

Lyric Epigrams in Meleager's *Garland*,
the *Anthologia Palatina*,
and the *Anthologia Planudea*

Alexander Dale

MELEAGER'S *GARLAND*, it has often been suggested, contained, in addition to the many hundreds of elegiac epigrams that we can ascribe to that collection, a small but significant number of non-elegiac, and specifically lyric, epigrams that were transmitted through the centuries to end up in the *Anthology* of Constantine Cephalas, whence they found their way into the *Palatine Anthology*, the main source for our knowledge of Greek epigram from the Classical to Byzantine periods.¹ In the following analysis I argue that there is little if any evidence for the inclusion of non-elegiac epigrams in Meleager, a thesis which if accepted would have implications not only for the transmission of the text of the epigrams in question, but also for the issue of generic classification and the formal features of epigram in the time leading

¹ E.g. Cameron 13; E. Magnelli, "Meter and Diction: From Refinement to Mannerism," in P. Bing and J. S. Bruss (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden 2007) 165–183, at 179.

The following abbreviations are used: Cameron = Alan Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford 1993); Lauxtermann = M. D. Lauxtermann, *Byzantine Poetry from Pisides to Geometres I* (Wien.byz.Stud. 24.1 [2003]); *HE* = A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge 1965); *GP* = A. S. F. Gow and D. L. Page, *The Garland of Philip* (Cambridge 1968); *FGE* = D. L. Page, *Further Greek Epigrams* (Cambridge 1981). The following sigla are also used: A = Palatine text scribe A; B = Palatine text scribe B; J = Palatine text scribe J, most likely to be identified with Constantine the Rhodian (see Cameron 300–307, Lauxtermann 84–85); C = Corrector of the Palatine Anthology.

up to Meleager's collection, as well as Meleager's editorial principles.

Three distinct groups of epigrams are to be considered: the metrical collection of *Anth.Pal.* XIII, lyric epigrams scattered elsewhere in *Anth.Pal.*, and lyric epigrams preserved uniquely in the *Anthology* of Planudes.²

Anth.Pal. XIII

Anth.Pal. XIII is a book of thirty-one epigrams in various metres.³ The book is headed [ἐπιγράμματα] διαφόρων μέτρων, and seems to have been intended as a miscellany of various and (somewhat) rare metres. When and how it became incorporated into the collection that is the *Anthologia Palatina* has long been disputed,⁴ but Cameron⁵ has persuasively argued that XIII formed part of the *Anthology* of Cephalas,⁶ from which *Anth.Pal.* V–VII and IX–XII and XIV derive.⁷ Cephalas was not however the compiler of XIII, but most likely copied it whole from another source.⁸ This is suggested not only by the

² *Anth.Pal.* XV, which includes amongst other things the Hellenistic *Technopaegnia*, need not be considered as (a) it seems to have been compiled by J and thus did not form part of Cephalas' *Anthology* (Cameron 298–328, Lauxtermann 114–118), and (b) the Hellenistic poets it contains were not included by Meleager in the *Garland*.

³ See Cameron 137–145; G. Morelli, "Origini e formazione del tredicesimo libro dell' Antologia Palatina," *RivFil* 113 (1985) 257–296.

⁴ E.g. P. Wolters, "De Constantini Cephalae Anthologia," *RhM* 38 (1883) 110–113; F. Lenzinger, *Zur griechischen Anthologie* (Zurich 1965).

⁵ Cameron 137–145, followed by Lauxtermann 87.

⁶ About whom we know nothing except that he was *protopapas* (palace chaplain) in 917, cf. Theophanes Cont. 388.24 Bonn. See further Lauxtermann 86–89.

⁷ See Cameron 121–159; M. D. Lauxtermann, "The Anthology of Cephalas," in M. Hinterberger and E. Schiffer (eds.), *Byzantinische Sprachkunst. Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner* (Berlin/New York 2007) 194–208. For the relation of *Anth.Pal.* I to Cephalas' *Anthology* see Lauxtermann 89–98.

⁸ See Morelli, *RivFil* 113 (1985) 257–296.

metrical lemmata in *Anth.Pal.* XIII, which are more sophisticated than Cephalas was probably capable of,⁹ but by what seems to have been a lacuna in the copy of Cephalas' *Anthology* used to compile *Anth.Pal.* XIII. After 27 (an epigram by Phalaecus in a combination of Archilochean and acatalectic iambic trimeter, dactylic hexameter, and a second trimeter) there is a lemma which reads *Καλλιμάχου· ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ τετραμέτρῳ* (i.e. Archilochean) *ἐνδεκασύλλαβον*, but no corresponding epigram. However, an epigram by Callimachus in this very metre (tetrameter [i.e. Archilochean] followed by hendecasyllable) occurs at *Anth.Pal.* VII 728, with the identical lemma to the missing epigram in XIII.¹⁰ In addition to this, two Theocritean epigrams in lyric metres occur in *Anth.Pal.* VII (663, 664) with the more technical metrical lemmata that are otherwise found only in *Anth.Pal.* XIII.¹¹

This strongly suggests that all three epigrams originally stood in the source Cephalas used. As for the Theocritus epigrams, it is likely that Cephalas, who also had a manuscript of the corpus of bucolic epigrams,¹² copied these from the metrical collection used to compile XIII into the funerary book *Anth.Pal.* VII, incorporating the metrical lemmata from this source. He most likely also transferred the Callimachus epigram that originally stood after *Anth.Pal.* XIII 27 to its present place in VII, and then deleted these three epigrams from the polymetric collection,¹³ leaving only the lemma to one of them behind (the Cal-

⁹ Note also that, uniquely in *Anth.Pal.*, the lemmata in XIII are copied directly into the text by the initial scribe (B), rather than added in the margin by J or C.

¹⁰ *HE* II 200, Cameron 140.

¹¹ Cf. Cameron 139–140, who also notes that 1–26 are numbered by the Palatine text scribe B, while 27 is numbered 29, and 28–31 are not numbered at all; as Cameron says, it looks as though two poems were missing or deleted in scribe B's exemplar.

¹² See Gow-Page's introduction to Theocritus, *HE* II 525, and Cameron 144: Meleager did not include any of Theocritus' epigrams in his anthology.

¹³ Cf. Cameron 144.

limachus epigram that exists as *Anth.Pal.* VII 728).¹⁴ That the source for these three epigrams was the same used to compile XIII is indicated both by the lemma to the Callimachus epigram missing from XIII which is reproduced in VII, and by the language used in the lemmata to the two Theocritus epigrams in VII. When B later came to transcribe this Cephalan text as what is now *Anth.Pal.* XIII, he dutifully transcribed the lemma to the missing Callimachus epigram and continued to copy everything that followed, but without the numeration he had used up to that point.¹⁵ As scribe B, who was responsible for XIII, never seems to have dealt with VII (the work of scribe A), there is no way he either could have recognized the Callimachus epigram missing from his text (nor would he have had the metrical expertise to do so) or could himself be responsible for the occurrence of these three epigrams in VII and their omission from XIII.¹⁶ Furthermore, the Theocritean epigrams in *Anth.Pal.* do not derive from Meleager, but were introduced by Cephalas into his anthology. There is therefore no Meleagrian context for either the epigrams in the polymetric book XIII, the three epigrams transposed from the source of XIII to VII, or for any of the Theocritean epigrams found in *Anth.Pal.*

Hellenistic lyric epigrams in Anth.Pal.

Once we have discounted the epigrams from *Anth.Pal.* XIII, we are left with only four lyric epigrams by Meleagrian poets in the whole of *Anth.Pal.* These four are: (1) VI 211 by Leonidas of Tarentum (= 2 *HE*), in iambic trimeters; (2) VI 266 by Hege-

¹⁴ As Gow-Page say (*HE* II 200) in the introduction to the epigram (48), "One might guess that the text was omitted from Bk 13 because its presence in Bk 7 had been noted, but the metrical note in Bk 7 is appropriate only to the position it held in Bk 13 and must, on that assumption, have been carelessly transported from its original context whether in Bk 13 or in the source of that collection."

¹⁵ Cameron 139–140 infers from this that B also copied the numeration of the epigrams in XIII from his exemplar.

¹⁶ Moreover, it seems that the sections copied by B were at least ten years earlier than those copied by A, see Lauxtermann 83–84.

sippus (= 3 *HE*),¹⁷ hexameter followed by iambic trimeter; (3) VII 345 by Aeschrion (= 1 *HE*),¹⁸ choliambics; and (4) VII 455 by Leonidas of Tarentum (= 68 *HE*), iambic trimeters. Furthermore, two of these four (VI 211, VII 345) are not in Meleagrian sequences in *Anth.Pal.* While the occurrence of an epigram outside of a Meleagrian sequence does not by any means rule out its inclusion in Meleager's *Garland*, it does not necessitate its inclusion in that collection either. Given that Cephalas used a number of sources other than Meleager which most likely contained Hellenistic epigrams, we need not suppose that every epigram in *Anth.Pal.* by a Meleagrian poet was taken by Cephalas from Meleager in cases where these are not found in a Meleagrian context.¹⁹ For example VI 211 occurs in a sequence of thematically arranged epigrams stretching from 179–226.²⁰ Within this sequence are epigrams ranging from “Simonides” and Hellenistic poets through to Philippan and later epigrams. Likewise VII 345, a poem on the hetaira Philainis, is in a large sequence of epigrams that runs from VII 1–363. In the case of 345 however we find an interesting feature which will be of importance below.

The Corrector of *Anth.Pal.* (C) went through the whole manuscript, collating it with another MS. which was (in part) the autograph of Michael Chartophylax's²¹ apograph of Cephalas'

¹⁷ On the apparent ascription of this epigram to Mnasalces in *P.Köln* V 204 see M. Gronewald *ad loc.* (22–32); Cameron 3.

¹⁸ In *Anth.Pal.*, VII 345 is headed ἀδέσποτον οἱ δὲ Σιμωνίδου, and the ascription to Aeschrion rests on Ath. 335B, cf. *HE* II 3.

¹⁹ For the sources used by Cephalas see below on Planudes and the sources of Cephalas.

²⁰ See the table in Cameron (pp. [xvi–xvii]), and compare the table of Meleagrian sequences posited by Stadtmüller and Weisshäupl, printed at *HE* I xxv.

²¹ See Cameron 111, Lauxtermann 84–85, and below with n.41. Nothing is known about Michael (though a rather lackluster epigram on the *theotokos* is ascribed to him at *Anth.Pal.* I 122), but the position of *chartophylax* at Constantinople was of great importance, and by the tenth century the *chartophylax* was *de facto* principal assistant to the Patriarch (a position much more

Anthology, which furthermore was copied directly from Cephalas' autograph.²² Upside-down in the lower left margin of the folio preceding 345 (fol. 256) C wrote out an epigram by Dioscorides on the same subject (26 *HE*) that occurs later in the book as 450, and following the Dioscorides epigram in the margin on fol. 256 wrote νομίζω ὅτι δισσῶς κέεται τὸ ἐπίγραμμα. πλὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει τῶν ἐπιγραμμάτων τοῦ κυροῦ Μιχαήλ οὕτως κέεται συνημμένον μετὰ τοῦ ἰαμβικοῦ (that is, the epigram of Aeschryon in choliambics). The obvious inference to be drawn from this is that in Michael's text 450 by Dioscorides was originally to be found after 345 by Aeschryon. Both Gow-Page (*HE* I xxxv–xxxvi) and Cameron (118) wrongly state that this comment is found next to 450 in its proper place in *Anth.Pal.*, on fol. 278. It seems that C, upon encountering the epigram at 450, then returned to where he had added it in the margin, and added his comment.²³ Cameron (119) seems to imply that this means that the epigram was found twice in Michael; surely the point C is making here is the contrast between *Anth.Pal.* and Michael, where 450 followed 345 (as πλὴν would suggest). Elsewhere C does the same thing, duplicating in the margin epigrams found elsewhere in *Anth.Pal.* Cameron (118) is surely right when he says that the reason he did this was not simply to “bring like to like,”²⁴ but that this was the order in which they were to be found in Michael, and thus the order in which they stood in Cephalas.²⁵ At some point between the compilation of Cephalas and *Anth.Pal.*, 450 was deleted from its original position after 345 and incorporated in its present loca-

—
 august than that of *protopapas* which Cephalas held).

²² The most likely meaning of C's words ἐκ τῆς βίβλου τοῦ Κεφαλά on fol. 273, cf. Cameron 111, Lauxtermann 84.

²³ The ink looks faint and the writing thinner than the preceding end of the epigram.

²⁴ As Gow said of these duplications, *The Greek Anthology: Sources and Ascriptions* (London 1958) 59.

²⁵ On Cameron's suggestion that *Anth.Pal.* represents Cephalas more faithfully than Michael see below.

tion. The same fate seems to have befallen VII 477 and 486, both also on Philainis, which are copied out in the upper margin of folio 257 in C's hand.²⁶ The obvious inference is that all four poems on Philainis stood together in this context in Michael. This all serves to remind us that we must be cautious when considering the relation of *Anth.Pal.* to Cephalas, and that in the fifty or so years separating the two a small but significant amount of the Cephalan portions of *Anth.Pal.* might have been disrupted.

In *Anth.Pal.* quite a few epigrams are often found in more than one place in the text. One example of this is an epigram that occurs both at VI 291, and in IX after 164. In VI it is ascribed to Antipater, while in IX it is anonymous. Its position in *Anth.Pal.* VI is in the midst of a long Meleagrian sequence (262–313), but Gow-Page ascribe the poem to the Philippian epigrammatist Antipater of Thessalonica, while allowing in their commentary that the poem might best be regarded as anonymous (which is how it is headed in Waltz's Budé edition of *Anth.Pal.* VI). As Gow-Page say,²⁷ it is strange that it occurs in this position in *Anth.Pal.* VI, since it is in no way dedicatory, and properly belongs in *Anth.Pal.* IX; it seems to have been reduplicated in its position in VI from its proper place in IX, and not vice versa. Thus it would seem that this epigram is an instance of an epigram intruding into a Meleagrian sequence at a later date.²⁸ Another possible example of a later intrusion into a Meleagrian sequence is *Anth.Pal.* VII 416, a fictitious epigram on Meleager himself. While Meleager did write "auto-

²⁶ Note that 450 was the first of these duplications that C encountered, and presumably he felt his comment on fol. 256 sufficient explanation for the presence of these further epigrams on Philainis on fol. 257.

²⁷ *GP* II 100.

²⁸ If the ascription to Antipater of Thessalonica is correct, then it of course could not have been included by Meleager; if anonymous this does not rule out its inclusion by Meleager, but its position in the Meleagrian sequence of *Anathematica* in VI is inappropriate, and thus it still stands as a likely example of an epigram that has intruded into a Meleagrian sequence.

biographical" epigrams, there are reasons for doubting the authenticity of this epigram. It was first written in *Anth.Pal.* without an ascription, but was then attributed to Meleager by C. Gow-Page rightly excluded it from their edition of *HE*, and Page printed it as anonymous in *FGE* (45, see further Gow-Page, *HE* II 606).

Scepticism is, as Gow-Page remind us,²⁹ always healthy when considering the integrity of the Meleagrian sequences in *Anth. Pal.* A final example of the difficulty of identifying Meleagrian sequences (in the strict sense, of large uninterrupted passages by *Garland* poets) is the way different commentators have regarded the earlier part of the massive Book VII. In Cameron's table, VII 1–363 is listed as "thematic," with no Meleagrian sequence worthy of note. Comparison with the analyses of Stadtmüller and Weisshäupl will highlight the discrepancy with Cameron. Stadtmüller (for example) queries VII 1–3 and 13–15, while labelling as Meleagrian the sequences 5–11, 21–31, 54–55, 76–81, 145–146, 160–167, etc. For Stadtmüller two sequential epigrams by Meleagrian poets constituted a "sequence" (for Weisshäupl it was no less than three).³⁰

Now let us return to the two remaining epigrams that are supposedly in Meleagrian sequences. *Anth.Pal.* VI 266 by Hegesippus is in a sequence that runs from 262 to 313. It should be noted that 266 is only the fifth poem in this sequence (the preceding sequence is an extract from Philip of 34 epigrams). There is no *prima facie* reason why we could not regard VI 262–265 as either a separate brief sequence (for which there are ample parallels in the earlier part of *Anth.Pal.* VII, as well as earlier in *Anth.Pal.* VI, e.g. 173–174, 188–189, 204–206, 210–226, the last directly preceding the sequence from Philip), or a later insertion into the Meleagrian sequence that begins with 262. This might be further suggested by subject matter. 262–265 are miscellaneous anathemata, connected by neither

²⁹ *HE* I xxiii–xxvii.

³⁰ Cf. *HE* I xxiv.

object dedicated nor deity dedicated to. 266 is addressed to Artemis, and there follow three more epigrams addressed to Artemis, then one to Ilithyia (VI 270), three more to Artemis, and then another to Ilithyia. Thus 266 is the beginning of a sequence of addresses and dedications to Artemis, cohering with what follows it but not with what precedes. Therefore regarding 266 as a later insertion would in no way disturb an organic order in a Meleagrian sequence; rather the subject matter of the following poems would explain why it might have come to be inserted here. Most likely 262–265 are a separate group from what follows, and are further separated from the sequence 267 ff. by 266.³¹

Nor is the context in which VI 266 is found beyond reproach. Not only is there the case of 291 mentioned above, but against VI 269 C wrote *εἰς τὸ ἀντιβόλιν οὐ κείται τοῦ κυροῦ Μιχαηλοῦ· πόθεν οὖν ἐγράφη οὐκ οἶδα*, and in the left and right margins respectively he wrote *περισσόν* and *ὀλόσφαλτον*. Now it could be the case (as Cameron 117 suggests) that Michael omitted the poem from his copy because of its corruption (though the poem as it stands in *Anth.Pal.* is no more corrupt than many others). Or it could well be that the compilers of *Anth.Pal.*, or the redaction of Cephalas they were using, added it, and that the reason it was not in Michael's copy was because it was not in Cephalas.

We are now left with one epigram that seems to have a strong claim to a place in Meleager based on its occurrence in the midst of a long Meleagrian sequence, *Anth.Pal.* VII 455, a poem in iambic trimeters by Leonidas of Tarentum, embedded in a Meleagrian sequence stretching from VII 406–506. The poem is an epitaph on Maronis, a bibulous old woman. There is an elegiac version of the poem by Antipater of Sidon at VII 353. In the upper margin of the folio facing that containing 353

³¹ Perhaps another reason for regarding it as originally out of place here is the balanced structure of 3 to Artemis, 1 to Ilithyia, 3 to Artemis, 1 to Ilithyia of 267–274.

(fol. 259) we find 455 written in the hand of the Corrector, C.³² This is an exact parallel to what we saw above in connection with VII 345 and 450. When C was collating *Anth.Pal.* with Michael's copy of Cephalas, he saw that the Antipater poem VII 353 was followed (or preceded) in Michael by the Leonidas poem on the same topic.³³ He (as he usually did when confronted by such discrepancies) then copied the Leonidas poem into the margin of *Anth.Pal.* next to 353 to indicate that this was the arrangement in Michael.³⁴ It might be objected that 353 is out of place in its present location (456–457 are also on drunken old women); against this one need only say that 353 would be less out of place if followed immediately by 455 in Cephalas.

One impediment to this analysis is that Cameron considers the order in *Anth.Pal.* to be the truer reflection of Cephalas' *Anthology*, and suggests that Michael rearranged some poems in his copy, so that when C comments that 450 is found after 345 in Michael this is peculiar to Michael, and that in Cephalas 450 did in fact stand in the location in which we find it in *Anth.Pal.* This assumption is unlikely for several reasons. Michael's autograph seems to have been a direct copy of the autograph of Cephalas' *Anthology*, while *Anth.Pal.* is a distinct collection that incorporated redactions of Cephalas, but was not based on Cephalas' autograph.³⁵ Errors of transcription are of course bound to occur in Michael (as they indeed do, see

³² Cf. Gow-Page on Leonidas 68 (*HE* II 373), and Waltz's apparatus to VII 455.

³³ Indeed the Antipater poem is obviously an imitation of Leonidas.

³⁴ The fact that he did not write such an explicit comment in the margin need not surprise us; he cannot be expected to do this every time *Anth.Pal.* diverged from Michael. Furthermore, his comment on the order of Michael's text occurred just two folios previously (fol. 256); C had just written this notice, and thus would not have felt it necessary to repeat himself so soon. He had also run out of space.

³⁵ This is proved by the silence of C in the non-Cephalan portions of *Anth.Pal.*, namely II–IV and VIII.

below), but we would not expect him to allow himself the same degree of freedom regarding rearrangement as the compiler(s) of a separate, larger anthology would, namely *Anth.Pal.* C, who had *Anth.Pal.*, *Anth.Pal.*'s exemplar(s), and Michael before him, regarded Michael as the better witness to Cephalas. While it does seem to be the case that in some instances Michael simply omitted poems that were corrupt in Cephalas, but which have left traces in *Anth.Pal.*,³⁶ it is easier to imagine Michael doing this than rearranging a few poems but otherwise leaving the rest as they were. It would be more likely for *Anth.Pal.* to show divergences from Cephalas than for Michael to do so. First of all, *Anth.Pal.* is a much larger collection than Cephalas, as well as later than and at a further remove from Cephalas than Michael is. Between Cephalas' *Anthology* (ca. 890–900)³⁷ and *Anth.Pal.* (ca. 950) it would not be surprising to find both omissions and additions.³⁸ Given the nature of Michael's text, all we would expect Michael to show (aside from variant readings) are omissions. And indeed the only divergences we can prove that Michael had from Cephalas are omissions.³⁹

A particular difficulty with Cameron's hypothesis is that we must assume that Michael had read up to 455 (with a view towards rearrangement?) before he had copied as far as 353 (and likewise in the case of 345 and 450), and had picked out this epigram for transposition (while leaving alone so many others whose subject matter might likewise recommend them for transposition) long before he would have come to it through copying. This is not the practice of scribes and copyists, even diligent scholars such as J, C, and Michael himself seem to have been. The practice of C in *Anth.Pal.* proves this. When he encountered 345, he simply wrote in the margin the poem that

³⁶ See Cameron 119.

³⁷ For this dating see Lauxtermann 86–87.

³⁸ Despite the fact that the "Cephalan" books of *Anth.Pal.* (V–VII, IX–IV) seem a fairly faithful representation of Cephalas.

³⁹ See Cameron 116–120.

followed it in Michael, and only later found that the same poem was to be found in *Anth.Pal.*, whereupon he added his note on the order of Michael. A further impediment to Cameron's theory is that, as he himself has proved, Michael himself stopped copying his text of Cephalas at VII 432, the remainder of the text being delegated to a copyist.⁴⁰ We thus have to suppose that Michael had read ahead and incorporated 450 and 455 earlier in the book, and that the copyist who took up at VII 433 did not transcribe 450 and 455 when he came to them (under instruction from Michael?). This seems inherently unlikely. C recognized the value of Michael as being a faithful witness to Cephalas (we must remember that Michael was not available to the scribes of *Anth.Pal.*, including J), and thus if he suspected that anything had been rearranged in Michael, we would expect him to comment. In conclusion, we can only say that 455 stood by 353 in Michael, and that the most likely reason for this is that it stood by 353 in Cephalas.⁴¹

Should the arguments detailed above be thought to involve some special pleading, I will attempt to anticipate some objections. First of all, rarity of non-elegiac epigrams by any *Garland* poets in *Anth.Pal.* should force us to examine critically the few that there are, and our scepticism should only be heightened by

⁴⁰ Cameron 111. This is the obvious explanation for C's note on VII 432 ἕως ὧδε τὰ τοῦ κυροῦ Μιχαήλ τοῦ μακαρίου περιείχον ἐπιγράμματα ἅτινα ἰδιοχείρως αὐτὸς ἔγραψεν ἐκ τῆς βίβλου τοῦ Κεφαλᾶ.

⁴¹ There do seem to be a couple of instances where Michael might have altered the material as it appeared in Cephalas, the cases of VII 2b and 254b, which are written in the margin of *Anth.Pal.* by C along with the note τοῦτο δισσωῶς κείται. As Cameron 119 notes, this is not true of *Anth.Pal.*, and thus would seem to refer to Michael's text. Perhaps also the case of VII 364 (Marcus Argentarius), which is added next to VII 190, a poem on the same subject, by C; at 364 however it begins an alphabetical sequence of Philippan poets, and thus seems to be in its natural place there. We cannot, however, extrapolate too much from this, and furthermore if we are to allow that Michael transposed these poems in his copy of Cephalas, I think it is significant that they later appear in the section he copied himself, unlike 450 and 455.

the fact that only two lyric epigrams out of ca. 6000 lines that we can plausibly ascribe to the *Garland*⁴² are in Meleagrian sequences. If there were a small number of non-elegiac Hellenistic epigrams scattered throughout several Meleagrian sequences in several books of *Anth.Pal.*, then of course it would seem likely that there was a small amount of non-elegiac epigrams in Meleager. But this is simply not the case. It might well be suggested that the majority of Meleager's non-elegiac epigrams were excerpted at a later date, leaving only the two that remain in Meleagrian sequences, and possibly the two that survive in miscellaneous sequences in *Anth.Pal.* This is highly unlikely. First of all, there is no reason why any subsequent editor/abridger would want to do this. By the time of Philip non-elegiac epigrams had experienced something of a resurgence; we have several iambic epigrams from Philip's own pen (e.g. *Anth.Pal.* IX 255 = *GP* 46, *Anth.Pal.* IX 416 = *GP* 52); no editor at this time would expunge a text of Meleager for purity's sake. Indeed, the number of non-elegiac epigrams that occur in Philippan sequences in *Anth.Pal.*, and undoubtedly stood in Philip's *Garland*, would tell against such an act of wholesale excerption; if Meleager was treated in this way, why not Philip? Furthermore, we cannot suppose that Cephala excerpted all metrical epigrams from his copies of Meleager to form the collection that we know as *Anth.Pal.* XIII because he obviously used a source that contained these already collected, and which he copied whole, lemmata and all.⁴³

⁴² For this number see Cameron 26.

⁴³ That Cephala omitted polymetric epigrams from Meleagrian sequences elsewhere in his Anthology because they were duplicated in *Anth.Pal.* XIII would not be in keeping with his carelessness when it came to duplications. It would furthermore be a great coincidence that almost every polymetric epigram in his copies of Meleager was duplicated in his metrical source. Nor can XIII be a collection of all polymetric epigrams from Meleager, since at least two poems in it are by Philippan authors (Philip himself and Parmenion), and several Theocritus epigrams occur in it, which were not included by Meleager.

Planudes and the sources of Cephalas

There is one last source for possible Meleagrian epigrams that are not included in *Anth.Pal.*, the *Anthologia Planudea*. Not an inconsiderable number of epigrams by poets from Meleager's *Garland* are missing from *Anth.Pal.* but preserved in *Anth.Plan.* In addition to the 40 epigrams printed by Gow-Page from *Anth.Plan.*, there are several that are ascribed to "Simonides" which could have stood in Meleager's *Garland*. While we need not assume that every single epigram preserved solely in *Anth.Plan.* was in Meleager, probability suggests that some at least if not all of these epigrams are from copies of the *Garland*.⁴⁴

In *Anth.Plan.* there are in fact four non-elegiac epigrams by authors who we know were in Meleager's *Garland*: two by "Simonides" (*Anth.Plan.* 60 = 57 *FGE* and *Anth.Plan.* 82 = 58 *FGE*), and two by Leonidas of Tarentum (*Anth.Plan.* 182 = 23 *HE* and *Anth.Plan.* 307 = 90 *HE*). Planudes used for his anthology (which can be dated to 1301) two manuscripts derived from Cephalas, though he did not use *Anth.Pal.* itself. The vast majority of epigrams that *Anth.Plan.* preserves but which are absent from *Anth.Pal.* are ecphrastica. And indeed the four lyric epigrams by Meleagrian poets preserved uniquely in *Anth.Plan.* are, or at least could be classified as, ecphrastic. It has long been recognized that there is a large lacuna of ca. 450 epigrams in the second half of *Anth.Pal.* IX, which contained the greater part of Cephalas' ecphrastic collection.⁴⁵ The presence of so many ecphrastica in *Anth.Plan.* missing from *Anth.Pal.* clearly indicates that the copies of Cephalas used by Planudes did not contain this lacuna, and thus represent a slightly different tradition from *Anth.Pal.* (though in many respects *Anth.Plan.* and *Anth.Pal.* show agreement). Thus the four epigrams listed above

⁴⁴ The vast number of otherwise unattested epigrams in the New Posidippus should serve to remind us that Meleager might have been highly selective in what he included from each epigrammatist.

⁴⁵ First noted by J. Basson, *De Cephalas et Planude syllogisque minoribus* (diss. Berlin 1917); cf. Gow, *The Greek Anthology* 45–46; Cameron 219–220; Lauxtermann, in *Byzantinische Sprachkunst* 194–208.

almost certainly stood in this missing second half of *Anth.Pal.* IX.

What more can we discern about this ecphrastic collection missing from *Anth.Pal.* (which might have represented Cephalas' collection reasonably faithfully)? Despite the vast number of epigrams involved, only a handful are by Meleagrian poets. As Cameron (125) notes "*AP* contains c.3,700 poems, c.1,700 of them absent from *API*; *API* c.2,400, 400 of which are absent from *AP*." Thus we can say that an approximate ratio for the poems preserved in *Anth.Plan.* to *Anth.Pal.* is 3:4.⁴⁶ Thus if ca. 35 of the poems by Meleagrian poets preserved uniquely in *Anth.Plan.* come from *Anth.Pal.* IX, then we might estimate that the total number of ecphrastica by Meleagrian poets in the lacuna of *Anth.Pal.* IX was something just under 50. If true, this is a strikingly small number of the ca. 450 ecphrastica missing from *Anth.Pal.*, roughly 1/9th. Compare *Anth.Pal.* VI: of its 358 epigrams, ca. 154 are by Meleagrian poets. Compare Philippan poets: roughly 54 of these are represented in the ecphrastica of *Anth.Plan.*; by the same ratio used for Meleagrian poets, this means ca. 75 Philippan ecphrastica stood in the lacuna in *Anth.Pal.*, that is, 1/6th. This accords more closely with the ratio of Philippan epigrams in other books of *Anth.Pal.* For example, in *Anth.Pal.* VI again, there are 87 Philippan epigrams out of 358, that is, a bit less than a quarter, as opposed to a bit less than half for Meleagrian. But we should not be surprised by the relatively small number of Philippan and Meleagrian epigrams in this lacuna: many of these poems might well have been inscriptions on the works described, and we know for a fact that Cephalas included in his *Anthology* many epigrams copied in situ by Gregory Magister of Campsa.⁴⁷ Furthermore, Agathias'

⁴⁶ The omissions in *Anth.Plan.* from *Anth.Pal.* vary from book to book; of the 358 poems in *Anth.Pal.* VI, *Anth.Plan.* omits 174, while only omitting 181 of the 755 from *Anth.Pal.* VII and 52 of the 441 from *Anth.Pal.* XI. See Cameron 125.

⁴⁷ Cf. J's lemma on VII 327 *μετεγράφη παρὰ Γρηγορίου τοῦ μακαρίτου διδασκάλου ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς λάρνακος*. See Cameron 110–111; Lauxtermann

Cycle seems to have contained a large number of inscriptional epigrams, a number of which turn up in Planudes and would thus have stood in the missing portion of *Anth.Pal.* IX.

Planudes broke up the ordering of poems he found in his redactions of Cephalas much more thoroughly than Cephalas did the material he used; thus we have no Meleagrian or Philippan sequences that can aid us in determining ascriptions to particular collections in *Anth.Plan.* What does seem likely is that, if there were indeed only ca. 50 epigrams by Meleagrian poets in the lost portion of *Anth.Pal.* IX, then they are unlikely to have been in one sequence. Had Cephalas ordered them so, they would have been dwarfed by the surrounding material, and poor organizer though he was on the whole, he did at least try to vary his material in an even manner.⁴⁸ Furthermore, the remnants of the ecphrastic collection in *Anth.Pal.* IX 584–827 are just so arranged; there are no discernable Meleagrian, Philippan, or Agathian sequences to speak of, but all are arranged thematically, with a good deal of late anonyma (as we would expect in an ecphrastic collection that drew heavily on inscriptions). Thus we can say with near certainty that the four polymetric epigrams by Meleagrian poets under consideration stood in the missing ecphrastic section of *Anth.Pal.* IX and, not certainly but with a reasonable degree of probability, that the Meleagrian ecphrastica missing from *Anth.Pal.* were not in a sequence that was transferred whole by Cephalas, but were distributed in small clumps of two or three throughout the collection (compare the occurrence of Meleagrian poets in IX 584–827: nowhere do more than five Meleagrian epigrams occur in a sequence).

Given the conjectural nature of the status of these four poems, I will limit myself to a few observations. Though it seems likely that there was no Meleagrian sequence in the

⁴⁷ 86–87; N. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1983) 138.

⁴⁸ Cameron 124. For a more sympathetic appraisal of Cephalas' editorial practice see Lauxtermann 88–89.

lacuna in *Anth.Pal.* IX, this is of course only inference. But the lack of any demonstrable Meleagrian context for the four poems is one less impediment to excluding them from a putative first edition of Meleager. If they, and the lyric epigrams from *Anth.Pal.* discussed above, entered Cephalas by another route, what might that have been? Cephalas used a number of sources, and *Anth.Pal.* more. In addition to (at least) two copies of redactions of Meleager and Philip,⁴⁹ we know that he used the *Anthologion* of Diogenian, the *Palladas Sylloge*, and Agathias' *Cycle*.⁵⁰ Furthermore, Cephalas used a number of prose texts; we can be sure of his knowledge of Diodorus, Diogenes Laertius, Pausanias, Plutarch, and Herodotus.⁵¹ Doubtless he used many others that are lost to us, and thus cannot be identified as sources for Cephalan epigrams in *Anth.Pal.* One imagines that he culled epigrams from any source he could.⁵² One of our Planudean epigrams (*Anth.Plan.* 82 = "Simonides" 58 *FGE*) is in fact partly preserved in a garbled form in Strabo (14.2.5), and also turns up in Constantine Porphyrogenitus *De Administrando Imperio* 21.65 (p.88 Moravcsik-Jenkins).⁵³ Furthermore, as far as

⁴⁹ And we should bear in mind that abridgment does not rule out the addition of alien material. Anthologies were particularly susceptible to tampering with.

⁵⁰ For Cephalas' sources see Lauxtermann 88. For the *Palladas Sylloge* see M. D. Lauxtermann, "The Palladas Sylloge," *Mnemosyne* IV.50 (1997) 329–337.

⁵¹ See Cameron 135.

⁵² As Lauxtermann 88 says, "Cephalas' main objective in compiling his anthology was to rescue from oblivion the epigrammatic legacy of the ancients."

⁵³ Textual variants suggest that Constantine's text is based on that in Cephalas—indeed most likely taken from a copy of Cephalas, whereas Strabo represents a different tradition. This does not of course imply that Cephalas found this epigram in a copy of Meleager; his source could have well been another prose text which is lost to us (the poem is on the Colossus of Rhodes, and gives its height and the name of the architect; such a text, with the authority of "Simonides," would be very likely to find its way into later writings). See further Cameron 293–297.

“Simonides” is concerned, many epigrams from the classical period onwards were circulated under his name; though we know that Meleager did include Simonides in his *Garland*, he cannot have begun to include all that have come down to us from *Anth.Pal.*, *Anth.Plan.*, and elsewhere. Nor would it be surprising if the very name of Simonides had ensured that there were enough copies of epigrams in his name in the Roman period to find their way into other sources that Cephala might have drawn on, be they other anthologies or prose texts.⁵⁴ In short, there is no particular need to imagine copies of Meleager preserving these *Simonidea* for Cephala. As for Leonidas of Tarentum, it is again not necessary to look to Meleager as the guarantor of his survival until Byzantine times. Leonidas was not only prolific but also important for later epigrammatists. After Meleager, Cephala included more epigrams by Leonidas than any other author; furthermore, Leonidas was imitated by subsequent epigrammatists more than any other Hellenistic poet.⁵⁵ Thus the statement applied to “Simonides” holds for Leonidas; unlike some poets included in Meleager’s *Garland*, about whom hardly anything is (or probably was) known, Leonidas was a famous name, and it is highly likely that for some centuries copies of his work were plentiful enough to ensure incorporation by later anthologists.

In conclusion to this survey of *Anth.Pal.* and *Anth.Plan.*, it must be acknowledged that there can be no certainty concerning the matters discussed. That being said, the cumulative weight of evidence strongly suggests that Meleager limited himself solely to elegiac epigrams, and that the few non-elegiac epigrams by Meleagrian authors that we do find in *Anth.Pal.* and *Anth.Plan.*, both in and outside Meleagrian sequences, found their way into these collections from external sources at some point in the thousand years separating Meleager and *Anth.Pal.*

It remains to ask why Meleager would have limited himself

⁵⁴ One look at the index of sources for “Simonides” in *FGE* confirms this.

⁵⁵ *HE* II 307.

in this respect. In the archaic period epigram was composed almost solely in hexameters; it was only in the early sixth century that elegiacs came to be common for verse inscriptions, and thereupon quickly overtook hexameters as the preferred form for epigram.⁵⁶ Beginning in the late sixth to early fifth century and from then on a small but steady stream of inscriptions provides examples of epigrams composed in iambic trimeters (e.g. *CEG* I 460, 307, 174, II 530, 707, 861, 893, 900).⁵⁷ Transmitted under the name of “Simonides” in *Anth. Pal. XIII* are two epigrams, one (14) a combination of hexameters and trimeters and the other (19) a combination of hexameters and hipponacteans. Both can reasonably be dated to the late archaic/early classical period.⁵⁸ From the early Hellenistic period we have a considerable number of polymetric and non-elegiac epigrams. We have seven examples from Callimachus,⁵⁹ all in different metres or unique combinations. From Theocritus we likewise have several lyric epigrams. In fact, every non-elegiac epigram we have from the Hellenistic period is by a poet either definitely or most likely dated to the third century.⁶⁰ It should be noted that the majority of Hellenistic lyric epigrams we have survive solely in *Anth. Pal. XIII*, which doubtless represents a small fraction of the non-elegiac

⁵⁶ See M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin/New York 1974) 2.

⁵⁷ For the unfortunate attempt of C. Gallavotti, *Metri e ritmi nelle iscrizioni greche* (Rome 1979), to find a plethora of lyric cola in what are in fact poorly composed hexameters and pentameters see P. A. Hansen, *CR* 34 (1984) 286–289.

⁵⁸ See Page on “Sim.” 35 and 43 *FGE*.

⁵⁹ It is unclear whether Callimachus fr.399–401 Pf. (68–70 *HE*) are in fact from epigrams; the first two are said to be incomplete (ὄν τέλειον) by the lemmatist of *Anth. Pal. XIII* (9 and 10), while the third is preserved in Hephaestion p.64.4 and 58.20 Consbruch, and was classified as an epigram by Otto Schneider on the strength of Caesius Bassus (Keil, *Gramm.Lat.* VI 61). Fr.554 Pf. (archilochean) might be from an epigram, cf. Pfeiffer ad loc.

⁶⁰ The dates of Hegesippus, Nicaenetus, and Phaedimus are uncertain, but all are ascribed to the third century by the editors of *HE*.

epigrams that would have been circulating in the third century. Yet the relative wealth of non-elegiac epigrams we find in the earlier Hellenistic period seems to diminish in the second century. We certainly cannot exclude the possibility that accidents of transmission have left us without any examples, but it would seem strange that later anthologists, who were relatively diligent in preserving selections of third-century lyric epigrams, would have completely disregarded specimens from such celebrated poets as Dioscorides and Antipater of Sidon. And obviously this was not the case. The reason we do not find any non-elegiac epigrams from poets of the second and first centuries is that by that time epigram had come to be written exclusively in elegiacs. It is beyond the scope of the present enquiry to address the question of why we see this narrowing of the genre to encompass only elegiacs. All we can say is that the reason Meleager did not include any non-elegiac epigrams in the *Garland* is that, at the time he was active,⁶¹ an epigram was not an epigram if it was not in elegiacs.

There is one last point of interest regarding the lyric epigrams we find in *Anth.Pal.* (excluding those in XIII) and *Anth. Plan.*, which bears on the question of why they might have found their way into Cephalas—indeed why they might have been preserved until the tenth century in the first place. Of the eight epigrams that are of concern here, all but two (*Anth.Pal.* VI 266 by Hegesippus = 3 *HE*, hexameter followed by iambic trimeter, and VII 345 by Aeschrion = 1 *HE*, choliambics) are in iambic trimeters. Though there are a number of examples of iambic epigrams from the Hellenistic period, this was by no means the predominant metre for non-elegiac epigrams, as a glance at the Hellenistic specimens in *Anth.Pal.* XIII proves. I should rather think that the secret to the preservation of these epigrams lies in the metre they are written in, which bears a marked similarity to the Byzantine dodecasyllable, the standard

⁶¹ Meleager most likely produced the *Garland* ca. 100–90 B.C., cf. Cameron 49–56. It was presumably a work of his mature years, given the amount of his own work he included.

metre for epigram from the seventh century onwards.⁶² Indeed none of these iambic epigrams admit resolution,⁶³ which would have made them more palatable to the average Byzantine reader. As for the Aeschrion poem in choliambics, this too would have seemed safe and familiar in an age that had lost its ear for quantitative verse.⁶⁴ Furthermore, all of these poems observe the caesura at either the fifth or seventh foot,⁶⁵ further assimilating them to the dodecasyllable. If Meleager did not include any non-elegiac epigrams in the *Garland*, then the reason that these found their way into the Byzantine corpus of epigrams (while many other exotic polymetric epigrams from the Hellenistic period doubtless vanished without a trace), from whatever sources might have contained them, was their relative metrical intelligibility.

December, 2009

Keble College
University of Oxford
Oxford OX1 3PG, UK
alexander.dale@keble.oxon.org

⁶² The dodecasyllable was essentially an iambic trimeter without resolution, a caesura after the fifth or seventh syllable, and a marked tendency towards a paroxytone line-end. On the relation of the dodecasyllable to the iambic trimeter see M. D. Lauxtermann, “The Velocity of Pure Iambic. Byzantine Observations on the Metre and Rhythm of the Dodecasyllable,” *JÖB* 48 (1998) 9–33.

⁶³ Though admittedly from the Hellenistic period onwards resolution was increasingly rare in trimeters. That being said, it does occur in the trimeters of Palladas, Agathias, and George of Pisidia (the last author to observe the rules of classical prosody). The few examples in the verse of Leo the Philosopher are otherwise anomalous for their period. See further M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982) 182–185.

⁶⁴ The Aeschrion poem as well does not admit resolution.

⁶⁵ With the sole exception of Aeschrion 1.9 *HE ἔγραψεν οἷ ἔγραψ’ ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐκ οἶδα*. The text of *Anth. Pal.* however gives us *ἔγραψεν ἐγὼ δ’ οὐκ*, and *Anth. Plan.* *ἔγραψεν αὐτῇ δ’ οὐκ*, both presumably attempts to introduce the expected caesura.