THE AMATORY EPIGRAMS OF DIOSCORIDES

A CRITICAL APPRECIATION OF THE AMATORY EPIGRAMS OF DIOSCORIDES

By

PAUL EDMOND BARRETTE

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

MASTER OF ARTS (1996) McMASTER UNIVERSITY

(Classical Studies) Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: A Critical Appreciation of the Amatory Epigrams of Dioscorides.

AUTHOR: Paul Edmond Barrette B.A. (Hons.) (University of Ottawa).

SUPERVISOR: Professor Paul Murgatroyd

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 94.

ABSRACT

The amatory epigrams of Dioscorides have been largely ignored by scholars. The bulk of the comment that his erotic poems have received has concerned the text; little has been written in way of appreciation of the poetic craft of the epigrammatist. In this thesis I have focused on developing a critical appreciation of the amatory epigrams of Dioscorides. I have devoted each chapter to one of the thirteen epigrams of Dioscorides, with the exception of chapters four, seven and eight. In these chapters I have dealt with the epigrams which seem to have been written in the same tradition. The chapters break down as follows: chapter one deals with A.P. 5. 138; chapter two 5. 55; chapter three 5. 54; chapter four 12. 37 and 5. 56; chapter five 12. 42; chapter six 12. 14; chapter seven 5. 53 and 193; chapter eight 5. 52 and 12. 170; chapter nine 12. 171; chapter ten 12. 169.

PREFACE

In this thesis I have leaned more towards a critical appreciation of the epigrams of Dioscorides, rather than a standard, line-by-line, philological commentary. I have chosen this route for two reasons: there is already a standard edition of the epigrams of Dioscorides, Hellenistic Epigrams; this is a learning experience for me and a formal philological commentary might fall outside the boundaries of my abilities. I have used Gow-Page's text for the epigrams of Dioscorides, a text which is reliable, critical and frequently cited by many commentators. I have followed other scholars[1] in categorizing the epigrams of Dioscorides in terms of types of poetry and placed them in their larger literary context where possible so as to bring out the poetic craft of Dioscorides, i.e. to show the degree of imitation, variation, and novelty in Dioscorides. Similarly, I have paid close attention to the literary motifs employed by the epigrammatist. In the course of my investigation, I have discussed the more striking effects of rhythm and sound where I have considered it important for an appreciation of the poem to do so. I have couched such comments in tentative terms, acknowledging the fact that remarks of this kind are subjective. For purposes of clarity I have considered the speaker of the poem to be the poet unless it is clear that the speaker is not the poet.

Many thanks are due the members of my advisory committee: to my thesis supervisor, Dr. Murgatroyd, whose scholarship, thoroughness and patience have been much appreciated, to Dr. Slater for his solid advice and to Dr. Kingston for his many helpful comments.

1 Cf. e.g. NISBET-HUBBARD, pp. xv ff.; FORDYCE, pp. 92, 96 f., 128 f.; MCKEOWN, pp. 7 f., 76 f., 121 f.; 162 ff.; MURGATROYD, 1991, pp. 48 ff.; 71 ff.; 99 ff.

Finally, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my wife for her support and confidence, and to my mother who never let me settle for less.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

LSJ Liddell, H.G., Scott, R. *A Greek English Lexicon.* rev. by H.S. Jones ninth edition (1925-40).

A.P. Anthologia Palatina

A.Pl. Anthologia Planudea

CA Powell, J.U. *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford, 1925).

RE *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft,* ed. G. Wissowa et al. (1894-)

OLD *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1990)

SEG *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* (1933-1990)

INTRODUCTION

We know very little about Dioscorides.[1] Meleager[2] refers to him by a periphrasis in his preface and the only other reference to him occurs (presumably) in the scholiast to Apollonius of Rhodes[3] concerning Amphion's lyre, τὴν δὲ λύραν δοθῆναι 'Αμφίονι ὑπὸ Μουσῶν φησι, Διοσκορίδης δὲ ὑπὸ 'Απολλωνος. D.'s works contain little biographical evidence; however there is a clue as to his *floruit,* which comes from an epigram of his on the dramatist Machon.[4] Machon was approximately contemporaneous with Callimachus, whose life extended into the reign of Ptolemy Euergetes;[5] thus, it would seem logical to conclude that D. wrote his epitaph on Machon after the death of the dramatist,[6] and so the end of the reign of Euergetes (221 B.C.) is a possible *terminus post quem* for the *floruit* of D. This time period also seems right for a poet who imitated Asclepiades and Callimachus, and was imitated by Antipater of Sidon.[7] Little is known of the birth place of D.,[8] although he seems to have been closely connected with Egypt and Alexandria: he mentions the yearly flood of the Nile twice;[9] he complains about a low-born victor of a race at Alexandria;[10] he alludes to a dedication to Aphrodite-Arsinoe;[11] he composed an epitaph on a Samian woman who was buried beside the Nile.[12]

---

[1]Dioscorides will be referred to as "D." from now on.
[2]See A.P. 4. 1. 24, ὅς Διὸς κούρων ἔσχεν ἐπωνυμίην.
[3]See GOW-PAGE, 2 p. 235.
[4]See A.P. 7. 708, which is ostensibly written on the tomb of the dramatist Machon of Alexandria.
[5]See GOW-PAGE, 2 pp. 257 f.
[6]See GOW-PAGE, 2 p. 258.
[7]See GOW-PAGE, 2. p. 235.
[8] NB that A.P. 7. 178, which is ascribed in one MS to a Dioscorides of Nicopolis (Cεἰc Τιμάνθη δοῦλον Λυδὸν γένος διοσκορίδου Νικοπολίτου); but this ethnic is by no means secure (in MS Jεἰc δοῦλόν τινα Λυδον ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου δεσπότου θαπτόμενον; in MS Pl A Διοσκορίδου οἱ δὲ Νικάρχου); cf. also RE 5. 1128; GOW-PAGE, 2 p. 268.
[9]See. A.P. 7. 76; 9. 568.
[10]See A.P. 11. 363.
[11]See A.P. 6. 290.
[12]See A.P. 7. 166.

Of the works of D., we have only forty epigrams, which may be classified as follows:

1. Amatory epigrams (thirteen)[13]
2. Dedicatory epigrams (three)[14]
3. Sepulchral epigrams (twenty)[15]
4. Epideictic epigrams (two)[16]
5. Satirical epigrams (two).[17]

Dioscorides was a versatile auther who wrote epigrams of varying lengths; however we have no example of a poem of D. shorter than four lines; the bulk of his epigrams are longer.

Since I have discussed at length the amatory poems of D. in the text of the thesis, I shall make some mention by way of introduction to the other epigrams in the corpus of D. D. shows a keen interest in literary history, and several of his epigrams centre upon or allude to important literary figures: in 7. 351 D. reworks the quarrel between Archilochus and the daughters of Lycambes; in 7. 450 D. recalls Philaenis and the controversy which attributes to her τὸ περὶ ἀφροδισίων ἀκόλαστον σύγγραμμα;[18] he wrote (presumably) imaginary epitaphs on such poets as Sappho,[19] Anacreon,[20] Thespis,[21] Aeschylus,[22] Sophocles,[23] Sositheus,[24] Machon.[25] D. also shows some antiquarian interest in Hyagnis

---

[13]See A.P. 5. 52; 53; 54; 55; 56; 138; 193; 12. 14; 37; 42; 169; 170; 171.
[14]See A.P. 6. 126; 220; 290.
[15]See A.P. 7. 31; 37; 76; 162; 166; 167; 178; 229; 351; 407; 410; 411; 430; 434; 450; 456; 484; 485; 707; 708.
[16]See A.P. 9. 340; 568.
[17]See A.P. 11. 195; 363.
[18]See Ath. 8. 335 B.
[19]See A.P. 7. 407.
[20]See A.P. 7. 31.
[21]See A.P. 7. 410.
[22]See A.P. 7. 411.
[23]See A.P. 7. 37.
[24]See A.P. 7. 707.
[25]See A.P. 7. 708.

and his invention of the pipes;[26] while in another epigram D. exploits a more contemporaneous theatrical form, the pantomime.[27]

D. was a typical Hellenistic epigrammatist: his style was compact, sharply focused and witty. D. had the ability to say a lot with just a word or two; often a word or phrase is packed with many implications and associations.[28] Subtle allusions are made throughout his amatory epigrams often through teasingly ambiguous[29] vocabulary or pointed imagery.[30] He had a sharp eye for detail and was keenly aware of the stock literary motifs and themes of his predecessors, which is clearly brought out through such techniques as variation[31] and imitation.[32]

Humour is an important part of D.'s erotic poetry and it is developed in several ways: irreverence, boldness, παραπροδοκίαν and wit.[33] Two epigrams in particular are striking in this respect, A.P. 5. 54 and 55. No other extant Hellenistic epigram contains such shocking yet skilfully handled descriptions of sexual intercourse; such a degree of explicit content seems to have been unequaled until the time of Martial and Rufinus centuries later. D. could also show a range of other moods in his epigrams, such as bitterness and anger, pity[34] and (perhaps) genuine caring and affection.[35]

As a lover D.'s persona seems playful. Whether at a festival or a entertainment event, D. has the ability to wryly create an erotic situation.[36] Similarly, several epigrams which ostensibly portray a lover, who seems genuinely rapt, are cleverly undercut with

---

[26]See A.P. 9. 340.
[27]See A.P. 11. 195.
[28]See ch. 3 pp. 36 f.; 4 pp. 45 ff.; 5 pp. 55 f.; 7 pp. 70 ff.; 8 pp. 79 f.; 10 pp. 87 f.
[29]See ch. 1 pp. 7 ff., 14; 2 pp. 19 ff.; 8 pp. 78 ff.
[30]See ch. 1 pp. 6, 14; ch. 2 pp. 23 ff.; ch. 3 pp. 35 ff.; ch. 4 pp. 45 ff.; ch. 5 pp. 53 ff.; ch. 6 pp. 63 ff.; ch. 7 pp. 70 ff.; ch. 8 p. 80; ch. 10 pp. 88 ff.
[31]See ch. 1 pp. 6 f.; 2. pp. 16, 19; 3 p. 32; 4 pp. 43 f.; 6 pp. 61 ff.; 8 pp. 74 f.; 9 pp. 82 f.; 10 pp. 88 f.
[32]See ch. 1 pp. 5 f.; 2 pp. 18 f.; 4 pp. 47 f.; 5 pp. 52 f.; 7 p. 71; 8 pp. 75 ff.
[33]See ch. 1. pp. 13 f.; 2 pp. 28 ff.; 3 pp. 33 f., 37 f.; 4 pp. 43 f.
[34]See A.P. 5. 52; 12. 42.
[35]See A.P. 12. 171.
[36]See A.P. 5. 53; 54; 138; 193

humorous situations and/or sharp turns of phrase.[37] D. comes across as an experienced lover; he does not seem to have been the type to focus on one or two beloveds, in fact ten different love interests are named,[38] and his amatory poems are almost evenly distributed between heterosexual and homosexual relations. Nevertheless, D. was not simply a *desultor amoris*; he was capable of emotional involvement.[39]

[37]See A.P. 5. 53; 54; 55; 138; 193; 12. 169.
[38]See A.P. 5. 53. 1; 55. 2, 8; 12. 14. 1; 37. 1; 42. 1; 169. 1; 170. 4; 171. 2.
[39]See A.P. 12. 171.

CHAPTER ONE: A.P. 5.138

Ἵππον Ἀθήνιον ἦcεν ἐμοὶ κακόν· ἐν πυρὶ πᾶca
Ἴλιος ἦν, κἀγὼ κείνῃ ἅμ' ἐφλεγόμαν,
†οὐ δείcac†[1] Δαναῶν δεκέτη πόνον· ἐν δ' ἑνὶ φέγγει
τῷ τότε καὶ Τρῶες κἀγὼ ἀπωλόμεθα.

Earlier poets had written poems describing how they had been completely overwhelmed with love upon seeing someone or listening to someone's voice;[2] 5.138 shows a thematic link to two earlier Hellenistic epigrams of Asclepiades:

†Τῷ θαλλῷ † Διδύμη με cυνήρπαcεν, ὤμοι ἐγὼ δέ
τήκομαι ὡc κηρὸc πὰρ πυρὶ, κάλλοc ὁρῶν.
εἰ δὲ μέλαινα, τὶ τοῦτο; καὶ ἄνθρακεc· ἀλλ' ὅτε κείνουc
θάλψωμεν λάμπουc' ὡc ῥοδεαι κάλυκεc. (A.P. 5. 210)

Ἡ λαμυρή μ' ἔτρωce Φιλαίνιον, εἰ δὲ τὸ τραῦμα
μὴ caφές, ἀλλ' ὁ πόνοc δύεται εἰc ὄνυχα.
οἴχομ' ,Ἔρωτεc, ὅλωλα, διοίχομαι, εἰc γὰρ ἔχιδναν
νυcτάζων ἐπέβην † ἠδ' ἐθίγον τ' ᾽αίδαι. (A.P. 5. 162)[3]

---

[1]οὐ δείcac was obelized by Gow-Page and there are probably as many emendations for this phrase as there are words in this epigram; see GOW-PAGE, 1965, II p. 237. Interpretation of this line is problematic if we accept the MS reading. Jacobs' understanding of the line did not meet with much favour, *"quamvis mihi nihil a decenni Graecorum oppugnatione timendum erat, i.e. quamvis ipse, non ut Ilium, decem annorum expugnationem essem expertus."*; cf. HECKER, 1843, p 53. "sententiam ineptissimam esse iure monuit Iacobsius..." However, Hecker's solution is not much clearer, *"Simul cum Troia incendio absumptus sum, licet non per decem annos Graecorum expugnationem extimuissem, i.e. licet Troianus non essem"*; see GIANGRANDE, 1967, pp. 44-45, who favours Hecker's interpretation although his argument is not very convincing. οὐ δείcac may be interpreted as referring to an earlier part of Athenion's song; namely, when the Greeks besieged or were in the process of besieging Troy (NB the aorist participle δείcac.) The point may be that he did not fear the earlier part of the story (i.e. the story of the ten years of the Danaans' suffering) because it did not have an erotic affect on him. It has been noticed that 5. 138 was imitated by Crinagoras (see Beckby, vol. 1 p. 675; MOLL, p. 28; GOW-PAGE, 1968, II p. 214. FRASER, 1972, II p. 848 n. 342); but unfortunately only the first two lines follow D.'s layout: τὸν cκοπὸν Εὐβοίηc ἁλικύμονοc ἦcεν ᾽Αριcτω | Ναύπλιον· ἐκ μολπῆc δ' ὁ θρacὺc ἐφλεγόμην. (A.P. 9. 429. 1-2). The situation is similar, the poet became enamoured of a singer named Aristo while she was singing. Crinagoras states that he was brave and he burned (ὁ θρacὺc ἐπλεγόμην), perhaps θρacὺc is reminiscent of οὐ δείcac.

[2]See Archil. Fr 84. (PLG) ...δύcτηνοc ἔγκειμαι πόθῳ | ἄψυχοc.... ; see also Sapph. 31.15-16 (PLF) ...τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω 'πιδεύηc | φαίνομ' ἔμ' αὔτᾳ; cf. subsequently: A.P. 5. 50; 132; Catul. 51; Hor. C. 1.13.

[3]NB the first two lines of A.P. 5.53 and 193 (Diosc.) are directly influenced by 162.

Both 210 and 162 show the poet captivated by the charms of a woman, while in 210 the poet melts with love and in 162 he perishes with love. D. makes use of these motifs. In short, he is captivated by the woman Athenion, he burns with fire and dies (metaphorically) with passion.

But, 5. 138 is not simply an amatory epigram; there are hints of another type of poetry. D. has blended the amatory with the sepulchral. 5. 138 is set apart in that D. is one of the first poets to blend these two kinds of poetry.[4] D. was no stranger to ἐπιγράμματα ἐπιτυμβία[5] and the opening of 5.138 is not unlike the brief, scene-setting introduction often used in sepulchral poetry, such as A.P. 7. 450.1, τῆς Σαμίης τὸ μνῆμα Φιλαινίδος.[6] Often sepulchral poems relate the cause of death,[7] and 5.138 follows this tradition as well: Athenion's singing is the cause of D.'s metaphorical death. Many epitaphs are written in such a way that the dead person seems to speak[8] and 5. 138 can be interpreted in this way too. D. has died with passion and he is briefly recounting the cause of his death. It was common in sepulchral poetry for the poet to end a line with a word denoting death, e.g. Ἀΐδης[9] or τάφος[10] or θάνατος.[11] In 5. 138 ἀπώλομεθα is significantly placed.[12] The reader assumes that D. is relating a simple, amatory experience until the last word which, in my opinion, suddenly highlights the sepulchral aspect. D. stresses the extent of his passion: his fire is as great as that of all Troy and his death is put

---

[4]See A.P. 5. 162. 4 (Asclep.), if the text is sound; cf. also n. 11.

[5]See A.P. 7. 31; 37; 76; 162; 166; 167; 178; 229; 351; 407; 410; 411; 430; 434; 450; 456; 484; 485; 707; 708;

[6]See also A.P. 7. 266 (Leon.); 481 (Philet.); 495(Alc.Mess.); 510 (Call.); 538 (Anyte) etc.

[7]See A.P. 7. 495 (anon.); 500 (Asclep.); 503 (Leon.), etc.

[8]See A.P. 7. 128 (Leon.); 172 (Antip.Sid.); 249 (Simon.); 450 (Diosc.).

[9]See A.P. 7. 13 ; 19 (Leon.); 25 (Simon.); 33 (Jul.Aegypt.); 178 (Diosc.); 190 (Anyte) etc.

[10]See A.P. 7. 76 (Diosc.); 124 (D.L.); 176 (Antiphil.); 183 (Parmen.) etc.

[11]See A.P. 7. 88 (D.L.); 151 (anon.); 177 (Simon.).

[12]See A.P. 7. 435. 2 (Nic.); 524. 4 (Call.), which end in ἀπωλόμεθα; 100. 4 (Plato), which ends in ἀπωλέσαμεν; 272.2 (Call.), which ends in ἀπολυμένην; see also 7. 213 (Arch.); 237 (Alph.); 258 (Simon.); 313; 336 (anon.) etc., which end in words with the meaning of "die".

on the same level as all the Trojans who perished. D. cleverly tops this off by writing his epigram with some aspects of an epitaph.

The context of A.P. 5.138 has been variously interpreted by commentators. There are four important questions that must be addressed:

1. Was the occasion where D. saw Athenion a private or public occasion?
2. Did she recite or sing the Horse?
3. What kind of composition did she sing/recite?
4. Was Athenion the author or was she singing someone else's work?

Firstly, most commentators have supposed that Athenion sang at some sort of public event,[13] while a few others have supposed that she sang/recited at a private symposium.[14] The scholiast does not clarify the situation. He wrote εἰc 'Αθήνιον κόρην τραγῳδόν, and it would follow that he interpreted the occasion to be public: a τραγῳδόc is a performer (actor or singer) of tragedy[15] or a writer of tragedy.[16] Unfortunately, there is no evidence that women wrote tragedies or acted in them at this time[17] and in this respect it is likely that the scholiast has recorded a guess.[18] D. tells us nothing that would imply a public event.[19] The title, Ἵππον,[20] need not be the title of a tragedy[21] or even refer to tragedy --a topic which we shall discuss later. However, some other kind of public event is possible (e.g. festivals often held competitions in poetry.)

---

[13]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, II p. 237; ROSTAGNI, p. 9; WEINREICH, p. 65; FRASER, 1972, I p. 595; REITZENSTEIN, R.E. vol. 5 p. 1126. 20. With the exception of Rostagni, whose argument is not convincing, no other commentator puts forth evidence that would preclude a private event.

[14]See WEBSTER, p. 143; GARRISON, p. 22.

[15]See LSJ s.v. τραγῳδόc 2.

[16]See LSJ s.v. τραγῳδόc 3.

[17]See ROSTAGNI, p. 9; see also WEINREICH, p. 65; WEBSTER, p. 143.

[18]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, I p. 237.

[19]See ROSTAGNI, p. 7, who thinks otherwise, "En aspice graece *Equum Troianum* in theatro Alexandrino plane actitatum."

[20]Ἵππον need not be the title; it may be an important word that recalled the work (e.g Μῆνιν ἄειδε as opposed to 'Ιλίαδα ἄειδε).

[21]See ROSTAGNI, p. 11, who says, "Ἵππον *tamen tragoediam exstitisse pro certo adfirmemus.*" He does not cite any Greek precedent, only an Equos Trojanus by Livius Andronicus and Naevius (p. 8).

Again, nothing in this epigram precludes the possibility that Athenion was singing at a private event of some kind. There are three possibilities for such an event: a private party with the poet, Athenion and musical accompaniment;[22] a select audience of literary people, where poets tested out their own material;[23] a symposium. The last possibility, I think, is the most appealing. There are many examples of singers at symposia on Red-Figure, the topos is as old as Homer,[24] and, more importantly, there are parallels for symposiasts being enamoured of singers at symposia.[25] Erotic songs were part of the symposium of all periods.[26] Our earliest example occurs in the Odyssey where Demodocus sings of the love affair between Aphrodite and Ares and their disclosure to an audience of the gods.[27] Alexandrian poets did not always spell things out plainly for their audience, often they depended on the audience's familiarity with a topos.[28] D. does not say that Athenion sang at a symposium, but his audience was well aware of the aspects of the symposium and would suspect, as we should, that the name Athenion has a termination often used by hetaerae. The name is very rare.[29] Names of women ending in the diminutive -ιον are quite common[30] and this type of diminutive is often employed by

---

[22]As far as I know, there is no evidence in the Hellenistic period for poets hiring a singer for their personal purposes; for this we much look to the Augustan period: Hor. C. 1. 17; 3. 28; 4. 11; Prop. 4.8.

[23]Given that the nature of Hellenistic poetry is highly literary, it is very tempting to assume that poets tested out new material on an audience of other poets and learned friends, but to the best of my knowledge there is no evidence for poets of this date testing their material publicly as there is for poets of the late Republic and Augustan periods. See WISEMAN, pp. 124-125, who cites Dion. Thrax Ars Gramm. 2. ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τῆς ὑποκρίσεως τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐκ δὲ τῆς προσῳδίας τὴν τέχνην, ἐκ δὲ τῆς διαστολῆς τὸν περιεχόμενον νοῦν ὁρῶμεν.

[24]See Hom. Od. 8.265ff. Demodocus sings about the love affair between Ares and Aphrodite.

[25]For love of singers see X. Smp. 3. 1; A.P. 9. 429 (Crin.); 5. 222 (anon.); Ath. Deipn. 15. 665d.

[26]See Ancr. 356 (Camp.); Ath. Deipn. 15. 665 d ; 14. 620 e; A.P. 11. 140.

[27]Hom. Od. 8. 265ff.

[28]See CAIRNS, pp. 87-88.

[29]Note that GOW-PAGE, 1965, II p. 237, state that, "the names seems not to occur elsewhere." For the use of the name Ἀθήνιον, see FRASER, 1972, II p. 848 n. 342, who states that the name does occur in Alexandria in 24 B.C.; see also FRASER, 1994, II p. 11, who cites three examples, all of which are much later than our epigram: I.G. II^2. 2776. 11, c. 120-138 AD; 2810. 10 c. 134 AD; SEG xix 172.5 c. 170-190 AD (Ἀθηνίου may not be Ἀθήνιον or even female); however, the Doric form Ἀθάνιον was used in the third century B.C. in Kalymnos; see FRASER, 1994. I. p. 15.

[30]See SEG. 39 (1989) 107 n. 318.

hetaerae, although it is not confined to them.[31] Asclepiades often used diminutive names of hetaerae in his epigrams[32] and Schneider lists forty-three names of a total of two-hundred and ninety-three known hetaerae with the -ιον diminutive ending.[33] If the occasion is symposiastic, it would not be surprising if Athenion were a hetaera; hetaerae often frequented symposia, in fact it was deemed odd if a woman came to a symposium who was not a hetaera or part of the entertainment.[34] Hetaerae were commonly depicted at symposia on Red-Figure[35] and it was a common topos in poetry to be enamoured of the singer[36], flute girl,[37] dancing girl,[38] or cithara player.[39] In short, the tradition of singers at symposia, the erotic nature of symposiastic songs, the possible association of the diminutive name of the singer with hetaerae names and the topos of being enamoured of the performer should make the private symposium the more probable occasion.

Secondly, did she sing or recite the Horse? ἦισεν seems to have caused some problems of interpretation.[40] Recitation was alive and well in the Hellenistic period.[41] If ἀείδω could be used of many different vocal sounds, then recitation is a

---

[31]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, II p. 237; cf also n. 32.

[32]See A.P. 5. 207. 1, Νάννιον; 162. 1, Φιλαίνιον; 194.1, Εἰρήνιον; 161. 1, Βοίδιον; 12. 161.1 (Asclep.), Δόρκιον.

[33]See "Hetairai", R.E. vol. 8.2. pp. 1331ff. Note that this list cannot be exhaustive.

[34]See Ath. Deipn. 13. 588, c-d.

[35]See LISSARRAGUE, p. 21. (= Beazley, ARV 467/118.)

[36]See A.P. 9. 429. 1-2, which is an imitative passage by Crinagoras; in 5. 131, Philodemus is enamoured of Xanthippe because of her skill at the lyre, singing and sweet voice; 132 (Mel.).

[37]See Ath. Deipn. 13. 577 c.

[38]See X. Smp. 9. 4-7.

[39]See A.P. 5. 222 (Agath.); 139 (Mel.).

[40]See WEINREICH, pp. 63-64.

[41]See WEINREICH, p. 63, n. 9; see also FRASER, 1972, I p. 598.

possibility.[42] Clearly, she sang or recited;[43] there is no mention of acting.[44] Whatever she did, the point of the epigram remains the same: that D. burned with passion for Athenion.

Thirdly, many commentators have touched upon the question of the type of composition which Athenion sang/recited.[45] We are not told what kind of piece Athenion was singing/reciting. There are many possibilities. It could have been a monody; [46] a parody of tragedy;[47] a solo-recitative[48]; or a semi-dramatic piece like Lycophron's Alexandra.[49] We need not be confined to drama; lyric,[50] elegiac, iambic, epic[51], epigrammatic[52] pieces are all possibilities too. Although Trojan themes were popular in tragedy (one need only look at a list of titles of Euripidean dramas), the fact that Athenion sang about Trojan themes should not persuade us to think that it was a tragic song. The A.P. contains several epigrams which deal with Homeric and Trojan themes,[53] but this similarity does not make them tragic. A.Pl. 7[54] shares some similarities with A.P. 5. 138; it records the story of a piper who "piped", among other pieces, the story of the fall of

---

[42]See LSJ s.v. 1. It may be used of "all kinds of vocal sounds". If the verb ἀείδω was used of both reciting and singing poetry, there would be no way to distinguish the two unless one actually heard the piece.

[43]See LSJ s.v. 1 ("sing"); note also Ath. Deipn. 14. 620 b-c, Οὐκ ἀπελείποντο δὲ ἡμῶν τῶν συμποσίων οὐδὲ ῥαψῳδοί.....Χαμαιλέων δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Στησιχόρου καὶ μελῳδηθῆναί φήσιν οὐ μόνον τὰ Ὁμήρου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ Ἡσιόδου καὶ Ἀρχιλόχου, ἔτι δὲ Μιμνέρμου καὶ Φωκυλίδου. See LSJ s.v. μελῳδέω, which is only used of "chant, sing". For recitation, cf. Ath Deipn. 14. 620. d, τοὺ δ' Ἐμπεδοκλέους Καθαρμοὺς ἐρραψῴδησεν Ὀλυμπίασι Κλεομένης ὁ ῥαψῳδός, ὥς φησιν Δικαίαρχος ἐν τῷ Ὀλυμπικῷ. See LSJ s.v. ῥαψῳδέω, whose primary meaning is "to recite poems".

[44]See ROSTAGNI, 1956, p. 7. He suggests that Athenion played the part of Cassandra singing the fall of Troy. He does, however, suggest that she may not have acted (p. 8).

[45]See WEINREICH, pp. 63-65; ROSTAGNI, 1965, p. 8; GOW-PAGE, 1965, II p. 237; FRASER, 1972, I p. 59.

[46]See WEBSTER, p. 143.

[47]Perhaps she was a "Hilarode"; see Ath. Deipn., 14. 622 c.

[48]See FRASER, 1972, I p. 598.

[49]See WEINREICH, p. 65.

[50]See Stesich. 133b (Campbell).

[51]See Ilias Parva of Lesches; Iliuperis of Arctinus.

[52]Vid. infra my discussion on female poets.

[53]See A.Pl. 7 (Alc.Mess.); A.P. 9. 152-155 (Agath.); 156 (Antiphil.); 11. 97 (Pall.); 259 (Lucill.); for Homeric themes, vid. infra n. 58.

[54]Alcaeus of Messene was approximately contemporary with D.; see GOW-PAGE, 1965, II pp. 6-9.

Troy, but A.P. 5.138 is not set in the same context as A.Pl. 7. In A.Pl. 7 Dorotheus piped the deeds of the horse in accompaniment to a singer or singers.[55]

Finally, we come to the question of authorship of the Horse. As noted above, there is a variety of genres of poetry which she could have sung/recited, but was she singing/reciting a known work of a predecessor or did she compose her own work? We should not dissuade ourselves from thinking that Athenion was presenting her own work on the basis of her gender as there were many female poetesses: *(lyricae)* Sappho, Telesilla, Cleobulina, Corinna, Erinna, Praxilla, Melinno, Babilla; *(epigrammaticae),* Anyte, Hedyle, Nossis; *(epica)* Moero; *(elegiaca)* Sulpicia (Latin). We have no evidence for a *tragica* [56]or an *iambographa*, but this does not necessarily exclude women from those genres.

To move on to the major topoi, D. chose two which were not developed in the Hellenistic period.[57] There are several poems in the A.P. which deal with Homeric themes[58] , but 5.138 is different. The themes of the Fall of Troy and the Trojan Horse were common knowledge both in poetry and art,[59] they are also very old myths. This, I think, is exactly why the Alexandrian poets chose to exclude them. The Trojan Horse and the *Iliupersis* motifs are conspicuous here in the A.P. because of their absence elsewhere in the Hellenistic period.[60] D. breathes new life into old themes and uses them in a new, light-hearted way; lyric, tragic, comic and epic poets treated the myths of the Fall of Troy

---

[55] A.Pl. 7 (Alc.Mess.) seems more like a public event or competition; see Gow-Page, 1965, II. p. 15.

[56]Vid. supra my discusion about the context of 5. 138.

[57]A.Pl. 7 (Alc.Mess.) mentions the aulistes Dorotheus piping the ἵππου | ἔργματ', but nothing more.

[58]A.P. 9. 152-155 (Agath.); 156 (Pall.); 457-480 (anon.); 11. 259 (Lucill.); A.Pl. 287 (Leont.).

[59]See Hom. Od. 4. 265ff.; 8.492ff.; 11. 523ff. Homer refers to the Trojan Horse episode briefly. Clearly his audience was expected to be familiar with the theme in as much the same way as they were expected to be familiar with the story of the "Argo": see Hom. Od. 12.69-70. For depictions of *Iliupersis* scenes on vases, see BROMMER, pp. 333-334; note p 334, E for the Trojan Horse.

[60]A.Pl. 7 (Alc.Mes.) briefly mentions the wooden horse, but the topos is not central to his epigram. Vid. supra n. 54.

and the Trojan Horse in a serious manner,[61] but amatory play on the Trojan Horse, the burning of Troy and the deaths of the Trojans is, to the best of my knowledge, a novel twist.

There are many other instances of humour. There is an irreverent tone to 5. 138. D. shows no respect for the famous deeds and exploits of his fellow Greeks at Troy. He exploits their noble struggles and hardships in comparing them to his trifling and frivolous feelings of passion and thereby he exaggerates the implications of his amatory "burning" and "death". We must not, however, take this insolence too seriously. The irreverence in 5. 138 is not especially piquant since earlier poets had shown similar disdain for the epic genre[62] and it was not uncommon for Hellenistic poets to show disrespect for their pantheon of gods and heroes.[63] In fact, this practice was common enough to be more of a poetic exercise than a serious comment made by the poet.

Athenion's name is another witty touch. One of the possible roots for the name Athenion is Athene.[64] The diminutive of Athene is thought-provoking for two reasons: it adds a touch of doctrina and brash wit. Athene is the goddess who helped Epeus build the wooden horse,

> ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ μετάβηθι καὶ ἵππου κόςμον ἄειcον
> δουρατέου, τὸν Ἐπειὸc ἐποίηcεν cὺν Ἀθήνῃ,
> ὅν ποτ' ἐc ἀκρόπολιν δόλον ἤγαγε διὸc Ὀδυccεύc,
> ἀνδρῶν ἐμπλήcαc οἳ Ἴλιον ἐξαλάπαξαν. (Od. 8. 493-495.)

For this reason the choice of the name Athenion in this context can hardly have been coincidental. The juxtaposition of Ἵππον Ἀθήνιον in line one is carefully contrived,

---

[61]See AUSTIN, p. 17.

[62]See BRANDT, *passim.*

[63]E.g. in Call. Ap. 49, Apollo is not simply enslaved to Admetus, but rather fired up with passion for him; cf. Dian. 145f., where Apollo waits at the doors of Olympus for Artemis like a doorman; at 146 ff. Herakles is portrayed as a house dog waiting for the huntress to return to see if she brought food. Cf. also A.R. Arg. 1. 459, 2. 409, 623, where Jason is often unheroic, (ἀμήχανοc) and at 4. 467ff. slays Apsyrtus in the temple of Artemis.

[64]Cf. Νικίον from νίκη or Σελήνιον from Σελήνη; note that Ἀθήνιc or Ἀθηναῖc are also possible roots of Ἀθήνιον; for the prosopography of Ἀθήνιc and Ἀθηναῖc, see FRASER, 1994, I p. 16; II. p. 11.

and the educated reader would have picked up on this. Secondly, the association of a possible hetaera-name with Athene, a virginal goddess, may be taken as a cogent, but humorously impudent association.[65]

There is further verbal play in line three. D. plays on the meaning of φέγγει. φέγγει means "light" whether of a fire or day.[66] It has been argued that ἐν δ' ἑνὶ φέγγει refers to the day of the festival or simply the light of day,[67] but also that it refers to the fire of Troy.[68] The fire of love[69] and perishing with love[70] are well developed images. D. enlivens these old images by associating ἐφλεγόμαν[71] and ἀπωλόμεθα with Troy and the Trojans. The wit and humour of 5. 138 depends on these images; D. uses the burning of Ilium and the deaths of the Trojans as analogies for his own fire of love and metaphorical death.

There is similar cleverness and humour in D.'s equivocation and teasing of the reader. The mixture of types of poetry in 5. 138 is only part of the puzzle, ambiguity makes up a significant part of the poem. In line one κακόν could be taken as a masculine adjective[72] with ῞Ιππον, or as a neuter substantive in apposition to῞Ιππον or to the whole preceding phrase.[73] Here, κακόν is ambiguous (and well chosen) because it contains a

---

[65]Cf. my discusion above on the name' Αθήνιον.

[66]See LSJ s.v. 2 for fire; s.v. 1 for daylight.

[67]See WEINREICH, p. 69; GOW-PAGE, 1965, II p. 237.

[68]See MACKAIL, p. 350, LVIII; cf. also A.P. 12. 83. 5 (Mel.), ἐκ δέ με φέγγος ἔτηξε.

[69]See Sapph. 31 (Camp.) λέπτον δ' αὔτικα χρῷ πῦρ ὑπαδεδρόμακεν; cf. A.P. 12.46; 5. 210 (Asclep.); 12. 48; 80 (Mel.); Theoc. Id. 2 *passim*; see also HEADLAM, p. 398.

[70]See Archil. 84 (PLF); Sapph. 31. 15-16 (PLF);Theocr. Id. 2. 26; A.P. 162.3 (Asclep.); 5. 171.4 (Mel.).

[71]ἐφλεγόμαν is interesting for its Doric termination. On a close inspection of D.'s vocabulary, one will find that he often employed Doric forms. Many of his poems are on Doric subjects. See A.P. 6. 126. 1, 3; 7.411. 1; 229. 1, 5; 430 (many Doricisms); 434. 4; 9. 340. 3; 11. 195. 3. Note also that Leonidas of Tarentum often ended epigrams in the Doric -αν; see A.P. 6. 35. 3, 5; 305. 8; 130. 2; 7. 67.7; 449. 3; 9. 322. 7; A.Pl. 190. 1; 306. 4. No final word can be made about D.'s use of Doricisms, since in this period Doricisms were simply another tool at the poet's command.

[72]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, II p. 237; see also PATON, I p. 195.

[73]See WALTZ, II p. 68; WEINREICH, p. 62.

number of implications: as an adjective κακόν can be used in a moral sense, "bad, evil,"[74] "unlucky[75]" or "pernicious;[76] as a substantive κακόν can have the sense of "evil, ill", "harm", "trouble".[77] If the horse is ἐμοὶ κακόν, one might expect that the speaker was a Trojan, as the Greeks captured Troy by this ruse.[78] This association of κακόν with Ἵππον misleads the reader who expects the story of the Trojan horse, but later on it is slowly revealed that it is D.'s attraction to Athenion that is the κακόν. This amatory usage of κακόν is not rare in the A.P. (e.g. Ὥρωτες, τί κακὸν τοῦτο. 12.46.2);[79] in fact, it was established before D.'s time. Here, κακόν may be a bit puzzling at first, but it is an integral part of 5. 138: D. parallels the burning of Troy and the deaths of the Trojans with his own metaphorical "burning" and "death",[80] and κακόν works in the same way. In the eyes of the Trojans the Horse spelled destruction, and D. associates the Horse with his own metaphorical κακόν of love. So, on a metaphorical level, D. likens himself to the Trojans.

There are many other ambiguous points to 5. 138. The brief beginning plunges the reader *in medias res* and there are several questions that come to mind: What Horse is this? Who is Athenion? Is this a private or public event? What kind of composition is this, her own or someone else's? Is she singing or reciting? What does D. mean by κακόν? With the exception of the Horse, which is clarified in the next sentence, these questions are not answered in this epigram. There is point to this (deliberate) equivocation. D. hooks the reader and entices him/her to read on and think about the unanswered questions.

---

[74]See LSJ s.v. I. 5.
[75]See LSJ s.v. II.
[76]See LSJ s.v. II.
[77]See LSJ s.v. B.
[78]See Hom. Od. 8. 276.
[79]See also 12. 80; 99; 5. 133; 50.
[80]See GIANGRANDE, 1967, pp. 44-45.

There are several other instances of cleverness in 5. 138; D. packs a lot into four lines of poetry. The placement of words like Ἵππον Ἀθήνιον adds a touch of doctrina to the epigram.[81] Sound play like the homoioteleuton in Ἵππον Ἀθήνιον...κακόν and alliteration in πυρὶ πᾶσα, κἀγὼ κείνῃ, Δαναῶν δεκέτη, τῷ τότε καὶ Τρῶες κἀγὼ add polish and sensitivity to the poem. Balance between words such as, πυρὶ, ἐφλεγόμαν, φέγγει, κακόν, πόνον, ἀπωλόμεθα is carefully managed. Throughout this epigram D. constructs a delicate balance with words that apply both literally and metaphorically both to himself and to the Trojans. In every clause[82] there is a shifting between D. and Troy. In line one there is the association between Athenion's singing the Horse and its affect on D. In the next sentence emphasis shifts between ἐν πυρὶ πᾶσα Ἴλιος ἦν and κἀγὼ κείνῃ ἄμ' ἐφλεγόμαν, and ἄμ' stresses D.'s association with the Trojans. Line four finally groups both the Trojans and D. together, Τρῶες κἀγὼ ἀπωλόμεθα.

5. 138 has sparked some attention for the most part because of the problems in line three (οὐ δείσας), but also for its assumed theatrical/sympotic theme. For all its interest, one commentator writes, "...Dioscorides compares the fire of love kindled in him by the singer Athenion with the fire of Ilion, of which she sang. This is a frigid conceit, and inferior to D.'s other pieces."[83] On the contrary, D.'s use of the Horse and fire of Ilium is lively and refreshing. He has revived old and stale topoi and cast them in a new, humorous way. Metaphorical "death" and "burning" are not new topoi, but D. takes them to an unprecedented level.

---

[81]Vid. supra my discussion on the name Ἀθήνιον.

[82]Although line three has some textual problems, balance is still maintained.

[83]See FRASER, 1972, I p. 597.

CHAPTER TWO: A.P. 5. 55

Δωρίδα τὴν ῥοδόπυγον ὑπὲρ λεχέων διατείνας
ἄνθεσιν ἐν χλοεροῖς ἀθάνατος γέγονα.
ἡ γὰρ ὑπερφυέεσσι μέσον διαβᾶσά με ποσσίν
ἤνυσεν ἀκλινέως τὸν Κύπριδος δόλιχον,
ὄμμασι νωθρὰ βλέπουσα· τὰ δ' ἠύτε πνεύματι φύλλα
ἀμφιταλευομένης ἔτρεμε πορφύρεα,
μέχρις ἀπεσπείσθη λευκὸν μένος ἀμφοτέροισιν,
καὶ Δωρὶς παρέτοις ἐξεχύθη μέλεσι.

A.P. 5. 55 is, of course, an amatory epigram, but of a very rare type; 5. 55 is a "subjective-sexual epigram".[1] The vivid and specific description of an act of intercourse in 5. 55 is, as far as I know, new in Hellenistic epigram. Nowhere is a subjective love affair fully described where the actual sex is the main theme of the whole poem. Often when sex is mentioned or implied we are not told specific details, but given instead either metaphor or double-entendre. Epigrams of this latter type may be said to follow the formula *cetera quis nescit.*[2] 5. 55 is different. Instead of leaving the reader to fill in the details or depending on the reader's understanding of metaphor, D. openly explains the details of their coition. Novelty on this level has a real impact and arrests the reader. 5. 55 depends more on shock-value than subtlety. Yet, for all the open description of details which are usually clandestine , 5. 55 contains wit, humour, doctrina and stylistic flourishes (all of which are discussed later on).

It has often been stated that epigram and iambic poetry lend themselves to vivid sexual description, but when did this kind graphic description begin? In iambic poetry we know that Archilochus[3] and probably Hipponax[4] employed sexual scenes, but models in

[1]I.e. an epigram in which the "I" of the poem speaks of his/her own sexual experience.
[2]Cf. A.P. 5. 4 (Phld.); 128 (Paul.Sil.); 252 (*cetera quis nescit* = Ov. Am. 1. 5. 25).
[3]Vid. infra fr. of Archil.'s epode.
[4]See ADAMS, p. 220.

epigram are either not extant or never existed.[5] There are other examples of subjective epigram which describe sexual encounters, but they are much later in the tradition than our epigram[6] and they often use extended metaphor, as did Asclepiades.[7]

On the question of sources in the Hellenistic period subjective sexual encounters are rarely described in specific detail;[8] instead, many poets were accustomed to use extended metaphor for coition. Two epigrams in particular from the early Hellenistic period show this kind of metaphorical description:

> Πορφυρέην μάστιγα καὶ ἡνία σιγαλόεντα
> Πλαγγὼν εὐίππων θῆκεν ἐπὶ προθύρων,
> νικήσασα κέλητι Φιλαινίδα τὴν πολύχαρμον
> ἑσπερινῶν πώλων ἄρτι φρυασσομένων.
> Κύπρι φίλη, σὺ δὲ τῇδε πόροις νημερτέα νίκης
> δόξαν, ἀείμνηστον τήνδε τιθεῖσα χάριν. (A.P. 5. 202) [9]
>
> Λυσιδίκη σοί, Κύπρι, τὸν ἱππαστῆρα μύωπα,
> χρύσεον εὐκνήμου κέντρον ἔθηκε ποδός,
> ᾧ πολὺν ὕπτιον ἵππον ἐγύμνασεν· οὐδέ ποτ' αὐτῆς
> μηρὸς ἐφοινίχθη κοῦφα τιναssομένης·
> ἦν γὰρ ἀκέντητος τελεοδρόμος· οὕνεκεν ὅπλον
> σοὶ κατὰ μεσσοπύλης χρύσεον ἐκρέμασεν. (A.P. 5. 203)

5. 202 and 203, although they are strictly dedicatory, describe the method of coitus in which the woman is said to be κελητίζουσα, and, as is fitting, both poems include the appropriate metaphors from equestrian events. None of the vocabulary used in these poems is, in its own right, obscene. D. is following and expanding on this earlier tradition

---

[5]This is, perhaps, an example where literature follows art; there are many Red-Figure vases portraying sexual scenes.

[6]Cf. e.g. A.P. 5. 275.3-4 (Paul. Sil.), which is indebted to 5. 55, τολμήσας δ' ἐπέβην λεχέων ὕπερ. ὡς δὲ κελεύθου | ἥμισυ κυπριδίης ἤνυον ἀσπασίως.

[7]For nautical terminology, cf. 5. 204 (Mel.); for three men dividing up the "realms" of a woman (as Zeus, Poseidon, Hades) cf. 11. 328 (Nicarch.); wrestling metaphor 12. 206 (Strat.); door metaphor 5. 242 (Eratosth.).

[8]Cf. 5. 158. 1 (Asclep.) Ἑρμιόνῃ πιθανῇ ποτ' ἐγὼ συνέπαιζον ... Note that nothing more is said about their sexual play; cf. also 5. 128. 3-4 (Marc.Arg.) ...χρῶτα πρὸς χρῶτα, τὰ λοιπὰ | σιγῶ.

[9]Note that the authorship for 5. 202 is disputed (ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΑΔΟΥ ἢ ΠΟΣΕΙΔΙΠΠΟΥ): GOW-PAGE include 5. 202 with the poems of Asclepiades, but Posidippus is the more likely author (see PAGE, p. 123; FRASER, 1972, 2 p. 812).

of erotic epigram in which he takes on the theme of a sexual encounter, but D. develops and varies it in new directions.

5. 55 shares a few similarities with 202 and 203: the adaptation of a sporting event to amatory/erotic epigram; the completion of a race; prominence of Cypris; κελητίζειν (?)[10]. 5. 55 shares a few specific similarities with 203 in particular, namely the reason for the dedication in 203 (ἦν γὰρ ἀκέντητος τελεοδρόμος.) This phrase is similar to D.'s γὰρ ...ἤνυσεν ἀκλινέως τὸν Κύπριδος δόλιχον (line 4). Both poets made reference to the ποδές (feet/legs/calves) of the ladies concerned (εὐκνήμου... ποδός, ὑπερφυέσσι ...ποσσίν).

However, 5. 55 is at the same time quite different from 202 and 203: 5. 55 is not thinly disguised metaphor; 5. 55 is not an ἀναθημάτικον; the poets of 202 and 203 are not said to have been participants in the sexual encounters and there is less importance placed on the couplings. Vis-à-vis 5. 202 and 203, the novelty of 5. 55 lies in the description of the sex act itself, the orgasm that was shared by both and the impact of sex on Doris after it was complete.

D. may or may not be relating a personal sexual encounter; however, to find a precedent for this kind of description we must look outside the genre of epigram. 5. 55 has a few points in common with a fragment of an epode of Archilochus (lines 28-35):

παρθένον δ' ἐν ἄνθε[σιν]
[τηλ]εθάεσσι λαβὼν ἔκλινα· μαλθακῆι δ[έ μιν]
[χλαί]νηι καλύφας, αὐχέν' ἀγκάληις' ἔχω[ν,]
[. . .]ματι παυ[ς]αμένην τὼς ὥστε νέβρ[ον
[. . .]ων τε χερσὶν ἠπίως ἐφηφάμην
[. . .] ἐφηνε νέον ἥβης ἐπηλυσιν χρόα[
[. . . .]ε σῶμα καλὸν ἀμγαφώμενος
[λευκ]ὸν ἀφῆκα μένος, ζανθῆς ἐπιφαύ[ων τιρχός.][11]

[10]Vid. infra my discussion on the problems on interpretation.
[11]The "Second Cologne Epode" of Archilochus; text printed here is from MERKELBACH-WEST, p. 101; cf. also BREMER, pp. 24-61.

Archil. is also graphic in the description of his conquest and there are a few important similarities which are peculiar to Archil.'s epode and 5. 55: earlier on in the epode, Archil. asks a girl for sex, "τὸ θεῖον χρῆμα" which has the same divine association as "ἀθάνατος γέγονα" in 5. 55. 2;[12] he lays the girl down on a "bed" of flowers (cf. ἄνθεσιν); he mentions that he had an orgasm. The two poems also share a few verbal reminiscences: D.'s λευκὸν μένος and ἄνθεσιν ἐν χλοεροῖς are reminiscent of Archil.'s λευκ]ὸν[13] ... μένος and ἐν ἄνθε[σιν] | [τηλ]εθάεσσι.

5. 55 does differ from lines 28-35 of Archil.'s epode in a few important ways: 5. 55 is set among consenting adults whose pleasure is mutual; it is playful and humorous; it is full of poetic vocabulary; care and attention is paid to the woman's needs. Archil. appears not to have had sexual intercourse,[14] unlike D.; 5. 55 is a celebration of sex not simply as a means to satisfy the man as in Archil.'s epode. If D. used Archil.'s epode as a model for 5. 55, he went to great lengths to differ from Archil. He also outdoes Archil. in that he actually has intercourse with Doris and they both reach a sexual climax (cf. line 7).

There are a few important problems of interpretation which need to be covered. Concerning Doris' position, it is generally accepted that Doris is κελητίζουσα,[15] with D. either lying on his back or sitting, because of ὑπὲρ in line 1, διαβᾶσα in line 3 and ἀμφιταλευομένης in line 6. ὑπὲρ has generally been taken in its usual meaning of "over" or "above".[16] However ὑπὲρ need not mean "over" or "above" and, although LSJ does not cite the meaning "on" for this preposition, I think that there are contexts which

---

[12]See BREMER, p. 37.

[13]Note that this conjecture is supported by A.P. 5. 55 and if this reading is correct λευκὸν μένος could be described as a learned allusion; note that D. does show some familiarity with the works of Archil. (see A.P. 7. 351). See BREMER, pp. 49-50, who cites in addition to A.P. 5. 55, S. Aj. 1412 f. μέλαν μένος and Hes. Th. 190 f. λευκὸς ἀφρός.

[14]See Archil. fr. 196a. (Camp.) 9-10.

[15]Cf. JACOBS, 7 p. 407; GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 239; DÜBNER, 1. p. 126; SCHRIER, 1979, p. 309; BALDWIN, p. 358; SCHRIER, 1982, p. 146; MOLL, pp. 4, 39.

[16]See LSJ s.v. 1; cf. SCHRIER, 1979, p. 309; SCHRIER, 1982, p. 146. GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 239, is an exception; vid. infra. my discussion on diction, i.e. ὑπὲρ λεχέων.

clearly show that ὑπέρ must in fact mean "on", i.e. "on the bed".[17] διαβᾶca[18] is perhaps the strongest evidence for the κέλης;[19] however, there is no equestrian imagery in 5. 55 as in 5. 202 and 203. It is possible that Doris is ὑποκειμένη with her legs around D.'s waist,[20] a position which would more naturally precede παρέτοις ἐξεχύθη μέλεσι since no change of position is mentioned.[21] ἀμφιcαλευομένης[22] is a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, but the uncompounded verb, cαλεύομαι, is used in nautical contexts elsewhere, where the woman is likened to a ship carrying the man and the man is placed on top as either a rower or passenger of the "ship".[23]

διατείνω also offers some problems of interpretation concerning Doris' position and GOW-PAGE rightly draw attention to the meanings of διατείνω. LSJ cites "stretch to the uttermost, δ. τὸ τόξον"; "keep stretched out", τὴν χεῖρα; ἀράχνιον δ. πρὸς τὰ πέρατα; τινὰ ὑπὲρ λεχέων (5. 55). None of these meaning fits well in the context of 5. 55 if Doris is κελητίζουcα, but would seem more fitting if Doris were ὑποκειμένη.

---

[17]Note that Gow-Page (1965, 2 p. 239) suggested, "'Υπὲρ λεχέων, though the use of the preposition is hard to parallel precisely, must surely mean *on the bed...*" I would like to confirm GOW-PAGE's assumption with a few parallels: cf. A.P. 5. 283. 2 (Paul.Sil.) Δάκρυά μοι cπένδουcαν ἐπήρατον οἰκτρὰ Θεανὼ | εἶχον ὑπὲρ λέκτρων πάννυχον ἡμετέρων; Mosch. Europa 22 τίc μοι τοιάδε φάcματ' ἐπουρανίων προΐηλεν;| ποῖοί με cτρυτῶν λεχέων ὕπερ ἐν θαλάμοιcιν | ἠδὺ μάλα κνώccουcαν ἀνεπτοίηcαν ὄνειροι; Nonn. Paraphrasis sancti evangelii Joannei, 11, 47, οἱ δὲ μάτην ἔλποντο, φίλον νέκυν ἔνδοθεν οἴκου | ἡδὺν ὑπὲρ λεχέων παλινάγρετον ὕπνον ἰαύειν. Cf. also perhaps A.P. 5. 275. 3 (Paul.Sil.) Δειελινῷ χαρίecca Μενεκρατὶc ἔκχυτοc ὕπνῳ | κεῖτο περὶ κροταφουc πῆχυν ἑλιξαμένη. | τολμήcαc δ' ἐπέβην λεχέων ὕπερ· ὡc δὲ κελεύθου| ἥμιcυ κυπριδίηc ἥνυον ἀcπαcίωc... For ὑπέρ + acc., cf. A.P. 12. 210. 1 (Strat.) Τρεῖc ἀρίθμει τοὺc πάντας ὑπὲρ λέχοc, ὧν δύο δρῶcιν, | καὶ δύο πάcχουcιν; A.P. 5. 119. 2 (Crin.) Κἦν ῥίψηc ἐπὶ λαιά, καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ δεχιὰ ῥίψηc, | Κριναγόρη, κενεοῦ cαυτὸν ὕπερθε λέχουc...

[18]See LSJ s.v. II. 3, which cites our epigram.

[19]See HENDERSON, p. 165, who cites Aristophanes: ἀλλ' ἐκεῖναί γ' οἰδ' ὅτι ἐπὶ τῶν κελήτων διαβεβήκαc' ὀρθριαι (Lys. 60); cf. LSJ s.v. III.

[20]See BALDWIN, p. 358; cf. also Ov. Ars 3. 776ff.

[21]Cf. DÜBNER, p. 126, who records, "διαβᾶca, ut eques. Describitur schema quod κελήτα appellant, et turpis Apuleius (Metam. II, p. 32) dixit *pendulam venerem.* Cui quum contraria sit in primo versu facta descriptio: ὑπὲρ λεχέων διατείναc, tenendum est primum distichum circa praeludia quaedam ac velitationem amatoriam versari."

[22]Vid. infra. my discussion on liquid and water imagery.

[23]Cf. A.P. 5. 44 (Ruf.); 54 (Diosc.); 161 (Hedylus or Asclep. or Simon.); 204 (Mel.); 9. 415 (Antiphil.); 416 (Philip); 11. 29 (Autom.) etc. Cf. also HENDERSON, p. 49; ADAMS, p. 167.

GOW-PAGE suggest (with the notion that Doris is κελητίζουσα) that διατείνω could also mean "putting her to the stretch, calling on her to exert her full powers".[24] It is also possible that διατείνω has a more expressive definition in keeping with the nature of 5. 55: perhaps διατείνας in this context is roughly equivalent to διατείνας ῥοδοπύγου τὸν κύσθον Δωρίδος,[25] and if this is the case, there is no difference whether Doris is κελητίζουσα or ὑποκειμένη.

ἄνθεσιν ἐν χλοεροῖς in line 2 is also problematical. It has generally been suggested that ἄνθεσιν should not be taken in its usual sense,[26] but rather that it should be taken in a metaphorical sense referring to Doris' physical charms.[27] This is possible, but there are several literal meanings of ἄνθος which may be present in this context: blossom, flower; anything thrown out upon the surface, eruption, froth or scum; (in plur.) embroidered flowers.[28] ἄνθεσιν may refer to real flowers. If we take ἄνθεσιν as real flowers, there are several possible contexts. Firstly, flowers of various kinds, meadows[29] etc. make up a background which is often chosen as the ideal place for a seduction;[30] the bed mentioned in line 1 (ὑπὲρ λεχέων) may not be a "bed" in the literal sense, but rather a

---

[24]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 239.

[25]Cf. SCHRIER, 1979, p. 309, who cites Id., In Hippocr. Prorrh. 605 (CMG V 9, 2, p. 59): τὸ ἀθροιζόμενον αὖρον οὔπω διέτεινεν ἰσχυρῶς τὴν κύστιν. Cf. also LSJ s.v. "διατείνω"(addenda et corrigenda) "strain of a woman in childbirth".

[26]Cf. LSJ s.v. II. See JACOBS, 7. 407, who states, "Hoc non sensu proprio accipiendum, in toro enim res agitur; sed referendum ad ῥοδόπυγον";GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 239, who cite Solon fr. 25 ἔσθ ' ἥβης ἐρατοῖσιν ἐπ' ἄνθεσι παιδοφιλήσῃ; Theoc. Id. 5. 87 τὸν ἄναβον ἐν ἄνθεσι παῖδα μολύνει; DÜBNER, p. 126; SCHRIER, 1979, p. 309-310.

[27]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 239; SCHRIER, 1979, p. 309.

[28]See LSJ s.v. I.

[29]Cf. E. Ba. 866, χλοεροῖς λείμακος ἡδοναῖς.

[30]E.g.Hom. Il. 14. 346-349 ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἀγκὰς ἔμαρπτε Κρόνου παῖς ἦν παράκοιτιν· | τοῖσι δ' ὑπὸ χθὼν διὰ φύεν νεοθηλέα ποίην, | λωτόν θ' ἑρσήεντα ἰδὲ κρόκον ἠδ' ὑάκινθον | πυκνὸν καὶ μαλακόν, ὅς ἀπὸ χθονὸς ὑψόσ' ἔεργε; Hes. Th. 278f. τῇ δὲ μιῇ παρελέξατο Κυανοχαίτης | ἐν μαλακῷ λειμῶνι καὶ ἄνθεσιν εἰαρινοῖσιν; Archil. fr. 196a. 27, (West) παρθένον δ' ἐν ἄνθ[εσιν | τηλεθάεσσι λαβὼν ἔκλινα; Theoc. Id. 5. 87, και τὸν ἄναβον ἐν ἄνθεσι παῖδα μολύει; Mosch. Europa. 72-73, οὐ μὲν δηρὸν ἔμελλεν ἐπ' ἄνθεσι θυμὸν ἰαίνειν, | οὐδ' ἄρα παρθενίην μίτρην ἄχραντον ἔρυσθαι; see BREMER, 1975, pp. 269-274.

soft place to recline, e.g. a patch of flowers;[31] D. may be referring to real flowers which were scattered upon their bed;[32] in the context of ἀπεσπείσθη λευκὸν μένος, ἄνθος may carry the additonal senses of *anything thrown out upon the surface, eruption, froth or scum.* Finally, ἄνθεσιν may refer to some kind artistic representation, e.g. an embroidered coverlet. The image of blooming flowers also adds colour, brightness and beauty to the poem which sets the *locus* for D.'s ἀποθέωσις.

πορφύρεα in line 6 is also ambiguous.[33] πορφύρεα need not mean the colour purple; Homer uses πορφύρεος of the sea; a wave; blood; death; a rainbow; a cloud etc.[34] πορφύρεα may also be used of another colour, e.g. bright-red, rosy-red or a flushing colour.[35] Unlike *purpureus* , πορφύρεος does not seem to include the meanings "radiant, glowing".[36] With this in mind many commentators have suggested how πορφύρεα should be taken: it could be taken with φύλλα,[37] e.g. "purple leaves or flowers";[38] however that explanation does not seem to fit in this context [39]and φύλλα is probably better left alone in the simile, ἠύτε πνεύματι φύλλα. πορφύρεα may be taken with τὰ referring back to ὄμμασι (e.g. τὰ πορφύρεα ὄμματα); trembling eyes are not unparalleled at or during orgasm.[40] In this context, τὰ δ' [sc.ὄμματα] ἔτρεμε πορφύρεα has reasonably been

---

[31]Cf. Apul. Met. 5. 1, *Psyche teneris et herbosis locis in ipso toro roscidi graminis* | *suave recubans...*

[32]See NISBET-HUBBARD, p. 74 (Hor. C. 1. 5. 1.), who cite: [Lucian], Asin. 7, τῶν δὲ στρωμάτων ῥόδα πολλὰ κατεπέπαστο, τὰ μὲν οὕτω γυμνὰ καθ' ἑαυτά, τὰ δὲ λελυμένα, τὰ δὲ στεφάνοις συμπεπλεγμένα; Ael. VH 9. 24, φύλλοις ῥόδων γοῦν ἐπαναπεσὼν καὶ κοιμηθεὶς ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἐξανέστη λέγων φλυκταίνας ἐκ τῆς εὐνῆς ἔχειν.

[33]See LSJ s.v.; cf. also SCHRIER, 1979, pp. 313-323.

[34]See Il. 16. 391; 1. 482; 17. 361; 5. 83; 17. 547; 17. 551 (respectively).

[35]See LSJ s.v. II.

[36]See OLD s.v. 3. Cf. LSJ s.v. Note that GERBER, p. 228 and CASTRIGANO, p. 121 suggest the meanings "shining, radiant," and "splendente" (respectively) concerning Anacr. fr. 12. 3 (πορφυρῇ τ' Ἀφροδίτῃ).

[37]See DÜBNER, p 126.

[38]Cf. Theoc. Id. 11. 26, ὑακίνθινα φύλλα.

[39]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2. p. 240.

[40]Cf. Juv. 7. 240-241, *non est leve tot puerorum* | *observare manus oculosque in fine trementis.*

deemed odd after ὄμμαcι νωθρὰ βλέπουcα,[41] and, if πορφύρεα refers to Doris' eyes, this eye colour, as far as I know, would be unparalleled. Another possibility is that τὰ πορφύρεα refers to Doris' hair.[42] GOW-PAGE suggest that πορφύρεα "...seems improbable of hair".[43] In response to this statement, BALDWIN cites Lucianus Salt.41 (purple hair of Nisus) and [Lucianus] Am. 26,[44] and to this list I would like to add Anacreont. 16. 11 (Camp.), ὑπὸ πορφυραῖcι χαίταιc. It is also possible that πορφύρεα refers back to, or is intended to recall ῥοδοπύγον.[45] τὰ...πορφύρεα may even be a poetic phrase referring to Doris' breasts,[46] but a reference to buttocks[47] would seem more pointed (cf. ῥοδοπύγον in line 1). We are introduced to Doris with the adjective ῥοδοπύγον and it would not be out of line in Hellenistic epigram to expect an explanation for this adjective once one has read the entire poem.[48] πορφύρεοc is often associated with Aphrodite and is common in erotic contexts,[49] but we are perhaps also to keep in mind the earlier uses of πορφύρεοc associating it with the sea (waves etc.) and the liquid/water imagery in 5. 55.[50]

To move on to some important images in 5. 55, the motif of "becoming immortal", ἀθάνατοc γέγονα, (= to have an orgasm) is not common. Sappho and Homer referred to people as ἴcοc θέοιcιν[51] and ἰcόθεοc φώc[52] and later it was a common topos to

---

[41]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 240; cf. also SCHRIER, 1979, p. 314-315 who found GOW-PAGE's argument "uncompelling". He claims that he has seen the answer in six pieces of Homer where φύλλα is used in similes, all of which, in my opinion, are used to describe great numbers of people and have no connection at all with A.P. 5. 55.
[42]See BALDWIN, p. 358.
[43]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 240.
[44]See BALDWIN, p. 359.
[45]Cf. LSJ s.v. πορφύρεοc II.2 is used of human complexion, e.g. "rosy".
[46]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 240.
[47]See BALDWIN, p. 48.
[48]Cf. A.P. 5. 53; 193 (Diosc.); 158; 162 (Asclep.).
[49]See BALDWIN, p. 359.
[50]Vid. infra my discussion on water imagery.
[51]See Sapph. 31. 1 (Camp);
[52]See Od. 1. 324; 20. 124 (of Telemachos); Il. 2. 565 (of Euryalos) etc.

compare the beloved to a divinity, e.g. Cupid or Venus.[53] Archil. went further than most poets by alluding to sex as τὸ θεῖον χρῆμα.[54] However, the image of becoming a god through sexual intercourse does not seem to be used before D. and it seems that later writers who employed this theme are indebted to D.[55] The ἀποθέωcιc of D. is shockingly irreverent and adds to the impact and humour of 5. 55.

Liquid or water imagery is prevalent in 5. 55. ἀμφιcαλευομένηc is a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, but the uncompounded cαλεύω is often used intransitively in nautical contexts.[56] Unlike the association of the sea and love, sea or liquid imagery and sex are rare in Hellenistic epigram; liquid/sea imagery in a sexual context is used only four times[57] and two of these poems are by D. If D. was inspired by 5. 161 (Hedyl. or Ascelp. or Simon.) (e.g. 5. 161 associates sex, Sirens and the sea; 5. 55 sex, Doris and the Nereid Doris), he outdoes it by making 5. 55 a subjective sex-epigram with extra emphasis on coition. In line 7, λευκὸν μένοc is the liquid that is poured forth somewhat irreverently as a libation either *for* both or *by* both[58] participants (ἀπεcπείcθη) and there is further liquid imagery in ἐξεχύθη in line 8. Liquid imagery is not only used for poetic effect, there is real point involved. The name Doris has a divine connection. Doris was the daughter of Oceanus and Tethys,[59] the wife of Nereus and the mother of the Nereids among whom were Thetis and Doris.[60] Once the connection between Doris the wife of Nereus/Nereid is

---

[53]See LIER, pp. 5-8.
[54]See BREMER, p. 36; τὸ θεῖον χρῆμα may also refer to marriage.
[55]Cf. A.P. 5. 94. 4 (Ruf.), ἡμίθεος δ' ὁ φιλῶν· ἀθάνατος δ' ὁ γαμῶν; 5. 105. 3-4 (Marc.Arg.), ἦ γὰρ ὁ ταύτης | οὐρανὸς ἐντὸς ἔχει καὶ κύνα καὶ διδύμους; 11. 328 (Nich.) *passim;* 12. 177 . 6 (Strat.), πῶc ἀποθειωθεὶc πλάζομ' ἐπιχθόνιοc; cf. also (Latin) Plaut. Curc. 166; Prop. 2. 14. 10, *immortalis ero, si altera (sc. nox) talis erit;* 2. 25. 39, *si dabit haec multas, fiam immortalis in illis.*
[56]See LSJ s.v. II. NB. A.P. 5. 54 (Diosc.).
[57]See MURGATROYD, 1995, p. 6, who cites also A.P. 5. 161 (Hedyl. or Asclep. or Simon.); 204 (Mel.).
[58]See DANIELEWICZ, p. 235.
[59]See Hes. Th. 350.
[60]See Hes. Th. 241 ff.; Hom. Il. 18. 45.

made, Doris' epithet (ῥοδόπυγον) may be viewed in a different light: Hesiod lists the fifty daughters of Nereus and Doris many of whom have a descriptive epithet, but two in particular have the epithet ῥοδόπηχυς (Εὐνίκη, Th. 246; Ἱππονόη, Th. 251), which is curiously reminiscent of ῥοδόπυγον in line 1.

Another important image in our epigram is ἤνυσεν ἀκλινέως τὸν Κύπριδος δόλιχον. The idea of completing a race occurs in early Hellenistic epigram, e.g. ἦν γὰρ ἀκέντητος τελεοδρόμος (A.P. 5. 203. 4 Asclep.).[61] D. shows variation on Asclepiades' image by employing a foot race metaphor, the δόλιχος.[62] δόλιχον has point: it was the long race c. 5000 m or twenty-four lengths of the stadion.[63] The δόλιχος emphasizes the duration of the their love-making, and Doris finished it with distinction, she did not stray from her course (ἀκλινέως).[64] The image of the δόλιχος had been used before,[65] but not, as far as I know, in an amatory context. The motif of the "course of Aphrodite" became more popular in later writers.[66]

There is also Homeric imagery in the simile ἠύτε πνεύματι φύλλα (line 5), which is bold and amusing. On several occasions, Homer compares leaves to: multitudes

---

[61]Cf. A.P. 5. 202 (Asclep./Posid.); vid. supra my discussion on this type of poetry.

[62]I agree with SCHRIER, 1979, p. 313, who states, "...the *eques*-metaphor is not used here." I do not see any reference to an equestrian event in δόλιχος. Cf. GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 240, who write, "It was however a foot-race and does not seem to be used as the official name for a horse-race, which would be more apposite to the theme..."; cf. BALDWIN, p. 48, who states, "If Doris is κελητίζουσα, Schrier (noted above) may be too cavalier in dismissing Gow-Page's notion of a horse race, given the usual more explicitly equestrian descriptions of such intercourse (he cites A.P. 5. 202; 203; Ov. Ars. 3. 778; Mart. 11. 105). Yet the horse race does not have to be postulated..." Unfortunately none of these refs. helps to elucidate Doris' position. JACOBS, 7. 408, tries to show that the δόλιχος was a short race; he cites Lucr. 4. 1196, *Et communia quaerens gaudia, sollicitat spatium decurrere amoris.* δόλιχος igitur est *stadium*, non...*longus cursus*. It seems that JACOBS has missed the point. The image of δόλιχος is almost proverbial for almost any long exertion, vid. infra. my note on the uses of δόλιχος.

[63]See MILLER, p. 212.

[64]Cf. A.P. 5. 203. 4 (Asclep.), ἀκέντητος.

[65]Cf. A.P. 7. 447. 2 (Call.), "Θῆρις Ἀρισταίου, Κρὴς" ἐπ' ἐμοὶ δόλιχος; 726. 6 (Leon.), Ἀθηναίης...δόλιχον (i.e weaving); 9. 342. 2 (Parmen.) μὴ ζητεῖτ' ἐν σταδίῳ δόλιχον; 11. 128. 6 (Poll.), οὕτω νικῆσαι καὶ δόλιχον δύνασαι; [Lucian.], Dem.Enc. 3. 7 καὶ σὺ δή μοι δοκεῖς νενικηκὼς τὸν δόλιχον τῶν ἐπῶν; Plu. Phoc. 23. 4 τὸν δόλιχον πολέμου φοβοῦμαι.

[66]Cf. A.P. 5. 275. 3-4 (Paul.Sil.) κελεύθου | ἥμισυ κυπριδίης ἤνυον ἀσπασίως; Lucr. 4. 1196.

of men; the cycle of life and death; working slaves.[67] It is likely that D. has taken this epic imagery and adapted it to 5. 55.

Colour, brightness and beauty set a pleasurable scene for those involved. 5. 55 is not solely about love, rather it is about εὐφροσύνη. The position of their coupling is of a more exotic type, one which perhaps shows off certain remarkable features of Doris', i. e. ὑπερφυέεσσι...ποσσίν.[68] Doris' pleasure is important also; she did not hesitate or swerve, she was focused on her work, ἤνυσεν ἀκλινέως τὸν Κύριδος δόλιχον. Their shared pleasure is also emphasized by their mutual orgasm, both their needs were taken into account. Mutual, balanced delight is also part of the beauty involved in 5. 55.[69]

To touch upon some of the technical skills of D., 5. 55 is only 8 lines in length, but much is packed into this narrow compass. Ring composition and linking threads unite the poem. In the first two and last two lines the name Doris, reference to a part of her body and orgasm are mentioned. The structure of 5. 55 may be described as a *tricolon crescendo*. 5. 55 is composed of three sentences which progressively become longer. In addition, there are several linking threads, such as the colour terms ῥοδο-, χλοερός, πορφύρεος, λευκόν; the idea of divinity in words like: Δωρίς, ἀθάνατος, Κύπρις, ἀποσπένδω. There is sea/liquid imagery in the association of Doris with the sea and verbs such as ἀποσπένδω and ἐκχέω. There is nautical imagery in ἀμφιαλευομένης.[70] Three different periphrases are used for "orgasm" in the three *cola* (ἀθάνατος γέγονα; ἤνυσεν... τὸν Κύπριδος δόλιχον; ἀπεσπείσθη λευκὸν μένος.) Pleasure is the focus

---

[67]See SCHRIER, 1979, p. 315, who cites: (multitudes of men) Il. 2. 468, 800; Od. 9. 51; (cycle of life) Il. 6. 146-147; 21. 464; (working slaves) Od. 7. 104-106.

[68]Cf. Ov. Ars. 3. 775f. *Milanion umeris Atalantes crura ferebat:* | *si bona sunt, hoc sunt accipienda modo*; 3. 778f, *strata premat genibus, paulum cervice reflexa,* | *femina per longum conspicienda latus.*

[69]Cf. 12. 163 (Asclep.), εὗρεν Ἔρως τι καλῷ μῖξαι καλόν, οὐχὶ μάραγδον | χρυσῷ †ὅ μήτ' ἀνθεῖ μήτε γένοιτ' ἐν ἴσῳ †, | οὐδ' ἐλέφαντ' ἐβένῳ, λευκῷ μέλαν, ἀλλὰ Κλέανδρον | Εὐβιότῳ, πειθοῦς ἄνθεα καὶ φιλίης; cf. also Apul. Met. 2. 17, *usque dum lassis animis et marcidis artubus defatigati, simul ambo corruimus, inter mutuos amplexus animos anhelantes*; Ov. Am. 1. 5. 25 *lassi requievimus ambo.*

[70]Vid. supra my discussion on liquid and water imagery.

of the poem and occurs throughout. D. stresses Doris' body parts by making mention of them in each colon (ῥοδόπυγον; ποσσίν; τὰ...πορφυρέα (?) and μέλεσι.)

To make a few observations on sound and metre, there is a preponderance of sigma sound throughout 5. 55, especially in line 3: ἡ γὰρ ὑπερφυέεσσι μέσσον διαβᾶσά με ποσσίν. 5. 55 is very dactylic and this dactylic rhythm (- ˘ ˘) undulates throughout the epigram suiting the liquid imagery. The pace and rhythm of 5. 55 are consistent until the change in caesura from weak to strong in line 7 and the spondees in the variable feet of lines 7 and 8. This sudden change in pace, caesura and foot composition is well timed as if to coincide with their orgasm. Word order in line 3 (ὑπερφυέεσσι μέσσον διαβᾶσά με πόσσιν) inspires an image of Doris' legs embracing D.

With regard to diction, D. employs sensuous, aptly singular and poetic language (for coition!).[71] He impresses the reader with several polysyllabic words, such as: ὑπερφυέεσσι, ἀμφισαλευομενης (NB line 6 contains only 3 words), ἀμφοτέροισιν. He also uses several rare words, such as: ῥοδόπυγον, ἀμφισαλευομένης (which are both ἅπαξ λεγόμενα), παρέτοις, ἀκλινέως, νωθρὰ "= langorously".[72] In addition to rare individual words he uses rare phrases, such as: ἄνθεσιν ἐν χλοεροῖς;[73] ὑπερφυέεσσι...ποσσίν (ἅπαξ λεγόμενον); νωθρὰ βλέπουσα (ἅπαξ λεγόμενον) παρετοῖς..μέλεσι.[74] These words are not only lofty[75] and decorous, they also have an important scene-setting function in the poem. ῥοδό- (of ῥοδόπυγον) is one of four colour

---

[71]5. 54, 55, 56 have come under suspicion for this very reason; cf. FRASER, 1972, 1 p. 598, who states that 54, 55, 56 are "...characterized by an extravagant voluptuousness of expression, and a highly sensuous vocabulary rich in compound adjectives, which is in complete contrast with the sparse economic language of Dioscorides' other erotic pieces...There therefore seems a strong case for denying these peices to Dioscorides." FRASER does not cite BOAS, whom BECKBY, 1. p. 668, follows in attributing 5. 55 to Rufinus. The style of 5. 54, 55, 56 may be different from D.'s other epigrams, but we know so little about D. Which poems were composed by the mature poet, which by the young poet? How dependable is style in distinguishing between poets when dealing with epigram? Why should a poet not vary his/her style?

[72]See LSJ s.v.

[73]χλεορὸς is not used again with ἄνθος until Jo.Chrysost. Deprec. 10; Nonn. D. 17. 370.

[74]παρετός with reference to μέλος is not used again with until Aret. SA. 2. 3. 8.

[75]Cf. Arist. Po. 1458a-b; Cic. De Or. 3. 152; Demetr. De Eloc. 77. 95.

terms (χλοέρος, πορφυρέος, λευκός) all of which add life, brightness[76] and beauty to the poem. ἄνθεσιν ἐν χλοεροῖς of line 2 has the image of the bloom of youth or charms in a metaphorical sense, and colour, brightness and fragrance in a literal sense. ἐκχέω is used in a rare sense, to "lie languidly"[77] and ἀποσπένδω, which is usually used in a ritualistic context of pouring out a libation,[78] is shockingly and boldly used for ejaculation. ὄμμασι...βλέπουσα is a lofty, solemn and poetic phrase which occurred only in the tragedians before D.[79]

With regard to humour, 5. 55 makes fun of the motif of the sexual encounter. D. focuses on sexual intercourse and treats at length what is usually not dealt with at all or briefly mentioned with restraint. He adds many lofty words, poetic periphrasis (e.g. three different ways of expressing sexual climax), simile (ἠύτε πνεύματι φύλλα), vividness, structural and technical ingenuity (e.g. *tricolon crescendo*), all for a sexual experience. The contrast with standard love poetry is revealing: most love epigrams deal with unfulfilled or spurned love (e.g. *exclusus amator*, girlfriend failing to make an assignation, infidelity etc.), 5. 55 celebrates in grand fashion sexual intercourse brought to a mutually pleasurable end. 5. 55 has an amusingly boastful tone. D. was virile enough to complete this long "race" and effective enough to bring Doris to a climax which completely drained her of strength, παρέτοις ἐξεχύθη μέλεσι.

The name "Doris" is well chosen. Doris was a fairly common name among women from all stations in life;[80] Doris is also a known hetaera-name;[81] but more importantly, Doris was also the name of the wife of Nereus and one of their daughters.[82] There is

---

[76]Note that the exact colour of "πορφυρέα" is not clear in this context.
[77]See LSJ s.v. II. 4.
[78]See LSJ s.v.
[79]Cf. e.g. A. Supp. 716; E. Ph. 397; 458; S. OT. 1311.
[80]See FRASER, 1994, 1 p. 136, who cites 15 (?) examples at Athens; 2 p. 144, (5 examples).
[81]Cf. R.E. 8.2 1364.
[82]Vid. supra my discussion of liquid imagery.

consistent play on this latter Doris in 5. 55: line 1, Δωρίδα τὴν ῥοδόπυγον (perhaps an epithet of a Nereid reminiscent of Hesiod's ῥοδόπηχυς,[83] or the condition of her loins after coition); line 2, D. became ἀθάνατος after sexual intercourse with her; line 3, ὑπερφυέεσσι in the sense of "big" or "admirable" (gods were marvellous and bigger than humans); line 4, τὸν Κύπριδος δόλιχον (association of coition with Aphrodite); line 6, ἀμφιταλευομένης (suggests liquid imagery as is fitting for a Nereid); line 7, ἀπεπείσθη (has both liquid and divine associations); line 8, ἐξεχύθη (liquid imagery). The divine association of the name Doris and the liquid imagery associated with her add wit and point to D.'s ἀποθέωσις.

The irreverence of 5.55 adds to the humour. The idea of becoming a god through intercourse is bold; it cheapens and pokes fun at the dignity of the gods.[84] In keeping with his immortality D. impudently uses ἀποσπένδω[85] for their mutual discharge of λευκὸν μένος. In line 4, D. imports an old[86] and well respected competition and wryly uses it as an euphemism for orgasm. The employment of the name of a sea deity (i.e.Doris), although a minor one, in this context is novel yet shocking.

5. 55 is an arresting epigram. D. captivates his audience with vivid description (ῥοδόπυγον, ἄνθεσιν ἐν χλοεροῖς, μέσον διαβᾶσα, λευκὸν μένος etc.) By employing in a sexual context a name which recalls the sea-deity Doris, he immediately grabs the reader's attention. D. also teases the reader with certain pregnant phrases and ambiguities, such as: διατείνας, ἄνθεσιν ἐν χλοεροῖς, τὰ...πορφύρεα. D. progresses from a description of some of Doris' appealing aspects (ῥοδόπυγον,

---

[83]Vid. supra my discussion of liquid imagery.

[84]This kind of humour at the expense of the gods was not rare in the Hellenistic period. See Chapter 1, my discussion of humour.

[85]See SCHRIER, 1979, p. 323, who states that ἀποσπένδω is used elsewhere only for the ritual pouring of a drink offering; cf. LSJ s.v. at sacrifices, Hom. Od. 3. 394; 14. 331; E. Ion 1198.

[86]See MILLER, p. 203, who states that the δόλιχος (for men) was established as an Olympic event in about 720 B.C.

ὑπερφυέσσι...πόσσιν) to a vivid and graphic ecphrasis of sexual intercourse with her, i.e. he makes Doris appealing to the reader by a physical description and also by demonstrating Doris' availability for sex. 5. 55 grips the reader because of its novel focus on sexual intercourse.

5. 55 is clever, witty and full of surprises; however, the abundant imagery may appear to clash. Transition from image to image is not particularly smooth, which should not be a major concern, as other poets such as Aeschylus and Pindar often use extensive imagery. There are also some problems of interpretation (textual?) which cannot, as I see it, be resolved. With this in mind there is still much to approve of in 5. 55. One does not expect D. to discuss at length one of his conquests. Words are carefully chosen which are rare, lofty and impressive, but which also create ambiguity by adding a variety of implications and layers of meaning, as well as innovation and humorous association . Imagery is woven into the poem on several levels along with the brightness and vividness of colour terms. Careful attention was paid to the structure (*tricolon crescendo*). There is variety in the witty periphrases denoting "orgasm" with both humour and irreverence throughout -- all these pains for an act of coition! In view of this, 5. 55 is a very novel poem, and D., like Archil. before him, did not shy away from novelty and variation. In 1974, when the papyrus of an unknown epode of Archil.'s came to light, A.P. 5. 55 became important, but only for the phrase of line 7, λευκὸν μένος. Yet for all its literary merit, 5. 55 has not met with much favourable comment: e.g. Fraser called 5. 55 a "*reductio ad obscoenissimum* of a subject popularized by earlier epigrammatists."[87] This is partially misleading: 5. 55 may be described as a *reductio ad obscoenissimum* , but, as I hope to have shown, 5. 55 is not at all about a "subject popularized by earlier epigrammatists." 5. 55 is, in fact, a rare commodity among Hellenistic epigram.

---

[87]FRASER, 1972, 1. p. 597.

CHAPTER 3: A.P. 5. 54

Μήποτε γαστροβαρῆ πρὸς σὸν λέχος[1] ἀντιπρόσωπον
παιδογόνῳ κλίνῃς Κυπριδι τερπόμενος,
μεσσόθι γὰρ μέγα κῦμα, καὶ οὐκ ὀλίγος πόνος ἔσται
τῆς μὲν ἐρεσσομένης σοῦ δὲ καλευομένου.
ἀλλὰ πάλιν στρέψας ῥοδοειδέι τέρπεο πυγῇ
τὴν ἄλοχον νομίσας ἀρσενόπαιδα Κύπριν.[2]

A.P. 5. 54 is an erotodidactic epigram in which the poet takes on the role of *praeceptor amoris*. Erotodidaxis is a specialized offshoot of didactic in which certain erotic precepts are imparted.[3] There are different kinds of erotic instruction; Cairns, who does not mention 5. 54, offers three different types:

> 1) Instruction aimed at promoting a non-mercenary successful mutual love between a pair of lovers and given by a love-god, courtesan, experienced lover, or poet in the role of 'teacher of love'.
>
> 2) Instruction aimed at enabling the mistress to deceive her husband, or the man keeping her, or the poet's rivals, and so to confer her favours on the poet, and given by a poet as 'teacher of love'.

---

[1]The phrase πρὸς σὸν λέχος is difficult to understand in this context and for this reason has received some attention from commentators (See JACOBS, 7 pp. 406-407; DUBNER, p. 126; VENIERO, p. 117; GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 241.) GOW-PAGE have rightly pointed out that it is possible that πρὸς σὸν λέχος is intended to mean "on your bed". In defense of the meaning "on" for πρός, GOW-PAGE cite: Theoc. Id. 6. 30 ποτ' ἰσχία ῥύγχος ἔχοισα; Polyb. 15. 29. 9 καθίσασα πρὸς τὸν βωμόν. However, this use does not seem to have been common and GOW-PAGE do not seem to have placed much credence in this suggestion as they offer Jacobs' emendation, προσιών (See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 241; cf. also DUBNER, 1. p. 126.) for πρὸς σὸν, as if it were an escape clause. HECKER (p. 40) believes the problem lies in κλίνῃς and offers κλινθῇς, citing Hom. Il. 6. 468 παῖς πρὸς κόλπον ἐΰζωνοιο | τιθὴνης ἐκλινήθη (which is not in a sexual context.) The active voice of κλίνω is used elsewhere in erotic contexts (Archil. fr. 196a. 29 Camp.), but in the A.P. it is usually occurs in homosexual scenes (cf. 12. 88; 213; 233). The active κλίνῃς seems apt (cf. also (Latin) e.g. *inclino* Juv. 9. 23; 10. 224) here, and the fact that it was used (although admittedly later) in homosexual contexts may add additional point to the last two lines.

[2]Note that FRASER, 1972, 1 p. 598; 2 p. 846 n. 339 misguidedly believes that 5. 54; 55; 56 should not be attributed to D., but rather to Mel. or those who imitated Mel. He bases his argument solely on diction (2. p. 846 n. 339). Unfortunately, FRASER'S argument is unconvincing and inaccurate. (He states that ἀρσενόπαις is hapax, when it is used (ironically!) by Meleager, A.Pl. 134. 4; see my discussion on rare words and phrases.)

[3]See CAIRNS, p. 73.

> 3) Instruction directed towards influencing the beloved to extract money and presents from as many lovers as possible simultaneously to the detriment of impoverished, sincere, lovers of single beloveds like the elegiac poet. This instruction is given by a bawd or courtesan.[4]

5. 54 is of type 1) with some variation: the poet plays the role of the learned advisor, but his instruction does not promote "... mutual love...". D. pays no heed at all to the woman's needs and 5. 54 concerns sexual intercourse not necessarily *love*.

D. breaks new ground in erotodidaxis, which is generally used to impart precepts in order to teach the ἐρώμενος/ἐρωμένη how to be more attractive to the ἐραστής. He incorporates sex, a married woman, a pregnant woman and sodomy, all of which are generally not part of erotodidaxis. Didactic poetry is at least as old as Hesiod, and the learned pose of one experienced in love is seen as early as Theognis and Aristophanes;[5] but erotodidaxis according to the criteria set forth above seems to begin with New Comedy,[6] and subsequently is seen in (possibly) Alexandrian elegy,[7] the bucolic poets Bion and Moschus,[8] becoming common in Latin comedy[9] and Latin love elegy.[10] However, erotodidaxis is very rare in Hellenistic epigram, and 5. 54 is, to the best of my knowledge, the only clear example of it there.[11] Strato is the only other poet in the A.P. to write on erotic teaching; there are in his poems some three or four examples, all of which are homosexual (12.184; 209; 211 and perhaps 206.)

5. 54 fills a unique niche in Hellenistic epigram. In no other epigram (or other poetry), as far as I know, is a pregnant woman -- i.e. one in advanced pregnancy, to judge

---

[4]See CAIRNS, pp. 173-174.
[5]See MURGATROYD, 1980, p. 130; cf. also WHEELER, p. 444.
[6]See MURGATROYD, 1980, p. 130, who cites Men. fr. 258; 541; 566; 646K.
[7]See WHEELER, 1910, p. 440.
[8]Cf. e.g. Mosch. 3.83; fr. 2.7 Gow; Bion fr. 13.10 Gow.
[9]See MURGATROYD, 1980, p. 130.
[10]See MURGATROYD, 1980, p.130; MCKEOWN, p. 74.
[11]Note that there is a fragmentary Iamb of Callimachus which seems to be erotodidactic, but there is not enough of it to make any firm judgments: Iamb fr. 5 Pf. Ὦ ξεῖνε, συμβουλὴ γὰρ ἔν τι τῶν ἱρῶν, | ἄκουε τἀπὸ καρδ[ίης. Note also that WHEELER, 1910, p. 449 had mistakenly assumed that "...epigram with the single exception of Moschus VI, is silent concerning the rôle of erotic teacher."

from line 3 "μέγα κῦμα" -- presented as an object for coition. Another novelty is that 5. 54 deals with a wife as the sexual interest. Wives, whether pregnant or not, are rarely the love interest in erotic epigram (or even in Latin love elegy). Usually when wives are mentioned they are treated with contempt, ridiculed or included only to make a point,[12] and this is the case at line 6 where D. suggests that sodomy is the most efficient way to engage a pregnant wife. The idea of sodomy with a female is unique in Hellenistic epigram, but later it is suggested as a cure for boy-love:

> στρέψας Μηνοφίλαν εὐΐσχιον, ἐν φρεσὶν ἕλπου
> αὐτὸν ἔχειν κόλποις ἄρσενα Μηνόφιλον. (A.P. 5. 116 Marc.Arg.)

The Roman epigrammatist Martial employs some tactics similar to those of 5. 54. He employs the idea of sodomizing one's wife, once where she is willing[13] and at another time where he is trying to convince her to yield to sodomy.[14] Closer still to 5. 54, in another epigram Martial takes up the role as the learned erotic advisor to a young bridegroom who is not experienced in heterosexual love-making. He warns him that sodomy is something that a young bride would consent to only once because she *metuit teli vulnera prima novi*.[15] Athenaeus too mentions this method of intercourse with young girls, παρὰ δὲ Σπαρτιάταις, ὡς Ἄγνων φησὶν ὁ Ἀκαδημαϊκός, πρὸ τῶν γάμων ταῖς παρθένοις ὡς παιδικοῖς νόμος ἐστὶν ὁμιλεῖν (13. 602 d-e).

Our epigram is very much like another of D.'s, 5. 55: both poems are innovative in their sexual themes; they both depend on shock value (ἀπεσπείσθη λευκὸν μένος; τὴν ἄλοχον νομίσας ἀρσενόπαιδα Κύπριν etc.); both use the explanatory γάρ after the first couplet; sea imagery involving tossing about is prominent in the two epigrams.

---

[12]Cf. A.P. 5. 18; 77 (Ruf.); 286 (Paul.Sil.); 11. 375 (Maced.); 12. 225 (Strat.). Note that 5. 208. 3-4 (Mel.) seems to contain some favourable comment, but the text has been obelized rightly by GOW-PAGE (1965, 1. 4048 f.) as it seems out of context. If the text is correct, the compliment is slight and made in passing.

[13]Cf. Mart. 11. 43. 1-2; 11-12: *deprensum in puero tetricis me vocibus, uxor,* | *corripis et culum te quoque habere refers.* | *...parce tuis igitur dare mascula nomina rebus* | *teque puta cunnos, uxor, habere duos.*

[14]Cf. 11. 104. 17. *pedicare negas...*

[15]Cf. 11. 78.

However, 5. 54 is neater than 5. 55 in that it does not contain so many loose and shifting images.

5. 54 surprises and shocks the reader. The subject of the poem concerns coition with a pregnant woman; it is a bold and arresting theme. D. seems to be toying with the subject: the first couplet misleads the reader into thinking that D. suggests not to have sex with a pregnant woman (μήποτε γαστροβαρῆ...), which seems logical as one may infer that coition during the later months of pregnancy might be harmful to the child or uncomfortable for the mother. In line 3 D. states ...οὐκ ὀλίγος πόνος ἔσται, but it is not clear exactly what πόνος means here ("suffering", "pain", "toil") nor for whom is the πόνος, e.g. for the child, the mother or the man. ἀντιπρόσωπον in line 1 has point, as it is later revealed in the final couplet that D. *is* suggesting sexual intercourse but not in the usual way. The explanatory γάρ of line 3 also catches the reader off guard. The mention of sexual intercourse with a pregnant woman alone is odd enough, but D. goes further still. D. explains why one should not do it face-to-face, (surprisingly) because it is too much work, i.e. for the man (line 3 οὐκ ὀλιγος πόνος ἔσται). There is further grounds for pause when it becomes clear that D. shows no concern for the welfare of the child, who could be at risk perhaps from the mans' weight on the womb, nor for the woman, should their intercourse cause complications with her pregnancy or discomfort. He is almost clinically detached. The παραπροσδοκίαν becomes even more pointed at lines 5 and 6: at line 5, πυγῇ is surprising as one would expect most naturally κύσθῳ or the like and, with this in mind, D. shockingly suggests sodomy. At line 6, the reader finally becomes aware that D.'s precepts concern *the* wife. D. is outrageously ambiguous with τὴν ἄλοχον which need not mean one's own wife; D. could have easily written σὴν ἄλοχον. D.

finishes with a flourish, he advises that one treat *the* wife as if she were an ἐρώμενος and Κύπριν is reserved for the final word where one would expect Ἔρωτα.[16]

To turn to imagery, nautical metaphor occurs at lines 3-4 which describes what συνουσία with a pregnant woman is like. μεσσόθι...μέγα κῦμα, the "great wave in the middle", of course, refers to the abdomen of the woman,[17] but there is also some *realien* in this image, as the abdomen of a pregnant woman is filled with a protective layer of fluid in which the foetus resides. D. greatly exaggerates the implications of this κῦμα, comparing it to a "great wave" which is capable of tossing about a boat at sea. In such instances, the man is usually understood as the passenger or rower (ἐρεσσομένης)[18] on a metaphorical boat (i.e. the woman).[19] The image in ἐρεσσομένης following οὐκ ὀλίγος πόνος is vivid, risqué and comical; D. hints at the in-out motion of a man "rowing" heavily and sweating profusely perched on top of this "great wave". In contrast with 5. 55. 6, where the woman is tossing about (ἀμφισαλευομένης), the man is being tossed about (σαλευομένου) in 5. 54. 4. The rowing image is expanded *ad absurdum* in 5. 54 with a full line.

As I have mentioned in chapter two, σαλεύω is often used in nautical contexts.[20] D. seems to be suggesting with this threatening sea imagery, admittedly with exaggeration, that under these circumstances this position of intercourse is actually rather dangerous for the man who would be tossed on top of a great wave as a rower in some fear for his life.

---

[16]Cf. 12. 86. 1-2 (Mel.),Ἁ Κύπρις θήλεια γυναικομανῆ φλόγα βάλλει· | ἄρσενα δ' αὐτὸς Ἔρως ἵμερον ἀνιοχεῖ.Vid. infra my discussion on humour.

[17]Cf. also Anacreontea 57. 19-20 Camp., ῥοδέων δ' ὕπερθε μαζῶν | ἁπαλῆς ἔνερθε δειρῆς | μέγα κῦμα χρῶτα τέμνει.

[18]Cf. e.g. Pl.Com. 3.4; Ar.Ec. 1091; A.P. 5. 44 (Ruf.); 161 (Hedyl./Asclep.); 204 (Mel.); 9. 415 (Antiphil.); 416 (Phil).

[19]Cf. e.g. A.P. 5. 44 (Ruf.); 161 (Hedyl./Asclep.); 204 (Mel.); 9. 415 (Antiphil.); 416 (Phil); 11. 29 (Autom.).

[20] Cf. also κάλος, which is commonly used of the sea and ships (see LSJ s.v. 1. 3; II.), as in A.P. 5. 204. 6 (Mel.)ἐκ...κάλου.

This reason for avoidance of face-to-face coition is lively and striking, as well as ridiculous.

Similarly, the fact that face-to-face intercourse is considered a πόνος (=hard work, toil) is both stunning and ironic. Sexual intercourse is usually considered pleasurable (NB lines 2 and 5: τερπόμενος, τέρπεο[21]) and the contrast of the pleasure with hard work is arresting. Hesiod advised his brother Perses to work (ἐργάζευ, Πέρση...), as an idle man was hateful in the eyes of the gods.[22] 5. 54, as mentioned above, is also in didactic tradition, but ironically D. advises the reader to take the easier route and to avoid the toil. There could also be a reference to *militia amoris* in πόνος and ἀντιπρόσωπον as both are used elsewhere in martial contexts.[23]

With regard to diction, λέχος is ambiguous;[24] it carries the literal sense of "bed", but also the extended sense of "marriage-bed",[25] both of which have point as the context is sexual and, as it is revealed later, the intercourse concerns a married woman (line 6, ἄλοχον).

As in 5. 55, D. uses rare words and phrases such as: γαστροβαρῆ (hapax); παιδογόνῳ...Κύπριδι (hapax); ῥοδοειδέι...πυγῇ (hapax); ἀρσενόπαιδα (occurs first here and subsequently in Mel. once, Nonn. seven times). He uses several polysyllabic words such as: γαστροβαρῆ, ἀντιπρόσωπον, παιδογόνῳ, τερπόμενος, ἐρεσσομένης, καλευομένου, ῥοδοειδέι, ἀρσενόπαιδα. The use of such lofty and impressive words in 5. 54 (as in 5. 55) contrasts sharply with the sensual content of the poem and adds to the humour of D.'s pose as the learned advisor and his ridiculous advice. The phrase

---

[21]Cf. also (of both men and women) A.P. 5. 160. 2 (Mel.); 201. 2 (anon.); cf. subsequently (Latin) *voluptas* (Lucr. 4. 1263; Ov. Am. 1. 10. 35; Met. 4. 327 etc.), *gaudium* (Catull. 61. 110; Tib. 2.1.12; Ov.Am. 3. 7. 63 etc.)

[22]See Hes. Op. 299ff.

[23]For ἀντιπρόσωπον cf. e.g. X. Cyr. 7. 1. 25; HG 6. 6. 26; Aen.Tact. 22. 11. For πόνος, cf. Hom. Il. 6. 77; 525; 16. 568; Od. 12. 117; A.P. 5. 138. 3 (Diosc.).

[24]As is pointed out in JACOBS, 7 p. 406.

[25]See LSJ s.v. 3, E. El. 481, κὰ λέχεα; Sapph. 121 Camp. λέχον νεώτερον.

μεccόθι...μέγα κῦμα adds to the lofty tone of the 5. 54. The form μεccόθι is first used by Hesiod[26] and subsequently becomes common in authors such as Aratus,[27] Apollonius Rhodius[28] and those of the A.P. [29] μέγα κῦμα was commonly used by Homer, occuring some seventeen times.[30]

Careful attention is paid to the transition from sex with a pregnant woman to the sea imagery and κῦμα provides the link. κῦμα is well chosen in this instance as it is used of things that are swollen.[31] It is generally used with the meaning "= wave, billow",[32] but may also have the more poetic meaning of "foetus, embryo".[33] With this meaning in mind the sea imagery of line 4 has point and wit: pregnancy is picked up by κῦμα in the sense of "foetus, embryo" and the sea imagery plays on the other more common sense of "wave".[34] Similarly, παιδόγονοc carries two senses. παιδογόνῳ...Κύπριδι has the sense of *capability of producing children* (A.P. 9. 437. 4), i.e. heterosexual intercourse, but παιδογόνῳ also hints at the sense of *pregnant*,[35] which adds further point and wit in this context of coition with a pregnant partner.

Humour is important in 5. 54. As mentioned above, 5. 54 is an erotodidactic epigram in which the poet gives advice or takes on the role of the experienced *praeceptor amoris*. The tone of 5. 54 is ostensibly instructive and objective and employs such devices as "the ideal second person" (line 1, cὸν; 2, κλίνῃc); imperative mood (τέρπεο); prohibitive subjunctive (Μήποτε...κλίνῃc), but the reasons he gives for his precept are

---

[26]Cf. Op. 369.
[27]Cf. Phaen. 231; 368; 414; 511; 526; 528.
[28]Cf. Arg. 1. 1278; 2. 172.
[29]Cf. 1. 5. 1; 5. 242. 6; 7. 529.4; 10. 80. 2; 15. 28. 2; 40. 13.
[30]Cf. Il. 15. 381; 17. 264; 21. 268; 313; Od. 3. 295; 5. 296; 313; 327; 402; 425; 429; 461; 12. 60; 202; 13.85; 99; 14. 315.
[31]See LSJ s.v.
[32]See LSJ s.v. I.
[33]See LSJ s.v. II. e.g. A.Eu. 659; E.fr. 106.
[34]As GOW-PAGE (1965, 2 p. 241) rightly point out.
[35]See LSJ s.v. II; I.

ridiculous and are not meant, I think, to be taken seriously. The sea-imagery depends on the comparison between a swollen abdomen and a "great wave" with the woman in the role of the wave/sea and the man playing the part of the rowing passenger. D. outrageously exaggerates the implications of the coupling. The notion that vaginal intercourse with a pregnant woman would be too much of a πόνος (i.e. for the man) and the solution to the problem (i.e. anal intercourse) are lively, vivid and humorous. In line 2, the participial phrase παιδογόνῳ...Κύπριδι τερπόμενος (e.g. "when enjoying procreant love-making...") presupposes that it is common to engage in coition during pregnancy (which is probably true), but the pose of D. as an educator who had made a hitherto unknown discovery implies that it was not common. Equally incongruous, after such a phrase as παιδογόνῳ...Κύπριδι τερπόμενος, is his supposedly original solution to the dilemma that one should have anal intercourse instead (especially as vase painting seems to depict anal copulation with females).[36] With these incongruities in mind, I think that D. is playing with his audience and 5. 54 is a *reductio ad absurdum.* The fact that the only flattering description the woman receives in the epigram concerns her rear-end (ῥοδοειδέι...πυγῇ) is humorous; according to D., it would seem that this is the only attractive part of a pregnant woman. The epithets of Aphrodite in 5. 54 are equally hilarious (παιδόγονος Κύπρις and ἀρσενόπαις Κύπρις are only used here). παιδόγονος Κύπρις infers the pregnant mother image of the goddess Aphrodite, who is usually sex personified. The phrase ἀρσενόπαις Κύπρις is a paradox, and the suggestion that one imagine the beautiful goddess of love as a boy is ridiculous; however, in this context ἀρσενόπαις Κύπρις is witty and apt as D. is advising anal intercourse with a female. There is further humour in the final word Κύπριν, as opposed to Ἔρωτα, which comes as a surprise.

---

[36]See DOVER, R543 (Tarquinia; ARV 408); R577(Boston, 1970.233; ARV 444).

D. employs sounds effects such as alliteration (κλίνῃς, Κύπριδι in line 2; μεσσόθι...μέγα, κῦμα, καὶ in line 3; σοῦ...σαλευομένου in line 4; ἄλοχον ...ἀρσενόπαιδα in line 6) and homoioteleuton (πρὸς σὸν λέχος ἀντιπρόσωπον in line 1; μέγα κῦμα, ὀλίγος πόνος in line 3; τῆς ...ἐρεσσομένης, σοῦ...σαλευομένου in line 4) which add to the learned pose of D. in that they suggest that his advice was carefully thought out and phrased accordingly.

There are several contrasts in 5. 54. The obvious one, though not verbally spelled out, is between anal and vaginal copulation. In this case, anal copulation is deemed less toilsome. In the final line of the epigram D. also contrasts spousal and homosexual love (ἄλοχον...ἀρσενόπαιδα); fertile/ procreant love (παιδογόνῳ...Κύπριδι) and homosexual love (ἀρσενόπαιδα Κύπριν); face-to-face coition with face-to-back (ἀντιπρόσωπον, πάλιν στρέψας); great effort (οὐκ ὀλίγος πόνος...) and the implied little effort in anal intercourse. At line 4 there is a contrast between the woman being rowed and the man being tossed about.

There is a delicate balance in lines 3-4. These lines, which contain D.'s reasons for his advice, both split into halves at their caesurae and they are carefully phrased: μεσσόθι γὰρ μέγα κῦμα is balanced by καὶ οὐκ ὀλίγος πόνος ἔσται, and τῆς μὲν ἐρεσσομένης by σοῦ δὲ σαλευομένου. There is also balance in the structure of the epigram. Lines 3 and 4 contain D.'s precepts and are the fulcrum of the poem, while the first and the last couplets are joined by ring structure (both discuss sexual intercourse and contain verbal reminiscences Κύπριδι / Κύπριν; τερπόμενος / τέρπεο).[37]

[37]I have established in my first three chapters that technical skills are an important element in D.'s poetry. Henceforth, I shall comment only on particularly significant examples of these skills.

CHAPTER 4: A.P. 12. 37 and 5. 56

Πυγὴν Σωσάρχοιο διέπλασεν 'Αμφιπολίτεω[1]
μυελίνην παίζων ὁ βροτολοιγὸς Ἔρως
Ζῆνα θέλων ἑρεθιξαι, ὀθούνεκα τῶν Γανυμήδους
μηρῶν οἱ τούτου πουλὺ μελιχρότεροι.

The poem consisting entirely or largely of praise of the beloved's charms, often with specific reference to physical beauty, is a common type in the A.P. Several writers in the A.P. who are earlier than or contemporaneous with D. wrote in this tradition.[2] However, apart from a poem of Sappho and a fragment of Pindar,[3] which are two of the earliest examples, this kind of poetry was not common before D. Pindar's fr. is an excellent exemplar to which one may compare the various aspects which make up this type:

1) The beloved is named.

2) The physical beauty of the beloved is praised.

3) The effect on the lover is described.

4) One or more divinities are mentioned.

5) There is an address to the soul.

6) The lover makes a wish.

7) The beloved is considered divine.[4]

I have included a table showing the authors of the A.P. (apart from 12. 37) who utilized one or more of the above aspects in the tradition of 12. 37:

---

[1]The use of an ethnic ('Αμφιπολίτεω) of mortals is odd in sympotic and amatory poetry; ethnics are more commonly used in sepulchral poetry (see KAIBEL, pp. 565-575.) The name Sosarchus does not occur elsewhere in literature, but it does occur in inscriptions, two of which are roughly contemporaneous with D. (but not from Amphipolis): see FRASER, 1994, 1 p. 420. It is difficult to see any further relevance to the ethnic in this context. With this in mind, perhaps we are to assume that D. is referring to a real Sosarchus from Amphipolis, as opposed to a fictional character.

[2]Cf. 5. 194; 210; 7. 217 (Asclep.); 12. 51 (Call.); 38, 58 (Rhian.). Subsequently, cf. 5. 13 (Phld.); 48; 62; 73 (Ruf.); 156 (Mel.); 231 (Maced.); 12. 106; 110 (Mel.).

[3]Cf. Sapph. 31 Camp. (φαίνεταί μοι....); Pi. fr. 108 Bowra (ΘΕΟΞΕΝΩΙ ΤΕΝΕΔΙΩΙ).

[4]It should be noted that no single epigram need contain all of, or be limited to, the above seven aspects.

Table 1.

Authors before D. or contemporaneous			Subsequent authors		
Author	Location	Aspects	Author	Location	Aspects
Asclep.	5. 194	1, 2, 4	Mel.	5. 156	1, 2
	5. 210	1, 2, 3		12. 106	1, 3
	7. 217	1, 2, 4		12. 110	1, 2, 3, 4, 7
Call.	12. 51	1, 2	Phld.	5. 13	1, 2, 7
Rhian.[5]	12. 38	1, 2, 3, 4, 7?	Rufin.	5. 48	2, 4, 7?
	12. 58	1, 2		5. 62	2, 7
				5. 73	1, 2, 4, 7
			Maced.	5. 231	1, 2

12. 37 is a poem which largely consists of praise and contains aspects 1, 2 and 4 from the above list: the beloved is named (Sosarchus, line 1); Sosarchus' physical beauty is praised (πυγή, line 2; μηροί, line 4); two divinities are mentioned (Eros, line 2; Zeus, line 3). As Table 1 shows, several epigrammatists writing in this tradition made use of aspects 1, 2 and sometimes 3. D., like them, employed ideas of his own as well as variations on old ones.

D.'s epigram differs from most of the above examples (Table 1) in various ways. D. does not suggest the overall beauty of Sosarchus, he stresses one particular part (as does 12. 38 Rhian.), his soft rear-end. Sosarchus is not considered divine, nor need one

[5]12. 38 (Rhian.,whose date is not certainly placed much before or after D.) is similar to 12. 37. D. and Rhianus are roughly contemporaneous as they were both probably active in the second half of the third century B.C. (see GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 pp. 235; 503). Although no final word can be said about the dating of the two epigrams, I am inclined to follow TARÁN (p. 45) in placing A.P. 12. 37 before 12. 38, as D.'s epigram is an expansion of the Ganymede theme, while Rhianus' seems to be a more elaborate expansion of 12. 37.

assume that he was so by association with Eros;[6] instead with a slight twist, Sosarchus is compared to a quasi-divinity, Ganymede.[7] The tone of 12. 37 is also set apart from the epigrams of Table 1, with the exception of 12. 38, in that it is tongue and cheek and does not have the same gravity. In addition, Zeus and Eros do not appear in any epigram of Table 1, nor does Eros play the playful role of provoking someone.[8]

To move on to some important themes, D. varies standard motifs. Eros has a curious role in 12. 37 as a creator; nowhere else in literature before D. does he seem to mould all or part of people. Zeus, Prometheus and Hephaestus are the standard creators of mankind.[9] Gods did, however, alter the appearance of mortals,[10] but they do not seem to have altered specific body parts. D. adds a risqué and humorous touch to both of these themes by making a childish and undignified god like Eros a divine creator, and by making him fashion a rear-end, which is a bold contrast to the noble creation myths, as an enhancement of Sosarchus' appearance. In making the πυγή of Sosarchus Eros' creation, it is also possible that D. is varying the motif of comparing the beloved to Eros, where the beloved is sometimes referred to as "another Eros" or the "child of Cypris" etc.[11] The

---

[6]See TARÁN, p. 41, who states that Sosarchus' πυγή was divine because "it had been fashioned by a god" and then compares 12. 64 (Alc.Mess.), among others, where the boy is called θεῖος. It should be stated that nowhere is Sosarchus called "divine", nor need we assume that he was from the context.

[7]Cf. h.Ven. 212-214, εἶπεν δὲ ἕκαστα | Ζηνὸς ἐφημοσύνῃσι διάκτορος Ἀργειφόντης. | ὡς ἔοι (sc. Ganymede) ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρως ἶσα θεοῖσιν; Theog. 2. 1345- 1348 Κρονίδης...| ἁρπάξας δ' ἐς Ὄλυμπον ἀνήγαγε, καί μιν (i.e. Ganymede) ἔθηκε | δαίμονα. Cf. subsequently, Ov. Met. 10. 155f. *qui nunc quoque pocula miscet | invitaque Iovi nectar Iunone ministrat.* I have not been able to locate any tradition which states that after Ganymede was abducted he did not obtain immortality; it would seem to me a little odd if a human were living agelessly amongst the immortals.

[8]Eros and Zeus do occur together in other types of epigram, e.g. komastic, 5. 64 (Asclep.); 12. 117 (Mel.).

[9]Vid. infra my discussion on word selection.

[10]Cf. Od. 10. 395 ff.; 13. 429 ff.; 16. 172 ff.; 454 ff.; 23. 155 ff.

[11]For the beloved referred to as equal to Eros, cf. 12. 54 (Mel.); 64. 2-3 (Alc.Mess.), δεύτερον υἷα | Κύπριδος...; 75 (Asclep.), Κύπριδος...παῖς; 76. 3-4 (Mel.), οὔποτ' ἂν ἔγνως | ἐκ μορφᾶς τίς ἔφυ Ζωΐλος ἢ τίς Ἔρως; 77.4 (Asclep./Posidipp.), οὐδ' αὐτὴ Κύπρις γνώσεται ὅν τέτοκεν; 78. 3-4 (Mel.), Ἀντίοχος μὲν | ἦν ἂν Ἔρως, ὁ δ' Ἔρως τἄμπαλιν Ἀντίοχος.

Ganymede motif was popular among ancient poets,[12] especially those of book 12 of the A.P.[13] However, to the best of my knowledge, the poets of the time of D. and before did not use this theme for the purpose of humour,[14] but rather as a recherché compliment to a beloved. Generally, poets of the A.P. utilized this motif in two ways: as an *exemplum* to justify the love of boys;[15] by way of a conceit in begging Zeus not to abduct their boy (who was likened to Ganymede).[16] Like the other poems in the A.P. which employ the theme,[17] D. expresses the beauty of Sosarchus by way of comparison with the Trojan youth, but D. varies this motif by alluding specifically to the thighs of Ganymede[18] and having Sosarchus outstrip him in the comparison by far, an idea which subsequently Meleager among others makes use of.[19] D. does not appear to be emotionally involved in the epigram as do the other authors in A.P. 12. 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 133, 230. In contrast to the usual idea of hoping that Zeus will *not* carry off the beloved, D. portrays Eros mischievously moulding a very attractive posterior *in order to* provoke Zeus into carrying him off.

D.'s use of humour in 12. 37 is worthy of note. There is an irreverent tone in supposing that Zeus was largely attracted to Ganymede because of his thighs. Homer's[20]

---

[12]Cf. e.g. Hom. Il. 20. 232-235; h.Ven. 202-206; S. fr. 345 Pearson; E. Or. 1392; Pi. O. 1. 43-45; Ibyc. fr. 289 Page; Thgn. 1345-1350; Theoc. Id. 15. 124; 20. 41; Virg. Aen. 5. 255; Ov. Met. 10. 155; Prop. 2. 30. 30. Cf. also TARÁN, pp. 7-13.

[13]Cf. 11. 88 (Lucill.); 12. 20 (Julius Leon.); 37 (Diosc.); 64 (Alc.Mess.); 65 (Mel.); 67 (anon.); 68 (Mel.); 69 (anon.); 70; 133 (Mel.); 230 (Call.).

[14]Cf. subsequently, A.P. 11. 88 (Lucill.).

[15]Cf. A.P. 11. 407 (Nicarch.); 12. 65 (Mel.); 133; 230 (Call.). Cf. also [Thgn.] 1345-1350; Theoc. Id. 20. 41; Prop. 2. 30.

[16]Cf. A.P. 12. 64 (Alc.Mess.); 65 (Mel.); 67 (anon.); 68 (Mel.); 69 (Alc.Mess.); 70 (Mel.) etc.

[17]Cf. e.g. A.P. 12. 20; 64-70; 133; 230.

[18]A fr. of Aeschylus may also refer to the thighs of the Trojan boy; cf. Ath. Soph. 13. 602 e, (sc. Aeschylus) ὁ δ' ἐν Κολχίσιν περὶ Γανυμήδους τὸν λόγον ποιούμενος· 'μηροῖς ὑπαίθων τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδα.'

[19]Cf. 12. 54. 3-4 (Mel.), ἦ γὰρ ὁ κοῦρος | εὕρεται κρείσσων οὗτος Ἔρωτος Ἔρως; 148. 1-2 (Mel.), φαμί..Ἡλιοδώραν | νικάσειν αὐτὰς τὰς Χάριτας χάρισιν; 5. 73. 6 (Rufin.), σύ, δοκῶ, τὴν θεὸν ἐκδέδυκας; 301. 6-7 (Paul.Sil.), Παφίη, | κάλλεϊ νικηθεῖσα τεοῦ χροὸς...

[20]Cf. Il. 20. 232-235; also h.Merc. 5. 202-6.

Ganymede was abducted by the *gods* because of his beauty, without mention of Zeus' love for the boy. After Homer, Zeus' passion for the Trojan shepherd is attested,[21] but D. plays this up further: the buttocks of Sosarchus are set up to attract the king of the gods. There is further humour in the type of posterior that Eros made to attract Zeus; it was not just any sort of crupper, but a soft, chubby one at that. The epithet for Eros is equally ridiculous. Eros is not called βροτολοιγός before D, but this title was commonly used of Ares.[22] Not only is βροτολοιγός paradoxical, contrasting sharply with Eros' role as the creator of Sosarchus' πυγή, but it also carries the metaphorical sense of killing men with desire.[23] The association of παίζων with βροτολοιγός Ἔρως is also comical. The Hellenistic Eros is often portrayed as playing like a child,[24] but the image of a foolish little boy who is *manslaughtering* is as engaging and laughable as the idea of little Eros provoking the king of the gods.

To touch briefly upon diction, D. exploits rare vocabulary and combinations of words. μυελίνος is not used elsewhere; word groupings such as βροτολοιγὸς Ἔρως and μελίχρος with μήρος occur first here; ὀθούνεκα is poetic and is used elsewhere only by Euripides, Sophocles and Theocritus. This employment of exceptional and poetic words in a frivolous context, as we have seen in D.'s other epigrams,[25] not only raises the tone in sharp contrast to the subject matter, but it draws attention to significant points. ἐρεθίζω has a cleverly ambiguous meaning and cleverly exploits several different interpretations. ἐρεθίζω[26] has the meanings of "rouse to anger", "rouse to fight",

---

[21]See TARÁN, p. 9, who cites: Theog. 1345-50; Pi. O. 1. 43-45; S. fr. 345 Pearson; E. Or. 1392; Pl. Phd. 255b 5-c 1; X. Smp. 8. 30.
[22]Cf. Hom. Il. 5. 31; 455; 518; 846; 909; 8. 349; 11. 295; 12. 130; 13. 298; 802; 20. 46; 21. 421; Od. 8. 115; Hes. Sc. 333; 425; Tyrt. fr. 9. 4 PLF; A. Supp. 665; A.P. 6. 91. 5; 9. 323. 8; 11. 191. 1 etc.
[23]See my discussion of this type of poetry in chapter 1 (A.P. 5. 138).
[24]A.P. 12. 46. 3-4 (Asclep.); 12. 47. 1-2 (Mel.); 9. 585. 3 (anon.).
[25]See my discussions in ch. 1 (A.P. 5. 138), 2 (55), 3 (54) on diction.
[26]See LSJ s.v. I.

"challenge", "provoke to curiosity", "excite to love", "irritate", "incite i.e. to rivalry",[27] any of which could be intended here.

The word order of our epigram is intricate and deliberate. The first line is well constructed. The noun, noun, verb, adjective structure is almost a golden line with the second adjective at the head of the following line (Πυγὴν Σωσάρχοιο διέπλασεν ᾽Αμφιπολίτεω | μυελίνην.) Prominent word placement, such as the first position in the line, plays an important role in our epigram: πυγὴν, μυελίνην, Ζῆνα and μηρῶν are all important for the main thrust of 12. 37, which centres upon Eros' craftsmanship of a rump to provoke Zeus and a comparison between the thighs of Ganymede and Sosarchus. The impact of the whole piece is increased by the shocking first word πυγὴν,[28] and μυελίνην makes this doubly emphatic. Visually, the association of the first word in each line is laughable, Zeus is drawn up between a soft rump and thighs, caught in the middle as it were. There is further intricate word placement in the chiastic order of: the body parts of the boys and their names, πυγὴν Σωσάρχοιο...Γανυμήδους | μηρῶν; in the order of the names Sosarchus, Eros, Zeus, Ganymede where the order is boyfriend, god, god, boyfriend. Care and attention is paid to the final word in each line which follow a genitive, nominative, genitive, nominative pattern (᾽Αμφιπολίτεω |῎Ερως | Γανυμήδους | μελιχρότεροι). There is παραπροσδοκίαν in the delayed placement of῎Ερως at the end of line two after the epithet βροτολοιγός. An astute reader would naturally have expected ῎Αρης after βροτολοιγός as this epithet is commonly used of the war god before D.[29]

The imagery in words such as διαπλάσσω, μυελίνος, βροτολοιγός and μελίχρος is rich. D.'s use of διαπλάσσω is novel and striking as it has not been used

---

[27]See TARÁN, p. 42; for vying with Zeus cf. also A.P. 5. 64 (Asclep.); 167; 12. 230 (Call.).
[28]Note that Rufinus also begins an epigram with πυγή, 5. 35, Πυγὰς αὐτὸς ἔκρινα τριῶν.
[29]Vid. supra my discussion on humour. Note that Meleager imitates D. at 5. 180. 1, Τί ξένον, εἰ βροτολοιγὸς῎Ερως τὰ...τόξα | βάλλει.

with πυγή before. διαπλάσσω suggests plastic art, e.g. moulding statuary.[30] Similarly, the verb πλάσσω is also used of a sculptor (e.g. Prometheus, Hephaestus, Eros) who is working with pliable material, such as clay.[31] This image of Eros the sculptor is comical and risqué as we are to imagine the god working intently and seriously on an objet d'art (= rump) with his hands. διαπλάσσω does not seem to have been used in this metaphorical sense elsewhere. In this context μυελίνος is apt and suited to the soft, yielding and pliable nature of clay. There may even be a hint of the amatory associations of μυελός here.[32] The imagery also appeals to the reader's sense of taste. Marrow is a rich, fatty food[33] and Sosarchus's behind is described as *marrow-like.* D.'s use of this food metaphor seems strange; no where is a posterior referred to as marrow-like, nor, as far as I know, is any other body part. D. is perhaps boldly playing with the idea of sacrificial offering in which the thighs and fat of a beast were set aside for the gods.[34] The other food image here involves honey. Honey is often included in amatory contexts,[35] but nowhere else are thighs or other specific body parts considered *honey-sweet.*[36] The honey-metaphor seems more apposite; this sugar was an important sweetener, but it is also enticing, pleasant-

---

[30]See TARÁN, p. 41, who cites, α. Τοὔνεχ' ὁ τεχνίτης σε διέπλασεν. A.Pl. 275. 11 (Posidipp.)

[31]πλάσσω is commonly used in connection with Prometheus' creation of man: Aesop. 228. 1.1 Hausrath, Προμηθεὺς...ἀνθρώπους ἔπλασε...; 229. 1; Philem. fr. 89 K, Προμηθεύς, ὃν λέγουσ' ἡμᾶς πλάσαι καὶ τἄλλα πάντα ζῷα; Apollod. Bibl. 1. 45. 2, Προμηθεὺς ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ γῆς ἀνθρώπους πλάσας; Call. fr. 493. 1 Pf. εἴ σε Προμηθεύς | ἔπλασε. πλάσσω is also used of the creation of other humans: Hes. Op. 70 (of Pandora) ἐκ γαίης πλάσσεν κλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυήεις παρθένῳ αἰδοίῃ ἴκελον; Men. fr. 535. 5 Kock, γυναῖκας ἔπλασεν (sc. Προμηθεύς); (of Praxiteles) A.P. 12. 56. 3-4 (Mel.) Ἔρως ἔμψυχον ἄγαλμα, | αὐτὸν ἀπεικονίσας, ἔπλασε Πραξιτέλην. (NB that πλάσσω is not used when Praxiteles makes Eros of marble in 12. 56. 1-2, Εἰκόνα μὲν Παρίην ζωογλύφος ἄνυσ' Ἔρωτος | Πραξιτέλης Κύπριδος παῖδα τυπωσάμενος·).

[32]Note the amatory association of μυελός in E. Hipp. 253ff.; cf. *medulla* in Cat.35. 15; 45. 16; 64. 93; 100. 7; 91. 6; Virg. A. 4. 66; Plaut. Most. 243.

[33]Astyanax ate μυελόν as a child: cf. Hom. Il. 22. 500f.

[34]Cf. Hom. Il. 1. 452ff.; Od. 12. 359ff.

[35]Cf. A.P. 5. 32. 3 (Marc.Arg.); 170. 2 (Noss.); 244. 6 (Paul.Sil.); 12. 22. 5 (Scynthin.); 81. 2; 126. 4; 132b. 8; 133. 6; 154. 4 (Mel.).

[36]Cf. 5. 219 (Paul.Sil.); A.Pl. 177 (Phil.); for some general uses of μελιχρός see LSJ s.v. where it is used of wine, foods, poetry, poets, sounds.

smelling and delightful to taste. By comparing the thighs and rump of the boy to food, D. is playfully suggesting that these parts were palatable. As noted above, βροτολοιγόc[37] is usually applied to Ares, and the imagery involved in Eros's epithet is important for humour.[38] There is *militia amoris* here and the implication of this epithet is that Eros is invested with all the power and ferocity of the god of war himself. Of course, this implication is not meant to be taken seriously; Eros' elevation in status is mock-solemn and hyperbolic. *Militia amoris* was a very old and widespread image, but in the Hellenistic period there is important development.[39] Apollonius Rhodius seems to be the first author to empower Eros with a warrior epithet (οὖλοc Ἔρωc) and it is likely that D. is following his lead.[40] There is also variation on the usual idea of the lover fighting with Eros; here Eros is provoking Zeus.

Like several of D.'s other poems, 12. 37 is frivolous and lighthearted, yet packed with poetic subtleties. He incorporates a variety of ideas with a novel, lively and humorous slant. As often, humour is an important aspect in D.'s epigrams; however, unlike many of his amatory epigrams, D. seems uninvolved. 12. 37 engages and charms the reader by incorporating dense imagery and intricate word order with a light subject matter.

Another epigram of D.'s in this tradition is 5. 56:

Ἐκμαίνει χείλη με ῥοδόχροα, ποικιλόμυθα,
ψυχοτακῆ cτόματος νεκταρέου πρόθυρα,
καὶ γλῆναι λαcίαιcιν ὑπ' ὀφρύcιν ἀcτράπτουcαι,
cπλάγχνων ἡμετέρων δίκτυα καὶ παγίδεc,
καὶ μαζοὶ γλαγόεντεc ἐύζυγεc ἱμερόεντεc
εὐφυέεc, πάcηc τερπνότεροι κάλυκοc.
ἀλλὰ τί μηνὺω κυcὶν ὀcτέα; μάρτυρέc εἰcιν
τῆc ἀθυροcτομίηc οἱ Μίδεω κάλαμοι.

---

[37]ἐριθίζω fits well with βροτολοιγόc as both can be interpreted in a martial and amatory sense; for ἐρεθίζω in an amatory context, cf. Ach.Tat. 5. 25. 7.
[38]Vid. supra my discussion of humour.
[39]See MURGATROYD, 1975, p. 59-65.
[40]Cf. also Mosch. 7. 1f.

This kind of self-imitation[41] is not rare in the A.P., and the concept of an author recycling a specific kind of poetry should not be surprising: Asclepiades wrote five poems of the komastic type[42] and Theocritus wrote four Idylls which include the komos;[43] Meleager wrote 3 epigrams on the *renuntiatio amoris* ;[44] D. himself wrote at least twenty sepulchral epigrams[45] etc. D. seems to be setting himself a test, in which he makes new additions and/or new twists to a type of poetry which he has already exploited. If part of that test is achieving novelty and variation on a previously dealt with theme, then 5. 56 is successful.

In addition to the actual praise of beauty, there are several similarities between 12. 37 and 5. 56: both epigrams include a beloved who is not directly addressed; imagery is important in each;[46] rare diction and word combinations are exploited;[47] mythological examples are incorporated.[48]

However, in content 5. 56 differs slightly from 12. 37. The beloved is not named, a technique which is not unique in this kind of poem (cf. A.P. 5. 48; 62 Ruf.), but is interesting, as D. does not seem to be concerned with the woman as an individual, but more so from a physical point of view. No gods are mentioned in 5. 56; different body parts and far more (5) of them are included. 5. 56 is longer and more emphasis is given to the beloved's (who is female here, to judge from line 5) charms. In form the two poems

---

[41]See Cairns' essay in WEST-WOODMAN, pp.121-143.
[42]Cf. A.P. 5. 64; 145; 164; 167; 189.
[43]Cf. Theoc. Id. 3; 6; 7; 11.
[44]Cf. A.P. 5. 175; 179; 184.
[45]See my chapter 1 on the blending of genres.
[46]Imagery is especially prevalent in 5. 56.
[47]ῥοδόχροα, ποικιλόμυθα, ψυχοτακῆ, ἀθυροστομίης occur first here; the word combinations ῥοδόχροα...χείλη, στόματος...νεταρέου, γλῆναι ...ἀστράπτουσαι, μαζοὶ with ἐΰζυγες or γλαγόεντες or εὐφυέες do not occur elsewhere (ἱμερόεντα μαζὸν occurs first here; the phrase occurs much later in A.P. 15. 27. 14 (Simias), where it is used of a deer's teat). πρόθυρα does not seem to be used elsewhere of a woman's lips.
[48]In 12. 37. 3-4, Ganymede is mentioned; in 5. 56. 7-8, there is a reference to Midas and his ass-ears, on which see GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 237; Ov. Met. 11. 180ff.; RE, 15. 2 col.1531-1532; REITZENSTEIN, p. 186; WEINWREICH, pp. 73-7.

differ. 5. 56 forms a list or catalogue detailing the woman's attractive features (lines 1-6); while 12. 37 is a brief account of a miniature scene.[49] There is slow revelation in 5. 56; we can not be certain that D. is referring to a specific woman or to a favourite type of woman until the final couplet, where D. intimates that he does not wish to reveal all of the woman's charms.

Most importantly, the tone of 5. 56 is very different from 12. 37, where D. does not seem to be seriously involved.[50] The tone of 5. 56 is passionate, exuberant and excited, D. seems directly and intensely concerned. D. exploits a variety of techniques in order to highlight his excitement. Firstly, D. shows his fervent interest by listing the charms of the woman with emphasis on their effect on him.[51] Secondly, the above mentioned rare words and combinations of words are striking and impressive. There are many polysyllabic nouns and adjectives which add to the woman's charm and impact. D. also shows his excitement by emphasizing the anonymous female's singular appeal with extraordinary diction used to describe an extraordinary woman. Thirdly, the crescendo of adjectives in lines 1-6 builds up the impact of D.'s passion and ecstasy, especially in contrast with the anticlimactic reaction in lines 7-8, where D. ostensibly stops himself from ranting and raving. Fourthly, the imagery suggests D.'s intense feelings. The imagery is extensive with comparisons, metaphors and allusions figuring in every line. The vividness and clarity of the imagery adds stress to D.'s jubilation. The comparisons made depend on common and tangible things such as, δίκτυα, παγίδες[52] and καλύξ, which makes the

[49]The catalogue format of 5. 56 is not new (cf. Hom. Il. 2. 494 ff.; Hes. Th. 176 ff.; Semon. 7 Camp.); however, D.'s use of it to list the attractive attributes of a woman, as far as I can tell, is novel.Strangely, GOW-PAGE (1968, 2 p. 381) refer to A.P. 5. 132 (Phld.) as a "strikingly original epigram" which "may have been the model of Ov. Am. 1.5. 19 ff.", and make no reference at all to 5. 56; nor in their commentary on 5. 56 (2. p. 236-237) do they refer to 5. 132. Clearly, there is a connection between these two epigrams and 5. 132 is likely an expansion on 5. 56 or at least it is a poem very much like it. For other catalogues of charms, cf. A.P. 5. 48; 60; 70; 76; 94 (Ruf.).

[50]See my discussion of humour in this chapter.

[51]Cf. line 1, ἐκμαινει...με; line 2, ψυχοτακῆ; line 4, σπλάγχνων ἡμετέρων δίκτυα καὶ παγίδες.

[52]For δίκτυα and παγίδες in amatory poetry, see MURGATROYD, 1984, pp. 363-364.

appeal more immediate. Fifthly, the word order draws attention to D.'s ardour. The first word in line 1 marks the tone of the epigram, ἐκμαίνει, as do the first words in lines 2, 4, 6 and the final words in lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and perhaps 6.[53] Sixthly, the pace of the poem is swift and excited, sped on by an absence of strong stops in the first six lines and by asyndeton in lines 1-2 and 5-6. In addition, lines 1-6 are comprised of one long, breathless sentence with cumulative impact. Seventhly, sound effects also perhaps point to D.'s ecstasy. Homoioteleuton is prevalent and seems to build up in proportion with D.'s passion in lines 1-6, e.g. ῥοδόχροα ποικιλόμυθα |...πρόθυρα; καὶ γλῆναι...ἀστράπτουσαι;[54] λασίασιν...ὀφρύσιν; σπλάγχνων ἡμετέρων; παγίδες | ...γλαγόεντες ἐὐζυγες ἱμερόεντες | εὐφυέες. There is framing in line 2 which adds to the impact of ψυχοτακῆ...πρόθυρα. The spondeiazon in line 3 adds further impact by altering the rhythm of the epigram.

The final two lines mark a shift in emphasis, where D. terminates his catalogue of charms with an explanation. This explanation has a teasing effect on the reader, much like the *cetera quis nescit* technique,[55] where some information is left to the reader's imagination. The list of charms begins at the woman's face and proceeds downward to her breasts, at which point he changes direction with the reader expecting a description of, perhaps, the female's pubic region.

---

[53] D. may be capping an epigram of Asclepiades (5. 210. 4), where the "rosebud" metaphor is used; here, the woman's breasts are more delightful than *any* "rosebud".

[54] There is also assonance in this line in 'αι' sound.

[55] See my opening discussion in chapter 2.

CHAPTER 5: A.P. 12. 42

Βλέψον ἐς Ἑρμογένην[1] πλήρει χερί, καὶ τάχα πρήξεις
παιδοκόραξ ὧν σοι θυμὸς ὀνειροπολεῖ
καὶ στυγνὴν ὀφρύων λύσεις τάσιν· ἢν δ' ἁλιεύῃ
ὀρφανὸν ἀγκίστρου κύματι δοὺς κάλαμον,
ἕλξεις ἐκ λιμένος πολλὴν δρόσον, οὐδὲ γὰρ αἰδὼς
οὐδ' ἔλεος δαπάνῳ κόλλοπι συντρέφεται.

Initially, 12. 42 seems to be an erotodidactic epigram: the speaker does give advice ostensibly aimed at helping the addressee obtain the favours of Hermogenes.[2] However, upon closer perusal it becomes obvious that the advice is not sincere and that the main thrust of the epigram is abuse of the beloved, Hermogenes. It is no great leap of faith to assume that D.'s advice to the addressee is insincere for two reasons. Firstly, why would D. give sincere advice to someone he simultaneously abuses?[3] Secondly, the advice given is not necessary, as it is common knowledge that one must very often have money to obtain the services of a *puer delicatus.*[4] We should also consider that it is highly probable that D.

---

[1]The name Hermogenes (Hermes-born) is well suited to the boy. The association with Hermes (the god of merchants, trickery and theft) suggests the mercenary personality of the boy (cf. Hor. C. 1. 30 and NISBET-HUBBARD, p. 344.).

[2]Note that CAIRNS' (pp. 173-174) definitions do not allow for this type of erotodidaxis. This type would be a variation on type 1 (see my chapter 3 on this type of poetry), i.e. instruction aimed at promoting, usually insincerely, a mercenary love affair between a pair of lovers and given by a love-god, courtesan, experienced lover, or poet in the role of 'teacher of love'; cf. Tib. 1. 5. 69 ff.

[3]The addressee or rival is also abused. This is clear from line 2 where the lover (or his θυμός) is called a παιδοκόραξ, and from the fishing analogy at lines 3-5. The κόραξ is often used in imprecations and other unfavourable contexts (Cf. e.g. Archil. fr. 196A. 21 Camp.; Thgn. 833; Pi. O. 2. 87; A. Ag. 1473; Supp. 751; Ar. V. 852; 982.); thus its use in this compound is highly abusive. θυμός fits well with παιδοκόραξ, suggesting an uncontrolled, voracious and lustful appetite (cf. e.g. Hom. Il. 343;Theoc Id. 17. 130; E. Med. 8) . The analogy is painfully obvious; it implies that the rival is so inept as to fish without a hook, which would leave him no chance of pulling in his catch, a fact which D. clearly points out, ἑλξεις...πολλὴν δροσὸν. There is no need to accept GOW-PAGE's (1965, 2 p. 244) assumption that a baited hook is meant by ἀγκίστρου; a hookless-line is even more futile than fishing without bait, as some fish (e.g. tuna) will strike a bare hook.

[4]For other epigrams involving payment to a beloved for his/her favours, see A.P. 5. 29 (Callicter); 30; 31 (Antip.Thess.); 32 (Marc.Arg.); 33; 34 (Parm.); 63 (Marc.Arg.); 81 (Dionys.); 101 (anon.); 125 (Bass.); 126 (Phld.); 217 (Paul.Sil.); 12. 239.

D. is or was one of the boy's lovers, to judge from the venom of the attack[5] and the themes exploited which commonly find their way into love poetry, e.g. the *venal boy, the unfaithful lover, the rival* and perhaps *the poor poet.* [6] These are standard amatory themes. Furthermore, when D. does not mention his reasons for the tirade against Hermogenes, he invites the reader to guess the answer (which is usually infidelity in amatory contexts). It is difficult to discount D.'s involvement with boy, and if we did, the point of the epigram would be lost without a link between D. and Hermogenes.

Abuse occurs in many kinds of writings, e.g. curses, *defixiones.*[7] In literature abuse is often personal with its main thrust aimed at discrediting someone.[8] There are many examples of invective against people in Aristophanes, e.g. Cleon,[9] Socrates.[10] Similarly, in 12. 42 the abuse is personal, but the context is amatory and the abuse is centred upon the beloved. This kind of abuse is not common in poetry.[11] An early example of this type occurs in an epode of Archilochus (fr. 196A. 16-23):

Νεοβούλη[ν μὲν ὤν]
[ἄ]λλος ἀνὴρ ἐχέτω· αἰαῖ πέπειρα δ̣ [
[ἄν]θος δ' ἀπερρύηκε παρθενήϊον
[κ]αὶ χάριc ἥ πρὶν ἐπῆν· κόρον γὰρ οὐ κ[ατέσχε πω,]
[̣ ̣]ηc δὲ μέτρ' ἔφηνε μαινόλιc γυνή·
[ἐc] κόρακεc ἄπεχε· μὴ τοῦτο ἐφ̣ ̣ ̣ ̣ιταν[
[ὅ]πωc ἐγὼ γυναῖκα τ[ο]ιαύτην ἔχων
[γεί]τοcι χάρμ' ἔcομαι·[12]

Like 12. 42, Archil. names the beloved and abuses her extensively. But, unlike D., he curses the beloved (21), acknowledges her beauty (18-20) and has an ulterior motive for

---

[5]Vid. infra my discussion of the abuse of Hermogenes.
[6]Vid. infra my discussion of amatory themes.
[7]See WATSON, pp. 1-48.
[8]Cf. Archil. fr. 72; 94B (against Lycambes); Hippon. fr. 10-12; 14; 83 B. See also BRECHT, p. 4-6.
[9]Cf. Eq. passim.
[10]Cf. Nu. passim.
[11]Threats against the beloved are common in book twelve of the A.P. where the lover warns that the bloom of youth will fade (cf. A.P. 12. 30 (Alc.Mess.); 31(Phan); 33 (Mel.); 39 (anon.) etc.). This kind of threat is generally aimed at convincing the beloved to yield to the lover's passion, but 12. 42 does not contain any of these threats nor is it aimed at convincing the boy to accept the poet (vid. infra my discussion on the theme of the rival).
[12]The text printed here is from MERKELBACH-WEST, pp. 99, 101.

his abuse, i.e. to obtain the favours of another woman. Another example in this tradition is a fragmentary Iamb of Call. (3), the gist of which is recorded by the Diegesis VI. 34ff.:

> Καταμέμφεται τὸν καιρὸν ὡς πλούτου
> μᾶλλον ἢ ἀρετῆς ὄντα, τὸν δὲ
> πρὸ αὐτου ἀποδέχεται ὅς τῆς ἐναν-
> τιάας ἦν τούτων γνώμης· παρεπι-
> κόπτει δὲ καὶ Εὐθύδημόν τινα, ὡς
> κεχρημένον τῇ ὥρᾳ πορισμῷ, ὑ-
> πὸ τῆς μητρὸς πλουσίῳ συσταθέντα.

To judge from the Diegesis, Iamb 3 was very similar to our epigram. Call. names the beloved and reproaches him. Unfortunately it is impossible to know the extent of the abuse in this Iamb. Some other poems written before 12. 42 should be considered: A.P. 5. 162; 164 (Asclep.); 186 (Posidipp.); 12. 43; 148 (Call.); Anacr. 358 PMG. These works share a number of aspects with our epigram: the beloved is named[13] ; abusive names are used;[14] rivals are mentioned;[15] specific failings are listed.[16] 12. 42 shows several novelties. D. does not simply include a rival, he addresses him and abuses him. The extent of the abuse[17] surpasses the others by far with its invective remarks and demeaning comparisons; clearly D. is not interested in a reinstatement with the boy. The list of his specific failings is far longer than in other poems of this type which include one or two; here, Hermogenes is greedy, frowning, shameless and pitiless.

The abuse here is conveyed variously. First of all there is the actual content of the poem. Hermogenes has no redeeming qualities here: D. describes the boy as having a

---

[13]See 5. 162. 3; 164. 2; 186. 1; 12. 43. 5; 148. 15; 162. 3; 164. 2; 186. 1; 12. 43. 5; 148. 1.
[14]See 5. 162. 3; 164.2.
[15]See 5. 186. 2-4; 12. 43. 6.
[16]See 5. 162. 1; 164. 1; 186. 1; 12. 43. 3; 148. 2, 4; Anacr. 358. 6-8 PMG.
[17]FRASER (1972, 1 p. 596) argues that D. gave impetus to this type of abusive epigram which he mistakenly states is not found in either Asclepiades or Callimachus; vid. infra my discussion on the influence of A.P. 12. 148 (Call.) and Iamb 3 which subsequently became very popular especially in the first and second centuries AD (See BRECHT, pp. 101-102.), e.g. the epigrams of Lucillius in book eleven of the A.P. ; but clearly the works of Archil., Call., Asclep., Posidipp. and Anacr. and perhaps Catullus (8. 12ff; 15; 21; 58 etc.) should figure in this equation.

frowning, sullen expression on his face[18], στυγνὴν ὀφρύων λύσεις τάχιν (12. 42. 3), as opposed to listing some attractive attributes.[19] In line 1 τάχα has the meanings "quickly, presently, forthwith",[20] which emphasize the boy's single-minded interest and the speed of his response in selling his charms for money/presents. In modern terms the boy could be likened to a vending machine, where the patron sees what he wants, pays his fee and obtains it. Hermogenes is described as greedy and unprincipled in that he is interested in money not love, and that he has no shame (i.e. in accepting presents) nor pity (i.e. for the poor lover/poet.)[21] Hermogenes is also called a δάπανος κόλλοψ.

There is further abuse in the fishing metaphor. Hermogenes is likened to a fish that the fisherman has no chance of catching without a hook.[22] The imagery of our epigram is sharp and focused. The fishing metaphor (3-6) is important and has point. Amatory fishing first occurs in the Hellenistic period,[23] but D.'s use of it here is striking and elaborate. Money is likened to the hook which neither the rival nor the fisherman has, and which the rival/fisherman must have in order to obtain his desire. D. draws some scathing parallels between the rival's association with Hermogenes and the fisherman's with the fish. The rival is likened to the fisherman who fishes with no chance of catching his prey; for without a hook obtaining his desire is nothing but a dream. Hermogenes is likened to a stupid fish who is attracted by a hook (or baited hook). There is a paradox in πολλὴ

---

[18]GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 244, correctly point out that the στυγνὴν ὀφρύων ... τάχιν belongs to the boy, but they offer no parallels. One could compare subsequently A.P. 5. 27. (Ruf.); 92. 2; 12. 186. 1 (Strat.).

[19]Cf. A.P. 12. 43. 5 (Call.).

[20]See LSJ s.v. I. τάχα (LSJ s.v. II.) may also mean "perhaps", which suggests that the boy is undependable and unattached. Both meanings of τάχα are possible; however the first seems more abusive and more apt.

[21]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 244. For the theme of the poor poet cf. Call. Iamb 3; A.P. 7. 460; 12. 71; 148 (Call.) etc.

[22]The place where the metaphorical fishing is to occur may be pointed. The implications of the metaphor with the fisherman at the harbour, which was a common haunt for whores, suggest that Hermogenes may have been a common harbour-whore. Cf. e.g. A.P. 5. 161 (Hedyl./Asclep.); 159 (Simon.). For other epigrams containing the hook metaphor, see A.P. 5. 67 (Capito); 247 (Maced.).

[23]See Lyc. Alex. 67; see also MURGATROYD, 1984 p. 364.

δρόcoc.[24] It is difficult to fathom how a fishing line dipped in the harbour (presumably once, to judge from the aorist participle, κύματι δοὺc κάλαμον) would result in much of anything. δρόcον comes as a surprise at the end of the second colon where the reader may wonder what the fisherman can possibly pull in without a hook. The whole analogy builds up to these two final words of the second colon where strangely and unexpectedly the climax is πολλὴν δρόcον. One might expect a lot of line or a lot of nothing, but a lot of water seems absurd. The paradox adds emphasis to the following lines where shame and pity are deemed inconceivable in and expensive *cinaedus*.

Several words are well chosen for their abusive character. παιδοκόραξ is a rare, unusual and economical word, thus drawing the reader's attention; but this word has important implications for both the unnamed rival and Hermogenes. παιδοκόραξ likens the rival to a κόραξ, the boy to the prey of the κόραξ. The raven is an opportunistic carrion feeder, an association which does not carry any redeeming qualities for the rival, but it is even worse for the boy who would be the carrion which the raven preys upon. Here, the carrion-association suggests the revolting and disgusting nature of a bloated corpse as well as the pungent odour of rotting flesh. πρήξειc has point, it has the meanings "achieve", "effect, accomplish",[25] but also "transact", "negotiate", "manage".[26] These latter meanings are more to the point here and add teeth to the invective bite which attacks the mercenary Hermogenes. πλήρει χερί stands out because it seems odd with

---

[24]Hermann's theory that the fishing metaphor was an elaborate double-entendre was rightly dismissed by GOW-PAGE (1965, 2 p. 244), who quote Hermann, "κάλαμον *de veretro* λιμένα *autem...de pueri parte postica interpretatur, ut verbis* ἕλξειc - δρόcον *nihil aliud indicetur quam* καταχεcεῖται cου." This interpretation is strained and ridiculous; I have yet to find such an instance where κάλαμοc is used for *penis* and λιμήν for *anus*. How exactly would this work? Would the lover be drawing πολλὴν δρόcον which dripped off his penis out of the boy's *anus* ? Is this not what the lover desires? To judge from A.P. 5. 54 and 55, D. is not the type to conceal a perfectly good obscenity behind such cloudy metaphors. Here the fishing metaphor works well without any double-entendre.

[25]See LSJ s.v. πράccω III.

[26]See LSJ s.v. πράccω III. 6.

βλέπω where ὄμμαcι or ὀφθάλμοιc would be more natural.[27] Here, πλήρει χερί adds further censure to D.'s tirade against greedy love; this is the part of the body that the boy is attracted to, i.e. a hand full of money. cτυγνόc (not used elsewhere with τάcιc) has the meanings "hated, abhorred",[28] "gloomy, sullen".[29] This word is economical in that it carries several meaning which are applicable to this context. Hermogenes has become hated by D., and his facial expression is not at all depicted by D. to seem attractive, but rather morose, black, haughty. δάπανοc (of men) has the meanings "lavish", "extravagant",[30] (of things) "expensive", "consuming".[31] Here too several of these meanings may be intended,[32] drawing more attention to the abusive term δαπάνῳ κόλλοπι (a rare and emphatic phrase which only occurs here) and making it doubly abusive. κόλλοψ is no doubt a term of abuse,[33] but the precise meaning of it in the time of D. seems unattainable. The metaphorical meaning "*cinaedus*", according to the LSJ, occurs first here.[34]

The tone of 12. 42 makes up part of the attack against Hermogenes. There is a mixture of strong emotions, e.g. bitterness, anger and sarcasm, especially at lines 1-3. From the end of line three to the end of the poem, D. becomes increasingly abusive. Each line is carefully laid out with barbed phrases which cast both the beloved and the rival in a

---

[27]Cf. A. Supp. 716; S. OT. 1371; E. Ph. 397; 458; A.P. 7. 669. 2 (Plato).

[28]See LSJ s.v. cτυγνόc.

[29]See LSJ s.v. cτυγνόc II.

[30]See LSJ s.v. δάπανοc (= δαπανηρόc).

[31]See LSJ s.v. δάπανοc (= δαπανηρόc) II, III.

[32]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 244, who suggest "expensive".

[33]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 244, who cite Hsch. AB 102. 33, τὸ νωτιαῖον, τὸ τραχηλιαῖον τοῦ βοός, κόλλοψ, διὰ τὸ εἰc κόλλαν εὐθετεῖν, καὶ τοὺc cκληροὺc δὲ καὶ παρηβηκότας παῖδας ἐντεῦθεν κόλλοπάc φαcιν. Cf. also HENDERSON, p. 212-213.

[34]Hsch.'s explanation does not clarify the meaning; if Hsch. is correct, that a κόλλοψ is a boy on the verge of losing his beauty, it would seem to contradict παιδοκόραξ in line 2; fading charms are also a very easy target for abuse (cf. A.P. 5. 21; 27 (Ruf.); 107 (Phld.); 204 (Mel.); 271 (Maced.); 12. 30 (Alc.Mess.); 31 (Phan.); 33 (Mel.); 39 (anon.)), which D. makes no use of here.

bad light, culminating in the final and extremely corrosive colon which is highlighted by the repetitious οὐδὲ γὰρ...οὐδ'.

Many important words are positioned at key places in the line. Verbs either begin or end every line (except line 4) which draws attention to the action of 12. 42. Other important placements include the abusive term παιδοκόραξ and the poignant ὀρφανὸν which clearly dangles the idea of Hermogenes' shortcomings (at lines 5 and 6) before the reader, i.e. Hermogenes is in need of certain human qualities. Similarly, αἰδώς at line 5 and οὐδ' at line 6 are notably placed to accent Hermogenes' deficiency.

Sound effects such as alliteration in "π" in lines 1-2 along with the clashing double consonants "χ, ξ" in χερί...τάχα πρήξεις | παιδοκόραξ and the hissing of "ς" throughout seems to add to the abusive tone and mood of the epigram.

Structurally (if we place a strong stop after δρόσον in line 5[35]) the poem becomes a *tricolon diminuendo* (Βλέψον...τάσιν; ἤν...δρόσον; οὐδε...συντρέφεται). The three part construction adds further emphasis to the abusive final colon; the epigram builds up and tapers down to the last colon and leaves a lasting impression on the reader. There is ring structure which gets the point across with some short and scathing remarks concerning Hermogenes: at line one his venality is featured (πλήρει χερί); similarly, lines 5-6 dwell upon venality by explaining why one needs money/presents, i.e. because the boy has no shame or pity (οὐδὲ...αἰδώς | οὐδ' ἔλεος).

To move on to some other important points of appreciation, D. incorporates several themes which are often perceived from the point of view of the lover. One of these is *the venal boy*. There are two ways in which this theme is used: firstly, the lover is put off when the beloved asks for a gift;[36] secondly, the lover becomes disenchanted when the

---

[35]It seems odd not to have a strong stop before οὐδὲ γὰρ: cf. e.g. A.P. 7. 148. 3 (anon.); 277. 3 (Call.); 472. 5 (Leon.); 497. 3 (Damag.); 551. 5 (Agath.); 566. 3 (Maced); 745. 9; 9. 151. 5 (Antip.Sid.); 176. 3 (Pall.) etc.

[36]Cf. A.P. 5. 32 (Marc.Arg.); 63; 114 (Maec.); 12. 148 (Call.); Diegesis on Iamb 3; Anacreont. 29. 9f.; Tib. 1. 5. 68ff.; 9. 52ff. For a tirade against venality, cf. Lyr.Alex.Adesp. p. 214.

beloved asks for more expensive gifts.[37] 12. 42 follows the first example with some variation: he includes a rival;[38] he does not address the boy at all and he paints a very black picture of the boy.[39] Another prominent theme is that of *the unfaithful beloved.*[40] Clearly, D. seems upset at the fickleness of Hermogenes. This is not unlike other pieces which deal with the unfaithful beloved,[41] where the lover naturally vents some hard feelings, but D. does not curse the beloved, like Thgn. 1311; he does not threaten him/her, like Theoc. Id. 29. 39-40; he does not focus his anger on the rival, like Tib. 1. 9. 53-74; rather D. abuses the boy with no hint of kindness, and he is extremely bitter and angry. He does not address the boy directly,[42] rather he sarcastically addresses the boy's lover. Unlike other poems which exploit this theme, D. adds no personal touches, no first person addresses, no first person personal pronouns, nothing that could be directly traced back to D. The theme of *the rival* is also present.[43] Here, D. varies the theme with an address to an unnamed rival,[44] by giving him insincere advice[45] and by abusing the rival.[46]

12. 42 may have been inspired by an epigram of Call., 12. 148 (and perhaps Iamb 3). D.'s epigram seems to be a more elaborate expansion on 12. 148. There are thematic similarities between 12. 148 and 42: *the venal boy, the unfaithful lover* and perhaps the *poor poet* (if we infer that D. did not have the money to offer Hermogenes). Call.'s detail of πλούτου κεναὶ χέρες (12. 148. 1) is inverted in our epigram, πλήρει χερὶ (12. 42.

---

[37]Cf. A.P. 12. 44 (Glauc.); 212; 237 (Strat.).
[38]Vid. infra my discussion on the theme of the rival.
[39]Vid. supra my discussion on the abuse of Hermogenes.
[40]Presumably, Hermogenes was the beloved of D., hence the abuse of him and the rival.
[41]Cf. Archil. 196A. 16-23; Thgn. 1311; Theoc. Id. 29. 39-40; Call. Iamb 3; A.P. 12. 237 (Strat.); Tib. 1. 9. 17-52.
[42]Cf. A.P. 12. 237 (Strat.), Thgn. 1311, Theoc. Id. 29. 39-40 and Tib. 1. 9. 17-54.
[43]Cf. A.P. 5. 8 (Mel.); 107; 120 (Phld.); 158 (Asclep.); 160; 165; 166; 191 (Mel.); 213 (Possidipp.);12. 43 (Call.).
[44]Cf. Tib. 1. 5. 69ff.; 2. 87ff.; Cat. 15; 21; 40; 83; Hor. Epod. 15. 17ff.; Prop. 1. 5.
[45]For the technique of insincere advice: cf. Call. Iamb 5. Ὦ ξεῖνε - συμβουλὴ | γὰρ ἔν τι τῶν ἱρῶν - | ἄκουε τἀπὸ καρδ|ίης.
[46]Vid. supra my opening paragraph.

1), and the idea of the dream is expanded upon (μὴ λέγε...τοὐμὸν ὄνειρον ἐμοὶ 12. 148. 2; πρήξεις | ...ὧν σοι θυμὸς ὀνειροπολεῖ 42.1-2). D. does not slavishly follow Call. in form and structure: he does not directly address the boy, but rather the rival; he does not refer to the boy in a kind and loving manner (φίλε 12. 148. 4); 12.42 is more than a chastising slap on the wrist, the focus here is highly abusive and it is centred upon Hermogenes. Although there are no verbal similarities between the fragmentary Iamb 3 and 12. 42, we may assume from the Diegesis synopsis that their main thrusts were similar.

CHAPTER 6: A.P. 12. 14

Δημόφιλος τοιοῖcδε φιλήμαcιν εἰ πρὸc ἐραcτάc
χρήcεται ἀκμαίην, Κύπρι, καθ' ἡλικίην
ὡc ἐμὲ νῦν ἐφιληcεν ὁ νήπιοc, οὐκέτι νύκτωρ
ἥcυχα τῇ κείνου μητρὶ μενεῖ πρόθυρα.

The main thrust of 12. 14 turns upon the prophecy at lines 3-4. Prophecy in general is a familiar element in ancient poetry. There are several earlier examples, such as Hom. Il. 19. 407ff.; Pi. N. 1. 62 ff.; Pae. 8. 25-35; Porphyrio, Commentum in Horati Carmina, 1. 15. 1, who says, "hac ode Bacchylidem imitatur. nam ut ille Cassandram facit vaticinari futura belli Troiani ita hic Proteum" [sic]); A. Pers. 796 ff.; Cypria (Procl. chrest. 1, ...Καccάδρα περὶ τῶν μελλόντων προδηλοῖ.); Lyc. Alexandra; Verg. A. 6. 756 ff.[1] Cairns summarises one form of prophecy as follows:

> The speaker is in a situation not to his liking and the blame or responsibility for this lies, in his opinion, with the addressee. The speaker warns/ prophesies [sic]/ wishes that the addressee may in the future find himself in a new position in which he will no longer incommode the speaker. The purpose of this threat is to induce the addressee to take faster action to relieve the speaker's present discomfort.[2]

Prophecy often figures in a specifically amatory context, where the actual prophecy is the main thrust of the poem and where the prophecy is almost always used as a *threat* against the beloved because he/she will not yield to the speaker's desires.[3] A brief synopsis of the standard features of *threat -prophecy* is as follows:

> ...the speaker may warn the addressee that old age will come and render him unattractive or/and place the addressee in a plight similar to that of the speaker. Or the speaker may, in sophisticated examples, simply say that the addressee's alternative love relationship will come to no good... Or --although this may be a different variant-- the speaker can say that the addressee will grow to an age to feel the same sentiments as the speaker but with a happy outcome.[4]

---

[1]See NISBET-HUBBARD, p. 189 for further examples.
[2]See CAIRNS, p. 85.
[3]See CAIRNS, p. 85.
[4]See CAIRNS, p. 85-86.

This type of poem is very common, especially in the A.P.[5] 12. 14 shares many similarities with *threat prophecy*: a god is mentioned,[6] (line 2, Cypris); the boy is named[7] (here Demophilos would be more acurately considered a prospective beloved); the komos is alluded to[8] (lines 3-4); other suitors are mentioned[9] (line 1 ἐραστάς); the door is included[10] (line 4, πρόθυρα); compliments are made to the boy[11] (line 1 τοιοῖσδε φιλήμασιν).

12. 14 is a prophecy but not a *threat-prophecy*. The speaker is not at all in a state of discomfort, nor is the prophecy made in order to induce the beloved to yield to the passions of the poet.[12] 12. 14 is an *inverse threat-prophecy*. The differences in 12. 14 from the standard *threat-prophecy* are important. Firstly, D. does not threaten that Demophilos' charms will fade with time,[13] but rather talks of him in his prime when older. Secondly, the poet does not complain that he has received poor treatment from the boy,[14]

---

[5]Cf. e.g. 5. 21 (Ruf.); 23 (Call.); 47; 103 (Ruf.); 167 (Asclep.); 233 (Maced.); 12. 16 (Strat.); 29; 30 (Alc.Mes.); 31 (Phanocl.); 35 (Diocl.); 39 (anon.); 174 (Fronto); 186; 195; 215 (Strat.). Cf. also CAIRNS, p. 85, who cites Thgn. 1299-1310; Theoc. Id. 29. 35-40; Hor. C. 1. 25. 9-10; 3. 10. 9-12, 19-20; 4. 10. 6; Ep. 15; Ov. Ars 3. 69ff.; Cat. 8. 14-19; Prop. 3. 25. 4; Tib. 1. 8. 71-78.

[6]Cf. A.P. 5. 167. 4, 5 (Asclep.); 12. 16. 1 (Strat.); 31. 6; 195. 4 (Phanocl.); Thgn. 1299-1310; Theoc. Id. 29. 22; Hor. C. 3. 10. 8, 9; 4. 10. 1; Ep. 15. 9; Tib. 1. 8. 5, 28, 35.

[7]Cf. A.P. 5. 21. 1 (Ruf.); 23. 1 (Call.); 47. 1; 103. 1 (Ruf.); 167. 3 (Asclep.; NB the text of this epigram is probably corrupt, see GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 126); 12. 16. 1 (Strat.); 29. 1; 30. 1 (Alc.Mes.); 31. 2 (Phanocl.); 35. 2 (Diocl.); 39. 1. (anon.); 174. 1 (Fronto); 186. 1; 195. 3, 5; 215. 2 (Strat.); Hor. C. 1. 25. 8; 3. 10. 1; 4. 10. 5; Ep. 15. 11; Prop. 3. 25. 6; Tib. 1. 8. 49, 71.

[8]Cf. A.P. 5. 23 (Call.); 103 (Ruf.); 167 (Asclep.); Hor. C. 1. 25; 3. 10; Ep. 15; Ov. Ars 3. 69ff.; Prop. 3. 25.

[9]Cf. A.P. 21. 5 (Ruf.); 233. 3 (Maced.); Theoc. Id. 29. 14-15; Hor. C. 1. 25. 9; 3. 10. 16; Ep. 15. 13; Tib. 1. 8. 50; Ov. Ars 3. 69.

[10]Cf. A.P. 5. 23. 2 (Call.); 167. 4 (Asclep.); Theoc. Id. 29. 39; Hor. C. 1. 25. 4; 3. 10. 5; Ov. Ars 3. 71; Prop. 3. 25. 10.

[11]Cf. A.P. 12. 29. 1 (Alc.Mes.); 35. 1-2 (Diocl.); 195. 4-8 (Strat.); Thgn. 1299-1310; Theoc. Id. 29. 5-6; Hor. C. 4. 10. 1.

[12]NB CAIRNS does not include 12. 14 in his discussion.

[13]Cf. A.P. 5. 21.4-5 (Ruf.); 23. 5-6 (Call.); 103. 3-4 (Ruf.); 233. 5-6 (Maced.); 12. 29. 1-2; 30. 4-5 (Alc.Mes.); 31.3-4 (Phanocl.); 35. 3-4 (Diocl.); 39. 1-2 (anon.); 174. 3-4 (Fronto); 186. 4-6; 195. 7-8 (Strat.); 215. 2; Thgn. 1299-1310; Hor. C. 1. 25. 9; 4. 10. 2-5; Ov. Ars 3. 73-74; Prop. 3. 25. 11-12.

[14]Cf. A.P. 5. 23. 4-5 (Call.); 47. 5-6; 103. 1 (Ruf.); 233. 1-4 (Maced.); 12. 31. 6 (Phanocl.); 35. 2 (Diocl.);174. 1-3 (Fronto); 186. 2 (Strat.); Thgn. 1299-1310; Theoc. Id. 29. 36; Hor. C. 1. 25. 7-8; 3. 10. 3-4, 19-20; 4. 10. 1; Ov. Ars 3. 69; Prop. 3. 25. 9-10.

because he has been treated favourably by him and he has obtained a sample of the boy's charms. Thirdly, there is no threatening assertion that the boy will be lonely[15] in the future when his charms fade. Instead, D. suggests that Demophilos will be anything but lonely when his charms mature because komasts will frequent his door every night. Fourthly, at no point does D. suggest that Demophilos is his ἐρώμενος nor that D. is himself the ἐραστής (this kind of relationship between the lover and beloved is commonly implied in other poems in this tradition.[16]) Finally, the boy is at present too young for a relationship and he is not directly addressed. Other poems of this type include beloveds who are of the appropriate age.[17] Inversion or variation of important aspects within a tradition of poetry is not new,[18] but inversion of *threat prophecy*, to the best of my knowledge, occurs first here,[19] and D.'s inversion of it is bold, striking and extensive.

Praise of Demophilos should also be included as part the main thrust of 12. 14. Like many other poems which praise the beloved the boy is named; the effect on the speaker is intimated (here the effect is implicitly contained in τοιοῖcδε φιλήμαcιν in line 1, in the address to Cypris in line 2, who is often invoked in amatory contexts, and in the favourable prophecy in the final 2 lines); a divinity is mentioned, Cypris.[20] Similarly, many poems of this type include a brief expression of the charms of the beloved aimed at emphasizing the beauty of the beloved, which is conveyed variously.[21] D. also adds his

---

[15]Cf. A.P. 21. 5-6 (Ruf.); 167. 3-4 (Asclep.); 12. 30. 3 (Alc.Mes.); 35. 3-5 (Diocl.); 186. 6 (Strat.); Ov. Ars 3. 69; Cat. 8. 15-19; Hor. C. 1. 25. 9-15.

[16]A.P. 5. 21 (Ruf.); 23 (Call.); 47; 103 (Ruf.); 167 (Asclep.); 233 (Maced.); 12. 16 (Strat.); 29; 30 (Alc.Mess.); 31 (Phan.); 35 (Diocl.); 39 (anon.); 174 (Fronto); 186; 195; 215 (Strat.); Thgn. 1299-1310; Theoc. Id. 29; Hor. C. 1. 25; 3. 10; 4. 10; Ep. 15; Ov. Ars 3. 69ff.; Cat. 8; Prop. 3. 25; Tib. 1. 8.

[17]For a few exceptions, vid. infra my discussion on the praise of Demophilos.

[18]See CAIRNS, pp. 127ff.; TARÁN, pp. 1-2; GIANGRANDE, pp. 99-100.

[19]For subsequent examples of *inverse threat-prophecy*, cf. A.P. 5. 111 (Antiphil.); 148 (Mel.); 12. 205 (Strat.)

[20]See the opening discussion in my chapter 4.

[21]Cf. e.g. A.P. 5. 194. 3-4 (Posidipp. or Asclep.), οἱά τε λύγδου | γλυπτήν...; 210. 2 (Asclep.), τήκομαι, ὡc κηρὸc πὰρ πυρί...; 12. 58. 3-4 (Rhian.), ὅccον ἐν ἄλλοιc | ἄνθεcιν εἰαρινοῖc καλὸν ἔλαμψε ῥόδον; Pi. fr. 108. 2-5 Bowra (a more lengthy example), τὰc δὲ Θεοξένου ἀκτῖνάc ποτ' ὄccων μαρμαριζοι-| cac δρακείc | ὅc μὴ πόθῳ κυμαὶνεται, ἐξ ἀδάμαντος | ἠὲ cιδάρου

own touch with an expression conveying a rare favourable prophecy (lines 3-4). Like 5. 13, 62, 156 and 194, D. mentions other potential suitors for Demophilos so as to highlight the boy's allure.

12.14 differs from other poems which praise the beloved in that the boy is young , i.e. too young for an ἐρώμενος/ἐραστής relationship, to judge from line 2, where the boy has not yet reached his prime ἀκμαίην...καθ' ἡλικίην, line 3, where he is called ὁ νήπιος, and deductively from lines 3-4 where he has not yet had a following of suitors besieging his door at night. D.'s mention of a boy who is too young (perhaps younger than twelve years of age if Strato's *terminus post quem* has any validity[22]) and acknowledgment of the fact that he has obtained kisses from him draw the reader's attention. D. does not praise the present beauty of the boy,[23] as is common, but rather the prospective beauty of the boy when he is in his prime.

To move on to some important themes, the παρακλαυσίθυρον or κῶμος is a very common motif in Greek and Latin literature[24] and thus the audience's sensitivity to it was highly attuned;[25] so, D.'s allusion to it here need not contain all or most of the traditional elements of the komos for his audience to know what he is referring to in lines 3-4. In fact, 12. 14 is not komastic, but the subtle allusion to the komos at the end of the poem is sharp and witty. Reference to the nightly carousal neatly hones the point of the poem, which is meant to be a compliment to the boy, while it also overturns the komastic threats (i.e. that the beloved will have no lovers at his/her door) which mark komastic poetry. Several poems of this type of poetry (*threat-prophecy*) contain allusions to the nocturnal

---

κεχάλκευται μέλαιναν καρδίαν | ψυχρῷ φλογὶ, πρὸς δ' Ἀφροδίτας ἀτιμασθεὶς | ἑλικοβλεφάρου |...

[22]Cf. A.P. 12. 4; 205 (Strat.). For other poems which deal with a beloved who is too young, cf. 5. 111 (Antiphil.); 45 (Callicter); 12. 188; 228; 251 (Strat.); Hor. C. 2. 5.

[23]Cf. A.P. 5. 13 (Phld.); 48; 62; 73 (Ruf.); 156 (Mel.); 194; 210 (Asclep.); 231; 7. 217 (Maced.); 12. 51 (Call.); 38; 58 (Rhian.); 106; 110 (Mel.).

[24]See HEADLAM, pp. 82-84; COPLEY, *passim*; McKeown, on Ov. Am. 1.6.

[25]See CAIRNS, pp. 88-89;

revel,[26] and so D.'s use of it here clearly places 12. 14 in this tradition. D. has carefully made use of a number of standard komastic motifs to achieve the above mentioned effect: a prospective beloved is named[27] (line 1); a door is mentioned[28] (line 4); one or more gods[29] are mentioned (line 2), notably Cypris herself, who is often included (e.g. A.P. 5. 189 (Asclep.), 191 (Mel.), 12. 167; Lyr.Alex.Adesp. 1. 2, 12, 19.) The komos is also revealed through emphatic word placement. Words such as ἐραστάς, ἡλικίην, νύκτωρ, πρόθυρα are all located at the end of lines 1-4 respectively. These words contain many of the necessary ingredients for a komos and so are noticeable as they foreshadow the final line:

1) ἐρασταί
2) a young boy
3) the proper time for a komos, evening
4) a destination, the beloved's door

D. also adds novelty to the komos theme by including the mother of Demophilos. D.'s mention of the boy's mother here is puzzling. Gow-Page suggest that the mother is a widow, as it would be more natural to expect mention of the father.[30] This need not be the case, the point of the epigram is that Demophilos is very young, he is a νήπιος (= infant, child);[31] reference to the boy's mother may have been made to emphasize the infantile nature of the boy as one would expect a child to be with his mother. There may be further innovation here. D. states that the πρόθυρα will not be ἥσυχα, e.g. "quiet", "still".[32] HEADLAM[33] may be correct in assuming that ἥσυχα = "quiet" and that D. is referring to

---

[26]Cf. A.P. 5. 23 (Call.); 103 (Ruf.); 167 (Asclep.); Hor. C. 1. 25; 3. 10; Ep. 15; Ov. Ars 3. 69ff.; Prop. 3. 25.
[27]Cf. A.P. 5. 23. 1 (Call.); 164. 2; 167. 3 (Asclep.); 190. 4 (Mel.); 213. 1 (Posidipp.); 12. 23. 3 (Mel.); 116. 4 (anon.); 118. 1 (Call.); 167. 1 (Mel.).
[28]Cf. 5. 23. 2 (Call.); 145. 1; 189. 2 (Asclep.); 191. 5; 12. 23. 3 (Mel.).
[29]Cf. A.P. 5. 64. 5, 6 (Asclep.); 168. 3, 4 (anon.); 189. 4 (Asclep.); 191. 7 (Mel.); 213. 2, 4 (Posidipp.); 12. 23. 3; 117. 6; 119. 1; 167. 2, 4 (Mel.); Lyr.Alex.Adesp. 1. 2, 12, 19, 15.
[30]See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 242.
[31]See LSJ s.v. νήπιος.
[32]See LSJ s.v. ἥσυχος.
[33]See p. 83.

komasts knocking on the door in order to get the beloved's attention more effectively; but it is also possible that οὐκέτι...| ἥcυχα...πρόθυρα = a door which is no longer still,[34] which could mean that the door will be opening often in order to let in komasts, a practice which is very rare in komastic poetry, but not unparalleled.[35]

There are minor themes as well in 12.1 4. The theme of the rival is present.[36] D. varies it here by alluding to future lovers of the boy.[37] Another theme in 12. 14 concerns kisses. Kisses are often praised for their special character or power in the A.P., where the effect or quality of them is conveyed variously.[38] D. adds novelty to this theme by employing a boy, who is not a beloved of the speaker, and who is too young for a relationship. The kisses given to the poet are not necessessarily erotic, but have the potential to be so.

There is a slow trickle of information in 12. 14. Δημόφιλοc, φιλήματα, ἐραστές and a prophecy are introduced in the first line; however it is not fully revealed what exactly is going on until the end of the final line. One might expect with the mention of Δημόφιλοc, φιλήματα, ἐραστές an erotic scene, but gradually it becomes apparent that 12.14 is not erotic. Midway through line 3, D. makes it clear that he has obtained kisses of distinction, nothing more, from the young boy. He then completes the prophecy which is finally fully revealed at the end of the poem. Thus, the tradition to which 12.14 belongs is slowly revealed and it is not until the end of the epigram that it becomes clear.

Sound effects add to the impact of 12. 14. In line 1 the 'φιλ' sound is repeated in Δημόφιλοc and φιλήμαcιν, which draws attention by highlighting the link between these

---

[34]Cf. A.P. 7. 277. 3-4 (Call.), ...οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸc | ἥcυχοc, αἰθυίῃ δ' ἶcα θαλαccοπορεῖ.
[35]See HEADLAM, pp. 82-84 (NB that he cites no refs. for this practice); COPLEY, pp.7-10, who cites Ar. Ec. 938-75; Pl. Cur. 156-157.
[36]See my discussion on "...other points of appreciation" in chapter 5.
[37]There may be some play here on the plurality of prospective lovers; the boy's name is made up of Δημός and φιλοc, i.e. he is a lover of "people".
[38]Cf. 5. 14 (Ruf.); 96 (Mel.); 266; 285 (Agath.); 12. 16 (Strat.); 68 (Mel.); 90 (anon.); 95 (Mel.); 133; 305 (anon.); cf also LIER, pp. 54-56.

two words, i.e. the boy and his kisses. The sigma sounds of line 1 may help to express D.'s jubilation after obtaining such kisses.[39] Excitement is also suggested by the lack of strong stops: 12.14 is one continuous and breathless assertion. In Line 2 there are repetitive 'κ' and 'χ' sounds in χρήσεται...Κυρπρι, καθ' and internal rhyme in ἀκμαίην...ἡλικίην. The alliteration seem to make the invocation of Cypris more forceful and memorable with the clashing sounds of the consonants, while the internal rhyme brings to the fore the boy's prospective prime of youth. The sound effects in lines 3 and 4 may also be intended to suggest the noise at his mother's front door, with all the knocking, pleading, singing and whining of the prospective komasts (and perhaps the opening of the door).

The beginning of lines 1 and 4 draws the reader's attention: line 1 opposes Demophilos with the final word ἐραστάς, perhaps separating the boy from an ἐραστής/ἐρώμενος relationship as he is too young. Line 4 is framed by ἥσυχα and πρόθυρα. Here the separation of ἥσυχα and πρόθυρα may highlight the fact that when the boy reaches his prime, silence/stillness will not at all be associated with his mother's door.

[39]For similar sigma sounds after having obtained some satisfaction from another, see my chapter 2 (5. 55) and 4 (5. 54) on sound effects.

CHAPTER 7: A.P. 5. 53; 193

'Η πιθανή μ' ἔτρωσεν 'Αριστονόη, φίλ' Ἄδωνι,
κοψαμένη τῇ σῇ στήθεα πὰρ καλύβῃ.
εἰ δώσει ταύτην καὶ ἐμοὶ χάριν, ἥν ἀποπνεύσω,
μὴ πρόφασις, σύμπλουν σύμ με λαβὼν ἀπάγου. (A.P. 5. 53)

'Η τρυφερή μ' ἤγρευσε Κλεὼ τὰ γαλάκτιν',Ἄδωνι,
τῇ σῇ κοψαμένη στήθεα παννυχίδι.
εἰ δώσει κἀμοὶ ταύτην χάριν, ἥν ἀποπνεύσω,
μὴ προφάσεις, συμπλουν σύν με λάβων †ἀγέτω. (A.P. 5. 193)

There are several points which 5. 53 and 193[1] have in common. Both poems exploit the fact that festivals were one of the few instances in which young women made public appearances, and so such occasions provided young men with many opportunities to see and meet them.[2] These two epigrams are also characterized by their vivid and sharp wit, part of which is the paradoxical combination of grief and death with love. D. has

---

[1] Some commentators have argued that these two poems could not have been written by the same author because of the extensive similarities in their content (STADTMÜLLER, 1 p. 161; WALTZ, 2 p. 88.); however, the ascriptions do not seem to have been disputed in the MSS. Waltz (who is cited by WEINREICH, p. 86; GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 238) argues that 193 is a parody of 53 based on the final word ἀγέτω, which is obelized by GOW-PAGE (1965, 1 p. 82). His premise is that Cleo is the subject of ἀγέτω and that there is an obscene allusion in σύμπλουν; thus, 193 is a parody of 53. This interpretation seems strained. If this were the case, the sense of the epigram would seem obscure, since Adonis is addressed in line 1 and spoken to at line 3. The idea of the parody seems equally odd. What is being parodied? The names of the two women are different, and the wording is so similar that it is difficult to see any real difference in the point of either piece. Waltz's theory is rightly dismissed by GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 238. GIANGRANDE, 1967, p. 42, argues that 193 is a satiric poem on the basis of the meanings of πιθανή (which he interprets as "wahrhaftig"), τρυφερή (which is interpreted as ψευδής) and the strange idea that Κλεώ of 193. 1 is really equivalent to Κλέων. There does not seem to be any good reason for refuting the authorship of 53 and 193. It is possible that we have two versions of the same poem which were written by the same author (so GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 238; REITZENSTEIN, RE 5. 1128), this is not the only example of such duplicity: cf. the two nearly identical versions of an epigram of Mel. preserved by MS Pa (5. 215 and 12. 19a); Cat. 68. 20-24 and 92-96; Verg. G. 4. 475-478 and A. 6. 306-308; Verg. G. 479-480 and A. 6. 438-439. There is a good possibility that one poem is an improvement on the other, as I hope to show.

[2] See GOW, 2 p. 49, and especially HEADLAM, p. 40 f., who lists many parallels for young men being love-struck at festivals.

become enamoured of a woman after she had grieved and taken part in the funeral rites of Adonis. This is not the context in which one would expect the woman to seem attractive to admirers, nor would one expect that people attended rites of this kind in order to meet prospective lovers. This paradox is surprising and adds to the impact of the poem.[3]

There is an irreverent tone in these two pieces. D. twists a solemn religious festival into an amatory scene. Aristonoe and Kleo exposed their breasts in ritual lamentation for Adonis[4] and this is considered a χάρις that is worth dying for. D. also boldly puts himself on the same level as Adonis in line 3, where he likens his own death to that of Adonis, and wishes that he be lamented over and carried in a procession to the sea as a "ship-mate" of Adonis'.[5] There is further wit in the imagery of line 1 of each poem. Hunting imagery is used. In 53, Aristonoe has wounded D., which likens him to Adonis who was wounded by a boar while hunting,[6] and like Adonis D. is the victim of the hunt. Similarly, hunting imagery is exploited in 193, where D. has been captured by Kleo. In each piece, the hunt which caused Adonis' death is wryly equated with D.'s amorous feelings.

The meaning of κοψαμένη, which seems to be the same in each piece ("after she struck her breasts"), is important for the overall point of the two epigrams. Gow-Page argue (rightly) that D. has not yet seen the woman's breasts in either poem primarily on the basis of the aorist participle (which normally refers to a time before the main verb) in line 2, κοψαμένη. They also suggest (but offer no proof) that the Adonia was

---

[3] For further examples of the combination of death and love in the A.P., see my discussion on the blending of types of poetry in chapter 1.
[4] See Ov. Met. 10. 708-730.
[5] See GOW, 2 p. 298.
[6] See Ov. Met. 10. 298-559; 708-739.

primarily a women's festival[7] in which men would be less likely to be present.[8] The suggestion that D. has not seen the woman's breasts in either poem may be further shown by the point of the two epigrams, which is that D. is willing to die if the woman (Aristonoe in 53, Kleo in 193) would grieve for him and strike her breasts (presumably bared[9]) in mourning. If he had already seen the woman's breasts, then the joke about his willingness to die in order to see them seems flat and pointless.

There are some slight but significant differences in each epigram (see the table below which outlines the differences in lines 1 and 2 of epigrams 5. 53 and 193):

5. 53	5. 193
1) πιθανή..'.Αριστονόη	τρυφερή...Κλεὼ
2) μ' ἔτρωσεν	μ' ἤγρευσε
3) φιλ' ῎Αδωνι	῎Αδωνι
4) κοψαμένη...στήθεα	τὰ γαλάκτιν'[α]...| ...κοψαμένη στήθεα
5) τῇ σῇ ...πὰρ καλύβῃ	τῇ σῇ...παννυχίδι

There is a difference in the adjectives used to describe the women (πιθανή / τρυφερή). The meaning of πιθανή is not immediately obvious,[10] and πιθανός is not common in the

[7]It is probably true that the funeral rites of Adonis were attended primarily by women, as it would seem odd for a man to be imitating the mourning ritual of Aphrodite (cf. Ov. Met. 10. 725-727, where upon the death of Adonis Venus says, "*luctus monimenta manebunt | semper, Adoni, mei, repetitaque mortis imago | annua plangoris peraget simulamina nostri*"; RE s.v. Adonis, 1. 389.) However, it should be pointed out that the festival must have been attended by both sexes (cf. Theoc. Id. 15 passim and Ov. Ars 1. 75, *nec te praetereat Veneri ploratus Adonis.*).

[8] See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 239. NB that Gow-Page also (mistakenly) suggest that the poet could not have seen the women since the funeral took place at dawn. If this were so, we must assume that the procession of women with a statue of Adonis made its way in the dark without a light source (which is unbelievable), or that they began their procession at the point of sunrise. Firstly, if they began their procession in the dark, clearly they would need some light source and then they would stand out in the darkness, and so the poet could see them. Secondly, if the sun was rising when they began their procession they would also be visible to the poet.

[9] For the baring of breasts in mouring, cf. GOW, 2. p. 302, who cites: Hom. Il. 22. 79; Plb. 2. 56. 7; Ov. Met. 3. 481; 13. 688; Fast. 4. 454; Cat. 64. 64.

[10]See LSJ s.v. πιθανός; NB that it is commonly used of arguments and orators.

A.P.; however there is one significant amatory instance of it. D. seems to be using it in the same way as 5. 158. 1 (Asclep.),Ἑρμιόνη πιθανῇ ποτ' ἐγὼ συνέπαιζον... The meaning of πιθανῇ in 5. 158. 1 seems to be "winning"[11], or perhaps "persuading" [to love]. [12] These meanings would also fit well in the context of 5. 53. 1. Here, the woman must be attractive and physically impressive, since D. is ready to die in order to obtain a glimpse of her bared breasts. There is point in D.'s use of the adjective πιθανός. πιθανός is etymologically linked to the name Πειθώ which is the name of a divinity who is often in attendance on Aphrodite.[13] This name is also a cult title of Aphrodite,[14] which may be important here in connection with the festival of Aphrodite's beloved Adonis. These etymological allusions add *doctrina* and depth to πιθανή. In 5. 193, D. has given Kleo more immediate and obvious appeal: she is τρυφερή, which is commonly used in amatory contexts in the A.P.[15] with the meanings "delicate, dainty", "tender, soft-fleshed" etc. In comparison, πιθανή seems more subtle, mysterious and thought-provoking than the obvious τρυφερή.

There is hunting imagery in both 5. 53 and 193, which is conveyed by the verbs ἔτρωσεν and ἤγρευσε. This imagery is apposite, as mentioned above, but there is a difference in the meaning of the two verbs. Of course, both poems play on the theme of amatory hunting, and ἤγρευσε is often seen in real and amatory hunting contexts.[16] However, the imagery in ἔτρωσεν is sharper than it is in ἤγρευσε. Adonis was wounded by a wild boar while hunting and it is this wound that killed him. Like Adonis, D. was wounded, which makes the relationship between D.'s trauma and that of Adonis closer.

---

[11] See LSJ s.v. πιθανός 3.

[12] Cf. the discussions of A.P. 5. 158. 1 (Asclep.) in GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 120; ARNOTT, p. 7; CAMERON, pp. 281-282; cf. also GIANGRANDE, 1967 pp. 42-43.

[13] See Ib. fr. 288 CAMPBELL; LIMC 2.1. s.v. Aphrodite, 1259, 1263, 1267, 1271.

[14] See FARNELL, ii. 664; CAMPBELL, p. 312.

[15] Cf. 5. 35. 8; 66. 6 (Ruf.); 151. 6; 154. 2; 190. 4; 198. 2 (Mel.); 12. 10. 2 (Strat.); 122. 2 (Mel.); 208. 3 (Strat.).

[16] Cf. A.P. 5. 231. 4 (Maced.); 12. 23. 1; 85. 4 (Mel.); 99. 1, 3 (anon.); 109. 2; 113. 2 (Mel.); 142. 2; 146. 1 (Rhian.).

To further differentiate ἤγρευσε from ἔτρωσεν, capturing is very different from wounding, since it is highly probable that one may bleed to death or die from the subsequent infection of the wound; therefore, ἔτρωσεν has more point than ἤγρευσε, and the idea of the mortality involved with ἔτρωσεν subtly and neatly introduces D.'s wish for death at lines 3-4.

The phrase φίλ'ʺΑδωνι seems to be a learned reference to an Idyll of Theocritus,[17] where it is used twice when the singer begins her song at the festival of Adonis. In addition φίλ'ʺΑδωνι seems to be hieratical language[18] (or, in this case, mock hieratical), a witty and irreverent touch which is not present in 193. The religious language contrasts sharply with D.'s near sacrilegious wish in lines 3 and 4. In 193. 1, Kleo's breasts[19] are τὰ γαλάκτιν'[α], an uncommon word, but the image of white breasts seems rather ordinary[20] and contrasts the subtle and intellectual appeal of φιλ'... in line one of 53.

πὰρ καλύβῃ is puzzling; the phrase seems to occur only here with reference to the festival of Adonis. Gow-Page state that the καλύβη seems to have been a tent or temporary structure of some sort which housed the statue of Adonis at this festival, but no parallels are cited.[21] The reference to καλύβη is likely a recherché reference to the festival of Adonis. In contrast to the specialized πὰρ καλύβῃ, παννυχίδι is more general and obvious, and is not restricted to the festival of Adonis.[22] . The sound of line 2 of 53 with its internal rhyme is more pleasing than that of 193. 2.

---

[17] See 15. 135, 143.

[18] For examples of φίλος + the name of a god in the vocative, cf. Hom. Il. 15. 221; 16. 667; Ar. Nu. 478, φίλ ' 'Ερμῆ; Pax 416; 718; Hippon. fr. 32. 1 West; A.P. 5. 86. 1 (Claudian.), φίλε Φοῖβε; A.P. 109. 4 (Antip.Thess.) Ζεῦ φίλε; 167. 6; 153. 4 (Asclep.), Κύπρι φίλη; 162. 2 (Mel.); 202. 5 (Asclep./Posidipp.); cf. also WEINREICH, p. 86, who does not cite any parallels.

[19] Cf. 5. 56. 5 (Diosc.), μαζοὶ γλαγόεντες.

[20] Cf. A.P. 56. 5 (Diosc.); 60. 1-2 (Ruf.); 84. 2 (anon.); 276. 4 (Agath.); 12. 165. 1 (Mel.); Bion 1. 10.

[21] See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 238.

[22] Cf. Ar. Ra. 371 (vigil for Diana); E. Hel. 1365 (vigil for the Great Mother); Pl. R. 328a (vigil for Athena); A.P. 200.4 anon (vigil for Priapus); 201. 4 anon. (vigil for love).

The first line of 53 cleverly resembles the first line of an epigram of Asclepiades (ἡ λαμυρή μ' ἔτρωσε Φιλαίνιον,... 5. 162.) There are also some similar ideas taken over by D. in 53, i.e. being wounded,being near death as a result of the wound and the polysyllabic name of the woman. However, 53 is not a slavish copy of 5. 162, but rather a witty variation: D. changes the name of the woman and the adjective used to describe her. In 162 Asclep. bemoans the fact that he was unwittingly wounded by Philainion and that he is dying. In 53, D. seems happily wounded by Aristonoe and he wryly invites death. These similarities seem too extensive to be coincidental, and the verbal reminiscences (ἡ...μ' ἔτρωσε[ν]) between 53. 1 and 162. 1, I think, are meant to recall 162. In contrast, 193. 1 shows little verbal resemblence to 162. 1, other than the metrical scheme.

Many commentators have stated that 193 is an improvement on 53,[23] but this seems to be based on personal preference without a close study of the differences themselves. On the contrary, I think that 53 is a great deal more dynamic, witty and pointed than 193, and that 53 is the newer piece, as it would seem improbable that an Alexandrian poet of D.'s calibre would write a rather stale and banal variation on a sharp and focused model.

[23] Cf. GIANGRANDE, 1967, p. 41; REITZENSTEIN, RE 5. 1128; JACOBS, 1 p. 372.

CHAPTER 8: A.P. 5. 52 (and 12. 170)

†Ὅρκον κοινὸν ἔρωτ' ἀνεθήκαμεν †· ὅρκος ὁ πιστήν
'Αρσινόης θέμενος Σωσιπάτρῳ φιλίην.
ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν ψευδὴς κενὰ δ' ὅρκια· τῷ δ' ἐφυλάχθη
ἴμερος· ἡ δὲ θεῶν οὐ φανερὴ δύναμις.
θρήνους, ὦ Υμέναιε, παρὰ κληῖσιν ἀκούσαις
'Αρσινόης πιστῷ μεμψαμένους προδότῃ. (A.P. 5. 52)

Poems in which a broken lover's oath makes up the main thrust are not uncommon.[1] Some of the standard features of this kind of poetry include: a broken oath;[2]

---

[1] Cf. A.P. 5. 5 (Stat.Flacc.); 6 (Call.); 7 (Asclep.); 8; 184 (Mel.); 279 (Paul.Sil.). NB that this type of poetry may appear as a part of larger works: cf. Ar. Pax 1332 ff.; Av. 1731 ff.; E. Tr. 308 ff.; Prop. 1. 15; Ov. Am. 3. 3; Hor. C. 2. 8; Tib. 1. 9; Verg. A. 4. 305 ff.; Sen. Med. 56 ff.; Claud. Rapt.Pros. 367 ff. Another epigram by D. should be included here, A.P. 12. 170:

Σπονδὴ καὶ λιβανωτὲ καὶ οἱ κρητῆρι μιγέντες
δαίμονες οἵ φιλίης τέρματ' ἐμῆς ἔχετε,
ὑμέας, ὦ σεμνοί, μαρτύρομαι, οὔς ὁ μελίχρως
κοῦρος 'Αθήναιος πάντας ἐπωμόσατο
* * * * * * *

JACOBS (1 p. 370) seems to have been the first to suggest that 170 was not complete and he was followed by GOW-PAGE (1965, 1 p. 84). If there is a lacuna after line 4, it is likely that the missing lines contained an assertion to the effect that the oath was foresworn. Whether 170 is complete as we have it here or not the point of the epigram seems clear, i.e. that the oath which Athenaios made was perjured. There seems to be implicit evidence to suggest that the oath was foresworn for several reasons: firstly, when a lover's oath is mentioned in amatory poetry, it is often perjured (see my opening discussion in this chapter); secondly, poets often list the powers by which an oath is sworn when the oath is foresworn (cf. A.P. 5. 7. 1 (Asclep.); 8. 1 (Mel.); 150. 2; 164. 1 (Asclep.); 279. 5 (Paul.Sil.); Ov. Am. 3. 3. 1, 14, 15, 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 40; Tib. 1. 9. 2); thirdly, gods are commonly invoked to bear witness when a crime has been committed, e.g. perjury (cf. Νύξ. σὲ γὰρ οὐκ ἄλλην μαρτύρομαι..., A.P. 5. 164. 1 (Asclep); cf. also A. Eu. 643; E. Hipp. 1451; Ph. 626; Med. 619). In poems of this kind, perfidy is usually mentioned (vid. supra), but in this case, D. may be cleverly varying this aspect by implicitly suggesting that the oath was broken, as opposed to stating it explicitly; and D. may have intentionally left out the perjury as if to suggest that he was so hurt by the perfidy that he can not bring himself to mention it (ἀποσιώπησις).

[2] Cf. A.P. 5. 5. 3 (Stat.Flacc.); 6. 1 (Call.); 7. 1 (Asclep.); 8. 2, 4 (Mel.); 279. 5-6 (Paul.Sil.); 12. 237. 3 (Strat.); Ov. Am. 3. 3. 1; Hor. C. 2. 8. 1; Tib. 1. 9. 1-2; Verg. A. 4. 305 ff.

a direct address to the beloved;[3] a lover's complaint;[4] the mention of gods;[5] a rival;[6] a wish for revenge;[7] perfidy, which is usually unpunished.[8] In our epigram, the broken oath makes up the main thrust, the god Hymenaios is included (line 5), a rival is implicitly alluded to in lines 5 to 6, and 52 ends with a wish for revenge.

There are several variations and innovations which set 52 apart from other pieces in this tradition. D. is not directly involved.[9] Uniquely, Arsinoe intends to marry the rival with whom she broke her vows to Sosipater. Weddings are rare in amatory epigram, and D. seems to be the first to use the motif in this tradition (and in amatory epigram in general). There is further novelty in D.'s invocation of the deity Hymenaios, who is not mentioned in other poems of this kind. The threat or wish at lines 5-6 also differs from the standard threats in this group of poetry in form. Often the lover wishes for revenge against the beloved,[10] but the wish for a disastrous marriage is a novel variation.

There is further variation in the generic make up of 52. Several aspects of the *wedding song* [11] are blended into our epigram. Reference to the *nuptial song* is made clear at line 5, where we are introduced to Hymenaios. *Wedding songs* often contain a statement introducing the couple,[12] a merry invocation to Hymenaios sung by members of

---

[3] Cf. A.P. 5. 184 (Mel.); 12. 237 (Strat.); Ov. Am. 3. 3; Hor. C. 2. 8; Tib. 1. 9. 17-52; Verg. A. 4. 305 ff.

[4] Cf. A.P. 5. 5. 2 (Stat.Flacc.); 7. 2 (Asclep.); 8. 5 (Mel.); 184. 3; 279. 1-2 (Paul.Sil.); Hor. C. 2. 8. 1-5; Tib. 1. 9. 17-52; Verg. A. 4. 305 ff.

[5] Cf. A.P. 5. 6. 4 (Call.); 7. 2 (Asclep.); 8. 1 (Mel.); 184. 1; 279. 5 (Paul.Sil.); Ov. Am. 3. 3. 1, 15, 27, 28, 30, 35, 40; Hor. C. 2. 8. 11, 13; Tib. 1. 9. 20, 34, 49; Verg. A. 4. 371 f.

[6] Cf. A.P. 5. 5. 3-4 implicitly (Stat.Flacc.); 6. 5 (Call.); 7. 3 (Asclep.); 8. 6 (Mel.);184. 5; Hor. C. 2. 8. 16 ff.; Tib. 1. 9. 53 ff.

[7] Cf. A.P. 5. 7. 3 (Asclep.); 184. 8 (Mel.); Ov. Am. 3. 3. 47 f.; Tib. 1. 9. 4; Verg. A. 4. 382 ff.

[8] Cf. A.P. 5. 6. 4 (Call.); 5. 279. 6 (Paul.Sil.); Ov. Am. 3. 3 *passim*; Hor. C. 2. 8. 1-6, 12-16; Verg. A. 4. 371 f.

[9] Cf. A.P. 5. 6 (Call.) only.

[10] Cf. A.P. 5. 7. 3 (Asclep.); 184. 8 (Mel.); Verg. A. 4. 382 ff.; Tib. 1. 9. 79; Ov. Ars 1. 657 f.

[11] Cf. Sapph. fr. 110-117 A Campbell; Ar. Av. 1731 ff.; Pax 1329 ff.; Theoc. Id. 18; Cat. 61, 62, 64. 323-381; Mart. 4. 13; Claud. Rapt.Pros. 361 ff.; Men.Rh. 399. 11 ff.; WHEELER, 1930, pp. 205 ff.

[12] Cf. Theoc. Id. 18. 1-5; Cat. 61. 16-20; 62. 336; Mart. 4. 13. 1; Men.Rh. 400. 10 ff.

the wedding party,[13] mention of the pair being well-matched and their love being mutual,[14] reference to mutual fidelity,[15] praise of the bride's noble character,[16] a wish for children.[17] However, many of the standard features of the wedding song (outlined above) are varied or inverted in our epigram. Firstly, we are not introduced to the couple who are to be married at the beginning of the poem, but rather a couple who are *not to be married.* Secondly, Hymenaios is not called upon to witness the happy union of a couple, instead he is invited to listen to the melancholic reaction of the person/people outside of Arsinoe's door to the inauspicious joining. Thirdly, there is no mention that the bride and groom are well-suited to one another, or of mutual fidelity and love. Instead, we are introduced to a couple who are not well-matched. Fourthly, D. does not highlight the noble character of the bride. Instead, she is singled out and depicted as a heartless adulteress: she is called ψευδὴς and her oaths are κενὰ. Fifthly, there is no wish that the couple may produce children. Here the wish is almost twisted into a curse. The wish for a disastrous marriage is an established curse motif, [18] and this is the type of marriage which the speaker of lines 5-6 is wishing for.

52 shows a number of similarities to an epigram of Callimachus' (A.P. 5. 6) and seems to have been inspired by it:

ʼΩμοσε Καλλίγνωτος ʼΙωνίδι μήποτ' ἐκείνης
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.

---

[13] Cf. Theoc. Id. 18. 58; Cat. 61.4-5, 39-40, 49-50, 59-60, 124-125, 144, 149-150, 154-155, 159-160, 164-165, 169-170, 174-175, 179-180, 184-185, 189-190; 62. 5, 10, 19, 25, 31, 38, 48, 66; Mart. 4. 13. 2; Men.Rh. 400 25 ff.; 405. 2 ff.

[14] Cf. Theoc. Id. 18. 51; Cat. 61. 225 f.; 64. 334.

[15] Cf. Cat. 61. 224 f.; 64. 335.

[16] Cf. Theoc. Id. 18. 32-38; Cat. 61. 224; 62. 23; 64. 23; Men.Rh. 403. 25 ff.

[17] Cf. Theoc. Id. 18. 50-51; Cat. 61. 225-235; 64. 338 (prophecy); Men.Rh. 404. 25 ff.

[18] Cf. WATSON, pp. 84, 97, 101. who cites Euph. Θραξ fr. C col. 1. 5-19 (which includes four separate disastrous marriage curses); fr. B 10.

Structurally, the two pieces are similar. Both poems contain the same number of lines (6), and both can be broken down into three sections, of which 1 and 2 contain similar content:

> 1) Lines 1-2 contain the swearing of an oath.
> 2) Lines 3-4 contain an abrupt statement that the oath was in vain, which is introduced by ἀλλά, and the proverbial statement in 5. 6 concerning lovers' oaths, i.e. that a perjured oath is not subject to punishment by the gods, is picked up by an allusion to the proverb in 52. 4.[19]

Neither poet is directly involved, they recount the stories of others. Neither rival is named. There are some verbal similarities in each piece: Callimachus' φίλην and φίλον are picked up by φιλίην in 52. 2; ὅρκους of 6. 4 is used in 52. 1 (ὅρκος) and 3 (ὅρκια). In addition, there are some significant technical skills common to each, e.g. repetition of important words (6,῾Ωμοσε...ὤμοσεν; 52, ὅρκος...ὅρκια), emphasis on the oath motif (the oath is mentioned three times in 6 as compared to two or perhaps three times in 52). There are proverbial allusions which are similar in each piece: in 6. 3-4, the gods do not hear lovers' oaths; in 52. 4, it is not stated whether the gods hear lovers' oaths or not, the point is that the gods do not take vengeance on forsworn lovers.[20] These two statments have essentially the same point, that lovers are free to forswear themselves without fear of retribution by the gods. [21]

D.'s epigram is quite similar to Callimachus' at certain points, but variation and innovation may still be seen. D.'s protagonist is female, as opposed to male in Callimachus, and the situation of 52 differs from 6. In 52 Arsinoe broke her vows to Sosipater with a man she intends to marry, while in 6, Kallignotos has broken his vows to Ionis with an unnamed boy. In 52. 4, D. has varied Callimachus' clearly proverbial

---

[19]The perjured oath not being subject to divine punishment occurs first in Hesiod, ἐκ τοῦ δ' ὅρκον ἔθηκεν ἀποίνιμον ἀνθρώποισι | νοσφιδίων ἔργων πέρι Κύπριδος (quoted by Apollod. 2. 1. 3. 1); Menand. fr. 449. 3 Austin; Publ.Syr. Sent. 22; Ov. Ars 1. 635; Greg.Cypr. Paroem. 1.

[20] The ἀφροδίσιος ὅρκος is an old and common motif in many types of poetry; see MURGATROYD, 1991, p. 139; HOLLIS, p. 132; SMITH, p. 271.

[21] Cf. OTTO, p. 17 s.v. *amare* 4.

statement, ἀλλὰ λέγουσιν ἀληθέα τοὺς ἐν ἔρωτι | ὅρκους μὴ δύνειν οὔατ' ἐς ἀθανάτων (3-4), by making a subtle allusion to a slightly different proverb, but one which has the same effect, i.e. that lovers' oaths which are foresworn are not punished by the gods. Callimachus seems neither to condone nor to condemn Kallignotos' actions. The tone of 6 differs significantly from 52. In 6, Callimachus seems detached, almost unconcerned about Ionis and little is said on Ionis' behalf; he shows little overt sympathy for her (only τῆς...ταλαίνης in line 5), although some sympathy is aroused retrospectively for Ionis in lines 1, 3, 4 where Callimachus repeats the fact that Kallignotos actually did swear, and in the oracular expression in the final line, where she is compared to the Megarians who were considered absolute nobodies.[22] 5. 6 is a simple narrative relating only a sequence of events, while 52 is more complex.

In 52, D. seems to be more involved[23] and emotional than Callimachus. D. condemns Arsinoe for her actions: much of 52 is devoted to building up and highlighting Arsinoe's deceit. In order to increase the impact of her perjury, D. (much like Callimachus) emphasizes her oath in the first three lines. The oath motif is an integral part of the impact of 52. D. builds up the importance of this oath so as to increase the impact of the perjury in the ensuing lines that follow. There is also a disproportionate number of lines (4) devoted to Arsinoe's broken vows in comparison to her pledging them (2). This contrast shocks the reader and draws his/her attention to Arsinoe's perjury by adding further impact to her deceit. D. takes aim at Arsinoe again by drawing a contrast between her and Sosipater in lines 3-4; she is a lying and deceitful adulteress, while he is the faithful and loving man. Not only does this comparison serve to bring out Arsinoe's crime from a different perspective, but it also creates sympathy for Sosipater, whose love for her is *preserved by him* in vain. There is further pathos in line 4 where D. alludes to the fact

---

[22]Cf. GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 166.

[23] Lines 5 f. may be D.'s emotional intrusion into the poem.

that Arsinoe will not be punished for her treachery. In addition, attention is drawn toward this *femme fatale* and her forsworn oath by emphatic placement of words throughout 52.[24] The association between the first and last words of lines 2 and 6 is important. There is a subtle and witty contrast between 'Αρσινόης...φιλίην and 'Αρσινόης...προδότη. The position of the name Arsinoe at the head of lines 2 and 6 also highlights her part in the pledging of oaths in lines 1-2, as well as the deceit of lines 3 ff. Other important word placements include: πιστήν at the end of line 1, which underscores Arsinoe's vow and love; ἐφυλάχθη and ἵμερος, at the end of line 3 and the beginning of line 4, which draw attention to Sosipater's faithfulness and true love in contrast to Arsinoe's. The final word also leaves a lasting impression on the reader, where he or she is left with the bitter taste of Arsinoe's betrayal. D. varies the straightforward narrative of 6 with an impassioned and complex direct address in lines 5 f., which makes his epigram seem more personal and vehement. D. varies his final couplet by writing in a wishful outcome as opposed to the actual one in Callimachus' epigram.

Lines 5 f. are complex, and there are several aspects which seem to have been left deliberately vague. There are many extra hints or clues that the poet could have woven into the fabric of 52 to clarify the situation therein, but D. seems to have deliberately avoided this, opting instead for vagueness and complexity. There is point to this technique; D. has created a puzzle for the reader to solve. This method also draws the reader into the poem as if he/she were eavesdropping, and leaves a lasting impression on him/her. Several aspects of lines 5 f. are unclear: we can not be sure who the speaker is; we can not say with any certainty which door is being alluded to in παρὰ κληῖσιν; we are not explicitly told who is the source of the θρήνους or what exactly are these θρῆνοι. There are, as I see it, two distinct possibilities for the speaker of lines 5 f., D. and Sosipater. It would seem logical

[24] The first word of the epigram (if correct), ὅρκον, creates a witty and pointed contrast with the final word, προδότη, and seems to call to mind Arsinoe's oath at the beginning, but then her subsequent betrayal at the end.

for the speaker of lines 5 f. to be the narrator of the entire poem, since no new speaker is introduced before or linked to these lines to alert the reader that there is a change of speakers. If D. is the narrator of the poem up to line 5, he may be the speaker of these lines, as it would not be uncommon for a poet to interject emotionally in the course of his/her narrative. If Sosipater is the speaker of the poem up to line 5, he would be the speaker of the entire poem. The powerful emotion in these lines would seem suited to Sosipater; he is the lover and mention of the door bolt mechanism (παρὰ κληῖcιν), instead of the door proper, suggests that Sosipater is an *exclusus amator.*[25] It would not be uncommon for the locked-out lover to wish for revenge against the beloved,[26] as is likely the case here at lines 5 f. Sosipater also has the most to lose from Arsinoe's marriage to another man, he is the one being hurt by this union; thus, it seems logical that the emotional outburst would be his. The door alluded to in παρὰ κληῖcιν may refer to Arsinoe's bridal chamber or another door of the house, presumably the front door which would likely have such a locking mechanism (κληῖcιν). The source of the θρήνοι may be any any number of people, or even just one person,[27] e.g. D., Sosipater, other lovers. Friends, family members or another interested party may also be the source of the θρήνοι, as they could have an intimate knowledge of the relationship between Arsinoe and Sosipater.[28] Thus, the more likely candidates are one or several of the following: D., Sosipater, Sosipater's friends and family, other paramours of Arsinoe. The meaning of θρῆνοc[29] is ambiguous. There are two distinct senses for it here: (in a sepulchral context)

---

[25] The *exclusus amator* is a common motif in the A.P. and several types of poetry, cf. A.P. 5. 23 (Call.); 145; 165; 167; 189 (Asclep.); 191 (Mel.); 12. 118 (Call.); 23 (Mel.); Alc. 65 D; Ar. Ec. 960 ff.; Theoc. Id. 3, 23, Lyr.Alex.Adesp.(= CA p. 177); MURGATROYD, 1980, p. 73 etc.

[26] Cf. A.P. 5. 23. 1 ff. (Call.); 145. 4 ff.; 164. 3 f. (Asclep.); Tib. 1. 5. 47 ff.; Hor. C. 1. 25. 9 ff.

[27] For the plural of θρῆνοc with a singular source cf. A.P. 7. 260. 2 (Carph.); 667. 2 (anon.); 712. 8 (Erinn.).

[28] It is doubtful that members of the wedding party or family members of the bride and groom would consider Arsinoe's marriage a betrayal to Sosipater.

[29] See LSJ s.v. θρῆνοc 1 and 2.

"dirge, lament";[30] (not in a sepulchral context) "complaint, sad strain".[31] If the former is true, then the speaker of lines 5 f. is inviting Hymenaios to hear people (or one person) grieving for a dead person[32] (presumably Arsinoe), and censuring her too. If the latter is true, then we may assume that the speaker of these lines has invited the marriage-god to witness the complaints/sad strains of those in attendance at Arsinoe's wedding. There may be further point and anger in θρήνοc; the speaker of lines 5 f. may be indirectly wishing for Arsinoe's death perhaps on her wedding day, a situation which is not uncommon in book seven of the A.P.[33]

D. uses pointed language and style to depict a very ominous, vivid and vehement setting for 52. The word θρήνοc is often associated with death and sepulchral poetry,[34] which makes the appearance of it here morbid, foreboding and inauspicious. θρήνοc also adds to the impact and vehemence of the vengeful wish in the final two lines. In addition, there are several short and pointed phrases in lines 3-4, which are filled with angry and powerful words (e.g. ψευδὴc, κενὰ, θέων, δύναμιc), all of which creates a joyless scene. D. also draws attention to this ominous scene in lines 5 f. with a rare phrase, παcτῷ...προδότῃ, which only occurs here. D. paints a visually striking picture with Hymenaios arriving on the scene and being locked out along with several other people (or perhaps just one person) who are grieving for Arsinoe and disgusted with her (i.e. if she has died), or blaming Arsinoe's betraying bed at her wedding (if she has not died).

---

[30]Vid. infra my discussion on pointed language.
[31]Cf. h.Pan. 18; Pi. P. 8.
[32]NB that Hymenaios is commonly mentioned in sepulchral poetry, often where the virgin bride (or groom: A.P. 7. 367 (Antip.Thess.) dies before she can consumate her marriage; cf. A.P. 7. 182 (Mel.); 183 (Parmen.); 186 (Phil.); 188 (Ant.Thal.); 547 (Leon.); 568 (Agath.); 712 (Erinn.).
[33]Vid. supra my discussion on the complexity of the final couplet.
[34]For θρήνοc cf. Hom. Il. 24. 721; Sapph. fr. 150 Campbell; S. El. 88; A.P. 7. 186 (Phil.); 260 (Carph.); 387 (Bianor); 549 (anon.); 608 (Eutolm.); 644 (Bianor); 667 (anon.); 712 (Erinn.).

CHAPTER 9: A.P. 12. 171

Τὸν καλὸν ὡς ἔλαβες κομίσαις πάλι πρός με θεωρόν[1]
Εὐφραγόρην, ἀνέμων πρηύτατε Ζέφυρε,
εἰς ὀλίγον †τίνας† μηνῶν μετρον ὡς καὶ ὁ μικρός
μυριέτης κέκριται τῷ φιλέοντι χρόνος.

The main focus of our poem is the speaker's wish that Euphragoras be returned to him safe, sound and soon. Lines 1-2 contain the speaker's concern for Euphragoras' safety. κομίζω (="bring") is carefully chosen as it may carry the additional sense of "take care of, provide for",[2] which is pointed here as it seems to show the speaker's feeling for the boy. Zephyrus is often considered "gentle" elsewhere,[3] but D. goes one step further by making him the "gentlest". πρηύτατε here implies that there will be extra caring shown for the boy, i.e. a deity who is "the gentlest" would be best suited to take care of such a special boy. The speaker also wishes that the boy return καλὸν, i.e. unharmed, unscathed. Lines 3-4 imply that the speaker wishes that the traveller return soon: the speaker is preoccupied with time and the fact that even a small amount of time seems endless to a lover.

---

[1]θεωρός (LSJ s.v. θεωρός I, II) may be being used in a technical sense (e.g.as a title of a magistrate; LSJ s.v. θεωρός II), as θεωροί had some sort of state-function (GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 243; FRASER, 1972, 2 pp. 844-845 n. 324), perhaps as religious envoys (JACOBS, 1 p. 370; FRASER, 2 pp. 844-845 n. 324.); but θεωρός may also have the meaning "*spectator*" or "*one who travels to see men and things*" (LSJ s.v. θεωρός III; GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 243). The latter meanings, I think, are better suited to our epigram. There seems to be an ἐρώμενος/ἐραστῆς relationship between the speaker and Euphragoras in our epigram, a relationship suggested by the reference to the boy as καλὸν and to the speaker as τῷ φιλέοντι. I think that θεωρός is not being used as a title of a state dignitary here, a title which would probably not be given to the youthful, prepubescent *puer delicatus* who is commonly referred to in book 12 of the A.P.

[2]Cf. LSJ s.v. κομίζω; this is the primary meaning.

[3]Cf. A.P. 6. 290. 4 (Diosc.); 349. 4 (Phld.); 9. 313. 4 (Anyte); 363. 10 (Mel.); 668. 2(Marian.); 791. 3 (Apollonid.); 10. 1. 2 (Leon.); 4. 4 (Marc.Arg.); 17. 6 (Antiphil.); 16. 11. 2 (Hermocr.); 12. 2 (anon.).

The form of 171 is that of a lover's prayer: there seems to be an intimate relationship between the speaker and Euphragoras;[4] something is being asked of a deity in the second person (κομίcαιc);[5] the divinity is referred to in the vocative;[6] there is an honorific address to the deity.[7] However, unlike other lover's prayers,[8] D. pays particular attention to the traveller and time; lines 1-2 emphasize Euphragoras,[9] while lines 3-4 emphasize time.[10] D. varies 171 further by making Zephyrus[11] the recipient of the prayer, as opposed to Aphrodite, Zeus and Eros who are commonly invoked by lovers.[12] Zephyrus is not normally called upon in this way elsewhere,[13] nor does he figure much in amatory poetry.[14] There may be further point in D.'s reference to Zephyrus: according to

---

[4]Vid. supra my discussion on θεωρόν.

[5]Cf. Hor. C. 1. 10. 1 ff., NISBET-HUBBARD, p. 127, who cite Hom. Il. 1. 37 ff.; cf. also Sapph. 1. 1 Campbell; A.P. 5. 11. 1 (anon.); 197. 6; 215. 2 (Mel.); 12. 64. 2 (Alc.Mess.); 131. 3 (Posidipp.); 230. 2 (Call.).

[6]Cf. A.P. 5. 11. 1 (anon.); 197. 5; 215. 2 (Mel.); 131. 1-2 (Posidipp.); 230. 3 (Call.); Sapph. 1. 1 Campbell.

[7]Cf. A.P. 165. 1 (Mel.); 12. 64. 2 (Alc.Mess.); 131. 1-2 (Posidipp.); 230. 3 (Call.); Sapph. 1. 1 Campbell.

[8]Cf. Sapph. 1. 1; 15. 9 ff.; 17 Campbell; Anacr. 357 Campbell;A.P. 5. 11 (anon.); 165; 197; 215 (Mel.); 12. 64 (Alc.Mess.); 131 (Posidipp.); 230 (Call.).

[9]Vid. infra my discussion on Euphragoras as the *raison d'être* of 171.

[10]Vid. infra my discussion on the role of time in 171.

[11]GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 243, suggest that D. did not take into account that a traveller departing with a westerly wind would return more swiftly on an easterly wind. Gow-Page may be right, but the point here may be that the speaker wants the boy back right away and perhaps the West wind is the one that is blowing; therefore, D. may be suggesting that the vessel "tack" against Zephyrus back to the speaker, and if this is the case, Zephyrus would still be conveying the vessel westward. For "tacking" cf. CASSON, pp. 273-278, who cites: Arist. Mech. 851b διὰ τί, ὅταν ἐξ οὐρίας βούλωνται διαδραμεῖν μὴ οὐρίου τοῦ πνεύματος ὄντος, τὸ μὲν πρὸς τὸν κυβερνήτην τοῦ ἱστίου μέρος στέλλονται, τὸ δὲ πρὸς τὴν πρῷραν ποδιαῖον ποιησάμενοι ἐφιᾶσιν; Nic. Ther. 268 ff. τράμπιος ὁλκαίης ἀκάτῳ ἴcος ἥ τε δι' ἄλμης | πλευρὸν ὅλον βάπτουca κακοcταθέοντος ἀήτεω | εἰc ἄνεμον βεβίηται ἀπόκρουcτος λιβὸc οὔρῳ; Verg. Aen. 5. 830 ff. *una omnes fecere pedem; pariterque sinistros,* | *nunc dextros, solvere sinus; una ardua torquent* | *cornua, detorquentque*; Ach.Tat. 3. 1. 3-6, κλίνεται δὴ κοῖλον τοιχίcαν τὸ cκάφοc καὶ ἐπὶ θάτερα μετεωρίζεται καὶ πάντῃ πρηνὲc ἦν...μετεcκευαζόμεθα οὖν ἅπαντεc εἰc τὰ μετέωρα τῆc νηόc...αἰφνίδιον δὲ μεταλλάττεται τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπὶ θάτερα τῆc νηὸc...καὶ τρίτον καὶ τέταρτον καὶ πολλάκιc τὸ αὐτὸ πάcχοντεc κοινὴν ταύτην εἴχομεν τῷ cκάφει τὴν πλάνην.

[12]Cf. Sapph. 1. 1 Campbell; Thgn. 1323-1326; 1386-1388; A.P. 5. 11. 1 (anon.); 64. 6; 153. 4; 158. 1; 162. 3; 164. 1; 167. 6; 207. 3 (Asclep.); 215. 1 ; 12. 45. 1 (Posidipp.); 46. 2 (Asclep.); 120. 2 (Posidipp.); 146. 4 (Rhian.); 168. 7 (Posidipp.); 230. 3 (Call.); A.Pl. 120. 4 (Asclep.).

[13]Cf. A.P. 6 359. 4 (Phld.), only.

[14]Cf. A.P. 36. 6 (Ruf.), only.

Alcaeus,[15] Zephyrus was the father of Eros, and so D. may be alluding to the amatory connection of the wind here. There is further variation in the reason for the prayer in 171; lovers usually pray for success in a love affair or revenge (e.g. komasts). Here, the speaker is wishing for the safe return of his beloved. It is not uncommon for someone in a similar situation to the speaker of our epigram to utter a prayer to a deity when another person, who is dear to him/her, is departing.[16]

Cairns[17] suggests that 171 is a *prosphonetikon* on the basis of some shared *topoi* between our epigram and other poems of the prosphonetic type.[18] However, this kind of poetry is built on the fact that someone is arriving;[19] here it is clear from line 1 that Euphragoras is still away (ὡς ἔλαβες). We are not told explicitly that Euphragoras is departing or returning, but nowhere is the boy welcomed home, which is another of Cairns' primary elements for this type of poetry.[20]

There are several similarities between our epigram and the *propempticon.*[21] Although 171 is brief, there is some mention of the elements of this kind of poetry: there is a relationship (of love or friendship)[22] between the speaker and Euphragoras; there is a

---

[15]Cf. 327 Campbell.

[16]Cf. Sapph. fr. 5 Campbell, Κύπρι καὶ] Νηρήιδες ἀβλάβη[ν μοι | τὸν κασί]γνητον δ[ό]τε τυίδ' ἵκεσθα[ι...; A.P. 12. 24 (Tull.Laur.), εἴ μοι χαρτὸς ἐμὸς Πολέμων καὶ σῶος ἀνέλθοι, | οἷος α<..Δήλου> κοίρανε, πεμπόμενος, | ῥέξειν οὐκ ἀπόφημι τὸν ὀρθροβόην παρὰ βωμοῖς | ὄρνιν; 12. 25 (Stat.Flacc.), Σῶόν μοι Πολέμωνα μολεῖν, ὅτ' ἔπεμπον,'Απόλλω | ἠτόυμην, θυσίην, ὄρνιν ὑποσχόμενος; 12. 26; 12. 27; 13. 10 (Call.), ἁ ναῦς, ἃ τὸ μόνον φέγγος ἐμὶν τὸ γλυκὺ τᾶς ζοᾶς | ἅρπαξας, ποτὶ τὲ Ζανὸς ἱκνεῦμαι λιμενοσκόπω; Hor. C. 1. 3. 1-8.

[17]Cf. p. 25.

[18]See CAIRNS, pp. 21-23.

[19]See CAIRNS, p. 21.

[20]See CAIRNS, p. 21.

[21]Cf. NISBET-HUBBARD, pp. 40 ff.; CAIRNS, p. 284 (Index of Genres); cf. e.g. Hom. Od. 5. 203 ff.; 15. 125 ff.; Sapph. fr. 5; 94 Campbell; Thgn. 691 f.; Ar. Eq. 498 ff.; Theoc. Id. 7. 52 ff.; Call. fr. 400 Pf. (= A.P. 13. 10); Erinna fr. 1 (= Ath. 283 D.); Prop. 1. 8; Hor. Epod. 10; C. 1. 3; Ov. Am. 2. 11; A.P. 5. 241 (Paul.Sil.); 287 (Agath.); 12. 24 (Tull.Laur.); 25 (Stat.Flacc.); 26; 27; 52 (Mel.); 53; 217 (Strat.).

[22]The intimate nature of the relationship between the one who has departed and the well-wisher is clear in line 3-4 (ὁ μικρός | μυριέτης κέκριται τῷ φιλέοντι χρόνος); cf. CAIRNS, p. 21.

wish for a safe and sound journey[23] implicitly alluded to in lines 1-2; the wind Zephyrus is mentioned in line 2;[24] there is an implicit wish for a swift return in lines 3-4.[25] There is also some variation on the primary elements of propemptic poetry. Normally in the sending off poem someone is in the act of departing; here the person has already departed. D. also pays very close attention to the traveller.

The tone of 171 seems to be serious, a tone which D. brings out in several ways. Unlike many of D.'s other epigrams, 171 is straightforward; the expression is plain and direct, there are no flashy locutions or stylistic flourishes. This kind of diction and style does not distract the reader's attention from the situation of the poem, and so it allows the subtle emotion of 171 to show through. The emotions expressed are feelings of concern and love for the boy, and loneliness in the boy's absence.[26] There is also a sense of urgency which comes across from the prayer format and the structure of the epigram, which is one brief and excited sentence.[27] These emotions are at the heart of 171 and they make the situation believable by engaging the reader's attention as if he/she were eavesdropping.

Euphragoras is the *raison d'être* of 171, and D. underscores the importance of the boy in several ways: the speaker prays for the boy; he is called καλὸν; his name is put in a prominent position at the head of line 2, and opposite the divinity mentioned at the end of the same line; line 1 is framed by attributes referring to Euphragoras (τὸν καλὸν...

---

[23]Cf. Hom. Od. 5. 205 ff.; 15. 111 ff.; Thgn. 691 f.; Ar. Eq. 498; Hor. C. 1. 3. 7; Ov. Am. 2. 11. 37; A.P. 12. 24 (Tull.Laur.); 25; 26; 27 (Stat.Flacc.).

[24]Cf. Theoc. Id. 7. 52 ff.; Prop. 1. 8. 12; Hor. Epod. 10. 4, 5, 6, 20; C. 1. 3. 4, 13, 14; Ov. Am. 2. 11. 9-10; A.P. 12. 53 (Mel.).

[25]Cf. Ov. Am. 2. 11. 38 ff., 55 f.; A.P. 12. 24 (Tull.Laur.). NB that there may have been an explicit wish for a swift return in line 3, but there are some textual problems in this line; see GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 243.

[26]Vid. infra my discussion on Euphragoras as the *raison d'être* of 171 and on the importance of time.

[27]If GOW-PAGE's punctuation is correct.

θεωρόν); there is alliteration in lines 1-2, which seems to emphasize the importance of the boy and the consequent urgency of the request, i.e. καλὸν...κομίσαις, πάλι πρός.

Time also plays an important role in 171. D. draws attention to the passing of time in several different ways: in lines 3-4 there are three chronological words or phrases (εἰς ὀλίγον...μηνῶν μέτρον; ὁ μικρός |...χρόνος; μυριέτης), contrasting time phrases (μικρός | μυριέτης) and emphatic word placement of μικρός, μυριέτης, χρόνος; he seems to use sound effects to emphasize time, e.g. alliteration in μ (μηνῶν μέτρον...μικρός | μυριέτης), and in the guttural sounds of κ and χ (καὶ...| ...κέκριται... χρόνος.). There may be real point to D.'s careful attention to these temporal references; the reader can feel the lover's longing and loneliness for his beloved Euphragoras, and this sentimental touch draws the reader in. There may also be another more selfish and pragmatic reason for these temporal references: if the relationship is sensual, the lover wants his beloved to return before he grows a beard.[28] The longer the boy stays away the closer he gets to puberty, which would (presumably) make him less attractive to his lover.

[28]For the combination of the wish for a safe return and the εἶσι τρίχες motif cf. A.P. 12. 24 (Tull.Laur.); 25; 26; 27 (Stat.Flacc.).

CHAPTER 10: A.P. 12. 169

ἐξέφυγον, Θεόδωρε, τό σὸν βάρος, ἀλλ' ὅσον εἶπα
' ἐξέφυγον τὸν ἐμὸν δαίμονα πικρότατον '
πικρότερος με κατέσχεν, 'Αριστοκράτει δὲ λατρεύων
μυρία δεσπόσυνον καὶ τρίτον ἐκδέχομαι.

Our epigram seems to fall in with the type of poetry in which the lover contemplates renouncing or formally renounces his/her beloved.[1] Some of the standard features of this kind of poetry include:

1) a speaker/lover
2) addressee/beloved
3) some sort of renunciation of the addressee by the speaker
4) reasons for rejecting the beloved
5) mention of the lover's rivals/successors
6) mention of future miseries of the lover's rivals/successors
7) mention of the future miseries of the beloved
8) some allusion to the lover's present state of mind
9) some resolve of the lover's to find another beloved.[2]

In 169, the speaker addresses Theodorus, and he speaks about two other ἐρώμενοι; he formally rejects Theodorus (ἐξέφυγον, Θεόδωρε, τό σὸν βάρος); he gives reasons for his rejection (βάρος, δαίμονα πικρότατον[3]); he mentions 2 successors to Theodorus (Aristocrates and an unnamed successor in the final line); there is some allusion to the

---

[1] NB CAIRNS, p. 80 , does not distinguish between these two types (i.e. formal renouncing and contemplation of renouncing the beloved). Clearly there is no actual renunciation of the beloved in Theoc. Id. 30; Theoc. does ponder it, but at lines 28 f. it seems that Theoc. has decided not to give up the boy; cf. also CAIRNS' reference to 12. 201 (Strat.). For other examples of this type of poetry cf. Anacr. 445 Campbell and Himerius' comments on this passage, Or. 48. 4; A.P. 5. 5. 2 (anon.); 28 (Ruf.); 107; 112 (Phld.); 175; 179; 184 (Mel.); 245 (Maced.); the present epigram (A.P. 12.169), which is one of the earliest examples of this kind of poetry; 12. 237 (Strat.); Cat. 8, 11, 58; 76; Tib. 1. 9; Hor. Epod. 15; C. 1. 5; 3. 26; Prop. 2. 5; 3. 24; Ovid. Am. 3. 11.

[2] See CAIRNS, pp. 80 f.

[3] Vid. infra my discussion of *servitium amoris*.

lover's mental state (he seems somewhat unconcerned about his situation in line 2, where he converses with himself[4]); the speaker seems to be on the look out for a new beloved.

The *renuntiatio amoris* poem was established, but not common by the time of D.; Anacreon alludes to it and Theocritus devotes an Idyll to the contemplation of renunciation of the beloved.[5] D. varies the renouncement of love poem in several ways: not only did the lover find another beloved (Aritocrates), but he suggests that he will find a successor for him too, a variation which seems to be a new element to this kind of poetry;[6] he combines the two forms of the *renuntiatio amoris* poem: he formally renounces the beloved in the first couplet, but then he seems to contemplate renouncing the second beloved at lines 2 f.

There is clever inversion of the farewell to love poem present too. In lines 1 f., D. states formally that he has left Theodorus (= *renuntiatio amoris*), yet at line 3, D. says that he has accepted another beloved, πικρότερος με κατέσχεν (= *nuntiatio amoris*). This process of *renuntiatio/nuntiatio amoris* is continued at lines 3 f., where D. hints that he will leave Aristocrates (= *renuntiatio amoris*) for a new δεσπότυνον (= *nuntiatio amoris*).

Servitium amoris [7] plays an important role in 169. In our epigram the lover takes on the role of a slave and the status of the beloved is elevated to that of the master. This relationship is emphasized in lines 3 f.: in line 3, the speaker is clearly servile (λατρεύων | μυρία); the third beloved is not named and is not yet (presumably) in control over the speaker, as the present tense of ἐκδεχομαι implies that the speaker is presently *waiting for*

---

[4] Cf. Theoc. Id. 30. 11 ff.

[5] Cf. Anacr. 346 fr. 4 Campbell; 445; Theoc. Id. 30.

[6] NB this variation is picked up by A.P. 5. 115 (Phld.); 232 (Paul.Sil.).

[7] For examples of this image before D. cf. MURGATROYD, 1981, pp. 589-606, who cites S. Ant. 756; E. Tr. 948 ff.; Pl. Smp. 183 A; Phdr. 252 A; X. Mem. 1. 3. 11; Men. 338 K; 541 K; Lyr.Adesp. 1. 27 f. (=CA p. 177).

or *expecting* him,[8] but the sense is clear enough, he is called a δεσπόσυνον ...τρίτον, which establishes him in the same role as the two other masters, and the status of the speaker need not be mentioned again, as it obviously follows that he is subservient to a δεσπόνσυνος (= master, lord[9]).

Servitium amoris occurs as early as Sophocles, but D. seems to have been one of the earliest to use this figure in erotic poetry.[10] D. highlights servile imagery in the final couplet; λατρεύων in line 3 and δεσπόσυνον...ἐκδέχομαι in line 4 are two striking examples of the image. βάρος[11] is well-suited to this context as it carries the senses of "weight, burden" (either physically, e.g. an embrace, or metaphorically[12]); "oppresiveness", which suggests the beloved's rule over the speaker; but also "grief, misery", which implies that there was poor treatment of the lover. δαίμονα carries the sense of "god"[13] which elevates the beloved's status; but it may also have the sense of "ill fortune", which (along with πικρότατον) implies that the lover was mistreated by the beloved. με κατέσχεν[14] is also well chosen here, as it emphasizes the beloved's total control over the lover; κατέχω carries the senses: "hold fast", "bridle", "keep down", "be master of", "occupy", "posses (of a god)", "press hard". D. also makes some significant advances to this figure: the concept of *escape* and of the *master* (δεσπόσυνον) are new;[15]

---

[8]See LSJ s.v. ἐκδέχομαι 4.
[9]See LSJ s.v. δεσπόσυνος II (=δεσπότης).
[10]Cf. MURGATROYD, 1981, pp. 590 f.
[11]See LSJ s.v. βάρος II, III, V.
[12] See GOW-PAGE, 1965, 2 p. 242.
[13]For the technique of elevating the beloved's status to that of a divinity cf. e.g. A.P. 5. 69; 70; 73; 94 (Ruf.); 95 (anon.); 146 (Call.); 149 (Mel.).
[14] See LSJ s.v. κατέχω I, II.
[15]Cf. MURGATROYD, 1981, p. 592. NB there may be further point to ἐκφεύγω here; slaves did run away from their masters on occasion (Herod. 6. 11; S. Fr. 36 Pearson; Ar. Ac. 1187; LSJ s.v. δραπέτης), a point which D. may have implied in this context of *servitium amoris*; however I have not found any examples of ἐκφεύγω used of runnaway slaves.

λατρεύων is rare and strong word, but fittingly so here as the extent of the lover's servility is emphasized, i.e. he *serves* Aristocrates *in a countless number of ways.*

In addition to imagery, word order draws attention to the plight of the servile lover. ἐξέφυγον begins the poem and plunges the reader *in medias res* , and the reader is expected to fill in the blanks, as it were. ἐξέφυγον is repeated at the beginning of the second line, which draws further emphasis to the lover's act of escaping love. The importance of the point of line 1 is underscored by its repetition in the second line (in a slightly paraphrased form). πικρότατον at the end of line 2 is picked up by πικρότερος at the beginning of the next line. There is further emphasis on the harsh treatment of the lover in the chiastic word order in lines 2-3 ('ἐξέφυγον τὸν ἐμὸν δαίμονα πικρότατον | πικρότερος με κατέσχεν), where πικρότατον | πικρότερος form the hub of the construction. The repetition of this word seems to underline for the reader a reason for the lover's flight: poor treatment at the hands of the beloved. λατρεύων at the end of line 3 and μυρία at the head of the final line draw attention to the extent of the lover's servitude. The final word in the epigram ἐκδέχομαι forms a witty contrast with the first word ἐξέφυγον and completes the pattern of the servile lover in our epigram, where he goes from one relationship to another (i.e. he escapes one beloved while he awaits another.)

The tone of 169 seems to be less serious than other examples in this tradition of poetry.[16] Nowhere is there any hint of sadness expressed by the lover after his departure from a relationship, nor is there any feeling of elation[17] after the lover separates himself from a beloved. In fact, the procession of beloveds is almost comical,[18] as is the lover's seemingly flippant attitude towards the whole situation.

---

[16] For more serious examples of this type of poetry cf.: A.P. 5. 112 (Phld.); 175; 184 (Mel.); 12. 201 (Strat.); Cat. 8.
[17] Cf. Anacr. 346 fr. 4. 4 ff.
[18] Cf. A.P. 5. 115 (Phld.).

169 is well contrived. Structurally, there is a witty arrangement of the ἐρώμενοι and the poem may be broken down chronologically: lines 1-2 deal with a past beloved; line 3 focuses upon the speaker's present ἐρώμενος; line 4 alludes to a future beloved. 169 also seems to follow a couplet structure: the first couplet centres upon D.'s escape from Theodorus (i.e. *renuntiatio amoris*), while the thrust of the second couplet deals with slavery and accepting another beloved (i.e. *servitium amoris, nuntiatio amoris*). The adjective πικρός acts as a bridge or link between the two couplets and is a witty transition from harsh master/beloved to harsh master/beloved. There is a tricolon diminuendo with the first couplet making up the first colon, πικρότερος...| μυρία forming the second and δεσπότυνον...ἐκδέχομαι making up the final colon. This construction draws attention to the first colon where the speaker renounces Theodorus.

The pace of our epigram is swift. There are no spondees in the variable feet. The pace of 169 seems to fit the personality of the lover; he is a busy lover moving from one relationship to the next.

There is some word play on the names Θεόδωρε and 'Αριστοκράτει: divinity is suggested by the θεο- (from θεός) part of Θεόδωρε, which is neatly picked up by δαίμονα[19] in line 2; the all-controlling power that Aristokrates has over the speaker of 169. 3 is hinted at by the -κρατ- (from κρατέω) part of 'Αριστοκράτει, and is picked up by κατέσχεν and δεσπότυνον.

[19]Vid. supra my discussion on *servitium amoris*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arnott, W. G. "Callimachean Subtlety In Asclepiades of Samos." *CR.* NS Vol. 19 (1969) 6-8.

Baldwin, B. "More Love With Doris." *Mnemosyne* IV. 33 (1980) 357-359.

Brandt, P. *Parodorum Epicorum Graecorum et Archestrati Relinquiae.* (Leipzig, 1908).

Brecht, F. J. "Motif und Typengeschichte des griechischen Spottepigramms" *Philologus* Supp. 22, Heft 11 (1930) 4-98.

Bremer, J. "The Meadow of Love and Two Passages in Euripides' Hippolytus." *Mnemosyne* 28 (1975) 268-280.

Brommer, F. *Vasenlisten zur griechischen Heldensage.* (Verlag Marburg, 1973).

Cairns, F. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry.* (Edinburgh, 1972).

Cameron, Alan. "Asclepiades' girl friends." pp. 275-302 in: Foley, H. *Reflections of Women in Antiquity.* (New York, 1981.).

Campbell, D.A. *The Golden Lyre.* (London, 1983).

Casson, L. *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World.* (New Jersey, 1971).

Castriganò, A. "Ancora a proposito di porfuvrw - porfuvreos." *Maia* 5 (1952) 118-121.

Copley, F. O. "Exclusus Amator." *Philological Monographs* 17 (Madison, 1956).

Danielewicz, J. "Love with Doris: A medical explanation?" *Konferenz zur 200 Wiederkehr der Gründung des Seminarium Philologicum.* (Halle, 1989) 233-236.

Dübner, F. *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina.* (Paris, 1871).

Farnell, L.R. *The Cults of the Greek States.* (repr. New York, 1977).

Fraser, P.M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria.* (Oxford, 1972). I. 595-611; II. 843-860.

----------. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names.* (Oxford, 1994).

Garrison, D.H. "Mild Frenzy" *Hermes* 41 (1978) 16-93.

Gerber, D. *Euterpe.* (Amsterdam, 1970).

Giangrande, G. "Aphrodite and the Oak Trees." *Museum Philologum Londoniense.* Vol. 2 (1977) 177-186.

----------. "Hellenistische Epigramme." *Eranos* 65 (1967), 44-45.

----------. *L'Epigramme Grecque.* (Genève 1967.)

Gow, A.S.F. *Theocritus.* (Cambridge, 1950).

Gow, A.S.F, D.L. Page. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams.* (Cambridge, 1965).

----------. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge, 1965).

----------. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and some Conteporary Epigrams.* (Cambridge, 1968.)

Headlam, W. *Herodas The Mimes and Fragments.* (Cambridge, 1966).

Henderson, J. *The Maculate Muse.* 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1991).

Hollis, A.S. *Ovid Ars Amatoria Book I.* (Oxford, 1977).

La Penna, A. "Note sul linguaggio erotico dell'elegia latina." *Maia.* 4 (1970) 187-209.

Lier, B. *Ad Topica Carminum Amatorium Symbolae.* (Ostern, 1914).

Lissarrague, F. *The Aesthetics of The Greek Banquet.* trans. by Andrew Szegedy-Maszak (Princeton, 1987).

Mackail, J.W. *Select Epigrams From The Greek Anthology.* (London, 1911).

Maxwell-Stuart, P. G. "Strato and The Musa Puerilis." *Hermes.* 100 (1972) 215-240.

Merkelbach, R., M.L. West. "Ein Archilochos-Papyrus". *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik.* 14 (1974) 97-112.

Miller, S.G. *Arete: Greek Sports From Ancient Sources.* 2nd ed. (California, 1991).

Moll, O. *Dioskorides.* Diss. (Zürich, 1920).

Murgatroyd, P. "Militia amoris and the Roman Elegists." *Latomus.* 34 (1975) 59-79.

----------. "Servitium Amoris and the Roman Elegists." *Latomus.* 40 (1981) 589-606.

----------. "Amatory Hunting, Fishing and Fowling." *Latomus.* 43, fasicule 2 (1984) 362-368.

----------. "The Amatory Epigrams of Rhianus." *Classical Views.* 32 N.S. 8 (1989) 301-313.

----------. *Tibullus 1.* (Bedminster, 1991).

----------. "The Sea of Love." *CQ.* 45 no. 1 (1995) 9-25.

Nisbet, R.G.M, Hubbard, M. *A Commentary On Horace Odes, Book 1.* (Oxford,1970).

Otto, A. *Die Sprichwörter und sprichtwortlichen Redensarten der Römer.* (Hildesheim, 1964).

Paton, W.R. trans. *The Greek Anthology.* (Cambridge, Mass. 1960.)

Pauly-Wissova. *Real-Encyclopädie* (1894-). s.v. Dioskorides 5 (Reizenstein).

Powell, J. U. *Collectanea Alexandrina.* (Oxford, 1925).

Reitzenstein, R. *Epigramm und Skolion.* (Giessen, 1893).

Rostagni, A. *Atti Accad. d. Scienze Troino.* 50 (1914-1915), 989-1013. (="Neos Dionysos: Poeti e letterali alla corte de Tolemeo IV Filopatore." Scritti Minori II, 1 (1956).

----------. "Equos Troianus sive de vetere Romanorum fabula ex Hellenisticis expressa." *Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione Classica.* 44 (1916), 379-397. (= Scritti Minori II,2 (1956), 3-12.).

Schrier, O. J. "Doris' Love Again." *Mnemosyne.* IV, 35 (1982) 146-148.

Schrier, O.J. "Love With Doris." *Mnemosyne.* IV. 32 (1979) 307-326.

Smith, K. F. *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus.* (repr. Darmstadt, 1971).

Smyth, H. W. *Greek Grammar.* (repr. Cambridge, 1984).

Stadtmüller, H. *Anthologia Graeca.* Vol. 1. Leizpig, 1894.

Tarán, S. L. "The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram." *Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition.* 9 (1979) 7-182

Waltz, P. *Anthologie Grecque.* (Paris, 1960) II.

Watson, L. *Arae The Curse Poetry of Antiquity.* (Leeds, 1991).

Webster, T.B.L. *Hellenistic Poetry and Art.* (New York, 1964). 143.

Weinreich, O. "Zwei Epigramme: Dioskorides V 138 und Krinagoras IX 429." *WS.* (1941), 61-77.

----------. Epigrammstudien I. (Heidelberg, 1948).

West, D. , Woodman, T. *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature.* (Cambridge, 1979.)

Wheeler, A. L. "Propertius as Praeceptor Amoris." *Classical Philology.* 5 (1910) 28-40.

Wheeler, A. L. "Erotic Teaching in Roman Elegy and The Greek Sources Part I." *Classical Philology.* 5 (1910) 56-77.

Wheeler, A. L. "Erotic Teaching In Roman Elegy and The Greek Sources. Part II." *Classical Philology.* 6 (1911) 440-450.

Wheeler, A. L. "Tradition in the Epithalamium." *American Journal of Philology.* 51 (1930) 205-233.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, von, U. *Hellenistische Dichtung.* (Berlin, 1924).

Wiseman, T.P. *Catullus and His World a Reappraisal.* (Cambridge, 1985).