CHAPTER 7

The epigram

1 INSCRIPTION AND EPIGRAM: THE 'PREHISTORY' OF A GENRE

In accordance with their common derivation, ἐπίγραμμα and ἐπιγραφή were originally almost synonymous: both referred to 'engraved' writing on a material which had not been specially constructed to receive writing, such as a waxed tablet, parchment or papyrus. Even as late as the early Hellenistic age, there is no indication that the idea of the epigram, as a specific genre of short poems usually in elegiac couplets, ever existed.[1] Moreover, it is probably only from the end of the fourth century that we can trace a tradition of *literary* epigrams, that is to say poems not, or not necessarily, designed for public inscription; when it did appear, this new form took up the two main earlier traditions of short poetry, namely epitaphic or dedicatory inscriptions, usually in hexameters or, increasingly from the end of the sixth century, elegiac couplets, and shorter lyric poetry and erotic elegy (represented most notably by Mimnermus and the second book of the corpus of Theognis). At the heart of this new form was the quest for concentrated expression and the acuteness of a final *pointe*, rather than specific and generically determinative subject-matter; consequently we find, in our corpus of literary epigrams, sad epitaphs alongside both serious and parodically solemn dedications, and playfully erotic anecdotes alongside moral maxims, witticisms, and convivial banter.

From the earliest days, epigrams had two different origins and two different aims: they were both graffiti engraved on cups or vases which were never meant to last and were linked to particular social circumstances, and also 'monumental' texts, devised with eternity in mind, and therefore fixed 'for ever' on a durable substance, such as stone. In both cases, the exceptional nature of this writing and the limitations imposed by the requirement of public inscription determined the limited scope and size which subsequently remained a peculiarity of the literary ἐπίγραμμα.

[1] Cf. Puelma (1996).

The rôle of public inscriptions in the development of the literary epigram of a funerary or dedicatory nature has long been familiar, but 'occasional' inscriptions may also have contributed to Hellenistic erotic epigram. Most of the 'occasional' epigrams known to us are engraved on cups or vases of the second half of the sixth century. Like the objects on which they are engraved, these graffiti are mainly connected with sympotic life: music, singing, drinking and, above all, *eros*. These short texts are, with few exceptions, all in prose, and some function as captions to the figures represented on the vases, often musicians or poets, but mythical characters also appear in such contexts. Sometimes these graffiti express, as in cartoons, rhythms and words of songs or dialogue, or expressions taken from the poetic texts that the depicted figures are imagined as reading or singing;[2] sometimes, too, the graffiti are independent of the representations on the vase, and they are situated between the figures, offering sympotic advice and exhortation such as (σὺ) χαῖρε καὶ πίε (εὖ) 'good health, and drink up'. By far the largest group, however, at least from the middle of the sixth to the third quarter of the fifth century, is made up of inscriptions proclaiming the beauty of a young man, in the standard form: X καλός 'X is beautiful'; these inscriptions, and the cups on which they appear, thus served as public avowals of love, designed to spread the *kleos* of the beloved among the symposiasts. There survive also other, more generic, graffiti of the kind ὁ παῖς καλός 'this boy is beautiful', which could be used as professions of love or admiration for any 'boy' who took a symposiast's fancy.

These texts transformed the objects on which they were inscribed into something more than simple vessels for the symposium: they acted as substitutes for more polished verbal compliments (in the case of the καλός inscriptions), or as incentives for discussion and comment among the symposiasts.[3] The banality and absence of any clear aesthetic ambition show that these texts were not so much complete messages in themselves, but rather stimuli or aides-mémoire to oral sympotic performances, which would often be in verse, whether extemporised compositions or recitals or adaptations of earlier lyric or elegiac poetry. A symbiosis between, on the one hand, the

[2] Poetic texts are in fact extremely rare among inscriptions of this kind; most examples depict poetic quotations written on a papyrus resting on the knees of boys learning to read and write, cf. J. D. Beazley, 'Hymn to Hermes' *AJA* 52 (1948) 336–40.

[3] Cf. N. Slater, 'The Vase as Ventriloquist' in E. A. Mackay (ed.), *Signs of Orality: the Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World* (Leiden 1999) 143–61; F. Lissarrague, 'Publicity and Performance' in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge 1999) 365–7. The compilation by W. Klein, *Die griechische Vasen mit Lieblingsinschriften* (2nd ed., Leipzig 1898) is still useful.

composition and reading of brief erotic and sympotic inscriptions and, on the other, 'literary' performance, whether of new or old poetic texts, was therefore probably already a reality in the archaic Greek symposium. Many erotic epigrams of the third century dramatise avowals of love or comment appreciatively on the aesthetic qualities of boys and girls, and this form is more prominent than our remains of archaic lyric and elegiac poetry would have led us to expect; it may therefore be that the first generation of 'literary' epigrammatists in the first half of the third century, who had behind them not a fixed genre with its topoi and conventions, but rather the unlimited cultural and literary heritage of the past, thought of their texts as a meeting-point between the sympotic practice of composing and reading graffiti on vases and the refined literary forms elaborated in the sympotic genres of archaic poetry.

Moreover, although there are very few non-epitaphic or non-dedicatory inscriptions of the archaic period to which it might perhaps be possible to attribute aesthetic ambitions, there are nevertheless some metrical graffiti which reveal a literary spirit foreshadowing that of the Hellenistic epigram. These include the hexameter scratched during the last part of the eighth century on a proto-geometric *oenochoe* (the 'Dipylon vase'), apparently to 'personalise' the vase as a prize in a dancing contest (*CEG* 432): hὸς νῦν ὀρχεστõν πάντον ἀταλότατα παίζει 'of all the dancers, the one who dances most sweetly'.[4] Apart from the metrical form, the word ἀταλώτατα leaves no doubt about the aesthetic ambition of the graffito. ἀταλός is an uncommon Homeric and poetic word, used three times in archaic epic in the neuter plural, as on the *oenochoe*, but always combined with the verb φρονέω 'I think'[5] in the sense 'think childish thoughts' or 'think things typical of young people';[6] on the *oenochoe*, however, ἀταλώτατα is combined with the verb παίζω ('I amuse myself', or more specifically, 'I dance'), and the whole expression must mean 'dances the sweetest dances' or 'dances in the sweetest way'. This is not merely a change from the formulaic combination of epic, but seems also to allude to *Iliad* 18.567 (the Shield

[4] The verse was followed by the dactyl τõ τόδε 'this is his', and by an apparently meaningless series of letters (κλλμιν), cf. G. Annibaldis and O. Vox, 'La più antica iscrizione greca' *Glotta* 54 (1976) 223–8.

[5] Cf. Hom., *Il.* 18.567, Hes., *Th.* 989, *HHom. Dem.* 24. It has been conjectured that this adjective arises from an erroneous division of ἀταλαφρονέω, cf. M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter* (Basel 1950) 139–41.

[6] On the meaning of ἀταλός, cf. C. Moussy, 'ἀταλός, ἀτάλλω, ἀτιτάλλω' in *Mélanges de linguistique et de philologie grecques offerts à P. Chantraine* (Paris 1972) 157–68.

of Achilles), where the young people who *danced* at a harvest festival were described as ἀταλὰ φρονέοντες.[7]

Another eighth-century text which is certainly a product of the world of the symposium[8] is the famous inscription on 'Nestor's cup', found at Ischia and dated to between 735 and 720[9] (*CEG* 454):

> Νέστορός ε[ἰμ]ι εὔποτ[ον] ποτέριον.
> hὸς δ' ἂν τõδε πίεσι ποτερί[ο] αὐτίκα κε̃νον
> hίμερος hαιρέσει καλλιστε[φά]νο Ἀφροδίτες.

I am the cup of Nestor, easy to drink from. Whoever drinks from this cup, the desire of fair-garlanded Aphrodite will seize him at once.

It is very likely that the first line, which is more probably prose than a trimeter composed of a choriamb and two iambic metra, regardless of the choice between ε̃μί/εἰμι and ἐστί/ἐντί, alludes to the Nestor of the *Iliad* (perhaps a namesake of the cup's owner), whose monumental cup had been made famous by the description in *Iliad* 11.632–7, which concluded: 'any other person could hardly have lifted it up from the table when it was full, but old Nestor picked it up without any difficulty'.[10] With this allusion, the first line makes clear that, unlike the unwieldy vessel of the heroic symposium, the little cup that bore the inscription was εὔποτον 'convenient for drinking', an adjective foreign to epic language and perhaps a 'technical' term from symposia (cf. Athenaeus 11.482b); analogously, in view of what follows, ποτήριον was perhaps drawn from the language of magical practice.[11] Be that as it may, the two hexameters which follow first lead us to expect a curse of a familiar kind which threatens severe consequences for anybody who misuses the object on which the curse is engraved;[12] this expectation is, however, defeated in a closural *pointe*

[7] The Dipylon vase may have originated in the world of the symposium – cf. Powell (1991) 161–2 and 172–3 – but a public feast cannot be excluded as a possible context: cf. e.g. Friedländer–Hoffleit (1948) 55.

[8] Cf. Powell (1991) 165.

[9] Cf. O. Vox, 'Bibliografia' in G. Buchner and D. Ridgeway, *Pithekoussai I: la necropoli* (Rome 1993) 751–9.

[10] For a survey of the views which have been held about the 'Nestor' of the cup cf. A. Bartonek and G. Buchner, *Die Sprache* 37 (1995) 153–4.

[11] Cf. C. Faraone, 'Taking the "Nestor's Cup Inscription" Seriously: Erotic Magic and Conditional Curses in the Earliest Inscribed Hexameters', *CA* 15 (1996) 77–112, p. 105. S. West, *ZPE* 101 (1994) 9–15 had also maintained that the inscription on Nestor's cup descends from a Peloponnesian epic tradition and is not connected to our *Iliad*; *contra* A. C. Cassio, 'Κεῖνος, καλλιστέφανος, e la circolazione dell'epica in area euboica' in *Aion* (archeol.) 1 (1994) 55–68.

[12] The roughly contemporary *lekythos* of Tataies, also from Magna Graecia, bears the inscription Ταταίες ἐμὶ λέφυθος· hὸς δ' ἄν με κλέφσει θυφλὸς ἔσται 'I am the lekythos of Tataies: anyone who steals me will go blind', cf. L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (2nd ed., Oxford 1990) 409 no. 47.3.

foreshadowing the technique of Hellenistic epigram: far from being cursed, whoever drinks from the cup will be overcome by uncontrollable desire, a very familiar (ancient and modern) result of too much to drink. The joke would have been even funnier if, as has been suggested, the inscription also alluded to an episode of the *Cypria*, in which Nestor gave hospitality to Menelaus after Helen had eloped with Paris and tried to console him with a series of mythological paradigms (*PEG* p. 40.26–9 = *EGF* p. 31.36–9); it was probably on this occasion that Nestor declared (*PEG* fr. 17 = *EGF* fr. 15): 'O Menelaus, in wine the gods have devised an excellent way for mortal men to scatter their cares' ('cares' of love, of course). The wine in the Ischia-cup was no longer (as the heroic Nestor had claimed) a remedy against the sufferings of love, but rather an aphrodisiac for the easy love affairs of the symposium.[13]

This common interpretation of the inscription on 'Nestor's Cup'[14] has been challenged as too 'modern', and it has been suggested that the verses may simply be a kind of magical formula asserting the effectiveness of aphrodisiac potions which were to be drunk from the cup.[15] In any event, even if it was truly epigrammatic *ante litteram*, 'Nestor's Cup' remained an isolated example. With every allowance for the impermanence of pottery in comparison with stone, verse inscriptions linked to the symposium and other types of social occasion seem to have been very rare; verse is, however, much more common for funerary and dedicatory inscriptions, and it is likely that verse was thought the appropriate mode, as stone the appropriate material, for inscriptions which were intended to offer eternal *kleos*.

Another exception which confirms the clear separation between lyric and elegiac poetry – which was largely oral, addressed to a particular individual or group, and arose from particular social and performative contexts – and written inscriptions – which were intended to be read 'for ever' by a general public – is offered by the didactic herms of the Athenian tyrant Hipparchus (late sixth century), one of which is extant (*CEG* 304). According to the account of [Plato], *Hipparchus* 228d–229b, Hipparchus wanted to make provision for 'the instruction also of those who lived in the countryside', and so he had herms erected 'along the roads connecting the towns and the single demes', on which were inscribed couplets containing the name of Hipparchus himself (μνῆμα τόδ' Ἱππάρχου 'this

[13] Cf. W. Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias* (Wiesbaden 1960) 257; G. Danek, 'Der Nestorbecher von Ischia, epische Zitiertechnik und das Symposion' *WS* 107–8 (1994–95) 29–44.

[14] Cf. P. A. Hansen, 'Pithecusan Humor: the Interpretation of "Nestor's Cup" Reconsidered' *Glotta* 54 (1976) 25–43 and Powell (1991) 163–7.

[15] Cf. Faraone (n. 11 above).

is a monument of Hipparchus') and brief maxims, such as στεῖχε δίκαια φρονῶν 'go forward on the basis of just thoughts', or μὴ φίλον ἐξαπάτα 'do not deceive a friend'; according to Pseudo-Plato, these maxims were supposed to act as an alternative to Delphic wisdom, creating the desire in countrymen to seek a more comprehensive education in town.[16] In this way (contravening the principle of anonymity, which is a constant of all other epigraphic texts of the archaic period and the fifth century, and borrowing from sympotic elegiac poetry, such as that composed by Phocylides and Theognis, both the custom of the σφραγίς 'seal' and the taste for aphoristic maxims), Hipparchus exploited the epigraphic medium to reach the wider non-aristocratic public with easily-digestible pills of wisdom and to familiarise them with that ethical knowledge which had previously been the prerogative of the speculations (and poetry) of aristocratic symposia. This, however, remained an isolated exception. The history of the archaic and early classical inscribed epigram is the history of a 'lesser literature', more subordinated to, than operating in parallel with, orally transmitted verse. Such poems are satisfied with anonymity: they convey a limited number of messages in relatively standardised forms (see further below, pp. 296–7).[17]

Not long after Hipparchus, Simonides began to write short poems in elegiac couplets, in which the εὐτράπελος λόγος for which Simonides became famous anticipated the taste for the witty quip and the humorous anecdote typical of the later 'literary' epigram. Furthermore, Simonides was perhaps the first to link his name to sympotic 'epigrams' and to clearly fictitious and witty dedicatory and funerary texts, the most famous of which is the sarcastic epitaph for his rival, Timocreon of Rhodes (*AP* 7.348 = *FGE* 831f.). He was also credited with the authorship of real epitaphic and dedicatory epigrams, and thus continued the tradition which we have already surveyed. There are, however, considerable uncertainties surrounding Simonides' epigrams and their 'publication',[18] and not just because his taste for the witty quip and brevity of expression might have led subsequent compilers of anthologies to attribute to Simonides epigrams about contemporary figures or events, or to imagine that some epigrams attributed to otherwise unknown poets were actually by Simonides. Herodotus (7.228.3) attributes

[16] Cf. A. Aloni, 'L'intelligenza di Ipparco' *QS* 10 (1984) 109–48.

[17] The metrical form too is standardised: initially we find only hexameters, but from the middle of the sixth century the elegiac couplet becomes popular; inscribed epigrams in iambics or trochaics appear at about the same time, but they are rare and disappear almost completely during the fifth century.

[18] Cf. B. Gentili, 'Epigramma ed elegia' in *L'Épigramme Grecque* (1968) 41–2; but cf. *FGE* pp. 119–23 and Puelma (1996) 125 n. 8.

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

an epitaph for the fortune-teller Megistias to Simonides (*AP* 7.677 = *FGE* 702ff.), but it is significant that in citing the epigram, Herodotus, who lived a generation after Simonides, observes that Simonides composed it because he was united to Megistias by a bond of *xenia*; this perhaps suggests that Herodotus received the information about Simonides' authorship from an oral source and not from some form of written anthology, created by, or based on, the author's wish to assert his authorship. The extreme variability between witnesses in recording the authorship of Simonides points in the same direction: many poems are disputed between Simonides and another poet, or are claimed by some as Simonidean and by others as anonymous.[19] The large number of epigrams referring to characters or events of the sixth and fifth centuries, some of which may be ancient but many of which are clearly Hellenistic compositions falsely attributed to Simonides, Plato, Anacreon, and a host of other authors whose interest in the epigram is otherwise unattested (Sappho, Bacchylides, Empedocles, etc.), shows that the custom of anonymity continued to be observed for a long time, and gave rise to the Hellenistic practice of assigning anonymous poems to the great figures of the past.

Before the Hellenistic age, we simply cannot know whether an author deliberately decided to link his name to an inscribed text, which will thus also have had a non-epigraphic transmission where the name of the author was preserved. As for the idea of compiling an anthology of one's own epigrams or those of others, it is important to remember that collections of inscriptions in book form must have been in circulation from the beginning of the fourth century, and it is very tempting to hypothesise[20] that these collections of inscriptions, both before and alongside the great editions of archaic lyric and elegiac poetry prepared by the Alexandrian philologists, acted as models for the collections of epigrams that a Leonidas or a Callimachus probably conceived for themselves (or others conceived for them, shortly after their death).[21] What is certain is that in the fourth century, which was the crucial period for the development of the literary epigram, there are at least two clear examples of inscribed epigrams which include the name of the author in the text (*CEG* 819 and 888[22]); in one of these two cases, moreover, the epigrams of Ion of Samos (*CEG* 819), the affirmation of authorship is found, together with an element of literary innovation; this raises doubts about the standard historical account, according to which

[19] Cf. *FGE* pp. 119–20. [20] Cf. Meyer (forthcoming) chapter A.5.1.
[21] On the circulation and collection of inscriptions in the fourth century, cf. H. T. Wade-Gery, 'Classical Epigrams and Epitaphs' *JHS* 53 (1933) 71–104, pp. 80 n. 35 and 88–95.
[22] The cases of 700. 3 and 889.7–8 appear more uncertain; see, however, *CEG* II.283.

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

(anonymous) inscribed epigrams were characterised by a relative roughness and conventionality, and were then replaced by the literary epigram, bringing with it greater refinement and a new importance for authorial identity. The epigrams of Ion, on the contrary, suggest that verse inscriptions had already followed their own autonomous course towards literary pretension and an authorial awareness, when the high period of the 'literary' epigram dawned.

CEG 819 consists of a triptych of three epigrams of two couplets each, inscribed on the plinth of a group of bronze statues for the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi; the statues represented the Dioscuri, Zeus, Apollo, Artemis, and Poseidon crowning Lysander, who had defeated the Athenians at Aegospotami, and also included images of twenty-eight other commanders of the Spartan fleet (cf. Pausanias 10.9.7–10).[23] Both the better preserved epigrams (*CEG* 819.ii and *CEG* 819.iii) include the name of the author, Ion of Samos, and the text is not presented as the voice of the dedicator or of the statues (as is usual in dedicatory inscriptions), but rather as the voice of the poet who 'comments on' the statues, in a manner familiar from Hellenistic deictic epigram:

[παῖ Διός, ὦ] Πολύδευ[κ]ες Ἴων [?καὶ τοῖσ]δ᾽ ἐλεγείοι[ς]
[?λαϊνέαν] κρηπῖδ᾽ ἐστεφάνωσ[ε ?τεὰ]ν,
[ἀρχὸς ἐπ]εὶ πρῶτος, πρότερο[ς δ᾽ ἔ]τι τοῦδε ναυάρ[χου]
[?ἔστας ἁγ]εμόνων Ἑλλάδος εὐρ[υχ]όρου.
(*CEG* 819.ii)

[Child of Zeus], Polydeuces, [with these] elegiacs Ion crowned [your stone] base, because you were the principal [commander], taking precedence even over this admiral, among the leaders of Greece with its wide dancing-places.

εἰκόνα ἑὰν ἀνέθηκεν [ἐπὶ] ἔργῳ τῷδε ὅτε νικῶν
ναυσὶ θοαῖς πέρσεν Κε[κ]ροπιδᾶν δύναμιν
Λύσανδρος, Λακεδαίμονα ἀπόρθετον στεφανώσα[ς]
Ἑλλάδος ἀκρόπολ[ιν, κ]αλλίχορομ πατρίδα.
ἐξάμο ἀμφιρύτ[ας] τεῦξε ἐλεγεῖον Ἴων.
(*CEG* 819.iii)

Lysander set up this image of himself on this monument when with his swift ships he victoriously routed the power of the descendants of Kekrops and crowned the

[23] In view of the script, these epigrams may be dated very close to the event that they commemorate; cf. J. Bousquet, *BCH* 80 (1956) 580–1; more commonly, however, they are dated to the late fourth century, cf. R. Meiggs and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (rev. ed., Oxford 1988) 290.

invincible Lacedaimon, the citadel of Greece, the homeland with the beautiful dancing-places. Ion of sea-girt Samos composed these elegiacs.

In the poem for Polydeuces, the author displays a highly developed self-consciousness: as composer of the epigram, he has crowned (ἐστεφάνωσε) the plinth (κρηπίς) of the statue, and the verb στεφανοῦν raises Ion himself to the same level as Lysander, who, as the other epigram says, had 'brought glory' to invincible Sparta (a metaphorical meaning which στεφανοῦν often has), or even to the level of the gods, who were represented 'crowning' Lysander quite literally. As Lysander himself seems to have fostered a personality cult and even accepted divine honours, so the poet magnifies his own rôle. Here, then, is perhaps the earliest 'literary' epigram, and it is in fact an engraved monument-inscription, and one with a definitely practical purpose.

2 FUNERARY AND DEDICATORY EPIGRAMS: EPIGRAPHIC CONVENTIONS AND EPIGRAMMATIC VARIATIONS

2.1 The importance of the name

Hellenistic funerary and dedicatory epigrams are a favoured sphere for the investigation of the literary character of Hellenistic poetry, and in particular for its relationship with earlier literary genres. There is a relatively large amount of comparative material, i.e. anonymous inscriptions, both metrical and not, which have been found on tombs and monuments and against which we can judge the 'literary' versions of these forms.

Funerary and dedicatory inscriptions had certain clear 'facts' to communicate. Dedications commemorated, in most cases, both the donor of the votive offering and the recipient god, and usually also the reason for the dedication; the identity of the god, however, was often of course supplied by the monumental context in which the inscription was placed. Funerary inscriptions identified the dead person on whose tomb they stood; the identification normally included certain details, established by social conventions which sometimes varied from one region to another, or depended on the sex and the age of the deceased. Thus, for example, the name of the dead is generally the only detail in the sepulchral inscriptions of most of central Greece and Boeotia,[24] as well as of Sicyon,[25] whereas in Attica

[24] Cf. P. M. Fraser and T. Rönne, *Boeotian and West Greek Tombstones* (Lund 1957) 92–101.
[25] Cf. Pausanias 2.7.2.

the demotic and the father's name are almost always present in the case of a male, or the name of the parents in the case of children; in the case of a woman, the name of her husband is added to that of her father, but it was considered to be excessive if the epitaph also specified her place of birth and the name of her mother.[26] Hellenistic 'literary epigrams', which were funerary or dedicatory, gradually moved ever further from any necessary basis in the contexts of real life and became fictional works of the imagination. Such distance from a real context encouraged the technique of variation among 'literary' epigrammatists, but at the same time the high degree of conventionality and the repetitiveness of inscribed archaic epigram created a precedent which, in a certain sense, authorised the highly topical character of literary epigram, perhaps indeed the most topical genre of all Greek poetry.

2.2 Tombs without names

The most basic element in the commemoration of the dead was the recording of the name; on the tomb of Petosiris was written: 'pronouncing a man's name means bringing him back to life again'.[27] Funerary inscriptions which do not record the dead's name fall into more than one class: non-metrical inscriptions for infants who had probably never been named survive;[28] so, too, some of the few surviving verse-inscriptions which omit the name of the dead[29] were for infants or young people, who in all probability had not yet achieved anything worthy of commemoration.[30] Among

[26] Cf. Theophrastus, *Characters* 13.10 (with Diggle *ad loc.*), E. L. Hicks, *JHS* 3 (1882) 141–2.

[27] Cf. G. Lefebvre, *Le Tombeau de Petosiris* (Cairo 1954) I p. 136 no. 81, already quoted by Nicosia (1992) 17. On the general subject cf. also A. Stecher, *Der Lobpreis der Toten in den griechischen metrischen Grabinschriften* (Diss. Innsbruck 1963) 14–19, H. Häusle, *Einfache und frühe Formen des griechischen Epigramms* (Innsbruck 1979) 109–13 and S. Georgoudi, 'Commémoration et célébration des morts dans les cités grecques' in Ph. Gignoux (ed.), *La Commémoration: Colloque du centenaire de la section des sciences religieuses de l'École pratique des hautes études* (Louvain–Paris 1988) 77. This section is based on Fantuzzi (2000a).

[28] Cf. *IG* VII, 690–722, 2900–1, 3118 (Boeotia), and *IG* II/III (2nd ed.): II.2, 13184, 13185 (Attica): cf. Pfohl (1953) 150 and 289 n. 53; M. Guarducci, *L'epigrafia greca dalle origini al tardo impero* (Rome 1987) 387.

[29] According to the data given by Page (1976) 169, out of the 711 pre-Christian sepulchral inscriptions in *GVI*, 66 certainly omit the name. In most of these cases, however, it is difficult to know whether the name of the dead person was completely omitted, or appeared in a non-metrical section of the inscription, which was subsequently lost.

[30] For example, *GVI* 89 (second century AD), 503 (second/first century BC), 790 (third century AD), 793 (third century AD), 869 (after 150 AD), 977 (second/third century AD), 1012 (first century AD), 1124 (second/third century AD), 1280 (second/third century AD), 1663 (third century BC). As for *CEG* 718 (400–350 BC), Hansen is surely correct to explain that 'caput defuncti animum corpusque suum lamentari dicitur'.

literary epigrams, the absence of the name is found almost exclusively *(a)* in *epitymbia* for sailors found dead on the seashore, in which anonymity underlines the exceptional bitterness of death at sea;[31] and *(b)* in a few epigrams – two by Leonidas, two by Antiphilus, and two in imitation of the latter – which develop another aspect of the lack of funeral honours, namely the theme of the neglected, desecrated or defaced tomb and of sacrilegious behaviour towards dead bodies, or in a few other anonymous epigrams, which describe the criminal concealment of corpses.[32]

There are, however, also a few literary *epitymbia* which do not name the dead, but do not fit into these classes. One of the earliest of these is a poem of Asclepiades (*AP* 13.23 = *HE* 962ff.):

ἰὼ παρέρπων, μικρόν, εἴ τι κἀγκονεῖς, ἄκουσον
τὰ Βότρυος περισσὰ δῆτα κήδη,
ὃς πρέσβυς ὀγδώκοντ᾽ ἐτῶν τὸν ἐκ νέων ἔθαψεν
ἤδη τι τέχνᾳ καὶ σοφὸν λέγοντα.
φεῦ τὸν τεκόντα, φεῦ δὲ καὶ σέ, Βότρυος φίλος παῖ,
ὅσων ἄμοιρος ἡδονῶν ἀπώλευ.

Ho! Passer-by, even if you are in haste, give ear to the grief of Botrys that passes measure. An old man now of eighty years, he buried his child who already from boyhood spoke with some skill and wisdom. Alas for your father and alas for you, dear son of Botrys: with how many joys untasted have you perished! (trans. Paton, adapted)

This clearly funerary epigram does not appear in Book 7 of the Palatine Anthology, which is dedicated to *epitymbia*, but its uncommon metrical form (couplets composed of catalectic iambic tetrameters and trimeters) led to it being placed in Book 13, which contains epigrams written in unusual metres. Even the most recent commentators, Gow and Page, fail properly to appreciate its epitaphic character: according to them, it is ‘in spite of the form, rather a poem of mourning than a genuine, or epideictic *epitymbion*’.[33] The epitaphic ‘form’ to which they refer is primarily the initial apostrophe to the wayfarer and the invitation to stop and read, which are

[31] Cf. *AP* 7.264 (Leonidas), 265, 268, 269 ([Plato]), 270 and 496 ([Simonides]), 276 (Hegesippus), 279 (adesp.), 282 (Theodoridas), 288 (Antipater Thess.), 350 (adesp.), 400 (Serapion), 404 (Zonas), 636 (Crinagoras), 651 (Euphorion). See S. Georgoudi, ‘La Mer, la mort et les discours des épigrammes funéraires’ *AION* (Archeol.) 10 (1988) 58.

[32] Leonidas, *AP* 7.478 and 480 = *HE* 2421ff. and 2427ff.; Antiphilus, *AP* 7.175 and 176 = *GPh* 929ff. and 935ff.; Heraclides, *AP* 7.281 = *GPh* 2390ff.; Isidorus, *AP* 7.280 = *GPh* 3887ff.; adesp. *AP* 7.356–60.

[33] *HE* II.139.

very familiar features of sepulchral inscriptions and funerary epigrams.[34] One formal reason which in all probability led Gow and Page to consider this epigram as a 'poem of mourning' was the form of its presentation. Compared with the most frequent forms of archaic sepulchral inscriptions, where the *persona loquens* was the tomb or, later, the deceased, there has been a tendency to consider fictitious those funerary epigrams in which an external 'I' mourns for the dead – even more so if this external 'I' sympathises with and consoles the father of the dead no less than the deceased himself, as happens for example in some epigrams by Callimachus.[35] Thus scholars have considered 'epideictic-consolatory' texts such as [Simonides], *AP* 7.511 = *FGE* 1006f., σῆμα καταφθιμένοιο Μεγακλέος εὖτ᾽ ἂν ἴδωμαι, | οἰκτίρω σε, τάλαν Καλλία, οἷ᾽ ἔπαθες 'whenever I see the tomb of the dead Megacles, I pity you, poor Callias: what distress you suffered!', in which an external 'I' sympathises with the sorrow of one of the dead person's nearest and dearest, rather than mourning for the deceased, and addresses the bereaved in the second person; such poems are not far from the manner in which the external 'I' mourns for Botrys and his son in the epigram by Asclepiades (above p. 293). More recently, however, the 'anonymous first person mourner' has been acknowledged as an important epitaphic form of presentation,[36] and the epitaphic nature of the poems of [Simonides] and Asclepiades has been properly appreciated. Inscribed examples include *CEG* 470 of 550/540 BC, Αὐτοκλείδο τόδε σε͂μα νέο προσορο͂ν ἀνιο͂μαι, κτλ. 'when I see this tomb of Autokleides, I am distressed, etc.', *CEG* 51 of about 510 BC, οἰκτίρο προσορõ[ν] παιδὸς τόδε σε͂μα θανόντος | Σμικύθ[ο] hός τε φίλον ὄλεσεν ἔλπ᾽ ἀγαθέν.[37] 'I weep to see this tomb of a boy, Smikythos, who has died, destroying the fine hopes of his dear ones', and *CEG* 43.3–5 of about 525 BC,]κλε͂ς hõ τόδε μέτερ [. . .] ὀλοφύρομαι hόνεκ᾽ ἄhο[ρος] '. . . . kles, whose mother this (tomb?) [. . .] I pity because untimely . . .'

[34] This opening address is relatively more common in the metrical sepulchral inscriptions of the sixth to the fourth century BC, cf. *CEG* 49 (sixth century BC), 556 (350 BC), 686 (fourth century BC?), *GVI* 1670 (sixth century BC) and 1671 (sixth century BC), and the inscriptions from Selinunte nos. 26, 28, 30–34 (550–450 BC) in R. Arena, *Iscrizioni greche arcaiche di Sicilia e Magna Grecia. I: Iscrizioni di Megara Iblea e Selinunte* (2nd ed., Pisa 1996). See also Mnasalces, *AP* 7.488 = *HE* 2639ff. and 7.491 = *HE* 2636ff.; [Simonides], *AP* 7.515 = *FGE* 986ff.

[35] Cf. e.g. *AP* 7.517 = *HE* 1193ff., *AP* 7.519 = *HE* 1241ff.

[36] Cf. D. M. Lewis, 'Bowie on Elegy: A Footnote' *JHS* 107 (1987) 188; A. C. Cassio, 'I distici del *polyandrion* di Ambracia e l' "io anonimo" nell'epigramma greco' *SMEA* 33 (1994) 106–17. See also J. W. Day, *JHS* 109 (1989) 20 n. 31 and 26; R. Scodel, *SIFC* 10 (1992) 70.

[37] For the text, cf. D. M. Lewis and A. C. Cassio (previous note); see also W. Peek, *ZPE* 23 (1976) 93 n. 1. The emendation of the initial indicative οἰκτίρο into the imperative οἴκτιρο<ν> was proposed by Willemsen and accepted by Hansen.

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

Gow and Page's view of Asclepiades' epigram was also explicitly influenced by the absence of the dead person's name: 'a significant fact, but if this is a poem of mourning, it is possible that Asclepiades did not know it'. In fact, however, there is an alternative explanation: Asclepiades' poem might have been conceived as the metrical part of an inscription, in which another non-metrical part, below, beside or beneath the verses, indicated the name of the dead. This type of inscription is first found in the fifth century, but becomes common from the fourth century, particularly, but not exclusively, in Attica.[38] There are over one hundred and fifty Attic verse inscriptions of the fourth century, of which more than twenty belong to this type.[39] From the fifth century, however, only two inscriptions of this kind are extant, *CEG* 77 and 89, both from Attica. In the earlier of the two, *CEG* 77 (500–475 BC), a couplet for the Spartan Πλειστίας, the absence of the name was very probably made necessary by the difficulty of fitting the name into dactylic verse. The later *CEG* 89 (late fifth century) honours Ἀμφαρέτη, which would fit the metre, and so must be considered as an anticipation of the practice of the fourth century.

Two fifth-century Attic texts offer the earliest evidence for the difficulty that could be encountered when composing dactylic verse to contain the name of the honorand. The earlier inscription, dated by Hansen to 477/476, was engraved on the pedestal of a monument to the tyrant-killers, perhaps the one erected in their honour during the last decade of the sixth century. As Ἀριστογείτων could not fit into a hexameter, the name was divided between the end of the hexameter and the beginning of the pentameter; such division was common for lyric cola, but hardly ever attested in recitative poetry, let alone hexameters or elegiac couplets, ἒ μέγ᾽ Ἀθεναίοισι φόος γένε<θ>᾽ ἐνίκ᾽ Ἀριστο|γείτον hίππαρχον κτε̃νε καὶ hαρμόδιος 'truly a great light shone forth for the Athenians when Aristogeiton and Harmodius killed Hipparchus' (*CEG* 430). Another solution to the metrical problem was found by Critias at the end of the century; when he had to name 'Alcibiades', which, with its run of three successive short syllables, does not fit dactylic verse, the poet composed an iambic trimeter in place of a pentameter and added an apology for the intrusion of a different metre: καὶ νῦν Κλεινίου υἱὸν Ἀθηναῖον στεφανώσω | Ἀλκιβιάδην νέοισιν ὑμνήσας τρόποις· | οὐ γάρ πως ἦν τοὔνομ᾽ ἐφαρμόζειν ἐλεγείῳ, | νῦν δ᾽ ἐν ἰαμβείῳ κείσεται οὐκ ἀμέτρως 'and now I will crown the Athenian Alcibiades, son

[38] *CEG* 684, e.g., is from Samos, the home of Asclepiades, *CEG* 724 from Macedonia.

[39] Cf. *CEG* 472 (?), 477, 486, 490 (?), 495 (?), 497 (?), 499 (?), 512, 531, 532, 533, 534, 537, 544, 557, 558, 560, 564, 570, 571, 582 (?), 585, 589, 590, 594, 595, 596, 613, 615 (?), 620 (?), 621 (the question marks indicate uncertain cases).

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

of Clinias, singing of him in new ways. It was not possible to adapt his name to the elegiac couplet, and so now it will be in iambics, but not without measure' (fr. 2 Gent.–Prato).[40]

The practice of placing the name of the dead, usually together with patronymic and nationality, on the tomb but not in the metrical epigram thus offered a solution to the problem of fitting certain proper names into the hexameter, in a period when the elegiac couplet had almost completely replaced the metrically more flexible iambic trimeter as the ordinary form for sepulchral inscriptions.[41] During the fourth century, however, the division of sepulchral inscriptions between the metrical epigram in one part and the name of the deceased (with patronymic and deme or tribe) in another was not limited in Attica to the tombs of those whose names were difficult for the hexameter. An example is *CEG* 532, which also bears very clear witness to the conscious division of the space of the inscription into two parts. This inscription, which is perhaps from the latter part of the first half of the fourth century, concerns a certain Πραξῖνος, a name which could fit into the hexameter perfectly well; the epigram, however, dwells rather on the deceased's nickname and refers the reader for the name of the dead to a separate space on the monument:[42]

> [τὄνο]μα μὲν τὀμὸν καὶ ἐμõ πατρὸς ἀγορεύ[ει]
> [στή]λη καὶ πάτραν· πιστῶν δὲ ἔργων ἕνεκα ἔσχο[ν]
> [Πίσ]τος ἐπωνυμίαν, οὖ σπάνις ἀνδρὶ τυχε͂ν.

The *stele* tells the names of myself and my father and our homeland. Because of my faithful deeds I acquired the nickname Trusty – a rare honour.

It is likely that private funerary monuments of the fourth century developed a taste for this layout, not simply to solve the problem of 'difficult' names, but also in imitation of the bipartition of inscriptional space between metrical and non-metrical elements which had already been practised for some time on *polyandria*, i.e. the public funerary monuments, on which lists of those who had fallen in war could only appear separately from the metrical

[40] Another solution was the hyper-Ionic spelling of Ἀρχέλαος as' Ἀρχέλεως in a pentameter attributed to Sophocles: cf. fr. 1 Gent.–Prato: 'Thus it was possible to speak of him in a metrical form'.

[41] For examples from later periods, cf. *SH* 615, *EG* 805a, *GVI* 278 and 1326. For discussion, cf. Page (1976) 167–8 and W. Lapini, 'I frammenti alcibiadei di Crizia: Crizia amico di Alcibiade? (I parte)' *Prometheus* 21 (1995) 2–12.

[42] References to the naming *titulus* in the metrical text are found also in later metrical inscriptions: cf. *GVI* 632 (third century BC), 1260 (second century BC), 650 (first/second century AD), 1087 (second century AD). At Rome, there are clear cases of a functional differentiation between the prose part of inscriptions, which contain the information about the person's name and life, and the 'comment' of the epigram in verse; cf. *CIL* 1.2 (2nd ed.) 11 for Lucius Scipio (c. 160–50); *CIL* 1.2 (2nd ed.) 15 for Gnaeus Cornelius Scipio Hispanus (c. 135 BC), on which see M. Massaro, *Epigraphica* 59 (1997) 97–124.

commentary provided by an epigram.[43] Such an influence from public funerary inscriptions to private ones is seen also in the conventional greeting between passer-by and deceased; it is a *polyandrion*, *CEG* 4, which first attests an address by the living to the dead, a form which was to become very common, whereas in the archaic age it was the dead who greeted passers-by.[44]

The Attic practice in which the funerary epigram did not necessarily contain the name of the deceased was guaranteed a wider circulation, towards the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the third, by the Ἐπιγράμματα Ἀττικά 'Attic epigrams', a collection compiled by Philochorus, the Attic historian;[45] this is one of the earliest collections of inscriptions known to us, and may have offered a convenient catalogue of 'real' models to Hellenistic epigrammatists. Philochorus' readers, whether Attic or Alexandrian, may well have gained the impression that this practice of separating the name of the dead from the poem in their honour was a modern technique worth imitating; (we do not know of any other collections of this kind for another century, until the Περὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλεις ἐπιγραμμάτων 'On epigrams, town by town' compiled by Polemon of Ilium, early second century BC). Asclepiades, *AP* 13.23 is not in fact the only literary *epitymbion* without the name of the dead person which does not fall into one of the two categories considered above, namely *epitymbia* for shipwrecked sailors and those on 'desecrated' tombs. Nevertheless, epigrams of this kind are decidedly rare, at least until halfway through the first century BC: all of the surviving examples seem close in time to Asclepiades.

Let us start with the two *epitymbia* composed by Callimachus for his father Battus and for himself, respectively *AP* 7.525 = *HE* 1179ff. and *AP* 7.415 = *HE* 1185f.:

> ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα, Καλλιμάχου με
> ἴσθι Κυρηναίου παῖδά τε καὶ γενέτην.
> εἰδείης δ' ἄμφω κεν· ὁ μέν κοτε πατρίδος ὅπλων
> ἦρξεν, ὁ δ' ἤεισεν κρέσσονα βασκανίης.
> οὐ νέμεσις· Μοῦσαι γάρ, ὅσους ἴδον ὄμματι παῖδας
> μὴ λοξῷ, πολιοὺς οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους.

[43] A 'titulus nomina praebens', obviously not in metrical form, is either preserved or postulated regularly by editors for the *polyandria*, mostly from Attica, which are extant from the fifth and fourth centuries.

[44] Cf. Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) 180–217 and 368–9. For other indications of the influence exerted by public funerary monuments on private ones in classical Attica, cf. Clairmont (1970) 43–6.

[45] We do not know the contents of this collection, but it is reasonable to expect from an author like Philochorus, who is credited with a passion for collecting 'oracles in verse' (*FGrHist* 328T6), that he did not limit himself to collecting only historical inscriptions in prose: cf. *FGrHist* IIIb (Suppl.) I p. 375.

You who walk past my tomb, know that I am son and father of Callimachus of Cyrene. You must know both: the one led his country's forces once, the other sang beyond the reach of envy. No marvel, for those on whom the Muses did not look askance in boyhood, they do not cast off when their hairs are grey. (trans. Nisetich, adapted)

Βαττιάδεω παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδας εὖ μὲν ἀοιδήν
εἰδότος, εὖ δ' οἴνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι.

You are walking past the tomb of Battiades, well versed in the art of song, and also of mixing wine and laughter seasonably. (trans. Nisetich, adapted)

It is plausible that the two epigrams were devised as a complementary pair: the first verse of the *epitymbion* for the father 'calls the son Καλλίμαχος, while the first line of the one for Callimachus calls him Βαττιάδης; the two verses complement each other, thus forming the complete name'; furthermore, 'the name of the son and of the grandfather, Callimachus, is only found in the epigram for the father [. . .] the name of the father, on the contrary, which is not mentioned in the epigram for his death, appears in the epigram for his son, included in the patronymic'.[46] This literary game may have had an extra-literary motivation, such as, for example, 'Callimachus could not write much about his father, because there was not much to say about him',[47] or he may have preferred not to speak about himself in his own epitaph, 'trusting that his verses would be sufficient for people to recognise him'.[48] What we have, in fact, is a somewhat paradoxical *epitymbion* by a son for his father, in which the father is not named, and the epitaph of a poet for himself, which named him only by means of his own patronymic (unless Βαττιάδης is an epithet derived from the name of the founder of Cyrene).[49] This is, however, not just another Alexandrian variation on the standard practices of 'real' sepulchral inscriptions, nor need we suppose that it was impossible to fit the name of Callimachus' father into a hexameter.[50] Onomastic similarity may in fact have pointed to the complementarity of

[46] G. Pasquali, 'Epigrammi callimachei' (1919), now in id., *Scritti filologici* (Florence 1986) I.307. The complementary relationship between the two epigrams would be a bit looser if we accept, with Cameron (1995) 8 and 78–9 and White (1999), that 'Battiades' is not a patronymic, but refers to the founder of Cyrene.

[47] Pasquali loc. cit. (previous note). The exegesis of Wilamowitz (1924) I.175 n. 2, followed by Pfeiffer, is very similar; cf. also Meillier (1979) 142–3;Walsh (1991) 93–4; Bing (1995) 126. The final couplet of *AP* 7.525, which is identical to fr. 1.37–8 Massimilla, is, I believe correctly, often viewed as an interpolation.

[48] Cf. White (1999) 170.

[49] See above, n. 46. Similarly, J. Larson, 'Astacides the Goatherd' *CPh* 92 (1997) 131–7, argues that the Ἀστακίδης of Callimachus, *AP* 7.158 = *HE* 1211ff. is not a proper name, but a poetic pseudonym formed from the name of the town of Astacus in Bithynia.

[50] Cf. Gow and Page *ad loc*. (*HE* II.186).

the two characters: the obvious allusion in the final couplet of the epigram on Callimachus the *father* to the famous verses of Hesiod (*Theogony* 81–5) on the protection of the Muses for just *kings*[51] might suggest that both the poet and his grandfather, who had led the army of the city, had operated in the sphere of the Muses, though in very different fields. The Callimachean epigram might be seen as a meeting-point between the Hellenistic taste for *Ergänzungsspiel*, in which the poet leaves his reader the task of working out important details from allusive hints in the poem, and the tradition of sepulchral inscriptions of the fourth century, in which the name of the deceased was not included in the metrical epigram. This necessity for reciprocal reading between the two inscriptions might have been influenced by real examples of inscriptions that stood over the tombs of two deceased relatives, placed side by side.[52] An example of the kind, once again from Attica and once again from the sixth century, has come down to us,[53] *CEG* 512 ὢ τὸν ἀειμνήστου σ᾽ ἀρετᾶς παρὰ πᾶσι πολίταις | κλεινὸν ἔπαινον ἔχοντ᾽ ἄνδρα ποθεινότατον | παισὶ φίλει τε γυναικί. – τάφο δ᾽ ἐπὶ δεξιά, μῆτερ, | κεῖμαι σῆς φιλίας οὐκ ἀπολειπόμενος 'Oh, you who won fame and glory among your fellow-citizens by reason of your virtue, which will never be forgotten, you who are sorely missed by your children and your dear wife. – I lie to the right of your tomb, mother, and am not separated from your love.' In this case, the name of the dead person, which is not supplied in the metrical text, is given in a separate inscription, *extra metrum*, on the same tombstone (Τηλέμαχος Σπουδοκράτος Φλυεύς); the name of the mother, however, who is mentioned without being named, must be found from the nearby tombstone of the mother herself, which was fortunately found *in situ*: Μελίτη Σποδοκράτος γυνὴ Φλυέως (*IG* II/III^2: III.2, 7695).

Another example may be found on the Milan papyrus of Posidippus, Poem 56 A–B (IX.7–14 Bast.–Gall.):

πέντε μὲν ὠδίνεσσιν ἐπήρατο τόξον Ἐλευθώ,
  δῖα γύναι, κατὰ σῶν ἱσταμένη λεχέων·
ἕκτης δ᾽ ἐξ ὠδῖνος ἀπώλεο, καὶ τὸ σὸν ἔσβη
  τέκνον ἐν ἑβδομάτῳ νήπιον ἠελίῳ
μαστὸν ἔτι σπαργῶντα μετατρέχον, ἠδὲ συναπτόν
  δάκρυ κατ᾽ ἀμφοτέρων ἤλυθε τυμβοχόων·
πέντε μὲν οὖν, Ἀσιῆτι γύναι, μακάρεσσι μελήσει
  τέκνων, ἓν δ᾽ ἐπὶ σοῖς γούνασι καὶ σὺ κομεῖς.

[51] In the light of this Hesiodic allusion E. Livrea, 'L'epitafio callimacheo per Batto' (1992), now in Livrea (1993) 107–17, even suggested that this final couplet should be referred not to Callimachus the poet, but to Battos the father.

[52] Cf. Bing (1995) 127–8. [53] Cf. Bing (previous note).

For five labours Eleutho raised her bow, O noble woman, and stood beside your bed. After the sixth labour you died and your infant child passed away on the seventh day still seeking the swollen breast, and combined tears fell from the eyes of both undertakers. Of five of your children, Asiatic woman, the blessed ones will take care, and one of them you too will tend as it lies on your knees. (trans. Austin)

If we accept the interpretation of Ἀσιῆτι γύναι proposed by the first editors,[54] 'Asian woman', the dead person remains without any name.[55] Another epigram of this kind is by Carphyllides (*AP* 7.260 = *HE* 1349ff.), a minor author usually dated to the third century:

μὴ μέμψῃ παριὼν τὰ μνήματά μου, παροδῖτα·
  οὐδὲν ἔχω θρήνων ἄξιον οὐδὲ θανών.
τέκνων τέκνα λέλοιπα· μιῆς ἀπέλαυσα γυναικός
  συγγήρου· τρισσοῖς παισὶν ἔδωκα γάμους,
ἐξ ὧν πολλάκι παῖδας ἐμοῖς ἐνεκοίμισα κόλποις,
  οὐδενὸς οἰμώξας οὐ νόσον, οὐ θάνατον·
οἵ με κατασπείσαντες ἀπήμονα τὸν γλυκὺν ὕπνον
  κοιμᾶσθαι χώρην πέμψαν ἐπ' εὐσεβέων.

Find no fault with my fate, traveller, in passing my tomb; not even in death have I aught that calls for mourning. I left children's children, I enjoyed the company of one wife who grew old with me. I married my three children, and many children sprung from these unions I lulled to sleep on my lap, never grieving for the illness or loss of one. They all, pouring their libations on my grave, sent me off on a painless journey to the home of the pious dead to sleep the sweet sleep. (trans. Paton)

Yet another example might be *AP* 7.662 = *HE* 3410ff., an epigram which the bucolic manuscripts attribute to Theocritus, but the Palatine and Planudean anthologies to Leonidas:

ἡ παῖς ᾤχετ' ἄωρος ἐν ἑβδόμῳ ἥδ' ἐνιαυτῷ
  εἰς Ἀίδην πολλῆς ἡλικίης προτέρη,
δειλαίη, ποθέουσα τὸν εἰκοσάμηνον ἀδελφόν,
  νήπιον ἀστόργου γευσάμενον θανάτου.
αἰαῖ ἐλεινὰ παθοῦσα Περιστέρη, ὡς ἐν ἑτοίμῳ
  ἀνθρώποις δαίμων θῆκε τὰ λυγρότατα.

The girl is gone to Hades before her time in her seventh year, before all her many playmates, hapless child, longing for her little brother, who twenty months old

[54] Bastianini–Gallazzi (2001) 178–9.

[55] Ἀσιῆτις may, however, be a proper name. It is not otherwise attested, but related male names are certainly known. Ἀσία and Ἀσιανά are two of the readings suggested in *IG* xiv. 1421 (cf. *SEG* xxx. 1211 and xxxv. 1049), and Ἀσία was the name of one of the daughters of Themistocles (and is also attested in Attic inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries BC: cf. *LGPN* II.72–3). For the name with γύναι, cf. *GVI* 411.1, Σόεμος ἀνήρ (second/third century AD).

tasted of loveless death. Alas, Peristera for your pitiable fate! How has Heaven decreed that the saddest events come all too easily to human beings. (trans. Paton, adapted)

Περιστέρη, the proper name in the penultimate line, is standardly taken as the name of the mother, and not that of the young girl who has died; it is, however, more likely to be the name of the dead girl.[56]

Among all the epigrams of Book 7 of the Palatine Anthology which can be attributed to poets from the third century to the first half of the first, there is not one *epitymbion* which does not include the name of the dead person, usually with patronymic and nationality.[57] Immediately after this group, we have a small group of such epigrams by poets who lived between the mid-first century BC and the mid-first century AD, which seem to testify to a sort of relatively short-lived 'fashion' for such poems: Apollonidas of Smyrna, *AP* 7.180 and 389, Heraclides of Sinope, 7.281, Erycius of Cyzicus, 7.368, Antonius Thallos, 7.373, Leonidas of Alexandria, 7.547, Crinagoras of Mytilene, 7.638. Apart from this small group, the 'signed' *epitymbia* without the name of the dead are very few and very late (sixth century): Julianus of Egypt, *AP* 7.32 and 603, Macedonius the consul, 7.566, Agathias Scholasticus, 7.568–9. All other epigrams of this kind, some fifteen in total, are anonymous,[58] and it is reasonable to suppose that most are transcriptions of actual sepulchral inscriptions,[59] where the name of the dead would have occurred elsewhere on the stone.

For Callimachus, Posidippus (if Ἀσιῆτις is not a proper name) and Carphyllides, the unsuitability of the name of the dead person for the hexameter might be argued to explain its absence, but this is less convincing for Asclepiades, given that his epigram is iambic. The most plausible hypothesis is that these poets, three and perhaps all of whom were born towards the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the third, followed the example of the bipartite inscriptions of the fourth century, in which, as we have seen, it was not only names that were 'difficult' which were placed

[56] Cf. Laura Rossi, *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: a Method of Approach* (Leuven 2001) 265–77.

[57] *AP* 7.472 by Leonidas of Tarentum (*HE* 2443ff.) does not belong here, as it is a philosophical diatribe about the fragility of human life. As regards Callimachus, *AP* 7.728 = *HE* 1255ff., the name of the priestess of Demeter to whom the *epitymbion* is dedicated is presumably concealed in the lacuna in v. 3.

[58] *AP* 7.48, 157, 323, 324, 325, 331, 332, 335, 336, 339, 342, 349 (attributed – probably wrongly – to Simonides, cf. *FGE* p. 253), 361, 474, 734.

[59] Cf. Weisshäupl (1889) 80–1. The lemmas which are sometimes placed before epigrams to record the name of the dead person and/or the geographical location of the original inscription (see e.g. *AP* 7.330–4) demonstrate beyond all doubt that some of the epigrams of the Anthology were transcriptions of inscriptions: cf. F. Chamoux, 'Épigraphie et littérature: Méléagre de Gadara fut-il un plagiaire?' *REG* 109 (1996) 35–43.

outside the metrical text. This is a phenomenon of no little cultural significance. The poets – mostly (to us) anonymous – who entrusted their verses to stone could count on the fact that the stonecutter would divide the text into a non-metrical part (with the names) and the metrical 'epigram'. The writers of 'literary' epigrams, whose names were preserved through personal editions or the various anthologies which eventually merged together in the Palatine Anthology, were 'high' poets who thought of a circulation of their texts in book form, whether or not they were also actually inscribed. These poets will hardly have been able to take for granted the continuity of this 'double space' in the course of tradition; there was no guarantee that something equivalent to the space on an inscription for the name of the deceased would be available in a book. Both the ancient papyri (above all, the Milan papyrus of Posidippus) and the obvious improvisation of the headings in the Palatine Anthology raise the suspicion that, during the Hellenistic age, the custom of placing supplementary headings in front of single epigrams was far from standard. Thus, Asclepiades and Callimachus, and perhaps also Posidippus and the obscure Carphyllides, testify to an early phase in which the presentation of 'real' inscriptions could still influence the presentation of 'literary' epigrams, shaping the latter in accordance with requirements and possibilities that are typical of inscriptions, but foreign to the literary text.[60] To leter development, in which the monumental context is no longer taken for granted, finds a precise parallel in the history of the dedicatory epigram. As mentioned above, the dedicatory inscriptions of the sixth and fifth centuries often omit the name of the god to whom the dedication is addressed, in all probability because the place where they were to be set up (a temple or other place consecrated to the god)[61] or a reproduction of the figure of the god on the same votive monument (cf. e.g. *CEG* 286) guaranteed knowledge of the name. On the contrary, with very few exceptions, the dedicatory epigrams of the Palatine Anthology hardly ever omit the name of the god.[62]

The exceptional nature of funerary inscriptions without the name of the dead person is clear also from a group of epigrams of the third century BC, which take the form of self-epitaphs for the misanthrope Timon. The earliest are a poem disputed between Leonidas and Antipater, but usually attributed with some confidence to Leonidas[63] (Leonidas, *AP* 7.316 = *HE* 2569ff.),

[60] Cf. Bing (1998) 34–9. [61] Cf. Lazzarini (1976) 59.
[62] Cf. *GPh* II.149, with important modifications in *FGE* p. 139.
[63] Cf. J. Geffcken, *Leonidas von Tarent* (Suppl. *Jahrb. Class. Philol.* 23) (Leipzig 1896) 9–19 and *HE* II.395. The uncertainty of the lemmatist is justified, according to Geffcken, by the frequency of the imitations of Leonidas in Antipater of Sidon.

τὴν ἐπ' ἐμεῦ στήλην παραμείβεο μήτε με χαίρειν
εἰπὼν μήθ' ὅστις, μὴ τίνος ἐξετάσας·
ἢ μή, τὴν ἀνύεις, τελέσαις ὁδόν. ἢν δὲ παρέλθῃς
σιγῇ, μηδ' οὕτως, ἣν ἀνύεις, τελέσαις.

Pass by my monument, neither greeting me, nor asking who I am and whose son. Otherwise may you never reach the end of the journey you are on, and if you pass by in silence, not even then may you reach the journey's end. (trans. Paton)

and a parallel poem attributed to Callimachus (*AP* 7.318 = *HE* 1271–2):

μὴ χαίρειν εἴπῃς με, κακὸν κέαρ, ἀλλὰ πάρελθε·
ἶσον ἐμοὶ χαίρειν ἐστὶ τὸ μὴ σὲ πελᾶν (Graefe: γελᾶν cod.)

Wish me not, well, evil-hearted one, but pass on. It will be well with me if I get rid of your presence

Close in time to these poems must be two hexameters which the biographical tradition presents as really engraved on Timon's tomb: ἐνθάδ' ἀπορρήξας ψυχὴν βαρυδαίμονα κεῖμαι· | οὔνομα δ' οὐ πεύσεσθε, κακοὶ δὲ κακῶς ἀπόλοισθε 'Here I lie, after breaking off a life oppressed by ill fortune. My name you will not know: may you come to a sticky end, you evil ones' (= adesp. *AP* 7.313). This might, of course, be a late and fictitious text, but expressions like ἀπορρήξας ψυχήν and βαρυδαίμων appear closer to the tragedy of the fifth century than to the Hellenistic age,[64] and the metrical form (two hexameters, and not the elegiac couplet which had became practically the canonical metre for sepulchral inscriptions by the fourth century) might suggest an early date.

Epigrammatists naturally followed the biographical tradition in their representations of this terrible misanthrope. In his *Life of Antony* (chapter 70), Plutarch recounts the misanthropy of Antony during the last few years of his life: he believed that his friends had shown ingratitude to him, nourished a distrust and a hatred for all men, and consequently he said that he could see analogies between the life of Timon and his own. The historian seizes the opportunity to narrate several anecdotes about this bad-tempered individual, and he also describes Timon's tomb, which, partly by chance and partly in accordance with the dead man's intentions, was a symbolic monument to misanthropy. It had been built on the seashore at Halai, on a spur of land, but as a result of erosion it was now 'out at sea' and could no longer be reached, or even approached, by other human beings. Plutarch informs us that on Timon's tomb stood the hexameters cited above, and moreover: 'They say that he composed this himself, while he was still alive.' The epigram that circulates, however, is the one by Callimachus,

[64] Cf. A. Wifstrand, *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos* (Lund 1933) 161. See also Schmid (1959) 165.

Τίμων μισάνθρωπος ἐνοικέω. ἀλλὰ πάρελθε | οἰμώζειν εἴπας πολλά, πάρελθε μόνον ('I, Timon the misanthrope, dwell here. Be on your way after heaping curses on my head – just be on your way'). The verses, which Plutarch erroneously attributes[65] to Callimachus, are in fact the second couplet of an epigram by Hegesippus (*AP* 7.320 = *HE* 1931ff.):

> ὀξεῖαι πάντῃ περὶ τὸν τάφον εἰσὶν ἄκανθαι
> καὶ σκόλοπες· βλάψεις τοὺς πόδας, ἢν προσίῃς.
> Τίμων μισάνθρωπος ἐνοικέω. ἀλλὰ πάρελθε
> οἰμώζειν εἴπας πολλά, πάρελθε μόνον.

All around the tomb are sharp thorns and stakes; you will hurt your feet if you go near. I, Timon the misanthrope, dwell here. Be on your way after heaping curses on my head – just be on your way. (trans. Paton, adapted)

In view of their emphasis on the anonymity of Timon's tomb, the epigrams of Leonidas (7.316) and Callimachus (*AP* 7.318) may be compared with another variation of Timon's 'original' inscription by Ptolemy, *AP* 7.314 (*FGE* 470f.):

> μὴ πόθεν εἰμὶ μάθῃς μηδ' οὔνομα· πλὴν ὅτι θνῄσκειν
> τοὺς παρ' ἐμὴν στήλην ἐρχομένους ἐθέλω.

Learn not whence I am nor my name; know only that I wish those who pass by my monument to die.

Hegesippus' epigram, however, belongs with one by Zenodotus or Rhianus (*AP* 7.315 = *HE* 3640ff.):

> τρηχείην κατ' ἐμεῦ, ψαφαρὴ κόνι, ῥάμνον ἑλίσσοις
> πάντοθεν ἢ σκολιῆς ἄγρια κῶλα βάτου,
> ὡς ἐπ' ἐμοὶ μηδ' ὄρνις ἐν εἴαρι κοῦφον ἐρείδοι
> ἴχνος, ἐρημάζω δ' ἥσυχα κεκλιμένος.
> ἦ γὰρ ὁ μισάνθρωπος, ὁ μηδ' ἀστοῖσι φιληθείς
> Τίμων, οὐδ' Ἀίδῃ γνήσιός εἰμι νέκυς.

Dry earth, grow a prickly thorn to twine all round me, or the wild branches of a twisting bramble, that not even a bird in spring may rest its light foot on me, but that I may repose in peace and solitude. For I, the misanthrope, Timon, who was not even beloved by my countryman, am no genuine dead man even in Hades. (trans. Paton)

The epigrams of Hegesippus and Zenodotus/Rhianus distinguish themselves by imagining Timon's tomb as isolated by a prickly tangle of

[65] For hypotheses about the origin of Plutarch's error, cf. *HE* II.304 *ad loc.*

brambles,[66] and by giving the name of the dead, as though the tombstone was not anonymous.[67] They thus differ from both Plutarch and, at least in part, his source, the 'On famous men' of Neanthes of Cyzicus, a historian of the third century BC, which presented the tomb as isolated inside the sea (cf. *FGr Hist* 84 F35).[68] The variant version which these poets followed perhaps came from Aristophanes, *Lysistrata* 806–15 or another similar text; Aristophanes' chorus report that 'Timon was a vagabond who showed his face surrounded by unapproachable thorn-bushes (ἀβάτοισιν ἐν σκώλοισι τὰ πρόσωπα περιειργμένος), an Erinys come to life. This Timon had withdrawn into solitude, out of hatred for wicked men . . . after pronouncing many curses on them (πολλὰ καταρασάμενος)'. Zenodotus/Rhianus and Hegesippus might have taken such a tradition of the misanthropic hermit[69] and extended it to his tomb. Such anti-social habits had, however, long since become part of the standard characterisation of any misanthrope, which itself, of course, was largely based on the rich 'Timonlegende'.[70] Monotropos ('Hermit'), the protagonist of the comedy of the same name by Phrynichus, a contemporary of Aristophanes, had claimed to live 'the life of Timon', a man ἀπρόσοδος and ἀδιάλεκτος, 'impossible to approach or converse with' (*PCG* fr. 19)[71], and our fullest picture of such a 'Timon-like' hermit is, of course, Cnemon, the central figure of Menander's *Dyskolos*.

Hegesippus (first half of the third century BC) and Zenodotus/Rhianus differ principally from the 'original' self-epitaph of Timon and the epigrams of Leonidas (7.316), Callimachus (*AP* 7.318), and Ptolemy (7.314) in

[66] The epitaphic topos of the blissful luxuriance of nature around tombs appears first at a later date, cf. Philodemus, *AP* 7.222 = *GPh* 3320ff. = 33 Sider; *GVI* 1409 (second century AD), 2027 (first century AD), 2005.34–9 (first/second century AD). Curiously, the first three of these all include the absence of those βάτοι which made Timon's tomb unapproachable; see also Prop. 4.5.1: *terra tuum spinis obducat, lena, sepulcrum.*

[67] Callimachus too seems to be thinking of a tombstone with a name in another epigram (*AP* 7.317 = *HE* 1269f.). This poem is, however, closer to the 'interview with the dead person about the afterlife' (below, p. 327).

[68] Cf. Piccolomini (1882) 251–57 and F. Leo, *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form* (Leipzig 1901) 114–15.

[69] So Piccolomini (1882) 258.

[70] Cf. F. Bertram, *Die Timonlegende* (Diss. Heidelberg 1906); Schmid (1959) and id., 'Menanders Dyskolos, Timonlegende und Peripatos' *RhM* 102 (1959) 263–6; P. Photiadès, 'Le type du misanthrope dans la littérature grecque' *CE* 34 (1959) 305–26; A. M. Armstrong, 'Timon of Athens – a Legendary Figure?' *G&R* 34 (1987) 7–11; T. Hawkins, 'Seducing a Misanthrope: Timon the Philogynist in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*' *GRBS* 42 (2001) 143–62.

[71] In Posidippus 102 A–B Menoitios the Cretan asks passers-by not to disturb him with the usual questions, but this may not be pure misanthropy: cf. M. Gronewald, *ZPE* 99 (1993) 28–9, E. Voutiras, *ZPE* 104 (1994) 28–31, Gutzwiller (1998) 198–9. Menoitios later provides full information about his identity.

removing the anonymity, which had either been a real characteristic of the tombstone and its epigram or a creation of a biographical tradition which may be reasonably supposed earlier than Leonidas and Callimachus. They thus belong to the same series of 'self-epitaphs' of Timon, but would both appear to derive from a different tradition, one more concerned with the *ekphrasis* of the tomb and its isolation, and one in which Timon's name was openly displayed. In the face of the uncertainty of the attributions and of the relative chronology of some of the poets, any attempt to establish a sequence for the various epigrammatic motifs is destined also to remain uncertain. Nevertheless, the development of these epigrams in the first half of the third century confirms that the idea of a tombstone for an unknown dead person was something atypical and exceptional; on the other hand, however, it could be taken as a real sign of recognition for an atypical, exceptional character like the 'inventor' of misanthropy, a true disrupter of the common social values celebrated in sepulchral inscriptions, which for the 'normal' dead included the presence of the name.

2.3 Dialogues with statues

Omission of the name of the dead was a radical departure from the conventions of funerary epigrams, and perhaps it is not surprising that such a tomb should arouse so much interest among epigrammatists of the third century. The very repetitive information contained in classical funerary and dedicatory inscriptions and epigrams put the search for variation at the centre of poetic concerns. As has already been observed for archaic sepulchral inscriptions, one of the most frequent variations consisted of adopting, not the common narrative form, but a dialogue form which dramatised the passage of information from the inscription to the passer-by; this was a natural outcome of the widespread practice of making the tomb, or the monument, the speaker of the epigram ('talking inscriptions'), thus transforming the person who observes the tombstone from its reader into its interlocutor.[72]

Epigrams in dialogue form which have come down to us in the *Anthologia Graeca* have regularly been considered to be typical products of Hellenistic affectedness, and their origin has been sought in the dialogic literature of the fourth century,[73] or both in it and in the dialogic element of Theocritean bucolic poetry.[74] Thus, for example, an epigram ascribed to Simonides

[72] As Meyer (forthcoming) chapter A.2.5 points out, at the end of a perceptive survey of the forms of presentation in archaic inscriptions.
[73] Cf. R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog: ein literarhistorischer Versuch* (Leipzig 1895) 1.398–401.
[74] Cf. W. Rasche, *De Anthologiae Graecae epigrammatis quae colloquii formam habent* (Diss. Münster–Westf. 1910) 13–21.

(*Anthologia Planudea* 23 = *FGE* 808f.) is in dialogue form, as a question put to the tombstone by a passer-by about the identity of the dedicator and the reasons for the dedication, followed by the answer of the tombstone:

εἶπον, τίς, τίνος ἐσσί, τίνος πατρίδος, τί δὲ νικῇς;
– Κασμύλος Εὐαγόρου, Πύθια πύξ, Ῥόδιος.

Say who you are, whose son, from what country, and in what a victor. – Casmylus, son of Evagoras, victor in boxing at the Pythian games, a Rhodian.

Not only is Simonidean authorship, as almost always, uncertain, but so is a date for the poem. The boxer from Rhodes, Casmylus, was the subject of a lost *Isthmian* by Pindar (cf. frs. 2–3 Maehler), and as it is difficult to imagine that he was important in subsequent periods, the most obvious hypothesis is that the poem celebrating him was contemporary with him. Page, however, pointed to the dialogue form of the epigram as an indication of 'Alexandrian ingenuity' and hence of a Hellenistic dating.[75] Such 'ingenuity' is, however, not in fact a prerogative of the Hellenistic age. A dialogue between the passer-by and the dead or the dedicator, about the monument erected for him or by him, occurs already in the comic 'dialogues with statues' of the fifth century (Aristophanes, *Clouds* 1478–85; Plato Com., *PCG* 204, Phrynichus, *PCG* 61)[76] and is perfectly understandable in the light of the strong archaic tradition in which inscriptions speak in the first person.[77] After all, reading a funerary or dedicatory inscription meant first of all, in anthropological terms, performing a kind of ritual to commemorate the dead or the dedicator. Inscriptions in dialogue form express the questions that the reader/passer-by is to put to the monument; they offer precise instructions, by which the person who had the monument set up guides the passer-by, point by point, in the execution of the ritual, often taking precautions against an 'imperfect' ritual by a hasty passer-by, through admonitions not to hurry, but to take one's time to read. Such instructions are very common in sepulchral inscriptions of all periods.[78]

There are at least two other metrical inscriptions which are closely parallel to that for Casmylus, and which can be dated in all probability to roughly

[75] Cf. *FGE* p. 245; against, U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and G. Karo, *AthMitt* 45 (1920) 159–60 and Kassel (1983) 11.

[76] Cf. Kassel (1983).

[77] Cf. M. Burzachechi, 'Oggetti parlanti nelle epigrafi greche' *Epigraphica* 24 (1962) 3–54; A. E. Raubitschek, 'Das Denkmal-Epigramm' in *L'Épigramme grecque* 9–26; Svenbro (1993) 26–43.

[78] Cf. J. W. Day, 'Early Greek Grave Epigrams and Monuments' *JHS* 109 (1989) 22–7 and 'Interactive Offerings: Early Greek Dedicatory Epigrams and Ritual' *HSCPh* 96 (1994) 43–6. As Meyer (forthcoming) chapter A.1.3 observes, an essential distinction between the reception of a literary text and that of an inscription is the discretional character of the latter: a guest at a banquet will rarely go away when the bard starts singing, but the passer-by may not stop to read.

the same period. One is a dedication from Halicarnassus, dated to the first half of the fifth century[79] (*CEG* 429 = *SGO* 01/12/05):

αὐδὴ τεχνήεσσα λίθο, λέγε τίς τόδ' ἄ[γαλμα]
στῆσεν Ἀπόλλωνος βωμὸν ἐπαγλαί[σας.]
Παναμύης υἱὸς Κασβώλλιος, εἴ μ' ἐπ[οτρύνεις]
ἐξειπε͂ν, δεκάτην τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε θε[ῷ].[80]

Artful voice of stone, tell me who set up this dedication and decorated the altar of Apollo. Panamyes, the son of Kasbollis – if you urge me to speak out – dedicated this tithe to the god.

Another funerary inscription from Thessaly, dated about 450 BC (*CEG* 120), is engraved on the plinth of a column which evidently supported a sphinx[81]; in the first two verses the passer-by addresses the sphinx, and the second couplet must have contained the answer:[82]

σφίξ, hαίδ[α]ο κύον, τίν' ε[. . . .]οπιν[. . φυ]λάσεις
hεμέν[α . .]ρο[. . . . . .]δο[.] ἀπο<φ>θιμ[ένο];
ξεῖ[ν(ε) (◡̄◡) – ◡̄◡ – ◡ ἀπο]φϑ[ιμένο(ιο) (◡) ◡ – –]
[– ◡̄◡ – ◡̄◡ – – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ –]

'Sphinx, deadly dog, whose corpse do you sit and guard . . .?' 'Stranger . . . of the dead . . .'

Together with these epigrams,[83] we should place other inscriptions of the late fifth and fourth centuries, which, so to speak, imply dialogue: they suggest the possibility of a question or at least a comment by the passer-by, but they express only the answer. The earliest is an Attic dedicatory inscription of the beginning of the fifth century, *CEG* 286:

πᾶσιν ἴσ' ἀνθρόποις hυποκρίνομαι hόστις ἐ[ρο]τᾶι
hός μ' ἀνέθεκ' ἀνδρο͂ν· Ἀντιφάνες δεκάτεν.

To all men I answer the same, whoever asks which man dedicated me: Antiphanes, as a tithe.

79 Cf. H. J. Rose, *CR* 37 (1923) 162–3. Panamyes also appears in an inscription from Halicarnassus which can be dated between 465 and 450: cf. R. Meiggs–D. Lewis, (n. 23), no. 32.

80 Cf. Svenbro (1993) 56–62. The paradoxical nature of the 'voice' of the tombstone is also noted in *SCO* 05/01/42 = *GVI* 1745, of the third century BC: (πέτρα) ἀφθόγγῳ φθεγγομένα στόματι '(stone) that speaks with a voiceless mouth'.

81 For the frequent representation of the sphinx on a *stele* as the 'guardian' of the tomb, cf. E. Vermeule, *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry* (Berkeley 1979) 171; Woysch-Méautis (1982) 83–7.

82 The opening of v. 3 has been variously interpreted as ξεῖνε (Peek) or as the genitive of a proper name (e.g. Ξεινοκράτεος, Friedländer).

83 Cf. Kassel (1983) 11.

Parallel to this is *AP* 6.269 = *FGE* 672ff., whose origin as an inscription is clear both by the heading in the anthology, ὡς Σαπφοῦς, 'in the manner of Sappho',[84] and by the obvious exploitation of a monumental context:

> παῖδες, ἄφωνος ἐοῖσα ποτεννέπω, αἴ τις ἔρηται,
> φωνὰν ἀκαμάταν κατθεμένα πρὸ ποδῶν·
> Αἰθοπίᾳ με κόρᾳ Λατοῦς ἀνέθηκεν Ἀρίστα
> †Ἑρμοκλείταο† τῶ Σαϋναϊάδα,
> σὰ πρόπολος, δέσποινα γυναικῶν·ᾇ σὺ χαρεῖσα
> πρόφρων ἁμετέραν εὐκλέισον γενεάν.

Children, though I am a dumb stone, if anyone asks, then I answer clearly, having set down at my feet the words I am never weary of speaking: 'Arista, daughter of Hermocl- (?) the son of Sauneus, dedicated me to Artemis Aethiopia. Your ministrant is she, sovereign lady of women; rejoice in this her gift of herself, and be willing to glorify our race'. (trans. Paton)

A question by the passer-by is also implicit in the second couplet of an Attic inscription of about 350 BC (*CEG* 545): 'The earth has the bones and the flesh of the sweet boy [. . .] if you ask my name [. . .], I am Theogeiton, etc.', and we may also note another Attic sepulchral inscription of the late fourth century (*CEG* 596), where a bilingual (Greek-Aramaic) metrical *titulus*, containing the personal information about the dead, together with the depiction of a lion and a figure, half-human, half-prow of a ship, is accompanied on the tombstone by an epigram:

> μηθεὶς ἀνθρώπων θαυμαζέτω εἰκόνα τήνδε,
> ὡς περὶ μέν με λέων, περὶ δὲγ᾽ πρῷρ᾽ ἰγκτετάνυσται·
> ἦλθε γὰρ εἰχθρολέων τἀμὰ θέλων σποράσαι·
> ἀλλὰ φίλοι τ᾽ ἤμυναν καί μου κτέρισαν τάφον οὕτῃ
> οὓς ἔθελον φιλέων, ἱερᾶς ἀπὸ νηὸς ἰόντες·
> Φοινίκην δ᾽ ἔλιπον, τεῖδε χθονὶ σῶμα κέκρυνμαι.

Let no one wonder at this image, that on one side a lion stretches out, on the other the prow of a ship. A hostile lion came, wishing to tear me apart. But my friends fought for me and buried me here, the friends whom I most wanted, coming from the holy ship. I left Phoenicia, and my body is buried here in the earth.

Here the opening anticipates and answers the surprised question of the passer-by about the meaning of the figures (cf. further below, pp. 329–30).[85]

In the inscriptions discussed so far, the epigraphic text acts to complete the message of the tomb, which is transmitted in part symbolically

[84] Cf. *FGE* pp. 181–2.
[85] Another Attic inscription of the fourth century, *CEG* 512, also has a dialogic form, but the dialogue is not between the reader and the statue or the tombstone, but between the figures of two dead people, mother and son, who are buried next to each other and portrayed on the *stele*.

by a statue, by an object that the inscription accompanies, or by a figure engraved on the tombstone. These inscriptions, however, do not perform their didactic function descriptively – that is to say, they do not describe what the passer-by/reader can 'see'; they presuppose the inscribed monument, which either speaks in the first person, or is indicated briefly by means of a deictic pronoun or adjective. They thus transform the act of vision (of the monument) and of reading (of the supplementary verbal message) into an act of verbal dialogue, which, even if fixed in writing, creates a typically oral situation of communication between the ignorant passer-by/reader and the stēlē or the dead person. In only one case, which also displays an unconventional metrical structure,[86] do we find a change in these rôles, and the person who seems at the beginning of the epigram to have the rôle of the passer-by turns out to be very well informed, with the result that he can anticipate the self-description of the *stele*, which depicts a bearded man and a woman (Onesimos and Melite), *CEG* 530:

χαῖρε τάφος Μελίτης· χρηστὴ γυνὴ ἐνθάδε κεῖται·
φιλοῦντα[87] ἀντιφιλοῦσα τὸν ἄνδρα Ὀνήσιμον ἦσθα κρατίστη·
τοιγαροῦν ποθεῖ θανοῦσάν σε, ἦσθα γὰρ χρηστὴ γυνή.
– καὶ σὺ χαῖρε φίλτατ' ἀνδρῶν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐμοὺς φίλει.

'Hail tomb of Melite: a good woman lies here; returning the love of your husband Onesimos, you were the best of women. Therefore in death he misses you, for you were a good woman.' 'And you too, hail, dearest husband, and cherish my children.'

Even if he received the χαῖρε of the dead woman which is usually addressed to the passer-by (v. 4), and even if he speaks of himself and of his own image on the stele in the third person (v. 3), the speaker of the first three verses must be Onesimos, as is confirmed by Melite's final exhortation: 'Love my dear ones', and as the ancient reader of the inscription will have understood at once from the depiction of a man standing up and talking to a woman. The speaker is thus the person who had the stela set up, who is obviously as well informed as the stele itself, even if he here assumes the rôle which is usually played by the uninformed passer-by.[88]

Dialogic inscriptions survive in their traditional forms into the Hellenistic age (cf. e.g. *GVI* 1833 and 1850, of the second century; 1851, 1859, of the

[86] Two hexameters and two catalectic trochaic tetrameters, a sequence for which no parallels are known to me in metrical inscriptions.

[87] The participle is an addition *extra metrum* to the text, probably requested by someone (perhaps Onesimus) who was interested in recording Onesimus' feelings. It has also been suggested (e.g. Pircher (1979) 39) that the second verse is an imperfect hexameter.

[88] Cf. Walsh (1991) 86–7.

second/first century; 1882, of the first century), and appear to have become a real fashion under the Roman Empire (*GVI* 1835–1849; 1860–1872; 1883–1887), to the point that they generated a parody by Paulus Silentiarius, *AP* 7.307:[89]

> Οὔνομά μοι . . . – Τί δὲ τοῦτο; – Πατρὶς δέ μοι . . . – Ἐς τί δὲ τοῦτο;
> – Κλεινοῦ δ᾽ εἰμὶ γένους. – Εἰ γὰρ ἀφαυροτάτου;
> – Ζήσας δ᾽ ἐνδόξως ἔλιπον βίον. – Εἰ γὰρ ἀδόξως;
> – Κεῖμαι δ᾽ ἐνθάδε νῦν. – Τίς τίνι ταῦτα λέγεις;

My name is . . . – What does it matter? – My country is . . . And what does that matter? – I am of noble race. – And if you were of the very dregs? – I quitted life with a good reputation – And had it been a bad one? – And I now lie here. – Who are you and to whom are you telling this? (trans. Paton)

From the third and second centuries BC on, however, we also find a different form of dialogic dramatisation, which does not transform the moment of vision and reading into a dialogue between the passer-by and the dead, but merely translates the act of reading by the passer-by into an act of listening; the message written on the monument is now pronounced by the monument itself. This form of presentation presupposes and, as it were, transforms into a narrative monologue the previous convention of true dialogue, leaving the responsibility for the message still with the inscription and/or the dead: cf. e.g. *GVI* 1620.1–3 (third/second century BC): ὁ τύμβος οὐκ ἄσαμος, ἁ δέ τοι πέτρος | τὸν κατθάνοντα σημανεῖ, τίς καὶ τίνος | ἐς Ἀίδαν βέβακεν, κτλ. 'the tomb is not without signs, and the stone will reveal the dead person: who, and the son of whom, has gone to Hades, etc.', 1745.3f. = *SGO* 05/01/42 (third century BC): ξεστὰ δὲ πέτρα καθύπερθε ἀγορεύει | τὸν νέκυν ἀφθόγγῳ φθεγγομένα στόματι, κτλ. 'above, the smooth stone announces the dead, speaking with a mouth without sounds, etc.', 1621.3 (second century BC) ∪ – ∪ – ∪ – ∪ ἀγγε]λεῖ γραφή, κτλ. 'the inscription will announce, etc.'.[90]

Inscriptions like those discussed so far are, more or less explicitly, 'words' that the convention of the speaking μνῆμα, whether dedicatory or funerary, lends to the stone, or to the dead person, or to the object to which the stone refers. As such, they presuppose that the passer-by/reader had in front of his eyes the monumental context of the dialogue, which was of course also

[89] Kaibel (1893) 51 rather fancifully hypothesised that the occasion (real or imaginary) for the epigram was the discovery of a fragmentary inscription in which a *homo insipidus* supplied foolish answers.

[90] Many other examples in *GVI* 1622–1635. This compendious form of dialogue is not common in literary epigrams, but cf. Callimachus, *AP* 7.447 = *HE* 1209f., the pseudo-Theocritean *AP* 7.262 = *HE* 3504f., and Antipater Sid., *AP* 7.425.3 = *HE* 382.

the subject of the dialogue: the passer-by was expected to ask about the monument, not about anything else. When epigram-writers began to link their names with the text of single epigrams, and to consider a circulation for texts separate from inscription on stone, and hence a reception which did not involve actual vision of a monument, it was to be expected that this would affect the character of the dialogue itself.

In fact, literary epigrams of the third and second centuries present a mixed picture. Some very faithfully follow epigraphical traditions, with the presupposition of a monumental context: a passer-by asks questions and a tombstone or monument explains itself. Examples of this kind include Leonidas, *AP* 7.503 = *HE* 2355ff. and *AP* 7.163 = *HE* 2395ff.,[91] Phalaecus, *AP* 13.5 = *HE* 2939ff.,[92] Theaetetus, *AP* 6.357 = *HE* 3342ff., Theodoridas, *AP* 6.224 = *HE* 3524ff., Philetas of Samos, *AP* 7.481 = *HE* 3028ff.,[93] [Theocritus], *AP* 7.262 = *HE* 3504ff.[94] There are, however, also other more ambiguous epigrams which play on the absence of the monumental context. An interesting case is Nicias, *AP* 6.122 = *HE* 2755ff.:

Μαινὰς Ἐνυαλίου, πολεμαδόκε, θοῦρι κράνεια,
τίς νύ σε θῆκε θεᾷ δῶρον ἐγερσιμάχᾳ;
– Μήνιος· ἦ γὰρ τοῦ παλάμας ἄπο ῥίμφα θοροῦσα
ἐν προμάχοις Ὀδρύσας δήιον ἂμ πεδίον.

Maenad of Ares, sustainer of war, impetuous javelin, who now has set you here, a gift to the goddess who awakes the battle? – Menios; for by springing lightly from his hand in the forefront of the fight I wrought havoc among the Odrysae on the plain. (trans. Paton, adapted)

This dedication of a javelin contrasts its present immobility with its past violent speed. This was probably a common type of dedicatory epigram by

[91] Leonidas was imitated by Antipater Sid., *AP* 7.164 = *HE* 302ff., who even copied the name of the dead person (!); see also the further variations of Antipater or Archias, *AP* 7.165 = *GPh* 3658ff., and of Amyntes, *SH* 43 = *FGE* 13ff. (cf. also Agathias, *AP* 7.552). A later dedicatory parallel is offered by Philip of Thessalonica, *AP* 6.259 = *GPh* 2789ff.

[92] The text is corrupt and the division of lines controversial. In all probability, the epigram is in the form of a dialogue between a passer-by and the *four* characters on a monument; so, most recently, Gow-Page and Buffière. The exegesis of Kaibel (1893) 50–1, followed by Beckby, according to which the dialogue is between only two characters commemorated by the statue or the relief, is much less likely.

[93] Here, the dialogue is not between the dead person and the passer-by, but between the father of the little girl, who will have been depicted on the *stele*, and the girl herself, likewise portrayed on the *stele*: cf. *CEG* 512.

[94] 'The inscription will say which tomb it is, and who lies beneath it: "I am the tomb of the famous Glauce"', which finds a precise parallel in *GVI* 1625 (first century BC)'The stele will tell you of my destiny, and the letters engraved on it will tell of my death and the name of my parents [. . .] my name is Ploutos, and at the age of three I arrived at the threshold of Hades, etc.' For Glauce, however, seeing that she is ὀνομαζομένη 'famous', no other details are necessary, as Walsh (1991) 87 observes.

Nicias' time; its roots lie perhaps in Alcaeus' description of an arms-room (fr. 140 V.),[95] and other examples are found in [Simonides], *AP* 6.52 = *FGE* 932ff., Mnasalces, *AP* 6.125 and 128 = *HE* 2611–2620, and Antiphilus of Byzantium, *AP* 6.97 = *GPh* 909ff. There is a close parallel in Anyte, *AP* 6.123 = *HE* 664ff.:[96]

> Ἕσταθι τᾷδε, κράνεια βροτοκτόνε, μηδ' ἔτι λυγρόν
> χάλκεον ἀμφ' ὄνυχα στάζε φόνον δαίων·
> ἀλλ' ἀνὰ μαρμάρεον δόμον ἡμένα αἰπὺν Ἀθάνας,
> ἄγγελλ' ἀνορέαν Κρητὸς Ἐχεκρατίδα.

Stand here, you murderous javelin, no longer drip from your brazen barb the dismal blood of foes; but resting in the high marble house of Athena, announce the bravery of Cretan Echecratidas. (trans. Paton)

Anyte, perhaps writing before Nicias, gives greater prominence to her relationship with the lyric-archaic model of Alcaeus: χάλκεον[. . .] μαρμάρεον δόμον picks up μαρμαίρει δὲ μέγας δόμος χάλκῳ 'the great hall sparkles with bronze' etc. in Alcaeus.

Anyone who read Nicias' epigram in its monumental context, next to the dedicated javelin, will not have had any doubts about its interpretation. The visible dedication will have made clear that 'Maenad of Enyalius' was a metaphor for 'fury of Ares', a metaphor of a common kind in which Dionysus and Ares were often involved.[97] The reaction of a reader of the epigram in book form will have been different, and Nicias may have wanted to suspend understanding by means of the metaphorical μαινάς and the ambiguous Ἐνυάλιος, which was both one of the names of Ares and (less commonly) an epithet of Dionysus.[98] Anyone who encountered the epigram without its monumental context, however, might until the clear signals of v. 2 have been led to suppose that the apostrophe was addressed to the statue of a 'Maenad of Dionysus', and that Enyalius was to be interpreted in its secondary, less common meaning; the uncertainty would only

[95] Cf. M. B. Bonanno, *L'allusione necessaria: ricerche intertestuali sulla poesia greca e latina* (Rome 1990) 125–46.

[96] The standard view, deriving from Reitzenstein (1893) 123–5, is that Anyte is the model for Nicias. This has recently been denied by Bernsdorff (2001) 113–14, in the course of a detailed survey, which lowers the chronology of Anyte, traditionally considered to be an authoress of the very first generation of Hellenistic epigram-writers. The use of κράνεια in the sense 'javelin' is found only in these two poems and would seem to guarantee a relationship between them. The ambiguity of Nicias' opening might point to the priority of Anyte.

[97] Timotheus had called the shield 'the drinking-bowl of Ares' (*PMG* 797) and 'cup of Ares' to mean 'shield' or 'shield of Dionysus' to mean 'cup' are typical examples of a metaphor by analogy, according to Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.1407a14–15; cf. also *Rhet.* 3.1412b34 and *Poet.* 1457b20–1.

[98] Cf. *PMG* 1027b, Macrob., *Sat.* 1.19.1: 'Bacchus has the name of Ἐνυάλιος, which is also one of the names used for Mars'.

be increased by κράνεια, which normally means 'cornel tree', but here is used for a spear made from cornel-wood. Someone, of course, who knew Anyte's poem, if it was indeed the earlier of the two, will have understood from the end of v. 1 that the subject was a javelin, and that the starting-point for the initial metaphor was the Homeric custom of personifying lances and the hands of warriors who brandish them through the use of the verb μαίνεσθαι.[99] Nevertheless, initial misunderstanding will have been even more likely if, at the beginning of the third century, the *ekphrasis* of statues in dialogue form was already a common epigrammatic form. An example from the late third century was inscribed on the plinth of a statue of Lysippus the Younger:[100] φώνει μοι, μικ(κ)ός, τίς σ᾽ ἔπλασε καὶ τίνος εἶ παῖς, | ἀτρεκέως, εἴ σοι γλῶσ(σ)α νέα λέλυται, κτλ. 'tell me truly, little boy, who formed you and whose child you are, if your young tongue is loosened up, etc.'. Other examples involving statues of Bacchants include [Simonides], *APlan.* 60 = *FGE* 914f., Τίς ἅδε; – Βάκχα. – Τίς δέ νιν ξέσε; – Σκόπας. | – Τίς δ᾽ ἐξέμηνε, Βάκχος ἢ Σκόπας; – Σκόπας 'Who is this? – A Bacchant – Who sculpted it? – Skopas. – Who inspired the passion, Bacchus or Skopas? – Skopas', and the non-dialogic Glaucus of Athens, *AP* 9.774, 775 = *GPh* 3869–74, Paulus Silentarius, *APlan.* 57 and adesp. *APlan.* 58.[101] Thus Nicias' epigram, with its metaphorical use of κράνεια, perhaps in competition with Anyte's, fully exploited the ambiguities created in dialogues between passer-by and inscription, when these epigrams could be read without the monumental context to which they refer.

Other epigram-writers too used the absence of the monumental context to problematise, while pretending to adopt, the dialogic conventions of the epigraphical tradition, which continued to be followed faithfully by many literary epigrams. Consider Dioscorides, *AP* 7.430 = *HE* 1657ff.:

τίς τὰ νεοσκύλευτα ποτὶ δρυὶ τᾷδε καθᾶψεν
  ἔντεα; τῶ πέλτα Δωρὶς ἀναγράφεται;
πλάθει γὰρ Θυρεᾶτις ὑφ᾽ αἵματος ἅδε λοχιτᾶν,
  χἀμὲς ἀπ᾽ Ἀργείων τοὶ δύο λειπόμεθα.
– πάντα νέκυν μάστευε δεδουπότα, μή τις ἔτ᾽ ἔμπνους
  λειπόμενος Σπάρτᾳ κῦδος ἔλαμψε νόθον.
– ἴσχε βάσιν. νίκα γὰρ ἐπ᾽ ἀσπίδος ὧδε Λακώνων
  φωνεῖται θρόμβοις αἵματος Ὀθρυάδα,

[99] For lances that 'rage', cf. *Iliad* 8.111 and 16.75; for the hands of warriors, cf. 16.244–5.
[100] Text of R. Herzog, 'Epigramm der Kinderstatue eines Lysippos in Kos' in *Schumacher-Festschrift* (Mainz 1930) 207–8; see also J. D. Beazley and A. S. F. Gow, *CR* 43 (1929) 120–2.
[101] The epigrams attributed to Simonides are notoriously difficult to date; Glaucus of Athens would appear to be later than Nicias.

χὠ τόδε μοχθήσας σπαίρει πέλας. – ὦ πρόπατορ Ζεῦ,
στύξον ἀνικάτω σύμβολα φυλόπιδος.

Who hung the newly-stripped arms on this oak? By whom is the Dorian shield inscribed? For this land of Thyrea is soaked with the blood of champions and we are the only two left of the Argives. – Seek out every fallen corpse, lest any left alive illuminate Sparta in spurious glory. – Nay! Stay your steps, for here on the shield the victory of the Spartans is announced by the clots of Othryadas' blood, and he who wrought this still gasps hard by. – O Zeus our ancestor, look with loathing on those tokens of a victory that was not won. (trans. Paton, adapted)

This epigram was included 'by mistake' in Book 7 of the Palatine Anthology, but, despite its opening, it is not a votive offering. After the first couplet, which clearly recalls dialogic dedications, the reader, who is unaware of the fact that this epigram could never be connected with any monument, expects an answer. The poem develops, however, as a mimetic-dialogic re-evocation of the night following the battle of Thyrea.

The Argives and the Spartans had decided to solve the question of the possession of Thyrea by staging a fight between three hundred Spartans and three hundred Argives. At the end, the two Argives who were left alive thought that they were the only survivors and therefore considered themselves the winners (cf. Herodotus 1.82.5: 'thinking that they had won, they ran back to Argos'); but one Spartan, Othryades, had also survived, and he seized the arms of the fallen Argives and took them to the Spartan camp as a sign of victory. Already by Herodotus' time, the story of this battle was subject to romantic variations: 'according to some people', the historian informs us, Othryades committed suicide from guilt at being the only one who returned home, while his fellow-soldiers had fallen on the battlefield. Dioscorides is our earliest datable witness to a version in which Othryades, with the arms he had taken from the Argives, erected a formal trophy and inscribed on it in his own blood a declaration of Spartan victory.[102] This battle was, however, very popular with Hellenistic epigrammatists, and Dioscorides will not have invented his version; an epigram of uncertain date ascribed to Simonides (*AP* 7.431 = *HE* 3334ff.) mentions the shield, 'stained with the manly blood of Othryades', and Nicander, *AP* 7.526 = *HE* 2723ff. describes Othryades as the one who 'had inscribed the spoils captured from the Inachidai (i.e. the Argives)'. Instead of offering the usual 'dialogic reading' of the dedicatory inscription, as the opening appears to announce, Dioscorides expands on the story of the origin of the inscription itself,

[102] This version, which enjoyed great fortune in the early imperial age, is also adopted by the two historians Chrisermus and Theseus, *FGrHist* 287F2 and 453F2: cf. P. Kohlmann, 'Othryades' *RhM* 29 (1874) 463–80.

told in dialogue form through the words of the two Argives; moreover, the perspective from which Dioscorides organises the *aition* of the inscription reverses what a reader expected for dedicatory inscriptions, whether dialogic or otherwise. The ordinary point of view in such poems was, of course, that of the person making the dedication, but here it is that of the enemies of the dedicator; the value of the victory celebrated by the trophy of Othryades is thus denied and, instead of containing the usual prayer to the god to accept the dedication, the end of the poem consists of a prayer not to accept it. In this way, Dioscorides overturns the conventions of the dedicatory epigram and the expectations of readers.

It is Callimachus who plays most openly and frequently with the dialogue form in dedicatory and sepulchral epigrams. In at least two of his dedicatory epigrams, Callimachus exploits the epigraphical convention of the talking monument, as the spokesman of the person who had it set up.[103] These two epigrams are *AP* 6.147 = *HE* 1157ff.

τὸ χρέος ὡς ἀπέχεις, Ἀσκληπιέ, τὸ πρὸ γυναικός
Δημοδίκης Ἀκέσων ὤφελεν εὐξάμενος,
γινώσκειν· ἢν δ᾽ ἄρα λάθῃ καὶ <δίς> μιν ἀπαιτῇς,
φησὶ παρέξεσθαι μαρτυρίην ὁ πίναξ.

Acknowledge, Asklepios, that the vow Akeson made for his wife Demodice's recovery is hereby 'Paid in full'. If you forget and bill me again, this tablet says it is my receipt. (trans. Nisetich)

and *AP* 6.149 = *HE* 1161ff.:

φησὶν ὅ με στήσας Εὐαίνετος (οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
γινώσκω) νίκης ἀντί με τῆς ἰδίης
ἀγκεῖσθαι χάλκειον ἀλέκτορα Τυνδαρίδῃσι·
πιστεύω Φαίδρου παιδὶ Φιλοξενίδεω.

Euainetos put me here, saying (I don't know myself) that he dedicates me to the sons of Tyndareus, a bronze cock in return for a victory I won. Just so: the son of Phaidros, grandson of Philoxenos, has spoken. (trans. Nisetich)

In both cases, the truth of the traditional information presented in the first person by the inscription, namely the reason for the dedication, is ironically problematised. In the first case, the author's point of view attributes to the inscription the somewhat comic desire to act as a sort of formal 'receipt', guaranteeing Akeson against the possibility of a second request for thanksgiving from the god: nothing could be farther from the usual devout tone of dedications. In the second case, the point of view is indeed that of the

103 Cf. Meyer (1993a) 166; Gutzwiller (1998) 192–3.

talking monument, but it is a monument that expresses itself very idiosyncratically. The epigram underlines the paradox of a bronze object which speaks,[104] while the parenthetic 'I don't know myself' stresses both that a bronze object cannot have a perception of facts[105] and, in particular, cannot know about a victory alleged to have taken place before it was created. The talking cock monument is indeed prepared to credit the affirmations of the dedicator, but it also humorously makes clear that if an object 'speaks', it can only be the spokesman of the dedicator.

In another poem of Callimachus (*AP* 6.351 = *HE* 1151f.), it is not the passer-by who apostrophises the dedicated monument, but rather we see a preliminary phase, in which the dedicator presents his gift for acceptance by the god:

Τίν με, λεοντάγχ' ὦνα συοκτόνε, φήγινον ὄζον
θῆκε. – Τίς; – Ἀρχῖνος· – Ποῖος; – Ὁ Κρής· – Δέχομαι.

For you, Lord, Lion-strangler, Boar-slayer, I, an oak club, from – Who? – Archinos. – Of? – Crete – Got it. (trans. Nisetich)

The novelty of the speaker is increased by the further ambiguity of the manner and the tone in which the divine interlocutor expresses himself: the gesture of impatience with which he interrupts the pompous words of the dedicator, together with the almost monosyllabic brevity of his questions, do not suggest so much the benevolent majesty of a god receiving a gift, as the rudely imperious haste of a Ptolemaic official, to whom a humble citizen has offered a small present.[106] Rather similar is Callimachus, *AP* 7.277 = *HE* 1265ff.:

Τίς, ξένος ὦ ναυηγέ; Λεόντιχος ἐνθάδε νεκρόν
εὗρεν ἐπ' αἰγιαλοῦ, χῶσε δὲ τῷδε τάφῳ
δακρύσας ἐπίκηρον ἑὸν βίον· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτός
ἥσυχος, αἰθυίῃ δ' ἶσα θαλασσοπορεῖ.

Who are you, shipwrecked traveller? Leontichos found your corpse here on the beach, and piled this grave with a tear for his own hazardous life: he too, without peace, like a gull, roams the sea. (trans. Nisetich, adapted)

The opening four words suggest the usual question about the identity of the dead, but this question remains unanswered. In the nineteenth century, attempts were made to emend the text, so as to obtain a request about the

104 Cf. Meyer (forthcoming) chapter B.3.4.
105 That 'written discourse' can be 'endowed with reason' is denied in the passage of Plato's *Phaedrus* quoted below, p. 322.
106 Cf. G. Luck, 'Witz und Sentiment im griechischen Epigramm' in *L'Épigramme grecque* 392–3.

identity of the person who had buried the dead, but the transmitted text lends itself, in fact, to two interpretations, both of which are plausible and presuppose a frustration of the expectations aroused by the tradition of the dialogic inscription. Callimachus may simply have left the initial question suspended, eliminating any answer at all. It is, however, more likely that Callimachus plays on the ambiguity created by the ellipse of the verb in the first hemistich. The ancient reader expected the ellipse of εἶ ('Who are you, shipwrecked stranger?'), but Callimachus also suggests and favours the possibility of the ellipse of χῶσε ('Who buried you, shipwrecked stranger?').[107] With either interpretation, the poem draws attention to the fact that there is no answer to the traditional question – it is unnecessary to force the epigram into a dialogue structure, by emending εὗρεν to εὗρε μ᾽ at the beginning of v. 2.[108] On the more likely reading, however, Callimachus inserts his own reflection in place of the answer to the conventional question, thus challenging the reader to understand why there was no answer; the reason is, in fact, that the convention of question and answer about the identity of the dead person clashed with another convention, attested only in literary epigrams and only from the third century onwards, namely that epitaphs for the shipwrecked were anonymous.[109]

Another epigram, once again by Callimachus (*AP* 7.522 = *HE* 1227ff.), is a sort of *mise en scène* of the act of reading and recognition, or – better – lack of recognition, of the monumental context. This, however, is not the reading of an uninformed passer-by, but a highly personalised reading by a far from generic figure, one who is so well informed as to rival the monument itself and to be able to fill out its message:[110]

> Τιμονόη. τίς δ᾽ ἐσσί; μὰ δαίμονας, οὔ σ᾽ ἂν ἐπέγνων,
> εἰ μὴ Τιμοθέου πατρὸς ἐπῆν ὄνομα
> στήλῃ καὶ Μήθυμνα τεὴ πόλις. ἦ μέγα φημί
> χῆρον ἀνιᾶσθαι σὸν πόσιν Εὐθυμένη.

Timonoe. Which Timonoe are you? By the gods, I would not have known you, had not the name of your father Timotheus come next on the *stēlē*, and Methymna,

[107] Other exegeses have been attempted: cf. P. Waltz, vol. iv of the Budé *Anthologie*, p. 174.
[108] As T. L. Agar, *CQ* 17 (1923) 83 does, followed by Gow-Page.
[109] Cf. above, pp. 292–3; for a different interpretation, see Gutzwiller (1998) 208–9. The same logic might lie behind Serapion, *AP* 7.400 = *GPh* 3404ff.: 'Whose skull is this? – That of a man who worked hard. – Then you will have been a merchant or a fisherman in the blind wave. – Tell mortal men that they take pains to accomplish other hopes, but this hope here is the one that we have access to'.
[110] Cf. Meyer (1993a) 166; Walsh (1991) 97–103. *Pace* P. Künzle, *RFIC* 11 (1933) 76, *GVI* 1845 is not parallel to Callimachus' poem, for that poem has a traditional 'generic' passer-by.

your city. Euthymenes, your widowed husband, is full of grief: that's for sure. (trans. Nisetich, adapted)

The implication that the figural representation, whether iconic[111] or aniconic,[112] by which the tomb indicated the identity of the dead woman was inadequate suggests a sort of historical and metaliterary reflection on the nature of sepulchral inscriptions, underlining the indispensability of the verbal element for a correct understanding of the iconic element.[113] At the same time, however, the passer-by/reader of the inscription (in actual fact, the author) also occupies the space of the standard epitaphic comment, and, together with the essential personal information, he includes his own highly personalised message. The inscription does not give any answer, on behalf of the dead woman, to the usual question of the passer-by/reader about her identity; Callimachus literally denies the inscription the right to speak, by substituting for the comment of the inscription the process of decoding what he sees engraved on the stele.[114] As a result, the initial τίς δ' ἐσσί unexpectedly proves to come from the soliloquy that follows the reading of the name of the dead woman in the inscription, and not from a dialogue between reader and tomb. Moreover, in the final sentence Callimachus comments emotionally himself, instead of repeating the standard phrases by which the spouse or the parents, who had set up the monument, expressed their mourning for the dead;[115] it is as if he were saying, "I, Callimachus, am telling you this; I knew Timonoe well, so this is not the usual rhetorical and generic expression you might find on a funerary stele".[116] The emotional reactions of the poet, not those of the person who commissioned the work, remain in the foreground from beginning to end; together with the process of reading, the poet's gradual discovery and his own feelings are dramatised, and we recognise here the Callimachus we know, the shrewd 'detective' and psychologist of the erotic epigrams. It is in fact difficult to say whether this epigram is closer to dialogues between

[111] Cf. Weisshäupl (1889) 95–6. Sepulchral portraits, could be not only badly executed but also generic, paying little or no attention to the specific physiognomy of the dead: cf. Clairmont (1970) 62.

[112] Cf. E. Livrea, 'Tre epigrammi funerari callimachei' (1990), now in Livrea (1993) 92–3.

[113] Iulianus Aegypt., *AP* 7.565 'The painter has portrayed Theodota perfectly (αὐτὴν Θειοδότην ὁ ζωγράφος). Ah, if only his art had betrayed him! He would have granted oblivion to us, who weep for her' represents a contrasting use of the same motif, and perhaps an imitation of Callimachus.

[114] Cf. Meyer (1993a) 166 and Meyer (forthcoming) chapter B.3.5.

[115] Some examples from the fourth century: *CEG* 477, 485, 503, 511, 585.

[116] As W. Kullmann, 'Kallimachos in Alexandrien und Rom' in *Candide iudex: Beiträge zur augusteische Dichtung. Festschrift für W. Wimmel* (Stuttgart 1998) 170 observes, the reader of this epigram has the impression that he is not dealing with the usual *captatio benevolentiae*, but rather acknowledging the reactions provoked in a reader by a successful reading of the epitaph.

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

passer-by and monument or to erotic epigrams like *AP* 12.71 = *HE* 1097–1102 (below p. 338): 'O Thessalian Kleonikos, poor, poor you! By the bright sun, I didn't recognise you. Poor wretch, what has happened to you? Only your bones and hair are left. Are you possessed by the same daimon that dominates me? Have you had this ill fortune? I understand. Euxitheos has enchanted you, too, etc.'

A narrativised and contracted variant of the dialogue form, which is to be interpreted in the light of typically Hellenistic inscriptions such as *GVI* 1620 (above), is Callimachus, *AP* 7.447 = *HE* 1209–10:

σύντομος ἦν ὁ ξεῖνος· ὃ καὶ στίχος οὐ μακρὰ λέξων
"Θῆρις Ἀρισταίου Κρὴς" ἐπ' ἐμοὶ δολιχός.

The stranger was short, his epitaph verse will also not be long: 'Theris son of Aristaios, of Crete' is long on me.

The future tense of λέξων in v. 1, about which doubts have been expressed,[117] has in fact many inscriptional parallels: the act of proclaiming a message is almost always in the future ('the stone will indicate who the dead person is', 'the inscription will announce' etc.),[118] and this is perfectly understandable, given that the passer-by would see the inscription before reading the message (i.e. the name) itself. The exegesis of the couplet is still controversial, but whatever the explanation of the excessive 'length' of the truly short Θῆρις Ἀρισταίου Κρής – the physical length of the inscription, compared with its stone, which was short because Theris was 'not tall', or perhaps rather its long-windedness, compared with the laconic Theris[119] – the voice of the poet, well informed about the dead, imposes itself on what remains, only formally, the voice of the tomb (ἐπ' ἐμοί); the poem once again problematises the suitability of the sepulchral message in the light of the superior, personal knowledge of the author. The epigram probably also alludes to the taste for ὀλιγοστιχία, an aesthetic preference which is typical of this poet in particular.[120]

[117] See most recently *HE* II.193 (with a survey of previous opinions) and P. Karpouzou in Pagonari-Antoniou (1997) 136. For μακρολογία 'long-windedness' as the opposite vice to συντομία, cf. Celentano (1995) 73–4.

[118] Cf. also [Theocritus], *AP* 7.262.1 = *HE* 3504 and Antipater Sid., *AP* 7.425.3 = *HE* 382.

[119] Cf. Celentano (1995) 75–6.

[120] Cf. Celentano (1995) 74–5. This does not mean, obviously, that this celebration of concision did not have precise contextual reasons; F. Cairns, 'The New Posidippus and Callimachus' in *Worte, Bilder, Töne. Studien zur Antike und Antikerezeption B. Kytzler zu ehren* (Würzburg 1996) 77–8 supposes that this virtue was particularly appreciated in a Cretan, seeing that the Cretans had a terrible reputation as liars.

Let us now consider Callimachus, *AP* 7.725 = *HE* 1233–7:[121]

Αἴνιε (καὶ σὺ γὰρ ὧδε) Μενέκρατες· οὐκ ἔτι πουλύς
ἦσθα;[122] τί σε, ξείνων λῷστε, κατειργάσατο;
ἦ ῥα τὸ καὶ Κένταυρον; – ὅ μοι πεπρωμένος ὕπνος
ἦλθεν, ὁ δὲ τλήμων οἶνος ἔχει πρόφασιν.

Menecrates of Ainos (you here, too!) were you not still in the prime of life? What destroyed you, O best of guests? Maybe what killed the Centaur too? – The sleep came which was destined to me, but insolent wine provides the reason. (trans. Nisetich, adapted)

Here Callimachus-the-reader is not a generic passer-by, but a close friend of the dead, and thus better informed, or at least more objective, than the inscription itself. Callimachus had imagined that Menecrates was still alive, because he was in the prime of life (ἔτι πουλύς); as soon as he discovers that he is dead – 'you here, too!' (i.e. in a cemetery) – the poet needs no inscription to guess what has happened. The poet himself has witnessed the sympotic excesses of this 'very dear guest' of his: Menecrates was as πουλύς 'imposing' as a Centaur, but wine destroyed him, just as it had destroyed the Homeric Centaur.[123] The inscription itself adds nothing to the poet's hypothesis, except for the self-justification which could be expected from the dead,[124] following in the wake of Elpenor in the *Odyssey*, who was led to his death by too much wine:[125] the fatal day came for Menecrates, and excessive drinking was no more than the contingent reason for his death.

That wine ἔχει πρόφασιν (v. 4) is open to different interpretations. If the words are given their usual meaning, then 'wine is justified/has an excuse for itself', i.e. it is to be forgiven, because fault is not to be attributed to it, but to inescapable destiny (cf. e.g. Demosthenes, *Adv. Leptinem* 140); alternatively, the phrase may be interpreted as 'wine supplies destiny with an excuse' (cf. e.g. Plato, *Rep*. 5.469c9), or 'wine provides the occasion for destiny' (cf. e.g. Herodotus 4.79.1).[126] On any interpretation, Menecrates disagrees with Callimachus' assessment of the cause of death,[127] and the

[121] I print the text and share the exegesis of M. Gronewald, 'Kallimachos Epigramm 42 G.-P. (61Pf.)' *ZPE* 100 (1994) 22–4.
[122] For the sequence οὐκ . . . ἦσθα, suspected, in my opinion wrongly, of being corrupt, cf. E. A. Barber, *CR* 4 (1954) 230 and G. Giangrande, *Hermes* 91 (1963) 154–6.
[123] Cf. *Od*. 21.295–6, Alcaeus Mess., *AP* 11.12 = *HE* 24ff., Nicarchus, *AP* 11.1.
[124] Cf. Hutchinson (1988) 73: 'Menecrates is indeed sensitive to the disreputable appearance of his decease'.
[125] In the Underworld, Elpenor explains to Odysseus: ἆσέ με δαίμονος αἶσα κακὴ καὶ ἀθέσφατος οἶνος 'the ill fortune of destiny and too much wine blinded me' (*Od*. 11.61).
[126] Cf. L. Pearson, '*Prophasis* and *Aitia*' *TAPhA* 83 (1952) 205–23.
[127] This is demonstrated by the highly probable imitation in [Virg.], *Cat*. 11.1–4: *Quis deus, Octavi, te nobis abstulit? An quae | dicunt, a, nimio pocula dura mero? | – Vobiscum, si est culpa, bibi; sua*

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

epigram turns on the contrast between the diplomatically softened truth of the presumed traditional inscription which Callimachus imagines that he observes, and the 'objective' voice of Callimachus-the-author which suggests a message similar to that of other epigrams 'for those who died of drink'[128] (such as Callimachus, *AP* 7.454 = *HE* 1325f.).[129] Here again we recognise the experienced psychologist familiar from the erotic epigrams.[130]

A different mode of variation of dialogic conventions is found in three other epigrams by Callimachus. Ideally, inscriptions should formulate the information that they wish to display in an articulate message, but the stone-cutters of archaic inscriptions were well aware of the limits of such messages. Inscriptions did not allow any possibility of feedback between the dead person and the passer-by; inscribed messages were unchangeable, and therefore remained deaf to the request of any future passer-by/'interlocutor',[131] as can be seen very clearly from *CEG* 286 (quoted on p. 308). A famous passage of Plato's *Phaedrus* (275d) makes this a characteristic of all writing:

> There is one strange element which truly unites writing and painting. The figures that are the fruit of painting stand in front of you as if they were alive, but if you ask them a question, they remain solemnly silent. The same thing happens in the case of written discourses. You might get the impression that they speak as if they had some sensible thoughts, but if you ask them about something that they have said, in order to understand it better, they continue to say one and the same thing.

The messages of archaic inscriptions remained limited either to information about the dead (identity, virtues, kind of death) or, something particularly common in Attic inscriptions from the late fourth century on, to the expectations of the relatives concerning the afterlife that awaited the dead as a result of their virtues. In three epigrams, however, Callimachus converses with the tomb to elicit from the dead information about the quality of (non-) life after death, a theme no less important in Hellenistic philosophy

quemque sequuntur | fata: quid immeriti crimen habent cyathi? 'What god, Octavius, took you away from us? Perhaps, as they say, the cruel cups of too much undiluted wine? – If it is an offence to drink, I shared it with you. Everyone has his own destiny: why accuse the cups of a fault that is not theirs?' On the meaning of πρόφασις, cf. H. R. Rawlings III, *A Semantic Study of Prophasis to 400 BC* (Wiesbaden 1975) and A. A. Nikitas, *Zur Bedeutung von* ΠΡΟΦΑΣΙΣ *in der altgriechischen Literatur* (Wiesbaden 1976).

[128] Leonidas, *AP* 7.455 = *HE* 2385ff. imitated by Antipater Sid. 7.353 = 356ff.; Dioscorides 7.456 = 1647ff.; Ariston 7.457 = 786ff.; Antipater Thess. 7.398 = *GPh* 423ff.; Marcus Arg. 7.384 = *GPh* 1469ff.; adesp. *AP* 7.329; adesp. *FGE* 1624ff.

[129] For this passage, I follow the interpretation of E. Livrea, 'Due epigrammi callimachei' (1989), now in Livrea (1993) 95–100. The reading οὐ βαθὺν, κτλ. attested by Athenaeus (and defended most recently by G. Giangrande, *Platon* 50 (1998) 3–10) is, however, tempting; Callimachean irony can never be ruled out.

[130] Cf. below, pp. 338–41.

[131] Cf. Svenbro (1993) 28–31.

than in Plato.[132] The motif of the dead person/tomb that transmits messages which are more wide-ranging than the conventional topics is developed by Callimachus also in the *Aitia* (fr. 64 Pf.) and the *Iambi* (11, cf. fr. 201 Pf.), though in both of these cases it is not the afterlife about which the dead instruct us, but rather their final moments on earth.

Let us begin with *AP* 7.524 = *HE* 1187ff.:

> Ἦ ῥ᾽ ὑπὸ σοὶ Χαρίδας ἀναπαύεται; – Εἰ τὸν Ἀρίμμα
> τοῦ Κυρηναίου παῖδα λέγεις, ὑπ᾽ ἐμοί.
> – Ὦ Χαρίδα, τί τὰ νέρθε; – Πολὺς σκότος. – Αἱ δ᾽ ἄνοδοι τί;
> – Ψεῦδος. – Ὁ δὲ Πλούτων; – Μῦθος. – Ἀπωλόμεθα.
> – Οὗτος ἐμὸς λόγος ὔμμιν ἀληθινός· εἰ δὲ τὸν ἡδύν
> βούλει, Πελλαίου βοῦς μέγας εἰν Ἀίδῃ.

Tell me, is Charidas buried here? – If it is the son of Arimmas of Cyrene you mean, he is here. – Charidas, how is it down there? – Very dark. – What of return? – A lie. – And Pluto? – A myth. – We are done for, then. – I have given you the truth. If you prefer a pleasantry, beef is a penny a pound in Hades. (trans. Nisetich, adapted)

The poet first apostrophises the tomb (ὑπὸ σοί) and then the deceased himself, whereas the 'talking' tomb conventionally spoke either in the first person or in the voice of the dead. Here a 'conventional' dialogue between passer-by and tomb leads into a conversation with the deceased Charidas; as the epigraphic tradition had so frequently imagined that not only the tomb, on behalf of the dead, but also the dead person himself could speak in the first person through the inscription, why should it not be considered legitimate to ask him for some more information, besides the usual details of identity, particularly as the tomb itself had already taken care of these details in the first couplet?

The second epigram in this group is *AP* 7.520 = *HE* 1199ff.:

> ἢν δίζῃ Τίμαρχον ἐν Ἄϊδος, ὄφρα πύθηαι
> ἤ τι περὶ ψυχῆς ἢ πάλι πῶς ἔσεαι,
> δίζεσθαι φυλῆς Πτολεμαΐδος υἱέα πατρός
> Παυσανίου· δήεις δ᾽ αὐτὸν ἐν εὐσεβέων.

If you search for Timarchus in Hades, to find out anything about the soul, or how you will exist again, search for the son of Pausanias of the tribe Ptolemais: you will find him among the pious. (trans. Nisetich, adapted)

The poem starts off in a similar manner to the second couplet of *CEG* 545: 'the earth has the bones and the flesh of the sweet boy, but his soul has

[132] Cf. Callimachus, *AP* 7.471 = *HE* 1272ff., on Cleombrotus, who committed suicide after reading the *Phaedo*.

gone to the chamber (θάλαμος) of the devout. *If you ask my name* (εἰ δὲ ὄνομα ζητεῖς), I who lie here in illustrious Athens am Theogeiton, the son of Thymouchos, a Theban by birth'; this and other epigraphic occurrences demonstrate that this conditional clause was a part of epitaphic formulaic language,[133] just as 'you will find him in the area of the devout' (δήεις δ' αὐτὸν ἐν εὐσεβέων) also alludes to such repetitive assertions. In *CEG* 545 and other inscriptions, however, 'if you ask my name etc.' refers to the usual curiosity of the uninformed passer-by about the name of the dead person,[134] but in Callimachus the addressee already knows who he is looking for, and the investigation in which he is imagined to be engaged from the beginning (ἢν δίζῃ) is completely different. Timarchus' personal details (v. 3) seem to be introduced only as necessary to trace him in Hades, together with his new 'address' (v. 4); the information that the passer-by would like to receive is not of the traditional kind about the deceased's identity, but rather first-hand information about the quality of life beyond the grave, and the whole epigram is centred on the possibility of such an extraordinary interview at this new, and highly unlikely, address in the Underworld.[135] By starting in the same way as sepulchral inscriptions, which elicited the conventional request from the passer-by about the identity of the dead person, and finishing with the equally conventional dwelling-place of the blessed, Callimachus makes the tomb itself speak the whole poem: an interview with the dead about life after death, which may be supposed to be a motif invented by Callimachus, is introduced within traditional epigraphic conventions, as if tombs could learn to speak with the intellectual voice of Callimachus, as the bronze cock of Euainetos had done (above pp. 316–17).

Thus far the primary meaning of the epigram. But if Callimachus' Timarchus was the Alexandrian Cynic philosopher, who was a disciple of Cleomenes,[136] and who, as a Cynic, will not have believed in life after death and may even have written, as other Cynics did, against mythical beliefs regarding Hades,[137] then the epigram acquires a high degree of irony.

[133] Cf. *GVI* 1260.11 (second century BC) and 1163.3 (second/third century AD); the first century AD inscription in J. G. Milne, *Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire (Greek Inscriptions)*, Oxford 1905, 61 no. 9253.4–6; *SGO* 05/01/57 (third century AD), and 18/01/19 (second/third century AD).

[134] Cf. *CEG* 535, 558, 593, which are all parallel to the funerary monument for the fallen at Potidea (*CEG* 10) and reflect the same religious conception as, e.g., Euripides, *Supp.* 533–4: cf. A. Skiadas, ΕΠΙ ΤΥΜΒΩΙ (Athens 1967) 81–2, J. D. Mikalson, *Athenian Popular Religion* (Chapel Hill–London 1983) 77; R. Garland, *The Greek Way of Death* (London 1985) 75 takes a different view.

[135] Cf. P. Karpouzou in Pagonari-Antoniou (1997) 131–2.

[136] Cf. Livrea (1993) 78–84, Gutzwiller (1998) 204–5, Meyer (forthcoming) chapter B.3.2.

[137] We have the titles of two works of Antisthenes, Περὶ τοῦ ἀποθανεῖν and Περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἅιδου (*Socr. et Socratic. rell.* VA.XXVIII Giannantoni and cf. vol. IV. 250–1); according to Diogenes Laert. 6.5 (176 Giannantoni), he argued that true immortality consisted of a devout, just life.

Callimachus, too, was probably sceptical, like the Cynics and Timarchus, about life after death;[138] it is, at least, likely that he conceived of the afterlife in a more sophisticated manner than contemporary popular opinion. The poem thus not only pokes fun at Timarchus himself (an atheist in Paradise . . .), but becomes a parody of the conventions of inscriptional dialogues with the dead and of their remorselessly certain pieties (cf. *CEG* 545 cited above). We may compare the case of Hippo, a natural philosopher of the age of Pericles, who affirmed that nothing existed except what can be perceived by the senses (*VS* 38A9); he was mocked for his materialism by Cratinus, *PCG* 167, and is regularly called 'the atheist' in later sources.[139] Nevertheless, he was credited with a self-epitaph which Clement of Alexandria (*Protrep*. 4, p. 43 Stählin) quoted as proof that Hippo had had a kind of conversion, though modern scholars have normally seen it as satirical (*FGE* 564–5):

> Ἵπωνος τόδε σῆμα, τὸν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν
> ἶσον ἐποίησεν Μοῖρα καταφθίμενον.

This is the tomb of Hippon, whom in death Fate made equal to the immortal gods.

In Callimachus' epigram, the exploitation of the stock expressions of sepulchral inscriptions is marked by the double specification 'in Hades'/'where the devout are'. We may fill out the translation as follows: 'If you want to know what life after death is like, and therefore you are looking for Timarchus in Hades – but it must be Timarchus the Cynic, the son of Pausanias of the Ptolemaic tribe of Alexandria – you will find him (the very one who denied immortality), obviously in the χῶρος εὐσεβῶν (as epitaphs put it)'! The idea of a χῶρος/δόμος/θάλαμος εὐσεβῶν (or μακάρων) for those who have lived righteously can be glimpsed in its very early stages in the *Odyssey* and is commonly attested in classical literature.[140] There is, however, no epigraphical reference to any 'dwelling-place of the devout' until *CEG* 545 (above pp. 323–4) of the fourth century, though this becomes quite frequent in the third and second centuries,[141] when sepulchral inscriptions

[138] Cf. Livrea (1993) 83. [139] *VS* 38A4, 6, 8, 9 and B2–3.

[140] Cf. E. Rohde, *Psyche* (4th ed., Tübingen 1907) i.307–14 and ii.381–85; P. Siegel, *Untersuchungen zu einigen mythologischen und eschatologischen Motiven in den griechischen metrischen Grabinschriften* (Diss. Innsbruck 1967) 228–53; Sourvinou-Inwood (1995) *passim* but esp. 17–56.

[141] See, e.g., *GVI* 1572 (third century BC), *GG* 194 (third century BC), *GVI* 677 = *SGO* 03/02/62 (third/second century BC), 842 (third/second century BC), 2018 = *SGO* 01/20/25 (200 BC), 753 = *SGO* 05/01/49 (second century BC), 805 (second century BC), 1154 (second century BC), 1346 (second century BC), 48 (first century BC), 258 (first century AD), 531 = *SGO* 03/02/60 (first century AD), 1474 (first century AD), 1967 (first century AD), 973 (first/second century AD), 1719 (first/second century AD), 1764 (first/second century AD), 1970 (first/second century AD), 2040 = *SGO* 06/02/32

often express the comforting thought that the dead person is indeed in Hades, *but* in the "dwelling-place of the righteous and/or blessed.'[142] It is thus very likely that the expression was fashionable in the formulaic sepulchral language of the third century, as Callimachus' ostentatious irony also suggests.[143]

Scepticism about life after death was an element of Greek culture existing alongside ordinary belief in the afterlife (cf. e.g. Euripides, *Troades* 1248–50 and *Helen* 1421), but it is not until the late imperial age that we find it clearly attested in sepulchral inscriptions.[144] Callimachean scepticism as regards the topoi of funerary inscriptions, however, would appear to find an isolated parallel in an inscription of the third century BC, namely *GVI* 350, engraved on the stele of a tomb from Eutresis in Boeotia:[145]

> Ἐνθάδ' ἐγὼ κεῖμαι Ῥόδιος. τὰ γελοῖα σιωπῶ
> [κ]αὶ σπαλάκων ὄλεθρον λείπω κατὰ γαῖαν ἅπασαν.
> αἰ δέ τις ἀντιλέγει, [κα]ταβὰς δεῦρ' ἀντιλογείτω.

Here I, Rhodius, lie. I do not utter jokes and I leave the cursed moles throughout the whole land. If anyone has a different view, let him come down here to express it.

The 'absurdities' which Rhodius[146] proposes to 'pass over in silence' are best understood as the usual expressions about the virtues of the deceased and the immortality of the soul, and the last verse points out that if anyone wants to converse with Rhodius and answer him back, he will have to go down into Hades; this may be an implicit criticism of the idea of an interview with the

(first/second century AD), 1871 (second century AD), 431 (second century AD), 1090 (second century AD), 1162 (second century AD), 1776 (second century AD), 1289 (second/third century AD), 1562 (third century AD), 1772 (third century AD), 2061 (third/fourth century AD).

[142] On this consolatory motif, cf. Vérilhac (1978–82) II 313–32 and see, e.g., *GVI* 1128.5–6 (third century BC); 1139.8 (second century BC); 1148.17–20 (second century BC); 760.1–4 = *SGO* 05/01/35 (second/first century BC); 994.3 (second/first century BC); vv. 6–7 of the epigram (second/first century BC) published by E. Atalay and E. Voutiras, *ArchAnz* 1979, 64; *GVI* 764 (first century BC); 642.4–6 = *SGO* 05/01/30 (first century AD). See also Carphyllides, *AP* 7.260.8 = *HE* 1355f. (above, p. 300): ἀπήμονα τὸν γλυκὺν ὕπνον | κοιμᾶσθαι χώρην πέμψαν ἐπ' εὐσεβέων.

[143] For further discussion of this epigram cf. Gutzwiller (1998) 204–5. In another poem, Callimachus parodies the topical expressions of dedications to the Dioscuri, *AP* 6.301 = *HE* 1175ff.: by playing on the ambiguity of ἅλς as both 'sea' and 'salt', he reduces the sea-storms after which survivors made dedications to the Dioscuri to the 'storms' of debts (v. 2), from which Eudemus saved himself by eating only bread and salt.

[144] See, for example, *GVI* 1905 (third century AD) and 1906 (third/fourth century AD), and the epitaph from Side *SGO* 18/15/13 (third century AD).

[145] Cf. W. Peek, *AthMitt* 56 (1931) 120 n. 1 and Nicosia (1992) 54.

[146] 'Rhodius' could, of course, designate the dead's origin, but the proper name is occasionally attested (*LGPN* I.398 and II.391; *SGO* 01/20/21.6 = *GVI* 1344.6 of the third/second century BC; *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos* no. 267 Maiuri); the practice of giving only the name, with no further details, was common in central Greece and in Boeotia (see above, p. 291).

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

dead, such as we have seen in Callimachus, or rather, more generally, of the inscriptional convention of the dialogue between passer-by and deceased.[147] The epitaph of this 'new Timon' remains an isolated third-century example, but it offers a precious parallel for the scepticism with which Callimachus deals with the typical expressions of sepulchral inscriptions in general, and his particular fun with the conventional dialogue form: what if someone took seriously the convention of a dialogue between passer-by and deceased and actually went looking for Timarchus in Hades . . .? Rhodius too foresees the possibility that someone may want to answer the bitter affirmations that he has left written on his tomb, but only in order to demonstrate his scornful certainty that nobody will ever come down to give him an answer – after all, only a person who had descended into the nether world could know as much as he knew about it . . .

Lastly, let us consider *AP* 7.317 = *HE* 1269f., one of the two epigrams which Callimachus dedicates to the best-known misanthrope, Timon[148]:

Τίμων (οὐ γὰρ ἔτ᾽ ἐσσί), τί τοι, σκότος ἢ φάος, ἐχθρόν;
– Τὸ σκότος· ὑμέων γὰρ πλείονες εἰν Ἀίδῃ.

'Timon (I can ask you, now you're dead), darkness or light: which do you hate?' – 'Darkness, for there are more of you in Hades.' (trans. Nisetich, adapted)

From the outset, Callimachus knows and presents the name of the dead, thus violating one of the basic conventions of sepulchral dialogues; he abandons the traditional rôle of uninformed passer-by and assumes the rôle of astute poet, who pretends to be carrying out a sort of *reportage* on life after death by contacting those who are most directly 'qualified' to answer. Immediately afterwards, however, the parenthetic οὐ γὰρ ἔτ᾽ ἐσσί reveals a metapoetic awareness that he is exploiting that same convention which the opening has violated: one who 'is no longer' obviously cannot 'really' talk to a living person,[149] but he can do so within the inscriptional-epigrammatic structure of dialogues with 'talking' monuments.

We would be wrong, however, to think that this insistent game of provocative play with the conventional structures of sepulchral epigrams

[147] The second line is very difficult. Rhodius is perhaps referring to his good fortune in not being plagued by moles, a curse which he is happy to 'leave' to the rest of mankind, rather than the more usual epitaphic topoi. The reference to moles must reflect the paradoxographic tradition whereby either the whole of Boeotia, or certain areas of it, were free from these beasts, cf. Aristotle, *Hist. anim.* 8.605b31–606a2, Aelian, *Nat. anim.* 17.10, Antigonus, *Mir.* 10. For earlier (less convincing) attempts at interpretation, cf. H. Goldman, *AJA* 32 (1928) 179–80 ~ id., *Excavations at Eutresis in Boeotia* (Cambridge, MA 1931) 279–80; Peek and Nicosia (n. 145) and Peek, *GG* 307–8.

[148] See above, pp. 302–6.

[149] Cf. Hutchinson (1988) 72, for whom the expression underlines 'the impossibility of the conversation before it begins'.

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

can be found in all epigram-writers. Rather, the epigrammatists seem to divide between (principally) Callimachus, who exploits changes in the circulation and reception of epigrams for humour and ambiguity, and other poets – Anyte, Leonidas, Phalaecus, Posidippus, Theaetetus, Theodoridas, etc. – who prefer broadly to maintain the traditional conventions of the dialogue between passer-by and tombstone (or statue); the intervention of their authorial voice is mostly limited to the heightening of poetic imagery and linguistic expression. It is, perhaps, not surprising that authors like Callimachus (or Dioscorides), who were also masters of the purely literary form of the erotic epigram, felt freer of the typical conventions of real inscriptions, even when writing on the traditional subjects of inscribed epigram.[150]

2.4 Puzzles and speculations

One extreme case of the didactic dialogue between the deceased (or the stele on his behalf) and the passer-by concerns the depictions of objects or animals that on funerary monuments sometimes accompanied, or more rarely substituted for, the usual representation of the dead (and their relatives); such depictions often had a rôle that was little more than decorative, but at times they carried symbolic value, connected with the name of the dead person, or the circumstances of his death, or his characteristics in life.[151] This is an extreme case because this is 'half-information', i.e. non-verbal messages which are not immediately clear, or are not to be interpreted in their primary meaning, and depend on the passer-by for their decoding.

Symbolic depictions on sepulchral monuments go back at least as far as the fifth century. For the most part, these were immediately understandable objects (arms, baskets, etc.) or animals (horses, birds, dogs, hares, etc.) which recalled the name of the dead person, his rank, his merits, or his favourite activities. Ambiguous cases undoubtedly existed: thus, for example, a lion was often just a semi-decorative 'guardian' of the tomb, but at times it indicated the strength and warlike courage of a fallen soldier;[152] on the tomb of Λέων of Sinope (Attica, fourth century BC), it marks the

[150] Without wishing to return to Reitzenstein's division into 'schools', it would thus appear to be true that the authors usually attributed to the Peloponnesian 'school' felt closer to the epigraphic tradition than did the authors traditionally considered 'Alexandrian': cf. H. Beckby, *Anthologia Graeca* (Munich n.d., but 2nd ed. 1966), I.32.

[151] Cf. Weisshäupl (1889) 68–94.

[152] The lion was a frequent effigy on *polyandria* for those who died in war: examples include the *polyandrion* at Cnidos for the Athenians who died at sea in 394, and that for the Greeks who fell at Chaeronea against Philip in 338 BC (cf. below, p. 334); for later periods, cf. *GVI* 34 (second/first century BC).

name of the dead,[153] and on the memorial of Λεωνίδας and his companions who fell at Thermopylae[154] it obviously carried multiple significance. Another animal which frequently guarded tombs was the dog, but the dog (κύων) over the tomb of Diogenes of Sinope pointed to the 'Cynicism' of the man they called 'the dog',[155] whereas the bitch over the tomb of the Athenian Εὐταμία etymologised her name, 'good keeper', and/or marked her gifts as a housewife;[156] the hunting dog on the stele of Apollodorus and Λάκων, the sons of Λάκων, very probably recalled the well-known breed of 'Laconian' hunting-dogs.[157] Such symbolic representations of names[158] were, on the whole, very easy to understand: the idea that names had meanings was widespread even in archaic Greece,[159] and many words could denote both a person and a category of objects or animals. Other symbols were equally familiar and comprehensible: dogs, hares or horses evoked the dead person's love of hunting (and therefore his aristocratic origins); the wool basket recalled the diligence of a slave or a housewife, etc. The straightforward comprehensibility of such depictions is shown by the fact that there is no sepulchral or dedicatory monument of the classical period in which an inscription explicitly refers to symbolic depictions on the monument, with the exception of the very unusual Greek-Aramaic *stēlē CEG* 596 (quoted above p. 309).

CEG 596 is on the sepulchral monument set up for Antipater the Ascalonite by Domsalos of Sidon. The complex iconography of the monument consists of a dead person on a coffin (Antipater), a lion pouncing on him from the left,[160] and on the right a composite figure defending him,

[153] A. Conze, *Die attischen Grabreliefs* III (Berlin 1906) 285 no. 1318. For [Simonides], *AP* 7.344 = *FGE* 1022ff., the lion on the tomb of Λέων had both meanings.

[154] Cf. Herodotus 7.225 and Lollius Bass., *AP* 7.243 = *GPh* 1591ff.

[155] According to Diogenes Laert. 6.78; see also adesp. *AP* 7.63 and 64.

[156] A. Conze, *Die attischen Grabreliefs* I (Berlin 1893) 21 no. 66.

[157] Cf. B. Freyer-Schauenberg, 'ΚΥΩΝ ΛΑΚΩΝΟΣ–ΚΥΩΝ ΛΑΚΑΙΝΑ' *AntKunst* 13 (1970) 95–100. A particularly complex problem of ambiguity was created by figures which could, but need not, allude to beliefs about death and the afterlife: e.g. birds, which were possible symbols of the separation of the soul from the body, dogs, which were sacred to Hecate, and goats, which were sacred to Dionysus and connected with mystery cults. The ancients will probably have solved these ambiguities much more easily than we can; at any event, I do not know of any case in which this kind of symbolism is reflected in a verbal text on the tomb.

[158] Cf. T. Ritti, 'L'uso di "immagini onomastiche" nei monumenti sepolcrali di età greca' *ArchClass* 25–26 (1973–74) 639–60.

[159] Cf. M. G. Bonanno, 'Nomi e soprannomi archilochei' *MH* 37 (1980) 65–88.

[160] It is difficult to imagine lions roaming freely in Attica in the fourth century: Antipater might have been wounded by a lion in some other part of the Mediterranean and taken on a ship to the Piraeus, where he died, or perhaps the lion escaped from a zoo in the Piraeus, or, more probably, the lion of the relief may have been a Phoenician demon of death, which Domsalos and his companions had driven away from Antipater's dead body before duly burying him: cf. Clairmont (1970) 116–17 and id., *Classical Attic Tombstones* (Kilchberg 1993) III.315; Woysch-Méautis (1982) 76–7.

human from the waist down, but the prow of a ship above (representing Domsalos and his companions, who attended to the burial of Antipater). The accompanying epigram, an explanatory 'caption' for this sepulchral depiction, is without parallel until the tomb of Menophila in the second century (below pp. 336–8), and the nationality of the dead and the dedicator, the bilingual inscription in prose, and the narrative detail both on the relief and in the inscription[161] might suggest that this inscription was a one-off, foreign to the Greek culture of the fourth century. On the other hand, this same Oriental influence may well have been important for the symbolism which characterised many Hellenistic sepulchral monuments from Asia; moreover, the two principal composers of riddling funerary epigrams, Antipater of Sidon and Meleager of Gadara, both came from Phoenicia, like Domsalos of Sidon and Antipater of Ascalon. The analogy between the first verse of *CEG* 596 'let no one be surprised (μηθεὶς ἀνθρώπων θαυμαζέτω) at this figure' and the opening of a riddling epitaph of Antipater, 'do not be surprised (μὴ θάμβει) at seeing on the tomb of Miro, etc.' (*AP* 7.425 = *HE* 380ff., below, p. 333), might indeed suggest that the stele for Antipater the Ascalonite is merely the only example from mainland Greece of an Oriental tradition of symbolic sepulchral monuments, which to some extent anticipates the custom of Hellenistic sepulchral enigmas.

Hellenistic epigrams which explained the riddling symbolism of (real or fictitious) sepulchral representations probably developed alongside more complex symbolic narrative in general. On the other hand, in the Hellenistic age, portrayals of the dead gave less importance to the generic (and predictable) types of virtue privileged by Attic funerary monuments, in favour of a greater emphasis on a whole series of minor details, which reflected specific, individual characteristics of the dead and which therefore had a greater need of illustration.[162] This need for 'captions', created by the use of a more complex figurative symbolism, was perhaps what in fact originally gave rise to the Hellenistic epitaphic riddle. However that may be, it was to be expected that games with complex symbolism would appeal to the intellectualism of the period, and its taste for the *Ergänzungsspiel*,[163] which soon created riddles for *stēlai* which had never existed.[164]

The earliest such epigram offers a perfect example of the complex relationship between such poems and the dialogue form, which had

[161] Cf. Clairmont (1970) 117.
[162] Cf. Schmidt (1991) 117–41; B. Schmaltz, *Griechische Grabreliefs* (Darmstadt 1983) 236–41.
[163] For the concept and a rich series of examples, cf. Bing (1995) and G. Zanker, *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art* (Madison 2003) chapter 3.
[164] Cf. Goldhill (1994) 197–215 and Gutzwiller (1998) 265–71.

traditionally served to dramatise the transmission of information by the verbal message on the stele. This epigram is by Leonidas of Tarentum, *AP* 7.422 = *HE* 2092ff.:

τί στοχασώμεθά σου, Πεισίστρατε, χῖον ὁρῶντες
γλυπτὸν ὑπὲρ τύμβου κείμενον ἀστράγαλον;
ἦ ῥα γενὴν ὅτι Χῖος; ἔοικε γάρ. ἤ ῥ᾽ ὅτι παίκτας
ἦσθά τις, οὐ λίην δ᾽, ὠγαθέ, πλειστοβόλος;
ἢ τὰ μὲν οὐδὲ σύνεγγυς, ἐν ἀκρήτῳ δὲ κατέσβης
Χίῳ; ναὶ δοκέω, τῷδε προσηγγίσαμεν.

What shall we conjecture about you, Pisistratus, when we see a Chian die carved on your tomb? Shall we not say that you were a Chian? That seems probable. Or shall we say that you were a gambler, but not a particularly lucky one, my friend? Or are we still far from the truth, and was your life's light put out by neat Chian wine? Yes, I think now we are near it. (trans. Paton, adapted)

Both signifiers, verbal and iconic, are presented in the first couplet. It is from the inscription on the *stele* that Leonidas will have learned (or, better, will have imagined that he has learned) the name of the dead, Pisistratus; seeing the name on the inscription and knowing that the dead person was called Pisistratus was one and the same thing. The *stēlē*, however, also implies something else about this Pisistratus, by means of the figure of a die in the 'Chian' position.[165] The poet does not appear particularly interested in the explicit verbal information on the *stēlē* – the name of the dead would probably have been joined by other information, such as the patronymic – and his attempt to converse is solely concerned with the iconic signifier. Dice were in fact a frequent sepulchral symbol, for example, on reliefs of the Hellenistic age from Asia Minor; on the tombs of those who had met a premature death, the ἄωροι, they evoked the precarious nature of human life, but the particular die that accompanies Pisistratus, lying in the position of the least favourable throw, implies here a non-standard meaning,[166] and thus the poet has to στοχάζειν 'speculate'. In spite of the apostrophe of the poet, who asks to be guided, Pisistratus/the *stele* does not answer, because the convention of inscriptional and epigrammatic dialogue between passer-by and deceased presupposes that all 'conversation' will be one-way; Callimachus, as we have seen, takes pleasure in exploiting this convention. The result is that instead of creating a dialogue between the naturally well-informed deceased and the uninformed passer-by, who

[165] See Gutzwiller (1998) 268 n. 82, with references to the various reliefs in Pfuhl–Möbius (1977–9), which include images of dice.
[166] As observed by Gutzwiller (1998) 268.

depends on the monument and/or the deceased for his knowledge, the epigram focuses exclusively on the poet, here generalised by means of a first person plural,'the other readers of the *stele* and I', and dramatises the various mental steps by which he finally arrives at the interpretation that he considers most likely.[167]

Chronologically, the next sepulchral riddle in the sequence is *AP* 7.429 = *HE* 96ff. by Alcaeus of Messene (end of the third century BC):

> δίζημαι κατὰ θυμόν, ὅτου χάριν ἁ παροδῖτις
> δισσάκι φεῖ μοῦνον γράμμα λέλογχε πέτρος
> λαοτύποις σμίλαις κεκολαμμένον. ἆρα γυναικί
> τᾷ χθονὶ κευθομένᾳ Χιλιὰς ἦν ὄνομα;
> τοῦτο γὰρ ἀγγέλλει κορυφούμενος εἰς ἓν ἀριθμός.
> ἢ τὸ μὲν εἰς ὀρθὰν ἀτραπὸν οὐκ ἔμολεν,
> ἁ δ' οἰκτρὸν ναίουσα τόδ' ἠρίον ἔπλετο Φειδίς;
> νῦν Σφιγγὸς γρίφους Οἰδίπος ἐφρασάμαν.
> αἰνετὸς οὑκ δισσοῖο καμὼν αἴνιγμα τύποιο,
> φέγγος μὲν ξυνετοῖς, ἀξυνέτοις δ' ἔρεβος.

I ask myself why this road-side stone has only two phis chiselled on it. Was the name of the woman who is buried here Chilias [= Thousand]? The number which is the sum of the two letters [i.e. 500 each] points to this. Or am I astray in this guess and was the name of her who dwells in this mournful tomb Phidis [i.e. twice phi]? Now am I the Oedipus who has solved the sphinx's riddle. He deserves praise, the man who made this puzzle out of two letters, a light to the intelligent and darkness to the unintelligent. (trans. Paton, adapted)

Alcaeus clearly imitates Leonidas at the formal level – the opening uncertainty, the presentation of different possible interpretations, the enthusiasm and pride with which the most likely one is discovered – but there is an important variation in the form of the poem. Alcaeus does not see (or imagines that he does not see) any name on the tomb, so there is no deceased to question, no inscription that can 'speak'; he has in front of him only a symbolic signifier, to which he must attribute a meaning. There is thus no dialogic apostrophe addressed to the dead person, as there had been at the beginning of the semi-monologue of Leonidas, but rather we have an absolute monologue which presents the poet in heroic isolation and silence (δίζημαι κατὰ θυμόν, the poet 'searches' inwardly), and which contrasts him with the *stēlē*, a novel Sphinx, over which in the end he triumphs.

[167] Why is the third interpretation, which appears to be the most abstruse of the three, also the most certain? One plausible reason is that this exegesis is the most attractive precisely *because* it is the least immediate and least obvious (cf. Gutzwiller (1998) 268). Perhaps, however, the truth of this third interpretation suggests that Leonidas had personal knowledge of the dead.

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

Some decades later, the epigrams of Antipater of Sidon (late second century) develop this now established tradition of symbolic interpretation in new directions,[168] by not giving undue emphasis to the gap between the controversial signification of symbols and the univocal meaning of the words of the inscription. As regards *AP* 7.425 = *HE* 380ff., we have already seen its similarity to *CEG* 596 (cf. above pp. 329–30):

μὴ θάμβει, μάστιγα Μυροῦς ἐπὶ σάματι λεύσσων,
  γλαῦκα, βιόν, χαροπὰν χᾶνα, θοὰν σκύλακα.
τόξα μὲν αὐδάσει με πανεύτονον ἁγέτιν οἴκου,
  ἁ δὲ κύων τέκνων γνήσια καδομέναν·
μάστιξ δ' οὐκ ὀλοάν, ξένε, δεσπότιν, ἀλλ' ἀγέρωχον
  δμωσί, κολάστειραν δ' ἔνδικον ἀμπλακίας·
χὰν δὲ δόμων φυλακὰν μελεδήμονα· τὰν δ' ἅ<μα κεδνάν>
  γλαῦξ ἅδε γλαυκᾶς Παλλάδος ἀμφίπολον.
τοιοῖσδ' ἀμφ' ἔργοισιν ἐγάθεον· ἔνθεν ὅμευνος
  τοιάδ' ἐμᾷ στάλᾳ σύμβολα τεῦξε Βίτων.

Do not wonder at seeing on Myro's tomb a whip, an owl, a bow, a grey goose and a swift bitch. The bow proclaims that I was the strict well-strung directress of my house, the bitch that I took true care of my children, the whip that I was no cruel or overbearing mistress, but just a chastiser of faults, the goose that I was a careful guardian of the house, and this owl that I was a faithful (?) servant of owl-eyed Pallas. Such were the things in which I took delight, wherefore my partner Biton carved these emblems on my grave-stone. (trans. Paton, adapted)

After forestalling the passer-by's surprise, by denying that there is any cause for it, the epigram describes and explains the symbols themselves, as in *CEG* 596. However, in order to do so, it adopts the structure of the now familiar narrativised dialogue in which the message of the tomb is 'uttered' by the monument and listened to by the passer-by, as in the 'the stone will tell you', 'the writing will give the message', 'the tomb will inform you' structures discussed above. Something analogous, but with an even greater degree of confidence in the expressive possibilities of symbols, is found in Antipater, *AP* 7.423 = *HE* 362ff.:

τὰν μὲν ἀεὶ πολύμυθον, ἀεὶ λάλον, ὦ ξένε, κίσσα
  φάσει, τὰν δὲ μέθας σύντροφον ἅδε κύλιξ,
τὰν Κρῆσσαν δὲ τὰ τόξα, τὰ δ' εἴρια τὰν φιλοεργόν,
  ἄνδεμα δ' αὖ μίτρας τὰν πολιοκρόταφον·
τοιάνδε σταλοῦχος ὅδ' ἔκρυψε Βιττίδα τύμβος
  †τιμελαχραντον† νυμφιδίαν ἄλοχον.
ἀλλ', ὦνερ, καὶ χαῖρε καὶ οἰχομένοισιν ἐς Ἄιδαν
  τὰν αὐτὰν μύθων αὖθις ὄπαζε χάριν.

[168] Cf. esp. Gutzwiller (1998) 271–6.

The jay, stranger, will tell you I was ever a woman of many words, ever talkative, and the cup that I was of a convivial habit. The bow proclaims the Cretan, the wool a good workwoman, and the snood that tied up my hairs shows that I was grey-headed. Such was the Bittis that this tomb with its *stele* covers, the wedded wife . . . But, hail, good sir, and do us who are gone to Hades the favour to bid us hail likewise in return. (trans. Paton, adapted)

Personal information about the dead, as conveyed by the traditional inscription, had previously been supported in some cases, as we have seen, by onomastic symbols. It was a different matter for the symbols to replace written information. The *polyandrion* of the Greeks who fell at Chaeronea against Philip was in the shape of a gigantic lion, and Pausanias (9.40.10) comments: 'This might well refer to the courage of the fallen, but there is no inscription, I imagine, because fortune did not reward this courage with the result that they deserved'; both the attention that Pausanias dedicates to the absence of any inscription in this case and, above all, archaeological evidence suggest that this inscriptionless practice was not common. In any case, symbols unaccompanied by words offered true *ainigmata*, and for Alcaeus of Messene, linking an abstruse symbol with a proper name had been a success worthy of Oedipus. For Antipater, however, symbolic icons and verbal signifiers are on an equal and complementary footing; here, one of the usual details, the nationality of the dead ('Cretan'), is expressed by the symbol of the bow, whereas the names of the dead woman and her husband seem to have been imagined by the epigram, as indicated in a verbal inscription elsewhere on the monument. Symbols, for Antipater, convey clear meanings, as do words.

Another epigram by Antipater (*AP* 7.426 = *HE* 390ff.), even if it is included among the funerary riddles of Book 7 of the Palatine Anthology, is in reality only a slight variation on the ancient dialogue structure in which the passer-by is unaware of the identity of the dead and asks the sepulchral monument for the name. In this case, the monument is iconic – a lion – but for Antipater this sepulchral symbol is so obvious that the poet/passer-by does not ask the monument what its meaning is, but he knows already in v. 2 that the dead must have been someone with the courage of a lion; this does not, however, prevent the statue confirming the information:

εἰπέ, λέον, φθιμένοιο τίνος τάφον ἀμφιβέβηκας,
 βουφάγε; τίς τᾶς σᾶς ἄξιος ἦν ἀρετᾶς;
– υἱὸς Θευδώροιο Τελευτίας, ὃς μέγα πάντων
 φέρτερος ἦν, θηρῶν ὅσσον ἐγὼ κέκριμαι.
οὐχὶ μάταν ἕστακα, φέρω δέ τι σύμβολον ἀλκᾶς
 ἀνέρος· ἦν γὰρ δὴ δυσμενέεσσι λέων.

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

Tell, lion, whose tomb do you guard, you slayer of cattle? and who was worthy of your valour? – Teleutias, the son of Theodoros, who was far the most valiant of men, as I am judged to be of beasts. Not in vain stand I here, but I signify the prowess of the man, for he was indeed a lion to his enemies. (trans. Paton, adapted)

AP 7.427 = *HE* 396ff. works in a very similar manner:

ἁ στάλα, φέρ' ἴδω, τίν' ἔχει νέκυν. ἀλλὰ δέδορκα
γράμμα μὲν οὐδέν που τμαθὲν ὕπερθε λίθου,
ἐννέα δ' ἀστραγάλους πεπτηότας, ὧν πίσυρες μέν
πρᾶτοι Ἀλεξάνδρου μαρτυρέουσι βόλον,
οἱ δὲ τὸ τᾶς νεότατος ἐφάλικος ἄνθος, ἔφηβον,
εἷς δ' ὅγε μανύει Χῖος ἀφαυρότερον.
ἦ ῥα τόδ' ἀγγέλλοντι· "Καὶ ὁ σκάπτροισι μεγαυχής
χὠ θάλλων ἥβᾳ τέρμα τὸ μηδὲν ἔχει";
ἢ τὸ μὲν οὔ; δοκέω δὲ ποτὶ σκοπὸν ἰθὺν ἐλάσσειν
ἰόν, Κρηταιεὺς ὥς τις ὀιστοβόλος·
ἧς ὁ θανὼν Χῖος μέν, Ἀλεξάνδρου δὲ λελογχώς
οὔνομ', ἐφηβείῃ δ' ὤλετ' ἐν ἁλικίᾳ.
ὡς εὖ τὸν φθίμενον νέον ἄκριτα καὶ τὸ κυβευθέν
πνεῦμα δι' ἀφθέγκτων εἶπέ τις ἀστραγάλων.

The *stele*, come on, let me see who lies under it. But I see no inscription cut on it, only nine cast dice, of which the first four represent the throw called Alexander; the next four that called Ephebus, the bloom of youthful maturity, and the more unlucky throw called Chian. Is their message this, that both the proud sceptred potentate and the young man in his flower end in nothing? Or is that not so? I think now like a Cretan archer I shall shoot straight at the mark. The dead man was a Chian, his name was Alexander and he died in youth. How well one told through dice without a voice of the young man dead by ill-chance and the breath of life staked and lost. (trans. Paton, adapted)

Faced with a tombstone which has no inscribed verbal text, but rather depictions of three typical dice throws, the poet is by now so familiar with the sepulchral symbolism as to be guilty, at first, of an excess of imagination: the first, highly symbolic, interpretation – 'Alexander' means 'powerful', the 'Ephebe' means 'young', and 'Chian' means 'nothing' – is immediately discarded in favour of another one, which starts, correctly, from the absence of a verbal message, and attributes an almost lexical value to the symbols – the dead person was called Alexander; he was an ephebe and a Chian; here, the symbols are read as if they were univocal words, and the ἄφθεγκτοι ἀστράγαλοι 'dice without a voice' (v. 14) provide three of the most basic pieces of sepulchral information: the name, the origin, and the age of the dead.

Two other epigrams by Antipater reveal his complete appropriation of the traditional dialogue structure: *AP* 7.424 = *HE* 370ff. and *AP* 7.161 = *HE* 296ff. The history of the enigmatic epitaph had begun with Leonidas' exploitation of the fact that the dead 'spoke' only through the words of the inscription and did not 'answer' questions about the symbolic representations on the tomb, leaving their interpretation to the intelligent passer-by. In the first of these two epigrams by Antipater, the passer-by/poet is uncertain in front of the paradoxically non-female symbols[169] that he finds on the tomb of a woman, Lysidice, and he thus questions the dead woman; in the second one, the uncertainty which Antipater displays is motivated in all probability by a symbolic eagle, which appears to have been mainly used elsewhere to indicate the survival of the soul and its separation from the body after death.[170] Both Lysidice and the eagle, unlike the Pisistratus of Leonidas, answer promptly and explain themselves, as if to make clear that Antipater's epigrams describe *stēlai*, whether real or fictitious, containing an inscribed 'caption' for the figurative designs.

This is, in fact, exactly what happens also in the epigram at the base of the *stele* of Menophila, which was found at Sardis, and is contemporary with Antipater, or slightly later. The relief shows the dead woman's head surrounded by symbolic figures (a lily, the letter alpha, a roll of papyrus, a crown and a basket), together with an inscription:[171]

κομψὰν καὶ χαρίεσσα πέτρος δείκνυσι. τίς ἐντί;
— Μουσῶν μανύει γράμματα· Μηνοφίλαν.
—τεῦ δ᾽ ἕνεκ᾽ ἐν στάλᾳ γλυπτὸν κρίνον ἠδὲ καὶ ἄλφα,
βύβλος καὶ τάλαρος, τοῖς δ᾽ ἔπι καὶ στέφανος;
ἦ σοφία<μ> μὲν βίβλος, ὁ δ᾽ αὖ περὶ κρατὶ φορηθείς
ἀρχὰν μανύει, μουνογόναν δὲ τὸ ἕν,
εὐτάκτου δ᾽ ἀρετᾶς τάλαρος μάνυμα, τὸ δ᾽ ἄνθος
τὰν ἀκμάν, δαίμων ἅντιν᾽ ἐληίσατο.
– κούφα τοι κόνις ἀμφιπέλοι τοιῇδε θανούσῃ.
αἴ, ἄγονοι δὲ γονεῖς, τοῖς ἔλιπες δάκρυα.

The graceful stone reveals a pretty lady. Who is she? – The letters of the Muses tell you: Menophila. – Why are a lily and an alpha carved on her stone, a book and a basket, and above them a garland? – The book points to her wisdom, the garland worn around the head to her rule, the one [i.e. alpha] to the fact that she was

[169] Cf. A.-M. Vérilhac, 'L'image de la femme dans les épigrammes funéraires grecques' in id. (ed.), *La Femme dans le monde méditerranéen* (Lyon–Paris 1985) 85–112 and Pircher (1979) *passim*; on funerary reliefs at Smyrna in the second century BC, cf. Zanker (1993) 212–13.
[170] Cf. adesp. *AP* 7.61, 62 and above, n. 157, for the sepulchral symbolism of the bird.
[171] Text in accordance with *SGO* 04/02/11 (Pfuhl–Möbius (1977–79) I.141 no. 418; *GVI* 1881).

an only child, the basket to her orderly virtue, the flower to her youthful prime, of which fate robbed her. – May the earth be light upon you, buried here. Your parents, alas, are childless; to them you have left only tears.

The closest analogy between this inscription and Antipater's epigram lies in the fact that both texts attribute the 'caption' for the symbolic figures to the voice of the monument. The passer-by, who does not know who is buried in the tomb, is informed by the inscription that the dead woman is Menophila (nine letters, the number of the Muses); then the passer-by wonders what the meaning of the symbols may be, and in the following lines they are explained by the monument (i.e. read on it), just as the name had been read in v. 2. As had happened in the case of the assumed inscription in the epigram of Antipater, here too the inscription includes a caption for the figures, because these are figures whose meaning is, for the most part, not the conventional one.[172] A crown regularly (especially at Smyrna) denotes the honorary crown that the deceased's fellow-citizens had conferred on him; for Menophila, on the contrary, the crown symbolises that the dead woman had occupied the public position of *stephanēphoros*. The roll of papyrus is a symbol here, as frequently elsewhere, of wisdom or culture, but elsewhere it is almost always exclusively an attribute of men: in spite of the increased cultural level of women in the Hellenistic age,[173] cultural attainments are not usually among the virtues celebrated in dead women; instead of a roll of papyrus, with very few exceptions,[174] woman are usually accompanied by images of jewels or objects from the dressing-table[175] – we may recall the observation of Antipater about the strangeness of male symbols for Lysidice. Furthermore, the letter alpha, i.e. 'one', indicating that Menophila was an only child, is another rather arcane usage, appearing here for the first time.

The quite exceptional tomb for Menophila was commissioned by the *demos* of Sardis, according to a separate *titulus* on the *stele*, and the designer may perhaps have had Antipater and the whole tradition of sepulchral riddles in mind; the result is an epitaph which is no less literary than the

[172] Cf. Pircher (1979) 54–5; Schmidt (1991) 140–1; differently, D. M. Robinson, 'Two New Epitaphs from Sardis' in *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir W. M. Ramsay* (London 1923) 350–1; Gutzwiller (1998) 266–7.

[173] Cf. e.g. S. Pomeroy, *Women in Hellenistic Egypt* (New York 1984) 59–72.

[174] Cf. e.g. N. Firatli, *Les Stèles funéraires de Byzance gréco-romaine* (Paris 1964) 33, who points out that the only exception among the *stelai* of Byzantium is that of Mousa, the daughter of Agathocles, of the second/first century BC (no. 139), where, however, the papyrus was a professional symbol denoting Mousa as a 'woman doctor'.

[175] As noted, e.g., by Zanker (1993) 222.

epigrams of the Palatine Anthology. Its designers, Antipater's contemporaries, when faced with the problem of illustrating the many, exceptional virtues of Menophila within the limited space of a relief, found it necessary, like Antipater, to provide an explanation for symbols whose meaning was far from fossilised. Whether life has here imitated art or vice versa, we cannot say.

3 EROTIC EPIGRAMS

The need to interpret, to make sense of visible signs, is dramatised by epigrammatists, above all Callimachus,[176] also in the sphere of erotic epigrams. Callimachus here displays his cunning intelligence, not so much in criticising and going beyond the conventional truths of inscriptions, as in interpreting and bringing out the true meaning of social behaviour and pretence. The 'detective' who recognises Timonoe (above pp. 318–19) and who understands why Menecrates died (above pp. 321–2) can also detect love when he finds it (*AP* 12.71 = *HE* 1097ff.):

> Θεσσαλικὲ Κλεόνικε τάλαν, τάλαν· οὐ μὰ τὸν ὀξύν
> ἥλιον, οὐκ σ᾽ ἔγνων. σχέτλιε, ποῦ γέγονας;
> ὀστέα σοι καὶ μοῦνον ἔτι τρίχες. ἦ ῥά σε δαίμων
> οὑμὸς ἔχει, χαλεπῇ δ᾽ ἤντεο θευμορίῃ;
> ἔγνων· Εὐξίθεός σε συνήρπασε· καὶ σὺ γὰρ ἐλθών
> τὸν καλόν, ὦ μόχθηρ᾽, ἔβλεπες ἀμφοτέροις.

Ah, poor, poor Cleonicus of Thessaly! By the sun's rays, I could not recognise you. Where have you been, wretched one? Nothing but bones and hair. Can it be that the god I worship got you in his clutches and you have met a terrible fate? I knew it: Euxitheos conquered you as well as me. Yes, when you came, you rascal, you were looking at his beauty with no eyes for anything else. (trans. Nisetich, adapted)

Similar is *AP* 12.134 = *HE* 1103ff.:

> ἕλκος ἔχων ὁ ξεῖνος ἐλάνθανεν· ὡς ἀνιηρόν
> πνεῦμα διὰ στηθέων – εἶδες; – ἀνηγάγετο,
> τὸ τρίτον ἡνίκ᾽ ἔπινε, τὰ δὲ ῥόδα φυλλοβολεῦντα
> τὠνδρὸς ἀπὸ στεφάνων πάντ᾽ ἐγένοντο χαμαί·
> ὤπτηται μέγα δή τι, μὰ δαίμονας· οὐκ ἀπὸ ῥυσμοῦ
> εἰκάζω, φωρὸς δ᾽ ἴχνια φὼρ ἔμαθον.

The guest kept his wound hidden. How painful the breath he drew – did you notice? – at the third toast, and the petals drooping from the man's garland littered the floor. He is done to a turn. By god, I guess not at random: a thief myself, I know a thief's tracks. (trans. Nisetich, adapted)

[176] Cf. Walsh (1990).

In this second epigram, the motif of the symptoms of love is intertwined, probably not for the first time, with that of drunkenness as the litmus test of love. If, as seems likely, Asclepiades was an older contemporary of Callimachus, Asclepiades, *AP* 12.135 = *HE* 894ff. will be earlier than Callimachus' version:

> οἶνος ἔρωτος ἔλεγχος· ἐρᾶν ἀρνεύμενον ἡμῖν
> ἤτασαν αἱ πολλαὶ Νικαγόρην προπόσεις·
> καὶ γὰρ ἐδάκρυσεν καὶ ἐνύστασε καί τι κατηφὲς
> ἔβλεπε, χὠ σφιγχθεὶς οὐκ ἔμενε στέφανος.

Wine is the proof of love. Nicagoras denied to us that he was in love, but those many toasts convicted him. Yes! He shed tears and bent his head, and had a certain downcast look, and the wreath bound tight round his head kept not its place. (trans. Paton, adapted)

The epigrams of Asclepiades and Callimachus present several similarities. Though the physical symptoms of love vary, both poets have the detail of the collapsed garland as a further symptom, perhaps here making its first appearance in Greek literature,[177] and in both poems drunkenness guarantees the truthfulness of the revelations, in Asclepiades explicitly (v. 1), whereas Callimachus is less direct ('after the third glass . . .').[178] Both poets also appeal to a proverbial expression,[179] though Asclepiades at the beginning and Callimachus at the end.[180] The similarities between the two poems are so great that we may suspect that the last sentence of Callimachus' epigram in fact announces its intertextual connection with Asclepiades. The standard interpretation is that Callimachus has understood what is happening to his friend 'not out of ῥυσμός (i.e. ῥυθμός)', because, as a person who has been in love, he can recognise the sequential series (the

[177] This is obviously not a strong argument, but Athenaeus (15.669d) did discuss the matter and had the opportunity to cite pre-Callimachean poetry – which he did not do.

[178] Why the 'third' glass, and not the fourth, or the tenth? According to G. Giangrande, 'Sympotic Literature and Epigram' in *L'Épigramme grecque* 120–2, Callimachus hints that his friend is so smitten that he betrays his feelings after the last of the three ritual 'libations' (to the Olympian Zeus, to the heroes and to Zeus Soter), with which participants used to start the symposium. This is possible, but there are many texts which point to the importance of the third 'round', but no parallel for a link between drunkenness and the three initial libations. Relevant texts include Panyassis, *PEG* 17 = *EGF* 13, ll. 5–9; Eubulus, *PCG* *93, and Callimachus fr. 178.13–20 (above, pp. 78–80).

[179] Cf. W. Ludwig, 'Die Kunst der Variation im hellenistischen Liebesepigramm' in *L'Épigramme grecque* 313.

[180] Both proverbs are already attested in Aristotle, *Eth. Eud.* 7.1235a6–9. The idea of sex, particularly but not exclusively adultery, as something 'stolen' is found as early as Homer (*Il.* 6.161) and Hesiod (*WD* 329). That love is a *furtum* seems, however, to be a Latin idea, cf. Catullus 68.136, 140 etc.

rhythmos[181]) of signs in a person who is in love. Perhaps too, however, Callimachus suggests that, as a love poet, he knows how to follow the line of interpretation (the 'traces') of an earlier poet, and as a result, his decoding follows the same series of stages already followed by the latter; his speculations were not 'outside the pattern'.

Asclepiades, in his turn, has appropriated a traditional motif.[182] The contexts of Alcaeus fr. 333 Voigt, οἶνος γὰρ ἀνθρώπω δίοπτρον 'wine lets you see into a man', and fr. 366 V., οἶνος, ὦ φίλε παῖ, καὶ ἀλαθέα, κτλ. 'wine – dear boy – and truth', are unknown, but we must not assume that these were necessarily erotic: wine is the mirror of the soul *tout court*, and drunkenness is the state in which the symposiast reveals the truth on all subjects, not just his erotic desires.[183] A broad interpretation is suggested both by the texts which quote fr. 366[184] and by other instances of the motif (e.g. Theognis 499–502).[185] Excess of wine and *eros* had, of course, frequently been put together in sympotic lyric poetry, but the relationship between the two was complex:[186] as well as being the cause of sympotic and erotic exuberance, wine could also be a remedy for the pangs of love,[187] and for sufferings in general.[188] Just, then, as drunkenness as the revealer of love draws out hints from the poetic tradition, rather than simply taking over the motif wholesale, so also the theme of the hiding of love, and the discovery of its symptoms, suddenly becomes prominent in Hellenistic epigram, but is not exclusive to it. Descriptions of the symptoms of love

[181] ῥυθμός, which appears to be a technical term in the field of music or medicine, had already, since Archilochus, *IEG* 128.7, denoted the predictable 'seriality', or 'orderly succession' of the events of human life in general, which must be 'learnt' (γίνωσκε) in order to avoid making wrong evaluations of the successes or failures of one's life.

[182] Cf. O. Knauer, *Die Epigramme des Asklepiades vom Samos* (Diss. Tübingen 1935) 12.

[183] Cf. Rösler (1995).

[184] Both Athen. 2.37e and schol. Plato, *Symp*. 217e speak of this as a text which proves that wine leads people to tell the truth – not specifically the truth about feelings of love.

[185] The speaker of Theocritus 29 adopts the expression of Alcaeus to justify his regrettable criticism of his beloved. See also Aeschylus, *TrGF* 393; Ion, fr. 1.12 Gent.–Prato; Plato, *Laws* 649a-b; Ephippus, *PCG* 25; Eratosthenes, *Erig*. fr. 6 Rosokoki = *CA* 36; Calleas Arg., *AP* 11.232.3–4.

[186] Cf. Theognis 873–5 'Ah, wine, I praise you in part, and I criticise you in part, and I cannot either hate you or love you completely: you are both a blessing and an evil, etc.' See also the scientific-medical ratification of this opinion by Mnesitheos ap. Athenaeus 2.36a–b (*PCG* adesp. 101); Horace, *Carm*. 1.18.

[187] Cf. e.g. Anacreon, *PMG* 346 fr. 4; Propertius 3.17.3–6.

[188] *Cypr*., *PEG* fr. 17 (see above, pp. 286–7); Alcaeus, frs. 335 and 346 Voigt; Theognis 879–84; Pindar, frs. 52d.25–6 Maehler = D4.25–6 Rutherford, 124a–b and 248 M.; Sophocles, *TrGF* 758; Euripides, *Bacch*. 278–83. The best analysis of the ambivalence of wine and drunkenness from Homer to the classical age remains G. A. Privitera, *Dioniso in Omero e nella poesia arcaica* (Rome 1970) chapter 3; but see also J. Garzón Diáz, 'Vino y banquete desde Homero a Anacreonte' *Helmantica* 30 (1979) 63–96 and S. Darcus Sullivan, 'The Effects of Wine on Psychic Entities in Early Greek Poetry' *Eirene* 33 (1997) 9–18. For a different perspective, cf. E. Belfiore, 'Wine and *Catharsis* of the Emotions in Plato's *Laws*' *CQ* 36 (1986) 421–37.

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

are common in archaic and classical poetry;[189] Sappho fr. 31 V. is the most famous example, with the *parodos* of Euripides' *Hippolytus* not far behind. Neither the character who conceals his love nor the poet (or a character) who sits in judgement as an expert and revealer of symptoms of love appear, however, before the early fourth century.[190] Even in a passage of Antiphanes (fourth century BC), concealed love and drunkenness are not connected in a causal relationship, but simply appear in parallel, as the two conditions which it is most difficult to hide: 'a person can succeed in hiding everything else, Phidias, but in two cases it is not possible: when he is a wine-drinker and when he is in love. Both are revealed in the gazes and in what is said, and consequently those who deny these conditions are exposed most of all' (*PCG* 232).[191] There is in the fourth century, however, at least one certain example of the 'expert' who is able to interpret the symptoms, even when the lover tries to conceal his love. This is Plato's Socrates, who tells the blushing young Hippothales: 'in other things I'm of little use, I'm a good-for-nothing, but this is a gift that I've received, perhaps from the god: I'm quick to recognise a person who is in love, and a person who is loved' (Plato, *Lysis* 204b–c), and in Menander's *Misoumenos* the motifs of concealed love and revelatory drunkenness appear in the form familiar from Hellenistic epigram: ποεῖν τ' ἄδηλον τοῖς συνοῦσι τὴν νόσον | δυνή[σομ.][. . .] ἀπαμφιεῖ γὰρ τὸ κατάπλαστον τοῦτό μου | καὶ λανθάνειν βουλόμενον ἡ μέθη ποτέ 'I shall be able to conceal the disease from those around me [. . .] sooner or later, drunkenness will take away this bandage, even if I want to keep my wound hidden' (vv. 361–2 and 364–5 Sandbach = 762–3, 765–6 Arnott).

There was a very long tradition of philosophical and rhetorical speculation about, and mistrust of, *eros*; all the Hellenistic philosophical schools concerned themselves with the topic.[192] Philosophers had also tried various ways of 'saving' *eros* as a force for good: the Stoics in effect neutralised the charge of love's passion, by making it equivalent to friendship or spiritual love, or by emphasising its educational aspects,[193] but Epicurus' attack upon sexual desire was very influential, and even Cicero, who gives a careful account of Stoic spiritualised love (*Tusc. Disp*. 4.70–2), affirms Epicurus'

[189] For archaic epic poetry, cf. M. S. Cyrino, *In Pandora's Jar: Lovesickness in Early Greek Poetry* (Lanham–London 1995).

[190] Cf. Pasquali (1964) 514. The motif is common in Latin poetry: cf. Catullus 6; Propertius 1.9.5–8 and 3.8.17–8; Tibullus 1.8.1–6; Horace, *Ep*. 11.8–10.

[191] Cf. P. Kägi, *Nachwirkungen der älteren griechischen Elegie in den Epigrammen der Anthologie* (Diss. Zürich 1917) 54–5.

[192] Cf. F. Lasserre, ''Ερωτικοὶ λόγοι' *MH* 1 (1944) 169–78.

[193] See, e.g., *SVF* I frs. 247–8 for Zeno, III frs. 716–22 for Chrysippus; cf. D. Babut, 'Les Stoïciens et l'amour' *REG* 76 (1963) 55–63.

P1: NGK/NKO P2: FXS
0521835119c07.xml CU1806B-Fantuzzi October 21, 2004 11:27

position. Love was, on this view, the most violent of the *perturbationes animi*, not only because it leads at times to rape or incest, but also because of the reprehensible mental alteration that it creates (*perturbatio ipsa mentis in amore foeda per se est*, 4.75). Love was indeed standardly considered as a sort of irrational passion. Theophrastus could not be clearer in fr. 557 Fortenbaugh ('love is the excess of an irrational desire, which is quick in its attack, but slow in its solution'), but even Epicurus saw sexual desire as a pleasure which is natural, but not necessary (cf. fr. 456 Usener), and thus placed it one level below the necessary pleasures; Aristotle, on the contrary, had put sex and eating on exactly the same level (*EN* 3.1118b8–12). Epicurus also emphasised the disruptive irrationality of love, which he defined as σύντονος ὄρεξις ἀφροδισίων μετὰ οἴστρου καὶ ἀδημονίας 'an intense appetite for sexual intercourse, with obsession and frustration' (fr. 483 Usener), and as something φαῦλον 'contemptible' (ibid., cf. fr. 574), rather than divine.[194] According to Diogenes Laertius (10.118), 'the Epicureans do not accept that the wise man falls in love' and the same opinion, according to Stobaeus (4.20.31), was also maintained by the Megarian philosophers Menedemus and Alexinus, who thus provoked the acrimonious opposition of Chrysippus (*SVF* III fr. 720). Antisthenes too had taken part in the debate: while maintaining that love was a 'defect of nature (κακία φύσεως), and those worthless souls who are not capable of coping with it consider this illness divine' (*Socr. et Socratic. rell.* VA.123 Giannantoni), he also affirmed that the intellectual must fall in love, because he is the only one who knows who he must love (*SSr* VA.58).

Some of the earliest writers of erotic epigrams show considerable interest in the paradoxical fact that the intellectual élite (i.e. themselves and their friends) could fall prey to the passion of love, which was of course a disease of the reason.[195] Both Posidippus and Callimachus, for example, appear to suggest that the intellectual could or should be exposed less than others to the risks of love. From Posidippus there is *AP* 12.98 = *HE* 3074ff. = 137 A–B:

> τὸν Μουσῶν τέττιγα Πόθος δήσας ἐπ' ἀκάνθαις
>   κοιμίζειν ἐθέλει πῦρ ὑπὸ πλευρὰ βαλών·
> ἡ δὲ πρὶν ἐν βύβλοις πεπονημένη ἄλλ' ἀθερίζει[196]
>   ψυχὴ ἀνιηρῷ δαίμονι μεμφομένη.

[194] Cf. R. D. Brown, *Lucretius on Love and Sex* (Leiden 1987) 108–18.
[195] Cf. J. G. Griffiths, 'Love as Disease' in id., *Atlantis and Egypt with Other Selected Essays* (Cardiff 1991) 60–7.
[196] This is Jacobs' suggestion for the transmitted ἄλλα θερίζει 'gathers other harvests'; other suggestions include ἄθλια τρίζει Wilamowitz, ἠλεὰ τρίζει Peppmüller. ἐθέλει in v. 2 (as Gow and Page already noted) suggests that the poet's resistance is more or less victorious: passion 'would like to' kill him/reduce him to silence, but . . .

Desire, having bound the Muses' cicada on a bed of thorns, wishes to silence it by throwing fire under its sides. But my soul, previously exercised in book-lore, has no care for other things, laying the blame on the troublesome god. (trans. Austin, adapted)

More ambiguous in tone is *AP* 12.150 = *HE* 1047ff., in which Callimachus combines the boast of the intellectual's strength of mind with a dignified consciousness of poverty:[197]

> ὡς ἀγαθὰν Πολύφαμος ἀνεύρατο τὰν ἐπαοιδάν
> τὠραμένῳ· ναὶ Γᾶν, οὐκ ἀμαθὴς ὁ Κύκλωψ.
> αἱ Μοῖσαι τὸν ἔρωτα κατισχναίνοντι, Φίλιππε·
> ἦ πανακὲς πάντων φάρμακον ἁ σοφία.
> τοῦτο, δοκέω, χἀ λιμὸς ἔχει μόνον ἐς τὰ πονηρά
> τὠγαθόν, ἐκκόπτει τὰν φιλόπαιδα νόσον.
> ἔσθ' ἁμὶν †κ' ακαστας† ἀφειδέα ποττὸν Ἔρωτα
> τοῦτ' εἶπαι· "Κείρευ τὰ πτερά, παιδάριον·
> οὐδ' ὅσον ἀττάραγόν τυ δεδοίκαμες· αἱ γὰρ ἐπῳδαί
> οἴκοι τῶ χαλεπῶ τραύματος ἀμφότεραι".

How fine a lover's charm Polyphemus hit on! By god, that Cyclops knew his stuff. The Muses, Philip, shrink a lover's swelling, poetry is a drug for every ill. Only hunger – good for nothing else in difficult circumstances – is as good at rooting out the craze for boys. . . . to Eros when he comes on strong, I say: 'You might as well clip your wings, sonny! I am not afraid of you. I have at home both charms against your cruel wounds'. (trans. Nisetich, adapted)

If, of course, poets did not fall in love, there would be no love-poetry, and two centuries after Callimachus, Bion of Smyrna showed that he had realised this, by beginning a declaration in favour of *seruitium* to love poetry (fr. 9 Gow) with a quotation and 'correction' of v. 3 of this epigram of Callimachus.[198] Callimachus and Posidippus, however, sought to explain how they could both be intellectuals and not only in love but also love poets. One of the strategies by which Callimachus, in particular, 'justified' his situation is implicit in his frequent detection of the symptoms of love itself; in this way, he reaffirms his psychological insight into, and hence control of, the irrationality of passion, both that of others and his own. Another of his strategies is the one that we have seen in action, in an ironic form, in *AP* 12.150: love poetry is a φάρμακον against love, a palliative which, according to Callimachus, reduces the suffering, but which also, as we readers perceive, is the exclusive prerogative of the poet-intellectual (with

[197] The same synthesis is also present in Callimachus, *Iambus* 3 (above, pp. 12–13), and cf. also the opening of Theocritus 16.
[198] Cf. also adesp. *AP* 12.100.4 τὸν σοφὸν ἐν Μούσαις Κύπρις ἔτρωσε μόνη 'Cypris alone struck the wise friend of the Muses'. See above, pp. 180–1.

the rather grotesque exception of the Cyclops), and thus allows him again to exhibit and enjoy his superiority.

Another more widespread strategy consisted of searching for an 'excuse' for love; Attic drama, in particular, sometimes excused offences committed under the impulse of *eros*, by celebrating the great, even if negative, power of love.[199] Epigram-writers found an 'excuse' for love in the drunkenness which removes self-control, by stating that desire arose from the same lack of intellectual self-control which was often regarded as its consequence. Homer's Odysseus had already introduced a somewhat boastful story by saying: 'I will tell you a rather boastful story. I am urged on by wine, which makes people mad, and prompts even the wise man to sing and laugh foolishly, or loosens him up for the dance, inspiring words which it would be better not to say' (*Od.* 14.463–66; cf. also *Il.* 8.229–32); Theognis too had emphasised the fact that too much wine makes even the wisest of men lose their self-control (479–83; cf. also 499–502, quoted above), and Plato (*Republic* 9.573c) had made a close connection between the absence of self-control of the person in love and that of the person who is drunk: a person becomes 'despotic' when he is 'subject to drunkenness, love or madness' (μεθυστικός τε καὶ ἐρωτικὸς καὶ μελαγχολικός). Epigram-writers exploited this tradition to present their fall into the irrationality of passion as a not very serious mistake, something almost justified by circumstances. We have already seen *AP* 12.135 by Asclepiades (above pp. 339–41). From Posidippus comes *AP* 12.120 = *HE* 3078ff. = 138 A–B:

εὐοπλῶ καὶ πρὸς σὲ μαχήσομαι, οὐδ' ἀπεροῦμαι
  θνητὸς ἐών· σὺ δ', Ἔρως, μηκέτι μοι πρόσαγε.
ἤν με λάβῃς μεθύοντ', ἄπαγ' ἔκδοτον· ἄχρι δὲ νήφω,
  τὸν παραταξάμενον πρὸς σὲ λογισμὸν ἔχω.

I am well armed and will fight with you and not give in, though I am a mortal. And you, Love, attack me no more. If you catch me drunk, carry me off a prisoner, but as long as I stay sober, I have reason drawn up in battle against you. (trans. Austin)

With this epigram we may contrast Anacreon, *PMG* 396 and 346 fr. 4: in these poems, wine gives Anacreon the recklessness to face up to Eros – or to accept him without a fight – but it also consoles him for the sufferings caused by Eros; the possibility raised by Posidippus of facing up to Eros and actually defeating him is not contemplated at all. Another instance of the theme in Posidippus is *AP* 5.134 = *HE* 3054ff. = 123 A–B:

[199] Cf. J. de Romilly, 'L'Excuse de l'invincible amour dans la tragédie grecque' in *Miscellanea tragica in honorem J. C. Kamerbeek* (Amsterdam 1976) 309–21.

Κεκροπί, ῥαῖνε, λάγυνε, πολύδροσον ἰκμάδα Βάκχου,
ῥαῖνε, δροσιζέσθω συμβολικὴ πρόποσις.
σιγάσθω Ζήνων ὁ σοφὸς κύκνος ἅ τε Κλεάνθους
μοῦσα· μέλοι δ' ἡμῖν ὁ γλυκύπικρος Ἔρως.

Cecropian jug, pour out the dewy moisture of Bacchus, pour it out: let the toast we all share be refreshed. Let Zeno the wise swan be silent, and the Muse of Cleanthes. Let our concern be with love and the bitter-sweet. (trans. Austin)

This poem has recently been interpreted as a plan by Posidippus, who had previously been a student of Stoic philosophy at Athens, to give up philosophical activity in favour of a career as an erotic poet;[200] it might, however, be interpreted simply as one of the various statements of the 'suspension' of rationality in favour of drunkenness and *therefore* of love (and love poetry). In the *Anacreontea* (cf. above, pp. 180 and 183) and elsewhere, we find related, though distinct, choices in favour of the erotic-sympotic life; another example is Antipater of Thessalonica, *AP* 9.305 = *GPh* 267ff.:[201]

ὕδατος ἀκρήτου κεκορημένῳ ἄγχι παραστάς
χθιζὸν ἐμοὶ λεχέων Βάκχος ἔλεξε τάδε·
"εὕδεις ἄξιον ὕπνον ἀπεχθομένων Ἀφροδίτῃ.
εἰπέ μοι, ὦ νήφων, πεύθεαι Ἱππολύτου;
τάρβει μή τι πάθῃς ἐναλίγκιον". ὣς ὁ μὲν εἰπών
ᾤχετ', ἐμοὶ δ' ἀπὸ τῆς οὐκέτι τερπνὸν ὕδωρ.

I had drunk my fill of unmixed water, when Bacchus yesterday, standing by my bed, spoke thus: 'You sleep a sleep worthy of them whom Aphrodites hates. Tell me, you sober man, have you heard of Hippolytus? Fear lest you suffer some fate such as his.' Having so spoken, he departed, and ever since then water is not agreeable to me. (trans. Paton, adapted)

Callimachus and Meleager frequently use the motif of the sympotic custom of drinking to the name of the beloved with undiluted wine (cf. e.g. Theocritus 2.150–3, 14.18–19); this motif almost triggers a distortion of the normal sequence, and instead of introducing the toast as the effect of love, the toast becomes the starting-point, and is presented as the cause of the more or less irrational manifestations of love. In *AP* 12.118 = *HE* 1075ff., for example, Callimachus remembers a manifestation of his passion for Archinus:

εἰ μὲν ἑκών, Ἀρχῖν', ἐπεκώμασα, μυρία μέμφου·
εἰ δ' ἄκων ἥκω, τὴν προπέτειαν ἔα.
ἄκρητος καὶ Ἔρως μ' ἠνάγκασαν· ὧν ὁ μὲν αὐτῶν

[200] Cf. Gutzwiller (1998) 157–61.
[201] On the water–wine opposition in this poem cf. below, pp. 448–9.

εἷλκεν, ὁ δ᾽ οὐκ εἴα τὴν προπέτειαν ἐᾶν.
ἐλθὼν δ᾽ οὐκ ἐβόησα, τίς ἢ τίνος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐφίλησα
τὴν φλιήν· εἰ τοῦτ᾽ ἔστ᾽ ἀδίκημ᾽, ἀδικῶ.

If, Archinos, I came carousing on purpose, load me with ten thousand reproaches; but if I am here because I could not help it, pass over my temerity. Wine at full strength and love forced me. Love dragged me and drink prevented me from laying aside my temerity. I did not shout: "it is so-and-so, son of so-and-so", but I kissed the doorpost. If that is a crime, I am a criminal.

It has been noted that epigram-writers of the Hellenistic age never break a door down, and never kidnap a girl, as happens regularly in New Comedy (and as probably happened in reality).[202] Here, Callimachus appears to apologise even for the most innocuous and mildest of komastic gestures,[203] simply because it was an irrational consequence of drunkenness.

There is a close parallel between the insistence of Callimachus on the aetiology (wine) of the *kōmos* as the culminating manifestation of the irrationality of eros and, two centuries later, the disjointed dialogue between the poet and his own soul, which we find in Meleager, *AP* 12.117 = *HE* 4092ff.; there is some uncertainty about the division between speakers, but it is clear that the opposing interlocutors are the rational intellect, with its desperate appeal to hard study, and the θυμός, the soul in the grip of the irrationality of alcohol and eros:

Βεβλήσθω κύβος· ἅπτε· πορεύσομαι. – Ἠνίδε τόλμαν,
οἰνοβαρές. τίν᾽ ἔχεις φροντίδα; – Κωμάσομαι,
κωμάσομαι; – Ποῖ, θυμέ, τρέπῃ; – Τί δ᾽ ἔρωτι λογισμός;
ἅπτε τάχος. – Ποῦ δ᾽ ἡ πρόσθε λόγων μελέτη;
– Ἐρρίφθω σοφίας ὁ πολὺς πόνος· ἓν μόνον οἶδα
τοῦθ᾽, ὅτι καὶ Ζηνὸς λῆμα καθεῖλεν Ἔρως.

Try the hazard! Light torches! I will go. – Come, be bold! You drunkard, what do you have in mind? – A revel I will hold, a revel. – Mind, whither do you stray? – What is logic to love? Quick, light a torch! – And where is all your old study of reasoning? – Away with the labour of wisdom! I know this only, that Zeus too by Love was brought to naught. (trans. Headlam, adapted)

Similar is another poem of Meleager, *AP* 12.119 = *HE* 4098ff.:

οἴσω, ναὶ μὰ σέ, Βάκχε, τὸ σὸν θράσος· ἁγέο, κώμων
ἄρχε· θεὸς θνατὰν ἁνιόχει κραδίαν·

[202] Thus D. H. Garrison, *Mild Frenzy: a Reading of the Hellenistic Love Epigram* (Wiesbaden 1978) 46. Menander's Demeas assumes that Chrysis seduced Moschion when the latter was in a state of drunkenness (*Samia* 340–2 Sandbach): 'Undiluted wine and youth produce many foolish deeds, when they find an accomplice close at hand.'

[203] This extreme, exaggerated courtesy, from which the first two couplets had led us to expect the bitterest consequences, is obviously the *pointe* of the epigram: cf. G. Giangrande, 'Sympotic Literature and Epigram' in *L'Épigramme grecque* 127.

ἐν πυρὶ γενναθεὶς στέργεις φλόγα τὰν ἐν Ἔρωτι
καί με πάλιν δήσας τὸν σὸν ἄγεις ἱκέτην.
ἦ προδότας κἄπιστος ἔφυς, τεὰ δ' ὄργια κρύπτειν
αὐδῶν ἐκφαίνειν τἀμὰ σὺ νῦν ἐθέλεις.

Bacchus, by you I swear, I shall bear your boldness. Lead on, begin the revel: you are a god: govern a mortal heart. Born in the flame, you love the flame love has, and again bring me, your suppliant, in bonds. Really you are a traitor and unreliable: while you bid me hide your mysteries, you would now bring mine to light.

This last poem includes the now familiar motifs of the person in love who hides his feelings out of shame, and of wine which frees a person from that shame, thus causing him to display the symptoms of love; in his complete subjection to wine, to which he has abandoned himself in the hope of consolation (vv. 3–4), the poet cries out that he has been betrayed, when the wine does away with his restraint and causes him to reveal the object of his erotic desire.

This same motif is also found in Callimachus, *AP* 12.51 = *HE* 1063ff.:

ἔγχει καὶ πάλιν εἰπέ: "Διοκλέος". οὐδ' Ἀχελῷος
κείνου τῶν ἱερῶν αἰσθάνεται κυάθων.
καλὸς ὁ παῖς, Ἀχελῷε, λίην καλός· εἰ δέ τις οὐχί
φησίν, ἐπισταίμην μοῦνος ἐγὼ τὰ καλά.

Pour in the wine, and again say: 'To Diocles!' And Achelous does not have to touch the ladlefuls hallowed to him. Beautiful is the boy, Achelous, passing beautiful; and if any say 'No', let me alone know what beauty is. (trans. Paton, adapted)

Here, the close of the poem leaves somewhat unclear whether the affirmation of the extraordinary beauty of Diocles accounts for the poet's falling in love (and hence the toasts), or whether it is the toasts which excite Callimachus and allow him to be so sure that he is not making a mistake about Diocles, in spite of the fact that others (who are sober?) may think differently. On either interpretation, there is probably an amusing ambiguity behind the mention of the river god, Achelous. On one hand, 'Achelous' was a relatively common metonymic usage for 'water', and one which was particularly suitable here, because this god was considered to be the 'first inventor' of the habit of mixing wine with water (cf. Sappho fr. 212 V.);[204] on the other hand, this same river god was famous for his passionate love for Deianira, which led him to fight with Heracles for her.[205] Ostensibly, then, Callimachus apologises for not allowing 'Achelous' to

[204] Cf. S. R. Slings, 'Callimachus, Epigr. 29 Pf. = V G.–P.' *Mnemosyne* 26 (1973) 285.

[205] For the metonymy, cf. G. Bond, *Euripides. Hypsipyle* (Oxford 1963) 86. The metamorphic exploits of Achelous in his fight against Heracles had been narrated several times, cf. Archilochus, *IEG* 287, Pindar, fr. *249a Maehler, Sophocles, *Trach.* 9–21.

take part in the toasts for Diocles: this was a love-toast, which must be carried out with unmixed wine. At a second level, however, Callimachus suggests that, in view of the irresistible beauty of Diocles, it is better if 'Achelous' does not notice him, because he might go mad with love once again and challenge Callimachus to a fight; Achelous is thus a potential rival, a rôle which Zeus often assumes in epigrams where the beauty of the beloved is compared to that of Ganymede.[206] In the case of Achelous, this risk might have seemed even more plausible, seeing that a widespread symbolic interpretation considered the death of youths by drowning to be a form of kidnapping for love by water divinities (most commonly, the Nymphs).[207]

The alibi of drunkenness was not only a justification for irrational love, but it could also carry complex metapoetic implications. Poets who were in love – Posidippus, Callimachus or Meleager – could thereby connect the love that they described as a first-person experience specifically with the occasion for poetic performance at a symposium, which was indeed the primary context for which the erotic epigram was (more or less fictitiously) conceived:[208] the poets seem to declare: 'I, Callimachus (or I, Posidippus, or I, Meleager), even if I have been brought up to make use of my intellect under the guidance of the Muses, I, too, sometimes get drunk, and *therefore* I fall in love, but only because I am/I want to become a sympotic poet'. Drunkenness at a symposium had also been explicitly marked by love poets such as Asclepiades or Callimachus as a justification for speaking about other people's love, even if this was hidden; as writers of erotic epigrams, they wore the mask of symposiasts, and they therefore placed themselves in that state of *parrhēsia*, i.e. complete liberty to speak about anyone or anything, which both Plato (*Laws* 1.649a–b) and Philochorus (*FGrHist* 328F170) considered to be natural in drunkenness.[209] For these epigrammatists, drunkenness was the litmus test which confirmed the 'discovery' of other people's symptoms of love, and this gave their poems about love an intellectual edge. As in all epistemological models based on the conjectural analysis of individual cases and circumstances, the investigation of symptoms of love was open to the risk of looking like purely speculative

[206] For this topos, cf. Tarán (1979) 7–51.
[207] Hylas is the most famous case, but the motif is found also in sepulchral inscriptions, cf. *GVI* 952 (first/second century AD) and 1897 (second century AD); V. Raimondi, 'Gli epigrammi per Isidora: una ripresa del mito di Ila in ambito egiziano' *Appunti romani di filologia* (1998) 93–120.
[208] Cf. Cameron (1995) 71–103.
[209] That the person who goes to excesses in drinking wine 'loses control of his tongue and his mind' was also, of course, a very common poetic thought: cf. e.g. Theognis 479–80 and Meleager, *AP* 12.119.5–6 = *HE* 4102f.

serendipity, and of course the more that individual traits were considered pertinent, the more concrete this risk was, and the possibility of attaining exact scientific knowledge diminished.[210] By pointing to specific conjectural paradigms, namely to specific sets of symptoms, Hellenistic poets demonstrated not only psychological perspicacity in identifying them, but also a rational clear-sightedness in their evaluation.

In Plato's *Symposium*, the participants decide to deliver encomia of love, because this was the only god who had not yet been celebrated appropriately by a poet (177a–d); they take this decision immediately after agreeing that they will drink as they like, but in moderation, so that nobody will get drunk (176a–d). Love as an earthly, material passion bursts in, of course, towards the end of the party, in the figure of Alcibiades, and here already that passion is firmly linked to drunken excess. In Plato's brilliant representation, and in archaic and classical sympotic culture generally, we can see the origins of the 'justification' that epigram-writers of the beginning of the third century BC present for being in love and writing love poetry. We must not, however, underestimate the novelty of this complex of the guilt of love and its excuse in drunkenness. The elaboration of these ideas was a precise, more or less conscious, choice, which distinguishes the emphatic self-awareness of these epigram-writers as learned poets; from Philetas on (cf. fr. 12 Sbardella, *CA* 10), these poets are only too conscious of the intellectualism of their aesthetics, and their repeated affirmations of superiority as spirits 'brought up by the Muses' keep them removed from those who were not.

[210] See on this C. Ginzburg, 'Clues: Roots of an Evidential Paradigm' (1979), now in id., *Clues, Myths, and the Historical Method* (Turin 1986, trans. Baltimore–London 1989) 105–25.