LEONIDAS OF TARENTUM: A WANDERING POET IN THE TRADITION OF GREEK LITERATURE

by

ALISSA A. VAILLANCOURT

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Classics in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2013

This manuscript has been read and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in Classics in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dee L. Clayman

Date

Chair of Examining Committee

Dee L. Clayman

Date

Executive Officer

Lawrence Kowerski

Joel B. Lidov

Craig Williams
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

LEONIDAS OF TARENTUM: A WANDERING POET IN THE TRADITION OF GREEK LITERATURE

by

Alissa A. Vaillancourt

Adviser: Professor Dee L. Clayman

This dissertation examines the poetry of Leonidas of Tarentum, a Greek epigrammatist from the first half of the third century BC. The study concentrates on the theme of wandering and his stylistic technique of *to oligon*, or meager, everyday subject matter, that is described in high language with elaborate diction and literary allusion, with reference to Homeric texts in particular. The project demonstrates how these themes provide coordination among his epigrams. Since his epigrams are preserved in the *Greek Anthology*, which is a combination of a number of anthologies from the first century BC through the sixteenth century CE, many scholars have doubted the possibility of a Leonidean, self-authored and autonomous collection. I argue that, through thematic coordination and a system of pairing, the collection proves to have once been an epigram book, comparable to the recently discovered epigram book attributed to Posidippus, also an author of the third century BC. This study reevaluates Leonidas' epigrams as part of their own autonomous collection, a collection that will be shown to have played an important role in the development of the genre of Hellenistic epigram and in the tradition of Greek literature.

For Marie-Rose

Acknowledgements

I owe great thanks to many people, who all guided and supported my efforts in completing this study. Thank you first and foremost to my adviser, Professor Dee L. Clayman, for inspiring me to undertake work on Leonidas of Tarentum in a Greek poetry seminar long ago. I owe a great deal of gratitude to Prof. Joel Lidov, who pays such careful attention to detail and offered so many thoughtful comments throughout my preparation for this manuscript and during my time at The Graduate Center. Thank you to Prof. Craig Williams for mentoring me in teaching at Brooklyn College and in studying epigram. Thanks also to Prof. Lawrence Kowerski for his support, contribution, and willingness to join this committee on short notice. I am honored by all of the support from my distinguished professors and colleagues, and from the magnificent community that is The City University of New York.

I extend dear thanks to my family and friends for their love, trust, and confidence that became my backbone. Thank you to my mother and stepmother, Debra Wehmeyer and Margaret Trafton, my father Jules, my sister Rebecca and her family, my grandparents, the Mancini-Scott family, and my friends and colleagues across the country. Most of all, I thank my husband, Andrew G. Scott, who supported me through every step of this process, and our lovely daughter Marie-Rose, who has bestowed upon me a lifetime of joy, and who gave the final push to complete this work.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

A-B	Austin, C. and Bastiniani, G., eds. *Posidippi Pellaei Auae Supersunt Omnia*. Milan, 2002.
AG	Beckby, H. *Anthologia Graeca*. 4 vols. 2nd edn., Munich, 1965-1968.
AP	*Palatine Anthology*
APl	*Planudean Anthology*
CA	Powell, J.U., ed. *Collectanea alexandrina*. Oxford, 1925.
CAH	*Cambridge Ancient History,* Cambridge, 1970.
CEG	Hansen, P.A., ed. *Carmina epigraphica graeca*. 2 vols. Berlin and New York, 1983-9.
Geffcken	Geffcken, J. *Leonidas von Tarent*. Leipzig (JbbClassPhil Suppl. 23), 1896.
G-P	Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L., eds. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1965.
G-P *Garland*	Gow, A.S.F. and Page, D.L., eds. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1968.
GVI	Peek, W. ed. *Griechische Vers-Inschriften, I: Grab-epigramme*. Berlin, 1955.
FGrH	Jacoby, F., ed. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*. Berlin 1923-1930. Leiden 1940-1998.
IG	*Inscriptiones graecae*
I.Magn.	Kern, O., ed., *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, 1900.
LSJ	Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon, 9th edn., rev. H. Stuart Jones, 1925-40.
ms./mss.	manuscript/manuscripts
OCD	Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A. eds. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd ed., rev.). Oxford, 2003.
OCT	*Oxford Classical Texts*

P.	papyrus
Page	Page, D.L., ed. *The Epigrams of Rufinus*. Cambridge, 1978.
P.Berol.	*Papyrus Berolinensis*
Pf.	Pfeiffer, R., ed. *Callimachus*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1949-53.
P.Mil.Vogl.	Papiri dell' Università degli Studi di Milano. Milan, 1961-2001.
P.Oxy.	*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. London, 1898.
P.Petrie	*The Flinders Petrie Papyri*. Dublin, 1891-1905.
RE	Pauly, A., Wissowa, G. and Kroll, W. *Real-Encyclopädie der klassichen Altertumswissenschaft*. Stuttgart, 1893-1978.
Reitzenstein E.u.S.	Reitzenstein, R. *Epigramm und Skolion: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung*. Giessen, 1893.
Stob.	Wachsmuth, C., and Hense, O., eds. *Joannis Stobaei Anthologium*. Berlin, 1884.

Introduction

This dissertation provides a thorough literary examination and analysis of the epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum. The scope of the project is a monograph in four chapters, which critically analyze and explore Leonidas' place within the Greek literary tradition, the themes that he has adopted and employed throughout his poetry, and the possibility that he himself might have compiled one of the earliest poetry books. The study concentrates on how his poems coordinate thematically, and how Leonidas of Tarentum should be considered an innovative poet in his own right, who reinvented and manipulated themes of earlier Greek and contemporary Hellenistic poetry to suit the artfulness of his collection.[1]

With this analysis, the study provides a new assessment of his epigrams in the context of the Greek literary tradition within and without the genre of epigram.[2] With the recently renewed interest in Hellenistic epigram, a number of studies on Hellenistic poetry books, speaker-identification in epigram, and literary allusion have shed new light on the development of the genre. Since these recent expansions in the study of Hellenistic epigram,[3] no study has offered a thorough and focused treatment of Leonidas' epigrams as a collection, despite the fact that Leonidas is the second largest contributor to the *Greek Anthology*, which greatly influenced later Greek and Latin poets.[4] By showing that Leonidas participated in the innovations in genre and

[1] All translations presented in this study are my own, unless noted otherwise.
[2] Within the Hellenistic period (typically assigned to literature composed within the years 323 - 31 BC), the epigram, originally a poetic form inscribed on tombstones, dedications, monuments, etc., became fictitious. Hellenistic epigrammatists reinvented the necessities of the genre, such as conciseness (and plays upon it), certain metrical prescriptions, and a sort of monumentalization as means of combining the traditional inscriptional form with rich allusiveness, and sharp wit, which became trademarks of the genre in later periods. See Giangrande 1968.
[3] In particular, the study of voice in Hellenistic epigram presented in Tueller 2008; the many contributions in Bing & Bruss 2007; Gutzwiller 2005; the many other studies that have been inspired by the publication of Austin & Bastianini 2002.
[4] Cameron (1993) offers a formal discussion on the influence of the Hellenistic anthologist Meleager, a poet who borrowed from earlier collections to build his own anthologies, and from whom later anthologists borrowed for the epigrams that they added to their own collections. This process of anthologizing eventually culminated in the *Greek Anthology*, which preserves many anthologies in one.

stylistic exchange commonly associated with the Hellenistic period, I hope to show that Leonidas' epigrams are a mastery of form in their own self-awareness of genre and are an engaged and thought-provoking response to contemporary Hellenistic literature. Leonidas' epigrams will be evaluated as part of their own autonomous collection, a collection that will be shown to have played an important role in the development of the genre of Hellenistic epigram and the tradition of Greek and later literature in general.

On account of the questionable chronology surrounding Leonidas' composition, many scholars once cast Leonidas aside and removed his studies of poetry that were Hellenistic in style and scope.[5] One of the last, more thorough, and progressive treatments of Leonidas was in 1971, when Marcello Gigante published a study of Leonidas that questioned the worthiness of earlier criticism that judged Leonidas' epigrams as "lower" – or inferior.[6] He argued that the poetic style of Leonidas should not be undervalued, considering that the number of his epigrams remaining is close to the number left behind by Meleager, from whose anthology Cephalas gathered and organized his own anthology.[7] Gigante, nevertheless, presumes that Leonidas' poetry, although contemporary to Hellenistic epigrammatists of the early third century BC, distinguishes itself as southern Italian poetry, and so distant from the poetic style of authors such as Callimachus and Asclepiades, on accounts of its incorporation of philosophical influences of his time and place.[8]

---

[5] Gow (1958: 113-123) argues for a date later than that proposed by Geffcken (1925b: 2021-31); Page (1975: x) lists Leonidas in category C, for poets dated to 250 BC, along with Euphorion, Hegesippus, Leonidas, Mnasalces, Philoxenus, which is listed after category B, which includes Alexander Aetolus, Apollonius Rhodius, Aratus, Arcesilaus, Asclepiades, Callimachus, Hedylus, Heraclitus, Nicias, Posidippus, Theaetetus, Theocritus.

[6] Before Gigante, although in a mode similar to Gigante, Labellarte (1969) focused on major themes of select poems, particularly exhibiting the "bucolic" and "morbid" as he sought to show that Leonidas' poems "speak to the heart and the mind of modern literature," though he separated Leonidas from contemporaries in the Hellenistic period. As Gigante (1971:12-23) points out, a turning point in the earlier criticism concerning Leonidas occurred in the response of Gow-Page (1965b: 307-309) in their *Hellenistic Anthology* to the arguments presented by Iohannes Geffcken (1925b: 2021-31).

[7] Gigante (1971: 11) notes that the number of epigrams oscillates between 92 and 103. In my evaluation, I will use the Gow-Page text, which ascribes 103, both certainly and uncertainly, to Leonidas of Tarentum.

[8] Gigante (1971: 43-71) notes the influences mostly of Cynic philosophy, but also of philosophical thought of Pythagoras, Aristoxenus, and Architas.

Although Gigante's treatment addresses Leonidas as an individual author, his study focuses primarily on identifying themes within the collection that situate Leonidas' biographical place among Greek poets and in Hellenistic society, and how his epigrams reflect Leonidas' biographical identity.[9] The present examination of Leonidas' poetry steps in the more progressive direction propelled by Gigante's *L'edera di Leonida,* yet it also evaluates the literary program inherent within his poetry in conjunction with other more recent studies in Greek epigram.

Contemporaneous to Gigante's treatment, the dissertation of Robert Douglass Philips offers a more philological analysis of the poetic style of Leonidas of Tarentum, and shows that in order to demonstrate the artfulness of Leonidas' elaborate poetry, it is important to understand the sources of his diction.[10] Philips' examination shows that Leonidas' use of neologisms and rare words was rooted in the poetry mostly of epic, but often of tragedy, lyric, as well as that of his contemporaries. Philips finds that Leonidas' word use was not merely for ornamentation or ostentation, as other scholars had previously assumed,[11] but that it tends to conform to adaptations of his contemporaries.[12] Philips' work shows that Leonidas' diction places him firmly among his Hellenistic contemporaries, and draws attention to the need to examine his collection not just in terms of diction, but also in terms of theme.

Kathryn Gutzwiller in her *Poetic Garlands*, which reinvigorated studies in Hellenistic epigram, proposes that Leonidas' epigrams were once possibly contained in his own autonomously organized poetry book, yet her study of him is not a focused and thorough

[9] For example, Gigante (1971: 130-132) argues that Leonidas' autobiographical epigrams show that the author identifies himself with "the laborious creature," as they emphasize the poverty of the poet himself.
[10] Philips 1972: 1-3.
[11] Geffcken 1896: 139, 149; Gow 1965b: 307; Gow 1958: 117; Lesky 1966: 739; et al.
[12] To an extent, I agree with Philips' (1972:3) argumentation, "only by determining the history of the word, i.e. its source, and its use by other poets, including his contemporaries, can the specific aims and peculiar qualities of Leonidas' use of the word be appreciated." We understand the aims and peculiar qualities of Leonidas' use of words even more thoroughly, when comparing its use in context of the corpus of his epigrams.

treatment. Gutzwiller, noting nineteenth century scholarship on Leonidas, which insisted on defining Leonidas as "a poor man's poet," commissioned by members of the lower class, shows how a unifying thread to his collection is one based on a perspective that treats all of society, lower and upper class, sympathetically, with philosophical and literary expertise.[13] Gutzwiller's argument does well in showing innovation in Leonidas' epigrams, yet within the framework of rejecting previous arguments proposed, rather than distinguishing his style as both unique and a reflection of the literary milieu surrounding him. This dissertation advances these arguments a step further, to show that Leonidas, by focusing on such themes and on the coordination among his epigrams, was not maneuvering outside of the literary world of his contemporaries, but was responding to the trends of his day.

Given the lack of dedicated attention paid to Leonidas previously, combined with the new studies that have been completed in the field of Hellenistic epigram,[14] it seems to be an appropriate time for offering a more detailed analysis of the form, style, and content presented in his collection of epigrams. This study argues that there is need for reassessment of the epigrams of Leonidas on account of his methods of adapting principles familiar from the Greek literary tradition to fit into his own uniquely Hellenistic design. Throughout the study, special attention is paid to the thematic development of "wandering" within his poems, the reconstruction of a possible poetry book of his epigrams, and how Leonidas' collection is an influential part of the Hellenistic literary tradition. As he responds to and marks the literary tradition with his own literary style and techniques, Leonidas of Tarentum proves to have had an interest in the literary and artistic exchanges of his Alexandrian peers, in style, and in organization, in addition to

[13] See Gutzwiller 1998a: 89 on Geffcken 1925a: 2023.
[14] See n.3 above.

having a certain "Cynic outlook" and attention to everyday figures.[15] This study as a whole analyzes not his biographical position, but his epigrams' literary outlook, by analyzing the theme of wandering. The theme of wandering provides a window toward understanding the place of Leonidas' poetry in the literary climate of the Alexandrian age, his artistic technique, and the coordination within his collection.

Reception and Preservation of Leonidas' Epigrams

The extant epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum have been preserved by a number of editors, anthologizers, and collectors of epigram. The largest and earliest anthology that we know included the epigrams of Leonidas was organized by Meleager, an author of the 1st century BC.[16] Leonidas is one of the earlier Hellenistic epigrammatists named in the introduction to Meleager's *Garland*.[17] In his *Garland*, Meleager excerpted epigrams from various authors from the 7th – 2nd centuries BC, and then added his own epigrams to this collection, while organizing all of the epigrams by his own methods.[18] As a result, it is very difficult to define the limits of the collection of Leonidas of Tarentum with exact certainty.

We cannot say that every epigram of Leonidas that has made its way into the *Greek Anthology* was one originally included by Meleager, nor that Meleager was working from a

[15] The collection as a whole shows elements of this "cynic outlook" that Webster (1964: 218-221) and others have discussed (Clayman 2007: 509-512; Gutzwiller 1998a: 102-104; Gigante 1971: 45-55; Geffcken 1896: 138), but the collection is also an exposé of well-versed literary caliber.

[16] *P.Oxy*. 662, a papyrus of the Augustan age, maybe collected by Amyntas himself, is perhaps earlier, from the end of the 2nd century BC, but this collection contains evidence for only three epigrams of Leonidas, which are repeated in the *AP*. Thus, we cannot conclude that Meleager was the first anthologizer, see Wifstrand 1926: 33-36; Cameron 1993: 25; Argentieri 2007: 149-151.

[17] Meleager 1.15 G-P = *AP* 4.1.15. There are other works before Meleager that discuss the history of epigram as a genre, which we have sadly lost, such as that named by Neoptolemus the Parian, in Athen. 10. 81 (Kaibel 1894: 367-380); Argentieri (1998: 1n3); Argentieri (2007: 147) gives a chronological list, by date of birth, of poets named by Meleager in the opening poem of his *Garland*.

[18] Argentieri (2007: 153) says that Meleager chose epigrams that best fit his personal taste, mainly erotic, votive, sepulchral, and epideictic, although in the third and second centuries BC other genres appeared, as proved by the "lithika" or "hippika" sub-genre categories of the Posidippus papyrus.

single collection of Leonidas.[19] Leonidas' epigrams show many thematic relationships, which suggests that there might have originally been at least one self-authored collection from which collectors or anthologizers gathered Leonidas' epigrams.[20] Although we know that Meleager included and refashioned many epigrams of Leonidas in his own *Garland,* we do not know the nature of the corpus of Leonidean poems with which he was working, if it was a self-authored collection or book, or more than one collection by Leonidas, or if it was a collection of either epideictic epigrams (literary epigrams) or inscriptional epigrams.[21] Nevertheless, since we are so reliant on Meleager's anthologizing in reconstructing the corpus of Leonidas' work, it is sensible to examine which of Leonidas' epigrams Meleager responds to, and which of them he preserves, as we attempt to define Leonidas' place in the literary tradition.

Beyond Meleager's anthology, Leonidas' poems were collected and/or anthologized once again by Cephalas, a *protopapas* of the 10th century AD, from whose collection the scribes of the *Palatine Anthology* in the later 10th century AD drew a number of epigrams.[22] Later in the 13th century AD, Maximus Planudes, the editor of the *Planudean Anthology*, rearranged and revised the work of Cephalas, with some epigrams overlapping between his manuscript and the *Palatine*

[19] As Gutzwiller (1998a: 91-92) recognizes.
[20] As Argentieri (2007: 150-151) and Gutzwiller (1998a: 88-114) discuss.
[21] Bettenworth (2007: 69) sees mutual influence between inscribed and literary epigram, and notes that verse inscriptions that describe an object, person or event are generally summarized in the category of "ecphrastic." For verse inscriptions, rather than literary epigrams, 'epideictic' assumes the category of dedicatory expositional epigrams, whereas the category of "epideictic" for literary epigrams defines those epigrams with a clearly literary scenario, composed simply as part of "Buchpoesie," according to Gutzwiller 1998a: 316; Lauxtermann (1998: 527-537) argues that "epideictic" as a name for a category of epigrams (in *AG* IXa – 1-358), a name which Cephalas, unaware himself of the ascription, probably took from Agathias or Pallade, where the term is also obscurely applied. Thus the meaning may be lost in the transmission of the texts, and so scholars misappropriate the term regularly. This word might have been not clearly defined even among Greeks and Romans, althought they gave us the category of "epideictic" epigrams in their anthologies.
[22] I follow Gow's (1965b: xvii) lead in rejecting the information that ascribes to Cephalas the knowledge of the Garland without intervening anthologists; Cephalas compiled epigrams from the *Garland* of Philip and the *Sylloge* or *Cycle* of Agathias, which were mixed with the epigrams dated previous to the 2nd century BC, i.e. those included the *Garland* of Meleager.

Anthology; from this combination comes the *Greek Anthology*.[23] There are nine epigrams of Leonidas that we inherit from the *Planudean Anthology* alone, outside of the *Palatine Anthology*, which later editors of the *Greek Anthology* have included.[24] Thus, we must acknowledge that we have a collection, or multiple collections, of epigrams of Leonidas that were perhaps cut, added to, and/or rearranged to suit each individual anthology. Recent scholarship has reformed some opinions on the collection of Leonidas, but there is still need for a reevaluation of his work.[25]

For the present study, I will be citing the version of this anthology that was edited and reorganized by Gow & Page in 1965.[26] One issue in ascribing epigrams to Leonidas of Tarentum in the *Greek Anthology* is how to distinguish his epigrams from those of Leonidas of Alexandria, an author of the 1st century AD, and from those of his imitators. Of those epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum not preserved by the *Palatine Anthology*, we inherit nine epigrams of Leonidas from the Planudean manuscript.[27] There are many epigrams that appear in both codices. One epigram, Leonidas 70 G-P = *AP* 7.163, that appears in the *Planudean* and *Palatine Anthologies* and the 1st century AD *P.Oxy*. 662 also supports the ascription of epigram 51 G-P to the

---

[23] We have inherited most of the epigrams of Leonidas through those preserved within the *Greek Anthology*, a group of epigrams finalized as a collection in the 13th century from a number of other anthologies, yet Leonidas' epigrams appear only in books five, six, seven, nine, and ten of the *AG*. Thus Leonidas appears under the following headings so-called by Cephalas; Amatory Epigrams (Book 5); The Dedicatory Epigrams (Book 6); Sepulchral Epigrams (Book 7); Declamatory Epigrams (Book 9); Hortatory and Admonitory Epigrams (Book 10) of the *AG*.

[24] Gutzwiller 1998a: 16; Cameron 1993: 10-11; Gow 1965b: xxxviii-xliv; Geffcken 1896: 6-13; Paton 1926b.

[25] Gigante (1971: 17-23) criticizes Gow's harsh judgments; Gutzwiller (1998a: 89-91) offers a thorough description of scholarship on Leonidas, and stresses that Leonidas' collection is a "typically Hellenistic literary endeavor" that should not be undervalued.

[26] Of the one hundred and three epigrams that the Gow-Page text ascribes to Leonidas, the editors mark eleven as of uncertain ascription. The reason for marking an ascription to Leonidas of Tarentum as uncertain is often on account of the lack of ethnic in the ascription in the Greek Anthology, or because he could have been confused with Leonidas of Alexandria, an author of the 1st cent. AD.

[27] Gow 1965b: 333; Leon. 23 G-P on Aphrodite Anadyomene, added later to ms. *Palatine Anthology* in the 12th or 13th cent. by *Sylloga Minor* Σπ; Leon. 31 G-P on the representation of Anacreon, drunk singing to lyre; Leon. 81 G-P = *APl* 190 for a figure of Hermes set up in pastoral country; Leon. 83 G-P = *APl* 236 – Priapus, set up to protect a garden; Leon. 84 G-P = *APl* 261 on figure of Priapus placed at road junction, guarding an orchard/garden; Leon. 86 G-P = *APl* 230 - lines in manner of Anyte 16-18, directing traveler to better drinking-place; Leon. 89 G-P = *APl* 206 on marble statue of Eros by Praxiteles given by him to Phryne, and dedicated by her at Thespiae; Leon. 90 G-P = *APl* 307 – On representation of drunken Anacreon; an iambic version of 31; Leon. 103 G-P = *APl* 171 on armed Aphrodite, cult at Sparta.

Tarentine Leonidas.[28] Finally, there is one epigram cited by Stobaeus (Leonidas 79 G-P = Stob. 4.52.28), a scholion of the 5th century AD.

Leonidas has multiple epigrams that relate to each other[29] and their original context might have made them even more significant to each other. Because Hellenistic epigrams were circulated in literary anthologies, regardless of their original contexts, either in book or on stone, we must evaluate the epigrams as a piece of art ascribed to an artist, whose work exists within the the context of the literary tradition. Thus, the literary tradition in which epigrams are preserved provide valuable insight into their originality and their impression on poetic tradition, and show what characteristics of that tradition these epigrams are incorporating and refashioning.[30] These epigrams are not just collected objects, they are engaged responses to the contemporary literary milieu and innovations upon the poetry of the past. In examining relationships between the poems, it will be equally helpful to ascertain how Leonidas is working with epigram as his medium, as it will be to understand how he is adapting a range of techniques from other genres as well, and what stylistic variations and literary themes he stresses in his epigrams overall.

Establishing Leonidas' Place Among Alexandrian Poets

When confronted with providing chronology for the work of Leonidas, we are presented with a few questions that make the endpoints of such chronology difficult to determine. We have no historical source that describes Leonidas' biography, time, and place, yet we do have his

[28] *P.Oxy*. 662 contains six epigrams; there are two complete epigrams (Leon. 51 & 70 G-P) ascribed to Leonidas, with only the first word of another epigram by Leonidas; Antipater has two – Antipager 21 & 48 G-P, which directly mimics Leon. 51; two other epigrams are ascribed to an otherwise unknown Amyntas, who Wifstrand (1926: 33-39) has argued formed the anthology in *P.Oxy*. 662.

[29] I.e. something like what in Martial's collections have been called "cycles," defined as a group of poems that are not contiguous but share similar subject matter; see Barwick 1958: 300-301; Williams 2004: 10-11.

[30] As Bettenworth (2007: 76) says, "once an epigram enters the literary tradition, it is open to re-invention by variation or by the context in which it is placed."

poems that point us in the direction of providing a general *floruit* date for him. Since his name appears in the introduction to Meleager's *Garland*, we know that he was certainly Hellenistic and living before the first century BC,[31] but when within the Hellenistic period does his poetry belong? Although Leonidas was a very productive poet, which we know from the large number of epigrams ascribed to him within the *Greek Anthology*, how is it that he is not mentioned by other earlier Hellenistic authors who could have been his contemporaries? Answers to these questions would help delineate where, when, and how Leonidas' poetry fits into the Hellenistic period, yet we can establish a general timeline based on his origin, themes, and few historical references offered within his poems. Scholarly opinion is divided on this issue. One group sets Leonidas' poetry within the early Hellenistic period, while others have argued that his date is more similar to those of the later Hellenistic period.[32] I suggest, however, that because Leonidas is responding to so many of the literary trends of the first half of the third century BC, his poetry is contemporary to poets within that period.[33]

The chronology of Leonidas of Tarentum is rooted in his relationship to the city of Tarentum and its history. There is a group of poems traditionally used to provide a relative *floruit* date for Leonidas of Tarentum. In Leon. 3 G-P = *AP* 6.334 the poet discusses the dedication of rustic gifts to Hermes by a Neoptolemus of the Aicides, who has been thought to be the son of Alexander of Epirus. Alexander ruled the Molossians of western Greece with Pyrrhus from 297 BC, shortly after which he was murdered, thus the event provides a relative date for the

[31] Such dating of Meleager's anthology is based, in part, on his autobiographical epigrams 2-5 G-P = *AP* 7.417-19; since Meleager excludes epigrams of Philodemus of Gadara, born 110 BC, Gow (1965a: xiv-xvii) approximates that the dates of Meleager's compilation extend from the death of Antipater of Sidon, estimated to 125 BC, and the publication of Philodemus' epigrams in 80 BC. Gutzwiller (1998: 276-7) offers similar dating, yet is less apprehensive of accepting the lemmatist's notes in the introduction to his *Garland*, which date Meleager's life to the reign of Seleucus VI Epiphanes Nicator, ruler from 96-95 BC.

[32] Most recently Gutzwiller (1998a: 88-91) has argued for an early third century date for Leonidas. For the later dating, most scholars of the twentieth century follow the argument presented by Gow (1958: 113-123).

[33] Other scholars have also argued for such a date, but have overlooked his similarity to other poets within the same contemporary period; cf. Geffcken 1896: 132; Gigante 1971: 17-19; Gutzwiller 1998a: 88-91.

epigram.[34] If this Neoptolemus is the Epirot, it is unlikely that the poem would have been composed long after 297 BC.

Providing another piece of evidence is a pair of epigrams on the dedication to Athena of spoils taken from the Lucanians (Leon. 34 G-P = *AP* 6.129 and Leon. 35 G-P = *AP* 6.130). Although the origin of the dedicant of the Lucanian spoils in the epigram pair is unnamed, it has been argued, on account of the origin of the author, that Leonidas' epigrams allude to a Tarentine victory over the Lucanians.[35] Because the dedication refers to a period of conflict between the Tarentines and the Lucanians, which was a frequent occurrence, the context of the dedication would only make sense outside of the timeframe of the Lucanian alliance with the Tarentines, Brutii, and Samnites against Rome in 280 BC, but before the allied powers, Tarentum and Lucania, submitted to Roman control in 272 BC with the defeat of Pyrrhus.[36]

Leon. 95 G-P = *AP* 6.130, on the dedication of spoils to Athena won by Pyrrhus from the Gauls in 273 BC upon his destruction of the army of Antigonus, would more ascertainably date Leonidas' collection to the first quarter of the third century BC, yet scholars have rejected the poem's authenticity.[37] Mele's agreement with the assertion of Gigante, that we should reject Gow's chronology for Leonidas, provides a good argument that we should accept the epigram's ascription of Leon. 95 G-P = *AP* 6.130 to Leonidas, and so accept its authority in dating the poet.

---

[34] *CAH* 7.2: 459; cf. Geffcken 1896: 12-13; Gow 1958: 113.

[35] Mele (1995: 4) has responded to Gow's rejection of the traditional dating by showing that Leonidas' pair of Lucanian poems (34, 35 G-P = *AP* 6.129, 6.131) obviously refers to the rivalrous encounters that happened in Italy near the beginning of the outbreak of the Tarentine war. Later meetings between the Lucanians and Tarentines were organized to sustain and favor the intervention of Pyrrhus, in the name of a coalition of the cities of Magna Graecia, although with the exclusion of Reggio.

[36] Plut. *Pyrrh*. 13; Gow (1958: 114) refutes this argument of Geffcken (1896: 14, 43-45), who argues that Pyrrhus, by the appeal of the Tarentines, and with support of Samnium, Lucania, and Bruttii, defeated the Romans at Heraclea in 280 BC. Geffcken, who organizes Leonidas' epigrams in his observation chronological order of composition, places this pair first, and so places 297 BC as *terminus post quem* for Leonidas' composition. Although the chronological ordering of Leonidas' epigrams is subjectively based on Leonidas' developing style, it is still reasonable to assume the historical backdrop to these epigrams is some hostility that arose between the Tarentines and the Lucanians, since such hostility would necessitate the alliance made in 280 BC.

[37] Gow 1958: 113.

It describes Pyrrhus' victory over Antigonus Gonatus in 273 BC and refers to the resulting alliance against and loss to Rome. According to Mele, such an event coincides well with the discussion in Leon. 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715, which describes Leonidas' distance from his native Tarentum, and his inability to return home.[38]

Further support for this range of chronology is found in comparing Leonidas with other Hellenistic poets of the first half of the third century BC. Leon. 101 G-P =*AP* 9.25 honors Aratus' *Phaenomena*, which was published by 277 BC, and, according to Gutzwiller, provides a possible *terminus post quem* for Leonidas' composition.[39] The comparable theme of Leon. 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25 (a dedication of Aratus' *Phaenomena*) and Callimachus 56 G-P = *AP* 9.507 (also a tribute to Aratus' *Phaenomena*) suggests that the two authors shared an interest in their recognition of Aratus' poetic skill and similar stylistic discussion. The praise of Aratus' verses as λεπταί by Callimachus (56. 3 G-P), and of Aratus' ingenuity as λεπτῇ by Leonidas (Leon. 101.1 G-P), both allude to the acrostic ΛΕΠΤΗ present in Aratus' *Phaenomena* 783-787, and suggest the common interest in stylistic discussion among poets in the first half of the third century BC.[40]

As Gutzwiller notes, a poem by Nossis (2 G-P = *AP* 6.132) celebrates a Locrian victory over the Bruttians in a manner similar to the celebration of victory over the Lucanians described in Leon. 35 G-P = *AP* 6.131. The similarity suggests a contemporary stylistic relationship

[38] Gow (1958: 115) has argued that since this poem must be discounted, then Leonidas' dating to the early 3rd century BC must also be discounted. Gow proposes a date of some time within the second of the third century BC, since, acc. to Gow, Leonidas' style is more similar to that of Dioscorides and Antipater Sidonius, rather than to Callimachus and Asclepiades; Gigante 1971: 17ff.; Mele 1995: 111-129.
[39] Gow (1965b: 396) offers, yet rejects, this date for the *Phaenomena* as possible *terminus post quem* for two epigrams, one of each Callimachus (56 G-P = *AP* 9.507) and Leonidas (101 G-P = *AP* 9.25); Fantuzzi & Hunter (2004: 224-225) assert that Aratus' *Phaenomena* was probably composed in the period c. 280-260 BC, perhaps at the court at Pella of Antigonos Gonatas, whose patronage Aratus is known to have enjoyed.
[40] Cf. Gow (1965b: 396) and others have doubted the relationship, and assumed it to be more stylistically distant; cf. Cameron 1972: 169-170; Bing 1990: 281-285.

between the authors.[41] The events referred to in Nossis' poem, and so Leonidas', must predate the tyrant Agathocles, who formed an alliance with Demetrius Poliorcetes after his death in 289 BC, and the defeat of the garrison left behind by Agathocles by the Bruttii.[42] Considering also that Nossis 10 G-P = *AP* 7.414 had to have been written after the death of the writer Rhinthon, who, according to the Suda, lived under Ptolemy Soter (d. 283 BC), her *floruit* can be traced to the first half of the third century BC.[43] The historical semblance we can make of Leonidas' poem is limited to a battle between the Lucanians and probably the Tarentines, which, as mentioned, must have occurred before 280 BC, when there was an alliance between the two tribes against Rome. Nevertheless Nossis' "conscious variation" of Leonidas shows that he must have been a prominent author in the first half of the third century BC.[44]

Leon. 40 G-P = *AP* 6.286 may also support the above chronology for Leonidas. The epigram describes a "rivalry of weaving" between three girls in devotion to Artemis, and also mentions the river Maeander.[45] Since another epigram of Leonidas similarly stresses the "thrice-

[41] Gutzwiller 1998a: 89. The two poems by Leonidas (35 G-P = *AP* 6.131) and Nossis (2 G-P = *AP* 6.132) resemble each other in the last line.

[42] Agathocles regained power over the Bruttians in 296 BC, and a series of coins that was minted between 296-289 BC that celebrate the salvation of the Greeks from the Bruttians; see Spink 1906: 10714 lists the history behind the coins engraved with ΣΩΤΕΙΡΑ, in reference to the salvation of the Greeks from the Bruttians, and with the head of Pallas with a Corinthian helmet, and probably minted this series between 296-289 BC; Agathocles, tyrant of Syracuse, is noted for saving the Greeks from the Bruttians, who had previously controlled the city from 326-296 BC. The city's tumultuous history through Bruttian, Carthaginian, and Roman rule was eventually settled by the Romans in 192 BC.

[43] Gow 1965b: 435.

[44] Webster (1964: 255) calls the dedication by Nossis "a conscious variation of an epigram by Leonidas," which allows a *terminus post quem* of 270, which I, in agreement with Gutzwiller (1998a: 88-91), suggest is not far off, and more fitting than Gow's chronology.

[45] Cf. Gow (1965b: 349-350) insists that Μαίανδρον refers a pattern within the woven garment, rather than the river itself. Antipater Sidonius 52 G-P = *AP* 6.287 mimics the epigram by Leonidas, and describes the river more definitively, and so Gow rejects the notion that Leonidas could have intended such a realistic depiction that "would have been unsuitable for such a piece of decoration." Gow's argument is subjective here, and so I argue there is nothing within the poem that limits the reference to Μαίανδρον to only the pattern; although Gigante (1972: 82-83) does not use this epigram to precisely date Leonidas of Tarentum, whose chronology overlaps also follows Wilamowitz, Gigante does say that this epigram bears witness to the popularity of the cult among women ("*Non un motivo mitologico, ma un motivo di cultura popolare, realizzato da donne del popolo*").

coiled" aspect of the Maeander river,[46] like the three girls named in the zig-zag shape of the winding Maeander in Leon. 40 G-P = *AP* 6.286, the Maeander acts as both the toponym and ecphrastic pattern referring to the cult of Artemis at Magnesia on the Maeander. The epigram may very well indicate the commemoration of the well-known cult festival in celebration of Artemis Leukophryne on the Maeander in Magnesia, since Magnesia had made known, in both prose and poetry, its benefactions to the Greek world by the time of Leonidas.[47]

The cult for Artemis Leukophryene on the Maeander was well-known throughout the Greek world, and inscriptions related to her epiphany reflect the strength of Magnesians' historical consciousness about the foundation of her religious rites.[48] Both inscriptional and literary evidence suggest that the fame of the Magnesians' cultic rites had spread to a great extent.[49] Magnesians wanted to communicate their region's claim to playing a prominent part in a certain victory against the Gauls in 279/8 BC, which was linked to the epiphany of Artemis during a panhellenic festival.[50] An inscription from Delphi, in celebration of the Delphic Soteria, shows that Magnesia had been involved in the important victory against the invading Gauls in 279/8 BC, thus suggesting that Magnesia on the Maeander had achieved its fame in association with the goddess' epiphany during the battle.[51] The Magnesians' aid of the Epidamnians is commemorated in the inscription as καλλίστα, much like the epithet for Artemis that Leonidas uses.[52] Although Leon. 40 G-P = *AP* 6.286 is only a dedication of weaving, it is plausible that

[46] Leon. 96 G-P = *AP* 6.110.
[47] Sumi (2004: 83-84) discusses how the Magnesians used events from the past to contextualize and justify their expansion of the festival of Artemis, which they would acknowledge and share with Greek city-state in order to demonstrate that they were part of the larger Greek world.
[48] See n.28 above.
[49] Sumi (2004: 83-84) mentions that an epic poet, Simonides from Magnesia, also attempted to make the exploits of Antiochus I against the Galatians known.
[50] *I.Magn*. 46.3010; Sumi 2004: 84; the cult at Magnesia had been well-known as early as the fifth century BC; see X. *HG* 3.2.19.
[51] *I.Magn*. 46.3010; Sumi 2004: 84.
[52] Sumi 2004: 84.

the dedication to Artemis as καλλίστα in the epigram, and the well-known cult for Artemis Leukophryne,[53] indicate the cult practices associated with Artemis at Magnesia on the Maeander. If Leonidas' dedication is in response to the Magnesia's proliferation of fame after their victorious feats in fending off the Gauls' invasion of Greece in 279/8 BC, Leon. 40 G-P = *AP* 6.286 provides additional support for the chronology of Leonidas' poetic subject, which coordinates well with the *floruit* date offered for him earlier in the first half, if not first quarter, of the third century BC.

Overall, there is more evidence in support of the traditional dating of Leonidas to the first quarter of the third century than there is evidence worthy of discounting it.[54] Thus, the range of 297 BC through at least the 270's BC provides a suitable chronological scope for the *terminus post quem* of the composition of Leonidas' epigrams. Placing Leonidas at the beginning of the third century supports the necessity for reinterpretation of his relationship to other Hellenistic poets, from whose stylistic techniques and literary discussions he is so commonly removed. Although we lack any reference to governing political bodies of Alexandria or Pergamum,[55] and although his poems more regularly portray humble folk, Leonidas' innovation on earlier models of poetry, his response to literary trends of the Hellenistic period, as in Posidippus, Theocritus, Callimachus, Asclepiades, et al., and his distinctive literary techniques, place him in the first half of the third century BC.

Outlining the Study

[53] Argentieri (1998: 15) urges that the fame of the cult is evident also in an epigram by Antipater Sidonius (52 G-P = *AP* 6.287); Antipater's epigram is surely mimicking the Maeander epigram of Leonidas, although Antipater's description of ῥεῖθρα Μαίανδρου, *streams of Maeander*, more clearly indicates the geographical location; cf. Gow 1965b: 76-77, 349-350. Leonidas' epigram laid the foundation for Antipater's discussion,
[54] Cf. Geffcken 1896: 12-13; Wilamowitz 1924, *H.D*. 1.139; Webster 1964: 252-255; Gow 1965b: 392.
[55] Gow 1965b: 307-308.

Leonidas' poetry is set within the Hellenistic intellectual landscape.[56] In the Hellenistic period, epigram, on account of its brevity and witty dynamism, provided a means for expressing the cutting-edge literary development occurring within the stylistic discussion of the age.[57] As Bing points out, "poets within the Hellenistic age express an unprecedented amount of concern with the act of reading itself and the impact of the written word as artifact and medium on the reception of their work."[58] Leonidas, in the fashion of Hellenistic poets, also shows a significant interest in the reader by establishing a relationship between reader and his collection through the theme of wandering. By stressing such an involuntarily aimless sort of motion, his epigrams ironize the motionless aspect of inscribed epigram, as they simultaneously involve readers in their movement through his own collection, unified by the theme, yet remain an unchanging imprint of poetic narrative.[59] The reader is introduced to the role of the wanderer through Leonidas' autobiographical dedication.[60] The reader is then set up to engage the theme of wandering within the collection as the subjects, about which he/she reads, are trapped, wandering within motionless poetic form. The interest in the reader's attention, and the significance of the reader in Leonidas' collection of epigrams responds to other authors' incorporations of a reader's role among contemporary Hellenistic epigram. This study builds toward such a discussion of engaging the reader's attention in his particular literary realism through an examination of the theme of wandering.

The first chapter of the study examines the categorization of Leonidas' poetry in its

---

[56] For this phrase, see Clayman 2007: 509.
[57] As Gutzwiller (1998a: 3) shows, "epigram is in some ways the most characteristic of Hellnistic poetic forms, because of its inherited brevity…and necessary concern with the personal and particular."
[58] Bing 2012: 2.
[59] See Fitzgerald (2007: 2, 68-106) for an analysis of paradox within the genre of epigram, where he notes the epigram's implications of simultaneous permanence in its pretense as inscribed, yet ephemerality in its brevity of form. Wandering is similarly paradoxical in Leonidas' epigrams, where the wanderer is assumed to be moving, yet stuck within the narrative of the epigram, as if fixed in constant, aimless motion.
[60] ἐκ †πλάνης†, Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300.

reception by both reader and anthologizer, Meleager of Gadara. Building upon our foundation of date and textual transmission of Leonidas' poems, we embark on our study of Leonidas' poems with an investigation into how Meleager characterizes them in the introduction to his *Garland*. Some of the authors, such as Posidippus and Leonidas of Tarentum, from whom Meleager borrowed epigrams for his own anthology, were exclusively known as epigrammatists. The recent discovery of the new Posidippus collection on the Milan papyrus (*P.Mil. Vogl. Inv.* 1295), a Hellenistic manuscript containing one hundred and twelve poems ascribed to Posidippus, makes more certain the existence of other collections of epigrams in the form of a published poetry-book from which Meleager constructed his own anthology. Chapter one supports the argument for the existence of a Leonidean poetry book,[61] like that of the *New Posidippus*, by examining the relationship between Meleager's use of "ivy" in categorizing Leonidas' poems, and the theme of wandering in Leonidas' collection. The "thick clusters of ivy of Leonidas," so-called by Meleager,[62] no longer exist in their original state, yet the denomination itself categorizes Leonidas' corpus of poetry from which Meleager drew his poems. The term goes beyond marking Leonidas as a "prolific epigrammatist," [63] since the categorization includes not just "thick clusters" but also the ivy to which these clusters belong, or what strings them together. The "ivy" is Meleager's first-hand observation of Leonidas' corpus, and, as I argue, the means by which the collection was both characterized and unified. With such categorization, Meleager indicates a major theme in Leonidas' collection, which is closely linked to how Leonidas presents himself.

The portrayal of everyday people, practices, and themes involving common people is also a

[61] An idea proposed by Gutzwiller 1998a: 89-106.
[62] Meleager 1.15 G-P = *AP* 4.1.15: ἐν δὲ Λεωνίδεω θαλεροὺς κισσοῖο κορύμβους.
[63] Gow 1965b: 307.

prominent part of a Hellenistic aesthetic.[64] The second chapter in the study shows how Leonidas adapts and responds to such an aesthetic. Leonidas shares in the Hellenistic affinity for the portrayal of the common or everyday men and women as his poetic subjects, but Leonidas provides his subjects with his own innovative artistic lens through which the reader perceives them.[65] The small, low nature of his subjects mirrors the genre with which they are described; with the use of complicated diction and allusion to epic, and in particular to wandering in the *Odyssey*, his epigrams provide an ironic response to the literature they are adapting, much like the interaction of other Hellenistic authors with Homeric poetry.[66] Leonidas' description of wandering, simple characters, and compounded epic forms presents the dichotomous association repeated about wandering passersby in the *Odyssey,* as they are ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε, or simultaneously simple and dear.[67] Although Leonidas' typical topics include laborers, simplicity of folk, and description of a lower-class, Leonidas' themes are poetic in form, and so reach beyond mere expression of class ideology.[68] His poems are highly literary in their grand neologisms, elevated epic language, and so suggest a literary pursuit of an aesthetic based on the real or everyday, with a stress on the repetitive motion of the common sphere.

Chapter two begins by demonstrating how Leonidas presents such an aesthetic in his own autobiographical portrayal as "a wanderer of meager breadbasket" in a dedicatory epigram (Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300), which is very likely to have stood as the dedication of his epigram

---

[64] Although she does not go into detailed description of what precisely the Hellenistic aesthetic is, Fowler (1989: 4) includes discussion of common or everyday people and their pursuits within the interests of Hellenistic poetry. She notes that the new interest arose from not just the decline of the city-state, but also from the increasing interest in the craftsmanship of poetry itself.
[65] On Hellenistic innovation in art and its audience, see Stewart 1993: 130-174; Zanker 2004: 3-26.
[66] As Nagy (2004: 57-64) notes, allusion is a kind of "distant echoing" of Homeric poetry. "Hellenistic poets of Alexandria were exponents of the kind of poetry that concentrates on displaying – artistically – the learning it took to distinguish newer from older kind of poetry" in favor of "distancing themselves from the core of Homeric poetry" while cultivating "a Homeric periphery."
[67] *Od*. 6.206-209; *Od*. 14.56-61.
[68] Cf. Gutzwiller 1998a: 91.

book.[69] The chapter argues that the definition of ὀλιγησιπύου - "meager breadbasket" - is a demarcation of Leonidas' stylistic technique of applying rich language to humble, rustic subjects.[70] Leonidas' focus on everyday craftsmen is an essential part of both his literary persona and his poetic style. The combined ornate compounds and focused diction that describe everyday, common subjects highlights the technical craft of the poetry that emphasizes his stylistic method. Leonidas' style is rooted in a sense of *to oligon*, both linguistically through the repetition of different compounded forms of *olig-*, and also in the sense of meagerness that the word's repetition throughout his epigrams conveys. Within the same dedication, the symbolically "meager breadbasket" is paired with Leonidas' identity as a "wanderer" (πλάνης). Such a coincidence emphasizes the pairing of belabored, highly technical language of the epigrams and the rustic wandering of the subjects that his epigrams describe, as they represent the everyday repetitive crafts of the panoply of common people, subject to their fated lot. Weavers, gardeners, shepherds, and other craftsmen in Leonidas' description and poetic form paradoxically pair elements of simplicity with dearness. With Leonidas' own repetitions and emphasis on the meagerness of humankind, his poetry reveals itself to be highly conscious of its aesthetic. This sort of realism creates the impression that Leonidas himself shared in the perspective of his subjects, yet the theme of wandering and the high style of his poems are highly technical and schematic representations of everyday, common life that stress the significance of craft and the recognition of the realism that he invents for the reader.

The third chapter examines how the themes of wandering and meagerness resonate within Leonidas' group of nautical epigrams. There are twelve epigrams that directly discuss or allude

[69] For this poem as dedication to the Leonidean poetry book, see Gutzwiller (1998a: 110-11).
[70] In later epigram in Mart. 2.43, 2.85, 2.90.3, Martial describes himself as a poor (*pauper*), while paradoxically complaining and boasting of his claims of "simplicity;" see Williams 2004: 78.

to elements of the sea.[71] Since the new manuscript of Posidippus presents a whole section of epigrams on shipwreck, and since there are so many coordinating, sea-themed epigrams ascribed to Leonidas, there is quantity, reason, and precedence set for analyzing the nautically-themed epigrams of Leonidas altogether as a group. Although Gutzwiller suggests that there are only eight total epigrams related to the category of shipwreck, the chapter insists that Leonidas be understood not through, but comparatively with the *New Posidippus*, and so we discuss here other sea-related topics outside of shipwrecks that coordinate thematically.[72] As much as sea-related topics are frequent within Hellenistic epigram, and grouped as categories in both the *New Posidippus* and in Theocritus, Leonidas' inclusion of the topic reflects the Hellenistic literary culture surrounding him and shows his response to it.

In discussing the group of sea-themed epigrams, the chapter analyzes the depth of literary allusion particular to the theme of wandering among the group. Much like the poetry contemporaneous to his own and his own that describes subjects on land, Leonidas' epigrams innovate upon the sea-wandering of Homeric poetry with his own innovations on form and theme in order to engage the reader in the invention of his own version of realism. The literary allusions call attention to the rich language and learnedness of Leonidas' poetic technique, and to the poetic form of epigram, as they enhance the theme of wandering and the characters' vulnerability to its force. Wandering related to the sea is of varying types. Firstly, wandering is used to accentuate the passive suffering of men and their frustration as they rove the sea. The sea-roving subjects in the epigrams undergo long journeys in distance and/or time, as they are

[71] In all, there are seventeen epigrams that incorporate elements of sea occupations (fishing, hunting on sea-shore, sailing), water-travel, or proximity to the sea as either primary importance to the context of the epigram, or as a passing reference in the epigram.
[72] Gutzwiller 1998a: 102.

"driven by a storm," continuously "whirling on the sea" and "suffering far from the shore."[73] They show wandering as an infliction on the characters that is repetitive, passive, and paralyzing. The description of wandering is overwrought with rare diction and patterns that are frequently variations of epic vocabulary or *hapax legomena*, or variations of his own uses.[74] Leonidas' rigorous diction mirrors the wandering movement of the characters, skilled in sailing, fishing, or journeying by sea, yet paralyzed in their respective tasks, and in his epigrams. Instead of solely elevating or celebrating the simple characters,[75] the diction guides readers' attention through the intricate poetic quality of the theme of wandering in relation to characters of a common lot.

The epigrams depict the regular practice of everyday crafts related to the sea, such as sailing, fishing, and hunting at sea, with a stress on the passive movement of wandering, that aestheticizes the reality of the characters. The sea-themed epigrams as a group mirror those set on land in their description of wandering, and in the characters portrayed on the fringe of society. With their frequent Doric dialect, the epigrams describe a quasi-bucolic setting, as their humble characters are engaged in sea-related crafts, or experience death at sea or retirement from their craft related to the sea, or are set apart from urbane society through their wandering sea-travel. The description of rustic characters with their marine settings and crafts related to the sea plays ironically on the *locus amoenus* on land of bucolic poetry, since the nautical epigrams consistently describe the danger of the marine setting, and the sufferings of their habitual practices; both non-urban settings in Leonidas' epigrams reflect human propensity to wander

---

[73] Long journeys: Leon. 14 G-P = *AP* 7.665; Leon. 61 G-P = *AP* 7.266, Leon. 62 G-P= *AP* 7.273, Leon. 63 G-P = *AP* 7.283; Leon. 64 G-P = *AP* 7.503. Driven by a storm: χειμήνασα, Leon. 15 G-P = *AP* 7.652. "Whirling on the sea": πόντῳ δινεύμενος, Leon. 62 G-P = *AP* 7.273. Suffering far from shore: τηλόσ' ἀπὸ ψιλῆς ἔπτυσας ἠιόνος, Leon. 63 G-P = *AP* 7.283; θινὸς ἐπεστηλωμένον ἄχθος… λαίλαπι χρησάμενον," burden set up as a column upon…shore, after suffering a storm", Leon. 64 G-P = *AP* 7.503.

[74] As Philips (1972: 277-347) has shown, Leonidas' epigrams apply a large number of compounds of which many are unique because of the rare nature of one of the compounded elements, and the other is often a Homeric term. Although ἁλιπλάγκτων in Leon. 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264 is borrowed from Sophocles *Aj*. 295, Leonidas creates two new compounds from the first component ἁλι-, ἁλίζωος and ἁλιφθόρος in Leon. 16 G-P = *AP* 7.655.

[75] Cf. Gutzwiller 1998a: 88-114; Gigante 1971.

until their fated end. In this way, the epigrams project a sense of realism that elevates the mundane to a level seen through a highly literary and artistic lens.

Sea-travel in Leonidas is also a frequent metaphor for a passage toward death, and so the theme of wandering among the sea poems as a group embodies the struggles of human existence and the inevitability of wandering in life, as one's approach to death is an unavoidable passage. All sea-themed epigrams coordinate, like many other epigrams of the collection, in their suggestion that humankind is a humble, suffering race vulnerable to its wandering until death.

The final chapter argues for direct coordination between epigrams in Leonidas' collection as a means of understanding its thematic organization. The previous chapters' discussions of the "unifying threads" of possible groupings, simple subjects, wandering, and literary technique set the stage for understanding coordination among the epigrams en masse more directly than their general association by "class ideology."[76] Nautically-themed elements provide means for one sort of grouping of epigrams similar to those in the *New Posidippus*, but there are many other groupings shared by the two authors' bodies of epigrams (e.g. dedications, epitaphs, statues, and characters). Leonidas presents a few others not treated by Posidippus, such as epigrams related to rusticity, craftsmen and women (such as weavers, gardeners, and fishermen), and epitaphs specifically for authors, among others.[77] Within these categories, the chapter demonstrates how there are a number of pairs in Leonidas' epigrams that respond to one another.[78] Modern scholars have recognized the frequency of pairing among Hellenistic

[76] The "unifying threads," as Gutzwiller (1998a: 91) coined of the organization in Leonidas' collection, as she argued that recognition of the theme "of lower class subject" was a means of appreciation for his poetic craft rather than mere criticism of it.

[77] The categories that divide the sections of the new Posidippus: λιθικά (1-20, stones), οἰνωσκοπικά (21-35, omens), ἀναθεματικά (36-41, dedications), ἐπιτύμβια (42-61, epitaphs), ἀνδριαντοποικά (62-70, statues), ἱππικα (71-88, horse racing), ναυαγικά (89-94, shipwrecks), ἰαματικά (cures), τρόποι (102-109, characters).

[78] I am less certain about the nature of the categories surrounding the pairs, since Leonidas probably organized his collection with categories that varied from those of Posidippus, or those offered in the *Greek Anthology*. Lest we be

epigrams, and how such pairs are used to involve readers in the dialogues that the sets of epigrams create.[79] These pairings establish a dialogue between the poems to elucidate some shared story, theme, or principle, which engage the reader in the corpus as a whole. The dialogues between Leonidas' pairs unify the collection and show forth their highly literary quality. The pairs provoke the reader to engage and share in the artistic rendering of the everyday wandering of the characters and the sort of realism that Leonidas establishes as his aesthetic.

An aesthetic of realism is communicated throughout the pairs and groupings in Leonidas' collection by the coordination of his poetic style, and the themes of wandering and simplicity emphasized in his epigrams. The use of epigram as a genre places the reader in the position of viewer, examining his subjects from an outside perspective. The highly technical, mechanical, and allusive language creates a distance between reader and subject, in their shared participation in the highly artistic, affected portrayal of everyday tasks and activities. The effect is realism – an artistic impression of the real and everyday, and it is this artistic form within the poetry's ornate style in which the reader is meant to participate as part of the particularized reality that Leonidas has created. The mode that guides the reader through the imagined reality is the wandering that is rooted in the author's persona, and the repetitive motion of his subjects, moving through life yet trapped in the motionlessness of epigram. Thus, Leonidas' medium of epigram stresses the wandering motion that ironically links poet, viewer, and poetic subjects together in a

---

distracted by others categories, I offer only a few recommendations about which categories are more definitive than others.

[79] In particular, scholars such as Bing 1995; Rossi 2001: 12, cited in Bettenworth 2007: 78-79. Kirstein (2002: 114-135) identifies one pair in Leonidas and in Callimachus, Theocritus, Dioscorides, and Martial; Scodel (2003: 257-268) identifies pairs between Callimachus 29, 30 G-P = *AP* 7.525, 415; Murray & Rowland (2007: 221-223) discuss pairing of Erinna 1 & 2 G-P = *AP* 7.710 & 712; Gutzwiller (2007a: 330-331) shows the technique in Meleager 27 G-P = *AP* 5.172, 173; Nisbet (2007: 363-364), identifies pairing in skoptic epigram of Lucillius, who uses pairs as "humorous acknowledgement that he has missed the boat."

movement trapped within the limits of the poetic form and its imaginary reality.

Chapter 1: Understanding the "Ivy" of Leonidas of Tarentum

Leonidas of Tarentum defines himself as a native of Tarentum, while his epigrams present him as a wanderer, and a poor man, who died far from his native city. Since we do not have a historical record of Leonidas outside of his own poems, and whatever others have said of him, we cannot confirm that the elements in Leonidas' poems are autobiographical artifacts. The thematic elements, however, such as those that he associates with himself and how others represent him, may shed light on where he fits in the grand scheme of the Greek literary tradition, and the stylistic tropes for which he was known. We will embark on our pursuit of understanding the epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum firstly with an analysis of how others have categorized him.

One representation of Leonidas is found in a metaphorical reference to his epigrams that Meleager has included in the prooemium to his *Garland*. As discussed in the previous section, the epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum comprised a large section of Meleager's *Garland*, and it is due to Meleager's preservation that we inherit so many them. In the introduction to his *Garland*, Meleager identifies the epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum with the phrase "the blossoming clusters of ivy of Leonidas" (Meleager 1 G-P = *AP* 4.1.15 ἐν δὲ Λεωνίδεω θαλεροὺς κισσοῖο κορύμβους).[80] Although this phrase has puzzled scholars in the past,[81] its meaning can be understood through an analysis of the way Meleager uses plants as metaphors in the introduction to his *Garland*, their relationship to the *corpora* of the authors whose work is described as a plant, and ivy's developing symbolism throughout the Classical and Hellenistic

[80] Please see appendix to this chapter for the text and translation of Meleager's elegy in its entirety.
[81] Gigante (1971: 10-150) entitles his study of Leonidas *L'edera di Leonida* (*The Ivy of Leonidas)*, yet he does not discuss the significance of the ivy, or its relationship to the persona, poetry, or Meleager's anthologizing of Leonidas of Tarentum.

periods.[82] In Meleager's introduction, the ivy appears to represent a specific theme in Leonidas' work, namely the paradoxical relationship between wandering and immobility. Meleager is not only an anthologizer, editor, and organizer of epigrams, he is also a reader of Leonidas's epigrams, and since his ascriptions of plant-life to the literature of other poets identifies prominent themes in others' corpora, such an assertion is logical for the ascription of plant-life to Leonidas as well.[83] Here I will argue that ivy, which both wanders and clings, is a succinct and accurate depiction of an important theme in Leonidas' collection.

Since Leonidas' corpus does not exist outside of the *Greek Anthology*, and we have no sources on Leonidas other than his own poetry and literary allusions by other authors in their epigrams, we must rely on how other poets and anthologizers present him or refashion his poetry in order to understand Leonidas' place in the literary tradition. Thus I will now focus on Meleager's ascription, since it is through sequences in Meleager's *Garland* that we have retained many of the epigrams that are composed by Leonidas.[84] Although metaphorically abstract in typifying Leonidas's epigrams, the ivy is the only generalizing reference we have to Leonidas' poems as a collection

---

[82] Gow (1965b: 596) arrives at the conclusion that it is possible that we could identify some of the plants with more certainty, if we knew more of some of these poets, then states that "the fact is however that he has undertaken a hopeless task. The resemblance of poems to flowers is too vague for it to be possible except in a few cases." The fault in Gow's conclusion is a result of his lack of explanation in his approach.

[83] There are many other modern scholars who have downplayed the importance of the botanical metaphor of ivy; Jacobs (1794-1814: 2-3) warns that because the categories of flowers in comparison to poets are devised with such subtlety, that it is necessary to take the poets on a case by case basis, but we should not assume that all investigations will be fruitful; Geffcken (1896; 1916) does not discuss the "ivy" in any metaphorical capacity; Radinger (1895: 90-94) indicates the importance of botanical symbolism in his discussion of the relationship between the thistle of Archilochus to iambs, the date-palm of Aratus to his poetic creation of *Phaenomena*, the grapevine for Simonides and grape cluster for Hegesippus to their use of dithyramb, et al. He considers the ivy for Leonidas to be untinterpretable to any exact symbolism; Gow (1965b: 307) downplays significance of "ivy" by saying the attribution references quantity of epigrams; Gigante (1971) titularly suggests that the "ivy" is an important part of Leonidas' poetry, but offers no discussion on the matter; Gutzwiller (1998a: 279) cites only the proemium's similarity to Lucretius 1.928, in that both poets, Meleager and Lucretius, are claiming originality through the metaphor of a crown of flowers plucked from a place where "the Muses had previously veiled no poet's head."

[84] Cameron 1968: 323-331.

In the introduction to Meleager's *Garland* plants generally have a metaphorical capacity to describe poetic styles or themes of authors' corpora, as modern scholars have generally accepted.[85] Commentators have discussed the significance of the relationship between plant name and works of individual poet in general, but few have investigated the literary relationship in depth.[86] In general, Meleager's preface limits each plant ascription to a verse, a distich, or two, to describe a poet's corpus by means of both plant and modifying elements that describe the plant. In the case of Leonidas, Gow says that the one verse that categorizes Leonidas and his poems is unclear, but "possibly [Meleager] implies that Leonidas was a prolific epigrammatist or that he has included a large selection of Leonidas' epigrams in his anthology."[87] I agree with Gow, that the entire phrase attributed to Leonidas suggests that he is a prolific epigrammatist, yet it is through the whole phrase that modifies part of the ivy, not the ivy itself, that Meleager comments on the sheer number of epigrams that Leonidas either composed or Meleager edited into his anthology. Meleager regularly uses attendant adjectives and phrases for other authors in this way throughout his preface even in reference to the introductory poem itself. The botanical

[85] Gow 1965b: 593-606; Giangrande 1968: 131.

[86] Scholars and scholia have historically presented a great deal of skepticism in debating about the methods of the arrangement of poets used by Meleager, of the connection between poet and plant, and of arrangement in other anthologies that borrowed from or varied from the *Garland* of Meleager; Συνέταξε δὲ αὐτὰ (τὰ ἐπιγράμματα) κατὰ στοιχεῖον, ἀλλὰ Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ ἐξπονομαζόμενος Κεφαλᾶς συνέχεεν αὐτὰ ἀφορίσας εἰς κεφάλαια διάφορα, ἤγουν ἐρωτικὰ ἰδίως καὶ ἀναθεματικὰ καὶ ἐπιτύμβια καὶ ἐπιδεικτικά, ὡς νῦν ὑποτέτακται ἐν τῷ παρόντι πτυκτίῳ (*So he organized these epigrams according to alphabetical order, but Constantinus, the one called Cephalus, divided these into different headings, [which]accordingly were erotic, votive, sepulchral, and epideictic, as they are now coordinated in the present codex, AP* pp. 81-2.*);* acc. to Argentieri (2007: 152-3, 156), the *AP* scribe "J [cited above] provides long scholium on Meleager 1 G-P = *AP* 4.1 on pp. 81-82 of the Codex Palatinus. Argentieri goes on to say that there is no "discernible criterion with which each name is coupled with a flower"; cf. Reitzenstein 1893: 276n1; Radinger 1895: 100-7; Wifstrand 1926; Gow (1965b: 596) says J. badly attempted to list the poets included in the Garland (that is to say summarize the poem). "Besides making some mistakes in the names, he omits Dioscorides and Hermodorus, baffled no doubt by M.'s simple periphrases (24,44)"; Tarán 1987: introduction to *The Greek Anthology v. 1 & 2*; Gutzwiller 1998: 279-80.

[87] Gow 1965b: 307; Clack (1992: 14) sees Gow & Page's comment as a remark not only on the ivy as typifying the sheer number of Leonidas' epigrams, but also thematically related to "lowly folk much as ivy is a lowly ground cover" that Leonidas' epigrams often discuss. I agree, however, when Clack goes on to discuss that there are many other themes in Leonidas' collection, thus the thematic relationship that Gow posits is too limiting.

metaphor in general is more complex than merely a symbol that quantifies production of poems.[88]

This tradition of relating poetry to plants through botanical metaphor is longstanding.[89] Sappho fr. 55 calls poems "roses from Pieria" (βρόδων τὼν ἐκ Πιερίας), roses as the product of inspiration of the Muses; Bacchylides 3.90-98 suggests that patron Hieron shows wealth to men by means of providing the most beautiful blossoms (ἀρετᾶ[ς γε μ]ὲν οὐ μνύθει / βροτῶν ἅμα σ[ώμ]ατι φέγγος, ἀλλὰ / Μοῦσά νιν τρ[έφει.] Ἰέρων, σὺ δ' ὄλβου / κάλλιστ' ἐπεδ[είξ]αο θνα- / τοῖς ἄνθεα· πράξα[ντι] δ' εὖ / οὐ φέρει κόσμ[ον σι]ωπά· / σὺν δ' ἀλαθ[είᾳ] καλῶν / καὶ μελιγλώσσου τις ὑμνήσει χάριν / Κηΐας ἀηδόνος, *so the excellence of men does not lessen with respect to the gleam of the body, but the Muse nourishes it. Hiero, you exhibited the most beautiful blossoms of wealth to men; silence is not an ornament for one who does well; therefore someone sweet-tongued – the Cean nightingale will sing truthfully [your] grace [received from] beautiful [deeds]*); i.e. by providing for song that celebrates excellence, the poems as blossoms are the means by which the fame of both Hiero and Bacchylides will be sung;[90] Aristophanes *Ran*. 1299 alludes to plucking poems from meadows ("lest I be seen plucking the same holy meadow of the Muses as Phrynicus," ἵνα μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν Φρυνίχῳ / λειμῶνα Μουσῶν ἱερὸν ὀφθείην δρέπων), with the meadows once again as the source of inspiration; Plato's *Ion* 534A, notes that poets are like bees who pluck honeyed songs from flowers in gardens and organize them ("for the poets say to us that they bring honeyed songs from honeyed fountains, plucking them from the gardens and dells of the Muses, like bees, as they themselves fly around in this way," λέγουσι γὰρ δήπουθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς οἱ ποιηταὶ ὅτι

[88] Clack's (1992: 51) translation, based on Gow's translation of Meleager 1.15 = *AP* 4.1.15, "fresh and vigorous flower clusters" for θαλεροὺς …κορύμβους, seems to agree with this notion, although Clack does not discuss the ivy itself.
[89] Schur 2004: 119.
[90] Martin 2009: 88-89.

ἀπὸ κρηνῶν μελιρρύτων ἐκ Μουσῶν κήπων τινῶν καὶ ναπῶν / δρεπόμενοι τὰ μέλη ἡμῖν φέρουσιν ὥσπερ αἱ μέλιτται καὶ / αὐτοὶ οὕτω πετόμενοι·); even Leonidas (98 G-P = *AP* 7.13) speaks of Erinna, like the maiden honey-bee, gathering flowers of the Muses as Hades carried her off to wed her;[91] Dioscorides mentions sweetly-scented thyme that grew along the Nile among the Muses, as if the sweet smell of thyme, a reference to poetic style, attracts other poets to adopt Machon's[92] poetic panache;[93] Daphnis in Theocritus *Idyll* 9.35 says that flowers are as sweet to bees as songs of the Muses;[94] and later Lucretius (1.124) attaches the epithet "ever flowering" to Homer (*semper florens Homerus*), and speaks of himself as led by his blossoming mind to pluck new flowers (*novos decerpere flores*), to take his place among other poets crowned in flowers of the Muses (1.925-930), a crown attributed to Ennius in 1.118-119 ("Just as our Ennius sang, who first brought out of Helicon a lovely crown with its immortal foliage," *Ennius ut noster cecinit, qui primus amoeno detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam…*).[95] Perhaps Lucretius is recalling Meleager's adaptation of this tradition, as has been suggested.[96]

Importantly, it is often not just the plants themselves that bear this relationship to inspired poetry, but it is the allusion to the poet's plucking of plant-life that seems to provide the source for such a metaphor; the precedent for the culling of inspiration seems rooted in Hesiod's *Th*. 29-31, wherein the poet receives divine inspiration from the Muses symbolically via the plucked laurel staff ("as those clear-voiced daughters of great Zeus said this, plucking they then gave to

[91] Gow 1965b: 593-594; Radinger (1895: 90-94) and Jacobs (1794-1814: 2-6) treat well the extensive tradition of botanical metaphor that Meleager is inheriting, which treatments Gow seems to pick up on.
[92] Machon, a comic poet, is the subject of the epitaph.
[93] Dioscorides 24 G-P = *AP* 7.708; Gow 1965b: 257-258.
[94] According to Van Sickle (1975: 55), citing *Il*. 1.249 and Hes. *Th*. 40, "'sweet' [in *Idyll* 1] recalls a commonplace of poetic interpretation as in Hesiod's praise of the Muses' speech or in Homeric praise of Nestor's eloquence." Flowers for poems seem also to be the metonymic reference to the literary tradition that poets pass on.
[95] Gow 1965b: 594; Gutzwiller 1998a: 279. In his idea of blossoming Homer, Lucretius may be recalling Meleager 1 G-P=*AP* 4.1; for this idea see Segal 1990: 201; or he may even be recalling, according to Gale 2001: 169, 170n9, an entire poetic tradition spawned from Homer.
[96] Segal 1990: 201; Gale 2001: 169.

me a staff –a bough of blossoming laurel, amazing sight, and they breathed their divine voice in me," ὣς ἔφασαν κοῦραι μεγάλου Διὸς ἀρτιέπειαι, / καί μοι σκῆπτρον ἔδον δάφνης ἐριθηλέος ὄζον / δρέψασαι, θηητόν· ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδὴν θέσπιν). The bough of blossoming laurel is a tool for the poet, a token culled from the process of inspiration; when the Muses had plucked the bough and given it to the poet, their inspiration becomes the poet's inspiration, as they breathed divine song into him. Thus, Meleager applies a traditional botanical metaphor in order to present his own inspired process of anthologizing while constructing his *Garland*. With this method, he plucks from other authors, is inspired by them and their methods, and organizes the epigrams he chooses, while adding his own epigrams to his newly-constructed anthology. Meleager receives both inspiration and epigrams from each poet, while the various poets act as the Muses in Hesiod's *Theogony*, as they provide their own plants as the foundation and inspiration for Meleager's mélange.

I. The two-fold nature of Meleager's metaphors

Within the first line of the elegy that introduces his *Garland*, Meleager writes that the poem is πάγκαρπον ἀοιδὰν. Meleager's "abundantly fruitful song"[97] born by the Muse contains a list of poets' names and their poems that are emblemized by various flowers and species of plants, presented as a dedicatory gift to a certain Diocles. Because of the stress on metaphor, each phrase in the proemium seems to solicit interpretation. Thus, the "abundantly fruitful" nature of the song may imply something about how Meleager has accomplished this artful assemblage and the pride he takes in its craft, as he claims it by name in response to his

[97] Similar to Gutzwiller's (1997: 170) "all-fruited song." Paton (1927: 111) has "varied fruits of song," while Gow (1965b: 597) translates the phrase as "rich in fruit of every kind;" S. *El*. 635 "of many fruits." Cf. S. *OT*. 83 "covered/laden with fruit."

seemingly rhetorical question posed in the first three lines (ἄνυσε μὲν Μελέαγρος 1.3 G-P = *AP* 4.1.3).

These flowers or plants prove that πάγκαρπον is an appropriate description of the song in three respects. Firstly, the description of abundantly fruitful, or more literally, "*all*-fruitful" with the *pan-* prefix on the adjective, shows that the song is associated with the great number of poets that Meleager is about to list – forty-seven including Meleager himself.[98] Secondly, Meleager's figurative description provides a symbol related to plant-life for each of these poets, and so characterizes them by nature as burgeoning with fruits of their own blossom, thus making the poem thoroughly fruitful in terms of Meleager's creativity in producing names of flowers relative to each poet. Thirdly, because the adjective seems to indicate the ingenuity in productivity with the καρπον root, perhaps it is a reference to the productivity of the named poets' innovations. The poem is therefore fruitful because it contains the names of such productive poets, and Meleager is commenting on their innovation through their assigned flower name.[99]

Nevertheless, Meleager seems to be jointly remarking on the fruitful nature of the poet. The implications are that the named poet's poetic style is a product of the poet's own cultivation, and also that Meleager is stylistically adapting the poet's name to be a certain type of fruit, and so their innovation becomes his own with his description of them.[100]

---

[98] Gow (1965a: xxiN5 & 1965b: 603) suggests that there might be forty-eight; Paton (1927: 111) translates Meleager 1.36 G-P= *AP* 4.1.36 as "and a bloom that may not be translated into verse," so referring to some other poet who did not fit the meter.

[99] cf. "παγκάρπων φυτῶν" in Pi. *P*. 9.58; As in Pindar, the plants are all-fruitful because of the land in which the plants live.

[100] Cf. Gow (1965b: 596), who comments that the resemblance of poems to flowers is too vague for it to be possible except in a few cases (e.g. Archilochus) to compare plausibly a particular poet to a particular plant, and facing a list of forty-seven poets, "must perforce have fitted out many of them with plants drawn more or less at random."; see Tarán (1979: 2) who says that Meleager seemingly arranged the poems in such a way as to indicate the link between the original and the variation; see also how the variation on Leonidas of Tarentum plays out in epideictic epigrams of Antipater Sidonius and Meleager in Tarán 1979: 150-7; Gutzwiller supports (1997: 176) that "[in] Meleager's

II. Plants to Poets

Although they argue that the resemblance of poems to plants is too vague, except in a few cases, Gow and Page concede that there are a few plants that seem to accurately represent the poet himself or herself, poetry, and/or the style of composition of the author. As Gow remarks, "Meleager provides his poetesses with the choicest and most delicate flowers" (like the "few roses" of Sappho and the "white lily" of Anyte, Meleager 1.5-6 G-P =*AP* 4.1.5-6) and names Antipater of Sidon with a plant from his native country.[101] Other poets included in Gow's list are Archilochus with a thistle and Hermodorus as a Syrian with spikenard.[102] Overall, Gow's explanation of the relationship of plant to poet is itself vague. In this section, I propose that Meleager may be using the plant name to allude to some aspect of an author's individual theme or style with which Meleager would have been familiar.

The botanical metaphor is often Meleager's interpretation of the emblemized author's creativity. For example, Plato's golden bough in Meleager 1.47-8 G-P = *AP* 4.1.47-8 is lit in every way by virtue. This is a curious ascription, since the epigrams attributed to Plato in the *Greek Anthology* are predominantly erotic and dubiously assigned to the philosopher.[103] Because

---

anthology, the possibility of such a figurative reading is reinforced by the verbal link between this στέφανος [in 12.51] which serves as a memorial of Heliodora (μναμόσυνον κείνος), and the larger Στέφανος (cf. Διοκλεῖ μναμόσυνον, 4.1.3-4, ἀείμνηστον…Διοκλε, 12.57.5)."

[101] Abel 1965: 367. Gow (1965b: 596) arrives at the conclusion that it is possible that we could identify some of the plants with more certainty, if we knew more of some of these poets and then states that "the fact is however that Meleager has undertaken a hopeless task. The resemblance of poems to flowers is too vague for it to be possible except in a few cases." The fault in Gow's conclusion is a result of his lack of explanation in his approach. Gow's view that Meleager "provides his poetesses with the choicest and most delicate flowers" assumes some over-generalizing delicacy in femininity that perhaps Meleager represents about other women (Meleager 36 G-P = *AP* 5.174; 46 G-P = 5.147), but Gow doesn't explain this or how this characterization is consistently apt for all of the poetesses of Sappho, Anyte, Erinna, Nossis, or Moero.

[102] Gow 1965b: 596.

[103] Ludwig 1963: 65-82; Sider 1987: 321; Cameron 1993: 385-7. Although Ludwig has "thoroughly disproved Platonic authorship," the question of whether the epigrams attributed to Plato are actually by Plato or Philodemus is irrelevant to this discussion, however, since Meleager undoubtedly mentions Plato in the proemium to his *Garland*.

of the references to astronomical objects in "Plato's" epigrams,[104] it is possible that Meleager may be describing imagery associated with both literal and figurative enlightenment. In epigrams attributed to Plato there is an overall thematic emphasis that connects light/fire/enlightenment and its metaphorical representation with passion, and this thematic imagery is possibly alluded to in the distich in Meleager's proemium. Examine epigrams *AP* 7.469 of 7.670 of "Plato," which use light as a property of the stars, that enable one to see or understand and to obtain fame. Meleager is categorizing, organizing, and appropriating the "golden bough" metaphor as a reference to the corpus that he himself attributes to Plato. We cannot completely discount that some of the "Platonic" epigrams that we have in the *Greek Anthology* are those that Meleager also had, or that he represented as having been composed by Plato.[105]

It is not far-fetched to think that the "golden bough" of "prophetic" Plato in the proemium of the *Garland* is simply Meleager's formulation of how Plato should be categorized, and what Meleager views as thematically typifying the epigrams he attributes to Plato, or more generally the themes relevant to the corpus of all of Plato's works. Some scholars have even mentioned a direct relationship between Meleager's botanical metaphor – the golden bough - and Plato's doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the Platonic idea of reincarnation.[106] Thus, although the connection between epigrams attributed to Plato in the *Anthology* is dubious, Meleager's ascription of the golden bough to Plato may be an allusion to the corpus of Plato as a whole, comprising epigrams that Meleager could have included in his *Garland,* even if they were

[104] With the exception of Plato's composition of a line in an epigram attributed to Asclepiades, Gow (1965b:145) excludes Plato's epigrams from his anthology. Page (1975: 47-55), however, includes Plato's epigrams in his selections of the *Greek Anthology*, entitled *Epigrammata Graeca*.
[105] Einarson 1943: 260-261.
[106] Pl. *R*. 2. 415a, *Cratylus* 398a; Einarson 1943: 260-1; Michels 1945: 60n4.

not actually composed by Plato, and Plato's doctrine of the immortality of the soul, is at least a possible reference.[107]

Commentators also state that the association of Meleager's characterization of Archilochus' poetry as ἄνθος ἀκάνθης Ἀρχιλόχου is clear without explanation (Meleager 1.37-8 G-P = *AP* 4.1.37-8),[108] although the ascription of poems to Archilochus in the *Greek Anthology* is dubious.[109] I support their claim with some additional evidence to further show how Meleager refers to an author's *corpora* of literature with individualized botanical metaphor. The "akantha blossom," or "thistle" of Archilochus is like the sharp insults that Archilochus hurls in his iambs, just as the species is described by Theophrastus - covered in "spines on the branches and shoots of leaves."[110] Meleager's characterization of Archilochus' poetry emphasizes the impending action that the plant has the ability to perform; like Archilochus' iambs, the thorny plant is able to do harm.

Meleager provides an echo of this idea in another epigram he writes about Archilochus Meleager 132 G-P = *AP* 7.352).[111] Here, Meleager writes in the voice of young girls - presumably the daughters of Lycambes[112] - who rebuke Archilochus as "bitter" (πικρός, Meleager 132.3) and his iambs as "outrageously violent" (ὑβριστῆρας, Meleager 132.7 G-P).[113]

---

[107] Verg. *Aen*. 6.137, 6.204; Michels (1945: 60-61) supports that Vergil may be alluding to the "golden bough" metaphor in the introduction to Meleager's *Garland* 1.47-48 G-P = *AP* 4.47-48.
[108] Gow 1965b: 596.
[109] Reitzenstein 1893: 106-7; Gow 1965b: 603.
[110] By "common," I am referring to what is suitable to real life, or πρακτικόν, as in Arist. *Pol*. 24.1459b8-1460a11; cf. Arist. *Pol*. 9.1451b11. Janko (1984: 61) states that Aristotle distinguishes between iambus not as part of the mimetic genre, as it depicts real individuals and not generalized persons or actions. Thus, in contrasting Homer's epic to comedy, the abusive poetry of Archilochus would not be referenced on account of the iambic element that was disappearing in comedy later than Archilochus.
[111] cf. Gow (1965b: 680) and Page remark that, although the ascription of Meleager to the authorship of this epigram may be faulty not only since its attribution in *GA* is Ἀδεσποτον ὁ δὲ Μελεάγρου, but also on account of the breach of Meleager's metrical rules in the prosody of Ἀρχίλοχος ἐπέων, there is no reason to exclude this epigram from Meleager's others.
[112] Meleager is probably mimicking an epigram of Dioscorides; Diosc. 17 G-P = *AP* 7.351.l-2, according to Gow 1965b: 680; Carey 1986: 60n1.
[113] Meleager 132 G-P = *AP* 7.352.

Archilochus' two epigrams in the *Anthology*[114] are not generally abrasive, and so do not support the characterization of "thistle," but more likely Meleager is thinking of Archilochus' other poetry. As some scholars have noted, Archilochus' iambs that directly attack Lycambes' daughter Neoboule in the Cologne epode, fragment 196a,[115] or Archilochus' definition of himself as both warrior and poet in fragment 1, seem to fit this characterization best.[116] Thus, it is Meleager's perception and interpretation of Archilochus' poetry as a whole, and Archilochus' self-definition that Meleager is noting with the thistle.

Callimachus is another case in point.[117] Meleager weaves him in as "the sweet myrtle of Callimachus, ever full of rough and honey [sweetness]" (ἡδύ τε μύρτον / Καλλιμάχου, στυφελοῦ μεστὸν ἀεὶ μέλιτος, Meleager 1.21-2 = *AP* 4.1.21-2). The myrtle is known for its

---

Δεξιτερὴν Ἀίδαο θεοῦ χέρα καὶ τὰ κελαινά *(1)*
ὄμνυμεν ἀρρήτου δέμνια Περσεφόνης,
παρθένοι ὡς ἔτυμον καὶ ὑπὸ χθονί· πολλὰ δ' ὁ πικρὸς
αἰσχρὰ καθ' ἡμετέρης ἔβλυσε παρθενίης
Ἀρχίλοχος· ἐπέων δὲ καλὴν φάτιν οὐκ ἐπὶ καλὰ *(5)*
ἔργα, γυναικεῖον δ' ἔτραπεν ἐς πόλεμον.
Πιερίδες, τί κόρῃσιν ἐφ' ὑβριστῆρας ἰάμβους
ἐτράπετ', οὐχ ὁσίῳ φωτὶ χαριζόμεναι;
By the right hand of the god Hades and the dark beds of not-to-be-uttered Persephone, / we maidens swear that it's true even under the earth; that bitter man, / Archilochus, gushed forth many shameful things against our maidenhood; / and he did not make a fair report of words for our good deeds, and he turned [it] into a polemic against women. / Muses, daughters of Pieria, why did he turn his outrageous iambs against maidens, / and why are you pleased with this unholy man?

[114] The two epigrams that are preserved in the *Greek Anthology*, although dubiously ascribed to Archilochus, are for the most part tame, with subtle hints of irony. Both poems are distichs, whose short length could be referenced in the "small drops from the Ocean" in the second line of the distich devoted to Archilochus in Meleager's introduction, but since the ascription to Archilochus is dubious, we cannot say this conclusively. Archilochus *AP* 6.133 (Ἀλκιβίη πλοκάμων ἱερὴν ἀνέθηκε καλύπτρην / Ἥρῃ, κουριδίων εὖτ' ἐκύρησε γάμων. *Alcibia dedicated this holy veil of locks / to Hera, when she obtained lawful marriage*.); Archilochus *AP* 7.441 (Ὑψηλοὺς Μεγάτιμον Ἀριστοφόωντά τε Νάξου / κίονας, ὦ μεγάλη γαῖ', ὑπένερθεν ἔχεις, *These highest pillars, Megatimos and Aristophon of Naxos, / great earth, you hold below*.); Gow (1965b: 603n37) says that Meleager is probably thinking about Archilochus' invectives in his iambs.

[115] Archil. *fr*. 196aW; Rosen 2007a: 25-6.

[116] Archilochus fr. 1, εἰμὶ δ' ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνυαλίοιο ἄνακτος / καὶ Μουσέων ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος, (*I am the one who guards the lord Enyalius, / and the one who knows the lovely gift of the Muses*); Scodel 2003: 258.

[117] Clack (1992: 52) says that this phrase may reference Callimachus' other works, like the *Hymns* and *Hecale*, but he does not explain exactly how.

ability to produce a certain sweetness, which suggests Callimachus' smooth writing style,[118] yet the plant may also allude to Callimachus' own description of the myrtle at Cyrene.[119] His *Hymn to Apollo* highlights the myrtle-hill in Cyrene as Μυρτούσσης κερατώδεος, or horned Myrtoussas.[120] Cyrene was Callimachus' birthplace, and it has a central place in four of his epigrams.[121] Such stress on Callimachus' origin would not be unique, since other authors of epigram also regularly note Cyrene as Callimachus' native city,[122] and scholia quoting Zenodotus on Apollonius Rhodes 2.1005-6a describe Cyrene itself as "rough," στύφελος, the same word that Meleager uses in his elegy.[123] The short-leafed nature of one species of the myrtle[124] as well as its sweetness and roughness may describe Callimachus' writing style, but one cannot overlook how Callimachus presents the relationship of the myrtle to Cyrene, and the city's thematic prevalence in much of his poetry.

If we turn our attention to Meleager, Meleager calls his own epigrams πρώιμα λευκόια, or "early gilliflowers," which are the earliest flowers to appear in bloom in the beginning of winter.[125] As the commentary states, there is no way to determine whether the adjective πρώιμα, or the "youthfulness" of the flower describes the poems written when the poet was younger, or

[118] Thphr. *HP* 3.16.4 & 3.12.2; Gow (1965b: 600) discusses Strab. 12.549 and Diod. 19.94.
[119] Gow (1965b: 600, 151) suggests that Meleager is referring to Callimachus' writing of smooth verses, and the style as possessing "an astringent economy of words uncommon among Hellenistic epigrammatists;" I agree, but I think that the reference is even more specifically to Callimachus' relationship to Cyrene, as seen in his epigrams and in *Hymns* 2 and 3, to Apollo and Diana, respectively; Hecker says that the phrase is a reference to Callimachus' erotic epigrams.
[120] As both Apollonius Rhodes' *Argonautica* and an inscription to Apollo on the hill also name it; Mair (1955: 26) notes, the hill is also so-called Myrtoussas in the *Argonautica*, A.R. 2.505, and in an inscription at the temple of Apollo at Cyrene which is dedicated to Ἀπόλλωνι Μυρτώῳ.
[121] Thus four epigrams total refer to Cyrene: 32 G-P = *AP* 7.517, 31 G-P = *AP* 7.524, 29 G-P = *AP* 525, 30 G-P = *AP* 7.415.
[122] Anonymous *AP* 7.42; Cat. 116.
[123] Apollonius Rhodes 2.1005-6a uses this word to modify a mass of land that is difficult to cultivate, because of the pains it afflicts on men attempting to achieve daily sustenance See also the relationship between this word and verbal abuse in Ar. *Eq*. 537.
[124] Thphr. *HP* 3.12.2; cf. Thphr. *HP* 3.16.4
[125] Theophr. *HP* 7.13.9. Gow (1965b: 605n56) also cites Theophr. *HP* 6.8.1.

poems written later than the other poems of his anthology.[126] Since the flower itself so frequently seems to coincide with references to the corpus of literature of the named poet, it seems possible that λευκόια is Meleager's encapsulation of his own style as an anthologizer and imitator, as he provides fresh innovation in both roles.[127]

Meleager is an anthologizer, and his self-assigned flower emphasizes that his poetry should be read in relation to that of others.[128] In Meleager's other applications of these λευκόια, or white violets, the flower is mentioned among other flowers, as part of a wreath or garland related to poetic composition (Meleager 78 G-P = *AP* 12.256), or in order to emphasize the honor bestowed upon someone, since a poet is crowned with this flower among others (Meleager 47 G-P = *AP* 5.147), or in order to provide contrast among other flowers so as to emphasize the beauty of a person (Meleager 31 G-P = *AP* 5.143). The similarity among all of Meleager's uses of λευκόια, like that in the proemium to his *Garland*, is the juxtaposition of this type of flower with others. Thus, with the λευκόια themselves, in addition to the modifying πρώιμα, Meleager symbolizes his own innovation both as a composer, whose style mimics or innovates upon the poetic stylistic techniques of others, and as an anthologizer, who provides his own fresh method of organization.[129]

The self-referential phrase "the white violets of *my own* Muse" distinguishes his own poems from those of others, and so this phrase seems to be an apology for the inclusion of his own poems, as the commentary reports.[130] With such a humble admission, he may be remarking

---

[126] For Aratus' term πρωτογόνους ἕλικας, *the first-born shoots*, scholars suggest that the epigrams were among Aratus' early work; see Gow 1965b: 605; cf. Gutzwiller 1998a: 17.
[127] Abel (1965: 368) opines that the "white violet" ascription reflects Meleager's "spotlessness."
[128] On Meleager's penchant for using old words in a new way, and adapting old words to fit in his context of botanical metaphor, see Giangrande 1967: 131.
[129] As Krevins (2007: 140) says, "the overlapping roles of poet and editor are aptly figured." Although Krevins' comments are in reference to the *coronis*, 129 G-P = AP 12.257, there is a clear relationship between references in the *coronis* and in the proemium of Meleager's *Garland*, as Van Sickle (1981: 66-67) has shown.
[130] Gow (1965b: 606) says that Meleager "seems apologetic for including his own works."

how his own poems provide variation from those of the other authors that he is editing into his *Garland*. Since ἅμα in the previous line gives the sense of togetherness with the previous poets (τοῖς), or the sense that he is composing in the same tradition as other poets, but also that the poems are crafted from his own inspiration, as in Μούσης καὶ σφετέρης.[131] The balancing of the phrases ἄλλων τ' ἔρνεα πολλὰ νεόγραφα with δ' ἅμα…σφετέρης…πρώιμα λευκόια, ("the many sprouts newly written," *with* "and also together with the young gilliflowers of my own," Meleager 1.55-6 G-P = AP 4.1.55-6) indicates that he incorporates the writing of others that is made even newer by his own new poems and as part of his own cultivation or organization of his *Garland*.[132]

III. Ivy in the Greek literary tradition

Meleager's choice of ivy to characterize Leonidas is equally significant. The attendant phrase "blossoming clusters" seems more symbolic of how Meleager as an editor fits Leonidas' epigrams into his Garland, whereas the ivy itself is how Meleager more directly characterizes Leonidas' epigrams. In line fifteen of his proemium, Meleager weaves Leonidas' epigrams into his *Garland* with the phrase ἐν δὲ Λεωνίδεω θαλεροὺς κισσοῖο κορύμβους – "likewise he wove in the blossoming clusters of ivy of Leonidas." The adjective θαλεροὺς, "thick," can mean "blossoming" in reference to plants, as in "the blossoming spring" of Alexander Aetolus 3.7, but the phrase Meleager uses, θαλεροὺς… κορύμβους, describes the plant's outgrowth, and is the direct object of what Meleager is weaving, and so is separate from ivy, which is in the

[131] Meleager 99 G-P = *AP* 12.23; Tarán 1979: 2, 98-101; cf. Clack 1992: 55, who says that these "others" are Meleager's contemporaries; Krevins 2007: 138-40.
[132] Abel 1965: 367; Schur (2004: 119) discusses the sense of "newly-written shoots" of Meleager 1.55 GP = AP 4.1.55 as close to the German word *Blatt*, meaning both leaf and page, and so plant material and written form become inextricable, and so the hybrid form of "newly-written shoots" exemplifies a poetics of transformation, as found in Posidippus 6.3 GP = *AP* 12.98.

genitive along with Leonidas.[133] The figurative presentation of "blossoming clusters" (θαλεροὺς… κορύμβους) may allude to the large number of poems of Leonidas that are included in the anthology, the organization of his poems into groups there[134] or even the ornate language of Leonidas' epigrams for which Leonidas was known.[135] Whatever the representation of the phrase attendant to the plant, it is not equal to the ivy but a part of its symbolism; the ivy itself, like other plant names, seems to symbolize something closer to, or belonging to, the product of the composer Leonidas, or the style of his writing. Although ivy may be a highly productive plant,[136] the ivy itself contains other allusions beyond what makes Leonidas "a prolific epigrammatist" to Meleager.[137]

Ivy is a developing metaphorical entity in Greek literature, but its association with a sort of motion, rooted in the sacred worship of Dionysus, is consistent with most uses, especially in archaic poetry.[138] Ivy's association with roaming and clinging is rooted in the sacred worship of Dionysus as well as the nature of the plant. In *Homeric Hymn* 26 *to Dionysus,* there is a connection made between wandering and ivy. Dionysus is crowned in ivy as he wanders wooded dwellings (*h. Bacch.* 26, 8-9), but the ivy seems to be more associated with the god's mystical power to make things grow; nevertheless, his wandering inspires others to wander as he

---

[133] Although Gow (1965b: 599) says κορύμβους is frequently found in description of ivy's clusters, the description of "thick clusters of ivy" does not seem to be a technical botanical term; cf. Theophr. (*HP* 3.18.6) who describes the fruit of ivy as thick clusters, but only for one particular kind – the "light" kind:
λευκοκάρπων μόνον ὁ μὲν ἁδρὸν καὶ πυκνὸν καὶ συνεστηκότα τὸν καρπὸν ἔχει καθαπερεὶ σφαῖραν *(…for the light one is the only one with fruit, and it has leaves. Again, this one has thick bunches of fruit that is like a ball, which indeed some call a white-berry…).*
[134] Krevins (2007: 139) argues that "Meleager's *Garland* is an elaborately designed work divided thematically into four books, each featuring interlocking series of poems that are framed and organized into symmetrical arrays;" Taràn (1979: 150-7) identifies a group of coordinating epigrams, which includes Leonidas, Antipater Sidonius, and Meleager himself, by different authors that Meleager probably organized in this "interlocking way" in his anthology.
[135] Hansen 1914: 30-65; for Leonidas' ornate style, see Gigante (1971: 15-17) on Geffcken's assessment of Leonidas (1896), or Gow 1965b: 308; Gutzwiller 1998a: 90, 90n108-9.
[136] Thphr. *HP* 3.18.6.
[137] Gow 1965b: 307, 599.
[138] This representation of Dionysus is in concordance with the archaeological record as well; see Sherratt 2004: 329-330.

leads nymphs in loud revelry. As it twines itself about the mast of a ship in another hymn to Dionysus, *Homeric Hymn 7*,[139] the movement and the quick growth of the ivy emphasize Dionysus' power, as the ivy forces the ship to become immobile (ἀμφ' ἱστὸν δὲ μέλας εἰλίσσετο κισσὸς / ἄνθεσι τηλεθάων, χαρίεις δ' ἐπὶ καρπὸς ὀρώρει, *h. Bacch.* 7. 40-41).[140]

In Greek literature, the ivy symbolizes the divine inspiration of Dionysus and his power that the chorus honor in their performance. In fragment 341 of Aeschylus, Apollo himself is "ivied" and called the βακχειόμαντις, "Bacchic prophet."[141] In Sophocles' *Trachiniae*,[142] as the chorus shout the Dionysiac cry *euhoi* and "talk about the ivy twisting a Bacchic contest, the ivy indicates the divine inspiration of Dionysus, and it symbolizes the circular dance itself."[143] In *fr.*

---

[139] *h. Bacch.*7.32-44:
ὣς εἰπὼν ἱστόν τε καὶ ἱστίον ἕλκετο νηός. /
ἔμπνευσεν δ' ἄνεμος μέσον ἱστίον, ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὅπλα /
καττάνυσαν· τάχα δέ σφιν ἐφαίνετο θαυματὰ ἔργα. /
οἶνος μὲν πρώτιστα θοὴν ἀνὰ νῆα μέλαιναν *(35)* /
ἡδύποτος κελάρυζ' εὐώδης, ὤρνυτο δ' ὀδμὴ /
ἀμβροσίη· ναύτας δὲ τάφος λάβε πάντας ἰδόντας. /
αὐτίκα δ' ἀκρότατον παρὰ ἱστίον ἐξετανύσθη /
ἄμπελος ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα, κατεκρημνῶντο δὲ πολλοὶ /
βότρυες· ἀμφ' ἱστὸν δὲ μέλας εἰλίσσετο κισσὸς *(40)* /
ἄνθεσι τηλεθάων, χαρίεις δ' ἐπὶ καρπὸς ὀρώρει· /
πάντες δὲ σκαλμοὶ στεφάνους ἔχον· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες /
νῆ' ἤδη τότ' ἔπειτα κυβερνήτην ἐκέλευον /
γῆ πελάαν· /
*When he said this he drew up both the mast and sail of the ship. / So the wind blew the middle of the sail, and the ship's crew stretched tight the tackle on either side;/ and swiftly a mysterious occurrence appeared to them. / First of all, wine, sweet to drink and good-smelling / gushed up the swift dark ship, and the ambrosial odor was overpowering, / and amazement seized all the sailors who watched. / **Immediately a vine stretched itself out beyond the highest point of the sail / here and there, and many grape-clusters hung from it; then the dark ivy twined itself on either side luxuriant with blossoms, and the beautiful fruit arose; / and all the rowers bore garlands; and when the crewmen saw all of this / they then immediately ordered the helmsman to steer the ship toward shore.***

[140] Gutzwiller (1986: 253) notes that κίσσος occurs only here in Homer, Hesiod, and the *Homeric Hymns*. G. (1986: 254) also calls the "supernatural speed" of its growing and its "entwining the mast and blooming fruit and flowers" a "Dionysiac miracle."

[141] A. *fr.* 341: ὁ κισσεὺς Ἀπόλλων, ὁ Βακχειόμαντις; Rutherford (1995: 118-120) discusses the characterization of the tragic paean and says that the the wearing of ivy by Apollo associates him with Dionysus as well as with song-dance in honor of "Paian" or himself as healer. Apollo as "Bacheiomantis" shows the affiliation of Apollo and Dionysus as reflective of the mixing of genres, the dithyramb and the paean. The symbolism of ivy and its stricter association with Dionysus himself and his powers, is clear in another *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (*h. Bacch.* 40 ff.); S. *Tr.* 205 ff.; Rutherford 1995: 120.

[142] Soph. *Tr.* 205ff.

[143] As Rutherford (1995: 120, 134n33) says of Sophocles' chorus.

75 of Pindar, Dionysus is the "ivy-knowing, loud-sounding god" who receives the gift of song, sung with circular dancing. Ivy appears in similar contexts associated with song and Dionysus in comedy, as seen in a call to the Hoophoe, who lurks in the ivy in Aristophanes' *Birds* (230-43), and in Bacchic revelry of the choral dance in his *Thesmophoriazusae* (985-90). In this context, ivy is associated with both movement and divinely inspired poetry. The action carried out with ivy is a means of worshiping Dionysus, much like Dionysus' wandering in hymns, and so to follow the god Dionysus often means to experience mad wandering under the control of Dionysus, as the ivy itself performs.[144]

Physical movement related to Dionysus, although not used to directly describe the ivy, is often associated with its presence. The plant, however, is often associated with the potential action of a person, god, or entity due to the power of Dionysus, and so it symbolizes a paradox of action and inaction. In Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* (674-5), during their praise of Colonus, the chorus describe the ivy in reference to the location's association with Dionysus, and they emphasize the sacredness of the place marked by the growth of the dark ivy. The growth of ivy there stands in contrast to the otherwise uncultivated & dark nature of the place – not to be walked on, unsunned, and unaffected by storms.[145] The living ivy grows in contrast to the darkness, and the lifeless nature of the place, through which sacred space living men should not pass. Similarly in Sophocles' *Antigone*, in a dirge preceding her death Antigone describes Niobe in a simile, like the clinging ivy that the gravestone subdues. The motion of the ivy "clinging," ἀτενὴς, is representative of Niobe's death and her attempts to achieve an immortal state, as she

---

[144] *h. Bacch. 7.* 32-44; *h. Bacch.* 26; Eur. *Bacch.* 57, 85-87; Gould 1988: 5-7; Montiglio 2005: 79.

[145] Note the parallel here between the bearing of ivy and the *abaton*, or place not-to-be-tread-on; *OC* 674-5: τὸν οἰνωπὸν ἔχουσα κισ/σὸν καὶ τὰν ἄβατον θεοῦ / φυλλάδα μυριόκαρπον ἀνήλιον /ἀνήνεμόν τε πάντων / χειμώνων. ἵν' ὁ βακχιώ-/τας ἀεὶ Διόνυσος ἐμβατεύει/ θείαις ἀμφιπολῶν τιθήναις. *[Ch:] …[674] it has dark-colored ivy and [there] is the place belonging to the god, not to be trodden, unsunned with respect to its much fruit-bearing foliage, and unblasted by any storms; so Dionysus, always frenzied with wine as he watches over [680] with divine nurses, tramples there.*

perpetually soaks (ὑπ' ὀφρύσι παγκλαὐτοις) the mountain with her tears.[146] Thus, in classical tragedy and comedy, the qualities of the living, moving ivy often stand in stark contrast to some aspect of immobile lifelessness or inaction, even if the movement does not refer directly to Dionysus.

Hellenistic poets often employ this paradoxical aspect of ivy's symbolism, yet its growth or movement is associated with poetic fame within and without allusion to Dionysus. The allusions to Dionysus seem to fit within the literary trope of what the god symbolizes; poetic inspiration, mad wandering, immortal fame, mystical growth.[147] The ivy, once a way of referring to the divine power of Dionysus, becomes its own paradoxical symbol of immortal, poetic fame, but by the action associated with the plant, eternal yet clinging to the dead. The plant's wandering action elicits immortal fame for whomever it clings to, thus it is a fitting symbol in sepulchral epigrams.

Poetic fame is a means of celebrating the dead and enlivening their poetry, and bearing the ivy symbolizes inspiration. Dioscorides (23 G-P = *AP* 7.707) demonstrates through the mouth of a red-bearded satyr named Scirtus, or "Frisky,"[148] who guards the body of Sositheus, that the poet Sositheus is just as worthy as Sophocles of receiving poetic fame because he "bore

---

[146] S. *Ant*. 823-33; [Αν] ἤκουσα δὴ λυγροτάταν ὀλέσθαι / τὰν Φρυγίαν ξέναν/ Ταντάλου Σιπύλῳ πρὸς ἄ- / *(825)* κρῳ, τὰν κισσὸς ὡς ἀτενὴς / πετραία βλάστα δάμασεν,/ καί νιν ὄμβροι τακομέναν / ὡς φάτις ἀνδρῶν, / χιών τ' οὐδαμὰ λείπει, *(830)*/ τέγγει δ' ὑπ' ὀφρύσι παγ- / κλαύτοις δειράδας· ᾇ με δαί-/ μων ὁμοιοτάταν κατευνάζει, *[An.] Indeed I have heard a most mournful thing, how our Phrygian guest, daughter of Tantalus, died [825] on steep Sipylus, like clinging ivy the growth of a stone subdued her. And the rains, as is said by men, [830] do not leave her melting form, nor does the snow, under the crags filled with weeping / she soaks the hills. Fate leads me to a rest [833] most similar to hers*.

[147] Burkert 1985: 412n3; for *dithyrambos* itself is an ecstatic hymn related to Dionysus' mythological yet mystical rebirth, and vine clusters and vines embody a source of life given to man by Dionysus, thus singing the dithyramb celebrates this tradition and Dionysus' chthonian symbolism, see Eur. *Bacch*. 528-533. Vines in general, ivy, grapevine, et al., are associated with the intoxicating growth of the god's power, as in *HH* 7, Pind. fr. 124., Eur. *Bacch*. 299-327; Plat. *Phdr*. 244, 265b; "mania" is a sort of madness associated with Dionysus, and is a sort of blessed and divinely inspired mystical escape, to which mantic arts, prophetic powers that are seen as superior to sanity, are related; Montiglio 2005: 73-76.

[148] Lehnus 1996: 295.

the ivy" (ἐκισσοφόρησε) for his choral dances worthy of Phlian Satyrs.[149] The satyr notes that his brother guards a tomb of Sophocles on the Acropolis. Interestingly, this epigram discussing "Frisky" forms a pair with Dioscorides 22 G-P = *AP* 7.37, which is a dialogue between the statue for the tomb of Sophocles and a passerby.[150] In this poem the statue says that he ceased his dance over the tomb of Sophocles when he died, whereas "Frisky," the satyr that guards Sositheus' tomb in the other epigram above, discusses the dance of satyrs as more imminent since Sositheus "bore the ivy." Although the ivy is born by Sositheus in a tomb, the bearing of the ivy seems to continue with the dance of the satyrs and its virile rhythm (23.4-5 G-P = *AP* 7.37.4-5). Thus the bearing of the ivy has some relationship to poetic composition and poetry's ability to flourish after death.[151]

This relationship between ivy's growth and eternal fame of poetry is upheld in another epigram of Dioscorides (24 G-P = *AP* 7.708).[152] In the first line (Dioscorides 24 G-P = *AP*

---

[149] Dioscorides 23 G-P = *AP* 7.707; Κἠγὼ Σωσιθέου κομέω νέκυν, ὅσσον ἐν ἄστει / ἄλλος ἀπ' αὐθαίμων ἡμετέρων Σοφοκλῆν, / Σκίρτος ὁ πυρρογένειος. ἐκισσοφόρησε γὰρ ὠνὴρ / ἄξια Φλιασίων, ναὶ μὰ χορούς, Σατύρων / κἠμὲ τὸν ἐν καινοῖς τεθραμμένον ἤθεσιν ἤδη / ἤγαγεν εἰς μνήμην πατρίδ' ἀναρχαΐσας, / καὶ πάλιν εἰσώρμησα τὸν ἄρσενα Δωρίδι Μούσῃ / ῥυθμόν, πρός τ' αὐδὴν ἑλκόμενος μεγάλην / †ἑπτά δὲ μοι ἐρσων τύπος οὐχερὶ† καινοτομηθεὶς / τῇ φιλοκινδύνῳ φροντίδι Σωσιθέου; *I, too, red-bearded Scirtus the Satyr, tend to the body of Sositheus as one of my brothers guards Sophocles on the Acropolis. For that man bore the ivy, indeed with his dances, worthy of Phlian Satyrs, and he led me to grow in fresh ways, as part of the memory inherited by our ancestors, and I reinvigorated the virile rhythm for the Doric Muse, and drawn to great song, I practiced it and his impression was freshly cut 7 times by my feet [*μοι … οὐχερὶ]?, *as by innovative Sositheus.*

[150] Gow 1965b: 254; Dioscorides 22 G-P = *AP* 7.37; Τύμβος ὅδ' ἔστ', ὤνθρωπε, Σοφοκλέος, ὃν παρὰ Μουσῶν / ἰρὴν παρθεσίην ἱερὸς ὢν ἔλαχον· / ὅς με τὸν ἐκ Φλιοῦντος, ἔτι τρίβολον πατέοντα, / πρίνινον ἐς χρύσεον σχῆμα μεθηρμόσατο / καὶ λεπτὴν ἐνέδυσεν ἁλουργίδα· τοῦ δὲ θανόντος / εὔθετον ὀρχηστὴν τῇδ' ἀνέπαυσα πόδα. —/ „Ὄλβιος, ὡς ἀγαθὴν ἔλαχες στάσιν· ἡ δ' ἐνὶ χερσὶ / κούριμος ἐκ ποίης ἥδε διδασκαλίης;" —/ Εἴτε σοὶ Ἀντιγόνην εἰπεῖν φίλον, οὐκ ἂν ἁμάρτοις, / εἴτε καὶ Ἠλέκτραν· ἀμφότεραι γὰρ ἄκρον. *(a) This, sir, is the tomb of Sophocles, which I obtained by lot to guard on account of a sacred pledge from the Muses. It was he who transposed me from Phlius, where I walked the tribulum, a figure made from oak into gold, as he dressed me in delicate purple. When he died, I ceased from a beautifully-arranged dance where my foot is here. (b) Blessed are you who obtain by lot such a good station; and so this here in my hands is the mask of a girl with short hair from which production? (a) Whether you speak of it as Antigone, or even Electra – you would not be wrong in either case, since both are the best.*

[151] cf. Gow (1965b: 256) says that the Greek verb "to bear ivy" itself means "to win success in the theater;" this translation is far too limiting.

[152] Dioscorides 24 G-P = *AP* 7.708; Τῷ κωμῳδογράφῳ, κούφη κόνι, τὸν φιλάγωνα / κισσὸν ὑπὲρ τύμβου ζῶντα Μάχωνι φέροις· / οὐ γὰρ ἔχεις κηφῆνα παλίμπλυτον, ἀλλά τι τέχνης / ἄξιον ἀρχαίης λείψανον ἡμφίεσας. / τοῦτο δ' ὁ πρέσβυς ἐρεῖ· „Κέκροπος πόλι, καὶ παρὰ Νείλῳ / ἔστιν ὅτ' ἐν Μούσαις δριμὺ πέφυκε θύμον. (Paton 1925: 377 trans.) "*Light earth, give birth to ivy that loves the stage to flourish on the tomb of Macho,*

7.708.1), the earth is invoked to give birth to ivy (κίσσον…φέροις) that loves poetic contest (φιλάγωνα) and lives (ζῶντα) above the tomb of Machon, writer of comedies, since he is what has remained (λείψανον) of the ancient art. Thus, the growth of the ivy guarantees poetic fame while the poet is dead, and solicits the recognition of all passing by to see it. Ivy represents perpetual action, and so perpetual achievement of poetic success at the end of life, although it clings to tombs.

Ivy represents both immortal fame and a journey toward achieving it in Callimachus 57 G-P = *AP* 9.565.4.[153] The epigram addresses Bacchus, suggesting that the poet Theaetetus has not yet received fame, or ivy, because Theaetetus followed a pure path, i.e. a fresh writing style that is different from poets who have achieved ivy.[154] Theaetetus could have traveled the accustomed route to an ivy crown (ἐπὶ κισσὸν) – but instead he wrote freshly, with wit, and so Hellas will grant him fame as they praise his immortal wit (ἀεὶ σοφίην).[155] Callimachus is playing on the paradoxical meaning of ivy here, since it is symbolic of immortal fame that is the reward for one's poetry, but also is ironically symbolic of average poetic accomplishment. Ivy is a commonplace reward for poets who follow a common path, or write in a dull style lacking wit. Thus, ivy's paradox highlights Theaetetus' original writing style. His "pure path" will always have wit, while other poets' ivy will be a dead-end.

---

the writer of comedies. For though holdest no re-dyed drone, but he whom though clothest is a worthy remnant of ancient art. This shall the old man say: 'O city of Cecrops, sometimes on the banks of the Nile, too, the strong-scented thyme of poesy grows.'"

[153] Ἦλθε Θεαίτητος καθαρὴν ὁδόν· εἰ δ' ἐπὶ κισσὸν / τὸν τεὸν οὐχ αὕτη, Βάκχε, κέλευθος ἄγει, ἄλλων μὲν κήρυκες ἐπὶ βραχὺν οὔνομα καιρὸν / φθέγξονται, κείνου δ' Ἑλλὰς ἀεὶ σοφίην. (*Theaetetus walks on an pure path and if /a different path leads to your ivy, Bacchus, / then heralds will profess the name of others for a brief time, / but of that man Hellas will profess his wit.*)

[154] Call. *Aet*. 25-28; Clayman 1980: 51; cf. Cameron 1992: 305; Arat. 783: λεπτὴ μὲν καθαρή τε…; Callimachus 57 G-P = *AP* 9.507; the two ideas of what is pure and narrow are clearly linked in Aratus, and in Callimachus' epitaph for Aratus, this stylistic quality is repeated in honor of Aratus, thus noting that Callimachus has these attributes of poetry are linked elsewhere.

[155] Raines (1946: 90) states that the ivy reference identifies Theaetetus as a comic poet, thus the translation of σοφίην as wit.

An epigram of Euphorion, 1 G-P = *AP* 6.279, relies entirely on the symbolism of the ivy to represent the journey toward manhood and poetic success.[156] Ivy becomes the defining quality of masculinity, as Eudoxos has shed his boyhood with the cutting of his hair, in exchange for ἀεὶ κισσὸς ἀεξόμενος, or "ever growing ivy," i.e. "topical down."[157] Ivy marks the transformation Eudoxus will undergo, while highlighting the exchange for the dedication to Phoibos. The ivy represents both the growth that Eudoxus will receive, and also the end of his youth. Considering that the ivy is forever (ἀεὶ) growing, the capacity of "forever" implies a sort of immortality, like the fame from poetic success that lives beyond death. The ivy, however, since it replaces the lock (ἀντὶ δέ οἱ πλοκαμῖδος), may be more closely associated with his head, and thus the ivy crown awarded in a poetic contest may be a factor as well.[158] These implications of the ivy metaphor are not mutually exclusive, and thus the well-famed Eudoxus may be both entering manhood and embarking on a successful career as a poet. Both metaphorical paths, to either manhood or poetic success, will hopefully result in beauty that is permanent.

The ivy has more direct associations with sexuality, or more specifically assertive sexual attraction, with the figure of Priapus in an epigram of Theocritus (19 G-P = *AP* 9.338).[159] Theocritus describes Priapus as the one who "fastened yellow ivy on his attractive crown" (κισσὸν ἐφ' ἱμερτῷ κρατὶ καθαπτόμενος), as he pursues Daphnis into a cave, while Daphnis

---

[156] Πρώτας ὁππότ' ἔπεξε καλὰς Εὔδοξος ἐθείρας, / Φοίβῳ παιδείην ὥπασεν ἀγλαΐην. / ἀντὶ δέ οἱ πλοκαμῖδος, Ἑκηβόλε, κάλλος ἐπείη / ὠχαρνῆθεν ἀεὶ κισσὸς ἀεξόμενος, *When Eudoxos cut his beautiful first locks, /he gave his youth to Phoibos as an adornment. / And for himself, in exchange for the lock, far-darter, may beauty be present, / since the ivy from Acharnia is ever growing,* (Euph. 1 G-P = *AP* 6.279).
[157] White 1979b: 123.
[158] Gow 1965a: 98.
[159] Εὕδεις φυλλοστρῶτι πέδῳ, Δάφνι, σῶμα κεκμακὸς / ἀμπαύων· στάλικες δ' ἀρτιπαγεῖς ἀν' ὄρη; / ἀγρεύει δέ τυ Πὰν καὶ ὁ τὸν κροκόεντα Πρίηπος / κισσὸν ἐφ' ἱμερτῷ κρατὶ καθαπτόμενος / ἄντρον ἔσω στείχοντες ὁμόρροθοι. ἀλλὰ τὺ φεῦγε, / φεῦγε, μεθεὶς ὕπνου κῶμα †καταγρόμενον. *You sleep on a leafy bed, Daphnis, after overworking your body and stopping to rest, when you set the newly-made stake on the hill, / even though Pan hunts you and with Priapus, who fastened the yellow ivy on his attractive crown, / they both pursue [you] inside the cave for one purpose. But you should flee, / flee, as you let go the lethargic state of sleep that is overcome,* (Theocritus 19 G-P = *AP* 9.338).

sleeps after ending his wandering.[160] The phrase stands in the middle of the poem, as if to provoke the ensuing action, although the ivy itself is fixed. The ivy fastened to the head of Priapus perhaps alludes to his previous attendance at a symposium, or some form of Bacchic revelry;[161] the ivy dually emphasizes the motion of the god as well as the potential sexual action and arousal.[162] Although the ivy itself is not growing, his stationary crown is made desirable by the ivy, and so solicits action on account of the ivy.[163]

Interesting to note is the parallel structure of the two participles in Theocritus' epigram, καθαπτόμενος and καταγρόμενον; the direct object of the former is the ivy itself, by which his head is made ἱμερτῷ, or "sexually desirable," while the latter participle modifies the sleeping state of the unknowing, sexual prey, Daphnis, who will be subdued – the actions are halted in motion, since the gods are about to pounce and Daphnis' sleep is about to be interrupted. Priapus' aggressive motion is noted as he invades (ἔσω στείχοντες) the cave with Pan, and as the poem charges Daphnis to respond to his pursuers by commanding Daphnis to flee (φεῦγε) from them, since Daphnis' stationary body (σῶμα κεκμακὸς ἀμπαύων) is sleeping yet about to be aroused (καταγρόμενον). The sexual nature of the chase is clear, and the crown of ivy rests on the head of the pursuer, who is by nature armed and ready with an erect phallus. The presence of the ivy on the head of the moving Priapus contrasts the immobile state of the sleeping Daphnis.[164] Regardless of its sexual connotation, the ivy is used to enhance some potential action in Theocritus' epigram. If we are to assume that ivy alludes to some association with poetry, this

[160] cf. αμπαύων in S. *OC*. 1113.
[161] *AP* 9.363 and *AP* 9.524; neither of these epigrams of book nine, however, are included in Gow's 1965 and 1968 collections from *Hellenistic Epigrams* or *The Garland of Philip*.
[162] Theocritus 21 G-P = *AP* 9.433; Raimondi (2000: 136) points out that *AP* 9.433, in which there is an invitation, presumably from Priapus for Pan and Daphnis, "standing inside the cave shaggy with hanging greenery," to wake Pan up with their poems, which seems to be a 'vendetta' in continuation of *AP* 9.338.
[163] cf. Gow 1965b: 535 who fails to mention the sexual connotation of καταγρόμενον, and so he provides a dagger; cf. Paton (1925: 183) prints καταρχόμενον.
[164] Cf. also an anonymous epigram (36 G-P = *AP* 5.200), where the ivy crown of a hetaera is also sexually alluring, as she dedicates to Priapus; Gow 1965b: 578.

epigram may imply that poetry is given in an exchange for sexual favor, but ivy provides a symbol of exchange between pursuer and pursued.

Ivy appears inseparable from its symbolism, and among its many applications, it symbolizes a sort of paradox between action and inaction. Meleager pushes the limits in his own use of the metaphor outside of the proemium to the *Garland* in order to emphasize his own yearning to produce poetry. Although his use is resonant of the classical incorporation of the plant to reference Dionysus as patron god of poetic contests, the paradoxical nature of the god's symbolism is still present.[165] In *AP* 9.363,[166] ivy is the clustering bloom with which men crown their heads in celebration of Dionysus, who is giver of the grape, φερεσταφύλῳ; growth and production characterize both ivy and grapevine, and both are associated with the dance of

---

[165] Meleager considers paradox as part of the nature of Dionysus, as in Mel. 127 G-P = *APl*. 9.331, where Bacchus metaphorically refers to paradox of water and fire and their respective properties as related to his birth from fire and the nymphs response of bathing him, as well as to the mixing of water and wine and the fire passion that results if wine is not mixed with water; Αἱ Νύμφαι τὸν Βάκχον, ὅτ' ἐκ πυρὸς ἥλατο κοῦρος, / νίψαν ὑπὲρ τέφρης ἄρτι κυλιόμενον. / τοὔνεκα σὺν Νύμφαις Βρόμιος φίλος· ἢν δέ νιν εἴργῃς / μίσγεσθαι, δέξῃ πῦρ ἔτι καιόμενον, *The Nymphs washed Bacchus when as a boy he rose out of the fire, above the ashes exactly where he was rolling. Therefore, for that reason, Bromios is a friend to the Nymphs, but if you prevent them from mingling, you will receive fire that is still burning*. (Mel. 127 G-P = *APl*. 9.331).

[166] Meleager *APl*. 9.363: Χείματος ἠνεμόεντος ἀπ' αἰθέρος οἰχομένοιο/ πορφυρέη μείδησε φερανθέος εἴαρος ὥρη. / γαῖα δὲ κυανέη χλοερὴν ἐστέψατο ποίην / καὶ φυτὰ θηλήσαντα νέοις ἐκόμησε πετήλοις. / οἱ δ' ἀπαλὴν πίνοντες ἀεξιφύτου δρόσον Ἠοῦς / λειμῶνες γελόωσιν ἀνοιγομένοιο ῥόδοιο. / χαίρει καὶ σύριγγι νομεὺς ἐν ὄρεσσι λιγαίνων, / καὶ πολιοῖς ἐρίφοις ἐπιτέρπεται αἰπόλος αἰγῶν. / ἤδη δὲ πλώουσιν ἐπ' εὐρέα κύματα ναῦται / πνοιῇ ἀπημάντῳ Ζεφύρου λίνα κολπώσαντες. / ἤδη δ' εὐάζουσι φερεσταφύλῳ Διονύσῳ / ἄνθεϊ βοτρυόεντος ἐρεψάμενοι τρίχα κισσοῦ. / ἔργα δὲ τεχνήεντα βοηγενέεσσι μελίσσαις / καλὰ μέλει, καὶ σίμβλῳ ἐφήμεναι ἐργάζονται / λευκὰ πολυτρήτοιο νεόρρυτα κάλλεα κηροῦ. / πάντῃ δ' ὀρνίθων γενεὴ λιγύφωνον ἀείδει, / ἀλκυόνες περὶ κῦμα, χελιδόνες ἀμφὶ μέλαθρα, / κύκνος ἐπ' ὄχθαισιν ποταμοῦ καὶ ὑπ' ἄλσος ἀηδών. / εἰ δὲ φυτῶν χαίρουσι κόμαι καὶ γαῖα τέθηλεν, / συρίζει δὲ νομεὺς καὶ τέρπεται εὔκομα μῆλα / καὶ ναῦται πλώουσι, Διώνυσος δὲ χορεύει / καὶ μέλπει πετεινὰ καὶ ὠδίνουσι μέλισσαι, / πῶς οὐ χρὴ καὶ ἀοιδὸν ἐν εἴαρι καλὸν ἀεῖσαι; *When windy winter goes away from the sky, and the purple day of flower-bearing spring smiles, then dark blue earth encircles herself with verdant foliage, and the blossoming plants sprout new leaves. The fields drinking tender dew of plant-nourishing Dawn laugh when the rose opens. The shepherd singing in the hills enjoys his pipe, and the goatherd delights in the grey kids. Then sailors sail over the broad waves, filling their sails with the misery-free wind of Zephyr. Then, immediately, as they crown their heads with the blossom of clustering ivy, they shout "euhoe" to Dionysus bearing bunches of grapes. Then, the bees born of ox tend to their skillful deeds, as they, sitting in their beehive, work on the white, fresh-flowing beauty of the porous beeswax. Everywhere [each] variation of bird sings sweetly, the kingfishers around the sea, the swallows on each side of the house, the swan by the banks of the river, the nightingale by the grove. If the leaves of plants rejoice and the earth blooms, and the shepherd plays his pipes and delights in his well-fleeced flock, and sailors sail, so Dionysus dances and winged creatures sing, and bees work hard, how is it not necessary for a poet also to sing beautifully in the spring?*

Dionysus, as well as reward for poetic production. The negative rhetorical question at the close of the poem, however, not only notes the author's desire to produce poetry alongside all of this burgeoning production of spring, but also suggests that this action is frustrated by some challenge; he asks "how is it not necessary for a poet too to sing beautifully in springtime," much like the Chorus in Euripides' *Bacchae* ask "I sing the *euhoe* for Bacchus; who is in the way, who is in the way? Who is in his halls? Let him get out of the way, let everyone keep his mouth pure, for I will sing of immortal Dionysus and his practices!" (…Βάκ-χιον εὐαζομένα. τίς ὁδῶι, τίς ὁδῶι; τίς / μελάθροις; ἔκτοπος ἔστω, / στόμα τ' εὔφημον ἅπας ἐξοσιούσθω· / τὰ νομισθέντα γὰρ αἰεὶ / Διόνυσον ὑμνήσω. E. *Bacch*. 64-70). The questions expect the response – "noone is in the way," as the Chorus announce that they will honor Dionysus with song. The ivy is a symbol of growth and poetic production, and the transitional nature of the beginning of spring, and the transgressive character of Dionysiac ritual itself. Spring as a transitional season marks the end of winter with the beginning of warmer weather, as the growth of ivy shows. This poem begs that beautiful poetic production is a natural response to the new growth of spring, yet the frustration expressed with the rhetorical question demonstrates the idleness and lack of inspiration that once was.

IV. Ivy as wandering in Leonidas and Meleager

In the following epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum himself (Leon. 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154), the paradoxical nature of ivy is clearly emphasized.[167]

Ἀγρονόμῳ τάδε Πανὶ καὶ εὐαστῆρι Λυαίῳ
πρέσβυς καὶ Νύμφαις Ἀρκὰς ἔθηκε Βίτων·

[167] Gow (1965a: 136-8) includes this poem under those uncertainly ascribed to Leonidas, although he states (1965b: 393) that the alternative ascription in the manuscript to Gaetulicus does not seem to deserve credence.

Πανὶ μὲν ἀρτίτοκον χίμαρον συμπαίστορα μητρός[168],
κισσοῦ δὲ Βρομίῳ κλῶνα πολυπλανέος,
Νύμφαις δὲ σκιερῆς εὐποίκιλον ἄνθος ὀπώρης
φύλλα τε πεπταμένων αἱματόεντα ῥόδων.
ἀνθ' ὧν εὔυδρον, Νύμφαι, τόδε δῶμα γέροντος
αὔξετε· Πάν, γλαγερόν· Βάκχε, πολυστάφυλον.

Old man Biton the Arcadian dedicated these things to rustic Pan / and to Lyaeus who cries Bacchanal, and to the Nymphs; / firstly to Pan he dedicated this newborn he-goat, playmate of his mother, / secondly to Bromios this stem of much-wandering ivy, / then to the Nymphs, a variegeted flower of summery shade / and the blood-red blossoms of budding roses. / For these things, increase this house of an old man with water, Nymphs, / and you, Pan, milk, and you, Bacchus, many clusters.

(Leon. 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154)

Leonidas directly describes the action of the ivy as much-wandering, πολυπλανέος,[169] as a rustic old man Biton dedicates twigs of the plant to Dionysus in exchange for a grape harvest. The cultic names Bromios combined with the ivy allude to cultic ritual associated with the god;[170] Bromios and Lyaeus (*loosener*) note the boisterous nature of Dionysus, his association with death,[171] yet also worthy of note is the name's association with rustic life.[172]

The ivy here, although it is an inanimate object being dedicated, symbolizes growth, as does its much-wandering, much like the ivy for beard in the epigram of Euphorion above.[173] The exchange of the ivy for grapes closely associates the vine of either plant, ivy or grapevine, with the properties of Dionysus. Leonidas emphasizes ivy's active growth as he stresses its wandering nature, but ivy still remains paradoxical. Because the κλῶνα, or twig, is the actual portion of the ivy that is being dedicated, the adjective "much-wandering" ironically suggests the opposite, since the dedicator has literally picked off the growth of the ivy-plant in exchange for the growth

[168] Gow (1965a: 138n3) changes the Doric form ματρός preserved in codex P and Suidas to μητρός without explanation.
[169] Gow (1965a: 136-138) includes this poem under those uncertainly ascribed to Leonidas, although he states (1965b: 393) that the alternative ascription in the manuscript to Gaetulicus does not seem to deserve credence.
[170] Burkert 1985: 166; The chorus in Ar. *Nu*. 311 use the name to celebrate festivity.
[171] In E. *HF*. 893 the staff of Bromios (Βρομίου) is described as waving along with the crash of cymbals and dancing, to accompany the vengeance that plunges Heracles into madness, as he seeks the death of his children.
[172] A. *Eum*. 24; Detienne 1989: 45.
[173] See discussion of Euphorion 1 G-P = *AP* 6.279 above.

of grapes.[174] In line 8, the πολυστάφυλον, "rich in grapes" stands in the same position as πολυπλανέος, "much-wandering" in line 4, and the exchange suggests that a seemingly fruitless item or activity may be fruitful. Both vines are traditionally closely associated with Dionysus, to whom the branch is dedicated, thus the exchange is naturally understandable.[175] Ivy in Leonidas' epigram is once again a paradoxical symbol of growth and lack thereof, wandering and immobility.

The rusticity of the dedication both characterizes the dedicator as such a rustic, and also suggests ivy's association with rustic life, a recurring theme in Leonidas' epigrams. The fourth line of this epigram of Leonidas is directly quoted by the *Suda* to define κισσύβιον, or the ivy-carved, wooden drinking cup used by the Cyclops (*Od*. 9.346) and Eumaeus (*Od*. 14.78 and 16.52), and this usage is seen in other Hellenistic poets as well.[176] This drinking cup, in its wooden nature, is a symbol of rusticity; since Leonidas' epigrams, like this one, often discuss rustic men and women, the *Suda* seems to be quoting him to reference the cup's association with country life.[177]

Motion, or wandering, is not completely absent from this association between ivy and rusticity. Both are also typical characteristics of the god Dionysus, whom ivy commonly represents, yet the *Suda*'s quotation of this poem in defining a tool used in the *Odyssey* is curious and so suggests of a literary quality to the plant. Because Theocritus also mentions the ivy cup in *Idyll* 1, this reference in the *Suda* to Leonidas may show a relationship between how these

---

[174] The κλῶνα references a lifeless part of a plant, as is clear in the differentiation between branch broken off and branch connected to tree in S. *Ant*. 712-4 κλῶνας…αὐτόπρεμν' and in Theophr. *CP* 1.3.1, which says that the κλῶνα is a part that is not entirely life-producing.

[175] Brown (1969: 168-170) stresses how both vines are related to Dionysus's *thyrsos*, which is linguistically similar to Hebraic vocabulary associated with vines; E. *Ba*. 706-711; in mythology, Dionysus first gave the grapevine to Oineus, as exemplified in Apollod. 1.8.1; Hyg. 129, etc.

[176] e.g. Call. *Aetia* fr. 178.12; Posidippus A-B 122.4.

[177] For further confirmation, see Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* (Ath. 11.53), which states "so the *ivied-cup*, he says, is always spoken of when rustics get together" (τὸ γὰρ κισσύβιον, φησί, λέγεται ἐπὶ συνόδου ἀγροικικῆς, ἔνθα προσήκει μάλιστα τὸ ξύλινον ποτήριον); Dale 1952: 131.

authors of southern Italy represent rusticity and Dionysus. In an article that discusses the relationship between such an ivy cup in Theocritus *Idyll* 1.27-31 and *Homeric Hymn* 7.40-41 to Dionysus, Gutzwiller notes how Theocritus stresses the importance of the motion that is suggested in the description of the ivy, as in the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus*.[178] The character Thyrsis[179] in *Idyll* 1 also seems to be a joint allusion to ivy and Dionysus, thus the ivy cup in Theocritus seems to allude to the rustic nature of bucolic characters involved, as well as Dionysus as god of wine. Nevertheless, "ivy-wood" seems to be a material common to wine-cups, such as Heracles holds in Euripides' *Alcestis* 756.[180]

In Leonidas' epigram, the symbolism of the ivy goes beyond simple rusticity. In the fourth line it is described as πολυπλανέος, "much-wandering," a rarely used adjective that stresses the plant's nature as burgeoning and actively mobile, and also unkempt, and set in a rustic setting.[181] This adjective provides a link between the ivy, or epigrams of Leonidas, and the epigrams of later poets in the *Greek Anthology* as well. In *AP* 9.669, Marianus Scholasticus, an author of the 5th or 6th century CE, applies this same adjective, πολυπλανέος, to describe a weary traveler, who is bidden to recline on riverbanks that are engarlanded with ivy.[182] Since the adjective modifying the ivy in Leonidas' epigram and modifying the traveler in Marianus Scholasticus is so rare, and since Leonidas' epigrams are called ivy in the introduction to Meleager's *Garland*, perhaps Marianus' poem recalls the itinerant description of Leonidas' ivy in Leon. 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154. The rare Leonidean use of this particular compound adjective

[178] Gutzwiller 1986: 253-254.
[179] Euripides refers to the thyrsos as the ivy-knotted bolt; Eur. *Ba*. 25; θύρσον τε δοὺς ἐς χεῖρα, κίσσινον βέλος.
[180] Was it in drinking from the ivy cup that Heracles is able to bring the dead to life, so further perpetuating ivy's paradoxical representation? Heracles's insulting behavior to his hosts is caused by his drunkenness, and his embarrassment about his drunken behavior incites him to bring Alcestis back from the dead.
[181] There are only four uses of the same compound form of the word before or contemporary to Leonidas; Hecataeus. *FGrH,* 12a3; Eur. *Hel*. 203; Pl. *Plt*. 288; Man. Hist. *FHG* 78. There are only one-hundred and ten total uses of this word in all of Greek literature.
[182] Marianus Scholasticus *AP* 9.669.

influences its use in later epigram, and this sort of refashioning is a common feature in the composition of epigrammatic poetry in general, particularly among anthologies.

An epigram of Antipater Sidonius (52 G-P = *AP* 6.287) uses the same adjective to describe the river Maeander, and the much-wandering Maeander refashions an epigram of Leonidas on the same theme, and perhaps uses the adjective to recognize Leonidas as its inspiration.[183] Antipater's epigram that describes the river as πολυπλανέος directly mimics an epigram of Leonidas (Leon. 40 G-P = *AP* 6.286)[184] that does not use the same adjective for "much-wandering," and wherein the Maeander references a pattern that one embroiders, the wandering motion of the river, and the maidens themselves as they weave.[185] In Leonidas' epigram, the Maeander pattern of the maidens lives on as an ekphrasis of the three girls rivaling each other in weaving; the pattern represents the weavers themselves, and the positions of their names simulate the zig-zag like the motion of the Maeander river.[186] In Antipater's epigram, the

---

[183] Cf. Gow 1965a: 28nLVII.4: γρ παλιμπλανέος C supr.for πολυπλανέος;
Ἄρτεμι, σοὶ ταύταν, ἐυπάρθενε, πότνα γυναικῶν,
τὰν μίαν αἱ τρισσαὶ πέζαν ὑφηνάμεθα.
καὶ Βιτίη μὲν τάσδε χοροιθαλέας κάμε κούρας
λοξά τε Μαιάνδρου ῥεῖθρα πολυπλανέος·
ξανθὰ δ' Ἀντιάνειρα τὸν ἀγχόθι μήσατο κόσμον
πρὸς λαιᾷ ποταμοῦ κεκλιμένον λαγόνι·
τὸν δέ νυ δεξιτερῶν νασμῶν πέλας ἰσοπάλαιστον
τοῦτον ἐπὶ σπιθαμὴν Βίττιον ἠνύσατο.
Artemis, for you, fair maiden, queen of women, we three wove this border. Bitie wove the dancing girls and the crooked stream of much-wandering Maeander. Blonde Antianeira decorated the pattern that lies on the left side of the river, and Bittion that on the right, measuring a span and a palm, (Antip. Sid. 52 G-P = *AP* 6.287)*;* this description of the river Maeander as "much-wandering" occurs also in Orph. *Argonautica* 154, which is undatable.

[184] Τῆς πέζης τὰ μὲν ἄκρα τὰ δεξιὰ μέχρι παλαιστῆς
καὶ σπιθαμῆς οὔλης Βίττιον εἰργάσατο·
θάτερα δ' Ἀντιάνειρα προσήρμοσε· τὸν δὲ μεταξὺ
Μαίανδρον καὶ τὰς παρθενικὰς Βιτίη.
κουρᾶν καλλίστη Διός, Ἄρτεμι, τοῦτο τὸ νῆμα
πρὸς ψυχῆς θείης, τὴν τριπόνητον ἔριν.
Bittion worked the embroidery on the right side as far as / a measure and a palm of wool, / and Antaneira attached another portion, and in the middle [of them] / Bitia [attached] the Maeander and the maidens. / Artemis, most holy here is this thread for the favor of your divine breath in [their] thrice-toiled competition. (Leon. 40 G-P = *AP* 6.286).

[185] Gow 1965b: 349; cf. Gow 1965b: 76-77 and Paton 1927: 453.

[186] Maeander is also noted as having three bends; see n108 for Leonidas 40 in which the name Bittion is in the second line the lead dactyl of the second hemistich, Antianeira is a dactyl trochee before the weak trochaic caesura,

girls' names are written in a diagonal pattern, rather than a zig-zag.[187] Thus Leonidas' epigram that describes the pattern paradoxically brings divine life to the yarn cut for Artemis and to the girls who have spun it into a pattern that, in its thrice-fold divisions, perpetually portrays their rivalry in weaving, as well as the wandering direction of the river.[188] The seemingly aimless motion of the river becomes the purposeful direction of the maidens' design and dedication to Artemis. Although Leonidas' epigram lacks the adjective for much-wandering, the much-wandering nature of the river is still present, and so Antipater's epigram seems to reflect Leonidas' theme with the addition of the adjective and denotation of the river itself.

Although Philip 58 G-P = *AP* 11.33 is a later epigram not in Meleager's *Garland*, but in Philip's *Garland,* and although it does not use the same adjective for "much-wandering," the epigram makes similar use of ivy and the cult name Bromios for Dionysus. Philip's epigram personifies ivy as wandering furtively, as it chokes a grape-vine, and the ivy is addressed as λάθριον, stealthy, ἑρπηστὴν, creeping, and with a σκολιόν πόδα, wandering foot.[189] Here, however, the name Bromios is used metonymically for wine in the last line of Philip's epigram, which wittily remarks, "so, [ivy,] you do not bind me, but you destroy yourself; for who should

---

Maeander comprises the first three long syllables of the fourth line, then is followed later in the line with Bitie short short long, an inversion of the rhythm of Bittion, then in the fifth line, like in the second, the name of Artemis in the vocative mirrors the position and dactyl of Bittion, although Artemi is in the line of hexameter and Bittion in pentameter. Cf. Leonidas 42 G-P =*AP* 6.289,in which three weavers are listed next to each other in the first line, then the positions of the articles representing them as "the first", "the second," and "the third" - ἁ μὲν…ἁ δὲ…ἁ…δὲ, at the beginning of the second, third, and fourth lines of the eight line poem respectively. Compare also Leonidas 41 G-P = *AP* 6.288 where the tools are also listed next to each other, rather than in some other pattern.

[187] The girls mentioned in the epigram of Antipater Sidonius are Bitie, who is in the first foot of the third line, while Antianeira comprises jointly the entire second foot and beginning trochee before the trochaic caesura of the third foot in the fifth line, and Bittion begins the second half of the pentameter in the eigth line.

[188] This epigram alludes to the cult of Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia, where a local cult had been established for her. There are a number of inscriptions regarding an epiphany of the goddess in 221 BC, and a temple that was established for her, although not until the early second century BC, along with a festival in 208 BC. See Sumi 2004: 86.

[189] Interestingly, in an epigram (36 G-P = *AP* 6.300 – see later in this paper below) where Leonidas names himself as both wanderer (ἐκ πλάνιος… Λεωνίδεω) and giving a dedication, Leonidas addresses a "Lathrian goddess" (Λαθρίη) who is commonly accepted as Aphrodite.

take ivy on his temples without first mixing wine?"[190] Thus, the wandering nature of ivy, as Leonidas describes it above, is a characteristic of the plant's allusion adapted by Philip as well, perhaps in following Leonidas' model. Perhaps Meleager reflects on these allusions to the "much-wandering" trope as reference to Leonidas' epigrams in other authors, like Antipater Sidonius, and perhaps this symbolism of ivy for Leonidas' literary wandering permeates in epigrams that later authors, like Philip, incorporate.

In his prooemium to the *Garland*, Meleager does not directly mimic Leonidas' epigram (Leon. 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154) in his ascription of the ivy to Leonidas, so far as I can see, but he may perhaps be referencing it. Unlike Leonidas, Meleager describes only the blossoming clusters of the ivy plant. He does, however, use the term κλῶνα, for the stem of plants in his ascription of the laurel to Samius (Meleager 1.14 G-P = *AP* 4.1.14) one line previous to his discussion of Leonidas' ivy; Meleager also uses the same word for "stem" in reference to Plato's golden bough (Meleager 1.14,48 – *AP* 4.1.14,48). Considering the variation that Meleager often employs in the prooemium,[191] it would not be surprising if he is transferring the use of κλῶνα from its allusion to ivy in Leonidas' poem, to Samius' dark-leaved laurel branch in the line previous; κλῶνα, however, is not generally an attribute specific to ivy, and so we cannot conclusively say that he has Leonidas' use in epigram Leon. 92 G-P = *AP* 6.154 in mind.

There are other differences between Leonidas' and Meleager's applications of ivy, thus it is not clear that Meleager, in his prooemium, is directly referring to Leonidas' description of the ivy, but the coincidence of the references is curious. Meleager applies the epic genitive singular

[190] Gow 1968a: 337.
[191] Gow (1965b: 596) remarks how Meleager transfers epithets for variation from poet to plant and plant to poet "by attaching to the former an epithet applicable to the latter, or vice versa." Although Argentieri (2007: 153) says that "the order of the poets seems random," he goes on to suggest that certain poets accompany others in the proemium's organization of names, and so "it may be no coincidence that among the first eight poets five are women, or that Posidippus, Hedylus, and Asclepiades, friends, operating in the Alexandrian court, occur side by side."

ending, whereas Leonidas uses the Ionic ending; the choice of dialect is consistent throughout each respective poem. The θαλεροὺς…κορύμβους, "thick" or "blossoming clusters" in Meleager 1.15 = *AP* 4.1.15 is a phrase completely absent from Leon. 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154, and, as mentioned, is more likely a reference to Leonidas' ornate style, the number of his epigrams in Meleager's collection, or that Meleager has edited his *Garland* to include "clusters" of Leonidas' epigrams. As discussed, the phrases that modify plants in the prooemium regularly have the capacity to reflect Meleager's editing of his collection, whereas the plant itself seems specifically reflect the mark that each individual poet has made on the Greek literary tradition. Considering that the ivy is described as much-wandering in Leonidas, the ivy itself seems then to be a symbolic reference to how this theme occurs in many of the poems of Leonidas.[192] Meleager is reusing this symbol and its parts, or the "blossoming clusters of ivy" to remark on both his editing of the many epigrams of Leonidas he incorporates and a frequent theme in Leonidas' epigrams.

Associations with ivy as representative of death, wandering, rusticity, and poetic fame seem to be natural references to principal themes in Leonidas' epigrams which Meleager captures in the preface to his *Garland*. Meleager, through his description of ivy and ascription of this plant to Leonidas in his *Garland*, highlights these important themes in Leonidas' work and points to the need for an examination of these themes in the rest of the collection and in the literary persona of Leonidas of Tarentum.

Chief among these themes is "wandering," which is a paradoxical conflation of stillness and movement. In no place in Leonidas' epigrams is the paradox of wandering more evident

[192] See Tueller (2008: 205) on the keen sensitivity to semiotic issues within Hellenistic sepulchral epigrams, in their tendency to blend old elements of the genre with the invention of new characters.

than in Leon. 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715, his "autobiographical" epitaph.[193]

> Πολλὸν ἀπ᾽ Ἰταλίης κεῖμαι χθονὸς ἔκ τε Τάραντος
> πάτρης, τοῦτο δέ μοι πικρότερον θανάτου.
> τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἄβιος βίος, ἀλλά με Μοῦσαι
> ἔστερξαν, λυγρῶν δ᾽ ἀντὶ μελιχρὸν ἔχω,
> οὔνομα δ᾽ οὐκ ἤμυσε Λεωνίδου· αὐτά με δῶρα
> κηρύσσει Μουσέων πάντας ἐπ' ἠελίους.
>
> Far from the land of Italy I lie, and far from Tarentum, / [my] homeland, and this thing itself is more bitter to me than death, / such is the lifeless life of those who wander, but the Muses loved me, / and I have something honey-sweet instead of gloomy things. So the name of Leonidas did not perish; these gifts of the Muses proclaim me for all days.
>
> (Leon. 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715)

In line 3 of Leon. 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715, the paradoxical nature of wandering is clear in the description of wanderers as a sort of living dead, ἄβιος βίος, like the paradoxical nature of ivy, forever growing, but still clinging and attached to what is immobile. The term πλανίων, like πολυπλανέος that describes ivy in Leon. 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154 above, implies a path that is apparently fruitless, but rewarded in the end. We find out these rewards in lines five and six, when the gifts of the Muses, or perhaps the poetry inspired by the Muses, behave like public heralds as they announce (κηρύσσει) the name of Leonidas. Like the ivy that is paradoxically both much-wandering and broken off for the dedicatory epigram the ivy (πολυπλανέος, Leon. 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154), the fame of his epitaph will jointly grow, yet persist without change through the sepulchral epigram, which petrifies Leonidas' name. In context, this public announcing of "me" (με), or Leonidas, refers to the reading aloud of his name as a stationary part of an epigram

[193] The epigam was probably included in Meleager's *Garland*, according to Gow (1965b: 390-391), whether the epigram is "by Leonidas of Tarentum or not, it is in a Meleagrian context;" I disagree with his following statement, however, which says that it is from this epitaph that we can glean biographical information about Leonidas of Tarentum. Since there is nothing to support factual representation of Leonidas, the context of this epitaph may have been an entirely fictional representation; Gigante 1971: 20; In terms of the authenticity of the poem's ascription to Leonidas of Tarentum, see also Gutzwiller (1998: 108), who, after discussing the tradition of denying the authenticity of this epigram, follows Gigante's argument against such doubts of Leonidas' authorship.

on a tombstone heralded permanently, for all time (πάντας ἐπ' ἠελίους).[194] Distance, wandering, and a living voice now lost are all emphasized, but made to appear lifeless, like a stationary epitaph.

Leonidas echoes a line from Aristophanes' *Frogs* here,[195] and in doing so he forms a significant relationship between wandering and performing, as well as the paradox of being remembered, or continuing to live in memory after death within the stillness of epigram. In their ode in Arist. *Ran*. 228, the chorus of frogs ironically address Dionysus as ὠ πόλλα πράττων, "performer of many things," after he has accused them of doing nothing other than "koaxing," and as he travels to the underworld to retrieve a tragic poet; the chorus then contrast themselves with Dionysus in line 229 (ἐμὲ γάρ ἔστερξαν μὲν εὔλυροί τε Μοῦσαι) saying that the Muses skilled in the lyre love them. Although he varies the particles and word order, Leonidas mimics this line with the repetition of με Μοῦσαι ἔστερξαν (also in the aorist). The exclusion of the adjective εὔλυροί, which describes the Muses as "skilled in the lyre" in the *Frogs* seems purposeful, as Leonidas distinguishes his own poetic skill by suggesting that he instead has *something honey-sweet instead of gloomy things* (λυγρῶν δ' ἀντὶ μελιχρὸν ἔχω), as if he is noting both his borrowing, but also distinguishing his own didactic style from poetry that accompanies the lyre.[196] The Muses loved Leonidas, and his wandering, and so Leonidas draws the comparison to the *Frogs* to note that poetic skill perpetuates within and without one's journey in the underworld.

In the third line of his epitaph Leonidas' use of πλανίων as a noun is a hapax, and so

[194] Tueller (2008: 16) discusses how the addressee is presumed to be the passerby, or reader of the epigram in sepulchral epigrams.
[195] Gow 1965b: 391.
[196] As μελιχρότατον, Callimachus 56 G-P = *AP* 9.507, in describing style of Aratus; see Volk (2010: 199-200) in discussion of "honey-sweetness" and didactic poetry of the Hellenistic era; much like scholars have addressed in Aratus, rather than formally didactic, Leonidas describes larger themes that concern the relationship of man to the universe, such as man's nature as wandering until death; see also ἀπλανέας, "fixed wanderers" (or planets) in Leon. 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25, an epigram on Aratus' *Phaenomena*.

considering its formation from the verb πλανάω, "to wander," the textual voice seems to be an innovation on the participle πράττων, "performing," in *Ran*. 228 from above. Leonidas is both the performer in the underworld like Dionysus, and loved by the Muses like the chorus, on account of his wandering. The epigram emphasizes that wandering is like performing, since both are commemorated in the underworld. Thus, according to the chorus, the performances of Dionysus, performer of many things, pale in comparison to the beautiful lyric poetry for which the chorus of frogs is praised, even if their song seems like meaningless "koaxing." Likewise, for Leonidas, the Muses not only loved him, but their gifts herald his name in praise for all days (πάντας ἐπ' ἠελίους). This sort of innovation on older models by replacing a line of classical poetry with the vocabulary that Leonidas himself invents and repeats, strongly suggests that Leonidas emphasizes wandering as a prevalent, thematic element resonant throughout his collection.

The theme of wandering is worked into many of Leonidas' epigrams whether the poems are reflections of his own poetic persona, or of the lives, dedications, or epitaphs of others. In addition to Leonidas' own description of the ivy as wandering, his epigrams present life in general as a wandering, terminal pursuit. The ivy represents something beyond what makes Leonidas "a prolific epigrammatist" to Meleager.[197] In the next chapter, we will discuss more thoroughly how Leonidas stresses a paradoxical idea of wandering in many of his epigrams, aside from that above that describes the ivy. Leonidas' paradoxical expression of wandering and its relationship to life is a theme that Leonidas emphasizes throughout much of his collection. We will treat the theme of wandering in Leonidas' collection, and offer a more thorough discussion of this theme's implications in the following chapter.

[197] Gow 1965b: 307, 599.

(1) Meleager 1 G-P = *AP* 4.1

Μοῦσα φίλα, τίνι τάνδε φέρεις πάγκαρπον ἀοιδὰν *(1)*
ἢ τίς ὁ καὶ τεύξας ὑμνοθετᾶν στέφανον;
ἄνυσε μὲν Μελέαγρος· ἀριζάλῳ δὲ Διοκλεῖ
μναμόσυνον ταύταν ἐξεπόνησε χάριν·
πολλὰ μὲν ἐμπλέξας Ἀνύτης κρίνα, πολλὰ δὲ Μοιροῦς *(5)*
λείρια, καὶ Σαπφοῦς βαιὰ μέν, ἀλλὰ ῥόδα,
ναρκίσσων τε τορῶν Μελανιππίδου ἔγκυον ὕμνων,
καὶ νέον οἰνάνθης κλῆμα Σιμωνίδεω·
σὺν δ' ἀναμὶξ πλέξας μυρόπνουν εὐάνθεμον ἶριν
Νοσσίδος, ἧς δέλτοις κηρὸν ἔτηξεν Ἔρως· *(10)*
τῇ δ' ἅμα καὶ σάμψυχον ἀφ' ἡδυπνόοιο Ῥιανοῦ,
καὶ γλυκὺν Ἠρίννης παρθενόχρωτα κρόκον,
Ἀλκαίου τε λάληθρον ἐν ὑμνοπόλοις ὑάκινθον,
καὶ Σαμίου δάφνης κλῶνα μελαμπέταλον·
ἐν δὲ Λεωνίδεω θαλεροὺς κισσοῖο κορύμβους, *(15)*
Μνασάλκου τε κόμας ὀξυτόρου πίτυος·
βλαισήν τε πλατάνιστον ἀπέθρισε Παμφίλου οἴμης,
σύμπλεκτον καρύης ἔρνεσι Παγκράτεος,
Τύμνεώ τ' εὐπέταλον λεύκην, χλοερόν τε σίσυμβρον
Νικίου, Εὐφήμου τ' ἀμμότροφον πάραλον· *(20)*
ἐν δ' ἄρα Δαμάγητον, ἴον μέλαν, ἡδύ τε μύρτον
Καλλιμάχου, στυφελοῦ μεστὸν ἀεὶ μέλιτος,
λυχνίδα τ' Εὐφορίωνος ἰδ' †ἐν Μούσῃσιν ἄμωμον†,
ὃς Διὸς ἐκ κούρων ἔσχεν ἐπωνυμίην.
τῇσι δ' ἅμ' Ἠγήσιππον ἐνέπλεκε, μαινάδα βότρυν, *(25)*
Πέρσου τ' εὐώδη σχοῖνον ἀμησάμενος,
σὺν δ' ἅμα καὶ γλυκύμηλον ἀπ' ἀκρεμόνων Διοτίμου,
καὶ ῥοιῆς ἄνθη πρῶτα Μενεκράτεος,
μυρραίους τε κλάδους Νικαινέτου, ἠδὲ Φαέννου
τέρμινθον, βλωθρήν τ' ἀχράδα Σιμίεω· *(30)*
ἐν δὲ καὶ ἐκ λειμῶνος ἀμωμήτοιο σέλινα,
βαιὰ διακνίζων ἄνθεα, Παρθενίδος,
λείψανά τ' εὐκαρπεῦντα μελιστάκτων ἀπὸ Μουσέων,
ξανθοὺς ἐκ καλάμης Βακχυλίδεω στάχυας·
ἐν δ' ἄρ' Ἀνακρείοντα, τὸ μὲν γλυκὺ κεῖνο μέλισμα *(35)*
νέκταρος, ἐν δ' ἐλέγους ἄσπορον ἀνθέμιον·
ἐν δὲ καὶ ἐκ φορβῆς σκολιότριχος ἄνθος ἀκάνθης
Ἀρχιλόχου, μικρὰς στράγγας ἀπ' ὠκεανοῦ·
τοῖς δ' ἅμ' Ἀλεξάνδροιο νέους ὄρπηκας ἐλαίης
ἠδὲ Πολυκλείτου πορφυρέην κύαμον. *(40)*
ἐν δ' ἄρ' ἀμάρακον ἦκε Πολύστρατον, ἄνθος ἀοιδῶν,
Φοίνισσάν τε νέην κύπρον ἀπ' Ἀντιπάτρου·
ναὶ μὴν καὶ Συρίαν σταχυότριχα θήκατο νάρδον
ὑμνοθέταν Ἑρμοῦ δῶρον ἀειδόμενον.
ἐν δὲ Ποσείδιππόν τε καὶ Ἡδύλον, ἄγρι' ἀρούρης, *(45)*
Σικελίδεώ τ' ἀνέμοις ἄνθεα φυόμενα·
ναὶ μὴν καὶ χρύσειον ἀεὶ θείοιο Πλάτωνος
κλῶνα, τὸν ἐξ ἀρετῆς πάντοθι λαμπόμενον.
ἄστρων τ' ἴδριν Ἄρατον ὁμοῦ βάλεν, οὐρανομάκευς
φοίνικος κείρας πρωτογόνους ἕλικας, *(50)*
λωτόν τ' εὐχαίτην Χαιρήμονος, ἐν φλογὶ μίξας
Φαιδίμου, Ἀνταγόρου τ' εὔστροφον ὄμμα βοός,
τάν τε φιλάκρητον Θεοδωρίδεω νεοθαλῆ
ἔρπυλλον, κυάνων τ' ἄνθεα Φανίεω,
ἄλλων τ' ἔρνεα πολλὰ νεόγραφα· τοῖς δ' ἅμα Μούσης *(55)*
καὶ σφετέρης ἔτι που πρώιμα λευκόια. —
ἀλλὰ φίλοις μὲν ἐμοῖσι φέρω χάριν· ἔστι δὲ μύσταις
κοινὸς ὁ τῶν Μουσέων ἡδυεπὴς στέφανος.

Lovely Muse, for whom do you bring this abundantly fruitful song,
Or who is it that constructed this poets' garland?
On the one hand Meleager accomplished [this task], and so for famous Diocles
he worked out this charming memorial,
So he inwove the many white lilies of Anyte, and many narcissus blossoms of Moira, *(5)*
and even a few roses from Sappho,
And the full-bloom of the clear hymns of Melanippides' narcissuses,
And a young wine-twig of the first shoot of a grapevine from Simonides,
And promiscuously weaving an iris breathing sweet unguents
From Nossis, whose wax for the writing-tablets Eros melted; *(10)*
And so together with her [he wove in] marjoram from the fragrant Rhianus,
then the sweet maidenly-colored crocus of Erinna,
and, from Alcaeus, a hyacinth talkative among poets,
[weaving in] both dark-leaved sprays of the Daphne of Samos.
And the blossoming clusters of ivy of Leonidas, *(15)*
And [the] fir of the prickly pine of Mnasalces,
But he cut off the crooked plane-tree of the vine of Pamphilus
Gathered together with the shoots of walnut-wooded Pankrates,
And [the] leafy poplar from Tymnes, and [the] greenish-yellow mint
Of Nicias, and [the] sandy root of [the] seaweed of Euphemus. *(20)*
Likewise into Damagetus, a dark violet, and in the middle,
the sweet myrtle of Callimachus, ever full of rough and honey [sweetness],
And rose campions of Euphorion, †blameless[198] among the Muses†
Who had an eponym from the maidens of Zeus.
Together with whom he wove Hegesippus, intoxicating cluster of grapes, *(25)*
sweet-smelling with respect to the mown ginger grass of Perses,
and together with the sweet-apple from the branches of Diotimus,
and the first blossom of the pomegranate of Menecrates
and the myrrh branches of Nikainetos, the terebinth of Phaennos,
and the tall wild pear of Simias; *(30)*
and in it also the celery from the flawless meadow
separating the paltry blossoms of Parthenis,
and the fruitful relics from the honey-dropping Muses,
the saffron-colored ears of grain from the stalk of Bachylides,
and among those of Anacreon, the sweet song
of nectar, and the honeysuckle that cannot be sown into his elegies, *(35)*
and among these a few drops from the ocean of the curly flower of thistle
from the pasture of Archilochus,
and together with the young saplings of the olive tree of Alexander,
this blue bean of Polykleites.
And he then wove the marjoram in, from the flower of the songs of Polystrates, *(40)*
And the young Phoenician henna by Antipater.
And indeed he put in the Syrian wit [that is the] spikenard,
Lyric poet who is sung as a gift of Hermes,
And he put both Posidippus and Hedylus, the wildflowers of the field, *(45)*
And the blossoms produced by the windflowers (poppies) of Sikelides.
And yes indeed, the forever golden bow of divine Plato,
Lit in every way by virtue,
And in the same place he cast skillful Aratus,
Who cut the first-born tendrils of twisty date-palm, high as heaven, *(50)*
And the lotus with beautiful leaves of Chairemon, mixing in the phlox
Of Phaidimus, and Antagoras' well-twisted ox-eye
And Theodoridas' newly-blossomed thyme, fond of wine,
And the blossoms of blue-cornflowers of Phanias,
And the many young sprouts of others, and together with those of the Muse *(55)*
And of my still early white violets.
But, on the one hand, I bring a favor for my friends; and on the other hand
For the initiates a sweet-voiced garland of the Muses shared by all of them.

[198] Gow 1965b: 601; I choose Heyne's emendation here, so ἐν Μούσῃσιν ἄμωμον = "*blameless*" *among Muses*, instead of Gow's ἐν Μούσῃσιν ἄμεινον.

.Chapter 2: Wandering and Meagerness – Theme and Style in Leonidas' Epigrams

Leonidas of Tarentum has often been viewed as an epigrammatist of low poetry since his poetic subjects are often ordinary, poor, humble men and women, and his language grandiose.[199] While it is true that he often makes these the subject of his poems, the poetry itself is highly conscious of its diction, style, and place within Greek literature. Leonidas has taken such "low" subjects and imbued them with his own literary style, which is identified by its innovation on the sparseness of epigram. This minimalism is expressed through a vocabulary built upon the *olig-* root, and both expresses the poverty and powerlessness of humanity among his subjects, and also self-referentially describes the medium with which he writes about them. The meagerness is directly parallel to the genre in which he is working, one which is diminutive and humble in comparison to others,[200] such as epic. From this sense of meagerness emerges the theme of wandering, which coordinates with his subject matter to unify the many poems under the aegis of Leonidas' own stylistic technique.

I. Dedication and Introduction to Theme and Style

In his autobiographical epigrams, wandering and suffering go hand in hand, and a component of this suffering is poverty, similar to that of the wandering Odysseus. In the first lines of Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300,[201] the epigram provides parallels among wandering (πλάνης),[202] poverty (πενέστεω), and the name Leonidas (Λεωνίδεω).[203]

[199] In the first monograph on Leonidas, Geffcken (1896: 139, 149) considered such a study to be a "distasteful duty." Wilamowitz (1924: 143) wrote Leonidas off entirely and considered him no poet at all, while Lesky (1966: 439) considered Leonidas' style as one of "baroque extravagance."
[200] According to Bing (2009: 148-151), epigram is a "humble" literary medium composed for a public space of some sort, as an inscription or a book is meant for a certain community of readers.
[201] Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300.
[202] Beckby (1965: *ad loc*.) has ἐκ πλάνιος, Paton (1927: 460) ἐκ πλανίου; Clack (1999: 138) suggests that the relationship between πλάνης and νούσου is unclearly relevant to Aphrodite, and so he daggers πλάνης. Although

Λαθρίη, ἐκ †πλάνης† ταύτην χάριν ἔκ τε πενέστεω
κἠξ ὀλιγησιπύου δέξο Λεωνίδεω
ψαιστά τε πιήεντα καὶ εὐθήσαυρον ἐλαίην
καὶ τοῦτο χλωρὸν σῦκον ἀποκράδιον
κεὐοίνου σταφυλῆς ἔχ' ἀποσπάδα πεντάρρωγον,
πότνια, καὶ σπονδὴν τήνδ' ὑποπυθμίδιον.
ἦν δέ μ' χὼς ἐκ νούσου ἀνειρύσω, ὧδε καὶ ἐχθρῆς
ἐκ πενίης ῥύσῃ δέξο χιμαιροθύτην.[204]

Lathrian goddess, receive this gift from a wanderer and from a poor man, / and from a man with little corn, Leonidas, / take some fat barley cakes and precious oil, / and this yellowish-green fig plucked from a fig tree / and take this cluster torn from a wine-rich bunch, / mistress, and this drink offering at the bottom of the vessel, / so if, just as you drew me up from disease, you likewise protect me from poverty that is hateful, / you will receive a sacrificial goat.

(Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300)

In addition, in line two of the epigram the name Leonidas is modified by the adjective ὀλιγησιπύου, "with meager breadbasket."[205] Since the term "with meager breadbasket" modifies the poet and is part of a dedication from the self-named poet,[206] the rare compound rings of poetic production, or seems to be a figurative symbol related to the tools he uses to create poetry. The rich cakes (ψαιστά τε πιήεντα),[207] and precious oil (εὐθήσαυρον ἐλαίην),[208] and

---

Leonidas is playing with a figurative role of Aphrodite, we must read the dedication within Leonidas' context. Considering wandering is a major theme, it is important to retain πλάνης, and its relationship to the Lathrian goddess to whom the epigram is dedicated.

[203] I agree with Gutzwiller (1998a: 110) that this epigram probably served as the introductory poem to his collection.

[204] Since χιμαιροθύτην is a hapax ("natürlich leonideisch" acc. to Geffcken 1896: 121), the symbolism here may be relevant to some literary element as well.

[205] Gutzwiller (1998a: 111) suggests that the word reflects the collection as a whole, but argues that the motif suggests "the Cynic ambience of the epigram book" and as a "coherent statement of class ideology founded on Cynic principles. (114)" Cynic thought may be present here, but more relevant is Leonidas' response to the stylistic discussions of poets and the literary tradition surrounding him. Gutzwiller does not provide of a study of ὀλιγ- as a term related to stylistic technique, but instead limits interpretation to the realm of Cynic philosophy, and so places Leonidas outside of the context of the Greek literary tradition and discussions of it that he is striving to show his stake in. Thus, I agree with Gutzwiller that his motifs are programmatic, yet that program goes beyond Cynicism to the greater context of discussions of poetic art. If we limit Leonidas' poetry to an entirely Cynic program, then we may overlook some of the finer literary allusions and poetic techniques he is adapting as a display of his part within the same literary tradition, much like Gigante (1971: 45-65), who also insisted on the ubiquity of Cynic philosophy in Leonidas' collection placed Leonidas outside of the Hellenistic poetic tradition.

[206] Gutzwiller (1998a: 109-110) has argued that this poem sat at the opening of Leonidas' collection.

[207] The juxtaposition of the term "rich" (πιήεντα), a rare form of the adjective, with a comedic term for cakes (ψαιστά) is ironically jarring. The *Suda* 1568.1, while citing this line, defines πιήεντα as "flowery" (ἀνθηρά) or "fat" (λιπαρά); compare Posidippus A-B113. 12 (εἰκόνα δ' ὑμετέρην ἐτυπώσατο **πίονι** λύγδωι), where the ornately-wrought image of the Ptolemies is in "rich white marble," part of an epigram calling attention to its artful

green/fresh fruit (τοῦτο χλωρὸν σῦκον), plucked from a fig tree (ἀποκράδιον, a hapax) are commonly rustic food items, yet partly representative of rich delicacy through their compounded forms and infrequent use.[209] The ironic richness of the common fruit shows the poem's self-awareness of its poetic irony, and reveals Leonidas' dedication as highly manipulated, and so a fictional, stylized representation of everyday items. Such a stress on ὀλιγ- rooted terms appears elsewhere in Leonidas, and so the repetition is suggestive of a stylistic trait. On account of the frequent rarity and grandiosity of his word choices, "with meager breadbasket seems symbolic of his poetic diction. Such meager quality could also refer to the short length of epigram, Leonidas' chosen genre, or the sort of common subject matter that he describes. The term ὀλιγησιπύου is made parallel to πλάνης, πενέστεω, and Λεωνίδεω, and so seems to conflate wandering with poverty of both poetic genre and subject as the tools of Leonidas' poetic production.

The sickness from which he has been freed in line seven relates to his role as the wanderer and dedicator; the dedicator is first named with the prepositional phrase ἐκ πλάνης in the second and third feet, and in the second and third feet in the second to last line ἐκ νούσου expresses of what the dedicator once before wished to be relieved. Thus, the disease is related to his own role as a wandering poet, not to that of lovesickness or other illness, although the epigram is most likely dedicated to Aphrodite.[210] The association of the Lathrian goddess

---

pretense at seeming to be real inscriptions; Austin 2002: 136-137; for ψαιστά compare also Herodas *Mim* 4.92, Aristophanes *Pl*. 138, 1115.

[208] The εὐθήσαυρον ἐλαίην, literally means "well-stored oil," but the εὐθήσαυρον derives from θήσαυρος, a treasury that keeps valuables, such as that for silver at Laureion, A. *Pers*. 238, a granary as in *P.Oxy*.2119, whose meaning later becomes treasury of words, or thesaurus in English.

[209] Philips (1972: 112-115) discusses the use of the rare epic command δέξο, which is commanded from the mouth of a divine being in Homeric poetry.

[210] Geffcken 1896: 120; cf. Gow 1965b: 346. Gutzwiller (1998a: 110-111) suggests that Leonidas' dedication to Aphrodite is comparable to her use in Philodemus 17 G-P = *AP* 11.41, "in which he asks the Muses to draw a *coronis* (convoluted sign that marks the end of a book) upon his love madness since he has decided to devote himself to a life of wisdom." With a dedication as prayer to Aphrodite to help Leonidas avoid sickness, Leonidas is

(Λαθρίη) with Aphrodite is supported by epigrams of Gaetulicus *AP* 6.190 and Longus *AP* 6.191, who address her as Κυθηριάς and Κύπρις respectively, while directly mimicking the dedicatory epigram of Leonidas. Yet the epithet Λαθρίη is more aptly associated with her role as a rural goddess,[211] although the title perhaps denotes some sort of healing role also.[212] Gutzwiller shows how Asclepiades and Nossis, and maybe Posidippus use Aphrodite as patron deity of their epigram collections, yet their approach to the goddess is reflective of their own individual style.[213] In Asclepiades 16 G-P = *AP* 12.50, which, as Gutzwiller has argued, provides closure and so may have been the *sphragis* of Asclepiades' collection,[214] the poet names himself as an addressee, one taken captive by Cypris, as the epigram's speaker behaves as a companion from a symposium, who soothes Asclepiades' affliction. Likewise, in Asclepiades 15 G-P = *AP* 12.46 the poet's use of Eros is also a sort of sickness – a madness, yet this madness is certainly related to sexual desire, which is metaphorically representative of his stylistic signature of erotic

---

not simply exhorting his readers to become self-sufficient with his collection that discusses class, he is providing an ex-urban setting for his readers as he and they wander through his collection.

[211] Λαθρία also related to Λάτμιον in Theocritus *Id*. 20.39, mostly about Cypris, but the adjective modifies a valley – thus, Lathrian goddess seems most reflective of her association to the countryside.

[212] Gow 1965b: 346-347.

[213] Nossis 1 G-P = *AP* 5.170; Posidippus 1 G-P = *AP* 5.134; Gutzwiller 1998a: 110; Höschele (2007: 360) takes this argument further by showing Nossis' (Nossis 4.1-2 G-P = *AP* 9.332) use of the temple of Aphrodite and the many famous paintings in it as symbolic of her collection and the many epigrams within it. Such a use provides an image of a three-dimensional setting for the two-dimensional medium that attempts to pretend it exists in a space outside of the papyrus upon which it actually sits.

[214] Gutzwiller 1998a; 147-148;

Πῖν', Ἀσκληπιάδη. τί τὰ δάκρυα ταῦτα; τί πάσχεις;
οὐ σὲ μόνον χαλεπὴ Κύπρις ἐληίσατο,
οὐδ' ἐπὶ σοὶ μούνῳ κατεθήξατο τόξα καὶ ἰοὺς
πικρὸς Ἔρως. τί ζῶν ἐν σποδιῇ τίθεσαι;
πίνωμεν Βάκχου ζωρὸν πόμα· δάκτυλος ἀώς.
ἦ πάλι κοιμιστὰν λύχνον ἰδεῖν μένομεν;
†πίνομεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔρως·† μετά τοι χρόνον οὐκέτι πουλύν,
σχέτλιε, τὴν μακρὰν νύκτ' ἀναπαυσόμεθα.

Drink, Asclepiades, what's up with these tears? What's your affliction? / Hard Cypris hasn't plundered you alone, / nor has nasty Eros sharpened his bow and arrows for you alone. / Why do you put yourself in a heap of ashes while you live? / Let's drink a pure draft of Bacchus! It is only a finger's breadth until morning! / Or, should we hang out to see the bed-lamp back again! / Let's drink; for desire is a non-entity; there is no longer much time for you, / you wretch, let's close out this long night. (Asclep. 16 G-P = *AP* 12.50).

poetry.[215] It should then be considered that Leonidas also plays with an epigrammatic trope to suit the themes of wandering and poverty in his own collection.

Could it be that Leonidas, a wandering self-ostracized poet, is following suit with a popular Hellenistic trend in his introduction to his own collection?[216] Why shouldn't his dedication to Aphrodite be a response to discussions of her as metonymy for poetic technique? Leonidas has his own style, with a different type of figurative language, and so he has a different Aphrodite as dedicatee, just as he has varying means of manipulating traditional genres. Much like Asclepiades uses Κύπρις for Aphrodite in order to stress the significance of erotic love in his poetic style, Leonidas may use Λαθρίη to assert his own poetic style. The term combines both the commonness of vulgar, and often rustic – bordering on bucolic – subject matter, with the certain uniqueness of high language on account of its infrequency in Greek literature. In Leonidas, Aphrodite is worthy of his dedication since she is often in epigram, but here in his dedication, she is part of the rustic sphere as his response to the contest, or discussion, of poetic form. Through the epithet Lathrian, Leonidas figuratively refers to his incorporation of everyday subjects of the rustic sphere, perhaps as a reference to bucolic poetry, into epigram, a genre which often uses Aphrodite as the goddess most typically worthy of receiving dedication.

By locating his dedication within a rustic domain, Leonidas may be alluding to other literary influences, such as mime or bucolic poetry, originating within such a compass and

---

[215] As in a poem thought to be an introduction to his own epigram collection:
῾Ηδὺ θέρους διψῶντι χιὼν ποτόν, ἡδὺ δὲ ναύταις
ἐκ χειμῶνος ἰδεῖν εἰαρινὸν Στέφανον·
ἥδιον δ', ὁπόταν κρύψῃ μία τοὺς φιλέοντας
χλαῖνα καὶ αἰνῆται Κύπρις ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων,
Snow-cooled water is a sweet drink for someone thirsting for summer, it is sweet for sailors to see a springtime garland after winter's storm; and it is sweeter, whenever one cloak hides lovers and Cypris is praised by both, (Asclepiades 1 G-P = *AP* 5.169); Catullus 68.57-65; Gow 1965b: 114-119; Clack 1999: 31; see Gutzwiller (1998a: 120-150) on Asclepiades as "undisputed founder of erotic-sympotic epigram."

[216] Gutzwiller (1998a: 110-111) and others have argued that this epigram is a fitting introduction to his epigram collection.

containing more vulgar content. The lifelikeness of the birth of Aphrodite in Leonidas 23 G-P = *APl* 182,[217] an epigram of Apelles' painting of Aphrodite Anadyomene, does not set Aphrodite within a rustic setting,[218] but it is an ecphrastic epigram, similar to the metapoetic use of art common to many Hellenistic contemporary epigrammatists.[219] Although Apelles' painting of Aphrodite is not mentioned in Herodas *Mimiamb* 4, the epigram's description of artwork purported to be in the Temple of Asclepius at Cos and the humanlike emotional reaction of the gods to its lifelike beauty shows Leonidas' attempts at achieving literary realism similar to Herodas' description of Phile's reaction of crying out at the sight of Apelles' ferocious ox.[220] The failure of judgment of the gods at the end of the epigram, alludes to poetic tradition surrounding the Trojan war with a humorous effect commonly sought in mime, just like the comic effect of stitching Homeric poetry into the realism of bucolic poetry.[221] Leonidas' use of epigram and Herodas' use of mime similarly show a conceptual link between art and literature.

Leonidas' Aphrodite is at the foundation of the bucolic poetry of Theocritus. In Theoc. *Id*. 20.39, Theocritus uses Λάτμιον, cognate with Λαθρίη, to prove the occurrence of love in the

---

[217] Τὰν ἐκφυγοῦσαν ματρὸς ἐκ κόλπων ἔτι *(1)*
ἀφρῷ τε μορμύρουσαν εὐλεχῆ Κύπριν
ἴδ', ὡς Ἀπελλῆς κάλλος ἱμερώτατον
οὐ γραπτόν, ἀλλ' ἔμψυχον ἐξεμάξατο.
εὖ μὲν γὰρ ἄκραις χερσὶν ἐκθλίβει κόμαν, *(5)*
εὖ δ' ὀμμάτων γαληνὸς ἐκλάμπει πόθος,
καὶ μαζός, ἀκμῆς ἄγγελος, κυδωνιᾷ·
αὐτὰ δ' Ἀθάνα καὶ Διὸς συνευνέτις
φάσουσιν· „Ὦ Ζεῦ, λειπόμεσθα τῇ κρίσει."
Apelles saw her who escaped from the bosom of her mother, Cypris who brings wedded bliss, murmering up from the foam, / and she received a beauty that is as attractive as possible, / [so beauty] that is not painted, but animate. / For on the one hand, he pressed her hair with the top of his hands, / but on the other hand tranquil desire of her eyes sparkles, / and her breast, herald of her prime, swells like a quince. / Athena herself, and the wife of Zeus / say, "Zeus, we fall short in the judgment," (Leon. 23 G-P = *APl* 182).

[218] Leon. 23 G-P is not as thematically influential or relevant to the entire collection as his dedication to Aphrodite Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300, and so the Aphrodite in 23 G-P is more an exhibition of Leonidas' use of ecphrastic epigram.

[219] E.g. Theoc. *Id*. 15; Posidipp. A-B 62; Call. *Iambus* 6, fr. 136; Gutzwiller 2007: 202-213, esp. 203-204.

[220] Webster 1964: 94-95.

[221] Theoc. *Id*. 1.64ff. ἄρχετε βουκολικᾶς, Μοῖσαι φίλαι, ἄρχετ' ἀοιδᾶς; Theoc. *Id*. 1.27-56 bucolic rendition of *Il*. 18.478-680; Gutzwiller 2007: 88.

bucolic sphere. As the shepherd speaker bemoans that his rustic existence has caused his beloved Eunica to mock him and reject him, he asks, "᾽Ενδυμίων δὲ τίς ἦν; οὐ βουκόλος; ὅν γε Σελάνα βουκλέοντα φίλασεν, ἀπ' Οὐλύμπω δὲ μολοῖσα Λάτμιον ἄν νάπος ἦλθε, καὶ εἰς ὁμὰ παιδὶ κάθευδε. *Who was Endymion, if not a shepherd? Did not Selena love him even though he was a shepherd, and didn't she come from Olympus to the Latmian glade, and sleep with her lover-boy there?* The "Latmian glade" locates the properties of Aphrodite, namely love, within an area associated with the goddess. Leonidas, however, focuses his use of Lathrian to mark only rustic location.

The relationship between laughing and this epithet for Aphrodite, as found in other poems of both Theocritus and Leonidas, hints at Aphrodite's use as a dedicatee to show Leonidas' incorporation of comic elements rooted in vulgar genres. Crane[222] discusses Theocritus' use of the adjective Lathrian in Theoc. *Id*. 1.95-96, where Aphrodite is named as laughing Cypris, Lathrian (secretly?) laughing Cypris, who has heavy anger (ἀ Κύπρις γελάοισα, / λάθρη μὲν γελάοισα, βαρὺν δ' ἀνὰ θυμὸν ἔχοισα). Crane points out the oddity of the juxtaposed emotions, since the goddess simultaneously reveals intense emotion while hiding her laugh. Just as the scholiasts on this poem think that the laughter is open yet the anger concealed, Crane argues that Aphrodite's laughter is visible, and so mocking, while θυμὸν connotes grief, and so this line sets the stage for a shift toward the healing role of Aphrodite, as she tries to keep Daphnis alive. Considering that Leonidas once looked to Aphrodite to be cured of illness in epigram Leon. 36 G-P, the scene in Theocritus offers support for the role of this rustic Aphrodite as a healer, as well as a symbolic influence of bucolic poetry on Leonidas.

It seems that Leonidas also plays up the mocking effect of Aphrodite's traditional epithet

[222] Crane 1987: 161-184. Gow (1965d: 21-22) insists that Aphrodite shows her anger; cf. Dover (1971: 88), who says the goddess laughs but is hiding her malignance. Hunter (1999: 94-95) thinks that the lines are corrupt.

as laughing with the name "Lathrian" goddess, since she is presented as laughing elsewhere in his collection (ἁπαλὸν γελάσαι, Leon. 24 G-P = *AP* 9.320), and in Greek literature.[223] The phrase for laughing here in Leon. 24 G-P is copied directly from ἁπαλὸν γελάσαι of *Od.* 14.465, in which context Odysseus - in disguise, and making a trial of Eumaeus the swineherd in order to obtain a cloak from Eumaeus - announces that wine, as it makes a man laugh softly, has encouraged him to tell a tale about Odysseus scheming at Troy. Leonidas so shows a playful relationship to Aphrodite, a mocking goddess who is harmful to Leonidas (ὡς ἁμῖν χὰ θεὸς ὁπλοφορεῖ, *to me, the god bears arms*, Leon. 24.6 G-P), perhaps even more so, as Gutzwiller suggests,[224] because of Leonidas' attempts to embrace Cynicism, and so avoid love. With this renunciation of Aphrodite and her harmful nature, Leonidas shows his favoritism toward a more rustic sort of poetry that embraces Odyssean themes, perhaps with comic elements, and so he rejects erotic-sympotic poetry, that so many other epigrammatists of his day favored.

Leonidas is not interested in love poetry, but he uses the traditional dedicatory format in order to introduce his theme of a vulgar, rustic sort of poetry, as a play on traditional genres. The themes he explores display his own artistic technique in reinventing literary themes, and are not simply a means of representing Cynic philosophy, although such philosophy is influential. Leonidas' renunciation of love hints at his own ascetic lifestyle and at a relationship to other poems that involve Cynics, but overall the appearance of Aphrodite in his poetry is Leonidas' response and refashioning of her more erotic role portrayed in other Hellenistic poetry.[225] Since

[223] For the more common epithet φιλομμειδὴς, see *Od.* 8.362, Hes. *Th.* 989, or for general description of playful Aphrodite, Sapph. *Fr.* 1.
[224] Gutzwiller 1998a: 108, 110-111.
[225] In comparing the dedication to Aphrodite in Leon.36 G-P = *AP* 6.300, with Leon. 92 G-P = *AP* 5.188 (where Leonidas insists that he is entitled to escape the torment of love) and Leon. 54 G-P = *AP* 6.293 (where a phony Cynic is ensnared by a boy-love), Gutzwiller (1998a: 110-111) suggests that Leonidas prays to Aphrodite because his renunciation of love is due to the Cynic themes that he discusses in his collection. Although Cynic philosophy influences Leonidas, let us not overlook his role as a poet, who refashions traditional themes in literary epigram in his response to the literary tradition.

wandering is a significant part of the assumed poverty of Leonidas from which he wishes to be saved,[226] his presence in the countryside, wandering far from an urban center shows that the epithet provides a setting and reinforces his role as traveler, as introduced in the first line of his dedication. Poverty and wandering are paired in his position as poet, and so in his poetic technique. Leonidas' epigrams intertwine these two themes as the figurative tools of his ironically "meager breadbasket."

II. The Ironic, Meager Breadbasket as Comment on Poetic Style

Thematic wandering resonates among the epigrams about poor or common beings, often overlooked for their insignificance, and upon which Leonidas focuses. Poetic composition is a craft, much like that in which many other craftsmen and women in Leonidas's epigrams participate.[227] His focus on meager craftsmen in much of his collection seems to be an essential part of his literary persona and literary style - the style of *to oligon*.[228] Through the subjects he describes, and by his technique of paradoxically applying epic, grandiose language to their characterization, Leonidas participates in the conversation on literary style of the Hellenistic age. His style is *to oligon,* since he discusses meager subject matter, or ordinary, small, poor, common, vulgar, or powerless beings – proved to be so by their aimless wandering - in shorter verse, i.e. epigram. Since his language is so very not-common or meager in his discussion of lesser subject matter, the paradox suggests of self-awareness, equivalent to that of other

[226] Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300.
[227] Poor craftsmen are wrought with anxiety, much like Leonidas and the sickness (νούσος) that Aphrodite once cured, although he continues to wander as a poor man and make poetry in Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 6.300; Compare Theoc. *Id*. 21.1-5, which Gow (1965c: 153) translates as "It is poverty alone, Diophantus, that awakes the crafts; she it is from whom men learn to toil, for carking cares forbid the laboring man even to sleep, and if for some fraction of the night (ὀλίγον νυκτός) he close his eyes, anxieties beset him on a sudden and disturb his rest;" for relationship between Theoc. *Id*. 21 and Leonidas as character, see Kirstein 2007: 168; cf. Rossi 2001: 33.
[228] I use this term to refer to another paradoxical poetic technique of Leonidas. Like wandering, a sort of paralyzed motion, *to oligon* is the conflation of ornate, rich diction with subjects who are poor, small, or powerless in some way, and with poetic form of his genre that is short, and so limits the rich narrative constructed throughout the poem.

Hellenistic authors who discuss stylistic merit of poetic tradition, form, content, genre, and meter in other authors. By this particular stylistic technique, Leonidas adapts aspects of the Greek literary tradition to suit his own poetry.

It is well known that Callimachus overtly focuses his attention on stylistic presentation,[229] and so shows that concern with such a topic was *au courant* for authors of epigram, and Hellenistic poets in general. In the first lines of his *Aetia*, Callimachus presents his argument for shorter, non-epic verse-composition. Although Callimachus' elegiac poem is in fragmentary form, some dominant terminology in this passage emphasizes his own poetic, stylistic principles,[230] such as with ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἑλ[ίσσω (*the tale I roll is toward a small measure*), οὐκ ὀλίγη (*[the tale is] not meager*), but it is [ὀλ]ιγόστιχος (*meager in lines*), αἱ κατὰ λεπτόν (*verses that are slender*). The diction on the surface is in response to accusations from the Telchines that Callimachus' poetry is immature, like a child, but he also argues that he is not meager, or immature (οὐκ ὀλίγη) in terms of age, but instead perhaps his poetry is immature in terms of size, since he has been taught by the slender verses themselves - αἰ κατὰ

---

[229] Asper 1997: 20.

[230] .....]ι μοι Τελχῖνες ἐπιτρύζουσιν ἀιοιδῇ,
νήιδεις οἳ Μούσης οὐκ ἐγένοντο φίλοι,
εἵνεκεν οὐχ ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκὲς ἢ βασιλ[η
.....]ας ἐν πολλαῖς ἤνυσα χιλιάσιν
ἢ .....].ους ἥρωας, ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἑλ[ίσσω *(5)*
παῖς ἄτιε, τῶν δ' ἐτέων ἡ δεκὰις οὐκ ὀλίγη.
.....].[.]και Τε[λ]χῖσιν ἐγὼ τόδε· 'φῦλον α[
.....] τήκ[ειν] ἦπαρ ἐπιστάμενον,
.....].. ρεην [ὀλ]ιγόστιχος· ἀλλὰ καθέλικει
.... πολὺ τὴν μακρὴν ὄμπνια Θεσμοφόρο[ς· *(10)*
τοῖν δὲ] δυοῖν Μίμνερμος ὅτι γλυκύς, αἰ κατὰ λεπτόν
.....] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή…

The Telchines mutter at my song, / they- who are ignorant, not friends of the Muse, / not into one continuous song, and not of kings, did I complete in many thousands [of lines] / or on […] heroes, but because the tale I roll is small, / like a child, although not small (ὀλίγη) is the count of my years, / and so I say this to the Telchines: "tribe…knowing how to waste away your liver…few-lined…but the law-giving goddess of grain drags the long one down far. / With these two the slender verses – not the fat lady - taught how Mimnermus is sweet …

λεπτόν /[.....] ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε, like those in the elegiac poet Mimnermus.[231] Thus, ὀλίγη for Callimachus is related to notions of stylistic brevity in his poetry and there is a certain subtle, lean, succinctness - κατὰ λεπτόν- that goes along with this brevity.[232] Considering that his verses are comparable to Mimnermus, the allusion to elegy, and so to a type of distich shorter than dactylic by one foot, seems evident within what is shorter as well as length of the poem in general.

Nonetheless the ὀλίγ- rooted terms allude to stylistic form. As we will examine critically below, Leonidas includes ὀλίγ- rooted terms with repetitions so prominent, that he too, with the so very common or low subject matter, uses the term metonymically for a particular sort of style, where meager, common, or ordinary subjects are the focus. Overall, the high vocabulary of Leonidas with the everyday subject matter creates a patina of affected simplicity and realism, which reinforces a sort of fictional quality. Selden argues[233] that 'the fundamental appearance of Callimachus' poetry is not its fictionality, but its detachment from everyday reality, it's non-everydayness."[234] He sees the ass in *Aet*. 1.21-22, 26-27, 29-30, as that in Cratinus *fr*. 52, Aristophanes *Nub*. 1273, Crates *fr*. 38 Kock – as "traditional metonymy for the desires, foibles, and shortcomings of the common man," and so representative of Callimachus' detachment from everyday Alexandria. Perhaps Leonidas is one of the Telchines, against whom Callimachus is arguing,[235] but we do not have the strong biographical tradition for Leonidas that surrounds

[231] Acosta-Hughes (2002b: 241) shows Callimachus' emphasis here is on being "childlike," in terms of age (opposite to the old Telchines) and "creative aethetics" (opposite to the uninspired Telchines).
[232] Call. *Aet*. *fr*. 178 and 43; Cameron (1995: 136-137) argues that these fragments are a speech of Callimachus, rather than narrative, and so ὀλίγῳ, describing the κισσυβίῳ (11-12) forces the Homeric usage to misdescribe the kissybion to signal the purity-in-smallness, like ὀλίγη in Hymn to Apollo 112. Cameron shows that the exaggerated antithesis highlights the meaning.
[233] Selden 1998: 303.
[234] As Acosta-Hughes (2002b) and Stephens have shown for aesthetic pursuit of Callimachus.
[235] Who are the Telchines? Apollonius? Asclepiades? Praxiphanes? Perhaps biographers' eagerness to establish connections between famous poets skews our understanding of their identity; see Lefkowitz (1981: 124-128), who suggests that the Telchines are probably not any poets in particular, as the biographical tradition suggests, but

Callimachus, and so could never sustain such an argument.

If Selden's argument is accurate, Leonidas may be commenting on this detachment of his Hellenistic contemporaries**,** and so showing the capabilities of incorporating the everyday into art, but with a grand attempt at creating fictionality. Leonidas also uses themes of wandering to show a seemingly realized detachment from the community. He – like Callimachus - is not, however, directly criticizing his contemporaries, but is instead offering a different means of discussing stylistics in epigram.[236] The ornate language of Leonidas with its "obsolete forms" and "obscure vocabulary" like that of Callimachus,[237] also shows that the intended audience is the same literate non-everyday reader, well-trained in the Classical cannon of texts, and the same as that of Callimachus. Neither Callimachus nor Leonidas is inventing these practices, nor each respective use of imagery as metaphors for poetry, but each poet is using traditional language and imagery in his own unique way.[238] Let us not assume that just because Leonidas' poetry differs markedly from Callimachus', that Leonidas is not also commenting on his own stylistic

---

perhaps an expression of the competitive discussion of poetic style during the Alexandrian age; cf. Cameron 1995: 185-194. I agree with Asper (1997: 209-217), who says that Callimachus is instead just trying to suggest that his poetry is good, and that of the Telchines is bad, and other Hellenistic poets are not implicated. Regardless of the identity of the Telchines, Callimachus shows that discussion of poetic stylistics is in vogue; see also Philips (1972: 151-153), who suggests, that Leonidas mimics the epic language with a particularly Homeric meaning in order to obliquely criticize Apollonius. Philips stops short of any formal argument about such a rivalry, but it is worth considering that Leonidas is more involved in the conversation of Hellenistic authors than scholars have given him credit for.

[236] Asper 1997: 216-217; cf. Philips 1972: 152.

[237] Selden 1998: 302-303; Gutzwiller (1998a: 104) argues that Leonidas' literary sophistication is not "in dissonance with his professed poverty and simplicity…but goes on to question whether "we his epigrams reflect historical realities or whether we are dealing with mere literary affectation, a poetic pose;" cf. Radice (1965: 157) argues that the persona of Leonidas as an everyday pauper is his denial of his actual wealth, as his language shows; I argue that Leonidas, either rich or poor, is committed to following a poetic tradition, but then to asserting his own poetic style as a response to the literature and stylistic tenets that precede him.

[238] Cf. Cameron (1995: 76-84) notes that Anyte and Leonidas are the earliest practitioners who "expanded tradition of authentic funerary and dedicatory epigram," whereas Callimachus and Posidippus united funerary and dedicatory with traditions of sympotic elegy with "a combination of allusiveness, conciseness, and wit that was to become the hallmark of the genre." I argue that Leonidas was not outside of such stylistic trends in combining tradition and innovation for the sake of unique allusiveness and wit. This "diversification of the genre" of epigram that "made possible the publication of entire books of epigrams" is something Leonidas also strove to achieve. The "ultimate yardstick was always Homer" for Hellenistic poets who were insistent on varying themes present in Greek literature; Asper (1997: 24-26) details Callimachus' use of traditional epic and lyric metaphors for poetic composition, and shows that Callimachus is following suit with the Greek literary tradition overall.

endeavor. Leonidas' regularly overstrained use of ὀλίγ- terms concerns a sense of meagerness that is anything short of his allusion to a stylistic medium. Perhaps Leonidas is communicating with what Callimachus states outright – and through imagery - with a sort of *recusatio* in the opening of the *Aetia*. Leonidas' repetitions are forced, and so reflect stylistic purpose.

Callimachus and Leonidas also similarly apply imagery associated with travel to refer to poetic technique.[239] In his *Aitia* 25-28, Callimachus claims he was addressed by the Lycian Apollo to drive on untrodden paths (κελεύθους / ἀτρίπτους, Call. *Aet*. 28). Callimachus insists that his "path," or perhaps way of poetry, is narrower and more difficult, but the more correct path, or the more proper way to compose poetry.[240] Leonidas' untrodden paths are of a different sort, although his paths may also have roots in lyric poetry,[241] as in Leon. 79 G-P = Stob. 4.52.28, in which the good spirit (εὔθυμος) mimics that in Pindar *Olympian* 5.22.[242]

> Εὔθυμος ὢν ἔρεσσε τὴν ἐπ' Ἄιδος
> ἀταρπὸν ἕρπων· οὐ γάρ ἐστι δύσβατος
> οὐδὲ σκαληνὸς οὐδ' ἐνίπλειος πλάνης,
> ἰθεῖα δ' ᾗ μάλιστα καὶ κατακλινὴς
> ἅπασα κἠκ μεμυκότων ὁδεύεται.
>
> Being cheerful, row to Hades / as you move slowly along this path; for it is not impassable, nor uneven, / nor full of wandering, / by which there is a very straight course, all sloping downward / and it is even traversed by those who have shut their eyes.
>
> (Leon. 79 G-P = Stob. 4.52.28)

In Leon. 79 G-P, the epigram exhorts one to arrive at Hades with good temper since the arrived will be free from wandering. Leonidas here shows that a more direct path is more beneficial and worthy of good cheer, just as wandering is frequently equated to suffering in his

---

[239] Call. *Aet*. 25-28; Clayman 1980: 51.
[240] Although Asper (1998: 94-100) resolves that the "path" metaphor is purposefully obscure, the metaphor undoubtedly alludes to poetic style that Callimachus is incorporating to be his own pure, straight, and narrow style.
[241] Asper (1998: 26-39) shows the influence of Pindar's lyric on Callimachus' composition.
[242] *P. Ol*. 5.22-23: εὔθυμον ἐς τελευτάν / υἱῶν, Ψαῦμι, παρισταμένων. ὑγίεντα δ' εἴ τις / ὄλβον ἄρδει, / ἐξαρκέων κτεάτεσσι καὶ εὐλογίαν / προστιθείς, μὴ ματεύσῃ θεὸς γενέσθαι (trans. Svarlien 1990: ad loc.), "*and that you, Psaumis the Olympic victor, delighting in the horses of Poseidon, may carry on to the end a pleasurable old age with your sons standing beside you. If a man cultivates both prosperity and health, being generous with his possessions and winning praise as well, let him not seek to become a god.*"
Leon. 79 G-P is ascribed to Λεωνίδα in Geffcken (96) 1896: 41; Gow 1965b: 383.

other epigrams. Considering that this epigram is one of the few composed in iambic trimeter, it seems that the short, direct distance to Hades is mimicked by the short form and shorter metrical line. His longer poems often suggest in their own longer form the frustration of wandering.[243] Wandering in Leonidas is not just travel, but perhaps also a poetic technique of composition in his incorporation of many genres, many allusions, in the wandering, aimless motion of his characters, who are meager, yet richly described.

The paths in Leonidas, like in Callimachus,[244] also have eschatological significance, as Callimachus' allusion about his poetic technique. In Leon. 74 G-P = *AP* 7.480, the entombed complains that the carts travel over his head, opening a previously untrodden road (ἰτὴν ὁδὸν), and the voice insists that the travelers go a different way (ἐκτὸς ἴτ' ἀτραπιτοῦ). Since those traveling them frequently communicate with the dead, the travelers have been led closer to them in wandering. Like Leonidas, the reader, wandering through his collection, has read multiple sepulchral epigrams, and so communicated with those in the world beyond; through poetry, Leonidas brings the living closer to the dead so that they share a common path that perhaps leads to the same place. This is emphasized by grotesque examples of the meaninglessness of materiality, the brevity and so insignificance of life – a meager destiny awaits.[245]

Just as ὀλίγ- rooted terms are a stylistic marker, Leonidas also values poetry that is stylistically λεπτὴ. This term may recall Callimachus' means of composing poetry κατὰ λεπτόν, but it first and foremost recalls Aratus' acrostic in *Phaenomena* 783-787.[246] Callimachus 56 G-P = *AP* 9.507 shows that Callimachus also associates Aratus' poetry with the same stylistic

[243] E.g. the long length (16 lines), repetitions, and epanadiplosis (for this see Murgatroyd 1982: 247) in Leon.76-77 G-P = *AP* 7.472a-b, stress the implied frustration of life and fruitlessness of its matter. Gutzwiller (1998a: 107) finds 77 G-P to be particularly similar to philosophical lectures, as opposed to inscribed epigrams, although she states that the ambience of the graveyard is present.
[244] As Asper (1997: 72-99) argues of Callimachus's paths.
[245] Like in Leon. 76-77 G-P = *AP* 7.472a-b.
[246] Bing 1990: 281-285; Cameron 1995: 323; Klooster 2011: 159n36.

principle. Leonidas comments on the λεπτὴ of Aratus' poetry in Leon. 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25 for Aratus, and he shows he has read the *Phaenomena*, and is conversant in the stylistic commentary frequently found in Hellenistic poetry.

> Γράμμα τόδ' Ἀρήτοιο δαήμονος ὅς ποτε λεπτῇ
> φροντίδι δηναιοὺς ἀστέρας ἐφράσατο
> ἀπλανέας τ' ἄμφω καὶ ἀλήμονας οἷσιν ἐναργὴς
> ἰλλόμενος κύκλοις οὐρανὸς ἐνδέδεται·
> αἰνείσθω δὲ καμὼν ἔργον μέγα, καὶ Διὸς εἶναι
> δεύτερος ὅστις ἔθηκ' ἄστρα φαεινότερα.
>
> This is the writing of skilled Aratus, who / once with a keen (λεπτῇ) / mind observed the ancient stars, both fixed and wandering, and by which / visible heaven weaving in circles is bound in; and let him be praised for toiling over this great work, and he is second to Zeus, who made the stars brighter.
>
> (Leon. 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25)

> Ἡσιόδου τό τ' ἄεισμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος· οὐ τὸν ἀοιδῶν
> ἔσχατον, ἀλλ' ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον
> τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο. χαίρετε, λεπταὶ
> ῥῆσιες, Ἀρήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης,
>
> His song[247] and his narrative mode[248] are from Hesiod; / not the most extreme of poets, but I do not doubt that / native of Soli modeled himself on the most honey-sweet of those words. Hello / slender verses, the symbol of Aratus' wakefulness.
>
> (Callimachus 56 G-P = *AP* 9.50)

Leonidas describes Aratus' thought and theme, mirrored in his writing, with λεπτῇ, but his use is not exactly congruous with that in the epigram of Callimachus on Aratus. The epigrams on Aratus by Callimachus and Leonidas seem to respond to each other nevertheless, even though Leonidas' version maintains the format of a traditionally dedicatory epigram, and Callimachus' is more overtly a discussion of style. Callimachus notes Aratus' power of perception with the description of Aratus as "watchful," and that his perception is tied to refined literary composition, on account of Aratus' own clever use of λεπταὶ, in lines 3-4 of his epigram that read χαίρετε, λεπταὶ / ῥῆσιες, Ἀρήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης, *greetings narrow verses, symbol of Aratus' wakefulness*. Leonidas compliments Aratus' keen mind and artful writing in

[247] Gow (1965b: 208) translates this as "theme."
[248] Gow (1965: 208) translates this as "style."

the first two lines of his epigram - Γράμμα τόδ' Ἀρήτοιο δαήμονος, ὅς ποτε λεπτῇ / φροντίδι δηναιοὺς ἀστέρας ἐφράσατο, *this is the writing of skilled Aratus, who with keen mind, observed the ancient stars*. As Clack points out, the first long alpha and Ionic eta for the second alpha in Aratus' name in the first line may refer to the pun of Aratus' own name in the first line and a half of *Phaen*. 1-2 (Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτ' ἄνδρες ἐῶμεν / ἄρρητον·, *let us begin from Zeus, which we men never allow to be unspoken*).[249] Leonidas' epigram is overall complimentary to Aratus, and so the translation of slender, or even refined, for λεπτῇ, as the modifier of mind or thought, would be unsuitable.[250] Thus, a translation for λεπτῇ in Leonidas's epigram as "keen" is more fitting. The similarity in the poets' admiration of Aratus' observation shows that Leonidas' epigram is either a variation of or is varied by Callimachus in his epigram, which compliments the keenly scientific style of Aratus as well.[251] The admiration of both Callimachus and Leonidas for the refined or keen style of Aratus shows that both have an interest in contemporary poetic style and close reading, but each in his own way.

Yet Leonidas distinguishes his own careful reading of Aratus' keenness, through deference to Aratus' discussion of theme, like that in both fixed and wandering stars, ἀπλανέας τ' ἄμφω καὶ ἀλήμονας in the first line of the central third distich of epigram Leon. 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25. The balanced pairing of opposites in Leonidas' epigram elicits the phrase's irony, and so highlights Leonidas' emphasis on wandering. According to Leonidas, the stars of Aratus in lines two and three of the epigram are both fixed and wandering - ἀστέρας ἐφράσατο

[249] Clack 1999: 183-184.
[250] Too often, scholars have tried to fit λεπτῇ of this epigram of Leonidas into Callimachean ideal of λεπτότης, whereas Leonidas seems to have offered his own philosophical nuance to the term; cf. Ar. *Nub*. 229, 740; cf. Kaibel 1894: 122, who thinks Leonidas has not read *Phaenomena* at all and took over the praise directly from Callimachus; cf. Gow 1965b: 396; although Cameron (1995: 322-323) shows how the term is associated with Callimachus first, not that Aratus is referencing the opening of the *Aetia* as Bing suggests, he does not assume that Leonidas offers a different definition; cf. Klooster 2011: 159.
[251] See De Stefani (2005: 179-184) on stylistic comparison of Leonidas and Callimachus, yet the proviso of caution that one should assume when attempting to show how one author predates another based solely on the authors' stylistic relationship.

ἀπλανέας τ' ἄμφω καὶ ἀλημονας… The alpha privative ἀπλανέας – "not wandering," contains a form of "wandering" frequently used by Leonidas,[252] which is sharpened by ἀλημονας, or "wandering". Since Aratus specifically says that he is only going to discuss the "not wandering" (ἀπλανέας) constellations in Arat. *Phaen*. 454-461, why does Leonidas pair the adjectives to emphasize the paradox?[253] Wandering is a major theme in Leonidas' epigrams, so he is pointing out that wandering within Aratus does occur, with the rarity of the vocabulary he uses; men are all wanderers, doing what they can within their limited means, and so like Eumaeus says in the *Odyssey*, all are invited to share in the same feast.[254]

The rare Greek form for wandering (ἀλήμονας), appears only in Homer *Od*. 17.376, here in Leonidas' epigram, and in Arat. *Phaen*. 1101, which describes the nature of mankind as wandering sufferers who seek occupation variably, like the shepherds in context of the passage.[255] Aratus associates wandering with some form of lower class much like in Antinous' rebuke of Eumaeus in the *Odyssey*,[256] or Odysseus' definition of wanderers and beggars in his rebuke of Melantho for excluding them.[257] Aratus *Phaen*. 1101 with the phrase "ἀλήμονες ἄλλοθεν ἄλλοι (*some wandering here and there*)" shows how he is a keen reader, or has a keen mind λεπτῇ φροντίδι (Leon. 101.1-2) in reading Homer *Od*. 17.376, ἦ οὐχ **ἅλις ἧμιν**

---

[252] Of the forty-three uses in the *Greek Anthology*, Leonidas uses a compounded form of πλαν- for wandering five times Leon. 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154.4, Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300.1, Leon. 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715.3, Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736.1, Leon. 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25.3, three of which uses he applies in describing himself; cf. Clack (1999: 184) translates the alpha primitive term (ἀπλανέας) as planets, and so limits the term to only the celestial body, rather than the action of wandering, or not wandering, that Leonidas indicates with the term.

[253] Other scholars have argued that Leonidas' epigram is an inaccurate reading of Arat. *Phaen*. 454-461; Klooster 2011: 161; Gow 1965b: II ad loc.; Kaibel 1894: 122.

[254] *Od*. 17.386, οὗτοι γὰρ κλητοί γε βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν·

[255] Arat. *Phaen*. 1101 ff. Οὕτω γὰρ μογεροὶ καὶ ἀλήμονες ἄλλοθεν ἄλλοι / ζώομεν ἄνθρωποι· τὰ δὲ πὰρ ποσὶ πάντες ἑτοῖμοι / σήματ' ἐπιγνῶναι καὶ ἐς αὐτίκα ποιήσασθαι./ Ἀρνάσι μὲν χειμῶνας ἐτεκμήραντο νομῆες / ἐς νομὸν ὁππότε μᾶλλον ἐπειγόμενοι τροχόωσιν…, For thus we sufferers and wanderers make our livelihood here and there; but all are prepared to recognize signs at our feet and to procure them for ourselves for what is immediately necessary. Like when shepherds conjecture about storms from their lambs when they run to pasture while hurrying more.

[256] *Od*. 17.376 …ἦ οὐχ ἅλις ἡμιν ἀλήμονές εἰσι καὶ ἄλλοι, / πτωχοὶ ἀνιηροί, δαιτῶν ἀπολυμαντῆρες…, *Are there not crowds of wanderers and other annoying beggars that are destroyers of our feasts?!*

[257] *Od*. 19.74, τοιοῦτοι πτωχοὶ καὶ ἀλήμονες ἄνδρες ἔασι. *Such men as these are beggars and wanderers*.

ἀλήμονές εἰσι καὶ **ἄλλοι** (*wanderers are not apart from us*). The assonance and alliterative repetition of liquids in *Odyssey* 17.376, is likewise apparent in Aratus, who says that all men are wanderers although each performs his own task: **ἀλήμονές ἄλλ**οθεν **ἄλλ**οι. Aratus goes on to say that men are not apart, since they all live while interpreting signs and adopting them for the moment.[258] Leonidas seems to be remarking on this reuse of wandering in Homer by Aratus, and so complimenting Aratus' attention to wanderers, as Aratus recognizes that all mankind is a lot of suffering wanderers, and insignificant in comparison to the universe.

So Leonidas shows the reader that he has his own stylistic bent when it comes to judging the merits of Hellenistic poetry, and it is different from Callimachus, since he incorporates a slightly different sort of τὸ ὀλίγον. This sort of τὸ ὀλίγον focuses on the wandering nature of mankind in short-versed composition, with attention to epic diction. Although Leonidas might have criticized Callimachus' fat lady – as Callimachus does - for her wealth (Call. *Aet*. 11-12, ἡ μεγάλη δ' οὐκ ἐδίδαξε γυνή), and read her as a symbol of epic-length, he would not have criticized her symbolism as epic meter and diction, since both are integral element in Leonidas' epigrams. The overlapping definition of ὀλίγ- terms in Callimachus and Leonidas is a sort of smallness in size of their poems, since both focus on writing non-epic poetry in elegy or epigram. Leonidas, however, presents poetic τὸ ὀλίγον (which I will continue to refer to as *to oligon*) with different themes – like that of wandering and meager subject matter, and emphasizes it with allusively epic vernacular. Leonidas proves himself to be a keen reader, conversant in contemporary trends, and so a Hellenistic poet with his own stylistic formatting and poetic

[258] Leonidas also provides a link between Aratus (Leon. 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25) and Homer (Leon. 30 G-P = *AP* 9.24) in epigrams on the two authors, whom Leonidas notes as brilliant in their description of astronomical objects. Leonidas presents a relationship between the two poems in the last word of the first line of both poems. The term λεπτῆι is the last word of the first line of the epigram on Aratus, which compliments Aratus' clever application of λεπτὴ as an acrostic in *Phaenomena* 783-787 to describe the moon. Σελήνης, or moon, is the last word of the first line in the epigram on Homer 30 G-P = *AP* 9.24. Callimachus 56 G-P = *AP* 9.507 compliments Aratus' form as borrowed from Hesiod, but Leonidas grants that Aratus' writing of the stars is akin to the other sort of epic as well.

technique.

III. Focus on the Ordinary, the Wandering: themes at the bequest of the *Odyssey*

The insignificant characters and subject matter fit within the theme of wandering, as both style and theme prove to be a play on other Greek poetry. In Leonidas, the theme of wandering is an innovation upon wandering in larger narratives in Greek literature, particularly that found in the *Odyssey*. Leonidas' interest in the *Odyssey*, as shown above in his epigram for Aratus, is emphasized throughout his collection. Often the Homeric epic is reflected in his diction – particularly the *dis legomena* of Leonidas and Homer, where a Homeric word or phrase is reused to enhance the context of Leonidas' epigram, but Leonidas also alludes to the Homeric context to emphasize the theme of his epigram. Allusions to the *Odyssey* and Odyssean language show, as in many other Hellenistic authors,[259] that this feature was deliberately contrived.[260] This refashioning of the theme to fit the limitations of epigram provides irony, since the genre is challenged by its brevity, stylistic or necessary. Analyzing the intertextual conversation between Homeric philology and contexts and Leonidas' epigrams adds a significant dimension to understanding Leonidas' poetic technique.

Odysseus, like many of the characters in Leonidas' epigrams, becomes the poor, suffering wanderer. The sort of suffering that derives from wandering is an essential part of Leonidas' poetic style, along with the Homeric language that he draws upon. Although Odysseus of the *Odyssey* is a suffering wanderer, the portrayal of Odysseus differs immensely from what is typical in the *Iliad*. Thus, Leonidas borrows the theme most often from the *Odyssey*, although he

[259] Gigante (1971: 77-89) notes that Leonidas is most definitely proved a Hellenistic poet, contemporary to Callimachus and Apollonius Rhodes on account of active restructuring of elements of Homeric epic.
[260] See Philips 1972: 321; e.g. as in Bion of Borysthenes, although he might have known the *Iliad* better than the *Odyssey* – see Kindstrand 1976: 35; for Homericisms in Aratus, see Kidd 2004: 25; Sistakou 2007: 391-408.

refashions the language of both epics.[261] The point of conflict for heroes in the *Iliad* is their involvement with and separation from other heroes at Troy, whereas in the *Odyssey*, the hero Odysseus is portrayed as a wanderer, defined by his separation from home and kin, and the conflict in returning.[262] Leonidas, with the "lifeless life of wanderers,"[263] mirrors the sort of suffering, and feeling of insignificance rooted in the *Odyssey*.

Odysseus' identity is related to the hero's endurance and suffering in getting home as well as to his identity as a stranger in foreign lands. The author introduces Odysseus as "turning many ways," much-traveled, or even wily (ἄνδρα…πολύτροπον), and the following phrase epexegetically emphasizes wandering as part of his trials and his craftiness, which is independent of his companions at overcoming them (ὃς μάλα πολλὰ…πλάγχθη… πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα ὃν κατὰ θυμόν, *who wandered in very many ways… and who, on sea, suffered toil in his heart, Od*. 1.1-5).[264] Overall, Odysseus' characterization as a suffering wanderer, in both language and context, resonates throughout Greek literature,[265] and so Leonidas adopts aspects of Odyssean wandering resonant in Greek literature for his own epigrams.

Because of Odysseus' wandering state in most of the *Odyssey*, he is without the class and legacy that often identifies him,[266] and he is also without fame;[267] when he tells the story of his

---

[261] Philips (1972: 5-134, 347-353) has catalogued the many epic forms, and how above all Leonidas proves to be most interested in epic diction. Although his uses of epic diction may mimic those of his Hellenistic contemporaries at times, Philips argues, these uses are for some ironic effect or play on heroic contexts, unspecified by Philips. Philips' cataloguing is wonderfully useful for understanding Leonidas' application of Homericisms, yet he seems to be responding too much to scholars' negative, and not always valid, views about Leonidas as a "poor poet" in more ways than one.

[262] Jebb (1896: 138-139) explains well how particular diction emphasizes these differences between the Homeric epics.

[263] πλανίων ἄβιος βίος, Leon. 93.3 G-P = *AP* 7.715.3.

[264] Forms of πολύτροπος and πλάζω are frequently related in characterizing Odysseus, as opposed to his characterization by epithets in the in the *Iliad* as πολύμητις and δῖος; Coleman-Norton 1927: 74.

[265] Montiglio (2005: 7-11) sees wandering as contiguously representative of humanity throughout Greek literature, and so wandering Homeric heroes are a reflection of ancient thought about the topic; Hunter (2003: 5) discusses how Hellenistic poets were well-versed in communicating geography of the past, and how geography was closely associated with famous poetic figures, and how such concepts were inherited from Homeric poetry and its reception.

[266] As among the characters Priam and Helen in the *Il*. 3. 200-224.

journey, he becomes the wandering poet, and so his fame, identity, and legacy are then revealed.[268] When Odysseus arrives in Phaeacia, Nausicaa declares to her handmaidens that Odysseus is not to be feared since he is an "unlucky wanderer," (δύστηνος ἀλώμενος); she then asserts that strangers and beggars are all "a meager and dear gift in the eyes of Zeus" (ἀλλ' ὅδε τις δύστηνος ἀλώμενος ἐνθάδ' ἱκάνει / …πρὸς γὰρ Διός εἰσιν ἅπαντες / ξεῖνοί τε πτωχοί τε, δόσις δ' ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε, *but this man who comes here is some unlucky wanderer…for all strangers and beggars are both a meager and dear gift in the eyes of Zeus, Od*. 6.206-209). This same phrase is repeated later in *Od*. 14.56-61, when Odysseus wears the identity of a wandering stranger, although he is in the hut of Eumaeus his swineherd:

> Ξεῖν', οὔ μοι θέμις ἔστ', οὐδ' εἰ κακίων σέθεν ἔλθοι, /
> ξεῖνον ἀτιμῆσαι·πρὸς γὰρ Διός εἰσιν ἅπαντες /
> ξεῖνοι τε πτωχοί τε· δόσις δ' ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε /
> γίγνεται ἡμετέρη· ἡ γὰρ δμώων δίκη ἐστὶν /
> αἰεὶ δειδιότων, ὅτ' ἐπικρατέωσιν ἄνακτες /
> οἱ νέοι…
>
> Stranger, it is not right for me to dishonor a stranger, not even if one more evil than you came, for all strangers and beggars are from Zeus, and it is both a meager and dear gift that becomes ours; for this is always the plight of slaves, always fearing when new masters come into power.
>
> (*Od*. 14.56-61)

It is customary for a wanderer to have little and to be thought of as little, so the stranger is like the beggar. A dearth of possessions, lack of identity, and unfamiliar kinship establish a sort of value in the suffering wanderer, although the wanderer has little of what marks him as a member of humanity. The term for little, or meager (ὀλίγη) is paired with what is dear (φίλη), and so the paradoxical pairing emphasizes the treasurable quality of strangers who have traveled. In the immediate context, Eumaeus expresses that it is right to honor guests, since they are gifts

---

[267] As Scodel (2007: 46-47) argues, perhaps his famelessness reflects a general sentiment of estrangement surrounding heroes within epic.

[268] *Od*. 9.37 by Antinoos, but Odysseus is also called a poet by Antinoos in *Od*. 11.368 and Eumaeos in *Od*. 17.518-521; Schein (1995: 19) compares well how, with the same verb (ἔννεπε) directed by the poet to the Muses in *Od*. 1.4-5, Odysseus likens himself to singer of his own heroic epic.

from Zeus, so there is a certain righteousness in valuing wanderers. The language of a wandering stranger is equated with the language of suffering and meagerness, yet there is a certain value, or dearness to their company. Leonidas describes suffering, meager, wandering characters with ornate language,[269] and so he too, like Nausicaa and Eumaeus explain, pairs simplicity with dearness in his poetry's careful attention to precise diction within his poetic form, i.e. short epigram and seemingly paltry content, and his style, composed of his epic diction.

Poetic craft and wandering are equivalent since they are both dear and meager conveyors of the treasurable aspects of humanity. Later, Eumaeus identifies wanderers by type, while responding to Antinous' haughty rebukes.[270] Wanderers' fame is as itinerant as they are on account of their craft; they are δημιοεργοὶ, public actors, such as prophets, doctors, builders, or bards.[271] Odysseus is not only a wanderer, but he is also an articulate bard,[272] clever, and loved by Athena,[273] and so Odysseus is an exemplum of poetic production himself. Thus, the *Odyssey* identifies wanderers as of a certain sector of society that is intertwined with poetic production, and it is upon this type of poetic production that Leonidas focuses his attention with the theme of wandering and the characters and subject matter he describes.

Since Homeric poetry is "the archetype for both serious and comic spirit in Greek

---

[269] The discussion of Leonidas' "dear" or "ornate" language is well-known in scholarship, although commonly overlooked or understudied, perhaps on the intricate nature of his diction. See Gutzwiller (1998a: 90) on both yet Wilamowitz' (1924: 143) epithet for Leonidas as "affected, careless in phrasing, and padded," Reitzenstein (1893: 145-150), who said that Leonidas employed "splendid, choice, or better-adorned language"; Philips (1972: 5 ff.) has shown how Leonidas' "bold neologisms" and "odd technical terms" are not merely for ornamentation, or to complete a particular verse, but for ironic effect.

[270] *Od*. 17.381-395.

[271] Gigante (1971: 78) points out Homer's interest in economic class in using this phrase, yet my aim is its incorporations within the poetic style of Leonidas.

[272] *Od*. 9.19-20, 11.368; 17.518-21; see Segal (1996: 202-205) for Odysseus' skill at storytelling as value of heroic *kleos*.

[273] As in the most frequently repeated epithet in the Odyssey, πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς, *Od*. 13.297-311; Slatkin 1995: 236-237 shows how this epithet, and *metis* in general, is his "preeminent attribute, which Athene, the daughter of Metis, enthusiastically endorses and claims as the source of both of their unity and their *kleos*."

poetry,"[274] refashioning Homeric poetry is a regular occurrence in Hellenistic poetry, just as much as Homeric characters and themes resonate in Hellenistic poetry. Each reappropriation provides a lens through which a reader may see each author's own poetic technique, themes, emphases, and interpretation, in what of Homeric poetry the Hellenistic author has focused on and adapted for his own verse. The *Odyssey* was particularly a favorite source of poetic themes and language for Hellenistic poets. Philitas of Cos, for example, wrote a dictionary of difficult words that was used by Hellenistic poets, of which *P.Oxy*. 2258 perhaps contains a fragment, which also shares the same rare word for bow with Callimachus *fr*. 236. [275] Philitas' *Hermes* describes Odysseus as seducer of daughters of Aiolus in his parodied versions of the *Odyssey*. Philitas' parody of Odysseus might have influenced descriptions in Callimachus' *Hecale* and other Hellenistic arts that show the popularity of everyday craftsmen as artistic subjects,[276] and Leonidas' interest in Homeric diction and innovation on the *Odyssey* seems akin to that of Philitas. Apollonios has the same fondness for rare, Homeric words that fit well his choice genre of epic; his diction fits thematically to the journey of the Argo, and yet his allusions to the *Odyssey* often occur in sections of his poem that describe the beginning of the workday.[277] Bion, an author of diatribes, is so-called in a section of the *Life of Bion* by Diogenes Laertius πολύτροπος,[278] an adjective other Cynics have translated allegorically, and Kindstrand cites as transferred from Odysseus who is the "patron saint" of the Cynic school, to the Cynic

[274] Arist. *Pol*. 4.1448b34-1449a6; Brink 1972: 548; Cameron 1995: 273.
[275] Webster 1964: 40-41.
[276] Webster 1964: 41, 70; Fowler (1989: 5-22) focuses on the "craft and elegance" that jointly appear in Hellenistic poetry and art.
[277] Apollonius 4.109; *Od*. 12.439; Webster 1964: 70.
[278] D.L. *Vit*. 4.47: Καὶ ἦν ὡς ἀληθῶς ὁ Βίων τὰ μὲν ἄλλα πολύτροπος καὶ σοφιστὴς ποικίλος καὶ πλείστας ἀφορμὰς δεδωκὼς τοῖς βουλομένοις καθιππάζεσθαι φιλοσοφίας·

philosopher Bion.[279] In philosophy, art, and poetry, the incorporation of the *Odyssey* is part of the Hellenistic aesthetic. In the Hellenistic age, poets and artists sought to show off the "technical virtuosity" of their craft,[280] both by their own methods of allusion to the *Odyssey* and with their own innovation on these allusions in their description of everyday, ordinary life. Leonidas responds to such a trend with his own particular poetic technique.

Leonidas' epigrams often reinvent Homeric diction and contexts in order to suit his own narrative, but also reveal an allusive layer in the poems. Such literary allusion indicates a highly stylized presentation of realism, and so bares the fictional quality of the narrative. Leonidas 19 G-P = *AP* 7.657 presents a pastoral setting for a tombstone begging for shepherds and goats to pass by and offer a libation of milk to the entombed.

> Ποιμένες οἳ ταύτην ὄρεος ῥάχιν οἰοπολεῖτε
> αἶγας κεὐείρους ἐμβοτέοντες ὄις,
> Κλειταγόρῃ, πρὸς Γῆς, ὀλίγην χάριν, ἀλλὰ προσηνῆ
> τίνοιτε χθονίης εἵνεκα Φερσεφόνης.
> βληχήσαιντ' ὄιές μοι, ἐπ' ἀξέστοιο δὲ ποιμὴν
> πέτρης συρίζοι πρηέα βοσκομέναις·
> εἴαρι δὲ πρώτῳ λειμώνιον ἄνθος ἀμέρξας
> χωρίτης στεφέτω τύμβον ἐμὸν στεφάνῳ,
> καί τις ἀπ' εὐάρνοιο καταχραίνοιτο γάλακτι
> οἰός, ἀμολγαῖον μαστὸν ἀνασχόμενος,
> κρηπῖδ' ὑγραίνων ἐπιτύμβιον. εἰσὶ θανόντων,
> εἰσὶν ἀμοιβαῖαι κἀν φθιμένοις χάριτες.
>
> You shepherds who wander this ridge of a mountain / leading to pasture goats and fleecy sheep, / for Cleitagoras, calling to the earth, would that you repay this small but pleasing favor / for the sake of chthonian Persephone. / Would that sheep bleat to me, and would that the gentle shepherd / pipe from his rough rock to those sheep grazing; / and in the first spring after plucking a meadow's blossom/ may a rustic inhabitant enwreath my tomb with a garland, / and may someone from [a stock] rich in sheep, sprinkle [it] with milk of an ewe, while holding up her udder ready to milk / dampening the edge of the tomb. They are favors from the dead, / in exchange for favors for those that are decaying.
>
> (Leon. 19 G-P = *AP* 7.657)

On a basic level, the epigram describes a rustic, everyday context in sepulchral epigram,

[279] Antisthenes in Porphyrius *Schol. ad Od.* 1.1 = *fr.* 51 (see Caizzi 1964: 74ff.): ἐπιστάμενοι δὲ πολλοὺς τρόπους λόγων περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πολύτροποι ἄν εἶεν; Kindstrand (1976: 134-135) on Buffiére 1956: 367 and Pépin 1958: 108.
[280] Fowler 1989: 22.

yet the high language and vivid imagery provoke a deeper reading that elucidates the parodic play on the mythology associated with the Cyclops. The epigram builds in allusion to the *Odyssey*, Euripides' *Cyclops*, Aristophanes' *Plutus*, which is similar to Theocritus' Polyphemus in *Id*. 11. The rare verb (οἰοπολεῖτε) expresses that wandering is done apart from others, like οἰοπόλος, the Homeric adjective that is its precedent.[281] The only other use of this verb for wandering is in Euripides' *Cyclops* 74, which Rosen has shown to be a parodic comment on the *Cyclops* of the Odyssey.[282] In response to Silenus' speech, the Chorus of Satyrs in Euripides' *Cyclops* 74 stress the absence of Dionysus; the Dionysian element in Euripides' *Cyclops* brings about the most important changes to the story of Polyphemus from the Homeric account in the *Odyssey*.[283] The garland enwreathing the tomb (χωρίτης στεφέτω τύμβον ἐμὸν στεφάνῳ), the bleating sheep (βληχήσαιντ' ὄιές μοι, like the parody of the Cyclops in Aristophanes' *Plutus* 292-295), and whistling shepherd (συρίζοι, like the Cyclops in *Od*. 9.316, and then in Theoc. *Id*. 11.38) are all called upon by the voice of the entombed, and so allude to the world of poetic performance surrounding the Cyclops. The absence of the mythological figure, however, restrains the imagery to everyday life. Through the beckoning voice of a dead man, Leonidas ironically enlivens, and so fictionalizes an everyday occurrence of shepherds wandering by a tombstone in a pastoral landscape. The context of the epigram that is riddled with literary allusion to wandering and poetic performance in a very real, living, pastoral landscape, unites the craft of sepulchral epigram together with the craft of the shepherds into an imagined setting where the living and the dead meet through the dialogue poetry creates, and the request for "a

[281] Gow (1965b: 328) states οἰοπολεῖτε is as οἰοπόλος – solitary – as in *Il*. 13.473, but I say that *Od*.11.574 (τοὺς αὐτὸς κατέπεφνεν ἐν οἰοπόλοισιν ὄρεσσι) bears more similarity to the context, where the vocabulary is more akin to the first line of Leonidas 19 G-P; the contexts are also similar; perhaps the man's voice is emphasized as dead through the allusion to Odysseus in the underworld.
[282] Rosen 2007: 143 n58 may show this reuse 'parasitic', in that Leonidas' epigram, like Euripides' *Cyclops* could not exist in its current form without a specific antecedent.
[283] Konstan 1990: 208.

small favor" (ὀλίγην χάριν, Leon. 19.3 G-P) of pastoral song.

In P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, Col. III.28-41, as shown by David Petrain,[284] "mythological figures and abstruse vocabulary" present two identities for the Cyclops that allow "Theocritus and Homer to communicate with each other." Like in Leon. 19 G-P above, the context of the epigram subverts the allusively literary frame and shows Posidippus[285] marking his own literary appropriations as unique to his own style. Both Posidippus and Leonidas are aware of past and contemporary literary allusions to the *Odyssey*, and express their own technique through the conversation with contemporary trends and with poetry of the past.

The focus on wandering, everyday characters is perhaps reflective of Leonidas' own role as a biographical wandering poet, but Leonidas certainly reiterates wandering and the everyday, ordinary figure as two essential, interconnected elements apparent throughout his collection of epigrams. These chief themes are introduced and joined within the characterization of his own persona, as we saw in the analysis of his autobiographical epigrams above. The application of thematic wandering that involves ordinary rustic characters and craftsmen has its roots in the *Odyssey*, and so shows how these interconnected themes as a poetic pattern within a narrative have a meta-literary function in Leonidas' epigrams.

IV. Wandering and Weaving in Leonidas

Weaving fits within the same stylistic frame and shows the overlap of weaving, wandering, and *to oligon*, frequent in Leonidas. The relationship between weaving and poetic

[284] Petrain 2003: 359-388, esp. 360.
[285] Bastianini-Gallazzi 2001 have verified that Posidippus is the author of the *New Posidippus* because two epigrams (II. 39-III.7 = 20 Page, X.30-33 = 18 Page) attributed to him are also found on the Milan Papyrus.

composition is well-known.[286] Scholars have shown the unique relationship between weaving and poetic design particularly prevalent in the *Odyssey*, where Athena, goddess of weaving, performs both "handicraft and the more metaphorical devising of plots,"[287] especially as she weaves the plot that allows Odysseus to succeed as hero of his own *nostos*.[288] Penelope's weaving parallels that of Odysseus' wandering journey, since it is through weaving and unweaving Laertes' shroud that she schemes to avoid marriage with the suitors, and protects the fame of his homecoming.[289] The weaving so paradoxically narrates Odysseus' wandering journey, while Penelope is fixed to the loom.

In Leonidas' epigrams, weaving, continual motion while fixed at the loom, and so simultaneously moving and still, is like the paradoxical motion of wandering of ordinary craftswomen; weavers' composition is ironically *to oligon*, like their fated, insignificant lives – brief, although their weaving, and woven art, persists. Their continual weaving, when compared to the brevity of the epigram in which it is described, establishes a paradox in their immobilized movement, as the elaborate narration of their movement remains trapped in a short, finite piece of art. Female weavers are tied to their craft by necessity of sustaining their livelihood, much like Leonidas wanders for his livelihood in his autobiographical epigrams. The description of their weaving self-sustainment, however, is trapped within the short epigram, an embodiment of their short-lived fate.

In the following epigram (41 G-P = *AP* 6.288), multiple variations of words rooted in ὀλιγ- emphasize the relationship between weaving, poetry, poverty, and paltriness, which

[286] e.g. *Od*. 5.59-62; Arist. *Pol*. 1253b 37. The relationship between weaving and poetry, or song, in Leonidas is similar to that of archaic poets discussed in Snyder 1981: 193-196, and so Leonidas fits within this trend in Greek poetry.
[287] In *Od*. 13.291-302, Odysseus is known for his deceits and tricky words although Athena calls him the best of men *Od*. 13.303, where Odysseus "weaves a plot with Athena" as he reaches Ithaca, after which (*Od*. 13.331-335) she compliments his courtesy, wit, and prudence; Cohen 1995: 64.
[288] *Od*. 1.5, 1.77, 1.87, 1.326, 13.297-299; Schein 1996: 11.
[289] As Penelope herself reveals in *Od*. 19.123-163.

Leonidas presents as a signature stylistic trait of his epigrams.

> Αἱ Λυκομήδευς παῖδες, Ἀθηνὼ καὶ Μελίτεια
> καὶ Φιντὼ Γληνίς θ', αἱ φιλοεργόταται,
> ἔργων ἐκ δεκάτας ποτιθύμια τόν τε πρόσεργον
> ἄτρακτον καὶ τὰν ἄτρια κριναμέναν
> κερκίδα, τὰν ἱστῶν μολπάτιδα, καὶ τὰ τροχαῖα
> πανία †κερταστὰς τούσδε ποτιρρόγεας†
> καὶ σπάθας εὐβριθεῖς †πολυάργυρα τώς δὲ† πενιχραί
> ἐξ ὀλίγων ὀλίγαν μοῖραν ἀπαρχόμεθα.
> τῶν χέρας αἰέν, Ἀθάνα, ἐπιπλήσαιο μὲν ἴσως,
> θείης δ' εὐσιπύους ἐξ ὀλιγησιπύων.
>
> We daughters of Lykomedes, Atheno and Meliteia / and Phinto, and Glanis, who love most to work, / offer a tithe of things agreeable [to you] from our work and on top of that a / spindle and a shuttle that distinguishes among the threads, / and is singer of looms, and the spinning / bobbins, ‡ these stitching winders ‡ and blades laden with fine yarn ‡ and so rich in silver ‡, although we are poor [girls] / who offer this meager lot (μοῖραν) from our meager [supplies]. / On the one hand, Athena, would that you always fill our hands equally, / and would that you make full breadbaskets out of these meagerly-supplied breadbaskets.
>
> (Leon. 41 G-P = *AP* 6.288)

The subject matter that Leonidas treats here is defined by *to oligon* although his diction is full of intricately-designed, elaborate compounds, which establish a parallel between poetic form and subject. The epigram describes the dedicators' prayer for escape from a simple livelihood and limited lot (ἐξ ὀλίγων ὀλίγαν μοῖραν). Through the chiasmatic repetition of phrases that jointly relate to meagerness and then to stocks that sustain life (ὀλίγων…ὀλίγαν μοῖραν…εὐσιπύους ἐξ ὀλιγησιπύων), the poem culminates into homeoteleuton, which epigrammatically ironizes their prayer for release. The poem is a dedication and prayer for escape (ἀπαρχόμεθα) toward the impossible, what is not fated, since their lot is decidedly meager. The phrase ὀλίγαν μοῖραν rings of double meaning, as it relates both to their combined poverty and scant supplies, as well as to their short-lived fate.

The characters here are weavers, tied to their craft. They are poor, and although they pray for a well-supplied breadbasket, the stress on words related to poverty shows that they cannot escape their poverty and their weaving, thus rendering them paralyzed. Such paralysis is similar to the way the wandering poet identifies himself, as one who also seeks to escape meager

breadbaskets (ἐξ ὀλιγησιπύων, Leon. 36.1-2 = *AP* 6.300.1-2) with his art. This focus on short-lived, poor, or simple people with original, compounded forms, lends to the strained effort of the weavers to compete with their fate, and the ironic fate of all humankind – the meager lot that they are.[290] The reader is expected to interpret the self-awareness lacking[291] in the meager characters as they are richly described through the paradoxical art of the *to oligon* of Leonidas of Tarentum. Wandering is the verbal embodiment of the paradox that Leonidas employs, and within which his humble subjects fit.

The craftsmen and craftswomen within Leonidas' epigrams present a seemingly realistic foreground. The language of heroes and the literary allusions in the background, however, offset the categorizing of these epigrams as an attempt at accurately depicting reality. Instead the rich descriptions are part of an ironic mold, as the everyday struggles of humankind are an immediate context, yet with a subtext which comments on the wandering nature of humankind. In the elegy below (Leon. 72 G-P = *AP* 7.726),[292] Platthis, a weaver and old maid, approaches death while performing her craft with constant, revolving movement.

> Ἑσπέριον κἠῷον ἀπώσατο πολλάκις ὕπνον
> ἡ γρηὺς πενίην Πλατθὶς ἀμυνομένη,
> καί τι πρὸς ἠλακάτην καὶ τὸν συνέριθον ἄτρακτον
> ἤεισεν πολιοῦ γήραος ἀγχίθυρος
> καί τι παριστίδιος δινευμένη ἄχρις ἐπ' ἠοῦς
> κεῖνον Ἀθηναίης σὺν Χάρισιν δόλιχον,
> ἢ ῥικνῇ ῥικνοῦ περὶ γούνατος ἄρκιον ἱστῷ
> χειρὶ στρογγύλλουσ' ἱμερόεσσα κρόκην.
> ὀγδωκονταέτις δ' Ἀχερούσιον ηὔγασεν ὕδωρ
> ἡ καλὴ καλῶς Πλατθὶς ὑφηναμένη.
>
> In the evening and during daybreak, she often thrusts away sleep / the old woman Platthis as she averted poverty, / and she sang something to her distaff and to her fellow-worker [the] spindle / [while she was] on the threshold of gray old age / and at the loom moving herself to and fro until dawn / [along] that long measure accompanied by the Graces of Athena, / or shriveled with cold

[290] Philips 1972: 278 lists a number of simple, original nouns and adjectives that create such irony, and lists (290-334) compounded forms, which show how Leonidas manipulates many of the compounded forms from other Greek literature.
[291] See Montiglio 2005: 64 for the lack of self-awareness as a trait of wandering men in *Od*. 17.483-87, Hes. *W&D* 252-255 and *Th*. 759-66.
[292] Clack (1999: 164) calls this an elegy.

around her shriveled knee sufficient for the web / she is charming as she twirls the yarn with her hand; / this eighty-year old saw the water of Acheron / Platthis goodly weaving good things.
(Leon. 72 G-P = *AP* 7.726)

Platthis averts poverty by weaving, but her continual motion shows that her livelihood competes with her fated death, as if she barely escapes poverty. The whirling of the spindle (δινευμένη ἄχρις ἐπ' ἠοῦς,[293] "whirling until daybreak") is a wandering motion to and fro, repetitive during the day and night, and with little progression; the only eventual progression made is in the time approaching Platthis' death. This verb (δινεύω), here as a participle, is often used as a repetitive whirling motion, as one paralyzed in a journey, and in this context the verb also implies walking a set path (δινευμένη…δόλιχον).[294] The tautological phrases emphasize the repetitive quality of her arduous task as she accompanies the loom in position, καί τι πρὸς ἠλακάτην …καί τι παριστίδιος (*and how nearby her distaff…and nearby the loom*, 3-5), ἣ ῥικνῇ ῥικνοῦ περὶ γούνατος (*shriveled around her shriveled knee*, 7), ἡ καλὴ καλῶς (*goodly…good*, 10), παριστίδιος… ἱστῷ (*next to the loom… the loom*, 5-7). Time is like a long course that she travels, ἄχρις ἐπ' ἠοῦς…δόλιχον,[295] while performing her daily routine of weaving. Much like in Leonidas' epitaph for Homer,[296] the whirling, here of a spindle, perpetuates time as the sun rises and sets, until at last she – the goodly-weaving Platthis, both weaver and creator of poetic

[293] Leon. 30 G-P = *AP* 9.24, like the sun whirling round his chariot, Leon. 62 GP = *AP* 7.273, like the sailor half-eaten by a fish, wandering at sea; Arat. *Phaen*. 454-455 discusses the basic circular motion through the Zodiac ordered by its wanderings; see *Sch. in Arat*. 454.17, ὁ δὲ λόγος· οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι πέντε πλάνητες (ἐπιμὶξ δινεύονται ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀναμεμιγμένοι), οὐκ ὄντες ὅμοιοι τοῖς προειρημένοις ἀπλανέσι διὰ τῶν ιβ΄ζῳδίων πλανῶνται, *the gist of the line is the other five planets (whirl mixedly instead of being all mixed up), are not the same as those aforementioned that are fixed when they wander through the twelve signs of the zodiac; Od*. 16.63-64 φησὶ δὲ πολλὰ βροτῶν ἐπὶ ἄστεα δινηθῆναι / πλαζόμενος, they say that he is whirled through many cities of men, wandering.

[294] For this verb as part of paralyzing stopover during an epic journey see ἐδινεόμεθα in *Od*. 9.153; for the equation of weaving and journeying see Pind. *P*. 9.17-18 …ἀ μὲν οὔθ' ἱστῶν παλιμβάμους ἐφίλησεν ὁδούς, …*she didn't like the paths of the loom that go to and fro*; Gow 1965b: 376.

[295] cf. Clack 1999: 165: "all-consuming."

[296] Leon. 30 G-P = *AP* 9.24; Ἄστρα μὲν ἠμαύρωσε καὶ ἱερὰ κύκλα σελήνης / ἄξονα δινήσας ἔμπυρος ἠέλιος / ὑμνοπόλους δ' ἀγεληδὸν ἀπημάλδυνεν Ὅμηρος / λαμπρότατον Μουσῶν φέγγος ἀνασχόμενος.
The stars and the sacred/luminous disks of the moon grew dim, / and the burning sun whirled round his chariot, / and Homer brought to naught the much-sung [heroes] in herds / as he held up the brightest light of the Muses.

song as she sings, illuminates the water of death with her art. The description of her in the aorist (ἀπώσατο, ἤεισεν, ηὔγασεν) suggests that this elegy as epigram is sepulchral, as each verb reaches toward her final embracing of the completion of her life, with a journey to the water of the underworld.

The singing of Platthis suggests a relationship between weaving and poetry, in that both control the fate of their heroes, yet despite being the singer, she is also the heroine of this epigram. She predicts her fate that is forever tied to the spindle as she sings, much like the Achaian women sing in Theocr. *Id*. 24.77; Teiresias predicts how the women will praise in their singing of Alcmena, mother of Heracles, as they guide with their hand the soft wool strewn about their knees.[297] Platthis, like Helen or Calypso, weaves her web ἄρκιον ἱστῷ… ἡ καλὴ καλῶς Πλατθὶς ὑφηναμένη;[298] the fate of Platthis is somewhat nobly heroic, but results in her wandering within her poor, laborious life, until she meets inevitable death. She fights off poverty (ἡ γρηὺς πενίην Πλατθὶς ἀμυνομένη), as she thrusts away sleep (ἀπώσατο) from herself in heroic fashion with epic language,[299] yet her shriveled old age catches up with her.

Overall, the passage is jointly mock-heroic and mock-romantic, since she, like Helen, is charming ἱμερόεσσα. But Platthis is also emphatically shriveled (ἢ ῥικνῇ ῥικνοῦ περὶ γούνατος), like the shriveled feet of the aged nurse Polyxo of the Lemnian Hypsipyle in Apollonius.[300] She is like the young lover embarking on paraclausithyron, as she serenades her

---

[297] Theocr. 24.5-8, ναὶ γὰρ ἐμῶν γλυκὺ φέγγος ἀποιχόμενον πάλαι ὄσσων, / πολλαὶ Ἀχαιάδων μαλακὸν περὶ γούνατι νῆμα / χειρὶ κατατρίψουσιν ἀκρέσπερον ἀείδοισαι / Ἀλκμήναν ὀνομαστί, σέβας δ' ἔσῃ Ἀργείαισι, *yes indeed my sweet light is far in the distance from these great things, that many women of the Achaians on approach of evening as they guide the soft wool about their knees with their hand – they will sing of Alkmene by name, and then the Argives will hold you in honor*; Gow 1965b: 376.

[298] *Il*. 3.125, μέγαν ἱστὸν ὕφαινε, *[Helen] was composing a great web*; *Od*. 5.61-62 ἱστὸν ἐποιχομένη χρυσείῃ κερκίδ' ὕφαινεν, *[Calypso] went up and down the web as she wove with a golden shuttle*.

[299] As in Leon. 78 G-P = *AP* 7.731; e.g. *Il*. 16.301 ὡς Δαναοὶ νηῶν μὲν ἀπωσάμενοι δήϊον πῦρ, *as the Danaans thrust away the blazing fire from the ships; Od*. 9.305, χερσὶν ἀπώσασθαι λίθον ὄβριμον, *so they could thrust the heavy stone away from the cave with their hands*, etc.

[300] A.R. 1.669 αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα φίλη τροφὸς ὦρτο Πολυξώ. / γήραϊ δὴ ῥικνοῖσιν ἐπισκάζουσα πόδεσσιν

spindle and distaff, but she was ironically just outside the door of her own gray old age, so childless and barren.[301] She is not a hero trapped in youth after dying young, but rather she is an old woman who wandered her way through life while moving back and forth at the loom. The spinning movement, her competition with time and poverty, and the mock-heroic tone are markers of the limited fate she has spun – yet she is content with it. The romantic tone set upon the realistic scene suggests that she, like Helen or Calypso, does control fate with her weaving, except it is her own fate that the weaving sets in place by causing her death, in a morbidly wry parody of ecphrasis and paraclausithyron. The epigram neither extols nor denigrates the woman's work, but proves to be a high form of poetry about meager subject trapped moving in motionless epigram text. Thus, the *to oligon* is here a paradox of paralyzed movement that is frequently apparent in epigrams of Leonidas similar to this.[302] The spinning of the yarn was Platthis' livelihood, but also a paradoxical symbol of the fate to which she is tied.

In other weaving dedications, the spindles are whirling, or forever whirling, although the weavers themselves are struggling with poverty and their short-lived lives. The phrase ὀλίγαν μοῖραν ἀπαρχόμεθα, *[we] who offer this meager lot (μοῖραν) from our meager [supplies],* in Leon. 41.8 G-P = *AP* 6.288.8,[303] shows the weaving-women-dedicators' claim to have escaped their poor fate, but there is dualism here: they have both escaped a small fate of poverty from performing tasks of the poor, but they are also of a fate that is probably shortlived. In the dedication Leon. 42.3 G-P = *AP* 5.206.3, the spindle is ever-whirling (ἀειδίνητον), yet the women dedicate the tools upon retiring from their trade, or stopping (παυσάμεναι) in Leon. 42.8

[301] This romantic paraclausithyron turned morbid is not without precedent. See Theocr. *Id*. 23; Copley 1940: 52-61
[302] cf. Gutzwiller 1998a: 93-94; This poem may thematically be similar to "the virtue of contentment with little" as in the fragment from a third-century Cynic philosopher quoted in Stob. *Flor*. 3.198, but it is linguistically a play on earlier Greek poetry, thus it seems to be a literary play on traditional literature to reinforce themes of wandering, and the *oligos* within it; to limit the poem to the Cynic frame would overlook the intricately interwoven allusions that Leonidas is applying.
[303] See above for text of Leon. 41 G-P = *AP* 6.288 in its entirety.

G-P= *AP* 5.206.8, and thus they cease to live.[304] Also in 42 G-P, the Doricizing of the epithet for Athena as Πανίτιδι (7), bobbin-spinner, signals a relationship to the Doricizing of Penelope (Πανελόπας, 8), the wool weaver, whose bed the shuttle guards in this epigram,[305] and so emphasizes a similarity in the etymologies of their names. The three women weavers in both Leon. 41 and 42 G-P allude to the three Fates, yet the fate they control is their own. Such a paradox of continual movement and humans' attachment to their limitations, like wandering, or paralyzed movement, fate, or poverty, with rich allusions to literary tradition, emphasize that all characters of poetry, be they men, heroes, or gods, are meager on account of their limitations. The labor of the women, like the epigrams of Leonidas, is ironically over-wrought since the workers' lives, like those of all humankind, are of a meager length.

The stylistic techniques of Leonidas prove to be self-aware of their fictional realism. Although meager, everyday men are the focus of his epigrams, the repetitions and literary allusions display Leonidas' highly stylistic poetic form. Through his weavers, Leonidas shows the combined poetic form in their lowly craft with his high style and emphasis on wandering. The weavers, like Leonidas' belabored limitation of his own high diction in description of meager subjects, are trapped in their wandering. Such thematic scope and poetic method respond to literary trends which Leonidas manipulates and to which Leonidas responds. Through *oligē,*

---

[304] Αὐτονόμα, Μελίτεια, Βοΐσκιον, αἱ Φιλολάδεω
καὶ Νικοῦς Κρῆσσαι τρεῖς, ξένε, θυγατέρες,
ἁ μὲν τὸν μιτόεργον ἀειδίνητον ἄτρακτον,
ἁ δὲ τὸν ὀρφνίταν εἰροκόμον τάλαρον,
ἁ δ' ἅμα τὰν λεπτῶν εὐάτριον ἐργάτιν, ἱστῶν
κερκίδα, τὰν λεχέων Πανελόπας φύλακα,
δῶρον Ἀθαναίᾳ Πανίτιδι τῷδ' ἐνὶ ναῷ
θῆκαν, Ἀθαναίας παυσάμεναι καμάτων.
Autonoma, Meliteia, Boiskion, the / three Cretan daughters of Philolaides and Niko, dedicated [these things]:/ the first one dedicated her yarn-making ever-revolving spindle, / and the second, her basket of dark garment worked in wool, / and the third her well-woven work and shuttle of finely-wrought webs /, the female-guardian of the marriage-beds of Penelope. Together they dedicated these as a gift in this temple / to Athena the weaver, / when they ceased from toils of Athena. (Leon. 42.3 G-P = *AP* 6.289).

[305] κερκίδα, τὰν λεχέων Πανελόπας φύλακα, Leon. 42.8 G-P = *AP* 6.289.8.

literary allusion, and the theme of wandering, Leonidas presents his own *sphragis* as a response to his part in the Greek literary tradition.[306]

V. The ironic repetition of ὈΛΊΓ- in Leonidas' epigrams

Like epigrams that intertwine weaving with poetic technique, *to oligon* is emphatically resonant in the diction of many of his epigrams. Leonidas repeats different forms of words with the ὀλίγ- root often in the same epigram, or emphasizes the term in some other way, most often ironically. The "meager breadbasket" so proves to be more than representative of poverty, but actually an ironic reference to the aesthetic richness of the methodological performance his own craft. In the following poems, the ὀλίγ-rooted words prove their metaphorically poetical might, and allude to the meagerness of humanity.

An example is the first line in Leon. 18.1 G-P = *AP* 7.656.1, Τὴν ὀλίγην βῶλον καὶ τοῦτ' ὀλιγήριον (*meager clod of earth and this meager burial mound*), as the small clod of earth hidden under a bramble and thicket litters around and obscures the tomb of the war hero Alkimenes.

> Τὴν ὀλίγην βῶλον καὶ τοῦτ' ὀλιγήριον, ὦνερ,
> σῆμα ποτίφθεγξαι τλάμονος Ἀλκιμένευς,
> εἰ καὶ πᾶν κέκρυπται ὑπ' ὀξείης παλιούρου.
> καὶ βάτου ἦν ποτ' ἐγὼ δήιον Ἀλκιμένης.
>
> This meager clod of earth and this meager burial mound, sir, / is the tomb called by the name of stout-hearted Alkimenes, / although it has been entirely covered under wooden thicket / and bramble, I Alkimenes once waged war here.
>
> (Leon. 18 G-P = *AP* 7.656)

The reader is left to seek and answer the adjective of the first line, "why meager?" The smallness of the tomb is the most direct implication, and this may be on account of the poverty of the

[306] Leonidas' contemporaries also had seals related to their own personae, as in Posidipp. 118; Lloyd-Jones 1963: 73-99; on seals and poetic authority in Theognis see Edmunds 1997: 29-48.

buried hero, who reveals himself as such in the last line. The short four lines confronting the reader, and repetitive phrases within it, however, are symbolically like the thicket crowding the tomb. The thicket masks his boldness mentioned in the third line (τλάμονος), and so the significance of the tomb marker seems to be the short four-line length and cluttering the name with pleonasm and shrubbery. The ironic reference to the generic short form of the poem with thick words mirror the cluttering of thicket around the subject, thus suggests that the character's boldness as a hero is insignificant.[307] The boldness, however, is the dissonant irony in the combination of diction, form, and subject.

In Leon. 87 G-P = *AP* 6.226,[308] Τοῦτ' ὀλίγον Κλείτωνος ἐπαύλιον (this meager camp of Cleiton), ὀλιγαῦλαξ (having a meager plot of arable land), ὀλιγόξυλον (meager shrubby area), in the repetition of ὀλίγ- root in the first line also emphasizes small size as a means of delineating the brief four-lined poem.

> Τοῦτ' ὀλίγον Κλείτωνος ἐπαύλιον †ἥ τ' ὀλιγαῦλαξ
> σπείρεσθαι† λιτός θ' ὁ σχεδὸν ἀμπελεὼν
> τοῦτό τε †ρω παίειν† ὀλιγόξυλον· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τούτοις
> Κλείτων ὀγδώκοντ' ἐξεπέρησ' ἔτεα.
>
> This is the meager camp of Cleiton and his little plot of land, / simple vineyard nearby for sowing, / and this is his for cuting down the little bit of wood; but next to these / Kleiton passed through for eighty years.
>
> (Leon. 87 G-P = *AP* 6.226)

The small plot of land and sparseness of the place is set in contrast to the long life (eighty

[307] Compare Leon. 17 G-P = *AP* 8.655, which uses the word μικρὴ similarly to ὀλίγ- rooted terms, as if to suggest that a small poem is enough for the meager man entombed within the small burial mound. The poem also suggests of the meaninglessness of materiality:
Ἀρκεῖ μοι γαίης μικρὴ κόνις· ἡ δὲ περισσὴ
ἄλλον ἐπιθλίβοι πλούσια κεκλιμένον
στήλη, τὸ σκληρὸν νεκρῶν βάρος. εἴ με θανόντα
γνώσοντ', Ἀλκάνδρῳ τοῦτο τί Καλλιτέλευς.
This small bit of land is sufficient for me [I have enough!], and the superfluous / monument – would that it press upon some other opulently buried; it's an unpleasant weight for dead bodies. If they think this is for Alexander son of Kalliteles, what's the difference? (Leon. 17 G-P = *AP* 8.655)

[308] It makes sense to include ῥωπεύειν here, since it had precedent in Leon. 39 = *AP* 6.355, and also in *Suda* lexicon entry 577 line 1; cf. Gow 1965a: 135; Page 1975*: ad loc*.

years!) of the subject Cleiton, so the last phrase also implies a sort of incongruity that begs of the attention of the reader. The last two lines ironize the wandering existence of the old man, passing through both time and his small plot for eighty years, with the term ὀλιγόξυλον, meager vineyard. The repetitive diction certainly recalls Leonidas "of meager breadbasket," (ὀλιγησιπύου) in Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300 symbolic of Leonidas "of meager diction," i.e. diction describing simple subject matter with ironically complex language. The simultaneous monotony and simplicity of the repetitive motion of men's modest lives – no matter how long – reinforced by the repetition of *to oligon* throughout the collection in form, diction, and content of Leonidas' epigrams.

Leonidas' wandering in the poetic tradition, then, seems to be a sort of entrapment within the confines of elaborate diction, few words, and application of traditional themes. In Leon.19 G-P = *AP* 7.657.3,[309] ὀλίγην χάριν (meager favor), is an ironic request of an entombed man to receive the bleating of sheep, whistling of shepherds, and milk from passing goats, sheep, and shepherds. The favor suggests that the epigram is dedicatory in form, yet the speaker is the entombed, and so the epigram conflates dedicatory with sepulchral epigram. The request also conflates two spheres – the rustic, or pastoral, and the chthonian – in a grotesque transgression of generic boundaries, which highlights the fictionalization in this epigram. As the epigram ironically points out – "there are reciprocal favors even from those who are decaying," the implication of the small favor is also a request for a short song from shepherds, while they are passing by, in exchange for the twelve-lined epigram sung by the entombed. The combination of motion and speech,[310] alludes to creative play on both genre and the theme of wandering through the rustic lens of *to oligon*, with its rich language and meager poetic form and subject.

[309] For Leon. 19 G-P = *AP* 7.657.3, see pages 84 above; cf. Theoc. *Id*. 18.39.
[310] Tueller 2008: 68n9.

As in the epigram above, repetitions of ὀλίγ- forms are not always insistent of grim poverty, as scatological humor is also evident in the word and style of *to oligon* in Leonidas.

> Αὐτοῦ ἐφ' αἱμασιαῖσι τὸν ἀγρυπνοῦντα Πρίηπον
> ἔστησεν λαχάνων Δεινομένης φύλακα·
> ἀλλ' ὡς ἐντέταμαι, φώρ, ἔμβλεπε. 'τοῦτο' δ' ἐρωτᾷς
> 'τῶν ὀλίγων λαχάνων εἵνεκα;' τῶν ὀλίγων.
>
> Beside his boundary walls Deinomenes set up this watchful Priapus / guard of garden production; / but look how I have stretched myself out, robber. So 'is this [statue]' you may ask, / 'set up for the sake of these few vegetables?' [Indeed, it is] for the sake of these few things.
>
> (Leon. 83 G-P = *A.Pl.* 236)

In Leon. 83 G-P = *A.Pl.* 236, a Priapus addresses passersby with the question that enhances the imposing nature of the statue, and the meagerness of the garden and the fruits in it, „Τοῦτο," δ' ἐρωτᾷς, / „τῶν ὀλίγων λαχάνων εἵνεκα;" τῶν ὀλίγων, (*you may ask, "is this [statue here] on account of only a few vegetables" [Indeed,] it is on account of [only] a few*.). The repetition of λαχάνων ("simple vegetables or herbs") once again suggests the author is "of meager words"; the meagerness here is a form of commonness, or vulgarity that he stresses, i.e. the related word choices most often occur in vulgar genres,[311] and his repeated use of rare words. The ironic incongruity of smallness or fewness of items in the garden enhances the implied, well-endowed physical form of this god of fertility, as well as his threat to thieves.

The overuse of combined ornate compounds and focused diction, and his special attention to the subject matter that is common, yet often overlooked subjects, mirrors the paradox of wandering, a paralyzed motion. The resulting irony stresses the insignificance of mankind's pursuits, as well as a stylistic argument that engages the discussion of boundaries within the literary tradition by simultaneously participating in such a tradition, while transgressing its

[311] The word λαχάνων is frequent in Aesop (Fab. 32, 96, 121), and almost limited to its appearance in comic plays (e.g. Crat. *frs*. 49, 191, 313; Epicharmus *fr*. 159; Ar. *Th*. 456, *Lys*. 557, *fr*. 908, Theopompus *fr*. 13.2, Eubulus *frs*. 1, 54, Alexis *frs*. 46, 15, 162, etc.; Hegesippus *fr*. 1.9) and scientific or philosophical texts, mostly medical (Bion fr. 17.8; Hippocrates *De Morbis* 2.50.28, *De mulierum affectibus* 66.17; Diocles 200.3, 209.4; Theoph. *HP* 3.6, 6.1, 7.2, etc.).

traditional limits. Perhaps wandering as a theme in Leonidas mirrors the paradoxical combination of Leonidas' constraints as a poet, as he is tightfisted in his devotion to both Homeric vocabulary and high, epic language, and to ordinary subject matter. His treatment of meager subject matter with ornate language does not show sentimentalism or sensitivity toward the hard work that a working class puts forth, but is an ornate display of irony remarking parodically on the repetitious nature of human life. Repetition of diction, theme, and frequent allusion to poetic technique provide a *sphragis* for Leonidas' poetry introduced by the epigrams related to his own autobiographical persona.

Chapter 3: Leonidas' Sea-Faring and Fishing Epigrams

In this chapter, I will offer a conspectus of the theme of wandering in the nautical epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum. I will then examine a few of these epigrams in detail in order to show how Leonidas applies the theme of wandering to suit his collection and its sense of realism. The theme of wandering resonates in multiple epigrams related to the sea, some that directly describe travel on the sea, others that suggest a relationship between repetitive crafts related to the sea, and others that more directly imply that life is like wandering, as water travel regularly symbolizes man's final approach toward death. Leonidas' epigrams reflect the literary culture surrounding him. Though other Hellenistic epigrams describe shipwrecks and the lives of fishermen, the stress on suffering wanderers in Leonidas' poetry comparatively highlights his own original mark on the theme.[312] Intricate literary allusions to Homeric poetry, and sea-wandering in the *Odyssey* in particular, show that Leonidas' epigrams provoke an engaged reader, a book reader, ready to interpret the many layers of allusion. These literary allusions and the poet's coordination of multiple epigrams through the theme of wandering prove the very bookishness of Leonidas' epigrams and his original, organizational techniques.

I. A conspectus of sea-related wandering in Leonidas' epigrams

Although only three of Leonidas' sea-themed epigrams appear among the thirty epigrams in the two series of sea-themed epigrams in the *Greek Anthology*,[313] many more of Leonidas'

[312] Through his epigrams' similarities to other Hellenistic poetry, through his thematic allusions to wandering in other poetry and repetition of his own poetic wandering, Leonidas distances himself from "well-trodden path of inscriptions," i.e. context of inscribed epigrams, and proves his epigrams' part in the context of the literary world, or "untrodden path," through repetition of this theme of wandering that plays on the context of inscribed epigram. For the distance between allusion in inscribed and literary epigrams, Bing 2009: 174.
[313] *AP* 7.263-279, 282-294.

epigrams contain sea-related elements.[314] Among the large number of sea-themed epigrams, wandering is implied by the epigrams' discussion of continuous sea travel, often forced by the sea, or with an occupation related to the sea. Men are marked as "sea-roaming fishermen" in Leon. 52 G-P = *AP* 6.4 (ἁλιπλάγκτων… δικτυβόλων), although the dedication of the fisherman in this epigram is upon his retirement from sea-roaming. The voice of the entombed often bemoans men's frustrating persistence in sailing,[315] although they are simply following their fates..[316] Men continuously rove in the sea or on shore to practice their everyday occupation or habits,[317] and the wandering of men is compared with movements similar to animals.[318] They undergo long journeys through distance and/or time, as they are "driven by a storm," continuously "whirling on the sea" and "suffering far from the shore."[319] The movement of the sea-related wandering of men is often repetitive, passive, and paralyzing, although the description is always intricately overwrought with rare diction and patterns that are frequently variations of epic vocabulary, or *hapax legomena*, or variations of Leonidas' own usage.[320] Leonidas' perfunctory diction mirrors the wandering movement of the characters, skilled in

---

[314] There are twelve epigrams that discuss directly or allude to elements of the sea, although there are 17 epigrams that incorporate elements of sea occupations (fishing, hunting on sea-shore, sailing), water-travel, or proximity to the sea as either primary importance to the context of the epigram, or as a passing reference in the epigram. Gutzwiller 1998: 102 suggests that there are eight total epigrams on shipwreck, yet, since many epigrams allude to sea-themes, we cannot formally conclude which epigrams relate to which section because of some overlap with other themes.

[315] Ναυηγοῦ τάφος εἰμὶ Διοκλέος, οἱ δ' ἀνάγονται, "I am the tomb of shipwrecked Diocles, yet they set sail!" in Leon. 61 G-P = AP 7.266; "it is the right time…to set sail for the whole sea-trade journey" πλόος ὡραῖος… ὡς πλώοις πᾶσαν ἐμπορίην, Leon. 85 G-P = *AP* 10.1

[316] Παλλομένη…ἦκε κυλινδόμενος… νήματ' ἀναπλήσας ἐπιμοίρια, Leon. 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504.

[317] εἰναλίων…δι' ἠιόνων, "of the sea…through the shores", Leon. 46 G-P = *AP* 6.13.

[318] "swimming more than a shearwater gull," τὸν αἰθυίης πλείονα νηξάμενον, L. 20 G-P = *AP* 7.295; man flops about on land like a fish, wandering to stay alive in Leon. 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504

[319] Long journeys: Leon. 14 G-P = *AP* 7.665; 61 G-P = *AP* 7.266, 62 G-P= *AP* 7.273, 63 G-P = *AP* 7.283; 64 G-P = *AP* 7.503. Driven by a storm: χειμήνασα, Leon. 15 G-P = *AP* 7.652. "Whirling on the sea": πόντῳ δινεύμενος, Leon. 62 G-P = *AP* 7.273. Suffering far from shore: τηλόσ' ἀπὸ ψιλῆς ἔπτυσας ἠιόνος, Leon. 63 G-P = *AP* 7.283; θινὸς ἐπεστηλωμένον ἄχθος… λαίλαπι χρησάμενον," burden set up as a column upon…shore, after suffering a storm", Leon. 64 G-P = *AP* 7.503.

[320] As Philips (1972: 277-347) has shown, Leonidas' epigrams apply a large number of compounds of which many are unique because of the rare nature of one of the compounded elements, and the other is often a Homeric term. E.g. (316), although ἁλιπλάγκτων in Leon. 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264 is borrowed from Sophocles (*Aj.* 295), Leonidas creates two new compounds from the first component ἁλι-, ἁλίζωος and ἁλιφθόρος in Leon. 16 G-P = *AP* 7.655.

sailing, fishing, or journeying by sea, yet paralyzed in their repetitve tasks, and in his epigrams. Instead of solely elevating or celebrating the simple characters,[321] the diction focuses readers' attention on the intricate poetic quality of the theme of wandering in relation to characters of a common lot.

Although poverty is often a component or proponent of sea-travel or fishing, and the characters may lead a "simple" existence, the thematics of sea-wandering do not depend on these descriptions. Instead of celebrating the simple life, the confluence of the wandering theme and focus on simple characters offers a statement about the paralysis of the human condition.[322] Often, sailors are identified with "not a large ship";[323] the litotes used to describe the small ship highlights the sailors' regular helplessness amidst the dangers of the sea.[324] The small ship also occasionally suggests the sailors' vulnerability to solitude in one's wandering struggle, as in 16 G-P where the entombed is mourned only by gulls, or even in Leon. 20 G-P where the protagonist does not die of storm but instead of old-age, alone in his hut. In the case of Theris, the protagonist of Leon. 20 G-P, the poetry of the first eight lines mirrors his vigorous movement with technical diction for the habitual skill applied in devotion to his trade; his "automatic" death (τῷ μακρῷ σβεσθεὶς ἐν χρόνῳ ἀυτόματος) and the small size of the ship coalesce to show his ironic struggles alone in life until death.[325] The small ship accentuates the characters' frustration

---

[321] Cf. Gutzwiller 1998a: 88-114; Gigante 1971.

[322] Poverty is not directly mentioned in any of the epigrams that discuss the sea or occupations related to the sea, although wandering is. We run the risk of overlooking larger poetic constructs if we evaluate paradoxical themes in Leonidas based simply on notions of class, as seen in Gigante (1971: 66-67) or Gutzwiller (1998: 94-96, 102), who suggests that the sea-themed poems offer a "celebration of fishing" and "praise of the fisherman," yet such a suggestion does not fit simply within "rich-poor" thematics. Analyzing thematics of rich/poor in poetry may present an antithesis based on perceptions that are often convoluted by modern social constructs, and so are far too limiting.

[323] Μήτε μακρῇ θαρσέων ναυτίλλεο μήτε βαθείῃ / νηί, Leon.14 G-P = AP 7.665; οὐ πολλῇ νηὶ, Leon. 15 G-P = *AP* 7.652, ὡς καὶ ἐμὲ πλώοντα σὺν οὐκ εὐπίονι φόρτῳ, Leon. 16 G-P = *AP* 7.655; οὐχὶ πολυσκάλμου πλώτορα ναυτιλίης, Leon. 20 G-P = *AP* 7.295.

[324] As in Leon. 15 G-P, the sailor's ship is driven by a storm, or in Leon. 16 G-P = *AP* 7.652, where the entombed is mourned pitifully by gulls, after pirates ransack his small ship.

[325] The sense of movement is diagrammed well by Guidorizzi (1977: 69-76), yet I suggest that wandering is not specific to one class or another, but the epigram uses wandering as a means of achieving realism, which impresses

and vulnerability in wandering, as well as the meagerness of human life.

Like Leonidas' rustic epigrams set on land, his sea-themed epigrams are quasi-bucolic,[326] and their emphasis on the theme of wandering elucidates this aspect. In their frequently Doric dialect,[327] they describe rustic characters engaged in sea-related crafts, or who are set on the fringe of society through their wandering sea-travel or habitual devotion to their craft. Leonidas' nautical epigrams are ironically aware of a sort of *locus amoenus*, since his epigrams consistently describe the danger of the marine setting. In Leon. 63 G-P = *AP* 7.283, a sailor who suffered a storm bemoans how the sea spit him out far from shore. In Leon. 65 G-P = AP 7.506, while reaching out to be saved by his fellow sailing crew, half of a sailor is devoured by sea-monster and left to wander in the sea, while the other half is buried on land, leaving no real hope for comfort. In Leon. 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504, "the steadfast fisherman" ironically flounders back and forth to his death, killed by swallowing a fish while fishing from the shore, and in Leon. 85 G-P = *AP* 10.1, Priapus announces the beautiful comforts of spring on land, yet ironically commands sailors to set sail for trade. Although Leonidas' epigrams distance themselves from Theocritus in their absence of erotic themes,[328] they respond to his work and to that of other Hellenistic epigrammatists,[329] in many ways.[330] Leonidas' epigrams are not based simply on thematics of

---

upon his readers the shared lot of humanity, which is to wander and struggle alone in order to suffer the common lot of death. The epigram does not celebrate the achievement of Theris, but instead shows Theris as an archetype for the common struggles and wandering of man, in which wandering occupation his coterie of fishermen (συνεργατίνης ἰχθυβόλων θίασος) are implied to share in their commemoration of him in the last two lines. They are neither rich nor poor, but fellow fishermen casting the woven, fated nets of their occupation.

[326] Arland 1937: 31; for other definitions of "bucolicity" compare Stanzel 2007: 335; Rossi 2001: 29-64.

[327] Bernsdorff (2001: 127-138) argues for a relationship between the Doric dialect and the bucolic.

[328] Stanzel (2007: 346-351) stresses how erotic themes distinguish Theocritus' bucolic style.

[329] Cf. Stanzel (2007: 346-351), citing Gutzwiller (1998a: 100-108) and Gigante (1971: 45-51) argues that Leonidas, comparatively holds interest in simpletons unlike Theocritus, Callimachus, and Herodas, since he "celebrates the ideal of modesty under the influence of Cynicism." The tone of wandering and the admonitory notion of man's wandering toward fate, shows that Leonidas is still interested in stylistics and poetic technique like these other Hellenistic poets, regardless of the influence of Cynicism.

[330] Leonidas marks his role in the rustic sphere, as discussed in the previous chapter, in the epigram which probably stood as dedication of his collection with Λαθρίη, rustic epithet for Lathrian Aphrodite in Leon.36 G-P = *AP* 6.300, is cognate with Λάτμιον in Theocritus *Id*. 20.39. Gutzwiller shows how Asclepiades and Nossis, and maybe

rich and poor, but overall contrast with the literary milieu surrounding him.

Although the narrative contexts described in his epigrams are not always set on the sea, epigrams that discuss fishermen show a sense of wandering through the repetitive reference to their craft. Fishermen are portrayed according to their regular practices of movement, and use of appropriate tools, which show their devotion to the skill of their craft, as much as their habitual performance of it.[331] The frequent litotes, baroque description, and ironic implications concerning fishermen's or sailors' skills, tools, or vehicles traversing the sea, often provide an equivocal comment about man's ability, as the characters struggle, sometimes nobly, sometimes ridiculously, to escape inevitable death or live out their short, brutish lives. The characters' occupations on sea and otherwise prove to be aimless, wandering pursuits, of which suffering forced upon them is a component part.

Nevertheless the description of craft in showing their toil against the difficulty of labor adds an element of realism to the theme of wandering. The wandering is shown as part of a common, everyday routine (as to the wandering performed by fishermen everyday in Leon. 52 G-P = *AP* 6.4) or is sometimes clearly fictional (as the very skilled fisherman who dies wriggling like a fish in Leon. 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504).[332] The everyday pursuits and irregular happenstance described in well-crafted language become a highly stylized reflection of reality through their

---

Posidippus use Aphrodite as patron deity of their epigram collections, yet their approach to the goddess is reflective of their own individual style. Nossis 1 G-P = *AP* 5.170; Posidippus 1 G-P = *AP* 5.134; Gutzwiller 1998a: 110; Höschele (2007: 360) takes this argument further by showing Nossis' (Nossis 4.1-2 G-P = *AP* 9.332) use of the temple of Aphrodite and the many famous paintings in it as symbolic of her collection and the many epigrams within it. Such a use provides an image of a three-dimensional setting for the two-dimensional medium that attempts to pretend it exists in a space outside of the papyrus upon which it actually sits. See also Leonidas 19 G-P = *AP* 7.657 wherein Leonidas alludes to the world of the Cyclops in a bucolic setting, much like Posidippus *P.Mil.Vogl.* VIII 309, Col. III.28-41; for this argument, see Petrain 2003: 359-388, esp. 360.

[331] E.g. τεχνασθέντα…τέχνας…τεχνοσύνας, "cunningly contrived…crafts…mastery of crafts", ἁλιπλάγκτων εὕρεμα δικτυβόλων, "nets of sea-roaming fishermen," Leon. 52 G-P = *AP* 6.4; τὸν αἰθυίης πλείονα νηξάμενον, "swimming more than a shearwater gull," Leon. 20 G-P = *AP* 7.295; ἐπακταῖος καλαμευτής, "reaper on shore", ἄκρος καὶ κίχλης καὶ σκάρου ἰχθυβολεὺς "utmost harpooner of both wrasse and parrot-wrasse" Leon. 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504.

[332] The absence of mythological reference and high poetry that describe suffering at sea lend to the realism within his poetic style, see Gigante 1971: 105-122.

elevated language and theme of wandering.

All sea-themed epigrams, like many other epigrams of the collection, suggest that humankind is a humble, suffering race vulnerable to its wandering until death. An element of sea travel occurs when a character in the epigrams meets his/her ultimate end in wandering, with a final sail across Acheron into Hades (as in ποντοπόρῳ … ὡς ἐμέ, τοῖς Ἀίδεω προσπελάσῃ λιμέσι, *…for a man traveling by sea…as with me, if a gale should bring him to the harbors of Hades*, Leon. 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264). Of course, this metaphor resonates in literature from Homer on,[333] yet the sea-themed epigrams and those that discuss sailing to Hades coordinate thematically with other epigrams of Leonidas' corpus. Epigrams sometimes describe a scenario where water becomes a defacto trip to Hades. In Leon. 59 G-P = *AP* 7.67, Charon is identified by boat travel, as his boat is full of all those dying by means of the nautical passage that they take (ἀποφθιμένων… ναυστολέων). A sociable man who sails to Acheron is described in Leon. 10 G-P = *AP* 7.440 (ἀπέπλεεν εἰς Ἀχέροντα). Leon. 79 G-P = Stob. 4.52.28 exhorts one to row to Hades since traveling there is without struggle (ἔρεσσε… ἀταρπὸν ἔρπων, οὐ γάρ ἐστι δύσβατος… κἠκ μεμυκότων ὁδεύεται *row…as you move slowly along this path, for it is not impassable…it is even traversed by those who have shut their eyes)*. Leonidas metaphorically presents life as a grim voyage that is inevitably brought to anchor (Χειμέριον ζωὴν ὑπαλεύεο νεῖο δ' ἐς ὅρμον, *escape this stormy voyage of life and bring yourself to anchor*, Leon. 77 G-P = *AP* 7.472b). Many of the sea-themed epigrams imply the senselessness of men's frustrated pursuits on the sea, through the humbling fate met by the entombed, or

[333] E.g. as Teiresias tells Odysseus that Death will come from the sea by men who know nothing of the sea in *Od*. 11.120-138; Circe describes of Odysseus' journey to the Underworld in *Od*. 10.501-516, or Pi. *Pyth*. 11.21 of Agamemnon's and Cassandra's souls to Acheron, or in Alc. 38A 2,8, where in the speaker repeats crossing into Acheron to emphasize foolish hopes for rebirth, thus to convince Melanippus to drink and be merry; for relationship between water and poetry in Pi. *Nem*. 4.1-5; see Segal 1974: 20-38, esp. 25-26 on water as metaphor symbolizing ford between death and rebirth in Greek literature, but specifically in Theocritus *Id*. 1.139-141.

because they contain warnings of the dangers of sea travel (Leon. 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264; 61 G-P = *AP* 7.266; 76 G-P = *AP* 7.472b). Thus, the theme of wandering stresses the struggles of human existence and the inevitability of wandering in life, as one's approach to death is an unavoidable passage. Death is the only definitively achievable goal in wandering.

The sea-voyage theme fits well into the literary tradition of Hellenistic literature, yet Leonidas' epigrams distinguish themselves from the poetry of others, especially since his sea-themed epigrams narrate tales that stress the wandering, or the frustrated toil or suffering, of the humanity beyond mere destruction of ships on sea.

II. Leonidas, sea-themed epigrams, and the Greek literary tradition

The *New Posidippus* presents an entire section of epigrams about the shipwrecked (ναθαγικά, epigr. 89-94 A-B),[334] and so shows that sea-themed poems may have been collected into a section of a book of epigrams by Leonidas.[335] Posidippus'[336] ναθαγικά epigrams are each unique, and are more light-hearted than Leonidas', as gods whisk away those about to die on sea (e.g. epigr. 92 A-B). In many cases, their self-awareness concerning themes creates a fictional quality. There are some sea-themed epigrams from 1-20 A-B (λιθικά) to 21-35 A-B (οἰωνοσκοπικά),[337] yet these epigrams appropriately centralize the rocks and omens respective to each epigram.[338] The epigrams in the *New Posidippus* generally do not focus on fishermen, or

[334] Austin 2002: 21, 114-119.
[335] Gutzwiller (1998a: 102) also suggests that sea-themed poems might have coordinated as a section of a Leonidean poetry book.
[336] Bastianini-Gallazzi 2001 have verified that Posidippus is the author of the *New Posidippus* because two epigrams (II. 39-III.7 = 20 Page, X.30-33 = 18 Page) attributed to him are also found on the Milan Papyrus.
[337] Austin 2002: 21, 41-47.
[338] *P. Mil. Vogl.* I-IV. epigr. 19 = A-B 19 is introduced with the distance of the rock form the sea and includes many mythical elements involving Polyphemus and Poseidon; A-B 20 alludes to Demeter kissing the hand of Poseidon in order to avoid destruction at Eleusis, in a prayer to keep Ptolemy's domain earthquake-free; A-B 21 discusses the presence of omens at the launching of a ship; A-B 22 on the appearance of omens for those about to set sail; A-B 23 is an address to fisherman that sight of the shearwater is a good omen for catching fish; A-B 24 again addressed to a

stress the suffering of the sea voyage common in Leonidas', yet they are united by the theme of shipwreck and death at sea, and the epigrams' witty remarks in using these themes.[339]

Leonidas' many sea-themed epigrams fit within this same sub-genre of Hellenistic epigram, yet Leonidas' distinguish themselves as admonitory reflections of the struggles on the sea and of the toils of fishermen.[340] Not every epigram explicitly discusses a specific aspect of wandering at sea or otherwise, but wandering resonates with the emphatic suffering of the speaker combined with the persistent motion of men in their struggles to sail in the motionless, seemingly inscribed poem. The following distich (Leon. 61 G-P = *AP* 7.266) insists that the tomb of Diocles stand as warning to anyone setting sail.

> Ναυηγοῦ τάφος εἰμὶ Διοκλέος· οἱ δ' ἀνάγονται,
> φεῦ τόλμης, ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πείσματα λυσάμενοι.
>
> I am the tomb of the sailor Diocles; yet in spite of this they set sail, / oh out of recklessness, loosening their ship cables from me!
>
> (Leon. 61 G-P = *AP* 7.266)

---

fisherman of good things to come from the black Theban bird, if the fisherman considers the shearwater untrustworthy; A-B 25 – the most similar to Leonidas' themes in its discussion of meeting an old man on a road, since the epigram equates a trip on land and a trip on sea to the voyage of life, in particular marriage. Troubling is the relationship of this epigram to *omina* specifically, except for its role in seeking advice for the future (for interpretations see Höschele & Konstan 2006: 99-102; Baumbach and Trampedach 2004:146). In terms of Leonidas, however, embarking on marriage is advice that his old men for the most part stray away from, Leon. 10 G-P = *AP* 7.648 (Aristocrates, who dies spouseless, advises on deathbed that others should marry); 31 G-P = *APl.* 306 ("old Anachreon" drunk and about to fall); 37 G-P = *AP* 6.302 (Leonidas describes himself as an old man alone in his hut with mice); 50 G-P = *AP* 6.296 (Sosippus, a hunter, caught by the weakness of old age dedicates traps); 71 G-P = AP 7.466 (on mother of Anticles, bemoaning the young death of her son and so her own old age); 72 G-P = *AP* 7.726 (old woman Platthis committed to her craft of weaving dies alone); 78 G-P = *AP* 7.731 (advice that an old man should not cling to his old age and to life); 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715 (Leonidas' epitaph commemorates his death far from his homeland and calls this fateful journey bitterer than death); 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154 (an old man gives rustic dedication to Pan, nymphs, and Dionysus to increase his sustenance).

[339] As Thomas (2004: 265) resolves in contrast to Propertius 3.7, relationship to thematic grouping of poems in the Milan papyrus may provide a direct or indirect model for poetry, Augustan or otherwise.

[340] Gutzwiller (1998: 313- 315) argues that the first sequence of sea-themed poems on shipwrecks in the Cephalan anthology (*AP* 7.263-273), appeared in the final section of the book of epigrams by Meleagrian authors, and she presents that poems by Leonidas provided an important balance to other epigrams in Meleager's anthology. She, developing her argument from that of Wifstrand (1926: 25), focuses on the admonition about the "perishability of wealth" among Leonidas' travelers or merchants lost at sea. Leonidas' epigrams on shipwrecks and fishermen, however, not only support his role as a Hellenistic poet, but also coordinate in literary theme other than their discussion of wealth, poverty, and Cynicism; for shipwreck epigrams in Posidippus as sub-genre of epigram that affects Augustan authors, see Thomas 2004: 260.

Although the epigram does not apply vocabulary that specifies wandering, the frustration of the speaker combined with the persistent motion of those setting out alludes to the frustrated suffering encapsulated in wandering. The first hemistich calls attention to the sepulchral format the epigram sets out to present, as the tomb in the first person, rather than the entombed himself, declares its imagined presence. The insistent voice of the tomb, however, is in vain, as its frustration is expressed by the adverse actions of other sailors in the last two feet of the first line introduced by the bucolic diaeresis and the phrase introduced by the correlative particle δ' ἀνάγονται (*yet they set sail!*), and set off by the strong caesura following the exclamatory φεῦ τόλμης (*oh – out of recklessness!*). The suffering and frustration of the tomb ironically correlates with others' setting sail and loosening cables from shore, as if to ask – *why would anyone wander on sea, or dare a sea voyage if a death – as miserable as mine - is the expected result*? The sailors, then, show their persistent sea-travel as an inevitable devotion to a reckless practice, and so the speaker suggests that such a pursuit is illogical and aimless. They are then paralyzed in their frustrating, repetitive practice, wandering at sea, and in their jointly loosening and destroying their cables (λυσάμενοι). Wandering is not stopped or completed with the death of another, but only by one's own death, as frustration, wandering, and death are inevitable parts of the human existence in the epigram. The language that emphasizes the distance from the shore and frustration of struggles met on the sea insists on the foolish dangers of inevitable wandering on sea.[341]

Some epigrams contained in the *New Posidippus* comparatively highlight Leonidas' epigrammatic themes. Epigram A-B 91 contains the same general message as Leonidas 61 G-P above, i.e. that those departing by sea should consider the inscribed tomb a warning of what sea

[341] For frustrated suffering and distance in sea-wandering, see also Leon. 14 G-P = *AP* 7.665, 15 G-P = *AP* 7.652, 62 G-P = *AP* 7.273, 63 G-P = *AP* 7.283, 65 G-P = *AP* 7.506.

travel can cause, yet the reader of A-B 91 is meant to engage the tombstone as a literal object that is inscribed, as the reader is asked to think four times with each of the four lines to consider the multiple warnings that the reader avoid sea-travel.

> τετράκι βουλεύσαιο καί, εἴ ποτε κῦμα πλοΐζου,
> μὴ ταχὺς Εὐξείνου γίνεο ποντοπόρος,
> τοῦτον ἰδὼν κενεὸν Δώρου τάφον, ὃν Παριανῶν
> τῆλέ που εἰκαῖαι θῖνες ἔχουσιν ἁλός.
>
> Plan four times and, if ever you sail the sea's swells, / do not be quick about navigation of the Euxine / when you see this monument of Dorus – an empty one, which far from Parium, / I suppose, the dunes of the sea hold.
>
> (Posidippus A-B 91)

Any frustration expressed in the warning presented in the first distich is relieved by the indefinite τῆλέ που (*at a distance, perhaps*) that ends the second, which implies the comfort of ignorance about where the sailor Dorus made his final rest, as the monument's pretenses evokes pathos for the dead. The epigram's message is docile compared to the exasperated remarks of Diocles in Leonidas 61 G-P. Compare also A-B 94 of Posidippus below, which with ναυηγόν με θανόντα καὶ ἔκλαυσεν καὶ ἔθαψεν begins similarly to Leon. 61 G-P above (Ναυηγοῦ τάφος εἰμὶ).

> ναυηγόν με θανόντα καὶ ἔκλαυσεν καὶ ἔθαψεν
> Λεώφαντος σπουδῆι, καὐτὸς ἐπειγόμενος
> ὡς ἂν ἐπὶ ξείνης καὶ ὁδοιπόρος· ἀλλ' ἀποδοῦναι
> Λεωφάντωι μεγάλην μικκὸς ἐγὼ χάριτα.
>
> Me, who died from a shipwreck, he, Leophantus, both mourned and buried / with haste, as he also hurried himself / just as if he were a traveler to a strange place; but to return great thanks / to Leophantus, I am too small.
>
> (Posidippus A-B 94)

The third person and simple structure, however, lack the frustration of the deceased, as the poem goes on to describe a death that is quick and without the suspense and the ominous warning. Instead the quip of A-B 94 develops from the second line, which introduces the haste of Leophantus and the complaint of the entombed – *the tomb is too small and not worth spending a*

lot of time on, since the composer Leophantus didn't spend any time making it. Since this is the last of the ναθαγικά in the epigram book, perhaps epigram A-B 94 is a comment on the small section or hasty composition of epigrams related to shipwrecks, or on the contrasting short poem and gravity of the subject matter.

Hellenistic poets were interested not just in adventures of sailors on the sea, but also in the world of fishermen and the craft of fishing from the early Hellenistic period. Leonidas' work often reflects this trend of realism common to Hellenistic art and literature.[342] The theme of wandering links many epigrams concerning fishermen to the rest of the collection, particularly the epigrams of shipwreck and those in a bucolic type setting.[343] Examine the following epigram (Leon. 85 G-P = *AP* 10.1), where sea, bucolic, and habitual practice of the craft of sea-travel come together:

> Ὁ πλόος ὡραῖος, καὶ γὰρ λαλαγεῦσα χελιδὼν
> ἤδη μέμβλωκεν χὠ χαρίεις Ζέφυρος,
> λειμῶνες δ' ἀνθεῦσι σεσίγηκεν δὲ θάλασσα
> κύμασι καὶ τρηχεῖ πνεύματι βρασσομένη.
> ἀγκύρας ἀνέλοιο καὶ ἐκλύσαιο γύαια,
> ναυτίλε, καὶ πλώοις πᾶσαν ἐφεὶς ὀθόνην·
> ταῦθ' ὁ Πρίηπος ἐγὼν ἐπιτέλλομαι, ὁ λιμενίτης,
> ὥνθρωφ', ὡς πλώοις πᾶσαν ἐπ' ἐμπορίην.
>
> It is the right time for sailing, for in fact the chirping swallow / and pleasant Zephyr now have come, / and the meadows are in bloom, and the sea / with its swells have grown silent / and are shaken violently with a rough gust. / Would that you take up your anchors and unloose your stern cables, / sailor, and setting up the entire sail would that you set sail; / I Priapus, god of the harbor, command these things, / sir, - that you set sail for the whole trade-journey.
>
> (Leon. 85 G-P = *AP* 10.1)

This poem uses the figure of Priapus to urge sailors to take on the sea since it is the right time for sailing (ὁ πλόος ὡραῖος, like in Hes. *WD* 630), yet he digresses about the idyllic beauty of spring, with the poetic chirping swallow (λαλαγεύσα χελιδών, like the chirping cicadas,

[342] Fowler (1989: 5-9) points to the decadently learned means that Hellenistic poetry and art portray the details of common crafts and occupations; for realism in Leonidas, see Gigante 1971: 77-122 and Kirstein 2007: 168-169.
[343] Cf. Gow 1965b: 386n8.

making sounds of spring in Theocritus *Id.* 7.139)[344], the blossoming flowers (λειμῶνες δ' ἀνθεῦσι) and, ironically, the violent, shaking movement of the sea (κύμασι καὶ τρηχεῖ πνεύματι βρασσομένη). The juxtaposition of the bucolic language and setting, with the violence of the sea, stresses the ironic inevitability of one daring to embark on a nautical enterprise. Rather than teaching about the pleasure of spring as common to bucolic poetry,[345] the epigram instructs the reader about the danger of spring because of wandering on sea. The chiasmus in line five (ἀγκύρας ἀνέλοιο καὶ ἐκλύσαιο γύαια) provides a tonal shift that leads into the equivocal command in the last line (ὄνθρωφ', ὡς πλώοις πᾶσαν ἐπ' ἐμπορίην). The repetition of the optative "would that you set sail" (πλώοις) dramatizes the inevitability of the sea-wandering enterprise.

Hellenistic poetry that describes fishermen and the craft of fishing may be considered within the category of perhaps even the 'bucolic', although apart from the world of herdsmen in their identification with an occupation of the sea.[346] Interest in the world of fishermen does not stray too far from the Hellenistic literary interest in the everyday, simple people,[347] particularly

[344] Λαλεῖν is also used of the singing of the birds in Mosch. 3.47; Gow 1965d: 101; like the cicadas as poets of bucolic song constructed by Meleager 12 – 13 G-P = AP 7. 195-196; Gutzwiller 2006: 395-396. .

[345] Gutzwiller (2006: 396) argues that bucolic poetry "integrates instruction and pleasure, or rather of subsuming instruction to pleasure. Theocritus' and other bucolic poets teach by offering past examples of erotic experience…as it strives to promote sweet, seductive effect on its audience." Leonidas favors the strongly instructional poetic song, yet with bucolic elements, perhaps in response to bucolic poetry of his contemporaries.

[346] As Kirstein (2007: 168ff.) notes, poetry that deals with humble people in settings on sea, sea-side, or on land, just as Arland (1937: 80) and Rossi (2001: 33), although she adheres to a more rigid definition of bucolic, she accepts that fishermen and harvesters belong to the *corpus Theocriteum*; Leonidas, like Theocritus, includes a number of epigrams that discuss hunters, herdsmen, and travelers in a pastoral setting, but in one poetic context (namely, epigram). The narratives are shorter but the language is as rich, highly stylized, and allusive as that of Theocritus' "bucolic" sphere. E.g. Leon. 3 = *AP* 6.334 (dedication of cakes to sheepfolds); 43 = *AP* 5.206 (dedication of musical instruments, including a shepherd's pipe); 46 = *AP* 6.13 (dedication of nets and hunting tools from hunters of animals on the shore, on land, and of those in the sky, see Kirstein 2007: 171 on this epigram); 47 = *AP* 6.35 (dedication of milk-pales, dog collars, and shepherd's staff); 48 = *AP* 6.232 (notably set in pasture in the first line, although a dedication of spoils of marauding animals); 50 = *AP* 6.296 (with much bucolic language – see Rossi 2001: 34, 134, dedication of hunting tools of Sosippus in his old age, although Rossi definition of bucolic is more rigid than what I have listed here); 91 = *AP* 6.120 (dedicatory epigram on singing cicada in pastoral setting).

[347] For Hellenistic interest in realism, see Zanker 2004: 13-15, and 125-126 for innovations of Hellenistic poets and artists concerning "everyday" subjects as response to "*Kleinwelt* of collapsed polis life under Alexander and

those of *corpus Theocriteum*. Theocritus shows his interest in fishermen in *Idyll* 21,[348] and emphasizes the hold of poverty over the trade of fishing;[349] the overall meaning of the opening portion of the *Idyll* 21.1-5 is that "poverty sharpens the wits and stimulates industry."[350] A list of fishing gear follows, which comprises fishermen's "wealth" (οὗτος ὁ πλοῦτος, *Id*. 21.14). Leonidas 52 G-P = *AP* 6.4 describes the craft of a fisherman named Diophantus through his dedication of tools, much like that addressed to the Diophantus of Theocritus *Id*. 21. The similarity of names may be a deliberate invitation to the reader to think of Theocritus *Id*. 21, although Theocritus' authorship of *Id*. 21 has been doubted.[351] Leonidas' epigram, however, does not focus on "poverty" as in *Idyll* 21,[352] which begins with "it is poverty alone, Diophantus" (Ἀ πενία, Διόφαντε, μόνα) and repeats the theme of poverty throughout the poem.

> †Εὐκαπὲς† ἄγκιστρον καὶ δούνακα δουλιχόεντα
> χώρμιὴν καὶ τὰς ἰχθυδόκους σπυρίδας
> καὶ τοῦτον νηκτοῖσιν ἐπ' ἰχθύσι τεχνασθέντα
> κύρτον, ἁλιπλάγκτων εὕρεμα δικτυβόλων,
> τρηχύν τε τριόδοντα, Ποσειδαώνιον ἔγχος,
> καὶ τοὺς ἐξ ἀκάτων διχθαδίους ἐρέτας
> ὁ γριπεὺς Διόφαντος ἀνάκτορι θήκατο τέχνας,
> ὡς θέμις, ἀρχαίας λείψανα τεχνοσύνας.
>
> Curved fish-hook and long rods / and line and the large baskets for holding fish / and this cunningly crafted

---

successors"; Kirstein (2007: 168-171) discusses how fishermen and seamen grew to become popular literary subjects; Arland 1937: 31.

[348] For authenticity of ascription of *Idyll* 21 to Theocritus, see Kirstein 2007: 150-212, esp. 162-168.

[349] Although the ascription of *Idyll* 21 to Theocritus is suspicious (for more on ascription, see Gow 1965c: 369-381), I agree with Rossi (2001: 33) that we should accept the ascription to Theocritus since epigrammatists had already turned their attention to fishermen from the early Hellenistic period, writing several compositions on them, and the presence of fishermen in the spurious *Idyll* 21 is justified by the conception of the much broader notion of 'bucolic poetry' that becomes popular in the period contemporary with and immediately following Bion.,Cf. Kirstein 2007: 168-212.

[350] Gow 1965d: 370; Theoc. *Id*. 21.1-14; Ἀ πενία, Διόφαντε, μόνα τὰς τέχνας ἐγείρει· *Poverty alone, Diophantus, urges on the crafts…*

[351] See enumeration of similarities between "list of tools" in Leonidas 52 G-P and Theocritus 21 in Kirstein 2007: 165-180, esp. 170-171, and stylistic similarities in Gow 1965d: .370-381.

[352] There are other epigrams where poverty is a major theme; e.g. Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736, 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300, 37 G-P = *AP* 6.302 (previous three epigrams describe Leonidas himself as poor), 39 G-P = *AP* 6.355 (poor mother presents lifelike image of son to Bacchus); 41 G-P = *AP* 6.288 (poor weavers dedicate to Athena); 55 = *AP* 6.298 (poor Cynic Sochares); 68 G-P = *AP* 7.455 (entombed wife of poor husband groans for more wine); 71 = *AP* 7.466 (lamentation for lack of son and desolate old age); 72 G-P = *AP* 7.726 (poor Platthis dies while weaving); L. 83 G-P = *APl*. 236 (Priapus set up to guard small plot of land and few things garden contains); 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154 (dedication from poor rustic).

> for night-fish – a trap, an invention of sea-wandering fishermen, / pointed trident, tool of Poseidon, / and these twofold oars of light vessels / the fisherman Diophantos set up his crafts for his lord / as is right, as what remain of his old-time trade.
>
> (Leon. 52 G-P = *AP* 6.4)

Leonidas' epigram places the dedication of tools of Diophantus to the fore, much like the list in *Id*. 21.8-14, but the epithet in Leonidas' epigram for fishermen – "sea-wandering" (ἁλιπλάγκτων εὕρεμα δικτυβόλων) highlights the juxtaposition between Diophantus' formerly active, inventive trade and its end with a "rightful" dedication to his lord, i.e. the retirement of his craft. The long list of items, consisting of compounds and neologisms, suggest of both rusticity of dedicator and the technical skill devoted to his trade. Leonidas' dedicating fisherman reflects the rusticity of the epithet for Pan (ἁλιπλάγκτων).[353] Rusticity also seems intended in the tone of the "sea-roaming" compound in Apollonius Rhodius (2.11), wherein the insulting Amyntas derogatorily addresses the Argonauts to challenge the "strangers" (ξείνοισιν and ἀνδρῶν ὀθνείων ὅς κεν Βέβρυξι πελάσσῃ, "to strangers" and "to anyone of men who wanders among the Bebrycians") to boxing. Since the adjective modifies the fishermen, the "sea-roamers" in Leonidas' epigram are a known entity, defined by the tools of their craft, although the term for fishermen, δικτυβόλων (literally "net throwers"), is original to Leonidas. Sea-roaming and rusticity are combined to provide for the poem's version of realism, a comment on devotion to an every-day trade by means of highly-technical equipment applied to it.

The dedicatee (ἀνάκτορι "to [his] lord"), as lord, is not specified, and this absence centralizes the importance of practicing one's craft to Diophantus. The repetition of craft-related words (τεχνασθέντα, τέχνας, τεχνοσύνας) stresses the industry of the fisherman, yet their similar derivation cues the reader toward the stark contrast among the terms, which sequentially

[353] This epithet was originally used at S. *Aj*. 694-698; cf. Philips 1972: 213-214.

suggest a temporal passing of Diophantus' life;[354] Diophantus first employs his craft (τεχνασθέντα), then is left with only his tools (τέχνας), which he dedicates, since his trade-skills have become ironically both a virtuous mastery and repetitive habit (τεχνοσύνας).[355] That he leaves behind his "old-time trade" (ἀρχαίας λείψανα τεχνοσύνας) suggests that his death is imminent with the abandonment of his habitual craft that had occupied him through old age. "The trap" or "the invention" (κύρτον, ἁλιπλάγκτων εὕρεμα δικτυβόλων) of sea-wandering fishermen is their habitual attachment to their trade – their own everyday wandering and refinement of skill. It is an ironic trap though, since skill at sea-wandering cannot escape the inevitable end of the trade. Leonidas suggests the grand irony of life through his medium as he describes the simultaneous sea-wandering, a movement without advantage, and technical skill in high form, within the narrow context of the highly technical language of Diophantus' dedication upon retirement from his trade.

The appearance of the name Diophantus in the similar contexts of Theoc. *Id*. 21 and Leonidas 52 G-P is uncanny, yet the coincidence, if not deliberate allusion of Leonidas, allows one to contrast how the idyll uses the "common" name to stress the poverty of fishermen, while the dedicatory epigram stresses the inevitable end of the habitual craft of the fisherman Diophantus, surrendering to the common lot with the dedication of his tools.[356] The comparison between *Idyll* 21 and Leon. 52 G-P shows that Leonidas' epigrams share in Hellenistic poetic trends, yet have their own unique style; Diophantus' "sea-wandering" dedication highlights the habitual nature of the craft behind his dedication of tools, rather than his poverty. The rich

[354] cf. Gutzwiller 1998a: 95.
[355] I do not doubt that Leonidas' ornate literariness suggest of the fisherman's perception of skill, as Kirstein 2007: 174-175, based on Gutzwiller (1998a: 94-95) argues, yet the poetic design of wandering is the limitation set to one's meager life forced by such an unavoidable "trap" in this perception, and everyday devotion to such a perception.
[356] Gow (1965b: 361) remarks that the name Diophantus is very common, but that it is not accidental that the fisherman's idyll (Theocr. 21) selected it for the person to whom he addresses his poem.

language surrounding fishermen and seamen in Leonidas alludes not just to Hellenistic counterparts but also to predecessors of Homeric poetry.

III. Allusions to Homeric Sea-related Wandering, Without Return

In the previous chapter, we have seen how Leonidas, like other Hellenistic poets, adapted many of the themes of the *Odyssey*.[357] He frequently alludes to the Homeric epics to emphasize the theme of wandering, as well as the frailty of man. With such allusion, Leonidas flaunts his literary technique that shows coordination through the theme of wandering, and rivals poetic techniques of other Hellenistic poets. Through Homeric allusion, the reader is invited to engage in how Leonidas reinvents the "strikingly humble public medium" of epigram.[358] Leonidas' allusion to wandering in Homeric poems supports the bookishness of his epigrams. Wandering is related not just to travel, but to the triviality ingrained in the human condition. The following epigrams of enhance the theme of wandering for those at sea or fishing, and call attention to the poetic form of the epigram.

As seen above, fishermen in Leonidas' epigrams often exude the theme of wandering, but they also suggest the meaninglessness of the material body, while they simultaneously push the limits of the genre of epigram with their extensive narratives and literary allusion. In Leon. 66

[357] As Sens (2007: 373) argues, that "one defining feature of compositions of Greek poets of the Hellenistic age as their persistent attention to and engagement with prior texts," particularly Homeric poems.

[358] Bing (2009: 148-151) uses a billboard of Goethe holding a can of Miller Lite with a quote "more Lite" as comparandum for suggesting how allusion in a literary medium composed for a public space creates a context for all "who share in a common cultural language." I agree that the contrast between such an allusion, which plays on Goethe's dying words, shows "recondite literary allusion embedded in strikingly humble public medium", yet such a billboard is not as exclusive toward its readership as Bing suggests. The allusion may suggest how contrasting the image is in and of itself, in the confluence of both the erudite and profane in image and in readership. Readers, if they notice the billboard, or inscription, will undoubtedly receive the image on a variety of levels, simply in the juxtaposition of a figure of the Rennaissance holding the object of the modern day American culture, and complexly in the direct reference to Tischbein's painting Goethe in Campagna, or to the "scholarly exegesis on Goethe's dying words." All are invited to engage in the artist's crafty allusion, and in the celebration of the complexity of our community of readers. In the following chapter, I will dwell more on the reader, and the context that Leonidas provides to engage the reader in his collection.

G-P = *AP* 7.504, the man eats a fish, and metamorphosizes into a flopping fish, wandering to and fro as he chokes.

> Πάρμις ὁ Καλλιγνώτου ἐπακταῖος καλαμευτής,
> ἄκρος καὶ κίχλης καὶ σκάρου ἰχθυβολεὺς
> καὶ λάβρου πέρκης δελεάρπαγος ὅσσα τε κοίλας
> σήραγγας πέτρας τ' ἐμβυθίους νέμεται,
> ἄγρης ἐκ πρωτῆς ποτ' ἰουλίδα πετρήεσσαν
> δακνάζων ὀλοὴν ἐξ ἁλὸς ἀράμενος
> ἔφθιτ'· ὀλισθηρὴ γὰρ ὑπὲκ χερὸς ἀίξασα
> ᾤχετ' ἐπὶ στεινὸν παλλομένη φάρυγα.
> χὠ μὲν μηρίνθων καὶ δούνακος ἀγκίστρων τε
> ἐγγὺς ἀπὸ πνοιὴν ἦκε κυλινδόμενος,
> νήματ' ἀναπλήσας ἐπιμοίρια· τοῦ δὲ θανόντος
> Γρίπων ὁ γριπεὺς τοῦτον ἔχωσε τάφον.
>
> Parmis son of Callignotus, reaper on the shore, / utmost harpooner of both wrasse and parrot-wrasse, / of boisterous perch snapping at the bait, /and the very sort that graze hollow caves hollowed out by water and rocks at the bottom of the sea, / out of [his] first catch once a rock-dwelling rainbow-wrasse / the biting man took up [along with his own] destruction from the sea / [and] he was destroyed; for slippery as it turned out above his hand / it came flapping at the narrow part of his throat. / So, on the one hand nearby both the lines and the pole's fish-hooks / he lost his breath while rolling around to and fro, / fulfilling his fated lines; and so because of this death / Mr. Fisher the fisherman built him this tomb.
>
> (Leon. 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504)

Parmis is described as a master fisherman, a description that is revealed as ironic.[359] Similarly to other characters in other epigrams, a type of sea-related wandering, or rolling around, brings about his end.[360] The epic allusions highlight the mock-heroic quality. The phrase ἐγγὺς ἀπὸ πνοιὴν ἦκε κυλινδόμενος, / νήματ' ἀναπλήσας ἐπιμοίρια, "while rolling around to and fro he lost his breath, he fulfilled his fated lines" is a grandiose description of a how a man's aimless task brought him to frustratedly flounder and gasp for breath on the ground to meet his death.

---

[359] Cf. Gutzwiller (1998a: 96) suggests foolishness is a result of the epigram's display, but the irony in the epithets is emphatic from the beginning to the end of the poem, as shown above.

[360] Cf. I see this epigram as less of a warning about the dangers of material possessions that sea-venturing poses, as Gutzwiller (1998a: 96) suggests; instead, the human body proves its insubstantiality, or meagerness, as it is transformed within a work of art. Both Theris (Leon. 20 G-P = *AP* 7.295) and Parmis (Leon. 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504), as well as Tharsys (Leon. 65 G-P = *AP* 7.506), prove their meagerness in their fated end, and their wandering, regardless of the hard work committed to their occupations. See Leon. 20 G-P = *AP* 7.295: Theris' movement is still emphasized as he is a man swimming more than a shearwater gull τὸν αἰθυίης πλείονα νηξάμενον,and although not wandering to the same extent as Parmis or lost at sea like Tharsys since Theris died in his hut, he is a rower of boat with few oars (οὐχὶ πολυσκάλμου πλώτορα ναυτιλίης (line 4)), and both Theris and Parmis are earners from their trade, as Theris is described as one who lived from animals caught in traps, τὸν εὐάγρων ἀπὸ κύρτων / ζῶντα. Leonidas does not "praise" one character over another based on old-age of Theris and short-lived efforts of other sailors at sea, and worker solidarity is not central to coordination among the poems.

The rolling, or wandering, encapsulates how the rich description of the short-lived man is trapped within the narrative of his death. The line is reminiscent of heroes of the *Iliad,* as Agamemnon says to Menelaus (*Il*. 4.170, αἴ κε θάνῃς καὶ μοῖραν ἀναπλήσῃς βιότοιο), or said by Hera to Zeus of the Danaans who perish and fulfill evil fate in *Il*. 8.465, or of the dying sons of Antenor at the hands of Agamemnon in *Il*. 11.263. Gow claims "the sense of the verb ἀναπλήσας is inappropriate and too incongruous to be perceptible."[361] The incongruity, however, builds on the irony of the whole scenario, with a wry parody of epic achievement of fated end to wandering of both fish and man. Leonidas' addition to the Homeric line enhances the frustration as the fisherman gasps for breath both wandering near to the tools that he once used to sustain himself, yet at a distance from his breath, and so the lines symbolize his doomed fate. The language of the movement of a fish is transferred to the movement of the man, much like the lines that he could not use to destroy the fish, he, with his hands was destroyed by the fish. The supreme hunter becomes the supreme choker, as the fish and fisherman, although seemingly made parallel with the participles παλλομένη…κυλινδόμενος, which both imply a to and fro motion, are paired with the line that should catch the fish. The line instead alludes to the man's destruction, as it points out the futility of the man's wriggling, and the power of the fish's wriggling.

Leonidas applies the epic term κυλινδόμενος for the back and forth motion typical of the frustration in wandering.[362] The word is defined as a writhing or rolling motion that is passive and aimless, much like the rolling/roaming of the similar term ἀλινδόμενος in Leonidas 33.2 G-

[361] Gow 1965b: 373.

[362] Philips (1972: 180) shows that this word occurs concentratedly 24 times in Homer's epics, and is scattered among different authors in the classical period – many alluding to Homer (see Pl. *Rep*. 388b6) before Leonidas, and of the nine times it is used by Leonidas' contemporaries, it occurs six times in epic (A.R. 2.732, 3.71, 4.152; Aratus *Phaen*. 1.539, 1.530, 1.97; cf. Theoc. *Id*. 7.145, 25.93, where its use parodies that in epic (see Gow 1965d: 166, cites *Il*. 14.410 *ad loc*. ἐκυλίνδετο Theoc. *Id*. 7.145). When the term occurs in the *Iliad*, it is mostly related to the writhing and frolicking (*Il*. 8.86),

P = *AP* 7.736.2,[363] which describes the much wandering life (περιπλάνιον βίον) of the addressee.[364] Leonidas' poetic persona seems to resonate here as the fisherman experiences the miseries of wandering, as this extraordinary tale in epigram proves its part in Leonidas' collection through a different sort of wandering. Each character in Leonidas' collection so shows his vulnerability to wandering's part in the human condition.

Although the entire scenario of man's humbling death while choking on a fish may seem inconceivable,[365] the language displays a vulgar attempt at realism contrary to the extraordinary event as the epigram flaunts itself as an ironic literary play. The characters' names, Parmis (Πάρμις, "steadfast")[366] and Gripon the fisherman (Γρίπων ὁ γριπεὺς, "Mr. Fisherman, the fisherman"), cue the reader toward understanding the seemingly real falseness of the event and the dramatic irony of Parmis' ill success. Leonidas' epigram is a caricature of realism that follows suit with the affected exercising of the genre in many of his other epigrams. The term for a reaper on shore (καλαμευτής) is a rare form used only four other times in Greek literature, three of which appear in the *Greek Anthology* and the last in Theocritus *Id*. 5.111 (wherein cicadas are said to provoke the "reapers on shore"), indicating the epigram's play on bucolicity, as Parmis wanders and gasps for breath.[367] Since he is a fisherman on shore and still meets his untimely, unexpected death, the term, literally from καλαμεύω, "to mow corn," emphasizes that even fishermen on land are vulnerable to death by wandering, regardless of how skilled or steadfast they seem. The fictional narrative operates within a frame of sepulchral eulogy, yet the

[363] This term is only in Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736 and in Nicander *Th*. 156; see Geffcken 1896: 122.
[364] Geffcken 1896: 121-122; Gow 1965b: 343; Gigante 1971: 51, 131; and Gutzwiller 1998a: 107 see the character in Leon. 33 G-P as a representation of the author.
[365] Gow (1965b: 372-373) assumed the epigram was based on far-fetched reality, as Clack (1999: 160-161) says, yet the name Γρίπων, disenchants, rather than "taxes," the credulity of the reader and evinces its form as "a Hellenistic literary endeavor;" cf. Combellack 1980: 223.
[366] If this name is short for Παρμένων (form of παραμένω, "to stand by") as Gow (1965b: 372) suggests, and so the name – a hapax – is most certainly purposeful.
[367] For cicadas as representative of music, see Leon.21 G-P = *AP* 7.198; for music and rusticity combining to create bucolicity, see Rossi 2001: 29-64.

stress on wandering highlights the incongruity of Parmis' heroic qualities and humbling death, revealing the poem's fiction as a grotesque parody of both heroic poetry and realism of epigram.[368] Regardless of how steadfast man's actions are, when likened to a fish, as here, they are in vain and so man is proved to be a frail being, left to wander until his fated end, just like other creatures. The epigram mirrors the fated end of the man by richly describing the narrative-like wandering as an attempt to escape fate, in short poetic form.

In Leon. 62 G-P = *AP* 7.273, Leonidas sets up a lexicographical and contextual relationship to the *Odyssey* that remarks on the role of wanderers at sea.

> Εὖρου με τρηχεῖα καὶ αἰπήεσσα καταιγὶς
> καὶ νὺξ καὶ δνοφερῆς κύματα πανδυσίης
> ἔβλαψ' Ὡρίωνος, ἀπώλισθον δὲ βίοιο
> Κάλλαισχρος Λιβυκοῦ μέσσα θέων πελάγευς.
> κἀγὼ μὲν πόντῳ δινεύμενος ἰχθύσι κύρμα
> οἴχημαι, ψεύστης δ' οὗτος ἔπεστι λίθος.
>
> A rough and sudden squall of the East wind / and night and the swells of the gloomy / full setting of Orion brought me down, / as I Callaeschrus glided away from life, / running through the middle of the Libyan sea. / On the one hand I, whirling around in the sea, / went as prey for fish, so on the other hand this stone set here is a liar.
>
> (Leon. 62 G-P = AP 7.273)

The subject of the epigram is a wandering sailor – not a hero, but instead a common member of the human race like so many who dared to journey through the sea's depths, suffering because of his powerless wandering.[369] This sort of powerlessness highlights his weakness and vulnerability as a sailor suffering at the hands of the sea and sky, while it poetically petrifies his wandering on

[368] Like the art of the period described in Zanker (1987: 155-227; 2004: 13-15), Leonidas' application of literal nomenclature and literary allusions in grand form and tradition parallels artistic representation rather than accurate description or report of people and events.

[369] Cf. Gutzwiller (1998a: 102), who argues that the rich/poor thematic concern for Leonidas is clear in the contrast between miserable end met at sea and the restful natural demise experienced by poor laborers like fishermen Theris (Leon. 20 G-P = *AP* 7.295) and Platthis (Leon. 72 G-P = *AP* 7.726), discussed in the previous chapter. The poverty is not mentioned in the epigram, and so invented by Gutzwiller; instead, the epigram stresses the similarity between the fish-pirate Theris (ἰχθυσιληιστῆρα) and his fellow community of fish-hunters (ἰχθυβόλων), who are all set to meet the same fate. In both of her examples, however, the subjects' occupations are their wandering, and so these epigrams show less a juxtaposition between rich and poor in his epigram collection; they coordinate in applying Leonidas' stylistic technique and in the suggestion that wandering is inescapable for humankind, since each member meets its inevitable, meager end represented by the art of epigram.

stone with the phrase πόντῳ δινεύμενος (literally, a "whirling motion at sea,"). The term δινεύμενος is reminiscent of the repetitive toil of weaving and wandering in Leonidas.[370] The verb (δινεύω), here as a participle, is often used to express wandering, as well as a repetitive whirling motion, as one paralyzed in a journey, and implies wandering a set path in other epigrams (δινευμένη…δόλιχον, Leon. 72 G-P = *AP* 7.726),[371] or alludes to part of paralyzing stopover during an epic journey as ἐδινεόμεθα in *Od*. 9.153. Thus the whirling motion is synonymous with the aimless, passive motion of wandering.

Suffering is part of the identity of wanderers in Leonidas, much as it is here for Callaeschrus, and Leonidas' epigrams interact with this tradition in Greek literature.[372] The epic tone of the action is set by the roughness (τρηχεῖα) of the squall that forces Callaeschrus to wander at the squall's mercy.[373] Like the total setting of the star Orion, Callaeschrus slips away from his life (ἀπώλισθον βίοιο) as if he were a setting star. Ironically, it is not the brightness of the star to which Callaeschrus is compared, but the sinking, passive motion of the star's setting. Leonidas emphasizes Callaeschrus' helpless motion by drawing a parallel between life slipping away and the downward fall of the star (πανδυσίης), which are ironically similar to the downward force of the squall (καταιγίς) ominous to Callaeschrus. The use of δνοφερῆς

---

[370] The whirling of the spindle (δινευμένη ἄχρις ἐπ' ἠοῦς,[370] "whirling until daybreak") is a wandering motion to and fro, repetitive during the day and night, and with little progression; the only eventual progression made is in the time approaching Platthis' death.

[371] For the equation of weaving and journeying see Pind. *P*. 9.17-18 …ἁ μὲν οὔθ' ἱ/στῶν παλιμβάμους ἐφίλησεν ὁδούς, …*she didn't like the paths of the loom that go to and fro*; Gow 1965b: 376.

[372] Montiglio (2005: 64-65) points out how wandering as a sort of suffering whose "action falls outside of human awareness," is a theme in the *Odyssey* and in Hesiod, as opposed to the *Iliad*, where the gods are more straightforward in dealing with men as they reveal their identity. As Odysseus relates in *Od*. 17.483-487, the gods, like strangers go from city to city, and are active wanderers as they examine or punish the violence and justice of men, whereas Odysseus speaking, a mere mortal, is the "suffering wanderer" with a certain passivity and vulnerability.

[373] τρηχεῖα, *rough*, as in *Od*. 9.27, *Od*. 5.425, or like Τετρηχυῖας in Leonidas 62.1 = *AP* 7.273.1, and in Leonidas 14 G-P = *AP* 7.665; Gow 1965b: 369-370; Philips (1972: 21-25) concludes that "regardless of if this verb derives from τρήχω or ταράσσω, because of its use with other epic words in the epigram οἰζυρὰ, rare epic ἐπιειμένος and τηλόσ', ἀχλύν, πτύω in describing the sea, the word is further evidence of L's practice of using epic diction to create an epic tone and texture in his sepulchral epigrams."

(gloomy) is a transferred epithet, since the adjective more regularly describes night, earth, and water, yet here describes the setting of Orion in Leon. 62.2-3 G-P.[374] The rare term δνοφερῆς is also used in *Od*. 13.269, wherein Odysseus, who has just landed in Ithaca tells false tales of his identity to Athena, as both characters are in disguise: νὺξ δὲ μάλα δνοφερὴ κάτεχ' οὐρανόν, οὐδέ τις ἥμεας / ἀνθρώπων ἐνόησε, λάθον δέ ἑ θυμὸν ἀπούρας (and the gloomy night covered the heaven, nor was any man aware of us, but I was hidden as I robbed him (Orsilochus) of his soul, *Od*. 13.269-270). In Leonidas' epigram, the adjective δνοφερῆς is positioned next to the waves (κύματα) and separated from night only by a conjunction (νὺξ καὶ δνοφερῆς), yet agrees with the setting (πανδυσίης) of the constellation. Through textual interplay, the poem provokes the reader to associate the all-destructive (πανδυσίης) nature of the season that destroys the speaker, with the deceitful cover of night and the destruction of Orsilochus, whom Odysseus cunningly claims to have killed in his previous wandering to Ithaca in a mask of deceit. The phrase is made prominent, since the epigram repositions and alters the common use of δνοφερὴ from νὺξ δὲ μάλα δνοφερὴ κάτεχ' οὐρανόν in *Od*. 13.269, to καὶ νὺξ καὶ δνοφερῆς κύματα πανδυσίης / ἔβλαψ' Ὡρίωνος to describe the setting of Orion rather than the setting of night in the second line of the epigram. The polysyndeton highlights his emendation of the phrase *gloomy night* to *gloomy setting*. Thus the epigram varies the use of the adjective from describing night, in an attempt to recall the common Homeric use, to develop the deceit of the epigram. The lie of the last line (κἀγὼ μὲν πόντῳ δινεύμενος ἰχθύσι κύρμα / οἴχημαι· ψεύστης δ' οὗτος ἔπεστι λίθος, *I have gone whirling in the sea as prey for fish, so*

[374] In *Il*. 9.15, δνοφερ- describes water of Agamemnon's tears, as he bemoans the state of Achaian forces; in Thgn. 243 it describes earth, as one goes under the gloomy earth to the die and maintain fame, like in Hes. *Th*. 736, 807; the adjective describes night in Hes. *Th*. 107, Pindar *fr*. 130.2, Soph. *El*. 91; cf. Simon. 37.8, describes grief in A. *Pers*. 536, connected to element of deceit or obscuring of vision in A. *Ch*. 811, A. *Eu*. 379, clod of earth in E. *IT*. 1266 and A.R. 3.1055. Later than Leonidas, this adjective is more often related to deceit, see in Oracula Sybillina 5.292, Plut. *Caes*. 69.5.4, etc.

this stone set here is a liar) is strengthened by the literary allusion to Odysseus' cunning while he wanders.

The last two lines of this epigram describe Callaeshrus' final state of wandering as food for fish, and again allude to the *Odyssey* to reinforce the theme of wandering. At *Od*. 15.480-481, Eumaeus describes the death of his father's Phoenician maidservant in Syrie who kidnapped Eumaeus and forced him to wander away into servitude before Laertes acquired him as his swineherd (*Od*. 15.390 ff.).[375] Leonidas' reuse of the line above directly correlates with Eumaeus' suffering in his wandering. Earlier, Eumaeus suggests as background to the story that wandering is suffering, and so establishes wandering/suffering as thematic context to the tale.

> …μετὰ γάρ τε καὶ ἄλγεσι τέρπεται ἀνήρ,
> ὅς τις δὴ μάλα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ πόλλ' ἐπαληθῇ.
> τοῦτο δέ τοι ἐρέω, ὅ μ' ἀνείρεαι ἠδὲ μεταλλᾷς.[376]
> νῆσός τις Συρίη κικλήσκεται, εἴ που ἀκούεις,
> Ὀρτυγίης καθύπερθεν, ὅθι τροπαὶ ἠελίοιο,
> οὔ τι περιπληθὴς λίην τόσον, ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ μέν
>
> …For a man takes delight in his own sorrows afterwards, / if he is one who has suffered very much and wandered far. / So I tell this to you, who inquires and so asks. / There is an island –a certain Syrie as it is called, perhaps you may have heard of it, / below Ortygia, where the sun makes its turnings, / not populous at all, but a good place…
>
> *(Od. 15.400-405)*

It is on account of the Phoenician woman's deceit that Eumaeus was forced to wander and take on a new identity. Callaeschrus emphasizes that his suffering is caused by wandering, and the allusion to Eumaeus in the *Odyssey* enhances the theme of wandering and the deceit of the stone.

---

[375] *Od*. 15.480-485; καὶ τὴν μὲν φώκῃσι καὶ ἰχθύσι κύρμα γενέσθαι
ἔκβαλον· αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ λιπόμην ἀκαχήμενος ἦτορ.
τοὺς δ' Ἰθάκῃ ἐπέλασσε φέρων ἄνεμός τε καὶ ὕδωρ,
ἔνθα με Λαέρτης πρίατο κτεάτεσσιν ἑοῖσιν.
οὕτω τήνδε τε γαῖαν ἐγὼν ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι.
…and so they threw this woman overboard to become bait for fish and pinnipeds / but I was left alone to grieve in my heart. / So both the current and wind drew these men to Ithaca, / and there Laertes bought me for himself with his own possessions. / This is how I saw this land with my own eyes.

[376] Note that *Od*. 15.400-401 links wandering with suffering in the introduction to his story; could this epigram allude to Leonidas' kinship with Eumaeus, a poor, poet forced to wander from his home? Similar diction in Leonidas' "autobiographical" epigrams, describes his life as περιπλάνιον βίον Leon.33.1 G-P = *AP* 7.736; cf. πλάνης…Λεωνίδεω in Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300.

The stone in Leonidas' epigram, like the woman in *Od*. 15.480-481 is deceptive, since it compounds two incongruous stories, as it jointly leaves the permanent impression that Callaeschrus is buried under the stone, and also that Callaeschrus is still wandering at sea. The epigrammatic quality is the subtle revelation of its false pretense as a real inscription, and the manipulation of the reader's expectation, as the reader is left to pick apart its literary allusions, and discover Leonidas' reinvention of Odyssean themes in a different context. In Leonidas' ornate application of allusion and rich narrative to the genre of sepulchral epigram, he stretches the bounds of the genre and emphasizes wandering as he does throughout many of his epigrams.

Another example of sea-roaming as a sort of wandering that is also linked with suffering through Homeric allusion in the epigram below (Leonidas 65 G-P = *AP* 7.506). The protagonist of this epigram dies by fish, and wanders to his death, just like Parmis in the epigram discussed above (Leon. 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504). Here, however, rather than ingesting a fish, Tharsys is divided in two by an epic-like narrative about a devouring fish.

> Κὴν γῇ καὶ πόντῳ κεκρύμμεθα· τοῦτο περισσὸν
> ἐκ Μοιρέων Θάρσυς Χαρμίδου ἠνυσάμην.
> ἦ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀγκύρης ἔνοχον βάρος εἰς ἅλα δύνων
> Ἰόνιόν θ' ὑγρὸν κῦμα κατερχόμενος
> τὴν μὲν ἔσωσ', αὐτὸς δὲ μετάτροπος ἐκ βυθοῦ ἔρρων
> ἤδη καὶ ναύταις χεῖρας ὀρεγνύμενος,
> ἐβρώθην· τοίόν μοι ἐπ' ἄγριον εὖ μέγα κῆτος
> ἦλθεν, ἀπέβροξεν δ' ἄχρις ἐπ' ὀμφαλίου.
> χἤμισυ μὲν ναῦται, ψυχρὸν βάρος ἐξ ἁλὸς ἡμῶν
> ἤρανθ' ἥμισυ δὲ πρίστις ἀπεκλάσατο·
> ᾐόνι δ' ἐν ταύτῃ κακὰ λείψανα Θάρσυος, ὦνερ,
> ἔκρυψαν, πάτρην δ' οὐ πάλιν ἱκόμεθα.
>
> We have been buried both on land and on sea – this is an extraordinary thing! / - that Tharsys son of Charmides obtained this from the Fates. / For when I dove into the sea as a weight subject to the anchor, / and descending the wet Ionion swell, / the anchor, on the one hand, I saved, but I myself while turning about moved laboriously out of the depth, / and immediately while stretching [my] hands to sailors / I was devoured. Such a savage very great sea-monster / came and gulped me down up to my bellybutton. / On the one hand half of me – a cold weight - the sailors took up from the the sea / and half the sawfish broke off, but on this shore they buried the accursed remains of Tharsys, sir, / and we arrived back home not in one piece.
>
> (Leon. 65 G-P = *AP* 7.506)

The paradox is evident; the man is simultaneously buried both on land and in the sea, a state highlighted by its extraordinary nature (τοῦτο περισσὸν). Wandering lies within the frustrated movement of the man in one piece, as stated in the fifth line: *but I myself while turning about moved laboriously out of the depth* (αὐτὸς δὲ μετάτροπος ἐκ βυθοῦ ἔρρων). The man's movments and outstretched hands prove to be in vain, since he and his efforts fell victim to a devouring fish (ἐβρώθην). The anguish within the man's frustrated movement introduces a rich allusive narrative surrounding the extraordinary event.

The use of μετάτροπος recalls Odysseus' epithet πολύτροπον in *Odyssey* 1.1, but here a different sort of epic hero is at the mercy of his wandering.[377] Altering the compound's prefix highlights the frustrated, helpless motion of the voice which was hopeless as its owner wandered to meet his death out of the sea's deep (ἐκ βυθοῦ ἔρρων), while he is forever stuck within it. Ironically, half of Tharsys is deprived of the help of his companions, as it is left to wander (ἔρρων), like Menelaus tells as part of his *nostos*,[378] stormbound off the coast of Egypt, wandering and deprived of the help of his companions (ἥ μ' οἴῳ ἔρροντι συνήντετο νόσφιν ἑταίρων, *Od*. 4.367). The buried half is accursed, as he is left to narrate the tale with no real return home, while the forced wandering of the unburied half is central to narration of the sepulchral epigram.

The man reaching out his hands to his fellow sailors (ναύταις χεῖρας ὀρεγνύμενος), although a standard gesture of supplication, lexicographically mimics Priam reaching out his

[377] *Od*. 1.1-2 Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ / πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε·; Callimachus too refashions the heroic epithet μετάτροπος for the wandering Leto in Call. *Del*. 99; see Mineur 1984:130.

[378] De Jong (2001: 106-107) describes this "if-not" section of Menelaus' *nostos* as closest to Odysseus' meeting with Hermes in 10.275-309, in the intervention of Eidothea, daughter of Proteus, Egyptian sea god, who assists Menelaus in overcoming Proteus with the help of his companions, so he can journey home.

hands to Hector, in an attempt to prevent unavoidable fate.[379] Since the man's body is not buried properly in this epigram (the remains are actually accursed, κακὰ λείψανα), the effect is mock-heroic, much like the body that is broken off (ἀπεκλάσατο)[380] by a sawfish. The enjambment intensifies the grotesque explanation of the man's divided state that results from his reaching out his hands, as he reveals in the first person passive that he was then devoured (ἐβρώθην). The passive voice marks the speaker's helplessness caused by wandering away from his fellow sailors. The mock-heroic tone places the fictive subject matter in an epic-like narrative, yet ironically bereft of *nostos*. Literary allusion assists in highlighting the role of suffering wanderers in Leonidas' epigrams.

IV. Water Travel and the Final Descent to the Underworld

Leonidas' epigrams regularly exhibit not just suffering wanderers on sea, but also provide more of a direct link between wandering while sailing and the approach toward death, as can be seen in Leon. 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264:

> Εἴη ποντοπόρῳ πλόος οὔριος· ὅν δ' ἄρ' ἀήτης,
> ὡς ἐμέ τοῖς Ἀίδεω προσπελάσῃ λιμέσιν
> μεμφέσθω μὴ λαῖτμα κακόξενον ἀλλ' ἕο τόλμαν
> ὅστις ἀφ' ἡμετέρου πείσματ' ἔλυσε τάφου.
>
> Would that there be a good weather for a man traveling by sea; and if a gale should bring him / to the harbors of Hades, as it did me / may he not then censure the gulf for being unfriendly to a stranger, but his own recklessness, / whoever loosened his cables from my grave.
>
> (Leon. 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264)

[379] *Il*. 22.37, ὃ γέρων ἐλεεινὰ προσηύδα χεῖρας ὀρεγνύς and to Achilles in 24.506 ἀνδρὸς παιδοφόνοιο ποτὶ στόμα χεῖρ' ὀρέγεσθαι; or like Achilles to his mother in *Il*. 1.351 πολλὰ δὲ μητρὶ φίλῃ ἠρήσατο χεῖρας ὀρεγνύς·; Gow 1965b: 371.
[380] The parodic tone of this term is clear also in Arist. *fr*. 109.3; Arist. *V*. 564; Theoc. *Id*. 22.14; Posidippus A-B 19.3.

When sailors are setting out to sea, they are frequently swept away by storm, wind, or water, not directly "to death" but appropriately "to the harbors of Hades" (ποντοπόρῳ … ὡς ἐμέ, τοῖς Ἀίδεω προσπελάσῃ λιμέσι, *…for a man traveling by sea…as with me, a gale brought me to the harbors of Hades*, Leonidas 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264). The term ποντοπόρῳ ("to a man traveling by sea") in Leonidas 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264, which is epic in tone,[381] to whom the above poem is addressed, is compounded from ποντος + πορεύω "traversing by sea," yet the compounded portion could just as easily have derived from the word for *passage* (πόρος), a derivative of πείρω, to cleave one's way through,[382] like one struggling in water travel. There are few exceptions that apply this word to modify something other than a ship,[383] but here the masculine suggests a sailor of some sort is the addressee. The "fair weather" and the "cleaving one's way by sea" as well as the προσπελάσῃ ("forced me to wander") suggest that the wishes for control over one's voyage are impossible; one of this word's previously few uses in *Od*. 9.295 is certainly an ironic allusion to the wandering/suffering at sea in this epigram, since Odysseus describes his escape from near death to Polyphemus, after Poseidon drove his ship against a cliff.[384] Here the man like Odysseus is forced to wander, yet without escape and without any *nostos*, except for the short epigram that warns others of his plight at sea.

The opening address to one embarking on sea-faring is juxtaposed with the final presence

---

[381] Twenty of its two hundred applications are in Homeric epics, one in the Milan Papyrus, A-B 91, and only two in the *Greek Anthology,* here in Leon. 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264 and of unknown ascription and not included in the Gow-Page *Hellenistic Epigrams* in *AP* 9.675. In the Alexandrian period, it is used in Moschus' Europa line 49 of the sea-faring bull; see Philips (1972: 20, 100-102) on epic tone of Leonidas' lexical variations. With this word, which refutes that Leonidas was simply interested in bombastic, ornamental language, but proves conscious of his variations.

[382] E.g. *Il*. 24.8; *Od*. 8.183; *Od*. 2.434; A.R. 2.326, 398.

[383] Philips 1972: 167n166; e.g. *Il*. 2.771, *Od*. 12.95, Hes. *WD* 628; Hom. *Ep*. 8.1.

[384] Od. 9.284-286; πρὸς πέτρῃσι βαλὼν ὑμῆς ἐπὶ πείρασι γαίης, / ἄκρῃ προσπελάσας· ἄνεμος δ' ἐκ πόντου ἔνεικεν·/ αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ σὺν τοῖσδε ὑπέκφυγον αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον, "*and so he threw my [ship] against the rocks at the borders of this land, forcing me to wander to this cliff; and the wind of the sea held [my ship], but I with these fled steep destruction*."; cf. Philips (1972: 20-21) deprived of the advantages of the TLG reports the use in the Odyssey to be the only usage preceding Leonidas', overlooking Aesop (*Fab*. 6.1, et al.), and Callimachus *fr*. 251.18, 24, and others among some philosophical texts.

of the tomb as an ominous warning; the poetically imagined inscription is all that remains of the life speaking from the tomb, on account of the speaker's own sea-faring. There is a certain amount of boldness in those attempting the sea frequently (μεμφέσθω … ἀλλ' ἔο τόλμαν / ὅστις ἀφ' ἠμετέρου πείσματ' ἔλυσε τάφου., *then censure… his recklessness, / whoever loosens his cables from my grave*, Leon. 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264), yet tombstones present themselves as ominous symbols of the fate of short-lived humanity, persistently attempting at sea-voyages. Thus, life as wandering on water is a natural metaphor for the final approach toward death.

Thematic wandering and literary allusion are also present in the journey to the underworld recommended in Leon. 79 G-P = Stob. 4.52.28.[385] The εὔθυμος[386] of the first line also reechoes that in *Od*. 14.63, where Eumaeus, to the disguised Odysseus, ironically describes

[385] See appendix for full poem; the epigram is preserved in book four of Stobaeus, in a section entitled "praise of death." Leonidas's epigram is placed between similar phrases, one extolling the benefits of dying young in Menander and on the sufficiency of a simple lifestyle in a fragment quoted from Euripides' *Philoctetes*. The relationship between this poem and Diogenes Laertius' life of Bion, and so Cynic philosophy, is well noted. Gow states that Leonidas is directly "versifying an apophthegm of Bion recorded in Diog. L. 4.49," an itinerant Cynic preacher and philosopher for the court of Antigonus Gonatas. Other scholars have noted this poem for its Cynic sentiments; Gutzwiller 1998: 104; Gow 1965b: 383; See Gigante 1971: 11 for questions about attribution of this epigram to Leonidas. Leonidas' incorporation of recycled epic and archaic diction pushes this epigram beyond the limits of the world of Cynic philosophy and shows that Leonidas is setting himself within the literary tradition by refashioning that tradition with elements of Cynicism. The apophthegm of Bion is within a section of his biography (Diogenes Laertius 4.49), a part of a short discussion of types of Bion's literary works and collection of sayings; the apophthegm reads εὔκολον / ἔφασκε τὴν εἰς ᾅδου ὁδόν· καταμύοντας γοῦν ἀπιέναι, *he said that the road to Hades is easy, at least for those who are drooping to go away*. The first line of Leonidas' epigram, although similar in sentiment, does not mimic the apophthegm directly. Leonidas seems to mimic the prominent placement of εὔκολον ("easy") that describes the road with the adjective εὔθυμος, which describes the traveler's expected "cheerful" attitude as he meets his death; the refashioned wordplay seems altogether an ironic stress on the emotional state of the traveler, happy to meet his end. In an earlier section of the *Life of Bion*, Diogenes Laertius describes Bion as πολύτροπος, an adjective other Cynics have translated allegorically, and Kindstrand (1976) cites as transferred from Odysseus who is the "patron saint" of the Cynic school, to the Cynic philosopher Bion (Antisthenes in Porphyrius *Schol. ad Od*. 1.1 = *fr*. 51 (see Caizzi 1964: 74ff.): ἐπιστάμενοι δὲ πολλοὺς τρόπους λόγων περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πολύτροποι ἄν εἶεν; Kindstrand (1976: 134-135) on Buffiére 1956: 367 and Pépin 1958: 108. With his many allusions to the epics of Homer, Leonidas seems instead to uphold the act of traveling, wandering, as similar to that in the *Odyssey*, and so revere the epic, rather than Odysseus as a "patron saint" of his epigrams. Thus it is not necessarily the "Cynic" identification of Odysseus to which Leonidas alludes, but instead the allusions stress the thematic prevalence of wanderers and Leonidas' literary play on the topic. Leonidas is not simply quoting cynic or Cynic sentiments, but he is manipulating Greek literature, inverting and subverting the themes of epic, classical, and archaic literature and philosophy to suit his collection and its narrative themes.

[386] As Gow suggests, εὔθυμος alludes also to Pindar *O*. 5.22, in which the adjective modifies the end of life as a journey. Leonidas emphasizes the pleasant journey toward the underworld, downward, as opposed to the upward struggle of life. Old age in Leonidas is frequently miserable wandering that the epigrams urge to be abandoned in order to find a sort of enjoyment, as in Leon. 78 G-P = *AP* 7.731, 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715, 71 G-P = *AP* 7.466.

the accursed homecoming of his "cheerful," or benevolent, master, as Eumaeus kindly hosts Odysseus and urges that all guests and wandering vagabonds should be hosted with care.[387] According to Eumaeus in this scene, wanderers are treated with care since all mankind is set to wandering until they meet their time of death, which is a direct, and easy route. In the Odyssean context, Eumaeus expresses the sentiments about wandering common in many epigrams of Leonidas, yet here, Leonidas emphasizes that the cheerful conclusion of suffering wandering comes with death. The poem exhorts one to row to Hades with good spirit, since the course is not errant, again equating living life and wandering. Let us focus on the diction related to travel in this epigram: ἔρεσσε (row), δύσβατος (impassable), ἀταρπὸν ἕρπων (creeping along a path), πλάνης (wandering), ἰθεῖα (straight path), κατακλινὴς (downward path), ὁδεύεται (it is traversed). The epigram strongly insists on a relationship between traveling and death.

The poem's structure mimics one rowing through life eventually arriving at Hades, as the middle two lines oppose each other with each leg of the trip. The first part of the journey in lines 2-3 contains three litotical phrases that narrate the path as metaphor for journey in tricolon crescendo building toward utter wandering; the journey is not impassible (οὐ γάρ ἐστι δύσβατος), not oblique (οὐδὲ σκαληνὸς), nor full of wandering (οὐδ' ἐνίπλεος πλάνης), described with the alliterative arsis of each of the last two feet. The poem then shifts toward three positive phrases that narrate the trip downward, as if the absence of the negative provides a more direct route. The concluding verb finalizes the journey with a sense of accomplishment (ὁδεύεται, it is traversed).

[387] *Od*. 14. 55-67.

The mock-epic diction of ἀταρπὸν is set within a greater literary narrative theme of wandering related to the persona of Leonidas, as well as the collection of his poetry.[388] The ἀταρπὸν is a journey nonetheless, but with an objective of ending life, thus being free from difficulty and wandering. The poem is advisory, moralizing, meant to instruct the reader with its commands, and notes its importance through literary allusion. It seems then that death is a journey with an objective and strong sense of direction, whereas life is an aimless pursuit. The paradoxical wandering is that it is like a living dead, as in Leonidas' autobiographical epitaph.[389]

Leonidas' own epitaph stresses wandering as repetitive motion in life that inevitably approaches death, like the watery descent to death described above. The absence of heroic reward for toil in wandering ironically portrays the antithesis of the *nostos* in Leonidas' epigrams, since sailing home is either an impossible reality or humbling fate endowed with meager notoriety,[390] an ironic comment that the characters' respective fate is remembered only by these short poems. For Leonidas, who reports to have died far from his native home in Tarentum in Leon. 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715 without commemoration from his kin, his own role as a wanderer is reflected in his distance from the watery gulf of Tarentum.

Πολλὸν ἀπ᾽ Ἰταλίης κεῖμαι χθονὸς ἔκ τε Τάραντος

---

[388] Philips (1972: 122 ff.) does not point out such a larger thematic contexts, as he discusses the history of the word ἄταρπος and how the word is used in *Iliad, Odyssey*, and Alcman, then falls out until Apollonius Rhodius *Argonautika* 2.138, and suggests that it retains the Homeric associations of a difficult path, and its use by Leonidas "as an easy road to death is ambivalent and evidence of the use of an epic form for purposes of irony (124)." He also notes the repetition of the word in ἀταρπιτός in Leon. 27 G-P = *AP* 9.316. Overall, the use of the word and its derivatives provide for a mock-epic tone. See also Leon. 74 G-P = *AP* 7. 480.8 where ἀτραπιτοῦ is used on a grave whose skeleton is visible on account of a path cut through the grave. For this form see *Argonautica* 4.123, where it describes the path used by Jason and Medea to reach the sacred grove, where the golden fleece was hung (125). This mock-epic diction, Philips argues, creates intellectual tension between author and reader by stressing the elements of irony, incongruity, and wit (134).

[389] τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἄβιος βίος, such is the lifeless life of wanderers, Leon. 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715.

[390] Such is the case for thrice-old Theris, who dies alone in his hut, commemorated by a coterie of fishermen in 20 G-P = *AP* 7.295; see the argument of Guidorizzi (1977: 69-76) esp. 70-74 about Theris in 20 G-P, whose actively mobile sea life is embodied by the language in the first eight lines, that abruptly ends with his death and commemoration in the last two lines. I argue, however, that Theris' life was his heroic wandering craft, but his death is that of a poor fisherman, and so the epigram doesn't necessarily elevate poverty to heroic stature, but instead shows it as a literary expression of the meager fate of man.

πάτρης, τοῦτο δέ μοι πικρότερον θανάτου.
τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἄβιος βίος, ἀλλά με Μοῦσαι
ἔστερξαν, λυγρῶν δ' ἀντὶ μελιχρὸν ἔχω,
οὔνομα δ' οὐκ ἤμυσε Λεωνίδου· αὐτά με δῶρα
κηρύσσει Μουσέων πάντας ἐπ' ἠελίους.

Far from the land of Italy I lie, and far from Tarentum, / [my] homeland, and this thing itself is more bitter to me than death, / such is the lifeless life of those who wander, but the Muses loved me, / and I have something honey-sweet instead of gloomy things. So the name of Leonidas did not perish; these gifts of the Muses proclaim me for all days.

(Leon. 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715)

The first line describes the distance of his burial, and so presumed travel, from the Italian land, much like one buried at sea, far from shore.[391] The bitterness (πικρότερον θανάτου) expressed about his distance traveled parallels the struggles suffered by other wanderers' lives in his epigrams. In his distance from the Italian land (Πολλὸν ἀπ' Ἰταλίης κεῖμαι χθονὸς), no alternative resting place is mentioned, and so the burial site is ambiguously either on land or in the sea. The "lifeless life of wanderers"[392] is the expectation of being buried far from one's homeland, as occurs so frequently in sea-themed epigrams;[393] πλανίος, an original coining of Leonidas,[394] stresses both the importance of the wandering theme and its literary quality,[395] since

[391] Leon. 63 G-P = *AP* 7.283, Τετρηχυῖα θάλασσα, τί μ' οὐκ οἰζυρὰ παθόντα / τηλόσ' ἀπὸ ψιλῆς ἔπτυσας ἠιόνος, *Agitated sea, why did you not disgorge (ἔπτυσας) me, a woeful sufferer, / at a [closer] distance from a barren bank?*; Leon. 65 G-P = AP 7.506, Κὴν γῇ καὶ πόντῳ κεκρύμμεθα …πάτρην δ' οὐ πάλιν ἱκόμεθα, *We have been buried both on land and on sea …we have not returned to our homeland*; Leon. 62 G-P = *AP* 7.273, κἀγὼ μὲν πόντῳ δινεύμενος ἰχθύσι κύρμα / οἴχημαι· ψεύστης δ' οὗτος ἔπεστι λίθος, *as I wandering have come as prey for fishes, so on the other hand a liar is this stone here*; Compare transferred phrase with τὶ…πλώοντ' οὐ πολλῇ νηὶ, *why did you throw [Teleutagoras mourned by gulls who sailed] on not a very big ship* in Leon. 15.2 G-P = *AP* 7.652.2, and Leon. 20 G-P, οὐχὶ πολυσκάλμου πλώτορα ναυτιλίης rower of a boat of few oars, of Theris who dies in his hut, so the litotes of both phrases seem to imply that the boat is for travelling not far but short distances.

[392] I offer a most literal translation of the Greek here, since it most clearly reflects the paradoxical language of wandering, πλανίων ἄβιος βίος; cf. Gow (1965b: 391) insists ἄβιος correlates with its later meaning "destitute," which strips away the nuance encapsulated in the language of wandering.

[393] Leon. 14 G-P = *AP* 7.665; 15 G-P = *AP* 7.652; 16 G-P = *AP* 7.655; 62 G-P = *AP* 7.273; 63 G-P = *AP* 7.283; 64 G-P = *AP* 7.503; 65 G-P = *AP* 7.506.

[394] As Philips (1972: 293-294) shows.

[395] Clack (1999: 177-178) insists that the epitaph does not reflect biographical life of Leonidas, but instead should be interpreted as a more literary posture; cf. Geffcken (1896: 12) argued that the poem authentically represents some aspect of Leonidas' life; Gutzwiller (1998:108-109), partly following Geffcken, although he rejected the ascription to Leonidas of Tarentum, sees this epigram as a discussion of his own exile, and focuses on the Cynic moralizing in Leonidas' epitaph, as if he is part Cynic philosopher and part poet. I agree with her assessment of Gigante (1971:

Muses will proclaim his poetic technique of wandering. The eternity mentioned in the last line (πάντας ἐπ' ἠελίους, *for all days*) stresses the final end to the wandering journey of his characters, including himself,[396] but also the poetic commemoration of Leonidas and his characters as wandering in a lifeless sort of life on land or sea.[397] The autobiographical epitaph urges readers to reflect on the theme of wandering, water travel, and commemoration of death through poetry, as resonant in his other epigrams.

V. Conclusion: Nautical Epigrams and Leonidas' Collection

The theme of wandering allows for coordination between many epigrams, since the sort of motionless motion is like reading. In this chapter, I have shown how the theme of wandering recurs among Leonidas' nautical epigrams, and how the individual epigrams in his collection coordinate to express Leonidas' bookish style through literary allusions, ornate language, and their similarity to epigrams of his contemporaries in the Hellenistic period. The plethora of Homeric and other literary allusions within the theme both emphasize wandering's presence, and present a challenge to the reader to interpret each short poem and its relationship to other poems. Wandering is established as a dominant theme in the poetic persona that Leonidas presents for himself as a wandering poet, as the many other subjects of his epigrams reflect. In the following chapter, we will examine how the theme of wandering engages the reader further, and so allows for further thematic coordination throughout Leonidas' *corpus* of epigrams.

---

20) that this epigram is authentically Leonidas' of Tarentum, and I am greatly indebted to her discussion that the wandering theme of this epigram resonates in his other "autobiographical" epigrams, yet it is more constructive to analyze wandering as a literary theme to his corpus than as cynic moralizing or as a reflection of his own biographical poverty or exile.

[396] Perhaps mimicking Leonidas' last line is that of Dionysius 2.5-6 G-P = *AP* 7.716.5-6, οὐδὲν ὅμοιον ἐπεσσομένοισιν ἀοιδὸς / φθέγξεται, ἀνθρώπους ἄχρι φέρωσι πόδες, *no singer of the same sort will ever sing to people of future generations, as long as men walk the earth*; Gow 1965b: 231-233.

[397] Gutzwiller (1998a: 108) argues that this poem might have been an epilogue to the collection.

Chapter 4: Wandering Through Pairs in the Collection

Throughout the one hundred and three epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum, there are a number of elements that hint at a general coordination of the poems to form a cohesive unit. Leonidas' work is preserved within the *Greek Anthology*, a group of epigrams collected in the 13th century from a number of other anthologies;[398] on account of this divided preservation, coherency of Leonidas' work as a whole poetry book is often doubted. With the discovery of the new Posidippus, which preserves his epigrams in book form at a date close to Leonidas' own *floruit*, it seems plausible that other authors, such as Leonidas, formed their own epigrams into collections.[399] Leonidas's poems seem to share section headings similar to those of Posidippus, (e.g. nautically-themed epigrams, dedications, epitaphs, statues, and characters), although he stresses a few others not treated by Posidippus, such as epigrams related to rusticity, craftsmen and women (such as weavers, gardeners, and fishermen), and epitaphs specifically for authors, among others.[400] Beyond these categories, pairs can be detected in Leonidas' epigrams that seem to reference one another.[401] These pairings set up a dialogue between the poems to elucidate some shared story, theme, or principle. Robert Kirstein has called poems such as these "companion pieces" and has identified a few within the Hellenistic epigrams of the *Greek*

[398] Cameron (1993: 29) says that these greater anthologies, such as Meleager's *Garland*, the *Planudeian Anthology*, and others, were based on a system of organization which aimed at variety rather than homogeneity.
[399] Gutzwiller (1998: 88): "The most likely date for the publication of Leonidas' collection was the second quarter of the third century, although he may have been composing epigrams from shortly after 300 BC." Gutzwiller (2005: 2) states that the copy date for the new Posidippus was in the late third century BC (c. 280-240 BC); Gigante 1971: 16-18; cf. Gow 1958: 113-115.
[400] The categories which divide the sections of the new Posidippus: λιθικά (1-20, stones), οἰνωσκοπικά (21-35, omens), ἀναθεματικά (36-41, dedications), ἐπιτύμβια (42-61, epitaphs), ἀνδριαντοποικά (62-70, statues), ἱππικα (71-88, horse racing), ναυαγικά (89-94, shipwrecks), ἰαματικά (cures), τρόποι (102-109, characters).
[401] I am less certain about the nature of the categories surrounding the pairs, since Leonidas probably organized his collection with categories that varied from those of Posidippus, or those offered in the Greek Anthology. Lest we be distracted by others categories, I offer only a few recommendations about which categories are more definitive than others.

Anthology by Theocritus and Callimachus.[402] Leonidas shows so many examples of these "companion pieces" that this coordination may have been a principle of organization of his entire book. The pairs not only unify the epigrams as members of a collection, but also assert their literary bookishness, and serve to engage the reader in the corpus as a whole, in the various stories these epigrams wish to tell and in the life of the author himself.

Within the epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum, Gutzwiller has already suggested that there was a "unifying thread not of subject matter, [like Cameron mentions of the Meleagrean and Planudeian anthologies] but of the perspective of the creative artist who shares in the lower-class values of his subjects."[403] His poetry book, according to Gutzwiller, would have expressed a "class ideology," one which is masked when the poems are analyzed as part of Meleager's organization, but quite evident when the epigrams are examined as a whole.[404] I would like to take Gutzwiller's argument in a different direction. Leonidas' epigrams focus not necessarily on class ideology, but on a selection of themes, such as wandering and poverty, that stress his literary technique of incorporating realism into an epigram collection that sought its own unique place within the Greek literary tradition.[405] The literary quality of the epigrams is made most

---

[402] Kirstein (2002: 114-135) examines *Parallelepigramme* with Callimachus 21 & 35 Pf. (29-30 G-P), (121ff.) *Fortsetzungsepigramme* with Theocritus 7-8 G-P = *AP* 7.658, 659, and (128ff.) *Parallelepigramme* with Ammianus *AP* 11.230 & 231 in more detail, and briefly cites Leonidas of Tarentum *AP* 7.264 and 266, Dioscorides *AP* 7.37 and 707, and Simias *AP* 7.21 and 22, as well as *AP* 7.710 and 712 as *Forsetzungsepigramme* if both of these are by Erinna. Kirstein (126) examines also how Martial in 2.91 and 2.92 uses the technique, as a development from his Greek predecessors.

[403] Gutzwiller (1998a: 91). Notably, she cites Weisshaupl, who argued that Melager himself copied the epigrams from poetic collections, although not necessarily by each of the individual authors themselves; cf. Cameron 1993.

[404] Gutzwiller 1998a: 91; cf. Brauer (1986: 117): "...his [Leonidas'] savage treatment of poor folk was a literary duplication of the taste of bronze and ceramic figures of slaves, dwarfs, drunken old women and hunchbacks that flourished in Asia Minor and Alexandria." See Fowler 1989: 100 for *pathos* brought out by contrast as result of cynical approach to poetry of Leonidas and art of the Hellenistic period.

[405] I argue that Leonidas uses a sort of philosophical realism both as a source of literary innovation and philosophical statement about the wandering nature of everyday life, as humans move errantly yet habitually toward death. Zanker (1987: 155-227) explores the innovation on realism among Alexandrian poets such as Aratus and also Philetas, and sees its application among Hellenistic poets as special attention to detail on the familiar or everyday; cf. Cox (1919: 438-459, esp. 451) argues that realism is a philosophy and an attitude toward life, without literary

evident in the dialogues presented in the pairing of epigrams. These dialogues serve to unify Leonidas' epigrams into book form by involving the reader in the artistic rendering of everyday lives of characters, and so the reader shares in in their everyday wandering.[406]

Using groupings similar to those in Kirstein's discussion of "companion pieces," I will analyze pairs in Leonidas according to category. Kirstein noticed three types of companion pieces prominent in various epigrams: *Parallelepigramme* (parallel epigrams), *Fortsetzungsepigramme* (continuation epigrams), and epigrams connected by word pun.[407] Pairing epigrams in such a way is a literary technique common to the Hellenistic period, as many other scholars have suggested.[408] Scodel also provides support for companion pieces in the corpus of Callimachus that "invite readers to consider the entire corpus of Callimachean poetry;"[409] Bettenworth notes similar elements in the same epigrams of Callimachus, while noting the existence of such a trend among inscribed epigrams as well.[410] With companion pieces, Leonidas similarly innovates upon inscribed epigram as a demonstration of his own

---

technic. Leonidas' application of realism is certainly literary and also applies philosophical argument, and so Leonidas' use sits within both of their arguments about the definition of realism.

[406] Gigante (1971: 120) says that Leonidas' characterizations are "a dense synthesis of Magna Graecia" and the indication of regular baroque form arising in the Hellenistic period. Thus the ideology preserved within his epigrams is sought through this dense synthesis.

[407] Kirstein 2002: 114. Peek (1960: 33-35) shows such a practice of pairing among grave poetry of the 5th and 4th centuries BC, yet calls the pairing either a form of "Konkurrenzgedichten" (poetic competition) or "Ergänzungsgedichte" (complement poems). Perhaps this practice proves to be another innovation of Hellenistic poets on inscribed epigram. After all, this practice of dialogue between poetic sections, individual poems, in a competitive or complementary way is also found outside of inscriptions and in a literary setting of oral texts, with Homeric rhapsodes as a means of embellishing poetry; on competitive motivation of variation of Homeric verses, see Nagy 1996: 18; Pl. *Ion* 530d 6-9.

[408] See Peek 1960:33; Bing 1995; Rossi 2001: 12, cited in Bettenworth 2007: 78-79; Murray & Rowland (2007: 221-223) show the intratextual dialogue between Erinna 1 & 2 G-P = *AP* 7.710 & 712; Gutzwiller (2007a: 330-331) shows the technique in Meleager 27 G-P = *AP* 5.172, 173; Nisbet (2007: 363-364), in skoptic epigram of Lucillius, who uses pairs as "humorous acknowledgement that he has missed the boat."

[409] Scodel (2003: 257-268) examines Callimachus 29, 30 G-P = *AP* 7.525, 415 to prove how Callimachus uses pairing to make clear certain literary qualities that he as poet does and does not have (257-262); Scodel also uses epigrams ascribed to Plato in the Greek Anthology (*AP* 5.80, 79) to prove another element of bookishness in such pairing that plays with inscriptional elements to invite attention to the process of reading.

[410] Bettenworth (2007: 78-79), like Scodel (2003: 257-68) examines Callimachus 29, 30 G-P = *AP* 7.525, 415, as well as a third or second century inscription from Miletus (*GVI* 1344).

literary technique, and to achieve an organizational quality in his epigrams much akin to that sought by his Hellenistic contemporaries.

I. Nautically-themed Pairs

Kirstein notes evidence of companion pieces among epigrams 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264 and 61 G-P = *AP* 7.266 of Leonidas.[411] As discussed in the previous chapter, there are a number of sea-themed epigrams that stress the suffering of wanderers at sea. Throughout all of the sea-themed poems, Leonidas retains his existential discussion of the well-lived life, and these poems may reference one another. Each of the following epigrams provides advice to sailors heading out to sea, in much of the same manner.

> Εἴη ποντοπόρῳ πλόος οὔριος· ὅν δ' ἄρ' ἀήτης,
> ὡς ἐμέ τοῖς Ἀίδεω προσπελάσῃ λιμέσιν
> μεμφέσθω μὴ λαῖτμα κακόξενον ἀλλ' ἕο τόλμαν
> ὅστις ἀφ' ἡμετέρου πείσματ' ἔλυσε τάφου.
>
> Would that there be a good weather for a man traveling by sea; and if a gale should bring him / to the harbors of Hades, as it did me / may he not then censure the gulf for being unfriendly to a stranger, but his own recklessness, / whoever loosens his cables from my grave.
>
> (Leon. 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264)

> Ναυηγοῦ τάφος εἰμὶ Διοκλέος· οἱ δ' ἀνάγονται,
> φεῦ τόλμης, ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πείσματα λυσάμενοι.
>
> I am the tomb of the sailor Diocles; yet in spite of this they set sail, /oh out of recklessness, loosening their ship cables from me!
>
> (Leon. 61 G-P = *AP* 7.266)

Kirstein briefly mentions that the epigrams above are "companion pieces" (although he doesn't specify which type) since they are "each designed for a shipwreck victim," and because one explains the other by providing a proper name (Diocles) in the absence of name on the other epigram. According to Kirstein's argument, "companion pieces" seem to have originally been

[411] Kirstein 2002: 131.

read one after the other to make evident their parallels to the reader.[412] Although I agree with Kirstein that the organization of Meleager is unable to represent Leonidas' own ordering of the poems, he did not necessarily organize the epigrams directly next to their corresponding companion piece. Considering that there are a number of different categories of epigrams, and sometimes more than one pair within the category, pairs seem to better unite the corpus of Leonidas of Tarentum by abutting either side of a particular category or book section, or were placed in contrasting order in some way, so that they introduce, transition into and out of, or even balance a section by placing the members of the pair on opposite sides of that section.[413] The epigrams in the pair, which Kirstein highlights above, do correspond, but they do not have to be read next to each other so that the reader can understand their relationship among other sea poems.

In each of the above, Leon. 60 G-P = *AP* 7.264 and 61 G-P = 7.266, the imagined tombstone which keeps boats at anchor is given epigrammatic context in its physical use of attaching boats to land, but also a more literary context in its description as characters in a narrative, warning the living about the perils of loosening the attached ship cables. The tombs stand as symbols of sailors' persistence in traveling by sea, yet with the yoke of death attached to them. Leon. 60 G-P begins ambiguously with the anticipatory subjunctive, Εἴη ποντοπόρῳ πλόος οὔριος, showing the inevitability that sailors trust in both sea-faring and seasonable

[412] Kirstein's (2002: 114-135) examination illustrates that the order of the anthologies cannot serve as reliable evidence as to whether the original author intended two of his pieces to be read together, as companion pieces or not. Although he mentions (130) that Martial might not have placed a pair next to each other but used them for more complicated patterns, he does not present such for the Hellenistic poets.
Krevins (2005: 81-96) discusses this ring composition frame of the statue section (ἀνδριαντοποικά) which is established by similarity of the opening and closing poems which both contain allusions to Lysippus as well as programmatic statements about sculpture for the new Posidippus**.** Links and contrasting juxtaposition provide "symmetrical framing and thematic variations." Framing in Leonidas of Tarentum would be difficult to identify because there are so many pairs, even per section, if we assume that all pairs belong to the same book. Perhaps the pairs stood in contrasting positions within their respective section (e.g. rather than A-B, A-B, A-B, the pairs would be organized A-A-A-B-B-B).

weather. This epigram shifts toward an entirely negative, portentous tone, however, with a warning to anyone so bold as to loosen the cables from his tomb in Leon. 60.4 G-P (ὅστις ἀφ' ἡμετέρου πείσματ' ἔλυσε τάφου). Leon. 61 G-P reflects the first line of its companion structurally, with the last two feet of the first line introduced by bucolic diaeresis. The poems also conclude with much of the same language, yet the speaker of Leon. 61 G-P is even more exasperated by men that loosen ship-cables to meet their destruction (φεῦ τόλμης, ἀπ' ἐμεῦ πείσματα λυσάμενοι), setting sail despite the warnings; "*I am the tomb...but they set sail, what recklessness!*" Perhaps the tomb in Leon. 60 G-P is unnamed because it is named in Leon. 61 G-P, as Kirstein suggests.[414] This would appear to continue a story between the two epigrams, but for all their similarity, the brevity of Leon. 61 G-P presents a slightly more frustrated tone.

The accumulating frustration between these epigrams may have been developed within the other sea poems, in which so many set sail and are killed by the perils of the sea.[415] Many of the epigrams related to the sea narrate the death of a sailor, merchant, or fisherman, making such admonitions like those in epigrams Leon. 60 and 61 G-P would be appropriate ends to such a section of sea-themed epigrams. Because there are so many nautical epigrams commemorating the boldness, or foolishness, of those men braving the sea, it seems that epigrams Leon. 60 and 61 G-P may best unite a section of sea-themed epigrams within Leonidas' cynical ideology of suffering wanderers by abutting each end with the warnings that Leon. 60 and 61 G-P evoke. With these epigrams at opposite ends, the section would strongly present the cynical treatment of the fleeting nature of life and the irony of efforts in life when attached to death so apparent in

[414] Kirstein 2002: 131.
[415] See the sea-themed epigrams and possible pairs among this set in Leon. 62 G-P = *AP* 7.273 with 63 G-P = *AP* 7.283, Leon. 65 G-P = *AP* 7.506 with 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504, Leon. 14 G-P = *AP* 7.665 with 20 G-P = *AP* 7.295, and Leon. 64 G-P = *AP* 7.503, a dialogue poem by itself.

many of his epigrams.[416] This framing technique would develop the theme of wandering and its philosophical implications, through a number of different poems that share the same matter at hand.[417]

Not all epigram pairs parallel one another. Some invert each other, and so their placement within a section of sea-themed poems may be at either end of a section, or perhaps next to each other to starkly invert one another.[418] The protagonist of Leon. 65 G-P = *AP* 7.506 below dies not just as a result of sea-travel alone, but by a fish, as the speaker wanders to his death in frustration. As in the tombstones above, the first line is structurally the same, yet the dichotomous phrase "land and sea" accentuates how location of the dead body of the speaker, Tharsys, is significant to the epigram that describes his suffering death by a hungry fish. Death by fish occurs similarly in 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504, yet rather than present a parallel tale as epigrams 60 & 61 G-P above, it inverts the tale of its counterpart. Rather than meeting death by hungry fish wandering at sea, the hungry man fishing on land ingests a fish and flounders to his death as a parody of epic narrative or even fable, even though the character partakes in his routine, everyday enterprise of fishing.[419]

> Κὴν γῇ καὶ πόντῳ κεκρύμμεθα· τοῦτο περισσὸν
> ἐκ Μοιρέων Θάρσυς Χαρμίδου ἠνυσάμην.

---

[416] Gutzwiller 1998a: 102; Gigante (1971: 109): Gigante, agreeing with Reitzenstein's statement, argues that "Leonidas demonstrates the liberal development of Leonidean poetry. The cycle of epigrams broadens, the sepulchral poetry becomes long narration, the dedicatory poetry becomes one vast painting, the end accomplishes an accurate development, the same theme is brought a second time in different form, the rhetoric presses on energetically, and it is only natural in the grand poetry of the time." Cf. Fowler (1989: 9) for cynical treatment of fishermen in Hellenistic poetry and art.

[417] Dudley (1937: 114-116) explores the idea that cynicism in Hellenistic literature is an exposition of an argument which often sought objective of argument through exposition of diatribe of main speaker, or that which is more regularly combined in an "imaginary adversary." If this can be applied to Leonidas' views on the frugal life, as Dudley states, it seems that this could also be applied to Leonidas' views on death. The "imaginary adversary" then becomes the "invented" or "literary adversary" through which Leonidas puts forth his cynical views.

[418] The dialogue epigram Leon. 64 G-P = *AP* 7.503 might be an appropriate middle to the sea-themed section.

[419] As Gutzwiller (1998a: 96) points out, and as I am trying to show as parallel in the two epigrams, the narratives are not merely "bizarre happenstance," but modification of traditional epigram form – and epic, not to praise fishermen, as Gutzwiller suggests, but instead to stress philosophical statement about the wandering nature of man and his epic pursuits and their epic end.

ἦ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀγκύρης ἔνοχον βάρος εἰς ἅλα δύνων
Ἰόνιόν θ' ὑγρὸν κῦμα κατερχόμενος
τὴν μὲν ἔσωσ', αὐτὸς δὲ μετάτροπος ἐκ βυθοῦ ἔρρων
ἤδη καὶ ναύταις χεῖρας ὀρεγνύμενος,
ἐβρώθην· τοῖόν μοι ἐπ' ἄγριον εὖ μέγα κῆτος
ἦλθεν, ἀπέβροξεν δ' ἄχρις ἐπ' ὀμφαλίου.
χἤμισυ μὲν ναῦται, ψυχρὸν βάρος ἐξ ἁλὸς ἡμῶν
ἤρανθ' ἥμισυ δὲ πρίστις ἀπεκλάσατο·
ἠόνι δ' ἐν ταύτῃ κακὰ λείψανα Θάρσυος, ὦνερ,
ἔκρυψαν, πάτρην δ' οὐ πάλιν ἱκόμεθα.

We have been buried both on land and on sea – this is an extraordinary thing! / - that Tharsys son of Charmides obtained this from the Fates. / For when I dove into the sea as a weight subject to the anchor, / and descending the wet Ionion swell, / the anchor, on the one hand, I saved, but I myself while turning about moved laboriously out of the depth, / and immediately while stretching [my] hands to sailors / I was devoured. Such a savage very great sea-monster / came and gulped me down up to my bellybutton. / On the one hand half of me – a cold weight - the sailors took up from the the sea / and half the sawfish broke off, but on this shore they buried the accursed remains of Tharsys, sir, / and we arrived back home not in one piece.

(Leon. 65 G-P = = *AP* 7.506)

Πάρμις ὁ Καλλιγνώτου ἐπακταῖος καλαμευτής,
ἄκρος καὶ κίχλης καὶ σκάρου ἰχθυβολεὺς
καὶ λάβρου πέρκης δελεάρπαγος ὅσσα τε κοίλας
σήραγγας πέτρας τ' ἐμβυθίους νέμεται,
ἄγρης ἐκ πρωτῆς ποτ' ἰουλίδα πετρήεσσαν
δακνάζων ὀλοὴν ἐξ ἁλὸς ἀράμενος
ἔφθιτ'· ὀλισθηρὴ γὰρ ὑπὲκ χερὸς ἀίξασα
ᾤχετ' ἐπὶ στεινὸν παλλομένη φάρυγα.
χὠ μὲν μηρίνθων καὶ δούνακος ἀγκίστρων τε
ἐγγὺς ἀπὸ πνοιὴν ἧκε κυλινδόμενος,
νήματ' ἀναπλήσας ἐπιμοίρια· τοῦ δὲ θανόντος
Γρίπων ὁ γριπεὺς τοῦτον ἔχωσε τάφον.

Parmis son of Callignotus, reaper on the shore, / utmost harpooner of both wrasse and parrot-wrasse, / of boisterous perch snapping at the bait, /and the very sort that graze hollow caves hollowed out by water and rocks at the bottom of the sea, / out of [his] first catch once a rock-dwelling rainbow-wrasse / the biting man took up [along with his own] destruction from the sea / [and] he was destroyed; for slippery as it turned out above his hand / it came flapping at the narrow part of his throat. / So, on the one hand nearby both the lines and the pole's fish-hooks / he lost his breath while rolling around to and fro, / fulfilling his fated lines; and so because of this death / Mr. Fisher the fisherman built him this tomb.

(Leon. 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504)

In the larger frame of this sepulchral epigram, Tharsys explains in an epic-like narrative that he has been divided in two by a devouring fish. The dualism of the speaker's burial "on land and on sea" refers not just to the tale of his death, but also to the narrative structure of the epigram describing it, and to its companion. The first epigram explains how one man dies by

being eaten by a fish on sea (Tharsys), and the other epigram describes how one man dies by eating a fish on land (Parmis), while both epigrams tell of the fish-like wandering of its speaker. The first person plural of Leon. 65.1 G-P notes the burial location of Tharsys, half at sea and half on land, as if to introduce an intertextual riddle, especially as the last two feet of the line exclaim the anomalous situation: τοῦτο περισσὸν, *this is an extraordinary thing*! Parmis of Leon. 66 G-P remained "steadfast" on shore, as his name suggests, yet this epigram similarly leaves a riddle to be solved, since this expert fisherman on shore, seemingly safe with his first catch, still suffered the destruction of the sea as line 6 introduces: δακνάζων ὀλοὴν ἐξ ἁλὸς ἀράμενος, *the biting man took up [along with his own] destruction from the sea*. Parmis of 66 G-P ironically experiences wandering forced by the sea, as the motion of the fish is transferred to his own flailing motion: ᾤχετ' ἐπὶ στεινὸν παλλομένη,… ἐγγὺς ἀπὸ πνοιὴν ἦκε κυλινδόμενος, νήματ' ἀναπλήσας ἐπιμοίρια, *the fish came flapping at the narrow part of his throat…[Parmis] lost his breath while rolling around to and fro, fulfilling his fated lines*. Much like Tharsys, he wandered to meet a humble death on account of a sea creature. What Tharsys obtained from the Fates in Leon. 65.2 G-P (ἐκ Μοιρέων Θάρσυς Χαρμίδου ἠνύσατο, *Tharsys son of Charmides obtained this from the Fates*) is mirrored by the fated lines in the second to last line of Leon. 66.11 G-P (νήματ' ἀναπλήσας ἐπιμοίρια· τοῦ δὲ θανόντος, / *fulfilling his lines of fate; and so from [this] death*), as if to wryly complete both Parmis' story as well as the pairing of these two tales of death by fish and some form of sea-wandering (ἔρρων, Leon. 65.5 G-P; ἐξ ἁλὸς ἀράμενος… ἦκε κυλινδόμενος, *accomplishing this from the sea…he came rolling to and fro,* Leon. 66.6-10 G-P). Each twelve-lined epigram indicates the fatal action of the fish inflicting death upon the character in line 10, particularly in the last word: ἀπεκλάσατο (Leon. 65.10 G-P), the saw fish "broke off" half of the man off, like a fish breaking off a line;

κυλινδόμενος (Leon. 66.10 G-P) he, like the fish in his throat, came rolling to and fro, trying to breath like a fish out of water. The pairs coordinate in length and seem to invert the storyline of the other, one on land and one on sea, although they share similar elements in their grotesque versions of realism.

II. Character Pairs

Many of the pairs relate even more directly, however, through character name and topic, as in the following epigrams. A number of characters in Leonidas are discussed in either a series or in a coordinating pair, which may fit into these pairing systems defined by Kirstein. These pairs can be linked together by character name, theme of the epigram, vernacular, or by any combination of these devices. The characters in pairs of epigrams appear only in each of their respective companion pieces in the collection, and are typecast as the pederast (Leon. 12 G-P = *AP* 7.448; 13 G-P = *AP* 7.449), the foolish cynic (Leon. 54 G-P = *AP*. 6.293; 55 G-P = *AP*. 6.298), the noble man (Leon. 10 G-P = *AP*. 7.648; 11 G-P. = *AP*. 7.440), the drunken sympotic poet (Leon. 31 G-P = *APl* 306; 90 G-P = *APl* 307), gods of love and war (Leon. 24 G-P = *AP*. 9.320; 25 G-P = *AP*. 9.322), Priapi (Leon. 83 G-P = *A.Pl*. 236; 84 G-P = *A.Pl*. 261). We cannot so definitively argue that these characters fit into a category devoted to characters, as opposed to some other category. The characters, although they appear prominently to pair a set of epigrams, the characters respective to a set do not directly correlate with the other sets of character pairs, with the exception of the nature of their pairing, i.e. that their set of companion pieces correlate by character name. We will analyze a few of these character doublets, which share the same name, although there are other pairs of characters which do not.

There is an example of a combined parallel and continuation epigram pair in those which describe the successes of Pratalidas.[420] Leonidas 12 G-P = *AP* 7.448 and 13 G-P = *AP* 7.449) coordinate by character name, and also respond to one another in structure much like other epigram pairs.[421] When the two are taken in tandem, they emphasize the pederastic characteristics of this young man and continue his story from life into death.

> Πραταλίδα τὸ μνῆμα Λυκαστίω, ἄκρον ἐρώτων
> εἰδότος, ἄκρα μάχας, ἄκρα λινοστασίης,
> ἄκρα χοροιτυπίης. χθόνιοι
> τοῦτον Κρηταιεῖς Κρῆτα παρῳκίσατε.
>
> The memorial of Pratalidas from Lucastus who knew the zenith of loves,
> successes in battle, successes in nets laid,
> successes in choral dances; you Cretan chthonian gods
> have settled this Cretan among you.

(Leon. 12 G-P = *AP* 7.448)

> Πραταλίδᾳ παιδεῖον Ἔρως πόθον, Ἄρτεμις ἄγραν,
> Μοῦσα χορούς, Ἄρης ἐγγυάλιξε μάχαν.
> πῶς οὐκ εὐαίων ὁ Λυκάστιος, ὃς καὶ ἔρωτι
> ἦρχε καὶ ἐν μολπᾷ καὶ δορὶ καὶ στάλικι;
>
> Eros put youthful yearning into the palm of the hand of Pratalidas, Artemis the chase,
> the Muses the dance, and Ares put the battle.
> How was this Lucastian not living the good life, who took the
> lead in love, and in song and with the spear and with the hunting-net?

(Leon. 13 G-P = *AP* 7.449)

One epigram is dedicated to Pratalidas' death, the other to his life. The words παιδεῖον…πόθον (Leon. 13.1 G-P) and τὸ μνῆμα, (Leon. 12.1 G-P) explain the characteristics for which Pratalidas is most notable and remembered, while the memory of his death contrasts his youth. Leon.13 G-P identifies that the reason for such success in Leon. 12 G-P was that Pratalidas was graced by the gifts of the gods. The tools used to achieve such a fruitful life, such

[420] Scholars agree that these epigrams were not originally inscribed: see Geffcken 1896: 74-75 and Gow 1965b: 323-324.
[421] Gow (1965b: 323-324) suggests a differing ascription, yet insists on keeping the pair together since they show coordination.

as ἔρωτι, μολπᾷ, δορὶ, and στάλικι in Leon. 13.3-4 G-P mirror the location of his success and where these tools were used: ἐρώτων, μάχας, λινοστασίας, χοροιτυπίας (Leon. 12.1-3 G-P). One poem is about the living Pratalidas, the other memorializes him after death; both poems mark his success, and Leon. 12 G-P completes the picture of his life introduced to us in Leonidas 13 G-P. Leon. 13.3-4 G-P asks, "*how is Pratalidas not living a good life if he is so blessed in song, spear, love and nets?*" and Leon. 12.1 G-P responds τὸ μνῆμα, as if to say that it is through his memory that his successes, ἄκρα, live on. The desire that is unfulfilled in Leon. 13 G-P, πόθον, is fulfilled by his high-level of experience in love, ἄκρον ἐρώτων εἰδότος (Leon. 12.1-2 G-P). His Cretan origin and final resting place among the pointedly Cretan, chthonian gods in Leon. 12.4 G-P, emphasize fulfillment of his pederastic pursuits all the more.[422]

Unlike those that are presented like sepulchral epigrams for the same character as with Pratalidas above, the pairs that repeat character names often represent statues. When comparing the epigrams in the pair below, each statue of Anacreon becomes less a realized image, and more an image of poetic design.[423]

> Πρέσβυν Ἀνακρείοντα χύδαν σεσαλαγμένον οἴνῳ
> θάεο †δινωτοῦ στρεπτὸν ὕπερθε λίθου†,
> ὡς ὁ γέρων λίχνοισιν ἐπ' ὄμμασιν ὑγρὰ δεδορκὼς
> ἄχρι καὶ ἀστραγάλων ἕλκεται ἀμπεχόναν·
> δισσῶν δ' ἀρβυλίδων τὰν μὲν μίαν οἷα μεθυπλὴξ
> ὥλεσεν ἐν δ' ἑτέρᾳ ῥικνὸν ἄραρε πόδα.
> μέλπει δ' ἠὲ Βάθυλλον ἐφίμερον ἠὲ Μεγιστᾶν,

[422] cf. Gow 1965b: 324; Arist. *Pol*. 1272 a24; Strab. 10.483.

[423] Kantzios (2005: 229) points out how popular it was to exaggerate Anacreon's wine-loving character; each epigram within Leonidas' pair enhances the meaning of the other. These epigrams (Leon. 31 G-P = *APl* 306 and Leon. 90 G-P = *APl* 307) mimic each other in diction: note the simultaneous vocabulary changes and mimicry in the pair – πρέσβυς, ἕλκεται are the same in the first two lines, but the words ἴδ', ἐκ μέθας…ὑπεσκέλισται (tripping up his heels because of the wine), γυίων (knees), λῶπος (shawl), τῶν δὲ βλαυτίων τὸ μέν ὅμως…θἄτερον (of his slippers this and likewise that other), ἀπώλεσεν, μελίσδεται (Doric for μελίζω - sings), ἤτοι…ἤ (either…or), τὰν χέλυν διακρέκων (plucking the lyre) of Leon. 90 G-P directly vary from θάεο, χύδαν σεσαλαγμένον οἴνῳ (promiscuously overloaded with wine), ἀστραγάλων (ankles), ἀμπεχόναν (shawl), δισσῶν ἀρβυλίδων…τὰν μὲν μίαν…ἐν δ'ἑτέρᾳ (of the two shoes, so the one and on the second), ὥλεσεν, μέλπει (sings), ἠὲ… ἠὲ (either…or), αἰωρῶν παλάμᾳ τὰν δυσέρωτα χέλυν (raising with his hand the accursedly-loving lyre) in Leon. 31 G-P respectively. Why the definitive variation by the same author if not to elucidate the poetic force that the statue symbolizes, rather than the statue itself?

αἰωρῶν παλάμᾳ τὰν δυσέρωτα χέλυν.
ἀλλά, πάτερ Διόνυσε, φύλασσέ μιν· οὐ γὰρ ἔοικεν
ἐκ Βάκχου πίπτειν Βακχιακὸν θέραπα.

Behold old Anacreon in a disorderly manner crammed full of wine / ‡ and garlanded above a turned stone ‡ /, as the old man having sight of water with his gluttonous eyes / he drags his trailing garment near his ankles, / and just like a wine-stricken [man] he has lost one of his two boots, / but he fixed the wrinkled foot to his other boot. / He sings either of desired Bathyllus or of Megistas / lifting up with his palm the accursedly-loving lyre. / But, father Dionysus, protect him since it doesn't seem [right] that / a Baccheian servant should fall because of Bacchus.

(Leon. 31 G-P = *APl*. 306)

Ἴδ' ὡς ὁ πρέσβυς ἐκ μέθας Ἀνακρέων
ὑπεσκέλισται καὶ τὸ λῶπος ἕλκεται
ἐσάχρι γυίων, τῶν δὲ βλαυτίων τὸ μὲν
ὅμως φυλάσσει θἄτερον δ' ἀπώλεσεν.
μελίσδεται δὲ τὰν χέλυν διακρέκων
ἤτοι Βάθυλλον ἢ καλὸν Μεγιστέα.
φύλασσε, Βάκχε, τὸν γέροντα μὴ πέσῃ.

See here how the old man Anacreon out of a drunken state / trips up his heals and trails his robe / as far as his limbs, and likewise he guards one of his slippers and he has lost the second. / He modulates the lyre as he strikes strings / verily for Bathyllus and for handsome Megistas. / Guard, Bacchus, this old man so that he doesn't fall.

(Leon. 90 G-P = *APl*. 307)

The epigrams' vocabulary and descriptions of the statue are very similar, but the diction, meter, and length are quite different, and so the consistent paraelleling of similarities and differences indicate a relationship between the two poems. Leon. 31 G-P = *APl* 306 seems to be an epideictic inscription, yet Anacreon is both attached to a stone base and is garlanded. The shorter iambic version (Leon. 90 G-P = *APl*. 307) is appropriately less verbose, yet it is also lighter and does not mention a statue base, so perhaps is meant to be more symposiastic, or less inscriptional. A major difference is with the types of traveling shoes; in Leon. 90 G-P = *APl* 307 the shoes (τῶν δὲ βλαυτίων, "slippers") are those worn at symposia and seen in comedy, whereas the other type in Leon. 31 G-P = *APl* 306 (δισσῶν ἀρβυλίδων, "boots") is more

generally associated with tragedy.[424] The emphatic "two" (δισσῶν) describing the boots is suggestive of a poetic double, as occurs in other poems of Leonidas.[425] Both are traveling shoes, and each statue has lost one shoe, though the means of loss is described differently. In both poems, Anacreon is a traveler in the company of Dionysus, so to speak.[426] The dualism of intoxication as both the subject of ridicule and tragic flaw of Anacreon is highlighted by the two shoes, mismatched and of different types.[427] Such duality correlates with the power of wine, or Dionysus, and with his role as patron god of performance. Anacreon shows the inspiration of Dionysus' dualistic qualities in each epigram, as one is quite tragic as he is flawed with lasciviousness and dressed in buskins, while the other is quite ridiculous and low with delicate sympotic slippers, which are about to trip him up.

Both epigrams embody an image of Anacreon as performance of poetry, beyond his different types of traveling shoes. The iambic epigram is more of an action-shot, as it commands the reader's attention to the scene about to be described with the first word (Ἴδ', ὡς ὁ πρέσβυς…, 90.1 G-P), whereas the other epigram notes the objective form of what is being seen with the first word (Πρέσβυν Ἀνακρείοντα χύδαν σεσαλαγμένον οἴνῳ, 31.1 G-P), and does not tell the reader until the first word of the second line to "behold" or "take heed" of the statue.

---

[424] For Βλαυτίων see Aristophanes *Eq*. 889, Aristodemus *fr*. 8.4 equated here and later commonly with σανδάλιον, Pl. *Symp*. 174a, L. 54 G-P = *AP* 6.293, which show the pretense of Sochares as a cynic philosopher returning from a symposium; see Clayman 2007: 499. Cf. δισσῶν ἀρβυλίδων in A. *Ag*. 944, those worn by Agamemnon before he is made to walk on the carpet, which shoes "slave-like, serve the treading of his foot," and which Agamemnon asks his servants to untie them: "as I walk on the purple vestments may I not be struck from afar by any glance of a god's jealous eye." A. *fr*. 435a, E. *El*. 532, E. *HF* 1304, E. *Bacch*. 638 & 1134, E. *Or*. 140 & 1470, E. *Hipp*. 1189 all allude to steps toward pending destruction or downfall; cf. Theoc. *Id*. 7.26.

[425] E.g. the Πέτρης ἐκ δισσῆς in Leon. 5.1 G-P = *AP* 9.326.1, a dedication to nymphs from a traveler is suggestive of its pair Leon. 6 G-P = *AP* 9.329, also a dedication to nymphs, but from a gardener; also similar to "land and sea" introducing intertextual doubling between Leon. 65 G-P = *AP* 7.506 and Leon. 66 G-P = *AP* 7.504.

[426] Theoc. *Id.* 7. 25-26 ὥς τοι ποσὶ νισσομένοιο / πᾶσα λίθος πταίοισα ποτ' ἀρβυλίδεσσιν ἀείδει, *as by the feet of someone coming, / every stone tripping [you up] sings to the [tap] of your traveling shoes*.

[427] In Leon. 31.5 G-P = *APl* 306.5 the two shoes are stressed as together then divided δισσῶν ἀρβυλίδων…τὰν μὲν μίαν…ἐν δ'ἑτέρᾳ (of the two shoes, so the one and on the second) but in Leon. 90.4 = *APl* 306.4 the shoes are described only separately with τῶν δὲ βλαυτίων τὸ μέν ὅμως…θἄτερον (of his slippers this and likewise that other).

The iambic poem is lighter in meter and less ominous in tone, whereas the epigram in elegiac couplets is more melodramatic and perilous in tone. Anacreon is an image of poetic performance, as his mantle drags, he plucks the lyre and totters from one foot to the next, much like the iambic rhythm of one of the epigrams that describes him in the iambic Leon. 90 G-P = *APl* 307. He guards one of his shoes, but has utterly wasted the second (θάτερον δ' ἀπώλεσεν, Leon. 90.4 G-P), and so he is therefore unevenly weighted on one shoe, (τὸ μέν ὅμως φυλάσσει, *of his two shoes, the one he guards the other he lost*, Leon. 90.4 G-P), just like the uneven weight of an iambic metron, with short syllable followed by long (τῶν δὲ βλαυτίων τὸ μέν ὅμως φυλάσσε θἄτερον ἀπώλεσεν, Leon. 90.3 G-P). In Leon. 31 G-P = *APl*. 306, its elegiac meter is embodied by a description that dwells on Anacreon's fixed shriveled foot (τὰν μὲν μίαν οἷα μεθυπλὴξ / ὤλεσεν, ἐν δ' ἑτέρᾳ ῥικνὸν ἄραρε πόδα, Leon. 31.5-6 G-P), like the halting long half foot by which the line of pentameter in elegiac meter is characterized.[428] The mention of stone shows the poem's self-awareness as a play on inscriptional epigram. The wordplay shows Leonidas' part in the poetic trend of poetological metaphor, wherein epigram characterizes subject as text, as was popular in the Hellenistic period.[429]

The prayer to Dionysus at the end of the elegiac version is more serious and condemning, while it ironizes his role as a servant of Dionysus – about to fall on account of such a service, and since it portrays the gluttonous drunkenness, whereas the light iambic version is a ridiculous scene worthy of laughter, that expects a fall but is more jocund.[430] Perhaps his base decorated

[428] Callimach. *Aet*. fr. 1.31-32; Acosta-Hughes 2002: 238-255. Keith (1999: 41): "This critical vocabulary developed in fifth-century Athens, perhaps in sophistic circles, and is so well established by the Hellenistic period that Callimachus need not refer specifically to either body or limbs to set in play a series of puns linking physical traits with literary goals."
[429] Meyer 2007: 208.
[430] Cf. Klooster 2011: 39 – Anacreon in Leon. 90 G-P = *APl*. 307 is certainly more a subject of comic abuse than direct invective, since the poem lacks any insults whatsoever, and instead only mocks.

with garland (στέπτον)[431] and his role as a Baccheian servant (Βακχιακὸν θέραπα) suggest his part in Dionysiac mysteries in the elegiac version. The similarity between the two epigrams shows that they are meant to discuss the same statue with similar narrative, but the perspective of the viewer, or reader is meant to change.[432] Thus the reader is called to recognize the type of each epigram – one that is epideictic elegy, and the other that is iambic. In the elegiac version the dramatic action – Anacreon's fall – is tragically pitiful, whereas in the iambic poem, he has already utterly lost his shoe, and the fall is spectacle worthy of ridicule. The intertextual play between the pair of epigrams shows the paradoxical power of Dionysus as he is both a saving and destructive force for poets, and allures the reader to contrast the two poetic images.

Although Leonidas, unlike other Hellenistic epigrammatists,[433] usually shuns eroticism, the following pairs prove otherwise; it is not until the next two are taken as a pair, however, that their eroticism is completely clear. The character name does not repeat, but the disparate characters in the two epigrams still relate to each other.[434] A dialogue between Ares and Aphrodite is hinted at in poems Leon. 24 G-P = *AP*. 9.320 and Leon. 25 G-P = *AP*. 9.322.

> Εἶπέ ποκ' Εὐρώτας πὸτ τὰν Κύπριν· "Ἢ λάβε τεύχη
> ἢ 'ξιθι τᾶς Σπάρτας· ἀ πόλις ὁπλομανεῖ.'
> ἀ δ' ἀπαλὸν γελάσασα· 'Καὶ ἔσσομαι αἰὲν ἀτευχής,'
> εἶπε, 'καὶ οἰκήσω τὰν Λακεδαιμονίαν.'
> χἀ μὲν Κύπρις ἄνοπλος· ἀναιδέες οἵδε λέγουσιν
> ἵστορες, ὡς ἀμῖν χἀ θεὸς ὁπλοφορεῖ.
>
> Once when Eurotas spoke to Cypris: "Either take up arms / or get out of Sparta; the city is mad for war!" / She then giggled gently and said, "I will both always be unarmed, / and I will always live in

[431] Heyne's proposal of "garlanded" is not incongruous with the inscriptional base, as Gow (1965b: 341) suggests, since decoration of a poet's statue with garland is a sign of poetic victory at Dionysiac festival, whether real or imagined; "garlanded" also agrees with the symposiastic portrayal of the drunken Anacreon.
[432] As Gow (1965b: 341) notes, Wilamowitz (1913: 104) thought Leonidas was describing a painting.
[433] Editors of the *Greek Anthology* include only Leon. 92 G-P = *AP* 5.188 "on the assaults of love" (Gow 1965b: 389) and Leon. 43 G-P = *AP* 5.206, on dedication of musical instruments to the Muses by two girls coming of age among the "erotic" or "amatory" epigrams of book five. The former fits well into the category, yet the category's inclusion of the latter is less understandable, except for the poem's allusions to symposia and flute-playing throughout the night while beating on doors as paraclausithyron; on the separation of erotic epigrams into *AP* 5 and *AP* 12 on moral grounds, and the structure of the erotic section of Meleager's *Garland*, see Argentieri (2007: 156-157), citing Gow-Page (1965: 2.xvii-xxi), Cameron (1993: 19-24), and Gutzwiller (1998a: 277-321).
[434] Clack (1999: 128-129) has suggested that these may be a pair.

Lakedaimonia."
/ And so, Cypris is unarmed; authors who say / that the goddess even takes up arms for me are shameless.

(Leon. 24 G-P = *AP*. 9.320)

Οὐκ ἐμὰ ταῦτα λάφυρα. τίς ὁ θριγκοῖσιν ἀνάψας
Ἄρηος ταύταν τὰν ἄχαριν χάριτα;
ἄκλαστοι μὲν κῶνοι, ἀναίμακτοι δὲ γανῶσαι
ἀσπίδες, ἄκλαστοι δ' αἱ κλαδαραὶ κάμακες.
αἰδοῖ πάντα πρόσωπ' ἐρυθαίνομαι, ἐκ δὲ μετώπου
ἱδρὼς πιδύων στῆθος ἐπισταλάει.
παστάδα τις τοιοῖσδε καὶ ἀνδρειῶνα καὶ αὐλὰν
κοσμείτω καὶ τὸν νυμφίδιον θάλαμον·
Ἄρευς δ' αἱματόεντα διωξίπποιο λάφυρα
νηὸν κοσμοίη· τοῖς γὰρ ἀρεσκόμεθα.

These are not my spoils; who has hung this / favorless favor on the coping-stone wall of Ares; / unbroken helmets, shields, not stained with blood / but polished, unbroken quivering spears. / My whole face grows red with shame, so sweat gushing out of my forehead drops over my breast. / Let someone adorn the porch and even a men's hall / and the home and the bridal chamber with such things. / Would that the bloody spoils of a horse-chaser adorn, / the temple of Ares; since in these we take pleasure.

(Leon. 25 G-P = *AP* 9.322)

The first, Leon. 24 G-P, is meant for a statue, the other, Leon. 25 G-P, is about arms in a temple, yet both are a play on dedicatory epigram. Thematically the two poems relate only because of the presumed love affair between the gods, and also because of the weapons involved.[435] Yet, in both cases the arms in the temple of Ares and on the figure of Aphrodite are inappropriate and both speakers are indignant at the sight of arms before them. Leon. 24 G-P concerns a well-known statue in Sparta of Aphrodite unarmed (Κύπρις ἄνοπλος) in the first of the set,[436] whereas epigram Leon. 25 G-P introduces a similar topic – inappropriate arms, but in a temple to Ares. Both settings are notably public. The arms hung on Aphrodite are unsuitable, as remarked by Eurotas the river, just as the arms in the temple of Ares, so Ares himself complains. The poets discussing Aphrodite's arms are shameless (ἀναιδέες, Leon. 24.5 G-P), as the face of Ares grows red with shame (αἰδοῖ πάντα πρόσωπ' ἐρυθαίνομαι, Leon. 25.5 G-P); that Ares is

[435] As Demodokos sings in *Od.* 8.266-366; on weapons of Ares and Aphrodite, see Orph. *H.* 65.
[436] Paus. 3.15.10; Plut. *Mor*. 317f; Quint. *Inst. Or*. 2.4.26; Gow 1965b: 334.

red with αἰδοῖ links him to the shame aroused by the passion of Aphrodite.[437] The unstained weapons, ἀναίμακτοι δὲ γανῶσαι (Leon. 25.3 G-P), are meant more for the private chamber rather than a public temple.[438] Ares is described erotically not only as his face grows red with shame, but also as his sweat, gushing, drips over his breast (αἰδοῖ πάντα πρόσωπ' ἐρυθαίνομαι, ἐκ δὲ μετώπου / ἱδρὼς πιδύων στῆθος ἐπισταλάει, *my whole face grows red with shame, so sweat, gushing out of my forehead, drops over my breast,* Leon. 25.6 G-P). It is as if he himself has seen the unarmed Aphrodite and is aroused by her. Aphrodite's serene, giggling response to Eurotas is worthy of such passion, as if she is undressing (ἁ δ' ἁπαλὸν γελάσασα· "καὶ ἔσσομαι αἰὲν ἀτευχής," *She then giggled gently and said, "I will always be unarmed…*" Leon. 24.3 G-P). Since the last distich suggests that the sexual advances of Aphrodite are so pervasive that they are even directed anomalously toward the author himself (χἀ μὲν Κύπρις ἄνοπλος· ἀναιδέες οἵδε λέγουσιν / ἵστορες, ὡς ἁμῖν χἀ θεὸς ὁπλοφορεῖ, *And so, Cypris is unarmed; authors who say that the goddess even takes up arms for me are shameless,* Leon. 24.5-6 G-P), the epigram portrays Aphrodite's eroticism as pointed toward a poetic companion, one aroused by shame and seeking pleasure, like Ares (Leon. 25.5-6 G-P).[439]

---

[437] Hes. *Th*. 44; Henderson 1991: 3-5.

[438] Taràn 1979: 157.

[439] In comparing the dedication to Aphrodite in Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300 (an autobiographical epigram) with Leon. 92 G-P = *AP* 5.188 (where Leonidas insists that he is entitled to escape the torment of love), and with Leon. 54 G-P = *AP* 6.293 (where a phony Cynic is ensnared by a boy-love), Gutzwiller (1998: 110-111) suggests that Leonidas prays to Aphrodite because his renunciation of love is due to the Cynic themes that he discusses in his collection. Although Cynic philosophy influences Leonidas, let us not overlook his role as a poet, who refashions traditional themes in literary epigram in his response to the literary tradition. The laughing Aphrodite is commonplace in Greek literature, yet the phrase Leonidas uses for laughing in Leon. 24.3 G-P is copied directly from ἁπαλὸν γελάσαι of *Od*. 14.465, in which context Odysseus - in disguise, and making a trial of Eumaeus the swineherd in order to obtain a cloak from Eumaeus - announces that wine, as it makes a man laugh softly, has encouraged him to tell a tale about Odysseus scheming at Troy. Leonidas so shows a playful relationship to Aphrodite, a mocking goddess who is harmful to Leonidas (ὡς ἁμῖν χἀ θεὸς ὁπλοφορεῖ, *to me, the god bears arms*, 24.6 G-P) with his epithet for Aphrodite as Lathrian in Leon. 36.1 G-P, Gutzwiller suggests, because of Leonidas' attempts to embrace Cynicism, and so avoid love. With this renunciation of Aphrodite and her harmful nature, Leonidas shows his favoritism toward a more rustic sort of poetry that embraces Odyssean themes, perhaps with comic elements, and so he rejects erotic-sympotic poetry, that so many other epigrammatists of his day favored. Leonidas' stance on presenting a more rustic sort of poetry as his way of spurning eroticism in Leon. 36 G-P would explain the subtlety

The sexual aspect of the dialogue alleviates any ambiguity as to the purpose each poem serves.

Later authors, such as Antipater Sidonius and Meleager, imitate this poem by Leonidas about the dishonored Ares, but with the absence of the sexual intrigue. As Taràn remarks, because such a poem about Aphrodite disarming does not accompany the Ares of Meleager or Antipater Sidonius, the erotic effect of the Ares poem is preserved by the dialogue that only Leonidas provides.[440] This suggests once again that Leonidas may be organizing his work around these "companion pieces." A different poem of Ares in arms, addressed to Aphrodite in the *Planudeian Anthology*, Leon. 103 G-P = *APl* 171,[441] provides an even stronger link between the two poems mentioned above, yet the ascription to Leonidas is uncertain.[442] The eroticism is made clear in Leonidas by the pairing of Leon. 24 and 25 G-P; the absence of the pairing in other authors makes Leonidas' pairing all the more a Leonidean characteristic. There are many other pairs within the dedications to the gods, but we will leave a few others of these aside for a more comprehensive evaluation of other types of pairs.[443]

The following set of Priapic dedications, although paired by character, probably would have fit more aptly among either the set of rustic dedications, or among the epigrams on statues,

---

of erotic elements in this epigram and in its companion. The erotic elements in Leon. 24 G-P, however subtle, are still there to provide a link between the epigrams in the pair.

[440] Taràn 1979: 150; Antip. Sidon. 60; Mel. 110.

[441] Leon. 103 G-P = *APl* 171:

Ἄρεος ἔντεα ταῦτα τίνος χάριν, ὦ Κυθέρεια,
ἐνδέδυσαι κενεὸν τοῦτο φέρουσα βάρος;
αὐτὸν Ἄρη γυμνὴ γὰρ ἀφώπλισας· εἰ δὲ λέλειπται
καὶ θεός, ἀνθρώποις ὅπλα μάτην ἐπάγεις.

For whose gratification, Cythereia, / have you put on these arms of Ares, since it is fruitless to bear such a burden? / For you, naked, have disarmed Ares himself, so if even he – a god - has been defeated / then you senselessly supply weapons among men.

[442] Gow (1965b: 397); Although Gow-Page include this among the uncertain ascriptions to Leonidas, in their commentary they assert that there is no reason for doubting the poem as one of Leonidas of Tarentum.

[443] Cf. Leon. 34 G-P = *AP* 6.129 with 35 G-P = *AP* 6.131; 7 G-P = *AP* 6.204 with 8 G-P = *AP* 6.205; 41 G-P = *AP* 6.288 with 42 G-P = *AP* 6.289.

since Priapi are commonly known as a rustic god.[444] The pair stands out, since it develops a dialogue through sexually explicit language, not common in Leonidas, although a topic not completely estranged from his collection, as with the pairing of Aphrodite and Ares. The rustic tone of the epigrams offer a realistic scene, shown to be pretentiously literary through their pairing. This pair of Priapi emphasizes the sexual nature of this god of fertility to attentive readers.

> Αὐτοῦ ἐφ' αἱμασιαῖσι τὸν ἀγρυπνοῦντα Πρίηπον
> ἔστησεν λαχάνων Δεινομένης φύλακα·
> ἀλλ' ὡς ἐντέταμαι, φώρ, ἔμβλεπε. 'τοῦτο' δ' ἐρωτᾷς
> 'τῶν ὀλίγων λαχάνων εἵνεκα;' τῶν ὀλίγων.
>
> Beside his boundary walls Deinomenes set up this watchful Priapus / guard of garden production; / but look how I have stretched myself out, robber. So 'is this [statue]' you may ask, / 'set up for the sake of these few vegetables?' [Indeed, it is] for the sake of these few things.
>
> (Leon. 83 G-P = *A.Pl.* 236)

> Ἀμφοτέραις παρ' ὁδοῖσι φύλαξ ἕστηκα Πρίηπος
> ἰθυτενὲς μηρῶν ὀρθιάσας ῥόπαλον,
> εἴσατο γὰρ πιστόν με Θεόκριτος. ἀλλ' ἀποτηλοῦ,
> φώρ, ἴθι, μὴ κλαύσῃς τὴν φλέβα δεξάμενος.
>
> I, Priapus, stand firm, a guard beside both roads / having set upright from my thighs, a phallus, / for Theocritus has set up trustworthy me; but, / thief, go far away, when you receive it might you not deflect my penis.
>
> (Leon. 84 G-P = *A.Pl.* 261)

The Priapi are set up to protect a garden at a road junction and can typically be identified as a set of companion pieces that tell one continuous story.[445] They are each a quatrain in the voice of the Priapus, with a similar line structure.[446] In each, Priapus as statue announces that he stands on guard to ward off travelers, as his name is positioned similarly in each as the last word of the first line. Leon. 83 G-P = *APl* 236 was dedicated by Deinomenes and only mildly

[444] There is a third epigram involving a Priapus in Leon. 85 G-P = *AP* 10.1, yet this epigram would fit more suitably among the sea-themed epigrams, as discussed in the previous chapter.
[445] An example of *Forsetzungsepigramme*, according to Kirstein's (2002: 117) categories.
[446] Gow 1965b: 385.

indicates the erotic nature of the figure with "I have stretched myself out" (ἐντέταμαι, Leon. 83.3 G-P). The Priapus questions the reader whether it is necessary that he protect only a few vegetables, implying that there may be some other purpose to his station, other than as a guard only. The repetition of τῶν ὀλίγων in the last line (Leon. 83.4 G-P) seems to imply something humorous, and that the conversation, introduced with τοῦτο…ἐρωτᾷς (*so…you may ask)*, is the emphasis of the epigram. Through this verb and pronoun, the reader of Leon. 83 G-P is invited to ask for a complete description of the Priapus and his symbolism.

The Priapus of Leon. 84 G-P = *AP*.261 reveals that the dedicator of the other epigram is Theocritus, but the dedicatory category does not seem to be the focus of this epigram either. Instead, Leon. 84 G-P = *APl* 261 explains, through explicitly erotic language, that Priapus not only guards, but also threatens with his penis; the gesture of the Priapus is more directly sexual. The first word Ἀμφοτέραις emphasizes the potent duality of the figure as watchman and fertility god standing by both roads; the term may also point to its response to the first of the pair, Leon. 83 G-P = *APl* 236, which describes the more curatorial stance of the Priapus.[447] Because Leon. 83 G-P is clearly meant to guard the vegetables, but only implies the figure's sexuality, it seems to introduce Leon. 84 G-P, which forcefully references the sexual threat of the god. In Leon. 84 G-P = *APl* 261, the Priapus is described in explicitly erotic vernacular: phallus (ῥόπαλον), thighs (μηρῶν), upright (ἰθυτενὲς). The thief receiving the penis (τὴν φλέβα δεξάμενος (84.4 G-P) emphasizes that the Priapus may have followed through with the threat of

[447] As discussed above, Ἀμφοτέραις seems like in Leon. 31 G-P = *APl* 306 (δισσῶν ἀρβυλίδων, "boots"), the emphatic "two" (δισσὼν) describing the boots is suggestive of a poetic double in Leon. 90 = *APl* 307 where the shoes (τῶν δὲ βλαυτίων, "slippers") are those worn at symposia and seen in comedy; the Πέτρης ἐκ δισσῆς in Leon. 5.1 G-P = *AP* 9.326.1, a dedication to nymphs from a traveler is suggestive of its pair Leon. 6 G-P = *AP* 9.329, also a dedication to nymphs, but from a gardener.

penetration.[448] Because the reader of this epigram is alerted not to deflect (μὴ κλαύσῃς τὴν φλέβα, 84.4 G-P) while told to receive the penis (δεξάμενος), the enigma presented in the last line of 83.4 G-P (*is all this – this robust figure – for only a few vegetables?*) is answered by this direct address to the reader and the reader's reception of the aggressive phallus in the last line of 84.4 G-P.[449] The suggestive humor in 83 G-P is fully developed as the focus of 84 G-P. The pair demonstrates a set of parallel epigrams, and through their coordination, the objective of a Priapic figure is fully explained.

III. Rustic Epigrams

As in the Priapi above, many of Leonidas' epigrams present a rustic scene, yet within this category there are a couple of pairs that present a challenge to the reader, so that the reader notes the epigrams' innovations on theme and literary allusion. Since there are so many "rustic epigrams," it is likely that Leonidas either had his own collection of rustic epigrams,[450] or these rustic epigrams were categorized as a group within a Leonidean self-authored collection in some way.[451] Rustic epigrams were undoubtedly an essential poetic type of Leonidas, as an

[448] Henderson (1991: 122-124) notes that φλέβα calls attention to the repetitive insertion of the penis into the one receiving it, whereas ῥόπαλον is more of a club-like penis, and a "pseudo-technical term for priapism."
[449] Whitmore (1918: 616); considering that the dedicatory epigram seems more of "a pure study of technical dexterity" with the lead of Leonidas of Tarentum in the Alexandrian age, as Whitmore proposes, it seems evident that the reader takes a more prominent role than the dedicant.
[450] As Gutzwiller (1998a: 91) points out, "we cannot assume that every epigram convincingly ascribed to Leonidas formed part of a single collection…But the great majority of the Leonidean epigrams display such sonsistency in topic, theme, and philosophical outlook that it seems likely Meleager's principal source was a carefully orchestrated epigram book, consisting of nearly one hundred poems at a minimum, and perhaps considerably more. Remains of other Hellenistic epigram books – the new Posidippus collection, the Theocritus epigram book, and even reconstructed portions of Meleager's Garland – suggest that Leonidas may have employed sequencing of like poems and thematic linkage to provide coherency and structure."
[451] Rustic epigrams may be those in a rustic setting (mountains, pasture, meadows, woodlands, springs) and/or with gods or characters typical of rustic sphere, and/or related to gardening or hunting of some sort, and so in Leonidas the list may include, and is not limited to the following: Leon. 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 19, 21, 27, 29, 32, 33, 36, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 81, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 91, 96, 97, 102 G-P = *AP* 6.334, *AP* 6.188, *AP* 9.326, *AP* 9.329, *AP* 7.656, *AP* 7.657, *AP* 7.198, *AP* 9.316, *AP* 9.337, *AP* 9.99, *AP* 7.736, *AP* 6.300, *AP* 6.281, *AP* 6.13, *AP* 6.35, *AP* 6.262, *AP* 6.263, *AP* 6.296, *P.Ox*. 662, *AP* 6.221, *A.Pl*. 190, *AP* 9. 744, *APl* 236, *A.Pl*. 261, *APl* 230, *AP* 6.226, *AP* 6.120, *AP* 6.110, *AP* 6.154, *AP* 9.563; I have excluded the poems on statues, fishermen, and on other craftsmen, and those that are not clearly set in rural location, for the most part, although these too may occasionally relate to the rustic

autobiographical epigram (Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300) – perhaps a dedication of his poetry book[452] – suggests. An overlooked, yet important ascription of Leon. 51 G-P to Leonidas in *P.Ox*. 662 names Leonidas as Λεωνίδου δρυμνονομου, which, as Gow argues, is probably meant to be the original adjective δρυμνόμος,[453] "of a habitation of thickets" or "of the custom of thickets," a commonly rustic location.[454] Perhaps this title in the manuscript notes a collection or section of a book from which the anthologist drew Leon. 51 G-P,[455] a dedication of hunting items to Pan and the to nymphs by an unknown Glanis.[456] If this epigram is representative of a category in some way, its elements may be representative of the style or theme in Leonidas that is Λεωνίδου δρυμνονομου: rustic gods such as the nymphs and Pan, locations in wooded thickets, mountains, and/or springs, and animals of the hunt, both predator and prey. Yet, since so many epigrams that relate to these particular elements of Leon. 51 G-P, a dedicatory epigram, are not definitively dedicatory, (e.g. Leon. 6 G-P = *AP* 9.329, a prayer to nymphs from a gardener), or refer to pasture instead of or in addition to mountains (e.g. Leon. 19 G-P = *AP* 7.657, for shepherds who wander mountain ridges, meadows, and pastures), or are dedicated to other gods (e.g. Leon. 3 G-P = *AP* 6.334, dedicated to Hermes and rocky crag of nymphs) the

---

category; for more explanation on division between 'rustic' and 'bucolic' epigrams, see Rossi 2001: 33-46; cf. Gigante (1971: 99-101) distinguishes Leonidas from Theocritus by the pessimism and similarity to fable of a couple of Leonidas' epigrams, yet there are many more epigrams that suggest of Theocritean influence, or some other poetic source who influenced both authors, Theocritus and Leonidas.

[452] Gutzwiller 1998a: 109.

[453] Cf. Gow (1965b: 359) calls the hapax indefinable, yet considering its similarity to other compounded forms in Leonidas and with suffix –νόμος, the word must be a compound of "copses" and "customs."

[454] E.g. Theoc. *Id.* 1.117; Arist. *Mir*. 837a24; Clearchus 32 *apud* Athenaeus 14.619c.

[455] Ἀκρωρίτᾳ Πανὶ καὶ ενπᾳ [.....] Ν̣ύμφαις / [Γ]λῆνις ὁ συνγείτων δῶρᾳ κ[υνηγεσί]ης / ταύτην τε προτομὰν και δ[.....]ησ.[.]ι / βύρσαν καὶ ῥοθίους τούσ[δ' ἀνέθηκε] π̣όφσδ. / Πσν ὦ καὶ Νύμφαι, τὸν δ[.....ἀγ]ρευτ̣ῆρα / Γλῆνιν ἀεξήσαιθ' αιεδ[.....]ς. *To the mountain-inhabiter Pan and to the nymphs of the springs, / Glanis their neighbor set up these gifts of his hunt [with dogs?] / and this front part cut off and d[.....]as.[.]i. / the hide and the swift hooves. / [Dear] Pan and nymphs, this hunt (d[.....ag]reuthra) / was won with respect to Glanis who is venerable (?).*

[456] *P.Oxy*. 662 contains six epigrams; there are two complete epigrams (51 & 70) ascribed to Leonidas, with only the first word of another epigram by Leonidas; Antipater has two - 21 and 48 G-P, which directly mimics Leonidas 51; two other epigrams are ascribed to an otherwise unknown Amyntas, who Wifstrand (1926: 33-39) has argued formed the anthology in *P.Oxy*. 662.

rustic category does not seem clearly unified by or restricted to elements of this epigram Leon. 51 G-P in particular. Such an epithet in the manuscript, however, provides support for a category of rustically-themed epigrams, whether related to hunting, dedicatory epigrams, or rustic setting.

The theme of wandering is a significant component of this category.[457] In the rustic dedication below (Leon. 5 G-P = *AP* 9.326), for example, which our commentators say closely resembles epigrams of Anyte (3 G-P = *A Pl* 291)[458] and Moero (2 G-P = *AP* 6.189),[459] the dedicator Aristokles calls himself a wayfarer (ὁδοιπόρος), as he dedicates his cup as a gift of thanks to the nymphs (and their wooden statues, ποιμενικὰ ξόανα) who guard the spring from which he takes a drink. In neither epigram of Anyte or Moero does the dedicator call himself a wayfarer, but instead a shepherd in the former and in the latter a sick man who names the nymphs as those who tread the water's depths.[460] The appearance of the wayfarer in Leonidas highlights the rusticity of the setting, the fleeting nature of the encounter, and is ironically juxtaposed with the permanent medium by which the entire scene is conveyed.[461]

---

[457] See the conclusion of Labellarte's (1969: 105-108) argument, that suggests that the modernity of Leonidas lies in the wandering aspect of Leonidas' own personality, as reflected in *AP* 9.329, although he offers a fatalistic interpretation of the poem.

[458] Φριξκόμᾳ τόδε Πανὶ καὶ αὐλιάσιν θέτο Νύμφαις
δῶρον ὑπο σκοπιᾶς Θεύδοτος οἰονόμος
οὕνεχ' ὑπ' ἀζαλέου θέρεος μέγα κεκμηῶτα
παῦσαν ορέξασι χερσὶ μελιχρὸν ὕδωρ. (*Theodotos the shepherd dedicated this gift to Pan / and to the cave-dwelling nymphs under the hills / when he grew very weary under the summer heat / and so stopped to try their sweet water with his hands,* Anyte 3 G-P = *APl* 291*)*.

[459] Νύμφαι Ἀμαδρυάδες, ποταμοῦ κόραι, αἳ τάδε βένθη
ἀμβρόσιαι ῥοδέοις στείβετε ποσσὶν ἀεί,
χαίρετε καὶ σῴζοιτε Κλεώνυμον, ὃς τάδε καλὰ
εἵσαθ' ὑπαὶ πιτύων ὕμμι, θεαί, ξόανα. (Hamadryadian nymphs, maidens of the river, you ever ambrosial ones / who tread on these depths with feet of roses / greetings and save Cleonymus, / who set up these beautiful statues under your pines, Moero 2 G-P = *AP* 6.189).

[460] cf. Gutzwiller 1998a: 97.

[461] Leonidas' epigram seems to be more fictional in nature than the epigrams of Anyte and Moero, since it is by means of wandering that the passerby Aristokles performatively leads the reader to the location of the carved images of the nymphs by the stream, and behaves as a character in dialogue with the setting. The presentation of the dedication of the statues is more objectively an inscription in Moero, and more religious as a dedication in the form of a prayer of thanks in Anyte – neither of these dedications is offered in the first person, nor does it have its

Πέτρης ἐκ δισσῆς ψυχρὸν καταπάλμενον ὕδωρ,
χαίροις, καὶ Νυμφέων ποιμενικὰ ξόανα,
πέτραι τε κρηνέων καὶ ἐν ὕδασι κόσμια ταῦτα
ὑμέων, ὦ κοῦραι, μυρία τεγγόμενα
χαίρετ'· Ἀριστοκλέης ὅδ', ὁδοιπόρος, ᾧπερ ἀπῶσα
δίψαν βαψάμενος, τοῦτο δίδωμι γέρας.

Cold water pouring down from the pair of rocks, / greetings to you, and rustic statues of the nymphs, / and rocks of the springs and these orderly statues of yours, / maidens, and greetings to the thousands of soaked things; / I, Aristocles, here a wayfarer, dedicate this cup as a gift / where I quenched my thirst by dipping it.

(Leon. 5 G-P = *AP* 9.326)

When the speaker greets the nymphs, water, rocks and all soaked things with the second person (χαίροις, χαίρετ', Leon. 5.2 & 5 G-P), then indicates that he is a wayfarer (ὅδ' ὁδοιπόρος 5.5 G-P), the poet seems to highlight the transient nature of the character, engaging in dialogue as a stranger passing through the place; since his destination is not mentioned, his wayfaring is without purpose outside of this dedication. The wooden statues of the nymphs (ποιμενικὰ ξόανα, Leon. 5.2 G-P) and their location provide for rustic ambience of the whole encounter, which gives the epigram a bucolic focus.[462]

There is a paradox between the permanence of the supposed dedication and the temporality of the encounter. Leonidas highlights the temporary nature of the connection between the established rustic shrine and the passing identity of the wayfarer briefly in contact with each place he passes. The repetition of rock (πέτρης…πέτραι, Leon. 5.1-3 G-P) in the first position of each lines one and three, however, suggests that within the seemingly fleeting encounter of passerby and his dedication, a sort of permanence through text endures, however fictive the dedication. His estranged transience is also noted with his gift (γέρας, Leon. 5.6 G-P), which he leaves behind as a permanent dedication, along with the epigram describing the

---

dedicator as actor. Although more apparent in Leonidas, the fictionality is limited by the genre, as the visual description of the scenery surrounding the wayfarer in Leonidas, and his engaging with the scenery, comes to a close with his dedication of a cup.

[462] Rossi (2001: 40) sees the rustic ambience here as transitional between two sub-variants of the topic of bucolic, since a quasi-*locus amoenus* is one of the distinctive elements of the bucolic.

encounter.[463] The first person and allusion to travel steer us away from understanding this epigram as the traditional inscription on an object, and so provokes readers to think not of the object itself, but of the wayfarer's encounter with the place. The demonstrative description of his present surroundings (ταῦτα, Leon. 5.3 G-P) gives the reader a full picture of the landscape where the spring is located and emphasizes that the setting is only a temporary station for the wayfaring dedicator, who dedicates in the present after quenching his thirst in the past. The figurative expulsion of his thirst with ἄπωσα - a word commonly used in fighting off an enemy[464] - implies that the traveler has worked hard to reach this spot where he dipped his cup. Wandering is a struggle for which one may be rewarded with the permanence of epigram in Leonidas' collection. With his play on the traditional aspects of the genre, Leonidas stresses the genre's capabilities of preserving the transitory encounter.

Leon. 6 G-P = *AP* 9.329 is ironically similar to Leonidas 5 G-P = *AP* 9.326. The pair of rocks in Leon. 5.1 = *AP* 9.326.1 (Πέτρης ἐκ δισσῆς), along with its repetition of rocks (Πέτρης …πέτραι, Leon. 5.1-3 G-P) and repetition of its greeting (χαίροις… χαίρετ', Leon. 5.2-5 G-P) in singular and plural, seem to show the δισσῆς to be self-referential, demonstrating awareness of its epigrammatic tricks. The repetition urges discovery of the figurative suggestion, as δισσῆς indicates a doubling of dedications.[465] The double rocks from which the water trickles in Leon. 5.1 G-P are the plural dedicatees of Leon. 6.1 G-P: the nymphs of irrigation.

> Νύμφαι ἐφυδριάδες, Δώρου γένος, ἀρδεύοιτε
> τοῦτον Τιμοκλέους κᾶπον ἐπεσσύμεναι,
> καὶ γὰρ Τιμοκλέης ὔμμιν, κόραι, αἰὲν ὁ καπεὺς

[463] Estranged by travel, much like Odysseus in *Od*. 20.296-298: ἀλλ' ἄγε οἱ καὶ ἐγὼ δῶ ξείνιον, ὄφρα καὶ αὐτὸς / ἠὲ λοετροχόῳ δώῃ γέρας ἠέ τῳ ἄλλῳ / δμώων, οἳ κατὰ δώματ' Ὀδυσσῆος θείοιο, *but go and to him let me give this token of hospitality, so he can give it as a gift to the woman who washes his feet, or to another of the maidens in the house of god-like Odysseus*.
[464] *Il*. 8.206, 24.446; *Od*. 9.81; Gaet. *AP* 6.190
[465] For δισσ- words as reference to intertextual double, see also use in elegiac epigram Leonidas 31.5 G-P = *APl* 306.5 in reference to iambic double Leon. 90 G-P = *APl* 307, and Priapic pair suggested by Ἀμφοτέραις in Leaon. 84 G-P = *APl* 261, linked with Leon. 83 G-P = *APl* 236 discussed above.

κάπων ἐκ τούτων ὥρια δωροφορεῖ.

Nymphs of the water, stock of Doris, may you hasten to irrigate this garden of Timocles, and for to you, maidens, Timocles the gardener will always bear gifts of the seasons from these gardens.

(Leon. 6 G-P = *AP* 9.329)

The dedication's indication toward doubling in Leon. 5 G-P alludes to the doubling of the name in the same position in Leon. 6.2-3 G-P. The chiasmatic repetition of the dedicator's name, Timocles, appears in the second metrical foot of the middle two lines; the chiasma contrasts the synchesis in the doubling of commands and rocks in Leon. 5.1-5 G-P. Both epigrams are dedications to nymphs, the first to rustic statues of nymphs (Νυμφέων ποιμενικὰ ξόανα, *rustic statues of the nymphs,* Leon. 5.2 G-P), so what seem to be nymphs related to the rustic water supply from which the wayfarer drinks, but the second to actual water nymphs (Νύμφαι ἐφυδριάδες, *nymphs living in the water*, Leon. 6.1 G-P). The first one is from a traveling wayfarer, the second one from a settled life-long gardener. Both address the nymphs as maidens, but in differing dialects: the Homeric/Ionic κοῦραι in Leon. 5 G-P = *AP* 9.326, and what could be the Attic, Doric, or Aeolic – κόραι – in Leon. 6 G-P = *AP* 9.329.[466]

The two names, Aristocles and Timocles, are both compounded forms of κλέος, showing the repute that is impressed upon a reader with a permanent dedication, for ordinarily unnoteworthy events.[467] Timocles earns the honor of his tribal namesake of Δώρου γένος in Leon. 6.1 G-P, whose internal rhyme is repeated with his dedication in the anadiplositic second hemistich of the last line **ὥρ**ια δ**ωρ**οφορεῖ, as *[Timocles] will bear gifts of the season,* Leon. 6.4 G-P. This similarity in sound echoes the repeted sounds within what is most noteworthy of

[466] Perhaps there is a "Doric patina" as Rossi (2001: 129) suggests, showing the poem's further awareness of itself as bucolic.

[467] cf. Gutzwiller (1998a: 97) assumes that Aristocles is a member of the upper class on account of his name, but there is little verification for this idea. Since irony is often the effect of high language with low subject matter, Leonidas could also be using the name ironically as part of his literary exposé in this epigram.

Aristocles, who is a wayfarer in **ὅδ' ὁδ**οιπόρος, Leon. 5.5 G-P= *AP* 9.326.5.[468] Both epigrams recognize their placement within a *locus amoenus*, which the gardener establishes through the "Doric patina" in Leon. 6 G-P = *AP* 6.329,[469] whereas the wayfarer establishes through his temporary dedication. The δισσῆς in the first line of Leon. 5 G-P may then suggest coordination between the two dedications within Leonidas' collection, that anthologists' editing has separated. Wandering, then, in Leonidas' collection is not necessarily continuous, but instead interspersed to keep the reader, not just the characters, engaged on a journey through the collection of epigrams.

IV. Materiality of Life and Death in Pairs

Leonidas' epigrams often explore the relationship between the materiality of life and its expected decomposition in death. With each set of pairs, as has been noted, Leonidas often engages the reader into his themes by means of pairing and literary allusion. The fable of Leonidas 32 G-P below is derived from Aesop, then refashioned by Leonidas,[470] then remade again by Leonidas in an epigram typical of his discussions of men and women clinging to life in their old age.[471] The two epigrams may be considered in the category of Leonidas' rustic epigrams; their rusticity lies in the fabulous narrative of 32 G-P and the character's simple analogy set within a rustic context in Leonidas 78 G-P. Both of the following epigrams on the vines of a goat (Leon. 32 G-P = *AP* 9.99) and old man (Leon. 78 G-P = *AP* 7.731) retell the

[468] On dialectal exchange, see Rossi 2001:51 for dialectal heterogeneity of epigram; on dialectal modifications caused by transmission of epigrams known in both the literary and epigraphic sources see Tiberi 1996: 71-85.
[469] Rossi 2001: 40.
[470] See Rossi 2002: 151-174 on "fable epigrams" as she argues that "the possibility of considering certain epigrams (among AP 9.1-583) as parallel to those typical of fable comes precisely from the presence of those that I would define as true "generic signs" of fable that unequivocally betray in epigram the origin of the episode recounted (as she cites for Leon. 32 G-P = *AP* 6.99);" Cf. Gigante (1971: 100-101) uses this epigram Leon. 32 G-P to show how dissimilar Leonidas is from Theocritus in its allusion to fable (unlike in Theocritus), yet the rich literary allusion to the *Iliad*, however, dispels notions that Leonidas' adaptations are literary. I agree with Gigante, however, that the epigram expresses didactic sentiments, and is similar to other rustic epigrams, although not a pair with, 49 G-P = *AP* 6.263.
[471] E.g. Leon. 79 G-P = Stob. 4.52.28, 10 G-P = *AP* 7.648, 37 G-P = *AP* 6.302, 50 G-P = *AP* 6.296, et al.

moral of a fable of Aesop in its ironic discussion of life's end as means of engaging the reader in their coordination.

> Ἴξαλος εὐπώγων αἰγὸς πόσις ἔν ποθ' ἁλωῇ
> οἴνης τοὺς ἁπαλοὺς πάντας ἔδαψε κλάδους·
> τῷ δ' ἔπος ἐκ γαίης τόσον ἄπυε· 'κεῖρε, κάκιστε,
> γναθμοῖς ἡμέτερον κλῆμα τὸ καρποφόρον,
> ῥίζα γὰρ ἔμπεδος οὖσα πάλιν γλυκὺ νέκταρ ἀνήσει
> ὅσσον ἐπισπεῖσαι σοί, τράγε, θυομένῳ.'
>
> Spry well-bearded spouse of a goat, when he was devouring all the delicate branches of a vine, it [the vine] spoke to him such a verse from the ground; "mow down my fruit-bearing vines with your jaws, wretched one, for since the root is steadfast, it will release sweet nectar, the very sort that will be poured for you, goat, when you are sacrificed."
>
> (Leon. 32 G-P = *AP* 9.99)

> ' Ἄμπελος ὡς ἤδη κάμακι στηρίζομαι αὔτως
> σκηπανίῳ· καλέει μ' εἰς Ἀίδην Θάνατος.
> δυσκώφει μή, Γόργε. τί τοι χαριέστερον ἢ τρεῖς
> ἢ πίσυρας ποίας θάλψαι ὑπ' ἠελίῳ;'
> ὣδ' εἴπας οὐ κόμπῳ ἀπὸ ζωὴν ὁ παλαιὸς
> ὥσατο κἠς πλεόνων ἦλθε μετοικεσίην.
>
> "Like a vine already to a vine-pole I am firmly fixed uselessly/ on this staff; Death summons me toward Hades. / Don't be hard of hearing, Gorgus; what is more pleasurable for you if you live for three / or four more summers under the sun?" / Thus, having spoken without further ado the old man pushed himself forward / and he came away from his life to the abode of the many.
>
> (Leon. 78 G-P = *AP* 7.731)

The epigrams are rustic on account of their setting, although only one involves a goat and the other only alludes to a setting in the countryside. The old man in Leon. 78 G-P = *AP* 7.731 is not a farmer or gardener necessarily, but the theme of vine and vine-pole alludes to such a setting.[472] A human figure is not present in Leon. 32 G-P, but the goat and his role as an ephemeral being with listening skills correlates with the old man and his advice of Leon. 78 G-P,

[472] Like the rustic Biton in Leon. 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154, who is described as an old man dedicating to rustic (Ἀγρονόμῳ) Pan, nymphs, and to Dionysus likewise assumed to be in the countryside.

and so the animal shows itself as "generic marker" of rusticity that the man expresses.[473] The poems are structured similarly, six lines in length and with opposite halves in reported speech, with the advisory comment of the vine to the goat about impending sacrifice in the second half of Leon. 32 G-P, and with the advisory comment of the man about the likeness of old age to a vine in the first half of Leon. 78 G-P. The first words of each epigram, Ἴξαλος and Ἄμπελος, correspond metrically and also thematically, since the first word in 32 G-P describes a spry goat nibbling on a vine, and since Leon. 78 G-P alludes to the speaker's final sacrifice, much like the goat's and vine's in Leon. 32 G-P. The pairing of first words occurs similarly to the pairing of the first words of Aesop's fables (ἄμπελος in 404b, and Τράγος in 339), which are the source of the story of goat and vine that epigram Leon. 32 G-P describes:

ἄμπελος ἐκόμα βότρυσι, παραπλήσιον δὲ ἦν τοῖς καρποῖς *(2)*
καὶ τὸ βλάστημα. τράγος δέ τις ὕβρει χρώμενος πλείονι
τῆς ἀμπέλου παρέτρωγε καὶ διελυμαίνετο προσιὼν τοῖς
βλαστήμασιν. ἡ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπεν· „μένει σε τῆς ὕβρεως *(5)*
δίκη· σὺ μὲν γὰρ ἔσῃ οὐ μακρὰν ὕστερον ἱερεῖον τοῖς θύμα-
σιν, ἐγὼ δὲ παρ' ἐμαυτῆς ἐπισπείσω τὸν οἶνον."
ἃ δρᾷ τις καὶ πείσεται.

There was a vine that grew its tendrils with clusters of grapes, and the offshoot was about as large as the fruit. Then, some goat attacking it with plenty of hubris, nibbled it while he came toward the offshoots of the vine. So the vine said to him: "retribution for your abuse awaits you; on the one hand it will not be long until you are a victim of sacrifice and I will pour the wine from myself."
Someone will suffer what one does.

(Aesop 404b/37.)

Τράγος δέ ποτε βλάστην ἀμπέλου τρώγων,
τούτῳ προσεῖπε· «Τί με βλάπτεις ἀδίκως;
μὴ γάρ, ὦ τράγε, οὐκ ἔστιν ἄρτι χλόη;
Ὅμως, πάναφρον, ποτὲ σοῦ θυομένου,
ἐγὼ τὸν οἶνον παρέξω τῷ σῷ φόνῳ.»

Once when a goat gnawed on the tendril of a vine the vine addressed the goat:
"Why are you harming me unjustly? So don't, goat, this is not merely the first shoot of spring; likewise is it senseless, since when you are sacrificed, I will provide the wine for your slaughter.

(Aesop 339 aliter.)

Leonidas' innovation on Aesop's first word in his description of the goat refers to the

[473] As Rossi (2001: 24) explains, the "rustic" epigrams are those that speak of hunters, farmers, bee-keepers, gardeners and the like, but "the epigrams where human figures are totally absent, the 'generic signs' are entrusted to animals."

specific context of *Il.* 4.105-106 (ἰξάλου αἰγὸς / ἀγρίου), which contains the only preceding occurrence of the word in Greek poetry.[474] The scene in the *Iliad* describes Pandarus who, near the streams of Aesepus, strings his bow made from the horn of a wild goat in order to strike Menelaus. The strained switch from the male goat (τράγος) in Aesop to the extended phrase containing the female goat (αἴξ, Leon.32.1 G-P) as in the *Iliad* clues readers toward the literary allusion.[475] Note also that in Aesop's own variations, the fables begin differently, one with ἄμπελος (vine) and the other with τράγος (goat), much like the pairing of Leonidas' epigrams – Leon. 78 G-P, which begins with vine, and Leon. 32 G-P, which retells Aesop but begins with a phrase from the *Iliad*. The allusion to the wild goat, as opposed to the more common τράγος, clues the reader into the rusticity of the epigram, as the literary allusion to the *Iliad* at the same time poetically enhances the fable of Aesop. Such a transformation of fable would agree with Leonidas' interest in *to oligon,* meagerness or low subject matter that is enhanced with poetic language.[476] Goat, vine, and man are all meager beings united in their expectation of death and the imminent fruitlessness of their material body.

The term for vine ἄμπελος seems wittily avoided in Leon. 32.2 G-P = *AP* 9.99.2, although the epigram certainly mimics the fable of Aesop (404b, 309), which uses ἄμπελος rather than οἴνης for vine.[477] The appearance of the vine as ἄμπελος in line one of epigram 78

[474] Philips 1972: 9-11; this is the only preceding occurrence of the word in Greek poetry.
[475] Gow 1965b: 342; compare Leon. 32 G-P = *AP* 9.99 with Evenus in *AP* 9.75, probably inspired by Leonidas; the last distich of Evenus' epigram is exactly the same as Leonidas', and is inscribed in the House of Epigrams on Via Stabiana in Pompeii, in a room where, as Prioux (2005: 40, 49) argues, Dionysus was central to the paintings and epigrams. Gow claims that the distich would be enigmatic without the picture, but it seems that Leonidas creates a picture in his collection with his pairs, and perhaps the painting is responding to the epigrams of Leonidas, as occurs with Leon. 46 G-P = *AP* 6.13 in a painting in the same house in Pompeii.
[476] Kurke (2011: 3-4) shows, Aesop is marked as "low" in classical prose and poetry (citing Hdt. 2.134-135; Ar. *V.* 1446-48) from the fifth century BC and later. With such heightening of poetic form, the intended audience of Leonidas is different, and so not the "popular", low and abject, as Kurke discusses for Aesop, but instead one that is particularly learned and able to sort through and perhaps understand the many poetic allusions within Leonidas' low subject matter.
[477] See above on p. 159 for Aesop 404b, 309.

G-P = *AP* 7.731 reveals Leonidas' purposeful choice in vernacular, and is made analogous to the advisory old man. In Leon. 32.2 G-P = *AP* 9.99.2, it is only the vine itself (οἴνης) which converses with a goat about the irony of the situation - that the wine from the vine will be poured upon the goat's own sacrifice. The absence of ἄμπελος in Leon. 32 G-P, as it appears in Aesop's fable, and the occurrence of ἄμπελος in Leon. 78 G-P, emphasize the irony of οἴνης as a vine that seems motionless or dead like wine because of the goat's nibbling, much like the goat, who is about to be sacrificed in Leon. 32 G-P, and just like the old man who clings to life like a vine in Leon. 78 G-P. Both vines in Leonidas' pair of epigrams emphasize the ephemeral lives of all plants and animals wandering toward their death. Although the topics vary, the verbal repetitions, literary allusions, and didactic sentiments about life and death indicate a relationship between the two epigrams.

The following two sets of epigram/s are sepulchral pairs, one joined by similar topic, the other by similar character. Both sets of epigrams are highly moralizing about the brevity of life, and man's substance as fleeting. In the pair below, there are no shared names, but the pairing is clear through their play on sepulchral epigram and similar subject matter, as both discuss a man's tomb through which a road has been constructed.

> Τίς ποτ' ἄρ' εἶ; τίνος ἆρα παρὰ τρίβον ὀστέα ταῦτα
> τλήμον' ἐν ἡμιφανεῖ λάρνακι γυμνὰ μένει;
> μνῆμα δὲ καὶ τάφος αἰὲν ἀμαξεύοντος ὁδίτεω
> ἄξονι καὶ τροχιῇ λειτὰ παραξέεται.
> ἤδη σου καὶ πλευρὰ παρατρίψουσιν ἄμαξαι,
> σχέτλιε, σοὶ δ' οὐδεὶς οὐδ' ἐπὶ δάκρυ βαλεῖ.
>
> Whoever are you? Whose bones are these that lie / wretched, naked by this track in a half-open box?/ [So this is a] memorial and a tomb that is always scraped smooth / by the round of an axle or a wheel of a traveler. / Yet, carts will rub alongside your ribs, / oh wretch, but no one even will shed a tear for you.
>
> (Leon. 73 G-P = *AP*. 7.478)

> Ἤδη μευ τέτριπται ὑπεκκεκαλυμμένον ὀστεῦν
> ἁρμονίῃ τ', ὦνερ, πλὰξ ἐπικεκλιμένη·
> ἤδη καὶ σκώληκες ὑπὲκ σοροῦ αὐγάζονται

ἡμετέρης· τί πλέον γῆν ἐπιεννύμεθα;
ἦ γὰρ τὴν οὔπω πρὶν ἰτὴν ὁδὸν ἐτμήξαντο
ἄνθρωποι κατ' ἐμῆς νισόμενοι κεφαλῆς.
ἀλλά πρὸς ἐγγαίων Ἀϊδωνέος Ἑρμεία τε
καὶ Νυκτός ταύτης ἐκτὸς ἴτ' ἀτραπιτοῦ.

Already ground down are my bones, uncovered, / as a slab has been leaning on my skeleton, oh man; / already worms are seen distinctly above my coffin. / Why do I cloak myself in earth any longer? / For indeed men / have split the roadway in this place, previously untrodden, / and are traveling through my head! / But, by the chthonian powers of Hades, Hermes, / and Night, keep clear from this pathway!

(Leon.74 G-P = *AP*. 7.480)

A conversation between a traveler and the tomb itself takes place between the epigrams; Leon. 73 G-P is written from the perspective of a passerby who is answered by the dead man himself in Leon. 74 G-P.[478] The pair not only fictionalizes a conversation between two poems, but the moralizing tone and wry humor form a relationship with the reader. The traveler in Leon. 73 G-P reveals that bones lie naked in the road in a half-open box, and the memorial becomes part of the daily hustle and bustle of carts rolling by and scraping the bones, rather than respected with tears of mourning (δ' οὐδεὶς οὐδ' ἐπὶ δάκρυ βαλεῖ, *and no one even will shed a tear for you*, Leon. 73.6 G-P). The memorial itself (μνῆμα, Leon. 73.3 G-P) presents a relationship between this tomb and the imagined passersby, scraped by carts and questioned by travelers, as much as it is the relationship between reader and text. Since the second person from the poem's introductory question is retained in the end of Leon. 73 G-P (εἶ …σευ… σοὶ), the third person verb between the 2nd person addresses to the tomb suggests ambiguity in the speaker of the middle lines, Leon. 73.3-4. The third person verb, παραξέεται, falls short of introducing a new speaker, and so the active questions of the speaker and the silence of the dead limit the speaking role to the passerby's address to the tomb. In Leon. 74 G-P a man's remains address passers-by;

[478] cf. Gow (1965b: 377-378); Gow-Page discuss in their commentary that these epigrams do not seem to refer to the same tomb and may perhaps be regarded as exercises suggested by desecrated graves rather than as referring to any particular graves. I agree with the latter point, that these epigrams were certainly not inscriptional; through their similar structure however, they do in fact appear to respond to each other more than not.

the seemingly rhetorical question "whoever are you?" in Leon. 73.1 G-P introduces this dialogue, and the conversation is continued by the complaints of the tomb's resident, (Leon. 74.1-3 G-P). The Ἄδη μευ in Leon. 74.1 G-P speaks back to the man by means of responding to the ἤδη σευ of Leon. 73.5 G-P. The tomb's resident asks his reader for sympathy in *why must I endure this earth any longer?*, but then invokes the gods to keep all travelers clear from this pathway in Leon. 74.7-8 G-P. Ironically, the sympathy given by passerby in Leon. 73 G-P is rejected in Leon. 74 G-P. Travelers, such as he in Leon. 73.6 G-P shedding crocodile tears for the exposed remains, should let the bones rest in peace.[479] The poems both parallel each other and continue to develop the theme of man's immateriality after death, and the characters on either side of the fictitious tombstone establish a dialogue exchange that reveals pretense in its seemingly realistic, although grotesque, scenario. With the dialogue, the tone is moralizing and insists that the reader recognize that man's material make-up reduces to nothing, and only poetry is present to preserve him.

The following epigrams on a character Aristocrates are undoubtedly companion pieces, meant to correspond to each other, firstly because they tell a completed story in their memorializing of the same character,[480] and secondly because of their common meter and literary allusion. The pair implies that regardless of how ἐσθλὸς we may assume a man is, materiality does not make the man as much as commemoration of his character.

---

[479] Dawson (1950: 279); Dawson claims that "careful study reveals convincingly that Leonidas fully appreciated how valuable for purposes of effective emphasis the last verse, last clause, or even last word could be."

[480] cf. Geffcken (1896: 79, 122-123), who denied any connection between the two, but identified both as epideictic, although he suggests a relationship between Callimachus 30 G-P = *AP* 7.415, an autobiographical epitaph with similarly, but not definitively allusive, sympotic elements, and Leon. 11 G-P = *AP* 7.440, and between Leonidas 10 G-P = *AP* 7.648 and Anyte 7 G-P = *AP* 7.646, of Erato's last words to her father, to which I see very little connection, with the exception of reported speech on one's deathbed. Gow (1965b: 319-322) argues that Theris is the same name for two very different characters in Leon. 7 G-P = *AP* 6.204 & 20 G-P = *AP* 7.295, though he does not suggest that the subject Aristocrates does not correlate in these epigrams Leon. 10 & 11 G-P = *AP* 7.648 and 7.440.

Ἐσθλὸς Ἀριστοκράτης, ὅτ' ἀπέπλεεν εἰς Ἀχέροντα,
εἶπ' ὀλιγοχρονίης ἁψάμενος κεφαλῆς,
'παίδων τις μνήσαιτο καὶ ἐδνώσαιτο γυναῖκα,
εἰ καί μιν δάκνοι δυσβίοτος πενίη.
ζωὴν στυλώσαιτο· κακὸς δ' ἄστυλος ἰδέσθαι
οἶκος, ὁ δ' ἂν †λῶιστος τ' ἀνέρος ἐσχαρεὼν
εὐκίων φαίνοιτο καὶ ἐν πολυκαέι ὄγκῳ
ἑνστῇ αὐγάζων δαλὸν ἐπεσχάριον.' †
ᾔδει Ἀριστοκράτης τὸ κρήγυον· ἀλλὰ γυναικῶν,
ὤνθρωπ', ἤχθαιρεν τὴν ἀλιτοφροσύνην.

Good Aristocrates as he sailed away into the land of Acheron, / and while grasping his short-living head, he said, / "Every man should be mindful of children and should marry a wife, / even if miserable poverty should bite him, / he should support his property; but without children his home appears bad. / So may the hearth of / that man appear best with good pillars / and in its much-burning mass, one fire-brand of the hearth would stand gleaming." / Aristocrates knew what was good, / but of women, sir, he hated their wicked mind.

(Leon. 10 G-P = *AP* 7.648)

Ἠρίον, οἷον νυκτὶ καταφθιμένοιο καλύπτεις
ὀστέον, οἵην, γαῖ', ἀμφέχανες κεφαλήν,
πολλὸν μὲν ξανθαῖσιν ἀρεσκομένου Χαρίτεσσι
πολλοῦ δ' ἐν μνήμῃ πᾶσιν Ἀριστοκράτευς.
ᾔδει Ἀριστοκράτης καὶ μείλιχα δημολογῆσαι,
στρεβλὴν οὐκ ὀφρὺν ἐσθλὸς ἐφελκόμενος,
ᾔδει καὶ Βάκχοιο παρὰ κρητῆρος ἄδηριν
ἰθῦναι κοινὴν εὐκύλικα λαλιήν,
ᾔδει καὶ ξείνοισι καὶ ἐνδήμοισι προσηνέα
ἔρδειν. γαῖ' ἐρατή, τοῖον ἔχεις φθίμενον.

Tomb, the sort of bones you cover are of a man who died at night; / Earth, the sort of head you have engulfed is this: / one who is very pleasing to the yellow-haired Graces, / since Aristocrates is very much in memory of all. / Aristocrates knew even how to speak gentle words publicly, / a good man not pulling a winch to the brow [of anyone]; / he knew also how to make easy conversation, / suited to the wine-cup, crater in hand. / He knew to offer kindness to both strangers and countrymen. / Beloved earth, you have such a man who has perished.

(Leon. 11 G-P = *AP* 7.440)

Leonidas tells a completed story of Aristocrates through the didactic correspondence between the two epigrams commemorating the character. On his deathbed the "noble" (ἐσθλὸς) Aristocrates ironically remarks on his role as a childless, unmarried man; he advises marriage so that one might leave behind pillars of his hearth.[481] This word ἐσθλὸς appears only twice in Leonidas, and both applications are used to describe Aristocrates, yet the allusion to literary

[481] Gutzwiller 1998a: 98.

precedents resonates with the implication of the paired use. Because the advice of Aristocrates in Leon. 10.1 G-P is ironic, since he himself didn't marry, the reader is provoked to question the use of the term. The reader can turn to the poem's companion, Leon. 11 G-P, for an answer. Upon first glance at Aristocrates in Leon. 11 G-P, Aristocrates is being remembered on account of his good graces. The character is ἐσθλὸς most directly in context for not causing others to furrow their brow[482] (στρεβλὴν οὐκ ὀφρὺν ἐσθλὸς ἐφελκόμενος, Leon. 11.6 G-P), and for being able to speak gentle words *ad captandum* (μείλιχα δημολογῆσαι, Leon. 11.5 G-P). The qualities of Aristocrates' goodness, however, culminate in the last distich of Leon. 11.9-10 G-P. Although he does not speak consistently with his actions or give good advice, Aristocrates is called ἐσθλὸς, and so his nobility instead comes from his kindness to both strangers and citizens alike.

The application of ἐσθλὸς to Aristocrates is reminiscent of a use of the term in the *Odyssey* and other archaic poetry. In conversation with Antinoös, Eumaeus calls him ἐσθλὸς, yet advises him that to be truly noble one must welcome wanderers and strangers alike, since they are often skilled workmen, prophets, healers, and inspired singers.[483] Such a reference to the *Odyssey* may support the moralizing tone that kindness to travelers wandering from afar and

---

[482] cf. Gow 1944: 38-39 wherein there is a discussion of the ὀφρῦς as "eye" instead of "brow."

[483] A number of scenes in the Odyssey reinforce that kindness should be offered to both strangers and countrymen – rich or poor – alike. These sentiments are clear in Eumaeus' criticism of Antinoös in *Od*. 17.381-395; "Ἀντίνο', οὐ μὲν καλὰ καὶ ἐσθλὸς ἐὼν ἀγορεύεις·/ τίς γὰρ δὴ ξεῖνον καλεῖ ἄλλοθεν αὐτὸς ἐπελθὼν / ἄλλον γ', εἰ μὴ τῶν, οἳ δημιοεργοὶ ἔασι; / μάντιν ἢ ἰητῆρα κακῶν ἢ τέκτονα δούρων, / ἢ καὶ θέσπιν ἀοιδόν, ὅ κεν τέρπῃσιν ἀείδων…. {Telemachus responds} /
Ἀντίνοος δ' εἴωθε κακῶς ἐρεθιζέμεν αἰεὶ / μύθοισιν χαλεποῖσιν, ἐποτρύνει δὲ καὶ ἄλλους," *Antinoös, although you are noble, you do not speak well; / for who, indeed comes from another place, and calls upon another stranger, at any rate, unless they are craftsmen? A seer, or healer of ills or crafter of weapons, or even inspired poet, who delights in singing…Antinoös is always accustomed to being awfully quarrelsome with harsh words, as he stirs the pot with others*.; Nausicaa also expresses this sentiment in Πρὸς γὰρ Διός εἰσιν ἅπαντες ξεῖνοί τε πτωχοί τε, δόσις δ' ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε, of *Od*. 6.206-209, and it is repeated by Eumaeus in *Od*. 14.56-61: Ξεῖν', οὔ μοι θέμις ἔστ', οὐδ' εἰ κακίων σέθεν ἔλθοι, /ξεῖνον ἀτιμῆσαι·πρὸς γὰρ Διός εἰσιν ἅπαντες / ξεῖνοι τε πτωχοί τε· δόσις δ' ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε / γίγνεται ἡμετέρη· ἡ γὰρ δμώων δίκη ἐστὶν / αἰεὶ δειδιότων; see also *Od*. 19.74, τοιοῦτοι πτωχοὶ καὶ ἀλήμονες ἄνδρες ἔασι, *such men are beggars and wanderers*; *Od*. 17.386, οὗτοι γὰρ κλητοί γε βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν.

skilled workmen, like those in Leonidas' collection, helps to shape one's nobility.[484] The didactic sentiment of Leonidas' pair is implied in the repetition of all that he knew (ᾔδει, Leon. 10.9 G-P; Leon. 11.5, 7, 9 G-P) and how he guided others in conversation (ἰθῦναι, Leon. 11.8 G-P). The name Aristocrates may suggest that Aristocrates was a wealthy man,[485] yet his nobility is rooted in his good graces toward all men. Leonidas defines the virtue of an ἀνὴρ ἐσθλὸς as akin to the moralizing guidance offered by Eumaeus in the *Od*. 17.381-395, with the pairing of the epigrams about Aristocrates. The epigrams, however, urge the reader to inquire about the nobility of Aristocrates on account of his inconsistent advice in Leon. 10 G-P, which the continuation of the pair (Leon. 11 G-P) and the literary allusion engage.

The echo of the term ἐσθλὸς may allude to other archaic poetry more directly, particularly in terms of its didactic sentiments. The didactic elegies of Tyrtaeus teach some of the same virtuous ideals that Aristocrates presents; although related to the military, and not necessarily to the wine-cup and conversation as in Leon.11 G-P, Tyrtaeus' virtuous man of fragment Tyrt. 12.7-15 is described with much of the same syntax and word choices as Leonidas' Aristocrates in Leon. 11 G-P.

οὐδ' εἰ Τανταλίδεω Πέλοπος βασιλεύτερος εἴη,
γλῶσσαν δ' Ἀδρήστου μειλιχόγηρυν ἔχοι,
οὐδ' εἰ πᾶσαν ἔχοι δόξαν πλὴν θούριδος ἀλκῆς·
οὐ γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται ἐν πολέμωι
εἰ μὴ τετλαίη μὲν ὁρῶν φόνον αἱματόεντα,
καὶ δηίων ὀρέγοιτ' ἐγγύθεν ἱστάμενος.
ἥδ' ἀρετή, τόδ' ἄεθλον ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἄριστον
κάλλιστόν τε φέρειν γίνεται ἀνδρὶ νέωι.
ξυνὸν δ' ἐσθλὸν τοῦτο πόληΐ τε παντί τε δήμωι…

Not would he be more kingly than Pelops, son of Tantalus,
Even if he should have the soft-voiced tongue of Adrastus,
If he should not have entirely good reputation except for his furious strength

[484] E.g. as with Leonidas' portrayal of himself in Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300, as a wanderer (πλάνης), a poor man (πενέστεω), with meager breadbasket (ὀλιγησιπύου).
[485] As Gutzwiller (1998a: 98), who also mentions the coordination between Leonidas' poems on Aristocrates, suggests.

For he will not become a good man in war
Unless he, on the one hand, takes courage while looking upon the bloody slaughter,
Then while standing nearby he would take aim at his enemies.
This virtue, this is the prize, which is best and most noble
For a young man to bear among men.
This noble thing must be common to the city and the entire populus.

(Tyrt. 12.7-15)

Tyrtaeus outlines the virtue of a good man as an ideal of what one should be or should have; his own excellence in battle, unlike that of any other king or hero in the past, ensures the greatness of a city.[486] This ἐσθλὸν is to be a shared quality of all members of the city and of the city itself; Tyrtaeus emphasizes that ἐσθλὸν τοῦτο is not defined by good speech but bravery in war. A man will gain nobility in life from sharing this virtue with the entire city. The didactic sentiment is clear here as well, with the idea of "becoming" good and most noble, which implies that it is a learned or developing process (γίνεται, Tyrt. 12.10 & 14).

Tyrtaeus emphasizes that this nobility will be attached to his reputation not just in life but also in death later on in fragment 12. This quality of ἐσθλὸν is indestructible, regardless of the passing of generations after one man has achieved it: οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ, / ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γῆς περ ἐὼν γίνεται ἀθάνατος, *nor ever is his noble fame destroyed, nor his name, but he becomes immortal because he is under the earth* (Tyrt. 12.31-32). Tyrtaeus teaches that a man is as noble as he is courageous in life, and he can never lose this quality; in addition, passing from life into death maintains the good qualities established by a man's courageous actions in life. By first discussing the life of the good man, and then the death, Tyrtaeus fully defines the virtue, and its benefits. He implies that men should strive for this virtue because it guarantees the virtuous man's nobility from life into death. Tyrtaeus establishes a general model to which men can look for virtue; Leonidas uses this model and applies it to a specific character.

[486] Campbell 1982: 177-178.

The structure of Leonidas' two poems reinforces the notion that Aristocrates has been memorialized for his being ἐσθλὸς, a concept of virtue which develops similarly from life into death as in archaic poetry. While his head in his hands notes Aristocrates' regret in Leonidas 10.2 G-P, in Leonidas 11.10 G-P the earth engulfs that same head. Aristocrates' material body, and assumedly all other materials of his life, have been consumed by his death, yet the essence of his preservation resonates in the coordination of the first words of both epigrams: the nobility that he is in the first word of Leon. 10.1 G-P (Ἐσθλὸς) remains because of the tomb (Ἠρίον, 11.1) that preserves his sociability, and not his material being. The two poems, when examined as "companion pieces"[487] hint that Aristocrates did not follow his own advice, but he is honored for his social abilities regardless. He is a good friend to all, even though he lacks wife and pillars, and so is memorialized by Leonidas through poetry. Leon. 11 G-P completes with endearing sentiment the life of Aristocrates, and emphasizes what it is to be ἐσθλὸς, perhaps in response to trends of archaic poetry. The allusions to archaic poetry indicate Leonidas' learnedness and high style, while exhorting didactic sentiments that teach the reader about a humble sort of nobility.

V. Commemoration of poetry through pairs

Two epigrams of Leonidas, dedicated to the poetry of Homer and Aratus, respectively, present the coordination of poetry and wandering,[488] in the epigrams' discussions of celestial bodies and commemoration of two distinct epic poets.

---

[487] As Kirstein (2002: 114-135) shows among other epigrams.

[488] It should be noted that these two epigrams sit next to each other in the *Palatine Anthology*, although such pairing the *AP* isn't a tell-tale for how Leonidas might have coordinated his own poems; on this see Gutzwiller 1998: 91-92; cf. Gow (1965b: 396) suggests that the ascription of Leon. 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25 to Leonidas is less certain, since the Planudean manuscript ascribes it to Antipater, although he agrees with Jacobs and Brunck in accepting it for Leonidas; I agree with Geffcken, (1896: 76) that there is a close relationship between Leon. 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25 and Callimachus 56 G-P = *AP* 9.507, although the influence might have been mutual.

Ἄστρα μὲν ἠμαύρωσε καὶ ἱερὰ κύκλα Σελήνης
ἄξονα δινήσας ἔμπυρος Ἠέλιος,
ὑμνοπόλους δ' ἀγεληδὸν ἀπημάλδυνεν Ὅμηρος
λαμπρότατον Μουσέων φέγγος ἀνασχόμενος.

The stars and the sacred/luminous disks of the moon, / the burning sun made dim as it whirled his chariot round them, / and Homer plunged [other] minstrels in herds into obscurity / as he held up the brightest light of the Muses.

(Leon. 30 G-P = *AP* 9.24)

Γράμμα τόδ' Ἀρήτοιο δαήμονος, ὅς ποτε λεπτῇ
φροντίδι δηναιοὺς ἀστέρας ἐφράσατο,
ἀπλανέας τ' ἄμφω καὶ ἀλήμονας οἷσί τ' ἐναργὴς
ἰλλόμενος κύκλοις οὐρανὸς ἐνδέδεται·
αἰνείσθω δὲ καμὼν ἔργον μέγα καὶ Διὸς εἶναι
δεύτερος ὅστις ἔθηκ' ἄστρα φαεινότερα.

This is the writing of skilled Aratus, who / once with a keen (λεπτῇ) / mind observed the ancient stars, both fixed and wandering, and by which / visible heaven, weaving in circles, is bound in; and let him be praised for toiling over this great work, and he is second to Zeus, who made the stars brighter.

(Leon. 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25)

The two epigrams work together in the following ways. First, we note that Homer dims the stars while Aratus illuminates them. The two epigrams coordinate from beginning to end, with Leon. 30 G-P on Homer's poetry beginning with stars (ἄστρα), and epigram Leon. 101 G-P on Aratus' poetry ending with stars that are brighter (ἄστρα φαεινότερα), a phrase which responds to, and, with the comparative, augments the phrase in the epigram on Homer's poetry. The λεπτῇ in the last word of the first line of Leon. 101 G-P on Aratus's poem shares this position with the last word in the first line of the epigram on Homer – Σελήνης. Through this placement Leonidas calls to mind the acrostic λεπτὴ in Aratus' *Phaen*omena (783-787) and the additional use of λεπτὴ at *Phaenomena* 783 and 784 to describe the shape of the moon. The holy orbits of the moon (ἱερὰ κύκλα Σελήνης, Leon. 30.1 G-P) in the epigram on Homer correspond to the many orbits of the stars that surround the sky (κύκλοις, Leon. 101.4 G-P) in the epigram on Aratus. The δεύτερος (*second* OR *another*) of Leon. 101.6 G-P sums up the epigram by saying that Aratus is second to Zeus in making brighter stars, but the indefinite relative pronoun (ὅστις,

Leon. 101.6 G-P) presents some ambiguity about whoever makes the stars brighter. The "second," therefore, may indicate that Aratus is second to Homer in some way, since Homer plunged other herds of minstrels into obscurity, as he, like the sun, illuminates the moon and stars in Leon. 30 G-P.

The subtle hint toward the theme of wandering in Leon. 101 G-P explains how Aratus is second to Homer. According to Leon. 101.2-3 G-P, the stars of Aratus are both fixed and wandering. Leonidas here employs the terms ἀπλανέας (*not wandering*), an alpha privative form of a word for wandering that Leonidas frequently uses, and ἀλήμονας (*wandering*).[489] Since Aratus specifically says that he is only going to discuss the fixed constellations (**ἀπλανέων** τά τε κύκλα τά τ' αἰθέρι σήματ' ἐνισπεῖν, Arat. *Phaen*. 454-461), why the paradoxical pairing of adjectives to modify stars in Leonidas' epigram?[490] Leonidas' epigram indicates that wandering within Aratus does occur, such as when he employs the rare term ἀλήμονας (Leon. 101.3 G-P), which Aratus (ἀλήμονες, Arat. *Phaen*. 1101) used to describe the nature of mankind as wandering sufferers who seek occupation variably, like shepherds.[491] This description of mankind equates wandering with some form of rustic or laboring men, much like in Antinous' rebuke of Eumaeus in the *Odyssey*, or Odysseus' defining of wanderers and beggars in his rebuke of Melantho for excluding them.[492] Leonidas' attribution to Aratus of a keen mind

[489] Of the forty-three uses in the *Greek Anthology*, Leonidas uses a compounded form of πλαν- for wandering five times Leon. 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154.4, 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300.1; 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715.3; 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736.1; 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25.3, three of which uses he applies in describing himself.

[490] Other scholars have argued that Leonidas' epigram is an inaccurate reading of Arat. *Phaen*. 454-461; Klooster 2011: 161; Gow 1965b: *ad loc*.; Kaibel 1894: 122.

[491] Arat. *Phaen*. 1101 ff. Οὕτω γὰρ μογεροὶ καὶ ἀλήμονες ἄλλοθεν ἄλλοι / ζώομεν ἄνθρωποι· τὰ δὲ πὰρ ποσὶ πάντες ἑτοῖμοι / σήματ' ἐπιγνῶναι καὶ ἐς αὐτίκα ποιήσασθαι. / Ἀρνάσι μὲν χειμῶνας ἐτεκμήραντο νομῆες, / ἐς νομὸν ὁππότε μᾶλλον ἐπειγόμενοι τροχόωσιν, *Thus we suffering lot, wandering from place to place, make our living; but all are ready to figure out the signs next to them and to apply them to their present circumstances. Like when, on the one hand, shepherds conjecture about storms from their sheep, when they hasten to pasture…*

[492] *Od*. 17.376 …ἦ οὐχ ἅλις ἡμιν ἀλήμονές εἰσι καὶ ἄλλοι, / πτωχοὶ ἀνιηροί, δαιτῶν ἀπολυμαντῆρες…, *Are there not crowds of wanderers and other annoying beggars that are destroyers of our feasts?!*
Od. 19.74, τοιοῦτοι πτωχοὶ καὶ ἀλήμονες ἄνδρες ἔασι. *Such men as these are beggars and wanderers.*

(λεπτῇ φροντίδι, Leon. 101.1-2) perhaps references Arataus' ability as a keen reader of Homer. For example, at *Phaen*. 1101, Aratus employs the phrase ἀλήμονες ἄλλοθεν ἄλλοι, which is reminiscent of ἦ οὐχ **ἅλις ἧμιν ἀλήμονές** εἰσι καὶ **ἄλλοι** in *Od*. 17.376**.** Just as this passage in the *Odyssey* relates that "wanderers are not apart from us," likewise in Aratus, all men are wanderers are not apart from us, although each performs his own task, since they all live while interpreting signs and adopting them for the moment.

In all extant Greek texts, Aratus' use of this rare word for wandering (ἀλήμονες, Arat. *Phaen*. 1101) is the next after Homer's chronologically, and the word only appears in the *Odyssey* twice, Aratus' *Phaenomena* once, and in Leonidas' epigram (Leon. 101 G-P) on Aratus; it does not appear again regularly until much later.[493] Thus, Leonidas shows that he is being far from an inattentive reader. Instead, he is recycling Aratus' use of "ἀλήμονες" in order to play up the theme of wandering and wanderers relevant to his own collection. With ἀλήμονας in Leon. 101.3 G-P, Leonidas comments that although Aratus is only confident to discuss the κύκλα and the σήματα that are fixed, Aratus is still astute in discussing wandering things that are limited to the bounds of the universe, much like men to their human condition.[494] Thus, through the epigram on Aratus, and its pairing to the epigram on Homer, Leonidas hints at his frequently expressed paradoxical sentiment about wanderers as sufferers, continually wandering through life, yet always bound to their death. The reader is left to interpret the poetic prowess of the authors' poems and their celestial greatness, since both Homer and Aratus reflect the brightness of the heavenly bodies with their poetry.

[493] Dorotheus *fr*. 387.21 (1st-2nd cent. BC); it appears also in the *Epica Adespota, encomium Heraclii ducis 43,* and *Epica Adespota, Mercurius mundi et Hermupolis magnae conditor fr. 1r*. 29, and so after the 1st century CE.
[494] As Kidd (2004: 559) mentions, ζώομεν in 1102 is a rare occurrence of the first person "whereby the poet identifies himself with the human condition he describes."

VI. Pairing with Poet and Reader

As seen above, Leonidas engages the reader in his collection through pairing, literary allusion, didactic sentiment, and wandering. Wandering portrayed in Leonidas' own description of himself is evident, as he calls himself a wanderer in a dedication (ἐκ †πλάνης†, Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300), which, as has been argued,[495] stood as the dedication to his collection, and in his epitaph (τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἄβιος βίος, Leon. 93.3 G-P = *AP* 7.715.3), which probably stood as epilogue. Pairing, literary allusion, and didacticism, however, do not coordinate simply as reflections of Leonidas' persona in his autobiographical epigrams, but, as has been argued above, also to engage the reader to continue in his/her own wandering throughout the collection so that he/she is held in the dialogue of the text and with the text. Within Leonidas' collection, the suggestion of wandering reflects not just poetic theme, but also the reader's journey through the epigrams.[496] The pairs, however, serve also to guide the reader in wandering through the collection, perhaps from section to section of epigram book.[497] With pairs at opposite ends of a section, the section would most strongly present the cynical treatment of the fleeting materiality of life and the irony of a brave death apparent in so many of his epigrams.[498] This framing technique would develop a discussion or argument with each of the pairs and so involve the reader through a number of different poems about whatever topic was the focus of a section.[499]

---

[495] See discussion in chapter 3; Gutzwiller 1998: 107-112.
[496] As Höschele (2006) has recently argued of other epigram collections, and in shorter form in Höschele 2007: 333-369. See note to Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736 below for further notation on Höschele's discussion of reader as traveler.
[497] Krevins 2002: 81-96.
[498] Gutzwiller 1998: 102; Gigante (1971: 109): Gigante agrees with Reitzenstein's statement; "Leonidas demonstrates the liberal development of Leonidean poetry. The cycle of epigrams broadens, the sepulchral poetry becomes long narration, the dedicatory poetry becomes one vast painting, the end accomplishes an accurate development, the same theme is brought one second time in different form, the rhetoric presses on energetically, and it is only natural in the grand poetry of the time"; cf. Fowler (1989: 9) for cynical treatment of fishermen in Hellenistic poetry and art.
[499] Dudley (1937: 114-116) explores the idea that cynicism in Hellenistic literature is an exposition of an argument which often sought objective of argument through exposition of diatribe of main speaker, or that which is more regularly combined in an "imaginary adversary." If this can be applied to Leonidas' views on the frugal life, as

There are four "autobiographical" poems of Leonidas of Tarentum that agree in their characterization of Leonidas, three of which include his name. Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300 is an eight-line rustic dedication to the Lathrian goddess from the wanderer Leonidas, just as the eight-lined Leon. 37 G-P = *AP* 6.302. Although like Leon. 36 G-P in its placement in book six of the *Greek Anthology*, the dedicatory category is less appropriate than the denomination as rustic for Leon. 37 G-P, since mice are the addressees, and since its setting is in the poor hut of Leonidas. Leon. 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715 is a six-lined epitaph composed in the voice of the poet, which stresses his distance from Tarentum, his lifeless life as a wanderer, yet the preservation of his name through the Muses' love for him for all days. Leon. 33 G-P does not include his name, but still coordinates with Leon. 36 G-P, Leon. 37 G-P in its eight lines, and also with Leon. 93 G-P in its discussion of a wanderer and/or discussion of the difficult life. If these epigrams all sat in the same poetry book, Leon. 93 G-P (the epitaph) and Leon. 36 G-P (the dedication to the rustic goddess agreed to be Aphrodite) would have respectively made fitting epilogue and prologue, yet these two epigrams Leon. 93 G-P and Leon. 36 G-P are not exactly companion pieces, although they are coordinating.

Of the autobiographical epigrams, the more definitive companions are the two rustic "dedicatory" epigrams, Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300 and Leon. 37 G-P = *AP* 6.302, whereas the epitaph may coordinate more as capstone to the entire collection, and to Leonidas' wandering and the theme of wandering altogether.

> Λαθρίη, ἐκ †πλάνης† ταύτην χάριν ἔκ τε πενέστεω
> κἠξ ὀλιγησιπύου δέξο Λεωνίδεω
> ψαιστά τε πιήεντα καὶ εὐθήσαυρον ἐλαίην
> καὶ τοῦτο χλωρὸν σῦκον ἀποκράδιον
> κεὐοίνου σταφυλῆς ἔχ' ἀποσπάδα πεντάρρωγον,
> πότνια, καὶ σπονδὴν τήνδ' ὑποπυθμίδιον.
> ἦν δέ μ' χὼς ἐκ νούσου ἀνειρύσω, ὧδε καὶ ἐχθρῆς

Dudley states, it seems that this could also be applied to Leonidas' views on death. The "imaginary adversary" then becomes the "invented" or "literary adversary" through which Leonidas puts forth cynical views.

ἐκ πενίης ῥύσῃ δέξο χιμαιροθύτην.

Lathrian goddess, receive this gift from a wanderer and from a poor man, / and from a man with little corn, Leonidas, / take some fat barley cakes and precious oil, / and this yellowish-green fig plucked from a fig tree / and take this cluster torn from a wine-rich bunch, / mistress, and this drink offering at the bottom of the vessel, / so if, just as you drew me up from disease, you likewise protect me from poverty that is hateful, / you will receive a sacrificial goat.

(Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300)

Φεύγεθ' ὑπὲκ καλύβης, σκότιοι μύες· οὔτι πενιχρὴ
μῦς σιπύη βόσκειν οἷδε Λεωνίδεω.
αὐτάρκης ὁ πρέσβυς ἔχειν ἅλα καὶ δύο κρῖμνα·
ἐκ πατέρων ταύτην ἠνέσαμεν βιοτήν.
τῷ τί μεταλλεύεις τοῦτον μυχόν, ὦ φιλόλιχνε,
οὐδ' ἀποδειπνιδίου γευόμενος σκυβάλου;
σπεύδων εἰς ἄλλους οἴκους ἴθι -τὰμὰ δὲ λιτά-
ὧν ἄπο πλειοτέρην οἴσεαι ἁρμαλιήν.

Flee from my hut, furtive mice; know that there is in no way / a poor breadbasket of Leonidas that mice can feed on. / An old man is self-sufficient if he has salt and [a couple of] crumbs; / I have contented myself with this livelihood that was inherited. / Why are you exploring this hole like this (τῷ), lover of dainties, / tasting not even scraps of leftovers. / Go – leave my plain hut – hurrying into other homes, / from which you'll get better rations!

(Leon. 37 G-P = *AP* 6.302)

The above two epigrams are parallel in their length, meter, and presentation of a rustic Leonidas. They also both showcase his poetic style with its combined rich pallet of rare lexica and familiar or everyday subjects. Each Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300 and 37 G-P = *AP* 6.302 are eight lines of elegiac couplets, yet the most striking similarity is the placement of the name Leonidas in the genitive at the end of second hemistich of the first couplet of each (δέξο Λεωνίδεω, Leon. 36.2 G-P; οἷδε Λεωνίδεω, Leon. 37.2 G-P. The prepositional phrase and metrical measure of the first and second feet of Leon. 37.1 G-P (Φεύγεθ' ὑπὲκ καλύβης, *flee from this hut*) correspond to that of the first and second feet of Leon. 36.1 G-P (Λαθρίη, ἐκ πλάνιος, *Lathrian goddess, from the wanderer*), and so the semblence pairs the rustic resident of Leon. 37 G-P with the wandering rustic dedicator of Leon. 36 G-P. Uniting the two Leonidas types is their poverty, which is stressed in similar position in each poem in the last foot and a beat πενέστεω…ὀλιγησιπύου (*poor man...of meager breadbasket*) of Leon. 36.1-2 G-P and

πενιχρὴ (*poor* – modifying σιπύη, *meal tub*, in Leon. 37.1-2 G-P). The offering of a meager meal tub from Leonidas (κἠξ ὀλιγησιπύου δέξο Λεωνίδεω, Leon. 36.2 G-P) metaphorically suggests not just poverty of rations of food, but may also refer to the small size of Leonidas' poems,[500] or the rustic or low subject matter of his poems. The meal tub of Leonidas in Leon. 37.1-2 G-P (οὔτι πενιχρὴ / μῦς σιπύη βόσκειν οἶδε Λεωνίδεω) is not compounded with the prefix ὀλιγη-, like ὀλιγησιπύου in Leon. 36.2 G-P, but instead is modified by the πενιχρὴ and likewise suggests poverty of the rustic Leonidas' store, and so an overall dearth in supply of what Leonidas has to offer for the mice. The phrases coordinate poetically to describe a rustic breadbasket, yet the first in Leon. 36 G-P is able to make an offering to the goddess, while the second in Leon. 37 G-P ironically does not have enough to share even with measly mice. The sacrificial goat (δέξο χιμαιροθύτην) that Leonidas promises from his poor meal tub (ὀλιγησιπύου δέξο Λεωνίδεω) implies a worthier offering of rustic poetry in Leon. 36.8 G-P.[501] By comparing the last word of Leon. 37.8 G-P the store elsewhere from which the mice are to garner rations (ἁρμαλιήν), with the last word of Leon. 36.8 G-P, the sacrificial goat (χιμαιροθύτην), the pairing of epigrams suggests some change of supply of rations has occurred, and so urges the mice to go elsewhere for their rations.

I argue that this pairing of terms, and the change implied from a comparison of the pairs, metaphorically urges the readers to continue reading beyond the poems following the dedication in Leon. 36 G-P, but by Leon. 37 G-P a change in theme is offered in the lack of resources

[500] For forms of this term as something sung, said, or composed in a small way, see ὀλίγῃ ὀπί με πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπε, *he told me this tale with a low voice* in *Od*. 14.492; cf. Callimacus Aet. 1-12, ἔπος δ' ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἑλ[ίσσω (*the tale I roll is toward a small measure*), οὐκ ὀλίγη (*[the tale is] not meager*), but it is [ὀλ]ιγόστιχος (*meager in lines*), α[ἱ κατὰ λεπτόν (*verses that are slender*), as discussed in detail in chapter three.

[501] Gow (1965b: 347) notes that "the promise of a larger offering is common, as in Theocritus 20 G-P = *AP* 9.437," yet Theocritus ironically offers a billy-goat among three offerings to Priapus, so that he may fall out of love with Daphnis. The poetic serenade of nightingales in the dedication of the statue of Priapus, meant for doing the work of Aphrodite (παιδογόνῳ δυνατὸν Κυπριδος ἔργα τελεῖν), emphasizes the bonded poetic connection between Theocritus' bucolic poetry and his love for Daphnis; Rossi 2001: 33-46.

described.[502] Perhaps a number of epigrams stood between the two epigrams as section ends, to which Leon. 36 G-P provided dedication and later Leon. 37 G-P is used to signal some change in the collection. Leon. 37 G-P is less about the wandering Leonidas, who is presented as living a settled life in a rustic hut, than it is about the mice rushing from house to house like wanderers, in their quest for some sort of livelihood. The disease from which Leonidas is greatful for being retracted, in a backward motion in ἠν δέ μ' ἔθ', ὡς **ἐκ** νούσου ἀνειρύσω Leon. 36.7 G-P, stands opposite to the forward motion of the mice rushing into others' houses, σπεύδων **εἰς** ἄλλους οἴκους ἴθι, Leon. 37.7 G-P.[503] The supply of the *five-fruited grape-vine torn off from its swollen bunch of grapes* (κεὐοίνου σταφυλῆς ἔχ' ἀποσπάδα **πεντάῤῥωγον**) of Leon. 36.5 G-P, stands parallel to an epithet for the mice, as if the grapes have run dry for those *lovers of dainties* (τῷ τί μεταλλεύεις τοῦτον μυχόν, **ὦ φιλόλιχνε**) in Leon. 37.5 G-P. If the two poems are read in sequence, some change has occurred that spurs the need for more provisions. The

[502] Cf. I am in part following Gutzwiller's (1998a: 110-113) suggestion, comparing Leon. 37 G-P with Ariston 3 G-P = *AP* 6.303, that "poor canister" mimics the programmatic motif that reappears in his epigrams as the "simple fare" of his working class characters, and that mice are driven by hunger for more poetry, yet I don't agree that Leon. 37 G-P, on account of its close relationship with Leon. 36 G-P necessarily appeaered "in dedicatory sequence" as reflected by Meleager's *Garland* with these poems preserved in the *Greek Anthology* as *AP* 6.300 and *AP* 6.302. I argue that Meleager and other editors and anthologists would undoubtedly have noticed the strong similarity between the two Leonidean epigrams (Leon. 36 & 37 G-P), but the preservation of one epigram next to another in the *Garland* doesn't necessarily mimic the ordering in the original collection. Catullus' parallel arrangement of sparrow poems immediately after his opening piece does not correlatively prove that Meleager's preservation of Leonidas' two epigrams effectively preserves the ordering of Leonidas' collection, since Catullus could be mimicking an anthology rather than an epigram collection. The web of pairs in Leonidas' collection is far too complex to assume that all epigram pairs are ordered one after another, although Gutzwiller argues position within a collection with hestitation. I cite as a counter example, the pair of epigrams on Anacreon in the corpus of epigrams of Theocritus 17 G-P = *AP* 9.599 & 21 G-P = *AP* 7.664, in two separate books of the *Greek Anthology* yet coordinative in subject matter.

[503] As discussed above, the condition that he suffers and from which he has been freed is related to wandering; the dedicatee is first named with the prepositional phrase ἐκ πλάνης in the second and third feet, and in the second and third feet in the second to last line ἐκ νούσου expresses from what the dedicatee was saved as means of avoiding hateful poverty. Thus, the sickness may be his own wandering and his role as a wandering poet, not that of lovesickness or other illness, although the epigram is most likely dedicated to Aphrodite. cf. Gow 1965b:346; Geffcken 1896: 120.; cf. Gutzwiller (1998a: 110-111) suggests that Leonidas' dedication to Aphrodite is comparable to her use in Philodemus 17 G-P = *AP* 11.41, "in which he asks the Muses to draw a *coronis* (convoluted sign that marks the end of a book) upon his love madness since he has decided to devote himself to a life of wisdom." With a dedication as prayer to Aphrodite to help Leonidas avoid sickness, Leonidas is not simply exhorting his readers to become self-sufficient with his collection that discusses class, his is providing an ex-urban setting for his readers as he and they wander through his collection.

poems reflect a change from an abundance of offering for a goddess, to an absolute lack of any sustanence for mice. Thus perhaps a supply of poetry is to be dedicated at the beginning of the collection, and now the well of poems has dried up, and this poetic section has concluded.

The mice of Leon. 37 G-P are like readers, wandering through Leonidas' collection in search for more sustenance. The innermost nook of the house (μυχόν, Leon. 37.5 G-P) implies the innermost part of Leonidas' collection, filled with descriptions of humble men and women. Just as the weaving and ornate embroidery of Andromache captivates her in the innermost part of a lofty house, and keeps her from knowing the lamentation of the household in *Il*. 22.442,[504] the mice are captivated by varied, ornate poetry, trapped wandering within a similar inner nook, yet of the humble home of Leonidas, from whom they search for more. The mice are held by the sumptuous craft of Leonidas, like the readers, as they search Leonidas' pantry for more epigrammatic wit, or salt, which, along with two crumbs, is all that Leonidas claims to have left in the pantry (αὐτάρκης ὁ πρέσβυς ἔχων ἅλα καὶ δύο κρῖμνα, Leon. 37.3 G-P).[505] To what better *store* would Leonidas wish that these mice go? The ἁρμαλιήν of Leon. 37.8 G-P, the larger store from which the mice are urged to draw up their sustenance, are not the rations that one can find in a small rustic hut, or among the rustic poems of Leondias, but larger, more extravagant rations, suggesting longer length and stock amassed from a longer period of time, like the store (ἁρμαλιήν) garnered by serfs from month to month.[506] The mice, however, are not

[504] The joyful web ironically mimics the lamentation she hears, but does not yet understand, and so portrays her lack of Hector and ignorance of the sad news; *Il*. 22.437-441: Ὣς ἔφατο κλαίουσ', ἄλοχος δ' οὔ πώ τι πέπυστο / Ἕκτορος· οὐ γάρ οἵ τις ἐτήτυμος ἄγγελος ἐλθὼν / ἤγγειλ' ὅττί ῥά οἱ πόσις ἔκτοθι μίμνε πυλάων, / ἀλλ' ἥ γ' ἱστὸν ὕφαινε μυχῷ δόμου ὑψηλοῖο / δίπλακα πορφυρέην, ἐν δὲ θρόνα ποικίλ' ἔπασσε. / *Thus she [Hekabe] spoke crying, but she - the wife - did not yet know about Hector, since no real messenger came to tell her husband remained outside of the gates, but in the middle of the lofty house, and so she was weaving a web, a double-folded purple web, and there she was embroidering variably-colored flowers*.
[505] Plat. *Symp*. 177b; Plut. *Comp. Menandri et Aristophanis*. 2.685A, 854C.
[506] Like those garnered from an extended period of time Hes. *WD* 560, τῆμος τῶμισυ βουσίν, ἐπ' ἀνέρι δὲ πλέον εἴη / ἁρμαλιῆς· μακραὶ γὰρ ἐπίρροθοι εὐφρόναι εἰσίν, *In this season let your oxen have half their usual food, but let your man have more; for the helpful nights are long*, trans. Evelyn-White 1914; Theoc. *Id*. 16.35, πολλοὶ ἐν

slaves; they are scavengers, seeking more poetry for their own benefit, not for that of their master.[507] The mice, those *lovers of dainties* - φιλόλιχνε, are keen on richer stores that can be found elsewhere, beyond the simple *rustic* abode of Leonidas (ὑπὲκ καλύβης). They perhaps search for more rich poetry that Leonidas' collection may be able to provide in other sections of his poetic book, outside of the rustic epigrams. Considering Leonidas has only enough salt for himself in the epigram, perhaps they should seek "salt" in its metaphorical symbolism for the sea, or among Leonidas' sea-themed poems (αὐτάρκης ὁ πρέσβυς ἔχων ἅλα καὶ δύο κρῖμνα).[508] In such a case the two crumbs (δύο κρῖμνα) would then likewise symbolize other sections of the book.

Since Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736 avoids the use of the name "Leonidas," yet in its subject who drags about his much-wandering life (περιπλάνιον βίον ἕλκων), Leon. 33 G-P presents a characterization that is glaringly similar to how Leonidas characterizes himself in other epigrams where he names himself. Thus, Leon. 33 G-P presents a riddle to be solved: who is the wanderer addressed in Leon. 33 G-P and what is his relationship both to Leonidas as character and as poet?

> Μὴ φθείρευ, ὤνθρωπε, περιπλάνιον βίον ἕλκων,
> ἄλλην ἐξ ἄλλης εἰς χθόν' ἀλινδόμενος·
> μὴ φθείρευ· κενεή σε περιστέξαιτο καλιή,
> ἢν θάλποι μικκὸν πῦρ ἀνακαιόμενον,
> εἰ καί σοι λιτή γε καὶ οὐκ εὐάλφιτος εἴη
> φυστὴ ἐνὶ γρώνῃ μασσομένη παλάμαις,
> εἰ καί σοι γλήχων ἢ καὶ θύμον ἢ καὶ ὁ πικρὸς
> ἁδυμιγὴς εἴη χόνδρος ἐποψίδιος.
>
> Don't give up, oh man, dragging about this wandering life, / rolling in the dust from one land to the next, / don't give up; would that some empty hut cover you, / or a little kindled fire warm it, / and if there were at least a paltry bit, there might not be even a good meal, / not some barley-cake, pressed in a mold with skill, / or even some pennyroyal for you, / or even thyme, or even might there be a bitter granule of salt sweetly-mixed for eating with bread.

Ἀντιόχοιο δόμοις καὶ ἄνακτος Ἀλεύα / ἁρμαλιὴν ἔμμηνον ἐμετρήσαντο πενέσται·, *many were the serfs that drew their measured rations month by month in the halls of Antiochus and king Aleuas*, trans. Gow 1965c: 125; Gow 1965d: 313.

[507] cf. Theoc. *Id.* 16.35, with n106 above, where pennyroyal is among an essembly of rustic items.

[508] They might also be in search of rations found on a ship, like ἁρμαλιὴν in Apollonius' *Argonautica* 1.393, which describes the Argo setting up to embark on its journey. Perhaps Leonidas urges the readers to leave the rustic section of his poetry book to go to the section of his book concerning seamen and fishermen.

(Leon. 33 G-P = *AP*. 7.736)

Why avoid the name Leonidas? The simple livelihood at home in Leon. 33 G-P, which the wanderer is beseeched to give up for wandering, is ironically charming like the empty house in Leon. 37 G-P, not containing enough to sustain even mice,[509] just as λιτά, the simple livelihood, is remarked upon both in Leon. 37.7 G-P (τἀμὰ δὲ λιτά) and that of the wandering addressee in Leon. 33.5 G-P (σοι λιτή). The length of Leon. 33 G-P mirrors Leon. 36 G-P and Leon. 37 G-P, two epigrams which parallel in their placement of the name Leonidas in the last foot of the second line. Leon. 33 G-P is addressed to a general "sir" (ὤνθρωπε), who is described in the last foot of the second line as ἀλινδόμενος – one who wanders. This term for "wandering" or "rolling" stands in the same position as, and so replaces, the name Leonidas in both Leon. 36 & 37 G-P.

The absence of Leonidas' name suggests that Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736 provides a turning post in the collection from Leon. 37 G-P, in its relationship to the two rustic autobiographical epigrams, Leon. 36 G-P & 37 G-P, as well as within the theme of wandering. The absence of the name Leonidas in Leon. 33 G-P engages the reader in further discerning the wandering within the collection of epigrams. Like Leon. 36 G-P and 37 G-P, Leon. 33 G-P is composed of eight lines that describe the poverty of a wanderer. The περιπλάνιον in Leon. 33 G-P, is a variation of πλάνης in Leon. 36.1 G-P, yet intensifies the route of travel, as longer and roundabout, similar to the thick leaves in a branch if ivy in κισσοῦ…κλῶνα πολυπλανέος of Leon. 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154. The περι- prefix suggests a turn, or change in direction, as reinforced by the change from one to another destination in Leon. 33.2 G-P, ἄλλην ἐξ ἄλλης εἰς χθόν'. Through repetition and direct address to the general "sir" (Μὴ φθείρευ, ὤνθρωπε,,... μὴ φθείρευ..,

[509] Fowler 1989: 129.

Leon. 33.1-3 G-P), the author implies that the exhortation is to a wider audience in Leon. 33 G-P.[510] The repetition of εἰ καί σοι λιτή with εἰ καί σοι γλήχων[511] in Leon. 33.5-7 G-P emphasizes the direct address (ὤνθρωπε), exhortation (μὴ φθείρευ), as well as dedication to whoever may be reading the epigram to continue from the rusticity to some other.[512] This command may be self-referential in part, as noticed by Gigante, Gutzwiller, and Gow.[513] Considering, however, that a similar message is contained in the epigrams which include the name Leonidas, the exclusion of the name seems to be a purposeful variation and a metapoetic suggestion.[514]

In Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736, Leonidas insists that, although poor, the traveler must persist in his roaming, since the settled life is not pleasurable either, as the poem advises that the life of the traveler does not create any more poverty than that of the settled man. The salt that provides self-sufficiency in Leon. 37.3 G-P (αὐτάρκης ὁ πρέσβυς ἔχων ἅλα καὶ δύο κρῖμνα) seems mimicked by the meager portion of salt that the addressee in Leon. 33.8 G-P (ἁδυμιγὴς εἴη χόνδρος ἐποψίδιος) would have upon giving up wandering in favor of a settled life. The variant diction in Leon. 33.8 G-P distinguishes this coarse lump of salt, sweetly-mixed for eating bread (ἁδυμιγὴς…χόνδρος ἐποψίδιος), from that of the ἅλα in Leon. 37.3 G-P, as if to allude to a variation from the settled life that one is to gain in wandering. The epigram teaches that poverty is not the reason to discontinue one's journey, implying that there is some other reason to

[510] Höschle 2007: 356-7.
[511] As in Theocritus *Id.* 5.56.
[512] Gutzwiller (1998: 107) also considers this a moralizing poem, "in which the epigrammatist appears to offer advice directly to the reader," yet her translation and argument suggests the author is advising himself to stop traveling.
[513] Gow 1965b: 343; Gigante 1971: 109; Gutzwiller 1998a: 110.
[514] Gutzwiller (1998a: 112-115) supports that the autobiographical poems are relevant to each other, and to Leonidas, in addition to a few other poems which are less directly autobiographical; Höschle (2007: 339) supports that there is an increasing consciousness of the reader in Hellenistic poetry, and puts forth that the image of traveler traveling is a metaphor for a reader reading; this naturally presents that the epigrams were written to suit a context created in the *libelli* by the individual authors of epigrams. She does not, however, discuss such a metaphor in Leonidas of Tarentum.

continue "rolling" (ἀλινδόμενος, Leon. 33.2 G-P). The reference to "rolling" may suggest the rolling and unrolling of a papyrus roll as well as the undertaking of boundless journey, and thus imply the invocation of the reader.[515] In Leon. 33 G-P, there is a certain didactic element in the exhortation to the reader to travel, which advises the reader to carry on.[516] Leonidas describes certain characters, and makes other literary connections between the pairs, to guide his readers from epigram to epigram (ἄλλην ἐξ ἄλλης εἰς χθόν', Leon. 33.2 G-P). The didactic implications in this exhortation of the traveler are clear in the repetition of the command (μὴ φθείρευ, Leon 33.1-3 G-P).[517] Because Leonidas does not name himself in Leon. 33 G-P, the general reference implies a shared exhortation to all accompanying him in these travels.[518]

The autobiographical poems seem to provide hints about the author's life, but because they do not directly mirror each other, yet still relate thematically, perhaps they were used as stepping stones throughout Leonidas' corpus. These stepping stones would have guided his readers through his compilation, from one section of epigrams to the next, and may have been interspersed among the pairs whose constituent parts each help the reader along his way.[519] Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736 would have made a fitting turning post from the section containing rustic epigrams, begun by Leon. 36 G-P yet concluded with Leon. 37 G-P, to introduce another section in the epigram collection. Persistence in wandering is central to the epigram (Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736), and to the life and death of Leonidas' poetry, as his autobiographical epitaph also makes clear the essential role of the reader in such preservation.

---

[515] See Austin 2002:148-151; Possidipp. *Epigram. (et elegi)* 118 .17: βίβλον ἑλίσσων; see also Ar. *Ra*. 904 for the metaphorical use in ἀλινδήθρας ἐπῶν, or "rolls of words."
[516] Höschele (2007: 356-357) argues similarly, but in her treatment of Dioscurides 22 GP = *AP* 7.37, that the speaker is addressed through vnyrvpe, and thus the addressee is assumed as a reader, moving through the space of a book in a "literary landscape."
[517] cf. Gutzwiller 1998a: 107-113.
[518] Gutzwiller 1998a: 107.
[519] Bing (2002: 62): "readers of epigrams on scrolls/papyri themselves become the wayfarers that readers by necessity had been before."

Leonidas' epitaph, Leon. 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715, explains the point of wandering in his collection, and emphasizes his wish to be remembered through his poetry as it is read by his readers. Just as there is bitterness apart from wandering, sweetly mixed in living a poor, settled life (ἤ καὶ…. ὁ πικρός / ἀδθμιγὴς εἴη χόνδρος ἐποψίδιος, 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736), lying apart from his native land of Tarentum is bitterer to Leonidas than death, in 93 G-P (κεῖμαι χθονὸς ἔκ τε Τάραντος …μοι πικρότερον θανάτου… τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἄβιος βίος).

> Πολλὸν ἀπ᾽ Ἰταλίης κεῖμαι χθονὸς ἔκ τε Τάραντος
> πάτρης, τοῦτο δέ μοι πικρότερον θανάτου.
> τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἄβιος βίος, ἀλλά με Μοῦσαι
> ἔστερξαν, λυγρῶν δ᾽ ἀντὶ μελιχρὸν ἔχω,
> οὔνομα δ᾽ οὐκ ἤμυσε Λεωνίδου· αὐτά με δῶρα
> κηρύσσει Μουσέων πάντας ἐπ' ἠελίους.
>
> Far from the land of Italy I lie, and far from Tarentum, / [my] homeland, and this thing itself is more bitter to me than death, / such is the lifeless life of those who wander, but the Muses loved me, / and I have something honey-sweet instead of gloomy things. So the name of Leonidas did not perish; these gifts of the Muses proclaim me for all days.
>
> (Leon. 93 G-P = *AP*. 7.715)

From these six lines we learn that Leonidas wishes to immortalize himself, his travels, and his relationship to the city of Tarentum through poetry. He says that the Muses proclaim his name for all days, and so Leonidas' epitaph proves that he has succeeded in this task by leaving behind the gifts of his poems in Leon. 93.6 G-P. He has exhorted his readers to continue on a boundless journey toward immortality, which Leonidas claims to have achieved by delivering the gifts of the Muses to his readers. The epigram laments the literary death of Leonidas through elegiac meter, who has died a traveler, and is therefore remembered by his readers as a wanderer. Leonidas has defined his own principles associated with "the lifeless life of wanderers" in his epigrams (τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἄβιος βίος), both thematic and organizational; the plural πλανίων notes the collective sense of the journey, which has been shared by Leonidas and his readers (unlike ἐκ †πλάνης†, Leon. 36.1 G-P). The poetic themes and techniques that he teaches are

hinted at through a general correspondence of the epigrams to each other and through his exhortation to the reader. Although he shares the grief of the lifeless life wanderers, his poetry immortalizes him and all those about whom he has written: ἀλλά με Μοῦσαι / ἔστερξαν, λυγρῶν δ' ἀντὶ μελιχρὸν ἔχω. / οὔνομα δ' οὐκ ἤμυσε Λεωνίδου, Leon. 93.3-4 G-P). The relationship between the Muses and poetic commemoration is conveyed by means of what is honey-sweet (μελιχρὸν ἔχω) – the didacticism nascent in poetry, for which his readers will remember his name (οὔνομα δ' οὐκ ἤμυσε Λεωνίδου).[520] The moribund nature of man's materiality is not anything to fear; instead, through descriptions of a wandering life, one is able to immortalize men's everyday wandering and the many things his epigrams have to teach his readers.

VII. Unity in the Corpus of Pairs

There are many relationships and links between the poems within the Leonidean corpus. The most prevalent relationship, repeated again and again, is a series of pairs. These pairs, since there are different types of relationships between the constituent members, parallel and continuing, subtle and exact, I believe, were placed not one after the other in a book, but served the purpose of uniting the various sections within the greater corpus. This effect would have kept the reader involved in the corpus as a whole, within the groups of related poems, and in the message the corpus wished to tell. Leonidas is the wandering poet, leaving pairs to the wandering reader, to keep the reader along a path of stepping stones. He emphasizes the importance of the simple life, the need for a traveler to persist, the dangers of the road, however humorous, a longing for home, and the immortality possible through poetry. It is important to

[520] Hes. *Th*. 35-52.

recognize the connection between the epigrams in order to understand this lively interaction between Leonidas and his readers through the landscape of his collection.

Leonidas' epigram fit into a number of categories concerning the everyday man, and so the collection stands as an oeuvre to the art of realism. Although readers may not be able to consistently categorize Leonidas' epigrams under the heading of sepulchral, dedicatory, or otherwise, a number of epigrams coordinate thematically through their subject matter: descriptions of weaving, fishing, sea-travel, old age, materiality, and rusticity. Within each of these categories, many epigrams correlate as companion pieces, or pairs. Each epigram in the pair or group is an autonomous poem, yet the poem's sense is often made clearer by some other like-themed poem within the same category. The unifying thread of the collection was not simply thematic commonality, but a poetry book that expressed, instead of an ideology of class as Gutzwiller (1998: 91) suggests, an ideology of literary realism that stands apart from and simultaneously rejoins the poetry of the surrounding literary milieu of the Hellenistic era. We have explored the themes of meagerness and wandering in the collection, and how these elements prove to be references to Leonidas' literary techniques and discussions. This chapter has shown how pairs and relationships among the poems prove the persistence of thematic coordination of wandering in the Leonidean corpus as a literary exposé of realism.

Conclusion: Leonidas and His Tradition in Greek Literature

We began our study with an observation on the importance of the theme of wandering within the poetic persona of Leonidas. Other scholars have typified his poetry, and often disregarded it, as "low" "baroque" or "Cynic" on account of the poor, simple subjects his epigrams describe. Other arguments have limited Leonidas' craft within these terms, and so isolated his work from that of his contemporaries in Alexandria. We have shown that his poetic craft reaches beyond these limits toward a poetic form that is highly skilled, artistically engaged, and in conversation with the trends of his day. The dating of his work and the new developments in the field of Hellenistic epigram shed light on the place of Leonidas of Tarentum in the Greek literary tradition. Our investigation of the theme of wandering in Leonidas has shown that this aspect of his poetry was most significantly recognized by his anthologizer as highly significant. We have observed the thematic presence of wandering and its introduction to the corpus through the literary persona of Leonidas, and its coordination with the thematically foregrounded *oligē*, or carefully crafted and highly literary description of poor, common and rustic subjects of his epigrams. Leonidas distinguishes his own *sphragis* while responding to contemporary literary styles through the confluence of wandering and *to oligon*. We have also examined the interweaving of wandering throughout a group of epigrams in the collection, and how such unification by theme and topic, namely epigrams associated with the sea, compares with sections of poetry books of other Hellenistic poets, and so argues for the existence of a self-authored poetry book by Leonidas. Lastly, we have identified a number of pairs throughout Leonidas' collection, and so have shown that such a design might have been an organizational technique within his own self-authored book of epigrams.

Meleager's anthologizing of the epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum provokes us to

understand Meleager's reading of Leonidas, so that we may know more of the collection of Leonidas' poems from which he was working. In Meleager's *Garland*, the classification of Leonidas' poems as "the blossoming clusters of ivy of Leonidas" (Λεωνίδεω θαλεροὺς κισσοῖο κορύμβους, Meleager 1 G-P = *AP* 4.1) proves to be a metaphorical classification. Since the metaphorical relationship between plants and poetry is a well-established symbol in Greek literature, the plant itself, ivy, can be understood as the ivy-like poetry of Leonidas and not limited to his prolific rate of composition. Since so many of the ascriptions of plant-life to poets within the introduction to Meleager's *Garland* symbolize themes and/or other aspects of the authors' poetry, the same sort of symbolism may reflect theme in the collection of Leonidas of Tarentum. Ivy, by nature, paradoxically wanders and clings. It is a blossoming, living plant-life as much as it is a symbol of death, poetic performance, Dionysus, and poetic merit in Greek literature. With his ascription of ivy to Leonidas' poetry, Meleager might even have had in mind an epigram by Leonidas that describes ivy as "much-wandering" (πολυπλανέος, Leonidas 97 G-P = *AP* 6.154), a description akin to how Leonidas describes himself and, as I argue above, his own poetry.[521] Meleager's metaphor appropriately describes Leonidas' epigrams, since the theme of wandering is apparent throughout the collection.

Although we have agreed with many scholars in our reading of Leonidas' epigrams that poor, simple folk is a common topic of his epigrams, its combination with a particularly ironical, high style of diction used in the humble medium of epigram reveals Leonidas' interest in responding to trends of his day, and proves to be a literary technique. The union of meagerness, or *to oligon*, and high style joins with the theme of wandering in his poetic persona, which indicates its convergence throughout his collection. The autobiographical dedication to his

[521] περιπλάνιον, Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736; ἐκ †πλάνης† … δέξο Λεωνίδεω, Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300; τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἄβιος βίος, Leon. 93 G-P = *AP* 7.715.

collection[522] shares many elements frequent in epigrams that act as seminal dedicatory or closing poems of collections of his contemporaries. Although Leonidas may be mimicking such a trend, he asserts his individual style with the epithet Lathrian for a rustic, healing Aphrodite that reflects her location in the countryside, and so point to the everyday, non-urban subject matter interwoven throughout his epigrams. This Aphrodite ironically contrasts her common association with erotic poetry in other Hellenistic authors, such as Asclepiades. Leonidas similarly responds to the Hellenistic discussion of "thin" style associated with Callimachus. With his epigram's recognition of Aratus' keen observation of the stars that are both fixed and wandering, Leonidas jointly compliments Aratus, notes his own close reading of Aratus' *Phaenomena*, and asserts his own judgment of the merits of Hellenistic poetry based on its awareness of wandering and style that is conversant in what is τὸ ὀλίγον.[523] Leonidas' merging of themes of wandering and common folk of the countryside is also rooted in the *Odyssey*, as evidenced through his many literary allusions to the Homeric epic. The refashioning of Homeric poetry is characteristic of Hellenistic poetry, yet Leonidas distinguishes his own use of allusion through its application in describing everyday wandering craftsmen, apart from urbane community. This shows how these interconnected themes are a highly stylized poetic pattern in Leonidas' epigrams, and so distinguish Leonidas' response to past and contemporary literary technique.

In the same chapter, we also show how the repetition of words that compound ὀλιγ- emphasize the relationship between wandering, poetry, poverty, and a sort of meagerness – or insignificance of the human condition, as much as they present a signature stylistic trait of Leonidas' epigrams. The epigrams display their very literary quality through their use of

[522] Leon. 36 G-P = *AP* 6.300.
[523] Leon. 101 G-P = *AP* 9.25.

allusion to Homeric poetry and original, high diction. The many compounded forms of ὀλιγ- with ornate language individually and as a group indicate the poetic technique of Leonidas that shows less sentimentalism or sensitivity toward the economic class participating in hard work, but instead careful attention to the tedious labor of the craft itself, and presents a learned display of irony much like a narrative that insists on the repetitious, impoverished, and moribund nature of human life.

Next to his epigrams' affirmed usage of these themes that offer narrative comment on the human condition is his epigrams' propensity to fit into certain categories or groupings that as a whole reflect the themes of wandering and poetic technique of *to oligon.* This study has offered both a conspectus and detailed analysis of wandering in nautically-themed poems to elucidate the themes' resonance throughout one of the epigram groupings. The epigrams allude to the theme of wandering in their narrative description of sea-travel, and those trapped at sea, repetitive crafts related to the sea, and through the metaphorical description of water travel as an approach to death. The nautical theme reflects trends of Leonidas' contemporaries; the theme sports an organizational quality akin to that in Posidippus, whereas the description of fishermen and everyday crafts related to the sea echoes the topic in Theocritus. So much of Leonidas' poetry is wrought with allusion to Homeric epic, which these sea-themed epigrams also display through the theme of wandering. Sea-wandering provokes the reader to engage the allusions and draw upon the theme's repetition throughout this group of poems that discusses shipwrecked sailors, who remain wandering forever at sea, and fishermen who repetitively wander their fated lines, as they with rich narrative description are shown to exercise their craft until they reach their end. Once again, this theme of wandering at sea resonates within the poetic persona of Leonidas, at a forced distance from his native Tarentum, living the paradoxical "lifeless life of a wanderer."

From examining thematic unity within a group with a similar setting, the argument moved to affirming unity among the collection by the identification of pairs, which prove to be a system of organization. The extent of such coordination supports the probability of a self-authored collection. The pairs engage the reader in the collection through the dialogue that they establish, as well as through their link to the theme of wandering. Some scholars have noted the existence of pairs among both inscribed and literary epigram of other authors, yet the pairing in Leonidas is a contrived and recurrent technique of organizing his literary epigrams that stresses themes in his collection and sustains the reader's involvement with ongoing themes. Pairs occur among each similarly themed group of epigrams, like pairs involving fishermen and those lost at sea among the nautically-themed epigrams. Many pairs relate more directly through topic, or shared character name, or they relate through the theme of wandering relative to location in some rustic setting. The pairs involve the reader directly through the theme of wandering embedded in vivid narrative, and offer moralizing discussions about the brevity of life and of man's substance as fleeting. Through a pair of epigrams commemorating Homer and Aratus, respectively, Leonidas communicates his respect for poetic craft that stresses the significance of wandering. The pair marks that literary prowess is rooted in authors' related understanding of the wandering nature of celestial bodies and errant suffering of mankind.

The pairs engage and guide the reader in his/her own journey through the collection of epigrams. Pairing, literary allusion, and didacticism coordinate in the autobiographical presentation of Leonidas' poetic persona, and the wandering within Leonidas' autobiographical epigrams, and throughout the collection reflect not only literary theme, but means of coordination through the reader's participation in the theme. We proposed that direct pairs might have unified sections of a self-authored poetry book by abutting each end of their respective

section, in order to prod the reader to settle within the topic's development by means of the frame that the pair provides. The parallels that occur among Leonidas' autobiographical epigrams urge the reader to interact with the author and the themes that he presents through his persona and literary markings. One example of provoked interaction occurs when an epigram equates supply of poetry with supply of sustenance in a description of Leonidas' own character; he suggests that the mice in the epigram, a metaphorical representation of his readers, keep going to other stores to look for more "salt." Such a suggestion urges that the reader continue from one section of the book to the next, to which Leonidas' autobiographical epigrams provide endpoints for each section. A certain epigram that parallels those that describe Leonidas' poetic persona command a general "sir" to keep "rolling," or wandering, implying that the author's wandering or rolling created in his poetry is not without the companionship of one wandering along with him.[524] Leonidas' autobiographical epigrams and those that mirror them, like his other pairs, suggest that the pairs provide a means of navigating through his collection for a reader. Through Leonidas' epigrams, the moribund nature of man's life is stressed, yet his and his characters' everyday wandering is immortalized forever through the journey shared with the reader in his epigrams. The delineated pairs and the thematic relationships among them prove that wandering is a coordinative theme persistent throughout the collection and Leonidas' poetic technique.

The confluence of coordinating themes, dialogic pairing, and frequent self-reference to his own fixed literary style supports the proposition of the former existence of a poetry book self-authored by Leonidas of Tarentum. Through an analysis of his epigrams and argument defining these concepts, we have situated Leonidas of Tarentum firmly within the Hellenistic period in his adaptation of certain poetic traditions, and his innovation in epigram. Leonidas is a wandering

[524] Leon. 33 G-P = *AP* 7.736.

poet with a unique interest on the common, everyday character, yet through such a description and through his wealth of diction, Leonidas elevates his own character to that of a literary persona, just as he elevates the seemingly mundane topics to the level of skilled exposé of aesthetics. The resulting poetic form achieves a sense of realism, which becomes the poet's means of establishing an engaging relationship between the reader and his art.

Appendix

The Poems of Leonidas of Tarentum

1 G-P = *AP* 6.202
Εὐθύσανον ζώνην τοι ὁμοῦ καὶ τόνδε κύπασσιν
Ἀτθὶς παρθενίων θῆκεν ὕπερθε θυρῶν,
ἐκ τόκου, ὦ Λητοί, βαρυνομένης ὅτι νηδὺν
ζωὸν ἀπ' ὠδίνων λύσαο τῆσδε βρέφος.

2 G-P = *AP* 6.211
Τὸν ἀργυροῦν Ἔρωτα καὶ περίσφυρον
πέζαν τὸ πορφυρεῦν τε Λεσβίδος κόμης
ἔλιγμα καὶ μηλοῦχον ὑαλόχροα
τὸ χάλκεόν τ' ἔσοπτρον ἠδὲ τὸν πλατὺν
τριχῶν σαγηνευτῆρα, πύξινον κτένα,
ὧν ἤθελεν τυχοῦσα, γνησία Κύπρι,
ἐν σαῖς τίθησι Καλλίκλεια παστάσιν.

3 G-P = *AP* 6.334
Αὔλια καὶ Νυμφέων ἱερὸς πάγος αἵ θ' ὑπὸ πέτρῃ
πίδακες ἥ θ' ὕδασιν γειτονέουσα πίτυς
καὶ σὺ τετραγλώχιν, μηλοσσόε, Μαιάδος Ἑρμᾶ,
ὅς τε τὸν αἰγιβότην, Πάν, κατέχεις σκόπελον,
ἵλαοι τὰ ψαιστὰ τό τε σκύφος ἔμπλεον οἴνης
δέξασθ', Αἰακίδεω δῶρα Νεοπτολέμου.

4 G-P = *AP* 6.188
Ὁ Κρὴς Θηρίμαχος τὰ λαγωβόλα Πανὶ Λυκαίῳ
ταῦτα πρὸς Ἀρκαδικοῖς ἐκρέμασε σκοπέλοις.
ἀλλὰ σὺ Θηριμάχῳ δώρων χάριν, ἀγρότα δαῖμον,
χεῖρα κατιθύνοις τοξότιν ἐν πολέμῳ
ἔν τε συναγκείαισι παρίστασο δεξιτερῆφι,
πρῶτα διδοὺς ἄγρης δῶρα καὶ ἀντιπάλων.

5 G-P = *AP* 9.326
Πέτρης ἐκ δισσῆς ψυχρὸν καταπάλμενον ὕδωρ,
χαίροις, καὶ Νυμφέων ποιμενικὰ ξόανα,
πέτραι τε κρηνέων καὶ ἐν ὕδασι κόσμια ταῦτα
ὑμέων, ὦ κοῦραι, μυρία τεγγόμενα
χαίρετ'· Ἀριστοκλέης ὅδ', ὁδοιπόρος, ᾧπερ ἀπῶσα
δίψαν βαψάμενος, τοῦτο δίδωμι γέρας.

6 G-P = *AP* 9.329
Νύμφαι ἐφυδριάδες, Δώρου γένος, ἀρδεύοιτε
τοῦτον Τιμοκλέους κᾶπον ἐπεσσύμεναι,

καὶ γὰρ Τιμοκλέης ὔμμιν, κόραι, αἰὲν ὁ καπεὺς
κάπων ἐκ τούτων ὥρια δωροφορεῖ.

7 G-P = *AP* 6.204
Θῆρις ὁ δαιδαλόχειρ τᾷ Παλλάδι πῆχυν ἀκαμπῆ
καὶ τετανὸν νώτῳ καμπτόμενον πρίονα
καὶ πέλεκυν ῥυκάναν τ' †εὐαγέα† καὶ περιαγὲς
τρύπανον ἐκ τέχνας ἄνθετο παυσάμενος.

8 G-P = *AP* 6.205
Τέκτονος ἅρμενα ταῦτα Λεοντίχου· αἵ τε χαρακταὶ
ῥῖναι καὶ κάλων οἱ ταχινοὶ βορέες,
στάθμαι καὶ μιλτεῖα καὶ αἱ σχεδὸν ἀμφιπλῆγες
σφῦραι καὶ μίλτῳ φυρόμενοι κανόνες
αἵ τ' ἀρίδες ξυστήρ τε καὶ ἐστελεωμένος οὗτος
ἐμβριθής, τέχνας ὁ πρύτανις, πέλεκυς,
τρύπανά τ' εὐδίνητα καὶ ὠκήεντα τέρετρα
καὶ γόμφων οὗτοι τοὶ πίσυρες τορέες
ἀμφίξουν τε σκέπαρνον· ἃ δὴ χαριεργῷ Ἀθάνᾳ
ὠνὴρ ἐκ τέχνας θήκατο παυόμενος.

9 G-P = *AP* 7.719
Τέλληνος ὅδε τύμβος· ἔχω δ' ὑποβωλέα πρέσβυν
τῆνον τὸν πρᾶτον γνόντα γελοιομελεῖν.

10 G-P = *AP* 7.648
Ἐσθλὸς Ἀριστοκράτης, ὅτ' ἀπέπλεεν εἰς Ἀχέροντα,
εἶπ' ὀλιγοχρονίης ἀψάμενος κεφαλῆς,
'παίδων τις μνήσαιτο καὶ ἐδνώσαιτο γυναῖκα,
εἰ καί μιν δάκνοι δυσβίοτος πενίη.
ζωὴν στυλώσαιτο· κακὸς δ' ἄστυλος ἰδέσθαι
οἶκος, ὁ δ' ἂν †λῶιστος τ' ἀνέρος ἐσχαρεὼν
εὐκίων φαίνοιτο καὶ ἐν πολυκαέι ὄγκῳ
ἑνστῇ αὐγάζων δαλὸν ἐπεσχάριον.' †
ᾔδει Ἀριστοκράτης τὸ κρήγυον· ἀλλὰ γυναικῶν,
ὤνθρωπ', ἤχθαιρεν τὴν ἀλιτοφροσύνην.

11 G-P = *AP* 7.440
Ἠρίον, οἷον νυκτὶ καταφθιμένοιο καλύπτεις
ὀστέον, οἵην, γαῖ', ἀμφέχανες κεφαλήν,
πολλὸν μὲν ξανθαῖσιν ἀρεσκομένου Χαρίτεσσι
πολλοῦ δ' ἐν μνήμῃ πᾶσιν Ἀριστοκράτευς.
ᾔδει Ἀριστοκράτης καὶ μείλιχα δημολογῆσαι,
στρεβλὴν οὐκ ὀφρὺν ἐσθλὸς ἐφελκόμενος,
ᾔδει καὶ Βάκχοιο παρὰ κρητῆρος ἄδηριν
ἰθῦναι κοινὴν εὐκύλικα λαλιήν,

ᾔδει καὶ ξείνοισι καὶ ἐνδήμοισι προσηνέα
ἔρδειν. γαῖ' ἐρατή, τοῖον ἔχεις φθίμενον.

12 G-P = *AP* 7.448
Πραταλίδα τὸ μνῆμα Λυκαστίω, ἄκρον ἐρώτων
εἰδότος, ἄκρα μάχας, ἄκρα λινοστασίης,
ἄκρα χοροιτυπίης. χθόνιοι
τοῦτον Κρηταιεῖς Κρῆτα παρῳκίσατε;

13 G-P = *AP* 7.449
Πραταλίδᾳ παιδεῖον Ἔρως πόθον, Ἄρτεμις ἄγραν,
Μοῦσα χορούς, Ἄρης ἐγγυάλιξε μάχαν.
πῶς οὐκ εὐαίων ὁ Λυκάστιος, ὃς καὶ ἔρωτι
ἆρχε καὶ ἐν μολπᾷ καὶ δορὶ καὶ στάλικι;

14 G-P = *AP* 7.665
Μήτε μακρῇ θαρσέων ναυτίλλεο μήτε βαθείῃ
νηΐ· κρατεῖ παντὸς δούρατος εἷς ἄνεμος.
ὤλεσε καὶ Πρόμαχον πνοιὴ μία, κῦμα δὲ ναύτας
ἀθρόον ἐς κοίλην ἐστυφέλιξεν ἅλα.
οὐ μήν οἱ δαίμων πάντῃ κακός· ἀλλ' ἐνὶ γαίῃ
πατρίδι καὶ τύμβου καὶ κτερέων ἔλαχε
κηδεμόνων ἐν χερσίν, ἐπεὶ τρηχεῖα θάλασσα
νεκρὸν πεπταμένους θῆκεν ἐπ' αἰγιαλούς.

15 G-P = *AP* 7.652
Ἠχήεσσα θάλασσα, τί τὸν Τιμάρεος οὕτως
πλώοντ' οὐ πολλῇ νηὶ Τελευταγόρην
ἄγρια χειμήνασα καταπρηνώσαο πόντῳ
σὺν φόρτῳ, λάβρον κῦμ' ἐπιχευαμένη;
χὠ μέν που καύηξιν ἢ ἰχθυβόροις λαρίδεσσι
τεθρήνητ' ἄπνους εὑρεῖ ἐν αἰγιαλῷ·
Τιμάρης δὲ κενὸν τέκνου κεκλαυμένον ἀθρῶν
τύμβον δακρύει παῖδα Τελευταγόρην.

16 G-P = *AP* 7.654
Αἰεὶ λησταὶ καὶ ἁλιφθόροι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι
Κρῆτες. τίς Κρητῶν οἶδε δικαιοσύνην;
ὡς καὶ ἐμὲ πλώοντα σὺν οὐκ εὐπίονι φόρτῳ
Κρηταιεῖς ὦσαν Τιμόλυτον καθ' ἁλὸς
δείλαιον. κἠγὼ μὲν ἁλιζώοις λαρίδεσσι
κέκλαυμαι, τύμβῳ δ' οὐχ ὕπο Τιμόλυτος.

17 G-P = *AP* 7.655
Ἀρκεῖ μοι γαίης μικρὴ κόνις· ἡ δὲ περισσὴ
ἄλλον ἐπιθλίβοι πλούσια κεκλιμένον

στήλη, τὸ σκληρὸν νεκρῶν βάρος. εἴ με θανόντα
γνώσοντ', Ἀλκάνδρῳ τοῦτο τί Καλλιτέλευς;

18 G-P = *AP* 7.656
Τὴν ὀλίγην βῶλον καὶ τοῦτ' ὀλιγήριον, ὦνερ,
σῆμα ποτίφθεγξαι τλάμονος Ἀλκιμένευς,
εἰ καὶ πᾶν κέκρυπται ὑπ' ὀξείης παλιούρου.
καὶ βάτου ἦν ποτ' ἐγὼ δήιον Ἀλκιμένης.

19 G-P = *AP* 7.657
Ποιμένες, οἳ ταύτην ὄρεος ῥάχιν οἰοπολεῖτε
αἶγας κεὐείρους ἐμβοτέοντες ὄις,
Κλειταγόρῃ, πρὸς Γῆς, ὀλίγην χάριν, ἀλλὰ προσηνῆ
τίνοιτε χθονίης εἵνεκα Φερσεφόνης.
βληχήσαιντ' ὄιές μοι, ἐπ' ἀξέστοιο δὲ ποιμὴν
πέτρης συρίζοι πρηέα βοσκομέναις·
εἴαρι δὲ πρώτῳ λειμώνιον ἄνθος ἀμέρξας
χωρίτης στεφέτω τύμβον ἐμὸν στεφάνῳ,
καί τις ἀπ' εὐάρνοιο καταχραίνοιτο γάλακτι
οἰός, ἀμολγαῖον μαστὸν ἀνασχόμενος, *(10)*
κρηπῖδ' ὑγραίνων ἐπιτύμβιον. εἰσὶ θανόντων,
εἰσὶν ἀμοιβαῖαι κἀν φθιμένοις χάριτες.

20 G-P = *AP* 7.295
Θῆριν τὸν τριγέροντα, τὸν εὐάγρων ἀπὸ κύρτων
ζῶντα, τὸν αἰθυίης πλείονα νηξάμενον,
ἰχθυοληιστῆρα, σαγηνέα, χηραμοδύτην,
οὐχὶ πολυσκάλμου πλώτορα ναυτιλίης,
ἔμπης οὔτ' Ἀρκτοῦρος ἀπώλεσεν, οὔτε καταιγὶς
ἤλασε τὰς πολλὰς τῶν ἐτέων δεκάδας·
ἀλλ' ἔθαν' ἐν καλύβῃ σχοινίτιδι, λύχνος ὁποῖα,
τῷ μακρῷ σβεσθεὶς ἐν χρόνῳ αὐτόματος.
σῆμα δὲ τοῦτ' οὐ παῖδες ἐφήρμοσαν οὐδ' ὁμόλεκτρος,
ἀλλὰ συνεργατίνης ἰχθυβόλων θίασος.

21 G-P = *AP* 7.198
Εἰ καὶ μικρὸς ἰδεῖν καὶ ἐπ' οὔδεος, ὦ παροδῖτα,
λᾶας ὁ τυμβίτης ἄμμιν ἐπικρέμαται,
αἰνοίης, ὤνθρωπε, Φιλαινίδα· τὴν γὰρ ἀοιδὸν
ἀκρίδα, τὴν εὖσαν τὸ πρὶν ἀκανθοβάτιν,
διπλοῦς ἐς λυκάβαντας ἐφίλατο, τὴν καλαμῖτιν,
καὶ θέτ' ἐφ' ὑμνιδίῳ χηραμένη πατάγῳ·
καί μ' οὐδὲ φθιμένην ἀπανήνατο, τοῦτο δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν
τὠλίγον ὤρθωσεν σᾶμα πολυστροφίης.

22 G-P = *AP* 7.422

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

23 G-P = *APl* 182
Τὰν ἐκφυγοῦσαν ματρὸς ἐκ κόλπων ἔτι
ἀφρῷ τε μορμύρουσαν εὐλεχῆ Κύπριν
ἴδ', ὡς Ἀπελλῆς κάλλος ἱμερώτατον
οὐ γραπτόν, ἀλλ' ἔμψυχον ἐξεμάξατο.
εὖ μὲν γὰρ ἄκραις χερσὶν ἐκθλίβει κόμαν,
εὖ δ' ὀμμάτων γαληνὸς ἐκλάμπει πόθος,
καὶ μαζός, ἀκμῆς ἄγγελος, κυδωνιᾷ·
αὐτὰ δ' Ἀθάνα καὶ Διὸς συνευνέτις
φάσουσιν· 'Ὦ Ζεῦ, λειπόμεσθα τῇ κρίσει.'

24 G-P = *AP* 9.320
Εἶπέ ποκ' Εὐρώτας πὸτ τὰν Κύπριν· 'Ἦ λάβε τεύχη
ἢ 'ξιθι τᾶς Σπάρτας· ἀ πόλις ὁπλομανεῖ.'
ἀ δ' ἀπαλὸν γελάσασα· 'Καὶ ἔσσομαι αἰὲν ἀτευχής,'
εἶπε, 'καὶ οἰκήσω τὰν Λακεδαιμονίαν.'
χἀ μὲν Κύπρις ἄνοπλος· ἀναιδέες οἵδε λέγουσιν
ἵστορες, ὡς ἁμῖν χἀ θεὸς ὁπλοφορεῖ.

25 G-P = *AP* 9.322
Οὐκ ἐμὰ ταῦτα λάφυρα. τίς ὁ θριγκοῖσιν ἀνάψας
Ἄρηος ταύταν τὰν ἄχαριν χάριτα;
ἄκλαστοι μὲν κῶνοι, ἀναίμακτοι δὲ γανῶσαι
ἀσπίδες, ἄκλαστοι δ' αἱ κλαδαραὶ κάμακες.
αἰδοῖ πάντα πρόσωπ' ἐρυθαίνομαι, ἐκ δὲ μετώπου
ἱδρὼς πιδύων στῆθος ἐπισταλάει.
παστάδα τις τοιοῖσδε καὶ ἀνδρειῶνα καὶ αὐλὰν
κοσμείτω καὶ τὸν νυμφίδιον θάλαμον·
Ἄρευς δ' αἱματόεντα διωξίπποιο λάφυρα
νηὸν κοσμοίη· τοῖς γὰρ ἀρεσκόμεθα.

26 G-P = *AP* 9.335
῾Υλοφόρου τῶγαλμα, ὁδοιπόρε, Μικκαλίωνος,
῾Ερμῆς· ἀλλ' ἴδε τὸν κρήγυον ὑλοφόρον,
ὡς ἐξ οἰζυρῆς ἠπίστατο δωροδοκῆσαι
ἐργασίης· αἰὲν δ' ὠγαθός ἐστ' ἀγαθός.

27 G-P = *AP* 9.316
Ὦ τάνδε στείχοντες ἀταρπιτόν, αἴτε ποτ' ἀγροὺς

δαμόθεν αἴτ' ἀπ' ἀγρῶν νεῖσθε ποτ' ἀκρόπολιν,
ἄμμες ὅρων φύλακες δισσοὶ θεοί, ὧν ὁ μὲν Ἑρμᾶς,
οἷον ὁρῇς μ', οὗτος δ' ἄτερος Ἡρακλέης·
ἄμφω μὲν θνατοῖς εὐάκοοι, ἀλλά ποθ' αὐτούς,
* * * * * * * * * *
αἰ †τῶ μαι† παραθῇς ἀχράδας, ἐγκέκαφεν·
ναὶ μὰν ὡσαύτως τοὺς βότρυας, αἴτε πέλονται
ὥριμοι αἴτε χύδαν ὄμφακες, εὐτρέπικεν.
μισέω τὰν μετοχὰν οὐδ' ἥδομαι· ἀλλ' ὁ φέρων τι,
ἀμφίς, μὴ κοινᾷ τοῖς δυσὶ παρτιθέτω
καὶ λεγέτω· 'τὶν τοῦθ', Ἡράκλεες', ἄλλοτε 'τοῦτο
Ἑρμᾷ', καὶ λύοι τὰν ἔριν ἀμφοτέρων.

28 G-P = *AP* 9.179
Τοξοβόλον τὸν Ἔρωτα τίς ἔξεσεν ἐκ λιβανωτοῦ,
τόν ποτε μηδ' αὐτοῦ Ζηνὸς ἀποσχόμενον;
ὀψέ ποθ' Ἡφαίστῳ κεῖται σκοπός, ὃν καθορᾶσθαι
ἔπρεπεν οὐκ ἄλλως ἢ πυρὶ τυφόμενον.

29 G-P = *AP* 9.337
Εὐάγρει, λαγόθηρα, καὶ εἰ πετεεινὰ διώκων
ἰξευτὴς ἥκεις τοῦθ' ὑπὸ δισσὸν ὄρος,
κἀμὲ τὸν ὑληωρὸν ἀπὸ κρημνοῖο βόασον
Πᾶνα· συναγρεύω καὶ κυσὶ καὶ καλάμοις.

30 G-P = *AP* 9.24
Ἄστρα μὲν ἠμαύρωσε καὶ ἱερὰ κύκλα Σελήνης
ἄξονα δινήσας ἔμπυρος Ἥλιος,
ὑμνοπόλους δ' ἀγεληδὸν ἀπημάλδυνεν Ὅμηρος
λαμπρότατον Μουσέων φέγγος ἀνασχόμενος.

31 G-P = *APl* 306
Πρέσβυν Ἀνακρείοντα χύδαν σεσαλαγμένον οἴνῳ
θάεο †δινωτοῦ στρεπτὸν ὕπερθε λίθου†,
ὡς ὁ γέρων λίχνοισιν ἐπ' ὄμμασιν ὑγρὰ δεδορκὼς
ἄχρι καὶ ἀστραγάλων ἕλκεται ἀμπεχόναν·
δισσῶν δ' ἀρβυλίδων τὰν μὲν μίαν οἷα μεθυπλὴξ
ὤλεσεν ἐν δ' ἑτέρᾳ ῥικνὸν ἄραρε πόδα.
μέλπει δ' ἠὲ Βάθυλλον ἐφίμερον ἠὲ Μεγιστᾶν,
αἰωρῶν παλάμᾳ τὰν δυσέρωτα χέλυν.
ἀλλά, πάτερ Διόνυσε, φύλασσέ μιν· οὐ γὰρ ἔοικεν
ἐκ Βάκχου πίπτειν Βακχιακὸν θέραπα.

32 G-P = *AP* 9.99
Ἴξαλος εὐπώγων αἰγὸς πόσις ἔν ποθ' ἁλωῇ
οἴνης τοὺς ἁπαλοὺς πάντας ἔδαψε κλάδους·

τῷ δ' ἔπος ἐκ γαίης τόσον ἄπυε· 'κεῖρε, κάκιστε,
γναθμοῖς ἡμέτερον κλῆμα τὸ καρποφόρον,
ῥίζα γὰρ ἔμπεδος οὖσα πάλιν γλυκὺ νέκταρ ἀνήσει
ὅσσον ἐπισπεῖσαι σοί, τράγε, θυομένῳ.'

33 G-P = *AP* 7.736
Μὴ φθείρευ, ὄνθρωπε, περιπλάνιον βίον ἕλκων,
ἄλλην ἐξ ἄλλης εἰς χθόν' ἀλινδόμενος·
μὴ φθείρευ· κενεή σε περιστέξαιτο καλιή,
ἣν θάλποι μικκὸν πῦρ ἀνακαιόμενον,
εἰ καί σοι λιτή γε καὶ οὐκ εὐάλφιτος εἴη
φυστὴ ἐνὶ γρώνῃ μασσομένη παλάμαις,
εἰ καί σοι γλήχων ἢ καὶ θύμον ἢ καὶ ὁ πικρὸς
ἀδυμιγὴς εἴη χόνδρος ἐποψίδιος.

34 G-P = *AP* 6.129
Ὀκτώ τοι θυρεούς, ὀκτὼ κράνη, ὀκτὼ ὑφαντοὺς
θώρηκας, τόσσας δ' αἱμαλέας κοπίδας,
ταῦτ' ἀπὸ Λευκανῶν Κορυφασίᾳ ἔντε' Ἀθάνᾳ
Ἄγνων Εὐάνθευς θῆχ' ὁ βιαιομάχος.

35 G-P = *AP* 6.131
Αἵδ' ἀπὸ Λευκανῶν θυρεάσπιδες, οἵδε χαλινοὶ
στοιχηδὸν ξεσταί τ' ἀμφίβολοι κάμακες
δέδμηνται, ποθέουσαι ὁμῶς ἵππους τε καὶ ἄνδρας,
Παλλάδι· τοὺς δ' ὁ μέλας ἀμφέχανεν θάνατος.

36 G-P = *AP* 6.300
Λαθρίη, ἐκ †πλάνης† ταύτην χάριν ἔκ τε πενέστεω
κἠξ ὀλιγησιπύου δέξο Λεωνίδεω
ψαιστά τε πιήεντα καὶ εὐθήσαυρον ἐλαίην
καὶ τοῦτο χλωρὸν σῦκον ἀποκράδιον
κεὐοίνου σταφυλῆς ἔχ' ἀποσπάδα πεντάρρωγον,
πότνια, καὶ σπονδὴν τήνδ' ὑποπυθμίδιον.
ἦν δέ μ' χὼς ἐκ νούσου ἀνειρύσω, ὧδε καὶ ἐχθρῆς
ἐκ πενίης ῥύσῃ δέξο χιμαιροθύτην.

37 G-P = *AP* 6.302
Φεύγεθ' ὑπὲκ καλύβης, σκότιοι μύες· οὔτι πενιχρὴ
μῦς σιπύη βόσκειν οἶδε Λεωνίδεω.
αὐτάρκης ὁ πρέσβυς ἔχειν ἄλα καὶ δύο κρῖμνα·
ἐκ πατέρων ταύτην ἠνέσαμεν βιοτήν.
τῷ τί μεταλλεύεις τοῦτον μυχόν, ὦ φιλόλιχνε,
οὐδ' ἀποδειπνιδίου γευόμενος σκυβάλου;
σπεύδων εἰς ἄλλους οἴκους ἴθι -τἀμὰ δὲ λιτά-
ὧν ἄπο πλειοτέρην οἴσεαι ἁρμαλιήν.

38 G-P = *AP* 6.200
Ἐκ τόκου, Εἰλείθυια, πικρὰν ὠδῖνα φυγοῦσα
Ἀμβροσίη κλεινῶν θήκατό σοι πρὸ ποδῶν
δεσμὰ κόμας καὶ πέπλον, ἐν ᾧ δεκάτῳ ἐπὶ μηνὶ
δισσὸν ἀπὸ ζώνης κῦμ' ἐλόχευσε τέκνων.

39 G-P = *AP* 6.355
Ἀ μάτηρ ζῷον τὸν Μίκυθον, οἷα πενιχρά,
Βάκχῳ δωρεῖται ῥωπικὰ γραψαμένα.
Βάκχε, σὺ δ' ὑψῴης τὸν Μίκυθον· αἱ δὲ τὸ δῶρον
ῥωπικόν, ἁ λιτὰ ταῦτα φέρει πενία.

40 G-P = *AP* 6.286
Τῆς πέζης τὰ μὲν ἄκρα τὰ δεξιὰ μέχρι παλαιστῆς
καὶ σπιθαμῆς οὔλης Βίττιον εἰργάσατο,
θάτερα δ' Ἀντιάνειρα προσήρμοσε· τὸν δὲ μεταξὺ
Μαίανδρον καὶ τὰς παρθενικὰς Βιτίη.
κουρᾶν καλλίστη Διός, Ἄρτεμι, τοῦτο τὸ νῆμα
πρὸς ψυχῆς θείης, τὴν τριπόνητον ἔριν.

41 G-P = *AP* 6.288
Αἱ Λυκομήδευς παῖδες, Ἀθηνὼ καὶ Μελίτεια
καὶ Φιντὼ Γληνίς θ', αἱ φιλοεργόταται,
ἔργων ἐκ δεκάτας ποτιθύμια τόν τε πρόσεργον
ἄτρακτον καὶ τὰν ἄτρια κριναμέναν
κερκίδα, τὰν ἱστῶν μολπάτιδα, καὶ τὰ τροχαῖα
πανία †κερταστὰς τούσδε ποτιρρόγεας†
καὶ σπάθας εὐβριθεῖς †πολυάργυρα τώς δὲ† πενιχραί
ἐξ ὀλίγων ὀλίγαν μοῖραν ἀπαρχόμεθα.
τῶν χέρας αἰέν, Ἀθάνα, ἐπιπλήσαιο μὲν ἴσως,
θείης δ' εὐσιπύους ἐξ ὀλιγησιπύων.

42 G-P = *AP* 6.289
Αὐτονόμα, Μελίτεια, Βοΐσκιον, αἱ Φιλολᾴδεω
καὶ Νικοῦς Κρῆσσαι τρεῖς, ξένε, θυγατέρες,
ἁ μὲν τὸν μιτόεργον ἀειδίνητον ἄτρακτον,
ἁ δὲ τὸν ὀρφνίταν εἰροκόμον τάλαρον,
ἁ δ' ἅμα τὰν λεπτῶν εὐάτριον ἐργάτιν, ἱστῶν
κερκίδα, τὰν λεχέων Πανελόπας φύλακα,
δῶρον Ἀθαναίᾳ Πανίτιδι τῷδ' ἐνὶ ναῷ
θῆκαν, Ἀθαναίας παυσάμεναι καμάτων.

43 G-P = *AP* 5.206
Μηλὼ καὶ Σατύρη τανυήλικες, Ἀντιγενείδεω
παῖδες, ταὶ Μουσέων εὔκολοι ἐργάτιδες,

Μηλὼ μὲν Μούσαις Πιμπληίσι τοὺς ταχυχειλεῖς
αὐλοὺς καὶ ταύτην πύξινον αὐλοδόκην,
ἡ φίλερως Σατύρη δὲ τὸν ἕσπερον οἰνοποτήρων
σύγκωμον κηρῷ τευξαμένη δόνακα,
ἡδὺν συριστῆρα, σὺν ᾧ πανεπόρφνιος ἠὼ
ηὔγασεν αὐλείοις οὐ ἐγκροτέουσα θύραις.

44 G-P = *AP* 6.281
Δίνδυμα καὶ Φρυγίης πυρικαιέος ἀμφιπολεῦσα
πρῶνας τὴν μικρήν, Μῆτερ, Ἀριστοδίκην,
κούρην Σειλήνης, παμπότνια, κεἰς ὑμέναιον
κεἰς γάμον ἀδρύναις, πείρατα κουροσύνας·
ἀνθ' ὧν σοι κατὰ πολλὰ προνήια καὶ παρὰ βωμῷ
παρθενικὴν ἐτίναξ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα κόμην.

45 G-P = AP 6.309
Εὔφυλλόν τοι σφαῖραν ἐυκρόταλόν τε Φιλοκλῆς
Ἑρμείῃ ταύτην πυξινέην πλατάγην
ἀστραγάλας θ', αἷς πόλλ' ἐπεμήνατο, καὶ τὸν ἑλικτὸν
ῥόμβον, κουροσύνης παίγνι', ἀνεκρέμασεν.

46 G-P = *AP* 6.13
Οἱ τρισσοί τοι ταῦτα τὰ δίκτυα θῆκαν ὅμαιμοι,
ἀγρότα Πάν, ἄλλης ἄλλος ἀπ' ἀγρεσίης·
ὧν ἀπὸ μὲν πτανῶν Πίγρης τάδε, ταῦτα δὲ Δᾶμις
τετραπόδων, Κλείτωρ δ' ὁ τρίτος εἰναλίων.
ἀνθ' ὧν τῷ μὲν πέμπε δι' ἠέρος εὔστοχον ἄγρην,
τῷ δὲ διὰ δρυμῶν, τῷ δὲ δι' ἠιόνων.

47 G-P = *AP* 6.35
Τοῦτο χιμαιροβάτᾳ Τελέσων αἰγώνυχι Πανὶ
τὸ σκύλος ἀγρείης τεῖνε κατὰ πλατάνου
καὶ τὰν ῥαιβόκρανον ἐυστόρθυγγα κορύναν,
ἃ πάρος αἱμωποὺς ἐστυφέλιξε λύκους,
γαυλούς τε γλαγοπῆγας ἀγωγαῖόν τε κυνάγχαν
καὶ τὰν εὐρίνων λαιμοπέδαν σκυλάκων.

48 G-P = *AP* 6.262
Τὸν νομίην καὶ ἔπαυλα βοῶν καὶ βώτορας ἄνδρας
σινόμενον κλαγγάν τ' οὐχὶ τρέσαντα κυνῶν
Εὐάλκης ὁ Κρὴς ἐπινύκτια μῆλα νομεύων
πέφνε καὶ ἐκ ταύτης ἐκρέμασεν πίτυος.

49 G-P = *AP* 6.263
Πυρσῶ τοῦτο λέοντος ἀποφλοιώσατο δέρμα
Σῶσος ὁ βουπάμων, δουρὶ φονευσάμενος

ἄρτι καταβρύκοντα τὸν εὐθηλήμονα μόσχον·
οὐδ' ἵκετ' ἐκ μάνδρας αὖτις ἐπὶ ξύλοχον,
μοσχείω δ' ἀπέτισεν ὁ θὴρ ἀνθ' αἵματος αἷμα
βληθείς· ἀχθεινὰν δ' εἶδε βοοκτασίαν.

50 G-P = *AP* 6.296
Ἀστεμφῆ ποδάγρην καὶ δούνακας †ἀντυκτῆρας
καὶ λίνα καὶ γυρὸν τοῦτο λαγωοβόλον,
ἰοδόκην καὶ τοῦτον ἐπ' ὄρτυγι τετρανθέντα
αὐλὸν καὶ πλωτῶν εὐπλεκὲς ἀμφίβολον
Ἑρμείῃ Σώσιππος, ἐπεὶ παρενήξατο τὸ πλεῦν
ἤβης, ἐκ γήρως δ' ἀδρανίῃ δέδεται.

51 G-P = *p.Oxy*. 662
'Ακρορίτᾳ Πανὶ καὶ ενπᾳ[…..] Νύμφαις
[Γ]λῆνις ὁ σθνγείτων δῶρα κ[υνηγεσί]ης
ταύτην τε προτομὰν καὶ δ[……..]ησ.[.]ι
βύρσαν καὶ ῥοθίους τούσ[δ' ἀνέθηκε] πόδας.
Πὰν ὦ καὶ Νύμφαι, τὸν δ[……ἀγ]ρευτῆρα
Γλῆνιν ἀεξήσαιθ' αιδ[……..]ς.

52 G-P = *AP* 6.4
†Εὐκαπὲς† ἄγκιστρον καὶ δούνακα δουλιχόεντα
χὠρμιὴν καὶ τὰς ἰχθυδόκους σπυρίδας
καὶ τοῦτον νηκτοῖσιν ἐπ' ἰχθύσι τεχνασθέντα
κύρτον, ἁλιπλάγκτων εὕρεμα δικτυβόλων,
τρηχύν τε τριόδοντα, Ποσειδαώνιον ἔγχος,
καὶ τοὺς ἐξ ἀκάτων διχθαδίους ἐρέτας
ὁ γριπεὺς Διόφαντος ἀνάκτορι θήκατο τέχνας,
ὡς θέμις, ἀρχαίας λείψανα τεχνοσύνας.

53 G-P = *AP* 6.221
Χειμερίην διὰ νύκτα χαλαζήεντά τε συρμὸν
καὶ νιφετὸν φεύγων καὶ κρυόεντα πάγον
μουνολέων καὶ δὴ κεκακωμένος ἀθρόα γυῖα
ἦλθε φιλοκρήμνων αὖλιν ἐς αἰγινόμων.
οἱ δ' οὐκ ἀμφ' αἰγῶν μεμελημένοι, ἀλλὰ περὶ σφέων,
εἵατο σωτῆρα Ζῆν' ἐπικεκλόμενοι.
χεῖμα δὲ †θὴρ μείνας θὴρ νύκτιος† οὔτε τιν' ἀνδρῶν
οὔτε βοτῶν βλάψας, οἴχετ'ἀπαθλόσυνος.
οἱ δὲ πάθης ἔργον τόδ' ἐυγραφὲς ἀκρολοφῖται
Ζανὶ παρ' εὐπρέμνῳ τᾷδ' ἀνέθεντο δρυΐ.

54 G-P = *AP* 6.293
Ὁ σκίπων καὶ ταῦτα τὰ βλαυτία, πότνια Κύπρι,

ἄγκειται κυνικοῦ σκῦλ' ἀπὸ Σωχάρεος
ὅλπη τε ῥυπόεσσα πολυτρήτοιό τε πήρας
λείψανον, ἀρχαίης πληθόμενον σοφίης·
σοὶ δὲ Ῥόδων ὁ καλός, τὸν πάνσοφον ἠνίκα πρέσβυν
ἤγρευσεν, στεπτοῖς θήκατ' ἐπὶ προθύροις.

55 G-P = *AP* 6.298
Πήρην κἀδέψητον ἀπεσκληρυμμένον αἰγὸς
στέρφος καὶ βάκτρον τοῦτό τὸ λοιπόρινον
κῶλπαν ἀστλέγγιστον ἀχάλκωτόν τε κυνοῦχον
καὶ πῖλον κεφαλᾶς οὐχ ὁσίας σκέπανον,
ταῦτα καταφθιμένοιο μυρικίνεον περὶ θάμνον
σκῦλ' ἀπὸ Σωχάρεος Λιμὸς ἀνεκρέμασεν.

56 G-P = *AP* 6.305
Λαβροσύνᾳ τάδε δῶρα † φιλευχείλῳ† τε Λαφυγμῷ
θήκατο δεισόζος Δωριέος κεφαλά·
τὼς Λαρισαίως †κυτογάστορας† ἐψητῆρας
καὶ χύτρως καὶ τὰν εὐρυχαδῆ κύλικα
καὶ τὰν εὐχάλκωτον ἐύγναμπτόν τε κρεάγραν
καὶ κνῆστιν καὶ τὰν ἐτνοδόνον τορύναν.
Λαβροσύνα, σὺ δὲ ταῦτα κακοῦ κακὰ δωρητῆρος
δεξαμένα νεύσαις μήποκα σωφροσύναν.

57 G-P = *AP* 7.19
Τὸν χαρίεντ' Ἀλκμᾶνα, τὸν ὑμνητῆρ' ὑμεναίων
κύκνον, τὸν Μουσέων ἄξια μελῳάμενον,
τύμβος ἔχει, Σπάρτας μεγάλαν χάριν † εἴθ' ὅ γε λύσθὸς†
ἄχθος ἀπορρίψας οἴχεται εἰς Ἀίδαν.

58 G-P = *AP* 7.408
Ἀτρέμα τὸν τύμβον παραμείβετε, μὴ τὸν ἐν ὕπνῳ
πικρὸν ἐγείρητε σφῆκ' ἀναπαυόμενον.
ἄρτι γὰρ Ἱππώνακτος ὁ καὶ τοκεῶνε βαΰξας
ἄρτι κεκοίμηται θυμὸς ἐν ἡσυχίῃ.
ἀλλὰ προμηθήσασθε, τὰ γὰρ πεπυρωμένα κείνου
ῥήματα πημαίνειν οἶδε καὶ εἰν Ἀίδῃ.

59 G-P = *AP* 7.67
Ἀίδεω λυπηρὲ διήκονε, τοῦτ' Ἀχέροντος
ὕδωρ ὃς πλώεις πορθμίδι κυανέῃ,
δέξαι μ', εἰ καί σοι μέγα βρίθεται ὀκρυόεσσα
βᾶρις ἀποφθιμένων, τὸν κύνα Διογένην.
ὅλπη μοι καὶ πήρη ἐφόλκια καὶ τὸ παλαιὸν
ἔσθος χὠ φθιμένους ναυστολέων ὀβολός.
πάνθ', ὅσα κἠν ζωοῖς ἐπεπάμεθα, ταῦτα παρ' Ἄιδαν

ἔρχομ' ἔχων, λείπω δ' οὐδὲν ὑπ' ἠελίῳ.

60 G-P = *AP* 7.264
Εἴη ποντοπόρῳ πλόος οὔριος· ὅν δ' ἄρ' ἀήτης,
ὡς ἐμέ τοῖς Ἀίδεω προσπελάσῃ λιμέσιν
μεμφέσθω μὴ λαῖτμα κακόξενον ἀλλ' ἔο τόλμαν
ὅστις ἀφ' ἡμετέρου πείσματ' ἔλυσε τάφου.

61 G-P = *AP* 7.266
Ναυηγοῦ τάφος εἰμὶ Διοκλέος· οἱ δ' ἀνάγονται,
φεῦ τόλμης, ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πείσματα λυσάμενοι.

62 G-P = *AP* 7.273
Εὔρου με τρηχεῖα καὶ αἰπήεσσα καταιγὶς
καὶ νὺξ καὶ δνοφερῆς κύματα πανδυσίης
ἔβλαψ' Ὠρίωνος, ἀπώλισθον δὲ βίοιο
Κάλλαισχρος Λιβυκοῦ μέσσα θέων πελάγευς.
κἀγὼ μὲν πόντῳ δινεύμενος ἰχθύσι κύρμα
οἴχημαι, ψεύστης δ' οὗτος ἔπεστι λίθος.

63 G-P = *AP* 7.283
Τετρηχυῖα θάλασσα, τί μ' οὐκ οἰζυρὰ παθόντα
τηλόσ' ἀπὸ ψιλῆς ἔπτυσας ἠιόνος,
ὡς σεῦ μηδ' Ἀίδαο κακὴν ἐπιειμένος ἀχλὺν
Φιλλεὺς Ἀμφιμένευς ἆσσον ἐγειτόνεον;

64 G-P = *AP* 7.503
--Ἀρχαίης ὦ θινὸς ἐπεστηλωμένον ἄχθος,
εἴποις ὅντιν' ἔχεις ἢ τίνος ἢ ποδαπόν.
--Φίντων' Ἑρμιονῆα Βαθυκλέος, ὃν πολὺ κῦμα
ὤλεσεν Ἀρκτούρου λαίλαπι χρησάμενον.

65 G-P = *AP* 7.506
Κὴν γῇ καὶ πόντῳ κεκρύμμεθα· τοῦτο περισσὸν
ἐκ Μοιρέων Θάρσυς Χαρμίδου ἠνυσάμην.
ἦ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀγκύρης ἔνοχον βάρος εἰς ἅλα δύνων
Ἰόνιόν θ' ὑγρὸν κῦμα κατερχόμενος
τὴν μὲν ἔσωσ', αὐτὸς δὲ μετάτροπος ἐκ βυθοῦ ἔρρων
ἤδη καὶ ναύταις χεῖρας ὀρεγνύμενος,
ἐβρώθην· τοῖόν μοι ἐπ' ἄγριον εὖ μέγα κῆτος
ἦλθεν, ἀπέβροξεν δ' ἄχρις ἐπ' ὀμφαλίου.
χἤμισυ μὲν ναῦται, ψυχρὸν βάρος ἐξ ἁλὸς ἡμῶν
ἤρανθ' ἥμισυ δὲ πρίστις ἀπεκλάσατο·
ἠόνι δ' ἐν ταύτῃ κακὰ λείψανα Θάρσυος, ὦνερ,
ἔκρυψαν, πάτρην δ' οὐ πάλιν ἱκόμεθα.

66 G-P = *AP* 7.504

Πάρμις ὁ Καλλιγνώτου ἐπακταῖος καλαμευτής,
ἄκρος καὶ κίχλης καὶ σκάρου ἰχθυβολεὺς
καὶ λάβρου πέρκης δελεάρπαγος ὅσσα τε κοίλας
σήραγγας πέτρας τ' ἐμβυθίους νέμεται,
ἄγρης ἐκ πρωτῆς ποτ' ἰουλίδα πετρήεσσαν
δακνάζων ὀλοὴν ἐξ ἁλὸς ἀράμενος
ἔφθιτ'· ὀλισθηρὴ γὰρ ὑπὲκ χεροὸς ἀίξασα
ᾤχετ' ἐπὶ στεινὸν παλλομένη φάρυγα.
χὠ μὲν μηρίνθων καὶ δούνακος ἀγκίστρων τε
ἐγγὺς ἀπὸ πνοιὴν ἧκε κυλινδόμενος,
νήματ' ἀναπλήσας ἐπιμοίρια· τοῦ δὲ θανόντος
Γρίπων ὁ γριπεὺς τοῦτον ἔχωσε τάφον.

67 G-P = *AP* 7.452

Μνήμης Εὐβούλοιο σαόφρονος, ὦ παριόντες,
πίνωμεν· κοινὸς πᾶσι λιμὴν Ἀίδης.

68 G-P = *AP* 7.455

Μαρωνὶς ἡ φίλοινος, ἡ πίθων σποδός,
ἐνταῦθα κεῖται γρηῦς, ἧς ὑπὲρ τάφου
γνωστὸν πρόκειται πᾶσιν Ἀττικὴ κύλιξ.
στένει δὲ καὶ γᾶς νέρθεν οὐχ ὑπὲρ τέκνων
οὐδ' ἀνδρός, οἷς ἔλειπεν ἐνδεεῖς βίου,
ἓν δ' ἀντὶ πάντων, οὔνεχ' ἡ κύλιξ κενή.

69 G-P = *AP* 7.463

Αὔτα Τιμόκλει', αὔτα Φιλώ, αὔτα Ἀριστώ,
αὔτα Τιμαιθώ, παῖδες Ἀριστοδίκου,
πᾶσαι ὑπ' ὠδῖνος πεφονευμέναι· αἷς ἔπι τοῦτο
σᾶμα πατὴρ στάσας κάτθαν' Ἀριστόδικος.

70 G-P = *AP* 7.163

--Τίς τίνος εὖσα, γύναι, Παρίην ὑπὸ κίονα κεῖσαι;
--Πρηξὼ Καλλιτέλευς. --Καὶ ποδαπή; --Σαμίη.
--Τίς δέ σε καὶ κτερέιξε; --Θεόκριτος, ᾧ με γονῆες
ἐξέδοσαν. --Θνῄσκεις δ' ἐκ τίνος; --Ἐκ τοκετοῦ.
--Εὖσα πόσων ἐτέων; --Δύο κεἴκοσιν. --Ἦ ῥά γ' ἄτεκνος; —
--Οὔκ, ἀλλὰ τριετῆ Καλλιτέλην ἔλιπον.
--Ζώοι σοι κεῖνός γε καὶ ἐς βαθὺ γῆρας ἵκοιτο.
--καὶ σοί, ξεῖνε, πόροι πάντα Τύχη τὰ καλά.

71 G-P = *AP* 7.466

Ἆ δείλ' Ἀντίκλεις, δειλὴ δ' ἐγὼ ἡ τὸν ἐν ἥβης
ἀκμῇ καὶ μοῦνον παῖδα πυρωσαμένη,
ὀκτωκαιδεκέτης ὃς ἀπώλεο, τέκνον· ἐγὼ δὲ

ὀρφάνιον κλαίω γῆρας ὀδυρομένη.
βαίην εἰς Ἄιδος σκιερὸν δόμον· οὔτε μοι ἠὼς
ἡδεῖ' οὔτ' ἀκτὶς ὠκέος ἠελίου.
ἆ δείλ' Ἀντίκλεις μεμορημένε, πένθεος εἵης
ἰητὴρ ζωῆς ἔκ με κομισσάμενος.

72 G-P = *AP* 7.726
῾Εσπέριον κἠῷον ἀπώσατο πολλάκις ὕπνον
ἡ γρηῢς πενίην Πλατθὶς ἀμυνομένη,
καί τι πρὸς ἠλακάτην καὶ τὸν συνέριθον ἄτρακτον
ἤεισεν πολιοῦ γήραος ἀγχίθυρος
καί τι παριστίδιος δινευμένη ἄχρις ἐπ' ἠοῦς
κεῖνον Ἀθηναίης σὺν Χάρισιν δόλιχον,
ἢ ῥικνῇ ῥικνοῦ περὶ γούνατος ἄρκιον ἱστῷ
χειρὶ στρογγύλλουσ' ἱμερόεσσα κρόκην.
ὀγδωκονταέτις δ' Ἀχερούσιον ἠΰγασεν ὕδωρ
ἡ καλὴ καλῶς Πλατθὶς ὑφηναμένη.

73 G-P = *AP* 7.478
Τίς ποτ' ἄρ' εἶ; τίνος ἆρα παρὰ τρίβον ὀστέα ταῦτα
τλήμον' ἐν ἡμιφανεῖ λάρνακι γυμνὰ μένει;
μνῆμα δὲ καὶ τάφος αἰὲν ἀμαξεύοντος ὁδίτεω
ἄξονι καὶ τροχιῇ λειτὰ παραξέεται.
ἤδη σου καὶ πλευρὰ παρατρίψουσιν ἄμαξαι,
σχέτλιε, σοὶ δ' οὐδεὶς οὐδ' ἐπὶ δάκρυ βαλεῖ.

74 G-P = *AP* 7.480
῞Ηδη μευ τέτριπται ὑπεκκεκαλυμμένον ὀστεῦν
ἁρμονίῃ τ', ὦνερ, πλὰξ ἐπικεκλιμένη·
ἤδη καὶ σκώληκες ὑπὲκ σοροῦ αὐγάζονται
ἡμετέρης· τί πλέον γῆν ἐπιεννύμεθα;
ἦ γὰρ τὴν οὔπω πρὶν ἰτὴν ὁδὸν ἐτμήξαντο
ἄνθρωποι κατ' ἐμῆς νισόμενοι κεφαλῆς.
ἀλλά πρὸς ἐγγαίων Ἀϊδωνέος ῾Ερμεία τε
καὶ Νυκτός ταύτης ἐκτὸς ἴτ' ἀτραπιτοῦ.

75 G-P = *AP* 7.740
Αὔτὰ ἐπὶ Κρήθωνος ἐγὼ λίθος, οὔνομα κείνου
δηλοῦσα, Κρήθων δ' ἐγχθόνιος σποδιά,
ὁ πρὶν καὶ Γύγῃ παρισεύμενος ὄλβον, ὁ τὸ πρὶν
βουπάμων, ὁ πρὶν πλούσιος αἰπολίοις,
ὁ πρίν—τί πλείω μυθεῦμ' ἔτι; πᾶσι μακαρτός,
φεῦ, γαίης ὅσσης ὅσσον ἔχει μόριον.

76 G-P = *AP* 7.472b
Χειμέριον ζωὴν ὑπαλεύεο, νεῖο δ' ἐς ὅρμον

ὡς κἠγὼ Φείδων ὁ Κρίτου, εἰς Ἀίδην.

77 G-P = *AP* 7.472
Μυρίος ἦν, ὄνθρωπε, χρόνος πρὸ τοῦ, ἄχρι πρὸς ἠὼ
ἦλθες, χὠ λοιπὸς μυρίος εἰν Ἀίδῃ.
τίς μοῖρα ζωῆς ὑπολείπεται ἢ ὅσον ὅσσον
στιγμὴ καὶ στιγμῆς εἴ τι χαμηλότερον;
μικρή σευ ζωὴ τεθλιμμένη, οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὴ *(5)*
ἡδεῖ' ἀλλ' ἐχθροῦ στυγνοτέρη θανάτου.
ἐκ τοίης ὤνθρωποι ἀπηκριβωμένοι ὀστῶν
ἁρμονίης †ὑψοσ τ'† ἠέρα καὶ νεφέλας.
ὦνερ, ἴδ', ὡς ἀχρεῖον, ἐπεὶ περὶ νήματος ἄκρον
εὐλὴ ἀκέρκιστον λῶπος ἐφεζομένη
†οἷον τὸ ψαλάθριον ἀπεψιλωμένον οἷον†
πολλῷ ἀραχναίου στυγνότερον σκελετοῦ.
ἠοῦν ἐξ ἠοῦς ὅσσον σθένος, ὦνερ, ἐρευνῶν
εἴης ἐν λιτῇ κεκλιμένος βιοτῇ
αἰὲν τοῦτο νόῳ μεμνημένος, ἄχρις ὁμιλῇς
ζωοῖς, ἐξ οἵης ἡρμόνισαι καλάμης.

78 G-P = *AP* 7.731
' Ἄμπελος ὡς ἤδη κάμακι στηρίζομαι αὔτως
σκηπανίῳ· καλέει μ' εἰς Ἀίδην Θάνατος.
δυσκώφει μή, Γόργε. τί τοι χαριέστερον ἢ τρεῖς
ἢ πίσυρας ποίας θάλψαι ὑπ' ἠελίῳ;'
ὦδ' εἴπας οὐ κόμπῳ ἀπὸ ζωὴν ὁ παλαιὸς
ὥσατο κἠς πλεόνων ἦλθε μετοικεσίην.

79 G-P = Stob. 4.52.28
Εὔθυμος ὢν ἔρεσσε τὴν ἐπ' Ἄιδος
ἀταρπὸν ἕρπων, οὐ γάρ ἐστι δύσβατος
οὐδὲ σκαληνὸς οὐδ' ἐνίπλεος πλάνης,
ἰθεῖα δ' ᾗ μάλιστα καὶ κατακλινὴς
ἅπασα, κἠκ μεμυκότων ὁδεύεται.

80 G-P = *AP* 9.318
Εὐμάραθον πρηῶνα καὶ εὐσκάνδικα λελογχώς,
Ἑρμῆ, καὶ ταύταν, ἃ φίλος, αἰγίβοσιν
καὶ λαχανηλόγῳ ἔσσο καὶ αἰγινομῆι προσηνής·
ἕξεις καὶ λαχάνων καὶ γλάγεος μερίδα.

81 G-P = *APl* 190
Τὰν αἰγῶν ὁ νομεὺς Μόριχος τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Ἑρμᾶν
ἔστασ' αἰπολίων εὐδόκιμον φύλακα·
ἀλλά μοι αἴ τ' ἀν' ὄρη χλωρᾶς κεκορεσμέναι ὕλας,
τοῦ γ' ἁρπακτῆρος μή τι μέλεσθε λύκου.

82 G-P = *AP* 9.744

Ὠιγινόμοι Σώτων καὶ Σίμαλος, οἱ πολύαιγοι,
οἷα βαθυσχίνων, ἅ ξένε, †παρολκίδαν,
Ἑρμᾷ τυρευτῆρι καὶ εὔγλαγι τὸν χιμάραρχον
χάλκεον εὐπώγων' ὧδ' ἀνέθεντο τράγον.

83 G-P = *APl* 236

Αὐτοῦ ἐφ' αἱμασιαῖσι τὸν ἀγρυπνοῦντα Πρίηπον
ἔστησεν λαχάνων Δεινομένης φύλακα·
ἀλλ' ὡς ἐντέταμαι, φώρ, ἔμβλεπε. 'τοῦτο' δ' ἐρωτᾷς
'τῶν ὀλίγων λαχάνων εἵνεκα;' τῶν ὀλίγων.

84 G-P = APl 261

Ἀμφοτέραις παρ' ὁδοῖσι φύλαξ ἔστηκα Πρίηπος
ἰθυτενὲς μηρῶν ὀρθιάσας ῥόπαλον,
εἴσατο γὰρ πιστόν με Θεόκριτος. ἀλλ' ἀποτηλοῦ,
φώρ, ἴθι, μὴ κλαύσῃς τὴν φλέβα δεξάμενος.

85 G-P = *AP* 10.1

Ὁ πλόος ὡραῖος, καὶ γὰρ λαλαγεῦσα χελιδὼν
ἤδη μέμβλωκεν χὠ χαρίεις Ζέφυρος,
λειμῶνες δ' ἀνθεῦσι σεσίγηκεν δὲ θάλασσα
κύμασι καὶ τρηχεῖ πνεύματι βρασσομένη.
ἀγκύρας ἀνέλοιο καὶ ἐκλύσαιο γύαια,
ναυτίλε, καὶ πλώοις πᾶσαν ἐφεὶς ὀθόνην·
ταῦθ' ὁ Πρίηπος ἐγὼν ἐπιτέλλομαι, ὁ λιμενίτης,
ὤνθρωφ', ὡς πλώοις πᾶσαν ἐπ' ἐμπορίην.

86 G-P = *APl* 230

Μὴ σύ γ' ἐπ' οἰονόμοιο περίπλεον ἰλύος ὧδε
τοῦτο χαραδραίης θερμόν, ὀδῖτα, πίῃς·
ἀλλὰ μολὼν μάλα τυτθὸν ὑπὲρ δαμαλήβοτον ἄκρην
κεῖσέ γε πὰρ κείνᾳ ποιμενίᾳ πίτυϊ
εὑρήσεις κελαρύζον ἐυκρήνου διὰ πέτρης
νᾶμα Βορειαίης ψυχρότερον νιφάδος.

87 G-P = *AP* 6.226

Τοῦτ' ὀλίγον Κλείτωνος ἐπαύλιον †ἥ τ' ὀλιγαῦλαξ
σπείρεσθαι† λιτός θ' ὁ σχεδὸν ἀμπελεὼν
τοῦτό τε †ρω παίειν† ὀλιγόξυλον· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τούτοις
Κλείτων ὀγδώκοντ' ἐξεπέρησ' ἔτεα.

88 G-P = *AP* 9.719

Οὐκ ἔπλασέν με Μύρων· ἐψεύσατο, βοσκομέναν δὲ
ἐξ ἀγέλας ἐλάσας δῆσε βάσει λιθίνῳ.

89 G-P = *APl* 206
Θεσπιέες τὸν Ἔρωτα μόνον θεὸν ἐν Κυθερείης
ἄζοντ' οὐχ ἑτέρου γραπτὸν ἀπ' ἀρχετύπου
ἀλλ' ὃν Πραξιτέλης ἔγνω θεόν, ὃν περὶ Φρύνῃ
δερκόμενος σφετέρων λύτρον ἔδωκε πόθων.

90 G-P = *APl* 307
Ἴδ', ὡς ὁ πρέσβυς ἐκ μέθας Ἀνακρέων
ὑπεσκέλισται καὶ τὸ λῶπος ἕλκεται
ἐσάχρι γυίων, τῶν δὲ βλαυτίων τὸ μὲν
ὅμως φυλάσσει θἄτερον δ' ἀπώλεσεν.
μελίσδεται δὲ τὰν χέλυν διακρέκων
ἤτοι Βάθυλλον ἢ καλὸν Μεγιστέα.
φύλασσε, Βάκχε, τὸν γέροντα μὴ πέσῃ.

91 G-P = *AP* 6.120
Οὐ μόνον ὑψηλοῖς ἐπὶ δένδρεσιν οἶδα καθίζων
ἀείδειν ζαθερεῖ καύματι θαλπόμενος
προίκιος ἀνθρώποισι κελευθήτῃσιν ἀοιδός
θηλείης ἔρσης ἰκμάδα γευόμενος
ἀλλὰ καὶ εὐπήληκος Ἀθηναίης ἐπὶ δουρὶ
τὸν τέττιγ' ὄψει μ', ὦνερ, ἐφεζόμενον·
ὅσσον γὰρ Μούσαις ἐστέργμεθα, τόσσον Ἀθήνη
ἐξ ἡμέων, ἡ γὰρ παρθένος αὐλοθέτει.

92 G-P = *AP* 5.188
Οὐκ ἀδικέω τὸν Ἔρωτα -γλυκύς- μαρτύρομαι αὐτὴν
Κύπριν, βέβλημαι δ' ἐκ δολίου κέραος
καὶ πᾶς τεφροῦμαι, θερμὸν δ' ἐπὶ θερμῷ ἰάλλει
ἄτρακτον, λωφᾷ δ' οὐδ' ὅσον ἰοβολῶν.
χὠ θνητὸς τὸν ἀλιτρὸν †ἐσώκει θνητὸς ὁ δαίμων,
τίσομαι· ἐγκλήμων δ' ἔσσομ' ἀλεξόμενος.

93 G-P = *AP* 7.715
Πολλὸν ἀπ' Ἰταλίης κεῖμαι χθονὸς ἔκ τε Τάραντος
πάτρης, τοῦτο δέ μοι πικρότερον θανάτου.
τοιοῦτος πλανίων ἄβιος βίος, ἀλλά με Μοῦσαι
ἔστερξαν, λυγρῶν δ' ἀντὶ μελιχρὸν ἔχω,
οὔνομα δ' οὐκ ἤμυσε Λεωνίδου· αὐτά με δῶρα
κηρύσσει Μουσέων πάντας ἐπ' ἠελίους.

94 G-P = *AP* 6.44
Γλευκοπόταις Σατύροισι καὶ ἀμπελοφύτορι Βάκχῳ *(1)*
Ἡρῶναξ πρώτης δράγματα φυταλιῆς
τρισσῶν οἰνοπέδων τρισσοὺς ἱερώσατο τούσδε

ἐμπλήσας οἴνου πρωτοχύτοιο κάδους,
ὧν ἡμεῖς σπείσαντες, ὅσον θέμις, οἴνοπι Βάκχῳ *(5)*
καὶ Σατύροις, Σατύρων πλείονα πιόμεθα.

95 G-P = *AP* 6.130
Τοὺς θυρεοὺς ὁ Μολοσσὸς Ἰτωνίδι δῶρον Ἀθάνᾳ
Πύρρος ἀπὸ θρασέων ἐκρέμασεν Γαλατῶν
πάντα τὸν Ἀντιγόνου καθελὼν στρατόν. οὐ μέγα θαῦμα·
αἰχμηταὶ καὶ νῦν καὶ πάρος Αἰακίδαι.

96 G-P = AP 6.110
Τὰν ἔλαφον Κλεόλαος ὑπὸ κναμοῖσι λοχήσας
ἔκτανε Μαιάνδρου πὰρ τριέλικτον ὕδωρ
θηκτῷ σαυρωτῆρι, τὰ δ' ὀκτάρριζα μετώπων
φράγμαθ' ὑπὲρ κραναὰν ἅλος ἔπαξε πίτυν.

97 G-P = *AP* 6.154
Ἀγρονόμῳ τάδε Πανὶ καὶ εὐαστῆρι Λυαίῳ
πρέσβυς καὶ Νύμφαις Ἀρκὰς ἔθηκε Βίτων·
Πανὶ μὲν ἀρτίτοκον χίμαρον συμπαίστορα μητρός
κισσοῦ δὲ Βρομίῳ κλῶνα πολυπλανέος,
Νύμφαις δὲ σκιερῆς εὐποίκιλον ἄνθος ὀπώρης
φύλλα τε πεπταμένων αἱματόεντα ῥόδων·
ἀνθ' ὧν εὔυδρον, Νύμφαι, τόδε δῶμα γέροντος
αὔξετε, Πάν, γλαγερόν· Βάκχε, πολυστάφυλον.

98 G-P = *AP* 7.13
Παρθενικὰν νεαοιδὸν ἐν ὑμνοπόλοισι μέλισσαν
Ἥρινναν Μουσέων ἄνθεα δρεπτομένην
Ἅιδας εἰς ὑμέναιον ἀνάρπασεν· ἦ ῥα τόδ' ἔμφρων
εἶπ' ἐτύμως ἁ παῖς, 'βάσκανός ἔσσ', Ἀίδα.'

99 G-P = *AP* 7.35
Ἄρμενος ἦν ξείνοισιν ἀνὴρ ὅδε καὶ φίλος ἀστοῖς,
Πίνδαρος, εὐφώνων Πιερίδων πρόπολος.

100 G-P = *AP* 7.316
Τὴν ἐπ' ἐμεῦ στήλην παραμείβεο μήτε με χαίρειν
εἰπὼν μήθ' ὅστις, μὴ τίνος ἐξετάσας,
ἢ μή τὴν ἀνύεις τελέσαις ὁδόν· ἢν δὲ παρέλθῃς
σιγῇ μηδ' οὕτως ἢν ἀνύεις τελέσαις.

101 G-P = *AP* 9.25
Γράμμα τόδ' Ἀρήτοιο δαήμονος, ὅς ποτε λεπτῇ
φροντίδι δηναιοὺς ἀστέρας ἐφράσατο,
ἀπλανέας τ' ἄμφω καὶ ἀλήμονας οἷσί τ' ἐναργὴς

ἰλλόμενος κύκλοις οὐρανὸς ἐνδέδεται·
αἰνείσθω δὲ καμὼν ἔργον μέγα καὶ Διὸς εἶναι
δεύτερος ὅστις ἔθηκ' ἄστρα φαεινότερα.

102 G-P = *AP* 9.563
Τὸν φιλοπωριστὴν Δημόκριτον ἦν που ἐφεύρῃς,
ὤνθρωπ', ἄγγειλον τοῦτο τὸ κοῦφον ἔπος,
ὡς ἡ λευκοόπωρος ἐγὼ καὶ ἐφώριος ἤδη
κείνῳ συκοφορῶ τὰς ἀπύρους ἀκόλους.
σπευσάτω -οὐκ ὀχυρὴν γὰρ ἔχω στάσιν- εἴπερ ὀπώρην
†ἀκρήτου† χρῄζει δρέψαι ἀπ' ἀκρεμόνος.

103 G-P = *APl* 171
Ἄρεος ἔντεα ταῦτα τίνος χάριν, ὦ Κυθέρεια,
ἐνδέδυσαι, κενεὸν τοῦτο φέρουσα βάρος;
αὐτὸν Ἄρη γυμνὴ γὰρ ἀφώπλισας, εἰ δὲ λέλειπται
καὶ θεός, ἀνθρώποις ὅπλα μάτην ἐπάγεις.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abel, D. H. 1965. "The White Violet Amid the Roses." *CJ* 60: 365-368.

Acosta-Hughes, B. 2002. *Polyeieia: The Iambi of Callimachus and the Archaic Iambic Tradition*. Berkeley.
_____. & S. Stephens. 2002b. "Rereading Callimachus' 'Aetia' Fragment 1." *CPh* 97: 238-255.
_____, E. Kosmetatou, & M. Baumbach, eds. 2004. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspsectives on an Epigram Collection*. Cambridge, MA.
_____. 2010. *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*. Princeton.

Adrados, F. 1979. "'The Life of Aesop' and the Origins of the Novel in Antiquity." *QUCC* 1: 93-112.

Albiani, Maria Grazia. 1980. "Leon. Tar. 92 G.-P. (= AP 5.188)." *QUCC* 5: 75-87.

Amerio, M.L. 1981/82. "L'elogio di Arato composto da Leonida di Taranto (A.P. 9,25) e la tradizione platonico-pitagorica della Magna Grecia in età ellenistica." *InvLuc* 3/4: 111-60.

Argentieri, L. 1998. "Epigramma e libro. Morfologia delle raccolte epigrammatiche premeleagree." *ZEP* 121: 1-20.
_____. 2007. "Meleager and Philip as Epigram Collectors." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss. eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 147-164.

Arland, W. 1937. *Nachtheokritische Bukolik bis an die Schwelle der lateinischen Bukolik*. Leipzig.

Asper, M. 1997. *Onomata allotria: Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos*. Stuttgart.

Austin, C. & G. Bastianini. 2002. *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia*. Milan.

Bagordo, Andreas. 2000. "Das Epigramm des Leonidas von Tarent auf Arat (Anth. Pal. IX 25 = 101 Gow/Page)." *WJA* 24: 79-88.

Bal, Mieke. 1997. *Narratology: introduction to the theory o narrative*, 2nd ed. (English translation of De theorie van vertellen en verhalen: inleiding in de narratologie, 5th ed. [Muiderberg, 1990]) Toronto.

Barchiesi, A. 2005. "The Search for the Perfect Book." In K. Gutzwiller. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. New York.

Barigazzi, Adelmo. 1985. "Leonida, A.P. 7.472. L'uomo e la ragnetella." *Prometheus* 11: 193-210.

Barwick, K. 1958. "Zyklen bei Martial und in den kleinen Gedichten des Catull." *Philologus* 102: 284-318.

Bastianini, G. & C. Galazzi. 2001. *Posidippo di Pella: Epigrammi (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309)*. Milan

Baumbach, M , A. Petrovic, & I. Petrovic. 2010. *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram: Contextualisation and Literarisation*, Cambridge.

Baumbach, M. & K. Trampedach. 2004. "'Winged Words': Poetry and Divination in Posidippus' Oionoskopika." In B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, & M. Baumbach. eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspsectives on an Epigram Collection*. Cambridge, MA.

Beckby, H. 1957-8. *Anthologia Graeca*. 4 vols. Munich.

Bernsdorff, H. 2001. *Hirten in der nicht-bukolischen Dichtung des Hellenismus*. Stuttgart.

Bettenworth, A. 2007. "The Mutual Influence of Inscribed and Literary Epigram." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss. eds. 2007. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 69-94.

Bevan, E. 1921. *Hellenism and Christianity*. London.
_____. 1931. *The Poems of Leonidas of Tarentum*. Oxford.

Bing, P. 1990. "A Pun on Aratus' Name in Verse 2 of the Phainomena?" *HSCPh* 93: 281-285.
_____. 1995. "Ergänzungsspiel in the Epigrams of Callimachus." *A&A* 41: 115-131.
_____. 1998. "Between Literature and Monuments." In Harder, M.A., eds. *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*. Groningen, 21-43.
_____. 2002 "The un-read Muse? Inscribed epigram and its readers in antiquity." In Harder, M.A. eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven, 39-66.
_____. 2005. "The politics and poetics of geography in the Milan Posidippus, Section One: On Stones (AB 1-20)." In K. Gutzwiller ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. Oxford, 119-140.
_____. 2009. *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*. Ann Arbor.

Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. 2007. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston.

Boedeker, D. & D. Sider, eds. 2001. *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. New York.

Booth, W. C. 1983. *The rhetoric of fiction*, 2nd ed. Chicago.

Bosman, P. 2006. "Selling Cynicism: The Pragmatics of Diogenes' Cynic Performances." *CQ* 56: 93-104.

Bowie, E. 1986. "Early Greek Elegy, symposium, and public festival." *JHS* 106: 13-35.

_____. 2007a. "From Archaic Elegy to Hellenistic Sympotic Epigram." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 95-112.
_____. 2007b. "Early expatriates: displacement and exile in archaic poetry." In Gaertner, J.F. ed. *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, Leiden, 21-49.
_____. 2009. "Wandering poets, archaic style." In Hunter, R. & I. Rutherford, eds. *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge. 105-136.

Bowra, C.M. 1969. *Early Greek Elegists*. New York.

Branham, Robert Bracht & Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé. eds. 1996. *The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and its Legacy*. Berkeley.

Brauer, G.C. Jr. 1986. *Taras: Its History and Coinage*. New Rochelle, NY.

Brink, C.O. 1972. "Ennius and the Hellenistic Worship of Homer." *AJPh* 93: 547-567.

Brown, J.P. 1969. "The Mediterranean Vocabulary of the Vine." *Vetus Testamentum* 19: 146-170.

Buffiére, F. 1956. *Les mythes d'Homére et la pensée grecque*. Thése, Paris.

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge, MA.

Caizzi, F. 1964. "Antistene," *Studi Urbinati* 38: 25-76.

Calame, C. 2005. *Masks of Authority: Fiction and Pragmatics in Ancient Greek Poetics*. trans. Peter M. Burk. Ithaca.

Cameron, A. 1965. "Wandering poets: a literary movement in Byzantine Egypt," *Historia* 14: 470-509.
_____. 1968. "The *Garlands* of Meleager and Philip." *GRBS* 9: 323-349.
_____. 1972. "Callimachus on Aratus' Sleepless Nights." *CR* 22: 169-170.
_____. 1992. "Genre and Style in Callimachus." *TAPhA* 122: 305-312.
_____. 1993. *The Greek Anthology: From Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford.
_____. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics*. New York.

Campbell, D.A. 1982. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*. Exeter.

Carey, C. 1986. "Archilochus and Lycambes." *CQ* 36: 60-67.

Cazzaniga, Ignazio. 1967. "Osservazioni critiche intorno allo hypomnema antimacheo di *Pap. Mil. Vogl.* I 17,33-36(= Fr. 182 Antimachi W)." *PP* 22: 63-74.

Cavallo, G. & R. Chartier, eds. 1999. *A History of Reading in the West*. Amherst, MA.

Cholmeley, R.J. 1901. *The Idylls of Theocritus*. London.

Clack, J. 1982. *An Anthology of Alexandrian Poetry*. The Classical World: Pittsburgh, PA.
_____. 1992. *Meleager: The Poems*. Wauconda, IL.
_____. 1999. *Asclepiades of Samos and Leonidas of Tarentum: The Poems*. Wauconda, IL.

Clay, Diskin. 1998. "The Theory of the Literary Persona in Antiquity." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 40: 9-40.

Clayman, D. 1980. *Callimachus' Iambi*. Leiden.
_____. 2007. "Philosophers and Philosophy in Greek Epigram." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 497-517.
_____. 2009. *Timon of Phlius: Pyrrhonism into Poetry*. Berlin.

Coco, L. 1985. "Leonida di Taranto." *C&S* 95: 61-2.

Cohen, B. 1995. *The distaff side: representing the female in Homer's* Odyssey. Oxford.

Coleman-Norton, P.R. 1927. "Odysseus in the *Iliad*." *The Classical Weekly* 21: 73-78.

Collins, D. 2004. *Master of the Game: Competition and Performance in Greek Poetry*. Center for Hellenic Studies. Harvard University Press.

Combellack F. M. 1980-1981. "Man bites fish again." *CW* 34: 223.

Consani, C. 1986. *Persistenza dialettale e diffusione della κοινή a Cipro: il caso di Kafizin* (Testi Linguistici 10). Pisa.

Copley, F. 1940. "The Suicide Paraclausithyron: A Study of Ps-Theocritus Idyll XXIII." *TAPhA* 71: 52-61.

Courtney, Edward. 1989. "Two Catullian questions." *Prometheus* 15: 160-164.

Cox, E.G. 1919. "Realism Pure and Applied." *Sewanee Review* 27: 438-459.

Crane, G. 1987. "The Laughter of Aphrodite in Theocritus Idyll 1." *HSCPh* 91: 161-184.

Criscuolo, Ugo. 2003. "Leonida di Taranto, poeta 'letterato'." *AAP* 52, 325-48.

Dale, A.M. 1952. "ΚΙΣΣΥΒΙΟΝ." *CR* 2: 129-132.

Dawson, C.M. 1950. "Some epigrams by Leonidas of Tarentum." *AJPh* 71, 280-1.

Day, J. 1989. "Rituals in stone: Early Greek grave epigrams and monuments." *JHS* 109: 16-28.

_____. 1994. "Interactive offerings: Early Greek dedicatory epigrams and ritual." *HSCP* 96: 37-44.
_____. 2000. "Epigram and Reader: Generic force as (re-)activation of ritual." In Depew, M. & D. Obbink, eds. *Matrices of Genre*. Cambridge, MA, 37-57.

Dawson, C.M. 1950. "Some epigrams by Leonidas of Tarentum." *AJPh:* 271-284.

Debrunner, A. 1917. *Griechische Wortbildungslehre*. Heidelberg.

Degani, E. 1976. "Note archilochee." *QUCC* 21: 23-5.

De Jong, I.J.F. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge.

Del Barrio Vega, M.L. 1989. "Epigramas dialogados: origenes y estructure." *CFC* 23: 193-197.

Del Re, R. 1965. "Un epigramma di Leonida." *RFIC* 93: 430-437.

De Stefani, Claudio. 2005. "Posidippo e Leonida di Tarento. Spunti per un confronto." In Di Marco, M. & Bruna M. Palumbo & Emanuele Lelli. eds. *Posidippo e gli altri. Il poeta, il genere, il contesto culturale e letterario. Atti dell'incontro di studio. Roma 14-15 maggio 2004*. Pisa, 147-90.

Detienne, M. 1989. *Dionysus at Large*. Trans. Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, MA.

Dillery, J. 1999. "Aesop, Isis, and the Heliconian Muses." *CPh* 94: 268-280.

Dilthey, K. 1876. "Dipinti pompeiani accompagnati d'epigrammi greci." *ADI* 48: 294-314.

Dougherty, C. 1994. "Archaic Greek foundation poetry: Questions of genre and occasion." *JHS* 94: 35-46.

Dover, K.J. 1971. *Theocritus: Select Poems*. London.

Dudley, D.R. 1937. *A History of Cynicism*. London.

Dunbar, N. 1995. *Aristophanes: Birds*. Oxford.

Easterling, P.E. & B. M. W. Knox, eds. 1985. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, Vol. I*. Cambridge.

Edmunds, L, ed. 1997. *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore.

Einarson, B. 1943. "Plato in Meleager's *Garland*." *CPh* 38: 260-261.

Erbse, H. 1969-1988. *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem*. Berlin.

Fantuzzi, M. & R. Hunter. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.

Fantuzzi, M. 2007. "Epigram and the Theater." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 477-495.
_____. 2010. "Typologies of variation on a theme in archaic epigraphic epigrams." In Baumbach, M, A. Petrovic, & I. Petrovic, eds. *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram: Contextualisation and Literarisation*. Cambridge.

Farnell, L. R. 1932. *The Works of Pindar. Translated with Literary and Critical Commentaries. vol. II: Critical Commentary*. London.

Ferrandini Troisi, Fr. 2000. *La donna nella società ellenistica: testimonianze epigrafiche*. Bari.
_____. 2006. "Professionisti 'di giro' nel Mediterraneo Antico. Testimonianze Epigrafiche." In Bertinelli & A. Donati, eds. *Le vie della Storia: Migrazioni di popoli, viaggi di individui, circolazione di idée nel Mediterraneo antico*. Rome, 145-154.

Fitzgerald, W. *Martial and The World of Epigram*. Chicago.

Fowler, B.H. 1989. *The Hellenistic Aesthetic*. Madison.

Franke, P.R. 1989. "Pyrrhus." In F.W. Walbank, A.E. Astin, M.W. Frederiksen, R.M. Ogilvie. eds. *The Cambridge Ancient History, Second Edition. Vol VII: Part 2, The Rise of Rome to 220 BC*. Cambridge, 456-485.

Furley, W.D. & J.M. Bremer. 2001. *Greek Hymns. Vol. I: The Texts in Translation. Vol II: Greek Texts and Commentary*. Tübingen.

Gaertner, J.F. 2007. *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*. Leiden.

Galán Vioque, Guillermo. 2002. "La astrología y los astrólogos en la Antología Palatina. Alusiones y parodies." *MHNH* 2: 221-236.

Gale, Monica. 2001. "Etymological Wordplay and Poetic Succession in Lucretius." *CPh* 96: 168-172.

Gauly, Bardo M. 2005. "Poseidipp und das Gedichtbuch. Überlegungen zur Sphragis und zum Mailänder Papyrus." *ZPE* 151: 33-47

Geffcken, Johannes. 1896. *Leonidas von Tarent*. Leipzig (JbbClassPhil Suppl. 23).
_____. 1925a. "Leonidas von Tarent." *RE* 24, 2021-31.

Giangrande, Giuseppe. 1967. "Sympotic Literature and Epigram." *L'épigramme grecque. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique*, 14. Geneva, 91-177.
_____. 1974. "Zwei hellenistische Epigramme." *RhM* 117: 66-71.
_____. 1975. "Fifteen Hellenistic Epigrams." *JHS* 95: 31-44.

Gigante, M. 1967. *La epigramma greca in Magna Graecia*. Salerno.
_____. 1969. "Il filo del mantello." *PP* 24: 215-216.
_____. 1971. *L'edera di Leonida*. Napoli.
_____. 1987. "Reflessi epigrafici su Leonida di Taranto." *PP* 42: 460-461.
_____. 1988. "Civiltà teatrale e epigrammatica a Taranto in età ellenistica." *Taras* 8: 7-43.

Goette, Hans, R. 2007. "Choregic Monuments and Athenian Democracy." In Wilson, P., ed. *The Greek Theatre and Festivals: Documentary Studies*. Oxford, 122-149.

Gould, J. 1988. "Dionysus and the Hippie Convoy: ritual, myth and metaphor in the cult of Dionysus." 18th Jackson Knight Memorial Lecture. *Pegasus* 43: 4-10.

Goulet-Cazé, Marie-Odile & R. Goulet. 1991. *Le Cynisme Ancien et ses Prolongements*. Paris.

Gow, A.S.F. 1944. "ΟΦΡΥΣ." *CR* 58: 38-39.
_____. 1958. "Leonidas of Tarentum." *CQ* 8: 113-23.
_____. 1959. "Epigrams by Theaetetus and Thymocles." *CR* 9: 5-7.
_____ & D.L. Page. 1965a. *The Greek Anthology, Hellenistic Epigrams, Vol. I: Sources and Ascriptions*. London.
_____ & D.L. Page. 1965b. *The Greek Anthology, Hellenistic Epigrams, Vol. II: Commentary and Indexes*. London.
_____. 1965c. *Theocritus, Vol. I: Introduction, Text, and Translation*. Cambridge.
_____. 1965d. *Theocritus, Vol. II: Commentary, Appendix, Indexes, and Plates*. Cambridge.
_____ & D.L. Page. 1968a. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip V. I*. Cambridge.
_____ & D.L. Page. 1968b. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip V. II*. Cambridge.

Gray, V. 2001. "Herodotus' Literary and Historical Method: Arion's Story (1.23-24)." *AJPh* 122: 11-28

Guarducci, M. 1929. *Poeti vaganti e conferenzieri dell' età ellenistica: ricerche di epigrafia greca nel campo della letteratura e del costume* (*Atti della R. Accademia nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, serie* 6: vol. 2, 9). Rome, 629-665.

Guichard, R. & L. Arturo. 2004. "Notes on Posidippus 74 AB (P.Mil.Vogl. VIII 309, XI 33-XII 7)." *ZPE* 148: 77-80.

Guidorizzi, G. 1977. "Il mare e il vecchio (Leonida A.P. VII.295)." *Acme* 30: 69-76.

Gutzwiller, K. 1986. "The Plant Decoration on Theocritus' Ivy-Cup," *APh* 107: 253-255.
_____. 1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies: The Formation of a Genre*. Madison.
_____. 1997. "The Poetics of Editing in Meleager's Garland," *TAPh* 127: 169-200.
_____. 1998a. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley.
_____. 1998b. "Genre Development and Gendered Voices in Erinna and Nossis." In Prins, Y. & M. Schreiber. eds. *Dwelling in Possibility: Women Poets and Critics on*

Poetry. Ithaca, 202-222.
_____, ed. 2005. *The New Posidippus*. Oxford.
_____. 2006. "The Bucolic Problem." *CPh* 101: 380-404.
_____. 2007. *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature*. Malden, MA.
_____. 2007a. "The Paradox of Amatory Epigram." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 313-332.

Halperin, D. 1983. *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry*. New Haven.

Hansen, B. 1914. *De Leonida Tarentino. Diss*. Leipzig.

Harder, M.A. et al. eds. 2002. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.

Henderson, J. 1991. *The Maculate Muse. 2nd ed*. New York.

Holdern, J.H. 1999. "The Cyclops of Philoxenus." *CQ* 49: 445-455.

Hopkinson, J.H. 1902. "New Evience of the Melian Amphorae." *JHS* 22: 46-75.

Hopkinson, N., ed. 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge.

Horrocks. 2010. *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*. Oxford.

Hort, A. 1948. *Theophrastus: Enquiry Into Plants*, Vols. 1-2. London.

Höschele, R. 2006. *Verrückt nach Frauen: Der Epigrammatiker Rufin*. Tübingen.
_____. 2007. "The Traveling Reader: Journeys Through Ancient Epigram Books." *TAPhA*: 333-369.
_____. 2010. *Die blütenlesende Muse: Poetik und Textualität antiker Epigrammsammlungen*. Tübingen.

Höschele, R. & D. Konstan. 2006. "Posidippus col. IV 30-35 = 25 Austin-Bastianini." *ZPE* 156: 99-102.

Hunter, R. 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*. Cambridge.
_____. 1999. *Theocritus: a selection*. Cambridge.
_____. 2001. "The poet unleaved." In eds. Boedeker, D. & D. Sider, eds. *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*, New York. 242-54.
_____. 2002. "The sense of an author: Theocritus and [Theocritus]." In Gibson, R.K. ed. *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*. Boston, 89-108.
_____. 2003. *Theocritus, Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*. Berkeley.

Hunter, R. & I. Rutherford, eds. 2009. *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge.

Jacobs, F. & R. F. P. Brunck. 1794-1814. *Anthologia Graeca*. 13 vols. Leipzig.

Jaeger, W. 1932. "Tyrtaios ueber die wahre ἀρετή." *Sitz. Ber. Akad. Wiss.* Phil.-Hist. Kl., 23: 537-68 (= *Scripta Minora*, II, Rome 1960: 75-114)

Janko, R. 1984. *Aristotle on Comedy*. Berkeley.

Jebb, R.C. 1896. *Homer: An Introduction to the* Iliad *and* Odyssey. Boston.

Johnson, W. 2005. "The Posidippus Papyrus: Bookroll and Reader." In Gutzwiller, K. ed. *The New Posidippus*. Oxford, 70-80.

Kägi, P. 1917. *Nachwirkungen der älteren griechischen Elegie in den Epigrammen der Anthologie*. Munich.

Kaibel, G. 1894. "Griechische Friedhofspoesie" *Deutsche Revue über das gesamte nationale Leben der Gegenwart* 19: 367-80.

Kantzios, I. 2005. "Tyranny and the Symposion of Anacreon." *CJ* 100: 227-245.

Keith, A.M. 1999. "Slender Verse: Roman Elegy and Ancient Rhetorical Theory." *Mnemosyne* 52: 41-62.

Kidd, D. 2004. *Aratus: Phaenomena*. Cambridge, England.

Kindstrand, J. 1976. *Bion of Borysthenes: A Collection of the Fragments with Introduction and Commentary. (Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 11)*. Stockholm.

Kirk, G.S. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. I: books 1-4*. Cambridge.
_____. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. I: books 9-12*. Cambridge.

Kirstein, R. 2002. "Companion Pieces." In Harder, M.A. ed. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven, 114-135.
_____. 2007. *Junge Hirten Und Alte Fischer: Die Gedichte 27, 20, und 21 des Corpus Theocriteum*. Berlin/New York.

Klooster, J. 2011. *Poetry as Window and Mirror: Positioning the Poet in Hellenistic Poetry*. Leiden.

Knaack, G. 1891. "Zu den griechischen Epigrammatikern." *JCPh* 143: 769-75.

Konstan, David. 1990. "An Anthropology of Euripides' Kyklops." In J. Winkler & F. Zeitlin. eds. *Nothing to do with Dionysus?* Princeton.

Körte, A. 1929. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Trans. J. Hammer & M. Hadas. New York.

Kousser, R. 2005. "Creating the Past: Venus de Milo and the Hellenistic Reception of

Classical Greece." *AJA* 109: 227-250

Kraus, M. 1908. "Artemis Aphaia." *CW* 22: 17.

Krevins, N. 2005. "The Editor's Toolbox: Strategies for Selection and Presentation in the Milan Epigram Papyrus." In Gutzwiller, K. ed. *The New Posidippus*. Oxford, 81-96.
_____. 2007. "The Arrangement of Epigrams in Collections." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden, 131-146.

Kurke, L. 2011. *Aesopic Conversations: Popular Tradition, Cultural Dialogue and the Invention of Greek Prose*. Princeton.

Labellarte, R. 1969. *Leonida di Taranto. Antologia di epigrammi*. Bari.

Lattimore, R. 1942. *Themes in Greek & Latin Epitaphs*. Urbana.
_____. 1975. *The Odyssey of Homer*. New York.

Lauxtermann, M.D. 1998. "What is an Epideictic Epigram?" *Mnemosyne* 51: 525-37.

Lefkowitz, M. 1981. *The Lives of Greek Poets*. London.
_____. 1991. *First-Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic 'I'*. Oxford.

Legrand, P.E. 1898. *Etude sur Théocrite*. Paris.
_____, ed. 1925. *Bucoliques grecs*. 2 vols. Paris.

Lehnus, L. 1996. "On the Metrical Inscription Found At Pergamum." *CQ* 46: 295-297.

Lesky, A. 1966. *A History of Greek Literature*. Translated by J. Willis & C. de Heer. London.

Lloyd-Jones, H. 1963. "The Seal of Posidippus." *JHS* 83: 75-99.
_____. 1998. "Ritual and Tragedy." In F. Graf. ed. *Ansichten griechischer Rituale. Geburtstag-Symposium für Walter Burkert*. Stuttgart.

Lombardo Radice, G. 1965. "Leonida tarentino, poeta 'ricco.'" *Maia* 17: 141-157.

Lorber, C. & O.D. Hoover. 2003. "An Unpublished Tetradrachm Issued by the Artists of Dionysos." *NC* 163: 59-68; pl. 15-17.

Ludwig, W. 1963. "Plato's Love Epigrams." *GRBS* 4: 59-82.

Ma, John. 2007. "A Horse from Teos: Epigraphical Notes on the Ionian-Hellepontine Association of Dionysiac Artists." In Peter Wilson, ed. *The Greek Theatre and Festivals: Documentary Studies*. Oxford.

Mackail, J.W. 1906. *Select Epigrams From the Greek Anthology*. New York & London.

Magnelli, Enrico. 2004. "Memoria letteraria in carmi epigrafici greci del Vicino Oriente." *ZPE* 147: 51-5.

Malkin, I. 1987. *Religion and Colonisation in Ancient Greece*. Leiden.

Männlein-Robert, I. 2007. "Epigrams on Art." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston.

Marcinkowska, M. 2000. "Spotkanie kultu i pracy w epigramatach Leonidasa z Tarentu (*A.P.* VI 204 i VI 205)." In Wlozimierz Appel & Przemyslaw Wojciechowskiego, eds. *Z antycznego swiata. Religio, cultus, homines*. Torún, 7-28.

Martin, R. 2009. "Read on arrival." In Richard Hunter & Ian Rutherford, eds. *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge, 80-104.

McGill, S.C. 2000. "The literary lives of a 'Scheintod,' Clitophon and Leucippe 5.7 and Greek epigram." *CQ* 50: 323-326.

Mele, Alfonso. 1995. "Leonida e le armi dei Lucani." In S. Cerasuolo, ed. *Mathesis e philia. Studi in onore di Marcello Gigante*. Napoli, 111-129.

Meyer, D. 2007. "The Act of Reading and the Act of Writing in Hellenistic Epigram." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 187-210.

Michels, A.K. 1945. "The Golden Bough of Plato." *AJPh* 66: 59-63.

Mimbrera, S. 2006. "Gramática del Dorio de Sicilia." Ph.D. dissertation, Universidád Complutense de Madrid.

Mineur, W.H. 1984. *Callimachus: Hymn to Delos. Introduction and Commentary*. Leiden.

Montiglio, S. 2005. *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture*. Chicago.

Moore-Blunt, J. 1981. "Enemies of the vine. Three epigrams." *Mnemosyne* 34: 322-30.

Murgatroyd, P. 1982. "Epanadiplosis." *CW* 75: 246-8.

Murray, J. & J. Rowland. 2007. "Gendered Voices in Hellenistic Epigram." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 211-232.

Nagy, G. 1979. *Pindar's Homer: the Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore.
_____. 1996. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge, England.
_____. 2004. "Homeric Echoes in Posidippus." In B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, & M. Baumbach, eds. 2005. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspsectives on an Epigram Collection*. Cambridge, MA, 57-64.

Nisbet, G. 2007. "Hellenistic Epigram in the Roman World: From the Beginnings to the End of the Republican Age." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 521-542.

Olivieri, A. 1949. *Epigrammatisti greci della Magna Grecia e della Sicilia (Leonida Tarentino, Teocrito, Teodorida Siracusano, Etrusco da Messina)*. Napoli.

Oltramare, A. 1926. *Les origines de la diatribe romaine*. Geneva.

Otto, N. 2009. *Enargeia: Untersuchung zur Charakteristik alexandrinischer Dichtung*. Stuttgart.

Page, D.L. 1975. *Epigrammata Graeca*. Oxford.

Pàmias, J. 2004. "Dionysus and Donkeys in the Streets of Alexandria: Eratosthenes' Criticism of Ptolemaic Ideology." *HSCP* 102: 191-198.

Paton, W.R. ed. & trans. 1925-27. *The Greek Anthology*. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA.
_____. 1927. *The Greek Anthology I*.
_____. 1925a. *The Greek Anthology II*.
_____. 1925b. *The Greek Anthology III*.
_____. 1926a. *The Greek Anthology IV*.
_____. 1926b. *The Greek Anthology V*.

Pavese, C.O. 1972. *Tradizioni e generi poetici della Grecia arcaica*. Rome.

Peek, W. 1960. *Griechische Grabgedichte, griechisch und deutsch*. Berlin.

J. Pépin. 1958. *Mythe et allégorie: Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*. Paris.

Perry, B. E. 1999. *Fables: Babrius and Phaedrus*. Cambridge, MA.
_____. 2007. *Aesopica: A Series of Texts Relating to Aesop or Ascribed To Him*. Champaigne.

Petrain, D. 2003. "Homer, Theocritus, and the Milan Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309. Col. III 28-41)." *CJ* 98: 359-388.
_____. 2005. "Gems, metapoetics, and value: Greek and Roman responses to third century discourse on precious stones." *TAPhA* 135: 329-357.

Philips, R. D. 1972. *Studies in the Diction of Leonidas of Tarentum*. Urbana-Champaign, IL.

Powell, J.U. ed. 1970. *Collectanea Alexandrina: reliquiae minores poetarum Graecorum aetatis Ptolemaicae, 323-146 A.C., epicorum, elegiacorum, lyricorum, ethicorum, Cum epimetris et indice nominum*. Oxford.

Prioux, É. 2008. *Petits musées en vers: Épigramme et discours sur les collections antiques*. Paris.

Radice, G. L. 1965. "Leonida Tarentino, poeta 'ricco.'" *Maia* 17: 141-57.

Radinger, C. 1895. *Meleagros von Gadara: Eine literargeschichtliche Skizze*. Innsbruck.

Raimondi, V. 2000. "Παχτίδ(α)... τι κέκειν in "A.P." 9, 433, 2-3." *QUCC* 66: 133-148.

Raines, J. 1946. "Comedy and the Comic Poets in Greek Epigram," *TAPhA* 77: 83-102.

Reitzenstein, R. 1893. *Epigramm und Scholion*. Giessen.

Rexroth, K., trans. 1999. *Poems from the Greek Anthology*. Ann Arbor.

Rogers, B.B. 1907. *The Comedies of Aristophanes: Edited, Translated, and Explained*. London.

Rosen, R. 1997. "Homer and Hesiod." In B. Powell & I. Morris, eds. *A New Companion to Homer*. New York, 463-488.
_____. 2007a. *Making Mockery: The Poetics of Ancient Satire*. Oxford.
_____. 2007b. "Hellenistic Epigrams on Archilochus and Hipponax. In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 459-476.

Rossi, L. 2001. *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: a method of approach*. Leuven.
_____. 2002. "Composition and Reception in AP 9.1-583: Aphegheseis, Epideixeis, and Progymnasmata." In Harder, M.A. et al. eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven.

Rutherford, I. 1995. "Apollo in Ivy: The Tragic Paean." *Arion* 3: 112-135.
_____. 2007. "Theoria and Theater at Samothrace: The Dardanos by Dymas of Iasos." In P. Wilson, ed. *The Greek Theater and Festivals: Documentary Studies*, 279-293.

Salanitro, G. 1969. "Contributi critico-testuali ad epigrammi ellenistici." *SicGymn* 22: 64-74.

Schein, S., ed. 1995. *Reading the Odyssey*. Princeton.

Schmeling, G., ed. 1996. *The Novel in the Ancient World*. Leiden.

Schur, D. 2004. "A Garland of Stones: Hellenistic *Lithika* as Reflections on Poetic Transformations." In B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, & M. Baumbach. eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection*. Cambridge, MA, 118-122.

Scodel, R. 2003. "Two Epigrammatic Pairs: Callimachus' Epigrams, Plato's Apples," *Hermes* 131: 257-68.

_____. 2007. "The story-teller and his audience." In R. Fowler, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*. New York, 45-58.

Scullion, S. 2002. "Nothing to do with Dionysus: Tragedy Misconceived as Ritual." *CQ* 52: 102-137.

Segal, C. 1974. "Death by Water: A Narrative Pattern in Theocritus (*Idylls* 1,13, 22, 23)." *Hermes* 102: 20-38.
_____. 1990. "Poetic Immortality and Fear of Death: The Second Proem of *De Rerum Natura*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 92: 193-212.

Selden, D. 1998. "Alibis." *CA* 17: 289-412.

Sens, A. 2007. "One Things Leads (Back) to Another: Allusion and the Invention of Tradition in Hellenistic Epigrams," In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. 2007. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 373-390.

Serrao, G. 1971. *Problemi di poesia alessandrina 1*. Roma.

Shapiro, A., ed. 2007. *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece*. Cambridge.

Sherratt, S. 2004. "Feasting in Homeric Epic." *Hesperia* 73: 301-337.

Sider, D. 1987. "The Love Poetry of Philodemus." *AJPh* 108: 310-324.
_____. 1996. *The Epigrams of Philodemus*. Oxford.
_____. 2004. "Posidippus Old and New." In B. Acosta-Hughes, E. Kosmetatou, & M. Baumbach. eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection*. Cambridge, MA, 29-41.
_____. 2007. "Sylloge Simonidea." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. 2007. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 113-130.

Sifakis, G. M. 1967. *Studies in History of Hellenistic Drama*. London.

Sistakou, E. 2007. "Glossing Homer: Homeric Exegesis in Early Third Century Epigram." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. 2007. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 391-408.

Slatkin, L. 1995. "Composition by Theme and the Mētis of the *Odyssey,*" In Schein, S., ed. *Reading the Odyssey*. Princeton, 223-237.

Snyder, J. M. 1981. "The Web of Song: Weaving Imagery in Homer and Lyric Poets." *CJ* 76: 193-196.

Specchia, O. 1973. "Recenti studi su Leonida di Taranto." *C&S* 45-46: 125-126.

Spink, S. 1906. *The Numismatic Circular, Volume 15*. London.

_____. 1908. *The Numismatic Circular, Volume 16*. London.

Stadtmüller, H., ed. 1894-1906. *Anthologia Graeca epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea*. 3 vols. Leipzig.

Stanzel, K. H. 2007. "Bucolic Epigram." In Bing, P. & J.S. Bruss, eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*. Boston, 333-352.

Stella, L.A. 1949. *Cinque poeti dell'Antologia Palatina*. Bologna

Stewart, A. 1993. "Narration and Allusion in the Hellenistic Baroque." In P.J. Holliday, ed. *Narrative and Event in Ancient Art*. Cambridge, 130-174.
_____. 2005. "Posidippus and the Truth in Sculpture." In K. Gutzwiller, ed. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book*. New York.

Sumi, G. 2004. "Civic Self-Representation in the Hellenistic World: The Festival of Artemis Leukophryene in Magnesia-on-Maeander." In S. Bell & G. Davies, eds. *Games and Festivals in Classical Antiquity: Proceedings of the Conference held in Edinburgh 10-12 July 2000*. BAR International Series 1220.

Svarlien, D., trans. 1990. *Pindar: Odes*. Unpublished, accessed at http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.01.0162:book=P.:poem=1

Taràn, S.L. 1979. *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram*. Leiden.
_____. ed. 1987. *The Greek Anthology, Vols. 1& 2*. London.

Thalmann, W.G. 1984. *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Poetry*. Baltimore.

Thomas, R.F. 2002. "Melodious tears: Sepulchral epigram and generic mobility." In M.A. Harder, ed. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Leuven, 205-23.
_____. 2004. "'Drowned in the Tide': the Nauagika and Some 'Problems' in Augustan Poetry." In B. Acosta-Hughes, Elizabeth Kosmetatou, & Manuel Baumbach. eds. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P.Mil. Vogl. 309)*. Washington, D.C.

Tiberi, L. 1996. "Epigrammi greci tramandati in versione epigrafica e in versione letteraria," *Lexis* 14: 71-85.

Tortorelli Ghidini, M. 2000. "I giocattoli di Dioniso tra mito e rituale." In M. Tortorelli Ghidini, A. Storchi Marino & A. Visconti, eds. *Tra Orfeo e Pitagora. Origine e incontri di culture nell'antichità. Atti dei seminari napoletani 1996-1998*. Napoli, 255-63.

Tueller, M. A. 2008. *Look Who's Talking: Innovations in Voice and Identity in Hellenistic Epigram*. Leuven.

Van Sickle, J. 1975. "Epic and Bucolic: (Theocr, Id. VII; Virgil, Ecl. I)" *QUCC* 19: 45-72.

_____. 1981. "Poetics of Opening and Closure in Meleager, Catullus, and Gallus." *CW* 75: 65-75.

Veniero, Alessandro. 1905. *I poeti de l'Antologia Palatina secolo III a.C. Vol. I, parte 1: Asclepiade, Callimaco, Dioscoride, Leonida Tarentino, Posidippo: Testo, versione e commento, con introduzione su la genesi de l'epigramma epidittico ed erotico*. Catania.

Volk, K. 2010. "Aratus." In J. Clauss and M. Cuypers, eds. *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*. Malden, MA, 197-210.

Webster, T.B.L. 1964. *Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. London.

Weisshäupl, R. 1896. *Zu den Quellen der Anthologia Palatina*. *Serta Hauteliana*.

West, M.L. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford.
_____. 1974. Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus. New York.
_____. 1978. *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford.
_____. 2003. Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer. Cambridge, MA.
_____. 2005. "*Odyssey* and *Argonautica*." *CQ* 55: 364-82.

White, H. 1979a. *Studies in Theocritus and Other Hellenistic Poets*. Amsterdam.
_____. 1979b. "Theocritus 'Idyll' XX." *QUCC* 3: 117-130.
_____. 1993. "An obscene epigram by Leonidas of Tarentum." *Habis* 24: 29-32.
_____. 2001. "Su due epigrammi ellenistici [in English]." *SicGymn* 54: 229-32.
_____. 2002. "Observations on Greek poetic texts." *Orpheus* 23: 140-51.

Whitmore, C.E. 1918. "Pastoral Elements in the Greek Epigram." *CJ* 13: 616-620.

Wifstrand, A. 1926. *Studien zur griechischen Anthologie*. Lund.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. 1913. *Sappho und Simonides*. Berlin.
_____. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. 2 vols. Berlin.

Williams, C. 2004. *Martial: Epigrams Book Two*. Oxford.

Wills, G. 1970. "Phoenix of Colophon's *KORONISMA*." *CQ* 20: 112-118.

Wilson, P. 2009. "Thamyris the Thracian: the archetypal wandering poet?" In R. Hunter and I. Rutherford, eds. *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture*. Cambridge.

Winkler, J. & F. Zeitlin, eds. 1990. *Nothing to do with Dionysus?* Princeton.

Ypsilanti, M. 2006. "An aspect of Leonidas reception in later epigrammatists and the art of variation. The case of fishermen in epitaphs." *CPh* 101: 67-73.

Zafiropoulos, C. 2001. *Ethics in Aesop's Fables: the* Augustana *Collection*. Boston/Leiden.

Zanker, G. 1987. *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry*. London.
_____. 2004. *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. Madison, WI.

Zeitz, H. 1936. "Der Aesoproman und seine Geschichte." *Aegyptus* 16: 225-56.