

to μελετῶμεν. Moreover it would separate καλοῖς...ἐν ὕμνοις from ὑποπίνοντες (for the phrasing cf. *E. Alc.* 447, ἐν τε ἀλύροις κλέοντες ὕμνοις) but the transmitted text is completely comprehensible.

PMG 357

§ 1. Sources

The main source for the fragment¹⁹⁵ is Dio Chrysostom's second speech, *Περὶ βασιλείας*, § 62, in a context which helps to illustrate the stylistic level which a first century AD readership considered An.'s poetry to have: in a discussion with his father Philip young Alexander quotes the poem (together with the Attic skolia PMG 900 and 901) as an example of a prayer not suitable for a king, but 'for common and very relaxed people'. The positive opposite is Agamemnon's prayer in *Il.* 2.412–18. It is remarkable that there is also a contrast between Agamemnon's panhellenic status (§ 64, τὸν βασιλέα τῶν πάντων Ἑλλήνων) and the regional restriction of the three lyric pieces (An. being called ὁ Ἰώνων ποιητής, the skolia in § 63 τὰς τῶν Ἀττικῶν σκολιῶν τε καὶ ἐποινίῶν εὐχάς). Certainly Dio's Alexander speaks here with regard to his future panhellenic mission. Already earlier in the speech, in § 28, Alexander had referred to An. in a deprecating way when he distinguished which genres of lyric poetry (if any) are suitable for a king: only hymns and encomia like those of Pindar and Stesichorus, not τὰ Σαπφούς ἢ Ἀνακρέοντος [ἐρωτικὰ μέλη] (secl. Wilamowitz).

§ 2. Metre

A combination of glyconics (with synapheia; cf. ll. 4–5, 7–8, 10–11) and pherecrateans, as in several of An.'s fragments (mostly as a four line stanza in the form of 3gl + ph, as in PMG 358 and 360–2). Line 5 is an anacastic glyconic (gl⁺), which occurs, also in combination with a glyconic, in An. PMG 349.1 (where the text is uncertain, however), in strophic correspondence to a glyconic in Sapph. fr. 96.7 V., and together with a glyconic as a modification of the polyschematic choriambic dimeter in Corinna PMG 654, col.iii. As in PMG 348 an alternation of 2gl + ph and 4gl + ph can be observed,¹⁹⁶ in our fragment the sequence of 4gl + ph is sandwiched by 2gl + ph so that a mesodic

¹⁹⁵ On the probable reflection of ll. 3–4 in Him. Or. 9.19, p. 84 Colonna cf. introd. to PMG 417, § 6 'Afterlife'.

¹⁹⁶ The fragment PMG 359 contains 2gl + ph alone.

form seems to be intended (Münscher 1927: 175) if the poem is complete. Whereas in PMG 348 the pherecratean always coincides with a syntactical break, this is not always the case in our fragment (this does occur in ll. 8 and 11, but note the enjambement in 3–4 which perhaps has the function of illustrating the idea of playing *together*; cf. general introd., § 5). The trochaic form of the aeolic base in l. 3 is rare in An.'s glyconics and pherecrateans.

§ 3. Completeness?

The fragment is plausibly regarded as complete by the majority of critics, but certainty cannot be achieved.

The strongest argument against completeness is PMG 348, where the sequence 2gl + ph + 4gl + ph probably forms a strophe. Since the same sequence appears in PMG 357.1–8, it has been suggested (by Kehrhaan 1914: 493 and later e.g. by Campbell 1982: 319) that ll. 9–11 (2gl + ph) form the first part of another strophe, to be continued by 4gl + ph.¹⁹⁷ But there were also other ways in which An. constructed glyconics and pherecrateans (see above, § 2). The mesodic structure of the fragment as transmitted looks plausible and finds parallels in examples from tragedy (Münscher 1927: 175).¹⁹⁸ As far as the content is concerned, there only seems to be evidence in favour of completeness. Unlike PMG 348 where the request is missing, these lines contain almost all the important elements of a cletic hymn (see next section). Only the description of past relations between the speaker and the god (prominent in the probable model Sapph. fr. 1 V.) is missing (Kirkwood 1974: 166). But it is difficult to see how such a description could be integrated, and one would not expect it to appear after the present request in ll. 9–11. Finally, the fragment shows a well-formed ring structure since not only does 'Ερως (1) correspond to 'Ερωτ' (10),¹⁹⁹ but part of the parallelism is also a relation between the vocatives with ὦ, both addressing Dionysus, in the first and in the last line, without any other address in between. This link is strengthened by the fact that the addressee remains anonymous until his name appears in l. 11. One might call this a relation of 'riddle' and 'solution'²⁰⁰ or of 'Erwartung' ('set-up') and 'Aufschluss' ('explanation'), to use Lessing's famous terms from his definition of the epigram.²⁰¹

¹⁹⁷ Kehrhaan 1914: 493–4 speculates that PMG 359 (of the form 2gl + ph) is the beginning of a further strophe of the same poem; against this Schroeder 1930: 134 stresses the completeness of PMG 357, after which PMG 359 would appear as a clumsy appendix.

¹⁹⁸ For a minor formal argument for completeness cf. comm. on l. 6, σέ, σὸ δ'.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Asclep. HE 888–93 = AP 12.166 where 'Ερωτες in the first and in the last couplet forms part of a ring composition, similarly ἔρωτι and ἐρᾶν in Asclep. HE 870 and 875 = AP 5.167.1 and 6.

²⁰⁰ Vetta 1999: 221: 'come lo scioglimento finale di un indovinello'.

²⁰¹ These terms, used by Lessing to characterize the virtues of Martial's epigrams, are not unproblematic, however; cf. Sullivan 1991: 222–4 with further literature.

§ 4. Hymnic Elements

Although all elements essential for a cletic hymn are present (invocation, description by a relative clause, request to come and to help the speaker), some deviations from the conventional form should be noted because they contribute to the impact of the verses. Whereas in other archaic hymns (cf. Sapph. fr. 1.1 V., but in An. PMG 348 not before l. 3) the deity is usually named within the first lines (in the Homeric Hymns it is often even the first word),²⁰² here Dionysus' name seems deliberately withheld until l. 11. Certainly this has a humorous and playful effect.²⁰³ After the first invocation no epithets of the god are given (unlike Sapph. fr. 1.1–2 V. and An. PMG 348.1–3), a procedure which gives more emphasis to the following relative clause and particularly its first element, the enumeration of Dionysus' companions (each of whom does receive an epithet). Although the second part, in ll. 4b–5, describing the god's haunts, is typical, such a prominent position of the god's companions also seems unusual. It can be explained by the content, i.e. Dionysus' capacity to 'play with' the other gods (l. 4 *συμπαίζουσιν*), that is, probably, to dance with them and thus to control them in a playful but nevertheless firm manner. This might be true particularly in the case of Eros, whose wildness is hinted at, if *δαμάλης* really means 'young bull' (cf. n.). Since Dionysus is asked for such control at the end of the poem (see n. on ll. 10–11), it turns out that this part of the relative clause, although still part of the 'invocatio', serves as a substitute of the 'argument' (as Bremer 1981: 196 calls it) which in other hymns, between *invocatio* and *precatio*, usually functions as a proof of the god's ability to give the help which is requested from him.²⁰⁴

There are some clues that this hymn had its place in a sympotic context. Apart from the metrical similarity to PMG 358, 359, and 360, whose purely erotic context rather fits an sympotic context, *ἥμιν* (l. 7) suggests a company of guests at a symposium (cf. n.). A more precise pragmatic context is difficult to determine: Wilamowitz 1913: 115 thought of an assembly in spring during the Anthesteria, when the purple anemones flower above in the mountains (for the

²⁰² On this practice see Faulkner 2008: ad *h. Ven.* 1–6, who points out that in lyric hymns postponement of the name occurs more often, but none of his examples is as radical as our fragment. A remarkable exception would be found in Sapph. fr. 2 V., if l. 1 is the first line of the poem, Kypris being named only in l. 13; on the problem cf. Page 1959a: 35–6.

²⁰³ See above, § 3 on completeness. Goldhill 1987: 12 interprets the delay of the name as '[marking] the mischievous licentiousness of a prayer to the god of drunkenness and transgression to aid erotic (mis)adventure'. But this presupposes 'a more physical manifestation' of An's relationship in the last line of the poem (Goldhill 1987: 12). But, as I hope to show in the next section, external as well as internal evidence suggests that concrete sexual activity does not play a prominent role in this poem.

²⁰⁴ The argument type is *da quia hoc dare tuum est* in Bremer's 1981: 196 terminology; he even adduces An. PMG 357 as an example, paraphrasing it as 'effortless and playful love is your speciality'.

Anthesteria celebrated in Ionia, and also in Teos, cf. *GHI* 30.32–4 (c.470 BC)).²⁰⁵ But this presupposes a less probable meaning of *πορφυρή* in l. 3.

§ 5. Dionysus

Dionysus' frequent occurrence in An's fragments comes as no surprise, given the mainly sympotic character of his poetry, but it may also reflect the special interest in this deity during the sixth century BC which saw the 'reinvention' of the dithyramb and the introduction of the Greater Dionysia by Peisistratus or Cleisthenes. In the courts of Hipparchus and Polycrates, An. must have met poet-colleagues such as Lasus, Simonides, and Ibycus, who were active in the field of the dithyramb (cf. Privitera 1970: 110–11 and, for the role of Dionysiac elements in archaic tyrannies, Andrewes 1956: 113). A remarkable hint at the role which Dionysus had in An's poetry is the testimony of Himerius (*Or.* 38.3, p. 155 Colonna = PMG 492) that he changed Dionysus into mortal shape and brought him (as Homer did Athena) into the cities of men 'to deal with the lawlessness and just behaviour of men' (tr. Campbell 1988: 135), *ἀνθρώπων ὕβριν τε καὶ εὐνομίην ἐφέποντας* (imitating Hom. *Od.* 17.487). Euripides did the same with Dionysus (this remark certainly refers to the *Bacchae*). Rather than referring to a now lost description of a human-shaped Dionysus mixing with men, this should be taken as a vague allusion to our fragment PMG 357, in which in fact Dionysus is asked to be a good adviser (9–10, *ἀγαθὸς... | σύμβουλος*, is picked up by Himerius' *εὐνομίην*).

The spheres of Dionysus (and wine) and love are close to each other in An. as well as elsewhere (Privitera 1970: 118–19). Drinking wine and erotic song are combined e.g. in PMG 373 or in fr. eleg. 2 W. (our fragment PMG 357 is an erotic song, too, after all). The relation of Dionysus (wine) and erotic action is less clear in the surviving fragments. According to some interpreters PMG 346 fr. 4 and PMG 396 say that Dionysus and wine respectively are aids to resisting Eros' power (in both cases the text is uncertain, however; cf. comm.), but of course elsewhere, outside An's fragments, wine can appear as a stimulus to love (e.g. Ion Lyr. PMG 744, Rufin. AP 5.93 = 34 Page, Posidipp. AP 12.120 = HE 3078–81 = 138 Austin–Bastianini). But whether this idea is prominent in our fragment remains doubtful (see next paragraph). It should be kept in mind that Dionysus' function cannot be reduced to wine or drunkenness, but encompasses ecstasy, vitality, and erotic agreement in a broader sense, and at least the scene depicted in ll. 1–4 of our fragment does not imply the drunkenness of the participating players.

²⁰⁵ For the importance of the cult of Dionysus in Teos from early times onwards cf. Cole 1995: 313–16.

§ 6. Structure

One of the main oppositions of the poem is that between wild nature and civilization. On the high mountain peaks, we hear, Dionysus plays with Eros, Aphrodite, and the Nymphs (these last being typical inhabitants of the place). From there Dionysus is requested to come to 'us'. We are not told where this community is, but it is reasonable to assume that it is a symposium taking place in the city. This opposition is similar to that in PMG 348 (wild nature as the place of Artemis' hunting vs. the city of Magnesia). In both poems the opposition is blurred, however, by the fact that the deity's impact covers both spheres. In PMG 348 this was symbolized by the 'middle' position which Artemis holds between the town and the mountains, in PMG 357 by the fact that Dionysus is able to come down and mingle with men. Thus, according to my interpretation (cf. the preceding section), Himerius could take this poem as evidence for an epiphany of Dionysus described in An.'s poetry.

Some recent critics have thought that Dionysus is mainly invoked as a god of wine because the speaker hopes that drunkenness will cause Cleobulus to yield.²⁰⁶ I would warn against such a specific interpretation, however. What we can find in the wording and in the imagery of the poem is that it is just the kind of *συμπαίζειν* which Dionysus practises in the mountains that he is requested to repeat now, but with different participants. This possibility of transferring Dionysus' activity from the mountains to the sphere of the symposium further contributes to the blurring of the original opposition between wilderness and civilization in the poem.²⁰⁷ As mentioned above, a proof of the god's ability to help the speaker, found in other hymns, is missing in PMG 357, but a substitute can be found easily: the words which describe Dionysus' activity in ll. 1–5 resemble that of the request. This suggests that it is the content of the relative clause in ll. 1–4 which gives the required reason for invoking Dionysus: he is able to play with Eros, i.e. (cf. ll n.) with Cleobulus. This playing together is an image, and what it means on a non-figurative level we are not told. But the possibility that sex with a drunken Cleobulus is meant is rather improbable, for two reasons:

- (i) The mountain scene does not seem to include drunkenness or sex: Dionysus' *συμπαίζειν* primarily refers to dancing and not to having sex; this view is supported by Athenian early red-figure vase paintings which often show Dionysus dancing within a group of Nymphs. In these groups usually no wine is being drunk, and there are no signs of

²⁰⁶ This paraphrase follows Lear 2008: 70. A more radical version can be found in Rosenmeyer 2004: 165–6: 'Dionysus' "playing" with Anacreon means getting his beloved boy drunken enough not to resist his sexual advances.'

²⁰⁷ This idea of repetition has been well observed by Fränkel 1975: 292 ('The cheerful sport which took place on the mountains was to find a counterpart in the room in which Anacreon sang'). For the differences from my interpretation, cf. comm. on ll δέχεσθαι.

drunkenness. Sexual attacks by satyrs (who, significantly enough, are missing in An.'s poem), are mostly rejected.²⁰⁸

- (ii) According to our knowledge of homosexuality of at least the classical age, the symposium was not the place of sexual activity between *eromenos* and *erastes*, but rather that of fantasizing about it. In particular the idea of having sex with an *erastes* after being made drunk would have been embarrassing for a free-born *eromenos*, who had already to show a certain reserve towards the advances of the *erastes*. While this extreme position has to be excluded, a weaker version remains possible, for instance that Cleobulus, relaxed after drinking wine, becomes more open to An. But as ll. 1–4 show, wine is not the main reason why Dionysus is invoked in the poem; it is rather his ability to create a harmonious erotic relationship, whose specific character simply is not the subject of this poem.

Apart from the identification of Cleobulus and Eros, which is essential for the interpretation of the poem (see ll n.), two other identifications have to be observed.²⁰⁹ Firstly, although An.'s addressee is Dionysus, the poem is aimed indirectly at Cleobulus (whom we might imagine to be present during the performance of the song). This results in an identification of Dionysus and Cleobulus, further highlighted by the similarity of the two names as well as by the possible overtones of lines 6 and 7 (see nn.). Read in this way, the poem explores the ambiguity of religious and erotic language, present already in Odysseus' first encounter with Nausicaa, which certainly serves as a model for our ode. Secondly, Dionysus is requested to be a good adviser for Cleobulus. Since 'giving advice' is primarily an act of language and the speaker of a poem often presents himself in the role of an adviser elsewhere (esp. in elegy), and since the content of Dionysus' 'good advice' can already be inferred from the poet's present words, the speaker can also be identified with Dionysus. Taken in this way the request to Dionysus to be a good adviser can be understood as a request for the success of the poet's own advice (aptly put at the end of the poem). Thus the fragment makes use of a tradition which stresses the importance of persuasion in erotics (see comm. on l. 10) as well as of Dionysus as a source of poetic inspiration.

§ 7. Related Texts

Archilochus' prayer to Dionysus (fr. 108 W.) shows an impressive number of similar or identical words within only two lines. Direct influence is difficult to

²⁰⁸ On this phenomenon cf. in detail Heinemann 2016: 166–200, who (p. 195, ill. 123) refers e.g. to the Bowl of Macron, c.480 BC, Munich 2654; Heinemann 2016: 200 points to a 'Lösung der Erotik des Thiasos von den kruden Realitäten diesseitiger Lustbarkeiten'.

²⁰⁹ On the technique of 'multiple identification' in Sappho cf. Winkler 1990: 170.

prove, however, since the resemblances may be due to a shared use of a common stock of hymnic language (... ἀναξ... μοι σύμμαχος γουνουμένω... γενέο... χαρίζο... with comm. on PMG 357.1, 6, 7, 9). The case of Sappho's fr. 1 V. (cf. Cavallini 1986: 23–4, 109–11) is different, since that poem also uses the form of a cletic hymn for personal purposes, culminating in the end in a prayer for fulfilment of the speaker's desires. Apart from less significant points of contact such as Sappho's ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν (l. 25; cf. comm. on l. 7) and her use of δέχεσθαι (l. 22; cf. comm. on l. 11), the wording of An.'s request at 9–11 strongly points to a direct adaptation, since his γένεο σύμβουλος not only picks up the last line of Sappho's ode but also follows her motif of a deity persuading a person whom the speaker loves (ll. 18–19, τίνα δηῦτε πείθω | ἄψ' ἱσάγην† ἐς σὸν φιλότατα; 'whom now must I persuade to join your friendship's ranks?';²¹⁰ with the last words probably a model for An.'s last two lines).

The enumeration of Dionysus' fellow deities seems to have been taken as programmatic and therefore might have inspired the emblematic use of names of gods in the later Anacreontic tradition, as is visible in ecphraseis of art such as *Anacreont.* 4 (iii).12–20 and 5.10–19 W. Here as elsewhere in the *Anacreontea* Dionysus is named together with Eros and/or Aphrodite or other gods like the Charites (*Anacreont.* 20.6–8, 38.1–6, 43.12–14, 44 W. and Antip. Sid. AP 7.27.9–10 = HE 268–9). Another source of this tradition might be the programmatic elegiacs of An. fr. eleg. 2 W. where a mixture (thus representing wine and Dionysus) of the gifts of the Muses and Aphrodite is recommended for the symposium.

For possible adaptations of the fragment in later literature cf. above, § 5 (Himerius) and comm. *passim*, esp. on l. 2 Νύμφαι (Sophocles²¹¹ and Aristophanes) and l. 11 δέχεσθαι (Meleager). The first strophe of Horace's ode *Bacchum in remotis* (*carm.* 2.19) is commonly held to be an adaptation of PMG 357; see comm. on l. 2, Νύμφαι and l. 4, συμπαίζουσιν. The description of Bacchus teaching the nymphs and the satyrs in the mountains stresses the aspect of musical control that is crucial for the understanding of PMG 357 as a whole.²¹² The idea of Dionysus as a source of poetic inspiration, probably present already in An. (cf. § 6 'Structure') has become prominent in Horace (see plenty of material in Nisbet/Hubbard 1978: 316–17 and Krasser 1995: 120–3, who interprets Bacchus' deeds as described in the second half of the ode (ll. 13–32) as an image of the poet's own achievements).

1–5 A vocative (which does not give the name of the deity invoked, however) followed by a relative clause consisting of two parts: the first (ᾧ... συμπαίζουσιν)

²¹⁰ I follow Page 1959a: 3–4 in text and translation, but the passage is notoriously difficult; cf. Budelmann 2018: 119–20.

²¹¹ Bagordo 2003: 138–44 analyses the relation between our fragment and S. OT 1105–8 and justly questions the necessity of a direct influence.

²¹² Bacchus' civilizing power is further stressed by Horace in ll. 17–20; cf. Krasser 1995: 119–20.

names three companions of Dionysus, each characterized by an epithet. Each pair of adjective and noun (arranged in a sort of twofold chiasmus around the central pair: *abbaba*) fills a single line. The second part of the relative clause has been connected to the first by a slight anacoluthon (since Dionysus becomes subject of the verb). The combination of adjective and noun is continued in ὑψηλὰς... κορυφὰς (5), which now appears in a parallel order to that of l. 3 (for a very similar arrangement cf. comm. on PMG 395.1–2). In spite of the change of subject the two parts of the relative clause belong closely together, because ll. 4b–5 describe not only the landscape in which Dionysus dwells but also the location of the 'playing together' with the other gods as described in ll. 1–4 (as in Hor. *carm.* 2.19.1–4).

1 ὦναξ: Often applied to gods, most frequently to Zeus and Apollo; to Dionysus e.g. at *h. Hom.* 1.5. For the crasis cf. S. OT 80 and Hdt. 1.159.1, both without the name of the god, as here. For the combination with γουνούμαι cf. comm. on l. 6. The prayer in Archil. fr. 108 W., starting κλῦθ' ἀναξ Ἥφαιστε, interestingly shows several resemblances to our text: ... καὶ μοι σύμμαχος γουνουμένω | ἱλαος γενέο, χαρίζο δ' οἷά περ χαρίζεαι (Perotti 1986: 16, n. 17).

δαμάλης: Hsch. δ 170 δαμάλ cod., δαμάλην Barnes, probably explaining our passage, gives two possible meanings: δαμάζων 'subduing' and ἀγέρωχος 'high-spirited' (obviously referring to 'young steer' as a meaning of δαμάλης). The first meaning is not attested elsewhere for δαμάλης, but might be strengthened by the use of verbs such as δαμάζειν in an erotic sense (e.g. *Il.* 14.199, Sapph. fr. 1.3 V. and comm. on PMG 417.3–4, also with Eros as subject, as in e.g. Hes. *Th.* 120–2, Ἔρος, ὅς... | δάμναται, and *Anacreont.* fr. 1.5 W. (= An. PMG 505d), ὅδε καὶ βροτοὺς δαμάζει, with West's apparatus for parallels for the idea of Eros' universal power). The meaning 'young steer' (i.e. 'the one who has still to be tamed'), attested at Arist. *HA* 632a 15 and Eryc. AP 6.96 = GP 2200–5, seems preferable, not only since it is better attested, but also since the idea of Eros as a frisky young animal would emphasize Dionysus' achievement in controlling him through playing together with him, the Nymphs, and Aphrodite (4). Note that ἀγέρωχος, the adjective used by Hsch. to paraphrase this meaning of δαμάλης, is used by Philostr. *Im.* 2.32.2 as an adverb with σκιρτᾶν, a verb used in PMG 417.5 of the untamed Thracian filly (κουφὰ τε σκιρτῶσα παίζει), which becomes a cow in Horace's *iuuencae*... | ludere cum uitulis... | praegestientis (*carm.* 2.5.6–9). It might be relevant that Dionysus could be represented as a bull (*Carm. Pop.* PMG 871, E. *Ba.* 1017; more examples are collected by Nisbet/Hubbard 1978: ad Hor. *carm.* 2.19.29 and Hornblower 2014: 112 with n. 95). This is exploited by Ov. *ars* 1.231–2 in a complicated image. Note especially Ion Lyr. PMG 744, with more similarities to our text: ἄδαμον παῖδα ταυρωπὸν (of wine). Thus the application of the word to Eros is part of an assimilation of Dionysus and Eros (for the strategy of a similar representation of both deities, cf. Privitera 1970: 120 and introd., § 5).

Ἔρως: Eros first occurs in Hes. *Th.* 120 and 201 (not yet in Homer), later Alc. *PMG* 58.1, also as player (μάργος δ' Ἔρως οἶα <παῖς> παῖσδει), and An. *PMG* 413.1, 459, as a player, *PMG* 358.2 (playing ball, also with συμπαίζειν), 398 (Eros' ἀστραγάλοι) and 396.4 (boxing) and, probably, 346 fr. 4.1 (cf. introd., § 2). For traces of an old cult of Eros cf. West 1966a: ad Hes. *Th.* 120. The personal name obviously corresponds to the use as an appellative in l. 10 (cf. Snell 1978: 10–11 on the frequent difficulty of deciding in archaic poetry whether a deity or an abstraction is meant); cf. e.g. An. *PMG* 378.2, διὰ τὸν Ἔρωτα, with comm.

2 Νύμφαι: The nymphs, as nurses of the infant Dionysus (e.g. S. *OC* 678–80), often appear as members of the thiasus in literature as well as in art (e.g. *h. Hom.* 26.9–10, αἱ δ' ἄμ' ἔποντο | νύμφαι, ὁ δ' ἐξηγεῖτο, with similar phrasing S. *OT* 1108–9, Νυμφῶν ἐλικωπίδων, αἷς | πλεῖστα συμπαίζει, Ar. *An.* 1097–8, χειμάζω δ' ἐν κοίλοις ἄντροις | νύμφαις οὐρείαις ξυμπαίζων, Carm. Conv. *PMG* 887.2 (of Pan), ὀρχηστὰ βρομίαις ὅπαδ' Νύμφαις, Hor. *carm.* 2.19.1–4, *Bacchum in remotis carmina rupibus | uidi docentem, credite posteri, | Nymphasque discentis et auris | capripedum Satyrorum acutas.* Alc. *PMG* 63 seems to regard Θυιάδες as the nymphs particularly associated with Dionysus. On 'the merging identities of nymphs and maenads' in literature as well as in vase painting cf. Seaford 1984 on E. *Cyc.* 72 and Heinemann 2016: 173–80.

κυανώπιδες: Possibly also combined with nymphs in *P.Oxy.* 3722 fr. 16 col. i.9, τὰς κυανώπιδας νύμφας (suppl. Cockle). As in κυανοχαίτης, the frequent epithet of Poseidon in Homer, the colour seems to point to water (although the kind of nymphs meant here are actually Oreiads: Perotti 1986: 15);²¹³ cf. the application to Amphitrite in *Od.* 12.60, later of mortal women e.g. in Hes. fr. 23a.14 and 27 Merkelbach–West of Clytaemestra. Dark eyes are often a sign of attractiveness: Ibyc. *PMG* 287.1–2, κυανέουσιν ὑπὸ | βλεφάροις (of Eros), ps.Hes. *Sc.* 7, *Anacreont.* 17.12 W. (prescriptions pertaining to how to paint the beloved Bathyllus), μέλαν ὄμμα γοργὸν ἔστω, Catull. 43.2, Hor. *carm.* 1.32.11 and *ars* 37; for the position at the end of a glyconic cf. *PMG* 349.2 κυανάσπιδας.

3 πορφυρῇ τ' Ἀφροδίτῃ: For spelling of the contraction see general introd., § 9 'Orthography'. Words of the same stem are used of Aphrodite, Eros, and objects related to them: the goddess's island Cythera was called Πορφυρίς or Πορφυροῦσσα (Weber 1895: 65). Amor is *purpureus* in Ov. *am.* 2.1.38 (with McKeown 1998: ad loc.), 2.9.34. The ball thrown by Eros to An. in *PMG* 358.1 is πορφυρῇ (see n.), as are the chlamys worn by Eros in Sapph. fr. 54 V., Aphrodite's cord in anon. *AP* 12.112.2 = *HE* 3711, and the sinew of the Erotes' bow.²¹⁴ What the exact meaning of the adjective is here has been much disputed. An

²¹³ Therefore, it does not seem possible to regard the nymphs as a simple symbol of the water mixed with the wine (= Dionysus) at the symposium (for the metonymy cf. Lygd. 3.6.57 *Naiada Bacchus amat*, with Navarro Antolín 1996: ad loc.), as Tsomis 2001: 61 with n. 90 proposes.

²¹⁴ Cf. Stesich. *PMGF* S104 (= 113 Davies/Finglass). 7 ἀλιπόρφυρον after *Κ]υπρογενῆς* in 6 with Davies/Finglass 2014: 443 and my note on An. *PMG* 447.

extensive report is given by Braghetti 1994: 49–51 and Leo 2015: 98–9. Marzullo 1950 assumed a meaning *marina*, corresponding to the idea of liquid, important for Dionysus and also present in κυανώπιδες (2). But, as Castrignanò 1952 objects, this interpretation is mainly based on the Homeric use of πορφύρω, which describes the 'heaving' or 'swirling' sea (e.g. *Il.* 14.16, ὡς δ' ὅτε πορφύρῃ πέλαγος μέγα κύματι κωφῶ; there is also the application to the heart as e.g. at *Il.* 21.551, the meaning 'growing red' being only post-Homeric), and on πορφύρεος as an epithet of the sea, e.g. at *Il.* 16.391, later Alc. *PGM* 89.5, An. *PMG* 347 fr. 1.18 (it is also used as a colour term already in Homer, e.g. of a χλαῖνα *Od.* 4.115). Although it can describe the movement and therefore the dazzling brightness of the sea (an aspect which leads to the usage as a colour term), it cannot be used in the simple sense of belonging to or even being born from the sea. As a colour term the adjective could have been chosen with regard to the rosy complexion of Aphrodite's face (so *LSJ* s.v. II.2, suppl. 1996), especially of her cheeks (among others Castrignanò 1952 and Goldhill 1984, referring to Phryn. *Trag.* fr. 13 Snell–Kannicht, λάμπει δ' ἐπὶ πορφυρέαις παρῇσι φῶς ἔρωτος, and Ov. *am.* 1.4.22, *purpureas tenero pollice tange genas*). But this synecdochic use (transferring the colour from the cheeks to the whole person) would seem rather bold (although a specifically erotic connotation of the adjective should not be excluded). Therefore a reference to the multi-coloured and bright garment of the goddess seems to be the most probable explanation (e.g. Weber 1895: 65; for the association of purple with the garments of gods in fifth-century lyric poetry, cf. Reinhold 1970: 23–4). πορφυρῇ takes up κυανώπιδες, with which it is in direct contact (like συμπαίζουσιν and ἐπιστρέφει in the next line and λευκόν and χαρίεσσα in *PMG* 395.2–3). The juxtaposition seems to be part of a particular sensibility towards colours observable also in other fragments of An.; cf. Harvey 1957: 217–18, referring e.g. to the ball poem *PMG* 358.1–3, whose style and content are close to 357 in general. Aphrodite was associated with Dionysus in cult (they shared a temple at Argos (Paus. 2.23.8) and at Bura in Achaea (Paus. 7.25.9)), in art (on vase paintings, mainly of the late fifth and fourth centuries, Aphrodite appears among maenads, *LIMC* s.v., nos. 1360, 1361, 1362, 1364 (A. Delivorrias, G. Berger-Doer, A. Kossatz-Deissmann) and Leo 2015: 99), and in literature: Panyas. 17.3 Bernabé assigns the second round of drinks to Dionysus and Aphrodite; E. *Cyc.* 68–72: οὐδ' ἐν Νύσαι μετὰ Νυμφῶν ἱακχὸν ἱακχὸν ὠιδᾶν μέλπω πρὸς τὰν Ἀφροδίταν, ἂν θηρεύων πετόμαν | Βάκχαις σὺν λευκόποσιν and Ba. 402–5 ἰκοίμαν ποτὶ Κύπρον, | νᾶσον τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας, | ἵν' οἱ θελξίφρονες νέμονται θνατοῖσιν Ἔρωτες, with Dodds 1960: ad 402–16. For purple elsewhere in An. cf. *PMG* 447.

4 συμπαίζουσιν: The assonance with σύμβουλος in 10 (also at the beginning of a line) is certainly intended and stresses Dionysus' activity to join people together (for this illustrative effect of repeated συν- (σύν) in sympotic poetry

cf. Carm. Conv. PMG 902 with Lissarrague 1990a: 9–10). Like Eros (see n. on l. 1) Dionysus can be represented as a jolly player (in addition to possessing more serious qualities); cf. the epithet in Hes. *Th.* 941, and Hor. *carm.* 2.19.25–6a, *quamquam choreis aptior et iocis | ludoque dictus*, with Nisbet/Hubbard 1978: ad loc. Here his play primarily seems to consist in dancing with other deities. This is suggested by the frequent representation of Dionysus as dancing in his thiasus, appearing for the first time in Athenian early red-figure vases;²¹⁵ for the meaning of (συμ)παίζειν, cf. *h. Ap.* 201 (dancing) and 206 (playing music), Pi. *O.* 1.16 and, probably imitating our passage, S. *OT* 1109 (quoted above, comm. on l. 2), later, perhaps adapting Sappho's words, *Him. Or.* 9.4, p. 76 Colonna, (εἰς) νυμφεῖον ἄγει καὶ Ἀφροδίτην ἐφ' ἄρμα Χαρίτων καὶ χορὸν Ἑρώτων συμπαίστορα. The closest parallel in An. himself, PMG 358.4, applies συμπαίζειν to playing ball (cf. also *Od.* 6.100–1, where the game appears as a kind of μολπή, and 8.373), which might be present in our poem, too, since forms of dancing and playing ball can be intermingled (see comm. on ll δέχεσθαι).

The erotic overtones often present in (συμ)παίζειν are also important, of course, with regard to Dionysus' dance with the Nymphs (joined by the deities of love!) and to the relation of the speaker and Cleobulus, but do not necessarily imply a concrete sexual meaning. Ar. *Av.* 1097–8, χεῖμάζω δ' ἐν κοίλοις ἄντροις | νύμφαις οὐρείαις ξυμπαίζων (where the erotic colouring seems probable; cf. Dunbar 1995: 590), and Orph. *H.* 58.3 (of Eros), συμπαίζοντα θεοῖς ἡδὲ θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις, might reflect our passage as well as *Anacreont.* 52.7–8 W. (after mentioning Lyaeus), δίδασκε παίζειν | μετὰ χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης.

ἐπιστρέφει: The relative clause is continued, with a change of subject (sc. ὅς). It describes Dionysus' haunts (as does the relative clause in the hymn to Artemis in PMG 348.4–6). For Dionysus as a mountain-god, cf. S. *OT* 1105–6 and Hor. *carm.* 2.19.1–4 (quoted in n. on l. 2, *Νύμφαι*). On the contraction with 'open' spelling cf. West 1982: 12; for the form cf. An. PMG 417.5 βόσκειαι. The verb ἐπιστρέφεισθαι (for a metaphorical usage cf. An. fr. eleg. 5 with n.) is used of the movement of a god in *h. Hom.* 27.10 (of Artemis) πάντη ἐπιστρέφεται, and, with an accusative of extent in space (Smyth 1956: 1581) as here, Hes. *Th.* 753, γαῖαν ἐπιστρέφεται, of Nyx and Hemera; sim. Thgn. 648, of ἀναιδείη.

5 ὑψηλὰς ὀρέων κορυφάς: The syntax of the line mirrors that of l. 3 (for the hyperbaton cf. PMG 407.2 n.). There have been several attempts to change the transmitted text into a regular glyconic, e.g. by Hecker's ἐπιστεφένων [sic!] ὕλης ἐν κορυφῆς ὀρέων, by Kaiser's ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ῥία, or by Barnes's transposition κορυφὰς ὀρέων. But, as Wilamowitz 1921: 235 points out, the line can be interpreted as an anacastic form of the glyconic ('choriambic dimeter') and

corresponds to the pure form as in Sapph. 96.7 V., Corinna PMG 654, col. iii, and An. PMG 349. Moreover, the transmitted word order is attested in *Il.* 12.282, ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων κορυφὰς, Alc. PMG 89.1 (but ἐν κορυφαῖς ὀρέων in Alc. PMG 56.1), Sapph. fr. 44a.6 V., ὀρέων κορυφὰς ἐπι, Ar. *Nu.* 280.

6–11 After the *invocatio*, the *preces* of the hymn. They consist of two sentences, both of three lines (6–8 and 9–11), forming the metrical sequence *gl, gl, ph* and displaying a reasonably parallel syntax: 6 εὐμενῆς – 9–10 ἀγαθός... σύμβουλος, 7 ἔλθ' – 9 γένεο, 7 ἦμιν – 9 Κλεοβούλω, 7–8 κεχαρισμένης δ' εὐχολῆς – 10 τὸν ἐμὸν δ' Ἐρωτ', 8 ἐπακούειν – 11 δέχεσθαι. On this structure cf. Panyagua 1971: 396–7. Note that the first part (6–8) gains a high degree of homogeneity by the strong assonance of 6 εὐμενῆς, 7 κεχαρισμένης (for homoioteleuton at the ending of two adjacent verses see comm. on PMG 347 fr. 1.1–2), 8 εὐχολῆς, while in the second 9 Κλεοβούλω and 10 σύμβουλος correspond strongly to each other; see n. on ll. 9 and 10.

6 γουνούμαί σε: The phrase forms the first half of a glyconic in An.'s hymn to Artemis, too (PMG 348.1, with comm. for γουνούμαι and γουνάζομαι in Homer and in other lyric poetry). In combination with ἄναξ the verb occurs Archil. fr. 108 W., on whose other resemblances to our fragment cf. comm. on l. 1 ὠναξ. Odysseus' address to Nausicaa in *Od.* 6.149 (γουνούμαί σε, ἄνασσα), within a scene that shows several points of contact not only with PMG 348 and 358 (see introd. to that poem, § 6.1 'Homer'), but also with PMG 357 (*Od.* 6.105–6: Nausicaa and her maidens are compared to Artemis τῇ δέ θ' ἅμα νύμφαι... | ... παίζουσι, 109 Nausicaa is called a παρθένος ἀδμής, cf. PMG 357.1 δαμάλης Ἐρωτος). This might be relevant for the interpretation of the whole fragment, since it provides a model for a possible ambiguity between religious and erotic language (Odysseus pretends to be unsure whether Nausicaa is Artemis in *Od.* 6.151–3, cf. Gross 1985: 39). For this strategy in An. PMG 357, see above introd., § 6.²¹⁶

σε, σὺ δ': The position of this polyptoton is remarkable, since it is situated in exactly the centre of the glyconic that is itself in the middle of the fragment (for the significance of the middle position in An.'s poetry cf. introd. to PMG 348, § 4). This may be taken as evidence for completeness. For word-end and syntactical break at this position cf. ll. 4 and 11. Note that the glyconic in PMG 360.2 (δίζημαί σε, σὺ δ' οὐ κλύεις, also in a context of imploring) is very similar. The similarity of this fragment which is, incidentally, also an invocation, further strengthens the impression that line 6 has erotic overtones (cf. introd., § 6). Cf. later in an erotic context ps.Pl. *AP* 5.79.1–2 = FGE 590–1: Τῷ μῆλ'ω βάλλω σε· σὺ δ' εἰ μὲν ἐκούσα φιλεῖς με, | δεξαμένη τῆς σῆς παρθενίης μετάδος (with δεξαμένη compare δέχεσθαι in l. 11).

²¹⁶ For γουνάζομαι in an erotic context, cf. *h. Ven.* 187 (Anchises to Aphrodite, ironically echoing 131 where the disguised Aphrodite is the suppliant; cf. Faulkner 2008: 247). Dover 1989: 91–2 refers to vase paintings where the *erastes* is depicted as imploring the *eromenos*.

²¹⁵ e.g. bowl of the Brygos Painter, c.500–490, Paris, Cab. des Médailles 576, Heinemann 2016: 159, ill. 101.

εὐμενής: An adjective commonly used to denote the kindness of a god, especially in hymns, e.g. in *h. Hom.* 22.7 (to Poseidon), καὶ μάκαρ εὐμενὲς ἦτορ ἔχων πλώουσιν ἄρηγε, and often elsewhere; cf. *LSJ* I.1.

7 **ἔλθ' ἦμιν:** The pronoun (for the accent see Barrett 1964: 425) forms an antithetical hyperbaton with σὺ at the beginning of the syntactical unit. Some of Dion's mss. offer the variant ἔλθοις μοι (for the optative expressing a milder form of wish than the imperative, cf. Kühner/Gerth 1898–1904: 1.229). This is adopted only by Furley/Bremer 2001: 2.127 who find the plural difficult for two reasons: (i) If it is taken as a *pluralis maiestatis* there would be a little break of sense after γουνοῦμαι. But such a change can be paralleled by PMG 395.1 ἦμιν and 7 ἀνασταλύζω (see 1–2 n.). (ii) If ἦμιν is taken literally, meaning the group of the fellow drinkers, it 'would not go well with the individual erotic tenor of this poem'. But it seems natural that even an intimate erotic reflection like this is spoken in front of a sympotic audience; cf. PMG 396, οἶνον... φέρε... ὥς... πυκταλίζω. The plural does not imply, however, that *all* members of the symposium are in want of Dionysus' erotic persuasion (as Vetta 1999: ad loc. suggests). Apart from this, the choice of the imperative ἔλθε (against the optative) is suggested by the parallel form γένεο in l. 9 (cf. n. on 6–11 and Weber 1895: 22). For the use of ἔλθε in a cletic hymn cf. Sapph. fr. 1.25 V. (see introd., § 7). For ἦμιν in such a context cf. Ar. *Th.* 1158–9.

7–8 **κεχαρισμένης δ' | εὐχολῆς:** 'Welcome, acceptable', used in a proleptic sense, since listening to the prayer (ἐπακούειν) is a condition of finding it acceptable. For the meaning of the participle in a religious context, cf. *Il.* 20.298–9, κεχαρισμένα δ' αἰεὶ | δῶρα θεοῖσι δίδωσι, *Od.* 16.184, ἵνα τοι κεχαρισμένα δώομεν ἱρά, and Parker 1998: 108–9. Therefore, there is no need to change the text (κεχαρισμένως Bergk 1834: 78, κεχαρημένος Hecker).

The middle χαρίζεσθαι, 'to give graciously', can be used in hymnic (Archil. fr. 108.2 W., quoted in introd., § 7 'Related Texts') as well as in erotic language; cf. *LSJ* s.v. I.3. 'grant favours to a man'. In this usage the subject more often is the beloved, as in Pl. *Phdr.* 227c 7, but sometimes it can be the lover who 'pleases' the beloved as in Pl. *Phdr.* 231c 3–4. Thus, even though according to *LSJ* the erotic use of χαρίζεσθαι is not attested before Aristophanes, An.'s application of κεχαρισμένης to the prayer might be considered part of a strategy to identify the deity invoked with the beloved boy Cleobulus (see introd., § 6). εὐχολή is the epic form for εὐχή; cf. ps.Hes. *Sc.* 68, εὐχολέων οὐκ ἔκλυε Φοῖβος. The word occurs in an epigram attributed to An. *AP* 6.137 = *FGE* 506–7, a prayer to Apollo (l. 2 εὐχολὰς τάσδ' ὑποδεξάμενος). For the possible meaning 'prayer' here, cf. below, ll n.

8 **ἐπακούειν:** The verb seems to have a solemn tone (as does the infinitive used as an imperative: Kühner/Gerth 1898–1904: 2.20–1), since it appears in prayers from Homer onwards; cf. *Il.* 3.277 (after an invocation of Zeus, Ἥελιός θ', ὃς

πάντ' ἐφορᾷς καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούεις), A. *Ch.* 725 (absolute, in a prayer to πότνια χθών). The variant ἐπακούων, found in two mss. of D. Chr., is unattractive for two reasons: (i) the participle would be connected with the imperative by δέ, which seems impossible (the two passages from Euripides adduced by Panyagua 1971: 397, *Heracl.* 794 and *Ba.* 816, are altered by most editors); (ii) the parallels between ll. 6–8 and 9–11 suggest an infinitive corresponding to δέχεσθαι.

As for the infinitive ἐπακούειν two possible explanations are worthwhile:

- (i) An infinitive of purpose quite common in Homer (to Kühner/Gerth 1898–1904: 2.14–17 add the collection in Perotti 1986: 17 n. 19): 'to come to hear my prayer' (suggested by Weber 1895: 24). But in this case the use of δέ would be difficult (Panyagua 1971: 399 cannot provide parallels for a δέ 'continuativo-explicativo' which he assumes here). Therefore the particle has been deleted by Perotti 1986: 17, who points to the fact that it is not required by metre; he adds that an infinitive for imperative (see below, (ii)) cannot be paralleled elsewhere in An.
- (ii) An infinitive for imperative, elsewhere also combined with a preceding imperative (Kühner/Gerth 1898–1904: 2.21 quoting *Od.* 16.150–1, ἀλλὰ σὺ γ' ἀγγείλας ὀπίσω κίε, μηδὲ κατ' ἀγρούς | πλάζεσθαι μετ' ἐκείνων, *Hdt.* 3.134.5, Ὅρα νυν, ἐπὶ Σκύθας μὲν τὴν πρῶτην ἵεναι ἔασον· οὗτοι γάρ, ἐπεὰν σὺ βούλῃ, ἔσονται τοι· σὺ δέ μοι ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα στρατεύεσθαι).

Explanation (ii) seems preferable since in that case the text needs no alteration, and the corresponding δέχεσθαι (11) also seems best to be taken as an infinitive as imperative.

9–11. In the second part of the *precatio* and the probable end of the poem, the speaker puts his specific wish into words, using the name of his beloved (9) and the personal pronoun of the first-person singular in l. 10, thus narrowing the perspective of ἦμιν (l. 7).

9 **Κλεοβούλω:** For the orthography of the monosyllabic diphthong *eo* see the general introd., § 9. Note the assonance with the last syllable of the line γένεο and with l. 10 Δεόνυσε. The second piece of assonance would correspond to the evident pun of Cleobulus' name and σύμβουλος, the function which Dionysus is asked to fulfil (for etymological play, cf. comm. on PMG 395.9 δεινός). Cleobulus' eyes are mentioned in Max. Tyr. 18.9 (272 Trapp); cf. also Max. Tyr. 21.2 (17–28 Trapp; cf. Bernsdorff 2014a) where he is named among the subjects of An.'s poetry; in PMG 359 his name is also part of a pun, this time forming a polyptoton; cf. n. ad loc. There might be a play with Εὐβουλεύς ('good adviser') which appears as a cult epithet of Dionysus (besides Zeus) in later sources²¹⁷

²¹⁷ *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum* II 1948 (of uncertain age) seems still to be lost; cf. Jessen 1909: 863.

(e.g. Orph. *H.* 30.6; Macr. *Sat.* 1.18.17 and Plu. *quaest. conv.* 714c, in a chapter on *βουλεύεσθαι παρὰ πότον*, and an inscription of the third cent. AD, of unknown provenience (no. 161 in Jaccottet 2003: 2.267–8); for the epithet applied to Dionysus, cf. Perotti 1986: 15–16 with n. 12 and Obbink 2011: 286). It should be noted that An.'s invocation of Eubuleus, the swineherd, in *P.Oxy.* 3722 fr. 15 col. i.17 occurs in the same metre (pherecratean) and a similar syntactic style (cf. especially PMG 357.3); this perhaps hints to a connection between Dionysus Eubuleus and Eubuleus, the swineherd, which would be all the more remarkable since in the Orphic Hymns Dionysus Eubuleus appears as son of Zeus and Persephone and is therefore regarded as chthonic (Jessen 1909: 864).

9–10 *ἀγαθὸς γένηο | σύμβουλος*: This phrase seems to modify the use of *σύμμαχος* in prayers, cf. Archil. fr. 108 W., *καί μοι σύμμαχος γουνουμένω | ἵλαος γενέο*, and Sapph. fr. 1.27–8 V., *σὺ δ' αὖτα | σύμμαχος ἔσσο* (both with other resemblances to our fragment; cf. introd., § 7); later e.g. A. *Ch.* 2, *σωτήρ γενοῦ μοι σύμμαχος τ' αἰτουμένω*. Here the god is asked to come not in order to assist the speaker but to give his advice to another person (albeit thus helping the speaker). *σύμβουλος* plays not only with the name of the addressee (see previous note), but also with *συμπαίζουσιν* in l. 4 (in the same position of the line), which describe Dionysus' playing with (among others) Eros. This ability is essential for his 'advice' here too. For *σύμβουλος* and an imperative of *γίγνεσθαι* cf. A. *Pers.* 170–1, Ar. *Nu.* 1481, *καί μοι γενοῦ ξύμβουλος*; for *εἶναι* in the sense of *συμβουλεύειν* cf. e.g. A. *Eu.* 712. For the attribute *ἀγαθός*, cf. Thgn. 163, *βουλῇ τ' ἀγαθῇ*, and *πονηρότεροι σύμβουλοι* in Antiphon 5.71. Words related to *βουλή* occur relatively often in the *Corpus Theognideum*, thus illustrating the importance of the idea of good counsel in archaic elegy; cf. e.g. Thgn. 69, 633, *βουλεύου δις καὶ τρίς*, 1101–2, *ὅστις σοι βούλευσεν ἐμεῦ πέρι, καί σ' ἐκέλευσεν | οἷχεσθαι προλιπόνθ' ἡμετέρην φιλίην* (a close parallel to our fragment since here Dionysus is asked to give Clearchus the opposite advice). Often the speaker of the elegy presents himself as an adviser; cf. Thgn. 37b–8, *καί ποτε φήσεις | εἰ συμβουλεύειν τοῖσι φίλοις ἐμέ*, Thgn. 1049–54, in iambus Hippon. fr. 118.5–6 W.

Advice can occur in an erotic context as in Thgn. 1365–6, and the importance of words and persuasion in erotics is a frequent motif, found as early as *Il.* 14.216–17 (of Aphrodite's girdle, *ἐνθ' ἐνι μὲν φιλότης, ἐν δ' ἥμερος, ἐν δ' ὀαριστύς | πάρφασις, ἥ τ' ἔκλειψε νόον πύκα περ φρονέοντων*) and is illustrated by the close connection between Peitho and Aphrodite; cf. West 1978: on Hes. *Op.* 73, adducing *inter alia* Ibyc. PMG 288 (Euryalus was fed by the Graces, Cypris, and *ἀγανοβλέφαρος Πειθώ*). For words of the stem *πειθ-* in erotic contexts Thgn. 1235–6, *ὦ παῖ, ἄκουσον ἐμεῦ δαμάσας φρένας· οὔτοι ἀπειθή | μῦθον ἐρῶ τῇ σῇ καρδίῃ οὐδ' ἄχαριν*, and, above all, Sapph. fr. 1.18–19 V. (Aphrodite asking), *τίνα δηῦτε πείθω | ἄψι †σάγην† [ἐς σὰν φιλότατα; here, if we grasp this difficult*

passage correctly, the goddess, in a way similar to Dionysus in An. PMG 357, is called on in order to persuade a person loved by the speaker (cf. introd., § 7). Among the later instances (for a collection of which see Sens 2011: 75 and 160) Asclep. AP 5.158 = HE 824–7 is particularly interesting, since the verb *συμπαίζειν* also occurs there: *Ἑρμιόνη πιθανῇ ποτ' ἐγὼ συνέπαιζον*. An. seems to have emphasized the erotic impact of his poetry in PMG 402c. In the later Anacreontic tradition *πηγὴ ῥέουσα Πειθοῦς* (Anacreont. 18.15 W.) forms part of a *locus amoenus* which represents the beloved Bathyllus, whose lips are full of *Πειθώ* in Anacreont. 17. 24 W.

On this traditional background of the speaker as the 'adviser' in erotics, and since the prayer itself functions as advice to Cleobulus, the wish that Dionysus might become a good adviser can be read as a wish for the speaker's own advice, given to Cleobulus in this poem. Seen from this perspective, the narrator as well as Cleobulus is assimilated to Dionysus. Furthermore, the closure of the poem would not only contain the request for divine help, but at the same time for success of the own poetry (for this closing request as a common pattern cf. Hutchinson 2001: 425, on Pi. O. 6.103–5). Read this way, the poem appears as a request to Dionysus to inspire the speaker's song. For the idea of Dionysus as a source of poetic inspiration cf. Archil. 120 W.; it is enhanced in Hor. *carm.* 2.19, which is modelled after PMG 357; cf. introd., § 7.

10b–11 *τὸν ἐμὸν δ' ἔρωτ', | ὦ Δεόνυσε, δέχεσθαι*: The transmitted δ(ε) is recommended by the same particle in the corresponding position of ll. 7–8. The parallelism further suggests that we understand *δέχεσθαι* as an infinitive for an imperative, directed to Dionysus like *ἐπακούειν* in l. 8. It is taken in this way by Wilamowitz 1913: 114, whose translation ('mögest du unser Gebet mit Wohlgefallen anhören...mögest Du meine Liebe nicht verschmähen, Dionysos') obscures the meaning of *δέχεσθαι*, however. Together with my interpretation of *δέχεσθαι* (see below) this syntactic explanation would give sufficient sense: Dionysus is asked to be a good adviser to Cleobulus (with no further specification) and to accept the speaker's Eros as a player (the possessive stressing the contrast with the Eros mentioned in the first line).²¹⁸ Giving good advice to Cleobulus (namely to respond to the speaker's wooing) and 'accepting the speaker's Eros in play' would be complementary actions of Dionysus' assistance in winning Cleobulus for the speaker. On the other hand, the imitation of our passage in Mel. AP 5.214.3 = HE 4270, *ἀλλ' ἄγε συμπαίκεται δέξει Πόθον* (to Heliodora), suggests that the beloved and not Dionysus is the subject of *δέχεσθαι*. But it seems difficult to assume a change of construction

²¹⁸ Bowie 2013: 37–8 also defends the transmitted text with *δέ*, giving three possible explanations: (i) 'Cleobulus is to be conducted under the watchful eye of Dionysus' (cf. Long. 2.5.3–4); (ii) The speaker produces 'a small terracotta of Eros' and places 'it at the foot of a herm of Dionysus in the sympotic room'; (iii) the *ἔρως* is An.'s love song (as later in Phanocles' *Ἐρωτες ἢ Καλοὶ* or Ovid's *Amores* (this explanation being preferred by Bowie)).

after *γένεο* and to take Cleobulus as the subject of an independent infinitive for an imperative of the third person (as e.g. Smyth 1900 ad loc. takes it).²¹⁹ Therefore it would seem necessary to make *δέχεσθαι* depend on *ἀγαθὸς γένεο σύμβουλος* in the sense of *συμβούλευε* (as pointed out by Renehan 1983: 23 who suggests removing Page's comma after *σύμβουλος*). This construction might be recommended by Sappho fr. 1.18–19 V., *τίνα δηῦτε πείθω | ἄψ†σάγγην† [ἐς σὰν φιλότατα*; But since *δέ* cannot have an explicative meaning (see comm. on l. 8 *ἐπακούειν*), Kan's 1881: 350 slight change from *τὸν ἐμὸν δ'* to *τὸν ἐμὸν γ'* then seems necessary,²²⁰ with *γέ* stressing the force of the possessive pronoun. It has to be asked, however, whether *ἀγαθὸς γένεο σύμβουλος*—itself a sufficient phrase—allows further syntactical supplement. On the whole, I would attach more weight to the intratextual argument and keep the transmitted *δέ* (as Bergk, Diehl, Gentili, and Leo do). The position of *δέ* is not problematic, since article and adjective form a close unity; cf. Denniston 1954: 186 in general and E. *Hec.* 213 (ath. Wil., Diggle), *τὸν ἐμὸν δὲ βίον*, X. *Oec.* 20.25, *ὁ ἐμὸς δὲ πατήρ*, 20.28, *ὁ σὸς δὲ πατήρ*, *Cyr.* 8.5.19, E. *Or.* 1144 *τὸν σὸν δὲ πατέρα*, Pl. *Com.* fr. 199.1 K.–A., *ὁ σὸς δὲ τύμβος*; with article and numeral in An. *PMG* 356.3–4, *τὰ μὲν δέκ' ... | ... τὰ πέντε δ'*. For the possibility that the Younger Critias plays on this verse in his laudatory hexameters on An. cf. Bing 2014: 37 with n. 30.

10 *τὸν ἐμὸν*: The article, used only rarely by An. (Weber 1895: 21), also occurs in combination with the possessive adjective in *PMG* 358.6, 360.3, *P.Oxy.* 3695 fr. 12.1 (without article in *PMG* 370, where the transmission is doubtful, and 432.2). Note the combination of the article with Eros in *PMG* 378.2, *διὰ τὸν Ἔρωτ'*, where the use has to be explained as demonstrative, however; cf. n.

11 *ὦ Δεόνυσε*: None of the variants in the mss. of Dion makes sense, so that Emperius' restoration of the addressee's name seems inevitable. For the contraction of the first syllable cf. *PMG* 365; for the spelling see general introd., § 9 'Orthography'. A similar technique of delaying the name occurs in *PMG* 388.5 and perhaps in *PMG* 347; cf. comm. on l. 12.

δέχεσθαι: Usually explained as 'to accept my love', most recently by Lear 2008: 70 and Carey 2009a: 35, sometimes (e.g. by Furley/Bremer 2001: 1.176,

²¹⁹ Similarly Gerber 1970: who ad loc. translates: 'grant that he [sc. Cleobulus] accept my love' and Leo 2015: 104. The examples of an infinitive for an imperative of the third person, as collected by Kühner/Gerth 1898–1904: 2.21 are not comparable, since either a regular imperative of the third person precedes (*Il.* 7.79, Theoc. 24.93–5 (95 *νεέσθαι* cod.: *νεέσθω* pap.)) or the subject of the infinitive is named explicitly (*Il.* 6.92); cf. also Kühner/Gerth 1898–1904: 2.22: 'Wenn der Infinitiv sich nicht auf die angeredete Person bezieht, so steht das Subjekt ... gewöhnlich im Akkusativ.' So in Ar. *Lys.* 317–18: *δέσποινα Νίκη* ξυγγενοῦ τῶν τ' (del. Bergk, Wilamowitz: γ' Bothe) *ἐν πόλει γυναικῶν | τοῦ νῦν παρεστῶτος θράσους θέσθαι τροπαίων ἡμᾶς*. Page's conjecture (in *PMG*) *δ' ἔρωτ' ... δεχέσθω* tries to solve the problem by changing the text.

²²⁰ Cf. the confusion of *δέ* and *γέ* in the previous line.

Leo 2015: 104–6) combined with the idea of 'returning' love (which is not in the text, however). But a more concrete idea of what is meant by the verb can be achieved: first, one might think of *δέχεσθαι* as meaning 'accepting a gift'. This would give a good sense, no matter whether Cleobulus or Dionysus is the subject of *δέχεσθαι*. In the former case the *eromenos* would accept a gift from the *erastes*, the gift being metonymically substituted by love itself. This interpretation is supported by Sapph. fr. 1 V. (for its probable influence on our fragment, see introd., § 7), where the idea of 'accepting gifts' (22 *αἱ δὲ δῶρα μὴ δέκετ'*, *ἀλλὰ δώσει*) is central in the description of the role of the beloved (cf. Leo 2015: 105 with n. 176 on the importance of gifts in classical Greek homosexuality). On the other hand, this meaning would also fit Dionysus as the subject of *δέχεσθαι*, since in votive epigrams the verb can denote the god's receipt of a dedication (*CEG* 367.1 (Laconia, fifth cent.), *δέξο, φάναξ, Κρονίδα[ι] Δεῦ Ὀλύνπια καλὸν ἄγαλμα*, similar *CEG* 345.2 (Phocis, sixth cent.), *CEG* 418.1 (Melos, sixth cent.); in Hellenistic literary epigrams Call. *HE* 1149–50 = *AP* 6. 347, *Ἄρτεμι, τὴν τόδ' ἄγαλμα Φιληρατὶς εἴσατο τῇδε* | *ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν δέξαι, πότνια, τὴν δὲ σάου*, similar Hegesipp. *HE* 1901 = *AP* 6.178.1; Theod. *HE* 3594 = *AP* 6.282.5, in the penultimate line of the poem); for *δέχεσθαι* of a god's accepting a sacrifice outside epigram see e.g. *Il.* 2.420 (of Zeus), *ἀλλ' ὃ γε δέκτο μὲν ἱρά*. For examples from archaic lyric poetry cf. Pi. *Pae.* 6.2–6... *Πυθοῖ, | λίσσομαι (~ γουνοῦμαι in PMG 357.6) | ... με δέξαι ... | αἰίδιμον Πιερίδων προφάταν*, adapted erotically in Alc. fr. 374 V. (start of a poem), *Δέξαι με κωμάσδοντα, δέξαι, λίσσομαί σε, λίσσομαι*. Given this interpretation *εὐχολῆς* would then have the sense 'vow' rather than 'prayer' (Bowie 2013: 36, who adduces *CEG* 275.2).

But, secondly, an even more specific meaning of *δέχεσθαι* can be detected by taking into consideration the imagery of play in the first lines of the fragment. Two special usages of *δέχεσθαι* attested in later poetry might be relevant here:

- (i) *δέχεσθαι* meaning 'catching a ball' as in Pl. *Euth.* 277b 3–5, *ὁ Διονυσόδωρος ὥσπερ σφαῖραν ἐκδεξάμενος τὸν λόγον πάλιν ἐστοχάζετο τοῦ μειρακίου*, also in an erotic context, and A.R. 4.950–2, in an imitation of Nausicaa's play with the maidens in *Od.* 6 (a passage with great relevance for An. *PMG* 348 and 358): the Nereids who pass the Argo between each other are compared to girls on a beach: *σφαίρῃ ἀθύρουσιν περιηγέι*· *αἱ μὲν ἔπειτα | ἄλλη ὑπ' ἐξ ἄλλης δέχεται* (cf. Emp. B 31.115.12 Diels–Kranz) *καὶ ἐς ἡέρα πέμπει | ὕψι μεταχρονίην, ἥ δ' οὐ ποτε πίλνεται οὐδεῖ*.

This explanation is not entirely different from the one given above, since 'catching the ball' and 'accepting a gift' are two actions which resemble each other; cf. Sen. *benef.* 2.17.3 = Chrysipp. *Stoic.* fr. 725, SVF 3.182 on proper catching and throwing of the ball as a model of giving and accepting *beneficia*. Both concepts together are present in ps.Pl. *AP* 5.79.1–2 = *FGE* 590–1, quoted above in comm. on l. 6 (here the apple

appears as a ball as well as a gift, so that δεξαμένη might imply 'catching' as well as 'accepting'. But for our text this interpretation is problematic: it presupposes that συμπαίζουσιν in l. 4 points to a ball game of Dionysus and the other deities. Although this might be justified by the use of συμπαίζειν in PMG 358.4, where it certainly means a kind of ball game which includes catching the ball,²²¹ it remains difficult: first, I do not know of any iconographic parallels for Dionysus playing ball and, secondly, one would have to assume a rather complicated metonymy, since τὸν ἐμὸν δ' ἔρωτα would mean 'the ball thrown by my Eros'.

- (ii) An easier solution would be to take δέχεσθαι in the sense of 'accepting as a partner in playing' (for δέχεσθαι of receiving persons in a friendly or hostile way, cf. *LSJ* s.v. II.1 and 2). The kind of playing would not have been specified, the most obvious play being dance, which sometimes appears closely connected with ball games (cf. *Od.* 6. 100–1 and 106 with Mendner 1956: 87). There are two advantages of this explanation: first, the expression in lines 10–11 would perfectly fit the context: Dionysus, after being invoked as a master of playing with Eros in lines 1–4, is now asked to accept the speaker's own Eros, who should therefore be capitalized (τὸν ἐμὸν δ' emphasizing the contrast with Ἔρως in line 1, not, as Carey 2009a: 35 proposes, the contrast between the poet's love and that of other participants of the symposium, as an indirect compliment to the much wooed Cleobulus). Secondly, this reading is supported by the Meleagrian epigram *HE* 4268–71 = *AP* 5.214: in an obvious imitation of An. *PMG* 358 the speaker of the epigram describes potential play between Eros and a beloved woman (An.'s woman from Lesbos becoming Heliadora). In line 3 (*HE* 4270), Meleager rouses Heliadora to accept Pothos (whose name here clearly serves as a synonym to Eros; cf. *LIMC* 7.1.501 (J. Bažant) on the lack of differentiation between Eros and Pothos in later sources): ἀλλ' ἄγε συμπαίκεται δέξαι Πόθον. Unnoticed by the interpreters, this is a clear modification of *PMG* 357.10–11, even if, as I suggest, we assume that it is addressed to Dionysus, not to Cleobulus. Interpreted in that way the close of the poem would describe Dionysus' assistance in creating a successful erotic relationship between the speaker and Cleobulus, which is modelled after Dionysus' play with the nymphs and the deities of love as described in the invocation.

There remains the question of whether it can be determined exactly who 'An.'s Eros' is. The most probable candidate would be Cleobulus: in l. 1 Eros (clearly to be taken as a god) appeared as one of Dionysus' partners in playing.

²²¹ In spite of the construction σφαίρη... με... | βάλλων (not μοι) in *PMG* 358.1–2 which does not exclude that the ball is being caught; cf. ps.Pl. *FGE* 590–1 = *AP* 5.79.1–2, quoted above.

This 'playing together' is described by συμπαίζουσιν (l. 4) and is picked up by σύμβουλος (10), which, however, now describes a relation between Dionysus and Cleobulus. Since, as we have seen, δέχεσθαι too seems to belong to the imagery of συμπαίζειν, it is tempting to see Cleobulus in τὸν ἐμὸν δ' ἔρωτα. Interpreted in that way, Dionysus would be requested to repeat the συμπαίζειν in the mountains, not with Eros the god, but with Cleobulus, who is called An.'s Eros because he is the person whom An. loves (whether the narrator himself wishes to be part of this repeated playing we are not told, but we can assume that he does).²²² Taken this way, the poem provides another example of the identification of Eros, the god of love, and the beloved boy, a technique well known from Hellenistic epigrams (Asclep. *HE* 906–7 = *AP* 12.75 with Sens 2011: 140, Mel. *HE* 4476–9 = *AP* 12.76, Asclep. *HE* 992–5 = *AP* 12.77, Mel. *HE* 4442–5 = *AP* 12.78, anon. *HE* 3768–9 = *AP* 12.111), but to be found already in Ibyc. *PMG* 287, where the description of Eros' glance resembles that of a beloved (see Wilkinson 2013: 234 and my general introd., § 2, 'Themes'). The technique also occurs in An.: in *PMG* 379 (uncertain as extent and wording of the quotation may be) Eros glances at the speaker's grey beard and flies past. Thus he behaves very similar to a beloved (cf. *PMG* 358.6–8, 360.4). It is striking that the quoting source of *PMG* 379, Luc. *Herc.* 8, speaks of ὁ Ἔρως ὁ σός (referring to An). It is true that 'your Eros' could be interpreted as 'the Eros as depicted in your poem' here, but perhaps also in this poem An. used the phrase 'my Eros', pointing to his beloved. This would be a close parallel to the end of *PMG* 357 according to the proposed interpretation. It should be added that the metonymy 'love for the beloved', common in *amor* in Latin (*ThLL* s.v. *amor* 1.1970.16–29) is much harder to find in Greek, but cf. *AP* 12.162.2 = Asclep. *HE* 913 where οὐμὸς Ἔρως is at least initially ambiguous since apart from denoting Eros as a person it means the speaker's desire (as in Call. *HE* 1039 = *AP* 12.102.5) as well as the beloved boy (Sens 2011: 149). Cf., moreover, anon. *HE* 3662 = *AP* 12.104.1, Οὐμὸς ἔρως παρ' ἐμοὶ μενέτω μόνω, with Gow/Page 1965: ad loc. and Sens 2011: 144, who convincingly adduces the passage as a variation of the motif of Eros as a fugitive, Mel. *HE* 4266 = *AP* 5.166.7 (in a question directed to the unfaithful Heliadora), ἢ νέος ἄλλος ἔρως, νέα παίγνια; (where Gow/Page 1965: ad loc. translate παίγνια with 'darling, pet'), later Alciph. 4.7.8 (p. 116.15 Schepers), ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως Εὐθύδημε;²²³ similar πόθος in anon. *HE* 3770–1 = *AP* 12.152, Μάγνης Ἡράκλειτος, ἐμοὶ πόθος;²²⁴ φιλότης 'darling', e.g. Ath. 671f (the meaning missing in *LSJ*).

²²² Fränkel 1975: 292 came close to this line of interpretation: 'beautiful boys, as captivating as Eros himself, as lively as young animals, wait upon the drinkers'. But this neglects the singular of ἔρως in l. 1 (in order to create a plural, Fränkel invents 'young animals' which are not in the text, however).

²²³ The two examples of ἔρως meaning 'object of love or desire' adduced by *LSJ* s.v. I.2 are difficult; cf. Henry 2005: ad Pi. N. 11.48.

²²⁴ Adduced by *LSJ*, suppl. 1996, s.v., where ἐμός has to be corrected to ἐμοί, however.

PMG 358

§ 1. Source and Pseudo-Biographical Background

Athenaeus found the fragment in the book on Sappho by Chamaeleon (general introd., § 8.2,¹ who reports the view held by some people that PMG 358 was addressed to Sappho and was answered by her in Lesb. fr. adesp. 35 Lobel–Page = PMG 953 (cf. ‘Sources’).

This story serves as another example of an assumed contemporaneity of Sappho and other archaic poets,² as Hermesianax (third cent. BC) maintained in the *Leontion*, fr. 3.47–51 Lightfoot, which draws the picture of a triangular relation in which An. was vexed by the eloquence (*πολυφραδίη*) of Alcaeus’ songs. Both views are rejected by Athenaeus who points out the obvious spuriousness of the alleged Sapphic response and supposes a joke (*ἡγοῦμαι παίζειν*) by Hermesianax, comparing Diphilus’ *Sappho* (fr. 70–1 K.–A.), in which the poetess had an affair with Archilochus and Hipponax. The whole passage illustrates well the tendency of the later biographical tradition (probably starting with comedy) to construct personal erotic relationships between archaic poets even by assuming adventurous chronologies. In this case (as often elsewhere) the anecdotal fiction was obviously stimulated by an original text, identifying the ‘girl from Lesbos’ with Sappho. Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the idea of rivalry with another man, which is so present in the passage from Hermesianax, can be drawn also from the last line of PMG 358 (if it definitely refers to a man),³ although the fragment is not quoted by Athenaeus in order to explain the erotic triangle as depicted by Hermesianax.

Although the ‘Sapphic’ reply contains several elements of PMG 358 (An. represented as an old man, the homeland of beautiful women, albeit here Teos), it is difficult to see how this could be a suitable reply to An.’s verses. It is, then, an independent creation which shows that there was pseudepigraphical poetry (adopting Sappho’s metre, but not, as it seems, her dialect) also outside of comedy and Hellenistic elegy (the latter represented by Hermesianax), based on an alleged contemporaneity of Sappho and An.

¹ On Chamaeleon’s method in this passage see Schorn 2018: 58–9, on whose reading it is probable that Chamaeleon himself did not believe in the truth of the anecdote.

² For the juxtaposition of Sappho and An. see Yatromanolakis 2007: 222–4.

³ But even if l. 8 is about another woman this might be reflected in ll. 51–2 of the Hermesianax fragment where ‘honey-sweet Anacreon contended for her, | As she withdrew among the many Lesbian women’ (tr. Pitts 2002: 113).

§ 2. Metre

Two stanzas, each consisting of three glyconics, followed by a pherecratean as clausula. The same form of stanza occurs in An. PMG 360–2 where in each case, however, only one stanza has survived. For the combination of glyconics and pherecrateans in An. cf. general introd., § 6 ‘Metre’.

§ 3. Completeness and Structure

The first line of the fragment is most probably also the first of the poem, since *δηῖτε* occurs in the first lines of several quotations by Hephaestion, whose wont it is to give the very opening of a poem (PMG 376.1, 394b, 400.1, 413.1, 428.1). Whether the poem ends after the second stanza we can say less confidently, but the *ἀπροσδόκητον* of *χάσκει* would serve well as the point of the complete poem. The manner of Athenaeus’ quotation of the lines does not give a clue as to whether they represent a complete poem.⁴

Similarly to PMG 388 (cf. introd. to that poem, § 3) bipartite and tripartite structures overlap in this poem: in each stanza three persons appear (identical persons if the hair mentioned in l. 8 were to belong to Eros). The three epithets of the first stanza (only two of which belong to persons, since *με* is without epithet⁵ and *πορφυρῇ* goes with *σφαίρῃ*) concern aspects of colour (as do *κυανώπιδες* and *πορφυρῇ* in PMG 357.2–3) and are arranged chiasmatically (as are the epithets in PMG 357.1–3). The similarity to PMG 357 is highlighted by l. 6, where an initial *συμπαίζειν* together with a directly juxtaposed verb forms a whole line (cf. the similar structure of PMG 357.4). As Wirth 1964: 296 observed, the epithets of the first stanza show a growing number of syllables, while the two adjectives of the second stanza (5 *εὐκτίτου* and 7 *λευκῇ*) become shorter (perhaps corresponding to the length of the two *γάρ*-clauses). This might reflect the growing atmosphere of expectation in the first stanza, culminating in the last word *προκαλεῖται*, and the narrator’s sobering up in the second, leading to the final *χάσκει*. The two stanzas form a clear bipartite structure even if the poem were continued, since there is a clear contrast on several levels of content (cf. similar divisions into two equal parts in PMG 395 and perhaps 356a and b, and two unequal parts in PMG 388 and 417). Stanza 1 describes an impulse towards the girl, stanza 2 the rejection by the girl; the world of the first stanza is dominated by the god, who has disappeared in the second one (unless his hair is meant in l. 8 cf. § 4). The language of the first stanza is highly metaphorical and is focused onto colours by the epithets, while the second (apart from the epic-sounding first parenthesis) is rather plain, has an almost vulgar

⁴ Thus e.g. Wilamowitz 1913: 116, Davison 1968: 254–5, Vetta 1999: 217, differently Hutchinson 2001: 273 who points to the possibility that the poem was combined with ‘reflections on the incident’.

⁵ On the effect of which see below, § 4.

tone at the end with *χάσκειν*, and only mentions the *lack* of colours of the narrator's white hair. These contrasts serve to illustrate the narrators' shift from hopeful desire to disappointment.

§ 4. General Interpretation

Three persons are involved in the action of the first stanza: Eros, the narrator, and the girl. Three persons are involved in the second stanza as well: the girl, the narrator (represented by his hair), and another person (also represented by his hair). That this other person is identical with Eros (or that this is at least a possible understanding suggested by the poem) is an attractive assumption for the following reasons:

- (i) 6b–7a *κόμην*, | *λευκή*, of the narrator's hair, picks up 2 *χρυσόκομης*, of Eros, allowing the attractive quality of the god's hair to be recalled just before another head of hair is mentioned in l. 8. Thus it would be most easy to think that this hair belongs to Eros who, as we heard in l. 1, is in the presence of the narrator and the girl.
- (ii) The choice of *τις* could then be explained as a variation of religious euphemism (cf. *LSJ* II.3 for the usage of *τις* 'in reference to a definite person whom one wishes to avoid naming'). Of course this euphemism would be ironic, since the god has already been named in l. 2.
- (iii) A hidden reference to Eros in l. 8 would create a kind of ring composition (all the more so if the poem is complete): after being the dominating actor in the first stanza, he disappears in the first three lines of the second only to reappear in the last line.
- (iv) Taken this way the poem would provide a structural parallel to that of *PMG* 357, provided that my interpretation of 357.10 *τὸν ἐμὸν δ' Ἔρωτ'* is correct. Here too *Ἔρως* is present (although not as dominantly as in 358, since he is in the company of other deities, of whom Dionysus is the most important) and reappears at the end, also in close interaction with the narrator's mortal beloved.

None of these arguments is cogent, however, and the general interpretation of *PMG* 358 should not be based on this understanding of line 8.

The first stanza represents Eros as arousing the narrator's desire for the girl. Thus he is mainly concerned with the difficult task of establishing an erotic relationship between the narrator and another mortal. In a quite similar way Dionysus is invoked in *PMG* 357 to establish a relationship between the narrator and Cleobulus by 'giving good advice'.⁶ As I try to show (cf. introd. to *PMG* 357, § 6 'Structure'), this relationship appears as a repetition of the *συμπαίζειν*

⁶ The similarities to *PMG* 357 in metre and wording (*συμπαίζειν*, *πορφυρέος*) as well as personnel (Eros) are obvious.

Dionysus performed in the mountain. Thus both fragments draw a picture of a successful relationship between the narrator and a beloved young person as a kind of 'playing together', which, as something difficult, needs the assistance or the initiative of god. The girl however does not respond to this desire (7 *καταμέμφεται*) but herself gapes at another head of hair, probably a man's hair that is still black (or golden, cf. above). So the poem's main oppositions concern the narrator's and the girl's desire, described in a very different style.

The whole scene highlights the narrator's separation from the other actors and his lack of power: in the first stanza he talks about himself only by using a one-syllable enclitic pronoun without epithet or any other supplement. On the other hand Eros and the girl as well as the ball get lavish epithets, which all refer to colours and splendid appearances. In the second stanza the narrator only appears metonymically reduced to his hair, which is white (i.e. colourless), whereas a distinguished Homeric epithet is added to the girl's home-island of Lesbos. The narrator's lack of colour is due to his old age, which also separates him from all other persons of the poem. In An.'s time Eros has to be imagined as a young man. The etymology of the very word which denotes the girl (*νήνις*) stresses the idea of youth, and whoever is meant by *ἄλλην τινά* in l. 8, his or her hair is certainly different from the narrator's because of less advanced age.

The motif of unrequited love is elsewhere, even before An., described in the image of the complementary pair of pursuit and flight, most famously in Sapph. fr. 1.21 V., *καὶ γὰρ αἰ φεύγει, ταχέως διώξει*, and later in Call. *AP* 12.102 = *HE* 1035–40 and Theoc. 6.17. Yet insofar the girl from Lesbos not only rejects the narrator (and thus probably 'flees' him), but at the same time longs for someone else (*χάσκει*, 8), the fragment appears as an early example of the pattern 'A loves B, but B loves C', not necessarily implicit in the image of pursuit and flight. The most distinctive and extensive adaptation is Mosch. fr. 2 Gow, but it occurs also in the later lyric tradition, cf. Hor. *carm.* 1.33.5–7 *Insignem tenui fronte Lycorida | Cyri torret amor, Cyrus in asperam | declinat Pholoen*, similar *carm.* 4.11.21–4, later e.g. Lib. *Progymn.* 2.39.1. Since *χάσκειν* often denotes unfulfilled and vain longing for someone (cf. comm. ad loc., and Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010: 170, referring *inter alia* to Aes. 417 Perry) the girl's desire (especially if the poem ended with *χάσκειν*, which is probable, cf. § 3) appears as futile as the narrator's longing for her; thus what she experiences is the same 'hate' (to use the words from Mosch. fr. 2.6 Gow) that the narrator has suffered from her. If this interpretation is followed, the girl's suffering would be the same as the narrator's (and probably also caused by Eros' power). This would add a further aspect to *δηῦτε* in l. 1, which stresses the regular recurrence of the narrator's erotic experience: we learn that this experience recurs not only in the biography of one subject, but simultaneously in the lives of others.⁷

⁷ One might compare Heinrich Heine's famous poem 'Ein Jüngling liebte ein Mädchen' (1822) which starts with the 'A loves B, B loves C' pattern and stresses the idea of repetition: 'Es ist eine

The fundamental situation of these lines reappears in other fragments of An.:⁸ if Eros invites the narrator to play with the girl (PMG 358.1–4):

μὲ... Ἔρως νήνι... συμπαίξειν προκαλεῖται.

This appears as a figurative version of what seems to be expressed in PMG 402a:

ἔραμαι (δέ) τρι συνηβάν,

Note the similar formation of *συμπαίξειν* and *συνηβάν*, both with a second element meaning youth.⁹ PMG 378.2 οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ (–) θέλει συνηβάν shows how such a wish is rejected (as is the wish for *συμπαίξειν* in PMG 358). It is remarkable that Eros appears in the latter fragment, too, perhaps also showing traits of the beloved as in PMG 358.¹⁰ A similar technique of description appears in PMG 379 where according to the quoting source, Luc. *Herc.* 8, An.'s Eros (ὁ Ἔρως ὁ σός, ὦ Τῆϊε ποιητά) 'on wings of shining gold' (χρυσοφαέννων πτερύγων) flies past having had a glance at (the narrator's) grey beard. Thus also here the narrator seems to be rejected because of his old age (illustrated by his beard). Also here Eros is involved, this time probably representing the beloved person directly. PMG 418 provides another interesting parallel: κλυθίμεο γέροντος, εὐέθειρα χρυσόπεπλε κοῦρα. The line has been taken by some interpreters (Tsomis 2001: 65–7) as a prayer to a goddess, mainly because *χρυσόπεπλος* is only applied to female deities elsewhere (cf. n. ad loc.). But given the fact that we frequently observe the merging of gods and beloveds in An.,¹¹ the addressee might well be a mortal girl,¹² styled as Artemis (like Nausicaa in *Od.* 6) or Aphrodite (who is never called *κόρη* or sim., however). Then it would be remarkable how many elements are in the line which we just observed in An.: a narrator who is old (metonymically illustrated by his grey hair) and tries to bridge the gap between him and a younger beloved, in this

alte Geschichte, | Doch bleibt sie immer neu. I owe the line to Wirth 1964: 295 who, however, adduced it only in order to illustrate *δηδτε* without drawing further conclusion.

⁸ These resemblances should prevent us from following Wirth 1964, who doubted the authenticity of the fragment and regarded it as a product of Middle Comedy which could be responsible for a distorted image of Sappho. None of his arguments, however, is convincing: he tries to demonstrate that the division into two parts, which he shows to be a common feature of An.'s poems, is atypical nevertheless, since in our fragment there is a development between the first and the second parts. But apart from the fact that PMG 417 does show a development (first the filly shrinks away from the narrator, then it is frolicking in the meadow), the basis of the text seems to be too small to deduce any firm rules about a typically individual style of An.'s. The same is the case with Wirth's hypothesis that the fragment's image of Eros, who first stimulates the narrator and then deserts him, is too negative to be by An. Welcker 1857: 230–2 thought only the second stanza to be spurious, without good reason either. Smyth 1900: 288 justly points out that the stanza must have been at least as old as the anecdote about An. and Sappho to which it gave rise.

⁹ Cf. PMG 378.2 n. for the usage of *συνηβάν*. The relationship of *συμπαίξειν* and *συνηβάν* was already pointed out by Wirth 1964: 304 n. 7.

¹⁰ Wilkinson 2013: 234 with more parallels and doxography.

¹² Thus Weber 1895: 79, Bowra 1961: 305, West 1970: 209.

¹¹ Cf. PMG 378.2 n.

case by means of a prayer. On the other hand the girl is characterized by beautiful hair and splendid appearance, just as if she combines the traits of Eros and the girls in PMG 358 (χρυσοκόμης, ποικιλοσανδάλω).

PMG 417, the poem on the Thracian filly can also be compared in this context. Again we have the grouping of a young girl (πῶλε 1, incidentally also characterized by her homeland) and a narrator who certainly is older, since he can pretend to be more experienced in love (l. 2). His offer to 'ride' the girl and to wheel her round the turning-post can be regarded as analogous to the attempt to play ball with the girl from Lesbos, since both activities are symbols of successful erotic or sexual interaction. In PMG 417 the gap between narrator and girl appears to be deeper because of the girl's being a horse, whereas in PMG 358 the girl is human; by the use of *χάσκειν*, however, which is often applied to animals (cf. n. ad loc.), a similar strategy might be followed. Instead of interacting with the older narrator in both poems the girl seems to prefer partners who are more akin to her: in PMG 358 a man closer in age to herself and in PMG 417 probably implied in the image of the meadows in which the filly might not be frisking all by herself.¹³ In this respect Hor. *carm.* 2.5 is enlightening. A clear adaptation of PMG 417 (cf. introd. to PMG 417, § 6), it describes the calf's inability to come together with the narrator, and at the same time has her longing (9 *praegeſtientis*) to play (*ludere*) with the other calves (being of her own species, unlike the human narrator). Although immaturity does not play a role in PMG 358 (unlike in PMG 417 and Hor. *carm.* 2.5) the use of strong verbs of desire (*χάσκει* in PMG 358.8 and *praegeſtientis* in Hor. *carm.* 2.5.9), each with objects different from the narrator, might be a significant parallel.

§ 5. Pragmatic Interpretation

Some interpreters (e.g. Wilamowitz 1913: 116–17,¹⁴ Wirth 1964: 297, Davison 1968: 248–50) maintained that the poem could be understood only if a sympotic setting of its action is assumed. This view has to be rejected (as more recent critics like Pfeijffer 2000: 170–1 or Hutchinson 2001: 273 do, although on the basis of only partly convincing arguments). For instance, the choice of the epithet *ποικιλοσαμβάλω* (l. 3) had been explained (by Wilamowitz 1913: 116 and Campell 1982: 320) as identifying the girl among the others present at the symposium. But as shown below (n. ad loc.) the choice of the adjective can be completely understood from its function to characterize the girl as elegant and fastidious and to assimilate her to the colourful and splendid sphere of Eros

¹³ If ἄλλην τίνα in 8 refers to a girl (as has been suggested by many interpreters (cf. n.) this might be another point of resemblance shared against the male narrator. Cf. the meadow image in PMG 346 fr. 1 where the girl joins the herds of Aphrodite's horses.

¹⁴ Note his almost programmatic remark: 'Alles ist einfach, treffend, wahr: darin liegt die Poesie. Man muß nur den Hintergrund mit hinzunehmen, den eine solche Dichtung voraussetzt, denn der Moment hat sie geboren.' For a more detailed bibliography Pfeijffer 2000: 170 n. 24.

(cf. above, § 4). Neither does the last line (no matter whether 'hair' or 'girl' has to be understood with ἄλλην) require an accompanying gesture (as assumed by Wilamowitz 1913: 116 and Wirth 1964: 297). The girl's Lesbian origins suggest that in the present context (perhaps on Samos?) she is a foreigner, and it may well be that she is a Lesbian musician (cf. 6 n.). Such a musician could of course perform at a private symposium, but that is certainly not the only environment in which someone like her can be imagined.¹⁵

Thus one is allowed to say that there is no element in the poem which would require additional information from a pragmatic background in order to be understood.¹⁶ On the other hand one cannot exclude a sympotic setting as some critics tried to do.¹⁷

If the ball game as depicted in ll. 1–4 is real, this would of course be an obstacle to locating it in a symposium, as Pfeijffer 2000: 170–1 points out. But taken in a purely figurative sense (as seems far more probable, cf. n. on ll. 1–4), illustrating the narrator's feelings towards the girl from Lesbos, the action does not restrict the possible settings. So, since nothing in the girl's behaviour could not be attributed to a hetaera present at a symposium (contrast the shy and girlish character of the Thracian filly, cf. introd. to PMG 417, § 5 'Allegorical Meaning') a symposium as dramatic setting, although not necessary, cannot be excluded. But even if such a dramatic setting is not assumed, a convivial setting of performance remains probable for other reasons, such as the formal and conceptual resemblance to PMG 357 for which a performance in a symposium is probable (cf. introd. to PMG 357, § 4 'Hymnic Elements').

§ 6. Models and Similar Earlier Texts

§ 6.1. Homer

The fragment shows a complex intertextual play with the ball scene in the encounter between Nausicaa and Odysseus in *Odyssey* 6, as observed by Davison 1968: 253–4, Davidson 1987: 134–5, Pace 1996, and most recently by Pfeijffer 2000: 181–4. The link is confirmed not so much by verbal echoes (cf. *Od.* 6.100 σφαίρη ται δ' ἄρ' ἔπαιζον with An. PMG 358.1 and 4 σφαίρη...συμπαίζειν, although in An. noun and verb are not connected syntactically; there is a closer verbal link to another Phaeacian ball scene, *Od.* 8.372–3a (of Halius and Laodamas) οἱ δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν σφαῖραν καλὴν μετὰ χερσὶν ἔλοντο, | πορφυρέην) as by an analogous action and grouping of characters: a god (Athena/Eros) somehow causes a ball to arouse a male character's (Odysseus'/the narrator's) attention to

¹⁵ Davison 1968: 248–50 gives a very detailed but highly speculative pragmatic interpretation of the poem's action as part of a *pannychis*; cf. comm. on ll. 1–4.

¹⁶ Thus e.g. Pfeijffer 2000: 171.

¹⁷ Hutchinson 2001: 27, finds it problematic to reconcile the poem's triangle situation with what we know about symposia. But this view is based on the assumption that l. 8 refers to a girl, cf. n.

a girl (Nausicaa/the girl from Lesbos).¹⁸ But whereas the princess is really fascinated by the stranger (that she has fallen in love with him is not mentioned explicitly in the *Odyssey*, but there are some passages which can be read in this sense, cf. Pfeijffer's (2000: 182–3) collection) while Odysseus has no deeper feelings for Nausicaa, the Anacreontic narrator's desire for the girl is rejected immediately.¹⁹

Since Odysseus will leave Nausicaa for Penelope later, he even resembles the girl from Lesbos who 'gapes after another' head of hair (or, less probably, girl, cf. n.). The main purpose of this Homeric background, then, seems to be to highlight the failure of the Anacreontic narrator by means of a mock-heroic and self-ironic contrast, something to which the differences in outer appearance might also contribute: An.'s speaker is rejected because of his white hair whereas Odysseus' appearance, at least after the make-over by Athena (*Od.* 6.229–49), is full of splendour, which makes him resemble Eros and the girl from Lesbos, who are opposed to the narrator's colourlessness in PMG 358 (cf. above, § 4 'General Interpretation'); cf. the motif of gold in the simile of *Od.* 6.323 (with χρυσοκόμης in PMG 358.1) and the comparison with a god in 6.243.

§ 6.2. Ibycus PMGF 287

Among the pieces of archaic lyric poetry dealing with old age, especially with its relation to love (e.g. Pi. fr. 123 Maehler), Ibyc. PMGF 287, composed by a probably slightly older contemporary, shows the most interesting parallels, although a direct influence cannot be proved.²⁰

Ἔρος αὐτέ με κυανέοισιν ὑπὸ
βλεφάροις τακέρ' ὄμμασι δερκόμενος
κηλήμασι παντοδαποῖς ἐς ἅπει-
ρα δίκτυα Κύπριδος ἐσβάλλει.
ἦ μὰν τρομέω νιν ἐπερχόμενον,
ὥστε φερέζυγος ἵππος ἀεθλοφόρος ποτὶ γήρᾳ
ἀέκων σὺν ὄχεσφι θοοῖς ἐς ἄμιλλαν ἔβα.

Lines 1–4 contain an image similar to that of An.'s first stanza, describing Eros's impact on the narrator, with αὐτε in the second position of the first line (it is probable that Ibycus' poem, too, starts with l. 1), stressing the repetitiveness of the action. Note how here too the narrator is reduced to an enclitic personal pronoun, immediately following αὐτε just as με leans against δηῦτε in An. Ibycus' image of Eros entangling the speaker in Aphrodite's hunting net stresses even more the passivity of the speaker. A beloved person corresponding to An.'s

¹⁸ There are of course differences in the details: Athena does not throw the ball herself, Odysseus is not hit by the ball, but awakes because of the shouting girls, etc.

¹⁹ Davison 1968: 254 wittily says that he becomes a rejected Hera, but there is no concrete evidence for that association in the text.

²⁰ Cf. Wilamowitz 1913: 125–6; Monaco 1958: 178 or Tsomis 2001: 258–9.

girl from Lesbos does not occur in Ibycus, but Eros 'with his dark eyelids' probably shows features of the boy who arouses the feelings in the narrator (for this technique elsewhere and as a possible interpretation in An. PMG 358.8, cf. above, § 4 'General Interpretation'). The second part then focuses on the narrator who now is the grammatical subject (albeit only of a verb of fear) and compares himself to an experienced horse near old age (l. 6) which shies away from entering the race contest. Thus also here love is perceived as a kind of sportive game (for the image of the race in particular cf. An. PMG 417.4 n.). As in An., then, a strong erotic impulse (ll. 1–4) is confronted with an obstacle to that impulse (ll. 5–7). But whereas in PMG 358 it lies in the rejection by the beloved, here it comes from inside the narrator who, because he has experienced Eros' power so often, takes fright at it; although, as ll. 1–4 tell us, he is driven by Eros' power nevertheless. So here the motif of old age in l. 6 (if we are allowed to infer from it the old age of the narrator himself) stresses the aspects of experience rather than of an unattractive appearance.

§ 7. Afterlife

At the beginning of the third book of the *Argonautica* (131–44), Apollonius of Rhodes has Aphrodite bribe her son Eros with a splendid ball which is described in detail and obviously is supposed to symbolize Eros' universal power by drawing on Pre-Socratic, especially Empedoclean, concepts of the cosmos (Hunter 1989a: ad loc.). That this scene is a transformation of An.'s imagery of PMG 358.1–4 into a concrete action becomes probable when one considers that the preceding scene can also be traced back to a metaphor of An.: Aphrodite finds Eros playing knucklebones together with Ganymede. Although Apollonius may have had in mind also artistic representations (cf. Hunter 1989: ad 115–18), the close collocation with the ball scene makes it probable that this harks back to An. PMG 398 (ἀσπραγάλαι δ' Ἐρωτός εἰσιν | μανίαι τε καὶ κυδοιμοί). For a detailed analysis of this Hellenistic transformation of two Anacreontic metaphors into two everyday scenes of typical Hellenistic pictorial vividness cf. Pretagostini 1990: 232–8, who also draws attention to details of *oppositio in imitando*, for instance in the colours which also play an important role in Apollonius' description of the ball (137–40): 'Golden are its zones (κύκλα), and two circular joints (ἀψίδες) curve around each; the seams [between the zones] are concealed as a twisting dark blue (κυανέη) pattern plays over all of them' tr. Hunter 1989a: ad loc.); later, in 141, it is compared to a shining star. This differentiation is certainly due to a 'scientific' perspective on the ball which now represents the cosmos, but it may also be no mere coincidence²¹ that κυανέος is the colour of Eros' eyelids in Ibyc. PMGF 287.1–2, which is closely related to our fragment. Such a reference would even be more probable given the fact

²¹ Not noted by former commentators as far as I can see.

(as reported by the scholia on 3.114–17b, p. 220 Wendel = Ibyc. PMGF 289) that in the Ganymede scene Apollonius looked back to Ibycus' account of the boy's rape.

There are clear adaptations of the fragment in Hellenistic epigrams, probably favoured by the epigrammatic structure of the lines, which becomes most distinct in the ἀπροσδόκητον function of χάσκει. One impressive example is Asclep. AP 5.158 = HE 824–7:

Ἐρμιόνη πιθανῇ ποτ' ἐγὼ συνέπαιζον ἐχούσῃ
ζωνίον ἐξ ἀνθέων ποικίλον, ὦ Παφίη,
χρύσεια γράμματα ἔχον. "Διόλου," δ' ἐγέγραπτο, "φίλει με
καὶ μὴ λυπηθῆς, ἦν τις ἔχῃ μ' ἔτερος."

This first-person account opens with the motif of 'playing with' (1 συνέπαιζον ~ 4 συμπαίζειν in An.) a girl and ends with the warning inscribed on the girl's girdle that the narrator may feel distress at being replaced by another (4 τις...ἔτερος corresponding to ἄλλην τινά in An.'s line 8).²²

An even clearer reworking of our fragment can be found in combination with echoes from the Dionysus hymn, PMG 357²³ (which is so closely related to PMG 358), in Meleag. AP 5.214 = HE 4268–71:

Σφαιριστὰν τὸν Ἐρωτα τρέφω· σοὶ δ' Ἥλιοδώρα,
βάλλει τὰν ἐν ἐμοὶ παλλομένην κραδίαν.
ἀλλ' ἄγε συμπαίκεται δέξαι Πόθον· εἰ δ' ἀπὸ σεῦ με
ρίψαις, οὐκ οἶσω (P: οἶσει Stadtmüller) τὰν ἀπάλαιστρον ὕβριν.

The allusion to An. is beyond doubt.²⁴ The initial σφαιριστὰν picks up the (probably) first word of PMG 358, while βάλλει recalls βάλλων in the same position of the second line, Meleager's συμπαίκεται in 3 modifies συμπαίζειν in An.'s line 4. A main variation (apart from the combination with PMG 357) concerns the passivity of the speaker, which is, as we have seen, already a central topic of the Anacreontic mode. After starting as Eros' trainer, and thus seemingly in a active position,²⁵ the speaker gradually becomes more passive, first when the ball is identified with his heart (in l. 2), then, when he is even totally identified with the ball in l. 3. After this, the phrase οὐκ οἶσω in l. 4 only appears to be a powerless and desperate warning.²⁶

Within the corpus of the *Anacreontea*, old age and its consequences for love, life, and the relation with younger people is a frequent theme, in general treated with greater optimism than in the original An.: *Anacreont.* 7 W. starts with a

²² For a further analysis, stressing that the Asclepiadean narrator appears more sophisticated than this Anacreontic model, cf. Sens 2010: 20–1.

²³ Cf. introd. to PMG 357, § 7.

²⁴ Pretagostini 1990: 231.

²⁵ But note that τρέφειν, in the sense of 'have within oneself, contain' (LSJ s.v. II.6) can govern a disease or an emotion as object, e.g. S. Ph. 795 νόσον, Tr. 28 φόβον.

²⁶ With Stadtmüller's οἶσει, Pothos would be the subject and the narrator would even totally disappear in the main clause.

reproach by 'the women' of the speaker's bald head, thus modifying the Lesbian girl's criticism of the narrator's white hair in PMG 358.7. But whereas An.'s poem seems to end in despair, the speaker of the *Anacreontea* expresses the conviction that τὸ τέρπνα παίζειν (10, ~ PMG 358.4 συμπαίζειν) is the more fitting as death (Μοίρη) comes closer (perhaps thinking of the closeness of Hades as described in PMG 395). For a similar attitude towards 'grey old age' cf. *Anacreont.* 53 W.; for the narrator challenged by Eros to a fight, although with weapons, cf. *Anacreont.* 13 W.²⁷

1–4 Eros throws a ball at the narrator in order to make him play (which means play ball) with a girl. Nothing is said about whether the girl has already been playing alone or with Eros and/or other girls. At any event, the narrator has not been involved up to this point (the accusative με (1) suggests that he does not expect the ball and thus is not ready to catch it; contrast the dative σοι in Meleager's imitation AP 5.214 = HE 4268–71, on which cf. introd., § 7). The image makes use of the eroticism of girls playing ball (Nausicaa and her girls play ball when she meets Odysseus for the first time, cf. introd., § 6.1); for a later exploitation of the motif cf. Damoxenus fr. 3 K.–A., first adduced in comparison to our passage by Davidson 1987: 135; for the motif in vase paintings from the late sixth cent. onwards Pfisterer-Haas 2003: 168–74.

Eros as a ball player may already have been a current motif in An.'s time, although it is not attested before the end of the fifth cent. (*LIMC* s.v. 'Eros' no. 755: red-figure oinochoé). In any case, the concept of Eros as a player seems to be established before An. (Alcm. PMGF 58 μάργος δ' Ἐρως οἶα <παῖς> παίζειν) and can be found elsewhere in his fragments (ἀσπραγάλαι PMG 398, cf. the stylization as boxer in PMG 346 fr. 4 and 396).²⁸ Whether the lines show the influence of other representations of Eros is difficult to determine, since βάλλειν is a standard word for sending missiles in Homer (cf. comm. on l. 2), and we should bear in mind the image of the god as an archer (although not attested in literature before E. *Med.* 530–1 and in visual art before c.490 BC in a red-figure lekythos by the Brygos Painter, *LIMC* s.v. 'Eros', no. 332). Even more doubtful is the association with the throwing of an apple as a love-challenge as proposed by Woodbury 1979: 279. It is true that the 'purple ball' might evoke the image of an apple, which occurs in erotic imagery before An. (as a simile in Sapph. fr. 105a V. and as an erotic gift in Stes. PMGF 187, probably in a description of Helen and Menelaus' wedding, cf. Davies/Finglass 2014: 327–8 with a rich collection of parallels). But the throwing of an apple as a form of courtship, as we

²⁷ For possible allusions to our fragment in later literature cf. nn. on 4 συμπαίζειν (Theocr.) and προκαλείται (Plato); Acosta-Hughes 2006: 46–7 sees a structural resemblance between Theoc. 6 (Galateia challenging Polyphemos by casting apples at him in the first song, corresponding to the first stanza of PMG 358), not necessarily pointing to direct imitation, though; on a similar pattern in Mosch. fr. 2 Gow, cf. above, § 4.

²⁸ For the later tradition see Pretagostini 1990.

should have to presuppose here, does not seem to be attested before Hellenistic times. The wording of ps.Pl. FGE 590–4 = AP 5.79 τῷ μῆλῳ βάλλω σε is remarkably close to our passage and thus probably influenced by it. This does not prove, however, that the association was already present in the model.

There is a discussion of whether the action as described in this stanza has a literal point of departure or is a completely metaphorical description of the attraction which the girl arouses in the narrator. According to the first interpretation, which was given by Pfeijffer 2000: 166–7 in an extensive and careful analysis (after Davison 1968: 248–50, who in a rather speculative way locates the action in a *pannychis*, and Davidson 1987: 134–6), the girl is really playing ball with others and the ball is deflected inadvertently²⁹ and hits the narrator, who interprets this as a purposeful action on the part of the girl (on whom he must have had his eye before). Therefore the narrator interprets the action as caused by Eros in order to challenge him to 'play with the girl' (in a literal and an erotic sense).³⁰ In the second stanza, however, this turns out to be an illusion, since the girl gapes after another girl (who according to Pfeijffer 2000: 168 is one of her fellow-players). The main problem with this literal interpretation of the action is the fact that it is marked by δηῦτε as something that has happened several times before and occurs with a certain regularity, whereas the deflection of a ball appears to be a single event (justly objected by Pelliccia 1991: 30 n. 3 and unconvincingly rebutted by Pfeijffer 2000: 167 n. 9). Moreover, in this case one would expect rather an aorist participle (βαλὼν) than the present which has to be taken best as iterative (Marcovich 1983: 382–3: 'the love god keeps hitting the poet with his love-ball'). It is one of the advantages of the metaphorical love-ball interpretation (cf. e.g. Pelliccia 1991: 30 n. 3) that it integrates the iterative aspect far better: the narrator experiences Eros' impact as he has done several times before. But the girl longs for another; l. 8 χάσκει would describe a feeling similar to that aroused in the narrator in the first stanza, whereas it would not really fit the behaviour of a girl playing ball, as Davidson 1987: 135 takes it.

Finally, not only the meaning of δηῦτε, but also the tradition of its usage as described in the commentary on PMG 376.1 recommends the metaphorical understanding of the first stanza, since wherever Eros is presented as doing something *again* (δηῦτε or αὔτε) to the subject in archaic poetry, this action must be regarded as figurative and cannot be taken in the sense that the narrator's beloved is the real agent: Alcm. 59a, pouring down and warming the heart, Sapph. fr. 130.1 V., shaking (sc. like a storm cf. fr. 47 V. where there is no δηῦτε, however), Ibyc. PMGF 287, throwings into nets, An. PMG 376.1, the narrator

²⁹ Thus Pfeijffer 2000: 167 (*contra* Davidson 1968: 249–50) who rightly says that a deliberate throwing by the girl would contradict her rejection of the narrator in the second stanza.

³⁰ Pfeijffer 2000: 168 thinks that συμπαίζειν in the literal sense means that the narrator throws the ball back to the player, but νήνι συμπαίζειν προκαλείται suggests that the play is to be ongoing. Pfeijffer himself regards συμπαίζειν in this sense as 'an accurate, though rather exaggerated description'.

jumping from the Leucadian Rock, drunk with Eros, PMG 413, striking like a blacksmith and dipping in cold water. So the audience of PMG 358 is also guided by the tradition to understand the action as a metaphor that describes the narrator's erotic feelings. It is true that the ball play (unlike the actions of the other *δηῦτε/αῦτε* passages listed above) could *theoretically* have the girl as its subject (as is confirmed by the intertextual link to the Nausicaa episode, cf. introd., § 6.1), but this by no means makes it less probable that in our case it is just Eros who plays ball. It only means that here the *illustrans* comes from a sphere close to the *illustrandum* as e.g. when Eros is presented as a blacksmith (An. PMG 413) or a hunter (Ibyc. PMGF 287).³¹ If the motif of Eros playing ball was already established in the visual arts this would further confirm this interpretation (similarly Wilamowitz 1913: 116).

1 *σφαίρη*: Vox 1990: 55 (cf. De Martino/Vox 1996: ad loc.) suggests that for a moment *σφαίρη* might create an ambiguity, since the word can also mean a padded boxing glove (for Eros as a boxer in an erotic context, cf. An. PMG 346 fr. 4 and 396). This seems improbable: apart from the fact that this use of *σφαίρα* is not attested before Pl. *Lg.* 830b 4 (cf. *LSJ* s.v. 2 with supplement), the figure of Eros (needed to evoke the image) appears after *πορφυρή* which by means of the intertextuality with *Od.* 8.373–4 and of *βάλλων* clearly suggests the meaning 'ball'.

δηῦτε: The mss. of Athenaeus have *δεῦτέ με* ('hitherto', plural of *δεῦρο*), which does not make sense in this descriptive context since it is normally joined with an explicit or implicit imperative (cf. *Lfgre* 2.256.68, W. Beck). Moreover, the use of *δηῦτε* in similar contexts which, probably at the beginning of poems, describe Eros' impact in a highly figurative language (cf. PMG 376.1 n. and 428.1 n.) suggests the same adverb here; the form *δεῦτε* occurs in the Athenaeus manuscripts of PMG 356a.6, but they have *δηῦτε* in PMG 356b.1 (cf. Weber 1895: 41–2 who tries to defend the reading *δεῦτε* at all locations in An.).

πορφυρή (for the spelling general. introd., § 9) recalls *Od.* 8.372–3 (the Phaeacians playing ball) *σφαίραν καλὴν...πορφυρέην* and thus contributes to the Homeric colouring, supporting the intertextuality with the Nausicaa episode (cf. introd., § 6.1), where, however, the adjective does not occur. On the problems of determining the meaning of the adjective see PMG 357.3 n.,³² where it is used of Aphrodite (probably her garment). This highlights the appropriateness of a purple ball to Aphrodite's son, Eros, whose chlamys is purple in Sapph. fr. 54 V. As in PMG 357 (cf. l. 2 *Νύμφαι κυανώπιδες*) the adjective is connected with other terms of colour (2 *χρυσόκομης*, 3 *ποικιλοσαμβάλω*, 7 *λευκή*), which appear together with it also elsewhere, usually to give the impression of precious splendour (e.g. *πορφύρεος* with *ποικίλος* in *Il.* 22.441, with *χρύσεος* in *Il.* 24.795–6, all three adjectives in Sapph. fr. 44.9–10 V.). Yet the purple

³¹ But note that even here Eros' eyes probably resemble those of the beloved, cf. introd., § 4.

³² Also PMG 347 fr. 1.18 n.

colour of the ball is not a purely fantastic motif, since ancient balls were often filled with hair and other materials which were wrapped with pieces of coloured cloth (S. Laser in *Archaeologica HomERICA* T 3: 93). Eros' ball may, then, be made from the remnants of a noble garment and thus characterize the distinction of the social environment.

2 *βάλλων*: For the construction of the verb with accusative of the person aimed at and instrumental dative cf. Homeric battle scenes, e.g. *Il.* 20.288 *ἐπεσσύμενος βάλε πέτρῳ* (*Lfgre* 2.32.26–35, A. Mette/W. Beck). In *Od.* 6.116 *ἐμβαλε* is used of throwing a ball. A similar use of the verb might be found in *P.Oxy.* 3722 fr. 21.8 col. i β]άλλει μὴ μ(ε). The verb *βάλλειν* is used of Eros' striking his victim in *Anacreont.* 26.7, 35.16 W.

χρυσόκομης: The adjective is used of Eros (E. *IA* 548, Eros sending his missiles, later *χρυσιχαίτας* in *Anacreont.* 43.12 and *χρυσοκομοῦσιν ἄμφω* in a comparison between roses and Eros in Philostr. *epist.* 55), but also of other gods, such as Dionysus (Hes. *Th.* 947) or, most frequently, Apollo (e.g. Tyrt. fr. 3a.2 W., *CEG* 308 = 125 Kaczko (elegiacs, Athens c.500–480 BC), cf. Rozokoki 2006: ad loc. and Leo 2015: 81–2, with an exhaustive collection of parallels. Davison's (1968: 248–9) symbolic interpretation, that An. applied the adjective to Eros in order to characterize him as son of Dionysus and Apollo, does not seem necessary. Eros' wings are golden in An. PMG 379a–b where they are in contrast with the narrator's grey beard.

The association of gold with gods is an old and widespread concept which can be found in different Indo-European literatures (West 2007: 153–4), but the quality connects Eros especially with Aphrodite, whose one Homeric stock epithet is *χρυσέη*, e.g. *Il.* 3.64 further *χρυσόστέφαν' Ἀφροδίτα* (note that in our poem Eros' ball has the epithet possessed by Aphrodite in An. PMG 357.3). *χρυσόκομης* stands in pointed contrast with *κόμην, λεύκη γάρ* in ll. 6–7, of the girl from Lesbos prefers (cf. Ibyc. PMGF 287.1–2, *κυανέοισιν ὑπὸ βλεφάρους* (of Eros); for more parallels cf. comm. on PMG 357.11). Moreover, since gold is a symbol of immortality, there is a contrast with the narrator's transience implicit in his white hair (Pfeijffer 2000: 170). This is aptly interpreted by Woodbury 1979: 286 as a symbol of the vitality, endurance, and value of the affection itself (also stressed by *δηῦτε*). For gold in a similar opposition of old and young cf. *χρυσόπεπλε κούρα* in PMG 418, on which see above, introd., § 4.

3 For other glyconics containing only two words or 'Wortbilder' (more often to be found in the pherecratean, cf. 4 n.) cf. An. PMG 348.1, 5 or 361.3 (like here before a two-word pherecratean).

νήνη: The contracted form (Schwyzer 1939: 241) of *νηνις* occurs only here in literature,³³ but is found in a vase inscription on a red-figured chous (Athens, National Archaeological Museum 1561, Green 1971: pl. 32d), Kretschmer 1894:

³³ But cf. Harder 2012: on Call. *Aet.* fr. 1.11.

144 = AVI 793. *νεᾶνις/νεήνις* is mainly poetic (e.g. *Il.* 18.418 or *Od.* 7.20) and seems to have remained in use in part of Ionic (Wackernagel 1953–79: 2.1171 referring to *Hp. Mul.* 2, 8.250.16 Littré). By its etymology (*νέος*) the word stresses the girl's youth, which she shares with Eros and which contrasts her with the narrator (cf. the phrase *νεάνιδες ἦβαι* *E. Ion.* 477).

ποικιλοσαμβάλω: Seidler's restoration of the adjective is generally accepted, although it is a *hapax*, but cf. other compounds in *ποικιλο-* and *χρυσεοσαμβάλος* *E. Or.* 1468, *IA* 1042. The form *σαμβάλ-* instead of *σανδάλ-* (as in *h. Merc.* 79 and elsewhere) appears in Aeolic and Ionic poetry, cf. Eumelus *PMG* 696.2, *Sapph.* 110 V., *Alc.* 303.1 V., *Hippon. fr.* 32.5 W., *Hdt.* 7.60, *Call. fr.* 631 Pfeiffer, cf. Headlam 1922: 346. Since it is not restricted to Aeolic, it does not seem to allude to the girl's Lesbian origin, as some interpreters like Woodbury 1979: 279 thought (sceptical also is Hutchinson 2001: ad loc.). The epithet may point to coloured strings or ornaments of the sandals (Vetta 1999: ad loc.). For the rare motif of sandals in archaic art, cf. the *Oltos* amphora (Paris, Louvre G 3 = *ARV²* 53, 1, c.520–515 BC, Denoyelle 1994: 103) which shows a naked hetaera, who ties her sandals (compared by Gentili 1973: 128, with photography). Hutchinson 2001: ad loc. reminds us of Phrasiclea's sandals, which might have been very colourful, too. The girl's fancy sandals may be imported from Lydia or Persia as the parallels adduced by Woodbury 1979: 278–9 show, especially *Sapph. fr.* 39 V. who uses *ποικίλος* of a type of Lydian sandals (*ποίκιλος* and derivatives are in general not in Sappho's fragments). At any event, *ποικίλος* not only evokes sophistication (fitting the girl's home in 'well-built Lesbos'), but associates her with the realm of Aphrodite (cf. *Il.* 14.214–15, where the goddess loosens her *κέστον ἱμάντα ποικίλον*, or her epithet *ποικιλόθρονος* in *Sapph. fr.* 1.1 V.). The girl is neither named nor addressed, which gives the impression of the narrator watching her from a great distance (Hutchinson 2001: 273–4, who offers a full collection of addresses of beloved girls and boys (similar to our poem—i.e. speaking about a beloved, not addressing him or her—are *PMG* 373.3, where the text is uncertain however, 357, and 359). Other examples of unnamed girls are *PMG* 373.3 (cf. above) or the Thracian filly in *PMG* 417, of unnamed boys *PMG* 360 (if complete);³⁴ named women are Herotime (*PMG* 346 fr. 1.13), Eurypyle (*PMG* 372), Callicrite (*PMG* 449), and Asteris (if *adesp. PMG* 957 is by An.). Their relationship with the narrator (except Asteris') is unclear, however.

The adjective *ποικιλοσαμβάλω* balances *χρυσόκομης* with which it forms a chiasmus: both are compounds (unlike *πορφυρῇ* in l. 1), and in both the first part describes a colour while the second metonymically focuses on a part of the body: on the head (through the hair) in Eros's case, on the feet (through the sandals) in the girl's case. This creates a contrast between top and bottom. This intratextual relation seems to be the main reason why the girl is characterized by this special epithet. Hence the word does not allow further speculation about a concrete context of the performance as maintained by Wilamowitz

³⁴ Pace Smyth 1900: 288 who maintains: 'The names of boys he does not attempt to conceal.'

1913: 116 ('An. uses the epithet to show which of the girls he picks out on the special occasion') and especially Davison 1968: 249 ('...the essential facts of the situation seem to be that the speaker saw the girl's feet before the rest of her became visible...').

4 A pherecratean which consists of only two words or 'Wortbilder' is a frequent pattern in An.: *PMG* 347.8, 357.3, 8, 359.3, 360.4, 361.4 (here also after a two-word glyconic, cf. above 3 with n.). The combination of a verb of challenging and the infinitive of *συμπαίζειν* governed by it occurs in Theoc. 11.77 (the Cyclops, also an isolated loving 'poet', speaking): *πολλὰι συμπαίσδεν με κόραι, τὰν νύκτα κέλονται* (thus a verb similar to *προκαλείται*, cf. De Martino/Vox 1996: 931).³⁵

συμπαίζειν: For other occurrences of the verb cf. *PMG* 357.4 (where it appears in the same metrical position, juxtaposed to another verb (*ἐπιστρέφει*), as here with *προκαλείται*) and the instances collected there and on *PMG* 417.5 (the simplex *παίζεις*). It is unclear whether the prefix *συμ-* implies that Eros is already playing with the girl, just as he takes part in the play with the other deities in *PMG* 357 (thus Wilamowitz 1913: 116, criticized by Degani/Burzacchini/Magnani 2005: ad loc.).³⁶ At any event the compound implies an interaction of the girl and the narrator as described in the image of reining in other fragments (especially *PMG* 417, but also *PMG* 360) or in the morphologically and semantically similar compound *συνηβάν* (*PMG* 378.2, 402), on the resemblance of which to our fragment see introd., § 4. There are multiple implications of the root *παιδ-* here. First the well-known ambiguity of play (*παίζειν* is the verbum for playing at ball, cf. *Od.* 6.100 *σφαίρῃ...ἐπαιζον*) and erotic play (on which see *PMG* 357.4 n. and 417.4. n) which is present here, all the more so since Eros is involved and the girl's *χάσκειν* seems to correspond to the feeling aroused by Eros (8 n.). Moreover, since we might assume a symposium as the background, the idea of dancing (much stressed by Wilamowitz 1913: 116) is perhaps not absent. In *Od.* 6.100–1 playing ball is closely connected to dance (cf. comm. on *PMG* 357.4). Since our fragment features the opposition of old (narrator) and young (the girl and Eros) in a much higher degree than the other fragments which use (*συμ*)*παίζειν* (*PMG* 357 and 417), the verb also highlights the play as an activity of *young* persons from which the narrator is excluded³⁷ (the use of the similar *συνηβάν* in *PMG* 402, on which see introd., § 4, is comparable).

προκαλείται: In Homer used of challenging to fight (e.g. *Il.* 3.432) but also to sporting competition (e.g. *Od.* 8.142). For the narrator as a competitor of Eros in sports, cf. An. *PMG* 346 fr. 4 and 396 (both fragments concern boxing); note

³⁵ Could the preceding line 76 *εὐρησεῖς Γαλάτειαν ἴσως καὶ καλλίον' ἄλλαν* somehow allude to *PMG* 358.8 *πρὸς δ' ἄλλην τινὰ χάσκει*? The parallel has not been noted by commentators of Theocritus yet.

³⁶ Neither does it seem clear to me that we should assume *συμπαίζειν* to imply that the girl plays with other girls (among them the one at whom she gazes in l. 8, as Pfeiffer 2000: 168 thinks).

³⁷ Well observed by Mace 1993: 347 n. 40.

that in Pl. *Smp.* 217b 7–c 1 Alcibiades uses the verb for his challenge of Socrates: συγγυμνάζεσθαι προκαλούμην αὐτόν. The author of *Anacreont.* 13 draws on the original martial use when applying it to the narrator's and Eros' fight (with weapons): 1.7 μάχη με προκαλείτο (cf. *Il.* 7.39–40, προκαλέσσεται...μαχέσθαι, and 218 προκαλέσατο χάρμη). Contrast *Anacreont.* 16.25–6 W. where the verb denotes the erotic attraction of the beloved's kiss and therefore comes closer to the metaphorical meaning of An.'s image in *PMG* 358.1–4. An influence of our fragment becomes probable given the fact that Eros' sending arrows is described by ἔβαλλ' later in the poem (l. 12). As in the case of the dependent συμπαλίζειν (cf. n.) the verb might have a special relevance against the sympotic background, since it is later used of the συμποσιάρχης ordering others to drink (Crit. fr. 6.6 W., cf. καλέω of the invitation to a drinking party Alc. fr. 368.1 V., cf. De Martino/Vox 1996: ad loc.).

5–8 The new stanza is covered by a whole sentence (as was the first), which is divided into a μέν- (5–7) and a δέ-part. The subject ἡ δ' is separated from its verb καταμέμφεται by two parentheses³⁸ (with the object in between, in l. 6), neither asyndetic, but both connected by γάρ, as in An. *PMG* 429.2 (πάρεστι γάρ ~ ἐστὶν γάρ *PMG* 358.5) and frequently elsewhere.³⁹ As Hutchinson 2001: 277 analysed well, the two parentheses (corresponding to each other not only in γάρ in the second position, but also in the assonance of Λέσβου (6) and λευκή, both at line-beginning) are put into contrast, with the first describing the girl, and the second (far shorter and without any Homeric colouring, unlike εὐκτίτου in 5) the narrator. The different length of the two γάρ-clauses may mirror the relation of the μέν-part (ll. 5–7) and the δέ-part (l. 8) of the second stanza. The whole construction reflects the narrator's nervousness (Marzullo 1967: 158) and fits 'the messiness of reality' (Hutchinson) which he describes in the stanza.

5 ἡ δ': This demonstrative usage of the article (Smyth 1956: 1112) occurs also in An. *PMG* 369. It contrasts the girl's desire for another person with Eros' throwing of the ball, an action symbolizing the narrator's desire for the girl from Lesbos.

ἀπ' denotes the girl's origin as in Alc. *PMGF* 16.5 Σαρδίῳ ἀπ' ἀκρῶν sc. ἡς (= ἡν) (well observed by De Martino/Vox 1996: ad loc.), which adduces the homeland as a proof of refinement, as probably here; cf. 6 n. Another interesting comparandum comes in E. *El.* 707, ἔνατος Ἀθηνῶν θεοδμήτων ἄπο, in an

³⁸ An accumulation of two γάρ-clauses in one stanza also occurs in *PMG* 395.7–12. For two γάρ-clauses in a sentence with a structure very much similar to our passage cf. Ar. *Ec.* 37–9, adduced by Renehan 1984: 31; cf. also Pelliccia 1991: 31; cf. Denniston 1954: 64–5 on different types of successive γάρ.

³⁹ Tyr. 11.1–2 W., Hdt. 1.129.2, more in Schwyzler/Debrunner 1950: 705–6. Around a third of all parentheses in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* are connected with *enim*, *nam*, or a similar causal particle, Albrecht 1964: 58.

enumeration of competitors in the Pythian games, a passage also tinged with epic vocabulary, as pointed out by Harvey 1957: 213 n. 3.

εὐκτίτου: The adjective⁴⁰ has a distinct epic flavour, since Homer often applies εὐκτίμενος or εὐκτίτος (only once) to buildings, streets, cities, or places, among them Lesbos (*Il.* 9.129, Λέσβον εὐκτίμενος, 271, *Od.* 4.342, 17.133).

It has been suggested plausibly that the solemn tone of the adjective fits well the girl's choosiness and arrogance towards the narrator, but also its literal meaning might be relevant here, since its origin from one of the 'well-built = well-fortified' cities of Lesbos might illustrate the narrator's difficulties in 'conquering' the girl herself (first suggested by G. D. Williams in Mace 1993: 348, cf. Pfeijffer 2000: 179–80). Such a meaning could be seen in the tradition of architectural imagery in the description of the female body, especially when 'attacked' by a male, as e.g. in Arch. fr. 196a.21 W.² θρ]ιγκοῦ δ' ἔνερθε καὶ πυλέω. Whether in addition the adjective is a hidden allusion to Polycrates' victory over the Lesbians, when he forced them to dig a ditch around the city walls of Samos,⁴¹ seems very doubtful. εὐκτίτου corresponds with πορφυρῇ (1) in meaning—the positive quality of a material object—as well as in metrical position (the end of the first line of a stanza). On the other hand its elevated tone contrasts with the rude χάσκει, the last word of the last line (Harvey 1957: 213 and Gianotti 1977: ad loc., Hutchinson 2001: ad loc.).

6 Λέσβου: If the background of the poem was Polycrates' Samian court, a possible historical explanation of the girl's origin might be the tyrant's victory over the Lesbians mentioned in Hdt. 3.39.4. In this case the girl perhaps has to be imagined as enslaved and brought to Samos, perhaps in order to serve as an αὐλητρίς,⁴² as Vetta 1999: 217 supposed, but that is by no means necessary, of course. Since the information regarding the girl's home island is connected by the causal particle γάρ, it must somehow explain the girl's behaviour; on such arguments from ethnicity cf. e.g. the similar *PMG* 417.1 with n. on Θρηκίη. There are two such reasons which the girl's Lesbian origin might imply, which do not exclude each other necessarily:

- (i) special elegance and beauty which make her choosy and proud.⁴³ This seems plausible, although admittedly there is no clear evidence that Lesbian women were thought to be especially beautiful; but Achilles' beautiful slaves (*Il.* 9.130 ~ 272 (Λεσβίδας)...αἱ κάλλει ἐνίκων φύλα

⁴⁰ In archaic poetry outside epic only in Bacchylides, who has it several times (e.g. 3.46 or 5.149), Stes. *PMGF* S118.7 and perhaps Simon. *PMG* S 414.14 (Hutchinson 2001: ad loc.).

⁴¹ As suggested by Vetta 1999: 217–18, referring to the story in Hdt. 3.39.4.

⁴² For the quality of Lesbian musicians cf. Sapph. fr. 106 V. and Cratin. fr. 263 K.–A.

⁴³ Cf. especially Woodbury 1979: 282. Note that in the reply which according to Chamaeleon Sappho gave to our fragment, *PMG* 953 (cf. introd., § 1), the idea is connected to An.'s homeland Teos, which is called καλλιγύναικος ἑσθλᾶς...χώρας.

γυναικῶν)⁴⁴ and the reports about Lesbian beauty contests (Alc. fr. 130b.17–18 V., Thphr. fr. 112 Wimmer = 564 Fortenbaugh, Sch. *Il.* 9.129, and Page 1959a: 168 n. 4) seem to be a sufficient basis for such a reputation.

- (ii) a homosexual orientation which makes the girl reject the narrator and prefer a girl (an additional meaning of l. 8., cf. n.). The main objection to this understanding is that evidence for the connection of Lesbos and homosexual love is only late.⁴⁵ Only their preference for fellatio and cunnilingus can be attested earlier, though not in An.'s time, and only in comedy, especially Ar. V. 1345–6, Theopomp. fr. 36 K.–A. (fellatio), Ar. *Ec.* 920 (cunnilingus).⁴⁶ On the other hand it should be taken into account that an image of female homoeroticism was established in Sappho's poetry.⁴⁷ Given the fact that An. imitates Sappho and obviously presupposes his audience's knowledge of her poetry, it cannot be excluded that the girl's Lesbian origin subtly paves the way for the surprising turn of the last line.

τὴν μὲν ἐμὴν κόμην: For the article combined with ἐμός cf. PMG 357.10, n.; for the contrast with χρυσοκόμης in 2, cf. n. ad loc. Given the importance of hair in An.'s erotic poetry (PMG 347.1, introd., § 5, PMG 395.1–2 n.). The focus on the hair here is obvious and κόμη does not have to be interpreted as a synecdoche of the whole person (as Woodbury 1979: 284 wishes, justly criticized by Marcovich 1983: 379 for not adducing suitable parallels). μὲν corresponds with δ' in l. 8. The combination of these particles, which quite frequently occurs in An. (PMG 356a.3–4, 359.1–2, 362.1–2, 388.1/10, 7–8, 395.1/5, 417.3/5), here marks a relatively strong contrast as in PMG 356.a.3–4, 388.1/10, 417.3/5 but not in 362.1–2 or 395.1/5.

7 λευκή γάρ: For the form of parenthesis cf. p. 470. The extreme and unepic shortness (perhaps stemming from ordinary speech) can be paralleled by PMGF Alc. 1.98, σιὰ γάρ, with Hutchinson 2001: ad loc. For λευκός in this context, cf. PMG 395.2, κάρη τε λευκόν, with n.

καταμέμφεται: of the four verba finita of poem all but one (ἐστίν in 5) are at the end of the line (4 προκαλεῖται, 7 καταμέμφεται, 8 χάσκει). This is the

⁴⁴ Strictly speaking the lines only say that Achilles chose the most beautiful of the Lesbian women. Note that in *Il.* 9.129, Lesbos is called well built as it is here in An., ὅτε Λέσβον εὐκτιμένην ἔλεν αὐτός (pointed out by Woodbury 1979: 282).

⁴⁵ It is implicit in Luc. *DMetr.* 5.2 and the use of the word Λεσβία in the sense of a female homosexual which is attested in the tenth cent. by Arethas, as shown by Cassio 1983, refuting the view that the usage is not attested before the nineteenth century.

⁴⁶ Cf. the careful analysis of the relevant passages by Pfeijffer 2000: 173 n. 34. The preference of fellatio would only be relevant to Giangrande's 1968: 112 interpretation of l. 8 which is unconvincing for other reasons, however.

⁴⁷ Page 1959a: 142–3 who adduces e.g. *P.Oxy.* 1800 fr. 1.16–17 (Sappho as γυναικεραστρία) from the later tradition, on this Marcovich 1983: 37–5, Renehan 1984: 30, Pelliccia 1991: 32–3, Hutchinson 2001: 277, Budelmann 2009: 230 and 2018: 195.

earliest occurrence of καταμέμφεσθαι, which seems to be mainly prosaic (but cf. Pi. N. 11.30); the Homeric epics prefer ἐπιμέμφεσθαι, while the simplex occurs from Hes. *Op.* 186 on, in lyric poetry Sapph. fr. 22.15 V., Cor. PMG 664(a).1, An. *P.Oxy.* 3722 fr. 3.5. (probably erotic). On the motif of women blaming an old man because of his hair, cf. *Anacreont.* 7 (introd., § 7).

8 πρὸς δ' ἄλλην τινά: There is a controversy (for an extensive doxography Burzacchini 2001/2: 232–4), as to whether (i) 'hair' (κόμην, from l. 6, paraphrased by Smyth 1900: ad loc. with πρὸς δ' ἄλλου τινὸς κόμην) or (ii) 'girl' has to be understood here (best translated by Campbell 1988 '...and gapes after another—girl'.⁴⁸ There are even (iii) interpreters (like Renehan 1984: 32; 1993: 46) who assume a deliberate ambiguity at this point. As for interpretation (i) there is the variant of referring the phrase not to the hair on the head (which is clearly meant in l. 6), but to the pubic hair either of the narrator himself (the hair is 'another' hair of his, thus Giangrande 1968: 112), or of another man (Gentili 1973: 127). This interpretation cannot explain the use of ἐμὴν in l. 6 since the narrator's pubic hair is of course *his* hair, too.⁴⁹

Gentili tries to avoid this problem by assigning the pubic hair to another man. But that is laying too much into ἄλλην τινά which would include two changes at once (from head to pubic hair and from the narrator to another man). In addition, the relation to the two γάρ-clauses remains unclear, since it would be difficult to understand why the girl, who as a native from Lesbos prefers fellatio, would care about the narrator's head hair (or his age). So the obscene variant of interpretation (i) can be dismissed with confidence. There remains the much easier interpretation as head hair,⁵⁰ which would create a clear contrast with 6, τὴν μὲν ἐμὴν κόμην. Just as the rejected narrator describes himself by means of a synecdoche in 6 now too the preferred rival is represented in the same way (*pace* Budelmann 2018: 195). According to this reading the first γάρ-clause would explain why the girl is so demanding (as a native of the elegant island). The second γάρ-clause (7a) would give the reason why the narrator does not satisfy her demands.⁵¹

⁴⁸ Good doxography in Mace 1993: 348 and Pfeijffer 2000: 171–6. Acosta-Hughes 2006: 46–7 with n. 74 cautiously proposed σφαῖραν as a third option, but given the fact that the word occurred in the first line for the last time, this option can be clearly dismissed. The conjecture ἄλλον (first proposed by Barnes 1705, later by De Pauw 1732, then accepted by Bergk 1843: 669 and Edmonds) is not necessary. However the reasons for it might not have been (at least not exclusively) the prejudice against homosexuality as assumed by Woodbury 1979: 281 or Pfeijffer 2000: 171–2, since linguistic objections can be made against each of the interpretations of the transmitted text.

⁴⁹ First objected by Campbell 1973: 168; Giangrande 1976: 46 n. 4 makes an unconvincing attempt to defend his interpretation by identifying the pubic hair with the narrator's *mentula* which is regarded as a person separate from the narrator himself (a frequent device in the *Carmina Priapea*), who speaks about his own hair in l. 6.

⁵⁰ Monaco 1965: ad loc., Tsomis 2001: 258, Woodbury 1979: 284–5, Wilamowitz 1913: 116.

⁵¹ The objection made by Marcovich 1983: 376 that χάσκειν πρὸς τινα demands an animate object can clearly be rejected (cf. Renehan 1993: 41 n. 4): If Aristophanes in *Nu.* 996–7 can say πρὸς ταῦτα κεχρηγώς (paraphrased by Marchovich with 'both the performance and the charms of the

There remains option (ii), the reference to another girl, preferred especially by more recent interpreters who find the relation of the feminine *πρὸς ἄλλην τινά* to a thing problematical and point to the fact that the *μὲν-δέ* opposition of ll. 6/8 also allows the change from a thing (6 *κόμην*) to a person (sc. *κόρην* 8) e.g. Gerber 1970: ad loc. and Hutchinson 2001: 276. This would give a more specific meaning to the first *γάρ*-clause, i.e. the girl's homosexual orientation (but cf. comm. on l. 6). The second *γάρ*-clause would then offer an alternative reason (the narrator's age, not his sex), the relation of which to the first *γάρ*-clause has been explained differently by the advocates of option (ii).⁵²

All in all option (i) seems inevitable to me. The contrast of the *μὲν-δέ* construction clearly suggests that we are to understand *κόμην* in l. 8.⁵³ This is also confirmed by the fact that the parenthesis *λευκὴ γάρ* in l. 7a still concerns the hair, so that the audience is even more inclined to connect the feminine ending of *ἄλλην* with *κόμην*. That does not mean that a reference to *νήνιν* is linguistically impossible,⁵⁴ but this interpretation should only be chosen if the reference to hair turns out to be unsatisfactory. However, none of the objections made against it seems valid to me:

- (i) On the level of content it was objected that a reference to hair makes the poem 'pointless, even trivial',⁵⁵ since the poet would be describing the normal behaviour of a young girl (i.e. rejecting an older lover). But this objection could be made against most examples of love poetry, which commonly describe very similar topics. What matters aesthetically is whether these conventional themes are depicted in an illuminating and original way. In our poem this is certainly also the case if we refer the last line to another man's hair; since, if the content of the last stanza is seen against the background of the first, the poem does not need an unexpected twist to a homosexual orientation of the girl. It deals with the paradox that one and the same person can arouse desire

dancing girl') there is no reason why An.'s girl should not gape after another head of hair (which stands for the person, after all).

⁵² Page 1959a: 143 n. 3: l. 7 represents the girl's pretended reason, ll. 5–6 turn out to be the real reason in l. 8; this view is somewhat modified by Marcovich 1983: 375 who assumes that the parenthesis in l. 7 is a kind of direct speech, belonging to the 'verbum dicendi' *καταμέμφεται* in the same line. Other interpreters who prefer the 'homosexual reading' see instead a deliberate misleading, not by the girl (who does not hide her sexual orientation in l. 8), but by the narrator: the exact function of this first parenthesis remains unclear until the girl's homosexual orientation is revealed in l. 8. Here the first parenthesis has superseded the second (cf. e.g. Preissshofen 1977: 73, Pelliccia 1983: 33–5, Pfeijffer 2008: 178).

⁵³ Westbury 1991: 331.

⁵⁴ The *μὲν-δέ* contrast can be asymmetrical as in Ibyc. PMGF 286.1 and 6 *ἦρι μὲν... ἐμοὶ δέ* (Pelliccia 1991: 35–6), and An. seems to put the article with the possessive pronoun regularly (cf. n. ad loc. and Hutchinson 2001: ad 5–8), so a slight break between 'my heart' and 'another girl' seems compatible with the language.

⁵⁵ Marcovich 1983: 374, cf. also 379, similarly Mace 1993: 348 n. 45, '...a flat conclusion', Pfeijffer

(metaphorically described in the first stanza) and reject it (already well put by Woodbury 1979: 287).⁵⁶ It should be noted, however, that not only is the rejection by the girl introduced but also her own object of desire (strongly emphasized by *χάσκει*), represented by the hair of this object (maybe male, maybe female). Pelliccia 1991: 32 finds no 'pay off' in this information, but it is an attractive early example of the pattern 'A loves B, but B loves C' which is more explicitly adopted in the later tradition (cf. above, introd., § 4).

- (ii) As for the language, it is true that *πρὸς δ' ἄλλην τινά* taken alone would naturally refer to a person, not to a thing. But a passage like Hdt. 2.115.6 *ἐκ τῆς ἐμῆς γῆς ἐς ἄλλην τινά*⁵⁷ shows that the reference of a feminine adjective plus *τίς* to a thing is possible in principle.⁵⁸ In the Herodotus passage (unlike in An.) no feminine person is at hand. But in An. the last feminine form that refers to the girl occurs in l. 5, whereas all feminine forms of lines 6–7 refer to the hair, so that it is inevitable that we understand *κόμην* also with *ἄλλην τινά* in line 8.

Things would be different if there were signals in the closer context of line 8 which pointed in the other direction.⁵⁹ *χάσκει* (8) may be a strong word denoting desire,⁶⁰ but there is no reason not to link it to the hair on a man's head, when in a metonymy denoting the whole person. If the parenthesis in 5–6 evoked the image of female homosexuality, l. 8 could become ambiguous insofar as *ἄλλην* would mean not only the hair but also a girl. But this is no more than a possibility, since a different explanation of the parenthesis would give a satisfying sense,⁶¹ and we have no certain evidence for such an association in An.'s time. Nothing else in the poem requires the assumption that *ἄλλην* also refers to *κόρην*.⁶²

⁵⁶ (The girl) 'personifies at once both the power to excite *eros* in the lover and the power to find him unworthy of its return'.

⁵⁷ First adduced by Hutchinson 2001: 276.

⁵⁸ I cannot see why there should be a difference in principle between prose and poetry in this respect, as Hutchinson 2001: 276 seems to think.

⁵⁹ In this respect Renehan's (1993: 46–7) parallel for ambiguity, S. OT 337–8 (Teiresias after being rebuked by Oedipus), *ὀργὴν ἐμέμφω τὴν ἐμὴν, τὴν σὴν δ' ὁμοῦ | ναίουσαν οὐ κατείδες, ἀλλ' ἐμὲ φέγεις*, differs, since *ναίουσα* clearly suggests a person (Jocasta) as the subject while the *μὲν*-clause makes one expect *ὀργὴν*, cf. Pelliccia 1995: 31–2 for further criticism of the parallel.

⁶⁰ Renehan 1984: 31–2 thinks that if the *γάρ*-clause in 5–6 were a clear hint to homosexuality (which he finds uncertain, however) the use of the rude verb *χάσκειν* has rather to be understood with *κόρην*, or with *κόρην* and *κόμην* at once.

⁶¹ Pace Pelliccia 1993: 32 who asks 'How does the information that she comes from well-built Lesbos set up such a climax?'

⁶² The same objection can be made to two more recent proposals: Davidson 1987: 135–6 who assumes the girl taking part in a real ball game and remaining 'intent on her game and camaraderie with the other woman (or women)'. Moreover, it seems doubtful whether *χάσκειν* is a behaviour that can be expected in a ball game. Leo 2015: 76 considers the possibility that the verb stresses the girl's passivity: 'she is only able to gasp at the other girl (not to act)', although her Lesbian origin

χάσκει: Used by Homer only in forms of the second aorist and in the literal sense of 'gaping, yawning', as in *Il.* 16.350 (blood coming of an open mouth), mostly in the wish *τότε μοι χάνοι εὐρεῖα χθών* (e.g. *Il.* 4.182). In post-Homeric poetry it is metonymically transferred to yawning and gaping as the expression of different emotions, among them desire and eagerness: Sol. fr. 13.36 W. ἄχρι δὲ τούτου (sc. ill fate) χάσκοντες κούφαις ἔλπισι τερπόμεθα (cf. Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010: 170, who sees an influence of the proverb λύκος ἔχανεν, Ar. fr. 350 K.-A., cf. below); it is often used in comedy, also with a sexual object, as in Ar. *Nu.* 996–7, where it is also constructed with *πρός*:

μηδ' εἰς ὀρχηστρίδος εἰσάπτειν, ἵνα μὴ πρὸς ταῦτα κεχηνῶς
μήλω βληθεὶς ὑπὸ πορνιδίου τῆς εὐκλείας ἀποθραυσθῆς.

Such an erotic connotation matches the relatively strong *καταμέμφεται* in l. 7 better than West's (1970: 209) interpretation of 'foolishly preoccupied' ('the girl is deep in trivial conversation with her friend', comparing Theoc. 4.53 εἰς ταύταν ἐτύπην χασμεύμενος 'I was gawping at the heifer when I trod on the thorn'.)⁶³

The representatives of the obscene interpretation discussed above maintain that in Old Comedy *χάσκειν* can mean *fellare*.⁶⁴ The most important evidence is Ar. V. 1345–50,⁶⁵ Philocleon addressing the hetaera:

ὄρῳς ἐγὼ σ' ὥς δεξιῶς ὑφειλόμην
μέλλουσιν ἤδη λεσβιεῖν τοὺς ξυμπότας·
ὦν οὐνεκ' ἀπόδος τῷ πέει τῷδ' ἰσχυρὸν χάριν.
ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀποδώσεις οὐδ' ἐφιαλεῖς, οἶδ' ὅτι,
ἀλλ' ἐξαπατήσεις καὶ γὰρ τούτῳ μέγα·
πολλοῖς γὰρ ἤδη χᾶτέροις αὐτ' ἠργάσω.

But, as Marcovich 1983: 377–9 and Renehan 1984: 29–30 showed, whereas *λεσβιεῖν* in 1346 certainly refers to fellatio, *ἐγχαάσκειν* in 1349 does not, but rather functions as a contrast to it, meaning 'to scoff at' while not performing fellatio. *χάσκει* is a complementary contrast to *καταμέμφεται* ('rejection of a pursuer and pursuit of another' Pelliccia 1991: 35). Since it describes the girl's desire it corresponds to the first stanza, the image of which depicts the same phenomenon, but on the part of the narrator. *χάσκει*, however, does so in a

promises sexual activity; for this aspect of *χάσκειν* cf. Ar. *Lys.* 426 τί κέχηρας 'une sottie inaction' Taillardat 1962: 264–5.

⁶³ Objected to by Campbell 1973: 169.

⁶⁴ Martial's technique of positioning *fellat* (or *fellas*) as the last word of an epigram, cf. below, n. 67) has not been adduced in support of this interpretation, as far as I can see.

⁶⁵ First pointed out by Wigodsky 1962. Carbone 1993 tries to show that in Suetonius' *Περὶ βλασφημιῶν* p. 52 Taillardat the noun *χάσκαξ* (of a male prostitute, not attested elsewhere) refers to fellatio but it better should be explained as referring to *pedicatio* as Taillardat 1967: 129 does, comparing *χανόπρωκτος* Ar. *Ach.* 104. Cyrino's 1996: 381–2 attempt to adduce the medical usage of *χάσκειν*, describing symptoms of various diseases of throat and larynx in order to find here a vivid depiction of the physical and emotional effects of fellatio is far fetched.

completely different style (noted e.g. by Davison 1968: 254), by means of metonymy, not metaphor, in a whole stanza, but confined to a single word (Hutchinson 2001: 278) and of a rather rude tone. Furthermore it might be significant that *χάσκειν* is often applied to animals.⁶⁶ Thus the verb serves as an ἀπροσδόκητον and gives the poem an epigrammatic structure.⁶⁷ All these strategies are obviously supposed to disparage the girl but by doing just this the narrator shows how much he suffers from his inability to win her (cf. Hutchinson 2001: 278); some of the obscenities in Catullus' 'Lesbia' poetry might have a similar function, cf. e.g. Catull. 58.5 *glubit*, opposed to *amavit* in l. 3, with Syndikus 2001: 1.281–2.

PMG 359

On attempts to join the fragment with PMG 357, cf. introduction to that poem, § 3, n. 197. Two glyconics followed by a pherecratean (a combination which occurs in PMG 348.1–3, 357.1–3 and 9–11, also on the subject of Cleobulus; cf. the pherecratean *Εὐβουλεῦ τε συμβῶτα* in P.Oxy. 3722 fr. 15 col. i.17 with n. ad loc.; for a possible play with the assonance *Εὐβουλεύς/Κλεόβουλος*, cf. PMG 357.9 n.). For Cleobulus as one of An.'s beloved boys, cf. PMG 357.9 and 402.

Cleobulus' name is used in an anaphoric polyptoton.⁶⁸ The rest of each line consists mainly of a verb in the first-person singular, each of which governs Cleobulus' name in a different case.

The sequence has three members, structured by *μὲν...δὲ...δέ* (cf. introd. to PMG 362, § 3): *μὲν* in l. 1 indicates that, contrary to what one might expect, there was no preceding verse with a nominative *Κλεόβουλος*; furthermore, the clausula of the pherecratean in 3 makes the end of the sequence probable. Thus the fragment fits An.'s preference for triple cola (cf. Fränkel 1975: 293–4, with n. 8, and comm. on PMG 388, introd., § 3). The immediate effect of the triple

⁶⁶ e.g. of a lion *Il.* 20.168, of a shellfish Sophr. fr. 25 K.-A., of a crocodile Hdt. 2.68.5, of a goose Eub. 114.3 K.-A. with Hunter 1983a: 214 who points to a probable link with *χῆν* in popular etymology; cf. the proverbial *λύκος ἔχανεν*: Ar. fr. 350 K.-A., Eub. 14.11. K.-A. with Hunter 1983a: 107 ad loc. and Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010: 170; of sexual desire of animals Ath. 9.389e *περὶ τὸν τῆς ὀχείας καιρὸν χάσκοντες* (first adduced by Davison 1968: 251–2). For animal imagery in An.'s erotic language cf. PMG 376.2 *κολυμβῶ*, with n., and PMG 417.

⁶⁷ One might compare the final position of *fellat* (or *fellas*) in several epigrams by Martial, where the obscenity of a single word executes the point, cf. Williams 2004: 129 and Mart. 2.33.4, 73.1, 82.33, 84.4, 79.4.

⁶⁸ For anaphoras in An. cf. for instance PMG 396.1 *φέρ' – φέρε* and 402c.2 *χαρίεντα...χαρίεντα*, P.Oxy. 3695 fr. 18.15ff. cf. Weber 1895: 25, for polyptota in An., cf. PMG 429 *μάχεσθαι – μαχέσθαι* (as epiphora), or PMG 424 *οὐκ ἐγγίμην ἀλλ' ἐγγίματο*, PMG 439 *μηροῖσι...μηρούς*.

Hesychius) would be for ἵπποθόρων to agree with ὄνων as in A. *Supp.* 301's βουθόρω ταύρω. Since the interpretation ἵπποθόρον μεῖξιν is well attested and does not cause logical problems it should be preferred (the pleonasm with πρὸς ἵππους is given in any case, contra Rozokoki 2005: 41 = 2006: 199).

2 εὐρεῖν: Bergk's 1834: 138 change into εἶρον (although always only in the apparatus; accepted *inter alia* by Wilamowitz 1886: 132 n. 9) is not necessary if we assume a nominative with infinitive, depending on a preceding verb of speaking (λέγονται rather than δοκέουσιν: cf. Labarbe 1988: 45, Rozokoki 2006: 199, cf. Führer 1967: 149–50, adducing *inter alia* Pi. *P.* 3.88 λέγονται, *N.* 9.39 λέγεται μὲν). This of course involves the complication of something else as the subject of λέγονται, before ἵπποθόρον δὲ Μυσοί.

μεῖξιν: The word is absent from Ionian inscriptions, but the accentuation is well attested in Hdt. (e.g. 1.203.2, Hoffmann 1898: 3.165, Labarbe 1988: 44). If it really is part of the quotation (see above), this would be the oldest instance of the word ('mixing' mostly, as here, in the sense of 'intercourse'), which is mainly prosaic (Hdt., Pl.). In verse it sometimes occurs in didactic poetry: Parm. fr. B 12.4 Diels–Kranz, Emp. fr. B 8.3 Diels–Kranz; cf. Schwabe 1980: 18 with n. 31.

PMG 378

§ 1. Metre

— — — — —, — — — — —, — — — — —, — — — — —
at^{2c}

An aristophanean with double choriambic expansion and resolution of the first longum, also describable as choriambic trimeter with a bacchiac as clausula. For an expansion of this kind in anaclastic glyconics (of which the aristophanean is the catalectic version) cf. An. *PMG* 388.4, 5, 7, and in aristophaneans (without initial resolution) cf. An. *PMG* 381b and Sapph. fr. 114.1; 128; perhaps in 103.3, 4, 5, 7, 10 V.

The resolution in ἀναπέτομαι has been explained as mimetic (Kannicht 1997: 357), but according to Hephaestion it was continued through the whole poem, and in fact is found in the second line, which the scholia on Aristophanes quote. Bergk's 1882: 263 (cf. already 1834: 124–5) restoration of 379 (on Eros flying past the grey-haired speaker) would have the same metre.

Since resolution in choriambic is very rare and not attested outside Attic poetry,¹³ Parker 1997: 79 and 344 prefers to analyse — — — — — as an iambic metron, referring to other examples of iambo-choriambic combinations in An. (e.g. *PMG* 388) and verses with an initial iamb, central choriambic, and a final bacchiac in Attic tragedy and comedy, also with resolution in the first iamb, as in S. *Aj.* 1185–6 = 1192–3.

§ 2. Poetic Imagery

We find the narrator in a typical situation: he is rejected by someone young, perhaps to be identified with Eros himself.¹⁴ Therefore he is 'flying up to heaven' διὰ τὸν Ἴρωτα. These words have been taken as denoting the purpose and aim of the flight: the speaker is searching for Eros on Olympus in order to complain about the beloved (e.g. Fränkel 1975: 297), or to retrieve Eros, who has abandoned the speaker (Rosenmeyer 1992: 47–8, taking Eros as subject of θέλει; cf. n. ad loc.). But διὰ probably denotes the cause rather than the purpose of the flight.

Whereas in tragedy and elsewhere humans commonly wish to fly to heaven or a place far away in order to escape 'an intolerable situation' (Barrett 1964: on E. *Hipp.* 732–4) here the flying is described as actually happening (not only in thought as in Pi. fr. 122.4–5 Maehler), a fantasy which appears later in Hor. *carm.* 2.20, where the poet is describing his transformation into a swan as in the process of happening, and probably in E. fr. 911 K. Similar fantasies under the influence of love appear also elsewhere in An.'s poetry, esp. in the leap from the Leucadian Rock as a result of 'drunkenness with love' (*PMG* 376, cf. also *PMG* 363.1 n.).

The image of the 'flying lover' may have more than one implication: firstly, the tradition of escape-wishes suggests that the narrator is fleeing from the painful situation described in the second line. So what elsewhere appears as a mere wish has become 'real', at least in the speaker's imagination. Secondly, since the speaker is represented as having light wings, the idea of metamorphosis may also be present. A transformation into a bird because of erotic pain¹⁵ can be found in the myth of Cycnus. Although the myth not is attested before Hellenistic times (Phanocles fr. 6, pp. 108–9 Powell), the type of metamorphosis might be older. Verg. *Aen.* 10.189–93 tells of Cycnus' fate as follows, calling it *crimen, Amor, vestrum* (188):

¹³ West 1982: 52 compares Ibyc. *PMGF* 285.3, where a princeps in a dactylic colon might be resolved (ἄλικας ἰσοκεφάλους ἐνιγνίους), but a different prosody of ἰσοκεφάλους is possible here.

¹⁴ For this pattern in other fragments cf. introd. to *PMG* 374, § 4. The situation of *PMG* 379 is particularly similar; therefore the fragment has been connected with *PMG* 378, but this is very speculative; cf. introd. to *PMG* 379.

¹⁵ In Anaxil. fr. 22.29–30 K.–A. those who feel love for hetaerae fly up to the aither.

namque ferunt luctu Cycnum Phaethontis amati,
populeas inter frondes umbramque sororum
dum canit et maestum Musa solatur amorem,
canentem molli pluma duxisse senectam
linquentem terras et sidera uoce sequentem.

The element of song which seems essential in the Cycnus myth is missing in the fragment, but it might have appeared in the lost context or be represented by the fact that the words were sung.

Another aspect of the flight-image might be rejuvenation (admittedly unlike the Cycnus myth in Vergil's version where the white feathers of the swan are called *senecta*). But the use of *συνηβάν* and *κούφης* (cf. nn. ad. loc.) suggests the possibility that by becoming a swift bird the speaker becomes young again at the same time (for a possible combination of escape-fantasy and rejuvenation see Mace 2001: on Simon. fr. 22 W.²). For the combination of rejuvenation and metamorphosis into a winged animal (cicada) cf. later Call. *Aet.* fr. 1. 32–6 Pfeiffer where, however, the rejuvenation is effected by the ecdysis of the cicada. Perhaps the idea is mirrored in *Anacreont.* 53.3–4 W. (the old narrator is feeling rejuvenated when he sees young men coming together): *τότε δὴ, τότε ἔς χορείην | ὁ γέρων ἐγὼ περουῖμαι.*

That An.'s flight has poetological implications¹⁶—the poet's search for immortality—might be suggested by parallels such as Hor. *carmin.* 2.20 and perhaps E. fr. 911 K. (see Wilamowitz 1935–72: 1.204) as well as by the fact that the first line is cited by the dithyrambic poet Cinesias in Ar. *Av.* 1372 with a clear metapoetic meaning. The fragment itself does not give any hints in this direction, however, and the emphasis on Eros as the cause of the flight does not recommend this interpretation.¹⁷

Eub. fr. 106.16–20 K.–A., in a riddle about the *πάππος ἀπ' ἀκάνθης* (the thistle-down, also called *γήρειον* by Arat. 921; cf. also S. fr. 868 R.) reverses the normal association of lightness and youth and heaviness and old age: *οἷδ' ἐγὼ ὅς νέος ὢν ἔστιν βαρύς, ἂν δὲ γέρων ᾦ, | ἄπτερος ὢν κούφως πέταται καὶ γῆν ἀφανίζει.* And in the explanation: *πέτεται κούφος ὢν, | δῆπουθεν ὑπὸ τῶν παιδίων φυσώμενος.* Interestingly, the last verse alludes to the old lover eluded by boys (as pointed out by Hunter 1983a: on his fr. 107.22).

Through the metamorphosis the narrator is assimilated to Eros and the beloved:

¹⁶ This might be the background of Rosenmeyer's 1992: 48 n. 112 alternative interpretation: 'We may also read in the act of flying up to Olympus a search for immortality.'

¹⁷ Theognis' song gives wings (i.e. immortal fame) to Kyrnos (Thgn. 237–9a and 245); the poet is called a *κούφον...χρήμα...καὶ πτηνὸν καὶ ἱερὸν* in Pl. *Ion* 534b 3–4, before which, however, he is compared to a bee (534b 2). This passage possibly influenced Callimachus, who in the prologue of the *Aitia* (fr. 1.32 Pfeiffer) wishes to become *οὐλαχὺς, ὁ πτερόεις*; cf. Hunter 1989b.

- (i) Since he acquires wings and is able to fly, he resembles Eros, who is winged himself (An. PMG 379, although before An. the wings of Eros are not mentioned explicitly; in visual art the oldest certain examples date from the late sixth century;¹⁸ on possible examples of flying Eros in Sappho compare LIMC 3.1.851 (A. Hermayr *et al.*) referring to Sapph. fr. 47 V. (Eros compared to a storm) and fr. 54 V. (Eros coming from heaven, wearing a purple chlamys); cf. also fr. 22.11–12 V. *πόθος... ἀμφιπόταται*).
- (ii) Since a kind of rejuvenation happens to the narrator, he is assimilated to the beloved who does not want to share his youth with him (if Eros is the subject of *θέλει* in 2, the rejuvenation is just another aspect of the assimilation of the narrator and the god).

The first assimilation is of special interest with relation to the Platonic *Phaedrus* where Socrates develops the idea that the winged Eros has the power to give wings to men, citing two hexameters of 'some of the Homerids' (Pl. *Phdr.* 252b 8–9 = ps.Homerus fr. 17, p. 109 EGF):

*τὸν δ' ἦτοι θνητοὶ μὲν Ἔρωτα καλοῦσι ποτηνόν,
ἀθάνατοι δὲ πτέρωτα διὰ πτεροφύτορ' ἀνάγκην.*

These verses are most probably Plato's invention (Heitsch 1997: 37 n. 35), and no older tradition of Eros as 'producer of wings' seems to exist (later Longus 2.7.1 takes up the idea; cf. Hunter 1983b: 109 n. 43). It is worth considering, then, whether Plato took this idea from An.'s image of *ἀναπέτεσθαι...πτερύγεσσι κούφης διὰ τὸν Ἔρωτα*. This is a fantasy, as we saw above, which seems typical of the erotic experiences described in his poetry. The assumption is all the more attractive since Socrates in *Phdr.* 235c 3 names 'wise Anacreon' beside 'beautiful Sappho' as someone who spoke better than Lysias about Eros (cf. general introd., § 7.1.1). On more possible echoes of Sappho and Anacreon in the *Phaedrus* see Fortenbaugh 1966 (Pl. *Phdr.* 241b 5–6 ~ Sapph. fr. 1 V.; *Phdr.* 254a 2–4 ~ An. PMG 417). The imagery of our fragment might have influenced an anonymous epigram, AP 7.62 (= D.L. 3.44), where a stone eagle on a tomb explains (ll. 3–4) *ψυχῆς εἰμι Πλάτωνος ἀποπταμένης ἐς Ὀλυμπόν | εἰκῶν.*

The lines are probably referred to by ps.Jul. *Ep.* 193, p. 263.1–6 Bidez/Cumont (cited in app.), as Bergk 1834: 123 observed, with several elements, such as bird metamorphosis, flying to Olympus, and complaining about Eros, all appearing. Bergk 1834: 123 referred to Him. *Or.* 48.4, pp. 197–8 Colonna, as another possible allusion to our fragment:

ἐκεῖνος (sc. *Ἀνακρέων*) γάρ ποτε ἐρασθεὶς ἐφήβου καλοῦ, ἐπειδὴ περ ἑώρα
τὸν ἔφηβον ὀλίγον αὐτοῦ φροντίζοντα, λύραν ἀρμόσας ἠπέλει τοῖς

¹⁸ Pellegrini 2009: 526.

Ἔρωσιν, εἰ μὴ αὐτῷ τιτρώσκοιεν αὐτίκα τὸν ἔφηβον, μηκέτι μέλος
εὐφημον εἰς αὐτοὺς ἀνακρούσασθαι.

But apart from Himerius' use of the plural some elements of our fragment are missing, such as Olympus and flying (Braghetti 1994: 238).

1 ἀναπέτομαι: The compound is not attested before An.; afterwards it occurs in Hdt., tragedy, comic parody, and Attic prose, applied to birds flying upwards (Ar. *Ra.* 1352, of a rooster, ὁ δ' ἀνέπτατ' ἀνέπτατ' ἐς αἰθέρα | κουφοτάταις πτερύγων ἀκμαῖς) or to humans who have or wish to have the ability to fly (Hdt. 4.132.3, ἦν μὴ ὄρνιθες γενόμενοι ἀναπτῆσθε ἐς τὸν οὐρανόν, Pl. *Phdr.* 109e 2–3, εἴ τις... πτηνὸς γενόμενος ἀνάπτειτο, in the context of metamorphosis Ant. Lib. 14.3). In tragedy the verb is used to express a wish to escape (E. *Ion* 796–9, ἀν' ὑγρὸν ἀμπταίνην αἰθέρα πόρσω γαί-|ας Ἑλλανίας ἀστέρας ἐσπέρους, | οἶον οἶον ἄλγος ἔπαθον, φίλαι, cf. *IT* 843–4, δέδοικα δ' ἐκ χερῶν με μὴ πρὸς αἰθέρα | ἀμπτάμενος φύγῃ, sc. Orestes); for the motif in general cf. introd. It also appears as a metaphor for emotional states: love S. *Aj.* 693, ἔφριξ' ἔρωτι, περιχαρὴς δ' ἀνεπτάμαν, as probably the simplex in An. *PMG* 363.1 (τί μὲν πέτεται...); fear S. *Ant.* 1308, ἀνέπταν φόβῳ, or excitement Ar. *Av.* 1444–5, ἐπὶ τραγωδίᾳ | ἀνεπτερώσθαι καὶ πεποτήσθαι τὰς φρένας; cf. *Nu.* 319. In the only other instance of the simplex in An. it is applied to the speaker (*PMG* 346 fr. 6.4, πάννυχος πετοίμην) in order to express a wish, the exact meaning of which remains unclear.

δῆ: Emphasizes the verb as often in tragedy. It conveys a pathetic tone, 'above all at moments when death or ruin is present or imminent' (Denniston 1954: 214), occasionally also in early lyric poetry, as in Pi. *N.* 8.19, ὅσταμαι δῆ ποσσὶ κούφοις (in a metaphor from starting a footrace). It comes as no surprise, then, that metamorphosis too can be emphasized by δῆ as a moment of strong emotion; cf. E. fr. 911 Kannicht:

χρύσει δῆ μοι πτέρυγες περὶ νώτῳ
καὶ τὰ Σειρήνων πτερόεντα πέδιλ' ἀρμόζεται,
βάσομαι δ' ἀν' αἰθέρα πουλὺν ἀερθεῖς
Ζηνὶ προσημείζων.

Cf. also *Anacreont.* 53.1–4 W., where, however, the transformation is only felt by the speaker:

Ὅτ' ἐγὼ'ς νέων ὄμιλον
ἐσορῶ, πάρεστιν ἦβα.
τότε δῆ, τότε' ἐς χορείην
ὁ γέρων ἐγὼ πτεροῦμαι.

Sometimes δῆ can take on a temporal force, similar to ἤδη 'already' (*Il.* 2.134, ἐννέα δῆ βεβῆασι... ἐνιαυτοί, An. *PMG* 352.1, δέκα δῆ μῆνες). The use in

metamorphosis scenes might therefore be similar to that of *iam* or *non iam* in Latin; cf. Hor. *carm.* 2.20.9–10 (Horace's transformation into a swan), *iam iam residunt cruribus asperae | pelles*, or Ov. *met.* 2.661 (Ocyroe speaking), *iam mihi subduci facies humana uidetur*, 2.830 (Aglauros), *saxum iam colla tenebat*, 3.678 (Thyrrhenic seamen), *iam non esse manus, iam pennas posse uocari (iam non* and sim. in a metamorphosis 2.585, 11.406, 14.165, 15.563). A combination of temporal and emotional force seems to be given also in *δηῖτε* (< δῆ αἰτε), a favourite word of An., often used in descriptions of erotic passion, as in *PMG* 376.1 and 428.1 (Hutchinson 2001: 275, giving parallels from Sappho and Ibycus), or actions of Eros, as in *PMG* 358.1; 400.1; 413.1. The idea of repetition expressed by *δηῖτε* may be present here in the article τόν (cf. n. ad loc.).

πρὸς Ὀλυμπον: Some interpreters thought this to be the seat of the gods, to which the speaker is flying in order to find Eros (διὰ τὸν Ἔρωτα). But since the preposition here probably does not indicate a purpose (cf. n.) Ὀλυμπος must either mean (i) 'sky, heaven' (for instance West 1993b: 105: 'I'm flying up to heaven...') or (ii) the Thessalian mountain itself without the function of a seat of the gods, as a concrete geographical destination (*Lfgre* 3.670.29–37, M. Schmidt). As for (ii), it is true that such destinations do appear in some of the escape-fantasies of tragedy (e.g. E. *Hipp.* 732–51) and in the metamorphosis of Horace (*carm.* 2.20.13–16), but there they regularly illustrate a long distance which the speaker wishes to cover. I cannot see that the Thessalian mountain is suitable for that purpose. So the speaker in our fragment rather wants to fly up to the sky, a wish actually mentioned in some tragic escape-fantasies (e.g. E. *Ion* 796–7 loc. cit., *Hec.* 1100, ἀμπτάμενος οὐράνιον ὑψιπετές ἐς μέλαθρον). In Homer Ὀλυμπος itself never clearly means 'heaven' as distinct from the mountain (M. Schmidt in *Lfgre* 3.665.17–32), but already here it can be closely bound to οὐρανός and sometimes becomes almost a synonym, especially when the motion of gods is described (e.g. *Il.* 19.128, ἐς Οὐλυμπόν τε καὶ οὐρανὸν ἀστερόεντα): for the interchangeability of οὐρανός and Ὀλυμπος in later authors (from Sophocles on) see Noussia 2002: 494–6. Further evidence for this interpretation of Ὀλυμπος may be found in the Aristophanic *Birds* where Cinesias uses l. 1 (1373) to express his wish to fly up high (cf. also *Av.* 1383–4, 1386, 1400, 1409). In *Ra.* 1352, where our fragment is probably also parodied, Ὀλυμπος is replaced by αἰθήρ (for the interchangeability already in Homer cf. Noussia 2002: 493).

πτερύγεσσι κούφῃς: The Aeolic dative occurs six times in Homer; on the dative form in early elegy see West 1974: 96. In An. πτέρυξ appears elsewhere only in *PMG* 379b, of Eros who flies past the old speaker (see introd.). On the change of the transmitted κούφαις to the Ionic κούφῃς (Schneidewin, attested in inscriptions) cf. Bechtel 1924: 138. The adjective is used by Homer as an adverb to describe light stepping (*Il.* 13.158 κούφα ποσὶ προβιβάς), a use adapted by An. *PMG* 417.5, of the Thracian filly's light leaping (cf. n. ad loc.); after Homer it is applied to feet and hands (Pi. *O.* 13.114 κούφοισιν... ποσίν, P. 9.11

χερὶ κούφα, and N. 8.19, cited above), as well as wings (Ar. Ra. 1352, probably parodying An., and A.R. 4.601 and 771). In Ovid's *Metamorphoses* the idea of lightness is often stressed when humans are transformed into birds (*Met.* 8.544–5, *natis in corpore pennis | alleuat*; 5.675 *braccia mota leuatae | aere pendebant*); for κούφος applied to Eros cf. Eub. fr. 40.5 K.–A., AP 9.443.2 (Paulus Silentiarius), Ov. *am.* 2.9.49 (of Cupid), *tu levis es multoque tuis uentosior alis* (for Eros associated with the idea of heaviness, cf. PMG 460, § 4). Since κούφος conveys the idea of light and quick movement, flying up to the sky may be regarded as a kind of rejuvenation in contrast to the speaker's old age, which might be the reason why he is not allowed to join somebody's youth in l. 2 (on the association of lightness and youth and heaviness and old age cf. Bernsdorff 2004a: esp. 32 on Simon. fr. 20.5–6 W.², ἡβης, | κούφον ἔχων θυμόν).

2 διὰ τὸν Ἔρωτ': Does this mean: (i) 'in search of Love' (Campbell 1988: 69), denoting the purpose of the speaker's flight (he wants to find Eros on Olympus to complain about unrequited love), or (ii) 'due to love' (West 1993b: 105), giving the cause of the speaker's flight? Interpretation (ii) is clearly preferable, since διὰ with accusative is only rarely used to denote a purpose and cannot be found in this meaning before Thucydides (Schwyzer/Debrunner 1950: 454). On the other hand the preposition is often connected with the name of a god who caused an action (*Od.* 8.520, νικῆσαι...διὰ μεγάλθυμον Ἀθήνην, Hes. *Th.* 962, ὑποδμηθεῖσα διὰ χρυσέην Ἀφροδίτην, *Op.* 3–4 (Zeus), ὃν τε διὰ βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ὁμῶς ἄφατοί τε φατοί τε, | ῥητοί τ' ἄρρητοί τε Διὸς μέγαλοιο ἔκητι, E. *Cyc.* 1 with Seaford 1984: ad loc.; cf. Ar. *Ec.* 972, διὰ τοι σέ πόνους ἔχω, where the beloved appears as the source of erotic distress). Furthermore in the similar fragment PMG 376 (the speaker is leaping from the Leucadian Rock; on the similarity of the two fragments see comm. on PMG 378, introd., § 2), μεθύων ἔρωτι presents love as the cause, not as the purpose of the act. Compare too PMG 432: κνυζή τις ἤδη καὶ πέπειρα γίνομαι | σὴν διὰ μαργουσύνην. Here, μαργουσύνη seems to mean something similar to ἔρως, and the prepositional expression forms an enjambement similar to that of διὰ τὸν Ἔρωτ' in 378. Thus, since διὰ in 432 clearly denotes a cause, not a purpose, it seems reasonable to assume the same for PMG 378.2. Ps. Julian's words (cited in the app.) οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ μέμψεως ἐρωτικῆς have been interpreted in the sense of διὰ denoting a purpose (e.g. Bowra 1961: 305–6). But, although ps. Julian's ὑπὲρ probably denotes a purpose, the phrase is consistent with the interpretation of διὰ preferred here: An. is flying upwards and, as a bird, while mourning, he complains about his boy (or Eros). The article seems to be demonstrative, in the sense of 'well known'; cf. PMG 346 fr. 1.7, τὰς ὑακιν[θίνας ἀρ]ούρας (see comm. on PMG 417.3 about An.'s use of the article connected with just one noun; the article in PMG 357.10 τὸν ἐμὸν δ' Ἔρωτ' has to be explained by the possessive pronoun: Weber 1895: 21). This use of the article would stress the fact that the speaker has become a victim of Eros not for the first time in a way similar to that achieved by δηῦτε; see n. on δη (1).

οὐ γάρ: For οὐ γάρ in a similar syntactical position cf. PMG 411a, ἀπό μοι θανεῖν γένοιτ'. οὐ γάρ ἄν ἄλλη | λύσις ἐκ πόνων γένοιτ' οὐδαμὰ τῶνδε, PMG 348.7–8, οὐ γάρ ἀνημέρους | ποιμαίνεις πολήτας; for γάρ probably giving the behaviour of the beloved as cause of the erotic distress of the speaker cf. PMG 367 σὺ γάρ ἡς ἔμοι γ' | ἀστεμφής.

ἐμοὶ <– > θέλει συνηβάν: To restore the same verse type as in l. 1 two syllables must be added: Porson's <παῖς ἐ>θέλει makes a beloved boy the subject, but given that in An. Eros himself can take on the traits of the beloved (cf. PMG 357.11 n.), it may be worthwhile to retain Eros as the subject by filling the lacuna differently or by considering a different metre in the second line (two choriambes and a penthemimer, x – – x, which appears as a colon in Aeolic poetry, esp. in the Alcaic stanza (West 1982: 32–3); in An. it possibly occurs in PMG 346 fr. 4, 391, 412, 437). συνηβάν 'to share one's youth' means 'to share the joys of one's youth in a symposium'. For the association of youth, joy, and the symposium, cf. Pi. *P.* 4.294–5, συμποσίας ἐφέπων | θυμόν ἐκδόσθαι πρὸς ἥβαν πολλάκις, with Braswell 1988: ad loc. and the later use. Accordingly, συνηβάν is something for which the speaker of sympotic poetry wishes; cf. An. PMG 402a.1, ἔραμαι <δέ> τοι συνηβάν, Carm. Conv. PMG 902.1,¹⁹ σύν μοι πῖνε συνήβα συνέρα, and as a possible supplement in Alc. fr. 306i col. i.26 V.). For compounds with συν- which express the idea of acting together in a context of a symposium, cf. συμπαίζειν in PMG 357.4 (of Eros, the nymphs, and Aphrodite) and 358.4 (Eros summons the speaker to play with the girl from Lesbos) and Snell 1965: 71–2, with n. 22, with examples from Alcaeus and Sappho. Eros' or the boy's refusal to share his youth might well imply that the speaker is old and grey, in which case συνηβάν would imply the traditional antithesis of γῆρας and ἡβη (comm. on PMG 395.3–4a), and the fragment would describe the typical situation of the elderly speaker being rejected by a young boy or girl (An. PMG 358, prob. PMG 379, perhaps 374.2, with ἡβᾶς). This would fit the escape-fantasy of a rejuvenation (cf. introd. and n. on l. 1 κούφης).

PMG 379

Lucian's treatise deals with the power of speech, which he praises for being the only human ability that is fully developed at an advanced age. Thus the speaker can easily bid farewell to physical goods and then in an apostrophe address An. in order to say that the poet's Eros may well fly past his greyish beard; the speaker will not mind (referring to the anecdote about Hippoclidēs

¹⁹ Given the rareness of the verb συνηβάν, Reitzenstein 1893: 20–1 assumes that the skolion is influenced by An.

before his stay in Athens, are concerned. Weil's conjecture makes a slight change and would restore a sound text.¹⁵⁴

In the light of similar phrases in Attic drama:¹⁵⁵

S. OT 676 οὔκουν μ' ἐάσεις κακτὸς εἶ; El. 630–1 οὔκουν ἐάσεις οὐδ' ὑπ' εὐφύμουν βοῆς | θῦσαι μ' (with Finglass 2007a: 286), Ar. Eq. 336 = 338 οὐκ αὖ μ' ἐάσεις; Ar. fr. 628 K.–A. οὔκουν μ' ἐάσεις ἀναμετρήσασθαι τάδε;

which are all questions, one should follow Bergk 1834: 174 in adding a question mark. The impatient and colloquial tone of the phrase would fit the content of the fragment, the topic of which—returning home after the symposium—occurs elsewhere in convivial poetry, cf. especially:

Thgn. (Euenus?) 467 μηδένα τῶνδ' ἀέκοντα μένειν κατέρυκε παρ' ἡμῖν

Thgn. 475–6 αὐτὰρ ἐγώ—μέτρον γὰρ ἔχω μελιηδέος οἴνου—| ὕπνου

λυσικάκου μνήσομαι οἴκαδ' ἰών.

843–4 ἀλλ' ὅποταν καθύπερθε ἐὼν ὑπένερθε γένηται, | τουτάκις οἴκαδ' ἵμεν παυσάμενοι πόσιος.

Xenoph. fr. 1.17b–18 W. πίνειν δ' ὅποσον κεν ἔχων ἀφίκοιο | οἴκαδ' ἄνευ προπόλου μὴ πάνυ γηραλέος.

οὐδ' αὖ μ' ἐάσεις: Page 1962 changed into οὐ δηῦτέ μ' ἐάσεις in order to avoid three syllables in ἐάσεις instead of a contraction of the first syllable as he expected in the Ionic dialect. But Fraenkel 1969 could adduce parallels from Attic comedy which showed that the original wording seems to be idiomatic in an impatient question, as would fit the content of our fragment: Ar. Eq. 336 = 338 (quoted above), cf. also Ar. Ec. 667, οὐδ' αὖ κλέπτῃς οὐδεὶς ἔσται; V. 942, οὐκ αὖ σὺ παύσει χαλεπὸς ὢν καὶ δύσκολος. For the prosody ~ – in ἐας- cf. Il. 8.243, 21.556, Hdt. 1.90 (Smyth 1894: 165, Gentili 1958a: 109, and Zuntz 1984: 32–3).

PMG 413

§ 1. Metre

— — — — —
— — — — —

The same verse schema appears in PMG 414 (cf. § 2 below) and perhaps in *P.Mich.* inv. 3250c recto col. ii.1, where see introd. The lines are quoted by Hephaestion

¹⁵⁴ See Herington 1985: 115 with appendix X and Bing 2014: 27 and 40 on An.'s metrical influence on tragedy.

¹⁵⁵ On the use of οὔκουν with the second-person future indicative in the following examples Denniston 1954: 431–2 remarks 'in impatient questions at the opening of a speech'.

in the chapter on the *ionicus a minore* and interpreted as brachycatalectic ionic tetrameters, i.e. ionic tetrameters with anacalasis between the second and the third metrum and lacking two elements (thus 4io⁺ ΛΛ). Hephaestion stresses that An. composed whole songs in this verse.

West also regards the verses as ionic,¹⁵⁶ explaining them as an amplified form of the ionic trimeter which occurs elsewhere in An. and Sappho, either in the form *3io or 3io⁺ (An. PMG 410, 411a, 415, and Sapph. fr. 134 V.). Other interpreters put more weight on the word-end after the seventh element (also in PMG 414), just there where the rhythm changes from ionic to iambic (Wilamowitz 1921: 230 2io_Λ | 2ia_Λ | 2io_Λ | 2ia_Λ |).¹⁵⁷

The first colon (called 'partheneus', 2io_Λ or Λ2ch; cf. Gentili 1958a: 109) as a colon of its own right occurs in tragedy (E. Ba. 370–4 = 386–90). A division into shorter cola would more clearly underline the different correspondences of the fragment; cf. § 3.

§ 2. Context

Since the lines are quoted by Hephaestion as a metrical example they probably come from the beginning of a poem, as is also the case with other δηῦτε-fragments (PMG 376.1). This does not rule out the theoretical possibility that the narrator is different from the poet's voice, i.e. a *persona loquens*; cf. e.g. introd. to PMG 385, § 3. There is no evidence that the distich forms a complete poem (as Mace 1993: 339 assumes). The hypothesis of Bergk 1834: 157 that the line can be combined with PMG 414, probably on Smerdies, is based on nothing other than the shared metre.¹⁵⁸

§ 3. Formal Analysis

Two syntactic cola which do not correspond exactly with the metrical structure because of the enjambement of πελέκει. Both cola are framed by hyperbaton, each consisting of an adjective and a noun. This parallelism is enhanced by the fact that both sets of words in hyperbaton are in the dative, but at the same time slightly diminished by the enjambement of πελέκει as well as by the different function of the case (instrumental vs. locative depending on ἐν). At the same time the enjambement creates another parallelism, since μέγαλῳ and its noun πελέκει have the same metrical position at the beginning of the verse. The two verbs also have the same position (after the caesuras),¹⁵⁹ while the constituents

¹⁵⁶ West 1982: 58 speaks of a 'hypercatalectic form', while at 1987: 41 he assumes 'an extra (–) in the middle'.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Leo 2015: 128 for a careful doxography of the metrical discussion.

¹⁵⁸ Edmonds 1924: 162; Smyth 1900: 294 suggests that the poem probably refers to Smerdies.

¹⁵⁹ Thus μέγαλῳ (1) and πελέκει (2) alternate with ἔκοψεν (1) and ἔλουσεν (2).

of the second hyperbaton alliterate (χειμ- / χαρ-); other phonetic correspondences might be found in Ἔρως...ὥστε, χαλκεύς...χαράδρῃ; note that χειμερίῃ in the middle stands before the caesura of the second verse. Both of the nouns consist of three syllables, as do their adjectives: Eros' name has no adjective of its own, but the comparison ὥστε χαλκεύς functions as a substitute.¹⁶⁰ This verbal abundance can be contrasted with the bare personal pronoun, whose vowel is even elided.¹⁶¹ This treatment of the pronoun of the first-person singular among a group of nouns each qualified by a lavish epithet resembles PMG 358. 1–4, another highly figurative δηῦτε-poem on the speaker as Eros' victim. A colometry which divides the lines into short cola (i.e. 2io_A | 2ia_A |) would bring out the phonetic and syntactic correspondence more clearly:

a	μεγάλῳ δηῦτέ μ' Ἔρως	a
b	ἔκοψεν ὥστε χαλκεύς	a
a	πελέκει, χειμερίῃ δ'	b
b	ἔλουσεν ἐν χαράδρῃ.	b

§ 4. The Imagery and its Tradition

The fragment surprises the listener/reader twice, each time by the noun in dative at the end of its syntactic colon. Both are stressed by their metrical position (πελέκει after the end of the verse and in enjambement, χαράδρῃ before the end of the second verse). μεγάλῳ...ἔκοψε makes us expect that Eros has hit the speaker with an instrument, but leaves open what instrument it is. When the inserted comparison ὥστε χαλκεύς has determined the beating as forging, a hammer is expected. However, what follows is πελέκει, which does not fit forging, although it is connected with κόπτειν elsewhere (cf. n.). Nevertheless, the dominant image of the first syntactic colon remains that of forging. The second colon starts with a similar hyperbaton technique, with χειμερίῃ leaving open to what noun it refers and with ἔλουσεν leading in a different direction (since the verb is rather unusually applied to the technical action in question, but nevertheless already adumbrates the dipping into water). χαράδρῃ then also comes παρὰ προσδοκίαν. Thus, the second colon continues the forging image, since it describes the following step of the working process. At the same time, however, by locating the cooling not in a smithy but somewhere open to nature,¹⁶² An. presents this continuation in a defamiliarized environment which has implications of its own as an erotic image.¹⁶³

¹⁶⁰ Note that Ἔρως...χαλκεύς, with Ἔρως before the caesura and χαλκεύς at the end of the verse, mirrors χειμερίῃ...ἐν χαράδρῃ in 2; cf. § 1.

¹⁶¹ As Goldhill 1987: 10 remarks.

¹⁶² Cf. Alc. PMGF 89.2 where χαράδρῃ form part of a picture of sleeping nature. In Verg. Georg. 4.172–3 the Cyclopes use a lacus in place of basin to cool the iron: *alii stridentia tingunt | aera lacu*, with Thomas 1988: ad loc.

The two cola describe opposites in several respects: hot and cold, flexible and hard,¹⁶⁴ fire and water, culture and nature. As Fränkel 1975: 297–8 points out, these contrasts are not explicitly emphasized. Rather they are implied, partly by the intertextuality with the Homeric model, *Od.* 9.391–4:

ὥς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ χαλκεύς πέλεκυν μέγαν ἦε σκέπαρνον
εἰν ὕδατι ψυχρῷ βάπτῃ μεγάλα ἰάχοντα
φαρμάσσων· τὸ γὰρ αὖτε σιδήρου γε κράτος ἐστίν.
ὥς τοῦ σίζ' ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐλαϊνέῳ περὶ μοχλῷ.

Homer mentions the heat and cold (mainly by the description of the glowing stake in the *illustrandum* and 392, εἰν ὕδατι ψυχρῷ, in the simile).¹⁶⁵ Other δηῦτε-fragments also dwell on opposites, such as Sapph. fr. 130 V. and An. PMG 428 (both more explicitly than in our fragment).

Both sides of the culture/nature contrast draw on motifs from Homeric similes (cf. nn.), but an image taken from nature illustrating the power of Eros also follows a lyric tradition (cf. Sapph. fr. 47 V., Ibyc. PMGF 286).

The strong contrasts between the two parts of the fragment, especially the apparent change of scenery—from a smithy to nature¹⁶⁶—has led some interpreters assume that the two images are independent,¹⁶⁷ but the process of forging is present in both and provides unity through pragmatic coherence. This does not rule out that this unity can be undermined at the same time.¹⁶⁸

Part of the boldness of the imagery comes in the identification of the narrator with a material object being formed by the tools of the blacksmith. This is mirrored in the bare, and even elided, personal pronoun μ' (cf. above, § 3). Sapph. fr. 47 V. and the δηῦτε-fragment Alc. PMGF 59a are less radical since psychic organs (καρδίαν, φρένας) are added. Sapph. fr. 130 V. (Ἔρως δηῦτέ μ' ὁ λυσιμέλης δόνει, | γλυκύπικρον ἀμάχανον ὄρπετον) is closer to our fragment, but the speaker here appears as an animal driven by an insect (cf. also the hunting image of Ibyc. PMGF 287). An.'s strategy here underscores the narrator's complete helplessness and passivity. In a way this materialization of the human

¹⁶⁴ This contrast is often emphasized in technical descriptions of forging, collected by Blümner 1875–1912: 4.345. n. 1.

¹⁶⁵ There were methods of striking the iron in a cold state (Blümner 1875–1912: 4.242), but the mention of the bath in the wintry torrent strongly suggests that the first colon implies heating. A mountain torrent is part of a figurative hot/cold opposition in Catull. 68.57–62.

¹⁶⁶ One might imagine a smithy on the bank of a torrent (Farnell 1891: 350, Schwyzler 1930: 315), but without further explanation such a combination is by no means obvious.

¹⁶⁷ Wilamowitz 1913: 126: '...zwei Vergleiche [...], die man gerne in Beziehung setzen möchte; ich bin aber im Verständnis des ersten überhaupt nicht sicher.' Bowra 1961: 290 thinks that only the first part recalls a sacrifice scene in the *Odyssey* (3.442–50), while the torrent is an independent image, illustrating trouble and perhaps suggesting that An. was on the receiving end of an opponent's spate of words (Ar. V. 1034, Pax 757). But this ignores ὥστε χαλκεύς in the first part and over-interprets the word χαράδρῃ in the second.

¹⁶⁸ Leo 2015: 128 draws attention to the myth of Lityerses, who was killed by Heracles with an axe and then thrown into a river. It cannot be ruled out that this mythical pattern is also evoked and contributes to the unity of the fragment.

has already been prepared by the Homeric model (cf. above), which presents the iron in an anthropomorphizing way.¹⁶⁹

After explaining which actions form the *illustrans*, one must ask the even more difficult question of what the *illustrandum* is. While the beating of the metal and (as to be supplied from the Homeric model) the previous heating are clearly referring to the emotional turmoil of erotic desire, the reference of the second image is more difficult to determine, although it is clear that it somehow functions as the opposite of hot love as described in the first colon. But what is this opposite exactly? Is it the *absence* of love (despite the fact that Eros is responsible for the dipping as well)? Then our fragment would resemble An. PMG 428 (a *δηῦτε*-poem quoted by Hephaestion) in the description of 'love' and 'non-love', except for the fact that both states are described as being present at the same time (cf. introd. to PMG 428) while here they form a succession. Or does the cooling of the hot metal also describe a state of erotic passion, but one that is quite different from the heat in the first part?¹⁷⁰

Different proposals have been made:

- (i) The coldness which the speaker suffers in the torrent is another symptom of love (e.g. Fränkel 1975: 297 with n. 18, Carson 1986: 7); for such a use of freezing cf. Sapph. fr. 31.10–13 V., where Longinus reads *ψυχρος* instead of *ἵδρω*s, and Longus 2.7.5, in Philitas' description of the symptoms of love, where *τὸ σῶμα ἐψυχόμην* appears alongside being beaten (*ἐβόων ὡς παιόμενος*; cf. *ἔκοιπεν* in An.) and 'burning': *εἰς ποταμοῦς ἐνέβαινον ὡς καόμενος*. This interpretation would explain more easily than others why it is also Eros who does the cooling, but it neglects that the action is still part of the forging image. Thus, not only the narrator's suffering when being dipped into the cold water but also the effect of this action on him has to be taken into consideration.
- (ii) Mace 1993: 339 proposed that the dousing represents the satisfaction of the desire which is illustrated by the blows and the heating beforehand. But this seems rather improbable since also the act of satisfaction, e.g. in having sex, would rather appear as something pleasant, while 'the bath in the wintry torrent' clearly contains the idea of torment itself.¹⁷¹ Moreover, like interpretation (i), this proposal does not ask what effect the dousing has on the quality of the metal.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. esp. *Od.* 9.392 *ἰάχοντα* (with *Lfgre* 2.1114.48–9, M. Schmidt: 'nicht wie σίζ' (v. 394) "zischt", sondern metaph. "daß es groß aufheult") and 393 *κράτος* (only here in early epic of an inanimate object).

¹⁷⁰ Goldhill 1987: 11 puts the alternative nicely: 'hardened to love...or tortured in its double tortments?'

¹⁷¹ As Mace 1993: 339 emphasizes herself by saying that 'the dousing...implies a tumultuous and no less jarring process'. She does not resolve this contradiction, however.

This question has been addressed by the following interpretations, which all more or less pay attention to the fact that the quenching of the iron was believed to be the crucial step in hardening it.¹⁷² This is also stressed in the Homeric model, *Od.* 9.393: *τὸ γὰρ αὐτε σιδήρου γε κράτος ἐστίν*; cf. also *S. Aj.* 650–1, *ὅς τὰ δαίν' ἐκαρτέρου τότε*, | *βαφῇ σίδηρος ὥς*, *S. Ant.* 475 *καὶ τὸν ἐγκρατέστατον σίδηρον ὀπτὸν ἐκ πυρὸς περισκελῇ*. But the state of hardness is understood differently:

- (iii) The coldness is simply a state of being strengthened or even rejuvenated (e.g. Perrotta/Gentili/Catenacci 2007: 211). But it is not an obvious idea that the suffering of 'hot' emotions leads to a state of regeneration.
- (iv) Others take the image to symbolize a better preparation for love, e.g. Tsomis 2001: 118,¹⁷³ but one should rather identify the first colon with desire.
- (v) Degani/Burzacchini/Magnani 2005: 252 somewhat differently put more weight on the idea that the narrator is in a better state to endure love now.¹⁷⁴ But this puts too little emphasis on the opposition of the two cola, which suggest that heat and striking stand for erotic passion which has come to an end after the dipping.
- (vi) Therefore, the best explanation seems to be to take the state of hardness effected by the cooling in the water as an emotional hardness, the absence of the feelings which tortured the narrator previously. This is in line with the later use of the forging image, as in *Pi.* fr. 123 Maehler (cf. below, § 5), *S. Aj.* 650–1 (note the contrast to *ἐθελύνθην στόμα* in 651), where the hardened steel always symbolizes the ability not to give in to the power of emotions.

One might object that Eros would not put the narrator in a condition which allows him to resist love. But it has to be considered that, first, this state is created by the bath in a 'wintry torrent' which itself implies violent erotic experiences. So we might assume that the narrator has experienced, for instance, 'the icy cooling of failure' (Goldhill 1987: 11) which may well have been caused by Eros himself. Secondly, it has to be taken into consideration that the state of emotional hardness which the narrator might have expected to be the end of his suffering turns out (because of *δηῦτε*) to be only a preliminary step to a repeated heating and striking. Thus, the state of emotional insensitivity by no means turns out to be Eros' surrendering of his victim, but rather part of a carefully planned strategy of torture. As becomes clear, the special point of the

¹⁷² Müller 1974: 151–2. Note that the German verb 'härtten' (besides 'löschen') is the *terminus technicus* for that step in forging; Schwyzer 1930: 314.

¹⁷³ 'Das Ich befindet sich in dem Zustand, in den Eros es versetzen wollte: von Liebesverlangen nach einer bestimmten Person erfüllt.'

¹⁷⁴ 'Il poeta...uscirà adeguatamente temprato per sostenere l'amoroso cimento.'

two lines lies in the combination of the forging image with the $\delta\eta\tilde{\nu}\tau\epsilon$ -topos.¹⁷⁵ The elements of violence seem to illustrate a particularly strong emotional experience which one would expect to be unique. If, however, the same process is presented as a repetition, the truth turns out to be different and the reliability of the speaker in choosing the right images for his emotions is undermined (Mace 1993: 339–40; Hutchinson 2001: 275 speaks of an ‘unserious metaphor’). But it is not only the intensity of the images which creates a tension with the idea of repetition inherent in $\delta\eta\tilde{\nu}\tau\epsilon$, but also the fact that dousing the iron appears as a final point in the process of forging. So, it is all the more striking when, despite this motif of closure (confirmed by the Homeric model where only one dousing is described), we learn that this is a repetition. This does not mean that in real forging the iteration of heating, beating and cooling would be something absurd. On the contrary, it is required in order to produce a more sophisticated artifact like a sword.¹⁷⁶ Nevertheless, what An. describes appears especially from the perspective of the treated iron, i.e. the loving speaker, as the painful iteration of a process which had seemed to have come to an end. Thus PMG 413 has an effect similar to PMG 376 where the leap from the Leucadian Rock is presented in the $\delta\eta\tilde{\nu}\tau\epsilon$ -formula. Since the jump was thought to be a cure from love (cf. n. on PMG 376.1–2) it resembles the dousing in the water (if we take it as an emotional hardening). The dominant role of water does not seem to be mere chance. Here, too, the paradox lies in the repetition of the process which should have brought final relief. This special effect of PMG 376 and 413 is due to the fact that in both the repeated process describes not erotic passion alone, but erotic passion followed by an apparent overcoming of it. This two-piece structure sets apart both fragments from other $\delta\eta\tilde{\nu}\tau\epsilon$ -pieces which (at least in their transmitted extent) describe the erotic passion alone.¹⁷⁷ Thus PMG 376 and 413 make clear very forcefully that any belief of having escaped the power of love will turn out to be an illusion, in the case of PMG 413 even an illusion created by cruel Eros himself.

§ 5. Afterlife

At the beginning of his encomium on Theoxenus of Tenedus, Pindar says of those who are not filled with desire when they see Theoxenus’ eyes (Pi. fr. 123.4–6 Maehler):

¹⁷⁵ It seems doubtful to me that the use of $\delta\eta\tilde{\nu}\tau\epsilon$ in combination with a piece of Homeric intertextuality can be taken as a metaliterary device (unlike Venus’ address to the poetess in Sapph. fr. 1.15 V., with Hutchinson 2001: 155). After all, the blacksmith in *Od.* 9.391–3 is not Eros.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. *Arch. Hom.* L 29 (F. Eckstein); another possible reason for reiterated heating and quenching was the wish to take away brittleness from the steel (cf. Griffith 1999: 205 on S. *Ant.* 474–6, with reference to Forbes 1950: 398–9).

¹⁷⁷ e.g. Alc. *PMGF* 59a, Sapph. fr. 130 V., An. *PMG* 358, which however also contains the speaker’s rejection by the girl from Lesbos; on the simultaneity of love and not-love in An. *PMG* 428 (similarly Ibyc. *PMGF* 287, where Eros’ impact on the speaker and the speaker’s reluctance is described; An. *PMG* 400 only seems to contain the speaker’s attempt to flee love).

ἐξ ἀδάμαντος
ἡ σιδάρου κεχάλκευται μέλαιναν καρδίαν
ψυχρᾷ φλογί.

In contrast, the speaker himself melts like wax when he sees ‘the young limbs of the boys’ (10–12):

ἀλλ’ ἐγὼ τὰς ἑκατι κηρὸς ὥς δαχθεὶς ἔλα
ῖρᾶν μελίσσῶν τάκομαι, εὖτ’ ἂν ἴδω
παίδων νεόγυιον ἐς ἥβαν.

Although direct influence of our fragment cannot be proved, Pindar, while drawing on the Odyssean blacksmith simile of *Od.* 9.391–3, probably also further develops the erotic use of the image as represented for us by PMG 413. In order to stress the lack of sensitivity of the others Pindar focuses just on the hardness of the steel after forging (with the verb in a resultative perfect).¹⁷⁸ The process of heating is called into mind by φλογί (6), but at the same time paradoxically qualified with ψυχρᾷ,¹⁷⁹ the very adjective used in *Od.* 9.392 of the water to quench the red-hot axe. This means that unlike the speaker in An. who experiences the change from heat (= passion) to coldness (= insensitivity), the ‘steel-hard ones’ in Pindar have reached that status even without having been red-hot.¹⁸⁰ Thus (seen from the perspective of the *illustrans*) these people’s hardness is a physical adynaton. The opposite pole, heat and flexibility, which had been *within* the forging image in An., is now represented by another image, that of beeswax melting under the sun.¹⁸¹ It picks up the rays (ἀκτῖνας) which come from Theoxenus’ eyes in 2–3; cf. e.g. *Od.* 5.479. This image (although not including any physical impossibilities) corresponds to the image of the steel which has never experienced heat, insofar as wax is soft (at least in comparison with iron) even before being heated.

By comparing Eros to a craftsman An. presents himself once more as a forerunner of Hellenistic poetry (cf. general introd., § 7.1.2.), especially epigram, where Eros, then imagined as a small child, is depicted in different professional occupations such as ploughing (Moschus *AP* 16.200 = *HE* 2683–8) and tending cattle (Myrinus *AP* 7.703 = *GP* 2568–73).¹⁸²

¹⁷⁸ Therefore the fragment confirms our interpretation of the second part of An. *PMG* 413; cf. above, § 4.

¹⁷⁹ The motif is continued in l. 9, †ψυχρὰν† φορεῖται πᾶσαν ὁδόν, but the adjective might be corrupt.

¹⁸⁰ Therefore they somewhat resemble Achilles, who was born to ‘the sea and the rocks’, i.e. infertile and inanimate parts of nature, in *Il.* 16.34–5.

¹⁸¹ ἔλα = ἡλίω (cf. Hsch. s.v. ἔλα, ε 1835) is a conjecture by Bergk, however.

¹⁸² A. Furtwängler in Roscher 1884–1937: 1.1367 for examples in visual art, also *LIMC* s.v. Eros/Amor, Cupido, nos. 521–48, N. Blanc/F. Gury. Erotes working in a smithy occur in Roman art, especially on sarcophagi (Blümmner 1875–1912: 4.369–71, Koch/Sichtermann 1982: 209).

Anacreont. 28 West modifies the forging image: it depicts Hephaestus producing arrows for the Erotes out of steel. Then Kypris dips the weapons into honey, into which Eros mixed gall (5-7):

ἀκίδας δ' ἔβαπτε Κύπρις
μέλι τὸ γλυκὺ λαβοῦσα.
ὁ δ' Ἔρως χολὴν ἔμισγε.

This act seems to evoke the quenching of the metal in water, since βάφη is the *terminus technicus* for it.¹⁸³ But at the same time, insofar as honey and gall are used instead of water (a clear reworking of Sapph. fr. 110 V.) the process appears as a poisoning of the arrows (cf. S. Tr. 574 for this use of the verb). Whether this poem is directly influenced by PMG 413 seems uncertain, given the different role of Eros and the absence of verbal links.

1 **μεγάλω**: For the collocation with πέλεκυς cf. Od. 5.234, 9.391 (the main model of our fragment, where in the next verse the sizzling of the hot axe in the water is described with μέγала ἰάχοντα). Here of course it emphasizes the violence which the narrator suffers in the form of Eros' blows.

δηῦτε: On this adverb used in a typical opening of a love poem see PMG 376 n. 1. Apart from PMG 400 this is the only instance of the δηῦτε-construction in archaic lyric poetry combined not with a present tense, but with an aorist. Thus, the narrator is not speaking while suffering the process described, but from a temporal distance. δηῦτε probably qualifies both actions, that is, the process of heating the metal and beating it, then dipping it into water happened again (pace Goldhill 1987: 10 who seems to take it to refer only to the first part). This interpretation is also suggested by the analogous process in PMG 376; cf. introd., § 5.

Fränkel 1975: 297 n. 17 aptly adduces Pl. Ti. 73e where the δημιουργός produces bony substance out of a mixture of earth and marrow. He hardens it by dipping it into fire and water repeatedly: μετὰ τοῦτο εἰς πῦρ αὐτὸ ἐντίθησιν, μετ' ἐκείνο δὲ εἰς ὕδωρ βάπτει, πάλιν δὲ εἰς πῦρ, αὐθίς (cf. δηῦτε in An.) τε εἰς ὕδωρ. μεταφέρων δ' οὕτω πολλάκις εἰς ἑκάτερον ὑπ' ἀμφοῖν ἄτηκτον ἀπηργάσατο. However, this is scarcely a deliberate allusion since very different substances are involved.

ἔκοψεν: Although the polysemy of the verb is limited by μέγλω (which suggests an instrument of striking, as often attached to κόπτω) and the accusative μ', several meanings and usages are relevant in the present context: (i) 'smiting with weapons', either in battle (Od. 8.528 δούρεσσι) or in sacrifice, in which case with a πέλεκυς (Il. 17.521, Od. 3.443; cf. also 449), or beating with other instruments, e.g. σκηπανίῳ (Il. 13.59-60), (ii) 'forging' as later in the sentence determined by χαλκεύς (Il. 18.379b ~ Od. 8.274b), (iii) 'chopping (trees)',

¹⁸³ Od. 9.392; Blümner 1875-1912: 4.345-6, with reference to Plu. mor. 436a.

e.g. Th. 2.75.1, not recommended by μ'(ε), but later perhaps suggested by the use of πέλεκυς. 'Blows of Eros' are implied in the image of PMG 396.2 ὥς μὴ πρὸς Ἔρωτα πυκταλίζω with n.¹⁸⁴

ὥστε: Used by An. only in this way, i.e. to introduce a comparison: PMG 427.1-2, 437, Homeric Il. 11.66, λάμψ' ὥς τε στεροπή.

χαλκεύς: Already in Homer a worker also in other metals than bronze, e.g. iron, as in the model simile Od. 9.391-3.

2 **πελέκει**: The word poses the biggest exegetical problem of the fragment: χαλκεύς at the end of l. 1 has made clear that Eros' beating is compared to a blacksmith's hammering. Therefore, one would expect a noun which denotes the proper instrument (prepared already by μέγλω), the word for which is σφύρα (Od. 3.434) or ραιστήρ (Il. 18.477), not πέλεκυς, which always means 'axe'. By pointing to the resemblance between axe and hammer, visible also in vase paintings and in the word σφυροπέλεκυς (IG 1².313.132, Eleusis, 408/407 BC), meaning 'hammer-axe', as well as to words for either axe or hammer in Indo-European languages which derive from the same roots, Schwyzler 1930: 316-18 argues for the existence of a locally restricted meaning 'hammer' for πέλεκυς. But apart from the lack of instances of πέλεκυς which actually have this meaning, and the fact that the verb κόπτειν in l. 1 is also compatible with an axe (cf. n.), the Homeric model should be taken into account (not done by Schwyzler 1930): here (Od. 9.391-3) a hot μέγας (cf. μέγλω in An.) πέλεκυς, dipped into the cold water by the blacksmith, illustrates the stake used to blind the Cyclops' eye, an action which has been illustrated not long beforehand (384-6) with a drill simile (with syntax similar to our fragment, namely with the tool in an instrumental dative plus an accusative). As Pace 1994 has shown, the abnormal usage of πέλεκυς in An. can be explained as a compendious blending of both Homeric similes, giving to the πέλεκυς (which was the object of the blacksmith's work in Od. 9.391) the function of the drill in Od. 9.385. By doing this, the analogy between the Anacreontic Eros and Odysseus becomes even stronger.¹⁸⁵

Despite this explanation by means of Homeric intertextuality, the result on the actual text of An. remains odd, as Pace 1994: 102 notes. By changing πελέκει into πέλεκυν or (paleographically easier) πελέκεα a clear sense would be given: Eros strikes the narrator as a blacksmith strikes an axe (strictly speaking its 'head'). Thus An. would follow the Odyssean model even more closely, since the axe remains the object produced. The accusative πελέκεα is attested in

¹⁸⁴ Cf. A. Ag. 1204, ἰμέρω πεπληγμένος. Ag. 479 (lyr.), φρενῶν κεκομμένος, is not a suitable parallel of a metaphorical usage of the verb since the genitive φρενῶν is rather to be interpreted as separative; cf. Fraenkel 1962: ad loc.; for the image in Latin cf. Catull. 63.79, ictus furoris. For 'beating' of other emotions cf. e.g. Il. 19.125, τὸν δ' ἄχος ὅξυ κατὰ φρένα τύψε βαθεῖαν.

¹⁸⁵ On this analogy see already Bonanno 1993: 192-4.

Hsch. π 1310 *πελέκεα*: *πέλεκυν δίστομον* (probably from Diogenianus);¹⁸⁶ for the form of the comparison—consisting only of subject and object—cf. Simon. PMG 519 fr. 92.6–7, ὥσθ' *νίῳ μάτηρ ὀψι[γόνῳ]*, and Catull. 72.3–4, *dilexi tum te non tantum, ut uulgu amicum*. A disadvantage of changing *πελέκει* would be that the alteration would have to include *μεγάλω*, which not only recalls the Homeric *πέλεκυν μέγαν* (*Od.* 9.391), but also forms an effective parallelism with *χειμερίη...χαράδρῃ* (cf. introd., § 3). After all, *μεγάλως* would be a possible alternative. The form is not attested in lyric poetry, but is in Homer and Herodotus. For the combination with *ἔκοιεν* cf. A. *Pers.* 905–7, *αὖ φέρομεν πολέμοισι δμαθέντες μεγάλως πλαγαῖσι πονταίαισιν*, with a semantically similar collocation in *Od.* 16.432, *ἐμέ δὲ μεγάλως ἀκαχίζεις*.

χειμερίη: 'Wintry' here in the sense of *χειμάρροος*, which is regularly joined with *ποταμός* in Homer, meaning 'swollen by the winter rain'; cf. e.g. *Il.* 4.452–4, especially 453, ὄβριμον ὕδωρ, and Sch. (D) *Il.* 5.88. In Homer (four times in *Il.*) it occurs only in similes and illustrates 'speed and violence' (*Lfgre* 4.1155.21–2, W. Beck). For *χειμέριος* itself combined with a word for 'river' cf. Antagoras *HE* 165 = *AP* 9.147.2, A.R. 4.460–1, *χαράδρης | χειμερίης*, possibly alluding to An. (Livrea 1973: ad loc.). Apart from coldness (therefore conserving the idea of ὕδατι ψυχρῷ in the Homeric model passage *Od.* 9.392) the adjective may evoke the idea of a storm (Monaco 1958: 185, referring to *χείμα* and *χειμών* in this sense; cf. the combination with *ἀέλλαι* in *Il.* 2.293–4), which is a traditional image of psychological and erotic distress; cf. Sappho fr. 47.1 V, Ibyc. *PMGF* 286.8–13, later e.g. S. *Aj.* 205–7 with Finglass 2011: ad loc.; in An. himself probably *PMG* 403; cf. introd. to that poem, § 3.

ἔλουσεν: After the speaker being represented as a piece of iron in the preceding parts, the dipping into the water (an action harmonizing with this image in principle) is now described with a verb which is rarely used of inanimate objects (*LSJ* s.v. 1b) and therefore emphasizes the human character of the object. For the combination with *ἐν χαράδρῃ* cf. *Od.* 6.210 and 7.296 (λ. ἐν ποταμῷ), of Odysseus being bathed by Nausicaa's servants. It seems doubtful whether a deliberate contrast with this Homeric scene is intended in An. (*pace* Vox 1990: 65 and De Martino/Vox 1996: 961).

ἐν χαράδρῃ: The etymology of the word is unclear (on the older connection with *χαράσσειν* ('cut') cf. Beekes 2010 s.v. *χέραδος*). The word means either the bed of a torrent (e.g. *Il.* 4.454, where the water itself is described with *χείμαρροι ποταμοί* in 452, similarly Thgn. 347–8, ἐγὼ δὲ κύων ἐπέρησα χαράδρην | *χειμάρρῳ ποταμῷ*) or (as here) the torrent itself (e.g. *Il.* 16.390), which is swollen by the winter rain (Hsch. χ 171 *χαράδρα*: *χείμαρρος ποταμός*). In Homer it

¹⁸⁶ I am grateful to K. Alpers (email of 18 March 2013) for explaining the entry to me. According to him, the entry refers to a lost source (the defective reading of A in Sch. *Il.* 16.559a hardly counting as evidence). Since An. is mentioned seven times in glosses from Diogenianus, the form *πελέκεα* may theoretically be taken from An. However, Alpers remains sceptical about the special case, since the alternative *πελέκει* is well attested by Hsch. and confirmed by *μεγάλω*.

is only used in two similes of the *Iliad* which illustrate the violence of a battle scene (cf. above *χειμερίη* with n.). Mart. 4.55.14–15 underlines that the Salo river, which tempers weapons, is rushing: (*Platea*) *quam fluctu tenui sed inquieto | armorum Salo temperator ambit*.

PMG 414

For the metre, cf. *PMG* 413. The line probably comes from a poem on Smerdies' lost hair (on the biographical tradition, cf. introd. to *PMG* 347 fr. 1, § 3). This poem was different from *PMG* 347 fr. 1.¹⁸⁷

The metaphor *ἄμωμον ἄνθος* is explained by the depending genitive *ἀπαλῆς κομῆς*. These syntagmata correspond to each other not only in content but also in form: the word order (adjective/noun) is parallel, with the corresponding words containing an equal number of syllables; it may also be worth noting that the adjectives start with the same vowel.¹⁸⁸ The imagery draws on two usages of *ἄνθος* in earlier poetry:

- (i) hair resembles an *ἄνθος* (through the aspects of growing as well as of beauty); cf. *Od.* 6.230b–231 = 23.157b–158 (beautification of Odysseus):

καὶ δὲ κάρητος
οὐλας ἦκε κόμας, ὑακινθίνῳ ἄνθει ὁμοίας.¹⁸⁹

- (ii) Moreover, *ἄνθος* is a metaphor for the bloom of youth from Homer onward, mainly in the collocation *ῥέβης ἄνθος*, which refers to the beauty of girls and boys in post-Homeric epic (*Lfgre* 1.876.61–77, B. Mader, with reference to Hes. *Th.* 988, *h. Cer.* 108), referring rather to strength in *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Therefore, as Fränkel 1975: 294 justly remarks, the occurrence of *ἄνθος* would point to the fact that the cutting of Smerdies' hair is a *rite de passage* to mark the beginning of adulthood.

ἀπέκειρας: If Favorinus paraphrases the context correctly by saying that Smerdies himself cut off his hair, one would rather expect a reflexive middle voice here (Kühner/Gerth 1898–1904: 1.103–4, *Lfgre* 2.1365.57–8, S. R. van der

¹⁸⁷ On the improbability that *PMG* 414 comes from the same poem as *PMG* 347 fr. 1, cf. introd. to *PMG* 347 fr. 1, § 3. Note that Favorinus shortly after his response to An. addresses the boy as ὦ καλὲ παῖδων which might reflect *PMG* 346 fr. 1.3 *καλλιπρόσωπε παῖδων*, cf. n.

¹⁸⁸ The correspondence described here would also work if we were to accept *ἀπαλὴν κόμην* in codex M, with *ἄμωμον ἄνθος* in apposition. But the genitive is better attested.

¹⁸⁹ Cf. also *h. Cer.* 178 and Hes. fr. 132 Merkelbach–West, where the loss of the Proteids' hair (probably related in fr. 133) is described as a loss of their *ἄνθος*, caused by Hera: εἵνεκα μαχλοσύνης στυγερῆς τέρεν ὤλεσεν ἄνθος. On these fragments cf. introd. to comm. on *PMG* 347 fr. 1.6 n.

has been developed by a slight change of the word *τάλαντα*,¹ as it is said in the comic poet: '*τὰ*) *Ταντάλου τάλαντα τανταλίζεται* ("Tantalus' talents are rocking").

Sud τ 147 (4.507.12–20 Adler) Photium exscripsit), cf. Suda τ 81 (4.501.21–3 Adler); Apostol. 16.16 (2.660.11–16 Leutsch–Schneidewin) Photium fortasse exscripsit; de *P.Oxy.* 3695 fr. 3.2]ατάν[cf. comm. ad loc.

In lemmate τὰ (om. Suda τ 147 cod. G et Sud τ 81) *Ταντάλου τάλαντα τανταλίζεται* Sud. | τὰ in fr. Ar. add. Porson (τα iam in Suda cod. G qui verba Ar. et quae sequuntur praemisso τὰ ante glossam transposuit). De ceteris fontium lectionibus cf. K.–A. ad Ar. fr. dub. 963.

PMG 356

- (a) ἄγε δὴ φέρ' ἡμιν ὦ παῖ
κελέβην, ὅκως ἄμυστιν
προπίω, τὰ μὲν δέκ' ἐγχέας
ὔδατος, τὰ πέντε δ' οἴνου
5 κυάθους, ὥς ἂν ὑβριστιῶς†
ἀνὰ δηῶτε βασσαρήσω.

- (b) ἄγε δηῶτε μηκέτ' οὔτω
πατάγω τε κάλαητῶ
Σκυθικὴν πόσιν παρ' οἴνω
μελετῶμεν, ἀλλὰ καλοῖς
5 ὑποπίνοντες ἐν ὕμνοις.

- (a) Come, boy, bring a cup, so that I can drink it dry in one draught, pouring in ten ladles of water, five of wine, that I may once again be in frenzy, but moderately.

- (b) Come now, let us no longer practise any more Scythian drinking with clatter and shouting over wine, but moderately drinking amid beautiful songs.

Ath. 10.427a–b (2.428–9 Kaibel) παρὰ δὲ Ἀνακρέοντι εἰς οἴνου πρὸς δύο ὔδατος· “ἄγε—βασσαρήσω.” καὶ προελθὼν τὴν ἀκρατοποσίαν Σκυθικὴν καλεῖ πόσιν· “ἄγε—ἐν ὕμνοις.”

In An. the mixture is one part wine to two parts water: ... and proceeding he calls the drinking of unmixed wine Scythian drinking: ...

- (a) 1–5: Ath. 11.475c (3.45 Kaibel; accedit epitome in codd. C et E) κελέβη. τούτου τοῦ ἐκπώματος Ἀνακρέων μνημονεύει. “ἄγε—κυάθους.”

Eust. *Od.* 1476.30–2 (1.138.6–7 Stallbaum) Ἀθήναιος δὲ παράγει καὶ Ἀνακρέοντος τό· “ἄγε —κυάθους”.

- (a) 6: in *P.Oxy.* 3722 fr. 80.6 fortasse βα[σ]σαρ[ι], sed cf. etiam PMG 411 (b).

Porph. *Hor. carm.* 1.27 (p. 35 Holder) *Protrepitice ode est haec ad hilaritatem, cuius sensus sumptus est ab Anacreonte ex libro tertio* (sed cf. comm., § 7).

- (a) 1 ἡμῖν codd. : corr. Barnes 2 ὅπως Ath. 475, Eust. 3 μὲν δ' ἐκχέας Ath. 427
5 ἂν ὑβριστιῶσανα A : ἀνυβρίστωσ Pauw: ἀνυβριστί Baxter : ὥς (ἂν) ἀνύβριστ(a) dubitanter
Page 6 δευτε A : corr. Bergk 1834: 184
(b) 1 μηκέτ' Fick : μηκέθ' Ath.

PMG 357

- ὦναξ, ᾧ δαμάλης Ἔρωσ
καὶ Νύμφαι κυανώπιδες
πορφυρῇ τ' Ἀφροδίτῃ
συμπαίζουσιν, ἐπιστρέφει δ'
5 ὑψηλὰς ὀρέων κορυφάς·
γουνουμαί σε, σὺ δ' εὐμενής
ἔλθ' ἡμιν, κεχαρισμένης δ'
εὐχολῆς ἐπακούειν·
Κλεοβούλῳ δ' ἀγαθὸς γένεο
10 σύμβουλος, τὸν ἐμὸν δ' Ἔρωτ',
ὦ Δεόνυσσε, δέχεσθαι.

Lord, with whom frisky Eros and the blue-eyed Nymphs and purple Aphrodite play and you roam the lofty summits of the mountains, I supplicate you, come to us with kindly favour, and hear my prayer and find it gracious. Be to Cleobulus a good adviser, and admit my Eros (to your play), Dionysus.

D. Chr. 2.62 (1.29 von Arnim, 96 Vagnone) τούτοις γε μὴν ξυνέπεται μηδὲ εὐχὰς εὐχέσθαι τὸν βασιλέα τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁμοίας μηδὲ αὐ τοὺς θεοὺς καλεῖν οὕτως εὐχόμενον ὥσπερ ὁ Ἰώνων ποιητὴς Ἀνακρέων, “ὦναξ—δέχεσθαι”.

From this it follows that the king should not offer prayers similar to others nor invoke the gods in prayer as An., the poet of the Ionians, does ...

St.Byz. s.v. Ἀσκάλων (1.276 Billerbeck) “δαμάλης Ἔρωσ”

Ael. NA 4.2 (p. 75 García Valdés) τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ὁ Τήϊος ἡμῖν Ἀνακρέων ἄδει, πορφυρῇν που λέγων.

¹ Bühler 1982–99: 5.276.

Hsch. δ 170 (1.539 Latte–Cunningham) δαμάλην· τὸν ἔρωτα. ἤτοι τὸν δαμάζοντα. ἢ ἀγέρωχον

cf. Hsch. δ 169 (1.539 Latte–Cunningham) δάμαλις· μόσχος. καὶ κατὰ παντὸς νέου.

1 ὦ ἀναξ U : ὦ pro ὦ codd. omn. | δάμαλις PWEYTo (ante corr.) Su 3 -ρέη codd.
4 -ουσι U | ἐπιστρέφει VB : -φεται rell. 5 ὕψηλᾶς... κορυφᾶς PWYToSu (κορυφῆς) :
-λῶν U : ὕψηλῶν κορυφᾶς ὁρέων transpos. Barnes 7 ἔλθ' ἡμῖν UBVT : ἔλθοις μοι
rell. 8 ἐπακούειν UBVT : ἐπακούων rell. 9 Κλεν- codd. | γ' PMToSu : γε Y | γενεῦ V :
γένεϋ rell. 10 δ' ἔρωτα E ('Ἐρωτα scripsi) : δέ ἔρωτα UBVT : δέ τ' ἔρωτα rell. : γ' ἔρωτ'
coni. Kan 11 ὦ δ' εὐνυσσε V : ὦ δ' εὐνύσε WEYToSu : ὦ δ' εὐνύσε PM (εὐ- M) : ὦ δ' εὐ νῦν σε
UB : corr. Emperius (Διό-), L. Dindorf (Δεύ-) : (δ' ἔρωτ')... δεχέσθω tempt. Page

PMG 358

σφαίρῃ δηυτέ με πορφυρῇ
βάλλων χρυσοκόμης Ἐρως
νήνι ποικιλοσαμβάλῳ
συμπαίζειν προκαλεῖται·
5 ἢ δ', ἔστιν γὰρ ἀπ' εὐκτίτου
Λέσβου, τὴν μὲν ἐμὴν κόμην,
λευκὴ γάρ, καταμέμφεται,
πρὸς δ' ἄλλην τινα χάσκει.

Once again, throwing a purple ball at me, Eros with the golden hair
challenges me to play with the girl with the colourful sandals. But she—
for she comes from well-founded Lesbos—finds fault with my hair (for
it is white), and she gapes instead at another (head of hair).

Ath. 13.599c–d (IV.A 164 Olson; om. epitome) Χαμαιλέων δ' ἐν τῷ Περὶ Σαπφούς
(fr. 26 Wehrli = fr. 29 Giordano = fr. 28 Martano) καὶ λέγειν τινὰς φησιν εἰς αὐτὴν
πεποιῆσθαι ὑπὸ Ἀνακρέοντος τάδε· “σφαίρῃ—χάσκει.” καὶ τὴν Σαπφὺν δὲ πρὸς
αὐτὸν ταυτὰ φησιν εἰπεῖν (Lesb. fr. adesp. 35 Lobel–Page = adesp. PMG 953).

κείνον, ὦ χρυσόθρονε Μοῦσ', ἐνίσπες
ὕμνον, ἐκ τᾶς καλλιγύναικος ἐσθλᾶς
Τήϊος χώρας ὃν ᾄειδε τερπνῶς
πρέσβυς ἀγαυός.

Chamaeleon in his work *On Sappho* reports that there are some who maintain that the fol-
lowing lines were composed by An. addressed to her (Sappho): ‘... And they report that
Sappho directed the following lines to him: ‘Utter that hymn, O golden-throned Muse, which
from the fine land of beautiful women the glorious old Teian man delightfully sang.’

Et.Gud. cod. z (*Etymologicum Sorbonicum* apud Gaisford in comm. ad EM 448.29) μήτι·
διὰ τοῦ “ι”, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τοῦ νεάνις κατὰ κράσιν γίνεται νήνις, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν νήνιος νήνι, καὶ

κράσει τῶν δύο “ι” εἰς ἐν μακρὸν νήνι, οἷ(ον) νήνι ποικίλους ἀμβάλῳ.

1 δηυτέ Seidler : δευτέ Ath. | πορφυρενι Ath. corr. Pauw 3 ποικίλος λαμβάνω Ath. :
ποικίλους ἀμβάλῳ *Et. Gud.* : corr. Seidler 5 ἀπευκτικού Ath. : corr. Barnes 8 ἄλλον
Barnes, ‘alios’ vertit Dalechamps

PMG 359

Κλεοβούλου μὲν ἔγωγ' ἐρέω,
Κλεοβούλῳ δ' ἐπιμαίνομαι,
Κλεόβουλον δὲ διοσκέω.

Cleobulus is the one I love,
Cleobulus I am crazy about,
Cleobulus I am staring at.

Ps.Hdn. Fig. 40 = 123.49–124.64 Hajdú Πολύπτωτον δέ, ὅταν...ὡς παρὰ
Κλεοχάρει...καὶ παρὰ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχῳ (fr. 115 W.)...παρὰ δὲ Ἀνακρέοντι·
“Κλεοβούλου—διοσκέω”.

Polyptoton is whenever (definition follows) as in Cleocharēs...and in Archilochus...and
in An.:...

1–3 Κλεν- ζ (in 3 H p.c.) M : κλεο- Ae, alii alia 1 ἔγωγ' ἐρῶ Hηβ : ἐγὼ γελῶ W
2 δ' ἐπιμαίνομαι α : δέ ποιμαίνομαι (-μεν E) β 3 δέ om. ζε | διοσκέω Bergk 1834 ex Hsch.
δ 1926 (1.620 Latte–Cunningham): διὸς κνέων ζ : διοκνέω F : διοσκνέω Bη : διὸς κναίω Bγρ :
διακνέω L : (διώκω suspicatur L. E. Rossi apud Leo 2015: 62 et 67) : διαινέω B : δι ιδεῖν ἐπιποθῶ
M, unde δ' ιδέειν ποθέω Dindorf

PMG 360

ὦ παῖ παρθένιον βλέπων,
δίζημαί σε, σὺ δ' οὐ κλύεις,
οὐκ εἰδὼς ὅτι τῆς ἐμῆς
ψυχῆς ἡνιοχέυεις.

Boy with the girlish glance, I seek you, but you do not listen, not
knowing that you hold the reins of my soul.

Ath. 13.564d (IV.A 99 Olson; accedit epit. in codd. C et E, IV.A 428 Olson) καὶ ἡ Σαπφὺ
δὲ πρὸς τὸν ὑπερβαλλόντως θαυμαζόμενον τὴν μορφήν καὶ καλὸν εἶναι νομιζόμενον
φησιν (fr. 138 V.). ὁ δ' Ἀνακρέων τί φησίν; “ὦ παῖ—ἡνιοχέυεις”.

PMG 375

τίς ἐρασμὴν
τρέψας θυμὸν ἐς ἥβην τερένων ἡμιόπων ὑπ' αὐλῶν
ὀρχεῖται;

Who has turned his mind to lovely youth and dances to the tender
half-size pipes?

Ath. 4.177a-182c οἷδαμεν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἡμιόπους καλουμένους, περὶ ὧν φησιν Ἀνακρέων
“τίς—ὀρχεῖται;” εἰσὶ δ' οἱ αὐλοὶ οὗτοι ἐλάσσονες τῶν τελείων... εἰσὶν δ' οἱ αὐτοὶ
τοῖς παιδικοῖς καλουμένοις, οἷς οὐκ οὔσιν ἐναγωνίοις πρὸς τὰς εὐωχίας χρώνται. διὸ
καὶ τέρενας αὐτοὺς κέκληκεν ὁ Ἀνακρέων.

We also know the so-called half-size pipes, about which An. says: ... These pipes are
smaller than the complete ones... they are the same as the so-called ‘child-pipes’,
which are not suitable for public contests but are used at parties. Therefore An. calls
them tender.

2 τρέψας recc. : θρέψας A | ἐς ἥβην Mehlhorn : ἐσέβην codd. | τερένων ἡμιόπων Casaubon : τέρεν
ὡς ἡμιόπον codd.

PMG 376

⊗ ἀρθεῖς δηῦτ' ἀπὸ Λευκάδος
πέτρης ἐς πολὺν κύμα κολυμβῶ μεθύων ἔρωτι.

Once more, I leap up from the Leucadian Rock,
and dive into the grey sea, drunk with love.

Heph. Poem. 7.2 (p. 71 Consbruch) Εἰσὶ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ποιήμασι καὶ οἱ ἀρρενικῶς οὕτω
καλούμενοι ἐπωδοί, ὅταν μεγάλῳ στίχῳ περιττόν τι ἐπιφέρηται... ὅταν δὲ ἔμπαλιν
ἡ τάξις ᾗ, προφδὸς καλεῖται, ὡς παρὰ Ἀνακρέοντι. “ἀρθεῖς—ἔρωτι”.

In poems there are also the so-called epodes (the noun is masculine) when an
addition is made to a long line... but if the order is reversed, it is called a pro-ode, as
in An.:...

Philostr. Im. 1.15.2 ἔρχεται παρὰ τὴν Ἀριάδην ὁ Διόνυσος, “μεθύων ἔρωτι” φησὶ περὶ
τῶν ἀκρατῶς ἐρώντων ὁ Τῆιος.

Apostol. 3.90c (2.308 Leutsch-Schneidewin) ἀρθεῖς—ἔρωτι. Ἀνακρέοντος.

2 ἐς Heph. cod. I : εἰς Heph. codd. AH, Apostol. | κολυμβέω conl. Schneidewin

PMG 377

ἵπποθόρον δὲ Μυσοὶ
εὐρεῖν μεῖζιν ὄνων

(They say) that the Mysians discovered mare-mounting copulation by
donkeys.

Sch. (T) Il. 24.278 (5.571.69-73 Erbse) Μυσοὶ πλησίον ὄντες “Ἐνετῶν, ὅθεν ἡμιόνων
γένος” (Il. 2.852). ἢ ὡς καὶ παρὰ Μυσοῖς διαφόρων ὄντων Ἀνακρέων “ἵπποθόρον
—ὄνων” πρὸς ἵππους, ἐξ ὧν ἡμίονοι.

Because the Mysians were neighbours of the ‘Enetians, from whom the breed of
mules came’. Or because Mysian mules were also outstanding. An.: ... with horses, from
which mules come.

P.Oxy. 3722 fr. 15 col. i.5] ρονδεμυσι, sed vid. comm. ad loc.

fortasse Hsch. ι 828 ἵπποθόρος· ὄνος (νόμος conl. M. L. West) ἵππους βιβάζων

1 ἵπποθόρω Schneidewin, quem sequitur Labarbe : -ρων Bergk 2 εὐρον Bergk |
μίξ- cod.

PMG 378

⊗ ἀναπέτομαι δὴ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον πετρύγεσσι κούφης
διὰ τὸν Ἑρωτ'· οὐ γὰρ ἐμοὶ (-υ) θέλει συνηβᾶν.

Now I am flying up to heaven on light wings due to Eros, because X
(or he, i.e. Eros) does not want to share his youth with me.

Sch. Ar. Av. 1372c (p. 201 Holwerda) ἀναπέτομαι δὴ· παρὰ τὰ Ἀνακρέοντος·
“ἀναπέτομαι—συνηβᾶν”. διὸ καὶ τὸ “χ” ἔχουσι οἱ δύο στίχοι.

‘Now I am flying up’: according to An.’s words... Therefore the two verses have the χ
(i.e. a sign used by Aristarchus to point to something noteworthy).

Heph. 9.3 (p. 30 Consbruch) Ἀνακρέων δὲ ἐπετήδευσε τὴν πρώτην συζυγίαν δι’ ὅλου
ἄσματος ἐκ τριβραχέος καὶ ἰάμβου ποιῆσαι, ὡς εἶναι κοινὴν λύσιν τῆς τε χοριαμβικῆς
καὶ τῆς ἰαμβικῆς· “ἀναπέτομαι—κούφαις”, cf. epitome Hephaestionea 5 (p. 360
Consbruch).

Ps. Jul. Ep. 193 (p. 263.1-6 Bidez-Cumont) Εἰ δέ μοι θέμις ᾗν κατὰ τὸν Τῆιον ἐκείνων
μελοποιὸν εὐχήν τὴν τῶν ὀρνίθων ἀλλάξασθαι φύσιν, οὐκ ἂν δήπου πρὸς Ὀλυμπον
οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ μέμφεως ἔρωτικῆς, ἀλλ’ εἰς αὐτοὺς ἂν τῶν ὑμετέρων ὀρῶν τοὺς πρόποδας
ἔπτην, ἵνα σε, “τὸ μέλημα τῶμον”, ὡς φησιν ἡ Σαπφώ (fr. 163 V.), περιπτύξωμαι.

παντὶ τόπῳ (τρόπῳ? Herington), ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς θρηνητικοῖς, ὡς καὶ Σοφοκλῆς Τυροῖ β' (fr. 656 R.). ἔστι δὲ ταῦτα ὅμοια τῷ “οὐδ'—ἀπελθεῖν”.

The rhythm is anacreontic anacastic in order to produce the effect of lamentation. For he (i.e. An.) came to live in Attica, being in love with Critias, and he was very much pleased by the songs of the Tragedian (i.e. Aeschylus; according to Weil's conjecture: the Tragedian was (or the Tragedians were) very much pleased by his songs). But they used them not in every place, but in the lamentations, as Sophocles did too in the second Tyro (fr. 656 R.). And this is similar to the verse:...

οὐδ' ἀν' Mediceus WXY : τὸδ' ἀν' Sj : οὐ δηῶτε Page | ἀπ' οὐκαδ' ἐλθεῖν Edmonds

PMG 413

⊗ μεγάλῳ δηῶτέ μ' Ἔρως ἔκοιπεν ὥστε χαλκεύς
πελέκει, χειμερίῃ δ' ἔλουσεν ἐν χαράδρῃ.

With a great axe Eros struck me once again like a blacksmith and washed me in a wintry torrent.

Heph. 12.4 (p. 39 Consbruch) Καὶ τῷ βραχυκαταλήκτῳ δὲ Ἀνακρέων ὅλα ἄσματα συνέθηκεν “μεγάλῳ—χαράδρῃ.”

And with the brachycatalectic (tetrameter) An. composed whole songs:...

πελέκει codd. : an πέλεκυν vel πελέκεα (Hsch. π 1310) et μεγάλως in 1? cf. comm.

PMG 414

ἀπέκειρας δ' ἀπαλῆς κόμης ἄμωμον ἄνθος.

You have cut off the blameless bloom of your soft hair.

Stob. 4.21. (κατὰ κάλλους) 24 (4.491 Hense) Φαβωρίνου (fr. 13, 3.49 Amato)· Ἡ φύσις ἢ ἐστῶσα σώζεται ἢ φερομένη. [ἡ] ἐστῶσα μὲν ἐξ ἀθανασίας, φερομένη δὲ ἐξ ἐπιγονῆς. πρὸς ταῦτα γελοῖος ἂν φανείη ὁ Ἀνακρέων καὶ μικρολόγος τῷ παιδὶ μεμφόμενος ὅτι τῆς κόμης ἀπεκείρατο, λέγων ταῦτα. “ἀπέκειρας—ἄνθος.” ἀλλ', ὦ Ἀνάκρεον, μικρὸν ἐπίμεινον, καὶ ὄψει πάντα ἀποκεκαρμένα.

Favorinus: Nature is preserved either being fixed or in evolution: fixed through immortality, in evolution through growing. Given this, Anacreon might appear ridiculous and small-minded in blaming the boy for having cut off his own hair when he says:... But wait a bit, Anacreon, and you will see that all has been cut off.

ἀπέκειραο Bergk 1853 (-ω Page) | ἀπαλῆς κόμης SA : ἀπαλὴν κόμην M

PMG 415

Σικελικὸν κότταβον ἀγκύλῃ †δαΐζων†.

Dividing? the Sicilian *kottabos* with his wrist.

Ath. (2:429–30 Kaibel; om. epitome) 10.427 c–d ἦσαν δ' αἱ τῶν †ἀκροατῶν† (A : ἀκρατοποτῶν Toup : ἀκροαμάτων dubitanter Fortenbaugh) ἐπιχύσεις, ὡς φησι Θεόφραστος ἐν τῷ Περὶ μέθης (fr. 118 Wimmer, 570 Fortenbaugh), οὐ παλαιαί· ἀλλ' ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὸ μὲν σπένδειν ἀποδοδόμενον τοῖς θεοῖς, ὁ δὲ κότταβος τοῖς ἐρωμένοις. ἐχρώντο γὰρ ἐπιμελῶς τῷ κοτταβίζειν ὄντος τοῦ παιγνίου Σικελικοῦ, καθάπερ καὶ Ἀνακρέων ὁ Τῆριος πεποίηκε· “Σικελὸν—δαΐζων”.

The custom of toasting (the participants of a symposium?) was, as Theophrastus says in his work on drunkenness, not old. Rather, at the beginning (of a symposium) the libations were the gifts for the gods, the *kottabos* for the beloved boys. For they used the *kottabos* with great devotion, the game being Sicilian, as also An. of Teos has written in a poem:...

Σικελὸν censor Ienensis : Σικελικὸν A | δαΐζων A : λατάζων Wilamowitz, alii alia, vid. comm.

PMG 416

ἐγὼ δὲ μισέω

πάντας ὅσοι χθονίους ἔχουσι ῥυσμούς
καὶ χαλεπούς, μεμάθηκα δ' ὡς Μεγιστῇ(s)
τῶν ἀβακίζομένων.

I hate all who have sullen and difficult characters: I have learnt that Megistes belongs to the quiet ones.

EM 2.47 Gaisford (= Sym.Et. apud Et.Gen. 1.8 Lasserre–Livadaras) Παρὰ τὸ ἀβapakῆς οὖν γίνεται ἀβapakῶ, ὥσπερ εὐσεβῆς εὐσεβῶ, γίνεται δὲ καὶ ἀβapakίζω. φησὶν Ἀνακρέων· “ἐγὼ—ἀβapakίζομένων,” ἀντὶ τοῦ, τῶν ἡσυχίων καὶ μὴ θορυβωδῶν.

From ἀβapakῆς ('quiet') comes ἀβapakῶ ('I am quiet'), like εὐσεβῆς/εὐσεβῶ. There is also ἀβapakίζω. An. says:... (he uses τῶν ἀβapakίζομένων) instead of 'the peaceful ones' and 'those not causing disturbance'.

cf. An.Par. s.v. ἀβapakίζω 4.84.28–30 Cramer, Zonar. s.v. ἀβapakῆσαν, col. 11 Tittmann et adnot. 59, Etymologicum Casulanum (Vat. Gr. 1276), ed. Parlangeli 1954: 120.

1 ἐγὼ EM : ἔγω An. Par. | δὲ om. Sym.Et. codd. CV 2 πάντας ὅσοι Bergk 1834 : πάντας οὐ vel οἱ codd. | ῥυσμούς Bergk 1843 : ῥυμούς An. Par. : ῥυθμούς EM, Sym.Et. 3 χαλεπούς EM, An.Par. : χαλεπῶς Sym.Et. | μεμάθηκα δ' ὡς Μεγιστῇ(s) Schneidewin (qui scripsit Μεγίστη(s), sed formam corr. Fick) : μεμαθήκασι ὡς μεγίστη EM (μεμάθη (superscr. ε) D),