

The *Garlands* of Meleager and Philip

Alan Cameron

THE PRINCIPAL SOURCES used by Constantine Cephalas for the *Anthology* of which the greater part is preserved in the *Palatine* and *Planudean Anthologies* were the *Garland* of Meleager (put together in the last decade or so of the second century B.C.),¹ the *Garland* of Philip (some time probably not too long after A.D. 53)² and the *Cycle* of Agathias (ca. A.D. 567).³ Some of the material from these three major collections Cephalas broke up and rearranged, together with material from a variety of minor sources,⁴ but fortunately for us he was not energetic enough to carry out his reorganisation systematically throughout, and long stretches of up to 100 or more consecutive epigrams by poets who are known or may reasonably be conjectured

¹ A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams I* (Cambridge 1965) xvi, say "early years of the first century," but in view of the likelihood (not mentioned by Gow and Page) that the *Garland*, compiled on Cos (AP 7.418.3, 419.6), was known to the 'circle' (I use the term loosely: cf. H. Bardon, *EtCl* 18 [1950] 145f; E. Badian, *Historia* 11 [1962] 221) of Q. Lutatius Catulus (*cos.* 102) in Rome (A. A. Day, *The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy* [Oxford 1938] 103f; G. Luck, *The Latin Love Elegy* [London 1959] 40-1), I should prefer to take it back a couple of decades. P. Capra-d'Angelo, *RendIstLomb* 74 (1941) 292-6, and L. A. Stella, *Cinque poeti dell'Antologia palatina* (Bologna 1949) 153-5 and 232-8 (both apparently unknown to Gow and Page) follow Diogenes Laertius 6.99 in placing Meleager in the first half of the third century B.C., but Diogenes' error is easily explicable (Gow and Page I.xvi n.2), and it is hardly possible seriously to doubt that the Antipater included by Meleager is Antipater of Sidon, who did not die till ca. 125 B.C. (Gow and Page II.32). On the chronology of the individual poets of the *Garland*, cf. also now G. Luck, *GGA* 219 (1967) 24-44.

² Many scholars still follow C. Cichorius' dating (*Römische Studien* [Leipzig 1922] 341-55) to the reign of Gaius (e.g. most recently G. W. Bowersock, *Augustus and the Greek World* [Oxford 1965] 141); but in my opinion K. Müller has satisfactorily demonstrated (ed., *Die Epigramme des Antiphilos von Byzanz* [Berlin 1935] 14-21) that AP 9.178 cannot have been written before A.D. 53 (cf. also S. G. P. Small, *YCS* 12 [1951] 71-3). Müller's interpretation is not in fact new (as Small supposes): cf. (in addition to the authorities cited by Müller himself, p.15) Furneaux on Tacitus, *Ann.* 12.58 and J. W. Mackail, *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*³ (London 1911) 326. V. Tandoi, *StItal* 34 (1962) 108 n.2, and P. Laurens, *REL* 43 (1965) 318 n.2, toy unnecessarily with the idea of a second edition under Nero.

³ Averil and Alan Cameron, *JHS* 86 (1966) 6-25, 87 (1967) 131.

⁴ On Cephalas' activity cf. Gow, *The Greek Anthology: Sources and Ascriptions* (London 1958), Gow and Page I.xvii f, and the useful analysis in part 1 of F. Lenzinger, *Zur griechischen Anthologie* (Diss.Zürich 1965).

to have been contributors to the two *Garlands* and the *Cycle* occur in most of the major books (v, vi, vii, ix, x, xi, xii) of the *Palatine Anthology*, which may be regarded as an expanded version (but with omissions as well as additions) of the *Anthology* of Cephalas.

I Meleager

Our knowledge of Meleager's *Garland* has benefitted greatly from the labours of Radinger, Weisshäupl, Wifstrand and (more recently) of Gow.⁵ For a long time no one saw fit to question the statement of the Palatine lemmatist that it was arranged alphabetically (that is to say, according to the initial letter of the first word of each poem. Indeed some scholars still perversely cling to this long exploded notion⁶—presumably the result of a confusion between the two *Garlands* (an easy slip), for Philip's *was* arranged alphabetically.

As early as 1894 Radinger showed that there were unmistakable traces of two quite different but complementary methods of arrangement in the longer *Garland* sequences, especially those of *AP* v, vii and xii. First, poems by the more prolific poets recur in a sort of rhythmical alternation, with the work of lesser figures distributed evenly between. Second, poems are grouped according to subject matter

⁵ C. Radinger, *Meleagros von Gadara* (Innsbruck 1895) 88–107; R. Weisshäupl, in *Serta Harteliana* (Wien 1896) 184–8; A. Wifstrand, *Studien zur griech. Anthologie* (Lund 1926) 5–29; for Gow's works see preceding note.

⁶ e.g. A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature*, tr. J. Willis and C. de Heer (London 1966) 741. The alleged traces of alphabetical order (on which see most recently Luck, *GGA* 219 [1967] 51–2) are unimpressive, and can be easily accounted for (in Gow's words) by "similarity of theme and a small element of chance" (I.xviii n.3, cf. xxii n.2). E.g. the series of *epitymbia* opening *ὀκέρτι* are so grouped for stylistic and thematic, not alphabetical reasons; it would no doubt be possible to detect alphabetical runs in the thematic and stylistic groupings used by W. Peek for his *Griech. Vers-Inschriften I* (Berlin 1955). Anyone who upholds the traditional view will have to explain (a) why an alphabetical order (not merely traces) is unmistakable in all Philipian sequences in *AP*, yet apparently broken up completely by Cephalas for the Meleagrian sequences (nothing we know about Cephalas' *modus operandi* suggests that he would have treated one differently from the other); (b) why, on the contrary, a thematic arrangement is perceptible in all Meleagrian sequences. There is also the excellent but neglected point made by J. Basson, *De Cephalas et Planude* (Diss. Berlin 1917) 36–7: the first and last poems of an alphabetically arranged collection will (inevitably) have opened with an *alpha* and *omega* respectively. It so happens that we possess what must have been the first and last poems of Meleager's *Garland* (*AP* 4.1 and 12.257: cf. Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides* [Berlin 1913] 300): they open with *mu* and *alpha* (!) respectively. By contrast, Philip's preface opens (of course) with an *alpha* (see p. 337).

(epitaphs on philosophers, soldiers and so on together: imitations follow the original), and there are sometimes verbal parallels linking poems on different themes. The latter pattern was discovered independently by Weisshäupl two years later, who showed that the three successive Meleagrian sequences in *AP* 7.406–506, 646–664, 707–740, had certain obvious similarities both in overall pattern and individual subjects, suggesting the conclusion that all three were different excerpts from the same source—obviously the *Garland* itself. If so, we would have three witnesses to the same pattern of arrangement among Meleager's *epitymbia*.

The same line was followed by Wifstrand, proving that *AP* v, heterosexual, and xii, homosexual *erotica*, were originally not so divided, and that the Meleagrian sequences in v and xii must have derived from a common source containing both sorts mixed up together. This source, again, can only have been the *Garland* itself.

Of course, caution is requisite. Although Cephalas probably did not tamper in any substantial way with the arrangement of the more solid of the *Garland* sequences in *AP*, he probably did omit some of Meleager's material (for example, three of the poets Meleager names in his preface are not represented in *AP*). But no one who has studied the tables of Radinger, Weisshäupl and Wifstrand will find it easy to ascribe the simple but skilful and consistent pattern they trace through all the substantial *Garland* sequences in *AP* to mere chance. It would have to be a curiously consistent chance—the more so since Mattsson has demonstrated beyond question that precisely the same twofold system was followed by Agathias for his *Cycle*.⁷ And though there must always be reservations about Cephalas' handling of his Meleagrian material, we can at least be sure that he did not significantly rearrange his Agathian material. For we know from Agathias' preface that he employed a third, more basic device as well. He divided his material between seven books according to subject matter: *anathematica*, *epideictica*, *epitymbia*, *protreptica*, *sympotica*, *erotica* and *scoptica*. Cephalas took over these convenient basic divisions for his own *Anthology*, and thus we can have every confidence that the Agathian runs in the major Cephalan books directly reflect the order and arrangement of the original Agathian books.

It can easily be shown that Agathias and his fellow poets were in-

⁷ A. Mattsson, *Untersuchungen zur Epigrammsammlung des Agathias* (Lund 1942) 1–16, and for Agathias' *sympotica*, see Lenzinger, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 22.

fluenced by the poems Meleager had included in his *Garland*,⁸ and it is almost inevitable that he should have been influenced by the way Meleager had arranged them too. And, predictably enough, we do find the same grouping according to topic and verbal links, and the same rhythmic procession of 'Hauptdichter' (Paul, Macedonius, Julian and Agathias himself, instead of Callimachus, Asclepiades, Leonidas and Meleager) that Radinger, Weisshäupl and Wifstrand (without reference to the striking Agathian parallel)⁹ detected in Meleager.

This much, then, we may accept as proven. But there is one further point about the arrangement of Meleager's *Garland* on which a little more light can perhaps be cast before we move on to Philip's, a point barely mentioned in the recent work of Gow and Page.¹⁰ How many and what sort of books went to make up the *Garland*? For there must have been some sort of subdivision: (a) because the Meleagrian poems in *AP* and *APl* total some 4000 lines (ca. 800 poems), not counting the several hundred more that would be required by the titles and ascriptions to individual poems—far too long for a Greco-Roman book of poetry. Birt long ago showed that 700 lines was considered the optimum length, 1000 on the long side. The 1779 of Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* iv is unique. (b) More prosaically, 4000 lines (nearer 5000 with titles and ascriptions) would be far too long for one papyrus roll. (c) Philip refers to Meleager's *Garland* in the plural as *στέφανοι*.

Naturally, certainty here is unattainable. But following and developing some hints of Wifstrand we can perhaps profitably guess at least at the principle of book division Meleager used, which will in turn suggest a number. The most obvious and easy principle would have been that followed by Agathias, division by subject matter. There are in *AP* something like 270 Meleagrian *erotica*, 290 *epitymbia*, 135 *anathematica* and 50 *epideictica* (to which we can add another 45 from *APl*). These are the only four of the seven Agathian divisions to which Meleagrian poets made any contributions. There are no Meleagrian poems at all in *AP* x and xi. *Scoptica*, *protreptica* and straightforward *sympotica* seem not to have been to their taste (such as we do find are

⁸ Cf. Radinger, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 72; Mattsson, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.7) ch. II; and G. Viansino, ed. *Epigrammi di Paolo Silenziario* (Torino 1963).

⁹ Except for a brief aside by Radinger, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 103 n.1.

¹⁰ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) I.xix n.4.

generally classified under one or other of the other four: e.g. most Meleagrian *symptica* are also erotic and hence in *AP* v). Split up into these four divisions, the 4000-odd lines of the *Garland* would have comprised four books which would have satisfied both contemporary canons of propriety and the length of an average papyrus roll.

There are, I believe, several pieces of evidence in favour of this proposed division. We have seen that Meleager used a twofold system: regular alternation of the major poets together with thematic and verbal links. And we have seen also that this same twofold arrangement is no less clearly visible in the Agathian sequences of *AP*, which we *know* to have been divided up according to subject. Does not the very fact that such a twofold pattern is still discernible in the major Meleagrian sequences strongly suggest that they too were drawn from similarly arranged continuous sequences of poems on the same subject? And further confirmation is surely to be found in the fact that the Meleagrian sequences in *AP* v and xii (*erotica*) are arranged on the same principle—two different excerpts from the same original sequence. Strong evidence in favour of this hypothesis is provided by the continuous run of Meleagrian *erotica* (*AP* 12.76, 77, 78; 9.15, 12.106, 5.152, 12.19) in the first-century anthology fragment *Berliner Klassikertexte* V.i 75f, which if not (as Wifstand has shown)¹¹ a fragment of the *Garland* itself, is clearly related to it, presumably an excerpt therefrom. Further evidence may be seen in the parallel arrangement of the three successive Meleagrian sequences in vii.

To what might have seemed the natural implication that these are three successive excerpts from the same original continuous sequence of *epitymbia*, Lenzinger objects¹² that other sorts of epigrams must have been intermingled among the *epitymbia*, for (he argues) if all the Meleagrian *epitymbia* had been concentrated in one section of the *Garland*, Cephalas would not have had to conduct more than one search for them. He contrasts the one Agathian sequence in vii. But we do not know that Cephalas “had to” (rather than chose to) look more than once for Meleagrian *epitymbia*. Nor can I see why Lenzinger’s assumption makes such repeated “searches” more comprehensible. It is relevant to observe that there are well over three times

¹¹ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) ch. II.

¹² *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 13.

as many Meleagrian as Agathian poems in vii. It may be that Cephalas distributed his Meleagrian material as he did at least partly because he had so much more of it than anything else. I suspect that he had originally intended to rearrange the material which now appears as the two rather broken minor Meleagrian sequences into a thematic pattern of his own, like the thematic arrangement he devised for the first half of the book, before the major Meleagrian sequence. But here (as elsewhere) his energy and enthusiasm flagged towards the end of the book, and he did not finish the job.

Wifstrand himself, while canvassing in a tentative parenthesis the possibility that the *erotica* comprised a separate book of their own and admitting too that there appeared to have been another such section (he avoided the word book) comprised mainly of *epitymbia*, was nevertheless loath to suggest a formal division of the Meleagrian material into books. His reason was the presence of what he was inclined to regard as alien matter—*viz.* a lacing of votive and epideictic poems—matter which in some cases at least there was reason to believe Meleagrian (rather than Cephalan insertion). The answer, I think, is that Meleager interpreted these classifications rather more liberally than we do.

Wifstrand lists a number of poems in the Meleagrian sequences of vii which are not sepulchral: *e.g.* 409 on Antimachus, 410 on Thespis, 411 on Aeschylus, 709 on Alcman, 713 on Erinna. Yet are these really intruders? One of the commonest types among the *epitymbia* included in vii is the poem on a famous writer cast in the form of a fictitious epitaph. Many are really no more sepulchral than those mentioned above. So unless Meleager was going to be pedantic, it might well have seemed more appropriate to include poems on writers which did not even pretend to be sepulchral along with those that did. While they might be more correctly placed among the *epideictica*, they would be in a non-literary context, away from their natural fellows. Similarly with 7.723, a lament for the defeat of Sparta: not an epitaph proper, but not wholly out of place among the epitaphs. ‘Intruders’ are alleged in v too. Gow, for example (Gow and Page II.171), states that 5.146 (Callimachus) on a statue of Berenice is “evidently misplaced” in v and “should have been” in ix. But the poem describes her beauty and concludes by saying that without her οὐδ’ αὐταὶ τὰι Χάριτες Χάριτες. This conceit links it closely with 148 (where Heliadora is said to excel αὐτὰς τὰς Χάριτας χάρισιν) and 149.4 (καυτὰν τὰν χάριν ἐν χάριτι), both

by Meleager himself. In fact, it is perfectly clear that Meleager derived this motif directly from Callimachus' poem. This, surely, is why he placed it before his own poems. It was not a true *eroticon*, to be sure, but it had some of the characteristics thereof, and as the model for later *erotica* was more appropriately placed among them than with the *anathematica* or *epideictica*, where this connection would be obscured. 205 might from the formal point of view be classified as an *anathematicon*, but the object dedicated is a love charm. 206 is a dedication of musical instruments, but by girls bearing names suitable for *hetairai* (Gow and Page II.353), one of them being described as *φιλερως* and a willing performer at revels. Here again the erotic and sympotic elements may in Meleager's judgement have outweighed the formal features. There are similar apparent 'intruders' in Agathian sections, where we can be certain that the selection was Agathias' own. For example, 5.217 and 218, though concerned with love, are both really epideictic. 222 on a *κιθαριστρίς* might have been more appropriately placed together with Leontius' run of poems on dancing girls, presumably included among Agathias' *ecphrastica*, though now preserved only in *AP* iv. Yet obviously in Agathias' eyes the erotic element predominated in all three.

I would suggest, then, that there is no real alien matter in these four Meleagrian categories as represented in *AP*. It is just that, like Agathias, Meleager was prepared to include 'formal intruders' if for some other reason they seemed to him more suitably placed elsewhere than in their formally correct context. Indeed, I would go further. It seems to me that the absence of real glaring misfits in Meleagrian sequences is an argument in favour of my thesis of fourfold division by subject. For grateful though we all are to Cephalas for his priceless collection, no one will deny that he threw it together very carelessly.¹³ One of the signs of haste and inattention is frequent wrong classification. One example out of many will suffice at this point (see also below, pp.333f) —one that will prove relevant to the next part of this paper. *AP* 7.641 Cephalas classified as an *epitymbion*, evidently supposing that its opening word *σῆμα* referred to a tomb. Had he taken the trouble to read the rest of the poem, he would have seen that it referred in fact to a water clock! There are no cases like this in the Meleagrian sequences. Or rather such cases as there are are confined to Cephalas'

¹³ According to K. Preisendanz, "Kephalas zur endgültigen Redaktion seines Sammelwerkes nicht mehr gelangt ist," *Gnomon* 34 (1962) 659.

own division of the Meleagrian *erotica* into two categories, heterosexual and homosexual. An easy enough task, one might have thought. Yet there are numerous homosexual poems in v and scores of heterosexual poems in xii—to some extent because Cephalas evidently did not realise that names ending in *-ιον* (Timarion, etc.) were feminine, but often just through sheer carelessness. This was the result when Cephalas was faced with thematically undifferentiated material and had to do his own categorising. Yet though he made such a sorry mess of the Meleagrian *erotica*, he apparently managed to deal with the Meleagrian *anathematica*, *epideictica* and *epitymbia* without making any mistakes of this order or nature, mistakes of a sort he often made when distributing the undifferentiated Philippan poems under these headings. And the explanation of this is, surely, not that for once Cephalas was extra careful and managed to avoid error, but that he found the Meleagrian *anathematica*, *epideictica* and *epitymbia* already differentiated in his source—the *Garland* itself.

Let us now have another look at the Palatine lemma referred to above: οὗτος ὁ Μελέαγρος . . . ἐποίησεν . . . τὸν θαυμάσιον τουτονὶ τὸν τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων στέφανον. συνέταξεν δὲ αὐτὰ κατὰ στοιχείον, ἀλλὰ Κωνσταντῖνος ὁ ἐπονομαζόμενος Κεφαλὰς συνέχεεν αὐτὰ ἀφορίσας εἰς κεφάλαια διάφορα· ἤγουν ἐρωτικά ἰδίως καὶ ἀναθηματικά καὶ ἐπιτύμβια καὶ ἐπιδεικτικά, ὡς νῦν ὑποτέτακται ἐν τῷ παρόντι πτυκτίῳ. The statement that the *Garland* was arranged alphabetically is certainly false. But this is not the only feature about the lemma that gives rise to problems. For it also appears to say that Cephalas made use of only four classifications, *erotica*, *anathematica*, *epitymbia* and *epideictica*. This no one has ever accepted, since, though several of the minor books of the Palatine collection are probably not Cephalan, seven at least certainly were (essentially categories used by Agathias). But if we look a little more closely at the lemma, we discover that it does not in fact state in so many words that there were only four Cephalan books—merely that these were the four categories into which the Meleagrian poems were distributed. And this, as we have seen, happens to be true.

It seems to me that there is a very simple explanation of both the lemmatist's statements. Being under the mistaken impression that Meleager's *Garland*, like Philip's, was arranged alphabetically, he was surprised to come across a copy (or a reference to a copy) divided up

into these four thematic categories. So he assumed that it must have been Cephalas who rearranged it on this principle, an arrangement (he adds) followed also in the *Palatine Anthology*. What he took to be a 'Cephalan revision' of the *Garland*, divided into *erotica*, *anathematica*, *epitymbia* and *epideictica*, was surely in fact the *Garland* itself. For while the Meleagrian poems do indeed fall into these four categories, the Meleagrian material in *AP* (and therefore Cephalas too) was *not* divided between these four books only. The poems described in the lemma as just *erotica* were divided in Cephalas and *AP* evenly between *erotica* proper (*AP* v) and *paidica* (xii). There were five Cephalan books containing substantial Meleagrian sections. So surely the four books mentioned by the lemma are the four books of the original *Garland* (where *paidica* and *erotica* were undifferentiated).

But for the statement of the lemma and the evidence of Agathias' own preface, no one who had studied the evidence set out above would be likely to doubt that Agathias had modelled his *Cycle* directly on Meleager's *Garland*. And this is surely exactly what he did. He took over from Meleager not only the alternation of 'Hauptdichter' and thematic linking, but also the preliminary subdivision according to type. Hitherto it has been supposed that this preliminary subdivision was a new departure of Agathias. I would suggest, rather, that all he did was to add three more headings to cover the wider scope of the work of himself and his friends.

II Philip

There is no lemma to tell us how Philip's *Garland* was arranged, nor does his preface offer any help. But as early as the first serious attempt to analyse the sources of *AP* (Passow's *De vestigiis Coronarum* in 1827) it was realised that all the substantial Philippan sequences in *AP* are arranged alphabetically. A convenient table of all the Philippan sequences¹⁴ together with the first word of each poem will be found at pp.13–20 of Weisshäupl's *Grabgedichte*, and one does not need even to read through to the end of it to see that there is no possibility of

¹⁴ Cf. too the useful table in Lenzinger, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) between pp.63–4 (where sequences are not always quite accurately delimited, especially in *AP* vii), and the list of sequences in Beckby's second edition, I (1966) 70 n.10.

error or denial.¹⁵ This was a discovery of the first importance, since it means that if the first word of any poem inside a Philippan sequence is even one letter out, it can be regarded with confidence as an intruder into that sequence—a confidence unfortunately never attainable in Meleagrian or Agathian sequences. But it was also a discovery which put an end to further inquiry about the arrangement of the *Garland*, since the last word appeared to have been said.

There seemed only one question left to ask. Was there more than one book, and if so, did the alphabetical order run from the beginning of the first book to the end of the last, or did each individual book run from *alpha* to *omega*? Since something like 3000 Philippan lines survive in *AP* and *APL*, there must presumably have been more than one book. As before, we must allow for titles and for omissions by Cephala. Even so, it looks as though Philip's *Garland* was a little shorter than Meleager's. Indeed, it is commonly believed that Philip himself admitted as much, but this notion is based on a misinterpretation of Philip's preface. "Familiar as you are with the fame of the older poets [*i.e.* the Meleagrian poets]," writes Philip to his patron Camillus, γνῶθι καὶ ὀπλοτέρων τῆν ὀλιγοστιχίην (*AP* 4.2.6). "Learn to know the *less abundant* verses of our younger ones," translates Paton; "lern auch die *knappere Kunst* jüngerer Dichter nunmehr," Beckby (in both cases my italics). "Doch war der Umfang der Sammlung bedeutend geringer als der des Meleagrishen Stephanos," writes Radinger, quoting this line. In fact there can be no doubt whatever that Philip is alluding to the brevity of the epigram as a literary genre, not to the small number of them included in his *Garland*. In the first place there is no com-

¹⁵ At both 6.239 and 9.410 a *sigma* (σμήνεος and σμίνθος respectively) occurs between *epsilon* and *eta*. The solution is obvious enough: what Philip wrote in both places was an initial *zeta* (Ζμήνεος and Ζμίνθος), just as Catullus' friend Cinna wrote *Zmyrna* for *Smyrna*. Editors have been curiously reluctant to admit this certain correction (certain in so far as it must be what Philip wrote for the purposes of his alphabetical order: whether the actual authors, Tullius Sabinus and Apollonides, used the *zeta* is another matter) to their texts (not one so far). Though advanced already by Franz Passow in his *Quaestio de vestigiis Coronarum Meleagri et Philippi* (Bratislava 1827) 8–9, and repeated by Wiegand in *RhM* 3 (1845) 542, it was proposed again by P. Friedlaender (*ap.* Maas) in *Gnomon* 7 (1931) 578, then again by A. Wilhelm in *AntCl* 4 (1935) 251 (both for 6.239 only), and yet again now by R. Merkelbach in *Glotta* 45 (1967) 39–40 (with a *Nachtrag* acknowledging Passow's priority, but no reference to Friedlaender or Wilhelm). A *zeta* now appears in the addenda to Beckby's second edition (though only for 6.239), the credit being assigned there to Friedlaender (to whom, rather than to Passow, he was referred by Luck in *Gnomon* 30 [1958] 272).

parative. In the second, compare *AP* 9.342 by Parmenion,¹⁶ one of the very poets Philip included, and one mentioned in his preface: *φημι πολυστιχίην ἐπιγράμματος οὐ κατὰ Μούσας | εἶναι . . .*

To return to the question of the individual books of the *Garland*. In the course of that tireless search for Graeco-Roman poetry books which eventually filled out a dossier of almost 150, Theodor Birt pounced on the long Philippan sequence at *AP* 11.215–312, 596 lines (or 694 counting titles), and declared it a book.¹⁷ This view was rejected almost at once by Weisshäupl¹⁸ on two counts, neither of them cogent. His first objection was based on the once fashionable but now generally (and rightly) rejected belief that Cephalas did not himself use the original collections of Meleager or Philip (or even the relatively recent Agathias) at first hand.¹⁹ His second, what he (for no stated reason) apparently regarded as the absurdity of each book having its own complete alphabetical sequence.

If Birt were right, we should be able to conclude that Philip's *Garland* was divided, like the collections of both his predecessor and successor, according to subject matter, each book being arranged alphabetically. But as Radinger observed, there are misfits in almost every Philippan sequence in *AP*, clearly the result of Cephalas' carelessness. The example of Antiphilus' poem *AP* 7.641 opening *σῆμα* has been cited already. Compare also 7.379 by the same author. It was presumably the mention of a mound in v.1 (*χῶμα*) that caused Cephalas to put it in the *epitymbia*; but again, had he read on he would have discovered that the mound was in fact a mole in the harbour at Puteoli!²⁰ Similarly 6.88. The first couplet does indeed suggest that the poem is an *anathematicon*, and so rightly placed in vi; but the last reveals clearly that it is an *eroticon*, and belongs in v. Yet all these poems are correctly placed in an alphabetical sequence. So they cannot be intruders inserted by Cephalas. On the contrary, they are all integral links of the original *Garland*, which Cephalas mistakenly *retained*. Obviously, then, the original *Garland* must have been thematically undifferentiated. It was Cephalas who did the distributing

¹⁶ Cf. also Callimachus' use of [ὄλ]υγόστιχος at fr.1.9, with Pfeiffer *ad loc.*, and W. Peek, *RE* 19 (1938) col. 2341 s.v. PHILIPPOS 36.

¹⁷ *Das antike Buchwesen* (Berlin 1882) 388–9.

¹⁸ *Grabgedichte d. griech. Anthologie* (*AbhArchSemWien* 7, 1889) 26 n.1.

¹⁹ On this see Wifstrand, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.5) 1f, 25; Gow and Page, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) I.xvii.

²⁰ Cf. Müller, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 59.

of individual poems into his own categories, sometimes getting it wrong and giving the game away.

So Birt was wrong to suppose that Philippan books were arranged alphabetically according to subject matter. But the possibility that there were several alphabetical books, *not* arranged according to subject matter, was left open by Radinger's argument. True, Radinger seemed to think that the presence of two or three Philippan sequences per book of *AP* was further evidence against such a view, but might it not in fact be possible to see here a trace of two or three such undifferentiated books successively excerpted by Cephelas? Perhaps. But this possibility too can be put out of court by a consideration long noted but never apparently exploited in this connection. *AP* 6.106, firmly embedded in an alphabetical sequence, appears again in the Palatine Ms after 6.255, where it is again firmly embedded in an alphabetical sequence. There is only one possible explanation. Originally both these alphabetical sequences formed one and the same sequence. Cephelas excerpted it *twice*, and absent-mindedly included the same poem twice in both the resulting sequences (which, since the original was alphabetical, would naturally both be alphabetical themselves).

Thanks to Cephelas' carelessness the conclusion seems inescapable that Philip's original *Garland* comprised one long alphabetical series without regard to subject matter; *erotica*, *anathematica*, *epitymbia* etc. all together. So the Philippan sequences of *erotica*, *anathematica*, *epitymbia*, etc. which we read in the various books of *AP* are a series of excerpts of the Philippan poems which Cephelas thought (sometimes mistakenly as we have seen) to be concerned with these subjects. The separate books into which (for considerations of size) the whole must have been divided, must have been split up on the same principle as the fascicules of an alphabetical reference work today—three books (say) comprising $\alpha-\theta$, $\iota-\pi$, $\rho-\omega$.

This has a consequence which might have seemed obvious enough, but does not seem to have been generally drawn. Even the cautious Gow is for once incautious enough to write of the Meleagrian, Philippan and Agathian sequences in *AP* in the same terms as "blocks of epigrams . . . transferred more or less unaltered from their respective sources."²¹ We have seen that there are good reasons for supposing this to be the case with the Agathian sequences, and probably

²¹ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) I.xvii-xviii.

too with the Meleagrian sequences (but only if, as argued above, they derive from thematically divided books). But it should be obvious that the Philippan sequences are on a completely different footing. Not one of them can be even relatively 'unaltered'.

The sequence of erotic poems (*AP* 5.104–133), for example, is simply an excerpt of all the erotic poems which Cephalas could find (or deemed good for us) scattered throughout the 3000-odd lines of the *Garland*. A mere 29 poems, 76 lines, out of 3000. And since they range from *alpha* to *omega*, they must have been culled evenly from all parts of the original. It is theoretically possible that each poem in the present sequence in *AP* v was in the original *Garland* separated by as many as ten or twenty poems from its present neighbours. The fullest of the Philippan sequences in *AP*, the nearly 100 poems and 600 lines of 9.215–312, again ranging all the way from *alpha* to *omega*, is still no more than an excerpt of one poem in six from the original *Garland*. So much for Birt's 'book'.

We could get a better idea of the appearance of the *Garland* proper if we could *amalgamate* all the different sequences in the different books of *AP*. Since the principle of arrangement is alphabetical, it might seem that this could be done easily enough: indeed that one could even intercalate in the appropriate alphabetical position all the 'loose' Philippan poems in both *AP* and *APl*. Unfortunately this would be impossible, because of a point which has no doubt occurred to others before me, but which I cannot recall having seen set down in print, much less systematically proved.

Philip did *not* in fact arrange his material on a thorough-going alphabetical principle. He merely divided it into 24 groups according to the initial letter of the first word of each poem. All the poems whose first word begins with *alpha* come before all those whose first word begins with *beta* (and so on), but *inside* each letter group no consistent attempt was made to arrange individual poems in alphabetical order. Compare the sequence *AP* 6.227–261. While no initial letter occurs before a preceding letter of the alphabet, inside letter groups no fewer than 13 out of a total of 34 are out of place. In the sequence 7.364–405 no fewer than 17 out of 41 are out of place inside letter groups. The proportion is approximately 1 : 3 in both cases. Let us now look at the fullest sequence for one letter which we have: 9.205–236, 21 consecutive poems opening with an *alpha*. Here are the first words: *αἰεῖ*, *ἁρμονίης*, *αἰ*, *ἀβάλε*, *αἰγιβότου*, *ἄ*, *αὐγάζω*, *ἀνέρα*,

ἀγγελίην, αἶγα, Ἀσωπίς, αἶ, ἀκταίην, ἀγγελίης, ἀρχαίη, ἀμβαίνων, αἶην, Ἀδριακοῖο, ἀθα, ἄχρι, ἄγχουροι, ἄρρηκτοι. It would be difficult to say how many were out of place here, for there is not even an approximate tendency towards alphabetical order. After the initial *alpha* we have a *rho* in second position and a *delta* and *gamma* (in that order) towards the end.

I cannot believe that this is merely one of the results of Cephalas' carelessness. His carelessness (which is undoubted) takes other forms—misunderstanding, inaccurate classification, false ascriptions. He usually copies his sources accurately enough except for errors of this sort. If we credit him with the disorder inside these Philippan letter groups, we should also have to expect up to one in three poems to be misplaced by several positions in Meleagrian and Agathian sequences too. Yet this is plainly not so. The subtle twofold pattern still discernible in those sequences could never have survived such treatment. There is, fortunately, one opportunity to check Cephalas' accuracy in this respect when copying from his sources. For 7.83–133, no fewer than 50 consecutive poems, are copied directly from a work which happily survives—Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of the Philosophers*. Every single one appears in *AP* in the same order as in Diogenes. Obviously it would be very singular if Cephalas had juggled around in this way with his Philippan material alone.

Let us suppose for a moment that Philip *did* order every poem alphabetically from first to last. Either Cephalas would have noticed, in which case his juggling about would be inexplicable. Or he would not have noticed, and his juggling about would not have been confined to letter groups. We should expect to find the odd *beta* among the *alphas* and *gammas*. Why should the juggling, whether deliberate or accidental, be confined to the letter groups? A further factor is the uniform pattern of irregularities throughout all the sequences. Carelessness is almost by definition spasmodic rather than regular.

Proof positive is provided by the poem which occurs in two Philippan sequences, 6.106, opening *τοῦτό τοι*. As 6.106 it comes in a sequence of alphabetically arranged letter groups after a poem opening *Τρῶγλαν* and before an *upsilon*. By Philippan standards it is in position inside a group of *taus* (whose order inside the group is in fact in reverse alphabetical order). At its second occurrence after 6.255, it comes after poems opening *τήν* (254) and *τοῦτο Σάων* (255), and before *Ταύρου* (256) and then *τίς* (257), *τάς* (258) and *τίς* again (259)—again,

inside a group of *taus* which are not themselves in alphabetical order. If the poem stands out of place in both these excerpts from the *Garland*, clearly it must have stood out of place in the *Garland* itself. If these two sequences were united, the disorder would become even more marked. The case of the *alphas* in 9.205f shows that the more poems inside a letter group, the greater the disorder. So when we find letter groups of only (say) two or three poems in the shorter sequences in other books of *AP* which happen to be in proper order, this may be just coincidence. If we could collect all the groups of this letter from all the sequences, we should probably find the same pattern of disorder.

One final point. We happen to have Philip's preface (*AP* 4.2), which for obvious reasons will have headed the whole collection. So the initial letter of its first word will have been the very first letter of the *Garland*. It is an *alpha*,²² of course, but after that only a *nu* (*ἄνθεα*). There are fourteen *alphas* from the 9.205f sequence alone which on alphabetical considerations should have preceded the preface.

It seems clear then that Philip made no attempt to arrange poems alphabetically inside letter groups. This need cause no surprise. Rather it would be surprising if he had. For obvious though the principle of alphabetisation might seem, it was not employed either early or consistently in ancient times. And alphabetisation after the first letter was particularly late in arriving. The earliest attested examples of second-letter order are the glossary *POxy.* 1801 and a Bodleian papyrus of Apollonius' *Homeric Lexicon*,²³ both mid-first century. By the second century there are several more: *POxy.* 1802, Galen's work on Hippocratic glosses, and the *Lexicon* of Harpocration. So the principle was certainly known by Philip's day. Yet it was obviously a principle devised in the first instance by lexicographers, dealing with so much material that the inadequacies of alphabetisation by first letter alone were revealed at a practical level. It is unlikely to have been used for a collection of poems: clearly Philip did not intend his system to be practical, that is, to enable readers to locate poems of which they knew the first word. There are parallels for poems arranged in first letter order: Bacchylides' *Dithyrambs* (at least in the

²² For this reason alone (though there are others) we may safely ignore L. Herrmann's proposal (*AntCl* 27 [1958] 98–9) to transfer the first two lines of Meleager's preface to stand in front of Philip's. Meleager's preface begins *Μοῦσα* (see n.6 above).

²³ Cf. E. W. B. Nicholson, *CR* 11 (1897) 390–3.

BM papyrus), and possibly Sappho.²⁴ It was surely these (probably Alexandrian) precedents that Philip was following, rather than contemporary lexicographical practice.

Yet when compared with the skilful twofold (I would add, threefold) system of Meleager—and we know from his preface that Philip was consciously following the example of Meleager—how utterly crude and feeble a system it would seem to be. Was Philip really so lacking in ingenuity that this was the best he could do?²⁵ With *ca.* 430 poems divided between 24 letters, the average per letter will have been *ca.* 20, and for the commoner letters 50 or 60 or more. Is it really plausible to suppose that Philip assembled 50 or 60 poems beginning with *alpha* in no order whatever before passing on to treat 25 poems beginning with *beta* the same way, and so on? I do not believe that it is.

The grouping of poems by initial letter was merely a preliminary, the external framework of his system. It was Philip's variation on Meleager's preliminary division of material into four basic categories before addressing himself to the more subtle task of arranging the individual poems inside those categories. Philip too had an internal *and* an external system. He may well have rejected Meleager's external division as being too crude. 270-odd erotic epigrams *en bloc* followed by 290 *epitymbia* (and so on) might certainly be deemed lacking in subtlety and variety for a work which was presumably intended to be read from cover to cover rather than (as the surviving *Palatine* and *Planudean Anthologies*) dipped into in small doses. By contrast he hit on the ingenious idea of dividing his material alphabetically in the first instance. The arbitrariness of the procedure would ensure that each letter group contained a good cross-section of poems of every genre, thus avoiding the monotony of long stretches of unrelieved *erotica* (or whatever). Inside these groups he could employ an internal system (presumably very similar to Meleager's) of linking by community (or contrast) of theme or verbal parallel.

²⁴ I gratefully borrow my information on this subject from Lloyd W. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Collection Latomus 90, 1967). I should like to thank Professor Daly for communicating relevant details to me before the appearance of his book.

²⁵ Reitzenstein, *RE* 6 (1909) col. 105 s.v. EPIGRAMM, who apparently accepted Birt's suggestion of a primary division according to subject matter, has harsh words for the crudity of Philip's system. W. Peek, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.16) 2340, is content to refer to Reitzenstein on this point.

III

We have seen that the Philippan sequences in *AP* are all excerpts from the one master sequence of the *Garland* itself. Thus in many cases poems juxtaposed in these sequences may not have stood together in the *Garland*. But we need not despair altogether. If, as I have postulated, Philip did arrange his material according to theme as well, then naturally Cephalas, who excerpted according to theme, will on occasions at least have taken over Philip's thematic sequences undisturbed into his own thematic categories. A number of examples of just this phenomenon will be collected in what follows. In most cases, of course, Cephalas' method of selection—and especially his carelessness—will have broken up these patterns, especially links of the more subtle variety. On occasions it will prove possible to recover them by juxtaposing the same letter group from different sequences (naturally a more hazardous undertaking). Nevertheless, it seems to me that there are sufficient traces of such an arrangement, both in the long Philippan sequences of *AP* and in the much briefer sequences of *APL*, to put the matter beyond any reasonable doubt.

▲ Let us begin with the two well known attacks on Callimachus and his school by Philip himself and Antiphanes (11.321–322).²⁶ It will be enough to quote the first full couplet of each:

Γραμματικοὶ Μώμου στυγίου τέκνα, σῆτες ἀκανθῶν,
 τελχῖνες βίβλων, Ζηνοδότου σκύλακες,
 Καλλιμάχου στρατιῶται . . . (11.321.1-3)

Γραμματικῶν περίεργα γένη, ρίζωρύχα μούσης
 ἀλλοτρίης, ἀτυχεῖς σῆτες ἀκανθοβάται,
 . . . Καλλιμάχου πρόκυνες . . . (11.322.1-4)

Obviously it is no coincidence that these poems are juxtaposed, and it seems reasonable to infer that they were so in the *Garland* too. Philip is in better form than usual and could even be the original, though it may be just alphabetical considerations that prompted him to place his own poem first.

²⁶ Cichorius, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 347f, argues that such attacks on hairsplitting pedantry could not have been written under Tiberius (who delighted in it) and so dates the poems (together with 11.347 by Philip) under Gaius. But now that we know that at least one poem from the *Garland* was written under Nero (see n.2), clearly we cannot rule out the possibility that the poems were written under Nero as a reaction against the pedantic Claudius. In any case, one is disposed to wonder whether contemporaries would have taken them quite so seriously as this.

Β Next 7.233–234 by Apollonides and Philip. Again it will only be necessary to quote the first couplet of each:

*Αἴλιος, Αὔσονίης στρατίης πρόμος, ὁ χρυσέοισι
στέμμασι σωρεύσας αὐχένας ὄπλοφόρους, . .*

*Αἴλιος, ὁ θρασύχειρ Ἄργους πρόμος, ὁ ψελιώσας
αὐχένα χρυσοδέτοις ἐκ πολέμου στεφάνοις, . .*

For our purpose it hardly matters which, but quite clearly one poem is a deliberate variation on the other.

γ 9.415–6 by Antiphilus and Philip are both about a ship suitably called *Hetaira* which was apparently built from the profits of prostitution. The corrector of the *Palatinus* thought that the ship was still used for prostitution, and Luck goes so far as to suggest that the poems were designed for placards advertising the attractions of the good ship *Hetaira*.²⁷ But this is to miss the point of both poems, which are merely rather tedious variations on Meleager's already overlong and not very funny comparison of the prostitute to a ship.²⁸ There is no need to suppose that the ship was really used as a brothel. But what matters for our present purpose is merely that Philip's poem is directly juxtaposed to Antiphilus' and is clearly a direct imitation of it. Nor is the juxtaposition the inevitable result of the fact that both poems open with the same word (as was true of the last two examples), for 415 begins *ἤμην* and 416 *ἡ ναῦς*. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that Philip wrote his poem as a conscious pendant to Antiphilus', taking care that it should begin with an *eta*.

δ 9.293–4. Once more Philip and Antiphilus, on the silly theme of the purple cloak allegedly laid on Leonidas' body by Xerxes after Thermopylae, much to Leonidas' posthumous disgust:

*πουλὸν Λεωνίδεω κατιδῶν δέμας αὐτοδαίικτον
Ἐέρξης ἐχλαίνου φάρει πορφυρέω·
. . . οὐδέχομαι προδόταις μισθὸν ὀφειλόμενον. (293.1-4)*

*πορφυρέαν τοι τάνδε, Λεωνίδα, ὤπασε χλαῖναν
Ἐέρξης ταρβήσας ἔργα τεῶς ἀρετᾶς—
“οὐδέχομαι προδόταις αὐτὰ χάρις . . .” (294.1-3)*

Antiphilus, author of the latest datable poem in the *Garland*,²⁹ could

²⁷ *Gnomon* 33 (1961) 782.

²⁸ 5.204, “the most unattractive and unsuccessful of M.'s poems” (Page, in Gow and Page II.640).

²⁹ 9.178: see n.2.

be the imitator, but it seems more natural to assume that it is Philip. For since the poems do not open with the same word, one of the two must have been written specially to ensure the alphabetical link, and while Antiphilus' *πορφυρέαν* is natural enough (and an element in the story repeated by Philip elsewhere in his first couplet), Philip's *πουλὺ* seems a little weak and forced.³⁰

ε 9.257–8, by Apollonides and Antiphanes, both on the theme of a fountain, formerly pure, which was defiled by some murderers washing the blood off their hands therein. Since they open respectively *ἡ καθαρὴ* and *ἡ πάρος*, once more the alphabetical juxtaposition must have been deliberately engineered.

Ϝ 7.236–7, by Antipater of Thessalonica and Alpheus, opening *οὐχί* and *οὔρεα* respectively, on the tomb of Themistocles in Magnesia.

Ϛ 7.382–3: two variations by Philip himself on the same theme, a drowned man washed up onto a rocky shore to take another beating after his death. Yet again Philip managed to avoid the easy solution of securing his juxtaposition by starting both poems with the same word (instead *ἡπείρω* and *ἡόνιον* respectively).

Next, traces of a rather more sophisticated interweaving of themes: η 6.240–4. 240 (*Ζηνός*)³¹ is a dedication by Philip to Artemis, daughter of Zeus. 242 (*ἡ*), by Crinagoras, is another dedication to Artemis, coupled with Zeus; Zeus Teleius, on the occasion of the birth of a child. 243 (*ἡ*), by Diodorus, and 244 (*Ἡρη*), by Crinagoras, are again both addresses to Hera; the second to *Hera Teleia* as goddess of child-birth—coupled with Zeus. Thus 244 has one sort of link with 243 and another with 242. 242, in turn, in addition to its link with 244 has another sort of link with 240. 241, by Antipater on a helmet of Piso, does not seem to have any obvious connection with the other members of the complex, but another poem or poems in the vicinity omitted or located elsewhere by Cephalas might have supplied the key. Even without the cumulative evidence of the foregoing examples it would be hard to credit that such a subtle interweaving of motifs (hence, of course, the title 'Garland') was the result of pure chance.

ι Whether or not there was once a fellow for the poem on Piso's

³⁰ On the dependence of Philip on Antiphilus in general, see Müller, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 68. Philip frequently imitated the poets he included in his *Garland*: cf. Peek, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.16) 2347–8; Small, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 93.

³¹ Hereafter I shall add the first word of a poem (where relevant) in brackets after the reference number.

helmet in this group, we do find a pair of such poems by Antipater juxtaposed at 9.92–3 (opening respectively *ἀρκεῖ* and *Ἀντίπατρος*). The first thanks Piso for a present to Antipater, the second accompanies a present from Antipater to Piso. The sequence in which this pair occurs is broken, but because of the alphabetical link they must have stood relatively close to each other in the *Garland*, and in view of the numerous other pairs discussed so far, there seems little reason to doubt that they were either directly juxtaposed or woven into a complex like 6.240–4. From the same broken sequence there are two juxtaposed poems (9.44–45) by Statyllius Flaccus (both opening *χρυσὸν ἀνήρ*) on the man who gave up the idea of hanging himself when he found some gold, while the man who had lost the gold used the noose left by the other. They too may perhaps have stood together in the *Garland*.

ι 6.227 and 229 both accompany presents from Crinagoras—and similar presents too, a pen-knib and a toothpick. 228 and 230 are both rustic dedications: 230 (Quintus Maecius) purports to be a dedication from a fisherman called Damis, as too does 231 (Philip). For the place of 230 in an even wider nexus, see example τ below.

κ 7.174 (Erycius) and 175–6 (Antiphilus), not in a regular sequence but opening *οὐκέτι, οὐτω* and *οὐχ* respectively, are all about oxen. 174 is an imitation of the lovely *ἀντόματα δειλή* (173, of uncertain authorship: cf. Gow and Page II.279). The oxen return alone because the farmer, their master, has died. 175–6 are both variations on the theme of the farmer who drove his oxen over a grave, disturbing the bones that lay underneath. Surely this is a block which Cephalas lifted whole from the *Garland* because they were all epitaphs (of a sort) concerned with oxen, so that he could place them in his own collection after the probably Meleagrian *ἀντόματα δειλή* at 173. If so, we would have an interesting example of how Philip moved from one motif to another, related, motif.

I will pass over less obvious cases: for example 9.296 (*Σκύλλος*) and 297 (*στέλλευ*) by Apollonides and Antipater, Themistocles' victory over the Persians followed by Gaius setting out against the Parthians in A.D. 1. Such a link would have been adequate for the purposes of Philip's pattern, but is hardly strong enough of itself to prove the existence of a pattern. 6.235 (*Ἐσπερίοις*) and 236 (*ἔμβολα*) are both contemporary poems, by Thallus and Philip, on someone described simply as *Καῖσαρ*: different Caesars, as it happens, Caligula and

Augustus respectively.³² But they obviously balance each other nicely. 9.311 (ὠκείαις) and 312 (ὠνερ) are linked by a rather bizarre use of the theme of motherhood. 9.288 (οὔτος) by Geminus and 289 (οὐλόμεναι) by Bassus both describe Greek disasters, one historical, the other mythical.

The next seven examples are all drawn, not from the regular sequences in *AP*, but from *APL*. Normally it has not been considered profitable to pursue the study of *Garland* and *Cycle* sequences into *APL*, because of Planudes' method of arrangement (subject categories, and then manifold subdivision into a series of sub-categories, thus on the whole breaking up the original sequences). But throughout *APL* we do find *short* sequences (2 or 3 poems), and where, in the case of Philippan poems, all poems in these sequences begin with the same letter of the alphabet, it is clear that they must at the very least have stood within a few poems of each other in the original sequence, if not (as seems more likely) directly juxtaposed. Not one of the otherwise exactly similar short Meleagrian and Agathian sequences are alphabetical, and the very number of the alphabetical Philippan sequences is enough to justify the assumption that Planudes took them direct from a Philippan sequence in Cephalas. It is relevant to note that no fewer than five of the pairs discussed above from Philippan sequences in *AP*, all but one firmly embedded in an alphabetical run there, are also found together as pairs in Planudes: Philip's pair on the shipwrecked mariner (7.382–3=*APL* 3a.19.25–6); Philip and Antiphanes on the Callimacheans (11.321–2=*APL* 2a.10.4–5); Apollonides and Philip on Aelius (7.233–4=*APL* 3a.5.13–14); Apollonides and Philip on the defiled spring (9.257–8=*APL* 1a.63.3–4); and the silly pair by Statyllius Flaccus on the noose and the gold (9.44–5=*APL* 1a.82.1–2). So there is no sound reason to doubt that in most, if not all, cases Planudes took the groups which follow from Philippan sequences in Cephalas which the compiler of *AP* happened to omit.³³

1. 103–4, a pair by Geminus and Philip on a statue of Heracles, opening respectively "Ἡρακλῆς and "Ἡρῆ. As so often, it is Philip who wrote the pendant and could thus fix the alphabetical sequence. It is worth adding that 98 (οὔτος ὁ νῦν) and 99 (οὔτος ὁ πανδαμάτωρ), and 101 (οἶω)

³² See Cichorius, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 356f and 342 respectively.

³³ On the ultimate Cephalan provenience of the Planudean Appendix (= *AP* xvi on the conventional numeration), cf. especially Gow, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 45–58, whose views are accepted by Lenzinger, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 29–30.

and 102 (οἶον) are alphabetical pairs on the same subject from the same chapter in Planudes. All four are anonymous in Planudes. It is uncertain to what extent Philip included *anonyma* in his *Garland* (both Meleager and Agathias seem certainly to have done so),³⁴ and in any case it may just be that Planudes, who was very careless indeed about ascriptions (countless poems anonymous in Planudes have satisfactory ascriptions in *AP*), omitted the poet's names. We should perhaps leave open the possibility that one or other of these groups derives from the *Garland*.

μ 136–7, Antiphilus and Philip (a familiar grouping by now) on Timomachus' statue of Medea killing her children in Rome. 135, on the same theme, is closely parallel, and fits into the same alphabetical run (τέχνη, τάν, τίς). Again, it seems a plausible conjecture that the author was a Philippan poet whose name Planudes carelessly omitted.

ν 195–7, three poems on a statue of Eros bound to a post, opening τόν, τίς and τίς respectively. The poems are ascribed by Planudes to Satyrus, Alcaeus and Antipater. Little is known of Satyrus. But at 10.6 he appears as one half of an alphabetical pair (both opening ἦδη) with the probably Philippan Thyillus, both variations on Leonidas' famous Spring poem (10.1). And surely he is to be identified with the author of 6.11, ascribed to 'Satrius' in *AP* but to 'Satyrius' by Planudes, another variation on Leonidas' hardly less popular poem 6.13. Antipater could be the Meleagrian from Sidon or the Philippan from Thessalonica equally. Luck³⁵ opts for the former on the more than questionable grounds that "nichts spricht dagegen," because it suits a theory of his about the Sidonian. Gow, more cautiously (II.23), leaves the choice entirely open. There is no reason to rule out the Thessalonican. This leaves Alcaeus. 196 bears little resemblance to the work of Alcaeus of Messene,³⁶ but it does bear a strong resemblance to the

³⁴ For statistics of the *anonyma* included in all three groups, and commentary thereon, see Gow, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.4) 22f. They occur "in Meleager rather more often than once in ten, in Philip about once in thirty, and in Agathias rather less often than once in fourteen" (Gow p.24). I shall be discussing some Agathian *anonyma* elsewhere before long.

³⁵ *op.cit.* (*supra* n.1) 46–7.

³⁶ Ascriptions to Alcaeus vary between the ethnics *Μυτιληναίου* and *Μεσσηνίου*. For a tabulation of the evidence see Gow and Page II.6–7, who conclude, probably correctly, that the former is an ignorant addition by someone who knew of only one Alcaeus, the lyric poet from Mytilene. There can, of course, be no doubt that Messene was Alcaeus' birthplace and that he was a contemporary of Philip V of Macedon (on his relationship to Philip see Edson's definitive refutation in *CP* 43 [1948] 116–21, missed by Gow and Page, of the Momigliano/Walbank interpretation of 9.518). But many scholars have believed in two

closely parallel poem sixteen later in this same chapter of Planudes (212), this time on a sleeping Eros, by the Philippan poet Alpheius of Mytilene. Partly for this reason, but mostly because of the alphabetical sequence, I should be inclined to attribute 196 to Alpheius as well (it is perhaps surprising that Alcaeus and Alpheius are not confused more often: for one example see 6.187—there may be more).

I will not pretend that this is not a hazardous chain of hypotheses, on a different footing from the examples that precede and follow. But the alphabetical sequence (neglected by Luck and Gow) extending to three, and the obvious close parallelism between 195, 6 and 7 all on the same subject, seem to me to point clearly to a Philippan group, in which case the Thessalonican Antipater and Alpheius become inevitable.

o There follow directly two more poems on the bound Eros by two certainly Philippan poets, both of whom we have met already in thematically linked groups: Maecius and Crinagoras (198–9). The one is patently an imitation of the other. Compare their openings: *κλαῖε δυσεκφύκτως σφιγχθεὶς χέρας, ἄφθιτε δαῖμον* and *καὶ κλαῖε καὶ στέναζε σὺ σφίγγων χεροῖν | τένοντας*.

p 214–5, by Secundus and yet again Philip himself, on a statue of a group of Erotes wearing the armour of the Olympians. Once more one is clearly a direct imitation of the other:

*σκυλοχαρεῖς ἴδ' Ἔρωτες, ἴδ', ὡς βριαροῖσιν ἐπ' ὤμοις
ὄπλα φέρουσι θεῶν νήπι' ἀγαλλόμενοι. (214.1-2)*

*συλήσαντες Ὀλυμπον ἴδ' ὡς ὄπλοισιν Ἔρωτες
κοσμοῦντ' ἀθανάτων σκῦλα φρυασσόμενοι. (215.1-2)*

It is worth noting that one of Secundus' two other poems in Philippan sequences in *AP* occurs as one member of a pair linked in the less obvious manner I have in general left on one side. 9.260 (*ἡ τὸ πάλαι*) by Secundus is on the aging Lais, 261 (*ἡ πάρος*) by the obscure but certainly Philippan Epigonus of Thessalonica is on the aging vine.

q 240–2, three consecutive poems on a Priapus by Philip, Argentarius and Erycius. 240 (*ὠραίας*) and 241 (*ὄριμος*) are concerned with the figs Priapus is supposed to be guarding, 242 (*ὡς βαρύ*) treats his anatomical

Hellenistic epigrammatists, one from Messene and the other from Mytilene (cf. Gow–Page II.7 n.1, and of these R. Reitzenstein (*Epigramm und Skolion* [Giessen 1893] 169 n.1) assigned 16.196 to the Mytilenaeon, not the Messenian (Planudes wrote merely *Ἀλκαίου*), presumably because he too found it alien to the style of the Messenian.

peculiarities. The alphabetical progression must plainly have been engineered. Since Argentarius' *floruit* probably fell under Tiberius, Philip's poem, as usual, is the imitation out of 240-1.

Lastly, I offer four examples obtained by the delicate procedure of juxtaposing the same letter group in different Philippan sequences. **κ** 7.379 (εἰπέ) by Antiphilus and 9.708 (ἔζευσ') by Philip, both on the mole in the harbour of Puteoli. Philip's poem is obviously (as usual) a direct imitation of Antiphilus', and it seems a natural inference, after the numerous examples assembled above, to suppose that they were directly juxtaposed in the *Garland*. Their separation is easy to explain. It has been remarked already (p.333) that Cephalas placed 7.379 (absurdly) among the *epitymbia* through a misunderstanding of *χώμα* in v.1.

σ Two poems on the grave of Protesilaus: 7.141 (Θέσσαλε) by Antiphilus and 385 (ἦρως), a typically slavish imitation by Philip. Would it be too fanciful to suggest that Antiphilus' poem (here in a broken sequence) came at the very beginning of Philip's *theta* group? There is one *eta* poem after 7.385 in the *AP* sequence at present, by Lollius Bassus on Niobe. Another poem on Niobe in the near vicinity, omitted by Cephalas, might have tied the sequence up.

τ 6.89 (ἀκτάλης) and 90 (ἄγχυραν), by Q. Maecius and Philip, are both dedications by fishermen: the first of a shell to Priapus "who delights in the rocks," the second of an anchor to Poseidon. In the second Philippan sequence in the same book we find at 6.230 (ἀκρείτα) another poem by Maecius: another dedication of a shell by a fisherman, this time to Apollo. 230, in turn, is linked to 231 (Philip) by the fact that both are dedications by a fisherman called Damis. Nor is this the last link in the chain. Earlier in the book there is another poem by the same Maecius (this time outside a sequence), 6.33 (αἰγιαλίτα): another dedication by a fisherman to Priapus of the shore, only this time of a bowl, stool and wine-cup. It is very tempting to conclude that all three of Maecius' poems stood together in the *Garland*. All three are dedications by fishermen. But over and above this common feature 6.89 is linked to 230 by the dedicated object (a shell), while at the same time having a different link, the dedicatee (Priapus), with 33. 230 is linked to 231 by the name of the fisherman. As usual, the chances against such a nexus of poems which do not begin with the same word nevertheless beginning with the same letter should normally be remote. It is hardly a coincidence that they do, nor that Philip should

have taken it into his head to round the group off with an *alpha*-fisherman-dedication of his own.

υ To close, two examples of the less obvious variety again. Between 7.367 (*Αὔσονος*) by Antipater, on the death of an Italian, and 7.368 (*Ἀτθίς*) by Erycius, on an Athenian woman who died at Cyzicus, we may perhaps intercalate from a Philippan sequence earlier in the book 7.185 by Antipater again (*Αὔσονίη*), on an African woman who died in Italy.³⁷ Over and above the formal link between 367 and 185 (*Αὔσονος* / *Αὔσονίη*), there is the obvious thematic link between 368 and 185 of the woman who dies away from home. There is a slight link between 9.403 (*αὐτός*) by Maecius on the making of wine, and 404 (*ἄ*) by Antiphilus on the making of honey. But for another link in the chain cf. 9.226 (*αἶ*) by Zonas from an earlier sequence in the book, on bees and honey. It is significant that Planudes should have juxtaposed the two (in the order 404, 226) in his book 1a, 58.6–7.

Most of these less obvious, more subtle links are now irrecoverable. Cephalas' division into thematic categories will alone have destroyed most of this interweaving, since each letter group will have contained a fair number from each of Cephalas' categories. It is perfectly possible (indeed likely) that Philip also employed some regular principle of alternation between the names of his contributors, as did both Meleager and Agathias. Naturally, however, the division of the original sequence among Cephalas' seven categories will have entirely removed all trace of this. All that is left for us are the (no doubt relatively few) cases where Philip directly or closely juxtaposed two or three poems on a closely related theme: a group, that is, which Cephalas was likely to remove intact from its original setting because all its members fitted into the same category in his own *Anthology*: in short, for the most part the cruder links. And there are surely enough of these in both *AP* and *APL* to rule out the possibility of coincidence.

By way of contrast, let us briefly compare one of the supposed alphabetical runs in a Meleagrian sequence. The four poems *AP* 7.265–8 open *Ναυηγοῦ*, *Ναυηγοῦ*, *Ναυτίλοι*, *Ναυηγόν* respectively. But all four are closely linked thematically: all commemorate the death of a sailor. Indeed almost the whole section of thirty-odd poems in which these four are embedded commemorates dead sailors. Inside

³⁷ On the historical significance of both poems, cf. Cichorius, *op.cit.* (*supra* n.2) 304–6, 330f.

this sequence it was natural enough for Meleager to juxtapose poems that happened to open with the same word to accentuate the thematic link, to provide a group within a group classified on a formal principle for the sake of variety. The resulting alphabetical sequence (in any case impure, as in Philippan sequences) was doubtless only a secondary consideration with Meleager. But since alphabetical considerations were obviously primary with Philip, such thematically arranged groups as I have listed above which happen also to be alphabetical cannot be explained in this way,³⁸ especially since in the majority of cases the poems thus linked do *not* open with the same word. Yet the number of pairs consisting of model and imitation which begin with the same letter nevertheless is clearly far higher than could have resulted from coincidence. And time and again we have seen that the imitation was written by Philip himself, the one person in the position of engineering the required initial letters. Juxtaposition of variations on a theme, often of a series of imitations, was a regular feature of epigrammatography as it was practised from Hellenistic times on. In addition to the numerous examples in Meleager's *Garland*, cf. also the first century anthology fragment published as *POxy.* 662. Thus it may be regarded as certain that Philip's imitations directly followed (or, for alphabetical reasons, preceded) his models and were intended to be directly compared with them.

We need no longer suppose Philip not only a poor poet, but also an incompetent and unimaginative anthologist. Though the individual constituents may on the whole have been of a much lower poetical level, from one point of view at least Philip's *Garland* may actually have made more interesting reading than Meleager's. For delightful as a love epigram by Callimachus or Meleager often is, 270-odd variations on the same relatively few themes without a break could hardly fail to cloy. Philip's system of preliminary alphabetical division would ensure much greater variety of theme per page than the more homogeneous categories of Meleager could allow. And the interweaving of motifs inside the letter groups must have called for more,

³⁸ Though naturally poems that happened to begin with the same word would sometimes automatically form a thematic group without any effort on Philip's part: e.g. 9.299 (*ταῦροι*) and 300 (*ταύρω*), both naturally enough about bulls. Yet the next three poems in the sequence, all beginning with *taus*, but different ones (*τίπτρε, τό, τῆ*), are all about animals as well, though different ones (a donkey, bees and a dog). So the thematic link does not depend entirely on 9.299–300.

not less, skill than the Meleagrian system, precisely because of the self-imposed alphabetical limitations. It was not merely in imitation of Meleager, and not entirely without justification, that Philip too called his collection a *Garland*.³⁹

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY *and*
BEDFORD COLLEGE, LONDON

March, 1968

³⁹ For helpful criticisms I am much indebted to Mr James Rizzo, one of the members of a Columbia University seminar on the *Anthology* given by my wife and myself in Autumn term 1967–68. It will be obvious that this essay was sent to press before the appearance of *The Greek Anthology: the Garland of Philip, and some Contemporary Epigrams*, ed. A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page (Cambridge 1968). Naturally, there are details which I might now modify in the light of their labours, but their discussion of the arrangement of the *Garland* (I.xi–xx) poses only questions, to which I hope that this article will provide some answers.