

# Amour, Encore! The Development of δηῦτε in Archaic Lyric

*Sarah T. Mace*

WHAT DO Alcman 59a, Sappho 130, Ibycus 287, and Anacreon 358, 376, 400, 413, and 428 have in common?<sup>1</sup> Prima facie, the word δηῦτε (“again!”) that appears in the opening verse<sup>2</sup> of each.<sup>3</sup> Denniston notes that this self-standing<sup>4</sup> particle-adverb combination (δή + αῦτε) is found “often in Lyric.”<sup>5</sup> Smyth observes, more precisely, that it is used “often of a renewed assault of love.”<sup>6</sup> Actually, the four lyric poets just named deployed δηῦτε in their work in such a

<sup>1</sup> The texts of Alcman, Ibycus, and Anacreon are from D. PAGE, *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962: hereafter ‘PMG’). Unless otherwise noted, the text of Sappho is that of E.-M. Voigt, *Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta* (Amsterdam 1971).

<sup>2</sup> Anac. 376, 400, 413, 428 and Sappho 130 are cited by Hephaestion, who naturally appealed to initial lines for his metrical examples. Cf. B. A. van Groningen, *La composition littéraire archaïque grecque*<sup>2</sup> (Amsterdam 1960) 182f. Anac. 358 and Ibyc. 287 are certainly complete; the inference that Alcman 59a is an initial line is, admittedly, based on its formal similarity to the other examples.

<sup>3</sup> αῦτε, exceptionally, at Ibyc. 287.1.

<sup>4</sup> J. G. Renner, *Quaestiones de dialecto antiquioris Graecorum poesis elegiacae et iambicae*, in G. Curtius’ *Studien zur griechischen und lateinischen Grammatik* I (Leipzig 1868) 200: “δηῦτε fortasse rectius sine coronide scribi, cum eius origo iam mature oblitterata esse videatur, ita ut semper vim unius fere particulae haberet.”

<sup>5</sup> J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1954) 228; cf. B. SNELL, *The Discovery of the Mind*, tr. T. G. Rosenmeyer (New York 1953: hereafter ‘Snell’) 57: “the ‘again’ is a feature typical of archaic poetry.”

<sup>6</sup> H. W. Smyth, *Greek Melic Poets* (London 1900) 196; cf. D. A. Campbell, *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection* (New York 1967) 266 (ad Sappho 1.15): “It is often used of a renewed assault of love.”

circumscribed way as to suggest that they regarded the word as the hallmark of a distinct compositional form.<sup>7</sup>

The eight poems listed above share two other formal features besides the distinctive δηῦτε. First, all are composed in the first-person, with five examples featuring a personal pronoun that reinforces the rôle of the speaker. Second, all the poems are erotic, not only in the broad sense that the theme of each is desire, but because (with a single exception) they all actually contain the word “eros” in the opening statement—in most cases to be understood as Eros with a capital ‘E’, or the divine personification of desire. In the majority of the poems the formal arrangement of the shared features ‘eros’, ‘me’, and ‘again!’ is actually identical. Eros appears in the nominative case as the grammatical subject of the opening statement, and the personal pronoun με (μ’) occurs either directly before or after δηῦτε as the object of some transitive verb: Alc. 59a.1: Ἔρωσ με δηῦτε; Sappho 130.1: Ἔρος δηῦτέ μ’; Ibyc. 287.1: Ἔρος αὐτέ με; Anac. 358.1f: δηῦτέ με .../... Ἔρωσ, 413.1: δηῦτέ μ’ Ἔρωσ.

As a direct result of these shared formal features, all the poems of this group are based on an identical situation: in each, a first-person speaker describes some way in which ‘desire’ (in the person of Eros) is acting upon him; the emphatic δηῦτε communicates the information that what this speaker describes has happened to him before—a pattern reducible to “Eros ... me again!” One final tie that binds the group is a general community of style. The compositions are all quite short—several apparently complete in two verses—and in each the poet develops and particularizes his situation by using vivid figurative language in the form of similes and metaphors.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> In a ‘notelet’ identifying some specialized uses of αὖ, P. Shorey (“The Pathos and Humor of αὖ,” *CP* 23 [1928] 285ff [=L. Tarán, ed., Paul Shorey, *Selected Papers* (New York 1980) 52ff]) described the behavior of Greek particles in a way that aptly characterizes the use of δηῦτε to be examined here: “by specialization of function they [the Greek particles] may take to themselves meanings which inseparable association makes as much a part of themselves as their conjectural etymologies.”

<sup>8</sup> The similarities that bind this group have not, of course, gone unnoticed: Smyth adds *ad* Alc. 59a: “The tone is that of a folk-song, which loves fixed formulas.” Snell (57f) discusses the use of “again” in archaic poetry and draws some distinctions between Sappho’s and Anacreon’s use of the word. See further n.33 below. D. A. Campbell, *The Golden Lyre* (London 1983) 9, describes δηῦτε as “almost a catchword of Greek love poetry,” stating that “Its force is in part humorous, in part pathetic.” For a refinement see n.33

Since the salient formal and stylistic characteristics of these poems are too close to be coincidence, it seems clear that the four poets whom we know to have written erotic poems with  $\delta\eta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  regarded the collocation "Eros ... me, again!"—in practice at least—as a distinct compositional form. The very existence of this phenomenon in early Greek verse calls, in the first place, for an attempt to elaborate on and refine the more or less passing observations typically made about  $\delta\eta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  in erotic contexts.<sup>9</sup> Next, the broad geographical and chronological distribution of these four poets suggests that the motif "Eros ... me, again!," far from being a local or isolated phenomenon, was in a sense the intellectual property of the poetic community at large.<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, it is also desirable to try to render some account of the popularity and persistence of poems of this type. One final incentive—were there need of one—for looking closely at these  $\delta\eta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  compositions involves one of the most vigorously debated passages in Sappho's only certainly complete poem. In verses 15–20 of the so-called "Hymn to Aphrodite" (Sappho 1),  $\delta\eta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  appears in an erotic setting three times in quick succession. A study of the range and ethos of the shorter erotic  $\delta\eta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$

---

below. G. Nagy, "Phaethon, Sappho's Phaon, and the White Rock of Leukas," *HSCP* 77 (1973) 142 n.18, remarks in passing: "For an appreciation of the contextual nuances in  $\delta\eta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$ , I recommend as a fascinating esthetic exercise the consecutive reading of the Lyric passages cited by Campbell 266, with reference to lines 15, 16, 18 of Sappho 1LP." A. P. BURNETT, *Three Archaic Poets* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1983: hereafter 'Burnett') 257 n.79, also examines  $\delta\eta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  with reference to Sappho 1 (see n.71 below). For more on  $\delta\eta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  in Sappho 1, see 18f and 25–32 with nn.11, 67, and 71 below. Other, more passing notices of  $\delta\eta\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  include: C. M. BOWRA, *Greek Lyric Poetry*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1961: 'Bowra') 283 n.1 (see n.12 below); M. DAVIES, *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta I* (Oxford 1991) 91 (*ad* Alc. 59a), and "Symbolism and Imagery in the Poetry of Ibycus," *Hermes* 114 (1986) 403 n.18; D. GERBER, *Euterpe* (Amsterdam 1970) *ad* Sappho 1. For some further references see Burnett.

<sup>9</sup> See the previous note.

<sup>10</sup> These four figures issued from—or, at various times, worked in—far-flung areas of the Greek world: Lesbos and Samos in the East, Italy in the West, and areas in between: Sparta, Athens, and Thessaly. They spanned the period from our earliest known lyric texts at the end of the seventh century (Alcman) down to the dawn of the classical period; according to Σ M Aesch. *PV* 128 (*PMG* 412), Anacreon lived long enough to hear Aeschylus' early lyric poetry; *cf.* Campbell (*supra* n.6) 314.

poems holds the promise of shedding some new light on the tone and meaning of these disputed verses.<sup>11</sup>

Even before analyzing the particulars of any individual δηῦτε poem, it is possible to make a few general observations about the character of a first-person speaker who makes the statement “Eros ... me, again!” Anyone who can say “δηῦτε” of an encounter with Eros is, de facto, giving an account of a fresh experience with desire from a veteran’s point of view.<sup>12</sup> Such a speaker’s “again,” however, not only implies experience; it also indicates that the current episode is taking the same course as one or more such episodes in this individual’s past. Experienced though the speaker may be, it is clear that he can no more direct the course of his desire as an ‘expert’ than he could as a novice. The regular syntax of “Eros ... me again!” even accentuates the helplessness of the ‘I’ in this type of poem. As already mentioned, desire, in the person of Eros, regularly appears in the nominative case, which is to say in control of the action. The speaker, on the other hand, normally refers to himself in the accusative, implying that, willing or no, he is the recipient of whatever treatment the god has to offer. Finally, any speaker who can observe that the situation he is describing is just like one he has experienced before must necessarily possess some degree of objectivity and perspective on his current state. In sum, a statement of the form “Eros ... me again!” presupposes a first-person who is experienced and somewhat distanced, but nevertheless at the mercy of his condition.

Although both the dramatic setting and the persona of the speaker in these δηῦτε poems are fixed by the data of “Eros,” “me,” and “again!”, the tone and tenor of the individual examples are anything but uniform. As it turns out, the *most* marked characteristic of the compositional motif “Eros ... me, again!” is an inherent flexibility; despite its apparent constraints, the form in fact permitted these four poets as wide a range of expression as their different talents and tempers urged.

<sup>11</sup> As already noted, Campbell (*supra* n.6) and Nagy (*supra* n.8) also suggest a connection between δηῦτε in Sappho 1 and elsewhere in erotic poetry (see *supra* n.8), but neither pursue the idea to any distinct conclusions. For those who have considered the matter more closely, see esp. 25–32 with nn.67, 70f below.

<sup>12</sup> *Contra*, Bowra 283 n.1: “It looks as if δηῦτε did not quite have the full force of our ‘again’ but simply drew attention to a new situation.”

Anacreon, whose five erotic δηῦτε poems make him the most prolific of the four in this area, tended, above all, to exploit the comic potential of the motif. In three examples, in particular, he uses his characteristic flair and wit to generate ironic self-mockery. In 413 (presumably complete in two verses) Anacreon likens Eros to a smith (ὥστε χαλκεύς) and then develops a vivid and compressed figurative scenario. He speaks of being violently “love-smitten”—struck “again!” by Eros’ “large hammer”<sup>13</sup>—and then plunged by Eros into an icy-cold torrent (*i.e.*, like red-hot metal after being worked upon an anvil):<sup>14</sup>

μεγάλῳ δηῦτέ μ' Ἔρωσ ἔκοψεν ὥστε χαλκεύς  
πελέκει χειμερὶν δ' ἔλουσεν ἐν χαράδρῃ.

Anacreon has done his utmost to make this encounter with Eros sound like an extraordinary, if not unique, experience. The hammer-blow depicts the onslaught of desire as sudden and painful, and the dousing, which figures the satisfaction of this desire,<sup>15</sup> implies a tumultuous and no less jarring process. The particular detail of the rushing torrent—in place of the vessel of standing water one would expect to find in a smithy—helps to emphasize the idea that the speaker has undergone some violent psychic and bodily disturbance.<sup>16</sup> Finally, Anacreon implies an acute if not actually uncomfortable stimulation of the senses when he figures the contrasting states of desire and satisfaction as extremes of temperature (his plunge into a winter torrent after, by implication, being heated in Eros’ forge). δηῦτε, for its part, wittily undercuts the tenor of the whole. The passion portrayed here is, in fact, neither unique nor particular-

<sup>13</sup> For those who have favored the rendering of πέλεκυς as “hammer” (in a defense of the translation “axe”), see S. Goldhill, “The Dance of the Veils: Reading Five Fragments of Anacreon,” *Eranos* 85 (1987) 9ff.

<sup>14</sup> The simile of the smith at *Od.* 9.391ff probably influenced details of Anac. 413, esp. (391f). Cf. *e.g.* Goldhill (*supra* n.13); Campbell (*supra* n.8) 22; B. GENTILI, *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece*, tr. A. T. Cole (Baltimore 1988: hereafter ‘Gentili’) 92.

<sup>15</sup> Satisfaction is the most natural interpretation of the dousing. Goldhill (*supra* n.13: 10f) suggests that there are several ideas in play here simultaneously, including the cold shower of a rebuff (“the blows of desire followed by the icy cooling of failure”).

<sup>16</sup> Gentili 92: “But [*i.e.*, unlike the simile of the smith in the *Odyssey*] Eros’ tempering bath is the eddying current of a chill winter torrent, an image that adds the new factors of momentum and violence to the idea of cold.”

ly extraordinary. On the contrary, we are to understand that the speaker's 'metal' has actually been worked *repeatedly* in the god's forge and that—as far as he is concerned—such an episode is really only all in a day's work for 'Eros the Smith'. Presumably, we are also to understand that, much as the process of tempering makes metal stronger, the speaker's repeated encounters with Eros have likewise rendered him more resilient in affairs of the heart.<sup>17</sup> The success of this sophisticated couplet lies, in the end, both in the cleverness and coherence with which Anacreon has worked out his image in such a short compass,<sup>18</sup> and in the comic tension between the extravagance of the conceit and the idea of 'again!'

In another clever two-liner, 376, Anacreon speaks of recurrent infatuation in equally extravagant terms, but this time takes the theme in a different direction. Here, the speaker, "drunk with eros/desire" is diving from high atop the Leucadian Rock into the sea "again!":

ἄρθεις δηῦτ' ἀπὸ Λευκάδος  
πέτρης ἐς πολὺν κῶμα κολυμβῶ μεθύων ἔρωτι.

This is one of three poems in all by Anacreon that diverge slightly from the 'classic' form of the δηῦτε motif. Here the 'I' of the poem (rather than Eros) is the grammatical subject of the statement, and the phrase "drunk with eros" relegates the typically personified Eros to an instrumental rôle. Still, the style and overall effect are fully in keeping with the 'regular' incarnations of the form, and the verses have a comparably witty point.

In Greek tradition, a leap from the Leucadian Rock (potentially fatal) was associated with a cure for troubled love.<sup>19</sup> In fact, one of the more fanciful elements of the biographical tradition of Sappho is that the poetess met her own death by diving from

<sup>17</sup> The Homeric parallel (*supra* n.14) supports the idea of tempering: τὸ γὰρ αὔτε σιδήρου γε κράτος ἐστίν (*Od.* 9.393).

<sup>18</sup> The image is surely coherent; *contra*, Bowra 290. Goldhill (*supra* n.13) 10f, for his part, rejects "the possibility of a simple or precise 'cashing' of the text's erotic metaphors" and believes that the imagery in both lines of the poem exhibits "shifting and ironisation."

<sup>19</sup> Strab. 10.2.9: ἔχει ... τὸ ἄλμα, τὸ τοὺς ἔρωτας παύειν πεπιστευμένον. See Bowra 177, 213f; 289f; Nagy (*supra* n.8) 141–48; D. A. CAMPBELL, *Greek Lyric I* (Loeb edition, Cambridge [Mass.] 1982: hereafter 'Lyric I') *ad* Sappho test. 23.

this cliff when frustrated in an unrequited passion.<sup>20</sup> The situation implied in this poem, therefore, is that the speaker has been rejected by the object of his desire and finds himself driven to desperate measures. The idea of 'again!' in such a setting is, of course, delightful. By declaring, in effect, that he is so miserable that he is prepared to end it all—"again!"—the speaker invites his audience to contemplate the improbable *repetition* of a suicidal leap motivated by erotic misfortune. The expression "drunk with Eros" contributes its own witty point. One would have to be besotted with desire in the first place to be planning a dive from the Leucadian Rock, but it also seems to have been part of the tradition of this lover's leap that one would not undertake the dive literally sober, either.<sup>21</sup>

Anac. 428 is based on a familiar conjunction of love and madness<sup>22</sup> that the poet uses in this case to generate a pair of willfully paradoxical statements:

ἔρέω τε δηῦτε κοῦκ ἔρέω  
καὶ μαίνομαι κοῦ μαίνομαι.

Anacreon diverges here from the regular form of the δηῦτε motif by combining the individual elements Ἔρωσ and με into the more condensed "ἔρέω." The most distinctive feature of this composition, however, is stylistic: a symmetrical balance of repeated verbs, connectives, and negatives both within and between the pair of verses. This highly mannered verbal patterning suggests, above all, that the speaker is making a cool and analytical appraisal of his situation. Still, any such *studied* confession of recurrent love-mania cannot help but be paradoxical in its own right; it compels one, in the end, to weigh this speaker's ostensibly rational stance against two blatantly illogical assertions, not to mention an admission of madness.<sup>23</sup> δηῦτε in

<sup>20</sup> *Suda s.vv.* Σαπφώ (Σ108 Adler), Φάων (Φ89=test. 211a Voigt). For the suggestion that the legend arose from a misunderstanding of Sappho's own words, see U. Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides* (Berlin 1913) 31; Bowra 177, 213, 290.

<sup>21</sup> Bowra 290 with reference to Eur. *Cyc.* 166f.

<sup>22</sup> E.g. Anac. 359, 398 *PMG*.

<sup>23</sup> For the split personality of this speaker, cf. H. Fränkel, *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*, tr. M. Hadas and J. Willis (New York 1975) 298: "Beside the self that is entangled and defeated stands another self that is quite free, rational, and capable of describing the dissociation. Such an attitude is very close to irony." Bowra (283) catches the effect nicely when he writes of this speaker, "Half of him watches the other half, and is amused by the spectacle."

this context has mitigating force. Far from focusing seriously on the disturbing paradoxes of desire adumbrated here, this analytical speaker is principally concerned with the absurdity of finding himself in this awkward condition ‘again!’<sup>24</sup>

The theme of Sappho 130, like the underlying idea of Anac. 428, is the paradoxical quality of desire, but the poetess, for her part, has chosen to develop the darker side of this theme and, accordingly, has put δηῦτε to a decidedly more serious use.<sup>25</sup>

Ἔρος δηῦτέ μ’ ὀ λυσιμέλης δόνει,  
γλυκύπικρον ἀμάχανον ὄρπετον.

By pitting the epithet λυσιμέλης<sup>26</sup> against the vigorous verb δόνει, Sappho suggests that one paradox of desire is that Eros is the source both of release<sup>27</sup> and torment. The first adjective in the second verse contains the more pointed paradox: desire is both alluring and repellent or “sweet-bitter.” By the end of this poem, however, the sinister aspect of Sappho’s mixed Eros wholly prevails, as she refers to him as a “creature” and, specifically, “a creature against which there is no device”; the speaker’s evident desire for some μηχανή to fend off this tormenting monster carries with it (with the α-privative) the admission that she is utterly unable to do so.

MacLachlan has shown recently that Sappho’s general word for ‘creature’ (ὄρπετον [=ἐρπετόν], usually thought of in terms of its etymological connection with ἔρπειν) can be used

<sup>24</sup> Consider, by contrast, Catull. 85: *Odi et amo. quare id faciam fortasse requiris? nescio, sed fieri sentio et excrucior*. This is just as paradoxical a love-complaint as Anac. 428, but contains no feature to mitigate its dark tone. Cf. G. Kirkwood, *Early Greek Monody* (Ithaca 1974) 168, on the same two poems: “[Anacreon] is torn not by conflicting passions [like Catullus] but by a conflict between feelings and the objective, sophisticated irony that colors so much of his poetry.”

<sup>25</sup> For those who have (and have not) chosen to join Sappho 131 LP to 130 LP, see B. MACLACHLAN, “What’s Crawling in Sappho Fr. 130,” *Phoenix* 43 (1989: hereafter ‘MacLachlan’) 95 n.1 and Voigt *ad loc*. The likelihood that Anac. 413, 376, 428, and 400—all two-liners—are self-standing may argue in favor of the autonomy of 130, but see 24–32 below for Sappho’s innovative uses of δηῦτε in poems 22 and 1.

<sup>26</sup> The epithet λυσιμέλης is traditional for Eros: Hes. *Th.* 121, 911. ὀ λυσιμέλης appears with Eros in *Carm. Pop.* 27.3f (873) *PMG* and with πόθος in Archil. 196 West; cf. Alc. 3.61 *PMG*.

<sup>27</sup> λυσιμέλης is, of course, also an epithet of sleep: *Od.* 20.57; 23.343.

properly of flying creatures and, in particular, of the bee.<sup>28</sup> The imagery of Sappho 130, therefore, is every bit as coherent and pointed as Anacreon's smithy or cliff-dive: a bee is "sweet" for its honey and "bitter" or "sharp" for its sting (γλυκύπικρον) and can "goad" or "sting" in the manner of the main verb δόνει. Still, the very allusiveness of the image—so allusive as to have gone unappreciated for so long—is not without its own point. First, Sappho's choice of a general neuter noun for "creature" (in preference to the more specific designation, "bee") strips Eros of his personified masculine identity and substitutes the suggestion of more vaguely sinister bestial attributes. Also, her decision to reserve the key term of the image for the final word of the poem allows the several meanings of δονεῖν to remain in play over its course. Besides being suitable to describe the "agitated buzzing" or goad of a stinging insect,<sup>29</sup> the verb also suggests the action of wind as it violently "lashes" trees or "drives" clouds;<sup>30</sup> the idea is that this goading Eros is casting the speaker into turmoil with all the violence and indifference of a meteorological force.<sup>31</sup>

Sappho 130 is by no means a lighthearted poem, and the difference between its tone and that of the poems by Anacreon discussed so far is dramatic testimony to the versatility of "Eros ... me, again!" Anacreon's exuberant figures of the smithy and the cliff-dive generate a lively figurative setting and invite appreciation of the poet's wit.<sup>32</sup> Sappho in 130 uses her metaphorical language in a more allusive fashion as part of a more serious portrayal of the abiding (and, in her vision, debilitating and threatening) nature of Eros. By the same token, if Anacreon speaks wittily of paradoxical *feelings* in 428—"I love and I do not love"—Sappho in 130 paints a picture of Eros as a paradoxical *force*, making her verses a more profound and

<sup>28</sup> MacLachlan 95–99. As she notes (96), Wilamowitz (*supra* n.20: 55 n.1) believed that ὄπτερον referred to an οἶστρος.

<sup>29</sup> MacLachlan 97; δονεῖν is used of the gadfly at e.g. *Od.* 22.300.

<sup>30</sup> For δονεῖν with wind, cf. *Il.* 17.55 (whipping a tree), *Bacch.* 5.65f (whirling leaves), and *Il.* 12.157 (driving clouds).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. T. Mann, *The Magic Mountain*, tr. H. T. Lowe-Porter (New York 1969) 482 (the chapter "Snow"). See MacLachlan 96 for examples of δονεῖν used for emotional agitation.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Kirkwood (*supra* n.24: 162) on Anac. 413: "the conceit is clearly dominant, and we feel that the poet as craftsman keeps his distance from the suffering of his speaker."

universalizing commentary on the iteration of desire. Sappho's δηῦτε in 130, therefore, has a completely different tone from the comic self-mocking δηῦτε of Anacreon. Whereas we cannot help but enjoy the spectacle of Anacreon's veteran lover who must admit that desire is forcing him to repeat the erotic misadventures of his past, we feel the pathos of Sappho's "again!" because it refers, apparently without irony, to the recurrence of an unwelcome helplessness visited upon the speaker by a powerful external force.<sup>33</sup>

Two short (and, in one case, probably fragmentary) δηῦτε poems—Alcm. 59a and Anac. 400—form a natural pair for the purely arbitrary reason that each is about as inscrutable as the other. Their difficulties notwithstanding, they can contribute in a general way to a survey of the range of δηῦτε in erotic verse.

From a strictly formal point of view, in 400 Anacreon departs from the norm by reversing the typical subject-object relation of 'Eros' and 'me'; more exceptionally, however, he chose to develop this poem along personal rather than figurative lines:

παρὰ δηῦτε Πυθόμανδρον  
κατέδυν Ἔρωτα φεύγων.

Obviously our ignorance of Pythomander's distinguishing qualities leaves us in no position to interpret this statement with any conviction. The innuendos—if any—of the phrase καταδύναι παρὰ (+acc. pers.) are also a mystery. Nevertheless, the single point that is clear—that this individual affords a refuge from desire—leads to the fairly safe inference that the verses entail some kind of joke at Pythomander's expense. Although the

<sup>33</sup> This analysis of Sappho 130 is close to Snell's (57f), but his pejorative estimate of Anacreon's achievement is less satisfactory: "In Anacreon's love poems the 'again' becomes a stereotyped formula of opening lines.... The inventive skill with which Anacreon puts his love on the boards is indeed masterly, but the exordium 'Again I love...' has lost its original force .... when Anacreon repeats five times over: 'Again I have fallen in love...' , we suspect his heart is not in it." It is a mistake to assess the difference between the poets' use of "Eros ... me, again!" on the basis of the relative 'sincerity' of the speakers; it is simply that one type of first-person regards the situation from an comic-ironic point of view and another develops its inherent potential for pathos. The distinction *between* ironic and pathetic δηῦτε slightly refines Campbell's view (*supra* n.8) that the force of δηῦτε is "in *part* humorous and in *part* pathetic" (my emphasis). For other comments on Anac. 428 and Sappho 130 see Fränkel (*supra* n.23) and Gentili 91.

precise point on which the joke turns must remain elusive,<sup>34</sup> Anac. 400 illustrates yet another possibility for 'again!' in erotic contexts. A poet could readily tailor his typically *self*-mocking δηῦτε to accommodate mockery of *another*.

The difficulties of Alcman 59a are of a slightly different order. The poem is presumably incomplete, since this conventional-sounding<sup>35</sup>—even bland—description of the effects of an Eros who is γλυκὺς (2) without even a hint of τὸ πικρὸν seems to have little pith or point as it stands:

Ἔρως με δηῦτε Κύπριδος φέκατι  
γλυκὺς κατεῖβων καρδίαν ἰαίνει.

All the standard formal elements of the 'classic' δηῦτε poem are present, including the typically compressed and figurative style. The underlying image, as Davies has shown, is that "of love as a fluid distilled into the heart."<sup>36</sup> Although any attempt to go beyond these basic points must be speculative, it is possible that this δηῦτε statement could have been considerably more sophisticated than it appears. Given what we know of Alcman's oeuvre, it is not out of the question that he could have used a dramatic frame to undermine the force of this rosy announcement of the advent of a fresh love.<sup>37</sup> The overall effect could have been something like Catull. 45, in which the poet puts Septimius' and Acme's declarations of love in a setting that strongly suggests a mixture of irony and pathos.

We turn now to two slightly longer δηῦτε compositions—one each by Ibycus and Anacreon—which are, arguably, representatives of a specialized and perhaps popular elaboration of the motif "Eros ... me, again!" The speaker in each poem is an aging lover, and this refinement transforms "Eros ... me, again!" into

<sup>34</sup> If Ἔρωτα φεύγων is to be taken at face value, Pythomander was presumably a notorious prude and a fit companion for one who would be chaste. An ironic reading of the statement (in conjunction with some sexual innuendo in καταδῦναι παρά) would imply, on the other hand, that Pythomander was promiscuous and could provide a ready alternative for whatever other 'Eros' the speaker was fleeing.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Hes. *Th.* 910f: [Χάριτας] τῶν καὶ ἀπὸ βλεφάρων ἔρος εἴβeto δερκομενάων λυσιμελής.

<sup>36</sup> M. Davies, "Alcman 59<sup>A</sup> P.," *Hermes* 111 (1983) 496f.

<sup>37</sup> Bowra (31f) makes the same suggestion. That Ath. 601<sup>B</sup> implies that the poet is speaking in *propria persona* probably has little bearing on the question.

a related formula that also has the potential for comedy or pathos: “Eros ... me, again! (but I’m past my prime).”<sup>38</sup>

Ibyc. 287 begins with a metaphorical description of the onset of desire and features a particularly seductive Eros playing the part of both magician and hunter. From beneath dark lids Eros shoots the speaker a melting look “again!” (in this case, exceptionally, αὔτε). Then, with the help of diverse enchantments, Eros delivers his prey into Aphrodite’s “boundless nets” (1–4):<sup>39</sup>

Ἔρος αὐτέ με κυανέοισιν ὑπὸ  
βλεφάροις τακέρ’ ὄμμασι δερκόμενος  
κηλήμασι παντοδαποῖς ἐς ἄπει-  
ρα δίκτυα Κύπριδος ἐσβάλλει.

The speaker immediately expresses horror at his “capture” (5) and embellishes his response with an elaborate simile (5ff):

ἦ μὰν τρομέω νιν ἐπερχόμενον,  
ὥστε φερέζυγος ἵππος ἀεθλοφόρος ποτὶ γήρα  
ἀέκων σὺν ὄχεσφι θοοῖς ἐς ἄμιλλαν ἔβα.

The explicit point of contact between simile and opening statement is reluctance: the speaker recoils (τρομέω, 5) at finding himself drawn inexorably into a fresh love-affair, just as an old race-horse is unwilling (ἀέκων, 7) to enter another contest. As Plato first pointed out (*Prm.* 137A), however, the details of the simile actually supply the explanation for the speaker’s distress. The speaker’s comparison of his own situation to that of a race-horse who is reluctant to compete because advanced age has left him no longer equal to the demands of competition implies that the speaker, too, feels that he is past his prime and unfit for the rigors of a new erotic entanglement. A different kind of treatment could have turned this poem into a gloomy reflection on one of the privations of old age, but the details of 5ff imply that Ibycus intended to take his theme in a less than wholly serious direction. The speaker’s emphatic asseveration (ἦ μὰν,

<sup>38</sup> Although there is no independent evidence for relations between Ibycus and Anacreon at Polycrates’ court (A. Lesky, *A History of Greek Literature*<sup>2</sup>, tr. J. Willis and C. de Heer [New York 1966] 182), it is tempting to posit an ‘exchange of ideas’ in the case of these ‘geriatric’ love-complaints.

<sup>39</sup> M. Davies, “The Eyes of Love and the Hunting Net in Ibycus 287 P.,” *Maia* 32 (1980) 255ff, reviews various interpretations of the image at 1–4 and concludes that this is “the earliest and most elaborate occurrence” of the topos of “the lover hunted down by the eyes of his beloved.”

5) and hyperbolic statement that he is “trembling” with fear at the onset of desire sound more histrionic than heartfelt. Also, his likening erotic attachment to a chariot race suggests a comic point of view overall, not to mention the intimation that he was at one time an ἀεθλοφόρος on the δρόμος of love. Given that the premise of the poem is that the speaker is, in fact, in love again—a condition which, whatever his reservations, does not sound entirely unwelcome—the whole amounts to a more playful than sober treatment of the theme.

Anac. 358, by contrast, is designed to give every appearance of being a geriatric love complaint in earnest—in earnest, that is, until the final verse. In the first half of this eight-liner, the speaker describes how a youthful blond Eros (like a child wishing to entice a newcomer into a game) is hitting him with a ball “again!,” inviting him this time to “play with” a fancily-shod young girl (1–4):

σφαίρη δηῦτέ με πορφυρῇ  
βάλλων χρυσοκόμης Ἔρωσ  
νήνι ποικιλοσαμβάλῳ  
συμπαίζειν προκαλεῖται.

The speaker then begins an account of the girl’s callous rejection of his suit (5ff):

ἦ δ’, ἐστὶν γὰρ ἀπ’ εὐκτίτου  
Λέσβου, τὴν μὲν ἐμήν κόμην,  
λευκὴ γάρ, καταμέμφεται.

Thus far, the tone *is* somber. The literal and metaphorical elements of the setting highlight the contrast between grey-headed old age and golden-haired youth;<sup>40</sup> the strong compound καταμέμφεται accentuates the cruelty of the girl’s rejection; even the speaker’s short explanatory parenthesis λευκὴ γάρ has all the marks of a terse and reluctant admission. Yet the witty Anacreon has reserved for the final verse a complete reversal from defeat to an unqualified triumph.

<sup>40</sup> The three words for bright colors at 1ff anticipate the contrast with the white hair of the aging speaker at 7. Given the natural association of youth and play (emphasized by the παιδ- root of συμπαίζειν, 4), the metaphor of the ball game and Eros as ball player aptly reinforce the dramatic situation: the speaker’s desire for a ripe young girl (νήνι, 3). On the metaphorical and literary associations of the ball game see J. F. Davidson, “Anacreon, Homer and the Young Woman from Lesbos,” *Mnemosyne* SER. 4 40 (1987) 133–36.

At 5f the speaker points out, apparently innocently enough—and perhaps even by way of a compliment<sup>41</sup>—that the girl is a native of Lesbos; the Homeric epithet εὔκτιτος<sup>42</sup> helps to give this piece of information a distinctly honorific ring,<sup>43</sup> while the concomitant idea of fortifications perhaps also suggests the girl's inaccessibility.<sup>44</sup> With this aside, however, the rejected suitor has carefully created an opportunity to have the last word. The girl may have faulted his hair, which, incidentally—as he had added—is white, but that is immaterial because (to paraphrase) “she is a girl's girl in any case, so no wonder” (8):<sup>45</sup>

<sup>41</sup> For the association of Lesbian women with “beauty,” “culture,” and “elegance,” see L. WOODBURY, “Gold Hair and Grey, or the Game of Love: Anacreon Fr. 13:358 *PMG*, 13; Gentili,” *TAPA* 109 (1979: hereafter ‘Woodbury’) 282 with nn.25ff; also, M. MARCOVICH, “Anacreon, 358 *PMG*,” *AJP* 104 (1983: ‘Marcovich’) 382.

<sup>42</sup> *Il.* 2.592; εὐκτίμενος of Lesbos at *Il.* 9.129 and 271; *Od.* 4.342, 17.133.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. R. RENEHAN, “Anacreon Fragment 13 Page,” *CP* 79 (1984: hereafter ‘Renehan’) 31: “Εὔκτιτος (ἐν-) is epic diction and sets a correspondingly elevated tone; the epithet is a small, but significant, indication that Anacreon intends the words to be taken as complimentary—at least at this stage.” For more on εὔκτιτος see Marcovich 381f.

<sup>44</sup> I owe this suggestion to Gareth D. Williams.

<sup>45</sup> Or, to be (somewhat) more precise: “and she is gaping at someone else—a girl” (ἄλλην τινά, *sc.* κόρην). Sadly (and, in my opinion, without good cause) the interpretation of Anac. 358.8 has been, and still is, notoriously controversial. For an overview with “a generous selection of scholarship (1899–1979)” see Marcovich 372f; for bibliography see also Woodbury 277 ff.1 and Renehan 28ff. D. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Oxford 1955) 143 n.3, gave a perfectly satisfactory account of this poem long ago: “This fashionable young person may choose her admirers at will: she scorns Anacreon because he is too old; the listener is ready to hear that she will turn from him to a younger man. But Anacreon, having prepared the way by the apparently casual mention of her native island, turns his rebuff to her discomfiture by the unexpected jest at the end—the real reason for her scorn is not that he is *old*, but that he is a *man*.” As to the alternative interpretations of verse 8:

(1) ἄλλον for ἄλλην (Barnes) fulfils those very ordinary expectations (described by Page), which it is the point of the poem to defeat. For the history and fate of this proposal, see Woodbury 281 with n.18. Despite the lack of independent evidence, the Lesbos-lesbian association seems assured by the fame of Sappho's homoerotic poetry; cf. Marcovich 374 and Renehan 30; *contra*, e.g., Gentili 95; Woodbury 282.

(2) ἄλλην τινά *sc.* κόρην. Cf. Smyth (*supra* n.6) 288: ἄλλην=πρὸς δ' ἄλλου τινὸς κόρην. The idea that the girl is interested in someone else's (dark) hair (*i.e.*, some younger man) would leave the poem with the same flat conclusion as the proposal in (1). Gentili's variation (95f), developed from Wigodsky and Giangrande and endorsed by Kirkwood, has even less to recommend it: “The ‘other’ ... will accordingly be another ... piece of hair (pubic), presumably

πρὸς δ' ἄλλην τινὰ χάσκει.

This parting shot completely transforms the tone and rhetoric of the poem. The white-haired speaker's assertion that the girl has homoerotic (*i.e.*, 'lesbian') interests (whether true or not)<sup>46</sup> instantly relieves him of the burden of an otherwise humiliating rejection. Simultaneously, we discover (with some relief and even a measure of satisfaction) that this poem is not the mournful geriatric love complaint it had appeared to be at first, but rather a craftily-constructed act of revenge for unkind behavior.<sup>47</sup>

The two 'geriatric' δηῦτε poems just discussed are precisely the context in which to introduce an additional single-verse δηῦτε fragment by Anacreon (394b):<sup>48</sup>

---

black, belonging to another guest." Not only is it unwarranted to assume that the poem implies a convivial setting (Renehan 30; *contra*, Woodbury 278); we should certainly not be required also to conjure up the unlikely picture of a nudist symposium. On the untenable assertions that Lesbis=*fellatrix* or that χάσκειν πρὸς implies that the girl has *fellatio* in mind, see Marcovich 375–79 and Renehan 28ff.

(3) Davidson (*supra* n.40: 132–36) sets out to defend the "unfashionable line of interpretation" advanced by M. L. West, "Melica," *CQ* n.s. 20 (1970) 205–15, that Anacreon 358 is neither hetero- nor homoerotic; the girl is simply preoccupied. If this view is correct, it is a wonder that Anacreon bothered to compose the poem at all.

The sanest and most complete discussion of the issues is Marcovitch 372–83. Also, H. Pelliccia, "Anacreon 13 (358 *PMG*)," *CP* 86 (1991) 30–36, nicely explicates the "joke logic" of the poem, whereby the two γάρ clauses at 5 and 7 set up the punchline of 8, παρὰ προσδοκίαν. Renehan (28–42) discusses the issues well, but disappoints in failing to endorse either "a girl" or "hair" and suggesting some intentional ambiguity on the part of the poet.

<sup>46</sup> Marcovitch (375) points out rightly that λευκὴ γάρ "is actually the reason adduced by the girl"; we need not, however, share his conclusion that "She is *pretending*, 'You are too old for me', while *concealing the real reason* for rejecting the poet: 'You are a man'" (my emphasis). The girl need not have been "pretending" when she blamed the poet's white hair; nor need she, in fact, be a lesbian at all for this speaker's retort to be a clever and effective revenge for a cruel rejection; the revenge is perhaps even cleverer and more effective if the charge is not actually true.

<sup>47</sup> Woodbury (286f) *does* read Anac. 358 as a mournful geriatric love-complaint and denies to Anacreon the "satirical (*i.e.*, invective) mode" in this poem (for which see n.49 below); for some pointed objections, see Marcovich 380f. When Woodbury tries to take account of the force of δηῦτε (286 with n.48), he fails to recognize that Anacreon has exploited some of its regular associations (the detachment and insight that can occur with 'pathetic' δηῦτε as in Sappho 130) to help set up the unexpected triumph of the final verse.

<sup>48</sup> An initial line, as cited by Hephaestion. See *supra* n.2.

μνᾶται δηῦτε φαλακρὸς Ἄλεξις.

Although the third-person reference excludes 394b from full membership in the δηῦτε group as defined here, its essential kinship with the others is beyond question. Eros does not appear *in propria persona*, but the verb μνᾶται (“is courting”) leaves no doubt about the poem’s erotic theme. The point of singling out Alexis’ baldness for comment must be that he is wooing at an advanced age: “Eros ... again! (but he’s past his prime).” Anacreon might have treated Alexis with sympathy, but the impertinent φαλακρὸς tells against it. It is far more likely that the poet intended to hold this man up to ridicule for repeated—and unsuccessful (?)—amorous pursuits at an inappropriate age. Depending on the speaker’s relationship to his target, the tone of the poem could have been anything from gentle teasing to outright abuse.<sup>49</sup>

In anticipation of the upcoming examination of δηῦτε in Sappho 1, I wish to leave the regular δηῦτε poems aside for now, pausing only to note that I have relegated a handful of miscellaneous occurrences of δηῦτε in early lyric to a footnote<sup>50</sup>

<sup>49</sup> The invective mode, as we have already seen, is not alien to first-person δηῦτε poems (Anac. 400, 358), but it is interesting to observe just how much the adjustment of applying “again!” to the erotic misadventures of *another* person strips the otherwise first-person motif of much of its subtlety. The third-person version implies neither the sophisticated detachment nor wit that one finds in a speaker who applies δηῦτε to himself; nor, of course, does it involve any degree of self-awareness on the part of the hapless lover.

<sup>50</sup> The few remaining occurrences of δηῦτε in lyric are worth a brief survey but can add little of substance to the present investigation: (1) Sappho fr. 83: δηῦτ’; Alc. fr. 33c: δαυτ (Voigt). Mere scraps of papyrus with little or no context. (2) Hipponax 122 West: Μηρτοτίμω δηῦτέ με χρῆ τῶ σκότῳ δικάζεσθαι. The appearance of a proper name and elusive figurative language (με ... τῶ σκότῳ δικάζεσθαι) present even more formidable obstacles to interpretation than the same features in Anac. 400 (above, 15f). Cf. Meineke, *Choliambica Poesis Graecorum* (Berlin 1845): “sententia mirifice obscurata.” Although there is no hint that this poem had an erotic theme, another verse or two to follow this initial line (cited by Hephaestion [*supra* n.2]) might have revealed its kinship with the erotic δηῦτε group. (3) δηῦτε in Sappho 127 (δεῦρο δηῦτε Μοῖσαι χρύσιον λίποισαι) should probably be δεῦτε; cf. Sappho 128 for δεῦτε in another invocation (Muses and Charites). At 128, L.-P. suggest the less plausible δεῦτε δηῦτε; cf. Voigt *ad loc.*: obstat cacophonia. (4) δηῦτε appears in one fragment with a political theme (Anac. 371), and is present (or conjectured) in three fragments on military subjects: Anac. 371, οὐ δηῦτε ἔμπεδός† εἰμι οὐδ’ ἀστοῖσι προσηνής; Archil. 88 West, Ἐρξίτη, πῆ δηῦτ’ ἄνολβος ἀθροίζεται στρατός; Anac. 349 (δηῦτ’ *pro* διίτ’ *coni.* Bergk), οὗτος

and a somewhat more coherent group to an appendix (“Symptotic δηῦτε”). I would like to focus at this point on three rare occurrences of erotic δηῦτε ‘out of context’, by which I mean occurrences of the word in settings other than in the motif “Eros ... me again!” All three passages, although obviously not themselves erotic δηῦτε poems, are arguably intended to evoke both the form and general associations of the self-standing compositions. Any such hints that the *poets* felt free, on occasion, to allude to the motif as a well-known type of poetic love-complaint seem quite significant. The phenomenon implies that the practitioners of this compositional form regarded it, in effect, as distinct sub-genre of erotic lyric that others would easily recognize as such; at the same time, the poets’ own allusions to this type of poem provide some assurance that it is neither anachronistic nor artificial to be speaking here of the δηῦτε motif in generic terms.

δηῦτε is not literally present in Ibyc. 286, but one does well to respect the instincts of Snell who cited the poem (although without comment) in a footnote to his discussion of Anacreon’s and Sappho’s use of “again.”<sup>51</sup> As it turns out, the ‘missing’ δηῦτε in 286 is very much present by implication. The poem opens with a lush description of an idyllic garden<sup>52</sup> blooming with plant growth in springtime. The speaker then breaks off abruptly—in mid-verse (6)—to contrast his own situation: “but, for me, eros is at rest in no season” (1–7):

ἦρι μὲν αἶ τε Κυδώνιαι  
 μηλίδες ἀρδόμεναι ῥοῶν  
 ἐκ ποταμῶν, ἵνα Παρθένων  
 κῆπος ἀκήρατος, αἶ τ’ οἰνανθίδες  
 ἀυξόμεναι σκιεροῖσιν ὑφ’ ἔρνεσιν

δηῦτε Ἰηλυσίουσ τίλλει τοὺς κυανάσπιδας; Anac. 401 (δεῦτε *codd.*), διὰ δηῦτε Καρικουργέος ὀχάνου χεῖρα ἰτιθέμενοι†. D. A. CAMPBELL, *Greek Lyric II* (Loeb edition, Cambridge [Mass.] 1988; hereafter ‘*Lyric II*’) 85, suggests that Anac. 401 could be a figurative description of arming with an erotic tenor (“Is Anacreon fighting against Love?”); but the language of all four fragments seems, on the whole, literal rather than figurative. Nor do these situations hint at any of the self-irony that characterizes the ‘I’s of the erotic δηῦτε group.

<sup>51</sup> Snell 313 n.16. Gentili (104) speaks of this poem as “a reelaboration of Sapphic and Anacreontic images of Eros” with a difference in “tone and coloring.”

<sup>52</sup> “The unstained orchard/garden of virgins” (nymphs?), 3f.

οἶναρέοις θαλέθοισιν· ἔμοι δ' ἔρος  
οὐδεμίαν κατάκοιτος ὥραν.

From here, the speaker embarks on a series of extraordinary images—framed, most probably, as a simile—which extends to the end of the poem (6–13):<sup>53</sup>

†τε†<sup>54</sup> ὑπὸ στεροπᾶς φλέγων  
Θρηίκιος Βορέας  
    αἰσῶν παρὰ Κύπριδος ἀζαλέ-  
    αἰς μανίασιν ἔρεμνὸς ἀθαμβῆς  
ἐγκρατέως πεδόθεν †φυλάσσει†<sup>55</sup>  
ἡμετέρας φρένας.

This picture of Eros “leaping from Aphrodite’s side” and advancing like a stormy northern blast “blazing with lightening” to overpower the speaker’s wits—an Eros who is “dark” and “shameless,” and brings “parching fits of madness”—is as powerful and memorable a poetic expression of the torments of relentless desire as one could hope to find. Beyond the immediacy of 6–13, however, and the effective contrast between the two parts of the poem (Davies [*supra* n.8] 399–402), 6ff bear a striking and sophisticated relation to the familiar δηῦτε compositions.

The statement “but, for me, eros is at rest in no season” (6f) contains: a mention of “eros” (preferably, “Eros”), a reference to the speaker via a personal pronoun (ἐμοί), and an expression for recurrence that is comparable to δηῦτε (at rest “in no season”=active “always”); there follows a description of Eros that is couched in highly-wrought figurative language. These features in combination set this poem squarely within the conventions of the δηῦτε group. The effect is to juxtapose the speaker’s complaint “Eros ... for me, always” with (an implicit) “Eros ... me, again! In addition to encapsulating the principal idea of the poem—that the speakers’ situation is that much more distressing than the norm—this poetic manoeuvre is noteworthy in its own right. Ibycus is using the conventions of

<sup>53</sup> Fränkel (*supra* n.23: 285) and Gentili (103) regard the speaker of Ibyc. 286 as “geriatric” (as in 287), but the language of the poem contains no hint that the speaker is old; all that can be said with confidence is that this speaker is the victim of a violent and unseasonable eros.

<sup>54</sup> *PMG* 8: ἄθ' ὑπὸ *coni.* Hermann, ἀλλ' ἄθ' ὑπὸ Mehlhorn, *alii alia* (ἠῦθ', οἶάθ').

<sup>55</sup> *PMG*: *sententiae contrarium*. For West’s “palmary” λαφύσσει, see Davies (*supra* n.8) 401 n.12.

the self-standing δηῦτε poems as a kind of shorthand in order to evoke the associations of the full form. In other words, as suggested above, the compositional strategy in 287 is based, in part, on the anticipated effect of a generic allusion to poetic love complaints of the type “Eros ... me, again!”

The single appearance of δηῦτε in an Attic poet (in this case δαῦτε in a lyric passage in tragedy)<sup>56</sup> is at once the most self-contained of the three and straightforward in its technique. At one point during the long central kommos at Aesch. *Cho.* 306–478, the Chorus responds to Orestes’ invocation of avenging powers with the words: πέπαλται δαῦτέ μοι φίλον κῆρ (410). Garvie’s somewhat strained apology for the awkwardness of this phrase<sup>57</sup> is a perfectly natural response to the odd manner in which these young women express their agitation in this context. Their words, however, *would* be perfectly at home in the opening of a typical erotic δηῦτε poem.<sup>58</sup> As improbable as it may seem that Aeschylus deliberately echoed the salient features of an essentially light-hearted genre of love complaint in such an incongruous setting, the device would not have been atypical. Fraenkel’s comment on the appearance of language proper to marriage ritual in the account of Iphigenia’s sacrifice at *Ag.* 65 is quite to the point: “The word [προτέλεια] in itself ... suggests cheerful images and ideas. For this very reason ... Aeschylus inverts it and gives it a sinister meaning. This employment of *bona verba* to indicate something disastrous is very characteristic of the poet.”<sup>59</sup> Something similar seems to be happening at *Cho.* 410. Aeschylus ‘inverts’ the *bona verba* of a familiar type of erotic poem by incorporating them incongruously in this eerie necromantic *kommos*.

The third and most engaging example of erotic δηῦτε in an ‘alien’ setting occurs in the fragmentary Sappho 22. At 11f the speaker refers in passing to her addressee’s beloved as [Gongyla?] “for whom desire flits around you again”: ἄς σε δηῦτε πόθος ... ἀμφιπτόταται. This phrase, once again, contains

<sup>56</sup> A. F. Garvie, *Aeschylus, Choephoroi* (Oxford 1986) 153.

<sup>57</sup> Garvie (*supra* n.56) 153: The meaning here [of δαῦτε] is ‘in its turn’, not ‘again indeed’, since this is the first time that the Chorus’s heart has been shaken. It is the act of shaking that is repeated, not the particular shaking by the Chorus’s heart.”

<sup>58</sup> *I.e.*, the statement includes the typical first-person focus, reinforced by a personal pronoun (μοι) adjacent to the hallmark δηῦτε; mention of (a seat of) desire (φίλον κῆρ); and figurative language (πέπαλται).

<sup>59</sup> E. Fraenkel, *Agamemnon* (Oxford 1950) II 41.

all the formal and stylistic markers of the self-standing δηῦτε poems: δηῦτε, a word for “desire” in the nominative (πόθος), an accusative personal pronoun (σε), and figurative language (ἀμφιπόταται). Of course, Sappho has woven these features of the first-person motif seamlessly into a highly personal *second*-person address. She introduces the whole complex obliquely in a relative clause, alters the pronoun from με to σε, and replaces the stylized personified Eros with πόθος (diction that is presumably better suited to her immediate and realistic setting). As the immediate context of the excerpt shows, however, Sappho’s phrase is more than just an inspired adaptation of conventional elements to an original setting (9–13):<sup>60</sup>

.] . ε . [ ... ] . [ ... κ]έλομαι σ' ἀ[εἶδη  
Γο]γγύλαν [”Αβ]ανθι λάβοισαν ἀ· [   
πᾶ]κτιν, ᾗς σε δηῦτε πόθος Τ. [   
ἀμφιπόταται

τὰν κάλαν·

As it turns out, the speaker has recast the familiar δηῦτε motif in the course of exhorting her addressee to take up her lyre and celebrate her beloved in song. Sappho’s theme, therefore, is not simply ‘desire’, but desire in the context of lyric poetry; and the addressee is not just a pining friend, but a pining *poetess*-friend. In such a context the phrase ᾗς σε δηῦτε πόθος ... ἀμφιπόταται passes naturally from being a literal description of the addressee’s current circumstances into the speaker’s recommendation (by way of allusion) as to the kind of composition she thinks most suitable for her love-lorn poetess-friend to produce at this time. If Aeschylus acknowledges “Eros ... me, again!” as a distinct compositional form by echoing it more or less directly at *Cho.* 410, and Ibycus does so by evoking it implicitly in 286, Sappho 22 exhibits a distinct ‘literary’ self-consciousness about erotic δηῦτε, by using the conventions of the motif “Eros ... me, again!” to allude to it as a productive genre of poetic composition that (in the dramatic fiction of the poem) her poetess-addressee would be quick to recognize. This passage, in particular, sets the stage for a similarly ‘literary’, but even more sophisticated exploitation of the regular form and associations of erotic δηῦτε poems in a fourth instance of δηῦτε ‘out of context’: Sappho 1.15–20.

<sup>60</sup> Campbell, *Lyric* I 72: 9 suppl. Hunt, West ; 10 Wilamowitz, L.-P.; 11 Castiglioni.

It is well known that Sappho 1, a first-person petition to Aphrodite, follows the formal pattern of the traditional κλητικός ὕμνος:<sup>61</sup> the speaker begins with an honorific address to the goddess (1f), makes an initial request for Aphrodite's present aid (2–5), and then reminds the goddess of an earlier occasion on which she had responded favorably to a similar summons (5–24).<sup>62</sup> The speaker narrates this earlier epiphany of Aphrodite in some detail,<sup>63</sup> beginning with the goddess' departure from heaven and descent through the sky on a chariot drawn by sparrows. The δηῶτε passage occurs when the speaker is recounting what Aphrodite had done and said upon her arrival on that occasion in the past. The goddess had first smiled (μειδίασαισ', 14) and then asked her petitioner about the reason for the summons; the speaker reproduces the first three of the goddess' five questions<sup>64</sup> in indirect form and then shifts

<sup>61</sup> For the hymnic features in Sappho 1 see Wilamowitz (*supra* n.20) 42ff, and *Der Glaube der Hellenen* (Basel 1956) II 109 n.2; A. CAMERON, "Sappho's Prayer to Aphrodite," *HTHR* 32 (1939: hereafter 'Cameron') 1–4; Bowra 200ff; W. CASTLE, "Sappho's Hymn to Aphrodite," *TAPA* 89 (1958) 69; Burnett 245ff.

Sappho 1 is a highly artful piece of poetic fiction, and not composed for some public or private ritual occasion; see e.g. Page (*supra* n.45) 42; *contra* Gentili 79f. Nor is it possible to entertain what M. L. West, "Burning Sappho," *Maia* 22 (1970) 308 n.1, has dubbed "the naive-realist interpretation" as, for example, Bowra 202: "The appearance of Aphrodite must be treated as a genuine experience"; Cameron (1–17) mustered the evidence of the literary tradition as a corrective. For an overview (with bibliography through 1976) see K. STANLEY, "The Rôle of Aphrodite in Sappho Fr. 1," *GRBS* 17 (1976) 1f with nn.1ff. An even more insidious problem is the failure to distinguish the historical poetess Sappho from the 'Sappho' who is the speaker of the poem. Many otherwise good observations are marred by this 'biographical fallacy' that, on occasion, involves the apparently irresistible urge to use phrases like "the darkness of Sappho's erotic despair" and "the sad mortal face of Sappho" (G. L. Koniaris, "On Sappho Fr. 1 [Lobel-Page]," *Philologus* 109 [1965] 34). Examples could easily be multiplied. Recent writers who have been careful to treat the situation and speaker as poetic fiction are Burnett 243ff *passim*, 258 and J. WINKLER, *The Constraints of Desire* (New York 1990) 166–76. See further nn.73, 77, 80 below.

<sup>62</sup> For the rationale behind such reminders in formal prayers see Cameron 2f; Bowra 201; Burnett 247f with nn.40ff, 253.

<sup>63</sup> Sappho's "lapse into narrative" is, in fact, also traditional: Cameron 3f.

<sup>64</sup> The first and last of Aphrodite's questions broach the issue of erotic misfortune: the possibility of a recent unpleasant turn of events, unspecified (ὅτι ... πέπονθα), and, more particularly, a wrong done (τίς σ' ... ἀδίκησι). The second, third, and fourth questions move similarly from the general to the specific: the reason for the summons (κῶτι ... κάλημμι) and then the object of the speaker's longing—both "what" she wants (κῶτι) and "whom" (τίνα).

into the more vivid style of direct quotation for the other two (14–20):<sup>65</sup>

μειδιαίσαισ' ἀθανάτω προσώπῳ  
ἤρε' ὅττι δηῦτε πέπονθα κῶττι  
δηῦτε κάλημμι,

κῶττι μοι μάλιστα θέλω γένεσθαι  
μαινόλα θύμῳ· τίνα δηῦτε πείθω  
...ἄγην<sup>66</sup> ἐς σάν φιλότατα; τίς σ', ὦ  
Ψάπῳ, ἀδίκησι;

It has been rightly said that a proper interpretation of δηῦτε in the first, second, and fourth of Aphrodite's questions is one of the keys to assessing the "spirit and meaning" of the poem as a whole.<sup>67</sup> On the other hand, there is little consensus about the force of the thrice-repeated δηῦτε in this context, and the main battle lines can be drawn as follows. Some regard the three-fold "again!" as a way of placing particular emphasis on the *recurrence* of the speaker's distress, which "heightens the pathos" of her situation;<sup>68</sup> the readiest parallel for this 'pathetic' δηῦτε is Sappho's own 130. Others interpret the repetition as a mark of impatience on Aphrodite's part, a view that turns the goddess'

<sup>65</sup> See Cameron 8 with n.38 for direct speech in "descriptions of epiphany."

<sup>66</sup> Page's comment on the crux in verse 19 (*supra* n.45: 9) *ad* Sappho 1.18f, still holds true four decades later: "A problem not yet solved." For discussion and bibliography see *e.g.* Page 9f; Castle 72 with n.19; Koniaris (*supra* n.61) 36ff; West (*supra* n.61) 309 n.5; Stanley 313ff; Burnett 243 n.35. Burnett also gives a good assessment of just how much, given the textual problem, can be safely inferred about the "poetic situation." As to the popular ἄψ σ' ἄγην (LP), I am inclined to think that reconciliation is probably *not* the issue here (*contra, e.g.,* Stanley 314), but rather the fresh onset of desire. *Cf.* West *loc.cit.*

<sup>67</sup> Page (*supra* n.45) 12; *cf.* Stanley 306. Kirkwood (*supra* n.24: 112) appears to be alone in the view that δηῦτε, as a "commonplace," has no special significance in Sappho 1; for him the word is merely "part of the naïveté of diction and syntax that characterizes all [Sappho's] poetry and that suggests simplicity, candor, and earnestness of attitude." After noting the recurrence of δηῦτε elsewhere in erotic poetry, he states similarly (249 n.23) that "To attach great interpretative importance to the repetition [in Sappho 1] of what appears to have been a thoroughly conventional word is very risky."

<sup>68</sup> Campbell (*supra* n.6) 266. For some slight variations on this line of interpretation *cf.* Koniaris (*supra* n.61) 35: δηῦτε "establishes the familiarity obtaining between Aphrodite and Sappho" and "how frequently Sappho's heart suffers"; Castle 70: the word re-enforces the sense of the speaker's "surfeit" implied by ἄσαισι (3) and conveys "the tired realization of the endless repetitiveness of the experience."

speech into a reprimand.<sup>69</sup> Yet another interpretation (most explicitly formulated, oddly enough, by a proponent of the last opinion cited) is that Aphrodite's "again!" marks her speech as an ironic commentary on the speaker's recurrent susceptibilities.<sup>70</sup> Some who have reached this conclusion also note a connection between δηῦτε in Sappho 1 and elsewhere in erotic poetry.<sup>71</sup> Before reexamining the relative merits of these interpretations, I would like to explore the force of the three-fold δηῦτε in Sappho 1 quite specifically in terms of the typical range of the word in the self-standing poems.<sup>72</sup>

Needless to say, Sappho 1.15–20 is a much more rhetorically sophisticated passage than any of the simple declarative statements of the first-person δηῦτε poems, and so it should come as no surprise that δηῦτε performs several functions here that go well beyond its force elsewhere. On one point, however, δηῦτε in Sappho 1 acts very much like its counterparts in the shorter poems: in its rôle in characterizing the speaker indirectly. The person to whom Aphrodite applies this insistent "again" is, of course, an acute case of the helpless and susceptible 'I' typically found in the first-person δηῦτε compositions—an individual who finds herself, time and time again,

<sup>69</sup> After submitting δηῦτε to some fairly detailed and—in light of Shorey's observation (*supra* n.7)—unnecessary philological scrutiny, Page (*supra* n.45: 13) calls Aphrodite's tone one of "reproof and impatience." Campbell (*supra* n.6: 266) objects to this directly. Page (15), taking note of the goddess' smile (see n.74 below), more moderately describes Aphrodite as "A little impatient, but tolerant, as a mother with a troublesome child." See also next note. Cameron (7) describes δηῦτε as mark of "friendly impatience."

<sup>70</sup> In addition to the statements cited in n.69, Page (*supra* n.45: 15) speaks (somewhat inconsistently) of the tone of Aphrodite's speech as "good-humoured raillery." Cf. Stanley 306, 315 for an explicit endorsement of this view of Page, and 306ff for a survey of adverse responses to the idea of irony in the poem. Winkler (171) also embraces the ironic interpretation.

<sup>71</sup> E.g. Stanley (315 n.45), who also reviews some less than satisfactory conclusions about Sappho 1 based on δηῦτε; Burnett 257 n.79: δηῦτε as "an ironic reminder that love comes again and again." The off-puttingly spare synopsis of the *content* of Sappho 1 along these lines by West (*supra* n.61: 310) is actually unobjectionable: "The content of the song can be reduced to "Oh dear, I am in love again."

<sup>72</sup> Given the opportunity, Wilamowitz (*supra* n.20: 45f) would probably have had second thoughts about his own interpretation of the repeated δηῦτε: "[Die Göttin] weiss aber auch gleich Bescheid, obwohl sich Sappho zur Antwort nicht entschliessen kann, den dreimal muss die Göttin verbeuglich fragen, was durch das dreimalige [*sic*] ὅτι δηῦτε unverkennbar hervorgehoben wird." Vigorously dismissed by Page (*supra* n.45) 12f.

at the mercy of desire. We should also appreciate the way Sappho's manipulation of the temporal frame of the poem permits this δηῦτε to communicate the long history of the speaker's condition at the same time that it marks simple recurrence. The economy of this device is masterly: the present summons of the goddess that is the dramatic setting of the poem includes the speaker's account of a previous summons, within which the quoted δηῦτε alludes to similar episodes earlier yet.<sup>73</sup>

Beyond characterizing the speaker and revealing the history of her 'case', δηῦτε, as already noted, plays a decisive rôle in defining the tone of Aphrodite's speech. Fortunately, we have already encountered an instructive parallel for assessing the tone of a statement in which one individual applies δηῦτε to another's recurrent passion. At Anac. 394b, the speaker had used δηῦτε to comment ironically on the affairs of bald Alexis and, as suggested earlier, the tone of this critique—whether teasing or abusive—would have depended on the relationship between the two men. The δηῦτε that Aphrodite applies to the speaker in Sappho 1 is clearly also meant to be an ironic commentary on the speaker's recurrent susceptibility to desire. Yet unlike the case of the Anacreon fragment, the surrounding context in Sappho's poem does contain some clues about the goddess' relationship to her petitioner and, therefore, to her tone. As others have observed, Aphrodite's smile at 14 and warm familiar style of address throughout clearly mark her tone as gently ironic and indulgent, rather than cruel.<sup>74</sup>

Even when we allow that Aphrodite's tone is gently ironic, an assessment of the tone of the poem as a whole remains an im-

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Snell 57: "Among the many beauties of this poem, not the least is this: that the experience which produced these verses is made to extend beyond the scope of the present, to a point twice removed in time." For "experience which produced these verses," however, one should read: "dramatic fiction"; see above n.61.

<sup>74</sup> For the smile (properly identified by *e.g.* Cameron (5) as "not merely that of φιλομειδῆς Aphrodite"), cf. Wilamowitz (*supra* n.20) 45: "ein freundlicher Gruss"; Page (*supra* n.45) 15: "Aphrodite smiles for an obvious reason: because she is amused"; Castle 72: "a smile of indulgence, understanding, and perhaps a little impatience." Bowra (203) speaks generally of Aphrodite's "friendly humour," "smiling comprehension," and "humorous tolerance." As to opinion on the tone of the goddess's address, see above nn.69–71. Cameron (7) points out nicely that "The direct speech itself, apart from the phraseology, helps convey the impression of intimacy" and he gives parallels for "colloquial and friendly" touches; cf. Burnett 254 with n.66.

portant issue yet to be resolved. This larger issue depends on our assessment of the character of the speaker. Just as in the 'classic' form of the δηῦτε poem, the δηῦτε of Sappho 1 emphasizes the helplessness of the 'I'. On the other hand, the speaker of Sappho 1 does *not* apply the "again" to herself as in the self-standing examples, but quotes another—Aphrodite—who had applied the expression *to* her. As we have seen, the susceptible first-person who applies δηῦτε to him- or herself necessarily enjoys some measure of self-awareness and perspective on the situation, and more often than not is prepared to engage in some witty self-mockery. Because the speaker of Sappho 1 offers no explicit commentary of her own on Aphrodite's ironic δηῦτε speech (and thus, no explicit indication that she is privy to Aphrodite's ironic perspective), it is possible to conclude that she is merely naively exposing a condition—painful and chronic vulnerability to recurrent passion—the nature of which she is not fully aware.<sup>75</sup> This view of the speaker leads naturally to the conclusion some have reached, that the prevailing spirit of this poem is pathos. One specific detail in the passage, however, calls into serious question the notion that this speaker is meant to sound so naive and unsophisticated after all.

Although it is always prudent to avoid conflating the 'I' of any work of fiction with the historical person of the author, we face a special situation here, for at line 20 Aphrodite addresses the speaker directly with the words: ὦ Ψάπφ'.<sup>76</sup> This address does not by any means transform poetic fiction into biography, but it does suggest that the speaker of this poem is to be understood, at the very least, as a stylized version of the 'real' Sappho. This first-person speaker, therefore, is not merely chronically love-lorn, but (like the addressee of 22) a chronically love-lorn *poetess*.<sup>77</sup> Once Aphrodite's speculations about the source of

<sup>75</sup> For the possibility of another naive first-person see above 16 on Alcm. 59a. If the interpretation is correct, the "I" of Alcm. 59a is still less pitiable than a naive 'I' would be in Sappho 1. In the former the speaker would at least be joyfully—if blindly—in love; the speaker of Sappho 1 would merely be in pain.

<sup>76</sup> West (*supra* n.61: 309) contrasts Sappho 1 with the more typically anonymous love poems of the Theognidean corpus: "It is not a love song for Everyman, it is labelled as hers."

<sup>77</sup> Winkler (171) also distinguishes the historical poetess from the speaker of the poem explicitly: "Sappho the singer, impersonating Sappho in needful prayer." I would only emend to "impersonating Sappho *the singer* in needful prayer."

the speaker's distress are understood as designed particularly for a poetess' ears, the thrice-repeated δηῦτε takes on a whole new—and primarily 'literary'—dimension. The goddess' words begin to sound, above all, like an ironic parody of what we are to understand is this poetess-speaker's most characteristic way of expressing her distress; to put it another way, Aphrodite's speech alludes playfully to the fact that this poetess-speaker's repertoire includes a regular litany of love complaints of the form "Eros ... me, again!"

The suggestion that the thrice-repeated δηῦτε in Aphrodite's speech in Sappho 1 is, in effect, a witty and self-reflective allusion to the independent motif of "Eros ... me, again!" has much to recommend it. In the first place, it supplies a full and economical account of an otherwise peculiar feature of Sappho 1: an emphatic three-fold repetition of the word δηῦτε that is, as we have seen, virtually the hallmark of an utterly different kind of composition. Second, this interpretation lends a unity of tone to Sappho 1. A naive and 'pathetic' narrator's complaint would hardly be in keeping with the otherwise playfully ironic spirit of the goddess's speech<sup>78</sup> (or, for that matter, with other playful elements in the poem).<sup>79</sup> A self-aware poetess-speaker—'Sappho'—who is capable of self-parody, on the other hand, might well be held responsible for the Aphrodite who appears in this poem.<sup>80</sup> From a somewhat broader perspective, a

<sup>78</sup> Stanley (315) points out additionally "a distinctly teasing irony in the way [Aphrodite] proceeds ... from the general to the specific source of unhappiness"; also, a "note of melodramatic exaggeration," and a "blend of humorous solicitude, hyperbole and assumed ignorance ... not unlike Dione's address to Aphrodite herself on her inglorious rout from the field of battle in *Iliad* 5.373."

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Burnett 245: "The solemn conventions of prayer are set to the melodies of popular song, so that the metre itself seems to comment saucily upon the matter"; she also notes (245f) the playful incongruity of the military imagery in the poem (cf. the humorously incongruous imagery of the racecourse in Ibyc. 287, as discussed above 17f). Stanley observes (316) playfulness on the part of the *speaker*, too, in her "repetition of Aphrodite's chiding questions and the mimicry of her direct quotation with its insistent δηῦτε and emphatic ὦ Ψάπφ'."

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Page (*supra* n.45) 15f (who would, however, have done better not to conflate the sophisticated first-person voice with the historical Sappho; see above n.61): "And we must not forget that the smile and speech of Aphrodite are given to her by Sappho; it is Sappho herself who is speaking and the smile must be Sappho's too." And later (18): "Sappho's attitude toward her own emotions, however intensely felt and sincerely expressed, is one of remarkable

'literary' interpretation of δηῦτε is also consistent with one of the most marked characteristics of Sappho's art. The longer or nearly complete fragments we possess reveal that the poetess had a predilection for incorporating the conventions of simple and familiar poetic forms into highly original and rhetorically sophisticated contexts; for this 'literary' coloring of Sappho's poetry one need only recall the priamel in poem 16 (on τὸ κάλλιστον), the *makarismos* in 31, the allusion to the δηῦτε motif in 22, or the conventions of the cletic hymn on which poem 1 is based.<sup>81</sup> A final (and, admittedly, subjective) point in favor of this interpretation is that the presence of a generic allusion to poems of the type "Eros ... me, again!" makes Sappho 1 a richer poem. A self-aware speaker who is capable of exercising irony at her own expense redeems Sappho 1 from the simpler and less sophisticated pathos of a naive sufferer. The whole implies for the mastermind of the work—the historical poetess Sappho—an engaging literary self-consciousness of particular wit and appeal: evidently she was capable of treating not merely her persona's love complaints, but specifically her persona's *poetic* love complaints (and thus her own poetry) with distance, sympathy, and humor.

We might step back from this most complex and sophisticated appearance of δηῦτε in Greek poetry to speculate briefly about the origins and dissemination of the simple self-standing motif, "Eros ... me, again!" The obviously early date of Alc. 59a (and, perhaps, also this poet's geographical remove from the hub of poetic activity in Asia Minor) implies that the πρῶτος εὔρετής of this type of poem lived some time before the poets whose δηῦτε compositions have survived. Furthermore, one may imagine that the first erotic δηῦτε poem was a happy

---

detachment. She can analyse her feelings, and pass judgement upon them, not without amusement at her own expense." Castle's wording (76) is more careful: "[Aphrodite] is a kind of projection of Sappho's *idealized* self" (my emphasis). On distinguishing the poetess-speaker 'Sappho' (who speaks in her own and in Aphrodite's voice) from the historical Sappho (who speaks in all three voices), cf. Winkler 171: "The person who we must think of as designing the whole is functionally and indeed practically quite different from any of the Sapphos in the poem.... The guileful weaver, the many-minded one who performs intricate shifts of perspective, is fictionally Aphrodite but poetically Sappho herself (171); see also Winkler at above n.77. On the ramifications of *poikil-* in the first word of the poem see Winkler 171ff; Burnett 249.

<sup>81</sup> For a recent treatment of reminiscences from Homeric episodes in Sappho 1 (with some bibliography) see Winkler 167–70.

accident: a spontaneous collocation of ‘Eros’, ‘me’, and ‘again!’ at a symposium or other convivial gathering. The success of that original production could well have inspired subsequent attempts (on that occasion and others) to ‘cap’ it, with each succeeding effort helping to define the parameters of the form and generating new and cleverer variations on the theme. Ultimately, many examples (like the one we are fortunate enough to possess) would have been worth committing to memory or writing, and would thus have passed readily—along with the conventions of the motif—from group to group and community to community.

The best explanation for the obvious popularity and persistence of these δηῦτε compositions lies in the sheer variety and range of the examples that survive. Within the confines of a distinct and recognizable form, the scenario “Eros ... me, again!” could accommodate a variety of erotic situations (including the special ‘geriatric’ subset of the group) and play host to a range of tones that, depending on the character, mood, and purpose of the poet in question, could include self-irony, pathos, or even invective. The select group of passages, in turn, that simply allude in some way to this compositional form (one each by Ibycus and Aeschylus and Sappho 22 and 1), have more far-reaching implications. That these three poets felt free to base some very sophisticated poetic techniques on generic allusions to the conventions of δηῦτε poems suggests that they had transcended a simple familiarity with—and mastery of—poems of the type “Eros ... me, again!” Evidently they had come to regard this type of poem as nothing less than a distinct and well-known sub-genre of erotic archaic lyric poetry. Their practice presumably makes it legitimate for us to do the same in theory.

## APPENDIX

### Sympotic δηῦτε

The speaker of Anac. 356a, about to embark on his evening’s drinking, calls for a large vessel “in order that I may drink up without closing the mouth” (1ff). Nevertheless, he also orders the slave to mix the wine moderately (3ff) “so that I may break forth in Bacchic frenzy, again (!), [but] without violence” (5f):

ἄγε δὴ φέρ' ἡμῖν ὦ παῖ  
 κελέβην, ὅπως ἄμυστιν  
 προπίω, τὰ μὲν δέκ' ἐγγέας  
 ὕδατος, τὰ πέντε δ' οἴνου  
 κυάθους ὡς ἂν ἔβριστιῶς†  
 ἀνά δηῦτε βασσαρήσω.

5 ἀνυβρίστως coni. Pauw, ἀνυβριστί Baxter

As in erotic contexts, δηῦτε does have an element of self-mockery in 356a, for it evokes precisely the sort of violent bacchanals in the speaker's past that he here eschews. On closer consideration, however, the word functions in a completely different way from its erotic counterparts. Here δηῦτε occurs late in the poem, in a purpose clause, and insofar as it appears with a negative expression (ἀνυβρίστως/ἀνυβριστί), it is part of the speaker's resolve to do things differently on the present occasion. Unlike the comically or pathetically helpless 'I' of the erotic examples who portrays himself in the act of falling prey to his own follies ("again!"), this veteran of raucous symposia speaks from the point of view of one who is currently in complete control.

At 356b, in a similar vein, Anacreon exhorts his drinking companions to forego a fresh bout of "Scythian style" reveling, recommending this time that they moderate their intake and turn to poetry instead:

ἄγε δηῦτε μηκέτ' οὔτω  
 πατάγω τε κάλαλητῶ  
 Σκυθικὴν πόσιν παρ' οἴνω  
 μελετῶμεν, ἀλλὰ καλοῖς  
 ὑποπίνοντες ἐν ὕμνοις.

Once again there is no doubt that the speaker is a veteran of excess; in fact he even appears to implicate himself in the undesirable behavior that seems already to have taken hold (δηῦτε μηκέτ' οὔτω ... μελετῶμεν). Just as in the previous example, however, he is not at the mercy of the situation, but taking control and speaking with the voice of authority. This δηῦτε, appearing in a negative exhortation, therefore communicates none of the irony it enjoys in a declarative statement by a susceptible speaker.

The speaker of Anacreon's third sympotic δηῦτε poem (412, a single-line fragment) bears the closest resemblance to 'I' of the erotic poems, in that he—at once experienced and susceptible—is recounting the actual recurrence of an unflattering predicament. He here asks<sup>82</sup> an individual (presumably his host): "Will you not allow me again (!)

<sup>82</sup> *PMG*: interrogat. signum add. Bergk, fort. recte; followed by Campbell *Lyric II*.

—drunk as I am—go off home?": οὐ δηῦτέ μ' ἔασεις μεθύοντ' οἴκαδ' ἀπελθεῖν.<sup>83</sup> This verse is to be distinguished from the erotic poems principally on the grounds that (like the other two sympotic δηῦτε poems) it has a literal (rather than figurative) setting that makes for circumstantial humor rather than figurative wit.

It is possible that some sympotic δηῦτε poems, not now extant, operated on the same principles as their erotic counterparts, with susceptible veterans of symposia voicing complaints not unlike the helpless victims of Eros. But to judge from these three examples, despite their superficial similarity to the poems based on "Eros ... me, again!," the sympotic poems do not in the end share the particular combination of formal and stylistic features that give the others their distinctive character.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

*May, 1994*

<sup>83</sup> *PMG*: οὐδ' αὖ μ' ἔασεις codd., corr. Page.