

The Epigrams of
Philodemos

*Introduction,
Text, and
Commentary*

David Sider

THE EPIGRAMS
OF PHILODEMOS

This page intentionally left blank

THE EPIGRAMS
OF PHILODEMOS

Introduction, Text, and Commentary

DAVID SIDER

New York Oxford
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1997

Oxford University Press

Oxford New York

Athens Auckland Bangkok Bogota Bombay Buenos Aires
Calcutta Cape Town Dar es Salaam Delhi Florence Hong Kong
Istanbul Karachi Kuala Lumpur Madras Madrid Melbourne
Mexico City Nairobi Paris Singapore Taipei Tokyo Toronto Warsaw

and associated companies in
Berlin Ibadan

Copyright © 1997 by Oxford University Press

Published by Oxford University Press, Inc.
198 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10016

Oxford is a registered trademark of Oxford University Press

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise,
without the prior permission of Oxford University Press.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Philodemus, ca. 110–ca. 40 B.C.

[Epigrammata. English]

The epigrams of Philodemus / introduction, [translation of] text,
and commentary by David Sider.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 0-19-509982-6

1. Epigrams, Greek—Translations into English. I. Sider, David.

II. Title.

PA4271.P3A27 1997

871'.01—dc20 96-21919

1 3 5 7 9 8 6 4 2

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper

P R E F A C E

A new edition of Philodemos needs little justification. Among the very best of the epigrammatists gathered by Philip of Thessalonica, an associate of Vergil and other Latin poets, and a literary critic, Philodemos has received only one separate edition and commentary, that of Kaibel in 1885, a brief Programmschrift of 27 pages, not much longer than the space allotted him by Gow and Page and earlier commentators of the Greek Anthology. Kaibel furthermore omitted or discussed only briefly a number of poems whose erotic contents he thought unworthy of Philodemos, even though Cicero tells us that Philodemos' poems were full of such themes.

In this edition, on the other hand, not only do I print and comment on all the poems ascribed to Philodemos (including several about which there are some doubts and two which are clearly not by him), I have also had the opportunity to treat a recently published papyrus which contains a list of incipits to many poems known to belong to Philodemos and, it seems, to many more which may also belong to him. I have also attempted to do what earlier editors have done only occasionally (Marcello Gigante being the most noteworthy of exceptions), that is to assess Philodemos' epigrams in the light of his Epicureanism, and especially his writings on the nature of poetry.

In brief, Philodemos is not only among the very best epigrammatists of the first century B.C. (there admittedly being little competition), he is, thanks to the accident of Vesuvius, now our source of much Hellenistic speculation (some of it his own) on the nature of poetry. And as both poet and Epicurean he had several famous followers among the Italians of his day and later, not least among them Vergil and

Horace. It is time, therefore, to take stock of the scholarship of the last 110 years, and to offer a new text and commentary of this poet.

Mindful of all the flaws which doubtless remain, and remain mine alone, I would nonetheless like to thank the many people who have removed even more, or who have provided access to materials: Elizabeth Asmis, Alan Cameron, Tiziano Dorandi, Clarence Glad, A. H. Griffiths, Dirk Obbink, Peter Parsons, and Anastasia Summers for letting me see work in advance of publication; Rosario Pintaudi and Dirk Obbink for answering papyrological questions; Alan Cameron, Diskin Clay, Christopher Faraone, Anthony Grafton, Thomas Hillman, Ludwig Koenen, Nita Krevans, Dennis Looney, Georg Luck, Myles McDonnell, Richard Mason, Carol Mattusch, Jørgen Mejer, Dirk Obbink, Matthew Santirocco, Alan Shapiro, and Jacob Stern for comments on earlier stages of various sections; Gerhard Koepfel, Amy Richlin, Roger Bagnall, and David Konstan for the opportunity to try out some ideas before critically receptive audiences in Rome, Lehigh, New York, and Providence; the librarians of Fordham and Columbia Universities for all the aid that professionals can and do cheerfully provide; and the several manuscript and rare-book librarians in the United States and Europe who provided me with access to and copies of their rare and unique material; Fordham University for providing much needed support and leave for writing and travel to libraries; and my immediate predecessors in the study of Philodemos' epigrams, chiefly A. S. F. Gow, D. L. Page, and Marcello Gigante, who are cited too much for where I disagree with them and not enough for where I have learned from them. And over and above the several particular reasons given above for thanking Dirk Obbink, I am happy to add the many conversations we have had over the past few years on numerous aspects of Philodemos' poetry and poetic theory. His advice, probably to my detriment not always taken, has helped to give impetus and shape to my work.

The typescript of this book was submitted in the spring of 1994. After the readers for Oxford University Press made many suggestions for improvement, it was then my extreme good fortune to have as copyeditor the learned Leofranc Holford-Strevens, whose keen eye caught errors of all sorts, from those of punctuation to even more embarrassing scholarly gaps and lapses. Although his name is recorded here only to credit him with some conjectures in Greek texts, there are far more places where my messy typescript benefited from his care. Nonetheless, for all the help I have received from him and others, all errors that remain are to be charged to me.

Bronx, New York
August 1996

D.S.

CONTENTS

Abbreviations ix

INTRODUCTION 3

Life 3

On the Bay of Naples 12

Philodemos and the Epigram 24

Metrics 41

The Greek Anthology: Formation and MSS 45

About This Edition 54

CONCORDANCES 57

THE EPIGRAMS 61

Sigla 61

Text, Translation, and Commentary 62

P.OXY. 3724 203

TESTIMONIA AD PHILODEMUM PERTINENTIA 227

Bibliography 235

General Index 245

Index of the More Important Passages 248

Index of Greek Words 254

This page intentionally left blank

ABBREVIATIONS

- AA *Archäologischer Anzeiger*
AGAW *Abhandlung der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*
AIPhO *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientale* (Brussels)
AJP *American Journal of Philology*
ANRW *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*
AP *Anthologia Palatina*
APL *Anthologia Planudea*
A&R *Atene e Roma*
Arr G. Arrighetti: *Epicuro, Opere*, 2d ed. (Turin 1973)
ARW *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*
ASNP *Annali della Scuola Normale di Pisa*
BACAP *Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy*
BAGB *Bulletin de l'Association G. Budé*
BCH *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*
BEFAR *Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*
BICS *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*
BIEH *Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Helenísticos*
BMCR *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*
BPhW *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift*
CA *Classical Antiquity*
CEG P. A. Hansen, *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*, 2 vol. (Berlin 1983–1989)
CErc *Cronache Ercolanesi*
CFC *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica*

- CIG *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum*
 CIL *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*
 CJ *Classical Journal*
 C&M *Classica et Mediaevalia*
 CO *Classical Outlook*
 CP *Classical Philology*
 CPF *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini* (Florence 1989–)
 CQ *Classical Quarterly*
 CR *Classical Review*
 CSEL *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*
 CVA *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*
 DAA A. E. Raubitschek, *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis* (Cambridge, Mass., 1949)
 DK H. Diels and W. Kranz, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 6th ed.
 EH *Entretiens Hardt*
 EV *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*
 FGE D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams*
 FG&Hist F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*
 GB *Grazer Beiträge*
 GP A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *Garland of Philip* [not to be confused with “Gow-Page,” the authors of both GP and HE; nor with GP, Denniston’s *Greek Particles*]
 G&R *Greece & Rome*
 GRBS *Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies*
 GVI W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* (Berlin 1955)
 HE A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *Hellenistic Epigrams*
 HSCP *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
 HTR *Harvard Theological Review*
 ICS *Illinois Classical Studies*
 IG *Inscriptiones Graecae*
 JAOS *Journal of the American Oriental Society*
 JHS *Journal of Hellenic Studies*
 K-A R. Kassell and C. Austin (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci*
 KG R. Kühner, rev. B. Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, vol. 2 (in 2 parts) (Hanover and Leipzig 1898)
 KS *Kleine Schriften*
 LCM *Liverpool Classical Monthly*
 LGPN *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*
 LIMC *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Graecae*
 LSCP *London Studies in Classical Philology*
 LSJ H. G. Liddell and H. S. Scott, rev. R. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed.
 MAAR *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*
 MAMA *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*
 MC *Mondo classico*
 MD *Materiali e discussioni*

- MMR T. R. S. Broughton, *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*
 MPG J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*
 MPL *Museum Philologicum Londinense*
 PAAAS *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*
 PGM *Papyri Graecae Magici*
 PMG D. L. Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962)
 PP *Parola del Passato*
 QUCC *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*
 RAAN *Rendiconti della Accademia di Archeologia, Napoli*
 RE Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*
 RF² M. Gigante, *Ricerche filodemee*, 2d ed. (Naples 1983)
 RLAC *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*
 RM *Rheinisches Museum*
 RSF *Rivista di studi filologici*
 SEG *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
 SH H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Berlin 1983)
 SIFC *Studi italiani di filologia classica*
 SLG D. L. Page, *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis* (Oxford 1974)
 Tait J. I. M. Tait, *Philodemus' Influence on the Latin Poets*. Diss. (Bryn Mawr 1941)
 TAPA *Transactions of the American Philological Association*
 TrGF *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, ed. B. Snell et al.
 U H. Usener, *Epicurea* (Leipzig 1887)
 VH *Herculanensium Voluminum quae Supersunt* (Naples 1793–1914)
 WJ *Würzburger Jahrbücher*
 WS *Wiener Studien*
 ZPaIV *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*
 ZPE *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

This page intentionally left blank

THE EPIGRAMS
OF PHILODEMOS

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

Life

Philodemos was born ca. 110 B.C. in the Syrian Greek town of Gadara, high above the plain of Galilee, about six miles southwest of the Sea of Galilee. In terms of today's map it is the Jordanian town of Um Qeis, just to the east of the border with Israel.¹ Gadara plays a small role in historical accounts, being mentioned more or less in passing by Polybios, Josephus, Pliny, Strabo, and others.² But in literary

1. In giving Gadara as the birthplace of Philodemos, Strabo 16.2.29 (T 6) in fact confuses Gadara (in the Decapolis) with Gazara, a town closer to the coast of the Mediterranean, but there can be no doubt that the former was the city of his birth; cf. T. Dorandi, "La patria di Filodemo," *Philologus* 131 (1987) 254–256. On Philodemos' life, cf. R. Philippson, *RE* 19 (1938) 2444–2447; J. I. M. Tait, *Philodemos' Influence on the Latin Poets* (Bryn Mawr 1941) 1–23; P. H. De Lacy and E. A. De Lacy, *Philodemos: On Methods of Inference*, 2d ed. (Naples 1978) 145–155; T. Dorandi, "Filodemo: Gli orientamenti della ricerca attuale," *ANRW* 2.36.4 (1990) 2328–2332; M. Gigante, *Philodemos in Italy*, trans. D. Obbink (Ann Arbor 1995) chs. 3–5.

2. Jos. *BJ* 2.97, *AJ* 17.320 calls Gadara a Greek city, although the name is clearly Semitic; Meleager 2 (*AP* 7.417.2) refers to his town as Ἀτθίς ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις νατομένα Γάδαρα. Cf. V. Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (New York 1970) 98. Further details in the "Gadara" articles in *RE* and the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (4.545). Note that the "Gadarene" swine of Matthew 8.28–34 must in fact (as at Mark 5.1–13, Luke 8.26–32) come from Gerasa, a city close to the sea whose name is often confused with Gadara. Gadara is currently being excavated under the auspices of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Berlin; cf. P. Bol et al. "Gadara in der Dekapolis: deutsche Ausgrabungen bei Umm Qais in Nordjordanien 1986 bis 1988," *AA* (1990) 193–266; B. Mershen and E. A. Knauf, "From Gadara to Umm Qais," *ZPAV* 104 (1988) 128–145.

history, Gadara may properly boast of having produced seven figures of note: Menippos, Meleager, Philodemos, Theodoros, Apsines, Oinomaos, and Philo. An inscriptional epigram of the second or third century A.D. is clearly justified in calling Gadara a delight for the Muses, *χρηστομουσία*.³

Menippos of course is known for his jocoserious (James Joyce's word) style, through which philosophical views of a Cynic sort are made more palatable by a humorous tone, and Meleager too wrote Menippean satire, although this is now but a literary footnote,⁴ his fame now depending entirely on his epigrams and on the *Garland* into which he wove them. Philodemos, who also wrote epigrams, although belonging to another philosophical school, invested his poems with a *spoudogeloios* style which may owe something to his Gadarene predecessors. Indeed, some of the philosophical point of his poetry has been obscured by their light-hearted tone (as I shall show). If there was anything jocular about Oinomaos, however, our evidence fails to show it, but he did follow his predecessors in writing poetry (specifically tragedies),⁵ and he wrote one work on Homer, *Περὶ τῆς καθ' Ὀμηρον φιλοσοφίας*, whose title sounds remarkably like one of Philodemos', *Περὶ τοῦ καθ' Ὀμηρον ἀγαθοῦ βασιλέως*.⁶ The work of Theodoros, the emperor Tiberius' teacher, also overlaps with that of Philodemos, in that both wrote on rhetoric (as did Apsines), but, as is suggested by other technical titles assigned to him, his interests were probably more practical than theoretical.⁷

Gadara was large enough to support two theaters, but it was too small to contain any of its talented sons, all of whom went elsewhere to seek their fortune (for example, Meleager in Tyre and Cos, and Philodemos in Athens and Italy). Their talent and ambition alone would have been enough to make them emigrate, but it is also possible that the local wars between Greek and Jewish armies for control over the region were even more impelling. In particular, the Hasmonean ruler Alexander Jannaeus

3. *Rev. Arch.*, 3rd ser. 35.49 = Peek GVI 1.1070.3.

4. One provided by Meleager himself: *AP* 7.417.3 f. = 2 HE ὁ σὺν Μούσαις Μελέαγρος | πρῶτα Μενιππειοῖς συντροχάσας Χάρτισιν; cf. 7.418, 419 = 3, 4. In the latter, he refers to Γαδάρων ἱερὰ χθών. Anyone growing up in Gadara, even if of Greek ancestry, would learn "Syrian," that is, the local Semitic tongue, as Meleager strongly hints in 4. And at 5.160.3 = 26, the point of the poem depends upon the reader's knowing Jewish marriage customs; cf. H. Jacobson, "Demo and the Sabbath," *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser., 30 (1977) 71 f. On Menippean satire, see now J. Relihan, *Ancient Menippean Satire* (Baltimore 1993).

5. The little evidence for which is collected at TrGF 188 (1.316); cf. H. J. Mette, "Oenomaos," *RE* 17.2 (1937) 2249–2251; J. Hammerstaedt, *Die Orakelkritik des Kynikers Oenomaos*, Beiträge zur kl. Philol. 188 (Frankfurt 1988); id., "Der Kyniker Oenomaos von Gadara," *ANRW* 2.36.4 (1990) 2834–2865.

6. A further link between Philodemos and Oinomaos (who was active in the early second century A.D.) may be provided by Π (= P.Oxy. 3724) ii.2, an incipit of a Pythian oracle which was cited by Chamaleion ap. Athen. 22e (fr. 11 Wehrli = fr. 13 Giordano). As I suggest in the commentary, the incipit may very well belong to a poem in which Philodemos quotes the oracle, or some part of it, only to continue with a criticism of it. Oinomaos, who seems consciously to have followed Philodemos in other ways, would have taken his lead here too from his Gadarene predecessor.

7. Cf. FGGrHist 850 for *testimonia et tituli*; G. M. A. Grube, "Theodoros of Gadara," *AJP* 80 (1959) 337–365. The mathematician Philo of Gadara is mentioned by Eutokios as having calculated the value of π with great accuracy; cf. Heiberg's edition of Archimedes, 3.258.

(Yannai) captured Gadara when Philodemus was a young man, taking it only after a ten-month siege (Jos. *BJ* 1.86, *AJ* 13.356), and we can presume that he forced conversion to Judaism on the Gadarenes as he did at Pella (*AJ* 13.397) about twenty-five miles to the south.⁸ Although it is usually assumed that Philodemus left on his own to seek education in Athens, it is equally likely that he was taken from Gadara by his parents, who may not of course have gone directly to Athens. This tentative reconstruction of his youth does not, it should be noted, rest on the supposition that Philodemus was himself Greek; even were he a “Hellenized oriental,” as Momigliano imagines him, there would still be reason or reasons for him and his family to leave Gadara.⁹ In Athens he studied with Zeno of Sidon, the head of the Epicurean school ca. 100–ca. 75 B.C. We do not know whether Philodemus was already a convert to Epicureanism or chose it after sampling what the other philosophical schools of Athens had to offer. Several first-person references in his histories of philosophy seem to indicate that he was acquainted with Academics, Stoics, and Peripatetics.¹⁰ What little evidence we have for Philodemus’ life is largely consistent in the general framework it suggests for times and places. Biographers of Philodemus should be particularly grateful to L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, not only because he acted as the poet’s patron in Herculaneum,¹¹ but also because his own life provides some landmarks for that of Philodemus. And for this we are further indebted to Cicero, who found it convenient to use Philodemus and other Epicureans in order to attack Piso in more

8. Alexander Jannaeus (104–76 B.C.) “was about as bad as a man could be”; W. W. Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation*, 3d ed. (London 1952) 236. Cf. further Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy* (above n. 1) 68; Tcherikover 246 f.

9. See below, n. 23.

10. Cf. E. Asmis, “Philodemus’ Epicureanism,” *ANRW* 2.36.4 (1990) 2376 n. 21. On Zeno, see further below. For summaries of Philodemus’ philosophical activity, cf. Asmis; Dorandi; Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy*; M. Capasso, *Manuale di papirologia ercolanese* (Lecce 1991) 163–192.

11. Piso can be considered a patron because (i) he allowed Philodemus to spend much time in his company (Cic. *Pis.* 68–72 = **T 2**; note esp. 68 *amicitiam*, a technical term of the patron-client relationship); (ii) Philodemus clearly invites Piso to provide support (**27**; n. 1 φίλτατε Πείσω, with commentary), which he would surely appreciate (Cic. *De Fin.* 1.65 tells us that Epicureans were an impoverished lot; see below, pp. 153f.); (iii) Philodemus’ *Good King* seems designed as much to please as to instruct Piso, to whom it is dedicated, that is, addressed (col. 43.16 f. Dorandi); (iv) The Socratio of Catullus 47 (**T 11**), who may be Philodemus under another name, is a frequent diner in Piso’s home (see the next section of this Introduction); (v) Philodemus himself says that the best way to make money is to allow others to share in one’s philosophical discourse: πρώτων δὲ καὶ κάλλιστον ἀπὸ λόγων φιλο[sό]φων ἀνδράσιν δεκτικοῖς μεταδιδόμεν[ων] ἀντιμεταλαμβάνειν εὐχάριστο[ν] ἅ[μ]α μετὰ σεβασμοῦ παντ[ός], ὡς ἐγένετ’ Ἐπικρο[ύ]ρω, λο[ιπὸν] δὲ ἀληθινῶν καὶ ἀφιλο[v]ε[ί]κων καὶ [σ]υ[λ]λήβδη[v] εἰπεῖν [ἀτ]αράχων (Περὶ Οἰκονομίας, col. 23.23–32 Jensen). Cf. R. Laurenti, *Filodemo e il pensiero economico degli epicurei* (Milan 1973) ch. 5, “Le fonti di ricchezza per il saggio,” esp. 164–166, who points out that Philodemus is following Epicurus on this point (D.L. 10.120).

W. Allen, Jr., and P. H. De Lacy, “The patrons of Philodemus,” *CP* 34 (1939) 59–65, argue that this evidence proves only that Philodemus tried to obtain Piso’s patronage, but their position has not won wide acceptance. It thus seems safe to apply the term *patron* to Piso, especially if one accepts the three standard criteria as outlined by R. P. Saller, *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire* (Cambridge 1982) 1: “First, it involves the *reciprocal* exchange of goods and services. Secondly, to distinguish it from a commercial transaction in the marketplace, the relationship must be

than one oration. Tendentious as many of Cicero's details are, they must serve as the starting point for any biography of our poet-philosopher.

Piso and Philodemus first became acquainted soon after the latter's arrival in Italy and in the former's *adulescentia*,¹² a vague term, which would by itself allow for their having met when Piso was as young as fifteen or as old as his mid-thirties. In *Post Red. in Sen.* 14 f., Cicero paints a picture of the libertine Piso and his conversion to Epicureanism: *Cum vero etiam litteris studere incipit et belua immanis cum Graeculis philosophari, tum est Epicureus* (T 12). It is true that Cicero goes on immediately to say that it was the one word *voluptas* that attracted Piso to Epicureanism rather than the drier and more demanding areas of study, so that presumably (even if Cicero's slander is only partly true)¹³ Piso could satisfy himself with this shallow Epicurean veneer without having ever to leave Rome; but nobody of Piso's new faith would stay away from Naples for long, as it was there that Siro and others were pleasantly employed in the professing of Epicurean doctrine to Romans of Piso's class.¹⁴ It may then very well have been here that Piso and Philodemus first met (as Philipsson 2445 suggests), rather than in Rome, as Cichorius and many others say; but Cicero's description of Piso's Epicurean teachers in *Post Red. in Sen.* is so much more hostile than that of Philodemus in

a personal one of some duration. Thirdly, it must be asymmetrical, in the sense that the two parties are of unequal status and offer different kinds of goods and services in the exchange." See further Saller, "Patronage and friendship in early imperial Rome: Drawing the distinction," in A. Wallace-Hadrill (ed.), *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London 1989) 49–62, where he defends this definition against critical reviewers. Also useful in this context is B. Gold (ed.), *Literary and Artistic Patronage in Ancient Rome* (Austin 1982); ead., *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome* (Chapel Hill 1987); P. White, *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome* (Cambridge, Mass. 1993).

12. Cic. *Pis.* 68 (T 2) *Est quidam Graecus qui cum isto vivit, homo, vere ut dicam—sic enim cognovi—humanus, sed tam diu quam diu aut cum aliis est aut ipse secum. Is cum istum adulescentem iam tum hac distracta fronte vidisset, non fastidivit eius amicitiam, cum esset praesertim appetitus; dedit se in consuetudinem sic ut prorsus una viveret nec fere ab isto umquam discederet.* (As Nisbet ad loc. notes, *viveret cum* is not meant to be taken literally as "dwell in the same house as"; rather it means something more like "was always at his side.") 70 *Devenit autem seu potius incidit in istum [sc. Pisonem] . . . Graecus atque advena.* White, *Promised Verse* (above, n. 11) 273 n. 2 lists the following additional passages where *vivere cum* or *convictus* is used of the poet and patron: Cic. *Arch.* 6, Hor. *Sat.* 1.6.47, Ov. *Tr.* 1.8.29, Suet. *V. Ter.* 292.9 f. Roth.

13. Cicero himself provides evidence to the contrary in *Pis.* 17, 56, 66 f.; cf. Tait 10. As suggested above, and as is obvious to anyone familiar with forensic oratory of any age, nothing Cicero states about Piso and, by extension, Philodemus, can be accepted uncritically. My account attempts to seek the truth behind Cicero's exaggeration, but some would argue that his slander owes nothing whatsoever to the truth.

14. R. G. M. Nisbet, *Cicero in L. Calpurnium Pisonem Oratio* (Oxford 1961) 187 f. objects to the view that Piso's family had an association with Campania. J. H. D'Arms, *Romans on the Bay of Naples* (Cambridge, Mass., 1970) is the best overall study of life in and around Herculaneum. Much useful information is also to be found in E. Rawson, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (London and Baltimore 1985), esp. ch. 2, "Rome and the Italian background"; M. Griffin, "Philosophy, politics, and politicians at Rome," in M. Griffin and J. Barnes (eds.), *Philosophia Togata* (Oxford 1989) 1–37; D. Sedley, "Philosophical allegiance in the Greco-Roman world," *ibid.* 97–119 (103–117 on Philodemus).

Pis. that, even within the bounds of Cicero's rhetorical exaggerations, it seems unlikely that Philodemos was among their number in Rome. Since Piso won the consulship on his first attempt (*sine repulsa*, Cic. *Pis.* 2), in 58 B.C.,¹⁵ he was born probably no later than 101 B.C. Nisbet (p.v), like others, infers, from *Pis.* 87 *videras enim grandis iam puer bello Italico repleti quaestu vestram domum . . .*, that "this might almost suggest that he was born about 104 or 105," but as there is some rhetorical point to be made from Piso's being old enough to understand what was going on during the years 91–87 B.C., there is no strong reason for setting Piso's birth before 101, since forty-two was the minimum age for the consulship.¹⁶ The year 101 therefore seems the most reasonable date for Piso's birth. And fifteen years after 101, then, is the earliest year in which Philodemos and Piso could have met, although the annoying vagueness of Roman *adulescentia* allows their meeting to have occurred many years after 86 B.C., and Cicero, although he may be blurring the chronology here, suggests that Philodemos—an honorable man, Cicero says, when he is not in Piso's company—hesitated to refuse a Roman senator,¹⁷ which status Piso would have attained ca. 70, when Philodemos need not have been much older than Piso's thirty. Thus, the evidence for his relationship with Piso suggests a birth date of ca. 110 B.C., but obviously Philodemos may have been born several years earlier or later.

This date, moreover, is consistent with Philodemos' having been anthologized by Philip and not by Meleager, who would surely have included a fellow Gadarene had he known his epigrams, but whose last author seems to be Archias of Antioch, born ca. 120. We cannot know when Philodemos began to write or publish his epigrams, but if Meleager's *Garland* dates to the 90s of the first century, as has been argued most recently by Gow-Page and Cameron, a birth date of ca. 110 B.C. could not be antedated by many years.¹⁸

That Philodemos had already taken up residence in Italy by 70 is shown by his having dedicated his *Rhetoric*, in which he refers to his teacher Zeno of Sidon in the present tense, to C. Vibius Pansa Caetronianus, of known Epicu-

15. Dated in part from his proconsulship in Macedonia, 57–55 B.C., on which see Nisbet *op. cit.*, app. 1, pp. 172–180. For the evidence, cf. T. R. S. Broughton, *MMR* 2.193f., and *Supplement* (1986) 47, who estimates that "his quaestorship, aedileship and praetorship may therefore be attributed to the normal years 70, 64, and 61, respectively."

16. Sulla's minimum was occasionally ignored in the late Republic, most notably by Caesar, Piso's son-in-law, who became consul at age forty. Cf. R. Develin, *Patterns in Office-Holding 366–49 BC*, Coll. Latomus 161 (Brussels 1979) 96–101. On the other hand, cf. E. Badian, "Caesar's *cursus* and the intervals between offices," *Studies in Greek and Roman History* (Oxford 1964) 140–156, who argues that Caesar and others known to have held office below the minimum age were beneficiaries of a special dispensation granted only to patricians. The plebeian Calpurnii Pisones could not, therefore, have served before the fixed time.

17. *Pis.* 70 (T 2) *Graecus facilis et valde venustus nimis pugnax contra senatorem populi Romani esse noluit*. For *senatorem*, ms. V reads *imperatorem*, that is, when he was proconsul, but as Nisbet says, this is inconsistent with Piso's having been *adulescens*.

18. Gow-Page, HE 1.xiv–xv; Alan Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford 1993) 49–56.

rean leanings.¹⁹ Zeno was succeeded as head of the Garden by Phaidros, who in turn was succeeded by Patron in 70/69. If we assume that succession occurs at the death of one's predecessor, and further assume that the present tenses are not merely a literary convention,²⁰ then Zeno (born ca. 150) must have died between 79 and 78, when Cicero heard him lecture in Athens (*ND* 1.59) and, say, 72, to allow Phaidros at least a year or so as head.²¹ This would also allow a similarly short time for Philodemus to be in Italy before meeting Piso. On the assumption that Piso was indeed a senator and that Philodemus would not have spent very many years in Italy before meeting him, I would put his arrival there and the composition, or at least preparation for Roman publication, of the *Rhetoric* ca. 74–73.²² We have arrived, therefore, at the following tentative partial scheme:

19. Cf. C. J. Castner, *Prosopography of Roman Epicureans* (Frankfurt 1991) 80. The correct reading and identification of the dedicatee of *Rhet.* IV is owed to T. Dorandi, "Gaio Bambino," *ZPE* 111 (1996) 41 f., who in place of the earlier reading ὁ Γάιτε παῖ, ἀπάντων (1.223.5 Sudh.), now reads ὁ Γάιτε Πάν' ὅ'α, πάντων. This now expelled "Gaio bambino" was identified as the dedicatee of Lucretius' poem; cf. Allen, and DeLacy (above, n. 11), 64, who made the (as it seemed then) reasonable point that this work of the 70s could have been dedicated to C. Memmius as a potential patron before Philodemus met Piso, with whom he was more successful; cf. further De Lacy and De Lacy, *Philodemus* (above n. 1), 150. Most scholars, however, rejected this identification, preferring to see him as C. Calpurnius Piso Frugi, born ca. 88 B.C., and later to be Cicero's son-in-law; cf. Philippon *RE* 2445, Dorandi *ANRW* 2381; Asmis *ANRW* 2400 n. 70; Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy* (above, n. 1) 31–32.

20. Tait 3 is properly cautious here; she also points out that Philodemus may have written the work earlier, when Zeno was still alive, and that he added the dedication to an Italian later when he was in Rome looking for a patron. This would allow Philodemus to be in Rome in the 80s, when Piso attained his *adulescentia*, but it still seems better, as I argue in the text, to have Piso older, in accord with Cicero's reference to him as senator, and at a time when he would be more likely to take on the role of patron. Dorandi, "Gaio Bambino," 42, argues for the likelihood that Philodemus began writing the *Rhetorica* in the 60s and that the dedication to C. Pansa appeared only in the last book, written in the 40s. But, as argued above, Zeno's being referred to in the present tense suggests that at least these passages were written no later than the 70s. The references to Zeno are as follows: [ὁ] παρ' ἡμῶν ἐστὶν Ζήνων (*Rhet.* II col. 53.10–11 Longo = Suppl. 45.1 Sudh.) and τίς ὁ ἐκεῖν' ἀναγράφας ἐστίν; οὐ Ζήνων γε (48.13 f.).

On Phaidros, cf. A. E. Raubitschek, "Phaidros and his Roman pupils," *Hesperia* 18 (1949) 96–103, repr. in *The School of Hellas* (Oxford 1991) 337–344, esp. pp. 97 f. = 338 f.

21. T. Dorandi, *Ricerche sulla cronologia dei filosofi ellenistici* (Stuttgart 1991) 64, places Zeno's death ca. 75; so also H. M. Hubbell, *The Rhetorica of Philodemus* (New Haven 1920) 259. Cf. Dorandi *ibid.* 52 f. for a brief account of the evidence for the Epicurean scholars.

22. Nisbet (above n. 14) 183 puts his arrival "about 75 or 70," but the data cited above concerning Zeno and the *Rhetoric* suggest that this range is a little too broad. Similarly, Hubbell (*loc. cit.* above, n. 21), arguing only from the *Rhetoric*, without considering Philodemus' connections with Piso, may be faulted for arbitrarily placing Zeno's death in 75, hereby having Philodemus in Italy for too long a time before meeting Piso. Tait 2 is initially the most cautious, setting the termini for the meeting between the two at "the late 80's and the early 60's"; D. Comparetti, "La bibliothèque de Philodème," in *Mélanges Chatelain* (Paris 1910), 118–129 puts their first meeting ca. 85 B.C.

- 110 ± ca. 5 Philodemos born in Gadara, perhaps to Greek parents;²³
 ?-? Studies with Zeno of Sidon in Athens;²⁴
 ca. 74–73 Arrival in Italy;
 ca. 73–70 Aet. ca. 35–40, meets Piso.

We should also consider the story, credible in itself, but not altogether securely stitched together from several lemmata in the *Souda*, that Philodemos was expelled from Sicilian Himera during a famine and plague, his Epicurean beliefs concerning the gods having been thought to have brought down the wrath of the gods on the town:

- (i) *Souda* s.v. Ἱμεραία: . . . πόλις: “ἐκ δὴ τούτων νόσοι καὶ τροφῶν ἀπορίαί τὴν Ἱμεραίαν κατέσχον.”
 (ii) s.v. συκοφαντεῖν (*Souda* defines the word as “criticize”) . . . Αἰλιανός: “ὁ δὲ ἐσυκοφάντει τὸν θεὸν ὀλιγορίας. ἐκ δὴ . . . κατέσχον.”
 (iii = T 8) s.v. τιμῶνται ζημιούσι, καταδικάζουσιν: “οἱ γε μὴν Ἱμεραῖοι τὸν Φιλόδημον τιμῶνται πρὸς τῇ δημεύσει καὶ φυγῆς ζημίᾳ.”

The first two clearly derive from one passage in Aelian (fr. 40 Hercher); the third is linked to the others by Hercher because of the common reference to Himera and because criticism of and contempt for a god could readily have come from an Epicurean (all the more so given Aelian’s hostility to this sect). These are not very secure links, especially since the Philodemos named is not specifically identified as the Epicurean, but, as was said above, they do consist with one another to form an acceptable narrative: Plague and famine hit Himera; in searching for a scapegoat, the citizens recall an alien Epicurean’s slighting statement(s) concerning an important god worshiped locally; Philodemos’ property is seized (which suggests an extended stay) and he is exiled (along with his books, to judge from the remains of

23. Cicero *Pis.* 68 (T 2) calls him a *Graecus*, but this need mean nothing more than that he spoke Greek as though it were his mother tongue. Momigliano, *Secondo Contributo* (Rome 1950) 382 calls him a “Hellenized Oriental,” but this can be no more than a conjecture; similarly, *VH* 1 (1793) 4: “Gadareni igitur non omnes admodum Graeci erant, sed γενικῶς Syri; quin immo Hebraei et Hebraicam religionem ritusque profitentes.” (Strabo, it is true, if in fact he is referring to the right Gadara, mentions the large Jewish population, but of course he writes well after Philodemos’ time; for Josephus, cf. n. 2 above.) Compare what was said above in n. 4 about Meleager, and note the similarities found between *Epigram 12* and the Hellenistic Jewish *Genesis Apocryphon*: S. J. D. Cohen, *Helios* 8.2 (1981) 41–53. Of course, as Meleager himself points out, anyone growing up in that area was familiar with Greek and more than one Semitic culture.

24. This is evident from the many times Philodemos, who can be quite polemical even against other Epicureans, aligns himself with the views of Zeno, whom he calls a true disciple of Epicurus; cf. e.g. *Rhet.* 1.77.26 ff., and esp. 1.89.11 ff., where he refers to his writings having been confused with those of Zeno. Note also P.Herc. 1005, col. 14.6–13 Angeli (T 14) καὶ Ζήνωνος ἐγεν[ό]μην περιόν[το]ς [οὐκ] ἀπιστ[ο]ς ἐραστής καὶ τ[ε]θνηκό]τος ἀκοπίατος ὑμνητής, μάλιστα πασῶν αὐτοῦ τῶ[ν] ἀρετῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐξ Ἐπικ[ο]ύρου καύχαις τε καὶ θεοφ[ο]ρίαις; cf. K. v. Fritz, “Zeno von Sidon,” *RE* 10A (1972) 122–124. The fragments of Zeno are now collected in Angeli-Colaizzo, *CErc* 9 (1979) 47–133.

the Villa dei Papiri). This episode would most naturally have occurred after Philodemos had received his Epicurean training in Athens. We also imagine that it would have occurred soon afterward, before Philodemos learned how to temper his exoteric statements. It is tempting to draw neat lines on the map from Athens to Hímera and from Hímera to the Bay of Naples, but Philodemos need not have been so tidy. For example, and as an exercise in pure conjecture, he may have spent some time with the Epicureans of Rhodes, against whom he was to direct much internecine polemic.²⁵ There is certainly time enough for him to have traveled to several cities before arriving in mainland Italy at roughly age thirty-seven. He may, for example, have visited Alexandria, which he mentions along with Rome as having “detained” philosophers.²⁶ But whether Philodemos actually went to Alexandria (or Rome for that matter), this sentence coming as it does after a favorable reference to Athens (see above) certainly suggests that nobody would want to stay long in either Alexandria or Rome to practice philosophy. Sticking to what evidence we do have, therefore, we can insert his stays in Athens and Hímera into the biographical schema. A very short stay in Alexandria is possible; a stay of longer but still unknown length in Rome is strongly indicated by Cic. *Pis.* 68–72 (T 2). It is not, however, indicated, as Gigante believes, by the epigrams, which he reads as strict autobiographical testimony which must be sorted chronologically and made to conform to a scheme for which there is, as we have seen, very little evidence. Thus, Gigante infers from Philodemos’ epigrammatic invitation to Piso (*Epigram* 27) that it must have been written in Rome because Philodemos invites his Roman patron to his simple house. The setting cannot be Herculaneum, Gigante argues, because there Philodemos lived with Piso in the grand Villa dei Papiri, as evidenced by *Epigram* 29. As I show

25. Sedley, op. cit. (above n. 14) 107–117 for a discussion of Philodemos’ arguments in his *Rhetorika* with the Epicureans of Rhodes. Note that Philodemos’ references to Zeno suggest a controversy continuing on after the former had heard the latter’s lectures on the subject (Sedley 117) and after Philodemos had left Athens. He may of course have been responding only to what he had read. See further F. Longo Auricchio and A. Tepedino Guerra, “Aspetti e problemi della dissidenza epicurea,” *CErc* 11 (1981) 25–40.

26. *Rhet.* 2.145, fr.3.8–15 ἐνίους δὲ [sc. φιλοσόφους] καὶ δυναστευτικά καὶ πόλεις καὶ χώραι κατέσχον ὡσπερ Ἀλεξάνδρεια καὶ Ῥώμη, τοῦτο μὲν ἀνάγκαις τοῦτο δὲ μεγάλαις ἑαυτῶν τε καὶ πατρίδων χρείαις. (Hubbell suggests that the reference to “necessity” may mean “as hostages.”) In *De Morte* he describes people eager to spend years studying philosophy in Athens, and then further years touring Greece and some non-Greek sites; after which he would (hope to) spend his remaining years at home in conversations with friends and relatives (δια<τά>ττονται τσαυτα μὲν ἔτη διατρεῖσθαι Ἀθήνησιν φιλομαθοῦντες, το[σ]αυτα δὲ τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ τῆς βαρβάρου τὰ δυνατὰ θεωροῦντες, τσαυτα δὲ οἴκοι διαλεγόμενοι, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ μετὰ τῶν γνωρίμων. “Ἄφνω δ’ ἄφαντον προσέβα μακρὰς ἀφαιρούμενον ἐλπίδας τὸ Χρεῶν.” [col. 38.7–11 Gigante]). Philodemos himself, however, may have had no expectation of returning home (cf. below, n. 34)—or, as Gigante *RF*² 206 believes, “home” for Philodemos may have come to mean Herculaneum. Π v.18 Πρωτέος Φάρε, if by Philodemos, could have been written during his stay in Alexandria.

For other cities which could have attracted Philodemos on his early travels, cf. W. Crönert, “Die Epikureer in Syrien,” *Jahresb. d. arch. Inst. in Wien* 10 (1907) 145–152.

in the commentary, however, another interpretation of the poem is more likely, one which says nothing about where Philodemus lived.²⁷

It is also worth mentioning the views held by earlier scholars that Philodemus travelled with Piso to Macedonia during his proconsulship in 57 or with him to Gaul in 55. He may in fact have done so—we know of other Greeks who accompanied their Roman patrons during foreign service—but the evidence for Philodemus' having done so derives entirely from a misunderstood passage in his poetry.²⁸

Of his death we hear nothing. It used to be believed that his *De Dis* contained a contemporary reference to the activities of Antony's political enemies: ὄ[ταν] ὀρθῶ παρωσαμένους ὑφ' ἐνός [Ἄ]ντωνίου [χεῖ]ρα[ς τ]ῆ [κα]τ' ἄσ[τ]υ τοῦς [ἐ]ναντίου[ς] (Book 1, 25.35 ff.²⁹ This had been taken to refer to the events at the end of 44, when Piso and other Caesarians opposed Antony,³⁰ and so providing us with a terminus post quem for Philodemus' death, which is often given as shortly after 40 (aet. ca. 70), although he could well have lived many years beyond this date. It has now been reported,³¹ however, that Antony's name is not to be read. We are thus deprived of the only means scholarship thought it had to approximate the date of Philodemus' death. Piso himself disappears from extant literary historical sources soon after the events of 44 (Syme op. cit. 97), and was thought to have died soon afterward.³²

27. Gigante argues for an autobiographical interpretation of the epigrams in many passages; note in particular *Philodemus in Italy* 79: "The circumstances in the epigram [sc. 27] indicate that the little dwelling that the poet offers as the location for the meeting is located in Rome and not on the sea in Campania . . . it cannot be the house with the belvedere where Philodemus had been a guest of his patron when he mourned with Sosylus the death of his two friends Antigenes and Bacchius.

28. G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* (Oxford 1965) 3 believes that Philodemus accompanied Piso (listing the other Greeks and their patrons). Dorandi, *ANRW* 2332 rejects the possibility. See the commentary on 8.4.

29. H. Diels, *Philodemus über die Götter. Erstes Buch*. (Berlin 1916) 44, 99 f. Cf. Tait 14, Nisbet op. cit. (above n. 14) 185.

30. For the details of which, cf. R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford 1939) 98, 117 f. Syme's overall opinion of Piso is quite favorable; cf. esp. 135 f.

31. By K. Kleve ap. Dorandi, *Buon Re* 28. Another Philodemian fragment does mention Antony without question: *De Signis* col.ii.18; c.4 De Lacy, (Pygmies whom) Ἀντώνιος νῦν ἐξ Ὑρία[ς ἐκο]μίσ[ατο], which has been used to date this work; cf. De Lacy and De Lacy, *Philodemus* (above n. 1) 163 f. for the details. But the verb's being in the middle voice allows that Antony merely had the pygmies brought to Rome at his command, without necessarily having conducted them either from Syria (in 54 or 40) or from Hyria (40). This Antony reference, then, provides neither a secure date for *De Signis* nor a firm terminus post quem for Philodemus' death. Cf. Asmis, *ANRW* 2.36.4.2372. It remains possible that *De Dis* was composed in the late 40s; cf. P. G. Woodward, "Star gods in Philodemus, PHerc 152/157," *CERC* 19 (1989) 29–47, esp. 31f.

32. Three inscriptions from Pola, however, name L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, one of them securely dated to 33 B.C.: ILLRP 423, 424, 639, now published in B. Frischer, *Shifting Paradigms: New Approaches to Horace's Ars Poetica* (Atlanta 1991) 55 f., who uses them as part of his argument that this Piso was the father among the dedicatees of Horace's *Ars Poetica*.

It is possible that the now elderly Philodemus retired from public life,³³ but this is mere conjecture, and, given the difficulty of dating his works (and reading them in their sorry physical state), it is quite possible that Philodemus continued to write and to teach well into his eighties. A passage in *De Morte* on dying in another land has usually been taken as an oblique personal reference: “Whenever [there is the expectation of dying] in a foreign land, this naturally stings lovers of discourse, especially if they leave behind parents and other relatives in their native land. But it stings only so much as to prick, so as not to bring pain, [to those] involved in the inconveniences that attend life in a foreign land” (tr. Asmis).³⁴ It seems that Philodemus had resigned himself to die in Italy.

But it is not so much the exact dates as what it was that Philodemus did during his long stay in Italy that is of the greatest interest, both for historians of the late Republic and even more so for historians of Augustan literature. And it is to this that we now turn.

On the Bay of Naples

Despite the uncertainties outlined in the previous section, we may safely assume that Philodemus spent at least the three decades of the 60s through the 40s largely, though probably not entirely, in Italy; more specifically in the environs of Naples and Herculaneum, the small but elegant coastal town about 10 km to the south of Naples.¹ Herculaneum was covered by the Vesuvian eruption of 79 A.D. and eventually uncovered along with Pompeii in the mid-eighteenth century, enabling

E. Sacks, however, in his review of Frischer, shows that the Piso of the inscriptions is far more likely to be a younger member of this family (*BMCR* 3 [1992] 113 f.). Also critical is D. Armstrong, “The addressees of the *Ars poetica*: Herculaneum, the Pisones and Epicurean protreptic,” *MD* 31 (1993) 185–230.

33. Philippson *RE* 2447 argues that Siro had died well before 42, which would be relevant here, were there any evidence to support this claim.

34. [ὄ]ταν δ' ἐπὶ ξένης, φυσ[ικόν] δη[χθῆ]ναι φιλολόγοις κα[ὶ] μάλιστ' ἐά[ν] γονεῖς ἢ συγγενεῖς ἄλλους ἐπὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἀπολε[ῖ]πωσιν, ἀλλ' ὥστε νύττειν μό[ν]ον, ο[ὐ]χ ὥστε λύπην καὶ μεγάλην τούτην ἐπιφέρειν [κ]αταφερομένους ἐπὶ τὰς ἐν τῷ ζῆν [π]αρακολουθούσας [ἐ]πὶ ξένης [γῆ]ς δ[ι]σ[σχρ]η[στ]ίας (*De Morte* 4 col.25.37–26.7). This passage would read all the more poignantly if Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy* (above n. 1) 44 is right to maintain that *De Morte* was written when Philodemus was elderly; similarly, Dorandi *ANRW* 2358. I tend to agree, but it must be admitted that the evidence is stylistic and subjective. It may be that the our papyrus of this work was written toward the end of the first century B.C.—cf. G. Cavallo, *Libri scritte scriveri a Ercolano* (Naples 1983) 52 f.—but this does not tell us when the work was composed.

* * *

1. Literature on the Villa, to say nothing of that on the whole of Herculaneum, is immense. On the former, let me mention only two recent works: D. Mustilli et al., *La Villa dei Papiri*, Secondo suppl. a *CErc* 13 (Naples 1983); M. R. Wojcik, *La Villa dei Papiri ad Ercolano: Contributo alla ricostruzione dell'ideologia della "nobilitas" tardorepubblicana* (Rome 1986); T. Dorandi, “La ‘Villa dei Papiri’ a Ercolano e la sua biblioteca,” *CP* 90 (1995) 168–182.

the world to get a near firsthand view of life in a first-century Italian suburb. Among the many discoveries, which ranged from the very finest statuary and wall painting to mundane objects of daily life, there was also found in one of the more prosperous villas the remains of a library containing about 1,100 papyrus rolls. Of the texts that could to any extent be read, almost all were Greek.² It has been suggested, however, since not all the rooms in the still subterranean Villa dei Papiri have been excavated, that the library found was the Greek one, and that a separate Latin library of the Villa remains to be found, just as Trimalchio segregated his books by language (Petr. *Sat.* 48) and just as Julius Caesar intended to establish two public libraries in Rome, one for each language (Suet. *D. Jul.* 44)³ At the very least, one might hope to find more copies of Lucretius and Ennius, to say nothing of other authors sympathetic to Epicureanism, such as Vergil and Horace.⁴ As the tedious (and initially ruinous) process of unrolling the papyri

On the town itself, C. Waldstein and L. Shoobridge, *Herculaneum: Past Present and Future* (London 1908) can still be recommended. *Cronache Ercolanesi*, although given over primarily to reports on the papyri, often contains archeological articles. See further below, n. 4. See also L. Franchi dell'Orto (ed.), *Ercolano 1738–1988: 250 anni di ricerca archeologica* (Rome 1993).

2. The most noteworthy of the 58 Latin texts are: (i) A fragment of a hexameter poem on the battle of Actium: P.Herc. 817 (ed.pr. in *VH* II, v–xxvi. Cf. G. Garuti, *C. Rabirius. Bellum Actiacum e papyro Herculansenis* 817 (Bologna 1958), who has not convinced everyone that the author is Rabirius; cf. E. J. Kenney's review in *CR* 10 (1960) 138 f. For bibliography, cf. M. Gigante, *Catalogo dei papiri ercolanesi* (Naples 1979) 186–189. An uncritical but useful text with English translation: H. W. Benario, "The Carmen de Bello Actiaco and early Imperial epic," *ANRW* 2.30.3 (1983) 1656–1662; A. Cozzolino, *CErc* 5 (1975) 81–86. A historical account: G. Zecchini, *Il Carmen de bello Actiaco: Storiografia e lotta politica in età augustea*, *Historia Einzelschr.* 51 (Stuttgart 1987); text with commentary in E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford 1993) 334–340, who tentatively suggests that it could have come from Cornelius Severus, *Res Romanae*; M. Gigante, "Virgilio e i suoi amici tra Napoli e Ercolano," *Atti e Mem. dell'Accad. Naz. Virgiliana* 59 (1991) 113–117. (ii) Fragments of Lucretius: K. Kleve, "Lucretius in Herculaneum," *CErc* 19 (1989) 5–27; now available in M. L. Smith's Loeb edition of Lucretius. (iii) Fragments of Ennius' *Annals*: K. Kleve, "Ennius in Herculaneum," *CErc* 20 (1990) 5–16. Other Latin papyri are unidentified, the literature on them being purely paleographical; cf. the list in Gigante, *Catalogo* 57, supplemented by M. Capasso, "Primo supplemento al catalogo dei papiri Ercolanesi," *CErc* 19 (1989) 210. See further M. Capasso, *Manuale di papirologia ercolanese* (Lecce 1991) 54, 82 f.

3. Cf. Capasso, *Manuale* (above n. 2) 52–56. That this segregation by language was well established by Petronius' time is shown by Trimalchio's boast: *tres bibliothecas habeo, unam Graecam alteram Latinam*. Presumably, since any ordinary rich person could boast of two libraries, Trimalchio has to improve upon this by saying "three", but when he immediately proceeds to enumerate them, he runs out of descriptions after two. Scholars who emend *tres* to *duas* have no sense of humor, but their arithmetic is quite correct; cf. R. J. Starr, "Trimalchio's Libraries," *Hermes* 115 (1987) 252 f.

4. Cf. M. Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy*, trans. D. Obbink (Ann Arbor 1995), chs. 1–2, and Capasso, *Manuale* (above, n. 2), both excellent introductions to the subject, summarizing vast amounts of recent and not-so-recent scholarship. Plans are under way to excavate the remaining rooms; cf. G. Gullini, "Il progetto di esplorazione della Villa dei Papiri," *CErc* 14 (1984) 7 f.; B. Conticello, "Dopo 221 anni si rientra nella Villa dei papiri," *CErc* 17 (1987) 9–13; A. De Simone, "La Villa dei Papiri: Rapporto preliminare: gennaio 1986–marzo 1987," *CErc* 17 (1987) 15–36.

proceeded,⁵ it became clear that these Greek texts formed a specialized collection of Epicurean texts, many identifiable by subscript as works of Epicurus himself (his Περὶ Φύσεως occurring in multiple copies) as well as works by Epicureans such as Polystratos, Kolotes, Karneiskos, and Demetrios Lakon.⁶

But the author represented by the greatest number of works (some in more than one copy) was Philodemus. It was inevitable, therefore, that this villa would be identified as the property of L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus, Philodemus' patron.⁷ This may well be the case, although one should note that the only physical evidence linking Piso with the villa is his name in Philodemus' *Good King*, which was found therein; nor should one forget that over a century had passed between Piso and Philodemus' deaths and the eruption of Vesuvius. The library could have been willed to someone (whether relative or philosophical friend; but see next paragraph) who could have moved the collection to another house; it could even have been sold (more than once). Yet the villa clearly belonged to a man of influence and culture; if one has to guess at a former owner, Piso certainly remains the best choice because of the links between poet and patron indicated by Cicero and by Philodemus himself in *Epigram 27* and in *The Good King*.

More interesting and more important here than the identity of the villa's owner during Philodemus' lifetime is the fact that, to judge from the Greek texts found therein, Vesuvius might as well have erupted on the day of Philodemus' death (although we probably have copies made after that date).⁸ This suggests a collection

5. And as it still proceeds; over a thousand rolls or pieces of rolls remain unopened. Cf. M. Gigante, *Catalogo* (above, n. 2) for a description of physical state, contents, possible titles and authors, and bibliography of all the Herculaneum papyri; brought more up to date by Capasso's "Supplemento," (above, n. 2) 193–264. For a survey of the hands of the papyri and of the library of the Villa, cf. G. Cavallo, *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano* Primo suppl. a *CErc* 13 (Naples 1983). For a description of how the unrolling is accomplished cf. B. Fosse et al., "Unrolling the Herculaneum Papyri," *CErc* 14 (1984) 9–15; and for an overview of the current state of affairs, R. Janko, "Philodemus resartus: Progress in reconstructing the philosophical papyri from Herculaneum," *BACAP* 7 (1991) 271–308; Capasso, *Manuale* (above n. 2) 85–116.

6. Surprisingly, no Epicurean texts of Zeno or Phaidros (who spent time in Rome) have been found. Some few texts of the Stoic Chrysippos on logic were also found: P.Herc. 307, 1038, 1421.

7. An especially strong case for Piso's ownership was made by H. Bloch, "L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus in Samothrace and Herculaneum," *AJA* 44 (1940) 490–493; M. R. Wojcik, *La Villa dei Papiri* (above, n. 1). After Piso, the strongest candidate for ownership is M. Octavius, put forward first by H. Diels in 1882 and championed more recently by B. Hemmerdinger and others. Wojcik suggests that the Villa belonged to the Appii Claudii Pulchri; cf. Capasso *Manuale* (above n. 2) 43–64 for a review of this controversy. Capasso himself, like Gigante, believes that Piso was the owner, for which opinion he was criticized in a review by P. De Lacy, *AJP* 114 (1993) 178–180, who rightfully stresses the fact that no positive evidence connects Piso with the Villa (nor even, it could be added, with the town of Herculaneum).

8. There are a few *auctores incerti*, so that the possibility exists that some of the texts assigned to Philodemus were in fact written by others, some of them perhaps after his death. Thanks to the work of Cavallo (above, n. 5), there is no doubt that a number of papyri were copied toward the end of the first century B.C. and in at least the beginning of the first century A.D.; cf. esp. his comments on what he calls Group R, the most recently written but containing works by some of the earliest Epicureans (56).

that was passed down in the family (most likely Piso's) from one generation to the next, rather than a collection that passed into the hands of philosophically inclined Romans (let alone a philosophically active group of Greeks), who would surely have added texts of similar content.

In any case, the important fact remains that documents of the greatest importance for the history of Epicureanism and Roman intellectual history were discovered in the mid eighteenth century. They also brought to the fore one of the most interesting Greek authors of the first century B.C. Hitherto, Philodemus was known solely from his thirty-five or so epigrams preserved in the Greek Anthology and from a few references to him in ancient literature as both poet and philosopher, the most famous and extensive of these being the vivid picture painted by Cicero in his oration *In Pisonem*.⁹ Although one could not know from these references that Philodemus had written anything other than poetry (although most philosophers wrote), the significance of his role in Roman cultural life could be assessed from his connection with Piso on the one hand and, although without the papyri this would have had to remain hypothetical, with Siro on the other.

Piso we have already touched upon.¹⁰ Siro was a leader of the Epicurean circle in Naples and the teacher mentioned in two poems of the *Catalepton*:

nos ad beatos vela mittimus portus
magni petentes docta dicta Sironis.
(5.8 f. = Siro F 6 Gigante)

villula, quae Sironis eras, et pauper agelle,
verum illi domino tu quoque divitiae,
me tibi et hos una mecum, quos semper amavi,
siquid de patria tristius audiero,
commendo, in primisque patrem, tu nunc eris illi
Mantua quod fuerat quodque Cremona prius.
(8 = F 7 G)¹¹

9. See the collection of Testimonia below, pp. 227–234.

10. See further R. G. M. Nisbet, *Cicero, In Calpurnium Pisonem Oratio* (Oxford 1961) 183–188; Münzer, “Calpurnius (90),” *RE* 3 (1899) 1387–1390.

11. Cf. the comments of R. E. H. Westendorp Boerma, *P. Vergili Maronis Catalepton I* (Assen 1949) ad locc., who regards these two poems as genuine (and those who disagree as *obstinati*). On Siro, cf. further W. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos [= K&M]* (Munich 1906) 126 ff., H. von Arnim and W. Kroll, “Siro,” *RE* 2.3 (1927) 353 f.; M. Gigante, “I frammenti di Sironi,” *Paideia* 45 (1990) 175–198. Westendorp Boerma 102 argues that *Cat.* 5 was written in 45 B.C., but certainty is impossible. See further on Vergil, below. For the relationship between Vergil and Philodemus, cf. Tait 48–63; cf. also M. Gigante, “Virgilio fra Ercolano e Pompei,” *A&R* 28 (1983) 31–50 (repr. in *Virgilio e la Campania* [Naples 1984] 67–92); B. D. Frischer, *At Tu Aureus Esto: Eine Interpretation von Vergils 7. Ekloge* (Bonn 1975), esp. 167–198; H. Naumann, “War Vergil Epikureer?” *Sileno* 1 (1975) 245–257; M. Erler, “Der Zorn des Helden: Philodems *De Ira* und Vergils Konzept des Zorns in der *Aeneis*,” *GB* 18 (1992) 103–126; K. Galinsky, “How to be philosophical about the end of the *Aeneid*,” *ICS* 19 (1994) 191–201.

Siro's *pauper agellus*, located in Naples (P.Herc. 312 = T 15) is probably on the same scale as Philodemos' λιτή καλιός (27); a humble dwelling was a hallmark of the professional Epicurean. Cf. Cic. *Fin.* 1.20.65 *Epicurus una in domo, et ea quidem angusta, quam magnos quantaque amoris conspiratione consentientes tenuit amicorum greges. Quod fit etiam nunc ab Epicureis.* It is interesting to note how Cicero's attack on Piso for inelegant living (*In Pis.* 67 esp. *nihil apud hunc lautum, nihil elegans, nihil exquisitum*) leads immediately to the section on his dealings with Philodemos (68–72). Since the *lauta elegans exquisita* Villa dei Papiri has been dated on archeological grounds to sometime before the middle of the first century,¹² it seems possible to conclude from Cicero's comments that (assuming the Villa dei Papiri in fact to be Piso's—at least eventually) it had not yet been occupied by Piso in 55 B.C., the year of *In Pisonem*. But Wojcik has described later additions to the Villa which she dates to the latter half of the first century. Since precise dating is impossible on architectural grounds alone, it may be permissible to conjecture that these later additions (the grand peristyle and the northeast entrance) were ordered by Piso sometime after he had taken possession, which was also of course after he had returned from Macedonia with the usual spoils. There may therefore have been a period of only some fifteen years (ca. 55–40) during which Philodemos and Siro lived in their small homes while Piso lived in his far more impressive dwelling.

Precisely where Piso and Philodemos consorted before this is not known. Piso had duties that kept him in Rome, but there would have been many opportunities to visit the Naples area, especially if, as Cicero asserts, he was drawn to Epicureanism. Our meager evidence allows for their having met in Rome and for Philodemos' having spent many years there before taking up residence in Herculaneum; it equally well permits Philodemos never to have set foot in Rome (however unlikely this is), and that Piso and Philodemos saw each other only in the south, where of course Piso could have been the philosopher's patron even before the construction of his magnificent villa. There is also a small possibility that Philodemos accompanied Piso on at least some of his foreign tours in Macedonia and Gaul (see above).

What was life like in *docta Neapolis* (Mart. 5.78.14) and Herculaneum? A judicious averaging of Cicero's various descriptions of partying in the company of Greeks, taken together with Philodemos' own brief but important picture, provides a preliminary sketch. In his attacks against Piso, of course, Cicero tells us the worst; not the extremes of human behavior which the later Roman emperors have accustomed us to, but enough to disgust an earlier age. Well before the Philodemos section of *In Pisonem*, we hear of parties in Rome held during Piso's consulship:

Quid ego illorum dierum epulas, quid laetitiam et gratulationem tuam, quid cum tuis sordidissimis gregibus¹³ intemperantissimas perpotationes praedicem? quis te illis

12. Cf. Wojcik 35 f., Mustilli 16 f. (opp. citt. above, n. 1).

13. These last two words are sure signs that Epicureans were present: *sordidus* is simply the pejorative opposite of *lautus* etc. (see above); *gregibus* seems all by itself capable of conjuring up Epicureans: In addition to the well-known *Epicuri de grege porcum* of Hor. *Ep.* 1.4.16, Cicero himself later in this speech refers to Piso as *Epicure noster, ex bara producta non ex schola*,

diebus sobrium, quis agentem aliquid quod esset libero dignum, quis denique in publico vidit? cum conlegae tui domus cantu et cymbalis personaret, cumque ipse nudus in convivio saltaret; in quo cum illum suum saltatorium versaret orbem, ne tum quidem fortunae rotam pertimescat: hic autem non tam concinnus helluo nec tam musicus iacebat in suorum Graecorum foetore atque vino; quod quidem istius in illis rei publicae luctibus quasi aliquod Lapitharum aut Centaurorum convivium ferebatur; in quo nemo potest dicere utrum iste plus biberit an effuderit.¹⁴

As with his attack on Piso's Epicureanism in **T 12** (see p. 6), Cicero may be referring to Epicureans in Rome who need not include Philodemus, if he was already (perhaps from the very time of his arrival in mainland Italy) a full-time resident in the Naples area. And, whether Philodemus was present or not, who would deny Cicero the opportunity to exaggerate? On the other hand, Philodemus himself in a few poems describes similar parties having taken place in the past; and since such gatherings are now (in these poems) rejected in favor of a more sedate and philosophical life, they are not presented in the most favorable light. Wine, women, and song all to excess are the hallmarks of these parties (note esp. *Epigram 6*), which accords with Cicero's picture. But how accurate and autobiographical are these poems? They all seem to center on a turning point in the narrator's life, when he turns from "madness" to a more reflective time that will be characterized by philosophical discourse and marriage, the latter (and hence the former) being dated to the narrator's 37th year. If Philodemus were the (truthful) narrator, this would occur ca. 73–70 B.C.

If consistency were demanded, one could have a wild Philodemus meet Piso in the late 70s (see above) at a time when the latter was converting to Epicureanism; Philodemus could shortly thereafter remove himself to Naples, where more sober Epicureans were gathered under Siro's leadership. Association between Piso and Philodemus could be intermittent, at least at first, so that Piso would be more under the influence of the hedonistic Epicureans in Rome than that of the more serious ones in Naples. This would explain the dichotomy of **T 12** between good and bad Epicu-

and has an Epicurean in *De Fin.* 1.65 speak fondly of *amicorum greges*. Plutarch repeats the porcine references in *Mor.* 1091c, 1094a; it has also been found in *Cat.* 47.1 *Porci et Socraton, duae sinistrae | Pisonis*; see further below. Nor perhaps should we ignore the beautiful bronze pig found in the Villa dei Papiri (now in the Naples Museum; Inv. 4893 (no. 27 in the list of statues in D. Pandermalis, "Sul programma della decorazione scultoria," in D. Mustilli et al. [above, n. 1] 45; cf. Wojcik 119 f., 124 f.) Pandermalis argues that it was placed near a statue of Epicurus which dominated the entrance to the peristyle, but Wojcik 124 f. is doubtful, as there are too many examples of sculpted animals in Herculaneum and Pompeii to feel sure that this particular pig was part of an Epicurean sculptural program. On the other hand, there is the small pig at the feet of Epicurus on a cup from Boscoreale; cf. M. Gigante, *Civiltà delle forme letterarie nell'antica Pompei* (Naples 1979) 110; A. T. Summers, *Philodemus' Περὶ Ποιημάτων and Horace's Ars Poetica* (Diss. Urbana 1995) 6–8. See also *Π viii.7*.

14. *Pis.* 22. Cf. *De Fin.* 2.23, also aimed at Epicureans: *Mundos, elegantes, optimis cocis, pistorbibus, piscatu, aucupio, venatione, his omnibus exquisitis, vitantes cruditatem, . . . adsint etiam formosi pueri qui ministrent; respondeat his vestis, argentum Corinthium, locus ipse, aedificium; hos ergo asotos bene quidem vivere aut beate numquam dixerim*. Cf. T. P. Wiseman, *Catullus and His World* (Cambridge 1985) 43–45, aptly comparing Epicurus, fr. 67 U.

reans and the uneasy reference to Philodemus in *Pis.* 68 ff. Consistency can sometimes be bought only at the expense of historical truth, but this picture may not be too far off the mark: Piso acting one way with one sort of Epicurean crowd in Rome, and acting another way with Philodemus and his circle in Naples. After his proconsulship, he could have built his villa in Herculaneum, primarily to devote more time to the kind of Epicureanism toward which he was now tending.

Now, from the mid-50s on, we can picture life in Herculaneum as consisting of days spent in the serious pursuit of Epicurean ideals (again, as described in **T 12**, followed by evenings of moderate drinking, eating, philosophical discussion, and the recitation of poetry, perhaps in the company of like-minded women.¹⁵ Philodemus provides the best evidence, but Cicero too can be tapped for a favorable picture of what such an evening could be like. In *Pro Archia*, where his client is a Greek resident in Italy, we hear of civilized dinners enlivened by cultured Greeks. Of particular interest is the fact that Archias was adept at the extemporaneous composition of poetry—epigrams most likely, given the contents. Archias was no philosopher, and doubtless differed from Philodemus in numerous other ways, but it is tempting to see in his description of Archias a picture that Philodemus might be willing to accept as describing his own talents.¹⁶ Philodemus too seems to have composed theme and variations, and Cicero's picture of Archias not only enables us to imagine a common setting for the recitation of epigrams, but also provides some evidence for assigning an epigram to Philodemus when attribution has been questioned. For example, *Epigram 21*, a dialogue between a streetwalker and a potential customer, which is ascribed to Philodemus by the Corrector of P (which ascribes it to Antiphilos) and by Pl, is similar to *Epigram 20*. Gow-Page follow P, recognizing that “the two may be deliberately contrasted variations on the same theme” (GP 2.125), but evidently not considering that as evidence in favor of **21**'s having been written by Philodemus. But this is now all but confirmed by the presence of **21** among a list on papyri of incipits almost all of those identifiable among which belong to Philodemus. See the commentary.

It is interesting to note that two of the incipits start with the word Parthenope, the older name for Naples and the name of its eponymous Siren (cf. Pliny 3.62): iv. 14 *παρθενοπηνα* . . . and iv. 15 *παρθενοπηρ* One hesitates to construct a poem from the first word plus a fraction of the second, but it seems reasonable to imagine Philodemus in Naples preaching to the converted about its charms, first in one way and then in another, contrasting, way. A suggestive parallel may be offered by Vergil's sphragis to the *Georgics* (4.563 f.):

15. For the role played by women in Epicureanism, cf. C. J. Castner, “Epicurean hetairai as dedicants to healing deities?” *GRBS* 23 (1982) 51–57; B. Frischer, *The Sculpted Word* (Berkeley 1982) 56 f., 61–63.

16. See below, p. 27, n. 13. For the difficulty in assigning any of the 37 epigrams under his name in the Greek Anthology to Cicero's Archias, cf. GP 2.434 ff. As Gow-Page note, 435 n.4, the four epigrams (*AP* 6.16, 179–181) on exactly the same theme (three brothers bring three different offerings to a statue of Pan) would admirably illustrate Archias' ability to supply variations on the day's events. On the symposium as the setting for the recital of epigrams, cf. Alan Cameron, *Callimachus and His Critics* (Princeton 1995), ch. 3.

illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti.

It is conceivable that these lines, which may of course have been written long before the poem was completed by 29 B.C., were inspired by similarly Epicurean sentiments expressed by Philodemos, probably in one of his epigrams. Indeed, Vergil may have heard Philodemos himself recite them at one of the dinner parties we have been trying to recreate.¹⁷ Note that *ignobilis oti* recalls *Cat.* 5.10 (following upon the lines quoted above), *vitamque ab omni vindicabimus cura*, which as we saw is put in a distinctly Epicurean setting.

P.Herc. 312 (= T 15, to be discussed further below) shows us that Philodemos and Siro associated with others in Naples. *Catalepton* 5 and 8 which even if not genuine probably reflect the accurate recollection of someone in Vergil's circle—links Vergil with Siro. The circle may be completed with three papyri which place Philodemos firmly in Vergil's literary circle.¹⁸ In the two papyri first known, which are no longer extant and must be edited from drawings now in the Bodleian Library, the name of Vergil had, unfortunately, to be restored.

οἱ μὲν καταλλοὶ
σεῖς φιλοσοφῆσαν[τες]
καὶ Οὐάρτε καὶ Οὐ[εργίλιε καὶ
Κοιντίλιε καθάπ[ερ]
P.Herc. 1082, Περὶ Κολακείας, col.xi

All that is sure here that some Romans are being addressed concerning some sort of philosophical activity: οἱ . . . φιλοσοφῆσαν[τες] (Körte) seems sure.¹⁹ But this in itself was of no small interest, especially when we realize that Varius is almost certainly L. Varius Rufus, whose epic poem *De Morte*, written perhaps as early as 44 and before 39 B.C., recalls both Lucretius and Philodemos' own Περὶ Θανάτου.²⁰ Furthermore, two lines of his poem are recalled in turn by two of the

17. Vergil's nickname Parthenias probably means "virginal," playing on his name, but there could be a further play on the name of either the Siren or the town. Probably not relevant here is Vergil's epitaph, which he is said to have composed himself: *Mantua me genuit, Calabri rapuere, tenet nunc | Parthenope; cecini pascua rura duces*. Cf. further M. Gigante, "La brigata virgiliana ad Ercolano," in M. Gigante (ed.), *Virgilio e gli Augustei* (Naples 1990) 7–22.

18. For earlier scholarship on this question, which until recently depended upon restoration, cf. M. Gigante, "Virgilio fra Ercolano e Pompei" (above, n. 11); id. "Atakta III. Plozio o Orazio in Filodemo?" *CErc* 3 (1973) 86 f. For an imaginative portrait of Vergil's years in Naples, see T. Frank, *Vergil* (New York 1922) 47–63.

19. Körte made the addressees the philosophers by restoring ὑμῶν δὲ] οἱ μὲν κτλ.

20. Cf. W. Wimmel, "Der Augusteer Lucius Varius Rufus," *ANRW* 2.30.3.1562–1621 (1569–1585 on *De Morte*), repr. in *Collectanea. Augusteertum und späte Republik* (Wiesbaden 1987); H. Dahlmann, *Interpretationen zu Fragmenten römischer Dichter* (Abh.Ak. d. Wiss. Mainz, Geistes- u. Sozialwiss. Kl. 1982.11) 24 f.; A.S. Hollis, "L. Varius Rufus, *De morte* (frs. 1–4 Morel)," *CQ*, n.s. 27 (1977) 187–190; P. V. Cova, "Lucio Vario Rufo," *EV* 5.441–443.

Aeneid,²¹ and Probus names Varius among Vergil's Roman associates in Epicureanism: *Vixit* (sc. *Vergilius*) *pluribus annis liberali in otio, secutus Epicuri sectam, insigni concordia et familiaritate usus Quintilii, Tuccae et Varii*.²² Vergil himself mentions Varius in *E.* 9.35 f. (*nam neque adhuc Vario videor nec dicere Cinna | digna*) and perhaps, if the poem is his, earlier in *Cat.* 7, an elegant four-line epigram addressed to Varius in which the narrator's lament of frustrated love is subordinated to the problem of whether or not it is permissible to use the Greek word *πόθος* to describe his plight.²³ The restoration of Οὐ[εργίλιε, therefore, seemed not at all unreasonable.

The names of Varius and Quintilius (who is also of interest) appear in a second list of Roman names found in the Herculaneum papyri: P.Herc. 253, [Περὶ Κ[ακίων], fr. 12:²⁴

...]τιε καὶ Οὐάρι[ε ...
... καὶ Κοιντίλι[ε ...

Quintilius is most likely Quintilius Varus, named by Probus above and similarly by Servius ad Verg. *E.* 6.13 = Siro F 9 Gigante, *hortatur Musas ad referenda ea, quae Silenus cantaverat pueris: nam vult exequi sectam Epicuream, quam didicerant tam Vergilius quam Varus docente Sirone. et quasi sub persona Sileni Sironem inducit loquentem, Chromin autem et Mnasyon se et Varum vult accipi*.²⁵ The two papyri have room for the same four names in the same order, so that [Οὐεργίλιε] was totally restored in PHerc 253 between Varius and Quintilius. Who could the first-named person have been, whose name ends in *-ius*? Körte's choice of Horace was long a leading contender, but Della Corte made a very good case for Plotius (Tucca), who along with Varius edited the *Aeneid* after Virgil's death.²⁶ But since Quintilius is

21. Cf. Varius fr. 1 Morel-Courtney *vendit hic Latium populis agrosque Quiritum | eripuit, fixit leges pretio atque refixit*, with V. A. 6.621 f. *vendit hic auro patriam dominumque potentem | imposuit, fixit leges pretio atque refixit*.

22. Probus, *Vit. Verg.* 10–12. Similarly, Donatus, *V. Verg.* 68 *audivit a Sirone praecepta Epicuri, cuius doctrinae socium habuit Varium*. On Vergil's Epicureanism, see above, n. 11.

23. *Si licet, hoc sine fraude, Vari dulcissime, dicam: | dispeream, nisi me perdidit iste Πόθος. | Sin autem praecepta vetant me dicere, sane | non dicam, sed "me perdidit iste puer."* Cf. Tait 59, Westendorp-Boerma (above, n. 11) 138 ff. Πόθος here = the son of Aphrodite, as in Phil. 8, Κύπρι Πόθων μήτερ, so that the peculiarly Hellenistic wit of the poem now lies in the fact that *puer* is only ostensibly a Latin synonym for *Pothos*, who is usually imagined as a child; what it really does is transfer attention from the deified abstraction Desire to the more concrete subject, the specific boy who is driving Vergil to distraction. Reserving the point until the last word is typical of Hellenistic epigram in general, and of many of Philodemos' in particular.

24. According to G. Cavallo (above, n. 5), 46, both this papyrus and P.Herc. 1082—each representing separate works of *On Virtues and Vices*—were written by the same scribe, whom he designates Anonimo XXV.

25. There remains the possibility that Varus here is Alfenus Varus; cf. Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. O. 1.24. On Siro = Silenus, cf. also schol. Veron. ad *E.* 6.10 (= Siro F 8 Gigante).

26. Donatus *V. Verg.* 37, Servius *V. Verg.* 29–31, Hieron. *Chron.* 166e14 (17 B.C.). Cf. F. Della Corte, "Vario e Tucca in Filodemo," *Aegyptus* 49 (1969) 85–88; repr. in *Opuscula* 3 (Geneva 1973) 149–152; and again cf. Gigante, "Atakta III" (above, n. 18) for a more detailed view of modern scholarship. For Tucca and Varius' role in the editing of the *Aeneid*, cf. Cova (above, n. 20), H. D. Jocelyn, *Sileno* 16 (1990) 263–285.

mentioned by Horace in the *Ars Poetica*²⁷ and in *O.* 1.24.5–12, where Horace speaks of Vergil’s grief for the recently deceased Quintilius, the restoration of Horace’s name in the two papyri could not be ruled out. It is, moreover, Horace himself who puts himself in the circle of Vergil, Varius, and Plotius.²⁸ The matter has finally been settled with the publication of P.Herc. Paris. 2, seemingly, like P.Herc. 1082, a fragment of Philodemos’ *Περὶ Κολακείας*,²⁹ which once again, this time leaving no doubt as to restoration, lists the four Roman addressees:

ὦ Πλώτιε καὶ Οὐά- 21
ρ[ι]ε καὶ Οὐεργ[ι]λίε καὶ Κοιντ[ί]-
λιε.³⁰

Why did Philodemos address this particular group? A reasonable guess would be that these four Romans and Philodemos shared a common interest not only in poetry and philosophy but more particularly in the relationship between poetry and philosophy (as we know to be the case with Philodemos). Perhaps we can answer a little more specifically on the basis of Horace, *Ars Poetica* 438–444, where Quintilius is described as the true friend who will not flatter a friend’s poetry but rather will offer only honest criticism.

Quintilio siquid recitares, “corrigere sodes
hoc” aiebat “et hoc.” melius te posse negares
bis terque expertum frustra, delere iubebat
et male tornatos incudi referre versus.
si defendere delictum quam vertere malles,
nullum ultra verbum aut operam insumebat inanem,
quin sine rivali teque et tua solus amares.

Brink ad loc. (p. 412) says that he knows of “no evidence attesting the conjunction of friendship and criticism in extant Hellenistic writing on literary theory as it is attested in Horace and seems to be attested in Lucilius” (cf. pp. 400 f.). Conceivably, however, Philodemos in a work on flattery could be making the same point as Horace, namely that people truly interested in philosophy would never flatter their friends. Just as *Good King* was written with its dedicatee in mind, so too could Philodemos have exemplified his general points on flattery with a reference to the proper way for friends who are poets to speak of each other’s works: Offer frank criticism and be willing to receive it in turn (or risk facing Quintilius’ silence, which is further criticism of you as a poet).

27. 438 ff. *Quintilio siquid recitares, “corrigere sodes | hoc” aiebat, “et hoc”*; see further below.

28. *Plotius et Varius Sinuissae Vergiliisque | occurrunt, animae qualis neque candidiores | terra tulit, neque quis me sit devinctior alter* (*Sat.* 1.5.40–43). Cf. *Sat.* 1.10.81 *Plotius et Varius Maecenae Vergiliusque*. And note Hieron. *Chron.* 166e14 (17 B.C.) *Varius et Tucca Vergilii et Horatii contubernales*.

29. This work, part of *Vices and their Corresponding Virtues*, is dated to the middle of the century by Cavallo (above, n.5) 41, 54 f. Cf. Capasso, *Manuale* (above, n. 2) 175 f.

30. Cf. M. Gigante and M. Capasso, “Il ritorno di Virgilio a Ercolano,” *SIFC* 7 (1989) 3–6.

Another papyrus fragment, untitled, also tantalizingly attests to Philodemos' life in Campania: P.Herc. 312 = **T 15**:

... he decided to return	... ἐδόκει δ' ἐπ[α-
with us to	νελθεῖν] μεθ' ἡμῶν εἰς
Naples and to	τὴν Νεάπολιν πρὸς τὸν
dearest Siro and his	φίλτατον Σίρωνα [κ]αὶ τὴν
way of life there	κατ' αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ δίαίταν
and to engage in active philo-	καὶ τὰς φιλοσόφους ἐνεργ[ῆ-
sophical discourse and to live	σαι ὁμιλίας Ἡρκλ[ανέωι
with others in Herculaneum	τε μεθ' ἐτέ[ρων συζητῆσαι ³¹

For all the uncertainties of the papyri, then, we should be more than satisfied with what little solid evidence they do supply to supplement the previously known data derived from scholia, lives of Vergil, and the autobiographical material in Horace and the *Catalepton*, all of which uniformly agree on placing a small group of Augustan literati in a Neapolitan setting which was thoroughly Epicurean. Nor should Horace be excluded from possible membership; he mentions Philodemos and his circle even if they do not return the favor. And if B. Frischer is right, a further link between Philodemos and Horace is to be found in the father among the dedicatees of the latter's *Ars Poetica*, a Piso whom Frischer identifies as L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus.³²

It may even be possible to detect an Epicurean flavor in the choice of *Catalepton* as title for the collection of epigrams (and perhaps for the *Priapeia* as well),³³ a word whose Greek original is disputed, it having been transliterated back into Greek as *κατάλεπτον*, *καταλέπτων*, *κατάλειπτον*, and *κατὰ λεπτὸν*. The meaning would thus be something like "leftovers" (from the unlikely *κατάλειπτον*), "fine" (i.e., "elegant"), or "small" (i.e., "modest"). Of these, E. Reitzenstein favors the second, finding in this sense a reference to the Alexandrian ideal of elegance.³⁴ But since the collection as a whole is not markedly Alexandrian in tone, it is probably better to side with the majority of scholars (Westendorp Boerma included) who translate the title in the last-named sense as "Schnitzel" (Ribbeck), "trifles" (Duff), and the like. This too is understood in an Alexandrian sense, i.e., with reference to the limited

31. For the text as here printed, cf. Gigante, *Virgilio e la Campania* (above, n. 11) 75 f.; id., "I frammenti di Sirona" (above, n. 11) 178–180 (F 1), who reports that Cavallo would place the papyrus ca. 50 B.C. Obviously other conjectures are possible (cf., e.g., Crönert, *K&M* [above, n. 11] 125–127), but the general sense is clear. I would, though, not go so far as Gigante in suggesting that the subject of ἐδόκει is Vergil. See further on **T 15**.

32. B. Frischer, *Shifting Paradigms: New Approaches to Horace's Ars Poetica* (Atlanta 1991) 52–68. Frischer deals with problems of chronology and family relationship among the Pisones, but I suspect that agreement will be given only grudgingly; cf. above, p. 11, n. 32. On the relationship between Horace and Philodemos, cf. Tait 64–76; M. Gigante, "Cercida, Filodemo e Orazio," in *RF²* 235–243; Summers (above, n. 13), esp. ch.2; and the articles in the bibliography by Cataudella, De Witt, Della Corte, Hendrickson, Michels, Muñoz Valle, Reitzenstein, and Wright.

33. Cf. Westendorp Boerma (above, n. 11) xx–xxiv, for further details.

34. "Die Entwicklung des Wortes ΛΕΠΤΟΣ. Zur Stilbezeichnung der Alexandriner," *Festschrift R. Reitzenstein* (Leipzig 1931) 25–31.

scope demanded of poetry by Callimachos and Aratus. What should probably be added is that this sense fits in very well with the Epicurean ideal of moderation in all things (which is not of course exclusive to Epicureanism).

In addition to Vergil, Varius, Quintilius, and Tuca (and perhaps Horace), there were other poets to be found in Philodemos' company. The otherwise unknown Antigones and Bakkhios of *Epigram* 29 were probably poets, or at least occasional tossers-off of epigrams (see the commentary). Catullus too may have made Philodemos' acquaintance, for in two poems he refers to two friends on the staff of a Piso who may well be Philodemos' patron.³⁵ In one, no. 28, we hear that Fabullus and Veranius were unhappy with the profit they made while on Piso's provincial staff. The other, no. 47 (T 11), berates Porcius and Socraton for receiving more favorable treatment from Piso than do Fabullus and Veranius:

Porci et Socraton, duae sinistrae
Pisonis, scabies famesque mundi,
vos Veraniolo meo et Fabullo
verpus praeposuit Priapus ille?
vos convivia lauta sumptuose
de die facitis, mei sodales
quaerunt in trivio vocationes?

G. Friedrich identified Socraton with Philodemos, partly on the questionable grounds that he, like Fabullus and Veranius, had accompanied Piso to Macedonia (see above, "Life").³⁶ Nonetheless, the identification is an attractive one, although it has not been universally accepted.³⁷ Although the attested name Σωκράτιων could conceivably appear in Latin as Socraton rather than the expected Socratio, Socraton is more likely to be the transliteration of Σωκράτιον, which is not otherwise attested,

35. For the relationship between Catullus and Philodemos, cf. Tait 36–47, L. Landolfi, "Tracce filodemee di estetica e di epigrammatica simpotica in Catullo," *CERC* 12 (1982) 137–143.

36. *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Leipzig 1908) 228: "Wir haben nach dem Wortlauf unseres Gedichtes keinen Grund, uns den Socraton anders vorzustellen als den Philodemos von Gadara, der auch bei Piso in Macedonien war." Another link, albeit tenuous, between Socraton and Philodemos is Catullus' choice of Fabullus for the addressee of his invitation poem (13), which is almost certainly modelled on Philodemos' invitation to Piso (27).

37. Accepting it are T. Frank, *Catullus and Horace* (New York 1928) 82–84; C. L. Neudling, *A Prosopography to Catullus* (Oxford 1955) 147. Rejecting the identification are P. Giuffrida, *L'epicureismo nella letteratura latina nel I sec. a.C.* (Turin 1950) 2.179 f., F. Della Corte, *Personaggi Catulliani* (Florence 1976) 204–208. Unsure are Quinn ad loc. and Nisbet (above, n. 10) 183. The question is further complicated in that not all agree that the Piso of Cat. 47 is Philodemos', because in two other poems of Catullus Fabullus and Veranius are said to have been in Spain together (9 and 12) and if the four poems form a tight chronological cycle the Piso can be Cn. Piso, who was *quaestor pro praetore* in Hispania Citerior in 65/64 B.C. (Sallust *Cat.* 18.4–19.5) or L. Piso Frugi. The whole problem is nicely analyzed by Tait 39–42, who shows that "there seems to be a decided difference of tone between the references to the Spanish journey and the references connecting Catullus' two friends with Piso" (41). R. Syme, "Piso and Veranius in Catullus," *C&M* 17 (1956) 129–134 = *Roman Papers* 1 (Oxford 1979) 300–304, ignoring differences of tone between the Spanish poems and the Piso poems, argues that after his praetorship Caesoninus

probably because it less a real name than a diminutive for Sokrates.³⁸ Anyone called Little Sokrates is presumably a philosopher; and just as Cicero singles out Philodemus as the Greek philosopher with the greatest influence on Piso, so too would Catullus be more likely to address him than any other, less well known, philosopher. That he calls him by a nickname should cause no surprise; Siro may have been called Silenos and Vergil was known by his Neapolitan friends as Parthenias. (See the commentary to Π v.19.) Why he would call an Epicurean after Sokrates, especially when Epicureans in general and Philodemus in particular made no attempt to disguise their dislike of Sokrates, will be addressed in the next section.

On the basis of these slight links, we are free to imagine, without insisting on it, that Catullus and Philodemus were acquainted with one another. There is almost nothing, however, to connect Philodemus with the most famous of Epicurean poets, Lucretius, about whose life we know so little, especially now that the dedicatees of Philodemus' *Rhetorica* and *DRN* can no longer be assumed to be the same.³⁹ It is, though, worth noting that traces of what was surely a complete *DRN* (mentioned by Cicero in 54 B.C.) have been found in the Herculaneum papyri (see above, n. 2), but this does not attest to any personal relationship between the two poets; for all we know the manuscript may even have been added to the library after Philodemus' death; the paleography suggests a date as late as the end of the first century B.C. The many passages in one philosopher-poet which sheds light on the other are of course due to their common dependence on and adherence to Epicurus.⁴⁰

Philodemus and the Epigram

I

In his prose Philodemus openly declares his debt as φιλόσοφος to Epicurus;¹ his debt as ἐπιγραμματοποιός (his word, see below) is more diffuse. It is, however, not

very likely served in Hispania Citerior. In either case, Catullus' Piso is Caesoninus. Still rejecting this identification is Wiseman, *Catullus* (above, n. 14) 2; accepting it is Frischer, *Paradigms* (above n. 32) 57.

38. Σωκρατίων appears only in Galen, *Comp. Med.* 12.835 Kühn. Socratio appears only in CIL 3.948. Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre der lat. Sprache* (3rd ed., Leipzig 1902) 1.246 ff., list some few Latin names ending in *-on* deriving from Greek names in *-ων*, but all names in *-ίων* show up in Latin as *-io*; cf. Nisbet, *op. cit.*, (above n. 10) 182.

39. See above, p. 8, n. 19.

40. Cf. G. Barra, "Osservazioni sulla 'poetica' di Filodemo e di Lucrezio," *Annali d. Fac. di Lett. e Filos. d. U. di Napoli* 20 (1977–1978) 87–104; D. Armstrong, "The impossibility of metathesis: Philodemus and Lucretius on form and content in poetry," in D. Obbink (ed.), *Philodemus and Poetry* (New York 1995) 210–232; D. Clay, *Lucretius and Epicurus* (Ithaca 1983) 24 f. (who briefly, p. 291 n. 57, lists some who maintained that Lucretius knew Philodemus).

* * *

1. Most notably in Περί Παρηρησίας, fr. 45.8–11 Olivieri, καὶ τὸ συνέχον καὶ κυριώτ[α]τον, Ἐπικούρου, καθ' ὃν ζῆν ἡρήμεθα, πειθαρχήσομεν, "The basic and most important [principle]

difficult to see that he owes most to his immediate predecessors in the genre, the authors of Meleager's *Garland* in general, and Asklepiades, Kallimachos, and his fellow Gadarene Meleager himself in particular—that is, the Hellenistic pioneers who transformed classical epigram and merged it with elegy.² Originally, ἐπίγραμμα (and related words) indicated nothing more—or less—than words, whether in verse or not, *written on* a stele or other object, and was probably to be distinguished from words which came directly from a living speaker, a bard or rhapsode in the case of poetry.³ In time, however, the word came to be associated almost exclusively with verse inscriptions, and even more particularly (but at first not exclusively) with the dactylic-pentameter distich, the elegiac couplet.⁴ Although this also came to be the distinctive verse scheme of elegy, modern scholarship finds it easy to keep the two distinct during the early and high classical period: Epigrams are short poems⁵ written down for public display to memorialize victories, temple offerings, and the dead; elegies, not limited physically by the nature of stonecarving, tend to be longer poems composed for oral presentation on a particular occasion: one

is that we will obey Epicurus, according to whom we have chosen to live" (trans. Asmis). The words φιλόσοφος, σοφός, φιλόλογος, are frequent synonyms in the Herculeaneum texts. In general, cf. M. Erler, "*Philologia medicans*: Wie die Epikureer die Texte ihres Meisters lasen," in W. Kullmann and J. Althoff (eds.), *Vermittlung und Tradierung von Wissen in der griechischen Kultur* (Tübingen 1993) 281–303.

2. Useful discussions of early and Hellenistic epigrams are: H. Beckby, *Anthologia Graeca*, 2d ed. (Munich 1967) 12–67; Alan Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford 1993) ch. 1; E. Degani, "L'epigramma," in F. Adorno et al. (eds.), *La cultura ellenistica* (Milan 1977) 266–299; id., "L'epigramma," in G. Cambiano et al. (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* 1.2 (Rome 1993) 197–233; *L'Épigramme grecque* = *EH* 14 (1968); P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972) 1.553–617; G. O. Hutchinson, *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford 1988) 20–24, 72–76, 264–276; A. Lesky, *Hist. Gk. Lit.* (New York 1966) 737–743; R. Reitzenstein, *Epigramm und Skolion* (Giessen 1893); id. "Epigramm," *RE* 6 (1907) 71–111; K. Gutzwiller, *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context* (Berkeley 1997). More specialized studies will be found in the bibliography.

3. The word ἐπίγραμμα first appears in our texts in Thuc. 6.59.3 (= Simon. 26(a) FGE), used of a four-line grave inscription in elegiac couplets. But even as late as Herodas an identifying mark on a forehead can be called an ἐπίγραμμα (5.79). And cf. Hesych. ἐπιγράμματα: αἱ ἐπιγραφαί. P. A. Hansen, "DAA 374–375 and the early elegiac epigram," *Glotta* 56 (1978) 195–201, dates the beginning of the popularity of elegiac inscriptions to ca. 560 B.C. Cf. M. B. Wallace, "The metres of early Greek epigrams," in D. E. Gerber (ed.), *Greek Poetry and Philosophy: Studies . . . L. Woodbury* (Chico 1984) 303–317; H. Hommel, "Der Ursprung des Epigramms," *RM* 88 (1939) 193–206.

4. Only Aelian, *VH* 1.17 uses the phrase διστιχον ἐλεγείων; elsewhere the one word ἐλεγείων can have this meaning; cf. e.g., Kritias 88 B 4.3 DK, Arist. *Poet.* 1447b12, K. J. Dover, "The poetry of Archilochus," *EH* 10 (1964) 187 f. For Latin, note Hor. *AP* 75 *versibus impariter iunctis* and Ovid's more elaborate periphrases, *Am.* 2.17.21 f., *AA* 1.264, *Pont.* 4.16.11, 36, *Trist.* 2.220. The word ἐλεγείων in the singular can also mean (i) the pentameter line alone; e.g., Arist. *Quint.* 1.24; or (ii) an elegiac poem of more than one distich: Ion of Samos (1 D) = Hansen CEG 2.819.9–13. In the plural, ἐλεγεία can mean hexameters: CEG 2.888.19, [Hdt.] *V.Hom.* 36.

5. CEG 1 (ca. 475 poems) contains only two 10 vv. or longer; CEG 2 (ca. 600 poems) contains eight. Note the view of J. W. Day, "Rituals in stone: Early Greek grave epigrams and monuments," *JHS* 109 (1989) 16–28, that the poetry of epigrams was originally recited at the grave site. This dissolves somewhat the barrier set up above between epigraphic texts and elegies, but the general point remains valid.

man⁶ speaking in his own voice (however artfully fashioned), whereas early epigram was anonymous, avoiding all reference to author.⁷ The Greeks themselves, however, did not always maintain so nice a distinction: Lykourgos 142, e.g., refers to sepulchral inscriptions as τὰ ἐλεγεία τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα; and [Dem.] 59.98 says τὰ ἐλεγεία ἐπιγράψαι of a single distich.⁸ Any poem comprising one or more elegiac couplets could thus be summed up as ἐλεγεία (neut. pl.). Usage, however, reserved the term ἐλεγεία (fem. sg.) (first in Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 5.2) for the poems of Solon, Mimnermos, Xenophanes, Tyrtaios, et al. By the beginning of the Hellenistic period, lengthy (say, longer than twenty-line) elegies continue to be written, and the term continues to be used with the same latitude as in the classical period.⁹

Once epigrams were liberated from their stone prisons, however, they were also free to increase in size; and as they took on new topoi (*in primis* erotic and sympotic), hitherto within the province of elegy (and skolion), whatever line there was between elegy and epigram should now be regarded as either nonexistent or insignificant.¹⁰ But having won the freedom to extend the epigram, Meleager, Kallimachos, and others, observing the general Hellenistic love of brevity, soon voluntarily imposed

6. "Kleoboulina" and Sappho are the only names of early female elegists to have come down to us (cf. West *IEG* 2 for the evidence), but Theogn. 579–582 and 861–864 are written either by one or two women (so M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* [Berlin 1974] 156, 160) or by a man taking a female voice (so Bowie [below, n. 7] 16). And who, man or woman, wrote Theogn. 257–260, spoken in the persona of a mare? See van Groningen *ad loc.* for suggested answers. Moiro (iv–iii cent.) also wrote elegies: fr. 2–3, 6 Powell.

7. There are, e.g., no *sphragides* in early inscriptional epigram. On elegy, cf. West, *Studies* (above, n. 6) 1–21; E. L. Bowie, "Early Greek elegy, symposium, and public festival," *JHS* 106 (1986) 13–35. West 10–13 lists and discusses the various occasions where elegies were typically presented (but see Bowie 15–21). On the several nonauthorial voices of early epigrams, cf. J. Svenbro, *Phrasikleia* (Paris 1988; Eng. tr. Ithaca 1993), ch. 2. Note that Simon. *Elegy* 25 W² (6 vv.) and Soph. *Elegy* 4 W² (4 vv.) are treated as elegies solely because they are personal poems delivered by pre-Alexandrian authors; if the same stories embodying these poems were told of Hellenistic authors, they would without question be classified as epigrams.

8. Cf. B. Gentili, "Epigramma ed elegia," *L'Épigramme grecque* (above, n. 2) 37–90, esp. 40 f.; West, *Studies* (above, n. 6) 3 f.; C. M. J. Sicking, *Griechische Verslehre* (Munich 1993) 83–86.

9. Parthenios, e.g., credited with elegies by the *Souda* (= SH 605) wrote longer poems and no short "epigrams." On the other hand, Macrobius 5.20.8 (= SH 100) says that an epigram of Aratos comes from his *liber elegion*, i.e., ἐλεγείων (*AP* 11.437 = 2 HE). W. Ludwig, "Aratos," *RE Suppl.* 10 (1965) 29 f., says that Macrobius confuses epigram with elegy, but his usage is consistent with classical authors; see above, n. 8. Similarly, Stephanos Byz. 171.3 Meineke (= SH 667) calls Phaidimos, whose epigrams appeared in Meleager's *Garland*, an elegist. For the view expressed above on the nature of early elegy and epigram, cf. Day (above, n. 5) and A. E. Raubitschek, "Das Denkmal-Epigramm," *L'Épigramme grecque* (above, n. 2) 1–36.

10. For this view, here argued briefly and schematically, see Gentili (above, n. 8) and G. Giangrande, "Sympotic literature and epigram," *L'Épigramme grecque* (above, n. 2) 37–90, 91–177, both of whom demonstrate several points of contact between early epigram and elegy. Some scholars, none the less, attempt to maintain a division between the two. For example, Fraser (above, n. 2) 1.668, on the basis of subject matter, classifies P. Petric II 49(a) = SH 961, at least 26 lines long, as an epigram, which Gow-Page, HE 2.483 expressly and curtly deny. Other works variously classified as either elegy or epigram: Kallim. *Epigr.* 54 HE (*AP* 7.89; 16 vv., said to come from an elegy by Diog. Laert. 1.79). Asklepiades 16 HE (*AP* 12.50), Leonidas 85 HE (*AP* 10.1); cf. Lesky (above, n. 2) 738. See also P. Kägi, *Nachwirkung der älteren griechischen Elegie in den Epigrammen der Anthologie* (Zürich 1917).

upper limits. Meleager is most influential in this regard in that he seems to have shown a marked preference for the shorter epigrams when assembling his *Garland*. The next generation of epigrammatists, although not of course limited to Meleager for their knowledge of the genre, could not help but be influenced by his choices in their own compositions. Indeed, Philip's term for epigrams in his introduction is ὀλιγοστιχίη (Philip 1 = *AP* 4.2.6). Note, too, Parmenion 11 GP (*AP* 9.342.1 f.) φημί πολυστιχίην ἐπιγράμματος οὐ κατὰ Μούσας εἶναι.¹¹ In HE there are only twenty-one poems longer than 10 lines, only six longer than 14; in GP only Philip's introductory epigram to his collection is longer than 10 lines (14, with which contrast the 58 lines of Meleager's prologue). This marked disparity between the *Garlands* not only shows the influence which Meleager's preference for shorter epigrams had on his successors, it also proves that the Byzantine editor Kephala was not the one responsible for the rarity of longer epigrams in the Anthology.

This, then, is what Philodemos inherited: the short poem in elegiac couplets, whose subject matter comprised the *topoi* of earlier epigraphic exemplars and those of the longer elegies. Philodemos also adopted the early Hellenistic taste, not of course limited to epigrams, for point or wit, which would be all the more appreciated if it could be reserved for the poem's last word.¹²

Hellenistic epigram is also comparable to classical sympotic elegy, not only in content, as Giangrande has amply shown, but also of performance (cf. West 11 f.). Epigrams were a regular accompaniment to dinner parties, although it may be doubted whether they, like elegies, were sung to the flutes and harps Philodemos and other epigrammatists mention; see esp. Phil. *Epigram* 6, West 13 f. Especially noteworthy is the apparently improvisatory nature of elegy and epigram. For elegy, note Athen. 125a–c Συμωνίδης . . . ἀπεσχεδίασε τὸδε τὸ ἐπιγράμμα (Sim. 25 W²); similarly, Athen. 656c (Sim. 26). *Ad libitum* compositions, furthermore, are implicit in the nature of the common practice in symposia for poetic challenges to pass around the company.¹³ In the Hellenistic age, we hear of Antipater of Sidon's

This problem of classification is by no means limited to the Hellenistic age; note West's classification "Incertum an ex epigrammatis" in his Simonides section of *IEG*, one poem of which was moved into elegy in West's second edition on the basis of its now appearing in a papyrus of Simonides' elegies (P.Oxy. 3965 fr.5 = 16 W²). Later librarians, as demonstrated by the *Souda* article on Simonides, distinguished between his elegies and epigrams. Epigrams could now be as long as the author wished. Most notably (and admittedly exceptionally), Meleager's introduction to his collection is 58 lines long. One of the new Posidippos epigrams, not yet published, is 14 lines long, another is 12; cf. G. Bastianini and C. Gallazzi, "Il poeta ritrovato," *Riv. "Ca' de Sass,"* n.121, March 1993; Cameron (above, n. 2) 400.

11. Later expressions of this motif: *AP* 6.327.2 (Leonidas Alex. 6 FGE) and 9.369 (Kyrillos). Cf. Cameron (above, n. 2) 13.

12. Hutchinson (above, n. 2) 21; G. Luck, "Witz und Sentiment im griechischen Epigramm," *L'Épigramme grecque* (above n. 2) 387–411. Much of G. Giangrande's work on the Greek epigram has been dedicated to elucidating the peculiarly Hellenistic point at the close; i.e., the end, often the last word alone, not only provides a neat closure but also may cast what has preceded in a new light.

13. Cf. West (above, n. 6) 16 f., Gentili (above, n. 8) 40–43. Skolia, in contrast, were to be taken up only by the best of the company, and were not responsatory by the company at large; Hesych. s.v. σκόλια, discussed by Reitzenstein (above, n. 2) 3 ff.

improvisatory ability;¹⁴ and of Archias, Philodemos' contemporary and fellow Greek sojourner in Italy, Cicero tells us that he would improvise on an event of that day, after which, acting like a one-man company of skoliasts, he would produce yet another epigram on the same event.¹⁵ Many of Philodemos' epigrams are designed to give the appearance of having been composed in just such surroundings. Even the erotic ones, ostensibly addressed in private to one woman, could well have been composed for a larger, komiastic or sympotic, company. But it is a fool's game to try to create the circumstances of composition for each poem, for as Cicero indicates (see last note), the published poems, even if some began as *ad lib* extemporizations, would be polished before publication to the best of Philodemos' ability.¹⁶ And publish them he certainly did, again following his immediate predecessors such as Poseidippos, Kallimachos, and Theokritos (cf. Fraser 1.607 f.), although there is nothing known of the circumstances of publication. Cicero, it is clear, as well as the several Latin poets who imitated Philodemos, had access to some sort of collection, perhaps copies made for limited circulation, although Cicero attests to their popularity, presumably in Rome.¹⁷ Philip and the compiler of the Oxyrhynchus incipits (see below, pp. 53, 203 f. for text and commentary) may well have had available a comprehensive volume designed for the book market.

But if the details of publication can never be recovered, it is still possible to infer that Philodemos was ashamed neither of having written poetry in general nor of having limited himself to epigrams in particular.¹⁸ How does the epigram fit into Philodemos' overall scheme of poetry? We can begin to answer this question by noting that at least once in his theoretical writings, whose examples for the most part are drawn from epic, lyric, and drama, he found the opportunity to make mention of "writers of epigrams."

37 [εἰ δ' ἐ]||φη [τ]ις ἀρ[ετῆ]ν εἶναι ποιητοῦ τὸ δύ[ν]ασθαι πάν[τ]η ποιή[μ]α σ[υ]νθεῖν[αι] καλῶς, | [τὰ ζ]ητοῦμ[εν] <ἀν> ἄ|νθρωπο|λογεῖτο. τ[ῆ] γὰρ δυνάμει | ζητοῦμεν, ἐπειδὴν

14. Cicero, *De Or.* 3.194: *Quod si Antipater ille Sidonius, quem tu probe, Catule, meministi, solitus est versus hexametros aliosque variis modis atque numeris fundere ex tempore, tantumque hominis ingeniosi ac memoris valuit exercitatio ut cum se mente ac voluntate coniecisset in versum verba sequerentur, quanto id facilius in oratione exercitatione et consuetudine adhibita consequemur.*

15. Cic. *Pro Arch.* 8.18 *quotiens ego hunc vidi, cum litteram scripsisset nullam, magnum numerum optimorum versuum de iis ipsis rebus, quae tum agerentur, dicere ex tempore! quotiens revocatum eandem rem dicere commutatis verbis atque sententiis!* It is worth pointing out that Cicero immediately goes on to distinguish Archias' extemporaneous verse from his more polished published work: *Quae vero accurate cogitateque scripsisset, ea sic vidi probari, ut ad veterum scriptorum laudem perveniret.* Epigrams, that is, were encountered either as dinnertime divertimenti, or in published form.

16. Even *Epigram 22*, which Philodemos presents in intentionally unpolished form; see below.

17. *In Pis.* 71 (= **T 2**) *multa a multis et lecta et audita.*

18. There is at any rate no indication that Philodemos wrote poems in any other genre than the epigram. Not everybody was so restrained: An incomplete list of Hellenistic poets who composed epigrams in addition to other genres includes Kallimachos, Theokritos, Apollonios Rhodios, Meleager, Rhianos, Asklepiades, Hedylos, Diotimos of Adramyttium, Anyte.

τίς | ὁ σπουδαῖός ἐστιν ποιη¹⁰τή[ς] ἐξετάζομεν, ὅπως | τὰ [π]οιήματα συντιθείς | καλῶς
 συντίθησιν, ὁ δὲ | τὸν καλῶς φησιν. εἰ δὲ | καὶ τὸ πᾶν γένος ποιή¹⁵ματος ἀξιοῖ [[καλῶς]],
 παντελῶς ἀγέννητον καταλεί[π]ει τὴν ἀρετὴν—οὐθεις | γὰρ ἐδυνήθη πᾶμ ποιῆσαι |
 καλῶς—ὡς δ' ἐγὼ πείθο²⁰μαι, καὶ ἀδύνατον—οὐδὲ | γὰρ δύναται ἄν. ἄλλως | μὲν τοῦτ'
 οὐδ' ἐν μοναχῷ | γένει διωμάλικέν τις | ποιητής. εἰ δὲ τὸ δύνασθαι²⁵ συ[ν]θεῖναι
 ποιῆσιν | ἀρετὴν ἔχουσα[ν], ἤττομ | μὲν ἀτόπως, ἀ[λ]λὰ προλιγνώσκων ἡμᾶς δεῖσαι
 38 [τί ἐστιν] ἀρετὴ ποιή³⁰σεως, ἧς θεωρηθείσης | φανερός [ὁ ταύ]την ποι[ο]ῦν ὅτι
 σπ[ουδα]ῖος, καὶ τελείου ποιητοῦ φή[σα]ι[μ]ε[ν] ἂν ταύτην ἀρετὴν [οὐ] || κοιν[ῶς]
 ἀρετ[ῆς] ἐν[ο]ύσης | ---]ως τοὺς ο[ὕ]τως πεποι[η]κότας ἀγνοεῖσθαι δε[ε]ή[σ]ει κατὰ
 τὸν λό[γ]ον εἰ [τ]ὴν | ἀρετὴν εἶχο[ν] τὴν [τοῦ ποιη]τοῦ. κοινῶ[ς] δὲ τῆς ποιη[σ]εως
 ὑπακουομένης, ὡς | καὶ τῶν ἐπιγραμματ[ο]ῖ¹⁰ποιῶν καὶ Σαφφούς, ἐ[κ]είνο[ς] ταύ[τ]ὸν
 ἐρεῖ τῷ ποιητῇ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τὸν | ποιημάτων κα[λ]ῶν συνθέτην, ὁ καὶ “πρὶν Θεογνιν
 |¹⁵ γεγονέναι” κατεῖχομεν.¹⁹

6 <ἄν> Hammerstaedt, quod si cum Gigante scriptum putes fit versus longior 17–21 οὐθεις
 γάρ—δύναται ἄν interpunxit Hammerstaedt 29 τί ἐστιν Gigante: τίς ἐστιν Jensen: τίς ποτ'
 Mangoni 34–1 οὐ κοινῶς ἀρετῆς Pace 1 ἐνούσης Dyck

But if someone said that the virtue of a poet is to be able to compose every poem <i.e., every poem he does compose, whether in only one genre or in many> beautifully, there would be agreement as to what we are seeking. For when we investigate who is an excellent poet, we in effect judge how he composes beautifully the poems he composes; but he [sc. Philodemos' opponent] says <simply> that it is the one “who composes beautifully” <who is the excellent poet>.

But if he further postulates <that it is a poet who composes> every genre of poem <beautifully>, he abandons virtue <of a poem> to be not only unrealized—for nobody has been able to compose every poem beautifully—but (as I think) also impossible—for no one could <compose every poem beautifully>. Besides, not even in a single genre has any poet maintained an even level.

But if <someone says that the excellence of a poet is> to be able to compose poetry containing <poetic> excellence, it would be less strange;

19. Phil. *Poem. 5 coll.* 37.2–38.15 Mangoni. For the text (and for a more complete apparatus) see now C. Mangoni, *Filodemo: Il quinto libro della Poetica*, La Scuola di Epicuro 14 (Naples 1993), which supersedes Jensen's (column numbers to Book 5 given below are those of Mangoni, which are three higher than Jensen's); M. Gigante, “Filodemo e l'epigramma,” *CErc* 22 (1992) 5–8. Note: (i) Philodemos' term for a writer of epigrams also occurs in D.L. 6.14 (etc.), IG 9² (1).17A24 (iii B.C.; used of Poseidippos), Eustathios on *Il.* 1.439.28 (etc.), *V.Hom. Plut.* 84. (Other terms are ἐπιγραμματιστής, found only as *epigrammatista* in Apollinaris Sidonius, and ἐπιγραμματογράφος.) (ii) The Theognis referred to is probably the elegist, who was known for his commonplaces, but Gigante 7 f. argues for Theognis of Athens, a minor tragedian (TrGF I 28).

For comments on the text and translation I am grateful to Elizabeth Asmis, Andrew Dyck, Marcello Gigante, Sander Goldberg, Jürgen Hammerstaedt, Nicola Pace, and Michael Wigodsky. In the translation which follows, angle brackets contain words which fill out the thought of Philodemos' typically compressed Greek.

but first we will have to know what the excellence of poetry is, and when this excellence has been realized, it will be obvious that the one composing it is excellent, and we might say that this is the excellence of a perfect poet, although excellence is not generally <i.e., uniformly> present. . . . It will necessarily be the case, according to this theory, that we fail to recognize whether those who have written thus <i.e., beautiful poetry> possessed the virtue of a poet. If “poetry” belongs equally to the epigrammatists and to Sappho, that man will be saying that to be the composer of beautiful poems is the same as to be a good poet—which we knew well “since before Theognis was born.”

This appears shortly before the end of Book 5, and hence close to the end of the entire work.²⁰ Philodemus’ immediate point is that ποίησις, poetry, which must be complete—as opposed to a ποίημα, which can be a portion of a ποίησις (col. 14.26–36)—can be instantiated by a short work such as a composition of Sappho or an epigram.²¹ But if Philodemus had not specifically mentioned the epigram in all the preceding five books,²² his purpose in doing so now might be to inform his readers where, according to the theories presented, the epigram, the particular genre produced by the author of the work they are reading, belongs in the grand scheme of all poetry. Thus, even without a review of the entirety of *On Poems*,²³ it can be seen that a more personal, less theoretical, analysis of this passage is possible.

Although Philodemus mentions Sappho only two other times in the extant papyri,²⁴ her name here likely stands for the very best of poets, just as it does in *Epigram 12*, where Flora is excused for being unable to sing Sappho’s lyrics. The pair of epigrammatists and Sappho, therefore, not only exemplifies short poetry, it

20. This may be inferred from Philodemus’ words as he begins the final section of Book 5: ἦδη [με]μῆκυσμένον τὸ σύγγραμμα καταπαύσομεν (col. 29.21–23). Cf. R. Janko, “Reconstructing Philodemus’ *On Poems*,” in D. Obbink (ed.), *Philodemus and Poetry* (New York, Oxford 1995) 185f., who allows for a very small possibility that there were more than five books.

21. For Philodemus’ use of ποίησις and ποίημα in *On Poems*, see Asmis on Neoptolemos of Parion (below, n. 23), esp. 210 f. The fragments of Neoptolemos have been collected by H. J. Mette, “Neoptolemos von Parion,” *RM* 123 (1980) 1–24.

22. Since Neoptolemos wrote both epigrams (collected in Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*) and a work *Περὶ Ἐπιγραμμάτων* (fr. 7 Mette = Athen. 10.81), Philodemus may have responded directly to his views on this genre earlier.

23. For an overview of the papyri which can with some degree of certainty be assigned to *On Poems*, cf. F. Sbordone, *Sui papiri della Poetica di Filodemo* (Naples 1983) 7–43; R. Janko (above, n. 20). Also useful are E. Asmis, “Philodemus’ Epicureanism,” *ANRW* 2.36.4 (1990) 2403–2406; and M. Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy*, trans. D. Obbink (Ann Arbor 1995) 36–38. For more detailed studies of Book 5, cf. Mangoni’s introduction and the important series of articles by Asmis: “The poetic theory of the Stoic ‘Aristo’,” *Apeiron* 23 (1990) 147–201; “Crates on poetic criticism,” *Phoenix* 46 (1992) 138–169; “Neoptolemos and the classification of poetry,” *CP* 87 (1992) 206–231; “An Epicurean survey of poetic theories (Philodemus *On Poems* 5, cols. 26–36); *CQ*, n.s. 42 (1992) 395–415.

24. Once only to quote a short passage (*De Piet.* p. 42 Gomperz = Incert. Auctor 23 Voigt), the second time to state Σαπφὸ τίνα ἰαμβικῶς ποιεῖ (*De Poematis* Tr.B fr. 20 col. i S.10–11).

also, I suspect, can be taken to span the qualitative limits within this range: Sappho, one of the greatest of lyric poets at one end; the ad-hoc ad-libitum epigram at the other. Philodemos' argument that ποίησις encompasses Homeric epic (as he says in *On Poems* 5 col. 14.31–33) as well as the shorter poems of Sappho thus carries epigram along in its wake. Since he describes ποίησις as a poem with a continuously woven theme and meaning—that is, a complete composition—he clearly implies that even a two- or four-line epigram can qualify as ποίησις;²⁵ and that all, or almost all, that he says about poetry in general applies to the epigram in particular.

Poetry, for example, as he says more than once, insofar as it is poetry, does not benefit its readers.²⁶ It is not that a poem cannot contain useful facts or a valid argument; only that these function entirely apart from any poetic virtue contained therein. “No one derives a benefit through either medicine or wisdom or many other kinds of knowledge by attaining the extreme together with poetic elaboration” (col. 4.24–31, tr. Asmis). With “extreme,” understand “of poetic virtue” (Asmis hesitantly suggests “of utility”). The emphasis is on “with.” A poem, however, may be a good one even if the poet is wrong on the facts or if his argument or morality is questionable. Cf. col. 5.6–18 “If there is a narration without benefit, nothing prevents a poet from knowing these things and presenting them poetically without benefiting us at all. He [sc. Philodemos' opponent of the moment], though, oddly burdens the good poet with exact knowledge of (all) the dialects, although the choices he (the poet) makes are quite acceptable.” And for an expression of the belief that bad men can produce good literature, cf. *Rhet.* col. 21.12–15 (2.226 Sudhaus) ὄγ[τ]ες πονηροί, τ[ε]χνίται | [δὲ] ὁμῶς οὐ κωλύονται | δ[ιαφορ]ώτατοι π[ά]ν[τ]ων | ὑπ[άρχ]ειν.²⁷

But if Philodemos absolves the poet of the need to instruct us, he is equally sure that no good poem can be free of *some* thought or ideas. His chief opponent here is Krates of Mallos, whose ideas on the primacy of euphony Philodemos finds largely objectionable. The excellence of a poem, therefore, lies in its artistic merging of thought (which need be neither true nor beneficial) and the standard elements of poetry, i.e., composition, diction, and (to a lesser extent) euphony. But if a poem does not benefit, neither does it harm; rather, its diction—or as we might say now, its persona—represents that of a person who is neither immoral nor a wise

25. Which is implicitly denied, e.g., by Varro, *Menipp.* fr. 398 *B poema est lexis enrythmos, id est verba plura modice in quandam coniecta formam. itaque etiam distichon epigrammation vocant poema. poesis est perpetuum argumentum ex rhythmis, ut Ilias Homeri et Annalis Enni.* Cf. H. Dahmann, *Varros Schrift “de poematis” und die hellenistisch-römische Poetik.* Ak. d. Wiss. u.d. Lit. Mainz: Abh. d. geistes- u. sozialwiss. Kl. (1953.3) 26, 29 f., 34 ff.; G. B. Walsh, “Philodemos on the terminology of Neoptolemus,” *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser. 40 (1987) 56–68, esp. 65 ff.; Asmis, “Survey” (above, n. 23) 413 f.

26. *On Poems* 5. col. 4. 10–31, 25.30–34, 32.17–19; cf. E. Asmis “Philodemos' poetic theory and *On the Good King according to Homer*,” *CA* 10 (1991) 4–13.

27. The immediate application of this statement is to rhetors, but G. M. A. Grube, *The Greek and Roman Critics* (Toronto 1965) 200, argues that it applies to poets as well. Cf. *Poems* 5 col.17.32–18.7, where Philodemos criticizes a Stoic (Ariston?) for crediting Homer and Archilochos (or Aischylos?) with only modified poetic excellence on the grounds that their thought and educational values are improper.

man: "Poetical goals have been established: For diction, to imitate diction which teaches us something beneficial in addition (to itself); for thought, to take a middle ground between that of the wise and that of the vulgar" (col. 26.1–8).²⁸

In addition to the above considerations in the proper assessment of poetry, another important criterion requires that hearing or reading the poem in question provide its audience with pleasure of a correct Epicurean sort.²⁹ In brief, as Asmis ably demonstrates,³⁰ Epicurus, despite what later detractors said of him, was willing to accept poetry, although with reservations. In particular, the wise man could be trusted to have the proper attitude, able to listen to the recitation of poetry without succumbing to its Sirenian charms or accepting its claims to do anything more than provide harmless pleasure. Poetry, that is, can be classified in Epicurean terms as a natural but unnecessary pleasure. As such it was allowed a place at the banquets attended by Epicureans, where, at least originally, it was listened to but not subjected to immediate literary criticism, which would detract from the pleasure.³¹

Presumably, almost any poetry could be recited at these banquets, but, in keeping with Epicurus' dictum that the wise man will not exercise himself overmuch with the composition of poetry, original compositions would have at least to give the appearance of not having required any effort. Epigrams meet this requirement as no other genre (see above, pp. 27 f.). It is thus possible to apply Philodemus' general view of poetry to the epigram in particular, as the performance of epigrams at dinner parties (see above) fits perfectly into our picture of the symposia held in the Epicurean Gardens of Naples and surroundings.³²

II

Having gone from poetry in general to epigrams in particular, we must now focus even further on Philodemus' own epigrams and ask whether they illustrate his views

28. Cf. Asmis, "Crates on poetic criticism" (above, n. 23); ead., "*Good King*" (above, n. 26) 8–11, esp. 10, "Philodemus's response to Plato is, in turn, indebted to Aristotle, who proposed that tragic characters should be neither outstandingly good (ἐπιεικεῖς) nor bad, but intermediate (μεταξύ). Like Aristotle, Philodemus demands ordinary human values. Differently from Aristotle, however, Philodemus clearly distinguishes the "thought" of the poem as a whole, as presented by the poet, from the thought of the characters."

29. For accounts of Epicurean pleasure, cf. J. Rist, *Epicurus: An Introduction* (Cambridge 1972) 100–126; P. Mitsis, *Epicurus' Ethical Theory* (Ithaca 1988) 11–58.

30. E. Asmis, "Epicurean poetics," *BACAP* 7 (1991) 63–93, with my response, *ibid.* 94–105; both reprinted in Obbink (above, n. 20) 15–34, 35–41. For the pleasures of poetry in particular, cf. Asmis, "*Good King*" (above, n. 26) 13–17. See further my "The Epicurean philosopher as Hellenistic poet," in Obbink 42–57; M. Wigodsky, "The alleged impossibility of philosophical poetry," *ibid.* 58–68.

31. Cf. Asmis, "Epicurean poetics" (above, n. 30).

32. Cf. Asmis, "*Good King*" (above, n. 26) 15 on the intellectual pleasures to be derived from listening to poems recited at parties; A. Cameron, *Callimachus and His Critics* (Princeton 1995), ch. 3, "The symposium."

in any special way. Let us begin by simply categorizing more or less as the Anthology does the 36 epigrams I consider genuinely or possibly Philodemean.³³ In my numeration they are:

Erotica: By far the largest category, totaling 21 or 22 poems, most coming from *AP* 5:³⁴ 1–2, 4–26, 36, plus 8 (Book 10), 4, 6, 19 (Book 11), 11 and 24 (both from Book 12). Gow-Page, by omitting the last distich, convert 3 into a love poem; see the commentary. The erotica, exclusively heterosexual, admit of several subgroupings (with some overlapping):

- (i) *Dark-but-comely*: 9, 12, 16, 17; cf. Π ii.27; cf. the commentary to 17.
- (ii) *Street encounters*: 20, 21
- (iii) *Female narrator*: 26, 36
- (iv) *Adulterous love*: 15, 25, 26
- (v) *Impotence*: 19, 25
- (vi) *Marriage/wife*: 4–8. These form part of an extended cycle of poems addressed to or concerning Xanthippe; see below.

Other books of the Anthology contain fewer Philodemian entries.

Dedicatory: 34, 35

Sepulchral: 33

Epidictic: 3, 29

Protreptic: 32. Poems with imperatives usually are assigned here.

Sympotic: 27, 28

Scoptic: 31

Since the early epigrammatists did not write with all these precise terms in mind, it is not surprising that some epigrams fit uncomfortably into the Anthology's schema, even were it to be correctly applied throughout. In Philodemos' case, five epigrams not only resist standard classification, they readily form their own little group: *AP* 5.112 (5) speaks of love only to turn away from it with a new desire for

33. More will be said on the arrangement of the epigrams below, p. 54. For now it will be enough merely to outline those books of the Greek Anthology containing classical and Hellenistic epigrams: 4. The proems to the various Garlands; 5.* *Erotica*; 6.* *Anathematica* (dedicatory); 7.* *Sepulchral*; 9.* *Epidictic* (Declamatory); 10.* *Protreptic*; 11.* *Sympotic* and satiric (scoptic); 12.* *Erotica*, largely homosexual; 13. In various meters (sc. other than elegiac pentameters); 15. Miscellaneous; 16.* Epigrams from Planudes missing from the Palatine Anthology. (* = containing epigrams of Philodemos) There are of course other ordering schemes, both ancient and modern; cf., e.g., G. Pfohl, "Die epigrammatische Poesie der Griechen: Entwurf eines Systems der Ordnung," *Helikon* 7 (1967) 272–280, who discusses the various ways one can classify inscriptional epigrams. P.Mil. Vogl. inv. 1295, the unpublished Poseidippos papyrus, illustrates ancient arrangements of epigrams; cf. Cameron (above, n. 2) 19, 400.

34. Depending on whether *Epigram* 24 is erotic or not. Note also that this poem is probably not homosexual; and that *AP* 12.173 (*Epigram* 11), also gathered with Strato's *Musa Puerilis*, is certainly heterosexual, as are all the rest of Philodemos' erotica. See on Π vi.18.

mature thought. 9.412 (29) and 9.570 (3), “epideictic” only by default, present the case for avoiding excessive grief at, respectively, the death of friends and the thought of one’s own death. Had they done so less obliquely, they might have shown up among the protreptica. 11.34 (6) employs two contrasting symposia as metaphors for contrasting ways of life. 11.41 (4), in obvious parallel with 5 and 6, seeks a new *modus vivendi*.

The affinities of this group are clear, even if a name for it is lacking. Each presents a narrator or main speaker, whom it is easy to see as a mask for Philodemus, wrestling, sometimes successfully sometimes not, with the excessive passions of love and the fear of death. I say “Philodemus” because of the evidence adduced below and in the commentary that the Xanthippe of the poems is to be understood as the partner, if not wife, of an Epicurean philosopher who can in turn be thought of, as it seems Philodemus was, as “Sokrates” or “Sokration.” Furthermore, even though epigrammatists often write with no particular person as narrator or even with someone clearly not the author as narrator (note especially Philodemus’ two epigrams with female narrators), I believe that unless the author warns the audience, especially his original listening audience, to look elsewhere, he is willing to accept being thought of as narrator. Since, however, the “Philodemus” of the epigrams is designed to overlap only partially with the authorial persona implicit in the prose treatises, we are not meant automatically to read the epigrams as straightforward autobiography. Indeed, this disjunction between personae seems rather to warn us off from regarding the epigrams as factual documents. Even though we, unlike the original audience, are ignorant of Philodemus’ real age, erotic/marital entanglements, and success or failure in adhering to Epicurean standards of behavior, we can still detect the rift between the serious promoter of Epicurean doctrine in the prose and the intentionally somewhat comic character of the poetry who needs frank instruction from another. Poems like this are also more amusing—not an inconsiderable point in Hellenistic epigram—when read this way.

Since in the poems listed above, the proper course proposed, however obliquely, is one espoused by Philodemus in his prose treatises, we may be permitted to refer to them as Epicurean poems, as long as we recognize, in line with what was said above, that thought is just one element in Philodemus’ idea of the successful poem. This group, once formed, can attract others epigrams which, although not inappropriately placed by the Anthology, display the same affinities.³⁵

The first step in this expansion is to include all the poems mentioning Xanthippe by name (or by her nicknames Xantharion, Xantho, and Xanthion), since she figures in two of the philosophical group (3 and 4). This adds 1, 2, 7, and Π iv.1. Although some Hellenistic epigrammatists use a woman’s name merely as a filler, not bothering to endow her with an enduring or recognizable personality from poem to poem (e.g., Meleager’s Heliadora), this is not true of Philodemus’ Xanthippe. To begin with, she is at least twice associated with the theme of marriage, although not unambiguously so: first in 7 (see the commentary for a defense of the reading

35. For what follows, cf. my “Love poetry of Philodemus,” *AJP* 108 (1987) 310–324.

ἄκοιτις) and again in 4, where, as I detail in the commentary, marriage best explains the narrator's goal.³⁶

The question "Why marriage?" arises immediately. One does not, after all, expect to find a wife as the object of attention in an erotic poem. As Philodemos himself says, employing the more usual pose, the unattainable, or at any rate the unattained, is more desirable than that which is near at hand (11). A more particular objection would raise the issue of Epicurus' strictures against the wise man's marrying,³⁷ but as both Chilton and Grilli agree, Epicurus does allow his followers to marry, although only in exceptional circumstances. This view is in line with the several other less than absolute strictures of Epicurus listed by Diogenes, including the general prohibition against writing poetry.³⁸

What these exceptional circumstances are neither Epicurus nor our sources spell out, but we may imagine that much would depend on the character of the woman. Since, moreover, women were welcome into the Garden for their intellectual abilities, these fellow Epicureans would seem to be obvious candidates for wives.³⁹ Since, furthermore, women were appreciated for their bodies as well as their

36. *Contra*, M. Gigante, "Filodemo tra poesia e prosa (A proposito di *P. Oxy.* 3724)," *SIFC* 7 (1989) 130.

37. Diog. Laert. 10.119 καὶ μὴν [codd., μηδὲ Gassendi] καὶ γαμήσειν καὶ τεκνοποιήσειν τὸν σοφὸν ὡς Ἐπίκουρος ἐν ταῖς Διαπορίαις καὶ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Φύσεως κατὰ περίστασιν δέ ποτε βίου γαμήσειν. Other sources state that according to Epicurus the wise man will not marry: Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 2.23.138, Epiktetos (Arrian *Epic. Disc.* 3.7.19), Theodoret. 12.74. Cf. further C. W. Chilton, "Did Epicurus approve of marriage? A study of Diogenes Laertius 10.119," *Phronesis* 5 (1960) 71–74, who defends Gassendi's conjecture. *Contra*, A. Grilli, "Epicuro e il matrimonio (D. L. 10.119)," *RSF* 26 (1971) 51–56, who ably defends the MSS; cf. Seneca fr. 45 Haase *raro dicit* [sc. Epicurus] *sapienti ineunda conugia*. Cf. further B. Frischer, *The Sculpted Word* (Berkeley 1982) 61–63, on marriages within the Garden and the favorable Epicurean attitude toward women in general; M. Gigante (ed.), *Diogene Laerzio: Vita dei filosofi* (Bari 1987) ad loc. See also M. Nussbaum, "Beyond obsession and disgust: Lucretius' genealogy of love," *Apeiron* 22 (1989) 1–59, who demonstrates the high value placed on marriage by Lucretius. See now T. Brennan, "Epicurus on sex, marriage, and children," *CP* 91 (1996) 346–352, esp. 348–350.

38. On Epicurus' prohibitions, cf. my response to Asmis (above, n.30). Note that in the *Ethica Epicurea*, P.Herc. 1251 col. 15.4–14 (ed. Schmid), marriage (among other things), although of little importance for the most important matters of life, can contribute to men's external goods: χρῆ [δὲ] κ[α]τέχειν καὶ δι[ό]τι σ[υ]μβ[ά]λλεται μὲν εἰς τὸ κ[α]τ[α]τυγχ[ά]ν[ε]ιν καὶ τὸ περ[ὶ] τ[ῶ]ν κατὰ μ[έ]ρο[ς] ποητικῶν τῶν ἕξω[θεν] ἠ[ὴ] κ[ρ]ι[τ]ι[β]ωκέναι πῶς ἔχει [πρὸς] ἡμᾶς, οἷον πολυτελείας καὶ μο[ρ]φ[ῆ]ς] καὶ πλούτου κοινῶς καὶ γ[ά]μου καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων, ἀλλὰ μικρὸν ὡς πρὸς τὰ κυριώ[τ]ατα περὶ ὧν ὑπεμνήσ[α]με[ν].

In other words, as Philodemos suggests at *De Musica* 4 col. 5.25–37, marriage is not ἀπλῶς ἀγαθόν, since it is possible to be happy without a wife (Phil. *Oik.* col. 9.1–3 γίγνεσθαι δυναμένης εὐδαιμονος ζωῆς καὶ χωρὶς αὐτῆς (sc. γαμετῆς). Some men, nonetheless, can obtain wives who will work with them for their common good (ibid. col. 2.3–5 τὸ γαμετὰς γυναικας ἐνίους ἔχειν συνέργως εἰς χρηματισμόν). Philodemos nowhere says that any man, let alone a philosopher, should not marry. Indeed, he says that the intelligent man (τῷ νοῦν ἔχοντι, a term which includes the Epicurean philosopher) will grieve most of all if his wife (or any other close relative) is left in dire straits (*De Morte*, col. 25.2–10).

39. Such as Leontion, who wrote a work directed against Theophrastos which Cicero praised for its style (*ND* 1.93), and who married Epicurus' chief disciple Metrodorus. Cf. C. J. Castner,

minds, sex being regarded as a providing a natural, albeit unnecessary, pleasure, sexual passion would not be expected to stop at marriage. As long as it not illegal, harmful, or otherwise contraindicated, Epicurus urges a friend χρῶ ὡς βούλει τῆ σεαυτοῦ προαιρέσει (*Sent. Vat.* 51).

A woman who could satisfy both body and mind would make the ideal wife. Such precisely is the picture of Xanthippe Philodemos develops over several poems. Her sexual charms are seen most notably in 7. Her usefulness as an Epicurean partner is shown in 4, where she is to remain with Philodemos through his years of mature thought; and even more so in 3, where she, very much like Sosylos in 29, keeps Philodemos from deviating from the correct Epicurean path. See further my comments *passim* to 6.

If, then, the Xanthippe of the poems is Philodemos' lover, wife, and Epicurean friend, what are we to make of her name? Conceivably, of course, it could actually be the name of the woman who played such a role in Philodemos' life, but far more likely it, like Neoboule and Heliodora among Greek poets and like Lesbia and Cynthia among Romans, either represents a complete fiction or stands as a convenient mask for a woman whose name was not to be presented in public. Either case—I suspect the latter but each is consistent with my argument⁴⁰—raises another question: What significance might there be to the choice of *this* name?

Two complementary answers present themselves. First, as I have argued in detail elsewhere, Philodemos, in the course of a the poetry cycle here described, has developed a persona of a narrator who tries to lead the life of a philosopher.⁴¹ In doing so, the poet has drawn upon topics found in the biographies of philosophers of all schools. The motif of philosophic conversion, for example, can be traced back—at least according to the ancient biographical tradition—to a disciple of Empedokles, and is found in the lives of Plato and Polemon. Philodemos may have derived all this from Epicurus' extended treatment of this theme in his *Letter on Occupations* (Περὶ Ἐπιτηδευμάτων), in which he discusses, among others, two converts to Epicureanism: Mys and Leontion.⁴² His choice of the age of thirty-seven for the narrator to marry echoes Aristotle (*ibid.*); and several elements are more specifically Epicurean. That not all the philosophical topoi are Epicurean accords perfectly with his view that poetry need not be beneficial, that is to say, didactic or protreptic. Since the wife of his generic philosopher plays an important role in his life, she has been given the name of the most famous of philosopher's wives,

"Epicurean hetairai as dedicants to healing deities?" *GRBS* 23 (1982) 51–57; Rist, *Epicurus* (above, n. 29) 10 f.

40. That is, I choose to believe that Philodemos, not giving any signs of favoring celibacy, has fashioned a literary persona for the woman in his life. But how close the overlap between "Xanthippe" and his real significant other I do not speculate.

41. *AJP* (above, n.35) and in Obbink ch. 4 (above, n. 30). On the poet's persona, cf. G. Paduano, "Chi dice 'io' nell'epigramma ellenistico?" in G. Arrighetti and F. Montanari (eds.), *La componente autobiografica nella poesia greca e latina* (Pisa 1993) 129–140.

42. Cf. Athen. 8.354a–d, with D. Sedley, "Epicurus and his professional rivals," in J. Bollack and A. Laks (eds.), *Études sur l'épicurisme antique* (Lille 1976) 125 f. For the topic in general, cf. O. Gigon, "Antike Erzählungen über die Berufung zur Philosophie," *MH* 3 (1946) 1–21.

Xanthippe.⁴³ He was, moreover, apparently following the lead of Epicurus; cf. Alkiphron *Epist.* 2.2.1–3 (fr. 142 U), where, in one of his *Letters of Courtesans*, Leontion complains of the way Epicurus treats her and others: οἶά με Ἐπίκουρος οὗτος διοικεῖ. . . . και σωκρατίζειν και σταμυλεύεσθαι θέλει και εἰρωνεύεσθαι, και Ἀλκιβιάδην τινὰ Πυθοκλέα νομίζει και Ξανθίππην ἐμὲ οἶεται ποιήσειν. Alkiphron could hardly have concocted such a strange scenario out of whole cloth, nor is it likely that he derived it from the epigrams of Philodemos. Whatever his source, however, he must have derived it from a tradition with which Philodemos too was familiar.

That this in turn would seem to call for Philodemos' philosopher being regarded as a kind of Sokrates should not cause us to reject this identification. It is true that Epicurus was not overly fond of Sokrates, and that he was followed in this regard by his early disciples;⁴⁴ Philodemos, however, who displayed less hostility than Epicurus to Plato, was similarly more disposed to a favorable consideration of Sokrates, who, better than anyone else, would provide a poetic paradigm for the philosopher acceptable to all schools.⁴⁵ Catullus 47, furthermore, offers some evidence that Philodemos was called Sokrates by others (see above, pp. 23–24), but whether this nickname was applied before or after Philodemos began his Xanthippe cycle we cannot say. If the latter, the nickname may well have come about as a result of the poems.

In any case, there might be another, complementary, reason for the choice of the name Xanthippe. In *On Poems* 5, Philodemos attacks Krates of Mallos for his theory that euphony was of primary importance in assessing the worth of a poem.⁴⁶ Philodemos of course was not deaf to the sonorous qualities of language; his poems

43. On the historical Xanthippe, see my "Love poetry of Philodemos" (above, n. 35) 321 f. Our most trustworthy source, Pl. *Phdo* 60a, portrays a woman who cared deeply for Sokrates and respected his relationship with his friends. The notion that Sokrates' Xanthippe was a shrew is a later biographical fiction based on comic and Cynic sources; cf. W. Ludwig, *GRBS* 4 (1963) 75–77. On the women in erotic poetry, cf. J. G. Randall, "Mistresses' pseudonyms in Latin elegy," *LCM* 4 (1979) 27–35; M. Wyke, "Mistress and metaphor in Augustan elegy," *Helios* 16 (1989) 25–47.

44. P. A. Vander Waerdt, "Colotes and the Epicurean refutation of Skepticism," *GRBS* 30 (1989) 253–259, argues that the Epicurean school's hostility began with Kolotes. Cf. further M. T. Riley, "The Epicurean criticism of Sokrates," *Phoenix* 34 (1980) 55–68; K. Kleve, "Scurra Atticus: The Epicurean view of Sokrates," in *Συζήτησις: Studi . . . a Marcello Gigante* (Naples 1983) 1.227–253; A. A. Long, "Sokrates in Hellenistic philosophy," *CQ*, n.s. 38 (1988) 150–171. Most of the later accounts charging Epicurus with jealously slandering his philosophical rivals derive from Metrodoros' brother Timokrates, who had a falling out with the school; cf. Sedley (above, n. 41).

45. Cf. G. Indelli, "Platone in Filodemo," *CErc* 16 (1966) 109–112; and, for Sokrates, D. Obbink, *Philodemos on Piety* (Oxford 1996) ad vv. 701–703, 1358–1363. Note Cicero's assesment of the place of Sokrates in the history of philosophy: *De Or.* 3.61 *Nam cum essent plures orti fere a Socrate, quod ex illius variis et diversis et in omnem partem diffusis disputationibus alius aliud apprehenderat; proseminatae sunt quasi familiae dissentientes inter se et multum disiunctae et dispaes, cum tamen omnes se philosophi Socraticos et dici vellent et esse arbitrentur.* Cf. further K. Döring, *Exemplum Socratis*, *Hermes Einzelschr.* 42 (Stuttgart 1979) 8 f.

46. Cf. E. Asmis, "Crates on poetic criticism" (above, n. 23) 138–169.

alone give ample testimony to this. In *De Poem.* Tract. I, P.Herc. 994, col. 29 N, furthermore, he lists several names which strike him as cacophonous: . . .]ώ, Φοῖ[νι]ξ, Ξάνθ[ος], Ζῆθος.⁴⁷ For Philodemus intentionally to choose an ill-sounding name for the chief love object of his erotic poems and to use it at least seven times in the extant poems and incipits (whether or not one believes in the complex Xanthippe cycle I argue for) serves as a challenge to Krates and any followers he may have had by offering a counterexample to disprove his theory. For Philodemus' audience of philosophically inclined poets, implicit in these poems is the message that the thought (διάνοια) of a poem not only may allow for a harsh sounding name, but that in this particular cycle of poems it almost calls for a name which by itself can be thought lacking in euphony, as indeed it was by Philodemus himself. The result may still be a good poem.

This not only is Hellenistic *Witz* of a high order, it also exemplifies the way in which Philodemus' epigrams, or at least some of them, manifest his theory of poetry. In the case of Xanthippe, he shows that a cacophonous word can be used to reinforce the poem's thought. In 22 he can violate several metrical norms in order to reinforce the crudity of thought. And in a more general way he alludes to ideas and anecdotes associated with other philosophers, such as Sokrates, Aristotle, and Polemon,⁴⁸ especially the last named's conversion to philosophy (see above). Thus, although presumably any nondidactic topic can appear in a poem designed to give pleasure and thus can satisfy Philodemus' criteria for good poetry, in a cleverly urbane way which is fully consistent with Hellenistic poetics Philodemus chooses manifestly un-Epicurean topics in order to demonstrate in the clearest way possible his Epicurean theory that neither truth nor benefit (both of which can be found in Epicurean prose treatises) is necessary in poetry.

The poems, then, are in accord with Philodemus' poetic theories in particular and may, when looked at obliquely, be in accord with broader Epicurean theories. Even in 27, for example, the invitation poem to Piso and the most overtly "Epicurean" of the epigrams, Philodemus plays with the idea of Epicurean friendship as it accommodates itself to Roman *amicitia* (see the commentary). Two other epigrams, 3 and 29, are alike in obliquely illustrating Epicurean ideas of *parrhesia*. Both are dialogues between "Philodemus" and a friend, Xanthippe and Sosylos respectively, who curtly and frankly recall him to the proper Epicurean attitude. The influence of Philodemus' *Περὶ Παρρησίας* on Horace's *Satires* has long been recognized,⁴⁹

47. The text is most easily available in F. Sbordone, "Filodemo e la teorica dell'eufonia," *RAAN* 30 (1955) 25–51, repr. in *Sui papiri della poetica di Filodemo* (Naples 1983) 125–153 (see p. 138); and in id. *Ricerche sui Papiri Ercolanesi* 2 (Naples 1976) 94 f. R. Janko (above, n. 20), locates this papyrus in *On Poems*, Book II. Note also Phil. P.Herc. 460 fr. 22 = Tr. B fr. 7 col.i S τοῦ ξεῖ π[ρ]οσενοχ[λή]σαντος τῆν] ἀκοήν. On Philodemus' theory of euphony, see also N. Pace, *Problematiche di poetica in Filodemo di Gadara* (Diss. Milan, 1992) 95–115.

48. See D. Sider, "The Epicurean philosopher as Hellenistic poet," in Obbink (above, n. 20), 44–57.

49. N. De Witt, "Parrhesiastic poems of Horace," *CP* 30 (1935) 312–319; A. K. Michels, "Παρρησία and the satire of Horace," *CP* 39 (1944) 173–177. On Epicurean *parrhesia* in general, cf. Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy*, 24–29; Asmis, "Philodemus' Epicureanism" (above, n. 23) 2393 f.; C. E. Glad, "Frank speech, flattery, and friendship in Philodemus," in J. T. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech* (Leiden 1996) 21–59; id., *Paul and Philodemus* (Leiden 1995), esp. ch. 3, "Epicurean communal psychagogy."

but Philodemos' use of it in his own poems has been ignored. In brief, *parrhesia* or frankness is important for the philosopher in two ways. First, he or she must apply it properly in order to improve others; second, the philosopher must learn to accept frank speech from others so that he too may be taught the better way. *Parrhesia* is not simply speaking the truth (nor is *Περὶ Παρρησίας* in any way concerned with epistemology); one must, rather, learn when to apply it to whom in order to achieve the desired moral end. A teacher will need to apply more cautious language in addressing a student or a ruler, but the situation of the two epigrams falls under the rubric of philosopher speaking frankly to philosopher and "if the wise recognize each other they will gladly be admonished by one another just as though they were reminded by themselves. And they will sting one another the gentlest sting and be grateful" (col. 8B).⁵⁰ By playing the admonished one and writing the words of the admonisher in 3 and 29, Philodemos exemplifies both aspects of *parrhesia*. For this division between poet and persona within the work, there are both poetic and philosophic models. Of the former the most noteworthy example is perhaps Sappho 1, where the poet clinically portrays a self who, incapable of rational analysis, is disdainfully regarded by Aphrodite.⁵¹ For the latter, consider the several passages in Plato where Socrates shifts what could easily be criticism of his fellow dialogist onto himself, as, supposedly, delivered by an outside voice: The Laws in *Crito*, Diotima in *Symposium*, an unnamed stranger in *Hippias Major*, and the Logos in *Protagoras*. In other words, Philodemos may be said to have composed epigrammatic diatribes in which he allows himself to be chided.⁵²

In sum, although, as we concluded above (p. 32), any (good) epigram—such as the many erotic ones to be found in this edition—can satisfy both Epicurus' and Philodemos' requirements for poetry, Philodemos, writing with his particular audience in mind, extended the range of epigrammatic *topoi* to include a number of philosophical subjects, largely but not exclusively Epicurean.

III

When did Philodemos write his epigrams? Let us assume what scholarship cannot prove—that early on in his education he was introduced to Greek verse composition.⁵³ His superiority to his contemporaries suggests long practice as well as

50. P.Herc. 1471, *Περὶ Παρρησίας*, ed. Olivieri, col. 8 B.6–13 ἄν μὲν οὖν οἱ σοφοὶ γινώσκωσιν ἀλλήλους ἡδέως ὑπομνησθήσονται πρὸς ἀλλήλων ἐν οἷς διεσαφήσαμεν, ὡς καὶ ὑφ' ἑαυτῶν, καὶ δῆ[ξον]ται δηγμό[ν] ἑαυτοῦς τὸν ἠπιώτατον καὶ χάριν εἰδήσου[σι τῆς ὄψελης]. I pursue this further in "How to commit philosophy obliquely: Philodemos' epigrams in the light of his *Peri Parrhesias*," in J. T. Fitzgerald et al. (eds.), *Philodemos and the New Testament World* (Leiden, forthcoming).

51. Cf. J. Winkler, *The Constraints of Desire* (New York 1990) 171.

52. Cf. E. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* (Leipzig 1909) 129; B. P. Wallach, *Lucretius and the Diatribe Against Death* (Leiden 1976) 6 f.

53. So, e.g., L. A. Stella, *Cinque poeti dell'Antologia Palatina* (Bologna 1949) 248.

natural talent. Let us further allow for the possibility that he brought some of these early efforts with him to Italy.⁵⁴ That he continued to write in Italy is guaranteed by 27, the invitation to Piso. For two other epigrams, 28 and 29, a setting in Herculaneum is likely, as Gigante has shown, and as I take as given in the commentary; but even though some Greeks are named who have been identified with individuals living in Italy, it has to be confessed that a Greek setting cannot be absolutely ruled out.⁵⁵ Setting, moreover, does not guarantee place of composition. Since Philodemus varies the narrating persona of his epigrams, any attempt to extract autobiographical data which could determine date of composition must be regarded with extreme caution, despite the interesting picture which Gigante has developed from just such an attempt.⁵⁶ It is also clear that a significant number of epigrams were available for purchase in Rome by 55 B.C., the date of Cicero's *In Pisonem* (see c. 71, T 2), as we could have inferred in any case from the several echoes of Philodemus in Catullus, who died about this time.⁵⁷

The date of one poem, 4, which is written in the persona of a poet who feels the call of a more cerebral life now in his thirty-seventh year, could, if taken literally, be assigned to ca. 73 B.C. (see above, pp. 6 f.), for the evidence for setting ca. 110 B.C. as Philodemus' birth year.) In the commentary I argue that this particular age was taken over from Aristotle, but Philodemus certainly could have been of a mind to write such a poem on his thirty-seventh birthday. I neither deny this nor make anything of it. I cannot, however, accept A. H. Griffiths's reading of this poem (*BICS* 19 [1970] 37 f.) in which he understands the *koronis* mentioned on v. 7 to refer to the actual *koronis* alongside this poem that would mark this poem as the last epigram in Philodemus' book. Since I find it more likely that the *koronis* refers metaphorically to Xanthippe—and that, moreover, the composition of more poems are foreseen—it would seem that we have as little idea of the arrangement of epigrams within Philodemus' book as we do of when they were written. Note, too, that in 55 B.C. Cicero refers to Philodemus' poetic activity in the present tense (*In. Pis.* 70 = T 2 *est . . . perpolitus; poema . . . facit*). There is therefore no evidence to suggest that Philodemus did not compose epigrams throughout his adult life.

54. Stated with more certainty than the evidence allows by T. Dorandi, "La Villa dei Papiri a Ercolano e la sua biblioteca," *CP* 90 (1995) 175, who follows Gigante in assuming that these first poems predate his "formazione filosofica."

55. Some of the papyrus incipits clearly refer to Italy; see pp. 212–214.

56. Note the title of the third chapter of *Philodemus in Italy*, "Philodemus' Epigrams as Autobiography." I am especially critical of his analysis of 34; see the commentary. Among much recent work on the poet's persona, the following may be profitably consulted: Paduano (above, n. 41); S. Goldhill, *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature* (Cambridge 1991); W. Rösler, "Persona reale o persona poetica? L'interpretazione dell'io' nella lirica greca arcaica," *QUCC* 19 (1985) 131–144; M. Lefkowitz, "Autobiographical fiction in Pindar," *HSCP* 84 (1980) 29–49 (repr. in ead. *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic 'I'* [Oxford 1991] 127–146).

57. Two of these were 1 (probably) and 27 (almost certainly); see Tait 36–47.

Metrics

A profile of Philodemos' metrical practices fits well within Hellenistic limits, which are often stricter applications of archaic and classical norms. Although reference is made to all the poems here published, percentage figures come from the 94 hexameters and 94 pentameters (when not affected by editorial changes which alter the shape of the line) of the twenty-nine poems regarded as Philodemos' own by Gow-Page (including the final distich of 3, which they relegate to the notes), since in the first place it was my intention to learn Philodemos' general practice in order to see whether it would provide any criteria for helping to determine authorship of the doubly or doubtfully ascribed poems (it does; see below), and secondly because some figures were already provided for this group by Gow-Page, Page (in his *Rufinus*), West, *Greek Metre*, and M. van Raalte, "Greek elegiac verse rhythm," *Glotta* 66 (1988) 145–178. Cf. also M. L. Clarke, "The hexameter in Greek elegiacs," *CR* 5 (1955) 18; W. Seelbach, *Die Epigramme des Mnasalkes* (Wiesbaden 1964) 135–140; D. Korzeniewski, *Griechische Metrik* (Darmstadt 1968) 35–40; C. M. J. Sicking, *Griechische Verslehre* (Munich 1993) 83–87; S. R. Slings, "Hermesianax and the Tattoo Elegy (P.Brux. inv. E 8934 and P.Sorb. inv. 2254)," *ZPE* 98 (1993) 29–37.

I. General

Correption

Philodemos is strict in generally allowing this only

- (a) in the first dactyl of the hexameter (11.6), and
- (b) at the bucolic diaeresis in the hexameter (5.3, 21.5, 22.5, 36.3) and at the equivalent position in the pentameter (12.4, 16.4); at 4.6 I prefer elision.

Within a dactyl only 22.1 δειν̃ ὁ (see comm.). For correption of καί, usually ignored in compiling these statistics, see introduction to [38] and GP 1.xxxix f. Cf. Kaibel iv–vi.

Elision

In nouns, adjectives, and verbs this is usually avoided in elegiac verses: Asklepiades' ratio of 14 per 100 lines is abnormally high; 5 per 100 is more common. Philodemos' ratio is 3.2 per 100 for the Gow-Page canon, with some additional exx. from the doubtful poems: 4.6 (see comm.), 7.5 (see comm.), 9.7, 11.4, 12.8, 15.3, 18.4, 21.4 (see comm.); AP 5.145.3.

Plosive + liquid/nasal

Generally this combination makes a short syllable long by position within a word, with exceptions allowed for otherwise metrically intractable compounds (3.1

μουσσοπρόσωπε, 3.3 μονοκλίνω) and for proper names (Κύπρι, Ἄφροδίτη). This combination tends not to make position when it begins a word, but will do so when the preceding word is an article, preposition, or τε. Exceptions are 3.3 χερσὶ δροσιναῖς (Gow-Page print Schneider's unnecessary emendation χερσίν), 14.3 αὔγαζέ χρυσέην, 23.7 μέγα κλαίουσα (although Gow-Page, GP 1.xxxix n.2, are willing to consider this last example as forming a word group which would allow for a long syllable), 32.2 ἀπαγέ δραχμῆς. Epigrammatists generally avoid placing a final short vowel before a plosive-liquid combination; Philodemos is freer than most in allowing this, with 11 examples all told (including those illustrated above). Cf. GP 1.xxxviii f.; Slings 36 f.

Nu movable

Philodemos allows this to make position only once: 9.4; GP 1.xliv f.; but cf. Π vii.16.

II. Hexameter

Masculine vs. feminine caesura

The ratio is 49:45, or 52% for the masculine caesura, which goes against the general tendency of Hellenistic authors greatly to favor the feminine over the masculine. Only Theokritos in his bucolics and mimes is close to Philodemos (50%–52% fem.); cf. Leonidas (56% fem.) Meleager (61%) and Apollonios (67%), Kallimachos in the epigrams (78%), Theokritos in the epyllia (72%); West 153, van Raalte 164. Philodemos has no hexameters without a third-foot caesura, as is the near universal rule in elegiac hexameters, as well as in Hellenistic hexameters in general; West 153, 157, van Raalte 164, Seelbach 137.

Proparoxytone hexameter-ends

Philodemos' 13% is unremarkable; cf. Philip (14%), Meleager (13%), Palladas (13%). Cf. Page *Rufinus* 28.

Bucolic caesura

This occurs in 72% of Philodemos' verses; with Homer's 47% contrast Meleager (58%), Leonidas and Apollonios (63%), Kallimachos' epigrams (89%), and Theokritos' bucolics (74%); West 154, van Raalte 165. Five verses (5.3%) with a masculine caesura fail to have bucolic caesura, which is somewhat "lax": 9.1, 12.1, 3, 26.1, 31.3. The average for early Hellenistic elegists is 4.5%, although Kallimachos has none; GP 1.xliii; Clarke, 18. Philodemos also has a higher than average percentage of lines (42, or 45%) combining masculine caesura with bucolic caesura; for the early Hellenistic elegists this is 35% (20% for Kallimachos).

Spondaic lines

These are in any case rare in elegiac hexameters, and do not occur in any poem ascribed to Philodemus; van Raalte 151. Furthermore, elegiac hexameters tend to avoid spondees after the second foot: 59% of Philodemus' have none, and no line has spondees in both the third and fourth feet. On the other hand, Philodemus is freer with spondees in the first two feet (53 and 50%, respectively) than others: Nearest to him in van Raalte's list are Kallimachos in the epigrams (31 and 53%) and *Aitia* (34 and 48%) and Theokritos (38 and 34%); van Raalte 163.

Fifth-foot word breaks

Philodemus (like Philip and Krinagoras, and unlike Antiphilos and Argentarius; GP 1.xliv, Clarke) is unusually willing to allow a word break after the first syllable of the fifth foot: 25.3 εἶπω, 31.3 κρῖω and 34.1 γλαυκὴ offend against the tendency to avoid a word ending at position 9 of the shape | _ _ - |; cf. Maas, *GM* §97, who cites Kallim. *H.* 1.36, 94, 4.311 and Plut. *Mor.* 747f, who calls such a verse κακόμετρον. 31.3, with word end at position 5, also violates Meyer's Third Law.

Note in addition 9.5 ἀμβροσίην |, 19.1 νῦν |, 20.1 καλεῖν |, (where also τί δεῖ σε | καλεῖν violates Hermann's Bridge), 33.3 ῆ̄.

The syllable before the masculine caesura

This is usually long by nature: Exceptions: 3.3 χερσὶ | δροσινᾶϊς (cf. I (iii) above), 15.3 κρημνῶν | τέμνω, 19.5 Γῆρᾶς | τί, 22.1 ἐνδῶς | τῆ. Philodemus at 8.5% thus falls between the average for all *Garland* authors (10%) and Philip (2.5%); GP 1.xlii n.

Wernicke's Law

Philodemus observes this, not allowing the final syllable of foot four where it coincides with word-end to be long by position; West 37, 155 n.50. (9.7 μή and [37].3 οὐ are prepositives.)

Meyer's First and Second Laws

The First Law (against word ending × - - | or × - _ _ | in the second foot) goes unobserved at 7.1, 9.1*, 22.1*, 23.3*, 34.3*, 34.5, [37].3 (the asterisk indicating that a word of shape | _ - | immediately follows, in violation of the Second Law). For Meyer's Third Law, see on 32. 3-4.

III. Pentameter

Accented pentameter-ends

The figure of 13% places Philodemus closer to the earlier generations of Hellenistic epigrammatists; e.g., Kallimachos (17%). Philip's authors, with the excep-

tion of Philodemos and Krinagoras (7.6%), employ this feature more sparingly; e.g., Antipater of Thessalonica (3%) and Philip himself (1%); Page *Rufinus* 30, West 159.

The syllable before the caesura

LENGTH. Philodemos is accord with most of Philip's authors in tending to keep this long by nature. Theokritos has 23%, Asklepiades 11%, Kallimachos and Leonidas each have 12% of such syllables long by position; whereas Meleager, Apollonides, Bianor, and Philip have none. What Philodemos actually has depends upon which reading is chosen (in 31.6), whether the text is to be emended (in 20.2), and whether the poem is by Philodemos or another ([37].2 and [38].2). I avoid positional lengthening in the first, keep it in the second, and use it as evidence against Philodemos' authorship in the third and fourth. Cf. Maas *GM* §22, Page *Rufinus* 30f., West 158.

ELISION. This is found only once, in 21.4, which is also ascribed on weaker authority to Antiphilos; see the comm. Cf. GP 1.xliii.

Homoioтелеuton between pentameter-halves

The figure for Philodemos is 22%, which is relatively high. Comparative percentages supplied by K. Müller, *Die Epigramme von Antiphilos von Byzanz* (Berlin 1935) 29 f., average out at 15–16:

Theokritos	8	Simmias	11
Nossis	9	Hedylos	18
Kallimachos	10	Anyte	20
Mnasalkes	10	Leonidas	21
Antiphilos	11	<i>Philodemos</i>	22
Asklepiades	11	Bakchylides	25
Poseidippos	11	Nikias	33

Agreement between pentameter-halves

Philodemos at 31.6% similarly ranks above average against his fellow epigrammatists (24.7%) in the related phenomenon where the words before the caesura and at the end of the pentameter are in grammatical agreement as noun + adjective/participle/pronoun (whether or not the noun comes first, and whether or not rhyme results). The comparative percentages come from Slings 37:

Nossis	12.5	<i>Philodemos</i>	31.6
Asklepiades	14.7	Mnasalkes	36.8
Kallimachos	16.1	Anyte	38.5
Leonidas	22.6		

The Greek Anthology

I. Philodemos in the Anthology

The “Greek Anthology,” as regularly constituted in modern printed texts, comprises sixteen books. The first fifteen essentially reproduce the Palatine Anthology (*AP*) as it is found in one manuscript (P), which is now divided between two libraries, the larger part in Heidelberg, the smaller one (containing no epigrams of Philodemos) in Paris. The sixteenth book gathers from a manuscript in Venice (Pl)—more specifically from the eleven sections contained therein of another, smaller, collection of epigrams, the Planudean Anthology (*APL*)—the 388 epigrams which it alone contains. This combination of the two manuscripts by modern editors makes sense since *AP* in large part and *APL* in its entirety derive from the same source, the even larger collection of epigrams put together by Constantine Kephalas, who was *protopapas* of the palace in Constantinople in 917.¹

Since Kephalas’ gathering was itself an omnibus edition of earlier collections of epigrams, beginning with those of Meleager and Philip, readers of the conglomerated “Greek Anthology” are presented with ca. 4,100 epigrams written by 363 named and an unknown number of anonymous authors ranging in date from Archilochos to the tenth century, arranged largely by subject matter or *topos* (e.g., erotic, dedicatory, sepulchral).²

Although the more interesting of these authors, such as Kallimachos, Asklepiades, and Philodemos, have been given separate modern editions and commentaries,³ it remained for A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page to reconstitute in large part the collections of Meleager and Philip.⁴ Although Brunck, Jacobs, and Reiske

1. This section can be but a brief and simplified summary of a complicated subject: See further Alan Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford 1993); C. Preisendanz, *Anthologia Palatina* (Leiden 1911) praefatio; P. Waltz, *Anthologie grecque 1* (Paris 1960) iii–xxxvii; HE 1.xiv–xlv, GP 1.xi–xxxii; Stadtmüller (see below, n. 16) 1.iii–xxxiii.

2. Arrangement by subject matter goes back to Meleager’s *Garland* (Cameron 19–33), which scheme was also followed by Agathias in his cycle, and by Kephalas, whose arrangement is largely reproduced in *AP* (Cameron [above, n. 1] 122–126). Planudes’ topical arrangement (see below) is different. Philip, however, arranged the poems in his *Garland* alphabetically; i.e., by initial letter (and no further) of the first word; cf. Cameron 33–40, who argues that “Philip’s original *Garland* comprised one long alphabetical series without regard to subject matter” (35), but that within the alphabetic arrangement there was some grouping by theme. That is, if two poems beginning with (say) beta were on the same subject, they would be placed together. This means that the Anthology offers absolutely no hint as to the disposition of Philodemos’ epigrams within its original publication.

3. See the bibliography for a list of these editions.

4. “In large part” because Meleager’s many pre-Hellenistic epigrams were excluded (to be published later in Page’s *Further Greek Epigrams*), since Gow-Page, as their title indicates, were interested only in Hellenistic epigrams. Further deviating from Meleager, Gow-Page include Hellenistic authors who wrote before the beginning of the period covered by Philip in his *Garland*, but who were not among Meleager’s authors, e.g., Theokritos; see further HE 1.xiii f., 2.525.

had earlier collected the poems of individual authors in their editions of the Anthology,⁵ it now became much easier, thanks to Gow-Page's far more comprehensive introductions and notes, to familiarize oneself with the individual contributors, and, furthermore, to get a sense of early (in HE) and late (in GP) Hellenistic epigrams as a whole. As Gow-Page note, the quality of poetry in Meleager's collection is significantly higher than that of later collections, although individual poets such as Philodemos, Antipater of Thessalonica, Argentarius, and Krinagoras rise above the generally low level.

Of all the problems faced by the editor of a single author from the Anthology, the most important is the question of ascription and genuineness.⁶ Most of the poems in the Greek Anthology are ascribed by both of its constituents to but one author, and, with few exceptions,⁷ this agreement is taken by editors to constitute sufficient grounds for trust. Occasionally, however, *AP* and *APL* disagree, often because of the practice of labelling one poem τοῦ αὐτοῦ, that is, "by the same poet who wrote the preceding poem." Since poems were reshuffled from earlier collections to later, this was bound to produce occasional confusion. In addition, a poem could lose its label and show up with one or another of the terms indicating anonymity in either *AP* or *APL*.⁸

In their introduction to individual authors, Gow and Page are careful to direct the reader to poems ascribed to this author but which they feel belong elsewhere. For Philodemos they print twenty-nine poems, whereas Kaibel in his edition of Philodemos printed and commented on only twenty-four as genuine, printing with brief dismissive statements another five which he regarded for various reasons as unworthy of him. (Kaibel's resulting twenty-nine poems are not coextensive with Gow-Page's.)

For Philodemos, the situation is as follows: Of the thirty-six poems ascribed to him by at least one source within the Greek Anthology,

- (i) There is no disagreement for **twenty-six**, that is, either *AP* and *APL* are in agreement or one lacks the poem in question;

HE also includes epigrams by Meleagrian authors known from sources (such as papyri) other than *AP* and *APL*, although it will never be known whether these poems in fact formed part of Meleager's selection. (One suspects from the low quality of many of the new Poseidippos epigrams that they would never have satisfied Meleager.) It should also be noted that Gow-Page's alphabetical arrangement by author is not that of either *Garland*, on which see n. 2.

5. And in a limited way Planudes before them; see below.

6. This was of course important for Gow and Page as well, since decisions on doubly ascribed and otherwise doubtful poems (especially those marked anonymous) determined placement within or exclusion from one or another of their authors. Hence the necessity Gow felt to examine the matter in *GA* = *The Greek Anthology: Sources and Ascriptions* (London 1958). For editors of the entire Greek Anthology, who print everything in the order of *AP* and then those unique to *APL* as "Book 16," this question is of less importance.

7. Such as *AP* 5.24 (13), ascribed by both sources to Phil. but usually given to Meleager; see the commentary.

8. Cf. Gow *GA*, *passim*, on problems of ascription due to these errors.

- (ii) For **two** poems there is ascription to Philodemos in both *AP* and *APL*, but *AP* adds a second claimant: **21** P Antiphilos, with the Corrector (see below) adding ἡ μάλλον Φιλοδήμου; **35** P Φιλοδήμου, οἱ δὲ Ἀργενταρίου;
- (iii) **Four** poems are ascribed to Philodemos by *AP* but are anonymous in *APL* (**4, 23, 31, 32**);
- (iv) **Four** poems are ascribed to Philodemos by one collection and to someone else in the other (**2** P Plato, Pl Philodemos; **18** P Maccius, Pl Philodemos; **36** P Meleager, Pl Philodemos, **37** P Marcus Argentarius, Pl Philodemos).

Gow-Page's twenty-nine epigrams comprise all from (i) except **13**, which they give to Meleager, and all from (iii); and none from (ii) or (iv). They also print as a thirtieth poem a passage from Horace which seems to allude to a poem of Philodemos; cf. **T 4**.

My editorial "solution" to the problem of authenticity is to print *all* poems, if not as separate epigrams with accompanying commentaries, then at least in some other appropriate place; that is, all poems (i) which have been ascribed to Philodemos by either Anthology, (ii) whose incipits appear in the P.Oxy. list (Π; see below), and (iii) of which there are some grounds for believing we have Latin translations in the Epigrammata Bobiensia, a late fourth-century collection. Also included are (iv) one anonymous and postclassical (i.e., Renaissance or Baroque) epigram which was written to supply the lost original of a poem alluded to by Horace, and (v) the Oxyrhynchus incipits in their entirety, some of which undoubtedly derive from unknown Philodemian epigrams. This results in forty-one Greek and two Latin epigrams, none longer than eight lines. Some of these doubtful poems, I shall argue, are not in fact by Philodemos, but there seemed to be a clear value in gathering together and assessing all claims for Philodemian authorship, however unlikely some may be.

Philodemos, like most epigrammatists, was undoubtedly prolific. It was in fact a genre in which facility of production was often as highly regarded as the finished product.⁹ Of all that Philodemos wrote an unknown fraction was published and readily available in Italy during his lifetime and later to Philip.¹⁰ From the existence of many epigrams known from outside the Greek Anthology (cf. e.g. Kallim. fr. 393–402 Pf. and the new epigrams of Poseidippos, totaling over 600 lines¹¹), we can be sure that Philip exercised editorial choice in gathering his *Garland*. In the case of Philodemos, we have the clear hint of far more Philodemian epigrams in Π than are now extant, but of course we do not know how many of these were included by Philip but excluded by Kephala, whether intentionally or, more likely,

9. Cf. Cic. *Pro Arch.* 18 on Archias (cited above p. 28).

10. Cic. *In Pis.* 71 (**T 2**). On Philip's Στέφανος, see Cameron [above, n. 1] 33–43 and (arguing for a Neronian date) 56–65; GP 1.xi–xlix.

11. Initial notice of the latter: G. Bastianini and C. Gallazzi, "Il poeta ritrovato: Scoperti gli epigrammi di Posidippo in un pettorale di mummia," *Riv. "Ca' de Sass"* n.121, March 1993. A preliminary text of 24 of the epigrams in eidem, *Posidippo. Epigrammi* (Milan 1993).

because, as Cameron *Greek Anthology* 43–48 argues, he was working from two incomplete copies of Philip's (and two of Meleager's) *Garland*.¹² As the poems unique to either *AP* or *APL* show, Kephala's collection itself was subject to further abridgement in *AP* and, to an even greater extent, in *APL*. Thus at each one of these stages we probably have lost some of Philodemos' (and of course others') epigrams.

II. The Manuscripts

For most purposes, there are but two manuscripts to be reported, P and Pl. Copies made from these are of only occasional value for Philodemos. Diogenes Laertios cites one epigram, 2, as the work of Plato. For some few poems of Philodemos, anonymous excerpts in *Souda* offer significant variants; cf. Cameron ch. 12. The readings of Π (see below) are occasionally of interest. See further below. In the descriptions which follow, an asterisk (*) indicates those manuscripts which I have not myself examined.

P

Heidelberg. Palat. 23, containing *AP* among other texts, compiled towards the middle of the tenth century, is the Codex Palatinus, so called from its stay in the Palatine Library in Heidelberg, although its latter part remained in Paris (as Paris. Suppl. Gr. 384) after the first part was returned to its rightful home (as Palat. 23) after the Napoleonic depredations. Cf. H. Görgemanns in E. Mittler et al. *Bibliotheca Palatina* (Heidelberg 1986) 1.485–487.

The manuscript contains the work of more than one scribe, one of whom, J,¹³ may have provided the lemmata to individual poems. This brief description can dispense with the details of scribal attribution, but one other hand in P deserves attention, that of C, its "Corrector," who ca. 950 took P in hand after it had already received additional lemmata and attributions by J (and perhaps others). C, like J, had access to an independent text, which he identifies as one made by Michael ὁ χαρτοφύλαξ (the archivist). Although the extent of C's dependence on Michael is unclear in many details (cf. HE 1.xxxv), the value of his comments and editorial alterations is manifest to anyone who notes how often he agrees with Pl in the better reading against P, or even more so, when he offers the better reading when Pl is lacking, or against PPl.¹⁴

12. Kephala, however, must have embodied Meleager, Philip, and Agathias' anthologies as completely as he could from his imperfect copies; cf. Cameron 121 f.

13. Now identified as Constantine the Rhodian by Cameron 300–307. For the wanderings of this MS across Europe, cf. Cameron 178–201.

14. C's contributions cease after *AP* 9.563; i.e., ten poems in P ascribed to Phil., one anonymous poem possibly by Phil. (24), and one from the Planudean anthology assigned to Phil. did not receive his attention. On C, see further Cameron 108–120, 129–134.

Unclear to the reader of a printed apparatus criticus, however, is how often C effects his alterations by either erasure or alteration of the letters in P. Altogether too many of these alterations have made P's original largely or totally illegible or indecipherable in Preisendanz's facsimile.¹⁵ In these cases, only autopsy, preferably with the aid of an ultraviolet light, can be trusted, and not always then, so thoroughly did C sometimes obliterate. For most readings, my autopsy confirmed that of Stadtmüller; occasionally I was forced to disagree with his most careful reading of the manuscript.¹⁶ C, that is, in opposition to the practice of modern copy editors, conceals the original text. He will, for example, with a little erasing and the addition of another circle, convert an omicron into an omega. Having been alerted to this by Stadtmüller, one can then see that indeed there seems to be some squeezing between the omega and the letter to its right, but nobody would dare declare on the basis of the facsimile alone that this was the work of C. Thus, throughout the Anthology, whenever the apparatus criticus states that C offers one reading while the reading of P is doubtful, the reader should assume that C has obliterated P. In 7.5, e.g., "Ξανθῶι ut vid. P" (Gow-Page) derives from Stadtmüller's "ξανθῶι?"

Pl

Cod. Ven. Marc. 481, containing *APL* among other texts, is the autograph of Maximus Planudes, who in 1301 (Cameron 75–77) prepared his own collection; although also derived ultimately from Kephala's, it is arranged differently from P.

Seven books of epigrams (*Pla* = 1*a*–7*a*) are separated by other matter from a second grouping (with some duplications, none affecting Philodemos, from the first seven sections) of four additional books of epigrams (*Plb* = 1*b*–4*b*), which, as Planudes explicitly says, derive from a different source from that of *Pla*. As was stated above, any epigram common to P and Pl is printed in modern editions in P's order (I follow Stadtmüller and Beckby in noting the location of these poems within Pl), while those unique to Pl are gathered as "Book 16." Planudes arranged his books by subject matter, providing a further breakdown within several of the books. Thus, Beckby's reference (which I follow) for 4, Pl 2*b*.23,14, indicates that the poem is found in the second book (2) of the second group of epigrams (*b*), as the fourteenth poem of the book's twenty-third topical subsection (κεφάλαιον; in this case, συμποτικά ἀστεῖσματα).¹⁷ Only Books 1–4 (*a* and *b* combined, as was customary

15. *Anthologia Palatina: Codex Palatinus et Codex Parisinus*, Codices Graeci et Latini 15 (Leiden 1911).

16. H. Stadtmüller, *Anthologia Graeca Epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea*, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1894–1906), ending at *AP* 9.563 (where there is a change of scribes). For Gow-Page's dependence on Stadtmüller for the readings where C has altered P, cf. HE 1.xxxvii with n. 2. Stadtmüller's apparatus is overfussy, giving details of accent, breathing, punctuation, and letter placement, when, for the most part, there is no doubt about what is intended. Although I have learned much from it, the models for my own apparatus criticus are the neater ones of Waltz, Beckby, and Gow-Page, although I report more conjectures of early editors than they.

17. As was noticed by R. Aubreton, *BAGB* (1967) 349, Beckby missed a heading after no. 9, with the result that all his heading numbers after nine should be raised by one.

since soon after *PI* was written) and 6 have headings, which are arranged alphabetically; cf. Beckby 4.560 ff. for an index of κεφάλαια and a concordance between *AP* and *API* (these subsections are like those in the new Poseidippos papyrus). Not surprisingly, more of Philodemos' epigrams are found in Book 7 than in any other, this book containing Planudes' erotica, or, as he calls them, ἐταρικά.

It has been little noticed, however, although immediately clear to all who examine the manuscript, that Planudes, or, more likely, his immediate source, made an attempt in this book to gather together poems by the same author. Among the longer runs are Meleager (eight poems, fols. 68v–69r), Paulus Silentarius (21, fols. 70r–71r), Agathias (12, fols. 71r–v), Philodemos (16, fols. 72v–73r), Meleager *bis* (13, fols. 73r–v), and Rufinus (28, fols. 73v–74r); cf. Stadtmüller 1 xxii–xxix. Since the Philodemos group contains more than its fair share of disputed poems—both more than a random sampling from Philodemos should have and more in absolute numbers than the other author groupings—Planudes' accuracy in attribution calls for examination. He and all compilers who make use of the phrase τοῦ αὐτοῦ instead of writing the author's name (see above) are liable to produce error, first if the phrase is applied carelessly (typically by the compiler jumping over the immediately preceding poem to the one before it), and second if the poem passes to another collection which is arranged differently from the first (τοῦ αὐτοῦ now designating an altogether different poet). There is no doubt that Planudes is guilty of carelessness in this regard, but he is not to be condemned outright, as Page does in examining his attributions to Rufinus,¹⁸ whose first poem in Planudes' group, labeled 'Ρουφίνου, is followed (as is true of all the author groups) by instances (twenty-seven in Rufinus' case) of τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Four of these poems receive variant attributions in *P*: two adespota, Marcus Argentarius, and Kallimachos, none of which Page admits into the Rufinus canon. Here he may be right, but in Meleager *bis*, *AP* 5.82, which is anonymous in *P*, seems to me to be worthy of Meleager.¹⁹ Consider Planudes' run of Philodemos' epigrams in Table 1. Operating on the principle enunciated by Page in *Rufinus*, wherever there is a discrepancy Gow-Page follow *P* against *PI*.²⁰ We now know, however, that for two of the poems in the Philodemos group (2 and 21) Philodemian authorship is strongly indicated by their incipits' appearing in *II*. This means that the remaining doubtful epigrams should be judged individually (as they will be in their respective commentaries below), and not denied to Philodemos automatically.

On the whole, *P* is a more reliable manuscript, but Planudes with access to other sources and with some common sense of his own often offers the true reading.

Cf. E. Mioni, *Codices Graeci Manuscripti Bibliothecae Divi Marci Venetiarum*, II. *Thesaurus Antiquus: Codd. 300–625* (Rome 1985) 276–283; id., "L'Antologia

18. D. L. Page, *The Epigrams of Rufinus* (Cambridge 1978) 14–18; sim. Stadtmüller 1.xxvii f.

19. Gow-Page HE 2.593 do not even bother to include it among the poems they exclude from the Meleager canon. C. Rädinger, *Meleagros von Gadara* (Innsbruck 1895) 81 at least mentions it (but without argument keeps it anonymous).

20. For their reasons for assigning 13 to Meleager, see the commentary.

TABLE 1 The Run of Epigrams Assigned to Philodemos by Planudes

PI	P	Π	Sider
7.86 Φιλοδήμου	5.306 Φιλοδήμου	v.13	25
87 τ.α.*	8 τ.α. = Plato	iv.31	2
88 τ.α.	4 Φιλοδήμου	iv.10	7
89 τ.α.	8 Μελεάγρου	—	36
90 τ.α.	124 τ.α.	—	16
91 τ.α.	24 Φιλοδήμου	iv.17	13
92 τ.α.	25 τ.α.	—	15
93 τ.α.	13 Φιλοδήμου	vii.25	9
94 τ.α.	112 Φιλοδήμου	v.11	5
95 τ.α.	113 Ἀργενταρίου	—	[37]
96 τ.α.	114 Μαικίου	—	18
97 τ.α.	115 Φιλοδήμου	vii.7	10
98 τ.α.	121 τ.α.	ii.19	17
99 τ.α.	131 Φιλοδήμου	v.14	1
100 τ.α.	132 τ.α.	v.20	12
101 τ.α.	308 τ.α. = Ἀντιφίλου, ἢ Φιλοδήμου	vi.4	21

*τ.α.: τοῦ αὐτοῦ (= Φιλοδήμου, unless another name is given).

Greca da Massimo Planude a Marco Musuro,” in *Scritti in onore di Carlo Diano* (Bologna 1975) 263–307; A. Turyn, “Demetrius Triclinius and the Planudean Anthology,” *Ἐπετηρίς Ἐταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν* 39–40 (1972–1973) 403–450.

Two early copies of PI contain nothing of interest for the text of Philodemos: (i) London BM Add. 16409, containing corrections in Planudes’ hand; and (ii) Paris gr. 2744, the first manuscript to unify the separate books in PI on the same subject. Cf. Cameron, App. 1–2.

Apographs

Apographs, or more precisely selections, of poems found in P (and unknown to PI) were made by Claude de Saumaise (Salmasius) and other scholars for their own and for their friends’ use before the larger collection of the Anthology was published. Some were made from P directly; others are copies of other apographs containing scholarly conjectures. These apographs traveled widely throughout Europe, picking up further scholarly conjectures along the way. As a result, ascription of conjectures to early scholars is a hazardous business, especially to Saumaise. Cf. HE 1.xliv f.; J. Hutton, *The Greek Anthology in France* (Ithaca 1946) 8–11; R. Aubretton, “La tradition de l’*Anthologie Palatine* du xvi^e au xvii^e siècle,” *Rev. d’hist. des textes* 10 (1980) 1–52, 11 (1981) 1–46; E. Mioni, “L’*Antologia Greca*”

App.B–V The Appendix Barberino-Vaticana contains three of the six lines of one Philodemian epigram (11). It exists in three manuscripts: (i) *Par. suppl. gr.* 1199 no. 2, written 1480–1500. (ii) *Vat. gr.* 240,* written ca.1560, and (iii) *Vat. Barb. gr.*

123,* written 1504–1509. See further L. Sternbach, *Anthologiae Planudeae Appendix Barberino-Vaticana* (Leipzig 1890); and Cameron, ch. 8, who shows that the source for these manuscripts was close to but independent of *AP*. Since almost all its epigrams are erotic and missing from *APL*, it was undoubtedly intended as a supplement to the latter (and hence dating from the fourteenth century), since Planudes confessed to having omitted poems tending πρὸς τὸ ἀσεμνότερον καὶ αἰσχρότερον. . . . τὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα πολλὰ ἐν τῷ ἀντιγράφῳ ὄντα παρελίπομεν (intro. to *APL* 7, f. 68v).

Ap. Voss Leiden Vossianus gr. O8, saec. xvi fin., containing **3, 6, 11, 14, 19, 26** (twice), **28**. Cf. Hutton 8 f., 252–254; Aubreton (1980) 5–15; K. A. De Meyier, *Codices Manuscripti. VI. Codices Vossiani Graeci* (Leiden 1955) 208 f. See further the introduction to **6**. This manuscript contains two sure conjectures: **6.1, 2, 19.3**

Ap.B Göttingen philol. 3; Paris Suppl. gr. 557.* Copies associated with Jean Bouhier (1673–1746), one in Göttingen, others in Paris. The original seems to have the work of Saumaise. Cf. *Verzeichniss der Handschriften im Preussischen Staate. I. Hannover. 1. Göttingen* (Berlin 1893) 2 f.; Hutton, op. cit., 523–526; Stadtmüller viii–x. Brunck made good use of its learned notes (some by J. G. Schneider). This *apographon Buberianum* contains Phil. **3, 6, 11, 14, 19, 20, 22, 26, 28, 34**.

Göttingen Philol. 6 “Epigrammata exscripta (a. 1758) ex codice bibliothecae Dresdensis, qui sumptus est ex eclogis anthologiae Isaci Vossii. notas hic adscriptas in codice reperi.” Containing **11, 14, 20, 22, 23, 26**. Cf. *Verzeichniss* (cit. supra) 4 f.

Ap.L Leipzig Rep. I fol. 55. An apograph owed either to I. Voss or Friedrich Sylburg used by Reiske, who saw it in Leipzig; Hutton, op. cit., 8 f.; Aubreton (1980) 15–20. This manuscript contains Phil. **11, 14, 20, 22, 26, 34, [38]**. Cf. G. R. Naumann, *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum qui in Bibliotheca Senatoria Civitatis Lipsiensis asservantur* (Grimma 1838) 4 (no. 4). Now housed in the Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig.

Leipzig Rep. I.35 “Exempla ex Anthologia Graecorum Epigrammatum quae est in bibliothecae Is. Vossii.” Cf. Naumann (op. cit.) 4 (no. 5). Containing **11, 14, 23, 26**. Now housed in the Universitätsbibliothek Leipzig.

Cr Hamburg philol. 5. (1716). Another apograph used by Reiske, also containing the spurious **[38]** as its last poem, as well as **6.7–8, 14, 19, 26, 28**; see the commentary to **[38]**. Cf. H. Omont, *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs des bibliothèques des villes hanséatiques* (Leipzig 1890) no. 17, pp. 10 f.

Leiden B.P.G. 34B, saec. xvii inc., in the hand of J. J. Scaliger, containing **14, 20, 22, 26, 34**. Cf. De Meyier, op. cit., 51; Aubreton 20–23.

Papyrus

Π P.Oxy. 54 (1987) 3724, ed. P. Parsons, written in the later half of the first century A.D., containing 175 incipits, probably all of epigrams, at least twenty-seven of which belong to poems by Philodemus. In the case of epigrams already known, I print the incipits in the respective apparatus critici, and the entire list is printed after the complete epigrams along with a commentary.²¹ See further below, pp. 203–205.

III. Printed Editions

I have examined the following early printed editions, all of which derive from *APL*. (Jacobs's edition of 1813–1817 is the first to print the epigrams of *AP*.)

- 1494.** Florence, Alopa. Ed. J. Lascaris. Ἀνθολογία Διαφόρων Ἐπιγραμμάτων κτλ. Cf. J. Hutton, *The Greek Anthology in Italy* (Ithaca 1935) 117 f.; on the typeface, R. Proctor, *The Printing of Greek in the 15th Century* (Oxford 1900) 78 f.
- 1503, 1521, 1550–1556.** Ἀνθολογία Διαφόρων Ἐπιγραμμάτων κτλ. *Florilegium Diversorum Epigrammatum etc.* The three editions published by the Aldine press in Venice, the first of which, edited by Aldus himself, was set up from a copy of Lascaris' editio princeps now preserved, with Aldus' instructors to the printers, in Paris (Hutton, *GA in Italy* 148 f.). The second edition was edited by F. d'Asola, probably from the same annotated edition of Lascaris. Differences among the three editions (which I collated at the Morgan Library) are inconsequential.
- 1519.** *Florilegium Diversorum Epigrammatum.* Ἀνθολογία Διαφόρων Ἐπιγραμμάτων. Florence. Per heredes Ph. Iuntae.
- 1540.** *In Graecorum Epigrammatum Libros IV Annotationes longe Doctissimae, iam Primum in Lucem Editae.* Basel. Ed. V. Obsopoeus.
- 1549.** *Epigrammatum Graecorum Libri VII Annotationibus J. Brodaeii Illustrati.* Basel, S. Gelenius.
- 1550.** Ἀνθολογία Διαφόρων Ἐπιγραμμάτων. Apud P. et J. Nicolinos Sabienses.
- 1566.** Geneva, H. Estienne. Ἀνθολογία Διαφόρων Ἐπιγραμμάτων Παλαιῶν. *Florilegium Diversorum Epigrammatum Veterum.* Cf. F. Schreiber, *The Estiennes* (New York 1982) 143 f. Hutton, *GA in France* 132 notes that Estienne's "text is probably founded on that of Badius [1531, not seen], but is treated by Estienne with the utmost freedom."

21. Incipits (*Graece* οὐδ' ἡ ἀρχή) serve to identify a work if a more formal title is lacking; cf. E. Nachmanson, *Der griechische Buchtitel*. Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift 47.19 (1941) 31–49 (repr. separately Darmstadt 1969).

1600. Frankfort, A. Wechel. *Epigrammatum Graecorum Annotationibus Joannis Brodae necnon Vincentii Obsopoei et Graecis in pleraque Epigrammata Scholiis Illustratorum*. The text is based on the Stephanus edition. The anonymous scholia alluded to in the title (Σ in the sigla) probably derived from M. Musurus (Hutton, *GA in Italy* 155–158).

Because of the great continuity from one printed edition to the next, I record only the earliest occurrence of peculiar readings. Thus, “edd. vett. (1494)” indicates that Lascaris was followed in this particular reading by later editions. Note in particular the apparatus to 9. For greater precision in citing these editions, cf. Stadtmüller’s Teubner edition.

About This Edition

The arrangement of the epigrams in this edition

Since it is impossible to know in what order the epigrams were written or arranged within their first, or indeed any, publication during Philodemos’ lifetime (especially since I find suspect attempts to interpret them autobiographically), a modern gathering of his or any other epigrammatist’s poems must either be arbitrary or satisfy some useful scheme devised by the editors. Gow-Page reasonably chose to follow, making allowances for mistakes and reinterpretation, the general scheme of the Palatine Anthology: Erotic, anathematic, epitymbic, epideictic, proreptic, sympotic, and scoptic (HE I.xlvii f.). Their numbering quickly became standard, and were I editing only the same twenty-nine epigrams they published under Philodemos’ name in GP, I would be happy to retain their order. But since there are thirty-eight epigrams included here, some new order and numeration had to be devised.

Making no historical claims, then, I print the epigrams in the following order:

- 1–8 The Xanthippe cycle, the poems either naming Xanthippe or seeming to refer either to her or to the marriage with her, arranged, for want of a better scheme, in what can be taken to be a dramatic chronology of the relationship.
- 9–26 The remaining erotic poems, arranged in no particular order, except that the two Demo poems (10–11), the two street encounters (20–21) and the two spoken by a woman (25–26) are placed together. It is not sure that 24 is erotic.
- 27–29 The invitation poem to Piso and two other poems which also seem to reflect on life in Campania.
- 30–34 Miscellaneous.
- 35–36 Doubly ascribed; Philodemean authorship can be neither proved nor disproved.
- [37–38] Not by Philodemos.

Transliteration

For the most part I avoid Latin forms for Greek names but find that I remain more comfortable with Plato, Epicurus, and a few others than with Platon, Epikouros, etc. My citations of their works may be by Greek (e.g., Aristophanes' *Ekkkl.*), Latin (Hesiod's *Op.*), or English (*Clouds*) forms.

Abbreviations and bibliographical references

References to classical authors and their works should be obvious; they are usually the same as or fuller than those in LSJ (but see paragraph above). Those to modern works are either complete and immediately clear, or they can be deciphered with the aid of the list of abbreviations. The bibliography, it should also be noted, is limited to works on Philodemos (primarily his epigrams and literary theory), epigrams in general, and the Greek Anthology. Other books and articles are cited only in their appropriate sections. The briefest of references in my book are of the form "West on Hes. *Tb.* nn.," which entails that someone named West wrote a (probably separately published) commentary, with or without text, on Hesiod's *Theogony*.

Emendations

New to this edition, emendations have been suggested as follows: 4.8 ταύτης, 6.5 ἀλλ' ἐμέ, 13.3 ἦ, 15.5 θρασεῖα γάρ, 19.3 οἰμοιμοῖ, 30.3 μηρῶ, 32.2 εἰς καλὰ, χορδόκολα.

The translations

The translations of Philodemos' epigrams appended to the texts come with the usual academic disclaimer to any esthetic value. Philodemos regularly shows up in translations of *Selected Epigrams*, but it is easy to single out the especially attractive versions by Sandra Sider of six poems: CO 61 (1984) 79 f.

This page intentionally left blank

CONCORDANCES

Concordance of Printed Editions

AG	Sider	GP	Kaibel	Gigante	Brunck-Jacobs
5.4	7	1	9	11	17
5.8	36	Meleager 69	—	—	—
5.13	9	2	16	2	18
5.24	13	Meleager 41	—	—	11
5.25	15	3	5	7	16
5.46	20	4	1	—	3
5.80	2	Plato 5 FGE	—	—	Plato 4
5.107	23	5	7	4	20
5.112	5	18	19	15	19
5.113*	37	Argentarius 9 GP	—	—	Arg. 15
5.114	18	Maccius 1 GP	—	—	Macc. 4
5.115	10	6	3	8	2
5.120	26	7	17	—	5
5.121	17	8	14	5	10
5.123	14	9	4	6	7
5.124	16	10	6	1	15
5.126	22	25	p. xxv	—	8
5.131	1	11	10	10	13
5.132	12	12	15	—	21
5.145*	†	Asklepiades 12 HE	—	—	Ask. 4
5.150*	†	Asklepiades 10	—	—	Ask. 14
5.306	25	13	18	—	6
5.308	21	Antiphilus 14 GP	p. vii	—	4
6.246	35	Argentarius 18 GP	p. xxvi	—	27
6.349	34	19	24	16	25
7.222	33	26	21	22	31
9.412	29	20	23	23	30
9.570	3	14	12	12	32, 34‡
10.21	8	15	8	3	24
10.103	32	24	p. xxvi	17	29
11.30	19	27	20	—	12
11.34	6	21	13	13	22
11.35	28	22	p. xxvii	19	23
11.41	4	17	11	14	14
11.44	27	23	22	18	33
11.318	31	28	p. xxvi	20	26
12.103	24	Anon. 56 HE	p. xii	—	—
12.173	11	16	2	9	1
16.234	30	29	p. xxvi	21	28
—	38*	—	—	—	9

*Not by Philodemos.

†Printed in the commentary to Π; see below, pp. 215, 220.

‡Pp. 144 f. Brunck (Jacobs prints the last distich as a separate poem).

Concordance of Manuscripts

P	PI	II
5.4	VII 88* fol. 72v (om. 5–6)	iv.10
5.8	VII 89* 72v	—
5.13	VII 93* 72v (om. 3–4, 7–8)	vii.25
5.24	VII 91* 72v	iv.17
5.25	VII 92* 72v	—
5.46	—	vii.15
5.80	VII 87* 72v	iv.31
5.107	VII 184 75v	vii.13
5.112	VII 94* 72v	v.11
5.113	VII 95* 72v	—
5.114	VII 96* 72v	—
5.115	VII 97* 72v	vii.7
5.120	—	viii.9
5.121	VII 98* 72v	ii.19
5.123	—	v.3
5.124	VII 90* 72v	—
5.126	—	ii.18
5.131	VII 99* 73r	v.14
5.132	VII 100* 73r	v.20
[5.145	VII 116 73v	vi.18]
[5.150	—	iv.28]
5.306	VII 86* 72v	v.13
5.308	VII 101* 73r	vi.4
6.246	VI 5 61v	—
6.349	—	iv.19
7.222	IIIa 11,11 34r	iv.18
9.412	Ia 36,12 10r	vii.21
9.570	—	iv.7
10.21	Ia 30,5 8r	viii.2
10.103	Ia 88,5 20v	ii.21
11.30	—	iii.7, v.31
11.34	—	ii.5
11.35	—	vii.17
11.41	IIb 22,14 89v (om.3, 7–8)	ii.14
11.44	—	iv.4
11.318	IIb 4,1 87r	—
12.103	VII 194 76r	ii.28
12.173	—	—
16.234	IVa 8,89 49v	—

* In the series VII 86–101, sixteen poems attributed to Philodemos in Pl: Φιλοδήμου + 15 instances of τοῦ αὐτοῦ. See above, pp. 50 f.

This page intentionally left blank

THE EPIGRAMS

Sigla

P = Palat. 23 Heidelberg

J = codicis P partim librarius, alibi lemmatista

C = codicis P corrector

Pl = Venet. Marc. 481

App. B-V = Appendix Barberino-Vaticana

ac = ante correctionem

pc = post correctionem

s.a.n. = sine auctoris nomine

Ap. = apographum

Voss = Lugd.-Bat. Vossianus gr. O8

B = Götting. philol. 3 et Paris. Suppl. gr. 557

L = Lips. Rep. I fol. 55

Cr = Hamburg. philol. 5

Π = P.Oxy. 3724

ed(d). vet(t). = editio(nes) vetus/veteres

Σ = scholia recentiora in ed. vet. 1600

Text, Translations, and Commentary

1

ψαλμός καὶ λαλιὴ καὶ κοτίλον ὄμμα καὶ ῥῆθι
 Ξανθίππης καὶ πῦρ ἄρτι καταρχόμενον,
 ὦ ψυχῆ, φλέξει σε· τὸ δ' ἐκ τίνος ἢ πότε καὶ πῶς
 οὐκ οἶδα· γνώση, δύσμορε, τυφομένη.

AP 5.131 [11 GP, 10 Kaibel, 10 Gigante]

P Φιλοδήμου PI 7.99, f. 73r τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] Π v. 14 ψαλμοικαιλαλη
 [C] εἰς Ξανθίππην ὁμοίως

1 ψαλμός PPI: ψαλμοί Π λαλιή PI: λαλιή P 4 γνώση CPI: γνώση P

The harp playing of Xanthippe and her talk, her expressive eyes and her song—and the fire within her just now beginning; these, my soul, will enflame you. The reasons why or whence or how I do not know; but you will know, ill-fated soul, that you are burning.

Del Re, *Epigrammi greci* 82, 129.
 Stella 271 f.

This would seem to be the first poem in the Xanthippe cycle, at least dramatically; it need not have been the first to be written. Since Catullus almost certainly echoes this poem (see on vv. 3–4), it was written before his death ca. 55 B.C. Somewhat similar is AP 5.51 (Anon. 8 FGE)

ἠράσθην, ἐφίλουν, ἔτυχον, κατέπραξ', ἀγαπῶμαι,
 τίς δὲ καὶ ἦς καὶ πῶς, ἢ θεὸς οἶδε μόνη.

1 ψαλμός καὶ λαλιὴ καὶ . . . ῥῆθι : Very similar language in 4.5, which also, I argue, pertains to Xanthippe.

ψαλμός: The harp, which was plucked with fingers, rather than the kithara (which was usually struck with a pick), seems to have been the standard accompaniment for female singers at dinner parties (cf. 4, 6) and elsewhere (cf. 3). For the distinction between harp and lyre, cf. M. Maas and J. Snyder, *Stringed Instruments of Ancient Greece* (New Haven 1989) 219, n. 1; and for the harp in the Classical period, *ibid.* 40f., 147–155, 181–185. Romans seem to have been of two minds about the instrument: on the one hand, it could be thought of as the musical accompaniment to wild if not orgiastic parties (cf. esp. 6); on the other hand, it was the instrument of Sappho and the Muses (Maas-Snyder 40, 148 f.; cf. Caesius Bassus 1

Morel *Calliope princeps sapienti psallerat ore*). Quintilian 1.10.31 has to argue on its behalf that *nec psalteria . . . uirginibus probis recusanda*.

The reading of the papyrus cannot be paralleled; the plural should refer to the playing of the harp by more than one person (Telestes 810.4 PMG, Phryn. 3 F 11 TrGF, Diogenes Athen. 45 F 1.9 TrGF). The more general sense wanted here, “the sound of the harp,” calls for the singular; cf. Aisch. fr. 57.7 ψαλμός δ' ἀλαλάζει, Pi. fr. 125.4 Snell (Terpander invented the *barbiton*) ψαλμόν ἀντίφθογγον ὑψηλᾶς ἀκούων πακτίδος. A carelessly written lunate sigma was read by the scribe of Π as an iota. (M. Gigante *SFIC* 7 [1989] 143 n. 55 prefers the reading of Π, comparing, irrelevantly, 6.1 ψάλαματα.)

Propertius praises his *docta puella*'s ability with the lyre: 2.1.9 *lyrae carmen digitis percussit eburnis*, 2.3.19, 1.3.42.

κωτίλον ὄμμα: Meleager refers to men who “speak” erotically only through their eyes: 85 (*AP* 12.122.4) σιγῶν ὄμμασι τερπνὰ λαλεῖ, 91 (*AP* 12.63.1), 108 (*AP* 12.159.3 f.). Cf. also Headlam-Knox on Herodas 1.40, *Ov. Am.* 2.5.17 *non oculi tacere tui*.

λαλιή: Conversation was highly regarded, especially in sympotic and/or erotic contexts; cf. 26.3. On the role of conversation (and silence) in Epicurean company, cf. F. Amoroso, “Filodemo sulla conversazione,” *CErc* 5 (1975) 63–76, an edition of Phil.'s *Περὶ Ὁμιλίας* (P.Herc. 873).

2 Ξανθίππης: For the significance of this name, see Introduction, pp. 36–38.

πῦρ: Heat is a frequent concomitant of erotic sensation; cf. Sappho 31 λεπτόν . . . πῦρ, 38, ὅπταις ἄμμε, Alkman 59(a) PMG Ἔρωσ . . . καρδίαν ἰαίνει, Soph. fr. 474.2 f., Kallim. *Ep.* 11.5 HE ὁ μὲν ἀρσενικῶ θέρεται πυρί, Phil. 10.6 θερμός . . . πόθος. Argentarius 4 GP (*AP* 5.89.5) οὗτος ἔρωσ, πῦρ τοῦτο, Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *O.* 1.33.6; N. Zink, *Griechische Ausdrucksweisen für Warm und Kalt im seelischen Bereich* (Diss. Mainz; Heidelberg 1962) 75–90; W. R. Smyth, *CQ* 43 (1949) 122 ff. Phil. himself has 4.6 πῦρ . . . τύφει ἐνὶ κραδίῃ and 16.4 πῦρ τύφεται ἐγκρῦφον, 10.6, 14.6.

καταρχόμενον: Although this word on occasion has religious or philosophical overtones (amply documented in LSJ), it is also frequently a synonym for the simplex in Phil.'s prose, and probably is so here as well. Cf., e.g., Phil. *Rhet.* 2.34.14–16 Sudh. ἐγλοισμός ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἐναργείας καταρχόμενος. For the thought in general, cf. Prop. 1.9.18 *haec est venturi prima favilla mali*.

3 ὦ ψυχή: Where Homer and other early poets had people address their *thumos*, fifth-century and later poets substituted the *psyche* (indeed, the scholia to Pi. *O.* 2.89 “interpret” θυμέ as ὦ ψυχή); e.g., Π vi.19, Aisch.(?) *Septem* 1033, Soph. *Tr.* 1260, Eur. *Alk.* 837. (Note that for Simon. *Elegy* 21.3 W² οὐ δύναμαι, ψυχ[ή], πεφυλαγμένος εἶ[ν]αι ὀπηδός, West, *ZPE* 98 [1993] 11, now prefers ψυχ[ή].)

Such addresses usually signal a soliloquy (C. Hentze, “Die Monologe in den homerischen Epen,” *Philologus* 63 [1904] 12–30), which is of obvious importance in drama; cf. F. Leo, “Der Monolog im Drama,” *AGAW* 10.5 (1908) 94 ff.; W. Schadewaldt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch*. Neue Philol. Unters. 2 (Berlin 1926) 201, 212–217. Here, however, Phil. alludes to a division between a rational self, the poem's narrator, who speaks like a philosopher (though not an Epicurean one; see

below) and his emotional soul. The former maintains, or perhaps would like to be seen to maintain, a sang-froid which should allow it/him to keep its distance from the passion-ridden soul. The readers, I suspect, are invited to doubt whether the rational narrator is being honest with himself and with us.

3–4 The cause is unknown; the feelings overwhelm, just as in Catullus 85:

Odi et amo. quare id faciam fortasse requiris.
Nescio, sed fieri sentio et excrucior,

which is a neat distillation of the thought found in Phil. and a far better poem; cf. Stella. Catullus may also have acknowledged his borrowing by having *odi et amo* echo somewhat ὄμμα καὶ ὄδῃ. For Catullus and Phil. in general, see above, pp. 23 f. Jacobs also aptly compares Prop. 2.4.9 f.

. . . nec causas nec apertos cernimus ictus:
unde tamen veniant tot mala caeca via est.

4 τυφομένη: Taken as circumstantial by Gow-Page (“you will learn [sc. the answer to these questions] . . . when you are afire”), Beckby (“wenn”), and Gigante (“mentre”), but knowledge of these Aristotelian categories and causes will not likely come in the middle of intense passion. Better is Waltz’s rendering as o.o.: “mais ce que tu verras bien, malheureuse, c’est que tu en es consumée,” the grammar of which is also reflected in Catullus’ *fieri sentio*. That is (to pursue the Aristotelian thread picked up above), although Phil. and his soul will be incapable of giving a scientific account, they will certainly recognize its essence, which is the most important of the categories: οὐσία δέ ἐστιν ἡ κυριώτατά τε καὶ πρώτως καὶ μάλιστα λεγομένη, ἢ μήτε καθ’ ὑποκειμένον τινὸς λέγεται μήτε ἐν ὑποκειμένῳ τινὶ ἐστιν (*Cat.* 2a11). And if they do not know τὸ ἐκ τίνος, they will certainly be aware of τὸ ὅτι (cf., e.g., NE 1095b6–7).

2

μῆλον ἐγὼ πέμπει με φιλῶν σέ τις· ἄλλ’ ἐπίνευσον,
Ξανθίππη· κάγῳ καὶ σὺ μαραίνομεθα.

AP 5.80 [Plato 5 FGE]

Pl 7.87, f.72v τοῦ αὐτοῦ (sc. Φιλοδήμου) P τοῦ αὐτοῦ (sc. Πλάτωνος) Diog. Laert.
3.32 καὶ ἄλλο (sc. Πλάτωνος) Π iv.31 μηλονεγωπεμ()

1 πέμ(πει) Π: βάλλει cett.

An apple am I. Someone who loves you sends me. Do but give a nod,
Xanthippe. Both you and I are wasting away.

Ludwig, *GRBS* 4 (1963) 4 (1963) 75–77.

Mariotti, *Studi Urbinati* 41 n.s. B 1–2 (1967) 1073–1078.

Although Platonic authorship was disproved by Ludwig, doubt remained about Philodemean authorship (Page, e.g., preferred to classify it as a work of Pseudo-Plato). This should be now completely dispelled by inclusion of the poem's incipit in Π (see comm.).

There is a companion piece within the Pseudo-Platonic corpus of epigrams (4 FGE = *AP* 5.79):

τῷ μῆλῳ βάλλω σε· σὺ δ', εἰ μὲν ἐκοῦσα φιλεῖς με,
 δεξαμένη τῆς σῆς παρθενίης μετάδος·
 εἰ δ' ἄρ' ὃ μὴ γίγνεται νοεῖς, τοῦτ' αὐτὸ λαβοῦσα
 σκέψαι τὴν ὄρην ὡς ὀλιγοχρόνιος.

This epigram is given to Plato by P and Diog. Laert (3.32), it is anonymous in Pl (f. 76r), and is absent from Π. Mariotti shows how **2** can be read as a concise paraphrase of 5.79, i.e., that the shorter poem was written in response to the longer one, which is reasonable. He also argues that since it is a better poem it must be by another hand, which does not necessarily follow; epigrammatists developed their own themes as well as those of others. We do not know where Aristippos, the compiler of the “Platonic” corpus of epigrams, found 5.79, but since there is nothing reminiscent of Plato about it, he may well, as Ludwig suggests, have found it in the same place as **2**, which would make Philodemean authorship of the former a possibility. The theme of **2**, like that of all exx. of the go-lovely-rose topos, fits in well with the Epicurean idea that one should enjoy the one life we have; see, e.g., on **29**. One does not, however, have to be an avowed Epicurean to profess this theme. A metrical anomaly, moreover, argues against Phil., namely a violation of Hermann's Bridge (1 εἰ μὲν | ἐ–), which Phil. scrupulously observes in the undoubted poems except in **20.1** (a dialogue poem) and in **22.1**, where metrical roughness is intentional.

1–2: This apple, not having read its Denniston, is sparing of connective particles. The first sentence can be considered a simple label, and πέμπει κτλ and κάγώ κτλ can easily be understood as explanatory asyndeta, which we find elsewhere in Phil. The overall effect is one of artful simplicity. On explanatory asyndeton, cf. KG 2.344 f., Verdenius on Hes. *Op.* 211.

1 μῆλον: On the μῆλον as a love-token, cf. A. R. Littlewood, “The symbolism of the apple in Greek and Roman literature,” *HSCP* 72 (1967) 149–181, esp. 154 f. (exx. of μηλοβολεῖν, to which now add Sappho S260 SLG μήλωι βάλ[, the earliest example), 167 f. (inscriptions on apples, the earliest example of which may be Hes. fr. 214 M-W). In addition to the literary sources cited by Littlewood, a magic charm involves the throwing of an apple: *Supp. Mag.* 72 (= *PGM* 122 Betz) col. 1.5–14, beginning ἐπὶ μῆλου ἐπωδῆ· τρίς· βάλ[ω] μῆ[λω]ις; cf. C. Faraone, *CP* 90 (1995) 9 f.

πέμπει: As Alan Cameron has pointed out (*Greek Anthology* 385–387 and ap. Parsons’s comm. on Π), the Latin translation of this poem (*Epigr. Bob.* 32) supports this reading over βάλλει, the far *facilior* reading:

malum ego: mittit me quidam tibi munus amator.
adnue: marcendum est, ut mihi, Flora, tibi.

Another possibility is that there were two poems by Phil., one whose incipit is in Π and translated in *Epigr. Bob.*, the other the one found in P, in which case βάλλει should be retained here.

Note the name **Flora**, which also occurs in **12** and two other Latin erotic poems: Varro, *Menippeae* fr. 136 and Juv. 2.49. Mariotti 1078, giving credit to the Latin translator of **2**, notes that Flora is an improvement over Xanthippe in that now the girl’s name is part of the message of the poem: flowers waste away like apples. But, as suggested just above, any such credit may be due to Phil.

Cf. the story of Akontion’s *sending* a message along with an apple to Kydippe: Kallim. fr. 67 with Diegesis and Pfeiffer’s n. But, as Mariotti points out, Latin *mittere* can be the equivalent of βάλλειν, as in, e.g., *mittere tela*. Note in particular Ovid, *Her.* 21.107 *mittitur ante pedes malum cum carmine tali*; with with contrast Vergil, *Ecl.* 3.71 *aurea mala decem misi*, where throwing seems unlikely. Similarly, Ps.-Petronius (*Anthol. Lat.* 218) *aurea mala mihi, dulcis mea Martia, mittis*. See D. A. Schmidt, *CQ*, n.s. 37 (1987) 21, who points out that in Pindar and Bakchylides πέμπω (a poem) = “bring” or “present.” In the epigram, the object of the verb is an apple, but if the poem accompanied the poem or were inscribed on it, the two objects would merge into one. Compare the apple thrown by Eris at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis inscribed with the words “Let the beautiful woman take (it/me)” (Luc. *Dial. Mar.* 5); Littlewood 167 f.

ἐπίνευσον: The silent nod in answer to the written message on the apple suggests the possibility that a secret assignation is hereby being arranged.

2 Ξανθίπη: Although Π (or a source) could have erroneously ascribed this poem to Phil. on the basis of this name alone (just as someone found the presence of the name useful for ascribing it to Plato), this is hardly likely for the compiler of the largely Philodemian incipits, who presumably had solid evidence for authorship. It should also be noted that the name Xanthippe is not very common in poetry, all exx. coming from epigrams:

(i) Xanthippe is one of three Bacchantes in Ps.-Anakreon 5 FGE (*AP* 6.134):

ἢ τὸν θυρσὸν ἔχουσ' Ἐλικωνιάς ἢ τε παρ' αὐτήν
Ξανθίπη Γλαύκη τ' εἰς χορὸν ἐρχόμεναι
ἐξ ὄρεος χωρεῦσι, Διωνύσω δὲ φέρουσι
κισσὸν καὶ σταφυλὴν πίονα καὶ χίμαρον.

There is no reason to claim this anonymous poem for Phil., but note that as parallel for the dislocation of copulative καὶ on v. 4, Page can cite only 5.5 ἠνίκα καὶ νῦν.

(ii) In an epitaph ascribed to Simonides (36 FGE = AP 13.26), Xanthippe appears as the wife of Archenautes and daughter of Periandros.

(iii) *Epigr. Bob.* 35 offers an erotic Xantho, one of Phil.'s nicknames for Xanthippe:

Musarum Xantho decimast, Cytherea secunda,
quarta Charis: Xantho Musa, Venus, Charis est.

Because of the general rarity of the name, in addition to the fact there is already another translation from Phil. in *Ep. Bob.*, it is possible that this too is a translation of a poem by Phil. Cf. Mariotti 1086–1093 for a survey of the topos of the tenth Muse, fourth Grace, etc. (cf. on Π iv. 26). *Ep. Bob.* 35 comes closest to to AP 5.95 (Anon.):

τέσσαρες αἱ Χάριτες, Παφίαι δύο, καὶ δέκα Μοῦσαι·
Δερκυλὶς ἐν πάσαις Μοῦσα, Χάρις, Παφίη .

Xantho also appears as a nymph in Vergil, *G.* 1.336, where R. Thomas, “Virgil’s *Georgics* and the art of reference,” *HSCP* 90 (1986) 190 f., detects an allusion to Phil.’s Xantho.

μαραινόμεθα: The same form and general sense at 19.6, q.v. Mariotti calls this an atemporal present, saying that it is too subtle to have it mean that we are wasting away every moment of our lives. This notion, however, was not too subtle for Herakleitos and appears in Epicurean atomism; cf., e.g., Lucretius’ example of the rings and statues which have imperceptibly worn away over the years, 1.311–319. Here of course it is the flower of youth which wastes away, for which poetry offers many parallels; e.g., Archil. 196a.24–28 W², where Neoboule is rejected because her *charis* is now gone (ἀν]θος δ’ ἀπερρύηκε παρθενήϊον), Aisch. *Suppl.* 998 τέρειν’ ὀπώρα δ’ εὐφύλακτος οὐδαμῶς.

3

—Ξανθῶ κηρόπλαστε μυρόχροε μουσοπρόσωπε,
εὐλαλε, διπτερύγων καλὸν ἄγαλμα Πόθων,
ψηλὸν μοι χερσὶ δροσιναιῖς μύρον· ἐν μονοκλίνῳ
δεῖ με λιθοδμήτῳ δεῖ ποτε πετριδίῳ
εὔδειν ἀθανάτως πουλὺν χρόνον. ἄδε πάλιν μοι, 5
Ξανθάριον, ναὶ ναὶ τὸ γλυκὺ τοῦτο μέλος.
—οὐκ αἰεὶς, ὄνθρφ’ ὁ τοκογλύφος; ἐν μονοκλίνῳ
δεῖ σε βιοῦν αἰεὶ, δύσμορε, πετριδίῳ.

AP 9.570 [14 GP, 12 K, 12 G]

P Φιλοδήμου Π iv.7 ξανθοκηροπλαατε caret Pl

1 Ξανθὸ κηρ- Π Huschke: ξανθοκηρ- P 3 ψῆλόν P^{pc} (marg.):
 ψιλόν P^{ac}: σπεισον Brunck: ψῆζόν Gigante χερσί P: χερσίν Schneider 4 δεῖ ποτε
 Kaibel: δέ ποτι P: δήποτε Huschke: δεσπότι Schneider 7 οὐκ αἰεὶς Salm.: ὁ υ καὶ εἰς
 P τοκογλύφος Chardon: τοκονγ- P: ἄνθρωπε τόκων γλύφος Salm. 8 σε βιοῦν αἰεὶ
 Chardon: σε βίου αἰεὶ P: ἄβιον ναίειν Salm.

<Man.> Xantho—formed of wax, with skin smelling of perfume, with the face of a Muse, of splendid voice, a beautiful image of the double-winged Pothoi—

pluck for me with your delicate hands a fragrant song: “In a solitary rocky bed made of stone I must surely someday sleep a deathlessly long time.” Yes, yes, Xantharion, sing again for me this sweet song.

<Xantho.> Don’t you understand, man, you accountant you? You must live forever, you wretch, in a solitary rocky bed!

VH 1 (1793) 4–8 (ed. D. Carlo Rosini).

Chardon de la Rochette, “Deux épigrammes,” 209–222.

Del Re, *MC* 6 (1936) 132 f.

Huschke 145–150.

Kaibel, *Hermes* 15 (1880) 460.

Luck, *EH* 14 (1968) 406–408.

Merkelbach, *RM* 115 (1972) 219–222.

Merlan, *Z. Philos. Forsch.* 21 (1967) 490 f.

W. Schmid, *Acta Conventus XI Eirene* (Warsaw 1971) 201–207; repr. in *Ausg. Philol. Schr.* (Berlin 1984) 267–274.

Sider, *AJP* 108 (1987) 317–319.

de Vries, *Mnemosyne* 23 (1970) 30 f.

The Xantho of this poem is εὐλαος and accompanies herself on the harp, just as Xanthippe does in 1. The narrator, on the other hand is a pathetic character: moaning about death and asking Xanthippe to provide an appropriately gloomy song (which he calls sweet). Xanthippe gives him his song in altered form, exaggerating the already ridiculous “sleep an immortally long time” to “live forever (in the grave)” to point up the illogicality of the man’s thinking: if he is sleeping he is alive; if he is alive he is not dead. And so all his maudlin posturing comes to nothing. We need not dwell on how much better an Epicurean Xanthippe is than the man. Note, however, how the form of the poem parallels that of 29, where I think that again the last two lines are spoken by another in order to bring the first speaker back to his Epicurean senses.

“Among the curiosities of Greek scholarship” (Gow-Page), dating from VH 1 (1793) 6, is the belief of some that Xantho, the “blonde one,” was not human but a bee: *Ardua quaestio est, apimne alloquatur poeta, an Xanthonem psaltriam*, wrote Dübner, although Huschke and Jacobs had earlier tried to dismiss the notion. Ruhnken went so far as to consider altering 1 μουσοπρόσωπε το σιμοπρόσωπε. Thus

κηρόπλαστε (vel-πλάστα) was taken in an active sense and διπτερύγων was understood to apply to Xantho as well as the Pothoi; see further Chardon. Kaibel finally laid the matter to rest, but introduced the idea that the last two lines were due to *iram rabiemque byzantini hominis*, convincing among others Gow-Page, who shunt the final distich, without apparatus, to their commentary. Schmid ably defended its authenticity, showing how, as Xantho's reply, it offers an Epicurean corrective to the man's complaints. Note the parallels between this poem and the diatribe against the fear of death in Lucretius, book 3, not only the similarity between the chiding tones taken by Natura and by Xanthippe towards those with the wrong attitude (cf. Kenney on Lucr. 3.894–899), but also the several rather specific points of comparison indicated below in the appropriate lemmata. It should also be noted that the last two verses are in harmony with Phil.'s regular metrical usage.

1 Ξανθὸ κηρόπλαστε: Huschke's reading has been confirmed by Π; For the adj., cf. Hor. O. 1.13.2 f. *cerea Telephi* | *laudat brachia*, Pliny NH 37.33 *candidum atque cerei coloris*. As Nisbet-Hubbard point out on Horace, the yellowish color of wax was not normally a sign of beautiful skin (lilies and milk being more usual for the pale end of the spectrum). The primary emphasis here, however, may be on Xantho's doll-like quality; cf. *Hist. Alex. Magn. Rec. e 2* (ed. Trumpf) κηρόπλαστα ζῶδα. Thus, Pl. *Ti.* 74c refers to the Demiourge as a κηροπλάστης; cf. Euboulos fr. 41.1 f. ὁ . . . κηροπλαστήσας Ἐρωθ' ὑπόπερον. (Waltz suggests "douce au toucher comme de la cire," but wax has an unappealing tacky quality.) Bee fanciers should also note Soph. fr. 398.5 ξανθῆς μελίσης κηρόπλαστον ὄργανον, although for the first word there are variants, including one missing from TrGF vol. 4: σοφῆς, Basil, *Epist.* 8.12.

μυρόχροε: Hapax legomenon. Men and women often perfumed their hair (cf. e.g. Eur. *Kyk.* 501 (μυρόχριστος, another hapax), Aristoph. *Ekkkl.* 524, Pl. *Rep.* 398a), but wider application was always possible; cf. Alkaios 50.1–2 κατὰ τὰς πόλλα παθοίσας κεφάλας κάκχεέ μοι μύρον | καὶ κατὰ τὸ πολίω στήθεος, Anakr. 18 PMG στήθεα χρισάμενος μύρω. μύρον means perfume in general rather than myrrh in particular.

μουσοπρόσωπε: Another hapax. If the word has any special meaning beyond "divinely beautiful," it would be "capable of producing poetry worthy of the Muses"; Chardon 212 f. (Muses could be portrayed in art as white-haired women, but presumably this is not what Phil. has in mind; cf. LIMC s.v. Mousai.) For the scansion –ὄπρ–, see Intro. pp. 41 f.; similarly with 3 μονόκλινω below.

2 διπτερύγων: Elsewhere in poetry only Meleager 33 (*AP* 5.151.2), of mosquitoes.

ἀγάμμα: Calling her a very image of the bipennate Pothoi is of a piece with the other exaggerated terms applied to Xantho. Reducing the word to ἐφ' ᾧ τις ἀγάλλεται, as Gow-Page do, not only robs it of its intended hyperbole, it makes little sense with Πόθων. The tendency of besotted husbands to treat their wives as ἀγάμματα is derided by Hippolytos (Eur. *Hipp.* 630–633).

Πόθων: For the frequent association between Pothos (or the Pothoi) and Eros, Himeros, Aphrodite, et sim., cf. Headlam ad Herodas 7.94–95. Pothoi do not have to be winged, but cf. Sappho 22.11 f. πόθος . . . ἀμφιπόταται, Phil. 8.2 (with comm.), Meleager 7.5 (*AP* 5.179) σευ [sc. Ἐρωτος] τὰ ποδηγὰ Πόθων ὠκύπετρα, where the wings properly belong to Eros. But note the comment of Pausanias 1.43.6: "And

by Skopas there are statues of Eros, Himeros, and Pothos, if indeed their function is as different as their names,” and in fact from the Alexandrian period on there was little distinction drawn between Pothos and Eros; note also that while Cupido is the usual name for Eros, semantically it represents Pothos. Cf. Höfer, “Pothos,” in Roscher, col. 2903. Cornutus, *Nat. Deor.* 25, p. 48 Lang, allegorically equates Eros and Pothos. Winged “amorini” were often painted on the walls of Herculaneum villas. Cf. F. Lasserre, *La Figure d’Éros dans la poésie grecque* (Paris 1946) 60–62, 220–227.

3 ψῆλόν . . . μύρον: Almost certainly the noun is an internal accus. (so Jacobs, Gow-Page, de Vries 30); cf. Persius *prol.* 14 *cantare . . . nectar*, and perh. Kallim. *Aitia* *prol.* fr. 1.33 ἵνα δρόσον ἦν μὲν αἰίδω, although other interpretations of this complicated sentence are possible; cf. N. Hopkinson, *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge 1988) 96 f. Some commentators take μύρον with δροσιναιῖς (Dindorf, Dübner, Waltz, Del Re): *manibus rorantibus unguentum*, but this would be more naturally expressed with μύρω, which Jacobs and Waltz were tempted to read. Also unlikely is the possibility that μύρον is a vocative; cf. 37.3 σε καλεῖσα μύρον καὶ τερπνὸν Ἄδωνιν. (Not pertinent is Aristoph. *Daital.* fr. 205.1 K-A εἰ . . . μύρον.)

δροσιναιῖς could mean “glistening” or “dewy” (Gow-Page); cf. Hesych. ἐρσήεντα δροσινόν, Romanus Mel. 9:16 δροσινὰ λαλοῦντα.

Gigante’s conjecture (“spalmami l’unguento”)—supported by Van Looy, *Rev. belg. philol. hist.* 68 (1990) 173—would leave ᾄδε πάλιν μοι . . . τοῦτο μέλος without point.

χεροσί: Schneider’s nu movable is unnecessary; Phil. allows initial plosive and liquid to make position elsewhere; cf. Introduction, pp. 41 f.

3–4 μονοκλίνῳ . . . λιθοδμήτῳ . . . πετριδίῳ: Two rare adj. modifying the rare πετριδίῳ. In epitaphs, whether real or putative, the material of the stele (which is very much in Phil.’s mind) is often mentioned (Weisshäupl 54 f.), and the stele may stand for the whole tomb; cf. AP 7.700.1 (Diodoros Grammatikos) μ’ ἔκρυφεν οἰκία ταῦτα | λάινα, but the chief aim here is to demonstrate his preoccupation with death. A πετριδίον is a small rocky cave (Aristotle, *HA* 547b21, fr. 239 Gigon), here of course in an extended sense. With μονοκλίνῳ, a harax, cf. πολυ-, τρι-, δεκα-, εἰκοσίκλιнос, κτλ. λιθοδμήτῳ was also thought a harax until the publication of P. Hibeh 172 (= SH 991.90), a list of compound poetic adjectives. We should accordingly note the comments of its editor, E. G. Turner: “The proportion of new words is a reminder of how much Greek poetry is lost. It is interesting that some of these words are known only because they are used by Hellenistic poets, almost certainly at a date later than the compilation of this list [ca. 270–230 B.C.]” (p. 2).

4 δεῖ ποτε: The best restoration of meter and sense. δῆ ποτε, which de Vries favors, is also possible, although the usual meanings of this combination—“at last,” “at one time,” “ever”—are not appropriate. If read, δῆ could emphasize με after the intervening word; cf. Denniston *GP* 208, 227 f.; Diggle ad Eur. *Phaethon* 96 f. Luck argues for Schneider’s δεσπότι, regarding the other conjectures as padding, but, despite de Vries’ objections, I find the repetition of δεῖ in line with the overall

maudlin tone. Cf. below 6 ναὶ ναὶ and note esp. Lucr. 3.894 *iam iam non domus accipiet te laeta*, in a very similar context.

5 εὔδειν ἀθανάτως πολὺν χρόνον: The adv. (which, as Kaibel observes, must modify πολὺν; cf. 31.6) is rare; cf. Ps.-Clemens, *Homiliae* 13.8 ὄχλος ἀθανάτως καὶ ἀλύπως βιωσαι ἔχει. Since the author has just described his thorough grounding in Greek thought in general and “godless” Epicurean (and Pyrrhonian) philosophy in particular, it is possible that he is here recalling something he read in Epicurus. Cf. Del Re 132, “quell’ἀθανάτως che ha poi qui, sulla bocca dell’epicureo Filodemo, un sapore ironico, e ci fa pensare al lucreziano *mors immortalis*” (3.869; cf. 904 *leto sopitus*, 921 *aeternum soporem*). Gigante *RF*² 164 adduces Amphis fr. 8 K-A θνητὸς ὁ βίος, ὀλίγος οὐπὶ γῆ χρόνος: ἀθάνατος ὁ θάνατός ἐστιν, ἂν ἅπαξ τις ἀποθάνῃ. Cf. Cat. 5.6 *nox est perpetua una dormienda*. For the motif of death as sleep (which is as old as Homer; e.g., *Il.* 11.241), cf. M.B. Ogle, “The sleep of death,” *MAAR* 11 (1933) 81–117; B.P. Wallach, *Lucretius and the Diatribe against the Fear of Death: De Rerum Natura III 830–1094* (Leiden 1976); D. Puliga, “Χρόνος ε θάνατος in Epicuro,” *Elenchos* 4 (1983) 235–260 (esp. 258 ff.). Cf. Theog. 567 ff. ἦβη τερπόμενος παίζω δηρὸν γὰρ ἔνερθε | γῆς ὀλέσας ψυχὴν κείσομαι ὥστε λίθος | ἄφθογγος.

6 Ξανθάριον: Phil. uses both name and nickname in the same poem also in 11 Δημῶ, Δημάριον. Cf. Catullus 12 *Veranius*, *Veraniolum* (and 56 *Cato*, *Catullum*, 59 *Rufa*, *Rufulum*).

ναὶ ναίς: Repeated as at Iambica Adesp. 57 West ναὶ ναὶ μὰ μήκονος χλόην, Glaukos 3 HE (*AP* 9.341.3), Poseidippos 5 HE (*AP* 12.45.1), Asklepiades 17 HE (*AP* 12.166.5).

7 οὐκ αἰεῖς: Cf. *Od.* 1.298 ἦ οὐκ αἰεῖς (same sedes).

ἄνθρωπε: Schmid 203 ff. offers several parallel exx. of what he calls “popular-philosophische Mahnrede.” Note in particular Lucr. 3.933 f. (*Natura loquens*) *quid tibi tanto operest, mortalis, quod nimis aegris luctibus indulges?*; P.Oxy. 2.215 (= Epicurus 11 CPF, ed. Obbink) col. 1.17 σὺ [δ', ὦ] ἄνθρωπε, μακαριώ[τα]τον μὲν τι νόμιζε κτλ; Polystratos *De contemptu* (ed. Indelli) col. 27.1. Indelli (and others) speak of the anonymity and fictitiousness of the addressee (as a hallmark of the diatribe style), but more important may be the emphasis that this particular address lays on the addressee’s human limits; cf. Simon. 521 PMG ἄνθρωπος ἐὼν μὴ ποτε φάσης ὅτι γίνεται αὔριον. Perhaps the most interesting parallel is Soph. *Ai.* 1150–1158, where Teukros clearly invents someone “like me” to criticize Menelaos: “ἄνθρωπε, μη δρᾶ. . .”. In the Anthology this vocative, in sepulchral or moralizing epigrams, always points up the mortality of the addressee: Leonidas 21, 33, 77 HE (*AP* 7.198, 736, 472), Dioskorides 22 HE (7.37), Automedon 12 GP (7.534), and four of Palladas (10, 45, 77; 11.62, 300). Cf. *Missale Romanum*, Ash Wednesday: *memento homo quia pulvis es et in pulverem reverteris*.

τοκογλύφος: A pejorative term for a money lender, i.e., a usurer, which Pollux 3.85 lists along with some synonyms; for Phil.’s metaphorical usage, cf. Luc. *Vit. Auct.* 23 τὸ δὲ Γνίφωνα (a notoriously stingy person) εἶναι καὶ τοκογλύφον, Plut. *Mor.* 18e μοχθηροὶ μὲν εἰσι λόγοι καὶ ψευδεῖς, . . . τοκογλύφω πρεσβύτη

πρέποντες. Hence my not entirely satisfactory “accountant,” which is intended to point up the man’s excessive concern with the number of days remaining in his life. A far more satisfying Englishing of the sentiment of this final distich is to be found in Shakespeare’s *Sonnet 4*; note especially 7 f.: “Profites userer why doost thou use
| so great a summe of summes yet can’st not live?”

7–8 ἐν μονοκλίῳ . . . πετριδίῳ: In repeating this phrase, Xantho makes the point that in death he will occupy this and only this physical spot. Note the very similar and particularly Epicurean point in a Latin sepulchral inscription dating from before ca. 50 B.C. (on metrical grounds):

Stallius Gaius has sedes Hauranus tuetur
ex Epicureio gaudiuigente choro.

(Courtney, *Musa Lapidaria* no. 22 = CLE 961 = CIL 10.2971 = ILS 7781).

8 δεῖ σε βιοῦν αἰεὶ: Saumaise’s emendation seems pedestrian alongside Chardon’s far neater suggestion. Xanthippe’s point is precisely that made by Lucretius, who takes to task those who express concern for what happens to their bodies after death as if they were somehow going to be present; cf. 3.870 ff. *proinde ubi se videas hominem indignarier ipsum, | post mortem fore ut aut putescat corpore posto | aut flammis interfiat malisve ferarum* etc., 878 f., 885 ff. *nec videt in vera nullum fore morte alium se | qui possit vivus sibi se lugere peremptum | stansque iacentem <se> lacerari urive dolere*, 923. βιοῦν αἰεὶ once again reminds us of Lucretius’ *mors immortalis* (3.869).

As Phil. puts it elsewhere, the man who lives his life thinking of death is already comparable to a dead man: ἐνταφιασμένος περιπατεῖ (*De Morte* col. 38.17 f.). For this sort of paradoxical expression, cf. *Epic. Ep.* 3.135 ζήσεις δὲ ὡς θεὸς ἐν ἀνθρώποις. οὐθὲν γὰρ ἔοικε θνητῷ ζῶν ζῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐν ἀθανάτοις ἀγαθοῖς. Lying behind these expressions are the views of Demokritos: 55 B 160 DK τὸ κακῶς ζῆν . . . οὐ κακῶς ζῆν, ἀλλὰ πολὺν χρόνον ἀποθνήσκειν, B 205 ἀνοήμονες ζωῆς ὀρέγονται θάνατον δεδοικότες.

δύσμορε: Cf. *Lucr.* 3.955 (*Natura loquens*) *aufer abhinc lacrimas, baratre, et compesce querellas*. (For the uncertain sense of *baratre*, see the commentaries; one possibility—“spendthrift”—suggests a rough contrast to τοκογλύφε, but this cannot be pressed.)

4

ἐπὶ τὰ τριηκόντεσσιν ἐπέρχονται λυκάβαντες,
ἤδη μοι βιότου σχιζόμεναι σελίδες;
ἤδη καὶ λευκαὶ με κατασπεύρουσιν ἔθειραι,
Ξανθίππη, συνετῆς ἄγγελου ἡλικίης,
ἀλλ’ ἔτι μοι ψαλμός τε λάλος κῶμοί τε μέλονται

καὶ πῦρ ἀπλήστῳ τύφετ' ἐνὶ κραδίῃ·
αὐτὴν ἀλλὰ τάχιστα κορωνίδα γράψατε, Μοῦσαι,
ταύτης ἡμετέρης, δεσπότιδες, μανίης.

AP 11.41 [17 GP, 11 K, 14 G]

P Φιλοδήμου Pl 2b.23,14, f. 89v s.a.n.; om. vv. 3, 7–8 Π ii.14 εἴπατριηκοντεσσιν
2 βιότου Pl: βρότου P 3 spat. vac. relicto om. Pl 4 Ξανθίππη Salm.: –ίπη P: –ίππης Pl
6 τύφετ' ἐνὶ Pl: τύφετ' ἐν P: τύφεται ἐν Jacobs 8 ταύτης scripsi: ταύτην P: αὐτὴν Hecker

Seven years are coming up on thirty; papyrus columns of my life now being
torn off;
now too, Xanthippe, white hairs besprinkle me, announcing the age of
intelligence;
but the harp's voice and revels are still a concern to me, and a fire smol-
ders in my insatiable heart.
Inscribe her immediately as the koronis, Mistress Muses, of this my mad-
ness.

Giangrande, *GB* 1 (1973) 141–148.
Griffiths, *BICS* 19 (1970) 37 f.
Sider, *AJP* 108 (1987) 315 f.

The first three hexameters are metrically unusual:

- (i) SSSDS (3) and DSSDS (1 and 5) are the only exx. of these shapes in Phil., the former to be avoided because of its heavy spondaic quality, the latter because of the repetition of the DS pattern.
- (ii) These same three lines lack a bucolic caesura, the only three consecutive hexameter lines to do so in Phil. (See above, p. 42.)

This oddness and heaviness mirrors the narrator's despondency, which is dispelled by the thought that his life and verses will be cheered up by the presence of Xanthippe: SDDDS (7) is one of Phil.'s (and others') most common metrical shapes (≥ 13 exx.).

1 ἐπὶ τριηκόντεσσιν: Hesiod, who comes by the form honestly (cf. West ad *Op.* 696), and some very few imitators (Kallim. fr. 714.2 and two post-Philodemean exx., AP 14.3.9, 123.13) have the inflected genitive τριηκόντων (or τριακ–); only Phil. has an inflected dative.

Phil.'s learned audience is alerted to the possibility that marriage is the subject of this poem, first, by the precise number thirty-seven, at which age Aristotle, *Pol.* 1335a29 argues a man should marry (and marry an “eighteen-year old woman” — an incipit at Π iii.14, q.v.); and, second, by the oddness of the inflected numeral, for Hesiod loc. cit. employs his inflected form in a passage urging ca. 30 as the best age for a man to marry (695–697):

ῥαῖος δὲ γυναῑκα τεὸν ποτὶ οἶκον ἄγεσθαι,
 μήτε τριηκόντων ἐτέων μάλα πόλλ' ἀπολείπων
 μήτ' ἐπιθεις μάλα πολλὰ · γάμος δέ τοι ῥαῖος οὔτος.

Cf. Hor. O. 2.4.22–4 *fuge suspicari* | *cuius octavum trepidavit aetas* | *claudere lustrum*, with Nisbet-Hubbard's n. for other poems in which the author/narrator mentions his age.

ἐπέρχονται: Often of time (LSJ II 1), e.g. *Od.* 2.107 ἐπήλυθον ῥαῖαι, and esp. the inscription πικρή μοι λυκάβαντος ἐπήλυθε μοῖρα (*Chiron* 17 [1987] 178, col. 1.1).

λυκάβαντες: Here, as usual, = “years,” but because of its unknown etymology and its significance in the *Odyssey* in the sense of either “month” or even “day,” the literature on this word is extensive; cf. e.g., N. Austin, *Archery at the Dark of the Moon* (Berkeley 1975) 244–246; D. N. Wigtill, “A note on λυκάβας,” *AJP* 99 (1978) 334 f.

2 ἤδη . . . σχιζόμεναι: Regularly translated (or paraphrased in commentaries) as a past tense (e.g., “already torn,” GP), but the sense of ἤδη + pres. is rather that, at age thirty-seven, Phil. has now become aware that time is passing (as becomes clearer with v. 3); KG 2.121. σχίζω—“divide a whole into parts” (LSJ), e.g., *Dsc.* 2.70, milk into curds and whey—here in the passive refers to the part(s) divided/torn.

βίотου . . . σελίδες: The metaphor of the book of life, which Phil. uses in *De Morte* IV 39.17 f. σ[υ]γκυρή[σ]ειν τὴν τοῦ β[ί]ου παραγραφὴν. Cf. D.L. 10.138 (referring to his own work, which ends with an account of Epicurus) τὸν κολοφῶνα, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, ἐπιθῶμεν τοῦ παντός συγγράματος καὶ τοῦ βίου τοῦ φιλοσόφου; cf. Gigante, *RF²* 233. (See further below on 7 κορωνίδα.) Not quite the same is *AP* 7.21.5 f. (Simias 4 HE), addressed to Sophokles:

τύμβος ἔχει καὶ γῆς ὀλίγον μέρος· ἀλλ' ὁ περισσὸς
 αἰὼν ἀθανάτοις δέρεται ἐν σελίσιν.

The σελίδες are the columns of a papyrus roll (Giangrande), rather than the pages of a codex (Gow-Page), the form of which was probably unknown to Phil. Cf. C. H. Roberts and T. C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London 1983), who show that “the codex scarcely counted for Greek literature before about A.D. 200” (37). In the *Herculaneum* papyri a σελίς could be limited to one *charta* = κόλλημα, but not necessarily; cf. W. Scott, *Fragmenta Herculaniensia* (Oxford 1885) 14.

βίотου = βίου, as often in early poetry. Construe with σελίδες rather than as gen. of separation with σχιζόμεναι.

3: This line was omitted in Planudes' exemplar owing to homoeoarcton; all that Planudes could do was leave a space for the missing line, perhaps in the hope that he would find it in another selection from Kephalas. (Kaibel mistakenly attributes the error to Planudes himself.)

καί: “Of two clauses linked by καί, the first sometimes gives the time or circumstances in which the action of the second takes place” (Denniston, *GP* 293). Cf. Thuc. 1.50.5 ἤδη δὲ . . . ἐπεπαιάνιστο . . . , καὶ οἱ Κορίνθιοι ἕξαπίνης πρύμναν ἐκρούοντο.

λευκαί . . . ἔθειραι: On the motif of white hair, cf. 5.3–4.

κατασπείρουσιν: A metaphor from sowing seed; cf. Kratinos fr. 246.2 K-A (spoken by the ashes of Solon in his name:) ἐσπαρμένος κατὰ πᾶσαν Αἴαντος πόλιν. The construction is odd—normal Greek would call for μοι κατασπείρονται ἔθειραι—but is readily understandable.

4 συνετῆς ἄγγελοι ἠλικίης: Or so one hopes: οἱ πρεσβύτεροι . . . συνετωτέρους οἴοντ[α] διὰ τὸν χρόνον[ν] ἑαυτοῦς . . . ἀμαρτάνουσι. (Phil. *Parrh.* col. xxiv a8–b1). συνετός and σύνεσις are common in Phil.’s prose. Cf. Phil. 5.3–4. Kaibel compares Apollonides 27 GP (*AP* 11.25.6) ἡ συνετὴ κροτάφων ἄπτεται ἡμετέρων, further suggesting that this author is the Stoic Apollonides of Smyrna mentioned by Phil. *Index Stoic.* col. lii. 3–4 Dorandi. The only connection between epigrammatist and philosopher, however, is the lemma to *AP* 235, Ἀπολλωνίου Σμυρναίου, which edd. emend to Ἀπολλωνίδου Σ.; but see GP 2.147.

5–6 ἄλλ’ ἔπι μοι κτλ: Phil. appears at least at first like those old men Kephalos speaks of in the *Republic* who bemoan the lost pleasures of youth: οἱ οὖν πλεῖστοι ἡμῶν ὀλοφύρονται ξυνιόντες, τὰς ἐν τῇ νεότητι ἡδονὰς ποθοῦντες καὶ ἀναμνησκόμενοι περὶ τε ἀφροδίσια καὶ περὶ πότους καὶ εὐωχίας . . . τότε μὲν εὖ ζῶντες, νῦν δὲ οὐδὲ ζῶντες (329a).

6 πῦρ: Raging desire for the ἀφροδίσια Kephalos spoke of. Cf. 1.2 n.

τύφει ἐνί: Gow-Page follow Jacobs on the grounds that elision of –αι is rare in this position, but –αι is elided fourteen times in GP and more often in HE; and there is elision in this position twenty-six times in GP. Correption, it is true, would be more in keeping with Phil.’s usual practice, but this is insufficient reason to condemn an elided τύφεται here; cf. Intro., p. 41, Kaibel vi, xiv. Ancient grammarians were at odds over the accentuation of disyllabic prepositions when they fell between noun and adj., some arguing that anastrophe always is called for, others only if the noun comes first, and others only if (as here) the adj. precedes; cf. McLennan on Kallim. *H.* 1.48.

7–8: A vexed passage, all the more so when ταύτην (cod.) is read. Either (i) αὐτήν emphasizes κορωνίδα, or (ii) it stands for Xanthippe. Gow-Page argue for (i): “Write this [ταύτην] same *Finis*.” First, it will not do to cite Homer’s use of αὐτήν = τὴν αὐτήν, as this usage is extremely rare elsewhere (Hes. *Sc.* 35, 37; Pindar *N.* 5.1; not in tragedy; cf. KG 1.630). Second, their understanding of “same” is strained: “here is the end of my poem; let it mark also the end of my dissipation.” Even spelled out like this it makes little sense (similarly Giangrande 142). Better is the usual construal of αὐτήν ταύτην = *hanc ipsam* = *Xanthippen* (Dübner, Kaibel, Giangrande): The Muses are to inscribe Xanthippe as the sign of Phil.’s new sanity. With this general interpretation I too am in agreement (see below on κορωνίδα), but suggest the slight

emendation of **ταύτης** in order to obviate the hyperbaton of αὐτήν . . . ταύτην. Holford-Strevens suspects 7 αὐτήν; perhaps ταύτην, in which case PPI's ταύτην in 8 may conceal something altogether different.

7 ἄλλά: This particle, frequently preceding imperatives or exhortations (Denniston *GP* 13 f.), came to lose its force as an adversative conjunction in their presence; in the fifth century it could be repeated in oratio obliqua; e.g., Aristoph. *Clouds* 1364 ἐκέλευσ' αὐτὸν ἄλλὰ μυρρίνην λαβόντα | τῶν Αἰσχύλου λέξει τί μοι (with Dover's n.), Eur. *Or.* 1562. In later Greek poetry, a significant number of postponed ἄλλά's occur with imperatives or deliberative subjunctives: Kallim. *Ep.* 14.11 HE, fr. 110.61; *AP* 5.17.5 (Gaeticulus). For other situations which allow postponement, cf. Denniston 13; in Hellenistic Greek, cf. Kallim. *H.* 1.18, fr. 260.55, *AP* 5.9.7 (Rufinus 1 Page). Kallim. fr. 10 ἄλλοτε codd., ἄλλ' ὅτε van Eldick (approb. Pfeiffer) may be another ex.

κορωνίδα: The elaborated paragraphus used to mark the end of a poem (esp. one in a series) or part of a poem (e.g., a choral ode in drama; cf. Hephaist. p. 75 Consb.), the section (e.g., a book) of a longer work, or the end of an entire work. That is, it may or may not be followed by more poetry. For a description cf. Schol. in Aristoph. *Plut.* 253: γραμμή τις ἐστὶ βραχεῖα, καμπήν τινα ὑποκάτω ἔχουσα. See further G. M. Stephen, "The coronis," *Scriptorium* 13 (1959) 3–14, with plates 1–2; E. G. Turner, *Gk. Mss of the Anc. World*², *BICS* Suppl. 46 (1987) 12 n. 59. Many exx. of varying designs are found in the Herculanum papyri (Stephen 8; G. Cavallo, *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano* [Naples 1983] 24), a particularly elaborate one at the end of *On Inference* (cf. De Lacey and De Lacey's ed. p. 21 for an illustration). Meleager 129 HE (*AP* 12.257), perhaps the last poem of his collection (see Gow-Page's pref. to 129), is spoken by the koronis alongside:

Ἄ πύματον καμπτήρα καταγγέλλουσα κορωνίς,
 ἔρκοῦρος γραπταῖς πιστοτάτα σελίσιν,
 φαμί τὸν ἐκ πάντων ἠθροισμένον εἰς ἓνα μόχθον
 ὕμνοθετᾶν βύβλω τᾶδ' ἐνελιζάμενον
 ἐκτελέσαι Μελέαγρον, ἀείμνηστον δὲ Διοκλεῖ
 ἄνθεσι συμπλέξαι μουσοπόλον στέφανον.
 οὐλα δ' ἐγὼ καμφθεῖσα δρακροντείοις ἴσα νότοις
 σύνθρονος ἴδρυμαι τέρμασιν εὐμαθίας.

(For another "speaking koronis," beginning Ἐγὼ κορωνίς εἰμι γραμμάτων φύλαξ [P.Lit.Lond. 11], see T. C. Skeat, "The use of dictation in ancient book-production," *PBA* 42 [1956] 183.)

Cf. Poseidippos 705.5 f. SH, also addressed to Muses:

νῦν δὲ Ποσε[ι]δίππῳ στυγερὸν συγγαίσατε γῆρας
 γραψάμεναι δέλτων ἐν χρυσέαις σελίσιν.

(On text and interpretation, neither without problems, cf. Lloyd-Jones, *Academic Papers* 2.167 ff.) For the metaphorical use of the koronis in Phil., see above on 2 σελίδες, and cf. P.Herc. 1005, edited as *Agli Amici di Scuola* by A. Angeli (Naples

1988), fr. 77 παραγράφ[άψα]ι τὰς τ[ό]τε δι[α]τριβ[ί]ας, “put an end to the earlier discussions”; fr. 34 λ[ό]γου[ς] παρ[α]γε[γ]ραμμένους, P.Herc. 1428 col. 15.20–23 τὸν περὶ τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον τῆς κατ’ Ἐπίκουρον αὐτοῦ παραγράφει[τι]ν (*De Piet.* p. 25 f. Henrichs); P.Herc. 1418 *Pragmat.* col. 13.6 f., col. 27.13; *Rhet.* I 120.6–10; etc.; D. Obbink, *Philodemus on Piety* (Oxford 1996) 89–94. Phil. is clearly fond of this metaphor. See further P. Bing, *The Well-Read Muse*, *Hypomnemata* 90 (Göttingen 1988) 33–35.

Phil.’s point is that Xanthippe is the koronis that marks the end of the manic stage of his life, and as a living koronis she fits into the book of Phil.’s life, as described at the poem’s beginning (Giangrande 143). If she is to do this, she cannot be simply the last of his loves from his earlier life; a koronis that has disappeared cannot perform its proper function. Phil. certainly is not claiming that henceforth (at age thirty-seven!) he will lead a celibate life (*pace* Philippon, *RE* 19 [1938] 2446; *rp.* in *Studien*). Xanthippe should rather be part of his new life in a way that demonstrates that his old ways are over. She can do this, first, by being his *patrona virgo*, like Lesbia, Cynthia, et al. Note especially Hor. *O.* 4.11.31 ff. *age iam, meorum | finis amorum, | . . . condisce modos, amanda | voce quos reddas*. Xanthippe can also help Phil. by acting as his partner/wife in their common pursuit of Epicurean virtues.

If this poem was in fact accompanied by a koronis, it marked the end of the poem (Gow-Page). For its being the end of a book of Phil.’s poetry (Griffiths) there is no firm evidence; to the contrary, Phil. would rather seem to be asking the Muses to help him in the writing of further poems about his new love. (See next lemma.) Griffiths’s detailed comparison with Poseidippos 705 SH (cited in part above) proves little, as this poem almost certainly introduced rather than closed Poseidippos’ book; cf. Lloyd-Jones, *Academic Papers* 2.171, 190. On poetic closure in general, cf. D. P. Fowler, “First thoughts on closure: Problems and prospects,” *MD* 22 (1989) 75–122 (106 f. on Phil.).

γράνατε: For the syntax, cf. Hdt. 7.214.3 τοῦτον [sc. Ἐπιάλτην] αἴτιον γράφω, *Pi. O.* 3.29 f. Hellenistic Muses have given up singing for writing: cf. Bing, *op. cit.*, pp. 10–48 [= ch. 1]. Phil. none the less maintains the fiction that it is the Muses who supply the words, in which he differs from Hellenistic epigrammatists (if not Hellenistic epic poets), who tend to regard them as fellow laborers; cf. Giangrande 143 n. 10.

8 ἡμετέρης . . . μανίης: Love as madness: Phil. *De Dis* 3 fr. 76.6 ff. Diels, love is <σ>ύν[εγγ]υς . . . τη παρανοία, Sappho 1.17 f. κῶττι μοι μάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι μαινόλα θύμω, Alkaios 283.5, Anakr. 428, Theogn. 1231, Eur. *Hipp.* 1274–1276; Plato *Phdr.* 265b, Theokr. 11.10 f. See further on 5.2. Griffiths 42 n. 48 suggested reading ἡμετέρη . . . μανίη because the phrase ἐπιτιθέναι κορωνίδα takes the dative; but outside of this formula κορωνίς is free to take the genitive; note in particular *Plut.* 789a κ. τοῦ βίου. (Editors before Kaibel construed the genitive with δεσπότιδες.)

8 δεσπότιδες: (The accent is wrong in GP.) Female deities, are called δέσποια or δεσπότις with some regularity: Persephone of course, but also, e.g., Eirene (Aristoph. *Pax* 976), Demeter (*Thesm.* 286), Athena (Eur. *Kykl.* 350), Aphrodite (Phil. 8.7–8, Eur. *Hipp.* 415 = Xenarchos fr. 4.21 K-A), Hekate (Aisch. fr. 388), a

mountain nymph (Aisch. fr. 342), and heroines (Kallim. fr. 602 Pf., Nikainetos 1 GP [AP 6.225]) and minor deities such as Tyche, Eutelia, Eirene, Peitho. See further A. Henrichs, "Despoina Kybele: Ein Beitrag zur religiogen Namenkunde," *HSCP* 80 (1976) 253–286.

5

ἠράσθην. τίς δ' οὐχί; κεκώμακα. τί δ' ἀμύητος
 κώμων; ἀλλ' ἐμάνην ἐκ τίνος; οὐχί θεοῦ;
 ἐρρίφθω, πολὴ γὰρ ἐπείγεται ἀντὶ μελαίνης
 θριξ ἤδη, συνετῆς ἄγγελος ἡλικίης.
 καὶ παίζειν ὅτε καιρός, ἐπαίξαμεν ἠνίκα καὶ νῦν 5
 οὐκέτι, λωϊτέρης φροντίδος ἀνόμεθα.

AP 5.112 [18 GP, 19 K, 15 G]

P Φιλοδήμου P1 7.94, f. 72v τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] P v. 11 ἠρασθηντιεδο.
 [J] ὅτι ἐν νεότητι ἐρωτόληπτος ὦν ἐν τῷ γήρα μάλιστα ἐσωφρόνησε

1 κεκώμακα P: –κε P1 2 θεοῦ P1: θῶ P 3 πολὴ C: –ιῆ P: πολλή P1 4 θριξ
 CP1: θριξί P? 5 παίζειν] κείνων Lumb ἠνίκα καὶ νῦν] ἠ. καιρός Herwerden: οὔνεκα
 καλόν F. W. Schmidt: οὔνεκα καὶ νῦν Desrousseaux 6 λωϊτέρης P: λωοτ– P1

I fell in love. Who hasn't? I reveled. Who is not an initiate of revels? But
 whose fault is it I went mad? A god's, isn't it?
 Let it go, for already grey hair rushes in to take the place of black—grey
 hair the proclaimer of the age of wisdom.
 And when it was right to play we played; and since it is right no longer, we
 shall lay hold of loftier thoughts.

Griffiths, *BICS* 17 (1970) 38.
 Jacoby, *RM* 60 (1905) 99 f.
 Lumb 11.

A complement to the longer and more complex 4, without any further reference to lovemaking after the first word, and hence with no hints of marriage. Having argued that 4 was the last poem in Phil.'s poetry book, Griffiths, noting the similarities between the two poems, goes on to suggest that this poem stood first. Since I regard Griffiths mistaken about the place of 4, there is no reason to follow him on the original place of 5 in the collection. And as we have noted in the Introduction, Phil., like other epigrammatists, often wrote variations on the same theme.

As Kaibel noted, this poem must be a conscious answer to Meleager 19 (*AP* 12. 117):

Βεβλήσθω κύβος· ἄπτε· πορεύσομαι. — Ἦνίδε τόλμαν·
οἰνοβαρές, τίν' ἔχεις φροντίδα; — Κωμάσομαι,
κωμάσομαι. — Ποῦ, θυμέ, τρέπη; — Τί δ' Ἔρωτι λογισμός;
ἄπτε τάχος. — Ποῦ δ' ἡ πρόσθε λόγων μελέτης
— Ἐρρίφθω σοφίας ὁ πολὺς πόνος· ἐν μόνον οἶδα
τοῦθ', ὅτι καὶ Ζηγὸς λῆμα καθεῖλεν Ἔρωτος.

Note in particular that the relatively rare form ἐρρίφθω is used to make precisely opposed points, Meleager rejecting the teachings of philosophy for revelry, Phil. embracing them. Propertius models 3.5.19 ff. on Phil. Note esp. the poem's Epicurean coloring, which may owe something to a lost poem of Phil.:

me iuvat in prima coluisse Heliconia iuventa	
Musarumque choris implicuisse manus . . .	20
atque ubi iam Venerem gravis interceperit aetas,	23
sparsit et nigras alba senecta comas,	
tum mihi naturae libeat perdiscere mores, . . .	
an ficta in miseras descendit fabula gentis,	45
et timor haud ultra quam rogus esse potest.	

For echoes of Phil. in Propertius, cf. Tait 79–81.

1 ἠράσθην: Ingressive, as usual; KG 1.155.

1–2 ἀμύητος . . . κῶμων: Phil. assimilates the erotic mania of κῶμοι to the telestic mania of religious rites. Hence it is easy to credit a god for his state of mind. Cf. Hesych. ἀνοργίας· ἀμυησίας.

2 ἐμάνην: It is easy to find parallels for love as madness (cf. 4.8 n. and Brown ad Lucr. 4.1068–1072, 1073–1120); and note in particular Phil. *De Dis* III fr. 76 Diels ἔρωτος <σ>ύν[εγγ]ύς ἐστι τῆ πα[ρανοίᾳ]. Other edd. mark a period after this word, but I prefer the run of thought as shown in the translation, which makes better sense of ἀλλά and allows ἐμάνην to be taken as ingressive. Jacobs's comment, *haec paulo gravior reprehensio*, seems an understatement.

ὄχι θεοῦ: A ready answer. Cf. Phaidra's ἐμάνην, ἔπεσον δαίμονος ἄτη (Eur. *Hipp.* 241).

3–4 πολιὴ . . . ἡλικίης: Cf. 4.3. In each poem, Phil. has adapted for his own purpose the topos of gray hair signaling both the onset of old age and the end of extreme sexual passion. Cf. Sappho 58.12–14 Voigt:

Ἰφιλάοιδον λιγύραν χελύνναν
πάν]τα χροὰ γῆρας ἦδη
λεῦκαί τ' ἐγένον]το τρίχες ἐκ μελαίναν ,

and *H.Aphr.* 228–230:

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πρῶται πολιαὶ κατέχυντο ἔθειραι
καλῆς ἐκ κεφαλῆς εὐηγενέος τε γενείου
τοῦ δ' ἦ τοι εὐνῆς μὲν ἀπείχετο πότνια Ἥως.

Prob. also Anakr. 420 PMG εὐτέ μοι λευκαὶ μελαίνησ' ἀναμεμείζονται τρίχες. Cf. Apollonides 27 GP (*AP* 11.25.6) ἡ συνετὴ κροτάφων ἄπτεται ἡμετέρων, ending a poem on the topos “Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we may die.” But as Anakr. 358 PMG (σφαίρη δηῦτε κτλ.) shows, sexual desire or activity does not necessarily end at this time (cf. 4). (Horace puts an interesting twist on this motif by pointing out that dark hair alone does not guarantee obtaining the girl of one’s choice: *Epist.* 1.7.25–28: *reddes | . . . nigros angusta fronte capillos, | . . . et | inter vina fugam Cınarae maerere protervae.*) Cf. also Soph. *Ant.* 1092 f.

3 ἐπείγεται: Cf. Pi. *N.* 4.34 ὦραι τ' ἐπειγόμεναι, where again the reference is to old age.

5–6: For the general thought, cf. Prop. 1.14.19 ff. (cited above), Hor. *Epist.* 1.14.36 (in a passage praising simple, Epicurean, pleasures) *nec lusisse pudet, sed non incidere ludum*, 2.2.211–216 *lenior et melior fis accedente senecta?* etc.

5 παίζειν: Lumb’s conjecture (“an easy correction”) is so unnecessary, one wonders how it occurred to him.

ἐπαίξαμεν: For the morphology, cf. Pi. *Pai.* 6.87 ἔριξε < ἐρίζω; cf. A. L. Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Oxford 1995) 516.

ἡνίκα καὶ νῦν: Despite both Jacobs’s explanation of these words as = καὶ νῦν ἡνίκα οὐκέτι καιρός and Kaibel’s and Stadtmüller’s defense of the MSS., scholars have tried to eliminate this dislocation of consecutive καὶ. (Stadtmüller even rejected two conjectures of his own.) Cf. Ps.-Anakreon 5 FGE (*AP* 6.134), quoted at 2.2 n.

For Herwerden’s conjecture, cf. *Mnemosyne* 2nd ser. 2 (1874) 307, on the basis of which he further emends v. 5 as follows:

οἶ, παίζειν ὅτε καιρός, ἐπαίξαμεν, ἡνίκα καιρός.

6

λευκοῖνους πάλι δὴ καὶ ψάλματα καὶ πάλι Χίους
οἴνους καὶ πάλι δὴ σμύρναν ἔχειν Συρίην
καὶ πάλι κωμάζειν καὶ ἔχειν πάλι διψάδα πόρνην
οὐκ ἐθέλω· μισῶ ταῦτα τὰ πρὸς μανίην.
ἀλλ' ἐμὲ ναρκίσσοις ἀναδήσατε καὶ πλαγιαύλων
γεύσατε καὶ κροκίνοις χρίσατε γυῖα μύροις
καὶ Μιτυληναίῳ τὸν πνεύμονα τέγξατε Βάκχῳ
καὶ συζεύξατέ μοι φωλάδα παρθενικὴν.

AP 11.34 [21 GP, 13 K, 13 G]

P Φιλοδήμου Π ii. 5 λευκοινουc caret Pl

1, 2 δῆ Ap.Voss(marg.) δεῖ P 3 ἔχειν Ap.B: ἔχει P 5 ἄλλ' ἐμέ scripsi: ἀλλά με PPI

Giangrande, *EH* 14 (1968) 145 f.; *GB* 1 (1973) 147 f.; *QUCC* 15 (1973) 13–15; *MPL* 5 (1981) 38.
 Hendrickson, *AJP* 39 (1918) 27–43.
 Schulze, *BPhW* 36 (1916) 317, 320.
 Sider, *AJP* 108 (1987) 313 f.

To have white-violet wreaths yet again, harp songs and Chian wine again,
 and Syrian myrrh yet again;
 to revel again, and to enjoy a drunken whore—this is what I do *not* want.
 I hate these things that lead to madness.
 But bind my brow with narcissus and give me a taste of cross-flutes and
 anoint my limbs with saffron myrrh
 and wet my lungs with wine of Mytilene and wed me to a stay-at-home girl.

As will become clear in the commentary, I follow Giangrande in interpreting this poem, which has to be understood dynamically, with attention paid to word order. At first a list of features of a coming banquet seems to promise an example of the invitation/reminder topos, such as we have most straightforwardly in 28, but which Phil. also rings changes on in 27 and 29. As we first read, and as Phil.'s original audience first heard, of wreaths, songs, wine, incense, and feasts—I translate generically because at first details like “Chian” and “Syrian” might not seem essential—and as we meet the repeated *πάλι* and *ἔχειν*, we expect that these pleasures are to be enjoyed once again. The drunken whore disturbs this picture, however, and *οὐκ ἐθέλω* turns it completely around. (Phil. could be describing the kind of party attacked by Cic. *In Pis.* 22.)

As the poem proceeds, we learn (with no tricks of word order to keep us in suspense) what is now considered desirable. The puzzle, as Gow-Page ably demonstrate, is that we find no significant difference between violets and narcissi, between harps and cross-auloi, between Chian and Mytilenaean wine. Phil.'s audience would have been listening to the attributes of the second banquet while trying to recall the details of the first. But when we get to the last line, we are told the one significant difference, the one between prostitute and *parthenos*, between drunken revelry and wedded tranquility. And with this revelation, we also realize that the seeming insignificance of the other pairs is exactly that: of no account whatsoever in comparison with the difference that this new woman will make in Phil.'s life.

Throughout this short poem Phil. plays with and and thwarts audience expectation: (i) What starts as a desirable party is rejected (see above); (ii) only midway through the poem does it reveal itself as a priamel (see on v. 4), (iii) whose cap seems to be the narrator (see on v. 5) but is in fact the girl he wishes to marry. Finally, a poem seemingly addressed to friends turns out to take the form of a prayer to some unnamed deities (see on v. 8). These alterations of poetic form and content brilliantly reflect the striking conversion of the narrator's life.

The apograph of P once in the possession of Isaac Voss (*Leidensis Vossianus* gr. O8), which contains this poem, was said to have been transcribed by Friedrich Sylburg (see above, p. 52); hence the readings assigned here and in GP to “Ap. Voss.” are assigned by Waltz and Beckby to “Sylburg”; cf. HE 1.xliv f.

1 λευκοῖνους: Sc. στεφάνους. There is nothing contemptuous in the ellipse, as Dübner said and as is favored by Gow-Page, who also suspect that the white violets can represent luxuriance by their being the first to blossom in the spring. That is, just as others prolong the season for expensive floral wreaths (*mitte sectari rosa quo locorum sera moretur*, Hor. O. 1.38.3 f.), others would try to get a jump on the season with white violets. But once the season began, it would cease to have this connotation, and πάλι shows that no one small stretch of time is meant. Cf. Hor. O. 1.38.2 *displicent nexae philyra coronae*.

1 ψάλαμα: Elsewhere only in Greg. Naz. *Carmina de se ipso* 37.1211.3 MPG, although διάψαλαμα, “musical interlude,” i.e., “inbetween song,” is found in the Septuagint; also σύψαλαμα (Σ Pi. O. 3.11), ὑπόψαλαμα (Greg. Nyss. *In suam ord.* 9.339.16 Gebhardt); see further on 1.1.

1, 2 πάλι δῆ: The particle often emphasizes “adverbs expressing frequency” (Denniston GP 206); cf. Aristoph. *Av.* 921, where the poet proudly says πάλαι πάλαι δὴ τήνδ’ ἐγὼ κλήζω πόλιν, and, expressing regret, Soph. *Ph.* 806 ἀλγῶ πάλαι δῆ. Note also the repeated δηῦτε of Sappho 1, on which cf. S. T. Mace, “Amour, encore! The development of δηῦτε in archaic lyric,” *GRBS* 34 (1993) 335–364; J. C. B. Petropoulos, “Sappho the sorceress: Another look at fr. 1 (LP),” *ZPE* 97 (1993) 43–56, esp. 46–48.

1–2 Χίους οἶνους: As Gow-Page show, no meaningful distinction can be drawn in this poem between Chian and Lesbian wine, both of which were plentiful; cf. Euboulos fr. 121 K-A Θάσιον ἢ Χίον λαβῶν | ἢ Λέσβιον γέροντα νεκταροσταγῆ; Hor. *Epod.* 9.33f. *capaciores adfer huc, puer, scyphos | et Chia vina aut Lesbia*.

2 σμύρναν . . . Συρίην: Although Gow-Page are right to point out that “Syrian” became an ornamental epithet for myrrh and similar exotic items (Schulze 317 gives many exx.), we should allow that a Syrian like Phil. would use the term in its precise sense.

3 ἔχειν: Not just “have at the feast,” as with its occurrence on v. 2, but the frequent “have sexually”; cf. 21.3.

διψάδα: “Drunken” is preferable to LSJ’s “thirsty”; cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.8.2–4 *est quaedam nomine Dipsas anus. | ex re nomen habet: nigri non illa parentem | Memnonis in roseis sobria vidit equis*, perhaps (so Kaibel) recalling Phil. A hetaira known for her tipsy ways was nicknamed Πάροπιος; Athen. 13.583e.

πόρνην: Women of some complaisant variety are to be expected; cf. Aristoph. *Ach.* 1090–1092:

κλῖναι, τράπεζαι, προσκεφάλαια, στρώματα,
 στέφανοι, μύρον, τραγήμαθ'—αἱ πόρναι πάρα—
 ἄμυλοι, πλακοῦντες, σησαμοῦντες, ἴτρια,

although the word πόρνη, especially after Phil.'s more poetic list, would seem to have some shock value. For women as an essential constituent of a full banquet, see also Pl. *Rep.* 373a κλῖναί τε προσέσονται καὶ τράπεζαι καὶ τᾶλλα σκεύη, καὶ ὄψα δὴ καὶ μύρα καὶ θυμιάματα καὶ ἑταῖραι καὶ πέμματα, Xen. *Mem.* 1.5.4 (πόρναι), Cat. 13.1 ff. (4, *non sine candida puella*). Note also Asklepiades 26 HE (*AP* 5.185), in which the narrator gives a shopping list to a slave for the day's dinner, the last line of which is καὶ Τρυφέραν ταχέως ἐν παρόδῳ κάλεσον; cf. Giangrande, "Symptotic literature and epigram," *EH* 14 (1968) 142.

4 οὐκ ἐθέλω μισῶ: These words come as a surprise (see introduction and on 7.3 ἔξιθι), producing an eccentric priamel. (For the priamel in general cf. Gerber on Pi. *O.*1.1, with bibliography.) Note Π iv.8 οὐ μισέω τὸ ποίημα (see comm. ad loc. for its possible relationship with a Kallimachean priamel) and v. 22 μισῶ καὶ στεφ(άνου). Here, as usual the form μισῶ (and ἐχθαίρω) occurs at the beginning of the poems; cf. Hor. *O.* 1.38.1 *Persicos odi, puer, apparatus*, *AP* 12.200 (Strato). Hendrickson adduces *Anthol. Lat.* 458 (= 456 Shackleton Bailey) which seems to echo both Horace and Phil. (note esp. the placement of *non amo*):

semper munditias, semper Basilissa decores,
 semper dispositas arte decente comas,
 et comptos semper cultus unguentaque semper.
 omnia sollicita compta videre manu,
 non amo. neglectam, mihi se quae comit amica, 5
 se det: inornatae simplicitate valent.
 vincula nec curet capitis discussa soluti.
 et coram faciem me lavet illa suam.
 fingere se semper non est confidere amori.
 quid quod saepe decor, cum prohibetur, adest? 10

(Cf. Housman *Classical Papers* 1121f. on v. 8.) Note also how Archil. 5.2 W² κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων alters the natural meaning of the first line, ἀσπίδι μὲν Σαίων τις ἀγάλλεται, which would naturally be taken to mean that the Thracian was rejoicing with his own shield; cf. A. W. H. Adkins, *Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists* (Chicago 1985) 52.

4 πρὸς μανίην: I follow Gow-Page and Aubreton in my translation (Beckby is unclear), but perhaps Jacobs, *Delectus epigrammatum Graecorum* (Gotha 1826) 230 is right to take it as an adverbial phrase (cf. LSJ s.v. πρὸς C III 7). In which case, render "I hate these things which are done in madness."

5 ἄλλ' ἐμέ: This slight alteration seems warranted, as an accented pronoun frequently identifies the "cap" of the priamel; cf. E. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (Berke-

ley 1986) 5 n. 18 for the definition of the term. Phil. is still playing with the audience's expectations, however, for the real cap comes in the last line.

πλαγιαύλων: Although its invention and use are credited to Pan (Bion fr. 10.7 Gow), this instrument is not the same as the panpipe or syrinx, which Longus (1.4.3 and 4.26.2) keeps distinct from it. Rather, it had a reed and was "held transversely and played by blowing across the open end or, as in modern flutes, across a hole cut in the side (Apul. *Met.* 11.9.6 *oblicum calamum ad aurem porrectum dexteram*)" (Gow on Theokr. 20.29); cf. K. Schlesinger, *The Greek Aulos* (London 1939) 79. Pollux 4.74 says that it is made of lotus and is a Libyan invention. It is also called (i) πλάγιος αὐλός: Lucian, *Ver. Hist.* 2.5, Longus locc. cit., and Heliodoros, *Aith.* 5.14.2 (who, unlike Longus, seems to confuse it with the syrinx); and (ii) φῶτιγξ (Athen. 4.175e, 182d–e. (Hesych. s.v. φῶτιγξ has the confusing entry, σῦριγξ, λῶπινος αὐλός, εἶδος σάλπιγγος.) Cf. A. A. Howard, "The αὐλός or *tibia*," *HSCP* 4 (1893) 1–60, esp. 14 f.; and the pertinent articles in *RE*: "Aulos," "Photinix, and "Plagiaulos."

A reasonable construal of the ancient references is that any cross-flute could, by definition, be called πλαγιάουλος, πλάγιος αὐλός, while Libyan examples made of lotus wood (and perhaps thereafter any of this wood from whatever source) were called φῶτιγγες. Note then that Poseidonios said φῶτιγγια καὶ μοναύλια κώμων οὐ πολέμων ὄργανα (F 54 E-K = Athen. 176c).

5–6 ἐμέ . . . πλαγιαύλων | γεύσατε: The closest parallel is Anaxippos fr. 1.27 K-A γεύσω δ', ἐὰν βούλη, σε τῶν εὐρημένων; cf. also Herodas 6.11 σ' ἔγευσ' ἄν τῶν ἐμῶν χειρῶν.

7 Μιτυληναίφ: See above on 1–2 Χίους οἴνους. The spelling Μιτυ- for Μυτι- begins as early as the fourth century B.C.; cf. L. Threatte, *Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* 1 (Berlin 1980) 266.

πνεύμονα τέγξατε Βάκχφ: "Drink deep"; cf. Alkaios 347.1 τέγγε πλεύμονας οἴνω, Eratosth. fr. 3 Diehl = 25 Powell καὶ βαθὺν ἀκρήτω πνεύμονα τεγγόμενος, Anon. ap. *Souda* T 212 τέγγε· βρέχε· οἴνω πνεύμονα τέγγε, φίλης δ' ἀπέχου Κυθερείης, Hor. *O.* 4.12 22 f. *te . . . tingere poculis*, Petron. 73 *tengomenas faciamus*.

Although some scholarly controversy exists concerning the equation of Bacchos and Dionysos in and before the fifth century (cf. S. G. Cole, "New evidence for the mysteries of Dionysus," *GRBS* 21 [1980] 223–238), well before Phil.'s day the synonymy between the two is complete. For Dionysus is "wine," cf. Eur. *Ba.* 284 σπένδεται θεὸς γεγώς, *Kykl.* 525 θεὸς δ' ἐν ἀσκῶ, Procl. in Plat. *Crat.* 406c Διόνυσον οἱ θεολόγοι πολλακίς. . . Οἶνον καλοῦσιν, οἶον Ὀρφεὺς . . . "Οἴνω ἀγαιομένη κούρφ Διός" (Orpheus fr. 216 Kern), Hesych. Οἶνος· Διόνυσος. The evidence for this belief in Campania is gathered by H. Herter, "Bacchus am Vesuv," *RM* 100 (1957) 101–114, esp. 106 ff. See further W. Burkert, *Homo Necans* (Berkeley 1983) 224 f.; D. Obbink, "Dionysus poured out: Ancient and modern theories of sacrifice and cultural formation," in T. H. Carpenter and C. A. Faraone (eds.), *Masks of Dionysus* (Ithaca 1993) 65–86, esp. 78–86.

In his more sober moments Phil. condemns this sort of equation; cf. *De Pietate*, P.Herc. 1428 fr. 19 Henrichs (*HSCP* 79 [1975] 107) and col. 3.10–13 Henrichs (*CErc* 4 [1974] 14); cf. Epic. fr. 87 U. More fully, Lucr. 2.656 f. *hic siquis mare*

Neptunum Ceremque vocare | constituit fruges et Bacchi nomine abuti. . . This readiness to deify objects and actions of everyday life is course a regular feature of early thought; cf. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen* 2.62 f.

8 συζεύξατε: Marriage is meant, as often with both this verb and its simplex (LSJ Π 2): cf. e.g. Eur. *Alk.* 165 f. τῷ μὲν φίλην | σύζευξον ἄλοχον, τῇ δὲ γενναῖον πόσιν, Soph. *Tr.* 536 κόρην γάρ, οἶμαι δ' οὐκέτ', ἀλλ' ἐζευγμένην. Note also Eur. *Hipp.* 545 f. τὰν . . . πῶλον ἄζυγα λέκτρων (with Barrett's note). See further E. W. Bushala, "Συζύγιοι Χάριτες, *Hippolytus* 1147," *TAPA* 100 (1969) 23–29; A. La Penna, *Maia* 4 (1951) 206; Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. *O.* 1.33.11. The imperatives from ἀναδήσατε to τέγξατε seemed, when first met, to be addressed to friends (his first audience?); this final imperative could hardly be so addressed and is more the sort of request addressed to gods; it thus retrospectively converts the entire poem into a prayer.

φωλάδα: A "stay-at-home"; cf. Eustath. ad Od. 1.412 αἱ δὲ τοιαῦται [sc. ἄρκτοι] καὶ φωλάδες λέγονται, ὅτε φωλοῦσιν; cf. Theokr. 1.115 φωλάδες ἄρκτοι. Also qualifying for this term are spiders (Erykios 9 GP = AP 9.233), bookworms which do their work without being seen (Evenos 1 GP = AP 9.251) φωλάς, . . . ἱερᾶς ψήφοισι λοχάζῃ, and oysters (Hesych. s.v. φωλαῖδες). Schulze 317 mistakenly compares Hor. *O.* 2.11.21 f. *quis devium scortum eliciet domo | Lyden?*

7

τὸν σιγῶντα, Φιλαινί, συνίστορα τῶν ἀλαλήτων
 λύχνον ἐλαιηρῆς ἐκμεθύσασα δρόσου
 ἔξιθι. μαρτυρίην γάρ Ἔρωσ μόνος οὐκ ἐφίλησεν
 ἔμπνουν· καὶ πυκνήν κλεῖε, Φιλαινί, θύρην.
 καὶ σύ, φίλη Ξανθῶ, με—σὺ δ', ὦ φιλεράστρι' ἄκοιτις, 5
 ἤδη τῆς Παφίης ἴσθι τὰ λειπόμενα.

AP 5.4 [1 GP, 9 K, 11 G]

P: Φιλοδήμου Pl 7.88, f. 72ν τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] Π iv. 10 τονκειγονταφιλαινι
 [J] εἰς Φιλαινίδα τὴν νεωτέραν 5–6 om. Pl

4 πυκνήν tent. Stadtm. (in app. crit.): πυκτὴν P: τυκτὴν Pl: πτυκτὴν Jacobs: πηκτὴν Salm.
 θύρην P θύραν Pl 5 φίλη P: φίλει C Ξανθῶ με C: Ξανθῶ *(*) P: Ξανθῶ με Brunck φιλεράστρι'
 ἄκοιτις C: –τρια κοίτης P: –τρια κοίτη J.G.Schneider: Φιλεράστρια, κοίτης Bosch (apud
 Huschke) 6 Παφίης C: –εἰς P

Philainis, soak with oily dew the lamp, the silent confidant of acts which
 are not to be spoken of,
 and then leave. For Love alone does not desire living witness. And shut
 the door tight, Philainis.

And you, dear Xantho, (to) me—but now, O lover-loving wife, learn what
Aphrodite has left for us.

Huschke, 150–153.

Mariotti, *Il 5° Libro dell'Antologia Palatina* (Rome 1966) 127–34.

Sider, *AJP* 108 (1987) 311–324.

Snyder 348.

A bedroom scene, one of many in the Anthology (Phil. alone has **14**, **25**, and **26**): The maid Philainis is told to fill (a presumably already lit) lamp and leave, locking the door behind her, before the lovemaking begins. The woman Xantho is now addressed, but, although the inanimate lamp is called by its traditional appellation of witness, there remains one more animate witness to be gotten rid of: the reader. Xantho will need no further instructions. This poem thus seems like the model for Marcus Argentarius 13 GP (*AP* 5.128):

στέρνα περι στέρνοις, μαστῶ δ' ἐπὶ μαστὸν ἐρείσας
χείλεά τε γλυκεροῖς χείλεσι συμπίεσας
Ἄντιγόνης καὶ χρώτα λαβῶν πρὸς χρώτα, τὰ λοιπά
σιγῶ, μάρτυς ἐφ' οἷς λύχνος ἐπεγράφετο.

Cf. R. Del Re, “Marco Argentario,” *Maia* 7 (1955) 190 f. Outside witnesses are often held to be undesirable: “Plato” 6 FGE (*AP* 7.100), Dioskorides 1 HE (5.56), Paulus Sil. 60 Viansino (5.252), Tibullus 1.2.33 f. *parcite luminibus. . . . celari vult sua furta Venus*; cf. F. Wilhelm, “Tibulliana,” *RM* 59 (1904) 288 f.; Lier 41–43.

1–2 τὸν σιγῶντα . . . συνίστορα . . . λυχνόν: For asyndeton of attributive adjectives, cf. KG 1.277.

1 Φιλαινί: A common name (23 exx. in LGPN 1–2); cf. the Philainion in **17**. Snyder reasonably suggests that this name was chosen for the maid to resonate with the more significant use of the φιλ- stem later in the poem. See further Headlam-Knox on Herodas 1.5. In erotic contexts the name might also be meant to recall the (real or imaginary) Philainis who wrote an illustrated treatise on love-making; cf. P. Maas, “Philainis,” *RE* 19 (1938) 2122; D. W. T. Vessey, “Philaenis,” *Rev. belg. phil. hist.* 54 (1976) 78–83; J. E. G. Whitehorne, “Filthy Philaenis (P. Oxy. 39.2891): A real lady?” *Pap. Flor.* 19 (1990) 529–542; Usener, *Epicurea* 419.

Since, therefore, the name has strong erotic overtones—cf. Poseidippos 2, Asklepiades 35 HE (*AP* 5. 186, 202), Luc. *Dial. Metr.* 6, and the Philainion in **17**—the first-time audience for this poem may be forgiven for thinking that Philainis is its love object. They would be brought up short, therefore, by the abrupt ἔξιθι of line 3 (I owe this observation to Nita Krevans), which word thus fulfills the same function as 6.4 οὐκ ἐθέλω, q.v. That is, in both poems the audience’s expectations of an erotic poem are dashed or altered when the woman who would seem to be the typical hetaira of such a poem is rejected for another woman who is or who will be the narrator’s wife. This structure makes the choice of wife all the more pointed.

συνίστορα: Lamps are several times called witnesses to the lovers' tryst: Aristoph. *Ekkēl.* 1–16, Argentarius 13.4 (see above), Meleager 23.3–4 (*AP* 5.197), *AP* 5.5 (Statyllius Flaccus; a particularly witty example spoken by the lamp itself); Mart. 14.39 *dulcis conscia lectuli lucerna: | quidquid vis facias licet, tacebo*; cf. Lier 43–45. They can also serve as witnesses to oaths by one or the other lover: 36. The lamp is an inanimate witness (below, v.3–4); cf. Aisch. *Ag.* 1090 (στέγην) συνίστορα.

ἀλαλήτων: Before Phil., only doubtfully in Stobaios' citation (along with other deviations from the codd.) of Theog. 422–424 = fr. dub. 6.2 Young, where πολλ' ἀλάλητα (*nisi* πολλὰ λαλητά) are on the tongue of many men; cf. M. L. West, *Stud. Gk. Eleg. Iambus* (Berlin 1974) 155. Elsewhere only in Christian writings, twice in the sense “inarticulate”: Ep. Rom. 8.26 (στεναγμοί) and Greg. Nys. 46.25a MPG (κραυγή). Only Greg. Nys. 44.310c in the same sense as here, “ineffable, secret.” Phil. is preparing the way for the aposiopesis to follow, perhaps (*pace* Mariotti 130 n. 1) with an allusion to the mysteries (cf. Meleager 11 = *AP* 6.162 λύχνον, | Κύπρι φίλη, μύστην σὼν . . . παννυχίδων), where the usual word is ἄρρητος; W. Burkert, *Ancient Mystery Cults* (Cambridge, Mass., 1987) 137 n. 44.

2 λύχνον: A lamp is obviously an important household object for an action that takes place behind closed doors (v. 4); cf. Asklepiades 9 HE (*AP* 5.7), where the poet prays (λύχνε, σὺ δ', εἰ θεὸς εἶ) that if his girlfriend should sleep with another it refuse to shine on them. The development from mere witness (see above on συνίστορα) to semidivine power is a natural one; cf. M. Marcovich, “A god called Lychnos,” *RM* 114 (1971) 333–339, repr. in id., *Studies in Graeco-Roman Religions* (Leiden 1988) 1–7; for lamps in general in the Anthology, see Mariotti 93–112, 121–134.

ἐλαιηρῆς . . . δρόσου: “Dew” is often applied metaphorically to various liquids; e.g., Pi. *O.* 7.2 ἀμπέλου . . . δρόσω; cf. 3.3.

ἐκμεθύσασα: Theophrastos *CP* 5.15.3 uses this compound in the (so-to-speak) watered-down sense “fill with (any) liquid,” as is common enough with the simplex μεθύσκω, μεθύω (cf. LSJ s.vv.; note esp. *Il.* 17.390 a bull hide μεθύουσιν ἀλοφιῆ), but to translate it here as “make it drink deep” (Gow-Page) *vel sim.* is to lose the point; if the lamp is to be present and, by the conventions of erotic poetry, to be a witness (see above), at least let its powers of observation be impaired. Hence, “make it thoroughly drunk.” Jokes about “drunken” lamps are common in comedy; cf. Aristoph. *Clouds* 57 τὸν πότην ἦπτεες λύχνον, Plato *Com.* 206 K-A, Alkaios *Com.* 21 K-A. Phil. seems to have been imitated in turn by Babrios 114 init. μεθύων ἐλαίω λύχνος (so Mariotti 133 n. 2).

3 μαρτυρίην: “Evidence, testimony,” although translators find that they must render it as “a witness, *témoïn*, etc.,” It is not so much that the word alone equals μάρτυς, but that “living testimony” readily converts to “living witness.”

ἐφίλησεν: The aorist gives the air of a *gnome* (so Mariotti 132) to a phrase probably made up to suit the occasion. Cf. in general J. Labarbe, “Aspects gnomiques de l'épigramme grecque,” *EH* 14 (1968) 349–383.

4 ἔμπνουν: “Animate”; in his prose, Phil. prefers ἔμπνυχος (e.g., *De Dis* I 12.5), but either word is at home in poetry. The enjambement has the effect of an afterthought,

all the more so after the quasi-gnomic v. 3, as if Phil. has just remembered that the lamp has been called *συνίστωρ*, and so can be considered a witness; cf. 36.4.

πυκνήν: Tentatively suggested by Stadtmüller in his app. crit., where he rightly compares the *Dios Apate*. In this *locus classicus* for unobserved sex between husband and wife, Hera says of their bedroom that Hephaistos *πυκινὰς δὲ θύρας σταθομοῖσιν ἐπήρσεν* (*Il.* 14.339). A literary allusion to this passage would obviously please Phil.'s audience, who would not yet know that they, like Homer's audience, are to be excluded before the lovemaking starts. For the sense—"tight" rather than "compact"—cf. LSJ s.v. III.

5 καὶ σύ: Having given orders to Philainis, he begins to do the same to Xantho; "and as for you."

φίλη: Without Pl, we have to choose between P and C, each of which offers an acceptable reading. Following Gow-Page, I print φίλη, but not for their reasons: "A completed sentence here detracts from the effect of the abrupt change of address and from the significance of ἴσθι τὰ λειπόμενα." First, I do not believe that there is a change of addressee (see below on *σὺ δέ* and *ἄκοιτις*); and, second, the force of the last words could be seen as being even stronger after we hear of the first kiss. I still think, however (as I argued in *AJP* 312), that we have here another Hellenistic example of aposiopesis designed to avoid the specific details of lovemaking: Meleager 72 (*AP* 5.184.5), Antipater 52 GP (*AP* 9.241.5), Theokr. 1.105, 5.149, Herodas 1.84; also Aristoph. *V.* 1178; for its continuation in Latin poetry, cf. J. N. Adams, "A type of sexual euphemism in Latin," *Phoenix* 35 (1981) 120–128. *Contra*, A. H. Griffiths in his review of GP, who finds the aposiopesis very harsh and deems (I think wrongly) φίλη the *lectio difficilior* (*JHS* 90 [1970] 218). Huschke 151 briefly entertains the conjecture καὶ σὺ φύλαξ ἀνά δῶμα, but in fact prefers the reading printed here.

Ξανθῷ με: C has in his usual assured way worked his correction into the text of P, obliterating what was there before; hence the note of doubt in the app. crit. as to even the number of letters there originally. "Ξανθῶι?" (Stadtmüller; similarly Gow-Page) is surely wrong as there would thus be too much space between *-ῶι* and the following *σύ*, but at least these scholars (unlike Waltz and Beckby) acknowledge that C has been at work here. With *Ξανθῶ*, Brunck, followed by Jacobs 1794, read the line as follows: καὶ σὺ, φίλη (sc. Philainis), *Ξανθῶ με*. . . σὺ δ' ὦ φιλεράστρια κοίτης, surely a difficult aposiopesis to complete. The direct object *με*, on the other hand, immediately suggests several possible ideas, none of which Phil. cares to spell out.

σὺ δ': For *σὺ δέ* + *impv.* after a vocative, cf. e.g., Eur. *Hek.* 1287 Ἐκάβη, σὺ δ', ὦ τάλαίνα . . . θάπτε; Asklepiades (cited above, on v.2 *λύχνον*) *λύχνε, σὺ δ'*, . . . *ἀπάμμνον*. But Phil.'s more complex example (omission of the first imperative, addressing Xantho anew) is probably to be explained more simply as resumptive after the preceding aposiopesis.

φιλεράστρι: "Lover-loving" (Gow-Page) is the basic meaning of this stem, which, although not common, also appears in several other words. *φιλέραστος* can be applied to inanimate objects, in which case it means little more than "dear to

lovers”; e.g., Meleager 42 (AP 5.136.5) φιλέραστον . . . ῥόδον, IG 14.793a = 560 Kaibel (Naples, i A.D.) πακτίδα τὰν φιλέραστον. φιλεράστρια appears elsewhere only in Argentarius 29 (AP 10.18), modifying Aphrodite (Huschke’s certain conjecture).

If the word means “lover-loving,” which half is verbal and which is nominal? Usually φιλ- is the verbal element, but so too is –εραστ– as the second element. In two philosophical passages the answer is clear: (i) Pl. *Symp.* 192b ὁ τοιοῦτος παιδεραστής τε καὶ φιλεραστής γίγνεται, where, despite the similarity of formation, context makes it clear that “the former term applies to the pursuer, the latter to his younger quarry” (Dover ad loc); cf., however, 213d (Sokrates on Alkibiades) ἐγὼ τὴν τοῦτου μανίαν τε καὶ φιλερασίαν πάνυ ὀρωδῶ, where φιλερασίαν is ambiguous since the “erotic” relationship between Alkibiades and Sokrates is reciprocal. E. Fantham, *Phoenix* 40 (1986) 48 n. 10, translates “passion for the lover,” not as *anteros*, comparing φιληλιαστής, where, however, the latter stem is not verbal. (ii) Arist. *Rhet.* 1371b24 includes φιλερασταί with φίλαντοι, φιλοκόλακες, φιλότιμοι, καὶ φιλότεκνοι. On the other hand, φιλεραστ- is the only stem ending thus where the final element need not be verbal. Thus, without specific context to determine otherwise, one is drawn to take φιλεράστρια first as a typical φιλο- word and then as a typical -εραστής word in order to bring out the tension inherent in its formation. Xanthippe, therefore, an Epicurean and hence a “friend” in the special sense used within the Garden (see on 27.1 φίλιτατε), is now addressed by a term that can be understood both as “friend to your lover” and “lover of your friend,” the alternation suggesting the reciprocity of their relationship: Each is lover and friend of the other. φιλεράστρια, therefore, is an erotically charged equivalent to φιλόφιλος, which Phil. uses twice in Περὶ Παρρησίας (frr. 50.8, 85.8); note also 27.2 μουσοφιλής. Also interesting is Semonides’ comment on his bee-woman: φίλη δὲ σὺν φιλέοντι γηράσκει πόσει (7.86 W); Xen. *Symp.* 8.3, *P. Ant.* 15.15–17.

ἄκοιτις: C abraded all but the vertical extender of P’s η, which looks like a roman-letter “h,” adding a diaeresis mark (two dots above the extender) further to indicate its new status as ι. Nouns ending in –ις frequently have their nominative forms serve as vocatives; cf. V. Schmidt, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Herondas* (Berlin 1968) ch. III, “Gebrauch des Nominativs für den Vokativ,” 89–95, esp. 93f.; I. Bekker, *Homerische Blätter*, I (Bonn 1863) 268–271. The omission of the last distich by Pl is further indication that ἄκοιτις was the original reading, as the address to the bed is well within Planudes’ tolerance level; on Planudes as a bowdlerizer, see below, p. 221. For Phil.’s use of elision, see Intro., p. 41.

Although modern editors from Dübner on prefer an address to the bed here (Schneider’s emendation), this would be the only such address in the Anthology. Renaissance edd., Jacobs (1813), and Huschke retain C’s reading, as does H. J. Polak *Mnemosyne*, 2d ser. 5 (1877) 434; but Gow-Page regard it as one of his “blunders” (GP 1.1 n. 5). It is more likely, though, that C and his source Michael had solid MS authority, rather than that they conjectured the less likely “wife” over “bed,” examples of which can be found elsewhere. Indeed, addresses to a bed by lovers were regarded as a commonplace by Plut. *de Garr.* 513f οὕτω καὶ τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς ἢ πλείστη διατριβὴ περὶ λόγους μνήμην τινὰ τῶν ἐρωμένων ἀναδιδόντας· οἱ γε κὰν μὴ πρὸς

ἀνθρώπους, πρὸς ἄψυχα περὶ αὐτῶν διαλέγονται· “ὦ φιλότατη κλίνη” καὶ “. . . εὐδαιμον λύχνε.” Cf. Ticidea fr.1, Prop. 2.15.2, Mart. 10.38.7. Kaibel adduces Ov. *AA* 2.703 as evidence for reading κοίτη: *consciūs ecce duos accepit lectus amantes*: | *ad thalami clausas, Musa, resiste foras*, which certainly makes the same point as Phil.; i.e., the poem stops before the lovemaking begins. Ovid’s model, however, may have been Asklepiades 25 (*AP* 5.181.12) κλίνη μάρτυς ἐπεγράφετο. Why, furthermore, would Phil.’s *consciūs* bed, which presumably has seen similar scenes before, need his command ἴσθι . . . ?

P. Chantraine, “Les noms du mari et de la femme, du père et la mère en grec,” *REG* 59–60 (1946–1947) 225, notes that ἄκοιτις, far more than ἄλοχος (“legitimate wife”), “présente volontiers une valeur affective,” and that “on n’est pas surpris enfin de lire ἄκοιτις (et non ἄλοχος) dans les scènes amoureuses.” In sum, the MS evidence combined with the argument presented here and in the introduction favors the reading “wife” here. See Intro., pp. 34–36 for further reason to accept a love poem addressed to a wife.

Open expression of erotic feeling such as is found here of a husband for his wife is extremely rare in Greek literature; erotic poetry deals largely with pursuit and rejection. It was noteworthy that Kandaules fell in love (ἠράσθη) with his own wife (Hdt. 1.8.1). The *Dios Apate* alone, however, provides a sufficient literary model for Phil. (see above on 4 πυκνήν), the aposiopesis of his poem substituting for Homer’s concealing cloud. For some other instances where a husband’s erotic passion for his wife is expressed or alluded to, cf. M. Lefkowitz, “Wives and husbands,” *G&R* n.s. 30 (1983) 31–47, esp. 36–38, where she adduces P. Antinoop. 15; K. Gutzwiller, “Callimachus’ *Lock of Berenice*: Fantasy, romance, and propaganda,” *AJP* 113 (1992) 359–385. The situation in Latin literature is far more complex, where mistresses are often spoken of as wives or at least with language more appropriate to wives than lovers; cf., e.g., Cat. 109.6, Tib. 1.5, Hor. O. 2.12, Prop. 2.6.41 f.; R. O. A. M. Lyne, *The Latin Love Poets: From Catullus to Horace* (Oxford 1980) 2–8, 79 f., and ch. 2 on Catullus *passim*; D. Konstan, “Two kinds of love in Catullus,” *CJ* 68 (1972–1973) 102–106; M. Santirocco, “Strategy and structure in Horace C. 2.12,” *Latomus* 168 (1980) 223–236; S. Commager, *A Prolegomenon to Propertius* (Cincinnati 1974). (Arguing against the view that Calvus wrote erotic poetry to his wife is E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* [Oxford 1993] 208.) Note too Sulpicia, who, according to Martial 10.35, 38, wrote love poetry addressed to her husband Calenus (Courtney 361).

6 Παφίης: Aphrodite as the “Paphian” is common by Phil.’s time; she returns to her temple in Paphos before appearing before Anchises (*H. Aphr.* 5.58–65), and it is again whither she repairs after being released from Hephaistos’ toils (*Od.* 8.362–366). Phil. himself uses the adj. of one of his girlfriends named Demo (10.1). Aristoph. *Lys.* 556 is first to apply the adj. to the goddess; ἡ Παφία [sc. Ἀφροδίτη] occurs several times in the Anthology. One of the Philodemean incipits is μυρία τῆς Παφίης (Π ii.10), where the goddess must be meant.

λειπόμυνα: Cf. Argentarius 13.3–4 (see above, intro.), Ov. *Am.* 1.5.25 *cetera quis nescit?*

Κύπρι γαληναίη φιλονύμφιε, Κύπρι δικαίοις
 σύμμαχε, Κύπρι Πόθων μήτερ ἀελλοπόδων,
 Κύπρι, τὸν ἡμίσπαστον ἀπὸ κροκέων ἐμὲ παστῶν,
 τὸν χιόσι ψυχὴν Κελτίσι νειφόμενον,
 Κύπρι, τὸν ἡσύχιόν με, τὸν οὐδενὶ κωφὰ λαλεῦντα, 5
 τὸν σέο πορφυρέῳ κλυζόμενον πελάγει,
 Κύπρι φιλορμίσειρα φιλόργιε, σῶζέ με, Κύπρι,
 Ναϊακοὺς ἤδη, δεσπότη, πρὸς λιμένας.

AP 10.21 [15 GP, 8 K, 3 G]

PPI 1a.30,5 Φιλοδήμου Π viii.2 κυπριγαληναίη

1 δικαίοις Pl: δικαίων P 3 κροκέων Pl: κροκαίων P 5 οὐδενὶ P: οὐδέν Pl κωφά]
 κοῦφα Brunck 8 Ναϊακοὺς Jacobs: ναϊκακοὺς (i.e., ναὶ κακοὺς) P: Ῥωμαϊκοὺς Pl
 ναϊκαοὺς Pl(spscr) δεσπότη Pl: -τη P

Unruffled bridegroom-loving Kypris, ally of just men, Kypris, mother of
 stormfooted Desires,
 Kypris, (rescue) the one halfway dragged from the saffron bridal bed, me,
 the one snowed upon by Celtic snowstorms,
 Kypris, peaceloving me, the one who says stupid things to nobody, the one
 awash on your purplish sea,
 Kypris, lover of harborage and lover of (your) rites, preserve me, Kypris,
 now, Mistress, to the Naiadic inlets.

Reitzenstein, *RE* 6 (1907) 98.

Giangrande, *MPL* 5 (1981) 37.

Cichorius, *Römische Studien* (Leipzig 1922) 295 f.

Falivene, *QUCC* 42 (1983) 129–142.

Cavallini, *Museum Criticum* 15–17 (1980–1982) 164 f.

In the form of a prayer addressed to Aphrodite. But if the reference to Nais is correctly understood, Aphrodite's help is scarcely necessary for gaining access to a courtesan. It would make more sense to imagine that the poem is only nominally addressed to Aphrodite while really intended for the wife's ears, the true message thus being: Take me back or lose me to a courtesan. Cf. Cat. 36.11–17 for another mock-serious prayer to Venus: *nunc, o caeruleo creata ponto, | quae sanctum Idalium Uriosque apertos | quaeque Ancona Cnidumque harundinosam | colis quaeque Amathunta quaeque Golgos | quaeque Durrhachium Adriae tabernam, | acceptum face redditumque votum, | si non inlepidum neque invenustumst*, where the repeti-

tion of *quaeque* is similar to Phil.'s repetition of the name; cf. H. Kleinknecht, *Die Gebetsparodie in der Antike* (Stuttgart and Berlin 1937) 178 f.; H. Pelliccia, *Mind, Body, and Speech in Homer and Pindar* (Göttingen 1995) 268–271.

Gow-Page show that this poem is almost certainly the lament of a recently married man now banned from the bedroom, and they quickly dispatch Kaibel's argument that the narrator has been caught in adultery. All that is required is some unspecified argument.

Since the narrator describes himself as stormtossed, Aphrodite, also a god of the sea, is doubly appropriate—and all the more so when we see how the nautical imagery can be used for erotic effect. Cf. *AP* 5.11 (Anon. 7 FGE):

εἰ τοὺς ἐν πελάγει σῶζεις, Κύπρι, κάμῃ τὸν ἐν γᾶ
ναυαγόν, φιλία, σῶσον ἀπολλύμενον.

Also *AP* 5.17 (Gaetulicus 1 FGE), cited below on 7–8; cf. also *Cat.* 68.1–6 for another metaphorical use of a storm and shipwreck (Kaibel xii); *Hor. O.* 1.5, with Nisbet-Hubbard's commentary on v.16 *deae*. And for the imagery of the harbor in general, cf. C. Bonner, "Desired Haven," *HTR* 34 (1941) 49–67.

1 Κύπρι: This vocative appears seven times all told in this short poem, giving an air of extreme desperation to the narrator. For "clitic" anaphora, cf. K. Keyssner, *Gottesvorstellung . . . gr. Hymnus*, Würzburger St. zur Altertumsw. 2 (Stuttgart 1932). Unusually for Phil., there is no A-caesura in any of the four hexameter lines of this poem, which produces a rushed quality; cf. H. Porter, "The Early Greek Hexameter," *YCS* 12 (1951) 1–63, esp. 10–12 for the A-caesura at either position 3 (A¹) or position 2 (A²).

γαληναίη: Properly "with the calm of the sea" (in Aeolic poetry prob. Alkaios 286a.5; cf. Voigt ad loc.), it easily transfers to calm or undisturbed visage, sound, or thought, although the metaphor can occasionally be revived; e.g. Aisch. *Ag.* 740 φρόνημα νηνέμου γαλάνας. Probably also here, as the poem continues in a distinctly nautical tone. Cf. Gow-Page and Cavallini n. 14, who points to Aphrodite's role as savior of sailors in danger (Roscher I 1.402). Her double role is appealed to by Gaetulicus 1 FGE (*AP* 5.17.6) δεσπότη καὶ θαλάμων, Κύπρι, καὶ ἡϊόνων, spoken by someone about to cross the sea to his girlfriend. Cf. *AP* 5.11, cited above; *Hor. O.* 3.26.5 *marinae . . . Veneris* (an erotic context).

φιλονύμφιε: "Friendly to νύμφιοι," a hapax legomenon designed to appeal to that aspect of Aphrodite's power of immediate interest to the person praying; cf. W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Oxford 1985) 74. Aphrodite's association with newlyweds is well known and obvious. Cf. e.g. *Il.* 5.429 (Zeus to Aphrodite): ἀλλὰ σὺ γ' ἡμερόεντα μετέρχεο ἔργα γάμοιο, Sappho 112 ὄλβιε γάμβρε, . . . τετίμακ' ἔξοχά σ' Ἀφροδίτα, *Diod.Sic.* 5.73.2. Cf. Joann. Damasc. *Enc. in St. J. Chrysost.* 96.781.14 MPG φιλονύμφος, "loving one's wife."

1–2 Κύπρι δικαίους | σύμμαχε: The dative is more common with σύμμαχος than the genitive (3× in Aisch. *Cho.* alone). Cavallini would like to see the influence here

of Sappho 1, another appeal from a rejected lover to Aphrodite, which has τίς σ', ὦ | Ψάπφ', ἀδικήει (19 f.) and σύμμαχος ἔσσο (28). This may be overreaching, but her remarks that ἄδικος often refers to adultery are well taken.

2 Κύπρι Πόθων μήτερ: As in Pindar fr. 122.3–5 ματέρ' Ἐρώτων . . . Ἀφροδίταν, Bakch. 9.73, Rufinus 31.5 Page (*AP* 5.87), Babrius 32.2, Hor. *O.* 1.19.1, 4.1.5 *mater Cupidinum*. On the Πόθοι, see on 3.2.

ἀελλοπόδων: “Kicking up a storm” is a close English equivalent. It is a frequent epithet for swift horses (*H. Aphr.* 217, Simonides 515 PMG, Pindar, *N.* 1.6 etc.), or excited dancers (*Eur. Hel.* 1314); but Phil. probably uses it because the Pothoi are winged, as in 3.2; cf. Euphorion 113 Powell ἀελλόποδος θ' Ἀρπυίας. [Homer's Ἴρις ἀελλόπος (*Il.* 8.409, 24.77, 159) may have suggested wings to Phil., as Iris is depicted with winged boots in early art and with bodily wings in later art; Homer himself may have meant little more than “swift.”]

3 τὸν ἡμίπαστον . . . ἐμέ: Cf. 5 τὸν ἡσύχτιόν με. Article + pronoun is rare, most prose exx. coming from late Plato (*Lys.* 203b, *Phil.* 14d, 20b, 59b; *Thet.* 166a; *Soph.* 239b), none of which is precisely parallel to Phil.; cf. J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* 2.138. In his discussion of the phenomenon Apollonios Dyskolos *Pron.* 13.16 Schn. offers several verse exx., including Kallim. fr. 28 τὸν σε Κροτωπιάδην (but Pfeiffer ad loc., who prints all the relevant ancient testimony, thinks that the article goes with the substantive, the pronoun being interjected *more Callimacheo*), 114.5 ναὶ μὰ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐμέ (but Pfeiffer ad loc. thinks that neither αὐτὸν nor ἐμέ goes with τὸν alone: “immo post formulam ναὶ μὰ τὸν ubi nomen proprium dei vel deae expectatur, παρὰ προσδοκίαν pronomen reflex. ponitur. Deus per se ipse iurat”). Cf. Menander fr. 409 K-Th vῶν δὲ κατὰ πόλιν | εὕρηκεν ἕτερον, τὸν σέ—τὸν ἐμέ τουτονί, and even more pertinent 19.1 ὁ πρὶν ἐγώ. But since there seems to be no parallel with an adj. in attributive position, it may be that in Phil. we should understand “the half-dragged (one), me” (likewise for v. 5), where the pronoun is eventually recapitulated in v. 7 σῶξέ με. Cf. Simias 4.1 HE (*AP* 7.21) τὸν σε χοροῖς μέλψαντα Σοφοκλέα, where the pronoun is governed by v. 5 ἔχει; and Meleager 103.1–2 (*AP* 12.101) τὸν με Πόθοις ἄτρωτον . . . τοξεύσας.

παστῶν: Cf. E. N. Lane, “Παστός,” *Glotta* 66 (1988) 100–123, who shows that παστός denotes a woven fabric which came to be so closely associated with the bridal bed it covered that it came to stand either for marriage, especially a recent marriage, or for the marriage bed; and that it never referred, as LSJ, Gow-Page, et al. say, to the bridal chamber. Cf., e.g., Pollux 3.37 τὸ δὲ παρὰ τῇ εὐνῇ παρεπέτασμα παστός. Note also IG 12.8.441.1–2 (= 208 Kaibel) ἄρτι με νυμφιδίων ἀπὸ δύσμορον ἄρπασε παστῶν | δαίμων. Lane unfortunately takes Phil.s' appeal to Aphrodite too literally, understanding the poem as “a prayer to Cypris for safety at sea by a recently married man.”

4 τὸν χιόσι ψυχὴν Κελτίσι νειφόμενον: This need not be interpreted too literally. As Kaibel says, *non membra sed animum riguisse*. Cf. Philemon fr. 28.1–4 K-A

οὐ τοῖς πλέουσι τὴν θάλατταν γίγνεται
μόνοισι χειμῶν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἀλλὰ . . .
καὶ τοῖς μένουσιν ἔνδον ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις.

Even if Piso had never campaigned in Gaul with Caesar during the 50s (Cichorius), the severity of northern winters could be drawn upon for metaphors of this sort; cf. Petronius 19 *frigidior hieme Gallica*; Hor. *O.* 3.26.10, where Memphis in Egypt is said to lack Sithonian (i.e., Thracian) snow.

Gow-Page do not explain their preference for the form νιόμενον (Stephanus, Brunck), which, although possible, is contraindicated by the inscriptional evidence; LSJ s.v., A. L. Sihler, *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Oxford 1995) 163.

5 κωφά: A favorite word of Phil. for “stupid,” with at least six occurrences in his prose. There is then no reason to follow Brunck in emending. Cf. also Giangrande 41 for a defense of the MSS.

6 πορφυρέφ: So PPI; Gow-Page’s –ίφ is no doubt a mere slip on their part.

7–8: Cf. *AP* 5.17.3–4 (Gaetulicus 1 FGE; a prayer to Aphrodite):

αὔριον Ἴονίου γὰρ ἐπὶ πλατῦ κῶμα περήσω,
σπεύδων ἡμετέρης κόλπον ἐς Εἰδοθέης.

Just as κόλπος has a double meaning (see on 23.8 κόλποις), so too here (where again we seem to have a reference to Nais) note the extended meaning of λιμήν for the female’s genitals, as in Empedokles 31 B 98.3 DK Κύπριδος ὀρμισθεῖσα τελείως ἐν λιμένεσσιν and Soph. *OT* 1208. (Cf. also Theogn. 460, where the young wife of an old man, compared in several ways to a ship, strays at night and ἄλλον ἔχει λιμένα.)

7 φιλορμίστειρα: A hapax, whose meaning is more metaphorical than the literal “she who loves to bring to harbor” (LSJ); cf. the preceding lemma.

φιλόργιε: Aphrodite is lover of her own rites; cf. 33.5–6 τὰ Κύπριδος . . . ὄργια. Elsewhere only IG 2².5021 = *AG Append.* 1.252 Cougny (iv/v A.D., of Dionysus) and Nonnos, *Par. Eu. Io.* 6.9 (of the Jewish Passover).

7–8 σφῆξέ με . . . πρός: Cf. *Od.* 5.452 f. τὸν δ’ ἐσάωσεν | ἐς ποταμοῦ προχοάς (LSJ s.v. σφῆξω II 2).

8 Ναϊακούς: Brunck preferred the reading of Pl to that of the obviously corrupt P (then in the Vatican), but Jacobs suspected that the latter concealed the truth. In 1794 he tentatively suggested Ἀκτιακούς, “of Actium,” but in his ed. of 1813 he elegantly dropped one letter to come up with an epithet for Nais, the woman Phil. mentions again in 23, again with erotic language punningly appropriate to her name. (LSJ’s “of the Naiads” misses the point.)

δεσπότι: See on 4.8 δεσπότιδες.

ἐξήκοντα τελειῖ Χαριτῶ λυκαβαντίδας ὄρας,
 ἀλλ' ἔτι κυανέων σύρμα μένει πλοκάμων,
 κὰν στέρνοις ἔτι κεῖνα τὰ λύγδινα κωνία μαστῶν
 ἔστηκεν μίτρης γυμνὰ περιδρομάδος,
 καὶ χρῶς ἀρρνυτίδατος ἔτ' ἀμβροσίην, ἔτι πειθῶ 5
 πᾶσαν, ἔτι στάζει μυριάδας Χαρίτων.
 ἀλλὰ πόθους ὀργῶντας ὅσοι μὴ φεύγετ', ἐρασταί,
 δεῦρ' ἴτε τῆς ἐτέων ληθόμενοι δεκάδος.

AP 5.13 [2 GP, 16 K, 2 G]

P Φιλοδήμου Pl 7.93, f. 72ν τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] Π vii. 25 ἐξηξοντα ... *Suda*
 s.vv. κωνοειδές (3–4 ἔστηκεν), λύγδινα (3–4) 3–4, 7–8 om. Pl [J] εἰς ἐταίραν τινὰ
 Χαριτῶ. θαυμάσιον

1 Χαριτῶ CPl: –τι P?: –τη C(spscr): Χαρικλώ edd.vett.(1494) λυκαβαντίδας P: –βαντος ἐς
 Pl 3 κὰν Kaibel: κ' ἐν P *Suda* utrubique 4 μίτρης *Suda*: μήτρης P περιδρομάδος
 P: –τρομάδος *Suda* 5 ἀμβροσίην edd. vett. (1531): –ίη PPl πειθῶ CPl: πειθ* P 6
 πᾶσαν P: πᾶσιν C edd. vett. (1566): πᾶσας Pl Σ ἔτι στάζει PPl: ἀποστάζει C⁷⁰: ἐπιστάζει
 edd. vett. (1494) πᾶς ἔτ' ἀποστάζει Kaibel: πᾶσα δ' ἀποστάζει Salm.: 7 πόθους ὀργῶντας
 P γε τὰς ὀργώσας Brunck φεύγετ' Salm.: φλέγετ' P

Charito brings sixty years to fulfilment, but she still has her long train of
 dark hair,
 and on her bosom those white marble cones of her breasts still stand firm
 without encircling halter,
 and her unwrinkled skin still exudes ambrosia, total seduction, and a
 myriad of charms.

So, all lovers unafraid of wanton passions, come hither and forget her years'
 decade.

Stella 259 ff.

An older woman is still sexy, as in AP 5.26 (Anon.), 5.48 (Rufinus 19 Page), 5.62
 (Rufinus 23), 5.258 (Paulus Sil. 52 Viansino), 5.282 (Agathias 78 Viansino), 7.217
 (Asklepiades 41 HE); cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.4.45 *me tangit senior aetas*. The general point
 of all these poems is that, whether or not there is a falling off from her prior
 beauty, a grace (χάρις) remains that keeps her desirable (see on v. 6). This motif of
 course counters the usual preference in poetry (if not in real life) for younger women,
 whether pubescent or nubile; Phil. himself has 11 and 16. For invective against old
 women, cf. A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus* (New Haven 1983) 109–116.

1 ἐξήκοντα: Phil. is the only author in the “older woman” group to specify the lady’s age. The spelling of the papyrus is not of a common phonetic sort; Parsons suggests simple carelessness. He also notes that “what little remains does not suit τελεῖ particularly: just offsets?” Parsons prints a question mark, keeping open the possibility that the incipit may belong to another poem.

On age sixty usually marking the effective end of one’s life, cf. Mimnermos 6, Herodas 10.1 f. ἐπὶ τὸν ἐξηκοστὸν ἡλιον κάμψης, ὦ Γρύλλε, Γρύλλε, θνήσκει καὶ τέφρη γίνεο, with Headlam-Knox ad loc.

τελεῖ: Primarily of time or one’s lifetime, “complete, bring to an end” (cf. LSJ s.v. I 7), but perhaps also in the sense “bring to fulfillment” (I 5).

Χαριτώ: Charito will be shown worthy of her name (see below, on 6 Χαρίτων); cf. Lucr. 4.1162, a woman is called Χαρίτων μίττα by the man who is too infatuated to realize that she is too small (*parvula, pumilio*) to be truly beautiful. Both Lucretius and Phil. probably knew Meleager 32 (*AP* 5.149); note esp. v. 2 τίς μίταν ἐκ τρισσῶν ἡγαγέ μοι Χάριτα; Cf. further R. D. Brown, *Lucretius on Love and Sex* (Leiden 1987) 287.

Knowing that the last syllable has to be long, C offers both Χαριτώ and, above the line, Χαρίτη. It is not clear to me why some early printed editions of the Anthology changed Charito’s name to Chariklo, hereby destroying the obvious pun on the meaning of her name.

λυκαβαντίδας ὥρας: Adj. derived from λυκάβας, which Phil. uses in 4. Since ὥραι can mean “years,” “seasons,” or “hours” (of the day), the adj. specifying the first meaning, which came to be the least common, is not merely ornamental. Cf. the inscription cited by Gow-Page ad loc. ἐννέα τοι δεκάδων λυκαβαντίδες ἤλυθον ὥραι.

2 σύρμα . . . πλοκάμων: An appositional genitive; cf. *AP* 12.190.3 (Strato) σύρμα τερῆδόνος (a kind of worm) εἶθε γενοίμην. “Mirabile quell’ondeggiar delle trecce brune in contrasto al candore immobile del seno” (Stella).

3 κείνα: “Those well-known (?)” breasts. Cf. LSJ s.v. I 2; for the sentimental use of the demonstrative cf. Lucr. 2. 362, Hor. *O.* 4.73.18, KG 1.650 f.

λύγδινα: “Marble-white” is the basic sense, and breasts are praised for their whiteness (when not for the rosininess of their nipples, or both qualities together as in Herrick’s “Upon the nipples of Julia’s breast”); cf. Rufinus 19.3 δειρὴ λυγδινέη; D. E. Gerber, “The female breast in Greek erotic literature,” *Arethusa* 11 (1978) 203 f., who is right to point out that breasts, like marble, are also admired for smoothness, although I am not convinced that this is “the primary significance” here, simply because, as Gerber argues, Rufinus elsewhere said that a face was smoother than marble (*AP* 5.28 = 10 Page). Χρῶς ἀρρυτίδων below (5) suggests this in any case. Lucillius 859 f., which Gow-Page cite on 4 ἔστηκεν, shows that firmness too may be alluded to: *hic corpus solidum invenies, hic stare papillas | pectore marmoreo*. Note also *Souda* ὀρθοτίθιος, “with outstanding breasts” (LSJ), Hor. *O.* 1.19.5 f. with Nisbet and Hubbard’s n., *urit me Glycerae nitor | splendentis Pario marmore purius*.

κωνία: The diminutive is not only used to express smallness, but is also, as often, a term of endearment; Gerber 204 f., 208. The word appears elsewhere only

in Poseidonios F 55a E-K (Athen. 14.649d), of a small pine cone (regarded as spurious or corrupt, though, by Kaibel, Theiler F87 assenting). Following Brunck, I correct the manuscripts' accent (κώνια) in accord with the general rule for dactylic diminutives in -ιον; cf. Chandler, *Gk. Accentuation* §§343, 350.

4 ἔσθηκεν: Cf. Gerber 206 on the vocabulary of firm and sagging breasts, and in particular Philostr. *Imag.* 2.18.4 ὑπανίστασθαι. Generally, the former are preferred, but cf. Paulus Sil. 52.2–4 Viansino, who admits to going against common preference.

μίτρης . . . περιδρομάδος: Given the right context, μίτρα, like ζωνή and κεστός, often = “brassiere”; cf. *AP* 5.199 (Hedylos 2 HE) μαλακαί, μαστῶν ἐκδύματα, μίτραι. Cf. A. Henrichs, *Die Phoinikikia des Lollianos* (Bonn 1972) 123 f., for a discussion of the ancient brassiere. Other terms in a brassiere onomastikon: ταινία, ταινίδιον, στροφήιον, περιδεσμος. With the adj. cf. *AP* 6.272.2 (Perses 2 HE) μίτραν μαστοῖς σφιγκτὰ περιπλομέναν. περιδρομάς, both a hapax and a “peculiar feminine of περιδρομος” (LSJ), should prob. be understood as an epithet designed primarily to amuse. Gerber 208 f. says that this is the only passage he can find in praise of bralessness, but Phil. does not actually say that Charito goes braless, only, as a lover would know, that she does not need one to keep her breasts from sagging. Cf. further *RE* 6.2007, Daremberg-Saglio s.v. *fascia*, 3° *pectoralis*.

5 ἄρρντίδατος: Other women remain sexy despite their wrinkles; cf. *AP* 5.258.1 f. (Paulus Sil. 52 Viansino) πρόκριτος ἐστὶ, Φίλινα, τεῆ ρυτίς ἢ ὀπὸς ἡβης | πάσης, Asklepiades 41.2 HE (*AP* 7.217) καὶ ἐπὶ ρυτίδων ὁ γλυκὺς ἔξειτ' Ἔρωσ, *AP* 5.26 (Anon.).

ἀμβροσίην: Cf. Theokr. 15.108 (Aphrodite) ἀμβροσίαν ἐς στήθος ἀποστάξασα γυναικός.

5–6 πειθῶ πάσαι: Cf. Aisch. *Ag.* 419 πᾶσ' Ἀφροδίτα, “all charm of love” (Fraenkel).

6 πᾶσαν: Although πᾶσιν is possible (cf. *Il.* 19.39 f. Πατρόκλω . . . νέκταρ στάξει), the reading of C (and Stephanus) interrupts the total concentration on Charito by referring to her effect on others, hereby blunting the point of the last distich.

στάξει: Generally used of distinct drops (blood, sweat, and tears), but cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 525 ff. Ἔρωσ Ἔρωσ, ὃ κατ' ὀμμάτων | στάξεις πόθον, εἰσάγων γλυκεῖαν | ψυχᾷ χάριν. Combining Eur. and Phil., we may say that Eros (as both agent and result) takes the beauty of Charito and distills it into an ambrosial desire which he then drops into the eyes of the beholder. Cf. also Pi. *I.* 4.90b τερπνὰν ἐπιστάζων χάριν, Alkman 59(a) Ἔρωσ με . . . γλυκὺς κατεῖβον καρδίαν ἰαίνει, Hes. *Tb.* 910 f. τῶν καὶ ἀπὸ βλεφάρων ἔρος εἴβετο δερκομενῶν | λυσιμελής, with West's n. ad loc. and M. Davies, *Hermes* 111 (1983) 496 f., Simon. 22.12 W² λείβοι δ' ἐκ βλ[εφάρ]ων ἱμερόεντα [πόθον], Krinagoras 50.6 f. GP (*AP* 199) ἀφύκτων ἰὸν ἔσταξας πόθον, | Ἔρωσ.

There is some confusion in this line and the preceding between nominative subject and accusative object of (-)στάξει, but the text printed here makes best sense and is closest to the MSS. Certainly, -ίη would produce an intolerable hiatus.

Χαρίτων: Charito in other words is well named—a common motif in *AP* as well as elsewhere; Snyder 347. Cf. 10, where Phil. discovers that he too has been aptly named. Puns on χάρις, Χάρις are particularly easy and common; Meleager alone has 30.4 (*AP* 5.140) αἱ τρισσαὶ Χάριτες τρεῖς ἔδοσαν χάριτας, 32.4 (5.149, see on v. 1 Χαριτώ) διδοὺς . . . τὰν Χάριν ἐν χάριτι, 47 (*AP* 5.148) Ἡλιοδώραν | νικάσειν αὐτὰς τὰς Χάριτας χάρισιν. On the nature of erotic charis, cf. B. MacLachlan, *The Age of Grace: Charis in Early Greek Poetry* (Princeton 1993), ch. 4.

For the loss of *charis* along with youth, cf. Archil. 196a.27 f. W^2 (of Neoboule) [ἄν]θος δ' ἀπερρῦηκε παρθενήϊον | [κ]αὶ χάρις ἢ πρὶν ἐπὶν. Two other older women praised in the Anthology retain χάρις: Rufinus 23 καὶ Χάριτες μίμνουσιν ἀγήρασι, Agathias τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἡβης οὐκ ἀπέθηκε χάριν, perhaps also Π vii.20 εὐχαρίς ἐστὶ Φίλινα (see comm.). The Graces of course are regular attendants of Aphrodite: *Od.* 8.364–366, 18.193 f., *H.Aphr.* 61–67, *H.Ap.* 194–196—probably so because they are deified rays of sunlight (and Aphrodite's origin is at least partially that of the Indo-European sun goddess); cf. P. Friedrich, *The Meaning of Aphrodite* (Chicago 1978) 196–198; W. A. Borgeaud & B. MacLachlan, “Les Kharites et la lumière,” *Rev. belge Phil. hist.* 63 (1985) 5–14. Indo-European origins aside, χάρις provides the finishing touch to beauty; cf. *AP* 5.67 (Capito) κάλλος ἄνευ χαρίτων τέρπει μόνον, οὐ κατέχει δέ.

7 πόθους ὀργῶντας: “sexual desires.” Cf. 8.2 Κύπρι Πόθων μῆτερ, with comm.; Pollux 6.188 ὁ δ' ἐπ' ἀφροδίσεισις μαινόμενος . . . ὀργῶν, and in general for this sense LSJ s.v. Π 1. The text is sound; there is no need for Brunck's emendation or those even worse given serious hearing by Jacobs (1794).

8 τῆς ἐτέων . . . δεκάδος: Cf. Kallim. fr. 1.6 τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἡ δεκάς οὐκ ὀλίγη, Leonidas 20 HE (*AP* 7.295.6) τὰς πολλὰς τῶν ἐτέων δεκάδας, Menekrates 3 HE (*AP* 9.55.2) πολλὰς εἰς ἐτέων δεκάδας.

ἠράσθην Δημοῦς Παφίης γένος· οὐ μέγα θαῦμα·
 καὶ Σαμῆς Δημοῦς δεύτερον· οὐχὶ μέγα·
 καὶ πάλιν Ὑσιακῆς Δημοῦς τρίτον· οὐκέτι ταῦτα
 παίγνια· καὶ Δημοῦς τέτρατον Ἀργολίδος.
 αὐταῖα που Μοῖραί με κατωνόμασαν Φιλόδημον, 5
 ὡς αἰεὶ Δημοῦς θερμὸς ἔχοι με πόθος.

AP 5.115 [6 GP, 3 K, 8 G]

P Φιλοδήμου Pl 7.97, f. 72ν τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] Π vii.7 ηρακθηνδημουσ
[J] γραμματικοῦ πολλὰς Δημοῦς φιλήσαντος, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ φιλοδήμου

1 Δημοῦς CPl: Δημοῦσας P? 3 Ὑσιακῆς Salmasius: ὑ*σιακῆς C ex ?P: Ἀσιακῆς
Pl: (πάλι) Νυσιακῆς Sternbach: Ὑπιακῆς Chardon: Ὑσσιακῆς Boissonade: αὐτ' Ἰακῆς Jacobs:
(πάλι) Ναξικακῆς Kaibel 6 ἔχοι PPl: -ει edd.vett. (1494)

I fell in love with Demo from Paphos; no surprise. And, second, with Demo from Samos; no big deal.

And again, and third, with Demo from Hysiai—this is no longer a joke—and fourth with Demo from Argos.

It must have been the Moirai themselves who named me Philo-demos, so that burning passion for a Demo would always take hold of me.

L. Sternbach, *Meletemata Graeca* (Vienna 1886) 85 f.

Philodemus' pandemic eros. He discovers that he has a *redender Name*. 31 offers a rough parallel for having one's character determined at birth, but closer in theme is Meleager 98 (AP 12.165), where the Erotes are credited with the poet's loving boys both black (μελ-) and white (ἀργός). In vocabulary more than theme Phil.'s poem would seem to be a descendant, perhaps through a chain of theme and variation, of Meleager 26 (AP 5.160):

Δημῶ λευκοπάρειε, σὲ μὲν τις ἔχων ὑπόχρωτα
τέρπεται, ἃ δ' ἐν ἔμοι νῦν στενάχει κραδία.
εἰ δέ σε σαββατικός κατέχει πόθος, οὐ μέγα θαῦμα·
ἔστι καὶ ἐν ψυχροῖς σάββασι θερμὸς Ἔρωσ.

1 Δημοῦς: A meaningful name in Hellenistic erotic poetry; cf. Meleager 26 (see introduction, above), 23, 27, 28 (AP 5.197, 172, 173); Antipater 5 HE (AP 6.175); Phil. 11. One expects one so named to sleep with many men; here, however we find Phil. sleeping with many Demos.

Παφίης γένος: Any girl born in Aphrodite's birthplace could be expected to be sexy; see on 2 Σαμῆς. (LGPN 1 records a real Demo of Paphos from the third cent. B.C.)

οὐ μέγα θαῦμα: "A ready made phrase" (Gow-Page); but see on 18.3.

2 Σαμῆς: Samos was famous for its red-light district; cf. Klearchos fr. 44 Wehrli (Athen. 12.540f) ἢ μὲν Σαμίων λαύρα στενωπῇ τις ἦν γυναικῶν δημιουργῶν πλήθουσα, Plut. *Mor.* 303c, K. Tsantsanoglou, *ZPE* 12 (1973) 192 f. Other sexy Samiotes in the Anthology are found in Asklepiades 7 HE (AP 5.207) and Rufinus 17 Page (AP 5.44). It is not only the low number two that is unsurprising, therefore, but also that they come from Paphos and Samos. There is also the possibility that in addition to the pun that is the point of this poem, Phil. alludes to the (ad-

mittedly weaker) link between his name and these *δημιουργοί*; cf. Hesych. s.v. *δαμουργοί· αἱ πόρνοι*.

3 πάλιν Ὑσιακῆς: Preferred by Waltz and Beckby, this is as close as we can get to the various readings of P, which are in agreement in having *πάλιν* followed by a vowel marked with breathing. Stadtmüller records *ὕ*τιακῆς* P^{pc}, but all I can see in the MS are the traces of the top of either a *σ* (so also Gow-Page) or a sigma-tau compendium. (Gow-Page are incorrect in giving *Νυσιακῆς* to C; he would have erased the breathing mark.) Pl's reading would be an unnecessary hapax for "Asian," when the name of a city is needed. Salmasius's *Hysiai* is the name of two Greek cities, one in Boeotia and another in Argolis; cf. Bölte, "Hysiai (1 and 2)," *RE* 9.1 (1914) 539 f. Beckby unconvincingly constructs the syllabic acrostic Πᾶ-Σα Ὑς Ἀργολίδος; *Jede ein Schwein von Argolis*, which has somehow to do with the sacrifice of a pig to Aphrodite in Argos. Stadtmüller and Gow-Page adopt Sternbach's reading.

5 Μοῖραί με κατωνόμασαν: One's lot in life is assigned at birth by the *Moirai* (Pi. N. 7.1 Ἐλεῖθυσια, *πάρεδρε Μοιρᾶν*, O. 6.42 f., Il. 6.488 f., 24.209 f., Plato, *Symp.* 206d, Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.8.2.1), who see to it that one lives accordingly; cf. Fraenkel ad *Ag.* 1535 f.; K. Krikos-Davis, "Moirai at birth in Greek tradition," *Neohellenica* 4 (1982) 106–134; and (for their appearance in art at the births of Athena, Aphrodite, and Dionysus) S. De Angeli, "Moirai," *LIMC* 6.1 (1992) nos. 13–22. For the fatefulness of names, cf. Aisch. *Ag.* 681 ff. (the chorus on Helen) *τίς ποτ' ὀνόμαζεν ὧδ' ἐς τὸ πᾶν ἐτητύμως· μή τις ὄντιν' οὐχ ὀρώμεν προνοίαισι τοῦ πεπρωμένου*. Agreeing with Phil. that it is the Fates who truly name people is Ausonius *Ep.* 20.4 *Protesilae tibi nomen sic Fata dederunt, | victima quod Troiae prima futurus eras*.

The verb appears in poetry before Phil. only in Anaxandrides Comic. 35.5 K-A, but is common in philosophical texts (Plato, Aristotle, Anon. Lond. Med., et al.).

Φιλόδημον: For the fickleness inherent in one so named cf. Pl. *Gorg.* 481de on Kallikles (ἄνω καὶ κάτω μεταβαλλομένου), the lover both of Demos the son of Pyrilampes and of the Athenian *demos*. Phil. may also have in mind Archilochos' *δημος* = "prostitute" (207 W²).

6 θερμός . . . πόθος: A well-known characteristic of sexual passion; in Phil. alone cf. 1.2, 4.6, 11.1, 16.4.

ἔχοι: PPl are in agreement here; Stadtmüller says "ἔχοι P, corr.Pl," but I see no sign that Pl "corrected" ἔχοι το -ει, nor evidently did Brunck or Jacobs. Subsequent edd., however (Waltz, Beckby, and Gow-Page), follow Stadtmüller, but ἔχει is found only in the early printed editions of the Anthology (1494+). Although an indicative would explain why Phil. said v. 5 and in particular *που*, an optative can be regarded as appropriate to the way the Fates fix everything in advance, and would have a slightly comic tone when spoken by an Epicurean.

11

Δημῶ με κτείνει καὶ Θέρμιον· ἡ μὲν ἑταίρη,
 ἡ Δημῶ δ' οὐ̄πω Κύπριν ἐπισταμένη·
 καὶ τῆς μὲν ψαύω, τῆς δ' οὐ θέμις· οὐ μὰ σέ, Κύπρι,
 οὐκ οἶδ' ἦν εἰπεῖν δεῖ με ποθεινοτέρην.
 Δημάριον λέξω τὴν παρθένον· οὐ γὰρ ἔτοιμα 5
 βούλομαι, ἀλλὰ ποθῶ πᾶν τὸ φυλασσόμενον.

AP 12.173 [16 GP, 2 K, 9 G]

P App.Barbero-Vaticana 11 (om. 4–6) Φιλοδήμου caret Pl

1 ἑταίρη P App.B-V^{pc}: ἑτέρη App.B-V^{ac} Götting.philol.6 2 ἡ Δημῶ δ' Sternbach (1890):
 Δημῶ δ' αὐτ' Sternbach (1886) δημῶ: η δ' P App.B-V (i.e., δῆμω, ἡ δ' Preisendanz): ἡ δ' οὐ̄πω
 Δημῶ Gallavotti: Θέρμιον ἡ δ' (deleto Δημῶ) Ap.B: Δημονόη δ' Kaibel 3 ψαύω] –ειν
 Wilam. Κύπρι P: Κύπρις App.B-V 5 Δημάριον] –ίου Petit

Demo is killing me, and so is Thermion, the one being a hetaira, Demo not yet knowing Aphrodite.

And one I touch, the other I may not. I swear by you, Kypris; I do not know which one I should say is more desirable.

I will say it is Demarion the virgin; for I do not want that which is at hand, but I have a passion for all that is under guard.

Gallavotti, *Boll. Class. Lincei* 5 (1984) 88–91.

Kaibel, *Hermes* 15 (1880) 459.

Prinz, *WS* 34 (1912) 227 ff.

Sternbach, *Meletemata Graeca* (Vienna 1886) 121.

Sternbach, *Anthologiae Planudeae Appendix Barberino-Vaticana* (Leipzig 1890) 18–20.

White, *Corolla Londin.* (1981) 175–177.

A double-sided topos of love poetry: Which woman is more desirable, the one who makes herself easily available (an adulterous wife or prostitute) or the one who is or plays hard to get? Prinz surveys the topos in the Anthology and Latin poetry; see below on vv. 5–6. Phil. prefers the latter here and the former in a poem alluded to by Horace, *Sat.* 1.2.119 (T 4); cf. 38, Meleager 18 (AP 12.86), Argentarios 4 GP (5.89), Rufinus 5 Page (5.18), Ov. *AA* 1.717 *quod refugit, multae cupiunt; odere quod instat*, *Am.* 2.19.3 f., Prop. 2.23.12 ff., Martial 9.32 (*hanc volo quae facilis* etc.).

On the Appendix Barberino-Vaticana, a collection found in three manuscripts, cf. A. Cameron, *Greek Anthology* (Oxford 1993), ch. 8, who argues for its independence from P. App. B-V lacks vv. 4–6 of Phil.'s poem; after v. 3 it continues with the following verse:

οὐ πολλοὺς Αἴγυπτος· ἐπὴν δὲ τέκη, μέγα τίκτει.

Beckby strangely treats this as v. 4 of the Phil. epigram; hence he and (even more misleadingly since they make no mention of the displaced line about Egypt) Gow-Page state that App. B-V omit only vv. 5–6). Gallavotti found this verse quoted (still anonymous) by Simeon Metaphrastes, *Vita. S. Patapii* 116, col. 337 MPG) with the comment: τοῦτο ἐπ' ἄλλω μὲν τινι τῶν φιλοσόφων εἴρηται, ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ Παταπίῳ τὸ πέρασ δέχεται. (Gallavotti also unconvincingly argues that the three-line excerpt in App. B-V was meant to stand as an independent poem.)

This is one of many heterosexual poems mistakenly assigned to *AP* Book 12, usually on the basis of a neuter diminutive proper name which can belong to either sex. There is little excuse for misclassifying this poem, however, which has so many indications that the names belong to women. Cf. Cameron, *Greek Anthology* (Oxford 1993) 239–242, who blames Kephalas for these errors.

1 κτείνει: cf. 12.1 ἀπόλωλα, Eur. *Hipp.* 1064, τὸ σεμνὸν ὡς μ' ἀποκτενεῖ, τὸ σόν, Asklepiades 8 HE (*AP* 5.162.3) οἴχομ', Ἔρωτες, ὄλωλα, διοίχομαι, Nonnos *D.* 16.297 κτείνεις γὰρ ποθέοντα.

2 ἡ Δημῷ δ': Sternbach's suggestion (uncredited by Gow-Page, who call it "the simplest suggestion") neatly both rids the text of an unwanted hiatus and properly distinguishes between the two women. Probably near-homoeoarcton led the scribe into error. Keeping to the MS here should entail following Petit on v. 5 (as Brunck, Jacobs, and Dübner do). But whereas Demo can be the name of a respectable woman (32 exx. in LGPN 1–2; contrast 10), Thermion is obviously a *redender Name* appropriate only to a prostitute, although Brunck et al. never consider the meaning of this name. Gow-Page's second suggestion—that Demo as intrusive gloss ousted Thermion in v. 2—is not credible: If Thermion had stood in the text there would have been no need for a gloss in the first place. Nor would . . . Θέρμιον ἡ μὲν ἐταίρη Θέρμιον be up to Phil.'s poetic standard. Similarly unpoetic is Preisendanz's suggestion, ἡ μὲν ἐταίρη | δῆμω, "Diese geht als Hetäre fürs Volk" (Beckby), which produces a counterproductive paronomasia and an unacceptable hiatus. White defends the MS, but her reading of the poem (which allows, among other things, for Thermion to be the virgin who is then called Demarion) is not convincing. C. De Stefani, *SIFC* 89 (1996) 205–206, now makes a good case for Δημῷ's having ousted a description of Thermion, but his tentative suggestion, ἡ μὲν ἐταίρη | δηρὸν <ἐτ>, ἡ δ' οὐπω κτλ, is not attractive.

Κύπριν ἐπισταμένη: Not so much "knowing who K. is" as a compression of Κύπριδος δῶρον ἐπ. (vel sim.); cf. Archil. 1 Μουσεῶν ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος.

3 ψαύω: "Fondle" (Gow-Page); cf. Silenos at Eur. *Kykl.* 171, numbering among erotic pleasures ψαῦσαι χερσῖν λειμῶνος. Cf. 25.2 ἄπτη. For *tango* as a Latin equivalent, cf. Westendoerp Boerma ad Vergil, *Cat.* 1.4; J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (London 1982) 185–187. Wilamowitz's conjecture (apud Kaibel) misses the point: Phil. has (indicative) all the sex he wants with Thermion whenever he wants; his desire for Demo remains nonetheless unabated.

4 ἦν: " = ὀποτέρην, a very rare use," as Gow-Page note, but even were the latter metrically possible it is made unnecessary by the comparative ποθεινοτέρην .

5 Δημάριον: Samuel Petit's conjectured gen. of comparison was necessary for all who accepted the MSS' ἡ μὲν ἑταίρη | Δημῷ and who hence thought Thermion the virgin (*Observationes* [Paris 1642] 1.94, approb. Brunck, Jacobs, Dübner). H. Keil, *RM* 19 (1864) 263, who follows these scholars in calling Demo the courtesan, considers saving the MS by punctuating Δημάριον; λέξω τὴν παρθένον.

λέξω: The future provides the answer to the preceding question, and reads more smoothly than a hortatory subjunctive.

παρθένον: A *parthenos* need not be *intacta* (Wilam. on Eur. *HF* 834), but that is clearly the meaning here; see on v. 2.

5–6 οὐ γὰρ . . . τὸ φυλασσόμενον: Cf. Kallim. *Ep.* 1.3–6 HE (*AP* 12.102; the hunter Epikydes ranges over rough terrain):

ἦν δέ τις εἶπη
 "τῆ, τόδε βέβληται θηρίον," οὐκ ἔλαβεν.
 χοῦμός ἐρωσ τοιόσδε· τὰ μὲν φεύγοντα διώκειν
 οἶδε, τὰ δ' ἐν μέσσω κείμενα παρπέταται.

Similarly, Eur. *Hipp.* 184 f. οὐδέ σ' ἀρέσκει τὸ παρόν, τὸ δ' ἀπὸν | φίλτερου ἦγη, Xen. *Hieron* 1.30; Theokr. 6.17, 11.75; Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.105–108 (a rendering of the Kallimachos passage shortly before Hor. names Phil. in this same context); Ov. *Am.* 2.9.9 f.; 2.19.1 f., 35 f.; 3.4.17 f., 25 f. In nonerotic contexts, cf. Hes. fr. 61 M-W νήπιος ὃς τὰ ἔτοιμα λιπῶν ἀνέτοιμα διώκει, Bakch. 1.176 f., Pi. *P.* 3.22; Demokr. B 202, Lucr. 3.957, 1082. See further Kaibel ad loc.

12

ὦ ποδός, ὦ κνήμης, ὦ τῶν (ἀπόλωλα δικαίως)
 μηρῶν, ὦ γλουτῶν, ὦ κτενός, ὦ λαγόνων,
 ὦ ὤμοιιν, ὦ μαστῶν, ὦ τοῦ ραδινοῖο τραχήλου,
 ὦ χειρῶν, ὦ τῶν (μαίνομαι) ὀμματίων,
 ὦ κακοτεχνοτάτου κινήματος, ὦ περιάλλων 5
 γλωττισμῶν, ὦ τῶν (θυέ με) φωναρίων·
 εἰ δ' Ὀπικὴ καὶ Φλωῖρα καὶ οὐκ ἄδουσα τὰ Σαπφοῦς,
 καὶ Περσεὺς Ἰνδῆς ἠράσατ' Ἀνδρομέδης.

AP 5.132 [12 GP, 15 K]

P Pl 7.100, f. 73r τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] [C] εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν Ξανθίππην μανίας μεστόν
 καὶ θαυμαστικόν *Suda* s.v. ῥαδινῆ (1 ὦ ποδός—κνήμης + 3 ὦ τοῦ—τραχήλου) Π
 v. 20 ὠποδος

3 ὁ ὅμοιν Jacobs: ὅμοιν P: ὁ ὁμῶν Pl: ὁμῶν Kaibel ὁ ὅμοιν, ὁ μαστῶν transpos. Griffiths
 4 χειρῶν] χειλῶν tent. Stadtmüller 5 κακοτεχνοτάτου Pl: κατατ- P 6 γλωττισμῶν
 CPl: γλωττισμῶν P θδέ με P: κλώμαι Pl: θύ' ἐμέ Ellis: θύψ' ἐμέ Hecker: θαδύ' ἔλε Stadtmüller:
 κλώμεθα Orsopoeus: μώμεθα Waltz: θύμ' ἐμέ Seidler 7 εἰ δ' Ὀπικῆ PPl^{pc}: ὄδ ὀπικῆ
 Pl^{ac} καὶ Φλώρα] παῖς Φλώρα Hecker οὐκ ἄδουσα CPl: οὐ καὶ ἰδοῦσα (?)P 8 Ἴνδῆς
 PPl^{pc}: ἠνδῆς Pl^{ac}

O foot, O leg, O (I'm done for) those thighs, O buttocks, O bush, O flanks,
 O shoulders, O breasts, O delicate neck, O hands, O (madness!) those eyes,
 O wickedly skillful walk, O fabulous kisses, O (slay me!) her speech.
 And if she *is* an Oscan—a mere Flora who does not sing Sappho's verses—
 Perseus too fell in love with Indian Andromeda.

Cohen, *Helios* 8.2 (1981) 41–53.

Courtney, *LCM* 15 (1990) 177 f.

Geffcken 133.

Giangrande, *Maia* 25 (1973) 65 f.

Griffiths, *BICS* 17 (1970) 36.

Muñoz Valle, *CFC* 7 (1974) 87–89.

Seidler, *Ber. Verb. Sächs. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Leipzig* 1 (1846–47) 128–130.

A description of a beautiful woman, feature by feature. Many parallels exist for this in later Greek and non-Greek literature, where it is sometimes called by the heraldic term *blason anatomique*. The description of the woman may proceed from the foot upwards, as here, or from head to toe. In the Anthology, Rufinus offers many fine exx.; cf. also Dioskorides 1 HE (*AP* 5.56). The most notable echo of Phil. in Latin poetry is Ov. *Am.* 1.5.19–23:

quos umeros, quales vidi tetigique lacertos,
 forma papillarum quam fuit apta premi,
 quam castigato planus sub pectore venter,
 quantum et quale latus, quam iuvenale femur!
 singula quid referam? nil non laudabile vidi.

For praise of women in general in Greek poetry, cf. K. Jax, *Die weibliche Schönheit in der griechischen Dichtung* (Innsbruck 1933); A. Richlin, *The Gardens of Priapus* (New Haven 1983) 44–56.

As detailed below, most of the body parts itemized are, at least at first, given their neutral anatomical rather than erotic names. The phrases in parentheses, on the other hand, reveal a barely contained passion just below the neutral surface description. By v. 5 the narrator can no longer keep up the façade and begins to list the beloved's sexy walk and tongue kisses. The dynamic point of the poem is thus the great difficulty if not impossibility of a man's maintaining his sang froid—perh. more specifically his Epicurean *ataraxia*—in the contemplation of a beautiful woman. The poem ends with the “X but comely” topos, of which Phil. was so fond, where X here is the girl's low social status; see the comm.

1 ὦ: Of surprise or exclamation with the nominative or, less often, genitive; cf. Hipparchos fr. 3.3 K-A ὦ περιβοήτου . . . λαβρωνίου (a certain kind of cup), Theokr. 15.4 ὦ τῶς ἀλεμάτω ψυχᾶς (“What a helpless thing I am!” tr. Gow). Generally but not universally said by later grammarians to be barytone rather than perispomenon; cf. LSJ s.v. ὦ, II 4, who cite inter alia EM 79.13 [τὸ ὦ] ἡνίκα θαυμαστικὸν λαμβάνεται βαρύνεται. Cf. the three *os* of Prop. 1.10.1–4 and 2.15.1.

ποδός: The description of Flora’s charms starts at ground level and works its way upwards, although not mechanically so. As Giangrande correctly points out (*contra* Griffiths), Phil.’s description is as dynamic as Flora’s own motions, which soon enough end in (at least as far as the poem is concerned) kisses and an embrace. Cohen surveys other Classical, but nonerotic, descriptions of bodies which proceed from foot to head or vice versa (there is an upward description of Odysseus at *Od.* 8.135 f. μηρούς τε κνήμας τε καὶ ἄμφω χεῖρας ὑπερθεν | αὐχένα τε στιβαρὸν μέγα τε σθένοσ), but offers a more interesting parallel from a Dead Sea scroll (Genesis Apocryphon, col. xx) in which the beauty of Abraham’s wife Sarai is described (head downwards) similarly to Flora’s. Cohen’s thesis is that these two nearly contemporary authors from Palestine were each adapting earlier detailed analyses of beautiful women; cf. esp. Song of Songs 7.1–8 (from feet to hair, incl. the ivory tower image for the neck). [Later *blason* literature consistently starts from the head and stops short, through pointed aposiopesis, of the genitals; it hence does not mention legs. Cf. Mark Taylor, “Voyeurism and aposiopesis in Renaissance poetry,” *Exemplaria* 4 (1992) 267–294.]

From Homer on, πούς = either “foot” (from the ankle down) or “leg” (from thigh down); here, as the next two nouns show, the former. Flora is not like Archilochos’ Neoboule, who is περὶ σφυρὸν παχεῖα, μισητὴ γυνή (206 W²).

1–2 κνήμης . . . μηρῶν: The leg divided into its two largest parts; cf. Tyrtaios 11.23 (a tall shield covers) μηρούς τε καὶ κνήμας κάτω καὶ στέρνα καὶ ὦμους. Calves do not elsewhere figure in erotic descriptions, but Solon 25.2 speaks of the *erotikos aner* as μηρῶν μιεῖρων καὶ γλυκεροῦ στόματος; cf. Asklepiades 20 HE (*AP* 12.161), where Dorkion reveals a γυμνὸν μηρόν; Simon. fr. 21.5 W², Song of Songs 7.1 (and on Song of Songs in general, cf. J. M. Sasson, *JAOS* 106 [1986] 736–738).

τῶν ἀπόλωλα δικαίως | μηρῶν: Most of Flora’s features are listed without the definite article, the exceptions being thighs, neck (3), eyes (4), and voice (6), where also words occur in the attributive position. τοῦ ραδινοῖο τραχήλου presents no problem, but the others contain finite verbs which defy easy analysis. Can one (e.g.) speak of “the I’m-truly-ruined thighs”? Gow-Page, with some hesitation, take τῶν as = ἐκεῖνων οἷς (2, 4) or ἐ. ᾶ, although they admit that ὀμματίοις μαίνομαι stretches the normal usage of μαίνομαι + dative, “mad as a result of (some activity or state)”; exx. from LSJ: γόοις, τόλμη, πόνοις. We can regard Phil.’s usage as a special instance of the parenthetical interjection of a verbal phrase into a syntactically unrelated sentence, of which Wilamowitz on Eur. *HF* 222 gives several exx. Cf. esp. Eur. *Kykl.* 465 γέγηθα, μαινόμεσθα, τοῖς εὐρήμασιν (LSJ, approb. Seaford, punctuate with only the first comma, taking it with the exx. of μαίνομαι + dative given above). I have accordingly, following others (cf. e.g. Griffiths 42 n. 46), set

these phrases within parentheses. These parenthetical phrases disprove Stella's contention (263 f.) that until the last distich we could be listening to the description of a statue. *δικαίως*, "justly," i.e. "with reason."

2 γλουτῶν: Not a word found in erotic contexts, where *πυγή* is far more common; cf. esp. *καλλιπυγος* (Athen. 12.554d = Kerkidas 14 Powell), said of women and of Aphrodite; *πυγοστόλος* (Hes. *Op.* 373), "rigging herself out (*στελλομένη*) in a way that focuses on her arse," West ad loc. *γλουτός*, on the other hand, is neutral, almost scientific in tone; *Il.* 5.66 and 13.651 (Meriones' arrow twice strikes someone *γλουτὸν κατὰ δεξιόν*), *Hdt.* 4.9.1 (a sea monster is a woman from the buttocks up). For more on the Greek appreciation of fine buttocks in motion, cf. the adj. *εὐπυγία* (Alexis 98.11 K = 103 K-A) and *καλλιπυγος* (Kerkidas 14). Note also Semonides' monkey woman: *κινεῖται μόγις ἰάπυγος* (7.75 f.), with Verdenius' note, *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser. 21 (1968) 148. For the epic language of body parts and functions, cf. Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Unters. zu Homer* (Göttingen 1916) 224–229.

κτενός: The pubic area: Rufus, *Onom.* 109 τῆς δὲ γυναικὸς τὸ αἰδοῖον, κτεῖς μὲν τὸ τρίγωνον πέρας τοῦ ὑπογαστρίου, Pollux 2.174 ὧν [sc. αἰδοίων γυναικῶν] τὸ μὲν σύμπαν κτεῖς καὶ ἐπίσπον, ἡ δὲ τομὴ σχίσμα.

λαγόνων: Again, more often neutral ("flanks, sides") than erotic ("waist, hips") in tone; note e.g. Kallim. *H.* 5.88 (Chariklo speaking to her son Teiresias in Athena's hearing) εἶδες Ἀθαναίας στήθεα καὶ λαγόνας, where it serves her interests to describe what Teiresias saw in clinical rather than erotic terms (a point missed by Bulloch: "flanks are inappropriate here, being of little sexual significance"). On the other hand, cf. [Lucian] *Am.* 14 (in a description of a statue of Aphrodite) πῶς δ' ἀμφιλαφεῖς αἰ λαγόνες, and Chairemon 71 F 14 TrGF (a description of some dancing girls):

ἔκειτο δ' ἡ μὲν λευκὸν εἰς σεληνόφωσ
 φαίνουσα μαστὸν λελυμένης ἐπωμίδος,
 τῆς δ' αὖ χορεία λαγόνα τὴν ἀριστερὰν
 ἔλυσε· γυμνὴ δ' αἰθέρος θεάμασιν
 ζῶσαν γραφὴν ἔφαινε, χρῶμα δ' ὄμμασιν 5
 λευκὸν μελαίνης ἔργον ἀντηγύει σκιᾶς.
 ἄλλη δ' ἐγύμνου καλλίχειρας ὠλένας,
 ἄλλης προσαμπέχουσα θῆλυν αὐχένα.
 ἡ δὲ ῥαγέντων χλανιδίων ὑπὸ πτυχαῖς
 ἔφαινε μηρόν, κάξεπεσφραγίζετο 10
 ὦρας γελώσης χωρὶς ἐλπίδων ἔρωσ.

With vv. 2–4, cf. Eur. *Hek.* 558–560, which may have served as Chairemon's model.

3 ὤῶμοι: ὤμος could include both shoulder and upper arm; cf. Rufus, *Onom.* 142.2ff, where he also notes that *χεῖρ* can include the shoulder. Synecphonesis with final -ω as first vowel is not so rare (West, *Gk. Metre* 13 offers several examples) that an unparalleled ὤῶ is objectionable. Shoulders alone appear in the dual (unlike thighs, buttocks, shanks, breasts, arms, or eyes), perh. to avoid the run of ome-

gas in ὦ ὤμων, ὦ (Pl). Waltz prints P's ὤμοιν (“per crasin pro ὦ ὤμ.”), perhaps rightly.

μαστῶν: See on 9.3.

ράδινοιο τραχήλου: Slenderness is a common compliment for women, either for a part as here, or applied generally as ἡ ραδινὴ (κούρη); e.g. Sappho 102.2 πόθω δάμεισα παίδος βραδιναν δι' Ἀφροδίταν, AP 5.173.3, 218.6, 220.6, Lucr. 4.1167 (the besotted lover calls a consumptive woman *rhadine*). Cf. Song of Songs, where twice a beautiful neck is compared to a tower (4.4, 7.4); Anacreonta 16.27 West *περὶ λυγδίνω τραχήλω*, 17.29 *ἐλεφάντινος τράχηνος*. Note that it is the beauty of three of the features listed here which allow Helen to recognize Aphrodite (*Il.* 3.396 f.):

καὶ ῥ' ὡς οὖν ἐνόησε θεᾶς περικαλλέα δειρήν
στήθεά θ' ἱμερόεντα καὶ ὄμματα μαρμαίροντα.

4 χειρῶν: Stadtmüller's tentative *χειλῶν* (app. crit. only) is defended by Griffiths, who also alters the order of shoulders and breasts (see app. crit.) to enforce a strict upward order; he is properly criticized by Giangrande (above, on 1 ποδός). (*χειρ-* appears instead of *χειλ-* in the MSS of Euboulos 56.3 K-A [ap. Athen.] and Semonides 27 W² [ap. Apoll. Soph.])

5 κακοτεχνοτάτου: “Wickedly skillful,” as in Automedon 1.1–2 GP (AP 5.129), is clearly the preferable reading:

τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίης ὄρχηστρίδα, τὴν κακοτέχνους
σχήμασιν ἐξ ἀπαλῶν κινυμένην ὀνόχων.

κινήματος: Herrick's “brave vibration each way free”; cf. Sappho 16.17 f. τὰς κε βολλαίμαν ἔρατόν τε βᾶμα . . . ἴδην; Argentarius 6.1 f. GP (AP 5.104) *ἐπίτηδες ἰσχίον ἐρχομένη σύστρεφε*, Rufinus 21.3 Page (AP 5.60) (of a woman swimming) *πυγαὶ δ' ἀλλήλαις περιηγέες εἰλίσσοντο*, Semon. 7.75 f. (quoted above, on v. 2 *γλουτῶν*). This wiggling of the hips is often compared to the way a lizard shakes its tail: Anakreon 458 *σαῦλα βαίνειν*, 411 Διονύσου *σαῦλαι Βασσαρίδες*, Aristoph. V. 1173 *σαυλοπρωκτιᾶν*, Rufinus 21.4 Page; cf. J. Bremmer, “Walking, standing, and sitting in ancient Greek culture,” in J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg (eds.), *A Cultural History of Gesture* (Ithaca 1991) 21. Cf. also Epicur. *Ep. ad Idom.* fr.131 U = 50 Arr. ὦ πάντα τάμ' ἀκινήματα τερπνὰ νομίσας ἐκ νέου. Ov. *Am.* 2.4.29 f. *illa placet gestu numerosaque brachia ducit | et tenerum molli torquet ab arte latus*. A woman's sexy walk hints at her motion during sexual intercourse; cf. Brown on Lucr. 4.1268.

περιάλλων: This word appears as adj. only here, *De Piet.* 1773 f. Obbink (as restored by Phillipson) τὸν [πε]ρίαλλον ὄν[τ]ρα νό[ι]μον, and in an unpublished papyrus of Hellenistic hexameters. Everywhere else only the adv. *πεπίαλλα* appears.

6 γλωττισμῶν: A hapax: “tongue kisses” is most likely; cf. Automedon 1.7 GP *γλωττίζει*, with what may be the same meaning (“fellates” is less likely). According

to Pollux 2.109, the comic poets prefer the compounds καταγλωττίζειν (found in Aristoph. *Thesm.* 131) and καταγλωττισμός; cf. *Clouds* 51, where Strepsiadēs refers to the sophisticated καταγλωττίσματα of his wife. For other terms for kisses, cf. Henderson, *Maculate Muse* 182. They must have figured in Philainis Samia's chapter of which we have only the title Περὶ Φιλημάτων (P.Oxy. 39 [1972] 2891). Lucretius perhaps surprisingly does not mention the tongue in his two brief descriptions of lascivious kisses in Bk. 4 (1108 f., 1194), but cf. Tibullus 1.8.37 f. *pugnantibus umida linguis | oscula*; Ov. *Am.* 2.5.23–28, esp. 23 f. *improba . . . oscula . . . illa mihi lingua nexa fuisse liquet*; 3.7.9 *osculaque inseruit cupide luctantia linguis*; 3.14.23 *purpureis condatur lingua labellis*.

Θυέ με: This so closely parallels the two earlier expostulations that one wonders why scholars have exercised themselves in producing unnecessary conjectures. For the sense here of “kill, slaughter” (LSJ s.v. I 2 b), cf. Hdt. 1.126.2 etc. (6× in all), Aristoph. *Lys.* 1062.

φωναρίων: Elsewhere only in the singular: Aristoph. fr. 753 K-A φωνάριον ὄδικόν καὶ καμπτικόν and Klearchos fr. 2 K-A.

7 Ὀπικῆ: Neither “barbarous” (LSJ) nor “Italian” in general, but “Oscan” (Kaibel, Stella 263, Gow-Page), which, assuming a Neapolitan setting for the poem, connotes “a local, uncultured, Campanian girl.” Even Romans who never went south knew the *Oscæ personae* who provided the rustic flavor of Atellan farces; cf. Diomedes 1.482, 490 Keil. Cf. A. Landi, “Lingue in contatto e circolazione sociale a Pompei,” in *La regione sotterrata dal Vesuvio. Atti del Convegno intern. 11–15 nov. 1979* (Naples 1982) 211–227, esp. 216, “Il greco nell’Italia meridionale è una lingua egemonica che convive con l’osco senza assorbirlo. Inoltre il greco probabilmente era considerato una lingua dominante anche nella valutazione intellettuale o estetica.” And several sources record general disdain, esp. by Greeks, towards the Campanian dialect: Juv. 3.207 *divina opici rodebant carmina mures*, with schol. ad loc. *opizin* [i.e., ὀπικίζειν] *Graeci dicunt de his, qui imperite loquuntur. Alii opicos dicunt eos qui foedam vocem habent*; Eudoxus fr. 321 Lasserre ap. Steph. Byz. *Eth.* 494.7 γλώσσας συνέμειξαν (sc. οἱ Ὀπικοί); Joh. Lydus, *Mens.* 1.13 ὀπικίζειν, καὶ ὡς τὸ πλήθος, ὀφικίζειν τὸ βαρβαρίζειν Ἴταλοι (Ἰταλιῶται tent. Holford-Strevens) λέγουσιν; Mayor on Juv. 3.207.

Given the greater variety of sibilants in Oscan than in Latin or Greek, there may be the additional point that the notion of the elegant Sappho sung by a Campanian is a funny one, esp. if in recital Phil. exaggerated the sibilants of ἄδουσα τὰ Σαπφοῦς; cf. C. D. Buck, *Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston 1928; rp. 1974) 8, 20, 73 ff.

καὶ Φλώρα καὶ . . . Σαπφοῦς: Exegetical καὶς giving two exx. of her Oscan rusticity: (i) She bears neither a noble Roman name nor a Greek one that would connote a certain amount of glamor. Pointing out the similarity of her name to φλάωρα (Kaibel; Huet, contrary to meter, actually conjectured it) is critical overkill. (ii) Probably “the Cynthias and Delias did sing the poems of Sappho to their lovers” (Gow-Page); cf. Plut. *Mor.* 711d. Lucian *Merc. Cond.* 36 speaks of women who want it to be said of them ὡς πεπαιδευμένοι τέ εἰσιν καὶ φιλόσοφοι καὶ

ποιούσιν ᾄσματα οὐ πολλὰ τῆς Σαπφῶς ἀποδέοντα. Sappho herself is the tenth Muse (AP 7.14, 17, 407; 9.506.2, 571.6 f.), singing her own songs to the accompaniment of harp or lyre. Cf. Catullus 35.16 f. *Sapphica puella* | *Musa doctior*.

Presumably Pompey's mistress for a time, also named Flora and also renowned for her beauty, as a professional hetaira would know how to sing Sappho (Plut. *Pomp.* 2.2–4), and hence cannot be the Flora described here (*contra* Seidler 129, Beckby). This suggests that this poem was written before Pompey's Flora gained notoriety. Phil. may have used the name Flora elsewhere; cf. *Ep. Bob.* 32 (cited in the comm. to 2.1 πέμπει).

Hecker's unnecessary conjecture, which violates Hilberg's Law (Maas *Gk. Metre* §94), was accepted by Bignone, Dübner, Stadtmüller, Romagnoli, and Stella.

οὐκ adheres closely with ᾄδουσα; cf. KG 2.189.

8 Ἴνδῆς . . . Ἀνδρομέδης: Andromeda was but one of several figures in Greek mythology considered black in color, whether called Ethiopian or Indian—the two terms are poetic synonyms, as here, since Andromeda is often Ethiopian. (She may have been originally Greek; cf. M. L. West, *Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, Oxford 1985, 147 ff.) Cf. Arrian, *Indika* 6.9 αἱ ἰδέαι οὐ πάντῃ ἀπάδουσιν αἱ Ἴνδῶν τε καὶ Αἰθιόπων. Others would include Prosymnos and Staphylos. In view of Phil.'s use elsewhere of the black-but-comely theme (cf. pp. 33, 123 f.), Gow-Page (approb. Courtney) are probably wrong to downplay Andromeda's color here, putting the emphasis rather on her "outlandish origin." Perseus, like Phil. with Flora, was taken by Andromeda's appearance. For Andromeda in particular as black (or white; authors differ), cf. F. M. Snowden, Jr., *Blacks in Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass., 1970), 153 f., 157–159. Cf. Ovid(?), *Her.* 15.35 f. (Sappho:) *Candida si non sum, placuit Cephæia Perseo* | *Andromede, patriæ fusca colore suæ*. This may well have been written with Phil. in mind, but, as H. Jacobson points out, whereas Ovid keeps to the motif of "homely but cultured," Phil. inverts it: Flora's lack of culture is more than compensated by her great beauty (Ovid's "*Heroides*" [Princeton 1974] 284 f.). That tradition had it that Sappho herself was far from beautiful lends further point to the reference to her here: P. Oxy. 1800 fr. 1 [T 252 Voigt] τὴν δὲ μορφήν [εὐ]καταφρόνητος δοκεῖ γε[γον]ῆγα[ι κα]ὶ δυσσειδεστάτη[ν], [τ]ὴν μὲν γὰρ ὄψιν φαιώδης [ὕ]πῆρχεν, τὸ δὲ μέγεθος μικρὰ παντελῶς. Cf. Ovid's *candida si non sum* (cited above).

The topos of mythological loves providing justification for human ones is of course ancient; cf., e.g., the reference to Helen in Sappho 16, Theog. 1345 ff.

παιδοφιλεῖν δέ τι τερπνόν, ἐπεὶ ποτε καὶ Γανυμήδους
ἦρατο καὶ Κρονίδης,

and in general R. Oehler, *Mythologische Exempla in der älteren griechischen Dichtung* (Diss. Basel 1925), Gow on Theokr. 8.59 f. Muñoz Valle points out that Horace justifies passion for an *ancilla* with just such paradigms (e.g., *præius insolentem* | *serva Briseis niveo colore* | *movit Achillem*, O. 2.4.2 ff.), suggesting that Phil. may have provided the model. Cf. also Ov. *Am.* 2.8.11 f. *Thessalus ancillae facie Briseidos arsit*; | *serva Mycænaeo Phœbas amata duci*, Rufinus 5.1 f., 7 f. Page (AP 5.18):

μᾶλλον τῶν σοβαρῶν τὰς δουλίδας ἐκλεγόμεθα,
οἱ μὴ τοῖς σπατάλοις κλέμμασι τερπόμενοι . . .
μιμοῦμαι Πύρρον τὸν Ἀχιλλέος, ὃς προέκρινεν
Ἐρμιόνης ἀλόχου τὴν λάτρην Ἀνδρομάχην.

13

ψυχή μοι προλέγει φεύγειν πόθον Ἡλιοδώρας,
δάκρυα καὶ ζήλους τοὺς πρὶν ἐπισταμένη.
φῆσι μὲν, ἀλλὰ φυγεῖν οὐ μοι σθένος· ἦ γὰρ ἀναιδὴς
αὐτὴ καὶ προλέγει καὶ προλέγουσα φιλεῖ.

AP 5.24 [Meleager 41]

P Φιλοδήμου PI 7.91 f., 72v τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] Π iv. 17 ψυχημοιπρολε(γει)

3 ἦ scripsi: ἢ PPI 4 αὐτὴ tent. Waltz in app. crit.: αὐτὴ P: αὐτὴ PI

My soul, knowing my earlier tears and desires, tells me in advance to flee
passion for Heliodora.

It speaks, but I have not the strength to flee; for shamefully indeed the
same (soul) both foretells and, while foretelling, desires.

Uniformly ascribed to Philodemus by P, PI, and, presumably, Π; given to Meleager by Jacobs and most others (Mackail is an honorable exception) on the basis of the name Heliodora, which appears in sixteen other poems of the latter, one of which (Meleager 54) is also ascribed to Poseidippos (23 HE = AP 5.215). But Loukillios also addresses a Heliodora (AP 11.256), and Phil. uses the “Meleagrian” names Kallistion (57 = AP 5.192) and Demo (23 = AP 5.197, etc.) = Demarion (24 = 5.198). The use of the plural ζήλους points towards Meleager, but not decisively (see comm.). The poem’s context within the Anthology is indecisive; HE 2.631. The evidence is clearly insufficient to deny the poem to Phil.; so also Cameron, *Greek Anthology* 387; E. Havelock, *Lyric Genius of Catullus* (Oxford 1939) 143.

Once this poem is restored to its rightful place in the Philodemian corpus, it is possible to see that its point rests upon some Epicurean notions of the soul, which is (i) corporeal and (ii) unitary, i.e., the body has but one soul, although (iii) it is not homogeneous. For this last point our chief testimony is Ep. *Herod.* 63, which speaks of differing amounts of wind and heat in the soul, and of one part (τι μέρος Woltjer: τὸ μέρος codd.) of exceeding fineness. Epicurus uses these differences to explain τὰ πάθη καὶ αἱ εὐκίνησιαι καὶ αἱ διανοήσεις. Much remains unclear in

this compressed account (cf. G. B. Kerferd, “Epicurus’ doctrine of the soul,” *Phronesis* 16 [1971] 80–96), but later Epicurean sources speak more explicitly of the one soul having both rational and irrational parts, which Lucretius in Book 3 designates as *animus* and *anima* respectively. Cf. Σ ad Epic. *Herod.* 66–67 καὶ τὸ μὲν τι ἄλογον αὐτῆς [sc. τῆς ψυχῆς] . . . , τὸ δὲ ἄλογον (311 U), *VH*² 7. 17 col. 22 [κα]τελέξαθ’ ὁ Ἐ. καὶ περὶ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ λογιζομένου μέρους τῆς ψυχῆς, ὡς καὶ τούτου πραγματικὴν τὴν [ζ]ήτησιν ἔχοντος [καὶ] κατὰ λόγον (313 U), *Aët.* 4.6.6 Ἐπίκουρος διμερῆ τὴν ψυχὴν, τὸν μὲν λογικὸν ἔχουσαν . . . , τὸ δὲ ἄλογον, 4.5.5 (312 U), *Diog. Oin. fr.* 37 Smith. Even if (which I doubt) Kerferd is correct in distinguishing between Epicurus’ simple soul and the divided soul of later Epicurean tradition, since Phil. belongs to the latter, the analysis of this poem along these lines remains consistent with the author’s beliefs (see below, on 4 αὐτῆ and προλέγει). Once again, the persona adopted by Phil. is that of someone who knows Epicurean teaching on the subject and who would like to follow its precepts, but who finds himself slipping from his ethical model.

1 ψυχή: The poem describes an address of the narrator’s soul to the narrator, just as in earlier poetry other parts of the body engage in internal dialogue; e.g. Odysseus εἶπε πρὸς ὄν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν, and, in the other direction, the chorus of the *Agamemnon* can say ὕμνωδεῖ θρήνον . . . αὐτοδιδάκτος ἔσωθεν θυμός (991 ff.). Note also 1. For other “split” souls in erotic contexts, cf. Kallim. 4 HE (*AP* 12.73), Asklepiades 17 HE (*AP* 12.166).

μοι: To be understood ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with ψυχή and προλέγει.

προλέγει φεύγειν: The sense “warn” is but a slight extension of the basic meaning “say beforehand,” which, like the simplex, can have imperative force with an infinitive; the infinitive here is thus not so odd as Gow-Page say. Cf. *Deinarchos* 1.71 τοὺς νόμους προλέγειν τῷ ῥήτορι . . . παιδοποιεῖσθαι, *Eur. fr.* 897.9f. *N*² τὸ δ’ ἔρᾶν προλέγω . . . μήποτε φεύγειν; Phil. uses the verb in the sense “said before, warned,” at 23.5. (In his prose he uses the verb merely to refer to what he had said earlier.) Gow-Page’s comments are especially overfussy in that Phil. seems to be playing on the two meanings of the verb on the last line.

φεύγειν is common in erotic contexts but it is also found in much ethical writing—in Epicurus most notably fr. 163 U παιδείαν δὲ πᾶσαν, μακάριε, φεύγε τὰκάτιον ἀράμενος; other exx. s.v. in *Glossarium Epicureum*.

πόθον: With an objective genitive, as usual (LSJ I), a favorite word of Sappho for sexual passion (it is decidedly unsexual in Homer), and exceedingly common in this sense thereafter.

2 δάκρυα: Men frustrated in love cry: Asklepiades 18.3 HE (*AP* 12.135).

ζήλους: The plural is largely prosaic and, except for Pl. *Laws* 679c1, postclassical. Poetic passages are: Meleager 64.2 (*AP* 5.190) and 102.4 (*AP* 12.70), Philip 70.6 (*AP* 137).

ἐπισταμένη: “Knowing for certain,” since knowledge is based on perception which cannot be false; cf. S. Everson, “Epicurus on the truth of the senses,” in S. Everson (ed.), *Epistemology* (Cambridge 1990) 161–183.

3 φῆσι: For this accentuation at the beginning of a clause, rather than the usual φησὶ, cf. Tyrannion fr. 9 Haas (Eustath. *Il.* 1613.16 ff. ad *Il.* 2.350); J. Wackernagel, *KS* 2.1068; Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* 389; J. Vendryès, *Traité d'accentuation grecque* (Paris 1904; rp. 1945) 108–110; M. L. West, *Aeschlyli Tragoediae* (Stuttgart 1990) xxxi.

ἦ γάρ: For the collocation of particles, cf. Denniston, *GP* 284. ἦ goes with the adj., as usual (ibid. 280). This accentuation seems preferable to ἡ γάρ, in allowing αὐτή, i.e., ἡ αὐτή, “the same,” rather than αὐτή, “the shameful one itself.” The point is that one and the same soul can act in totally contrary ways. See next lemma. For the predicate word order and adverbial sense of an adj. indicating mental state, cf. Xen. *Kyr.* 1.6.2 οἱ θεοὶ εὐμενεῖς πέμπουσί σε, *KG* 1.275.

ἀναιδής: Use of this word argues for Philodemean authorship; see on 18.5.

4 αὐτή: The soul (Dübner, Waltz, Gow-Page), not the woman (Paton). The Epicurean soul comprises both rational and irrational parts, respectively the *animus* and *anima* described in Lucretius III; cf. Σ ad Epic. *Herod.* 68 f., quoted above.

προλέγει καὶ προλέγουσα φιλεῖ: Although the soul may be said to have parts, it is but one and corporeal (cf. Epic. *Herod.* 63 ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ σῶμά ἐστι λεπτομερές, παρ' ὄλον τὸ ἄθροισμα παρεσπαρμένον; Rist, *Epicurus* 79 f.). While the rational part of the soul “speaks beforehand” (in warning) of desire for Heliadora, the soul’s irrational part must also be speaking beforehand of this same desire—and so stirs it up. Lucretius’ analysis is somewhat different, but note 4.1048 *idque petit corpus, mens unde est saucia amore*, 1057 *voluptatem praesagit muta cupido*, 1106 *cum praesagit gaudia corpus*. (For Lucretius’ peculiar use of this verb, cf. Brown on 4.1057.) The most interesting parallel, however, comes from Epicurus himself: ἀφυσιολόγητον μηδὲν ἠγοῦ βωώσης τῆς σαρκὸς βοᾶν τὴν ψυχὴν. σαρκὸς δὲ φωνή· μὴ πεινῆν, μὴ διψῆν, μὴ ρίγοῦν (200 U).

 14

νυκτερινὴ δίκηρωσ φιλοπάννουχε φαῖνε, Σελήνη,
 φαῖνε δι' εὐτρήτων βαλλομένη θυριδων·
 αὐγαζε χρυσέην Καλλίστιον. ἐς τὰ φιλεύντων
 ἔργα κατοπτεύειν οὐ φθόνος ἀθανάτη.
 ὀλβίζεις καὶ τήνδε καὶ ἡμέας, οἶδα, Σελήνη· 5
 καὶ γὰρ σὴν ψυχὴν ἔφλεγεν Ἐνδυμίων.

AP 5.123 [9 GP, 4 K, 6 G]

P Φιλοδήμου Π v. 3 νυκτεριν(νῆ) caret Pl

[C] εἰς Καλλίστιον τὴν ἐταῖραν

2 βαλλομένη) ἄλλομένη Dilthey: παλλομένη Knaack
 Götting.philol.6, Lips.Rep. I. 35,Cr: -τη P: -οις Ap.B
 (marg.)

4 φθόνος C: φόβος P ἀθανάτη
 5 καὶ τήνδε P: σαυτὴν τε Ap.B

Shine, o nocturnal bicornate lover of allnight revelry, Selene; pass through the latticed windows and shine.
 Illumine golden Kallistion. There is no ill-will directed towards your immortal self when you gaze down upon the actions of lovers.
 You count both her and me happy, I know, Selene; for your soul too was inflamed by Endymion.

Hopkinson 75, 263.

Knaack, "Analecta," *Hermes* 18 (1883) 31.

In tone the most lyrical of Phil.'s epigrams. The path of light is traced from Selene through the windows onto the (probably nude) body of Kallistion; and moonlight, as Selene's visual rays, will continue to be present during the (presumably imminent) lovemaking. Selene's own love for Endymion is then recalled, his name, the poem's last word, providing the final detail of the narrator's description: Kallistion is asleep during his address to Selene, and, if the parallel with Endymion continues, will remain asleep during lovemaking; see on 6 Ἐνδυμίων.

Cf. Prop. 1.3, where a description, again with mythological paradigms, leads to embraces and kisses of the still sleeping Cynthia. Propertius' references to moon and windows (see below on vv. 1, 2) suggests an allusion to Phil.; so P. Fedeli, *S. Properzio: Il primo libro* (Florence 1980) ad 31–33, 32; O. Pecere, "Selene e Endimione (*Anth.Lat.* 33 R.)," *Maia* 24 (1972) 304–316, who surveys the Selene-Endymion motif in literature. Agathias 90 Viansino (*AP* 5.294) also describes the stroking and kissing of a sleeping woman. On the eroticism of sleeping figures in art and literature, cf. E. J. Stafford, "Aspects of sleep in Hellenistic sculpture," *BICS* 38 (1991–1993) 105–120, esp. 109–112.

As Kaibel notes, this poem was read and imitated by the twelfth-century author Niketas Eugeneianos, *Drosilla and Charikles* 8.113–115.

σύ γοῦν, Σελήνη, γλαυκοφεγγῆς ὀλβία
 ἄθρει, ποδήγει, φωταγῶγει τὸν ξένον·
 Ἐνδυμίων ἐφλεξε καὶ σὴν καρδίαν.

Niketas' source was the Anthology, not Philip; cf. A. Cameron, *The Greek Anthology* 128 f., 341.

1 νυκτερινή: "The other epithets in this couplet are carefully chosen rarities, and it is surprising to find here the common form νυκτερινή . . . instead of the poetic νυκτερίη" (Gow-Page). Phil. could have seen the latter in Aratos, *Phain.* 999, modifying γλαύξ, and in Maccius 10 GP (*AP* 9.403), modifying ἔργον. But νυκτερινός is not alien to poetry, occurring in Aristoph., Eupolis, and SH 1090. It is credible that Phil. wrote the rarer adj., which was altered subconsciously by one of his learned editors (rather than by a careless scribe), but not enough so to justify altering the text of the MSS. (It is unfortunate that II stops just short of set-

ting the matter, but since its usual custom is to omit more than one letter, it may be thought to favor the MS reading.)

δίκερος: For the anomalous accentuation of compound adj. in -ως, -ων, cf. Kühner-Blass 1.321. Applied elsewhere to Pan (*Hom.Hymn* 19.2, Agathias 62 Viansino = *AP* 6.32.1, and *AP* 9.142.1) or an animal (Aristotle, *HA* 499b18), but note Horace, *Carm.Saec.* 35 f. *bicornis . . . luna* and *Orph.H.* 9.1 f. *Σελήνη ταυρόκερος*.

φιλοπάννυχε: The only compound adj. beginning φιλοπαν-; occurring elsewhere only at *Orph. H.* 3.5 (of Night). The piling up of epithets is typical of hymns (increasingly so in later literature; Orphic Hymns—cf. 9 in particular—contain vocative epithets of this sort almost exclusively).

φαίνε: Intransitive, as often of celestial phenomena, from Homer on (LSJ s.v. A II); cf. Theokr. 2.10 f. *Σελάνα, | φαίνε καλόν*, Meleager 73 (*AP* 5.191.1) ή φιλέρωσι καλόν φαίνουσα *Σελήνη*.

Σελήνη: Note that, according to Schol. ad Theokr. 2.10, Πίνδαρός φησιν ἐν τοῖς κεχωρισμένοις τῶν Παρθενείων ὅτι τῶν ἐραστῶν οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες εὐχονται παρ-εῖναι Ἥλιον, αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες Σελήνην (fr. 104 Sn.-M.). Cf. also Propertius' mention of the moon at 1.3.31 f. (quoted in the next lemma).

2 δι' . . . θυρίδων: the singular is more normal in early Greek; cf. Praxilla 754 PMG ὦ διὰ τῶν θυρίδων καλὸν ἐμβλέποισα | παρθένε τὰν κεφαλὰν τὰ δ' ἔνερθε νόμφα (but note that R. Renehan, "Praxilla fr. 8 Page," *Hermes* 115 [1987] 373–377, argues for τὰς θυρίδος), which may be echoed in Asklepiades 3 HE (*AP* 5.153.2), where the beautiful face of Nikarete is seen δι' ὑψηλῶν φαινόμενον θυρίδων. Phil.'s plural probably reflects a later style of double-gated window; cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.5.3 *pars adaperata fuit, pars altera clausa fenestras*, Prop. 1.3.31 f. *donec diversas praecurrens luna fenestras, | luna moraturis sedula luminibus*, and next n.

For visible rays, cf. Lucr. 2.114–141. It might also be pertinent that according to Aristotle, *de An.* 404a1, Demokritos compared the atoms of soul to the motes seen in rays coming through windows (οἷον ἐν τῷ ἀέρι τὰ καλούμενα ζύσματα ἃ φαίνεται ἐν ταῖς διὰ τῶν θυρίδων ἀκτίσιν).

εὐτρήτων: The original meaning "well-bored" yielded to "many-holed," here "latticed." Cf. Varro *RR* 3.7.3 *fenestris reticulatis*, Plautus *Mil.Glor.* 379 *fenestra clatrata*, Vergil *A.* 3.151 f. *qua se plena per insertas fundebat luna fenestras*.

βαλλομένη: To the exx. of this verb used for the "casting" of light adduced by Gow-Page, add Asklepiades 3.1, cited above for θυρίδων: Νικαρέτης τὸ Πόθοισι βεβλημένον ἦδὺ πρόσωπον. (Dilthey's conjecture is recorded by Knaack.)

3 αὐγαξε: For the sense here, "shine on, illumine" (LSJ s.v. II 1), used of the sun, moon, or stars, cf. Eur. *Hek.* 635–637 . . . Ἐλένας ἐπὶ λέκτρα, τὰν καλλίσταν ὁ χρυσοφαῆς Ἄλιος ἀγιάζει (but Dodds ad Eur. *Ba.* 596–599, says that it "may mean merely 'whom the sun sees'"), Ap. Rh. 3.1377 f. ἀστήρ | ὀλκὸν ὑπαυγάζων, *Orph.H.* 7.10. Another possible parallel is Leonidas 10 HE (*AP* 7.648.8), where a room bright with torches may illuminate (i.e., be brighter than) a log burning in the fireplace:

ἔνσθητ' ἀυγάζων δαλὸν ἐπεσχάριον. For a different interpretation, cf. M. Gigante *L'hedera di Leonida* (Naples 1971) 71.

Καλλίστιον: The name occurs in Hedylos 3 HE (Athen. 486a), Kallim. 16 HE (AP 6.148), Meleager 57 (AP 5.192), and Poseidippos 8 (AP 12.131). Probably all were named after the well-known hetaira who appears in Machon 433 Gow and mentioned by Athen. 858b.

3–4 τὰ φιλεύντων ἔργα: The same as the ἔργα . . . πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης (Hes. *Op.* 521 = *H. Hymn* 5.1); sim. *ibid.* v. 6, Solon 26.1, Theokr. *Epig.* 4 HE (AP 9.437.4), and AP 7.221.1 (Anon.), 9.416.1 (Philip 52), 9.157.7 (Anon. 85 FGE). Cf. *Il.* 5.429 ἔργα γάμοιο.

4 κατοπτεύειν: Rare in poetry (Soph. *Ajax* 829, *Phil.* 124); it is, however, a particularly apt word for the observing of heavenly phenomena: Phil. *De Signis* 25.33 τῶν φαινομένων κατοπτευμένων, 33.12 τὸ παντοδαπὸν ποίκιλμα τῶν φαινομένων κατοπτεύσας, Ps.-Aristotle, *De Mundo* 391a10; cf. Geminus, *Elem.* 16.24, 33. There is thus some wit in reversing the normal application of this verb: One of the heavenly phenomena observes two humans.

ἀθανάτη: The gender shows that this statement is not general, but applies specifically to Selene: “positum ex more poetarum pro σοί ” (Jacobs). (Some apographa, keeping P’s reading, punctuate as though ἀθανάτη were vocative, but this is not likely.)

5 ὀλβίζεις: Cf. Fraenkel on Aisch. *Ag.* 928 f.

ἡμέας: Trisyllabic, in accord with Naeke’s law.

6 καὶ γάρ: “For . . . also”; Denniston *GP* 108.

Ἐνδυμίων: The story of this love affair was told as early as Sappho: Σ *Ap. Rh.* 4.57 f. (p. 264 W) = Sappho 199 Voigt, although testimonia are few and details vary. The longest account, Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.7.5 = Zenob. 3.76, says merely that “Selene fell in love with Endymion. . . Zeus granted him a wish. He chose to sleep forever deathless and unaging.” Cicero, on the other hand, says that it was Selene who put Endymion to sleep so that she could kiss him while he slept (*Tusc.* 1.38.92). Cicero’s *oscularetur* suggests repeated action, as well as euphemism, which would further explain the 50 children she had by him according to Paus. 5.1.4. The picture of Selene viewing the sleeping Endymion becomes a common one in art; cf. H. Gabelmann, “Endymion,” *LIMC* 3.1.726–742. Closest in erotic tone to Phil. is Prop. 2.15.15 f. *nudus et Endymion Phoebi cepisse sororem | dicitur et nuda concubuisse deae*. Cf. also Ov. *Her.* 18.59–65, where Leander prays to the Moon, reminding her of Endymion.

As suggested above in the introduction, the mention of Selene’s love for Endymion fills in the picture that the listener has been developing: Kallistion is lying asleep alongside the narrator, and he will try not to wake her as he begins to make love to her.

ὄσσάκι Κυδίλλης ὑποκόλπιος εἶτε κατ' ἡμαρ
 εἶτ' ἀποτολμήσας ἤλυθον ἐσπέριος,
 οἶδ' ὅτι πὰρ κρημνὸν τέμνω πόρον, οἶδ' ὅτι ρίπτῳ
 πάντα κύβον κεφαλῆς αἰὲν ὑπερθεν ἐμῆς.
 ἀλλὰ τί μοι πλέον ἐστί; θρασεῖα γὰρ ἦδ' ὅταν ἔλκη 5
 πάντοτ', Ἔρωσ, ἀρχὴν οὐδ' ὄναρ οἶδε φόβου.

AP 5.25 [3 GP, 5 K, 7 G]

P Pl 7.92, f. 72ν τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου]
 Κυδίλλην τὴν ἑταίραν

Suda s.v. κύβος (3 οἶδ'—4)

[J] εἰς

3 πὰρ Pl: παρά P 5 θρασεῖα γὰρ scripsi: γὰρ θρασύς P: γὰρ οὖν θρασύς Pl: ὁ γὰρ θ.
 Salmasius: ἄγαν θ. Jacobs: ἄγει θ. Stadtmüller: σὺ γὰρ θ. Gow-Page: ἦ γὰρ θ. Lumb: τί γὰρ θ.
 Brunck ὅταν PPl: ὄν ἄν Desrousseaux ἔλκη] —ης Gow-Page 6 πάντοτ'] πάντοσ'
 Brunck οἶδε] οἶδα Boissonade Gow-Page φόβου] φόβον ed.vet. (1494)

All the times I dare whether by day or evening to come to rest on Kydilla's
bosom,
I know that I cut a narrow path along a precipice, I know that each time I
risk my head on the throw of the dice.
But what's the use? For she is bold, Eros, each time when she drags me
and altogether knows not even the dream of fear.

Lumb 9.

von Prittwitz-Gaffron, *Das Sprichwort im griechischen Epigramm* (Giessen 1912) 32 f.

Doubts have been expressed over the authorship of this poem since the preceding poem in P (13) has been given to Meleager; see, e.g., Stadtmüller (who thought also of Asklepiades as author) and Waltz. The presence in Π of the incipit to 13 should settle the question of authenticity for both poems.

The topos illustrated here is a variation of that of the “Poet Caught by Love” (S. L. Tarán’s phrase: *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram* [Leiden 1979] 103), in which we typically see the man willing to risk all; cf., e.g., Anon. 9 HE (AP 12.99.1) ἠγρεύθην ὑπ’ Ἔρωτος. In this poem, however, the poet seems a prisoner less of Eros than of the woman who not only is herself subject to insatiable desires but who also, most likely because she is married, induces fear in the man as he thinks of the various punishments meted out to adulterers; see on 22.6. This is particularly applicable to Rome—cf. C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge 1993) ch. 1, “A moral revolution? The law against adultery,” esp. p. 56—but this poem also presents a humorous counterexample to the Epicurean view that the sexual pleasures of adultery are more than canceled out by the

thought of punishment. Note Origen, *Contra Celsum* 7.63 = Epic. fr. 535 U (Epicureans do not avoid adultery because it is morally wrong or unnatural)

ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ νενομικένας τέλος τὴν ἡδονήν, πολλὰ δ' ἀπαντᾶν καλυπτικά τῆς ἡδονῆς τῷ εἴξαντι μιᾷ τῇ τοῦ μοιχεύειν ἡδονῇ καὶ ἔσθ' ὅτε φυλακὰς ἢ φυγὰς ἢ θανάτους, πολλάκις δὲ πρὸ τούτων καὶ κινδύνους κατὰ τὸ ἐπιτηρεῖν τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἔξοδον ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας καὶ τῶν τὰ ἐκείνου φρονούντων, ὡς εἰ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν μοιχεύοντα οἶόν τ' ἦν λαθεῖν καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τοὺς οἰκειοὺς πάντας αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς παρ' οἷς τις ἐκ τοῦ μοιχεύειν ἀδοξεῖ, κἂν ἐμοίχευσε διὰ τὴν ἡδονὴν ὁ Ἐπικούρειος.

Even though Origen's account has to be viewed within the wider context of anti-Epicurean criticism (cf. P. A. Vander Waerdt, "The justice of the Epicurean wise man," *CQ* 37 [1987] 402–422), his general point nonetheless provides the background both for this poem and the equally Epicureanly colored Hor. *Sat.* 1.2 (cf. Q. Cataudella, "Filodemo nella Satira I 2 di Orazio," *PP* 5 [1950] 18–31); i.e., the Epicurean sage would do no wrong even were he sure to escape detection and punishment, although Epicurus thought such certainty unlikely.

1 ὀσσάκι: Only thrice in Homer (+ τοσσάκι in Simonides), and then not again found until Kallimachos (*H.* 4.254, *Ep.* 34.2 HE = *AP* 7.80) and Phil.

Κυδίλλη: *LGPN* 1 records one instance of Κύδιλλα (ii c. B.C. Delos); prob. more significant is Herodas' use twice of Κυδίλλα; cf. Headlam-Knox on Herodas 5.9.

ὑποκόλπιος: Gow-Page understand εἰμί, "whenever I lie on Cydilla's bosom." It is tempting to prefer their second choice, i.e., to take vv. 1–2 = ὑπὸ τοὺς Κυδίλλης κόλπους ἤλυθον, which seems livelier. More likely, however, ἤλυθον is to be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with ὑποκόλπιος and ἐσπέριος. Cf. *Od.* 9.451f. (Polyphemus to his ram) πρῶτος δὲ σταθμόνδε λιλαίεαι ἀπονέεσθαι | ἐσπέριος. Cf. *KG* 1.274 a) and b) for adj. used as the equivalents of adv. phrases; F. Létoublon, "Υστατον ἐλθεῖν, ἄγγελος ἐλθεῖν: Prédication, attribut, et apposition," in A. Rijksbaron et al. (eds.), *In the Footsteps of R. Kühner* (Amsterdam 1988) 161–175.

The word in the sense found here seems to be due to Theokritos: ἄλλος τοι γλυκίων ὑποκόλπιος; (14.37), although Kallimachos (earlier or later?) used it in the sense *in utero* (*H.* 4.86). Maccius (earlier or later than Phil.?) also uses it in the erotic sense (4 GP = *AP* 5.130.3); cf. also Automedon 11 GP (*AP* 12.34.3) εἰς αὐτοῦ κατέκειθ' ὑποκόλπιος.

The name of Petronius' Encolpius is similarly formed, but whereas ὑποκόλπιος is only mildly erotic, Encolpius has vulgar overtones; cf. J. P. Sullivan, *The Satyricon of Petronius* (London 1968) 117; Henderson, *Maculate Muse* 140 f.

2 ἀποτολήσας: "Philodemus as an adulterer at Rome is risking not only his life . . . , but indeed a fate far worse than death (Hor. *Serm.* 1.2.45ff.)," A. H. Griffiths, *JHS* 90 (1970) 218. The word does not, therefore, apply any more to his evening forays than to those during the day (*sic* Kaibel, *contra* Gow-Page). On adultery in Rome, cf. Edwards, *op. cit.*; A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus* (New Haven 1983) 215–219.

ἤλυθον: An iterative clause with indicative, rather than the more usual subjunctive + ἄν or optative, emphasizes the factual nature of the specific occurrences; cf. Pl. *Charm.* 158a ὁσάκις ἐκεῖνος . . . ἀφίκετο, Xen. *Mem.* 3.43, KG 2.451.

3 πᾶρ κρημνὸν τέμνω πόρον: Even if Phil. invented this phrase on the spot, as Gow-Page suspect, they should not therefore reduce it to mere metaphor; it still has a proverbial character (Prittwitz-Gaffron). Jacobs compares Ovid *AA* 1.381 *non ego per praeceps et acuta cacumina vadam*, which is certainly pertinent as Ovid a few lines earlier had written *alea grandis inest*. And Ovid's concern in this passage with concealed adultery, which is reminiscent of Phil.'s, suggests that he probably had this epigram of Phil. in mind. For τέμνειν ὁδὸν/κέλευθον/πόρον = "make one's way," cf. Aisch. *Supp.* 545 διατέμνουσα πόρον, Trag. Adesp. 668.6 TrGF, Eur. fr. 124 N², Aristoph. *Pl.* 69f. ἀναθεῖς γὰρ ἐπὶ κρημνὸν τιν' αὐτὸν καταλιπὼν | ἄπειμ', ἴν' ἐκεῖθεν ἐκτραχλισθῆι πεσῶν.

3-4 ῥιπτῶ . . . ἐμῆς: Phil. uses the simplex for the more usual ἀναρριπτῶ (LSJ s.v. II). πάντα κύβον must mean "bet one's entire stake"; cf. Thuc. 5.103 ἐς ἅπαν τὸ ὑπάρχον ἀναρριπτοῦσι, Plut. *Fab.* 14.2 τὸν περὶ τῶν ὄλων ἀναρρίψων κύβον, *Brut.* 40.3 ἀναρρίψαι τὸν περὶ τῆς πατρίδος κύβον, *Demosth.* 20.3 (cited below), *Arat.* 5.4. Without a parallel, Gow-Page are right to question the equation of ὑπερθεῖν and ὑπέρ, but we would also like a parallel for throwing the dice over one's head, which is how they would understand the phrase. I think that Phil. is in fact using the word in just such an extended sense; cf. Plut. (who is clearly fond of dicing metaphors) *Dem.* 20.3 τὸν ὑπέρ τῆς ἡγεμονίας καὶ τοῦ σώματος ἀναρρίψαι κίνδυνον ἀναγκασθεῖς.

5 τί μοι πλέον ἐστί; I.e., What is the use of knowing, if one continues the dangerous practice? On τί πλέον in the sense *quid prodest?*, cf. Kaibel ad loc., Gow on Theokr. 8.17.

θρασεῖα γάρ: P does not scan, and Pl must be faulty because "the ordinary rules of rhythm are strongly against punctuating before ἐστί" (Gow-Page ad loc.). Most editors (Brunck and Jacobs are exceptions) accordingly punctuate afterwards and offer new beginnings for the sentence, understanding Eros to be the subject. (Note that ἦ γὰρ θρασὺς calls for ἐστ', although elision is usually avoided at the midline caesura; GP 1.xlii.) Desrousseaux and Boissonade think that the corruption goes further. These earlier edd. are properly criticized by Gow-Page, who, however, proceed to take the greatest liberty with the text:

σὺ γὰρ θρασὺς, ἦδ' ὅταν ἔλκης
πάντοτ', Ἔρωσ, ἀρχὴν οὐδ' ὄναρ οἶδα φόβου.

Although Eros may indeed be a vocative (as often in amatory epigrams and as I punctuate), in saying that "it is the victim of Eros [rather than Eros himself] who puts aside all thoughts of danger here" they assume that only the male can be such a victim. My text can be read with Ἔρωσ as nominative, but the poem seems more effective as an appeal to Eros and with Kydilla as the subject of ἔλκη.

It is easy to see, however, that *θρασεῖα*, once miscopied as *θρασύς*, perh. because of a misunderstood abbreviated ending, could lead someone unsure of where the preceding sentence ended to transpose with *γάρ* to save the meter. (A postpositive may occupy the second half of a resolved position 8 without violating Hermann's Bridge; West, *Greek Metre* 38 n.18.)

ἔλκη: Cf. 27.2 n.

6 ἀρχήν: Adverbial *ἀρχήν* is rare in poetry and seems always to be found with the negative (Soph. *Ant.* 92, *El.* 439, *Pb.* 1239).

οὐδ' ὄναρ: For many exx. of this phrase, cf. Knox on Herodas 1.11

οἶδε: The reading suggested for the previous line replaces a merely acceptable but certainly unimaginative close with a witty turn of thought: "I know [twice stated] that I risk my life (*ἀποτολήσας* + vv. 3–4) going to see Kydilla at all times of the day and night. But what can I say? She is audacious, and when she drags me to her at any time, Eros, *she* does not know the meaning of the word fear." That is, she does not know the meaning of *Philodemos'* fear. Cf. *Hor. Sat.* 1.2.127 ff. (which follows soon after a reference to Phil. and a similarly adulterous situation) *nec vereor ne, dum futuo, vir rure recurrat*, and when the husband does in fact return, 131 *cruribus haec metuat, doti deprensa, egomet mi*. That all three οἶδα phrases are proverbial in character (Prittitz-Gaffron) adds further point: my two proverbial sayings count as nothing if she does not know the third.

16

οὐπω σοι καλύκων γυμνὸν θέρος οὐδὲ μελαίνει
 βότρυς ὁ παρθενίους πρωτοβολῶν χάριτας,
 ἀλλ' ἤδη θεὰ τόξα νέοι θήγουσιν Ἔρωτες,
 Λυσιδίκη, καὶ πῦρ τύφεται ἐγκρύφιον.
 φεύγωμεν, δυσέρωτες, ἕως βέλος οὐκ ἐπὶ νευρῆ· 5
 μάντις ἐγὼ μεγάλης αὐτίκα πυρκαϊῆς.

AP 5.124 [10 GP, 6 K, 1 G]

P Pl 7.90, f. 72v τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] [C] εἰς Λυσιδίκην παρθένον τοῦ αὐτοῦ,

2 χάριτας P: χάριτα Pl 3 θήγουσιν CPl: -σ*ν P? 6 μεγάλης P: πολλῆς Pl

Not yet bare of its cover is your summer growth; not yet do you have a dark grape cluster to shoot forth the first rays of a young girl's charms, but already the young Erotes are whetting their swift arrows, Lysidike, and a secret fire smolders within.

Let's flee, unfortunate lovers, while the arrow is off the string. I am a prophet of a great and imminent blaze.

Macleod, "Horatian *imitatio* and *Odes 2.5*," *Collected Essays* (Oxford 1983) 245–261.
Schulze, *BPhW* 36 (1916) 319.

With this poem cf. the less elaborate Maccius 2 GP (*AP* 5.117):

θερμαίνει μ' ὁ καλὸς Κορνήλιος, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦμαι
τοῦτο τὸ φῶς ἤδη πῦρ μέγα γίνομενον.

Lysidike, like Demo in **11**, is sexually immature but none the less desirable. Hor. *O.* 2.5 is an obvious borrowing from Phil; see Macleod and below on 1 οὐπω, μελαίνει.

The metaphorical equation of the human body and vegetation is a poetic commonplace; cf. Alk. 119 (adduced by Macleod), Ibyk. 286.3–6 ἵνα Παρθένων | κῆπος ἀκήρατος, αἶ τ' οἰανθίδες | αὐξόμεναι σκιεροῖσιν ὑφ' ἔρνεσιν | οἰναρέοις θαλέθοισιν, Aisch. *Ag.* 1391 f. διοσδότω | γάνει σπορητός κάλυκος ἐν λοχεύμασιν. Cf. further C. Segal, "The tragedy of the *Hippolytus*: The waters of Ocean and the untouched meadow," *HSCP* 70 (1965) 117–169; repr. in his *Interpreting Greek Tragedy* (Ithaca 1986) 165–221.

Phil.'s authorship of this poem has been unnecessarily doubted by Kaibel and Stadtmüller. Kaibel thought that the style belonged to an earlier age, but the poem is solidly embedded in a Philippan context: *AP* 5.104–133. Stadtmüller suggests either Argentarios or Bassos (the author of the next poem in P).

The language of this poem, in praise of the charms of a virgin and anticipating with some dread a great blaze of passion, shows that it is, perhaps at several removes, a variation of an epigram of Asklepiades in praise of an elderly hetaira who will not enflame the lover (41 HE = *AP* 7.217):

Ἀρχεάνασσαν ἔχω τὰν ἐκ Κολοφῶνος ἐταίραν,
ἄς καὶ ἐπὶ ρυτίδων ὁ γλυκὺς ἔζειτ' Ἔρωσ.
ἄ νέον ἤβης ἄνθος ἀποδρέψαντες ἐρασταί
πρωτοβόλου, δι' ὄσης ἤλθετε πυρκαϊῆς.

1 οὐπω: Cf. Hes. *WD* 521 οὐπω ἔργα ἰδυῖα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης, *Il.* 10.293 ἀδμήτην ἦν οὐπω ὑπὸ ζυγόν ἤγαγεν ἀνὴρ, Hor. *O.* 2.5.1 f. *nondum subacta ferre iugum valet | cervice*, which owes a debt to Phil. and to Asklepiades 23 HE (*AP* 12.162); cf. Macleod 98 ff., Tait 73.

καλύκων γυμνὸν θέρος: The *kalyx* here is not the bud of a flower (as translations seem to suggest), but the sheath of grain; see below on θέρος. The reference may be general; cf. 33.8, Aristoph. fr. 483 K-A σταθερὰ δὲ κάλυξ νεαρᾶς ἤβης. Or, more likely, given the next clause, it may be a specific reference to Lysidike's forthcoming pubic hair; for the sense "hair" cf. Kallim. *H.Del.* 4.298 f. παῖδες

δὲ θέρος τὸ πρῶτον ἰούλων | ἄρσενες ἠϊθέοισιν ἀπαρχόμενοι φορέουσιν, Apollonides 26 GP (AP 10.19.1 f.) ἡδὺ παρειῶν πρῶτον θέρος . . . κείρεο. Cf. further E. Eyben, “Antiquity’s view of puberty,” *Latomus* 31 (1972) 677–697, esp. 691 f. on hair.

θέρος = “summer fruits” (LSJ s.v. II), and as such suggesting imminent harvest. Although γυμνός + gen. of separation is an extension of the word’s basic meaning, the erotic connotation should not be forgotten here.

οὐδέ: The negative of exegetical καί; see next lemma.

μελαίνει: This is the only instance of the intransitive use of the active in poetry; cf. Pl. *Ti.* 83a, Theophr. *De Igne* 50. The chromatic range of μέλας includes the dark blue-purple of grapes; cf., e.g., *Il.* 18.562 (on Achilles’ shield) μέλανες δ’ ἀνὰ βότρυες ἦσαν; see further M. Platnauer, “Greek colour perception,” *CQ* 15 (1921) 153 f.; A. E. Kober, *The Use of Color Terms in the Greek Poets* (Diss. Columbia 1932) 25–36; V. J. Bruno, *Form and Color in Greek Painting* (New York 1977), esp. 83–85. Cf. Cat. 17.15 f. *puella . . . | adservanda nigerrimis diligentius uvis* (Tait 47 n. 91), Hor. *O.* 2.5.9 ff. *tolle cupidinem | immittis uvae: iam tibi lividos | distinguet autumnus racemos | purpureo varius colore.*

This passage has been adduced by scholars trying to supplement Archil. 196a.17 W² (First Cologne Ode) εὐτ’ ἂν μελανθη[, some even restoring βότρυα. (I think that the man here is referring to the coming night rather than the onset of either his or the girl’s puberty.) Cf. S. R. Slings in J. M. Bremer et al., *Some Recently Found Greek Poems* (Leiden 1987) 37.

2 βότρυς: Hair; cf. Agathias 74 Viansino (AP 5.287.6) εὐπλέκτου βότρυν ἔρηξε κόμης, Nonnos 2.197 πλοκάμους . . . βοτρυδὸν ἐλίξας; here of course the pubes, which has somewhat the same triangular shape as grape clusters. Cf. Aristoph. *Nu.* 978 τοῖς αἰδοίοισι δρόσος καὶ χνοὺς ὥσπερ μήλοισιν ἐπήνθει, *Ekkkl.* 13 ἀφεύων τὴν ἐπανθοῦσαν τρίχα; Henderson *Maculate Muse* 136.

πρωτοβολῶν: Cf. Asklepiades 41.3 f. (above).

3 θοὰ τόξα . . . θήγουσιν: Cf. Hor. *O.* 2.8.14 ff. *ferus et Cupido | semper ardentis acuens sagittas | cote cruenta.* For τόξα = “arrows,” cf. Eur. *Ion* 524, Meleager 8 (AP 5.180.1 f.) Ἔρωσ τὰ πυρίπνοα τόξα | βάλλει. [Note Asklepiades 16 HE = AP 12.50.3 κατεθήκατο (–θήξατο Boissonade et al.) τόξα καὶ ἰοὺς | πικρὸς Ἔρωσ; cf. Giangrande, “Symptotic literature and epigram,” *EH* 14 (1967) 129 for a defense of the MSS] The missiles of love appear as early as Aisch. *PV* 649 f. Ζεὺς γὰρ Ἰμέρου βέλει | πρὸς σοῦ τέθαλπται. In general, cf. F. Lasserre, *La Figure d’Éros dans la poésie grecque* (Lausanne 1946) 90 ff., 155 f.; esp. ch. 7 for a survey of Eros in Alexandrian epigrams, pp. 150–171.

véoi: Should this be taken merely as an ornamental epithet for the traditionally young Cupids (cf. the plates in LIMC s.v. Eros), or as an epithet transferred from the young Lysidike?

Ἔρωτες: Eros first becomes pluralized in the fifth century (Pi. *N.* 8.5 ff., fr. 122.4, Bakch. 9.73, Aisch. *Supp.* 1042, and [Simonides] 1005.2 PMG); cf. T. G. Rosenmeyer, “Eros-Erotēs,” *Phoenix* 5 (1951) 11–22.

4 ἐγκρύφιον: Not quite the hapax legomenon Gow-Page think; later writers use the adj. to describe bread cooked “hidden” in ashes, i.e., = classical ἐγκρυφίας (sc. ἄρτος). (And ἐγκρυφία is the Septuagint’s word for bread/cake, e.g. Gen. 18.6, Ex. 12.39)

5–6: The asyndeton indicates the haste with which all must act if they are to escape in time; for ancient discussions of asyndeton, cf. D. A. Russell on Longinus 19.

5 φεύγωμεν: Cf. Prop. 1.1.35 *hoc, moneo, vitate, malum*, 1.9.30 *quisquis es, assiduas a fuge blanditias*.

δυσέρωτες: “Those whose ἔρω is obsessive”; Barrett ad Eur. *Hipp.* 191–197.

ἔως plus present indicative (here entailed by οὐκ) is rare; cf. Hdt. 3.134.3 ἔως νέος εἶς.

6 πυρκαϊῆς: Cf. Asklepiades 41.4 (above). For the thought in general, cf. Prop. 1.9.17 f. *vero nec [=necdum] tangeris igni: | haec est venturi prima favilla mali*.

17

μικκῆ καὶ μελανεῦσα Φιλαίνιον, ἀλλὰ σελίνων
οὐλοτέρη καὶ μονῷ χρῶτα τερεινοτέρη
καὶ κεστοῦ φωνεῦσα μαγώτερα καὶ παρέχουσα
πάντα καὶ αἰτῆσαι πολλάκι φειδομένη.
τοιαύτην στέργοιμι Φιλαίνιον ἄχρις ἂν εὔρω 5
ἄλλην, ὧ χρυσέη Κύπρι, τελειοτέρην.

AP 5.121 [8 *GP*, 14 *K*, 5 *G*]

P Pl 7.98, f. 72ν τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] Π ii. 19 μικκηκαιμελα *Suda* s.vv.
μαγώτερα (1 ἀλλά—3 μαγώτερα), μονῶς (2 καί—τερεινοτέρη), κεστός (3—μαγώτερα) [J]
εἰς Φιλένιον ἐταίραν [καὶ μίκκη] ἔπαινος. θαυμάσιος

1 Φιλαίνιον *Pl*: Φιλένιον *P* 2 καὶ μονῷ *PSuda* (s.v. μονῶς): καὶ ἀμονῷ *Pl*: καὶ μου *Suda*
(s.v. μαγώτερα)

Small and dark is Philainion, but with hair curlier than celery and skin tenderer than down;
and with a voice sexier than Aphrodite’s she offers her all, often forgetting to set a price.
May I love such a Philainion until, golden Aphrodite, I find another, more perfect one.

One of several poems by Phil. praising the sexual charms of a woman not meeting the standard criteria of beauty; cf. 9 (sixty-year-old Charito), 16 (prepubescent Lysidike), 12 (rustic Flora); and perh. also Π ii. 27 ἡ σιμή τὸ πρόσωπον. Π iii. 15 λευκὴ καὶ μακρὴ would appear to be a counterpart to this one (so Alan Cameron). There are several *topoi* concerning the beloved's faults: (i) The lover who has so lost his wits that he is unaware of the beloved's flaws is described by a third party, for which Plato *Rep.* 474d–475a and Lucretius 4.1160 ff. are the *loci classici*. (ii) The lover uses euphemism and other forms of flattery knowingly in order to seduce the woman. Philainis of Samos' Περὶ Ἀφροδισίων seems to be the literary model for this: τὴν δὲ αἰσχρο[ν] ὡς ἐπαφρόδιτον, τ[ῆ]ν δὲ πρεσβυτέραν ὡς . . . (P.Oxy. 39 [1972] 2891 fr. col. ii.3–7). Cf. Ov. *AA* 2.657–662 *nominibus mollire licet mala* (cont'd below) (iii) Phil.'s version: The lover, aware of what are normally taken as flaws, tallies them against her charms for a third party in order to demonstrate that the latter outweigh the former. This allows for a certain amount of detachment, such as here where Phil., far from swearing eternal love, would have it last only until he finds a more perfect woman to love. What Phil. admits piecemeal Ovid accepts and tallies in one poem: *Am.* 2.4; cf. esp. 9 *non est certa meos quae forma invitet amores*, 47 f. *denique quas tota quisquam probet urbe puellas*, | *noster in has omnis ambitiosus amor*.

1 μικκή: Cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.4.35 *haec habilis brevitate sua est*, *AA* 2.661 *dic "habilem" quaecumque brevis*; Lucr. 4.1162, where the woman who is *parvula, pumilio* is called *Χαρίτων μία*, *totum merum sal* by her besotted lover. For a discussion of this well-known passage and its Greek models and Roman parallels, cf. R. D. Brown, *Lucretius on Love and Sex* (Leiden 1987), 128 ff., 286 f. C. D. Buck, *Greek Dialects* (Chicago 1955) 76, compares the form *μικκός*, common in Doric and other dialects, to "doubling in hypocoristic proper names, where it originates in the vocative and is due to the emphatic uttering in calling."

μελανεῦσα: Obviously "(being) black," rather than LSJ's "grow<ing> black," which seems lexically unlikely in any case for a verb in –έω. Cf. Theophr. *de Igne* 50 ἐρυθρὰ καὶ μελανοῦντα, "red and black." Plato's original is μέλανας δὲ ἀνδρικοὺς ἰδεῖν (*Rep.* 474e). Cf. also Ov. *Am.* 2.4.40 *est etiam in fusco grata colore Venus*, *AA* 2.657 f. *fusca vocetur* | *nigrior Illyrica cui pice sanguis erit*. With the word *black*, this poem qualifies for the black-yet-comely genre; cf. M. Gigante, *Civiltà delle forme letterarie nell'antica Pompei* (Naples 1979) 189 f., who briefly discusses this motif in connection with an interesting graffito found in Boscotrecase:

quisquis amat nigra(m), nigris carbonibus ardet,
nigra(m) cum video, mora libenter aedeo [=edo].

This motif shows up again in 12, where the narrator's desire for Flora is compared to that of Perseus for the black Andromeda. Σιμή in Π ii. 27 may be another reference by Phil. to a black woman; cf. commentary ad loc. Men were expected to explain how it was they were attracted to women who fell outside their society's idea of what constituted the normal range of charms (cf. Brown 280 ff.); in this case, women who were black or swarthy (we do not know which is true of Philainion), either because they worked outside the house or because they were more "Mediterranean," i.e. olive-complexioned, than the norm. Thus, Theokr. 10.26 f.

μελιχλωρον of a woman likened to a Syrian, who, it should be noted, may well have been of the same skin color as Phil. himself. Cf. further Asklepiades 5 HE (AP 5.210.3) εἰ δὲ μέλαινα, τί τοῦτο; καὶ ἄνθρακες, Vergil *Ecl.* 10.38 f., Ov. *Her.* 15.35 f. (quoted on 12.8). For ancient attitudes towards blacks in general, cf. F. M. Snowden, Jr., *Blacks in Antiquity* (Cambridge, Mass. 1970), esp. ch. 8; id. *Before Color Prejudice* (ibid. 1983), esp. ch. 3.

Φιλαίνιον: Is Phil. signaling a literary debt to Philainis with this choice of name? Both names are probably diminutives of Φίλαινα; cf. K. Tsantsanoglou, *ZPE* 12 (1973) 192 n. 35. Two other erotic Philainia are found in Asklepiades 8 HE (AP 5.162) and Anon. 40 HE (AP 6.284). See on 1.1.

1–2 σελίνων οὐλοτέρη: Sc. χαῖτας, as in Archil. 238 W τρίχουλον and Theokr. 20.23 (a rejected shepherd describing his earlier appearance favorably) χαῖται δ' οἷα σέλινά περὶ κροτάφοισι κέχυντο. Lucian calls this a literary commonplace: ποιητῶν . . . οὐλοὺς τινὰς πλοκάμους ἀναπλεκόντων καὶ σελίνοις . . . εἰκαζόντων (*Pro Imag.* 5). Ps.-Lucian, *Amores* 26 may contain an echo of Phil.: οἱ δὲ παρ' ὧτα καὶ κροτάφους πολὺ τῶν ἐν λειμώνι οὐλοτέροι σελίνων. African blacks had notably “woolly” hair (cf. esp. Hdt. 7.70, Snowden [1970] 6 f.), but since this adj. occurs on the “comely” side of the description, it does not share in the general attitude towards black skin. When Athena, e.g., makes Odysseus more handsome, καδὲ δὲ κάρητος οὐλας ἦκε κόμας (*Od.* 6.230 f. = 23.157 f.).

2 μνουῦ: “fine, soft down, as on young birds” (LSJ). Cf. Aristoph. *Danaids* fr. 268 K-A τῶν χειρῶν ἔργα μνουῦς ἐστίν, quoted by Pollux 10.38, who says εἴποις δ' ἄν . . . μνουῦν ἐπὶ τῶν μαλακῶν. Hippocr. *Mul. Affect.* 1.61 uses this word to describe the skin over the spleen of a hydrosiacial patient. Although the color of Ethiopians' skin is the feature most likely to be mentioned in Greek and Latin poetry, there seems to be no comment elsewhere on how it felt to the touch, perhaps because there is no significant difference. The tenderness of Philainion's skin, then, is not specifically related to her blackness; Phil. is simply commenting as any lover would about his beloved.

3 κεστοῦ φανεῦσα μαγώτερα: A compendious expression combining two related ideas found together in the *locus classicus* for the κεστός, the Διὸς Ἀπάτη, *Il.* 14.214–217:

Ἡ, καὶ ἀπὸ στήθεσφιν ἐλύσατο κεστὸν ἱμάντα
ποικίλον, ἔνθα τέ οἱ θελκτήρια πάντα τέτυκτο
ἔνθ' ἐνὶ μὲν Φιλότης, ἐν δ' Ἴμερος, ἐν δ' ὀαριστύς
Πάρφασις, ἥ τ' ἔκλεψε νόον πύκα περ φρονεόντων.

The anthropomorphic figures of Love, Desire, and Allurement are embroidered into the garment; cf. H. A. Shapiro, *Personifications in Greek Art* (Kilchberg 1993) 19. Similar is the language of Achilles' great shield, where τεύχειν is used of the images fashioned (e.g., 18.483). But these qualities, including the power of sexy talk which can cloud men's minds, accompany Aphrodite's breast halter and work for whoever wears it. Aristot. *EN* 1149b15 associates the keston chiefly with seductive words (Homer's πάρφασις), as does Phil. himself, *Rhet.* 2.289 Sudh. (a refer-

ence to Hermes' magic wand) καὶ τὸν κεστὸν ἱμάντα τῆς Ἀφ[ρο]δίτη[ς], “ἐνθ' ἐνὶ μὲν φιλότης,” τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν τὸν λόγον, ὃς οὐκ ἀ[χάρις]το[ς καὶ] ἴδιος εἶναι λειαν.τη τῆς ῥητορικῆς]. Cf. Phil. *De Piet.* P.Herc. 1648 fr. 3.11–15 Schoeber (*CErc* 18 [1988] 95); C. A. Faraone, “Aphrodite's κεστός and apples for Atalanta: Aphrodisiacs in early Greek myth and ritual,” *Phoenix* 44 (1990) 219–243. On κεστός as a noun, cf. McLennan ad Kallim. *H.* 1.14. Unpacked, then, Phil.'s phrase becomes “speaking with more sexy magic than one who wears Aphrodite's keston.” Cf. *API* 16.288 and Antiphanes 1 GP (*AP* 6.88):

αὐτῇ σοὶ Κυθέρεια τὸν ἱμερόεντ' ἀπὸ μαστῶν,
 Ἴνώ, λυσαμένη κεστὸν ἔδωκεν ἔχειν,
 ὡς ἂν θελξινόοισιν ἀεὶ φίλτροισι δαμάξης
 ἀνέρας· ἐχρήσω δ' εἰς ἐμὲ πᾶσι μόνον.

On the keston, see further C. Bonner, “Κεστός ἱμάς and the saltire of Aphrodite,” *AJP* 70 (1949) 1–6 (the heraldic term “saltire” represents “a diagonal or St. Andrew's cross”); W. Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1992) 93, who says that the keston “seems to be oriental in a particular way”; cf. Janko on *Il.* 14.214–217.

μάγος occasionally occurs as adj., cf. Philostr. *VA* 1.2 μάγῳ τέχνῃ πράττειν, Aesop 56 Haus. γυνὴ μάγος (if not in a substantive in opposition); *AP* 4.3.71 (St. Greg.) μάγον . . . ἀνάγκην. [For MSS *παρὰ μάγοις* at *Phoenix Ninos* 1.5 Powell, Kaibel read the adj. *παμμάγοις*.]

3–4 παρέχουσα πάντα: “Acquiescing to any sexual desire” on the part of the man; cf. Aristoph. *Lys.* 362 f. (chorus of women) στᾶσ' ἐγὼ παρέξω, | κού μὴ ποτ' ἄλλη σου κύων τῶν ὄρχεων λάβηται, *AP* 12.232.4 (Skythinos) πάντα διδούς; cf. Henderson, *Maculate Muse* 161.

4 αἰτῆσαι πολλάκι φειδομένη: For women who charge little or nothing, cf. **22.1–3**; *Ov. Am.* 1.10, esp. 47 *parcite, formosae, pretium pro nocte pacisci*; *Mart.* 9.32.5 f.

6 ἄλλην: Sc. Φιλαίνιον; cf. Theokr. 11.76 εὐρησεῖς Γαλάτειαν ἴσως καὶ καλλίον' ἄλλαν, *Lucr.* 4.1173 *nempe aliae quoque sunt* (with Brown's n.).

ἡ χαλεπὴ κατὰ πάντα Φιλήστιον, ἡ τὸν ἐραστήν
 μηδέποτ' ἀργυρίου χωρὶς ἀνασχομένη,
 φαίνεται ἀνεκτοτέρη νῦν ἢ πάρος. οὐ μέγα θαῦμα
 φαίνεσθ' ἠλλάχθαι τὴν φύσιν οὐ δοκέω.
 καὶ γὰρ πρηυτέρη ποτὲ γίνεται ἀσπίς ἀναιδῆς, 5
 δάκνει δ' οὐκ ἄλλως ἢ θανατηφορίην.

AP 5.114 [Maccius 1 GP]

P Μαικίου Π 7.96, f. 72ν τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] [] εἰς πόρνην βαρῦμισθον
 ἐν τῇ νεότητι, γηράσασαν δὲ πᾶσιν ὑποκύπτουσαν

1 Φιλῆστιον P: Φιλῆσιον Pl: Φιλίστιον Salm. 4 ἠλλάχθαι Pl: ἠλλακται P 6 οὐκ ἄλλως
 Pl: οὐ καλῶς P

Philestion, hard in all ways, the one who never tolerated a lover without money, seems more tolerant now than before. No source of amazement, this seeming: I do not think that she has changed her nature. For even the shameless asp in time becomes tamer, but it bites no bite other than a deadly one.

Maccius (or Maikios; cf. GP 2.310) is known only through his elegant epigrams. This doubly ascribed epigram is printed among those of Maccius by Gow-Page, but “doubts remain.” One notes in slight favor of Phil. that this epigram mentions, even dwells on, the price charged by a prostitute, with which cf. 17, 20, 21, 22, whereas none of Maccius’ undisputed epigrams does. (Phil. is not the only epigrammatist to write on this subject, however; cf. 5.29–34, 63, 81, 101, 109, 113 (= [Phil. 37]), 125, 217, 240). See also on 5 πρηυτέρη and ἀναιδής. But the close similarity between Maccius 2 and Phil. 16 (q.v.) suggests the possibility that he and Phil. were poetic comrades who wrote variations on the same theme. Note also that Maccius 4 (AP 5.130) has the Philodemean name Philainis and the rare adj. ὑποκόλιος, as in 15. See further on v. 3. Some lexical evidence, presented below, favors Phil. as author, but certainty is not possible.

Note that Pl’s τοῦ αὐτοῦ refers to AP 5.113, which in fact, if I am correct, was written by Argentarius; see on [37]. Planudes, however, seems to have thought that he was gathering together a string of poems by Phil.

1 Φιλῆστιον: According to Stadtmüller (followed by Gow-Page), φιλι*στιον (with punctuation now erased before the sigma) was corrected to φιληστιον. The space before the sigma, however, seems to me to be too large for iota + punctuation; more likely the scribe dipped his pen after the left vertical stroke of Η, giving the appearance of a later correction. All editors follow Saumaise in emending to Φιλίστιον (four instances in LGPN 1–2), a diminutive of the common Φιλίστα, but P’s reading could just as easily represent a by-form of the attested Φιλησῶ, Φιλησία, or Φιλησίς, perhaps via *Φιληστῶ; cf. Ἡδυτῶ, Ἡδύτιον.

1–2 ἡ . . . ἀνασχομένη: The subject of the woman’s price comes up elsewhere; see above, introduction.

3–4 φαίνεν’ . . . οὐ . . . φαίνεσθ’: For repetition with negation, cf. Hom. *Il.* 22.495 χεῖλα μὲν τ’ ἐδίην’, ὑπερώην δ’ οὐκ ἐδίηνε; D. Fehling *Wiederholungsfiguren* (Berlin 1969) 129.

3 οὐ μέγα θαῦμα: This phrase is used elsewhere in the Anthology by Phil. 10.1, Meleager 26 (AP 5.160.3, where the girl’s name is also Demo; on the main point of

the poem, cf. H. Jacobson, *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser. 30 [1977] 71 f.), and Leonidas 95 HE (*AP* 6.130.3). (A later instance is *AP* 8.219, St. Gregory.) Meleager also has τὸ θαῦμα (2 = *AP* 7.417.5); and Metrodoros *AP* 14.126.1 and Anonymous *AP* 1251.5 have ἄ μέγα θαῦμα.

4 ἠλλάχθαι . . . δοκέω: Explanatory asyndeton; cf. 32.4, 2.1–2 (with comm.)

5 πρηύτερη: Although the comparative is common in medical writings (11× in the Hippocratic and Galenic corpora), it and the superlative are uncommon in poetry, but the latter is used by Phil. (34.4); the comparative elsewhere in poetry only at Dionysios 1 HE (*AP* 7.78.1). This rarity tends to favor Philodemean authorship for this poem. On the other hand, the author, whoever he was, may have been drawn to this rare form here because of its use by Hippocrates.

ἄσπίς: The asp, the cobra of Egypt, could be made to act tame, or at any rate sluggish, but never lost its power to kill; cf. Nikandros, *Ther.* 158–167, Aelian, *NA* 1.54.

ἀναιδής: Since this adj. appears in two epigrams doubtfully attributed to Phil., it is worth pointing out how few poets between Homer (*Il.* 4.521 = *Od.* 11.598 λῆας ἀναιδής) and Phil. (13) employ ἀναιδής in this *sedes*: Peek *GVI* 53 = *CEG* 1.132 (“ca. 650?,” Hansen) Δφεινία τόδε [σᾶμα], τὸν ὄλεσε πόντος ἀναιδής, Theogn. 207 θάνατος γὰρ ἄ., and perhaps Bianor 13 *GP* (*AP* 9.278.3); cf. Pi. *N.* 11.45. 13 is virtually guaranteed for Phil. by Π, so that it would seem, especially since Phil. is one of the very few prose authors to use this adj. (3× in *Rhet.*, once reasonably restored in *De Mus.*), that its occurrence here weighs heavily in favor of Phil. as author.

6 δάκνει: This verb is equally appropriate to Philestion; cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1303 δηθεῖσα κέντροις παιδὸς ἠράσθη, Kallim. *Ep.* 27 HE (49 Pf. = *AP* 6.311) ἐν ἔρωτι δεδαγμένον, Pl. *Rep.* 474d, “Aspasia” ap. Athen. 5.219c, Asklepiades 8 HE (*AP* 5.162) with Borthwick *CQ* 17 (1967) 250–254.

θανατηφορήν: *Hapax legomenon*, derived from the common θανατηφόρος, which is noted by Herodian *Part.* 187.9–188.1, along with a few of the many other compounds in –φορ-. For the syntax, an acc. of result, cf. Soph. *Ai.* 55 ἔκειρε . . . φόνον, KG 1.305 ff. For the poisonous nature of the asp’s bite, cf. Nik. *Ther.* 185 ἀμείλικτον . . . ἰόν.

ὁ πρὶν ἐγὼ καὶ πέντε καὶ ἐννέα, νῦν, Ἄφροδίτη,
 ἐν μόλις ἐκ πρώτης νυκτὸς ἐς ἥλιον.
 οἰμοιμοῖ καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ βραχύ, πολλάκι δ' ἤδη
 ἡμιθανὲς θνήσκει τοῦτο τὸ Τερμέριον.
 ὦ Γῆρας Γῆρας, τί ποθ' ὕστερον ἦν ἀφίκηαι
 ποιήσεις, ὅτε νῦν ὦδε μαραινόμεθα;

AP 11.30 [27 GP, 20K]

P Φιλοδήμου Π iii.7 [οπριντεγωκαπεντε], v.31 οπρινεγωκ' caret Pl

3 οίμοιμοι scripsi: οίμοι μοι Ap. Voss (μοι² in marg.) Cr: οίμοι P: φθίνει μοι Reiske τοῦτο P: τοῦτ' αὐτό Jacobs: ποτε τοῦτο Kaibel 4 ἡμιθανές P: -θαλές Page: -τανές Boissonade: -φανές Jacobs: -τελές Jacoby Τερμέριον Pauw: τερμόριον P: τερμόνιον Brunck τοῦτ' ὅτι περ μόριον Graef

I, earlier capable of five or nine (acts), now, Aphrodite, with difficulty (manage only) one from sunset to sunrise.

Oy oy oy, and this (one act lasts) but a short time; and often already half-dead this little rammer dies.

Old Age, Old Age, what will you manage if ever you arrive, since we now so waste away?

Sider, *AJP* 103 (1982) 211–213.Thomas, *CQ* 41 (1991) 130–137.Wright, *AJP* 42 (1921) 168 f.

The topos of the *segnis* (but not altogether impotent) *amator*; cf. 25 and 26 (both told from the woman's point of view), Rufinus 18 Page (*AP* 5.47), Skythinos, *AP* 12.232, Strato, *AP* 12.11, 216, and especially 240:

ἤδη μοι πολιαί μὲν ἐπὶ κροτάφοισιν ἔθειραι,
καὶ πέος ἐν μηροῖς ἀργὸν ἀποκρέμαται·
ὄρχεις δ' ἄπρηκτοι, χαλεπὸν δέ με γῆρας ἰκάνει.
οἴμοι· πυγίζειν οἶδα, καὶ οὐ δύναμαι.

Among Latin poets, cf. *Juv.* 10.204–206, *Mart.* 3.79, 12.86. Note how *Phil.*, in contrast to *Strato*, prefers coyness to explicitness: no verb in the first sentence and no noun for πέντε, ἐννέα, or ἐν; merely the pronoun τοῦτο in the next sentence; and a euphemism in the next clause. For all this, however, the diminuendo of the impotent lover remains clear: What he used to do up to nine times before he now does only once, with difficulty (μόλις); and the thing itself, the act from start to finish, lasts but a short time (κατὰ βραχύ); and already half-dead his member often dies altogether. For *Ovid*'s borrowings, see below on vv. 1–2, 4, 5–6. Cf. *Kay ad Mart.* 11.46.

1 ὁ πρὶν ἐγώ: For article + pronoun, v. ad 8.3. Cf. further *Alk.* 130b1 *Voigt* = 130.16 LP ὁ τάλαις ἔγω, *Antipater* 22 *HE* (*AP* 7.172.1) ὁ πρὶν ἐγὼ . . . ἐρύκων, *Meleager* 99 (*AP* 12.23.1 f.) ἡγρεύθην <ὁ> πρόσθεν ἐγὼ . . . ἐγγελάσας, *Apollinides* 23 *GP* (*AP* 9.287.1. [A second-century epitaph begins τὸ πρὶν ἐγὼ (*Peek, GVI* 609), but *Phil.*'s text is secure.] The scansion ὁ πρὶν is sanctioned by tradition; cf. *Intro.*, pp. 41 f. Note that πρὶν and πρόσθεν serve as adverbs for their clauses, and do not modify ἐγὼ alone; cf. also 32.1 τὴν πρότερον θυμέλην.

1–2 πέντε καὶ ἐννέα . . . ἐν: “πέντε = πεντάκις,” *Gow-Page*, comparing *Asklepiades* 25 (*AP* 5.181.11 f.) πέντ' ἐφίλησεν | ἐξῆς, but an internal accusative

may be a better explanation in both poems; cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 32 (Phaidra) ἐρῶσ' ἔρωτ' ἔκδημον. Phil., unlike Asklepiades, omits the verb, but ellipsis is merely a specific form of the euphemism frequently found in erotic poetry; cf. J. N. Adams, "A type of sexual euphemism in Latin," *Phoenix* 35 (1981) 120–128. Dübner supplies *coitus agebam* to fill out the sense. Cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.7.23 ff.

at nuper bis flava Chlide, ter candida Pitho,
ter Libas officio continuata meo est;
exigere a nobis angusta nocte Corinnam
me memini numeros sustinuisse novem.

Cf. A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus* (New Haven 1983) 117 f.; also 22.1, Ov. *Am.* 2.10.27 f., Hor. *Epod.* 12.14–16, Prop. 2.22.23 f., Mart. 11.97. With ἐννέα cf. also Cat. 32.8 *novem continuas fututiones*. Two similar but more modest boasts in Pompeian graffiti: CIL 4.4029 *hic ego bis futui*, 4816 *Chryseros cum Successo hic terna futuimus*.

Ἄφροδίτη: Cf. Tibullus 1.5.39 *deseruit Venus*, spoken in similar circumstances. Although addressed at first to Aphrodite, this poem is more lamentation than prayer; cf. K. v. Fritz, "Greek prayers," *Rev. of Rel.* 10 (1945–1946) 5–39.

2–3 ἐν μόλις . . . κατὰ βραχύ: The two terms are not synonymous, as Gow-Page think. Sexual satisfaction was difficult to attain and was over with quickly. See introduction above, and below on κατὰ βραχύ.

2 ἐκ πρώτης νυκτός: The phrase πρώτη νύξ in the sense "nightfall" is rare: Aratos 41, 747, Pollux 1.70. Cf. Soph. *OC* 477 πρὸς πρώτην ἔω (Jebb ad loc. says that the meaning here is only local, "eastwards," but if so the adj. is unnecessary; cf. LSJ s.v. ἠώς 4; Pollux 1.68 ὑπὸ πρώτην ἔω is clearly temporal). Cf. Hor. *O.* 3. 7, 20 *prima nocte domum clude*.

ἐς ἥλιον: After the epic formula ἐς ἥλιον καταδύντα (12× in Homer, once each in Hesiod and *H. Herm.*), it was likely if not inevitable that a Hellenistic poet like Apollonios would produce ἐς ἥλιον ἀνιόντα (1.725), but Phil. is the only one to have shortened the latter phrase. The sense is clear enough, however; cf. Soph. *El.* 424 f. (Klytaimestra) Ἠλίῳ | δείκνυσι τοῦναρ, where the sense seems to be "upon arising at dawn."

3 οἰμοιοῖ: The line's defect is most easily made up thus, the exaggerated lament being in accord with the narrator's entirely personal view of the situation; for the accent, cf. Apoll. *Dysk. Adv.* 177.21. Cf. Strato, *AP* 12.240.4 (cited above, intro.), Aristoph. *Pax* 247 οἶμοι μοι (better: οἰμοιομοῖ), τάλας, ᾧ δέσποτα, Aisch. *Ag.* 1257 (Kassandra): Λύκει' Ἄπολλον, οἱ ἐγὼ ἐγώ.

κατὰ βραχύ: The most likely sense here is "briefly, for a short time," which is how Phil. seems to use the phrase at *Rhet.* 1.273.9–11 (fr. 12) καθόσον [τὸ] διαλέγεσθαι ταῦτο τ[ὸ] κατὰ βραχύ, where Phil. contrasts dialectic with rhetoric: τὸ μ[ακρὸ]ν λόγον ἐκτεῖνα[ντα] πο[λλὰ] δύνα[σθαι] εἰς τὸ ἀ[ὐτ]ὸ εἰπεῖ[ν] (ibid.

fr. 11). Thus, Phil. uses *κατὰ βραχύ* where others use *ἐν βραχεῖ* or *διὰ βραχύ* (cf. LSJ s.v. *βραχύς*). The usual sense of this phrase, as pointed out by Thomas, “gradually, little by little, slowly,” is inappropriate. Hence I continue, with others, to understand the phrase to refer backwards to *τοῦτο* (*contra* Thomas, who, placing *πολλάκι . . . ἤμιθ*. in parentheses, has it refer to *θνήσκει*).

4 ἤμιθανές: The various conjectures weaken an intentionally strong statement; cf. Automedon 2 GP (*AP* 11.29.3 f.) ἢ [sc. κέρκος?] ἀκαμπής | ζῶσα, νεκρὰ μηρῶν πᾶσα δέδουκεν ἔσω; id. 1 (*AP* 5.129.8) ἐξ Ἰαίδου τὴν κορύνην ἀνάγει (i.e., brings an old man’s penis to erection); *Ov. Am.* 3.7.65 f. *nostra tamen iacuerunt uelut praemortua membra | turpiter besterna languidiora rosa*. Thomas argues for the word’s referring to the flaccidity *after* ejaculation (comparing *Cat.* 50.14 f. *at defessa labore membra postquam | semimortua lectulo iacebant*), but this is far less embarrassing than the inability to achieve full erection before intercourse. For the general tone of the lament cf. Aristoph. *Nu.* 504 οἴμοι κακοδαίμων, ἤμιθνης γενήσομαι.

θνήσκει: In addition to the passages quoted just above, cf. Skythinos’ *segnis amator* poem (*AP* 12.232.4): νεκρὸν ἀπεκρέμασο, Strato, *AP* 12.216.2, Mart. 13.34.1 *mortua membra*, *Ov. Am.* 3.7.16 *et non exactum corpus an umbra forem*. For *θνήσκει* = “dies, is dead,” cf. Kallinos 1.19 W, Hdt. 4.190, KG 1. 137).

τοῦτο τὸ Τερμέριον: Later lexis derive the phrase *τερμέρια κακά* from Termerium, where prisoners were kept, defining it generically as *μεγάλα κακά* (Photios, *Souda*). Kaibel and others, however, have recognized that Phil. is here referring to the monstrous Termeros, who used to kill people by butting them with his head until he had his head broken by Theseus: *καὶ τὸν Τέρμερον συρρήξας τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀπέκτεινεν. ἀφ’ οὗ δὴ καὶ τὸ Τερμέριον κακὸν ὀνομασθῆναι λέγουσι· παίων γάρ, ὡς ἔοικε, τῇ κεφαλῇ τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας ὁ Τέρμερος ἀπώλλυεν. οὕτω δὴ καὶ Θησεὺς κολάζων τοὺς πονηροὺς [sc. Sinis, Skiron, Prokroustes, etc.] ἐπέξῃλθεν, οἷς μὲν ἐβιάζοντο τοὺς ἄλλους, (Plut. *Thes.* 11). As ἀφ’ οὗ (loosely temporal and causal) makes clear, *Termerion kakon* applies not to the harm suffered by Termeros’ victims, but to the nature of his punishment. And the following sentence suggests that it is not merely the punishment itself so much as its appropriateness that is conveyed by the phrase, which is thus equivalent to *Νεοπτολέμειος τίσις* (cf. Pausanias 4.17.4), the punishment that fits the crime. This is certainly the case with Phil., where that which has done the butting has had its *κεφαλὴ* “die.” For punning on *κεφαλὴ*, *φαλλῆς*, *φαλλός*, κτλ., cf. Aristoph. fr. 244, 566 (Hermes *τρικέφαλος* = *τριφάλης*), 568, (?)569 (Aristoph. may have punned on the *Φαληρικὸν τεῖχος*) K-A; see further Henderson *Maculate Muse* 112 f.; R. Seaford, *LCM* 12.9 (1987) 142 f. Cf. also Mart. 11.46.4 *nec levat extinctum sollicitata [sc. mentula] caput*. Opposed to this, Thomas argues that the antecedent of ἀφ’ οὗ is Termeros and that the Termerian evil is the evil meted out by this villain, although it is unclear to me why what must have been the infrequent occurrence of a cracked skull should have been granted a special name.*

Nevertheless, although I disagree with Thomas’s interpretation of Plutarch and his punctuation of vv. 3 f. (see on *κατὰ βραχύ*), his analysis of this phrase is preferable to mine of 1982. There is, after all, no *κακόν* in this poem, so that *τοῦτο* τὸ

Τερμέριον is better understood as “this Termerian thing,” i.e., “this rammer,” who like Termeros has his “head” softened.

5–6: Cf. *Ov. Am.* 3.7.17 f.

quae mihi ventura est, siquidem ventura, senectus,
cum desit numeris ipsa iuventa suis?

Old age, horrible thought that it is, could at least provide a somewhat honorable excuse for failure. Other possibilities are drugs and witchcraft (*Ov. Am.* 3.7.13, 27–36, 79 f.); and then failure to perform itself is a reason: *pudor ipse nocebat* (*Ov. Am.* 3.7.37). Cf. Mimnermos 1.5 ff. W^2 ἐπεὶ δ' ὀδυνηρὸν ἐπέλθη | γῆρας, ὅ τ' αἰσχρὸν ὁμῶς καὶ κακὸν ἄνδρα τιθεῖ κτλ.

5 ὦ Γῆρας, Γῆρας: The repetition magnifies the complaint; cf. Aisch. *Ag.* 1538 ἰὼ γᾶ γᾶ, etc., Herod. 10.2 ὦ Γρύλλε, Γρύλλε, θνήσκε καὶ τέφρη γίνεο, Hor. *O.* 2.14.1 f. *eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume, | labuntur anni*; D. Fehling, *Wiederholungsfiguren* (Berlin 1969) 169, 174 f.

Γῆρας οὐλόμενον is the child of Night (Hes. *Tb.* 225) and had an altar in Gadeira: Aelian fr. 19. He is depicted on vases as an old man with a notably flaccid (though often exaggerated in size) penis; cf. H. A. Shapiro, “Geras,” *LIMC* 4.1.180–182; id. *Personifications in Greek Art* (Kilchberg 1993) 89–94. Note also Herod. 2.71 f. ὦ Γῆρας, | σοὶ θυέτω.

ἀφίκτηι: Because Γῆρας is personified, Phil. can reverse what must have been the more normal expression; cf. Aristoph. *Av.* 606 πῶς δ' ἐς γῆρας ποτ' ἀφίζονται. But γῆρας ἐπερχόμενον is a “dactylic cliché”; M. S. Silk, *Interaction in Poetic Imagery* (Cambridge 1974) 93 n. 15.

6 μαραινόμεθα: Prob. not *plurale modestatis*, as Gow-Page's “I” suggests; rather, as suggested by some parallel passages, both the “I” so prominently positioned at the beginning of the poem and this man's penis, which has just been compared to an old man near death: cf. 2, Skythinos *AP* 12.232.1 οὐδὲ μαραίνῃ (an address to a penis), Automedon 1.6, where I think context makes it sure that γηραλέας ρυτίδας refers primarily to the penis; Mart. 11.46.3 *pannucea mentula*, with Kay's n.; Ovid's *languidiora* (v. ad 4 ἡμιθανές). Cf. 30, where once again there is some point to the shift to first person plural in the last word.

For the wasting action of time, cf. Soph. *Ai.* 713 πάνθ' ὁ μέγας χρόνος μαραίνει, Sophron 54 Kaibel γῆρας ἀμὲ μαραίνον ταριχεύει, Isok. 1.6, Aristotle fr. 881 Gigon = Galen, *De Mixt.* 2.581 f. K (adduced by Kay). For the reduction in sex drive in old age, cf. Pl. *Rep.* 329a–c, where Kephalas notes that although usually men τὸ γῆρας ὑμνοῦσιν ὅσων κακῶν σφίσιν αἴτιον, he himself agrees with Sophokles that he no longer is a slave to the passions of Aphrodite; and *Ov. Am.* 3.7.41 f.

illius ad tactum Pylius iuvenesceere possit
Tithonosque annis fortior esse suis.

A(NHP). χαῖρε σύ. Γ(ΥNH). καὶ σύ γε χαῖρε. A. τί δεῖ σε καλεῖν;

Γ. σέ δέ; A. μήπω

τοῦτο φιλόσπουδος. Γ. μηδὲ σύ. A. μή τιν' ἔχεις;

Γ. αἰεὶ τὸν φιλέοντα. A. θέλεις ἅμα σήμερον ἡμῖν

δειπνεῖν; Γ. εἰ σὺ θέλεις. A. εὖ γε· πόσου παρέσει;

Γ. μηδέν μοι προδίδου,—A. τοῦτο ξένον.—Γ. ἀλλ' ὅσον ἄν σοι 5

κοιμηθέντι δοκῆ, τοῦτο δός. A. οὐκ ἀδικεῖς.

ποῦ γίνῃ; πέμψω. Γ. καταμάνθανε—A. πηνίκα δ' ἤξει;

Γ. ἦν σὺ θέλεις ὄρην. A. εὐθὺ θέλω. Γ. πρόαγε.

AP 5.46 [4 GP, 1 K]

P Φιλοδήμου [J] πρὸς ἐταίραν κατὰ πεῦσιν καὶ ἀπόκρισιν caret Pl Π vii.
15 χαιρεσ []

1 σύ γε χαῖρε P: σύγχαيره Ap.L σέ δέ P: τί δέ Brunck (v. comm.) 2 φιλόσπουδος P: -ει
Kaibel μηδὲ Dübner: μήτε P: μή γε Herwerden 3 αἰεὶ C: αἰεί P 4 δειπνεῖν P^{pc}:
δειπλεῖν? P^{ac} εὖ γε πόσου P: εὐτ' ἀπὸ σοῦ Ap.L: εἶτ' ἀπὸ σοῦ Reiske 6 εὐθὺ θέλω
πρόαγε C: πρόαγε P

m(AN). Hello there. w(OMAN). And hello to you. m. What should I call you?

w. And what should I call *you*? m. Don't be eager to learn this so soon.

w. Nor you. m. Do you have someone?

w. Always: the one who loves me. m. Are you willing to dine together with
me today? w. If *you* are willing. m. Great! How much for your presence?

w. Give me nothing in advance,— m. This is strange.— w. but after lying
with me give what you think right. m. You're very fair.

Where will you be? I'll send for you. w. Take note— m. But when will you
come? w. Whatever hour you wish. m. I'm willing right now. w. Lead on.

Herwerden, *Mnemosyne*, 2nd ser. (1874) 13.

Hopkinson 79, 270.

Falivene, *QUCC* 42 (1981) 94f.

A conversation on the street between a potential customer and a saucy prostitute who displays the professional's hauteur and uses it to manipulate her potential customer. Conversation poems are mimes in miniature, with the easygoing language of ordinary life combined with the polished literary form of Hellenistic epigram. Their origin probably lies in actual epitaphs in this form; cf. W. Rasche, *De Anthologiae Graecae epigrammatis quae colloquii formam habent* (Munich 1910) 6–16; but literary examples become popular by the third century B.C., with Leonidas, Kallimachos, and Anyte trying their hand. Phil., however, may have been the first to write an erotic encounter in this form (Rasche).

For the sake of clarity, I have, following the lead of some papyrus texts of mimes—e.g., P.Berol. 13876 = no. 12 Cunningham—provided indication of speaker.

1 καὶ σὺ γε χαίρει: An unexceptional response; cf. Aristoph. *Pax* 718 f. χαίρει πολλά.—καὶ σὺ γε and [Plato] *Eryx.* 392b χαίρει, ὦ Σώκρατες.—καὶ σὺ γε.

Τί δεῖ σε | καλεῖν |: Phil. allows himself to violate both Hermann's Bridge and "Plutarch's Law" (above, p. 43), probably because of the colloquial nature of the conversation.

σέ δέ: With this the conversation deviates from what we may imagine to be the ordinary course; cf., e.g., Prop. 2.23.13–24, esp. 16 *nec sinit esse moram, si quis adire velit*. The woman in Phil.'s poem, however, instead of complaisantly revealing her name, lets the man know that she will not give hers unless he reveals his; note esp. 2 μηδὲ σὺ. Presumably the usual practice was for the man to learn the woman's name while withholding his own. Herwerden would read Γ. σὲ δ' ἔμ'; Α. εἶπω τοῦτο;

2 φιλόσπουδος: A near hapax (again only in Dittenberger, OGI 339.39 [Sestos ii B.C.] ὁ δῆμος ἀποδεχόμενος αὐτοῦ τὸ φιλόσπουδον), which Kaibel altered to the unattested verb φιλοσπουδεῖν, approb. Gow-Page: "the isolated nominative . . . seems unnatural and contrary to the easy conversational flow," but mime (see introduction above) often includes the natural interruptions and inelegant formulations of colloquial speech. With the ellipsis of ἴσθι here, cf. Herodas 5.14, where ἄν εἶην is ellipsed (Headlam; *contra* Cunningham).

Φιλόσπουδος provides the only ex. in my edition of the long syllable at the caesura of the pentameter produced by lengthening (see Intro., p. 44), but *einmal* is not always *keinmal*.

μή τιν' ἔχεις; The man hopes for, rather than expects, a negative answer; cf. Barrett ad Eur. *Hipp.* 794. Although from the start the ultimate purpose of this conversation would be clear to both participants, the first sign of this is this coded oblique question: "Do you have anyone?" = "Are you free at the moment?" On the use of ἔχειν in this context, see on 21.3.

3 αἰεὶ· τὸν φιλέοντα: This may not be equivalent to τὸν αἰεὶ φ. (Gow-Page, Hopkinson), which is merely "anyone who fancies me" (Gow-Page), "whoever is my friend/lover at the moment." Her answer rather seems closer to "I always have someone: the one who loves me," "toujours celui qui m'aime" (Waltz), "eum semper habeo, qui me habere cupiat" (Jacobs). Hence my punctuation, with explanatory asyndeton; on which cf. KG 2.344 f., West on *Th.* 533, and Verdenius, *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser., 27 (1974) 17 f. Cf. Theogn. 1367 f. γυναικὶ δὲ πιστὸς ἐταῖρος | οὐδεὶς, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τὸν παρεόντα φιλεῖ.

4 δειπνεῖν: Obviously a code word for what is really on the man's mind; cf. the current use of "massage" and "escort" in advertising. δειπνεῖν seems to be P's own alteration rather than a correction of C, as reported by Stadtmüller, who is followed by Gow-Page.

πόσου παρέση: I find no exact parallel for this phrase, but πόσου with verbs used absolutely is common enough, e.g., πόσου διδάσκει; (Pl. *Ap.* 20b). The sense

of παρέση, “be my guest” (cf. Aristoph. *Av.* 131), maintains the pretense that she is being asked only to dine with the man.

5 τοῦτο ξένον: This interruption may be imagined as an aside, of the sort “where a speech is interrupted and after the interruption the speaker continues without taking up the interruptor’s point”; D. Bain, *Actors and Audience: A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama* (Oxford 1977) 87; cf. esp. ch. 7, which covers these “asides in conversation.”

5–6 ὅσον ἄν σοι . . . δοκῆ: Cf. Machon 346 Gow <δ’ ἐμοὶ μὲν Kaibel> δὸς ὅσον ἐπιθυμεῖς, spoken by a prostitute to a customer reluctant to pay her price. Gulick (Loeb ed.) translates “you may give anything you like,” which is close to Phil.; Gow, however, rejecting Kaibel’s supplement, is probably right to interpret the indicative as “. . . the [specific] fee you wish to pay,” i.e., the five minai offered by the man. Cf. 21.2 ὁ θέλεις δώσομεν.

6 κοιμηθέντι: A common euphemism; cf. Henderson, *Maculate Muse* 160f.

οὐκ ἀδικεῖς: If taken literally, these words assigned by the MSS to the man, would make better sense spoken by the woman, as an explanation of her novel pricing policy: “You’re an honest man” (and hence will not cheat me). And since it is not dishonest to set a price in advance, she cannot be called honest for refusing to do so. (Thus for a while I was prepared to assign these words to the woman.)

These words, however, have to be understood in the wider context of Greek attitudes towards justice, *philia*, and reciprocity. In brief, anyone helping you is, at least for the moment, your friend and is acting justly. οὐκ ἀδικεῖς, then, is a colloquial equivalent to εὖ ποιεῖς; cf. K. J. Dover, *Greek Popular Morality* (Oxford 1974) 181f., who cites Isok. 18.63 for the “clear antonymy between *adikein* and *eu poiein*”; cf. further Falivene.

7 ποῦ γίνῃ: A present used with future sense: “where will you (come to) be”; so Kaibel, strongly supported by Wackernagel, *Syntax* 1.161, Müller *Antiphilos* 40, and Gow-Page. Cf. P. Prag. Varcl. N.S. 41.16 f. πρὸς ὑμᾶς γίνομαι μετὰ τὴν αὔριον. For Gow-Page, this is equivalent to asking where she lives, which Kaibel, Wackernagel, and Müller deny. Professional “call-girls” (πέμψω) may be found at a favorite location away from home. The same phrase appears in the companion piece, 21.3 (q.v.), where the woman’s address is clearly what is desired. 21.3 ποῦ γίνῃ; πέμψω . . . , spoken entirely by the man, also shows that Kaibel was wrong to assign ποῦ γίνῃ to the woman here.

καταμάνθανε: “The word means ‘learn,’ not ‘ask,’ and it is not easy to understand in this context”—Gow-Page ad loc., who, after running through the strained attempts of earlier scholars, tentatively suggest that the verb “means in effect ‘you can find out,’ i.e., you can easily learn my address,” which strikes me as notably less responsive than her immediately previous answers. As my punctuation shows, however, I think that what we have here is a man so eager that he interrupts the answer to his first question with another question. This has the further advantage of mediating dramatically between πέμψω and εὐθὺ θέλω.

By chance, the imperative of this verb recurs in a recently published fragmentary mime (P.Oxy. 53 [1986] 3700, ed. M. Haslam; i A.D.). There is enough to suggest that the imperative may have the same colloquial force as is found in Phil. The scene is at a door:

δᾶδε φαῖνε. τίνα βλέπῳ
]ETE. () οὐκ οἶδασημα . . ερ[5
]υ θέλει. —κατάμαθ' ἄκρε[ιβῳς
]με.—ETEP(). ἀγνοῶ.

Haslam suggests either οὐκ οἶδά σ' or οὐκ οἶδας ἡμᾶς; for v. 5. For his supplement of v. 6, cf. P.Herm. 6.17 ἀκριβῳς καταμαθεῖν. (ETEP = (i) ἕτερος, —α, or (ii) ἑταῖρα, ἑταῖρος.)

Phil.'s poem is far livelier if we understand an interruption of the woman's directions. The man starts out pretending, or at any rate trying, to be businesslike and detached, but manipulated and aroused by the woman's professional guile, he can no longer wait for a later appointment.

7–8 πηνίκα δ' ἤξεις; | ἦν σὺ θέλεις ὥρην: These words in particular recall what Kerkidas said of ἅ δ' ἐξ ἀγορᾶς Ἀφροδίτα · καὶ τὸ μη[δε]νός μέλειν ὀπ[α]νίκα λῆς, ὅκα χρήζης (5.27–29 Powell). The incorporation of the antecedent into a relative clause (KG 2.416 ff.) allows the main clause to be dispensed with entirely. (It would have been simply τῆς ὥρας [cf. 28.6 δεκάτης], with ἤξω understood.)

8 εὐθὺ θέλω: What LSJ s.v. εὐθύς B I 3 say of adv. εὐθύ, “rarely used of time,” is absolutely belied by the Anthology, where all 14 exx. are temporal; cf. in particular AP 12.200.3 (Strato) εὐθὺ θέλοντα, which has the same erotic sense as here. Note also 28.6.

Immediately after ὥρην, the scribe of P wrote πρόαγε, which C erased in order to write out in its proper place the second half of the pentameter.

21

ἡ κομπή, μεῖνόν με· τί σοι καλὸν οὖνομα; ποῦ σε
 ἔστιν ἰδεῖν; ὃ θέλεις δώσομεν. οὐδὲ λαλεῖς;
 ποῦ γίνῃ; πέμψω μετὰ σοῦ τίνα. μή τις ἔχει σε;
 ὦ σοβαρή, ὑγίαιν'· οὐδ' “ὕγαινε” λέγεις;
 καὶ πάλι καὶ πάλι σοι προσελεύσομαι. οἶδα μαλάσσειν 5
 καὶ σοῦ σκληροτέρας. νῦν δ' ὑγίαινε, γύναι.

AP 5.308 [Antipilos 14 GP, 3 Müller]

P τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Ἀντιφίλου] [C] ἢ μάλλον Φιλοδήμου Pl 7.101, f. 73r τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] Π vi.4 ηκομψη

3 σοῦ PPI: σ' αὐ Gow-Page: σ' οὖν Scaliger 4 ὑγιαίν' CPI: ὑγιαίνε P 5 μαλάσσειν CPI –σσον P

Wait for me, my fine lady. What's your pretty name? Where are you to be found? I'll give you what you want. Won't you even speak?
Where do you live? I'll send someone with you. No one calls you his, I hope?—Goodbye, Miss Hoity-Toity. Won't you even say Goodbye?
I'll come up to you again and again. I know how to soften women even tougher than you. But for now, goodbye, woman.

K. Müller, *Die Epigramme des Antiphilos von Byzanz* (Berlin 1935) 39–41.

With ascription to Phil. by Pl, C (however oddly), and now (almost certainly) Π, there is no reason to deny him this poem. In writing τοῦ αὐτοῦ, the scribe of P jumped over the immediately preceding poem by Antipilos to the second one back, which is by Phil. (25).

Also arguing in favor of Phil. is the way this poem complements 20: In each a man confronts a woman in/of the streets who controls the situation, one by using speech to sharpen his desire, the other by maintaining silence to reduce the man to near-spluttering impotence. (I doubt, though, whether, as Müller 40 argues, C would have taken a poem with a perfectly good attribution and assigned it to Phil. on the basis of this similarity alone.) The poem is credited to Phil. by Brunck, Jacobs, and K. P. Schulze, *BPhW* 36 (1916) 319. Another variation on this scene is offered by AP 5.101 (Anon. 6 FGE). The woman (who may be the maid acting for her mistress; cf. Page) is responsive, as in 20, but the man is disappointed, as here:

A. χαῖρε κόρη. Γ. καὶ δὴ σύ. A. τίς ἢ προϊοῦσα; Γ. τί πρὸς σέ;
A. οὐκ ἀλόγως ζητῶ. Γ. δεσπότις ἡμετέρη.
A. ἐλπίζειν ἔστι; Γ. ζητεῖς δέ τι; A. νύκτα. Γ. φέρεις τι;
A. χρυσίον. Γ. εὐθύμει. A. καὶ τόσον. Γ. οὐ δύνασαι.

1 κομψή: The “elegance” of this passing (see next lemma) woman, which the man obviously finds attractive, will, after she ignores him, be interpreted otherwise; see below on 4 σοβαρή. See on Π v.15.

μείνον: We should imagine that the man sees the woman approach in the street, addresses her, and (see on v. 4 σοβαρή), after being ignored, follows after her as she continues on her way.

καλόν: Part of his attempt to win her affection: A woman as elegant as she is must have a fine name.

2 θέλεις . . . λαλεῖς: Homoioteleuton of pentameter halves occurs more than twice as much in Phil. than in Antipilos; see *Introd.*, p. 44, Müller 29 f.

3 ποῦ γίνῃ: See on 20.7.

σοῦ: Twice he has asked where she is to be found and twice she has ignored him. He now threatens to send a slave along with her to learn her address—but not so that he can “come to her again and again” (5), as Jacobs, Müller, and Waltz think; see below. Scaliger and Gow-Page are wrong to desire an accusative here.

μή τις ἔχει σε; With clear sexual overtones; cf. Skolion 904 PMG, where this sense is played off against a more neutral meaning: ἄ ὄς τὰν βάλανον τὰν μὲν ἔχει, τὰν δ' ἔραται λαβεῖν | κἀγὼ παῖδα τὴν μὲν ἔχω, τὴν δ' ἔραμαι λαβεῖν. Cf. further Poseidippos 2 HE (*AP* 5.186.3–4) εἰ δ' ἕτερός σε | εἶχε, φιλεῖν ἄν ἔφης μείζον ἐκεῖνον ἐμοῦ, Asklepiades 41 HE (*AP* 7.217.1; cf. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* [Oxford 1972] 2.805 n.97), Kallim. 2 HE (*AP* 12.43.6), Asklepiades 4 (*AP* 5.158.4), LSJ s.v. ἔχω A I 4.

4 σοβαρή: The first half of the poem is addressed to the woman as she approaches; we may imagine that the second half is addressed to her back. The man now drops the pretense of politeness. The early sense of this word, “impetuous,” gave way to “haughty”; cf. Page, *Rufinus* 44 ff. Used to describe either a strutting gait or a haughty carriage, such as raised eyebrows (see below and cf. the adj. σοβεροβλέφαρος) or a neck held high (*Rufinus* 10 Page = *AP* 5.28.4), the word here shows that the woman does more than merely maintain silence; rather, she indicates through body language what she thinks of this pest. Cf. the similar situation in *Rufinus* 33 Page (*AP* 5.92.1 f.): ὑψοῦται Ῥοδόπη τῷ κάλλει, κῆν ποτε “χαῖρε” | εἶπω, ταῖς σοβαροῖς ὀφρῦσιν ἠσπάσατο. This is obviously not a quality a would-be seducer would likely find attractive; cf. Agathias 77 Viansino (*AP* 5.280.8) (Aphrodite) ἐχθαίρειν τὰς σοβαρευομένας.

Epicurus uses the word in a complimentary sense, perhaps “high-spirited”: *VS* 45 φυσιολογία παρασκευάζει . . . σοβαροὺς καὶ αὐτάρκεις.

ὕγιαιν': C erased what was probably a final epsilon (though to my eyes it could just as easily have been an alpha). Elision between pentameter halves is rare: only 7–9 exx. in GP. Since neither Phil. nor Antiphilos allows this elsewhere, the question of authorship is unaffected. (Antiphilos elides δέ, τέ, με in this position; Phil. elides δέ only at 31.2 [36.4 may not be by Phil.]—but these short words do not figure in the statistics; cf. GP 1.xliii: H. Lloyd-Jones and N. Wilson, *Sophoclea* (Oxford 1990) on *OT* 523.) It is doubtless the colloquial tone of this poem which allows this deviation from the norm. For this verb in leave-taking, cf. P.Oxy. 219(a).24 (a papyrus mime = 4 Cunningham) ὑμεῖς δ' ὕγιαίνετε, φίλοι, Aristoph. *Ran.* 165, *Ekkel.* 477; further exx. given by Headlam-Knox on Herodas 6.97. (Jacobs, following Lucian *Pro lapsu* 1, thought that ὕγιαίνε was limited to evening, χαῖρε to mornings, but this may not be valid in Phil.'s lifetime; cf. *Ran.* 165, where the latter is answered with the former.)

5 προσελεύσομαι: By itself this word could indicate “approach”, i.e. “accost” (Gow-Page), in the street, but it is possible that, since the man seems not to have seen this woman before and hence could not know that he would see her again, he plans to adopt (see above on 3 σοῦ) the more aggressive tactic of finding out where

she lives so that he can wait for her at her door. (In which case, this poem could be called a *proparaklausithyron*.) I think, though, that the man is covering up his defeat with a display of braggadocio: If she will not stop now, he will wear her down in future encounters and so win her over eventually.

καὶ πάλι καὶ πάλι: A good word to repeat; cf. Phil. 23.1–2, Meleager 42 (*AP* 5.136.1) ἔγχει καὶ πάλιν εἶπέ, πάλιν πάλιν, “Ἥλιοδώρας”.

5–6 μαλάσσειν . . . σκληροτέρας: The contrast is obvious and of long standing; cf. Pl. *Rep.* 411a–b ὥσπερ σίδηρον ἐμάλαξεν καὶ χρήσιμον ἐξ ἀχρήστου καὶ σκληροῦ ἐποίησεν, *Tbt.* 186b, *Symp.* 195d–e, Polyb. 4.21.3 μαλάττειν . . . τὸ τῆς φύσεως . . . σκληρόν.

6 ὕγιαίνε: As νῦν δέ indicates, this final imperative means only “goodbye,” and not also “porte-toi bien,” i.e., “réfléchis bien à ce que je te dis” (Waltz).

 22

πέντε δίδωσιν ἐνὸς τῇ δεῖνα ὁ δεῖνα τάλαντα
 καὶ βινεῖ φρίσσω καί, μὰ τόν, οὐδὲ καλήν·
 πέντε δ' ἐγὼ δραχμᾶς τῶν δώδεκα Λυσιανάσση,
 καὶ βινῶ πρὸς τῷ κρείσσονα καὶ φανερωῶς.
 πάντως ἦτοι ἐγὼ φρένας οὐκ ἔχω ἢ τό γε λοιπὸν 5
 τοὺς κείνου πελέκει δεῖ διδύμους ἀφελεῖν.

AP 5.126 [25 GP, p. xxv K]

P Φιλοδήμου Π ii.18 πεντεδιδῶσιν caret Pl [C] τωθασιτικὸν ἐπὶ τινι ἐρῶντι
 σαπρῷ καὶ πολλὰ παρεχομένῳ ταῖς ἐταίραις

1 δεῖνα P: δεῖνα Ap.B, Philaras: δεῖνι Ap.B(marg.): δεῖνω Leid.B.P.G. 34B 2 καὶ μά P:
 ναὶ μά Reiske 3 δραχμᾶς Philaras: δραχμᾶς Ap.B: δραγμαῖς C: δραγμαῖς P: δραχμῆς Leiden
 B.P.G. 34B Λυσιανάσση Ap.B, Ap.L, Leid. B.P.G. 34B, Philaras: τῇ Λ. P

Mr. X gives Mrs. Y five talents for one favor, and he screws, shivering with fear, one who is, what's more, God knows, no beauty.

I give five—drachmas—to Lysianassa for the twelve favors, and what's more I screw a finer woman, and openly.

Assuredly, either I'm crazy or, after all this, he should have his balls cut off with a knife.

The vulgarity of the language led Planudes to omit the poem and Kaibel to deny Philodemean authorship (p. xxv), but authorship is all but guaranteed by its inclusion in Π. The various metrical licenses detailed below *passim* are no doubt intended to maintain the tone.

Wright argues that Horace refers to this poem at *Sat.* 1.2.119–122 (T 4):

parabilem amo venerem facilemque.
illam “post paulo,” “sed pluris,” “si exierit vir,”
Gallis, hanc Philodemus ait sibi, quae neque magno
stet pretio neque cunctetur cum est iussa venire.

But Horace praises the woman who charges little, he does not attack the man who pays much. Nonetheless, the combination of high/low fees and castration/Galli in close proximity while discussing two types of women is curious; cf. C. Dessen, “The sexual and financial mean in Horace’s *Serm.*, I 2,” *AJP* 89 (1968) 200–208. Perhaps, given Phil.’s propensity for composing poems in contrasting pairs, we can infer that Horace refers to a poem which Phil. composed to go along with this one. See 38, introduction.

Like Horace, Phil. seems to allude to the difference between a married woman and one with whom intercourse offers no threat of punishment. Phil.’s model may have been, as Jacobs suggests, Xenarchos, *Pentathlos* fr. 4 K-A, in which trouble-free dealings with prostitutes are compared favorably with the dangers posed by furtive adulteries; see further below, on 2 φρίσσων.

1 πέντε δίδωσιν ἐνός: As Gow-Page note, “the division of words – – | – – | – – in the first half of the line is a very rare phenomenon in this *genre*.” Lack of *Ac*-caesura: 4.1, 6.7 (proper name), 8.1,7, 12.5, 35.1 (if by Phil.). For Meyer’s First Law (the rarity of words ending × – | in the second foot), cf. West, *Greek Metre* 37 f., 155. *Μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά* is of the same metrical pattern (West 197), but the Alexandrians as usual were more Homeric than Homer. See above, p. 43. It is also unusual to have the syllable before the masculine caesura long by position; elsewhere in Phil. only 3.3, 15.3 and 19.5; see above, p. 43. As stated in the introduction, I suspect that the metrical irregularities of this poem are intended to mirror the crudeness of the person and situation described. Cf. Hesiod’s intentionally irregular line describing the Chimaira; J. Solomon, “In defense of Hesiod’s ‘schlechtestem Hexameter,’” *Hermes* 113 (1985) 21–30. Perhaps also Catullus 116.8; H. Dettmer, “The first and last of Catullus,” *Syll. Cl.* 5 (1993) 32 f.; and for seven possible *exx.* in Vergil, *E.* 7, cf. F. M. Sandbach, *CR* 47 (1933) 216–219.

ἐνός: Genitive of cause giving the thing purchased; cf. Xen. *Mem.* 1.6.11 οὐδένα τῆς συνουσίας ἀργύριον πρᾶττει, Smyth 1373a. For the scansion, see above.

τῆ δεινᾶ: This passage apart, only two forms of the dat. fem. sg. of this odd noun are known: (i) δεινί (Epiktetos 1.12.28, Philostratos, *VA* 6.43, 8.5, Joh. Chrysostom, *In Gen.* 53.300, *In Matth.* 58.678) and the undeclined (ii) δεινᾶ (Origen, *Contra Cels.* 5.45 = *Philokalia* 17.3). Did Phil. either invent or know of a

third form, (iii) δεινᾶ (P), or is scribal error at work (e.g. δεινᾶ for δεῖνᾶ)? Of the three possible forms, (i) is the most presentable, being vouched for by the Atticist Philostratos and least objectionable metrically, since the hiatus of δεῖνι ὁ can be paralleled by similar instances after τι, ὅτι, and vocatives ending in -ι in Herodas (West, *Gk. Metre* 161), whose tone is comparable to that of this poem; as well as after datives of the third declension generally (Jacobs). The hiatus produced by (ii) is much harsher. The correction of (iii), however, falls within a dactyl, a practice Phil. elsewhere avoids. The scansion of the fourth foot | δεινᾶ ὁ |, violates Hermann's Bridge in all three readings.

In this poem, however, we cannot simply go with the best attested form and least objectionable meter, since Phil. has given his narrator a roughness of tone and meter which may here be reinforced by a morphological irregularity. Hence, tempted as I am by (i), it seems best to print the reading of P. Cf. Solomon 25 f.

ὁ δεῖνᾶ: This strange noun means either (i) "someone or other," where almost any name will do, or, less commonly, (ii) "you know who," where there is a reason for not specifying the name; cf. Dover on Aristoph. *Frogs* 918. Here, for both fem. and masc. forms, the latter applies, the reason for anonymity, at least ostensibly, being to protect the guilty adulterers, from the embarrassment of being known for overpaying and overcharging.

2 βινεῖ: The social vulgarity of the man is matched by the vulgar tone of this word, which is like Eng. *fuck*; cf. Henderson, *Maculate Muse* 151 f. with addenda, p. 249; D. Bain, "Six Greek verbs of sexual congress (βινῶ, κινῶ, πυγίζω, ληκῶ, οἴφω, λαικάζω)," *CQ* 41 (1991) 51–77, esp. 54 ff. For the tone, cf. Π ii.16, where στύων is a likely restoration.

φρίσσω: In fear of being caught, in contrast with the narrator's doing it φανερώς. Cf. 15. Gow-Page, following Jacobs, aptly cite Xenarchos fr. 4.16 ff. K-A, which talks of young men able to βινεῖν prostitutes without fear, in opposition to married women:

ἀεὶ δὲ τετρεμαίνοντα καὶ φοβούμενον,
δεδιότα ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἔχοντα (19 f.).

Presumably Phil.'s τῇ δεινᾶ is a married woman. Cf. Antipater 53 GP (*AP* 5.109.1–2) δραχμῆς Εὐρώπην τὴν Ἀθίδα μήτε φοβηθεῖς, | μηδένα μήτ' ἄλλως ἀντιλέγουσαν ἔχε.

καὶ μὰ τόν: Sc. θεόν, Δία vel sim. (LSJ s.v. μὰ (A) IV); cf. schol. ad Aristoph. *Ran.* 1374 ἄλλειπτικῶς ὀμνύει, καὶ οὕτως ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις ἐνίοτε μὴ προστιθεῖναι τὸν θεὸν εὐλαβείας χάριν. Reiske may be right to suggest ναὶ μά, which frequently occurs elsewhere, with and without the god's being named (LSJ *ibid.*), but the repeated καὶ is rhetorically superior.

3 τῶν δώδεκα: The twelve times a night the narrator is known for being capable of (or for boasting of); cf. on 19.1 πέντε καὶ ἑννέα.

Λυσιανάσση: Names with the ending -ανασσα are rare, the most famous being Agamemnon's daughter Iphianassa; some others are Archeanassa (a hetaira in Asklepiades 41 HE = AP 7.217), Kallianassa, Kleanassa, and Kleitanassa. Lysianassa appears in myth as a daughter of Nereus (Hes. *Th.* 258), Polybos (Pausanias 2.6.3), and Epaphos (Apollod. 2.5.11).

Two conjectures, usually credited to Reiske, can be found at least as early as Leonardos Philaras's sylloge from P (s. xvii, Paris Coislin 352, f. 11v). The conjectures may not be original to him, however, as J. Hutton reports that "he had before him some of Saumaise's corrections"; *The Greek Anthology in France* (Ithaca 1946) 189.

4 πρὸς τῷ: = πρὸς τούτῳ (as in Hdt.). Over the omega, C wrote •/•, indicating that he thought the phrase corrupt and could find no MS variant to replace it, but the phrase, probably colloquial, should be allowed to stand. No doubt, it was meant to sound odd.

5 πάντως ἦτοι: Transposition on Phil.'s part could have obviated correction, with little change in meaning; but, as was said above, he probably intended some metrical roughness, here two exx. of correction on one line.

φρένας οὐκ ἔχω: From Homer onwards, one could be said to be apart from or without φρένες; cf., e.g., *Il.* 13.394 ἐκ δέ οἱ ἠνίοχος πλήγη φρένας, ἄς πάρος εἶχεν. Phil. uses the phrase οἱ φρένας ἔχοντες of intelligent people who may not be philosophers: *On Poems* 5.22.35 Mangoni, *Rhet.* 1.201.12–202.14, 240.10 f. Sudh. For the scansion, cf. 36.3 ἐγὼ, which may not be by Phil.

τό γε λοιπόν: Not "in future" (Gow-Page), an altogether too vapid sentiment for our narrator; rather, "after all this," i.e., "all that remains to do now" (LSJ s.v. λοιπός 4).

6: For castration as punishment for adultery in Rome, cf. Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.44 ff. *quin etiam illud | accidit, ut quidam testis caudamque salacem | demeteret ferro. "iure" omnes*, Mart. 2.60.3 *dum ludis, castrabere*, 3.85, 3.92, 6.2. See further on 15. For adultery in general, cf. C. Edwards, *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome* (Cambridge 1993) 34–62. Phil.'s poem, however, may be a literary exercise, drawing, as was said, on Xenarchos, who specifically alludes to the harsh penalties meted out to adulterers in Athens under the laws of Drakon. Cf. A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens* 1 (Oxford 1968) 32–38. And for a comparison with Horace, cf. M. Gigante, *Orazio: Una misura per l'amore: Lettura della satira seconda del primo libro* (Venosa 1993) 82 f.

διδύμους: "Twins" = "testicles" as in Herophilos, who also used the term for ovaries; cf. Galen, *De Sem.* 4.596 f. K (Herophilos T 61 von Staden), *Us. Part.* 14.11 (2.323 Helmreich = Herophilos T 109), with von Staden's note to the former (p. 231). The word appears in this sense in Marcus Argentarius 7 GP (AP 5.105.4), Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 2.15.2, and in LXX Deut. 25.11; and probably also by Phil. himself in 31.4, q.v.

γινώσκω, χαρίεσσα, φιλεῖν πάλι τὸν φιλέοντα
καὶ πάλι γινώσκω τὸν με δακόντα δακεῖν·
μὴ λύπει με λίην στέργοντά σε μηδ' ἐρεθίζειν
τὰς βαρυοργήτους σοὶ θέλε Πιερίδας.
—ταῦτ' ἐβόων αἰεὶ καὶ προύλεγον, ἀλλ' ἴσα πόντω 5
Ἴονίῳ μύθων ἔκλυες ἡμετέρων.
τοιγὰρ νῦν σὺ μὲν ᾧδε μέγα κλαίουσα βαῦζεις,
ἡμεῖς δ' ἐν κόλποις ἡμεθα Ναϊάδος.

AP 5.107 [5 GP, 7 K, 4 G]

P Φιλοδήμου Pl 7.184, f. 75ν ἄδηλον Π vii.13 γεινω . . . [.]χαριεσσα [J] εἰς
ἐταίραν ὑπερήφανον

1 γινώσκω P: γιγν—Pl πάλι Scaliger: πάνυ PPl 2 γινώσκω P: γιγν—Pl 3 ἐρεθίζειν
P: —ζε Pl 4 σοί P: μὴ Pl 5 ταῦτ' Pl: τοῦτ' P 7 βαῦζεις Pl: —ζοις P 8
ἡμεθα Pl: ἡμέραι P: ἡμέρα C Ναϊάδος C: Νηϊάδος Pl: αἰάδος P

I know, dear, how to return the love to the one who loves me, and I know
how to bite the biter back.

Do not cause me who loves you too much pain, and do not stir up against
yourself the wrath of the Muses of Picria, fierce in their anger.

—These words I would shout and and give warning, but you heeded them
the way you would the Ionian Sea.

This is why *you* are now are howling so loudly, while *I* rest in the bosom of
Naias.

Falivene, *QUCC* 37 (1981) 87–95.

Giangrande, *MPL* 5 (1981) 42.

Rossi, *Maia* 33 (1981) 213 f. [Rossi M]

Rossi, *Vichiana* 10 (1981) 163–167. [Rossi V]

Sider, *AJP* 108 (1987) 317 n. 22.

The first half of the poem, as the audience learns only on v. 5, is in fact a complete poem as it was already recited more than once to the woman, although to no effect. It was a warning from a rejected lover who is also a poet: be good to me or I will invoke the Muses against you, i.e., write poems against you; cf. Rossi V 166. The 8-line poem before us is at least partial fulfillment of that threat, as well as being an especially interesting example of metapoiesis. The woman, however, has shown that she is invulnerable to words, which is particularly frustrating to a poet. To reciprocate, Phil. goes to Naias, which has the desired effect of reducing the woman to the same state of inarticulateness as she had reduced him. Only thus does Phil. accom-

plish with the 8-line poem what he failed to do with the 4-line poem. Before she treated Phil. like the roar of the sea; now she is the inarticulate one, barking inarticulately at one who rests in the κόλπος of “Naias”.

The trick of turning the first half of a poem into a previously recited poem was imitated by Ovid *Am.* 2.5, where again there is no warning that what has been heard or read up to this point is a repetition of what the poet’s mistress had heard before: *haec tibi sunt mecum, mihi sunt communia tecum* (v. 31); cf. Horace *Epode* 2, where it is not until v. 67 that we learn the preceding were the words of Alfius. Ovid, I am sure, has Phil. as his immediate model, but all may ultimately be drawing upon Archilochos, who began at least two poems with the undeclared words of another: 19 W² (οὐ μοι τὰ Γύγεω κτλ., which turns out to be spoken by Charon the *tekton*) and 122 (χρημάτων ἀελλτον οὐδέν ἐστι κτλ., a father to his daughter); but cf. K. J. Dover, “The poetry of Archilochos,” *Archiloque* = *EH* 10 (1964) 206 f., 215 (repr. in id. *Greek and the Greeks* [Oxford 1987] 111 f., 116 f.). Cf. also Sappho 1, where in v. 13 we learn that the preceding prayer to Aphrodite was in fact answered by her.

As Falivene 93 points out, Phil.’s chief model for the repetition of a threat made to a woman almost certainly is Archilochos 23 W² (P.Oxy. 2310 fr. 1 col.i.7ff. ed. Lobel):

τὴν δ' ἐγὼ γιντ' ἀμειβόμε[την
 “γύνα[ι], φάτιν μὲν τὴν πρὸς ἀνθρώπω[ν κακὴν
 μὴ τετραμήνης μηδέν· ἀμφὶ δ' εὐφ[ρόνη,
 ἐμοὶ μελήσει· θυμὸν ἴλαρον τίθεο. 10
 ἐς τοῦτο δὴ τοι τῆς ἀνολβίης δοκ[έω
 ἦκειν; ἀνὴρ τοι δειλὸς ἄρ' ἐφαινόμην,
 οὐ]δ' οἴος εἰμ' ἐγὼ [ο]ὔτος οὐδ' οἶων ἄπο.
 ἐπ]ίσταμαί τοι τὸν φιλ[έο]ν[τα] μὲν φι[ι]λεῖν,
 τὸ] γ' δ' ἐχθρὸν εχθαίρειν τε [κα]ὶ κακο[
 μύ]ρμηξ. λόγῳ γυν τ[ῶ]δ' ἀλη]θείη πάρ[α]. 15

(Cf. M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* [Berlin 1974] 118–20.) Lobel’s restoration of 15, κακο[στομέειν], suggested by v. 16, is also consistent with Phil.’s threat.

1–2: For the prevalence of the thought, cf. Archil. 23.14 f. (cited above), 126 (see next lemma); Hes. *Op.* 353 τὸν φιλέοντα φιλεῖν καὶ τῷ προσιόντι προσεῖναι, Theogn. 337ff., Pi. *P.* 2.83–85, Aisch. *PV* 1041f., Sappho 5.6f., Solon 13.5, Soph. *Ant.* 643f. (see below on 1 πάλι); Eur. *Medea* 809f., *Her.* 585f. Note also Plato, *Kriton* 49b οὐδαμῶς δεῖ ἀδικεῖν . . . οὐδὲ ἀδικούμενον ἀνταδικεῖν, ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ οἴονται; for the broader social and political contexts in which this phrase figures (and for far more parallel passages), cf. M. W. Blundell, *Helping Friends and Harming Enemies* (Cambridge 1989), ch. 2. But for us the most interesting parallel is 24.

Archilochos and Phil. are alone in applying the complete form of this political maxim to the erotic sphere, which has its own code of reciprocity and divine vengeance; cf. Falivene 88f. and Rossi *V* 165f. The reciprocity-of-love half of the for-

mula is of course implicit in the familiar notion of ἀντιφιλία, ἀντέρως; cf., e.g., CEG 2.530 (a wife's tombstone, Attic, ca. 365–340) φιλοῦντα ἀντιφιλοῦσα τὸν ἄνδρα; cf. J. Pircher, *Das Lob der Frau im vorchristlichen Grabepigramm der Griechen* (Innsbruck 1979) 39 f.

1 γινώσκω χαρίεσσα: = Theokr. 11.30: Polyphemos, in circumstances similar to that of Phil., often (cf. 10ff.) sings to the unresponsive Galateia (and also to the sea which is her home). γινώσκω + inf. in the sense “know how to” is rare (and barely acknowledged by LSJ); cf. Men. *Sent.* 20 γίγνωσκε τῆς ὀργῆς κρατεῖν; Smyth 2129. χαρίεσσα is “ironical as in, e.g., Aristoph. *Ekkkl.* 794, Pl. *Rep.* 452b” (Gow-Page). Cf. Clark Gable’s “Frankly, my dear, I don’t give a damn.” It would seem that this earlier poem (vv. 1–4) was far from the first to be addressed to this woman.

πάλι: Scaliger’s emendation is not (*pace* Gow-Page) “strongly supported by πάλι (to be taken with δακεῖν) in v. 2.” Word order and sense allow πάλι to be taken with γινώσκω. Nor does the fact that “πάνυ is rare in poetry” count for much in a Hellenistic poet. (It occurs, e.g., thrice in Aisch., twice in Soph., once each in Eur. and Xenophanes.) πάνυ is retained by Stadtmüller, Dübner, Waltz, Falivene 92 n.13. On the other hand, φιλεῖν πάνυ is an odd expression (in fact, πάνυ + verb is rare in prose and poetry) and πάλι may easily be seen as Phil.’s variation on the more usual ἀντί found in some of the parallel expressions; cf. Archil. 126 W² τὸν κακῶς < μ' > ἔρδοντα δεινοῖς ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς; Aisch. *Cho.* 123 τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς, Soph. *Ant.* 643 τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἀνταμύνωνται κακοῖς, sim. Pl. *Kriton* 49b (see above); Blundell 29 n.17.

2 δακόντα δακεῖν: Metaphorical as in *Il.* 5.493 δάκε δὲ φρένας Ἴκτορι μῦθος. And Phil. too probably has biting words in mind. Cf. 18.6.

3 λίην: With λύπει alone, not, as Gow-Page would allow, with στέργοντα as well. Phil.’s saying that he loves her too much would upset the idea of balance established in vv. 1–2.

στέργοντα: “Seldom of sexual love” (LSJ s.v. I 3, where the exx. from Xenophon barely qualify for inclusion), but this no longer applies by the Hellenistic age: in addition to Phil. himself at 17.5, cf. Moschos fr. 2.8, Meleager 77, 82, 93 (*AP* 12.95.1, 54.3, 158.5) and Argentarius 10, 34 GP (*AP* 5.116.3, 11.320.1); also Sosikrates 4 Kock ὅταν ποθεῖν λέγη σε καὶ στέργειν γύνη.

3–4 μηδ' . . . θέλε: “Do not”; LSJ s.v. ἐθέλω I 5.

3 ἐρεθίζειν: Pl’s reading may derive from a scribe’s transcribing one remembered line at a time and unconsciously assimilating the infinitive to the preceding imperative.

4 βαρυοργήτους: This word appears elsewhere only in *Souda* s.vv. Ἠνίοχος, Πολύεκτος. For the sense, cf. Pollux’ list of adj. expressing the anger of a god: δύσμηνην καὶ βαρῦμηνην καὶ δυσόργητον (1.39).

σοί: An accented form is more likely for the beginning of the second half of the pentameter (Gow-Page). Construe as dative of disadvantage with ἐρεθίζειν (so Waltz, Dübner), rather than “do not of your own will” (Gow-Page).

5–8: Phil. turns away from the woman who has rejected him. In addition to Archil. 23 (above, intro.), cf. Cat. 8.12–19 (*vale, puella*, etc.); Tait 45 f.

5 ταῦτ': Pl's reading sits better with the following ἴσα, which in either case may be taken as adverbial (see the quotations from Homer in the next lemma). Note also Ovid's *haec* (above, introduction).

5–6 ἴσα πόντῳ . . . μύθων ἔκλυες: The sea between Italy and Epirus; cf. Gow-Page on Diodoros 5 GP (AP 7.624.1). This compendious comparison can be construed in two ways: (i) Talking to you is like talking to the sea, i.e., you were deaf to my poem. For the thought, cf. *Il.* 16.34, Eur. *Med.* 28f. ὡς . . . θαλάσσιος κλύδων ἀκούει νοουθετουμένη, *Hipp.* 304 f., Aisch. *P.V.* 1001, Horace, *O.* 3.7.21f. For the syntax, cf., e.g., *Od.* 11.304 τιμὴν δὲ λελόγγασιν ἴσα θεοῖσι. Or (ii) You heeded my words as much as you would the sea. Cf. *Il.* 13.176 = 15.551 ὁ δὲ μιν τίεν ἴσα τέκεσσι. Translators uniformly adopt (i), but as suggested above in the introduction, the punishment Phil. works on the woman is more condign if he reduces her to the same state (inarticulateness, not deafness) she had induced in him.

7 ᾧδε: Waltz, who reads βαύζοις, is forced to translate unnaturally “à ton tour”; see below.

μέγα: Perhaps to be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with each of the two following words; cf. Homer, *Il.* 16.428 μεγάλα κλάζοντε.

βαύζεις: “Bark,” like a dog; cf. Herakl. B 97, Fraenkel ad Aisch. *Ag.* 449. Phil. knows how to repay in kind. The woman reduced him to a state of ineffectual muttering by failing to react to his poems; he now gives her a taste of her own medicine by turning a deaf ear to her growls now that he has gone off to Naias. Cf. below on Naias' name, and Lykophron 1452 f. εἰς κύμα κωφὸν . . . βαύζω.

The optative of wish (P) is out of place after ᾧδε and τοιγάρ, which, since it “bears a strong logical force” (Denniston *GP* 565), is followed by either an indicative (often a future) or imperative. An indicative here is balanced by ἡμεθα in the corresponding δέ clause. The indicative furthermore fulfills Phil.'s initial threat, and is far more satisfying than an optative.

8 κόλποις: The bosom of male or female; cf. 36.6 λύχνε, σὺ δ' ἐν κόλποις αὐτὸν ὄρας ἐτέρων. But in this poem of nautical imagery (as in 8), there is also a pun on its sense of watery gulf or expanse, especially since the girl involved is named Naias, i.e. Naiad; Rossi M. Cf. Argentarius 1 GP (AP 5.16.2) οὗς κόλποις Ὠκεανὸς δέχεται, *Il.* 6.136 Θέτις δ' ὑπεδέξατο κόλπω.

Ναϊάδος: The name Phil. has given elsewhere to a hetaira who is ready to receive him when he is rejected by another woman (8). On the form of the name, cf. Giangrande 43. The well-known hetaira Nais (Aristoph. *Gerytades* fr. 179 K-A, Athen. 592c–e) could serve as eponym for later practitioners.

The MS of P is extremely difficult to read here because of C's overwriting, but most likely P had ἡμεραι ἀταδος which C converted to ἡμερα,ν αιαδος, the comma indicating (as elsewhere in C's corrections) the word break.

οἶδα φιλεῖν φιλέοντας· ἐπίσταμαι ἦν μ' ἀδικῆ τις
μισεῖν· ἀμφοτέρων εἰμὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀδαής.

AP 12.103 [Anon. 56 HE]

P ἄδηλον Pl 7.194, f. 76r s.a.n. Π ii. 28 οἰδαφιλεῖνφιλέοντας

I know how to love those who love (me); I know how to hate if someone treats me unfairly. For in both (love and hate) I am not without experience.

Falivene, *QUCC* 37 (1981) 88 f.

Tarán, *Variation* 8 n.2.

With no claimant in the Anthology, and with its incipit in the papyrus list, this neat little poem may well be by Phil, especially as it complements 23. The Palatine Anthology, on the other hand, places it, along with thirty-two other interspersed anonyma, well within a Meleagorean context of 136 epigrams: 12.36–171. Gow, *Sources and Ascriptions* 21 ff., is surely right to think that in general anonymous poems belong to the series in which they are embedded (all thirty-three anonyma are printed in HE, one identified as a work of Meleager by Pl), but he himself points out that this is far from an absolute rule (*ibid.* and 41), for breaks in series may occur when two poems from different sources are collated because of similar subject matter (Gow 41 f.), and it may be that 12.103 was placed before 12.104 (Anon. 4 HE) for this reason, the narrators of both poems expressing a jealous hate:

οὐμός ἔρωσ παρ' ἐμοὶ μενέτω μόνον· ἦν δὲ πρὸς ἄλλους
φοιτήση, μισῶ κοινὸν ἔρωτα, Κύπρι.

AP 12.107 and 108 also deal with jealous love. Planudes placed this poem ninth in a series of twenty-five anonyma at the end of his seventh book (*amatoria*). Of this series, eight are identified as the work of three of Meleager's authors by P (Meleager, Asklepiades, and Dioskorides), another three come from the same Meleagorean series as 12.103, and two are identified as Philip's authors by P (Euenos and Archias). It may be significant that in Planudes' twenty-five, which are generally interspersed throughout P's two amatory books (5 and 12), AP 12.103 and 104 once again appear together in the same order (similarly, AP 12.50 + 51 [missing, however, 50.7–8 and 51.1–2], 5.304 + 305).

In sum, although Phil. cannot be ruled out, the external evidence for authorship is inconclusive.

Although “not visibly erotic” (Tarán), it could be recognized as such in the right context, which, if Philodemean, would include 23. M. Lausberg, *Das Einzeldistichon* (Munich 1982) 334, compares Euenos 7 GP (AP 12.172)

εἰ μισεῖν πόνος ἐστί, φιλεῖν πόνος, ἐκ δύο λυγρῶν
αἰροῦμαι χρηστῆς ἔλκος ἔχειν ὀδύνης,

noting that neither is specifically erotic.

1–2: For asyndeton throughout, cf. 2.

1 οἶδα φιλεῖν φιλέοντας: Cf. 23.1 γινώσκω . . . φιλεῖν τὸν φιλέοντα.

1–2 ἐπίσταμαι . . . μισεῖν: Here there is greater deviation from 23: γινώσκω τὸν με δακόντα δακεῖν.

2 λείμι: Phil. allows an enclitic ἐστί after the pentameter's caesura at 31.6. Cf. West, *Gk. Metre* 26, who notes that these two forms can occur after caesura and even begin a verse.

25

δακρῦεις, ἔλεεινὰ λαλεῖς, περίεργα θεωρεῖς,
ζηλοτυπεῖς, ἄπτη πολλάκι, πυκνὰ φιλεῖς·
ταῦτα μὲν ἐστὶν ἐρώντος, ὅταν δ' εἶπω “παράκειμαι”
καὶ σὺ μένης, ἀπλῶς οὐδὲν ἐρώντος ἔχεις.

AP 5.306 [13 GP, 18 K]

PP1 7.86, f. 72v Φιλοδήμου Π v.13 δ[ρα]ακρueis

1 λαλεῖς CPL: *αλεῖς P (θαλεῖς?) 4 μένης Hecker: μένης Pl: μένεις; P (v. comm.) οὐδὲν ἐρώντος ἔχεις CC⁷⁰ Pl: ἐρώντος οὐδὲν ἔχεις P

You cry, you ask for pity, you look me up and down, you are jealous, you keep touching me and kissing me hard.

These are the deeds of a lover, but whenever I tell you I am ready and you hold back, you have absolutely nothing of the lover in you.

Huschke 153–157.

Lumb 19.

Salanitro, *Studi . . . Cataudella* (Catania 1972) 2.498–501.

de Vries, *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser. 23 (1970) 30; 26 (1973) 179.

The topos of the *segnis amator*: A would-be lover fails to satisfy; cf. A. Richlin, *The Garden of Priapus* (New Haven 1983) 117 ff. Phil. also has 19 and 26. The former

is spoken *in persona feminae*, for which the Anthology offers few parallels, the only early erotic exx. being 36 (probably also by Phil. but ascribed as well to Meleager), Asklepiades 19 HE (*AP* 12.153), and probably this poem as well. There are, it is true, no grammatical markers to identify the gender of the speaker, but with a Philodemean parallel for a poem of this topos spoken by a woman and with none for a homosexual poem, I shall proceed on the assumption that this poem is an example of the former. Since this topos is an exercise in public self-humiliation, there can be no better way to accomplish this than by allowing the woman to revile the man.

Ovid *Am.* 3.7, the lament of an impotent lover, draws upon both this poem and 19; note especially 77–80, where the woman taunts the man, and see below on vv. 3, 4.

1–2: Asyndeton throughout these two lines; cf. Plato *Phdr.* 255e ἐπιθυμῆ [sc. ὁ ἐρώμενος τὸν ἐρώμενον]. . . ὄραν, ἄπτεσθαι, φιλεῖν, συγκατακεῖσθαι, 240d (also in an erotic context) ὄρωντι, ἀκούοντι, ἀπτομένῳ.

1 περίεργα: Used again with a verb of seeing by Strato τίς δὲ καλοῦς οὐ π. βλέπει; (*AP* 12.175.4), where the sense is “can’t keep his eyes off,” which works well here. Note the role of seeing in the *Phaidros* passages cited above.

2 ζηλοτυπεῖς: The first verb in the poem to make it clear that the context is erotic, although this was strongly hinted at by the preceding phrase. Cf. Pl. *Symp.* 213d, where Sokrates describes how Alkibiades has acted since he first fell in love with him: οὐκέτι ἔξεστί μοι οὔτε προσβλέψαι οὔτε διαλεχθῆναι καλῶ οὐδ’ ἐνί, ἢ οὔτοσι ζηλοτυπῶν με καὶ φθονῶν θαυμαστά ἐργάζεται καὶ λοιδορεῖται τε καὶ τῷ χεῖρε μόγις ἀπέχεται. Phil. calls ζηλοτυπία a vice at *Rhet.* 2.139.14 Sudh. (a detached fragment). Cf. E. Fantham, “*Zelotypia*: A brief excursion into sex, violence, and literary history,” *Phoenix* 40 (1986) 45–57.

ἄπτη: Touching to arouse, as often; cf. Pl. *Phdr.* 240d and 255e (cited above). It can also serve as a euphemism for intercourse itself; cf. Aisch. *Cho.* 71 θιγόντι, Ov. *Am.* 3.7.39 at *qualem vidi tantum tetigique puellam*. See further on 11.3.

πυκνὰ φιλεῖς: Cf. Aisch. fr. 135.2 ὃ δυσχάριστε τῶν πυκνῶν φιλήματων (*v.l.* πικρῶν; cf. Dawe, *Collations . . . of Aeschylus* [Cambridge 1964] 70, who lists several other passages where MSS alternate between these two words). Although adverbial πυκνά can serve as a synonym for πολλάκις, which has just appeared in this line, here, as in the Aischylos citation above, it probably refers to mouths pressed together hard and close; cf. *Il.* 12.454 πύλας εἴρυντο πύκα στιβαρῶς ἀραρυίας, Ov. *Am.* 3.7.9 *oscula luctantia*.

3 ταῦτα μὲν ἐστὶν ἐρώμενος: Here ordered into a reasonable erotic progression which would naturally end in sexual intercourse. Jacobs adduces Xenophon *Ephes.* 3.2.4 καὶ τὰ πρῶτά γε τοῦ ἔρωτος ὁδοιπορεῖ φιλήματα καὶ ψαύσματα καὶ πολλὰ παρ’ ἐμοῦ δάκρυα. Note the generic use of the attributive participle (which, being active, is more appropriate to men than women; cf. Gow-Page, *Salanitro* 498 n. 67) without the article, as often in prose and verse (cf. *Il.* 9.318, quoted on v. 4); *KG* 1.608 f.

ὅταν δ' εἶπω: “Whenever” throughout this one night; cf. 19.2. Not only do we have a rare spondaic fourth foot (Intro., p. 43), it is especially surprising after three dactyls, for whereas DDDDDS is among the commonest of metrical shapes ($\geq 12\times$ in Phil.), DDDSDS is one of the rarest (indeed, only here in Phil.). The result is a heaviness in these words which emphasizes the contrast with the preceding.

παράκειμαι: The entry in LSJ can lead one to conclude that this verb is used only of inanimate objects or abstractions in various metaphorical and technical senses; but the context makes it clear that the verb is here being used as a synonym for the more usual (συγ)κατάκειμαι and παρακλίνω; cf. Pl. *Symp.* 213b–c, where Alkibiades (shortly before the passage cited above on 2) first uses it of Sokrates in the sense “lie in wait” and then again as an erotic synonym for κατακλίνω: διεμηχανήσω ὅπως παρὰ τῷ καλλίστῳ [sc. Ἀγάθωνι] τῶν ἔνδον κατακείσῃ. For παρακλίνω in an erotic sense, cf. e.g. *AP* 5.2 (Anon.).

4 καὶ σὺ μένης: Emended by many (see below) and crucified in GP, the line has been defended by de Vries and Salanitro, who independently cite *Il.* 9.318 ἴση μοῖρα μένοντι καὶ εἰ μάλα τις πολεμίζοι and *Ap. Rh.* 4.856 (Thetis to Peleus:) μηκέτι νῦν ἀκταῖς Τυρσηνίσιν ἦσθε μένοντες, where the verb seems to mean “be/remain inactive.” (But in Homer it is very easy to understand μοῖραν = “death” as object.) Cf. also, with Salanitro, *Soph. El.* 958 ποῖ γὰρ μενεῖς ράθυμος, “remain indifferent.” Although none of these passages makes the same demands on the verb as found here, they are sufficiently close to defend (if not guarantee) its use in Phil. An interesting parallel may be found in *Aristoph. Peace* 341 (Trygaios explaining his idea of freedom to the chorus) πλεῖν μένειν, κινεῖν καθεύδειν κτλ, where the second pair is close to Phil. in sense (“screw or not,” i.e. sleep [alone]), but since πλεῖν may well have its usual erotic sense here (so Henderson, *Maculate Muse* 164), μένειν would have to assume the precise sense it has in Phil; cf. Toup’s conjecture, below.

Salanitro also adduces passages in Latin poetry where the woman expresses impatience with her lover, but the uses of *remorari*, etc. in these lines are not quite parallel, because none applies to the inactivity of the *segnis amator*, who (note the present general condition) has disappointed her more than once. The indicative of P probably resulted from its position so soon after παράκειμαι καί. Lumb would understand the word as a wrestling term, “can you last out a bout?” (cf. *Mart.* 14.201, cited below).

Let me keep the apparatus relatively clean by listing here, in what I consider to be a descending order of probability, the various emendations suggestions for these words and the next: κ. τί μένεις; ἀπλῶς tent. Stadtmüller (looked on with favor by Gow-Page); κ. σὺ, μανείς, ἄ. (my suggestion; cf. *Ov. Am.* 3.7.77 *male sane*, *Soph. Aias* 726 τοῦ μανέντος; for apodotic καί, cf. *Od.* 13.79, etc., Denniston, *GP* 308); “κ. σὺ μένεις ἄλλως” Jacobs (1794); κ. μέλλης, ἄ. Paton; κ. σὺ μένεις—ἀπλῶς Jacobs (1813); “κ. σὺ μ' ἔχεις,” ἄ. Meineke; κ. σὺ μ' ἔχης, ἄ. Schmidt (but this verb would destroy the contrast of v. 4); κ. σὺ μένεις ἄπλους Toup (cf. *Ov. AA* 2.721 ff., esp. 725 *velis maioribus usus*); κ. σὺ μένεις ἀπτῶς Huschke (cf. *Mart.* 14.201 *et didicit melius* τὴν ἐπικλινοπάλην); κᾶν σὺ μανῆς, ἄ. Pikkolos. κάσθμαίνης ἄ. Kaibel.

ἀπλῶς: “Simply,” i.e., the actions of vv. 1–2 count as nothing when it comes to defining the Lover if he can’t produce the final action. Cf. *Phil. De Ira* col.28.26f. (someone enslaved by anger cannot be a good juryman, Council member, ecclesiast,

archon) οὐδ' ἄνθρωπος ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν. Common in Plato and Aristotle, where, as Bonitz says, ἄ. λέγεσθαι κτλ is opposed to διχῶς, πλεοναχῶς λέγεσθαι (*Index. Arist.* 76b39).

 26

καὶ νυκτὸς μεσάτης τὸν ἔμὸν κλέψασα σύνευνον
 ἦλθον καὶ πυκινῇ τεγγομένη ψακάδι·
 τούνεκ' ἐν ἀπρήκτοισι καθήμεθα, κούχι λαλεῦντες
 εὔδομεν ὡς εὔδειν τοῖς φιλέουσι θέμις;

AP 5.120 [7 GP, K 17]

P Φιλοδήμου Π viii. 9 καινυκτομεεσ ατης caret Pl [J] εις την εαντου μοιχαλιδα
 νυκτὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐλθοῦσαν

1 ἔμὸν P: ἔόν Ap.L, Leiden B.P.G. 34B, Cr 2 πυκινῇ P: πυκνή Ap.L 3 ἐν P: ἐπ'
 Hecker ἀπρήκτοισι P: εὐπρήκτοισι Ap.L λαλεῦντες] v. comm. 4 εὔδομεν ὡς εὔδειν
 P: ἔρδομεν ὡς ἔρδειν Boissonade φιλέουσι P: στυγέουσι Jacobs

I came having stolen away from my husband in the middle of the night,
 and having gotten wet into the bargain in a driving rain.
 Was it for this that we (now) sit doing nothing, and talking we do not go
 to bed as lovers should?

Hecker 47 f.
 Lumb 12.

Another epigram narrated by a woman complaining about her disappointing lover;
 cf. 19 and 25. Normally it is the man who complains, often in paraklausithyra, of
 being rainsoaked; cf. Asklepiades 14, 42 HE (AP 5.167, 189).

1 νυκτὸς μεσάτης: Although the adj. is common enough in poetry, it is rarely
 applied to temporal nouns; before Phil. only Theogn. 998 (ἦμαρ), afterwards only
 Orpian *Hal.* 5.115 (night), *Orphic Argonautica* 536 (night), 649 (dawn).

κλέψασα: Most exx. of this verb in the sense “cozen, cheat” (LSJ s.v. II) have
 νοῦν or φρένα as object, but cf. Pindar *P.* 3.29 κλέπτει νιν, and *Il.* 1.132, where με
 is easily supplied from context.

2 πυκινῇ . . . ψακάδι: Cf. Soph. fr. 636 P–R:

φεῦ φεῦ, τί τούτου χάρμα μεῖζον ἄν λάβοις
 τοῦ γῆς ἐπιψαύσαντα κᾶθ' ὑπὸ στέγη
 πυκνής ἀκοῦσαι ψακάδος εὐδοῦση φρενί;

Since this thought, admittedly a commonplace (cf. Pearson and Radt ad loc.), is best known to us from Lucr. 2, proem (*suave, mari magno etc.*), it is possible that the Sophokles passage was known to Phil. from Epicurean sources rather than from his own readings in Greek literature. (Ap. Rh. 2.1083–1087 imitated Sophokles; note especially 1083 πυκινὴν . . . χαλάζαν.)

3 τούνεκα: Looking backwards and used ironically; otherwise no sense can be made of the woman's complaint (Gow-Page). For the accent, cf. West on Hes. *Tb.* 88.

ἐν ἀπρήκτοισι καθήμεθα: Jacobs (1794) correctly discerned the erotic import of this and the following phrases (although he unnecessarily questioned the soundness of the text). Gow-Page (following Jacobs) are right to take the prepositional phrase as = ἐν ἀπραξίᾳ, rather than Kaibel's *in otiosorum numero*. Cf. D.L. 4.7 (Phryne, failing to seduce Xenokrates) ἀπρακτον ἀναστήναι; LSJ s.v. κάθημαι 3, Ov. *Am.* 3.7.15 *truncus iners iacui*. Note also AP 12.240.3 (Strato) ὄρχεις δ' ἄπρηκτοι (cited in full at 19, intro.).

οὐχὶ λαλεῦντες: Are both participle and finite verb negated, as Gow-Page argue, adducing Aisch. *Ag.* 290f., Thuc. 6.33.1, Soph. fr. 88.8? It is true that λαλεῖν occurs a total of seven times in Phil., always in generally erotic contexts, so that words (of love) could be regarded by this woman as important as the lovemaking itself. On the other hand, talking in itself is no substitute for lovemaking, and could be thought of as part of "sitting and doing nothing." In support of this, Waltz compares 25, also spoken to a *segnis amator*; in particular ἐλεεινὰ λαλεῖς, . . . οὐδὲν ἐρῶντος ἔχεις. On balance, I favor Waltz's view: (i) The rarity of epigrams spoken in the persona of a woman suggests that 25 and 26 were intended as companion pieces. (ii) A participle can be excluded from an initial negation of A. C. Moorhouse, *Studies in the Greek Negatives* (Cardiff 1959) 107 f., Fraenkel on Aisch. *Ag.* 1312. And in this case, the meaning would be even clearer for an audience if they already heard either 25 or another, nonextant, variation on this theme.

Kaibel, Gow-Page, and Waltz deserve credit for making sense of the text as transmitted. The irony of the woman's question and the erotic import of λαλεῦντες and εὔδομεν, εὔδειν have been lost on earlier editors, who make various emendations. χαλῶντες (Lumb), καμώντες (Dübner), τελεῦντες (Stadtmüller), φιλεῦντες (Herwerden).

4 εὔδομεν ὡς εὔδειν: A common euphemism; cf. *Od.* 8.313 καθεύδεται ἐν φιλότῃ. (Sappho 168B.4 Voigt, ἔγω δὲ μόνα κατεύδω, which uses the verb in the basic sense, gains in poignancy because μόνα makes one think of what "sleeping with someone" means.)

φιλέουσι: The text is sound: They deserve the description "lovers," because they have gone to bed together in the past. Once again, Phil. plays upon the way lovers use language. The various attempts of the editors here and above simply make explicit what Phil. keeps colloquially euphemistic.

αὔριον εἰς λιτὴν σε καλιάδα, φίλτατε Πείσων,
 ἐξ ἐνάτης ἔλκει μουσοφιλῆς ἔταρος
 εἰκάδα δειπνίζων ἐνιαύσιον· εἰ δ' ἀπολείψεις
 οὔθατα καὶ Βρομίου Χιογενῆ πρόποσιν,
 ἀλλ' ἑτάρους ὄψει παναληθέας, ἀλλ' ἐπακούση 5
 Φαιήκων γαίης πολὺν μελιχρότερα.
 ἦν δέ ποτε στρέψης καὶ ἐς ἡμέας ὄμματα, Πείσων,
 ἄξομεν ἐκ λιτῆς εἰκάδα πιωτέραν.

AP 11.44 [23 GP, 22 K, 18 G]

P Φιλοδήμου Π iv.4 αυριονεισλειτηνδε caret Pl

1 σε P: δέ Π 2 ἔταρος Salm.: ἔταρις P 3 ἐνιαύσιον] ἐπιμήνιος tent. Schmid ἀπολείψεις
 Brunck: -ψης P 6 πολὺ P^{pc}: πολὺ P^{ac}

Tomorrow, friend Piso, your musical comrade drags you to his modest digs
 at three in the afternoon,
 feeding you at your annual visit to the Twentieth. If you will miss udders
 and Bromian wine *mis en bouteilles* in Chios,
 yet you will see faithful comrades, yet you will hear things far sweeter than
 the land of the Phaeacians.
 And if you ever turn an eye to us too, Piso, instead of a modest feast we
 shall lead a richer one.

Braga, *Catullo e i poeti greci* (Messina 1950) 195–199.

Chardon de la Rochette, “Deux épigrammes,” 200–209.

Clay, “The cults of Epicurus,” *CErc* 16 (1986) 11–28.

Dettmer, “Catullus 13: A nose is just a nose,” *Syllecta Classica* 1 (1989) 75–85.

Edmunds, *AJP* 103 (1982) 184–188.

Geffcken 341.

Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy* 79–90.

Hiltbrunner, “Einladung zum epikureischen Freundesmahlg,” in *Antidosis: Festschrift W. Kraus*
 (Wien 1972) 168–182.

Landolfi, *CErc* 12 (1982) 137–143.

Marcovich, *QUCC* 40 (1982) 131–8; repr. in *Stud. in Gk. Poetry* 193–199.

Schulze *BPhW* 36 (1916) 318.

Snyder *CJ* 68 (1973) 350 f.

Williams, *Tradition and Originality* (Oxford 1968) 125 f.

In a poem sent on the nineteenth of an unknown month (but quite likely not Gamelion; see below on 3 εἰκάδα), Phil. invites Piso to attend on the next day the celebration in honor of Epicurus (and some other early Epicureans) known as the Twentieth (ἡ εἰκάς). The evidence for this festivity has been gathered, translated,

and analyzed by Clay; the “test.” numbers appended to ancient sources below are those of his testimonia, where they can be conveniently consulted. Clay’s central text (P.Herc. 1232 fr. 8 col. 1 = test. 16) is a section from Phil.’s *On Epicurus* which discusses Epicurus’ own invitation to attend a feast. Several points of contact between Phil.’s prose discussion and his poem will be given below in the appropriate lemmata, but Clay’s translation of this important fragment should be given in full to provide what context there is: “. . . as concerns those who experience turmoil and difficulty in their conceptions of natures that are best and most blessed. [But Epicurus says] that he invites these very people to join in a feast, just as he invites others—all those who are members of his household and he asks them to exclude none of the ‘outsiders’ who are well disposed both to him and to his friends. In doing this [he says], they will not be engaged in gathering the masses, something which is a form of meaningless ‘demagoguery’ and unworthy of the natural philosopher; rather, in practicing what is congenial to their nature, they will remember all those who are well disposed to us so that they can join on their blessed day (?) in making the sacred offerings that are fitting to . . . Of the friends . . .”

Phil. *De Pietate* 812–819 Obbink (which now replaces test. 17) also refers to an invitation to an Epicurean dinner; see below, on 1 λιτήν. If the invitation to an Epicurean celebration appears even these few times in the fragmentary papyri from Herculaneum, we may imagine that it showed up far more often in the lost writings of the various Gardens. There may be no need, therefore, to search earlier Greek literature for the origins of the poetic invitation, as Edmunds 187 f. ably argues. But rather than reflecting “a Roman social convention” (Edmunds), it probably derives, at least primarily, from Epicurean conventions and concerns. And as I suggest in the introduction to 28, Greek invitation poems can take other forms. That this poem would give rise to a minigenre in Latin never entered Phil.’s mind; cf. E. Gowers, *The Loaded Table: Representations of Food in Roman Literature* (Oxford 1993), ch. 4, “Invitation poems”; Cat. 13 (which for all we know may have preceded 27); Hor. *O.* 1.20 (to his patron Maecenas), 4.12, *Epist.* 1.5 (to celebrate Augustus’ birthday; on Horace’s invitation poems, cf. Tait 68–70); Mart. 5.78, 10.48, 11.52; Juvenal 11.56–76. (Phil.’s poem does not qualify as a birthday poem, for which now see K. Burkhard, *Das antike Geburtstagsgedicht* [Zurich 1991].)

1 αὔριον: Epicureans should not live for tomorrow; more precisely they should live each day as though it were their last (bearing in mind that death is nothing to us); cf. ὁ τῆς αὔριον ἥκιστα δεόμενος ἥδιστα πρόσεισι πρὸς τὴν αὔριον (fr. 490 U = 215 Arr), σὺ δὲ οὐκ ὦν τῆς αὔριον κύριος ἀναβάλλη τὸ χαῖρον (*VS* 14). Phil. alludes to this doctrine in *De Morte* IV col. 37.26 f.: ἄδ[ηλόν] ἐ[στι]ν οὐ τὸ αὐ[ρι]ον μόν[ο]ν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ αὐτίκα δῆ; cf. M. Gigante, *RF²* 181 (text), 193 f. (commentary, with parallels from non-Epicurean literature). Phil. may intentionally be disarming Piso with this un-Epicurean note by ironically looking ahead with lavish promises to an event which includes Epicurean instruction. For αὔριον + pres., see below on 2 ἔλκει.

λιτήν: Simplicity and frugality are Epicurean virtues: cf. Ep. *Ep.* 3.130 οἱ τε λιτοὶ χυλοὶ ἴσην πολυτελεῖ διαίτη τὴν ἡδονὴν ἐπιφέρουσιν. Phil. urges λιτήν καὶ προστυχ[οῦσ]αν ταφήν (*De Morte* IV, col. 30.10 f.) and contrasts δι[αί]της

πολυτε[λοῦς] τε καὶ λ[ι]τῆς (*Oec.* 38.7 f.); see further Hiltbrunner 169 f.; Gigante 82 f. The frequent contrast in Epicurean literature between λιτός and πολυτελής would seem to make all the more pointed Karneades' mocking of Epicurus for supposedly asking the rhetorical question πόσας εἰκάδας ἐδείπνησα πολυτελέστατα; (*Plut. Non Posse* 4.1089c = test. 21). Yet the Epicureans in fact may well have praised the lavishness of their own celebrations; two fragmentary papyri making mention of Epicurean cult and feast use the word reasonably restored in both places as forms of ἐπιλαμπρύνειν (*P.Herc.* 176 Fr. 5 XVII 1–7 = test. 15, referring to the cult of Pythokles; *Phil. De Piet.* col. 29 Obbink = test. 17). Perhaps, then, Phil.'s reference to the frugality of the next day's celebration is ironical; cf. *Hor. O.* 1.20.1 *vile potabis modicis Sabinum | cantharis*, *Epist.* 1.5.1–5, *Mart.* 11.52.

οε: Some otherwise unaccountable ink suggests that the scribe of Π tried to correct his error (Parsons).

καλιάδα: “A depreciatory term, not necessarily to be taken at face-value” (Gow-Page ad loc.); that is, presumably, Phil. self-effacingly calls his home a hut, which fits well with the adj. “humble”; cf. Vergil's referring to the house he inherited from Siro as a *villula* (*Catal.* 8.1; Hiltbrunner 169); *Cic. De Fin.* 1.65 *Epicurus una in domo, et ea quidem angusta, quam magnos quantaque amoris conspiratione consentientes tenuit amicorum greges! quod fit nunc ab Epicureis*.

But the word also can mean “shrine” or “chapel” (*IG* 2².1533.5 [iv c. B.C.], *D.H.* 3.70.2, *Plu. Num.* 8.8, etc.; so also the related καλιά, *Krinagoras* 43 GP [*AP* 6.253.3] Πανός . . . καλίη), a sense equally appropriate to a poem in which a friend of the Muses invites Piso to a near-religious occasion.

Where is this καλιάς? Gigante 79, who thinks that Phil. lived in the Villa dei Papiri, argues for Rome, but Herculaneum or environs seems more likely; see below on 3 ἐνιαύσιον. The fact that Phil.'s library was found in the Villa dei Papiri does little to prove that Phil. ever lived there. Philippson *RE* 19.2945 and Hiltbrunner 169 suggest that Phil.'s house was given to him by Piso, but if so would the poet have used such depreciatory language in describing it to the donor?

φιλάτε: One invited to a simple dinner may appropriately be called friend; cf. *Hor. O.* 1.20.5 *care Maecenas*. Since the dinner, furthermore, is in celebration of Epicurus, whose company regarded themselves bound by a special bond of φιλία, the word easily picks up this sense as well. And since Phil. is here addressing a Roman who will be asked to grant Phil. favors (at first, no more than his presence), the bond between *patronus* and *cliens* known euphemistically to the Romans as *amicitia* is also evoked. Cf. Lucretius' words to Memmius: *tua . . . sperata voluptas | suavis amicitiae* (1.140 f.).

On Epicurean friendship, cf. *Cic. De Fin.* 1.20.65 (Epic. fr. 539 U) *de amicitia . . . Epicurus quidem ita dicit, omnium rerum quas ad beate vivendum sapientia comparaverit nihil esse maius amicitia, nihil uberius, nihil iucundius*; frr. 540–546; Rist, *Epicurus* (Cambridge 1972) 127–139; B. Gemelli, “L'amicizia in Epicuro,” *Sandalion* 1 (1978) 59–72; P. Mitsis, “Epicurus on friendship and altruism,” *OSAP* 5 (1987) 127–153.

On *amicitia* and Roman patronage, and on Piso as Phil.'s patron, see Intro., pp. 5, 14; P. White, “*Amicitia* and the profession of poetry in early imperial Rome,” *JRS* 68 (1978) 74–92; R. Saller, “Patronage and friendship in early impe-

rial Rome,” in A. Wallace-Hadrill (ed.), *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London 1989) 49–62.

Πείσων: This spelling of the Latin name Piso owes nothing to iotacism, but is rather the standard absorption of the name to a preexisting Greek name built on the stem *πειθ-*; cf., e.g., Πείσων the son of Πείσανδρος (LGPN 1 s.v.). For more on the Latin name, which may be of Etruscan origin, cf. W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, (Abh. d. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss., ph.–hist. Kl.² 5 (Berlin 1904) 209–211. For the vocative form Πείσων, cf. comm. ad 38.7.

2 ἐνάτης: Sc. ὄρας; cf. Poseidippos 10 HE (AP 5.183.6) ὄρας γὰρ πέμπτης πάντες ἄθροιζόμεθα. The festivities begin ca. 3 p.m., the usual hour; cf. Hor. *Ep.* 1.7.71 *post nonam venties*. The dinner in 28 begins an hour later.

ἔλκει: A futuristic present, most often found in the company of a word indicating the specific, and usually not too distant, future time; cf. P.Ryl. 233.7 (ii A.D.) αὔριον στεγάζεται, “it is (to be) roofed tomorrow”; other epistolary exx. of αὔριον + pres. are P.Fuad I Univ. 31.r.12 f., P.Mil.Vogl. 50.4, 50.10, P.Oxy. 1931.7, 3758.120. Cf. Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* 2.273; B. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri* (Athens 1973) 215(a). The Latin invitation poems use the future (*cenabis bene/belle, potabis, etc.*); cf. Nisbet-Hubbard ad Hor. *O.* 1.20.1. The verb, used for dragging dead bodies on the battlefield (*Il.* 13.383 etc.) and for hauling reluctant people into court (Aristoph. *Nu.* 1218 etc.) or elsewhere (cf. 15.5), must presumably here be understood not so much as referring to great reluctance on Piso’s part but rather as an oblique allusion to the humbleness of Phil.’s home, which, Phil. suggests, would not be entered readily by someone of Piso’s standing. The equivalent of ἔλκει . . . δειπνίζω in test. 16 is [κα]λεῖν εὐωχ[εῖσ]θαι; in *De Pietate* 818–819 καλέσαν[τα πάντ]ας εὐωχῆσαι. Cf. Alkaios 368 κέλομαί τινα τὸν χαρίεντα Μένωνα κάλεσαι, | αἰ χρῆ συμποσίας ἐπόνασιν ἔμοιγε γένεσθαι.

μουσοφιλῆς: “Musical,” i.e., a poet; an especially Hellenistic notion derived from Hes. *Tb.* 96 f. ὁ δ’ ὄλβιος, ὄντινα Μοῦσαι | φιλωνται· γλυκερή οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδῆ. Cf. Kallim. *Ait.* 1.2 οἱ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι, 37–8 Μοῦσαι γὰρ ὄσους ἴδον ὄθματι παῖδας | μὴ λοξῶ, πολλοὺς οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους, Theokr. 1.141 τὸν Μοῖσαις φίλον ἄνδρα (Daphnis), 7.95 φίλος ἔπλεο Μοῖσαις (Lykidas), 11.6 πεφιλημένον ἔξοχα Μοῖσαις (Nikias), Meleager 1 (AP 4.1.1) Μοῦσα φίλα, Nossis 11 HE (AP 7.718.3; text uncertain).

Phil.’s word, a hapax, is probably passive, “dear to, i.e. loved by, the Muses,” as with the similarly formed θεοφιλῆς (Hiltbrunner 171), which develops an active sense only in late authors (Philo, Lucian). Note, though, the active γυναικοφιλῆς (Polyzelos 11 K-A, Theokr. 8.60 and δημοφιλῆς, which, according to Σ Aristoph. *Pl.* 550 = φιλόδημος. But since φίλια is a reciprocal relationship, especially as one imagines one’s dealing with divinities, the passive almost entails the active. Cf. Phil. *De Dis* 3 col. 1–17f. καλείτω καὶ τοὺς σοφούς τῶν [θεῶν] φίλους καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν σοφῶν, “let him call wise men friends of the gods and the gods friends of the wise.” Thus, μουσοφιλῆς is prob. meant to combine the passive sense of Korinna’s μωσοφιλειτος and the active sense of φιλόμουσος, used by, among others, Phil. *De Musica* col. 1B.2 Neubecker (note also τοὺς φιλομουσοῦντες, “music lovers,” *ibid.* col. 22.12). In this Epicurean context (see above, on φίλιτατε) the word thus sug-

gests that Phil. identifies himself as someone who is both a poet and a Epicurean. More specifically, it obliquely suggests that among other entertainments at this celebration Phil. will recite some of his epigrams; see below on 5 ἑπακούση, 6 γαίης.

ἔταρος: The poetical equivalent to φίλος. Epicurus uses only the latter, Phil. the former perhaps only once (*Pragm.* col. 25.14 Diano). That this is the word used repeatedly for Odysseus' companions may not be irrelevant.

3 εἰκάδα: Epicurus stipulated in his will that money be allocated from his estate for (i) sacrificial offerings to himself (as well as to his father, mother, and brothers), to be made every year on the προτέρα δεκάτη of the month of Gamelion, a day already celebrated within the school in his lifetime; and for (ii) the continuance of the customary meetings held on the εἰκάς of every month, in which those who agree with his philosophy are to commemorate both himself and Metrodorus (D.L. 10.18 = test. 1, 2). (Cf. the festival to Theseus held on 8 Pyanepsion and the lesser sacrifices in his honor on the 8th of every other month; Plut. *Tib.* 36.) This relationship between his birthday and the celebrations on the 20th was badly misunderstood until quite recently, because it was thought, first, that Epicurus was born on 7 Gamelion, and then that his birthday celebration was to be held on the tenth of this month. In an important note, however, D. M. Lewis, *CR*, n.s. 19 (1969) 271 f., showed that ἑβδομή (nom.), given as the date of his birth at D.L. 10.14 may well be nothing more than a intrusive gloss identifying Gamelion as the seventh month of the Athenian year; and, second, that the term προτέρα δεκάτη unambiguously refers to the twentieth day of a month rather than, as had been universally assumed by students of Epicurus, the tenth (on this form of dating cf. further B. D. Meritt, *Athenian Year* [Berkeley 1961] 46 n.6; *TAPA* 95 [1964] 208 n.27). Thus earlier confusion (cf. Gow-Page ad loc. e.g. for a typical statement of the problem of the various dates—7th, 10th, and 20th—as it was then known) resolves itself: Epicurus' birthday, its celebration, and the monthly Epicurean gathering all occur on the twentieth. See also K. Alpers, "Epikurs Geburtstag," *MH* 25 (1968), 48–51, who reaches the same conclusion as Lewis.

It is important to note further that during the month of Gamelion the sacrificial offerings, presumably held at some suitable outdoors site, were considered distinct from the regular monthly meeting, although they may well have been considered the most important of the monthly meetings, if only because of the consumption by the celebrants of the sacrificial offerings; cf. Clay 18 f. That the two events were kept separate seems clear both from Cicero's close translation of Epicurus' will (*Fin.* 2.101 = test. 4), which continues to treat annual birthday celebration and monthly meeting as distinct events; and from Pliny, *NH* 35.5 = test. 10 *natali eius sacrificant, feriasque omni mense vicesima luna custodiunt, quas εἰκάδας vocant*. Note also Menippus, who wrote Γοναὶ Ἐπικούρου καὶ αἱ θρησκευόμεναι ὑπ' αὐτῶν εἰκάδες (D.L. 6.101 = test. 3), which, whether one work or two, argues for funeral rites apart from the monthly celebration. (One work: Wachsmuth, *Sillographi* (Leipzig 1885) 82 n.1. Two works: Clay; Paton [D.L. Loeb].)

In *Epist.* 1.5 Horace invites a friend to a meal in honor of Augustus' birthday: *9 cras nato Caesare festus*.

δειπνίζων: This verb almost always has a personal object—"to feed (someone) dinner"—and when, only rarely, it is used absolutely, the sense remains "to feed"; cf. e.g. Plut. *Mor.* 823e δειπνίζει Λίχας. It never means "to celebrate." Here the σε of v.1 is the object of both main verb and participle, as often; it is (see above) further modified by ἐνιαύσιον. This is missed in such translations as "giving a dinner for the anniversary of the Twentieth" (Gow-Page) and "er feiert das jährliche Festmahl des Zwanzigsten" (Hiltbrunner). Εικάδα, here = "feast of the Twentieth" (*ferias . . . quas εικάδες vocant*, Pliny *NH* 35.5), serves as an internal object, for which cf. Plut. 1089c (quoted above, on 1 λιτήν, where note that ἐδείπνησεν is intransitive), Matron (iv c. B.C.), *Conv. Attic.* 2 ἄ [sc. δειπνα] . . . δειπνισεν ἡμᾶς.

One expects a future participle, as in Aristoph. *Clouds* 1218 ἔλκω σε κλητεύσοντα; a futuristic present participle dependent upon an already futuristic present finite form (see on ἔλκει) is unusual; cf. M. Sánchez Ruipérez, *Estructura del sistema de aspectos y tiempos del verbo griego antiguo* (Salamanca 1954) 92 f.: "la imaginación presenta como actual un contenido verbal aún perteneciente al futuro."

ἐνιαύσιον: This is universally understood to modify εικάδα, although "annual twentieth" produces no immediate sense. The idea that the phrase could signal that Twentieth which also celebrates Epicurus' birthday cannot be right, since, as has just been shown, the two occasions were kept distinct. Gow-Page desperately and with little enthusiasm offer the suggestion that these words might mean "yearlong (not 'annual') Twentieth," i.e. the twentieth of each month which is celebrated throughout the year. The problem is resolved when we realize that in poetry (Alkaios 130.35, Ion 19 F 21, Eur. *Hipp.* 37), as in many prose authors (Herodotos, Hippokrates, Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon et al.), ἐνιαύσιος is an adjective of three terminations. [For exx. of two-termination ἐνιαύσιος, cf. W. Kastner, *Die gr. Adjektive zweier Endungen auf- ΟΣ* (Heidelberg 1967) 88.] And since (see previous lemma) δειπνίζω always takes a personal object, the adjective would be understood to modify Piso, in the way that Greek temporal adjectives such as ἐσπέριος (15.2) often do. Cf. Hom. *Epig.* 15.10 (the *Eiresione*) νεῦμαί τοι, νεῦμαι ἐνιαύσιος, ὥστε χελιδὼν κτλ. If this analysis, which makes better morphological sense, and which makes no strange demands upon meaning, is accepted, Phil. would be addressing Piso at a time when the latter came to celebrate a Twentieth only once a year: "Philodemus invites you to *your* annual visit," exactly the same sense this adj. has in the *Eiresione*. Whether this is a special celebration, to which many "outsiders" (as presumably Piso is at this point; cf. test. 16 cited above) are invited (here we can consider the possibility of the εικός occurring in Gamelion), or whether it is a date designed to suit Piso's schedule (such as during a regularly scheduled visit to Naples) cannot be determined.

The possibility should also be considered that ἐνιαύσιος is designed to recall the situation of the *Eiresione* (see above), in which the beggar makes his annual call to the house of the rich (δῶμα προσετραπόμεσθ' ἄνδρὸς μέγα δυναμενοῖο, | . . . Πλοῦτος γὰρ ἔσεισι | πολλός . . . καὶ Εὐφροσύνη τεθαλυῖα | Εἰρήνη τ' ἀγαθή). Here in a playful reversal it is the wealthy man who reluctantly (see above, on ἔλκει)

comes to house of the poor, and who will, again in a reversal of the sense found in the *Eiresione*, bring at least the promise of future wealth along with him. On begging songs in general, cf. W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* 101 f.; Frazer, *Golden Bough* (3d. ed.) 8.317 ff.; M. Nilsson, *Ges. d. gr. Rel.* 1.124. W. Schmid's conjecture is obviously unnecessary ("Epikur," *RLAC* 5 [1962] 749 f. = *Ausg. Philol. Schr.* [Berlin 1984] 208).

4 οὔθατα: Sow's udders could be boiled and then grilled, and could be stuffed before cooking (Apicius 7.2). According to Galen they were most appreciated when full of milk (*De rebus boni malique suci* 6.774 f. K.; Plut. *De esu carn.* 997a gives the disgusting steps taken to attain this gourmet's delight.) Since they were expensive, they would be out of place at Phil.'s simple table; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 124f ἄτοπόν ἐστὶ πρᾶγματος σπανίου καὶ πολυτελοῦς μὴ ἀπολαῦσαι, παρόντος οἶον οὔθατος κτλ. Martial 11.52.13 also lists *sumen* among the delicacies that will not be served at a meal. Furthermore, since Greeks were far less fond of them than Romans (cf. Athen. 9.399c = 14.656e), there may be a touch of humor in this remark, much as if one were to invite a French friend to dinner with an apology for not offering snails. Cf. Chardon 204–206.

Χιογενῆ: Epicurus himself is said by Carneades to have boasted of his consumption of Thasian wine (Plut. *Non Posse* 1089c = Epic. fr. 436 U = test. 21). Generally Chian wine was most highly praised (see on 6.1 f.), but Euboulos fr. 121 K-A Θάσιον ἢ Χιον λαβῶν ἢ Λέσβιον γέροντα νεκταροσταγῆ suggests that when old there would be little to choose between them.

Derived from the noun Χίος are Χίος (< Χῆ-τος; cf. Eustath. ad *Il.* 1.35), Χτᾶζω (< Χτ-ιάζω; cf. Λεσβ-ιάζω), and Χτουργῆς ("made by Χιοι"; cf. Μιλησιουργῆς). The artificial lengthening of Χιογενῆς is either by false analogy with the preceding words in Χτ- or an example of the common epic lengthening of the first of three shorts to have the word fit the meter. Δτιογενῆς is a close parallel; cf. W. Schulze, *Questiones Epicae* (Gütersloh 1892) 8, 140–179.

πρόποσιν: Not simply "drink" (Gow-Page), but the vinous toasts and pledges made after dinner and before the symposium (Latin *praebibere, propino*); cf. Athen. 675b παρὰ δεῖπνον, W. Heraeus, "Προπεῖν," *RM* 70 (1915) 1–41; repr. in *KS* (Heidelberg 1937) 190–226; esp. 217. Gigante 83 compares Hedylos 2 HE (*AP* 5.199.1) οἶνος καὶ προπόσεις.

5 ἄλλ' . . . ἄλλ': Ἄλλά is apodotic after a (usually negated) protasis; Denniston, *GP* 11–13: "even though . . . still." The anaphoric second ἄλλά clause produces a vivid exegesis of the first; cf. Hdt. 7.11.2 εἰ ἡμεῖς ἡσυχίαν ἄξομεν, ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐκεῖνοι [sc. οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι διάξουσιν ἢ.], ἄλλὰ μάλα καὶ μάλα στρατεύσονται. Cf. Cat. 13.9 *sed contra accipies meros amores*.

παναληθέας: "Altogether true"; cf. Pl. *Rep.* 583b παναληθῆς ἡδονή, Hor. *Epist.* 1.5.24 *fidus inter amicos*.

ἐπακούση: Recitations during dinner were standard (cf. Kay on Mart. 11.52.16), but what in fact will Piso hear (and see, apart from true comrades) at this Epicurean party? Since Phil. does not write purely ornamental epithets,

μουσοφιλήs suggests some sort of literary activity, as does the reference to the Phaeacians (see below). *Eikades* generally may have been more prosaic affairs, the participants parading about with images of Epicurus (Pliny *NH* 35.5 = test. 5) and reciting long passages (μυριάδες στίχων) on the virtues of Epicurus, Metrodoros, Aristoboulos, and Chairedemos (Plut. *Life Unknown* 3.1129a = test. 20); cf. Clay and M. Capasso, *Carneisco: Il secondo libro del "Filista"* (*P.Herc.* 1027) (Naples 1988) 37–53. But Cicero's hostile references to these gatherings, however much they have to be tempered, would seem to suggest that in Piso's Rome and Naples Epicureans did more than simply praise their predecessors: *Quid ego illorum dierum epulas, quid laetitiam et gratulationem tuam, quid cum tuis sordidissimis gregibus intemperatissimas perpotiones praedicem?* (*In Pis.* 22); *omnia cenarum genera conviviorumque* (ibid. 70, the Phil. passage).

6 Φαιήκων: Mention of the Phaeacians recalls Odysseus' stay in Scheria, and perhaps in particular his praise of good poets. Phil., that is, is here obliquely comparing himself both to Demodokos, who received extra meat for his singing, and to Odysseus, who received additional gifts for his account (compared to that of a bard by Alkinoos; 11.367 f.). Piso will no doubt get the hint. In addition, the Phaeacians were famous in later literature for their luxurious lives and more particularly for their feasts—S.Eitrem, "Phaiaken," *RE* 19 (1938) 1532 f.—cf. Horace, *Epist.* 1.15.22–24:

tractus uter pluris lepores, uter educet apros;
 ultra magis piscis et echinos aequora celent,
 pinguis ut inde domum possim Phaeaxque reverti.

Epicurus himself was called ὁ δὲ Φαίαξ φιλόσοφος ὁ τῆς ἡδονῆς (Herakleitos *Alleg. Hom.* 75 = Epic. fr. 229 U). See further E. Asmis, "Philodemus' poetic theory and *On the Good King according to Homer*," *CSCA* 10 (1991) 1–45; M. Jufresa, "Il mito dei Feaci in Filodemo," *La regione sotterrata dal Vesuvio: studi e prospettive. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, 11–15 novembre 1979* (Naples 1982) 509–518.

γαίης: A compendious comparison (KG 2.310 f.) standing either for (i) ἢ ἢ Φαιήκων γῆ, "you will hear things sweeter than the Phaeacians heard" (Gow-Page, Hiltbrunner; better would be ἢ τῶν ἐν τῇ Φαιάκων γῆ ἀκουσθέντων), or (ii) ἢ τὰ κατὰ τὴν Φ. γῆν, "you will hear sweeter tales than those told about the Phaeacians" (Kaibel). Cf. Soph. *Pb.* 680 ff. ἄλλον δ' οὐτιν' ἔγωγε οἶδα . . . μοῖρα τοῦδ' ἐχθίονι συντυχόντα, where τοῦδε grammatically can = either ἢ τῇ τοῦδε or (the case here) ἢ τόνδε. Sense (i) may well be primary, with Phil. thus comparing himself to Odysseus and Demodokos, both of whom sang to the Phaeacians (see previous lemma); but sense (ii) need not be absent, which would also have Phil. comparing himself to the poet Homer, who sang *of* the Phaeacians, and hence of the things Epicureans valued. If Phil. were to recite epigrams, both senses would be satisfied.

The comparison may owe something to Pl. *Rep.* 614b ἀλλ' οὐ μέντοι . . . Ἀλκίμου γε ἀπόλογον ἐρῶ, ἀλλ' ἀλκίμου μὲν ἀνδρός (sc. Er). Jufresa op. cit. 517

follows Aubretton (Budé) in seeing Piso as the Odysseus figure in this poem, since it is he who is to come as a guest of the Phaeacians, who, Jufresa 512 f. has shown, were used by Phil. in *Good King* as the model of a Utopian Epicurean community. (Cf. Juv. 11.61, an invitation to Persicus, *venies Tiryntius*, i.e., Herakles.)

7 ἦν δέ ποτε: This sentence seems to look beyond the next day's festivities (*contra* Gigante 85), although prob. not exclusively to the next event of this sort, as Kaibel thought. The thought here accords best with the view that Piso, a sympathetic "outsider" to the Epicurean community, is being asked to take a greater part in the future—in the community in general and perh. as a Phil.'s patron in particular.

στρέψης καὶ ἐς ἡμέας ὄμματα: Since an eye can be either friendly or hostile, it is often labeled one way or the other. (Aischylos offers several exx. of both types; cf. e.g. *Se.* 359 πικρόν, *Cho.* 810 f. ἰδεῖν φιλίους ὀ.) Cf. Meleager 108 (*AP* 12.159.5 f.):

ἦν μοι συννεφές ὄμμα βάλης ποτέ, χεῖμα δέδορκα,
ἦν δ' ἰλαρόν βλέψης, ἠδὺ τέθηλεν ἔαρ.

Although I can find no exact parallel for Phil.'s unmodified eye, perhaps we may compare Alkman 1.55 ποτιγλέποι Φίλυλλα [sc. με] and the adj. ἐπίστρεπτος, "admirable" (cf. Rose ad Aisch. *Cho.* 350). Perhaps Phil.'s phrase translates Lat. *respicio*, as would be appropriate when addressing a Roman; cf. Verg. *A.* 4.275 *Ascanium surgentem respice*, OLD s.v. 8a. Ἡμέας must be scanned a trisyllabic to avoid violating Nacke's Law; similarly 5 παναληθέας.

8 ἄξομεν: "Conduct, celebrate," as in P.Herc. 176 fr. 5 col. 27.15 f. = test. 14 τελ[ετή]ν ἄγειν and Phil. *De Piet.* 812–814 τ[α]ύτην ἄγειν (sc. τὴν ἑορτήν), and common enough elsewhere; LSJ s.v. IV 1.

ἐκ λιτῆς εἰκάδα πιωτέρην: For which thought Epicurus may be thought to provide justification: ἔστι καὶ ἐν λιτότητι μεθόριος (*VS* 63). For ἐκ = "after, as a change from," cf. Eur. *Or.* 279 ἐκ κυμάτων γὰρ αὐθις αὐ γαλήν' ὄρω.

κράμβην Ἀρτεμίδωρος, Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ τάριχον,
βολβίσκους δ' ἡμῖν δῶκεν Ἀθηναγόρας,
ἠπάτιον Φιλόδημος, Ἀπολλοφάνης δὲ δύο μνάς
χοιρείου, καὶ τρεῖς ἦσαν ἀπ' ἐχθρῆς ἔτι·
Χῖον καὶ στεφάνους καὶ σάμβαλα καὶ μύρον ἡμῖν 5
λάμβανε, παῖ· δεκάτης εὐθὺ θέλω παράγειν.

AP 11.35 [22 GP, 19 G]

P τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου] Π vii.17 κραμβηναρτεμι caret Pl

5 Χιον Page: ωίων P στεφάνους Reiske: στέφανος P 6 παῖ Meineke: καί P: τῆς Reiske

Artemidoros has given us cabbage, Aristarchos *baccalà*, Athenagoras spring onions,
Philodemos a small liver, and Apollophanes two pounds of pork (three are left from yesterday).
Slave, get us Chian wine, wreaths, sandals, and myrrh: I want to have them in at 4 P.M. sharp.

Cichorius, *Römische Studien* 297 f.
Gigante, *Philodemos in Italy* 59–61.
Giangrande, *QUCC* 15 (1973) 17–19.

Like 29, a poem listing the modest ingredients of a meal which would be appropriate for Epicureans, some of which occur in both poems. And once again friends are named, each of whom in good *eranos* fashion is expected to show up with his share of the meal. For other poetic preparations and anticipations of a meal, cf. 27, Asklepiades 25, 26 HE (AP 5.181, 185), Poseidippos 10 HE (5.183); A. Wifstrand, *Studien zur griechischen Anthologie* (Lund 1926) 63 f. for parallels from Greek and Roman comedy.

The poem contains the line “Phil. has given us a small liver,” which allows Gow-Page to entertain the possibility that the poem, written by another, was assigned to Phil. solely because his name is among the invited guests. But ἡμῖν can easily include Phil. (“for us all”), and Phil. refers to himself in the third person in the invitation to Piso, and perhaps also Π ii.12. Cf. Ephippos fr. 15.11 K-A (a master giving his slave a shopping list) πάντως κρέ' ἡμῖν ἔστι. Note that, in contrast with 27, Phil. here casts himself as an equal among equals.

If each of the (other) persons named received this poem from Phil. early in the morning, it could serve either as a reminder of an earlier invitation or, as I think more likely, as the invitation itself (Tait 68 so understands it). The instructions to the slave in the last distich would thus be essentially a fiction which provides the time of the meal. If so, we can expand the brief corpus of invitation poems to include those of this sort. Asklepiades 26 HE (AP 5.185) and Poseidippos 10 HE (AP 5.183) could similarly serve as reminders or invitations. Two prose invitations for the same day: P.Oxy. 1485 (ii/iii A.D.), 1486 (iii/iv A.D.). Perhaps Π v.23 τοῦς φέρε begins a similar poem. Π iv.3 ὠνησαι, vii.8 νῦν ὠψωνησαι, and vi.10 οἶνος καὶ ῥοδινοι could also have been invitation poems. On the συγκλητικὸν μέλος (Aelian VH 8.7, = *vocatio ad cenam*) as a genre, cf. F. Cairns, *Generic Composition in Greek and Latin Poetry* (Edinburgh 1972) 240–245.

Cicero thought that Epicureans spent too much time talking about food: (Epicurus) *ipse quam parvo est contentus! nemo de tenui victu plura dixit* (*Tusc.* 5.89 = fr. 472 U).

1 κράμβην: Cf. 29.2. Listing of the food to be enjoyed is a standard feature in invitation poems: Cat. 13, Mart. 5.78, 10.48, 11.52; Juv. 11.56–76.

Ἀρτεμίδωρος: The most attractive candidate remains the one identified by Cichorius 297: The orator A. of Knidos, son of Theopompos and friend of Julius Caesar, who as Piso's son-in-law provides a link, should one be needed, between Phil. and Artemidoros. Plut. *Caes.* 65.1 calls him Ἑλληνικῶν λόγων σοφιστής; “Artemidoros (28),” *RE* 2 (1896) 1330 f. [G. Hirschfeld, “C. Julius Theopompos of Cnidus,” *JHS* 7 (1886) 286–290, argues that Artemidoros was the father not the son of Theopompos.]

The guests are also named in one of Horace's invitation poems: *Epist.* 1.5.26 f. (Butra, Septicius, Sabinus).

τάριχον: Masc. or neut.; cf LSJ s.v. ad fin. Salted and dried fish, frequently mentioned in comedy, was an important part of the ancient diet; cf. R. I. Curtis, *Garum and Salsamenta* (Leiden 1991), esp. 6 f., 10 f., 16–19.

2 βολβίσκος: This diminutive only here. βόλβοι, the bulbous roots of various plants, usually grown wild, figure in the diet of the second stage of Sokrates' early state (*Rep.* 372c); see on 29.1 ἐρέβινθος. Reflecting the same attitude towards this food as Glaukon's, Herakles rejects βόλβοι, καυλοί, κτλ, preferring instead beef, a real man's food (Euboulos fr. 6 K-A) Cf. Philemon fr. 113 K-A αὐτὸς δ' (sc. βόλβος) ἐφ' αὐτοῦ ἔστιν πονηρὸς καὶ πικρὸς. Cf. Apicius 7.14. for recipes and Athen. 63d–64f for instances of its occurrence in Greek literature.

3 ἡπάτιον: Jacobs thought perhaps that of a goose (cf. Hor. *Sat.* 2.8.88 *ficis pastum iecur anseris albae*), but lamb, kid, hare, and pork were also eaten. Gigante 60 is probably right to say that a less luxurious liver than goose would be more appropriate for this Epicurean company.

Ἀπολλοφάνης: Identified by Cichorius as the freedman of Pompey who served as admiral and who went over to Octavian's side in 38 B.C.; “Apollophanes (10),” *RE* 2 (1896) 165. Cichorius argues not only that he would have lived in Rome after this (which is likely) but that this date therefore provides a *terminus post quem* for the poem's composition (which is unlikely). Gigante 60, however, doubts Cichorius' identifications of Artemidoros and Apollophanes, questioning whether the people who will share this meal with Phil. would be such a socially distinguished group. But if Piso could be invited to share in a simple Epicurean fare, could any Greek be too socially elevated to be invited?

4 χοιρείου: Humble fare, as when Eumaios tells Odysseus: ἔσθιε νῦν, ὦ ξεῖνε, τὰ τε δμῶεσσι πάρεσσι, | χοίρεα. (*Od.* 14.80 f.). Giangrande, however, reasons that since hetairai are regular features of Greek symposia, and hence figure in sympotic epigrams, this word must have its well known obscene meaning here. But if Phil. is inviting or reminding his guests of a meal set along Epicurean lines, they would not expect to find hetairai present (so Gigante). Furthermore, the sentence would

read very oddly with Giangrande's meaning. Pork, moreover, was standard fare; cf. Alkaios 71 φίλος μὲν ἦσθα κάπ' ἔριφον κάλην καὶ χοῖρον.

5 Χῖον: Sc. οἶνον; cf. 6.1-2 Χίους | οἶνους. Although the MS can stand as read, a singular for plural (see e.g. Gow's index to Theokr., s.v. "number"), eggs are not so special as to be singled out for a feast (though of course they were eaten: P.Petr. 3.142 lists ᾠα among items to be purchased for a household), whereas wine makes a regular appearance in this sympotic genre; cf., e.g., Hor. *Sat.* 2.8.15 *ferens Alcon Chium*, O. 4.12.16 (an invitation ode) *nardo vina merebere*. Gow-Page's suggestion (printed by Page in the text of his OCT) is therefore easy and attractive; only slightly less so, because of its rarity, is Giangrande's ᾠδόν, which occurs in the sense "cup of wine" only in Antiphanes 85.2 K-A τὸν ᾠδὸν λάμβανε, and Tryphon's *Onomatika* (cf. Athen. 11.503 de). Unlikely are οἶνον (considered and rejected by Gow-Page) and ᾠτα δέ (considered and rejected by me), the ear-shaped shellfish mentioned by Asklepiades 25.8 (cf. LSJ s.v. οὖς II 3; Π v.23 τοῦς φέρε). Gigante, retaining the MS, suggests that an egg-shaped cup is meant, as mentioned by Deinon 690 F 4 FG_{rh} Hist οἶνος κεκραμένος ἐν ᾠῶ, but this special cup is reserved for the king of Persia and, golden or otherwise, is unparalleled elsewhere.

στεφάνους . . . καὶ μύρον: Cf. Hor. O. 3.14.17 *i pete unguentum, puer, et coronas*.

σάμβαλα: These Greeks seem to have adopted the Roman habit of donning slippers when entering the house (which would be taken off while dining); thus, Nasidienus' calling for his slippers (*soleas poscit*, Hor. *Sat.* 2.8.77) indicates that he is ready to leave the dinner. See further J. Marquardt, *Privatleben der Römer* (Leipzig 1879) 1.313; Hug, *RE* 1A (1920) 2261; Hor. *Epist.* 1.13.15.

The form σαμβαλ-, which is said to be Aeolic, is found in Sappho, Anakreon, Hipponax, Herodas, Kallimachos, et al.; cf. Hesych. = Herodian *Orthograph.* 3.2.578 *σάμβαλα: σάνδαλα*. Cf. Headlam-Nock on Herod. 7.60.

6 λάμβανε: The general sense is "get, have ready," which may for some of the items entail "buy" (a common meaning; cf. Gow on Theokr. 15.19, Asklepiades 25.1, 26.4f.)—wreaths have to be fresh, and perhaps wine (if that is what is to be read) is running low—but sandals and a cup would be simply have to be placed in position; cf. Alkaios 346 *κὰδ δ' ἄερρε κυλίχνας*, Antiphanes 85 (cited above). Other poems containing commands for slaves to obtain and prepare items for dinner are Anakreon 356, 396 and Ephippos fr. 15 K-A; see further Nisbet-Hubbard on Hor. O. 1.38, p. 421 f.

παῖ: For other directions to a slave in this genre, cf. Asklepiades 25 (imperatives without a vocative, but the slave is slightly described in the third person), 26 (Δημήτριε), Poseidippos 10 (παιδάριον). Giangrande would retain the MS' καί, understanding it as explanatory—get (the items listed), *because* I wish to begin on time—but this would be a strange instance of explanatory καί, which usually explains by being more specific than what preceded.

δεκάτης: See on 27.2 ἐνάτης.

—ἤδη καὶ ρόδον ἐστὶ καὶ ἀκμάζων ἐρέβινθος
καὶ καυλοὶ κράμβης, Σώσυλε, πρωτοτόμου
καὶ μαΐνη σαλαγεῦσα καὶ ἀρτιπαγῆς ἀλίτυρος
καὶ θριδάκων οὕλων ἀφροφυῆ πέταλα·
ἡμεῖς δ' οὐτ' ἀκτῆς ἐπιβαίνομεν οὐτ' ἐν ἀπόψει 5
γινόμεθ' ὡς αἰεὶ, Σώσυλε, τὸ πρότερον.
—καὶ μὴν Ἀντιγένης καὶ Βάκχιος ἐχθὲς ἔπαιζον,
νῦν δ' αὐτοὺς θάψαι σήμερον ἐκφέρομεν.

AP 9.412 [20 GP, 23 K, 23 G]

PPI 1a. 36.12, f. 10r Φιλοδήμου Π vii.21 ἠδικαιοροδον/ [C] εἰς Σώσουλόν τινα φίλον

2 καυλοὶ P: καυλοῖο P πρωτοτόμου PPI: πρωτότομοι Gow-Page 3 καὶ μαΐνη PPI: καὶ
μὴν ἢ Σ σαλαγεῦσα Dilthey: ζαλαγεῦσα PPI: ζαγαλαγεῦσα Σ: λαλαγοῦσα Σ: σελαγεῦσα
Scaliger: γλαγώσα Kaibel ἀλίτυρος P^{ac}P: ἀλί τυρός P^{pc} 4 ἀφροφυῆ PPI: ἀβρο- vel
ἀκρο- Scaliger: ἀρτι- Schneider 6 γινόμεθ' P: γιγν- P1

PHILODEMUS: Already the rose and chickpea and first-cut cabbage-stalks are
at their peak, Sosylos,
and there are sautéed sprats and fresh cheese curds and tender curly let-
tuce leaves.

But we neither go on the shore nor are we on the promontory, Sosylos, as
we always used to.

SOSYLOS: Indeed, Antigenes and Bakkhios were playing yesterday, but
today we carry them out for burial.

Del Re, *Epigrammi greci* 84, 129 f.

Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy* 54–59.

Luck, *Rev. de Philol.* 33 (1959) 46.

Stella 276 ff.

The death a day earlier of two friends reminds Phil. of the meals they will no longer
share. For the sentiment of vv. 1–6, cf. Kallim. 44 HE (AP 7.519):

δαίμονα τίς δ' εὔοϊδε τὸν αὔριον ἀνίκα καὶ σέ,
Χάρμι, τὸν ὀφθαλμοῖς χθιζὸν ἐν ἀμετέροις,
τῶ ἐτέρῳ κλαύσαντες ἐθάπτομεν; οὐδὲν ἐκεῖνον
εἶδε πατὴρ Διοφῶν χρῆμ' ἀνιαρότερον.

A boating accident would account not only for the death of Phil.'s friends together
but also for his aversion to viewing the sea. But if this is the case, Phil. is failing to

observe the proper emotional detachment from death expected of an Epicurean. In particular, he may be ignoring (and hence for the reader, alluding to) the specific passage of Epicurus that contained Lucretius' model for 2.1 f. *suave, mari magno turbantibus aequora ventis, | e terra magnum alterius spectare laborem* (see below on 7 καὶ μὴν and on 26.2). Sosylos, to whom Phil. addresses his grief, seems to reply in the last distich (see on 7 καὶ μὴν), reminding him that their deaths have to be accepted: Well then, they played yesterday, today they are dead—from which the message obviously to be extrapolated is that we should enjoy today's (simple) pleasures such as those given in vv.1–4, for tomorrow we too may be dead; cf. Jacobs (1794) 241, Gigante 54. For the contrast between the pleasures of eating with death, cf. Alkaios 38 πῶνε . . . Ἀχέροντα κτλ; Archil. 13 W² κήδεα μὲν στονόοντα, Περικλεες, οὔτε τις ἀστῶν | μεμφόμενος θαλῆς τέρπεται, id. 11 οὔτε τι κλαίων ἰήσομαι, οὔτε κάκτιον | θήσω τερπῶλᾶς καὶ θαλίας ἐφέπων (for which thought Archilochos was criticized by Plut. *Quomodo Aud. Poet.* 12, 33a–b). Archil. 13 should also be compared for the way it too moves from grief to a desire to put grief aside; Archilochos seems to be conducting a conversation with himself. On Phil.'s attitude toward Archilochos cf. V. De Falco, "Archiloco nei papiri ercolanesi," *Aegyptus* 3 (1922) 287–296.

More particularly, Sosylos' response is equivalent to Epicurus' *Vat. Sent.* 66 συμπαθῶμεν τοῖς φίλοις οὐ θρηνοῦντες ἀλλὰ φροντίζοντες; cf. *Sent.* 40 πληρεστάτην οικειότατα ἀπολαβόντες οὐκ ὠδύραντο ὡς πρὸς ἔλεον τὴν τοῦ τελευτήσαντος προκαταστροφὴν. For a similar dialogue, in which Lucretius gives himself the voice of reason, cf. *Lucr.* 3.904–911.

For recent work on Epicurean views of death, cf. D. Puliga, "Χρόνος ε θάνατος in Epicuro," *Elenchos* 4 (1983) 235–260; D. Furley, "Nothing to us?" in M. Schofield, and G. Striker (eds.), *Norms of Nature* (Cambridge 1986) 75–91; P. Mitsis, "Epicurus on death and the duration of life," *BACAP* 4 (1989) 303–322; C. Segal, *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety* (Princeton 1990).

ἦδη καὶ ρόδον: A flower of late spring, when it might be pleasant once again to spend time along the seaside. The rose thus helps determine the time of year, but since wreaths were made of roses it also has a place along with the list of edibles to follow as one of the items to be gathered for the meal alluded to; cf. Asklepiades 25 HE (*AP* 5.181.2) πέντε στεφάνους τῶν ροδίνων, 26 (5.185.5) ροδίνους ἔξ πρόσλαβε. It may also subliminally prepare the way for the joint funeral of Antigones and Bakkhios in that it was placed on tombs during the Roman festival of Rosalia held in May. Thus the judgement of Gow-Page that it would be "macabre" to associate the rose of this poem with the Rosalia is misconceived.

With Phil.'s listing of the various blooms, which contrast with the now-dead Antigones and Bakkhios, cf. Meleager 31 (*AP* 5.144.1–4)

ἦδη λευκόιον θάλλει, θάλλει δὲ φίλομβρος
 νάρκισσος, θάλλει δ' οὐρεσίφοιτα κρίνα·
 ἦδη δ' ἡ φιλέραστος, ἐν ἄνθεσιν ὠριμον ἄνθος,
 Ζηνοφίλα Πειθοῦς ἠδὲ τέθηλε ρόδον.

ἐστὶ . . . ἀκμάζων: Predicate of *ρόδον*, *ἐρέβινθος*, and *καυλοί*, in agreement only with the nearest (Kaibel); cf., e.g., Aristoph. *Ran.* 36 βαδίζων εἰμί, KG 1.39 f. This way of establishing the season is familiar from Hesiod on; note esp. Hes. *Op.* 582 ἦμος δὲ σκόλυμος τ' ἀνθεῖ, Alkaios 347.4 ἄνθει δὲ σκόλυμος. ἐστὶ remains the verb to be supplied in vv. 3–4.

ἐρέβινθος: “No luxury” (Gow-Page), and yet when his Edenic society is criticized by Glaukon for being ἄνευ ὄψου, Sokrates adds, among other things, chickpeas (*Rep.* 372c), as well as salt, cheese, and greens. καὶ οὕτω, says Sokrates, διαγόντες τὸν βίον ἐν εἰρήνῃ μεθ' ὑγιείας, ὡς εἰκόσ, γηραιοὶ τελευτῶντες ἄλλον τοιοῦτον βίον τοῖς ἐκγόνοις παραδώσουσιν. That this description of an idealized life could have served as a model for inhabitants of the Epicurean Garden is made more likely by Glaukon's rejection of even these additions: ὑὼν πόλιν . . . κατεσκεύαζες. (For the association of Epicureans with pigs, cf. Cic. *In Pis.* 37, with Nisbet's n., Hor. *Ep.* 1.4.16, Plut. *Mor.* 1091c, 1094a, Catullus 47.1, above, p. 16 n. 13.) But even if this *Republic* passage is not alluded to, Gigante is correct to point out that the food mentioned in this poem is entirely appropriate to the modest menu of Epicureans. Contrast Phil.'s list of blooms with that of Meleager 31 (quoted above on 1 ἡδη καὶ *ρόδον*).

2 καυλοὶ κράμβης . . . πρωτοτόμου: Pl's epic but unmetrical *καυλοῖο* is puzzling. Cf. Columella, *Cult. Hort.* 369 *sed iam prototomos tempus decidere caules*, where, as in Greek as well (LSJ s.v. *καυλός* III), the stalk by synecdoche stands for the whole plant (cf. G. Kohl, Eng. *kale*). Phil.'s genitive therefore is not strictly necessary, but BGU 1118.12 (i B.C.; adduced by Gigante 104 n. 54) and Automedon 5 GP (*AP* 11.319.4) *καυλοῦς κράμβης* show that cabbage could be called equally *καυλός* (cf. esp. Euboulos 6 K-A, adduced on 28.2 *βολβίσκους*), *κράμβη* (cf. 28.1), or *καυλός κράμβης*. And once written, the genitive is just as likely to receive the adj. as *καυλοὶ*, since cabbage is cut at the stalk. Thus there is no reason to depart from the MSS and follow Gow-Page in reading *-τομοί*; cf. Gigante 104 n. 55. At worst, this would be a very mild ex. of transferred epithet. Athen. 9.369e–370f collects reference to cabbage in Greek literature. The ref. here is to the tenderness of young plants; Automedon 7 GP (*AP* 11.325.1 f.) criticizes a host for serving “ten-day-old yellow stalk of hemp-like cabbage.”

Σώσυλε: So accented by PPI here and again on v.6. (To be more precise, Pl has Σώσυλε, the mark over the upsilon indicating, as often in Pl, that this is a proper name.) Jacobs, followed by all subsequent editor, printed Σωσύλε, which is (with who knows what accuracy) found in Lucian *Gall.* 29. The MSS of Polyb. 3.20.5 record both Σώσυλος and Σωσύλος. Chandler, *Greek Accentuation* §§280 f. records numerous exceptions to the norm that trisyllables in *-ύλος* are paroxytone.

3 μαινῆ: Σ ad loc. (printed by Stadtmüller) contains many guesses as to the meaning both of this word (unsure whether it is a plant or a fish) and its accompanying participle—and one that does neither: καὶ μὴν ἡ ζᾶλλαγεῦσα, which would link it with the cheese of the preceding line. Gow-Page rightly fault the conjecture for producing a barely metrical hapax; like Kaibel's conjecture, it looks to Homeric

γάργος = γάλα. Both Kaibel and Σ offer a milky μαίνη, which assumes this noun to stand for some sort of plant which exudes a whitish pith when cut. There seems, however, to be no evidence for any plant, edible or otherwise, so called; for the fish with this and related names, on the other hand, there is abundant evidence; cf. D'A. W. Thompson, *Glossary of Greek Fishes* (London 1947) 153–155. Gow-Page's concern that this fish was considered poor fare by the Romans is properly answered by Gigante 57–58, who shows that this is in fact the point: humble fare for a humble Epicurean repast.

σαλαγεῦσα: A variant form of σαλεύω, which can mean “shake, toss, roll” (intrans.), often used of ships at sea. I am not sure what Dilthey meant by *de pisce palpitante*—his conjecture may have been intended to describe the motion of the fish when alive—but I take the phrase to depict the manner of preparation; cf. “tossed (salad),” “sauté.” Small fish being fried in a shallow pan have to be kept in motion to prevent their sticking together (as I have learned from my own mistake).

άρτυπαγῆς ἀλίτυρος: Freshly set cheese will either have salt rubbed on it (Vergil *G.* 3.403 *parco sale contingunt*) or be soaked in brine. In addition to improving the flavor, salt decreases the cells' eutectic pressure and so reduces moisture; it also retards bacterial growth. Cf. further Kroll, “Käse,” *RE* 10 (1919) 1489–1496.

4 θριδάκων: Lettuce, also mentioned in BGU 1118–1112 (see above on καυλοὶ κράμβης).

ἀφροφυῆ: This hapax is rightfully retained by Gigante, against most recent edd. The outer edge of some curly lettuce is whiter and curlier than the rest of the leaf, and can easily be called “foamlike.” For Scaliger's conjectures, see Luck.

5 ἡμεῖς: At this point in the poem the audience will assume that Phil. and Sosylos alone are meant. With the next sequence, however, we realize that Phil has also been thinking of Antigenes and Bakkhios.

ἀκτῆς . . . ἐν ἀπόψει: Identified by Gigante as the high point and belvedere to the west of the Villa dei Papiri, i.e., Piso's villa, where Phil. and his Epicurean friends met. The belvedere would have had a splendid view of the sea, and, as Gigante vividly describes, would have been a pleasant spot to partake of the simple meal whose ingredients we have listed. This is indeed tempting; note, however, that Herculaneum was situated on a promontory: Strabo 5.4.8 ἐχόμενον δὲ φρούριόν ἐστιν Ἡράκλειον ἐκκειμένην εἰς τὴν θάλατταν ἄκραν ἔχον, καταπνεομένην λιβὶ θαυμαστῶς ὥσθ' ὑγιεινὴν ποιεῖν τὴν κατοικίαν. Similarly, Seneca *QN* 6.1 *ab altera parte Surrentinum Stabianumque litus, ab altera Herculaneense conveniunt et mare ex aperto reductum amoeno sinu cingunt*, Sisenna fr. 53 *Peter quod oppidum tumulo in excelso loco propter mare*. Strabo's φρούριον Ἡράκλειον (perhaps the original full name of the settlement; cf. C. Waldstein and L. Schoobridge, *Herculaneum* [London 1908] 89) obviously cannot have its common sense of fortified military base; it more likely is simply a synonym of φρουρά, “lookout”; cf. Aisch. *Eum.* 948 πόλεως φρούριον, “city's watch-post.”

Phil. thus may be referring in ἀκτῆς to that part of Herculaneum that juts out most prominently, and in ἐν ἀπόψει to the view of the sea from that point; Waldstein and Schoobridge 59 f.

For the pleasures of the seaside, cf. Nikainetos 4 HE, Cic. *Cael.* 35 *accusatores quidem libidines amores adulteria Batae actas convivia comissationes cantus symphonias navigia iactant*; *Ad Fam.* 9.6.4, *actis et voluptatibus*; *Verr.* 5.96.

7 καὶ μὴν: Of all the possible ways this combination is used, the most appropriate here is “inceptive-responsive,” when “a person who has been invited to speak expresses by the particles his acceptance of the invitation” (Denniston, *GP* 355); for the difficulties involved with other interpretations, cf. Gow-Page 388, who reluctantly settle for an unparalleled causal use. See also Del Re 129 f. Denniston notes that the inceptive-responsive usage is “common in Aristophanes and Plato, and is almost confined to them,” which is simply another way of saying that a particular usage is colloquial, as is entirely appropriate here.

The reply could be spoken only by Sosylos, to whom the preceding words have been directed. Implicit is the message that the goods of the season are indeed to be enjoyed, and today, before we too are dead; cf. Phil. *De Morte* IV col.37.23 ff. πᾶς ἄνθρωπος . . . ἐφ[ή]μερός [ἐσ]τι . . . καὶ ἄδ[ηλ]όν ἐ[σ]τιν οὐ τὸ αὐ[ρι]ον μόν[ο]ν, ἀλλὰ καὶ [τὸ αὐ]τίκα δῆ. Jacobs was on the right track when he suggested (1794) that, if the preceding distich ended in a question, the last lines would provide the answer: *Ipsa vitae brevitates et rerum vicissitudines nos admonent, ut ne fruendi opportunitatem nobis patiamur elabi* (p. 241).

With Sosylos as the speaker of the last distich, the epigram is formally parallel to 3, where the final distich is given over to Xanthippe. Sosylos’ answer is also somewhat similar in tone to Xanthippe’s, in that both give frank (i.e., properly Epicurean parrhesiastic) answers intended to put an end to Phil.’s reverie, and which are more in accord with Epicurean teaching than the romanticizing thoughts of Phil. Cf. *Epic. Ep.* 3.124 f. γνώσις ὀρθῆ τοῦ μηθὲν εἶναι πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὸν θάνατον ἀπολαυστὸν ποιεῖ τὸ τῆς ζωῆς θνητόν. Phil. comments on this and other Epicurean passages concerning death in *De Morte* IV coll. 1–2 et passim; cf. M. Gigante, “L’Inizio del quarto libro *Della Morte* di Filodemo,” in *RF²* 127 ff.

To the lament of the preceding lines, Susylos could well have quoted Phil.’s own words on the subject: καὶ τοὺς θ[ρή]νους μέντοι ποι[ή]ματ’ εἶναι συμβέ[β]ηκε καὶ τοῖς ὄλοις οὐ[δ]ὲν ἰατροῦειν τῆς λύπης, ἀλλ’ ἐλίγιτε καὶ ἐπισχεῖ[ν], τὰ δὲ πολλ[λ]ὰ δὲ ἐπιτείνειν (*De Musica* IV 6.13–18).

Ἀντιγένης . . . ἐχθὲς ἔπαιζον: Most likely the same Antigenes as in Π 2.8 Μουσῶν Ἀντιγένους. As Gigante, *SIFC* 7 (1989) 136 observes, the mention of Muses there strongly suggests that ἔπαιζον here = “write poetry”; i.e., that Antigenes and hence Bakkhios too are poets. Cf. Phil. *De Piet.*, P.Herc. 1428 col. 11.9 (Henrichs, *CErc* 4 [1974] 21) ἔπαιξεν, of the poetry of Diagoras; Hedylos 6.4 HE (Athen. 11.473a) Σικελίδεω παίξει πολλὴ μελιχρότερον; *AP* 11.134.1 (Loukillios) ποιήματα παίζομεν; *Cat.* 50.1–5 *hesterno*, *Licini*, *die otiosi* | . . . *scribens versiculos uterque nostrum* | *ludebat*. The verb in this sense is applied self-deprecatingly by poets to slight examples of their art. Loukillios calls himself a μακροφλυαρητής. Presumably, then, Antigenes and Bakkhios, like Phil. himself, regularly recited epigrams

at dinner. ἐχθές, although strictly contrasting with σήμερον, allows us to imagine that they did this ὡς αἰεὶ τὸ πρότερον (so Dübner; *contra* Gow-Page).

8 νῦν δ': A strong, largely atemporal, adversative. There is no redundancy with σήμερον; cf. Kaibel.

ἐκφέρομεν: The *vox propria* for the laying out of the dead, usually associated with an expression of grief, which is notably lacking here; cf. *Il.* 24.786, ἐξέφερον θρασὺν Ἴκτορα δάκρυ χέοντες, CEG 159 (Thasos, ca. 500 B.C.), 795.7 (Thessaly, ca. 335 B.C.). For bibliography on *ekphora*, see N. Richardson, *The Iliad: A Commentary*, 6 (Cambridge 1993) 183.

30

τρισσοὺς ἀθανάτους χωρεῖ λίθος· ἄ κεφαλὰ γὰρ
 μανύει τρανώς Πάνα τὸν αἰγόκερων,
 στέρνα δὲ καὶ νηδὺς Ἡρακλέα, λοιπὰ δὲ μηρῶ
 καὶ κνήμας Ἑρμᾶς ὁ περόπους ἔλαχεν.
 θύειν ἀρνήση, ξένε, μηκέτι· τοῦ γὰρ ἑνός σοι 5
 θύματος οἱ τρισσοὶ δαίμονες ἀπτόμεθα.

API 234 [29 GP, p. xxvi K, 21 G]

Pl 4a. 8.89, f. 49v Φιλοδήμου εἰς ἕτερον ἄγαλμα Πανός caret P

3 μηρῶ scripsi: μηρῶν Pl 4 κνήμας Gow-Page: κνήμης Pl Ἑρμᾶς tent. Gow-Page: Ἑρμῆς
 Pl 6 ἀπτόμεθα Pl: ἀντόμεθα Hecker

The stone contains a trinity of immortals: The head clearly reveals Pan the goat-horned,
 the chest and belly Herakles, and the rest, thighs and legs, has Hermes the wing-footed obtained.

Refuse no longer, stranger, to sacrifice, for your one sacrifice will be received by the three of us.

Beginning as a third-person narrative of the statue putatively above the inscription (1–4), the poem addresses the notional passer-by with a request for a sacrifice/gift (5), the one sacrifice being received by the three gods (6), each of whom, presumably, will respond favorably. The wit of the poem lies in the fact that not until the last word is it revealed that the poem has been spoken by the gods themselves, shame-

lessly cadging sacrifices. It easy to imagine that Phil.'s Epicurean audience would have appreciated this from their own point of view. Although Epicurus believed in anthropomorphic gods (Σ ad *KD* 1, Sext. Emp. *AM* 9.25 = Epic. fr. 353 U, Phil. *De Piet.* 137–144 Obbink) and acquiesced in their public worship (Phil. *De Piet.* 653–657, 737–740), he also argued that they take no part in human affairs (*Ep. Her.* 76–78, Lucr. 5.1161–1240, Phil. *De Piet.* 2032–2450), although they do have the power to benefit us (Phil. *De Piet.* cols. 46 f. ed. Obbink). It may, however, be doubted whether Epicurus would allow that a god could come in the form depicted here; cf. Cic. *ND* 1.46, spoken by the Epicurean Velleius, *Ac de forma quidem partim natura nos admonet partim ratio docet. Nam a natura habemus omnes omnium gentium speciem nullam aliam nisi humanam deorum.* Moreover, the idea of three gods speaking as one presents an amusing theological problem: “dans cette conclusion, n’y a-t-il pas une parodie du syncrétisme religieux; économie pour le fidèle!” (Aubretton). Cf. Phil. *De Piet.*, P.Herc. 1428, coll. 13.23–14.2 (Henrichs, *CErc* 4 [1974] 24) “it occurs to me to apply to them what Timocles said in his play *The Egyptian* about the gods of that country: ‘When those who commit impieties against the acknowledged gods do not at once pay the penalties, whom would the altar of a cat destroy?’” (fr. 1.2–4 K-A, tr. Obbink).

The literature on Epicurus’ attitude towards the gods is immense, but several recent works survey the many ways Epicurus retained traditional customs and beliefs: B. Frischer, *The Sculpted Word* (Berkeley 1982); D. Obbink, “The atheism of Epicurus,” *GRBS* 30 (1989) 187–223, esp. 200 f. on the various religious activities in which Epicureans took part; J. Mansfeld, “Aspects of Epicurean theology,” *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser. 46 (1993) 172–210.

Gow-Page point out that no triple statue of the sort described here is known, although it is vaguely reminiscent of the Chimaira: πρόσθε λέων, ὄπιθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα (*Il.* 6.181 = Hes. *Th.* 323), which was parodied by Ariston of Chios: πρόσθε Πλάτων, ὄπιθεν Πύρρων, μέσσος Διόδωρος (ap. D.L. 4.33 = 204 SH). Very likely Phil.’s figure is a poetic fiction.

Although an exact parallel for the statue is lacking, single individuals may be similarly described. Cf. *Il.* 2.477–479:

Ἀγαμέμνων,
ὄμματα καὶ κεφαλὴν ἵκελος Διὶ τερπικεραύνω,
Ἄρει δὲ ζώνην, στέρνον δὲ Ποσειδάωνι.

Rufinus 35 Page (*AP* 5.94):

ὄμματ' ἔχεις Ἥρης, Μελίτη, τὰς χεῖρας Ἀθήνης,
τοὺς μαζοὺς Παφίης, τὰ σφυρὰ τῆς Θετίδος.
εὐδαίμων ὁ βλέπων σε, τρισόλβιος ὅστις ἀκούει,
ἡμίθεος δ' ὁ φιλῶν, ἀθάνατος δ' ὁ γαμῶν.

Note also *Anacreontea* 17, beginning γράφε μοι Βάθυλλον οὕτω, in which the image of Bathyllos is described detail by detail, some of them with a simple

reference to a god or hero, e.g., 32 f. Πολυδεύκεος δὲ μηρούς, | Διονυσίην δὲ νηδύν.

1 τρισσοῦς: A poetic troika (LSJ s.v. II). Applied to gods by Soph. *OT* 164 (Athena, Artemis, Apollo), Eur. *Hek.* 645, *Hel.* 708, and *Tr.*, 924 (Athena, Hera, Aphrodite), Meleager 39 (*AP* 5.195.1) and 74 (9.16.1) (Graces). Leonidas 27 HE (*AP* 9.316.3) refers to a Janiform statue as δισσοὶ θεοί.

χωρεῖ: “Trois immortels *en ce marbre*” (Aubretton), which is better than “the stone *has room for three immortals*” (Gow-Page); my emphasis.

2 μανύει: Cf. Bakch. fr. 14 Λυδία μὲν γὰρ λίθος μανύει χρυσόν. That is, just as the Lydian stone reveals the gold within (cf. LSJ s.v. Λύδιος), so too the external shape of the stone reveals the god within.

3 στέρνα δὲ καὶ νηδύς: The same pair at *Il.* 13.290

ἀλλά κεν ἢ στέρνων ἢ νηδύος ἀντιάσειε
πρόσσω ἰεμένονο μετὰ προμάχων ὀαριστύν.

Herakles' front was of course notably muscular, but it cannot be said to be uniquely recognizable.

3–4 μηρῷ | καὶ κνήμας Ἑρμᾶς: If the MS's combination of plural and singular (“thighs and leg”) is objectionable, as Gow-Page rightly point out, so too is their own new combination of gen. and acc. It would be easy, however, for a scribe who has not learned the lesson of Doric κεφαλᾶ and μανύει, in ionicizing Ἑρμᾶς, to alter κνήμας along with it (an error of homoioteleuton), especially since the error produces an acceptable form with ἔλαχεν. It would now be all but inevitable for μηρῷ, which occurs 5× in Homer and once in *H.Herm.*, to be altered to genitive plural. Phil. has a dual among plurals at 12.3. (Kaibel's objections, p. xxvi, to Phil.'s authorship on the basis of the two Doric forms of vv. 1 f. would also be met now that all possible forms are seen as originally Doric.) Cf. P.Oxy. 2624 fr. 1.4 (387 SLG) δαῖμον ἀ[ι]γίκναμε.

4 πτερόπους: Elsewhere only Eustath. *Od.* 2.9 (of Perseus).

6 ἀπτόμεθα: Cf. Pi. *N.* 8.22 ἄπτεται [sc. ὁ φθόνος] δ' ἐσλῶν, where the violent sense of the verb may, as Bury says, derive from medical terminology. Hecker, *approb.* Dübner & Paton, compared *AP* 253.5 f. (Anon.) ἐς δὲ θυηλᾶς | εἴμ' αὐτῶς, ἱρῶν ἀντομένη θυέων, but, as Kaibel saw, the sense is clearly not the same: Artemis runs to meet her cloud of incense, Phil.'s statue is stationary.

Epicurus prayed to the gods (Phil. *De Piet.* 790–797, 879–884 Obbink), but believed that they, in sharp contrast with this triple deity's eagerness to receive offerings, were entirely unaffected by outside (i.e., human) forces or concerns; see intro. above and Obbink's nn. ad locc.

Ἄντικράτης ἦδει τὰ σφαιρικὰ μᾶλλον Ἄρατου
 πολλῶ, τὴν ἰδίην δ' οὐκ ἐνόει γένεσιν·
 διστάζειν γὰρ ἔφη πότερ' ἐν Κριῶ γεγένηται
 ἢ Διδύμοις ἢ τοῖς Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφοτέροις.
 εὔρηται δὲ σαφῶς ἐν τοῖς τρισί· καὶ γὰρ ὀχευτῆς 5
 καὶ μῶρος μαλακῶς ἐστι καὶ ὀσοφάγος.

AP 11.318 [28 GP, p.xxvi K, 20 G]

P Φιλοδήμου Pl 2b.4.1, f. 87r s.a.n.

2 ἰδίην δ' P: δ' ἰδίην Pl 6 μαλακῶς P: μαλακός τ' Pl

Antikrates knew astronomy far better than Aratos, but he did not know his own birth:

He said that he was in doubt whether he had been born under the sign of Aries, Gemini, or Pisces.

But he has been found under all three, for he is a tupper, an effeminate sex maniac, and an eater of dainties.

Maxwell-Stuart, *Hermes* 106 (1978) 253 f.

Stadtmüller ap. Riess, “Antikrates (8),” *RE* 1 (1894) 2427 thought this epigram to have been written by Antiphilos, but there is no reason to deny the ascription to Phil. Rather, the relatively rare sense of δίδυμοι = “testicles” (here in v.4 as it will be reinterpreted on v. 6, and again in 22.6) argues for Philodemean authorship.

Phil. combines mockery of astrology with an attack against Antikrates, who does not know his true sexual nature: Does he play the man with women and men (Aries), does he play the woman with men (Gemini), or does he play the woman with women (Pisces)? Cf. AP 11.160 (Loukillios):

πάντες ὅσοι τὸν Ἄρην καὶ τὸν Κρόνον ὠροθετοῦσιν,
 ἄξιοι εἰσι τυχεῖν πάντες ἐνὸς τυπάνου·
 ὄψομαι οὐ μακρὰν αὐτοῦς τυχὸν εἰδότας ὄντως
 καὶ τί ποιεῖ ταῦρος, καὶ τί λέων δύναται.

For the reaction of philosophers to the claims of astrology, cf. A. Bouché-Leclercq, *L'astrologie grecque* (Paris 1899) 570–609; A. A. Long, “Astrology: Arguments pro and contra,” in J. Barnes et al. (eds.), *Science and Speculation: Studies in Hellenistic Theory and Practice* (Cambridge and Paris 1982) 165–192; W. & H. G. Gundel, *Astrologumena: Die astrologische Literatur in der Antike und ihre Geschichte* (Wiesbaden 1966) 180–189.

1 Ἀντικράτης: Presumably a real person, but otherwise unknown. It is tempting to imagine that he was a Stoic, as several of this school were sympathetic to the determinative aspects of astrology; Bouché-Leclercq 28 ff.—not, however, Panaitios; cf. F.H. Sandbach, *The Stoics* (London 1975) 80. Epicureanism, of course, would reject astrology because its theory of the swerve (*quod fati foedera rumpat*) would guarantee that there is no fixed linkage between all the motions of the universe; cf. Lucr. 2.251–262, 277–293; Bailey on Lucr. 5.728. Tacitus *Ann.* 6.22.3 contrasts Epicurean and Stoic attitudes towards astrology.

ἦδει: Equivalent to the following imperfects: This was the state of affairs until now, when the truth has been discovered (v. 5).

τὰ σφαιρικά: Both Aratos and Eudoxos (see next note), as well as Euclid, entitled their works *Φαινόμενα*; Phil. uses a generic term which he probably knew from the astronomical *Sphairika* of Theodosios (ii–i. B.C.). Earlier, ἡ σφαιρική [sc. τέχνη] was applied solely to spherical geometry (e.g., Archytos B 1 DK, in a sentence that refers as well to astronomical knowledge). The usual terms, ἀστρονομία and ἀστρολογία, would not fit the meter; cf. O. Hultsch, “Astronomie,” *RE* 2 (1896) 1829 f. for the terminology; and F. H. Cramer, *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics* (Philadelphia 1954) 3 f.

Earlier exx. of the use of mathematical *topoi* by Hellenistic poets are Hermesianax fr. 7.85–88 Powell and Kallimachos, fr. 191.59–63, both mentioning Pythagoras; cf. P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford 1972) 1.407 f. For epigrams directed against astrologers, cf. F. J. Brecht, *Motiv- und Typengeschichte des griechischen Spottepigramms* (Leipzig 1930) 41–45.

Ἄρατου: Aratos of course derived all of his star lore from Eudoxos (so Hipparchos 1.1.5, et al.; cf. the testimonia in G. R. Mair’s Loeb edition, pp. 196 f.). He was, however, naturally given full credit for knowledge of his material; cf. Meleager 1 (*AP* 4.1.49) ἄστρον τ’ ἴδριν Ἄρατον. He was also praised by Kallim. 56 HE = 27 Pf. (*AP* 9.507) and Leonidas 101 HE (*AP* 9.25). A horological monument from Tenos offers an interesting parallel to Phil: The star lore of Andronikos, the builder of the Tower of the Winds in Athens (i B.C. ex.), is compared favorably to that of Aratos (*IG* 12[5] 891.1–5):

πάτ]ρα σε Κύρρος, Ἀνδρόνικε, δεύτερον
Ἄρα]τον ἐν ζωίσις ἄλλον ἔτρεφεν·
σὺ μὲ]ν γὰρ ἔγνως οὐρανοῖο παμφαῆ
κύκλω]ν ταμέσθαι [σ]φαιρικὰν τε πασσόφο]υ
τέχνην] Ἄρατου, κτλ.

Note that Aratos himself in one (of only two extant) of his epigrams compares one man to another (text and interpretation obscure; cf. Gow-Page on Aratos 1 HE = *AP* 12.129), as do Phil., Kallimachos (Aratos is compared with Hesiod), and the stone from Tenos. Even Leonidas of Tarentum compares him to Zeus (Διὸς . . . δεύτερος; cf. the stone). Could this have been a common feature of Aratos’ epigrams?

On Andronikos, cf. Fabricius, *RE* 1 (1894) 2167 f. On Aratos’ reception by Hellenistic poets, cf. P. Bing, “Aratos and his audiences,” *MD* 31 (1993) 99–109.

2 γένεσιν: The configuration of stars and planets at the time of one's birth has predictive value. Conversely, it would seem, one could try to deduce one's sign from one's character; cf. Hor. *O.* 2.17.17 ff.:

seu Libra seu me Scorpios aspicit
 formidulosus, pars violentior
 natalis horae, seu tyrannus
 Hesperiae Capricornus undae. . . .

It is not that Horace is unaware of his own birthdate, but that he is (or pretends to be) unsure how to characterize himself. Cf. R. Scarcia, "Orazio, Mecenate e le stelle," in *AA.VV. L'astronomia a Roma nell'età augustea* (Galatina 1989) 34–53.

3–4 πότερ' . . . ἦ . . . ἦ: Parallels can be found for multiple alternate questions (Soph. *El.* 539 ff. has three ἦ's after a πότερον), but perhaps here, after διαστάζειν, the second ἦ is meant to come as a surprise in order to emphasize even more the extent of Antikrates' ignorance. Note that v. 3, containing a masculine caesura without a bucolic diaeresis, is Phil.'s only violation of Meyer's Third Law. With his 1%, compare 11% for early elegists and 4.5 for Hellenistic epigrammatists (with none at all in Kallimachos's epigrams); M. L. Clarke, "The hexameter in Greek elegiacs," *CR* 5 (1955) 18; West, *Greek Metre* 197.

3 ἐν . . . (γεγένηται): "(Is born) under the sign of"—a regular meaning of the preposition in astrological writings (unnoticed by LSJ). In general, one may consult O. Neugebauer and H.B. van Hoesen, *Greek Horoscopes* (Philadelphia 1959), e.g., BGU 957, P.Oxy. 804, PSI 1276 verso, etc. (many more examples may be found through their glossary, p. 193); for a poetic example, cf. Dorotheos fr. 5 Stegemann (p. 323 Pingree)

ἐν δέ νυ Παρθενικῇ Μαίης προσλάμβανε κούρον. 8
 ἐν Διδύμοισι, Ζυγῶ τε καὶ Ὑδροχόῃ κτλ.

In Dorotheos and others the dative alone may appear (as, e.g., in Dorotheos frr. 6 and 79a [p.395]; P.Oxy. 596 col.2.4 f. ἥλιος ἰχθύσι, αελήνη διδύ[μοις]). See also T. Barton, *Ancient Astrology* (London 1994), esp. 21–63.

4 Διδύμοις: The constellation Gemini, but also "testicles" and/or "ovaries"; cf. 22.6 n. Argentarios 7 GP (*AP* 5.105) similarly puns on this word: Menophila's palate (οὐρανός, cf. Gow-Page ad loc.) contains both Dog-star (= "penis"; cf. Henderson, *Maculate Muse* 127) and Twins; such is her κόσμος. The inherent duality of δίδυμοι contributes to this amphiboly. Bisexuality as such (a dubious ancient category) is not the point, but that Antikrates will take his sex in any and all ways.

Ἰχθύσιν ἀμφοτέροις: The two fish of Pisces taken together (cf. Homer's ἀμφοτέρω Αἴαντε, Aratos 548 δῦος . . . Ἰχθύες), and not two separate constellations, as Maxwell-Stuart argues. First, the references are not to constellations as such, but to the zodiacal signs in the ascendant at one's birth. The two Pisces

determine one such division; cf. D. R. Dicks, *Early Greek Astronomy to Aristotle* (London 1970) 17. Moreover, for the three signs, there are but three corresponding adjectives, not four; see below, on v.6 μαλακῶς. Note the many erotic puns on various fishes in Antiphanes fr. 27 K-A; cf. Henderson 142.

5 εὐρηται: For what it is worth, εὐ- is never augmented to ἠ- in the Herculeum papyri; W. Crönert, *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis* (Leipzig 1903) 205.

ὄχευτής: As befits Antikrates' being born under the sign of the Ram; used literally of stud animals (cf. LSJ s.v.), and metaphorically of humans ([Archil.] 327.7, 328.7) and of Pan by Cornutus ND 27, p. 49; or perhaps not so metaphorically: cf. the statuette from Herculeum showing Pan making love to a goat, Naples, Mus. Naz. Arch., Raccolta Pornografica, Inv. no. 27709. Cf. D. Bain, "Greek verbs for animal intercourse used of human beings," *Sileno* 16 (1990) 253–261.

6 μῶρος: Often applied to sexual folly by Euripides: *Ba.* 644 (with Barrett's n.), 966 (Theseus): ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ μῶρον ἀνδράσιν μὲν οὐκ ἔνι | γυναιξὶ δ' ἐμπέφυκεν, etc. That the word has this connotation here is guaranteed by the context and by its accompanying adv.

μαλακῶς: This must be the right reading, not only because it gives us only three terms after τρισί, as expected, but also because Phil. prefers not to depend upon position to produce the long syllable before the caesura of the pentameter (see on 20.2). According to figures provided by P. Maas, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1962) §22 and M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982) 158, only Philip of Thessalonica is as strict on this point as Phil.; cf. Intro., p. 44. For the combination of adv. + adj., cf. Phil. *Rhet.* I 151.7–8 φ[υ]σικῶς καλ[ό]ς λόγος.

ὄψοφάγος: Sexual delights come in various forms: Alexis uses ὄψον to stand for both vagina (fr. 168.6 f. K-A) and penis (fr. 50). As an explication of Antikrates' link with Pisces, the former is to be understood here. For ancient expressions of disapproval of cunnilingus, cf. Kaster on Suet. *De Gramm. et rhet.* 23.7.

32

τὴν πρότερον θυμέλην μήτ' ἔμβλεπε μήτε παρέλθης·
 νῦν ἄπαγε δραχμῆς εἰς καλὰ χορδόκολα.
 καὶ σῦκον δραχμῆς ἔν γίνεται· ἦν δ' ἀναμείνης.
 χίλια. τοῖς πτωχοῖς ὁ χρόνος ἐστὶ θεός.

AP 10.103 [24 GP, p. xxvi K, 17 G]

P Φιλοδήμου
 τηνπροτερονθυμε

Pl 1a.88.5, f. 20v s.a.n.

Π ii.21 τηνπροτερον

Π iv.16

2 δραχμῆς PPl: δραχμῆν Gigante εἰς καλὰ χορδόκολα (χορδόκολα iam Jacobs) scripsi: εἰς κολοκορδόκολα PPl: ἔσθ' ὅλα χορδόκολα tent. Gow-Page: εἰς κολόχορδα λέχη Lumb: εὐκολοκορδόκολα Hecker: εἰς κολοκυνθιάδα Giangrande: εὐκολα χορδόκολα tent. Dübner 3 ἔν γίνεταί Scaliger: ἐγγίνεταί P: ἐγγίγνεταί Pl

Don't keep looking into the butchershop [where you bought] before nor enter it. Withdraw now to good tripe sausages for a drachma. One fig too goes for a drachma, but if you wait, a thousand do. For beggars time is a god.

Giangrande, *RM* 106 (1963) 255–257.
Lumb 87.

Difficulties in some details remain (see comm.), but the general sense is clear: Give up what you can no longer afford (v. 1); take satisfaction from what you can now afford (v. 2). Alternately, the object you cannot afford today may be practically free later (figs; vv. 3 f.). All a poor man can do is pray that in time he can get what he wants (v. 4). There is nothing in these lines to suggest an erotic context (Lumb, Giangrande), despite the well-known erotic connotation that σῦκον can assume. Unlike the case with real figs, the availability of vaginas is not seasonal. H. Herter ap. Giangrande says that the point about the figs is that as a hetaira ages her price drops, which is true enough; but who would advise a poor man to wait until a particular hetaira grows old rather than just, that very day, turn to an older one? (The courtesan Phryne, on the other hand, charged more as she grew older διὰ τὴν δόξαν; Plut. *De Tuenda San. Praec.* 125ab.)

1 θυμέλην: Obelized by Gow-Page, but now all but guaranteed by Π, as no other Greek word beginning θυμε- can fit, and μήτ' is secure. Giangrande deduces from the context that the required sense is “sacrificial cake,” as in Pherekrates 247 K-A = Phryn. *Praep. Soph.* 74.9 θυμέλην . . . Φερεκράτης δὲ τὰ θυλήματα, ἅπερ ἐστὶν ἄλφιτα οἴνω καὶ ἐλαίῳ μεμαγμένα; cf. Hesych. s.v. θυμέλαι· οἱ βομοί. καὶ τὰ ἄλφιτα τὰ ἐπιθυόμενα. As Giangrande notes, such a cake, an offering to a god made with oil and wine, would be expensive. None of the other, far more common, senses of θυμέλη (altar, stage, theater, performance) fit here. For θυμέλη = *song*, missing from LSJ, cf. Herodian, *Partitiones* 61.1 Boiss. θυμέλη, ἡ τερπνὴ ᾠδή.

The problem with Giangrande's interpretation, however, is that, in order for θυμέλην to be the object of the two verbs, the cake in question, learned allusion that it already is, must actually refer to an expensive prostitute—a “tart” would be the perfect English translation. Even if the obscene interpretation of this epigram had not already been rejected on other grounds, Giangrande's construal of θυμέλην with the two verbs is very strained and would have to be rejected in any case. Earlier views may be closer to the truth, namely that Phil. is referring to a source of expensive food (Jacobs), most likely meat. Dübner's explanation (“notare etiam potuit popinam ubi sacrificiorum reliquiae venum exponebantur”) is possible, but θυμέλη makes better sense as the place where animals are butchered rather than

cooked; cf. the various euphemisms, especially θύειν, for the slaughtering of animals in sacrifice as detailed by W. Burkert, *Homo Necans*, ch. 1.1, *Gr. Rel.*, ch. 2.1.1. This interpretation assumes that θυμέλη = “butchershop,” although now unattested, was in common parlance.

παρέλθης: “Enter” rather than “pass by” seems the appropriate meaning here.

2 ἄπαγε: “Elliptically, *retire, withdraw*,” LSJ s.v. I 2 b, adducing Hdt. 5.126.1 ἐς τὴν Μύρκινον ἀπάγειν, Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.34 ἰδὼν δὲ ταῦτα ἼΑγισ ἀπήγαγε ταχέως. Here, “withdraw from the expensive to the cheap.”

δραχμῆς: Gigante reads –ήν, construing with ἄπαγε, “rendi una dracma al banco del rivendugliolo,” but, as the prefix indicates, when this verb means “render,” it suggests something due, a debt of money or honor (LSJ s.v. III), which is not appropriate here.

καλὰ χορδόκολα: Editors have included εἰς within the corruption, but it goes easily with ἀπάγειν, as in the Herodotos passage adduced. Sense demands that the reference here is to some cheap food, perhaps a cheaper form of meat to be found in a butchershop, especially since κολ- suggests κόλον, “intestines,” and κορδ- would be an easy error for some form of χορδ-, “guts, tripe,” which were regularly made into sausages; cf. χορδή, χόρδευμα, χορδεύω. A minimal change adopting these leads would be εἰς καλὰ χορδόκολα, tripe sausage stuffed into intestines, the final –κολα of a strange word affecting the initial καλα, perhaps with κολα at an intermediate stage of the corruption. The point, not made explicit until the next distich, is that if you cannot afford fresh meat, you should wait until the cheaper, and perhaps less fresh, cuts are turned into sausage.

3 σῦκον δραχμῆς ἕν: A further example of the advantage of waiting, linked to the first by the price: At the same moment that sausage is considered cheap for a drachma, this same drachma will purchase only one fig. For another poem on the variable value of figs, cf. Ananias 3 W² (figs are more valuable than gold to starving men); and for another expression of supply and demand, cf. Poseidippos III.3–4 B-G (speaking of common rock crystal):

εἰ δ' ἦν ἐκ γενεῆς σπάνιος, τὸ διαυγές ἀν' αὐτοῦ
τίμιος ἦν ὥσπερ καὶ καλὸς ἥελιος.

(ἀν . . . τίμιον Holford-Strevens is preferable.)

4 τοῖς πτωχοῖς κτλ: Proverbial in expression (like English “Beggars can’t be choosers”), with explanatory asyndeton; for other proverbs involving beggars, cf. Kallim. fr. 724 Pf. πτωχῶν οὐλὰς ἀεὶ κενεή, Hes. *Op.* 26 πτωχὸς πτωχῷ φθονεῖ.

ὁ χρόνος ἐστὶ θεός: At least since Pherekydes, on whom cf. H. S. Schibli, *Pherekydes of Syros* (Oxford 1990) 27 ff.; M. L. West, *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient* (Oxford 1971) 10–14. Also in Soph. *El.* 179 χρόνος γὰρ εὐμαρῆς θεός, Eur. *Hrkld.* 900, and in Orphic literature; cf. also M. B. Galán, “Chronos,” *LIMC* 3.1, pp. 276 ff.

ἐνθάδε τῆς τρυφερῆς μαλακὸν ῥέθος, ἐνθάδε κείται,
 Τρυγόνιον, σαβακῶν ἄνθεμα σαλμακίδων,
 ἧ καλύβη καὶ δοῦμος ἐνέπρεπεν, ἧ φιλοπαίγμων
 στωμυλίη, μήτηρ ἦν ἐφίλησε θεῶν,
 ἧ μούνη στέρξασα τὰ Κύπριδος ἀμφιγυναϊκῶν 5
 ὄργια καὶ φίλτρων Λαΐδος ἀψαμένη.
 φῦε κατὰ στήλης, ἱερὴ κόνι, τῇ φιλοβάκχῳ
 μὴ βάτον ἀλλ' ἀπαλὰς λευκοῖων κάλυκας.

AP 7.222 [26 GP, 21 K, 22 G]

P[C]Pl 3a.11.11, f. 34r Φιλοδήμου *Suda* s.vv. ῥέθος (1–2 Τρυγ.), σαβακῶν (2) Π iv.18
 ενθαδετητρυφε [J] εις Τρυγόνιον ἐταίραν τοῦ Σαβακῶν [C: Σακῶν P] ἔθνουσ ὀρμωμένην

2 Τρυγόνιον PPl (τρῦγ. Pl, i.e. nomen proprium): –ίου Reiske σαβακῶν CPISouda: **σακῶν
 (βασακῶν?) P 3 ἧ *** καλύβη C (rasura): ἧ καὶ καλύβη P: ἧ Κυβέλης Salm. δοῦμος
 PPl: δοῦπος: Scaliger, Salm. 5 ἀμφιγυναϊκῶν Theiler (haesitanter sed recte): ἀμφὶ γυναικῶν
 PPl: Ἀφρογενείης vel ἡμιγυναϊκῶν Herwerden 6 ἀψαμένη CPI: –να P 8 λευκοῖων
 CPI: –ότων P

Here lies the tender body of the delicate girl, here lies Trygonion, devotee
 of feeble effeminate,
 (she) through whom chapel and duma gained glory, to whom there was
 playful chatter, whom the Mother of the Gods loved,
 she who in a class by herself cherished the Cyprian rites of those all-around
 women, and helped with Lais's love philtres.
 O sacred dust, nourish around this philobacchic's stele not prickly shrub-
 bery but tender buds of white violets.

K. Buresch, *Aus Lydien* (Leipzig 1898) 62–65.

Luck, *Philologus* 100 (1956) 271–285.

Paton, *CR* 30 (1916) 48.

Sider, *AJP* 103 (1982) 208–211.

White, *LSCP* 8 (1981) 173–175.

Wiseman, *CQ* 32 (1982) 475 f.

A mock grave epigram for Trygonion, a castrated Gallos; see comm. on vv. 1 τρυφερῆς, 2 Τρυγόνιον, σαβακῶν, etc. For the subject of castrati in general, cf. A. D. Nock, "Eunuchs in ancient religion," *ARW* 23 (1925) 25–33 (= *Collected Papers* [Oxford 1972] 7–15); for an survey of Galloi in literature, cf. R. Ellis's introduction to Catullus 63; and in general H. Graillot, *La Culte de Cybèle Mère des dieux à Rome et dans l'empire romain* (BEFAR 107; Rome 1912), especially 287–319; G. M. Sanders, "Gallos," *RLAC* 8 (1972) 984–1034; T. P. Wiseman, *Catullus*

and *His World* (Cambridge 1985) 198–206. Horace, *Sat.* 1.2.120 f. suggests that Phil. used the Greek equivalent of *illam . . . Gallis*, “the hell with her,” in one of his epigrams.

According to Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, our most extended ancient account, funeral service for a Gallos had its special character: “His comrades carry him aloft to the area just outside the city, place him along with his pallet on the ground and cover all with stones. They then wait seven days before entering the sanctuary” (52). Phil. refers to none of this, however. The corpse of Attis was occasionally a subject for artists: LIMC s.v. Attis, nos. 325 f.; cf. S. Karwiese, “Der tote Attis,” *ÖJb.* (1971) 50–62.

No doubt irrelevant to Phil.’s poem, but too *χαρίεν* not to quote, is the following anecdote told of Arkesilaos: “Someone had inquired why it was that pupils from all the other schools went over to Epicurus, but converts were never made from the Epicureans: ‘Because men may become eunuchs, but a eunuch never becomes a man,’ was his answer” (D.L. 4.43, trans. Hicks).

On the subject of sepulchral epigrams, see R. Weisshäupl, *Die Grabgedichte der griechischen Anthologie* (Vienna 1889; repr. 1987); R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana 1942); U. Ecker, *Grabmal und Epigramm* (Stuttgart 1990).

1 ἐνθάδε: The beginning of many grave epigrams: 16 in *AP* and 82 in *GVI*, a common formula being ἐνθάδε (. . .) proper name (. . .) κείται/κείμει, which Peek, *GVI*, classifies as Typus I 4; see next note. Usually addressed to the passer-by, the words may be impersonal (as here), those of the grave stone itself, or those of the deceased. Cf. Weisshäupl, ch. 2, “Gräberformen.”

τῆς τρυφερῆς: Perhaps because a proper name often follows ἐνθάδε, some editors, despite J’s summary, took Tryphere as the name of the deceased and τρυγόνιον as “a pet name for a girl” (LSJ). But, although *Τρυφέρα* is indeed a common name (14 exx. in *LGPN* 1–2, and in *Meleager* 63 = *AP* 5.154 and *Asklepiades* 26 HE = *AP* 5.185), in none of the parallels examined does the definite article accompany the name, and here the name follows the second ἐνθάδε (as Pl’s τρυγόνιον indicates), which is repeated to enhance the pathos, as a repeated ἐνθάδε does in *Agathias* 5 *Viansino* = *AP* 5.292. Although I do not find an exact parallel for the phrase τῆς τρυφερῆς, it is not unusual to characterize the deceased with an adjective before s/he is named; e.g., Peek 371 *GVI* (Rome, ii–iii cent. = *IG* 14.1589) Μουσάων θεράπων, ἀνὴρ σοφὸς ἐνθάδε κείμει | Ἐρμοκράτης.

As Paton has shown, the poem makes far better sense as a mock lament for a castrato than as a maudlin epitaph for a real (i.e., biological) woman. Wiseman, however, would keep open the possibility that, like the next poem in *AP*, this one is also addressed to a dancing girl.

The semantic leap from τρυφή, “luxury,” to “softness, wantonness, effeminacy” is easy; cf. LSJ s.vv. τρυφερός, τρυφάω, κτλ. As Luck points out, this aspect of Trygonion is repeated in μαλακόν and σαλμακίδων as well as in his/her name; cf. also on σαβακῶν. Cf. *Aristoph.* *Lys.* 387 f. ἀρ’ ἐξέλαμψε τῶν γυναικῶν ἡ τρυφή | χῶ τυμπανισμὸς χοῖ πυκνοὶ Σαβάζιοι. Note also the worshiper of Kybele named Τρυφῶσα, below on 3 *δοῦμος*. [Giangrande, *Eranos* 65 (1967) 41 f. does not con-

vince me that ἡ τρυφερὴ . . . Κλεώ (AP 5.193 = Dioskorides 4 HE) is also a *pathicus*.]

ῥέθος: Here obviously “body,” a substitute for the more usual σῶμα or δέμας of epitaphs. (An infrequent synecdoche: κεφαλὴ, AP 7.3, 363.) Thus, *Il.* 16.856 (quoted just below) was used on a tombstone; Kaibel, *Ep.Gr.* 243.5 f. The lemma s.v. in LSJ has been almost completely rewritten in LSJ Suppl., although not, I think, yet satisfactorily (at the very least, for “Lyc. 1173” [omitted in the revised supplement] read “Lyc. 1137”). The basic sense would seem to be “cheek” (in Homer only in plural: *Il.* 16.856 ψυχὴ δ’ ἐκ ῥεθέων παμμένη, 22.68 ῥεθέων ἐκ θυμὸν ἔλται; Aeolic ῥεθομάλιδες said to be an epithet for the εὐπρόσωποι by Σ ABT ad *Il.* 22.68 probably = “apple-cheeked”; cf. Theokritos(?) μαλοπάρανος, 26.1). Since in Classical Greek (Sappho[?], Soph., Eur., plus Theokr., Kallim., Ap.Rh., Lykophron) the word came to mean “face,” there was probably an intermediate stage = “mouth” (cf. *bucca* > *bocca*), the shift from this meaning to “face” being paralleled by Lat. *os*. This meaning is in fact given by Σ ad *Il.* 22.68b διὰ γὰρ μυκτῆρων ἢ στόματος ἐκπνέομεν, and “mouth” does indeed make good sense of the Homeric plurals, but I suspect this is no more than a guess made at a time when the true meaning of the word had been lost. In post-classical Greek, the meaning “body” is found (Theokr. 23.39, Phil.), which may derive from a misreading of Homer’s usage found in several scholia (cf. Σ ad *Il.* 16.856 ὅτι πάντα τὰ μέλη ῥέθη Ὀμηρος προσαγορεύει, sim. ad 22.68) and lexica (Hesych. s.v. ῥεθέων· σπλάγγων μελῶν σωμαίων). On the other hand, a semantic shift from “face” to “body” is also possible; *facies* went in the opposite direction (so Frisk). Note that Theokritos uses the word to mean “face” in an Aeolic poem, “body” in an Ionic-dialect poem, and that “face” is said by the scholia ad *Il.* 16.856b to be a specifically Aeolic meaning. Cf. B. Snell, *Entdeckung des Geistes*, ch. 1 (pp.10 ff. of Engl. tr.), and M. Leumann, *Homerische Wörter* (Basel 1950) 218–222, for a different analysis.

2 Τρυγόνιον: A diminutive of the name Τρυγών (cf. F. Bechtel *Historische Personennamen* 591); for its form cf. the two hetairai Χελιδόνιον < χελιδών (Lucian *Dial.Metr.* 10) and Ἀηδόνιον < ἀηδών (Alkiphron 3.5), both of whom are again identified as hetairai by Eustathios *Il.* 3.662. For the diminutive of τρυγών, “dove,” as an appropriate name for a Gallos, note Apul. *Met.* 8.26.4, where Galloi are called *palumbulae* (pointed out by A. D. Nock apud Luck 274). Two qualities of the turtle dove may have suggested the association: (i) διαγνῶναι δ’ οὐ ῥάδιον τὴν θήλειαν καὶ τὸν ἄρρενα (Arist. *HA* 613a16), and (ii) *turturum educatio supervacua est, quoniam id genus in ornithone nec parit nec excudit* (Columella 8.9). Luck points out that turtle doves were sacred to Aphrodite and Demeter (both of whom have been associated with Kybele; cf. L. Robert, *J. Savants* [1971] 91; see on v.5), but this does not seem as immediately pertinent as the points just raised. (On the amorousness of doves, cf. especially Prop. 2.15.27 f.) The similarity between doves and pigeons may also be relevant, as the latter were the sacred bird of Galloi; cf. especially *De Dea Syria* 54; Thompson, *Gk. Birds* 244 ff. A Hellenistic terracotta shows Attis riding a dove (LIMC s.v. Attis, no. 303). In the Near East, (turtle) doves could stand for promiscuous women; cf. Job 43.14, Song of Songs 2.14, with (e.g.) Pope’s commentaries ad locc. in the Doubleday Bible Commentaries.

σαβακῶν: “Nerveless” is Gow-Page’s translation, an especially good one given *νεῦρον* = *penis*, for this is in fact the sense of the Greek word. As I showed in greater detail in *AJP*, the various ancient definitions for *σαβακός*, *Σαβάκτης*, *σαβάζω* can all be subsumed under the rubric of “smashing, breaking,” especially in a Dionysian/Sabazian context. Thus, Sabaktes is almost certainly the Smasher or Breaker, one of the demons of the kiln “Homer” threatens to invoke if the potters refuse him payment (*Epigr. Hom.* 14.9 = Hes. fr. 302 M-W; cf. M. J. Milne, “The poem entitled Kiln,” in J. V. Noble, *The Technique of Painted Attic Pottery* [New York 1965] 102–113). The *Souda*, glossing this poem of Phil., defines the word as *Διονυσιακῶν*, whereas Hesychios says that it = *σαθρός* among the Chians, and glosses the corresponding adv. as *αὔστηρως*, *ξηρῶς*, *τραχέως*. The seeming disparity between the meanings offered by the two lexica is paralleled by their glosses of *σαβάζω*, the *Souda* again associating the word with Dionysos and Sabazios, Hesychios glossing the verb as *διασκεδάσας*, *διασαλεύσας*.

The link between these various meanings may lie in the nature of Dionysos, the god of *sparagmos*, who can receive the epithets *ἀνθρωπορραίστης* (Aelian *NA* 12.34) and *Λυαῖος*, which, as M. Astour, *Hellenosemitica* (Leiden 1965) 191, points out, probably meant Destroyer before the more benign sense of Deliverer came to be understood. (Astour 188–193 also offers etymologies for Bassareus, Satyros, and Bakchos which explain these names as Render, Striker, Killer, etc.) *Σαβακός*, then, recalls both Sabazios’ role as an active destroyer and the particular destruction of a castrated Gallos, a (Phrygian?) word that itself may mean “the cut one,” < IE *g^whol (cf. Lat. *calvus*); cf. A. H. Sayce, *CR* 42 (1928) 161 f.

For the association between Sabazios and Kybele, cf. Aristoph. *Av.* 873 ff. *φρυγίλω* [= *finch* (? cf. Dunbar on *Av.* 763), a pun on *Φρυγίω*] *Σαβαζίω* καὶ *στρουθῶ* *μεγάλη* *μητρὶ θεῶν* [*μεγάλη* is to be taken ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, since *στρουθὸς* *μεγάλη* = *ostrich*]; Strabo 10.3.15, 18; Apul. *Met.* 8.25, Eustath. *In Od.* 1431.45 f. Cf. further S. E. Johnson, “The present state of Sabazios research,” *ANRW* 17.3 (1984) 1583–1613, especially 1587 f. (S. and Dionysos) and 1600 f. (S. and Kybele).

ἄνθεμα: Morphologically either (i) pl. (tantum) of *ἄνθεμον*, “flower” (so Brodaeus, Beckby), or (ii) the syncopated form of *ἀνάθεμα*, which appears in the same *sedes* in Kallim. *Ep.* 14 HE (5.2 Pf.) and Theokr. *Ep.* 2 HE (13.2 Gow = *AP* 6.340). Although Waltz would like exploit the ambiguity (“fleur des Salmakis consacrées à Sabazios”), there is no parallel for this metaphorical, let alone plural, use of *ἄνθεμον*, although Cat. 63.64 *gymnasi*. . . *flos* may be meant as a translation; Luck 275. Thus, especially given the Kallimachean and Theokritean parallels, sense (ii) is far more likely, although the two earlier writers apply the word to inanimate offerings (shell and statue, respectively) dedicated to gods—as does Phil. *De Mus.* IV 19.1. The use of the word for people is common in NT as a translation of *קִדְשׁ*, “something sacred to a divinity,” where, however, it is almost always found in the unfavorable sense “accursed” (see Arndt-Gingrich s.v.). Even if he did not know Hebrew (as his countryman Meleager did), Phil. may have been familiar with no longer extant Greek religious texts where *ἀνάθεμα* was used in either a neutral or positive sense. The only other author who seems to use this word in the sense “devotee” is Christodoros (iv–v c. A.D.) (*AP* 2.1.13 f.) *νοήμονος ἄνθεμα Πειθοῦς*, |

Αίσχινης. [ἄνθεμα C: ἄνθεα PPL. Paton (unlike Stadtmüller and Beckby) prints C's reading but translates "flower"; see above.]

Although, as Arndt-Gingrich s.v. ἀνάθημα report, NT texts often confuse this word with ἀνάθημα, I do not believe that Gow-Page are right to look to this latter word for the sense they find in Phil., i.e., "adornment," as, e.g., Eur. fr. 518. 4–5 Ν² (children,) τοῖς τεκοῦσί τε ἀνάθημα βιότου.

σαλμακίδων: The spring Salmakis near Halikarnassos had the power, it was said, to emasculate those who drank from it: Strabo 14.656 ἡ Σαλμακίς κρήνη διαβεβλημένη—ὡς μαλακίζουσα τοὺς πίνοντας ἀπ' αὐτῆς· ἔοικε δ' ἡ τρυφή τῶν ἀνθρώπων αἰτιῶσθαι τοὺς ἀέρας ἢ τὰ ὕδατα κτλ. Cf. also Ennius ap. Cic. *Off.* 1.61, *Or. Met.* 4.285 ff. et al. (amply quoted by Gow-Page). σαβακῶν . . . σαλμακίδων, then, must be an intentional hyperbole: almost "emasculated castrati." Buresch, noting the similarity in meaning, thought that one acts as a gloss on the other as a kind of hendiadys.

3-4 ἦ . . . ἦ . . . ἦν· For the anaphora of relative pronoun, cf. *H. Dem.* 481, D. Fehling, *Wiederholungsfiguren* (Berlin 1969) 205 f. Like Catullus in 63 (but more consistently), Phil. refers to a Gallos using the feminine gender, following what probably was normal cult practice, as Hesych. Κυβέβις· γάλλος indicates. Cf. also 1030 PMG Γάλλαι (quoted on v.4) and *Cat.* 63.12, 34 *Gallae*; *AP* 6.51.3 θῆλυς Ἄλεξις (a Gallos), *Apul. Met.* 8.26. But in this and the other Gallos poems referred to below on v.5 ἀμφιγυναϊκῶν, they are not modified by feminine forms. It is, of course, an insult for a man to refer to another as a woman, the *locus classicus* being *Il.* 2.235 Ἀχαιίδες, οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοί, copied by Vergil *Aen.* 9.617 *O vere Phrygiae, neque enim Phryges*, but with an additional oblique reference to (Phrygian) Galloī; cf. also *Cat.* 13.20; E. Maass, "Eunuchos und Verwandtes," *RM* 74 (1925) 455–458; Cic. *ND* 1.93, where Phil.'s teacher Zeno *Chrysippum numquam nisi Chrysippam vocabat* (Pease ad loc. gives further parallels for calling men women, as does Fraenkel on *Ag.* 1625). Literary parallels apart, however, eunuchs usually wore women's clothing and "were commonly regarded as of the feminine gender"; cf. *De Dea Syria* 15 (after Rhea castrated Attis, he ceased his male way of life) μορφήν δὲ θηλέην ἡμεῖσάτο καὶ ἐσθῆτα γυναικίην ἐνεδύσατο, *Souda* s.v. Γάλλοι· ἐν γυναικείοις στολαῖς; cf. *De Dea Syria* 27, 51; Nock 26.

3 **καλύβη:** The lack of definite article suggests that some special meaning is attached to this word for "hut, cabin" (LSJ); probably a humble structure in or close to a sacred area, like the μικρὰ καλύβια inhabited by Polemon and others near the Academy so that they would not have to live in the city (*Phil. Index Acad.*, col. 14.39 Dorandí καλύβια and D.L. 4.19). Cf. CIG 4591 (Palestine) τὸ κοινὸν τῆς κόμης καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ἱερὰν καλύβην ἔκτεισεν [?]. Wiseman makes the attractive suggestion that the καλύβη mentioned by Phil. is the very one said by Josephos (*AJ* 19.75,90) to have been located near the temple of the Great Mother on the Palatine (although later on, it was assigned to other, more Roman, gods).

δοῦμος: "Holy Assembly." Phil. provides the only sure instance of this obscure word in a literary text. On the principle of *einmal ist keinmal*, it was often emended away to δοῦπος (first independently by Scaliger and Salmasius), and hence

does not appear in LSJ until the Appendix of 1940. Its sense (and genuineness) is clarified, as Buresch was the first to recognize, by a number of inscriptions from Asia Minor: (a) No. 34 Buresch ἀνεστάθη ὁ βῶμος προνησαν]τος τοῦ δούμου ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τῆς ναυκόρου; (b) CIG 3439, iii A.D. from Maeonia, κατὰ τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἐπιταγὴν ἱερὸς δούμος εὐχὴν Διὶ . . . ἐκέλευσεν τηρεῖσθαι; (c) *Ath. Mitt.* 35 (1910) 144 (O. Walter), ἱεροῦ δούμου; (d) *Anat. St.* 18 (1968) 75 no. 19 (A. S. Hall), δο[ῦ]μος ὁ περὶ Ἐρδιν . . . εὐχὴν Μητρὶ Ουεγνα (Ουετνα?). CIG 3438, an inscription related to (a) seems to use the term ἱερά συμβίωσις as a synonym, which suggests that “(sacred) assembly” is an appropriate translation. (e) It almost certainly appears again in a bilingual Phrygian-Greek inscription from Dorylaeum (*Ath. Mitt.* 23 [1898] 362 [MAMA 5.183]) as ΔΟΥΜΘ, which P. Kretschmer *Ath. Mitt.* 25 (1900) 446 argues is a mistake for δουμω or δουμο, and, to judge from the Greek half, equivalent to τῆ κώμη (cf. CIG 4591, cited above on καλύβη). (f, g) The word also appears in *SEG* 28 (1978) nos. 893 and 899 (both from Maeonia), funerary inscriptions in which ὁ ἱερὸς δούμος joins with relatives in honoring the deceased; in 893 it would seem that a fellow worshiper in the δούμος was ἡ σύντροφος Τρυφῶσα (cf. τῆς τρυφερῆς?), in 899 Ἀμμαῖας ἡ σύμβιος reminds us of συμβίωσις in CIG 3438). (h) An inscription from Thessalonica has δούμος Ἀφροδίτης Ἐπιτευξιδίας; cf. E. Voutiras, *ZPE* 90 (1992) 87–96. [δούμος was mistakenly restored to yet another inscription; cf. *SEG* 28 (1978) no. 841.] See further O. Masson, “Le mot *doumos* ‘confrérie’ dans les textes et les inscriptions,” *Cahiers F. de Saussure* 41 (1987) 145–152, who tentatively suggests that the word is Maeonian; J. Kolendo, *Mélanges Lévêque IV: Religion* (Paris 1990) 245–249; *SEG* 40 (1990) no. 1737.

Δούμος is cognate with Gothic *doms*, “judgment” (cf. Domesday Book) and Slav. *duma*, “council” (and also with Lat. *ab-domen*; cf. Pokorny 2. *dbe*, p. 1.237). Although it may (Masson thinks not) be cognate with θωμός, “heap,” δούμος entered Greek as a loanword from Phrygian; cf. A. Heubeck, *Lydiaka* (Erlangen 1959) 81 n. 101. I. M. Diakonoff and V. P. Neroznak, *Phrygian* (Delmar, NJ, 1985) print the several Phrygian inscriptions to contain the word: A28 [= B-01 Brixhe-Lejeune], A58 [the bilingual], C48; A24 contains the fem. adj. *dumeja*, “woman of the *dumas*.” *Contra*, O. Haas, *Die phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler* (Sofia 1966) 97 f., who takes δουμω as *tumulo*, which is closer in sense to Greek θωμός.

Two literary passages have been emended from δουλ- το δουμ-: Hipponax 30 Masson–West οὐ μοι δικαίως μοιχὸς ἀλῶναι δοκεῖ | Κριτίης ὁ Χίος ἐν †τῷ κατωτικῷ† δούμω (em. Masson, *Rev. Phil.* [1955] 289; approb. West, Degani), and Hesychios s.v. δοῦλος· ἡ οἰκία, ἣ <σημαίνει> τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέλευσιν τῶν γυναικῶν (em. Wackernagel), which Masson (1987) 147 argues derives from a Hellenistic gloss on the Hipponax passage. The Hesychios passage, if rightly emended, shows how the word can refer both to the material structure and to the people assembled (cf. Fr. *église* etc. < Gr. ἐκκλησία). Buresch suggests hendiadys of καλύβη καὶ δούμος.

ἐνέπρεπεν: Not “simply an inversion” of verb and dative as Gow–Page and Luck say, which translates weakly as “Trygonion is well suited to . . .” or “der Laube und Dumos wohl anstand Trygonion”; rather, between the praise entailed in ἄνθεμα and Μήτηρ ἦν ἐφίλησεν, understand it rather as in LSJ s.v. ἐμπρέπω 2 “to be conspicuous or famous”; cf. especially Pindar *Pyth.* 8.28 (Aigina) ἀνδράσιμ ἐμπρέπει.

That is, just as Aegina was famous because of its citizens, Trygonion did not merely fit into this group in some congenial way, he was its leading light; perhaps an exaggeration, but in keeping with the usual hyperbole of tombstones. R. Keydell, rev. of GP, *Gnomon* 43 (1971) 680, suggests that this is an example of *ἐν* having lost its force in compounds, as was to be common in later Greek, but this is not necessarily the case here.

ἦ²: Dat. of the possessor; not with *ἐνέπρεπεν* (as edd. usually take it).

φιλοπαίγμων: More than just “fond of play,” at least in poetry, where it is regularly applied to joyful dance and song: *Od.* 23.134 (the false wedding celebration after the slaughter of the suitors), Hes. fr. 123 M-W

οὔρειαι νόμφαι θεαὶ < ἐξ > ἐγένοντο
καὶ γένος οὔτιδανῶν Σατύρων καὶ ἀμηχανοεργῶν
Κουρητῆς τε θεοὶ φιλοπαίγμονες ὄρχηστῆρες,

and Aristoph. *Ra.* 333 (the chorus calling Iakchos to his dance). The earlier sense would seem to be somewhere between “sportive” and “ecstatic”; cf. *κισσοφόρου Βρομίου πρόπολον φιλοπαίγμονα Πᾶνα* on a statue base of the 3rd or 2nd c. B.C. from Thasos; G. Daux, *BCH* 50 (1920) 240. Similarly, *Anacreontea* 3.3 *φιλοπαίγμονες δὲ Βάκχαι*, 42.1 f. *Διονύσου | φιλοπαίγμονος χορείας*. Arist. *HA* 629b12 secularizes the term, using it of a playful lion (so too Aristoph. *Gramm. Epit.* 2.144), but in Phil. the Dionysian overtones should not be lost. Applied to chatter, the adjective conjures up a lot of arm waving and moving about. [There may be a distant echo of Phil. in Pollux 5.161, a typically compendious paragraph, where *φιλοπαίγμων* and other adjectives are said to be used of *στωμυλία* and other activities.]

4 στωμυλία: “chatter, gossip,” whose stem shows up in poetry mostly in Aristophanes (8x), but also in a dialogue poem of Theokritos (5.79).

Μήτηρ . . . Θεῶν: The Great or Mountain Mother, Kybele, associated with (among other things) the emasculated Galloi; two Phrygian inscriptions address her as *Matar Kubeleja*. Note that the galliambic measure was also called *μητρωακός*. As Hephaest. *Ench.* 12.3 tells us, it was often used by “the newer” poets in works concerned with the Mother of the Gods; as an example he cites Kallim.(?) fr. 761 Pf. *Γάλλαι μητρὸς ὀρείης φιλόθυρσοι δρομάδες* (= 1030 PMG). The literature on this Phrygian goddess is large; cf. W. Burkert, *Greek Religion* 176–179, ch. III 3.4, with references to earlier literature; J. Bremmer, “The legend of Cybele’s arrival in Rome,” in M. J. Vermaseren (ed.), *Studies in Hellenistic Religions* (Leiden 1979) 9–22. The Phrygian evidence suggests that *Kubeleja* originally meant “of (Mt.) Kubelon” (cf. e.g. *Μήτηρ Δινδυμήνη*), i.e., a specific *μήτηρ ὀρεία*; cf. C. Brixhe, “Le nom de Cybèle,” *Sprache* 25 (1979) 40–45.

5 μούνη: “In a class by herself”; Gow-Page refer to Jebb on *OT* 299. Perhaps cf. Parmenides B 8.4 *μουνογενές*.

στέρξασα: When this word appears in epitaphs it is usually applies to the deceased, who in life was loved by one or another of his relatives; but cf. 708 GVI

= 212 Kaibel (Syria, i cent. A.D.) ἄδ' ἀρετὰν στέρξασα καὶ ἔνδικα λέκτρα συνεύνου. For goddesses of fertility being worshiped by the infertile (who could be prepubescent youths or the very old), cf. Nock 28 f.

Κύπριδος: For Aphrodite's connection with Kybele, cf. Charon 262 F 5 FG_{GrHist}; Eur. *Hel.* 1341–1357, where the chorus links the worship of Aphrodite, Demeter, and the Mountain Mother. Cf. also Phil. *De Piet.* fr. 3.11–14 Schober (*CErc* 18 [1988] 109) Μελανιπ[πί]δης δὲ Δήμητ[ρα καὶ] Μητέρα θεῶν φ[η]σιν μίαν ὑπάρχ[ειν]. Cf. further D. Obbink, “A quotation of the Derveni papyrus in Philodemus’ *On Piety*,” *CErc* 24 (1994) 111–135, esp. 114 ff.

ἀμφιγυναικῶν: Paleographically an undemanding change from the MSS' ἀμφὶ γυναικῶν. But, although prep. + noun would be unobjectionable in itself (cf. Pi., *P.* 9.105 f. Λιβύσσας ἀμφὶ γυναικὸς ἔβαν | Ἴρασα πρὸς πόλιν, Aisch. *Ag.* 62 f. πολυάνερος ἀμφὶ γυναικὸς | πολλὰ παλαίσματα), it is hard to understand what *orgia* “for the sake of women” could mean: one either partakes in these activities or not; they are not done for anybody else's sake. The words cannot mean “concerning women” (so White, alone among recent commentators to retain the MSS). Dilthey, *Observationes Criticae in Anth. Graecam* (Göttingen 1878) 11 f. (approb. Kaibel, Luck) takes ἀμφὶ with Κύπριδος, but only rarely does this preposition follow its noun, in all instances the acc. φρένας; cf. Hes. *Th.* 554 with West's n.; see further Gow-Page ad loc. Herwerden, followed by Paton (approb. Gow-Page), suggested ἡμιγυναικῶν, the very adj. applied to a Gallos by “Simon.” 59 FGE (*AP* 6.217.9; comm. in HE 2.517 f.): ἡ. θεῆς [sc. Κυβέλης] λάτρην, but this is unnecessary. It can probably also be shown to be wrong, for in all the six Gallos poems in the Anthology, the authors seem, in a fashion typical of the Anthology, to make sure never to copy one another in the way they describe the Gallos' unusual sexual category. Erykios calls him νεῖτομος, “cut when young,” a *hapax* (6.234). Alkaios: κειράμενος γονίμην τις ἀπὸ φλέβα (6.218). Antipater: ἴθρις (ἴδρις codd.), a rare word for eunuch (6.219). Dioskorides: θαλαμηπόλος, i.e., keeper of Kybele's underground chamber (where the castrations took place; 6.220). Since all these authors were in Meleager's collection, Phil. would certainly feel called upon to maintain the tradition and find yet another descriptive epithet for Galloi. Theiler's solution, therefore, not even really a conjecture, is hard to resist: Trygonion, as in vv. 2 and 3, is singled out from his peers, this time for his activity during the rites of—i.e., those carried out by—the people (now) women in front and back. And without ἀμφιγυναικῶν, Phil.'s poem would lack the reference to castration which all others include. White's objection that the adjective cannot mean “hinten und vorne weiblich,” on the grounds that “the Gallus was not ‘hinten weiblich,’ because human posteriors are common to both sexes” is in effect countered by the Anthology itself where more than one poet claims that from the rear one sex can substitute for the other, which is all ἀμφιγυναικῶν need mean. e.g., Argentarius 10 (*AP* 5.116.5 f):

στρέψας Μηνοφίλαν εὐίσχιον ἐν φρεσὶν ἔλπου
αὐτὸν ἔχειν κόλποις ἄρσενα Μηνοφίλον.

Cf. also 5.49 (Gallos), where a man who enters the woman from behind is called φιλόπαιδα. Mart. 11.43.12 *teque puta cunnos, uxor, habere duos* (i.e., vagina and anus); i.e., she is, like Trygonion, γυνή on both sides. Note also ἀμφιδέξιος, which of course

means only that for all intents and purposes (but not literally) one has two right hands. Cf. also Emped. 31 B 61.1 DK πολλά μὲν ἀμφιπρόσωπα καὶ ἀμφίστερνα φύεσθαι; J. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* (Basel 1926) 2.159.

For two genitives each with its own its own relationship to the same noun, cf. Pl. *Lg.* 665b Διονύσου πρεσβυτῶν χορός; KG 1.337 An.4.

6 ὄργια: Cf. CIL VI, 30780 = CCCA III 237 (2nd half iv c. A.D.), an altar honoring two holy men: ὄργια συνρῆξαντε θεᾶ παμμήτορι Ῥεΐη.

φίλτρων . . . ἀψαμένῃ: “Having prepared the love charms/potions.” φίλτρα can be potions or verbal spells (cf. Barrett on Eur. *Hipp.* 509), and ἄπτουμαι could also apply either to a drink (cf. *Od.* 10.379, take food or drink *for oneself*) or to a primarily verbal activity.

Λαΐδος: The name of the famous courtesan could be used to stand for sexual activity in general; best seen in Agathias 54 Viansino = *AP* 5.302.19 f., where Diogenes the Cynic, rejecting the possibility of sex with one type of woman after another, only one of whom is a courtesan, prefers masturbation: τὸν δ' ὑμέναιον | ἤειδεν παλάμη Λαΐδος οὐ χατέων.

7–8: Praying for the appropriate flowers to grow at the grave is a common Hellenistic motif; Luck 279–282 collects literary and inscriptional exx.

7 φῦε: The upsilon of this word often appears short in verse before a vowel, as in the inscription quoted in the next lemma (LSJ s.v.), but is properly long in the present system.

ιερῆ κόνη: Trygonion is buried in sacred ground, perhaps because Galloī, serving in some sort of priestly capacity, were considered pure, perfect, sage, etc.; Graillot 288 f., 294. Unusually, instead of being addressed to the passer-by, the epitaph turns out to be an appeal to the earth covering the corpse to produce the proper floral covering. For parallels, cf. Kaibel, *EG* 569.5 f. ἀλλὰ σύ, γαῖα, πέλοις ἀγαθῇ . . . ἄνθεα λαρά φύοις; 222b, p.x, 11 f. Krinagoras reverses the prayer: χθῶν . . . ἐπὶ τέφρης | ἀνδρὸς μὴ κούφη κέκλισο (*AP* 7.401.7 f. = 41 GP). For other exx. of vocative κόνη, see *AP* 7.315 (quoted in the next lemma), 632.5 (Diodoros 7 GP), 708.1 (Dioskorides 24 HE).

8 βάτον: Brambles are obviously inappropriate for the delicate Trygonion (see next lemma). S. L. Tarán, *JHS* 105 (1985) 91 f. cites some epigrams where “brambles” stand for the rough hair of the longer sexually desirable young man. For an inversion of the usual prayer, cf. *AP* 7.315.1–2 (Zenodotos or Rhianos), spoken by the corpse of Timon the misanthrope, τρηχεῖαν κατ' ἐμεῦ, ψαφαρῆ κόνη, ῥάμνον ἐλίσσοις | πάντοθεν, ἢ σκολιῆς ἄγρια κῶλα βάτου, Prop. 4.5.1 *terra tuum spinis obducit, lena, sepulcrum*.

ἀπαλὰς λευκοῦτων κάλυκας: More than mere synecdoche of course; the tender cups of the flowers are to remind the passerby of the equally tender Trygonion. Cf. CIG 5759 = Kaibel, *EG* 547a.1–6, an address to the dead man to produce fine flowers, especially v.4 κεις καλὰ βλ[α]στήσαις ἄνθεα λευκοῦτου; see further Lattimore 129–131, who also cites the inscriptions noted in the preceding lemma.

For the placing of violets on tombs, cf. A. B. Cook, "Iostephanus," *JHS* 20 (1900) 1–13, who demonstrates the connection between violets and Attis and Persephone. His reference to CIG 6789 = 548 Kaibel is particularly pertinent:

ἄνθεα πολλὰ γένοιτο νεοδητήω ἐπὶ τύμβω,
 μὴ βάτος ἀύχηρῆ, μὴ κακὸν αἰγίπυρον,
 ἀλλ' ἴα κτλ (other delicate flowers are listed).

34

Ἴνουῶς ὦ Μελικέρτα σύ τε γλαυκὴ μεδέουσα
 Λευκοθέη πόντου δαίμον ἀλεξίκακε
 Νηρήδων τε χοροὶ καὶ Κύματα καὶ σύ, Πόσειδον,
 καὶ Θρήιξ Ἄνέμων πρηῦτατε Ζέφυρε,
 ἴλαοί με φέροιτε διὰ πλατὺ κῶμα φυγόντα 5
 σῶον ἐπὶ γλυκερὴν ἠόνα Πειραέως.

AP 6.349 [19 GP, 24 K, 16 G]

P Φιλοδήμου Π iv.19 εὐνουσωμελικερ caret P1

1 σύ τε P: σύ δέ Ap.L (marg.) γλαυκὴ P: γλαυκοῦ Reiske: γλαυκῆς D'Orville: Γλαύκης Kaibel 3 Κύματα καὶ σύ P: χεῦματα καὶ σύ Gigante: κυανοχαῖτα F. W. Schmidt 6 σῶον P: ζῶον D'Orville γλυκερὴν Kaibel (–ράν iam D'Orville): γλυκύν P: γλαυκὴν Ap. L (marg.), Leid. B.P.G. 34 (marg.) ἠίονα Πειραέως C: ἰον ἀπειραεος P

Melikertes son of Ino, Leukothea the grey ruler of the open sea and divine averter of troubles,
 choruses of Nereids, Waves, and you Poseidon, and Thracian Zephyros the gentlest of the Winds,
 graciously may you bear me safely across a calm sea in my flight to the sweet shore of Peiraeus.

Giangrande, *GB* 7 (1978) 77 f.

Gigante, *Philodemus in Italy* 49–52.

Hopkinson 79, 271.

Kaibel, *Hermes* 15 (1880) 460 f.

Gigante argues that this carefully crafted literary prayer, with its complete lack of irony in addressing the gods, could have been written only before Phil.'s arrival in Athens from Gadara, since in Athens he would have learned from Zeno that the gods are unreceptive to prayers (sim. Dorandi, *CP* 90 [1995] 175). This may be so

(cf. 30, which reflects a more Epicurean idea towards prayer), but it should also be said that (i) we do not in fact know Phil.'s philosophical allegiance or leanings before he arrived in Athens. There were centers of Epicureanism in his part of the world; cf. W. Crönert, "Die Epikureer in Syrien," *Jahresb. d. Arch. Inst. in Wien* 10 (1907) 145–152. And (ii) the reference to Thracian Zephyros (v.4) may suggest a point of origin other than Gadara. In sum, this poem cannot be relied upon to provide unambiguous autobiographical statements.

One wonders, moreover, why, if Gigante is right about the strictness with which Phil. would compose a prayer, he would hold on to a poem so inconsistent with his later views. Since for most practitioners of the art, the epigram is, by design, the most ephemeral and occasional of poetic genres, an epigram no longer to the author's liking would be quietly discarded. If Phil. kept this poem over a period of years, he would also be capable of writing it at any time during that period, especially since Epicureans in fact did allow themselves to partake in prayers to the gods. There is, furthermore, no reason to regard this poem as in any way autobiographical; it may, for all we know, be written in the persona of the sort of people who Phil. in *De Morte* says are deserving of criticism for risking their lives in pursuit of profit: [ἐ]κε[ῖ]νους μέντοι [ν]ῆ τὸν Δία κα[ὶ] ψέγειν καὶ κ[α]κοδαίμων[ί]ζειν φυσικὸν [ἦ]δη, τοὺς δ[ὲ] φ[ί]λοκερδί[α]ν [τ]ὸν ἅπαντα βίον ἐπ[ι]κυματίζομέν[ου]ς καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πο[τε] βυ[θ]οιζομένους (col. 33.25–30 *Kuiper*).

Phil.'s poem, in other words, need be no more than an exercise in a common topos; cf., e.g., Prop. 2.26, wherein is described a similar prayer for safety at sea, containing invocations to, among others, Neptune, Leucothoe, and Nereids. Even more telling is Prop. 3.21, another journey to Athens, where echoes from this poem of Phil. lead to an Epicurean goal (which as we have just said may not be true of Phil.'s poem): Propertius plans a trip from Rome in order to escape from *gravi amore*: On board, *cogar et undisonos nunc prece adire deos*; and, *inde ubi Piraei capient me litora portus*, I will seek solace either in the Academy or in *hortis, docte Epicure, tuis*. Indeed, so reminiscent is Propertius of our poem that one wonders whether in it too Phil. was in flight from a *gravis amor*, looking to Athens (real or metaphorical) for philosophical solace. This could have been clear to Phil.'s audience as they heard or read this poem in conjunction with others in a series on the same theme, e.g., 8.

1–2 Ἴνου ὃ Μελικέρτα . . . Λευκοθέη: Ino, maddened by Dionysos, threw herself and her son Melikertes into the sea, whereupon they became known as Leukothea and Palaemon, deities now upon whom storm-tossed sailors could call; cf. esp. Orphic Hymns 74–75 and Frazer's note to his translation of Apollod. 3.4.3 for other ancient sources. For the Semitic origins of this tale, cf. M. Astour, *Hellenosemitica* (Leiden 1965) 204–212. There is no discrepancy in the narrator's calling the son by his land-name and the mother by her sea-name, and it may be regarded as a Hellenistic nicety that Melikertes strictly speaking is the son of Ino rather than Leukothea. Cf. Prop. 2.28.19 f.

Ino etiam prima terris actate vagata est:
hanc miser implorat navita Leucothoen.

1 γλαυκή: Reiske is followed by, e.g., Page (OCT) and Hopkinson, but too many sea deities are called γλαυκός for us to deny it to Ino here: In addition to Glaukos himself there are Thetis (Ap. Rh. fr. 12.15 Powell; Parthenios 2), Galaneia (Eur. *Hel.* 1457), Amphitrite (Theokr. 21.55), Nereids (id. 7.59), and Triton (Leonides Alex. 12 FGE = AP 7.550); cf. Nonnos *D.* 42.108 (a Naiad) ἐδύσατο σύγχροον ὕδωρ. Reiske's reading would provide an adj. for the otherwise bare πόντου, but is not compelling.

μεδέουσα: Cf. Alkman 50(b) PMG Ἴνώ σαλλασσομέδοισα. The simplex is common in hymns; cf. K. Keyssner, *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im gr. Hymnus* (Stuttgart 1932) 75 ff.

2 δαίμον ἀλεξίκακε: Although their violent deaths disqualify Ino and Melikertes from inclusion in Hesiod's Golden Race, his description of them at *Op.* 121 ff. offers a generally valid attitude towards helpful divinities:

αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ μοῖρ' ἐκάλυπεν,
οἱ μὲν δαίμονες ἀγνοῖ ὑποχθόνιοι καλέονται,
ἔσθλοί, ἀλεξίκακοι, φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων.

(The text, however, is vexed; cf. West ad loc. I quote from Pl. *Crat.* 397e–398a.) Cf. further Keyssner 107–113 f.

3 Νηρήδων: Several of the words of this poem recall the names of Nereids, as given by Hes. *Tb.* 240 ff., along with their power to calm the sea: γλαυκή ≈ Γλαύκη (243), Γλαυκονόμη (256); πόντου ≈ Ποντοπόρεια (256); ἡόνα ≈ Ἡτιόνη (255); σῶφον ≈ Σαώ (243); and κύμα ≈ several names beginning with Κυμο–, esp. 252 ff.

Κυμοδόκη (θ'), ἢ κύματ' ἐν ἡεροειδέι πόντω
πνοίας τε ζαέων ἀνέμων σὺν Κυματολήγῃ
ρεῖα πρηύνει.

χοροί: Not a metaphor, as, e.g., Phil. *Rhet.* 1.236.5 f. Sudh. ὁ τῶν πολιτευομένων χορός, but a literal description of the Nereids, who are often described or pictured as dancers. Cf. Eur. *Tro.* 2 Νηρήδων χοροὶ | κάλλιστον ἵχνος ἐξελίσσουσιν ποδός, *IT* 427 Νηρήδων . . . χοροί, *Ion* 1080–1084, *IA* 1054–1057, *Andr.* 1267; Bakch. 17.101–108; Philostr. *Imag.* 2.8; Nonnos 48.192–194. See further J. M. Barringer, *Divine Escorts: Nereids in Archaic and Classical Greek Art* (Ann Arbor 1995), 83–89, who, in addition to supplying the literary references just given, has identified several groups of dancing Nereids on Greek vases. (Wilamowitz *S&S* 169 conjectured νυμφᾶν δέ μιν θοᾶν χορόν in Simon. 579.3 PMG.)

Κύματα: Kept lowercase by modern editors and taken as parallel to χοροί with Νηρήδων, but “waves of Nereids” is unparalleled, whereas Waves appear as gods in Artemidoros 2.34, and, as was said in the introduction, Phil. seems intent on getting as many sea gods as possible into this poem. Note also that Prometheus' invocation of semipersonified cosmic elements includes ποντίων τε κυμάτων | ἀνήριθμον γέλασμα, *PV* 89f. Gigante, *Epigrammi scelti and Philodemus in Italy* 51, conjec-

tures χεύματα (“cori ed onde delle Nereidi”), comparing Paulus Sil. 32 Viansino (*AP* 9.663.4) χεύματα Νηρείδων and Eur. *IA* 166 Εὐρίπου διὰ χευμάτων; and arguing that the paradosis is suspect in view of the following διὰ πλατὺ κῦμα, but an address to Waves would not be amiss in a prayer for a calm voyage. Schmidt’s conjecture, designed to meet the same objection, is far less likely. (Neuter deities occur elsewhere; e.g., Γῆρας in 19 and Κράτος in *PV*, both of whom vase painters freely portray as males.)

4 Θρήξ ανέμων πρητύατε Ζέφυρε: Gow-Page wonder why the gentle western wind of Zephyros should be associated with the north, whence blows harsh Boreas. They suggest a “misapplied” literary reference to *Il.* 9.5 Βορέης τε καὶ Ζέφυρος, τῷ τε Θρήκηθεν ἄητον. But, although Zephyros can indeed be the gentlest of winds, as Theophrastos, *De Ventis* 38 says (ὁ δὲ ζέφυρος λειότατος τῶν ανέμων), it is also, as Theophrastos goes on to spell out (cc. 38–45), associated with destructive cold weather and storms, especially in early spring and late fall. And a wind can come from the west wherever one is located; Theophrastos mentions the west wind in Thessaly, the Malic Gulf, etc. A traveller from Macedonia to Athens (say, Piso) could more specifically call upon a zephyros which came from Thrace to start him on his journey. In this case, invoking the needed wind as gentle may be an instance of *captatio benevolentiae*. If this poem were in fact written for Piso’s departure from Macedonia in 55 B.C., Phil. could have been with him (so, e.g., Cichorius, *Röm. Stud.* 295; G. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* [Oxford 1965] 3), or, equally possible, it could have been included in a letter to Piso from Phil., who had remained in Italy.

The phrase ἀνέμων πρητύατε Ζέφυρε is copied from Dioskorides 11 HE (*AP* 12.170.2). For the comparative of this adj., cf. 18.5. For Zephyros in art and myth, cf. K. Neuser, *Anemoi: Studien zur Darstellung der Winde und Windgottheiten in der Antike* (Rome 1982) 119–142.

5 ἴλαοι: For use of this adj. and its related verb in prayers, cf. Keyssner 91–93.

φέρουτε: Most applicable to a wind (cf. *Od.* 10.25 f. αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ πνοιήν Ζεφύρου προέηκεν ἄηται, ἴσθρα φέροι νῆάς τε καὶ αὐτούς), but as the plural shows, it is meant to apply to all the divinities, who see to it that he is carried safely by his ship (cf. *Od.* 16.322 f.).

πλατὺ κῦμα: Etymologically an oxymoron, but here, as part of a prayer for smooth sailing, probably better taken as a proleptic adj.: “a wave that is to be flattened.” Gaetulicus *AP* 5.17.3, another prayer to Ino, imitative of 34, contains the phrase ἐπὶ πλατὺ κῦμα.

6 σῶφον: Travelers by sea had good reason to appeal to sea deities in their capacity as σωτήρες; cf. *Hom.H.* 22.5 (Poseidon), *Orph.H.* 74.4 (Leukothea), 75.7 (Palaimon = Melikertes). D’Orville’s ζῶφον (approb. Brunck, Reiske) is altogether unnecessary.

Πειραῖως: Normally –αιεύς ὀρ –ἄεύς. The former appears as –αιεῖ in Aristoph. *Pax* 145, and for the scansion here, cf. IG II² 12476/7.3 (ca. 150 A.D.) πᾶρ χθονὶ Πειραῖως; L. Threatte, *Grammar of Attic Inscriptions* 1 (Berlin 1980) 213.

κέντρα διωξικέλευθα φιλορρώθωνά τε κημόν
 τόν τε περι στέρνοις κόσμον ὄδοντοφόρον,
 †καὶ συΐνην < Ξ > † ῥάβδον ἐπὶ προθύροισι, Πόσειδον,
 ἄνθετό σοι νίκης Χάρμος ἀπ' Ἴσθμιάδος,
 καὶ ψήκτρην ἵππων ἐρυσίτριχα τήν τ' ἐπὶ νώτων 5
 μάστιγα ροίζου μητέρα θαρσαλέην.
 ἀλλὰ σύ, κυανοχαῖτα, δέχευ τάδε, τὸν δὲ Λυκίνου
 υἷα καὶ εἰς μεγάλην στέψον Ὀλυμπιάδα.

AP 6.246 [Argentarius 18 GP = 15 Small]

P Φιλοδήμου, οἱ δὲ Ἀργενταρίου Pl 6.5, f. 61v Φιλοδήμου Suda s.vv. κημός (1),
 διωξικέλευθα et κέντρα (1 διωξικέλευθα κέντρα), στέρνοις (2), ψήκτρα (5–6)

3 καὶ συΐνην PPl: οἰσιΐνην καὶ vel οἰσ. δ' ἔτι Salm.: κοἰσιΐνην Brodaeus: κοἰσιΐνην ἔτι Jacobs:
 οἰσιΐνην τε Boissonade: οἰσιΐνην παρὰ Stadtmüller 3–4 post 6 (iam tent. Stadtmüller)
 traiec. Beckby, Waltz 6 ροίζου . . . θαρσαλέην PPl: –ης . . . –ης Suda 7 Λυκίνου Pl
 –κειν– P

Course-chasing spurs, nostril-hugging muzzle, tooth-bearing breastpiece,
 and willow wand(?)—these Charmos has dedicated in your porch,
 Poseidon, because of his Isthmian victory—
 and the horses' curry comb and whip for their rumps, bold mother of
 whirring sound.
 So then, O dark-haired one, receive these, and crown the son of Lukinos
 also for a great Olympian contest.

Small, YCS 12 (1951) 103, 121 f.

A dedicatory epigram, of which sort Argentarius offers two other examples (17 GP = AP 6.201, a dedication to Artemis after childbirth; 23 = 6.248, dedication of a flask to Aphrodite); Phil. offers none other (nor does any incipit in Π seem to begin a dedication). The external evidence for authorship is indecisive, the combined weight of PPl favoring Phil., and the lack of an incipit in Π somewhat telling against him. It sits well within a Philippan run of epigrams (6.227–261), which of course does nothing to settle a dispute between two of Philip's authors. Although Gow-Page "cannot resolve the doubt about 6.246" (GP 2.166), they include it in Argentarius because "there is nothing similar in Philodemus, but Argentarius occasionally composes in this style" (GP 2.371). The style, however, belongs to the dedicatory genre rather than to the author, and had Phil. written one such no longer extant it would doubtless conform to type. Our small Philodemian corpus con-

tains other poems without parallels, such as the mock epitaph of 33 and the prayer of 34. Beckby merely says “wohl Argentarius.” The poem is also claimed for Argentarius by Small 121 on grounds similar to those of Gow-Page (Small in addition to the two poems mentioned above adduces Argentarius 24 = *AP* 9.229, a similarly adjective-filled ode to a flagon).

Gow *GA* 30–40 surveys the epigrams with alternative ascriptions, of which there are many in Meleager’s, Philip’s, and Agathias’ collections. Of the various causes for this phenomenon, the most likely at work here is “erudition and conjecture”—erudition if Argentarius is the true author, conjecture if Phil. is. Small and Gow-Page may well be right, but certainty is not possible. (In any case, Stadtmüller’s unsupported suggestion “Ἀντιφίλου ?,” in app. crit., need not be seriously entertained.)

The vast majority of dedicatory epigrams in the Anthology are for objects maritime, martial, cosmetic, agricultural, musical, etc. which, often now decrepit, are offered up (and gotten rid of) in thanks. Victory offerings (not always the prizes; cf. below on 1 κέντρα) are 6.49, 100, 149, 213, 233, 259, 292, 311, 350, of which the closest to Phil./Argentarius is Maccius 8 *GP* (*AP* 6.233):

γομφιόδουπα χαλινὰ καὶ ἀμφίτρητον ὑπεϊρκτάν
 κημόν καὶ γενύων σφίγτορ' εὐρραφέα
 τάνδε τ' ἐπιπλήκτειραν ἀπορρύτιο διωγμοῦ
 μάστιγα ἄσκαιοῦτ' δῆγμα τ' ἐπιψελίου
 κέντρα τ' ἐναιμήεντα διωξίπποιο μῦωπος 5
 καὶ πριστὸν ψήκτρης κνήσμα σιδηρόδετον
 διπλοῖς αἰόνων ὠρύγμασιν, Ἴσθμιε, τερφθεῖς
 δῶρα, Πόσειδον, ἔχεις ταῦτα παρὰ Στρατίου.

For such offerings in general, see W. H. D. Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings* (Cambridge 1902), ch. 4, “Games and contests,” pp. 163–186. Dedicatory inscriptions: M. Lazzarini, *Le formule delle dediche votive nella Grecia arcaica*. Mem. dell’ Acc. Naz. dei Lincei 19.2 (1976). Inscriptions celebrating athletic victories: J. Ebert, *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*. Abh. der Sächs. Ak. der Wiss. zu Leipzig. Phil.-hist. Kl. 63.2 (Berlin 1972). For equine gear and horsemanship in general, see J. K. Anderson, *Ancient Greek Horsemanship* (Berkeley 1961); P. Vigneron, *Le Cheval dans l’antiquité gréco-romaine* (Nancy 1968); S. Georgoudi, *Des chevaux et des bœufs dans le monde grec* (Athens and Paris 1990); D. G. Kyle, “The Panathenaic games: Sacred and civic athletics,” in J. Neils (ed.), *Goddess and Polis* (Princeton 1993) 77–101.

An oddity of this poem is that the contest is not named (as is the case elsewhere in the Anthology and on inscriptions), which suggests that it is an exercise in the dedicatory topos rather than a poem written for a real occasion. Perhaps an original poem in honor of the son of a certain Lykinos of Sparta who won with horses at Olympia in 384 B.C. (Paus. 6.2.2) provided a model, as it was not uncommon for victories to run in families; cf., e.g., Paus. 6.1.6 (Kyniska and her family), 6.2.1 f., 6.2.8, 6.7.1–7 (Diagoras and his family), 6.7.8.

1 κέντρα: Although this word when applied (literally) to horses usually means either “crops” or “goads,” (LSJ s.v. 1, Anderson 205 n.30), *Souda* (κέντρα· τὰ τῶν ἵππων πλῆκτρα· κέντρα διωξικέλευθα) and Gow-Page are very likely right to take it here to mean “spurs.” First, two other horse-goads are mentioned below. Second, the Maccius poem given above, which either imitates or is imitated by Phil./Argentarius, (i) again distinguishes κέντρα from the μᾶστιξ, and (ii) applies to the former the descriptive phrase διωξίπποιο μύωπος, which more certainly can refer to spurs; cf. Asklepiades 6 HE (*AP* 5.203.1–2) Λυσιδίκη σοί, Κύπρι, τὸν ἵππαστήρα μύωπα | χρύσειον εὐκνήμου κέντρον ἔθηκε ποδός, Theophr. *Char.* 21.8 ἐν τοῖς μύωφι κατὰ τὴν ἀγορὰν περιπατεῖν, and note also Xen. *Eq.* 8.5, where, Anderson *ibid.* argues, μύωφι refers to spurs. Spurs can be seen on the boy jockey from Artemision, a Hellenistic bronze of the third or second century; cf., e.g., D. Finn and C. Houser, *Greek Monumental Bronze Sculpture* (New York 1983) 89 f.

Since spurs are of no use to a charioteer, the race (if indeed the author thought about the matter) must have been of mounted riders (see introduction above, *fin.*).

Rouse 151 divides athletic offerings into (i) prizes, (ii) instruments, and (iii) other commemorative offerings, of which Charmos here offers (ii).

διωξικέλευθα: One of several ἄπαξ λεγόμενα in this poem (Graefe conjectured it at Nonnus *D.* 5.233); the others are: 1 φιλορρώθωνα, 2 ὄδοντοφόρον, 5 ἐρυσίτριχα. A similar accumulation of hapaxes may be found in 3; Small 83 lists ἄπαξ and δις λεγόμενα in Argentarius. This word, Pi. *P.* 9.4 (etc.) διωξίππου, and Schol. in Oppian. *Hal.* 1.140 διωξίφαγροι (swiftly moving fish; not in LSJ) are the only Greek words compounded with διωξι-. (Διωξίππος, Διώξανδρος, and Διωξίμαχος also occur as proper names.)

φιλορρώθωνα: ρώθωνες, “nostrils,” whether of humans or animals; often of horses in *Hippiatr.* 21

κημόν: Muzzles were not used during races, but were used during training and grooming; cf. Xen. *Eq.* 5.3 ὁ γὰρ κημὸς ἀναπνεῖν μὲν οὐ κωλύει, δάκνειν δὲ οὐκ ἔβ, Maccius 8.1–2 (above), D. Cahn, in D. von Bothmer (ed.), *Glories of the Past: Ancient Art from the S. White and L. Levy Collection* (New York 1990) 122.

A κημὸς can also be a bit (χαλινός) or hackamore, but its epithet here, “nostril-loving,” fits better with muzzle. Note, however, that bits often have external lateral branches which extend as far as the nostrils. In general, cf. Vigneron ch. 2, “Le harnais de tête,” pp. 51–79, with pls. 14–28.

2 ὄδοντοφόρον: Waltz, translating “dentelée,” followed by Gow-Page, adduces Daremberg-Saglio s.v. Ephippium, fig. 2686 (third quarter of sixth cent., Clazomenae, *CVA Great Britain* 13, BM fasc.8 [1954], pl. 585, fig.1 = plate 17 Anderson), a horse wearing a neck collar from which depend objects which I doubt are meant to be taken as teeth. Anderson more cautiously says “the collar round the horse’s neck is purely ornamental, unless the discs hanging from it are charms to avert bad luck” (caption to pl.17). R. M. Cook, the author of the *CVA* fascicle, says merely that the trappings are “of Oriental—and perhaps specifically Assyrian—style” (pl. 18); similarly decorated horse collars are to be seen on other Clazomenian vases and sarcophagi illustrated here. Without any surer visual evidence for teeth, we can

probably do no better than follow Jacobs (1799): “Fuisse videtur lorum, dentibus distinctum, pectora equi ambiens, quale ornamentum et hodie equis adhiberi solet”; sim. LSJ.

3–4: There is no doubt that other dedicatory poems offer unbroken lists of offerings, but this is in itself no reason to follow Stadtmüller et al. in transposing these lines in order to make this poem conform to what is often a very tedious type.

3 καὶ σϋῖνην: Since σϋῖνον (sc. χρῖμα) appears in three codd. vett. of Xen. *An.* 4.4.13 (*v.l.* σϋετον, which edd. prefer), the reference here may well be to a leather switch (cf., e.g., fig. 42 Neils). Editors, however, aware of the many representations in art of a driver or rider with willow wand in hand, prefer the easy emendation to (κ)οῖσϋῖνην; cf., e.g., fig. 41 Neils. This poem, like Xen. *Eq.* 8.4 μάστιξ ἢ ῥάβδος, distinguishes between the whip and the switch. The latter, like the muzzle and comb, would be used during training and grooming.

προθύροισι: Specially commissioned items, such as statues, would be set up in their place; smaller items, such as masks, could be hung from the wall; offerings in between could, as here, be left in the portico of the temple; cf. e.g. *AP* 5.202 (Asklepiades 35 HE = Poseidippos 24 Page OCT, a hetaira dedicates her leather gear to Aphrodite), 6.24.2 (Anon.), 114.2 (Samios 2 HE), 143.2 (Ps.Anacreon 14 FGE), 178.2 (Hegesippos 2 HE), 211.7 (Leonidas 2 HE), 254.8 (Murinos 2 GP), 297.5 (Phanias 4 HE). Afterwards, temple attendants would enter the objects in the temple inventory and then either store or bury them; Rouse ch.13.

4 σοι: This pronoun alone may be enough to mark this poem as a literary exercise, for although the formula ὁ δεῖνα ἀνέθηκε τῷ θεῷ is very common (cf. Lazzarini 181–207), inscriptions address the (human) reader who is standing before the offering or statue. On the other hand, cf. *AP* 6.9.1, 16.1, 21.9, 36.1 etc., which are of course literary examples.

νίκης . . . Ἰσθμιάδος: Cf. *Pi. I.* 8.4 Ἰσθμιάδος τε νίκας ἄποινα, Maccius 8.7–8 Ἰσθμιαίε . . . Πόσειδον.

Χάρμος: 21 exx. of this name in LGPN 1–2.

5 ψήκτρην: Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 1174 ψήκτραισιν ἵππων ἐκτενίζομεν τρίχας, Maccius 8.6, Anderson 95 f. See Xen. *Eq.* 5.5–10 for advice on grooming.

ἐρυσίτριχα: lit. “hair-drawing”; perhaps constructed with the epic ἐρυσάρματα (ἵπποι) in mind (*Il.* 15.354, 16.370, Hes. *Sc.* 369).

ῥώτων: A single rider swings the whip backwards and to the side, striking a flank; a charioteer still strikes the horse’s hindquarters but can hit either flank or the back; cf., e.g., figs. 41, 42, 44 Neils. For ῥώτων in this sense, cf. *Od.* 4.65 (Menelaos prepares for eating) ῥῶτα βοός . . . πίονα.

6 ῥοίζου μητέρα θαρσαλέην: ῥοίζος can describe the rushing sound made by an object as it moves through the air, e.g., arrows, wings, falling trees; Phil. also uses the word to describe the displeasing sound represented by rho, three instances of which appear in this phrase: Phil. *Poet.* P.Herc. 994 col. 33.5–8 (text available in

F. Sbordone, "Filodemo e la teorica dell'eufonia," in *Sui papiri della Poetica di Filodemo* [Naples 1983] 142); similarly D.H. *Comp.* 14 and S.E. *M.* 1.102. Stadtmüller in app.crit. suggested the reading καρχαλέην, comparing Nonnos 48. 307 καρχαλέης . . . ἦχον ἰμάσθλης.

μητέρα: That is, a productive source of; LSJ s.v. II. Thus, Pylos, Iton, Phthia, and Thrace is each called μήτηρ μήλων by Homer. Cf. I. Wærn, *Γῆς Ὀστέα: The Kenning in Pre-Christian Poetry* (Uppsala 1951), esp. 7 f., 49 f., 108 (where she compares Phil.'s use of the "messenger kenning" in 5.3 f. and 4.3 f.); and West's index to Hes. *Op.*, s.v. "kenning." Perhaps the author of this victory poem had in mind Pi. *Ol.* 8.1 μᾶτερ ὦ χρυσοστεφάνων ἀέθλων, Οὐλύμπια.

ἀλλά: In wishes and prayers; Denniston *GP* 16.

7 κυανοχαίτα: An epic epithet; e.g. *Il.* 20.224 (cf. Edwards ad loc.), *Od.* 9.536, Hes. *Tb.* 278, *H.Herm.* 347 (vocative); and Schmidt's conjecture at 34.3.

δέχου: Occasionally the request that the god receive the offering is made explicit; e.g., IG 12 Suppl. p. 86 (CEG 1.345 = Lazzarini 800) τὸ δὲ δέξαι, Φοῖβε Ἄπολλον, *AP* 6.18.5 (Julian), 47.3 (Antipater 43 HE) τήνδ' ἔχε, 191.2 (Cornelius Longus) ταῦτα δέχου δῶρα, 250.3 (Antiphilos 1 GP).

8 καὶ εἰς . . . Ὀλυμπιάδα: With this wish for future victories, cf. *Inscription von Olympia* 174.3 f. (CEG 2.827 = Geffcken 131 = Ebert 55) ἀλλά, πάτερ Ζεῦ, | καὶ πάλιν Ἀρκαδία καλὸν ἄμειβε κλέος. Such wishes or prayers are also found at the conclusion of epinicia; cf., e.g., Pi. *I.* 1.64–68, with E. L. Bundy, *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley 1986) 77–83. Gow-Page notice the oddness of εἰς here; it seems to fall under LSJ s.v. IV, "relation." Since, strictly speaking, Poseidon cannot crown an Olympic victor, this phrase may be a compression of something like "crown me (here) for (i.e., looking forward to) a future Olympic contest."

στέψον: The *vox propria* in this context, as many exx. in Ebert show. Usually the subject of the verb is the victor's city (or fellow citizens), but cf. Ebert 79.3 (Chios, ii A.D.) [ἔσ]τεφε με Ζ[εὺς], Alkaios 9 HE (*AP* 12.64.1–2) Ζεῦ, . . . Πειθήνορα . . . αἰπεινῶ στέψον ὑπὸ Κρονίῳ.

36

νύξ ἱερὴ καὶ λύχνη, συνίστορας οὔτινας ἄλλους
 ὄρκοις ἀλλ' ὑμέας εἰλόμεθ' ἀμφότεροι·
 χῶ μὲν ἐμὲ στέρξειν, κείνον δ' ἐγὼ οὔποτε λείψειν
 ὀμόσαμεν· κοινήν δ' εἶχετε μαρτυρίην.
 νῦν ὁ μὲν ὄρκιά φησιν ἐν ὕδατι κείνα φέρεσθαι,
 λύχνη, σὺ δ' ἐν κόλποις αὐτὸν ὄρᾳς ἑτέρων.

AP 5.8 [Meleager 69]

P Μελεάγρου ΠΙ 7.89, f. 72ν τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου]

2 ὄρκοις PPI: fort. ὄρκων 5 νῦν PPI: fort. νῦν δ' κείνα PPI: κεινά tent. Gow-Page φέρεσθαι PPI: γράφεσθαι Polak, Dehèque: γεγράφθαι tent. Stadtmüller 6 αὐτόν CPl: -ὦν P

Sacred night and oil-lamp, we two together chose no other witnesses for our oaths than you.

We swore: he that he would love me, I that I would never leave him. You were witnesses to testimony sworn jointly.

But now he says that those oaths are carried on water, and you, lamp, see him in the bosom of others.

Ludwig, *MH* 19 (1962) 156 f.
Wifstrand 55 f.

This poem is unworthy of both Meleager and Phil. That the theme is a common one proves nothing in itself, but this, combined with the several infelicities detailed below and the lack of any final point, does not point towards Phil. Gow-Page point out that of the two poets only Phil. elsewhere writes in the persona of a woman, but this could well have been done by Meleager as well (as Gow-Page acknowledge), and of course by any later imitator; see below on 6. It is accepted as Philodemian by K. P. Schulze, *BPhW* 36 (1916) 319. Wifstrand and Ludwig point out how this poem offers variants both on Kallim. *Ep.* 11 HE (see below on 5) and, with specific reference to the poem's being spoken by a woman (Ludwig), on Asklepiades 9 HE (*AP* 5.7):

λύχνη, σὲ γὰρ παρεοῦσα τρὶς ὤμοσεν Ἡράκλεια
ἤξειν, κοῦχ ἤκει· λύχνη, σὺ δ' εἰ θεὸς εἶ,
τὴν δολίην ἀπάμυνον· ὅταν φίλον ἔνδον ἔχουσα
παίζη ἀποσβεσθεὶς μηκέτι φῶς παρέχε.

1 νύξ ἱερή: Since this adj. means that something belongs to or is closely associated with a god, it does not directly modify a god; here, therefore, as in Aisch. fr. 69.7 *ιεράς νυκτὸς* and Eur. fr. 114 N² *ὦ νύξ ἱερά*, night is simply part of the daily cycle controlled by the gods; cf. *Il.* 11.194: *δύη τ' ἥελιος καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἱερὸν ἔλθη*. Cf. P. Wülfing-von Martitz, "Ἱερός bei Homer und in der älteren griechischen Literatur," *Glotta* 38 (1960) 272–307; 39 (1961) 24–43, esp 26 f.; J. T. Hooker, *Hieros in Early Greek* (Innsbruck 1980), who 25 f. argues for the word's conveying the meanings "strong," "swift" when applied to night.

νύξ . . . καὶ λύχνη, συνίστορας: Lamps are often witnesses to erotic scenes in the Anthology (see on 7.1), cf. the last line; here, though, strictly speaking, lamp and night are but witnesses of the oaths sworn by the lovers. Cf. also Asklepiades 13 HE (*AP* 5.164.1) *νύξ, σὲ γάρ, οὐκ ἄλλην, μαρτύρομαι*. The word *συνίστωρ* is

relatively uncommon in early literature: once each in Aischylos, Euripides, and Thucydides, and twice in Sophokles.

1–2 οὔτινας ἄλλους . . . ἀλλ’: For ἀλλά after a negative clause, cf. KG 2.283 f. and e.g. *Il.* 21.275 f. ἄλλος δ’ οὐ τίς μοι τόσον αἴτιος Οὐρανίωνων | ἀλλὰ φίλη μήτηρ.

2 ὄρκους: This is the only instance of a *dativus rei* with συνίστωρ rather than a genitive, which may well have been the original reading. When a dative occurs with either the noun or the equivalent verb it refers to the person for whom one acts as witness; e.g., *Phil. De Mus.* IV col. 18.13 αὐτοῖς συνιστορηκέναι.

3 ἔγῳ: Correption of a disyllabic word is rare at the bucolic diaeresis: once elsewhere in Meleager 95.1 (*AP* 12.60) and once elsewhere in *Phil.* 22.5, where, probably, metrical roughness is intended.

4 κοινήν δ’ εἶχετε μαρτυρίην: As Gow-Page note, word order suggests that the emphasis is on the oaths sworn together by the two lovers. The phrase μαρτυρίαν ἔχειν (‘to receive as testimony’: cf. *Aristot. Pol.* 1338^a36) suggests that the lovers swore to, or by, night and the lamp. See on 7.2 λύχνον.

δ’ | εἶχετε: Meleager often has elided δέ at the pentameter half (*Gow-Page* ad loc.); *Phil.* at 31.2 and 21.4.

5–6 ὁ μὲν . . . σὺ δ’: Only the clauses as a whole are properly contrasted; the contrast which seems at first glance to be drawn between “you” and “lamp” is awkward; as is perhaps the reference to the lamp without night.

5 ὄρκια . . . φέρεσθαι: Hesiod (fr. 124 M-W) is credited with first expressing this idea:

ἐκ τοῦ δ’ ὄρκον ἔθηκεν ἀποίνιμον ἀνθρώποισι
νοσφιδίων ἔργων πέρι Κύπριδος.

And among the epigrammatists, cf. *Kallim. Ep.* 11 HE (25 Pf. = *AP* 5.6): ὤμοσε Καλλιγνώτος . . . ἀλλὰ λέγουσιν ἀληθέα τοὺς ἐν ἔρωτι | ὄρκους μὴ δύνειν οὔατ’ ἐς ἀθανάτων. The most influential poetic model, however, is *Soph.* fr.811 ὄρκους ἐγὼ γυναικὸς εἰς ὕδωρ γράφω, which produced this and many other copies; e.g., *Menander, Sent.* 26 J., ἀνδρῶν δὲ φαύλων εἰς ὕδωρ γράφε, *Philostratos* fr. 7 K-A ὄρκους δὲ μοιχῶν εἰς τέφραν ἐγὼ γράφω, *Xenarchos* fr. 6 K-A ὄρκους ἐγὼ γυναικὸς εἰς οἶνον γράφω, *Catullus* 70.3 f. *mulier cupido quod dicit amanti | in vento et rapida scribere oportet aqua*. Since all these versions and others (*Plato, Philostratos, Lucian, et al.*) speak of “writing,” it is tempting to emend accordingly. *Gow-Page* regard the paradosis as “free from objection” on the grounds that “variation of familiar phraseology is characteristic of Meleager’s style.” But all that passes without objection is that Greek can use the verb φέρω for something “carried” or “floating” on water—a notion which applied to oaths makes little or no sense here, and cannot

serve as a meaningful variation of this well-known phrase. Rather than alter the text, however (Stadtmüller attributes γράφεισθαι to Polak, Waltz to Dehèque), I would regard this inappropriate word as the author's. κεινά would not improve matters with φέρεσθαι and is otiose with γράφεισθαι, whereas the reference of κείνα is easily understood as Ἀφροδίσια ὄρκια.

6 ἐν κόλποις: Parallels suggest that this phrase refers to a man lying with a woman (note esp. Phil. 15 and 23; see further Gow-Page, intro.), but as Petronius' Encolpius indicates, παιδικά could also be meant (so Stadtmüller, Beckby, and Geffcken). For similar endings, cf. Phil. 23.8 and Meleager 42 (*AP* 5.136) κείναν | ἄλλοθι κοῦ κόλποις ἡμετέροις ἐσορᾶ.

37

ἠράσθης πλουτῶν, Σωσίκρατες, ἀλλὰ πένης ὦν
οὐκέτ' ἐρᾶς· λιμὸς φάρμακον οἶον ἔχει.
ἢ δὲ πάρος σε καλεῦσα μύρον καὶ τερπνὸν Ἄδωνιν
Μηνοφίλα νῦν σου τοῦνομα πυνθάνεται,
“τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις;” ἦ μόλις ἔγνωσ 5
τοῦτ' ἔπος, ὡς οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ἔχοντι φίλος.

AP 5.113 [Argentarius 9 GP]

[J] Μάρκου [P] Ἀργενταρίου Pl 7.95, f. 72v τοῦ αὐτοῦ [sc. Φιλοδήμου]

2 φάρμακον CPl: φάρκαμον P 3 καλεῦσα P: -οῦσα Pl^{pc}: -οῦσι Pl^{ac} 4 σου P: σοι Pl:
τοι Stephanus 5 εἰς Pl: ἦς P πόλις C[rasura]Pl: πόλις P

You fell in love when you had money, Sosikrates, but, now a poor man,
you no longer love. Hunger has such curative power!
And she, Menophila, who before used to call you Sweet and Darling
Adonis, now asks you your name:
“Whose son art thou? Where pray is thy city?” It wasn't easy for you to
learn this saw, Nobody is a friend to the man who has nothing.

Arguing against Philodemian authorship are:

(A) The absence of its incipit in Π ; see below, p. 204.

(B) Metrics: (i) 2 λιμῶς | φαρμ-: Phil. is among the strictest of epigrammatists in having the syllable before the caesura in the pentameter long by nature (see on 20.2, 31.6). Argentarius on the other hand admits two instances:

- (a) κυάνεον | τούξ (31 GP = AP 7.384.6) and (b) ὀλίγων | φείσεται (35 GP = AP 9.221.6; -ον Pl -ων P, the latter rightly rejected by GP). (ii) **3 μύρον καί!**: Generally, as here, a spondaic fourth foot occurs before word-end only with a prospective monosyllable (Naeke's Law); GP 1.xliv. But even with prospective monosyllable such lines are rare. Phil. has only one such in the undisputed poems (9.7 ὄσοι μή!), whereas Argentarius has two others: 13.3 λαβῶν πρὸς | and 35.5 γὰρ καί |.
- (C) Argentarius writes of Menophila in two other poems (7, 10 GP = AP 5.105, 116), but cf. Phil.'s use of Heliodora (13, intro.).

The ascription to Phil. probably arose, as Gow-Page note, from its following immediately upon a genuine poem of his in Kephalas' collection (5), since the two poems are found in the same order in both P and Pl.

 38

εἰνὶ μυχοῖς κραδίας δοιούς περιθάλλω ἔρωτας,
 τὸν μὲν Ῥωμαίδος, τὸν δὲ Κορινθιάδος.
 ἡ μὲν ματρῶνας τε τρόπους καὶ ἦθεα στέργειν
 οἶδ' ἀπὸ κεκρυφάλου μέχρι περισκελίδων.
 ἡ δὲ χύδην παρέχει πάση φιλότῃτι προσηνῶς
 πλαστουργοῦσα τύπους τοὺς Ἐλεφαντιακούς. 5
 εἰ δὲ μίαν ταύταιν, Πείσον, μ' αἰρεῖν ἐπιτέλλεις,
 εἰν' Ἐφύρη μίμνω, τὴν δ' ἄρα Γάλλος ἔχει.

Reiske 9, Brunck 9

Ap.L (Φιλοδήμου) Cr (Φιλοδήμου)

6 Ἐλεφαντιακούς scripsi: Ἐλεφαντιάδος codd. 7 εἰ Τουρ: ἄν Ap.L: τί Cr ταύταιν Ap.L:
 αὐταῖν Cr Πείσον Ap.L^{ac} Cr: αἰείσον Ap.L^{pc} μ' αἰρεῖν Cr: αἰρεῖν Ap.L 8 Γάλλος
 codd.(marg.): γ' ἄλλος codd.

In the recesses of my heart I nourish two loves, one for a Roman woman,
 the other for a Corinthian.

The first knows how to cherish the ways and the manners of a *matrona*
 from her hairnet to her anklets.

The other wantonly lends herself to all manner of love, complaisantly
 taking on the positions described by Elephantis.

If, Piso, you bid me choose one of the two, I remain in Ephyra. May a Gallos
 have the other!

F. Jacobs, "Über ein dem Philodemus beigelegtes Epigramm," in *Vermischte Schriften* 5 (Berlin 1834) 264–291.

This epigram was first printed in 1754 by Reiske, who found it as the last poem of the Leipzig apograph of P, where it is written by a different hand on a separate piece of paper tipped in at the end of the volume; and at the end of what he refers to as the *Schedae La Crosii*, i.e., a copy, now in Hamburg (Cr), containing epigrams purportedly derived from P: *Epigrammata graeca inedita, descripta primum a Friderico Sylburgio e codice Msto. bibliothecae Palatinae, ex cuius apographo quod erat apud Isaac. Vossium, ea descripsit Ill. Ezech. Spanheimius, ex cuius codice ego ea descripsi Berolini A.C. 1716*, and signed Maturinus Veysièr La Croze. Since this poem is not in fact found in P, someone either carelessly let a poem found elsewhere stand at the end of a collection of epigrams from the Anthology, or may have mistaken his exemplar (see below) as a source of pure Anthology material; for the extremely complicated relationship among the many late copies of the Anthology, cf. R. Aubreton, "La tradition de l'*Anthologie Palatine* du xv^e au xviii^e siècle," *Rev. d'Hist. des Textes* 10 (1980) 1–52, esp. 5–14, 24–27; J. Hutton, *Greek Anthology in France* (Ithaca 1946) 8 ff.

The name Piso and the phrase τὴν δ' ἄρα Γάλλος ἔχοι in the same context as Horace's *Gallis hanc, Philodemus ait* (*Sat.* 1.2.121) led Reiske to ascribe the poem to Phil. Brunck, followed, with reservations, by Jacobs in his first edition of the Anthology, did likewise, and it was considered Philodemean by J. Toup, *Opuscula Critica* (Leipzig 1780) 1.158 f. It was regarded as un-Philodemean by Rosini, *VH* 1 (1793) 1 n.1 and as a later forgery ("due à quelque moderne") by Chardon de La Rochette, *Magasin encyclopédique* 4.1 (1798) 563, who seems eventually to have convinced others. A more substantial argument against authenticity was presented by Jacobs in 1816 (reprinted in his *Vermischte Schriften*, cited above). As a result, later editors of the Palatine and Planudean manuscripts, from Jacobs 1813 on, were under no obligation to print this and the other poems found only in apographa. This epigram thus dropped from sight, to the extent that Gow-Page, who of course knew the works of Reiske, Brunck, and Jacobs (note especially HE 1.xliv), make no reference to it in their notes to the Horace passage; nor are recent commentators on Horace aware of it. (Orelli 1852 ed. of Horace prints the poem, but regards it as a forgery.)

Is the epigram actually by Phil.? "Elegans tamen epigramma, nec veterē poeta indignum," was Jacobs's original assessment, and students of both Phil. and Horace would surely welcome a positive answer to this question. The only sure piece of evidence for Philodemean authorship of an anonymous poem, however, is lacking, i.e., the presence of its incipit in Π (see below, p. 204, *introduction*). That is, although to an unknown extent, its absence from Π counts against Philodemean authorship. (It is possible that the poem Horace refers to is Π v.29 τὴν ἀπὸ παλλιόλου; see ad loc.)

Chardon de La Rochette, loc. cit., rejected ancient authorship for the poem entirely, it would seem, because of its absence from P and Pl. He attributed it to a "modern" poet who wished to pass it off as ancient. The case against Philodemean

authorship is certain. In addition to some other considerations mentioned in the commentary, note two metrical objections:

- (a) The scansion of v.2 Ῥωμαίδος | τὸν at the pentameter-half, which Phil. generally avoids (see Intro., p. 44).
- (b) Hiatus at v.3 καὶ ἦθεα is unique. Everywhere else Phil. corrects καὶ before a vowel: 1.1, 6.3, 12.7, 14.5, 17.4, 19.1, 27.7, 29.1,3 (Jacobs 274).
- (c) No hexameter contains a bucolic diaeresis, in sharp contrast with Phil.'s marked preference (Jacobs 273).

A likely guess is that it was composed by an *eruditus*, Renaissance or later, either (as Chardon de La Rochette thought) as a forgery, or, as I am willing to believe, with no intention to defraud, but to provide for the amusement of himself and for his friends a simulacrum of the lost original alluded to by Horace. Although the topos of comparing and contrasting two disparate types of women is common in Phil., the contrast is clear enough in Horace, *Sat.* 1.2. The address to Piso is a nice touch, but as the morphology hints (see below), the author's knowledge of Phil.'s friendship with Piso may derive solely from Cicero's *In Pisonem* [T 2] rather than from Epigram 27, where the manuscript has Πείσων (and certainly not from the then unknown *Good King*). Note that 27 is lacking in Pl, and so would have been unknown to all but a few scholars and literati.

A possible author of this poem is Daniel Heinsius, many of whose Greek epigrams are written "to" or "by" Greek philosophers; *Poemata Graeca* (Leiden 1640). He also published a six-part cycle of erotic epigrams addressed to Demophile (ibid. pp. 57–60); note esp. the one on p. 59, which begins δισσοὶ ἔρωος, δισσός με πόθος καλεῖ· ὃς μὲν Ἀθήνησιν | ὃς δ' αὖ Κυπρογένους, and ends with the choosing of the latter via a geographic reference: ἡ Παφίη νικάτω· Ἀθηναίη γὰρ ὑπέικειν, | καὶ πρὶν, ἐν Ἰδαίοις οὖρεσιν ἐξέμαθε. Heinsius also translated one of Phil.'s epigrams (14) into Latin (ibid. p. 143). But perhaps most interesting is that in his notes to *Sat.* 1.2 he recognized Horace's debt to Phil., first in his borrowing 92 *o crus! o braccia!* from 12, and then from Horace's direct reference to Philodemus he inferred that *certum est magnam huius Satyrae partem ad Philodemi epigrammata amatoria, quorum multum nondum edita habemus, respexisse poetam. . . . "Gallis hanc Philodemus ait." Hic nobis dubium non est quin ad illas Philodemi exclamations alluserit* (D. Heinsius, *Quintus Horatius Flaccus* [Leiden 1629] 2.53). Indeed, as Hutton, op. cit., 255–259, points out, not only was Heinsius among the first to hear from Saumaise about the Palatine manuscript, he made good use of it in his writings, especially his edition of Horace. An objection to Heinsius' authorship may be the form Πείσων (see above and the commentary), but this perhaps may simply be a hypercorrective slip on his part. There might have been a twinkle in Heinsius' eye when he wrote on *Sat.* 1.2.121 "locus plus venustatis haberet si quidem ipsa Philodemi exstarent verba."

St. Petersburg ms. Greek no. 148 (The Hague 1637) tantalizingly mentions "Philodemi apud Horat. lib. I, sat. II, v. 121" on page 2, but does not in fact contain a copy of this epigram. Cf. E. von Murlat, *Cat. des mss. grecs de la Bibliothèque Impériale Publique* (St. Petersburg 1846) 810; Hutton 9. (Its readings of 7, 11, 14, 20, 22, 34 offer nothing new.)

1 εἰνί: Neither this form nor 8 εἶν appears in the undisputed poems, but Phil. surely would have felt free to use these well-established poetic variants.

2 Ῥωμαῖδος . . . Κορινθιάδος: Both are late forms; for the former only Damaskios ap. *Suda* s.v. Μαρκελλίνος, Steph. Byz. *Eth.* 374.2; for the latter only Steph. Byz. *Eth.* 548.12. Since Stephanos also (not surprisingly, given the purpose of the *Ethnika*) discusses Ephyra (see below, on v.8), he may well be the source of these rare adjectives for the author of this poem (*ed. princ.* Venet. 1502, ed. A. Manutius).

3 ματρώνας: Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.54 *matronam nullam ego tango*, 62 f. *quid inter | est in matrona, ancilla, peccesne togata?*, 78 *desine matronas sectarier*, 94 *matronae praeter faciem nil cernere possis*.

5 προσηνῶς: This word sits oddly in this erotic context: “gently” or “soothingly” is precisely what is not wanted from this Corinthian woman. Epicurus in particular contrasts αἰ κατὰ σάρκα λείαι καὶ προσηνεῖς γινόμεναι κινήσεις with οἰστρωδές and other disturbing feelings (fr. 411 U).

6 Ἐλεφαντιακούς: Elephantis seems to have written a compendious work (for women?) containing cosmetic, medical, and erotic material, accompanied by illustrations of sexual positions; cf. O. Crusius, *RE* 5 (1905) 2324 f. Since the genitive of her name is Ἐλεφαντίδος (-*idis* or -*idos* in Suetonius, *Tib.* 43, Martial 12.43.4, etc.), either the author or the transmission is at fault. If the latter (an error of homoioteleuton four lines after Κορινθιάδος?), a form such as 8.8 Νατακούς is likely. If the former, he was surely not Phil.; and I should not “improve” the text.

7 Πείσον: Cf. 27.1 φίλτατε Πείσον, *Good King* col. 43.16 f. ὦ Πείσων. Our author thought that the vocative was formed like other names in -ων, e.g., Ἀπολλων, Ἀγάμεμνον, κτλ (Jacobs 275).

μ: Having written πείσον, the author needed a consonant here to make position, doubtless intending it to represent με rather than (with epic elision) μοι.

αἰρεῖν: The active seems too strong; Reiske accordingly read αἴρειν in the sense of *L. tollere*, but this is no better (Jacobs 275).

8 Ἐφόρη: Another name for Corinth; Σ ad *Il.* 6.152; Steph. Byz. *Eth.* 290.9 f., 300.20 f., 374.1.

Γάλλος: Reiske identifies the hand of the marginal annotations as that of Gisbert Cuyper’s, one of the several people who had access to the apograph before it came to rest in Leipzig; Hutton 9, 270 f. γ’ ἄλλος could just barely stand (cf. Toup), but even if ἄρα γε were not uncommon, if this poem is to be understood as Horace’s model (real or imagined), Γάλλος has to be read unless one agrees with Toup that Horace’s *Gallis* derives from his misreading of the Greek exemplar!

P. O X Y. 3 7 2 4

P.Oxy. 54 (1987) 3724, ed. P. Parsons. Reviewed: W. Luppe, *CR* 39 (1989) 125–126 (who thinks they all are by Phil., even the two ascribed to Asklepiades); B. Palme, *Tyche* 3 (1988) 306. Cf. also A. Cameron, *Greek Anthology*, app. 7; M. Gigante, “Filodemo tra poesia e prosa (A proposito di P.Oxy. 3724),” *SIFC* 7 (1989) 129–151 (cited in this chapter as “Gigante” plus page number). What follows incorporates Sider, *ZPE* 76 (1989) 229–236, and draws freely on Parsons’s edition and notes. References below to Griffiths are to some unpublished observations, used with his kind permission; other scholars cited below without further reference, except for Obbink, are found in Parsons.

P.Oxy. 3724, written (on both sides) in the later first century A.D., comprising three fragments, consists largely of ca. 175 incipits (i.e., the first few words, the last of which may be abbreviated), chiefly by hand C in fr. 1, of which 27 are attributed to Phil. by the Anthology (in two cases not uniformly, however). Frr. 2 and 3, written by hand A, also contain what seem to be epigram incipits. Two incipits in fr. 1 belong to poems already known but anonymous (col. ii.2 and 28). Two others belong to poems attributed uniformly to a poet other than Phil., namely Asklepiades (iv.28 and vi.18, the latter also copied out by another hand (A) in full elsewhere in fr. 1). Thus, only five poems from the Gow-Page canon of Phil. are unaccounted for: **11, 15, 16, 30, 31** (my numeration). Since all but, it seems, one of the incipits to poems already known appear in the Greek Anthology, it seems safe to assume that all the unknown poems, at least those among the list written out by hand C, are epigrams as well. (For the possible exception, see on col. ii.2.)

It is possible that these incipits list (for what purposes we are not sure) the personal favorites of someone who liked almost everything he found by Phil. in

Philip's *Garland*, in which case, there would be no reason to suspect that any, or at any rate many, of the unknown incipits come from poems of Phil. But the fact that there are so many incipits unknown to the Greek Anthology (over 145) indicates that the compiler could draw from the complete editions of Phil. and perhaps other poets as well. *Contra Gigante* 133, who argues that the compiler knew Philip's *Garland*.

Since, then, twenty-seven of thirty-one known poems are by Phil., it is clear that the papyrus does not contain a random sampling; it follows also that, given that Phil. wrote more than the thirty plus attributed to him by one source or another (see Intro., pp. 47 f.), the likelihood of there being more incipits belonging to Phil. among the remaining 145 is high. How high, it is impossible to say, given that two begin poems whose attribution to Asklepiades by the Anthology there is little reason to doubt (see below, on vi.18). There remains a small possibility, however, that these two incipits belong to similarly beginning poems of Phil., which would allow for *all* the incipits to be Philodemean. (Note how Π v.28 recalls the beginning of Asklepiades 1.) Attractive as I find this notion, the fact that the Asklepiades poem which continues vi.18 is copied out in full in the papyrus seems to argue that this incipit (and if this incipit, then iv.28 as well) is indeed intended to belong to a poem of Asklepiades. Furthermore, a glance at the complete incipits for the Greek Anthology (Beckby 4.686–731) shows that inventive epigrammatists over the centuries rarely duplicated beginnings past the second word, even when one includes common words like articles and particles.

Thus, although I cannot follow Luppe and Cameron, who are willing to have them all belong to Phil., I believe that most do; *contra Gigante*, who would assign to him only ten from among the unknown poems, adding two as doubtful. Parsons too is cautious but allows that many could come from Phil.

If, then, the proportion of Philodemean to non-Philodemean poems remains as high among the unknown epigrams as among those already known, the presence of a doubtful epigram in Π can contribute to our deliberations about authorship. That is, the presence of an incipit would seem to weigh heavily in favor of Philodemus as author. The absence, on the other hand, counts much less in weighing against Phil., since we have no idea from how many published epigrams of Phil. the compiler of incipits could draw. Thus, I use the existence of an incipit as evidence for authorship in epigrams **2, 21, 24** (the last anonymous in PPI). The absence of an incipit does not outweigh other evidence deciding for Phil. in epigrams **11, 18, 35**, whereas in epigrams **36, 37**, absence combines with other negative evidence in helping me to decide against Philodemean authorship.

The main purpose of the commentary will be to consider any piece of evidence for signs of Philodemean authorship. Any such evidence, no matter how slight, given the preponderance of already known Philodemean poems among the incipits, should, it seems to me, point to Phil. as author. I do not claim to prove that any one incipit is his, although some are surer than others, but the sum total of all that point to Phil. tends to indicate that even among those showing no signs of Philodemean authorship there must be a good number written by him. Many of my identifications have been rejected by Gigante, largely because they do not fit his autobio-

graphical scheme for the composition of the epigrams, in which some were written before and the others after Phil. converted to Epicureanism in Athens—a view I dispute; cf. above, Intro., pp. 34, 40, and my review of his *Filodemo in Italia*, *BMCR* 2 (1991) 353–355. I also am not happy with his suggestion that the epigrams represented by the incipits formed a Garland edited by Phil. himself (134), who, like Meleager and Philip, included many epigrams written by himself. First, why would he have included in his own garland Asklepiades, who was already well represented in Meleager’s collection? Second, while it is reasonable (on the assumption that the incipits are all, or almost all, by Phil.) that Philip would have chosen from among a larger number of Phil.’s epigrams, leaving the rest unknown to us, it is unlikely that Phil. (or anyone else for that matter) would have made a selection of poems he presumably liked, of which Philip chose none but the Philodemean ones.

Fr. 1

col. i (hand A)

contains

- (a) the tail end of some hexameter lines (1–14), which may have been either (like the lines below) a complete hexameter poem, perhaps an oracle (Cameron) or a hymn (Janko, Tannenbaum), or incipits consisting of first lines, in which case they could come from epigrams. I agree with Cameron and others who argue for the former on the grounds that entire lines copied out immediately above a complete poem suggest that here too there was a complete poem.
- (b) Identifiable line-ends of Asklepiades 12 HE (15–20; for the text, see below, col. vi.18); and
- (c) what may be other complete epigrams (21 ff.), none of which matches any known epigram, but since Asklepiades’ epigram occurs among the incipits it is possible that these lines likewise presented the full text of an incipit. Only three lines, however, offer even a few words each:

]ι στεφάνους γάρ? []
]ην.
]καὶ περὶ μουσαγ (μουσᾶν)
]
] ζην

All that can be said is that no poem referring to one or more Muses (even in Doric; cf. 30) and wreaths can be denied to Phil. For details of the readings, here and throughout, see Parsons.

col. ii (hand C)

1 κεκρήγειν ἔτι: Most likely an unaugmented plup. of κράζω (“I/he/she was still shrieking/screaming/croaking”), although elsewhere the perfect stem is κεκρᾶγ-. Parsons compares κέκληγα, κέκλαγα.

2 εἴκοσι τὰς πρὸ κυ(νός): Identified by Alan Cameron ap. ed. pr. as the beginning of the hexameter “Pythian oracle” derided by the Cynic philosopher Oinomaos of Gadara (fr. 11 B Hammerstaedt, ap. Eusebios, *PE* 5.30), who flourished in the time of Hadrian.

εἴκοσι τὰς πρὸ κυνός καὶ εἴκοσι τὰς μετέπειτα
οἴκῳ ἐνὶ σκιερῷ Διονύσῳ χρῆσθαι ἡτρῶ.

The oracle (414 P-W), which Fontenrose considers unhistoric (L103), was cited by Chamaileon (ap. Athen. 22e = fr. 11 Werhli = 13 Giordano). Beyond the mere Gadarene connection between Oinomaos and Phil., note that Oinomaos’ *Περὶ τῆς καθ’ Ὀμηρον φιλοσοφίας* would seem to be similar in methodology to Phil.’ *Περὶ τοῦ καθ’ Ὀμηρον ἀγαθοῦ βασιλέως*; and that Oinomaos too was a philosopher who wrote poetry (in this case, tragedies [TrGF 188]); cf. H. J. Mette, *RE* 17.2 (1937) 2249–2251; J. Hammerstaedt, *Die Orakelkritik des Kynikers Oenomaos* (Frankfurt 1988) 48–53. The possibility, admittedly slight, should at least be raised that Oinomaos knew the oracle from a poem of Phil., with whom he felt some special tie. Phil. himself would have seen it in Chamaileon, whom he names twice in *De Musica* (fr. 4–5 Wehrli). See above, p. 4.

If Oinomaos derided the oracle (ιατρικόν, ἀλλ’ οὐ μαντικόν), he may have taken his lead from Phil., who in turn had some statements of Epicurus on the nature of wine to guide him: cf. fr. 58 U = 20.1 Arr., where Epicurus, in his *Symposium*, rejects general statements about the nature of wine on men. My proposal, then, is that the incipit here is not, as far as we can see, uniquely in this list that of a hexameter oracle (although we may have a hexameter oracle written out in col. i. 1–14), but rather that of an epigram of Phil. that begins with a quotation from this oracle and continues with a criticism or parody of it. (So also Luppe 125 and Griffiths.) The topos of the best time of year for wine drinking (cf. Hes. *WD* 588 ff., Alkaios 347.1, Theogn. 1039 f.) would obviously be appropriate for a sympotic epigram written by any author, but Phil. would be able in addition to allude to the comments Epicurus made on the properties, medical and otherwise, of wine in his *Symposium* (fr. 57–65 U). For a parallel to this form of poetic quotation, cf. Simon. *Eleg.* 19 W²,

ἐν δὲ τὸ κάλλιστον Χίος ἔειπεν ἀνὴρ·
 “οἷη περ φύλλων γενεή, τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.”

West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin 1974) 179 f. cites other examples of metapoiesis, but a closer parallel may be found in this papyrus, if col. iv. 8 οὐ μισέω τὸ ποίημα, as I suggest, is Phil.’ quotation of Kallimachos; see below.

Gigante 137 calls my suggestion “un’ipotesi troppo fantasiosa,” but here as elsewhere he has misread my aim, which is solely to gather evidence that would explain how an incipit, if by Phil., could continue. On Oinomaos, see now, in addition to his book cited above, J. Hammerstaedt, “Der Kyniker Oenomaus von Gadara,” *ANRW* II 36.4 (1990) 2834–2865.

For the equation of Dionysos with wine, see on 6.7 Βάκχῳ.

3 οὐκ οἶδα προφα() or οὐκ οἶδ’ ἀπροφα() or οὐκ οἶδ’ ἄ (or Doric ἄ): Phil. and most others tend to avoid οἶδ’ ἀπρο-, but will do so to accommodate an otherwise intractable word; cf. Intro., pp. 41 f.

4 [εἰ μὴ τὰς οὐπῶ]: Deleted here, copied again on line 24. Griffiths notes that in the several instances where a duplicate entry is marked for omission, it is the earlier one.

5 λευκοίνους: Phil. 6.

6 ἤδη λουσαμένη: Probably an erotic epigram (although Parsons allows for its referring to a work of art); cf., e.g., Asklepiades 36 HE (*AP* 5.209), Rufinus 27 Page (*AP* 5.73), where the sight of a woman bathing stirs a man’s passion.

7 ἦν ἔλαβον πρόην: Erotic?

8 Μουσῶν Ἀντιγένου(ς)? Μ. ἀντὶ γένου(ς)?: Quite possibly the fifth-century dithyrambic poet of this name who refers to himself in the third person while praising his poetic skills (Page, *FGI* 11–15), but the pervasive presence of Phil. among the incipits makes it more likely that this is the same Antigènes mentioned in 29 (also below, vii. 21) as being recently deceased, especially since the two references taken together seem to indicate that he was a poet; cf. Gigante 136 and commentary to 29.

9 οὗτος ὁ τὰς μορφάς: The last letter of τὰς is not sure; see Parsons, who also notes that μορφή may refer to a living body or to one represented in painting or sculpture.

10 μυρία τῆς Παφίης: Most likely Παφίη for Aphrodite, as in Phil. 7.6; note however its use as the adjective for the city of Paphos (10.1), whence came one of the many women named Demo in his life; cf. below, col. iv.13. μυρία is either adj. (with what noun?) or, more likely, adv., as at *AP* 7.374.2 (Argentarius 19 GP), 7.241.1–2 (Antipater Sidonius 25 HE), 12.169.3–4 (Dioskorides 8 HE).

11 μαίνεται εἰ βάλλει. Sc. μῆλον?

12 ἰξεύειν Φιλοδη(μ-): Possibly, as Parsons notes, a vocative in a poem written by a friend of Phil., but more likely another poem by Phil. himself in which he either refers to himself in the third person, as he does in **28** (cf. **10** and Π i.15), or addresses himself in the vocative (as, e.g., Catullus often does). The verb, “to catch birds with lime,” may be literal, but more probably as an amatory metaphor (cf. Timotheos Com. fr. 2 K-A (= fr.2 K) ὁ περωτὸς ἰξὸς ὀμμάτων Ἔρωσ, Page, *FGE* 312 f.). One further possibility is suggested by Aristoph. fr. 736 K-A, where the stickiness of ἰξὸς refers to greediness, a quality which Phil. charges himself with in **3**: τοκογλύφος, where there is excessive desire for more days, i.e., a longer life, the poem reflecting a common Epicurean topic of criticism. This incipit could begin a poem with a similar concern. Cf. Gigante 136.

13 ἀνευδής (ἀνευδηή σ'), ὦ λύχνη: Even when not addressed, lamps are often mentioned in erotic contexts: see on **7.2, 36**.

14 ἐπτά τριηκόντεσσιν: Phil. **4**.

15 μὴ πρότερον Φιλο(δημ-): A form of φιλότις or a compound adjective, as Parsons notes, is obviously another possibility; cf. above on v.12.

16 ὁ πρότερον στύγι The last word, which seems certain to me, was first read by Rea. Phil. **19** on impotence, adduced by Parsons, uses more refined language (on the roughness of στύειν, cf. Henderson, *Maculate Muse* 112), but note **22**, with βινεῖν (cf. Henderson 152).

17 νήφειν μεπλου: Either μ' ἐπλου() or με πλου(). A link between wealth and sobriety? Cf. Phil. *Good King* col. 19 “For it belongs not only to the sober (νη[φόντων), but also to those drinking, to sing the ‘glories of men’ [*Il*.9.189]; nor [does this happen] only among the more severe, but also among the luxurious (τρυφεροβίους) Phaeacians” (tr. Asmis).

18 πέντε διδωσιν: Phil. **22**.

19 μικκή καὶ μελα(νεῦσα): Phil. **17**.

20 ὀχληρή: Epicureans shun disturbance of the soul, ὀχλησις; Epic. *KD* 8 τὰ τινῶν ἡδονῶν ποιητικὰ πολλαπλασίους ἐπιφέρει τὰς ὀχλήσεις τῶν ἡδονῶν, *Nat.* 131; Phil. uses this word eight times, acc. to Vooy's *Lexicon Philodemum* s.v. The adjective ὀχληρός is at home in both poetry (Aristophanes and Euripides, but not in the Anthology) and prose, but its stem is prevalent throughout Epicurean writings: ἐνοχλεῖν (Epic. *KD*. 11 etc.) and often in Phil., ἐνόχλημα (Epic. ap. Philod., fr. 154 U = 72 Arr.), ἀοχλησία (Epic. *Ep. ad Men.* 3.127), and ἀόχλητος (Epic. *Sent. Vat.* 79). Phil. also uses ὀχλέω (*Oik.* XIII.10, 29) and ὀχληρῶς (*De Musica* p. 63.2 Kempke). Gigante 137 rejects a connection between this incipit and Epicureanism.

21 τὴν πρότερον: Phil. 32? This incipit, which belongs to no other known epigram, appears more fully below, col. iv.16. Conceivably, therefore, this belongs to an unknown poem, but other duplicates appear in the list, one of which is marked for deletion, e.g. [iii.7] = v. 31.

22 κἄν μηδεὶς σε καλῆ or σε, καλή (voc.): καλῆ could be adj or verb.

23 ... και...

24 εἰ μὴ τὰς οὐπῶ: See above, line 4.

25 εἰ μεθύειν Χίῳ: Chian wine of course is a commonplace as a mark of luxury; in Phil., definitely in 6 and 27 (the invitation to Piso); and Χίον is Page's likely conjecture in 28.5 for the MS's οἰόν.

26 οὐ μὰ τὸν ἠδὺν Ἔρωτα: Similar is Argentarius 8 GP (AP 5.110.3 f.) οὐ μὰ τὸν ἠδὺν | Βάκχον; cf. Secundus 2 GP (AP 9.260.3) οὐ μὰ Κύπριν, AP 12.2.5 (Strato) ἠδὺν Ἔρωτα (same *sedes*).

27 ἡ σιμή τὸ πρόσω(πον)?: (σειμή Π) If the last word is not simply πρόσω, Parsons is right to compare other poems (and Plato) where a woman is desired despite what would be perceived by a dispassionate observer as one or another flaw. Phil. has three such poems: 9 (Charito is sixty years old), 17 (Philainion is small and black; the following “but” shows that these qualities are not attractive to all); and 12 (Flora is an uncultured Oscan girl); and perhaps Π iii.15, 17.

Parsons compares Lucr. 4.1169 *simula Silena ac Saturast*, as does Gigante 137, raising the possibility that Lucretius knew this epigram, or that both draw on an Epicurean anti-erotic source.

28 οἶδα φιλεῖν φιλέοντας: Phil. 24.

29 ταύτας ὁ τρικίναιδος: For the first word “there are palaeographic difficulties” (Parsons). τρικίναιδος, which seems certain, would be a hapax. The hitherto known prefixed forms of this root are παρακίναιδος (D.L. 3.34), ἀκίναιδος (*Souda* s.v.), ἐπικίναιδισμα (Clem. Alex. *Paed.* 3.4.29.2), and ἐκκίναιδίζομαι (D.C. 50.27).

30: There is only the barest, unreadable, trace of another incipit here, and the possibility that one or two incipits have been lost below.

col. iii

1–6 (hand B): A recipe in prose for cough medicine.

7 [ὅ πρὶν ἐγὼ καὶ πέντε]: Phil. 19, repeated below, v. 31.

8 [Ἀίσώπου τινά]: Repeated below, v. 32, q.v.

9 ἄρρωτος το . . (): Griffiths intriguingly compares the beginning of Prop. *Monobiblos*, *me contactum nullis ante cupidinibus*. Either τὸ πά[ροιθε(ν)] (Griffiths) or τὸ πά[ρος] (Holford-Strevens) is possible.

10 τίς μισεῖ τὸν Ἔρω(τα) or, less likely, ἐρῶ(ντα): (μεισει Π) If the former, the answer to this question is anyone (poet or not) who rails against Eros; cf. Alkaios 6 HE (*AP* 5.10.1) ἐχθαίρω τὸν Ἔρωτα.

11 μηδει.: After the iota “a trace like a high point to the right (accidental?),” Parsons. This word has been crossed out, although it, unlike other strikeouts, does not appear elsewhere in Π. Obbink suggests that the scribe might have begun to write out the second line of the preceding epigram and then caught himself. This would account for the shortness of this incipit.

12 μήτηρ καὶ θυ(γατ–): Parsons compares Argentarius 12 GP (*AP* 5.127), a man sleeping with both mother and daughter. Or perhaps Hor. *O.* 1.16.1 *o matre . . . pulchrior* is pertinent, although metrical norms calls for μήτηρ καὶ θυγάτηρ rather than θυγάτρ–.

13 τοὺς πλοκάμους: If erotic, praise of a woman’s hair (cf. Phil. 9.2); a dedication is also possible (cf. Argentarius 17 GP = *AP* 6.201.2 and, in general, W. H. D. Rouse, *Greek Votive Offerings* [Cambridge 1902] 240–245).

14 ὀκτωκαιδεχέτιν: See on 4.1, where it is pointed out that 18 years is the ideal age for a woman to marry. This poem, then, could come from the Xanthippe cycle; *contra* Gigante 137. On the other hand, epitaphs frequently point up the pathos of someone’s having died young by giving the age at death; e.g., Kaibel, *EG* 222 ὀκτωκαιδεχέτης, ματρί λιπὼν δάκρυα κτλ. Similarly, *AP* 7.167.5 ὀκτωκαιδεκέτις δ’ αὐτῆ θάνον, 7.466.3 (Leonidas 71 HE), 7.468.2 (Meleager 125), *CEG* 2.709.4, 739.2.

15 λευκὴ καὶ μακρῆ: Alan Cameron has pointed out that this poem begins with an exact contrast to Phil. 17; see above, col. ii.19. Gigante aptly adduces Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.123 f. (immediately after Phil. has been named) as an imitation of what is very likely a now lost epigram of Phil.:

candida rectaque sit; munda hactenus, ut neque longa
nec magis alba velit quam dat natura videri.

16 νμαλα.

17 εἰ μὲν μὴ καλή: The μὲν entails a contrast, such as (i) “If she were not beautiful, I would not pay her anything, but (δέ) since she is I pay her high price”; or (ii) “If she were not beautiful, I would not care about her price, and (δέ) if she

were inexpensive, I would not care about her beauty. As it is, she is both beautiful and cheap, so count me blessed.” Cf. 22.

18 χρήμασιν οὐ πλο(υτιῶ), πλο(ῦτος)?: It is not by wealth that riches are judged, as Epicurus said; e.g., *Sent. Vat.* 25, “Poverty, when measured by the natural purpose of life, is great wealth, but unlimited wealth is great poverty” (tr. Bailey); “If you wish to make Pythokles wealthy, don’t profer money but take away the desire” (fr. 46 Arr. = 135 U). See below on Frr. 2–3.

19 φωνῶ γινώσκου(σι): Cf. Aisch. *Ag.* 39 μαθοῦσιν αὐδῶ, 1402 f. πρὸς εἰδότας | λέγω, Pi. *Ol.* 2.85 φωνάεντα συνετοῖσιν. For ἀεῖδω/ἀείσω ξυνετοῖσι in Orphic verse, cf. M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford 1983) 83. γινώσκου(σα) is less likely.

20 εὔδεις Καλλικρα(): Phil. 14 has (as I understand it) the sleeping Kallistion. Is this poem erotic (cf. Meleager 36 = *AP* 5.174.1 εὔδεις, Ζηνοφίλα) or sepulchral (cf. Antipater Sid. 16 HE = *AP* 7.29.1 εὔδεις ἐν φθιμένοισι, Ἀνάκρεον)? Either Kallikrates or Kallikrateia, both names appearing in the Anthology, the latter in two anonymous sepulchral epigrams (*AP* 7.224.1, 691.4).

21 εἶ τις μ. φίλος ἐς(τι?).

22 τρεῖς ἔκθες κάδον: This is Rea’s almost certain reading. εκθες can represent ἐχθές, as in vi.11. Three people drank yesterday from a κάδος?—on which cf. Gow-Page on Hedylos 5 HE.

23 σκλαπλαπαντω, ε().

Two incipits may have been lost below 23.

col. iv

1 Ξάνθιοφ φύκ ἤδειγ? οὐ κήδειγ?: Of the possible meanings of *Xanthion* rightly considered by Parsons—herb, town, man’s name, girl friend of Phil.—the last alone obviously has the context going for it; cf. Introduction, pp. 34–38, where I present the case for a Xanthippe-cycle in Phil.’ poetry. Each of the two articulations (with at least four possible construals) seems equally likely. Gigante 136 suggests Ξάνθιον, οὐκ ἤδειν τὸν ἔρωτα (or τὸν πόθον), Xanthion, I did not know what love was, until you revealed it to me—a statement which can be made at the beginning of relationship (as Gigante believes) or toward its end.

2 τὸν φίλον αἰσχύνη(ι?): Verb or (perhaps personified) noun.

3 ὄνησαι γλυκερῶγ (γλυκερῶι?): Preparation for a dinner (Parsons), perhaps in an invitation poem.

4 αὐριον εἰς λιτὴν δέ: Phil. 27.

5 ἡμετέρας μούσας.

6 οὔτε φιλεῖς (οὔτ' ἐφίλεις) ἄλλον τιν'.

7 Ξανθὸ κηρόπλαστε: Phil. 3. Π confirms Huschke's conjecture.

8 οὐ μισέω τὸ ποίημα: Quite likely, as Parsons says, a poetic elaboration or reaction to Kallimachos' poem with similar beginning (2 HE = 28 Pf. ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν); and Phil. of course was very much concerned with the nature of poetry. But if by Phil., how would it continue? Perhaps just as Kallimachos' did, with τὸ κυκλικόν, the thought now reversed, for Phil. did not regard length as a criterion of a poem's worth. Cf. *Περὶ Ποιημάτων* Bk. V, col. 7.1–6 Mangoni (= col. 4 Jensen) [τ]ὸ βέλτιστον π[ῶς ἄ]μα | [τ]οῦτο καὶ ἐλάχισ[τον; π]ῶς | [δὲ] βέλτιον ἐνά[ργεια κ]αὶ | [σ]υ[ντομία [τῶν ἄλλων τ]ῶν | [τῆ] ποιητικῆ [προσηκ]ό[ν]των; κτλ. See also his reference to epigrammatists, discussed above, *Intro.*, pp. 28–30, vii. 5. If indeed modeled on Kallimachos, this poem too may have begun as a (here negative) priamel which introduces an erotic subject; cf. A. Henrichs, "Kallimachos *Epigram* 28: A fastidious priamel," *HSCP* 83 (1979) 207–212. Of all the poems whose incipits we have this is the one I would most like to have in full. See now A. Cameron, *Kallimachos and His Critics* (Princeton 1995) 387–402.

9 ἤδη σοι τρίτον εἶπα: . . . but you would not listen; probably erotic. Perhaps this epigram was meant to follow 23.

10 τὸν σιγῶντα, Φιλαινί: Phil. 7.

11 εἰς ἀνέμους καὶ . . . ρ (): "The doubtful letters look most like ἰδε," Parsons, who suggests a reference here to the casting to the winds; cf. Meleager 125 (*AP* 7.468.8) στεῖρα γονᾶς στοργᾶν ἔπτυσσας εἰς ἀνέμους (a notably sibilant line), "Barren of offspring, you have spat affection to the winds" (tr. Gow-Page).

12 τίς τάμᾳ κροκεοντα: Parsons suggests correcting to κροκόεντα.

13 τὸν πρῶτον Παφίη: See on ii.10.

14 Παρθενόπης ἀνάλυσ(ον)?: The traces are quite difficult to read. The triangular shape which suggested a broken delta to Parsons might just as well be a broken sigma. ἀνάλυσον or ἄνα (iam Gigante) λῦσον most readily satisfies the constraints of traces, morphology, and metrics, but other suggestions will be welcome. The compound verb could refer to (i) departure (LSJ s.v. III; sc. from Naples, for which see below); or (ii) a breakup into elements (cf. Tim. Lokr. 102d, Phil. *De Morte* 30.4 f. εἰς τὰς πρώτας ἀναλ[ύ]ονται φύσεις), which here would more specifically allude to death (cf. Diog. Oin. 3 Π 11 f. Smith ἀναλύειν [ἀπὸ τοῦ] ζῆν).

The first word, however, is clear. A reference by Phil. to Naples by its other name of Parthenope, or to the town's eponymous Siren, would not be surprising,

even if in his prose he seems to have used *Neapolis*, if P.Herc. 312 (T 15) may be assigned to him. As Lykophron 718–721 tells the story, the body of the Siren Parthenope was washed ashore near Naples and there entombed (cf. Ps.-Aristotle *Mirab.* 839a32, Eustath. ad *Od.* 12.167, p. 1709). A Rhodian settlement on this site was named after her (Herodian, *Pros. Kath.* 339.18 = Stephen Byz. *Ethn.* 504.6), but in time her name could be applied to all of Naples (Herod. op.cit. 388.20 Παρθενόπη ἢ Σειρήν, ἢ καλεῖται Νεάπολις = Stephen 656.20; cf. Pliny, *NH* 3.62 *Neapolis* . . . *Parthenope a tumulo Sirenis appellata*). Cf. further J. Ilberg, “Parthenope,” Roscher, *Lexikon* 3.1653ff; M. Napoli, *Napoli greco-romana* (Napoli 1959); B. Capasso, *Napoli greco-romana esposita nella topografia* . . . Soc. Nap. di Storia Patria (Napoli 1905); E. Pirovine, *Napoli nella visione del golfo delle Strene* (Napoli 1977), esp. 9–28; M. Gras, “Il golfo di Napoli e il Tirreno arcaico,” in *Neapolis: Atti del venticinquesimo convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia* (Taranto 1986) 11–35, esp. 17–19 (where, doubting that there was a Rhodian settlement, Gras argues that Cumaean Parthenope became Palaiopolis which later merged with Neapolis); F. Càssola, “Problemi di storia neapolitana,” *ibid.* 37–81, esp. 40–45 (who allows for a Rhodian Parthenope before the Cumaean settlement).

Naples could have been mentioned for any number of reasons by Phil. or another poet, but note how Vergil, who studied Epicurean theory there with Siro and Phil., not only begins a verse in the sphragis to the *Georgics* with the same word as that of this incipit, but also recalls the pleasure it afforded him while writing (4.563 f.)

illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti,

with which cf. Ov. *Met.* 15. 15.711 f. *in otia natam | Parthenopen*. Cf. Tait 48–63; M. Korenjak, “Parthenope und Parthenias: Zur Sphragis der *Georgika*,” *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser. 48 (1995) 201 f, who argues (I think unconvincingly) that with Parthenope Vergil meant to recall his own nickname Parthenias, on which see below v.19. Phil. may well have referred similarly to the Edenic character of the place that allows Epicurean life to flourish. Dirk Obbink has reasonably suggested that Vergil’s sphragis, written ca. 30 B.C., alludes to this (or to the next incipit’s poem). This view was strongly criticized by Gigante 139, who improbably would reverse the allusion and have Phil. refer to the *Georgics* and to Vergil himself. He thus restores Παρθενόπης ἄνα (sc. Vergil), which he strangely understands as “*alumnus* of Naples”; cf. also his “La brigata virgiliana ad Ercolano,” in M. Gigante (ed.), *Virgilio e gli Augustei* (Naples 1990) 13 f.; “Virgilio e i suoi amici tra Napoli e Ercolano,” *Atti e Mem. dell’Acc. Naz. Virgiliana di Scienze Lettere ed Arti di Mantova* 59 (1991) 97. But if there is any link between this incipit (and the next) and Vergil, it is the sphragis to the *Georgics*, which in all likelihood was written after Phil.’s death.

15 Παρθενόπης παρη(ονίης): Parsons would read Π. παρη(). I can find no ancient source attesting to the healing powers of Parthenope, but Norman Douglas’s travel book on the region records that “the siren Parthenope escaped by taking refuge during mediaeval storms in the narrow confines of an amulet, such Siren-charms as are still seen in the streets of Naples and credited with with peculiar ef-

ficacy against the evil eye” (*Siren Land*, London 1911; I quote from pp. 12 f. of the Penguin ed.). It would not be unknown for such modern beliefs to have ancient origins.

16 τὴν πρότερον θυμέ(λην): Phil. 32. The papyrus shows that Gow-Page were too quick to obelize the last word, difficult as it is. Nor should they have been so dismissive of Giangrande, *RM* 106 (1963) 255–257, who made a good case for θυμέλη having here the sense of “sacrificial cake,” although this is not the meaning I adopt.

17 ψυχὴ μοι προλέ(γει): Phil. 13, attributed to Phil. by both P and Pl (the latter with the common τοῦ αὐτοῦ), but generally regarded by editors since Jacobs as the work of Meleager on the grounds that the girl of this poem, Heliodora, regularly shows up in his poems. It would now seem that the MSS are correct in their attribution.

18 ἐνθάδε τῆς τρυφε(ρής): Phil. 33.

19 Ἴνους ᾧ Μελικέρ(τα): Phil. 34.

20 ζωροπότην ωρη(ι?) or ωρη(): In his prose Phil. is fond of the construction ὄρα (ἔστι) + infinitive; so perhaps “It is the hour for the man who drinks his wine straight to . . .”?

21 Δημῷ τις . . . : After τις, τῆ is possible. As Parsons notes, this may be another poem of Phil. in which a woman named Demo is mentioned, especially as he seems to have had a predilection for women with this name (10, cf. 11).

22 νηὸν συλησασα(σ): “It is not clear whether the final sigma was meant to be suspended” (Parsons); i.e., the last word may be συλησάσας. Most likely another accusative followed: “The women having robbed the temple (of?).”

23 τέσσαρες εἰς, ραι: “The doubtful letter looks like alpha; if so, εἰσᾶραι? εἰς Ἄραϊ (a deliberate sophistication of the usual trio)?” (Parsons). Connection, if any, with 24 or 26 below is unclear.

24 Ἀτθίδος ᾧ Παφίη: A possible imitation of this poem is *AP* 6.17 (Loukianos): (i) It begins αἱ τρισσαί (see above); (ii) One of the three hetairai mentioned, Atthis, makes a dedication to Aphrodite. The incipit could continue, e.g., τόδ' ἄγαλμ' ἀνέθηκε(ν) | ---. Atthis of course may refer to Attica or Athens, but we should not exclude Gadara, which Meleager 2 (*AP* 7.417.2) calls the Syrian Atthis.

25 οἱ[δ' ὄ]τι Καῖσαρ: But Καῖσαρ() and (from Holford-Strevens) καὶ Σάρ(δεις) are also possible. Gigante 140 f. tends to favor the incipit as printed here, believing it to begin a poem of Phil., and hence that the Caesar in question is Julius.

26 τέσσαρα Κύπριδος: Although several epigrams refer to a woman as the fourth Grace and/or second Aphrodite (and tenth Muse), a topos Phil. probably tried at least once (*Ep. Bob.* 35; see on 2.2 and above, 23), the combination of the number four with Kypris and the neuter gender makes this an improbable topos for this incipit. I suggest rather an erotic parody modeled on an Empedoclean line similar to his B 96.3 τέσσαρα δ' Ἡφαίστοιο, i.e., “four parts of fire” as an ingredient in the composition of bone. If so, this incipit could be like ii.2 and iv.8 in taking another line from someone else’s poem as a starting point. Cf. 2.

27 πτωχὸν ἔχουσα: Beggars occur often in the Anthology; cf. Phil. 32.

28 ὠμολόγησ' ἤξειν: The incipit to *AP* 5.150 (Asklepiades 10 HE, 17 Knauer) :

ὠμολόγησ' ἤξειν εἰς νύκτα μοι ἢ πῖβόητος
 Νικῶ καὶ σεμνήν ὤμοσε Θεσμοφόρον,
 κούχ ἤκει, φυλακὴ δὲ παροίχεται. ἄρ' ἐπιорκεῖν
 ἤθελε; τὸν λύχνον, παῖδες, ἀποσβέσατε.

P Ἀσκληπιάδου Suda s.v. Θεσμοφόρος (1–2) caret Pl

1 ἢ πῖβόητος C: –βοτ- P: ἐπι- (om. ἦ) Suda 2 Νικῶ om. Suda Θεσμοφόρον om. P add. C

Since this poem occurs in a Meleagrian sequence of *AP* (5.134–215), where there is no discrepant ascription, and since there is nothing that would in any way suggest Philodemean authorship, it should be allowed to remain as Asklepiades’, who uses the name Niko elsewhere (13 HE = *AP* 5.164; cf. further S. L. Tarán, *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram* [Leiden 1979] 83). The poem is ascribed to Asklepiades by the scribe of P, not, as Parsons mistakenly says, by C. See on col. vi.18. But see the introductory comments above, on the likelihood that this incipit, as opposed to the poem of Asklepiades, belongs to Phil.

The situation described here is a variant, probably a conscious one, of that in Sappho 168B Voigt (δέδυκε μὲν ἄ σελάννα); cf. Knauer ad loc., B. Lavagnini, *Nuova antologia dei frammenti della lirica greca* (Turin 1932) 184 ff.; P. Maas, “Zum griechischen Wortschatz,” *Mélanges Emile Boisacq* 2 = *AIPbO* 6 (1938) 131 f. (repr. in *KS* 199 f.); W. Ludwig, “Ein Epigrammpaar des Asklepiades (*A.P.* v, 7/150),” *MH* 19 (1964) 191–199.

29 αὐται (αὐταὶ) τὰς χρυσέου.

30 ἐκτετόνημαι, Ἔρωσ: If the verb struck its original audience as it strikes us, as a *hapax*, it would at the very first moment mean nothing more than “I have lost my *tonos*, I am unstrung” (cf. ἐκτονίζομαι, “lose force,” Herodotos Medicus, i A.D. (*RM* 58 [1903] 99); δυνάμιες . . . τονοῖσαι καὶ τὰ σώματα καὶ τὰς ψυχάς, Tim. Lokr. 103de). *Tonos* is practically a technical term of the Stoics, so it is quite possible that the *hapax*, together with whatever followed, produced a lighthearted love poem couched in Stoic terms. If it is by Phil., it may well have been, e.g., a parody of Stoic views on the place of emotions in poetry, which Phil. criticizes throughout

his *De Musica* IV; cf. the statements on Diogenes of Babylon to the effect that music produces harmony within the soul (coll. 7.22–31, 21.23–35 Neubecker).

31 μῆλον ἐγώ· πέμ(πει): Phil. 2.

32 ὦ σφύραι κεφαλῆς: I do not understand why Parsons compares Phil. 12—below, col. v.20—since an address to “hammers of (the) head” could not easily begin a poem parallel to 12. Perhaps we have here a poem on that remarkable man Phil. refers to in *De Signis* 4, “the man in Alexandria half a cubit high, with a colossal head (κεφαλῆν) that could be beaten with a hammer (ἐσφυροκόπουν), who used to be exhibited by the embalmers” (trans. De Lacy and De Lacy, who note, p. 93 n. 9, that he is “apparently not mentioned elsewhere”).

Gigante 141, rejecting my suggestion, would like to read this an erotic epigram like 12 he suggest reading ὦ σφυρῶν, κεφαλῆς, “o ankles, o head,” but σφύραι seems certain, and σφυρῶν, “ankles,” does not scan.

33 θύετε τῇ Νεμέ(σει?): Two epigrams display the motif of a stone converted by Pheidias to a statue of Nemesis (*AP* 221 f., by Theaitetos and Parmenion respectively). If this poem is by Phil., it could have gone on to reflect Epicurean views on the worship of stones in the shape of gods. Compare Phil. 30, which I interpret similarly.

col. v

1 τὸν Κρονίδ(): –δην, –δαο, –δεω, and –δη are the likely supplements. Zeus most likely, although Poseidon and Hades are also possible (Parsons).

2 τὸ γράψαι πο().

3 νυκτερι(νή): Phil. 14. (*AP* 12.250 [Strato], beginning νυκτερινήν was of course written later than our papyrus.)

4 δεῦθ' ᾧδ'.

5 χθιζός.

6 εἶχεν δημο(): A name beginning Demo-?

7 πειθιμαρει: A form of πείθω, or πείθι = πῖθι; If the latter, a reference to Mareotic wine may follow. Cf. Hor. *O.* 1.37.14, with Nisbet-Hubbard's n. ad loc. For the form (Μαρει- rather than the usual Μαρι-), Lloyd-Jones adduces Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἄζειωται.

8 ἀμφότεροι πιθα().

9 παῖδα πολυτρη(): πολυτρήρων (abounding in doves, *Il.* 2.502, 582) and πολύτρητος suggest possible restorations.

10 οὐκ ἔα θῆλυ, θηλυ(τερ- ?): Ὀν ἔᾶ = *eram*, cf. Σ A ad *Il.* 5.887, adduced by Pfeiffer on Kallim. fr. 384.32. Spoken by a Gallos?

11 ἠράσθην, τίς δ' ὀ(ύχι);: Phil. 5.

12 τρεῖς κιάθους: Ladles as a measure of wine in a sympotic epigram is likely; cf. Argentarius 8 GP (*AP* 5.110.1 f.).

ἔγχει Λυσιδίκης κιάθους δέκα, τῆς δὲ ποθεινῆς
Εὐφράντης ἓνα μοι, λάτρι, δίδου κιάθον.

Similarly, Anacr. 383 PMG, Alexis 116 K-A.

13 δακρύεις: Most likely Phil. 25.

14 ψαλμοὶ καὶ λαλιή: Phil. 1, where the MSS have ψαλμός, which I think correct, although Gigante 143 n. 55 defends Π's reading; cf. the commentary ad loc.

15 ἤρεσέ μοι κομψή: Parsons notes that κομψός occurs in the Anthology only in a poem (21) attributed both to Antiphrilos (by P) and to Phil. (by C, Pl, and, it would seem by Π vi.4); see the commentary. The occurrence of κομψή in this context strongly suggests Philodemean authorship for both incipit and 21; but see below, line 19.

16 νάρδα κ(αὶ) σμύρνη: Probably both here are unguents, although the former can refer to the flower spikenard. The latter appears in Phil. 6.2

17 ἀγρός καὶ στεφ(αν): Perhaps the beginning of a list of rural delights, which may then be contrasted with more urbane pleasures; cf. the preceding incipit (Parsons) and Phil. 6.

18 Πρωτέος Φάρε: To scan, we must read Πρωτήος, an error that usually presupposes an original ΠΡΟΤΕΟΣ, a spelling which would of course antedate Phil. Perhaps here a simple scribal error. It was on the island of Pharos where Menelaos met Proteus (*Od.* 4.385, Eur. *Hel.* 1–37), who was worshipped by the early inhabitants of the region; cf. [Kallisth.] 1.32.2 οἱ δὲ ἐγχώριοι εἶπον· Φάρος· Πρωτεὺς δὲ αὐτόθι κατώκισεν, <οὐ καὶ> τὸ μνῆμα τοῦ Πρωτέως ἐστὶ. Cf. further Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* 1.17 f.; Poseidippos 11.1 HE Ἑλλήνων σωτήρα, Φάρου σκοπὸν, ὃ ἄνα Πρωτεῦ.

19 παρθένιος: Another papyrus list of epigrams, P.Vindob. G 40611, begins παρθένιος μοι κομψός ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίας, but this papyrus, dating from the third century B.C., cannot contain anything by Phil.; cf. H. Harrauer, "Epigramincipit auf

einem Papyrus aus dem 3. Jh. v. Chr. Ein Vorbericht,” *Proc. XVI Int. Congr. Pap.* (Chico 1981) 49–53. This papyrus will be edited in full by P. Parsons and B. Kramer. (Note that the occurrence of κομψός in this unknown epigram weakens the case made above, on line 15.)

Parthenios, if a proper name rather than noun or adj., may refer to P. of Nicaea (or Myrlea), Vergil’s teacher, and hence someone known (if only by name) to Phil. Or it may refer to Vergil himself, who *Neapoli Parthenias vulgo appellatus sit* (Donatus *Vita Verg.* 11); see above, p. 19, n. 17.

20 ὦ ποδός: Phil. 12.

21 Νικαρέτη πείθει: An erotic epigram is likely, as in the other epigrams where a Nikarete appears: Asklepiades 3 HE (*AP* 5.153), Dioskorides 39 HE (*AP* 7.166), Nikarchos 2 HE (*AP* 6.285).

22 μισῶ καὶ στεφ(άνους): Parsons is right to compare 6, but Phil. does not there give up all parties, and he will continue to wear wreaths; see the commentary. If by Phil. and in line with 6, στεφάνους would presumably receive the proper modification.

23 τοῦς φέρε καὶ πα(): Either (i) “Lend me your ear,” as in Hipponax 118.5 West τοῦς μοι παράσχες, Plato, *Rep.* 531a; or (ii) Conceivably directions to a household slave; cf. Phil. 28. If not τοῦς, then τοῦς; Holford-Strevens offers as a possibility τοῦς φέρε καὶ πά(λι) <τοῦς>.

24 ἄδειν κ(αὶ) ψάλλειν: In addition to 1, cf. 3.3–5: ψῆλον . . . ᾄδε.

25 οὐδέπω ἐμβεβλη().

26 μέλλει μοι.

27 γεινώσκω ταλ .ευν.

28 ἡδὺ θέρευς ἔλκει: This almost certainly was meant to recall Asklepiades 1 HE (*AP* 5.169.1) ἡδὺ θέρους διψῶντι χιῶν ποτόν, and may therefore also form part of a priamel culminating in something sweeter or sweetest of an erotic nature.

29 τὴν ἀπὸ παλλιόλου: “Latin writers . . . associate this Greek garment [= *himation*] with Greek practices—comedy, philosophy, immorality” (Parsons), any one or more of which can easily be imagined to have been the subject of a Philodemean epigram. If a self-contained phrase, it could mean “the women with the little *pallium*.”

Another possibility is that the reference is to the *pallium*, referring to bed-covering (cf. *Ov. Am.* 1.2.2 *neque in lecto pallia nostra sedent*). Thus, e.g., “her from the bedding (having leaped, . . .)” could begin the description of a husband returning home unexpectedly, such as Horace describes soon after referring to Phil. (*Sat.*

1.2.127ff, esp. 129 f. *vae pallida lecto | desiliat mulier*). In which case, the poem begun here could have provided the source for Horace's *Gallis, hanc Philodemus ait*. Cf. Gigante 141 f.

30 ἤδη πολλάκις.

31 ὁ πρὶν ἐγὼ κ(αί): The deletions in this list seem designed to avoid duplication, so that this must surely be the beginning of Phil. 19 rather than of Antipater Sid. 22 HE (AP 7.172); see above, on col. iii. 7.

32 Αἰσώπου τινά: A statue of Aesop is described in Agathias 16 Viansino (AP 16.332). Holford-Strevens suggests Αἰ. τ. <μῦθον>.

col. vi

1 μή μοι φάρμακα: Drugs/poisons appear often in the Anthology, five in erotic epigrams, including 37.2

2 ρουλλη καὶ τη: Parsons offers Latin *Rulla* (ρουλλη, conceivably an otherwise unattested woman in the family of P. Servilius Rullus, *tr. pl.* 63) or *bullā* (βουλλη) as bare possibilities. Obbink suggests πουλλη, which could refer to a young girl (“chick”) as *pullus* does to a boy (OLD s.v. 2). Note also late Latin *rulla*, ‘plow staff.’

3 αὔσαι κύριε: This vocative is a late form of address, e.g., to God in the Greek of Jews and Christians. Phil. could be using here a term which must have been familiar to him in Gadara. Cf. below, fr. 3.3. With [π]αῦσαι, we could expect a supplementary participle to follow; Parsons allows also for καῦσαι and ψαῦσαι.

4 ἡ κομψή: Phil. 21. See above on col. v. 15, and below on vii. 15.

5 ἦς καὶ ἐμὴ καὶ ω: “καὶ ἐμὴ (ἐμῆ) καὶ ω or (perhaps better) καὶ γώ” (Parsons).

6 τίς σ' ἐκέλευσε.

7 ὀρχεῖσθε γλαφυ(ρ): Repeated below, vii. 14, q.v.

8 ψάλλε κατα().

9 ψάλλειν Ἴκαρε: Two frigid epigrams of Julian of Egypt addressed to a bronze statue of Ikaros begin Ἴκαρε (AP 107 f.; Schulte, pp. 112 ff.). Parsons also raises the possibility of a reference to the Island in a festive context, as in Tib. 3.7.9 *cunctis Baccho iucundior hospes | Icarus*.

10 οἶνος καὶ ῥοδινοί: Ingredients for a party? [στέφανοι] is a likely supplement, as in Stesich. 187 PMG ῥοδίνους στεφάνους, Anakr. 434 PMG, Asklepiades 25 HE (AP 5.181.2) πέντε στεφάνους τῶν ῥοδίνων.

11 ἐχθὲς ἔδωκεν: Of Π's ἐκθές Parsons notes the similar phonetic spelling in the papyrus of Phil. *De Ira* (e.g., ἐκθρών, coll. xvi. 32, xix.11, xxiii. 31, xxxii. 25), but it is not uncommon in koine papyri.

12 ἰζὸν ἔχεις τόν (ἔχει στον-?): See above on col. ii. 12. Gigante 136 suggests, e.g., ἰ. ἔ. τὸν ἔρωτα, comparing Meleager 59 (*AP* 5.96.1) ἰ. ἔ. τὸ φίλημα.

13 ταῦτα οθε .

14 ἡνίκα μεν ε[: Philip 59 (*AP* 11.36) begins ἡνίκα μὲν καλὸς ἦς, but Parsons says that the traces are not consistent with καλ.

15 οὐκ ἔλεγον νησ[] .

16 παῦε φιληλακατη[: A feminine form of φιληλάκατος, –ον (elsewhere only Antipater Sid. 4 HE = *AP* 6.160.5; restored at Bakch. 1.74) is possible, but Parsons prefers φίλ' ἡλακατη[.

17 ραι

18 αὐτ[ου] μοι στέφα(νοι): This seems to be the incipit of *AP* 5.145 [Asklepiades 12 HE, 9 Knauer]:

αὐτοῦ μοι στέφανοι παρὰ δικλίσι ταῖσδε κρεμαστοί
 μίμνετε μὴ προπετῶς φύλλα τινασσόμενοι
 οὐς δακρύοις κατέβρεξα—κάτομβρα γὰρ ἰῶμματ' ἐρώντων
 —ἀλλ' ὅταν οἰγομένης αὐτὸν ἴδητε θύρης
 στάξασθ' ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἐμὸν ἕρπον ὡς ἂν ἐκείνου
 ἡ ξανθή γε κόμη τὰμὰ πῆ δάκρυα. 5

PPI 7.116, f. 73v Ἀσκληπιάδου Π i. 15–20

3 ἐρώντων CPl Π (ερων.ων): ἐρώτων P 4 αὐτὸν PPl: αὐτήν C 5 ἐκείνου Π
 Schneidewin: ἄμεινον PPl 6 κόμη PPl κόρη C τὰμὰ πῆ δάκρυα P(Π ut vid.): τ. δ.
 π. Pl

Tarán, *Variation* 73–77.
 Gigante 134 f.

Copied out in full in Π col. i. 15–20 (where a corruption in the MSS is cleared up), and its incipit included among the rest, this epigram may thus be by Phil. (as Cameron and Luppe now believe), although it contains nothing in language or quality to recommend this ascription. Nor are any of Phil.'s undisputed poems homosexual. Furthermore, whereas Asklepiades sets other erotic poems in front of houses (3, 13, 14, 42 HE = *AP* 5.153, 164, 167, 189), Phil. does not. Probably even more telling, for this and *AP* 5.150, which is also among the incipits (col. iv. 28), is that *AP* includes both in a long run of Meleagorean poems (5.134–215), where there are no double ascriptions.

There remains the possibility that the two incipits that match two of Asklepiades' poems may have been from poems of Phil. which began similarly; cf. Cameron, app. 7.

In v. 5 **ἐκείνου**, the papyrus vindicates Schneidewin's conjecture and also shows that C's αὐτήν and κόρη derives from an attempt to heterosexualize a homosexual poem, such as we occasionally find in Planudes' bowdlerizing, cf. Cameron, *Greek Anthology* 353 f.

19 ἀρχόμεθα, ψυχή: As Parsons points out, if in fact the soul is being addressed in the vocative (–η is also possible), there are only two other examples of this in AP: Phil. 1, where note καταρχόμενον, ἰὼ ψυχή), and 9.411 (Maccius 3 GP), where note the plural verb εἴκωμεν, ψυχή.

Col. vi ends here, leaving one-third of the column blank, although the papyrus is undamaged. One also notes that there is room for at least one column to the left of col. vii on the verso.

col. vii (verso)

1 μὴ π.. νη γείνου? See Parsons.

2 ἦδη μὴ πέμπτον: μοι is also possible. Perhaps a sepulchral epigram; cf. AP7.601.2 (Julian of Egypt) πέμπτον ἐφ' ἑνδεκάτω πικρὸν . . . ἔτος (cf. Schulte ad loc.), 7.602.5 (Agathias 23 Viansino) πέμπτου καὶ δεκάτου . . . ἐνιαυτοῦ, κτλ.

3 ὄλετ' ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων: A sepulchral epigram.

4 μὴ πρότερον φιλ(): See on col. ii.15.

5 μισῶ πάντ' αἰεῖ: Is the object once again something literary? Cf. iv.8.

6 οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ τὸ πρόσ(ωπον?): A similar beginning at iv.25.

7 ἠράσθην Δημοῦς: Phil. 10.

8 νῦν ὀψωνησαί: The verb (*to buy victuals*) can be proparoxytone, paroxytone, or properispomenon. If the last, an order to a slave in an invitation epigram?

9 μηνωπός: With this hapax, suggested by Lloyd-Jones, cf. κερᾶψ σελήνη (Max. 337). A less likely articulation is μὴ νωπός (νώψ' ἀσθενῆς τῇ ὄψει, Hesych.).

10 οὐ μὰ τὰ κροκεοντα?: ii. 26 also begins with a negative oath. On κροκεοντα, see iv.12.

11 εἴ τί ποτ' ἐν θνηταῖσι?: Since θνηταί = “mortal women” occurs in Kirke's speech to Odysseus, in which she compares unfavorably the beauty of mortals to

that of goddesses (οὐ πω οὐδὲ ἔοικε | θηνητὰς ἀθανάτησι δέμας καὶ εἶδος ἐρίζειν, 5.212 f.), it is possible that this epigram continues with a similar comparison.

12 χρυσηκερ[] ... σχο: “χρυσόκερω μόσχον is very tempting” (Parsons, pointing out the paleographical difficulties).

13 γινώσκω, χαρίεσσα: Phil. 23, as ascribed by P (ἄδηλον, Pl).

14 ὀρχεῖσθε γλαφυρς: See above, vi. 7. Probably –ως, although Parsons is doubtful. The word is used of music by Lucian *Dial. Deorum* 7.4 ἐμελῶδει πάνυ γλαφυρὸν καὶ ἐναρμόνιον.

15 χαῖρε σύ. καὶ σύ γε: Phil. 20. Parsons notes that “the scribe normally takes no notice of” punctuation, but the space before καί falls between “voices” of the dialogue, and may well go back to Phil.’s autograph, where they would have served as a reminder to change tone or pitch in reciting.

16 πέμπτης ε: Parsons reads ἐστίν μοι, but an enclitic in position 3 jars, and in the complete poems, Phil. allows movable nu to make position only once (9.4). Thus, if this is in fact the reading (Obbink declares ἐστί not secure), either not by Phil. or intentionally crude, like 22.

17 κράμβην Ἄρτεμί(δαρος): Phil. 28.

18 νικ υσιπ.ω.

19 μὴ μέγα, μὴ μέγα: The last word can be μεγα(λ), and both gammas can be taus, although sense argues for gammas. Cf, Phil. 10.1,2.

20 εὐχαρίς ἐστί Φιλιννα: This may belong to the topos of the sexy older woman (cf. 9): (i) Philinna is the name in Paulus Silentiarius’ example of this genre; (ii) in three of these poems, the woman, despite some falling off of youthful beauty, retains her χάρις (see on 9.6).

21 ἤδη καὶ ῥόδον (ἐστί): Phil. 29.

22 ἐξήδεινηδη: “ἐξ-, ἔξ, ἦδει ν-, ἦδεν (first or third person?), ἦδεν, ἦ δειν’ and much else” (Parsons). The last character may be a nu or lambda + omicron: ἦ Δῆλο(ς), ἦ δῆλο(ν). ἐξήδεν ἦδη, *bene iam sciebam* (Holford-Strevens) is very likely.

23 μουκιαδα: No known word is possible; perhaps, as Parsons suggests, a patronymic or Greek adjective (such as the Lucretian *Memmiadas* or *Scipiadas* for the Roman name *Mucius*).

24 εἶ με φίλοι ης: Nu and mu are possible for the first doubtful letter.

25 ἐξήκοντα: Phil. 9.

col. viii

1 ἦν ψήχη πιθανς: –ας (preferred by Obbink) or –ῶς, although neither adv. nor adjective sits comfortably with the idea of rubbing.

2 Κύπρι γαληναίη: Phil. 8.

3 ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί: An erotic epigram is very likely.

4 ἔνχει Ῥωμαίης: Cf. Phil. 12.7 εἰ δ' Ὀπικὴ καὶ Φλώρα. For the genitive with ἐγγέω, cf., e.g., Meleager 43 (AP 5.137.1) ἐγγχει . . . Ἡλιοδώρας. ἔκχει is also possible; least likely in ἐγγχεῖ < ἐγχος. ἐγγχεῖ Ῥωμαίης ῥώμησ would amuse.

5 ἐγλέγομαι καλά: Parsons adduces Pl. *Symp.* 198d τὰ κάλλιστα ἐκλεγομένουσ.

6 Ἡδύλιον πεφίληκα: Hedyllion figures in an erotic epigram of Maccius 5 GP (AP 5.133).

7 οἶδας τὸν θυκο: Or οἶδ' /οἶδ' ἄστον. Rea suggests τὸν θ' ὑκόν, which (to me at any rate) raises the possibility of a reference to Epicureans as porkers; cf. Intro., p. 16, n. 13.

8 εἶπω Χαῖρε κα(λή?): This could have begun an address to a woman passing in the street; cf. Phil. 20 and 21. For the syntax, cf. Rufinus 10 Page (AP 5.28.1) νῦν μοι Χαῖρε λέγεις, with Page's n. ad loc.

9 καὶ νυκτὸς μεσάτης: Phil. 26.

10 ω . . . εστι: “ω . . . σ μ' ἔστι would be possible” (Parsons), or ω γ τ μ ε σ τ ι (Obbink).

11 λιτόν σοι τοῦτ' α . . . ς: Ὁν λιτόν cf. Phil. 27.1 (with commentary) and 17. ἀδτις, α<ύ>θις? (Parsons).

12 Κύπριδι καὶ με: Parsons suggests another dative in the lacuna, perhaps Χάρισιν, which would be a tight fit. A dedicatory poem is very likely.

Frr. 2–3

Written by hand A, this too may contain incipits and, as is suggested by paragraphoi setting off vv. 9–12 (see on Fr. 2.3), at least one entire epigram. The likely equality between two lines below with incipits in fr.1 suggests that here too Phil. is the principal or sole source.

Fr. 2

1] ... ο ... [

2]ενδεκα[

3 ν]αὶ κακο[: There seems to be the tail end of a paragraphos below the alpha, which would suggest that the next lines, fitting one of the incipits from Fr. 1, contained a complete poem. But only after only three lines (obviously an impossible number for an epigram) we may have another incipit, where again it is preceded by a paragraphos. If we are reading the paragraphoi correctly (which is not certain, especially since some may be lost), this fragment may contain a mixture of incipits and complete poems, perhaps as follows:

- 1–3, three incipits or the last three lines of an epigram
- 4–5, a poem of one distich
- 6, an incipit
- 7–8, a poem of one distich
- 9–12, one poem of four lines or four incipits
- 13, an incipit

Although such a combination of poems and incipits may well seem unlikely, it receives some support from the inference that the poem beginning on v. 4 is followed by the poem beginning on v. 7, just as these two incipits are contiguous in Fr. 1.

4 χ]ρήμασιν[: = Fr.1 iii. 18? *χρήμασιν οὐ πλο()*.

5]τειδεσ: The second line of the poem on vv. 4–5?

6] ρησεισ : Parsons suggests e.g. *ε]υρησει(ς)* .

7]ωνωγ[: Phi seems possible, although Parsons is doubtful; in which case, cf. fr. 1 iii. 19 *φωνῶ γινωσκου-*; and see above on v. 3, which reinforces the identification.

8 αυτοα. [: The first unclear letter may be either lambda or nu; for the latter Parsons compares Maccius 10 GP (*AP* 9.403.1) *αὐτὸς ἀναξ*. But as suggested above it may be the second line of a poem.

9–12: A complete poem? (Parsons's supplements except for 10 < >)

ειδεθελε[εἰ δὲ θέ[λ-	
αλλοεχω	ἄλλο<ν> ἔχω	10
τηνελ.[τὴν ἐλπ[?	
ζευστα.[Ζεὺς τὰ μ- (Ζεῦ σταμ-?)	

13 οὔτος ὁ τ[: Followed by the foot of the column.

Fr. 3

1]ουμαι.[

2]μαι.[

3 κ]ύριε[: Obbink compares Fr. 1 vi.3]ουσαικυριε.

4].[

This page intentionally left blank

TESTIMONIA ad Philodemum pertinentia

This collection of sources contains texts where Philodemus is clearly (section **A**) or quite likely (**B**) referred to by others. A very brief selection is offered of passages from the papyri where Philodemus seems to refer to himself (**C**). These are limited to those alluded to in the Introduction. Excluded are all epigrams that have been interpreted autobiographically. Annotation is minimal.

A

T 1 Cicero *De Finibus* 2.119

Quae cum dixissem, “Habeo,” inquit Torquatus, “ad quos ista referam, et, quamquam aliquid ipse poteram, tamen invenire malo paratiores.” “Familiare vestros, credo, Sironem dicis et Philodemum, cum optimos viros tum homines doctissimos.” “Recte,” inquit, “intelligis.”

When I had finished, Torquatus said “Although I would be able to respond myself, I prefer to refer these matters [sc. your arguments] to those who are more able than I am.” “You are, I believe, speaking of your colleagues, the finest and most learned Siro and Philodemus.” “You understand me perfectly.”

Composed in 45 B.C., the dramatic date of the dialogue is 50 B.C.; its setting is Cicero’s Cumanum estate near Naples. Cf. D. Delattre, “Philodème dans la correspondance de Cicéron,” *BAGB* (1984) 28 f.

T 2 Cicero *In Pisonem* 68–72, 74 (ed. Nisbet)

68 Dicit aliquis “unde haec tibi nota sunt?” Non me hercules contumeliae causa describam quemquam, praesertim ingeniosum hominem atque eruditum, cui generi esse ego iratus ne si cupiam quidem possum. Est quidam Graecus [sc. Philodemus; v. T 3] qui cum isto vivit, homo, vere ut dicam—sic enim cognovi—humanus, sed tam diu quam diu aut cum aliis est aut ipse secum. Is cum istum adulescentem iam tum hac distracta fronte vidisset, non fastidivit eius amicitiam, cum esset praesertim appetitus; dedit se in consuetudinem sic ut prorsus una viveret nec fere ab isto umquam discederet. Non apud indoctos sed, ut ego arbitror, in hominum eruditissimorum et humanissimorum coetu loquor. Audistis profecto dici philosophos Epicureos omnis res quae sint homini expetendae voluptate metiri; rectene an secus nihil ad nos, aut si ad nos, nihil ad hoc tempus; sed tamen lubricum genus orationis adulescenti non acriter intellegenti et saepe praeceps. 69 Itaque admissarius iste, simul atque audivit voluptatem a philosopho tanto opere laudari, nihil expiscatus est: sic suos sensus voluptarios omnis incitavit, sic ad illius hanc orationem adhinnivit, ut non magistrum virtutis sed auctorem libidinis a se illum inventum arbitraretur. Graecus primo distinguere et dividere, illa quem ad modum dicerentur; iste, “claudus” quem ad modum aiunt “pilam,” retinere quod acceperat, testificari, tabellas obsignare velle, Epicurum disertum decernere. Et tamen dicit, ut opinor, se nullum bonum intellegere posse demptis corporis voluptatibus. 70 Quid multa? Graecus facilis et valde venustus nimis pugnax contra senatorem populi Romani esse noluit. Est autem hic de quo loquor non philosophia solum sed etiam ceteris studiis quae fere ceteros Epicureos neglegere dicunt perpolitus; poema porro facit ita festivum, ita concinnum, ita elegans, nihil ut fieri possit argutius. In quo reprehendat eum licet si qui volet, modo leviter, non ut improbum, non ut audacem, non ut impurum, sed ut Graeculum, ut adsentatorem, ut poetam. Devenit autem seu potius incidit in istum eodem deceptus supercilio Graecus atque advena quo tot sapientes et tanta civitas; revocare se non poterat familiaritate implicatus, et simul inconstantiae famam verebatur. Rogatus invitatus coactus ita multa ad istum de isto quoque scripsit ut omnis hominis libidines, omnia stupra, omnia cenarum genera convivorumque, adulteria denique eius delicatissimis versibus expresserit, 71 in quibus si qui velit possit istius tamquam in speculo vitam intueri; ex quibus multa a multis et lecta et audita recitarem, ni vererer ne hoc ipsum genus orationis quo nunc utor ab huius loci more abhorreret; et simul de ipso qui scripsit detrahi nil volo. Qui si fuisset in discipulo comparando meliore fortuna, fortasse austerior et gravior esse potuisset; sed eum casus in hanc consuetudinem scribendi induxit philosopho valde indignam, si quidem philosophia, ut fertur, virtutis continet et officii et bene vivendi disciplinam; quam qui profitetur gravissimam mihi sustinere personam videtur. 72 Sed idem casus illum ignarum quid profiteretur, cum se philosophum esse diceret, istius impurissimae atque intemperantissimae pecudis caeno et sordibus inquinavit. . . 74 Quare ex familiari tuo, Graeco illo poeta: probabit genus ipsum et agnoscet neque te nihil sapere mirabitur.

68 Someone will no doubt ask, “How do you come to know all this?” Well, I do not propose to describe any individual in such a manner as to insult him, especially if he be a man of parts and learning, a class with which I could not be angry, even if I wished. There is a certain Greek [sc. Philodemus; cf. T 3] who virtually lives with him, a man whom, to tell the truth, I have found to be a very gentlemanly fellow, at any rate as long as he is in other company than Piso’s, or is by himself. This man met our young friend Piso who even then went about with eyebrows raised, and was not averse to his friendship, especially as the other eagerly sought him; he so far gave himself up to his

company that he absolutely lived with him and scarcely ever left his side. I am speaking not to an ignorant audience, but, as I think, in an assembly of learned and accomplished gentlemen. You have of course heard it said that Epicurean philosophers assess the desirability of anything by its capacity to give pleasure—whether rightly or wrongly is no concern of ours, or at any rate not relevant to the present issue—it is, however, a dangerous argument to put before a young man of only moderate intelligence, and one that often leads to disaster. 69 Accordingly, as soon as that stud heard pleasure praised so highly by so great a philosopher, he did not pick and choose; he so stimulated all his pleasurable sensations, and raised such a whinnying to welcome his friend's arguments, that he plainly thought he had found in the Greek not a professor of ethics but a master of the art of lust. The Greek at first drew distinctions as to the meaning of the precepts; but, as the proverb says, "a cripple has got the ball [sc. but cannot run with it]"; Piso was prepared to bear witness as to what he had received, and to put a seal on the matter, and would have it that Epicurus was an eloquent fellow; and indeed Epicurus does, I believe, assert that he cannot conceive any good apart from bodily pleasure. 70 To make a long story short, the Greek was far too charming and complaisant to have any notion of standing up to a Senator of the Roman people.

Now the Greek of whom I speak is polished not only in philosophy but also in other accomplishments which Epicureans are said commonly to neglect; he furthermore composes poetry so witty, neat, and elegant, that nothing could be cleverer. Anyone who wishes is at liberty to find fault with him for this; but let him do so gently, not as though with a low and bare-faced rogue, but as with a poor little Greek, a parasite, a poet. When he came upon Piso, or rather fell in with him, he was beguiled, a Greek in a strange land as he was, by the same savage scowl as has beguiled so many sages and so great a society as our own. Once in the toils of friendship, there was no drawing back for him, and, what was more, he wished to avoid the reproach of fickleness. In response to request, invitation, pressure, he wrote reams of verse *to* Piso and *about* Piso, sketching to the life in lines of perfect finish all his lusts and immoralities, all his varied dinners and banquets, all his adulteries; 71 and in these poems anyone who wishes can see the fellow's life reflected as in a mirror. I would read you a copious selection from these (they have often been read and listened to before), were it not that I am afraid that, even as it is, my present subject is out of keeping with the traditions of this place; and at the same time I do not wish to cast any slur upon the character of their author. Had he been luckier in the sort of pupil he found, he might have turned out a steadier and more irreproachable character; but chance led him into a style of writing which was unworthy of a philosopher, if, that is to say, philosophy is correctly described as comprising the whole theory of virtue and duty and the good life; and the man who professes that seems to me to have taken me to have taken upon himself the most responsible of functions. 72 He did but imperfectly apprehend what he was professing in calling himself a philosopher, and chance too defiled him with the mud and filth of that bestial and unbridled monster. . . . 74 [Cicero is defending his own poetry against Piso's criticism of it] Ask your friend the Greek poet; he will pass my figure of speech and recognize it, and will feel no surprise at your lack of discernment. (Transl. N. H. Watts, adapted)

In addition to his notes *ad locc.*, see Nisbet's appendices 3 ("Piso and Philodemus") and 4 ("Piso and the Villa of the Papyri"); R. G. M. Nisbet, *M. Tulli Ciceronis: In L. Calpurnium Pisonem Oratio* (Oxford 1961). Cf. also M. Gigante, "Il ritratto di Filodemo nella *Pisoniana*," in *RF²* 35–53.

T 3 Asconius ad Cic. *In Pis.* 68

Philodemum significat qui fuit Epicureus illa aetate nobilissimus, cuius et poemata sunt lasciva.

Cicero means Philodemus, who was the finest Epicurean of that time, and who wrote lascivious poems.

T 4 Horace *Serm.* 1.2.119 ff.

parabilem amo venerem facilemque.
illam “post paulo,” “sed pluris,” “si exierit vir,”
Gallis, hanc Philodemus ait sibi, quae neque magno
stet pretio neque cunctetur cum est iussa venire.

I like a woman who is available and easy. The woman who says “later,” “more money,” or “when my husband has left”? As Philodemus says, let the Galli have her: that woman is his who charges little and doesn’t delay when called.

This poem is imbued with Epicurean coloring derived from the prose works of Epicurus and his school. By capping his general, philosophical, point with a reference to one or more of Phil.’s poems, Horace hints at a relationship between Epicurean/Philodemean poetics and the epigrams. Cf. Tait 67; Q. Cataudella, “Filodemo nella Satira I 2 di Orazio,” *PP* 5 (1950) 18–31; M. Gigante, *Orazio. Una misura per l’amore: Lettura della satira seconda del primo libro* (Venosa 1993). For an attempt to reconstruct the epigram of Phil. alluded to here, cf. [38].

T 5 Philip 1 (*AP* 4.2.8 f.)

λάμπει . . . ἀμάρακον ὡς Φιλόδημος.

Philodemus will shine (in my poetic Garland) like marjoram.

Why Phil. should be associated with marjoram, which Meleager in his introductory poem had linked with Polystratos, is a mystery. See Gow-Page ad loc.

T 6 Strabo 16.2.29

ἐκ δὲ τῶν Γαδάρων Φιλόδημός τε ὁ Ἐπικούρειος γεγονὼς καὶ Μελέαγρος καὶ Μένιππος ὁ σπουδογέλοιος καὶ Θεόδωρος ὁ καθ’ ἡμῶν ῥήτωρ.

From Gadara come Philodemus the Epicurean, Meleager, Menippus the jocosserious, and our contemporary Theodoros the rhetor.

Cf. Introduction, “Life”; T. Dorandi, “La patria di Filodemo,” *Philologus* 131 (1987) 254–256.

T 7 Diogenes Laertius 10.3

... καθά φησι Φιλόδημος ὁ Ἐπικούρειος ἐν τῷ δεκάτῳ Τῆς τῶν φιλοσόφων συντάξεως.
10.24 ... ὡς οἱ περὶ Φιλόδημόν φασιν.

10.3 (Epicurus' three brothers studied philosophy with him,) as Philodemus the Epicurean says in the tenth book of his *Syntaxis of Philosopher*. 10.24 (Epicurus's successor Polyainos was just and amiable,) as Philodemus and his circle say.

For the similarities between Diogenes' *Lives* and Philodemus' *Syntaxis* (both of which end with a tenth book on the life of Epicurus), cf. J. Mejer, *Diogenes Laertius and his Hellenistic Background* (Wiesbaden 1978) 69–74; M. Gigante, “Biografia e dossografia in Diogene Laerzio,” *Elenchos* 7 (1986) 25–34; id. *Philodemus in Italy* 21.

T 8 *Souda*, s.v. τιμῶνται

ζημιούσι, καταδικάζουσιν· οἱ γὰρ μὴν Ἴμεραῖοι τὸν Φιλόδημον τιμῶνται πρὸς τῇ δημεύσει καὶ φυγῆς ζημίᾳ. (= Aelian, fr. 40 Hercher)

(words for “fine,” “penalize”). The citizens of Himera penalize Philodemus with exile in addition to confiscation.

Ζημίᾳ should probably be deleted as a gloss (Holford-Strevens). See Introduction, “Life,” for related texts derived from Aelian. For the expulsion of other Epicureans, cf. Obbink, *GRBS* 30 (1989) 204 n. 59; *ibid.* *Philodemus on Piety* (Oxford 1996) 14, n. 4.

T 9 Ambrose, *Epist.* 14 (63), 13 Zelzer (CSEL 82/83, 241 f. = Epic. fr. 385a U, p. 356)

Atque hic [sc. Epicurus] quam alienus a vero sit etiam hinc deprehenditur quod voluptatem in homine deo auctore creatam asserit principaliter, sicut Philodemus [*Maurini*: Filominus *codd.*] eius sectator in epitomis suis disputat et huius allegat Stoicos esse auctores sententiae.

And how divorced Epicurus is from the truth can be seen from his assertion that pleasure was created in man by god from the beginning, just as his follower Philodemus argues in his summaries, alleging that the Stoics are responsible for this view.

Cf. W. Liebich, “Ein Philodem-Zeugnis bei Ambrosius,” *Philologus* 98 (1954) 116–131; T. Dorandi, “Filodemo: Orientamenti della ricerca attuale,” *ANRW* 36.4 (1990) 2354; D. Obbink, *Philodemus on Piety* (Oxford 1996) 78–80.

T 10 *Lucreti Vita Borgiana*, p. 6 Masson

C. Memmio Epicureo dicavit opus. Romani autem Epicurei hi memorantur praecipui: . . . L. Calphurnius Piso Frugi qui Philodemum [Polidemum *MS*] audivit, . . . Vergilius Maro Sironis [Scyronis *MS*] auditor. . . .

Lucretius dedicated his work to Gaius Memmius. The most notable Epicureans among the Romans: . . . Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi, who was a student of Philodemos, . . . Vergil who was a student of Siro.

This Piso, born ca. 88 B.C., could easily have known Phil., but the value of the *Life* has been questioned. A. Rostagni, “Ricerche di biografia lucreziana, 2: *La Vita Borgiana*,” *Scritti Minori* 2.2 (Turin 1956) 121–147, argues that it contains material deriving from Probus; similarly, C. Bailey, *Lucretius* (Oxford 1947) 1.2 finds that “it cannot be entirely discarded.” On the other hand, M. F. Smith, *Lucretius: The Man and his Mission* (thesis, Dublin 1965) 23–26 argues that it is a product of humanist learning and “of no importance whatsoever.”

For the complete text of this life, see J. Masson, *Lucretius: Epicurean and Poet. Complementary Volume* (London 1909) 4–6.

B

T 11 Catullus 47

Porci et Socration, duae sinistrae
Pisonis, scabies famesque mundi,
vos Veraniolo meo et Fabullo
verpus praeposuit Priapus ille?
vos convivia lauta sumptuose
de die facitis, mei sodales
quaerunt in trivio vocaciones?

Sokration and Porcius, Piso’s two left-hand men, scabs and famine to the world, does that prickless Priapus prefer you to my buddies Veraniolus and Fabullus? Does he serve you sumptuous food and drink all day, while my friends wander the streets looking for formal invitations?

Socraton = Philodemos? Cf. Introduction, pp. 23 f.; G. Friedrich, *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (Leipzig 1908) 228; Nisbet, *Cic. In Pis.*, pp. 180–182.

T 12 Cicero *Or. post Red. in Sen.* 14 f.

Cum vero etiam litteris studere incipit [sc. Piso] et belua immanis cum Graeculis philosophari, tum est Epicureus, non penitus illi disciplinae quaecumque est deditus, sed captus uno verbo voluptatis. Habet autem magistros non ex istis ineptis, qui dies

totos de officio ac de virtute disserunt, qui ad laborem, ad industriam, ad pericula pro patria subeunda adhortantur, sed eos qui disputent horam nullam vacuum voluptate esse debere: in omni parte corporis semper oportere aliquod gaudium delectionemque versari. His utitur quasi praefectis libidinum suarum; hi voluptates omnes vestigant atque odorantur; hi sunt conditores instructoresque convivi; idem expendant atque aestimant voluptates sententiamque dicunt et iudicant quantum cuique libidini tribuendum esse videatur.

But when Piso began to study the liberal arts, when this monster began to philosophize with Greeklings, then he is an Epicurean. Nor was he deeply involved with this way of life (whatever it is) to which he has devoted himself; rather he was caught up by the single word “pleasure.” He does not, however, have as teachers those “unworldly fools” who spend their days on the subjects of duties and virtues, those who urge one on to hard work and facing danger for one’s country; rather, he chooses those who argue that no hour of the day should be free of pleasure, and that joy and delight should spread through every limb. *These* are the men he employs as the superintendents of his libidinous pleasures; these are the ones who track down and smell out every form of pleasure; these provide the basis and guidance for his feasts. These same men dispense and weigh out his pleasures, and they lay down the law, judging how much should be allotted to each pleasure.

Written Sept. 57. Cicero distinguishes two classes of Epicureans: the serious teachers and the strong hedonists. Since the general picture of Piso’s adherence to Epicureanism is roughly comparable to that found in *Pis.* (T 2), where Phil. is singled out as Piso’s most notable teacher and flatterer, we must conclude that Phil. belongs to the former class here, although we are also free to believe that the picture is a greatly distorted one.

C

T 13 Περὶ Παρρησίας fr. 45.8–11 Olivieri

καὶ τὸ συνέχον καὶ κυρι-
 ὠτ[α]τον, Ἐπικούρω, κα-
 θ' ὄν ζῆν ἡ<ι>ρήμεθα, πει-
 θαρχήσομεν.

“The basic and most important [principle] is that we will obey Epicurus, according to whom we have chosen to live” (tr. Asmis).

T 14 P.Herc. 1005 col. 14. 4–13. Angeli = Zenon fr. 11 Angeli-Colaizzo

Ἐ[πι] | κρ[ύ]ρ[ε]ι[ο]ι, μεθ' ὧν ΑΠΟ.[...] ΠΟΥ[] καὶ Ζήνωνος ἐγεν[ό]μην περιόν[το]ς
 [οὐκ] | ἄπιστ[ο]ς ἐραστής καὶ τ[ε]θνηκό[το]ς ἀκοπίατος ὑμνητής, | μάλιστα πασῶν αὐτοῦ
 τῶ[ν] | ἀρετῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐξ Ἐπικ[ο]ύρου καύχαις τε καὶ θεοφ[ο]ρίας.

Epicureans, with whom I [*verb*] and with whom I was an obedient follower of Zeno when he was alive and his tireless laudator after his death, especially of all his virtues (found) in the “vaunts and ecstasy” from/of Epicurus.

Cf. K. v. Fritz, “Zeno von Sidon,” *RE* 10A (1972) 122–124. The fragments of Zeno are collected in A. Angeli and M. Colaizzo, *CErc* 9 (1979) 47–133, but the text of P.Herc. 1005 has now been reedited in A. Angeli, *Filodemo: Agli Amici di Scuola (P.Herc. 1005)* (Naples 1988). Since *καυχῆ* is found elsewhere only in Pindar, *N* 9.7, *θεσπεσία δ' ἐπέων καύχας αἰοιδὰ πρόσφορος*, I suspect that Phil. is here quoting a poetical tag, which could come, e.g., from another poem of Pindar (and analyzed as either “– cr cho” or “– e d”, with resolution in dactylo-epitrite as in *Pi. N.* 10.32).

T 15 P.Herc. 312, col. 14 ed. Gigante

... ἐδόκει δ' ἐπ[αίνε]λθεῖν] μεθ' ἡμῶν εἰς | [τὴν Νεά]πολιν πρὸς τὸν | [φίλτατο]ν Σίρωνα
[κ]αὶ τὴν | [κατ' αὐ]τὸν ἐκεῖ δῖαιταν | [καὶ τὰς φι]λοσόφους ἐνεργ[ῆ]σαι ὀμι]λίας
Ἡρκλ[ανέω]ι | τε μεθ' ἐ]τέ[ρων συζη]τήσαι].

φίλτατο]ν Körte: ἡμέτερο]ν Crönert κατ' Gigante: περὶ Crönert δῖαιταν Gigante:
δῖαιτησιν Crönert ὀμι]λίας E. Schwartz συλλα]λίας Crönert μεθ' ἐ]τέ[ρων
συζη]τήσαι Gigante: συχνό]τε[ρον παρενδιατρί]ψαι Crönert

He decided to return with us to Naples and to dearest Siro and his way of life there and to engage in active philosophical discourse and to live with others in Herculaneum.

Cf. Crönert, *Kolotes und Menedemos* 125–127 for fuller context; Gigante, *A&R* 28 (1983) 36 f.; id., *Catalogo* 124 f.; Capasso, *CErc* 19 (1989) 221.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reference Works

- Berkowitz, L., and K. A. Squitier, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Canon of Greek Authors*. (3rd ed.) (New York 1990), s.v. Philodemus. Arranged by title, a comprehensive list of sources of texts.
- Capasso, M. "Primo supplemento al catalogo dei papiri ercolanesi," *CErc* 19 (1989) 193–264. Supplement to Gigante.
- Erler, M. "Philodem aus Gadara," in H. Flashar (ed.), *Die Philosophie der Antike* 4.1 *Die hellenistische Philosophie* (Basel 1994) 289–362. A bibliographical survey.
- Gigante, M. *Catalogo dei Papiri Ercolanesi* (Naples 1979). Detailed description of the papyri (arranged by P.Herc. no.) plus full bibliography, now supplemented by Capasso, above.
- Usener, H. *Glossarium Epicureum*. Ed. M. Gigante and W. Schmid. Rome 1977. An Epicurean dictionary, based on Epicurus and the Herculaneum papyri.
- Vooijs, C.J. *Lexicon Philodemum*. Vol. 1, Purmerend 1934; vol. 2, Amsterdam 1941. Though somewhat dated, a still useful list of Phil.'s prose vocabulary, especially since the papyrus texts of Philodemus have not yet been entered in the TLG data bank.

Editions of Philodemos' Epigrams

- Brunck, R. F. P. *Analecta Veterum Poetarum Graecorum*. Strasburg 1772–1776. Vol. 2.83–91 (text), 3.141–145 (notes).
- Jacobs, C. F. W. *Anthologia Graeca sive Poetarum Graecorum Lusus ex Recensione Brunckii*. 13 voll. Leipzig 1794–1814. Vol. 2.70–79 (text), 7.211–250 (notes).

- Kaibel, G. *Philodemi Gadarensis Epigrammata*. Greifswald 1885.
 Gow, A. S. F., and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip* (Cambridge 1968). Vol. 1.351–369 (text), 2.371–400 (notes). [GP]
 Gigante, M. *Filodemo. Epigrammi Scelti*. 2d ed. Naples 1989.

Editions of Epigrams

- (from *AP* and elsewhere; in addition to those named in the last section)
 Beckby, H. *Anthologia Graeca*. 2d ed. 4 voll. Munich 1967–1968. [Tusculum]
 Dübner, J. F. *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis*. 2 voll. Paris 1864–1872.
 Del Re, R. *Epigrammi greci*. Roma 1970.
 Geffcken, J. *Griechische Epigramme*. Heidelberg 1916. Repr. Hildesheim 1976.
 Gow, A. S. F., and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 voll. Cambridge 1965. [HE]
 Hansen, P. A. *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca*. 2 voll. Berlin 1983–1989. [CEG]
 Huschke, I. G. *Analecta Critica in Anthologiam Graecam*. Jena and Leipzig 1800.
 Jacobs, C. F. W. *Anthologia Graeca*. 3 voll. Leipzig 1813–1817. [In *AP* order plus *Planudea*]
 Kaibel, G. *Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus collecta*. Berlin 1878.
 Lumb, T. W. *Notes on the Greek Anthology*. London 1920.
 Page, D. L. *Further Greek Epigrams*. Cambridge 1981. [FGE]
 Paton, W. R. *The Greek Anthology*. 5 voll. London 1916–1918. [Loeb]
 Peek, W. *Griechische Versinschriften*. I. *Grabepigramme*. Berlin 1955. [GVI]
 Preger, T. *Inscriptiones Graecae metricae ex scriptoribus praeter Anthologiam collectae*. Leipzig 1891.
 Preisendanz, C. *Anthologia Palatina*. 2 voll. Leiden 1911. [Facsimile of P]
 Reiske, J. J. *Anthologiae Graecae a Constantino Cephala conditae libri tres*. Leipzig 1754.
 New ed. Oxford 1766.
 Speyer, W. *Epigrammata Bobiensia*. Leipzig 1963. [BT]
 Stadtmüller, H. *Anthologia Graeca. Epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea*. 3 voll. Leipzig 1894–1906. [BT; only to *AP* 9.563]
 Sternbach, L. *Anthologiae Planudeae Appendix Barberino-Vaticana*. Leipzig 1890.
 Waltz, P. et al. *Anthologie grecque*. Paris 1928– . [Budé]

Separate Texts and Commentaries or Monographs on *AP* Authors

AGATHIAS

- G. Viansino, *Agazia Scolastico: Epigrammi: Testo, traduzione e commento*. Milan 1967.

ANTIPATER OF SIDON AND ANTIPATER OF THESSALONICA

- Setti, G. *Studi sulla Antologia greca: Gli epigrammi degli Antipatri*. Turin 1890.
 Waltz, P. *De Antipatro Sidonio*. Bordeaux 1906.
 Weigand, G. *De Antipatris Sidonio et Thessalonicensi poetis epigrammaticis*. Breslau 1840.

ANTIPHILLOS

K. Müller, *Die Epigramme des Antiphilos von Byzanz*. Berlin 1935.

ANYTE

M. J. Baale, *Studia in Anytes poetriae vitam et carminum Reliquias*. Diss. Harlem 1903.

D. Geoghegan, *Anyte: The Epigrams, A Critical Edition with Commentary*. Rome 1979.

ARCHIAS

T. Reinach, *De Archia Poeta*. Diss. Paris 1890.

M. ARGENTARIUS

S. G. P. Small, "Marcus Argentarius: A poet of the Greek Anthology," *YCS* 12 (1951) 65–145.

ASKLEPIADES

O. Knauer, *Die Epigramme des Asklepiades*. Würzburg 1935. Repr. in Tarán (ed.) 2.

JULIAN

H. Schulte, *Julian von Ägypten*. Trier 1990.

KALLIMACHOS

L. Coco, *Callimaco. Epigrammi*. Manduria 1988.

L. A. de Cuenca y Prado, *Calímaco. Epigramas*. Madrid 1974–1975.

G. Zanetto & P. Ferrari, *Callimaco. Epigrammi*. Milan 1992.

KRINAGORAS

M. Rubensohn, *Crinagorae Mytilenaei Epigrammata*. Berlin 1888.

LEONIDAS

E. R. Bevan, *The Poems of Leonidas of Tarentum*. Oxford 1931.

J. Geffcken, *Leonidas von Tarent*. Leipzig 1896.

M. Gigante, *L'edera di Leonida*. Naples 1971. (Not an ed.)

B. Hansen, *De Leonida Tarentino*. Leipzig 1914.

R. Labellarte, *Leonida di Taranto: Antologia di epigrammi*. Bari 1969.

LUCIAN

G. Setti, *Gli epigrammi di Luciano*. Turin 1892.

LUCILLIUS

Rozema, B. J. *Lucillius the Epigrammatist: Text and Commentary*. Diss. Wisconsin 1971.

MELEAGER

J. Clack, *Meleager: The Poems*. Wauconda, Ill. 1992.

G. Graefe, *Meleagri Gadareni Epigrammata*. Leipzig 1811.

- G. Guidorizzi, *Meleagro. Epigrammi*. Milan 1992.
W. Headlam, *Fifty Poems of Meleager*. London 1890.
J. C. F. Manso, *Meleagri Reliquiae*. Jena 1789.
H. Ouvré, *Méléagre de Gadara*. Paris 1894.
C. Radinger, *Meleagros von Gadara*. Innsbruck 1895. Repr. in Tarán (ed.) 2.

MNASALKES

- W. Seelbach, *Die Epigramme des Mnasalkes von Sikyon und des Theodoridas von Syrakus*. Wiesbaden 1964.

PALLADAS

- A. Franke, *De Pallada epigrammatographo*. Leipzig 1899.

PAULUS SILENTIARUS

- G. Viansino, *Paolo Silenziario. Epigrammi*. Turin 1963.

POSEIDIPPOS

- G. Bastianini and C. Gallazzi, *Posidippo. epigrammi*. Milan 1993.
P. Schott, *Posidippi epigrammata*. Diss. Berlin 1905.

RUFINUS

- D. L. Page, *The Epigrams of Rufinus, Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge 1978.

SIMIAS

- H. Fränkel, *De Simia Rhodio*. Diss. Göttingen 1915.

SIMONIDES

- M. Boas, *De epigrammatis Simonideis*. Groningen 1905
A. Hauvette, *De l'authenticité des épigrammes de Simonide*. Paris 1896.

THEOKRITOS

- R. J. Smutny, *The Text History of the Epigrams of Theocritus*. Berkeley 1955.

THEODORIDAS

See Mnasalkes.

General Studies

- Asmis, E. "Philodemus' Epicureanism," *ANRW* 2.36.4 (1990) 2369–2406.
Capasso, M. *Manuale di papirologia ercolanese*. Lecce 1991.

- Crönert, W. *Kolotes und Menedemos*. Leipzig 1906; repr. Amsterdam 1965.
- Dorandi, T. "Filodemo: Gli orientamenti della ricerca attuale," *ANRW* 2.36.4 (1990) 2328–2368.
- Gigante, M. *Ricerche Filodemee*. 2d ed. Naples 1983. [RF²]
- . *Filodemo in Italia*. Florence 1990. Eng. trans. D. Obbink, *Philodemus in Italy* (Ann Arbor 1995).
- Jufresa, M. "Sobre Filodemo," *BIEH* 10 (1976) 15–73.
- Philippson, R. "Philodemos," *RE* 19 (1938) 2444–2482. Repr. in *Studien zu Epikur und den Epikureern* (Hildesheim 1983) 229–248.

Poetic Theory

- Romeo, C. "Filodemo: La 'poetica'," in *Συζήτησις: Studi sull'epicureismo greco e romano offerti a Marcello Gigante*. Naples 1983. 2.565–583. (This bibliographical survey is the proper starting point to learn about Philodemus' poetical theory. Listed below are a very few highlights from earlier literature and a more complete listing of recent contributions. Cf. also Dorandi [above], pp. 2341 ff.)
- Asmis, E. "Philodemus' poetic theory and *On the Good King According to Homer*," *CA* 10 (1991) 1–45.
- . "Epicurean poetics," *BACAP* 7 (1991 [1993]) 63–93. Repr. in Obbink 15–34.
- Barra, G. "Osservazioni sulla 'poetica' di Filodemo e di Lucrezio," *Annali d. Fac. di Lett. e Filos. d. U. di Napoli* 20 (1977–1978) 87–104.
- Dorandi, T. "Dichtender Philosoph und philosophierender Dichter: Das literarische Schaffen des Epikureers Philodem von Gadara," *WJ* 18 (1992) 183–193.
- Greenberg, N. A. *The Poetic Theory of Philodemus*. Diss. Harvard 1955. Repr. New York 1990.
- Obbink, D. (ed.) *Philodemus and Poetry*. New York 1995.
- Pace, N. *Problematiche di poetica in Filodemo di Gadara*. Diss. Milan, 1992.
- Sbordone, F. "La poetica di Filodemo," *Maia* 36 (1984) 17–19.
- Schenkeveld, D. M. "ΟΙ ΚΡΙΤΙΚΟΙ in Philodemus," *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser. 21 (1968) 176–214.
- Sider, D. "Commentary on Asmis," *BACAP* 7 (1991 [1993]) 94–105. Revised version in Obbink 35–41.
- . "The Epicurean philosopher as Hellenistic poet," in Obbink 42–57.
- Summers, A. T. *Philodemus' Περὶ Ποιημάτων and Horace's "Ars Poetica"*. Diss. Urbana 1995.
- Walsh, G. B. "Philodemus on the terminology of Neoptolemus," *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser. 40 (1987) 56–68.

Philodemos' Poetry and Its Influence on and Echoes in Latin Poetry

[Numbers in square brackets indicate the epigrams treated.]

- Barra, G. "Filodemo di Gadara e le lettere latine," *Vichiana*, n.s. 2 (1973) 247–260.
- Braga, D. *Catullo e i poeti greci* (Messina and Florence 1950).

- Cataudella, Q. "Filodemo nella Satira I 2 di Orazio," *PP* 5 (1950) 18–31.
- Cavallini, E. "AP X 21, 1s. (Philod.)," *Mus. Crit.* 15–17 (1980–1982) 164 f. [8]
- Chardon de La Rochette, S. "Dissertation sur deux épigrammes grecques de Philodème," in *Mélanges de critique et de philologie* (Paris 1812) 196–222. [3, 27]
- Cichorius, C. "Persönliches in den Epigrammen des Philodemos von Gadara," in *Römische Studien* (Leipzig 1922) 295–298. [8, 28]
- Cohen, S. J. D. "The beauty of Flora and the beauty of Sarai," *Helios* 8.2 (1981) 41–53 [12]
- Courtney, E. "Ovid and an epigram of Philodemus," *LCM* 15 (1990) 117 f. [12]
- Della Corte, F. "Orazio 'desaparecido,'" *Maia* 42 (1990) 41 f.
- Del Re, R. "Filodemo, poeta," *MC* 6 (1936) 121–142.
- De Stefani, C. "Note a quattro epigrammi dell' *Antologia Greca*," *SIFC* 89 (1996) 205–208. [11]
- De Witt, N. "Parresiasitic poems of Horace," *CP* 30 (1935) 312–319.
- Edmunds, L. "The Latin invitation poem: What is it? Where did it come from?" *AJP* 103 (1982) 184–188. [27]
- Falivene, M. R. "Il codice di δίκη nella poesia alessandrina (alcuni epigrammi della *Antologia Palatina*, Callimaco, Teocrito, Filodemo, il *Fragmentum Grenfellianum*," *QUCC* 37 (1981) 87–104. [23, 24]
- . "Per l'interpretazione di AP 10, 21 (Filodemo)," *QUCC* 42 (1983) 129–142. [8]
- Giangrande, G. "Konjekturen zur *Anthologia Palatina*," *RM* 106 (1963) 255–257. [32]
- . "Symptotic literature and epigram," in *L'épigramme grecque = EH* 14 (1968) 91–174. [6].
- . "Erklärungen hellenistischer Stellen," *GB* 1 (1973) 137–148. [4, 6]
- . "An epigram of Philodemus," *Maia* 25 (1973) 65 f. [12].
- . "Gli epigrammi alessandrini come arte allusiva," *QUCC* 15 (1973) 7–31. [6, 28]
- . "Vierunddreißig hellenistische Epigramme," *GB* 7 (1978) 77 f. [34]
- . "Quelques aspects de la technique littéraire des épigrammatistes alexandrins," *MPL* 5 (1981) 37–46. [6, 8, 23]
- Gigante, M. "Virgilio fra Ercolano e Pompei," *A&R* 28 (1983) 31–50. Repr. in *Virgilio e la Campania* (Naples 1984) 67–92
- . "Cercida, Filodemo e Orazio," in *RF²* 235–243.
- . "Filodemo e Pisone: Da Ercolano a Roma," *ASNP* 15 (1985) 855–866. (repr. in *Filodemo in Italia* 103–116, Eng. trans. 79–90). [27]
- . "Gli epigrammi di Filodemo quali testimonianze autobiografiche. Filodemo a Atene: La preghiera agli dèi (AP 6,349)," in *Filologia e forme letterarie. Studi . . . F. Della Corte*, 1 (Urbino 1987) 385–389. Repr. in *Filodemo in Italia* 63–68; Eng. trans. 49–52) [34]
- , and M. Capasso, "Il ritorno di Virgilio a Ercolano," *SIFC* 7 (1989) 3–6.
- . "Filodemo tra poesia e prosa (A proposito di POxy. 3724)," *SIFC* 7 (1989) 129–151. Also in *Proc. of the XIXth Intern. Congress of Papyrology*. Cairo 2–9 September 1989 (Cairo 1992) 1.403–446. [II]
- . "Filodemo nella Villa di Ercolano: Incontri al Belvedere (A.P. IX 412 e XI 35)," in A. Battita et al. (edd.), *Studi di Filologia in onore di G. Monaco* (Palermo 1991) 1.421–427. Repr. in *Philodemus in Italy* 69–79; Eng. trans. 53–61. [29, 28]
- Griffiths, A. H. "Six passages in Callimachus and the Anthology," *BICS* 17 (1970) 32–43. [4, 5]
- Grilli, A. "Filodemo," *A&R* 33 (1988) 1–6.
- Hecker, A. *Commentatio Critica de Anthologia Graeca* (Leiden 1843) 37 f. [20], 47 f. [26], 50–52 [12], 93 f. [25], 346 [32].
- Hendrickson, G. L. "An epigram of Philodemus and two Latin congeners," *AJP* 39 (1918) 27–43. [6]

- Hiltbrunner, O. "Einladung zum epikureischen Freundeswahl," in *Antidosis: Festschrift W. Kraus* (Vienna 1972) 168–182. [27]
- Jacobs, F. "Über ein dem Philodemus beigelegtes Epigramm," in *Vermischte Schriften* 5 (Berlin 1834) 264–291. [38]
- Kaibel, G. "Sententiarum liber primus," *Hermes* 15 (1880) 459 f. [3, 11, 34]
- Kleve, K. "Lucrèce, l'épicurisme et l'amour," *Actes du VIII^e Congrès (Paris, 5–10 avril 1968)* (Paris 1969) 376–383.
- Klinger, A. "Augusteer bei Philodem," *RM* 45 (1880) 172–177.
- Landolfi, L. "Tracce filodemee di estetica e di epigrammatica simpotica in Catullo," *CErc* 12 (1982) 137–143. [27]
- Lavagnini, B. *Erotion: Il Libro dell'amore alessandrino. Epigrammi di . . . Filodemo*. Torino 1928.
- Luck, G. "Trygonions Grabschrift (Philodemus, AP 7.222)," *Philologus* 100 (1956) 271–286. [33]
- . "Witz und Sentiment im griechischen Epigramm," in *L'Épigramme grecque = EH* 14 (1968) 387–408. [3]
- Marcovich, M. "Catullus 13 and Philodemus 23," *QUCC* 40 (1982) 131–138. Repr. in *Studies in Greek Poetry* (Atlanta 1991) 193–199. [27]
- Mariotti, S. "Da Platone agli Epigrammi Bobbiesi: Appunti su due temi epigrammatici antichi," *Studi Urbinati* 41 n.s. B 1–2 (1967) 1071–1096. [2]
- Maxwell-Stuart, P. G. "The nature of Anticrates. Anth. Graec. 11.318 (Philodemus)," *Hermes* 106 (1978) 253 f. [31]
- Merkelbach, R. "Philodem, Anth. Pal. IX 570 und die epilogischen Geschichten," *RM* 115 (1972) 219–222. [3]
- Michels, A. K. "Παρρησία and the satire of Horace," *CP* 39 (1944) 173–177.
- Muñoz Valle, I. "Horacio (*Od.* II 4), imitador de Filodemo (*A.G.* V 132)," *CFC* 7 (1974) 87–89. [12]
- Nunn, T.P. "The fatal name: An epigram of Philodemus," *Intern. J. Psychoan.* 11 (1929) 97 f. [10]
- Paton, W.R. "Anth. Pal. VII.222 (Philodemus)," *CR* 30 (1916) 48. [33]
- Prinz, K. "Zu Horaz Sat. I.2.121 und Martial Epigr. IX 32," *WS* 34 (1912) 227–236. [8, 11, 17]
- Reitzenstein, R. "Horaz und die hellenistische Lyrik," *NJabrb* 21 (1908) 81–102 (esp. 83).
- Rossi, M. "Nota a Filodemo Ep. V G.P. (AP V 107)," *Maia* 33 (1981) 213 f. [23]
- . "Un motivo arcaico in Filodemo Ep. V GP (AP 5 107)," *Vichiana* 10 (1981) 163–167. [23]
- Salanitro, G. "Varia Graeco-Latina," in *Studi classici in onore di Q. Cataudella* (Catania 1972) 2.498–501. [25]
- Schmid, W. "Philodem als Dichter und als Philosoph: über eine Athetese Kaibels in AP 9.570," *Acta Conventus XI Eirene*, 21–25 Oct. 1968 (Warsaw 1971) 201–207 = *Ausgewählte philologische Schriften* (Berlin 1984) 267–274. [3]
- Schulze, K. P. "Zur Erklärung des Horaz," *BPhW* 36 (1916) 317–320.
- Seidler, J. F. A. "Über ein Epigramm des Philodemus," *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig* 1 (1846–1847 [1848]) 128–130. [12]
- Sider, D. "Notes on two epigrams of Philodemus," *AJP* 103 (1982) 208–213. [19, 33]
- . "The love poetry of Philodemus," *AJP* 108 (1987) 310–324.
- . "Looking for Philodemus in P.Oxy. 54.3724," *ZPE* 76 (1989) 229–336. [II]
- . "How to commit philosophy obliquely: Philodemos' epigrams in the light of his *Peri Parrhesias*," in J. T. Fitzgerald et al. (eds.), *Philodemus and the New Testament World* (Leiden, forthcoming).

- Snyder, J. M. "The poetry of Philodemus the Epicurean," *CJ* 68 (1973) 346–353.
- Stella, L. A. *Cinque poeti dell'Antologia Palatina* (Bologna 1949), 239–307.
- Sternbach, L. *Meletemata Graeca*. Vienna 1886. [3, 10, 11]
- Tait, J. I. M. *Philodemus' Influence on the Latin Poets*. Diss. Bryn Mawr 1941.
- Thomas, R. F. "'Death,' doxography, and the 'Termerian evil' (Philodemus *Epigr.* 27 Page = A.P. 11.30)," *CQ* n.s. 41 (1991) 130–137. [19]
- Vries, G. J., de, "Notes on Greek Epigrams," *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser. 23 (1970) 30–32. [3, 25]
- . "Philodemus' poor lover again," *Mnemosyne*, 4th ser. 26 (1973) 179. [25]
- White, H. "Two epigrams by Philodemus," in G. Giangrande (ed.), *Corolla Londinensis* (Amsterdam 1981 = *LSCP* 8) 173–177. [11, 33]
- Wilkinson, L. P. "Philodemus and poetry," *G&R* 2 (1932–1933) 144–151.
- Wiseman, T. P. "Philodemus 26.3 G-P," *CQ* 32 (1982) 475 f. [33]
- Wright, F. A. "Horace and Philodemus," *AJP* 42 (1921) 168 f. [19, 22]

Epigrams in General

- Autore, O. *Marziale e l'epigramma greco*. Palermo 1937.
- Bendorff, O. *De Anthologiae Graecae epigrammatis quae ad artes spectant*. Bonn 1862.
- Bignone, E. *L'epigramma greco: studio critico e traduzioni poetiche*. Bologna 1921.
- Brecht, F. J. *Motiv- und Typengeschichte des griechischen Spottepigramms*. Philologus Supplbd. 22.2. Leipzig 1930.
- Cameron, Alan. *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford 1993.
- Degani, E. "L'epigramma," in *Storia e civiltà dei greci. La cultura ellenistica: filosofia, scienza, letteratura* (Milan 1977) 266–299.
- Degani, E. "L'epigramma," in G. Cambiano et al. (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* 1.2 (Rome 1992) 197–233.
- Dihle, A. (ed.), *L'Épigramme grecque*. (EH 14) Fondation Hardt. Vandoeuvres-Genève 1968.
- Ebert, J. *Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen*. Berlin 1972.
- Ecker, U. *Grabmal und Epigram*. (Palingenesia 29). Stuttgart 1990.
- L'Épigramme grecque*. Fondation Hardt. See Dihle, A. (ed.).
- Gabathuler, M. *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter*. Diss. Basel, St. Gallen 1937.
- Garrison, D. H. *Mild Frenzy: A Reading of the Hellenistic Love Epigram*. Hermes Einzelschr. 41. Wiesbaden 1978.
- Geffcken, J. "Studien zum griechischen Epigramm," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* 20 (1917) 88–107. Repr. in part in G. Pfohl (ed.), *Das Epigramm* 21–55.
- Gow, A. S. F. *The Greek Anthology: Sources and Ascriptions*. London 1958. [GA]
- Gragg, F. A. "A study of the Greek epigram before 300 BC" *PAAAS* 46 (1910–1911) 1–62.
- Hartigan, K. *The Poets and the Cities*. Meisenheim 1979.
- Herwerden, H., van, *Studia critica in epigrammata graeca*. Leiden 1891.
- Hezel, O. *Catull und das griechische Epigramm*. Stuttgart 1932.
- Kägi, P. *Nachwirkung der älteren griechischen Elegie in den Epigrammen der Anthologie*. Zürich 1917. Repr. in part in Pfohl, *Die griechische Elegie* (Darmstadt 1972) 54–71.
- Kock, B. *De epigrammatum Graecorum dialectis*. Diss. Göttingen 1910.
- Lausberg, M. *Das Einzeldistichon: Studien zum antiken Epigramm*. Munich 1982.
- Lier, B. *Ad topica carminum amatorium symbolae*. Stettin 1914. Repr. in Tarán (ed.) 1.
- Longo, V. *L'epigramma scoptico greco*. Genua 1967.
- Mariotti, S. *Il 5° libro dell'Antologia Palatina*. Rome 1966.

- Pertsch, E. *De Valerio Martiale Graecorum poetarum imitatore*. Diss. Berlin 1911.
- Pfohl, G. (ed.), *Das Epigramm: Zur Geschichte einer inschriftlichen und literarischen Gattung*. Darmstadt 1969.
- Pircher, J. *Das Lob der Frau im vorchristlichen Grabepigramm der Griechen*. Comm. Aenipontanae 26. Innsbruck 1979.
- Prittitz-Gaffron, E. von, *Das Sprichwort im griechischen Epigramm*. Giessen 1912. Repr. in Tarán (ed.) 1.
- Rasche, W. *De Anthologiae Graecae epigrammatis quae colloquii formam habent*. Munich 1910.
- Reitzenstein, R. *Epigramm und Skolion*. Giessen 1893.
- . "Epigramm," *RE* 6 (1907) 71–111.
- Stella, L. A. *Cinque poeti dell'Antologia Greca*. Bologna 1949.
- Tarán, S. L. *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden 1979.
- (ed.). *The Greek Anthology*. 2 voll. New York 1987.
- Tarditi, G. "Per una lettura degli epigrammatisti greci," *Aevum Antiquum* 1 (1988) 5–75.
- Weinreich, O. *Epigramm und Pantomimus*. Heidelberg 1948.
- Weisshäupl, R. *Die Grabgedichte der griechischen Anthologie*. Abh. d. Archäologisch-epigraphischen Sem. d. Univ. Wien 7. Vienna 1889. Repr. in Tarán (ed.) 1.
- Wifstrand, A. *Studien zur griechischen Anthologie*. Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N.F. Avd. 1. Bd. 23.3. Lund 1926. Repr. in Tarán (ed.) 1.

This page intentionally left blank

GENERAL INDEX

- Actium, epic poem on 13
 n.2
 adultery 116–117, 139–141
 anaphora 92
 Andromeda 109
 Andronikos 173
 Antigenes 168, 207
 Antikrates 172–173
 Antiphilos 172
 Antony, M. 11
 Aphrodite 91–92, 124–125,
 185
 apographs 51–52
 Apollophanes 162
 aposiopesis 88
 apples, as love tokens 65–66
 Apsines 4
 Aratos 173
 Archias 18, 28
 Argentarius 191–192, 198–
 199
 Aristippos 65
 Arkesilaos 179
 arms 107
 Artemidoros 162
 ascription, problems of 46,
 192
 Asklepiades 203–204, 215,
 220–221
- Asmis, E. 29 n.19
 Astour, M. 181
 astrology 172
 asyndeton 65, 122, 127, 148,
 177
 Atthis 214
 Attis 179–180
 auloi 84
 authenticity, criteria for 46–
 47
- Bakchios 168
 Bakchos. *See* Dionysos
 bee, Xanthippe as 68–69
blason anatomique 104
 book of life metaphor 74,
 76–77
 Bouhier, J. 52
 brassieres 97
 breasts 96–97
 Brink, C. O. 21
 buttocks 106
- Caesar, J. 214
 Calvus 90
 Cameron, Alan 204, 206,
 210
Catalepton, Epicurean flavor
 of 22
- Catullus, and Phil. 24–25,
 37, 62, 64
 Cavallini, E. 92–93
 Chantraine, P. 90
 charis. *See* grace, Graces
 cheese 167
 Cicero, source for Phil.'s
 life 5–7
 codex 74
 columns, papyrus 74
 conversation 63
 conversion to philosophy 36,
 38
 Corrector of P 48–49
 cunnilingus 175
- Demokritos 114
 dew 70, 87
 διάνοια, in poems 38
 Dionysos = wine 84
Dios Apate 88, 90, 124
 Doric forms 171
 Douglas, N. 213
 doves 180
 Dyck, A. 29 n.19
- εἰκάδες 156–158
Eiresione 157–158
 ἐλεγεῖον 25–26

- elegy, women writers of 26
 n.6
 ellipsis 82, 129
 Encolpius 116
 Endymion 115
 Ennius, in *Herculaneum* 13
 Ephyra 202
 Epicureanism
 papyrus texts of 14
 pleasure 6, 32
 poetry 32
 soul 110–111
 views on death 165, 208
 Epicureans
 attitude toward
 Socrates 37
 and food 161–162
 as pigs 16 n.13, 223
 of Rhodes 10
 simple life of 16, 153–
 154, 160
 of Syria 10 n.26
 Epicurus
 birthday 152 ff.
 will 156, 233–234
 epigram
 as autobiography 10–11,
 17, 25, 40, 188, 204–205
 improvisatory 18, 27, 47
 topoi of 33, 38, 104, 209,
 215
 Eros 69–70
 pluralized 121
 Ethiopians 109, 124
 Eudoxos 173
 euphemism 133–134, 151.
 See also aposiopesis
 euphony. *See* Krates
 eyes, erotic 63

 Fabullus 23, 232
 Flora 66, 108–109
 Friedrich, G. 23
 Frischer, B. 22

 Gable, Clark 144
 Gadara, 3–4, 187–188, 214,
 230
 Galloi 178 ff., 200, 202–203,
 217, 230
 Giangrande, G. 176
 Gigante, M. 29 n.19, 40,
 125, 162, 167, 177, 187–
 188, 189–190, 207–213,
 215, 220

 gnomes 87
 Goldberg, S. 29 n.1
 grace 95
 Graces 98
 Greek Anthology 45
 Griffiths, A. H. 40, 78, 203

 hair, grey 79–80
 erotic 121, 124
 Hammerstaedt, J. 29 n.19
hapax legomena
 ἀμφιγυναϊκῶν 185–186
 γλωττισμῶν 107–108
 διωξικέλευθα 193
 ἐρυσίτριχα 193
 θανατηφορίην 127
 λυκαβαντίδας 96
 μηνῶπος 221
 μονοκλίνῃ 70
 μουσοπρόσωπε 69
 μυρόχροε 69
 ὀδοντοφόρον 193
 περιδρομάδος 97
 φιλονύμφιε 92
 φιλορρώθωνα 193
 χορδόκολα 177 (by
 conjecture)
 harbor, as erotic
 metaphor 92, 94
 harp 62–63
 Haslam, M. 135
 heat, erotic 63, 100
 Heinsius, D. 201
Herculaneum 12 ff., 167
 Himera 9–10
 Holford-Strevens, L. 76,
 108, 177, 210, 214,
 218–219 f., 222, 231
 homoeoarcton 101
 Horace, on flattery 20
 horse tack 193–194

 Ino 188–189
 invitation poems 153, 161,
 221
 Ionian Sea 145

 Jannaeus, 4–5
 Julian of Egypt 219

 kennings 195
 Kephala, Konstantine 45
 keston 124
 kisses 107–108
 koronis 76

 Krates of Mallos 31–32, 37–
 38
 Krevans, N. 86
 Kybele 184–185

 Lais 186
 lamps in bedrooms 86, 196,
 208
 Leontion 35 n.39, 37
 Leukothea. *See* Ino
 Lewis, D. M. 156
 LSJ, addenda and corrigenda
 to, s.vv.
 εὐθύς 135
 γιγνώσκω 144
 διψάς 82
 ἐν 174
 θυμέλη 176
 μονόκλινον 70 (*lg.* -ος)
 παράκειμαι 149
 μελάνω 123
 παστός 93
 ῥέθος 180
 στέργω 144
 σύνους 194
 Luck, G. 70–71
 Lucretius, in *Herculaneum*
 13, 24, 71, 209
 Lydian inscriptions 183

 Maccius 126
 madness, erotic 79
 marriage 34–36, 85, 210
 matrons (Roman) 202
 Maxwell-Stuart, P. G. 174–
 175
 Meleager 27
 Meleagrian context 145
 Melikertes 188
 Memmius, G. 8 n.19
 Menippos 4
 metapoiesis 142, 206–207
 metrics, in general 41–45, 139
 caesura 92
 correction 197, 201
 diaeresis 201
 elision 75, 137
 Hermann's Bridge 65,
 133, 140
 hiatus 140
 Hilberg's Law 109
 metrical patterns 73
 Meyer's First Law 139
 Meyer's Third Law 174
 Naecke's Law 160, 199

- Moirai 100
monolog. *See* soliloquy
myrhh 69, 82
myths as exempla 109–110
- Nais 91, 145
Naples. *See* Parthenope
Nereids 189
nicknames 24, 71
- oaths of lovers 197
Obbink, D. 210, 213, 222–223, 225
Oinomaos, 4, 206
old age 131
older women, sexy 95–96, 176, 222
Origen 117
Oscan 108
Oinomaos 4, 206
- Pace, N. 29 n.19
Palatine Anthology 45
Pansa, Caetronianus, C. Vibius 7–8
Paphos 90, 207
paragraphos, 224. *See also* koronis
παρρησία 38–39
Parthenope = Naples 18–19, 212
Parthenios 26 n.9, 217–218
patronage. *See* Piso
persona, of epigrammatists 34, 36, 39–40
personification 124, 131
Petit, S. 103
Phaeacians 159–160
Phaidros, head of Garden 8
Pherekydes of Syros 177
Philainis
in Phil. 86
of Samos 86, 108, 124
Philaras, L. 141
Philo of Gadara, 4
Philodemos
accompanies Piso 16
in Alexandria 9
birth 3
death 11
on epigrams 28–31
expelled from Himeria 9
his books 9–10
publication 28
Phryne 176
- pigs
as food 158, 162
Gadarene 3 n.2
See also Epicureans
Piso Caesoninus, L.
Calpurnius 4–5, 155, 157–160, 202, 228–229, 232–233
birth 7
death 11–12
owner of Villa 14, 16–17, 20
as patron 5 n.11
travels 11, 94
Piso Frugi, C. Calpurnius 8 n.19
Planudean Anthology 45
Planudes, Maximus
as bowdlerizer 221
his arrangement of epigrams 45 n.2, 49–50, 74
Plato, as author of epigrams 65
Plotius Tucca 20–21
Polemon 38
Poseidippos 27 n.10, 46 n.4, 47, 76
Pothos 69–70. *See also* Eros
prayer 91
present tense for future 134, 155
priamel 81, 83–84, 212
prostitutes 82–83, prices charged 125, 177
puns. *See redende Namen*
- Quintilius Varus 20–21
redende Namen 98, 99–100, 102
Reiske, J. J. 200
Reitzenstein, E. 22
repetition 70–71, 92, 131, 182
- Sabaktes 181
Sabazios 181
Salmakis 182
sandals 163
Sappho 30–31, 62, 108–109, 110
Scaliger, J. J. 52
segnis amator 128, 147–148
- Selene 113
Shakespeare, Wm. 72
Simonides 27
Siro 15–16, 19, 22
called Silenos 24, 227
skolia 27 n.13
sleep
as death 68, 71
erotic 115
Socraton 23–24, 34, 232
soliloquy 63
soul 63
Stoics 173, 215
Sulla 7 n.16
Sulpicia 90
synecphonesis 106–107
- Tarán, S. L. 116, 186
Termeros 130–131
testicles 141, 174
Theodoros of Gadara 4
time 177
Torquatus 227
touching, erotic 148
Tower of the Winds 173
Trimalchio, faulty arithmetic of 13 n.3
- Um Qeis. *See* Gadara
- Veranius 23, 232
Varius Rufus, L. 19–20
Vergil, and Phil. 11 n.5, 17–18, 20, 67, 213
called Parthenias 24, 218
Villa dei Papiri 10–16, 154, 167
- Wigodsky, M. 29 n.19
winds 190
wine 82, 158, 163, 209
Wiseman, T. P. 182
wives, erotic 90
- Xanthippe (Phil.'s)
other women named 66–67
poem cycle on 33–38, 54, 62
- Zeno of Sidon 4
head of Garden 8, 182, 234

INDEX OF THE MORE IMPORTANT PASSAGES

Epigrammatists are quoted by the number of their latest editor, as well as by Greek Anthology numbers.

<p>Aelian fr. 40 Hercher: 9</p> <p>Agathias, ed. Viansino 74 (5.287.6): 121 78 (5.282): 98 90 (5.294): 113</p> <p>Aischylos <i>Agamemnon</i> 419: 97 681 ff.: 99 991 ff.: 111 1391–1392: 120</p> <p><i>Choephoroi</i> 123: 144</p> <p><i>Prometheus Bound</i> 89–90: 189 649–650: 121</p> <p><i>Fragmenta</i>, ed. Radt 57.7: 63</p> <p>Alkaios, ed. Voigt 50.1–2: 69 346: 163 347.1: 84 347.4: 166 368: 155</p>	<p>Alkiphron <i>Epist.</i> 2.2.1–3: 37</p> <p>Alkman (PMG) 59(a): 97</p> <p>Ambrose <i>Epist.</i> 14 (63), 13 = T 9</p> <p>Amphis (K–A) 8: 71</p> <p><i>Anacreontea</i>, ed. West 3.3: 184 16.27: 107 17: 170 17.29: 107</p> <p>Anakreon <i>Epigrams</i> (FGE) 5 (6.134): 66</p> <p><i>Lyrice</i> (PMG) 363: 69 358: 80 411: 107 420: 80 458: 107</p> <p>Anaxippos (K–A) 1.27: 84</p>	<p>Anonymous <i>Epigrams</i> 6 FGE (5.101): 136 7 FGE (5.11): 92 8 FGE (5.51): 62 4 HE (12.104): 146 9 HE (12.99.1): 116 56 HE = Phil. 24 AP 5.95: 67 AP 1 235.5–6: 171</p> <p><i>Iambica</i>, ed. West² 57: 71</p> <p><i>Anthologia Latina</i> 371 (Ps.-Petron.): 66 458: 83</p> <p>Antipater (GP) 53 (5.109.1–2): 140</p> <p>Antiphanes (GP) 1 (6.88): 125</p> <p>Antiphilos (GP) 14 = Phil. 21</p> <p>Apollinides (GP) 26 (10.19.1–2): 121 27 (11.25.6): 75, 80</p>
--	---	---

- Apollonios Rhodios
3.1377–1378: 114
- Archilochos, ed. West²
1: 102
5: 83
19: 143
23: 143
122: 143
126: 144
196a.17: 121
196a.24–28: 67, 98
206: 105
- Argentarius (GP)
1 (5.16.2): 145
6 (5.104.1–2): 107
7 (5.105): 174
8 (5.110.1–2): 217
9 = Phil. 37
10 (5.116.5): 185
13 (5.128): 86
18 = Phil. 35
- Ariston of Chios (SH)
204: 170
- Aristophanes
Archarnians
1090–1092: 82–83
- Aves*
921: 82
- Clouds*
504: 130
978: 121
1364: 76
- Ekklesiazousai*
13: 121
- Lysistrata*
362–363: 125
387–388: 179
- Peace*
341: 149
- Ploutos*
69–70: 118
253: 76
- Wasps*
1173: 107
- Fragmenta* (K–A)
268: 124
483: 120
753: 108
- Aristotle
De Anima
404a1: 114
- Categories*
2a11: 64
- Arrian
Indika 6.9: 109
- Asconius
ad Cic. *In Pis.* 68 = T 3
- Asklepiades (HE)
3 (5.153.1, 2): 114
5 (5.210.3): 124
6 (5.203.1–2): 193
8 (5.162.3): 102
9 (5.7): 196
10 (5.150): 215
12 (5.145): 220
13 (5.164.1): 196
16 (12.50.3): 121
25 (5.181.12): 90
41 (7.217): 97, 120
- Ausonius
Epistulae 20.4: 100
- Automedon (GP)
1 (5.129.1–2): 107
1 (5.129.8): 130
2 (11.29.3–4): 130
- Babrius
114.1: 87
- Basil
Epistulae 8.12: 69
- Bassus, ed. Morel
1: 62–63
- Carmina Epigraphica*
Graeca
1.132: 127
2.530: 144
- Catullus
5.6: 71
7: 20
8.12–19: 145
13.1 ff.: 83
17.15–16: 121
35.16–17: 109
36.11–17: 91
47 = T 11: 23
50.1–5: 168
50.14–15: 130
70.3: 197
85: 64
- Chairemon (TGrF 71)
14: 106
- Christodoros (AP)
2.1.13–14:
181–182
- Cicero
Pro Archia
8.18: 28 n.18
- Pro Caelio*
35: 168
- De Finibus*
1.65: 16, 154
2.23: 17 n.14
2.101: 156
2.119 = T 1
- De Natura Deorum*
1.46: 170
- De Oratore*
3.61: 37 n.45
3.194: 28. n.14
- In Pisonem*
22: 16–17
68–72, 74 = T 2
68: 6
71: 28 n.17
87: 7
- Post Red. in Sen.*
14 f. = T 12: 6
- Clemens
Homiliae 13.8: 71
- Cornutus
Natura Deorum 25: 70
- Corpus Inscriptionum
Latinarum*
4.4029: 129
4.4816: 129
- Deinarchos 1.71: 111
- Demokritos (DK 55)
B 160: 72
B 205: 72
- Diodoros Grammatikos (AP)
7.700.1: 70
- Diogenes Laertius
6.101: 156
10.3 = T 7
10.119: 35 n.37
10.138: 74
- Donatus
Vita Verg. 68: 20
- Dorotheos, ed. Stegemann
5.8 f.: 174
- Empedokles (DK 31)
B 61.1: 186
B 96.3: 215
B 98.3: 94
- Epicurus
Epistulae
1.63: 112
3.130: 153
3.135: 72
- Fragmenta* (U)
131: 107
135: 211

- Epicurus
Fragmenta (U) (*continued*)
 142: 37
 163: 111
 200: 112
 215 A: 153
 229: 159
 311: 111–112
 312: 111
 313: 111
 411: 202
 472: 161
 535: 117
 539: 154
Fragmenta (CPF)
 11, col. 1.17: 71
Kyriai Doxai
 8: 208
 40: 165
Sent. Vat.
 14: 153
 25: 211
 51: 36
 66: 165
Epigrammata Bobiensia
 32: 66
 35: 67
 Eratosthenes, ed. Powell
 25: 84
 Euboulos (K–A)
 41.1–2: 69
 121: 82, 158
 Eudoxos, ed. Lasserre
 321: 108
 Euenos (GP)
 7 (12.172): 146–147
 Euphorion, ed. Powell
 113: 93
 Euripides
Alkestis
 165–166: 85
Backhai
 644: 175
Hekabe
 635–637: 114
Hippolytos
 525–527: 97
 545–546: 85
 1064: 102
 1303: 127
Kyklops
 171: 102
 465: 105–106
Troades
 2–3: 189
- Fragmenta*, ed. Nauck²
 897.9–10: 111
 Gaetulicus (FGE)
 1 (5.17.3–4): 94
 1 (5.17.6): 92
 Hedylos (HE)
 6.4: 168
 Herodas
 6.11: 84
 10.1–2: 96, 131
 Herodian
Partitiones 61.1: 176
 Hesiod
Opera et Dies
 252–254: 189
 353: 143
 521: 115, 120
 695–697: 72–73
Theogony
 96 f.: 155
 910 f.: 97
Fragmenta, edd.
 Merkelbach–West
 61: 102
 123: 184
 124: 197
 Hesychios, s.v.
 δαμιουργός: 99
 δοῦλος: 183
 θυμέλη: 176
 νόψ: 221
 Hipponax, ed. West²
 30: 183
 Homer
Iliad
 2.235: 182
 2.477–479: 170
 3.396–397: 107
 5.493: 144
 10.293: 120
 13.390–391: 171
 13.394: 141
Odyssey
 5.452–453: 94
 8.135–136: 105
 9.451–452: 117
Epigrams
 15.10: 157
Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite
 228–230: 79
 Horace
Ars Poetica
 438–444: 21
- Epistulae*
 1.5: 156
 1.5.24: 158
 1.7.25–28: 80
 1.14.36: 80
 1.15.22–24: 159
 2.2.211–216: 80
Epodes
 2: 143
 9.33–34: 82
Odes
 1.13.2–3: 69
 1.19.5–6: 96
 1.20.1: 154
 1.38.1: 83
 1.38.2: 81
 1.38.3–4: 81
 2.4.2–4: 109
 2.4.22–24: 74
 2.5.1–2: 120
 2.5.9–12: 121
 2.11.21–22: 85
 2.14.1: 131
 2.17.17–20: 174
 2.18.14 ff.: 121
 3.7.20: 129
 3.14.17: 163
 4.1.5: 93
 4.11.31 ff.: 77
 4.12.12–13: 84
Satires
 1.2.54, 62–63, 78,
 94: 202
 1.2.119–122 = T 4:
 139
 1.2.123–124: 210
 1.2.127 ff.: 119,
 218–219
 1.5.40–43: 21 n.28
 1.10.81: 21 n.28
 2.8.15: 163
 2.8.88: 162
 Ibykos (PMG)
 286.3–6: 120
Inscriptiones Graecae
 2².5021: 94
 4.358: 127
 12(5).891.1–5: 173
 12(8).441.1–2: 93
 14.793a: 89
 14.1589: 179
 Jerome
Chron. 166e14: 21 n.28

- Kallimachos
Epigrams (HE)
 1 (12.102.3–6): 103
 2.1: 212
 11 (5.6): 197
 44 (7.519): 164
Hymns
 4.298–299: 120 f.
Fragmenta, ed. Pfeiffer
 1.6: 98
 1.33: 70
 28: 93
 114.5: 93
 761: 184
 Klearchos, ed. Wehrli
 44: 99
 Kratinos (K–A)
 246.2: 75
 Krinagoras (GP)
 41 (7.401.7–8): 186
 50 (16.199.6–7): 97
 Leonidas (HE)
 10 (7.648.8): 114–115
 20 (7.295.6): 98
 Loukillios (AP)
 11.160: 172
 Lucian
Amores
 26: 124
De Dea Syria
 15: 182
 52: 179
De Mercede Conductis
 36: 108–109
Pro Imaginibus
 5: 124
Lucreti Vita Borgiana, ed. Masson
 p. 6 = **T 10**
 Lucretius
 1.140–141: 154
 2, proem: 151, 165
 2.656–657: 84 f.
 3.869–872: 72
 3.885–887: 72
 3.894: 71
 3.933–934: 71
 3.955: 72
 4.1048: 112
 4.1057: 112
 4.1106: 112
 4.1160 ff.: 123, 209
 Lydus, Johannes
De Mensibus 1.13: 108
 Maccius (GP)
 1 = Phil. **18**
 2 (5.117): 120
 8 (6.233): 192
 Machon, ed. Gow
 346: 134
 Macrobius
 5.20.8: 26 n.9
 Martial
 11.43.12: 185
 11.46.4: 130
 14.39–40: 87
 Meleager (HE)
 2 (7.417.2): 3 n.2
 2 (7.417.3): 4 n.4
 7 (5.179.5): 69
 8 (5.180.1–2): 121
 11 (6.162): 87
 19 (12.117): 78–79
 26 (5.160): 99
 30 (5.140.4): 98
 31 (5.144.1–4): 165
 32 (5.149.2): 96
 32 (5.149.4): 98
 41 = Phil. **13**
 47 (5.148): 98
 69 = Phil. **36**
 73 (5.191.1): 114
 103 (12.101.1–2): 93
 108 (12.159.5–6): 160
 129 (12.257): 76
 Menander
Fragmenta, ed. Körte-Thierfelder
 409: 93
Sententiae
 20: 144
 Menekrates (HE)
 3 (9.55.2): 98
 Mimnermos, ed. West²
 1.5 ff.: 131
 Niketas Eugeneianos
Drosilla and Charikles
 8.113–115: 113
 Nonnos
 16.297: 102
 Oinomaos, ed. Hammerstaedt
 11 B: 206
 Ovid
Amores
 1.2.2: 218
 1.5.19–23: 104
 1.8.2–4: 82
 1.9.18: 63
 1.10: 125
 2.4.29–30: 107
 2.4.35: 123
 2.4.40: 123
 2.4.45: 95
 2.5: 143
 2.5.17: 63
 2.5.23–28: 108
 2.8.11–12: 109
 3.7.9: 108, 148
 3.7.15: 151
 3.7.16: 130
 3.7.17–18: 131
 3.7.23–24: 129
 3.7.39: 148
 3.7.41–42: 131
 3.7.65–66: 130
 3.14.23: 108
Ars Amatoria
 1.381: 118
 1.717: 100
 2.657–658: 123
 2.661: 123
 2.703: 90
Heroides
 15.35–36: 109
 18.59–65: 115
 21.107: 66
 P.Herc. (*See also* Philodemos)
 1251.15.4–14: 35
 n.38
 P.Lit.Lond.
 11: 76
 P.Oxy.
 219(a).24: 137
 3700: 135
 P.Prag.Varcl.
 N.S. 41.16–17: 134
 Parmenion (GP)
 11 (9.342.1–2): 27
 Paulus Silentarius, ed. Viansino
 52 (5.258.1): 97
 Pausanias
 1.43.6: 69–70
 Persius
prol. 14: 70
 Pherekrates (K–A)
 247: 176
 Philemon (K–A)
 28.1–4: 93–94
 113: 161

- Philip
1 (4.2.8 f.) = T 5
- Philodemos
De Bono Rege, ed.
Dorandi
19: 208
De Dis, ed. Diels
Bk. I.25.35 ff.: 11
Bk. III.1.17–18: 155
Bk. III, fr. 76: 77, 79
De Ira, ed. Wilke
28.26–27: 149 f.
De Morte, IV
25.37–26.7 Kuiper: 12
30.10–11 Kuiper: 153
33.25–30 Kuiper: 188
37.23 ff. Gigante: 168
37.26–27 Gigante: 153
38.7–11 Gigante:
10 n.26
38.17–18 Gigante: 72
39.17–18 Gigante: 74
De Musica IV, ed.
Neubecker
6.13–18: 168
Oikonomikos, ed.
Jensen
2.3–5: 35 n.38
9.1–3: 35 n.38
23.23–32: 5 n.11
38.7–8: 153–154
Parrhesia, ed. Olivieri
fr.8–11: 24 n.1
fr. 45.8–11: 24 n.1
fr. 45.8–11 = T 13
col. 8B.6–13: 39
n.50
col. 24A.8–B.1
De Pietate, ed. Obbink
818–819: 155
1773–1774: 107
De Poematis, ed. Mangoni
7.1–6: 212
29.21–23: 30 n.20
37.2–38.15: 28–31
Rhetorika
1.273.9–11
Sudhaus: 129–130
2.34.14–16 Sudh.: 63
2.145, fr. 3.8–15
Sudh.: 10 n.26
2.226 Sudh.: 31
2.289 Sudh.: 124 f.
col. 53.10–11 Longo: 8
n.20
- De Signis*, ed. De Lacy and
De Lacy
4: 216
25.33: 115
33.12: 115
P.Herc. 253
fr. 12: 20
P.Herc. 312
14 = T 15: 22
P.Herc. 460
fr. 22: 38 n.38
P.Herc. 994
29 N: 38
33.5–8: 194
P.Herc. 1005, ed.
Angeli
fr. 77: 77
col. 14.6–13 = T 14: 9
n.24
P.Herc. 1082
11: 19
P.Herc. 1428, ed.
Henrichs
13.23–14.2: 170
15.20–23: 77
P.Herc.Paris. 2: 21
Philonides (K–A)
7: 197
Pindar
Isthmians
4.90b: 97
Olympians
2.85: 211
Fragmenta, ed.
Snell-Maehler
104: 114
122.3–5: 93
125.4: 63
Plato
Epigrams (FGE)
4 (5.79): 65
5 = Phil. 2
Kriton
49b: 143
Phaidros
255e: 148
Republic
329a–c: 75, 131
373a: 83
411a–b: 138
474d–475a: 123
614b: 159
Symposium
192b: 89
213d: 89, 148
- Plautus
Miles Gloriosus 379:
114
Pliny
NH 35.5: 156–157
Plutarch
Moralia
18e: 71–72
124f: 158
513f: 89
1089c: 154
Theseus
11: 130
Pollux
3.37: 93
6.188: 98
10.38: 124
Poseidippos
2 HE (5.186.3–4): 137
10 HE (5.183.6): 155
11.1 HE: 217
705.5–6 SH: 76
3.3–4 Bastianini-
Gallazzi: 177
Praxilla (PMG)
754: 114
Proklos
in Plat. Crat. 406c: 84
Propertius
1.1.1–2: 210
1.3: 113
1.19.18: 63
2.1.9: 63
2.4.9–10: 64
2.15.15–16: 115
2.23.13–24: 133
2.26: 188
2.28.19–20: 188
3.1: 188
3.5.19–46: 79
4.5.1: 186
Quintilian
1.10.31: 63
Rufinus, ed. Page
5 (5.18): 109
21 (5.60.3): 107
23 (5.62): 98
33 (5.92.1): 137
35 (5.94): 170
Sappho, ed. Voigt
1.17–18: 77
16.7–8: 107

- 22.11: 69
 58.12–14: 79
 102.2: 107
 112: 92
 168B: 151
 T 252: 109
- Scholia ad
 Aristoph. *Ra.* 1374:
 140
 Theokr. 2.10: 114
- Semonides, ed. West²
 7.86: 89
- Seneca
QN 6.1: 167
- Servius
 ad Verg. *E.* 6.13: 20
- Simias (HE)
 4 (7.21.1): 93
 4 (7.21.5–6): 74
- Simeon Metaphrastes
Vita S. Patapii 116: 102
- Simonides
Elegies, ed. West²
 19: 206
 21.3: 63
 22.12: 97
 25: 27
 26: 27
Lyrica (PMG)
 521: 71
- Siro, ed. Gigante
 F 6: 15
 F 7: 15
 F 9: 20
- Sisenna, ed. Peter
 53: 167
- Skolion (PMG)
 904: 137
- Skythinos (*AP*)
 12.232.4: 125, 130
- Solon, ed. West²
 25.2: 105
- Sophokles
Aias
 713: 131
 1150–1158: 71
Antigone
 643: 144
Elektra
 424–425: 129
Trachiniai
 536: 85
Fragmenta, ed. Radt
 398.5: 69
 636: 150
 811: 197
- Sophon, ed. Kaibel
 54: 131
- Souda, s.v.
 ἡμερία: 9
 συκοφαντεῖν: 9
 τιμώνται = T 8: 9
- Strabo
 5.8.4: 167
 14.656: 182
 16.2.29 = T 6
- Strato (*AP*)
 12.240: 128
 12.175.4: 148
 12.240.3: 151
- Supplementum Magicum*
 72 (122 PGM): 65
- Theognis
 422–424: 87
 567–569: 71
 1345 ff.: 109
 1367–1368: 133
- Theokritos
 2.10–11: 114
 10.26–27: 123 f.
 11.76: 125
 15.108: 97
 20.23: 124
- Tibullus
 1.2.33–34: 86
 1.8.37–38: 108
 3.7.9: 219
- Ticida, ed. Courtney
 1: 90
- Timotheos Comicus
 (K–A)
 2: 208
- Tyrtaios, ed. West²
 11.23: 105
- Varro
Menippeae, ed. Buechler
 136: 66
 398: 31 n.25
- Vergil
Aeneid
 3.151–152: 114
 9.617: 182
Catalepton
 5.8–9: 15
 7: 20
 8: 15
Eclagues
 3.71: 66
 9.35–36: 20
Georgics
 1.336: 67
 4.563–564: 199,
 213
- Xenarchos (K–A)
 4.16 ff.: 140
 6: 197
- Xenophon Ephesius
 3.2.4: 148
- Zeno Sionius, ed. Angeli-
 Colaizzo
 11 = T 14
- Zenodotos (*AP*)
 7.315.1–2: 186

INDEX OF GREEK WORDS

Words are listed as in LSJ (or as they would list proper names). Ignored are καί, τε, μέν, δέ, οὐ, μή, ἄν, articles and pronouns, as well as uncertain words in Π and those which begin complete epigrams. (Words are cited by epigram and line; those of the incipits in Π are cited by column and line). Thus, 23.3 for an epigram, iv.6 for the incipits. Some words found only in the apparatus are in parentheses. The words of the last two epigrams are in square brackets, but those of Π, whose authorship can only be guessed at, go unbracketed. See also the general index s.v. *hapax legomena*.

ἄγαλμα 3.2
 ἄγγελος 4.4, 5.4
 ἄγρός v.17
 ἄγω 27.8
 ἄδαής 24.2
 ἀδικέω 20.6, 24.1
 [Ἄδωνις 37.3]
 ἀεὶ 3.8, 15.4, 20.3, 23.5,
 29.6, vii.5
 ἀεῖδω 3.5, 12.7, v.24
 ἀελλόπος 8.2
 ἀθάνατος 3.5, 14.4, 30.1
 Ἄθηναγόρας 28.2
 αἰγόκερως 30.2
 αἰρέω 36.2, [38.7]
 Αἴσωπος v.32
 αἰτέω 17.4
 αἰώ 3.7
 ἀκμάζω 29.2
 ἄκοιτις 7.5

ἄκτη 29.5
 ἀλάλητος 7.1
 ἀλεξίκακος 34.2
 ἀλίτυρος 29.3
 ἀλλά 2.1, 4.5, 4.7, 5.2, 9.2,
 9.7, 11.6, 13.3, 15.5, 16.3,
 17.1, 15.5, 20.5, 23.5, 27.5
 (bis), 33.8, 35.7, 36.2,
 [37.1]
 ἀλλάσσω 18.4
 ἄλλος 17.6, 18.6, 36.1, iv.6
 (ἄλς 29.3)
 ἄμα 20.3
 ἀμβρόσιος 9.5
 ἀμύητος 5.1
 ἀμφιγύναξι 33.5
 ἀμφοτερος 24.2, 31.4, 36.2,
 v.8
 ἀναδέω 6.5
 ἀναιδής 13.3, 18.5

ἀνατίθημι 35.4
 Ἄνδρομέδα 12.8
 ἀνεκτός 18.3
 ἄνεμος 34.4, iv.11
 ἀνέχω 18.2
 [ἀνήρ 37.5]
 ἄνθεμα 33.2
 ἄνθρωπος 3.7, vii.3
 ἀντί 5.3
 Ἄντιγένης 29.7
 Ἄντικράτης 31.1
 ἀπαλός 33.8
 ἀπλός 25.4
 ἀπό 8.3, 28.4, 35.4, [38.4],
 v.29, vii.3
 ἀποθνήσκω 19.4
 ἀπολείπω 27.3
 Ἀπολλοφάνης 28.3
 ἀπόλλυμι 12.1
 ἀποτολμάω 15.2

- ἄποψις 29.5
 ἄπρακτος 26.3
 ἄπτω 5.6, 25.2, 30.6, 33.6
 Ἄρατος 31.1
 Ἀργολίς 10.4
 ἀργύριον 18.2
 ἀρέσκω v.15
 Ἀρίσταρχος 28.1
 ἀρνέομαι 30.5
 ἀρρυντίδωτος 9.5
 Ἀρτεμίδωρος 28.1
 ἄρτι 1.2
 ἀρτιπαγής 29.3
 ἀρχή 15.6
 ἄρχω vi.19
 ἀσπίς 18.5
 Ἄτθίς iv.24
 ἄτρωτος iii.9
 ἀυγάζω 14.3
 αὔριον 27.1
 αὐτίκα 16.6
 αὐτός 13.4, 29.8, 36.6, vi.18
 ἀφαιρέω 22.6
 ἀφικνέομαι 19.5
 Ἄφροδίτη 19.1
 ἀφροφυής 29.4
 ἄχρις 17.5
 ἀψευδής ii.13

 Βάκχιος 29.7
 Βάκχος 6.7
 βάλλω (2.1), 14.2, ii.11
 βαρυόρητος 23.4
 βάτος 33.8
 βαύζω 23.7
 βέλος 16.5
 βινέω 22.2, 22.4
 βίος (3.8)
 βίωτος 4.2
 βιόω 3.8
 βοάω 23.5
 βολβίσκος 28.2
 βότρυς 16.2
 βούλομαι 11.6
 βραχύς 19.3
 Βρόμιος 27.4

 γαῖα 27.6
 γαληναῖος 8.1
 [γάλλος 38.8]
 γάρ 5.3, 7.3, 11.5, 14.6,
 15.5, 18.5, 24.2, 30.1, 30.5,
 30.5, 31.3, 31.5
 γε 20.1, 20.4, 22.5
 γένεσις 31.2
 γένος 10.1
 γεύω 6.6
 γίγνομαι 18.5, 20.7,
 21.3, 23.1, 23.2, 29.6,
 31.3
 γινώσκω 1.4, [37.5],
 iii.19, v.27
 γλαυκός 34.1
 γλαφυρός vi.7
 γλουτός 12.2
 γλυκερός 34.6, iv.3
 γλυκύς 3.6
 γλωττισμός 12.6
 γράφω 4.7, v.2
 γυῖον 6.6
 γυμνός 9.4, 16.1
 γυνή 21.6

 δαίμων 30.6, 34.2
 δάκνω 18.6, 23.2 (bis)
 δάκρυον 13.2
 δακρύω 25.1
 δεινα 22.1 (bis)
 δειπνέω 20.4
 δειπνίζω 27.3
 δεκάς 9.8
 δεσπότης 4.8, 8.8
 δεῦρο 9.8
 δεῦτε v.4
 δεύτερος 10.2
 δέχομαι 35.7
 δέω 3.4 (bis), 3.8, 11.4, 20.1,
 22.6
 δῆ 6.1, 6.2
 Δημῆριον 11.5
 Δημῶ 10 (passim), 11.1,
 11.2, iv.21
 διά 14.2, 34.5
 διδυμός 22.6, 31.4
 δίδωμι 20.6, 21.2, 22.1,
 28.2, vi.11
 δίκαιος 8.1, 12.1
 δίκερως 14.1
 διπτέρυγος 3.2
 διαστάζω 31.3
 διψάς 6.3
 διαζικέλευθος 35.1
 [δοιός 38.1]
 δοκέω 18.4, 20.6
 δοῦμος 33.3
 δραχμή 22.3, 32.2, 32.3
 δροσινός 3.3
 δρόσος 7.2
 δύο 28.3
 δύσεως 16.5
 δύσμορος 1.4, 3.8
 δώδεκα 22.3

 ἐγκρύφιος 16.4
 ἐγχέω viii.4
 ἔθειρα 4.3
 ἐθέλω 6.4, 20.3, 20.4, 20.8
 (bis), 21.2, 23.4, 28.6
 εἰ, ἤν 12.7, 19.5, 20.4, 24.1,
 27.4, 27.7, [38.7], ii.25,
 iii.17, vii.11
 εἰκάς 27.3, 27.8
 εἴκοσι ii.2
 εἶμι 9.8
 εἶμι 15.5, 21.2, 24.2, 25.3,
 28.4, 29.1, 31.6, [37.1],
 [37.5], vii.20
 εἶπον 11.4, 25.3, iv.9, viii.8
 εἰς 14.3, 19.2, 27.1, 27.7,
 35.8, iv.11
 εἰς 19.2, 22.1, 30.5, [38.7]
 εἶτε 15.1, 15.2
 ἐκ 1.3, 5.2, 19.2, 27.2, 27.8
 ἐκείνος 22.6, 36.3, 36.5
 ἐκλέγομαι viii.5
 ἐκμεθύσκω 7.2
 ἐκτονέω iv.30
 ἐκφέρω 29.8
 ἐλαιηρός 7.2
 ἐλεινός 25.1
 [Ἐλεφαντιακός 38.6]
 ἔλκω 15.5, 27.2, v.28
 ἐμβάλλω v.25
 ἔμπρους 7.4
 ἐμπρέπω 33.3
 ἐν 3.3, 3.7, 4.6, 9.3, 23.8,
 26.3, 29.5, 31.3, 31.5,
 [38.1], [38.8]. vii.11, viii.3
 ἔνατος 27.1
 Ἐνδυμίαν 14.6
 ἐνθάδε 33.1 (bis)
 ἐνιαύσιος 27.3
 ἐννέα 19.1
 ἔξειμι (*ibo*) 7.3
 ἐξήκοντα 9.1
 ἐπακούω 27.5
 ἐπείγω 5.3
 ἐπέρχομαι 4.1
 ἐπί 16.5, 34.6, 35.3
 ἐπιβαίνω 29.5
 ἐπινεύω 2.1
 ἐπίσταμαι 11.2, 13.2, 34.1
 [ἐπιτέλλω 38.7]
 [ἔπος 37.6]
 ἔραμαι 5.1, 10.1, 12.8, 37.1]

- ἐραστής 9.7, 18.1
 ἐράω 25.3, 25.4, [37.2]
 ἔργον 14.4
 ἐρέβινθον 29.1
 ἐρεθίζω 23.3
 Ἐρμῆς 30.4
 ἐρχομαι 15.2, 26.2
 Ἔρωσ 7.3, 15.6, 16.3,
 [38.1], ii.26, iii.10, iv.30
 ἐσπέριος 15.2
 ἐταῖρα 11.1
 ἐταῖρος 27.2, 27.5
 ἕτερος 36.6
 ἔτι 4.5, 9 (passim), 28.4
 ἐτοίμος 11.5
 ἔτος 9.8
 εὖ 20.4
 εὐδω 3.5, 26.4 (bis), iii.20
 εὐθύς 20.8, 28.6
 εὐλαλος 3.2
 εὐρίσκω 17.5, 31.5
 εὐρυσίθριξ 35.5
 εὐτρητος 14.2
 εὐχαρις vii.20
 [Ἐφύρα 38.8]
 ἐχθές 28.4, 29.7, iii.22,
 vi.11
 ἔχω 6.2, 6.3, 10.6, 20.2,
 21.3, 22.5, 25.4, 36.4,
 [37.2.], [37.6], [38.8],
 iv.27, v.6, vi.12
 ἔως 16.5
 Ζέφυρος 34.4
 ζῆλος 13.2
 ζηλοτυπέω 25.2
 ζωροπότης iv.20
 ἦ 13.3, [37.5]
 ἦ 1.3, 18.3, 18.6, 22.5, 31.4
 (bis)
 ἦδέ 15.5
 ἦδη 4.2, 4.3, 5.4, 7.6, 8.8,
 16.3, 19.3, 29.1, ii.6, iv.9,
 v.30, vii.2
 Ἡδύλιον viii.6
 ἠδύς ii.26, v.28
 [ἦθος 38.3]
 ἠϊών 34.6
 ἦκω 20.7, iv.27
 ἠλικία 4.4, 5.4
 Ἡλιοδώρα 13.1
 ἦλιος 19.2
 ἦμαι 23.8
 ἦμαρ 15.1
 (ἡμέρα 23.8)
 ἡμιθανής 19.4
 ἡμίπαστος 8.3
 ἡνίκα 5.5, vi.14
 ἡπάτιον 28.3
 Ἡρακλῆς 30.3
 ἡσύχιος 8.5
 ἦτοι 22.5
 θανατηφορία 18.6
 θάπτω 29.8
 θαρσαλέος 35.6
 θαῦμα 10.1, 18.3
 θέμις 11.3, 26.4
 θεός 5.2, 33.4
 Θέρμιον 11.1
 θερμός 10.6
 θέρος 16.1, v.28
 θεωρέω 25.1
 θήγω 16.3
 θνητός vii.11
 θοός 16.3
 Θραξ 34.4
 θρασύς 15.5
 θρίδαξ 29.4
 θριξ 5.4
 θυγάτηρ iii.12
 θῦμα 30.6
 θύρα 7.4
 θυρίς 14.2
 θύω 12.6, 30.5, iv.33
 ἴδιος 31.2
 ἱερός 33.7, 36.1
 Ἴκαρος vi.9
 ἴλαος 34.5
 Ἰνδός 12.8
 Ἰνώ 34.1
 ἰξεύω ii.12
 ἰξός vi.12
 Ἰόνιος 23.6
 ἴππος 35.5
 Ἰσθμιάς 35.4
 ἴσος 23.5
 ἴστημι 9.4
 ἰχθύς 31.4
 κάδος iii.22
 κάθηναι 26.3
 καιρός 5.5
 Καῖσαρ iv.25
 κακότεχνος 12.5
 καλέω 20.1, [37.3]
 καλιάς 27.1
 Καλλίστιον 14.3
 καλός 3.2, (18.6), 21.1,
 22.2, iii.17, viii.5
 καλύβη 33.3
 κάλυξ 16.1, 33.8
 καρδία 4.6, [38.1]
 κατά 15.1, 18.1, 19.3,
 33.6
 καταμανθάνω 20.7
 κατάρχω 1.2
 κατασπείρω 4.3
 (κατάτεχνος 12.5)
 κατονομάζω 10.5
 κατοπτεύω 14.4
 καυλός 29.2
 κείμαι 33.1
 [κεκρύφαλος 38.4]
 κελεύω vi.6
 Κελτίς 8.4
 κέντρον 35.1
 κεστός 17.3
 κεφαλή 18.4, 30.1
 κημός 35.1
 κηρόπλαστος 3.1
 κίνημα 12.5
 κλαίω 23.7
 (κλάω 12.6)
 κλείω 7.4
 κλέπτω 26.1
 κλύζω 8.6
 κλύω 23.6
 κνήμη 12.1, 30.4
 κοιμάω 20.6
 κοινός 36.4
 (κοίτη 7.5)
 κόλπος 23.8, 36.6
 κομπός 21.1, v.15
 κόνις 33.7
 [Κορινθιάς 38.2]
 κορωνίς 4.7
 κόσμος 35.2
 κράζω(?), ii.1
 κράμβη 28.1, 29.2
 κρείσσαν 22.4
 Κριός 31.3
 κρόκεος 8.3
 κρόκινος 6.6
 Κρονίδης v.1
 κτείνω 11.1
 κτεῖς 12.2
 κύαθος v.12
 κυάνεος 9.2
 κυανοχαίτης 35.7
 κύβος 18.4
 Κύδιλλα 15.1
 κύμα 34.3, 34.5

Κύπρις 8 (passim), 11.2,
11.3, 17.6, 33.5, iv.26,
viii.12
κύριος vi.3
κύων ii.2
κωμάζω 5.1, 6.3
κῶμος 4.5, 5.2
κώνιον 9.4
κωτίλος 1.1
κωφός 8.5

λαγχάνω 30.4
λαγών 12.2
Λαίς 33.6
λαλέω 8.5, 21.2, 25.1, 26.3
λαλίη 1.1
λάλος 4.5
λαμβάνω 28.6, ii.7
λανθάνω 9.8
λέγω 11.5, 21.4, vi.15
λείπω 7.6, 36.3
Λευκοθέα 34.2
λευκόιος 6.1, 33.8
λευκός 4.3, iii.15
λίην 23.3
λιθόδητος 3.4
λίθος 30.1
λιμήν 8.8
λιμός [37.2]
λιτός 27.1, 27.8, viii.11
λοιπός 22.5, 30.3
λούω ii.5
λύγδινος 9.3
λυκαβαντίδες 9.1
λυκάβας 4.1
Λυκίνος 35.7
λυπέω 23.3
Λυσιάνασσα 22.3
Λυσιδίκη 16.4
λύχνος 7.2, 36.1, 36.6, ii.13
λωίων 5.6

μά 11.3, 22.2, ii.26
μάγος 17.3
μαίνη 29.3
μαίνομαι 5.2, 12.4, ii.11
μακρός iii.15
μαλακός 31.6, 33.1
μαλάσσω 21.5
μάλλον 31.1
μανία 4.8, 6.4
μάντις 16.6
μανύω 30.2
μαραίνω 2.2, 19.6
μαρτυρία 7.3, 36.4

μάστιξ 35.6
μαστός 9.3, 12.3
[ματρῶνα 38.2]
μέγας 10.1, 10.2, 16.6, 18.3,
23.7, 35.8, vii.19 (bis)
μεδέων 34.1
μεθύω ii.25
μελαίνω 16.1
μελάνω 17.1
μέλας 5.3
Μελικέρτης 34.1
μελιχρός 27.6
μέλλω v.26
μέλος 3.6
μέλω 4.5
μένω 9.6, 21.1, 25.4
μέσατος 26.1
μετά 21.3
[μέχρι 38.4]
μηδεῖς 20.5
μηδέποτε 18.2
μηκέτι 30.5
μηλον 2.1
μήν 29.7
[Μηνοφίλα 37.4]
μηνώψ vii.9
μηπω 20.1
μηρός 12.2, 30.3
μήτηρ 8.2, 33.4, 35.6, iii.12
μικκός 17.1
[μίμνω 38.8]
μισέω 6.4, 24.2, iii.10, iv.8,
v.22, vii.5
μίτρα 9.4
μνᾶ 28.3
μόνος 17.2
Μοῖρα 10.5
μόλις 19.2, [37.5]
μονόκλινος 3.3, 3.7
μόνος 7.3, 33.5
μορφή ii.9
Μοῦσα 4.8, ii.8, iv.5
μουσοπρόσωπος 3.1
μουσοφιλής 27.2
μῦθος 23.6
μυριάς 9.6
μυρίος ii.10
μύρον 3.3, 6.6, 28.5, [37.3]
μυρόχροος 3.1
Μυτιληναῖος 6.7
[μυχός 38.1]
μῶρος 31.6

ναί 3.6 (bis)
Ναϊακός 8.8

Ναϊάς 23.8
ναός iv.22
νάρκισσος 6.5
νειφω 8.4
νευρά 16.6
νηδύς 30.3
Νηρηΐς 34.3
νήφω ii.17
Νικαρέτη v.21
νίκη 35.4
νοέω 31.2
νυκτηρινός 14.1
νῦν 5.5, 18.3, 19.1, 19.6,
21.6, 23.7, 29.8, 36.5,
[37.4], vii.8
νύξ 19.2, 26.1, 36.1, viii.3
νῶτος 35.5

Ξανθάριον 3.6
Ξάνθιον iv.1
Ξανθίπη 1.2, 2.2, 4.4
Ξανθώ 3.1
ξένος 20.5, 30.5

ὄδοντοφόρος 35.2
οἶδα 1.4, 7.6, 11.4, 14.5,
15.3 (bis), 15.6, 21.5, 24.1,
31.1, [38.4], ii.3, iv.25,
vii.6, viii.7
οἰμοιοῖ 19.3
οἶνος 6.2, vi.10
[οἶος 37.2]
ὀκτωκαιδεκέτις iii.14
ὀλβίζω 14.5
ὀλλυμι vii.3
Ὀλυμπιάς 35.8
ὄμμα 1.1, 27.7
ὀμμάτιον 12.4
ὄμνυμι 36.4
ὀμολογέω iv.28
ὄναρ 15.6
ὄνινημι iv.3
ὄνομα 21.1, [37.4]
Ὀπτικός 12.7
ὄραω 21.2, 27.5, 36.6
ὄργαω 9.7
ὄργια 33.6
ὄρκιος 36.5
ὄρκος 36.2
ὄρχεομαι vi.7
ὄσος 20.5
ὄσσάκι 15.1
ὄτε 5.5, 15.6, 19.6, 25.3
ὄτι 15.3 (bis), vii.6

- οὔδεις 25.4, [37.6] (bis)
 οὐδέπω v.25
 οὐθαρ 27.4
 οὐκέτι 5.6, 10.3, [37.2]
 οὐλος 17.2, 29.4
 οὔποτε 36.3
 οὕτω 11.2, 16.1, ii.24
 οὖς v.23
 οὔτις 36.1
 ὀχευτής 31.5
 ὀχληρός ii.20
 ὀψοφάγος 31.6
 ὀψωνέω vii.8
- παίγνιον 10.4
 παίζω 5.5 (bis), 29.7
 παῖς 28.6, v.9
 πάλι(v) 3.5, 6.1 (bis), 6.2,
 6.3 (bis), 10.3, 21.4 (bis),
 23.1, 23.2
 παλλίολον v.29
 Πάν 30.2
 παναληθής 27.5
 πάντοτε 18.6
 πάντως 22.5
 παρὰ 15.3
 παράγω 28.6
 παράκειμαι 25.3
 πάρειμι (sum) 20.4
 παρέχω 17.3, [38.5]
 παρθενικός 6.8
 παρθένιος 16.2, v.19
 Παρθενόπη iv.14, iv.15
 παρθένος 11.5
 πάρος 18.3, [37.3]
 πᾶς 9.6, 11.6, 17.4, 18.1,
 18.3, [38.5], vii.5
 παστός 8.3
 πάυω vi.16
 Πάφιος 7.6, 10.1, ii.10,
 iv.13, iv.24
 πειθῶ 9.5, v.21
 Πειραιεύς 34.6
 Πείσων 27.1, 27.7, [38.7]
 πέλαγος 8.6
 πέλεκυς 22.6
 πέμπτος vii.2, vii.16
 πέμπω 2.1, 20.7, 21.3
 [πένης 37.1]
 πέντε 19.1, 22.1, 22.3
 περί 35.2
 περίαλλος 12.5
 περιδρομάς 9.4
 περιέργος 25.1
 [περιθάλλω 38.1]
- [περισκελῖς 38.4]
 Περσεύς 12.8
 πέταλον 29.4
 πετρίδιον 3.4, 3.8
 πηνίκα 20.7
 Πιερίδες 23.4
 πιθανός viii.1
 πῖαν 27.8
 πλαγίαυλος 6.5
 [πλαστοουργέω 38.6]
 πλατύς 34.5
 πλείων 15.5
 πλεύμων 6.7
 πλόκαμος 9.2, iii.13
 πλουτέω [37.1]
 ποθεινός 11.4
 [πόθεν 37.5]
 ποθέω 11.6
 [πόθι 37.5]
 πόθος 3.2, 8.2, 9.7, 10.6,
 13.1
 ποιέω 19.6
 ποιήμα iv.8
 πολιός 5.3
 [πόλις 37.5]
 πολλάκι(ς) 17.4, 19.3, 25.2,
 v.30
 πολὺς 3.5, (16.6), 27.6, 31.2
 πόντος 23.5, 34.2
 πόρνη 6.3
 πόρος 15.3
 πορφύρεος 8.6
 Ποσειδών 34.3, 35.3
 πόσος 20.4
 πότε, ποτε 1.3, 3.4, 18.5,
 19.5, 27.7, vii.11
 πότερος 31.3
 ποῦ, που 10.5, 20.7, 21.1,
 21.3
 πούς 12.1
 πρᾶος 18.5, 34.4
 πρὶν 13.2
 πρό ii.2
 προάγω 20.8
 προδίδωμι 20.5
 πρόθυρον 35.3
 προλέγω 13.1, 13.4 (bis),
 23.5
 πρόποσις 27.4
 πρὸς 6.4, 8.8, 22.4
 προσέρχομαι 21.5
 [προσηγής 38.5]
 πρόσωπον ii.27
 πρότερος 29.6, ii.15, ii.16
 πρῶην ii.7
- Πρωτεύς v.18
 πρωτοβολέω 16.2
 πρώτος 19.2, iv.13
 πρωτότομος 29.2
 πτερόπομος 30.4
 πτωχός iv.27
 πυκνός 7.4, 25.2, 26.2
 (πυκτός 7.4)
 [πυνθάνομαι 37.4]
 πῦρ 1.2, 4.6, 16.4
 πυρκαϊά 16.6
 πῶς 1.3
- ῥάβδος 35.3
 ῥαδινός 12.3
 ῥέθος 33.1
 ῥίπτω 5.3, 15.3
 ῥόδινος vi.10
 ῥόδον 29.1
 ῥοῖζος 35.6
 (Ῥωμαϊκός 8.8)
 Ῥωμαῖος viii.4
 [Ῥωμαῖς 38.2]
- σαβακός 33.2
 σαλαγέω 29.3
 σαλμακίς 33.2
 Σάμιος 10.1
 σάνδαλον 28.5
 Σαπφώ 12.7
 σαφής 31.5
 Σελήνη 14.1, 14.5
 σέλινον 17.1
 σελῖς 4.2
 σήμερον 20.3, 29.8
 σθένος 13.3
 σιγάω 7.1
 σιμός ii.27
 σκληρός 21.6
 σμύρνα 6.2, v.16
 σοβαρός 21.4
 στάζω 9.6
 στέργω 17.5, 23.3, 33.5,
 36.3, [38.3]
 στέρνων 9.3, 30.3, 35.2
 στέφανος 28.5, v.22, vi.18
 στέφω 35.8
 στήλη 33.7
 στρέφω 27.7
 στῖω ii.16
 σταμυλία 33.4
 συζεύγνυμι 6.8
 σύνιος 35.3
 συλάω iv.22
 σύμμαχος 8.2

- συνετός 4.4, 5.4
 σύνευνος 26.1
 συνίσταω 7.1, 36.1
 Σύριος 6.2
 σύρμα 9.2
 σφαιρικός 31.1
 σφύρον iv.32
 σχίζω 4.2
 σῶζω 8.7
 σῶς 34.6
 [Σωσικράτης 37.1]
 Σώσυλος 29.2, 29.6
- τάλαντον 22.1
 τάριχος 28.1
 ταχύς 4.7
 τέγγω 6.7, 26.2
 τέλειος 17.6
 τελέω 9.1
 τέμνω 15.3
 τέρην 17.2
 Τερμέρειον 19.4
 [τερπνός 37.3]
 τέσσαρες iv.23, iv.26
 τέτρατος 10.4
 τίς, τις 15.5, 20.1, 20.2, 21.3
 (bis), 24.1, [37.5], iv.6,
 iv.12, iv.21, vi.6, vii.11
 [τοι 37.5]
 τοιγάρ 23.7
 τοιοῦτος 17.5
 τοκογλύφος 3.7
 τόξον 16.3
 τούνεκα 26.3
 τρανής 30.2
 τράχηλος 12.3
 τρεῖς 28.4, 31.5, iii.22, v.12
 τριάκοντα 4.1
 τρικίναιδος ii.29
 τρισσός 30.1, 30.6
 τρίτος 10.3, iv.9
 [τρόπος 38.3]
 Τρυγόνιον 33.2
 τρυφερός 33.1
 (τυκτός 7.4)
 [τύπος 38.6]
 (τυρός 29.3)
 τύφω 1.4, 4.6, 16.4
- ὑγιαίνω 21.4 (bis), 21.6
 ὕδωρ 36.5
 υἱός 35.8
 ὑπερθεν 18.5
 ὑποκόλπιος 15.1
 Ὑστακός 10.3
 ὕστερος 19.5
- Φαίαξ 27.6
 φαίω 14.1, 14.2, 18.3,
 18.4
 φανερός 22.4
 φάρμακον [37.2], vi.1
 Φάρος v.18
 φείδομαι 17.4
 φέρω 34.5, 36.5, v.23
 φεύγω 9.7, 13.1, 13.3, 16.5,
 34.5
 φημί 13.3, 31.3
 φθόνος 14.4
 Φιλαίνιον 17.1, 17.5
 Φιλαίνις 7.1, 7.4
 φιλεράστρια 7.5
 φιλέω 2.1, 7.3, 13.4, 14.3,
 20.3, 23.1 (bis), 24.1 (bis),
 25.2, 26.4, 33.4, iv.6, viii.6
 Φιλήστιον 18.1
 Φίλινα vii.20
 φιλόβακχος 33.7
 Φιλόδημος 10.5, 28.3, ii.12,
 ii.15
 φιλονύμφιος 8.1
 φιλοπαίγμων 33.3
 φιλοπάννουχος 14.1
 φιλόργις 8.7
 φιλορμίσειρα 8.7
 φιλορρώθωνος 35.1
 φίλος 7.5, 27.1, [37.6],
 iii.21, iv.2
 φιλόσπουδος 20.2
 φίλτρον 33.6
 φιλῶω 1.3, (9.7), 14.6
 φλῶρα 12.7
 φόβος (14.6), 15.6
 φρήν 22.5
 φρίσσω 22.2
 φροντίς 5.6
 φυλάσσω 11.6
- φύσις 18.4
 φύω 33.7
 φωλάς 6.8
 φωνάριον 12.6
 φωνέω 17.3, iii.19
- χαιρώ 20.1 (bis), viii.8
 χαλεπός 18.1
 χαρίεις 23.1
 χάρις 9.6, 16.2
 Χαριτώ 9.1
 Χάρμος 35.4
 χεῖρ 3.3, 12.4
 χθιζός v.5
 Χιογενής 27.4
 Χίτος 6.1, 28.5, ii.25
 χιών 8.4
 χοίρειος 28.4
 χορός 34.3
 χρῆμα iii.18
 χρίω 6.6
 χρόνος 3.5
 χρύσεος 14.3, 17.6, iv.29
 χρώς 9.5, 17.2
 [χρῶδη 38.5]
 χωρέω 30.1
 χωρίς 18.2
- ψακάς 26.2
 ψάλλω 3.3, v.24, vi.8,
 vi.9
 ψαλμός 1.1, 4.5
 ψαύω 11.3
 ψήκτρα 35.5
 ψήχω viii.1
 ψυχή 1.3, 8.4, 13.1, 14.6,
 vi.19
- ὄ 1.3, 3.7, 19.5, 21.4,
 34.1, ii.13, iv.24, iv.32
 ὄ 12 (passim)
 ὄδε 19.6, 23.7, v.4
 ὀδή 1.1
 ὄμος 12.3
 (ὀφόν 28.6)
 ὄρα 9.1, 20.8, iv.20
 ὡς 10.6, 26.4, 29.6,
 [37.6]