

ON THE METRE OF *ANACREONT.* 19W.*

Αἱ Μοῦσαι τὸν Ἑρωτα
 δῆσσαι στεφάνοισι
 τῷ Κάλλῃ παρέδωκαν·
 καὶ νῦν ἡ Κυθήρεια
 ζητεῖ λύτρα φέρουσα
 λύσασθαι τὸν Ἑρωτα.
 κᾶν λύσῃ δέ τις αὐτόν,
 οὐκ ἔξεισι, μενεῖ δέ·
 δουλεύειν δεδιδακται.

An. 19 has a metrical form which is quite peculiar and anomalous if compared either with hemiambs or with anacletic ionic dimeters (anacreontics), i.e. the metres of all the other *Anacreontea*.

This metre, ---○○○-○, remains unchanged in each of the poem's nine lines, and in current descriptions it is considered a pherecratean,¹ which is thought to have been felt by the ancient author as assimilable either to a pure ionic dimeter with contraction of the biceps in the first foot (there is but a single sure instance of this kind in the *Anacreontea*: 44.2; in 52A.3 either the text is corrupt or prosody is faulty),² or to a hemiambic with anacletic giving a trochaic second foot.³ The second interpretation seems more plausible, because 'pherecratean' hemiambs are more numerous in the *Anacreontea*,⁴ but these instances also are lines where the structure in question originates as the isolated and accidental outcome of anacletic.

Therefore the stichic fixity of the metric form ---○○○-○ in *An.* 19 continues to be problematic, all the more since it is absolutely invariable, and even avoids any of the rational or irrational substitutions which are common both in the hemiambic and in the anacreontic *Anacreontea* (and also in the 'pherecratean' hemiambs quoted above, n. 4).⁵

* I thank Richard Hunter and the anonymous referee for their acute remarks and patient efforts to improve my English.

¹ The metre of *An.* 19 is interpreted in this way also in the most recent editions, by M. L. West: *Carmina Anacreontea* (Leipzig, 1984), p. xvi, and D. A. Campbell: *Greek Lyric* vol. 2 (Cambridge, MA and London, 1988), p. 9.

² This explanation has been reposed by West, loc. cit.; it had been shared, e.g. by F. Hanssen, *Die Metra der Anacreontea*, 'Excurs' in A. Rossbach-R. Westphal, *Theorie der musischen Künste der Hellenen*³, vol. iii.2: *Spezielle griechische Metrik* (Leipzig, 1889), p. 862, n. **; J. Sitzler, 'Zu den Anacreonten', *WKPh* (1913), no. 30/31, p. 855; M. Brioso Sánchez, *Anacreontea. Un ensayo para su datación* (Salamanca, 1970), p. 27.

³ Cf. Campbell, loc. cit.

⁴ According to the list provided by Campbell, loc. cit.: 5.19, 21.2, 36.6 and 16, 47.3 (doubtful), 49.4 and 5, 51.6.

⁵ From this point of view *An.* 19 is more markedly exceptional than *An.* 20, a poem often quoted as the other instance of heavy metrical anomaly in the *Anacreontea*. In fact *An.* 20 consists of two strophes, each of four lines which can all be interpreted as dimeters formed by two metra easily found in the hemiambic *Anacreontea* (1-○○○-○○○, chor. + ia.: 2-○○○-○○○, chor. + ia.cat. = aristoph.; 3-○○○-○○○, chor. + ia. = ibyc.; 4 = 1: the choriamb is a very frequent outcome of anacletic in the first metron of hemiambic *Anacreontea*, while the anapaest in the beginning of the second iambic metron (line 3 = 7) is a quite possible replacement in iambic verses, although not very common). Furthermore, the 'strophic' subdivision of contents is quite a common device in the *Anacreontea*, though only *An.* 20 demonstrates a properly strophic repetition of the same metrical sequences in the same order; in any case, by virtue of the alternation between ia.cat. and ia.acat. and of the replacement of iambs by anapaests in the second metron of line 3 = 7, *An.* 20 shares at least some variability with the other *Anacreontea*. Only the stichic fixity of *An.* 19 really makes any difference.

Such a strict fixity hardly leaves room for doubt that we are dealing with a deliberate metrical choice. So why *this* metre? Nothing prevents us from supposing that either some unknown reason or a mere arbitrary act led the author of *An. 19* to extend to the whole poem a metrical structure, the 'pherecratean' hemiambic, which he had found here and there in previous *Anacreontea* as isolated results of anacalasis and substitutions.⁶ Nevertheless I think this metrical choice may be accounted for in a more satisfactory way.

As far as I know nobody has noticed the perfect metrical and lexical identity (apart from dialectal details) which joins *Αἱ Μοῦσαι τὸν Ἔρωτα*, the incipit of *An. 19* (a micro-epyllion about Eros), to *Ταὶ Μοῖσαι τὸν Ἔρωτα*, the first hemistich (a feminine hemiepes) of a hexametrical incipit in Bion 9 Gow (also an epyllion about Eros) and finally to *αἱ Μοῖσαι τὸν ἔρωτα* in Call. *Ep.* 46.3 Pfeiffer = 1049 Gow-Page (*AP* 12.150.3), a first hemistich which neither was an incipit nor concerned the god, but may have influenced Bion, though the high frequency in the hexameter of word shapes: $\bar{1} - \bar{2}$ and $\cup \cup \bar{3} \cup$ must not be forgotten. Besides, both *An. 19* and Bion 9 fall into a group of short hexametrical stories on 'XY and Eros...' which begin with the same metric and semantic structure, i.e. a feminine hemiepes (---- $\cup \cup \cup$), where the first word is the name of Eros' deuteragonist: 'XY τὸν Ἔρωτα': the instances we know in addition to Bion 9 and *An. 19* are Mosch. 1. 1 Gow = adesp. *AP* 14.3.1 'Ἀ Κύπρις τὸν Ἔρωτα, which may have been an imitative pair, just as I suppose Bion 9 and *An. 19* are.

The oldest *Anacreontea* we know, among which nearly all the modern chronological theories on the corpus include also *An. 19*, are commonly dated back to a period between the third and first century B.C. and the first century A.D.⁷ So at least some of the old *Anacreontea* may antedate Bion (beginning of the first century B.C.), and it is impossible to prove absolutely that *An. 19* postdates Bion 9. At any rate (i) the easy intelligibility of the stichic structure ---- $\cup \cup \cup$ as the hemiepes of the commonest stichic verse, (ii) the rarity of this structure in the *Anacreontea*, and (iii) the radical anomaly of the stichic fixity in *An. 19*, are clues which allow us to argue that the first line of *An. 19* quoted the 'motto iniziale' of Bion's poem (and thus possibly recalled the Moscho-Bionian beginning pattern) – not vice-versa.

In my opinion the very quotation of this initial 'motto' may have suggested to the author of *An. 19* the choice of the structure: ---- $\cup \cup \cup$ as the metre for the first line – a choice allowed by the formal coincidence of the fem. hemiepes with the 'pherecratean' hemiambic –, while both the stichic nature of the model's versification and the rare but paralleled stichic use of pherecrateans may have induced him to perpetuate the same metre in the other lines of the poem.

Is it right to suppose that a poem by Bion might be so crucial a focus in an anacreontic author's mind as to let him use its incipit as an initial 'motto'? I think so. Not only were the two poems short stories about Eros as a god associated with the Muses, but above all Bion's poetic Eros impressively resembled the one we find in many *Anacreontea*. The last part of Bion 9 is concerned with the uniqueness and the 'physical' inevitability of erotic poetry (and the uniqueness of the beloved as a theme of this poetry), a form of *recusatio* which is fairly common in the Latin elegiac poetry

⁶ This is, for instance, Brioso Sánchez's opinion, loc. cit.

⁷ A useful survey is to be found in Campbell, op. cit., pp. 16–18. There are a few discordant opinions. E.g. F. Hanssen, loc. cit., dates *An. 19* in the second century A.D.; among twentieth-century scholars, Brioso Sánchez proposes by thoughtful arguments to date *An. 19* in the early-middle imperial age: 'Aportaciones al problema de la métrica griega tardía', *Eclás.* 16 (1972), 131–7.

of Bion's century (and after), but is very rare in Greek literature, with the exception of the *Anacreontea*, where this kind of *recusatio* stereotyped a theme by Anacreon and became an obsessive topos of the 'anacreontic' poetic ideology.⁸ As a matter of fact the closest parallel passage I know for Bion 9.8–11 (the poet's tongue cannot sing other gods and men, that is to say epic-encomiastic and mythological poetry, since it can sing only Eros and the poet's beloved⁹)

ἦν μὲν γὰρ βροτὸν ἄλλον ἢ ἀθανάτων τινὰ μέλπω,
βαμβαίνει μοι γλώσσα καὶ ὥς πάρος οὐκετ' αἰεῖδει·
ἦν δ' αὖτ' ἐς τὸν Ἔρωτα καὶ ἐς Λυκίδα τι μελίσδω,
καὶ τόκα μοι χαίροισα διὰ στόματος ῥέει αὐδά.

is to be found in *An.* 23, a poem commonly included in the oldest nucleus of the *Anacreontea* (the poet's instruments can play nothing but love):

θέλω λέγειν Ἀτρείδας,
θέλω δὲ Κάδμον ἄδειν,
ὁ βάρβιτος δὲ χορδαῖς
ἔρωτα μόνον ἤχει...
καὶ γὰρ μὲν ἦδον ἄθλους
Ἡρακλέους· λύρη δὲ
ἔρωτας ἀντεφώνει.

Università di Firenze

MARCO FANTUZZI

⁸ Cf. the excellent analyses by P. A. Rosenmeyer, *The Poetics of Imitation: Anacreon and the Anacreontic Tradition* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 96–101.

⁹ This text seems to have been overlooked both as a forerunner of the poetics and the poetical-existential credo of Latin elegy (cf., however, Nisbet-Hubbard on Horace, *Odes* 1.6, p. 81), and as a parallel for the *recusationes* in the *Anacreontea*. For instance even the very rich similia-apparatus provided by West in his Teubner edition of the *Anacreontea* (quoted above, n. 1), pp. 18–19, quotes only passages from Ovid's *Amores* with regard to *An.* 23.

SENATE INTERVENANTS IN 50 B.C.

M. Bonnefond-Coudry has performed a great service by compiling a list of senators who are known to have spoken in the senate ('intervenants') in the first century B.C. Yet her list for the year 50 invites a thoroughgoing revision. Beside the rubric '*supplicatio* à Cicéron' she gives the following list: Cato, Hirrus, Balbus, Lentulus (Spinther?), Domitius (Ahenobarbus or Calvinus), Scipio, Favonius. She also notes that Pompey spoke at a session late in the year (App. *B.C.* 2.28–9, instead of her reference, 2.29–30), and maintains that Scipio spoke on 1 December (Plut. *Caes.* 30.4–6).¹

The debate on Cicero's *supplicatio* is reported to us by Caelius (ap. Cic. *Fam.* 8.11.1–2):

renuntiatio nobis erat Hirrum diutius dicturum. prendimus eum; non modo non fecit sed, cum de hosti<i>s</i> ageretur et posset rem impedire si ut numeraretur postularet, tacuit. tantum Catoni adsensus est, qui <de> te locutus honorifice non decrerat supplicationes. tertius ad hos Favonius accessit. qua re pro cuiusque natura et instituto gratiae sunt agenda, his quod tantum voluntatem ostenderunt pro sententia, cum impedire possent non pugnarunt. Curioni vero quod de suarum actionum cursu tua causa deflexit. nam Furnius et Lentulus, ut debuerunt, quasi eorum res esset una nobiscum circumierunt et laborarunt. Balbi quoque Corneli operam et sedulitatem laudare possum; nam cum Curione vehementer locutus est et eum, si aliter fecisset,

¹ *Le Sénat de la République romaine de la guerre d'Hannibal à Auguste* (Rome, 1989), p. 628.