

**From the holdings of the Department of Special Collections , Princeton University Library,
Princeton, NJ**

These documents are either in the public domain, or can only be used for educational and research purposes (Fair use) as per U.S. Copyright law (text below). By accessing this file, all users agree that their use falls in the public domain or within fair use as defined by the copyright law. We do not charge any permission or usage fees for the publication of images of material in our collections, including those provided by Princeton University Library, via our website, catalog, or directly from staff. For more information regarding copyright, credit, and citation please review the information on the Copyright, Credit and Citation Guidelines page of our website.

<https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/policies/copyright-credit-and-citation-guidelines>. If you have any questions, including how to order higher-quality images from the collection, contact Special Collections Public Services via our Ask Us! Form. <https://library.princeton.edu/special-collections/ask-us>

Doctoral Dissertations, 2011-2026

Classics

2013

Drastic Measures: Meter and the Birth of Book Lyric in Greece and Rome

Pedicone, Jason Christopher

Princeton, NJ : Princeton University

<http://arks.princeton.edu/ark:/88435/dsp0108612n65k>

U.S. Copyright law: The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, §108, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of fair use that user may be liable for copyright infringement. This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve a violation of copyright law. <https://www.copyright.gov/title17/title17.pdf>

**DRASTIC MEASURES: METER AND THE BIRTH OF BOOK LYRIC IN
GREECE AND ROME**

Jason C. Pedicone

**A DISSERTATION
PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY
OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**RECOMMENDED FOR ACCEPTANCE
BY THE DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS**

Adviser: Denis Feeney

November 2013

Abstract

“Lyric” poetry has been traditionally defined as such chiefly by metrical criteria. In Archaic Greece, lyric poetry was chiefly sung poetry in contrast to “epic” poetry which was recited. The transition from an oral to a written poetic culture in Greece caused meter to take on an even larger significance for the “lyric poets,” a thematically and chronologically disparate group of poets who came to be identified as a specific group. Greek lyric poetry produced in the Hellenistic period displays extraordinary metrical self-consciousness, with lyric poets drawing on the received ethos of a particular lyric meter to add subtle layers of meaning to their work. Callimachus seems to have advocated such metrical virtuosity in his *Iambi* and Theocritus practiced it in his lyric *Paidika*. This phenomenon is also particularly well observed in Hellenistic Greek epigram as well as among the Greek *technopaignia* which used complex lyric metrical systems to create visual images on the page that interact with the literary meaning of the poem they present. This intense attention to meter was not lost on the Latin lyric poets, though it has gone somewhat unobserved by scholars. Beginning with Laevius, Latin poets inherited the Hellenistic Greek tradition of metrical self-consciousness in their lyric poetry, relying on meter to add layers of meaning to their works. A closer attention to the semantic ethos of a given meter in the lyric poetry of Horace and Catullus not only reveals that the Roman lyric poets’ engagement with meter surpasses previous scholarly estimations but also yields new readings of important poems.

© Copyright by Jason Christopher Pedicone, 2013. All rights reserved.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	ii
CHAPTER ONE: THE BIRTH OF LYRIC	1
Melos in Early Greece.....	4
Melos and “Lyric Poetry” in Plato and Aristotle	8
Lyric in Alexandria	12
Lyrikē Poiēsis.....	23
CHAPTER TWO: MELIC METRICAL EXPERIMENTATION IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD	31
Callimachus’ <i>Iambus</i> 13: A Metrical Manifesto.....	32
Naming Meters: Theocritus <i>Idylls</i> 29 and 30.....	41
Rest in Pieces: Metrical Play in Theocritean Funerary Epigram	55
<i>Ut pictura poiesis</i> : The ‘Technopaignia’ of Simmias of Rhodes.....	73
CHAPTER THREE: THE BIRTH OF ROMAN LYRIC.....	82
Metrical Games and Catullan <i>Iambi</i>	90
Sappho Reborn.....	101
Catullus’ Sappho	108
CHAPTER FOUR: METER AND MEANING IN HORACE’S <i>ODES</i>	121
The Asclepiad.....	127
The Sapphic and the Alcaic.....	136
The Lydia Odes	141
Alcaic Beginnings	149
WORKS CITED	165

CHAPTER ONE: THE BIRTH OF LYRIC

quodsi me lyricis vatibus inseres
sublimi feriam sidera vertice.

-Hor. *Carm.* 1.1.36-7.

With these words, Horace reaches the climax of the famous priamel that makes up the opening poem of the *Odes*. After a long list of various other avocations, Horace declares his own vision for himself and by extension, his vision for his *Carmina*, the collection for which this ode stands as a frontispiece. While other men excel as athletes, hunters, and merchants, Horace is a poet whose communion with the muses makes him stand out from the crowd. He identifies himself as a special kind of poet by making reference to a very specific tradition. By asking for inclusion among the “lyric bards” (*lyricis...vatibus* 1.36) Horace defines himself and the poetry of the *Odes* within the tradition of the nine lyric poets of the Alexandrian canon. The word *insero* is a Latin translation of the Greek ἐγκρίνω,¹ the technical Alexandrian term meaning “to canonize” an author. This selective process of canonization was a matter of literary life and death for the authors in question. Only the ἐγκρινθέντες went on to become the πραττόμενοι, the poets whose works were “treated” by the scholars at Alexandria.² This treatment meant the production of commentaries, monographs and critical editions of the chosen poets and the preservation of their work for later generations of scholars and readers. One need only peruse the unfamiliar names collected in J. Pomtow’s *Poetae Lyrici*

¹ *OLD* s.v. *insero* 3c “To insert into a class or category.” Cf. Pfeiffer (1968) 206, Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) *ad. loc.*

² For the term πραττόμενοι specifically applied to the lyric poets cf. Hilgard (1901) 17.

Graeci Minores to realize the grisly fate of those who did not make the cut: the unfortunate ἐκκριθέντες all but vanished, leaving only fragments behind.³

With his ambitious request to be inserted into the Alexandrian canon of lyric poets Horace suggests that his collection of lyric poetry is a new classic, a new example of an ancient type of poetry that has lain dormant for centuries. But this implication elides a history that is far less tidy – and far more interesting. In fact, the genre of lyric underwent an ongoing formative process over the centuries up until Horace’s time that shaped authors’ perception of what sort of poetry it was. None of Horace’s archaic models would have known the word λυρικός as a literary term. In fact, Horace is the first Roman author to use it as a Latin adjective.⁴ In doing so, he forgoes another, arguably better adjective for his Greek models – for Alcaeus, Pindar, Sappho and the rest. In their own period, these poets would have been called *melic* poets or μελοποιοί. Their poems are more properly μέλη. Latin poets before Horace had already used the term *melicus*.⁵ Why then does Horace choose to term himself a *lyricus vates* and imply that his collection is “lyric poetry?” What does the novel usage signify? Just what was “lyric poetry” to Horace anyway?

These questions call for an examination of the development of the genre of “lyric” as a whole and a recalibration of critical sensitivity to the idea of lyric at this point in literary history. It seems hard to believe that Sappho and Pindar would have felt that the former’s personal monody and the latter’s bombastic epinician had much in common and harder still to believe that either of them would acquiesce to being grouped in the same

³ Pomtow (1885).

⁴ Before Horace, Cicero uses the word once at *Orat.* 55. However, for him it is a Greek word that he writes in Greek characters remarking on its Greek origin.

⁵ Lucr. *DRN* 5.334.

category as Shakespearean sonnets. Yet this is often what happens when the term “lyric” is used imprecisely today to refer to a large corpus of often only tangentially related poetry. When discussing any lyric poetry – especially ancient lyric poetry – it is important to remember that the idea of the genre of lyric means different things to different poets at different times.

Scholarship in the last twenty years has done much to disabuse readers of ancient lyric of the mistaken idea that Greece transitioned from “an epic age of communal consciousness to a lyric awakening of individualism in the Greek literary mind.”⁶ Claude Calame’s influential article *La poésie lyrique grecque, un genre inexistant?* cautions against the fallacious impulse of the Romantic period to identify lyric, alongside epic and drama, as one of the three fundamental genres of poetry.⁷ In previous generations, however, the assumption of a transition from epic to lyric permeated highly influential treatments of Greek literature such as Jaeger’s *Paideia*, Snell’s *The Discovery of the Mind*, and Fränkel’s *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy* and went on to have a larger influence on the study of literature as a whole.

By closing his first poem with the programmatic proclamation that he is a lyric poet, Horace tells his reader something about how he wants the *Odes* to be understood in terms of their literary genre. But it is a statement that must be understood in the historical context of when it is made. His use of the adjective *lyricus* suggests a poetic program keyed to specific formal and literary-historical qualities. It is on these qualities of lyric poetry that the following study will focus.

⁶ Miller (1994) 10.

⁷ Calame (1998).

Melos in Early Greece

The word for a lyric song in Archaic Greece was μέλος. The word first appears only in the plural as μέλεα in Homer, where it means “limbs.” Slightly later, it takes on a secondary meaning, “tune.” Some have seen a relation between these two meanings, positing an extension of the original meaning, “limb,” to include “musical phrase.” Others argue for a separate derivation for the musical meaning from the verb μέλω, seeing a μέλος as that which was “a care to the muses.”¹

A fragment of Alcman, which divides lyric song into two distinct parts, suggests that the earliest meaning of μέλος was strictly musical. The poet describes himself as the originator of his craft by the imitation of the tune of the partridge:

φέπη τάδε καὶ μέλος Ἀλκμᾶν
εὔρε γεγλωσσαμέναν
κακκαβίδων ὅπα συνθέμενος (PMG 39)

Alcman discovered these words and tune,
Having perceived the melodious voice of partridges.

The new creation consists of two component parts, φέπη “words” and μέλος “tune.” In another similar early usage in the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*, the phrase ἐν μέλεσσι refers to the tune of Pan’s syrinx.² By the late archaic period, however, the word had taken on the broader meaning of “song,” as Pindar uses it, referring to his Second Pythian: ὕμνιν τόδε τᾶν λιπαρᾶν ἀπὸ Θηβᾶν φέρων μέλος ἔρχομαι.³

¹ Cf. Koller (1965) 37.

² *Hom. Hymn Pan* 16.

³ *Pyth.* 2.2-4.

Archaic μέλη fell into various subcategories based on criteria related to their performance.⁴ Θρήνοι were mourning songs written for funerals, ὕμνοι and διθύραμβοι were religious performances, ἐπιθαλάμεια were written for weddings, etc. The other important defining characteristics of lyric song were musical. Melody and rhythm gave each μέλος a distinct character and constituted an important criterion by which different types of μέλη were classified. The mixed Lydian mode, for instance, was more appropriate to songs of mourning, while the Ionic better befitted the symposium.⁵ In the *Laws*, Plato complains of the corruption and mixing in his own time of the traditional categories of μέλη and their corresponding musical modes, which suggests that the musical and occasional categorizations of lyric song persisted, at least for conservatives like Plato, into the fourth century.⁶

Originally, these various attributes of live musical performance were what made a μέλος a μέλος. As such, this class of sung poetry differed from the main other class of poetry composed for recitation. The second element in Alcman's description of his poetry, ἔπος, eventually evolved to be contrasted to μέλος to formally distinguish between sung and recited poetry. The word ἔπος did not necessarily imply dactylic hexameters, but any stichic, recitative poetry. Herotodus, for example, describes Solon's elegiac encomium (in elegiac couplets) of the tyrant of Cyprus as written ἐν ἔπεσιν, whereas in each of the two instances in which he refers to songs by Alcaeus and Sappho, he calls their song a μέλος.⁷ In Plato's time, the stichic/melic distinction between the two words was also clear: in the *Meno*, Socrates responds to Meno's question ἐν ποίοις

⁴ Harvey (1955) 159.

⁵ *Resp.* 398e1ff.

⁶ *Leg.* 700b-e.

⁷ *Her.* 5.95.5; 2.135.27.

ἔπεισι; with the answer ἐν τοῖς ἐλεγείοις citing the distichs of Theognis and in the *Laws* the Athenian refers to ποιηταί...ἐπῶν ἑξαμέτρων...καὶ τριμέτρων, referring to both stichic meters, iambic trimeter and dactylic hexameter, as ἔπη.⁸ A scholiast to Dionysius Thrax, observing the same phenomenon from the first century B.C.E., best sums up the breadth of use of the term in the Greek critical vocabulary:

ἔπος λέγεται πᾶς στίχος ἱαμβικός τε καὶ τροχαικός καὶ ἀναπαιστικός καὶ δακτυλικός καὶ οἴωδῆποτε ποδὶ μετρούμενος, κατ' ἐξοχὴν δέ, τούτεστι κατὰ τιμὴν καὶ ὑπεροχὴν, τὸ ἥρωικὸν μέτρον ἔπος ἐκάλεσαν.

Every iambic trochaic anapaestic dactylic and *stichos*, and those measured in any other foot, is called an ἔπος. But because of its prominence, that is to say, its honor and outstanding quality, they called the heroic meter ἔπος.⁹

While there was a firm early distinction based on formal characteristics separating μέλη from stichic poetry as early as Herodotus' time, there was still no strong distinguishing term for the lyric poet: Arion, for example is an ἀοιδός just like Homer and Hesiod.¹⁰ Slightly later, however, the noun μελοποιός emerges for the poets who make μέλη, the verb μελοποιῶ for the action of composing μέλη. But the word did not signify a class of poets in the sense of an exclusive notion of genre, as an example from Aristophanes' *Frogs* makes clear. During the contest between Euripides and Aeschylus at the end of the comedy, the two tragic poets move through the different parts of their dramas, lampooning each other as they go. They begin by mocking each other's prologues and then, when both poets feel they have succeeded at demonstrating the other's incompetence at composing in stichic trimeters, Dionysus, who is judging the

⁸ *Meno* 95c – 96a; *Leg.* 810e.

⁹ Hilgard (1901).

¹⁰ *Her.* 1.23.

contest, asks Euripides to move on to another section of tragedy, choral lyric which he calls μέλη.

ἀλλ' εἰς τὰ μέλη πρὸς τῶν θεῶν αὐτοῦ τραποῦ.¹¹

Euripides responds that he will now prove that Aeschylus is a bad μελοποιός.

καὶ μὴν ἔχω γ' οἷς αὐτὸν ἀποδείξω κακὸν
μελοποιὸν ὄντα καὶ ποιοῦντα ταῦτ' ἀεὶ.¹²

The pair then proceeds to compare their lyric choral odes. It is clear now that we have moved from one type of poetry to another, from recitative iambic dialogue to lyric song.

This example of the divisions of the different types of poetry that make up tragedy shows that the main criteria by which the different genres of poetry were divided in Classical Greece were still largely formal. Characteristics like meter and music exclusively determined if a poem was a μέλος or not. In this case, the stichic recitative parts of the tragedy are clearly defined from the musical μέλη, the choral odes. This largely formal division makes sense, given the importance that occasion had for genre in early Greece and given the large and obvious difference in performative modes. It also highlights a major divide which is born out by general usage: no Greek writer ever refers to stichic meters, be they epic hexameters or iambic trimeters, as μέλη nor are the poets who composed in them ever referred to as μελοποιοί. Aeschylus is only a μελοποιός in this context to the extent that he composes choral μέλη. In the argument about the sections of his plays written in iambic trimeters, both he and Euripides are repeatedly called ποιηταί, their poetic output ποίησις.

¹¹ Ar. *Ran.* 1248.

¹² *Ibid.* 1249-50.

Melos and “Lyric Poetry” in Plato and Aristotle

It is often remarked that the two most serious investigations of literary genre in Greek literature do not mention lyric poetry. It is true that lyric is lacking in the systematic discussions of literature by Plato and Aristotle, but of course this absence does not mean the absence of the category μέλη in Greek thought altogether. First of all, Plato and Aristotle were anything but representative of the general Greek conception of its literary landscape. Moreover, they both existed at a time of flux in the development of genre in Greek literature when, due to the introduction of writing, traditional notions of genre tied to occasion had already begun to atrophy. It may have been as a result of this sea change in critical perspective that Plato and Aristotle were led to base their discussions of literature not on traditional performance-oriented criteria, but on representational mode of narration or *mimesis*.

When in books two, three, and ten of the *Republic* Plato divides poetry into three different classes of *mimesis*, the purely narrative, the purely mimetic, and the mixed class, which he correlates to dithyramb, tragedy, and epic respectively, it is important to realize that these classifications of poetry do not represent an established trinity of poetic genres, even if Plato succeeds at roughly mapping his new schema onto preexisting poetic typologies. Plato’s divisions of poetry according to its narrative mode form part of a complex philosophical appraisal of literature with *mimesis* as its main rubric, a system which only coincidentally aligns with preexisting formal notions of genre. Thus, the categories of pure and mixed mimesis happen to correspond relatively closely to tragedy and epic, whereas for the third category, pure narrative, it is more difficult to find an exact fit. The best example Socrates can find of this category is the dithyramb, a long

narrative song to Dionysus written in melic meters. But the inexactitude of the match is clear in Socrates' words: εὖροις δ' ἂν αὐτὴν μάλιστα που ἐν διθυράμβοις, "you would find the best example of that, I suppose, among the dythrambs."

Now, the dithyramb is a good choice for Plato because, since it happens to be a long narrative poem to the god Dionysus, it corresponds well to his third category of direct narration. The fact that it is also one of the subgenres ultimately subsumed into the larger umbrella category of lyric, or even that it would have been called a μέλος, is not relevant to Plato's philosophical agenda here. Although it would go on to be in later eras, in Plato's time melic poetry was not yet a stand-alone genre to be distinguished from epic and tragedy. As we have already seen in the *Frogs*, in the early fourth century B.C.E. Aeschylus and Euripides could just as easily be μελοποιοί as Sappho and Alcaeus could. The term depended on the formal characteristics of the poetry they wrote, not on prescribed notions of membership among a certain group of poets.

Understanding that μέλη did not exert the same force as a generic heading as tragedy or epic for Plato helps make sense of other seeming inconsistencies in the Platonic corpus. In book ten of the *Republic* when Socrates allows only ὕμνους θεοῖς and ἐγκώμια τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς into the ideal state, he follows this admission with what from a modern perspective seems like a puzzling statement:

εἰ δὲ τὴν ἡδυσμένην Μοῦσαν παραδέξῃ ἐν μέλεσιν ἢ ἔπεσιν, ἡδονὴ σοι καὶ λύπη ἐν τῇ πόλει βασιλεύσετον ἀντὶ νόμου τε καὶ τοῦ κοινῇ ἀεὶ δόξαντος εἶναι βελτίστου λόγου.¹³

For if you grant admission to the honeyed muse in lyric [*sic*] or epic, pleasure and pain will be lords of your city instead of law and that which shall at any given time have approved itself to the general reason as the best (Trans. Shorey).

¹³ *Resp.* 607a5-8.

For later readers, hymns and encomia are two of the most classic melic subgenres. By today's standards of Greek lyric, it seems self-contradictory for Socrates to say in one sentence that these two subgenres are allowed into the ideal city and then in the next that the entire category of μέλη has no place there.

Realizing that the term μέλη lacked any absolute generic force makes it easier to see the untidy meeting of two different critical systems in Plato's text. A traditional system based on formal and occasional genre attributes butts heads with Plato's new classifications based on representational mode. It is important to note that the language that Plato uses here recalls the distinction first foreshadowed in Alcman and then articulated more clearly in later authors: ἔπος and μέλος were the two different types of poetry in formal terms. In this quick catch-all phrase for poetry, Plato reverts to a system of generic divisions based on formal criteria. This is the traditional division in the Greek mind before Plato, and one Plato still felt. In the *Ion*, for instance, Plato also discusses melic poets. These μελοποιοί compose μέλη characterized by musical qualities (ἁρμονίαν ... ῥυθμόν) and are separated off from stichic poets, οἳ... τῶν ἐπῶν ποιηταί.¹⁴

In the *Poetics*, Aristotle is more explicit about old and new ways of forming genre. He identifies the formal criteria such as meter by which poetry has traditionally been classed and argues that definitions based upon these criteria are insufficient because they do not consider the content of the poetry:

πλὴν οἱ ἄνθρωποι γε συνάπτοντες τῷ μέτρῳ τὸ ποιεῖν ἐλεγιοποιούς
τοὺς δὲ ἐποποιούς ὀνομάζουσιν, οὐχ ὥς κατὰ τὴν μίμησιν ποιητάς

¹⁴ *Ion* 533e.

ἀλλὰ κοινῇ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον προσαγορεύοντες· καὶ γὰρ ἂν ἱατρικὸν ἢ φυσικὸν τι διὰ τῶν μέτρων ἐκφέρωσιν, οὕτω καλεῖν εἰώθασιν.¹⁵

Of course, people attach the verbal idea of “poetry” [τὸ ποιεῖν] to the name of the meter, and call some “elegiac poets”, some “epic poets.” But this is not to classify them as poets because of mimesis, but because of the meter they share: hence, if writers express something medical or scientific in meter, people still usually apply these terms.

Aristotle proposes a new system, based on Plato’s new criterion, for analyzing and classifying different types of poetry. Yet he too falls back upon earlier methods of classification in other parts of the poetics. For example, when analyzing the component parts of tragedy, Aristotle abides by criteria similar to those identified above in

Aristophanes:

λέγω δὲ ἡδυσμένον μὲν λόγον τὸν ἔχοντα ῥυθμὸν καὶ ἀρμονίαν, τὸ δὲ χωρὶς τοῖς εἶδεσι περαίνεισθαι καὶ πάλιν ἕτερα διὰ μέλους. ἐπεὶ δὲ πράττοντες ποιοῦνται τὴν μίμησιν, πρῶτον μὲν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἂν εἴη τι μόριον τραγωδίας ὁ τῆς ὄψεως κόσμος· εἴτα μελοποιία καὶ λέξις, ἐν τούτοις γὰρ ποιοῦνται τὴν μίμησιν. λέγω δὲ λέξιν μὲν αὐτὴν τὴν τῶν μέτρων σύνθεσιν, μελοποιίαν δὲ ὃ τὴν δύναμιν φανεράν ἔχει πᾶσαν.¹⁶

I use “embellished” for language with rhythm and melody, and “distinct forms” for the fact that some parts are conveyed through metrical speech alone, others again through song. Since actors render the mimesis, some part of the tragedy will, in the first place, necessarily be the arrangement of spectacle; to which can be added lyric poetry [sic] and diction, for these are the media in which they can render the mimesis. By “diction,” I meant the actual composition of the metrical speech; the sense of “lyric poetry” [sic] is entirely clear (Trans. Halliwell).

Poetry differs from prose in that it is language “made sweeter” by two things, by meter alone on the one hand (τὸ διὰ μέτρων...μόνον) and by the addition of music on the other (διὰ μέλους). That this division represents the traditional view of genres is clear

¹⁵ Arist. *Poet.* 1447b13-17.

¹⁶ *Ibid.* 1449b28-36

from his final remark that the meaning of μελοποιία, the word he uses to distinguish the lyric sections of tragedy is “clear to all.”

Plato and Aristotle’s literary critical divisions of Greek literature should be appreciated for their novelty and not misinterpreted as neatly itemized eidographic catalogues of the early Greek literary mindset. As should be clear by now, in early Greece there were first μέλη, and then eventually μελοποιοί and μελοποιία. These were generic categories based largely on the basic formal criteria of whether verse was recited or sung. There were also the traditional εἶδη, the subgenres such as hymns, dithyrambs, encomia, and skolia. These were all μέλη to the extent that they were sung and not recited, but this status had not yet taken on the all encompassing, unifying force of a stand-alone genre with its representative poets. Though he never says so explicitly, we can deduce that Herodotus might have called Sappho and Alcaeus ᾠδοί just as he does the lyric poet Arion. In Aristophanes, the paradigmatically *tragic* poets can just as easily be μελοποιοί depending on what sort of verse they are composing. There was clearly a class of “songs” and “poets of songs” for the early Greeks, but these groupings constituted no distinct group of lyric poets as there would go on to be in later eras

Lyric in Alexandria

The following epigram, by most accounts to be dated to the late second century B.C.E., shows how this notion of genre changed over the course of the centuries that followed Plato and Aristotle:

Εἰς Πίνδαρον τὸν ποιητὴν καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς λυρικοὺς

Πίνδαρε, Μουσάων ἱερὸν στόμα, καὶ λάλε Σειρὴν
Βακχυλίδη Σαπφοῦς τ’ Αἰολίδες χάριτες
γράμμα τ’ Ἀνακρείοντος, Ὅμηρικὸν ὅς τ’ ἀπὸ ρεῦμα

ἔσπασας οἰκείοις, Στῆσίχορ', ἐν καμάτοις,
 ἢ τε Σιμωνίδεω γλυκερὴ σελὶς ἡδὺ τε Πειθοῦς (5)
 Ἰβυκε καὶ παίδων ἄνθος ἀμυσσάμενε
 καὶ Ξίφος Ἀλκαίοιο, τὸ πολλάκις αἶμα τυράννων
 ἔσπεισεν πάτρης θέσμια ρυόμενον,
 θηλυμελεῖς τ' Ἀλκμᾶνος ἀηδόνες, ἴλατε, πάσης
 ἀρχὴν οἱ λυρικῆς καὶ πέρας ἐστάσατε.¹ (10)

To Pindar and the Remaining Lyric Poets

Pindar, holy moth of the muses, and Bachylides, talkative Siren, graceful Aeolian Sappho and doggerel-writing Anacreon, and Stesichorus, who drew from Homer's flow his own toils, Simonides' poet of sweet pages, and sweet Ibycus born of Persuasion, reaping the bloom of youths, and swordsman Alcaeus, who often spilled the blood of tyrants dragging down the laws of his fatherland, and Alcman, that soft singing nightingale, be propitious, you who are the beginning and end of all lyric.

By the second century B.C.E. at the latest, a clear group of nine “lyric poets” had developed: Pindar, Bachylides, Sappho, Alcaeus, Ibycus, Stesichorus, Alcman, Anacreon, and Simonides.² This group was exclusive, as the final line of the epigram makes clear. By this time, these nine poets were the ἀρχὴ and the πέρας of lyric. The intervening centuries between Plato and Aristotle and the composition of this epigram were a time of intense scholarly activity, first in the Peripatetic tradition of Aristotle and then in the massive organization of Greek literature carried out by the Alexandrian scholars. As the strange circumlocutions Σιμωνίδεω γλυκερὴ σελὶς and γράμμα τ' Ἀνακρείοντος make clear, the Alexandrian age also cemented the transition from an oral culture based in ritual performance to a scholarly book culture: lyric poetry is now imagined as poetry on the page. The Alexandrian period had huge ramifications for the formation of the lyric genre. It was in Hellenistic Alexandria that the genre of “Greek lyric” as scholars know

¹ *AP* 9.184.

² Cf. also *AP* 9.571. For the lyric poets in epigram see Acosta Hughes and Barbantini (2007).

it today and Horace knew it in the first century B.C.E. truly began to take shape, both conceptually in the Greek mindset and also literally on the page, as we shall see.

One important step in the formation of this genre was the identification of a group of “lyric poets,” the *novem lyrici* that Horace had in mind when he wrote his opening ode. To this end, we would like to know more about the processes of information gathering that went into the establishment of the collections at Alexandria, because this information would help answer the question of how this canon formed. In his foundational study of the problem, *Die Textgeschichte der Griechischen Lyriker*, Willamowitz, pointing to the lack of direct evidence for a process of selection for the Lyric poets, suggests that these nine poets were the only ones whose texts remained in the temple libraries and archives when the Alexandrian scholars began to collect manuscripts.³ He adduces the fact that Corinna was added as a tenth lyric poet at some later point as evidence that she was added to the group when her textual remains were discovered. This theory seems improbable. First, the fact that these nine poets are not the only Greek lyric poets known to us makes it hard to believe that only nine remained to the Alexandrians who were so much closer in time to the original compositions. Secondly, the fact that only a few generations before, the peripatetic scholar Chaemaeleon could write an entire treatise on the poet Lasus, a poet ultimately not included in the canonical nine, makes it hard to believe that Lasus and the work of other lesser known poets like him was entirely lost to the Alexandrian editors. Finally, the number nine, the number of the muses, carried a special significance at Alexandria. The text of Herodotus, for instance, was divided into 9 books in the Alexandrian period so that it might correspond to the number of the

³ Willamowitz (1900) 63-71. The only direct evidence is for the orators. Cf. Pfeifer (1968) 206-7 n.2 and 3.

muses.⁴ A choice of the number nine for the lyric poets is even more appropriate.⁵ If only nine poets remained by chance, it would be a striking coincidence.

To these points contradicting Wilamowitz's theory should be added the observation that even as early as the comic poet Aristophanes, members of the lyric cohort had already begun to be associated with one another. Among Aristophanes' fragments we find the exhortation of one symposiast to another to sing a sympotic lyric song, a *skolion* of either Alcaeus or Anacreon: ἔσον δὴ μοι σκόλιόν τι λαβὼν Ἀλκαίου κ' Ἀνακρέοντος.⁶ In early Hellenistic poetry members of the group of nine poets begin to be associated more closely in literary historical fantasy. A fragment of Hermesianax's *Leontion* (early 3rd century B.C.E.) records the story of Alcaeus, Sappho, and Anacreon's love triangle:

Λέσβιος Ἀλκαῖος δὲ πόσους ἀναδέξατο κώμους
Σαφοῦς φορμίζων ἡμερόεντα πόθον
γιγνώσκεις· ὁ δ' αἰδὸς ἀηδόνης ἤρασαθ', ὕμνων
Τήϊον ἀλγύνων ἄνδρα πολυφραδίῃ
καὶ γὰρ τήν ὁ μελιχρὸς ἐφήμιλλητ' Ἀνακρείων. (fr. 7 Powell)

And you know how many revels the Lesbian Alcaeus took part in, singing his desirous longing for Sappho on his lyre. The poet loved the nightingale, paining the man of Teios with the eloquence of his songs. For honey-sweet Anacreon was his rival in love.

The grouping of at least some of the canonical lyric poets with each other, then, was almost certainly not the mere result of what the early Alexandrian librarians managed to collect; Greek literati had begun to notice these poets' similarities and to associate them long before the Alexandrian age and canon formation was already in motion when the Alexandrian age began.

⁴ See Caganazzi (1975) 385 – 423.

⁵ On Sappho as the tenth muse cf. Acosta-Hughes (2010) 85-87.

⁶ Fr. 223 (Edmonds).

We have already made brief mention of Chamaeleon of Hereclea Pontica, who flourished near the beginning of the 3rd century B.C.E. Chamaeleon was part of a group of Peripatetic intellectuals working in the tradition of Aristotle to explain and categorize the Greek world and its literature. The contribution made by the Peripatetics to Alexandrian scholarship on Greek literature has not been fully explored or appreciated.⁷ Though their main subjects of interests seem to have been Homer and the tragedians, several Peripatetic authors also blazed new trails working on the lyric poets. Their goals were largely biographical and they saw little methodologically wrong with drawing conclusions about the lives of the poets they studied from their poetry.⁸ For the lyric poets, Chamaeleon seems to have been most prolific, writing specific monographs on five of the nine canonical *lyrici*. His monographs included a *περὶ Σαφοῦς* in which he proliferated the legend that Sappho had been romantically involved with Anacreon, a *περὶ Στησιχόρου* which provides the interesting tidbit that Stesichorus wrote not one but two palinodes, a *περὶ Πινδάρου* with a section analyzing Pindar's self-reflection on the potential scandalous effect of Olympian 13 on its Corinthian audience, a *περὶ Σίμωνίδου* which seems to have focused largely on biographical details of the poet, a *περὶ Ἀλκμάνου* which uses the fragment mentioned above as evidence that men learned song from birds, and finally a *περὶ Ἀνακρέοντος* and the aforementioned *περὶ Λάσου* of which almost nothing has been preserved besides the name.

In addition to Chamaeleon, the sparse fragments show many other peripatetic scholars taking an interest in lyric. The polymath Dichaearchus and the great musical scholar Aristoxenus also must have handled the lyric poets to some extent. Traces of

⁷ Podlecki (1969).

⁸ Momigliano (1971) 64 ff; Leo (1960) 390 ff.

Dicharchus' περὶ Ἀλκαίου can be seen in an early textual-critical dispute between him and Aristophanes of Byzantium regarding a reading in an ode of Alcaeus.⁹ In his treatise *On Music*, Aristoxenus credited Sappho with the invention of the mixed Lydian mode. It was also a common Peripatetic practice to group individuals according to their profession. This interest in analyzing and grouping individual poets and poetry constitutes a documentable tradition going back to Aristotle, whose lost dialogue περὶ ποιητῶν would have doubtless told us much about how his school understood the different categories and groups of poets. Works of the same name are also traceable to Phantias of Eresus and Herionymus of Rhodes, who also wrote a treatise *On Citharodes*. Though the fragmentary nature of the evidence leaves the details murky, the general trend is clear: the strong Peripatetic interest in biography, in studying groups of individual writers, in etiology and in merging biographical and literary historical information combined with their interest in lyric must have contributed much to a notion of a group of lyric poets that would go on to be inherited by the Alexandrians.

But this new age of book lyric clashed with the traditional classification of poetry based on formal characteristics we have identified. First of all, literary editions of the “lyric poets” artificially brought together highly disparate poetic traditions differing widely in terms of language, content, tone, and historical context. Nearly opposite poetic *personae* such as Sappho and Pindar were suddenly forced into an arbitrary category that implied a similarity of genre that is not organically reflected in their poetry.

The awkward fit of this poetry – not originally written down, let alone grouped according to prescribed generic criteria – is evident in the haphazard organization of

⁹ Fr. 99 (Wehrli).

literary editions of the lyric poets produced by their greatest Hellenistic editor, Aristophanes of Byzantium. Some poets are groups by meter. For instance, Sappho's books were divided according to meters, but there is evidence that her partheneia were grouped together as a single εἶδος at the end of the edition of her work.¹⁰ The poems of Alcaeus, on the other hand, seem to have been notionally grouped by content; scholars have suggested (though not without some difficulties) general groupings of *stasiotika* (poems about political *stasis*) and hymns in his collection.¹¹ Others poets' work was grouped according to εἶδη, the sub categories of poetry that reflected a given poem's original performance occasion including hymns, dithyrambs, epincians, threnoi, paeans, etc. Pindar's epincians were then grouped by the locations of the games they celebrated. Those of Bacchylidies, on the other hand, were grouped by event. This incongruity of organization reflects the variegated group of poets and poetry brought together under the new heading λυρικοί.

There is evidence that one Alexandrian grammarian known as Apollonios Eidographos made an effort at retaining the traditional organizational criterion of musical mode. But such a method must have quickly lost its value as the memory of how the lyric songs originally sounded faded. It is ironic that melic poetry was largely stripped by the Alexandrians of the music that had traditionally been a *sine qua non* for the genre. By the time of the great edition of Aristophanes, lyric poetry had been majorly

¹⁰ On the Alexandrian edition of Sappho see Page (1955) 318-23; Liberman (2007), Yatromanolakis (1999) Acosta-Hughes (2010) 12-16.

¹¹ The exact nature of the Alexandrian Edition of Alcaeus is a huge debate. Wilamowitz (1900) thought that metrical *polyeideia* was its defining characteristic, a characteristic then in turn imitated by Horace. Pardini (1991) Porro (1996), Liberman (2002), and most recently Acosta-Hughes (2010) have all contributed to the *communis opinio* that there were indeed some divisions of content. There may also have also been a chronological component to the internal ordering the political poems.

transformed by two drastic and interrelated editorial changes: the distribution of the text of the lyric songs onto the page according to metrical cola and the omission of musical notation. The remaining evidence suggests that prior to Aristophanes' edition, the text of the lyric poets had been written out as one continuous line of prose accompanied by musical notation.¹² Presumably, this musical accompaniment helped dictate the melody to which the words were to be sung in rhythm. The omission of this notation from editions of the lyric poets and the new page layout following the new colometry altered the way lyric poetry was perceived by its reader and finalized the transition from lyric song to book lyric. It also raised meter to a level of new importance, being the only element of a lyric song's original audible performance character that remained on the pages of Alexandrian editions.

It is no wonder therefore, that the Alexandrians took a great interest in melic meters and used them as one of their chief organizational criteria for grouping lyric poetry. But Aristophanes of Byzantium also faced a metrical editorial dilemma when producing his edition of these poets. On the one hand, he wished to preserve – to the extent that he understood them – the original metrical verses of the poets. On the other hand, the physical restrictions of the page on which the edition was displayed, a restriction never envisioned at a lyric song's initial composition, imposed strict physical boundaries. To judge from the evidence that is available, Aristophanean colometry seems to have been a compromise between the two.

The only poet for whom any evidence of the Aristophanean colometric layout remains is Pindar. By examining medieval manuscripts based upon Aristophanes'

¹² Cf. West and Pohlman (2001).

edition, the French scholar Jean Irigoin has shown how Aristophanes laid out the cola of several Pindaric odes and how this layout differs from the structure of Pindar's original verse, first discovered in 1811 by the German scholar August Boeckh. In a large majority of cases, Aristophanes correctly identifies Pindar's verse and merely divides it into parts or "cola" in an effort to lay it out more evenly on the page. In these cases, the cola are divided at recurrent caesurae and other natural divisions in the verse. A comparison of the Aristophanean colometry to a modern edition of Pindar such as Bruno Snell's, whose page layout aims at a reconstruction of Pindar's ancient verse structure, makes clear how much more uniform and presentable the Aristophanean version looks on the page.

Snell's Teubner Edition	Alexandrian Edition ¹³
᾽Οθεν περ καὶ Ὀμηρίδαι ράπτων ἐπέων τὰ πόλλ' αἰδοί ἄρχονται, Διὸς ἐκ προοιμίου, καὶ ὅδ' ἀνὴρ καταβολὰν ἱερῶν ἀγώνων νικαφορίας δέδεκται πρῶτον, Νεμεαίου ἐν πολυύμνητῳ Διὸς ἄλσει. (5) ὀφείλει δ' ἔτι, πατρίαν εἴπερ καθ' ὁδὸν νιν εὐθυπομπὸς αἰὼν ταῖς μεγάλαις δέδωκε κόσμον Ἀθάναις, θαμὰ μὲν Ἰσθμιάδων δρέπε- σθαι κάλλιστον ἄωτον ἐν Πυθίοισι τε νικᾶν Τιμονόου παῖδ'· ἔστι δ' εὐικός (10) ὀρεῖαν γε Πελειάδων μὴ τηλόθεν ὠαρίωνα νεῖσθαι. καὶ μὰν ἅ Σαλαμῖς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατάν δυνατός, ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἔκ- κτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν, ὦ Τιμόδημε, σὲ δ' ἀλκά παγκρατίου τλάθυμος ἀέξει. (15) Ἀχάρναι δὲ παλαίφατον εὐάνορες· ὅσσα δ' ἄμφ' ἀέθλοισι, Τιμοδημίδαι ἐξοχώτατοι προλέγονται. παρὰ μὲν ὑψιμέδοντι Παρ- νασσῶ τέσσαρας ἐξ ἀέθλων νίκας ἐκόμιξαν· ἀλλὰ Κορινθίων ὑπὸ φωτῶν (20) ἐν ἐσλοῦ Πέλοπος πτυχαῖς ὀκτῶ στεφάνοις ἔμιχθεν ἦδη· ἐπτά δ' ἐν Νεμέᾳ, τὰ δ' οἴκοι μᾶσσον· ἀριθμοῦ, Διὸς ἀγῶνι. τόν, ὦ πολί- ται, κωμάξατε Τιμοδήμῳ σὺν εὐκλείῃ νόστῳ· (24) ἀδυμελεῖ δ' ἐξάρχετε φωνᾶ.	᾽Οθεν περ καὶ Ὀμηρίδαι ράπτων ἐπέων τὰ πόλλ' αἰδοί ἄρχονται, Διὸς ἐκ προοιμίου, καὶ ὅδ' ἀνὴρ καταβολὰν ἱερῶν ἀγώνων (5) νικαφορίας δέδεκται πρῶτον, Νεμεαίου ἐν πολυύμνητῳ Διὸς ἄλσει. ὀφείλει δ' ἔτι, πατρίαν εἴπερ καθ' ὁδὸν νιν εὐθυπομπὸς (10) αἰὼν ταῖς μεγάλαις δέδωκε κόσμον Ἀθάναις, θαμὰ μὲν Ἰσθμιάδων δρέπεσθαι κάλλιστον ἄωτον ἐν Πυ- θίοισι τε νικᾶν (15) Τιμονόου παῖδ'· ἔστι δ' εὐικός ὀρεῖαν γε Πελειάδων μὴ τηλόθεν ὠαρίωνα νεῖσθαι. καὶ μὰν ἅ Σαλαμῖς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατάν (20) δυνατός, ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἔκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν, ὦ Τι- μόδημε, σὲ δ' ἀλκά παγκρατίου τλάθυμος ἀέξει. Ἀχάρναι δὲ παλαίφατον (25) εὐάνορες· ὅσσα δ' ἄμφ' ἀέθλοισι, Τιμοδημίδαι ἐξοχώτα- τοι προλέγονται. παρὰ μὲν ὑψιμέδοντι Παρνα- σσῶ τέσσαρας ἐξ ἀέθλων (30) νίκας ἐκόμιξαν· ἀλλὰ Κορινθίων ὑπὸ φωτῶν ἐν ἐσλοῦ Πέλοπος πτυχαῖς ὀκτῶ στεφάνοις ἔμιχθεν ἦδη· ἐπτά δ' ἐν Νεμέᾳ, τὰ δ' οἴκοι (35) μᾶσσον· ἀριθμοῦ, Διὸς ἀγῶνι. τόν, ὦ πολῖται, κωμάξατε Τιμοδήμῳ σὺν εὐκλείῃ νόστῳ· ἀδυμελεῖ δ' ἐξάρχετε φωνᾶ. (40)

Again, in a large majority of instances, Aristophanes did recognize Pindar's original verses, merely breaking them at logical points to distribute them more evenly on the page. Most telling, however, are the instances in which Aristophanes misunderstood the nature of Pindar's original verse structure, a fault he is guilty of with much higher frequency in the more complex iambo-trochaic odes than in the dactylo-epitritic

¹³ Adapted from Irigoin (1958) 27.

compositions. In these instances, Aristophanes can be seen to have divided the Pindaric verse not based on any internal metrical quality of the verse in question, but in an effort to fit the verse into specific cola. In many of these instances, these predetermined cola correspond to the metrical phrases lifted out of archaic lyric and used *kata stichon* by earlier Hellenistic poets.¹⁴ This sort of poetic activity points towards a new way of *reading* the ancient lyric songs that focused more on individual metrical phrases than on the overarching musical structure of a verse.

On the other hand, Aristophanes' activity - preserving as much as he was able the original lyric metrical structure of the lyric songs but also producing a document that was able to stand on the physical printed page - also makes some sense of the Hellenistic practice of sampling phrases of archaic practice κατὰ στίχον. It is only natural that in the bookish Hellenistic period, *mise en page* and the physical characteristics of the papyrus began to play a role in determining composition. Hellenistic poets like Aratus, Callimachus, and Apollonius limited the length of their longer compositions to fit them on a single papyrus roll. It makes complete sense that this new limitation would also affect lyric composition. Just as Aristophanes, who as an editor was forced by considerations of *mise en page* to break up the lyric songs of the archaic poets into uniform columns on the page, the lyric experimenters of the Hellenistic period faced a similar predicament which they solved by choosing their favorite metrical phrases from the longer lyric verses into compositions *kata stichon*. This provided an appropriate alternative on the page to the unpredictable, unwieldy lyric verse. The cola of

¹⁴ Iambic trimeter: *Ol.* 6 strophe colon 8. Glyconic: *Isthm.* 7, epode, colon 5; *Pyth.* 8, epode, cola 8 and 9. Iambic dimeter: *Ol.* 6 colon 7. Phalaecean: *Ol.* 14, colon 13. Cf. Irigoin (1958).

Aristophanes of Byzantium and the stichic lyric that developed in the same period ultimately had similar practical functions as editorial and poetic solutions, respectively, to the same problem of presentation.

It is in the Alexandrian period that the adjective μελικός is first attested in a metrical scholion on a choral passage in mixed meters in Aristophanes' *Peace* 1127ff. Here melic verse is opposed to stichic, restating the traditional opposition between μέλη and ἔπη that existed since the archaic period in the new technical language of Alexandria:

αἱ πλεῖσται [συζυγίαι] ἐπιρρηματικαὶ δυαδικαὶ εἰσιν, αὕτη δὲ ἔχει μελικήν μὲν πρώτην ἰγ' κώλων, στιχικήν δὲ ἰς' στίχων, ὧ μάλιστα φιληθεῖ Ἀριστοφάνης, καὶ ὑστέραν τρίκωλον.

The majority of verses are epirrhematic dyads. This has first a melic element of 13 cola, then a stichic element of 16 stichoi, and finally a tricolon, of which Aristophanes is especially fond.¹⁵

A division originally born out of the contrast between song and recitation has become an entirely literary phenomenon, a silent object to be viewed, counted, and categorized on the page of the Hellenistic poetry book.

Lyrikē Poiēsis

At the same time, however, the increased interest in individual metrical cola lead to a new type of book lyric, composed almost entirely in stichic combinations of metrical phrases culled from the archaic poets. This meant that even in terms of its appearance on the page, new melic poetry lost its distinction from recitative poetry. Both the μέλη and ἔπη produced in the Hellenistic period were stichic. Unsurprisingly, around the same time that this traditional formal division was breaking down in contemporary practice, a new name for the class of μέλη and the poets who produced them was emerging. The

¹⁵ Holwerda (1982) 139.

new adjective λυρικός seems to have connoted not traditional formal notions like meter but rather the abstract, canonical group of poets identified by the epigram above.¹⁶ In an ironic twist, meters which had just been robbed of most of their most musical attributes by the stripping of musical notation from the text and the forced division of musical verses into cola were given a name derived from a musical instrument, the lyre.

The lyre itself had become an abstract symbol by the Hellenistic period rather than an object meant to signify any specific musical activity. The earliest datable occurrence of the word λυρικός is in an inscription on the base of a statue erected along the Sacred Way at Delphi to the Megalopolitan general Philopoimon, presumably on his death in 183-2 B.C.E. The inscription, which simply exploits an empty space on the Philopoimon base and has nothing to do with the statue itself, is to be dated somewhat later than the statue, around the middle of the second century B.C.E.¹⁷ The text honors two poets, Thrason and Socrates, for their poetic performance to the god (Apollo):

ἔδοξε τᾷ πόλει τῶν Δελφῶν· ἐπειδὴ Θράσων καὶ Σοκράτης
Πάτρωνος Αἰγυρᾶται παραγενόμενοι ποθ' ἅμ' ἐπιδείξεις ἐποίησαντο
τῷ θεῷ διὰ τῶν λυρικῶν συστημάτων προφερόμενοι [τ]ῶν
ἀρχαίων πο[ητ]ῶν ἃ ἦν πρέποντα ποτί τε τὸν θεὸν καὶ τὰν πόλιν
ἀμῶν, φιλοτιμίας καὶ σπουδᾶς οὐθὲν ἐλ(λ)είποντες, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἐνδημίαν
καὶ ἀναστροφὰν ἐποίησαντο ἀξίαν αὐτοσσαντῶν τε καὶ τᾶς πόλιος
ἀμῶν....

By decree of the Delphians: Since Thrason and Socrates the son of Patron, both of Aigira, when they were at Delphi, made demonstrations to the god (Apollo) in lyric systems, offering the elements of the ancient poets that were befitting both the god and our city, falling short of distinction and earnestness in no way, and still also because they made sojourn and departure worthy of themselves and our city...¹⁸

¹⁶ Färber (1936) 7.

¹⁷ Görgemanns (1990) 52, n.5 dates it to 160 B.C.E.

¹⁸ Fouilles de Delphes, III: Epigraphie, I. Paris (1929) 23, n.49.

Next to the text, carved into the stone, is the figure of a lyre. This figure, along with the phrase διὰ τῶν λυρικῶν συστημάτων,¹⁹ shows the abstract symbolic connotation the lyre had adopted by this time and the general awareness that meter and verse are important characteristics of the genre in question. Clearly for the Delphian magistrates who composed this inscription, the lyre itself and to a lesser degree also the meter of the poetry they were commemorating somehow represented the essence of archaic lyric, or as they put it τῶν ἀρχαίων ποιητῶν ἃ ἦν πρέποντα.

A recently discovered fragment of Poseidippus shows how the lyre had begun to take on metonymic force as a symbol for poetry even by the early Hellenistic period. This epigram, which dates from the early- to mid-third century B.C.E., recasts in a Hellenistic setting the legend of the poet Arion narrated by Herodotus. The story is one of the most familiar from Herodotus' first book: Arion, the greatest "singer of songs to the kithara" (κιθαρωδός) of his age, is betrayed by his hired crew on a voyage to Tarentum from Corinth and ordered by the mutineers to jump overboard. Arion asks their permission to make one final performance and after doing so throws himself overboard in the full regalia of an αοιδός with kithera in hand (λαβόντα τὴν κιθάραν). The mutineers sail on to Tarentum and then back to Periander's court in Corinth, intending to tell Periander that Arion is still safe in Italy. But upon their return to Corinth, they find Arion there, having been ferried on dolphinback to safety at Tanaerus, whence he had made his way back to Corinth. Herodotus closes his account by

¹⁹ σύστημα is a general ancient metrical term used by Hephaestion in a general way for any metrical grouping. Cf. Consbruch (1906) 63.

mentioning that a small statue of Arion on the back of a dolphin remains at Tanaerus and could still be seen there in his day.²⁰

Posidippus recasts the tale of Arion in a dedicatory inscription on the the shrine to queen Arsinoe:

Ἀρσινόη, σοι τήν δέ λύρην ὑπὸ χειρ[.....]ῷ
φθεγξαμένην δελφίς ἤγαγ' Ἀριόνιος
οὐ..ελου[....]ας ἐκ κύματος αλλοτ
κεῖνος ἀν[....]σ λευκὰ παρᾶι πελά[γη
πολλαπο[....]τητι καὶ αἰόλα τῇι.
φωνῇι π[....]ακον κανον ἀηδον[
ἄνθεμα δ', [ὦ Φιλ]άδελφε, τὸν ἤλασεν [.....]ίων
τόνδε δέ[χου, .]υσου μ(ε)ίλια ναοπόλο[υ

To you, Arsinoe, this lyre from the hand? (...) made to resound, Arion's dolphin brought. (...) from the wave (...), that one crossed the white sea – and many varied things (...) – with voice (...). As an offering, Brother(-loving one), receive this (which brought?...) give from the temple guard (Trans. Acosta-Hughes).²¹

As Benjamin Acosta-Hughes rightly points out, despite its fragmentary nature, it is clear that this epigram adopts many of the motifs from the myth of Arion and fits them to Hellenistic parallels.²² Queen Arsinoe is cast in the role of Periander, the benevolent ruler to whom Arion returns. Since this poem is a dedicatory inscription on her shrine at Cape Zephyrium, a parallel can also be drawn between the monument of Arion riding the dolphin at Cape Tanaerum, with the inscribed text of the poem itself coming to embody the object, a familiar trope we will examine further in Hellenistic dedicatory epigram in chapter two. One change, however, is particularly striking. In Herodotus, it was Arion himself whom the dolphin ferried across the physical distance back to dry land, in this

²⁰ Her. 1.23-4.

²¹ Text from Acosta-Hughes (2010) 1. Cf. Bing (2007) 127–8, pointing out a similar metonymic importance granted to Orpheus' lyre in a Hellenistic inscription by Phanocles (Fr. 1 Powell).

²² Acosta-Hughes (2010) 1.

poem, it is Arion's lyre that is carried by the dolphin. The voyage becomes not a physical but chronological as Arion's voice is carried from the Archaic period through to the Hellenistic period. Also – and this is most important – Arion and the object which represented him in Herodotus, the small statue of a man riding a dolphin, have been replaced by the image of the lyre, which is represented not by any figure but by the poem itself. In Herodotus, Arion did not have a lyre at all. He was not a λυριστής but rather a κιθαρωδός and specific mention is repeatedly made of his κιθάρα. For some reason, Posidippus has chosen to change the instrument that represents Arion's poetry from the kithara to the lyre.

A similar phenomenon can be identified in the *Carmina Anacreontea* which frequently mention the lyre of Anacreon and even his λυρική μούσα though there is no mention of the lyre in the extant fragments of Anacreon. On the other hand, Anacreon does mention the barbiton and is even credited as its inventor by Athenaeus. He is also frequently depicted holding the barbiton on vase paintings.²³ Again, these Anacreontic imitators chose to focus on the lyre to symbolize Anacreon's poetic activity, even though the *barbiton* would have been a much more appropriate choice. There are also traces of the lyre's importance among the Peripatetics, where a fragment of Heracleides shows the author suggesting that the lyric poet Linus' name derived from λίνος, the word for a lyre string.²⁴

By the early Hellenistic period, then, the lyre had already taken on metonymic force as a symbol for poetry. Yet it is possible to trace this phenomenon even earlier. In

²³ Carm. Anacreontea fr. 2,1 and 3,2 West (1993); Ath. 3.182ff. On depictions of Anacreon cf. Nagy (2007) 245 and Frontisi-Ducroux and Lissarrague (1990) 237 Fig. 7.6.

²⁴ Fr. 160 (Wehrli).

book six of Plato's *Laws* there is a discussion of education in which the lyre is given a special metonymic force. The Athenian is enumerating different "subjects" of education for his idealized guardian of the laws:

καίτοι τὰ μὲν περὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἃ δεῖ μανθάνειν τε αὐτοὺς καὶ μελετᾶν ἔχεις τῷ λόγῳ, τὰ δὲ περὶ τὰ γράμματα πρῶτον, καὶ δεύτερον λύρας πέρι καὶ λογισμῶν, ὧν ἔφαμεν δεῖν ὅσα τε πρὸς πόλεμον καὶ οἰκονομίαν καὶ τὴν κατὰ πόλιν διοίκησιν χρῆναι ἐκάστους λαβεῖν, καὶ πρὸς τὰ αὐτὰ ταῦτα ἔτι τὰ χρήσιμα τῶν ἐν ταῖς περιόδοις τῶν θείων, ἄστρον τε πέρι καὶ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης, ὅσα διοικεῖν ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν περὶ καὶ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης, ὅσα διοικεῖν ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν περὶ ταῦτα πάσῃ πόλει.²⁵

You know from our discourse what are the military exercises they ought to learn and to practice, but the matters that have not as yet, my friend, been fully declared to you by the lawgiver are these – first literature, next, lyre-playing; also arithmetic, of which I said that there ought to be as much as everyone needs to learn for purposes of war, house-management and civic administration; together with what it is useful for these same purposes to learn about the courses of the heavenly bodies – stars and sun and moon – in so far as every State is obliged to take them into account (Trans. Bury).

In his list of potential subjects for education, the Athenian singles out lyre-playing (λύρας πέρι) as representative of music and opposes it against other subjects such as physical education (τὰ περὶ τὸν πόλεμον) reading and writing (τὰ περὶ τὰ γράμματα), arithmetic ([τὰ] λογισμῶν [περὶ]) and astronomy (τὰ ἄστρον πέρι). Here lyre-playing is singled out as representative of the subject of music. Later in the same discussion a further distinction is made, this time within poetic compositions, between those meant only to be recited and those written specifically for musical accompaniment:

πρὸς δὲ δὴ μαθήματα ἄλυστα ποιητῶν κείμενα ἐν γράμμασι, τοῖς μὲν μετὰ μέτρων, τοῖς δ' ἄνευ ῥυθμῶν τμημάτων, ἃ δὴ συγγράμματα κατὰ λόγον εἰρημένα μόνον, τητῶμενα ῥυθμοῦ τε καὶ ἀρμονίας.²⁶

²⁵ *Leg.* 809c5.

²⁶ *Leg.* 810b5-9.

With regard to lessons in reading, there are written compositions not set to music, whether in meter or without rhythmical divisions – compositions merely uttered in prose, void of rhythm and harmony (Trans. Bury).

Here, in his use of the adjective ἄλυρος, Plato moves beyond simply designating musical education by means of the lyre. He actually draws the distinction between poetry to be sung accompanied by the lyre and other poetry, written merely (one assumes) for recitation. This early use of the lyre to distinguish between different types of poetry seems like a clear precursor to the clear articulation of a lyric genre using the same object that became emblematic of the genre later in the Hellenistic period.

But why all this focus on the lyre in the first place? In the archaic period, lyric poetry was accompanied primarily by stringed instruments, such as the lyre, the kithara, the phorminx, and the barbitos, and by wind instruments, such as the aulos. Archaic lyric poets mention all of these instruments. Vase-paintings from the archaic period bear images of young boys training with either a lyre or an aulos and sometimes shows their teacher with the more complicated barbitos.²⁷ Strangely, the kithara is absent from these images. Stranger still, in the fifth century, the aulos disappears and the lyre alone remains. This disappearance of the aulos can be explained by the fact that wind instruments were spurned for their orgiastic associations. There is much evidence for the rejection of the aulos in preference of stringed instruments in the classical period in Athens, ranging from the myth of Athena's rejection of the flute because it distorted her features to Alcibiades' legendary refusal to learn aulos-playing.²⁸ Plato and Aristotle both

²⁷ Görgemanns (1990) 56.

²⁸ Plut. *Alc.* 2.4-5; Arist. *Pol.* 8.6 Cf. McKinnon (1998).

specifically favor stringed instruments to wind instruments for educational purposes.²⁹

The Platonic material quoted above suggests that the lyre was *the* instrument on which well-brought-up Athenian men would have been musically educated. Thus, when these well educated men gathered for a night of drinking and poetry at a symposium, any lyric poem sung will have most likely been accompanied by the lyre, just as a folk song originally composed for another instrument might be strummed on the guitar around a camp fire. It is not at all difficult to imagine that the lyre's central role in the education process led to its preferred status at the symposium and its eventual association with the sort of poetry performed there by symposiasts.³⁰

²⁹ Plat. *Resp.* 399c-e; Arist. *Pol.* 1341a-b on which see Ford (2004) 325-6.

³⁰ This argument for the origin of the term *λυρικός* owes much to Görgemanns (1990).

CHAPTER TWO: MELIC METRICAL EXPERIMENTATION IN THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

“Auch metrisch ist das Bild bunt.”

-Willhelm Kroll¹

Chapter one traced the process of the emergence of book lyric in the Hellenistic period from the melic poetry of the archaic period. By Hellenistic times, lyric poetry had transitioned from songs composed to be heard at symposia or other ritual occasion to a self-conscious literary entity, written to be read among the learned circles of Alexandria. As the music faded, meter emerged as a new means for Hellenistic lyric poets to add texture and connotation to their compositions. Chapter two will examine several instances of how Hellenistic poets began to manipulate meter in Hellenistic book lyric. It begins with close reading of Callimachus’ *Iambus* 13, a programmatic poem that looks back on the author’s metrically diverse collection of *Iambi*, but serves as a good general introduction to the new heightened attention to formal aspects of poetics like meter. Next it examines several of the lyric compositions of Theocritus, including his longer lyric *paidika* as well as his epigrams in lyric meters. The chapter closes with a look at two *technopaignia*, metrical picture poems by Simmias of Rhodes. This discursive overview of different examples of Hellenistic book lyric will demonstrate both how metrically self-conscious the Hellenistic lyric poets could be and how important meter was to the definition of the new genre of “lyric” poetry as such.

¹ Kroll (1924) 204.

Callimachus' *Iambus* 13: A Metrical Manifesto

Arguably Callimachus' best-known fragment is his prologue to the *Aitia*, in which the poet answers his literary enemies, the Telchines, who criticize his short but polished poetry, mocking it as ἔπος...τυτθόν. Callimachus' response becomes a programmatic mantra for the refined Hellenistic aesthetic, the Μούσαν...λεπταλέην.² It is likely that late in his life Callimachus placed this poem at the beginning of his collected works to serve as a frontispiece to his poetry by championing its characteristically slender, cultivated style. *Iambus* 13 is a similar poem in placement, content and tone. Placed at the end of his collection of iambic poetry, it serves as a sort of epilogue to the collection, an opportunity for Callimachus to look back and comment on the *Iambi* as a whole literary opus. As in the prologue to the *Aitia*, *Iambus* 13 delivers a programmatic message through an imaginary *tête à tête* between Callimachus and one of his critics. As we shall see, *Iambus* 13 also similarly elaborates an aspect of Hellenistic poetics for which Callimachus can be seen as spokesman.

Though it fared better than many of the other poems in the collection, *Iambus* 13 is still preserved in a highly fragmentary state. Luckily, one of the papyri³ that preserve the *Iambi* also contains a prose summary of each poem known as the *diegesis*. These summaries are invaluable for the light they shed on the main themes of each poem. For *Iambus* 13, the *diegesis* runs as follows:

Μοῦσαι καλαὶ κ᾽πολλόν, οἷς ἐγὼ σπένδω·
Ἐν τούτῳ πρὸς τοὺς καταμεμφομέ-
νους αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῇ πολυειδεῖα ὧν
γράφει ποιημάτων ἀπαντῶν φησιν ὅτι
Ἴωνα μιμεῖται τὸν τραγικόν·
ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸν τέκτονά τις μέμφεται πολυειδῇ

² Fr. 1 (Pf.)

³ *P. Mil.* 1. 18.

σκεύη τεκταινόμενον.

“Fair Muses and Apollo, to whom I make my libation.”
In this he says to those who fault him
For the *polyeideia* of the poems which he writes
That he is imitating Ion the tragic poet.
Nor does anyone find fault with a carpenter
For creating varied artifacts.

After quoting the first line of the poem, the *diegesis* explains that main charge leveled by the critic against Callimachus is one of πολυείδεια. This term, which literally means “variety of form,” is difficult to interpret. Acosta-Hughes, adducing the use the term εἶδος for classes of poetry, suggests that πολυείδεια refers to multiplicity of poetic genre.⁴ It is true that the Callimachean *oeuvre* does comprise many types of poetry and often mixes elements of different genres within the same poem or collection. It is true, too, that the collection of *Iambi* contains aspects drawn from many different poetic genres. But it is an oversimplification to see Callimachus simply defending this style of his book of *Iambi* as a *Kreuzung der Gattungen*. In point of fact, the word πολυείδεια appears nowhere in the extant text of any of the *Iambi*. Moreover, while the *Iambi* do draw on elements of several genres, this mixing is characteristic of almost all of Callimachus’ poetry. *Iambus* 13, unlike the *Aitia* prologue, is positioned so as to retrospect specifically on the book of *Iambi* as a collection. A close examination of the text of *Iambus* 13 will show that the πολυείδεια defended by Callimachus in *Iambus* 13 does involve notions of poetic genre, but more precisely, that it articulates these notions specifically in terms of the creative use of formal poetic attributes, with a specific focus on meter. As such, *Iambus* 13 can be read as a statement of Hellenistic poetics that

⁴ Acosta-Hughes (2002) 68. Cf. Harvey (1955) On Plato’s use of the term εἶδος cf. *Leg.* 700a-b.

involves a heightened sensitivity to formal elements of poetry. What is more, *Iambus* 13 singles out meter as one of the most important tools in the poet-craftsman's poetic repertoire.

Let us first examine the extant text that preserves the critic's individual points of criticism against Callimachus. The beginning of the critic's speech is too fragmentary to be read with any certainty. The first clear criticism comes at line ten:

ἐκ γὰρ[. οὐτ'] ἰῶσι συμμείξας
οὐτ' Ἐφεσον ἐλθών, ἥτις ἐστι.αμ.[
Ἐφεσον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλ[λοντες
τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύ[ονται·

...neither having mixed with the Ionians
nor having visited Ephesus, which is ...
Ephesus, whence those who would produce meters
That limp are inspired not without learning.

Callimachus is criticized for composing in Choliamb without ever having “visited Ephesus,” which, as Hipponax' hometown, is the source of learned inspiration for those who would compose in the meter. Indeed, argues the critic, Callimachus has not even ever been to Ionia. This criticism implies that instead of experimenting with Choliamb, Callimachus should stick to the meters with which the Alexandrians were most familiar, the hexameter and the pentameter, which indeed comprise the large majority of Hellenistic verse.

The critic next attacks Callimachus' use of dialect, arguing that Callimachus blends the old and the new (one assumes, though the end of line 16 is illegible) as his fancy strikes him:

ἀλλ' εἴ τι θυμὸν ἢ ἑπὶ γαστέρα πνευσ[(15)
εἴτ' οὖν ἐπ... ἀρχαῖον εἴτ' ἀπαι[[..].
τοῦτ' ἐμπ[έ]πλεκται καὶ λαλεῖσ[[..].
ἴαστῖ καὶ Δωριστὶ καὶ τὸ σύμμικ[τον]
τ[ε]ῦ μέχρι τολμᾶς;

But if any breath of fancy touches your spirit or stomach
Either for the old or...
This is folded together and chattering
Both Ionic and Doric and a mixture of the two.
How far will your daring go?

This criticism is not off the mark, the *Iambi* are indeed written in a variety of dialects:

Iambi 1-5, 8, 10, and 12-13 are composed in a literary Ionic, *Iambi* 6, 9, and 11 in a literary Doric, and *Iambus* 7 in a literary Doric with some Aeolic features.⁵ For the mixture of old and new, one need look no farther than *Iambus* 1, which features the ghost of the archaic poet Hipponax returning to chastise contemporary Alexandrian philologists. The critic reproves Callimachus' mixture of poetic elements as overly daring and even "unhealthy" (ὥς ὑγίειης οὐδὲ τῶνυχι ψάυεις l. 21).

Callimachus' response to the critic begins with the vocative ὦ λῶσ τε at line 24. The adjective is significantly the same one used by Hipponax' ghost to single out one of the envious Alexandrian philologoi in *Iambus* 1.⁶ In one of several shrewd allusions that look back on earlier poems in the collection, Callimachus adopts the role of Hipponax' ghost and casts his critic as one of the envious Alexandrian contemporaries of poem one.⁷ When the text becomes fully legible at line 30, Callimachus response comes cast in explicitly metrical terms:

⁵ The same can be said for their meter. The first four *Iambi* are written in Choliamb, the meter associated especially with Hipponax. *Iambi* 5-8 are epodic. 5 is a combination of Choliamb and iambic dimeters, 6 and 7 alternating iambic trimeters and Ithyphallics. *Iambi* 8-10 are in iambic trimeters (though only one line of *Iambus* 8 is preserved, so we cannot be sure if this poem was epodic). *Iambi* 11-12 are brachycatalectic iambic trimeters and catalectic trochaic trimeters respectively.

⁶ Fr. 191 (Pf.) l. 33.

⁷ The fragmentary text of the following line seems to preserve some form of the word ἀκούω, reinforcing the allusion. Cf. fr. 191 (Pf.) 1: ἀκούσαθ' Ἰππώνακτος [ο]ὐ γὰρ ἀλλ' ἤκω.

τίς εἶπεν αὐτ[....]λε..ρ.[....]. (30)
σὺ πεντάμετρα συντίθει, σὺ δ' ἡ[ρῶο]ν,
σὺ δὲ τραγῶδε[ῖν] ἐκ θεῶν ἐκκληρώσω ;
δοκέω μὲν οὐδεῖς...

Who said ...
'You compose pentameters, you compose the hexameter
It is your lot from the gods to write tragedy.'
No one, as it seems to me...

Most critics interpret Callimachus' mention of the pentameter and the hexameter as metonymic for their representative genres, epic and elegy respectively. Pfeiffer notes that the pentameter is used metaphorically for Elegy by other Hellenistic poets.⁸ If the reading of ἡ[ρῶο]ν is correct, however, it is a strange term for Callimachus to use if he wants to evoke the epic genre. "The word ἡρῶος usually describes ῥυθμός rather than poetic genre *per se*;"⁹ the metrical word standing for epic was of course ἔπος. The use of these technical metrical terms for the genres they represent concords with the focus on formal elements of poetry like meter and dialect on which the critic bases his earlier criticism.

The *diegesis* tells us two more important pieces of information about *Iambus* 13:

(1) Callimachus justified his multiform poetry by claiming that he was imitating the tragic poet Ion, and (2) Callimachus argued that poets should not be criticized for producing variegated poems just as carpenters are not criticized for producing multiform crafts. On the basis of the scanty remaining words in lines 35–40, it is plausible that the comparison to the τέκτων came in this section of the poem. Line 36 includes the letters]φρρα καὶ τράπ[which Barber has suggested should be read as δι[φρρα καὶ τράπ[εζαν,

⁸ Pfeiffer (1965) 1:207.

⁹ Acosta-Hughes (2002) 88. On the use of ἡρῶον Cf. Plato *Resp.* 400c4-c1, Demetr. *Eloc.* 5.

“chairs and a table” two examples of object built by the carpenter.¹⁰ Line 39 preserve the letters]ε κην τῶμηκ[, a seeming reference to the measurements (...κ’ῆν το μῆκος...) of the objects composed by the carpenter. If this is correct, perhaps Callimachus here compared himself to a carpenter being criticized for the measurements of his multiform products. “Should a poem’s quality” we can imagine him arguing, “be measured by the length of its verse?” Such a metaphor would also agree with the general sense of attention to meter already; a pun in this section on the original sense of the word μέτρον, “measure” is not difficult to imagine. One recalls Callimachus’s rejection of the “Persian Chain” used to measure poetry at *Aitia* fr. 1 (Pf.) 18.

Lines 40-41 seem to mark a transition in the poem. Callimachus concludes that the critic is talking nonsense and the word τεθμός, “law, ordinance” appears. A law of metrical or generic purity, we imagine, that Alexandrian poets are expected to follow. Pfeiffer has hypothesized that the following section (lines 42–51) describes the poetic activity of Ion of Chios. Ion of Chios was best known as a tragedian, but also composed in numerous other genres including elegy and lyric.¹¹ If the words]οὐχὶ μοῦνον ἐξ.[in line 43 indeed read οὐχὶ μοῦνον ἐξάμετρον as Willamowitz suggests,¹² then this section echoes lines 31-33 in mentioning the hexameter and pentameter in combination with tragedy. The Lydian flute and the lyre strings of line 47 may have been a reference to Ion’s lyric compositions.¹³ Whatever Ion was doing with pentameters, hexameters, flutes and lyre strings, his poetic product seems to have been described in terms reminiscent of a τέκτων. His poem is an ἐντελές...χρῆμα and is “formed” ἀνεπλάσθη. It also seems,

¹⁰ Barber (1951) 80.

¹¹ *OCD*⁴ s.v. *Ion*² (A. Brown).

¹² Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1924) 18.

¹³ *PMG* 383-6.

that the reaction of the muses (αἱ θεαὶ line 50) to these poetic productions was positive ἠγάπησαν line 51.

In line 52, Callimachus shifts his focus to the present to comment on the contemporary poetic atmosphere, contrasting the love of the muses for Ion's multifarious poetic output with the current climate of envy and captious criticism that obtains among the Alexandrian poets. Pfeiffer has suggested that he evokes this state of Eris through an allusion to Hesiod's description of Eris in the *Works and Days*, suggesting that
[..να|οιδος ἐς κέρας τεθύμωται / κοτέω]ν ἀοιδῶ κήμὲ δει..ταπραχ...[recalls καὶ
κεραμεὺς κεραμεῖ κοτέει καὶ τέκτονι τέκτων. / καὶ πτωχὸς πτωχῶ φθονεῖ καὶ
ἀοιδὸς ἀοιδῶ.¹⁴ If so, this deft allusion would accord with the earlier description of the poet as τέκτων and also provides another link between Callimachus and Hipponax in *Iambus* 1 by recalling poetic envy, the very issue Hipponax returns from Hades to correct (cf. *Iambus* I.5 ...ἀπαγορεύει φθονεῖν).

This envy results in the other Alexandrian poets condemning any poet who deviates from the conservative τεθμός that restricts the poetics of the day. For this reason there are those who do not share his own poetically (and specifically metrically) adventurous spirit, Callimachus says. But these poets reap an unhealthy poetic harvest:

τοῦδ' οὐνεκ' οὐδὲν πῖον, ἀ[λλὰ] λιμηρά (60)
ἕκαστος ἄκροισ δακτύλοις ἀποκνίζει,
ὥς τῆς ἐλαίης, ἣ ἀνέπαυσε τὴν Λητώ.

For this reason nothing rich, but rather famine-causing
Each one scrapes off with his fingertips
As though from the olive treat, which gave rest to Leto.

¹⁴ Hes. *Op.* 25-6; Cf. Pfeiffer (1965) 1:208.

This seemingly bizarre passage becomes clearer with explication of its numerous puns and allusions. The contrast drawn between πῖον rich and “hungry” λιμνρά poetry is reminiscent of the advice given to Callimachus by Apollo in the prologue to the *Aitia*, but with the terms cleverly reversed. Here, rather than being fat (παχύς) as opposed to slender, Callimachus characterizes current poetic practice as “starved” by a lack of formal creativity. As a result even the muses themselves fear for their reputation and have deserted the contemporary poetic community (παρέπτησαν / καὐταὶ τρομεῦσαι μὴ κακῶς ἀκούσωσι· l. 58) The implied criticism is that Alexandrian poets are too fearful to dare the sorts of experimentation with poetic form that Callimachus ventures in the *Iambi*. Their traditional hexameters and pentameters are ironically “famished” despite their hulking size and stout subject matter. That Callimachus has formal elements like meter in mind is clearly brought out by a metrical pun, when Callimachus paints these poets as scraping with their fingertips (δακτύλοις) bits from the olive tree that supported Leto when she birthed Apollo, the god of poetry. The mention of an olive tree is also a case of internal self-reference within the *Iambi*, as line 62 is an almost direct quotation of line 84 of *Iambus* 4 (τὸ τῆς ἐλαίης, ἣ ἀν[έπασσε] τὴν Λητώ.) *Iambus* 4 is another *agon* on questions of poetics between an olive and a laurel tree, in which Callimachus contrasts the olive’s simplicity with the anger and bombast of the laurel. It is significant, given the context of poetic richness and famine, that the olive wins the contest because it is edible while the laurel is merely decorative. Through these allusions to other poems in his *oeuvre*, both in the *Iambi* and in the prologue to the *Aitia*, Callimachus situates this one debate on formal poetics within his larger aesthetic system.

Iambus 13 closes with Callimachus defiantly repeating the words of his critic:

οὐτ' [Ἐφεσο]ν ἐλθών, οὐτ' [Ἴω]σι συμμείξας
Ἐφεσον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλ[λοντες
τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύ[ονται]

Depew has suggested that Callimachus, in closing with a focus on learned inspiration, may be answering not only his critic in *Iambus* 13, but also providing a general defense of the scholar poet as a skilled craftsman. Plato famously treats the question of whether or not Greek poets possessed τέχνη in the *Ion*, in which Socrates proves that the hapless Ion excels as a rhapsode not on account of any skill but because he is possessed by the muses.¹⁵ Socrates argues by extension that this is the case for all poets. Much evidence supports the idea that Callimachus positions his response in *Iambus* 13 against Plato's dialogue. Not only does Callimachus find in Ion of Chios a poet who skillfully composes in many genres—the very ability denied to the poets by Socrates in Plato's dialogue—he manages to produce him as a counterexample with the same name as Plato's hapless rhapsode. Callimachus also co-opts the well-known Platonic metaphor of a carpenter in his defense of the skilled poet who composes in a variety of forms.¹⁶ In this context, Callimachus' reaffirmation of the inspired learning behind the *Iambi* sounds like a direct attack on the Platonic idea that poets cannot be both skilled and inspired simultaneously. The recherché word ἐναύονται and litotic phrase μὴ ἀμαθῶς certainly demonstrate his poetic τέχνη. Due to his learning, Callimachus may fruitfully experiment with the meters of archaic poet Hipponax without needing to visit Ephesus, ironically also the hometown of Plato's rhapsode.

In *Iambus* 13 Callimachus advances the image of a poet with the erudition to access the multiform Greek poetic tradition and the inspiration to employ the various

¹⁵ *Ion* 533e6.

¹⁶ E.g. *Resp.* 597d9ff.

formal elements he finds there in creative new ways. These formal elements like dialect and, even more so, meter, become the materials in which the poet-craftsman fashions his wares. Like the prologue to the *Aitia*, *Iambus* 13 may be read as a statement of Callimachean poetics that can be profitably applied to the entire Hellenistic period. The motif of a poet as a craftsman manipulating formal elements of the Greek tradition occurs again and again in Hellenistic poetry, especially in instances of metrical experimentation. As Callimachus does in *Iambus* 13, many poets specifically saw meter as an opportunity for formal creativity in experimental new types of poetry.

Naming Meters: Theocritus *Idylls* 29 and 30

In addition to being a time of metrical experimentation, the Alexandrian period was an era of scrupulous literary taxonomy. Literature was divided by genre and pigeon-holed, most famously in Callimachus' *pinakes*. This organizational impulse also extended to meter and overlaps to some extent with our investigation of metrical experimentation in Hellenistic book lyric. As Hellenistic poets excised various metrical phrases from archaic and classical strophic compositions and used them *kata stichon* to create entire poems, they often also gave these phrases their names. Friedrich Leo was the first to point out that these metrical phrases almost always took the names of the Hellenistic poets who first used them in stichic repetition.¹⁷ As a result, many minor Hellenistic poets like Glykon and Phalaecus earned an immortality they would probably have never achieved on the basis of the quality of their poetry alone.

Some opportunistic poets even took to inventing new metrical combinations solely for the *kleos* their invention would confer upon their name. Take for example the

¹⁷ Leo (1897) 65.

otherwise unheard of Philicus, who unabashedly attached his name to the first line of a poem in choriambic hexameters:

καινογράφου συνθέσεως τῆς Φιλίκου, γραμματικοί, δῶρα φέρω πρὸς
ὑμᾶς·

I bring to you, grammarians, the gifts of the new-written composition of Philicus.

The poem is pure metrical artifice, indeed much more of a gift to the Alexandrian philologists than Demeter and Persephone, the goddesses to whom it was apparently dedicated. Philicus no doubt hoped the verse would be named in his honor and tried to ensure this by placing his name directly in the middle of the first line. Hephaestion tells us that although Philicus did not invent this verse (Simmias uses it in the *Ax*), it was nevertheless named the “*philikion*” because Philicus was “the first to make entire poems out of it” (ὥς πρῶτος τούτῳ τῷ μέτρῳ [τα] ὅλα ποιήματα γράψας.)¹⁸ In other words, he first used it create an entire poem in only this meter by using it *kata stichon*. As Leo notes, “*in der Regel*” this was the case whenever the name of a Hellenistic poet was assigned to a new metrical cola. Like Philikus, Boiskos of Kuzikos also hunted the glory of an eponymous verse by “inventing” the trochaic octometer:

Βίοςκος ἀπὸ κυζίκου, πάντος γραφέντος ποιήματος, τὸν ὀκτάπουν
εὐρών στίχον Φοίβῳ τίθησι δῶρον.

Bioskos of Kuzikos, the writer of an entire poem, having invented the eight-foot *stichos*, dedicates it as a gift to Apollo.

Bioskos not only tries to ensure that this verse will bear his name in the metrical handbooks by including it in the opening line of his poem, he also explicitly points out that he meets the criteria for canonization: *kata stichon* use of a meter to write an entire poem (πάντος ποιήματος γραφέντος). For these reasons, Bioskos implicitly argues that

¹⁸ Consbruch (1906) 31.

he is the inventor (εὐρῶν) of the meter. He even suggests that meter can be used to build a structure that can be dedicated (τίθησι) like a statue to Apollo.

Of course, meters were also named for archaic poets like the Anacreontean, the Archilochean, the Alcaic, and the Sapphic. But when they were named after a contemporary Hellenistic poet, it was almost always based on the criteria that Bioskos identifies. In fact, there is only one seeming exception to Leo's *Regel*—an instance when a verse took the name of a Hellenistic poet who was not the first to use it *kata stichon*.¹⁹ This was the Asclepiad, first used to compose entire poems in the Archaic period by Sappho and Alcaeus.²⁰

Asclepiades was an important poetic figure in the Hellenistic period, especially for epigram, on which he exerted a “powerfully formative influence.”²¹ Theocritus makes reference to him in the *Idylls*²² as one of the great poets of his age. At least 33 of his epigrams survive, the majority amatory in theme. Though he must have composed enough lyric poems in Asclepiads to warrant an eponymous meter, none of these poems survive.²³ The meter to which Asclepiades gave his name is a glyconic with choriambic expansion of two recurring forms, the ‘Asclepiad’ (××–UU–UU–U×) and the so-called ‘greater Asclepiad’ (××–UU–UU–UU–U×), merely adding an extra choriamb to the

¹⁹ Some have made the argument from Caesius Bassus' statement (Keil 6.258.16) that the Phalaecean was written *et dispersi et continuati* in the fifth book of Sappho, but the meaning of *continuati* is unclear and could very possibly refer to the repetition of the verse every several lines as in Sappho 96V. Even this exception is complicated by the fact that while the Archaic poets did compose entire poems in Asclepiads, they were not technically *kata stichon* but *kata distichon*.

²⁰ According to Page (1955), the third book of Sappho was composed in greater Asclepiads. Alcaeus also used the meter.

²¹ Gow and Page (1965) 115.

²² *Id.* 7.39.

²³ Unless the line quoted by Trichas (*SH* 215) is his.

first.²⁴ Again, the Asclepiad is unique because Alcaeus and Sappho composed entire poems in it during the archaic period but it nevertheless went by the name of a Hellenistic poet. The tension between the meter's archaic birth and Hellenistic namesake is evident in Hephaestion's lemma on the meter in his *Enchiridion Peri Metrōn* where he calls it the Asclepiad, but chooses to exemplify it from Alcaeus.²⁵

This tension can be profitably explored in Theocritus' *Idyll* 30, a Hellenistic poem written in Greater Asclepiads, and its partner poem, *Idyll* 29 written in Aeolic pentameters (×× –UU–UU–UU–U×). Along with *Idyll* 28 and the mutilated *Idyll* 31, both in greater Asclepiads, they are the only Theocritean idylls written in lyric meters and composed in the Doric dialect. In the manuscripts of Theocritus, these poems are both entitled παιδικά.²⁶ Their shared subject is pederastic, erotic homosexual relationships between an aging lover and his beloved. In each case the speaker, an ἐραστής, bemoans the unrequited love of his ἐρώμενος. Since I will compare the two poems in detail, I quote them both here in full and offer Gow's translation, slightly modified, for preliminary consideration.

“Οἶνος, ὦ φίλε παῖ, λέγεται, ‘καὶ ἀλάθεα’ (1)
 κᾶμμε χρή μεθύοντας ἀλάθεας ἔμμεναι.
 κᾶγω μὲν τὰ φρένων ἐρέω κέατ’ ἐν μύχῳ·
 οὐκ ὅλας φιλέην μ’ ἐθέλησθ’ ἀπὺ καρδίας.
 γινώσκω· τὸ γὰρ αἴμις τὰς ζοίας ἔχω (5)
 ζᾶ τὰν σὰν ιδέαν, τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἀπώλετο·
 κῶταν μὲν σὺ θέλῃς, μακάρεσσιν ἴσαν ἄγω
 ἀμέραν· ὅτα δ’ οὐκ ἐθέλῃς σύ, μάλ’ ἐν σκότῳ.
 πῶς ταῦτ’ ἄρμενα, τὸν φιλέοντ’ ὀνίαις δίδω;
 ἀλλ’ αἶ μοί τι πίθοιο νέος προγενεστέρῳ, (10)
 τῷ κε λῶιον αὐτὸς ἔχων ἔμ’ ἐπαινέσας.

²⁴ We have no trace of the term “greater Asclepiad” in antiquity. The expanded form was also referred to by Sacerdos as the *pentametrum brachycatalectum asclepiadeum choriambicum* Keil 6. 536. Cf. Hunter (1996) 176.

²⁵ Consbruch (1906) 31.

²⁶ Gow (1952) 504.

πόησαι καλίαν μίαν ἐνν ἑνὶ δενδρίῳ,
 ὅππυι μὴδὲν ἀπίξεται ἄγριον ὄρπετον.
 νῦν δὲ τῷδε μὲν ἅματος ἄλλον ἔχης κλάδον
 ἄλλον δ' αὖριον, ἐξ ἀτέρω δ' ἄτερον μάτης· (15)
 καὶ μὲν σευ τὸ κάλον τις ἴδων ῥέθος αἰνέσαι,
 τῷ δ' εὖθυς πλέον ἢ τριέτης ἐγένευσ φίλος,
 τὸν πρῶτον δὲ φίλεντα τρίταιον ἐθήκαο.
 † ἀνδρῶν τῶν ὑπερανορέων δοκέης πνέην·
 φίλη δ', ἅς κε ζόης, τὸν ὕμοιον ἔχην ἄει. (20)
 αἱ γὰρ ὧδε πόης, ἄγαθος μὲν ἀκούσσαι
 ἐξ ἄστων· ὁ δὲ τοί κ' Ἔρος οὐ χαλέπως ἔχοι,
 ὅς ἀνδρῶν φρένας εὐμαρέως ὑπαδάμναται
 κάμε μόλθακον ἐξ ἐπόησε σιδαρίῳ.
 ἀλλὰ πέρρ ἀπάλω στύματός σε πεδέρχομαι (25)
 ὁμνάσθην ὅτι πέρρυσιν ἦσθα νεώτερος,
 κῶτι γηράλεοι πέλομεν πρὶν ἀπύπτυσαι
 καὶ ῥύσσοι, νεότατα δ' ἔχην παλινάγρετον
 οὐκ ἔστι· πτέρυγας γὰρ ἐπωμαδίαις φόρει,
 κᾶμμες βαρδύτεροι τὰ ποτήμενα συλλάβην. (30)
 ταῦτα χρή σε νόεντα πέλην ποτιμώτερον
 καὶ μοι τῶραμένῳ συνέραν ἀδόλως σέθεν,
 ὅππως, ἄνικα τὰν γένυν ἀνδρείαν ἔχης,
 ἀλλάλοισι πελώμεθ' Ἀχιλλεῖοι φίλοι.
 αἱ δὲ ταῦτα φέρην ἀνέμοισιν ἐπιτρέπης, (35)
 ἐν θύμῳ δὲ λέγης 'τί με, δαιμόνι', ἐννόχλης;
 νῦν μὲν κάπῃ τὰ χρύσια μᾶλ' ἔνεκεν σέθεν
 βαίην καὶ φύλακον νεκύων πεδὰ Κέρβερον,
 τότα δ' οὐδὲ κάλεντος ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις
 προμόλοιμί κε, παυσάμενος χαλέπω πόθῳ.

'Wine and truth, dear lad', the saying goes, and in our cups we too must speak truth. And I shall tell thee what lies in the recesses of my mind: thou wilt not love me with all thy heart. I see it; for half my life is mine by reason of thy beauty, the rest is lost; and when though wilt, the day I pass is that of the Blessed, but when thou wilt not, it is dark indeed. How can this be right, to plunge in troubles one that loves thee? Nay, thou are young and I thy elder; hearken then to me and though shalt profit thereby thyself and thank me for it. Make thee thy single nest in a single tree whither no wild creeping thing can come. Now on one bough thou lodgest to-day, to-morrow on another, and from the one lookest ever for a new; and whoso sees and praises thy fair face, for him thou makest thyself forthwith a friend of three years' standing, while him that loved thee first though settest among thy three-day friends. [Thou art too fickle, and shouldst cling ever to thy like.] If so thou dost thou shalt be of fair repute in the town and Love shall not deal hardly with thee – Love that lightly tames the hearts of men, and has robbed me, that once was iron, of all my strength. Nay, by thy soft lips, I bid thee call to mind that thou was younger a twelvemonth since, and ere a man can spit we grow old and wrinkled. Youth once gone is past recovery, for on its shoulders it wears

wings, and we are slow to capture things which fly. These thoughts should make thee kinder and teach thee to return my love which is without guile, and then when the beard of manhood covers thy cheeks we may be to one another as Achilles and his friend. But if thou cast my words upon the wind to bear away and say in thy heart, “Nay, Sir, why must thou vex me?, though now for they sake I would even go seek the golden apples or fetch Cerberus who wards the dead, then would my heavy longing be stayed nor would I even come to the house-door shouldst you call me.

ὦϊαι τῷ χαλέπῳ καίνομόρῳ τῷδε νοσήματος· (1)
 τετόρταιος ἔχει παῖδος ἔρος μῆν' ἀ με δεύτερον,
 κάλῳ μὲν μετρίῳς, ἀλλ' ὅποσον τῷ πόδι περρέχει
 τὰς γὰς, τοῦτο χάρις, ταῖς δὲ παραύαις γλύκυ μαιδία.
 καὶ νῦν μὲν τὸ κάκον ταῖς μὲν ἔχει ταῖς δ' ὀνίησί με, (5)
 τάχα δ' οὐδ' ὅσον ὕπνῳ 'πιτύχην ἔσσει' ἐρωῖα.
 ἔχθες γὰρ παρίων ἔδρακε λέπτ' ἄμμε δι' ὀφρύων,
 αἰδέσθεις προσίδην ἄντιος, ἠρεύθετο δὲ χροῶ·
 ἔμεθεν δὲ πλέον τὰς κραδίας ὥρος ἐδράξατο·
 εἰς οἶκον δ' ἀπέβαν ἔλκος ἔχων καῖνο<ν ἐν ἡπατι. (10)
 πόλλα δ' εἰσκαλέσαις θυμὸν ἐμαύτῳ διελεξάμαν·
 'τί δῆτ' αὖτε πόης; ἀλοσύνας τί ἔσχατον ἔσσειται;
 λεύκαις οὐκέτ' ἴσαισθ' ὅττι φόρης ἐν κροτάφοις τρίχας;
 ὥρα τοι φρονέην· μὴ <οὔτ>ι νέος τὰν ιδέαν πέλων
 πάντ' ἔρδ' ὅσσαπερ οἱ τῶν ἐτέων ἄρτι γεγεύμενοι. (15)
 καὶ μὰν ἄλλο σε λάθει· τὸ δ' ἄρ' ἧς λώιον ἔμμεναι
 ξέννον τῶν χαλέπων παῖδος ἐρώ<των προγενέστερον.
 τῷ μὲν γὰρ βίος ἔρπει ἴσα γόννοις ἐλάφῳ θόας,
 χαλάσει δ' ἀτέρᾳ ποντοπόρην αὔριον ἄρμενα·
 τὸ δ' αὖτε γλυκέρας ἀνθεμον ἄβας πεδ' ὑμαλίκων (20)
 μένει. τῷ δ' ὁ πόθος καὶ τὸν ἔσω μύελον ἐσθίει
 ὀμμιμνασκομένῳ, πόλλα δ' ὄραι νύκτος ἐνύπνια,
 παύσασθαι δ' ἐνίαυτος χαλέπας οὐκ ἴκανος νόσω.
 ταῦτα κᾶτερα πόλλα πρὸς ἔμον θυμὸν ἐμεμψάμαν·
 ὃ δὲ τοῦτ' ἔφατ'· 'ὅττις δοκίμοι τὸν δολομάχανον (25)
 νικάσῃν Ἔρον, οὗτος δοκίμοι τοῖς ὑπὲρ ἀμμέων
 εὖρην βραϊδίως ἄστερας ὀππόσασκιν ἔννεα.
 καὶ νῦν, εἴτ' ἐθέλω, χρή με μάκρον σχόντα τὸν ἄμφενα
 ἔλκην τὸν ζύγον, εἴτ' οὐκ ἐθέλω· ταῦτα γάρ, ὦγαθε,
 βόλλεται θεὸς ὃς καὶ Δῖος ἔσφαλε μέγαν νόον (30)
 καῦτας Κυπρογενήας· ἔμε μὰν, φύλλον ἐπάμερον
 σμίκρας δεύμενον αὔρας, ὀνέλων ὦκα φόρει πινόα.

Alack for this grievous and ill-starred sickness of mine! For two months now a quartan passion has held me for a lad no more than passing fair; yet clad he is with charm from head to foot, and sweet the smile upon his cheek. Till now some days the plague lies heavy on me, and other days abates, but soon no respite will there be – not even enough to compass sleep, for yesterday as he passed he gave me a quick glance from between

his eyelids, too shy to look me in the face, and blushed. And love laid tighter grip upon my heart, and home I went fresh-wounded to the quick. And summoning my soul long converse held I with myself: ‘What is this though art at again? When will this folly cease? Hast thou forgotten thou wearest white hairs upon thy temples? The season for sense has come. No longer young in looks, thou must not act as those whose foot is new-set on the threshold of the years. Ay, and this too has thou forgotten: better it is for him who is older to hold aloof from the painful love of lads. For one, life speeds on the hoof of the swift deer; to-morrow he will cast loose his tackle and set forth to sail another course, and the flower of his sweet prime abides among his peers. But the lover is prey to memories, and desire feeds even on his innermost marrow: many are the dreams that beset him by night, nor is a year’s space long enough for him to rid him of his heavy sickness.” Such complaints and many more I laid before my spirit, which thereto made answer, “whoso thinks to vanquish crafty Love thinks to find readily how many times nine in number are the stars overhead. And now, whether I chose or no, I must stretch forth my neck to all its length and drag my yoke, for such, friend, is the will of that god who brought low the great mind of Zeus and of the Cyprian-born herself. Me with a breath he lifts and swiftly bears away, like a leaf that lives but for a day in the sport of lightest airs.”

These two poems seem very similar, but scholars have pointed to subtle but illuminating differences between them in both content and style. Scholars generally agree that the speaker in *Idyll* 29 “self-consciously sets himself within the Archaic ethos” of pederastic verse.²⁷ This poem, written in the Aeolic pentameters used by the Lesbian poets, opens with a well-known proverb from Alcaeus.²⁸ Pretagostini has shown how this quotation sets the stage for a group of *topoi* from archaic pederastic verse, particularly those found in the verses of Theognis.²⁹ These include (1) the speaker’s disappointment over his beloved’s unwillingness to reciprocate, (2) the praise of the pedagogical role of the ἐραστής, (3) the condemnation of the mercurial nature of the ἐρώμενος, (4) the ethico-political importance of proper behavior for the ἐρώμενος, (5)

²⁷ Hunter (1996) 175.

²⁸ Fr. 366V.

²⁹ Pretagostini (1997) 9–18.

the sentiment that what goes around comes around, *i.e.* that an ἐρώμενος who rejects his ἐραστής will one day suffer the same fate as an adult, and (6) a reminder to consider the fleetingness of youth.³⁰ On the other hand, *Idyll* 30 exhibits a decidedly more Alexandrian tone.³¹ The description of love as a disease is typical of much ancient love poetry including, of course, Sappho 31 V, but the specificity with which Theocritus treats it in *Idyll* 30 is highly Alexandrian. The speaker metaphorically compares his lovesickness to the Quartan fever (l.2), speaking in detail about his symptoms in a way that betrays a learned medical knowledge, a detailed display of erudition that is typically Alexandrian. Equally Hellenistic in taste is the dialogue in this *Idyll*, not between ἐραστής and ἐρώμενος as it is imagined in *Idyll* 29, but as an introverted conversation between the ἐραστής and his θύμος. Similarly, poetic *topoi* that are familiar from archaic erotic poetry are transformed in ways that conform to precious Alexandrian sensibilities. Human helplessness in the face of love is compared to the difficulty of counting the stars in the sky in multiples of nine (l.27). The traditional Homeric simile comparing human beings to falling leaves³² no longer describes the tragedy of human life, but is rather co-opted to comment on the frailness of the human spirit when faced with the power of love (l.31-2).

The archaizing character of *Idyll* 29 contrasts the Alexandrian sensibility of its partner poem, *Idyll* 30, even at the formal level of meter. The differing distribution of

³⁰ 1) v.9; 35-40. Cf. Sappho 1V l. 19-24; Thgn. 1299-1203, 1283-1285; Anac. 15 Gent. 2) l.10-11. Cf. Thgn. 1351, 1235, 1321 and 1366. 3) v. 16-18. Cf. Thgn. 1257-1285, 1261-1262, 1265-1266, 1270, 1373-1374. 4) l. 21-22 Cf. Thgn. 1377-1379. 5) l.21-22 Cf. Thgn. 1307-1309 and 1330-1334. 6) l.25-30 Cf. Mimnermus fr. 7 (Gentili) and Thgn. 1305-1307.

³¹ Pretagostini (1997) 18.

³² Cf. *Il.* 5.441-2; Simonides *IEG* 99.

verses in the two poems reinforces both the archaizing aesthetic of *Idyll* 29 and the Alexandrian one of *Idyll* 30. Hephaestion informs us that Alcaeus and Sappho actually used Aeolic pentameters and greater Asclepiads *kata systema*—in repeating distichic strophes—rather than in single verses *kata stichon*. Both indirect and direct evidence verify Hephaestion’s statement.³³ By paying close attention to enjambment, Fassino and Prauscello have demonstrated that *Idylls* 28 and 30 clearly display *kata stichon* composition, while *Idyll* 29 is articulated in artificially reinforced distichs.³⁴ In the archaic period, Sappho and Alcaeus could allow for enjambment between distichic strophes, presumably because the melody accompanying them as they performed their poetry repeated itself every two verses, reinforcing the form of the distich. In the Hellenistic period, when the structuring force of music was lost, poets relied more on meter to structure their verse.³⁵ *Idyll* 28 and 30 allow enjambment between both odd and even numbered verses. *Idyll* 29, on the other hand, only allows it after even numbered verses.³⁶ By allowing for enjambment only between even numbered verses, Theocritus creates the effect of *kata systema* composition in distichs that he must have known from his Aeolic models. He makes no effort to reproduce this effect in the other *Idylls*.

³³ Hephaestion bases his argument on the fact that the paragraphos appears next to every other verse in the papyri of Sappho and that all the poems written in these meters contained an even number of verses cf. Consbruch (1906) 63, 4–8 and 15–24. The extant papyri of Sappho do not bear the paragraphos, but papyri bearing poems of Alcaeus (38a and 50V) in the same meters do. Cf. Fassino and Prauscello (2001) 9–12.

³⁴ The monostichic nature of 28 and 30 is also detectable in more obvious ways; *Idyll* 28, for instance, has an odd number of lines!

³⁵ L. E. Rossi (1998) has made a similar argument for Horace’s relaxation of metrical “rules” established in his book poetry when he wrote the sung *Carmen Saeculare*.

³⁶ The one exception between v.28 and 29 seems to be on purpose and for effect. Cf. Fassino and Prauscello (2001) 35.

The history of the use of the Asclepiad meters on the one hand and Aeolic pentameters on the other also supports the notion of an archaic/Alexandrian divide between the two poems. Asclepiad meters (and choriambic expansion in general) were used widely not only by archaic lyric poets but also in *kata stichon* compositions between the archaic period and Theocritus' time.³⁷ Other stichic compositions in choriambic meters in the Hellenistic period are not hard to find.³⁸ Instances of meters with dactylic expansion, however, are much more limited in the intervening centuries. More importantly, there is no evidence of any poetry composed *kata stichon* in this particular meter between Alcaeus and Theocritus.³⁹ Thus, as opposed to the contemporarily popular Asclepiads of *Idylls* 28 and 30, the Aeolic pentameter in *Idyll* 29 must have had a strong archaic flavor. It seems, then, that the fact that *Idyll* 29 is conspicuously *not* written in Asclepiads plays an important role in its overall archaizing aesthetic.

It would be odd, then, to note several allusions to Asclepiades' poetry in *Idyll* 29. But this does seem to be the case. For although the proverb that opens the poem was a common one in antiquity, Asclepiades, the very poet whose eponymous meter Theocritus consciously avoids in *Idyll* 29, also used a version of this proverb prominently at the head of one of his epigrams.⁴⁰

Οἶνος ἔρωτος ἔλεγχος· ἔρᾱν ἀρνεύμενον ἡμῖν
ἦτασαν αἱ πολλαὶ Νικαγόρην προπόσεις·

³⁷ Cf. especially *PMG carm. conv.* 897, 902-905, 908. For a fuller account of the history of the aeolic meters in the centuries between the Archaic and Hellenistic period see Fassino and Prauscello (2001) 21-37.

³⁸ Call. fr. 400 (Pf.): gl^{2c} | gl^{2c}, Simmias fr. 16 (Campbell): hipp^{2c}, Seleucus fr. 3 (Campbell): gl^{2c} | gl^{2c}, Ps.-Stisich. *PMG* 278: gl^{2c} | gl^{2c}, Anon. *SH* 215. Asclepiades' stichic compositions must have added to this group considerably.

³⁹ *SH* 1001 cannot be included because it is the result of a conjectural reading. *PMG* 989 should also not be included because, as a pure dactylic pentameter, it is most likely not Aeolic.

⁴⁰ GP 18.

καὶ γὰρ ἑδάκρυσεν καὶ ἐνύστασε καὶ τι κατηφὲς
ἔβλεπε, χῶ 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).

That Asclepiades, one of Theocritus' admired poetic predecessors,⁴¹ had conspicuously rewritten this Alcaean sentiment in an epigram, adds a new layer of meaning to the Theocritean quotation. Whether or not the verse stood as such in Alcaeus or whether Theocritus inserted the word λέγεται,⁴² the fact that Asclepiades had also recently made poetic use of this proverb adds ambiguity to the parenthetical statement "it is said." The proverb's statement *in vino veritas* "is said" both by Theocritus' archaic models and his Hellenistic contemporaries. The fact that Theocritus choose to quote Alcaeus in a particularly archaizing meter, instead of rewriting his own version of the proverb as Asclepiades does, suggests that Theocritus is consciously rejecting contemporary trends in favor of classical models.

In doing so, Theocritus acts out poetically the amatory advice his speaker gives to his beloved: he stays true to Alcaeus' trusted poetic model, rather than pursuing whatever pop trend strikes his fancy. Another Asclepiad intertext at the end of the poem, also contrasted with alternative archaic models, confirms this identification of poetic practice with erotic impulse. If his beloved heeds his advice, the speaker promises, the two will become friends like Achilles and Patroclus (l.34). If, however, the beloved ignores his pleas, though the speaker is currently willing to perform Hercluean labors to prove his affection, he will soon not even come to the door when his beloved stands outside calling

⁴¹ Theocritus specifically mentions him under the pseudonym Σικιλίδας as one of the most outstanding poets of his era in *Id.* 7.40.

⁴² Gow (1952) 504.

him.⁴³ This vignette, Hunter has noted, is quite similar to the *paraklausithyron*, in which an *exclusus amator* sings a woeful ballad on his beloved's doorstep. Though best known from Roman elegy, the *paraklausithyron* was also a popular subgenre in the Hellenistic period, and among its most prominent practitioners is none other than Asclepiades himself.⁴⁴ What is more, it seems that Theocritus may have a specific epigram of Asclepiades in mind when he writes: τότα δ' οὐδὲ κάλεντος ἐπ' αὐλείαις θύραις / προμόλοίμ' κε, παυσάμενος χαλέπω πόθω. Included among Asclepiades' many amatory epigrams, is this *paraklausithyron*:

Νύξ, σὲ γάρ, οὐκ ἄλλην μαρτύρομαι, οἷά μ' ὑβρίζει
 Πυθιάς ἢ Νικοῦς, οὔσα φιλεξαπάτης.
 κληθεῖς, οὐκ ἄκλητος, ἐλήλυθα· ταῦτ' αὖ παθοῦσα
 σοὶ μέμψαιτ' ἐπ' ἐμοὶ στᾶσα παρὰ προθύροις.⁴⁵

Night, for I call you along to witness, look how shamefully Nico's
 Pythias, ever loving to deceive, treats me. I came at her call and not
 uninvited. May she one day stand at my door and complain to you that
 she suffered the like at my hands (Trans. Paton).

The use of the word καλέω combined with a wish for role reversal between the lover and the beloved are present in Theocritus' *Idyll* and Asclepiades' epigram. What is more, the *paraklausithyron* provides a perfect example of new Hellenistic *mores*, both poetic and social, that fly in the face of much of the archaic erotic ethos.

A major literary development of the Hellenistic period was the emergence of amatory poetry written by men for women. While there was certainly still much male-male pederastic Alexandrian verse,⁴⁶ poetic reflections on 'homo- vs. heterosexual love'

⁴³ This interpretation differs slightly from Gow's but is preferred by Hunter (1996) 176.

⁴⁴ On the genre in general cf. Canter (1920).

⁴⁵ *AP* 5.164.

⁴⁶ Cf. Cameron (1993) 24–8.

also begin to emerge in the Hellenistic period as this epigram of dubious authorship⁴⁷ demonstrates:

οὐ μοι θῆλυς ἔρωσ ἐγκάρδιος, ἀλλὰ με πυρσοὶ
ἄρσενες ἀσβέστῳ θῆκαν ὑπ' ἀνθρακιῇ.
πλειότερον τόδε θάλπος· ὅσον δυνατώτερος ἄρσην
θηλυτέρης, τόσσον χῶ πόθος ὀξύτερος.

The love of women touches not my heart, but male brands have heaped unquenchable coals of fire on me. Greater is this heat; by as much as a man is stronger than a woman, by so much is this desire sharper (Trans. Paton).

The fact that this epigrammatist felt the need to defend his homosexual proclivity documents that homosexual pederastic verse was no longer the norm in the Hellenistic period. This tension is also observable in Theocritus' seventh *Idyll* when Simichidas, Theocritus' poetic identity, engages in a poetic contest with Lycidas in which both compose homosexual pederastic love songs. While the paradigmatically bucolic Lycidas sings of his own love for the boy Ageanax, Simichidas, the urbane scholar-poet, points out that he himself loves the female Myrto and frames his own song in the experience of his friend Aratus' pederastic interest in the boy Philinus.⁴⁸ By the Hellenistic period, a palpable duality between heterosexual and homosexual poetics had been elaborated that may have led Theocritus to contrast the Alexandrian Simichidas' detached poetic treatment of the them with Lycidas' personal account of his own erotic misadventures.

⁴⁷ Gow and Page include this poem among the collected epigrams of Asclepiades (37 GP), but it has also been attributed to Posidippus. There seems to be no clear reason to prefer one attribution to the other.

⁴⁸ *Id.* 7.96-7. Theocritus repeatedly emphasizes that his friend, Aratus, is in love with a παῖς.

Now the *paraklausithyron*, as it seems from the preserved Hellenistic examples, was almost always a heterosexual genre.⁴⁹ As such, it can be understood as a model of new-age Hellenistic taste that specifically undermines the archaic homosexual pederastic ethos expressed by the speaker in *Idyll* 29. The figures of Achilles and Hercules, the two examples of mythical homosexual lovers against whom Theocritus contrasts his Asclepiad allusion, reinforce this tension between archaic homosexual pederasty and more novel heterosexual poetry. Hercules was a great lover of boys elsewhere in the Theocritean corpus, his pederastic relationship with Hylas is the subject of *Idyll* 13. In addition, an epic poet called Diotimos, a near contemporary of Theocritus, wrote a poem “in which Eurystheus was the hero's *paidika* and the labors were presumably represented as acts of devotion of the kind imagined by the speaker of *Idyll* 29.”⁵⁰ Achilles relationship with Patroclus was also a classic example of homosexual love in Greek literature.⁵¹ The fact that these two examples are contrasted with a vignette that bears comparison to an Asclepiadic *paraklausithyron* suggests that by rejecting his male lover the ἐρώμενος is rejecting classical paradigms for contemporary trends and threatening the archaic customs advocated by the ἐραστής in the poem.

The conspicuously metrical absence and intertextual presence of Asclepiades in *Idyll* 29 are both essential to the overall meaning of the poem. This *Idyll*'s grouping with three others in greater Asclepiads makes it metrically discordant and therefore conspicuously different. This conspicuous metrical absence of Asclepiades' eponymous meter in turn heightens the reader's attentions to the two important allusions to

⁴⁹ Of the five *paraklausithyra* collected in book five of the *AP* (23, 145, 164, 129, 191) three are by Asclepiades and all but one are heterosexual.

⁵⁰ Hunter (1996) 178. For Diotimos' poem cf. *SH* 393.

⁵¹ Aesch. *Myrmydons* fr. 1 (Smythe); Plato *Symp.* 179e5.

Asclepiades' epigrams, allusions which work to align Theocritus' poetic choices in the poem with the erotic advice the speaker gives his ἐρώμενος. This subtle use of meter provides an excellent example of how the names that meters took on in the Hellenistic period could hold meaningful connotations and how these connotations were sophisticatedly exploited by Hellenistic poet-philologists.

Rest in Pieces: Metrical Play in Theocritean Funerary Epigram

Hellenistic epigram also shows evidence of increased attention to meter and the literary act. In early Greek epigram, the inscription of a text on stone serves as an anchor for a performance occasion. In doing so, it builds on a tradition of archaic Greek practice using writing in ritual acts to add formality and a lasting record to the sacred act.⁵² As Joseph Day notes in his useful overview of scholarly perspective on early Greek inscribed epigram:

“[W]riting symbolized performance, even became a kind of performance...a reader utters the inscription aloud, providing the performance's voice; the reader and the others present hear the words. Inscriptions functioned as scripts; epigrams were experienced as poetry normally would be, as performed speech.”⁵³

An excellent example of an inscription memorializing performed speech is the Phrasikleia inscription.⁵⁴ This funerary distich has been associated with the κόρη statue (pictured below) since it was found at Merenda in 1972. The inscription, written out in its distichic form reads:

⁵² Steiner (1994) 61–98.

⁵³ Day (2007) 32.

⁵⁴ *CIG* I³ 1261 = *CIG* I 28.



Σῆμα Φρασικλείας· κούρη κεκλῆσμαι αἰεὶ
ἀντὶ γάμο παρὰ Θεῶν τούτο λάχουσ' ὄνομα.

The grave marker of Phrasikleia, I shall always be called “maiden”
Having this name as my lot from the gods instead of marriage.

Svenbro's⁵⁵ treatment of the ensemble points out how important the reader's voice was to the activation of the poetic mechanism in this inscription. This monument is funerary like many of the earliest Greek inscriptions. As such, it encodes the remembrance of the young girl, dead before reaching marriage age. By reading the inscription aloud, the reader keeps alive the memory of the girl by speaking her name. The inscription implicitly expresses this memory as Phrasikleia's κλέος, both at the root of her name and etymologically implicated in the word that indicates the reader's speech act of calling it out, κεκλήσομαι. The speech act giving life to the stone is reinforced by the acoustic elements of the reader's voice; repeated “k” sounds link the related words. Even at the level of grammar, Phrasikleia is transformed from an impersonal thing, a neuter σῆμα, into a feminine κούρη...λάχουσ[α.]

⁵⁵ Svenbro (1988) 5–32.

Yet this statue and its inscription pairing also show the importance of the visual to Greek epigram and how the aural, visual, and written combine to create a sophisticated poetic moment. The complex meaning of the inscription also involves the statue of the girl showing the viewer a closed flower. For φράζειν, the other root of Phrasikleia's name, often means "to show without words."⁵⁶ The suggestion of one etymological root "kleos" in Phrasikleia's name through presence of its cognate καλέω invites reflection on this second element of her name, suggesting to the reader to look at what the statue "shows" him. In her hands, the κόρη shows the viewer a closed flower, yet to bloom. This image completes the game of the aural, visual, and written. Phrasikleia shows the viewer her κλέος, rendered, like the lotus blossom, with vegetal newness by the speech of the reader. In doing so, this ensemble succeeds in bestowing on Phrasikleia glory that, like the flower she shows the reader, remains forever unwilting, κλέος ἄφθιτον.

The Phrasikleia epigram is a good archaic paradigm against which to explore experimentation in Hellenistic epigram. It demonstrates how important performance was to the genre at this stage and how epigrammatists exploited aural, graphic, and visual elements to memorialize an occasion, in this instance the act of remembering of Phrasikleia through the assignation of a new, significant name. The meter of this epigram is also very typical. The elegiac couplet was felt as the proper meter for early epigram, especially funerary epigram, which makes up the majority of the earliest examples of the

⁵⁶ Cf. *ibid.* 20-21.

genre.⁵⁷ As Hansen's collection makes clear, early epigram is almost exclusively written in elegiac couplets.⁵⁸

Early writers of epigram felt the generic force of the meter to be so binding that they would even alter words to make them fit into the meter. For example, Hephaestion points out how Sophocles alters the prosody of Achelaos' name to make it fit into an elegiac couplet in a fragmentary pentameter, presumably from an epigram for the man:⁵⁹

ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἔπεσι σπανιώτερον, οὕτως ὥστε τὸ τοῦ Ἀρχελάου ὄνομα
Σοφοκλῆς ἐν ταῖς ἐλεγείαις οὐκ ᾤετο ἐγχωρεῖν οὔτε εἰς ἔπος οὔτε εἰς
ἐλεγεῖον· φησὶ γοῦν·

Ἀρχέλεως· ἦν γὰρ σύμμετρον ὧδε λέγειν·

In epic meters this is more rare, as when Sophocles does not know how to make Archelaus' name fit into either hexameters or pentameters. For he says:

‘Archeleos; for saying it this way was mete.’

In this fragment, Sophocles shows self-conscious awareness of the generic appropriateness of the meter to his subject matter to the point where he changes the normal lettering of Archelaos' name.⁶⁰ Another strategy was to represent a proper name in a pleonastic construction that fit the meter such as μοίρης καὶ δώρων σύνθετον

⁵⁷ C.f Page (1976) 167 n.5: “the elegiac couplet is the proper metre for epitaphs, and all other meters (not only the iambic) are very rare.”

⁵⁸ Hansen, first in Latin on the earliest inscriptions: “*exceptis tamen duobus dimetris trochaicis (n.460) et versu lyrico (n.307) et rudi locutionum dactylicarum catena (n.174) omnes tituli saeculorum VIII-V a.Chr.n. videntur aut hexametris dactylicis vel pentametris vel senariis modo bene currentibus modo claudicantibus esse conscripti.*” Hansen (1983) XII. And then again several years later in English on fourth century epigrams: “most metrical lines...are either hexameters or pentameters... We also find a few epigrams consisting wholly or partially of iambic or trochaic verses (some iambic trimeters, plus one inscription containing a catalectic iambic trimeter (n.893) and four containing catalectic trochaic tetrameters (n. 530, 707, 861, 900.)” Hansen (1989) XI.

⁵⁹ Consbruch (1906) 4.

⁶⁰ For other examples of this phenomenon see Page (1976) 168a.

οὐνομ' ἔην⁶¹ for Μοιρόδωρος or to divide an unmetrical name between two lines⁶² or simply to ignore prosody altogether: all alterations made to preserve the elegiac couplet, the proper meter of the epigram.

There are many things that are typical about the Phrasikleia inscription, but one thing is not. It is highly uncommon for an epigram, especially an early epigram, to be preserved so well in its original context and so securely connected with the statue or monument for which it was originally inscribed. Thus, even when analyzing the oldest inscribed epigrams, without a doubt written to accompany a tomb or monument of some sort, modern scholars are left with a void to fill in by scholarly supposition. Even in antiquity, however, epigrams began to be disassociated from their original context and considered as freestanding poetry.⁶³ Collections or anthologies of inscribed epigrams were made and “literary” epigram—poems composed in an epigrammatic style with no intention of ever accompanying a material object—became a poetic vogue, especially in the post-classical period.⁶⁴ This transition from stone to papyrus fits perfectly well with the larger contemporary transition in the Greek world from performance-based to literary poetry. Collected in poetry books, epigrams also became disassociated from the performance occasion to which they were rooted and stood alone on the page as floating poetic entities. Hellenistic poets especially enjoyed and played with this disassociation from performance and the materiality of the visual. Bing has coined the term *Erganzungsspiel* to describe the way Hellenistic literary epigrammatists took advantage

⁶¹ Peek (1955) 752.

⁶² As in Simonides 79 (Diehl).

⁶³ Cf. Bing (1995) 116–118.

⁶⁴ Bing (2007) 69–93.

of this new lack of occasion and materiality for typically Hellenistic, self-conscious literary play.⁶⁵

One aspect of epigram that was particularly affected by this change in context was meter. When Hellenistic poets started using lyric metrical cola stichicly, these meters began to contaminate the traditionally stichic genre of epigram and made the genre one of the favorite stomping grounds for Hellenistic metrical impresarios. First, the canonicity of the elegiac couplet deteriorated. Poets felt freer to experiment with meter and to apply those experiments to previous poetic dilemmas. For example, while Sophocles had felt constrained to alter the name of the dedicatee in the epigram quoted above, Critias the Athenian contemporary of Socrates, found a *new* solution to the problem of incorporating the name of his friend Alcibiades into this literary epigram:

καὶ νῦν Κλεινίου υἱὸν Ἀθηναῖον στεφανώσω
Ἀλκιβιάδην νέοισιν ὑμνήσας τρόποις·
οὐ γάρ πως ἦν τοῦνομ' ἐφαρμόζειν ἐλεγείῳ,
νῦν δ' ἐν ἱαμβείῳ κείσεται οὐκ ἀμέτρως.⁶⁶

And now I will celebrate the Athenian son of Kleinias
Alcibiades, singing him in a new mode
For his name would not fit in any way in an elegiac pentameter.
But now he will lie in an iambic not inappropriately.

Critias' adopting of the typical epigraphic characteristic makes it clear that he is toying with epigram, though this is almost certainly a literary composition. The verb στεφανώω (l.1) is a favorite of epideictic epigram,⁶⁷ and seems to have even been used metaphorically to refer to the erection of statues while κεῖμαι (l.4) is also classically

⁶⁵ Bing (1995) 116.

⁶⁶ Fr. 2 (Gentili).

⁶⁷ Cf. Hansen (1989) 496, 519, 524, 594, 819.6, 890 892 Esp. 799 n.49 and 855.

formulaic in much funerary epigram.⁶⁸ But Critias not only mixes formulae from different types of epigram, he also mixes meters, using a iambic trimeter to accommodate Alcibiades' name and producing as a result a very unconventional form of epigram. The more conservative Sophocles preferred to mar the prosody of the name of his subject rather than the meter of his epigram. Critias is conscious of his metrical audacity, his νέοις τρόποις, but he is not apologetic. The final line punning on ἀμέτρως recalls the original sense to το μέτρον in archaic Greek poetry, what was "fitting."⁶⁹ Furthermore, the statement that Alcibiades "lies" in the meter suggests another theme that we will see developed further below. This poem itself becomes a monument and the strange construction of hexameters and iambs, the heroic and the invective, becomes the image on the page of a fitting memorial for the fascinating antihero Alcibiades.

Other writers of epigram took this metrical license and ran with it even further. Highly interesting is a set of epigrams composed on ancient poets by Theocritus, who goes beyond merely substituting the iambic trimeter for the pentameter. We will consider the following epigrams attributed to Theocritus on the poets Hipponax (19 Gow), Epicharmus (18 Gow), Anacreon (17 Gow), and Archilochus (21 Gow):

Ὁ μουσοποιὸς ἐνθάδ' Ἰππῶναξ κεῖται.
εἰ μὲν πονηρός, μὴ προσέρχου τῷ τύμβῳ·
εἰ δ' ἔσσι κρήγυός τε καὶ παρὰ χρηστῶν,
θαρσέων καθίζου, κῆν θέλῃς ἀπόβριξον.

Here lies the poet Hipponax; so if you are a knave, do not come near the tomb. But if you are honest and come of decent folk, sit down without hesitation, and, if you like, take a nap.

⁶⁸ Hansen (1989) 799. Cf. Hansen (1983) 52, 76, 84–85, 91, 102, 105, 112, 125–6, 170, 172–3.

⁶⁹ Cf. Ford (2002) 14.

Ἄ τε φωνὰ Δώριος χώνηρ ὁ τὰν κωμωδίαν
 εὐρών Ἐπίχαρμος.
 ὦ Βάκχε, χάλκεόν νιν ἀντ' ἀλαθινοῦ
 τὴν ὥδ' ἀνέθηκαν
 τοὶ Συρακούσσαις ἐνίδρυνται, πελωρίστᾳ πόλει, (5)
 οἳ ἄνδρα πολίταν.
 σοφῶν ἔοικε ῥημάτων μεμναμένους
 τελεῖν ἐπίχειρα·
 πολλὰ γὰρ ποττὰν ζόαν τοῖς παισὶν εἶπε χρήσιμα.

Dorian is the speech and Dorian too the man – Epicharmus the inventor of Comedy. In thy honor, Bacchus, since he was their fellow-townsmen, the fold that dwell in the splendid city of Syracuse have set him here, in bronze, not flesh and blood. Fitting it is that they who recall his words of wisdom should recompense him, for many precepts serviceable for the ordering of their lives did he utter to the young. Many thanks to him therefore.

Θᾶσαι τὸν ἀνδριάντα τοῦτον, ὦ ξένε,
 σπουδᾶ, καὶ λέγ' ἐπὴν ἐς οἶκον ἔνθης·
 Ἄνακρέοντος εἰκόν' εἶδον ἐν Τέῳ
 τῶν πρόσθ' εἴ τι περισσὸν ὠδοποιῶν.
 προσθεῖς δὲ χῶτι τοῖς νέοισιν ἄδετο, (5)
 ἐρεῖς ἀτρεκέως ὅλον τὸν ἄνδρα.

Look well upon this statue, stranger, and when thou art come home again say 'I saw in Teos the likeness of Anacreon, pre-eminent among the singers of old.' And that young men were his delight and thou wilt describe the whole man exactly.

Ἀρχίλοχον καὶ στᾶθι καὶ εἶσιδε τὸν πάλαι ποιητάν
 τὸν τῶν ἰάμβων, οὗ τὸ μυρίον κλέος
 διήλθε κῆπὶ νύκτα καὶ ποτ' ἄω.

ἦ ῥά νιν αἱ Μοῖσαι καὶ ὁ Δάλιος ἠγάπευν Ἀπόλλων,
 ὥς ἐμμελὴς τ' ἐγένετο κῆπιδέξις (5)
 ἔπεά τε ποιεῖν πρὸς λύραν τ' αἰεῖδεν.

Stop and look upon Archilochus, the ancient, the iambic poet, whose infinite fame has spread from the sun's rising place to where he sets. Certain it is the Muses and Apollo of Delos favored him, so filled was he with music and with skill to fashion verses and to sing them to the lyre.

It is immediately clear that these poems exhibit a self-consciousness and attention to formal detail of the sort already discussed, especially with regard to meter. The epigram on Hipponax is written in scazons, the meter with which Hipponax was most famously

associated. The epigram on Epicharmus is written in a combination of tetrameters, iambic trimeters, and Reiziana similar to combinations in Epicharmus' comic fragments. The poems to Anacreon and Archilochus are also composed in epodic structures similar to the ones used by these poets. These poems exhibit a general attention to formal detail, and consciously link these formal details to the poets memorialized, as the remark on dialect in the poem to Epicharmus, Ἄ τε φωνὰ Δωρῖος χῶνῆρ (l.1), makes clear.

Despite this attention to detail, however, there is also a studied inaccuracy in one of these epigrams. As Bing has noticed in particular in the epigram on Anacreon, much is amiss, especially for an epigram posing as an inscription about Anacreon. The epigram claiming to be placed in Teos should be written in the Ionic dialect, not the Doric, but the verb θᾶσαι is clearly a Doric form with no alternate readings. The Epicharmus epigram shows that Theocritus was sensitive to such niceties. He could have easily written in literary Ionic as Callimachus did in the *Iambi*. Dialect aside, it is highly odd to imagine a statue of a Teian poet, specifically situated in Teos, yet addressing foreigners and ignoring the native populace.⁷⁰ These inconcinnities combined with the odd use of dialect and the appeal to foreigners to λέγ' ἐπὶν ἐς οἶκον ἔνθης means that this inscription almost certainly never existed on a statue in Teos at all, but was intended for the Hellenistic armchair reader. Small wonder, then, that by commanding the viewer to speak upon his arrival at home, the epigram noticeably separates the speech act from the act of viewing in a way that completely undermines the performance function noted in the Phrasikleia inscription above.

⁷⁰ Bing (1988) 119 notes that this use of the ὄ ζένε topos is “different,” due to its explicit situation ἐν Τέῳ, than other instances which are grounded in the fact that graves were most often located outside of cities allowing even the residents of the cities near which they were placed to be addressed as ξένοι with regard to their status as wayfarers.

If this epigram was never inscribed on a statue base, what are these Hellenistic readers being asked to θασσαί...σπουδᾷ? The meter, a combination of Phalaceans and iambic trimeters, may provide a clue. Anacreon certainly used trimeters in epodic combinations and elsewhere used anacastic glyconics quite similar to the Phalaecean. So metrically this poem does indeed *look* like something that Anacreon could have written. But the fact that it is written in Doric makes it impossible that he ever did so, since Anacreon wrote in Ionic. Thus, at the formal level of meter and dialect, this poem can only ever be a semblance of Anacreon. It is a semblance that appears not as a statue before the reader of an epigram in Teos, but rather as a picture (εἰκόν' l. 3) on the page of the Hellenistic poetry collection, a picture of the poet that Theocritus paints in metrical strokes.

Let us then consider the second half of the poem under a metrically sensitive critical lens. The final line of the poem has puzzled its readers; Gow remarks that its particular use of ἐρεῖν as a transitive verb “lacks precise parallels.”⁷¹ Also odd is line 5 (προσθεῖς δὲ χῶτι τοῖς νέοισιν ᾔδετο), which implicitly asks the reader to add to that Anacreon “also enjoyed youths,” a seeming *non sequitur*. Does adding this extra detail really somehow capture the essence of Anacreon (ὅλον τὸν ἄνδρα)? It is important to note that this epigram asks the reader to reperform one of its couplets on another occasion, once he has returned “home” from “Teos.” If the reader obeys the inscription’s initial request (λέγ’) he will repeat the odd metrical combination by quoting lines 3-4 of the epigram. If he further complies and adds the detail about Anacreon’s pederastic inclinations, he will also make a rather abrupt thematic addition to the otherwise normal

⁷¹ Gow (1952) 541.

idea, “I saw in Teos a statue of Anacreon, one of the great poets of old,” a thematic addition as abrupt as the addition of a Phalaecean to a trimeter. In asking the reader to do so, the poem reenacts thematically in the reader’s imagined words the jarring visual effect of its own metrical structure. This metrical structure serves as a likeness of the poet, strange as it may be (εἴ τι περισσόν).⁷² Hence, the reader is told that by adding this odd epodic detail about Anacreon’s life that he will “say” (ερεῖς recalling λέγ’ 1.2) the whole “man” (ἄνδρα recalling ἀνδριάντα 1.1). He will recreate in speech the metrical ἀνδριάντα he saw on his poetic journey to Teos.

Hellenistic epigrammatists often exploit this conceit of travel, especially when the travelling is not done in person, but in the mind through reading. We have seen that in the *Iambi*, Callimachus brags of his ability to imitate Choliambics without “going to Ephesus or mixing with the Ionians.”⁷³ Through poetic skill and affectation, poets are able to “travel” metaphorically: Theocritus himself transports readers to Sicily by adopting a Sicilian dialect in his *Idylls*. In literary epigrams, as we have just seen in the case of the epigram on Anacreon, this conceit is adopted and transformed by Hellenistic poets. Where an early Greek epigram would address a traveling ξένος or ὁδοίπορος, Hellenistic poets adapt the conceit of the wandering reader to the travel in the mind through poetry. The reader would “wander” through a collection of poetry, encountering poems like a wayfarer encountering monuments.

The importance of the literary journey can be seen in the epigram on Hipponax, which also deserves special attention for its metrical character. It too claims to be a grave

⁷² The word περισσός can mean “outstanding” but its literal meaning “beyond the regular number” may also come through in this context. *LSJ* s.v. *περισσός*

⁷³ Fr. 203 (Pf.) l. 11-12, 64.

marker for Hipponax, but upon closer inspection it too reveals a clever metrical game. The first line, 'Ο μουσοποιὸς ἐνθάδ' Ἰππῶναξ κεῖται is already enough to alert the attentive reader's suspicion. Any poem about Hipponax in Choliamb written during this time period cannot but make one think of Callimachus' *Iambi*, which open with a famous image of Hipponax' ghost, returning from the underworld to rebuke the philologists of Alexandria for pedantic envy. In Callimachus, Hipponax does anything but rest in peace; rather his "limping" iambic comes cantankerously back to life as he upbraids the Alexandrians.

Now the terms χωλίαμβος or σκάζων used the metaphor of "limping" σκάζειν or "lameness" χωλός to refer to the acoustic effect of stichic iambic trimeters in which the "penultimate position is a drag-anceps and in most verses is occupied by a long syllable."⁷⁴ In Hipponax himself, the introduction of this aberration in the trimeter is usually understood as the poet's "metrical ribaldry, in keeping with the iambographers' studied vulgarity."⁷⁵ In the Hellenistic period, however, the meter took on this association of lameness, a connotation that dovetailed nicely with the new metrical designation of the "foot." Our earliest sources for this new characteristic associated with the Choliamb are the Hellenistic poets themselves: Callimachus, Herondas, and perhaps Theocritus also, as we shall see. Callimachus, in *Iambos* 13, speaks of Ephesus as the place where poets produce lame meters:

Ἔφεσον, ὅθεν περ οἱ τὰ μέτρα μέλλοντες
τὰ χωλὰ τίκτειν μὴ ἀμαθῶς ἐναύονται.

⁷⁴ West (1982) 41.

⁷⁵ *ibid.* Hipponax was capable of metrical innovation to the point of pushing genre boundaries. In one fragment (35 W) a trimeter becomes a hexameter due to the content of a prayer that it expresses.

Ephesus, whence those about to produce the “lame” meters are inspired, not without learning.

This sentiment is echoed by Herondas who in his *Mimiambi* calls Hipponax’ verses κύλλα, “club-footed and bandy-legged.”⁷⁶ This new conception of this verse was quite different from its original association in the archaic period. The verse has now taken on a slow, tired association in part, no doubt, reinforced by the image of Hipponax’ ghost created by Callimachus in the *Iambi*. This slow, tired, plodding connotation jibes well with notions of travel. Callimachus’ first and thirteenth *Iambi* are full of tired, old men going on journeys: Hipponax’ travels from Hades to Alexandria and Bathycles describes his impending journey to the underworld.⁷⁷ Callimachus’ high-profile use of the meter must have tied the Choliamb even more to the image of a lame and tired traveler.

This background provides a perspective for a metrically sensitive analysis of Theocritus’ grave epigram written in Choliamb for Hipponax. Again, this epigram is already complicated by the first *Iambos* of Callimachus. But the situation is even more complicated because it is a funerary epigram, and as such—although it does not state it explicitly—would most likely have accompanied a statue of Hipponax. Now, Hipponax had a special relationship with statuary, for Bupalus and Athenis, his most famous victims, had incited the poet’s wrath specifically because of their unattractive statue of the poet.⁷⁸ This raises the stakes considerably for Theocritus in composing a funerary

⁷⁶ Herod. 8.79.

⁷⁷ Cf. Hipponax’ arrival, ἀκούσαθ’ Ἰππώνακτος· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλ’ ἤκω; and Bathycles’ ‘departure’ ἡνίκ’ ἤμελλεν / ἐς μακρὸν [.....]fr. 191 (Pf.) l. 1, 38-9; *Iambos* 13, on the other hand, is all about about a journey that did not take place οὐτ’ Ἐφεσον ἔλθων (fr. 203 (Pf.) l. 12, 64.

⁷⁸ Suda 2.665.16 (Adler), Plin. *HN*. 31.11.

epigram for Hipponax, causing the reader to remember the story and reflect what the statue this epigram accompanied must have looked like.

The poem continues to play on the Hipponax' potential to come back from the dead to haunt the *πονεροί*, who are urged to stay away from the tomb. Again, no doubt because of the *Iambi*, the resurrection of Hipponax seems to have become a *topos* in Hellenistic epigram. Another epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum (or Philip), written in iambic trimeters, casts Hipponax as a sleeping wasp, not to be awakened:

ἴω ξεῖνε, φεῦγε τὸν χαλαζεπῆ τάφον
τὸν φρικτὸν Ἰππώνακτος, οὗ τε χά τέφρα
ἱαμβιάζει Βουπάλειον ἐς στύγος,
μή πως ἐγείρης σφῆκα τὸν κοιμῶμενον,
ὃς οὐδ' ἐν Ἄιδῃ νῦν κεκοίμικεν χόλον (5)
σκάζουσι μέτροις ὀρθὰ τοξεύσας ἔπη.

Avoid, stranger, this terrible tomb of Hipponax, which hails forth verses, Hipponax, whose very ashes cry in iambs his hatred for Bupalus, lest you wake the sleeping wasp, who not even in Hades has lulled his spite to rest, but in a halting measure launches straight shafts of song.

This poem plays on a similar motif of Hipponax' potential return from Hades, where his iambic invective does not find rest. This poem too shows metrical self-awareness, the lameness of the meter is contrasted with the straightness *ὀρθὰ* of the sting of the verse, a sting the reader must avoid awaking. Also curious is that in the line where Hipponax' name occurs, the last word *τέφρα* may be scanned long, making the line a Choliamb. The writer of this epigram plays on the ambiguity of the end of the verse on purpose to alert the reader's attention to this penultimate syllable and set up a pun on *χόλον* in line five, which of course, if it were written as its near homograph *χωλόν*, would make the line a "true" Choliamb. So easily might Hipponactean iambic vitriol be awakened.

To return to Theocritus, his epigram on Hipponax can be seen to take advantage of the varying connotations that the Choliamb had taken on in the Hellenistic period as

well as the mythology surrounding Hipponax himself. In this epigram too, Hipponax rests in Hades with the potential to be revived by amorality. The epigram also adopts the motif of the travelling reader. Here the traveler may fit into one of two categories: *πονηρός* or *κρήγυος*. This latter word has an interesting semantic pedigree as well as a remarkable relationship to the Choliamb in the Hellenistic period. In general, the word means “good, useful, or agreeable.”⁷⁹ But by a misreading of its most well known use in book one of the *Iliad* by Agamemnon to rebuke Chryses, (*μάντι κακῶν οὐ πῶ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον εἶπας*),⁸⁰ it was also understood by Theocritus and his contemporaries as meaning “true.”⁸¹ In the Hellenistic period the word shows up with remarkable frequency in poems written in Choliamb.⁸² As Gow rightly intuit, “the word was presumably used by Hipponax.”⁸³ Though there is no attested use of this word in Hipponax, it seems safe to assume, from what we know of archaic iambos, that Hipponax used the word in contrast with the many forms of *ψόγος* that iambic invective hurled at its targets.

By telling the *πονηροί* to stay away from the tomb, but the *κρήγυοι* to approach and even sleep there, Theocritus ingeniously involves both the ancient tradition of Hipponax’ relationship to statuary and the new associations of the choliambic meter with the visual and mental *Ergänzungsspiel* played by the reader. As already mentioned, this memorial conspicuously lacks a statue, that is to say, a human form above the tomb. A mocking statue is the very thing which incited Hipponax’ iambic rage in the first place.

⁷⁹ *LSJ* s.v. *κρήγυος*.

⁸⁰ *Il.* 1.106.

⁸¹ By Theocritus himself: *Id.* 20.19 *ποιμένες, εἶπατέ μοι τὸ κρήγυον· οὐ καλὸς ἐμμί;*.

⁸² Cf. Herod. 4.46, 6.39; Call. fr 193 (Pf.) l. 20; Phoenix fr. 6.4 (Powell).

⁸³ Gow (1952) 543.

By inviting the κρήγυος ἄνθρωπος to stop and sleep on the tomb, Theocritus provides Hipponax with a positive likeness in the erudite Hellenistic reader of his epitaph. In doing so he also exploits the polysemy he attached the word: the “true” (κρήγυον) image of Hipponax is the erudite Hellenistic poet resting on his tomb, not the mockery sculpted by Bupalus. The same conceit also gives rest (ἀπόβριξον) both to Hipponax’ ghost, which does not have to pursue the traveler for his immortality, and to the traveler himself, who has made the long (literary) journey to Hipponax’ tomb, perhaps even limping along the way. Both Hipponax and the reader who pronounces his choliambic lines are given a place to rest their tired feet.

Finally, the epigram on Archilochus also seems to show an awareness of its own metrics, its first line being composed a meter known in the Hellenistic period as the ‘Archilochian’ (a dactylic tetrapody followed by an ithyphallic). Like the other epigrams, this poem asks the reader to stand and “look at” (εἶσιδε l.1) Archilochus in an epigram that was most likely never inscribed on an actual memorial. Also as in the other poems, this conceit suggests to the reader to consider more closely how the poem stands on the page. The opening Archilochian is followed by a pair of iambic trimeters, first an acatalectic and then a catalectic. There is no evidence that Archilochus ever used this combination himself, though in some ways it is quite similar to his other epodic combinations.⁸⁴

The Archilochian is an example of a group of verses that Hephaestion called the ἀσυνάρτητα, “when two cola unable to be joined together (συναρτηθῆναι) to form a

⁸⁴ Cf. the quite similar 191W 4d | ith || 3iaλ.

union are used together instead of a single line.”⁸⁵ These sorts of verses brought together different types of meters, often dactylic and lyric cola, into single stichic units. Here, dactyls are combined with an ithyphallic. As such, asynarteta bridged the gap between stichic and lyric poetry, even in the archaic period before the transition to book poetry brought about new metrical behaviors. As L.E. Rossi has observed:

Asynarteta are a special kind of verse... They are something between recitative verse and lyric verse: with the recitative verse they have in common the regular word-end (a feature which is foreign to lyric verse) and with the lyric verse they have in common the lyric shape of the cola of which they are made. I should add now that the epodic strophe of Archilochus is in itself a metrical feature which is, also, between song and recitative: it is a lyric strophe, but – being so short – it is also in some way akin to the stichic repetition of stichic recitative verses. So there must be some truth in the statement of the ancient *testimonia* that Archilochus was not only the inventor of epodes and asynarteta, but also of *parakatalogé*, a mode of rendering half way between speech and song....⁸⁶

We have already noted how the formal divide between stichic and lyric began to break down as poetry shifted from an oral, performed phenomenon to a written and read phenomenon. As Rossi observes from a modern standpoint, asynartete and epodic meters represent an anomaly in the otherwise dichotomous division of recited and sung poetry that mapped onto the stichic/melic divide.

Did Theocritus, the poet-philologist, also make this observation? His epigram on Archilochus suggests that he did. The poem includes self-conscious markers at key transitional points in its meter. In the first line, the initial appeal to the reader to stand and inspect Archilochus is given in dactyls, making it reminiscent of a normal epigram beginning with a hexameter. At the end of the verse, however, the qualification of

⁸⁵ Consbruch (1906) 47: “Γίνεται δὲ καὶ ἀσυνάρτητα, ὅποταν δύο κῶλα μὴ δυνάμενα ἀλλήλοις συναρτηθῆναι μηδὲ ἔνωσιν ἔχειν ἀντὶ ἐνὸς μόνου παραλαμβάνηται στίχου.”

⁸⁶ Rossi (1976) 216.

Archilochus as an ancient poet (τὸν πάλαι ποιητάν) shifts to ithyphallics, a melic meter. Along the same lines, the next verse identifies him as a poet of *iambos* with an appropriate shift into iambic trimeter. The first trimeter is then followed with a catalectic iambic trimeter. This is a metrically unparalleled move both in the Hellenistic period and in general. Hellenistic poets did use catalectic iambic trimeters in their metrical lyric and epodic experiments, but aside from this particular case, they always follow a more elaborate initial verse.⁸⁷ Following a iambic trimeter, a recitative verse *par excellence*, with a catalectic version of the same meter that was reserved exclusively for lyric and epodic verses can be read as a metrical statement about what sort of poetry this is. On the one hand, two iambic trimeters seem recitative, on the other, the fact that the second is catalectic reminds the reader that this is not simple stichic, recitative poetry.

The second strophe makes direct comment on this metrical dissonance. Archilochus is both ἐμμελής (an adjective very rarely applied to people) and also “adroit, cunning” (ἐπιδέξιος l.5) presumably for his ability to both compose stichic meters (ἔπεά τε ποιεῖν) and to sing to the lyre (πρὸς λύραν τ’ αἰδεῖν l.6). This metonymic use of singing to the lyre in direct contrast to the act of composing stichic verses is another good example of the association of the lyre at early stage with non-stichic poetry, an association that—as we have already discussed in Chapter One—most likely led to the designation of “lyric” poetry. As with the other poems, the Archilochus epigram provides a visual memorial to Archilochus for the reader to stand and observe, but this memorial is not carved out of stone but constructed out of metrical building blocks.

⁸⁷ Cf. ‘Simon’ *epigr.* 36(P) – 4da | ith || 3iaλ; Asclepiades *epigr.* 33. 4iaλ || 3iaλ; ‘Simon’ *epigr.* 64 hex || 3iaλ.

Ut pictura poesis: The ‘Technopaignia’ of Simmias of Rhodes

In *Iambus* 13, Callimachus develops the idea of the poet as an artisan, likening his creative use of meter to that of a skilled craftsman. Perhaps the most artistic use of meter in the Hellenistic period comes in the picture poems commonly known as *technopaignia*, though this is not an ancient term.⁸⁸ There are six extant *technopaignia* in Greek.⁸⁹ Three are by Simmias of Rhodes, a poet and grammarian who flourished in the first half of the third century B.C.E. The titles of these poems are taken from the shape of the object that their layout creates on the page: an *Egg*, an *Ax*, and a *Pair of Wings*. The remaining three Greek examples include a *Syrinx*, attributed to Theocritus but probably a later composition,⁹⁰ a lesser *Altar* by Dosiadas, probably a contemporary of Theocritus, and a greater *Altar*, often called the *Doric Altar* or *Ionic Altar* because of its dialect, by a certain Besantinos who wrote in the time of Hadrian.

The *technopaignia* have long fascinated scholars of the Hellenistic period from the Greek scholiasts who first commented on them up until the present day. In the 19th and early 20th century, scholars debated whether or not these poems were actually written on real objects. These debates resulted in misguided, often protracted excursus into what

⁸⁸ The word *technopaignion* is first attested in Ausonius, who uses it to refer to a different type of poetry that exhibits metrical virtuosity. Ausonius seems to have coined the term in his dedication to the proconsul Pactus: “*libello Technopaegnii nomen dedi ne aut ludum laboranti aut artem crederes defuisse ludenti*” Cf. Evelyn-White (1921). The poem in question (3 White) does not create a picture on the page, but is rather a cunning game of metrical play with monosyllables, in which each verse ends with a monosyllable that in turn begins the next verse. It seems that Ausonius himself invented this word.

⁸⁹ Though it became a popular genre of poetry in the Latin Middle-Ages. For a history of the *carmen figuratum* from its ancient beginnings onward, see Ernst (1991). Cf. also Strodel (2002) 2–7 for an in-depth analysis of the Hellenistic Greek examples complete with extensive doxography and Paul Mass’s *RE* article s.v. *τεχνοπαίγνιον* 103-4.

⁹⁰ Cf. Gow (1952) 553.

shape of axes could be found in third century Greece⁹¹ and even in one accomplished metrician's detailed account of his own attempt to inscribe Simmias' poem on an actual egg.⁹² But the relationship of meter to *mise en page* in the Alexandrian period explored so far suggests an answer to this question of form. Chapter One explained how Alexandrian editorial circumstances occasioned a neglect of the true metrical cola in Pindar's *Odes* that favored their appearance in the printed editions. Theocritus' metrically self-conscious epigrams also play with the potential of lyric metrical cola to create an εἶκλον on the page. The technopaignia are even more explicit instance of Hellenistic poets exploiting the new semantic medium made available by this new editorial reality. Now that a poem's meter meant as much about how looked as how it sounded, poets like Simmias took the opportunity to draw pictures with their verse. Meter became an element that could be manipulated for the reader's eye, lyric composition a self-conscious act of technical virtuosity that extended into the visual realm. The final section of this chapter will examine these aspects in closer detail in two technopaignia, Simmias of Rhodes' *Ax* and *Egg*.

Simmias of Rhodes' *Ax* exhibits a self-consciousness of its own use of meter similar to the sort found in other the Hellenistic poets discussed above. The poem claims to reproduce the image of the ax which Epeius, the Greek craftsman who built the Trojan Horse, used to fell the wood he used to build the key to the Greeks victory. He then dedicated the ax to Athena. Though the poem is preserved in papyri to be read by a reader alternating between the first to the last line and so on, it is printed here in thought order to facilitate reading:

⁹¹ For the debate on the *archäologische Frage* cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1899).

⁹² Prier (1994) 82 n.4.

Ἄνδροθέα δῶρον ὁ Φωκεὺς κρατερᾶς μηδοσύνας ἦρα τίνων Ἀθάνᾳ (1)
 ὥπασ' Ἐπειὸς πέλεκυν, τῷ ποκὰ πύργων θεοτεύκτων κατέρειπεν αἶπος,
 τᾶμος ἐπεὶ τὰν ἱερὰν κηρὶ πυρίπνῳ πόλιν ἠθάλωσεν
 Δαρδανιδᾶν, χρυσοβαφεῖς δ' ἐστυφέλιξ' ἐκ θεμέθλων ἄνακτας,
 οὐκ ἐνάρημος γεγαῶς ἐν προμάχοις Ἀχαιῶν, (5)
 ἀλλ' ἀπὸ κρανᾶν ἰθαρᾶν νᾶμα κόμιζε δυσκλῆς·
 νῦν δ' ἐς Ὀμήρειον ἔβα κέλευθον
 σὰν χάριν, ἀγνὰ πολύβουλε Παλλᾶς.
 Τρὶς μάκαρ ὄν σὺ θυμῷ
 ἵλαος ἀμφιδερχθῆς· (10)
 ὅδ' ὄλβος
 αἰεὶ πνεῖ.

Epeius the Phocian, doing honor to masculine Athena, for his mighty cunning gave [her] as a gift an ax, with which he once felled the steeps of the godbuilt towers at that time when he reduced the holy city of the Dardanidai to soot with his fire-breathing heart and smote the gilded lords from their foundations. Not numbered among the best fighters of the Achaeans, he nevertheless brought clear water from a cheerful spring without fame. But now he walks on the Homeric path, thanks to you holy Athena of much insight. Thrice blessed is he whom you, propitious in your spirit, look upon. This happiness breaths forever.

In a poem in which meter is so important, the name of the main character would put a smirk on the face of any attentive Hellenistic reader; the name Ἐπειός, looks like an adjective form of the word ἔπος, which should mean “of or relating to the hexameter.” It bears a striking resemblance to the other metrical words for elegiac and iambic verses such as ἐλεγεῖον and ἱαμβεῖον. Another clear metrical pun, that Epeius is not “numbered” οὐκ ἐνάρημος γεγαῶς (l.5) among the champions of the Achaeans makes it hard to believe that Simmias himself was ignorant of the irony that a man whose name was essentially ‘Mr. Epic’ and without whom the Achaeans would never have won the Trojan war is all but unheard of (δυσκλῆς l.6) in Homer.⁹³ In fact, instead of receiving due κλέος for his important contribution to Greek victory at Troy, Epeius is traditionally

⁹³ Epeius is mentioned briefly at *Od.* 8.492 and 23.523.

pitied as the water-carrier of the Greek heroes, whence the reference to him carrying water from a spring in line six. In fact, Epeius' cowardice became proverbial: the comic poet Cratinus was once called Ἐπειοῦ δειλότερος.⁹⁴

Epeius' character presents the perfect subject for a Hellenistic technopaignion: a mythical craftsman whose creation, the Trojan Horse, represents the triumph of τέχνη when brute force has failed. Yet Epeius' complete absence from the *Iliad* and brief mention in the *Odyssey* along with his disrepute in the post-Homeric tradition renders him arcane enough to suit Hellenistic taste and in need of poetic rehabilitation. By honoring this Homeric craftsman and presenting his poem as a dedication composed by Epeius himself, Simmias, the metrical craftsman, aligns himself with his subject. As Epeius uses the ax, a traditionally destructive weapon of war, in a creative and clever new way, Simmias' metrical image of an ax employs the choriamb, the meter of slender melic verse, instead of the thundering hexameter. As Epeius used his literal ax to assail the heights (αἶπος l.2) of the Trojan citadel, Simmias challenges the lofty hexameter genre (ἔπος the homoioteleuton with αἶπος seems intentional) with his metrical instantiation of the same object. Simmias statement that Epeius now walks the Homeric pathway (Ὀμήρειον..κέλευθον l.8), draws on the metaphor that equates meter with notions of travel identified in several of the poems examined in this chapter.

Epeius/Simmias appropriately dedicates his ax/*Ax* to Athena in thanks for μηδοσύνας, a choriambic synonym for τέχνη. The goddess of war(e)fare is a perfectly

⁹⁴ Cf. Cratinus Comic fr. 459 (Kock) and Photius Lexicon E – Ω. s.v Ἐπειοῦ δειλότερος· οὕτως ἐλέγετο Κρατῖνος ὁ κωμικός ἴσως διὰ τὸ ταξιαρχῆσαι τῆς Οἰνηίδος φυλῆς καὶ δειλότερος φανῆναι· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ἐπειὸς δειλὸς ἦν. Cf. also Plato's characterization of Epeius as effeminate at *Resp.* 620c.

double-edged recipient for this artful dedication. The verb ἀμφιδερχομαι is studied and exceedingly appropriate, for Athena does indeed look upon this new literary dedication that Simmias, Epeius’s poetic dopplegänger, has set up on the page. But instead of cutting down trees, Simmias cut up the limbs of archaic melic meter, fashioning his new metrical production in choriamb, the melic building block *par excellence*. The result is an *objet d’art* that could only be forged in the newly metrically self-conscious Hellenistic period.

The *Egg* surpasses the *Ax* in complexity of both meter and meaning.⁹⁵ Like the *Ax*, it must be read alternating between its first and last line etc. Metrically, it is a dense mixture of iambic, trochaic, dactylic, anapestic and other metrical lengths increasing from a cretic monometer in the first line to a decametric kolon (line 19-20) at the egg’s widest point, and then receding back to a cretic monometer in the final line:⁹⁶

Κωτίλας (1)

ματέρος

τῇ τόδ’ ἄτριον νέον

Δωρίας ἀηδόνοσ·

πρόφρων δὲ θυμῷ δέξο· δὴ γὰρ ἀγνᾶς (5)

λίγειά νιν κάμ’ ἀμφὶ ματρὸς ὠδὶς.

Τὸ μὲν θεῶν ἐριβόας Ἑρμᾶς ἔκιξε κᾶρυξ

φῦλ’ ἐς βροτῶν, ὑπὸ φίλας ἐλῶν πτέροισι ματρὸς,

ἄνωγε δ’ ἐκ μέτρου μονοβάμονός μέγαν πάροισι ἀέξειν

ἀριθμὸν εἰς ἄκραν δεκάδ’ ἰχνίων, κόσμον νέμοντα ρυθμῶν, (10)

θοῶς δ’ ὑπερθεν ὡκὺ λέχριον φέρων νεῦμα ποδῶν σποράδην πίφανσκεν,

ἵχνει θενῶν + ...τὴν + παναίολον Πιερίδων νομόδουπον αὐδάν,

θοαῖς ἴσ’ αἰόλαις νεβροῖς κῶλ’ ἀλλάσσων, ὀρσιπόδων ἐλάφων τέκεσσιν·

ταῖ τ’ ἀμβρότῳ πόθῳ φίλας ματρὸς ῥώνοντ’ αἴψα μεθ’ ἡμερόεντα μαζόν,

πᾶσαι κραιπνοῖς ὑπὲρ ἄκρων ἰέμεναι ποσὶ λόφῳ κατ’ ἀρθμίας ἵχνος τιθήνας (15)

βλαχᾶ δ’ οἰῶν πολυβότων ἀν’ ὀρέων νομὸν ἔβαν τανυσφύρων <ὑπ’> ἄντρα Νυμφᾶν·

καὶ τις ὠμόθυμος ἀμφίπαλτον αἴψ’ αὐδάν θῆρ ἐν κόλπῳ δεξάμενος θαλαμᾶν μυχοιτάτῳ

ρίμφα πετρόκοιτον ἐκλιπῶν ὄρουσ’ εὐνάν, ματρὸς πλαγκτὸν μαιόμενος βαλιᾶς ἐλεῖν τέκος·

κᾶτ’ ὦκα βοᾶς ἀκοᾶν μεθέπων ὄγ’ ἄφαρ λάσιον νιφοβόλων ἀν’ ὀρέων ἔσσεται ἄγκος·

ταῖς δὴ δαίμων κλυτὸς ἴσα θοοῖσι ποσὶ δονέων πολὺπλοκα μεθίει μέτρα μολπᾶς. (20)

⁹⁵ West (1982) 151 calls it “the most complex product (metrically) of all Hellenistic book-poetry”.

⁹⁶ For the full scansion cf. the useful diagram in Strodel (2002) 55.

Here is the new warp of the babbling mother, the Dorian Nightengale. Take it willingly in your heart, for indeed the shrill birth pang of a loving mother produced it. And Hermes, the wide-voiced messenger of the gods brought it to the race of men, having taken it from beneath the wings of its dear mother. And he ordered its great number to increase from one sole meter continuously to a high ten count of tracks, distributing the order of the rhythms. Quickly from above, bearing a crooked command of the scattered feet he was speaking, striking out ...the multifaceted, thundering song of the Pierians in his tracks, alternating limbs like swift, nimble fawns, the children of deer, who stir their feet to flight. These, who rush quickly after the precious teat of their dear mother with immortal yearning, all going on swift feet along the high hills, hugging the tracks of their kindly nurse. Now with a bleat they walked among the pasture of the mountains, rich in nourishing sheep and into the cave of the slender-ankled nymphs. And some savage-spirited beast, having heard the suddenly-tossed-about song in the deep caverns of his lair, quickly leaving behind his rocky bed in the mountains leapt forth, desiring to take the wandering offspring from its dappled mother. And quickly pursuing the sound of the cry, he shot forth along the shaggy hollow of the snowcapped mountains. Indeed, similar to these does the famous god loose tangled rhythms, whirring with swift feet the complex meters of song.

This poem dramatizes the process of lyric composition in the Hellenistic period through the image of a nightingale bearing an egg. As in the other poems we have seen, meter plays an essential role. At the start of the poem, Simmias styles himself as an archaic lyric poet, calling himself a nightingale and then qualifying this metaphor with a geographic epithet, just as Bacchylides called himself the Cean nightingale.⁹⁷ Though the poetic child is clearly meant to be an egg, Simmias never calls the poem this, calling it rather an ἄτριον, a “warp”, the parallel series of strings through which the weft passes on the loom. This comparison to a woven textile is yet another example of a Hellenistic metrical experimenter comparing himself to an artisan. The warp can be read as a reference to the parallel metrical lines of the poem into which Simmias will weave his poetic content. But it is also significant that other Hellenistic poets used the word ἄτριον

⁹⁷ 3 Snell.

to refer to the woven papyrus on which they composed their poems.⁹⁸ Simmias may have wished to play on this ambiguity to draw attention to his work as a written composition on papyrus as opposed to an archaic lyric poem composed to be sung.

The notion of the *Egg* as a silent, metrical textile on the page, contrasts the many references to sound at the beginning of the poem. The warbling nightingale produced this poem with a shrill birth pang. Hermes, the herald of the gods, is given the epithet “far shouting” (ἐριβοας l.7), an epithet usually reserved for Dionysos in archaic poetry. Simmias probably chooses Hermes for several reasons. He invokes the god’s traditional role as messenger κήρυξ for the part he plays in bringing poetic creation into the world. Hermes is also a famous thief, and therefore a fitting character to “take the Egg from under the wing of its mother” (l.7). Most importantly, Hermes, as inventor of the lyre, is also a famous lyric craftsman. The description of Hermes construction of the first lyre from a turtle shell in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* would have provided Simmias with a detailed picture of Hermes as a craftsman.⁹⁹ In the *Egg*, Simmias gives Hermes a similar role as a metrical craftsman who orders the meters of Simmias’ poem to grow in size from a monometer to a decameter into a “fitting order of rhythms” (κόσμον...ῥυθμῶν l.10).

Hermes’ method for organizing the meters is remarkable: he demonstrates the proper order of the meters by stamping out the rhythms with his own feet.¹⁰⁰ This action is important to the overall meaning of the poem because it aligns the poem’s metrical pattern with the movement in the poem. The phrase κῶλ’ ἀλλάσσων is delightfully

⁹⁸ cf. Leonidas of Alexandria *AP* 9.350.1-2.

⁹⁹ *Hom. Hymn Hermes* 39ff.

¹⁰⁰ ἴχνει θενῶν l. 12, ὀρσιπόδων l. 13, κραιπνοῖς...ποσὶ l. 15, ποσὶ δονέων l.20.

ambiguous; the limbs can be understood both as the meterical κῶλα that Hermes arranges into order or his own limbs as he moves with the meter. The phrase introduces a complex simile brimming with metrical puns in which the movement of the κῶλα is compared to young deer following their “swift-footed” mother into the mountain cave of the muses. Their cries (βλάχα l.16) rouse from its mountain lair a ravenous predatory beast, which pursues the group of deer in the hopes of stealing one of the mother’s young. This simile looks back on the earlier content of the poem, linking its vehicles with other objects in the poem through the repetition of words and themes. The bleating young deer recalls the egg of Simmias, both offspring stolen from a “caring mother” with the key phrase φίλας ματρός repeated in both contexts. The “cruel spirited” (ὠμόθυμος l. 17) beast that “receives” δεξάμενος the cry of the deer reminds us of Simmias’ reader whom Simmias asks to “receive” δέξο the poem “well disposed in his spirit” (πρόφρων δὲ θύμῳ l.5). But the beast also resembles Hermes in its speed (ῥίμφα l.18 ὤκυ, θοῶς l.11) and its desire to “steal” (ἐλεῖν l.18, c.f ἐλών l. 8) the offspring from its mother. The final line closes the simile returning the reader’s attention to Hermes relationship with Simmias’ warp with a reference to weaving (πολύπλοκα looking back to ἥτριον l.3) at the beginning of the poem.

In addition to the numerous foot puns, the poem also melds the visual and the auditory in both language and meter. Hermes strikes out “dappled sound” (παναίολον...αὐδάν l.12). The poem’s meter itself changes to mimic the movements and sounds described. By lines 19 and 20, the lines have increased to a series of anapests that mimics the sound of the running deer and the pursuing beast.¹⁰¹ Into this complex

¹⁰¹ l. 19 = --||UU--||UU--||UU--||UU--||UU--||UUU--||UUU--||UU--||--;

nexus of sound, speed, and visual effect, Simmias weaves a profound statement: producing written lyric poetry is like giving birth to an egg. Unlike in the archaic period, when poets produced their poems as living, breathing entities that were heard by audiences amidst the music of ritual occasion, in the Hellenistic period, poets produce lyric poems as lifeless objects that lie still and silent on the page. Only the process of reading (aloud, most probably) brings the sound and imagery of a poem to life. This process, especially if the poem titters with movement and sound as the *Egg* does, can catch the fancy of the reader, who like a beast who would steal a mother's bleating young pursues the delight of the poem's sounds and movements on his own. Yet the reader also interprets and understand the poem. If so, he becomes, like Hermes, a participant in the poem's divine birthing or better, "hatching," process.¹⁰² In reading the poem aloud he interprets its meaning, giving it an independent existence. By this literally "Hermeneutic" process, a piece of Hellenistic written lyric like Simmias's *Egg* may "hatch" for the reader, independent of its poet mother.

1. 20 = --||--||UU--||UU--||UU--||UU--||UUU--||UUU--||UU--||--.

¹⁰² Hermes role as Psychopompos may be felt here.

CHAPTER THREE: THE BIRTH OF ROMAN LYRIC

In his commentary on Horace's *Odes* III.1, the second or third century C.E. grammarian Porphyryon explains Horace's claim to sing *carmina non prius audita* with the following comment: *Romanis utique non prius audita, quamvis Laevius lyrica ante Horatium scripserit.*¹ Porphyryon is right. Before the publication of Horace's *Carmina* in 23 B.C.E there had already been several generations of experimentation with Greek lyric forms at Rome. Catullus is only Horace's most well known predecessor in this regard, but he too cannot be called the first to introduce Greek lyric meters to Roman poetry. That honor goes to a poet named Laevius Melissus, writing one generation before Catullus.

Laevius was the author of a unique group of poems called the *Erotopaignia*. Παίγνια was a common Hellenistic title for collections of light verse. Both Philetas and Aratus wrote collections by the same name. The connotation of the word is best gleaned from the final sentence of Gorgias' *Encomion to Helen*, where he labels his rhetorical *tour de force* in defense of Helen, traditionally reviled by the Greeks for causing the Trojan war, as his παίγνιον: a virtuosic exposition of technical skill, a *jeux d'esprit* that was a typical product of the learned, academic atmosphere of Alexandria.² It was in the same tradition that the metrically virtuosic picture poems by Simmias of Rhodes were named τεχνοπαίγνια.

¹ Holder (1896) 86.

² Cf. Gorgias (fr. 11.132 Kranz) ἐβουλήθη γράψαι τὸν λόγον Ἑλένης μὲν ἐγκώμιον, ἐμὸν δὲ παίγνιον.

The sparse fragments³ of Laevius reveal that he reworked mythological stories into erotic vignettes in a wide range of lyric meters. He may have been especially interested in Euripides as he composed his own *Alcestis*, *Ino*, and *Helen*. In addition, fragments survive of his *Adonis*, his *Centaurs*, a poem about Protesilaus and Laodamia called the *Protesilaodamia*, and a poem about the wandering of Odysseus to the islands of Circe and the Sirens called the *Sirenocirca*. It is generally supposed that these single poems with individual titles were grouped under the larger heading of *Erotopaignia*, though Priscian also mentions his *Polymetra* (fr. 30), leaving it is unclear whether this refers to a separate group of poems or is simply another general name for any group of poems in mixed meters.⁴

The titles *Protesilaodamia* and *Sirenocirca* exemplify a characteristic of Laevian diction that affiliates him with the Roman dramatist Pacuvius, who also indulged in coining compound words (cf. his *Dulorestes* “Orestes the Slave”).⁵ To take the fragments of the *Alcestis* as an example, Laevius uses the word *tardigenuchus* (cf. Pacuvius’ *tardigradus* fr.4 Ribbeck) to describe the deteriorating old age of Pheres, whom he then contrasts to Nestor, a *trisaeclesenex* who is nevertheless *dulciorelocus* (fr.7-9). Yet if Laevius finds parallels in Roman drama in terms of vocabulary and subject matter, metrically speaking he is very Greek. Many discussions of Laevian metrics are plagued by unverifiable hypotheses, given the difficulty of establishing the proper scansion of what are often tiny fragments taken out of context. Some see Laevius following in the Anacreontic tradition, since five of the thirty three fragments

³ All fragments are cited according to their numbers in Courtney (1993) 118-143.

⁴ Prisc.1.258.

⁵ Later Romans like Horace criticized these *sesquipedalia verba* (AP 97). Quintilian was also critical. *Inst.* 1.5.67. On Pacuvius’ style cf. Manuwald (2003) 121 n.153.

preserved in his edition (frs. 5, 14, 22, 26, 28) are in anacreontics (anacastic ionic dimeters *a minore*: UU-U | -U--) and eight (frs. 1, 4, 6, 15, 18, 21, 23, 27) in systems of iambic dimeters with synapheia, another verse regularly employed by Anacreon (*PMG* 427-8). Laevius' use of iambic dimeters provides an instructive point of comparison with early Roman drama's use of the same meter, since the iambic dimeter also shows up in Plautus' cantica. Comparing the nature of this meter in Plautus and Laevius demonstrates that, despite apparent verbal and thematic connections to the Roman stage, Laevius turned to *exemplaria graeca* when composing his meters. Of the twenty iambic dimeters in Laevius, all preserve a pure iamb in the second foot of each iambic metron.⁶ This means that Laevius considered these iambic verses dimeters in the Greek sense: i.e. consisting of two iambic metra, of which the second had to be a pure iamb. On the other hand, Plautus's use of the same meter shows that he treated the verse as tetrapodic, allowing substitution in every place in the line and making no effort to preserve the iamb in the second foot of each metron.

Along with his contemporary Gnaeus Matius (fr.16 Courtney), Laevius was also one of the first Roman poets to revive the Scazon in a fragment that, as Courtney suggests, "seems to be from some sort of preface about stylistic controversy."⁷ In this fragment, Laevius may be quoting his critics' disdainful characterizations of his own poetry as "rough in reading and offputtingly haggard" (*scabra in legendo rediviosave offendens* fr. 25). Other fragments support the idea that Laevius engaged with his literary contemporaries and attacked his critics within his own poetry: we are informed by Aulus Gellius that Laevius coined the breathtaking compound *subductisupercilicarptores* to

⁶ One, fr. 4.4, depends on an emendation to do so.

⁷ Courtney (1993) 128.

attack his “*vituperones*” (fr. 9). It is reasonable to assume that in the line *Meminens Varro corde volutat* (fr. 3), Laevius refers to the impressive knowledge of his near contemporary and fellow metrical innovator, Marcus Terentius Varro, whose *Menippean Satires* rival the *Erotopaignia* in metrical experimentation. It also seems significant that fragment 25, characterizing poetry in bawdy, low language – a *reduvia* is a “hangnail” – should be written in Scazons. The Scazon had a natural connotation of the racy iambic world of Hipponax and, since Callimachus’ *Iambi*, of literary polemic as well. This fragment may show Laevius exploiting these two connotations of the Scazon as he revives it for Roman literary polemic.

Another fragment shows just how much of a παίγνιον Laevius could make of his meter: *omnis sunt denis syllabis versi* (fr.30). The verse is of course self-descriptive, since the fragment itself has ten syllables. One may imagine a poem in which Laevius used many different types of Greek meters stichically with the only organizational rational being that each line contained ten syllables. The sort of metrical poetic game shows Laevius following the tradition of Hellenistic metrical games explored in chapter two. One Greek example quite similar in its conceit is Kastorion’s *Hymn to Pan*, a piece composed in iambic trimeters in which each metron could be transposed to another point in its verse without changing the meaning or spoiling the meter of the verse.⁸ Like Laevius’ poem, Kastorion’s hymn showcased an extreme attention to numerical detail; each metron contained exactly eleven letters.

But of all of Laevius’ poems, it is fragment 22 that most showcases both his metrical virtuosity as well as his strong connection to the metrical impresarios of the

⁸ SH 310. Cf. Bing (1985).

Hellenistic period. The poem, a technopaignion called the *Phoenix* that formed the image of a pair of wings on the page, must have had special significance in the book of *Erotopaignia* from its final position.⁹ Unfortunately, only the first two verses of the poem are preserved:

’enus <o> amoris altrix, genetrix cupiditatis, mihi quae diem serenum hilarula praepandere cresti, opseculae tuae ac ministra
Etsi ne utiquam quid foret expavida gravis dura fera asperaque famultas potui dominio concipere <sub> superbo.¹⁰

The first line had ten metra, the second nine, and so on. The pattern of syllables decreased and then increased to produce two mirroring wings. This poem is clearly indebted to a similar one by Simmias of Rhodes, who wrote a technopaignion entitled *The Wings*, spoken by the god Eros:

Λεῦσσε με τὸν Γᾶς τε βαθυστέρνου ἄνακτ’, Ἀκμονίδαν τ’ ἄλλυδις ἐδράσαντα,
μηδὲ τρέσης, εἰ τόσος ὢν δάσκια βέβριθα λάχνα γένεια·
τᾶμος ἐγὼ γὰρ γενόμεν, ἀνίκ’ ἔκραιν’ Ἀνάγκα,
πάντα δὲ τᾶς εἶκε φραδαῖσι λυγραῖς
ἐρπετά, πάνθ’ ὅσ’ εἶρπε (5)
δι’ αἴθρας.
Χάους δέ,
οὔτι γε Κύπριδος παῖς
ὠκυπέτας ἦδ’ Ἄρεος καλεῦμαι,
οὔτι γὰρ ἔκρανα βία, πραῦνός γε δὲ πειθοῖ· (10)
εἶκε δέ μοι γαῖα, θαλάσσας τε μυχοί, χάλκεος οὐρανός τε·
τῶν δ’ ἐγὼ ἐκνοοφισάμαν ὠγύγιον σκάπτρον, ἔκρινον δὲ θεοῖς θέμιστας.

Behold the ruler of the deep-bosomed Earth, the turner upside-down of the Son of Acmon, and have no fear that so little a person should have so plentiful a crop of beard to his chin. For I was born when Necessity bare rule, and all creatures, moved they in Air or in Chaos, were kept through her dismal government far apart. Swift-flying son of Cypris and war-lord Ares—I am not that at all; for by no force came I into rule, but by gentle-willed persuasion, and yet all alike, Earth, deep Sea, and brazen Heaven, bowed to my behest, and I took to myself their olden sceptre and made me a judge among Gods (Trans. Edmonds).

⁹ Charius 375 B = 288 K: *in pterygio Phoenicis Laevii, novissimae odes Erotopaeignion*. Galasso (2004) makes the attractive suggestion that this final avian ode may have influenced Horace *Odes*.2.20.

¹⁰ For the metrical schema of its ionic metra, see Courtney (1993) 136.

Given the fragmentary state of the *Phoenix*, it is unclear if Laevius indulged in the same sort of punning on the visual aspects of his own composition that Simmias enjoyed. Here, opening the poem with the loaded phrase λεῦσσε μέ, Simmias immediately draws attention to the physical appearance of the poem on the page. In the second verse, a similar effect is achieved in the phrase: μηδὲ τρέσης, εἰ τόσος ὦν δάσκια βέβριθα λάχνα γένεια. Of course, the reader cannot see Cupid's cheeks, so the reference to his physical appearance is unsettling and the word τόσος cleverly ambiguous.¹¹

The two surviving verses of the *Phoenix* suggest that Laevius may have had Simmias' poem in mind. These verses also focus on the contrast between the domination of a ruler and the subordination of a servant, with the *dominium superbum* of Venus comparable to the φραδαῖσι λυγραῖς of necessity in Simmias poem (l.4). The *Phoenix* also plays on the theme of reversal of traditional expectations developed by Simmias in the *Wings*. There Eros, normally the son and follower of Aphrodite, rejects this traditional parentage and boasts a more ancient lineage descending from Chaos. In the *Phoenix*, the mythological bird often associated with the rising sun, which it preceded in its orbit, is cast instead as a follower of Venus.¹² By associating the goddess Venus with her eponymous planet, the morning star that appears directly before sunrise, Laevius imagines the phoenix following Venus instead of leading the sun.¹³ Thus, the phoenix,

¹¹ Cf. the opening lines of Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo* which play similarly on the reader's inability to see: οὐχ ὁράας (l.4).

¹² Cf. Plin. *HN*.10.4-5.

¹³ An association that goes back to early Greece. Cf. Evans (1998) 289.

preceding the rise of the sun, can also be seen as following the morning star, i.e. a “follower” (*obsecula*, derived from *sequor*) of Venus.¹⁴

Laevius’ fragments show that he not only introduced into Latin poetry a number of Greek lyric meters, but continued the Hellenistic practice of using meter to express meaning. Laevius engaged in learned games like Kastorion, wrote technopaignia like Simmias and exploited the traditional connotation of meters like Theocritus in his *Paidika* or Callimachus in his *Iambi*. Yet the most recent and authoritative scholarship on Laevius, in its efforts to differentiate him from the neoterics, risks ignoring that he may have passed this practice on to later Latin poets, especially Catullus. To quote Ross’ summary statement on Laevius in *Style and Tradition in Catullus*:

Laevius experimented, but even his meters, diverse and original as they are, show no more than a skill in adapting early Hellenistic frivolities; the Neoterics’ discovery of Alexandrian poetry brought with it an interest in the technical refinements of meter that went far beyond mere adaptation and led them to practice actual translation. Catullus’ sources are thus very different from Laevius’ experimental profusions: the New Poets were selective, and this selectivity was inspired by their Callimachean creed....Catullus shows no interest in Laevius’ Roman dramatic meters, and none in the haphazard experiments Laevius made in adapting the meters of early Hellenistic verse.¹⁵

It must be granted that the neoterics and Catullus in particular approach Alexandrianism and even the individual poets of the lyric canon in strikingly different ways – ways which will be examined in this chapter. But if Laevius’ influence by Roman drama is undeniable in his vocabulary and subject matter, Ross overemphasizes Laevius’ interest

¹⁴ On this poem cf. Galasso (2004) and Barchiesi (2009) 321.

¹⁵ Ross (1969) 157-8.

in dramatic metrical forms. Courtney identifies anapaestic dimeters in only three (3, 7, 8) of 32 fragments; the identification of other dramatic meters in Laevius is uncertain.¹⁶

On the other hand, there are several suggestions - beyond those similarities of vocabulary that have already been widely noted - that suggest continuity between Laevius and Catullus.¹⁷ First of all, while some of Laevian metrics may have been “experimental profusions,” he did rehabilitate meters like the Scazon (fr. 25) and even more importantly the Phalaecean hendecasyllable (fr. 32) that went on to be widely embraced by the neoterics. His vignettes on mythological stories for his *Erotopaignia* were characteristically neoteric: Catullus’ *Peleus and Thetis* (Poem 64) as well as Cinna’s *Smyrna*, Calvus’ *Io*, Cornificius’ *Glaucus*, and Valerius Cato’s *Dictynna* are all examples. Catullus’ Poem 68, strongly centered on the myth of Protesilaus, may also owe a specific debt to Laevius *Protesilaodamia*. It is certainly tempting to read the “monumental line” 74, *Protesilaëam Laodamia domum*, with Cairns as a “salute” from Catullus to his predecessor Laevius’ composite title.¹⁸ In other ways too, like his dismissive attacks of his officious critics (compare the Laevian *subductisupercilicarptores* with the *senes seuiore*s from Poem 5) Catullus resembles Laevius. Even his characterization of his own poetry as *nugae* (a Latin translation of παίγνια) and his playful approach to metrical innovation (cf. Poem 50 below) reveal a debt to Laevius that probably reflects an admiration among the neoterics for Rome’s first

¹⁶ Courtney (1993) 119.

¹⁷ Ross (1969) 159 argues that Laevius’ vocabulary, though at first sight similar to Catullus’ in some important aspects, is “entirely different in poetic intention and purpose....”

¹⁸ Cairns (2003) 173 also sees “the adultery/infidelity motif” in Laevius fr.18 (Courtney) as “highly significant for Poem 68.”

lyric innovator. While Ross's corrective effort to show that Laevius was not a neoteric is appreciated, it is also important to note the very real connections between Catullus and Laevius.

Ross's criticism is mostly fueled by the desire to show that Catullus and the other neoterics dutifully pursued a "Callimachean creed," while Laevius' metrical experiments were more closely tied to the "early Hellenistic frivolities" of poets like Kastorion and Simmias. But this mutually exclusive way of viewing these two aspects of Hellenistic poetry misses a crucial point. Close attention to and playful use of meter do not necessarily prevent a poet from adhering to and articulating a sophisticated system of poetics. In fact, this metrical sensitivity can support and articulate such a creed more fully.

Metrical Games and Catullan *Iambi*

One of the things that sets Catullus apart from the so called "preneoterics" like Laevius is the way he begins to ask questions of himself and his readers about what sort of poetry he is writing. His "little book, whatever it might be" (*quidquid hoc libelli* Cat.1.8) contains a wide array of meters including many that would qualify as lyric by Alexandrian criteria. When pointing out that Horace was not the first to write Lyric at Rome, however, Porphyryon does not think to mention Catullus. This is almost certainly because neither Catullus nor his contemporaries considered his work "lyric" poetry. It was not until the age of Jerome that we first find the adjective *lyricus* applied to Catullus, but this late antique usage is most likely a projection of Horace's term for himself back onto his most famous predecessor in the composition of lyric meters at Rome.¹⁹ More

¹⁹ *Chron.*173.2.

contemporary judges seem to have put Catullus and his poetry in a different category. Quintilian, for example, writing about one hundred years after Catullus, identifies him among the Roman iambic poets.²⁰ Catullus, too, calls his own verses *iambi* at several instances in the collection.²¹

Iambic presents a particularly interesting problem to the metrically self-conscious poet. As Aristotle points out in the *Poetics*, the iambic meter got its name from the fact that many ἰαμβοὶ were written in it, not the other way around.²² Nevertheless, because the name of the meter and genre overlap, later genre-conscious poets naturally began to explore the extent to which iambic content should be written in iambic meters. Horace for example, in *Epodes* 13 – 16, experiments with non-iambic meters such as the hexameter, only to return to the iambic trimeter in Epode 17, which significantly begins with the words *iam iam*.²³ A metrically conscious poet like Catullus could not call his own work *iambi* without questioning to what extent this label determined the character of his own work or noticing the inherent tension between name and metrical form.

In his own *Iambi*, as we have seen in Ch. 2, Callimachus reacts to the overly schematic taxonomical impulse to allow meter to dictate genre, when he advocates creative use of meters beyond their genre associations. In the *Iambi*, Callimachus used Scazons, traditionally a iambic meter of aggressive attack, in a creative new way. In the opening statement of Hipponax' ghost,

²⁰ Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.96.

²¹ 36.5, 40.2, 54.6, fr.3.1.

²² 1448^b31. The archaic iambic poets Archilocus and Hipponax wrote many iambic poems in non-iambic meters. Moreover, iambic elements may be located in the work of poets we might not consider as iambic like Sappho and Alcaeus cf. Aloni (2001) and Andrisano (2001).

²³ Did Horace realize that he announced his return to pure iambic by writing *iam* “twice,” that is *iam bis*? On Horace metrical variation in the *Epodes* cf. Harrison (2001) 180.

Ἀκούσαθ' Ἰππώνακτος· [ο]ὐ γὰρ ἄλλ' ἦκω

...

Φέρων ἱάμβον οὐ μάχην [ἀείδ]οντα
τὴν Βοῦπ[αλ]ειον...

Listen to Hipponax. For indeed I have come from the place where they sell an ox for a penny, bearing an iambos which does not sing of the Bupallean battle (Trans. Acosta-Hughes).

Callimachus announces that his new book of *Iambi* will offer a new type of iambos, adapting the vulgar, aggressive attack (μάχην) Hipponax had directed at Bupalus, to a more refined poetic purpose.²⁴ Callimachus' *Iambi* include light Hellenistic poems in the paignia tradition, like the *agon* between the olive and the laurel, and literary rather than personal polemic.

Catullus' Rome was, of course, a very different place than Callimachus' Alexandria. While a scholarly court poet such as Callimachus might naturally incline towards a more refined version of iambos redeployed for literary polemic, Catullus' world was more receptive of the aggressive iambic of Archilocus and Hipponax. Newman suggests that "because Roman society was more primitive than that of the contemporary Greek world, when Hellenistic genres entered this new ambience, they tended to retrace their development, to revert to type."²⁵ To call Roman society "more primitive" than Hellenistic Alexandria is perhaps unfair and overly simplistic, but it was certainly a very different social and political milieu. Catullus wrote as a member of an upper class of nobles jockeying for political and financial advance in the melting pot of

²⁴ Perhaps, as Denis Feeney suggested to me in conversation, Callimachus imprints a personal stamp on this new sort of refined iambos, suggesting it will be a καλήν...μάχην.

²⁵ Newman (1990) 66.

first century Rome where sex and violence were on daily display.²⁶ His political cracks and dirty jokes could never have been tolerated in the demure court of an autocratic hereditary monarch – Callimachus’ situation. Rome’s more complex and varied social reality made a return to the vulgar and aggressive iambic of Archilochus and Hipponax relevant and appropriate in first-century B.C.E. Rome.

Despite returning to the aggressive archaic roots of iambos, the Catullan corpus owes a great debt to Callimachus and the poetics cultivated in Alexandria. Many of Catullus’ most poignant poetic moments turn on this dual heritage, juxtaposing a refined, emotionally aloof Hellenistic air with the painful awareness of a highly visceral present. An excellent example is Poem 85:

Odi et amo qua re faciam fortasse requires
Nescio sed fieri sentio et excrucior

The first line of this famous poem clearly owes much to the tradition of Hellenistic epigram that delighted in paradox and riddle. The hexameter calmly asks the reader to consider the paradoxical nature of Catullus’ conflicted emotional state. The word *fortasse* gives an air of nonchalance to the question. In a very similar example, Alcaeus of Mitylene expresses his own paradoxical hatred for love:

Ἐχθαίρω τὸν Ἔρωτα. τί γὰρ βαρὺς οὐκ ἐπὶ θῆρας
ὄρνυται, ἀλλ’ ἐπ’ ἐμὴν ἰοβολεῖ κραδίην;
τί πλέον, εἰ θεὸς ἄνδρα καταφλέγει; ἢ τί τὸ σεμνὸν
δῆώσας ἀπ’ ἐμῆς ἄθλον ἔχει κεφαλῆς; (AP 5.10)

I hate love. Why does not he not attack wild beasts, oppressive spirit, but constantly target at my heart? What point is there for a god to burn up a man, or what trophies shall he win from my head (Trans. Paton, adapted).

But the second part of each poet’s reaction to his conflicting emotions is very different.

Alcaeus departs on an abstract philosophical investigation of the relationship between the

²⁶ Cf. Wiseman (1985) 1-14.

human and the divine. His epigram ends with a series of questions directing the reader's attention away from his own emotional situation and towards the abstract. Catullus' technique is the opposite. The first line's question is answered with an emphatic expression of his ignorance in the second line (*nescio*), but (*sed*) this is not the poem's focus. Rather, Catullus contrasts the abstract paradox of his emotional conflict with the very concrete human suffering it causes within him. The simple language in which he expresses his pain underlines the conflicting relationship between the complexities of human emotion and the simplicity of pleasure and pain.

This tension between grace and grit permeates the Catullan corpus and is relevant for our understanding of the nature of iambic in Catullus. Poem 116, for instance, turns on a contrast between Alexandrian finesse and iambic vitriol. The poem begins with Catullus attempting to justify his attempts at Callimachean poetry. As Barchiesi has pointed out, this poem is deeply engaged with the *Aitia*, its opening words *saepe mihi* translating the beginning of *Aitia* fr. 1 Pf. *πόλλ' ἄκι μοι*, and "the entire rest of l. 1...[recalling]...research, the poet's memory-cum-imagination, hunting for antiquarian rarities, and toil."²⁷ The phrase *mittere...carmina battiadae* repeated from Poem 65, suggests that the focus of this poem is Catullus' poetic *labor* (l.5) to recreate the learning and refined elegance of his Alexandrian model. This attempt at formal refinement is pushed to a humorous level of metrical exaggeration in line three when Catullus' attempt to lighten (*lenirem* l.3) Gellius' opinion of his poetry results in the heaviest line in Latin literature – the holospondaicus – humorously emphasizing how Catullus' attempts at formal virtuosity end up backfiring

²⁷ Barchiesi (2005) 335.

Indeed these efforts are met with nothing but criticism from Gellius. In response, Catullus shifts his tone from high Alexandrian elegy to unadulterated Roman iambic. Many verbal clues point to a shift here. Catullus describes Gellius' criticism as the shooting of darts (*tela...mittere* l.4) warping the process of "sending" a poem into one of "hurling" invective. The *tela* (= βέλη) presuppose the etymology of ἱαμβος from βάλλω found in the *Etymologicum Magnum*, while *mittere* recalls another popular etymology from ἦμι. ²⁸ Catullus makes his critic the target of his new iambic attack, abandoning high elegy for a lower iambic register, Greek refinement for Roman toughness. As Barchiesi points out, since the poem's close with the phrase *tu dabis supplicium*, complete with the archaic metrical shortening of the syllable of *dabis*²⁹, "has been recognized as an allusion to the revenge of Romulus in Ennius' *Annales* (95 Sk. *dabi' sanguine poenas*,) involving both fighting spirit and the abrasive toughness of the archaic style, it is tempting to view the dynamics of the poem as a regressive movement from Callimachus to Ennius."³⁰ With *Aitia* 1 in mind, the metaphor of criticism as *tela* also sonically recalls the Τελχῖνες, the critics to whom Callimachus responds at the beginning of the *Aitia*. The holospondaic hexameter is also absent from polished hexameters, but is found in Ennius.³¹ The shift from academic elegy to aggressive iambic thus ironically traces a Callimachean movement even as it rejects Alexandrian finesse for Roman toughness, since Callimachus closes the *Aitia* by announcing his intent to write

²⁸ *Ibid.*; Newman (1990) 67; cf. EM Gaisford (1848) 1324 s.v. ἱαμβη: "ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱαμβίζειν, τὸ ὑβρίζειν, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰὸν βάλλειν, ἢ ὡς βέλη βάλλειν τὰ λέγομενα." The connection with ἦμι disinclines us to accept the emendation of *mittere* to *vertere* by Forsythe (1977) 352-3.

²⁹ Though Trappes-Lomax (2007) 6-8 disagrees, restoring a number of elisions of 's.'

³⁰ Barchiesi (2005) 336.

³¹ l.31, 117, 157, 190, 286 Sk.

Iambi as a shift to the “prose pastures of the muses” (Μουσέων πεζὸν [ἔ]πειμι νομόν fr. 119.9 Pf.).³²

Poem 116 can thus be usefully read as another instance of Catullus’ exploitation of the tension between finesse and aggression to raise and answer questions for the reader about his own status as a poet. Such an interpretation also lends weight to the argument that Poem 116 was the final poem of the collection, because it shows how the poem looks back on the tension between decorum and aggression in Catullus’ work overall. This poem is also noteworthy for the way it utilizes meter to point to the genre tensions it explores. The heavy spondaic line 3 humorously satirizes the Alexandrian attempts at metrical virtuosity, while the archaic metrical flourish at the poem’s close underlines the return to the archaic Roman force of Ennius. Poem 116 exemplifies Catullus’ keen attention to the meter of his poetry and how he martials its significance to underscore the important poetic questions that his work occasions.

The two poems we have examined so far have been in elegiac couplets, but Catullus’ favorite lyric meter was the Phalaecean hendecasyllable, the lyric meter which Catullus calls *iambos*. This meter, too, had a history that involved the tension between high and low poetic registers. Morgan has shown how a reading of the derivation based metrical theory found in grammarians such as Caesius Bassus might inform ancient understandings of the verse.³³ Derivation theory saw lyric forms as consisting of pieces of other more familiar meters.³⁴ Bassus explains that the *vulgaris divisio*³⁵ of the meter in

³² Macleod (1973) 307 notes that “it is fitting that Catullus should express himself in as un-Callimachean way [sic] as possible.”

³³ Morgan (2012) 88.

³⁴ On metrical theory see Leo (1889).

³⁵ Keil 6.258.

his day analyzed the Phalaecean as a combination of a dactylic hexameter (*Pāssēr / mōrtūšs / ēst*) and an iambo-trochaic element (*mēaē pūēl / laē*). Morgan suggests that Catullus may have been aware of this tension and exploited it for humorous poetic effect, allowing the high register of the hexametric element and the low register of the iambic to reinforce humorous clashes in content in each half of the verse like *Ānnālēs Vōlūsī / cācātā cārtā*.³⁶ If Catullus did this, it would be nothing new. In chapter two we have seen how Theocritus exploited the connotations of the cola of his asynartete meters to add meaning to his epigrams.

The editorial history of Callimachus' *Iambi* may have also contributed to the connotation of the Phalaecean as a verse that straddled the gap between two types of poetry. Whether or not Callimachus originally intended for his μέλη (fr. 226 – 229 Pfeiffer) to be notionally connected to his book of *Iambi*, the evidence of Horace's 17 Epodes, with their internal debate of whether to end the collection at the end of Epode 14, suggests that at least some first-century B.C.E. Romans read Callimachus' four μέλη as *Iambi* 14–17.³⁷ It is not difficult to understand why later readers were ready to consider these four poems as an extension of the collection, given the metrical and thematic license Callimachus advocates in *Iambus* 13.

The first of these four poems (fr. 226 Pfeiffer), was written in Phalaecean hendecasyllables. What is more, the Diegesis tell us, it was a poem about the mistreatment of the young men of Lemnos (τοὺς ὠραίους) at the hands of the Lemnian women. The significance of the placement, meter, and content of this poem for Catullus

³⁶ Morgan (2012).

³⁷ On the modern debate see Cameron (1995) 95 and Acosta-Hughes (2002) 4. Cf. Hor. *Epod.* 14.6-8.

has yet to be fully appreciated. If this poem were seen as Callimachus' *Iambus* 14, it makes complete sense that Catullus would call his Phalaecans *iambi*. Moreover, a Callimachean poem in Phalaecans about the abuse of men by women is also an important precedent for the erotic themes Catullus treats in his own Phalaecans.

There are grounds, then, both theoretical and historical for seeing the Phalaecan as a meter of both high and low register and with both lyric and iambic connotations. This made it an excellent meter for Catullus to explore the contrast between finesse and vulgarity or love and hate, as he does in so many of his Phalaecan poems. Poem 16, for instance, frames a serious literary discussion of the relationship between a poet's character and his poetry with two vulgar verses threatening sexual violence, *pedicabo ego vos et irrumabo* (l. 1 and 14). Poem 16 reverberates with a tension between literary and sexual propriety, which are aligned and compared through the concept of *mollitia*, a word with very different meanings in the literary and moral sphere.³⁸ As a possible translation of the Alexandrian λεπτός, *mollis* was a byword for slender, refined poetry, thus Catullus' calls his refined love poetry *versiculi..molliculi* (l.3-4). In the Roman sexual sphere, however, male "softness" meant a lack of masculinity.³⁹ In Poem 8, we find *miser Catullus* attempting to reaffirm his manhood after being rejected by Lesbia by repeatedly telling himself to "be hard" (*obdura* l.11). In Poem 16, Furius and Aurelius attribute the softness of Catullus' love poetry (*milia multa basiorum* l.12) to his character and therefore attack his manhood (*male me marem putatis* l.13).

Just as he does on Gellius in Poem 116, Catullus turns the tables on Furius and Aurelius, here showing that his "soft verses" can quickly shift to take on the sexually

³⁸ Wiseman (1976) 223.

³⁹ OLD s.v. *mollis* 3a.

aggressive power of iambic. It is thus important that Poem 16 is written in Phalaeceans, the same meter as the kiss poems for which Catullus is criticized. Pointing out the power of his own sexually potent *versiculi* to ignite even their “hard groins” (*duros lumbos* l.11), Catullus reverses the traditional associations of hard and soft: hardness, normally characteristic of male sexual dominance, has become a characteristic of aged impotence, while supposedly soft verses take on a penetrating force. As Heyworth has noted, it is not Catullus himself who threatens Furius and Aurelius with oral and anal rape – that would not be the act of a chaste poet (*castum poetum*)⁴⁰ - rather, it is Catullus’ verses which will do skewering, both in the metrical pun on *pedicabo* and in the image this poem creates on the page, penetrating attack by an aggressive verse at the top (*irrumatio*) and bottom (*pedicatio*) of the body of verses on the page.⁴¹

Poem 15 also contains a switch in tone from a restrained, refined style to one of vulgar, aggressive attack. This poem begins with a polite request from Catullus to his friend Aurelius, asking him to avoid pursuing Catullus’ erotic interest, a *castum puerum* (l.4-5) whom Catullus has entrusted to Aurelius for safe-keeping. Propriety is an important concept in this poem as well, expressed through several variations of the word *pudicus*, which again bridges the gap between the literary and the moral/sexual sphere. Catullus calls his polite poetic request to Aurelius’ a *veniam...pudentem*, and he expects that Aurelius’ moral behavior will reflect its *politesse* (*conserves pudice* l.5). By the poem’s close, Catullus’ polite request has become an aggressive threat. He has asked nicely (*pudenter* l.13), but if Aurelius does not respond to a polite request, Catullus

⁴⁰ Though Wiseman (1976) argues that it is not the sexual act, but whether one penetrates or is penetrated that constitutes *castitas*.

⁴¹ Heyworth (2001) 134.

shows that he can change his tune, ending with a vulgar threat of anal penetration by mullets and radishes. The language of this threat also suggests that this sexual violence will come in the form of poetry, since Aurelius will suffer his fate with his “feet” spread apart (*pedibus attractis* l. 18).⁴²

Poem 42 plays on the same possibility for a transition between sweetness and aggression, but reversed. This poem, addressed to Catullus’ hendecasyllables, begins with an indignant Catullus commanding his verses to attack a woman (*moecha turpis* l.3) who has stolen his writing tablets. Catullus directs his verses to attack this woman with their most aggressive iambic vitriol, calling her a “dirty whore” (*moeche putida* l.11), a “piece of dirt” (*lutum*) a “brothel” (*lupanar* l.13), and anything worse that he can not even imagine. When none of these attacks has any effect on the woman, however, Catullus resolves to change his tone, switching from iambic aggression to cajoling praise (*putida* to *pudica*) in the final line. Again, poetic form is implicated in this shift, specifically through attention to the poem’s meter – which makes sense in a poem addressed to hendecasyllables. It is significant that the *moecha* has stolen Catullus *pugilaria*, his writing tablets. This theft implies a loss of poetic potency, which is expressed as an inability on Catullus’ part to manage his meter. The *moecha* smiles mockingly at him with the face of a Gallic hound (*catuli ore Gallicani* l.9), mocking Catullus with a metrically altered version of his own name.

Catullus initial verses directed at the *moecha* show him trying to marshal the meter against his victim. The command *circumsistite eam et reflagitate* (l.10), by placing the pronoun *eam* in the center of the verse, presents a word image on the page of Catullus

⁴² *Ibid.* 133.

command to “surround” his target. The quoted verses of attack (*moecha putida, redde codicillos / redde putida moecha, codicillos* 1.11-12 = 1.19-20) display Catullus’ metrical virtuosity by changing the word order of the verse while keeping its metrical structure the same. But though Catullus can move words around in his verses, his attacks ironically do not emotionally move his target (*nihil movetur* 1.21). He thus decides to completely change his approach, shifting from aggressive attack to wheedling praise. He announces this change in metrically charged language, telling his verses: *mutanda est ratio modusque vobis* (1.22-23). Yet, instead of changing meters, Catullus simply changes tone. His hendecasyllable goes from a verse of abuse to a verse of praise. This change is reinforced by the clever shift from *pūtīdī* to the sonically similar but metrically different *pūdīcā*. This clever metrical pun responds to the initial metrical challenge that that *moecha*’s theft of Catullus writing tablets posed to the poet. By quickly changing his hendecasyllable from a verse of blame to praise, Catullus reaffirms his power as a poet in control of his meter, which the initial theft of his *pugilaria* called into question.

Sappho Reborn

The previous section has aimed to show the importance of meter to Catullus in exploring the nature of his own poetry. In each of the poems examined, Catullus explored the boundary between refined, light poetry and gritty invective. The following section will examine how Catullus used meter to articulate his relationship with one important poet, Sappho. Sappho is an important poet for Catullus, not only because, as we shall see, she was exceedingly popular among the so called “proneoterics,” but also because his poems in Sapphic meters represent a formal departure from the stichic lyric experimentation of the Hellenistic period. Catullus’ resurrection and use of the Sapphic

strophe in Latin suggests a new interest in the personality of a Greek lyric poet as a whole, rather than a mere rearranging of pieces of Greek lyric kola in a lyric metrical exercise.

The fragments of the preneoterics suggest that Sappho occupied an iconic place in their poetic consciousness. Laevius can be seen alluding to one of Sappho's poems (fr. 96V) in one of the fragments of the *Protesilaodamia*.⁴³ In particular, Sappho's famous fragment on envy (fr. 31V) was already a popular piece for imitation among the preneoterics, apparently already singled out for its grace and beauty as it would go on to be by Pseudo-Longinus in his *On the Sublime*. At least two examples of imitation of this fragment by poets before Catullus have been preserved.⁴⁴ In both examples, the poet chooses one aspect of Sappho's poem on which to elaborate in an epigram. Lutatius Catulus, for instance, explores the implications of the comparison of mortal and divine:

Constiteram exorientem Auroram forte salutans,
cum subito a laeva Roscius exoritur.
Pace mihi liceat, caelestes, dicere vestra:
mortalis visus pulchrior esse deo. (fr. 2 Courtney)

In the first couplet, Catulus establishes the terms for comparison by referring to the dawn in human terms and Roscius in supernatural language. The speaker describes himself as "greeting" dawn as he would a fellow Roman acquaintance during the morning *salutatio*. In the corresponding pentameter Roscius *rises*. Here Catulus chooses to go a step further than Sappho by suggesting that Roscius actually surpasses a god in beauty. He also anticipates Catullus in begging gods' pardon (cf. *si fas est* Cat.51.2), addressing them

⁴³ Fr. 18; cf. Fantuzzi (1995).

⁴⁴ Cf. also Plaut.*Mil.*1216-83 and Trail (2005).

with the term *caelestes*, appropriate in this context of heavenly bodies. Catulus has turned a phrase from Sappho into a serious meditation on mortal and divine beauty.⁴⁵

Valerius Aedituus does something similar with a bit of Sappho's famous poem in his exploration of two symptoms of Sapphic lovesickness, sweating and speechlessness:

Dicere cum conor curam tibi, Pamphila, cordis
quid mi abs te quaeram, verba labris abeunt,
per pectus manat subito <subido> mihi sudor:
sic tacitus, subidus, dum pudeo pereo (fr. 1 Courtney).

Courtney remarks that this poem's frequent alliteration and repetition, if the proposed emendation is correct, of the vulgar word *subidus* "destroys the delicacy of Sappho."⁴⁶ This is one way to read the poem, but it is perhaps unfair to Aedituus because it assumes that the poet does not intend this affect. As in Catulus' fragment, this poem takes one element of Sappho's poem and explores it in a more extended form, here contrasting speechlessness and sweating. The two symptoms are juxtaposed repeatedly over the course of the two couplets. Both are localized in the same part of the body: sweat trickles down the chest of the speaker (*per pectus* l.3), the same place where he localizes his feelings for Pamphila (*cura cordis* l.1). In the final line, both concepts contrast in the sonically similar adjectives, *tacitus* and *subidus*. The intrusion of the vulgar adjective *subidus* (derived from the word *subare* of sows in heat) in a love poem dramatizes the contrast between proper expression and embarrassing verbal *faux pas*.⁴⁷ The poem's frequent alliteration, exaggerated almost to the point of humor, mimics the stuttering

⁴⁵ Cf. Weber (1996) 208-302 who points out the between Roscius' name and the adjective *roscidus*, frequently attributed to the dawn, as well as the tension established between male and female.

⁴⁶ Courtney (1993) 72.

⁴⁷ OLD s.v. *subo*.

lover.⁴⁸ With the final words, Aedituus moves from the specific to the general, pointing out the impossibility of maintaining standards of propriety while expressing his powerful emotions. As in the Catullan examples, the idea of *pudicitia* is adapted to poetic propriety, as Aedituus tries to express himself eloquently while restraining his powerful emotions.

Catullus' Poem 51 should be read in the context of this earlier poetry. Like Aedituus, Catullus also uses Sappho's poem as an opportunity for poetic reflection on the nature of his poetry as it relates to his Greek models and his particular situation as a Latin poet adopting Greek forms. However, Catullus' poem also demonstrates marked differences from his predecessors' adaptations of Sappho. Most obviously, it is a translation rather than an adaptation. Catullus' choice to translate Sappho's poem in Sapphic stanzas was not only unprecedented in Latin literature, but is quite possibly the first instance of a poet composing serious verse in the meter since Sappho herself. Apart from a few exceptional cases,⁴⁹ composers of Hellenistic lyric had been primarily interested in redeploying the old melic metrical cola in new stichic combinations, styling themselves as architects or craftsmen at play. The Sapphic, by contrast, was a strophic meter, repeating its pattern every three lines. We will see below that Catullus' decision to engage with the entire meter in its strophic form is matched by a more serious engagement with Sappho's poetic personality than we have seen before.

Although the Sapphic formally differs from the stichic compositions explored so far, it was affected by the same editorial changes that brought about the transition from

⁴⁸ This sonic effect may be inspired by Sappho's hiatus $\gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha\ \epsilon\alpha\gamma\epsilon$ at this significant point in fr. 31V l.9. Her use of meter to express meaning may have inspired Aedituus.

⁴⁹ Such as the *strofette* of Theocritus' Aeolic paidika.

lyric song, composed to be publicly performed, to book lyric, written to be read. One major structural change precipitated by this transition was that the strophe began to be written as four lines instead of three, with the final Adonius (–UU–x) written below the three preceding hendecasyllabic verses as a sort of coda.⁵⁰ The Alcaic stanza also underwent a similar editorial change, with the final ten syllables (–UU–UU–U–x) being rewritten as a fourth verse. Given what we have observed in the manuscripts of Pindar, it is safe to assume that considerations of *mise en page* precipitated this change. Written in their old form, both verses would have presented an unwieldy metrical protrusion in their third verse. As is the case with Pindar, the desire of Alexandrian editors to produce clean columns of poetry will have led to these changes in how the verses appeared in Hellenistic poetry editions. The fact that each colon contains a dactylic flourish and that the Adonius essentially repeats the familiar ending of the hexameter may have contributed to this change sounding natural to Roman ears. The change gave the Adonius a special sonic and spatial status in the Sapphic stanza, which poets could exploit for effect. Horace, for instance, will often place the name of his addressee in the Adonius of his Sapphics.⁵¹ Later Seneca went on to use the Sapphic hendecasyllable κατὰ στίχον, only adding an Adonius when he wishes to end a thought.⁵²

The potential for attaching one's name to a novel metrical invention combined with the Hellenistic penchant for creative experimentation with στίχοι made strophic forms like the Sapphic and Alcaic rather uninteresting to Hellenistic book lyricists. It is not surprising, therefore, that Sapphics are all but unattested in the period between

⁵⁰ Cf. West (1982) 33.

⁵¹ Cf. e.g. *Odes* I.2.53, 12.24, 22.4.

⁵² Morgan (2012). *Tro.* 814–60, 1009–55, *Phaedr.* 736–60, *Med.* 607–69, *Oed.* 110–53, 416–28, 547–622, *HO* 1518–606.

Sappho and Alcaeus and their resuscitation by Catullus and Horace. These two meters also got their names in different ways. According to the Roman grammarian Marcus Victorinus, the Sapphic was invented by Alcaeus, but named after Sappho because the latter used it “more frequently.”⁵³ The scanty remains of the Lesbian poets’ corpus make the truth of this statement impossible to evaluate. Regardless of how many poems each poet wrote in these meters, however, it must also be significant that the first book of the Alexandrian edition of Sappho was a collection of poems in Sapphics. Similarly, while the first book of Alcaeus contained numerous meters, the first poem of the collection (fr. 308V) was in Alcaics. It is highly likely that the conspicuous placement of these meters by the Alexandrian editors at the head of each poet’s edition also influenced the association of each meter with its eponymous poet.

The only recurrences of the Sapphic meter between Sappho and Catullus are in Greek. In the first, the meter invokes a clear connection with the Lesbian poetess. This snippet, either borrowed or composed by Chamaeleon for his book on Sappho, is written in the persona of Sappho and intended to prove that Sappho was romantically involved with Anacreon. Sappho is imagined as asking, in a Sapphic strophe, the muse for inspiration to sing one of Anacreon’s hymns:

κεῖνον, ὦ χρυσόθρονε Μοῦσ’, ἔνισπες
 ὕμνον, ἐκ τᾶς καλλιγύναικος ἐσθλᾶς
 Τήϊος χώρας ὃν ᾄδειε τερπνῶς
 πρέσβυς ἀγαυός (fr. 26 B⁴ Kaibel)

O Muse of the golden throne, raise that strain which the reverend elder of Teos, from the goodly land of fair women, used to sing so sweetly (Trans. Wharton).

⁵³ Keil 6.161.

This fragment shows the association of the Sapphic meter with Sappho even in the fourth century. In order to make it seem more believable that these verses were actually composed by Sappho, the author composed them in her eponymous meter. Pseudo-Sappho's impulse to sing one of Anacreon's hymns in Sapphics shows to what extent this meter became associated with the poetess. Of course, if Anacreon never composed in Sapphic stanzas. The implication is, however, that any song that Sappho sings, even one originally written in another meter by another poet, will come out in her signature meter.⁵⁴

The second example of later Greek Sapphics is a hymn to the goddess Roma (*PMG* 541), which Bowra places (though not with much conviction) at the end of the second century B.C.E.⁵⁵ The style, meter and tone, however, have suggested a later date to more recent scholars including Llyod-Jones, who writes in the *Supplementum Hellenisticum*: *turgidus iste stilus et inanum iterationum strepitus aetatem Hadriani sapere videntur*.⁵⁶ West agrees, pointing out the interesting parallel of the four epigrams of Julia Balbilla on the Colossos of Memnon at Luxur in Egypt (28-31 Barnard). Balbilla composed these poems in Lesbian Aeolic, West suggests, because this dialect, being the dialect of Sappho, marked her as a female poet.⁵⁷ We shall see below how this Sapphic ethos of femininity was highly relevant for the clever use Catullus makes of the Sapphic meter.

⁵⁴ Sappho 137V, in which Sappho and Alcaeus talk to each other, is puzzling. If it is indeed by Sappho, it is the only fragment in which she composes in Alcaeics. It seems more than coincidental that she would choose to compose in this meter in a poem in which she quotes Alcaeus. If this is true, the association of the poet with each meter may go back to ancient Lesbos. Cf. Nagy (2007).

⁵⁵ Bowra (1957) 28.

⁵⁶ 269.

⁵⁷ West (1978) 107.

Catullus' Sappho

Scholars who trace the biographical saga of Catullus' affair with Lesbia have placed Poem 51 at the beginning of their love story. As such, it pairs with the other Catullan Sapphic, Poem 11, which marks the end of this relationship, with Catullus bitterly insulting Lesbia and the famous, poignant comparison of his love for her to a severed flower. Now, even without fully accepting this biographical reading of the Catullan corpus, these two poems can certainly be read profitably against each other. In fact, it will be argued below that they correspond antiphrastically in a manner that is essential to Catullus' own self-definition vis-à-vis Sappho. But Poem 51's revolutionary metrical character – perhaps the first poem written in Sapphics in several centuries – suggests that it be read in combination with another poem deeply concerned with metrical experimentation. This poem, which stands directly before Poem 51 in the collection, is addressed to Catullus' contemporary and fellow neoteric poet Licinius Calvus.

Poem 50 is cast as a letter to Calvus, with whom Catullus has spent the previous day drinking and writing poetry. Catullus places great emphasis in the poem on metrical experimentation as a key part of his and Calvus' poetic play. This fact alone encourages a reading of the poem with the unprecedented metrical experiment that follows it. But the two poems are also linked by many structural, thematic, and lexical similarities.

Part 1 HESTERNO, Licini, die otiosi multum lusimus in meis tabellis, ut conuenerat esse delicatos: scribens uersiculos uterque nostrum ludebat numero modo hoc modo illoc, 5 reddens mutua per iocum atque uinum. Part 2 atque illinc abii tuo lepore incensus, Licini, facetiisque, ut nec me miserum cibus iuuaret nec somnus tegeret quiete ocellos, 10 sed toto indomitus furore lecto uersarer, cupiens uidere lucem, ut tecum loquerer, simulque ut essem. at defessa labore membra postquam semimortua lectulo iacebant, 15 Part 3 hoc, iucunde, tibi poema feci, ex quo perspiceres meum dolorem. nunc audax caue sis, precesque nostras, oramus, caue despuas, ocelle, ne poenas Nemesis reposcat a te. 20 est uehemens dea: laedere hanc caueto.	Part 1 Ille mi par esse deo uidetur, ille, si fas est, superare diuos, qui sedens aduersus identidem te spectat et audit dulce ridentem, 5 Part 2 misero quod omnis eripit sensus mihi: nam simul te, Lesbia, aspexi, nihil est super mi [vocis in ore] lingua sed torpet, tenuis sub artus flamma demanat, sonitu suoapte 10 tintinant aures gemina, teguntur lumina nocte. Part 3 otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est: otio exsultas nimiumque gestis: otium et reges prius et beatas 15 perdidit urbes.
---	--

Structurally, both poems both fall into three parts. The first part describes a vignette of an encounter between two people. In Poem 50, this is Catullus and Calvus' tipsy poetry session. In Poem 51, it is the scene of Lesbia conversing with another man. This first part is then followed by a second part in which Catullus reacts to what happens in the first part. In both poems, the result is the same: the encounter described in part one of the poem makes Catullus *miser* (*me miserum* 50.9 and *misero...mihi* 51.6-7) and precipitates in him a series of reactions. Both poems end with a third part in which Catullus breaks off from the description of these reactions to address someone. In Poem 50, this address is directed at Calvus as a bid not to reject Catullus' request to see him again accompanied

by a warning about the dangers of the goddess Nemesis. In poem 51, it is a warning from Catullus to himself about the dangers of *otium*.

As in almost every other Catullan example examined so far in this chapter, part one of Poem 50 articulates the nature of Catullus and Calvus' poetic play through a series of key terms linking the erotic and poetic process. The two are described as enjoying *otium* – the important Roman concept for the free time in which poets compose verse and lovers fan the flame of their desires.⁵⁸ Like the word *mollis* in Poem 16, the double meaning of this word sets the stage for a series of words with similar dual meanings that associate the erotic with the poetic throughout the poem. The two poets “play” (*lusimus* l.2) together, suggesting both erotic play and poetic play of the sort expected in poetic *nugae* (i.e. παίγνια). They themselves are *delicati* (with connotations, like *mollis*, of both sexual and poetic refinement) and they compose *versiculi*, which, as we have seen in Poem 16, denote the light, limber verses of lyric as opposed to the larger more traditional hexameter, the *versus durus*.⁵⁹ The repetition of the verb *ludere* in line 5 specifies the nature of their poetic play as metrical.

The second parts of the two poems, which each describe Catullus' reaction to the first part, are strikingly similar on a thematic and verbal level. Catullus suffers a “burning” as a result of each encounter. In Poem 51, a *tenuis flamma* (l. 9-10) flows through Catullus' limbs. In Poem 50, Catullus' passions are ignited (*incensus* l.8) by Calvus' *lepos* and *facetiae*. Again, these words for wit and charm can be understood in

⁵⁸ On *otium* cf. Frank (1968) and more recently Hanchey (2013).

⁵⁹ OLD s.v. *delicatus* 5b “effeminate.”

both an erotic and poetic context.⁶⁰ We have already noted the Callimachean connotations of *lepos*; *tenuis* too was a word associated with a refined aesthetic, another Latin translation of λεπτός. As a result of his erotic/poetic encounter with Calvus, Catullus spends the night tossing and turning in bed, his limbs half dead (*semimortua* 1.15), impatiently awaiting dawn. These references to Catullus' limbs and his impaired sight recall the symptoms he experiences as a result of seeing Lesbia together with another man in Poem 51. Similar language is also found in each poem: cf. *nec somnus tegeret quiete ocellos* (50.10) and *gemina teguntur lumina nocte* (51.11-12). These several similarities suggest a close connection between the two poems.

Catullus begins part three of Poem 50 by announcing to Calvus that he has composed a poem for him: *hoc, iucunde, tibi poema feci* (1.16). The question is, which poem? Traditionally, scholars have understood the demonstrative pronoun *hoc* as referring to the present poem, addressed to Calvus. A more interesting and fruitful line of interpretation, however, is to consider Poem 50 as a letter of introduction to Poem 51.⁶¹ Wray, the scholar who most recently argues in favour of reading the poems in this way, points out extensive evidence for “a commerce of request and compliance” for poetry sent back and forth among poets.⁶² This circumstantial evidence reinforces the numerous textual connections between the two poems and opens up new critical avenues to Poem 51, encouraging a more closely attuned critical appraisal of Poem 51 as an extraordinary specimen of the refined metrical play Catullus and Calvus describe in the first part of Poem 50. It also sets the stage for a connection of the poetic and erotic within Poem 51.

⁶⁰ Cf. Sallust's (*Cat.* 25) description of the alluring Sempronia who is endowed with both *lepos* and *facetiae* and has little regard for *pudicitia* or *decus*.

⁶¹ Cat.65.15-16 *mitto / haec expressa tibi carmina Battiadae*.

⁶² Wray (2001) 88 - 112.

In addition to the fact that the two poems correspond structurally and linguistically, several other clues suggest that Catullus may be introducing a translation in Poem 50. We have already seen that it was specifically the metrical play he engaged in with Calvus that ignited Catullus' poetic interest. Catullus' description of himself tossing and turning in bed (*versarer* 50.12), invites a pun on the word *versus*, suggesting that he spent his night up writing verses or perhaps on *vertere*, suggesting that he spent the night translating. At the end of this night of poetic/erotic rapture, Catullus lies in bed, his half-dead limbs (*semimortua...membra*) exhausted. The word *membra* – in addition to its erotic connotation of the *membrum virile* – retained in Latin the metrical associations of its Greek counterpart, κῶλον. The adjective *semimortuus* is unique in Latin literature, apparently coined by Catullus here. Given its location at the end of this litany of “symptoms” that Catullus suffers following his encounter with Calvus, this new coinage can be viewed as an allusion by Catullus to Sappho's final symptom of being “almost dead” (τεθνάκην δ'ολίγω 'πιδεύης / φαίνομ' ἔμ' αὖτ[α 31V 15-16) redeployed as a clever metrical pun. Finally, bilingual puns on the perceived connection between Greek ποιεῖν and Latin *facere* also suggest poetic translation. As Wray points out, the juxtaposition of two words *poema feci* suggests poetic translation of Greek to Latin.⁶³ We recall, also, that Catullus was delighted, among other things, by Calvus' *facetiis* (l.1).

Reading Poem 50 as an introductory poem to Poem 51 suggests a new context of understanding for the latter poem. It lessens the need to locate the poem in a biographical scenario between Catullus and his beloved and opens up avenues of critical exploration of the poem as a revolutionary poetic achievement, metrically and otherwise, sent to a

⁶³ Wray (2001) 98.

contemporary neoteric poet who could appreciate it as such. Traditionally, scholars have tacitly accepted Apuleius' claim⁶⁴ that name Lesbia is a metrically equivalent pseudonym for Catullus' love interest, Clodia Metelli. But Poem 51 is much more interesting if explored as a metrical experiment resultant from a poetic exchange between two *avant-garde* poets. Such a context inspires a more thorough critical exploration of the implications surrounding the fact that the name Lesbia, simply an adjective denoting a woman from Lesbos, refers to Sappho herself.

By giving his beloved a Sapphic name in his translation of Sappho, Catullus continues to explore the tension between poetic and erotic established in Poem 50. This first part of Poem 51 corresponds to the first part of poem 50, in which the poetic achievements of another man send Catullus into sensual overdrive. The structural and thematic similarity of the beginning of the two poems suggests an interpretation of the interactions between *Ille* and *Lesbia* in Poem 51 as poetic as well as erotic. This motif is strengthened by changes that Catullus makes to Sappho's original Greek:

⁶⁴ *Apol. 10.2.*

φαίνεται μοι κῆνος ἴσος θεοῖσιν ἔμμεν' ὦνηρ, ὅττις ἐναντιός τοι ἰσδάνει καὶ πλάσιον ἄδῃ φωνεί- σας ὑπακούει		Ille mi par esse deo uidetur, ille, si fas est, superare diuos, qui sedens aduersus identidem te spectat et audit	
καὶ γελαίσας ἰμέροεν, τό μ' ἦ μὰν καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν, ὥς γὰρ ἔς σ' ἴδω βρόχε' ὥς με φώναι- σ' οὐδ' ἐν ἔτ' εἴκει,	5	dulce ridentem, misero quod omnis eripit sensus mihi: nam simul te, Lesbia, aspexi, nihil est super mi [vocis in ore]	5
ἀλλ' ἄκαν μὲν γλῶσσα ἔαγε λέπτον δ' αὐτίκα χρῶι πῦρ ὑπαδεδρόμηκεν, ὀππάτεσσι δ' οὐδ' ἐν ὄρημ', ἐπιρρόμ- βεισι δ' ἄκουαι,	10	lingua sed torpet, tenuis sub artus flamma demanat, sonitu suo tintinant aures gemina, teguntur lumina nocte.	10
†έκαδε μ' ἴδρως ψῦχρος κακχέεται† τρόμος δὲ παῖσαν ἄγρει, χλωροτέρα δὲ ποίας ἔμμι, τεθνάκην δ' ὀλίγω' πιδεύης φαίνομ' ἔμ' αὐταί·	15	otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est: otio exsultas nimiumque gestis: otium et reges prius et beatas perdidit urbes.	15
ἀλλὰ πὰν τόλματον ἐπεὶ †καὶ πένητα†			

In his Latin translation, Catullus focuses more on his *Ille* than Sappho does on her κῆνος,⁶⁵ repeating the demonstrative pronoun in a second line that is nowhere in Sappho's Greek and focusing more on the process of the lover's visual and aural perception of his beloved (*sedens aduersus identidem te / spectat et audit* 1.3-4) rather than on the beloved's charming qualities. This change in focus to the lover and his perception makes Catullus' version of the scene recall a poet sitting down to translate the Greek verses (literally *sedens ad versus*), looking at them, reading them aloud, and listening to their graceful sounds (*dulce ridentem* 1.5).⁶⁶ An allusion to previous poetic "translations" of Sappho—the first two lines basically paraphrase L.Q. Catullus' epigram

⁶⁵ Snell (1953) 73; Miller (189).

⁶⁶ O'Higgins (1990) 157. In Sappho, the man only listens (ὑπακούει 1.4) to the beloved, whose attractive qualities are primarily aural (ἄδῃ φωνείσας...γελαίσας ἰμέροεν 1.4-5). In Catullus, the man both sees and hears her. One thinks of the practice of reading poetry aloud.

quoted above—adds further layers of literary historical depth to the lover/translator conceit. Other changes from the Greek later in the poem continue to reinforce this poetic motif. It has been frequently pointed out that Catullus does not translate all of Sappho's symptoms⁶⁷ which include (1) loss of voice, (2) burning skin, (3) loss of hearing/ ringing in ears, (4) sweating, (5) shaking, (6) turning green, (7) almost dying. Catullus is affected only with regard to his senses (as he says *omnis eripit sensus mihi* l. 5-6); he (1) loses his voice, (2) his limbs burn, (3) his ears ring, and (4) he loses his sight. Catullus focuses on the faculties that affect his ability as a poet: seeing, hearing, speech, and the ability moving his “slender” limbs (or his lyric metrical κῶλα).⁶⁸

As a result, Catullus simultaneously casts himself both in the position of *Ille*, i.e. the man who looks at Sappho again and again as he sits down to translate her, and the observer who is dismayed by the seeming impossibility of the task of matching the grace and beauty of Sappho in Latin verse. This conceit is intimately connected with the issues of identity Catullus explores in Poem 51. Sappho, as we have seen, was an important poet for the preneoterics and fragment 31V was later elevated as a paragon of poetic excellence. Because of Sappho's status as a popular model for imitation by Roman poets, Catullus' own expression of his relation with the Lesbian poetess involves larger questions surrounding the relationship between Greek authors and their Latin imitators. The format of a translation of Sappho beautifully showcases these issues, since it complicates notions of authorial identity by problematizing poetic creativity on the part

⁶⁷ For a clever solution to this problem, see Vine (1992).

⁶⁸ It is tempting to read the lacuna in line 8 as intentional. In Sappho, the hiatus that occurs at line 9 γλῶσσα ἔαγε has been defended as intentional by Nagy (1974) and O'Higgins (1990) 159, the break in air-flow mimicking the loss of the voice. An understanding of Poem 51 as a poetic missive to Calvus makes such a bold and unorthodox metrical maneuver even more appealing.

of the translator. In absolute terms, in the perfect translation, the translator makes himself invisible, acting only as a conduit for the source he translates. Conversely, the less accurate a translation is, the more the translator shows himself to the reader.

For this reason, ancient theorists do not recommend literal translation. Horace expresses the idea eloquently in the *Ars Poetica*

Publica materies priuati iuris erit, si
non circa uilem patulumque moraberis orbem,
nec uerbo uerbum curabis reddere fidus
interpres nec desilies imitator in artum,
unde pedem proferre pudor uetet aut operis lex (131-135).

The terms Horace uses to refer to translator such as “faithful” (*fidus*) and restrained by “propriety” (*pudor*) express the idea of translation in erotic terms that are highly concordant with Catullus’ poetic technique. Aside from the verbal changes Catullus makes to the Sapphic original, there is one other important place where he departs from his model, the adjective *misero* (l.5). Like Sappho (παῖσαν l.14) Catullus subtly betrays his gender in an adjectival ending. But for Catullus this special adjective links Poem 51 both to its letter of introduction in Poem 50 and also to the larger association of the poetic with the erotic throughout the Catullan corpus. We have already noted that Catullus’ poetic encounter with Calvus left him *miser* in Poem 50 (l.9). But the adjective is also associated with Lesbia’s infidelity throughout the corpus, perhaps most famously in the first line of Poem 8. Here, again, Catullus explores the dual meaning of the concept of *fidelitas* as it can be understood in the literary and erotic sphere. As a poet and translator he is unfaithful to Sappho, which ironically leaves him *miser* as a result. On the other hand, though, this instance of infidelity is also an opportunity for Catullus to break free

from simple word for word translation of his female source to assert his own masculine identity as a poet.

A similar effect is achieved when Catullus moves from part 2 to part 3 of Poem 51, a transition out of the “translation” section of the poem. The final flourish *gemma teguntur lumina nocte* invokes not only blindness, but also death alluding to the Homeric formulaic description of death τὸν δὲ σκότος ὄσσε κάλυψε.⁶⁹ With a beautiful flourish, Catullus suggests that the task of translation is too great for him and dies a poetic death, the enallage *geminā...lumina nocte* suggesting a breakdown of syntax as Catullus the translator is poetically overwhelmed. This poetic night also concludes the two-poem sequence that began with the words *hesterno die* (50.1). Yet Catullus resurrects himself from his translator’s death with an assertion of his own identity, inserting his own name in the final stanza. This is another Sapphic trope, since Sappho famously named herself in her own poetry.⁷⁰ By calling himself *Catulle* in his own Sapphics just as he breaks off from his translation of Sappho’s famous poem, Catullus boldly contrasts himself with his model and declares his own identity. This final stanza, with its repeated mention of *otium* also brings the reader back to this beginning of Poem 50, where poetic *otium* cast in erotic terms inspires metrical experimentation. This *otium* is *molestum* for Catullus because it occasions the symptoms he has described first in Poem 50, from his experience with Calvus, and then again in Poem 51, from his experience translating Sappho.

All these themes of poetic self-exploration and self-evaluation in Poem 51 depend on Catullus’ decision to translate Sappho’s poem in its entirety and in its original metrical

⁶⁹ Cf. *Il.* 4.503.

⁷⁰ Cf. fr. 1V.20. This reading rejects the 19th-century argument that the fourth stanza of Poem 51 was either spurious or came after a long lacuna. Cf. Fredricksmeyer (1965) 153 n.1.

schema rather than simply experimenting with pieces of Sappho as his Preneoteric predecessors had done. By making explicit the poetics of this encounter with Sappho, Catullus can explore and express poetically how he is different from Sappho and what she means to his poetic persona.

A critical perspective with a similar attention to metrical form will also elucidate Poem 11, the other Sapphic poem in the collection and another important companion piece to Poem 51, complementing it as the end Catullus' relationship with Lesbia.

FVRI et Aureli comites Catulli, siue in extremos penetrabit Indos, litus ut longe resonante Eoa tunditur unda, siue in Hyrcanos Arabesue molles,	5
seu Sagas sagittiferosue Parthos, siue quae septemgeminus colorat aequora Nilus, siue trans altas gradietur Alpes,	10
Caesaris uisens monimenta magni, Gallicum Rhenum horribile aequor ulti- mosque Britannos, omnia haec, quaecumque feret uoluntas caelitum, temptare simul parati,	15
pauca nuntiate meae puellae non bona dicta. cum suis uiuat ualeatque moechis, quos simul complexa tenet trecentos, nullum amans uere, sed identidem omnium ilia rumpens;	20
nec meum respectet, ut ante, amorem, qui illius culpa cecidit uelut prati ultimi flos, praetereunte postquam tactus aratro est.	

Morgan has noted how jarring the Sapphic meter is to the content of the poem.⁷¹ The references to far-off places, military exploits, and bellicose peoples are highly discordant with the received ethos of the Sapphic stanza. Even more out of place are the vulgar *non*

⁷¹ Morgan (2012) 202.

bona dicta, the disgusting accusations of sexual promiscuity that Catullus asks Furius and Camillus to transmit to his beloved. Catullus exploits the newly conspicuous final adonius, placing these key words, as well as the vulgar *ilia rumpens*, in this prominent place to heighten the discordant effect of such language appearing in the delicate Sapphic stanza. It is significant that this poem is addressed to Catullus' friends rather than Lesbia herself, as if Catullus is already gone, leaving this dismissive note for his former beloved. All of this discordance with the normal ethos of the Sapphic corresponds to Catullus's abandonment of Lesbia (i.e. Sappho), breaking the initial erotic associations the meter has from Poem 51.

Of course, the famous last stanza reveals how Catullus actually feels, trampled by Lesbia's infidelity. This emotional revelation must be understood in terms of the context of rejection of all things Sapphic that has driven the entire poem thus far. As the final stanza reveals that Catullus is not over Lesbia, the tone of the poem reverts back to the delicate language of love poetry traditionally associated with the Sapphic. Additionally, the final stanza may actually contain a very specific allusion to Sappho herself. The simile of the fallen flower resembles a similar metaphor used by Sappho (105bV):

οἷαν τὰν ὑάκινθον ἐν ὄρεσι ποίμενες ἄνδρες
πόσσι καταστείβοισι, χάμαι δέ τε πόρφυρον ἄνθος.⁷²

Just as shepherds tread upon the hyacinth growing in the mountains, and its purple flower lies on the ground.

⁷² Woodman (2002) 58; Miller (1993) 194. That this is almost certainly the fragment that Catullus had in mind here is supported by Virgil's borrowing of the same motif at *Aen.* (9.534), where he compares Euryalus to a flower: *pupureus veluti cum flos succisus aratro languescit moriens*. The fact that Virgil includes the detail from the original Greek of the flower's purple color, but adopts Catullus image of the plow, means that both authors must have had this passage in mind.

Catullus' efforts to distance himself formally and spatially from Lesbia have failed; his admission of his own pain not only accords with the received ethos of the Sapphic meter but includes a direct imitation of Sappho herself. Catullus is rendered all the more pathetic in his inability to escape his devotion to Lesbia, both as a lover and as a literary model. In the end, Lesbia has been unfaithful to Catullus, but Catullus has not managed to be unfaithful to Lesbia.

The fact that Catullus chooses this new strophic meter coincides with his more sophisticated relationship with the lyric past. These verses are no longer so much the product of a technical metrical workshop. They represent a new stage of engagement with Greek lyric in which Roman authors struggle with questions of their own poetic identity and the nature of their poetry defined against their models. Strophic composition offers a formal parallel for the change in poetic consciousness that Catullus' Sapphics represent. Archaic lyric is no longer something to be taken apart and put back together as a showcase of τέχνη. For Catullus, Sappho is an integrated poetic personality. In the following section, we will see that in the way he uses meter to define himself against Sappho, Catullus paves the way for Horace to do the same in his *Carmina*.

CHAPTER FOUR: METER AND MEANING IN HORACE'S *ODES*

Pindarum quisquis studet aemulari,
Iulle, ceratis ope Daedalea
nititur pinnis, uitreo daturus
nomina ponto.

-Hor. *Carm.* 4.2.1-4.

Horace's *Ode* 4.2 is about the difficulty of imitating Pindar. In it, Horace compares the poet who does so to Icarus, flying too close to the sun. Of course, as has been widely noted, this poem is rife with imitation of Pindar.¹ Syntactically, lines 5-24 recreate the gushing style of Pindar's verse, forming one nineteen-line period that contrasts the apophthegmatic opening stanza. This massive sentence takes the reader on a poetic tour of Pindaric genres, ranging from dithyrambs (l.9) to hymns (l.13) to epinicians (l.16f) to threnoi (21f). This sequence also forms a classic Pindaric priamel, with a "pronominal cap" *ego* at the caesura of line 27. Thomas points out that the first three lines of the first stanza even seem to begin an acrostic of Pindar's name PIN – a deft formal imitation of Pindar indeed and a clear debt to Hellenistic book lyric.² Pindar's grandiloquence is also communicated in metrical terms. He is *immensus* – literally "beyond measure" recalling the original meaning of meter from μέτρον. His words pour forth in his intractable periodic meter *numeris lege solutis* (l.11-12).³

These references to Pindar's meter remind the reader that this highly Pindaric poem is written in Sapphics. Thus, metrically, Horace exonerates himself from the charge of imitating Pindar formally, even as he does so thematically. Casting himself as

¹ E.g. Putnam (1996) 48.

² Thomas (2011) *ad loc.*

³ Morgan (2012) 228.

a Matine bee and Pindar as a raging river, he recalls Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*, styling Pindar's poetry a raging metrical river, an unlikely foil for a classic Callimachean *recusatio*, with Pindar cast in the role normally reserved for the unwieldy epic poet in contrast to the refined poet of lighter verse. Horace rejects Pindar's formal style for Sappho's, embracing the image of the bee in Callimachus' hymn:

Δηοῖ δ' οὐκ ἀπὸ παντὸς ὕδωρ φορέουσι μέλισσαι,
ἀλλ' ἥτις καθαρὴ τε καὶ ἀχράντος ἀνέρπει
πίδακος ἐξ ἱερῆς ὀλίγη λιβὰς ἄκρον ἄωτον (110 - 112).

Bees, however, do not carry water to Demeter from just anywhere, but that which flows clean and undefiled from a sacred spring, a small trickle, best and choicest.

Unlike Pindar, Horace is the Callimachean poet-artisan, crafting well-worked poems (*carmina operosa* l.33) around the banks of a small clear stream (*i.e.* the Callimachean καθαρή κρήνη) at Tivoli. The second half of the poem uses this opposition to set Horace's poetry against the grander poetry of Iullus Antonius, the poem's addressee, who will sing the praises of Caesar in a more august key. As such it presents itself as a typical *recusatio*, with Horace rejecting high public poetry for subject matter more appropriate to his slender lyric verse. The sacrifice with which the poem closes seems to fit these terms: while Iullus will offer twenty full-grown cows, Horace's offering consists of one small calf (l.53-54).

But reducing Pindar to a muddy Callimachean river makes no sense in Horace's *oeuvre* overall. Horace imitates Pindar – who was after all a lyric, not an epic poet – numerous times throughout the *Odes* with great success, most memorably perhaps in the priamel that opens the collection in *Ode* 1.1. Upon closer examination, it becomes clear that this poem purposely defies neat categorization according to any prescribed stylistic system. For instance, the metaphor of the bee is a complicated one in this context of

Pindar and Callimachus. Surely, it is meant to recall Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*, but it is also a significant Pindaric symbol.⁴ Pindar uses the bee explicitly in *Pythian* 10 as a symbol of his muse that flits from theme to theme:

ἐγκωμίων γὰρ ἄωτος ὕμνων
ἐπ' ἄλλοτ' ἄλλον ὥτε μέλισσα θύνει λόγον. (53-54)

For the finest of victory hymns flit like a bee
from one theme to another.

Yet even more suggestive is the implicit symbol of the bee in *Pythian* 11, which Norwood argues “governs, inspires and explains [the] whole ode.”⁵ In *Pythian* 11, the bee that “lives near to the earth, buzzing quietly” becomes the symbol of the man who eschews the dangerous heights of fortune to live a quiet happy life.

...ἴσχει τε γὰρ ὄλβος οὐ μείονα φθόνον·
ὁ δὲ χαμηλὰ πνέων ἄφαντον βρέμει. (29-30)

...prosperity brings with it envy as great as itself.
But the man who lives close to the ground resounds unseen.

This situation presents a close parallel with the analogical use Horace makes of the bee metaphor in *Ode* 4.2, eschewing the poetic heights of Pindar to buzz in simple Sapphics (*more modoque* 1.28). As such, this symbol makes the opposition between Horace and Pindar rather complicated, since Horace uses the very Pindaric symbol of the bee, a symbol to which Pindar compares himself repeatedly, to align himself with Sappho against Pindar.

Horace's supposedly small contribution to the praise of Augustus is also more complicated than it seems at first glance. Horace will join in with the voice of the crowd at Augustus' imagined triumph to sing “*O Sol pulcher, O laudande* (1.46-7).” Thomas

⁴ Noted by Richardson (1985) 383-401.

⁵ Norwood (1945) 126.

points out that the meter of this particular snippet of verse is a trochaic septenarius, the meter employed by soldiers for their *versus quadratus*, the marching songs they sang in praise of generals.⁶ But Horace's fantasy of his voice blending in with the crowd must be more complex than this. Are we really to imagine our elitist and *vulgus*-hating priest of the muses as happily mixing with the mob as they sing the *versus quadratus*, a verse "firmly planted among the Romans before their writers adopted, in a learned way, metrical forms from Greek literature?"⁷

The first clue that this self-vulgarization is disingenuous is that Horace imagines himself mixing with the people in language that distinctly recalls the *Carmen Saeculare*, his most public, occasional and in many ways most Pindaric poem. The quoted snippet of song recalls similar language used to praise Apollo and Diana in the hymn whose inherent structure rests on the images of the sun and the moon. Specifically, that language recalls the phrase *alme sol* (CS.9) and *o colendi* (CS.2) addressed to Apollo and Diana. Thus, the suggestion that Horace will recede into the crowd as a small part of the whole populace is contrasted by the intimation that he has already composed a very public poem precisely on the public themes he leaves to Iullus in his *recusatio*. Horace will even go on to picture himself leading a chorus of youths and maidens as they sing his hymn in *Ode* 4.6.35ff. Significantly, both of these other important public odes are also written in Sapphics.

Even the poem's closing image of a sacrifice, seemingly reinforcing the opposition between Iullus as a poet of grand martial themes and Horace as a poet of light verse, is more complicated than it seems. Of course, on a formal level, Horace does

⁶ Thomas (2011) *ad loc.* referring to Heinze (1965) 408-9.

⁷ Conte (1999) 27.

mean that his sacrifice will align with his small but finely wrought poetry – hence the detailed description of the calf’s physical appearance (l.56-60). Yet at the same time – especially given the clear image of the Callimachean river and bee in the first stanza – this image of a sacrifice calls to mind another famous Callimachean poetic credo from the *Aitia*:...τὸ μὲν θύος ὅτι πάχιστον / θρέψαι, τῇ]ν Μοῦσαν δ’ ὠγαθὲ λεπταλέην· (fr. 1.21-24 Pf.). Horace’s sacrifice openly defies Callimachus’ advice: for while the Muse may be arguably skinny – at least metrically – so is the sacrifice! Horace specifically offers a *tener vitulus*, a modest young calf without any horns yet to speak of. This θύος λεπτόν is just another way that Horace defies complete association with any poetic system in this poem.⁸ The poem closes with an image of the moon formed by the calf’s horns cresting on its brow. The double associations of the final lunar image contrasts comparison of Pindar to the sun in the first stanza of *Ode* 4.2, but also recalls the solar/lunar dynamic of the *Carmen Saeculare*.

The Sapphic meter is the key to this complex nexus of contrasting symbols and stylistic systems in *Ode* 4.2. It is the reader’s first clue to look beyond the meaning of the words and consider the poem as a whole unit of meaning that balances form with content. Imitating Pindar in Sapphics allows Horace to rewrite the Callimachean poetic credo reigning at Rome, authorizing himself to write public encomium – so important to Book Four of the *Odes* - in slender lyric meters and thus avoid the pitfalls of imitation while still reaching Pindaric heights of praise. By combining elements of Sappho and Pindar, Horace also achieves a lyric synthesis of these two models that is more than the sum of its parts. As the first self-conscious work of “Lyric Poetry,” the *Odes* do more than

⁸ Noted by Thomas (2011) *ad loc.*

imitate a group of individual Greek poets.⁹ They speak with a unified voice that harmonizes the traditions of the vastly different poetic personalities grouped under the heading of *lyric* in the Hellenistic period. By blending elements of different models, Horace creates a poetic product that transcends his predecessors in its novelty and its vitality.¹⁰ In many of the odes to be examined in this chapter, Horace achieves this harmonized balance of lyric models by alluding to the poetic persona contained in a meter. *Ode* 4.2 thus serves as an excellent example of how Horace uses meter to add richness and dynamism to the *Odes*.

Surprisingly, although Horace is the most metrically diverse of any major Roman poet (*numerosus Horatius*, Ovid calls him),¹¹ there have been almost no serious studies of how Horace uses meter to add meaning to the *Odes*. Karl Nurmberger, who attempted such a study in his 1959 German doctoral dissertation, gives a dismal report on the *status questionis* at the time: “Eine ausführliche Arbeit über die Wechselbeziehung zwischen innerer und äusserer Form, d.h. zwischen Inhalt und Metrum in der Lyrik des Horaz, gibt es bis jetzt nicht.”¹² Today, more than fifty years later, the situation is much the same. As Llewelyn Morgan notes, there has been a scholarly resistance to the idea that meters can themselves function as units of poetic meaning.¹³ For example, Matthew Santirocco felt the need to preface his introductory remarks on the importance of meter to the

⁹ Fittingly, Horace makes the first attested use of *lyricus* as a Latin word. Cicero uses the term at *Orat.* 183, but leaves it in Greek characters.

¹⁰ Woodman (2002) likens this lyric blending of Alcaeus and Sappho in *Ode* 1.32 with Horace’s claim in *Ode* 2.20 to be a *biformis vates*.

¹¹ *Tr.* 4.10.49

¹² Nurmberger (1959) 1. Unfortunately, Nurmberger’s Procrustean conclusions like “das sapphische ist *das* horazische Mass für Götterlieder” do not stand up to the dynamism and versatility of the *Odes* (53).

¹³ Morgan (2000) 100.

programmatic value of the Parade *Odes* in 1986 with the following statement: “it may seem odd that metrical forms, especially when they are viewed apart from their content, should be a vehicle for an implicit poetic program.”¹⁴ Morgan’s important 2012 study, *Musa Pedestris*, has helped open scholars’ eyes to the profound interconnection of meter and poetic meaning in Roman poetry. Yet that work, in its stated focus on metrical self-consciousness beginning in the second century C.E., as well in its range over all genres and type of meters in Latin poetry, has left a great deal of work to be done, especially in Hellenistic and early Latin lyric, poetry for which meter, as we have seen, is a defining characteristic.

Because of limitations of space, the following pages cannot constitute the *ausführliche Arbeit* whose inexistence Nurmberger lamented in 1959. They will hopefully show, however, how closer attention to Horace’s use of meter can reveal important aspects of the *Odes* that have gone unnoticed thus far. The following readings not only show how important meter was to Horace’s articulation of his own poetic program, they also reveal him as heir to the tradition of metrical self-consciousness that permeated book lyric, both Greek and Roman, since the Hellenistic period.

The Asclepiad

We have seen how the transition from oral to book lyric occasioned a new sensitivity to the visual appearance of lyric meters on the page. The very earliest traces of this new sensitivity are apparent in the metrical arrangements of Pindar by the Alexandrians. Hellenistic poets like Simmias of Rhodes and Pseudo-Theocritus took advantage of this new visual aspect of poetry to create picture-poems like the *Egg* or the

¹⁴ Santirocco (1986) 20.

Syrinx. Without a doubt, the Roman poet Laevius also took part in this tradition in his *Phoenix*. The previous chapter argued that Catullus, too, was conscious of the image his verses created on the page. Horace, I believe, also knew this tradition, and brought it to bear on some of the *Odes*' most important and prominent poems.

The Asclepiad is one of the few stichic meters Horace uses. That Horace chooses to open the *Odes* with a stichic, Hellenistic meter instead of an Alcaic or Sapphic strophe is important. Had Horace opened with an Alcaic or Sapphic, he would have risked identifying himself too closely with one of these poets. The Asclepiad, a comparatively unaffiliated Hellenistic meter,¹⁵ allows him to stand back and comment on his poetic achievement as a whole, which is exactly what he does in *Ode* 1.1 as well in 3.30, which will be treated in further detail below. As one of Horace's few stichic meters, the Asclepiad forms a clean column of verse down the page. This graphic aspect of stichic verse is even more important in Horace than in other poets, since stichic poems are so rare in the *Odes*. The even column of verses would have served as an attractive frontispiece to the ancient edition of the *Odes*, taking Pindar's advice at the opening of *Olympian* 6, "to place a gleaming face at the beginning of his work" to a metaliterary visual level.¹⁶ The descending column formed by the verses also interacts semantically with the ode's content, helping to establish the group of professions that make up the poem's famous priamel as a list onto which Horace will be added at the end. Each character is named by the first word or pair of words in the verse: Maecenas (1), the

¹⁵ Noted by Zetzel (1983) 87. More recent scholarship such as Barchiesi (2005) 424 has explored in greater depth the programmatic importance of first lines and first poems in Hellenistic poetry books. The first asclepiad was used *kata stichon* by Alcaeus (fr. 34a, 112, 117, 349b-353V), but did not carry the strong connotations of the Alcaic stanza, the opening meter in Alcaeus' Alexandrian edition.

¹⁶ *Ol.* 6.1-4. ἀρχομένου δ' ἔργου πρόσωπον / χρή θέμεν τηλαυγές.

chariot racers (*sunt quos* l.3), the politician (*hunc* l.7), the merchant (*mercator* l.16), the hedonist (*est qui* l.19), the soldiers (*multos* l. 23), the hunter (*venator* l.26) and finally Horace himself (*me* l.29). The repeated metrical pattern of the descending list adds force to Horace's description of his own vocation beginning with the pronoun *me*, what specialists of Pindar's style would call a "pronominal cap."¹⁷

These Asclepiads are particularly well constructed to reinforce the form of a descending list. As Syndikus points out, Horace makes a greater effort here than he does in other Asclepiad poems to make the end of a thought coincide with either verse end or with the strong pause that comes at the break after the first choriamb.¹⁸ This concinnity of meter and sense emphasizes the semantic value of each verse or group of verses as a unit of meaning that is added to the lengthening list. The high frequency of homoioteleuton and grammatical agreement between the final syllable before the caesura and the final syllable of the verse, as well as the frequent alliteration, also add to this stacking effect.¹⁹

Horace's description of his own vocation as poet in the final eight lines of the ode recalls many aspects of the previous professions he mentions in the poem's opening list, but transfers them to the poetic realm.²⁰ The charioteer's botanical prize, the palm (l.5), becomes ivy, the *praemia* of learned brows (l.29). Like the athletes exalted to divine heights (l.6), Horace's poetry also brings him into the divine realm, mixing him with the gods (*dis miscent superis* l.30). The hunter's forgetful seclusion beneath the wintry sky

¹⁷ Cf. Bundy (1986) 5. n. 18.

¹⁸ For example in the strophic asclepiads in *Ode* 1.6 or 1.15. Cf. Syndikus (1972) 23 n.1.

¹⁹ Homoioteleuton: 1.2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 22, 24; grammatical agreement: 1.1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 31; alliteration: 2, 6, 8, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 27.

²⁰ On this general technique of contrast and balance in Horace cf. West (1973).

(1.24-5) becomes Horace's willful poetic seclusion in the cool grove of the muses (*gelidum nemus...secernunt populo* 1.30-32). The warlike *lituus* (1.23) is replaced by the lyric *tibia* (1.32). By echoing many of the characteristics from his first list of occupations, Horace borrows the gradually building force from the first priamel for his description of his own poetic activity, ending with another capping device in line 35 (*quod si me*).²¹ The list of professions culminating in the poet becomes a list of poetic attributes culminating in a request for canonization. Here too, the image of the column of verses reinforces the ode's content. Horace's name may literally be "inserted" into the end of the stack of verses that build a visible list on the page.

The stichic Asclepiad does not occur again until *Ode* 3.30, the final poem of the first edition of *Odes* published together as three books in 23 B.C.E. Together with *Ode* 1.1 this second column of verses forms a set of visible bookends to the collection. In *Ode* 3.30 as well, the Asclepiads exhibit the same evidence of metrical structuring as those in *Ode* 1.1, with sense breaks and punctuation coming either after the first choriamb or at verse end. In an ode about poetry's ability to form a literary monument that outlasts physical monuments, the physical form of the meter is even further implicated, since the column of verses forms a monumental structure on the page. As the closing poem of the first three books of *Odes*, this poem also serves as Horace's own epitaph, the sturdy block of verses as a headstone and epitaph in one. Thus it also structurally recalls the final ode of book two and the grave that Horace there rejected *sepulchri...supervacuous honores* (2.20.23-4).

²¹ Commager (1962) 331.

Ode 3.30 also demonstrates how Horace can make serious poetic use of what had been merely a “paignion” for his Hellenistic predecessors. By saying that his poetic monument outlasts the pyramids, Horace specifically recalls the Augustan victory over Cleopatra in Egypt.²² His lyric achievement becomes a poetic reflection of Augustan political victory, a poetic image of the Capitoline Hill, the center of Roman political power. Thus, Horace describes the ascent of the Pontifex Maximus up the Capitoline with the verb *scandere*, which also means to read verse by meter.²³ The movement of the reader’s eye up Horace’s column of verses becomes an ascent up a Roman poetic monument. The poem’s close with a request for Melpomene to crown Horace with laurel recalls not only the crowning of a poetic victor at Delphi, but also that of Roman *triumphator* at the top of the Capitoline, since the verb *deducere* can mean “to lead in triumph” as it does at *Ode* 1.37.31.²⁴ As the *princeps* of Roman song, Horace has lead Greek meters to Rome in triumph by creatively adapting Greek lyric forms to write poetry of an essentially Italian style (*aeolium carmen ad italos deduxisse modos* 1.13-14).

These public triumphant connotations of the verb *deduxisse* contrast the word’s other significant Callimachean connotations, the *carmen deductum* being one of many Roman translations for Callimachus’ μοῦσα λεπταλέη.²⁵ As he does in *Ode* 4.2, Horace again challenges the Callimachean idea that refined poetry is inappropriate for public

²² Noted by Pöschl (1991) 255. The words *dum Capitolium* at line end in l.8 also recall Cleopatra plotting for the Capitoline’s ruin in the line ending *dum Capitolio* at 1.37.6.

²³ *OLD* s.v. *scandere* 6 “to scan a verse.” Cf. Keil 6.341.

²⁴ Hardie (1983) 49-57.

²⁵ Nisbet and Rudd (2004) *ad. loc.* reject this meaning, but it seems hard to believe that word that has such programmatic meaning for the Augustan poets (Cf. Verg.*Ecl.* 6.5 and Ov.*Met.* 1.4) does not carry notions of Callimacheanism at in such a programmatic Horatian passage. For a different take, cf. Woodman (1974) 124 – 226 and Ross (1975) 133.

themes. The poetic product unites the best of both kinds of poetry: it treats serious political themes in lyric verse and uses its stylistic refinement, including the image it forms on the page, to contribute to the glorification of Horace's own poetry and the Augustan regime.²⁶ Like the imposing monument on the page built from slender lyric verses, Horace too is *ex humili potens*. In an ironic twist, his reputation as a poet at Rome causes his name to be spoken in the region of his humble origins. By naming the region's dead king Daunus (the past tense of *regnavit* 1.12 is important), Horace suggests that his poetic fame, like Roman military might, reaches even the furthest corners of Italy.

The language describing the transition of Greek poetry to Italy also reveals a semantic tension to the reader who knows the numerous meanings of the word *modus* including "meter" (μέτρον) "melody" or "poem" (μέλος) or "manner" (τρόπος).²⁷ By choosing the word *modus* to mean "melodies" when he describes this process of adaptation, Horace reminds the reader that he has also, more literally, transferred Greek "meters" to Italian song. This chiasmus of thought produced by the interaction of two meanings is reinforced by the juxtaposition of the Greek adjective *Aeolius* with the Latin word for "song," *carmen*.²⁸ The third meaning of *modus* "style" is also felt here, proleptically suggesting that although the *Odes* draw heavily on Greek poets and Greek forms, the result is an essentially Italian style of poetry. All of these aspects of the

²⁶ "Horace and Virgil made a means of what may often have been for the Alexandrians an end..." Commager (1962) 36.

²⁷ OLD s.v. *modus* 7 "meter," 8 "poem," 9 "type."

²⁸ The juxtaposition of Greek and Latin words is a favorite technique of Horace to bring out the dynamism of his Greco-Roman work. Cf. also *lyricis vatibus* (1.1.35) and *dic Latinum barbite carmen* (1.32.3-4). A similar affect is achieved by Propertius, inspired by this passage: *primus ego ingredior puro de fonte sacerdos / Itala per Graios orgia ferre choras* (3.1.3-4).

unifying, transformative and triumphant processes of adaptation from Greek to Roman coexist in counterpoint in the verb *deducere*, which trades its exclusionary Hellenistic connotations for Roman ones of dynamic integration.²⁹

Horace uses the Asclepiad once more, in book four of the *Odes*. As in the first three books where the two stichic columns of poetry bookend the collection, the metrical shape of *Ode* 4.8 serves an architectural purpose as well, standing at the exact center of the fourth book. Horace takes advantage not only of the physical form of the meter on the page, but also the associations the meter has gained from its previous use in *Odes* 1.1 and 3.30. Like 3.30, *Ode* 4.8 is also concerned with the physicality of monumentalization. If he could, Horace would happily give physical gifts such as mixing bowls, tripods and handsome bronzes (*commoda...aera* 1.2). The mention of this metal recalls *Ode* 3.30 and implies that the gift of poetry that that Horace will ultimately offer in its place will be *aere perrenius*. Like *Ode* 1.1, *Ode* 4.8 uses a listing motif to build up to Horace's ability as a poet. As he cycles through the other visual artists, his language recalls the list of other professions in the priamel leading up to Horace's vocation as poet in *Ode* 1.1, with similar language repeated at several points.³⁰ The phrase *praemia fortium* (4.8.3) appears at the same position in the Asclepiad as the sonically similar phrase *praemia frontium* (1.1.29), suggesting to the reader familiar with Horace's earlier work that these *praemia aena* will be replaced by a poetic prize of even more lasting value.

But unlike the visual arts that it imitates on the page, *Ode* 4.8 also suggests that poetry confers a special immortality by giving voice to those whom it chooses to

²⁹ On the programmatic significance of this entire passage, cf. Ross (1975) 133-137.

³⁰ *hic...ille* 4.8.7 and *hunc...illum* 1.1.7&9; *nunc...nunc* 4.8.9, 1.1.21-22.

remember. While statuary or painting may raise imposing images of the great figures of the past before our eyes, they are doomed to remain silent. Poetry, which causes the names and deeds of past heroes to be spoken again (cf. l. *dicar* at 3.30.10), confers more valuable fame in its truest etymological sense of *fama* from *for* – “to speak.”³¹ Thus, Horace jokes, the muses are able to “indicate praise more clearly” (*clarius indicant/laudes* 1.19-20) than the visual arts. The two words are carefully chosen: *clarus* means both “famous” and “easily seen” while *indico* is a word that means “to show” derived from a word that means “to say” (*dico*). The ambiguity of diction highlights the contrast between the visual and aural realms that Horace here juxtaposes – the visual arts’ ability to bring the past before our eyes with poetry’s power to give the past new voice.

The real danger for Censorinus is that poetry might pass over his good deeds in silence (*chartae sileant* 1.21).³² Hateful silence (*taciturnitas... invida* 1.23-4) itself is to be feared as oblivion. The only salvation is the *tongue* of powerful poets (*lingua potentium vatum* 1.26-7). This glory (κλέος, the Greeks would call it) is ironically expressed in concrete, fiscal terms. Scipio Africanus “earned” (*lucratus* 1.19) his name from his deeds at Carthage just as Censorinus hopes for his own glory as “wages” (*mercedem* 1.22). The reference to Scipio also contains a historical inaccuracy that hints at the power of poetry to keep the historical record straight. The elder Scipio Africanus, the one glorified by Ennius (*Calabrae Pierides* 1.20), was not responsible for burning Carthage (*incendia Carthagini* 1.17). Rather, it was his grandson, Scipio Africanus the younger, who burned the city in 146 B.C.E, more than 20 years after Ennius died. This confusion of the two,

³¹ de Vaan (2008) s.v. *for* 235.

³² Feeney (1993) 55: one of “two examples where Horatian lyric is treated as a textual artifact, not as ‘voice’ or ‘song.’”

which must be intentional, demonstrates the potential of history to obscure great political deeds if poets like Ennius fail to immortalize their doers.³³

This reference to the poetic relationship between Scipio and Ennius also begs the question of whether or not Horace has a similar relationship with Augustus. Perhaps, as Commager suggests,³⁴ it would have been too bold for Horace to explicitly suggest that he was responsible for Augustus' immortality in this poem. Yet Horace and the other Augustan poets often mention Romulus, Hercules, and the Dioscuri (l. 22-31), heroes who earned a place among the gods for their deeds on earth, alongside Augustus' own deification.³⁵ Moreover, the close of *Ode* 4.8 recalls *Ode* 3.25, both in the reference it makes to the inspiring presence of Bacchus and in its striking near repetition of language in Asclepiadic cadence (cf. *ornatus uiridi tempora pampino* 3.25.20 and *cingentem uiridi tempora pampino* 4.8.33). In *Ode* 3.25, Bacchus inspires Horace to meditate on the immortalization of Augustus and his intention to "place Augustus among the stars and the counsel of Jove":

Quibus
antris egregii Caesaris audiar
aeternum meditans decus 5
stellis inserere et consilio Iouis?
Dicam insigne, recens, adhuc
indictum ore alio.

Appropriately, Horace uses the verb *inserere* here to describe the action of Augustus' immortalization, the same one he used to denote his own poetic canonization at *Ode*

³³ This reading, which draws on a suggestion by Commager (1962) 319, is another argument against excising this reference, despite the poem's violation of the *Lex Meinekiana*. For more arguments in favor of retaining line 17, cf. Harrison (1990) 38-40 and Kovacs (2009) 25-28.

³⁴ *Ibid.*

³⁵ Cf. 1.12.25, 3.3.9-10, 4.5.33-36.

1.1.35. Though he does not mention Augustus by name in *Ode* 4.8, this internal allusion to another ode in which the poetic memorialization of the emperor is so prominently featured suggests that this poetic monument has the power to “canonize” Augustus’s immortality along with its poet. This ode’s physical shape on the page and its position as the centerpiece of book four bears witness to the status of the fourth book - indeed the entire collection of *Odes* – as a poetic monument of lasting importance.

The Sapphic and the Alcaic

The preceding study of the stichic Asclepiad shows how Horace brought the technical virtuosity associated with the Hellenistic *technopaigion* to bear on poems about serious poetic and political themes. Two other important meters, the Sapphic and the Alcaic, make a good case study for exploring how Horace could exploit a meter’s particular ethos, since each of these meters had a direct association with a given poet.³⁶ Sappho and Alcaeus, whose eponymous meters account for more than 50% of the *Odes*, are both important models for Horace. In terms of their significance to the *Odes*, however, the two poets differ considerably. While Sappho and her namesake meter had been iconic for Catullus, Horace seems to have been the first poet to write in Alcaics since Alcaeus himself. We shall see how Horace uses the metrical personae of Sappho and Alcaeus to deal with the particular set of connotations that each Lesbian model brings to his work.

Horace’s shady encounter with Sappho and Alcaeus in the underworld in *Ode* 2.13 sheds important light on how he viewed his Lesbian models. After nearly being hit

³⁶ On the relative certainty that the Sapphic and Alcaic were known as such in Horace’s day, cf. Lyne (1995) 98-99.

by a falling tree, Horace imagines his own descent into the underworld to find Sappho and Alcaeus entertaining the dead. Each poet is singing a distinct type of poetry: Sappho sings love poetry about her fellow *hetairai* on Lesbos, while Alcaeus sings political poetry about the hardships of war and exile (*dura fugae mala dura belli* 1.28). The two poets are clearly compared, with Alcaeus coming out ahead. Sappho gets the unflattering participle *querentem* (1.24), while Alcaeus sounds “more fully” (*plenius*) and the shades “more avidly” (*magis*) drink in his tales of war and political intrigue (1.26).

For generations, readers of this poem interpreted this scene as Horace showing preference for Alcaeus.³⁷ But several details suggest that things are not this simple. First of all, it is important to remember that Horace pictures these poets in the underworld in an imagined scenario in which he himself has died. We must, therefore, read the scene not as an assessment of these poets during their lives, but rather how they are remembered after their death. Horace knew well that the poetry of Alcaeus and Sappho was far more complex than the one-dimensional image of them offered in this poem. Sappho’s broad poetic activity, nine books of hymns, hymenaia and other types of lyric, certainly cannot justifiably be reduced to the whimpering participle *querentem*. Along similar lines, the Alcaic corpus encompasses far more than merely poems about war and exile.³⁸ An important clue that this is an intentionally reductive portrayal of the two poets is the final detail that Alcaeus’ poetry is more avidly appreciated by the *vulgus*, a word that connoted lack of discrimination in poetic taste to all poets after Callimachus.³⁹

³⁷ For the list cf. Woodman (2002) 55.

³⁸ As Horace will go on to tell us in Ode 1.32.

³⁹ Cf. Feeney (2002) 10.

A more sophisticated way to read *Ode* 2.13 is to see Horace expressing his own anxieties about how the figures of Sappho and Alcaeus will be incorporated into the *Odes*. Reducing either of these poets to their stereotypes would spoil the dynamic lyric synthesis that Horace needed to create, reducing the important figures of Sappho and Alcaeus to shades of their former selves and revealing Horace's poetic judgment as vulgar in the process. The remaining pages of this chapter will constitute a study of how Horace uses the Alcaic and Sapphic meter to avoid this pitfall of imitation and form a complex and balanced picture of each poetic persona.

Before proceeding, however, it is worth noting how *Ode* 2.13 itself uses the Alcaic meter to destabilize the one-dimensional image of Alcaeus given in the ode. The tone of the first three stanzas, humorous invective directed against the tree that almost sent Horace to the underworld, sharply contrasts the serious meditation on the *post mortem* fate of poets that closes the ode. These three opening stanzas are unmistakably iambic in tone and contain several allusions to Horace's own third Epode, another invective poem directed against a harmful plant.

<i>Ode 2.13</i>	<i>Epode 3</i>
Ille et nefasto te posuit die, quicumque primum, et <u>sacrilega manu</u> produxit, arbos, in nepotum perniciem obprobriumque pagi; illum et parentis crediderim sui 5 fregisse ceruicem et penetralia sparsisse nocturno <u>cruore</u> hospitis, ille <u>uenena Colcha</u> et quidquid usquam concipitur nefas tractauit, agro qui statuit meo 10 te, triste lignum, te, caducum in domini caput inmerentis.	Parentis olim siquis <u>inpia manu</u> senile guttur fregerit, edit cicutis alium nocentius. o dura messorum ilia. quid hoc veneni saevit in praecordiis? 5 num viperinus his <u>cruor</u> incoctus herbis me fefellit? an malas Canidia tractavit dapes? ut Argonautas praeter omnis candidum <u>Medea mirata est ducem</u>, 10 <u>ignota tauris inligaturum iuga</u> <u>perunxit hoc Iasonem</u>, hoc delibutis ulta donis paelicem serpente fugit alite.

It is hard to believe that Horace did not have his rant against Garlic in mind when composing the opening stanzas of *Ode 2.13*.⁴⁰ The two poems share numerous obvious thematic and verbal connections (highlighted above) including the mention of patricide, a reference to the story of Medea, the similar concept of a “wicked hand,” and the presence of miasmic or poisonous *cruor*. These silly, iambic Alcaics directed against a fallen tree contrast with the picture of Alcaeus as a serious political poet given in the ode. By beginning a poem written in Alcaeus’ namesake meter that is ultimately a reflection on the overly simplified received ethos of Alcaeus as a serious poet in such a blatantly unserious way, Horace demonstrates his own vivacity and versatility as an imitator of Alcaeus. In his hands, the Alcaic verse is very much alive.

The poem closes with a description of the effect Alcaeus’ poetry has on several other denizens of the underworld:

⁴⁰ Noted by Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) 202.

Quid mirum, ubi illis carminibus stupens
 demittit atras belua centiceps
 auris et intorti capillis 35
 Eumenidum recreantur angues?
 Quin et Prometheus et Pelopis parens
 dulci laborum decipitur sono
 nec curat Orion leones
 aut timidos agitare lyncas. 40

These lines borrow heavily from Virgil's description of Orpheus' descent into the underworld in the *Fourth Georgic*:⁴¹

Quin ipsae stupuere domus atque intima Leti
 Tartara caeruleosque implexae crinibus angues
 Eumenides, tenuitque inhians tria Cerberus ora
 atque Ixionii vento rota constitit orbis. (481 – 484)

Horace follows Virgil in mentioning Cerberus, the snaky-haired Eumenides, and the punished heroes (replacing Virgil's Ixion with Prometheus and Tantalus) and uses language clearly inspired by Virgil, revealing that he had Virgil's description of Orpheus' journey into the underworld in mind. In Virgil's version of the Orpheus legend, these verses describe the effect of the songs of a living poet upon the inhabitants of Hades, while in Horace's version it is long-dead poets who produce the charming music. In Virgil, these verses are followed immediately by Orpheus' escape from Hades. In Horace, Sappho and Alcaeus will remain in the underworld. Yet it is not Sappho and Alcaeus, but Horace himself who embodies Orpheus in *Ode* 2.13. These two Greek poets are not the only ones who can compose Sapphics and Alcaics. Horace can as well, as the present poem – a lively use of Alcaics that mixes iambic humor with serious poetic reflection – demonstrates. By making his own poetic *catabasis*, Horace looks upon his models and, like Orpheus, he affirms his status as a versatile poet in land of the living.

⁴¹ Noted by Nisbet and Hubbard (1978) *ad loc.*

The Lydia Odes

As intimated above, the figures of Sappho and Alcaeus are important to the *Odes* for different reasons. Alcaeus provided new opportunities for metrical originality and a model for the reconciliation of lyric poetry with politics. On the other hand, Sappho was an important link with the Roman lyric that had been written before the *Odes*. Sappho was a figure of central importance for Catullus, the other neoterics and even for earlier poets like Laevius. Not only had these poets drawn heavily on Sappho's love poetry as a thematic model, Catullus had composed two poems in Sapphics, one of them nearly a direct translation of one of the Lesbian poetess's most famous poems.⁴² For Horace to make a creative, new use of Sappho in the *Odes* he needed to free the Sapphic meter from its neoteric and especially its Catullan connotations.

One way he does this is by making conspicuous use of the Sapphic meter in odes that differ sharply in tone from the light, occasional love poetry that was the hallmark of the neoterics. In the first Sapphic of the *Odes*, the important *Ode* 1.2 describing the disorder a decade of civil war has brought on at Rome, the inconcinnity of the meter and subject matter contribute to the feeling of conflict that dominates the ode. For readers used to Catullan Sapphics, the violent picture of discord and destruction in the first stanza must have struck a rather shocking chord that immediately served to differentiate the *Odes* from Sapphics that had come before it. Horace also recasts the associations of the Sapphic by avoiding it for love poetry, especially in the first books of *Odes*. In the Sapphic odes in Book One, Horace almost never mentions his own romantic interests in the way Catullus had: 1.10 is a hymn to Mercury, 1.12 an encomium of great men and

⁴² La Penna (1972) 209-210 first proposed the possibility of Sappho in the *Odes* as a symbol for critical commentary of the neoterics.

heroes, 1.20 a drinking invitation to Maecenas, 1.30 a rather detached request for Venus to visit Glycera, 1.32 a homage to Alcaeus, 1.38 a reflection on simplicity. There are two exceptions to this rule in Book One: *Ode* 22, about Horace's relationship with Lalage, and *Ode* 25 to Lydia. These two poems, however, form part of a larger poetic movement in Book One in which Horace allusively recalls and implicitly criticizes the tradition of neoteric love.

The name Lydia has much to remind the reader of neoteric poetry and the Sapphic tradition. As a dactylic three-syllable, female name beginning with the letter L and corresponding to a Greek geographical region, it mimics Catullus' Lesbia. Of equal importance, however, is the fact that Valerius Cato, one of the foremost members of the neoteric school, had composed a poem by this name.⁴³ What is more, the region of Lydia is an important symbol in Sappho of eastern luxury and temptation.⁴⁴ For Catullus and his peers, love of women like Lesbia had been all-consuming and destructive, dominating their world, distracting them from public life and enslaving them to their beloved's affection. This sort of love poetry was incompatible with the serious, political purpose to which the *Odes* often aspired. Horace never allows love to consume him in the *Odes* as it did the neoterics, preferring the role of the detached observer to the obsessed lover. To be sure, love is an important theme for Horace, but it is balanced against his other interests in poetry and politics.⁴⁵

The few studies of the Lydia *Odes* as a thematic unit have not noticed how they function together to elaborate a critical commentary on the overwhelming erotic

⁴³ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 110.

⁴⁴ 132 l.3, 39 l.2-3, 96 l.6, 16 l.19 V.

⁴⁵ Cf. Arkins (1993) 106-11. The fact that the *Odes* philander between numerous female addressees is an important manifestation of Horace's noncommittal romantic attitude.

experiences that lit neoteric fires.⁴⁶ At numerous points in the sequence, thematic and linguistic echoes of Catullus' poetry reveal Horace mocking and rejecting neoteric love for a less impassioned version that is more appropriate to the tone and purpose of the *Odes*. In all of these odes, the Sapphic meter is important, either by its presence or absence.

Lydia makes her first appearance in *Ode* 1.8, in which the speaker observes her distracting her lover, Sybaris, from his usual athletic activities in the Campus Martius. Like Lydia, the name Sybaris also has connotative, geographical significance. The city of Sybaris, a Greek colony in Magna Graecia, was associated with luxury in antiquity as it is today in the English word "sybarite."⁴⁷ In other words, the very name of this poem's male character suggests his potential to fall victim to Lydia's temptation. Horace, employing not one, but two significant geographic epithets together in the ode, not only recalls the neoteric tendency to do the same, but pushes the allegorical envelope. His deliberate overuse of this neoteric *topos* belies a critical smirk directed at his predecessors, setting up the figure of Lydia as a tool for critical comparison in this and the coming odes in which she features.

The language and setting are also reminiscent of other poetic commonplaces of the neoteric world. Horace chooses the verb *perdere* to describe Lydia's effect on Sybaris, "destroying him by loving him" (*amando perdere* l. 1-3). This verb is one of Catullus' favorites to describe the desperation of all-consuming love,⁴⁸ but Horace never uses it this way elsewhere in the *Odes*. The actions from which Lydia distracts Sybaris,

⁴⁶ Cf. Dettmer (1983) and Doyen (2004).

⁴⁷ E.g. the description of the effete Sybarites at Athen.12.19.

⁴⁸ Catullus 8.2; 45.3; 64.70, 119, 177; 75.2, 91.2.

athletic events and horsemanship in the Campus Martius, are reminiscent of military training and the *lusus Troiae*, events that held importance for young men in Augustan public life.⁴⁹ Thus, Lydia's distraction of Sybaris maps neatly onto the common neoteric theme of rejection of the obligations of public life for the private erotic world.

Recognizing this ode as a critique of neoteric love also explains the comparison of Sybaris to Achilles, hiding in women's clothes on Scyros to avoid going to war at Troy. Achilles symbolizes military excellence on the battlefield, but also the everlasting glory that poetry could confer on a man. His presence at the close of this ode may also suggest to the reader that neoteric love poetry lacks the immortalizing power that grand political lyric has. The private erotic realm fetishized by the neoterics becomes the poetic embodiment of the νόστος that distracted Achilles from achieving his κλέος on the battlefield.

Lydia reappears in *Ode* 1.13, another poem that clearly recalls the neoteric tradition in its imitation of Catullus' Sapphic symptoms in Poem 51. In this poem, however, Horace seems to abandon the emotionally detached position of the observing critic, describing his own visceral emotional reactions to Lydia's relationship with Telephus. Yet, it is hard not to agree with Commager that "[Horace's] burning passions were kindled less by an actual situation than by Catullus' slender flame."⁵⁰ In Catullus Poem 51 we saw the speaker disintegrate both emotionally and poetically before our eyes. But despite Horace's very graphic account of his own emotional turmoil at seeing Lydia with Telephus, his controlled verse tells another story. The chiastic pattern of alliteration in the opening words *cum tu Lydia Telephi cervicem* (C – T – L – T – C)

⁴⁹ Jaeger (1995).

⁵⁰ Commager (1962) 153.

announces a poetic control that contradicts the loss of emotional control the poem describes.⁵¹ Throughout the poem, near homoioteleuton (*difficili...bile* 1.3; *penitus...ignibus* 1.7) reveals another smirk as Horace toys with the picture of raging emotions. Instances of balanced, quasi-chiastic grammatical structure such as that in lines 9-11 achieve a similar effect. This contrast between form and content suggests that this poem is a parody of rather than an homage to its Catullan model.⁵²

Another imitation of Catullus 51 (and Sappho 31V) is the way in which the speaker breaks off from the description of his (or her) love sickness in the final stanza.⁵³ *Ode* 13 also closes with a dramatic change in tone with the words *felices ter et amplius* (1.17) a patently epic phrase that occurs in Homer and Virgil.⁵⁴ The idealized version of *inrupta copula* that Horace advises in lines 17-20 sharply contrasts the passionate vicissitudes of the neoteric relationship parodied in the poem. Some scholars who have picked up on this see Horace rejecting the ups and downs of passion for a love that lasts “*in ruhiger Zufriedenheit*.”⁵⁵ Yet at the close of an ode full of so much tongue-in-cheek mimicry, it is hard to take Horace’s vision of a happy relationship as genuine. His characterization of lasting love here mocks the ludicrous hyperbole of the devout love poet.⁵⁶ What must have been genuine, however, was Horace’s glee at twisting Catullus’

⁵¹ Commager (1962) 154.

⁵² Lowrie (1995) 38 points out Horace’s effort to “establish a difference between his love poetry and that of his elegiac predecessors and elegiac contemporaries.” West (1966) 67 agrees: “[Horace] is conspicuously out of sympathy with the self-pity and literary sentimentality of the elegiac poets.”

⁵³ Cf. Cat.51.13 *Otium Catulle tibi molestum est* and Sappho 31V 17 Ἀλλὰ πᾶν τολματὸν...

⁵⁴ Cf. Hom.*Od.*5.306; Verg.*Aen.*1.94.

⁵⁵ Syndikus (1972) 16.

⁵⁶ Cf. Septimius declarations of eternal love at Cat.45.3-7. Owens (1992) 244.

shift in tone at the final stanza of Poem 51, here redeployed to reveal Horace toying with a picture of the tormenting love that had been the Catullan *raison d'être*.

Lydia makes her final appearance in *Ode* 25, where Horace effectively bids farewell to her character in the *Odes*.⁵⁷ In this poem, also in heavy dialogue with Catullus' Lesbia poetry, Horace bids a final farewell to Lydia and Neoteric love. The paradigmatic neoteric temptress Lydia, whose doors formerly resounded with the nocturnal appeals of many a neoteric *exclusus amator*, now finds herself neglected and alone. The picture Horace paints of the aging Lydia's unhappy final years is rife with allusions to Catullus. The image of the elderly Lydia "alone in an alley bemoaning her johns one after another" (*invicem moechos anus arrogantis / flebis in solo levis angiportu* 1.9-10) is a composite of Catullus' Poem 11, where Lesbia "repeatedly breaks the groins" of her countless *moechi* (*identidem / omnium ilia rumpens* 1.19-20) and Poem 53, which finds Lesbia engaged in morally suspect acts in alleys (*in...angiportis / glubit magnanimos Romuli nepotes*, 1.4-5).⁵⁸ Significantly, Horace's image of Lydia's old age robs her of her sexual power and renders her *levis* (1.10), replacing Catullus' discourteous *glubit* with the sonically similar word *flebit* that emphasizes the sadness of rejection. The tables have been turned: Lydia's unsatisfied libido drives her liver (*iecur*, 1.15) into the same rage the speaker (supposedly) suffered in *Ode* 13.⁵⁹ Like Catullus's Poem 11, this

⁵⁷ Lydia appears once more in the amoebean *Ode* 3.9, but there she is a past lover, whom Horace has exchanged for a more mature partner who *is docta modos et citharae sciens* (1.10). Do we detect a note of wistfulness in this ode for a bit less Horatian control and a bit more Catullan passion?

⁵⁸ Putnam (2006) 11. The precise reference of *glubit* is not clear Adams (1982) 108. But it is relatively clear that it does not denote a virtuous activity.

⁵⁹ The shared erotic context and glances back on earlier Lydia poems such as that contained in the repletion of the word *iecur* (cf. 1.13.4) make it clear that Horace is talking about the same woman in the three odes addressed to Lydia in Book One.

poem also closes with a botanical metaphor, as the young men of Rome prefer green ivy to dark myrtle. The metaphor of course suggests the rejection of old age for young beauty, symbolized by the light and dark green of the two plants (*hedera virenti...pulla...myrto* l. 17-18). But the transition from myrtle to ivy also carries a secondary symbolic meaning in that myrtle, a plant sacred to Venus, gives way to ivy, which recalls the more mature poetic goals symbolized by the *doctae hederæ* in *Ode* 1.⁶⁰ Thus the ode also closes on a note of transition from Venus to Bacchus that reinforces the transition away from the puerile eroticism of Catullus to a more mature, controlled lyric inspiration.

It is significant that this is the only Lydia poem written in Sapphics. As we have demonstrated, one of Horace's major challenges in Book One of the *Odes* is to divorce the Sapphic from its Catullan associations. The first two Lydia odes, though in sustained dialogue with Catullus' Lesbia odes, are prominently not in Sapphics, though *Ode* 8, written in the so-called "Greater Sapphic" a combination of Aristophaneans and choriambically expanded Sapphics may have suggested a subtle metrical association with the Sapphic poems of Catullus in the first of Horace's Lydia series. *Ode* 13 is written in the Second Asclepiad, a Hellenistic meter Horace favored for erotic poetry addressed to women.⁶¹ Horace avoids the Sapphic in the first two poems that imply the destructive force of love, subject matter with which the meter was already well associated.⁶² It is only in *Ode* 25, where he successfully banishes Lydia and the destructive love she

⁶⁰ On the connection of the Myrtle plant with Venus cf. Verg. *Ecl.* 7.62

⁶¹ Cf. 1.19 to Glycera, 1.36 to Damalys, 3.9 again to Lydia, and 3.15 to Chloris. 4.1, an erotic poem addressed to Venus.

⁶² It may be significant that neither the Greater Sapphic nor the second Asclepiad is attested in Sappho.

represents, that he returns to the Sapphic. In this poem, the Sapphic meter serves to strengthen the allusions to Catullus 11, the poem that structurally informs *Ode 25*.

The other Horatian Sapphic love poem in Book One, *Ode 22*, links with the previous odes discussed in several ways. More allusions to Catullus in this ode reveal yet another critical commentary on a neoteric *topos*, the rejection of travel for love.⁶³ Again, this ode is addressed to a woman with a three-syllable name beginning with the letter L, Lalage. Again, the ode recalls Catullus' Poem 11 in the list of far-off places separated by a sequence of the conjunction *sive* ending in descriptions of the motion of foreign bodies of water in the metrically conspicuous Adonic (*tunditur unda* Cat.11.4 / *lambit Hydaspes* Hor.1.22.8). Yet while for Catullus these far-off, exotic places represent imagined escape from his failed relationship with Lesbia at Rome, for Horace, the exotic locales are inhospitable environments that his relationship with Lalage enables him to endure. By bidding farewell to his Lydia/Lesbia character, Horace has transferred geographic exoticism from the beloved back onto the map where it belongs.

Ode 22 closes with another important allusion to Catullus. Unlike Catullus, who ended Poem 51 by breaking off his translation, Horace finishes what Catullus started, translating Sappho's ἄδυ φωνείσας...γελαίσας ἡμέροεν by recalling Catullus' *dulce ridentem* (1.5) but completing and perfecting his predecessor's imperfect translation by adding *dulce loquentem* (1.23-4), a more accurate translation of Sappho's Greek. Horace's lyric love relationship with Lalage enables him both as a man who bravely endures danger and as poet who translates Sappho with poise and control. The final Sapphic flourish can thus be read as another comparison of his and Catullus' relationship

⁶³ Cf. Cat.45.6-9 where Septimius misses out on adventures in Lybia and India for Acme and later Propertius, whom Cynthia will not permit to visit *doctas Athenas* (1.6.12).

with Sappho – the clearheaded lyricist, his emotions under control and his wits about him, produces a more successful translation of his models than the reeling neoteric. Unlike Lydia,⁶⁴ whose name suggests the distracting temptation of luxury, or Lesbia, who simultaneously inspires and stymies Catullus as a poet, Lalage (from Greek λαλεῖν “to chatter” thus recalling Sappho’s ἄδυ φωνεῖσας) becomes a new, lyric personification of the part of Sappho that Catullus did not translate. She is a sublimation of what is most beautiful and pure in the Greek poetess, Sappho’s voice, sweetly speaking.

Alcaic Beginnings

By using the Sapphic meter to characterize Catullus (perhaps unfairly) as a querulous trifling love poet, Horace presents his own version of Sappho in the *Odes* as a poetic persona that has been restored to her pristine beauty, rehabilitated from *querentem* to *dulce loquentem*. The situation with the Alcaic was different, since Horace was the first poet to revive the Alcaic stanza since Alcaeus himself. As with Sappho, Horace used Alcaeus as a metrical persona to address literary challenges he faced in the *Odes*. In *Ode* 2.13, Horace mocked the vulgar reduction of Alcaeus to a one-dimensional poet singing songs of the *dura fugae mala dura belli*. But earnest meditations on Alcaeus such as *Ode* 1.32 reveal that Horace saw in the figure of Alcaeus a powerful union of public and private. This dynamic reconciliation of contrasting elements made the presence of Alcaeus an important one in the *Odes*, a work that sought to make a grand public statement in a humble poetic form.

The Sapphic meter in 1.32 contributes to the balance the ode establishes between the figures of Sappho and Alcaeus. The ode opens heavy with resonance of the private

⁶⁴ Lalage is also the metrical opposite of Lydia and Lesbia, an anapest instead of a dactyl.

poetic world of the Catullan love poetry.⁶⁵ The first line (*si quid vacui sub umbra / lusimus tecum*) rephrases the beginning of Catullus' "letter" to Calvus, Poem 50, introducing the Sapphic Poem 51: *hesterno, Licini, die otiosi / multum lusimus in meis tabellis* (l.2). More allusions to Catullus in the following line leave little doubt that Horace has his predecessor in mind, recalling the end of Catullus's Poem 1 (*plus uno maneat perenne saeclo* l.10) with the words: *quod et hunc in annum / uiuat et pluris* (l.2-3). These allusions, along with the Sapphic meter, call to mind the erotic, playful tradition of private lyric poetry going back through Catullus to Sappho. Indeed, as Tony Woodman has discovered, the first stanza even closes with a sonic allusion to Sappho who also addresses the lyre, *age dic latinum barbite carmen* recalling the ἄγι δὴ χέλυσί μοι λέγε / φωνάεσσα δὲ γίνεο, (fr. 118V) where the Latin words sonically mimic Sappho's Greek: ἄγι δὴ χ = *age dic*.⁶⁶

In the second stanza, the reader is surprised to learn that not Sappho but Alcaeus is the subject of the ode. Horace does not introduce Alcaeus by name; instead, playing the same grammatical game that Catullus had in Poem 51, he identifies Alcaeus by the grammatical gender of a key noun. The second stanza begins with the adjective *Lesbio*, the very adjective that Catullus applied in the feminine to his beloved in Poem 51. Here Horace uses this adjective in the masculine to show the reader that it is not Sappho but Alcaeus to whom he refers. The noun modified by this adjective, *civi* "citizen," further implies the ramifications of this difference in gender (l.5). As a male citizen, Alcaeus could participate in the public life of Lesbos while the female Sappho would have been

⁶⁵ Putnam (2006) 50-52.

⁶⁶ Woodman (2002) 54.

limited to the private sphere.⁶⁷ Thus, the surprise shift from the Catullan *Lesbia puella* to the Horatian *Lesbius civis* rewrites the surprise shift from male to female in the Catullan key word *misero* with a new key word that connotes the civic engagement that Catullus' erotic *miseria* caused him to neglect.

Ode 32 juxtaposes public and private, male and female, Sappho and Alcaeus in the first two stanzas, but then serves to integrate these two poets and the realms they represent. Horace emphasizes Alcaeus' ability to situate lighter poetry within a violent political context (*inter arma* l.6).⁶⁸ The persona of Alcaeus, who can compose both public and private poetry in lyric meters, shows that lyric is not out of place in the public word, and vice versa. Lighter poetry of the sort Catullus wrote (*Veneremque et illi haerentem puerum* l.12 recalling Catullus' *Veneres Cupidinesque* Cat.3.1) may be integrated into a larger epic world as a *lenimen laborum* (l.14-15). The word *lenimen*, a Horatian coinage derived from the adjective *lenis* (another possible Latin translation for λεπτός) invokes notions of Alexandrian refinement. But again, for Horace, refinement is redefined as integrative rather than exclusive, joining the realms of public and private, male and female. The Sapphic meter of this ode becomes an important symbol of this reunification as the reader realizes that the ode is about Alcaeus and not Sappho, since although the Sapphic was more associated with the private, female world of Sappho, it was also used by the public male poet Alcaeus. As Woodman has noted, the dual associations of the meter also help to sanction the harmonious existence of Sappho and Alcaeus and the poetry they represent in the *Odes* overall.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ Noted by Feeney (1993) 49.

⁶⁸ Feeney (1993) 47.

⁶⁹ Woodman (2002) 63.

Alcaeus was thus a powerful symbol for Horace, serving as a model for the reconciliation of public and private poetry in a single poet. Also, since no poet had written in Alcaics since Alcaeus himself, he offered Horace an attractive claim to primacy that Sappho did not. He emphasizes his resuscitation of Alcaeus' meter in the *Epistles* and the pride he took in it:

Hunc ego, non alio dictum prius ore, Latinus
uolgaui fidicen; iuuat inmemorata ferentem
ingenuis oculisque legi manibusque teneri. (1.19.32-34.)

Yet at the same time, the very impulse to cast himself as the 'Roman Alcaeus' endangered Horace's claims to originality. Horace knows this, and expresses his hostility to this sort of synkrisis in *Epistle 2.9* in a tongue-in-cheek description of himself and an anonymous elegist battling it out for claims to the title of Roman version of their favorite Greek model:

Discedo Alcaeus puncto illius; ille meo quis?
Quis nisi Callimachus? Si plus adposcere uisus,
fit Mimnermus et optiuo cognomine crescit. (99-103)

Horace's ambitions in the *Odes* surpass a claim to the Roman Alcaeus. Just as producing a mere translation of Sappho threatened to rob Catullus of his own poetic identity in Poem 51, any claim to be the 'Roman Alcaeus' jeopardized Horace's achievement of being the Roman Horace.⁷⁰

Just as he did with the Sapphic and Sappho, Horace uses meter to add subtlety to the presence of Alcaeus in the *Odes*, mitigating the received ethos of Alcaeus as a public political poet and tempering his own self-presentation as a Roman Alcaeus. Regarding

⁷⁰ Cf. Feeney (2002) 12: "he claims to be like [his Greek models] obviously in important respects; but he is not their incarnation or their equivalent or counterpart."

the latter issue, it is interesting to review the placement of Alcaic poems at prominent places in the *Odes*, especially at the beginning of books. Book one begins with an Asclepiad, by no means as strong a symbol as Alcaeus' eponymous meter, but nevertheless one of Alcaeus' favorites and a subtle sign to the careful reader of Horace's Alcaic aspirations.⁷¹ Of course, the following flurry of metrical variation that constitutes the Parade Odes immediately disassociates any direct association with Alcaeus. Yet, the Parade Odes themselves build up to *Ode* 1.9, which is not only written in the Alcaic meter, but also alludes heavily in its opening stanza to one of Alcaeus' poems (fr. 307aV). This coincidence of meter and content strikes a clearly Alcaic note at the prominent climax of the *Odes*' introductory movement.

We hear this Alcaic note all the more clearly if we observe, with Lyne, that the metrical acrobatics of the Parade Odes set them apart as a prologue, making *Ode* 1.9 the opening ode of the main body of Book One.⁷² This suggestion is rendered all the more appealing by Lyne's observation that subtracting the first eight odes from Book One leaves 30 poems, a much more usual number for a Roman book of poetry. The following two odes, 1.10 and 1.11, also repeat the meter of the second and third poems in the Alexandrian edition of Alcaeus, fr. 308V in Sapphics and fr. 343V in Greater Asclepiads.⁷³ Thus, metrically, we see Horace "opening" the main body of the *Odes* with a series of poems replete with metrical and thematic allusions to the opening of Alcaeus' collection of poetry as he read it. This sequence looks back on and reinforces the subtle

⁷¹ Noted by Morgan (2012) 222. Cf. also Nisbet-Hubbard (1970) xxxviii.

⁷² Lyne (2005) 547.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

metrical allusion to Alcaeus present in *Ode* 1.1 to subtly suggest a programmatic connection between Horace and Alcaeus at the start of the *Odes*.

If the meter of these odes calls Alcaeus firmly to mind, however, their content works to disassociate them from the public poetry with which Alcaeus was most commonly associated. Indeed, none of these odes contain content that might qualify as the *dura fugae mala dura belli* of *Ode* 2.13. *Ode* 1.9 describes the private world of the symposium, a refuge from the violent “storm of life.”⁷⁴ In fact, the violence and conflict of the battlefield are here manifested in the natural world (*ventos deproeliantis* 1.11), giving the speaker cause to enjoy private sympotic pleasures. Innocuous activities like drinking and dancing, socializing in Rome’s *piazze* and amorous encounters in dark corners are ironically described in fiscal and political metaphors that heighten their separation from the public realm: the days of youth should be “counted as profit” (*lucro / adpone* 1.12-13) and a lover’s tryst is a shadowy conspiracy betrayed by the “traitor laugh” (*proditor...risus* 1.21-22) of a young girl.

A similar lightening effect may be noted in *Ode* 1.10, which follows the opening sequence of odes in the Alexandrian edition of Alcaeus in meter, placement (after 1.9, 1.10 is “second” in the body of Book One) and addressee, but also makes major changes to subject matter, as far as we can tell. Like Alcaeus fr. 308V, Alcaeus’ hymn to Hermes, this ode is a hymn to Mercury, the Roman version of the Greek god. From the first word, however, Horace affects a familiarity with Mercury that differs sharply from Alcaeus’ deferential distance, addressing the god by name in the first word of the *Ode*, while in

⁷⁴ Wilkinson (1951) 131.

Alcaeus Hermes is addressed only through a more respectful patronymic.⁷⁵ As a Sapphic poem about Mercury, *Ode* 1.10 also recalls *Ode* 1.2 both thematically and metrically, since this is the first point in the *Odes* that a meter is repeated. Yet the characterization of Mercury in this more conspicuously Alcaic ode differs sharply from the highly politicized image of Mercury as Augustus in *Ode* 1.2. In *Ode* 1.10, Horace imbues the myth of Hermes' theft of Apollo's cattle and quiver with a mirthful quality (*iocosus...furto* 1.8). Even as he bellows threats at Mercury, Apollo cannot help but crack a smile (1.10-12).

This levity extends even to the dour belligerents in the Trojan War:

Quin et Atridas duce te superbos
 Ilio diues Priamus relictio
 Thessalosque ignis et iniqua Troiae 15
 castra fefellit.

Amidst the violent backdrop of the *Iliad*, Priam fools the Greek warlords with Mercury's help just as the god had fooled Apollo (*fefellit* 1.16). The ablative absolute *duce te* (1.13) recalls the same language deployed in a much more pointed political context in *Ode* 1.2 (*te duce Caesar* 1.52), further reinforcing the contrast between the presentation of Mercury in the two odes. The closing description of the god's potentially ominous role as *psychopompos* (1.17-20) is also brimming with benign adjectives: *pias*, *laetis*, *levem*, *gratus*.⁷⁶

Because of the fragmentary state of the Alcaic corpus, it is hard to know how much *Ode* 1.11, the third in this Alcaic sequence, owes to Alcaeus fr. 343V aside from its

⁷⁵ Putnam (1974) 216.

⁷⁶ Cf. Lyne (2005) 551.

Greater Asclepiad meter, but the trend is already clear.⁷⁷ Just as Horace avoids the Sapphic for love poetry in the first book, choosing instead jarring military and political content for the opening Sapphic poem, 1.2, so too does this opening Alcaic pattern confound any received image of Alcaeus as a primarily public, serious political poet.

Another marked Alcaic moment in Book One occurs in *Odes* 16-17, the first time Horace repeats a meter in two sequential odes.⁷⁸ This first instance of metrical doubling alerts the reader's attention to the metrical form of the ode and prepares the poem's opening metrical pun: another *double entendre* of the word *modus* in the first stanza. Horace suggests that lyric "meter" will place a "limit" on the iambic aggression of his youth, making the poem's Alcaic meter a symbol of a gentler lyric mode that contrasts with iambic anger.⁷⁹ The poem's list of the destructive results of *tristes irae* also implicates the world of epic, a genre where anger is an important theme, nowhere more prominently than the *μῆνιν... Ἀχιλλῆος*, the highly conspicuous first word of the *Iliad*. The previous *Ode* 15, an account of Helen's kidnapping by Paris, closes with Nereus prophesying the coming rage of Achilles (*iracunda classics Achillei* 1.33-34). The story of Helen and Paris is important to *Ode* 16 because it occasioned the most famous change of tone in archaic Greek lyric, Stesichorus' "palinode" written to take back his offensive account of Helen's adulterous voyage to Troy. The description of the poem's addressee, *matre pulchra filia pulchrior* could very easily describe Helen herself, the exceedingly

⁷⁷ Lyne *ibid.* thinks that Leuconoe is meant to recall one of the Nymphs in mentioned by Alcaeus in the lost lines of fr. 343V.

⁷⁸ The Alcaic is the only meter Horace repeats in this way. The other repetitions are 1.26-27, 34-25; 2.13-14, 19-20; 3.1-6; 4.14-15.

⁷⁹ OLD s.v. *modus* 5b "limit." The fact that iambic is both a genre and a meter heightens the punch of the pun on *modum*. Cf. also Santirocco (1986) 49 and Lowrie (1995) 42. Kiessling and Heinze (1964) 81 first suggest the generic implications of the opening conceit.

beautiful daughter of Leda, beautiful in her own right.⁸⁰ By aligning iambic and epic through their shared theme of anger, Horace maps his own transition from iambic to lyric onto a preexisting archaic lyric typology, restyling Stesichorus' palinode (*recantatis* l.27 cleverly translates παλινοδία) as a contemporary genre-conscious *recusatio*.⁸¹

The repetition of the Alcaic meter in the next ode suggests that *Ode* 17 is poetry of the mode promised in the previous poem. Indeed, *Ode* 17 may also be read as a palinode that makes good on the promise for softer poetry in *Ode* 16 and announced by the *nunc* in line 25 of that poem. The link with Helen is also maintained in *Ode* 17 in its addressee, a woman named Tyndaris or “daughter of Tyndareus” (Helen’s father), who is also pursued by a Paris-like figure, Cyrus. But unlike the world of epic, where Helen is kidnapped and taken to Troy, the lyric world protects Tyndaris from Cyrus, with the hardness of nature taking on a soft, protective quality that responds to softness of Horace’s lyric music (*levia personuere saxa* l.12). From the safety of the lyric grove, Tyndaris produces her own lyric reworking of an epic story: the *Odyssey* is recast as a lyric tale of two women fighting over one man (*laborantis in uno Penelopen uitreamque Circen* l.19-20.) Tyndaris accompanies her song on a Teian lyre, suggesting that in the protection of the lyric world, Anacreon’s love poetry replaces the violent tales of Homer. She weaves her tale while sipping Lesbian wine that is specifically described as “harmless” (*innocentis...Lesbii* l.21), another reference to the Alcaic meter, throughout a symbol of the change in tone from *tristia* to *mitia*.

At the start of Book Two, Horace steps up Alcaic tension between public and private in the ode to Pollio. This ode is another *recusatio*, with Horace again refusing to

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ Nisbet and Hubbard (1970) 214.

treat in slender lyric verse the military themes that Pollio has treated in his history of the civil war. The structure of the first two stanzas, however, delays the reader's recognition of this conceit until the word *tractas* (l.8). For the first twenty-five words of the ode, Horace does exactly what he tells us he will not, singing the violence and vicissitudes of civil war in lively Alcaic stanzas. This opening Alcaic moment to Book Two, even if short lived, reechoes the earlier inceptive Alcaic sequence in Book One and alludes more brazenly to Alcaeus' public side, especially since the ode looks back metrically to the last Alcaic ode in Book One, the Cleopatra *Ode* 1.37, which also had civil war as its main theme. These bellicose connotations go so well with the Alcaic meter's received ethos that the reader's realization in line 8 that the opening lines are merely a foil is quite jarring, rendering the *recusatio* all the more effective.

The importance of the meter to this ode may be perceived in its numerous references to sound and its sonic effects, which play off and highlight the tumbling Alcaics. As Pollio buffets the ears of his audience with a threatening murmur and the trumpets blare, the reader hears the terrified horses galloping away in the final dactylic flourish of the Alcaic fifth stanza: *terret equos equitumque uoltus* (l.16 – 20). The following stanza reinforces this interaction of sound and poetry with the almost paradoxical phrase *audire...videor* (l.21), as does the fifth stanza, which asks what Italian field has not witnessed the sound (*testatur...sonitum*) of the destruction of Italy (l.29-32). As some scholars have suggested, this interaction of the written and heard word most likely alludes to Pollio's reputation as the first Roman author to hold public recitations of

his work.⁸² This historical detail further implicates the meter of Horace's ode, alerting the reader's attention to the sounds and significance of the Alcaic meter.

At the end of the ode, these sonic and metrical resonances collude in the final conceit as they recall and comment upon the opening stanza. Horace will not write in a lyric meter the themes of civil war that Pollio treated in his history (*retractes* l.37, recalling *tractas* l.8). Horace's treatment of these lugubrious public themes in lyric meters would only produce the repetitive lamentation of the *nenia*, which the reader hears not only in the repetitive interrogative clauses of the antepenultimate and penultimate stanzas (*quis...qui...quae...quod...quae*), but also in the repeating rhythms of the Alcaic stanzas themselves. The alliteration and assonance in these final stanzas are particularly ferocious as the Alcaic moves from the heavy third to rapid fourth line: *non decoloravare caedes / quis caret ora cruore nostro*. As West puts it, "The horror can be heard."⁸³ To prevent his lyric from descending into this cacophony of carnage, Horace must replace Pollio's heavy political *modos* (l.2 'reasons') with lighter lyric *modos* (l.40 'poetic meters'). As in *Odes* 1.16, the Alcaic is again a 'limit' to Horace's public poetic ambitions. While in 1.16-17, the repetition of the Alcaic reinforces the motif of a palinode, here *Ode* 2.2's Sapphic meter, the traditionally softer Lesbian mode, answers Horace's imperative to *quaere modos leviores plectro*.⁸⁴ Significantly, the following eight odes of Book Two alternate between Sapphics and Alcaics, metrically reinforcing a sense of control and balance that characterizes Book Two's *aurea mediocritas*.⁸⁵

⁸² Eg. West (1998) 8.

⁸³ *Ibid.* 11.

⁸⁴ It also anticipates Horace's description of Alcaeus as *sonantem plenius aureo...plectro* at 2.13.26-27.

⁸⁵ Cf. Santirocco (1986) 83.

Perhaps the most conspicuous use of the Alcaic meter in the *Odes* comes at the beginning of Book Three in the so-called “Roman Odes.” Indeed, the fact that these six lengthy odes all share an elevated tone, contain similar political themes, and are all written in the Alcaic meter has even led some commentators, both ancient and modern, to read them as one continuous poem.⁸⁶ Considering the care that Horace has taken to temper the received ethos of the Alcaic by avoiding it for highly conspicuous political poetry at the beginning of Book One, and then explicitly denying it this function at the beginning of Book Two, it may seem odd that in Book Three he chooses to write such blatantly public political poetry in such a conspicuous string of Alcaics.

Horace’s choice makes more sense, however, when one considers the placement of the Roman Odes at the start of the third and final book of *Odes* as they were first published. While in the first books, Horace had to present a varied and composite picture of himself as a lyric poet drawing on a plurality of models, by Book Three he has established his own claims to originality enough to allow the ‘Roman Alcaeus’ to sing out. The Roman Odes mark the third, final and most unabashed Alcaic beginning in the first three books of *Odes*. Recognizing them as such sheds important light on overarching metrical patterning that informs the development of Horace’s self presentation as an Alcaic poet in the first three books overall. Book One opens with the extreme metrical variety of the Parade Odes and contains only a subtle metrical Alcaic movement that is carefully balanced by light, highly private content. The beginning of Book Two is characterized by balance between ten alternating Alcaics and Sapphics and hinges on the tension between the inherent power of the Alcaic as a meter for serious

⁸⁶ For example, the ancient grammarian Diomedes (Keil 1.251) and perhaps also Porphyrio. For a more recent view cf. Griffiths (2002) 65-80.

political poetry and Horace's explicit refusal to use it for this purpose in *Ode* 2.1. At the start of Book Three, metrical and thematic continuity is the defining characteristic, and the sustained engagement with political themes in the Alcaic contributes to the heightened, serious tone of the Roman Odes.

Our understanding of *Ode* 3.1 gains much from a reading informed by this metrical transition from variety to uniformity. Critics have seen the ode's Epicurean rejection of ambition and luxury in favor of the simplicity of the Sabine farm as primarily private and therefore inappropriate as an introduction to the highly public Roman Odes.⁸⁷ Solmsen gives a good summary of this viewpoint (which he eventually refutes): "[Horace] seems to be urging the young Romans to strive for their individual happiness - in the same way in which he himself has found his - rather than helping them to become devoted citizens of the new Rome which Augustus is anxious to build up."⁸⁸ Woodman and others have shown that Horace's personal philosophy of simplicity can be integrated into the larger political messages conveyed in the Roman Odes. Namely, Horace's criticisms of extravagance echo Augustan policy in their call for a return to the simple virtues of Republic Rome.⁸⁹ This message of simplicity is mirrored stylistically by a studied repetition of the Alcaic meter, which Horace consciously contrasts with the dazzling metrical variety that begins the first book of *Odes*.

In this regard, it is important to note how *Ode* 3.1 corresponds antiphrastically to *Ode* 1.1, the opening of the highly metrically varied Parade Odes. The link between the two poems is the theme of ambition, which Horace embraces in *Ode* 1.1 and rejects in

⁸⁷ Cf. also Fränkel (1966) 262.

⁸⁸ Solmsen (1947) 338.

⁸⁹ Woodman (1984) 83–94.

Ode 3.1. Where at the end of *Ode* 1.1, Horace expresses his hopes to become a *lyricus vates*, at the beginning of 3.1, he speaks with vatic authority as a *musarum sacerdos*, a more “stately” word for priest that contrasts the inspired ambition of *Ode* 1.1.⁹⁰ The sacred seclusion and the presence of the chorus of youths and maidens in the first stanza of *Ode* 3.1 also recall similar elements contained in the language at the end of *Ode* 1.1 (*nympharumque leves cum satyris chori / secernunt populo*. 1.31-2). But these mythical lyric personae have been replaced by a chorus of real Roman youths and maidens. In *Ode* 3.1, Horace speaks no longer as one who hopes for inclusion, but rather, as an initiate into the lyric mysteries who can induct the chosen few while keeping the masses at bay. Horace’s own authority is also communicated by the lack of any direct addressee or patron, though the mention of kings (*regum, reges* 1.5-6) does remind the reader of Maecenas, *edite regibus* (1.1.1). But where in the first ode Horace’s hopes for poetic status depended on Maecenas’ patronage and Maecenas’ advanced status was in turn predicated upon on his royal lineage, here Horace authoritatively redefines the hierarchy behind his poetic sanction: *imperium Iovis* has replaced *praesidium Maecenatis*.

As in *Ode* 1.1, there follows a preambular list of different types of professions introduced by an impersonal use of the verb to be (*est ut* 3.1.9 cf. *sunt quos* 1.1.3). This list also contains many echoes of *Ode* 1.1, and features familiar figures such as the farmer and the politician. In the attention Horace devotes to these figures in each poem, however, there are telling differences. In the priamel of *Ode* 1.1, the farmer receives the longest description of all the professions mentioned (1.1.9-14), while in *Ode* 1.3 he is reduced to a mere line and a half (1.3.9-10). On the other hand, the politician who

⁹⁰ Cf. Lyne (1995) 185 “The poet as *vates* lacked the stately, public, high-class aura of the poet as *sacerdos*.”

received relatively short shrift in *Ode* 1.1.7-8 has been enlarged to include three types of candidates, those who campaign based upon name, reputation, and political influence (1.3.9-14). This last candidate's *turba clientium* (1.13) constitutes a less respectable but metrically and sonically similar version of the *turba Quiritium* at *Ode* 1.1.7. *Ode* 1.1's triple honors (*tergeminis...honoribus* 1.8) have been replaced by three types of political ambition. These changes set the stage for the Roman Odes' engagement with political issues in general and also suggest political corruption that anticipates Horace's rejection of ambition in this poem's closing stanzas as well as the more general call for reform that dominates the Roman Odes.

The echoes of *Ode* 1.1. do not stop with the farmer and the politician. In the following two stanzas the tyrant with the sword suspended over his neck who cannot enjoy the pleasure of food, drink and the shady riverbank in the vale of Tempe (3.1.16-24) provides a twisted vision of the hedonist from *Ode* 1.1, stretched out beneath a wild strawberry bush drinking wine by the banks of a stream (1.1.19-22). Similarly, the potential worries that could plague the man who desires too much (3.1.25-32) are reminiscent of those experienced by the merchant, who risks his livelihood at sea at *Ode* 1.1.15-18. Even the description of the contractor and homeowner who hubristically build out above the water on pozzolana pilings briefly suggest to the reader, in the phrase *dominusque terrae* (l. 35), an echo of *Ode* 1.1's description of athletes as *terrararum dominos* (1.6), before it becomes clear that the genitive *terrae* actually depends on *fastidiosus*, delayed in enjambment to the beginning of the following stanza.⁹¹

⁹¹ Noted by Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 17.

Ode 3.1's darker reworking of *Ode* 1.1's priamel ends with the same capping formula, the words *quod si* followed by an accusative *dolentem* (cf. *quodsi me* 1.1.35). Yet instead of stating his own ambitious request for poetic canonization as he does in *Ode* 1.1, Horace rejects ambition all together. Again, the language is keyed to *Ode* 1.1, where he hoped to hit the stars with his lofty head (*sublimi feriam sidera vertice* 1.1.36). If even the stars⁹² (*sidere* 3.1.42) may be outdone by luxury, Horace will dispense with lofty rites (*sublime ritu* 3.1.46). Just as the poetic ambition Horace announces in *Ode* 1.1 precedes the dazzling metrical *variato* of the parade odes, the ambition he rejects in *Ode* 3.1 prefigures the constant string of Alcaics that make up the Roman *Ode*. This metrical simplicity harmonizes with Horace's refusal to change his Sabine home for more luxurious setting (*cur...permutem* 1.46). This unchanging severity of tone carries on throughout the Roman Odes from the monumental final line of *Ode* 3.1.48 *divitias operosiores* to its metrical partner at the end of the Roman Odes at 3.6.48 *progeniem vitiosiore*, together the only two-word lines in all Horatian Alcaics. The metrical move is subtle, but the effect is profound and the message clear: excess breeds vice in the Roman youth. The repeated Alcaic carries with it a reminder of the theme introduced in this perfect and unified Roman Ode,⁹³ that private life is not only not antithetical to public life, but that individual actions can serve as a model for an entire nation –

⁹²A much better reading than *Sidone*, conjectured by Nisbett and Rudd (2004) *ad. loc.* considering the numerous allusions to *Ode* 1.1 and the authority of the MSS, Porphyry and the parallel usage at 3.9.21 *sidere pulchrior*.

⁹³In addition to its propriety as an introductory ode, 3.1 has been traditionally attacked as disjointed. Fränkel (1966) 261 reassures us that “the days are long past when editors endeavored to separate the first stanza of iii.1.” Yet cf. Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 4: “There is some reason in the conjecture that the portentous opening has been grafted onto a more personal piece to serve as an introduction to the series.” Detecting the careful resposion of 3.1 to 1.1 is another strong argument for unity.

especially if they are proclaimed by the right poet and modeled by the right emperor. By documenting how the private life of one many can serve as the example for an entire society, the Roman Odes exemplify the reconciliation of public and private elements that Horace has placed in Alcaeus and his namesake meter throughout the *Odes*.

WORKS CITED

- Acosta-Hughes, B. (2002) *Polyeideia : the Iambi of Callimachus and the archaic Iambic tradition*. Berkeley.
- (2010) *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*. Princeton.
- and Barbantani, S. (2007) "Inscribing Lyric," in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Eds. P. Bing and J. Bruss. Leiden: 429-458.
- Adams, J. N. (1990) *Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. Baltimore.
- Andrisano, A. (2001) "Iambic motifs in Alcaeus' Lyrics," in *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Eds. A. Cavazere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi. Lahnam, Md.: 41-65.
- Aloni, A. (2001) "What is that man doing in Sappho 31V?" in *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Eds. A. Cavazere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi. Lahnam, Md.: 29 – 40.
- Arkins, B. (1993) "The Cruel Joke of Venus: Horace as Love Poet," in: Rudd (1993), 106-119.
- Barber, E. A. (1951) "The Fragments of Callimachus," *The Classical Review* 1: 78-80.

- Barchiesi, A. (1996) "Poetry, Praise and Patronage: Simonides in Book 4 of Horace's *Odes*," *ClAnt* 15: 5-47.
- (2005) "The Search for the Perfect Book: A PS to the New Posidippus," in *The New Posidippus: a Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Ed. K. Gutzweiler. Oxford: 320-343.
- (2009) 'Lyric in Rome,' in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Ed. F. Buddelman. Cambridge: 319-35.
- Bing, P. (1985) "Kastorion of Sulloi's Hymn to Pan (Supplementum Hellenisticum 310)," *AJP* 106, 4: 502-509.
- (1988) "Theocritus' Epigrams on the Statues of Ancient Poets," *Antike und Abendland* 34 (2): 117-123.
- (1995) "Ergänzungsspiel in the Epigrams of Callimachus," *Antike und Abendland* 41: 115-31.
- (2007) *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.
- Bowra, C.M. (1957) 'Melinno's Hymn to Rome,' *JRS* 47: 21-8.
- Bundy, E. (1986) *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley.
- Caganazzi, S. (1975) "Tavola dei 28 logoi di Erodoto," *Hermes* 103: 385-423.
- Cairns, F. (1976) "The Philosophical Content of Horace, Odes I.29," *LCM* 1: 71-77.
- (2003) "Catullus in and about Bythinia," in *Myth, history and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in Honour of T.P. Wiseman*. Eds. D. Braund and C. Gill. Exeter: 165-190.
- Calame, C. (1998) "La poésie lyrique grecque: Un genre inexistant?," *Littérature* 111: 87-110.
- Cameron, A. (1993) *The Greek anthology: from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford.

- (1995) *Callimachus and his Critics*. Princeton.
- Canter, H.V. (1920) "The Paraclausithuron as a Literary Theme," *AJP* 41: 355-368.
- Chersoni, M. T. (1998) 'Le incisioni dell'endecasillabo falecio catulliano (C. 5),' *Eikasmos* 9: 235 – 6.
- Commager, S. (1958) "Horace, Carmina 1.37," *Phoenix* 12: 47-57.
- (1962) *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*. New Haven.
- Consbruch, M. (1906) *Hephaestionis Enchiridion*. Leipzig.
- Conte, G. B. (1999) *Latin Literature: a History*. Baltimore.
- Courtney, E. (1993) *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- Davis, G. (1991) *Polyhymnia*. Berkeley.
- Day, J. (2007) "Poems on Stone: The Inscribed Antecedents of Hellenistic Epigram," in *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden: 29-47.
- Dettmer, H. (1976) *The Structured Pattern of Horace's Odes*. Anne Arbor.
- Doyen, C. (2004) "Lydia, Glycera, Chloe. Analyse d'une triade féminine dans les Odes d'Horace," *LEC* 72: 313-332.
- Evelyn-White, H., Trans. (1921) *Ausonius*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Ernst, U. (1991) *Carmen figuratum: Geschichte des Figurengedichts von den antiken Ursprüngen bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*. Cologne.
- Evans, J. (1998) *The History and Practice of Ancient Astronomy*. New York.
- Fantuzzi, M. (1995) "Levio, Saffo e la grazia delle fanciulle lidie (Laev. fr. 18)," in *Studia Classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata*. Ed. L. Belloni. Milan: 341–7.
- Färber, H. (1936) *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike*. Munich.

- Fassino, M. and Prauscello, L. (2001) "Memoria ritmica e memoria poetica: tra
'archaiologia metrica e innovazione alessandrina," *Materiali e discussioni per
l'analisi dei testi classici* 46: 9-37.
- Feeney, D. (1993) "Horace and the Greek Lyric Poets," in Rudd (1993) 41-63.
- (2002) "The Odiousness of Comparisons: Horace on Literary History and the
Limitations of Synkrisis," in *Horace and Greek Lyric Poetry*. Ed. M. Paschalis.
Rethymnon.
- Ford, A. (2002) *The origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical
Greece*. Princeton.
- (2004) "Catharsis: the power of music in Aristotle's Politics," in *Music and the
Muses: song, dance and word in classical Athenian culture*. Eds. P. Wilson and P.
Murray. Oxford: 309-36.
- Frank, R. I. (1968) "Catullus 51: Otium versus Virtus," *TAPhA* 99: 233-239.
- Fränkel, E. (1966) *Horace*. Oxford.
- Fredricksmeyer, E (1965) "On the Unity of Catullus 51," *TAPhA* 96: 153-163.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F. and Lissarrague, F. (1990) "From ambiguity to ambivalence: A
Dionysiac excursion through the 'Anakreontic' vases," in *Before sexuality: The
construction of erotic experience in the ancient Greek world*. Eds. D. M.
Halperin, J. J. Winkler, and F. Zeitlin Princeton. Princeton: 211-256.
- Galasso, L. (2004) "Laevidius, fr.22 Blänsdorf," in *Il diletto monte: raccolta di saggi di
filologia e tradizione classica*. Ed. M. Gioseffi. Milan: 29-38.
- Görgemanns, H. (1990) "Zum Ursprung des Begriffs 'Lyrik,'" in *Musik und Dichtung* 23:
51-61.

- Gow, A.S.F. (1952) *Theocritus*. Cambridge, England.
- and D. L. Page. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic epigrams*. Cambridge, England.
- Griffiths, A. "The *Odes*, just where do you draw the line?," in *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*. Eds. T. Woodman and D. Feeney. Cambridge: 53–64.
- Hansen, P, Ed. (1983) *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca Saeculorum VIII-V a. Chr. n.* Berlin.
- (1989) *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca : saeculi IV a. Chr. n.* Berlin.
- Hardie, P. (1983) "Horace, Odes 3.30: The Poet as Triumphator," *Studi Classici* 21: 49-57.
- Harrison, S. (1990) "The Praise Singer: Horace Censorinus and Odes 4.8," *JRS* 80: 31-42.
- (2001) "Some generic problems in Horace' epodes. Or, on (not) bring Archilochus," in *Iambic Ideas: Essays on a Poetic Tradition from Archaic Greece to the Late Roman Empire*. Eds. A. Cavazere, A. Aloni and A. Barchiesi. Lahnam, Md.: 165 – 186.
- Harvey, A.E. (1955) "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry," *CQ* 5: 157-74.
- Heinze, R. and Keissling, A., Eds. (1965) *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Oden und Epoden*. Berlin.
- Hilgard, A., Ed. (1901) *Scholia in Dionysii Thracis Artem grammticam*. Leipzig
- Holder, A., Ed. (1969) *Pomponi Porphyrius Commentum in Horatium Flaccum*. New York.
- Holwerda, D., Ed. (1982) *Scholia in Aristophanem. Pars II. Fasc. II*. Groningen.

- Hunter, R. (1996) *Theocritus and the archeology of the Greek poetry*. Cambridge, England.
- Irigoin, J. (1958) *Les scholies métriques de Pindare*. Paris.
- Jaeger, M. (1995) "Reconstructing Rome: the Campus Martius and Horace, Ode 1.8," *Arethusa* 28: 177-191.
- Koller H. (1965) "Melos," *Glotta* 43: 24-38.
- Kovacs, D. (2009) "Horace, Pindar and the Censorini in *Odes* 4.8," *JRS* 99: 23-35.
- Kroll, W. (1924) *Studien zum verständnis der römischen literatur*. Stuttgart.
- La Penna, A. (1972) "Sunt qui Sappho malint: Note sulla σύνκρισις di Saffo e Alceo nell'antichità," *Maia* 24, 208-215.
- Leo, F. (1897) *Die Plautinische Cantica und die Hellenistische Lyrik*. Berlin.
- (1889) "Die Beiden Metrischen Systeme des Alterthums," *Hermes* 24: 280-301.
- (1914) "Die römische Poesie in der sullanischen Zeit," *Hermes* 49: 161-195.
- (1960) *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften II*. Rome.
- Liberman, G. (2002) *Alcée: Fragments*. Paris
- (2007) "L'édition alexandrine de Sappho," in *I papiri di Saffo e di Alceo*. Eds. A Casanova and G. Bastianini. Florence: 41 – 66.
- Loomis, J. W. (1972) *Studies in Catullan Verse: An Analysis of Word Types and Patterns in the Polymetra*. Mnemosyne Supplement 24. Leiden.
- Lowrie, M. (1995) "A Parade of Lyric Predecessors: Horace C.1.12–1.18," *Phoenix* 49: 33–48.
- (1997) *Horace's Narrative Odes*. Oxford.

- Luce, J. V. (1963) "Cleopatra as *fatale monstrum* (Horace, Carm. I, 37, 21)," *CQ* 13: 251-7.
- Lyne, R.O.A.M. (1995) *Horace. Behind the Public Poetry*. New Haven.
- (2005) "Horace Odes Book 1 and the Alexandrian edition of Alcaeus," *CQ* 55: 542-58.
- Macleod, C. W. (1973) "Catullus 116." *CQ* 23: 304-9.
- Manuwald, G. (2003) *Pacuvius, summus tragicus poeta: zum dramatischen Profil seiner Tragödien*. Munich.
- McKinnon, J. (1998) *The Temple, the Church Fathers and Early Western Chant*. Brookfield.
- Miller, P. A. (1993) "Catullus 51 and Sappho 31: The Dialogism of Lyric," *Arethusa* 26: 183-199.
- (1994) *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness: The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*. New York.
- Momigliano, A. (1971) *The Development of Greek Biography*. Cambridge, MA.
- Morgan, L. (2000) "Metre matters: some higher-level metrical play in Latin Poetry," *PCPhS* 46: 99-120.
- (2012) *Musa Pedestris: Metre and Meaning in Roman Verse*. Oxford.
- Nagy, G. (2007) 'Did Sappho and Alcaeus ever meet? Symmetries of myth and ritual in performing the songs of ancient Lesbos,' in *Literatur und Religion I. Wege zu einer mythisch-rituellen Poetik bei den Griechen*. Eds. A. Bierl, R. Lämmle, K. Wesselmann. Berlin: 211-269.

- Newman, J. K. (1990) *Roman Catullus and the Modification of Alexandrian Sensibilities*.
Hildesheim.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M. (1970) *A Commentary on Horace's Odes: Book I*.
Oxford.
- (1978) *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book II*. Oxford.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. and Rudd, N. (2004) *A Commentary on Horace Odes, Book III*. Oxford.
- Norwood, G. (1945) *Pindar*. Berkeley.
- Numberger, K. (1959) *Inhalt und Metrum in der Lyrik des Horaz*. Munich.
- O'Higgins, D. (1990) "Sappho's Splintered Tongue: Silence in Sappho 31 and Catullus 51," *AJP* 111: 156 – 167.
- Owens, W. (1992) "Double Jealousy: an Interpretation of Horace Odes 1.13," in *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VI*. Ed. C. Deroux. Collection Latomus 217: 237-244.
- Page, D. L. (1955) *Sappho and Alcaeus: an introduction to the study of ancient Lesbian poetry*. Oxford.
- (1976) "Five Hellenistic Epitaphs in Mixed Meters," *Wiener Studien* 10: 165-76.
- Pardini, A. (1991) "La ripartizione in libri dell' opera di Alceo: Per un riesame della questione," *RFIC* 119: 257-284.
- Peek, W. (1955) *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*. Berlin.
- Pfeiffer, R. (1965) *Callimachi Fragmenta*. Oxford.
- (1968) *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.
- Podlecki, A. (1969) "The Peripatetics as Literary Critics," *Phoenix* 23: 114-137.

- Pomtow, J. (1885) *Poetae Melici Graeci Minores*. Leipzig.
- Porro, A. (1996) Carmi 'di Mirsilo' e carmi "di Pittaco": ancora sull' edizione aristarchea di Alceo," *Aevum Antiquum* 9: 177-192.
- Pöschl, V. (1970) *Horazische Lyrik: Interpretationen*. Heidelberg.
- Pretagostini, R. (1997) "La ripresa teocritea della poesia erotica arcaica e tardoarcaica (Idd. 29 e 30)," *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* (38): 9-24.
- Prier, R. A. (1994) "And Who Is the Woof? Response, Ecphrasis and the 'Egg' of Simmias," *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 46: 79-92.
- Putnam, M. C. J. (1974) "Mercuri, facunde nepos Atlantis," *CP* 69: 215-217.
- (1986) *Artifices of Eternity: Horace's Fourth Book of Odes*. Ithaca, NY.
- (2006) *Poetic Interplay: Catullus and Horace*. Princeton.
- Richardson, N. (1985) "Pindar and later literary criticism in antiquity," *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5: 383-401.
- Ross, D. (1969) *Style and tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge, Ma.
- (1975) *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge.
- Rossi, L. E. (1976) "Asynarteta From the Archaic to the Alexandrian Poets: On the Authenticity of the New Archilochus," *Arethusa* 9: 207-229.
- (1998) "Orazio, un lirico greco senza musica," *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 1: 163-181.
- Rudd, N. ed. (1993) *Horace 2000: A Celebration. Essays for the Bimillennium*. London.
- Santirocco, M. (1986) *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*. Chapel Hill.
- Skutsch, O. (1969) "Metrical Variations and Some Textual Problems in Catullus," *BICS* 16: 38-43.

- Snell, B. (1931) "Sapphos Gedicht ΦΑΙΝΕΤΑΙ ΜΟΙ ΚΗΝΟΣ," *Hermes* 66: 71-90.
- Snell, B., and H. Mahler Eds. (1987) *Pindari Carmina Cum Fragmentis, Pars I: Epinicia*.
Leipzig
- Solmsen, F. (1947) "Horace's First Roman Ode," *AJP* 68: 337 – 352.
- Steiner, D. (1994) *The tyrant's writ: myths and images of writing in ancient Greece*.
Princeton.
- Strodel, S. (2002) *Zur Überlieferung und zum Verständnis der hellenistischen Technopaignien*. Frankfurt.
- Svenbro, Jesper. (1988) *Phrasikleia: anthropologie de la lecture en Grèce ancienne*.
Paris.
- Syndikus, H. (1972) *Die Lyrik des Horaz. Eine Interpretation der Oden*. Darmstadt.
- Thomas, R. (2011) *Horace: Odes IV and Carmen Saeculare*. Cambridge.
- Traill, A. (2005) "Acroteleutium's Sapphic infatuation (Miles 1216–83)," *CQ* 55: 518–
33.
- Trappes-Lomax, J. M. (2007) *Catullus: a Textual Reappraisal*. Swansea.
- de Vaan, M. "for" in: *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*.
Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries Online. Ed. A. Lubotsky.
Brill Online. December 15, 2012.
- Vine, B. (1992) "On the Missing Fourth Stanza of Catullus 51," *HSCP* 94: 251-258
- Weber, C. (1996) "Roscius and the Roscida Dea," *CQ* 46, 1: 298-302.
- Wehrli, F. (1944) *Die Schule des Aristoteles*. Basel.
- West, D. (1973) "Horace's Poetic Technique in the Odes," in *Horace* Ed. C. Costa.
London.

- (1998) *Horace Odes II: Vatis Amici*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. (1978) 'Die griechischen Dichterinnen der Kaiserzeit,' in *Kyklos: Griechisches und Byzantinisches; Rudolf Keydell zum 90. Geburtstag*. Eds. H. G Beck, A. Kambylis, and P. Moraux. Berlin: 101–15.
- (1982) *Greek Metre*. Oxford.
- and Pohlman, E. Eds. (2001) *Documents of Ancient Greek Music: The Extant Melodies and Fragments*. Oxford.
- Ed. 1993. *Carmina Anacreontea*. Leipzig
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1899) "Die Griechischen Technopaignia." *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 14: 51-59.
- (1900) *Die Textgeschichte der Griechischen Lyriker*. Berlin.
- (1924) *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. Berlin.
- Wilkinson, L.P. (1951) *Horace and his Lyric Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1976) "Catullus 16," *LCM*: 222-225.
- (1985) *Catullus and his World: a Reappraisal*. Oxford.
- Woodman, A. (1974) "Exegi monumentum: Horace, Odes 3.30," in *Quality and Pleasure in Latin Poetry*. Eds. T. Woodman and D. West. London: 115-128.
- (1984) "Horace's First Roman Ode," in *Politics and Poetry in the Age of Augustus*. Eds. T. Woodman and D. West. Cambridge: 83-94.
- (2002) 'Biformis vates: the Odes, Catullus and Greek lyric', in *Traditions and Contexts in the Poetry of Horace*, Eds. T. Woodman and D. Feeney. Cambridge: 53–64.
- Wray, D. (2001) *Catullus and the Poetics of Roman Manhood*. Cambridge.

Yatromanolakis, D. (1999) "Alexandrian Sappho Revisited," *HSCP* 99: 179-195.

Zetzel, J. (1983) "Recreating the Canon: Augustan Poetry and the Alexandrian Past,"
Critical Inquiry, 10.1.83-105.