his gluttony. This fish, as it is inferred from Aristotle's words,[134] is too much for a man to eat alone. In the next epigram Hedylus reached the climax of jeering at the gluttons. Here the other sex comes under the lash and not without reason; for Cleio is worse than Agis:

ἀφοφάγει, Κλειοῖ· καταμύομεν· ἢν δὲ θελήσῃς,
ἔσθε μόνη· δραχμῆς ἐστιν ὁ γόγγρος ἅπας.
θὲς μόνον ἢ ζώνην ἢ ἐνώτιον ἤ τι τοιοῦτον
σύσσημον· τὸ δ' ὁρᾶν μαινομένου λέγομεν.
ἡμετέρη σὺ Μέδουσα· λιθούμεθα πάντες ἀπλάτου
οὐ Γοργοῦς, γόγγρου δ' αἰ μέλεοι λοπάδι.[135]

'Cleio, play the gourmand; we shut our eyes. But if you please eat by yourself. The whole conger-eel costs a drachma (English 9¾d.). Just put up a girdle or an ear-ring or some sign like that; but to look at you, we say, would be the act of a madman. For you are our Medusa; we all, miserable creatures, are turned to stone, not by the terrible Gorgon, but by the dish of conger-eel.' - In this epigram, the poet is a bit harsh and the whole poem is more of the nature of a lampoon. It is, it seems, a bitter comment on Cleio's bad or unseemly

behaviour at a party at which the poet was present. This could easily be understood from the use of the vocative case and the imperative mood. Likening her to Medusa, the well-known monster with her cruel and ugly face and her eyes that could transfer people into stone, the poet tries to give us a graphical picture of this glutton at the table. She must have devoured the conger-eel, which is presumably big and could be served to more than one guest, alone and left her neighbouring wretched companions sitting idle, looking stupefiedly at her and becoming petrified. And by a quick turn of wit, he altertly confirms that it is by the plate of conger-eel not by Medusa that they were all turned into stone. It is this unexpected ascription of the chief characteristics of Medusa to the plate that gives the epigram a happy and climactic point. Such a point, I venture to say, is a 'sting in the tail' and almost in the manner of the Roman epigram especially in the hand of Martial, the master of the pointed epigram. Again it is an outcome of a blend of Greek Comedy and rhetoric. The one wittily criticises and the other brings the jest into worked climax.

Passing now to the convivial epigrams or more strictly the sympotic, Athenaeus luckily preserved two,

the tone of which leads me to the assumption that Hedylus is naturally given to writing, drinking songs than his colleagues, Asclepiades and Poseidippus. This is then another probable speciality of Hedylus who might have wrote scores of epigrams in praise of wine and the wine-drinkers among his comrades. This view is attested by the following epigrams which I am going to quote. The first is a sincere glorification of wine to which the poet sticks because it is to him the instigator of his wits and source of his inspiration:

Πίνομεν· καὶ γάρ τι νέον, καὶ γάρ τι παρ' οἴνου
εὕρομ' ἄν λεπτὸν καὶ τι μελιχρὸν ἔπος.
ἀλλὰ κάδοις Χίου με κατάβρεχε καὶ λέγε "παῖ ξε,
'Ηδύλε." μισῶ ξῆν ἐς κενόν, οὐ μεθύων.[136]

'Let us drink, for truly, yes, truly that in my wine I shall find a theme that is new, something subtle and sweet. Well soak me in jars of Chian and say 'Write your playful verse, Hedylus.' I hate to live in vain and not being drunk.' This epigram is a real offspring of the Scolion and the sympotic ἐλεγεῖα.[137] As Alcaeus in his drinking-songs and as his colleagues Asclepiades and Poseidippus,[138] wine to him is an aid most welcome. But unlike them, he looks at it as a medium and inspirer of his light and playful epigram. Such a view asserts the

fact that epigram replaces scolion or becomes a scolion in elegiac metre and that it is the scolion that contributed to the introduction of the Alexamdrian sympotic epigram and its development. As far as the whole theme is concerned, no Greek poet since Alcaeus praised wine with such fervour and sincerity as Hedylus in this epigram. Without any affectation of any sort the theme is expressed in simple and flowing words. And without any intended exaggeration, he holds wine, as is generally admitted, to cause the flame of wit to kindle and blaze higher and help those in gay drinking mood to create the cleverest ideas. Finally the poem reveals Hedylus' familiarity with Alcaeus and some instances could be taken as reminiscences showing the influence of Alcaeus on the Alexandrian epigrammatists including Hedylus. Thus Hedylus opens his epigram with πίνωμεν as Alcaeus did.[139] Again Hedylus' .. κάδοις χίου με κατάβρεχε (1.3) may be suggested by Alcaeus' τέγγε πλεύμονας οἴνῳ.[140] The next epigram on a certain Soclês, a distinguished but unknown poet whose fondness for wine ended his life suddenly, gives the poet a chance for praising wine once more. This epigram is important due to the mentioning of Asclepiades under the nickname Sicelidas:

ἐξ ἠοῦς εἰς νύκτα καὶ ἐκ νυκτῶν πάλι Σωκλῆς
εἰς ἠῶ πίνει τετραχόοισι κάκοις,

εἶτ' ἐξαίφνης που τυχὸν οἴχεται. ἀλλὰ παρ' οἶνον
Σικελίδεω παίξει πουλὺ μελιχρότερον,
ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ πολὺ δὴ στιβαρώτερος. ὡς δ' ἐπιλάμπει
ἡ χάρις. ὥστε φίλε, καὶ γράφε καὶ μέθυε.[141]

'From daybreak till night-fall and again from the watches of the night until dawn, Soclês drinks from twelve-quart jars (about 24 pints). Then on a sudden, as chance will have it, he is gone! Yet in his wine he writes his playful verse much more sweetly than Sicelidas. And what is more, he is also much stronger. How his grace shines upon us! Therefore, dear friend, keep on writing playful verse and be given to drinking'. - This epigram is a high tribute paid admittedly to a close friend of his and probably known to Asclepiades. Otherwise, being a real soaker boozing nearly all day and night, he would not have escaped the poet's mockery. It is at the same time a lavish propaganda for wine; for in spite of the deplorable death of a friend who was only a victim of wine, the poet calls to the end for keeping on drinking instead of warning from it. Strangely enough he reveals himself more enthusiastic than Alcaeus who, although he used to drink at all times and in all circumstances,[142] warns against excessive drink.[143] Concerning

Socles' mastery over Asclepiades nothing could be said; for both the poet and his poems are covered in obscurity. The fact that Hedylus could not be so rude to his master and that Socles used to write under the spell of wine make me believe that Socles' mastery showed itself in writing more licentious epigrams expressed with unreserved and low buffoonery than those of Asclepiades. There could be no other satisfactory explanation.

The last theme is the topical or occasional. Again Athenaeus preserved two epigrams. The first is on the death of Theon, a contemporary flute-player, who seems to have acquired a high reputation as a musician:

τοῦτο Θέων ὁ μόναυλος ὑπ' ἠρίον ὁ γλυκὺς οἰκεῖ
αὐλητής, μίμων ἡ'ν θυμέλησιν χάρις.
τυφλὸς ὑπὸ γήρως εἶχεν καὶ Σκίρπαλον υἱόν,
ῥήτιον ὄντ' ἐκάλει Σκίρπαλον Εὐπαλάμου,
ᾀδων αὐτοῦ τὰ γενέθλια· τοῦτο γὰρ εἶχεν
τὴν παλαμῶν ἀρετὴν τοὔνομα σημανέων.
ηὔλει δὴ Γλαύκης μεμεθυσμένα παίγνια Μουσέων
ἢ τὸν ἐν ἀκρήτοις Βάττακλον ἡδυπότην
ἢ καὶ Κώτακλον ἢ καὶ Πάκκαλον. ἀλλὰ Θέωνα
τὸν καλαμαυλήτην εἰπατε· χαῖρε Θέων.[144]

'In this tomb dwells Theon, the single-piper, the sweet flute-player, the glory of the mimes on the stage. When

blind through old age, he had even a son, Scirpalus, whom when an infant, he called Scirpalus, son of Ready-hand, as he sung at his birthday feast; for he bore this name to point out the skill of his hands. So he played at his flute the drunken bagetelles of the Muses of Glauce or the tune of "Battalos" who delights in the drinking of unmixed wine, or of Cotalus or Pacalus. Well, of Theon, the reed-piper, say, "Farewell Theon!" ' - This epigram is a quite nice piece of commemorative elegy written on an artist. An epitaph, as the scholars call it, is certainly not; for although, the 'tomb' is mentioned, this is not all the requirements of an epitaph, inscriptional or even epidictic. It is to my mind an obituary in verse much like those written in a modern newspaper or broadcast on the wireless on the death of persons distinguished in politics, music, art or some other field of activity. Like a modern obituary, it gives a brief biographical information concerning his profession, his productions and the striking events in his life time. Thus the first couplet refers to his speciality in the single pipe and the role he used to play in mimic performances on the stage. In lines 7-9, the poet enumerates his musical masterpieces. Then he touched on some personal and family particulars in lines 3-6: Theon died as an old man, he was blind with

age and had a son not long before his death. All these points are dealt with so plainly and spontaneously that one is tempted to believe that the poet is paying a sincere tribute to a personal friend and a stage-star whose entertainments are appreciated by the poet. Finally it is worth mentioning that the poet paid in passing another tribute to the Chian poetess Glauce who is mentioned by Theocritus (Idyl. IV, l.31) as I have already said. In the next and last epigram, Hedylus, like Poseidippus, concerns himself with Egypt. It is a description of a piece of art, a rhyton, a wine-cup, in the temple of Arsinoë at Zephyrium:

Ξωροπόται, καὶ τοῦτο φιλοξεφύρου κατὰ νηὸν
τὸ ἐυτὸν εὐδίης δεῦτ' ἴδετ' Ἀρσινόης,
ὀρχηστὴν Βησᾶν Αἰγύπτιον· ὃς λιγὺν ἦχον
σαλπίξει κεροεσσοῦ πρὸς ἐύσιν οἰγομένου,
οὐ πολέμου σύνθημα, διὰ χρυσέου δὲ γέγωνεν
κώδωνος κώμου σύνθεμα καὶ θαλίης,
Νεῖλος ὅκοιον ἄνακτ' ἐμύσταις φίλον ἱεραγωγοῖς
εὗρε μέλος θείων πάτριον ἐξ ὑδάτων.
ἀλλ' εἰ κτησιβίου σοφὸν εὕρεμα τίετε τοῦτο,
δεῦτε, νέοι, νηῷ τῷδε παρ' Ἀρσινόης. 145

'Come here, you drinkers of sheer wine, look also at this rhyton in the temple of Arsinoë the Gracious, lover of the West Wind; it is in the form of the Egyptian cup,

Bessa, the dancer who trumpets a sweet sound when the spout is opened for the flowing wine - no military signal for battle but through the golden mouthpiece, there rings the signal of revelling and good cheer. It is like the traditional melody which the Lord Nile devised from the divine waters, dear to the initiates who carry for him their offerings. Well, if you will hold the skilful invention of Ctesibius in honour, come here, young men by the side of this temple "of Arsinoë." - In this epigram, the poet not only describes a wine cup but also pays a homage to the royal family and celebrates as well the clever and mechanical invention of Ctesibius, a contemporary engineer.[146] Again it is a glorification of wine and drinkers of unmixed wine. The description is rather minute, for likening to a local-made-cup, the ῥῆσσα,[147] the rhyton is broader at the lower parts and narrowed above. Such description corresponds to the present Egyptian 'Colla' an earthen war jar used for cooling water in summer. It is not the shape that appeals to the poet, but the sound which the cup produces when the wine flows from the cup-neck. This sound rings sweetly and it is a signal for revelling and mirth not for battle. Then it is likened to the sound produced by the running waters of the Nile.

As an Egyptian, I can imagine to a certain extent the kind of sound the rhyton produces when the spout is opened for the flowing wine. The 'Colla' to which I have just referred and also some similar water-vessels usually by certain devices - produce vibrating[148] and tuneful sounds. Some of them are intentionally made to produce sweet melodies. Therefore this description, although clothed in poetical expressions, is almost realistic. Likening however such sounds to that produced by the pouring forth of the Nile-water, the poet falls in a hyperbolic comparison. For the ever roaring waters of the Nile never produce an agreeable sound. The fact lying behind this comparision is that the poet only shows a nice gesture to the Egyptians, the worshippers of the Nile and to the country where he voluntarily passed a part of his life.

Our tour concerning Hedylus' epigrams is now at an end. Although these are few in number, yet I take them as specimens surviving a bigger number which were regretably lost. This view, although conjectural, is attested by the fact that Hedylus is known almost as an epigrammatist and that his themes which have very slight connection with the traditional and inscriptional epigram or none at all, are exclusively concerned with

society especially to the gay one; for apart from two occasional or topical ones, Hedylus' epigrams touches on types, i.e. individuals whose behaviour, generally poor, stirs the poet's disgust and arouses his ridicule. These types, as we have already seen, are courtesans, soakers and gourmands. These moved in the narrower society and came under the eyes of the poet who was deeply concerned with their unseemly behaviour. The fact that their foibles did not escape the poet's notice is of a paramount importance; for it points out an outstanding trait of Hedylus as a social critic endowed with much caustic wit. In his scornful and humorous comments, he carries on the same function of the comedy, ancient and contemporary, the target of which is to inveigh and gibe at individuals or types, and thus gave the epigram the ridiculing colour not known before him. Again the similarity of the tone of his epigrams in general to the later satiric epigrammatists, especially the Romans,[149] could with probability confirm his position as a forerunner and pioneer in this particular subject not without any influence on them. Anyhow two of his types, the gourmands and the parasites are the butt of both Lucilius and Martial. It may be that both Poseidippus and Hedylus participated that influence on

their successors; although it seems to me that, if they had any influence, it is Hedylus that had more, because the majority of the latter's epigrams are but witty and humorous catches. This in itself attests the assumption that Hedylus was given to the humorous theme than Poseidippus and that he wrote more than his colleague did. Again unlike Poseidippus, he did not indulge himself in the composition of amatory epigram on either women or boys and his few epigrams in the fifth Book of the Anthology have nothing to do with love-problems treated by both his colleagues. All this shows that the humorous epigram is the speciality of Hedylus and his influence therefore on later epigrammatists seems plausible or very probable.

As an epigrammatist, he shows an individual turn of mind different from that of his colleagues Asclepiades and Poseidippus; for although the tone of his epigrams is as that of his friends, yet he has his own style which is distinguished for a certain vigour of rigid himour, a cynical vein and a sharp turn of phrase. And as with the majority of the Alexandrians, his epigrams display an occasional play of learning. As far as his language is concerned, he, unlike Poseidippus, expresses himself in popular language with no intention to achieve any polished phrase.

Finally as an originator of themes and contributor to the development of the Alexandrain epigram, Hedylus - in spite of the small number of his epigrams - has his eminent place among the makers of Greek epigram.

NOTES ON CHAPTER V.
B
Hedylus, from 103- 150, pp.750-756

103. IV, ll. 45-46.

104. Athen., VII, 297, a & b.

105. Ath. XI. 497 d & e.

106. Ath. XI. 473 a & b.

107. Cf. Theocrit. VII, 40; Wilamowitz, Hellenistische Dichtung.i, 145.

108. He mentions the 'epigrams of Callimachus. Cf. Etym. Magn. s.v. "Ἀλυτάρχης" Ἡδύλος δὲ εἰς τὰ ἐπιγράμματα Καλλιμάχου διὰ δύο λ ἀνομάξει τοὺς ἀλύτας."

109. Athen. IV, 176, c.d.: an epigram on Theon, Line 7.

110. Idyl. IV, l. 31. Cf. Susemihl, op. cit., vol. II. p. 521, note 18.

111. Athen. IV. 174 e & XI, 497 e; Wilamowitz, op. cit. vol. I p. 145.

112. IV, 176. C; he uses nearly the same expression in all his quotations.

113. VII, 297a.

114. In the lines quoted by Athenaeus (VII, 297 b & c) Hedyle's Glaucus fell in love with Scylla. Hedylus, her son, on the other hand, made the sea-god fall in love with a boy - Melicertes, son of Athamas and Ino -. Although none of his extant epigrams treats of the love of boys, this epyllion

reveals the influence of Asclepiades.

115. XIV, 683.

116. The Palatine MS. attributes five epigrams to him: A.P.V. 161, 199; VI, 292; XI, 123 & 414 of these V. 161 has a double headings (Hedylus or Asclepiades). On this epigram, see my apparatus criticus ad loc. The two epigrams XI, 123 and 414 are rightly rejected by Susemihl (op. cit, vol II, p. 533, note 74 and also Radinger (PW. vol. VII, p. 2593). They are undoubtedly later production and are in the style of Nicarchus. In addition to these, A.P.V. 159 which is wrongly attributed to Simonides, could be by Hedylus' pen. See my apparatus criticus ad loc. Moreover Athenaeus, the only authority, preserves another series of seven epigrams: IV, 176 c and d (Jacobs XII), VIII, 344 f - 345a (Jacobs III), VIII, 345 a and b (Jacobs IV), XI, 47 3 a (Jacobs I), XI, 473 a and b (Jacobs II), XI, 486 b (Jacobs VII) and XI, 497 d and e (Jacobs VIII). Thus the total number amounts to 11 epigrams: four in the Anthology (V. 159, 161, 199; VI. 292) and those seven preserved by Athenaeus.

117. Almost all the modern scholars reject the attri-

bution of this epigram to Simonides. On the authority of A.P.V. 161 (Hedylus or Asclepiades) and 164 (Asclepiades) it is attributed to either Hedylus or Asclepiades. Personally I am inclined to attribute it to Hedylus; for it is not written in the subtle style of Asclepiades and is similar in tone to the epigrams in which Hedylus enveighs the courtesans. The name is also used by Poseidippus (A.P. V. 213 in imitation of Asclepiades' V. 167). This could testify that the two pupils used the same name favoured by their master. Susemihl (op. cit. vol II, p. 533, note 72) says that it could be by Hedylus.

118. The inveighing tone is that of Hedylus. Moreover the name Agis which occurs in two epigrams of Hedylus (A.P. XI, 123 and Athen. VIII, 344f - 345a) leads me to believe that it is by Hedylus not Asclepiades.

119. Reitzenstein, op. cit, p. 101; cf. Susemihl (op. cit. vol. II) p. 533, note 72.

120. Ep. U. Skol. p. 101 f. I have already discussed Professor Reitzenstein's conjectures in my account on Poseidippus. What I said there can do spontaneously here. Professor Radinger (PW. vol. VII, p. 2592) meets me halfway when he rejects

the possibility that Hedylus' epigrams were included in the Σωρός : 'Reitzenstein (Ep. U. Skol. p. 101 f) assumed that the three poets published their poems together in one collection called Σωρός, but at least for Hedylus this cannot be proved.'

121. As far as Hedylus' collection is concerned, it could be inferred from Athenaeus' quotations that it has no title or has the title Ἐπιγράμματα.

122. In his quotations of Hedylus' epigrams, Athenaeus understands epigram to be a vehicle for ridiculing drunkards and gourmands (Ath. XI. 486, b; VIII, 344 f - 345 b), convivial (XI, 473a) and an occasional poem, or a sort of obituary for a dead man (IV, 176, c.d., XI, 473 a and b) or a description of a piece of art (XI, 497 d and e). This conception conforms with many epigrams of the early masters of Alexandrian epigram like Callimachus, Leonidas, Poseidippus and others.

123. Ath. XI, 473 a, ll. 3 & 4.

124. Ath. XI, 473 a & b. ll. 3&4. V infra. p. 756, note 141.

125. A.P.V. 159. On the attribution of this epigram to Hedylus, see my apparatus criticus, note .....

126. A.P.V. 161 (not in Jacobs). This epigram (Ἡδύλου

εἰ δὲ Ἀσκληπιάδου) appears again in the Anthology after XI. 9 under the name of Σιμωνίδου who certainly did not write it. (Jacobs mentions it under the name of Simonides, LVIII). There is a resemblance between it and A.P.V. 44 (by Rufinus) which Stadtmüller (ad loc.) attributes to Asclepiades. If it is really by Asclepiades - and it could be - A.P.V. 161 which is a copy not a model could be attributed to Hedylus. This attribution is justified by many factors: A.P.V. 44 is simple while 161 is, in the style of Hedylus, elaborate. Furthermore, the name 'Cleophon' is taken from Asclepiades (cf. A.P.V. 153). Again the name 'Agis' occurs in one of Hedylus' epigrams (Athen. VIII, 344 f - 345 a). For these reasons I attribute it to Hedylus. Radinger (PW. vol VII, p. 2592) and Waltz (ad loc.) attribute it to Hedylus without giving any reason.

127 γραῖαι may refer to the Γραῖαι , the sisters of the Gorgons, who were noted for their ugliness: very old, with one eye and one tooth.

128 The connection between ships and Aphrodite (Cypris) is quite in order; for Cypris is known as the goddess of the 'Harbour'.

129. A.P. V. 199 (Jacobs, V).

130. A.P. XII. 135 imitated and excelled by Callimachus, 134.

131. VIII, 344 f.

132. Ath. XI. 486b (Jacobs. VII). In this epigram together with those preserved by Athenaeus, I followed the emendations suggested by different scholars and accepted by Professor C. B. Gulick (Athenaeus, the Deipnosophists, Loeb Edition.)

133. Athen. VIII, 344 f - 345a; (Jacobs, III).

134. Ath. VII, 282d: 'Αριστοτέλης δὲ καὶ καρχαρόδοντα εἶναι τὸν κάλλιχθυν σαρκοφάγον τε καὶ συναγελαζόμενον. Although there is no mention of the size or weight, yet it is not far from truth to assume, depending on καρχαρόδους and σαρκοφάγος, that this kind of fish is of a fairly enormous size.

135. Athen. VIII, 345 a & b (Jacobs, IV).

136. Athen. XI. 473 a (Jacobs I).

137. No. 163 (Edmonds, Lyr. Graec. vol. I, p. 421 - Bergk 41, & Hiller 44). Cf. also 73 (Bergk 86) ibid p. 376.

138. Asclepiades, A.P. XII. 50; Poseidippus, A.P. V. 134.

139. Cf. Alcaeus (Edmonds, Lyr. Graec. vol. I, p. 420)

No. 163, l. 1 with Hedylus, Ath. XI, 473a, l. 1.

140. Op. cit. p. 418, No. 161, l. 1.

141. Athen. XI. 473a and b (Jacobs II).

142. Athen. X. 430a.

143. Cf. No. 82 (Edmonds, op. cit. p. 374).

144. Athen. IV, 176c and d. (Jacobs XII).

145. Athen. XI. 497d and e. (Jacobs VIII).

146. Athen. IV. 174e; Cf. Wilamowitz, Hellenist Dichtung, i, p. 145.

147. Athen. XI, 784b: 'βῆσσά ποτηρίων παρ' Ἀλεξανδρεῦσι πλατύτερον ἐκ τῶν κάτω μερῶν, ἐστενωμένον ἄνωθεν.

148. So it is the oscillation of the fluid content in the neck of the Bessa which gives it the epithet 'the dancer'.

149. Lucilius, a Roman epigrammatist who wrote in Greek, may have taken the theme on the gourmands (Cf. A.P.XI. 205-209) from him.

150. For his style see H. Cȳré (Quae fuerint dicendi genus ratioque metrica apud Asclepiaden. Posidippum, Hedylum. Paris, 1894) p. 83 ff; for his language and dialects, see ibid p. 39 ff.

C. Alcaeus of Messene

Our third and last type is Alcaeus of Messene. As far as the Alexandrian epigrammatic themes are concerned, Alcaeus is strongly entitled to be mentioned among the outstanding makers of the Alexandrian epigram; for he did not only treat the themes handed down to him by the earliest Alexandrian epigrammatists very efficiently and successfully, but he also established himself as the originator of the invective and political epigram which no epigrammatist before him dared to attempt. It is with him that the Alexandrian epigram or the epigram in general reached the zenith of its development and of the wide range of its themes.

Of alcaeus' life, we know little or nothing. His epigrams against Philip V, King of Macedon, however, throw some faint light: he is contemporary to this King (220-179). We do not know when he was born, but it is generally assumed that his floruit falls in 200 B.C. Owing to the bad relations between Philip and Messene, his birthplace, Alcaeus seems to have been forced to exile by Philip himself and he chose Aetolia for refuge.[151] We do not know when he left for Aetolia; but it is most probable that he left Messene in either 215 or 214. In the first of these years, Philip caused an upheaval

among the parties and was responsible for the massacre of the officials and 200 of their supporters.[152] In the second, after Demetrius of Pharus, one of Philips' agents failed to invade Messene and died in the operation, Philip, in fury, wiped out the plain outside Messene and spared nothing sacred or profane. As a result of this wave of sheer violence and terrorism, Messenia's opposing parties turned from the Symmachy under the leadership of Philip to an Aetolian alliance and so Philip's position in the Peloponnese was weakened.[153] Here it appears that Alcaeus was pro-Aetolia. Anyhow it is from Aetolia that Alcaeus, expressed his patriotism in a shower of vitriolic lampoons against the ravager of his country on some occasions in the long and most tiring military career of this most ambitious King who wished to be primarily the Champion of the Hellenes and who endeavoured, when the Roman intervention in Greece began to show itself more and more, to substitute the Macedonian Imperialism for the Roman. Whether Alcaeus returned to Messene or spent all his life in Aetolia is not within our reach at all. The date of his death is uncertain too. His epigram in eulogy of Titus Flamininus who in 196 B.C. proclaimed the freedom of Greece at the Isthmian Games is the last epigram that

can be dated but it is not enough to settle this question.

Of his literary activity we have no contemporary information. But Eusebius of the third century A.D. speaks of him as a poet of abusive iambics and epigrams: Ἀλκαῖος δὲ ὁ τῶν λοιδόρων ἰάμβων καὶ ἐπιγραμμάτων ποιητής.[154] None of his iambic pasquinades are extant. Moreover, according to Reitzenstein, he is identical with the author of the polemic Συγκρίσεις, critical comparisons, in which, among others, the Grammarian Isocrates of the time of Philip V was ridiculed.[155] At last there is a tendency to identify him with the epicurian philosopher of the same name who was expelled from Rome by a decree of the Senate in B.C. 173, but this is, as Reitzenstein thinks, doubtful.[156] These are the sources of information oncerning his life and literary career. As most of them are conjectural, they do not reveal much of this most brilliant epigrammatist to whom the epigram in general and the Roman in particular, especially in the hands of Catullus, as we will see, owe much.

As an epigrammatist, Alcaeus reveals himself in his epigrams[157] as quite efficient and original poet. These epigrams treat some of his predeces ors' themes and show most clearly the early Alexandrian

characteristics and tendencies. These I put under some distinct sub-divisions: the paegnion-like epigrams recited at the banquet, commemorative elegies on the dead, topical epigrams celebrating an athlete's victory or a musician dexterity, descriptive literary exercises and finally the political epigrams on current events which took place in the poet's life-time. As I will concern myself only with his political epigrams in detail, a speciality of Alcaeus, without which the subject on the themes of the Alexandrian epigram would be incomplete, I will content myself with treating other themes only in passing. These themes were already tried more or less by Callimachus, Poseidippus and Hedylus, the early masters of the Ionic epigram with whom Alcaeus seems to have linked himself. To the paegnion-epigram[158] belong those he wrote on classical poets such as Homer and Hesiod.[159] His epigrams on Homer, although they reveal the poet's admiration of the greatest of poets, yet deal with questions of minor points in the ever obscure story of Homer's life especially the place of his birth and death, in other words they touch, in a witty way, on the tendency of those places that claimed his birth.[160] In the first Alcaeus mentions the death of Homer in Ios, the

well-known small island of the Sporades in the Aegean Sea as a result to his failure to solve the riddle given to him by the children of that island.[161] In the second, the poet is more witty.[162] It deals with the erection of a statue of Homer at Salamis in Cyprus, one of the cities which claimed his parentage.[163] In order to give effect to the denial of taking Salamis as a birth place, he put it into the mouth of Homer himself who, on his part, rejects the idea inspite of any attraction. The allusion to Chios in the eighth line confirms the best traditional claim of this island.[164] The next epigram is a nice tribute to Hesiod. In this poem Alcaeus speaks of the death of Hesiod in Locris[165] far from his birth place Ascra on the slopes of Helicon. The pastoral tone of the epigram which is quite clear, shows Alcaeus' appreciation of the author of the 'Works and Days.' Thus he was deservedly washed and buried by the Nymphs and on his tomb the goat-herds poured libations of milk mixed with golden honey.

To pass to the amatory epigrams, Alcaeus is no different[166] to his predecessors. In the first he complains of Eros. He hates him 'Ἐχθαίρω τὸν Ἔρωτα' and asks why this cruel god does not attack wild beasts instead of the shooting at his heart. In addition to

this the Palatine MS. preserves a series of three epi-[167] grams on boys. The first is a quite nice piece not inferior to those of Asclepiades. It is a song on the beauty of a certain boy, Peithenor by name, whose graceful beauty entitles him to be a second son of Cypris and matches at the same time with that of Ganymede. The invocation to Zeus is fascinating and most expressive; for he entreats the father of the gods not to become an eagle and seize the beloved for his cup-bearer. In this way the beauty of the beloved becomes a fact beyond dispute. The whole tone of the epigram is graceful, simple and typical of the period. Moreover it is one of the masterpieces of its kind. In the two other epigrams,[168] Alcaeus is a bit cynical and outspoken.[169] In the one, an epigram of one couplet, the poet speaks of a boy called Protarchus who is fair but not wishing to be so. To this strange temperament, the poet answers that the boy will wish to be fair one day when advanced age makes it impossible. There is, I believe, a certain target behind this passing remark. It is probable that the poet, as a lover of boys, reminds the beloved to realize and make use of their beauty, to enjoy love and please their lovers before it is too late. This can be understood from the next

epigram[170] in which the poet draws Nicander's attention to the fact that his leg is getting hairy. Taking this as a sign for passing over the years of youth,[171] the poet harshly tells the boy that he has already lost every prestige in the lovers' eyes. The epigram is somewhat obscene but such obscenity is not altogether missing in the amatory epigrams of this period.[172]

In addition to these literary exercises and amatory trifles, other themes can be equally referred to. Of the serious epigrams,[173] there is a commemorative epigram written on the death of Pylades of Megalopolis, the citharoedus. It is a neat and sincere tribute to this minstrel who is mourned, as the poet put it, by all Hellas. This is not all; for Pylades is also bewailed by gods and Muses. This is expressed in a rather hyperbolical, dramatic but not altogether boring way. This same minstrel once greeted Philopoemen, the general of the Achaean League, sometime after the latter's victory at Mantinea (207) over Machanidas, the Spartan general, on his arrival in the theatre at the Nemean Games of 205 by singing the opening lines from Timotheus' Persae.[174] The second is a kind of dirge in the form of a cenotaph on a certain Aspasius who met his bitter fate by the blast of Boreas and whose body was

washed by the waters of the Aegaean sea. Here, in the manner of his predecessors, the dead, whose body lies elsewhere, is speaking from an empty tomb and tells his sad story simply but effectively. It is noticeable that the poet did not forget to refer to Arcturus, the bad season for the sailors. Moreover the epigram ends in a lamentable note on those who die young especially who perish in the sea. Of his occasional or topical epigrams, there are two which celebrate a victory of an athlete and the dexterity of a musician. Both of them are Thebans.[175] In the first the poet concerns himself with the statue of Cleitomachus, the most invincible boxer and wrestler and refers to one of his famous deeds, as an athlete, at the Isthmus.[176] According to Pausanias,[177] the statue, which is a typical image of Cleitomachus, was dedicated to him by his father Hermocrates. Of his deeds at the Isthmus, this youth with sturdy spirit and unwearied vigour won the men's wrestling-match, overcame all competitors in the boxing-match and also in the pancratium. As a result of this, he, his city and his father were crowned with unquenchable glory. This epigram is more of the nature of Pindar's odes or epinicia. In fact there is hardly any theme expressed by other types of poetry which the epigrammatists did

not try within the minute frame of the epigram. The second[178] is a tribute paid to Dorotheus, the flute-player, whose art was inspired by the deathless Graces. Some of his favourite songs - naturally admired by the people - are mentioned: the mournful Trojans, the Trojan horse and Semele's death, caused by Zeus' thunderbolts, a trick devised by Hera who was jealous of her husband's association with Semele. This song must have been popular in Thebes since Semele has a cult in this city in Historical times.[179] This tribute is cast in a dedicatory form; for in the last couplet, the poet associated Dorotheus with Thebes, as his birthplace, mentioned the name of his father, named the ex-votos , the mouth-band and the reed pipes and also the god-Dionysus - to whom the offering was dedicated. Although these are the requirements needed in an inscriptional epigram, yet the whole epigram could not have been written to accompany a real offering. Another theme which Alcaeus tried is the descriptive. In a small series of three epigrams[180] the poet dealt directly and indirectly with pieces of plastic art belonging to legendary and mythological figures: Marsyas, the satyr, Eros and Pan, the gods. The poet may have been inspired by some statues or reliefs, but at the same time he was

trifling with tradition together with the characteristics of those powers. The general tone of these epigrams reveals their nature. They are only literary exercises expressing in words what a sculptor, would playfully do. The first of these probably represents a relief from a[181] Mantinean basis: Apollo and Marsyas.[182] Bearing the legend in his head, the poet began to retell it in a most dramatic way by addressing the satyr. He is a Phrygian, a proficient player on the flute devised and abandoned by Athene which he picked up and soon learned to play on it. Then he reminds him of his foolish ambition when he challenged a god, Appollo, to a contest in music, for which he suffers a lot, according to a previous agreement, by being tied tight to a tree and flayed alive. Thus the poet passes by the legend lightly but masterfully.[183] The next epigram on Eros Bound is more attractive. This again may have been inspired by a piece of art,[184] for this god, more than others, was at times cherished and at others maltreated. This is the way in which the god was always treated in Hellenistic art and poetry. What a contrast it is between Eros the attacker, furnished with his invincible arms: his swift bow, his treacherous arrows which pierce the hearts of mortals and immortals alike and Eros, the

captive stripped of all his fatal equipments. Such contrast is treated by the poet in a dramatic but amiable way in a series of questions put to the god himself: "Who impiously hunted you down and set you here in fetters? Who crossed and bound your hands, and wrought you with squaled face? Where, poor child, is your swift bow, where the bitter quiver that held your arrows?"[185] The theme, as it is expected, attracted some epigrammatists during and after the Alexandrian period.[186] The third epigram[187] deals with Pan. It is a relief-like scene in words[188] giving a beautiful pastoral picture of the goat-footed god, the lover of mountains, the patron of Shepherds and the inventor of the musical pipe of seven reeds most beloved by the shepherds.[189] The setting of the epigram covers the mythological and pastoral scene associated with the god. But the vivid direct address to god(for the poet uses the vocative case) gives the picture a paramount effect. In addressing the deity he concerned himself with three important factors: Pan, as he says, the treader of mountains, the piper that fills the wilderness with his tuneful and sweet music poured fourth from his high-pitched pipe dear to the shepherds and finally his company of the water-nymphs whose inspired feet move in the dance keeping with the

sweet-toned pipe. As far as this picture is concerned, this epigram is but an idyll of a minute bulk; the scene given is a pastoral one full of music produced by the pipe of the god of Shepherds and the protector of their flocks and the dances of the nymphs.

This quick review of Alcaeus' other themes brings us to the discussion of his political epigrams, a novel theme worthy of full treatment. These poetic and literary poems are to a certain extent precious records revealing some factors concerning the Greek Social war, Philip's V ambitions and the clash between him and Rome. The invective tone of some of these epigrams reveals the author's personal indignation and hostile attitude towards the dominating usurper, his love of freedom and his utmost patriotism. These factors, it appears are held differently by the scholars who touched the relation of Alcaeus with Philip. These I will discuss fully in the course of my comment on each epigram. I will also put these epigrams in a chronological order when it is possible, for it is not certain to date some of them. The first epigram refers to Philip's first great successes on land and sea:

Μακύνου τείχη, Ζεῦ Ὀλύμπιε πάντα Φιλίππῳ
ἄμβατά· χαλκείας κλῆε πύλας μακάρων.

χθὼν μὲν δὴ καὶ πόντος ὑπὸ σκήπτρῳσι Φιλίππου
δέδμηται· λοιπὰ δ' ἀ πρὸς Ὄλυμπον ὁδός.[190]

'Build higher your walls, Olympian Zeus; all is accessible to Philip. Shut the brazen gates of the gods. Earth and sea lie vanquished under Philip's sceptre: there remains the road to Olympus.' - In the light of 'χθὼν μὲν δὴ καὶ πόντος ὑπὸ σκήπτρῳσι Φιλίππου δέδμηται', this epigram is connected with some success on both land and sea achieved by Philip. According to authoritative historians,[191] it is connected with Philip's naval successes in 201 B.C. and his campaign against the mainland possessions of Rhodes in late summer of that year.[192] As to the nature of this poem, scholars hold opposite views.[193] To some, it is a serious flattery of Philip or a bitter recognition of the latter's successes, to others,[194] it is a piece of raillery at Philip's ambitions and his military enterprises. Although it is difficult to deduce anything definite from the epigram itself, for the language could be that of slavish flattery and could be still very ironical and bitterly hostile, yet I am inclined to agree with those who consider it against Philip. The view of Professor Walbank that Alcaeus was a supporter of Philip until 201 B.C.[195] is not congent; it robs Alcaeus

of his patriotism and makes his epigram pointless. Alcaeus in fact was never a supporter of Philip at least since the year 215 B.C. The ferocity with which Philip treated Messene in 215-214 B.C., as I have already said, Messene's anti-Macedonian attitude from 215 onwards and her alliance with Rome since 211 confirm the assumption[196] that the epigram is not a homage paid to Philip, but on the contrary a bitter recognition of his partly successes expressed in an ironical way just to reconcile the poet's hatred. Moreover the way by which Zeus is treated in this epigram may offer a clue to the nature of this poem and justify my personal views. In bidding Zeus to build high his Olympian walls and to shut the brazen gates of the gods, Alcaeus is not speaking seriously but merely trifling with the god in the manner of other epigrammatists especially those of the amatory epigrams. In so doing the irony against Philip becomes obvious. This is confirmed by the closing words of the poem where the poet states that every place lies vanquished under the sceptre of Philip except the road to Olympus. Such thing is not confirmed by historical evidences. At that time Philip did not achieve much success for he had his difficulties in the Peloponnesus and elsewhere and Aetolia before and after this date

remains always a thorn in his side. For all these reasons I take this epigram to be ironical and hostile. This is only natural if we consider Alcaeus patriotic and judge his attitude towards Philip in his lampoons. Such attitude was the same all the time form 215 B.C. onwards.[197] The next series of epigrams reveal the poet's deep-rooted hatred for Philip. The first which could be dated with certainty is connected with Philip's decisive defeat at Cynoscephalae in Thessaly, 197 B.C. at the hands of the Roman general, Titus Flamininus. It is an epideictic epitaph on the soldiers who were killed in this battle:

Ἄκλαυστοι καὶ ἄθαπτοι, ὁδοιπόρε, τῷδ' ἐπὶ νώτῳ
Θεσσαλίης τρισσαὶ κείμεθα μυριάδες,
Αἰτωλῶν δημοθέντες ὑπ' Ἄρεος ἠδὲ Λατίνων
οὓς Τίτος εὐρείης ἦγαγ' ἀπ' Ἰταλίης,
Ἡμαθίῃ μέγα πῆμα· τὸ δὲ θρασὺ κεἶνο Φιλίππου
πνεῦμα θοῶν ἐλάφων ὤχετ' ἐλαφρότερον.[198]

'Unwept, O wayfarer, and unburied, we lie on this Thessalian mound, the thirty thousand, slaughtered by Ares of the Aetolians and the Latins whom Titus led from vast Italy, a great woe to Macedonia; and nimbler than quick deer, fled the daring spirit of Philip.' - This is a real grim mocking epigram recording[199]

a paramount incident for which Alcaeus must have longed for a long time. How maliciously the poet puts the mockery into the mouths of the fallen Macedonians to whom the defeated King was not able to give burial. The poet's malice too shows itself in the exaggerated number of the slain which, according to Plutarch, is fewer than eight thousand in addition to five thousand taken prisoners.[200] It is only natural that this salient piece which was composed immediately after the battle, must have been welcomed by all the opponents of Philip. Therefore one is inclined to accept an ancient authority stating that it was recited in many placed and by many persons.[201] It is strange enough to know that this epigram gave more annoyance to Titus Flamininus than to Philip.[202] It is generally assumed, on the authority of Plutarch, that Titus' irritation was provoked by ll. 3-4,[203] which mention the Aetolian first (l.3). To my mind these lines could not have aroused Flamininus' resentment alone. Although the epigram was on the lips of everybody, yet there are other writings, poetic and prosaic which ascribe the victory to the Aetolians.[204] These could have been composed to order by the Aetolians themselves as a part of organized propaganda. This is not all; for, as is generally the case with allies after a victory the two parties, the

Aetolians and the Romans, began to work owing to their interest and a tension was hardly avoided.[205] It is clear now that Plutarch was exaggerating when he said that Alcaeus' epigram gave more annoyance to Titus than to Philip. If Titus was ever vexed, this epigram was only one among many reasons especially the behaviour of the Aetolians during the battle.[206] In fact the poem was directed against Philip to hurt his feeling and it must have done; for embittered by Alcaeus' mockery, he composed a biting epigram in return, which he parodied the first distich of the poem in question:

Ἄφλοιος καὶ ἄφυλλος, ὁδοιπόρε, τῶδ' ἐπὶ νώτῳ
Ἀλκαίῳ σταυρὸς πήγνυται ἠλίβατος.[207]

'Barkless and leafless, passer-by, on this ridge, a high cross is fixed for Alcaeus. - The parody which is a clever one, could be grasped better if the lines composed by Alcaeus (A.P. VII, 247) are brought near Philip's parodied distich and the two are rendered in verse:
Alcaeus' lines run thus:

Tombless, unwept we lie, O thou who passest by,
Full thirty thousand men on this mound in Thessaly.

The King's reotort, on the other hand reads thus:

Leafless, unbarked it stands, O thou who passest by,
The cross upon the hill, where Alcaeus shall hang high[208]

The epigram is cool and ironical retort which reveals

Philip's sense of ironical humour at its best. It also shows a side in his character to which Professor Walbank points out: 'Indeed his capacity for coolness and grim humour when luck was against him provides a remarkable contrast to the impetuosity and careless romanticism, with which he would fling himself, without proper consideration, into the most hazardous exploits ... Great personal courage and enthusiasm in whatever he undertook and a cool head to meet its failure.'[209] Thus instead of attacking and insulting openly and vehemently, the King very calmly, but perhaps not without threat, announces the fate of the poet. The next epigram is interesting for it celebrates a happy occasion dear to the heart of every Greek. It is a eulogy on Flamininus, the conqueror of Philip, after he proclaimed in the year 196 B.C.[210] the freedom of Greece:-

Ἄγαγε καὶ Ξέρξης Πέρσαν στρατὸν Ἑλλάδος ἐς γᾶν,
καὶ Τίτος εὐρείας ἄγαγ' ἀπ' Ἰταλίας·
ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Εὐρώπᾳ δοῦλον ζυγὸν αὐχένι θήσων
ἦλθεν, ὁ δ' ἀμπαύσων Ἑλλάδα δουλοσύνας.[211]

'Both Xerxes led the Persian army to the land of Hellas, and Titus led there a host from broad Italy, but the one was going to set the yoke of slavery on the neck of Europe, the other to put an end to the Servitude of Hellas.' -

This epigram reflects the wave of joy felt

by the Greeks, lovers of liberty.[212] In fact Alcaeus here is no more pro-Aetolian or anti-Macedonian but a mere patriotic Greek who cherishes the golden occasion like any other Greek. If he is Pro-Roman, this is because it happened that the freedom longed for is granted by a Roman. Therefore the epigram is an expression of gratitude which Titus deserves. Although this general was yet quite young,[213] not being over thirty, yet he showed a great deal of good sense, tolerance and human disposition which accompany generally old age and are the outcome of long experience. The contrast held between the Persian Xerxes and the Roman Titus is the best tribute which could be paid to the latter who made himself the best instrument in establishing a friendly protectorate over an autonomous Greece. But the second line 'καὶ Τίτος εὐρείας ἄγαγ' ἀπ' Ἰταλίας' which is an almost repeated version of A.P. VII, 247, l. 4 (οὓς Τίτος εὐρείης ἤγαγ' ἀπ' Ἰταλίης,) raises a difficulty which is, as I said before, beyond a reasonable explanation. This line however serves a more positive purpose in this epigram than it does in the previous one provided that the mentioned epigram was composed against Philip. After this epigram which seems to be the latest of Alcaeus' epigrams, I deal

with two epigrams, the tone of which reveals the poet's bitter hostility towards Philip and his brutal way in attacking his opponent. At any rate they are the first specimen of political lampoons cast in an epigrammatic form. They deal with Philip's savage way of killing anybody who stands in his way provided that their death serves his own ends. The first refers to such practice where the poet takes much liberty in expressing his unquenched malice and indignation:

Πίομαι, ὦ Ληναῖε, πολὺ πλέον ἢ πίε Κύκλωψ
νηδὺν ἀνδρομέων πλησάμενος κρεάων·
πίομαι. ὡς ὄφελον γε καὶ ἔγκαρον ἐχθροῦ ἀράξας
βρέγμα Φιλιππείης ἐξέπιον κεφαλῆς·
ὅσπερ ἑταιρείοιο παρὰ κρητῆρι φόνοιο
γεύσατ', ἐν ἀκρήτῳ φάρμακα χεύμενος.

'I drink, Bacchus, much more than the Cyclops, when he had filled his belly with flesh of men. I drink. O that I could strike hard the brains of my enemy and drain his skull dry, Philip who enjoyed the murder of his friends as he carouses, pouring poison into the wine.' - This epigram which is a fierce outburst against Philip, is but an echo to numerous accusations concerning Philips' practice of poisoning his friends and kindred. Moreover the fact that no victims are named,

adds some weight to the epigram; for in this way it is a general testimony of the King's brutal side confirmed by historical authorities and naturally known to his contemporaries. The way the poet follows in attacking the King is quite surprising and excellently designed to penetrate the breast of the King. The poet's heaviness on drinking (for he, as he says ' πίομαι πολὺ πλέον ἢ πιὲ Κύκλωψ ' out drinks even the Cyclops) is not because he is proper soaker and lover of wine which he celebrates in wine-song in the manner of old Ionic elegy, the songs of Anacreon or the Attic scolion, but simply because it is under the spell of excessive drink that he is able to cherish the wish of dashing out the brains of Philip and draining his skull to the dregs. In attaching himself with the Cyclops, a reminiscence of Homer's Odyssey,[216] he satisfies his vengance by imagining what this monster actually did when he ate Odysseus' comrades two by two. The wish for smashing Philip's brains is as well a reminiscence of Homer; for the Cyclops was used to smash the brains of his victims.[217] This same disgusting picture may have been borrowed from the old Theban epic in which the dying Tydeus asked for the head of Melanippus, who mortally wounded him and finally killed by his hands, and gnawed it and sips the brains of his

enemy. Again the idea that Philip tastes the blood of his friends may very probably be reminiscent of Theognis' line 349 'τῶν ἐγὼ μέλαν αἷμα πιεῖν ,'. The drinking of one's enemy's blood as a sign of bitterness and enmity is a primitive thought which can be still heard as a swearing in conflicts.[218] Finally, it is clear that Philip in the manner of the Cyclops outraged the laws of hospitality by putting them to death, through poisoned wine or any other means. The next epigram treats the same theme even more coarsely. The victims of Philip are mentioned by name:

Οἶνος καὶ Κένταυρον, Ἐπίκρατες, οὐχὶ σὲ μοῦνον,
ὤλεσεν, ἠδ' ἐρατὴν Καλλίου ἡλικίην.
ὄντως οἰνοχάρων ὁ μονόμματος, ᾧ σὺ τάχιστα
τὴν αὐτὴν πέμψαις ἐξ Ἀΐδεω πρόποσιν.[219]

'Wine killed the Centaur too, Epicrates, not yourself alone and the lovely prime of Callias. Truly the one eyed is the wine Charon. Would you send him very quickly from Hades the same draught.' - This epigram is more fierce and subtle; for unlike the first the name of Philip is not mentioned. And here as in the previous epigram, Alcaeus tries to reinforce his assualt by drawing on the myth. Thus, the Centaur, presumably Eurytion, the Cyclops and Charon were intentionally

picked up. Philip's hardiness of drinking[220] brought the Centaur Eurytion into the scene. If wine made this glorious centaur so foolish that he committed an unseemly outrage in the house of his host, the great-hearted Peirithous, which caused him both mutilation and humilation, so it is the wine that made Philip what he was and brought upon him a curse for his sin and grief and utter destruction of his victims. It is clear from the opening words of the epigram which is a verbal echo of Homer, 'Οἶνος καὶ Κένταυρον'[221] that Alcaeus has in mind the Homeric passage describing how the semi-human monster outraged the laws of hospitality as an invited guest. Philip is not only a Centaur but also the one-eyed monster, the Cyclops, Polyphemus to whom I have already referred in the previous epigram as mad on wine and human flesh. 'Ο μονόμματος', as a metaphorical attribute of Philip connects him naturally with the Cyclops, but it may also, as Professor Walbank thinks,[222] be an unfriendly allusion to Philip's ancestors, Philip II and Antigonus I. The fact that Philip whose descent from Philip II and Alexander is most dubious,[223] stresses his direct descent from the famous Argeads[224] may support this view. These were no better than Philip.[225] Again the compound word οἰνοχάρων is very in-

teresting; for it shows how Philip, in providing his guests with poisoned wine, sent them over the Styx in the manner of Charon. From the linguistic point of view, this compound which is unusual, is an echo of Cercidas of Megalopolis, cf. οἰνοχάλκων with Cercidas' λεβητοχάλκων.[226] Alcaeus, however may have been influenced by the satiric verses of Cercidas. Moreover his enthusiasm for Homer, as we have already seen in his epigrams,[227] which he shares with Cercidas,[228] may have been due to the latter's influence on him. Finally the personalities of both Epicrates and Callias are unfortunately hard to grasp with any certainty. According to Dübner and Paton, Callias was a tragic and Epicrates a comic poet;[229] but this is now disputed. Other identifications are tried but none of them are decisive. Professor Walbank refers to this 'More recently Callias has been tentatively identified with Philip's agent at Nisyros, or the Delian who proposed honours to the father of Philip's enemy, Philip of Megalopolis, and Epicrates with the famous Rhodian admiral of that name. These identifications are possible, but not very likely?[230] The date of their murder is also obscure. It could have taken place, however, after the year 198B.C., since Aristaenus, the praetor, who wished the Achaeans to join the Romans, did not mention them in his harangue

to the assembly of the Achaean League in 198 B.C. in which he refers to the crimes committed by Philip.[231] In any case it is assumed from the ferocity of Alcaeus' attack that these persons were important antagonists of Philip and that their death for some reason or other outraged the poet to such an extent that he attacked the king very fiercely. These two lampoons could not have been left unanswered either by the king himself or by some court-poet. Thus in answer to his insulting pieces, a fictitious epitaph was written for his tomb:-

Ἀλκαίου τάφος οὗτος, ὃν ἔκτανεν ἡ πλατύφυλλος
τιμωρὸς μοιχῶν γῆς θυγάτηρ ῥάφανος.[232]

'This is the tomb of Alcaeus whom the broad-leaved daughter of the earth, the radish, executioner of debauchers' - Short and concise, the epigram is a pungent attack, the sharp and poisoned weapon of which must have hit Alcaeus very strongly. Here Alcaeus is accused of adultery which caused his death. The death by ῥάφανος is pointless, because this plant, radish, or cabbage, is eatable and does no harm by itself. Anyhow, according to Theophratus, a species of this plant, ῥάφανος ἡ ὀρεία ' could be fatal to dogs and pigs if it is mixed with χαμαιλέων ὁ λευκός.[233] If the poet meant this same species, Alcaeus is considered as a pig. In

this case the poet adds a new insult; for the stupidity and rashness of the pig lead him to his own destruction.[231] Thus this epigram is the last in a series of invectives or word-vollies discharged from both parties in quick and terrible successions.

These political epigrams in general, some of which are ironical jokes and others lampoons in the true sense of the word, throw a light, although not always bright, on an episode in the long story of Philip's struggles for acheiving an ambition tried for long by his predecessors. Compared with his previous Kings on the throne of Macedon, the warfare-experiences were unceasingly severe; for out of a long reign of forty-two years, Philip enjoyed at the most only eight at peace.[235]

In his epigrams especially the lampooning ones, Alcaeus reveals himself as one who sticks hard to his own political views which took hold on him all the time at least from the year 215 B.C., as I have already said before. From that year onwards he never changed or relaxed. They are a testimony of his strict patriotism for Messene and the outcome of his love to the larger community of Hellenes. In this he is the first political epigrammatist of the period. Professor

Barber refers to this fact most intelligently. 'A sentimental enthusiasm for their homeland occasionally colours the poetry even of expatriated Alexandrians, such as Theocritus and Callimachus, but the only representative of a sterner patriotism is Alcaeus of Messene, who in the second century. - I should like to say the latter part of the third century and the beginning of the second - assailed Philip V of Macedon with biting epigrams.[236]

Finally from the literary point of view, the lampoons of Alcaeus - and they are generally political - are of a paramount importance for the study of the lampoonising epigram, for these are the earliest specimens of their kind. No epigrammatist before him dared openly to challenge a King. On the contrary the epigrammatists were generally more given to flattery than to criticism. It is he then, the progenitor who took the initiative and gave the precedent to the later epigrammatists, especially the Romans. Such a theme conforms with the latter as they are by nature too frank in their speech and writings. Moreover they traditionally enjoyed every licence to express themselves, using any word they wished. This freedom of expression which is an essential thing for satire of

the horrible sort, may have arisen from the Fescennine verses - versus Fescennini - the licence of which was admittedly approved. These verses which are referred to by Horace as 'opprobria rustica'[237] were sung at weddings and on other occasions of rejoicing and were made part of rustic merry-makings, in which the performers indulge in mutual abuse and coarse jokes. These without doubt permeated into the writings of the Romans especially their satiric epigrams, most of which, as is obvious from Martial's epigrams, are distinguished by an absence of any moral restrictions, a thing which harmonizes with the Roman character. So strictly speaking and without committing myself to assess too much the debt the Roman epigrammatists owe to Alcaeus, I should like to make it clear that Alcaeus' influence on them shows itself in their choice of the theme and in attacking great personalities but the workmanship was achieved according to the Roman peculiarities to which I have already referred. Alcaeus' influence, however strong or weak it may be, can be at least traced with difference of tone in an epigram of Calvus (Caius Licinius Calvus Macer, 82-47 B.C.). This poet composed scurrilous epigrams in which he attacked eminent men in his day. Suetonius speaks of his

scandalous epigrams against Julius Caesar in the following words. "When Gaius Calvus, after some scurrilous epigrams (lampoons), aimed at reconciliation through his friends, Caesar, on the other side, wrote to him first."[238] I will quote one of his few epigrams directed against Pompeius. It is marked by a very offensive tone:

> Magnus, quem metuunt omnes, digito caput uno
> Scalpit, quid credas hunc sibi velle? virum.[239]

'The great, whom all revere, scratches his head with one finger: what do you believe this man wishes for himself? A man.' Here Pompey is accused of being philander. Is it not most obscene and shocking? The epigram, however, indicates that ruling men were not spared. The theme therefore is Alcaean but the tone is Roman. The composition is purely Roman too; for in order to achieve a 'point,' the poet gave a picture of an uneasy Pompey; then he asks what occupies his mind and finally he gave the mordant answer. Catullus (Gaius Valerius Catullus of Verona, B.C. 84-54), the poet of love and hatred, of extreme tenderness and fulsome grossness is another example of the epigrammatists who indulged in lampoons against the great figures of his age. As an epigrammatist, he is responsible for making the Roman

epigram a vehicle of invective and insolence. In his hands, the innocent elegiac couplet, was destined, I should say, to be a medium of the most virulent attacks directed to many victims, I shall illustrate two examples of his invectives. The following is directed against Julius Caesar:

Nil nimium studeo, Caesar, tibi velle placere,
nec scire utrum sis albus an ater homo. 24C

'I have no excessive desire to wish to please you, Caesar, not to know whether you are a white or a black creature.' - The epigram smacks of the utmost contempt. Although Caesar is great and powerful, yet the poet dared to say that he takes no notice of him as a worthless person. It is, however, practically nothing compared with the following lampoon in hendecasyllables. The poem is also against Caesar and one of his best soldiers, Mamurra, who on reaching Verona in the winter of 55-54 B.C. met and fell in love with the Veronese Ameana, Catullus' sweetheart, and took her from the poet who had to avenge himself with the following fulsome attack, leaving all restraint behind:

pulcre convenit improbis cinaedis,
Mamurrae pathicoque Caesarique
nec mirum: maculae pares utrisque,

urbana altera et illa Formiana
impressae resident nec eleuentur,
morbosi pariter, gemelli utrique,
uno in lecticulo erudituli ambo,
non hic quam ille magis vorax adulter,
rivales socii puellularum.
pulcre convenit improbis cinaedis.[241]

'They agree beautifully, these wicked profligates, the effeminate Mamurra and Caesar; and no wonder. Like stains, the one from the city, the other from Formiae, having been impressed on each, are remaining and will not be washed clean. Diseased alike, very twins, the two on one settee, but slightly experienced writers both, one is not a more voracious adulterer than the other, rivals and partners in love of little girls. They agree beautifully, these wicked profligates.' - I think this is the worst lampoon I have ever met in my readings. It is filthy and most disgusting. How openly and daringly does the poet attack his great victims for being dissolute persons: licentious, effeminate and adulterers. The attack with its successive accusations is so plain and direct that it needs no further comment except that it is typically Roman in tone and workmanship. Many scores of Martial's

epigrams are echoes of this epigram. This is not strange; for Catullus is, in a way, a teacher and pattern to Martial and the two have much in common except that Martial is a servile flatterer of the great. The attack as a whole indicates that Catullus was so furious at losing his beloved that he lost all control of himself. The repetition of the opening line at the end of the epigram which is intended to form a point, is in itself a sign of the poet's heavy loss. It is worth mentioning that Catullus apologized for such a nasty epigram and that Caesar forgave him.[242]

These Roman examples are, as their contents reveal, real invectives or lampoons - and presumably or admittedly personal - directed against distinguished persons. This feature brings them nearer to those of Alcaeus. If so, the question arises whether the similarity of the theme is a matter of coincidence or rather they mark Alcaeus' influence on these Roman epigrammatists. In my opinion the latter alternative is more likely accepted simply because the Romans draw on the Alexandrian poetic productions. Again Catullus' familiarity with Callimachus could as well have extended to other literary figures of the same period, i.e. the Alexandrian. They are therefore reminiscences of Alcaeus

cast in a Roman mould. And as their counterpart they were recited at the banquets publicly or privately. Thus it can be said in passing that the theme is an offspring of the Greek - especially the Alexandrian - epigram and like it, it forms one of a series of entertaining items at the Symposia. Catullus himself refers to this in a very beautiful piece in which[243] Calvus, his intimate friend, makes a nice partner:

> Scribens versiculos utarque nostrum
> ludebat numero modo hoc modo illoc,
> reddens mutua per iocum atque vinum.
> atque illinc abii tuo lepore
> incensus, Licini, facetiisque,[244]

'Writing verses, each of us sported now in one metre, now in another answering each other while jesting and drinking our wine. And so I came away from that place fired, Licinius, by your wit and humour.' - With this we unmistakingly conclude this point by acknowledging the debt of the Roman invective epigram in the hands of Calvus, Catullus and even Martial to the Alexandrian epigram.

Finally in the light of the themes tried by him and his way of treating them, we can safely say that Alcaeus is deservedly considered one of the few prominent

epigrammatists of this period. And as far as the development of the Alexandrian epigram in general is concerned, he is the last representative.[245] His originality is not disputed; for he is the only political poet of the Anthology and as Professor Reitzenstein pointed out, he filled the sympotic epigram with new content without too much borrowing.[246] His style as a rule varied; it is sometimes hard, at another elegant, delicate or bitter. His love for mythological themes is most obvious and he used them dexterously and without being erudite or obscure.

NOTES ON CHAPTER V

C.

Alcaeus of Messene; from 151-246, pp. 791-807

151. Walbank, Philip V of Macedon, (Cambridge 1940) p. 74. We, however, are not sure of the fact that Aetolia was the poet's place of refuge. But it was there or in any place far from Philip's reach that Alcaeus could have attacked the King without fear or anxiety.

152. Plutarch. Arat. 49. 3. cf. Walbank, op. cit. p. 72.

153. Walbank, op. cit. pp. 77-78.

154. Porphyr. In Euseb. Praep. Ev. X, 2, 23. 467d. One of his epigrams (A.P. IX. 519) is mentioned by a scholiast (Schol. B. Hom. Il, 1. 378).

155. Polybius, XXXII, 2, 6. On the releation of Alcaeus and Isocrates, see Walbank, C.Q. vol. XXXVII, p. 3, note 2 and pp. 10-11.

156. PW. vol. I, p. 1506. See also Susemihl (op. cit., vol. II, p. 545 note 134.) where he considers such idea is completely uncertain and even most unlikely.

157. The number of Alcaeus' epigrams is a matter of dispute and affords a big chance for conjectures. Thus it wavers between 22 and 15: (Jacobs, 22, Mackail 22, Croiset, about twenty - une vingtaine de morcaux - , Reitzenstein - PW. vol. I, p. 1506-15. As for Bergk he attributes to Alcaeus not a

a few composed by anonymous epigrammatists, cf. P.L.G. pars III, pp.195-196 but his conjectures are almost rejected, cf. Susemihl, op. cit. vol II, p.454, note 134.) The scholars' differences and conjectures are due to the fact that the Palatine MS. gives the epigrams under different titles: under Alcaeus only or Alcaeus of Mytilene, who according to Professor Reitzenstein (PW, vol I, p.1506 (14)) likely lived in the second century B.C: 'A. von Mytilene Epigrammatiker des Meleager-Kranzes (A.P.VI. 218; VII, 429, 536) wohl aus dem 2 Jhdt.V. Chr.' (Such state of confusion lessens the symbolic description or criticism by Meleager of Alcaeus' epigrams - A.P.IV, 1, l. 13- as "Ἀλκαίου τε λάλημθεον ἐν ὑμνοπόλοις ὑάκινθον" 'the hyacinth of Alcaeus, the vocal poets' flower' for we are not sure about the 'Alcaeus whom Meleager means. Is he the distinguished poet of the classical period, or of Messene or the later poet of Mytilene? I may say in passing also that, owing to the fact that the Palatine MS. does not include all Meleager's selections and that in many cases epigrammatists have but small number, Meleager's

criticism is beyond our reach. The ambiguity of the name, as in the case of Alcaeus makes it more difficult still). In addition to these, there are some under the poet's full name - Alcaeus of Messene: A.P.VII, 1, 412, 495, IX, 518 and 519. To my mind, the total number counts to 18 (A.P.V. 10; VII, 1, 5, 55, 274, 412; IX, 518, 519, 588; XI, 12; XII, 29, 30, 64; XVI, 5, 7, 8, 196 and 226). For my views on these epigrams, see the apparatus criticus on disputed attribution.

158. In the treatment of Alcaeus' theme, I will refer only to the epigrams which are ascribed to him by the majority of scholars and occasionally by myself.

159. The epigram on Hipponax is generally attributed to Alcaeus of Mytilene (Reitzenstein, Ep. U. Skol. p.169. Note 1 and Susemihl, op. cit. vol II, p.544. Note, 134).

160. A.P.VII. 1 (Jacobs VII) mentioned under the poet's full name and universally attributed to him.

161. Concerning the riddle, cf. Pausanias, X, 24, 2.

162. A.P.VII. 5 (Jacobs VI). Tradition is not certain about the authorship of the epigram, but as Waltz states 'Messenio tribuunt Jacobs et plerique

commentatores'. Cf. Bergk. P.L.G. III^{4}, p.196. Note.

163. Waltz (op. cit. Tome IV, p.58, note 3) attributes 'salamis' to Rhodes. This is certainly a mistake.

164. A.P.VII. 55 (Jacobs XVII). It is generally attributed to the Messenian cf. Reitzenstein (Ep. U. Skol., p.169, note 1) attributes it to the Messenian because of the similarity of A.P.VII, 1. So also Waltz who says: 'Messenio tribuunt plerique editores. And in spite of the doubtfulness of Bergk (P.L.G. III^{4}, p.196 note) and of Susemihl (op. cit. vol. II. p.544, note, 134) the epigram could be rightly attributed to him.

165. On Hesiod's death in Locris, see Thucidyd. III, 96 and Plutarch, conv. Sept. Sap. 19. 162 d-f.

166. A.P.V. 10 (Jacobs, IV) entitled Alcaeus only; but all scholars accept the attribution to the Messenian. At any rate the subject is Alexandrian.

167. A.P.XII. 64 (Jacobs III), although the epigram bears the name 'Alcaeus' only, no scholar rejects its attribution to the Messenian.

168. A.P.XII, 29 and 30. I agree with Reitzenstein

(Ep. U. Skol, p.169, Note 1) in attributing them to the Messenian. Susemihl (op. cit. II.p.546, note 141) rejects their ascription to the Messenian simply because 29 is rather poor, 30 is very clumsy and the two do not match with 64. This is not enough to reject them since the subject is Alexandrian and the poet, owing to his changeable mood, writes good and bad by turns.

169. A.P.XII. 29 (Jacobs, I).

170. A.P.XII. 30 (Jacobs, II).

171. As far as the bodily beauty of the boys (the word is used loosely in the same way as is used at present by landladies when they call University students boys) is concerned, ἡλικία (line 4) like pubertas refers to tender age and sexual maturity, but in what age does it begin and when does it end? This puberity could begin in Europe between the age of fourteen - it may be earlier - and fifteen. In the East it begins generally at thirteen owing to the warmer climate which naturally calls forth an early maturity. This pubertas extends, as it is known, to 45, but in the calculation of lovers, it expires with the growing hair on the body or the appearance of

the first down of the boys' beard upon their chins (this is not anyhow a Homeric conception). Strato of Sardis, the composer of about 100 epigrams dealing almost all with homosexual love, goes further than that; for in A.P.XII.4 he refers to the different ages of boys which appeal to him: 'I delight in the prime of a boy of twelve, but one of thirteen is much more desirable. He who is fourteen is a still sweeter flower of the Loves, and one who is just beginning his fifteenth year yet more delightful'. A boy older than this does not attract him.

172. Cherished by such epigrammatists as Euphorion, Rhianus, Dioscorides, Meleager and above all by Strato.

173. A.P.VII.412 (Jacobs XIX).

174. Plut. Philop. 11 = Pausanias VIII, 50, 3. Professor Walbank (C.Q. vol.XXXVII, p.9) thinks that it is curious that Alcaeus pays a tribute to a pro-Achaean minstrel at a time when Messenia was at this time in the opposite camp to Achaea for some ten years, and suspects that Alcaeus was not a loyal Messenian. I disagree with him because we do not know when Pylades died. His

death, however, which took place long or shortly after 205, might have occurred in or about 191; in this year in particular Messenia was made a member of the Achaean League (Walbank, Philip V, p.207). Under this circumstance Alcaeus, as a true patriotic Messenian, could have written a tribute to this minstrel.

175. A.P.IX.588 (Jacobs IX). It is universally attributed to the Messenian. The theme touches a topic which happened in the poet's lifetime, for Cleitomachus flourished about 216-212 (Susemihl op. cit., II, p.545, note 136) cf. Pausanias, VI. 15, 3 ff. This epigram was found in a papyrus belonging to first century B.C. together with some mutilated epigrams of other Alexandrian epigrammatists (Cf. Grenfell, Hunt et Smily, The Tebtunis Papyri. No.3.). This papyrus, admittedly a part of an anthology, gives some support that Anthologies were already compiled before Meleager.

176. For other victories on other occasions, see Pausanias, ibid. For his fame and the contest between him and an Egyptian, see Polybius, XXVII.9.

177. Ibid.

178. A.P.XVI.7 (Jacobs V)

179 Pausanias, IX, 12, 3-4.

180 A.P. XVI. 8 (Jacobs, X); 196 (Jacobs XI); 226 (Jacobs XII). Susemihl (op. cit. II, p. 544, note 134 thinks that they are hardly composed by the Messenian. Reitzenstein (Ep. U. Skol., p. 169 note I) is inclined to attribute A.P. XVI, 196 to the Mytilenean. Of the other two, he thinks that they are likely his. I do not see why these epigrams, especially the two on Marsyas (A.P. XVI. 8) and on the statue of Eros Bound (196), should not be composed by Alcaeus himself. Alcaeus has a liking for treating methological themes and he has already shown an interest in Eros (A.P. V. 10).

181 A.P. XVI. 8 (Jacobs, X).

182 Fig. 36 (Ernest Arthur Gardiner, A Handbook of Greek Sculpture, London, 1897, Part II, pp. 366-367). Cf. also Fig. 584, (Richter, Gisela, New Haven, 1938, pp. 70, 207): Marsyas, Roman copy of a work by Myron. It is in Lateran Gallery, Rome.

183 A.P. XVI, 196 (Jacobs XI).

184 I have not met with a statue of Love Bound in any book of 'Art'. If such a thing ever existed, it would have been in the nature of dolls bought from shops for mere fun.

185. ll. 1-4.

186. Cf. A.P.XVI, 179 (Antipater of Sidon), 199 (Crinagoras), 198 (Maecius) and 195 (Satyrus).

187. A.P.XVI. 226.

188. If the composer (Anonymous) of A.P.XVI. 262, an epigram celebrating a work by Praxiteles on Pan and the Nymphs, is right, Alcaeus may have drawn inspiration from it.

189. This pipe is called by Pan, Syrinx, in honour of the nymph of that name whom he loved (His love-affair with nymphs are well-known but none responded to his love: he loved Pitys, but she fled from him and was changed into a pine tree, so also Echo, who was changed into a voice that can only repeat the last words spoken to her) and Syrinx who was changed into a reed.

190. A.P.IX. 518 (Jacobs, XIII). It bears his full name and accepted by all scholars as his.

191. De Sanctis (Storia dei Romani, 1921) IV. I. 9-10, note 26; cf also Walbank, Philip V, p.120.

192. Walbank (C.Q. vol.XXXVI) p.137. See also the same author's Philip V, pp.125 seq and the works there quoted.

193. Among other authorities are Bergk (Philol. xxxii,

1873, 678-81, 'Ein Epigramm des Alkaios v. Messene') and P.L.G.^{4} III. 196; Knaack ap. Susemihl, op. cit., II, p. 545, Wilamowitz, op. cit. I, p. 224. H. Stadtmüller, Anth. Graec. ad loc; Körte, op. cit., p. 398. etc.

194. Among other authorities are Walbank, op. cit. p. 120; De Sanctis, op. cit. IV, I. 9-10; W. Paton, Loeb. ed. of Greek Anth. ad loc; R. Reitzenstein P.W. s.v. Alkaeus (13), col. 1506 etc.

195. Walbank, C.Q. vol. XXXVII, p.1.

196. Walbank, ibid. p. 13 also, Philip V, p. 78, note 8; 301f.

197. For the same reasons I reject the ascription of the following two anonymous epigrams to Alcaeus simply because they are designed to be learned flattery to Philip; the first is No. 790 from Dyme (Kaibel, Epig. ex Lap. Coll. pp. 320-321) which Kaibel attributes to Alcaeus with some probability. The second is A.P. XVI. 6. It is a slavish praise beyond all limits. The attribution to Alcaeus is a matter of dispute. Among those who ascribe it to the Messenian is Bergk (P.L.G.^{4} III, p. 169; Geffcken, P.W. s.v. Samos (2) col. 2161. Dübner (Didot. ed. ad loc.) to

Antipater of Sidon. H. Hecker (Comment. crit. de Anth. Gr. (Leiden, 1852) 1.76) attributes it to Samos, the Macedonian court-poet.

198. A.P.VII. 247; (Jacobs, XXII); Plut. Flam. 9. 2. Lines 3 and 4 are missing in the version of the Palatine MS. For the different views of the absence of these lines see note 203.

199. Although the battle of Cynoscephelae (for a fuller description of this battle, see Livy, XXIII, 7-10; Polybius, XVIII, 20-27) was fought in 197 B.C., yet their bones were collected and buried by Philip of Megalopolis who was entrusted by Philip to do this job in 191 (Livy, XXXVI, VIII, 3-6). If this is true, Philip seemed to have been involved in war-affairs.

200. Flamin. VIII, 5 cf. Livy (xxxiii, x, 8) who mentioned the same number as Plutarch. According to Livy (ibid) Valerius Antias mentions forty thousand and Claudius thirty-two thousand. Livy believes that they exaggerated the number. Livy's number is taken from Polybius (XVIII, 27. 6) whom he used as a source.

201. Plut. Flamin. IX. 3.

202. Idem, IX, 3: μᾶλλον ἡνίκα τὸν Πίτον ἢ τὸν Φίλιππον.

203. The absence of these two lines in the Palatine MS arises some surmises. Walbank (C. Q. XXXVII, p.2) thinks that the poet himself likely omitted them after he discovered that they were given an interpretation which he did not intend. Cf. also Körte, op. cit. pp.399-400. Stadtmüller ad loc; suggests that they were an insertion by pro-Aetolian poet or that they were omitted through the error by the scribe at some later date. Of all these suggestions, I agree with Stadtmüller's second surmise, but I am inclined to add that Alcaeus is the same pro-Aetolian poet referred to in his first suggestion. His patriotism and his hatred to Philip is well understood from his invectives: IX. 519 and XI. 12.

204. Plutarch, Flamin, IX. 1 and 2.

205. Idem, ibid.

206, Thus I do not fully agree with Walbank (op. cit. p.173) & Reitzenstein (PW., s.v. 'Alkaeus (13)' vol. I, p.1506); for Plutarch, as I have already stated, mentioned other provoking instances.

207. A.P. XVI. 26B. There is no objection in attributing the epigram to the King who was highly talented. Philip was well educated. In a fragmentary

speech preserved in Polybius (XXIII, 11, 1-8; cf. Livy XL.8), Philip told his sons not only to read tragedies, myths and stories, but know well and ponder over such things. Cf. also Susemihl (op. cit. vol. II, p.547, note 149) who quoted some valuable references to Philip's culture and his ability of quoting poetical quotations.

208. The verses are quoted from Paton, op. cit. vol. V, p.175.

209. Op. cit. p.263. Cf. also, Livy XXXII, 34, 4; Polyb. XXV, 3, 9 and XVIII, 33, 7.

210. Susemihl (op. cit. II, p.545, note 136) thinks that the epigram was composed either in 189 or 196 B.C. To my mind, it was written immediately after the proclamation, i.e. 196 B.C. I do not see why the poet postpones it till later.

211. A.P.XVI. 5 (Jacobs, XVI); although it is under the name of Alcaeus only, yet its attribution to the Messenian is quite in order.

212. For the reaction of Titus' proclamation which took place at the Isthmian games, 196 B.C. on the throng of people sitting in the Stadium and watching the Athletic contests, see Plut. Flamin. X and XI.

213. Polyb. XVIII, 12.

214. A.P.IX. 519 (Jacobs XIV).

215. Among his alleged victims are the following: Aratus the father and the son (Polyb. XXXII. 12. 2-8; Plut. Arat. 52. 1, 54. 2-3; Pausan, II. 9. 4), Chariteles of Cyparissia (Livy. XXXII. 21. 23), Eurycleides and Micion of Athens (Pausan. II. 9. 4), Cassander of Maronea (Polyb. XXII. 14. 2-6), Philip's own son Demetrius (Polyb. XXIII, 7; 10-11; Livy XL, 5-16; 20, 3-24, 8; 54-6. Diod. XXIX, 25. Plut. Arat. 54, 7 etc. Flamininus (Plut. Flam. 17. 2; Moral. 197A. Polyb. XVIII. 7. 6) at the conference in Locris, accused Philip in his face of killing his own friends and kindred and the latter smiled sardonically and made no reply.

216. For the Cyclops' hardness of drinking, cf. Odyssey, IX, 360-362. and for his greed of eating human flesh, cf ibid 296 ff.

217. Odyssey, IX, 290. Cf. also Eur. Cyc. 402.

218. It is a custom among many peoples: (the Scythians, Herod. IV. 65; the Thracians, Amm. Marcell. 27.4). It is not unusual to hear nowadays in Egypt, one shouting to his opponent 'I will drink your

blood' which conveys only an expression of bitterness.

219. A.P.XI. 12 (Jacobs XV). Although it is entitled Alcaeus only, yet it is unanimously accepted as his.

220. For Philip's immoderation in his potations at the table, see Polyb. X, 26; XXV, 3-7; Livy XXVII, 31; XXXII, 21. 24; XXXVII, 7. 8-18; Plut. Moral. 760A, Aratus, 51. 2-3 etc.

221. Cf. Od. XXI, 295. The same verbal echo was borrowed by Callimachus, A.P.VII. 725, 1.3 and Nicarchus, A.P.XI. 1, 1.3.

222. Cf. C. Q. vol. XXXVII, pp.5-6.

223. Walbank, op. cit, p.258.

224. Polyb. V. 10, 10; Livy XXVII, 30, 9; XXXII, 22, 11.

225. Philip II, in particular, was abused by Theopompus (quoted by Polyb. VIII, 9.13 = Fr. gr. Hist. 115 fr. 225) who regards him and his companions as Centaurs.

226. Cf. J. U. Powell, Collectanea Alexandrina (1925), 212, fr. 11 (= Athen. VIII, 347D).

227. A.P.VII. 247; IX, 519 and XI. 12.

228. Susemihl, op. cit., 11, 546, n. 140.

229. In the Didot and Loeb editions ad loc.

230 C. Q. vol. XXXVII, pp. 6-7

231 Livy, XXXII, 21.

232 A.P.IX. 520. Although Philip's authorship is uncertain, yet it could be possibly his; cf. (Stadtmüller, ad loc; Susemihl, op. cit., vol. II, p. 546, note 142). If it is not by him, it is certainly written by one belonging to his circle.

233 IX, 12, I.

234 Cf. L. and S. sub voce 'cus'.

235 Walbank, op. cit. p. 259.

236 Cambridge Ancient History, vol.VII, p.269. The words in parenthesis are my own.

237 Hor. Epistles, II, i, 146.

238 Suet. Jul. 73: 'Gaio Calvo post famosa epigrammata de reconciliatione per amicos agenti ultro ac prior scripsit'.

239 Frag. Poet. Rom. By Baehrens, p.322.

239a There may be a play on the other sense of Sibi velle and vir. What does he amount to? A hero.

240 Catull. XCIII.

241 Catull. LVII.

242 Suetonius, 'The deified Julius' LXXIII.

243 Catullus, however, did not use the word epigram nor attached it to any of his verses. He, as he

says in different places, wrote 'carmina' (116, 2), poema (50, 16) versiculi (50, 4) and hendecasyllables (42. 1). The fact that his occasional and lighter poems in which he addressed his friends, mocked, ridiculed and inveiged his different victims are composed in hendecasyllables, iambics and elegiac metre allows us to regard them as epigrams. This is confirmed by two facts; First, Martial, the epigrammatist, considers Catullus his teacher and his pattern. (The introductory Epistle to his first book : "Lascivam verborum veritatem, id est epigrammaton linguam, excusarem, si meum esset exemplum: sic scribit Catullus, ...", secondly these metres as vehicles for occasional and satiric verses were practised after him by Martial.

244. Catull. 50, 4-8.

245. Reitzenstein, Ep. U. Skol., p. 168.

246. ibid.

C H A P T E R VI

THE CONCLUSION

To conclude my study of these five epigrammatists: Callimachus, Leonidas of Tarentum[1], Poseidippus, Hedylus and Alcaeus of Messene[2], I think that I am justified in selecting them from the long list of the Alexandrian poets mentioned by Meleager[3], the last of the series. These, as far as I can see, are the true makers of the Alexandrian epigram. First in handling the themes handed down to them by their predecessors they showed many signs of originality. Their imitation was far from being slavish; for they merely adapt the theme, or reshape it again and strive to improve it and they often succeeded in surpassing their models. We have already seen some instances where Callimachus surpassed Asclepiades and how often Leonidas did so with Anyte as a model. In this way, they delveloped what they inherited and nursed it - every one in his own way - most efficiently. Secondly in their treatment, they drew inspiration from whatever poetic genre they fancied necessary for the development of their themes. In this way they devised the fundamental stylistic conventions which were made use of after their examples by their followers for many centuries. Thirdly, endowed with vigorous inventive talent, they innovated themes that were unknown before and hardly added to by their

successors and so they brought the movement of development to its end.

These epigrammatists belong only to the first third or slightly more of this period; but as far as the development and the treatment of the themes are concerned these remain the undisputed masters and the actual representatives of the Alexandrian epigram. In regard to the development of the themes, they collaborated in creating new themes and thus completed the final structure of epigram and constituted its poetic function. Considering the treatment of their themes, their epigrams, with the exception of those of Leonidas of Tarentum, show a style reminiscent of the classical epigram: rather plain, terse, free from excessive artificiality, but not void of some of the typical Alexandrian stylistic features, such as playing on words, playing with myths and legends and the climactic end, which appeared from time to time in some epigrammatists' epigram.[4] But compared with their successors, especially at the end of this period, as, for instance, Meleager, Philodemus and Antipater of Sidon (the representatives of the Syrian school, whose fondness of rhetoric and fantastic display, sometimes tedious and morbid, lessen or mar the charm of the themes dealt with) these poets still to a great extent

preserve the virility and the artlessness of the classical epigram.

It may be thought that an account of the Alexandrian epigram would be incomplete if the epigrams of two important epigrammatists such as Meleager and Antipater of Sidon at the end of the period are not discussed. To my mind, this is not true. A thorough examination of their epigrams led me to the conclusion that, as far as the themes and the development of the Alexandrian epigram are concerned, they practically did nothing. Their importance depends on their productive Muse who is given to sport, phantasy and artificiality. Their large production, however, cannot replace originality. Meleager's epigrams are but copies, variations, adaptations and reminiscences of the early epigrammatists of this period.[5] As for Antipater of Sidon, I have given many instances revealing his dependence on Leonidas of Tarentum in particular.[6] We can safely conclude by saying that the best specimens of epigram like any other poetic genre, belong to the early decades of this period when the masters of the Alexandrian school tried very hard to achieve poetic innovations and to show some mastery in their adaptations. In epigram in particular they became a

welcome model not only to their immediate successors but their influence continued at work up to the time of the mediaeval poets in Italy, Germany, and France.[7] Instances showing that influence are too many to quote.

Having given illustrations of all themes attempted in the Alexandrian epigram composed by those epigrammatists who brought epigram to the last stage of its development and completed the wide range of its themes, I am now in a fairly good position to give it a definition. This definition will be also convenient for the Greek epigram in general, for the reasons I have just given. I am aware of the difficulty of the task, for no traces of an attempt at a satisfactory definition are found in the extant works of the classical writers or the Alexandrians themselves.[8] Slight attempts in this direction are to be found amongst the Romans and the Byzantines.[9] Some Mediaeval poets and scholars occupied themselves with this question with zeal. But in their definitions, they were rather thinking not so much of the Greek epigram, nor even the Alexandrian, but of the Roman epigram and specially that of Martial.[10] Their treatment, which is not scientific at all, is encumbered with recondite researches concerning the nature of epigram, its style

the classification of its themes and above all the rhetorical point. They make no distinction between the Greek epigram and the Roman one or lay too much stress on the latter. In so doing, their definitions are out of place. As for the Modern scholars nothing worthwhile was attempted. Reitzenstein, the best authority on Greek epigram, is rather pessimistic. He opened his article on Greek epigram as follows: "At present it is still impossible to write the history of epigram... Neither is the term sufficiently clear, nor the material easy to survey, nor can one expect that scholars will reach an agreement as to the main problems in the near future."[11] In another place,[12] the same scholar gave a special attention to the meaning and definition of epigram at length, but he depended in his deductions on later authorities beginning with Meleager[13] onwards and no conclusion is reached. This unsettled question therefore still offers a fertile field for research. To my mind there is a possibility of giving the Alexandrian epigram or the Greek epigram in general an appropriate definition if we approach it on a thematic basis; in other words by marking the steps of development by tracing two different kinds of poems: firstly those which acquired the form of an inscription without being

inscribed, secondly those which were called epigrams by the ancient authorities, although in form and theme, they have no connection with inscription beyond brevity, and are in fact short elegies. In addition to the inscribed epigram, sepulchral and dedicatory, these two classes, one of which plays with the traditional form and the other which acquire the name 'epigram', help us in giving the developed Alexandrian epigram a suitable definition. Of the first class we have the famous humorous epitaph on Timocreon composed by Simonides,[14] the appreciative critcism of the classical poets and heroes cast in an epitaph-form by the Alexandrian epigrammatists and the humorous dedicatory epigrams composed by Callimachus, Leonidas of Tarentum, his imitators and others. These poets' poems are called epigrams by ancient authorities.[15] As for the second class, the convivial poems of Hedylus, the humorous poems of both Poseidippus and Hedylus and the invectives of Alcaeus of Messene are also called epigrams by ancient authorities.[16] In fact the collections of these poets, which include the various epigrammatic themes tried in this period,[17] are known as epigrammata. These topics confirm the fact that the literary epigram is a result of the fusion of the inscription with

certain other poetic genres and that it gradually became a medium for expressing any theme that was previously treated by these poetic types[18] or an elegy, reduced to the length of the inscription and acquiring its tendency of dealing with one point, was made, according to the prevailing tendencies of this period to express whatever thought worthy of remark. Thus as a poetic genre, it acquired certain characteristics: its structure is at its best brief, its metric medium is generally the elegiac couplet, in regard to language, it is generally Ionic mixed with other dialects, and from the stylistic point of view, it employs all manners of style: the plain, the grand and the middle. According to these characteristics, the Alexandrian epigram or the Greek epigram in general could be defined on a thematic basis as follows: "It is a flexible medium (in the form of inscription or in keeping with its brevity)[19] in which any poetical theme under different impulses[20] and aims[21] is briefly expressed in any style, in a blend of dialects and generally cast in elegiac couplet". Compared with Scaliger's definition 'Epigramma igitur est poema breve cum simplici cuiuspiam rei, vel personae, vel facti indicatione, aut propositis aliquid deducens,[22] 'the present definition seems to be

more adequate than Scaliger's, the last four words of which touch on the Roman epigram.

It is, however, in the hands of these epigrammatists, with whom I concerned myself in this thesis, that the Greek epigram completed the range of its themes in such a way that such definition depends entirely on their contribution and invention.

Notes on Chapter VI.

1. Chapter IV.

2. Chapter V.

3. Proem, A.P. IV, I, passim.

4. cf. Some epigrams composed by Callimachus and Leonidas of Tarentum, Chapter IV.

5. Cf. Asclepiades (A.P. XII, 75) and Poseidippus (A.P. XII, 77) with Meleager (A.P. XII, 76, 78); Rhianus (A.P. XII, 58, 121) with Meleager (A.P. XII, 59, 122) etc. etc. For his dependence on his predecessors see Radinger (Meleagros Von Gadara, 1895) pp. 22 ff., where he gives a large number of instances in which Meleager made use of the epigrams of the poets of the Ionic school and even of the Doric one.

6. See my account of Leonidas of Tarentum (Chapter IV).

7. James Hutton (The Greek Anthology in Italy to the year 1800, Ithaca, New York, 1935), Registef, pp. 443-649, passim. In this useful Catalogue the influence of the epigrams of the early Alexandrian epigrammatists as models is noticeable in the references to the later poets.

8. I have already mentioned them in the course of this thesis and especially in the IInd Chapter.

9. Martial, II, 77; Parmenion, A.P. IX, 342; Cyrillus,

A.P. IX, 369. These poets merely insisted on its brevity.

10. See Hutton, op. cit. pp. 59-74. This author reviewed all the definitions of the epigrammatic theorists in Italy, Germany, France and other places.

11. PW, vol VI, p. 71; s.v. Epigramm.

12. Ep. U. Skol, pp. 103 ff.

13. As I said before (Chapter II) Meleager did not use the word 'epigram' in his Proem of his Stephanus; but the fact that he used collections containing epigrams or given the title 'epigrammata' confirms that he knew that he included in his Stephanus poems with different themes known long before him as epigrams.

14. A.P. VII, 348. Cf. my account on this epigram which I consider the first epideictic epitaph, Chapter II, p. 239 seq.

15. I mentioned these authorities in the course of the accounts on the different epigrammatists in the IVth and the Vth Chapters.

16. For these authorities see my account on these epigrammatists in the Vth chapter.

17. See the IIIrd Chapter.

18. I have already referred to these types: The Ionic elegy, the scolion, the paegnion, the griphos, the idyll etc.

19. This conforms with the nature of the development of the Greek epigram: firstly under the influence of the songs recited at the banquet, the real inscription acquired certain poetic qualities and turned to epideictic themes. Secondly the same poetic types with an artistic touch of Asclepiades (if not Plato) were adapted into the form of inscription (the scolion changed its media from lyrical into elegiac and the Ionic elegy was shortened). This way of adapting themes was carried by the Alexandrians to other themes, as, for instance the Idyll, and handed down to their successors.

20. For the themes that come under these two headings, see Chapter III.

21. This is only natural because the epigram was composed by different schools and in places far and wide and have their sytlistic characteristics.

22. Quoted in Hutton, op. cit., p. 64. It is worth mentioning that this definition (which was set forth in the third book of Scaliger's Poetics,

1561) is the best definition I met and that this scholar's successors made use of it in coining further definitions.

A P P E N D I C E S

I. CALLIMACHUS' LIBRARIANSHIP

II. THE LITERARY MEANING OF 'κυκλικός' IN CALLIMACHUS' A.P. XII, 43, l. 1.

APPENDIX I

Callimachus' Librarianship.

As far as the Librarianship of Callimachus is concerned, there is nothing in Callimachus' own extant works which refers to any discontent or complaint about his status. Other documents are far from being successful in giving consistent and convincing information. Parsons, in his recent work (The Alexandrian Library, London, 1952) has carefully reviewed and discussed the different records on the librarianship of both Callimachus and Apollonius together with the various views and hypotheses of scholars who concerned themselves with the study of the Alexandrian Library and its first chief Librarians (op. cit. pp. 106-121, 141-145, 147-149, and 153-162). I have myself consulted and examined the records of which the scholars made use: Apollonius' two 'Vitae' (G. W. Mooney, The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, London, 1912, p.1), the notice in Suidas, Oxyrhy. Papyrus found in 1903-4 (Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part X, 1241. p.99 seqq by S. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, London, 1914) and the Plautine Scholium, the only record which names Callimachus as librarian (Parsons, op. cit. 106-121 and Mair, Callimachus etc., L.C.L. London, 1921 pp. 6-11). The conclusion I reached

from my personal investigation is regretably disappointing. These testimonies are not self-consistent nor consistent with one another and practically all are full of major mistakes which lessen or rather mar their validity. A few examples will be sufficient to support my conclusions. There are in Apollonius' vita I, two sentences which contradict each other: "ὁ φὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ ποιεῖν ποιήματα ἐτρέπετο "Χ" τοῦτον λέγεται ἔτι ἔφηβον ὄντα ἐπιδείξασθαι τὰ Ἀργοναυτικά". Apollonius' Vita II states that after retiring to Rhodes, Apollonius returned to Alexandria and was appointed librarian (i.e. after Eratosthenes); Suidas similarly regards him a successor of Eratosthenes "καὶ διάδοχος Ἐρατοσθένους γενόμενος ἐν τῇ προστασίᾳ τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βιβλιοθήκης". But according to the papyrus, 1241, the same Apollonius was a predecessor not a successor to Eratosthenes: (Col ii, ll. 1-6: "Υ[ι]ος Σιλλέως Ἀλεξανδρεὼς / ὁ [κ]αλούμενος Ῥόδιος Κάλ/λ[ι]μαχου γνώριμος· οὗτος / ἐγένετο καὶ διδάσκαλος τοῦ πρώτου βασιλέως· τοῦτον / δ[ι]εδέξατο Ἐρατοσθένης." This latter regards Apollonius the teacher of Ptolemy I Soter (ll. 4-5) and Aristarchus the teacher of the children of Ptolemy Philopator (ll. 13-15). These two mistakes are enough to make us take no notice of this anonymous and careless

testimony.

Of Callimachus as a Librarian, we have only one testimony as I said before. It is the Scholium Plautinum (A scholium concerning the Alexandrian Library on one page of the fifteenth century parchment codex of Plautus discovered by F. Osanm in 1819 in the library of old Collegio Romano. The unknown Caecius or Cecius, the authority given by this scholium was identified by W. Dindorf with Johannes Tzetzes (Rhein. Mus., 1830, iv, p.232). Although Cramer (Anecdota graeca e codd. manuscriptis Bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis, Oxford, 1839, vol. I. p.3 ff) refused the identification of Caecius with Tzetzes, yet the similarity between the third form (Kaibel Mb. 1-28-34) of the Prolegomena to Aristophanes of Johannes Tzetzes may confirm Dindorf's conjecture). According to this Scholium Plautinum, Callimachus was "aulicus Regius bibliothecarius" (a man of court and Royal librarian). If we compare this phrase with another in the same passage about Eratosthenes "eratosthenes non ita multo post eiusdem custos bibliothecae"(not so much later the guardian of the same library), it will be clear that this scholium regards Callimachus as librarian attached to the court but not the chief of the Library. Again according to

Tzetzes' Prolegomena to Aristophanes, Callimachus is also considered a royal cataloguer "ὡς ὁ Καλλίμαχος νεανίσκος ὢν τῆς αὐλῆς ὑστέρως μετὰ τὴν ἀνόρθωσιν τοὺς πίνακας αὐτῶν ἀπεγράψατο ". (as Callimachus states who was a young man of the court and catalogued the books after they were edited). Among the many mistakes in which Tzetzes fell, is his statement about Eratosthenes which considers the latter a colleague of Callimachus in the Library, "ἀλλὰ τὰ Καλλιμάχου καὶ τοῦ Ἐρατοσθένους μετὰ βραχύν τινα χρόνον ἐγένετο τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν βίβλων, ὡς ἔφην, καὶ διορθώσεως, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ φιλαδέλφου." (The work of Callimachus and Eratosthenes took place a short time after the collecting and editing of the books - as I said - even within the lifetime of Ptolemy Philadelphus himself) It is well known that Eratosthenes returned to Alexandria under Ptolemy III Euergetes. Professor Dziatzko (PW. II, p.412) is right when he said 'Die Worte des Tzetzes oder des Schol. Plaut. sind übrigens an dieser Stelle nicht in Ordnung". But I see that the statement in the Schol. Plaut.is not accurate but not wrong.

These two records did not mention the name of Apollonius nor shed new light on the librarianship of

Callimachus. They are like the others full of grave chronological errors. All without exception, in spite of careful amendations, are incapable of solving our present riddle.

Considering the uncertainty of chronological data or rather the lack of chronological data, this problem remains and must remain undecided until we have some new and accurate evidence. In the meantime we should not stop still but approach the question on the basis of Callimachus' and Apollonius' scholarly productions which would suggest that one was better qualified than the other for holding the librarianship. In the first place Callimachus was older than Apollonius and contributed to Alexandrian literature more than Apollonius did. 'He is an Encyclopaedia in himself. There is nothing the man does not know, or probably, if we spoke more correctly, nothing he does not know about. He writes on history, on the Museum, on the barbarous names, on colonization, on winds, on birds, on the rivers of the world etc'. (Kingsley, Alexandria and her schools, Cambr. 1854, pp.39-40). He had the chance to prove his scholarly efficiency and unsurpassed capacity as a scholar-librarian. His Πίνακες, which are regarded a great feat even in our own days must have

secured him a remarkable position. His relation with Philadelphus must have been safe and exceptionally good. No poet could have done better for Philadelphus and the establishment of his Kingdom than Callimachus did, whose hymns concerned more with the glorification of this king than of the Olympian gods. His Coma Berenices, a compliment to the newly-wedded queen of Ptolemy III Euergetes, must have kept his relation with the new King intact. In the light of these factors, I am disinclined to deprive Callimachus of the post of librarian. If Apollonius, however, whose contributions were far less than those of his teacher in both quantity and quality and whose Argonautica, which is void of any glorification of Philadelphus, could not have given him an opportunity of acquiring this post before Callimachus, were ever a chief librarian, he must have been a successor of Callimachus not his predecessor.

Finally, if Callimachus was not a chief librarian at all, his post as a cataloguer must have been one of the highest grading posts of the library and one which is not surpassed even by that of the chief Librarian. I am tempted also to add that it is quite reasonable to presume that Callimachus wished sua sponte to continue in this particular job which enabled him to be an author

of eight hundred works on different topics and that he found it more profitable to him than the mere leadership of the Library as long as he was directly attached to the court. The description 'aulicus regius bibliothecarius' supports this and gives the impression that it was a kind of life-appointment with which Callimachus was not only content but rather proud of. Finally it is just possible that an Apollonius (for the name is very common) may have been actually custos in the time of Callimachus but far less important than he was. Such a person would immediately be confused with Apoll. Rhod. He would come between Zenodotus and Eratosthenes. He could not however, have taught Ptolemy I.

This is what can be broadly assumed. I think this question with the unhelpful documents available cannot be answered with any certainty and we should no longer grope in darkness but patiently wait for some new evidence.*

---

* It should be added that Professor Pfeiffer (Callimachus, vol. II, Oxford, 1953, has referred in the chapter entitled (Testimonia De Callimachi Vita et Scriptis, pp.XCV-CVI to the documents already mentioned here but has not discussed any of them at all.

APPENDIX II

'Τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν' (Callim. A.P.XII, 43, l. 1)

To translate 'τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν' by 'the cyclic poem' would be extremely vague in an epigram beginning with 'Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν' and conveying much of Callimachus' Literary views and polemical criticism. The phrase therefore must be clarified. Does Callimachus aim by using κυκλικός to refer to the series of poems which were included afterwards by Proclus (of the fifth or second century) under the title of ἐπικὸς κύκλος with a view to making the story of Troy complete - by starting from the union of Ouranos and Ge to the final settlement of the family of Odysseus after his death -? If so, does he poke fun at the early poems or the later ones or both? And finally what meaning can be given to the word with which we are concerned at present? The fact that 'κύκλος' does not

---

⁂ A.P.XII, 43:

Ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν, οὐδὲ κελεύθῳ
χαίρω τις πολλοὺς ὧδε καὶ ὧδε φέρει.
μισῶ καὶ περίφοιτον ἐρεῶμενον, οὐδ' ἀπὸ κρήνης
πίνω· σικχαίνω πάντα τὰ δημόσια.
Λυσανίη, σὺ δὲ ναίχι καλὸς καλός· ἀλλὰ πλεῖν εἰπεῖν
τοῦτο σαφῶς Ἠχώ, φησί τις "Ἄλλος ἔχει."

appear until later times, does not prove that it was coined and used as a name of a group of epic poems in ancient times long before the Alexandrian period. When Aristotle spoke of the epic, he regarded the Iliad and the Odyssey as Homeric works and Cypria and the Little Iliad, for example, as works of other authors (Poetics, XXIII, 1429b). This makes it clear that there exists a group of epics besides those of Homer. Again the adjective κυκλικός qualifying ποίημα could be taken as a proof of the existence of the noun κύκλος and of its special use; for it is derived from it. I do not see any point in Professor Wilamowitz' doubtfulness about this derivation (Homerische Untersuchungen, p.357). Are not the adjectives derived from the nouns by adding 'ικος' - denoting relation - to the stem of the noun such as πολεμ-ικός from πόλεμ-ος? There is however an evidence which proves that the Alexandrians used the adjective κυκλικός in conformity with the special literary meaning of κύκλος. Lysanias of Cyrene - the namesake of the beloved in this same epigram - an Alexandrian philologist and teacher of Eratosthenes, called the composer of the Iliou Persis, which is, according to Proclus included in the Epic Cycle, 'κυκλικὸν ποιητὴν' (F. H. G. iii 342 - ut videtur ap.

Schol. Eur. Andr. 10; Στησίχορον μὲν γὰρ ἱστορεῖν ὅτι τεθνήκοι [ὁ Ἀστυάναξ], τὸν τὴν Πέρσιδα συντεταχότα κυκλικὸν ποιητὴν ... Allen, Homeri Opera, p.136). Here the Oratio Obliqua of the Scholium implies that

Was the expression used by Lysanias himself. There is no valid reason to doubt this, but even if the expression were thought to have been intruded by the scholiast, there is no reason to suppose the scholium to be as late as the IInd. century A.D. (the earlier date for Proclus). The fact that Lysanias flourished in the IInd. century B.C. makes certain that Callimachus and his contemporaries knew the name κύκλος and the collection in such a way that Professor Bowra, who says 'the name is not found before the Christian era, and the collection of poems may or may not have been known to the Alexandrians - Cnf. Class. Dict. p.319 - should not by now doubt it. I myself believe that κύκλος cannot owe its existence to later times and that if it does not go back to the ancient times, it must be then an invention of the scholars of Alexandria. These, as it is well-known, are the first and the best among those who concerned themselves with the study of Homer's works. Their studies would have been incomplete it they did not care for the study of these poems, the attribution

of some of which to Homer would have been unwelcome to those critics. The disappearance of most of the writings of the Alexandrians especially the prose ones tempts me to believe that Proclus used some kind of incomplete Alexandrian manuscript which he discovered by chance, as the source of his information.

It is clear from the foregoing statement that Callimachus must have thought of epics other than those of Homer. If so, and it is hardly disputed, I doubt that he meant to speak too slightingly of all the earlier epics. He must have held them to have their merits. Compared with Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, they are undoubtedly inferior as all of them lack at least the Homeric unity and dramatic movement; but in spite of their failures they were highly estimated in the golden period of Athenian literature. They were used by Pindar and the tragedians and even younger poets as Lycophron, occasionally drew on them (Schol. Pindar Ol. 6. 15; Nem. 10. 114 etc; Sophocles, Ath. 277e; Professor Rzach, PW. vol. II. col. 2349). Aristotle speaks of the debt the tragedians owe to two of these epics more clearly. He says that several tragedies were made of the Cypria and out of the Little Iliad more than eight (Poetics, XXIII. 1459b). Callimachus may have thought

then of some particular ones, such as the Telegonia which is an example of the tendency to exploit exhausted material inartistically (Bowra. op. cit) But he was surely thinking more of some examples of the other cyclic epics - those outside the Homeric cycle - such as the Οἰχαλίας ἅλωσις of Creophylus of Samos and the Θηβαΐς of Antimachus of Colophon. It may be said also that he has in mind the poems of the epic revival at the hands of Panyassic and Choerilus of Samos. Again because of the fact that these earlier cyclic epics were written by different hands, they were not of the same standard; some of them must be good, some bad and some indifferent. Again the same thing may be said of the latter ones which were repetitions of the old stories and whose composers, as learned poets, strove after displaying their learning. Their dependence on the prose compilations called κύκλοι and their tendency of treating their themes in a banal length and their excessive use of the traditional formulas undoubtedly did wrong to the term κύκλος . This can be seen in the meaning given to its derivatives from the third century B.C. onwards. The Aristarchan school especially Aristonicus uses the adverb κυκλικῶς to denote the dull use of epic formula. (Die aristar-

chische schule, speziell Aristonikos, gebraucht das adverbium κυκλικῶς um die geistlose verwendung epischer formelhafter phrasen zu bezeichnen; Wilamowitz, op. cit. p.355). Horace, who - he may be a contemporary of Aristomicus - drew inspiration from Alexandria said in his Ars Poetica 'nec sic incipies ut scriptor cyclicus olim' (l. 136). Again Pollianus (II nd century A.D.) refers to this banality and triviality which became recognised attributes of the cyclic poets and their works; (A.P.XI. 130,11: 1-2: τοὺς κυκλίους τούτους, τοὺς αὖτε ἔπεσι λέγοντας/μισῶ, ...). We can now assume without much exaggeration that Aristonicus owes the meaning he gives to κυκλικῶς to Aristarchus, that Horace and Pollianus follows in the steps of Callimachus in their attacks and that all are indebted to the first masters of the Alexandrian school, who must have known the collection and concerned themselves with the study of its poems. Again the meaning of these derivatives which must have been given to them first by specialists is a further evidence supporting my assumption.

We are now in a position valid enough to enable us to understand what Callimachus meant by κυκλικός. Professor Wilamowitz wishes to consider it as a synonym to ψευδομήρος (Ich will es griechisch geben, ψευδομήρος,

op. cit. p.356). In some way it is a reasonable meaning but at the same time a rather broad one; for it can be interpreted as "non-Homeric". As Callimachus must have undoubtedly realized that these poems are not Homeric, this meaning is not suitable and we should try to restrict it. I myself feel that Callimachus meant by "τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν", either 'a trivial cyclic epic' or rather an 'epic in slavish imitation of Homer' or both. This is justified by his epigram on Creophylus, the author of Οἰχαλίας Ἅλωσις, in which he pokes fun at its author as an imitator of Homer (Strabo. xiv, s.v. supra, p.152) and by attacking the Lyde of Antimachus (s.v. supra, p.36 sqq). We already know why Callimachus hates such poems.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHY

N.B. The following periodicals and books are not included and are found in the notes:

(1) Those quoted by the different scholars whose works I quote myself.

(2) General works to which I occasionally referred such as Greek-English Lexicon (Liddell and Scott, 8th and 9th editions), Etymologicum Magnum (Tomas Gaisford, Oxonii, 1845), Suidas (Tomas Gaisford, Oxonii, 1834), Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classische Altertum-swissenschaft from 1894 onwards), The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 1949) and others.

(3) Texts (Teubner, Budé, Loeb, etc.) of authors other than epigrammatists.

I TEXTS

Cahen, Emile.
Callimaque, Epigrammes, Hymbes, etc., Paris, 1948

Dübner, F.
Anthologia Palatina cum Plaudes, Paris, 1871.

Herbertson, Viscount.
Meleager and the poets of Jacobs' Anthology - from Plato to Leon. Alex., London, 1895.

Jacobs, F.
Anthologia Graeca Leipzig, 1814.

Mair, A. W.
Callimachus etc., (L.C.L.) London, 1921.

Paton, W. R.
The Greek Anthology with an English translation (L.C.L.) 5 vols., London, 1925-7.

Pfeiffer, R.
Callimachus, Hymni et Epigrammata, (vol. II). Oxford, 1933.

Powell, J. U.
Collectanea Alexandrina, Oxford, 1925.

Schneider, Otto.
Callimachea (2volumes), Lipsiae, 1870-1893.

Stadtmüller, H.
Anthologia Graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea (3 vols.), Leipzig, 1894-1906.

Waltz, P.
Anthologie grecque (5vols.), Budé texts, Paris, 1928-1941.

Wilamowitz, Moellendorff, U. Von.
Kallimachi Hymni et Epigrammata, Berlin, 1924.

II LEARNED BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Agar, T. L. — Notes on the Greek Anthology (The Classical Quarterly, T.XVII, 1923), p.82 sq.

Aly — Skolion (PW. vol IIIA) Col. 558 sqq.

Benndorf, Otto. — Anthologiae Graecae Epigrammatis quae ad Artes spectant, Lipsiae, 1862.

Bevan, E. — The poems of Leonidas of Tarentum, Oxford, 1931.

Blakeway, A. A. — The date of Archilochus (Greek Poetry and Life, 1936) pp.34-55.

Bowra, C. M. — Plato's Epigram on Dion's death, (Problems in Greek Poetry, Oxford 1953) pp. 126-137.

Cahen, Émile, — Callimaque et son oeuvre poetique, Paris, 1929.

Friedländer, Paul — with the collaboration of Herbert B. Hoffleit. Epigrammata, Greek Inscriptions in verse from the beginnings to the Persian Wars, The University of California, 1948.

Gabathuler, Mathaus Von. — Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter, Universität Basel, 1937.

Geffcken, Johannes — Leonidas von Tarent (PW, vol. XII), Cols. 2021-2031.

" " — Griechische Epigramm, Heidelberg, 1916.

Miss Gragg (Florence Alden). — A study of the Greek epigram before 300 B.C., (Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, vol. 46, 1909, No.1) p.1 sqq.

Hansen, B.	De Leonida Tarentino, Leipzig, 1914.
Harrison, E.	Studies in Theognis, Cambridge, 1902
Hauvette, Amédée.	Les épigrammes de Callimaque, Étude Critique et Littéraire (Revue des Etudes Grecques, Tome XX, 1907) pp. 297-354.
" "	De L'authenticité des Épigrammes de Simonide, Paris, 1896.
" "	Archiloque, Sa Vie et ses poésies, Paris, 1905.
Herter, H.	Kallimachus (PW. Suppl. V) Cols., 386 sqq.
Hutton, J.	The Greek Anthology in Italy To 1800, Ithaca, New York, 1935.
" "	The Greek Anthology in France, Ithaca, New York, 1946.
Kaibel, G.	Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta, Berolini, 1878.
Legrand, Ph.-E.	Sur quelques épigrammes du III e siecle (Revue des Etudes Anciennes, 1901) p. 185 sqq.
Legrand, Ph.-E.	Sur la date de quelques poemes de Theocrite et de Callimaque, (Revue des Études Grecques, Tome VII, 1894) pp. 276-283.
" "	Leonidas de Crete (Revue des Etudes Grecques, Tome VII, 1894) pp. 192-195.
Lumb. M.M.T.-W.	Notes on the Greek Anthology, London, 1920.
Mackail, J.W.	Select epigrams from the Greek Anthology, London, 1906.
Nock, A.D.	Eros the Child (Classical Review, XXXVIII, 1924) pp. 152-155.

Ouvré, H. — Quae fuerint dicendi genus ratioque metrica apud Asclepiaden, Posidippum, Hedylum, Paris, 1894.

Page, D.L. — The Elegiacs in Euripides' Andromache (Greek Poetry and Life, 1936) pp. 206-230.

" " — Greek literary papyri (vol. I, L.C.L., 1942).

Pfeiffer, R. — Callimachus, 2 vols. Oxford, 1949-1953.

Radinger, Carl. — Hedylus (PW. vol. VII) Cols. 2592-2594.

" " — Meleagros Von Gadara, Leipzig, Wien, 1895.

Reitzenstein, R. — Epigramm (PW. vol. VI) Cols. 71-111.

" " — Epigramm und Skolion, Giessen, 1893.

" " — Alkaios aus Messene (PW. vol. I) Col. 1506.

Rouse, W.H.D. — Greek Votive Offerings, Cambridge, 1902.

Schmidt, L. — Anthologia Griechisch (PW. vol. I) Cols. 2380-2391.

Schott, Paulus. — Posidippi epigrammata collecta et illustrata, Berlin, 1905.

Schwartz — Asclepiades von Samos (PW. vol. II) Cols. 1625-1627.

Stella, Luigia Achillea — Cinque Poeti Dell' Antologia Palatina, Bologna, 1949.

Stengel — Eros in Literatur (PW. vol. VI) Col. 493 sqq.

Walbank, F.W. — Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V. and Rome (The Classical Quarterly,

vol. XXXVI, 1942 pp. 134-145 and vol. XXXVII, 1943, pp. 1-13.

Waser. Eros (PW. vol. VI) Col·284 ff.

Wilamowitz, Moellendorff U. Von. Sappho und Simonides, Berlin, 1913.

III GENERAL WORKS, LITERARY, HISTORICAL, ETC.

Atkins, J. W. H. Literary Criticism in Antiquity (vol. I), Cambridge, 1934.

Barber, E. A. Alexandrian Literature (Cambridge Ancient History, vol. VII, Chapter VIII, pp. 249-282.

" " " 'Callimaque et son œuvre poetique par Emile Cahen' (Classical Review XLVI, 1932) pp. 163-165.

" " " Alexandrian Literature (The Hellenistic Age, Cambridge, 1923) pp. 31-78.

" " " The Lock of Berenice: Callimachus and Catullus (Greek Poetry and Life, 1936) pp.343-363.

Bell, H. Idris. Egypt from Alexander the Great to the Arab conquest, Oxford, 1948.

Bowra, C. M. Erinna's 'Lament for Paucis' (Greek Poetry and Life, 1936) pp.325-342

" " " Greek Lyric Poetry from Alcman to Simonides, Oxford, 1936.

" " " Early Greek Elegists, London, 1938.

Bury, J. B. 'The Hellenistic Age and the History of Civilization' (The Hellenistic Age, Cambridge, 1923) pp. 1-30.

Cahen, Emile. Les Hymnes de Callimaque, Paris, 1930.

Cary, M. A History of the Greek World from 323-146 B.C., London, 1951.

Couat, Auguste. Alexandrian Poetry under the first three Ptolemies, trans. by James Loeb, London, 1931.

Croiset (Alfred et Maurice) Histoire de la Littérature Grecque (5 Tomes) Paris.

Farnell, George. S. Greek Lyric Poetry, London 1891.

Furness, Robert Allason Poems of Callimachus, London, 1931.

Gillies, Marshall. M. The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, Book III. Cambridge 1928.

Gow, A. S. F. Theocritus (2 vols.) Cambridge, 1950.

Hardie, W. R. Res Metrica, An Introduction to the Study of Greek and Roman Versification, Oxford, 1920.

Jacoby, Felix 'Atthis', The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens, Oxfords, 1949.

Johns, C. H. Macurdy. The Hellenistic Queens, Oxford, 1932.

Jouguet, Pierre. Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East, London, 1928.

Kiefer, Otto Sexual life in Ancient Rome, trans. by Gilbert and Helen Highet, Vth edition, London, 1951.

Kingsley, Charles. Rev. Alexandria and her Schools, Cambridge, 1854.

Knaack Alexandrinische Litteratur (PW. vol. I) Col. 1399 sqq.

Körte, Alfred Die Hellenistische Dichtung, 1925, Engl. trans by J. Hammer and M. Hadas, New York, 1929.

Lausberg, Heinrich. Elemente der literarischen Rhetorik, München, 1949.

Legrand, Ph.-E. La Poesie Alexandrine, Paris, 1924.

Licht, Hans. Sexual Life in Ancient Greece, trans. by J. H. Freese, (Vlth Impression), London, 1952.

Mackail, J. W. Lectures on Greek Poetry, London, 1910.

Mahaffy, J. P. A history of the Classical Greek Literature, vol. I, London, 1883.

" " Greek Life and Thought from the age of Alexander to the Roman Conquest, London, 1887.

" " A history of Egypt under the Ptolemaic dynasty, London, 1898.

" " The progress of Hellenism in Alexander's Empire, Chicago, 1905.

" " With the collaboration of Arthur Gilman. Alexander's Empire, London 1920.

Marouzeau, J. Terminologie Linguistique, Paris, 1951.

Meillet, A. Apercu d'une Histoire de langue Grecque (5e Edition), Paris, 1943.

Mooney, G. W. The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, London, 1912.

Müller, K. O. And J. W. Donaldson. History of the literature of Ancient Greece, (3 volumes) London, 1858.

Parsons, E. A. The Alexandrian Library, London, 1952.

Powell. J. U. And E. A. Barber. New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature 1st series, Oxford, 1921-2nd series, Oxford, 1929-3rd series, Oxford, 1933.

Rose, H. J.	A Handbook of Greek Mythology (IVth Edition), London, 1950.
" " "	A Handbook of Greek Literature from Homer to the age of Lucian, (IVth Edition), London, 1950.
Rostovtzeff, M.	A History of the Ancient World trans. from Russian by J. D. Duff, Oxford, 1925.
Sandys (Sir John Edwin)	A History of Classical Scholership, 3 volumes (2nd Edition), Cambridge, 1906-8.
Schroeder, Otto.	Grundriss der Griechischen Versgeschichte, Heidelberg, 1930.
Sikes, E. E.	The Greek View of Poetry, London, 1931.
Souter, C.	Nature in Greek Poetry, Oxford, 1939.
Susemihl, Franz.	Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit, 2 vols, Leipzig, 1891-1892.
Symonds, J. A.	Studies of the Greek Poets, 2 vols (IIIth Edition), London, 1893.
Tarn, W. W.	Hellenistic Civilisation (IIIrd Edition), London, 1952.
Walbank, F. W.	Philip V of Macedon, Cambridge, 1940.
Wallace, W. & Mary Wallace.	Asclepiades of Samos, Oxford, 1941.
Wilamowitz - Moellendorff, U. von.	Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos (2 vols), Berlin, 1924.
" " "	Homerische Untersuchungen, Berlin, 1884.
Wright, F. A.	A History of later Greek Literature, 2nd Impression, London, 1951.
" " "	The complete Poems of Meleager of Gadara, London, 1924.
" " "	The Girdle of Aphrodite (2nd Edition)

London, 1926.

Wright, F. A. Poets of the Greek Anthology, London, no date is given.