

THE EPIGRAMS OF LUCIAN

BARRY BALDWIN

ALL BUT ONE OF THE FIFTY-THREE epigrams ascribed to Lucian derive from the Greek Anthology;¹ the exception is the first one (*On his Own Book*), cited by Photius and possessing slight manuscript authority.² And, as will be seen, the total number of attributed epigrams has been whittled down considerably by Paton and other commentators on the Anthology.³

Reaction to the merits of these little pieces is entirely subjective. MacLeod, Lucian's most recent editor, dubs the first epigram "spurious"; of the others, he allows that "at least a few are not un-Lucianic in style and thought," but does not elaborate (523-525). Bompaire, who made an effort to correlate some of the epigrams with Lucian's other work, states the only reasonable general approach (646): "On pourrait se fonder sur les talents de poète de Lucien pour lui attribuer les Épigrammes, généralement tenues pour apocryphes. Certaines sont fort proches par l'esprit du reste de l'oeuvre. Mais l'appréciation est subjective et l'on n'a pas le droit, dans l'état présent des recherches, de se prononcer."

Unexceptionable sentiments. Hence, it seems worthwhile to collect the poems together (providing collation with the *A.P.* numbers), and to examine their style and themes within the joint framework of Lucian's other work and the Anthology as a whole.

The poems run as follows:⁴

¹The following works will be cited by author's name: J. Bompaire, *Lucien Écrivain* (Paris 1958); A. S. F. Gow and D. Page, *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams* (Cambridge 1965, "Gow-Page, HE" below); and *The Garland of Philip* (Cambridge 1968, "Gow-Page, GP" below); C. Jacobitz, *Luciani Opera, ed. maior* 4 (Leipzig 1841); G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* (Leipzig 1878); M. D. MacLeod, *Lucian* 8 (London 1967, Loeb); Pape-Benseler, *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen*³ (Braunschweig 1884); W. Paton, *The Greek Anthology* (London 1916-1918, Loeb); W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* 1. Grab-Epigramme (Berlin 1955); C. Reitz, *Lexicon Lucianum* (Amsterdam 1746); also the papers by G. Giangrande, "Sympotic Literature and Epigram," J. Labarbe, "Aspects gnomiques de l'épigramme grecque," G. Luck, "Witz und Sentiment im griechischen Epigramm," and L. Robert, "Les épigrammes satiriques de Lucillius sur les athlètes: parodie et réalités," in *L'Épigramme Grecque* (Entretiens Hardt 14, Geneva 1968).

²Photius, *Bibliotheca* (Cod. 128); see MacLeod 523-525.

³Paton allowed 37 epigrams to Lucian; one or two more are left as possibilities (details will emerge in subsequent parts of this article).

⁴Text after Jacobitz. MacLeod prints only *Epigram* 1; the rest are of course in editions of the Anthology.

1.

Λουκιανὸς τὰδ' ἔγραψα παλαιὰ τε μωρὰ τε εἰδώς,
 μωρὰ γὰρ ἀνθρώποις καὶ τὰ δοκοῦντα σοφά.
 οὐδὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι διακριδὸν ἔστι νόημα,
 ἀλλ' ὃ σὺ θαυμάζεις, τοῦθ' ἐτέροισι γέλως.

2.

Τὸν πατρικὸν πλοῦτον νέος ὦν Θήρων ὁ Μενίππου
 αἰσχροῦς εἰς ἀκρατεῖς ἐξέχεεν δαπάνας.
 ἀλλὰ μιν Εὐκτήμων, πατρικὸς φίλος, ὥς ἐνόησεν
 ἤδη καρφαλέῃ τειρόμενον πενίῃ,
 καὶ μιν δακρυχέων ἀνελάμβανε καὶ πόσιν αὐτὸν
 θῆκε θυγατρὸς ἑῆς πόλλ' ἐπὶ μείλια δούς.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Θήρωνι παρ' ἐλπίδας ἤλυθε πλοῦτος,
 αὐτίκα ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐτρέφετ' ἐν δαπάναις
 γαστρὶ χαριζόμενος πᾶσαν χάριν, οὐ κατὰ κόσμον,
 τῇ θ' ὑπὸ τὴν μιάραν γαστέρα μαργοσύνη.
 οὕτως μὲν Θήρωνα τὸ δεύτερον ἀμφεκάλυψεν
 οὐλομένης πενίης κύμα παλιρρόθιον.
 Εὐκτήμων δ' ἐδάκρυσε τὸ δεύτερον, οὐκέτι κείνον,
 ἀλλὰ θυγατρὸς ἑῆς προῖκά τε καὶ θάλαμον.
 ἔγνω δ' ὥς οὐκ ἔστι κακῶς κεχρημένον ἄνδρα
 τοῖς ἰδίοις εἶναι πιστὸν ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις.

3.

Ὡς τεθνηξόμενος τῶν σῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπόλαυε,
 ὥς δὲ βιωσόμενος φείδεο σῶν κτεάνων.
 ἔστι δ' ἀνὴρ σοφὸς οὗτος, ὃς ἄμφω ταῦτα νοήσας
 φειδοῖ καὶ δαπάνῃ μέτρον ἐφηρμόσατο.

4.

Θνητὰ τὰ τῶν θνητῶν καὶ πάντα παρέρχεται ἡμᾶς
 ἦν δὲ μή, ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς αὐτὰ παρερχόμεθα.

5.

Τοῖσι μὲν εὖ πράττουσιν ἅπας ὁ βίος βραχύς ἐστι,
 τοῖς δὲ κακῶς μία νύξ ἀπλετός ἐστι χρόνος.

6.

Οὐχ ὁ Ἔρως ἀδικεῖ μερόπων γένος, ἀλλ' ἀκολάστοις
 ψυχαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἔσθ' ὁ Ἔρως πρόφασις.

7.

Ὀκείαι χάριτες γλυκερώτεραι· ἦν δὲ βραδύνη,
πᾶσα χάρις κενεή, μηδὲ λέγοιτο χάρις.

8.

Φαῦλος ἀνὴρ πίθος ἐστὶ τετρημένος, εἰς δὲν ἀπάσας
ἀντλῶν τὰς χάριτας εἰς κενὸν ἐξέχεας.

9.

Ἀνθρώπους μὲν ἴσως λήσεις ἄτοπὸν τι ποιήσας·
οὐ λήσεις δὲ θεούς, οὐδὲ λογιζόμενος.

10.

Οὐδὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι φύσις χαλεπώτερον εὔρεν
ἀνθρώπου καθαρὰν ψευδομένου φιλίην.
οὐ γὰρ ἔθ' ὥς ἐχθρὸν προφυλασσόμεθ', ἀλλ' ἀγαπῶντες
ὥς φίλον ἐν τούτῳ πλείονα βλαπτόμεθα.

11.

Ἀρρήτων ἐπέων γλώσση σφρηγὶς ἐπικείσθω·
κρείσσων γὰρ μύθων ἢ κτεάνων φυλακή.

12.

Πλοῦτος ὁ τῆς ψυχῆς πλοῦτος μόνος ἐστὶν ἀληθής,
τᾶλλα δ' ἔχει λύπην πλείονα τῶν κτεάνων.
τὸν δὲ πολυκτέανον καὶ πλούσιόν ἐστι δίκαιον
κληῖζειν, ὃς χρῆσθαι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς δύναται.
εἰ δὲ τις ἐν ψήφοις κατατήκεται ἄλλον ἐπ' ἄλλῳ
σωρεύειν αἰεὶ πλοῦτον ἐπειγόμενος,
οὗτος ὅποια μέλισσα πολυτρήτοις ἐνὶ σίμβλοις
μοχθήσει, ἐτέρων δρεπτομένων τὸ μέλι.

13.

Ἀγρὸς Ἀχαιμενίδου γενόμεν ποτέ, νῦν δὲ Μενίππου,
καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ἐτέρου βήσομαι εἰς ἕτερον.
καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἔχειν μέ ποτ' ὤετο, καὶ πάλιν οὗτος
οἴεται, εἰμὶ δ' ὅλως οὐδενός, ἀλλὰ Τύχης.

14.

Εὖ πράττων φίλος εἰ θνητοῖς, φίλος εἰ μακάρεσσι,
καὶ σευ ῥηϊδίως ἔκλυον εὐξαμένον.
ἦν παΐσης, οὐδεὶς ἔτι σοι φίλος, ἀλλ' ἅμα πάντα
ἐχθρὰ Τύχης ῥιπαῖς συμμεταβαλλόμενα.

15.

Πολλὰ τὸ δαιμόνιον δύναται, κἂν ἤ παράδοξα,
 τοὺς μικροὺς ἀνάγει, τοὺς μεγάλους κατὰγει.
 καὶ σοῦ τὴν ὄφρυν καὶ τὸν τύφον καταπαύσει,
 κἂν ποταμὸς χρυσοῦ νάματά σοι παρέχῃ.
 οὐ θρόνον, οὐ μαλάχην ἀνεμὸς ποτε, τὰς δὲ μεγίστας
 ἢ δρύας ἢ πλατάνους οἶδε χαμαὶ κατὰγειν.

16.

Ἦ βραδύπους βουλή μέγ' ἀμείνων, ἡ δὲ ταχεῖα
 αἰὲν ἐφελκομένη τὴν μετάνοιαν ἔχει.

17.

Ἐξ ὧραι μόχοις ικανώταται, αἶ δὲ μετ' αὐτὰς
 γράμμασι δεικνύμεναι ζῆθι λέγουσι βροτοῖς.

18.

Εἰ ταχὺς εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν καὶ πρὸς δρόμον ἀμβλὺς ὑπάρχεις,
 τοῖς ποσὶ σου τρῶγε καὶ τρέχε τῷ στόματι.

19.

Εἰς τί μάτην νίπτεις δέμας Ἰνδικόν; ἴσχεο τέχνης,
 οὐ δύνασαι δνοφερὴν νύκτα καθηλιάσαι.

20.

Οἱ συναγωνιστὰι τὸν πυγμάχον ἐνθάδ' ἔθηκαν
 Ἄπιν, οὐδένα γὰρ πώποτ' ἐτραυμάτισεν.

21.

Πᾶσαν ὅσαν Ἕλληνες ἀγωνοθετοῦσιν ἄμιλλαν
 πυγμῆς, Ἀνδρόλεως πᾶσαν ἀγωνισάμαν.
 ἔσχον δ' ἐν Πίσῃ μὲν ἐν ὠτίον, ἐν δὲ Πλαταιαῖς
 ἐν βλέφαρον· Πυθοὶ δ' ἄπνοος ἐκφέρομαι.
 Δαιμοτέλης δ' ὁ πατὴρ καρύσσετο σὺν πολιῆταις
 ἀραί με σταδίων ἢ νεκρὸν ἢ κολοβόν.

22.

Ἰλαθι Γραμματικὴ φυσίζοε, ἴλαθι λιμοῦ,
 φάρμακον εὐρομένα "μῆνιν αἶδε θεά."
 ἐχρῆν νηὸν καὶ σοὶ περικαλλέα δωμήσασθαι
 καὶ βωμόν θυέων μήποτε δευόμενον.
 καὶ γὰρ σοῦ μεσταὶ μὲν ὁδοί, μεστή δὲ θάλασσα
 καὶ λιμένες, πάντων δέκτρια Γραμματικῇ.

23.

Δαίμονα πολλά λαλῶν ὀξόστομος ἐξορκιστὴς
ἐξέβαλ' οὐχ ὄρκων ἀλλὰ κόπρων δυνάμει.

24.

Οὔτε Χίμαιρα τοιοῦτον ἔπνει κακὸν ἢ καθ' Ὅμηρον,
οὐκ ἀγέλη ταύρων, ὥς ὁ λόγος, πυρίπνους,
οὐ Λήμνος σύμπασα καὶ Ἀρπυιῶν τὰ περισσὰ
οὐδ' ὁ Φιλοκτῆτου ποῦς ἀποσηπόμενος.
ὥστε σε παμψηφεί νικᾶν, Τελέσιλλα, Χιμαίρας,
σηπεδόνας, ταύρους, ὄρνεα, Λημνιάδας.

25.

Ποιητὴς ἐλθὼν εἰς Ἴσθμια πρὸς τὸν ἀγῶνα
εὐρῶν ποιητὰς εἶπε παρίσθμι' ἔχειν.
μέλλει δ' ἐξορμᾶν εἰς Πύθια' κἂν πάλιν εὖρῃ,
εἰπεῖν οὐ δύναται, καὶ παραπύθι' ἔχω.

26.

Εἰπέ μοι εἰρομένῳ, Κυλλήνιε, πῶς κατέβαινεν
Δολλιανοῦ ψυχὴ δῶμα τὸ Φερσεφόνης;
θαῦμα μέν, εἰ σιγῶσα' τυχὸν δέ τι καὶ σε διδάσκειν
ἤθελε' φεῦ, κείνου καὶ νέκυν ἀντιάσαι.

27.

Τὸν τοῦ δειπναρίου νόμον οἶδατέ' σήμερον ὑμᾶς,
Ἀῦλε, καλῶ καινοῖς δόγμασι συμποσίου.
οὐ μελοποιὸς ἐρεῖ κατακείμενος, οὔτε παρέξεις
οὔθ' ἔξεις αὐτὸς πράγματα γραμματικά.

28.

Παῖδά με πενταέτηρον ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντα
νηλειῆς Ἀΐδης ἥρπασε Καλλιμαχον.
ἀλλὰ με μὴ κλαίοις' καὶ γὰρ βιότοιο μετέσχον
παύρου καὶ παύρων τῶν βιότοιο κακῶν.

29.

Ἦχῳ πετρήεσαν ὄρῳ, φίλε, Πανὸς ἐταίρην,
ἀντίτυπον φθογγὴν ἔμπαλιν ἔδομένην,
παντοίων στομάτων λάλον εἰκόνα, ποιμέσιν ἡδὺ
παίγνιον' ὅσσα λέγεις, ταῦτα κλύων ἅπιθι.

30.

Τὴν Παφίην γυμνὴν οὐδεὶς ἶδεν· εἰ δέ τις εἶδεν,
οὗτος ὁ τὴν γυμνὴν στησάμενος Παφίην.

31.

Σοὶ μορφῆς ἀνέθηκα τεῆς περικαλλές ἄγαλμα,
Κύπρι, τεῆς μορφῆς φέρτερον οὐδὲν ἔχων.

32.

Εἰς τὸ κενὸν με τέθεικε νόμον χάριν ὧδε Πρίηπον
Εὐτυχίδης, ξηρῶν κληματίδων φύλακα.
καὶ περιβέβλημαι κρημνὸν βαθύν. ὅς δ' ἂν ἐπέλθῃ,
οὐδὲν ἔχει κλέψαι πλὴν ἐμὲ τὸν φύλακα.

33.

Ἑλλάδα νικήσασαν ὑπέρβιον ἀσπίδα Μήδων
Λαῖς θῆκεν ἐφ' ἀλλεῖ ληϊδίην.
μοῦνῳ ἐνικήθη δ' ὑπὸ γήραϊ, καὶ τὸν ἔλεγχον
ἀνθετο σοί, Παφίη, τὸν νεότητι φίλον.
ῆς γὰρ ἰδεῖν στυγέει πολιῆς παναληθέα μορφήν,
τῇσδε συνεχθαίρει καὶ σκιοέοντα τύπον.

34.

Γλαύκῳ καὶ Νηρηΐ καὶ Ἴνοϊ καὶ Μελικέρτῃ
καὶ βυθίῳ Κρονίδῃ καὶ Σαμόθραξι θεοῖς
σωθεὶς ἐκ πελάγους Λουκίλλιος ὧδε κέκαρμαι
τὰς τρίχας ἐκ κεφαλῆς· ἄλλο γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔχω.

35.

Ἐν πᾶσιν μεθύουσιν Ἀκίνδυνος ἤθελε νήφειν,
τοῦνεκα καὶ μεθύειν αὐτὸς ἔδοξε μόνος.

36.

Ἔσβεσε τὸν λύχρον μῶρος ψυλλῶν ὑπὸ πολλῶν
δακνόμενος λέξας· οὐκέτι με βλέπετε.

37.

Ἦν ἐσίδης κεφαλὴν μαδαρὰν καὶ στέρνα καὶ ὦμους,
μηδὲν ἐρωτήσης, μωρὸν ὀρᾷς φαλακρόν.

38.

Τὴν κεφαλὴν βάπτεις, γῆρας δὲ σὸν οὔποτε βάψεις,
οὐδὲ παρειάων ἐκτανύσεις ῥυτίδας.

μή τοῖνυν τὸ πρόσωπον ἅπαν ψιμίθῳ κατάπлатτε,
 ὥστε προσωπεῖον κούχῃ πρόσωπον ἔχειν.
 οὐδὲν γὰρ πλέον ἐστὶ. τί μαίνεαι; οὐποτε φύκος
 καὶ ψίμυθος τεύξει τὴν Ἑκάβην Ἑλένην.

39.

Οὐδέποτ' εἰς πορθμεῖον ὁ κηλήτης Διόφαντος
 ἐμβαίνει μέλλων εἰς τὸ πέραν ἀπίναι.
 τῆς κήλης δ' ἐπάνωθι τὰ φορτία πάντα τεθεικῶς
 καὶ τὸν ὄνον διαπλεῖ σινδόν' ἐπαράμενος.
 ὥστε μάτην Τρίτωνες ἐν ὕδασι δόξαν ἔχουσιν,
 εἰ καὶ κηλήτης ταῦτ' οὐ ποιεῖν δύναται.

40.

Ὁ γρυπὸς Νίκων ὁσφραίνεται οἶνου ἄριστα,
 οὐ δύναται δ' εἰπεῖν οἶος ἂν ᾗ ταχέως.
 ἐν τρισὶν ὥραις γὰρ θεριναῖς μόλις αἰσθάνετ' αὐτὸς
 ὥς ἂν ἔχων πηχῶν ῥίνα διακοσίων.
 ὦ μεγάλου μυκτῆρος, ὅταν ποταμὸν διαβαίῃ,
 θηρεύει τούτῳ πολλάκις ἰχθύδια.

41.

Ζωγράφει, τὰς μορφὰς κλέπτεις μόνον· οὐ δύνασαι δὲ
 φωνὴν συλῆσαι χρώματι πειθομένην.

42.

Θαυμάζειν μοι ἔπεισιν, ὅπως Βύτος ἐστὶ σοφιστής,
 οὔτε λόγον κοινὸν οὔτε λογισμὸν ἔχων.

43.

Θᾶττον ἔην λευκοὺς κόρακας πτηνάς τε χελώνας
 εὐρεῖν ἢ δόκιμον ῥήτορα Καππαδόκην.

44.

Πολλὰς μυριάδας ψηφίζων Ἄρτεμίδωρος
 καὶ μηδὲν δαπανῶν ζῇ βίον ἡμιόνων,
 πολλάκις αἶψ' χρυσοῦ τιμαλφέα φόρτον ἔχουσαι
 πολλὸν ὑπὲρ νώτου χόρτον ἔδουσι μόνον.

45.

Εἰ τὸ τρέφειν πώγωνα δοκεῖς σοφίαν περιποιεῖν,
 καὶ τράγος εὐπώγων εὖστολός ἐστι Πλάτων.

46.

Τοῦ πωγωνοφόρου Κυνικοῦ τοῦ βακτροπροσαίτου
 εἶδομεν ἐν δειπνῷ τὴν μεγάλην σοφίαν·
 θέρμων μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον ἀπέσχετο καὶ ραφανίδων,
 μὴ δεῖν δουλεύειν γαστρὶ λέγων ἀρετὴν.
 εὖτε δ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἶδεν χιονώδεα βόλβαν
 στρυφνὴν, ἣ πιτυτὸν ἤδη ἔκλεπτε νόον·
 ἤτησεν παρὰ προσδοκίαν καὶ ἔτρωγεν ἀληθῶς,
 κούδεν ἔφη βόλβαν τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀδικεῖν.

47.

Μισόπτωχε θεά, μούνη πλούτου δαμάτειρα,
 ἢ τὸ καλῶς ζῆσαι πάντοτ' ἐπισταμένη·
 εἰ δέ καὶ ἀλλοτρίοις ἐπιῖζομένη ποσὶ χαίρεις,
 ὀπλοφορεῖν τ' οἶδας καὶ μύρα σοι μέλειται,
 τέρπει καὶ στέφανός σε καὶ Αὔσονιου πόμα Βάκχου.
 ταῦτα παρὰ πτωχοῖς γίγνεται οὐδέποτε.
 τοῦνεκά νυν φεύγεις πενίης τὸν ἀχάλκεον οὐδόν,
 τέρπη δ' αὖ πλούτου πρὸς πόδας ἐρχομένη.

48.

Πολλάκις οἶνον ἔπεμψας ἐμοί, καὶ πολλάκις ἔγνων
 σοὶ χάριν, ἡδυπότῳ νέκταρι τερπόμενος.
 νῦν δ' εἶπερ με φιλείς, μὴ πέμψης' οὐ δέομαι γὰρ
 οἶνου τοιούτου, μηκέτ' ἔχων θρίδακας.

49.

Αἱ τρισσαὶ τοι ταῦτα τὰ παίγνια θῆκαν ἐταῖραι,
 Κύπρι μάκαιρ', ἄλλης ἄλλη ἀπ' ἐργασίης.
 ὦν ἀπὸ μὲν πυγῆς Εὐφρώ τάδε, ταῦτα δὲ Κλειώ,
 ὡς θέμις· ἢ τριτάτῃ δ' Ἀθθίς ἀπ' οὐρανίων.
 ἀνθ' ὧν τῇ μὲν πέμπε τὰ παιδικά, δεσπότι, κέρδη,
 τῇ δὲ τὰ θηλείης, τῇ δὲ τὰ μηδετέρης.

50.

Μηδεὶς μοι ταύτην, Ἐρασίστρατε, τὴν σπατάλην σου
 ποιήσῃς θεῶν, ἥ σὺ κατασπαταλῆς,
 ἔσθων ἐκτραπέλως στομάχων κακά, χείρονα λιμοῦ,
 οἷα φάγοιεν ἐμῶν ἀντιδίκων τεκνία.
 πεινάσαιμι γὰρ αὔθις ἔτι πλέον, ἢ πρὶν ἐπεινῶν,
 ἣ χορτασθεῖην τῆς παρὰ σοὶ σπατάλης.

51.

Αἱ τρίχες, ἦν σιγῆς, εἰσὶ φρένες· ἦν δὲ λαλήσης,
ὥς αἱ τῆς ἥβης, οὐ φρένες, ἀλλὰ τρίχες.

52.

Ἰητήρ τις ἐμοὶ τὸν ἐὼν φίλον υἱὸν ἔπεμψεν,
ὥστε μαθεῖν παρ' ἐμοὶ ταῦτα τὰ γραμματικά.
ὥς δὲ τὸ μῆνιν ἄειδε καὶ ἄλγεα μυρὶ' ἔθηκεν
ἔγνω καὶ τὸ τρίτον τοῖσδ' ἀκόλουθον ἔπος,
πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἀῖδι προΐαψεν,
οὐκέτι μιν πέμπει πρὸς με μαθησόμενον.
ἀλλὰ μ' ἰδὼν ὁ πατήρ, σοὶ μὲν χάρις, εἶπεν, ἐτάριε·
αὐτὰρ ὁ παῖς παρ' ἐμοὶ ταῦτα μαθεῖν δύναται.
καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ πολλὰς ψυχὰς Ἀῖδι προΐάπτω
καὶ πρὸς τοῦτ' οὐδὲν γραμματικοῦ δέομαι.

53.

* * * * *

ἀλλὰ σύ μοι προφέρεις τέκνιον ἀλλότριον
τῇν προτομήν αὐτῷ περιθεῖς κυνός· ὥστε με καλεῖν,
πῶς μοι Ζωπυρίων ἐξ Ἑκάβης γέγονεν;
καὶ πέρας ἔξ δραχμῶν Ἑρασίστρατος ὁ κρεοπώλης
ἐκ τῶν Ἰσικίων υἱὸν Ἀνουβιν ἔχω.

1. As stated, this epigram derives from Photius' entry on Lucian. It could simply be an editorial comment, or a bookseller's "blurb." Apart from Photius' appreciation, the brief comments on Lucian by Eunapius, Lactantius, and Isidore of Pelusium (sharply contrasting, of course, with the diatribes of the *Suda*, Arethas, and the scholiasts!) are in the same vein.⁵ It is true that Lucian hardly ever used his own name in his multifarious writings, preferring "Lycinus" or suitably self-flattering nicknames,⁶ but the author's real name is to be expected in a poem prefixed to a collection of his works. It is not impossible that Lucian dashed off this epigram for the above purpose. The trouble is that it is usually dangerous to speak of publication in the modern sense in the context of ancient authors, and there is no evidence that Lucian ever supervised such a collection. However, there is also no evidence that he did not. If he did, then Galen's

⁵Eunapius *VS*, p. 454; Lactantius *Inst. Div.* 1.9; Isidore *Epist.* 4.55. Later *testimonia* are fully discussed in my *Studies in Lucian* (Toronto 1974).

⁶On this matter see Macleod 4; the dialogues in question are the disputed *Soloeicista* and the *Piscator*.

experience with the fraudulent bibliopoles in the Sandalarium suggests that an author needed to be vigilant over his title page.⁷

The Anthology exhibits two similar poems, one ascribed to Theocritus, the other to Ignatius.⁸ It is worth noting that, in the case of the Lucian epigram, the verb "wrote" is variously given by the manuscripts in the first or third person. In the Theocritus poem, this verb seems firmly established in the first person, whereas the equivalent verb is securely in the third person in the case of Ignatius. Not that the point establishes authorship of any of the three pieces, since either person can be used by the author with equal logic.

It should also be observed that the relatively infrequent adverb *διακριδόν* occurs in the Lucianic or pseudo-Lucianic *Amores*;⁹ further, it is quite close in the latter passage to the noun *νόσημα*, which is striking in view of its proximity in the epigram to *νόημα*. A deliberate echo? And, if so, by what author? Or mere coincidence?

2 (= *A.P.* 9.367). The theme of this, the longest of the epigrams in question, is the extravagant misuse of wealth; it is quite appropriate to Lucian, but is an obvious commonplace in the Anthology (so Labarbe, 380–381). The introduction of Menippus looks a tempting clue, especially since the famous Cynic was credited with accumulating a large fortune through usury,¹⁰ which would have given his son something to waste.

Actually, the name proves nothing: it is far too common. There is, for easy example, Menippus the geographer;¹¹ Cicero mentions a sophist who bore the name; a Menippus is mourned on a sepulchral inscription from Chios; and so on. The name also recurs in another of the Lucian epigrams, attached to the owner of a field.¹²

More to the point, perhaps, is the greedy catamite Menippus who is attacked for his rapacity in an epigram by Callimachus (*A.P.* 12.148). Giangrande, in his detailed analysis of the poem, sees the use of the name as a deliberately ironic pointer to the reputation of the Cynic (136–139).

⁷*De Suis Libris* 1 (= 19.8K.); or the Teubner *Galenī scripta minora* (Teubner 1891—reprinted in 1967), vol. 2, 5. For the possibility of ancient, even Lucianic, collection of Lucian's works, see MacLeod (with L. R. Wickham) in *CQ* 20 (1970) 297–299; and MacLeod on the text of the *De Calumniā* in vol. 1 of his *OCT* (1972).

⁸*A.P.* 9.434 (15.39); see Gow's note (on the former) in his *Theocritus* 2 (Cambridge 1950) 549–550, indicating that an identical argument over authorship of this piece has a considerable history.

⁹*Amores* 3. Guyet read *διάκριτον*; but see Kaibel 1028.14.

¹⁰Diogenes Laertius 6.99. His "biography" claims that the Cynic hanged himself after he had been robbed; the tragedy is heightened by the fact that it moved Diogenes to compose some of his execrable verses on the subject.

¹¹Addressed by Crinagoras in *A.P.* 9.559; see the note of Gow-Page, *GP* 2.243.

¹²*Brutus* 91.315; Kaibel, 302; *Ep.* 13 (= *A.P.* 9.74).

This is important. The mercenary catamite is a commonplace in epigrams.¹³ Also, Theron (Menippus' son in the Lucian poem) recurs from time to time in the Anthology (especially in Strato's *Musa Puerilis*) as a catamite.¹⁴ The Lucian epigram draws on a common stock of names and themes. The poem is a serious exercise, not a skit; the introduction of the final moral by *ὥς* conforms to the stylistic norm.¹⁵

The third character in the epigram is Euctemon, who gives his daughter and a large dowry to Theron. The name is common enough (cf. Pape-Benseler), and the Euctemon who was the satellite of Meidias is mentioned in the *Demosthenis Encomium*.¹⁶ Interestingly enough, a Euctemon features in an epigram by Lucillius (*A.P.* 11.393). He suffers from a hydrocele, but is consoled by the poet, who assures him that a daughter is a greater burden, one which he would cheerfully exchange for a hundred hydroceles. Hydrocele jokes occur elsewhere in the Anthology: in one case in an epigram ascribed to Lucian (*Ep.* 39). All this is further demonstration of the recurrence and interrelation of names and themes throughout the Anthology. It may be subjoined that Lucian and Lucillius vie for the authorship (no great prize!) of several of the epigrams in question, as we shall see.

Such particularities will crop up again and again in discussion of other epigrams. They are not conclusive of anything. The recurrent names obviously cannot and will not be correlated with individual characters. They make a useful contribution to the understanding of the framework and conventions of the epigram, and may sometimes hint at the author of a particular poem: that is all. A general discussion of the basic question of Lucianic authorship is reserved for the conclusion of this paper. But it may as well be admitted now that such details are not going to decide anything certain.

Nor will points of style. There is, for example, some parallel to the phraseology of line 2 of the present epigram in Lucian's *Timon* 55. The noun *μαργαρίνη* (line 10) seems not to occur elsewhere in Lucian, nor does the adjective *καρφαλέος* (line 4), though it is found in other poets of the Anthology.¹⁷ Such phenomena are worth remarking, but what do they prove? Lucian could have rehashed the *Timon* phrase in an epigram, or *vice versa*. Or another poet could have liked the phrase and reworked it. Words not found elsewhere in Lucian might indicate that they are ones

¹³Giangrande cites *A.P.* 5.113; 11.320; 12.42, 44, 212.

¹⁴See, e.g., 12.41, 60, 95.

¹⁵Labarbe, 375, compares *A.P.* 11.425 to the present poem.

¹⁶*Dem.Enc.* 48; see my article, "The Authorship and Purpose of Lucian's *Demosthenis Encomium*," *Antichthon* 3 (1969) 54-62.

¹⁷They are absent, at least, from Reitz and from Jacobitz' *Index Graecus*. The former word was used by Anacreon and Theognis. The latter occurs in *A.P.* 9.272 (Bianor); 9.384 (Anonymous).

he did not care for, thus suggesting that the epigram is not from his pen. Alternatively, it is perfectly possible that there are words which a writer, consciously or otherwise, uses only once in his literary career. One's verdict is bound to be influenced by what one conceives of as valid stylometry (and, nowadays, by what one thinks of computer-determined authorship), but no agreed solution will be reached through such approaches.

3 (= *A.P.* 10.26). The theme of thrift or moderation can obviously be related to the previous one; it is equally a commonplace. Thematically, it can be connected with *Epigram* 12 in the collection, which is tolerably striking since there is one small flourish of style common to the two pieces: the emphatic use of *οὗτος* to point the moral. This detail might suggest that both poems are by the same author, whoever he was. Yet even that modest proposal is risky, for the usage is found elsewhere in the Anthology.¹⁸ The paraenetic opening of the present poem is paralleled in *Epigram* 11, but is far too widespread to prove anything (see Labarbe 375).

It may be more notable that *Epigrams* 3, 11, and 12 contain the only Lucianic uses (apart from a mock oracle in *Alexander* 24) of *κτέανον* listed by Reitz and Jacobitz. In each case, the word is in the second line of the poem, always in the genitive plural; it is the last word in the line in two passages, penultimate in the other. Does this denote common authorship (Lucianic or otherwise), or common metrical convenience within the couplet form?¹⁹ Word-breaks after fourth spondees, like the one in line 3, are excessively rare (if we exclude cases where the foot ends in a prospective monosyllable); see Gow-Page xliv—no examples in *GP*, three in *HE*. Would Lucian's metric be so wilful? (See also *Ep.* 44.)

4 (= *A.P.* 10.31). There is little worth saying about this fragment of "cracker-barrel philosophy." Lucian could have written it; so could hundreds of others. The opening is reminiscent of Pindar's *θνατὰ θνατοῖσι πρέπει*, but many a later writer could have adapted this quotable phrase to the hackneyed sentiment (see Labarbe 376 f.).

5 (= *A.P.* 10.28). The previous comment obtains. The sentiment is widespread (Labarbe 377), and the language unremarkable, save that the adjective *ἄπλετος* is nowhere else registered by Reitz or Jacobitz.

¹⁸For the flourish, Labarbe 356; for the parallel, *A.P.* 7.574 (Agathias Scholasticus).

¹⁹See other examples in Kaibel, 118.4 = Peek, *GV* 1007 (genitive plural at end of line); 388.4 (accusative singular, penultimate position); 776.4 (genitive plural, in middle of line); 1064.12 (genitive plural, second word in line).

6 (= *A.P.* 10.29). Lucian liked to make jokes on sexual themes,²⁰ but did not usually moralize on love and lust. This epigram seems unlikely to be by him, but Lucian is not notable for consistency and he was certainly capable of writing to a patron's order. The Homeric-sounding μέρον occurs in *Tragodopodagra* 50.

7 (= *A.P.* 10.30). Paton designated this as an anonymous poem. It should perhaps be connected with the following:

8 (= *A.P.* 9.120). The two cohere in theme and language, and both might be by the same author. The conceit of pouring into an empty jar occurs (with great similarity of language) in *Dial. Mort.* 11.4 (in the context of the daughters of Danaus). It is also found in *Timon* 18 (on the lips of Wealth, the speaker in the dialogue). The significance of these parallels is subject to the aforementioned limitations, and the image may be found in earlier authors, e.g., Theophrastos, *Characters* 20, but I incline for subjective reasons to accept *Epigram* 8 as genuine, leaving the authorship of *Epigram* 7 as unprovable. This is one of four poems ascribed to Lucian which share the extremely rare licence of *syllaba anceps* at pentameter break. Gow-Page, *GP* 1 xli n. 1, admit four cases in *HE* and none in *GP*. Four occurrences in our 217 lines is hardly a coincidence, and suggests unity of authorship for the poems involved: 18, 42, 46 (cf. R. Aubreton, *Anthologie Palatine* 10 [Paris 1972, Budé] 40 n. 9) and this poem.

9 (= *A.P.* 10.27). The religious sentiment is alien to Lucian, though my earlier *caveat* concerning his willingness to write to order should always be kept in mind.

10 (= *A.P.* 10.36). Another commonplace (Labarbe 381). *A.P.* 10.121 is a close verbal parallel. The thought has something in common with *Epigram* 14 (Labarbe), and perhaps with *Calumnia* 14, where friendships are pessimistically viewed as vulnerable to slander. *Navigium* 39 makes the common Lucianic point that rich men and tyrants have only false friends; *Demonax* 10 praises that philosopher for regarding friendship as the greatest of boons. Lucian, of course, consecrated his dialogue *Toxaris* to the theme of friendship, but one cannot help remembering that Cicero was writing about this virtue at the time of the *Second Philippic*! All in all, however, the epigram could be authentic.

²⁰A glance at the *Index Nominum* in H. Licht's *Sexual Life in Ancient Greece* (London 1932) will indicate the frequency of sexual passages in Lucian, though it will be kept in mind that the major sexual pieces (*Amores*, *Asinus*, *Charidemus*) are not usually accepted as genuine. But the *Dial. Mer.* are unchallenged, and Lucian's taste for sexual innuendo against his enemies is pertinent. See e.g., *Adv. Ind.* 23; *Peregrinus* 9; *Rhet. Praec.* 24.

11 (= *A.P.* 10.42). Palladas liked this theme (cf. *A.P.* 10.46, 98). If Lucian wrote the lines, he certainly did not practice what he preached. The paraenetic opening has already been discussed, as has the κτεάνων phenomenon. The Ionic form σφρηγίς is found in *De Dea Syria* 20.

12 (= *A.P.* 10.41). The theme is appropriate to Lucian, and to virtually any satirist or moralist (Labarbe 381). The οὔτος flourish has been discussed before; Reitz and Jacobitz register no other Lucianic use of the verb σωρεύειν (line 6).

13 (= *A.P.* 9.74). The tradition tends to regard this poem as anonymous, and it is usually so regarded by scholars.²¹ The sentiment is Lucianic enough, but fatally common. The conceit of the philosophical field would not be out of place for Lucian, who elsewhere has a litigious letter of the Greek alphabet, and a tyrant's bed and lamp as witnesses in an infernal courtroom.²² However, other poets in the Anthology use the technique,²³ and so the point is inconclusive.

The dangers of inferring anything from the name Menippus have already been discussed. Achaemenides is so infrequent a name²⁴ that it is omitted from Jacobitz' *Index Rerum*.²⁵ One may think of the hapless Achaemenides left behind on Polyphemus' island by Ulysses,²⁶ but he has no obvious relevance. The name was perhaps employed for its overtones of Persian royalty; this would provide a superficially effective contrast with the name of Menippus.

14 (= *A.P.* 10.35). The theme of fickle friends is on a par with *Epigram* 10; see my discussion of that poem (also Labarbe 377). Two linguistic details merit attention. The last word of the epigram (συμμεταβαλλόμενα) is registered only for *Demosthenis Encomium* 46 by Jacobitz and Reitz, outside the present passage. Also, in line 4, the manuscripts vary between ῥιπαῖς and ῥοπαῖς. The former was read by Jacobitz, who gives no other example of the noun in Lucian. Reitz preferred the latter, probably because it occurs in *Demosthenis Encomium* 38, in exactly the same context of Fortune, as well as in *Rhetorum Praeceptor* 9.

As always, it is hard to know what to make of such details, and this particular situation is bedevilled by the long dispute over the authorship of the *Demosthenis Encomium*. It is tempting, however, in spite of this,

²¹So Paton; also Pape-Benseler, s.v. Achaemenides.

²²In the *Iudicium Vocalium*, and *Cataplus* 27.

²³9.3, 4, 6, 75, 78, 79.

²⁴Only registered in this passage by Pape-Benseler.

²⁵As, indeed, was the word ἀγρός from his *Index Graecus*!

²⁶*Aen.* 3.588 f.; see R. D. Williams' note *ad locum*.

and of the manuscript variants, to believe that whoever wrote this dialogue also penned the present epigram.

15 (= *A.P.* 10.122). Manuscript evidence tends towards Lucillius as the author of this piece on the humble and the exalted (so Paton). The theme is a little outside the run-of-the-mill ethical commonplaces in the Anthology (Labarbe 382). The opening phrase and its thought are strikingly paralleled in *Halcyon* 4, but this piece is usually denied to Lucian (cf. MacLeod 303–305). It is also redolent of the celebrated Euripidean tag which concludes the *Alcestis*, *Andromache*, *Bacchae*, *Helen*, and *Medea*; this tag is quoted by Lucian in *Convivium* 48, to round off that dialogue. The epigram may or may not be by Lucian: it is certainly Lucianic.

16 (= *A.P.* 10.37). There is little one can say about this piece. The sentiment could be related to Lucian's philosophical agnosticism, though certainly not to his own frequently hot-headed self. The epithet *βραδύπους* is uncommon, and seems to occur nowhere else in Lucian.

17 (= *A.P.* 10.43). This piece of semantic play has really come down as an anonymous epigram, and Paton so regards it. It would fit the collection of riddles and similar squibs in Book 14 of the Anthology, most of which Paton ascribes to Metrodorus. The attribution of this epigram to Lucian is without much warrant in the manuscripts; it is not impossible, though, that such an acute student of language as the satirist liked to fool sometimes with this sort of play.

18 (= *A.P.* 11.431). The theme of gluttony recurs in *Epigram* 46 (a greedy Cynic) and *Epigram* 50 (on a glutton). Lucillius has a group of epigrams on the theme (*A.P.* 11.205–208), the last of which has the same jest about slow runners who are quick to the table. The general theme is quite Lucianic (e.g., the *Convivium*).

The lengthening of the imperative “*ε*” is paralleled in epigrams by Hedylus and Posidippus (see Giangrande, 158, n. 2), but we have already suggested that the occurrence of *syllaba anceps* at pentameter break in four of our 217 “Lucianic” lines is no coincidence (above, *Ep.* 8).

19 (= *A.P.* 11.428). On the impossibility of turning black into white. Lucian has the proverbial scrubbing of the Ethiopian in *Adversus Indoctum* 28, and Zeus regards an Ethiopian tan as one of the marks of fake philosophers in *Bis Accusatus* 6.

The adjective *δυοφερός* is not registered elsewhere in Lucian by Reitz or Jacobitz; as applied to night, however, it is Homeric, and the phrase

occurs in sepulchral hexameters.²⁷ The verb *καθηλιάζω* is equally isolated; indeed, *LSJ* cites only this occurrence.

Both theme and Homeric flourishes are utterly Lucianic,²⁸ and it is quite likely that Lucian wrote this epigram.

20 (= *A.P.* 11.80). On the statue of the useless boxer Apis. This poem needs to be assessed along with the following:

21 (= *A.P.* 11.81). On the equally ineffectual pugilist Androleos. Both epigrams are usually assigned to Lucillius; they have been exhaustively analysed by Louis Robert (181 f.). The theme was certainly a favourite of Lucillius.²⁹ Androleos is a very uncommon name; Lucian has the commoner Androgeos.³⁰ Apis is a professional name, connoting the Egyptian bull.³¹ Lucian liked to poke fun at the latter (*De Sacrificiis* 15; *Charon* 13; *De Astrologia* 7; *De Dea Syria* 6), and a joke about a boxer called Apis might be seen as a logical extension of this motif. Might the serious metrical fault incurred in order to bring Apis into *Ep.* 20 suggest that the name is one used by an actual boxer? As might be expected from the author of the *Anacharsis*, Lucian knew enough about the prevalence of Egyptian athletes to include the boxer Areius from that country in the mock contests in *Vera Historia* 2.22.³² It is notable that Areius draws his bout, and is not ridiculed. Jokes against boxers are not a normal Lucianic motif, and the evidence points to Lucillius as the author of these epigrams, but Lucian was capable of ridiculing anything out of personal spite, and the theme is not impossible for him.

The name Damoteles in *Epigram* 21 is omitted from Jacobitz' index; it does not assist in the search for the author.

22 (= *A.P.* 11.400). An invocation to Grammar. Sincere or ironic? The Anthology is full of attacks on grammar and grammarians.³³ Lucian's statement that Grammar's cure for hunger is the opening of Homer's *Iliad* is reversed in *A.P.* 9. 169 (Palladas), and *A.P.* 11.140 (Lucillius). The concluding parody of the opening of Aratus' *Phenomena* has a Lucianic flavour, for the satirist likes quoting the original (*Prometheus* 14; *Icaromenippus* 24).

²⁷*Od.* 13.269; Kaibel, 1046.26.

²⁸See O. Bouquiaux-Simon, *Les Lectures Homériques de Lucien* (Brussels 1965).

²⁹*A.P.* 11.75, 76, 79 (to cite but a few); see also H. A. Harris, *Greek Athletes and Athletics* (London 1964) 101.

³⁰Androleos. Only here in Pape-Benseler; Androgeos in *De Saltatione* 49.

³¹See Robert, 236–237, for an amusing account.

³²See Robert for Egyptian boxers; Bompaire sees this epigram as Lucianic, but does not say why.

³³9.169, 173, 489; 11.138, 139, 140, 321, 322.

According to his mood of the moment, Lucian was capable of penning a sincere or a mocking tribute to Grammar (one also recalls the Goddess Gout). The Aratus parody is not conclusive as to authorship; in view of Lucian's liking for the original, the epigram could be seen as a poem written by someone with Lucian in mind. The references to Homer's exordium to the *Iliad*, and the hunger motif, are quite standardized within the Anthology's poems on grammar and grammarians.³⁴

23 (= *A.P.* 11.427). This attack on a stinking exorcist can be compared to *Philopseudes* 16 (thought by a furious scholiast to be an attack on Christ), where an unnamed Syrian from Palestine is described as casting out devils for large fees; also with *Dial. Mer.* 4.4, where an old Syrian hag supplies love-spells to courtesans to bring back faithless lovers (a nice touch, in context) at modest prices. The dung motif is also in keeping, since the *Alexander* opens with a comparison of the filthy tale of the false prophet to the accumulations in the Augean stables. The epigram is very likely to be genuine.

24 (= *A.P.* 11.239). An attack on Telesilla. Lucillius is usually credited with this lampoon. Personal abuse of women is not typical of Lucian. The poetess Telesilla is mentioned favourably in the disputed *Amores* 30; she is commended in a list of female poets in *A.P.* 9.26 (Antipater of Thessalonica), and had something of an enduring reputation.³⁵ However, the poetess need not be meant. The name occurs in a sepulchral inscription, and, as the dedicator of a weaving-comb, in a poem by Antipater of Sidon.³⁶

25 (= *A.P.* 11.129). This epigram on a mumpsy poet is generally ascribed to Cerealis or Cerealius; it occurs in a group of epigrams on poets (*A.P.* 11.127–137) by Antipater of Sidon, Pollianus, and Lucillius. Attacks on poets are rare in Lucian, largely no doubt because of the relative dearth of them, compared with sophists and archaists, in the second century; however, there is some general mockery of poets and poetry (especially epic) in, e.g., *Jupiter Tragoedus* 6. It is quite possible that Lucian had the chance to belittle some poetaster of the time; alternatively, that he invented the target in order to utilise the *παρὰνθια* joke.

Although the circumstances are different, it is of peripheral relevance that there is a peculiar account of Nero's tragic ambitions at the Isthmian Games in *Nero* 9 (this dialogue, of course, is usually regarded as spurious).

³⁴Bompaire connects this epigram with the *Convivium* (he presumably had *Conv.* 40 in mind), but does not elaborate.

³⁵Athenaeus 467 f.

³⁶Kaibel, 676; *A.P.* 6.160.

There is also the elaborate anecdote concerning the Pythian ambitions of Evangelus of Tarentum retailed in *Adversus Indoctum* 8.

26 (= *A.P.* 11.274). This squib against Lollianus is very likely to be genuine. That is, assuming that the butt is Lollianus of Ephesus, the second-century sophist immortalized by Philostratus.³⁷ One infers from the biographer's account that Lollianus was an Asianist, and materially successful: both aspects would be enough to provoke Lucian, especially if there was also something personal between them. Bompaigne connects the epigram with *Dial. Mort.* 10, presumably because a recently deceased rhetorician is mocked there. It may be more to the point to observe that the length of the epigram is identical to the inscription set up in Athens to celebrate Lollianus' skill.³⁸ The epigram might be a parody of, or counterblast to, this.

The mock-epic flavour of the opening, though paralleled in sepulchral epigrams,³⁹ is completely Lucianic. Yet it has to be admitted that the Anthology exhibits epigrams on rhetoricians by Lucillius and other poets (11.141–152); Lucian had no patent on the theme.

27 (= *A.P.* 11.10). Usually ascribed to Lucillius. A certain Aulus (omitted from Jacobitz' index) is invited to a banquet with the promise that it will not be spoiled by poets or men of letters. (Aulus is enjoined to obey the new rules himself.)

This poem is typical of the problems facing us. On the one side, it coheres with the *Convivium* (and when one reads it, the soirées of Aulus Gellius come to mind); the "law" enunciated in *Saturnalia* 13, which precludes literary activities on festive days, also will be recollected. Yet the theme is timeless, and one may just as validly adduce the post-Lucianic *Deipnosophistae*. One would like to equate the Aulus of the epigram with Aulus Gellius, but dare we?⁴⁰

28 (= *A.P.* 7.308). The touching commonplace of untimely death, in this case of the five-year old boy Callimachus. The theme is all too

³⁷*VS*, p. 527 (W.C. Wright, in the Loeb *Philostratus*, accepts the epigram as Lucianic, but without discussion). For Lollianus, see O. Schissel, "Lollianus aus Ephesos," *Philologus* 82 (1927) 181–201, and G. W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford 1969) 18, 26, 57.

³⁸Kaibel, 877; see Bowersock (above, note 37) 57, n. 1.

³⁹Kaibel, 110.1 = Peek, *GV* 1872 (for *ἐπὶ*), cf. Peek 1356, 1834, and (with *ἐπὶ* and *φράζε*) 1868–1871; 414.9 = Peek *GV* 1090 (Kyllenian Hermes); see Lucian *Dial. Deorum* 22 for Kyllenian Hermes.

⁴⁰F. G. Allinson, *Lucian: Satirist and Artist* (New York 1927) fancied that Lucian and Aulus Gellius both attended the soirées at the Cephisia villa of Herodes Atticus: a piquant thought. However, Aulus features in another Lucillius epigram, and the name is common enough (see Pape-Benseler's list).

prevalent in both literary and sepulchral epigram.⁴¹ The epithet here attached to Hades is not registered elsewhere in Lucian by Reitz or Jacobitz, but is common in the context of fate or death, and the statistic is inconclusive.⁴² The sentiment that death spares the victim the woes of life might seem suitable to Lucian, but is closely paralleled in a poem by Philetas of Samos (*A.P.* 7.481). It is treated in a more brutal fashion by Lucian in *De Luctu* 17; of peripheral relevance is the satire on stock lamentations (excluding, however, the present theme) in *Cataplus* 20.

29 (= *A.P.* 16.154). This exercise on a statue of Echo is variously attributed to Lucian or Archias; it occurs in a small group of such poems by a number of hands.⁴³ It only seems worth noting that Echo as the garrulous girl friend of Pan is also adduced in *Dial. Mar.* 1.4, and *Dial. Deorum* 22.4.

30 (= *A.P.* 16.163). One of an interminable number of poems on the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles. Lucian has several conventional references to the celebrated statue (e.g., *Pro Imaginibus* 23); there is a detailed study of it in the dubious *Amores*; a small jest about the provenance of the marble and the transmogrification of goddess into statue is attempted in *Jupiter Tragoedus* 10. Lucian was keenly interested in the visual arts (partly a legacy from his upbringing as described in the *Somnium*?), and could well have written a conventional exercise on the theme.

31 (= *A.P.* 16.164). This dedication of a statuette of Aphrodite to the Cyprian herself is misplaced in the above collection of poems to the Cnidian statue. Paton compares *A.P.* 6.7, in which the boxer Scaeus dedicates a statuette to Apollo. The Anthology pullulates with such epigrams (cf. Labarbe 369–370).

32 (= *A.P.* 16.238). A mild joke on *Priapea*, comparable to *Epigram* 49 (a bawdier skit on dedications to Pan). The number of formal poems on this theme is almost as large as the god's major attribute. Lucian waxes frivolous on Priapus' sexuality in *Dial. Deorum* 23, and this epigram is quite in keeping. Eutyichides (omitted from Jacobitz' index) is a frequent name in the poems of the Anthology, especially in the satirical epigrams of Lucillius,⁴⁴ which may or may not be significant in the present context.

33 (= *A.P.* 6.20). This exercise on Lais' loss of beauty is usually credited to Julian, Prefect of Egypt, with whom the theme was something of a

⁴¹See Labarbe 366–367; R. Lattimore, *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* (Urbana, Ill. 1962). See *A.P.* 7 in general, and Kaibel, 697a, for an identical opening in the case of a deceased five-year old.

⁴²See Kaibel, 647.11 = Peek, *GV* 1571, for *νηλὴς θάνατος*.

⁴³16.152, 153, 155, 156.

⁴⁴11.133 (a dead bad poet); 177 (a thief); 208 (a glutton and slow runner).

favourite. The theme is an obvious commonplace, with or without Lais;⁴⁵ in *Dial. Mort.* 18, Hermes points out to Menippus the faded beauty of Helen and others in Hades. Lais is omitted from this sad register, but Lucian had another, perhaps worse fate in store for her in Hades in *Vera Historia* 2.18: marriage to Diogenes.

34 (= *A.P.* 6.164). Lucillius dedicates his lock of hair to Glaucus, Nereus, and Melicertes. Paton gives the epigram to Lucian, whereas MacLeod assigns it to Lucillius (presumably influenced by the name of the dedicant). This is hardly a conclusive reason, though a neighbouring epigram (*A.P.* 6.166) which has Dionysius (saved, like Lucillius, from the deep) dedicate the image of his hydrocele in gratitude is by Lucillius.

It is worth noting that the commonplace first line of the present epigram was discussed, in the context of Parthenius and Vergil, by Aulus Gellius (*NA* 13.27); this might just suggest that the cliché had a certain vogue in Lucian's time.

35 (= *A.P.* 11.429). This squib is the first of the epigrams conventionally printed as the *Epigrammata Omissa*. All but one appear in the collection of satirical epigrams in Book 11 of the Anthology. The situation of Acindynus is strikingly reminiscent of that of Lycinus in the *Convivium*, though the sobriety of Socrates in the *Symposium* could also have been in the author's mind.

The name Acindynus is rare, and looks suspiciously appropriate in context. It is borne by an *ab epistulis Latinis* of Augustus, and one is also tempted to think of the Septimii Acindyni of the late third and fourth centuries, though a reference to any of these would obviously rule out Lucian as the author of the epigram.⁴⁶

The phraseology of the first line is close to *Nigrinus* 6, where it is said that to be drunk on the wisdom of Nigrinus is really to be sober. Of marginal relevance is *Hermotimus* 47, where Lycinus quotes the adage of Epicharmus about the need to "keep sober and remember to disbelieve."

Speculation is extravagant, but one is tempted to say that this poem might not be by Lucian, but by someone who had Lucian's writings in mind. Indeed, Acindynus might even be taken as a nice name for the satirist who called himself Parresiades!

36 (= *A.P.* 11.432). This equivalent to our ostrich-in-the-sand motif is omitted from MacLeod's conspectus. I can only say that I need a stronger light than the fool's lamp to see any clue to authorship here.

⁴⁵Labarbe 377; Bompairé compares the debunking of Helen's beauty in *Gallus* 17.

⁴⁶*CIL* 6.8609, M. T. W. Arnheim, *The Senatorial Aristocracy in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford 1972) 193–194, cf. *PLRE* 1.11.

37 (= *A.P.* 11.434). A bald fool. Paton's notion that this might allude to a Cynic is surely wrong, since that breed was notorious for long hair. One of the conceits in *Vera Historia* 1.23 is that bald men are considered beautiful on the moon, in logical contrast to the ethos of those who live on comets. There could be an allusion to the adoxographical popularity of baldness.⁴⁷

The adjective *μαδαρός* (line 1) is not registered elsewhere in Lucian by Reitz or Jacobitz, and only here by *LSJ* in the sense of bald.

38 (= *A.P.* 11.408). Cosmetic deceit is a frequent motif (Labarbe 379), and is used by Lucian against his enemy in *Adversus Indoctum* 23. The concluding punch that rouge and paste cannot make a Helen out of a Hecuba is striking in view of *Gallus* 17, where it is claimed that Helen was really as old as Hecuba at the time of the Trojan War. The repeated failure of mute and liquid to make position is most irregular.

39 (= *A.P.* 11.404). The hydrocele of Diophantus. The hydrocele motif has already been discussed. Lucian was all too capable of extracting humour from physical disability, but had no monopoly on this unpleasant ancient trait. A rhetorician called Diophantus is mentioned in a neutral way in *Dial. Mort.* 10, but the name is frequent in the Anthology in the usual variety of roles.⁴⁸

40 (= *A.P.* 11.405). The hook-nosed Nicon is also the butt of *A.P.* 11.406 (Nicarchus), and the theme is not uncommon.⁴⁹

The epithet *γυρνός* is omitted in Jacobitz' index, and only registered for this poem by Reitz. In general, the comment on the previous epigram obtains.

41 (= *A.P.* 11.433). The notion that painters cannot capture the full essence of their subjects smacks of Plato. It is a theme found elsewhere in the Anthology (Labarbe 382), but is quite untypical of Lucian's general attitude to the art. Had a painter been attacked by name, this might have been a case of Lucian's spite overcoming his principles, but the epigram has no formal victim.

42 (= *A.P.* 11.435). Butos is an uncommon name; it is just worthwhile to adduce the rhetorician Buteo, mentioned by the elder Seneca, *Controv.* 2.5.15. See the discussion of *Epigram* 26 for the theme in general, and that of *Epigrams* 8 and 18 for *syllaba anceps* at pentameter break.

⁴⁷On these trifles see A. S. Pease, "Things without Honor," *CP* 21 (1926) 27-42.

⁴⁸6.4 (fisherman); 11.114 (doctor), 257 (victim of doctor); 14.126 (in a riddle).

⁴⁹11.198, 199; also 11.203, 204.

43 (= *A.P.* 11.436). The bad accent of Cappadocians is ridiculed also by Philostratus.⁵⁰ Cappadocians were proverbial butts, though other nations and cities are the targets of ethnic jokes in the Anthology 11.438–440). Lucian would not be above such sneers, especially if provoked by some individual member of that race.

44 (= *A.P.* 11.397). Artemidorus the miser. The theme would be suitable to Lucian (one recollects the attacks on the rich in the *Saturnalia*), but there are poems on the topic in the Anthology, by Lucillius and others (11.165–173). *ψηφίζω* gives a second example of word-break after fourth spondee—cf. *Ep.* 3.

45 (= *A.P.* 11.430). This equation of hispidity with wisdom is best related to the following:

46 (= *A.P.* 11.410). A gluttonous Cynic. Such jokes are entirely in the Lucianic manner; the greedy philosopher, for instance, can easily be referred to the *Convivium*.⁵¹ But the theme was not restricted to Lucian, and the subject is no guide to authorship (cf. *A.P.* 11.153–158). For *syllaba anceps* at pentameter break see the discussions on *Epigrams* 8 and 18.

The compound *βακτροπροσαίτης* (*Ep.* 46, line 1) is a *hapax legomenon*.

47 (= *A.P.* 11.403). One automatically thinks of Lucian in the context of the Goddess Gout, thanks to his delightful skit *Tragodopodagra*.⁵² However, there was also the *Ocypus*, which is probably spurious,⁵³ and the malady was the theme of adoxographical exercises.⁵⁴ It is possible that Lucian himself suffered from the disease (*Heracles* 7; *De Mercede* 31, 39), but so did Fronto and many others.⁵⁵

The epigram begins with a *hapax legomenon*, which is a striking introduction to the poem's theme that gout is the enemy only of the rich. This commonplace is found elsewhere in Lucian (*Menippus* 11; *Saturnalia* 28). However, in *Tragodopodagra* 70, the victim is a poor man. The epigram hopefully lists Italian wine and ointments as remedies, but in the playlet the Goddess routs the Syrian doctors (a nice touch, in view of Lucian's origins) and their much-boasted salve. Inconsistencies of detail

⁵⁰*VS*, p. 594; *Vit. Apoll.* 1.7.

⁵¹Thus Bompaire, with the usual lack of elaboration.

⁵²See MacLeod, 319 f., and the edition by J. Zimmermann (Leipzig 1909).

⁵³See MacLeod for the theory that it was written by Acacius, the friend of Libanius.

⁵⁴See Pease (above, note 47).

⁵⁵See Aulus Gellius *NA* 2.26.1 (Fronto), 4.13 (for an unlikely cure by listening to soothing music); one recalls that Dryden, in his so-called *Life of Lucian* (1696), concluded that Lucian died of the malady.

in such humour are not conclusive of anything, but they help to show that an epigram on gout is not necessarily by Lucian.

A two-line epigram by Hedylus (*A.P.* 11.414) regards gout as the limb-relaxing consequence of limb-relaxing Wine and Love.

48 (= *A.P.* 11.396). A rejoinder to one who sends out bad wine as a gift. The theme is as stale as the wine.⁵⁶

49 (= *A.P.* 6.17). A bawdy skit on dedicatory exercises in honour of Pan, six of which immediately precede it in the Anthology.⁵⁷ The parody is interesting in its details. Three whores, Kleio, Euphro, and Atthis, make suitably lubricious dedications to Venus. The triad conforms to the Pan dedications, which almost invariably come in threes. Euphro appears in a parallel poem by Hedylus or Asclepiades (*A.P.* 6.161), along with Thais and Boidion (cf. Luck 400). Kleio (or Kleo) is mentioned as a glutton and boozier in Athenaeus; in the second connection, she was attacked in an epigram by Phalaecus.⁵⁸ Atthis makes a post-partum dedication in a poem by Leonidas of Tarentum (*A.P.* 6.202).

The humour involved, and the attention to detail, tempt one to accept the poem as Lucianic. Unhappily, as always, the self-same details revealed by analysis indicate that both theme and treatment are too conventional to prove anything.

50 (= *A.P.* 11.402). Another poem on gluttony, this time attacking a certain Erasistratus; see the discussion of *Epigram* 18. The name of Erasistratus recurs in another context in *Epigram* 53.

The noun *σπατάλη* (lines 1, 6) is omitted from the indexes of Reitz and Jacobitz, as is the compound verb in line 2. *LSJ* demonstrates that the noun is quite common in the Anthology, but registers the verb only in the present passage and the Septuagint.

51 (= *A.P.* 11.420). An anonymous poem on the wisdom of silence on the part of an unnamed person with grey hair. This is yet another common theme in the Anthology;⁵⁹ the closest parallel to the present poem is the one preceding it by Philo.

52 (= *A.P.* 11.401). On a killer doctor. Bompaire correlated this piece with the *Convivium*, presumably because of the farcical doctor Dionicus

⁵⁶Apart from the Anthology, see Rhianus 3246 (Gow-Page), with Giangrande's discussion, 410.

⁵⁷6.111–116; cf. 6.179–187.

⁵⁸Ath. 345a; 440d; Luck 398–399.

⁵⁹Labarbe 381; *A.P.* 10.46, 98; 11.310.

in that dialogue (*Convivium* 20). In spite of this character, and the rout of the Syrian doctors in the *Tragodopodagra*, jokes against the medical profession are not typical of Lucian.⁶⁰ They are, however, common in the Anthology (11.112–126).

53 (= *A.P.* 11.212). A complaint against a hopeless painter by the butcher Erasistratus concerning the portrait of his son Zopyrion. The epigram is assigned to Lucillius by Paton, who supplies an opening line which gives the painter the name of Diodorus.⁶¹ There are two other epigrams on the same theme by Lucillius (*A.P.* 11.214, 215), and one by Leonidas of Alexandria (*A.P.* 11.213); this latter also attacks Diodorus.

The name Erasistratus has been discussed. A servile Zopyrion is alluded to in *De Mercede Conductis* 23. Lucian's concern for painting, and his penchant for personal attacks, make it not impossible that he could have written this poem.

Finally, there is *A.P.* 11.411, on the theme of an overheated bath. As MacLeod notes, Paton attributed this epigram to Lucian in his index, but has it as anonymous in his text. The attribution was probably a simple error. The poem is not usually included in editions of Lucian.

For the record, *A.P.* 9.617 has the reverse joke of a bath that is too cold. The epigram might most charitably be viewed as a welcome comment on the tedious bath poems in Book 9 of the Anthology. But it also recalls the *Hippias*, Lucian's tiresome ecphrasis on the same subject!

The results of the above analyses are meagre, but inescapable. Not one of the epigrams can definitely be assigned to Lucian, and very few (if any) are quite impossible. In the present state of knowledge, this situation will not change. The reader will have to react subjectively; I have set out what seem to me to be the salient details, but have only rarely offered a formal opinion on the authorship of this or that epigram, for the very good reason that I have found no positive way of coming to a decision. Dull, but honest.

It has been seen that the poems frequently exhibit words not used elsewhere by Lucian. This fact decides nothing. He could well have reserved certain words for his poetic vocabulary; or such phenomena may simply be a reflection of a writer's unconscious selection. Equally inconclusive is the demonstration that there are occasional echoes (sometimes close ones) of Lucianic phraseology. This could be Lucian

⁶⁰See J. D. Rolleston, "Lucian and Medicine," *Janus* 20 (1915) 86–108; H. Crosby, "Lucian and the Art of Medicine," *TAPA* 54 (1923) xv–xvi. Still, it would be a pity to overlook the comment in Athenaeus 666a: "Were it not for doctors, there wouldn't be anything stupider than grammarians."

⁶¹11.112–126.

repeating himself, Lucian imitating someone else, or someone else borrowing from Lucian.

The majority of the themes and techniques suit Lucian; the trouble is, they would always suit any one of a number of poets represented in the Anthology.

Manuscript ascriptions decide nothing. The presence of Lucian's name does not confer authenticity; it could result from an editorial guess or the fraudulent use of a name that "sells," or simply refer to another Lucian. For the satirist was not the only Lucian; it is sufficient to recall the shadowy sophist of this name, to whom the emperor Julian addressed a letter (*Ep.* 64).

Lucian was a versatile writer, and there is no reason to deny that he could have written some epigrams. The second century was not barren of poets: Strato and Mesomedes are the most pertinent examples, and there are a number of verse inscriptions. Lucian might occasionally have entered into epigrammatic exchanges such as those between Hadrian and Florus. If he ever really endured the life so mordantly portrayed in the *De Mercede Conductis*, one might trace the source of some of his inspirations to the table and the atmosphere of poetic competition over the wine. It is impossible to decide whether the poems should be regarded as *juvenilia*, *senilia*, or simply occasional verses dashed off throughout his career.

There is only one certitude. Whatever their provenance, the *Epigrams* conform in themes, techniques, nomenclature, and language to the conventions of the genre. This is not a blanket condemnation of them, for not all conventions are bad ones: it is simply to state a fact. If Lucian wrote them, he conformed to the rules of the epigrammatic game. Those who find this conclusion unpalatable had better deny him their authorship. By the same token, it will be useful, perhaps even pleasing, for those critics who still worship in the temple of Mimesis.⁶²

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

⁶²τεκνίον εὐμορφον, Διόδωρε, γράφειν σ' ἐκέλευσα.

I wish to thank two anonymous referees of *Phoenix* for their very helpful criticisms, and also Associate Editor M. B. Wallace for his many valuable references and observations.