The Traveling Reader: Journeys through Ancient Epigram Books*

REGINA HÖSCHELE

University of Toronto

SUMMARY: In ancient literature writing and reading are frequently equated with wayfaring. Given the origins of the genre, the image of the traveling reader gains a special meaning in the context of epigram collections: the reception situation of epigraphic poetry, which forms part of antiquity's material culture, is transferred to the literary landscape of the bookroll, and the traditional passer-by morphs into a metaphorical wanderer. Just as inscriptions are concerned with catching the traveler's attention, the epigrams contained within a *libellus* have to attract the interest of the reader who is moving through the book.

WHEN VERGIL DECLARES AT THE END OF *GEORGICS* 2 THAT HE HAS CROSSED the immeasurable expanses of the sea and that it is high time to loosen the foaming necks of the horses (*sed nos immensum spatiis confecimus aequor / et iam tempus equum fumantia solvere colla*, 2.541–42), he makes use of a widespread metaphor that equates the writing or reading of poetry with a journey. The travel metaphor is present not only in Augustan literature, but identifiable already in early lyric poetry such as Pindar's odes, where it refers, however, not to the process of reading or writing, but to the oral performance of the song.[1] Given the dissemination of this poetological imagery—further

---

[1] Cf. e.g. *N.* 6.45–46, *I.* 2.33–34 (easy access), *N.* 9.1–2 (imaginary κῶμος), *I.* 3/4.19 (several paths to choose from), *P.* 11.38–39 (poet has lost his way), *P.* 4.247–48 (shortcut), *N.* 5.16, *O.* 3.44–45 (narrative comes to a halt), *O.* 8.54–55 (running through the narrative), fr. 52h.10–12 Snell-Maehler (Homer's carriage-road), *N.*

types will be discussed below—it should not come as a surprise if it also played an important role within the context of epigrammatic *libelli*. Indeed, I would go so far as to claim that the idea of a traveling reader gained a particular meaning in the case of such collections. For if the reader is conceived of as a traveler, then he may be imagined as following in the footsteps of the original audience of inscriptional epigrams—and I shall argue that ancient epigrammatists consciously evoked this aspect.

In what follows I show how epigrams arranged on a (two-dimensional) papyrus scroll might create the sense of a three-dimensional space through which the *lector* moves in the course of his reading. In this regard the concrete materiality of inscribed poetry seems to be transferred into the imaginary space of the book, with the genuine wayfarer morphing into a metaphorical traveler.[2] At the same time the very physicality of the monuments or artifacts on which poems had been inscribed is replaced by the physicality of the bookroll, which constitutes both a material object and a literary landscape. It should be noted beforehand that the travel metaphor was certainly not the only means of giving cohesion to epigram books—we must not expect that it was perceptible throughout a given collection or that it constantly took the same form. What is more, the reader does not necessarily have to slip into the role merely of a traveler, but might also be imagined as a visitor of a temple or an art gallery, both of which evoke further possible settings for inscriptional poetry.

Admittedly, any analysis of this phenomenon is bedeviled by the fact that (with exception of the New Posidippus) no Hellenistic or later Greek epigram books have come down to us intact.[3] However, I share the view most prominently put forward by Kathryn Gutzwiller that Hellenistic poets edited their

---

6.53–54 (carriage-road of earlier poets). For the "Weg des Liedes" in Pindar's poetry cf. Becker 1937: 68–85. Homer's role in the development of the poetological image is disputed, cf. Asper 1997: 24 with further references. It is noteworthy that similar metaphors are found in Vedic texts, cf. Asper 1997: 23 and Nünlist 1998: 228, 255, 265.

[2] This idea has already been expressed by Bing 1988: 63 ("the reader of *this* poem [*AP* 7.26] remains a passerby only figuratively. For he encounters Anacreon's epitaph as he makes his way through the scroll") and Hunter 1992: 116 ("The 'traveller' whom the poet addresses [in *AP* 7.465] is in fact a reader on a poetic journey; the act of travelling, of walking past tombstones, is the act of reading"). However, they both confine themselves to these statements without investigating the concept in detail.

[3] It is still disputed whether the Posidippus papyrus contains an authorially designed poetry book or a collection of epigrams put together by a later editor; for recent studies on the papyrus cf. Acosta-Hughes et al. 2004 and Gutzwiller 2005.

epigrams in artfully arranged collections, which were conceived for a linear reading (cf. Gutzwiller 1998).[4] The image of the traveling or, more generally, the moving reader is clearly discernible here and there and may thus allow us to draw conclusions about its original function within the context of a book. Furthermore, the presence of the travel metaphor within Martial's *Epigrammaton libri* and the *Carmina Priapea* gives us a sense of how it could operate within an epigrammatic oeuvre. Before taking a look at those passages, however, and reflecting upon possible uses of the travel imagery, I offer a brief glance at the metaphor in texts belonging to other genres: considering the wide dissemination of the image, it is the more likely that ancient readers of epigram collections might easily conceive of themselves as travelers on a poetic journey.

1. THE TRAVEL METAPHOR IN ANCIENT LITERATURE

It seems as though the travel image was initially applied, in one form or another, to all sorts of intellectual activities that were characteristic of *oral* discourse, from where it was then transferred to the experience of reading and onto the landscape of the bookroll. First of all, there are certain expressions which are firmly established in everyday language, but nonetheless endowed with a clear metaphorical potential. The Greek verb διέρχομαι, for instance, can be used in the sense of "to go through in detail, recount" (*LSJ* I 6).[5] As Otfrid Becker (1937: 68) pointed out: "Der 'Weg' ist irgendwie Bild für das Wesen der Rede überhaupt" ("The 'path' is somehow an image for the very essence of speech"). Thus we read in the *Iliad*: ἐξείπω καὶ πάντα διίξομαι ("I shall speak and tell you everything," 9.61[6]) and ἐν μοίρῃ γὰρ πάντα διίκεο καὶ κατέλεξας ("for you have spoken wisely throughout," 19.186). Playing on the idea of going through a speech, Socrates remarks in Plato's *Phaedrus*, as he is about to present his first *logos* on Eros (237a): ἐγκαλυψάμενος ἐρῶ, ἵν᾽ ὅτι τάχιστα διαδράμω τὸν λόγον καὶ μὴ βλέπων πρὸς σὲ ὑπ᾽ αἰσχύνης διαπορῶμαι ("I will speak with my head covered, so as to run through the speech as fast as possible and so as not to get embarrassed out of shame when looking at you"). In another passage of the dialogue, we read (264e): εἰς δὲ τοὺς ἑτέρους λόγους ἴωμεν—the step from such a phrase to *Übergangsformeln*

---

[4] *Aliter* Cameron 1995, who, reviving Reitzenstein's once-discredited hypothesis, argues that Hellenistic epigrams were primarily conceived for symposiastic contexts.

[5] Cf. the use of *persequi* in the sense of "to go over, run through in speech or writing (events in a narrative, items in a series, etc.)", *OLD* 8.

[6] If not indicated otherwise, translations are my own.

(transitional formulae) à la Pindar, which frequently made use of the travel metaphor (see below), does not seem huge.[7]

Significantly, at the beginning of the dialogue, Socrates and Phaedrus meet in the street, the young man invites the philosopher to go for a stroll outside the city walls and to listen to Lysias's speech, while they are walking (προϊόντι ἀκούειν, 227b), even if Phaedrus recites the *logos* only after they have sat down under a plane tree. Similarly, in the beginning of Plato's *Theaetetus,* Terpsion and Euclides come across each other in the street and decide to "go through" the notes in which the latter had written down a conversation between Theaetetus and Socrates (143a): ἀλλὰ τί κωλύει νῦν ἡμᾶς διελθεῖν; πάντως ἔγωγε καὶ ἀναπαύσασθαι δέομαι ὡς ἐξ ἀγροῦ ἥκων ("But what prevents us from going through them now? I for my part definitely need a rest, as I am coming from the countryside"). Again it is worth noting that an actual journey is directly followed by the reading of a text.[8]

In any case, the connection between such everyday expressions and the full-fledged metaphor are manifest. Furthermore, ancient mnemotechnics are closely tied to the idea of movement: it is recommended that the orator imagine a room or place where he can 'store' single points of his speech—to recall the items in the correct order, he simply has to revisit them by going through that place.[9] The gradual pacing of the room in the orator's mind is clearly reminiscent of the metaphorical journey that leads the reader through a book.[10] Even though detailed descriptions of this technique are only found in Roman authors (the relevant passages are *ad Her.* 3.28–40, Cic. *de or.* 2.350–60 and Quint. *inst.* 11.2.1–26), it seems likely to have developed earlier.[11]

---

[7] Cf. also Becker's chapter on "Der Weg des λόγος" in Herodotus (101–16): "Da ist die Erzählung, sein λόγος, ein Entlanggehen an den Gegenständen der Wirklichkeit, den großen und den kleinen Städten, die seine Geschichtschreibung berührt. Es ist, wie wenn die Dinge der Wirklichkeit, sobald sie Stoff für die Erzählung sind, eine 'Reihe' bildeten, die die Rede 'durchschreitet'" ("The narrative, his *logos*, is here a journey through the subject-matter of the world, the great cities and the small, upon which his history touches. It is as though the physical objects of the world, as soon as they become subjects of narrative, form up 'in a row' which his discourse 'traverses,'" 1937: 101–2).

[8] In this context it should be observed that walking itself was frequently connected with intellectual activities in antiquity (cf. the Peripatetic school). On the motion of body and mind in the *ambulatio* (which was popular among the Roman elite), cf. O'Sullivan 2006.

[9] On the art of memory in antiquity, cf. Blum 1969, den Boer 1986 and Yates 1972: 1–49.

[10] Konstan 2001 draws a connection between mnemonics and the travel narrative of Pausanias.

[11] Of course, the famous anecdote that presents Simonides as the πρῶτος εὑρετής of mnemotechnics may be projecting a later invention back to the 6th century BCE, but

Turning to poetry, we may observe, first of all, that the Greek word for song, οἴμη, which appears several times in the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 8.73, 8.481, 22.347), closely resembles the word for path or road, οἶμος, which itself can be used with reference to song: the expression οἶμος ἀοιδῆς ("the path of song") first occurs in the Homeric hymn to Hermes (Μούσῃσιν ... / τῇσι χοροί τε μέλουσι καὶ ἀγλαὸς <u>οἶμος ἀοιδῆς</u> /καὶ μολπὴ τεθαλυῖα καὶ ἱμερόεις βρόμος αὐλῶν, 450–52).[12] Even if the exact etymological relation of the two words is unclear, their very similarity suggests a link between path and song, which appears to be intrinsic to Greek thought.[13]

As mentioned above, lyric poets already made use of metaphorical language which identifies composing or performing poetry with undertaking a journey. The numerous forms of this imagery are collected and categorized in Nünlist's 1998 study, *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (228–83). He distinguishes four types according to the means of locomotion: (1) by foot, (2) by carriage, (3) by ship, (4) in flight. It should be noted that, in the archaic and classical ages, it is either the producer or the product, i.e., the poet or the song, which is imagined as walking, driving or flying. As Nünlist observes (238), the image is often used to structure a song by naming significant stops in the journey; the kinetic metaphor may thus serve as an (1) *Anfangs-,* (2) *Übergangs-* or (3) *Abbruchsformel.*[14]

Greek writers and philosophers were clearly concerned with the art of memory (cf. Blum 1969: 38–128).

[12] Cf. also Pi. *O.* 9.47 ἐπέων...οἶμον λιγύν and, later, Call. *Iov.* 78 λύρης...οἴμους.

[13] Cf. Becker 1937: 69. "Wenn also die Vorstellung des Gehens im Liede belegt ist und andererseits das Lied hier mit dem anklingenden Wort οἶμος bezeichnet wird, so besteht zum mindesten große Wahrscheinlichkeit dafür, daß οἴμη mit οἶμος verwandt ist und ursprünglich auch eine Wegvorstellung in sich enthält" ("If, then, there is evidence for the notion of journeying in songs, and song itself is here characterized through the near-homonym οἶμος, then it is at least very likely that οἴμη is related to οἶμος, and that it originally implied the idea of a path"). According to Frisk 1970: 363 a relation between the two words is possible (though he also cites other views). On οἶμος and οἴμη cf. now Giannisi 2006: 65–73.

[14] For (1) cf. e.g. Nünlist 1998: [11.35] Πάρεστι <u>μυρία κέλευθος</u> /ἀμβροσίων μελέων, / ὅς ἂν παρὰ Πιερίδων λά- / χῃσι δῶρα Μουσᾶν (Bacch. 19.1–4): at the beginning of his song Bacchylides reflects upon possible paths he could take. For (2) cf. Nünlist 1998: [11.43] αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ <u>παλίνορσος ἐλεύσομαι</u> ἐς πόρον ὕμνων, / τὸν πρότερον κατέλεξα, λόγου λόγον ἐξοχετεύων (Emp. B 35.1–2 DK): the verses lead over to a subject which Empedocles has already treated. For (3) cf. Nünlist 1998: [11.47] τὸ πόρσω δ' ἐστὶ σοφοῖς <u>ἄβατον</u> / κἀσόφοις. οὔ νιν <u>διώξω</u> κεινὸς εἴην (Pind. *O.* 3.44–5): Pindar marks the end of his song by calling the following "inaccessible" and stating that he will not go any further.

A particularly multi-layered example of a metaphorical carriage ride is provided by Pindar's sixth *Olympian* (22–28):

ὦ Φίντις, ἀλλὰ ζεῦξον ἤ-
  δη μοι σθένος ἡμιόνων,
ᾇ τάχος, ὄφρα κελεύθῳ τ᾽ἐν καθαρᾷ
βάσομεν ὄκχον, ἵκωμαί τε πρὸς ἀνδρῶν
καὶ γένος· κεῖναι γὰρ ἐξ ἀλ-
  λᾶν ὁδὸν ἀγεμονεῦσαι
ταύταν ἐπίστανται, στεφάνους ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ
ἐπεὶ δέξαντο· χρὴ τοίνυν πύλας ὕ-
  μνων ἀναπιτνάμεν αὐταῖς·
πρὸς Πιτάναν δὲ παρ᾽ Εὐρώ-
  τα πόρον δεῖ σάμερον ἐλθεῖν ἐν ὥρᾳ.

Oh Phintis, come yoke at once the strong mules for me, as quickly as possible, so that we may drive our chariot on a clear path and I may come to his family's very lineage, because those mules beyond all others know how to lead the way on that road, for they won crowns at Olympia. Therefore we must throw open for them the gates of song, for today it is necessary to go to Pitana by the course of the Eurotas in good time (transl. Race 1997).[15]

This stanza transforms the concrete ride of Hagesias, whose victory in the mule race is being celebrated, into the poet's figurative journey, intermingling, as it were, a real-life event with the singer's activities. The apostrophe to the charioteer Phintis and the reference to the garland-winning mules link the passage to the actual competition, while the metapoetic dimension of the image is made explicit by the mention of the song's doors (πύλας ὕμνων, 27). The coupling of concrete event and poetological imagery is remarkable, insofar as we may observe a similar phenomenon in epigrammatic *libelli*.

Even if the recipient of archaic and classical poetry does not appear in the role of a traveler,[16] it seems only a short step to transfer the metaphor to the reader (or listener). In the above-quoted passage from the *Georgics* (2.541–42), for instance, *nos* might refer to both the speaker and his addressees, insofar as the audience accompanies the poet on his figurative journey. In any case, the shift of the metaphor's focus from producer to recipient may well be related

---

[15] For this stanza cf. Goldhill 1991: 150–51, Asper 1997: 28–30 and Nünlist 1998: 255–56.

[16] Renaud Gagné has pointed out to me that there is, however, one genre in which the recipient appears in the role of a traveler early on: the initiatory poetry of the 'Orphic' gold tablets (on which cf. Edmonds, forthcoming). Yet this does not change the fact that the metaphor is principally applied to the poet/song in early lyric poetry.

to the fact that readers of Hellenistic poetry are granted a more active part in the creation of meaning than the recipients of oral performances: it is hardly a coincidence that many of the texts of the period reflect an increasing consciousness of the recipient's role. This too, together with the *Appellstruktur* of inscribed epigrams (cf. Meyer 2005 and below), which are explicitly addressed to ὁδῖται, would have favored the application of the travel metaphor to the reader. A fragment of Callimachus's *Victoria Berenices* illustrates the reader's newly gained importance (57.1–2 Pf = *SH* 264.1–2; cf. Bing 1995: 123–24):

> αὐτὸς ἐπιφράσσαιτο, τάμοι δ᾽ ἄπο μῆκος ἀοιδῇ·
>   ὅσσα δ᾽ ἀνειρομένῳ φῆ[σ]ε, τάδ᾽ ἐξερέω.

> He [= the reader] may imagine it for himself and thus cut short the length of the song. But what he replied to his question, that I shall narrate.

The distich probably belongs to a passage which described Heracles' return to his host Molorchus after the defeat of the Nemean lion. Here we see the poet turning aside in a metanarrative remark: he tells his readers to picture the hero's struggle against the monster themselves[17]—being Callimachus, he obviously does not want to deal in detail with such a well known and stereotyped theme (cf. Fuhrer 1992: 71–75, 121–25 and Fuhrer 1993: 85–86). We may compare similar *Abbruchsformeln* in Pindar, e.g. *P.* 4.247–48:

> μακρά μοι νεῖσθαι κατ᾽ ἀμαξιτόν· ὥρα
>   γὰρ συνάπτει. καί τινα
> οἶμον ἴσαμι βραχύν.

> Going along the carriage road would take too long. For the hour urges and I know a shortcut.[18]

These verses not only offer an early example of the travel metaphor, but also shed a special light upon the Callimachean fragment. For despite their similarities the two passages are marked by a fundamental difference first pointed out by Peter Bing: "In all earlier instances—and the passage from *Pythian* 4 is a good example—it is exclusively the *poet* who undertakes to shorten the poem. In fr. 57, by contrast, it is the *reader,* for the poet expressly invites him to imagine the rest for himself and thus abridge the poem" (Bing 1995: 124). Of course, the author still controls the narrative, since *he* chooses what the reader should add. But the fact that the recipient is explicitly invited to this

---

[17] Even if Callimachus does not address his audience directly (he uses a third person singular), Pfeiffer's interpretation αὐτός *sc.* ὁ ἀναγιγνώσκων *vel* ὁ ἀκούων *ipse excogitet quid aliud fecerint* is convincing; see also D'Alessio 1997: 463.

[18] Fuhrer 1992: 74 argues that Callimachus alludes to this very passage.

sort of *Ergänzungsspiel* (to use Bing's term) shows how much importance is granted to him and his abilities.

Such highlighting of the recipient's role is typical of Hellenistic poetry. Of course, the use of the travel imagery with regard to the author was not abolished. What changed was the spectrum of the poetological metaphor that could henceforth be applied to the reader. This shift seems not least due to the establishment of the book as the new medium of poetry.[19] To be sure, an oral audience might immediately react to (or even interrupt) what is being sung, but basically auditors are forced to follow the performance as it is presented to them. By contrast, a book reader is able to decide the course of reception: he can accelerate his reading, slow it down, interrupt it, pass certain things by or reread them—and thus he acquires more power over the text.[20] In the words of Roland Barthes (1973: 19): "nous ne lisons pas tout avec la même intensité de lecture; un rythme s'établit, désinvolte, peu respectueux à l'égard de *l'intégrité* du texte" ("we do not read everything with the same intensity; a rhythm establishes itself, unconstrained, hardly respectful towards the *integrity* of the text")—for him the pleasure of the text lies exactly in the fact that he can "run, jump, raise the head and dive in again" ("je cours, je saute, je lève la tête, je replonge." Barthes 1973: 20). The process by which the book gained its hegemonic status with regard to the writing and receiving of poetry, is, of course, far more complex than just indicated, but the appearance of bookish literature most probably led to the emergence of the recipient as a figure to be reckoned with.

Reading *per se* is a movement in time, a linear moving forward within the text—it is not hard to see why one would conceive of it as a journey. Indeed, the very act of gradually unrolling a papyrus, i.e., the continuous forward motion within the medium,[21] might have aroused associations with a voyage. In the case of narrative texts, moreover, the "reading of plot," as defined

[19] For the bookish character and self-reflexivity of Hellenistic poetry cf. esp. Bing 1988.

[20] For the reader's power in the context of lyric collections and multidirectional readings cf. Miller 1994. According to him the reader is supposed to receive the poems "in terms of one another" (74) and, by a complex process of rereading and relating single texts to other parts of the book, he may construct various narratives of his own. Johnson 2000: 607 notes that a written text cannot transport paralinguistic elements such as intonation, facial expression, eye contact, body language, etc., and remarks: "reading becomes, then, in large part the reader's attempt to project illocutionary force into the bare locutionary signals of the written script." Cf. too 620: "A surprising amount of the burden to interpret the text was shifted from author to reader."

[21] For the idea of unrolling a book cf. Posidippus 118.17 Austin-Bastianini 2002 (βίβλον ἑλίσσων) and Marcus Argentarius *AP* 9.161.1 (Ἡσιόδου ποτὲ βίβλον ἐμαῖς ὑπὸ χερσὶν ἑλίσσων).

by Peter Brooks, can be characterized as "a form of desire that carries us forward, onward, through the text" (Brooks 1984: 37).[22] That is to say, our eagerness to reach the end of a book may suggest the wish of a traveler to arrive at the terminus and our moving forward within the text can easily be equated with such a journey. To be sure, the textuality of poetry collections differs substantially from the textuality of continuous narratives, but insofar as ancient authors conceived them for a linear reading, the recipient may be said to strive for the closure of the final poem all the same.[23]

Correspondingly, the endings of books frequently coincide with the end of a journey (as in the case of *Georgics* 2),[24] whereas the idea of setting out on a trip is commonly evoked at the beginning of a work. It seems, for instance, significant that the Apollo of the *Aetia* prologue tells Callimachus to avoid broad and busy roads and to move along small, untrodden paths,[25] since this paraenesis casts the poet in the role of someone who is about to go on a trip.

[22] On narrative desire cf. Brooks 1984: 37–61.

[23] On the linear reading of poetry collections cf. e.g. Zetzel 1980: 63 on Horace's *Satires*: "The only significant chronology in a *liber* of this sort is that of unrolling the book: that we are to read the first poem before the second, the second before the third. The order of reading creates its own dramatic time, and neither the Eclogues nor the Satires ever violate it. Any interpretation that takes the poems out of order separates them from the literal unrolling of time and ignores the poet's clear intention."

[24] For the end of a book = end of a journey cf. e.g. Ov. *ars* 1.771–72 *pars superat coepti, pars est exhausta, laboris; / hic teneat nostras ancora iacta rates* and Ov. *ars* 3.809–10 *lusus habet finem: cygnis descendere tempus, / duxerunt collo qui iuga nostra suo.* Lucretius identifies his sixth and last book with the final stage of a race, asking Calliope to show the way (6.92–5): *tu mihi supremae praescripta ad candida calcis / currenti spatium praemonstra, callida musa / Calliope, requies hominum divumque voluptas, / te duce ut insigni capiam cum laude coronam.* The race-course image is also evoked by Meleager *AP* 12.257.1: Ἁ πύματον καμπτῆρα καταγγέλλουσα κορωνίς. Just as Meleager plays with the double meaning of κορωνίς (a *coronis* was used to mark the end of a text or passage in ancient papyri, but the word can also mean 'crown' and thus allude to the title of Meleager's anthology: *Stephanos,* cf. Bing 1988: 34), Lucretius's wish to gain the *corona* might arouse associations with the κορωνίς (thereby reversing Meleager's pun).

[25] *Aet.* 1 fr. 1. 25–28 Pf: πρὸς δέ σε] καὶ τόδ' ἄνωγα, τὰ μὴ πατέουσιν ἄμαξαι / τὰ στείβειν, ἑτέρων ἴχνια μὴ καθ' ὁμά / δίφρον ἐλᾶν μηδ' οἷμον ἀνὰ πλατύν, ἀλλὰ κελεύθους / ἀτρίπτο]υς, εἰ καὶ στεινοτέρην ἐλάσεις. ("I further order you to move along roads which are not used by carriages, do not steer your cart, following the tracks of others, along a broad lane, but along untrodden paths, even if this means driving along a narrower trail"). The two routes obviously symbolize two different ways of writing poetry, with the positive path standing for Callimachus's own oeuvre (cf. Asper 1997: 71–72). What kind of literature Apollo/Callimachus rejects, is disputed: while many scholars think that it is (epigonous) epic poetry, Cameron 1995 argues that Callimachus is against the writing of long elegies. For the reception of this passage in Augustan poetry cf. Wimmel 1960: 103–11.

Apollonius's *Argonautica* can, in turn, be regarded as the very paradigm of a "textual journey," insofar as the Argo's voyage constitutes an analogue to the epic itself or, in the words of David Wray, "the text iconizes its own telling, mimics its subject as much as it imitates it" (Wray 2000: 244).[26] At the end of the poem the narrator proudly declares that he has reached the κλυτὰ πείρατα (4.1775) of the struggles of his heroes; their disembarkment at Pagasae, which is contained in the final word εἰσαπέβητε (4.1781), may, on a metapoetic level emblematize the reader's arrival at the end of the bookroll (cf. Wray 2000: 244).[27]

In Theocritus's *Thalysia* the narrator Simichidas and his two companions, who are on their way to a harvest festival, run into the goatherd Lycidas; for a while they travel together and recite songs to each other (*Id.* 7.35–6): ἀλλ᾽ ἄγε δή, ξυνὰ γὰρ ὁδός, ξυνὰ δὲ καὶ ἀώς, / βουκολιασδώμεσθα. ("Come on, we share the way, we share the hour—let us sing bucolic songs!"). The recital of the songs is thus parallel to their moving forward, which again illustrates the analogy between traveling and writing/reading poetry.[28] In this context one may also recall the end of Horace's fifth satire, whose speaker states *Brundisium longae finis chartaeque uiaeque* (1.5.104), thereby identifying the end of an actual trip with the poem in which it is described.[29]

Probably in allusion to Horace's line Apuleius has Lucius observe at one point: *is nobis finis et sermonis et itineris communis fuit* (1.21). At the beginning of the *Golden Ass* the narrator had come across a man who was in the midst of telling an incredible story. Out of sheer curiosity, Lucius asks him to start his narrative over again from the beginning: *sed iam cedo tu sodes, qui coeperas, fabulam remetire* (1.4). The request *fabulam remetire* equates the repetition of the narrated story with the pacing anew of a distance already covered.[30] Later on, Lucius enthusiastically declares that listening to this story has made the exhausting way a lot easier for him and claims that he has not ridden on the

---

[26] On the voyage of the Argo cf. also Clare 2002.

[27] Wray furthermore equates the Argo's arrival at the mouth of the river Phasis at the end of book 2 with the reader's reaching of the poem's midpoint: Apollonius calls Kolchis ἔσχατα πείρατα (2.1261), "the point furthest from home and also furthest from the poem's beginning and end."

[28] On the 7th *Idyll* and its topographical references cf. Krevans 1983.

[29] For an interpretation of the fifth satire as an "inconsequent journey" cf. Gowers 1993.

[30] In a way this can be seen as a definition of narrative *per se*, insofar as it always is a repetition of something, "a going over again of a ground already covered" (Brooks 1984: 97).

back of his horse, but on his own ears.[31] Here the recipient is clearly cast in the role of a traveler, as the narrative is embedded in a concrete journey.

Last, I would like to draw attention to the fact that Ovid in the *Metamorphoses* playfully reverses the traditional identification of a book's conclusion with the end of a trip by sending his characters on journeys at the very end of certain books (cf. Holzberg 1998): Phaethon travels to the palace of the sun (1→2), Zeus/the bull hastens away with Europa on his back (2→3), Calais and Zetes and the rest of the Argonauts sail toward Colchis (6→7), Glaucus swims from Sicily to Latium (13→14). By chiastically associating departures and arrivals with the ends and the beginnings of books (contrary to the usual implications of the travel imagery), Ovid in a way deconstructs the crossing points between his *libri*.[32]

These few examples should give an initial idea of how the poetological image was made functional by authors writing in different genres.[33] Significantly, the notion of a poetic journey is often not simply evoked as such, but may be embedded in a context which itself is concerned with traveling.

2. THE ACCIDENTAL READER AND THE POETICS OF STONE EPIGRAMS

In the case of epigrammatic *libelli* the image of a traveling reader inevitably evokes the original setting of inscribed poetry: the metaphorical wayfarer is a transformed version of the ὁδίτης commonly addressed in stone epigrams[34]—and the strategies by which epigraphic texts try to attract the attention of passers-by continue to live on in a modified form. To see how the literary topos is merged with the conventions of this sub-literary genre, let us take a look at the materiality and textuality of inscriptions, before moving on to the traveling reader.

Many stone epigrams ask the traveler to stop and read the inscription, as does a 5th century epitaph from Eretria (*Carmina epigraphica graeca*, henceforth *CEG* 108.1–2):

---

[31] *Sed ego huic et credo hercule et gratas gratias memini, quod lepidae fabulae festivitate nos avocavit, asperam denique ac prolixam viam sine labore ac taedio evasi. Quod beneficium etiam illum vectorem meum credo laetari, sine fatigatione sui me usque ad istam civitatis portam non dorso illius sed meis auribus pervecto* (1.20).

[32] On Ovidian book transitions cf. also Wheeler 1999: 87–93.

[33] Cf. also the entanglement of reading and traveling in Seneca's *Epistles*, as discussed by Montiglio 2006. In the context of Seneca's Stoic doctrine wandering about is generally seen as a sign of a restless soul—both with regard to actual journeys and to intellectual activities (567: "unstructured travel is both a behavioral equivalent and a metaphor for dispersive reading.")

[34] On the passer-by in archaic and classical epigrams cf. Tueller (forthcoming).

χαίρετε τοὶ παριό | ντες, : ἐγὸ δὲ θανὸν | κατάκειμαι. :
δεῦρ | ο ἰὸν ἀνάνεμαι, ἀν | ἐρ τίς τέδε τέθαπ|πται· : [35]

Hello, you who are passing by, while I am dead and lie there. Come here and read which man is buried at this spot…

The implications of such a text seem to be paradoxical. For the request can only be received by people who have already stopped and are already reading the epigram. In most cases the addressee will be a traveler who happens to come along and does not necessarily expect to find an epigram on his way. Therefore he might be called an accidental reader—even though the monument and its inscription try to attract his attention, it is anything but guaranteed that they will succeed in doing so. As Peter Bing has pointed out, many inscriptions are likely to have been more or less ignored by passers-by, since their physical location—in general below eye-level—does not favor reading. Furthermore literary evidence for the reception of stone epigrams is extremely scarce (cf. Bing 2002).

Be that as it may, a number of inscriptions contain self-reflexive statements that transcend their alleged "subliterariness," and the means by which they try to appeal to readers can be rather subtle. The struggle for the traveler's attention can in fact be regarded as a constitutive element of epigraphic poetry.[36] Even though there were masses of stereotyped inscriptions, characterized by ready-made formulae and without any particular sign of self-awareness, some outstanding poems may serve to illustrate the poetics of inscribed texts.

Epigrams chiseled on stone are made to last: they are immobile, constant and unchanging. This unchangeability is reflected in a 5th century inscription that accompanied a bronze statue no longer extant (*CEG* 286):

πᾶσιν ἴσ᾽ ἀνθρόποι |ς ηυποκ |ρίνομαι ηόστις ἐ[ρ|ο]τᾶι : |
    ηός μ᾽ ἀνέθεκ᾽ ἀνδ|ρôν· ᾽Αντι | φάνες δεκάτεν.

I give the same answer to everyone who asks which man has dedicated me: Antiphanes as a tithe.

---

[35] For the type "Geh nicht vorüber," "Bleib stehn und lies" cf. *GV* 1302–1329. The role of the roadside monument in inscribed epigrams is discussed by Bruss 2005: 38–57.

[36] Walsh 1991: 92 calls the reader's indifference "a basic pre-condition of epitaph." For the strategies by which epitaphs nonetheless try to attract the passer-by's attention cf. Meyer 2005. See also Svenbro 1993: 44–63 on how the written word appropriates the reader's voice. The efforts to make the passer-by stop and read are wittily turned upside down by a couple of fictitious epitaphs concerning the misanthrope Timon, who warns the wayfarer not to approach his tomb (cf. *AP* 7.314–16, 319–20).

The last two words suffice to give us the information needed, but the author of the epigram decided to stage a dialogue between the monument and its accidental reader, into which the basic inscription is, so to speak, inserted. The dative πᾶσιν ἀνθρόποις and the relative pronoun ὅστις, "whoever," indicate that everyone is addressed, the audience being unspecified and all-inclusive.

The stone epigram thus attempts to force the passer-by to show an interest in the dedicator that he might not have felt at all. What I find particularly remarkable about this inscription, though, is the expression ἴσα ὑποκρίνομαι, for it self-consciously reflects the immutability of something chiseled on stone (cf. Svenbro 1993: 28). Given the circumstances of transmission in antiquity, changes are hardly avoidable in texts written on and repeatedly copied from papyri. By way of contrast, the wording of our epigram has, indeed, remained the same to this very day. Similarly, the epitaph quoted above states that the deceased's mother has put an "untiring stele" (στέλεν ἀκάματον, 5) on his tomb "which will tell passers-by constantly and every day: 'Timarete has erected me <on the grave> of her dead beloved son'" (ἡάτις ἐρεῖ παριδσι δια | μερὲς ἄματα πάντα· / Τ | ιμαρέτε μ.' ἔσστεσε φίλ | οι ἐπὶ παιδὶ θανόντι, *CEG* 108.6–7).

The stone is there to keep the memory of a dead person or a dedicator alive; it reaches out to future generations and tries to convey messages on behalf of people who are absent from the site of inscription.[37] Even though writing is a constituent element of epigraphic poetry, inscribed epigrams often imitate situations of oral communication by imagining dialogues between the reader and the deceased or the reader and the monument.[38] The concepts of written-ness and orality are wittily juxtaposed by an epitaph from the 2nd or 1st century BCE. In fact, this poem may serve as a paradigm of how literary and material culture intersected on the 'material side,' as opposed to their intersection in literary texts (*Griechische Versinschriften,* henceforth *GV* 1729.1–4):

[π]ρὶν μὲν Ὁμήρειο[ι γρα]φίδες φιλ[οδέσπο]τον ἦθος
    Εὐμαίου χρυσέαις ἔκλαγον ἐν σελίσιν·
σεῦ δὲ καὶ εἰν Ἀίδαο σαόφρονα μῆτιν ἀείσει,
    Ἴναχ', ἀείμνηστον γράμμα λαλεῦσα πέτρη [...]

Homer's stylus once cried aloud the faithful nature of Eumaeus in golden columns, but your prudent counsel, Inachus, will be sung, even when you are in Hades, by the stone, which speaks through ever-remembering letters…

---

[37] On the role of κλέος cf. Svenbro 1993: 5–25. For the "monument as guarantor of posthumous fame" in Latin inscriptions cf. Häusle 1980.

[38] Cf. the "Dialog-Gedichte" in Peek (1831–1887 *GV*).

This poem is exceptional in more than one regard, starting, as it does, with a reference to the *Odyssey*.[39] While modern philology assigns Homer's epics to an oral tradition, they are firmly associated with the idea of writing here (γραφίδες, σελίσιν—note, however, the verb ἔκλαγον, which evokes the notion of song). By way of contrast, the inscribed stone has taken over the function of a bard singing the fame of Inachus (ἀείσει, λαλεῦσα). The epigram's author seems to see himself as Homer's equal (the *Iliad*'s μῆνιν ἄειδε is allusively turned into μῆτιν ἀείσει), and, what is more, he even presents his ambitious little poem as ever-lasting, while Homer's works are ascribed to the past (πρὶν ... ἔκλαγον)—the pages on which the epic is written may be golden, but the future belongs to the solid stone of Inachus's tomb. Thus the poetological debate between writers of minor and major genres, well-known from Hellenistic and Roman poetry, seems to be reflected by and adapted to an epigraphic text. The inscription was obviously influenced by Hellenistic literature (it would be unthinkable in the archaic or classical period) and can serve as an example of the process by which the lapidary origins of epigrams were modified through the advent of book poetry.[40] The border line between inscriptional and literary epigrams is therefore not as easily defined as one might think.

A 3rd century epitaph from Smyrna also characterizes its stone as speaking, with the self-aware reservation that, by its very nature, it should not be able to do so (*GV* 1745.3–4): ξεστὰ δὲ πέτρα καθύπερθε ἀγορεύει, / τὸν νέκυν ἀφθόγγῳ φθεγγομένα στόματι. ("The polished stone on top speaks, talking of the deceased with a silent mouth"). Stones, then, seem to have gained the ability to talk, but not every passer-by will be able to read. This problem is wittily reflected upon in an epitaph from Alexandria (2nd century bce, *GV* 1312):

εἰ καὶ βουκόλοι ἄνδρες | ὁδὸν διαμείβετε τήνδε,
    καὶ ποίμνας οἵων | φέρβετε μηλονόμοι,
ἀλλὰ σὺ Μουσείοις καμ[άτο]ις | τεθραμμέν᾽ ὁδῖτα, |
    ἴσχε καὶ αὐδήσας | "σῆμ᾽ Ἀλίνης" ἄπιθι.
"χαῖρ᾽" εἰπὼν δὶς [δ᾽ α]ὑτὸς | ἔχοις τόδε. τέκνα δὲ λείπω |
    τρίζυγα καὶ ποθέοντα | ἄνδρα λέλοιπα δόμοις.

---

[39] For references/allusions to the *Odyssey* in inscribed epigrams, cf. Bing (forthcoming).

[40] Whereas there are numerous studies on the influence of inscriptional poetry on book epigrams, hardly anyone has examined the appropriation of literary texts by the anonymous authors of epigraphic poems; on this phenomenon cf. now Bettenworth 2007.

Even if you cowherds travel this road, and you shepherds feed your flocks of sheep, nonetheless you, wayfarer, reared in the Muses' labors, stop and, saying 'This is Aline's tomb,' go your way. Add 'Farewell,' and may you fare doubly so. I leave a brace of three children at home, I have left a husband who yearns for me.

<div align="right">

(Translation by Peter Bing [http://www.classics.emory.edu/indivFacPages/bing/publications/bing01.html]).

</div>

This truly is an Alexandrian text *par exellence*, presupposing a learned audience. Surprisingly, and contrary to the epigraphic tradition, the addressees of the first distich are more or less given permission to pass by without so much as looking at the inscription—only the educated ὁδίτης, who is said to be "reared in the Muses' labors," is asked to stop and read the epigram. It appears as though Aline, who could be a poetess (at least she presents herself as a very cultivated woman), wanted to appeal exclusively to a genuinely learned audience.[41] However, for a sophisticated reader the given task seems fairly simple: at first sight all he is asked to do is read a mini-inscription saying "Aline's tomb" and bid her farewell. Admittedly, that is a plea even the dumbest cowboy could fulfill—if he was able to decipher the epigram in the first place.

Even though literacy in antiquity was far lower than it is today (on ancient literacy cf. Harris 1989), one cannot rule out the possibility that some herdsmen would have been able to read the text.[42] Nonetheless, I think that the inscription essentially excluded illiterate persons as possible readers, thereby creating a peculiar form of performative self-contradiction: for this means that its first distich addresses people who are unable to receive what is being said.[43] Interestingly, the βουκόλοι and μηλονόμοι play no role at all in the rest of the epigram—obviously, they can be ignored due to their illiteracy.

---

[41] This is the view of Bing 1998. According to Rossi 2001: 59–60 the addressee has to be a poet himself. For Sens 2006: 147 there is an "apparent contradiction between the professions of those who frequent the locale, on the one hand, and the learning expected of its intended readers, on the other."

[42] Merle Langdon has discovered 6th century graffiti in Attica presumably written by shepherds while they tended their flocks. (These inscriptions have not yet been published.)

[43] *Aliter* Sens 2006: 147, for whom the apostrophe implies that the shepherds addressed in the beginning are in fact able to read. For the representation of an illiterate shepherd cf. a fragment from Euripides' *Theseus* (Kannicht *TGF* 382), in which the βοτὴρ ἀγράμματος tries to decipher the hero's name by describing the form of its letters: ἐγὼ πέφυκα γραμμάτων μὲν οὐκ ἴδρις, / μορφὰς δὲ λέξω καὶ σαφῆ τεκμήρια (1–2); the passage is imitated in Agathon's *Telephus* (Athen. 10.454d = Snell *TGF* 4).

But what about the learned shepherd poets, known to us, for instance, from the *Corpus Theocriteum*? In the context of Hellenistic literature it seems, in fact, possible that the poem offered an ironic inversion of that motif. Theocritus's vision of bucolic poets, who compose verses imbued with sophisticated learning despite the simplicity of their surroundings, is thoroughly undermined by the picture given here: instead of representing the Hellenistic ideal of erudition, herdsmen serve as paradigms of ignorance. In a way, then, the poetic creation of a pastoral world is deconstructed in terms of a more realistic and pragmatic approach to shepherding. At the same time, the text wittily suggests that whoever passes by without paying any attention belongs to the (despised) category of illiterate βουκόλοι.[44] The distinct opposition between herdsmen and Muses might furthermore recall the making of the first shepherd poet ever: while Hesiod is tending his flocks on Mt. Helicon, the Muses appear and insult the entire group of ποιμένες as ἄγραυλοι, κάκ᾽ ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον ("rustics, wretched disgraces, mere bellies," *Th.* 26). Aline seems to follow the Muses' dictum when considering shepherds unworthy of receiving her message.

Of course, the characterization of the traveler as "being nurtured in the Muses' labors" implies more than merely the ability to read. The epigram plays exactly on the notion of learnedness, by ironically rejecting the uninitiated and reflecting upon the implications of true sophistication. Even though the reader is confronted with a rather undemanding task, he must, indeed, be sophisticated to see through this multi-layered game and appreciate the poem as a whole: Aline invites the addressee to recognize himself in her description of an erudite reader and thus creates an elite audience for herself—whereas most inscriptions are primarily concerned with eliciting pity from *any* passer-by.

In any case, Aline addresses an accidental reader. Whoever answered her plea hardly came along for the inscription's sake. By way of contrast, the *lector* of an epigram collection consciously chooses to read the poems presented to him therein. Earlier I have called the requests to stop and read paradoxical. However, they do serve a certain purpose: they underline how important it is for the passer-by to read on and try to make sure that he does *not* continue his journey before finishing the epigram at hand and doing whatever else he is asked to do. Given that the reader most probably has something else on his mind, he is likely to move on after just a cursory glance—if in fact he has

---

[44] It should be noted that Βουκόλοι was also the name of a people living in the marches east of Alexandria, who were feared as hijackers and can hardly be called cultivated (cf. Hel. *Eth.* 2.17 and Ach. Tat. 4.12).

noticed the poem at all. The authors of such inscriptions were aware of this risk, as is shown by a 6th century epitaph found near Dipylum (*CEG* 28):

> ἄνθρωπε hὸστείχε[ι]ς : καθ' ὁδὸ | ν : φρασὶν : ἄλα μενοινῶν, :
>   στε̂θι | καὶ οἴκτιρον : σε̂μα Θράσονος : ἰδόν.

> You, man, who are walking along the road, having other things on your mind, stand still and mourn, when you see the tomb of Thrason.

Even if the *lector* of an epigram collection is not an accidental reader, it is anything but guaranteed that he will pay equal attention to each and every poem—or, in fact, that he will continue his reading until the end of the book. Given the high number of very short texts contained in a *libellus*, it is extremely difficult to keep someone entertained all the way through—a problem which is continually reflected upon by Martial (cf. e.g. 1.16, 1.118, 2.1, 2.6, 4.29, 4.82, 7.85, 8.29, 10.1, 11.107 and Höschele [forthcoming c]). The efforts of inscribed poetry to grab the attention of passers-by seem to live on in a modified form within the context of epigram collections. To be sure, authors of all genres face the difficulty of having to thrill their readers so that they do not break off their reading.[45] But in the case of poetry books, which consist of many single texts, the danger of being distracted or losing one's concentration is much higher than in the case of continuous narratives, since the text as a whole dissolves into a myriad of tiny components: a reading that takes place in countless little steps might easily tempt us to skip single elements.[46]

While an inscription primarily wants the traveler to interrupt his journey, the composers of epigram collections seem to pursue a double strategy. On the one hand, the reader must, again and again, be seduced into paying attention to single epigrams, on the other he has to be convinced that it is worthwhile to continue his poetic journey. The next stop on his way (which may be of no importance in the case of actual travelers) is also part of the poetic universe constituted by the landscape of a bookroll. What in inscriptions, then, is an effort to grab a passer-by's attention, becomes in books an effort to keep it over a series of poems.

---

[45] In her study of the second book of the *Ars Amatoria,* Sharrock 1994 has, for instance, illustrated how the second point of Ovid's didactic program (*tenere puellam*) mirrors, on a metapoetic level, the poet's efforts to keep his readers interested.

[46] Cf. Bing 1995: 121: "And the possibility of neglect is heightened by the very format of the «Anthology» or «Collection» … which invites us to dip in here or there, to pick and choose whatever happens to catch our eye, rather than read its parts with equal intensity throughout, as one might a single continuous work…"

3. *LASSUS TAM CITO DEFICIS VIATOR?*
THE TRAVEL METAPHOR IN MARTIAL

The notion of a traveling reader is repeatedly evoked by Martial. In 2.6, for instance, he asks Severus why he urges him to edit his books, even though he can hardly read two columns without starting to yawn and look out for the last page. The poet concludes his vituperation by inquiring (2.6.14–16):

> lassus tam cito deficis viator,
> et, cum currere debeas Bovillas,
> interiungere quaeris ad Camenas?

> Do you also get tired so quickly while traveling and do you, when you have to hurry to Bovillae, already desire to rest at the site of the Camenae?

One could hardly wish for a more evident parallel between reading and traveling! Bovillae is situated about 12 miles from Rome, the shrine of the Camenae was very close to the city's walls—so the image itself is clear. But maybe we could go a bit further and wonder whether there is a metapoetic touch to the places chosen by Martial to illustrate his point. For if we derive the name of Bovillae from *bovis*,[47] we might recall that one of the most prominent features of cows or bulls are their horns—and the *cornua* of a bookroll mark exactly the final destination of our literary trip, as is shown by Martial 11.107.1: *explicitum nobis usque ad sua cornua librum*.[48] In this case, it should not surprise us that the first stop of Severus is said to be the site of the Camenae, local goddesses commonly identified with the Muses—since many books opened with an invocation of these goddesses their shrine might, in fact, iconize the very beginning of the *liber*.[49]

---

[47] A connection between *bovis* and *Bovillae* seems to be created by Cicero (*ad Att.* 5.13.1), who ironically calls the murder of Clodius (which took place in Bovillae) *pugna Bovillana* (on which cf. Georges 1998: "scherzh[aft] u[nd] wahrscheinlich im Wortspiel mit bovillus [=Rinder-]"). Cf. also Ov. *Fast.* 3.661–74: before telling the story of Anna of Bovillae, Ovid mentions the possibility of identifying Anna Perenna with Io, the *Inachia bovis* (3.657–8)—this too suggests a link between *bovis* and *Bovillae*.

[48] For *cornua* (= horns of a bookroll) cf. Besslich 1973 and Ishøy 2006: 71–2. In Roman poetry the term is used only here, at Ov. *Trist.* 1.1.8 and [Tib] 3.1.13. At the end of *Metamorphoses* book 2 Ovid seems to play with the materiality of the *liber*, by evoking the popular motif of Europa's abduction: *respicit et dextra cornum tenet, altera dorso / imposita est* (*Met.* 2.874f.): both the reader and the girl are holding a horn in their hands when reaching the end of the scroll, cf. Wheeler 1999: 93. See also Barchiesi 1997: 187 on the end of book 15 (Cipus) and Holzberg 1998: 83–84 on the end of book 8 (Achelous's horn).

[49] This metapoetic reading is still possible, though Martial himself does not start his book with such an invocation.

The notion of a traveling reader is also evoked at the beginning of book 2. In the prose epistle that precedes the epigrams, Martial playfully claims that writing such an introduction is unnecessary. Thanks to Decianus (the letter's addressee, who was against a long preface), readers who come across the book will not arrive at the first page in a state of exhaustion: *debebunt tibi si qui in hunc librum <u>inciderint</u>, quod ad primam paginam <u>non lassi pervenient</u>* (note especially the adjective *lassus*, also used with reference to Severus in 2.6.14). Readers who have reached the end of an epigram book may, however, rightly be characterized as tired—the fourth *libellus* nonetheless wants to move on:

> Ohe, iam satis est, ohe, libelle,
> iam <u>pervenimus</u> usque ad umbilicos.
> tu <u>procedere</u> adhuc et <u>ire</u> quaeris,
> nec summa potes in scheda teneri,
> sic tamquam tibi res peracta non sit,   5
> quae prima quoque pagina peracta est.
> iam lector queriturque deficitque,
> iam librarius hoc et ipse dicit
> "Ohe, iam satis est, ohe libelle."   (4.89)

> Whoa, that's enough, whoa, little book, we have already reached the navel (= roller-stick). But you want to advance further and keep going, you cannot even be held at the final sheet, as though your business had not been finished on the first page. The reader is already complaining and grows weary, and the copyist himself says 'Whoa, that's enough, whoa, little book.'

The expression *iam pervenimus usque ad umbilicos* (2) casts both author and reader in the role of wayfarers reaching their destination.[50] By way of contrast, the book wants to continue the journey and is thus presented as a restless traveler, who ignores the exhaustion of his companions (*deficere,* 8, also appears in 2.6.14).

The mobility of the book marks a fundamental difference between inscribed and literary epigrams: just as Pindar famously contrasted his songs, which travel around the world, with statues forever fixed on their basis (*N.* 5.1, Οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ'…), poems gathered on a bookroll can be carried around, whereas epigraphic texts are tied to one spot.[51] Accordingly, the *libellus* is already introduced as a travel companion at the very beginning of

---

[50] For *umbilicus* cf. Hor. *epod.* 14.8 *ad umbilicum adducere* (with reference to the author) and *AP* 9.540.1 Μὴ ταχὺς Ἡρακλείτου ἐπ' ὀμφαλὸν εἴλεε βίβλον.

[51] To be sure, some stone epigrams were copied from their original setting and thus entered the realm of books (for this process cf. Gutzwiller 1998: 47–52), but that does not change the basic conditions of epigraphic poetry.

Martial's first book.[52] The author advertises a bookseller in whose shop one can purchase a handy edition of his epigrams (1.2.1–4).

> Qui tecum cupis esse meos ubicumque libellos
>   et comites longae quaeris habere viae,
> hos eme, quos artat brevibus membrana tabellis:
>   scrinia da magnis, me manus una capit.

> If you wish that my little books be with you everywhere and accompany you on long trips, then buy these that are compressed in small pages by the parchment: reserve the chests for large books—I can be held in a single hand.

In this poem, the medium is presented as a material object offered for sale.[53] Such a highlighting of the book's materiality is in line with the concretization of the travel metaphor: the route of which Martial speaks does not have to be understood figuratively, but since the *libelli* are presented as *comites longae viae,* traveling and reading are closely intertwined. Of course, Martial plays on the contrast between the *long* voyage and the *short* tablets, which emblematize, as it were, the generic features of epigrammatic poetry: lightness and *brevitas.* The reader is thus setting out on a genuine journey together with the book, but on another level we may consider him as starting his voyage *through* the book.[54]

In addition, Martial uses the verbs *praeterire* and *transire* several times to describe neglectful readers (cf. 6.65, 10.59.1, 11.106.4 [*transire*], 1.25.4, 13.3.8 [*praeterire*]). Even though these are everyday expressions, they seem to gain a special meaning in the context of an *epigrammaton liber.* For both words (and their Greek equivalent παρέρχεσθαι) can be found in funerary inscriptions, which are addressed to wayfarers and ask them not to pass by without reading the poem.[55] The epigrams which are embedded in a bookish context thus take over the role of monuments erected at the side of a road—the παροδίτης or *viator* has clearly been turned into a traveling reader. Like such passers-by he can refuse to pay attention, as does the addressee of 11.106:

---

[52] This is not the place to discuss the problems regarding the transmission of epigrams 1.1 and 1.2 (cf. Citroni 1975 *ad loc.*) nor what kind of edition Martial had in mind.

[53] For the representation of literary materiality in Martial cf. Roman 2001.

[54] Note too that 1.3 presents the book as being eager to leave its home (like the *liber* in Horace *Ep.* 1.20). For the book as a traveler cf. also the beginning of Theoc. *Id.* 16.

[55] Cf. e.g. *CLE* 127a.1 (*bene sit tibi viator qui me non praeteristi*), *CLE* 477.1 (*te rogo, praeteriens fac | mora et perlege versus*), *CLE* 1007 (*praeteriens quicum|que legis, consiste | viator*), *CLE* 123.1 (*frequens viator saepe qui transis lege*), *CLE* 1152.3 (*tu qui via Flaminea transis, resta ac relege*), *GV* 1304.1 (τύμβον ἐμὸν καθορῶν, φίλε ⟨ὁδοιπόρε⟩ μή με παρέλθῃς), *GV* 1310.1 (μή με θοῶς, κύδιστε, παρέρχεο).

> Vibi Maxime, si vacas havere,
> hoc tantum lege: namque et occupatus
> et non es nimium laboriosus.
> transis hos quoque quattuor? sapisti.

> Vibius Maximus, if you have time to say hello, just read this: for truly you are
> not too stressed and too busy. You also pass these four <verses> by? How wise
> of you.

Martial tries to thrust a couple of his verses upon Vibius Maximus, as he
encounters him in the street. What strikes me as particularly remarkable is
that Martial asks if Vibius has time to say hello—just as tombstones beg the
traveler to say χαῖρε or *ave* (cf. *GV* 1342–1352).[56] And the situation underly-
ing the poem is as paradoxical as epigraphic pleas to stand still and read: if
Vibius is to receive Martial's request, he has to read the four lines, but by the
end of the epigram we learn that he actually passes them by. The joke lies
precisely in the fact that the failure of its *Appellstruktur* is thematized within
the appealing text, and its very addressee is excluded as a possible reader.

To conclude this section, I would like to take a brief look at the preface to
Martial's first book. Defending the obscene contents of his poetry, the author
claims that it was written for those who celebrate a lascivious festival like the
Floralia and he adds: *Non intret Cato theatrum meum, aut si intraverit, spectet.*
("Cato shall not enter my theater, or, if he should enter, let him watch"). This
statement is followed by an epigram:

> Nosses iocosae dulce cum sacrum Florae
> festosque lusus et licentiam volgi,
> cur in theatrum, Cato severe, venisti?
> an ideo tantum veneras, ut exires?

> You knew of jesting Flora's sweet ritual, the festal jokes and the license of the
> masses, why then, stern Cato, have you come to the theater? Or have you come
> simply to walk out?

Here the reader appears not in the role of a wayfarer, but of a spectator. How-
ever, the beginning of the book is identified with the entrance to a theater and
the expected reaction of a no-nonsense person like Cato[57] (i.e., breaking off

---

[56] In Latin epitaphs we find the form *have,* cf. e.g. *CLE* 1330.1–2 (*terris quicumque viator
transieris et dixeris [h]ui[c] tumulo / 'Avito, [h]ave …*), *CLE* 92 (*have dulce nobeis nome[n,*
1, *have casta coniunx…,* 8, *have mi Diodore…,* 9, *have pupa blanda …,* 11).

[57] Martial is alluding to an anecdote (cf. Val. Max. 2.10) according to which Cato left
the theater voluntarily during the Floralia, as he realized that people did not dare to ask
the actresses to strip in his presence. In the anecdote, then, Cato does not get upset at

his reading) is equated with exiting the building before the performance has come to an end. Thus Martial evokes the idea of a space constituted by the epigrams of his collection—in this case the poems are imagined as spectacles passing in front of the reader's eyes.[58]

4. *QUILIBET HUC LICEBIT INTRET:*
THE TRAVEL METAPHOR IN THE *CARMINA PRIAPEA*

The liminal space of the book is also symbolized by the setting pictured at the beginning of the *Corpus Priapeorum* (*CP*).[59] In the first two texts the *poeta* introduces his epigrams as graffiti written on the walls of Priapus's temple and asks the god to accept his gift (2.9–11): *ergo quidquid id est, quod otiosus / templi parietibus tui notavi / in partem accipias bonam, rogamus.* ("Therefore you may, I beg you, graciously accept whatever it is that I have idly scribbled on the walls of your temple"). It is very tempting to identify this temple with the book we are holding in our hands[60]: after having passed the paratextual threshold of the book (as Genette put it), we are, so to speak, entering the obscene realm of the ithyphallic garden god through the door of his shrine.[61] In light of this scenery *carmen* 14 might be interpreted as an inner proem, a postponed invitation to read the collection:

> Huc huc, quisquis es, in dei salacis
> deverti grave ne puta sacellum.

---

what he sees, but stands in the way of obscenities—and grants others the right to amuse themselves.

[58] If Martial published the *De spectaculis liber*, which is commonly dated to CE 80, before this book (which is very likely), he created a clear link between the two works: back then he had praised the miraculous happenings of the imperial amphitheater and the emperor's achievements. Now he himself has slipped into the role of an entertainer, who puts spectacles on stage for the audience's sake. This change of roles is also reflected by poem 1.5, where the Caesar (now Domitian) contrasts his naumachy to Martial's epigrams: *Do tibi naumachiam, tu das epigrammata nobis: / vis, puto, cum libro, Marce, natare tuo.*

[59] I endorse the view that this is not an arbitrary anthology of poems written by different authors, as many tend to believe (cf. e.g. O'Connor 1989: 37 and Richlin 1992: 141–43), but an artfully composed *libellus*. This was convincingly argued by Buchheit 1962; for more recent studies cf. Kloss 2003, Holzberg 2005 and Höschele (forthcoming a and b).

[60] Cf. Buchheit 1962: 10: "Das *templum* ist das Buch, die Wände die einzelnen Seiten, denen der Dichter die einzelnen Gedichte anvertraut hat (*carmina notavit*)." It is, however, not necessary to assume with Buchheit that the demonstrative pronouns *hoc* (1.3) and *hanc* (1.8) refer to a picture of Priapus's shrine.

[61] Cf. Plantade & Vallat (2005: 283): "il [le lecteur] est sur le point d'entrer dans un monde d'obscénité."

> et si nocte fuit puella tecum,
> hac re quod metuas adire, non est.
> istud caelitibus datur severis: 5
> nos vappae sumus et pusilla culti
> ruris numina, nos pudore pulso
> stamus sub Iove coleis apertis.
> ergo quilibet huc licebit intret
> nigri fornicis oblitus favilla.   10

Come here, come here, whoever you are, and do not consider it dangerous to enter the sanctuary of the horny god. Even if you spent the night with a girl, this is no reason to have fear of approaching. This holds true only for stern divinities. I am a good-for-nothing, a tiny country god; I stand here shamelessly with my balls out in the open air. So anyone may come in here and forget about the black ashes of the brothel.

The passer-by, whoever it is, should not hesitate to stop at the temple of the horny god: *quilibet huc licebit intret* (9). When we encounter this epigram within the context of the *libellus*, it gains, I suggest, a metapoetic dimension and self-consciously reflects how the traditional wayfarer has been turned into a reader of book epigrams. In fact, the poem contains both an invitation to read the collection and a *recusatio* typical of minor poetry: Priapus, the *pusillum numen,* explicitly distances himself from the mighty gods who traditionally featured as patrons and protagonists of epic poetry.[62] Detached from its literary surroundings, however, the poem would not take on such a meaning. As it happens, the text was actually found chiseled on a tablet from Capena (*CIL* 11.3862 = *CLE* 1505)—it is, however, most likely that the epigram was copied from the *CP* onto the marble rather than vice versa (cf. Buchheit 1962: 122 and Buecheler 1895–1926 *ad CLE* 1505). Interestingly, this shift from papyrus to stone reverses the process by which inscriptions had once wandered into anthologies and turns the poem into what it had pretended to be all along: an invitation to enter a (real) temple.

In any case, the entire collection is built upon the generic pretence that we are dealing with inscriptions or rather graffiti and the idea of a reader coming across Priapus's shrine is repeatedly evoked (cf. especially *c.* 41 and 49). All in all, the *CP* offers one of antiquity's wittiest take-offs on epigraphic

---

[62] Significantly, the adjective *gravis* (2) is frequently used in poetological contexts with reference to epic poetry; cf. Ov. *Am.* 1.1–2 (*arma gravi numero violentaque bella parabam / edere, materia conveniente modis*), Ov. *Met.* 10.150 (*cecini plectro graviore Gigantas*), Ov. *Trist.* 2.423 (*utque suo Martem cecinit gravis Ennius ore*), Prop. 1.9.9 (*grave dicere carmen*) and *Culex* 8 (*graviore sono tibi Musa loquetur*).

conventions, continuously casting its readers in the role of wayfarers and making its protagonist realize the inconvenience, in this context, of being a statue: Priapus becomes more and more aware of the fact that he is only made of wood and cannot actually put his threats into action.[63] Again elements of ancient material culture have been transferred and appropriated to a literary landscape.

5. TRAVELING THROUGH GREEK EPIGRAM BOOKS

Let us now see how the travel image, which evidently was evoked in Latin epigram collections, made its appearance in Greek *libelli*. Two poems by the Hellenistic epigrammatist Dioscurides offer a fascinating example: they interact in a way which makes it all but certain that they were conceived for a bookish context (cf. Bing 1988: 39–40 and Gutzwiller 1998: 259–60). In *Anthologia Palatina* (henceforth *AP*)[64] 7.37 (= 22 GP[64]), a fictitious epitaph on Sophocles, the passer-by is addressed as follows (1–2):

> Τύμβος ὅδ᾽ ἔστ᾽, ὤνθρωπε, Σοφοκλέος, ὃν παρὰ Μουσῶν
>   ἱρὴν παρθεσίην, ἱερὸς ὢν, ἔλαχον

> This is the tomb, O man, of Sophocles, which I, the holy one, have received
> from the Muses to guard as a holy trust…

The speaker, a satyr, goes on to relate how Sophocles led him from his rustic place of birth in Phlius to more refined and noble surroundings (thereby reflecting the ancient tradition according to which tragedy originated from satyr drama[65]). *AP* 7.707 (= 23 GP) features another satyr. He stands on Sositheus's grave and starts his speech by referring to his "brother" (1–3):

> Κἠγὼ Σωσιθέου κομέω νέκυν, ὅσσον ἐν ἄστει
>   ἄλλος ἀπ᾽ αὐθαίμων ἡμετέρων Σοφοκλῆν,
> Σκίρτος ὁ πυρρογένειος.

> I too, Skirtos the red-bearded, watch over a body, namely Sositheus, just as one
> of my brothers watches over Sophocles in the city.

---

[63] Priapus's growing self-awareness is tied to his loss of virility; for Priapus's impotence cf. Holzberg 2005. In a forthcoming article (b) I further show how the author plays on Hellenistic aesthetics by advocating the primacy of minor poetry and simultaneously presenting Priapus as an utterly un-Callimachean character: the (imaginary) materiality of a roughly-carved Priapus and of the graffiti dedicated to him mirrors the curious poetics underlying this collection.

[64] Greek epigrams are quoted from Gow and Page 1965 and 1968.

[65] Pratinas of Phlius was said to be the inventor of satyr plays.

The reader is thus reminded of the previous epigram, which he must already have encountered on his way through the collection: given its beginning κἠγώ ("I too"), the second poem makes sense only when it is read in connection with the epitaph on Sophocles.[66] Just as the reader has moved forward within the book, the addressee of *AP* 7.707 is pictured as someone who is moving away from the city and coming across Sositheus's monument on the road. The two texts might have been juxtaposed,[67] but it is equally possible that they were separated by other poems. Thus the distance between the two graves, which only exist in a literary landscape,[68] could have been mirrored by the spatial distribution of the epigrams in the bookroll. If the two texts were combined with Dioscurides' other epitaphs on poets,[69] this ensemble probably evoked the notion of a literary necropolis—in which the reader is invited to go for a stroll.

In connection with epitaphs, we may consider the two poems which Callimachus wrote in honor of his father and of himself. The text of *AP* 7.415 (= 30 GP = 35 Pf) is as follows:

> Βαττιάδεω παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδας εὖ μὲν ἀοιδήν
> εἰδότος, εὖ δ' οἴνῳ καίρια συγγελάσαι.

> You are passing the tomb of Battus's son, who could sing well and laugh well with others at the right time over the wine.

Just as Callimachus gives only his patronymic here, he conceals his father's name by referring exclusively to himself and his grandfather in *AP* 7.525 (= 29 GP = 21 Pf):

> Ὅστις ἐμὸν παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδα Καλλιμάχου με
> ἴσθι Κυρηναίου παῖδά τε καὶ γενέτην.
> εἰδείης δ' ἄμφω κεν· ὁ μέν κοτε πατρίδος ὅπλων

---

[66] The epitaph on Sositheus repeatedly recalls the one on Sophocles: whereas the tragedian had modernized drama, Sositheus brought it back to its archaic form (Sophocles led the satyr out of Phlius, Sositheus reminded him of his hometown). Sophocles' satyr stopped dancing at the moment of his death (ἀνέπαυσα πόδα, 6), Skirtos started to move in "manly rhythms" thanks to Sositheus (εἰσώρμησα τὸν ἄρσενα ... ῥυθμόν, 7–8) etc.

[67] Cf. Bing 1988: 40: "Their sequential connection – κἠγὼ, "I too" (v. 1) – is that between neighboring texts *on the page.*"

[68] In fact, Sophocles was not buried "in the city," but—according to the *Vita*—in Deceleia, and his tomb bore either a sirene or a swallow (cf. Gow-Page *ad loc.*).

[69] *AP* 7.410 = 20 GP (Thespis), 7.411 = 21 GP (Aeschylus), 7.708 = 24 GP (Machon). Gutzwiller 1998: 259–60 argues that we are dealing with a series of poems "which were evidently published together as a chronological sequence." For epigrams on poets cf. in general Gabathuler 1937.

ἦρξεν· ὁ δ' ἤεισεν κρέσσονα βασκανίης·
οὐ νέμεσις· Μοῦσαι γὰρ ὅσους ἴδον ὄμματι παῖδας
    μὴ λοξῷ πολιοὺς οὐκ ἀπέθεντο φίλους.

You, who are passing my tomb, shall know that I am both son and father of
Callimachus of Cyrene. You probably know them both; the one once served as
general in his hometown, the other sang songs mightier than envy. No marvel:
those at whom the Muses did not look with their eyes askew when they were
children, they do not cast off when they are old and grey.

It has long since been argued that the two epigrams are meant to be read
together, for they obviously supplement each other.[70] If the two poems stood
next to one another within a *libellus*, their juxtaposition might have conjured
up the idea of a family burial place.[71] In any case, it is remarkable that the
reader is, once again, cast in the role of a wayfarer (note the parallel expressions
παρὰ σῆμα φέρεις πόδας/πόδα) who comes across two graves (implicitly)
pointing to one another—most probably at a strategically important point
within the collection. For it is very likely that 21 and 35 Pf served as some
kind of sphragis at the end of Callimachus's epigram book (cf. Gabathuler
1937: 56), if not as a conclusion to his entire oeuvre.[72]

Similarly, the female epigrammatist Nossis might have closed her *libellus*
with a text that played on the conventions of funerary epigrams (*AP* 7.718
= 11 G-P)[73]:

---

[70] Cf. Wilamowitz 1913: 299 and 1924 I: 175n2, Gabathuler 1937: 54–56, Bing 1995:
126–28, Gutzwiller 1998: 212–13, Kirstein 2002: 117–21, Scodel 2003: 257–62, Fantuzzi
& Hunter 2004: 297–99, and Meyer 2005: 176–78. Against the mutual supplementation
theory cf. Cameron 1995: 78–79. The epitaph on Battus is, of course, ironical insofar as
it defines the deceased solely through the achievements of his father (in war) and his son
(in poetry). Since Callimachus's glory, which is not obscured by malevolence, presup-
poses that people know his patronymic (cf. Walsh 1991: 94), the 'riddle' could be easily
solved without the other text. Nonetheless, the two epigrams are obviously conceived for
a mutual 'Ergänzungsspiel.'

[71] Bing 1995: 127–28 compares *CEG* 512, where the speaker points out that he lies
next to his mother's tomb.

[72] Gutzwiller 1998: 212 points out that the intratextual references to the *Aetia* pro-
logue in 21 Pf (v. 4 recalls ἔλλετε Βασκανίης ὀλοὸν γένος, fr. 1.17 Pf) creates a clear
link to the first book of Callimachus's oeuvre and may thus form a ring around his entire
works. (She also argues, against Pfeiffer, that the last distich, which is a direct quotation
from fr. 1.37–38 Pf, is not an interpolation, but is meant to connect the poem with the
beginning of the *Aetia*.)

[73] Cf. Reitzenstein 1893: 139 (who, however, had a collection of songs in mind, not of
epigrams), Wilamowitz 1913: 298–99 and 1924, I: 135, and Gutzwiller 1998: 85–86.

ὦ ξεῖν’, εἰ τύ γε πλεῖς ποτὶ καλλίχορον Μιτυλήναν,
    τᾶν Σαπφοῦς χαρίτων ἄνθος ἐναυσαμένος
εἰπεῖν, ὡς Μούσαισι φίλαν τήνᾳ τε Λόκρισσα[74]
    τίκτεν · ἴσαις δ’ ὅτι μοι τ’οὔνομα Νοσσίς, ἴθι.

If you, stranger, are sailing to Mitylene with its lovely dances in order to inspire yourself by the flower of Sappho's graces, announce that a Locrian woman gave birth to one dear to the Muses and to her. You should know that my name is Nossis—now go.

The addressee, who can be identified with the reader of Nossis's collection, is sent out on another poetic journey: after having crossed her book of epigrams, he may sail on to Mitylene and herald Nossis's fame as Sappho's literary heir.[75] This voyage, which is undertaken in search of poetic inspiration, suggests the reading of Sappho's works[76]—thus the recipient is, once more, cast in the role of a traveler.

However, there was presumably more to Nossis's *libellus*. As Kathryn Gutzwiller has suggested, the poet seems to lead her audience through a collection of votive offerings standing in a sanctuary of Aphrodite—or, more generally, through an art gallery (Gutzwiller 1998: 83–84).[77] Similarly, we may picture the *iamatika* section of the "New Posidippus" (95–101 AB) as a set of inscriptions fixed on the walls of Asclepius's temple[78] and the *andriantopoiika* (62–70 AB) as an exhibition hall which contains the works of famous artists (cf. Sens 2005: 208). What all these images have in common is that a group of epigrams put together on a papyrus somehow evokes a three-dimensional

---

[74] For the reading Λόκρισσα cf. Gallavotti 1971; for the textual problems of the second distich in general Cazzaniga 1970.

[75] Cf. Gutzwiller 1998: 86: "Nossis sends a message of her birth across both temporal and spatial seas to her poetic mother Sappho." Significantly, Nossis does not announce her death, but her birth. However, the plea to convey a message is a common motif in funerary poems, cf. *GV* 947 und 1353 and Tarán 1979: 132–49 on the motif in literary epigrams.

[76] According to Gutzwiller 1998: 86, Nossis presents herself as an intermediary between Sappho and a new generation of poets.

[77] Eight out of the eleven epigrams that have come down to us concern dedications; on Nossis's poems cf. Gutzwiller 1998: 74–88, Skinner 1989, 1991a and b and Männlein-Robert (forthcoming). The voice of the dramatic narrator is that of a woman addressing a female audience. For the localization of the epigrams in a fictive sanctuary cf. already Reitzenstein 1893: 141–42.

[78] Cf. Bing 2004: 278. "I would suggest that the section offers readers the impression, as they turn from poem to poem, of strolling through a shrine of Asclepius. It allows them to play the part of an imaginary pilgrim…"

setting through which we may be thought to move. As we proceed from one poem to the next, our gaze can be seen to move from one inscription or one object to the next. Thus Nossis's request (4.1–2 GP = *AP* 9.332) Ἐλθοῖσαι ποτὶ ναὸν ἰδώμεθα τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας / τὸ βρέτας, ὡς χρυσῷ δαιδαλόεν τελέθει ("come on, let's go to the temple and see the statue of Aphrodite, how artfully it is decorated with gold") could have served as a (postponed?) invitation to enter the collection.[79]

Anyte, in turn, possibly opened a book of her epigrams by summoning a traveler to sit down in the shadow of a laurel tree and to repose for a little while next to a lovely spring (16 GP = *AP* 9.313; cf. Gutzwiller 1998: 73)[80]:

ἵζε᾽ ἄπας ὑπὸ καλὰ δάφνας εὐθαλέα φύλλα,
    ὡραίου τ᾽ ἄρυσαι νάματος ἁδὺ πόμα,
ὄφρα τοι ἀσθμαίνοντα πόνοις θέρεος φίλα γυῖα
    ἀμπαύσῃς, πνοιῇ τυπτόμενα Ζεφύρου.

Sit here, completely under the beautiful, luxuriant leaves of the laurel, and draw a sweet draught from the lovely spring, so that your limbs, which are panting under the labors of the summer, may relax, beaten by the breeze of Zephyrus.

On a metapoetic level, this could be understood as an invitation to relax from everyday chores by reading the poems to follow.[81] To be sure, the recipient is not explicitly pictured as someone going from epigram to epigram here—quite the contrary, he is told to take a rest, but at the same time this does make him a traveler. In addition, the idea of settling down at a *locus amoenus* in order to read recalls the beginning of Plato's *Phaedrus*, where the two interlocutors come to rest under a plane tree.

While the poetological implications of these poems have been recognized before, the metapoetic potential of two epigrams by another author, Antiphilus, has remained unnoticed. The *Greek Anthology* attributes 53 poems to Antiphilus (they were originally part of Philip's *Garland*)—we do not know how the epigrams circulated prior to their incorporation into that collection, but in my opinion two of the texts suggest that Antiphilus assembled his epigrams within a self-edited book, as did, in all likelihood, the Hellenistic epigrammatists mentioned above. Poem 11 GP (= *AP* 10.17) reads as follows[82]:

---

[79] The *libellus* was most probably opened by the programmatic epigram 1 GP (= *AP* 5.170), cf. Gutzwiller 1998: 75–79.

[80] On Anyte's *libellus* in general cf. Gutzwiller 1993 and 1998: 54–74.

[81] Cf. also 18 GP (= *AG* 16.228) with its explicit address of a ξεῖνος.

[82] Here I follow the reading of Beckby 1965–1967.

Ἀρχέλεω, λιμενῖτα, σὺ μέν, μάκαρ, ἠπίῳ αὔρη
    πέμπε κατὰ σταθερῆς οἰχομένην ὀθόνην
ἄχρις ἐπὶ Τρίτωνα· σὺ δ᾽ ἠόνος ἄκρα λελογχὼς
    τὴν ἐπὶ Πυθείου ῥύεο ναυστολίην·
κεῖθεν δ᾽, εἰ Φοίβῳ μεμελήμεθα πάντες ἀοιδοί,
    πλεύσομαι εὐαεῖ θαρσαλέως ζεφύρῳ.

Do escort with gentle breeze the departing ship of Archelaos, oh blessed guard-
ian of harbors, through a calm sea to the temple of Triton. And you, inhabiting
the high coasts, protect the voyage as far as the Pythian shrine. From there, if
indeed all we singers are dear to Phoebus's heart, I will daringly sail on with
the help of a well-blowing west wind.

The fact that Antiphilus explicitly describes himself as a singer (ἀοιδός) and
appeals to the god of poetry for a safe journey indicates, I think, that he hopes
for support on his poetic endeavour. Of course, one might wonder why he
first begs two unnamed gods to escort him, but then we do not have to pos-
tulate that every single element of a poem can be included in a metapoetical
reading. However, the name of the ship's captain might be of significance,
since it contains the root ἀρχή and could hence self-reflexively point to the
beginning of the book.[83]

    Admittedly, this interpretation is rather speculative and rests upon a set
of (unprovable) premises. But let us, nonetheless, move to the second text.
In 16 GP (= *AP* 6.199) Antiphilus dedicates his traveling hat to Einodia, the
goddess of roads:

Εἰνοδίη, σοὶ τόνδε φίλης ἀνεθήκατο κόρσης
    πῖλον ὁδοιπορίης σύμβολον Ἀντίφιλος·
ἦσθα γὰρ εὐχωλῇσι κατήκοος, ἦσθα κελεύθοις
    ἵλαος· οὐ πολλὴ δ᾽ ἡ χάρις, ἀλλ᾽ ὁσίη.
μὴ δέ τις ἡμετέρου μάρψῃ χερὶ μάργος ὁδίτης
    ἀνθέματος· συλᾶν ἀσφαλὲς οὐδ᾽ ὀλίγα.

Einodia, Antiphilus has dedicated to you this felt-hat from his head, a symbol
of his wayfaring. For you have answered his prayers, you have been merciful to
him on his paths. It is not a great gift, but a pious one. May no greedy traveler lay
his hands on my offering. It is not safe to despoil a shrine of even little gifts.

If Antiphilus set out on a journey at the beginning of his book, he has now
(at the end of the collection?) successfully reached his destination—and
thanks Einodia for a safe trip. We are not dealing with just any kind of dedi-

---

[83] On speaking names in epigrams cf. Ferguson 1970 and Bruss 2005: 105, 107, 109,
115, 122, 128, 146.

cation here, which one could encounter no matter where one was within an epigram book, but with a dedication by the poet Antiphilus, who explicitly names himself. This could suggest that the epigram once served as a *sphragis* to his *libellus*. Since the writing and reading of poetry can be identified with traveling, it does not seem a coincidence that the goddess addressed here is called Einodia. Read on a metapoetic level, the warning against "greedy travelers" might even suggest that no reader should dare to steal Antiphilus's poems, his little (ὀλίγα) gifts.[84]

6. THE AUSONIAN TRAVELER AND THE PREFACE TO AGATHIAS'S *KYKLOS*

Lastly I would like to draw attention to the preface of Agathias's *Kyklos*. To be sure, the evidence for the use of the travel metaphor within an epigrammatic oeuvre taken from this anthology is rather late (it was published in the 6th century CE[85]), but Agathias offers a sophisticated version of the motif and very likely followed a tradition that had been there for centuries. The proem consists of three parts: In *AP* 4.3a (1–46), written in iambics, Agathias addresses his readers, who might already be fed up with the dishes presented at the grand "literary banquet" (τῶν λόγων πανδαισία, 2), i.e., with the numerous poetic products they have been consuming. Nonetheless he has decided to prepare a banquet of his own by combining his meals/poems with the contributions of others. The hexametric part 2 (*AP* 4.3b: 47–133) contains an elaborate panegyric of the emperor together with a celebration of the *pax Romana* and an enumeration of the pacified regions.[86] This section is rounded off by a description of Agathias's poetic endeavor (which, according to him, would have been unthinkable, if it were not for the new-found peace) and a summary of the anthology's contents (98–133). A short poem in elegiac distichs concludes this three-fold preface (*AP* 4.3c: 134–43): Agathias asserts that a man's glory rests solely upon his wisdom—only products of the mind are able to keep his memory alive, not steles or pictures.

At first sight the longish excursus on the pacified regions of the East, which are now part of the empire, might seem out of place in the preface to an epigram anthology. That is to say, one could easily gain the impression that it is inserted only for the sake of praising the ruler. However, at closer investiga-

---

[84] Of course, the idea of a *pilos* does not necessarily suggest poems, but in this context Antiphilus's dedication may very well take on such a metapoetic meaning.

[85] For the dating of the *Kyklos* to around 567 CE, cf. Cameron 1966 and 1993: 69–75.

[86] The (unnamed) emperor was commonly identified with Justinian who had fought wars against Persia in 528–32, 540–45 and 561; *aliter* Cameron 1966, dating the publication of the *Cycle* to the early reign of Justin II.

tion this part of the proem turns out to be closely intertwined with Agathias's poetic program. He equates, I would like to suggest, his literary universe with the Roman empire, and the pacification itself is taken as a starting point for an (implicit) *recusatio*. After wishing that Persia's power never rise again and that peace be everlasting (47–57), Agathias asserts (58–64)[87]:

Καυκασίῳ δὲ τένοντι καὶ ἐν ῥηγμῖνι Κυταίη
ὁππόθι ταυρείοιο ποδὸς δουπήτορι χαλκῷ
σκληρὰ σιδηρείης ἐλακίζετο νῶτα κονίης,
σύννομον Ἀδρυάδεσσιν ἀναπλέξασα χορείην
Φασιὰς εἱλίσσοιτο φίλῳ σκιρτήματι νύμφη,
καὶ καμάτους μέλψειε πολυσκήπτρου Βασιλῆος,
μόχθον ἀπορρίψασα γιγαντείου τοκετοῖο.

By the ridge of the Caucasus and on the Colchian shore, where once the hard back of the iron soil was broken by the resounding hoofs of the brazen bulls, let the Phasian bride, weaving a measure in company with the Hamadryads, wheel in the dance she loves, and casting away her dread of the race of giants, sing the labours of our many-sceptred prince (trans. Paton 1916–1918).

The following references to Kolchis, the Argo, Medea and the dragon's seed (65–71) suggest epic and tragic subject matters—as does the mention of the giants' off-spring (γιγαντείου τοκετοῖο, 64[88]). I think that we can read this passage as a poetological rejection of such topics[89]—in favor of epigrammatic poetry. For the image of nymphs "plaiting round dances" (ἀναπλέξασα χορείην, 61) could evoke the plaiting of a poetic garland, i.e., the creation of an anthology, according to the metaphor chosen by Meleager and Philip to describe their literary undertaking.[90] Indeed, Agathias presents his own collection as a wreath (στέμμα σοι εὐμύθοιο καθήρμοσα Καλλιοπείης, 107) and "the playful dance of the singers" (παίγνια ἀοιδοπόλοιο χορείης, 102) set in motion by the poet clearly recalls the dance inspired by the Phasian nymph.

In our context it is of particular interest that the passage on Kolchis is directly followed by an apostrophe to the "Ausonian wayfarer" (Αὐσόνιε

---

[87] Agathias's proem is quoted from Beckby.

[88] Cf. also Κολχὶς ἄρουρα, γονῇ πλησθεῖσα Γιγάντων (67).

[89] Innes 1979: 166 "The combination of gods and battles makes the Gigantomachy the grandest theme of martial epic." For the writing of (or rather the refusal to write) a gigantomachy cf. e.g. Hor. c. 2.12.6–9, Ov. *Am.* 2.1.11–16, Prop. 2.1.19–20, 39–40, *Culex* 26–29.

[90] Cf. e.g. *AP* 4.1.2 (τεύξας στέφανον), 4.1.5 (ἐμπλέξας), 4.2.3 (ἀντανέπλεξα). For the image in Meleager cf. Gutzwiller 1997, Guichard 2000, and Höschele (forthcoming c).

ὁδοιπόρε, 78) and an invitation to travel around the world. It might already seem significant that the notion of traveling is repeatedly evoked at the beginning of an epigram collection,[91] but there is more to it. For the realm of the emperor, which extends to the most distant places, is indirectly analogized to Agathias's bookish universe. First of all, the ruler is said to have "surrounded the world with his dominion" (κυκλώσατο κόσμον κοιρανίῃ, 95–96), which could suggest the very title of the collection: Κύκλος[92] (note, too, that Agathias calls his panegyrical poem κόσμος at v. 42). Furthermore the list of books contained in this anthology, which is given later on (117–33), recalls the list of places to be visited by the Ausonian ὁδοιπόρος. A close analogy between the *imperium Romanum* and the epigram collection is, among other things, suggested by certain expressions that are used with reference to both the empire and the poetic work: βαλβῖδα νεήνιδος ... βίβλου (121) ~ καλλιρέεθρον ... βαλβῖδα θαλάσσης (85), βίβλοιο παρὰ κρηπῖδα τετάρτην (126) ~ κρηπῖδα Γαδείρων (53), σύζυγι βίβλῳ (104) ~ δίζυγος ἠπείροιο ... κεραίη (86). Last but not least, the reader of the *Cycle* is explicitly cast in the role of a wayfarer in v. 130, where Aphrodite is said to direct his steps (παρατρέψειε πορείην) to "lovers' whispers and sweet amours" (= the subject of the seventh book).

All in all, Agathias evokes the idea of a poetic universe through which the reader can travel just as every citizen of the empire may henceforth perambulate the world without fear. Once more the actual ὁδοιπόρος has been turned into a wandering reader. The recently established peace has not only made traveling riskless, but has also enabled the poet to dedicate himself to light verses—instead of wars, we get an agon of songs (98–102), instead of giants dancing nymphs, instead of epic—epigram.

7. CONCLUSION

In his 1814 preface to a poetry collection entitled "The excursion," William Wordsworth wrote:

> the two Works [the "Prelude" and the "Recluse"] have the same kind of relation to each other, if he [the author] may so express himself, as the ante-chapel has to the body of a Gothic church. Continuing this allusion, he may be permitted to add, that his minor Pieces, which have been long before the Public, when they shall be properly arranged, will be found by the attentive Reader to have such connection with the main Work as may give them claim to be likened to the little cells, oratories, and sepulchral recesses, ordinarily included in those edifices.

[91] Cf. ἴθι (77), ἀμφιθέων (79), ἐπίβηθι (80), κελεύθοις (80), ἕρπων (82), μετέρχεο (83), ἴχνιον ἀμπαύσειας (84), πορείης (87), ἐπιστείβων (88), ἔρχεο (89), ἀΐξειας (95).
[92] The Suda (s.v. Ἀγαθίας) calls the collection κύκλος τῶν νέων ἐπιγραμμάτων.

And, a bit later on:

> It is not the Author's intention formally to announce a system; it was more animating to him to proceed in a different course; and if he shall succeed in conveying to the mind clear thoughts, lively images, and strong feelings, the Reader will have no difficulty in extracting the system for himself.

Here the reader is pictured as someone strolling through a church and the poems are identified with different parts of the building. Just as Wordsworth bids the reader to explore his complex poetic edifice, the recipients of ancient epigram collections were frequently invited to imagine themselves in the roles of wayfarers or tourists.

I do not want to claim that every ancient epigram collection necessarily evoked the idea of a traveling reader, but when the poetological imagery was used, it should have aroused associations with the epigraphic origins of the genre—at the same time, fictitious epitaphs, which addressed passers-by within the realm of the book, might have reminded the reader of his role as a metaphorical wayfarer. Artfully arranged poetry books (including epigram-matic *libelli*) first emerged in Hellenistic times—if my observations are correct, it is also this era that saw the birth of the traveling reader.

WORKS CITED

Acosta-Hughes, B., E. Kosmetatou, M. Baumbach. eds. 2004. *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus (P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309).* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Asper, M. 1997. *Onomata allotria: Zur Genese, Struktur und Funktion poetologischer Metaphern bei Kallimachos.* Hermes Einzelschriften 75. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

Austin, C., Bastianini, G. Eds. 2002. *Posidippi Pellaei quae supersunt omnia.* Milano: LED.

Barchiesi, A. 1997. "Endgames: Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 15 and *Fasti* 6." In F. M. Dunn, D. Fowler. eds. *Classical Closure. Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. 181–208.

Barthes, R. 1973: *Le plaisir du texte.* Paris: Points (Seuil).

Beckby, H. 1965–1967. *Anthologia Graeca. Griechisch Deutsch.* 4 vols., 2nd ed. Munich: Ernst Heimeran Verlag.

Becker, O. 1937. *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken.* Hermes Einzelschriften 4. Berlin: Weidmann.

Besslich, S. 1973. "Die 'Hörner' des Buches. Zur Bedeutung von *cornua* im antiken Buch-wesen." *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch.* Mainz Verl. der Gutenberg-Ges. 44–50.

Bettenworth, A. 2007. "The Mutual Influence of Inscribed and Literary Epigram." In P. Bing, J. Bruss. eds. *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram Down to Philip.* Leiden and Boston: Brill. 69–93.

Bing, P. 1988. *The Well-Read Muse. Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

———. 1995. "'Ergänzungsspiel' in the Epigrams of Callimachus." *A & A* 41: 115–31.

———. 1998. "La culture littéraire d'Alexandrie au IIIe siècle avant J.-C." In *La Gloire d'Alexandrie*, catalogue of an exhibition at the musée du Petit Palais, 5.7.98 – 7.26.98. Paris. 133–35.

———. 2002. "The Un-Read Muse? Inscribed Epigram and Its Readers in Antiquity." In M. A. Harder et al. eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams.* Hellenistica Groningana 6. Leuven: Peeters. 39–66.

———. 2004. "Posidippus' *Iamatika.*" In B. Acosta-Hughes et al. 2004. 276–91.

———. Forthcoming. "Allusion from the Broad, Well-Trodden Street: The Odyssey in Inscribed and Literary Epigram." In *The Marble and the Scroll: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Blum, H. 1969. *Die antike Mnemotechnik.* Spudasmata 15. Hildesheim and New York: Olms.

den Boer, W. 1986. *The Art of Memory and Its Mnemotechnical Traditions.* Amsterdam, Oxford and New York: North Holland Publishing Company.

Brooks, P. 1984. *Reading for the Plot. Design and Intention in Narrative.* New York: A. A. Knopf.

Bruss, J. 2005. *Hidden Presences: Monuments, Gravesites, and Corpses in Greek Funerary Epigram.* Hellenistica Groningana 10. Leuven: Peeters.

Buchheit, V. 1962. *Studien zum Corpus Priapeorum.* Zetemata 28. Munich: Beck.

Buecheler, F. 1895–1926. *Carmina Latina Epigraphica, 3 vols, (vol. 3ed. Ernst Lommatzsch).* Leipzig: Teubner.

Cameron, A. and A. 1966. "The *Cycle* of Agathias." *JHS* 86: 6–25.

Cameron, A. 1993. *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cazzaniga, I. 1970. "Critica testuale ed esegesi a Nosside *A.P.* VII. 718." *PP* 25: 431–45.

Citroni, M. 1975. *M. Valerii Martialis epigrammaton liber primus.* Florence: La nuova Italia.

Clare, R. J. 2002. *The Path of the Argo: Language, Imagery and Narrative in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

D'Alessio, G. B. 1997. *Callimaco. Aitia, Giambi e altri frammenti.* vol. 2. 2nd ed. Milano: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli.

Edmonds, R., ed. Forthcoming. *Further Along the Path: Recent Approaches to the 'Orphic' Gold Tablets.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fantuzzi, M. and R. Hunter. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferguson, J. 1970. "The Epigrams of Callimachus." *G & R* 17: 64–80.

Frisk, H. 1970. *Griechisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch.* vol. 2. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Fuhrer, T. 1992. *Die Auseinandersetzung mit den Chorlyrikern in den Epinikien des Kallimachos.* Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 23. Basel and Kassel: F. Reinhardt.

———. 1993. "Callimachus' Epinician Poems." In M. A. Harder et al. eds. *Callimachus.* Hellenistica Groningana 1. Groningen: Egbert Forsten. 79–97.

Gabathuler, M. 1937. *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter.* Basel and St. Gallen: Selbstverlag des Verfassers.

Gallavotti, C. 1971. "L'epigramma biografico di Nosside come esempio di critica testuale." In *Studi di filologici e storici in onore di Vittorio De Falco.* Naples: Libreria scientifice editrice. 241–50.

Georges, H. 1998. *Ausführliches Lateinisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch.* 8th ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Giannisi, P. 2006. *Récits des voies. Chant et cheminement en Grèce archaïque.* Grenoble: Jérôme Millon.

Goldhill, S. 1991. *The Poet's Voice. Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gow, A. S. F. and D. L. Page 1965. *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams.* 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1968. *The Greek Anthology. The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams.* 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gowers, E. 1993. "Horace, *Satires* 1.5: An Inconsequent Journey." *PCPS* 39: 48–66.

Guichard, L. A. 2000. "Intertextualidad y antologación en la *Corona* de Meleagro." In V. Bécares et al. eds. *Intertextualidad en las literaturas griega y latina.* Madrid and Salamanca: Ed. Clásicas. 105–19.

Gutzwiller, K. 1993. "Anyte's Epigram Book." *SyllClass* 4: 71–89.

———. 1997. "The Poetics of Editing in Meleager's *Garland.*" *TAPA* 127: 169–200.

———. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context.* Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

———. ed. 2005. *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hansen, P. A. 1983–89. *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca.* 2 vols., Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

Häusle, H. 1980. *Das Denkmal als Garant des Nachruhms: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Thematik eines Motivs in lateinischen Inschriften.* Zetemata 75. Munich: Beck.

Harris, W. V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy.* Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.

Höschele, R. Forthcoming a. "Priape mis en abyme ou Comment clore le recueil." In F. Biville et al. eds. *"Les vers du plus nul des poètes": Nouvelles recherches sur les Priapées.*

———. Forthcoming b. "Longe longissimum: Il *carmen* 68 del *Corpus Priapeorum,*" In A. Morelli. ed. *EPIGRAMMA LONGUM. From Martial to Late Antiquity.*

———. Forthcoming c. *Die blütenlesende Muse. Textualität und Poetik antiker Epigrammsammlungen.* PhD diss., University of Munich.

Holzberg, N. 1998. "*Ter quinque volumina* as *carmen perpetuum*: The Division into Books in Ovid's *Metamorphoses.*" *MD* 40: 77–98.

———. 2005. "Impotence? It Happened to the Best of Them! A Linear Reading of the *Corpus Priapeorum.*" *Hermes* 133: 368–81.

Hunter, R. 1992. "Callimachus and Heraclitus." *MD* 28: 113–23.

Innes, D. C. 1979. "Gigantomachy and Natural Philosophy." *CQ* 29: 165–71.

Ishøy, H. 2006. "Bimsstein und Stirn, Horn und Nabel. Zu den Beschreibungen der Aus-stattung der Papyrusrolle in römischer Poesie." *Hermes* 134: 69–88.

Johnson, W. A. 2000. "Toward a Sociology of Reading in Classical Antiquity." *AJP* 121: 593–627.

Kirstein, R. 2002. "Companion Pieces in the Hellenistic Epigram (Call. 21 and 35 Pf; Theoc. 7 and 15 Gow; Mart. 2.91 and 2.92; Ammianos *AP* 11.230 and 11.231)." In M. A. Harder et al. eds. *Hellenistic Epigrams*. Hellenistica Groningana 6. Leuven: Peeters. 113–35.

Kloss, G. 2003. "Überlegungen zur Verfasserschaft und Datierung der Carmina Priapea." *Hermes* 131: 464–85.

Konstan, D. 2001. "The Joys of Pausanias." In S. E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, and J. Elsner, eds. *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 57–60.

Krevans, N. 1983. "Geography and the Literary Tradition in Theocritus 7." *TAPA* 113: 201–20.

Männlein-Robert, I. Forthcoming. *Stimme, Schrift und Bild. Zum Verhältnis der Künste in der hellenistischen Dichtkunst*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Meyer, D. 2005. *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen. Das inschriftliche Epigramm und seine Rezeption bei Kallimachos*. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

Miller, P. A. 1994. *Lyric Texts and Lyric Consciousness. The Birth of a Genre from Archaic Greece to Augustan Rome*. London and New York: Routledge.

Montiglio, S. 2006. "Should the Aspiring Wise Man Travel? A Conflict in Seneca's Thought." *AJP* 127: 553–86.

Nünlist, R. 1998. *Poetologische Bildersprache in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner.

O'Connor, E. M. 1989. *Symbolum Salacitatis: A Study of the God Priapus as a Literary Character*. Studien zur Klassischen Philologie 40. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

O'Sullivan, T. M. 2006. "The Mind in Motion: Walking and Metaphorical Travel in the Roman Villa." *CP* 101: 133–52.

Paton, W. R. 1916–1918. *The Greek Anthology*. 5 vols., Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.

Peek, W. 1955. *Griechische Vers-Inschriften: 1. Grab-Epigramme*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Plantade, E. and D. Vallat. 2005. "Les *Priapées*: De la parole au livre." *RPh* 79:279–307.

Race, W. H. 1997. *Pindar. Olympian Odes, Pythian Odes,* Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.

Reitzenstein, R. 1893. *Epigramm und Skolion. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der alexandrinischen Dichtung*. Gießen: J. Ricker.

Richlin, A. 1992. *The Garden of Priapus. Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor.* 2nd ed. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roman, L. 2001. "The Representation of Literary Materiality in Martial's *Epigrams*." *JRS* 91: 113–45.

Rossi, L. 2001. *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach*. Hellenistica Groningana 5. Leuven: Peeters.

Scodel, R. 2003. "Two Epigrammatic Pairs: Callimachus' Epitaphs, Plato's Apples." *Hermes* 131: 257–68.

Sens, A. 2005. "The Art of Poetry and the Poetry of Art: The Unity and Poetics of Posidippus' Statue-Poems." In K. Gutzwiller, ed. 2005. 206–25.

———. 2006. "Epigram at the Margins of Pastoral." In M. Fantuzzi, T. Papanghelis, eds. *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral.* Leiden and Boston: Brill. 147–65.

Sharrock, A. 1994. *Seduction and Repetition in Ovid's* Ars Amatoria II. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skinner, M. 1989. "Sapphic Nossis." *Arethusa* 22: 5–18.

———. 1991a. "Aphrodite Garlanded: Eros and Poetic Creativity in Sappho and Nossis." In F. de Martino, ed. *Rose di Pieria.* Bari: Levante. 79–96.

———. 1991b. "Nossis Thêlyglôssos: the Private Text and the Public Book." In S. B. Pomeroy, ed. *Women's History and Ancient History.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 20–47.

Svenbro, J. 1993. *Phrasikleia. An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece.* Trans. J. Lloyd. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Tarán, S. L. 1979. *The Art of Variation in the Hellenistic Epigram.* Columbia Stud. Class. Trad. 9. Leiden: Brill.

Tueller, M. Forthcoming. "The Passerby in Archaic and Classical Epigrams." In M. Baumbach, A. Petrovic, I. Petrovic, eds. *Archaic and Classical Greek Epigram.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walsh, G. B. 1991. "Callimachean Passages: The Rhetoric of Epitaph in Epigram." *Arethusa* 24: 77–105.

Wheeler, S. 1999. *A Discourse of Wonders. Audience and Performance in Ovid's* Metamorphoses. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. 1913. *Sappho und Simonides: Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker.* Berlin: Weidmann.

———. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos,* 2 vols. Berlin: Weidmann.

Wimmel, W. 1960. *Kallimachos in Rom: Die Nachfolge seines apologetischen Dichtens in der Augusteerzeit.* Hermes Einzelschriften 16. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Wordsworth, W. 1991. *The Excursion.* Oxford: Woodstock. Reprint of the First (1814) Edition.

Wray, D. 2000. "Apollonius' Masterplot: Narrative Strategy in *Argonautica* 1." In M. A. Harder et al. eds. *Apollonius Rhodius.* Hellenistica Groningana 4. Leuven: Peeters. 239–65.

Yates, F. A. 1972. *The Art of Memory.* London: Routledge. Reprint of the 1966 edition.

Zetzel, J. E. G. 1980. "Horace's *Liber Sermonum*: The Structure of Ambiguity." *Arethusa* 13: 59–77.